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INTRODUCTION

This book attempts to understand the origins, functions, organizations, and social and legal status of the collegia centonariorum in the Roman Empire. Laberius (c. 106–43 BC), one of the most distinguished writers of mimes, once wrote a mime entitled Centonarius, which, unfortunately, has not survived. We do have, however, a portrayal in Petronius’s Satyricon (45–46) of a centonarius called Echion, who was one of Trimalchio’s guests. Echion chattered on about the upcoming gladiatorial shows, throwing in comments and gossips here and there. As in the protagonist Trimalchio himself, the contrast of material prosperity and cultural insecurity/poverty can be seen in Echion.1 When Echion suspected that Agamemnon was bored with his talks, he quickly mentioned his villa and cottage (casula), and began to voice his opinions concerning his son’s education.2 “Learning is a treasure, and a trade doesn’t die (Litterae thesaurum est, et artificium nunquam moritur),” concluded Echion with this rather favorable verdict towards trade and occupation (artificium). The meaning of the word centonarius in both instances, however, has been a puzzle to the students of Latin literature and language. One scholar of Latin literature recently commented in frustration that “no definite decision can be made as to the exact meaning of the word (one who extinguishes fire by using mats or a clothes-dealer?).”3 Centonarius may be an obscure word to today’s students of Latin and Roman history, but it was by no means an unfamiliar term in Roman times. In fact, the guilds of the centonarii (collegia centonariorum) were conspicuously present in numerous Western cities over a period of time stretching from at least the first to the fourth centuries AD. In the town of Interamna Praetuttiorum (Picenum, Regio V), for example, the communal tomb of the local collegium centonariorum measured as much as 1,200 Roman feet (no. 54) in dimension. Not only were the inscriptions put up by, and for, them a familiar feature

---

1 The literature is vast, see, for example, Courtney 2001: 91–93.
2 Petronius had Echion characterize his own words as pauperorum verba (Satyr. 46.1). Since these freedmen were certainly not ‘poor’, Goldman (2008: 61) points out “the phrase suggests pauperes verborum, a problem” “not of the freedmen but of the scholastici.”
of the urban landscape, but the members seemed to have even enjoyed legal privileges such as *immunitas* in certain places no later than the late second century AD. Since they are relatively well documented and were prominent among Roman *collegia*, the *collegia centonariorum* clearly merit a separate and thorough examination. Such a study is further necessitated by the multitude of conflicting opinions concerning the nature and functions of these *collegia*.

The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (*TLL*) defines *centonarius* as *is qui centones consuit, vendit, ad incendia extinguentia et ad usus militares suppeditat*. But in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (*OLD*), *centonarius* becomes simply “A fireman who used mats for extinguishing fires.” No final consensus as such has ever been reached on this subject, although scholars generally assumed that the primary function of the *collegia centonariorum* was fire-fighting until O. M. van Nijf questioned their assumption in 1997.

The fire-fighting hypothesis was deduced essentially from three types of evidence: (1) in epigraphic records, the *collegia centonariorum* are often mentioned together with the *collegia fabrum*, whose role as fire brigades is implied in the correspondence between Pliny the Younger and Trajan (*Ep. 10.33–34*); (2) *centones* are among the fire-fighting instruments listed in the *Dig. 33.7.12.18* (Ulpianus 20 *ad sab.*); (3) the existence of a certain *centuria centonariorum dolabra* (*scalae*). Since *centones*, *dolabra* and *scalae* have nothing in common except as fire-fighting instruments, this *centuria* has been considered as a division in a larger fire-brigade.

O. Hirschfeld (1884) and H. C. Maué (1886) disagreed on whether *centonarius* was an occupational title or not, but agreed on the *centonarii*’s involvement in fire-fighting. J.-P. Waltzing subscribed to Maué’s opinion that the *centonarii* had double roles as a type of textile workers/tradesmen (*drapiers*) and fire-fighters. B. Sirks (1990) ‘assigned’ both fire-fighting and night-watch duties to the so-called *tria collegia*

---

5 In *Roberti Stephani lexicographorum principis. Thesaurus lingue latine* (Basileae, 1740–1743), *centonarius* was defined as *qui centones conficit, in obsidione necessarios*. But *centonarii* were defined as *qui tabernacula & castrensem supellectilem, quos centones vocaverunt, suppeditabant*.
7 Maué 1886: 8–18; Waltzing II: 195. See also *RE* III: 1933–1934; Rostovzeff, *SEHRE* I: 409–10; Linderski 1957: 24–37; Alföldy 1966: 433–44; Weber 1968 and 1969 (his opinions have not been consistent: he was more inclined to Hirschfeld in the former than in the latter; De Robertis 1963: 236; 1971: esp. 106; Jones, *LRE*: 695; 1285, n. 16;
(the \textit{collegia fabrum}, the \textit{collegia centonariorum} and the \textit{collegia dendrophorum}), which form his Type A \textit{corpora}, as opposed to his Type B \textit{corpora}, which served the \textit{annona} (food supply system).\footnote{According to Sirks 1990: 86–89, 93, the differences between the two types of \textit{corpora} are as follows: for Type A \textit{corpora}, the exemption is intended only for the more impecunious members, while the members of Type B \textit{corpora} “could benefit from the exemption precisely because they were able to shoulder the \textit{munera};” Type A did not acquire the status of \textit{corpus} until under Marcus Aurelius, while Type B “achieved the qualification of corpus right from their beginnings”.} According to him, none of the \textit{collegia} belonging to these two categories should be duly considered as occupational \textit{collegia}. A variant of this theory can be found in P. Kneissl (1994), who grouped the \textit{centonarii} with the \textit{fabri tignarii}, the \textit{fabri subaediani}, and the \textit{dolabrarii} as fire brigades in the Western provinces. Kneissl insisted that \textit{centonarius} was not an occupational title at all. Instead, he argued that the existence of rich \textit{centonarii} would preclude any association of the title with makers of, or dealers in, \textit{centones}, which was relatively valueless material for slaves and the poor, and that people joined the \textit{collegia centonariorum}, regardless of occupation, to seek the recognition and prestige that came with fire-fighting. According to Kneissl, membership of the \textit{collegia centonariorum} should be understood as analogous to that of the \textit{corpus Augustalium}, which was not a marker of occupation but rather of social status.\footnote{Kneissl 1994: 133–46. See also Kneissl 1977: 133; 1998: 447. For similar views, see Ausbüttel: 72–76; Vicari 2001: 12. The earliest argument along these lines can be found in Hirschfeld 1884.}

Since we lack any reference to their supposed fire-fighting activities, van Nijf questioned the traditional view associating the \textit{collegia centonariorum} with fire brigades.\footnote{Van Nijf 1997: 177–81; 1999: 198. See also Salamito 1987: 999.} He suggested instead that these \textit{collegia}, as well as the \textit{collegia fabrum} and the \textit{collegia dendrophorum}, should be understood as parallel to the ‘civic guard’ in early modern Holland, serving as \textit{de facto} status groups for the more successful craftsmen and tradesmen from a wide range of trades. R. Lafer (2001), however, identified the \textit{fabri}, \textit{fabri tignarii}, \textit{fabri subaediani}, \textit{centonarii}, \textit{dendrophori}, \textit{utric(u)larii}, \textit{dolabrarii} and \textit{scalarii}, even \textit{scabillarii} and \textit{subrutores cultores Silvani} as fire brigades without much justification. For Lafer, these were what the call \textit{omnes collegiati} that was shouted out in case of fire in the Late Antique Byzantium would have meant. Quite
recently, however, J. S. Perry (2006) provided very helpful insights into the various modern assumptions and agendas that had influenced the modern historiography of *collegia*. In his analysis, the deduction that Roman cities must have had some comparable form of fire protection betrayed the kind of reasoning that assumed Roman civilization to be advanced, forward-thinking, rational, and far-sighted.

The different opinions on the identification of the title *centonarius*, and the composition and the functions of the *collegia centonariorum*, would have different implications on our understanding of both socio-economic history and urbanism in the Roman World. Yet, these implications have been rarely expounded on in a systematic fashion. Given the long history of their existence (at least from the first century to the fourth century AD), and wide geographical distribution, however, we are bound to ask: How and why did the *collegia centonariorum* originate and proliferate? Were there regional and chronological differences in the function and organization of these *collegia*? What distinguished the *collegia centonariorum* from other types of *collegia*? The lack of geographical and diachronic focuses in the available studies has not enabled proper answers. This study, therefore, aims at clarifying these issues based on a thorough study of all the epigraphic, legal and literary sources available.

**Current Scholarship on Collegia**

By focusing on a particular type of Roman *collegia*, I aim to shift the attention of research in *collegium* scholarship, which has been increasingly dominated by a global and synthetic approach.\(^{11}\) To elaborate on this point, we will first take a look at what the global type of approaches has achieved. Initially a reaction to the earlier, more schematic types of analysis which focused on the juristic aspects of *collegia*,\(^{12}\) the global

---

\(^{11}\) MacMullen 1974; van Nijf 1997; Bollman 1998; Harland esp. 2003b; Tran 2006; Verboven 2007a.

\(^{12}\) For a summary of earlier scholarship confined to the study of the formal character and juristic aspects of *collegia*, I refer to the works of others, who have provided not only systematic surveys but also analyses of the historical background against which the earlier scholars, in particular Mommsen, Waltzing and De Robertis, were writing. (See Cracco Ruggini 1971: 59–64; Ausbüttel 1982; Royden 1988; van Nijf 1997; Perry 2001: 205–16; Tran 2001: esp. 185–86; Perry 2006.) Although the works of Waltzing (1895–1900) and De Robertis (1938, 1955, 1963, esp. 1971) are still fundamental as systematic treatments of the history of the Roman *collegia*, their limits have become
approaches have reflected and nurtured a growing scholarly awareness of the multi-functional nature of the Roman collegia.\textsuperscript{13} More significantly, such approaches have contributed to firmly establishing collegia as an integral element in understanding the complexities of Roman civic life, urban fabric, social hierarchy, and the world of craftsmen and businessmen.\textsuperscript{14}

Unlike earlier studies that approached the associative phenomenon in terms of conflict and control, recent studies have tended to look more into the positive interactions of collegia in the urban context and in society in general. R. MacMullen (1974) incorporated collegia into his wider study of Roman social relations. He observed that collegia not only resembled the social context in which they existed, but also imitated it as best they could. For him, collegia constituted in every detail ‘miniature cities’, in which humble folk sought satisfaction for a range of needs and desires not attainable in society at large.\textsuperscript{15} A prosopographic study of the collegial magistrates was first attempted by R. H. Royden (1988). His study has certainly bettered our understanding of the collegia with respect to their internal structures and membership composition in the Early Empire. Yet Royden’s evidence fails to prove definitively his statement that there was a difference between the internal organization of the professional collegia and those in the other categories, in particular the religious collegia.\textsuperscript{16}

The broader question of whether or how the magistracies within collegia could be translated into some meaning in society at large was later tackled by S. R. Joshel (1992) among others. Approaching the inscriptions not only as sources but also as “a language, with a readable vocabulary, grammar, and syntax”,\textsuperscript{17} Joshel interpreted the preference increasingly clear, especially since they focused heavily on governmental control and legislation without devoting a great deal of attention to social reality or the actual implementation of laws.

\textsuperscript{13} See, for example, Ausbüttel 1982; Flambard 1987; Kloppenborg 1996; Tran 2006.

\textsuperscript{14} Most recently, Patterson’s works on urban transformation, esp. 2006; Tran 2006; Verboven 2007a.

\textsuperscript{15} MacMullen 1974: esp. 76–77.

\textsuperscript{16} Royden 1988: 14. See Kloppenborg (1996: 16–30, esp. 23 and 26), who suggests that it is more appropriate to distinguish collegia on the basis of their membership bases. In his taxonomy (Kloppenborg 1996: 23–27), followed by Harland (2002: 388–91; 2003a), collegia could be divided into five categories according to the profile of their membership: 1) the family/household, 2) common ethnic or geographic origins, 3) common occupation, 4) common neighbourhood, or 5) common cultic interests.

\textsuperscript{17} Joshel 1992: 14.
for noting collegium affiliation, and especially office-holding positions within collegia, as a way of substituting a ‘prestige symbol’ for a ‘stigma symbol’ associated with vulgar trade.\textsuperscript{18} By studying subjects such as the funerary activities and honorific practices of collegia, their participation in civic festivals, their place in public commensality, and their seating arrangements in theatres and stadia, van Nijf (1997) demonstrates that collegia had a recognized and integrated place in civic life and that “collegium membership could be seen as an acceptable source of social identity.”\textsuperscript{19} For him, the collegia shared the dominant elite value systems and principles. B. Bollman’s 1998 monograph on collegial scholae confirmed the active role played by collegia in urban life. In Bollmann’s analysis, the archaeological finds and reconstructions of some 100 collegial meeting places (scholae) in Italy suggest three theses: (1) the sheer numbers of scholae made them an important factor in the landscape of such cities as Rome, Ostia, and Puteoli; (2) the architecture and furnishings of the scholae show many similarities to those of ‘official’ buildings, betraying the efforts of the collegia to give their activities a public character; (3) all of the identified scholae were designed for both social and religious activities, regardless of which categories of collegia the scholae belonged to.\textsuperscript{20}

The analytical framework of the scholarly approaches discussed above can be described as the “integration and compensation model.” This model, however, has recently come under closer scrutiny, and been increasingly viewed with suspicion. A. Bendlin (esp. 2002) points out that imitation and adaptation did not guarantee integration. For him, the Roman collegia did not simply conform to the elite paradigms of representation and actions. Rather, the associations provided an alternative space of political, social and religious networking. In a densely rich article on status and ethos among Roman businessmen, K. Verboven approaches collegia as ‘a symbolic order’ which allowed the non-aristocrats to find a place “distinct from the civic order in which they could occupy only positions defined by inferiority and exclusion.”\textsuperscript{21} Verboven


\textsuperscript{19} Van Nijf 1997: 28. For him, collegia meant associations of all kinds, not necessarily those that called themselves collegia in the Western cities.

\textsuperscript{20} More recent discussions concerning the meeting places of the associations have focused on their architectural aspects, especially space arrangement. See the various papers in Egelhaaf-Gaiser and Schäfer (eds.) 2002: esp. 123–244 and Nielsen (ed.) 2007.

\textsuperscript{21} Verboven 2007a: 861–93. See similarly Pavis d’Escurac 1990: 120.
makes an important point that this symbolic order is instrumental in the regeneration of value systems for Roman tradesmen and workmen. Belonging to a (mostly) professional collegium was the main mechanism through which “the business elite affirms its position and communicates its claims to social status.”

Linking the study of collegia with that of larger structural and historical issues in the Roman society seems to be the scholarly trend. Shifting the focus of attention to the experience of collegial members, N. Tran (2006) has elaborated on how the honors and titles acquired in the microcosm of collegium constitute a system of ‘symbolic capital’, which can be accumulated and transmitted as heritage by way of the collegial life. Tran notes, however, that collegia only represent one of the multiple, partly complementary and overlapping networks (families, neighborhoods, ethnic groups, friends, civic subdivisions, occupational affiliations, etc.) which the collegiati belonged to, and that the issue of social and economic dependence, autonomy, and solidarity must be understood against this plurality. As Tran rightly emphasizes, for collegia and the collegial members, the city remains a fundamental framework for the construction of social identities in the Empire. In order to achieve an understanding of the collegia in their full complexity, the inquiry must be set against the evolution of the cities themselves. J. R. Patterson (2006)’s book on rural settlement and civic transformation in early Imperial Italy, therefore, is quite timely. For Patterson, the flourishing of collegia was intricately linked with urban development. The development of towns encouraged immigration. Against this background, associations “played a part in integrating the new inhabitants into civic life.” Economic expansion also “led to increasing profits for the artisans and traders of the city, leading to an increasing influence on their part and a growing differentiation between them and the destitute.” The Italian towns in turn ‘exploited’ the ‘competitive instincts and dynamism’ of these craftsmen and tradesmen. In Patterson’s opinion, the existence of the Augustales and the

---

22 Verboven 2007a: 872. He (esp. 871) does acknowledge that the associations “remained indissolubly linked to the civic order, playing a crucial role in creating a civic identity for the humiliores.”

23 Patterson 2006: 261, citing Clark 1986: 5. For other similar observations, see Thijs 2006: 157: “Medieval citizens deeply needed associations. As migrants from the countryside, many felt they had been wrenched from the comfort of familiar surroundings. Eager to escape their isolation as quickly as possible, they joined local networks.” See also Rosser 1994b.
collegia helped to socialize the upwardly mobile into the civilized nexus of patronage, benefaction, and reciprocal honors.\textsuperscript{24} Since Patterson’s focus is on Italy in the Early Empire, whether his observations are applicable to the provinces remains to be seen.

The value of collegia as a means of understanding Imperial urban life as well as the social life of the sub-elite, therefore, has been deservedly emphasized. The synthetic studies clearly have their merit, for they bring out the broader social environment that encouraged the formation of associations, the shared traits of various types of associations, and their aggregate impact in the cities, especially with respect to social interactions. At the same time, however, such synthetic studies are often done at the expense of the individual characters of different types of associations, and run the risk of conflating organizations and phenomena that developed in different historical moments and/or circumstances. General observations can explain why associations crop up in general, but are not adequate to account for the formation of a particular collegium in a particular place at a particular time. Similarly, they can explain why people join collegia in general, but cannot sufficiently explain why people join particular collegia. Furthermore, much of the generalization has been based on the data from Italy and Gaul, especially cities such as Rome and Ostia. The roles of collegia in the other provinces have not yet been sufficiently explored.

More potentially troublesome is that in the synthetic analyses, the specific occupations of the members do not seem to matter any more. There has been a tendency, for instance, to be non-committal in defining occupational titles. Yet, to the Roman mind, artificium dumtaxat did matter at several levels. For example, there was apparently a tradition that ascribed to a king, either Numa or Servius Tullius, the organization of several occupationally defined groups.\textsuperscript{25} There were variations as to the list of these groups and their order, but the use of occupations as an index of reputation is clear enough. Artificium dumtaxat was also the basic criterion in claiming eligibility for legal privileges granted to occupational collegia.\textsuperscript{26} A systematic and historical investigation of a

\textsuperscript{24} Patterson 2006: 262–63. Cf. Mouritsen 2007 to be discussed below.

\textsuperscript{25} Pliny \textit{HN} 34.1: \textit{a rege Numa collegio tertio aerarium fabrum instituto}; 35.159: \textit{propter quae Numa rex septimum collegium figulorum instituit}; Plut. \textit{Num.} 17.2; Florus 1.6.3. See Gabba 1984: 81–86, esp. 82, 85 for incisive discussions on the “invention” of this tradition.

\textsuperscript{26} E.g. \textit{Dig.} 50.6.6.12 (Callistratus).
particular *collegium* or a particular type of *collegia*, therefore, should be a good way to integrate and test what have been achieved in the general *collegium* scholarship, as well as to expand its research frontier. Such an investigation is particularly necessary since few studies of particular types of *collegia* are both comprehensive and current. J. H. More’s study (1969) of the *fabri tignarii* (builders and carpenters) was limited to Rome; J. L. D. Pearse (1974, 1975, 1976/7) shed further light on the history and organizational aspects of the *collegia fabrum tignariorum*. But both works need to be updated in view of the recent development in the study of the Roman building industry, and urbanism. Sabino Perea Yébenes’s book about the *collegia militaria* (1999) is rather comprehensive and important in its own right. However, due to the military settings in which these *collegia* functioned, rather than the urban settings in which most of the Roman *collegia* operated, the significance of that study for the general understanding of *collegia* is limited. The *collegia naviculariorum* have attracted much scholarly attention. Much of this attention has focused on the legal aspects of these *collegia* and their role in Rome’s food supply. A more comprehensive treatment of the *corpora naviculariorum* can be found in L. de Salvo (1992), who discussed the *navicularii* in relation to the ancient maritime trade, the Roman *annona*, and the legal frameworks for business, as well as the social organization of the *corpora*. De Salvo’s work provides a model for my studies of the *collegia centonariorum*. Further models for structuring my materials are provided by A. Abramenko (1993)’s and H. Mouritsen (2007)’s works on the *Augustales* in Italy. Both are based on meticulous and systematic examinations of the epigraphic materials, and emphasize the chronological development and regional variations of the *Augustales* in terms of their origins and compositions. This examination has enabled Mouritsen to challenge received theories concerning the origins, development, characters, and functions of the

---

27 Perea Yébenes 1999: 69: “A mi juicio, el desarrollo del fenómeno asociativo entre los militares es independiente a la consolidación del fenómeno de los tenuiores a partir de Trajano.”

28 See in particular Sirks 1991.

29 For other discussions of the *navicularii* and various other organizations that were connected with seaborne or river transportation see Rougé 1959 (de Salvo 1992 differed with Rougé 1959 on many specific points); Rickman 1981; Meiggs 1973; Erdkamp 2005: 244–49.
Augustales.\textsuperscript{30} Mouritsen argues that the Augustales (including seviri, Augustales, seviri Augustales and so on) did not have any official role in the worship of the ruler. They were not priests; nor did they constitute an ordo. Rather, “the institution was invented as an energetic office which exploited an otherwise untapped resource.”\textsuperscript{31} As local phenomena, their titles, internal structures, and public profiles, as well as the social composition of their membership, varied from city to city. Similarly, my findings concerning the collegia centonariorum will help provide a better understanding of the phenomenon of collegia in the Roman cities in terms of diversity versus uniformity.

An important point that needs clarification is what constituted a collegium in Roman thinking. Our sources, unfortunately, do not articulate what a collegium was. But it seems that a full-fledged collegium should have had at least the following features: the minimum size was three,\textsuperscript{32} it had structural features such as magistrates, a name, by-laws, membership requirements, and/or some sort of common treasury (pecuniae communes); and a collegium could formally take a patron or patrons.\textsuperscript{33} A collegium would have been a durable rather than an ephemeral organization. Other terminologies such as sodalitas may also be used.\textsuperscript{34} Nominative plurals such as fabri, centonarii or cisiarii may also refer to a formally structured association, provided that such formal features as collegial magistrates and so on are also attested.\textsuperscript{35}

A more complicated question is in what ways a collegium differed from a societas, or (business) partnership. Societas was often formed for a specific enterprise, either long-term or temporary, with an objective to make a common profit. Share of profits and losses among the socii

\textsuperscript{30} For important earlier works on the Augustales, see Taylor 1914: 231–53; Duthoy 1974 and 1978; Kneissl 1980: 291–326.

\textsuperscript{31} Mouritsen 2007: 247.

\textsuperscript{32} Dig. 50.16.85 (Marcellus 1 Dig.): Neratius Priscus tres facere existimat collegium, et hoc magis sequendum est.

\textsuperscript{33} van Nijf 2003 (collegial patrons); Verboven 2007a (structural features).

\textsuperscript{34} Koina, synodoi, synergia, and so on in Greek.

\textsuperscript{35} Tran (2006) sees the nominative plurals as representing men of specific occupations rather than corpus/collegium (e.g. saburrarii in AE 1977. 171 versus corpus saburrariorum in ILS 6177). Tran thinks that the activities of the collegiati as individuals and the actions of the collegia as collectivities took place on different platforms and had distinct foci. In my opinion, however, the nominative plurals such as fullones from the Pompeian materials may indeed have referred to (loosely grouped) individuals rather than incorporated craftsmen. But after Trajan, it becomes much harder to draw a line between nominative plurals and collegia. See Liu forthcoming in AHB.
(partners or shareholders) was internal to the contract.\textsuperscript{36} Societas was governed by different legal provisions than those covering collegia or corpora; and its dissolution was thus brought about quite differently.\textsuperscript{37} The death of a partner, for example, would terminate the societas except in the case of the societates bound by redemptura.\textsuperscript{38} The existence of a societas vectigalium, for example, was not affected by the death or withdrawal of a socius. Bringing the actio pro socio, a civil action based on bona fides, against a co-partner, or the withdrawal of a partner would have also involved the dissolution of the societas. None of these would affect the continued existence of a collegium. Despite the differences, there are some complexities in the relationship between societates and collegia. De Salvo, for example, has argued that societates may operate within the corpora or collegia. People may join a collegium individually, but can form a societas within the collegium to undertake a particular business.\textsuperscript{39}

\textit{Comparative Perspectives and Theoretical Models}

There is much more to be learned from the insights provided by scholars of other pre-industrial societies. The purpose of the comparative perspective, however, is not to reach a straightforward answer regarding whether the Roman collegia possess or lack the functions of the corporate organizations in other historical or cultural contexts. Rather, the value of the comparative materials lies in the fact that they help provide a wider range of possibilities to explain our materials and to draw inferences. Both theoretical and empirical studies of associations

\textsuperscript{36} Sirks 1991: 85–87. There were various kinds of ordinary societates such as societas omnium bonorum, societas uniuersorum quae ex quae st ueniunt, societas unius negotii, societas unius rei, and societas vectigalium. For these categories, see, for example, Gaius, \textit{Instit.} 3. 148; \textit{Dig.} 17. 2.5–13. For more recent discussions on the societates vectigalium, see de Salvo 1992: 246–47; Verboven 2002: 276.

\textsuperscript{37} For legal regulations, see \textit{Dig.} 17.2 \textit{Pro socio}. For a recent discussion of partnership in the Roman concept and law, see Randazzo 2005. Socius (metokos) was often used to indicate a business partner, but may also loosely mean companion in a non-technical sense.


\textsuperscript{39} De Salvo 1992: 253. At Puteoli, the collegium scabilariorum quibus s\textit{enatus} c\textit{onsulo} coire licet (CIL X.1642, 1643) seems to have been the same organization as the socii scabilarior(um) Puteolanorum quibus ex s\textit{enatus} c\textit{onsulo} coire licet (CIL X.1647).
in various pre-industrial societies have revealed many striking similarities in terms of the presence of state intervention, the associations’ social significance, their ‘aspiration for respectability’, and their multi-faceted nature. There has been a surge of interest in associations in the Greek world, where the associative phenomenon has a long history. Scholarly attention has focused on important centers of such as Delos, Rhodes, and Athens. For the classical period, the Hellenistic era, and the Roman period, more and more scholars no longer accept the theory that associations were a compensatory phenomenon in a period of civic decline. Rather, “there is substantial evidence for the participation of associations and their members within several areas of civic life, including political structures, networks of benefaction, and other social or cultural structures”, and “belonging within an association and belonging within the polis were by no means mutually exclusive.” Scholars have approached the Hellenistic associations as multi-layered structures, noting, among other things, the “fluidity of terminological distinctions or similarities” and the “multiplicity of functions performed by a given corporate body.” In his study of the associations of Hellenistic Rhodes, V. Gabrielsen warned against using professional activities as the sole index of the economic performance of these associations. In his analysis, this simplistic approach “has the propensity to divert attention away from a whole range of other

---

40 Rosser 1997: esp. 10; Tran 2006.
41 Rauh 1993 (Hellenistic Delos); Arnaoutoglou 1994: 104–07; Arnaoutoglou 1998: 68–83 (legal and social dimensions of religious associations in ancient Athens); Arnaoutoglou 2002 (Roman law and collegia in Asia Minor); Arnaoutoglou 2003 (private religious associations in Hellenistic Athens); Parker 1996 (Athenian religious associations); Leiwo 1997; van Nijf 1997 (collegia in the Roman East); Baslez 1998: 431–40 (from the end of the fourth century BC on, the organizing principle of the Greek associations tended to be the ownership of a common space free from any private use and devoted to the various meetings of the members); Jones 1999 (all kinds of associations in classical Athens); Gabrielsen 2001: 215–44 (about 200 different associations are known from Hellenistic Rhodes); Carrié 2002; Harland 2003 a, b and c (Roman Asia Minor); for the associations of Dionysiac Artists (technitai), see le Guen 2001, Jaccottet 2003 and Aneziri 2003.
42 For the most recent and important criticisms of the theory that sees associations as symptoms of the decline of the polis, see Arnaoutoglou 1998: 68–83; Harland 2003b: 89–112.
resource- and value-generating performances that made associative life a societal asset.”

Intense research in the past twenty years on the Medieval and Early Modern guilds has also thrown new light on their continuous evolution, shifting interests, multiple functions, flexibility, and the complexities of the relationships both between different guilds, and between guilds and authorities of different levels. A rather inescapable question is: “Were the Roman collegia comparable to Medieval guilds as economic actors?” Scholars have given both negative and positive evaluations of this question. Four lines of arguments have been advanced concerning the comparability between collegia and guilds.

1) Following Waltzing, scholars used to draw a clear line between Medieval/Early Modern guilds and Roman collegia, seeing the former as economic agents and the latter as social and convivial bodies. M. I. Finley, in particular, set the problem of the nature of Roman collegia in a much broader discussion of the nature of the ancient economy. In his ‘primitivist’ model of the ancient economy, the collegia were defined negatively by the characteristics that they did not possess compared with Medieval guilds. In view of the progresses in the studies about

47 Thrupp 1942 and 1963 still remain quite important; Mackenney 1987 (guilds in Venice in a general European contexts, c. 1250–c. 1650); Banker 1988 (lay confraternities’ roles in remembering the dead and dispensing charity to the poor in an Italian town); Flynn 1989 (confraternities in Spain, 1400–1700); Epstein 1991 (guilds in Medieval Europe up to the fourteenth century); Cerutti 1990 (family strategies and guilds in seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Turin); Strocchia 1992 (guilds in Renaissance Florence); Rosser 1989: 281–93 (fraternities/guilds in Medieval Westminster); 1994a, 1994b (fraternities/guilds in England), 1997; Ward 1997; Crossick 1997 assembles several articles that examined guilds against the larger background of artisanal production in the European towns in 1500–1900, demonstrating, among other things, the function of the guild system as a bridge between the private and public worlds; Guenzi and Massa and Caselli 1998; Farnhill 2001 (guilds and parish in Late Medieval East Anglia): “The basic characteristics of each can be summarized as follows: ‘religious’ relates to those aspects of guild activity concerned with devotional or pious practices; ‘social’ factors broadly concern the contacts and relationships between individuals or groups of individuals; ‘economic’ aspects cover all areas with a financial or commercial impact; and finally, ‘political’ deals with matters relating to the power of a guild or its members within the local community and its place within the hierarchy of communal institutions” (13); Ogilvie 2004 (guilds and women in the light of ‘social capital’ theory) and 2005 (‘trust’ and Early Modern guilds); Prak and Lis and Lucassen and Soly 2006. Note that guild is simply a convenient blanket name that modern scholars use to refer to a diversity of organizations such as crafts, Zünfte, métiers, arti, fraglie, misterie, scuole, etc. (Goldthwaite 1980: 243; Rosser 1997: 3–4).
48 Finley 1985: esp. 81, 138. For Finley, the guild halls, the effort to foster or protect the economic interests of their members, and the hierarchical pattern of apprentice,
Medieval and Early Modern guilds, to be discussed at greater length below, it must be emphasized that Finley's guilds could only be a highly abstracted model, and that if it were used as a benchmark for understanding *collegia*, problems would immediately arise. Furthermore, since more recent studies have cast considerable doubt on the minimalist school's approach to trade and traders in the ancient world, Finley's understanding of the nature and functions of *collegia* has also been re-evaluated. His main observations, however, still remain quite influential.

2) Currently, a small number of ancient historians subscribe to a view completely opposite of Finley's. P. van Minnen collected papyrological evidence for the associations in Roman Egypt as economic actors. Van Nijf, too, believes that there are few grounds for insisting upon a fundamental divide between Medieval guilds and ancient *collegia* in terms of economic concerns. But he and other scholars with kindred mind face a certain dilemma or 'helplessness' in further attempts to

journeyman and master characterized the Medieval and Early Modern guilds, but the *collegia* did not have any of them.

49 That Finley's understanding of guilds was overly simplistic has already been noted by van Nijf 1997: 16–17; for views on Medieval guilds up to 1997, see esp. 17 n. 62. Van Nijf particularly depends on C. Lis and H. Soly, eds. *Werken volgens de regels. Ambachten in Brabant en Valaanderen*. Leipzig 1994 (*non vidi*). For more about views de-emphasizing economic factors as the raison d'être of Medieval guilds and the ancient historians' acceptance of these views, see Garnsey 1985: 150.

50 The literature on ancient economy with respect to trade and traders has grown considerably over the past thirty years. For bibliography and the most recent sythetic volume, see Scheidel, Saller and Morris 2007. I provide a very brief summary of the scholarly trends here. For the tax-trade model in the Roman Empire, see Hopkins (1980); complete self-sufficiency can never be more than an ideal (Hopkins 1983b); Morley (1996 and 1997) argues that the isolation of the ancient city has been exaggerated; Mouritsen 1997: 59–82 argues against a rigid distinction between landed and commercial income; Horden and Purcell's ambitious book (2000) defies simple summaries, but the point that stands out centers around exchanges necessitated by all the various ecological pockets in the Mediterranean world, and facilitated by the sea; Temin 2001: 169–81 argues that Roman economy was market economy; but see Bang 2006 for a more nuanced analysis of the Roman markets, which he called a bazaar; Scheidel and von Reden 2002 (survey and bibliography); Bang, Ikeguchi and Ziche, eds. 2006 (All the contributions in this volume highlight the values of comparison, conceptualisation, and model-building.); Marzano’s monograph (2007) on the elite villas in central Italy demonstrates that they were more than just status symbols but were important income sources for the owners; Verboven 2007/a re-evaluates the value systems of tradesmen in the Roman Empire.

51 See also Ausbüttel 1982: 99; Morley (1996: 176) states that craftsmen and retailers in Roman Italy were “free from the restrictions imposed by medieval guilds.”

explore the economic functions of the Roman collegia. They are hampered by a scarcity of evidence as well as the varied interpretations of the key evidence. The extensive by-laws of the koinon of the salt-dealers (halopolai) of Egyptian Tebtunis (P.Mich. V.245, AD 47), for example, seems to have provided a rare glimpse into the economic activities of an ancient trade association: the salt-dealers elected their own president, allocated trading areas among themselves, set (minimum) prices for three different grades of salt, stipulated penalties for selling salt at a lower price, prohibited any single dealer to sell more than a stater’s worth of salt to a trader (emporos), made special arrangements for larger transactions to be dealt with by the association as a whole, and laid down provisions for drinking activities. P.Mich. V.245 has been repeatedly cited as one of a few key passages in support of the argument that ancient trade associations are comparable to Medieval guilds in terms of their economic concerns and regulatory functions. Some scholars are willing to generalize from this document and claim that, “the guild of salt-sellers regulated their trade, as must many and perhaps all of the other trade guilds of the Roman period.” A close examination of this rich text, however, has led me to believe that we must be careful not to stretch the evidence too far. The special status of salt as a commodity, for example, has not been fully taken into account in scholarly discussions; nor has sufficient attention been paid to governmental control of the production and distribution of salt in early Roman Egypt. I wish to elaborate on these points elsewhere. Suffice it to say here that we cannot safely assume that the salt-dealers were typical of ancient tradesmen. Consequently, the value of P.Mich. V.245 for understanding the regulatory and protective functions of ancient occupational associations is limited.

3) The above mentioned scholarly approaches either deny or emphasize the ancient associations’ similarity to the Medieval and Early Modern guilds. It must be noted, however, that ancient historians

---


54 Alston 2002: 209.

55 The other examples that van Nijf (1997: 12–18) cited are the ferrymen of Smyrna, the money-changers of Pergamon, and the bakers of Ephesos. For other discussions on the bakers of Ephesos, see Aubert 1999: 49; Arnaoutoglou 2002: 39–42. For criticisms of van Nijf’s analyses, see Hawkins 2006: 84–86.
have a lot of catching up to do in order to fully grasp the complexities of these guilds as historical phenomena and the realities of their impact.\textsuperscript{56} Recent studies have made it clearer than ever that many of the Medieval and Early Modern guilds had a variety of dimensions ranging from quality enforcement, technology transmission, credit provision, and welfare support, to deeds of devotion. They should not and could not be reduced to mere regulatory agents that were only or primarily concerned with price fixing or market demarcation.\textsuperscript{57} Nor does the incorporation of the restrictive and protective measures in a number of guild statues necessarily point to the power of guilds in their respective trade. The guild statutes cannot always be taken as a reliable indicator of the power of the guilds because we often cannot measure the gulf between what the guild laws laid down and what actually happened. More and more historians have come to acknowledge the ‘normative and idealistic’ nature of the guild statutes.\textsuperscript{58} In fact, the guilds’ ‘banning power’, varied greatly from region to region. It was strong in Germany, moderately so in France and Italy, but hardly so elsewhere.\textsuperscript{59} The reality of the operation of the guilds must also be considered. The failure of some guilds to collect membership dues and to have a strong financial profile went hand in hand with a low level of organization, which weakened these guilds’ roles as regulatory agents.\textsuperscript{60} Some scholars have even argued that the high enforcement

\textsuperscript{56} Van Nijf 1997 has already called for a better understanding of guilds. See also Garnsey 1998a: 80.

\textsuperscript{57} Goldthwaite 1980: 243 (on building-craft guilds in Medieval Europe): “No such constituted group, especially in the uncertain urban society of the time, could have been without its strong social bonds as well, and much of the guild’s attention was directed to providing welfare benefits for its members and to sponsoring gourp religious activities;” Mackenney 1987: 44: “trade guilds were associations which united in Christian brotherhood the practitioners of a particular occupation. Some confraternities existed purely for devotional purposes and were not formed around the practice of a common trade;” Epstein 1991 and 1998; Farnhill 2001: 13: “It seems clear that all fraternities had not only social and religious roles, but also economic and political concerns, and that whilst the study of any one of these on its own can be justified, an opposition of these concepts seems unwarranted;” Thijs 2006: 158: “Craft guilds and religious craft brotherhoods often existed alongside one another and were in some cases affiliated. Some craft guilds arose from brotherhoods during the early modern period. The Antwerp retailers of woolen fabrics were approved by the magistrate as a craft guild after they set up an altar in the main church in 1492.”

\textsuperscript{58} Rosser 1997: 5 with bibliography.


\textsuperscript{60} Goldthwaite 1980: 257–58 on the financial weakness of the building-craft guild at Florence in the fifteenth century.
costs resulted in the guilds’ general lack of concern with fixing price.\(^{61}\) Furthermore, a guild’s capacity in regulating a trade must be understood in the context of its relationship with the local authorities and/or the State, as well as the other local guilds. The privileges of craft guilds, for example, were “contingent upon competing political interests,” which changed from time to time.\(^{62}\)

Recent studies have also warned against identifying the activities of a trade with the guild representing it. The demarcation of boundaries between different crafts was constantly defined and redefined; rivalries or alliances between closely associated but different specialized crafts changed from time to time; even the differentiation between masters and journeymen was not always as strict as it may seem, or as previously stressed by scholars. As far as the membership composition is concerned, on the one hand, admission of members not occupation-ally engaged in a particular trade was hardly unfamiliar;\(^{63}\) on the other hand, there was also evidence for intentional avoidance of guild membership.\(^{64}\)

This rather complex and nuanced picture of guilds means that a simple yes or no regarding the comparability between Roman collegia and Medieval/Early Modern guilds is out of the question. Instead, it is imperative to go beyond superficial similarities or dissimilarities and inquire into the historical circumstances that stimulated or facilitated the formation of guilds. What made it necessary for some of the Medieval and Early Modern guilds to encourage regulatory and restrictive measures? Did the same necessity also exist in the Roman Imperial period? Crucial questions like these have barely been taken into consideration by ancient historians. In fact, some scholars of the Medieval or Early Modern period have argued that in certain places the restrictive attitudes and practices were caused by “the narrowness of the market” “so as to guarantee a subsistence level for the master

\(^{61}\) “[G]uilds were cost sharing rather than price-fixing cartels.” (Epstein 1998: 688).


\(^{63}\) For such fluidity, see Cerutti 1991: esp. 102, 139; Rosser 1994b and 1997; and the articles in Guenzi and Massa and Caselli 1998; and Prak and Lis and Lucassen and Soly 2006. Also cf. Goldthwaite 1980: 244 on the grouping of building-craft guilds in Italy in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

artisans.” In other words, the lack of regulatory stipulations may be a positive sign of market strength and scale. In this connection, the third line of arguments has outstanding potential to link the understanding of the nature of collegia more closely with the issues of competition and market, as well as supply and demand. Drawing on the model of ‘perfect competition’, D. Hollander will soon argue that since lack of demand or excess supply were seldom problems, the collegia would rarely need to limit competition. Indeed, the new lines of arguments are all built on economic and/or sociological theories. As we will see shortly, on the one hand, these theoretically-informed interpretations of the significance of ancient associations have contributed to understanding how social and economic structures interacted with each other in the ancient world; on the other hand, because there is a wide range of available and potentially applicable theories, the results may be quite different depending on the theoretical models applied.

4) Among historians of pre-industrial societies, Social Capital theory and the New Institutional economics have become increasingly influential as conceptual frameworks and analytical tools. Many of the pre-industrial associations can be analyzed as social arrangements possessing the two key features, namely, ‘closure’ and ‘multiplex relationships’, that social capital theorists have identified as essential for social networks to generate social capital. ‘Closure’ means that network membership is clearly defined, increasing the density of interactions between members, so that norm-violating behaviors can be easily identified and effectively punished, and norm-compliant behaviors rewarded. ‘Multiplex relationships’ means that once brought into existence, an organization may serve multiple purposes. Members engage in repeated transactions in multiple spheres—economic, religious, social, political—which ensures multiple means for the members to get information about, punishing

65 Borelli 1996: 19–20. See also Swanson 1989, who argued that the workshop size was kept down not because of guild restrictions but because of the practicalities of production with available technology.
66 Gwartney and Stroup (1995: 530) describe the necessary conditions of perfect competition as follows: 1. All firms in the market are producing a homogeneous product; 2. A large number of independent firms produce the product; 3. Each buyer and seller is small relative to the total market; 4. There are no artificial barriers to entry into or exit from the market.
67 Unpublished manuscript entitled Euergetism and the Roman Economy: Markets, Prices and Competition. It was presented at the symposium “Graeco-Roman Philanthropy and Christian Charity,” held at DePauw University, March 17, 2007. I thank David Hollander for allowing me to use the manuscript.
deviance in, and urging collective action on, one another. Such theoretical framework has the advantage of enabling economic and social historians to go beyond the stated purpose(s) of the associations, and excavate the wider socio-economic consequences of the many forms of group activities and regulations, some of which have often been seen as mundane or trivial.

The Medievalists applied this analytical framework earlier than ancient historians. In a series of publications on the (con)fraternities/guilds in Europe, especially those in Medieval English towns, G. Rosser brought into focus the wider social and economic value of membership to the Medieval urban worker. For Rosser, the (con)fraternities/guilds can be seen as a means of facilitating the creation of networks of trust. With the requisite cash subscription and a substantial moral commitment on the part of the members, these organizations were able to endow the participants with “the vital cachet of respectability.” Significantly, the worker’s reputation and public credit was crucial for his/her personal establishment and for the building of human relationships. In this connection, subscription to a (con)fraternity/guild functioned as the most effective strategy to help advance the worker’s pursuit of “access to financial credit, to primary materials, to hired labour, or to the market.” More recently, however, S. Ogilvie has drawn attention to the darker side of the (ab)use of trust by Early Modern guilds. She distinguishes between a ‘particularized’ trust in persons of known attributes and a ‘generalized’ trust that applies even to strangers, as well as between a ‘differential’ trust in institutions that enforce the rights of certain groups and a ‘uniform’ trust in impartial institutions that enforce the rights of all. Guilds had the potential to generate the ‘particularized’ and ‘differential’ trust, but they also had the potential to abuse their trust, resulting in a blockage of the spread of ‘generalized’ and ‘uniform’ trust. The abuse was in fact better attested in empirical findings. Drawing on C. Tilly (2005)’s comparative study of trust

---

68 The literature on the concept and theory of ‘social capital’ and its application is vast. The summary here is mainly derived from Coleman 1989; Ogilvie 2004; Ogilvie 2005: esp. 17.
70 Rosser 1997: 10.
72 Ogilvie 2005. Her main concern, as in Ogilvie 2004, was to argue against the assumption among many social capital theorists that the social capital generated by the pre-industrial guilds was good for the society at large. Ogilvie (2005: 23–46) questions
networks, A. Monson (2006) provides a new way of interpreting the rules and accounts of the Ptolemaic religious associations. In Monson’s analysis, the threat of high fines for insults and violence tends to push out or deter rule-breakers and free-riders. The associations’ written rules, therefore, had the effect of transforming informal norms shared by the group into institutions that constrained behavior and thus institutionalized the boundary between trust networks and ordinary social networks. The heightened level of trust among members lowered the costs of transaction and facilitated cooperation among villagers. As for the larger significance of the trust networks, Monson proposes that the wealthier villagers used association to build trust and strengthen their community against intrusion from state officials. A question that Monson’s very interesting analysis makes me ask, but is not answered, in his article is: “If all or most of the religious associations functioned as trust networks, why did the villagers participate in association A instead of association B or C?”

In his dissertation research on urban artisans in the Roman West, C. Hawkins (2006) discussed the economic functions of collegia along lines similar to that of Monson’s, emphasizing collegia as a structure that enabled private-order enforcement networks in the context of reputation mechanisms and communal sanctions. Collegia, according to Hawkins, may facilitate information circulation, particularly concerning personal reputation. On the one hand, violators of collegial rules may suffer high fines and expulsion, which would cause damage to their reputation and “increase the potential costs of the malfeasance in their business affairs.” On the other hand, as private-order enforcement institutions that supplemented the deficiencies of the formal legal institutions, collegia could help lower the ‘transaction costs’ for the artisans. In Hawkins’ analytical framework, which draws heavily on the three main ways in which the guilds were supposed to have used their social capital of trust to benefit the early modern economy: guilds are regarded as having generated the trust necessary to solve asymmetries of information between producers, merchants, and consumers concerning product quality; guilds are held to have overcome problems of trust in markets for trained labour; they were also supposed to solve imperfections in markets for technological innovations. Cf. Epstein 1998.

73 Hawkins 2006: 121.
74 Hawkins 2006: 88–90.
New Institutional Economics, it is in these areas that *collegia*’s impact on economic life should be understood.\(^{75}\)

Such analyses exemplify how sociological and economic theories can advance our understanding of the value of association membership in the ancient society.\(^{76}\) In particular, these theories or models provide valuable insights into the economic consequences of social institutions, and enable the discussions to go beyond the dichotomy between economic bodies and social/convivial bodies. The state of our evidence makes it rather impossible to test whether membership in ancient associations actually led to lower transaction costs. However, the scarcity of empirical evidence in itself should not discourage us from pursuing theoretical analyses. Some qualifications should nevertheless be noted in order to further refine the methodology and eventually achieve more nuanced results.

First of all, we need to ask “How effective were the formal institutions such as Roman law in helping to reduce the transaction costs caused by all of these uncertainties?” The answers will vary. There has been no consensus on crucial issues such as the effectiveness of contract enforcement, and the characteristics of Roman litigation.\(^{77}\) These will remain issues for debate for a long time to come, which makes it rather difficult to evaluate the extent of need for help outside of the formal system. Hawkins is skeptical of the effectiveness of contract enforcement, which leads him to believe that the artisans and craftsmen had to turn elsewhere for assistance.\(^{78}\) Based on a case-study of the Sulpicii archive, however, T. Terpstra suggests that “the complex legal system”, especially laws governing pledge-giving/loan making, inheritance, as

---

\(^{75}\) For a similar approach, see Bang 2006. Bang applies the concept of “bazaar” to understanding the ancient markets: they were characterized by uncertainty and unpredictability; they were also a mixture of retailers with large wholesalers. To cope with the irregularity and the resulting risks, the bazaar also developed commercial strategies including “parcelling of capital, low standardisation of products, opportunistic speculation and the formation of segmented social networks.” The religious and cultic groups may be considered as such social networks. (Bang 2006: 80).

\(^{76}\) The social capital theories or at least the terminologies seem to have become increasingly popular among scholars of ancient society. See Lo Cascio 2006 for the application of North’s theory to the discussion of the role of the emperor/state in the Roman economy. Quite recently, Bremmer (2007: 270–78) discusses “social” and “religious” capital of the early Christians. His understanding of these concepts seems to differ from that of the social capital theorists.

\(^{77}\) See Morley 2007: 55–78.

\(^{78}\) Hawkins 2006: esp. 93–97.
well as litigation, “had its influence in facilitating transactions by lowering the risks caused by high mortality and a dearth of information as well as in providing aid in enforcing contracts.”

Although Hawkins and Terpstra both work within the framework of New Institutional Economics, the former emphasizes the weakness of the Roman judicial machinery, while the latter highlights the strengths of the legal institutions of the Roman world. Their different assessments of the workings of the formal institutions have resulted in divergent understandings of how the transaction costs were mitigated in the Roman world. Hawkins emphasizes reputation-based mechanism, while Terpstra sees an enforcement-based mechanism. It should be noted that these two mechanisms do not have to be mutually exclusive. P. Kessler and P. Temin (2007) have argued that the Roman tradesmen employed all sorts of formal and informal institutions ranging from the Roman court system, the companies (societates), private financing, complex documentation systems, guilds, and reputation mechanisms through the recommendation system, to casual personal communications to help raise the cost of fraud, to keep the agents in check, and to combat incomplete information.

Second, in assessing the influence of private organizations in helping reduce transaction costs (information costs, risk costs, waiting costs, and so on), it is necessary to distinguish larger urban centers from smaller ones, as well as between commercial centers with high geographical and social mobilities and non-commercial centers. Would it be reasonable to assume that transaction costs—especially information costs—were lower in smaller centers, where normative social pressures tended to be strong? If yes, then, the potential of associations in further reducing transaction costs among members may be in reverse proportion to the size of the city. It must also be noted that the organization of collegia in small centers seemed to follow different patterns than those in larger centers. Hawkins is certainly correct in noting that the Roman occupational collegium often included a wide range of artisans that were related to a broadly defined trade. But that seems to be a phenomenon typical of smaller centers. Larger commercial centers such as Rome, Ostia and Lugdunum featured many collegia whose titles suggested highly specialized trades. The patterns of information flow, social inclusion

79 Terpstra 2008: 369.
80 For Medieval parallels, see, e.g., Goldthwaite 1980: 244.
and exclusion, as well as the interactions between artisans, therefore, would have been quite different in urban centers of different sizes. Since most of the Roman cities were small communities, we perhaps need to be cautious in assessing the collegia’s contribution to building trust among members.81

Third, more attention should also be given to the hierarchical nature of the collegium’s internal structure, as well as the range of the members’ socio-economic levels. We are bound to ask: “If the collegia had indeed functioned as private-order enforcement networks, who among the members would have benefited the most?” “Who got to make the collegial rules?” “Who were more easily affected by penalty clauses?” “Is it possible that unnecessary ‘social costs’ may have fallen upon the poorest members who were already in a more vulnerable position?” Given the state of our sources, these questions are difficult to answer but must be brought into the picture.

Fourth, when measuring social capital, scholars have emphasized the importance of considering its externalities.82 Social capital may produce either positive or negative externalities. In other words, the social capital generated by a particular group may benefit or harm the society at large, depending on whether the ‘radius of trust’ goes beyond the group itself or the trust resides only within the narrow circle of the group at the expense of the outsiders. As far as the Roman collegia are concerned, we are ill-equipped to investigate these ‘radii of trust’. But at least the relationship between collegia and other pre-existing networks and social infrastructures should be laid out as much as the sources allow.83

Finally, even if collegia did contribute to lowering transaction costs, all of the members did not necessarily join collegia because of this. Nor can we assume that a potential member always had choices and was free to choose. A variety of impetuses and constraints, ranging from patterns of local residence, marital behavior, kinship ties, cult affiliations, family traditions, patronage relationships, and work relationships, to expectations of tangible benefits such as privileges and exemptions granted by

---

81 For city populations, see Duncan-Jones 1982: 259–77; Morley 1996; Savino 1999: 20–21; Leveau 2007: 657–60. There were certainly cities that had a population size more than 100,000 in the Roman world. But a large number of urban centers only had 2,000–15,000. Cf. “...in small-scale markets, less formal arrangements could be just as effective.” (Epstein 1998: 686).
82 See Fukuyama 1995 and 2002 for discussions of the concepts of externalities and radius of trust.
83 Tran 2006 has done helpful work in this area.
the government, may have been at work. All of these elements would surely complicate the ideal theoretical scenario. Through this book, I will strive to identify specific elements that tended to draw participants to the *collegia centonariorum*.

*The Ancient Sources and Their Limitations*

Following L. de Ligt (2000, 2001), who has called for a closer interdisciplinary examination of the phenomenon of *collegia*, I take an integrative approach, incorporating epigraphic, onomastic, prosopographic, and juristic analyses. Indeed, to overemphasize any one type of source at the expense of the others would give misleading impressions of these *collegia*, especially since each type has its own values and limitations.

Our main body of information concerning *collegia* comes from inscriptions. I have compiled a catalogue of 234 inscriptions that are relevant to the *collegia centonariorum*. This dataset is presented in Appendix A: Catalogue of Inscriptions about the *Collegia Centonariorum*. This catalogue updates Waltzing’s century-old list of the relevant inscriptions. G. Mennella and G. Apicella’s supplementary collection of new finds relating to the *collegia* in Italy up to 2000 has been very helpful. But I have also filled in new publications in the past several years and new finds from the provinces since Waltzing’s time. *L’Année Épigraphique*, and the print and digital *corpora* of *inscriptions* of the various Western provinces and cities have been consulted for the compilation of the catalogue. The provenance, or the original location of display, of the inscriptions, however, is not always known, nor could all of them be expanded or restored with certainty. Technical problems surrounding these inscriptions are discussed in Appendix C. Based on the epigraphic evidence, Appendix B lists the geographical distribution of the *collegia centonariorum* in comparison with other popular types of *collegia* in the Roman world, such as the *collegia fabrum* and *collegia dendrophorum*.

An equally, if not more, serious challenge is the interpretation of epigraphic evidence. On one hand, the inscriptions do provide valuable insights into the vibrant nature of the ancient urban life and many other aspects of the ancient society, which the literary texts often fail to

---

85 For a list of the epigraphic *corpora*, see the Abbreviations.
note; on the other hand, the inevitable incompleteness of the picture that emerges from the inscriptions must be noted. These inscriptions are often succinct, featuring highly formulaic languages with an elevated tone. The predominantly public nature of inscriptions means that they are more likely to suffer from the law of ‘publication bias’ than the papyrological materials are. The inscriptions tend to prioritize the stories of the ‘winners’ and the positive interaction between the collegia and the personages of some importance, as well as the funerary, religious and convivial aspects of the collegial activities. The highly selective nature of the content means that we know much more about the ‘formal and competitive components’ than the ‘less formal sides’ of the collegial life.\(^{86}\) It is regrettable that “inscriptions do not tell the whole story, [because] it is the things that were taken for granted and were not worth recording that we most want to know.”\(^{87}\) The ‘pronounced advertising orientation’\(^{88}\) can certainly be seen in many inscriptions set up by the collegia or collegial members. As such, treating inscriptions as particular genres, and reading them in a contextualized manner, would help to maximize their value as historical sources.\(^{89}\)

In addition, the epigraphic output fluctuated chronologically and varied geographically.\(^{90}\) This fluctuation is further complicated by the existence of varied epigraphic practices among the elite and the non-elite, the freedmen and the freeborn, and so on. As Mouritsen recently argued, “[n]o epigraphic practice was universal—throughout the Empire, or even within a region or a single community. Instead we find multiple ‘habits’, which changed and interacted with each other.”\(^{91}\) The freed population, for example, seemed to be more eager to communicate with posterity through the medium of inscriptions, especially epitaphs,

---

86 Cf. Gabrielsen 2001: 219 about the activities of the koina in Hellenistic Rhodes.  
87 Meiggs 1973: 313. See also Wilson 2001: 291, who speaks of "the trap set by the nature of the surviving evidence;" Van Nijf 2007: 227, who notes that the ancient documents "employed a quite marked rhetoric of concealment: they had a tendency to mask unpleasant realities, including economic interests."  
88 This expression is borrowed from Gabrielsen 2001: 219.  
at least in Imperial Italy.\textsuperscript{92} The uneven ‘epigraphic culture’ poses serious problems to tracing and interpreting the chronological, geographical and compositional development of collegia. It is also unfortunate that we lack secure archaeological contexts (location, environ, and so on) for most of the inscriptions. Apart from these general issues in using inscriptions as historical evidence, there are also specific problems with individual inscriptions, which will be mentioned wherever they occur. Apart from these general issues in using inscriptions as historical evidence, there are also specific problems with individual inscriptions, which will also be mentioned wherever they occur. Other types of archaeological evidence than inscriptions have only recently come to play an important role, as represented by B. Bollmann’s above-mentioned study of collegial scholae. Yet, there remains the fundamental question of whether or not the identifications of collegial meeting places are reliable.\textsuperscript{93}

Legal material will also be essential. The municipal laws (esp. the \textit{Lex Irnitana}) and the relevant citations in the \textit{Theodosian Code} and Justinian’s \textit{Digesta} are the main sources in this category. Ancient authors such as Cicero, Ausonius, Josephus, Pliny the Younger, and Symmachus also recorded official regulations concerning collegia. In addition to gaps in chronology, the legal sources present several general problems of interpretation.\textsuperscript{94} The citations were usually taken out of their original contexts, and the details became garbled. In many instances, the specific issue(s) that any given regulation was intended to address can only be surmised. Certain legal citations, especially those in Justinian’s \textit{Digesta}, suffered emendations and interpolations. Textual problems aside, the legal texts, especially the later ones, tended to employ highly rhetorical and exaggerated styles, to the extent that a distinction between the legal component and the literary aspect becomes quite difficult to make. Scholarly opinions also differ as to whether and to what extent the juristic writings reflect actual conditions rather than academic inquiries or antiquarian interests.\textsuperscript{95}

\textsuperscript{92} Taylor 1961; Mouritsen 2001b and 2005.
\textsuperscript{94} For the interpretive problems of the legal sources, and sources from Late Antiquity in general, see Mitchell 2007: 33–38.
\textsuperscript{95} Cook 1967: 7–13; Watson 1995 (juristic writings were scholarly opinions not necessarily bearing reflections of their own time and place); the “Frier school,” however, sees the juristic writings as more relevant to contemporary concerns. [For a discussion, see Kehoe 1998 with D. J. Gargola’s helpful review in \textit{AJPh} 120.2 (1999): 323–26].
If the legal texts themselves are fraught with interpretive challenges, the effect of law in the Roman Empire is even more difficult to gauge, a point that has already been mentioned earlier. Scholars often note the ‘amateurish nature’ of Roman administration, the low ratio of administrators to total population, and hence the inefficiency of the enforcement of the laws. This was perhaps only part of the story. The role of informers (delatores) in law enforcement, for example, should not be underestimated. As far as law in the Late Antiquity is concerned, J. Harries’ anthropologically-informed view of its significance opens up a different window for understanding its role in Roman society. For her, the law was many things: “a tool of enforcement, an expression of power, or a pawn in the endless games played out between emperor and citizen, centre and periphery, rich and poor.” A more complicated question is how the laws emanating from the Emperors or the Senate were communicated and transmitted in the Empire.

The literary writers had little interest in lower-class craftsmen and tradesmen unless they caused trouble, and, hence, tend to give modern readers the misleading impression that the collegia were seditious bodies in conflict with the Roman state. Papyri sometimes provide very detailed records of guild affairs and tend to be less selective in their themes, for unlike inscriptions, these papyri were not intended to be displayed in public places. As such, papyri may compensate for the lack of mundane details in the other types of ancient sources. To be sure, the papyrological evidence is circumscribed geographically, coming mostly from Egypt. But papyrologists and ancient historians have warned against seeing Egypt as a unique province full of peculiarities. Although the Roman rulers did not tend to interfere significantly with local customs and practices in the provinces, it is also true that they introduced many administrative changes to make Eastern practices conform to Imperial norms. As such, the rich papyrological material can and should be used to shed light on broader issues in the Roman Empire.

The main body of this book is divided into eight Chapters and a Conclusion. The first seven Chapters concern the origin(s), historical development, various organizational aspects, and activities of the

97 Harries 1999: 8.
98 For discussions, see Galsterer 1986: 13–28; Ando 2000.
collegia centonariorum, particularly in the first three centuries AD. The eighth Chapter looks closely at the evidence from the fourth century AD, when the epigraphic material has tapered off but specific legal rulings concerning the collegia centonariorum stand out. The inscriptions catalogued in Appendix A will be referred to by their catalogue numbers in the Chapters. In order for Appendix E: Catalogue of Members of the Collegia Centonariorum and Appendix F: Catalogue of Multiple Patronage to be independently useful, however, the inscriptions in these catalogues are referred to by their numbers in standard epigraphic corpora.

Throughout this book, the terms ‘guild’ and ‘collegium’ are used to refer to a formally structured private organization, while the word ‘association’ is used for a wide range of voluntary organizations, formal or loose.
CHAPTER ONE

MAPping THE COLLEGIA CENTONARIORUM

This chapter represents an attempt to chart the geographical and chronological distributions of the *collegia centonariorum*. Failure to consider these distributions, and the lack of geographical and chronological analyses, would result in a methodologically flawed, impressionistic picture of these *collegia*. The project of mapping out the geographical and chronological distributions, however, is beset with problems, largely relating to the use of epigraphy as evidence. The imprecision and distortion that may result from these problems will be pointed out whenever they occur. It will become clear, in the course of this Chapter, that the geographical and chronological diffusion of this type of *collegium* had particular patterns, distinct from those of other well attested Roman *collegia*, especially the *collegia fabrum* and the *collegia dendrophorum*. The investigation of both the distributions of the *collegia centonariorum* and the implication(s) of such distributions has significant bearing on a proper understanding of the origin(s), nature and functions of these *collegia*. This Chapter, then, lays the foundation for the rest of the book, especially Chapters 2–4.

**The Geographical Distribution of the Collegia Centonariorum**

Epigraphic evidence indicates the presence of the *collegia centonariorum* in 84 urban centers, including Rome (See Appendices A and B). In addition, these *collegia* might have been formed in ten other places (Assisium, Clusium, Ligures Baebiani, Marsi Antinum, Pollentia, Praeneste, Tarraco, Vada Sabatia, Uthina, and the place which is modern Divajeu, Drôme in southern France). The dubious inscriptions are noted on the catalogue (Appendix A) and further discussed in Appendix C. The uncertainty of their relevance usually arises from either the fragmentary conditions of the texts, which prevent readings or restorations with any certainty. Despite these uncertainties, the general picture of the geographical distribution of the *collegia centonariorum* that emerges from the available epigraphic record is clear enough.
Chart 1.1. Distribution of the collegia centonariorum in different regions.¹

The collegia of this type are attested in both large and small cities.² These collegia clustered in northern and central Italy and southern Gaul (Chart 1.1). They were relatively well represented in the Pannonian provinces, but only sparsely found in the Italian Regio IV (Samnium), Dalmatia, the Spanish provinces, Noricum and Moesia Superior. They have left little trace in North Africa, and Latium, and no trace in Britain, Germania, Moesia Inferior and the Italian Regio II (especially Apulia) and Regio III (Lucania and Bruttium) in southern Italy. It will be further discussed below that this picture of distribution cannot simply be attributed to chance.

¹ Venetia (Regio X, 10 cities), Transpadana (Regio XI, 10 cities), Umbria (Regio VI, 13–14 cities), Aemilia (Regio VIII, seven cities), Liguria (Regio IX, four–six cities), Gallia Narbonensis (six–seven cities), Picenum (Regio V, six cities), Etruria (Regio VII, six cities), and the two Pannoniae (nine cities). Others distributed in Rome, Noricum (one city), Dacia (one city), Moesia Superior (one place), Samnium (Regio IV, one or two cities), Hispania (one or two cities), Dalmatia (two places), and Campania (three cities). Apulia and Calabria (Regio II, one city?), and Africa Consularis (one place?) are not reflected in the Chart, as the identification is not certain. For details, see Appendices A and C.

² When talking about cities, I use the concept shared by many scholars and summarized nicely by Boatwright 2000: 8: "Roman cities were much more than built-up and densely populated areas. They were always considered individual peoples, a fact reflected in their proper nomenclature as ethnic plurals rather than as place names. They combined an urban agglomeration of buildings and services, including administrative and governmental ones, with the land (territorium or chora) furnishing the basic livelihood for inhabitations of ‘city’ and ‘countryside’ alike.” See similarly Mitchell 2007: 302.
Most cities are represented by only one inscription each, but some cities have a rich assemblage of related inscriptions (Chart 1.2). However, the number of relevant inscriptions retrieved from any given place is not always a reliable index of the prosperity and importance of the local *collegium centonariorum*. The ranks of the personages mentioned in the inscriptions, the size, material, location and execution of the inscription, the agents who put up the inscription, the types of inscriptions (elaborate honorific inscriptions, simple epitaphs, or votive dedications), and the length of the existence of the local *collegium* are more significant indicators. Taking these elements into consideration, the *collegia*

---

3 The main concentration of epigraphic finds concerning the *collegia centonariorum* lies in Brixia, *Regio X* (26 inscriptions); Aquincum, Pannonia (15 inscriptions); Sassina, *Regio VI* (14 inscriptions); Mediolanum, *Regio XI* (10–12 inscriptions); Rome (seven inscriptions); Cemelenum (seven inscriptions); Comum, *Regio XI* (five or six inscriptions); Ariminum, *Regio VIII* (six inscriptions); Aquileia, *Regio X* (four–five inscriptions); Lugdunum, Gallia Lugdunensis (six inscriptions); Salona, Dalmatia (between five and six inscriptions). Verona (*Regio X*), Pisaum (*Regio VI*), Ravenna (*Regio VIII*), and Apulum, Dacia (four inscriptions) have four inscriptions each. Auximum (*Regio V*), and Savaria (Pannonia) have three inscriptions each; Alba Helviorum (Gallia Narbonensis), Aquae Sextiae (Gallia Narbonensis), Nemausus (Gallia Narbonensis), Industria (*Regio IX*), Mevania (*Regio VI*), Sestinum (*Regio VI*), Suasa (*Regio VI*), Fanum Fortunatae (*Regio VI*), Hispalis (Spain), Ulcisia Castra (Pannonia Inferior), and Brigetio (Pannonia Inferior) each has two.

4 It matters whether the inscriptions were put up by the *collegium* or they simply mentioned the *collegium*. Among all the inscriptions related to the centonarii, more than half were put up neither by the *collegia* nor by the members, but the *collegium centonariorum* was mentioned, in most cases, as a recipient of gifts, or client of a patron. Among the other relevant inscriptions only 46 are honorific *tituli* set up by the *collegia* themselves; five are metal patronage tablets; 50 are epitaphs for members: 22 out of these epitaphs are put up by the *collegia*. 
centonariorum appear to have been particularly active and important in Brixia in Italian Regio X, Mediolanum in Regio XI, Aquincum in Pannonia, Ravena in Regio VIII, Apulum in Dacia, and Salona in Dalmatia, among all the places where these collegia are attested.

The implications of this data will be best understood by comparison with that from other most widely attested types of collegia such as the collegia fabrum and the collegia dendrophorum (Appendix B). The collegia centonariorum are attested in fewer places than the collegia fabrum, but in more places than the collegia dendrophorum. These three types of collegia had wider geographical distribution than any other type of collegia except for the Augustales, and their distribution overlapped to a great extent in some regions, particularly in Umbria, Venetia, Aemilia, Transpadana, and Gallia Narbonensis (Appendix B and Map 1.1). However, this was not always the case in other regions.

The collegia dendrophorum are missing from the epigraphic records in the Spanish provinces, Noricum, and Pannonia Inferior, but seemingly ubiquitous in southern Italy, Moesia, and North Africa, where the collegia centonariorum are hardly attested. In Latium, both the collegia fabrum and the collegia dendrophorum are well represented, which is not the case with the collegia centonariorum. In Britain, the collegia fabrum are attested in two places, while there is only one dubious reference to the dendrophori, and none to the centonarii.

A question emerges: to what extent does the map based on epigraphy reflect the actual distribution of these collegia in the Roman period? Certainly, there would be no epigraphic references in places where the collegia centonariorum never existed. At the same time, that a collegium is not epigraphically attested in a certain place does not necessarily mean that it never existed there. Other elements ranging from low epigraphic culture,\(^5\) low survival rate of evidence (due to intensive building activities, or hostile destruction, or low durability of the non-marble monuments), and lack of excavation activities, to delayed publication of the archaeological reports, may all contribute to the silence. But do these elements seriously distort our knowledge of the collegia centonariorum in terms of their geographical distribution? I suggest that the answer is likely to be “not quite so”, by looking at how our knowledge of the centonarii’s distribution has evolved in the past

\(^{5}\) For the theories and problems of the ‘epigraphic habit’ and ‘epigraphic culture’, see Introduction.
Map 1.1. The distribution of inscriptions related to the *collegia centonariorum*. The size of the dot is proportional to the number of relevant inscriptions found in a given place. The map was generated by Sarah Craft at the GIS Lab of DePauw University.
century, as well as how and whether the epigraphic finds concerning the *collegia centonariorum* in different regions correlate to the local or regional pattern of epigraphic culture.

Archaeological recovery since the first publication of the *CIL* volumes has indeed brought to light more local *collegia centonariorum*. For example, the *collegium centonariorum* was not attested in the province of Noricum until 1915 (no. 36), in the city of Savaria (Pannonia) until 1929 (nos. 225–226), or in Stojnik (Moesia Superior) until 1931 (no. 229). Mennella and Apicella (2000)’s list of the distribution of the *collegia centonariorum* in Italy contains five more cities (Ligures Baebiani?, Ricina, Ferentium, Tridentum, and Laus Pompeia) than Waltzing’s list. Among the provinces, most of the new discoveries have been made in the Pannonian provinces, where four Roman sites and 19 new inscriptions have been added to the corpus. However, it should be noted that most new finds have come from the cities or regions where the *collegia centonariorum* were already attested. For example, excavations at Aquincum (Pannonia), which was already on Waltzing’s list, have continued to yield more references to the local *collegium centonariorum*. Eleven out of the 19 new inscriptions from Pannonia came from Aquincum. In fact, epigraphic finds in the past century have only served to confirm the picture that was already visible in Waltzing’s list, that is, that there is a geographical concentration of the *collegia centonariorum* in central and northern Italy, Gallia Narbonensis, and the frontier provinces near those regions. In contrast, continued excavation in southern Italy, Britain and North Africa has barely added anything to our general knowledge of this particular type of *collegium*. Similarly, despite active archaeological activities in the past century, no *collegium centonarium* has been found at the site of Sarmizegetusa in Dacia, while more and more inscriptions concerning the local *collegium fabrum* have come to light. For this reason, I suspect that future finds will not significantly alter the general picture of the regional distribution of our *collegia*, although the list of Roman cities that had them will probably be further expanded.

---

7 For southern Italy, see Zumbo 1992: 312.
8 For example, *AE* 1912.76 (= IDR 3.2.6) refers to an *aedes* of the *collegium fabrum*. Another inscription mentioning the *aedes fabrum* was found during the excavations at the *forum vetus* in 1993 (*AE* 2003. 1517).
But how viable is the possibility that our *collegia* existed in certain places but simply did not put up inscriptions? It should be noted that the presence or absence of epigraphic finds relating to the *centonarii* in a given region cannot always be explained by a high or low level of epigraphic culture in the local context. The low incidence of inscriptions relating to the *centonarii* in Latium and Africa Consularis, regions with a relatively high level of epigraphic culture, is telling. According to several scholars, the regional variations in the density of inscriptions largely correspond to the differing densities of urban settlement, and “the areas closest to the capital tended to produce more inscriptions.”

The paucity of inscriptions either mentioning or produced by the *collegia centonariorum* in densely populated areas such as Latium, which is near Rome, would very likely indicate the paucity of these *collegia* themselves. After all, some other *collegia*, such as the *collegia dendrophorum*, seem to have been quite active in these regions. In the southern Italian regions of Lucania and Apulia, too, the absence of the *collegia centonariorum* demands an explanation other than the chance survival of evidence, especially since there have been rich finds of the *collegia dendrophorum* in these regions. The epigraphic culture may have remained at a relatively low level in Britain, Raetia, Aquitania, Belgica, Germania, and Moesia. Low epigraphic culture may be indicative of a low level of Romanization. Given that *collegia* were essentially a Roman phenomenon, at least in the Western provinces, a low level of Romanization would suggest a low incidence of *collegia*. Unless we can assume that the Roman state or the army took a certain amount of initiative in establishing the *collegia centonariorum* in these regions, we

---

9 One indicator of the level of epigraphic culture is the number of inscriptions per 1,000 km². For figures, see Harris 1989: 266, 268. The following table shows that in Campania, Africa Consularis, and Apulia, where the numbers of inscriptions relating to the *centonarii* are particularly low, the epigraphic culture is by no means low.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of inscriptions per 1,000 km²</th>
<th>Campania</th>
<th>Africa Consularis</th>
<th>Umbria</th>
<th>Venetia</th>
<th>Apulia</th>
<th>Narbonensis</th>
<th>Liguria</th>
<th>Pannonia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>related to <em>CC</em></td>
<td>410.9</td>
<td>127.3</td>
<td>275.7</td>
<td>119.6</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


11 MacMullen 1982: passim.
perhaps have not missed much. However, I do not intend to press this point too far because of the inherent circularity in the argumentation. More importantly, the ample epigraphic finds concerning the *collegia fabrum*/*collegia fabrum tignariorum* and the *collegia dendrophorum* in Moesia and Germania would suggest that the epigraphic culture alone cannot explain why we are not informed of the presence of the *centonarii* in these regions. The silence is more likely due to either the absence of our *collegia* or the lack of wealthy members/benefactors who were able to support epigraphic activities. In either case, the phenomenon of the *collegia centonariorum* would seem less significant in these regions than elsewhere in the Roman West.

What would also complicate the picture may be the possibility that the *collegium* existed, but under a different name. It is not uncommon for there to be regional or chronological variations in the naming of identical or similar types of *collegia*. *Coci*, for example, was a synonym for *culinarii*; the *fontani*, *gnapheis* (Greek) were certainly the *fullones*, with which the *cultores Urae Fontis*, *lotores*, and *aquatores* may also be associated. Seplasarius and unguntarius both referred to trader and worker in perfume. Were there synonyms for *centonarii*? If there were, the popularity of the title *collegium centonariorum* begs to ask why other names were used.

The geographical distribution of the *collegia centonariorum* as indicated by inscriptions, then, seems to be a good though undoubtedly incomplete reflection of the actual distribution of this type of *collegium*. Future discoveries are surely to change the map that we have now, but I suspect that the changes are unlikely to be substantial.

The Chronological Distribution of the Collegia Centonariorum

Precisely dated inscriptions and legal citations concerning the *collegia centonariorum* are few, but they provide helpful *termini ante quos* or *post quos* in outlining the chronological span of the *collegia centonariorum*. The earliest dated inscription (AD 69) is from Patavium (no. 142). The

---

12 *Coci* (CIL XIV.2875, Praeneste), Republican period; *culinarii* (CIL IV.373, Pompeii).

13 For a list, see Waltzing IV: 90–91; Calderini 1946: 73–78. The *conlegium aquae* at Rome (CIL VI.10298; Vicari 2001) and the *corpus Fontanorum* at Ostia (CIL XIV.4573 = AE 1909. 215; Meiggs 1973: 312) may have been organizations of the *fullones*.
latest dated inscription (AD 367) is an honorific inscription, found in Forum Popilii in Campania (no. 48). Three fourth-century legal texts in the Theodosian Code (12.1.162, 14.8.1, 14.8.2) are concerned with the collegia centonariorum. They date to AD 399, AD 329, and AD 369, respectively. We no longer hear about the collegia centonariorum after AD 399. They are never mentioned in Justinian’s Digesta, although it contains references to many other types of collegia.

This type of collegium certainly has a long history of existence. There are, however, some practical problems involved in delineating a chronology of its diffusion. I should also emphasize, from the outset, that the collegia centonariorum were local in character, but they were not local chapters of a centralized organization. Of the 234 inscriptions, only 16 have consular dates and can thus be assigned precise dates. Imperial titulatures and references to prominent senators help us closely date another 22 inscriptions. For the other inscriptions, we have to depend on a range of internal and external dating criteria as diverse as paleography, orthography, personal career, the nomenclature of legions, onomastics, the use or absence of tribal designations, the use of signum, the formulae of epitaphs, a change in the status or name of a city, the use or absence of hederae (ivy leaves) as punctuation, the style of the monument bearing the text(s), and the archaeological contexts. Apart from the fact that they are not equally reliable, these criteria, in many cases, only help to establish rough termini. A number of inscriptions cannot be dated within a hundred years. A more serious problem is that we have too few samples of the founding dates of our collegia. Without knowing the founding dates of the majority of the collegia, we are in a very weak position to trace the chronology of the overall diffusion of these collegia. Finally, there is the rise and fall of the ‘epigraphic habit’ to be considered. Not surprisingly, in many cities, the earliest datable inscriptions relating to the centonarii fall in the second and early third centuries AD, when the epigraphic output seemed to be at its peak.

14 For the date of CTh 14.8.1, see the discussion in Salamito 1987: 993–97.
I will return to these difficulties below. For now, I will discuss the early history of the *collegia centonariorum* in various places to the extent that the epigraphic material allows.

Patavium has the earliest precisely dated inscription concerning the *collegium centonariorum* (no. 142). The first *collegium centonariorum*, however, seems to have been established at Rome. Waltzing, De Robertis, and Linderski all list it among those *collegia* founded in the Republican period. The dating depends on nos. 37 and 41. No. 37 mentions the eleventh *lustrum* of the *collegium centonariorum*. Since *lustrum* occurs every five years, the founding date of the *collegium* would have been 50–55 years earlier than no. 37. This inscription belongs to a group of epitaphs from the same *columbarium* found on the Via Salaria. The tomb was built during the time of Augustus, but was used until the second century AD. The orthography *conlegi centonariorum* points to a date range between the late second century BC to the mid-first century AD. The absence of the *D(is) M(anibus)* formula on these tombstones also suggests a pre-Flavian date. If all of the dating clues are considered together, then the founding date of the *collegium centonariorum* would fall in the period between the early first century

---

16 Waltzing I: 282 n. 5; Linderski 1956: 254–55. In a footnote, De Robertis 1971 listed the *collegium centonariorum* among those founded during the Republican period. However, the reference he gave was *CIL* VI.9254, which post-dates Augustus.

17 The people buried inside this *columbarium* were mostly freedmen and freedwomen of the Lucii Octavii and Lucii Tuccii (*CIL* VI.7860–7877).

18 Waltzing IV: 12.

19 See *ILS* (Dessau): 757–60 for several examples of *conlegium*. The orthography *conlegium* was used in epigraphy as early as 113/112 BC (*CIL* X.3772 = W 1709, Capua). It was quite popular in literary writings in Cicero’s time. In *Lex Coloniae Genetiva*, a Caesarian law probably re-engraved in the Flavian period, both *conlegium* and *collegium* are used but the former is used more often (LXVI 35, 38; LXVII 12, 14, 17, 20, in Crawford 1996a: II 401). According to Mommsen, the orthography disappeared at the end of the reign of Augustus, only to reappear in the reign of Claudius and Nero (*Ephemeris Epigraphica* 1.79; Waltzing IV: 4). However, several more inscriptions using *conlegium* have been found in the last century, all of which appear to belong to the first century AD. One of them could be dated between AD 14–42 (*AE* 1990.68 = Panciera et al. 1987: 75 n. 24). *AE* 1996.209 = *AE* 2000.507 from Ameria (Regio VI) probably also has a post-Augustan date, for it mentions [*V*]ir August(alis). So, the orthography was perhaps still used in Tiberius’ time. In the provinces, this orthography disappeared relatively late. In Spain, it was still in use in the time of Domitian, as chapter 74 of the *lex Iuritana* shows. In Germania Superior, it was still used occasionally as late as the third century AD (*AE* 1978.531 = *AE* 1981.693 = *AE* 1986.524).

20 Almar 1990: 385.
BC and the early first century AD.\textsuperscript{21} Another datable inscription that does not belong to the group of epitaphs mentioned above is no. 41, the dating indication for which is the reference to natali divi Augusti. This very likely suggests an early Tiberian date, although it may not be safe to exclude a later date for no. 41—a mid-Tiberian date is certainly possible; a Claudian date is also plausible.\textsuperscript{22} But the arrangement of celebrations on the birthday of the deified Augustus may suggest that the collegium already existed under Augustus.\textsuperscript{23} In an inscription dated to AD 10, one [Oct]avius Silanio has the title quinquennalis. Since several Octavii were magistrates or members of the collegium centonariorum, Royden suggested that Octavius Silanio might also have been affiliated with that collegium.\textsuperscript{24} If this is accepted, then the collegium had to have been in existence before AD 10. However, the restoration of the name [Oct]avius is not the only choice. Several nomina gentilicia ended in -avius; H. Solin and O. Salomies (1994) listed 46 gentilicia with that ending. Therefore, [---]avius Silanio does not supply any conclusive help with the dating. Outside of Rome, a fragmentary inscription from Praeneste dating to the Republican period (no. 44) may have referred to cen]tonaries;\textsuperscript{25} but the centonarii or their collegia are never heard of again at Praeneste.

The pre-Augustan or Augustan date of the collegium centonariorum and its continued existence at Rome after the death of Augustus is of great interest, as from 64 BC to the time of Augustus, a series of restrictive measures were taken by the authorities. In the turbulent last years

\textsuperscript{21} I have assumed that the founding date corresponds to the first-year of the first lustrum of the collegium. However, this may not always be the case. Other important events may be taken as the starting point of a dating system by lustrum. The collegium of the fabri tignuarii of Rome provides an important case in point. Recent studies of seven fasti of the collegium fabrum tignuariorum have confirmed Waltzing’s proposal that the collegium fabrum tignuariorum of Rome dated its lustrum from 7 BC (Panciera 1981: 271–80). Scholars also agree with Waltzing that this date was not the date of the founding of the collegium, but the date of its reorganization. Therefore, it is possible that the founding date of the collegium centonariorum may be even earlier than its first lustrum.

\textsuperscript{22} AE 1969/70. 110 from Cales refers to sacratissimo die natali divi Augusti and is dated to AD 28.

\textsuperscript{23} This inscription (no. 41) uses the spelling collegium instead of conlegium. Therefore, it likely, but not necessarily, post-dates the inscriptions using conlegium, as there must be a long period during which both spellings were used concurrently.

\textsuperscript{24} CIL VI.4418; Royden 1988: 199 no. 304.

\textsuperscript{25} For the -es ending in cen]tonaries, see also fabres in CIL XIV.2876 = ILS 3683b = ILLRP 105.
of the Republic, *collegia* incurred more attention than ever before in Roman history. They became and were seen as many things, especially ready-made structures for electoral support, factitious conflicts, mass mobilization, information dissemination, and violent disturbances of all kinds. Politicians coveted their support, but were also eager to deprive their opponents of any potential support from the *collegia*, as shown in Cicero’s oscillating attitudes towards *collegia*. Cicero and Asconius, his commentator, are our main sources for the restrictive legislation leveled at associations between 64 and 49 BC. According to Asconius, a *senatus consultum* dating to 64 BC abolished “those *collegia* that seemed to have been established in conflict with the public interest.” Publius Clodius Pulcher reportedly not only restored these *collegia*, but also established numerous new ones by virtue of the *lex Clodia de collegiis* passed in 58 BC. This process does not seem to have been reversed until Caesar’s dictatorship. Between 58 and 49 BC, other laws addressed certain distinct, yet relevant, phenomena, namely *sodalitates/sodalicia* and *ambitus*. According to Suetonius, Casesar banned all the *collegia* except those that had been established in antiquity during his dictatorship.

---


29 Asc. Pis. 8: *collegia sublata sunt quae adversus rem publicam videbantur esse constituta.*

30 Cic. Pis. 4.9: *collegia non ea solum quae senatus sustulerat restituta, sed innumerabilia quaedam nova ex omni faece urbis ac servitio concitata;* Asc. Pis. 7: *Post VI deinde annos quam sublata erant P. Clodius tr.pl. lege lata restituit collegia.* Cass. Dio 38.13.2.

31 *Lex Licinia de sodaliciis* passed in 55 BC made the punishment for *sodalitates* the same as that of *vi*. Cic. Planc. passim; esp. 36, 45–48. For discussion, see Mouritsen 2001a: esp. 150.

sometime after the end of the Civil War, Augustus abolished all the collegia except the ‘ancient and legitimate’ ones.\textsuperscript{33}

It is against this dramatic background that the significance of the continued existence of the collegium centonariorum at Rome should be understood. It either survived these restrictive measures or was even founded during the period, when times were hard for collegia in general. Whichever the case, it indicates the extent to which this type of collegium was acceptable to the authorities from its very inception, belonging to either the category of (collegia) antiqua or legitima or both. Outside of Rome, a regional survey of the chronology of the epigraphic incidences involving the collegium centonariorum will show that they did not develop at an even pace in different regions.

\textit{Regio X (Venetia):} In Patavium, an inscription mentioning a local magistrate as patron of the collegium centonariorum is dated by the 242nd year of the Patavian Era, that is AD 69.\textsuperscript{34} This would suggest that the collegium may have been founded before or during the Julio-Claudian era. In Brixia, an epitaph to M. Cornelius M.\textit{f.} Proculus and his parents can, with little doubt, also be dated to no later than early second century AD (no. 160). In fact, the semi-abbreviated \textit{Dis Manib(us)}, the long I, and the tall T all point to a first-century date.\textsuperscript{35} Three other inscriptions from Brixia may have had a first-century date, though this remains uncertain. No. 154 mentions C. Aemilius C.\textit{f.} Fab\textit{ia} Proculus, a \textit{flamen divi Aug(usti)}. This title, combined with the lettering, would make a first-century date possible. But this is far from conclusive. The use of a tribal designation in his name is not a helpful indicator of an early date, for it was apparently still common among the elites in Brixia at the end of the second century and the beginning of third century.

\textsuperscript{33} Suet. \textit{Aug.} 32. 1: \textit{plurimae factiones titulo collegi novi ad nullius non facinoris societatem coibant. Igitur…collegia praetor antiqua et legitima dissoluit.}

\textsuperscript{34} For the identification of the Era of Patavium, see the note to no. 142 (Appendix A). For bibliography and the most recent discussion, see Liu 2007: 281–89.

\textsuperscript{35} Datable examples of tall T and I from Brixia: \textit{InscrIt} 10.5.85, 138 (tall T), 154 (all Tiberian date); 90 (c. AD 90), 94 (long I, \textit{terminus post quem}, AD 112); 164 (long I, Nero). There are very few examples of unabbreviated \textit{Dis Manibus} from Brixia. I found two: \textit{InscrIt} 10.5.381 (\textit{Dis Manibus} + genitive, long I), \textit{Dis Manib}. (\textit{InscrIt} 10.5.1009 = \textit{CIL} V.4734 = \textit{IB} 540). For the date of no. 160, the inscription under discussion, also cf. Gordon and Gordon 1957: 216; Limentani 1991: 130; Mollo 2000: 299 no. CCXCVII. I agree with Mollo that this inscription has an early date (contr. Gregori 1990: C 49). But we do have examples of the combination of long I and \textit{Dis Manib(us)} dating to mid-second century (e.g., \textit{AE} 2004. 210 from Rome).
AD.\textsuperscript{36} No.169 may be datable to the first century AD, on the basis of the deep cut of the letters and the use of long I, but the dating is not entirely certain.\textsuperscript{37} Based on the presence of double gentilicia, S. Mollo dated no. 174 to the first century AD.\textsuperscript{38} This inscription concerns a M. Publicius M. f. Fab(i)a Sextius Calpurnianus, of the equestrian status, who was among other things a sacerdos iuven(um) Brix(ianorum). No. 161 refers to a sacerdos colleg(ii) iuven(um) Brixian(orum) primum institutis (sic!). It is quite possible that the sacerdos iuven(um) in no. 174 was the same as the sacerdos colleg(ii) iuvenum. If so, no. 174 can not be dated earlier than no. 161.\textsuperscript{39} The reference to a defensor rei publicae in the latter inscription seems to suggest a date later than the early second century AD. In any case, there is no doubt that in Hadrian’s time, the collegium centonariorum of Brixia had already become a very active element in erecting statues to important local figures (no. 152).

**Gallia Narbonensis:** Waltzing mentioned only one inscription related to the collegium centonariorum that could be dated to the first century AD in this region, that is, no. 23 from Vasio, dated by O. Hirschfeld on the basis of letter forms. No. 25 from Alba Augusta Helviorum was dated by M. LeGlay to the first century AD on the basis of palaeography, especially the round forms of O and D, and the form of the tail of Q.\textsuperscript{40} The early date of this inscription is of some interest, for the inscription concerns four collegia: the dendrophori, the fabri, the utriclarii, and the centonarii. P. Kneissl rejected an early date, but his argument is somewhat circular; according to him, this inscription could not be assigned an early date because “in Gallien nirgendwo centonarii und utriclarii mit Sicherheit für das 1. Jahrh. bezeugt sind.”\textsuperscript{41}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{36} The inclusion of tribal designation became rarer from the beginning of the second century AD; but persisted among the upper classes (Degrassi 1962: 659; Duncan-Jones 1974: 362–63; Harris 1977: 286 with n. 18; Dondin-Payre and Raepsaet-Charlier 1999: VII; Mollo 2000: 29).
\item\textsuperscript{37} Mollo 2000: 298.
\item\textsuperscript{38} Mollo 2000: 66 no. XXXI with n. 249. She also mentioned that the phenomenon of duo gentilicia was still attested as late as the second and third centuries AD.
\item\textsuperscript{39} Mollo 2000: 235 no. CLXXXIII with n. 259. Mollo is of the opinion that the iuvenes Brixianorum are not the same as the collegium iuvenum Brixianorum. This is not impossible, but not certain, either.
\item\textsuperscript{40} LeGlay 1964: 149 with n. 1. He referred to the famous Claudian inscription from Lugdunum and other Gallic inscriptions as parallels.
\item\textsuperscript{41} Kneissl 1981: 203.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
REGIO XI (Transpadana): As far as Transpadana is concerned, it is possible to trace the founding date of the collegium centonariorum of Mediolanum by looking at four inscriptions that contain a dating system.

- curator[es] anni XXXX (no. 185)
- c[ur]at(or) arc(ae) coll(egiorum?) fabr(um) et cent(onorium) m(unicipi) M(ediolaniensis or ediolani) ann(i) LXX (no. 188)
- curatorib(us) arc(ae) T[i(tianae)] coll(egiorum?) fabr(um) et centon(aria) c(oloniae) A(elia?) or A(urelia?) or (Antoniniana?) A(ugustae?) [M(ediolaniensis)] ann(i) CXXXVII concordiae eorum (no. 186)
- curator(is) arc(ae) Titiannae coll(egia?) s(upra) s(criti) anni CLI colon(iae) G(allienianae) A(ugustae) F(elicis) Med(iolaniensis or iolani) (no. 193).

Mommsen, followed by Dessau and Waltzing, was inclined to think that these years are those of collegia, not of the city. This opinion should still be maintained. In all four cases, the year is preceded by curator/curatores arcae. This highlights the importance of the collegial treasury (arca collegii), an important element of any collegium, as shown by both epigraphic and legal sources.

In view of the importance of Mediolanum in Gallienus’ reign, the attribution of the renaming and reorganization of the colonia to this emperor could hardly be challenged, although no. 193 is the only inscription that refers to the change of the title of the colonia from CAAM to Colon G A F Med. These abbreviations most likely stand for c(olonia)
A(elia?) or A(urelia?) or (Antoniniana?) A(ugusta?) [M(ediolaniensis)] and colon(ia) G(allieniana) A(ugusta) F(elix) Med(iolaniensis or iolani), respectively. Consequently, the terminus post quem for no. 193 would very likely be AD 260, when Gallienus became sole emperor. Since no. 193 refers to the 151st year of the joint collegia, this would then give AD 109 as the terminus post quem for the first year of the ‘era’ of the collegia fabrum and centonariorum. The terminus ante quem for Mediolanum to acquire the status of Colonia Gallierna should be AD 268, when Gallienus’ reign ended. Since no. 186 dates from before the change of the name of the colonia, it would have AD 268 as the terminus ante quem for the 137th year of the collegia. Consequently, the terminus ante quem for the founding of the collegia would be AD 131. In other words, the foundation of the joint collegia had either a Trajanic or a Hadrianic date. The collegia existed before the change of status of Mediolanum from municipium to colonia (nos. 188, 189): in the 70th year of the collegial era, Mediolanum was still a municipium (no. 188). This suggests that the change of status happened between AD 179 and 201. Consequently, CAAM most likely represented c(olonia) A(urelia) or (Antoniniana) A(ugusta) [M(ediolaniensis)]. The possibility of a c(olonia) A(elia) can be ruled out.

Assuming that the first year of the curator(es) arcae corresponds to the first year of the union of the fabri and the centonarii, we will have the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collegial era</th>
<th>Range of possible dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Founding date</td>
<td>AD 109–131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40th year (no.185)</td>
<td>AD 149–171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70th year (no.188)</td>
<td>AD 179–201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137th year (no.186)</td>
<td>AD 246–268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151st year (no.193)</td>
<td>AD 260–282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But is it possible that the separate collegia of the fabri and the centonarii already existed before they joined each other? It is perhaps not safe to rule out this possibility, which will be discussed further in Chapter 4.

line 7 of no. 193 is very unlikely to refer to one of the Gordians. A parallel is Verona, which changed its name to colonia Augusta Verona nova Gallieniana at or immediately before AD 265 (CIL V.3329 = ILS 544).
Pannoniae: Several inscriptions from both Aquincum and nearby centers indicate that the *collegium centonariorum* may already have been active at the beginning of the second century AD or earlier. A series of epitaphs were put up by the *collegium centonariorum* together with the *collegium fabrum* for veterans of the legio II Adiutrix.⁴⁷ This legion was transferred to Aquincum from Britain in the late Flavian period, and was stationed there after the end of Trajan’s Dacian war. The legion or its subunits took part in Verus’ Parthian campaign and Marcus Aurelius’ campaigns.⁴⁸ Further dating indications of these funerary inscriptions are the absence of D M and the use of H S E; both would discourage a late date, but point to a Trajanic or Hadrianic date if not earlier.⁴⁹ The lack of Imperial names such as Aelii or Aurelii among these epitaphs would also suggest dates earlier than mid-second century AD. The same date range could be suggested for no. 222, recovered from Ulcisia Castra near Aquincum. Thus, the creation of these *collegia* may date back even farther, to the end of the first century AD or the beginning of the second century AD. These *collegia* may very likely have been formed even before Aquincum acquired *municipum* status in AD 124. The *collegium centonariorum* of Aquincum continued to be active until the third century. In AD 210 (no. 205), a *magister* of the *collegium* made a votive dedication to a pagan god Sedatus Augustus. In AD 228, a *decurio* of Aquincum donated a musical instrument (hydra) to the *collegium* (no. 206). In Brigetio (Pannonia Inferior) in AD 217 (no. 218), Quintus Ulpius Felix, an Aug(ustalis), built a *porticus* for Apollo and Hygia, which the *collegium centonariorum* was entitled to use the *porticus* for banquets (*ad epulas*).

Region V (Picenum): Several statues put up by the *collegium centonariorum* of Auximum to known equestrians and senators make it quite clear that it cannot have been established later than Hadrian’s reign, but that it may have already been active in or before Trajan’s reign.⁵⁰

---

⁴⁷ From Aquincum: nos. 202, 203, 211, 216; from Ulcisia Castra: no. 221.
⁴⁸ About the location of the *legio II adiutrix*, see Mócsy 1974: 99; Burns 2003: 220.
⁴⁹ For the changes of the funerary formula in the non-Italian provinces, see Hatt 1952: 19. The standards assembled by Hatt apply to all Gaul, Germany, and the regions on *limes*. See also Limentani 1991: 153; Kurz 1960: 140–43 for a summary of Nagy and Alföldy’s dating of these inscriptions. All of them were inclined to an early date for the formation of *collegia fabrum* and *centonariorum* in Aquincum.
⁵⁰ Nos. 59, 60 (AD 137), 61 (AD 161–166).
No. 58 from a small center, Trea,⁵¹ may have a first- or second-century date, as suggested by the editor of the inscription in *SupIt* 18 (2000). Neither the text nor the lettering, however, provide any decisive dating indications.

**Regio VI (Umbria):** No. 77 from Fanum Fortunatae mentions a *sevir Augustalis* who was affiliated with the *collegia fabrum, centonariorum,* and *dendrophorum.* His *praenomen* and *nomen* were Titus Flavius. Both his parents bore the *nomen* Flavius/a. A Flavian date is plausible, but not at all certain. I have not been able to find an image of this inscription. In Suasa, the local *collegium centonariorum* together with a *sevir* made a dedication to Antoninus Pius during his fourth consulship (no. 75, AD 145–161). Two patronage tablets from Sentinum point to the close relationship between the *collegium centonariorum* and an increasingly important local family in the AD 260s (nos. 68, 69).

**Regio VIII (Aemilia):** In Ariminum, the *collegium centonariorum* made a dedication (no. 113) to L. Betutius L. f. Pal(atina) Furianus, who is among others a *flamen divi Nervae.* This only provides AD 97 as the *terminus post quem* for the date of the inscription, though the possibility of an early second century date does exist.⁵² L. Faesellius L. f. An(iensi tribu) Sabinianus, a patron of the *collegium centonariorum* of Ariminum, had been procurator of Antoninus Pius (no. 111). In Ravenna, the reference to *fisc(us) Augustorum duorum* in an epitaph of a *decurio* of the *collegium* (no. 107), suggests AD 161–166 (Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus) or 198–211 (Septimius Severus and Caracalla).

No. 52 (Marsi Antinum, *Regio IV*) mentions a Q. Novius Q. f. Serg(ia) Felix, who belonged to the most prominent local family from the first

---

⁵¹ Bejor 1977: *Trea, un municipium piceno minore.*

⁵² In the following two instances, the title *flamen* of a deified emperor can be dated to not long after the deification: *CIL V.*7458 (*flamen perpetuus [divi Vesp]asiani, divi Nervae, [divi] Traiani, AD 117–125, Hasta), *CIL V.*4368 = *ILS* 6725 (*flamen divi Traiani, AD 117–138, Brixia), *CIL V.*7783 = *ILS* 1128 (cos. 191, pontifex et *flamen Divi Severi*), *AE* 1975. 251 (*flamen divi Claudi,* early Flavian date, see Keppie 2000: 228), *CIL V.*875 = *ILS* 1374 (*flamen divi Claudi,* Aquileia, the inscription dates to AD 105, but the person’s career already took off under Vespasian). But see a *flamen divi Claudii,* who was also a *flamen divi Traniani* (*CIL V.*5126, AD 118–130, Bergomum); *AE* 1961.109 (Corfinium) mentions a *flamen divi Augusti* and dates to AD 180 or later.
to the second century AD. This inscription may date to the first or second century AD. But since the reading of the text is very uncertain, this inscription may not be relevant. No. 126 (Pollentia, Regio IX) may also be dated to first century AD, on the basis of lettering, as suggested by InscrIt 9.1.131. However, this is a dubious inscription (see Appendix C), which may or may not be relevant. As far as Etruria (Regio VII) is concerned, the earliest datable inscriptions come from or after Marcus Aurelius’ reign (no. 103).

**Gallia Lugdunensis:** The collegia centonariorum in this region began to function actively no later than the reign of Marcus Aurelius. No. 13 mentions a Fulvius Aemilianus of the senatorial rank, c(larissimus) v(ir). Under his supervision, the centonarii restored, with their own money, the 500 loca in the circus which Iulius Januarius gave to the city when he was aedile. As Mommson suggested, this senator might be identified with L. Fulvius Gavius Numisius Petronius Aemilianus, whose cursus is recorded in CIL XIII.1806. This person had been the curator coloniae Lugdunensis. His quaestorship and praetorship date to the joint reign of Aurelius and Verus (AD 161–166). Therefore, by Marcus Aurelius’ reign, the centonarii in Lugdunum were already rich enough to help the city rebuild these loca.

**Spanish Provinces:** The dating can be made on much firmer ground. Two inscriptions commemorating the foundation of the collegium centonariorum in Hispalis of Baetica inform us that it was established through the kindness of Antoninus Pius, indulgentia eius (nos. 33, 34). Unfortunately, both inscriptions survive in very fragmentary conditions. The exact number of members at the time of foundation and the tribunician date of Antoninus Pius are lost. The surviving dating indication is the fourth consulship of Antoninus Pius—AD 145–161—for he only held the consulship four times.

---

53 For the figure 500, see CIL XIII.1919. See CIL XII.3316, 3317 for parallels of such loca.

54 Quaestor candidatus Augustorum duorum, praetor tutelarius candidatus Augustorum duorum. Cf. CIL XIII.1806; PIR F 541. He was the recipient of two rescripts from Marcus Aurelius (Frag. Vat. 189, 210). Cf. Waltzing II: 187. His dating of this episode to after Septimius Severus seems too late.
Dalmatia: An honorific inscription from Salona mentions one M. Ulpius M. f. Sabinus, an equestrian (no. 10). He or his ancestors may have obtained citizenship from Trajan. J. J. Wilkes suggested a second-century AD date for the inscription. A funerary inscription (no. 6) from the same city probably dates to after AD 212, as both the husband and wife mentioned in the inscription bore the nomen gentilicum Aurelius/Aurelia. 55

Noricum: No. 36 from Solva attests to the possession of immunity and other benefits by the collegium. It does not specify which emperor(s) granted these privileges and benefits. The wording beneficia, quae amplissimo ordine uel aliquo princi[pe iubente collegiis c]entonal(iorum) concessa sunt may suggest that the privileges were granted during the reign of an emperor other than Severus or Caracalla. It is very likely that this emperor was Commodus, whose name was deliberately avoided here as his memory was officially condemned. 56 In any case, the date of the rescript—that is, AD 205—gives the terminus ante quem of the receipt of immunity by the collegium.

Dacia: The collegium centonariorum is only attested in colonia Aurelia Apulensis, a status that municipium Aurelium Apulense (Apulum I) acquired under Commodus. 57 It would seem that the collegium occupied a prestigious position by AD 202/203–?205 (no. 2). Thus, it was able to build a meeting hall with a pediment (schola cum aetoma) with its own money. More significantly, the building was dedicated to the well-being (pro salute) of the emperors by Lucius Pomponius Liberalis, the then governor of the three Dacias. 58

Moesia Superior: Only one relevant inscription is known from this province (no. 229). A decurio of the collegium, Aurelius Bardibalus, along with his son, put up the epitaph for his wife Aelia Lucia. The

56 SHA Comm. 19.1; Cass. Dio 74. 2.1; Aur. Vict, Caes. 17.
57 There were two Apulums near the same military base: Apulum I, which became municipium Aurelium Apulense under Marcus Aurelius, and was promoted to colonia status under Commodus (Colonia Aurelia Apulensis); and Apulum II, which grew out of the canabae as municipium Septimum Apulense. (Piso, IDR III.5.1: XV–XXI; Ardevan 2000: 99–102).
58 Lucius Pomponius Liberalis was called consularis in AD 204 (PIR P. 729). The length of his tenure is not clear; perhaps 3 years?
gentilicia Aelia and Aurelia would suggest a late second century date, or a date after AD 212.

Campania (Regio I): The related inscriptions from this region are few (there are only three in total) and relatively late. The latest inscription for this type of collegium was found in Forum Popilii (no. 48). Dated by consular dates to AD 367, it recorded the centonarii’s decision to put up a statue for their patron. The other datable inscription from this region can be dated to not much earlier or later than AD 171 (no. 46).

To sum up: the chronological span of collegia of this type extends from the Late Republic, or at least the Augustan era, down to at least the end of the fourth century AD. The earliest such collegium is attested in Rome. Related inscriptions datable to the first century AD come from Regio X of Italy and Gallia Narbonensis, and less certainly from Regiones IV and IX. During the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian or earlier, the collegia centonariorum became active in the Italian Regiones V and XI, and the Pannonian provinces. Under the Antonines, this type of collegium spread in northern and central Italy as well as in the Spanish provinces, Gallia Lugdunensis, Dalmatia, and perhaps in Moesia Superior. In Dacia and Noricum, the collegia centonariorum became very visible under the Severans. The collegia centonariorum received various privileges perhaps under Commodus, but certainly before AD 205.

This is, of course, only a tentative outline of the chronology of the collegia centonariorum, to be revised by both a more accurate dating of the related inscriptions and the publication of new finds. More importantly, randomness of the survival of the epigraphic records as well as their recovery must be acknowledged and the fluctuation of the epigraphic production must be taken into account. These variables mean that we stand on shaky ground as far as the chronology of the collegia centonariorum is concerned, and that any chronology established primarily upon epigraphic data is subject to interpretation. That the second and third centuries are well represented in the inscriptive material concerning the collegia centonariorum may be explained in different ways. The following possible interpretations are distinct from each other but not mutually exclusive: 1. there were fewer collegia centonariorum in the first century because of the legal regulations, or because of the low ‘associative habit’; 2. there were fewer inscriptions in the first century AD because the peak of the epigraphic output was yet to come; 3, or alternatively, the demographics of the collegia changed in the second and third centuries, with there being more affluent members and
benefactors, who were more able and eager to participate in ‘public discourses’ via the epigraphic media.

To understand the general situation of collegia in the first century AD, the Pompeian case may serve as a helpful chronological index. The collegium centonariorum as well as the collegium fabrum and the collegium dendrophorum are absent from the Pompeian data, although a number of groupings were mentioned in graffiti, painted electoral endorsements, funerary monuments, and honorific inscriptions. In fact, none of these groupings seem to be formal collegia. No formal features such as collegial magistrates have been attested; no Pompeians were explicitly referred to as collegial patrons; nor did the groups call themselves collegia (or similar titles). The significance of the Pompeian data lies in the broader implications with regard to the historical development of collegia. The underdeveloped state of the groups at Pompeii as formal organizations allows us to see that before AD 79, when the city was buried in the volcanic ashes, the phenomenon of formally structured collegia could not be taken for granted even in a prosperous Italian or provincial town with a high degree of urbanization. In this connection, the pre-Flavian date of the collegium centonariorum of Patavium, and the relatively early date of these collegia in northern Italy and southern Gaul, invite particular attention, to which I will return in Chapters 2–4.

Tria Collegia?

The collegia centonariorum have often been studied as part of a ‘tria collegia’ phenomenon. In other words, they are often lumped together with the collegia fabrum and the collegia dendrophorum and explained with a single model. Indeed, these three types of collegia shared several common features, especially their wide geographical diffusions, as well as their active roles in local social life. Sometimes, two or more different collegia joined each other in honoring their patrons/benefactors, or local personages of significance. In a few cities, the collegium fabrum and the collegium centonariorum even shared internal structures such as the treasury (see further Chapters 4 and 6). Yet, each type of

59 Waltzing: I 169–70; III: 115–18 no. 370–403; for the more recent lists of the occupational groups, see M&AJ: 56–58; Cooley and Cooley 2004: 116–17, and 174.
60 Mouritsen 1988; Liu forthcoming in AHB.
these collegia did have their own peculiar characters, and trajectories, not the least of which is the different patterns of their geographical and chronological distributions as indicated by available inscriptions. While the collegia centonariorum developed early in northern Italy, the collegia dendrophororum were established relatively early in southern Italy: the earliest dated inscription mentioning the dendrophori (AD 79) was found in Regium Iulium of Bruttium (Regio III), where the collegia centonariorum have never been attested.61 As far as the collegium fabrum is concerned, scholars generally agree that it experienced a reorganization in 7 BC at Rome.62 Collegia fabrum were present in Ostia, Aquileia, Patavium, Noviomagus Regnorum (now Chichester, Britain), Velitrae (Regio I), and perhaps in Brixia and Alba Helviorum in the first century AD.63 In general, the diffusion of the collegia fabrum did not entirely parallel that of the collegia centonariorum. The early establishment of the collegium fabrum in Britain (most likely under Claudius) is one example; another is its relatively early settlement in Sarmizegetusa (Dacia) under Antoninus Pius or earlier (CIL III.1497). The collegia centonariorum were never attested in either place. I would not suggest for a moment that the pictures presented above are accurate reflections of the historical situation. But unless we can completely dismiss the inscriptive evidence, we must address the patterns presented in the available data. Certainly, as already mentioned before, a variety of factors ranging from the lack of epigraphic activity in a particular place in ancient times, to the low survival rate of inscriptions, to the lack of excavations may account for the absence of inscriptive reference to the collegia centonariorum in that place. But we can never safely rule out the possibility that places, especially inscription-rich places such as Ostia and Sarmizegetusa, did not yield any epigraphic reference to the collegium centonariorum simply because it had never existed there.

61 CIL X.7, CIL V.2794 (= W 462) from Patavium, which is datable to the 256th year of the Patavian era, or AD 88, may have referred to a collegium dendrophorum. But the restoration G(enio) c(ollegii) d(dendrophorum) is by no means certain.

62 For the most recent discussions, see Panciera 1981: 271–80; Royden 1988.

Furthermore, Appendix C shows that the term *tria collegia* was perhaps not a technical term at all. Nor did it have a universally accepted meaning; any three *collegia* of local importance could constitute *tria collegia* in local terminology. Nor did these types of *collegia* always enjoy comparable prestige in the local context. In the city of Rome, for example, the *collegium fabrum tignariorum* was considerably more prominent than the *collegium centonariorum* or the *collegium dendrophorum*. A collective approach, then, should be viewed with caution, and fresh inquiries are needed to address the individualities of each type of *collegia*. Van Nijf (1997) pointed out that the identification of these *collegia* as fire brigades was based on tenuous ground. However, he continued the collective approach and suggested that we should see these *collegia* as status groups in the Roman cities. But neither seeing them as purely fire brigades nor applying the paradigm of ‘status-group’ theory provides satisfactory answers to the individuality of these *collegia*. In what follows, I further illustrates this point by a brief discussion of the case of the *collegia dendrophorum*.

Although the connection between the *dendrophori* (tree-bearers) and the cult of Magna Mater and Attis has long been realized, scholarly treatment of the *dendrophori* in relation to religious practices has been far from sufficient. As a matter of fact, Vermaseren’s classic book (1977) on Magna Mater and Attis, the cult and the myth, had no special section for the discussion of the *dendrophori*, but referred to them only sporadically. In fact, the oversight of the peculiar cultic component of these *collegia* has led to the opinion, erroneous in my opinion, that the *dendrophori* were wood-cutters, tree transporters, and so on. The -phori ending apparently had an eastern origin. These *collegia* most likely came into being as a result of the substantial changes made to the cult under the emperor Claudius. Three changes were particularly significant, namely, the establishment of the March festivities in which

---

64 For the *dendrophori* (or *dendrophores*), see RE (by Cumont); Waltzing III; *DizEpigr*: II 1671–1705; Salamito 1987 and 1990; Kneissl 1994; van Nijf 1997: 195–98; van Nijf 2002: 322–23; Goffaux 2008: esp. 49–55. Rubio Rivera 1993 emphasizes that the geographical distribution of the *dendrophori* did not always match that of the cult of Magna Mater. The circularity of the reasoning, however, should be noted: in her opinion, shrines and altars are the most reliable criteria for the identification of the cult, and that the presence of the *dendrophori* alone is not indicative of the existence of the cult.

65 For example, *pastophori* (worshippers of Isis), *pastophori* (priest of Apollo, e.g. *P.Oxy.* XII. 1435, *AD* 147), *hastaphori*, *cannaphori*. For discussions, see Fishwick 1966 and 1967.
Arbor intrat was a focal part, the opening of the priesthood of Magna Mater to the Roman citizens, and the prominence of the bull-slaying and ram-slaying sacrificial ceremonies, known as the taurobolium and criobolium.\(^{66}\) All of these changes had significant impact on the functions of the dendrophori and the spread of their collegia. Epigraphic sources attest to the active participation of these collegia in cultic activities such as the March festivals in honor of Magna Mater and Attis, the taurobolium (bull-sacrifice), and the criobolium (ram-sacrifice).\(^{67}\) The dendrophori also had close connections with the priests/priestesses (galli, sacerdotes) of the Magna Mater.\(^{68}\)

The early presence of the collegia dendrophorum, and the relative abundance of the inscriptive finds concerning these collegia in southern Italy, invites attention for two reasons: firstly, the epigraphic culture in the South Italian regions such as Lucania, Apulia and Bruttii were relatively low; secondly, few other types of collegia are attested in these regions.\(^{69}\) Yet, the Greek colonists would have introduced the worship long before Magna Mater’s arrival in Rome.\(^{70}\) In North Africa, the widespread worship of Magna Mater along with Ceres can be explained by their being the goddesses of fertility, which would be of central significance to the ‘granary’ province. In addition, the trade

---

\(^{66}\) For these changes, see Lydus, de Mensibus 4.59; Fishwick 1966 and 1967; Vermeseren 1977; Turcan 1996: 44–74; Roller 1999.

\(^{67}\) For collection of inscriptive references, see DizEpigr: II 1671–1705; Vermeseren 1977; Salamito 1987: 992 note 5; M&A passim; Liu forthcoming in AHB. In several places, the collegium’s full name was collegium dendrophorum Matris deum (et Attidis) (e.g. Bull. Com. 1890: 18; CIL VI.461 and 30973). Following an imperial letter by Antoninus Pius, C. Dissenius Fuscus, curator of the municipium Bovillensis, designated a place for the collegium salutare dendrophorum to plant pine trees, which are sacred to Magna Mater and Attis. (AE 1927. 115; AD 147). Archeological finds also confirm such a connection. In Ostia and Glanum, for example, the inscriptions concerning the dendrophori were found in or near the sanctuaries of Magna Mater and Attis. (Ostia, CIL XIV.33, 34–7, 40; for Glanum, see CCCA V: 116–117 no. 341, 342.) In Rusicade, Numidia, a dendroforus (!) decretarius made a dedication to Sanctus Attis and to the Genius of the dendrofori out of his own money (CIL VIII.7956 = ILS 4117). Whether the dendrophori actually carried trees or simply branches does not matter for my purpose.

\(^{68}\) E.g., in AD 190, the dendrophori who resided in Lugdunum performed taurobolium sacrifice on account of the prophecy of the high priest Pusonius Julianus (ex vaticinatione Pusoni Iuliani archigalli). (CIL XIII.1752 = W. 2086 = ILS 4132 = Duthoy 1969: no. 127 = CCCA V.385). The dendrophori often received gifts from the priests of the ‘Great Mother of the gods [from (mount) Ida]’ (e.g., CIL V.81 = ILS 4172, Pola; AE 1929.120, Novae, Moesia Inferior).

\(^{69}\) See briefly in Lomas 1993: 165–66.

\(^{70}\) Graillot 1912: 429.
routes connecting Africa and southern Italy may have facilitated the spread of the phenomenon of the *collegia dendrophorum*. The evident visibility of the *collegia dendrophorum* in Moesia Inferior may be attributed to the proximity of Asia Minor, where the cult originated. Significantly, the iconography of Magna Mater/Cybele in Moesia Inferior bore striking similarity to that in Asia Minor. The paucity of the *collegia dendrophorum* in the Danubian provinces may be explained by the fact that Magna Mater was not one of the more popular deities among the military.

What I have offered here is but a brief and simplified introduction to the *dendrophori*, which still await a systematic treatment. The purpose is to show that this type of *collegium* had its own trajectories. As organizations attached to a major cult, the picture of the chronological and geographical development of the *collegia dendrophorum* derived from the epigraphic records seems to be perfectly in line with their cultic aspects. In other words, the cultic aspects of the *dendrophori* seem to have been the determining factor in their formation and spread. It is precisely this feature that separates this type of organization from the *collegia fabrum* and the *collegia centonariorum*. Lumping all these *collegia* together only obscures their origins and peculiar places in Roman society.

**Conclusion**

The epigraphic and legal sources indicate that the history of the *collegia centonariorum* extends from the Late Republic, or at least the Augustan era, down to at least the end of the fourth century AD. The earliest such *collegium* is attested in Rome; but the next earliest incidences of the *collegia centonariorum* are found in northern Italy and southern Gaul. In fact, northern and central Italy, and southern Gaul were the regions where the epigraphic finds involving this type of *collegia* have clustered. They also left conspicuous traces in frontier provinces such as Pannonia and Dacia. Could the uniform name of the *collegia*

71 Vermaseren 1977: 144.
72 Iupiter Optimus Maximus, Silvanus, and Mithras were the best attested gods among the votive inscriptions from soldiers and veterans. Cf. Mócsy 1974: 250–52.
73 A prosopographical investigation of the many *sacerdotes* that were connected with the *collegia dendrophorum*, for example, would shed much helpful light on the nature of the *dendrophorii*. 
centonariorum, as well as their concentration in certain regions, have been due to nothing more than competitive emulation between cities? Maybe. But why were there so few references to such collegia around Rome? Why did the collegia centonariorum not spread to southern Italy, Africa Consularis or Moesia Inferior? These questions are yet to be addressed. But they cannot be answered by simply treating the collegia centonariorum as part of the ‘tria collegia’ phenomenon. In fact, the varied patterns of geographical and chronological distributions of the three most popular collegia would mean that no single theory can explain their origins, diffusions or functions. To be sure, their paths indeed crossed after the second century. Yet, that should not obscure the individualities of each type of collegia. The next Chapters explore new explanatory models for the origin(s) and development of the collegia centonariorum. In the case of these collegia, which seem to have been attached to no major cult, I believe the major factor(s) behind their geographical distribution is to be found in their occupational aspects (Chapter 2). Furthermore, since associations were subject to legal regulation under the Empire, one must also take into consideration the extent to which the state played a role in shaping the development of the collegia centonariorum (Chapter 3).
CHAPTER TWO

CENTONARIII AND THE ROMAN TEXTILE ECONOMY

In dealing with such a word as centonarius, we will inevitably face the general problem with what the -rius suffix signifies. Is it supposed to mean the maker or dealer of something or the user or operator of something? The answer varies according to context. Faber pectinarius means a maker of comb, while lanarius pectinarius means a wool-comber. The sagitarii on the battleground are apparently archers (Tac., Ann. 2.9–17), while the sagitarii among the immunes attached to the army would be arrow makers (Dig. 50.6.7). The siphonarius among the Vigiles of Rome was the operator of the fire-fighting engine (siphon) rather than a builder of that machine. In the case of centonarius, however, the difficulty of an interpretation is substantially increased by the different understandings of the word cento, the etymological root for centonarius. Based on a close investigation of the legal, etymological, literary and epigraphic material, this Chapter intends to establish the centonarius as an occupational title for craftsmen and tradesmen of woolen fabrics and clothing. Such an identification will have profound bearings on a better understanding of the origins of the collegia centonariorum, their place in the urban scene, as well as the structure of the Roman textile economy.

Centonarius: An Occupational Title

In 1915, an inscription (no. 36) recording a rescript from Severus and Caracalla, and dated by consular date to AD 205, was discovered during excavations in insula V of Flavia Solva, a town in the Roman province of Noricum. This rescript, partially quoted below, restated who among the members of the collegium centonariorum could enjoy privileges including exemption from munera (compulsory services) and who could not.

---

This inscription has been used in discussions of various subjects, particularly the relationship between collegia and the state, and between municipal autonomy and centralized authority. The text, however, is also significant for understanding the meaning of the title centonarius.

As is often noted, this rescript apparently had a similar legal source as Dig. 50.6.6.12 (Callistratus 1 cogn.). Indeed, it was on the basis of this legal citation that the Solva inscription was restored:

Quibusdam collegiis vel corporibus, quibus ius coeundi lege permissum est, immunitas tribuitur: scilicet eis collegiis vel corporibus, in quibus artificiali sui causa unusquisque adsumitur ut fabrorum corpus est et si qua eandem rationem originis habent, id est idcirco instituta sunt, ut necessariam operam publicis utilitatis exhiberent. Nec omnibus promiscue, qui adsumpti sunt in his collegiis, immunitas datur, sed artificialibus dumtaxat. Nec ab omni aetate allegi possunt, ut Divo Pio placuit, qui reprobavit prolixae vel inbecillae admodum aetatis homines. sed ne quidem eos, qui augeant facultates et munera civitatum sustinere possunt, privilegiis, quae tenuioribus per collegia distributis concessa sunt, uti posse plurifariam constituentum est.
Immunity is granted to certain *collegia* or corporations to which the right of meeting has been given by law, namely to those *collegia* or corporations in which each member is enrolled on the basis of his craft such as the corporation of builders and any other which has the same reason for existence, that is to say, those instituted to provide services required for public needs. Nor is immunity given indiscriminately to every one enrolled in these *collegia*, but only to craftsmen. Nor can men of any age be adlected, as the deified Pius decided, in excluding men of advanced or very tender years. But it has been established in many ways that those who have increased their resources and are capable of supporting the *munera* of the communities can no more avail themselves of dispensations which were granted to poorer men who are divided among *collegia*.


The Solva inscription (no. 36) and *Dig.* 50.6.6.12 (Callistratus 1 *cogn.*) were roughly contemporary, and they reflected the same principles governing the distribution of privileges, such as immunity from public services, among the members of a *collegium*. Those legal *collegia* or corporations in which each member was enrolled on the basis of his craft (*artificii sui causa*)—that is to say, those instituted to provide services required for public needs (*necessariam operam publicis utilitatisibus exhiberent*)—might enjoy *immunitas* and other benefits. But members could be disqualified from such privileges on account of irrelevant occupation, extreme youth or old age, or ‘excessive’ wealth. The rescript of Severus and Caracalla is a perfect example of the implementation of such regulations. Or, perhaps the rescript was the precedent or the source for *Dig.* 50.6.6.12, although Callistratus used the *collegia fabrum*, not the *collegia centonariorum*, as an example. As I have already suggested in Chapter 1, although the Solva rescript dates to AD 205, the grant of the *beneficia* might have been made by earlier emperor(s), perhaps Commodus, the repression of whose memory was officially sanctioned. It is not clear, however, whether the rescript was provoked by local issues, or whether the local *centonarii* were citing the rescript to back themselves up. Judging from the plural form of *collegia* in the Solva inscription, the rescript, though discovered in Solva, likely addressed the phenomenon of the *collegia centonariorum* in

---

2 Cf. also *Dig.* 27.1.17.2–3 (Callistratus): *eos, qui in corporibus sunt veluti fabrorum, immunitatem habere etiam circa tutelarum exterorum hominum administrationem habeunt excusationem, nisi si facultates eorum adauctae fuerint, ut ad cetera quoque munera publica suscipienda compellantur*...
general.³ One of the beneficia of the collegia centonariorum is specified as vacatio (exemption), which is doubtless equivalent to the immunitas mentioned in Dig. 50.6.6.12.⁴

Both the Solva inscription and Dig. 50.6.6.12 suggest that, just like the title faber, centonarius was an occupational title, designating an artifex, and that the centonarii were people who all practiced a certain artificium.⁵ There may be outsiders (non-centonarii) in the collegia, but only the true (dumtaxat) centonarii, who were not considered rich by prescribed standard, could enjoy the privileges granted by the government in exchange for the necessaria opera publicis utilitatibus they provided. One might argue that the word artificium in Dig. 50.6.6.12 should be understood in a broad sense, that is, as referring not to a particular craft but to ‘craft’ in general. However, this argument is not supported by the ancient evidence. In proposing to establish a collegium fabrum in Nicomedia, Pliny (Ep. 10.33) specifically states that “no one would be admitted except a faber (ne quis nisi faber recipiatur).”⁶ Faber is certainly a rather broad occupational category.⁷ The broadness of the term, however, does not negate the implication in the Plinian reference that the collegium fabrum was meant to be an organization in which a person was accepted on the grounds of his trade. Another informative parallel comes from the navicularii (shippers/shipowners):

Dig. 50.6.6.6 (Callistatus, 1 cogn.): Licet in corpore naviculariorum quis sit, navem tamen vel naves non habeat nec omnia ei congruant, quae principalibus constitutionibus cauta sunt, non poterit privilegio navicularis induto uti.

---

⁴ These two words, namely, vacatio and immunitas, were not always interchangeable, but in many cases, they were. More discussions are provided in Chapter 2. But see, for example, Dig. 50.5.3 (muneris publici vacatio); CTh 12.1.17, where vacatio and immunitas both meant exemption from munera. For a detailed discussion, see Sirks 1989: 79–112.
⁵ Cf. Verboven 2007a.
⁶ Pliny, of course, is trying to reassure Trajan that the proposed collegium fabrum would not cause trouble in the city of Nicomedia which was already plagued with factitious problems. But the restriction of the membership to the fabri does inform us of the correlation between the name collegium fabrum and fabri. Even Sirks, who does not view the collegia fabrum as occupational associations, in discussing this legal citation, admits that “they were composed of craftsmen (fabri) who may also have performed other general services of a useful nature” than fire-brigade and night-watch duties (1991: 93).
Although a man may be a member of the corporation of shipowners, yet if he does not possess a ship or ships and if all the things laid down in imperial constitutions do not fit his case, he will not be able to avail himself of the dispensation granted to shipowners. (trans. Michael Crawford, in A. Watson, ed. 1998)

B. Sirks may be correct in claiming that the business of the ship-owner (navicularius) perhaps should not be categorized as artificium. This is, however, not important for my purpose; for when the law distinguished the ship-owners from those who did not have ship(s) at all, the principle was the same as when it distinguished the artifices dumtaxat from qui artem non exercent in a given collegium. In both cases, the correlation between the titular name of the collegium and a particular category of trade/craft was clearly underlined. The collegium of the fabri tignarii (builders and carpenters) of Rome proudly advertise their work tools on their altar. The collegia themselves made a distinction between the different components of their membership by calling the non-practitioners qui in eo/eodem corpore sunt or qui inter nos sunt. Some collegia even took strict measures to prevent non-practitioners from sneaking in. There could have been a variety of reasons for non-practitioners to join a collegium: better sociability, investment possibilities, family tradition, a lack of the collegium of a particular certain craft in town, a desire for exemptions from compulsory services and other benefits, and so on. The fact that ‘outsiders’ were commonly present

---

8 The collegium dendrophorum of Brixia also obtained immunity sometime in the early third century AD. The privilege was secured through the intervention of M. Nonius M. f. Fab(ia) Arrius Paulinus Aper, who, among others, was a XVvir sacris faciundis, and patron of the collegium. (CIL V.4340, 4341). This may have been a special grant of the privilege. In any case, the basis for the dendrophori’s entitlement may have been religionis causa and thus very different from what is mentioned in Dig. 50.6.6.6. The collegia dendrophorum seemed to have close contact with the officials in charge of religious matters such as the Xviri sacris faciundis.

9 CIL VI.30982 = AE 1975.13. The Arte dei Maestri di Pietra e di Legname in fifteenth-century Florence (Goldthwaite 1980: esp. 127, 244, 249–56) is an interesting parallel. For the Coat of arms of the Maestri (mid-fifteenth century) that displays building tools, see Goldthwaite 1980: 255.

10 Scaenici Asiaticiani et qui in eodem corpore sunt (CIL XII.1929, Vienna); collegium fabrorum et qui in eo sunt (CIL VII.11, Noviomagus Regnorum in Briannia); aurificibus et coniugibus eorum et (iis) qui inter nos sunt (AE 1981.387, Mutina).

11 E.g., the negotiatores eborarii et citriarii [dealers of (artifacts of) ivory and citrus wood] of Rome (AE 1891.14 = CIL VI.33885 = W 2414 = ILS 7214 = FIRA III 33, under Hadrian).

12 Contr. van Nijf 2002: 315: “Such ‘openness’ was not usually shared by other associations with a more clearly defined professional background, however, and it suggests
in various *collegia* whose names incorporated occupational titles does not prove that these *collegia* were not formed or at least intended to be formed along the line of certain occupation.\(^{13}\)

It is sometimes assumed that *artificium* meant ‘fire-fighting’ in these contexts. This is a misunderstanding. *Dig.* 50.6.6.12 refers to *necessaria opera publicis utilitatis*. If fire-fighting is relevant at all here, it belongs in this category.\(^{14}\) Ancient, Medieval and Early modern parallels all suggest that it was by no means rare for occupation based associations to be involved in services unrelated to their specific trade. The same organization could certainly play the dual roles of occupational guild and fire brigade. The salt-carriers of Medieval Riga, for example, won the same degree of autonomy as other guilds “at the cost of undertaking to serve as the town fire brigade.”\(^{15}\) Confusing *artificium* with *necessaria opera publicis utilitatis* can only lead to serious misinterpretation of the title *centonarius*. It is my contention that the line of argument that denies seeing *centonarius* as a possible occupational title should be abandoned. After all, the Solva inscription attesting to the possession of *vacatio* and other *beneficia* by the *collegia centonariorum* was only discovered in 1915, and so was unknown to Hirschfeld, the major advocate of that argument.

\(^{13}\) For the term ‘*Berufsfremde*’, see Ausbüttel 1982: 99. The Medieval and Early modern guilds provide plenty of helpful parallels of admitting “outsiders” as members. (Thrupp 1963: 258; Edgren 1977: 144; Goldthwaite 1980: 245; Swanson 1983: 10; Cerutti 1991; Ward 1997: 48; Rosser 1997.)

\(^{14}\) Cf. Verboven 2007a: note 94.

\(^{15}\) Thrupp 1963: 262–63; Cunnington and Lucas 1967: 262–64. “The Thames watermen, whose main employment was manning the numerous boats engaged in the Thames passenger traffic, were favoured by the companies as part-time firemen for a number of reasons—e.g., they were their own masters, they were centered around the City river-side stairs, close by the companies’ offices, and their river training, and in some cases sea-going experience, was adaptable to the business of fire-fighting and the use of ladders and ropes” (Thrupp 1963: 262); “in addition to firemen proper the companies also recruited porters whose job it was to salvage goods and remove them out of danger” (Thrupp 1963: 263). See also Farr 1988: 125 for an example of a master shoemaker gaining exemption from service in the night watch (Dijon, AD 1550–1650).
Cento and Centonarius

If *centonarius* was an occupational title, what trade exactly did the *centonarii* practice, then? It is generally agreed that *cento* and *centonarius* are cognates. Theoretically, *centonarius* may mean either a user or a maker/dealer of *cento*. In order to understand the meaning of *centonarius*, it is necessary to explore the range of the meanings of *cento*. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae (TLL)* gives three definitions for *centones*: *ex multis pellibus vestes confectae; filtra; cilitia*. The first definition alone has attracted much attention in the past discussions. The *Oxford Latin Dictionary* defines *cento* simply as “a quilt, blanket, or curtain made of old garments stitched together.” The word must have been in use long before Plautus’ time, when the phrase *centones sarcire* had already acquired the metaphorical meaning ‘to make up stories’. The earliest references for the literal meaning of *cento* are in Lucilius and Cato. The ‘patchwork clothing’ definition seems to have been deduced from a quote from Cato: *quotiens cuique tunicam aut sagum dabis, prius veterem accipito, unde centones fiant* (*Agr. 59*). Clearly, clothes were worn until they were worn out, and the parts that were still usable were reused; it is also quite possible that they could have been turned into patchwork clothing. Archaeological excavations have turned up many worn-out textiles and garments showing signs of repair and reuse. A tunic found in Mons Claudianus, for example, seems to have been remade from a mantle. Besides, *cento/centunculum* (κεντόνιον/κέντουκλον in Greek) can refer to the rags that were used to patch up torn clothes. It can also be used to refer to old, torn, or

---

17 Cf. also Lewis & Short: “*cento, -onis, m. [kentrôn], 1. a garment of several bits or pieces sewed together, a rag-covering, patchwork, etc.*”
18 Plaut. *Epidicus* 451–55; *centones sarcire alicui* is understood as ‘to impose upon by falsehoods’.
19 A graffito from Herculaneum did vocabulary exercise with words beginning with *cen*: *Centurio | centonem non habet | cen* (*CIL IV.10581*).
20 E.g., two relatively well preserved pieces of garments, one a cloak/blanket and the other a tunic, from northern Germany; each was apparently pieced together out of various fragments of reused textiles. Though this find is from the seventh century, it certainly illustrates what *centones* might have looked like (Farke 2001: 130). “It seems that in antiquity rags were cut into squares or rectangles of some 10 to 15 cm” (Mannering 2000: 283; the Mons Claudianus Textile Project).
22 Apul. *Met.* 9: *Nec mora nec cunctatio, sed calculis omnibus ducatum latrones uniamines ei deferunt, vestemque lautiusculam proferunt sueret, abiecto centunculo divite.*
dirty garments. In Petronius’ Satyricon, pannucia and cento are used interchangeably in reference to a shabby tunic. Apuleius also used centuculum to refer to the varicolored costume of the mime.

From at least the time of Tertullian, cento began to be used to refer to a type of ‘patchwork’ poem—that is, a poem composed of various verses from another poem. This meaning survived in Medieval Latin and various modern languages, and may refer not only to a patchwork poem but also to a patchwork song. In modern Italian, the Latin cento has survived as centone, which still means ‘patchwork’; another possible cognate, cenciata, means ‘heap of rags’, and cenciaiuolo means ‘rag-picker’. Therefore, it is quite understandable why many scholars would identify the centonarii as rag-pickers/ragmen, makers of patchwork garments, and dealers in old clothes. This identification presents significant difficulties for some scholars trying to reconcile the occupation of the centonarii with their apparent prominence in many cities (some centonarii were Augustales!). For these scholars, associating them with fire-fighting provides a workable way to get around this perceived difficulty.

There are, however, at least two problems with this approach: First, even if the identification of the centonarii as ragmen were correct, one should not assume that their occupation was necessarily much more vulgar than many others. It is not always justifiable to evaluate the status of occupations in ancient times or in the pre-industrial societies in general by modern standard. A study of occupational classification in a Canadian town prior to industrialization has shown that, as far as socioeconomic rank was concerned, the rag-dealer and rag-sorter could be listed in the second of six categories containing more than a hundred occupations, and can be higher than the baker, the smith, and so on. Furthermore, Medieval and Early Modern sources also suggest that those involved in the business of used clothing did not have to be poor or insignificant. The Florentine rigattieri (used-clothing and

---

23 Cato Agr. 59; Petron. Sat. 14.7–8, 15.7–8.
linens retailers) in the thirteenth to the sixteenth century, for example, were often wealthy, “as they organized the first retail clothing market in the city of Florence” in the early thirteenth century. Poor ambulatory rigattieri did exist, but many of them seem to have been female, who were barred from pursuing this trade outside of guild control.29 This being said, it still remains to be decided whether ragmen was the right definition for centonarii or not.

Second, as Maué (1886: 10–15) and the TLL pointed out long ago, the definitions currently found in mainstream dictionaries—rags, shabby clothes, patchwork—do not exhaust all the possible meanings of cento. To be sure, there has been no lack of historico-linguistic discussion of cento and its variant forms, such as centunculum.30 This type of discussion focuses exclusively on the horizontal comparison between the various terms for rags/patchwork in Indo-European languages: cento (Latin), kantha (Sanskrit), hadara (High German), and more disputably kentrôn (Greek). It is outside the scope of this book to judge the soundness of such studies. But their limitations are obvious: linguists have paid insufficient attention to how the centones were used in the Roman society, and a group of references to cento from the Roman military writers has seldom figured in linguistically oriented discussions. Only by taking a thorough examination of the material, uses, and users of cento can we place the centonarii in their proper context.

One of the earliest literary references to cento is in Cato, where it appears to refer to a cloak/blanket for agricultural slaves.31 Certainly centones circulated in the market. In Cato’s time, the best price for centones in Italy was to be found at Rome.32 Columella (Rust. 1.8.9) indicates that their insulating and protective qualities against wind, low temperatures, and rain made the centones confecti suitable clothing (vestimenta) for rural laborers, together with hooded saga and leather garments with sleeves. The writings of Caesar, Vegetius, and Ammianus Marcellinus show that cento was not only one of the most easily found materials in the Roman army, but also had a variety of

31 In the Roman context, there is usually no strict dividing line between a cloak and a blanket. It is well known that making Roman clothing required little sewing or cutting. What could be used as a cloak during the day could easily be converted to a blanket at night (Kendrick 1920; Granger-Taylor 1982: 3–25; Croom 2000: 20–21).
32 Cato Agr. 135.1.
uses—as a hat under one’s helmet, protective clothing against arrows, a covering to protect machines against fire and projectiles, and so on. The insulating and protective qualities of centones must also account for their extensive use by the military.

In Dig. 33.7.12.18 (Ulpianus 20 ad Sab.), a passage attributed to the first-century jurist Pegasus and dealing with legacies of equipment, centones are listed together with vinager (acetum), pumps (sifones), poles (perticae), ladders (scalae), mats (formiones), sponges (spongiae), buckets (amae), and brooms (scopae) as fire-fighting instruments. Presumably, cento was a thick and heavy material. Both Sisenna and Vegetius juxtaposed centones with cilicia, a thick textile material probably made of (goats’) hair. Sisenna also mentions the use of centones soaked in vinegar (acetum madefactis centonibus) as a sort of protective covering. Pliny the elder claimed that cloth and clothing made of “self-felted fleece (lana coacta)” soaked in vinegar was capable of “even resisting iron and what is still more, fire.” This seems to suggest an equivalency between cloth/clothing made of ‘self-felted fleece’ and centones. Since centones were more than once mentioned together with acetum, it is not without reason that many scholars think that centones were perhaps soaked in vinegar or water and then used to put out fire.

In addition to cilicia, centones were often juxtaposed with coria in agricultural and military writings: these two types of material seem to have been interchangeable. All these considerations point to the similarity of centones to felt, which is second only to leather in its insulating and protective qualities. That cento was comparable to felt may be further confirmed by comparing cento with pilêma and pilos (Greek

---

33 Amm. Marc. 19.8.8; Caes. BCiv. 2.9, 2.10.6; Vegetius Epit. rei mil. 2.59.2, 4.14, 15, 17, 18, 23.
34 Gordon 1980: 37.
35 Vegetius Epit. rei mil. 4.14.
36 Pliny HN 8.48, 73, 192.
37 A rough parallel can be found in Vitruvius, who mentions that machines may be protected against the blow of hurling engines and the attack of fires by being covered with double crude leather stuffed with seaweed or chaff soaked in vinegar (De Arch. 10.14: percrudis coris duplicibus consutis, fartis alga aut paleis in aceto maceratis, circa tegatur machina tota. ita ab his recientur plagae ballistarum et impetus incendiorum).
38 For its insulating and protective qualities, cf. Caes. BCiv. 2.10.6, 3.44.7; Columella Rust. 1.8.9; Vegetius Epit. rei mil. 2.59.2, 4.14, 15, 17, 18, 23. For the characteristics of felt and the process of its manufacture, see Gillow and Sentence 1999: 24–25; Geijer 1979: 225; Harris, ed. 1993: 50; Laufer 1930: 1–18, 32.
They have similar range of uses—pîlos, in particular, was used as a fire-retarding material in the military, much like cento. Both cento/centunculum and pilêma/pîlos were also put to common use as saddle-cloth. In a passage from Livy, it is clear that centuncula could be used as saddle-blankets for mules. Diocletian’s Price Edict mentions centunculum equestrae quaoactile, which was translated as κέντουκλον ιππικόν πιλωτόν (saddle cloth of felt for horse) (7.52) in the Greek version. Another well known use of felt was as a head-covering, just as it is used in many places today. An anecdote told by Ammianus (19.8.8) shows that Roman soldiers sometimes wore removable cento-hats under their helmets—when Ammianus and his companions, having been walking in the desert, were trying to get water from a well (AD 359), they tore their linen clothing to make a rope and tied to it centonem quem sub galea unus ferebat e nostris, which worked like a sponge (hauriens ad peniculi modum), suggesting a woolen texture. This type of hat, worn under the helmet, may have had multiple functions, such as making the metal helmet fit snugly and providing a layer of insulation to keep the head from getting too hot or too cold. Finally, judging from its apparently absorbent quality, cento may have been used to absorb sweat.

In the Medieval English translation of Vegetius (AD 1408), ‘felt’ was used to translate cento, a word that he used frequently in his military writings. A passage from the sixth-century strategist Maurikios clearly shows that centunculum/κέντουκλον was a particular textile material for ‘felt’.)

---

39 Th. they could be used as curtains, blankets, saddle cloths, hats, fireproof coverings for military machines, bumpers, and military apparel (Cato Agr. 2.3, 11.5, 59, 135.1; Sen. Ep. 80.8; Livy 7.14.7; Diocletian Edictum de pretiis 7.52, 53; Caes. BCiv. 2.10.6, 3.44.7; Vegetius Epit. rei mil. 2.59.2, 4.14, 15, 17, 18, 23; Maurikios Strategikon 1.2). For the uses of pilêma and pilos, see LSJ; for felt hats and straps (phasisxidion piloton), see P.Oxy. XXXI. 2598; Wild 1985: 383.

40 Aeneas Tacticus 33.3.

41 See Bingen 1953: 656–58; Lauffer 1971; Giacchero 1974: 152–53 II. Plate LII. Before the discovery of the Argos fragment, 7.53 was restored as pilêma based on Mommsen [1893 (1958)]’s reading of the very damaged Megarese fragment. For visual presentations of horse blankets, see, for example, Davies 1989 Plate 7.4; figs. 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 14 in Bishop 1988.


43 For such “arming-caps,” see Bishop and Coulston 2006: 175 (citing finds from Dura), 216. For a modern description of the similar properties of felt, see Gordon 1980: 11.

44 Lester 1988: passim, esp. 169.
from which a cavalryman’s outer cloak could be made.\textsuperscript{45} It was also used to make tents, according to Ioannes Cananus, a fifteenth-century source. The Suidas gives \textit{pilos} (‘felt’) as the definition for \textit{κέντουκλον}.\textsuperscript{46} Studies of Medieval Latin from several different local sources show that \textit{cento/centunculum} can mean both ‘rags’ and ‘felt’.\textsuperscript{47}

Since references to \textit{centones/centoncula} are usually found in association with farms, fortresses, and battlefields, it is reasonable to think that agricultural workers and the military constituted the main consumers of this material. Our sources also point to an association between the urban poor and the use of \textit{centones} as blankets, door-hangings, etc.\textsuperscript{48} References to \textit{centones/centoncula} can also be found in a monastic context. \textit{Ψίαθος} (‘rush mat’) and \textit{κεντωνίον} were the standard bedding and clothing of model ascetics.\textsuperscript{49} It is not always clear, however, whether in this context \textit{cento} refers to coarse/low quality or torn/patched bedding/clothing.

What emerges from this survey is that as fabrics and clothing, \textit{cento} was valued for its utilitarian and functional, particularly protective, qualities, rather than for its aesthetic appeal. One might be tempted simply to identify \textit{cento} with felt. There are, however, two obstacles. One is Caesar \textit{BCiv.} 3.44.7: \textit{magnusque incesserat timor sagittarum, atque omnes fere milites aut ex coactis aut ex centonibus aut ex coriis tunicas aut tegimenta fecerant, quibus tela vitarent}. Here, he listed \textit{coacta, centones}, and \textit{coria} together, suggesting that \textit{coacta} and \textit{centones} were in fact different materials. \textit{Coactum} could be viewed as etymologically equivalent to \textit{pilêma}, because felt was (and is) made by \textit{pressing} wool. However, \textit{coactum} was rarely used in that sense; this passage is the sole reference for that meaning. Significantly, in two other, similar contexts, Caesar did not use \textit{coacta}, but only \textit{centones} in conjunction with \textit{coria}. There are perhaps two possible explanations: (1) \textit{coacta} was redundant with \textit{centones}, or (2) \textit{centones} was a broader category that included

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{45} Maurikios \textit{Strategikon} 1.2. Dennis (1984: 13) rightly, I think, translated it as ‘felt.’
\item \textsuperscript{46} \textit{Suidas}: entries 1599 and 1601.
\item \textsuperscript{47} See especially the glossaries, such as Sophocles 1887; Lorenze Diefenbach 1968; Latham 1975; Du Cange 1883–87 (1954); Fuchs, Weijers, and Gumbert 1981; Colussi, ed., 1986: “\textit{cento(’)}ne, panno composto con pezzi di stoffa differenti; lo fultro, la zangola”; Arnaldi, ed., 1936: “\textit{cento-vestis pannis intextis: Vers. Ver. 79 tumulum aureum cooptertum -us. centonium-cento, pannis: Ioh. Am. Lib. 89.22 vestiabatur -m}.”
\item \textsuperscript{48} Sen. \textit{Ep.} 80.8; Petron. \textit{Sat.} 7.2.
\item \textsuperscript{49} For a collection of references to them, see Du Cange 1688 (1958).
\end{itemize}
centonarii. The latter explanation may begin to seem more plausible if we take a look at Diocletian’s *Price Edict* 7.52, cited previously. Here, the wording *centunculum equestrae quoactile* (*sic!*!) seems to suggest that the *centunculum* of felt (*quoactile*) was only one kind of *centunculum*, and that it could also be made by other methods. Indeed, 7.53 listed another *centunculum* that was specified as *ornamentum ab acu* (*‘embroidered’*); but it is not clear whether or not this type of *centunculum* was made of felt. In both cases, *centunculum* may simply mean ‘(small) blanket’. What these two kinds of *centuncula* had in common is that they were both very cheap (100 and 250 denarii, respectively), meaning that they were not luxury objects.

From the survey provided in this section, it emerges that *cento/cen-
tunculum* had the meanings of both ‘felt’, ‘blanket’, or simply ‘a piece of woolen’. This is not surprising, for the close association between the first two meanings also occurs in many other languages. But it is of particular interest in the Roman context because Roman clothing manufacture was dominated by a tradition of weaving cloth into shape, and involved little sewing; nor was the functional distinction between clothing and soft furnishings as marked as it is today. Since the main characteristics of this material seem consistent, we may be justified in seeing *cento* as a term for all kinds of coarse/heavy/utilitarian woolen products, among them felt and its products. *Cento* probably had a base meaning of simply a piece of medium- and/or low-quality cloth of wool.

Who, then, were the *centonarii*? In my opinion, they were primarily tradesmen and/or manufacturers engaged in the production and distribution of low- or medium-quality woolen textiles and clothing, including felt and its products. This idea is not entirely new. Calderini,

---

50 The nature and value of denarius changed over time. As a silver coin, it was no small denomination before the inflation in the third century AD. In Diocletian’s *Price Edict*, however, the denarius was just a unit of very small value.

51 Steinkeller 1980.


53 Wild 2002: 22 citing *Dig.* 34.2.24 (Ulpianus).

54 This meaning persisted from the Republic down to the fifteenth century, at least in the military context. However, in Medieval and early modern vernacular, many words were used to refer to coarse cloth and/or clothing: felt, frieze, fusians, beige, rough serge, *orbace*, and *bisella*, to name just a few. (Piponnier and Mane 1997: 44; Epstein 1989: 162; Giusberti 1998: 302–03.)

55 The distinction between tradesman and craftsman is often too artificial to be applicable to the ancient world, when “a combination of a workshop and shop was not
for example, saw the *centonarii* simply as clothiers who dealt with *coperture più rozze*. But perhaps there is no need to push for homogeneity among them. The same occupational title in antiquity might refer to workmen doing very different things, from a modern point of view. A good case in point is the *fullones*, whose occupations included both laundry work and the finishing of newly woven cloth. In addition, urine-collecting was a part of their work, for they used urine as a detergent. It would not be surprising if the *centonarii* were also involved in collecting, mending, reusing, and reselling secondhand textiles, even though, according to our sources, these recycling functions were distributed among various other professionals and were often done domestically. It does not seem necessary, however, to insist on a clear-cut distinction between craftsmen/tradesmen who dealt with used textile materials and those who did not.

Parallels from other pre-industrial societies are abundant. For example, since 1557 throughout the Early Modern era, the drapers (clothiers) of Bologna, locally known as *strazzaroli*, were “entitled to buy and sell, retail and wholesale, all kinds of fabric or clothing—new and second-hand—whatever the style of decoration.” In the Medieval and Early Modern eras, there existed in various places the guilds of the *rigattieri*, that is, *hominis artis vendentium pannos et pelles veteres*—dealers of secondhand clothes or as is sometimes translated, scrap merchants. Some of their guild charters have survived to inform
us of their functions. The business dimension of the *rigattieri*, however, was seldom limited to secondhand clothes alone, but often intersected diverse spheres. The roles of the *rigattieri* in the circulation of goods and money could be multifaceted, and their relationship with various other craftsmen and tradesmen may be rather complicated. In Bologna, the local *rigattieri* swore to the *strazzaroli*’s guild, but the former were involved in trafficking and assessing all kinds of goods including furniture and metals. In Florence, the *Arte dei rigattieri* was first formed in 1266 as “the retail guild of dealers in second-hand clothing, cloth, household linens, and related items, which organized the first Florentine ready-to-wear marketplace.” In the three hundred years or so since 1296, tailors were normally under the jurisdiction of the *rigattieri*, who were also closely associated with the *linaiuoli* (linen workers) to the extent of forming a single guild with them after 1382. More significantly, the Florentine *rigattieri* bought and sold a wide range of goods from clothing, furs, brocades, remnants of textile material from the cloth-industry workshops, cushions, rugs, mattresses, bed linens, horse covers, used campaign awnings, woven and knitted handwork from independent female home-laborers, cheaper foreign cloth, fabric used for making coverlets, curtains, bed canopies and chair backs, to undergarments, socks, trousers, and caps.

For my purpose, the examples of the Bolognese *strazzaroli* and the Florentine *rigattieri* who were entitled to trade a wide range of textile objects would serve to strengthen the point that an oversimplified definition of the occupational aspects of the *centonarii* is neither necessary nor warranted: they may have been craftsmen and tradesmen of woolen fabrics and clothing, both new and used. Nor did they have to be the only businessmen involved with secondhand clothing in the Roman cities.

The subject of the secondhand clothing trade in ancient times remains little charted, although H. W. Pleket drew attention to it more than a decade ago. The papyri provide much evidence of the practice of selling used clothing. One papyrus mentions an old cloak acquired for

---

61 They bought low, sold high. The *rigattieri* at some places did not deal with all kinds of old clothing: blood-stained clothes and felt, for example, were forbidden articles. Sartini 1958; Mulholland 1941. Giuberti 1998: 301–06; Frick 2002: esp. 20–38.

62 Giuberti 1998: 304–05: the Bolognese “*rigattieri* may traffic in everything, provided it is used.”


burial purpose at the low price of 24 obols.65 Another possibly refers to a used cloak acquired for 10 drachmae.66 The list goes on; but unfortunately, not one mentions the sources of these secondhand clothes. It seems that secondhand clothing circulated in various ways. One could go directly to the market and sell used clothes, either one’s own or stolen.67 Petronius’ Satyricon (12–13) provides an example of this kind of practice. Pawnbrokers, for instance, might have been sellers of secondhand clothing. Of course, pawnbrokers took a variety of goods as pledges, not exclusively clothing; but there is no lack of evidence for clothing being taken as surety.68 Clothing was pledged for small as well as relatively large amounts of money, which shows that pawning catered to potential customers of all socioeconomic backgrounds. Unredeemed clothing could also have supplied the secondhand clothing market. Epigraphic evidence also shows that there were tradesmen who specialized in secondhand goods. The Greek grutopôlês and its Latin equivalent scrutarius have been identified as titles for dealers of secondhand goods.69 The equivalence between these two titles is attested by one bilingual inscription from Cos, dedicated to Augustus by the guild of the grutopôlai/scrutari.70 The presence of the grutopôlai is attested in

---

65 SPP XXII.56. (second–third century AD).
66 P.Oxy. IV.736 (Oxyrhynchus, early first century AD). This papyrus contains household accounts. Since most of the expenditures were recorded in obols, a small monetary unit, the household was probably not very well off. But it could not have been very poor, either. L. 4 mentions phainolou Koraksou, apparently purchased for 10 drachmae. The text does not make it explicit whether the cloak is a new one or secondhand. But l. 10 mentions the mending of a cloak belonging to Coraxus. If this refers to the same cloak mentioned in l. 4, then either Coraxus’ cloak was acquired in a used condition or he damaged it shortly after purchase. This price is moderate if not low. In BGU 1666 (Philadelphia, first century AD), all the apparel listed, including stolae and tunics, cost more than 60 drachmae apiece. P.Mich. 121 (AD 42) mentions a robe valued at 60 drachmae. But P.Ryl. 128, dated to AD 30, from Euhemeria, mentions a himation which was valued at only 4 drachmae.
67 For more about the theft of clothing, see Croom 2000: 24. However, Croom did not cite the many papyrological sources attesting to this phenomenon. Many stolen articles of clothing may have supplied the secondhand clothing market.
68 White tunic pledged for 11 drachmae, red tunic pledged for 20 drachmae (P.Lond. 193V, second century AD); men’s garments pledged for 112 drachmae (P.Oxy. III. 530); P.Mich.inv. 3163, and see Husselman 1962: 256–66; also P.Oxy. XLIV.3201 with references.
70 Maiuri 1925: 168 no. 466 (the reign of Augustus).
Arsinoë, Aphrodisias, Tyre, Alexandria, and various other cities. A second-century wooden tablet in Greek seems to suggest that a woman named Isidora played the dual role of *grutopôlês* and pawnbroker, which seems to confirm that the pawnbrokers’ function often overlapped with that of the dealers in secondhand goods, and vice versa.

In antiquity, textiles were unlikely to end up in the rubbish heaps before they were worn out, as evidenced by finds from Mons Claudianus (first–third century AD). Mending was frequent; it could certainly be done at home, but there is also explicit evidence showing that mending was sometimes done by paid professionals. *P.Oxy.* IV.736 provides an example of an outer coat, and not even a very expensive one, being mended by a paid professional. When *cento* means ‘patchwork’ or ‘ragged/old clothes’, the verb used with it is almost always (*con*)sarcire (except in one case, where suere was used). Making patchwork, tailoring, and mending, then, must have been closely associated with the title *sarcinator*. Indeed, Lucilius (1.747) says that *sarcinatorem esse summum, suere centonem optume*. Roman clothing did not require much sewing or tailoring, which also points to the function of the *sarcinatores* more often as menders rather than dress-makers. *Sarcinatores/sarcinatrixes*, both free and freed, are attested by several legal passages and more than a dozen inscriptions. Many of them were members of the household staffs of rich families; some appear to have been independent. There is no evidence that any of them belonged to any *collegium*.

---

71 Arsinoë: *BGU* I.9 = *W. Chrest* 293 (late third century AD); cf. Wallace 1938: 208: here, however, the title is translated as “sellers of small wares;” Aphrodisias: excavation inventory no. 76.1, b. 1.28; Tyre: Hombert 1976: 621–26; Rey-Coquais, *BullMusBeyrouth* 29 (1977) 56 no. 95; Alexandria: *CIJ* II.928, an Alexandrian whose son was buried at Joppa.

72 Hombert 1976: 621 (AD 192).


74 E.g., Cato *Agr.* 2.3: *cum tempestatibus pluviae fuerint centones, cuculiones familia<m>* oportuisse *sibi sarcire*.

75 A cloak worth 10 drachmae was repaired at the price of 1 1/2 obols (*P.Oxy.* IV. 736; Oxyrhynchus, first century AD).

76 Legal texts: Gai. *Inst.* 3.205; *Dig.* 4.9.5pr (Gaius 5 *ad ed. provinc.*), 14.3.5.6 and 10 (Ulpianus 28 *ad ed.*), 14.4.1.1 (Ulpianus 29 *ad ed.*. It refers to *servos fullones vel sarcinatores vel textores vel venaliciarios*), 19.2.13.6 (Ulpianus 32 *ad ed.*), 19.2. 25.8 (Gaius 10 *ad ed. provinc.*), 47.2.83pr (Paulus 2 *sent.*). Inscriptions: *AE* 1972.111; *AE* 1981.502; *AE* 1977.54, 62; *AE* 1987.641; *CIL* II.5437; V.2386, 2881, 2542, 7568; VI.4029, 6349–51; XI.5437, etc. Cf. Maxey 1938 (1975): 37–39; Treggiari 1979: 68.

In view of the market for secondhand clothing and the mending so often applied to clothing, the pace at which a garment disappeared from circulation and one’s wardrobe in ancient times must have been slow, which must in turn have slowed the demand for new garments. Nevertheless, the aggregate demand for apparel and furnishing textiles from the lower classes must still have been massive, for the simple reason that they constituted the majority of the population. Scholars all agree that both ‘domestic’ and ‘commercial’ production of clothing provided the means to meet the demand. Based on the literary texts, papyrological sources, and Diocletian’s *Price Edict*, A. H. M. Jones put forward the opinion, half a century ago, that “weaving was...in the main a professional occupation, and clothing an object of trade.” While this may be an overgeneralization, the role of commercial clothing in the Roman world cannot be easily dismissed as insignificant. Recent estimations of the (low) work rates in textile production (especially spinning and weaving) in ancient Greece and Rome have made it quite difficult to believe that household self-sufficiency in textile could be achieved. Clothing for slaves, too, seemed to have been mainly pur-

---

78 According to Brunt 1987: 703: 90 percent of the Roman population had to work for their livelihood. Cf. also Vicari 2001: 16; Wild 2002: 31 (the case of Roman Britain).
79 Dixon (2001b:11–12; 15) is certainly right in emphasizing that the categories of “domestic” and “commercial” are not necessarily opposing. Therefore, some qualifications of the meaning of the terminologies that I use here is in order. By “domestic”, I mean produced domestically for domestic use; by “commercial”, I mean produced for market/profit by specialists or others. In other words, it is the destination rather than where the clothing were produced that separates these two sources of supply.
80 Jones 1974: 352, with a survey of primary sources. An additional piece of information is Dio Or. 7.105–06. Cf. also Rostovtzeff, *SEHRE*: 577–79; Pleket 1988: 31; van Minnen 1987: 32; Wipszycka 1965 (with reservations). For different opinions, see Jongman 1988a. It should be noted that cloth-making and clothes-making should not be thought of as equivalent to weaving, for as I mentioned earlier, felting was also an important method of making cloth.
81 The Zarai tariffs from Numidia (*CIL VII.4508 = CIL VIII.18643; AE 1966. 547; AE 2003.1895; Horden and Purcell 2000: 355; AD 202) included sections on imported textile and leather products. In Diocletian’s *Price Edict*, eleven out of thirty-two sections concerned a wide range of textiles. Horden and Purcell 2000: 357; also Etienne 1966: 209–11; Jones 1974: 350–64; Duncan-Jones 1982: 245. For the East, see Wipszycka 1965 and 1966; Kleijwegt 2002: 94 with n. 50. Here I use the term “commercial” in a broad sense, to mean any articles that were either purchased on the market or made by paid professionals, whether in workshops or at customers’ homes.
82 For the work rates, that is, the time spent in the spinning and weaving, see *PSI* VI.599, cited by Wild 2002: 31 and 2003: 40, 42 (three weavers plus one woman assistant could weave a linen sheet in six days); *P.Oxy. IV.736* (the *gerdios* appeared in the account on the tenth day of the month; the final *kerkistra phainolou* or the payment for making the garment, was paid on the 22nd. But since the host provided only breakfast
chased from the market. P. van Minnen has rightly warned against an underestimation of the aggregate volume of common utensils, clothing, and so on, “not intended for conspicuous consumption by the elite, but for the ordinary man,” produced by craftsmen. It is in this connection that the role of the centonarii in the Roman economy should be understood.

In what follows, I will explore the relationship between the centonarii and the other important manufacturers and distributors of textiles, both raw materials and finished products, in the Roman world. This investigation will not only confirm the proposed identification of the centonarii as clothiers of non-luxury textile products in general but will also allow us to gain a clearer picture of where to situate the centonarii in the textile sector of Roman economy.

Centonarii, Sagarii, Vestiarii

Aside from centonarii, the best attested occupational titles in textile in the Roman imperial period are sagarii and vestiarii. Some attention should be paid to the close association between the centonarii and the sagarii: one centonarius of Lugdunum was himself a sagarius, and his companion and fellow freedman was also sagarius (no. 27); at Rome, a sagarius M. Octavius Carpus (CIL VI.339), bore the same praenomen and beer, the weaver might have worked only in the mornings. The weaver seems to have worked on and off for about 12 days; first century AD). Wild (2002: 31) estimates that “five to six weeks weaving time might be a more appropriate figure to quote for the weaving of each of the . . . requisitioned items in Roman Britain…. Not included here are the hours of yarn spinning and wool preparation.” Based on the modern imitation of the Medieval technique of hand-spindling, and the “standard” figure of “one hour of weaving for every ten or twelve of spinning” (source not indicated), Carr (2000: 165) came to the conclusion that “First, Greek women really must have spent a great deal of time spinning, though perhaps not so much weaving. Second, even spending every spare minute spinning would not have produced enough clothes for households which happened to have more men than women…”

83 See Columella Rust. 12.3.6–7. What the passage tells us is that clothing for the slaves of better position were usually bought from the market and that the domestic wool-working was just a desirable way to help cut down budget. This is in accordance with what was practiced as early as Cato’s time. Cato, with his economical mind, always knew where to get the best buy of vestimenta for his slaves. The estates, of course, could also maintain slave girls to work wool and make clothing (Dig. 33.7.12.5 Ulpianus 20 ad Sab). Agricultural slaves were expected to do other chores including wool-working in bad weather when they could not work outdoors (Cato Agr. 2.3).

and nomen as two centonarii, M. Octavius M. l. Attalus, centonar(ius)
a turre Mamilia, and M. Octavius M. [l.] Marcio, mag(ister) conleg(ii)
centon(ariorum). We cannot be certain whether or not they were con-
nected, but there is a strong possibility that they were.85

At this point, it becomes relevant to take a look at the functions of
the sagarii/negotiatores sagarii.86 As an outer cloak, the sagum/sagus was
part of the basic costume for civilians and soldiers alike. According to
Dig. 34.2.23.2 (Ulpianus 44 ad sab.), saga belonged to vestimenta virilia
and familiarica, suitable for adult men and slaves, but not for children or
women (puerilia aut muliebria aut communia).87 It was Gallic in origin.
According to Strabo, the Gallic saga (sic!) were rough and flocy.88 In
Martial, saga was used almost as a synonym for low-quality clothing.89
However, saga must have ranged in quality, since all kinds of people
wore them. Indeed, in Diocletian’s list, the price of saga ranged from 500
to 8,000 denarii.90 A sagum is easily identifiable in visual presentations:
it is oblong and fastened by a fibula on one shoulder.91 Saga were closely
associated with the military, to the extent that as early as the time of
Cicero, ad saga ire or saga sumere/ponere had the symbolic meaning
of ‘prepare for war’. The sagarii/negotiatores sagarii were makers and
dealers of saga. They are attested by 40 inscriptions: 16 from Rome, the
other 24 from 19 other cities.92 It seems that the sagarii formed collegia

85 Cf. Joshel 1992: 209 n. 48. See also Chapter 5 below.
87 For saga as basic clothing for slaves, see also Cato, Agr. 59.
88 Strab. 4.4.3 in discussing Belgae.
89 Mart. 11.7–8
90 Diocletian Edictum de pretiis 19.72 (sagum Afrum), 19.73 (sagum Gallicum hoc et
Ambianense sive Biturigense).
91 Franzoni 1987 studies the visual representation of soldier’s clothing in northern
Italy. The complete lack of images in the book, however, is inconvenient. For a descrip-
tion of saga, see also Bishop and Coulston 2006: 68, 184, 114–25. For a very brief but
interesting comment on military clothing, see Thorne 2007: 227.
92 Sagarius/sagarii: Rome (16 inscriptions mentioning individual sagarii and groups),
Brundisium (Regio II, AE 1978.250), Luceria (Regio II, AE 1996.450 mentions a sagar(ius)
Aug(ustalis)), Pompeii (Regio I, CIL IV.753, before AD 79), Puteoli (Regio I, CIL IX.1872,
first century AD: Augustalis) Puteoli(is) et Neapol(iti) negotiator sagar(ius), Capua (Regio
BC–first century AD), Alliae (Regio IV, CIL IX.2399), Ricina Picenum (Regio V, CIL
IX.5752, first half of the first century AD, sagarius Mediolanensis); Mevania (Regio VI,
AE 1947. 64; cf. Vicari 166, before the first half of the first century AD), Mediolanum
(CIL V.5925 = ILS 7578, negotiatori sagario ex Apulia; 5926; 5928 = ILS 7580: negotia-
tori sagari(oi) et pell(iciariori); 5929 = ILS 7579), Vercellae (Regio XI, CIL V.6773, end of
the first century AD), Bononia (Regio VIII, AE 1945.51 = AE 1982.359; cf. Vicari 2001:
only in Rome (CIL VI.339, 956) and Lugudunum (no. 27), and there might be loose groups of them in Pompeii (CIL IV.753) and Thuburbo Maius (Africa Proconsularis, ILAfr. 243). The centonarii have not been attested in the latter two cities so far; but they certainly had collegia in Rome and Lugudunum, where, as I have already mentioned, it seems the centonarii were closely associated with the sagarii.

Two things now need explaining: Why was there such a close association between these two groups where both of them were present? Why didn’t the sagarii and their collegia have a wider geographical distribution, especially since the sagum was such an important element of Roman dress? The answer could be rather simple—perhaps centones were among the materials that could be used to make saga, meaning that the functions of the centonarii and the sagarii would have overlapped. In many places where the centonarii were present, they may have absorbed the functions of the sagarii. This could be tested by comparing the geographical distribution of the sagarii with that of the centonarii as known from inscriptions. Although our data do not belong to a short, closed period of time, most of the inscriptions related to these two occupational titles do come from the same period (second–early third century AD), which makes a comparison between their geographical distributions both possible and legitimate. The result is rather interesting. Both were present only in four places: three were large urban centers (Rome, Lugdunum, Mediolanum), one was a relatively small city (Mevania); in the other 16 cities where sagarii, either individuals or groups, are attested, the collegia centonariorum were absent. There is a temptation to attribute this to mere chance survival of evidence. However, the sagarii seem to have been more active in places outside the orbit of the collegia centonariorum.

This is perhaps no mere coincidence, for the same could be said of the vestiarii/negotiarores vestiarii, the best attested tradesmen in

---


93 Pompeii: Gavium Rufum | [...] sagari rog(ant) (CIL IV.753); Thuburbo Maius: Herculi [Aug(usto) sacr(um)] sagari(i) qui [Thub(urbo) Maius] morantur s(ua) p(ecunia) f.d.d. (ILAfr. 243).
texts after the *centonarii*. The inscriptive and legal references that juxtapose *vestiarii* with *lintearii* seems to suggest that the *vestiarii* dealt only with woolen clothing. Of the 85 inscriptions related to the *vestiarii*, 37 come from Rome, and the others come from 37 cities. In 30 out of all these 38 cities, the *collegia centonariorum* have not been attested so far. Only in eight cities—Rome, Pisauro, Detorna, Regium Lepidum, Verona, Aquileia, Novaria, and Nemausus—does the presence of the *vestiarii* overlap with that of the *collegia centonariorum*. In such provinces as Belgica, Germania, Africa, Spain, and Raetia, where the *vestiarii* are epigraphically attested, the *centonarii* are absent. The *vestiarii* seem to have formed somewhat formal organizations only in Aquileia and Volubilis (Mauretania). An epitaph from Aquileia men-

---

94 Vestiarii: Rome (37 inscriptions, mostly of first-century AD dates, no collegia; cf. Grelle and Silvestrini 2001: 124), Nomenum (Regio I, CIL XIV.3958 = ILS 7572, vestiario de horreis Agrippinianis), Beneventum (Regio II, CIL IX.1712, first century AD), Capua (Regio I, CIL X.3771, 106 BC; CIL X.3959, 3960, 3963), Ficulae (Regio I, IG XIV.1686), Sora (Regio I, Latium; CIL X.5718, first century AD), Pompeii (CIL IV.3130), Forum Sempronii (CIL XI.6109), Pisauro (Regio VI, CIL XI.6367 a, b, end of the second century—beginning of the third century AD; this inscription mentions a *vestiarius*, a *lanarius* and a *structor*, or builder, who were all *magistri vici*), Rovigno (Regio X, CIL V.324), Pola (Regio X, CIL X.7576), Bogliun (Regio X, CIL V.324 = Inscrip. 10.3.200, vestius Aquileiensis), Aquileia (Regio X, CIL V.774 = ILS 3120 = IA 3490 = AE 1972.193; AE 1931.96 = IA 687), Verona (AE 1990.354, CIL V.3460), Novaria (Regio XI, G. Mennella, Epigraphica 62: 125–35 = AE 2000.632, Vivir Aug(ustalis) civit(ate) Helvetiorum negotiator vestiarius Cisalpinus et Transalpinus), Dertona (Regio IX, CIL V.7378 and 7379), Regium Lepidum (Regio VIII, CIL XI.963); Mutina (Regio VIII, CIL XI.868, first century AD; 869; 6962a), Bononia (Regio VIII, CIL XI.6839, first century AD), Narbo (Gallia Narbonensis, CIL XII.4520, 4521, first century AD; 4422), Nemausus (Gallia Narbonensis, CIL XIII.3202, vestiar. Ital.); Elusates (Aquitania, CIL XIII.542); Ambarri (Gallia Lugdunensis, CIL XIII.2548), Lutetia (Lugudunensis, CIL XIII.3037, first century AD), Viducasses (CIL XIII.3168), Durocortorum (Belgica, CIL XIII.3263), Augusta Trevororum (Belgica, CIL XIII.3705), Mediomatrici (Belgica, CIL XIII.4564), Augusta Vindelicum (Raetia, CIL III.5800 = ILS 7108, CIL III.5816), Semendria (AE 1894.105), Novaesium (Germania Inferior, CIL XIII.8568), Andemantunnum (Germania Superior, CIL XIII.5705), Corduba (Baetica, CIL II.2240, first century AD), Hadrumentum (Africa Proconsularis, ILAfr. 62), Sousse (Byzacene, ILTun. 194), Thamugadi (Numidia, AE 1909.4, fourth century AD), Volubilis (Mauretania, AE 1891.118 = CIL VIII.21848 = ILS 7291, collegi Mercuri vestiarior(um)), Cirta (Numidia, ILAlg. 2.1816).

95 Dig. 14.3.5.4 (Ulpianus 28 ad ed.): Sed etiam eos institores dicendos placuit, quibus vestiarii vel lintearii dant vestem circumferendam et distrahebant, quos volgo circitores appellamus. CIL III.5800 (Augusta Vindelicum, Raetia, second century AD): Municipi Aeli(i) Aug(usti) negotiator(es) | vestiariae et lintiariae aedem | cum suis ornamentis sibi et P(ublio) pat(ri) | C(aio) Antonio Aeliano equiti Romano | decurioni municipi(i) Ael(iae) Aug(ustae) filio. See also Cod. Iust. 10.48 (47) 7: negotiantes vestiarios lineteones purpurarios et parthicaries, qui devotioni nostrae deserviunt, visum est secundum veterem consuetudinem ab omni munere immunes esse.

96 AE 1891.118 = W 1489 (Volubilis, Mauretania Tingitana); AE 2000.632 (Novaria).
tions a Ti. Claudius Ti. l. Syntrophus, who was described as a vestiarius centonarius (no. 230). The authenticity of this inscription, however, is disputed. Mommsen categorized it as falsa, while A. Calderini, followed by S. Panciera and A. Buonopane, was inclined to the opposite opinion.97 If the latter opinion were to be accepted, then this inscription would be a further proof of the involvement of the centonarii in the textile industry. Judging by the Hic situs est formula and the absence of Dis Manibus, this inscription is datable to the first century AD. The vestiarii of Aquileia had a large collective tomb measuring 3,200 ft².98 From the tall T in the inscription, the loc(us) m(onumenti) vestiariorum probably dates to the first century AD. However, this dating is by no means decisive. There is no other reference to the activities of the vestiarii as a group at Aquileia. Therefore, it is unclear whether they remained an independent group throughout the Imperial period or whether they were absorbed into the collegium centonariorum of Aquileia at a certain point. A vestiarius Aquileiensis left a monument in Histria, but he does not seem to have been affiliated with any collegium.99

Nor do the geographical distributions of the epigraphic records of the vestiarii and sagarii substantially overlap: epigraphic records of both titles have been found only in Rome, Pompeii, Capua, Corduba, and Bononia. In the other 53 urban centers, only one of the two titles is attested.

Through the foregoing comparison, one conclusion presents itself: more often than not, the geographical distributions of the epigraphic records of the sagarii, vestiarii, and centonarii seem complementary to each other, rather than mutually overlapping; geographical

97 There is no internal evidence against its authenticity. Mommsen classified it as falsa because he did not find it in Ramberto, from which the record of the inscription (G. B. Doni, Inscriptiones antiquae nunc primum editae notisque illustratae et XXVI. Iudicibus auctae, Florence, 1731: 332 no. 75, hence Mur. 946 and Orelli 4296) was said to have come. (Mommsen, ad CIL V.* 50) Calderini 1930: 323 note 5; Panciera 1957: 25 note 16; cf. Vicari 2001: 38. Most recently, Buonopane (2003a: 301–14) argued for its authenticity (AE 2003.696).

98 IA 687 = AE 1931.96. Among the four collegial tomb complexes in Aquileia whose dimensions are known to us, this was substantially smaller than two of the others.750 ft² (IA 686, Sodales); 9600 ft² (IA 679, gen(tiles?) sal(viorum?)); 12,540 ft² (IA 684, cultores Fortis Fortunae). The dimension of the collective tomb of the veterans at Aquileia is not known to us: 25x? ft² [IA 685, locus sepultura(e) gentilium veteranor(um)]. In the case of the gentiles sal(viorum), the plot measuring as much as 9600 ft² was perhaps given by a wealthy patron, Marcus Trosius Celadus, who himself possessed a large monument (ad IA 679).

99 CIL V.324 = InscrIt 10.3.200.
coincidence and close association between these clothiers occur only in larger urban centers, such as Rome, Lugudunum, and Aquileia. This relative infrequency of geographical overlapping should perhaps not be attributed simply to the chance survival of evidence. It seems likely that the occupational spheres of these clothes-dealers overlapped to a great extent; they all catered mostly to the need for low- and medium-quality textiles. The term centonarius quite possibly served as a collective name for all the clothiers in many places. Dealers and tailors of luxurious/high quality textiles had their own distinctive name, that is, (vestiarii) tenuiarii. They were heavily concentrated in Rome, and were often found in the Vicus Tuscus, the expensive shopping area of Imperial Rome.

There are also fewer inscriptions mentioning vestificus/a (clothes/dress maker). When they were mentioned, they often seemed to be household staff members rather than independent artisans. Another relevant occupational title not yet discussed is textor (weaver), a title well attested by literary, legal, and papyrological sources. Significantly, the collegium of the textores has never been attested in the West, and textores figure little in epigraphy. The textores, when mentioned in the legal texts, seem to have been of servile status. They were classed

---

100 See Kleijwegt 2002: 103 for some relevant remarks: “How much labour specialization takes place in a town depends on a number of factors: the availability of a labour supply not needed in any other sector of the economy (e.g., agriculture), and the level of demand. A simple rule may be applied here: the bigger the city, the more specialized the occupations.”


102 See, for example, CIL VI.9980 = ILS 7428 (Rome): here, a woman named Italia was specified as the dress maker (vestifica) of a Coccea Phyllidis. Acastus, her fellow slave (conservos!) put up the epitaph for her because of her poverty (pro pauperie!).


104 CIL VI.6361–6362 = ILS 7432 a–b (from the tomb of the Statilii at Rome). CIL VI.9290 = ILS 7354 (Rome, 13 bc) mentions a Quartio textor IIIvir | quaestor trib(unus). But it is not entirely clear whether ‘textor’ was a part of his name or an indication of his occupation. A graffito from Pompeii mentions a textor, who seems to have been a slave (CIL IV.8259: Successus textor). CIL IX.379 (Canusium) comes from a tomb built by [---]ssidius Felix | [te]xtor for himself and some others. CIL XIII. 7737, a votive inscription from Niederberg, mentions textor senex. But again, it is not clear whether Textor was a proper name or an occupational title here. Cf. Grelle and Silvestrini 2001: 121.
as servi vulgares in the legal documents.105 We know more about the textores/gerdioi from papyri. In most instances, these Egyptian textores/gerdioi were clearly independent, corresponding with Roman officials, recruiting apprentices, making contracts of apprenticeship, and fulfilling governmental requisitions.106 These ‘weavers’ did not necessarily always work in their own workshops/houses; often they were hired out to work in the customer’s house.107 It may also be possible that in the West, the textores were covered by the broad title centonarii.

As recently (re-)emphasized by Horden and Purcell, textile production and sheep-rearing were ubiquitous in the Mediterranean World.108 It must be emphasized from the outset that my main concern is not where woolen products were produced, but why formal organizations of textile craftsmen and tradesmen were formed in certain places in the West. T. Frank observed that the centonarii were “frequent in sheep-raising districts.”109 But was easy access to wool the determinant factor in shaping the geographical development of the collegia centonariorum? Gallia Narbonensis, Liguria, Transpadana, Venetia, Picenum, Umbria, and the hinterland of Etruria, where the collegia centonariorum clustered, were all major sheep-rearing regions in antiquity.110 Literary sources make it very clear that the Po valley was an important wool-producing region. Strabo commented on the quality of wool in northern Italy: “the soft kind is produced by the regions round Mutina and the River Scultenna (the finest wool of all); the coarse, by Liguria and the country of the Symbri, from which the greater part of the households of the Italiotes are clothed; and the medium, by the regions round Patavium.”111 Vergil mentions the pastureland near Brixia in the
Georgics. In both Patavium and Brixia, the collegia centonariorum were established fairly early. Martial also refers to wool from Pollentia, and Altinum.

The well attested presence of the collegia centonariorum in Pannonia could perhaps also be attributed to local sheep-rearing to a limited extent. Noricum was apparently a sheep-rearing region in the early Empire, as well as in the third and fourth centuries AD. Archaeological evidence shows that the Dacian uplands were active in sheep-rearing.

According to Jongman’s theory (1988b, 2000), the scale of sheep-rearing was inversely proportionate to population density. This may account for why the collegia centonariorum were few in the areas near Rome. On one hand, the geography of sheep-farming appears to be one of the elements that influenced the geographical distribution of the collegia centonariorum. On the other hand, the simple correlation between the geographical distribution of the collegia centonariorum was not always the case. In particular, the geography of sheep-farming cannot account for the fact that these collegia were not widely distributed in southern Italy, North Africa, Gallia Belgica and Spain, for wool was abundant in these regions.

The ready access to wool, therefore, does not fully explain the formation of formal associations of the textile workers and tradesmen. In fact, the geographical distribution of the collegia centonariorum—and, indeed, of the textile collegia, as we know from the epigraphic records in general, including the collegia of the sagarii in four places and the collegia of the vestiarii in two places—cannot be attributed to any one

---

114 Diocletian’s Price Edict listed various articles of clothing of Danubian origin such as fibulatorium Rhaeticum, fibbia Petovionico, byrrus Ripensis. Cf. Vicari 2001: 62–64.
115 Noricum was called regio pastorum by Vergil; the Expositio totius mundi spoke of vestis Norica; Diocletian’s Price Edict mentions various garments that are associated with Noricum, e.g. byrrus Noricus, banata Norica, and fedox Noricus.
117 Columella, Rust. 7.2.3; Varro, Ling. 9.28. 39; Varro Rust. 2.11.8; Strab. 6.3.6.9; Mart. 14.150; Pliny HN 8.190–1; Diocletian’s Price Edict 25.7 (cf. Wild 1976: 54); Morley 1996: 154; for wool of Apulia, see Grelle and Silvestrini 2001: 91–137.
reason. The production mode, urbanization, scale of demands and production, and other stimuli including governmental promotion through legal infrastructure combine to provide the answer. The next section provides a detailed discussion of these aspects.

The Collegia Centonariorum and the Textile Economy in the West

If the earlier discussions establish centonarius as an occupational category embracing all kinds of artisans and tradesmen dealing with woolen, how do the centonarii fit in with or revise the overall picture of the textile economy in the Roman West? Why were formal organizations of textile craftsmen and tradesmen formed in certain places? In order to answer these questions, it is necessary to review the current state of knowledge concerning the textile economy. There have been three main directions of research.

1) One type of approach that has produced a steady stream of publications centers around the technical aspects of textile production ranging from loom sizes and types, spinning and weaving techniques, fabric compositions and quality, and dyeing methods, to ancient sheep breeding. Of central significance to this study are analyses of the textile fragments retrieved from ancient sites such as Mons Claudius. Professional hand-weavers have played an important role in this type of study, which has outstanding potential for revealing dissemination and evolution of technology, tracing geographical and chronological development of textiles and clothing, and determining local or foreign origins of the fabrics in any given place and, therefore, determining trade patterns. Since the survived textile samples are both sparse and fragmentary, however, analyses of the technical aspects are yet to shed

---

118 Collegia of the sagarii: CIL VI.339, 936 (Rome); no. 27 (Lugdunum); CIL IV.753 (Pompeii?); ILAfr. 243 (Thuburbo Maius, Africa Proconsularis). Collegia of the vestiarii: AE 1931.96, IA 687 (Aquileia), AE 1891.118 (Volubilis, Mauretania).

119 Here I have excluded important studies, e.g., Edmondson and Keith 2008, with a primary focus on clothing as status symbols and objects bearing cultural meanings. Although these studies are quite relevant for understanding the patterns of textile consumption, they are not concerned with the organization of production or distribution, or textiles as a commodity for exchange.

120 See the many publications by J. P. Wild, who is the leading scholar in this field of archaeological textile studies; for more recent findings and progress, see Rogers, Jorgensen and Rast-Ericher, eds. 2001 (dedicated to Wild); Cottica 2003: 261–83; Alfaro, Wild and Costa, eds. 2004.
significant light on the organization of the ancient textile economy or the scale of the trade.\textsuperscript{121}

2) Another type of research focuses on the occupational titles known from the epigraphic and papyrological sources. Representative and fundamental works such as E. Wipszycka (1965, 1966) and F. Vicari (2001) on Egypt and the West respectively have brought into focus the sophistication and a high degree of specialization in Roman textile production.\textsuperscript{122} As already mentioned earlier, the papyri preserved valuable documents ranging from apprentice contracts and payments to weavers, to price declarations after the third century AD. The papyri have even provided a cursory glimpse of a practice that resembled the 'putting-out' system in the late Medieval Ages.\textsuperscript{123} For the West, the materials are not as detailed, and fewer varieties of occupational titles are known than from the East.\textsuperscript{124} To a certain extent, the difference can

\textsuperscript{121} Looms made of wood are easily perishable. But studies on the survived loom weights and tools for spinning that were made of terra cotta or metal are also important. Finds of a large number of loom weights in a single place may indicate a large-scale production. See Cottica 2003: 261–83 for the case of Altinum.

\textsuperscript{122} See also Aspects de l'artisanat du textile dans le monde méditerranéen 1996; Grelle and Silvestrini 2001 regarding the woolen industry of Canusium; Buonopane 2003b and Cottica 2003 about Altinum.

\textsuperscript{123} Wipszycka 1965: 98–102. The so-called putting-out system (Verlagsystem) was a system in which the merchant would supply the materials and collect the finished product. This system would enable the merchant to bind small producers usually in the rural areas to himself. The development of such a system has often been analyzed in connection with the rural origins of capitalist industry in Europe. The literary is large. See, for example, Kriedte, Medick and Schlumbohm 1981: esp. 101–07.

\textsuperscript{124} For the various occupational titles and their guilds in the textile sector in the East, see Calderini 1946: 13–84; Wipszycka 1965: esp. 45, 55–56, 102–28; Bagnall 1993: 82–83; Aspects de l'artisanat du textile dans le monde méditerranéen 1996, passim. Occupational titles: huphantai, gerdioi (weavers); eriopóloi, eriorgoi, eriophantai, pokuphoi, eriokapéloi, lanarioi (workers and/or dealers of wool and/or woolens); an association (synergasia) of wool-workers (lanariôn) (W 140, Ephesos); erioplutês (wool-cleaner); an association (sennotatê ergasia) of the wook-cleaners (erioplutôn) (BGU 118 iii 7); IG Rom. 4.821, Hierapolis; pilopoioi (felt-makers): a synergasia tôn pilopoïôn (the association of felt-makers) is attested in Lydia [SEG 29.1191 = ZPE (1979) 36.173]; pilopoioi (IGBulg. IV.2214, Serdica; SEG 41 (1991) 1100, Prusa ad Olympum); himatiopôlai (dealers/makers of garments, P.Oxy. XIX.2230; IEph 1478: honorific dedication made by local himatiopôlai); gnaphalîologi, kassopoioi (makers of low-quality mantles). On kassopoioi, see Wipszycka 1965: 116–17; P.Oxy. LXIV.4434 (AD 154?); P.Lond.inv. 1562 verso (the kassopoioi, like other weavers, were subject to taxation; cf. Wallace 1938: 199); tapiduphantai, tapiduphoi, tapêtai, tapitarioi, tapêtemporoi (carpet- and canvas-workers and/or dealers). For an ergasia tapitariôn (the guild of canvas- and carpet-workers), see Pap.Lugd.Bat. XXV.62, with the note on line 4; P.Matr. 7 (AD 483). See P.Oxy. LXIII.4353 (AD 304) for an advance from a 'tapestry-weaver' and 'master of a workshop of the same trade' to an employee, with
be attributed to the different nature of the source materials. However, other contributing factors, including the longer history of urbanization in the East, may have been at play. It should also be noted that there was a visible difference between the Eastern and Western textile economies, namely that linen seems to have played a larger role in the East than in the West.\textsuperscript{125} That is not to say that there was no wool production in the East, or linen production in the West.\textsuperscript{126} In Egypt, for example, many tax-related declarations of sheep and goats as well as copies of leases of flocks have survived.\textsuperscript{127} But the linen-workers certainly loom large in the evidence from Egypt and Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{128} Diocletian’s \textit{Price Edict} suggests that linen had a much wider range of qualities and prices than wool. The cheapest linen was cheaper than the cheapest wool. Furthermore, the \textit{Price Edict} (26) lists a subsection of linen clothing \textit{ad usus rusticorum vel familiaricorum}; but there was no such subsection in the section concerning woolens and wool (19, 25).\textsuperscript{129} According to papyrological sources, the typical fabric for \textit{sticharion}, \textit{dalmatica}, and

related references; \textit{tuloplokoi} (mattress-makers), see PSI XII.1239. For more references to linen workers and tradesmen, see below.

\textsuperscript{125} Curchin 1985: 35; Wild 1988: 29; Strab. 17.1.41, on linen production in Panopolis; Pliny \textit{HN} 19.7, on Egypt’s purchase of Eastern wares by means of flax. In Palmyra, however, wool seems to have been the most prevalent raw material, although “linen fabrics were used abundantly in Palmyra” (Stauffer 2000: 248). See also Mayerson 1997: 201–07; Horden and Purcell 2000: 353.


\textsuperscript{127} Declarations: \textit{P.Berl. Möller} 7; \textit{P.Princ.inv.} GD 9561 = \textit{Aegyptus} (Hanson) 63–64 (AD 29); \textit{P.Princ.inv.} AM 1090 = \textit{P.Oxy.} II.357 descript. (first century AD); \textit{P.Oxy.} II.245; \textit{P.Oxy.} LV.3778 (AD 21); \textit{P.Oxy.} LV.3779 (AD 20/21). The size of the flock owned by an individual declarant usually ranges from several animals to one or two dozen. See Wallace 1938: 84–88 for more references. \textit{P.Oxy.} XIX.2228 provides information about the total number of animals in particular villages: 72 miscellaneous sheep, one lamb, and 14 ditto goats in “the village of the Syrians,” for example; Leasing sheep from large estates in the third century AD: \textit{P.Chept.}, passim; \textit{P. Prag. Varcl.} II.2; \textit{P.Flor.} 322.8–10; \textit{P.Lond.} 948 verso (for discussion, see Rathbone 1991: 202–09)

\textsuperscript{128} This point becomes self-evident when comparing the list of Eastern linen workers/dealers recorded in San Nicolò and Poland to the most recent list of Western linen workers/dealers in Vicari. Occupational titles relating to linen working: \textit{linourgoi}; \textit{linoplokoi}, \textit{linuphoi}, \textit{linuphantai}, \textit{linuphanteion}; “linen-weavers”; \textit{linoplutai}, “flax-washers”; and so on (see, e.g., \textit{P.Tebt.} 5.238; \textit{P.Gen.inv.} 108; Wipszyka 1965: 54.) There are also special names for the workers of particular types of linens: \textit{linuphoi bussourgoi} (?), \textit{othionioploki/othoniopôloi}, \textit{tarsikarioi}, and so on. See Wipszyka 1965: 109–12. On \textit{othioniopôloi}, see \textit{P.Oxy.} LIV.3776 (a \textit{koinon} of the \textit{othoniopôloi}). On \textit{tarsikarioi}, see Wipszyka 1965: 116; Wild 1969: 810–19; \textit{P.PalauRib.} 14, with a list of additional references; \textit{BGU} XV.2471, intro. and comm.; \textit{P.Bodl.} I 16 (AD 342); \textit{CPR} X.63; \textit{P.Oxy.} LXVI 4534 (AD 335). Cf. also McGing 1990: 115–21.

\textsuperscript{129} For the section on wool, see Reynolds 1981.
so on, in non-military contexts appear to have been linen; and even in a military context, linen seems to have been used more in the East than in the West. Ammianus and his company wore linen clothes when they were in the East. Linen clothing was among the levied textiles for temples and the Roman army in Egypt. Linen (linum) and coarse flax (stuppa), along with glass and papyrus, were specified as the four products from Egypt connected with Aurelian’s establishment of the anabolicae species. From the late third century AD, the state established clothes factories known as gynaecea (‘textile factories’) and linyphea (‘factories of linen products’). In the Western provinces, there were 14 gynaecea and only two linyphea. Unfortunately, we do not have a full list of these establishments in the East for purposes of comparison. In general, there were more varieties of textile guilds in the East than in the West. In addition to the different emphasis of the textile economy, the longer history of the associative phenomenon and urbanization in the East was perhaps also a contributing factor in the diversification of textile guilds in the East. It would be problematic to say, however, that the associative life had little significance among the textile craftsmen and tradesmen in the West. F. Vicari (2001) has a low estimation of the influence of the formal or informal organizations of the textile artisans and dealers in the Western cities. But this conclusion was contingent on his exclusion of the centonarii among the textile

---

131 Amm. Marc. 19.8.8.
132 P.Oxy. XII.1414, on linen yarn required for making the vestments of a local temple; for linen clothing, see P.Beatty Pan. II.20; P.Flor. I.13.9, cited by Wild 1969: 819. An additional reference is P.Bodl. I.16 (AD 342), a receipt for 3,500 linen tunics doubtless destined for the army. L. 9 of P.Masada 722 (AD 72 or 75), a soldier’s account, mentions tunica linia (denarii) VII. See P.Dubl. 20 and Sheridan 1998 for bibliography on vestis militaris, a tax paid in cash rather than in clothes or clothing.
133 SHA, Aurel. 45: vectigal ex Aegypto urbi Romae Aurelianus vitri, chartae, lini, stuppeae, atque anabolicas species aeternas constituit. Cf. Wallace 1938: 216. A series of fourth-century price declarations collected in P.Oxy. LIV mentions preparers of raw flax, bleachers of flax, sellers of linen textiles, wool-sellers, fullers, and dyers; but wool textiles are not mentioned. Wild 2003a: 42 attributes this absence to an accident of survival. But it could perhaps also be understood as an indication of the more significant role played by linen production in the Egyptian economy in the fourth century AD.
135 A linypheum almost certainly existed in Scytopolitan (CTh 10.20.8, AD 374); but little is known about the other Eastern linyphea.
craftsmen and tradesmen.\textsuperscript{137} The conclusions arrived at earlier in this present Chapter, however, directly contradict Vicari’s assessment. This means that we can move beyond the kind of analyses that are based on anecdotal epigraphic references to largely disconnected craftsmen and tradesmen in textile, and explore interactions between them to shed light on the social infrastructure of urban economy with respect to this particular sector (Chapter 5). Adding the centonarii to the picture of the textile economy also points to a larger scale of commercial production and a higher volume of trade, either locally or long-distance, than has been previously envisaged for the West.

3) Textiles have often been seen as ‘pacemaker’ in the Medieval and Early Modern economy. Studies of textiles in the Roman world have also been used to provide insight for the ongoing discussions on the nature of ancient economy, especially the applicability of the Weberian models of ‘consumer city’ as opposed to ‘producer city’, in understanding ancient cities.\textsuperscript{138} In an attempt to prove that Roman cities were more than parasitic ‘consumer cities’, much energy has been spent in identifying cities equipped for or specialized in exporting textile products. Some scholars have argued that Timgad, Pompeii, and Oxyrhynchus,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{137} Vicari 2001: 12 “Il problema dei centonari.” See also Grelle and Silvestrini (2001). In their collection of the epigraphic references to woolen workers/tradesmen, the centonarii as well as the sarcinatores were excluded, because “sono state prese in considerazione le testimonianze che attengono alla prima manipolazione della lana e dei tessuti, non a manipolazioni successive: quindi sono stati esclusi mestieri quali i centonarii e i sarcinatores.” (Grelle and Silvestrini 2001: 121 note 120.) Here, the centonarii were classified into the same category as the sarcinatores but not as the sagarii and vestiarii.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{138} The ‘consumer city’ model assumes that the city dominates the countryside, that the city is maintained primarily by taxes and the rents collected from the countryside, and that the economic position of the urban elite is based on political foundation. For the on-going discussions on the economic models of the ancient city (‘consumer city’, ‘producer city’, and ‘service city’), see Finley 1981: 3–23; 1985:194; Jongman 1988a (supporter of the consumer city model); Burnham and Wacher 1990 (many interesting observations with respect to the small towns in Roman Britain—these cannot be classified simply as consumer cities); Whittaker 1995: 9–26 [“the distinction between urban and rural production is irrelevant economically” (18)]; Parkins 1997; Wilson 2002: 231–36 (for a succinct but very helpful summary of the debate from the point of view of a non-believer in the consumer city model); Erdkamp 2005: 332–56 [The bibliography is very useful. The article also clarifies several points of confusion: “the consumer city does not imply a primitive economy, nor does it necessarily apply to large cities”(336); “the concept of the consumer city does not rule out the existence of a numerous and prosperous group of artisans” (339)]; a number of articles in Bang, Ikeguchi, and Ziche 2006 search for alternative models.
\end{flushright}
among others, may have been textile production and export centers.\textsuperscript{139} In many places of the Empire, the archaeological evidence for textile production is simply too sporadic or fragmentary for identifying commercial or relatively large-scale productions.\textsuperscript{140} As far as Timgad and Pompeii are concerned, in order to argue for a large-scale production, scholars have emphasized the epigraphic references to textile dealers, but more importantly the scale of the fulleries in town. The bases for identifying specific fulleries as well as the interpretations of their functions, however, are not always accepted by all. For the identification of fulleries, the kinds of fixtures that archaeologists look for are vats, treading tubs, and easy access to water. It is, however, not always easy to distinguish dyeing and fulling facilities, or even fulling vats from cooking equipment. Nor do the archaeological remains make it automatically clear whether the fulling facilities were primarily used for finishing up new cloth or for washing dirty clothes.\textsuperscript{141} Depending on their theoretical taste, different schools give different weights to these two functions. W. Jongman famously refuted Moeller’s theses that Pompeii produced textiles for export and that the fullers played a significant role in organizing textile production at Pompeii.\textsuperscript{142} For Jongman, the textiles produced at Pompeii were mainly for local consumption rather than export, and the picture of fuller-entrepreneurs was a mere fantasy. Recently, however, A. Wilson has suggested reopening the question of the fullers being an important link in the chain of production.\textsuperscript{143} We await M. Flohr’s systematic treatment of the fullers and the fulleries. In general, however, the ties between fullers and other textile craftsmen

\textsuperscript{139} Timgad: Johannesen 1954; Wilson 2001; 2002: 232–41, and 2004; Pompeii: Moeller 1976; Oxyrhynchus: van Minnen 1986. Van Minnen’s discussion represents an effort to quantify the volume of textile trade in a specific place based on evidence such as lists of textile objects. For criticism of his analysis, see Bagnall 1993: 82–83, seasonal variations, for example, should have been taken into consideration. Wild 2003a: 37–45. Cf. Dixon 2001a: 118.

\textsuperscript{140} “The corresponding evidence for textile manufacture and treatment on a commercial basis is everywhere lacking in Britain, except for the possible cloth-finisher’s or dyer’s shop at Chelmsford, which contained several hearths and a large tile structure identified as a vat.” (Burnham and Wacher 1990: 47–48).

\textsuperscript{141} For discussions of fulleries and fullers in the Early Empire, see on the one hand, Jongman 1988a; Bradley 2002 (the fullers were laundrymen); Pirson 2007: 463. On the other hand, see Moeller 1976; Wilson 2002 (which disagrees with Bradley 2002 on a number of points), 2003 and 2004. For a balanced view, see Flohr 2003; Borgard and Puybaret 2004: 58–59.


\textsuperscript{143} Wilson 2003. See also Bogard and Puybaret 2003: 314.
can hardly be traced in the extant evidence from the Roman period. It is also entirely plausible that some centonarii, vestiarii or sagarii may have run their own fulling facilities. But we do not have to assume that all the newly-produced cloth had to be fulled before reaching the customers, or that all the cloth was ‘finished’ in the same town or village where it was produced. De Ruyt has recently suggested that cloth destined to Rome may have been shipped to Ostia in unfinished forms, and could be treated after being unloaded in Ostia. Customers, of course, may also purchase cloth or clothing off the loom and have them ‘polished’ by the fullers if need be. In other words, fulling, like dyeing, would have been optional rather than essential.

The identification of the centonarii as a broad occupational category would serve as a significant supplement to the fragmentary archaeological evidence and anecdotal references to individual textile dealers. As such, it will allow us to revisit the overall structure and geography of textile economy in the Roman West. However, that we now have many more collegia of the textile dealers does not automatically mean that whichever cities had them must have been producer cities or export centers. The stimuli behind the formation of these formal organizations still need to be sorted out, and the destinations of the textile products need to be explored. H. W. Pleket articulated the conceptual model used to approach the overall structure of textile production in the Empire. This model envisages three levels of textile production: (1) local production of coarse wool and/or linen for local consumption in a large number and variety of small towns and villages; (2) production in relatively large cities for both local needs and those of a larger area; (3) production of luxury items in certain urban centers for regular export to distant markets. This model needs to be amplified in order to allow a fuller understanding of supply, production, and consumption in the textile sector as well as to explain the development of the collegia centonariorum.

144 De Ruyt 2001: 190, on the basis of large fullonicae just on the right bank of the river.
145 In the legal sources, the fullones were often described as receiving clothing from customers [polienda vestimenta accepit, see, e.g., Dig. 19.2.13.6 (Ulpianus 32 ad ed.), 47.2.83pr (Paulus 2 sent.)]. These customers can surely include both the artisans who wanted to have their cloth fulled and individual customers who wanted to have their clothing either finished or cleaned. For dyeing as ‘une intervention optionnelle’, see Borgard and Puybaret 2003: 303.
First, the co-existence of different modes of production needs to be recognized. Peacock (1982) lists the following modes of production in the pre-industrial world: household production, household industry, individual workshops, nucleated workshops, the manufactory, estate production and military/official production. All of these modes can be identified in textile production. The roles and significance of urban craftsmen in the textile economy would vary according to the modes of production. Significantly, Annalisa Marzano’s studies of the economic activities in the Italian villas have shown that the geographical distribution of the villas where active textile production was archaeologically attested seems to differ from the distribution pattern of the *collegia centonariorum*. The dominance of large proprietors in sheep-rearing and the related economy in southern Italy and Africa may have been one important element that led to the absence of textile collegia in Apulia, Lucania, Sicily, and Africa. The situation in these regions was exactly the opposite of that in Gallia Narbonensis and Gallia Cisalpina, where there seem to have been few *latifundia*, but a higher degree of urbanization. The dominance of large proprietors should help explain the absence in that region of the *centonarii*, who were urban-based craftsmen and tradesmen. As far as Gallia Belgica is concerned, Strabo said that this region supplied an abundance of coarse clothing (*saga*) to Rome, as well as to most parts of Italy. Several scattered funerary monuments seem to indicate textile production and trade of noticeable scale in the second and third century AD. They come from countryside and villages, which points to the predominantly estate-centered

---


149 Garnsey 1976: 23; Bandelli 1991: 90; Morley 1996: 157. It is not to say that there were no sizable estates in southern Gaul at all, see Christol 2003. The associations on private estates tend to be cult associations. See Vogliano 1933: 215–31; Purcell 1995: 157 with n. 26. Pastoralism is dominant in southern Italy; but pastoralism does not simply mean sheep-rearing. Southern Italy was also well-known in supplying Rome with pork and beef. See recently, Patterson 2006: 68–69.  

mode of production. Individual vestiarii have been attested in Gallia Belgica, but no collegia have been found (CIL XIII.3263, 3705, 4564). Nor is there any sign of the presence of collegium centonariorum in Gallia Belgica. The concentration of the production in the estate in the countryside may explain the absence of the textile guilds. Spain, on the other hand, seems to have played the role of wool supplier. According to Strabo, in his time, Baetica exported wool, mostly of black color, instead of cloth.

Second, it is important to differentiate the various processes in textile production. The shearing and washing of wool, spinning, dyeing, weaving, felting, and fulling involved not only different skills but also labor bases. As discussed earlier in this Chapter, wool processing, especially towards yarn and thread preparation, was more time-consuming. In fact, scholars of textile economy commonly recognize spinning as the production bottleneck in the pre-industrial societies. Spinning, then, would have involved a much larger labor base, supplied by home-based female ‘workers’, slaves, and so on. The trade of the woolen textile material in the form of yarn may have been an integral element in the textile economy. It is a general impression that the textile economy has been dominated by female workers. Indeed, in the Roman tradition, lanificium, meaning literally wool-working, not only acquired moral value signifying wifely virtue, but also became a symbol of traditional

---

151 For the images and discussions of these monuments, see Young 2000. On the reliefs on the monument of the Secundinii (Igel, third century AD) and their involvement in textile production, see Drinkwater 1982; Wightman 1985: 149–51; Wild 2002: 28. Wild does not agree with Drinkwater, who sees the Secundinii as entrepreneurs in the textile business. For the funerary inscription attached to the monument, see AE 2001. 1408 = CIL XIII.4206. It tells us nothing about the Secundinii’s status or trade.

152 Strabo 3.2.6; Wild 2002: 5.

153 For these stages, see Forbes 1964; Wild 2003b; more in Borgard and Puybaret 2003 and 2004.

154 “Spinning, in fact, was a production bottleneck; for on a low estimate at least five handspinners would be needed to keep a single weaver in continuous employment.” (Wild 2002: 8) See also Berman 2007: 10.

155 For Hellenistic, Medieval and Early Modern parallels, see Rowlandson and Bagnall 1998: 247; Ogilvie 2004; Lis and Soly 2006: 16. For iconography of women spinning and tools for spinning in the Roman West, see Cottica 2003: 262–71.

156 E.g., ILS 8402, 8403, 8393 (l. 30). Dixon 2001: 119. One female character in Apuleius (Met. 9.5), who cheated on her husband, complained when he, a faber, came home early one day: “and miserable me, I twist my fingers wool-working (lanificio) every day so that the lamp may light in our little room.” These words, for her purpose, would serve to present the image of a virtuous wife by manipulating the symbolic association between lanificium and good, honest and hard-working women (see Treggiari 1976: 69).
mores. But the legal, epigraphic, papyrological, and iconographic materials amply attest to the importance of male workers and tradesmen in textiles. They seem to have been more involved in other stages of wool processing than in preparing yarn and thread. They were also often shown displaying cloth and clothing. It is not surprising, then, that male members dominated textile organizations such as the *collegia centonariorum* (see also Chapter 5). These urban based craftsmen and tradesmen would need to depend on the rural areas for the supply of raw materials such as wool and on a large number of scattered laborers (including female spinners working in a domestic setting) for the semi-processed materials such as yarn and strings. These urban craftsmen and tradesmen, then, can be seen as active agents in constructing the socio-economic relationships between cities and countrysides, between a wide net of consumers and producers.

Third, some room should be allowed in Pleket’s model for special customers, such as the army, and ‘oversized’ cities such as Rome. The early development and concentration of the *collegia centonariorum* in

---

157 Livy’s Lucretia was spotted working wool while other wives that Tarquinius saw were having fun. In a moralizing tone, Columella XII, Preface 9–10 lamented that among the upper-class women, it was not fashionable to do or supervise wool-working or wear home-made garments. Augustus promoted the symbolic significance of wool-working by women at home. Cf. Êedmunds, Jones, Nagy, and Marek 2004; Erdkamp 2005: 90–94; Marzano 2007: 121. See similar observations in regard to women and spinning/weaving in the Greek home: “the relationship of women and cloth came to be not a *topos* but a powerful metaphor.” (Carr 2000: 165–66).

158 Moeller 1969 (“The Male Weavers at Pompeii.”); weaver’s contracts mention more male apprentices than female ones; Dixon 2001b: 14. For the Greek parallel (in Plato, Aristotle and Aristophanes), see Thompson 1982: 217–22. In the rich household, even though women predominate in clothes production, male workers are by no means unheard of. Cf. Treggiari 1976: 82, 85, 91 (esp. Table 1). For papyri mentioning male weavers, see, for example, *P.Oxy.* II 275 (AD 54). For the richness of visual representations of the textile trade, see Zimmer 1982; Young 2000: 215–33; Larsson Lovén 2000: 235–40. The artistic representations, however, are not of much help for the understanding of the nature of different occupational titles. The problem, as Lovén (2000: 237) has noted, is that “the combination of an iconographic representation and an inscription including the name of a profession is unusual.”

159 For wool-workers who were engaged in specific stages of wool processing, see such titles as *lanariorum carminatores* and *pectinatores* (wool-combers), *lanaioi cardatores* (wool-carders), and *lanariorum purgatores* (wool-cleaners). For discussions of these titles, see Moeller 1970b: 1971; Frayn 1984: 153; Angelone 1986; Jongman 1988a: 165–66; Vicari 2001: 45; Grele and Silvestrini 2001: 122–23; Wild (2002: 5) is of the opinion that woolcombing “may have been a professional or semi-professional occupation.” But only in a handful of places, mostly in northern Italy and in the first century AD, have these titles been attested.

northern Italy and southern Gaul has to be set against the general background of economic development in these regions in the Early Roman Empire. N. Morley (1996) has brought into focus the economic impetus that arose from the growth of Rome and the resulting demand of supplies. The population of Rome may have been no less than 700,000 when Augustus died, and perhaps remained stable at around one million at the peak of the Empire. To supply a city of such magnitude would have involved resources from various places outside Rome. As far as textiles are concerned, the ancient sources tell us less about the role of the neighboring regions in supplying Rome with clothing than they do about the farther regions.

Literary sources make it very clear that Rome imported textile products from such regions as Gaul and the Po Valley. According to Strabo, Cisalpine Gaul exported Ligurian tunics and ‘sagi’, and Liguria and the country around Symbri produced coarse wool (tên tracheian), from which the majority of Italian households were clothed. Strabo also mentioned that textile products such as gausapae came from the regions around Patavium, which exported a large part of its manufactured clothing to Rome. Pliny the Elder confirms the popularity of Patavian textiles, which became known in his father’s generation. This, again, is perfectly in line with the presence of the collegia centonariorum at Patavium before the Flavians. Martial refers to bardocuculli (hooded overcoats) from Gallia, lodices (rugs/blankets) from Verona, and tunics and paenulae (overcoats) from Patavium. The list could go on. But

---

161 Also see Morley 1997; Lo Cascio 2007a: 640 on the challenge that the concentration of so many consumers in a single place posed to a pre-industrial economy. For the market of the megalopolis as a powerful force in organizing industrial production elsewhere in other historical and geographical contexts, see, e.g., Barker and Sutcliffe 1993 (the case of Medieval London in particular).
163 Strab. 4.6.2; 5.1.12.
164 Strab. 5.1.7. Cf. Morley 1996: 154; Noé 1974: 920–21. Gausapae were woolen cloth that could be used for clothing, covering, blankets, and so on. For other references to gausapae, see Mart. 14.147; Hor., Sat. 2. 8.11; Juv. 6.151; Petr. Sat. 28.4; Suet. Aug. 83.
165 Pliny HN 8.191; 193: gausapae patris meis memoria coeper.
166 Mart. 14.128: Bardocucullius: Gallia Santonicio vestit te bardocucullo. Cercopithecorum paenula nuper erat; 14.152: Gausapum Quadratum: Lodices mittet docti tibi terra Catuli: nos Helicaonia de regione sumus (Based on this reference, some scholars have suggested that gausapae and lodices might have been synonyms. Cf. Noé 1974: 921 note 20.); 14.143: Tunicae Patavinae: Vellerus consumunt Patavinae multa trilices, et pingues tunicas serra secare potest; 14.145: Paenula Gausapina: is mihi candor inest, villorum gratia tanta, ut me vel media sumere messe velis (This seems to suggest that
the point should be quite clear by now: in the first century AD, Gaul and the Po Valley were thought of as sources of cloth and clothing for Rome and Italy. The textile business may have been one of the main sources of the considerable wealth in places like Patavium. According to Strabo, Patavium had an impressive number of 500 equestrians. It is hardly clear, however, whether their roles were “limited to supplying raw materials,” and it was left in the hands of artisans and workers to undertake the actual production of manufactured goods.

The development of the textile production went hand in hand with the development of sheep-rearing and wool production. This is confirmed not only by literary sources but also by archaeological finds. In the plain of the Crau near Arelate in Gallia Narbonensis, for example, a series of very large covered sheep-pens have been found, “indicating a highly organized development for the potential of this inhospitable environment to provide seasonal pasture for flocks of sheep that perhaps totaled over 100,000 animals,” a scale that has no Iron Age precedent in the region. Not only so, the size of sheep grew bigger in these regions, which meant more meat and wool. Turning to northern Italy, we find highly specialized professionals engaged in specific stages of wool processing. Inscriptions put up for, or by, groups of wool carders, wool combers, and wool washers have been found in Brixia, Regium Lepidum, Altinum and Brixellum. There is little doubt that there were intense activities surrounding wool in this region. Some merchants acquired wealth and status through wool trade. A tombstone found in the overcoat made by gausapa was usually worn in winter). Also see Mart. 14.147, 152; Pliny HN 8.191, 193.

167 Te Cadmea Tyros, me pinguis Gallia vestit: Vis te purpureum, Marce, sagatus amem? (Mart. 6.11). These words from Martial also clearly illustrate the contrast between Gallic clothing and high-quality materials as well as the attachment of low status to those who wore Gallic clothing. One may argue that Gallia in Martial’s texts indicate certain types of clothing rather than provenance. But the Strabo and Pliny the Elder’s testimony concerning Gallic textiles would suggest otherwise.

168 Strab. 5.1.7.

169 This is Kehoe’s suggestion concerning the elite’s involvement in production (2007: 568–69).


171 Brixia: CIL V.4501 = InscrIt. 10.5.294 = ILS 7290a (lanari(i) pectinar(ii) sodales); InscrIt. 10.5.875 = AE 1927.100; CIL V.4504 = InscrIt. 10.5.933, and CIL V.4505 = InscrIt. 10.5.297 = ILS 7557 [lanari co(a)c(atores); Regium Lepidum: AE 1946.210 [lanari(i) pect(inarii) et carmin(atores)]; Altinum: AE 1987.443 [colleg(iatis) gentilibus lanari(orum) purg(atorum)] (Claudian or Neronian date; see Buonopane 2003b for discussion); Brixellum: for a communal burial place of the lanariorum carminator(um) sodalicium, see CIL XI.1031 = ILS 7290.
Mutina (Aemelia, Regio VIII) mentioned a wool merchant (negotians lanarius) of freedman status (CIL XI.862 = ILS7559). He was a sevir at Forum Sempronii (Umbria, Regio VI), but was also involved with a collegium harenariorum, or an organization of gladiators at Rome. The inscription showcased not only his translocal connections, but also his wealth and status.

Notably, textile products from southern Gaul and northern Italy moved not only in the direction of Rome and central Italy but also to the military frontier, where there was a concentration of consumers. Clothing sometimes traveled long distances to supply the army. A papyrus dated to AD 100–105 shows that the Coh. I Hispanorum Veterana stationed in Stobi, Macedonia sent soldiers to get clothing from Gaul. “Canusiana Rufae: Roma magis fuscis vestitur, Gallia rufis, et placet hic pueris militibusque color.” These lines from Martial also hint at the connection between Gaul and military clothing. It is not always clear, however, in these texts exactly what region is meant by Gallia—it might refer to Gallia Narbonensis, Gallia Cisalpina, or Gaul in general.

Conclusion

Recent studies of the Roman textile economy tend to exclude the centonarii or assign minimal significance to them due to the ambiguity of the meaning of the term. In his otherwise very helpful investigation of the production and trade of textile in the Roman West, F. Vicari (2001: 12) asserts that the associative life of the textile workers does

---

172 For example, Egypt supplied not only garments, tunics, and blankets, but also raw materials, and not just for local armies, but sometimes also for those in Judaea, Cappadocia, and so on. See P.Ryl. II.189 (AD 128), BGU VII.1564 (AD 138). Cf. Mattingly 2006: 296.

173 RomMilRec 63, col. ii. 18 (= Campbell 1994: 114–15 no. 183), cited in Harris 1993: 17–18 n. 44; Whittaker 1994: 105; 2002: 212; Elton 1996: 115–16 (English translation); Sheridan 1998: 82; Roth 1999: 133; Harris 2000; Adams 2007: 228. Although the Coh. I Hispanorum Veterana was stationed in Stobi, many of its soldiers were on detachments elsewhere. Some, for example, were assigned to Moesia (col. ii. 4). T.Vindol. II. 255 mentions a person who just returned from Gaul and approved some clothing; cf. Birley 2002: 101; Whittaker 2002: 212.

174 Mart. 14. 129.

175 Gallia for Gallia Narbonensis (Varro Rust. 2.4.10; Pliny HN 3.34), or Cisalpine Gaul (Varro Rust. 2.4.11; Polyb. 2.15; Strab. 5.1.12). In Martial, it often means Gallia togata.
not seem to have played a significant role in Western communities. Vicari reached this conclusion precisely because he declined to include centonarii. Avoidance and dodging, however, only further increase the gaps in our understanding. In fact, this Chapter serves to suggest that we are missing an important aspect of the Roman textile economy—in fact, the Roman economy in general—if we dismissed the centonarii as unrelated to the textile sector. W. Jongman (2000) has put forward the hypothesis that an important feature of the Roman textile economy may have been the trade of wool, which was typically exported in raw form from the less-densely populated areas in northern and southern Italy to the more populous cities in central Italy for manufacturing close to its ultimate consumers. Attractive as it is, this model can only be partially true. In fact, this Chapter has shown that at least in northern Italy and southern Gaul, raw-material production and clothing manufacture were both significant. It is by no mere coincidence that collegia centonariorum flourished in these regions. Both southern Gaul and northern Italy were in a position to supply the military as well as meet the demand from Rome and Italy. Such a position puts into perspective both the early presence and the concentration of the collegia in these regions. Granted, historical details are lacking. A reasonable hypothetical reconstruction is nevertheless plausible. Business opportunities in Rome, Italy, and the frontier provinces would have provided considerable incentives for investment and business expansion, as shown by evidence like the above-mentioned archaeological data from Arelate. Such opportunities would also have given rise to numerous occasions for cooperation and competition between craftsmen and tradesmen. The initial formation of collegia might have been a result of intensified economic activity and even a response to it. The initial stimulus or push to form collegia might also have come from the military, since it would have been easier for the military to deal with the head(s) of organizations than with individual tradesmen or craftsmen. It may also have been easier, within this relationship, for the collegia to obtain governmental support and authorization. This aspect will be further elaborated upon in Chapter 3.

176 Northern Italy may have attracted wool from elsewhere, see Grelle and Silvestrini 2001: esp. 99–100; Mart. 14.129. See also Cottica 2003: 272 which mentions "massiccia presenza di pesi da telaio troncopiramidali in terracotta"; Buonopane 2003b: 291: Altinum was not just a center of sheep-rearing or wool trade, but it also played an important role in textile production.
The key question for this Chapter concerns how official policies influence the *collegia centonariorum* as a specific type of *collegia*. Their standing in the eyes of law and public authorities must be understood in the broader context of the legal frameworks governing the phenomenon of *collegia*. From the Late Republic throughout the Imperial Period, there accumulated a multitude of *leges*, senatorial decrees, *mandata*, Imperial rescripts and so on that regulated *collegia*. These legal regulations have been systematically sorted out by earlier scholarly works, especially those of Mommsen, Waltzing, and De Robertis. At the methodological level, however, the drawbacks of the earlier scholarship have become increasingly clear, for it was confined to the juristic framework, and directed its attention to intentions of law without taking into much consideration its implementations and its social effects. Still, a general neglect of the impact of official regulations does not do justice to the ancient sources. Instead, it will hinder a proper understanding of the history of *collegia*. B. Sirks’s study of the food supply and the development of the *collegia naviculariorum*, as well as other *collegia* involved in that system, is an illuminating demonstration of how much we can benefit by approaching these *collegia* from the point of view of legal history. In fact, it will become clear from the discussions in this Chapter that the interaction between *collegia* and law was not a separate domain or plateau divorced from the other aspects—social or economic—of these *collegia*.

**Governmental Control versus Promotion**

While earlier scholarship fixed its attention on central legislation and approached state regulations mainly in terms of normative repression, recent researchers have called into question the alleged severity of those restrictive regulations and their actual implementation. Several scholars have suggested that as far as Egypt and Asia Minor are concerned, there did not seem to have been any general ban of associations or consistent
enforcement of restrictive regulations.¹ The occasional suppressions of associations or assemblies occurred in circumscribed contexts and were often for practical aim only.² There has been a visible scholarly tendency to minimize the governmental anxieties over the associations, and to emphasize the ineffectiveness or failure of law enforcement. While this scholarship has substantially expanded our understanding of the complexity of the interactions between the public authorities and collegia, a further aspect, that is, the authorities as validators of associations, has not been fully integrated into the scholarly narrative of the social history of collegia.³ It is important to emphasize from the outset that the Roman State played a dual role in both controlling and validating collegia. Certain aspects of collegia caused anxiety on the part of the authorities, which simultaneously promoted, and were attracted to, certain other aspects of these organizations. Similarly, certain types of collegia were more acceptable to the authorities than others. The collegia fabrum, in particular, were often cited as representatives of collegia by the jurists and ancient authors.⁴

Acknowledging the dual role of the Roman State means that we do not need to brush aside the Roman government’s anxieties toward collegia’s potential as sources of unrest.⁵ These anxieties, although not to the extent of ‘morbid fear’,⁶ were real and persistent, as shown mainly by a number of legal citations in the Digesta. Although the jurists’ writings excerpted in the Digesta cannot be taken as representing positive laws at the time they were issued, they are nevertheless indicative of the concerns of the ruling elite at a given time. In addition, official regulations such as Imperial rescripts were sometimes cited in these juristic writings.⁷ According to a clause in the Twelve Tables preserved in the Digesta, collegia had the right to make internal agreements (pactio) as

³ Tran 2006 is an exception.
⁴ Cf. Pliny’s reference to the senatorial debate de instituendo collegio fabrorum and Trajan’s familiarity with the functions of the collegia fabrum elsewhere (Pliny, Pan. 54.4; Ep. 10.34).
⁵ Arnaoutoglou 2002: 44.
⁷ E.g., Dig. 1.12.1.14 (Ulpianus I. S. de off. praef. urb.): Divus Severus rescripsit eos etiam, qui illicitum collegium coisse dicuntur, apud praefectum urbi accusandos.
they wished, provided they did not violate public law (lex publica). This remains the basic principle governing the phenomenon of collegia throughout Roman Imperial history, which may explain its inclusion in Justinian’sDigesta. The Lex publica in question would embrace a wide range of subjects, among which must have been the laws concerning violence (de vi), and other crimes. In fact, in the Digesta, a special section concerning collegia and corpora appeared in Book 47, along with other sections on theft (furtum), sedition (turba), robbery, violation of tombs, lampooning, extraordinary crimes, extortion with menaces (concussio), removal of boundary stone, etc. In other words, certain issues of the collegium organization and activities were considered in the context of maintaining security and order in the cities and provinces. The legal citations seem to be particularly concerned with the potential of the collegia being hijacked as ready-made structures toward a politically motivated use of violence.

The scrutiny of collegia was intended to occur at all levels—municipal, provincial, and imperial. At the provincial level, there are abundant juristic references to the provincial governors’ duty in the supervision of collegia. The Digesta contains many guidelines—mostly dating to the Antonine and Severan periods—for provincial governors. Gaius’ Book Three on the provincial edict, Marcianus’ Book Three of Institutiones, and Ulpianus’s Book Six on the Duties of Proconsuls all attest to the fact that provincial governors were expected to monitor associations in accordance with laws, senatorial decrees, and imperial mandates.

At the municipal level, it seems that a provision regarding associations and assembly may have become a regular part of the municipal laws regardless of whether or not the associative phenomenon was causing problems in the local context. Chapter 74 of the lex Irnitana, a Flavian municipal charter discovered in Spain in 1981, for example, ruled, “No one is to take part in an assembly (coetus) in that municipium or to form

---

8 Dig. 47.22.4, Gaius ad l. xii tab: Sodales sunt, qui eisdem collegii sunt, quam Graeci hetairian vocant. His autem potestatem facit lex, pactio nem, quam ulim, sibi ferre, dum ne quiet ex publica lege currumpant. Cf. Waltzing I: 84; RE III (collegium); Eliachevitch 1942: 224; Yavetz 1983: 90; Crawford 1996a: 694–95; Jones 1999: Appendix 2.
9 E.g., Dig. 47.22.2 (Ulpianus 6 de off. procons.): Quisquis illicitum collegium usur-pauerit, ea poena tenetur, qua tenentur, qui hominibus armatis loca publica vel templa occupasse iudicati sunt.
10 Dig. 3.4.1.pr. (Gaius 3 ad ed. provinc.); Dig. 47.22.1.pr. (Marcianus 3 inst.): Mandatis principalibus praepititur praeidibus provinciarium, ne patiantur esse collegia sodalicia neue milites collegia in castris habeant; Dig. 47.22.2 (Ulpianus 6 de off. procons.).
a society (sodalicum) or association (collegium) for that purpose or to conspire that it be held or to act in such a way that any of these things occur.” The penalty of violation was 10,000 sesterces, a considerable sum for the majority of municipal citizens.\textsuperscript{11} We cannot assume that this was the first time such a clause was inserted in a municipal law. In fact, there was a very similar clause in the Lex Coloniae Genetivae (ch. 106) dated to 47/46 BC, although its fragmentary nature precludes further comparison.\textsuperscript{12} It must be noted that the main purpose of such clauses in the municipal charters was to prevent coetus, which was often defined as turba multitudinis hominum.\textsuperscript{13} To the Roman mind, collegia were certainly seen as a locus where turba may potentially happen.

The Roman law concerning collegia, however, has never been sweepingly repressive. Even during the late Republic and Augustan era, when collegia repeatedly became the targets of suppression, there were always exceptions. The Augustan policies toward collegia, for example, were by no means completely repressive in nature, nor did they involve any general ban. This is made clear by Augustus’ positive treatment of a variety of collegia including the musicians, the fabri tignarii, our collegia, and several others.\textsuperscript{14} According to Suetonius, the criteria for exception were legitima et antiqua.\textsuperscript{15} It must be noted that antiqua should perhaps not be understood in a purely literal sense. Pliny the Elder, Plutarch and Florus all seem to know listings of collegia whose origins can be traced back to the monarchical period.\textsuperscript{16} But as E. Gabba has shown, such a list and the attribution of the creation of specific collegia

\textsuperscript{11} For the text, see González and Crawford 1988; Liu 2005 (discussion of chapter 74 and bibliography).

\textsuperscript{12} The style of the letters suggests that the text was engraved in the Flavian period rather than in the Caesarian age. But it is not clear to what extent the text was altered in the course of the intervening century or so. The imperfectly preserved ch. 106 apparently dealt with gatherings [ILS 6087; Crawford 1996a: 410 (text), 429 (translation)]: Quicumque c(olonus) c(oloniae) G(enetiuae) erit, quae iussu C. Caesaris dic<rupta> est, ne quem in ea col(onia) coetum conventum coniu---. Despite the fragmentary state of the passage, the message that participation in any gathering or meeting or conspiracy was subject to regulation is clear. What is not entirely certain is how restrictive the regulation might have been and to what extent it affected the phenomenon of collegia in a local context.

\textsuperscript{13} E.g., Dig. 47.8.4.3 (Ulpianus 56 ad ed.).


\textsuperscript{15} Suet. Aug. 32.1.

\textsuperscript{16} Plutarch ascribes the creation of eight craft collegia to Numa, Florus to Servius Tullius. Pliny HN 34.1; 35.159; Plut. Num. 17.2; Florus 1.6.3.
to a king may have been “invented” “to enhance the reputation and consequently justify the continuing existence of certain collegia in the face of increasing hostility toward the associative phenomenon from the Late Republic.”  

In light of Gabba’s analysis, it seems advisable neither to take the term antiqua at face value nor to treat it simply as an indication of chronology. The meaning of legitima at Suet. Aug. 32.1 is similarly unclear. Is legitima a further limitation of the category of antiqua? Or does legitima itself represent a separate category? Should legitima be understood in its technical sense, that is, “legitimate by virtue of a law or laws”? If so, what law or laws are being referred to? Or is legitima used in a non-technical sense, meaning simply “appropriate” or “proper”? We do not know on what sources Suetonius based his description of Caesarian and Augustan reactions to collegia or how antiqua and legitima were defined in these sources. For Asconius (Pro Cornelio de maiestate 75), however, it was “a few and certain collegia (pauca et certa),” such as those of the fabri and the fictores, which were desired for the public good (quae utilitas civitatis desiderasset), that were not targeted for suppression. “Antiqua et legitima” mentioned by Suetonius and public utility, emphasized by Asconius, are different types of criteria. Although an overlap could be possible, it is also likely that these references reflect different stages of legislation.

To the Romans, collegia could be potentially dangerous, but they could also be potentially useful. The Roman rulers were quite aware that the realization of collegia’s varied potentials may take different focus in different social and political environment. The well-known correspondence between Pliny the Younger and Trajan concerning the proposal to establish a collegium fabrum in Nicomedia, and the petition to organize eranoi in Amisus, illustrate how the authorities weighed the advantages and disadvantages of various associations according to the particular situation in any given province or city. The official regulations had a double-edged effect. One hand, they could be used by the authorities as tools of control; on the other hand, the law would provide privileges and protection to the accepted collegia, and thus facilitate their development. In fact, law can be seen as a tool of

---

19 For a discussion, see Liu 2005: 291.
20 Pliny the Younger, Ep. 10.33–34, 93. For the nature of eranoi, see Maier 1969 (credit institutes).
differentiation, and an important element in promoting the status of collegia in Roman society.21 The formal recognition of a collegium in the Imperial period took the form of a governmental grant of ius coeundi. This measure is more than a shield to protect the state from harm but offered protection, judicial advantages, and even such privileges as immunity from compulsory public services for the authorized collegia. The possession of ius coeundi (the right to assemble) would separate collegia licita from illica. The procedure of acquiring and granting ius coeundi, however, is by no means clear. Nor is it clear when ius coeundi as a requirement was first initiated. The concept may have become a subject of much discussion around Publius Clodius Pulcher’s tribuneship (58 BC), when he reportedly not only restored the collegia abolished by a senatus consultum of 64 BC, but also established numerous new ones.22 The testimony of Asconius points to the necessity of official authorization from early on. Asconius spoke of coetus factiosorum hominum sine publica auctoritate, suggesting that in his day, collegia—or at least those at Rome—needed to operate with auctoritas publica. CIL VI.4416 = 2193 = ILS 4966, which mentions a collegium symphoniacorum authorized by an unspecified lex Iulia ex autoritate Augusti for the purpose of games (ludorum causa), has led scholars to believe that there was a comprehensive Julian law governing the authorization of collegia.23 Yet, the public character of the collegium symphoniacorum should be noted,24 and the case of the symphoniacii should perhaps be best considered within the context of the Augustan ‘restoration’ of religion.25 Another type of evidence of authorization, that is, the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan concerning the authorization of different types of associations, is also of limited use. Two pairs of letters exchanged by Pliny and Trajan discussed whether a collegium fabrum should be formed in Nicomedia and whether a benevolent association (eranoi) should be allowed to operate in Amisus.26 While

21 Tran 2006: 355: “un critère de différenciation entre les collèges.”
22 Cic. Pis. 4.9; Cass. Dio 38.13.2.
23 See, for example, Berger 1947: 44–56.
24 The full name of the collegium was collegium symphoniacorum qui sacris publicis praeestu (sic!) sunt. They perform at the public religious ceremonies. Such seems also to have been the case with the collegia of various types of musicians such as the flute-players (tibicines) and lyre-players (fidicines) (CIL VI.4416 = 2193 = ILS 4966; CIL VI. 2191–2192, 240, 1054, 3696).
26 Pliny the Younger (Ep. 10.33) mentions ius concessum to the members of the collegium fabrum he proposed to establish in Nicomedia. This ius in question must have been ius coeundi.
the turbulent situation in Bithynia should be noted, which led Pliny to ban the formation of *hetairae*, the Plinian testimonies bear much on our understanding of how the authorities may have responded to specific applications/requests for official recognition. According to a third century source recorded in *Dig. 47.22.3.1*, senatorial or Imperial authorization was the only source of legitimacy for *collegia*. This passage, however, is not without its own problems. For one thing, the sentence is grammatically unsound, which suggests possible textual alterations; for another, like many passages in Justinian’s *Digesta*, this may reflect a juristic opinion rather than the real state of affairs at the time. These materials do not provide decisive grounds for concluding that the legal requirement for *collegia* to have senatorial or Imperial authorization was essentially consistent and uncontested from at least the first century AD. But they do point to the use of *ius coeundi* as a form of control and differentiation.

**The Ius Coeundi and Its Benefits**

We know from two inscriptions dated to AD 145–161 that the *collegium centonariorum* of Hispalis was created through the *indulgentia* of Antoninus Pius (nos. 33, 34). An inscription from Cemelenum dated to around AD 239 indicates that the local *collegia III*, which seem to be the *collegium fabrum*, the *collegium utriculariorum* and the *collegium centonariorum*, were permitted to assemble by a senatorial decree (no. 128). These three examples are among the 24 inscriptions dating from AD 136 to 251 that explicitly record the Imperial or senatorial authorization of 23 different *collegia* (Table 3.1). Based on the observation that “the majority of *collegia* do not mention this permission,” van Nijf declines to attach any legal significance to such formulae of authorization. For him, “these ‘senatorial charters’ had merely a symbolic or honorific function, designed to boost the public image of the *collegium* concerned.” While it is perfectly sensible to envisage senatorial or Imperial authorization as a source of prestige for the authorized

29 *Dig. 47.22.3.1* (Marcianus 2 iudic. publ.): *In summa autem nisi ex senatusconsulti auctoritate vel Caesaris collegium vel quodcumque tale corpus coierit, contra senatus consultum et mandata et constitutiones collegium celebrat* (sic).
30 Van Nijf 2002: 316; Tran 2006: 353 in a similar vein. See also Duff 1938: 103.
collegia, the out-and-out denial of the legal value of such authorization is problematic. Regardless of whether the authorities at all levels actively seek to enforce the requirement of authorization or not, a collegium itself would be interested to seek legal sanction since its own common good would benefit from the formal recognition. The significance of the ius coeundi was that it gave the authorized collegium access to protection and privileges. Illegal associations may have existed in reality but did not exist in the eyes of the law, and of course were barred from any legal benefits such as the right to immunity.31

According to Dig. 3.4.1.pr.-2 (Gaius, 3 ad ed. provinc.), selected corpora, societates, and collegia were entitled to the right of corpus habere—that is, the legal capacity to hold common property and a common treasury, to be represented by an agent (actor or syndicus), and to sue and be sued as a collective entity.32 B. Sirks must be right in pointing out that what are involved in Dig. 3.4.1. pr.-2 are not ordinary private law organizations.33 Nor is this text about the authorization of collegia. Rather, the focus throughout is corpus habere.34 An actor or syndicus could defend these organizations, upon which the right of corpus habere had been conferred. If a situation should arise and the

32 Dig. 3.4.1.pr.-2 (Gaius, 3 ad ed. provinc.): Neque societas neque collegium neque huiusmodi corpus passim omnibus habere conceditur: nam et legibus et senatus consultis et principaliibus constitutionibus ea res coercetur. paucis admodum in causis concessa sunt huiusmodi corpora: ut ecce vectigalium publicorum sociis permissum est corpus habere vel aurifodinarum vel argentifodinarum et salinarum. item collegia Romae certa sunt, quorum corpus senatus consultis atque constitutionibus principalibus confirmatum est, veluti pistorum et quorundam aliorum, et naviculariorum, qui et in provinciis sunt. Quibus autem permissum est corpus habere collegii societatis sive cuiusque alterius eorum nomine, proprium est ad exemplum rei publicae habere res communes, arcum commu- nem et actorem sive syndicum, per quem tamquam in re publica, quod communiter agi fierique oporteat, agatur fiat. Quod si nemo eos defendat, quod eorum commune erit possideri et, si admoniti non excitentur ad sui defensionem, venire se iussurum proconsul ait. et quidem non esse actorem vel syndicum tunc quoque intellegimus, cum is abit aut valetudine impedietur aut inhabitis sit ad agendum. For discussions of the legal capacity of the Roman collegia connected with the actio institoria, see Duff 1938; Eliachevitch 1942; De Robertis 1971; Biscardi 1980: 1–20; Aubert 1999: 59–64.
34 When referring to official corporations, collegia and corpora are often used interchangeably in both literary texts and inscriptions (Dig. 10.4.7.3, collegia ceteraque corpora). But corpus may sometimes carry a more specific connotation, indicating that the association was recognized by the state and had received from the law a public quality. For discussion, see Waltzing II: 140 with n. 3; Kneissl 1998: 446–48; Sirks 1991: 87. See also Cracco Ruggini 1971: 140 for the interchangeability of these two terms (corpus, collegium). However, the word corpus in the phrase ‘corpus habere’ concerns the juristic capacity of an organization.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference (city)</th>
<th>Type of collegium</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Authorization formula, type of inscription, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIL VI.2193 = ILS 4966 (Rome)</td>
<td>Collegium symphoniacorum</td>
<td>Terminus post quem 27 BC</td>
<td>quibus senatus c. c. c. permisit e lege Iulia ex auctoritate Aug(usti) ludorum causa; funerary inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scavi di Antichità 1919, 72 (Ostia)</td>
<td>Corpus corporatorum</td>
<td>First century AD?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XIV.2112 = ILS 7212 (Lanuvium)</td>
<td>cultores Dianae et Antinoi</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Lex collegii, caput ex s(enatus) c(onsultum) p(opuli) R(omani)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL III.7060 = ILS 7190 (Cyzicus)</td>
<td>Neoi</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>authorization by sc. For discussion of this case, which is special in its own right, see Forbes 1933; de Ligt 2001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL II.1167 (Appendix A, no. 33, Hispalis)</td>
<td>Corpus centonariorum</td>
<td>145–161</td>
<td>Indulgentia ei(us) (i.e. Antoninus Pius)… [constituta]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL X.1642 = ILS 335, CIL X.1643, 1647 (Puteoli)</td>
<td>Collegium/socii scabillariorum Puteolanorum</td>
<td>139, 140, 161</td>
<td>Dedications to Antoninus Pius, Faustina Aug(usta), and Marcus Aurelius respectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XIV.168 (Ostia)</td>
<td>corpus fabrum navalium Ostiensium</td>
<td>April 11, 195</td>
<td>honorific inscription (?) by the corpus to an eques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XIV.169 (Ostia)</td>
<td>corpus fabrum navalium Ostiensium</td>
<td>April 11, 195</td>
<td>honorific inscription by the corpus to patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VI.85 (Rome)</td>
<td>mensores machinarii frumenti publici</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>dedicatory inscription, put up by magistrate of the collegium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VI.1872 (Rome)</td>
<td>corpus piscatorum et urinatorum totius alvei Tiberius</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>dedicatory inscription by the corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL VI.29691 (Rome)</td>
<td>Collegium dendrophorum</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>collegio dendrophorum Romano quibus ex sc coire licet, record of benefactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XIV.4573 (Ostia)</td>
<td>Corpus fontanorum</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>corpus Fontanorum q(uod) ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) c(oire) l(icit), album?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL IX.2213 (Telesia)</td>
<td>Collegium fabrum tignariorum</td>
<td>3rd century</td>
<td>Honorific inscription by the collegium to v.c., patronus coloniae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL V.7881 (no. 128, Cemelenum)</td>
<td>collegia III</td>
<td>3rd century</td>
<td>Honorific inscription by the collegia tria to patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 1333 (Rome)</td>
<td>Collegium uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL X.3700 (Cumae)</td>
<td>Dendrophori</td>
<td></td>
<td>[dendrophori quibus ex s.c. coire licet?]; album</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XIV.10 (Ostia)</td>
<td>Corpus pell(ionum)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fragmentary, restoration uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL X.5198 (Casinum)</td>
<td>Collegium fabrum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collegium to patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL XIV.256 (Portus)</td>
<td>corpus fabrum navalium [Ostiensium or Portuensium]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Album</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE 1935. 25 = AE 1963.17 (Minturnae)</td>
<td>Collegium fabrum tignariorum</td>
<td></td>
<td>collegium fabrum tignariorum quibus ex s-enatus c(onsulto) c(oire) l(icit), honorific inscription ---]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35 See also Tran 2006: 352.
collegium, corpus or societas, had no such defender, the proconsul could order its common property to be seized or even sold, if, having been warned, the group did not take measures to defend itself. According to Dig. 3.4.1.pr.-2 (Gaius), the possibility of corpus habere was only available to a small number of corpora. However, a couple of Imperial rescripts cited by the jurists indicate that the rights to own property, manumit slaves, and receive legacies as a collective whole may have been extended to all collegia that possessed the right to assemble no later than the reign of Marcus Aurelius. Thus, a collegium or corpus, upon being granted the ius coeundi, would be viewed juridically as a separate entity, comparable to a municipium or populus, rather than as a number of individuals. In other words, such collegia were entitled to the regulations governing universitas. As a technical legal term, universitas (of persons) denotes a unit, which is different from the members (singuli) who comprised it. The status of universitas thus amounts to fictitious or artificial personality.

This does not necessarily suggest that no collegia or corpora except those mentioned in Dig. 3.4.1.pr. (Gaius) enjoyed the status of universitas before Marcus Aurelius. The list was open. Furthermore, an individual grant was always a possibility. It may be reasonably suggested that Marcus Aurelius’ ruling assimilating collegium possessing ius coeundi to universitas may just have been a response to increasing cases of individual requests for relevant rights. Nor did a lack of the right of corpus habere prevent various organizations from accept-

36 Dig. 40.3.1–2 (Ulpianus, 5 ad sab.); Divus Marcus omnibus collegiis, quibus coeundi ius est, manumittendi potestatem dedit; quare hi quoque legitimam hereditatem liberti vindicabunt; Dig. 34.5.20 (Paulus, 12 ad plaut.). Cf. Sirks 1991: 86–89, 93; Tran 2006: 349.

37 See in general Dig. 3.4 Quod cuiusscumque universitatis nomine vel contra eam agatur. Dig. 3.4.2 (Ulpianus, 8 ad ed.): Si municipes vel aliqua universitas ad agendum det actorem, non erit dicendum quasi a pluribus datum sic haberis: hic enim pro re publica vel universitate intervent, non pro singulis. Dig. 3.4.7.1 (Ulpianus, 10 ad ed.): Si quid universitati debetur, singulis non debetur: nec quod debet universitas singuli debent. Sirks 1991: esp. 83, 88. See also Dig. 2.4.10.4 (Ulpianus, 5 ad ed.): qui manumittitur a corpore aliquo vel collegio vel civitate, singulos in ius vocabit: nam non est illorum libertus; Dig. 4.2.9.1 (Ulpianus, 11 ad ed.): et ideo sive singularis sit persona, quae metum intulit, vel populus vel curia vel collegium vel corpus.

38 Eliachevitch (1942: 327) dubbed such a right ‘une nouvelle construction juridique’ and readily applied the term ‘juristic personality’, a term that not all scholars think applicable to the Roman period. See more recently, Tran 2006: 347–50.

39 E.g., CIL V.4428: the sexviri Augustales of Brixia obtained authorization to have an arca during the reign of Antoninus Pius. Tran 2006: 358–61.

40 Dig. 40.3.1–2 (Ulpianus, 5 ad sab.).
ing gifts or legacies. The way to bypass the laws regulating corporate possession was to involve the individual member(s) or magistrates personally in the acceptance and management of gifts and legacies.\textsuperscript{41} It is not difficult to imagine the sorts of problems that could potentially stem from the latter kind of arrangement, which is precisely why the status of \textit{universitas} matters. Since the \textit{ius coeundi} had begun to bring with it important judicial capacities by the time of Marcus Aurelius, it provided even more protection and advantages to authorized \textit{collegia}. Such advantages might have had numerous implications. For instance, the \textit{collegia} with \textit{ius coeundi} might have been more attractive to potential benefactors/donors, since donations to such \textit{collegia} would involve less legal trouble. According to Paulus, a legacy left to an illegal \textit{collegium} was not valid unless it was bequeathed to each (member) individually: they were granted the legacy not as a \textit{collegium} but as a number of persons (\textit{certi homines}).\textsuperscript{42} In any case, the existence of such unauthorized associations was risky, as they were subject to censure and dissolution.\textsuperscript{43} It is important to bear in mind that many of the gifts to \textit{collegia} were perpetual endowments, which came in the forms of both cash foundations and revenue-generating properties.\textsuperscript{44} The dissolution of an organization would make it rather difficult for any such gifts to sustain.

It should not be taken for granted that what the \textit{collegia} did was always part of their original purpose, although it remains difficult to ascertain which activities were intended and which were simply byproducts. The Roman \textit{collegia} certainly sustained “a whole range of other resource- and value-generating performances that made associative life a societal asset.”\textsuperscript{45} The expansion of the legal capacities of the \textit{collegia} with \textit{ius coeundi} may be seen as a further response to their growing dimensions. The law both regulated and facilitated the development of these

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{41} D’Arms 2000: 139.
\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Dig}. 34.5.20 (Paulus 12 \textit{ad plaut.}): \textit{cum senatus temporibus divi Marci permiserit collegis legare, nulla dubitatio est, quod, si corpori cui licet coire legatum sit, debeatur: cui autem non licet si legetur, non valebit, nisi singulis legetur: hi enim non quasi collegium, sed quasi certi homines admittentur ad legatum.\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Dig}. 47.22.3.pr.-1 (Marcianus 2 \textit{iudic. publ.}); \textit{Dig}. 1.12.1.14 (a rescript from Severus).
\textsuperscript{44} For the gifts to the Roman \textit{collegia}, especially the perpetual endowments, see Liu 2008.
\textsuperscript{45} These expressions are borrowed from Gabrielsen 2001: 237 on the associations of Hellenistic Rhodes.
\end{footnotes}
aspects, allowing certain collegia to develop into durable organizations that were able to accumulate and transmit all kinds of resources.\textsuperscript{46}

Many collegia centonariorum were property-owners, as shown, among others, by such formulae as l(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreti) c(ollegi).\textsuperscript{47} In order to sustain the fund and/or generate revenue, the collegia, at least in theory, had either to invest the money or to manage the properties efficiently. The close involvement of these collegia in receiving legacies, buying, selling, leasing, and lending means that they often entered contractual relationships, and thus faced legal problems. The status of universitas would thus also be important in addressing ownership issues and other legal problems.\textsuperscript{48} Many, if not all, collegia centonariorum had their own treasuries, called arcae or res publicae. Finances were handled by magistrates such as curatores or quaestores arkae. In some collegia, the position of curator was so important that the collegial era was dated by eponymous curatores, as in the case of the collegia (?) fabrum and centonariorum of Mediolanum, as already discussed in Chapter 1 and will be further discussed in Chapter 4. This dating system lasted more than two hundred years.\textsuperscript{49} Endowments and other gifts may have significant impact on the internal organization and functions of collegia.\textsuperscript{50} It is entirely possible that the collegia themselves functioned as sources of credit. But we have no detail about how the money was invested, or how and to whom the credit was extended. Presumably, members had priority in borrowing money from their own collegium more cheaply than on the open market.\textsuperscript{51} If this was indeed true, the appeal of collegial membership for craftsmen and/or tradesmen in terms of access to credit should not be underestimated. Collegia may also have had to staff or rent out the shops, gardens, and other properties they received and/or do the marketing for them. In Altinum, Lucius Ogius Patroclus, while

\textsuperscript{46} Cf. Verboven 2007a.

\textsuperscript{47} For example, the collegium centonariorum of Comum (nos. 181, 182). Examples from other collegia: L(ocus) d(atus) d(atum) d(ecreto) college(ii) (CIL V.5287; Comum); LDDC (no. 193, Mediolanum, second century AD); LDPC (CIL V.5773 = Sartori 1994 S 8; Mediolanum, collegium uncertain, first century AD).

\textsuperscript{48} Andreau 1977: 158; Liu 2008.

\textsuperscript{49} Parallels for curatores as eponymous—the cultores domus divinae at Rome: cur(atores quattuor) anni I cultorum domus divinae (CIL VI.353); curatores anni secundi (quinque) cultorum imaginum domus divinae (CIL VI.471); curatores quattuor anni primi (CIL VI.253); curam agentibus anno primo (CIL VI.8826); etc.

\textsuperscript{50} Liu 2008: 231–56.

\textsuperscript{51} P.Stras. IV.287 (Hermopolis? Fourth century AD), lending without interest by a corporation to a member; cf. Fikhman 1994: 37.
he was alive, gave the *collegium centonariorum* gardens (*hortos*) with a building adjoining his tomb so that from their yield a greater abundance of roses and edibles might be offered to his patron and to himself (no. 141). Here, the mention of *horti* is of particular interest. These gardens were not just decorative; they had functional purposes. Known as a *cepotaphium*, this type of garden-tomb paid for itself through horticulture. The building (*aedificium*) mentioned in Patroclus’ endowment likely served as living quarters for the maintenance staff and doubled as a storehouse or even a shop. Such an endowment gave *collegia* the opportunity to maintain a corporate business, which might or might not have been related to the occupations of the *collegiati*.

Not only did the possession of *ius coeundi* help attract donations and endowments, it was also the prerequisite for *privilegia* (special arrangements). The bulk of evidence detailing the special arrangements is provided by the writings of third-century jurists preserved in Justinian’s *Digesta*. This does not mean, however, that granting privileges to *collegia*, especially for their *utilitas publica*, was a new development in the third century AD. Rather, it was a familiar concept to the Roman authorities, and was probably practiced on a case-by-case basis before the third century. The most important document relating to the *privilegia* of the *collegia centonariorum* is the Solva rescript (no. 36). Although the rescript itself dates from the joint reign of Severus and Caracalla, it alludes to a grant of benefits (*beneficia*) by the senate and the earlier emperors. One of the *beneficia* of the *collegia centonariorum* is specified as *vacatio*, which is doubtless equivalent to the *immunitas* mentioned in Dig. 50.6.6.12. Immunity must have covered

---

52 Toynbee 1971: 94–100; Jashemski 1979: chapter 4; Purcell 1987: 35. For the types of flowers grown in peripheral gardens, see Varro *Rust.* 1.16.3 (violets and roses). For the demand for flowers, especially roses, see the many inscriptions (e.g., *CIL* V.7454) that mention roses for the deceased during the festival of *rosalia*; for weddings, *P.Oxy.* XLVI.3313. For tomb vineyards planted to provide wine for libations, see *CIL* XII.1657. Cf. Farrar 1998: chapter 9 (Non-Residential Gardens), 175–86.

53 *Immunitas* and other benefits may be granted to the *collegia* or corporations, provided that they possess the right to assemble (*quibus ius coeundi lege permissum est*), and that each member was enrolled on the basis of his craft, to provide services required for public needs (*necessariam operam publicis utilitatis exhiberent*). See Dig. 50.6.6.12 (Callistratus), which will be further discussed below. *Privilegium*, in these cases, should be understood as ‘special arrangement’. As Sirks 1989: 98 has emphasized, ‘such *privilegia* often contained favours, which explains the meaning of the word *privilege,* though this was not always the case.”
both munera personalia and munera patrimoniorum.\textsuperscript{54} Other beneficia may have included exemption from guardianship (vacatio tutelarum) of outsiders (circa tutelarum exterorum hominum administrationem habebunt excusationem).\textsuperscript{55} This would be quite a desirable privilege, since tutela could be a very burdensome obligation. At least in the fourth century, monopoly was another side benefit that sometimes accrued to the authorized collegia, who provided services to the state. In the fourth century, the saccarii (porters) seem to have monopolized the business of unloading the goods that arrived at the gates of Rome, regardless of whether these goods were related to state or private business.\textsuperscript{56}

Privilegia/Beneficia were evidently granted to qualified collegia as organizations—in other words, only through membership in these collegia could one obtain these special arrangements. However, membership per se did not assure access to the benefits. Members could be disqualified from such privileges on account of irrelevant occupation, or ‘too much’ wealth. ‘Rich’ members in the collegium centonariorum, therefore, could not receive the benefits, nor could those who did not practice the artificium of the centonarii. The circumstances surrounding the Solva case will be further explored in Chapters 5 and 6. For now, suffice it to say that one of the problems that the governing authorities had to address was how to prevent people from joining collegia to escape other duties and/or from taking advantage of the privileges while not providing any of the services to which these privileges were attached. The Solva rescript (no. 36), along with Dig. 50.6.6.12 (Callistratus),

\textsuperscript{54} Compulsory public services included embassies, duty as a judge of lawsuits or an advocate for the city, preservation of public order and guard duties, tax collection, supervision of public post and of aqueducts, repair of buildings, construction or repair of roads, heating of baths, provision of animals for transport, and the sheltering and equipping of troops (Garnsey 1974: 236 = 1998: 9 n. 25).

\textsuperscript{55} Dig. 27.1.17.2–3 (Callistratus, 4 de cogn.). The most impressive catalogue of privileges is provided by the Dionysiac associations of technitai and the associations of the athletes (P. Oxy. 2476 = P. Frisch 1986: 50–73 no. 3, under Hadrian). Their privileges as granted by Hadrian included, among other things, personal inviolability, seating precedence (in the theaters, etc.), exemption from military service, immunity from compulsory public services, untaxed retention of all earnings from games and other performances, dispensation from providing sureties for their exemption from the tax for common sacrifices, the right not to be compelled to billet strangers, to be confined under any other constraint, or to be liable to the death penalty. Such lavishly granted privileges would have been exceptional. I do not suppose that the members of the collegia centonariorum enjoyed a similar package.

represents responses to issues concerning the principles governing collegial members’ eligibilities for privilegia.

Necessaria Opera Publicis Utilitatibus

The collegium centonariorum must have been one of the “paucae utilitas civitatis desiderasset, sicut fabrorum fctorumque” mentioned by Asc. Corn. 75, especially since this connection between the collegia centonariorum and utilitas publica recurs in the Solva rescript (with Dig. 50.6.6.12, Callistratus). In order to understand what constitutes utilitas publica, a discussion of the concept and forms of public service in general in the Imperial period is in order.

Dig. 50.6.6.12 lists the qualifications of the collegia whose members may be eligible for beneficia/privilegia:

1. legal status: quibus ius coeundi lege permissum est;
2. composition: in quibus artificii sui causa unusquisque adsumitur ut fabrorum corpus est et si qua eandem rationem originis habent;

This last qualification is of key significance for understanding the nature of the collegia centonariorum. Although there is a gap of more than 200 years between Dig. 50.6.6.12 (Callistratus) and Asc. Corn. 75, a certain continuity is obvious, for both use the collegia fabrum as examples and both refer to utilitas to underline the qualification of these collegia. However, neither specifies exactly what constitutes utilitas publica or utilitas civitatis. Were these concepts the same? Did the meaning of utilitas change over time? In what terms were the collegia centonariorum considered ‘useful’? And for what were they granted their various privileges?

Our sources never specify what kind(s) of necessaria opera utilitatibus publicis in which the centonarii were involved. But utilitas publica has a range of meanings. It can mean ‘general good’ as opposed to private interest.57 N. Lewis has shown that in Egypt some essential craftsmen,

57 Dig. 11.7.43 (Papinianus, 8 quaest.): nam propter publicam utilitatem, ne insepulta cadauera iacerent, strictam rationem insuper habemus; Cod. Iust. 1.22.6: quae generali iuri vel utilitati publicae adversa esse videatur; rubric of Cod. Iust. 1.22: si contra ius
including weavers, enjoyed exemptions from liturgies either temporarily or on a regular basis.\(^{58}\) This may also have been true elsewhere, in which case, the *necessaria opera publicis utilitatis* were not always necessarily connected with specific services for the government. By contrast, *munera* were always embodied in particular obligatory services.\(^{59}\) But *utilitas* and *munera* were not necessarily mutually exclusive categories in practice. In *CTh* 12.1.7, for instance, *utilitas civilitatum* seems to be used as a synonym for *munera civica* (municipal obligations).\(^{60}\) In Theodosian’s *Novellae* 3.6, *munera* were described as a means of serving *utilitas publica*. But there were some crucial conceptual differences between *utilitas publica* and *munera publica*: the latter were bound to the person or property of the individuals who were liable, while the former was not; *munera* were performed at the expense of the incumbents, which was not the case with the *necessaria opera publicis utilitatis*. A particular kind of *utilitas* could be transformed into a *munus*, as in the case of the *navicularii*.\(^{61}\) The performance of one *munus* granted exemption from other *munera*. But the *necessaria opera publicis utilitatis* were not all turned into *munera*.

As far as *collegia* in general are concerned, three broad categories of specific public services have been attested:

*Public Services for the Capital(s) (Rome, and later also Constantinople)*

The most important services in this category were those for the *annona*. The ship-owners (*navicularii*), millers and bakers (*pistores*), *negoziatores*, and ship-builders were eligible for special benefits as individuals provided that they fulfilled certain requirements, such as transporting grain to Rome for a certain number of years. According to B. Sirks, the *collegia*


\(^{60}\) *CTh* 12.1.7 (AD 320): *Filios decurionum, qui decem et octo annorum aetate vegetantur, per provinciam karthaginem muneribus civicis adgregari praecipimus. neque enim opperientur familia et sacris explicentur, cum voluntates patrum praecidicare non debent utilitatis citatitum. proposita. For different terminologies for municipal *munera*, see *Dig*. 50.6.6.7 (*munera civitatum*); 27.1.17.3 (*munera municipalia*). Cf. Sirks 1991: 93 with n. 158.

\(^{61}\) Sirks (1989: 109–10; 1991) has argued that the *munus navicularium* was introduced in early third century AD, then further evolved into a *munus patrimonii* at the end of the third century.
naviculariorum were first established during the reign of Trajan.62 It was also Trajan who not only recognized the collegium of the pistores, but also reserved certain privileges for members of that collegium alone.63 The annona involved the provincial navicularii as well as the various collegia in Rome and Ostia.64 But the provincial navicularii were not all connected exclusively with the annona. Some African navicularii were awarded privileges for transporting ligna (firewood) to the baths in Carthage.65 While the corpus mensurarum in Rome enjoyed vacatio because of its service to the annona, those in the provinces did not.66 Various other types of collegia transported marble, wood, and other commodities for Rome. In the fourth century, Symmachus’ Relationes shows—with all due considerations of the rhetorical stance—how much the city of Rome had come to depend on the services of collegia.67 The boundary between services for Rome and those for the state, however, is by no means always clear-cut.

Public Services Connected with the Supply of Goods

The most important service in this category would be the food supply (annona). But public services connected with the supply of other types of goods are also known. The weavers in Egypt supplied the government with requisitioned clothing ranging from several pieces to hundreds or even thousands.68 In AD 139, on receiving orders to make clothing for the state, the weavers (gerdioi) of the village of Philadelphia sent

62 Suet. Claud. 18–19; Gai. Inst. 1.32c and 33.
64 Dig. 3.4.1.pr. (mentions provincial navicularii); Dig. 50.6.6 (5) 5: Navicularii: annonae urbis servient.
66 Dig. 50.5.10.1.
67 Symmachus Relat. 14.3: (Valentinian I) noverat horum corporum ministerio tantae urbis onera sustineri.
68 P.Oxy. XIX.2230 (AD 119) recorded payment to the himatiopôlai, clothes-dealers, for 200 lodikai, the Greek equivalent to the Latin lodices (blankets) (Sheridan 1998: 83); P.Ryl. II.189 (AD 128; Sheridan 1998: 83); BGU VII.1564 (AD 138); BGU VII.1572 (AD 139); P.Oxy. LXIV.4434 (AD 154?) was issued by the optio of the legio III Cyrenaica to the kassopoioi of Oxyrhynchus in recognition of the receipt of 55 large Syrian garments (tas surias megalas). See Sheridan 1998, Appendix 2, for more references.
a petition to Dio, the strategos of the Arsinoite nome, and asked for exemption from liturgies. In the fourth century, the linen-weavers in Egypt claimed that they were “of no small usefulness to the public good (hai démosiai chreiai),” for “they contribute much to the anabolicum and there is all the work that they have to do.”

Public Services for the City (Collegia and Fire-Fighting)

Occupationally-based collegia could be used as frameworks for services related or unrelated to their specific trades. Additional functions and/or services may have accrued or changed over time. One such service is firefighting. As the letters of Pliny the Younger show, the collegia fabrum seem to have served as fire brigades in a number of cities as early as Trajan’s reign. Pliny’s language made it quite clear that the collegium was intended to recruit exclusively from the fabri. Presumably, the fabri were qualified by their physical strength, by conveniently possessing the tools for fire-fighting, and because ancient fire-fighting often involved demolition of buildings to block the spread of fire. We cannot assume, however, that fire-fighting was the only public service performed by the collegia fabrum across time and place. Meiggs (1973) and DeLaine (2000) have indicated that the collegium fabrum tignariorum of Rome and the collegium fabrum of Ostia, at least, do not seem to have been linked to fire-fighting. In these places, the members may have had an advantage acquiring contracts in the construction of public buildings (opera publica) through collegium membership. After all, the collegium of the fabri tignarii (builders and carpenters) of Rome proudly advertise their work tools on their altar. In Noviomagus Regnorum (now Chichester), Britain, the fabri formed a collegium as early as Claudius’

---

69 P.Phil. 10; for English translation, see Lewis and Reinhold 1955: II 77.
70 P.Ryl. 654, L. 6.
71 After a conflagration in Nicomedia, Pliny the Younger proposed to establish a collegium fabrum in that city, and asked for Trajan’s approval (Ep. 10.33). Trajan’s response shows that in asking to establish such a collegium, Pliny was following the example of a number of other places (secundum exempla complurium; Ep. 10.34). Waltzing I: 129, 346; II: 193; Hirschfeld 1913: 96–111, followed by Kneissl 1994: 133–46.
72 For discussion of fire prevention and fire fighting in the Roman cities, see Hermansen 1981: 208–27.
73 CIL VI.1673 = ILS 1211: curator operum publicorum as patron of the collegium fabrum tignariorum of Rome (Cracco Ruggini 1971: 141 with n. 168); Symmachus Relat. 14: Sunt qui fabriles manus augustis operibus accommodent. Symmachus is most likely referring to the fabri here (Waltzing II: 26 n. 1).
74 CIL VI.30982 = AE 1975. 13.
reign even before urbanization took off in Briain. This *collegium* may have been closely involved in the business of ship building and repairing.\(^{75}\) In Alba Fucens, a veteran, who held such positions as *IIIIVir i(ure) d(icundo)* and *curator operum publicorum* (among others), was a *q(uin)q(uenalis)* of the *col(legium fabrum tignariorum* (carpenters and builders) (*CIL IX.3923 = ILS 6536*), which also seems to point to the connection between the *collegium* and public building projects. Although they would be almost impossible to trace, there may have been chronological and geographical variations in the types of *utilitas publica* for which the *collegia fabrum* could be used.

*The Utilitas Publica of the Collegia Centonariorum: A Hypothesis*

The previous discussions indicate that *utilitas publica* was not a narrowly or strictly defined concept in the Roman legal system. According to how the *collegia* served the *utilitas publica*, all the services listed above can be divided into two categories: (1) services that used the occupational skills of the *collegiati* directly; and (2) those that were general in nature and not directly connected with the occupations of the *collegiati*.\(^{76}\) Some services were temporary or incidental in nature, but others developed into binding *munera*, as in the case of those *corpora qui annona serviant*.\(^{77}\) Few *collegia*’s services were restricted to one category alone. The *utilitas* of the *fabri*, for instance, cut across all these categories. Similarly, the *necessaria opera utilitatis publicis* of the *collegia centonariorum* should be understood in a broad and general sense. At the same time, it may be possible to be somewhat more specific about the original *utilitas* of these groups. The parallel I have in mind is that of the organizations of the textile workers in Egypt, who supplied not only garments, tunics, and blankets, but also raw materials for both the local armies and, at times, those in Judaea, Cappadocia, and other places.\(^{78}\) In

---

\(^{75}\) The *fabri* and the others in the *collegium* set up a temple to Neptune and Minerva, for the well-being of the divine household (*RIB 91*; Bogaers 1979: 243; Saddington 2007: 213).

\(^{76}\) Also cf. a very late example: in Alexandria, the *corporati* were obliged to clean mud out of the Nile, a task from which they were freed in AD 436. (*Cod. Iust. 11.29; CTh 14.27.2; Waltzing II: 420; Ausbüttel 1982: 78*).

\(^{77}\) In general, see Sirks 1991.

\(^{78}\) P.Ryl. II.189 (*AD 128*); *BGU VII.1564* (*AD 138*) and a number of other examples already cited before. See Sheridan 1998: esp. 83–86 for discussion. For other references, see Sheridan 1998, Appendix 2.
fact, connecting the *centonarii* with the textile economy makes it easy to understand the early presence and subsequent concentration of the *collegia centonariorum* in southern Gaul and northern Italy (Chapter 1). As already discussed in Chapter 2, these regions were well positioned to supply both Rome and the military, which provided stimulus for the textile production and trade. Whatever the incentives on the part of the *centonarii* to form *collegia*, their usefulness in supplying the army must have made their *collegia* highly acceptable to the authorities. It is likely that the *collegia centonariorum* were originally deemed useful because these organizations could facilitate military purchase or requisitioning. The state may have had little interest in making sure that the civilians were clothed, but the clothing supply for the military was of different gravity. The military or the state may not have created these *collegia*, but the official recognition would have contributed to accelerating their development.

At this point, it becomes necessary to take a closer look at the patterns of supply and demand in the Roman army in the Empire. These patterns changed over time, and may have varied between the privileged groups, such as the Praetorian Guards and the provincial army, as well as between war and peacetime. The insights into these varied and changing patterns are mainly provided by sparse ancient authors’ accounts, military records survived on papyri or ostraca (mainly from Egypt) and wooden or waxed tablets from forts such as Vindolanda on Hadrian’s Wall, inscriptions mentioning merchants with military connections, as well as excavations of the Roman forts.\textsuperscript{79} These materials provide the basis for the subject of the impact of military on ancient society and economy, a topic that has seen a conspicuous increase in publications in the past two decades.\textsuperscript{80} This literature has made it clear that a centralized supply system did not come into existence until very late, perhaps the fourth century AD, and that private contractors and

\textsuperscript{79} E.g. Tac., *Ann.* 1.70; 4.72; *FIRA* III. 137; the papyri are collected in *Rom.Mil.Rec.* by Fink. The Vindolanda tablets are available both in print and online (http://vindolanda.casad.ox.ac.uk/). A variety of sources are collected in Campbell 1994. For a summary of these sources, see Whitaker 2002: 204–05.

private shops were the main sources for a variety of supplies in the early Empire.\textsuperscript{81} In the first two-and-a-half centuries of the Empire, the Roman soldier apparently paid for his food, clothing, and weapons. The cost, which seemed to have constituted a large percentage of a soldier’s pay (\textit{stipendium}), was deducted from his pay.\textsuperscript{82} The military officials were responsible for obtaining clothing from suppliers.\textsuperscript{83} Officers and some soldiers at times acquired additional supplies privately either from the market or home.\textsuperscript{84} Military \textit{fabricae} are known to have been attached to the camps throughout this period. Opinions differ as to whether these \textit{fabricae} manufactured or simply repaired armor and weapons.\textsuperscript{85} It is possible that their function changed over time.\textsuperscript{86} Although self-sufficiency was an ideal endorsed by the Roman military theorists, it seems fairly clear that the army did not and could not manufacture all that was needed.\textsuperscript{87} In the case of the clothing supply, the most recent study suggests that the army does not seem to have produced its own uniforms.\textsuperscript{88} The relationship between military supply and demand over long distances has been noted repeatedly.\textsuperscript{89} The army could obtain goods

\textsuperscript{81} See, for example, MacMullen 1960: 24; Bishop 1985a; Adams 1995: 119–24; Rathbone 2007: 167.


\textsuperscript{83} Sheridan 1998, with J. P. Roth’s review (BMCR 2000.03.26).


\textsuperscript{85} For military \textit{fabricae} and the problems of their identification, see Bishop 1985b: 5–9. These \textit{fabricae} did repairs (Oldenstein 1985: 83–86); for a synthetic account, see Rathbone 2007: 168. See also a recent report on the \textit{fabricae} excavated in Elginhaugh, a Flavian fort in Scotland (Hanson 2007: 86–92, 674).

\textsuperscript{86} Harris 1993: 17–18 with n. 44.

\textsuperscript{87} For the (ideal of) self-sufficiency of the Roman army, see Vegetius 2.11; Joseph. BJ 3.5.2. Cf. Robinson 1975: 8; Bishop 1985a: passim, esp. 3, 65, 269; Speidel 2001: 52. No military unit was ever completely self-sufficient; see Whittaker 1994: 103–04.

\textsuperscript{88} Bowman and Thomas 1994: 34: “Clothing supplies are also documented, for which it is less likely that Vindolanda will have been a primary producer, although it probably possessed the facilities for refurbishment and repair;” Sheridan 1998: 82; Wild 2002: 31.

\textsuperscript{89} See Speidel 1981 on a \textit{signifer} of the Prefect’s Horse-guards (\textit{equites singulares}) stationed at Alexandria arranging the weapons supply from Fayum; Manning 1987: 589–90: “Obtaining a state contract must have been the making of many firms in the Roman world; indeed it may have been sufficient to have established some provincial industries which had the advantage of being closer to the military bases than were the older industries of Italy. This factor will have applied most fully in the western
from the local territory, their own province, and the other provinces in the Empire.90 By the third century AD, goods provided for the army were not subject to taxation.91 Supplies could be obtained in a variety of ways: by requisition, by compulsory purchase, or by purchase at market.92 After the third century, however, the general pattern of military supply experienced significant changes in that direct contact between the military or the Imperial administrators and the producers gradually ceased. The burden of supply shifted to the communities. In the course of the third century, part of the soldier’s pay was given out in the form of ready-made equipment. State factories manufacturing armor and clothing were eventually established in the last quarter of the third century, perhaps as a result of Diocletian’s reform.93 Despite the central planning and control, however, the private craftsmen remained important sources of suppliers in the fourth century.94

Military accounts from the Imperial period show that a large percentage of a soldiers’ allowance went to clothing.95 However, the supply of military clothing has remained a rather marginal interest in the discussion of the logistics of the Imperial Roman army or military supply in general, the focus of which has, not surprisingly, always been food

---

provinces where the armies lay on the frontiers far from the Mediterranean; in the east they were more often associated with existing cities which could supply their needs. In the west too, most of the fortresses were situated on navigable rivers; a policy probably intended to make provisioning easier but a great bonus for any industry wishing to break into the military market or gain a military contract. One result was that some of the contractors were surprisingly far from the armies which they supplied. Thus much of the coarse pottery used on Hadrian’s Wall came over four hundred miles by sea from southern Dorset, an arrangement which led to substantial growth in the pottery industry there.” Most recently Carreras Montfort 2002; Mattingly 2006: 296; Whittaker 2006; Papi and Bonifay 2007.

90 Carreras Montfort 2002: 70–89. The considerations behind the practice of not procuring supplies locally may be manifold: to maintain positive relationship with the locals, to reduce corruption, to find the most reasonable prices, or to meet the desired quantities or qualities.

91 Dig. 39.4.9.7 (Paulus): res exercitui paratas praesationi vectigalium subici non placuit.


94 See, for example, P.Ryl. 654, L. 6.

(and fodder). J. P. Wild (1967, 1976)’s studies of gynacea, and J. A. Sheridan (1998)’s investigation of military clothing requisition in Egypt are the only works devoted to clothing supply. The former focused more on the late antique period (after the 3rd century AD), while the latter focused on Egypt, leaving geographical and chronological gaps to be filled. In what follows, I discuss the magnitude of the military demand for textiles in the first three centuries in the West.

Composed basically of tunics and cloak (sagum, paenula), the Roman military costumes lacked uniformity in terms of color or design. Nor were they easily distinguishable from civilian clothing. Apart from the regular clothing, there was also a special type of padded or layered garment (thoracomachus) worn beneath mail or scale armor to protect the body from friction of the armor, counteract its weight, and help absorb force of blow. The arming caps may have served similar functions. Apart from outfit and cap, there was also demand for a wide range of other textile products such as beddings, horse saddles, protective coverings for war machines, and so on. Whether in times of peace or war,
the need for clothing would have been staggering. Demographically, a total of about 80,000 soldiers were stationed in the Germanic provinces in the first century and around 40,000 in the second century, about 30,000 in Roman Britain in the first century, and around 15,000 during the second and third centuries.\textsuperscript{100} In the second century, the concentration of military shifted from the Rhine to the Danube, with the number of legions increased to 10 and perhaps equal number of auxiliaries being deployed in the Danube provinces. Apart from the soldiers on the Rhine and Danube frontier, in the city of Rome, 10,000 strong troops needed to be clothed in the first two centuries AD. This number increased to more than 35,000 in the third and early fourth centuries AD.\textsuperscript{101} Suppose each soldier needed two sets of clothing and two sets of undergarments under their armor each year, and leave some room for caps and other textile products; about 400,000 pieces of textile articles would be needed by the military on the Rhine frontier and at Rome, and about 550,000 pieces would be needed to supply the army in the Germanic provinces, Britain, and Rome in the first century. In the second century, the military in the Danube provinces alone would need 450,000 pieces of clothing. These are just the bare minimums, based on relatively low estimations of the military strength in these regions and individual demand for textile products. This overall demand must have been met by surplus textile products over a wide area, and would ultimately be satisfied by private producers and contractors.

As far as the geography of the supply of goods is concerned, it has been suggested that in the first two centuries AD, Gaul supplied a variety of goods to less Romanized neighboring provinces like Britain and the Germanic provinces.\textsuperscript{102} P. S. Middleton argued more than thirty years ago that the military presence and the satisfaction of its demand for materials contributed to the geographic distribution of the \textit{collegia nautarum} in Gaul. He suggested that one reason why so many \textit{collegia}

\textsuperscript{100} Verboven 2007b: 303–04. For different estimations of the military strengths in Britain, see also Breeze 1982: 148; Anderson 1992: 89; Davies 2002: 169.

\textsuperscript{101} Busch 2007: 315–16; Southern 2007: 115–20. The military and paramilitary units included \textit{Cohortes praetoriae, speculatores Augusti, evocati} (number uncertain), \textit{Statoes, Germani corporis custodes} (abolished in AD 69), \textit{Equites singulares Augusti, Cohortes urbanae, Cohortes vigilum, Classiarii} (number uncertain), \textit{Frumentarii, speculatores legionis, legio II Parthica} (third and fourth centuries), and so on.

of this type were allowed in Gaul was that they played a specific and necessary role for the state in moving supplies to the armies settled on the Rhine. For Drinkwater, “if Rhône was the flute of Gallic trade, it was the Rhine army that generated its massive upward draught.” Others have argued that it was in Cisalpine Gaul that we would find the centers of production of daggers, helmets, and other armor in the first century AD. Titles such as negotiator castr[e]nsiarius (Mediolanum) point to the importance of Transpadana in supplying the military. Furthermore, the transport of Arretine wares and other goods across the Alps into the Valais and thence to the military camps on the Rhine and the Danube can be followed during the early part of the first century AD, but fades out thereafter, as local production takes over.

It is against this general background of Gaul’s importance in military supply that the organization of the supply of textiles to the military and the early development of the collegia centonariorum in southern Gaul and northern Italy can be understood. Our sources indicate that the Gallic provinces did supply to the military in the other provinces. The Coh. I Hispanorum Veterana, which was stationed in Stobi and had many of its soldiers on detachments in Moesia and other places, procured clothing from Gaul. In Vindolanda, a tablet mentions a person who just returned from Gaul and approved some clothing. What about the mechanisms of textile supply, then? How did the collegia centonariorum fit in with the chain of supply? There are many missing links in our understanding of these issues for the West. As far as the procedure of clothing acquisition for the military is concerned, the most detailed sources are provided by the papyri from Egypt, and helpfully summarized by Sheridan:

103 Middleton 1979: 85; see also Drinkwater 1983: 128.
105 Bishop (ed.) 1985a.
106 CIL V.5932 = ILS 7563 from Mediolanum. The absence of D M and the lack of tria nomina for two of the three people mentioned in the inscription point to a relatively early date, perhaps mid-first century AD.
110 For the ambiguity of the evidence from Vindolanda, see Whittaker 2002: 204–34.
Second century clothing and textile purchases, as illustrated in the preceding four papyrus texts, were rather simple transactions: compulsory sales between the consumer (the government) and manufacturers (weavers, their guilds, and cloth dealers). Civilian liturgists or military officials placed an order and made a downpayment on the purchase; they later made the final payment, collected, and delivered the merchandise. Government collectors sometimes had to lay out the money for the payments themselves. In such situations, the strategus authorized and distributed reimbursements to them. The strategus also acted as a check on the honesty of the collectors, and the office of the praefect supervised the entire process of purchasing clothing for state needs.\textsuperscript{111}

By analogy, as the organizers of the textile production and/or producers themselves, the \textit{centonarii} organized into \textit{collegia} may well have been at the receiving end of the military orders or contracts. In Ravenna, for example, a \textit{decurio} of the local \textit{collegium centonariorum} stipulated a high fine on violation of his tomb payable to the Imperial \textit{fiscus} (no. 107). The connection between him and the \textit{fiscus} might point to his involvement in supplying the nearby navy with clothing and textiles (see further Chapter 4). It should be noted that the formation of \textit{collegia} did not change the basic organization of production, which centered on workshops. It would be more significant to know whether the \textit{collegia} divided bulk orders and requisitions among the various independent workshops.\textsuperscript{112} But our sources do not provide ready answers. Apart from direct contact between the military officials and the \textit{collegia}, there would certainly have been big-time merchants who purchased textile products in various places, transported them to the frontier and sold them to the soldiers.\textsuperscript{113}

\textit{Conclusion}

The development of \textit{collegia} was not an entirely natural or spontaneous process, but was affected by governmental regulations, which could be negative or positive, long-term or temporary. Governmental policies regarding \textit{collegia} were never rigid or uniform, and the relationship between \textit{collegia}, law and the public authorities was complex at all

\textsuperscript{111} Sheridan 1998: 84.
\textsuperscript{112} Wilson 2001: 291.
\textsuperscript{113} Cf. Verboven 2007b for the \textit{negotiatores} in Gaul.
levels. Certain types of collegia, including the collegia centonariorum, were promoted by the government as useful structures to serve the public good in a broad sense. These collegia obtained official recognition from very early on, enjoying ius coeundi and the accompanying right of corpus habere, which contributed to the durability of these organizations and their ability to attract both one-time gifts and perpetual endowments. The collegia centonariorum continued to enjoy various beneficia such as immunity from compulsory public services from at least Commodus’ reign through the end of the fourth century. These privileges were sources of both increased popularity for the collegia and potential conflict with the decuriones, which led to further governmental intervention aimed at preventing ‘outsiders’ from taking advantage of collegial membership and protecting the rights of bona fide collegiati. It is important to note that being linked to utilitas publica does not entail that a collegium was created by the authorities, or on the initiative of the authorities. There is no indication in our sources that the collegia centonariorum were anything but private and voluntary in origin.

We can also be more specific about the utilitas publica of the collegia centonariorum. Taking into consideration the chronological and geographical dimensions of these collegia, I propose a new reconstruction of their public utility. Quite possibly, the collegia centonariorum were originally deemed useful because these organizations could facilitate military purchases or requisitioning. Connection with military supply might have made it particularly easy for these collegia to receive official recognition, which accelerated the formation and spread of these collegia in certain regions, especially in northern Italy, southern Gaul, and the Danube provinces. The military connection could also explain the early distribution of this type of collegia in such frontier provinces as Pannonia. Even their presence in central Italy could be linked to the military: there was a fleet in Ravenna, not to mention the fact that the province of Dalmatia was by no means far from Umbria by sea. However, to overemphasize this thesis would lead to an oversimplified understanding of the nature and functions of these collegia. I want to make the following clarifications, which will be further elaborated in the next Chapters.

It must be emphasized that utilitas publica of the collegia centonariorum cannot be equated with their overall functions as seen by the collegial members. Necessaria opera utilitatis publicis were gateways or passes to rights and various privileges, but did not necessarily encompass
all of the accrued functions or even their *raison d’être* in the eyes of the members (Chapters 5 and 7). Furthermore, the organization of the *centonarii* into *collegia* did not involve fundamental changes in the organization of production. Nor is it my contention that whenever the *centonarii* did business, they did so with the state. Not only did the military constitute only part of their customer base, but also the military demands were usually satisfied by single-orders. Other markets—local, regional and long-distance, especially Rome—would have been also if not even more important.

It is conceivable that once a particular type of *collegium* established itself as useful, it was easier for new *collegia* of the same type to obtain authorization. In other words, some of the newer *collegia centonariorum*, especially those formed during the *Pax Romana*, may have had no direct connection with military supply at all. This should not be surprising. A parallel is the *collegia naviculariorum*, of which not all of those known from inscriptions and legal sources were necessarily connected with *annona*, although the origin of these *collegia* was closely connected to the grain supply of Rome. However, a swing of the pendulum may have occurred after the later second century. The transition from *Pax Romana* in the Early Empire to more frequent occasions of war operations after Marcus Aurelius’ reign may have had an impact on how the authorities wanted to press or take advantage of the *utilitas publica* of *collegia*. The possession of *beneficia* of the *collegium centonariorum* at Solva, Noricum since perhaps Commodus’ reign, and the prominence of the *collegium centonariorum* in Apulum, Dacia, for example, can quite possibly be understood in connection with the intensified needs for organizing military supplies in the frontier regions. Since the third century, the *collegia centonariorum* may have been more attached to public services as textile suppliers than ever before as shown by three legal documents preserved in the *Theodosian Code* (see Chapter 8).

---

115 This has already been discussed in Chapter 2. See also Rathbone 2007: 176: “The impact of the military should not be exaggerated. It accounted for less than 1 per cent of the total population of over 50 million. The million or so inhabitants of Rome, more than twice the arm’s size and concentrated in one place, presented a far more testing logistical challenge, and urbanization was the main motor of economic development in the provinces.”
In Chapters 2 and 3, I connect the origin of these collegia in the provinces with the importance of northern Italy and southern Gaul as supply centers for both Rome and the military on the frontier. I hypothesize that the utilitas publica for which collegia centonariorum received official recognition from very early on lied in their roles as clothing suppliers to the armies at Rome, on the Rhine and Danube frontier, and perhaps also in Britain at least in the first century AD. The argument is made primarily on the basis of the chronological and geographical distributions of the collegia centonariorum (with due consideration of the potential distortions of the picture), a philological inquiry into the term cento, and the analogical evidence from Egypt. Linking the collegia centonariorum with military supply, however, does not automatically disapprove of the widespread opinion that they were involved in fire-fighting, especially since there might have been geographical and chronological variations or adjustment of their services. But can we discern changes and adjustment? And how? The density of their regional distribution, scale, their internal organizations, as well as their external connections with other types of organizations, varied from region to region. This fact, combined with the variations in the economic conditions, levels of urbanization and the strategic importance of different regions, makes an examination of the utilitas publica of these groups in local or regional contexts both plausible and necessary. Since the argument that the centonarii were merely fire-fighters were made primarily on the basis of their close association with the fabri, as well as the fact that centones may be used as fire-fighting tools, particular attention will be paid to the fire-fighting practices in the Roman world, as well as the relationship between the collegia centonariorum and the collegia fabrum. An overview of the attitude and approaches to fire-fighting will thus be provided, which will be followed by two sections tracing the differences in the character and function of these collegia in different regions, inasmuch as the sources permit. As our sources are seldom explicit enough for us to reach definitive conclusions, the analysis in this Chapter is by nature exploratory. I will leave many questions open, which can only be resolved when we have more evidence.
The connection between the *collegium fabrum* and fire-fighting is well-known from the Plinian testimony.\(^1\) As already mentioned in Chapter 3, presumably, the *fabri* were qualified because they possessed physical strength, and tools for both putting out fire and for demolishing buildings to stop fire from spreading.\(^2\) To our frustration, however, inscriptions or legal documents fail to reveal any details of their fire-fighting activities, or even their involvement in fire-fighting. The third-century jurist Paulus, in discussing fire-fighting at Rome in the Republican period (*Dig.* 1.15.1, *l.S. de off. praef. vig.*), refers to *triuviri (nocturni)*, who were in charge of nocturnal duties, as well as two different groups of fire fighters: the *familia publica* stationed near the city gate and walls, and *familiae privatae*, or privately maintained teams who fought fire for a fee or for free. The fire brigades of Crassus and Egnatius Rufus were perhaps such *familiae privatae*.\(^3\) In any case, under Augustus, fire fighting duties at Rome were taken over by the *familia publica* of 600 slaves formally organized in 23 BC, only to be replaced by thousands of *vigiles* in AD 6.\(^4\) The juristic sources do not help us understand *collegia*’s roles in fire-fighting at Rome or in the municipalities. Nor do the epigraphic sources. While scholars used to interpret the *ambulativa*, in which the *collegium fabrum* of Aquinicum was involved, as patrolling activities,\(^5\) more recently D. Fishwick has explained *ambulativa* as a religious procession.\(^6\) This latter explanation is to be preferred, especially since the relevant inscription was a votive dedication made to a deity, and a specific date seems to have been attached to the *ambulativa*.

\(^1\) Pliny, *Ep.* 10.33 and 34.
\(^2\) For these aspects, see Hermansen 1981: 210, 215–16.
\(^3\) Catull. 23.9; Juv. 14. 305; Plut. *Crass.* 2; Cass. Dio 53.24.4 (26 BC).
\(^4\) Sablayrolles 1996. The number of the *vigiles* was probably maintained at 3,500 in the first two centuries, and perhaps increased to 7,000 in the third century.
\(^5\) *CIL* III. 3438 = *ILS* 7254 = *Lupa* 10050: I(o) O(ptimo) M(aximo) pro salute | C(laudius) Pompeius | Faustus dec(urio) | coll(oniae) Aq(uincii) aed(iles) | Ilviral(is) praef(ectus) | coll(egii) fabr(um) item|que patronus | duxit coll(egium) s(upra) s(critptum) | in ambulati | vis V Kal(endas) Aug(ustas) | [---].
\(^6\) “A practice with roots reaching back into the Hellenistic period and earlier was the transportation of images, whether of gods or rulers, in colourful processions marking important occasions.” (Fishwick 1989: 182 note 28. See also Fishwick 2005: 280.) Cf. van Nijf 2002: 323; Goffaux 2008: 54.
Did fire-fighters automatically command respect and prestige? A fragmentary inscription from Ostia, datable to the early Julio-Claudian dynasty, mentions a soldier of the sixth praetorian cohort who died in fire-fighting (*quod in incendio restinguendo interit*), for which he was granted a place of burial (300 ft²) and a public funeral (*CIL XIV. 4494 = ILS 9494 = AE 1912. 250*). Such rather distinguished honor was certainly not common. Nor do we know the circumstances surrounding the outbreak of the fire, the location, or the gravity of its impact. These may have been described in the beginning of the inscription, which, unfortunately, did not survive. This inscription perhaps represents a rather exceptional case, and cannot be used to establish the point that fire-fighting invariably constituted a source of prestige. In fact, it seems that fire-fighting was not normally considered worthy of boasting or commemoration. Even for the *Vigiles* at Rome, fire-fighting activities were by no means a favored subject. The only explicit reference to their duties is *sebaciara* (night watch), a recurring term in the inscriptions and graffiti. Fire-fighting did not become a highly technical occupation or a specialized domain of trained professionals until quite recently. It used to be a lot more strenuous and hazardous than it is nowadays. In today’s society, fire-fighters are viewed as local heroes, and the embodiment of masculinity. This, however, did not seem to be the case in the Roman society. Indeed, as far as Rome is concerned, the duties of fire-fighting were reserved for slaves in the Republican period and the early Augustan era. In the first three centuries, the standing fire brigades of Rome were composed of freedmen. In Petronius’ *Satyricon* (78), the local *vigiles* were a subject of mockery. If the connection between fire-fighting service and prestige cannot be taken for granted in the Roman society, it would mean that we will look in vain for evidence of fire-fighting practices in the inscriptive material.

The *collegia* of Rome did not seem to have any formal or self-imposed role in fire-fighting at all, at least not before the fourth century AD. In fact, no evidence connects any *collegium* of Rome to fire-fighting before the fourth century. During Symmachus’ time, the *collegiati* of various

---

7 Capponi and Mengozzi 1993: 137–45; Friggeri: 130–31. Is it also possible that the mention of fire-fighting was deliberately avoided so as not to incur divine wrath? This aspect is well-attested in ancient China.

8 Tebeau 2003.
kinds of collegia in Rome were involved in fire-fighting. But it is by no means clear that the collegium centonariorum was one of these collegia. As far as the provincial collegia centonariorum are concerned, the lack of explicit epigraphical references to fire-fighting activities means that scholars who see them as fire-bridgades have to resort to circumstantial evidence especially for a number of joint mentions of the collegia centonariorum and the collegia fabrum in epigraphy. However, since, as already mentioned in Chapter 3, the focus of the public services of the collegia fabrum may not have been the same across time and place, and the fact that these two types of collegia were sometimes mentioned together does not help resolve the issue concerning the public service of the collegia centonariorum. In addition, as will be further discussed below, in most cases, the reason why the collegia fabrum and the collegia centonariorum were referred to together may have had more to do with the joint benefactions or patronage that they received than it had to with shared public services.

There is no doubt that fire hazards were a constant threat in the ancient cities. It should be noted, however, that we do not have to assume that every city or the majority of the cities in the Roman world necessarily had formal fire-fighting groups. Even cities of metropolis stature such as Nichomedia did not seem to have an organized fire-brigade by Trajan’s time. According to Pliny the Younger’s description, not only did the people just stand watching during a conflagration, but the city also lacked even basic fire-fighting equipment. Trajan suggested

---

9 Symmachus Relat. 14.3: Noverat horum corporum ministerio tantae urbis onera sustineri. Hic lanati pecoris invector est, ille ad victum pupuli cogit armentum, hos suillae carnis tenet functio, pars ureutiae lavacris ligna conportat, sunt qui fabriles manus augustis operibus adcommodent, per alesos fortuita arcensur incendia. Iam caupones et obsequia pistoria, frugis et olei bafulos multosque id genus patriae servientes enumerare fastidium est. “He [Valentinian I] knew that the burdens of such a great city were supported by the service of the corpora. One corpus brings in wool-bearing sheep to the city, another drives in herds to nourish the people; the supply of pork obligates some, others transport firewood for the baths. There are those who train their skillful hands for noble works; fires that happen to break out are extinguished by others. It would be tedious to give a list—innkeepers, bakers, porters of corn and oil, and the many people of that kind who serve their country.” Notitia Dignitatum records region by region the number of collegiati “qui e diversis corporibus ordinae incendiis solent casibus subvenire” in Constantinople. The number varied from one region to another. It could be as low as 17 or as high as 90. The total is 560 (2.25, 3.21; also see Jones LRE: 694–95; 1285, n. 16).


providing fire-fighting apparatus (including pumps, buckets and so on), and encouraging property owners to make use of them, and to call on the crowd for assistance. Similar self-help and ad hoc arrangements may have been the norm in many places. Some cities or villages did possess night watchmen or guards. The duties were assigned to ordinary citizens, and collegia had no role in this process. At the same time, effort was made in the area of fire prevention. Legal regulations concerning the criminal liability for fire, the responsibility of tenants and property owners, building codes, building materials developed over time.

Collegia Centonariorum in Italy and Gaul

In this section, I will first look at places such as Rome, Patavium, Ravenna and Lugdunum where the collegia centonariorum seem to have no particular connection with the collegia fabrum, which may or may not be due to chance survival of evidence. I will then move to discuss the nature of the connections between these two types of collegia in the cities in Gallia Narbonensis, Alpes Maritimae, and Umbria. Finally, I will turn to the intriguing cases of Mediolanum, Brixia, and Comum.

As already mentioned earlier, the collegium/a centonariorum of Rome did not seem to have any formal or self-imposed role in fire-fighting at all, at least not before the fourth century AD. In fact, no evidence connects any collegium of Rome to fire-fighting before the fourth century. Rather, the vigiles must have constituted a large and stable group of the centonarii’s customers. As fire-fighting materials, centones perhaps needed to be replaced fairly frequently. It is also possible that because of their fire-resistant qualities, centones were even used to make the uniforms of the vigiles. Since the vigiles were a large force of several thousand men, the demand from them alone would have been massive. Some rich centonarii, such as L(ucius) Sextilius Seleucus (no. 41), who could afford to make a handsome gift of more than 5,000 denarii,

---

12 See Vita Polycarpi 22 (Smyrna, the second century); Jones LRE: 1285; Sherwin-White 1966 (1985): 607.
13 P.Oxy. I.43v (Tetrarchic period), cited by van Nijf 1997; Alston 2002: 85, 262. For police and guards in Roman upper Egypt, see Bagnall 1977: 67–86
14 E.g., Dig. 1.15.4 (Ulpianus l.S. de off. praef. urb.); Vitr., De arch. 2. 8. 20; MacCormack 1972: 382–96; Hermansen 1981: 207–26.
15 3,920 in AD 55. See Cass. Dio 54.2.3. Later the number increased to about 7,000. See CIL VI. 1057 and 1058; Rainbird 1986: 150–51.
may have acquired their wealth as contractors in this business. The relevant parallel to the *collegium centonariorum* in this context is the *collegium sagariorum*, which may have been closely involved in supplying the Praetorian Guards with clothing and which took Hercules Salutaris, the patron deity of the *cohors prima* of the Praetorian Guards, as its own patron god.\(^{16}\) Onomastic analysis points to a close connection between the *collegium centonariorum* and the *collegium Herculis Salutaris c(o)hortis primae sagariorum* (for details, see Chapter 5). These two groups were among the many groups of tradesmen and workmen in textiles in Rome, the enormous demand for which drew supplies from various regions and acted as a driving force in the development of the Italian economy, as already discussed in Chapter 2.\(^{17}\)

We have no epigraphic evidence for the *centonarii* at Rome after the third century AD, but legal sources attest to its continued existence through the third and fourth centuries (Chapter 8). Like many other *collegia* at Rome, the *collegium centonariorum* could have become involved in fire-fighting at a later date,\(^{18}\) as both the Praetorian Guards and the *vigiles* were dissolved in the course of the fourth century.\(^{19}\) This is uncertain, however, for apparently, even in Symmachus’ time, the *collegia* of Rome were not all engaged in fire-fighting.

As Chapter 1 has shown, the earliest dated instance of the *collegium centonariorum* in the Imperial period outside of Rome is found in Patavium. We have only one inscription concerning the *centonarii* from Patavium. In AD 69, M. Iunius Sabinus, the patron of the *collegium centonariorum*, used his own money to decorate the front of a temple with fountains and marble statues and donated 2,000 sesterces for their maintenance (no. 142). Not only is this the earliest known example of this type of *collegium*, it is also the first *collegium* known to have been founded in Patavium—it predates even the *collegium*...

---

\(^{16}\) CIL VI.339 = CIL VI.30741 = ILS 7315. The full name of the *collegium* is *collegium Herculis Salutaris c(o)hortis primae sagariorum*. Cf. MacMullen 1960: 25 with n. 23. The *vigiles* and the Praetorians Guards constituted large part of the military and paramilitary organizations at Rome in the first three centuries. For the scale of military presence at Rome, see Busch 2007: 315–16; Southern 2007: 115–20.

\(^{17}\) Morley 1996.

\(^{18}\) According to Symmachus, *Relat.* 14.3. (AD 384). Ausbüttel 1982: 77; Waltzing II: 128; Hirschfeld: 111. The use of *collegia* to fight fires in Rome may have been an imitation of the provincial practice in the West. The cry ‘*omnes collegiati*’ (in Latin) when fire broke out in Constantinople might have been borrowed from the West (Lydus *Mag.* 1.50). Jones, *LRE*: 694–95, 1285 n. 16.

\(^{19}\) Jones, *LRE*: 693–94; Sablayrolles 1996.
fabrum. An inscription dated by consular date to AD 97 refers to ex voluntate college fabrum [constitutione] facta ann(i) prim(i).\textsuperscript{20} If the ‘[constitutione]’, which may mean a guild ordinance, is any guide, the collegium fabrum may have been founded in, or at least not before, AD 97. As already discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, the early appearance of the collegium centonariorum at Patavium is by no means surprising, since Patavium was a major textile export center at least in the Early Empire.\textsuperscript{21} There were only a few types of collegia in Patavium, and only two inscriptions concerning collegia seem to date to after the first century AD. Is the lack of epigraphic record of collegia for the second and the third centuries AD due simply to the chance survival of evidence? Or, alternatively, is the decline in epigraphic evidence a consequence of the decline of the collegia? If so, why did the importance of these collegia wane in later centuries? One might suspect that the decline of the collegium centonariorum was one of the symptoms of the decline of the Patavian textile industry as well as the economy of the city in general. It is, however, difficult to be assertive on this point. As P. Garnsey has pointed out, the evidence for such a decline is meager;\textsuperscript{22} but then, so is evidence to the contrary. The latest reference to Patavian textiles is found in Martial.\textsuperscript{23}

In Ravenna, the collegium centonariorum was divided into at least seventeen decuriae in the late second century AD (no. 107). As we know from parallels elsewhere, a decuria was usually comprised of 22–25 persons. Therefore, the collegium centonariorum could have had about 400 members. The large size of the collegium may be due to the presence of the Imperial fleet, with its c. 5,000 marines, at Ravenna.\textsuperscript{24} It is quite plausible that the collegium centonariorum was used as a framework for supplying clothing and all kinds of textiles to the fleet. M. Caesius Eutyches, a decurio of the collegium, and his wife stipulated that anyone who put or built anything else in front of their tomb should pay a fine of 30,000 sesterces to the fiscus Augustorum (nostrorum duorum) (no. 107). Although it is by no means rare to designate the recipient of such fines, it is quite unusual for the Imperial fiscus to be the recipient. It

\textsuperscript{21} Strab. 5.1.12.
\textsuperscript{22} Garnsey 1978: 16 (= 1998: 48); Chilver 1941: 54–55.
\textsuperscript{23} Mart. 14.143: *Tunicæ Patavinae: Vellera consumunt Patavinae multa trilices, et pingues tunicas serra secare potest.*
\textsuperscript{24} For the number of marines, see Starr 1941: 16. For uncertainties concerning the scale of the Imperial classes, see Saddington 2007: 209.
seems likely that Eutyches had a direct connection with the Imperial fiscus under the joint reign of Marcus Aurelius and Verus, or else that of Septimius Severus and Caracalla. Perhaps his connection derived from his being a supplier of clothing and textiles to the fleet and being paid by the Imperial fiscus. If so, the implications of this case are of great significance for our understanding of the public service and business connection of the centonarii in Ravenna.

Sizable as the collegium centonariorum of Ravenna was, it was overshadowed by the collegium fabrum of Ravenna, which was composed of at least 28 decuriae. The names of the fabri were found inscribed on a stone (AE 1977. 265a). The collegium fabrum was the recipient of two large endowments, 30,000 and 70,000 sesterces respectively (CIL XI.126, 127). The large size of the collegia fabrum can, with little doubt, be connected with the fabri’s importance in building and repairing ships. There does not seem to have been any special relationship between the fabri and the centonarii in Ravenna, except that they shared an equestrian patron. The fabri also shared a patron with the dendrophori. It is rather difficult to see all these collegia at Ravenna as fire brigades: Why would a city of medium size need such a large group of fire fighters?

In Gallia Lugdunensis, the collegium centonariorum is attested only in Lugdunum. Situated at the meeting point of the Araricus (Saône) and the Rhodanus (Rhône), as well as at the intersection of great Roman roads, the city was well known for its strategic and commercial importance. There were two types of centonarii in Lugdunum: the local centonarii (nos. 13, 27) and the centonarii Lug(uduni) consistentes (nos. 14, 15). The word consistere with the name of a place indicates residence in some place other than in one’s place of origin. It could be used to refer to a foreigner as well to as a collegium composed (mainly) of members of foreign origin. Such consistentes have been amply

---

25 CIL XI.126, 127. See also CIL XI.132 = ILS 7235.
26 Interestingly, the gifts recorded in CIL XI.126, 127 both mentioned the temple of Neptune, aedes Neptu(ni), where distributions were to be made to those present die Neptualiorum.
27 CIL XI.124 (late second or third century AD).
28 AE 1957.138, third century AD.
29 For Lugdunum’s trade links to the North and South, see Wierschowski 2001; Verboven 2007b: esp. 301.
30 Waltzing II: 176; Cracco Ruggini 1973: 289 with n. 67. Local citizens could also join a collegium consistens.
attested, suggesting the geographical mobility of many merchants and artisans. Both the local collegium centonariorum and the centonarii Luguduni consistentes claimed seviri Augustales among their members and patrons. In fact, all four of the centonarii from Lugdunum whose names have survived were Augustales. It is difficult to know, however, whether freedmen made up the majority of the collegia centonariorum in Lugdunum, especially since freedmen were more likely to advertise their affiliation than others. Unfortunately, no membership list of the collegia centonariorum at Lugdunum has survived. Munatius Felix was a (se)vir [A]ug(ustalis) Lug(udun)i, curator of the corpus of the seviri Augustales, patron of the centonarii Lug(uduni) consistent(entes), and had held all kinds of magistracies among them (no. 14). [T]outius Incitatus (no. 15) was a (se)vir Aug(ustalis) Lug(udunensis), naut(a) Arar(icus) (shipper on the Saône), centonarius Lug(uduni) consistens honoratus (former magistrate), and negotiator frumentarius (grain merchant). The combination of several occupational titles in one person is typical of important commercial centers such as Lugudunum and Ostia. Such people may have been

---

31 CIL III.6166: Vet(erani) et cives R(omani) consist(entes) ad canab(as) leg(ionis) V Mac(edonicae); CIL VIII.9250: Rus(gunienses) et Rusg(uniis) consist(entes); CIL X.1634 (cf. CIL X.1759): cultores Iovis Helioptitan Berytenses, qui Puteolis consistunt; CIL VI.404, 7458, 9404: collegium fabrum soliarium baxiarium, qui consistunt in scola sub theatro Aug(usti) Pompeian(o); CIL V.4017: negotiatores vinarii Luguduni in canab(is) consist(entes), collegium nautarum Veronensium Arilicae consist(entes); no. 121: collegium centonariorum Placentinorum consist(entes) Clastidi; CIL II.170 (Alimer): consistens Luguduni, pertinens ad collegium fabrum; CIL VI.29722: seviri Augustales Luguduni consist(entes) et Augustales coloniae Lugudunensis; Bramb 770: Ar[en]arii consist(entes) col. Aug. Tre(virorum); CIL XI.3209: Coll. Lit(n)tion[um quod consistit] Fale[riis]; CIL II.165 (Alimer): fab(er) [tign.] Lug. Cons(istens); CIL II.1180, 1183, 1186, 1189: scapharii Hispalenses, scapharii Romulae consistentes et scapharii qui Romulae negotiantur; CIL XIII.5474 (Dijon): fabri ferrari Dione consistentes; CIL XIII.5475 (Dijon): lapidari pag. Andomo co(n)sistentes. Individual—CIL VI.29722: negotiator vinarius Luguduni(i) in canabis consist(ens). In a few cases, local cives were also admitted into collegia consistentes. CIL XIII.2039, for example, is an epitaph for a civis Lugudunnensis, incorporatus inter utriclarios Luguduni consistentes.

32 Fabri tignariarum Luguduni consistentes (CIL XIII.1939, 1967), negotiatores vinarii Luguduni consistentes (CIL XII.1911, 1954), utriclarii Luguduni consistentes (CIL XIII.1954, 1960, 1998), civis Trever, negotiator vinarius et artis cretariae Luguduni consistens (CIL XII.2033), and civis Viennensis, nauta Araricus honoratus, utriclarius Luguduni consistens (CIL XII.2009), to name just a few.

33 For the meaning of honoratus, see Royden 1988.
great entrepreneurs. It is very likely that this [T]outius Incitatus was involved in shipping both clothing and food to the Rhine frontier by the river Saône.

Apart from multiple affiliations, geographical mobility and translocal connections are also attested among the centonarii of Lugdunum. A tombstone (no. 27) found in Vienna, Gallia Narbonensis (modern Vienne, France) involved two Rusonii, who seem to have come from Lugdunum, or at least to have had close connections with Lugdunum. C. Ruson(ius) Muron put up the tombstone for C. Ruson(ius) Secundus according to the latter’s wish/prescription (iussu) (no. 27). A sagarius by occupation, Secundus held the position of (se)vir [Aug(ustalis)] at Lugdunum. Muron, heir and fellow freedman (collibertus) of Secundus, was an ex-magistrate among the (se)viri A[ug(ustales)] of Lugdunum, an ex-magistrate among the centonarii, and a member of the corpus sagariorum. The inscription did not specify whether Muron was affiliated with the collegium centonariorum and corpus sagariorum of Lugdunum or Vienna. The former seems more likely, especially since the gentilicium Rusonius is better attested in Lugdudum. This inscription shows close trading connections between Lugdunum and Vienna, the latter of which, situated on the Rhodanus, was itself a meeting place of trade routes. The epitaph for P. Vettius Gemellius, sagarius Romanenis(is), also points to the trading activities relating to textile in Vienna. Vettius Gemellius might have originally come from Rome and/or maintained business relationship with Rome.

Given the socioeconomic status, multiple occupations, geographical mobility and translocal connections of these members of the two types of collegia centonariorum at Lugdunum, it would be difficult to believe that these collegia were not organized as trade-oriented guilds. Significantly, the centonarii of Lugdunum have not been found mentioned together with the fabri or the fabri tignarii (builders, carpenters).

---

34 An Attalus may have been a perfume trader [negotiator s]eplasi(arius), shipper (nauta Rhodan(ici?)), and a member of the corpus of the centonarii who reside at Lugdunum (no. 17; the inscription is very fragmentary).
35 CIL XIII.1970 (Rusonius Hyla, a sevir Augustalis of Lugdunum, and C. Rusonius l. Mercurialis); CIL XIII.2251 [Rusonius Senator and his fellow freedman, Rus(onius) Patrophilus.]
36 Strab. 4.1.2, 14; Ptolemy 2.9; PECS: 4886 Vienna.
37 CIL XII.1928 = ILS 7583 = ILN 5.1.120 (most likely from late first century and early second century). For the meaning of Romanensis, see Waltzing III: 685–6, ad CIL XI.3936. Romanensis may indicate ‘from Rome’, but could also mean ‘after the Roman fashion’.
Even if these two latter groups were fire brigades, which is doubtful as far as Lugdunum is concerned, it is irrelevant to our understanding of the function of the centonarii in Lugdunum. The fabri tignarii and the artifices tectorii (plasterers, stucco-workers) of Lugdunum shared not only the same burial place but also the same Genius (CIL XII.1734, second century AD). It can hardly be doubted that their close relationship was based on their involvement in the building business. Kneissl’s thesis, that the collegium fabrum tignariorum was not an occupational association but only a fire brigade, does not seem to be applicable to Lugdunum.

An inscription found in Lugdunum mentions a praefectus vigilum (CIL XIII.1745). It is not clear whether he was the local praefectus in charge of fire-fighting or whether he was the praefectus vigilum from Rome, and was honored either when he happened to be in Lugdunum or because he was originally from there. In any case, there is no further reference to the activities of such a praefectus or to the relationship between the praefectus and the various collegia in Lugdunum. One wonders whether the Urban Cohort that was stationed in Lugdunum functioned as a police force for the city in addition to protecting the mint.38

In Gallia Narbonensis and Alpes Maritimae, the phenomenon of collegia shared several peculiar characteristics in these two nearby regions. Here, the collegium centonariorum is referred to in epigraphy by a variety of names: centon[ar(ii)] corp(orati) (no. 19, Massilia), [cor]pora(tus) centona(rius) (no. 20, Aquae Sextiae), or simply the nominative plural centonari(i) (no. 28, Ugernum; no. 22, Arelate). This is somehow different from other regions, where the expression corpus centonariorum was seldom used. The use of the term corpus in Gallia Narbonensis may have been a local habit; corpus does not seem to have different legal implications from collegium, but was used interchangeably with it.39 Another, perhaps more peculiar phenomenon in these regions is the prominence of the utriclarii, whose geographical distribution was confined to Gallia Narbonensis, Gallia Lugdunensis, Alpes Maritimae,

38 For the cohorte XIII urba[na] qu[a]e est Lugduni, see e.g., AE 1914. 84 = CIL XVI. 133 = ILTG 233 (AD 192).

39 Nos. 20 and 21, both from Aquae Sextiae, used corpus and collegium, respectively. The use of both terms also occurred for other types of collegia, such as the utricularii, and seviri Augustales. Cf. Cracco Ruggini 1971: 140 for the interchangeability of these two terms.
and Dacia. Many inter-collegia relationships revolved around the utriclarii, to which I will return shortly.

The centonarii in Arelate (modern Arles) shared a patron, a sevir Augustalis, with the fabri navales (ship-builders), the utriclarii, and the corpus of the seviri Augustales (no. 22). In Alba Helviorum, the collegium centonariorum, together with the collegium fabrum, the collegium utriclariorum, and the collegium dendrophororum, were the joint recipients of sportulae, perhaps from their common patron (no. 25). In Cemelenum, C. Cassius Paternus, a decurio and patron of the collegium utriclariorum, dedicated a statue to Mercury. On this day, he distributed sportulae and oil to the collegium fabrum utriclariorum et centonariorum (no. 133). It is not entirely clear whether the singular form of collegium should be understood in a distributive sense, or as indicating a joint organization among the fabri, utriclarii and centonarii. There is also the question of whether we should read fabri utriclarii (makers of leather containers) or fabri [et] utriclarii here. The former reading is not impossible, since the inscription also mentions a separate collegium utriclariorum. On the other hand, it would be surprising that as patron and decurio of the utriclarii, C. Cassius Paternus did not include them among the recipients of the handouts. The term tria collegia appears in three inscriptions from Cemelenum. But, as will be discussed in Appendix C, exactly what it refers to is unclear—perhaps the utriclarii, the fabri, and the centonarii in the case of Cemelenum.

Who were the utriclarii, then? The utriclarii were once thought to be makers of leather containers (bottles, bags, etc.) for wine and other liquids. In the middle of the 20th century, this identification was replaced with raftmen/boatmen employing rafts supported by inflated skins, which is the definition adopted by standard dictionaries. In 1981, P. Kneissl proposed a different identification by connecting the utriclarii with the transportation by wagon of wine and oil in leather containers.

---

40 Qua die collegio fabrum utriclariorum et centonariorum sportulas et oleum dedit. Collegio here is in the dative; it can only be singular.
41 Kneissl 1981: 203 no. 27.
42 For the collection of inscriptions, see Rougé 1959; Deman 2002. The etymological root is uter (skin). In a different context, utricularius may also mean bag-piper (Suet. Ner. 54; Deman 2002: 239–41).
containers. The argument was supported mainly by three types of evidence: 1) a bronze tessera of the collegium utriculariorum seems to show a skin bag; 2) skin rafts may be difficult to operate in northern Gaul, where the rivers were quite fast and full of pebbles; 3) some of the collegia utriculariorum were found in places that were either not near a river or near an unnavigable river. Reii Apollinaris, Haudui, Nemausus, Alba, and Cemelenum seem to be such places. Recently, Kneissl’s idea was pushed further by A. Deman, who identified the utricularii as muleteers that transport wine overland. Both Kneissl and Deman focused on the Gallic cases. But the Dacian evidence seems to confirm their conclusions. In Dacia, the collegium utriculariorum has been found at Mikhaza (CIL III.944 = ILS 3748 = IDR III.4.215, Calugareni), and Pons Augusti (CIL III.1547 = ILS 3747 = IDR III.1.272, modern village of Marga). Both were located on important roads. But Pons Augusti was not near navigable rivers. Although Mikhaiza was situated near the river of Mures, the town was located on the upper half of the river, where its narrowness made navigation impossible. It seems less likely that these Dacian utricularii were boatmen.

The utricularii’s role in transportation make it easy to understand their close associations with the various river shippers (nautae) and sea-going shippers/ship-owners (navicularii). It is not surprising that they were also connected with all kinds of other tradesmen, including those in the textile industry. CIL XIII.1998 = ILS 7035, CIL XIII. 2023 = ILS 7034 mention a lintiarius (dealer in linen products) and a negotiator [artis prossari]ae (dealer in woolens?), respectively, who were also affiliated with the organizations of the utricularii, most likely because of their transportation-related functions. One could look at the association between the centonarii and the utricularii from the same perspective. The utricularii helped the centonarii distribute their goods. After all, Mercury, the dedication of whose statue the utricularii,

\[\text{REFERENCES}\]

44 Kneissl 1981; already in AJPh (1934): 275: “utricularii, contractors who rented out skins for the transport of wine and oil.” See also IANice: 107–08 ad no. 66.
45 Deman 1987: 91; 2002: 233–46. Most of the visual presentations Kneissl cites show tubs instead of leather containers. (Kneissl 1981: 169–203.) Wine was often transported overland in wooden barrels (See Strab. 5.1.8, 5.1.12; cf. Wightman 1985: 148; Colls, Etienne and Mayet 1988: 309–19, cited by Harris 1993: 28 n. 122.) For Deman, the utricularii did not transport with wagons but were simply muleteers.
46 I owe these points to Professor Radu Ardevan.
the fabri, and the centonarii celebrated (no. 133 discussed above), is a god of trade.

In several cities in these regions, magistrates bearing titles such as praefectus vigilum et armorum, praefectus praesidiorum et privatorum are well-attested. Despite the titles, their functions are not entirely clear. Presumably they were in charge of police duties. No cohorts under the command of these praefecti have been attested, nor is it clear that they commanded collegia, as Hirschfeld suggested. Ten inscriptions from Nemausus inform us of the local praefecti vigilum et armorum. They all seem to be of very high social standing. A few of them were of equestrian status, and the majority of them rose to the quattuorvirate. The office of praefectus vigilum et armorum, then, would seem to have been an established element in the cursus honorum. Yet, none of them seem to have been closely connected with local collegia. One bilingual inscription (no. 30) is of some interest. It records the decision of the sacra synodos Neapoli, that is, the Dionysiac artists, actors and musicians of Neapolis, to honor T. Iulius T. f. Vol(tinia) D(olabella), who had been quattuorvir ab aerario, pontifex, and praefectus vigilum et armorum. At certain point, the inscription refers to the centonarior(um). Unfortunately, however, the text becomes too

---

48 Praefectus vigilum et armorum, Nemausus: CIL XII.3210 = Duforg 1969: 74 = Burnand 1975: 773–74 = AE 2003. 1070: D(is) M(anibus) | C(ai) Cascelli Vol(tinia) | Pompeiani | praef(ecti) fabr(um) | IIIIr( vir) iur(e) dic(undo) praef(ecti) vig( ilum) et arm(orum) | Antoniae Titullae | xoxri; CIL XII.3247 = Duforg 1969: 66— | Honorat(i) IIIIr( vir) iur(e) dicund(e) pontific(is) | praef(ecti) vig( ilum) et armor(um) | Q(uintus) Lucretius Honorat(us) | patri optimo pietatis c(au sa?) f(ecit) | CIL XII.3259 = Duforg 1969: 66; CIL XII.3296: Sex viri Elio | Sex fil Vol| Severino | IIIIr( vir) iur(e) dicund(e) pontific(is) praef(ecti) vig( ilum) et armor(um) | Primituos | lib.; CIL XII.3002, 3213; 3223; CIL XII.3232 = ILS 5082 = no. 30, CIL XII.3274 = ILS 6980: [Q(uinto)] Soillio T(iti) f(ilio) Volt(inia) | Valeriano | [I]IIIIr( vir) ab aerar(i) | [p]ontific( e) vig( ilum) et armor(um) | [e]qvum publicum habe[nti] d(ecreto) d(ecurionum); CIL XII.3303 (fragmentary); cf. CIL VI.29718 from Rome: D(is) M(anibus) v(ivus) f(ecit) | Sex(tus) Sammius | Sex(ti) f(ilius) Vultin(a) | Aper | domo Nemauso | quattuorvir iure dicund(o) | pontifex publicor(um) | sacrificiorum | praefectus vig( ilum) et armorum; Vocontii: praefectus praesidiorum et privatorum. Cf. Van Berchem 1982: 47–53; CAH2 X: 475. In Germania Superior, such titles as praefectus arcendorum latrociniorum and praefectus latrociniis arcendis have been attested (CIL XIII.3010 = ILS 7007, AE 1978. 567 = AE 2003. 80, Noviodunum Equestrium; CIL XIII.6211, Dhaun; cf. AE 1994. 1288). Frei-Stolba (1999: 45–48) explains that the praefectus arcendorum latrociniorum at Nyon dealt with brigandage, and connects all the praefecti cited here with the defense of the city.

49 Hirschfeld 1913: 99.
fragmentary to make any sense out of it. T. Iulius Dolabella might have been the patron of the centonarii.

Now turning to Umbria, where the sharing of magistrates and patrons by multiple collegia was common. In Ameria, the c(ollegium) centonar(iorum), [col(legium)] scabill(ariorum) (percussion musicians connected with mimes and later on pantomimes), and col(legium) [fabr]um tignar(iorum) shared the same praefectus (no. 63); L. Succonius Priscus was patron of omnia corpora of Mevania (no. 66); C. Scæfius Sulpicianus was patron of both the municipium and col(legia) tria of Asisium (no. 67); Coretius Fuscus was patron of tria collegia pricipal(ia) of Sentinum (no. 68). A fragmentary inscription from Urvinum Mataurense mentions a patron of both the municipium and collegia plura (no. 74), which included the (cultor)es domus Augustae, the centonarii, and some others, the names of which are now lost. In Pisaurum, one inscription was dedicated to T. Caedius Atillius Crescens, equ(uo) p(ublico), who, in addition to having held the top magistracies, was also the patron of the (se)vir(i) August(ales), the collegia of the fabri, centonarii, navicularii, dendrophori, vicimagistri, and iuvenes foreses, and the studia Apollinaris et Gunthar(um?) (no. 80). The grouping of collegia under the patronage of C. Valius Polycarpus, a freedman with ‘decurial decorations’ granted by both Ariminum and Pisaurum, is similar (no. 82). Yet another inscription from Pisaurum mentions a high-ranking local magistrate, who was patron of the (se)vir(i) August(ales) and the collegia fabrum, centonariorum, and navicular(iorum) (no. 81). In Fanum Fortunae, the city, the seviri Augustales, and the collegia fabrum, centonariorum, (et) dendrophorum shared an equestrian patron (no. 77).

It appears that it was the ‘habit’ of the local elite in this region to patronize as many collegia as possible, even to the extent of omnia collegia. The groupings of collegia vary from case to case, with no clear pattern. This plurality might be explained in different ways. It could be taken as a sign of the liveliness of civic life in the cities of this region. Or perhaps it is a result of the concentration of economic and political power in the hands of a few people. Whatever the reason, it does not really add to our understanding of the particular functions of the collegia centonariorum in this region, but it does provide a strong case against the supposition that certain collegia must have shared the same functions simply because they are mentioned together in epigraphic records. We do not know whether or not the collegia fabrum fought
fires in this region. If they did, it becomes somewhat ironic that the *fabri* of Pisaurum apparently could not save their own *schola* from fire—they had to rebuild it after it was destroyed by fire.\footnote{AE 1962.264 = SupIt 1 (1981) 6 = M\&A 53, vi ignis am[issam].}

Multiple affiliations of the same person could be another reason why certain *collegia* were mentioned together in the inscriptive record. The epitaph for T. Flavius Eutiches (no. 77, Fanum Fortunae) is of further interest. The text reads:

\[
D(is)\ M(anibus)\ |T(ito)\ Flavio\ Eutich(e)s|\ sev(iro)\ Aug(ustali),\ co\(lle\)(giato)\ f(abrum)\ |F(anestrium),\ |idem\ cent(onario)\ colle\(giato),\ d\(endro\)(phoro):\ posue\(re)\ |T(itus)\ Flavius\ Verus\ pa\(tri)\ et\ Flavia\ Nea\ |b(ene)\ m(erenti).
\]

If the restoration adopted by Waltzing (W 1918) is correct, then T. Flavius Eutiches was a member of all three *collegia*. This would suggest, if anything, that the *collegium fabrum*, the *collegium centonariorum*, and the *collegium dendrophorum* of Fanum Fortunae were not all fire brigades, or at least that fire-fighting was not the sole *raison d’être* of these *collegia*. Otherwise, why would T. Flavius Eutiches be enrolled in all three of these organizations? But this inscription could be read somewhat differently: lines 4 and 5 could also be restored as *idem cent(urio) colle(gii) d\(endro\)(phororum)*. If this reading is accepted, then Eutiches is no longer a *centonarius*, but a member of the *collegium fabrum* and a *centurio* of the *collegium dendrophorum*. This restoration is problematic, however. Unlike *decurio*, the title of *centurio* was usually followed by the number of the *centuria* to which one belonged, not the name of the *collegium*.\footnote{E.g., *centurio c(enturiae) VII* (collegii fabr. et cent.) (no. 188).} In addition, we do not know whether or not the *collegium dendrophorum* of Fanum Fortunatae was even divided into *centuriae*. So, for the time being, perhaps Waltzing’s version is to be preferred; but the question of an alternative restoration should remain open.

So far, the material that I have dealt with does not allow us to draw meaningful inferences regarding the *collegia centonariorum*’s alleged roles as fire-brigades. But if the connection between the *collegia centonariorum* and the *collegia fabrum* was superficial, to say the most, in the cities discussed so far, the situation at Mediolanum and Brixia seems quite different. The evidence seems to suggest that the *collegia centonariorum* experienced changes in terms of their organizations and
relationship with the *collegia fabrum* in these two cities in the second century AD.

The *fabri* and the *centonarii* of Mediolanum shared many important internal structures, including a common treasury (*arca*) and a common era, as already discussed at length in Chapter 1. Several inscriptions show that the common treasury bore the title *arca Titiana*. The joint association in question had its own ‘era’; dated by the annual curators of the *arca Titiana*. This dating system last more than two hundred years. The earliest reference to *arca Titiana* was in the 137th year of the common era of the joint association (between AD 246–268). This named treasury may have significant bearings on understanding why the *fabri* and *centonarii* were so closely linked to each other at Mediolanum. This *arca* was most likely named after its donor. There were several parallels of such named foundations, most of which were designated to cities. In Corfinium, for example, on account of his election as patron of the city, P. Mammius Aufidius Priscinus donated 50,000 *sterces* to the local senators and the entire *populus*. This money was called *Mammiana*, out of the interest of which distribution should be made on his anniversary. If this condition was not fulfilled, distribution should be made in another city. The *arca Titiana* of the *fabri* and *centonarii* perhaps had a similar origin. It is not clear whether the *arca* bore such name from the very beginning. In any case, their being the joint recipients of a sizable foundation might explain why the tradesmen and workers in textile and the builders/carpenters/smiths formed a joint organization in Mediolanum.

The joint organization seemed to be of very large size. In the third century, this joint organization was divided into at least 12 *centuriae* (no. 186); each *centuria* had at least five *decuriae* (no. 193). Therefore, the *fabri* and the *centonarii* must have numbered at least several hundred, possibly even more than a thousand. The only *collegium* of

---

52 *CIL* IX.3160 (Corfinium, Regio IV). *CIL* XI.6369 (= no. 81), 6377 from Pisaurum also provide a parallel of such named foundations. C. Titius Valentinus left a legacy of one million sesterces to Pisaurum: from the interest of 400,000 sesterces, the people (*populus*) should feast on his birthday every year; from the yield of 600,000 sesterces, gladiatorial games should be held every five years. This latter fund was called *pecunia Valentiniana* and was taken care of by a *curator calendarii*. (cf. Waltzing III: ad no. 1925; Mrozek 1987: 55–56; see Mennella 1981: 238–39 for more discussion.) Other named foundations are: *curatori pecuniae Ennianae* (*AE* 1946, 186; Ascoli Piceno); *curatori muneris peq(uniae) Aquilianae* (*CIL* X.226; Grumentum); *curatore muner(is) Tulliani* (no. 197; Ticinum). See Liu 2008: 231–56.
comparable size is the *collegium tignariorum* of Rome, which had at least 60 *decuriae*, each having about 22 members.\(^{53}\) It is not clear whether the organization of *fabri* and *centonarii* of Mediolanum was already of such a great size when they joined together in the early second century AD. If so, it would be natural to assume not only official approval but also the encouragement or even initiative of the government in the establishment or combination of the *collegi(a)*.

It is possible that there were separate *collegia fabrum* and *centonarii* before they began to share important internal structures. But a more puzzling problem is whether they still somehow maintained their independent identities while sharing a treasury. No. 120 used the unmistakable plural form *collegia fabrum et centonariorum*. This inscription honored Q. Albinus Ouf(entia) Secundinus Aebutius Tullianus, the patron and repunctor splendidissimorum collegiorum fabrum et centonariorum (coloniae) A(lboninianae) [or A(ureliae)] A(gustae) F(elicis) M ediolaniensis, and was put up by the collegia super scripta.\(^{54}\) Besides this one, we have at least two other inscriptions that attest to the independence of the *collegium centonariorum* in Mediolanum. One of these recorded the dedication by the *collegium centonariorum* of an honorific monument to the family of L. Coelius Valerius (no. 183).\(^{55}\) Mommsen attempted to assign this inscription to a provenance other than Mediolanum; Comum, to be specific.\(^{56}\) However, since L. Coelius Valerius was a *sevir* of Mediolanum, and one of his sons was a *decurio* of both Mediolanum and Novaria, there is no reason why this inscription could not have come from Mediolanum. The date of this inscription, however, is not certain. The *duo cognomina* of M. Aemilius Coelius Coelianus may point to a late–second or third-century date for the inscription.

So far, we may be convinced that the *collegium fabrum* and the *collegium centonariorum* did maintain some individuality. However, there is also evidence pointing to the opposite. C. Attilius C. f. Ouf(entina tribu) Tertulli[n]us, one of the *curatores* of the 70th year of the collegial

---

\(^{53}\) On the size of the *collegium tignariorum* of Rome, see *CIL* VI.1060 (AD 198–218); *CIL* VI.9405 = *ILS* 7238; Pearse 1976: 163–76.

\(^{54}\) The dating indicator of this inscription is *flamen divi magn(i) Anton(ini)*, i.e. Caracalla deified by Macrinus. So the *terminus post quem* is AD 217–218. For the problem of the provenance of this inscription, see Bormann, *ad CIL* XI.1230; and see Chapter 5 for further discussions.

\(^{55}\) Cf. no. 191, which also seems to mention a *collegium centonariorum*—.

\(^{56}\) *CIL* V., p. 635.
era (AD 179–201), was said to have been elected ‘to the same collegium [eodem coll(egio)]’ (no. 188). A fragmentary tombstone datable to the late second or third century refers to collegium fabrum et [---](no. 192). One possible restoration is collegium fabrum et [centonario]rur.

We are not on a solid enough chronological basis to establish the order of the use of plural and singular forms of collegium. In fact, there may not have been any such order at all. I suspect that there was internal conflict between the fabri and the centonarii from time to time, which might account for the inconsistency in the use of plural or singular forms of collegium. Concordiae eorum was attached to the end of an inscription that recording the names of the four curatores of the 137th era of the joint organization (no. 186). I take these words to be an indication of the tension within the association.

In discussing the fabri and centonarii of Mediolanum, some scholars tend to connect them with the collegium aerar. col(oniae) M(ediolaniensis) (CIL V.5847; CIL V.5892 = ILS 6731). Mommsen, followed by Hirscheld, restored the name of the collegium as collegium aerar(ii) and identified it with the joint association of the fabri and the centonarii. This identification was based on the similar structures of the collegium aerar. and the collegium fabrum et centonario]rur: both were divided into 12 centuriae and both had the magistrate called repuncctor (auditor?), a title not attested in other collegia. According to Mommsen, the reason why the joint organization of the fabri and centonarii was also called collegium aerar. coloniae was that the fabri and the centonarii received subsidy from the public treasury of the city.57 If this opinion is accepted, then the fabri and the centonarii may have been organized as fire brigades and financially compensated by the city, as Hirschfeld believed. However, there is no parallel for collegia receiving subsidy from a city. Even more problematic is the fact that such a large fire brigade might seem disproportionate to the population of Mediolanum.58 Furthermore, I disagree with the assumption that the divisions centuriae and decuriae should be understood as military organization applied to facilitate mobilization for fire-fighting.59 In fact, the use of centuriae and/or decuriae was a common method of organizing groups of any

57 *CIL* V., pp. 635, 1191.
58 For the population of Mediolanum (about 30,000), see Morley 1996: 182.
The division of a collegium into centuriae and/or decuriae had more to do with the size of the collegium than its function(s).

Let us consider the alternative restoration provided by Waltzing and De Ruggiero, that is, collegium aerar(iorum) or a collegium of bronze-workers. According to this restoration, the collegium aerar. of Mediolanum was a separate organization from the fabri and the centonarii. Granted, both the collegium aerariorum and the occupational title aerarius are rarely attested epigraphically, although Pliny the Elder stressed the general importance of bronze-working. Two inscriptions from Rome did mention the associations of the aerarii: sodales aerari a pulvina(e), and A. Argentari(us) A. l. Antioc(hus), coactor inter aerarios (CIL VI.9136, 9186). There were also a group of aerari[---] in Nida, Germania Superior (CIL XIII.7378), and a socii/societas aerar(iorum) in Corduba, Baetica (CIL II.7.334 = HEp IV. 286 = AE 1971. 181). Apart from these, there is no explicit evidence for any association of bronze-workers. Perhaps metalworkers of all kinds were usually incorporated in the collegium fabrum. For P. Garnsey, this lack of parallels was not a decisive consideration. In fact, he was inclined to see Mediolanum as a center of metalworking in Transpadana. He based his argument on CIL XIII.6763, which seems to show that the city was a center of arm-manufacturing in the third century. Mediolanum, however, was not particularly famous for the mining of metal. How were the work-

---

60 Household staffs, the Augustales, and a variety of collegia may be divided into centuriae and/or decuriae. E.g., decuriae suae (AE 1929. 161, Familia Silvani, AD 60; cf. Flambard 1987: 223); centuria Cornelia, centuria Petronia Augustalium (Puteoli, CIL X.1873, 1874, 1888); centuria Veneria, centuria Concordia of the Augustales (Herculaneum, CIL X.1403); decuria scerdotus bidentalium (CIL VI.567, 568; BullComm (1881) no. 438; decuriae IIII scabiliariorum (Umbria, Mevania, no. 66 = CIL XI.5054 = ILS 5271); dec(uria) IIII scamillar(iorum) (Umbria, Spoletium, CIL XI.4813 = ILS 5272); initiales collegi Silvani Aureliani: decuria III (CIL VI.631, Rome); CIL VI.10148 (Rome); cultores Herculis Somnialis decuria I (CIL XI.1449); decuria (VI.10396). See also Mouritsen 2001a: 151.


62 Pliny HN 34.1. Individual bronze-worker (aerarius) is found at CIL I.2947 = AE 1958. 267 = ILLRP 712 (Capua, Republican period), Nemausus (CIL XII. 3333), Balaklavna (AE 1995. 1351), CIL II.7.341 = CIL II.2238 (Corduba, Baetica). Rome (CIL VI.9664 = ILS 7536, negotiator aerarius et ferrarius), CIL IX.1723 (Beneventum), CIL XI.1234 (Placentia), CIL XI.4428 (Amerlia), CIL XIII.7378 (Nida), RIB 194 (Camulodunum), AE 2003. 1369 (Brigetio), RIT 441 = HEp XII.394 = AE 1957. 3a (Tarraco). Titles such as aerarius sevir are not included here.

63 CIL XIII.6763 (AD 242) referred to an L. Fab(ia tribu) Annian[us], who was missus adv(ersus) h(ostes) p(ublicos) in re[gi(ionem) Tra] [nsp] [ur(be) [Me]diol(ania). Garnsey 1976: 19; cf. Calderini 1965: 39. Garnsey further connected the establishment of this industry with the subjugation
shops in Mediolanum supplied with metal? This remains a problem for modern scholars. But the very fact that a *fabricensis* was established in Mediolanum in the late Roman period suggests that the supply of raw materials was perhaps not an issue. I am inclined to the opinion that the *collegium aerar*. was not the *fabri* and the *centonarii* under a different name, unless future findings show that the treasury of the *collegium aerar*. was also called *arca Titiana*. Even then, it would not prove anything but that the same donor made two (or more) distinct donations. It follows that in the second century and the first half of the third, there were at least two or three very large *collegia* in Mediolanum. Judging from the magnitude of these *collegia* and their continued importance, it seems likely that they had official standing and a public character.

That Mediolanum was a center for the textiles trade is evidenced by the presence of clothes dealers (*negotiatores sagarii*) from other regions as well as the presence of clothes-dealers from Mediolanum in other cities. Not only was there a *negotiato sagarius* from the South (Apulia), but there was also one from the North (Mediomatricus, now Metz, North-East France), who likely transported clothing to supply the Rhine armies. The clothes dealers from Mediolanum were also present elsewhere. A *sagarius Mediolanensis* built a tomb for himself and his friend in Ricina Picenum, *Regio V*. That Mediolanum was an important center for supplying the state with clothing in the third and fourth centuries is also clear enough from the fact that one of the 14 Western *gynaeceae* was located in Mediolanum. Since we have no inscriptions relating to the *centonarii* after the third century AD, we do not know whether or not they continued to function independently outside the *gynaeceum* but were obliged to supply materials to the state clothes
factory from time to time, as textile workers in some other cities often
did.69 In any case, no matter what kind of public services the *collegia fabrum and centonariorum* provided in the second century AD, in view of the increased strategic importance of Mediolanum in the third and fourth centuries AD, it can hardly be doubted that the focus of their activities in this later period was oriented towards fortifying the city, and supplying arms and clothing to the army.70

To sum up so far: The *fabri* and *centonarii* formed a joint organization in Mediolanum in the early second century AD. This merger must have been supported by the authorities, as the considerable size of the organization would have us believe. It is not entirely clear whether or not the *fabri* and the *centonarii* still, to a certain extent, maintained independent identities, but it seems that there was at least some tension between them. We do not know what led to the combination of the two groups. One possible reason, although not very solid chronologically, is that they were the joint recipients of a considerable endowment, after the donor of which the *arca Titiana* may have been named. The large size of the joint *collegium* (c. 1,200 members) makes it hard to believe that it was solely a fire brigade, as Hirschfeld and some other scholars believed, although it could have been an incidental development. Given the importance of Mediolanum as a supply center of weapons and clothing throughout the Imperial period, it is quite likely that the *fabri* and *centonarii* were officially organized to facilitate requisitions and other business with the military. Whether the *collegium fabrum et centonariorum* was the first joint *collegium* of this kind is not clear. But its magnitude, as well as its very formal organization, may have made it a model for *fabri* and *centonarii* in other cities. In Regium Lepidum, *Regio* VIII, for example, a patronage tablet dated to AD 190 refers to a joint *collegium fabrum et centonariorum*, which had a temple as their meeting place (no. 117).

Brixia (*Regio* X) has yielded the most number of inscriptions relevant to the *collegium centonariorum*, which enable a better look into its development over time. Founded no later than the end of the first century AD, the *collegium centonariorum* of Brixia remained prominent until at least the third century, and developed a close relationship with the

69 *CTh* 10.20.8 (AD 374).
70 Two signs of its importance in Late Antiquity: a mint was opened there in the fourth century AD, and emperors resided there until Honorius preferred Ravenna. See also Auson. *Ordo nob. urb.* 7.
collegium fabrum no later than mid–second century AD, to which I will return below. What is of particular interest in Brixia is the epigraphic references to the specialization of the woolens industry. Several tombstones refer to the lanari pectinan(i) sodales (wool-combers), lana[rii carmi]nator(es) sol[da]les (wool-carders), and lanari coatores (felters?). Interestingly, the funerary formulae of all these inscriptions point to an early date, most likely the first century AD. Is it possible that these specialists became incorporated in the collegia centonariorum later on? That the Capitol Temple of Brixia was erected by the Emperor Vespasian in AD 73–74 seems to indicate Imperial support of that city (CIL V.4312 = IB 118 = InscrIt 10.5.88). Could this be the reason why industries in Brixia continued to prosper while they declined in Patavium, as our sources would lead us to believe?

On several occasions, the collegium centonariorum and the collegium fabrum joined together to make dedications to the same people, who did not bear the title of patrons of these collegia. Significantly, the two collegia seem to have shared the same freedman, Fabricius Centonius collegiorum lib(ertus) C(h)resimus. Although Fabricius was by no means a rare name, his praenomen and nomen derive, in all probability, from the names of these collegia (no. 162). Furthermore, the collegium fabrum and the collegium centonariorum at least shared the same curator once, L. Gabo Arunculeius Valerianus, at the end of the second or the beginning of the third century AD. This person was of equestrian status, had held all kinds of magistracies in Brixia, and had senatorial son(s) and grandson(s) (no. 151). The fabri and the centonarii were also joint recipient of at least two endowments (nos. 161, 173).

Despite all these connections, however, the collegia fabrum and centonariorum were evidently independent organizations. In their joint dedication to the priestess of Diva Matidia, for example, the plural form

71 CIL V.4501 = InscrIt. 10.5.294 = ILS 7290a; InscrIt. 10.5.875 = AE 1927. 100; CIL V.4504 = InscrIt. 10.5.933; CIL V.4505 = InscrIt. 10.5.297 = ILS 7557.
72 Fabricius as gentilicium is particularly well-attested at Rome and North Africa. Fabricius, see for example, CIL III.1553; CIL V.8114; IDR III.1.269; IDR III.5.528 is an interesting case, the Fabricii mentioned in this inscription seem to have been connected with the collegium fabrorum; CIL V.7607 (Alba Pompeia). For Centonia/us as praenomen or nomen gentilicium, see CIL XI.3372 (Tarquini); CIL VI.14655 (C. Centonius C. f. Lucrinus, Centonia Blanda).
of collegium was used, collegia fabror(um) et cent(onariorum) (no. 172).  

The freedman Fabricius Centonius C(h)resimus is similarly marked as collegiorum lib(ertus). And not only were several endowments or legacies given to the collegium fabrum or the collegium centonariorum alone (e.g., CIL V.4433, 4448), several dedications were made by one of the collegia alone (nos. 150, 155). There are more epigraphic records of donations made to the collegium fabrum than to the collegium centonariorum.  

The cases of Mediolanum and Brixia may suggest that sizable endowments are likely to have lied behind the close association of the fabri and centonarii in these places. After all, they tended to share curators, or magistrates of finance. Conceivably, their services (utilitas publica) became assimilated to each other as a consequence, although it also remains plausible that their being joint recipients of the same endowment(s) was a result of similar public services (fire-fighting, for instance) in which they had become involved.  

The case of Comum also deserves special attention. The organization and functions of the collegium centonariorum in this city are not as easy to explain as it seems, nor are we certain whether the unique structures were local peculiarities or reflect a new development in the roles of the collegium centonariorum. About four different types of collegia have been attested in Comum. They are never mentioned together in inscriptions. As far as the collegium centonariorum is concerned, two inscriptions are of particular interest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 181:</th>
<th>No. 182:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L(ucio) Apicio</td>
<td>Bruttidio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74 Cf. also nos. 152, 154, 156, 157, 158, 161, and 174.
According to Mommsen, Benedetto Giovio (c. 1471–1545)’s drawings of the two inscriptions were the only source of the texts. The authenticity and the readings of these two inscriptions can no longer be confirmed: the actual stones are reportedly lost. These two inscriptions have much in common. Both mention quaeestor followed by year; both use the formula L D D C; and both mention sevir urbanus. Due to the lack of parallels, we cannot be certain whether sevir urbanus indicates a position within a board of six in charge of certain municipal affairs or is simply another name for sevir Augustalis. In consideration of all these similarities, we can reach a valid conclusion only by examining the two inscriptions in conjunction with each other.

\[
\begin{align*}
q(uae)stori anni primi cur. praesidi & \quad (\text{no. 181}) \\
q(uaestor)\ collegi centonari(um) anni quo curia dedicata est & \quad (\text{no. 182})
\end{align*}
\]

No. 182 is explicit: q(uae)stor collegi centonari(um) makes it clear that T. Tadius T. f. Catianus held quaestorship in the collegium, and not in the city. Q(uae)stor collegi centonari(um) is followed by an indication of year, anni quo curia dedicata est. In this context, as Waltzing has pointed out, curia means schola, or the meeting place of the collegium. What we see here is evidently a dating system used by the collegium centonariorum of Comum. The annus primus perhaps refers to the year following the dedication of the curia. Therefore, it is reasonable to restore quaestori anni primi cur(iae) praesidi in no. 181. Hirschfeld, however, restored cur(ator) praesidi(i) here, seeing it as a parallel to curator instrumenti Veronaes(ium) ex numero collegii fabrum mentioned in CIL V.3387 from Verona. In his understanding, both positions must be referring to a keeper of fire-fighting tools. But

---

75 CIL V.588 ad CIL V.5446: Servavit Iovius f. 64, a quo videntur pendere reliqui omnes: Alciatus l.2 f.49 adnotans ‘de eius interpretatione longam, quae clarissimo viro Ben. Iovio mecum fuit, disputationem iam acceptum.’


77 Orelli no. 4071 has L D D D(ecurionum) instead of L(ocus) D(atus) D(ecreto) C(ollegii).

78 AE 1996. 733 from Comum refers to a person, who had held the positions of IIIvir a(edilicia) p(otestate) and VIvir urb(anus). See CIL V.5360 for the title [(se)]vir Comi. The title (se)vir augustalis has been attested in Comum; see, for example, CIL V.5275.

79 Possible parallels for curia as schola: decuriones in hac curia qui conveniunt aram et ariam silic(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) straverunt. (CIL VI.541, Rome); sacrae curiae (CIL II.1346, Acipino, Hispania; cf. Santero Santurino 1978: 44–45).

80 Cf. ad Orelli 4071.

the *instrumentum* mentioned in *CIL* V.3387 may be an implement of any kind including dining utensils, and/or religious apparatus, and not necessarily fire-fighting tools. In addition, although *cur.* is often an abbreviation for *cur(ator)*, the title *cur(ator) praeidis(i)* has only been attested in military contexts and, more significantly, only in the East. There may be other interpretations of the word *praesidi* after *cur*. For example, the title *praesidium (collegii)* is attested once, whose function seems to have been similar to that of the patron and *defensor collegii*. However, if *praesidium* is meant here, we would expect the dative *praesidio*, unless we can assume that the stonemason accidental dropped an -o from the end of *praesidi*. This seems unlikely. Another possibility is *praeses*, as suggested by Mommsen and followed by Mennella and Apicella, and Boscolo. L. Apicius Bruttidius Soterichus, then, might have been the *praeses curiae*, or the president of the association. This title is surely rare; but not surprising given all the unique characteristics of nos. 181 and 182.

No. 181 is also unique in that it is the sole reference to a *centuria centonar(iorum) dolabrar(iorum) scalar(i)or(um)*. This is often interpreted as the subdivision consisted of the *dolabrarii* and *scalarii* within the *collegium centonariorum*. *Centones, dolabrae* (axes), and *scalae* (ladders) were all fire-fighting instruments as well as farming and military equipment. Who were the *dolabrarii* and the *scalarii*? Could they have been makers of axes and ladders? Or were they fire-fighters equipped with these tools? Hirschfeld believed that this *centuria* should be understood as a division of the *collegium centonariorum* staffed by *dolabrarii* and *scalarii*, whom he identified as Vorbrecher and fire-fighters equipped with ladders, respectively. For his interpretation of the term *dolabrarius*, Hirschfeld depended on Mommsen’s description of

---

82 Cf. van Nijf 1997.
83 Waltzing, *ad CIL* V.5446. *Curator* was often abbreviated as *cur.*. examples are *cur(ator) iter(um)*, *eodem anno cur(ator) in k. Jan. design(atus)* (*CIL* VI.10333), *cur(ator) arc(ae) Aug(ustalium)* (*CIL* X.6677), *cur(ator) corporis maris Hadriatici, negotians vinarius, item navicularius* (*CIL* VI.9682); *cur(ator) col(egii) subrut(orum) cultor(orum) Silvani* (*CIL* VI.940), *CIL* VI.6069, 10330, 10327, 10339, 10527; *CIL* XI.3123, *CIL* X.6555; etc.
84 O.Claud II.357–76; *P.Quseir* 5: a position of limited duration rather than a rank; O.Florida 2 and O.Florida 6, letters to *curator praeidis*. See O.Florida: 24, and Bagnall 1977: esp. 69 for a discussion of this position. *Praesidia* in the Egyptian context meant well-fortified garrison points. See also O.Skeat 11.
85 Boscolo 2002: 93.
86 *Dig.* 1.15.3.4 (Paulus), 33.7.12.18.
87 Hirschfeld: 102–03 n. 4.
the relief that accompanied CIL V.908, an epitaph for a dolabrarius who belonged to the collegium fabrum of Aquileia. According to Mommsen, the relief shows a young man carrying an axe (dolabra) in one hand and something that should be identified as a cento in the other. The combination of the two materials, which seemed to Hirschfeld to have nothing in common except that they were both fire-fighting instruments, led him to identify the dolabrarius as a specially equipped fire-fighter in a fire brigade. Mommsen’s description, however, proves problematic. That the young man was holding a cento in one hand is pure conjecture.

CIL XIII.7723 from Brohl in Germania Superior was a votive dedication made by the dolabrarii [---] classis Aug. Germ. P. Fid. to Minerva. Here, the dolabrarii were associated with a specific fleet. It is difficult to connect them with fire-fighting in this context. In the context of religious ceremonies, dolabrarius may also refer to the specialist who performed sacrificial duties. Is it possible that a dolabrarius in was a faber who specialized in making and selling dolabrae? Dolabrae were, after all, among the necessary implements of carpenters, farmers, woodcutters, and Roman soldiers. Furthermore, makers of particular tools are sometimes attested. I suspect, however, that there is another possible meaning of dolabrarius: it may well be another name for a faber tignarius (builder, carpenter). For according to Dig. 50.16.235, fabros tignuarios dicimus non eos dumtaxat, qui tigna dolarent, sed omnes qui aedificarent. Perhaps qui tigna dolarent could be called either dolabrarii or tignarii. A collegium dolabrarium is known to us from Augusta

---

88 CIL V.908 = Lupa 9639 (with image; grave altar): Ti(berius) Claudius | Ti(berii) Claudii Epaphroditian(i) | vet(erani) leg(ionis) VII Cl(audiae) p(iae) f(idelis) | fil(ius) Astylus, | dolabrarii col(legii) fab(rum), | vivos fecit sibi et | Iuliae Dionysiadi | bene de se mer(itae). The terminus post quem for this inscription is AD 42, the year legio VII acquired the sobriquet Claudia pia fidelis. The lack of the formula Dis Manibus is in line with a first century date.
89 Zaccaria 1987: 131 n. 6: “In realtà, almeno nella riproduzione fotografica, non è agevole identificare l’oggetto che pende dalla mano destra della figura.” For image, see fig. 1b. Cf. IA 2747.
90 CIL XIII.7723; DizEpigr II: 1929.
92 Dig. 1.15.3; Isid. 19.19.11; Joseph. BJ 3.95 (Roman legionaries). Cf. Sablayrolles 1996: 354–56 with n. 97; Wallat 2004: 166. Dolabra can be used, for example, to dig trenches, break the wall, and so on.
93 Cic. Cat. 1.8; Sull. 52 (falcarius, maker of scythes or pruning-hooks). Cf. CIL VI.9215 (M. Sergius M. l. Eutychus, axearius or axle maker).
Treverorum (Trier), an important city militarily. As far as the *scalarii* are concerned, there are very few references in the ancient sources. The *scalarii* in the references that we do have seemed to mean certain type of building operations rather than people.

In sum, the *collegium centonariorum* of Comum is unique with regard to its organization and function(s), and can be understood in different ways. It may have been a fire brigade primarily. But it is also possible that the special structures of this *collegium* came about in response to circumstances about which we know nothing.

**Collegia Centonariorum in the Frontier Provinces**

Aquincum, Ulcisia Castra, Mursa, Ig, Cibalis, Brigetio, Siscia, Carnuntum and Savaria of the Pannonian provinces all share similar characteristics, being either civilian settlements grown up around military bases on the *limes* or close to the frontier. The case of Pannonia is a convincing illustration of the fact that the distribution of the *collegia centonariorum* and of *collegia* did not necessarily correspond to the degree of urbanization of a particular province or a particular city. Significantly, as already discussed in Chapter 1, the creation of *collegia centonariorum* in Aquincum may date to the end of the first century or the beginning of the second century AD, when Aquincum had not yet acquired the status of *municipium*. Urbanization was not always the decisive factor in the formation of *collegia*. The establishment of the *collegium centonariorum* and the *collegium fabrum* in Pannonia may have been an imitation of northern Italian practices. The presence of northern Italian traders and manufacturers in Aquincum and other places, such as Savaria and

94 AE 1908. 132 = AE 1909. 203 = ILS 9418 = CIL XIII.11313. The dolabrarii of Augusta Treverorum had their own *templum*. Headed by a *praefectus*, they were devided into decuriae.

95 CIL VI.34013 = ILS 7868 (Rome): Mellax Veidianus / decur(io) iter(um) / parietes et camaras / scalariorum opere / tectorio expolitum / d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) d(ecreto) / C(ai) Caesare L(uicio) Paullo c(on)s(ulibus). CIL VI.10377: Lucrio Vedlan(o) (sic!) / decur(iones) / dedic(averunt) / scalaria prima opere / tectorio expolienda et / pavimentum eodem loco d(e) s(uo) f(ecerunt). Cf. IDR III.3.2.4 = AE 1977. 667 (Sarmizegetusa).

96 E.g., XXX Ulpia Victrix in Brigetio, XV Apollinaris in Carnuntum.

97 The civilian town perhaps acquired the status of *municipium* in AD 124 under Hadrian.

98 However, the *collegia* that flourished in northern Italy did not all find their way into Pannonia. The *collegia dendrophorum*, for example, does not seem to have become
Brigetio, has been well attested by studies of nomenclature. Aquileia is a particularly important link between Italy and both Illyricum and Pannonia. At Aquileia, one inscription shows that the collegium fabrum and the collegium centonariorum shared the same equestrian patron and praefectus (no. 134); they may also have jointly put up a gilded statue for their shared patron (no. 138). However, these two collegia were evidently separate organizations. At least three inscriptions show that the collegium fabrum had its own patrons and/or praefecti, which were not shared with any other collegium. The collegium fabrum seems to have had a closer relationship with the collegium centonariorum. The latter collegium made a dedication to L. Domitius Epaphroditus and M. Livius Tertius, decurions of the collegium fabrum, through subscription, in a public place (AE 1995. 573a = CIL V.8289 = IA 672). C. Zaccaria has argued that the collegium centonariorum was composed of the offspring of the fabri. Another inscription mentions that the same L. Domitius Epaphroditus provided food and drink for “those going to the sea, ad mare euntibus” (AE 1995. 573b = CIL V.8251). It is not clear who these people were or what they went to sea for. But it is quite possible that they were going to sail on a business trip.

In Pannonia, the inscriptions inform us that the collegium centonariorum had high-ranking municipal magistrates among their praefecti and patrons, and that they put up tombstones for a number of veterans. There has been no lack of references to the collegium centonariorum in modern works on the cities of Pannonia. But all assume that they were fire-fighters. In Aquincum (modern Budapest, Hungary), the location where a plate was found recording the donation of a musical instrument to the collegium centonariorum has been identified as the site of the collegial meeting place (no. 206). On that site now stands the Budapest Museum of Fire-Fighting. There is, however, no evidence that unmistakably point to their fire-fighting service. The collegium centonariorum and the collegium fabrum certainly had some

---

99 Mócsy 1974; see also Wilkes 2005: 176–77.
101 CIL V.865 (cf. 866); IA 539, 675.
relationship with each other at least in Aquincum and Ulcisia Castra, where the centonarii and the fabri jointly put up a series of funerary stelae for veterans (nos. 202, 203, 211, 216, 221). However, they were evidently separate organizations.\(^{103}\) Nor was the collegia fabrum’s role in fire-fighting service in the Pannonian cities self-evident. As already mentioned earlier, the ambulativa in which the local collegium fabrum of Aquincum was involved should be interpreted as religious procession rather than patrolling activities.\(^{104}\)

Both the collegia centonariorum and the collegia fabrum evidently had very close connections with the veteran population in the Pannonian cities (see further Chapter 5). It was often assumed that the veterans who were associated with these collegia served as fire-fighters because their qualifications and background in military training. Although veterans were perfectly qualified to be fire-fighters, it remains an open question whether they could, did or would even wanted to serve as fire-fighters, especially since many soldiers retired at an advanced age by the Roman standard, having already passed at least forty or fifty after about 25 years of service.\(^{105}\) Furthermore, veterans retired with privileges (such as exemption from liturgies), money, and allotments of land; they were also ranked as honestiores after Hadrian’s reign.\(^{106}\)

On the other hand, there is no lack of examples of veterans going into business, either related or unrelated to military supply.\(^{107}\) It is difficult to guess the percentage of veterans who became businessmen. However, it is quite plausible that those veterans who had close relationships with the occupational collegia had business interests themselves. It is also reasonable to think that the significant presence of legionary troops must have constituted an incentive for the production of textiles in the Danubian provinces. In these places, however, apart from the cen-

\(^{103}\) For references to the collegium fabrum of Aquincum alone, see AE 1933. 110 = Lupa 2834; CIL III.3580 = ILS 7230 (AD 201); AE 1937. 202; CIL III.3438 = ILS 7254 = Lupa 10050.


\(^{106}\) Dig. 50.6.8, 1.5.7, 50.4.3.1. See Wesch-Klein 2007: 439–49.

tonarii, neither collegia nor individuals related to the production and distribution of textiles have been attested. This is somehow surprising, given the relatively abundant epigraphic finds in Aquincum, Savaria, Carnuntum, and Apulum.108 But the gap in the evidence becomes less problematic if we assume that the collegia centonariorum simply played the roles of guilds of all kinds of textile workers and traders in these places. As for the connection between the collegia fabrum and the veterans, it is quite easy to understand: Roman armies often included a variety of skilled fabri ranging from engineers, architects, smiths, to stonemasons; troops were also often involved in various construction projects including road building in Pannonia.109

The phenomenon of praefectus collegii deserves special mention here.110 Collegia centonariorum and fabrum in Pannonia and Dalmatia sometimes shared members of the local elite as patrons and praefecti.111 Among the collegia centonariorum, seven such praefecti are known, of whom one belonged to the equestrian rank (no. 134, Aquileia); four were local magistrates, the lowest-ranking being a quaestor (nos. 224, Ig; 228, Siscia; 225 and 227, Savaria); and two others were municipal decurions without magistracy (nos. 206, Aquincum; 220, Mursa). The relatively high rank of these praefecti raises some questions: Were these praefecti imposed on the collegia from above or elected by the members from their own number? If the former were true, it would point to the official status and public character of these collegia; if the latter, to the

108 Indeed, Diocletian’s Price Edict listed various articles of clothing of Danubian origin: fibulatorium Rhaeticum, byrrus Noricus, banata Norica, fedox Noricus, fibbia Petovionico, and byrrus Ripensis. The Expositio totius mundi speaks of vestis Norica. A tessera fullonica gives us the name saga Ulkisiana, presumably related to Ulcisia castra. A record from a fullonica referred to saga Ulkisiana, which could be connected with Ulcisa Castra in Pannonia (Égger 1967: 206–07; Vicari 2001: 62). All this evidence, however, comes from relatively late (third century AD and after). For the earlier periods, there is a dearth of information. In Raetia and Dalmatia, there are only six inscriptions from three places referring to clothing merchants: tradesman/craftsman involved in the business of purple dye (CIL III.5824, Augusta Vindelicum, Raetia; CIL III.2115, Salona, Dalmatia); negotiator[es artis] vestiariae et lintiariae (CIL III.5800, Augusta Vindelicum); negot[iator] la[narius] (AE 1925.60, Salona; the restoration, however, is uncertain); a negotiator vestiarius (CIL III.5816, Augusta Vindelicum) and a vestiarius (AE 1894.105, Semendria), both of whom perhaps had military connections (Vicari 2001: nos. 309–14).


110 See Gallego Franco 1997: 121–28 for praefectus collegii in general. See also Goffaux 2008 on a praefectus of the collegium dendroforum of Tusculum.

111 The title praefectus collegii fabrum should not be confused with praefectus fabrum, for a recent discussion, see Bass 2000: 197–224; Cerva 2000: 177–96.
relatively high status of the *collegiati*. We have no definitive answers. Nor do we know whether *praefectus collegii* was simply an honorary title granted by the *collegia* in very much the same way they granted the title of *patronus collegii*. It would seem that the position of *praefectus collegii* constitutes a stepping-stone towards high public offices.\(^{112}\) Yet, the position was by no means an integral or essential element of the official municipal *cursus*.\(^{113}\) Interestingly, none of the known *praefecti* were veterans. This should not be surprising, however, as the veterans’ limited participation and/or the lack of interest in municipal and administrative affairs is well-known.\(^{114}\)

Is having a *praefectus collegii* indicative of military or quasi-military organization? Not necessarily, especially since the title has been attested in a variety of types of *collegia* other than the *collegia fabrum* and *centonariorum*.\(^{115}\) Furthermore, using the title *praefectus* to refer to the highest magistrates of *collegia* is most likely a regional custom. As far as the *collegia centonariorum* are concerned, the geographical distribution of the position shows a visible pattern: it is found mostly in Pannonia (Aquincum, Ig, Siscia, Savaria, and Mursa), Dalmatia (Salona) and northern Italy (Aquileia).\(^{116}\) The geographical distribution of the *praefecti* of the *collegia fabrum* has the same pattern: they cluster in the frontier regions.\(^{117}\) The position of *praefectus collegii centonariorum* was attested from the late second century to at least AD 228 (no. 206, Aquincum). But since accurate dates in the majority of cases are

---

\(^{112}\) Gallego Franco 1997: 123.

\(^{113}\) For decurions and magistrates who did not seem to have been *praefecti collegii*, see *AE* 1965. 119; *AE* 1982. 807; *AE* 1986. 592; *RIU* VI.1324, 1356, 1377; *AE* 1995. 1273; *AE* 1953.14 = *AE* 2003. 1408.

\(^{114}\) See Wesch-Klein 2007: 447–49.

\(^{115}\) *Praefectus* is attested among the *iuvenes* (Lanuvium, *CIL* XIV.2121), *ministri ad Tritones* (Salona, *CIL* III.1967, 1968), *collegium Augustalium* (Aquincum, *CIL* III.3487), *collegium fabrum tignariorum* (Dyrrachium), *collegium iuventutis* (two *praefecti*; Poetovio, *CIL* II.4045 = *ILS* 7304 = *RIS* 400); the corpus of the *negotiatores Cisalpinorum et Transalpinorum* (*CIL* XIII.2029 = *ILS* 7279); the corpus of the *n(autae) [Rh]od(ani)* (*CIL* XIII.1967); *collegium dendroforum* (!) (Tusculum, *CIL* XIV.2634).


\(^{117}\) No. 134 (Aquileia); *CIL* III.3438 = *ILS* 7254 (Aquincum); no. 177, *AE* 1995.586, *IRConcor* 36 (*praefectus collegii fabrum*, Concordia, Regio X); *CIL* V.335 (Parentium, Hstricia); *CIL* V.8143 (Polai, Hstricia); *CIL* III.2026, 2087 (Salona); *CIL* III.1495 (Sarmizgetusa); *CIL* III.4557 (Vindobona, Pannonia Superior); *AE* 1908. 132 (*collegium fabrum dolabrario rum*, Trier). *CIL* V.1888, V.545, 546, V.355, V.60. Cf. Salamito 1990: 169; *IRConcor* 101 ad no. 35.
unavailable, we cannot say when and where the first praefectus collegii was established.

The collegia centonariorum sometimes shared the same praefecti with the collegia fabrum. Three out of seven of the known praefecti of collegia centonariorum were also praefecti of collegia fabrum (nos. 225, 227, Savaria; no. 134, Aquileia). But this overlapping is not universal. In Concordia, for example, Q. Dec(ius) Q. f. Cl(audia) Mett(ius) Sabinanus, an equestrian patron of both the collegium fabrum and the collegium centonariorum, was praef(ectus) of the coll(egium) fab(rum) alone (no. 177). Due to the fragmentary condition of the inscription, it is not clear whether the other praef(ectus) coll(egi) fab(rum) at Concordia, [---] Cicrius [---f(ilius)] Cla(udia tribu) S[e]v[erus], was associated with the collegium centonariorum (AE 1995. 586). In Aquincum, several praefecti collegii fabrum were not also praefecti of the collegium centonariorum.

Turning to the province of Noricum, we find a sizable collegium centonariorum comprised of at least 93 members. It must be mentioned that Solva was not altogether a notable city in the first two centuries. It suffered destruction during the Marcomannic War, but seems to have gained new momentum after being resurrected perhaps under Commodus. As already discussed in earlier Chapters, it was most likely Commodus who granted beneficia including immunity to the local collegium centonariorum (no. 36). These benefits were challenged because of real or perceived abuses by wealthy members (see further Chapter 5) but were re-confirmed by Severus and Caracalla by a rescript. The grant of the benefits can possibly be understood in connection with the intensified needs for organizing military supplies in the frontier regions.

Around the same time as the centonarii received confirmation of their privileges, the collegium centonariorum had a grand opening of its guild hall in Apulum (no. 2). In Dacia, the collegium centonariorum is attested only in Colonia Aurelia Apulensis (Apulum I). In contrast, the collegium fabrum became active in Apulum as early as it first became a municipium [anno primo [f]acti municipi(i)] under Marcus

---

118 PECS: 1675 Flavia Solva (Steiermark) Austria.
119 For a recent discussion of the impact of the Marcomannic War, see Heather 1996: 30–39.
The local *collegium fabrum* and *collegium centonariorum* were evidently distinct organizations, and seem to have different tracks of development. But both *collegia* were prominent, counting high-ranking personages as their patrons. The *collegium centonariorum* even had the governor of the Dacian provinces to dedicate their meeting hall, which was furnished with an *aetoma* (no. 2). This high-profile building operation might have been in competition with the *collegium fabrum*, which received from its patron M. Aurelius Chrestus 6,000 sesterces for the construction of the *aetoma* (*CIL* III.1212 = *IDR* III.5.2.444 = *ILS* 7255). But it may well have been the other way round, as the chronology is unclear. The *collegium centonariorum* of Apulum may have been possibly created on the initiative of the government. The need for this *collegium* perhaps arose from the increased necessity to secure supplies of clothing to the legion (XIII Gemina) stationed there as well as the other Danubian legions.

It is somehow surprising that the *collegium centonariorum* was absent from the important city of Roman Dacia, Sarmizegetusa, a ‘metropolis’ (*CIL* III.1495). The majority of the inscriptions concerning the *collegia* of Sarmizegetusa concern the *collegium fabrum*. Already in the reign of Antoninus Pius, the *collegium fabrum* of Sarmizegetusa had an *eques* as one of its patrons. It must have had a few to several hundreds of members, for it was divided into 13 *decuriae*. It may make a difference that compared with Sarmizegetusa, Apulum was the seat of a legion: the demographic composition of these two cities may have been quite different; and trade may have been more significant in Apulum. After all, Apulum was also an important riverine and land transport center. It is perhaps no accident that the *collegium centonariorum* had among its patrons a P. Aelius P. fil. Strenuus, of the equestrian rank and holding positions in Sarmizegetusa, the colony of Apulum, and Drobeta (no. 5). Of specific interest is that he was also specified as *conduc(tor) pascui*,

---

120 *AE* 1996.1276a = *CIL* III.7805 = *ILS* 7145 = *IDR* III.5.446. See also *CIL* III.1210 = *W* 239 = *IDR* III.5.486. The *collegium fabrum* of the Municipium Apulense (Apulum I) may have been closely connected with the *collegium fabrum* of Sarmizegetusa. Apulum I was originally a *pagus* of Sarmizegetusa. For the historical relationship between Apulum and Sarmizegetusa, see Piso, *IDR* III.5.1: XV–XXI.

121 For the *collegium fabrum* at Sarmizegetusa, see Ardevan 1998: 296–312; cf. Oltean 2007: esp. 187, 199.


123 For a map of the transport network in Roman Dacia and the harbor at Apulum, see Oltean 2007: 194–95.
The epigraphic and legal sources are silent about the Roman collegia’ roles in fire-fighting. Nor does any literary evidence provide details of their fire-fighting services. In the past, the connection between the collegia fabrum and the collegia centonariorum was often used as an index for the latter’s involvement in fire-fighting. Based on a survey of the evidence available to us, however, I reach the following observations. First, in some places, the collegium centonariorum was formed earlier than the collegium fabrum (e.g., Patavium), in other places, the reverse was true. The connection between these two types of collegia does not seem to have been universal. In places like Rome, Lugdunum, and Ravenna, all of which left abundant epigraphic material, there is little trace of any interactions between the collegia centonariorum and the collegia fabrum. Instead, at Rome and Ravenna, the collegia centonariorum’s connection with military supply can be inferred. Second, in a number of places, the ‘connections’ between the two types of collegia may have been rather superficial in that they were usually mentioned together, often along with various other groups, in the epigraphic sources as the clients of the same patron(s), and/or the joint recipients of benefactions. There were also members who participated in both type of collegia. From these cases, it is rather impossible to draw the inference that the collegia fabrum and the collegia centonariorum shared the same kind of public service. Third, in a few places at certain points of time, we do see some peculiarities. In Mediolanum, Brixia, and Comum the organization of the collegium centonariorum experienced changes in the course of the second century. In Mediolanum and Brixia, the transformation of the collegium centonariorum is manifested in the close connection between the centonarii and the fabri: they shared the arka (treasury), occasionally

124 For conductor, see Whittaker 1994: 108–10; 2002: 215–16 [on conductores (contractors) sometimes being part of the actual military unit in Egypt and perhaps at Vindolanda].
the magistrates in charge of finances, and even slaves and freedmen as property or employees. These features may well have been a side effect of large endowments designated to both the fabri and the centonarii as joint recipients, especially since their connections are most evident on the financial side. It is possible, but not at all certain, that common public services such as fire-fighting developed out of their close association with each other. Comum represents a different scenario; it would seem that a centuria within the collegium centonariorum was devoted to fire-fighting. It is to be regretted, however, that the actual stones bearing the two key inscriptions are nowhere to be found and thus cannot be re-examined.

Fourth, in the frontier provinces, the early development of the collegia centonariorum in places like Aquincum, perhaps even before it acquired the status of municipium, speaks against seeing them as municipal fire-brigades. Furthermore, the military situation on the Danube frontier changed much after late second century AD, which resulted in more legions being deployed in the Danube provinces. It is reasonable to link the beneficia granted to the collegia centonariorum under perhaps Commodus with the increased dependence of the state on the centonarii as suppliers of textiles. The frontier cities such as Aquincum (Pannonia), Solva (Noricum) and Apulum (Dacia) may have played an increasingly important role in supplying the military on the Danube frontier after the second century AD.

To a certain extent, this Chapter is a response to the widespread opinion that the collegia centonariorum, just like the collegia fabrum, were no more than fire-brigades. Nor do I subscribe to the opinion that fire-fighting led to prestige and reputation, which attracted rich members to join the collegia centonariorum.\(^\text{125}\) It is my contention that if fire-fighting took place at all, it may have been incidental or under specific circumstances rather than the raison d’être or dominant service of these collegia in all times and places. After all, in Petronius’ Satyricon, the centonarius Echion seems to have nothing to do with putting out fire. While he is enjoying the dinner party, the local vigiles are patrolling the city, and make a big scene when they (mistakenly) think they have spotted fire (78).

CHAPTER FIVE

MEMBERSHIP COMPOSITION

Details of the recruitment process among the *collegia centonariorum* are simply unavailable to us.¹ Nor do we have the complete membership lists of a specific *collegium centonariourm* for any extended period of time. Fortunately, the names and profiles of 226 persons who were affiliated with the *collegia centonariorum* provide rich, although highly incomplete, onomastic and prosopographic data for exploring the membership base of these *collegia* (Appendix E).² Based on detailed analyses of these data, this Chapter investigates the following questions and their implications: What was the social and economic status of the members of the *collegia centonariorum*? How visible were freedmen, and non-citizen members in general within any given *collegium centonariorum*? How significant were kinship ties within a *collegium*? How and to what extent were *collegiati* connected with the elite families? How were the hierarchies within the *collegia* constructed and what their implications may have been for a better understanding of the motivations for joining a *collegium*? What variations might there have been across time and geography? General observations concerning the social composition of the Roman *collegia* have tended to fixate their attention on members of freedman status, and view *collegia* as locus for social advancement

---

¹ The law did not stipulate the recruitment procedure. But it indicated that a *collegium* should have at least three members, and that the very young and the very old should not be adlected to those *collegia* or *corpora* in which each member was enrolled on the basis of his craft (*artificium*) [Dig. 50.6.6.12 (Callistratus, 1 de cogn.): *nec ab omni aetate allegi possunt, ut divo pio placuit, qui reprobavit prolixae vel inbecillae admodum aetatis homines*].

² In the following cases, it is not certain that the people in question were members of the *collegia centonariorum*. But judging from the fact that they were buried by the *collegia*, it seems quite reasonable to assume that they were affiliated with the *collegia*: nos. 153, 160, 167 (Brixia); 193 (Mediolanum); 28 (Ugernum); 202, 203 204 (two names), 207–214, 216 (Aquincum); 221, 222 (Ulcisia castra). In no. 75 from Suasa, the person made a dedication to the emperor together with the *collegium centonariorum*. No. 163 from Brixia is a dedication made by Sex(tus) Helvius Leo to the *collegium centonariorum* on account of favors bestowed on him. The relationship between him and the *collegium* is by no means clear. He may or may not have been a member. ‘Mothers’ and ‘fathers’ of the *collegia* are included (see Chapter 6), while the names of patrons are not included in this list unless they were also *collegiati*.
and integration. It should be noted, however, that such observations are often generalized from the situation of Rome and Ostia, where a large number of membership lists (alba), and epitaphs commemorating individual members have survived. A detailed study of the membership composition of the collegia centonariorum in various places may serve as test cases against the generalized impression. Equally importantly, this investigation provides a glimpse into the workforce composition of the textile sector of the Roman economy.

Social and Economic Status of the Members of the Collegia Centonariorum

Many scholars have provided general descriptions of the social composition of the Roman collegia. Earlier scholars tended to describe the collegiati (members of a collegium) as ‘humble folks’ or ‘the poor’. In their studies of the building-related businesses and associations, however, J. H. More (1969) and J. D. L. Pearse (1974) saw the collegiati more frequently as ‘employers’ than ‘employees’, at least in the case of the collegia fabrum. This approach was carried on by F. M. Ausbüttel (1982). Although one of his most important themes was the heterogeneity of the membership base of Roman collegia, he forcefully refuted the persistent scholarly tendency to connect the members of collegia with the poor, based on a survey of entrance fees, monthly dues, member donations, and funerary costs. Nowadays, it is quite fashionable to approach the collegiati as the ‘upper echelon’ of the plebs, or the ‘plebs media’. Scholars who approach the collegiati in this way tend to view the collegium membership as a privilege, and reach a high assessment of the influence of the collegia in civic life. While it is not difficult to agree that the majority of the collegial members belonged to the middling sort, this category itself is vague, and covers a wide range of men (and

---

1 See recently Tran 2006; Patterson 2006: esp. 260–3; Verboven 2007a.
2 Seen from the membership lists (alba) in Ostia, 26–30% of collegia members had Greek cognomina (Mouritsen 2005: 43). For a prosopographic study, see Royden 1988. Even in Rome and Ostia, the collegia magistrates who can be securely identified as freedmen were a minority. The majority could only be classified as incerti (Royden 1988: 229).
3 Waltzing passim; De Robertis passim; Cracco Ruggini 1971: 95.
5 Ausbüttel 1982: 48: “ist... keineswegs gesagt, dass diese arm waren.”
women) who differed from each other in terms of the relative reputation of their respective trades, their aspirations, legal status, financial security, and social connections. Categorical and generic description, therefore, is inadequate in many instances. The situation might vary between different types of collegia, as well as between commercial and non-commercial centers. The members of the collegia of navicularii (sea-going shippers/ship-owners) and nautae (river shippers) were certainly much wealthier than most other collegial members. Within the same collegium, there may also be a wide spectrum of financial and social status of the members. Indeed, Dig. 50.6.6.12 made a contrast between “those increased their wealth and were able to bear compulsory public obligations of the cities” and “the poorer members (tenuioribus per collegia distributis).”

While it might be reasonable to suspect that it was common for collegia to have entrance fees, we have very few concrete examples or numbers. No regulations concerning entrance fees for the collegia centonariorum have survived, with the result that we do not know how high or low the ‘bars’ were. It is, however, possible to draw some conclusions concerning the financial capacity of collegiati on the basis of the scale of the gifts donated by the members, titles like eques and Augustalis, the quality of the monuments, the scale of collegial graves and burial allowances, and the amount of the fines imposed by the members of the collegium on the violators of their tombs.

---

9 Historians of the Medieval and Early Modern eras, too, have repeatedly pointed out the uneven distribution of wealth among members within a particular guild/confraternity, see, e.g., Mackenney 1987: 54–60 (Venice, c. 1250–1650); Cerutti (1991: 144) has identified the ‘Turin tailors’ guild in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century as “an extraordinarily stratified guild which included both workers and the richest merchants of the city, those who provided jobs.”

10 Entrance Fees: IG IX.12.670 (Physkos; second century AD): (thiasos) Worshipers of Dionysos, 14 obols; ILS 7212 (Lanuvium, AD 136): Cultores Dianae et Antinoi, 100 sesterces, one amphora of good wine; 5 asses per month; upon entering office, quinquennalis should sacrifice with incense and wine, and on the birthdays of Diana and Antinous, should provide oil for the collegium; ILS 9100 (Lambaesis, c. 198–211): a collegium of the clerical grades (cornicularius, actarius, librarii, and exacti) of the Legio III Augusta required new members to contribute 1,000 denarii; P.Lond 1178 = P. Frisch 1986: 98–99 no. 6 (AD 194): the athletes’ guild, 100 denarii; P.Oxy. 2476 = P. Frisch 1986: 50–73 no. 3: the Dionysiac artists of the empire and the holy, artistic, traveling, worldwide, grand society, under the patronage of Diocletian and Maximian, 850 denarii in the late third century. But these powerful associations, with their long histories, may not have been typical.
Wealthy members did exist, as shown by their profiles preserved in the epigraphic evidence. It should be noted from the outset, however, that there is only a small number of members whose economic status is clear. As early as the first century AD, Lucius Sextillius Seleucus, a decurio of the collegium centonariorum at Rome, for example, could afford to donate 5,000 denarii (= 20,000 sesterces) to the common treasury (arka) of the collegium, in addition to some sort of monument (letters missing) with a marble base and two bronze candlesticks bearing the effigy of Cupid holding baskets (no. 41).\textsuperscript{11} Tullius Marc(\textit{i}) lib(ertus) Achilles, a freedman magistrate of the collegia centonariorumque at Ticinum, was a decurio ornamentarius (no. 197). Such ornamenta were “most easily won by a lavish use of wealth.”\textsuperscript{12} Eleven collegiati from eight different collegia centonariorum were seviri, Augustales, or seviri Augustales.\textsuperscript{13} Four of these eleven came from the two organizations of the centonarii at Lugdunum: the local centonarii and the centonarii residing in Lugdunum [Lug(uduni) consistentes].

Among all the known members of the collegia centonariorum, there were at least two equestrians, from Brixia and Mediolanum, respectively. L. Gabo Arunculeius Valerianus, curator of the collegium fabrum and the collegium centonariorum, held all kinds of magistracies in Brixia. The social ascendancy and distinction of his descendants is summarized in his being the father and grandfather of senators, \textit{pater et avus senator(um)} (no. 151). L. Gabo Arunculeius P. Acilius Fab. Severus, possibly one of his senatorial son(s) or grandson(s), was \textit{clarissimus vir}, \textit{iurid(icius) reg(ionis) Transpad(anae), proco(n)s(ul) desig(natus) prov(inciae) Cyperi}.\textsuperscript{14} The Gabones apparently intermarried with the locally prominent gens Acilia, which also produced senators in the second century.\textsuperscript{15} In Mediolanum, Magius Germanius Stator Marsianus,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{11} Cf. Joshel 1992: 115–17.
\item \textsuperscript{12} Gordon 1931: 66.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Nos. 14, 15, 18 (Lugdunum); 20, 21 (Aquae Sextiae); 27 (Lugdunum, inscription found in Vienna); 77 (Fanum Fortunae); 86 (Sassina); 147 (Verona); 164 (Brixia); 149 (sevir Cl(audialis) maior, Verona).
\item \textsuperscript{14} CIL V.4332 = \textit{InscrIt.} 10.5.119; Mollo 2000: 182 no. CXIV.
\item \textsuperscript{15} For the gens Acilia of Brixia, see Mollo 2000: 183. P. Acilius Heliodorus, (se)vir Aug(ustalis) (CIL V.4383 = IB 189; Mollo 2000. CLXXV; first or second century); P. Acilius P. f. Fab. Forus, \textit{praef(ectus) i(ure) d(icundo) aedilic(ia) potest(ate)} (AE 1954.75; Mollo 2000. LII); P. Acilius Surus, \textit{nutri(tor)} (CIL V.4400 = IB 206; Mollo 2000. CCCXL); a certain Acilius was the recipient of one of Pliny’s letters (\textit{Ep.} 3.14; Mollo 2000. CXXVI); he is perhaps the same as the P. Acilius, whose nephew, Minicius Acilianus, was Pliny’s friend (\textit{Ep.} 1.14.6; Mollo 2000. CXXVI; Sherwin-White 1966
\end{itemize}
eq(ues) R(omanus) eq(uo) p(publico), was dec(urio) of the fifth decuria of the fourth centuria of the collegia fabr(um) et centon(ariorum). He served as curator of the treasury [ark(a) Titianna] in the collegia in the 151st year of the collegial era (AD 260–282). Both he and his wife were patrons of the 12 centuriae that seem to have constituted the coll(egia) (no. 193). An epitaph retrieved from Ager Volcarum, Gallia Narbonensis, may suggest a third equestrian collegiatus among the centonarii (no. 29). But since neither the reading nor the restoration of the inscription is certain, it remains a dubious case.

Eleven praefecti collegii and a repunctor (auditor?) are attested among the collegia centonarirorum. They all belonged to the municipal elites; three were equestrians. In Aquileia, C. Pettius C. f. Pal(atina) Philatus, an equestrian with public horse and praef(ectus) with the power of an aedile, was praef(ectus) collegiorum fabr(um) et cent(onariorum) (no. 134). In Salona, T. Fl(avius) Herennius Iason, praef(ectus) of the coll(egia) fab(rum) et cent(onariorum), was eq(ues) R(omanus), dec(urio) of Salona, pont(ifex), and aed(ilis). His father was a v(ir) e(gregius) and patron of the colony (no. 9). Another equestrian, Q. Albinus Ouf(entina) Secundinus Mestrius Aebutius Tullianus, was the repunctor of the collegia fabrum et cent(onariorum) of Mediolanum (no. 120). However, it is not clear whether these praefecti and repunctores were imposed from above or were simply officers chosen by the collegiati from within the collegia.17

The total number of collegiati whose financial capacity is fairly clear adds up to 16 (excluding the praefecti and repunctor). This seems an insignificant minority among all the 226 possible members whose
names have survived. Are we to think that wealthy *collegiati* were rare or exceptional? Not necessarily. We have to be aware of the problem of our sources. Epitaphs, honorific inscriptions, tend to record the career, deeds, and even connections of the persons involved. But other types of inscriptions, such as patronage tablets (*tabulae patronatus*) and collegial membership lists (*alba*), usually provide only the names of the members, without further information about their socioeconomic status. Since more than half (123/226) of the surviving personal names of *collegiati centonariorum* come from the latter two types of documents, our data is biased from the very beginning. The 30 *legati collegii* (collegial representatives) from Sentinum and Ostra and the 93 members of the *collegium centonariorum* and its *pater* at Solva are known to us by names alone. They may have borne other titles or have other qualifications. But we do not have as many helpful data with respect to the personal ‘cursus’ of the individual members as we would like to. The existence of wealthy members among the *collegium centonariorum* at Solva is evident from the Solva inscription referring to “those who you (the then governor) say [are enjoying] their wealth without burden” (*ii, quos dicis diuiti(i)s suis sine onere [uti]*). According to legal citations (esp. *Dig.* 50.6.6.12, Callistratus) and the rescript recorded in the Solva inscription (lines 4–6), both of which date to the third century AD, if the wealth of a *collegiatus* exceeded certain official limits, he was disqualified from privileges to which other members may be entitled.

The financial capacity of the members of the *collegia centonariorum* can also be assessed by looking at the quality of the inscriptions they put up. The *collegia centonariorum* made numerous dedications with high-quality carvings. Brixia, in particular, provides many such examples. The inscription from the statue base which was dedicated jointly by the *fabri* and the *centonarii* of Ferentium to their common patron shows careful execution: not only were the letters beautifully carved but the space was also carefully budgeted (no. 99). Such is also the case with the dedication by the *collegium centonariorum* of Vicentia to the younger Matidia (no. 144). Some of these inscriptions or statues were paid for by the honorees,\(^\text{18}\) but some were funded by the *collegia*

\(^{18}\) No. 145. At Aquileia, the *fabri* and the *centonarii* decided to put up a gilded statue [*statuam aurat(am)*], for a certain person, whose name has been lost and who appeared to have paid for the monument (no. 138). At Comum, for L. Coelius Valerius, his wife, and their two sons and daughter paid for the statues the *collegium centonariorum* put up for them (no. 183). See also no. 184. In Industria, the *collegium centonariorum* put
themselves, either out of their own treasuries or through subscription (aere conlata).\textsuperscript{19}

Other indicators of the financial capacity of the individual members as well as the collegium as a whole include the scale of their collective graveyards, their burial allowances, and the amount of the fines stipulated by the members in case of violation of their tombs.\textsuperscript{20} The collegium centonariorum of Interamna Praetuttiorum (Regio V, Picenum) owned a collective graveyard of 1,200 ft\(^2\) (no. 54). By the standards of Picenum, this was a large tomb—it is, in fact, the third largest tomb attested epigraphically in that region.\textsuperscript{21} It is true that the collective tombs could have been gifts from wealthy benefactors, who may or may not be affiliated with the collegium, and do not always directly reflect the financial status of all the members. It is clear, however, that rich collegia tended to attract rich benefactors. The more prominent and well off the collegium, the larger and more frequent the donations it tended to receive.\textsuperscript{22} The large size of the collegial graveyard mentioned above is, therefore, suggestive of the significance of the local collegium centonariorum. In Aquincum, the collegium centonariorum up a statue for C. Lollius C. lib. Pal. Agraulus (no. 124), who we know from another inscription (CIL V.7486) was a sevir and Augustalis. He paid for the statue.

\textsuperscript{19} Nos. 10 (Salona), 66 (Mevania), 115 (Ariminum).

\textsuperscript{20} Summa Honoraria, Munera Summa honoraria, which were the fees for new magistrates upon election or entering an office (ob honorem magistri), are not attested among the collegia centonariorum, although known from several other types of collegia. The practice was modeled after the municipal practice. Cf. CIL VI.33885 = ILS 7214 = FIRA III 33 (collegium eborario et citriario et, Rome, under Hadrian): item placere [uti] | [quisquis adlectus] set inferret arcae | (denarios) (summa honoraria); CIL III.3580 = ILS 7230 (collegium fabrum Silanum, Aquincum, AD 201), ob honorem magistri coll. fabrum Silanum pecunia sua fecit; W 479 (collegium nautarum, Arilica, Gallia Cisalpina); three seviri (new members of the collegium nautarum) made a dedication to Herculis Augustus ex summis honorariis, supplemented by 2,200 sesterces; CIL VI.29691 (collegium dendrophorum Rome, AD 206). Ti(berius) Claudius Chresimus, upon being elected quinquennalis, gave 10 (Roman) pounds of silver and 10,000 sesterces to the collegium dendrophorum, to be divided among the members according to their rank on the anniversary of the collegium. cf. Waltzing I: 453. For summa honoraria for municipal magistrates, see Duncan-Jones 1982: 147–55.

\textsuperscript{21} The second largest regional graveyard (1,600 ft\(^2\)) also comes from Interamna Praetuttiorum, built by an otherwise unknown Publius Fabius P.f. Gratus for himself, his wife, his descendants, and his freedmen (CIL IX.5105). The largest tomb (2,550 ft\(^2\)) in Picenum is from Hadria (CIL IX.5020). The owner, Venerius Col. I. Felix, was doubtless one of the richest people in town, for he held the position of Magister Augustalis. Most of the tombs in that region ranged in size from 144 to 400 ft\(^2\).

\textsuperscript{22} Liu 2008: 231–56.
gave a handsome sum of 300 denarii (= 1,200 sesterces) for the burial of Iulius Athenodorus (no. 207). How he was connected with the collegium centonariorum was not specified, nor is it clear whether the collegium gave this sum as a gift or as a funerary fee due to any member upon death. This sum was almost four times what the Lanuvium collegium stipulated—that is, 250 sesterces for a member’s funeral and 50 sesterces to be distributed to the mourners— and almost five times the cheapest burial fees epigraphically attested in Italy and the burial grant introduced by Nerva. It is also four times what the collegium fabrum at Ulcisia Castra contributed to the burial of a Marcus Cocceius [---] in the second century. The date of the epitaph for Iulius Athenodorus is not specified. But since the epitaph was inscribed on a sarcophagus, a third century date is more likely than first or second century date. If a third century date could be confirmed, the relatively large sum can be attributed to inflation. Otherwise, it is perhaps more appropriate to consider this cash a kind of gift given for particular reason(s), which now escape us. In any case, the funerary monuments put up by the fabri and the centonarii of Aquincum, either jointly or by the latter, tended to be very elaborate.

In Ravenna, M. Caesius Eutyches, a dec(urio) of the 17th decuria of the collegium centonariorum and his wife, Tullia Ferusa, built a tomb for themselves while alive. They imposed a considerable fine—30,000 sesterces payable to the imperial fiscus—on anyone who put or built anything else in front of their tomb (no. 107, AD 161–66 or 198–211). In Mediolanum, a curator of the joint treasury of the collegia fabrum et centonariorum imposed a fine of 15,000 sesterces, payable to the second centuria of the collegia, for violation of the tomb (no. 196, second century AD). There may have been a correlation between the amount of the fines and the scale of the tombs, as well as the importance of the deceased. If so, these sizable fines would point to the wealth of these two collegiati.

---

25 RIU III. 898 = Lupa 3173 (with images): D(is) [M(anibus)] | M(arco) Cocc(eio) [--- et] | Cocc(eiae) Fo[---] | coni(ugi) vi(vae) e[t ---] | Marcel[l --- et] | Marciae [fil(iis) viv(is)] | ad hoc [cont(ulit) idem. coll(egium)] | fab[rum] idem. | HS n(ummos) idem. CCC.
26 Cf. Libitina e dintorni 2004: 444–45 (Camodeca) for a discussion of the scales of the fines for tomb violations.
The *collegiati*’s capacity to contribute, at times, to civic activities or building projects also helps us measure their financial standings. One such example comes from Lugdunum, where the *centonarii* helped out with funding (*suo impendio*) the restoration of the circus, probably during the reign of Marcus Aurelius (no. 13). These examples all point to the occasional prosperity of the *collegia centonariorum*. There are, however, some complications. The finances of the *collegia* were supported by a variety of sources, including donations from benefactors, as have already discussed at greater length in Chapter 3.27 Furthermore, the wealthy members of *collegia* were not necessarily all *centonarii dumtaxat*. As the Solva inscription and Dig. 50. 6.6.12 clearly show, at least in the third century AD, it was not a rare phenomenon for rich people to join certain types of *collegia*, such as the *collegia fabrum* and *collegia centonariorum*, in the hopes that they might benefit from the privileges to which these *collegia* were entitled.28

A more difficult question is how often these *collegia* were open exclusively to master craftsmen or shop owners. The state of our data frustrates any attempt to assess the low-end bar for admission to the *collegia centonariorum*. But as already mentioned before, both the Solva inscription and Dig. 50.6.6.12 made it clear that among the members of the *collegia centonariorum*, there were both those who possessed

---


28 As far as the *collegia dendrophorum* are concerned, however, we know of no equestrian *dendrophori*. There were only three *dendrophori* who were also *decuriones*, members of the local senate. [CIL VIII.9401 = ILS 4167 (Caesarea Mauretania); CIL X.1790 (Putoeli, Campania); CIL XIV.2809 (M. Iulius Zoticus, *decurio*, father of *decuriones*, *sevir Augustales*, *quinquennalis* of the *seviri Augustales*, was both *quinquennalis perpetuus* and patron of the *collegium dendrophorum* of Gabii in Latium Vetus, AD 220). D(is) M(anibus). | Q(uinto) Aemilio Heli[diphoro], *decur(ioni), et dendroforo et Aug[[gust(ali)] du[plic(iario)]; qui vixit an(nis)—me(nibus) II d(iebus) XXV; || [Aemilia—ina, co(n)[jugi] ben[e mere]n(ti) (CIL X.1790).] All other known members belonged to the non-elite. This, however, does not mean that these members were necessarily poor. At least five of the c. 150 members whose names have survived were *Augustales*. [CIL XIV.33 (Royden 1988: 116 no. 115; Ostia, AD 143): T(itus) Annius Lucullus, (se)vir Aug(ustalis), idem q(uin)q(uennalis), honoratus | signum Martis dendrofor(is) | Ostiensium d(orum) d(edit) dedicavit | Id(ibus) Mat(is) Torquato et Herode co(n)s(ulibus); AE 1971.90 (Cumae, Regio 1): Aug(ustae) sacrum | Matri deum. | M(arcus) Antonius Faustu[s] | Aug(ustalis) Cumis [dendrofor(is) Baianis ara[m] | p(ecunia) s(ua). fec(it); CIL X.3938 (Alba Fucens): Marcus Faustus libertus, *sevir Augustalis*, *dendroforus Albensis*. See also CIL XIII.1751 = ILS 4131 (Lugdunum, AD 161).] Imperial freedmen were also present among the *dendrophi*. [Orelli 4412 = W 1377 (Rome, AD 107): Dis Manibus. Eutycheti Caes(aris) n(ostri) liberto, qui reliquit collegio suo dendroph(orum) (HS 1,000) n(ummum), ut ex reeditu omnibus annis ei parentent cum rep(ublica) college(i) dendroph(orum), aere collato bene merenti Sura et Senec(ione) co(n)s(ulibus).]
enough wealth to make them eligible to take up compulsory public services, and those who were ‘poorer (tenuiores)’. Conceivably, it may be in the interest of the shop owners to enroll those who worked for them in the collegia, since from at least the late second century AD onward, membership in the collegia provided these ‘poorer’ craftsmen with immunity from all kinds of compulsory public services.

Furthermore, the large size of these collegia in Mediolanum (12 centuriae or 60 decuriae together with the fabri), Ravenna (17 decuriae), and Solva (93 members and one pater) suggest that membership was not reserved for shop owners, or master craftsmen alone. We do not know the exact sizes of the other collegia centonariorum. In Sentinum and Ostra, 16 and 14 members, respectively, were selected as delegations (legati) to present patronage tablets to the patrons elect (nos. 68, 69). This gives us the minimum number of members in Sentinum and Ostra. However, since we do not know whether or not it was normal to choose only a small percentage of the collegiati as legati, we do not know whether the members numbered a few dozen or over a hundred. In Interamna Praetuttiorum, the collegium centonariorum owned a graveyard of 1,200 (Roman) ft², capable of accommodating a hundred or more burials (no. 54). But since it is most likely that the communal graveyard was intended for continuous use, its size may not directly indicate the size of the collegium at any one point in time. In Mevania, C. Attius Ianuarius left 1,000 sesterces to the collegium centonariorum and stipulated that, each year, no fewer than 12 people should dine beside his tomb on the dies parentalia (no. 64). Were these 12 people supposed to be a selected few among the collegiati? Or, alternatively, does this stipulation suggest that there were just 12 collegiati at the time when the donation was made? If the latter is true, the collegium centonariorum of Mevania may have been composed of shop owners or master craftsmen alone. But again, this is not certain.

In general, I think admission to the collegia centonariorum on a mixed basis was perhaps the norm. The Solva rescript made it quite clear that certain members (qui maiores facultates praefi(ni)to modo possident) were wealthier than others, and thus were not eligible for the legal privileges granted to the centonarii through membership in the collegium. Collegial membership may thus mean very different things for members of different social and economic backgrounds. Conceiv-

---

29 For a detailed discussion of the capacity of collective tombs, see Chapter 7.
ably, if a shop owner or master craftsman is in a collegium, it would be in his interest to include those who worked for him in the collegium, for these free-born or freed laborers would then enjoy such benefits as immunity. The discussion of the size and the composition of the collegia centonariorum directly affects the validity of the theory that sees these collegia as 'status groups'. This theory cannot be universally valid. It would be particularly difficult to assert that the exceptionally large collegia such as those in Mediolanum and Ravenna served as status groups.

The Visibility of Non-citizen Collegiati?

Did collegium membership appeal particularly to freedmen? Some scholars are convinced of this, for they believe that by serving as collegial magistrates, freedmen might have enjoyed the kind of quasi-political life denied to them in municipal contexts. However, it remains to be discovered just how many freedmen and ingenui there were among the collegiati. In this section, I will look at the percentage of freedmen among the known collegiati.

In the Imperial period, freedmen did not automatically have full Roman citizenship, and were bound to their former owners in a number of ways. That they often had close relationships with their former masters—now called patrons—is shown by the many tombstones granting burial slots to freedmen/women as well as by the (at least occasional) uses of freedmen as institores (agents) for their patrons. Freedmen may have also depended on their patrons for capital, sites of their shops, and various other forms of support. It should be acknowledged, however, that not all freedmen were merely agents or dependents of their former masters. Independent freedmen certainly

---

30 One of Royden (1988)'s main observations is the (high) percentage of freedmen or descendants of slaves among the collegial magistrates. He admits, however, this conclusion is heavily skewed by the available dataset, with the majority of the names coming from Ostia. Joshel (1992: 118) is more focused on how magistracies within a collegium were used "at the expense of status indication." See also most recently Tran 2006, passim.


32 For freedmen as agents for their patrons, see Dig. 40.9.10 (Gaius, 1 rer. cottid. sive aureor.); Kirschenbaum 1987; Aubert 1994: 14–15.

33 Mouritsen 2001b: esp. 9–11.
existed, especially if they were freed _ex testamento_ (orcini), or moved farther away from their former masters. 34 One should also be aware that freedman status was a legal category, and that freedmen did not constitute a social class or _ordo_. Although freedmen were all faced with various (legal) limitations and the servile past could not be erased, there were tremendous differences of wealth and socioeconomic connections among freedmen. 35 It is often emphasized that freedmen were more likely to advertise their affiliation than others. However, a large fraction of the persons mentioned in our inscriptions never specified their legal status. In fact, identifying members of freedmen status proves to be no easy task. Nevertheless, an inquiry into the presence of freedmen in _collegia_ may have some bearing on our understanding of such issues as the appeal of _collegium_ membership and the compositional features of the _collegia centonariorum_.

Some personal names contain a status indicator between the _gentilicium_ and _cognomen_. Father’s _praenomen_ + _filius_ (often abbreviated as _f._ or _fil._) indicates free origin; patron’s _praenomen_ + _libertus_ (often abbreviated as _l._ or _lib._) indicates freedman status. From the middle of the first century AD onward, the status indicator for freedmen tended to be omitted, except in the case of Imperial freedmen. 36 When the status indicator is lacking, uncertainty arises as to the person’s legal status. Onomastic studies in the past several decades have contributed much to deciphering the mechanisms of nomenclature among the servile population and the population of those descended from slaves.

The common association in Roman contexts of servile origin with a Greek _cognomen_ still holds much truth, 37 although not all the Greek _cognomina_ in the West implied servile connotation. 38 The connection

---

34 Garnsey [1981: 359–71 (= 1998: 28–44)] emphasized that the dependence of freedmen in terms of their relationship with their patrons in business could not have always been the case. On Garnsey 1998: 43–44, Scheidel provides a useful brief survey of the recent work on the relationship between freedmen and patrons, as well as the freedmen’s role in business. See also Kirschenbaum 1987; Aubert 1994: 102–03 (on the obstacles to the employment of agents performing _operae_). But see Mouritsen 2001b: 8: the likelihood of independent freedmen being numerically significant is not great.


38 Cf. Huttunen 1974: 148 note 59; 195–97. Huttunen stated that “Rome became an onomastic melting pot and in this urban society scarcely any attention was paid
between a Greek cognomen and freedman status is strongest when such a cognomen occurs in conjunction with other indicators of servile origin. Such indicators include the title of sevir or sevir Augustalis or Augustalis, the tribal designation Palatina, absence of filiation, association with such Latin nomina as Imperial names or non-senatorial names, the sharing of the same gentilicium between husband and wife, the discrepancy of the gentilicia between father and children, and so on. It should be noted, however, that the title of Augustalis or sevir Augustalis alone does not necessarily suggest freedman status. Scholars have also noted the chronological limits of the value of Greek cognomina as status indicators. As people with Greek cognomina began to hold high magistracies and enter the senatorial order, the servile associations of the names gradually disappeared. Thus, as far as the third century is concerned, it becomes very difficult to say with any confidence whether a Greek cognomen is indicative of freedman status or not. In my data, M. Aurelius Demetrius Surapammonius, for example, was apparently of equestrian rank (no. 109).

Based on the higher percentage of Latin cognomina among the collegiati in Italy than in Rome, Ausbüttel is of the opinion that the collegiati in Italy were predominantly of free origin. His conclusion, however, is methodologically problematic, for, as mentioned before, Latin cognomina are not reliable for the determination of legal status. Latin cognomina also occurred among the slave population. Freedmen

to the etymology of cognomina.” His study, however, was not comprehensive, as he sampled one-fifth of the epitaphs in CIL VI., excluding metric epitaphs. Furthermore, as Duncan-Jones (1978: esp. 196) pointed out, Huttunen’s book contained little discussion of the cognomina per se.


40 Scholars have noted the chronological changes and geographical differences in terms of the compositions of the Augustales. Some scholars are of the opinion that the associations of the Augustales did not start as libertine organizations, but that progressively freemen members became more prominent in these organizations, and that the membership became less attractive to the ingenui. See esp. Abramenko 1993; Mouritsen 2007.


sometimes used a Latin name to cover their servile origins. Among freedmen, the use of Greek cognomina for their children decreased rapidly from generation to generation. Some of the Latin cognomina common among the slave or freed population were: Primitivus, Felix, Hilarus, Ianuarius, Primigenius, Verna, Peregrinus, Fortunatus, Primus, Faustus, Romulus, Vercundus, et al. On the other hand, one of these cognomina alone does not constitute a criterion for the conclusive identification of status. Names such as Primus, Hilarus, Faustus, Fortunatus, Felix, and Vercundus were popular among all levels of society. Therefore, ex-slaves may well have names indistinguishable from the ingenui. H. Solin avoided the purely onomastic dichotomies of free/freed and free/slave by including the category of “incerti.” This has been followed by H. L. Royden (1988) in his study of collegial magistrates, among whom the incerti constituted the majority.

Applying these criteria to our data, we reach the following conclusions. Out of 226 names, there are only 11 members that were incontrovertibly of freedman status, as evidenced by the status indicator l. or lib. in their names or a reference to collibertus in the inscription. Five members bearing both Greek cognomina and the title sevir or Augustalis were very likely freedmen. Apart from these, I also count 40 dubious names, including 12 Greek cognomina, 23 suspect Latin cognomina, and five incomplete names. We have no further information with which to decide their status, except in one case: M. Veronius Epaphroditus and his “wife(?)” Veronia Calliste were most likely public freedmen of Verona (no. 147). The 39 remaining members with dubious names could have been ingenui, freedmen, or descendants of freedmen. While some other names in our data explicitly indicated filiation, certain features in these names may imply servile ancestry. One such name was C. Sassinatus C. f. Pup(ilia) Polycarpianus from Sassina (no. 91). Polycarpianus himself was apparently an ingenuus. But his ancestor had probably been a public slave of the city Sassina, as his nomen gentilicium Sassinatus

---

43 Literary sources refer to such practices (e.g., Mart. 6.17; Suet. Gramm. 18.1). Cf. Treggiari 1969: 251.
47 Already in Kühn 1910. See also Huttunen 1974: esp. 132.
suggests. His cognomen was formed from a Greek root (Polycarpus + the suffix -ianus), which again may suggest servile ancestry. Another such name is M. Cocceius M. f. Cam(ilia) Erotianus (no. 108). Erotianus was a dec(urio) of the col(legium) cent(onariorum) at Ravenna. His cognomen (Eros + the suffix -ianus) may point to non-citizen ancestry. Perhaps one of his ancestors either was an Imperial freedman (of M. Cocceius Nerva) or had acquired his citizenship under Nerva. But, of course, Erotianus’ ancestor may simply have been a freedman of a M. Cocceius, either ingenuus or a freedman himself, who may or may not have been only connected to the emperor Nerva. Despite their possible servile ancestry, both Polycarpianus and Erotianus, of course, were no different from any other Roman citizens as far as their legal rights were concerned. What would be of more interest to know is whether their freed or slave ancestors were members of the collegia. Tran (2006) notes that urban prosperity and the legal privileges such as immunitas allowed some collegiati to accumulate facultates and diversify their patrimony, which underlied their social ascension. It may well be the case here.

In sum, the total number of members of collegia centonariorum that may have been freedmen add up to 56 (including five incomplete names), constituting a relatively small percentage of the 226 names we possess. The regional differences in the ratio of freedman members should also be noted. As will be discussed at greater length below, the percentage of freedmen or descendants of slaves among the known

---

48 Sassinatius and Sassinas, the variant forms of the gentilicium Sassinatus, occurred in CIL XI.6568 (Sassinas Secundus), 6579 (Sex. Sassinas Gratus) and 6580 (husband and wife: Sassinatia Asia and L. Sassinas Facultalis; their son: Chrysogonus). Their legal status is not specified; but there is no clear indication that they were of libertine status.

49 Names with /lib. Nos. 20 (Aqua Sextiae); 27 (Lugdunum, collibertus); 37–40; 42 (two names) (Rome); 50 (Aesernia); 64 (Mevania, Umbria); 197 (Ticinum).

Greek cognomina + sevir, Augustalis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>577</td>
<td>Fanum Fortunae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Sassina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Verona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Comum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Brigetio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greek cognomina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Sassina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Ravenna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Luna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Regium Lepidum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Brixia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Acerrae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suspect Latin cognomina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lugdunum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Ligures Baebiani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>eight names, Sentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>seven names, Ostra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87–89</td>
<td>Sassina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Verona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incomplete names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>two names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Acerrae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 56
collegiati was significantly higher in Rome, Sassina, and Ludgunum than in other places. All the inscriptions relating to the centonarii from these places are epitaphs expect one. Given the frequent overrepresentation of freedmen in the funerary inscriptions at Rome, Italy, and the Gallic provinces, it is possible that the actual percentage of freeman members might have been lower than indicated by the inscriptive evidence.  

In the frontier provinces, the composition of the collegia centonariorum was quite different from Italy and Rome, in that there was a close association between these collegia and the veterans, a high percentage of members were of free origin, and there were many peregrini among the collegiati. These phenomena will be further analyzed later, when I discuss the cases of Solva and Aquincum.

As far as our documents indicate, there do not seem to have been any slave members of the collegia centonariorum. One dubious name is Aetrius Verna, who was listed as one of the delegates (legati) of the collegium centonariorum of Sentinum chosen to present the patronage tablet to the patron-elect in AD 261 (no. 68). Verna, when attached to a personal name, may indicate three things: a freedman or a freedman’s descendant, an ingenuus of local origin, or a home-bred slave. In the last two instances, Verna was usually preceded by a cognomen with or without other names. Therefore, in the case of Aetrius Verna, Verna is more likely a cognomen than an indicator of local origin or slave status. Roman law did not forbid slaves to become members of collegia. The consent of the owner was the only prerequisite. In this way, the law protected the owners’ rights over their own slaves. The decision to accept slaves on a regular basis or not perhaps depended on the individual collegium. But no extant collegial by-laws (leges collegii) contain particular provisions against the admission of slaves. Although

---

50 For the freedmen’s uses of epigraphic media in the commemorative practices, see, for example, Taylor 1961: 113–32; Mouritsen 2005; Petersen 2006.
54 For collegiati of servile status, see Tran 2006: 49–53.
55 The by-laws of the cultores Dianae et Antinoi in Lanuvium (CIL XIV.2112 = ILS 7212) provide information concerning slave members: the patron/patroness, master/mistress, or creditor had no claim to the funeraticium (funerary fees) unless he/she was mentioned as heir in the will; if the body of a slave could not be recovered from his master, a funus imaginae should be given; and on the occasion of their
members of servile status among *collegia* have certainly been attested,\(^{56}\) in general, slave members, and especially slave magistrates within *collegia*, are much rarer than *liberti* in the epigraphic data.\(^{57}\)

Slave and freedman *collegiati* should not be confused with slaves and freedmen whom the *collegia* owned or manumitted. We do not have much information concerning the functions of slaves owned by the *collegia*.\(^{58}\) If the case of the *corpus Augustalium* is any guide, one of these slaves’ roles was to serve as collegial *arcarius* (‘treasurer’). Thus, Cosmion, the slave of the incorporated *Augustales* of Misenum, received the legacy of 10,000 sesterces in the name of all of the *corportati*.\(^{59}\) Under Marcus Aurelius, the lawful *collegia* were entitled to manumit slaves. The *collegium* as a collective entity rather than individual *collegiati* would then become the patrons of these freedmen/women, and was entitled to be their legitimate heir.\(^{60}\) Fabricius Centonius *colligerorum lib(ertus) C(h)resimus* may have been an example of a (joint) collegial freedman (no. 162). His patrons may have been the two *collegia*, that is, the *collegium fabrum* and the *collegium centonariorum* of Brixia.\(^{61}\)

His *praenomen* and *nomen* may have derived from the names of these

---

\(^{56}\) Among the occupational *collegia*, the *collegium fullonum* in Spoletium (*CIL* XI.4771) and the cart/carriage drivers (*cisiarii*) in Praeneste had slaves among their magistrates (*CIL* XIV.2874 = *ILLRP* 103 = *ILS* 3683, dated to the Republican period).

\(^{57}\) Waltzing IV: 151–54. Ausbüttil (1982: 41–42) suggests two reasons for this: the owner may not have been willing to grant permission for his/her slave(s) to join the *collegium* for fear that they might come under other people’s influence; or the slaves may have been trying to save money for later manumission. Household *collegia* were a different case.

\(^{58}\) For the slaves of the *collegia*, see Waltzing IV: 429. Keay’s interpretation (1988: 76) of *CIL* II.3434. from Carthago Nova, Spain—that “a local *collegium* employed its slaves to build the foundations of a shrine financed by its members”—does not seem to be justified by the content of the inscription.

\(^{59}\) D’Arms 2000: Text B lines 43–45. He may be an *institor* (I owe this suggestion to Jean-Jaques Aubert).

\(^{60}\) Dig. 40.3.1–2 (Ulpianus); Dig. 2.4.10.4 (Ulpianus).

\(^{61}\) For similar nomenclature, see *Tignuaria Restut(a)*, *Tignuaria Victorina vern(a)* (*CIL* VI.27414); *L(uicius) Vestiarbus Trophimus* (*CIL* VI.28251); *Fullonia Restuta* (*CIL* VI.29159). However, in these cases, it is not certain whether the *gentilicia* Tignuaria, Vestiarbus, and Fullonia derived from the *collegium tignuariorum*, *collegium vestiari-orum*, and *collegium fullonum*, respectively, or from these people’s or their ancestors’ association with these occupations.
collegia. He put up an inscription commemorating his wife, Fabricia Centonia Arethusa, and his daughter, Chresime. Since his wife bore the same praenomen and nomen as himself, she may have been a freedwoman either of the collegia or of Fabricius Centonius C(h)resimus himself. The gentilicium Centonius is also found in Vasio, Gallia Narbonensis. A woman named [Q]uinta Centon(ia?) put up a tombstone to D. Valer(ius) Valentinus according to his will. She may have been a freedwoman of the collegium centonariorum that is attested in Vasio (no. 24), but this is by no means certain. It is far from clear whether or not the gentilicium Centonius always indicated a relationship with the collegium centonariorum or with the occupation. There were numerous cognate names (e.g., Centenius, Centius, Centinus, and Centho), which had a long history in Rome as well as in central and southern Italy.62

Were there female collegiatae within the collegium centonariorum?63 This question is of some significance, especially since it is “natural” to associate textile production with women. We do not have a definitive answer, but we have five possible cases. In Ugernum (Gallia Narbonensis), the centonarii put up a tombstone for Moccia C. f. Silvina (no. 28). She herself may have been affiliated with the collegium. But it is also possible that she was the daughter or spouse of a member, and that she herself did not belong to the collegium. A similar case was Gigennia Verecunda (no. 89), who was buried by the collegium centonariorum in Sassina (Regio VI, Umbria). Verecunda’s status is uncertain. She may have been a freedwoman or daughter of one of the two other Gigennii in the collegium (nos. 87, 88). A third case comes from Aesernia (Regio IV). Gavillia Optat[a] (no. 51) was called mater of the collegium centonarior(um). Such titles as mater/pater/parens will be further discussed in Chapter 6 about patronage. For now, suffice it to say that matres/patres were often members of the collegia. They participated in collegial activities such as feasting and the election of patrons.64 Gavillia was termed contubernalis in the inscription. Since contubernalis denotes an illegitimate marital relationship, her ‘husband’

63 For the presence of women in other types of collegia, see CIL II.5812; III.870, 7532; VI.2239, 9398, 30983, 34004; XI.1355, 6310; XIV.256, 326; AE 1977.265; AE 1993.1245 a–b; Piccottini 1993: 111–23. Cf. Waltzing: I 348; IV: 205, 254–57. For the presence of female members in the Eastern associations, see Harland 2003b.
64 See, e.g., no. 68 (collegium centonariorum, Sentinum, Umbria). In the collegium Aesculapi et Hygieae at Rome (ad 153), mater together with pater and quinquennalis were assigned larger shares of food or cash distributions.
was perhaps a slave. His name is not mentioned, nor is it clear what his relationship with the *collegium* was. Another *mater collegii* was Fabia Lucila (no. 3). She put up an inscription in memory of her father-in-law, a Roman equestrian who had served as *duovir* and *sacerdos* in *Colonia Apulensis* (Dacia). Finally, Cissonia Aphrodite, together with her husband, Magius Germanius Stator Marsianus, was patron of the *coll(egia) fabrum et centonariorum* of Mediolanum as well as *decurio* and *curator* of the *coll(egia)* (no. 193). All 12 *centuriae* jointly made a dedication to the *Genius* and *Honor* of Marsianus and the *Iuno* of Cissonia Aphrodite. But it is not clear whether or not she was a formal member of the *collegia*.

No legal restrictions barred women from joining *collegia*. The presence of women in the cult associations, especially those revolving around the cults of Isis, Magna Mater, and Bona Dea, was not rare. In a few cases, the entire association was made up of women. However, in the occupational *collegia* in general, female members were few, although *matres* were relatively common. A rather exceptional case was the *corpus (fabrum) sub(a)edianorum*, or the association of the builders, in Virunum, Noricum. There are 19 clearly identifiable female names among the 52 names that have survived in the *album* of the *corpus*. On the other hand, it seems that few of these women were members in their own right: 12 of the 19 were wives of *collegiati* and three were sisters of male *collegiati peregrini*, although the relationship of the other four women to the male members was not clear. The way in which the names of these women were arranged on the stone is of some interest. Rather than being mixed together, the male names were inscribed in two columns on the left, while the female names were inscribed on the far right hand side of the stone, in the order of the names of their male relatives. This arrangement indicates that the status of these women in the *collegium* depended on that of their male relatives.

The limited legal capacities of Roman women may have been an obstacle for their participation in collegial membership and life. This should be true for all types of occupations regardless of their nature.

---

65 About the worship of *Genius* and *Iuno* (a woman’s *Genius*), see chapter 7.

66 An all-female association of initiates of the Great Mother, Cybele, is found at Serdia in Thracia (*IMoesiaTh* 101, c. AD 200; cited by Harland 2003b). *CIL VI.2239* (Rome) mentions one Veturia Semne, who was honored on account of magistracy of the *collegium* of Bona Dea (*honorata ob magistratum collegi Bonae Deae*). It is not clear whether or not this *collegium* was all-female/female-dominant.

That women were not a regular part of the collegia centonariorum, of course, represents a “historical pattern of exclusivity” and is not an indication of the extent of women’s involvement in the actual production.68 Although women are conceivably actively involved in textile production in the households of their fathers, husbands, or masters, they perhaps had little say in any decision-making process and were normally barred from the core of the organization of economy. In addition, parallels from other pre-industrial economies make it quite clear that certain tasks or stages of preparation for textile production such as the more time-consuming jobs of yarn and thread production may be dominated by women, other stages such weaving were by no means so.69

To sum up so far: it should be noted that the epigraphic sources were in general biased towards the collegial magistrates and the richer members. We tend to know more about them than the ordinary members. Relatively wealthy members were certainly present among the collegia centonariorum, suggesting that these collegia had members who were shop owners or master craftsmen. Slave and female members were rare among the collegia centonariorum. Nor did freedman members dominate our data. The case studies below will elaborate on these points. In particular, I want to emphasize the regional variations of the composition of the collegia. It is not always easy to determine, however, whether these variations should simply be attributed to the regional variations in the social and ethnic composition of the population.

Social Status and Social Relationships: Case Studies

In this section, I will analyze the membership lists in the hopes of identifying regional peculiarities in the composition of the collegia centonariorum, as well as the role of kinship or other forms of close relationships, both within the collegium and between the collegium members and the local elites. I will discuss the cases of Rome, Sassina (Umbria), Sentinum (Umbria), Ostra (Umbria), Mediolanum

68 Cf. Treggiari 1979: 78–79; Dixon 2001b: 14. Also, a recent article provides an illuminating comparandum of how women including the widows of masters were barred from the core of the organization of economy in a male-dominant society by studying the negative effect of ‘social capitals’ on female workers in a preindustrial German town, Wüttemberg. (Ogilvie 2004: 325–59.)

69 Berman 2007: 10–32. See also Chapter 2.
(Transpadana), Solva (Noricum), and Aquincum (Pannonia), where multiple names of *collegiati* are available. The focus of my onomastic analysis is fourfold: first, to identify the clusters of *gentilicia* or the lack of such clusters in a given *collegium*; second, to ask whether the *nomina gentilicia* attested among the *collegiati* were common or rare in a given city and/or region; third, to ask whether or how clusters of *gentilicia* suggest a connection between the *collegia* and prominent local families; and fourth, to identify trans-regional/trans-local relationships between *collegiati* as well as between *collegia*.

In many instances, the sharing of the same *nomen gentilicum* can be a helpful indicator pointing to some kind of connection between the people bearing the name. Such cases are strongest when people with the same *gentilicum* also shared the same *praenomen* and/or burial plot. Quite often, however, it is impossible to pinpoint the nature of the relationship between people bearing the same *praenomen* and *gentilicum* without definite information. They could have been father/grandfather and son/grandson, uncle and nephew, brothers, patrons and their freedmen, or fellow freedman manumitted by the same patron. In some instances, especially when Imperial *nomina* or very common *nomina* are involved, the sharing of the same *nomen* may not have any direct value. Munatius in Lugdunum and Publius Aelius in Apulum are two such cases. These names were numerous in the two places, respectively: the former was the name of the founder of Lugdunum; the latter were the names of Hadrian. In the discussion below, I will mention these problems whenever they occur.

**Rome**

Among those buried inside a *columbarium* on the Via Salaria at Rome were at least six members of the *collegium centonariorum*. All of them were either magistrates or at least *decuriones* within the *collegium*. Five out of the six bore the same *praenomen* and *nomen gentilicum*, Lucius Octavius. Three were freedmen, as signified by the status indicator *l(ibertus)*. But it does not necessarily follow that they were all manumitted by the same L. Octavius. One of them is explicitly referred to as the freedman of one L. Octavius Atta (no. 39). We do not know the *cognomen/cognomina* of the former owner(s)/patron(s) of the other two freedmen (nos. 37, 40). The other two L. Octavii in the *columbarium*, namely, L. Octavius Primigenius and L. Octavius Secundus, are specified as brothers (*fratres*) (no. 37). Since, unlike many others
buried in this *columbarium*, their names do not include L. *l.* as a status indicator, they were probably *ingenui*. And since the two brothers were commemorated together with L. Octavius L. *l.* Secundus Maior by the same inscription, it is very likely that they were the sons of the latter. L. Octavius L. *l.* Secundus Maior achieved the highest position within the *collegium*: he was *mag(ister) quinquennalis conl(egi) cent(onariorum) lustri XI* and *decurio*. L. Octavius Primigenius and L. Octavius Secundus both held the position of messengers (*viatores*) of the *collegium*. Not all the *centonarii* buried in this *columbarium*, however, bore the name L. Octavius. Lucius Tuccius Mario[---], also buried in the *columbarium*, bore the title *quinquennalis*, very likely of the *collegium centonariorum* (no. 38).70 He was apparently related to Tuccia L.*l.* Diodota, one of the owners of the *columbarium*.71 Since Diodota shared the ownership of the tomb with three freedmen of the L. Octavii, namely, L. Octavius L.*l.* Dama Maior, L. Octavius L.*l.* Philoxe[---], and L. Octavius L.*l.*, she must have had close ties to the L. Octavii.

This *columbarium* continued to be used over a long period. The freedmen of the L. Octavii and their descendants played important, if not dominant, roles in the *collegium centonariorum* at Rome at least during the period around the eleventh *lustrum* of the *collegium*, that is, the period between the end of the first century BC and the mid-first century AD. The L. Octavii were not the only Octavii who were closely associated with the *collegium centonariorum*. M. Octavius Marcio, the son or (more likely) a freedman of a Marcus Octavius, was *magister* of the *collegium centonariorum* (no. 42). It is not clear whether this was the same *collegium centonariorum* as the one mentioned previously; it was possible for a city to have more than one *collegium* of the same type or name, as in the case of Ostia and Lugdunum.72 But this is not an issue of crucial importance here, for the use of the same name itself is a significant indicator of common interest. Buried in the same tomb with Marcio was a freedman of Marcus Octavius, M. Octavius M.*l.* Attalus, who was a *centonar(ius) a turre Mamilia*, where his shop was perhaps

---

70 Due to the fragmentary condition of the inscription, it is not certain whether or not Mario was his complete name.
71 CIL VI.7860: L(ucius) Octavius L(uci) l(ibertus) Dama | Maior | Tuccia L(uci) l(iberta) Diodota | L(uci) Octavius L(uci) l(ibertus) Philoxe[nus] | L(uci) Octavius L(uci) l(ibertus) Plus | in fr(onte) p(edes) XVI in agr(o) p(edes) XXIV.
The inscription does not state his affiliation with the *collegium centonariorum*; he may or may not have remained outside of the *collegium*. That the M. Octavii had a professional interest in textiles can also be discerned from their close association with the *collegium sagariorum* at Rome. M. Octavius Carpus was one of the *curatores* of the *collegium Herculis Salutaris c(o)hortis primae sagariorum*, which may have been closely involved in supplying the Praetorian Guards with clothing. It is very likely that all the M. Octavii mentioned above were connected with each other, as well as with the L. Octavii.

Not all of the wealthy or important members of the *collegium centonariorum* at Rome were directly connected with branches of the Octavii. Lucius Sextilius Seleucus, a *decurio* of the *collegium* and perhaps of freedman status, for example, was wealthy enough to donate 5,000 denarii to the common treasury (*arka*) of the *collegium*, in addition to a few building decorations (no. 41). Another member of the *collegium*, P. Vibius Felix, is known from a very brief epitaph found on via Pinciana (no. 43).

It is not clear whether there were multiple *collegia centonariorum* at Rome, but three conclusions emerge from the above analysis of the *centonarii* at Rome. First, the presence of members from the same family, broadly defined, may continue for more than one generation. We have seen fathers and sons, as well as brothers, sharing magistracies in the *collegium centonariorum* at Rome. Second, Octavius seems to have been a dominant *gentilicium* within the *collegium/a centonariorum* at Rome at least in the first century AD. The L. Octavii and M. Octavii supplied several high magistrates for the *collegium/a*. This suggests that the Octavii had a concentrated interest in the textile trade. The occurrence of the *gentilicium* Octavius in related *collegia*, such as the *collegium* of the *sagarii*, suggests that the interests of the Octavii also extended to different sectors of the textile economy. However, we need to be aware of the distortion caused by the problematic nature of the data. Our information about this *collegium* derives mainly from two tombs of the Octavii. It is not clear whether these tombs were used as collective tombs, available to all the members of the *collegium/a centonariorum* at Rome, or simply as family tombs for closely related

---

74 *CIL* VI.339. Cf. MacMullen 1960: 25 with n. 23. Also see Chapters 1, 2 and 4 of this book.
people. If we find more such tombs associated with other names, such as Sextilius or Vibius, the picture may begin to look very different. Various hypothetical situations can be imagined: perhaps, together with the Octavii, there were clusters of other names within the collegium at the same time, but these names have been lost; or, perhaps, the Octavii were once dominant among the centonarii, but later lost their place to other families, such as the Sextilii; or, there were multiple collegia centonariorum at Rome, and the Octavii were only prominent within one of them. Only new discoveries can clarify these issues.

Finally, freedmen constitute a very high percentage (50–70%) of the epigraphically attested members of the collegium centonariorum at Rome. All these members except Lucius Sextilius Seleucus were known from epitaphs, and with the exception of Pulius Vib(i)us Felix and M. Octavius M. l. Attalus, they were either magistrates or decuriones of the collegium, that is, members of the upper echelon of the collegium. Since the freedmen population tended to be over-represented on the funerary monuments, and since the collegial magistrates may have been more prone to advertising their affiliations, it is likely that the percentage of freed members may not have been as high as the tombstones would lead us to think. In Sassina and Lugdunum we also see a comparably high percentage of freedmen among the known centonarii. Again, all of them are known from funerary monuments. We are thus faced with similar interpretative challenges with respect to the ratio of freedmen members within the collegia.

Sassina (Umbria)

In Sassina, we have nine epitaphs put up by the collegium centonariorum. Since all of them use similar or identical formulae, it is likely that all the deceased recorded in such inscriptions were affiliated with the collegium in the same period, perhaps the second century AD. Three out of the nine persons buried by the collegium centonariorum bore the same gentilicium, Gigennius. Two of them were males, C. Gigennius Festivus and C. Gigennius Ianuarius; one was a female, Gigennia Verecunda. Due to the lack of status indicators, we cannot tell

---

76 For this tendency, see more recently Mouritsen 2001b: 2–3; 2005.
77 For the case of Lugdunum, see Chapter 4. All the known members from Lugdunum were freedmen.
78 Nos. 86–91, 93, 95, and 97.
79 Nos. 87–89.
whether they were *ingenui* or freedmen. All their *cognomina* sometimes occurred in freedmen’s names.\(^{80}\) It is not made explicit in the inscriptions whether or not all three were members of the *collegium*; however, judging from the fact that the *collegium centonariorum* took care of putting up their epitaphs, they were likely either *collegiati* or relatives of members. C. Gigennius Ianuarius was also patron of the *collegium* in question. Gigennius was not a common *gentilicium* in Umbria. As far as Sassina is concerned, we know of only two other Gigennii, recorded in the same inscription: C. Gigennius C. *fil.* Monit(?)\(^{81}\), who lived for 17 years and was perhaps buried by his father, C. Gigennius. Neither their social background nor their relationship with the three Gigennii mentioned above is clear. None of the other six people connected with the *collegium* had similar *nomina*. Compared with the case of Rome, the proportion of the *collegium* members that came from the same family or could claim the same former masters (patrons) seems low in the case of the *collegium centonariorum* in Sassina.

Three of the nine members bore Greek *cognomina*, indicating that they may have been freedmen or at least descended from slaves.\(^{82}\) We cannot exclude the possibility that at least some, if not all, of the *collegiati* with Latin *cognomina* were of freedman status.\(^{83}\) There is only one member whose *ingenuus* status is without doubt, C. Sassinatus C. *f.* Pup(lilia) Polycarpius. But as has already been discussed, he may well have had servile ancestry (no. 91). Five patrons are epigraphically attested for the *collegium centonariorum* of Sassina (nos. 84, 86, 88, 92, 94). Unlike in many other cities, where municipal magistrates often functioned as patrons of *collegia* (see Chapter 6), no patrons of the *collegium centonariorum* of Sassina have been attested as holding municipal or Imperial offices. In fact, all or at least three of these patrons were freedmen. Among them, Sextius Tettius Sexti l. Herme, a freedman and a *sevir*, married a free-born wife (no. 92); Caius Caesius C. l. Chresimus was a *sevir Aug(ustalis)* and was buried by his freedwomen (no. 84). None of the *gentilia* of the patrons of the *collegium centonariorum*, excepting that of C. Gigennius Ianuarius, occurred among the known members of the *collegium*, indicating again the rather humble status of the collegial members in Sassina.

---

\(^{80}\) Kajanto 1965: 218, 219, 260.
\(^{81}\) *CIL* XI.6560 (second century AD).
\(^{82}\) Nos. 86 (*Augustalis*), 93, 95.
\(^{83}\) Nos. 87–89, 90, 95. All these Latin *cognomina* have been attested among freedmen.
Sentinum, Ostra (Umbria)

We possess three patronage tablets (tabulae patronatus) of the same period for the collegium fabrum of Sentinum (AD 260), the collegium centonariorum of Sentinum (AD 261), and the collegium centonariorum of Ostra (AD 260), respectively, and one membership list of the cultores d(ei) s(olis) i(nvicti) Mithrae of Sentinum, which may also date to the same period. The tabulae recorded the names of the magistrates of these collegia, as well as of the delegates (legati) chosen to present these tabulae to the patrons-elect. When read together, the names from the four documents provide invaluable information concerning kinship relationships within collegia, multiple affiliations, and the construction of patronage relationships.

Table 5.1. Lists of cultuali from four collegia, Sentinum and Ostra (alphabetical by Gentilicium)\(^8\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legati collegii fabrum CIL XI.5748 (Sentinum, AD 260)</th>
<th>Legati collegii centonariorum (no. 68, Sentinum, AD 261)</th>
<th>Legati collegii centonariorum (no. 69, Ostra, AD 260)</th>
<th>Cultores d(ei) s(olis) i(nvicti) Mithrae CIL XI.5737 = ILS 4215</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aemilius Victor Aeldius Primus</td>
<td>Antistius Maximus</td>
<td>--- [---][---]t(us)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetrius Romanus Aelius Honoratus</td>
<td>Cocceius Mercurialis</td>
<td>--- [---][Verecun]d(us)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetrius Verna Aetrius Honora[us]</td>
<td>Aurelius Ursinus</td>
<td>Aduren(us) Theseus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bebidius Ienuari&lt;vi&gt;us Aetrius Verna</td>
<td>Cornelius Tertius q(uin) q(uennalis)</td>
<td>Aelius (H)ylas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bebidius Iustus Apronius (?) Hilarianus</td>
<td>Octavius Clemens</td>
<td>Aetrius Irenaeus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casidius Clementinus Brittius Maximus</td>
<td>Octavius Taurus</td>
<td>Aetrius Romanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassidius Iustissimus Casidius Romulus</td>
<td>Petronius Felix Antist(ius) Benign(us)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^8\) The original lists were not in alphabetical order. In most cases, only gentilicia and cognomina were recorded. The omission of the praenomen was a common phenomenon from the second century AD on (Salomies 1987: 346–413). Lomas’ reading of the names in CIL XI.5748 is different from CIL. Lomas 1996: 250 put a comma between Titratius and Ampliatius, so that these became separate names. But it is more appropriate to read Titratius Ampliatus as a single name, especially since Ampliatus has been attested as cognomen while Kajanto did not record Titratius among his list of Latin cognomina.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legati collegii fabrum</th>
<th>Legati collegii centonariorum (no. 69, Ostra, AD 260)</th>
<th>Cultores d(ei) s(olis) i(nvicti) Mithrae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIL XI.5748 (Sentinum, AD 260)</td>
<td>CIL XI.5737 = ILS 4215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Casidius Martialis</th>
<th>Casidius Severus (pater)</th>
<th>Publilus Maximinus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casidius Rufinus quinquennalis</td>
<td>Gavius Felicissimus Heldius Peregrinus (parens)</td>
<td>Gavius Felicissimus Heldius Peregrinus (parens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulius Martialis quinquennalis</td>
<td>Gavius Felicissimus Heldius Peregrinus (parens)</td>
<td>Gavius Felicissimus Heldius Peregrinus (parens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orfus Veritas Statius Velox</td>
<td>Satrius Achilles Satrius Clemens</td>
<td>Satrius Achilles Satrius Clemens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satrius Vercundus</td>
<td>Satrius Ianuarius Satrius Ursus</td>
<td>Satrius Ianuarius Satrius Ursus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiratius Ampliatus</td>
<td>Satrius Ursus</td>
<td>Satrius Ursus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassidenus Favor Veturius Celerinus</td>
<td>Vassidenus Verinus Voesidenus Marcellinus</td>
<td>Vassidenus Verinus Voesidenus Marcellinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statius Faustus Caesoni(us) Dexter</td>
<td>Statius Faustus Caesoni(us) Dexter</td>
<td>Statius Faustus Caesoni(us) Dexter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orfus Veritas Statius Velox</td>
<td>Satrius Achilles Satrius Clemens</td>
<td>Satrius Achilles Satrius Clemens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satrius Vercundus</td>
<td>Satrius Ianuarius Satrius Ursus</td>
<td>Satrius Ianuarius Satrius Ursus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiratius Ampliatus</td>
<td>Satrius Ursus</td>
<td>Satrius Ursus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassidenus Favor Veturius Celerinus</td>
<td>Vassidenus Verinus Voesidenus Marcellinus</td>
<td>Vassidenus Verinus Voesidenus Marcellinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statius Faustus Caesoni(us) Dexter</td>
<td>Statius Faustus Caesoni(us) Dexter</td>
<td>Statius Faustus Caesoni(us) Dexter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 (cont.)
In AD 261, a *tabula patronatus* from Sentinum recorded the names of 16 delegates (*legati*) who were to present the tablet to the patrons-elect, Coretius Fuscus and his family, on behalf of the *collegium centonariorum* (no. 68). Among these delegates, the *gentilicum* Satrius seems particularly prominent. Four *legati* shared that *gentilicum*: Satrius Achilles, Satrius Clemens, Satrius Ianuarius, and Satrius Ursus. It is difficult to know whether they were of freedman status or not, since the nomenclature criteria such as the use of Greek *cognomina* were not entirely applicable at this late date. Heldius, Casidius, and Aetrius are the other three *gentilicia* that were borne by more than one member: Casidius Romulus and Casidius Severus, the latter bearing the title *pares collegii*; Aetrius Terminalis and Aetrius Verna; Aeldius (= [H]<a>eeldius) Primus and Heldius Peregrinus, the latter also bearing the title *pater collegii* (no. 68). Heldius was a very rare *nomen gentilicum*. In fact, the only known occurrence of the *gentilicum* Heldius is among the *collegium centonariorum* of Sentinum.85 The name Heldius Peregrinus may suggest that he was either recently enfranchised or was an immigrant to the region.86 All the other *gentilicia* occur only once each among the delegates of the *collegium centonariorum* of Sentinum. Apart from Heldius, there are two other rare *nomina gentilicia* among the *collegium centonariorum* of Sentinum: Voesidenus occurs only once in CIL XI. Apro[nius] is attested only three times in CIL XI, but does not seem to have been a rare *nomen* in Rome or North Africa.87

The Casidii seem to have been most prominent among the *collegium fabrum* at Sentinum in the same period (CIL XI.5748 = ILS 7220). In AD 260, there were four Casidii among the 16 delegates chosen to present the *tabula patronatus* to Coretius Fuscus: C. Casidius Rufinus, Casidius Mart[i]alis, Casidius Clementinus, and Casidius Iustissimus. C. Casidius Rufinus was also the *quinquennalis* of the *collegium fabrum*. There were two B(a)ebidii and two Aetrii in the *collegium*: Bebidius Ienuarious and Bebidius Iustus; Aetrius Romanus and Aetrius Verna. Unlike in the *collegium centonariorum*, where there were several Satrii, there was only one, Satrius Verecundus, among the *legati* in the *collegium fabrum*.

In Ostra, a city not far from Sentinum, among the two *quinquennales* and 12 *legati* of the *collegium centonariorum* (no. 69; AD 260),

---

86 Kajanto 1965: 313.
87 Solin and Salomies 1994: 19, 212.
three shared the gentilicium Vessidius: T. Vessidius Fortunatus, who was also one of the presiding magistrates (quinquennales) of the collegium, Vessidius Filoquiritum, and Vessidius Veredundus. The gentilicium Octavius occurs twice: Octavius Clemens and Octavius Taurus. There are no other clusters of gentilicia among the 14 known members of this collegium.

In order to talk meaningfully about these names, it should be noted that we do not have complete membership lists for these collegia. Nor do we know what percentage of the total membership the delegates (legati) represent. Among the members whose names have not survived, there may or may not have had a heavy concentration of certain gentilicia. On the other hand, if we assume that the legati represent the more active and dominant groups among the collegia, the cluster of certain gentilicia among the legati may be indicative of the prominence of these names within the collegia as a whole. This assumption will enable us to draw further conclusions.

Each of these three collegia had a dominant gentilicium.\(^{88}\) That the most prominent gentilicia in these collegia were different is perhaps an indication of the differing interests and networks of the gentes Satrii, Casidii, and Vessidii. The presence of multiple Casidii and Aetrii in both the collegium fabrum and the collegium centonariorum at Senticum may suggest an overlapping interest of these gentes in different sectors. Satrii and Aetrii were not rare nomina gentilicia in Umbria; but they by no means rank among the most frequently attested names in the local or regional contexts.\(^{89}\) None of the inscriptions referring to men bearing the gentilicia Casidius or Vessidius mention any Imperial

---

\(^{88}\) The gentilicum Gessius seems to be well represented among the worshippers of Mithra, see also CIL XI. 5736 = ILS 4207 (AD 219). Gessius Castus and Gessius Severus put up a decorated statue (simulacrum exornatum) to the numen of Mithras. The president was C. Propertius Augurinus. This is interesting, as the president in CIL XI.5737 = ILS 4215 is C. Propertius Profuturus, who in all probability was related to Augurinus.

\(^{89}\) Satrii (24 times, Satrinii three times in CIL XI), Casidii (nine times in CIL XI), Vessidii (eight times in CIL XI), Aetrii (16 times in CIL XI). Some popular nomina attested passim in Regio VI (Umbria), Regio VII, Regio VIII (Aemilia) were: Aelii (81 times), Aemilii (57 times), Albii/Albinii (39 times), Arrii (47 times), Atilii (62 times), Aufidii (50 times), Avilii (58 times), Aurelii (180 times), Baebii (62 times), Caecilii (42 times); Caesii (80 times), Calpurnii (41 times), Cassii (72 times), Cornelii (144 times), Decimii (30 times), Egnaei (59 times), Fabii (68 times), Gavii (69 times), Herennii (57 times), Helvii (27 times), Pontii (41 times), Terentii (54 times). Licinii, Iuli, Domitii, Marcii, Marii, Lucillii, Octavii, Flavii, Petronii, Tittii, Valerii, Vatrii, Vibii, Vettii, were all numerous.
offices or municipal offices in Sentinum. Therefore, these gentes do not seem to have been particularly prominent in the local context. The gens Aetria may have been of more significance. C. Aetrius C. f. Lem. Naso from Sentinum was an Roman equestrian with a public horse (equo publico), and had a military career (CIL XI 5745). It is not at all clear whether or not the Aetrii among the collegiati were connected with the family of C. Aetrius Naso, but a possible connection cannot safely be ruled out. The Satrii seem to have been a prominent and wealthy gens in the Umbrian city of Iguvium in the early Empire. Under Augustus, [C]n. Satrius Rufus was IIIvir iuri dicundo in Iguvium and spent 23,400 sesterces for various public occasions (CIL XI.5820 = ILS 5531). Some other prominent gentilicia in local civic life in Sentinum—e.g., the Aelii, Cocceii, Aurelii, and other senatorial names in this region—are under-represented among the known members of these collegia.

It is noteworthy that none of the gentilicia that occur among the members of the collegium centonariorum of Ostra overlap with the gentilicia of the collegiati in Sentinum. This could indicate that these collegia were purely local phenomena. However, it is evident that some connection existed between the collegia in these two places. In the 260s, both collegia under discussion shared patrons from the same gens Coretia: Coretius Fuscus, together with his wife Vesia Martina and his son Coretius Sabinus, were the patrons of the collegium centonariorum of Sentinum; Coretius Fuscus was the patron of the collegium fabrum; and Coretius Fuscus’ brother Coretius Victorinus was elected patron of the collegium centonariorum of Ostra.90 In CIL XI, the nomen gentillicium Coretius occurs only in Sentinum.91 Coretius Fuscus is the only Coretius known to have reached decurial rank. The gens Coretia may have been a rising economic and political power in Sentinum around the 260s. This would explain why none of the known members of the three collegia bore the same gentilicum as their new patrons. However, it is also possible that the Coretii existed among the collegiati, but they were simply not among the legati collegii. Nothing is known of the father of Coretius Fuscus and Coretius Victorinus. But their mother

---

90 The circumstances surrounding the election of these patrons will be discussed in Chapter 6.
91 CIL XI.5741 (C. Coretius L. f. Pomp[ina--], the restoration ae[dlis?] is very uncertain); CIL XI.5775 (L. Coretius Aphrodisius, husband of Cassia Iustina, third century AD); CIL XI.5776 (Coretia L. f. Ampliata, wife of Solanius Romanus).
Memmia Victoria was eulogized by the patronage tablet (CIL XI.5748) presented by the collegium fabrum of Sentinum to her son Coretius Fuscus in AD 260. She bore the title of mater of the collegium in question and obviously had great influence within the collegium. The rise of Coretius Fuscus to the decural rank was perhaps owing to the wealth of Memnia Victoria.92

There is only one case of possible overlapping membership in the three collegia. The name Aetrius Verna appears as legatus for both the collegium fabrum (CIL XI.5748 = ILS 7220; AD 260) and the collegium centonariorum (no. 68; AD 261) of Sentinum. This very likely refers to the same person, but the correspondence is not entirely certain, especially since we do not know whether the Aetrius Verna in the two collegia bore the same praenomen or not. There are, however, more cases of overlapping membership between the collegium fabrum and the cultores S(olis) I(invicti) Mithrae of Sentinum: Aetrius Romanus, Statius Velox, and Casidius Rufinus were members of both collegia (CIL XI.5737 = ILS 4215; CIL XI.5748 = ILS 7220). Among the 37 cultores Mithrae, there were four Coiedii, two Aetrii, two Helvenatii, two Ligurii, and two Sentinae. All the others had different gentilicia. There was one Vassidenus each in the collegium fabrum, collegium centonariorum, and cultores Mithrae: Vassidenus Favor (collegium fabrum, AD 260), Vassidenus Verus (cultor Mithrae), and Vassidenus Verinus (collegium centonariorum, AD 261). The latter two were perhaps father and son.93

All four of the collegia under discussion were, therefore, connected to each other in one way or another. The four documents fully illustrate the complicated social network constructed through the sharing of patrons, the multiple affiliations of certain individual members, and the kinship relationships between members of different collegia. Interestingly, few of the nomina gentilicia of the collegial members belonged to those of the local elite. This may suggest that in Sentinum and Ostra, the collegia were support groups for those who did not have the backing of the leading families in these cities.

---

92 For a parallel influential female figure within a collegium, see Meiggs 1973: 318 [Maecia Menophile, mater of the fabri navales (ship-builders) of Portus (CIL XIV.256 = Thylander B 344)].
93 Bormann, CIL XI: part 2, 845, ad CIL XI.5750.
Mediolanum

We do not have a membership list from this city. But several inscriptions point to the kinship relationships within the collegia, the close relationship between the collegia and the elite families, and the trans-regional connections between individual collegia centonariorum.

L. Pullius Valerius, in conjunction with the sixth centuria or six centuriae of a collegium, put up a tombstone for his grandparents, [L. Pullius Natis?]lis and Statoria Pupa (no. 193). The collegium can be identified with the collegium aerariorum or the collegium fabrum et centonariorum, because only these collegia had more than six centuriae. The burial place was given by the decree of the collegium. [L. Pullius Natis?]lis had been the d(ecurio) of the collegium. It is not clear whether L. Pullius Valerius was affiliated with the collegium in question or not. If yes, then the L. Pullii may have had a lengthy association with the collegium (three generations).

Coelius was a common gentilicium in northern Italy. The connection between the collegium centonariorum and the Coelii is attested by two inscriptions. Coelius Ben. was buried by the collegium aerariorum (no. 189). This inscription dates to the second century AD, before the status of Mediolanum changed from municipium to colonia. Another inscription (no. 183) is a dedication made by the collegium centonariorum to L. Coelius Valerius and his family. Valerius was (se)vir Mediol(aniensis). His name does not specify freedman status. His wife Calpurnia L. f. Optatilla was apparently freeborn. Calpurnius was a prominent name in northern Italy.94 One of their sons, M. Aemilius Coelius Coelianus, was a decurio in both Mediolanum and Novaria. Valerius and his family paid for the inscription, and gave 2,000 sesterces for maintenance. The name Aemilius in the names of the two sons of L. Coelius Valerius may suggest their adoption into the prominent gens Aemilia. Obviously, L. Coelius Valerius was a wealthy and well connected personage. It was perhaps his wealth that helped his son rise to the decurial rank.

94 It is particularly well attested in the city of Comum. E.g., among other offices, L. Calpurnius L.f. Ouf. Fabatus, of the equestrian rank, served as quattorvir i(ure) d(icunto) and flamen Divi Aug(usti) (CIL V.5267 = ILS 2721; Tac. Ann. 16.8). He was the grandfather of the wife of Pliny the Younger, as well as the recipient of nine of Pliny’s letters.
Atilius was another common gentilicium. The collegium centonariorum seems to have had a close relationship with the C. Atilii. In a votive dedication (no. 188), we find the name C. Atilius C. f. Ouf(entina) Tertullin[us]. He was pon[tif(ex)] and c[ur]at(or) arc(ae) of the collegium fabr(um) et cent(onariorum) in the 70th year of the collegia era, that is, the second half of the second century or the beginning of the third century AD. He was also a centurio of the seventh centuria within the joint collegia. His wife was one Atilia C. f. Veneria. This Tertullin[us] could be connected with and may even have been a descendant of C. Atilius C. f. Ouf. Tertullus (CIL V.5822), a veteran, based on the similarity of their names. Outside of Mediolanum, the association between the collegium centonariorum and the C. Atilii is also attested in Clastidium (Regio IX, Liguria). M. Labik(anus) Memor built a tomb for his wife, Atilia C. f. Secundina, as well as his parents-in-law, C. Atilius Secundus and Serr(ia?) M. lib. Valerianna (no. 121). The task of perpetuating their memory with roses, amaranth, and banquets was assigned to the collegium centonariorum of Placentia that resided in the vicus Clastidium. The use of adjectives describing the quality of the deceased, the exact statement of the deceased’s age, and the orthography karissimor(um) suggest a relatively late date for the inscription, probably late second century or third century AD, thus making it possibly contemporary with the aforementioned inscription from Mediolanum (no. 188). Either M. Labik(anus) Memor or his father-in-law C. Atilius Secundus, or both, were associated with the collegium, but we do not know the nature of the connection. It remains to be seen whether the connection between the C. Atilii and the collegia centonariorum was merely incidental or representing a pattern. If the latter were true, was the connection originated in Liguria or Placentia (Regio VIII, Aemilia) and then extended to Mediolanum, or vice versa?

No. 120 may also point to the relationship between Mediolanum and Placentia. However, there are some uncertainties revolving around

---

95 C. Atilius Albucius was perhaps also connected with the collegia fabrum and centonariorum. He made a votive dedication to Jupiter the Best and the Greatest [I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(axio)]. The place was given by the permission of the collegium or collegia [L(ocus) d(atus) p(ermissu) c(ollegii)] (CIL V.5773).


97 The name C. Atilius Secundus is also attested in Mediolanum. A C. Atilius C. f. Secundus built a tomb for himself, his wife, Valeria P. l. Crocine, as well as a household slave girl (verna sua), who died at the age of ten (CIL V.5959). Nothing else is known of this C. Atilius Secundus.
the provenance and restoration of the inscription. In *CIL XI*, this
inscription is listed under Placentia. A dubious source attributed it to
Parma.\textsuperscript{98} Based on the content, Bormann suspected that the inscription
may have come from Mediolanum. The inscription was put up by the
collegia fabrum et cent(onariorum) of Mediolanum for their patron
and repunctor Q. Albinus Ouf(entia) Secundinus Mestrius Aebutius
Tullianus, who was a Roman equestrian, flamen of the deified Caracalla, duovir i(ure) d(icundo) MP, as well as cur(ator) r(ei) p(ublicae) of
Parma. Mommsen’s restoration for MP—M(unicipii) P(lacentiae)—was
followed by Waltzing. More recently, however, scholars have preferred
m(anumittendi) p(otestate).\textsuperscript{99} If the latter resolution is correct, then it
is possible that neither this person nor the inscription is relevant to
Placentia. After all, the tribal designation (Oufentia) of this person was
that of Mediolanum, not of Placentia (Voturia).

That the relationship between the collegia centonariorum and the
C. Atilii occurred in more than one place is not a unique situation.
The connection between the C. Vibii and the collegium centonariorum
is also attested in two places, Perusia and Brixia. In Brixia (Regio X),
the collegium centonariorum made a dedication to C. Vibius Iustus and
C. Vibius Burdo, both seviri Augustales (no. 169). The exact relation-
ship between the collegium and these two C. Vibii is not clear. The
inscription is datable to the first century or early second century AD.
In Perusia (Regio VI, Umbria), in the early third century AD, C. Vibius
C. f. L. n. Tromentina Gallus Proculeianus was the patron of the colle-
gium centonariorum (no. 101). This C. Vibius was the great-grandfather
of C. Vibius Trebonianus Gallus, emperor from AD 251–253. Were the
incidences of the connection between the collegia centonariorum and the
C. Vibii in Brixia and Perusia simply coincidental? Or could it be that
the gens Vibia had a continuous involvement in the textile trade and
spread the business into various regions? Our sources are inadequate
to warrant a definitive answer.

Not all the names occurring in the coll(egia) fabrum et centonariorum
of Mediolanum were common in the region. Two of the four curatores
in the 137th year of the collegial era (third century AD) had uncom-
mon gentilicia (no. 186). One such gentilicum was Bericricenionius.
H. Solin and O. Salomies (1994) did not record it, nor was it listed in
the index of nomina in *CIL V*. Another uncommon gentilicum was

\textsuperscript{98} Bormann, *ad CIL XI* 1230.
Scribonius, attested only three times in CIL V but known to be a common name in Rome and central Italy. So far, we have identified several rare gentilicia among the members of the collegia centonariorum in Italy. Heldius (Sentinum) and Bericricenionius (Mediolanum), for example, were such rare names. All are attested by one or two inscriptions each in the whole of the Empire. Uncommon names in local and regional contexts are Voesidennus (Sentinum), Apronius (Sentinum), and Scribonius (Mediolanum). To this list we may add Tadius (no. 182, Comum), Apicius (no. 181, Comum), Metellus (no. 146, Verona), and Samicius (no. 149, Verona). All these names occurred among the magistrates of the collegia centonariorum.

What does the presence of uncommon or less common names imply? In order to answer this question, a different one may be asked: why are these names uncommon? Not everyone received inscribed references or markers recording their names. This ‘epigraphic bias’ against the poorer strata of society suggests that what appear to us as rarer names may not have been rare in antiquity at all, but are simply underrepresented in the epigraphic data. In the provinces, certain less Roman-sounding names may have been replaced by more Roman-sounding ones when the family accumulated enough wealth for their sons/descendants to enter the decurial rank and/or to hold magistracies. These descendants might still have had connections to the business and collegia with which their ancestors were associated. However, such connections may no longer be recognizable onomastically. In such cases, upward social mobility may have rendered some names ‘rare’. Certain rare names may also be common in a different region or regions, and immigration may account for the presence of these names in a community. Taking

---

100 The gentilicium Tadius only occurs in this inscription in CIL V. Tadius is attested at least five times in CIL XI.

101 The gentilicium Apicius is attested three times in CIL V.

102 M. Metellus Hadrianus was magister collegi centonariorum candidatus. The term candidatus suggests that he died before the election was complete. Although it was a prominent name in Rome, Metellus was not a common gentilicium in Verona or Regio X. In Taurini, a P. Metellus L. f. was dec(urio) and quaestor of Taurini as well as decurio and duovir of Eporedia. He left 10,000 sesterces for the worship of Iovis Augustus in his will (CIL V.6955). This shows that at least at a certain point, the Metelli were a wealthy family and had influence in more than one city in northern Italy.

103 Samicus was attested four times in CIL V, three times in Venona, once in Mediolanum (CIL V 5846, tomb size: 40 x 13 ft²); twice in CIL XII, once in Moesia (soldier, AE 1936.12) Cf. Solin and Salomies 1994: 161.

104 C. Catullius Decinimus had held all kinds of magistracies in Lugdunum—Secerd(os) of the Templ(um) Romae and Aug(ustorum duorum or trium?). His father’s name was Tutius Catullinus (CIL XIII.1691).
all these factors into consideration, the presence of uncommon names among collegial members may suggest that the collegia, as support structures, were appealing or necessary for immigrants, and those small craftsmen/tradesmen not backed by elite families. However, it is rather difficult to further press this point especially since none of the collegia centonariorum discussed so far seem to have a overwhelming representation of collegiati with rare nominina gentilicia.

Flavia Solva (Noricum)

Along with the rescript from Septimius Severus and Caracalla, the collegium centonariorum of Solva inscribed the names of its members on the stone (no. 36). This is one of several well preserved alba of various collegia from Noricum, two of which have received thorough treatments by Piccottini (1993, 1994). The album from Solva (Table 5.2) still awaits comprehensive investigation. A comparison between all three alba will also yield interesting results concerning the varied composition of collegia in the frontier provinces.

The album was inscribed in seven columns, which had 14, 12, 12, 14, 14, 14, and 13 names, respectively, and 93 names altogether. The name of M. Secundius Secundinus, who bore the title of pater (collegii), was not included in the list, but is mentioned below it. It is not clear whether each column represents a decuria. In column VII, perhaps six to eight names were added later on, after the inscription was put up in AD 205. The carving of these names was very different from the rest. The names were not organized in alphabetical order, which was by no means unusual. E. Weber suggested that the names may have been arranged according to chronological order/seniority: the first columns recorded the names of the oldest members and the magistrates of the collegium; the last column, those of the most recent members.

In order to make some sense out of this album, a few words about the naming practices in the provinces are in order. Tria nomina signify Roman citizenship. Praenomina may be omitted, a practice amply attested both in Italy and in the provinces from the second century AD on. The peregrini usually had single names, to which paternal names in the genitive were attached. The indicator of filiation, f(ilius), however, was often omitted. The names of freedmen and slaves were usually

---

105 Few alba were arranged alphabetically. One rare example is CIL VI.30983.
Table 5.2. Album of the collegium centonariorum of Solva

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. I</th>
<th>Col. II</th>
<th>Col. III</th>
<th>Col. IV</th>
<th>Col. V</th>
<th>Col. VI</th>
<th>Col. VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>Maleio Maturi</td>
<td>Classician(us)</td>
<td>Crispinus</td>
<td>Vitalis</td>
<td>Fl(avius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iunianus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canio(nis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>Castruc(ius)</td>
<td>Primianus Primit(i)</td>
<td>Rett(ius) Heraclia</td>
<td>Pom(eius?)</td>
<td>Sext(ius) Max(i)mus</td>
<td>Genialis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---]l</td>
<td>Crisp(ius)</td>
<td>Secundin(us?)</td>
<td>Nonius Ter-tull(i)</td>
<td>Masculin(us)</td>
<td>Rutil(ius) Rutilianus</td>
<td>Terentinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>Respectinus</td>
<td>Sert(orius) Karus</td>
<td>Insequens Taciti</td>
<td>Tertullin(us)</td>
<td>Severus Senilis</td>
<td>Iustus Iustini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rest(itutti)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[---]cus</td>
<td>Cl(audius)</td>
<td>Vibi(nus)</td>
<td>Potentin(us)</td>
<td>Primigeni(a)n</td>
<td>Aur(eius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ti</td>
<td>Quintus</td>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>Catussa</td>
<td>Potentin(a)e</td>
<td>(-us) Primig(enii)</td>
<td>Maximus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---]n</td>
<td>Cong(ius?)</td>
<td>Ulp(ius) Vitalis</td>
<td>Secundus Tertull(i)</td>
<td>Atilis</td>
<td>Long(inius)</td>
<td>Crisp(us)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cosalus</td>
<td>Atilianus Attic(i)</td>
<td>Finitus Valention(is)</td>
<td>Fl(avius)</td>
<td>Dom(itius)</td>
<td>Honoratus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ursus</td>
<td>Emerit(us) Serotin(i)</td>
<td>Sert(orius) Karus jin(ior)</td>
<td>Kan(ius)</td>
<td>Adnamat(us?)</td>
<td>Ingenuus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publ(i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[---]incus</td>
<td>Iul(ius) Saturnin(us)</td>
<td>Calend(inus) Angulat(i)</td>
<td>Aur(elius)</td>
<td>Val(erius) Valerian(us)</td>
<td>Maleonis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mascul(i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>Vitalis Rucces(si?)</td>
<td>Spectat(inus) Spectati</td>
<td>Sabinianus(s)</td>
<td>Terti(us)</td>
<td>Lic(inius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvis(i)</td>
<td>Adnamati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[--- Vict</td>
<td>Valer(ius)</td>
<td>Kan(ius)</td>
<td>Valentin(us?) Vital(is)</td>
<td>Sacr(etius)</td>
<td>Iun(ius) Tertullus</td>
<td>Iun(ius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-orianti</td>
<td>Commod(us?)</td>
<td>Dignus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sextus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quintianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---ni</td>
<td>Maternus</td>
<td>Veranus Iun(i)</td>
<td>Iulius Ianarius</td>
<td>Secundian (-us) Secund(i)</td>
<td>Ingen(uus) Adnami</td>
<td>Secundinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crisp(i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---]tae</td>
<td>Iul(ius)</td>
<td>Marinian(us)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iul(ius)</td>
<td>Ruf(ius)</td>
<td>Macedo Optati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secundinus</td>
<td>Optatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---S]exti</td>
<td>Ulp(ius)</td>
<td>Quietus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iul(ius)</td>
<td>Marcianus</td>
<td>Ingenuus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I use the most recent version of the list, as published in Wedenig 1997: 224–26 S 25. Weber put the name Secundin(us) Adnamati in col. V line 16 (RIS: 204–06 no. 149) instead of col. II line 10. Weber read Mateio Maturi (col. III/1) instead of Malerio Maturi, Ingenuus Mateionis (col. VII/7) instead of ingenuus Maleionis. It is difficult to tell whether an I or a T should be preferred. The vertical stroke is clear enough, but the horizontal stroke above or below the vertical one is hard to see.
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composed of their own names and their patron or master’s names in the genitive plus the status indicators *lib(ertus)* or *ser(vus).* In the case of slave names, the owner’s name may be omitted; so, a single name + *S.* is indicative of slave status. In the case of the names of freedmen, it is still unclear how common it was to omit the freedman status indicator.

Of the 93 names in the Solva inscription, 42 were Roman citizens, 44 were *peregrini,* and the status of seven members is uncertain. Celtic names occurred among both the Roman citizens and the *peregrini.* The composition of the *collegium centonariorum* at Solva around AD 205 was, therefore, a mixture of Roman citizens and non-Roman citizens. Slightly more than half of the *collegiati* were *peregrini.* How typical was this mixed composition? Comparison with the membership lists of other *collegia* from the same province shows that the presence of *peregrini* was quite usual. An exceptional case is the *collegium* of the *cultores* D(ei) I(nvicti) M(ithrae) in Virunum. Among the 99 *cultores* Mithrae

---

109 For forms of names for freedmen, see *CIL* III.11735 = *RIS* 221; *CIL* III.11644 = *RIS* 291; *RIS* 292; etc. For the names of slaves, see *CIL* III.5699 = *RIS* 2; *CIL* III.5067 = *RIS* 261; *CIL* III.5061 = *RIS* 275; etc. Cf. Weber 1968: 44.


111 A woman’s name was often composed of her own name + her husband/father’s name in the genitive. Piccottini 1993: 111–22 = *AE* 1993.1245 a–b = Wedenig 1997.

112 Weber 1968: 206 counted only six uncertain cases. Uncertainty arises due to lacunae (col. I lines 1 and 2) or abbreviations (col. II/10; col. III lines 3 and 10; col. IV/3; col. VI/7). Rostovzeff, *SEHRE:* 551.

113 Celtic names: Adnamatus II 10, VI 7; Admanus VI 12; Catussa IV 5, Cosatus(?) II 7, Dubitanus II 9; Maleio III 1 and VII 7; Paterio (?) VI 6, VII 4; Recessus III 10; Serotinus (?) III 8; Surianus VII 8; Surio V 3. Cf. Weber 1968: 206 n. 1; von Hüttenebach 1989: 186–89.

114 For forms of names for freedmen, see *CIL* III.11735 = *RIS* 221; *CIL* III.11644 = *RIS* 291; *RIS* 292; etc. For the names of slaves, see *CIL* III.5699 = *RIS* 2; *CIL* III.5067 = *RIS* 261; *CIL* III.5061 = *RIS* 275; etc. Cf. Weber 1968: 44.
in AD 184, only two were non-Roman citizens: one was a *peregrinus*, the other was a slave, Speratus *s(ervus)* (col. IV/17). Four *cultores Mithrae* bore Greek *cognomina*. They may have been freedmen.\(^{115}\) The comparison of these lists shows that most associations in Noricum recruited their members on a mixed basis. This was perhaps also true in other provinces. In Dacia, all the magistrates (*magister, quaestores*) of the *collegium Iovis Cerneni* were *peregrini*.\(^{116}\) In Augusta Treverorum (modern Trier), of the 46 readable names of a *collegium*, 12 *gentilicia* seem to be Gallic in origin.\(^{117}\) Whether or not membership in the *collegia* was more desirable to the *peregrini* than to the Roman citizens is hard to say, unless we can assume that membership served as a kind of status symbol for non-citizens. Nor do we know the chronological changes in the ratio of *peregrini* to citizens in the *collegia*. The imperial rescript did not make a distinction between *collegiati* who were Roman citizens and those who were not. Wealth and occupation were the only criteria for differentiation. *Peregrini* among the *collegia* were treated on a par with Roman citizens; both were entitled to certain privileges, provided that they were bona fide *centonarii* and were not rich beyond the prescribed bar.

The absence of any explicit status indicators, such as *lib.* or *ser.*, suggested to E. Weber that the *collegium* did not have freed or slave members. Weber’s statement is true as far as the evidence goes, but it needs to be qualified because of the difficulty of identifying freedmen; moreover, even if there weren’t any freedmen in the membership, there were surely descendants of freedmen, who themselves may have been associated with the *collegium*. Such names as Ingenuus may be suspicious. Freed parents tended to name one of their children, often the first-born, *Ingenuus*/*Ingenua*.\(^{118}\) Therefore, in at least some instances, the name *Ingenuus* may imply descent from ex-slaves if not freedman status. Furthermore, as I mentioned before, the question of how often the status indicator among freedmen in the provinces was omitted has not been fully investigated. If, as in Italy, the freedman status indicator tends to be absent, then it will be impossible in many instances to distinguish


\(^{116}\) Artemidorus Apolloni, Iulius Iuli, Valerius Niconis, Offas Menofili (*ILS* 7215a = *IDR* 1.31; Flambard 1987: 240). These names were interpreted as slave names by Waltzing, followed by Flambard 1987: 240–41. But see *IDR*: I 198 for the discussion of these names (*peregrini*).


\(^{118}\) *CIL* III.5363 = *RIS* 195; *CIL* III.5376 = *RIS* 205. Weber 1968: 46.
the freedmen from the *ingenui* on purely onomastic grounds.\(^{119}\) In two cases, mothers’ names rather than patronyms follow single names (col. I/13 and col. V/5). These were perhaps illegitimate children.\(^ {120}\) Unlike the *album* of the *corpus sub(a)edianorum* found in Virunum, Noricum, where there were 19 clearly identifiable female names among the 52 names that have survived, there do not seem to have been any women in the *collegium centonariorum* of Solva.\(^ {121}\)

Kinship ties are difficult to establish purely on the basis of onomastics. Three aspects of the naming practices among the residents in Noricum contribute to this difficulty. First, Imperial names, such as Flavius, Aelius, Aurelius, Iulius, and Ulpius, were common names in Noricum. These names were acquired in various ways, most notably by serving in the army, as a result of which they were numerous among veterans. In most cases, we cannot be sure whether any connection existed between two persons bearing the same *gentilicium*, unless more specific information is available. The Iulii were many in the *collegium centonariorum* of Solva, but there is no reason to see them all as connected to each other.\(^ {122}\) Second, among *peregrini*, certain names were particularly popular. As a result, we do not know whether or not two or more persons bearing

---

\(^{119}\) In the *album* of the *cultores S(olis) I(nvicti) M(ithrae)* at Virunum, Noricum, among the members with *tria nomina*, some had Greek *cognomina*, but no status indicators were used (Piccottini 1994 = Wedenig 1997: 293–98 V 46).

\(^{120}\) Weber 1968: 44 with n. 18. Uncertainty arises in some instances, for some Celtic names end in -*a*. There were different types of illegitimate marriage: ‘marriage’ between free people and slaves, ‘marriage’ between Roman citizens and non-citizens, and, before Severus, soldiers’ ‘marriage’. The status of the children followed the status of the mother. The point is above all that the mother is always known, whereas the father could not be known with certainty. If the mother was not married, then the presumption of legitimacy accorded the children of married women would not be applicable.

\(^{121}\) Piccottini 1993: 114, 119: twelve out of the 19 women in the *album* were married to *collegiati*; three were sisters of *collegiati peregrini*; the other four were perhaps members in their own right.

\(^{122}\) Iul(ius) Saturnin(us) (col. III/9), Iul(ius) Ianuarius (col. IV/12), Iul(ius) Marinian(us) (col. IV/13), Iul(ius) Secundinus (col. V/12), Iul(ius) Tacitanus (col. V/14), Iul(ius) Valentinus (col. VII/9): since Iulius was a common name in Noricum, we do not know whether these Iulii were all connected or not. But it is very unlikely that they all belonged to the same family. Aur(elius) Maximus (col. VII/5), Aur(elius) Sabinian(us) (col. V/9); Fl(avius) Ann(i)anus (col. V/7), Fl(avius) Genialis (col. VII/1): since Aurelius and Flavius were Imperial names, the relationship between these Aurelii and Flavius is not certain. There is only the faintest possibility that Aur(elius) Sabinian(us) (col. V/9) was the son of Sabinian(u)s Sabini (col. V/10). If this was indeed the case, when the former was enfranchised, he took the Imperial name as his *nomen gentilicium* and his father’s name, Sabinian(us), as his *cognomen*. 
the same patronymic were the sons of the same father.\textsuperscript{123} These names include Adnamatus, Vibi, Secundus, Secundinus, Tertullius, Tertius, Quartus, Ingenuus, Primigenius, and Valentinus, to name just a few. Third, sometimes the names of father and son could be completely different.\textsuperscript{124} Therefore, without further information, some family relationships are simply unrecoverable. On one hand, all the aforementioned problems make it difficult to assess the influence of kinship ties on the recruitment process. On the other hand, it would be rash to dismiss all together the role that kinship may have played in the membership composition. Sert(orius) Karus iun(ior) (col. IV/8), for example, was quite likely the son of Sert(orius) Karus (col. III/4). When the gentilicium or patronymic involved was not particularly common in the local context, the possibility that the shared gentilicium indicates kinship relationship increases.\textsuperscript{125} Castruc(ius) Castruci(i) (col. II/2) and Quintus Castruci(i) (col. II/6) may both have been the sons of the same Castrucius or two different Castrucii, but it is also possible that Quintus Castrucius was the son of Castruc(ius) Castruci(i).\textsuperscript{126} Quintianus Quinti (col. VII/11) may

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{123} von Hüttenbach 1989.
\item \textsuperscript{124} CIL III.5663 = Wedenig 1997: 157–59 Cet. 5: one of the sons of M. Sextius Vettonianus was P. Aelius Marcianus; CIL III.5357 = RIS 227: Cla(u)dius Restutus and Cas(s)ia Qu(a)tra’s two sons took their gentilicium from their mother, Cas(s)ius Ingeniu(s) and Cas(s)ius Restutius.
\item \textsuperscript{125} Boldface indicates shared names: Crisp(ius) Quartzus (col. II/3), Crisp(ius) Horatus (col. VII/6); Iun(ius) Tertullus (col. VI/11), Iun(ius) Paterio (col. VII/4), Iun(ius) Secundinus (col. VII/12); Kan(ius) Dignus (col. III/11), Kan(ius) Valentin(us) (col. V/8); Sextus or Iun(ius) Atilis (col. V/6), Sextus Iun(ius) Maximus (col. VI/2); Ulpius Iun(ius) Vitalis (col. III/6), Ulpius Iun(ius) Quetius (col. IV/14): whether these two persons were connected is not certain. The name Ulpius may have two origins in Gallia and Germania: (1) from the Imperial name, M. Ulpius Traianus; (2) from the Latinized form of the Germanic/Celtic noun for ‘wolf’. (von Hüttenbach 1989: 170, citing Mócsy 1959: 148.)
\item \textsuperscript{126} Other examples: Brothers (?): Dom(itius) Adnamat(i) (col. VI/7), Secundinus Adnamati (col. II/10); it is not clear whether Dom(itius) was a Roman citizen or not; the name Adnamat. following Dom(itius) could have been either Adnamat(i) or Adnamat(us); [--- Quart(i) (col. I/6), Secundin(us?) Quart(i?) (col. III/3); Vitalis Ingenui (col. VI/1), Marcianus Ingenui (col. VI/10). Vitalis Ingenui (col. VI/1) and Marcianus Ingenui (col. VI/10) may be related. It is, however, not certain whether or not the Ingenuus in these two names refer to the same person. If Vitalis and Marcianus were both sons of Ingenuus Adnami (col. VI/12) or Ingenuus Maleionis (col. VII/7), then Vitalis and Marcianus were brothers. But if Vitalis and Marcianus were sons of different Ingenui, there may have been no relationship at all between them. It is also possible that the father of Vitalis and Marcianus was not one of the Ingenui in the album. Father and son, nephew and uncle, grandfather and grandson: Maleio Maturi (col. III/1), Ingenuus Maleionis (col. VII/7): Ingenuus may have been the son of Maleio, son of Maturius. As mentioned before, it is not clear whether or not this Ingenuus was the father of Vitalis (col. VI/1) and/or Marcianus (col. VI/10);
have been the son of Quintus, son of Castrucius (Quintus Castruci(i); col. II/6), and nephew of Castruc(ius), son of Castrucius (col. II/2). Or Quintianus may have been the grandson of Castrucius Castruci(i), if Castruc(ius) Castruci(i) (col. II/2) and Quintus Castruci(i) (col. II/6) were father and son instead of brothers.

Also of particular interest is the relatively late date of the inscriptions relating to Norican collegia: the epigraphic data mostly belong to the time of Commodus and the Severans, although the inscriptive evidence from the earlier period is much more abundant in general. Alföldy suspects that the economic difficulties after the Marcomannic Wars began led the urban craftsmen to join collegia on a larger scale.\footnote{Alföldy 1974: 190.}

\textit{Aquincum}

In Aquincum (as well as in Apulum), Imperial names like Publius Aelius were very common. It becomes very difficult, even impossible, to discern the nature of the relationship between people bearing the same gentilicium on purely onomastic grounds. I will not attempt an onomastic analysis for these places, focusing instead on the significance of the presence of veterans among collegia in Aquincum and some other frontier urban settings that grew from canabae.

In Aquincum and the nearby Ulcisia Castra (Pannonia Inferior), at least five tombstones have been found for veterans of the legio II adiutrix that were erected by the collegia fabrum et centonariorum (nos. 202, 203, 211, 216, 221). In Aquincum, a member of the coll(egium) vet(eranorum) was perhaps also a member of the collegium c[enton(ari)orum] (no. 209). In Carnuntum (Pannonia Superior), no. 223 mentions two m[agistri coll(egiarum?) vet[eranorum?] centonariat(m)].\footnote{Ausbüttel 1982: 75 n. 27.} While individual veterans were sometimes patrons and/or members of collegia in Italy,\footnote{In collegium fabrum (CIL V.908, Aquileia); collegium tibicinum (CIL VI.2584 = ILS 2049, Rome); collegium fabrum tignariarum (CIL IX.3923, Alba Fucens); patron of collegium dendrophorum and collegium fabrum (CIL IX.1459, Ligures Baebiani).} the clear visibility of veterans within the membership of a

\textbf{Secundin(us) Adnamati (col. V/15), Surianus Secundini (col. VII/8):} Surianus may have been the son of Secundin(us), son of Adnamatus. The pater of the collegium, M. Secundius Secundinus, may or may not have been connected with these two members; Nonius Tertull(i)n(i or us?) (col. IV/3) and Tertullin(us) Tutoris (col. V/4): it is not clear whether or not Nonius was a Roman citizen; the name Tertull(i)n. following Nonius could be either nominative or genitive.

\footnote{In collegium fabrum (CIL V.908, Aquileia); collegium tibicinum (CIL VI.2584 = ILS 2049, Rome); collegium fabrum tignariarum (CIL IX.3923, Alba Fucens); patron of collegium dendrophorum and collegium fabrum (CIL IX.1459, Ligures Baebiani).}
collegium was typical of the militarily heavy zones including the frontier provinces of Germania, Panonnia, and Noricum, as well as the areas surrounding the naval bases at Ravenna and Puteoli (near Misenum).\textsuperscript{130} Interestingly, P. Aelius Respectianus, a freedman of a veteran, was also recorded as a member of the collegium centonariorum (no. 218). He was buried by his fellow freedwomen, coni libertae. It may be argued that the high visibility of veterans as collegia members was due to a stronger epigraphic habit among the veterans in the frontier provinces. But that cannot be the entire explanation, especially since the relevant inscriptions seem to have been put up by the collegia rather than the veterans themselves.

The presence of veterans in the collegia may have had some impact on the internal organization and/or the terminology used for collegial magistrates or staff. The title vexillarius collegii, for example, has been attested in Aquincum. Ael(ius) Annianus made a votive dedication to I(ovius) O(ptimus) M(aximus) and Liber Pater for his own health as well as that of the five vexillarii of the collegium centonariorum (no. 211). The vexillarii collegii may have carried the banners of their collegia in parades.\textsuperscript{131} But it is also possible that vexillarius was just an honorary title.\textsuperscript{132} The title vexillarii of various other collegia have been attested in Pannonia (Aquincum, Oescius), Dacia (Sarmizegetusa, Drobota), Dalmatia (Salona), Moesia (Nicopolis), and Regio X (Brixia).\textsuperscript{133} All these places were either close to military bases or were military bases themselves. The title vexillarius very likely reflected the penetration of military vocabulary into civilian life. Such a title, though ‘military’-sounding, was not necessarily indicative of a military or para-military nature of these organizations.

‘Outsiders’ and Multiple Affiliations

The presence of ‘outsiders’ (in the sense of ‘non-centonarii’) in collegia has already been touched on in Chapter 2, as well as earlier in this present chapter. There do not seem to have been any legislative efforts to

\textsuperscript{130} Waltzing IV: 151–52.
\textsuperscript{131} For the banners of collegia and their participation in parades, see SHA, Gall. 8.6; Aurel. 34.4.
\textsuperscript{132} In military, men with 20 years of service or more but not yet discharged may be also designated as vexillarii, as they are still sub vexillo. (Mann 2000: 153–55).
\textsuperscript{133} Waltzing IV: 430.
forbid the admission of outsiders as *collegiati*. Several legal citations preserved in Justinian’s *Digesta* attest to the tolerance of such practices. On the other hand, the presence of outsiders in those *collegia* that were granted privileges for their public services was a concern to both the emperor and the provincial administrators. As the case of Solva shows, the presence of outsiders in such *collegia* may sometimes have been a source of conflict between the *collegia* and the local administrators or provincial governors. The key issue for the government was how to prevent these ‘outsiders’ from taking advantage of the privileges while not providing any of the services to which these privileges were attached. For this reason, the Roman administrators sometimes interfered with recruitment. Thus Pliny the Younger promised to Trajan that “no one would be admitted except a *faber* (*ne quis nisi faber recipiatur*)” into the *collegium fabrum*, which he proposed to establish after a conflagration in Nicomedia. But in general, it seems that whether or not to take outsiders was up to the *collegia*. The openness of recruitment has been attested in a variety of *collegia*, although certain *collegia* such as the *collegium* of the *negotiaiores eborarii et citrarii* had firm policies against taking in non-practitioners.

As far as the *collegia centonariorum* are concerned, there are three suspect cases of ‘outsiders’. In Brixia, the *collegium centonariorum* put up a tombstone for one L. Cornelius Marius and took on the obligation to put roses on his tomb *in perpetuum* (*rosalia*). His relationship with the *collegium* is not stated, but he was probably a member. The name is followed by *pictori*. It is not entirely certain whether this describes his occupation or was a second *cognomen* (no. 153). The *praenomen* and *nomen* L. Cornelius are of some interest. The *collegia fabrum* and *centonariorum* honored L. Cornelius Prosodius, (*sevir Aug(ustalis)* of both Brixia and Veron(a) (no. 161). Perhaps these *collegia*, especially the *collegium centonariorum*, had traditional connections with the L. Corneli. This is plausible, especially since the Corneli of Brixia seem to have been much involved in the textile sector since at least the first

---

134 Dig. 50.6.6.6, 50.6.6.12.
135 E.g., *scaenici Asiaticiani et qui in eodem corpore sunt* (*CIL* XII.1929, Vienna); *collegium fabrorum et qui in eo [sunt]* (*CIL* VII.11, Noviomagus Regnum in Britannia); *aurificibus et coniugibus eorum et (iis) qui inter nos sunt* (*AE* 1891.14 = *CIL* VI.33885 = W 2414 = *ILS* 7214 = *FIRA III* 33 (Hadrian)): *Item placere ut si alius quam negotiator eborarius aut citrarius [p]er [fr]audem curatorum in hoc collegium adlectus esset, uti curatores eius [causa] ex albo raderentur ab ordine.*
century AD.\textsuperscript{137} L. Cornelius Ianuarius, son of L. Cornelius Primio (\textit{sic}!), was buried by the felt workers (?), \textit{lanari coa<ct>ores}\.\textsuperscript{138} L. Cornelius L.f. Labeo was a \textit{pectinarius} (wool-comber).\textsuperscript{139} The \textit{collegium centonariorum} seems also to have been connected with another branch of the \textit{gens Cornelia}. The \textit{collegium} put up a tombstone for M. Cornelius M. f. Proculus, his father M. Cornelius Aequus, and his mother Quinta (no. 160).

Another case was Primus Valerius Magirra, from Brixia (no. 167). The \textit{cognomen} Magirra is Greek for \textit{cocus} (cook).\textsuperscript{140} It is possible that he acquired the \textit{cognomen} from his occupation. He was probably affiliated with both \textit{collegium fabrum} and the \textit{collegium centonariorum}, although his occupation may have had nothing to do with either building or textile production. It may be possible that he was simply the cook of the \textit{colleg(ia)}.

A sarcophagus from Aquincum commemorates two people: C. Iulius Feletio, a doctor from Africa (\textit{domo Africa medico}), and his brother Iulius Athenodorus (no. 204). The burial of C. Iulius Feletio was taken care of by his parents, C. Iulius Filetus and Iulia Euthenia. Iulius Athenodorus, however, was commemorated by Euthenia alone, with the \textit{collegium centonariorum} contributing the handsome sum of 300 denarii (= 1,200 sesterces) for his burial. The inscription did not specify the occupation of Athenodorus or his relationship to the \textit{collegium centonariorum}.

Why did ‘outsiders’ wish to join a \textit{collegium} that was not related to their own occupations? Why were the \textit{collegia} willing to accept ‘outsiders’? It seems that whether or not to accept outsiders was up to individual associations. Apart from the hankering after privileges mentioned above, there could have been diverse reasons and motivations on both sides.\textsuperscript{141} For example, the lack of \textit{collegia} for cooks

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{137} Vicari 2001.
\textsuperscript{138} \textit{CIL} V.4505 = \textit{IB} 311 = \textit{ILS} 7557 = \textit{InscrIt} 10.5.297; Mollo 2000: 315 no. CCCXX and CCCXXI.
\textsuperscript{139} \textit{AE} 1972.210 = \textit{InscrIt} 10.5.298; Mollo 2000: 317 no. CCCXXIV (first century AD).
\textsuperscript{140} \textit{Magirra/magirus} for \textit{cocus}, see \textit{AE} 137.159: \textit{M. Aurelius Aug. lib. Hermes, archimagirus}. He was apparently a master cook among the \textit{coci} mentioned in the last line of the inscription.
\textsuperscript{141} For Medieval parallels, see Thrupp 1963: 258; Edgren 1977: 144; Goldthwaite 1980: 255; Swanson 1983: 10: “in some Late Medieval cities, presumably because of limited numbers, the masons sometimes amalgamated with other crafts such as the painters, saddlers, and cardmakers;” Ward 1997 (on early modern London): 48: “[The
or painters in town may account for the presence of *cocus/magirra* and *pictor* in the *collegium centonariorum* in Brixia, if these indicated occupations rather than names. The traditional connection between a certain *collegium* and a family may also explain the admission of ‘outsiders’, as in the case of L. Cornelius Marius, *pictor*, of Brixia. It is also possible that the non-*centonarii* in the *collegia* were staff rather than regular members. Some *collegiati* came from places other than where they joined the *collegia*. Iulius Athenodoros (Aquincum) may have been such a case. His whole family seemed to have emigrated to Aquincum from Africa. Such non-natives perhaps sought affiliation with the *collegia* that could provide the best support structures (including burial arrangements) and social opportunities. This type of situation is particularly well attested in commercial centers such as Lugdunum. Furthermore, membership could quite possibly have been gained by means of monetary contributions.

A separate but related phenomenon was the tendency of *collegiati* to have multiple affiliations. I have already discussed the overlapping membership of the *collegium fabrum*, *collegium centonariorum*, and *cultores d(ei) s(olis) i(nvicti) Mithrae* in Sentinum. As far as the *collegia centonariorum* are concerned, we have several more such cases. *Collegiati* with multiple affiliations are particularly well attested in commercial centers such as Lugdunum. C. Ruson(ius) Muron, an

---

Carpenter’s Company’s) Petition also complained that children of citizens often learned trades other than their fathers’ only to join their fathers’ companies by patrimony according to the custom of London. See also Ward 1997: 50: guilds may add workers from a variety of occupations to their staff on a continuing basis for the maintenance of the guild halls and properties.

### Notes


143 For *collegia* in general, multiple affiliations are best attested in Ostia and Lugdunum. For Ostia, see, e.g., *CIL XIV*. 128, 309, 374, 4569, 4656; *AE* 1989.124; Royden 1988: 65 no. 4, 70 no. 17, 106–08 no. 98. For many more examples, see Meiggs 1973; Royden 1988: 25–125. For parallels of multiple affiliations from the Hellenistic era, see Gabrielsen 2001: 230–31; from Medieval Zamora, Spain, "commoners shared with clerics
ex-magistrate among the (se)viri A[ug(ustales)] of Lugdunum, was also an ex-magistrate among the centonarii and a member of the corpus sagariorum (no. 27). [Mu]natius Felix was curator of both the corpus (se)virorum Augustalium and the corpus dendrophorum of Lugdunum (no. 14). In addition, he was patron of the centonarii that resided in Lugdunum and held all kinds of magistracies among them. Since they were often great merchants involved in a variety of trades, the negotiatores, the navicularii, and the nautae, in particular, tended to have membership in more than one collegium (see also nos. 15 and 17). In Verona, C. Samicius Firmus, sevir Cl(audialis) maior, seems to have been affiliated with the coll(egium) dendr(ophorum) and the coll(egium) cent(onariorum) (no. 149). In Fanum Fortunae, T. Flavius Eutiches, sev(ir) Aug(ustalis) may have been a member of the collegium fabrum, the collegium dendrophorum, and the collegium centonariorum (no. 77). In Brixia, L. Gabo Arunculeius Valerianus, a Roman equestrian, was the curator of both the collegium fabrum and the collegium centonariorum (no. 151); M. Vettidius Aquilei[e]sis, a (se)vir Aug(ustalis) quinquentalis, held magistracies in all the collegia of Brixia (no. 164). In Carnuntum, the collegium centonariorum and collegium veteranorum shared two or more magistri (no. 223). Finally, three out of the seven praefecti of the collegium centonariorum were also praefecti of the collegium fabrum (nos. 225, 227, Savaria; no. 134, Aquileia). It is not always clear whether or not the members who were affiliated with multiple collegia at the same time were closely involved in all the relevant trades. What seems fairly clear is that multiple affiliations occurred only among the wealthier collegiati; they were either Augustales, decuriones, equestrians, or veterans. It is possible that they had extensive business interests in more than one trade, which would explain their presence in multiple collegia. However, it is also possible that the collegia themselves were interested in enlisting these relatively

and nobles an interest in joining several different spiritual alliances. A gardener residing in the parish of San Juan in 1556 claimed affiliation with seven confraternities, and in 1564 the wife of another gardener claimed six. The weaver Juan Mogollo belonged in 1578 to a special confraternity composed solely of workers of his own trade as well as five other devotional groups. In 1598 the tailor Antonio López belonged to six and the widowed María Alvarez claimed membership in seven” (Flynn 1989: 23).

144 For many other examples of negotiatores, navicularii, and nautae having membership in multiple collegia at Lugdunum, Ostia and Rome in particular, see e.g., CIL XIII.1960, 1966, 1967, 1996; CIL XIV.430; Royden 1988: 76 no. 28; 78 no. 31; CIL VI.9682,29722; W 1313.

rich people, regardless of whether or not they were associated with the relevant occupations.

The phenomenon of multiple membership incurred legislative concerns. Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, for example, ruled that it was illegal for a *collegiatus* to be associated with more than one legitimate *collegium*. But the *collegiatus* was entitled to choose the *collegia* he preferred, and when he withdrew from a *collegium*, he received back from the *collegium* in question the share that was due to him.\textsuperscript{146} Scholars have proposed various explanations for the motivation(s) behind this restriction. According to some scholars, the ban reflected governmental concern for potential seditious activities.\textsuperscript{147} De Robertis, however, suggested rather that this measure aimed at forcing the *collegiati* to devote their resources to specific public services.\textsuperscript{148} Rickman, followed by Ausbüttel, tended to think that the ban on multiple affiliations was to make administration easier.\textsuperscript{149} Whichever explanation is the correct one, however, it is beyond doubt that the phenomenon of multiple membership continued into the third century AD and even later. The case of Sentinum (AD 260s) provides an illustrative example. Perhaps the legal regulation was not efficiently enforced; or perhaps the ruling was only aimed at (a) specific case(s) but not intended to be universally applied at all.

*Conclusion*

The membership composition of the *collegia centonariorum* varied in different regions. As far as we can tell from the evidence, the percentage of freedmen members was perhaps higher in Rome, Lugdunum, and perhaps Sassina than in cities elsewhere, especially those in the frontier provinces, such as Pannonia and Noricum. In the latter two provinces, the *collegia* tended to have large numbers of veterans and *peregrini* among their members. The collegial membership does not seem to discriminate on the basis of citizenship, or legal status. From a different perspective, this indifference may also mean that collegial

\textsuperscript{146} *Dig.* 47.22.1.2 (Marcianus 3 *inst.*).
\textsuperscript{147} Waltzing I: 354.
\textsuperscript{148} De Robertis 1955: 179–80.
\textsuperscript{149} Rickman 1981: 229.
membership was by no means only attractive to or jealously guarded by groups of specific legal or social status across time or geography.

One or several gentilicia may have had a higher frequency within a given collegium at a given time. The clustering of the L. Octavii and the M. Octavii among the centonarii and sagarii at Rome in the first century BC and/or AD, for example, may suggest that a couple of families used the collegium as the instrument for maintaining their joint power. But we do not have continuous membership lists over a long enough period of time to enable us to observe changes in the internal composition of the collegia centonariorum in different places. Kinship relationships can occasionally be detected among the members; and one family’s association with the same collegium may continue for more than one generation. But the meaning(s) of such phenomena can be interpreted in different ways. It may possibly but not necessarily point to sons continuing their fathers’ business or crafts. It may also suggest that some families were more (demographically) stable than others, or that the collegium functioned as a community or support structure for the members’ families. But again, the current state of our sources makes it rather impossible to gauge how significant a factor kinship was in collegium recruitment over an extended period of time in any given place. It should also be noted that onomastic analysis has serious limitations when it comes to identifying such important relationships as that based on marriage.¹⁵⁰ How many in-laws were there at any given time in a given collegium? How might marriage relationships have complicated the social network within the collegium? These questions will remain unsolvable unless we obtain more information.

Not all the gentilicia among the collegiati were prominent names in local and regional contexts. A small percentage of the names of the collegiati known to us from inscriptions are rarely attested names. These phenomena may suggest that collegia, as support structures, were perhaps important for those craftsmen/tradesmen who were not backed by local elite families. At least in some cities (e.g., Mediolanum), however, some collegiati seem to have either come from or been connected with prominent local families. Trans-regional connections between the

¹⁵⁰ Medieval and Early Modern parallels show that intermarriage between the families of members was an important element in internal guild politics. See, for example, the various studies in Woolf (ed.) 1991. The close interaction between family strategies, kinship networks, and the guild system can also be seen in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, see Ehmer 1991: esp. 193–96.
collegia centonariorum and certain names have been attested in two cases. Some members apparently traveled and may have had business connections in cities other than their own. But we know nothing about how a centonarius would have been treated by the collegia centonariorum in other cities.\textsuperscript{151} In Lugdunum, the centonarii from elsewhere formed their own collegium, distinct from the local collegium centonariorum. It is difficult, however, to be assertive on the issue of whether the existing collegium had the effect of blocking out the new immigrants.

Multiple affiliations are attested among the wealthier collegiati. Rich collegiati were not rare, which confirms the theory that at least some collegium members were shop owners, or master artisans. However, the large size of the collegia centonariorum in several places suggests recruitment on a mixed basis. Whether these collegia as social structures function as a contributing factor towards ‘fragmented social hierarchy’,\textsuperscript{152} however, is to be viewed with caution. Given the fragmentary state of the evidence concerning the membership composition, it is rather impossible, for example, to gauge how easy or difficult for a member of freedman status to advance himself to high magistracy within a collegium if it were dominated by ingenui.

An estimate of the contribution of the centonarii to local textile production may be helpful for a better understanding of professional textile production in the Roman economy. But such an estimate would be necessarily difficult to make, for want of statistics. Only in a few cases do we know the sizes of these collegia. In Solva, the collegium had 93 members and a pater. In Mediolanum and Ravenna, the collegia centonariorum were divided into 12 centuriae (or 60 decuriae) together with the fabri and at least 17 decuriae, respectively; and the centonarii may have numbered several hundred. In these two cities, the centonarii may have constituted up to two percent of the total population,\textsuperscript{153} not

\textsuperscript{151} Ascough 1997: 223–41 tries to show that some voluntary associations had translocal links. But his examples were mostly foreigners’ groups, groups that centered on such Eastern cults as the worship of Isis, and the ecumenical guild of the Dionysiac artists. Ascough’s main point is to argue that the Christian congregations were locally-based organizations with few translocal connections. This must have also been the case with the majority of the Roman collegia.

\textsuperscript{152} Tran 2006: 203.

\textsuperscript{153} Suppose 600:30,000. For the population of Mediolanum, see Morley 1996: 182. Cf. also Garnsey 1976: 13 n. 2. Ravenna should not be much below that. Calderini estimated the population of Mediolanum in the third century AD at 400,000 (1965: 136); this figure is subject to serious doubts if we consider the general distribution of urban population. Cf. Harris 1993: 11.
a particularly high number compared to the high percentage of professional textile workers in the Medieval times.\textsuperscript{154} In many other places, the number might have been still lower. A reasonable estimate would be 10–60 members, based on data available from other \textit{collegia}\.\textsuperscript{155} If we accept that the population of the majority of Roman cities fell in the 5,000–20,000 range, then the percentage of \textit{centonarii} in the various cities may have ranged from 0.05 to 1.2 percent.\textsuperscript{156} However, we do not know whether or to what extent these \textit{collegium} members represented the total work force in the textile sector in a given community. First of all, there is the difficult question of whether or not the master craftsmen and those who work for them were both normally included. Some known members of the \textit{collegia centonariorum} were \textit{Augustales} or even equestrians; they must have been shop owners or big-time businessmen. In such cases, the work force under the masters’ control could easily multiply the percentage of (professional) textile workers in the local population. In other cases, we know some of the other members by name only; and about the majority, we know nothing at all. Were they shop owners/master craftsmen or dependent workers? At any rate, if we count the families and the apprentices of these \textit{centonarii}, which we certainly should, the estimate of the proportion of the population engaged in commercially oriented textile production would surely be higher.\textsuperscript{157} What makes things more complicated is the problem of the composition of the Roman \textit{collegia}, which did not necessarily include all the professional workers in a specific trade. It was not uncommon for some craftsmen or tradesmen to remain outside the \textit{collegia}.\textsuperscript{158} In several visual representations of Roman occupations, the figures depicted are apparently engaged in textile production; but judging from the inscriptions, they do not appear to belong to any \textit{collegium}.\textsuperscript{159}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{154} For six selected early modern cities, the textile industry’s share of the working population averaged about 35 percent (Jongman 1988a: 155–56, 162).
\textsuperscript{157} For Egypt, van Minnen 1987: 37: “other categories should be added: women, apprentices and other dependent persons who worked in the same craft but were not (yet) incorporated in a guild.” \textit{P.Oxy.} 1414 suggests that both those who took oden from the government and their wives were involved in spinning.
\textsuperscript{158} It was also possible, and perhaps not uncommon, for a craftsman/tradesman to remain outside the guilds in the Middle Ages (cf. Thrupp 1963: 258).
\textsuperscript{159} Zimmer 1982; Vicari 2001. See also Chapter 2.
\end{flushright}
There is no doubt that the *collegia* also admitted people who practiced occupations outside the textile trade, but concrete examples are few. All of these variables would certainly make it impossible to come up with an accurate estimate of the urban-based work force in this sector.
How desirable was the title of collegial patron? To whom was it particularly appealing? What influenced the benefactors and patrons to associate themselves with certain collegia? What were the roles of the collegia in their dealings with the patrons and benefactors? These are the central questions of this chapter. It is not intended to be an exhaustive study of collegial patronage; my focus is the collegia centonariorum. But the discussion will take place in the context of the broader phenomenon of euergetism and patronage, especially since, as already discussed in Chapter 4, the sharing of patrons and benefactors was a common phenomenon. As such, my attention is not simply to document specific relationships, but to investigate the dynamics of the interaction between collegia and the (potential) patrons/benefactors. Such an exploration has significant bearing on how collegia became interwoven into the fabric of social networks in the Western cities. Quite recently, J. R. Patterson approached the patronage of the Augustales and collegia as one of the key features in the transformation of the Italian towns under the Principate. He painted a rather rosy picture of (the mechanisms) of social mobilities:

The existence of Augustales and the collegia helped to socialize the upwardly mobile into the civilized nexus of patronage, benefaction, and reciprocal honours that characterized the Roman city, and allowed their members to participate in civic affairs to their own benefit and that of the community more generally.¹

Patterson’s argumentation, however, cannot be complete without a more elaborate inquiry into the formation of or the gaps in the “nexus of patronage, benefaction and the reciprocal honours.” This present Chapter contributes to the understanding of these aspects through a case study of the collegia centonariorum.²

¹ Patterson 2006: 262. See also Tran 2006 passim.
² It is sometimes assumed that patronage, as understood in the Roman context, is generally lacking from the Medieval system of guilds/confraternities (e.g., van Minnen 1987: 55). But see Rosser 1996b: 440–41.
Patronage and Euergetism: Conceptual Framework and Definition

While personal patronage and patronage of civitates have been established as central themes in the discourse on social and political aspects of ancient history,\(^3\) patronage of collegia and other smaller types of collectivities—such as tribes, plebes, and neighborhoods (vici)—incurred serious attention only recently.\(^4\) The patron-client relationship is often defined as an asymmetrical and voluntary relationship marked by unequal exchange of the different resources (broadly defined) possessed by the two parties.\(^5\) According to this definition, the actual use of the term *patronus* should be treated as a less important indicator of a patron-client relationship than the activities leading toward an exchange of resources;\(^6\) in fact, a varied vocabulary can be used to describe this relationship.\(^7\) Finally, the effects of patronage are viewed in terms of cohesion, integration, or schism.\(^8\) The value of such a sociological approach “lies in the possibility it creates of cross-cultural comparison and of analyzing the dynamics of specific social systems.”\(^9\) On the other hand, there are dangers inherent in rolling into one category a vast range of social phenomena, as has been repeatedly noted.\(^10\)

---


\(^6\) Saller 1980: chapter 1, esp. 11, 18; Saller 1989: 57: “More important than the language is what the patterns of behaviour and social conventions reveal about the Roman understanding of these relationships.”

\(^7\) Saller 1980; Rich 1989.

\(^8\) Saller 1980: 150.


\(^10\) Saller’s work is not received without disputes; see the reviews by E. Badian in *CPh* 77 (1982): 348–49; John D’Arms in *CPh* 81 (1986): 95–98. For a recent criticism of this approach, see “The more the concept of patronage covers, the less it explains” (Yakobson 1999: 81); Eilers 2002: 6–7, which should be read in conjunction with Koenraad
A different approach, emphasizing the possible economic roles of patrons, is to be found in P. van Minnen and H. W. Pleket’s studies of urban craftsmen and elites in the Roman economy. It is their main contention that the nature of the ancient economy differs from that of pre-modern Europe in structure rather than in quantity of production: unlike in the Medieval period, when the elite was directly involved, elites in the Roman Imperial period may have been ‘merchants in disguise’, who dominated trade and production “directly via slaves/freedmen and indirectly via lending to tenants or debtors.”11 In other words, the elites “kept themselves in the background” and assumed the roles of patrons.12

Van Nijf has evaluated both approaches in his study of the honorific practices of the Eastern collegia. Having placed patronage and euergetism on an equal footing, he emphasizes the symbolic value of honorific inscriptions by identifying them as a source of prestige, on which the patron/benefactor’s position of social and political prominence depended. In van Nijf’s analysis, these inscriptions reveal how dependent the collegia were on their wealthy patrons and benefactors for legal assistance and intercession, the improvement of infrastructures essential for their trades, and other means to furthering their economic interests.13 At the same time, he demonstrates that there is too little evidence for the personal involvement of patrons and benefactors in the business activities of the collegia. Nor is there any evidence for the statement “that patronage relationships were used as a dignified smoke screen for economic involvement.”14

To a great extent, these conclusions are also applicable to the patronage of collegia in the West. However, as inclusive and insightful as van Nijf’s discussion is, it will be of some benefit if we clarify and disentangle three fundamental issues. First, one has to agree with van Nijf that we lack unequivocal evidence of patrons’ having economic interests in the collegia they supported. But this observation may actually mean

---

12 van Minnen 1987: 55, esp. n. 91: “Needless to say, some of these patrons may have been involved in the business of the guilds, by way of investments.”
little, in view of the general lack of explicit reference to elite involvement in economic activities.\textsuperscript{15} As I have already discussed in Chapter 5, onomastic studies may help us to understand the relationship between patrons and collegia. If the nomen gentilicium of the patron overlaps with some or many of the members of the collegium, we might suspect direct involvement on the part of the patron in that trade.\textsuperscript{16} As far as the centonarii are concerned, however, the data is too fragmentary for us to discern any such pattern. At the same time, the existence of rare nomina gentilicia among the collegial members may suggest that traders and/or artisans who had not had pre-existing links with locally important families can be integrated into a larger social network of patronage through the patron(s) of the collegium.\textsuperscript{17} But the caprice of our evidence prevent further conclusions.

Second, van Nijf claims that the Romans saw no conceptual difference between the patronage of individuals and that of collectivities.\textsuperscript{18} In many ways, this is true. After all, fundamentally, both individual and collective clients were sources of prestige for the patrons, who were in turn sources of material benefits, legal advocacy, and protection for their clients.\textsuperscript{19} As in personal patronage, the number and/or types of collegia one patronized served as a general indication of one’s power and wealth. But the evidence also warrants the acknowledgement of certain differences. Most notably, the extent of formalization was much less imperative in relationships of personal patronage than in relationships between patrons and collectivities.\textsuperscript{20} The formalization of a patronage relationship could be manifested in various ways, among them cooptatio and the granting of a bronze patronage tablet (tabula patronatus), which will be discussed in greater detail below. Patronage of collectivities could

\textsuperscript{15} But for the scholarly opinions that favor the involvement of some urban elites in production and commerce, see more recently Wallace-Hadrill 1991: 249–50; Aubert 1994; Mouritsen 1997: 59–82 (agriculture and commerce would have been closely integrated; the separation of trade and agriculture may have been more of an ideal than economic reality; “this aristocratic self-image cannot as a matter of course be applied to local elites in imperial Italy, where a rigid distinction between landed and commercial income seems unrealistic”); Shaw 2001: 242; Wilson 2002: 260–62; Marzano 2007.

\textsuperscript{16} But see the caution in Tran 2006.

\textsuperscript{17} A useful parallel is perhaps Bagnall 1993: 214–25, on the patronage relationship between landowners and village tenants.


\textsuperscript{20} Eilers 2002: passim, esp. 184.
also be listed along with one’s formal *cursus*, that is, the list of official positions one had held. In other words, like patronage of municipalities, patronage of *collegia* assumed a public character and could be seen as a politically and socially accepted element of one’s career. One of the most illustrative examples is an inscription recording the career of C. Bassidius C. f. Cl(audia) Secundus (no. 224; Ig, Pannonia). Notably, his patronage of two *collegia* was inserted between the positions of *(duo)vir iur(e) d(icundo)* and *IIvir i(ure) d(icundo) q(uin)q(uennalis)*, which was usually the pinnacle of a municipal career.

For those who did not have a splendid *cursus honorum* to their name, or who did not have a formal *cursus* at all, patronage of a collectivity could sometimes be the only public or quasi-public role available to them. The title of patron of a collectivity may have had particular significance for women and freedmen, who were barred from holding magistracies. Thus, Gaius Ulattius Meleagrus, a *sevir Augustalis*, had the following titles inscribed on his tombstone: patron of the *corpus Augustalis*, patron of all the lawful *corpora* at Lugdunum (*omnium corpor(um) Lug(uduni) licite coeuntium*, no. 15). Alliena T. f. Berenice was commemorated as *uxor sanctissim(a), mater piissima* as well as *patrona collegiorum fabrum et centonariorum* (of Firmum Picenum). This inscription was displayed in a public place (no. 55). Such a *cursus vitae* neatly summarized a woman’s matronly/domestic roles along with her activities outside the domestic sphere.

Third, to further understand the difference between the personal and collective forms of patronage, we need to look at a closely related problem, namely, the fine distinction between patronage and euergetism. Any discussion of the patronage of collectivities easily becomes entangled with that of euergetism, for in practice, patronage and euergetism share many outward characteristics—e.g., monetary generosity—and they were often eulogized in the same way. P. Veyne (1976) and R. Duthoy (1984) are inclined to distinguish between the two concepts on the basis of the presence or absence of the intention/expectation/desire

---

21 This is not to say that patronage of collectivities was the only choice in order for them to have some public role. For women from influential local families, for example, it was a desirable position to be a priestess, either of a goddess or of one of the deified Imperial women.

22 Similarly, in Apulum, in the epitaph put up by her father-in-law, Fabia Lucila describes herself as *e(gregiae) m(emoriae) v(iri) fi lia* and *mater coll(egiorum) fabr(um) et cent(onariorum) col(oniae) s(upra) s(critae) (no. 3). Gavillia Optata, a *contubernalis*, was the *mater* of the *collegium centonariorum* of Aesernia (no. 51).
for reciprocity. Th is criterion is necessarily of limited use because of its subjectivity. Van Nijf avoided trying to distinguish between the two phenomena with a good excuse, as he focused on the dynamics behind the honorific practices rather than on the phenomena of euergetism and patronage per se. It may be suggested that van Nijf’s approach is particularly well suited to the situation in the East, where the traditional terminology of patron/client relationships was not regularly used. But in his recent works on the Roman patrons of Eastern cities, C. Eilers has argued that even in the East, patronage and euergetism were not usually overlapping categories.

As far as the patronage of collectivities in the West is concerned, terminology does matter: patronus was not only a frequent term, but also indicated a closer, more stable relationship between the individual so titled and the collegium under his or her patronage than a benefactor-beneficiary relationship incurred by occasional benefactions. Patronage implies a commitment by the patron who accepted the nomination. Indeed, patronage was an integral part of collegial life: patrons were formally elected (cooptare, optare) by collegium members; patrons could be (symbolically) considered part of the collegium, and their names could head its membership list (album); the birthdays of patrons were customarily occasions for collegial feastings and could feature in the ordo cenarum, which was often an integral part of the inscribed collegial by-laws (lex collegii); as will be discussed in the following chapter, the Genius of the patronus collegii could be an object of worship within the collegium; and finally, as I have already mentioned, the title of patron of collegia tended to be one of the things that one included in the list of accomplishments inscribed on one’s tombstone. Thus, to downplay

---

23 For efforts to disentangle these two phenomena, see also Lomas and Cornell 2003: 2.
25 “The frequent conjunction of patròn with euergetes and sôtêr seems to show that for the Greeks of the period these concepts had more or less the same meaning” (Gelzer 1969: 88). See also Eilers 2002: 17–18. For the use of patronus in papyrological sources from the Imperial period, see Bagnall 1993: 216.
27 Duration is considered one of the elements that constitute a patron-client relationship. See Johnson and Dendeker 1989: 224.
29 As, for example, in CIL XIV.2112 = ILS 7212.
30 E.g., CIL XI.1355. It does not follow that they were always formal members of the collegia. See below.
the distinction between the phenomena of patronage and euergetism would misleadingly diminish the special meaning and social significance of the title of the collegial patron.

**Patrons and Benefactors: Status and Functions**

What patrons were capable of doing naturally depended on their social, economic, and political status. Among the 75 known patrons of the *collegia centonariorum*, at least 65 percent belonged to municipal elites (the first six categories in Table 6.1). Freedmen (10 percent) were in the minority; the majority of freedmen patrons were the *Augustales*. Two freedmen patrons had *ornamenta decurionatus* (nos. 82, 170). Female patrons were relatively few. One of the female patrons was the wife of a patron and municipal *decurio*; another was the wife of an equestrian patron. Only one of the three female patrons seems to have been a patron in her own right: Alliena T(iti) f(iliae) Berenice’s husband does not seem to have been connected with the *collegia fabrum* and *centonariorum* that she patronized (no. 55, Firmum Picenum). This distribution is representative of the overall distribution of patrons of *collegia*. It is noteworthy that while among the patrons of municipalities, the percentage of senatorial patrons closely approximates the percentage of equestrian patrons, this is far from being the case among patrons of *collegia*. The distribution of the patrons of *collegia* between the two top *ordines* appears to have been highly unbalanced. The equestrians, local magistrates and *decuriones* of the cities loom large in our evidence. These, of course, are overlapping categories. Since many of the patrons of municipal *collegia* were of local origin, the small number of senatorial patrons of *collegia* can be attributed to the small number of available senators in the municipalities. But even in Rome and Ostia, there seem to have been few senatorial patrons of *collegia*. We might imagine two explanations: the *collegia* seldom chose senators for patrons.

---

31 Decurial honors granted to those who could not formally become *decuriones*.
34 Clemente 1972: 191, 185.
35 An exception is the *ordo corporatorum qui pecuniam ad ampliand(um) templum contuler(unt)* of Ostia. Its nature is not entirely clear, but it had a dozen senatorial patrons (Clemente 1972: 192–94).
owing to the social distance between them; or senators often refused to play the role of collegial patron. If the latter explanation is the true one, perhaps the senatorial order in general did not consider patronage of collegia to be particularly prestigious. The few senatorial patrons of the collegia centonariorum that we do know of all came from the third century, and were senators of local origin.

Table 6.1. Status of patrons of the collegia centonariorum (first–fourth centuries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senatorial rank</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian rank</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal magistrates (duoviri, quattuorviri)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal magistrates (below duoviriate, quattuorvirate)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal decurions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son of a decurial patron of the coll. Cent.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men of military career</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustales (one with ornamenta decurianalia)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedman with ornamenta decurionalia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cursus, but specified as patrons of municipalities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicus (of freedman status)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursus/status absent or unclear (one freedman)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women (freeborn)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A curious group of titles are pater, mater, and parens of collegia. For the collegia centonariorum, the inscriptions give two matres, three patres, and one parens. One was the daughter-in-law of an equestrian (no. 3). The status and/or social relations of the others are not clear, but they do not seem to have belonged to the two top orders or the local elite. Some think that these titles were comparable to that of patron; others think they were merely honorary. The most extensive discussion is recently

---

36 Matres: no. 3 (Apulum, Dacia), no. 51 (Aesernia, Regio IV); patres: no. 36 (Solva, Noricum, AD 205), no. 68, no. 219 (Brigetio, AD 220; this is a dubious example, as the restoration is uncertain); parens: no. 68 (Sentinum). I have only counted those instances in which a person is explicitly referred to as pater. But, in several cases, abbreviated forms such as p. and patr. might be read either patronus or pater.

37 Clemente listed pater/mater/parens among patrons. But see Cracco Ruggini 1973: 298: "…si ricava l'impressione che il titolo di pater or mater fosse concesso a benefattori del collegio al di fuori del vincolo giuridico-più prestigioso e impegnativo-del patronato vero e proprio." See also Cracco Ruggini 1971: 122 n. 129; Waltzing I: 446; Meiggs 1973: 318–19; For a list of references for such titles, see Cracco Ruggini 1973: 296–98 n. 101; Daria Saavedra Guerrero 1991a: 109–13; Perry 1999: 185–89, concurring with van Bremen 1997: 169 on the point that "the choice of terminology indicates something
provided by E. A. Hemelrijk, who argues that there was a conspicuous difference between patroness and ‘mothers’ of the Western collegia in terms of their social rank, and that pater/mater tended to be a title for the non-elite benefactors. Hemelrijk also shows that while few patronesses were praised for (specific) benefactions, the ‘mothers’ of collegia were often connected with specific gifts including substantial monetary donations.38 It seems to me that while pater/mater does seem to be a title distinct from patronus/patrona, the distinctions between them were not always clear-cut.39 Ancient sources sometimes compare the patron-client relationship to that between father and son.40 This may have some bearing on the understanding of the title pater/mater/parens collegii. Patres/matres were often, if not regularly, members of the collegia, participating in collegial activities such as feasting and the election of patrons.41 The patrons of the collegia centonariorum were not usually themselves members of the collegium they patronized. But in a small

---

38 Hemelrijk 2008: 115–62.
39 For example, the tabula patronatus of the collegium dendrophororum of Lavinium (AD 227) chose Servilius Diodorus, v(ir) e(gregius), as patron, and his wife as mater (AE 1998.282). In choosing Coretius Fuscus as patron of the collegium fabrum of Sentinum, the tabula patronatus referred to his mother, Memmia Victoria, mater of the collegium in question—“she and her whole family being called our patrons.” (CIL XI.5748 = Gordon 1983: 163–64 no. 78, with English translation. Lomas 1996: 250 also provides a literal translation; AD 260.) Numis(s) Tacitus was listed among the patrons, but was also titled pater bisellarius; L. Tettius Hermes Olympius was both patron and pater of the cultores aedis Iovis Dolicheni (CIL VI.406, 408). Cf. also CIL III.8837: Terentius Mercurius may be both pater and patron of the collegium fabrum of Salona. Flavia Festa, mat(er) Aug(ustalium) was listed under patroni allecti (AE 2001. 854, Liternum).
40 “If clients are quasi-colentes and patroni are quasi-patres, then to wrong a colens is as bad as to wrong a son” (Servius, on Aen. 6.609; cited by Saller 1989: 58). The ‘mothers’ and ‘fathers’ of cities may also serve as useful parallels. Jones equated pater civitatis with curator civitatis (LRE: 1491, 1506); the most recent evidence is P.Oxy. LXIII 4393 (fifth century AD), which mentions pater poleôs. This position is known to have involved some responsibility for taking care of municipal finances. For ‘mother of municipality’, see Pleket 1969: no. 18. For a discussion of ‘mothers’ of cities in the Eastern provinces, see van Bremen 1997.
41 E.g., no. 68 (collegium centonariorum, Sentinum, Umbria).
number of cases, the patrons were also members of their collegia.\textsuperscript{42} Not surprisingly, such patrons tended to hold leading positions in the collegia. Munatius Felix, a (se)vir [A]ug(ustalis) of Lugudunum, was patron of the centonarii Lug(uduni) consist(entes), having held all kinds of magistracies among them [omnib(us) honorib(us) apud eos f(unctionus)] (no. 14). An equestrian was the repunc(tor) (= dispunctor/auditor?) and patron of the collegia fabrum and centonariorum of Mediolanum (no. 120); another equestrian patron was cura(tor) ark(ae) and dec(urio) dec(uriae) V ex (centuriae) III of the same collegia (no. 193). In Cales, M. Cornelius Iustus Acutianus, who, among other honors, had held the position of (quattuor)vir q(uin)quennalis i(ure) d(icundo), functioned as both quaglato(r) and patron of the collegium cento(nariorum).

But the meaning of quaglato(r) (= coactor?) is by no means clear (no. 46). In Ig of Pannonia, C. Bassidius Secundus, whose highest position was (duo)vir iur(e) d(icundo), was both praefectus and patron of the coll(egium) centonariorum (no. 224). In Aquileia, C. Pettus Philtatus, eq(uo) p(ublico), praef(ectus) aed(ilicia) pot(estate), was both praef(ectus) and patron of the collegia fabr(um) and cent(onariorum) (no. 134). The next example is exceptional: the c(collegium) c(entonariorum) of Sassina put up a tombstone for C. Gigennius Ianuarius, patron, who did not seem to have held any position either within the collegium or in the city.\textsuperscript{43}

It is natural to think of patrons as sources of material benefits to the collegia: on various occasions, patrons might give their collegia handouts, banquets, wine, and oil, among other things; patrons were also sources of perpetual endowment, in the form of foundations, statues, meeting halls, dining rooms, burial plots, and so on.\textsuperscript{44} It should be noted, however, that not all benefactors were explicitly titled ‘patrons’; by no means did patrons have a monopoly on material benefaction.\textsuperscript{45} At the same time, the collegium/collegia under the patronage of a certain individual did not always have to be a part of any liberalitas he or she gave out. As far as the collegia centonariorum are concerned, in only two cases were the benefactors also patrons. One example comes from

\textsuperscript{42} For a collection of references for this phenomenon among various collegia, see Waltzing IV: 384–86.

\textsuperscript{43} No. 88. He was perhaps related to the other two Gigennii mentioned in nos. 87 and 89 (Chapter 5).

\textsuperscript{44} CIL III.7960 = ILS 5548 (Sarmizegetusa); AE 1913.1 (Rome); AE 1948.31 (the repair of the aedes of the hastophorii, Ostia). See also van Nijf 1997: 108.

\textsuperscript{45} Compare the similar situation of city patrons discussed by Eilers 2002: 100–01.
Mevaliola, where the collegium centonariorum put up a statue to Q. Velcenna L. f. Stel(lata) Proculus, decurio of the city. Satisfied with the honor, he paid for the statue and, on the occasion of the dedication of the statue, distributed two denarii to each member of the collegium (no. 98). Another example comes from Pisaurum. The plebs of Pisaurum put up an honorific inscription for C. Valius Polycarpus on account of his virtues (ob merita). Upon its dedication, he distributed sportulae to the decuriones, the members of the collegia, and the plebs at the rate of five denarii, two denarii, and one denarius each, respectively (no. 82). In both of these examples, the distributions were made by the benefactors in return for an honor previously granted to them by the collegium or by other types of collectivities. In the latter example, the benefaction was not exclusively directed at the collegium centonariorum. This situation is by no means atypical, especially since many collegial patrons patronized multiple collectivities, as already mentioned in Chapter 4 and will be further discussed below.

One-time donations in the forms of cash, statues, meeting places, and burial plots might have been provided by members and non-members, patrons and non-patron benefactors alike. Sometimes, the benefactor bequeathed all his or her belongings (res, facultates) to one or more chosen collegia. I have collected 18 instances of perpetual endowments donated to the collegia centonariorum. They come from Rome, Regiones VI, VIII, X, and XI of Italy, Alpes Maritimae, and Gallia Narbonensis. But no perpetual endowment to the collegia centonariorum from their patrons has been attested so far, although dozens of inscriptions record perpetual endowments and other donations to these collegia by benefactors not specifically titled ‘patrons’. Therefore, judging from the evidence that we do have, financial benefits do not seem to be a particularly significant aspect of the patronage of our collegia. This impression, however, may be due simply to the gap of our sources, for we do have evidence for various other types of collegia receiving relatively large donations or perpetual endowments from their patrons. On the other hand, it is conceivable that the importance of the financial aspects of collegial patronage may have varied in different collegia, with some collegia being more dependent on their patrons’ financial commitment

---

46 No. 62; CIL V.4122, 4433, to the collegium fabrum, Brixia.
47 Clemente 1972: 215–19. No. 31 may have recorded the establishment of a perpetual foundation for the collegium centonariorum in Nemausus, but the inscription is fragmentary.
than others. In general, however, we do not know to what extent patrons were financially obliged to their client-collegia.

Few endowments were unconditional, but the recipients were often obliged to provide services to the donors. Most endowments were testamentary. The most common condition was that the recipient(s) should fulfill funerary services, which included putting up roses on the donor’s tomb, holding memorial banquets on the anniversaries of the donors, and nourishing the spirits (di manes) of the deceased. In those cases where the donation was not made ex testamento, the most common condition was that the recipients should celebrate the donor’s birthday. Small donations were usually given for the maintenance of statues or buildings.

Similarly, complicated relationships might also develop between collegia when a benefactor appointed multiple collectivities as recipients of an endowment. Six of the 18 endowments to the collegia centonariorum were shared with other collegia. In one case from Sassina (no. 85), Certania P. f. Severina, who was a priestess of Diva Marciana and was survived by her husband, set up a funerary foundation of 6,000 sesterces among three collegia in her will. It was stipulated that every year, on her birthday, from the yield of 4,000 sesterces of this sum, each collegium should distribute oil to its members, and they should tend her Manes (spirits of the deceased) with the yield of the remaining 2,000 sesterces. Such joint endowments might demand some degree of cooperation between the recipients in keeping up the funds and carrying out the wishes of the donors. But we do not know how the joint obligation was carried out. As already discussed in Chapter 4, the joint arka Titiana of the fabri and the centonarii may have been named after the donor. Although perpetual endowments were not the only sources of collegial funds, they had a significant impact on the organization and activities of collegia and their economic and financial roles in society, as well as on inter-collegial relationships. Endowments sometimes provided the collegia centonariorum with opportunities to expand their economic involvement and interests outside the realm of their occupation(s). In Brixia, the collegium centonariorum was the joint recipient (with the collegium fabrum) of two endowments. In one case, the donors left as legacies tabernae cum cenaculis (shops with upper stories) in the vicus Herculius and a castellum (resevoir?) to the

---

collegium centonariorum in addition to the 2,000 sesterces that was to be shared with the collegium fabrum (no. 173). The castellum was to yield 200 denarii (= 800 sesterces) every year, of which half should be used to perform funerary rituals (profusiones) for the testators, and the other half for the maintenance of the shops.49

Equal attention should be paid to the non-material benefits reaped by collegia from the work of their patrons. Tutela and defensio are recurring themes in the epigraphy.50 The collegium fabrum and centonariorum of Salona put up an honorific inscription for their praefectus and patron, M. Ulpius Sabinus, on account of his diligence, innocence, integrity, and defense.51 It is interesting to note the easy combination of defensio and abstract administrative virtues.52 The concern of the collegium centonariorum of Luna in AD 255 may also have been tutela (protection) (no. 100).

Now, what did tutela/defensio entail? Presumably, the economic interests of the collegium needed to be defended from time to time. These interests might be affected by a variety of factors, ranging from the level of taxation to the supply of requisitioned goods and the conflict between occupationally related collegia.53 Apart from these, collegia could be subject to all kinds of abuses from the state or the provincial/municipal authorities. They may particularly have depended

49 Vicus Herculius has not been securely identified but was probably inside the city (Mollo 2000: 300).

50 CIL VI.1872 = ILS 7266 (Rome, AD 206) is an interesting case. The corpus of the piscatores et urinatores (fishermen and divers) honored their patron, Ti(berius) Claudius Severus, for three things: (1) he was the first to put up the statues of Caracalla and Iul(ia) Augusta perhaps in the collegial meeting place; (2) he donated 10,000 sesterces to the corpus, from the yearly interest of which sportulae were to be distributed to everyone on his birthday; (3) he helped the corpus obtain the right of navigatio scapharum, for which they were particularly thankful (praesertim cum navigatio scapharum diligentia eius adquisita et confirmata sit). For discussions of this inscription, see van Nijf 1997: 99; Verboven 2007a: 886. In the same year, the tabula patronatus from the collegium fabrum of Fidentia made it very clear that the patrons were elected for the defense and protection of the collegium (AE 1991.713).

51 Ob industrim (sic!) adque singrm (sic!) eius innocentim (sic!) et integritatem defensionemque (no. 10). See also praevidatus (no. 128).

52 For a study of administrative virtues in epigraphy, see Forbis 1996: 61–82; for innocentia and integritas in particular, see 64–68: “…innocentia, abstinentia and integritas emphasize the disinterested motives of certain benefactors, indicating that their generosity did not arise from any desire for political advancement of self-aggrandizement”; for industria, see 72–74.

53 See van Nijf 1997: 95–99 for papyrological evidence; CIL VI.1759 = ILS 1272 (AD 389) for the long-standing conflict between the mensores Portuenses and the caudicarii.
on a patron’s interference to safeguard their legal privileges, such as *immunitas* (from *munera*), and to prevent extra obligations or services from being imposed on them. In fact, the privileges that certain *collegia* including the *collegia centonariorum* enjoyed could potentially cause problems between the *collegia* and the local authorities, who looked for manpower to shoulder all kinds of *munera*. The Solva rescript, for example, may have reflected pre-existing tensions between the *collegium centonariorum* and the city of Solva. It addressed the problem of the rich members in the *collegia centonariorum* who had enjoyed benefits without ‘burden (*onus*)’. We do not know the origins of these rich men. They may have been rich local elite who chose to avoid liturgies by becoming *collegiati*. But they may also have been those *collegium* members who became rich due to their success in business. Either way, the fact that some members were able but unwilling to bear the burden of liturgies may have led to conflict with the municipal *decuriones*, who perhaps asked the governor of Noricum to intervene. The provincial governor referred the case to the emperors, either because he did not want to decide the case or because he was expected to report such cases, owing to the importance of the *collegia centonariorum* and the fact that benefits were granted by the senatorial or Imperial authority. The *decurions* and/or the governor may have proposed to abolish altogether the privileges of the *collegium*, including their *vacatio* from *munera*. Severus and Caracalla’s Imperial rescript, however, confirmed the *beneficia* granted to the *collegia*, but urged the provincial governor to take legal action against those *collegiati* who were not qualified for these benefits. This measure is probably intended not so much to discourage rich members from joining *collegia* as to reduce exemptions, in order to maintain a sufficient pool of liturgists. This solution was a compromise between local interests and central authority, between municipal autonomy and Imperial intervention.

---

54 For these privileges, see Chapter 3. See below the cases of the *centonarii* of Solva and the *dendrophori* of Brixia. Cf. also later evidence, *CTh* 14.2.1 (AD 364); *CTh* 14.2.3 (AD 397). Cf. also Symm. *Relat.*; Libanius’ *Orations*.


56 For cases reflecting the same tendency or principle, see *Dig*. 50.4.11.2 (Marcus Aurelius and Verus): suspension of immunity in case of the lack of available magistrates; *Dig*. 27.1.6.4 (Modestinus): Antoninus Pius fixed the maximum number of doctors, rhetors, and grammarians that may enjoy immunity. See Garnsey 1974: 236–38 (= 1998: 10–11) for the fullest discussion of the concern over the number of liturgists in the second century AD; cf. also Jacques 1984: 645.

expressly stated to have been put up in honor(em) M(arcii) Secundi(i) Secundini, which seems to suggest that he was an important link in the chain that led to the final solution of the problem. But exactly what role M. Secundius Secundinus played in this affair escapes us, especially since we have no information regarding his social and political status. His title was pater rather than patron of the collegium. But this case is nonetheless relevant to the discussion, as there is no doubt that such intercession also fell within the sphere of the patron’s functions.

Both cities and collegia could use the Imperial or provincial authorities to back them up. The relationship between the collegia and the local ruling bodies was rather complicated. On one hand, the collegia found benefactors and patrons among the elite; on the other hand, having certain types of collegia (especially those that were entitled to various exemptions) in town did not always benefit the local elite. Almost all the epigraphic records of the official authorization of a collegium (in the West) came from the mid second to third centuries. It is also significant that the chronological distribution of the authorization of various types of collegia (Table 3.1) roughly parallels that of the bronze patronage tablets (Table 6.2 below). I do not think that the epigraphic habit could be the explanation here, especially since many of these epigraphic record came from the period when the epigraphic habit was supposedly declining. In my opinion, such formal authorization, as it was in the late second to the third century AD, had different significance and implications than that in the first century AD. It was more about (re)defining the relationship between certain collegia and local authorities and confirming the former’s status rather than simply obtaining the ius coeundi. At the same time, collegia probably felt the need to pin down their relationships with the more prominent or strategically placed local figures, who could protect the rights of the collegia they supported. There may have also been instances of ‘abusive protection’, whereby patrons helped collegia obtain privileges/exemptions for which they were not qualified. Due to the vague and economical nature of our sources, it is impossible to determine how often the administrative virtues for which the collegia praised their patrons refer to abuses of power rather than to true ‘integrity’ and ‘innocence’.58

58 The corpus of the piscatores et urinatores (fishermen and divers) honored their patron, Ti(berius) Claudius Severus, through whose work the corpus obtained the navigatio scapharum (CIL VI.1872, Rome, AD 206). It is not clear whether or not the
Judicial advocacy was another important aspect of the collegial patron’s function, especially since, after the second half of the second century AD, the authorized collegia acquired the status of universitas (already discussed in Chapter 3), meaning that, as collectivities, they could both sue and be sued. In Latin, patronus was also a technical term for ‘advocate’. It becomes relevant at this point to take a look at some other titles relating to juristic functions. One such title is defensor. According to a passage in the Historia Augusta, Alexander Severus organized all the tradesmen and craftsmen of Rome into collegia, then granted them defensores chosen from among their own members and designated the judge to whose jurisdiction each should belong. This passage points to the judicial function of the defensores. However, the title of defensor of collegia is rarely attested in epigraphy; we know it from only five inscriptions. In two of these, the titles patronus and defensor are both applied to the same people. Both were equites Romani and do not seem to have been members of the collegia. Nor do the other three epigraphically attested defensores seem to have been members of the collegia. Another title that seems to be associated with judicial protection is praesidium, attested only once by an inscription from Roman Vienna (modern Vienne). It is reasonable to assume that the protective function of a patron overlapped with that of a defensor or praesidium, rendering separate titles unnecessary in many cases.

corpus was genuinely eligible for the right of sailing in light boats. See also the case of the dendrophori (CIL V.4341 = ILS 1150, Brixia).

59 This is standard Ciceronian vocabulary. See also Saller 1982: 9; Eilers 2002: 88–89.

60 SHA, Alex. Sev. 18.33.2: corpora omnium constituit vinariorum, lupinariorum, caligariorum et omnio omnium artium, atque ex sese defensores dedit et iussit qui ad quos iudices pertinent. Cf. Waltzing: II 101, 254; RE III: 451 (Kornemann); De Robertis 1971 II: 100, 522; Cracco Ruggini 1973: 283.

61 Defensor was sometimes used as a synonym for actor, but it also had the restricted meaning defensor litis. See Biscardi 1980: 16.


63 CIL XII.1877 = W 2004 with note: L(ucio) Aquilio L(ucii) fi 1(i) [V]olt(inia) Severiano, aedili, (duum)viro aerar(ii), fabri tignuari Viennenses pra[e]sid(i)o suo.
A special kind of patronage deserves particular attention here. Inscriptions sometimes attest to the patron-client relationship between the quindecimviri sacris faciundis and the dendrophori, between the praefecti annonae and the navicularii, and between the curatores operum publicorum and the collegia fabrum. These relationships were rooted in official relations. In the case of the collegia centonariorum, there is at least one inscription that may suggest a similar connection. In Apulum, Dacia, the collegium centonariorum had among its patrons a P. Aelius Strenuus, equo p(ublico), sacerd(os) arae Aug(usti), augur et II viral(is) col(oniae) Sarm(izegetusae), augur col(oniae) Apul(i), dec(urio) col(oniae) Dro(betarum), who was also specified as conduc(tor) pascui, salinar(um) et commercior(um) (contractor of pasture, salt works, and trades) (no. 5). Pasture would certainly concern the centonarii. But since Strenuus had several other titles pointing to his prominence in Apulum, it is not certain whether his relationship with the collegium centonariorum stemmed primarily from his being conductor pascui.

Patronage certainly did not operate in isolation from various other social relationships, and this intertwining could manifest itself in a variety of ways. Quite recently, Philip Harland (2003a) has illustrated the dynamic and complicated interactions between associations and benefactors in Sardis and Smyrna with a stimulating discussion of the rivalry for economic support from benefactors and for the honor and prestige that such contacts entailed. This type of analysis can be substantially amplified by borrowing a methodological model from the sociologists and approaching patronage as a pluralistic and competitive system. The following section elaborates on this point.

**Multiplicity and Competition**

As already mentioned above, exclusivity was not a feature in the patronage of collegia—the centonarii shared 65 percent of their patrons with other types of collegia. Nor was this plurality unique to the collegia

---

64 For the relationship between the dendrophori and the XVviri sacris faciundis, see CIL X.3699 = ILS 4174 (Cumae, AD 251): ex s.c. dendrophori creati sunt sub cura XVviri sacris faciundis clarissimorum virorum; CIL X.3698 = ILS 4175; CIL V.4340; CIL V.4341 = ILS 1150 (Brixia).
65 CIL XII.672 = ILS 1432; CIL II.1180 (Hispalis).
67 For this sociological approach, see Johnson and Dandeker 1989: 223–24.
centonariorum. As a general phenomenon, it is attested by at least 71 inscriptions regarding a variety of collegia from the first to the fourth centuries. As a general phenomenon, it is attested by at least 71 inscriptions regarding a variety of collegia from the first to the fourth centuries. Not only could the same person patronize multiple collegia, but a collegium could also have multiple patrons simultaneously. In some larger collegia, even the subdivisions within the collegia could have separate patrons. Sometimes collegia from different cities shared the same patron(s). C. Valius Polycarpus, *ornamenta decurionatus*, patronized two groups of collegia: one included the collegia of the fabri, centonarii, and dendrophori of Ariminum, while the other included the collegia of the fabri, centonarii, navicularii, and vicimagistri of Pisaurum (no. 82). C. Firmius Rufinus, an equestrian with public horse (*equo publico*), in addition to being the patron of the collegium fabrum of Altinum, also functioned as the patron of the collegia fabrum, centonariorum, and dendrophorum of both Feltria and Berua (no. 139).

*Collegia* do not seem to have minded sharing patron(s). Rather, it seems to have been a matter of pride if a given collegium shared (a) patron(s) with other prominent collegia. This certainly seems to be the

---

68 For brief references to this plurality, see Cracco Ruggini 1971: 117 with n. 123; MacMullen 1990: 247 n. 83. For the patronage of multiple collegia, see Appendix F. I list here the attested groupings of various collegia under the same patrons. The number in brackets indicates the epigraphic frequency of such groupings: *fabri, centonarii* (15 times); *fabri, centonarii, dendrophori* (nine times); *fabri, dendrophori* (five times); *dendrophori, centonarii* (once); *fabri, centonarii, nautae/navicularii/utric(u)larii* (twice); *fabri/fabri navales, utriclarii, centonarii* (six times); *centonarii, utriclarii, dendrophori, fabri* (once); *fabri, centonarii, navicularii, dendrophori, vicimagistri, iuvenes forenses, studia Apollinaris et Gunthar(um)?* (once); *fabri, centonarii, dendrophori, navicularii, vicimagistri* (once); *centonarii, iuvenes* (once); *centonarii, amatores Romulii* (once); *fabri, iuvenes* (once); *corpus suariorum et confectuariorum, collegium pistorum, collegium suariorum* (once); *fabri ferrari, lapidarii* (once); *collegia/corpora omnia* (four times); *collegia urbis* (once); *collegia plura* (once); *collegia tria* (four times); 14 collegia of Ostia (once); *negotiatores vinarii Luguduni in cannabis consistentes, nautae Ararici* (twice); *nautae Arare navigantes, utriclarii, fabri, negotiatores vinarii Luguduni in cannabis consistentes* (once); *vena[llicior(um) corp(us) Cisalpinorum et] Transalpinorum, [nautae Arar]icor(um) [Rho]danicor(um)* (once); different types of shippers: *Nautae Ararici et Rhodanici, Condeutes et Arecarrii Luguduni consistentes; nautae Ararici et Ligerici, Arecarri et Cond(ates), Nautae Rhodanici Arare navigantes, utriclarii, quinque corpora lenunculariorum Ostiensium* (four times); *mensores frumentarii, urinatores* (once); *Pisto*res, mercuratores frumentarii Ostienses (once); *menses frumentarii, curatores navium marinum et annalium Ost.*, *dendrophori* (once); *ordo corporatorum qui pecuniam ad ampliandum templum contulerunt, lenuncularii* (three times).

69 Multiple patrons of a collegium: two patrons and one patroness of the Cultores Iovis Latii (*CIL* XI.6310, Pisaurum); 15 patrons of the collegium fabrum tig[nuariorum] (*CIL* XI.1355, Luna); for the many examples from Ostia and Rome, see Clemente: 191–99, 206–08; Cracco Ruggini 1971: 134 n. 155.

70 E.g. *CIL* III.7960 = *ILS* 5548 (*decuria* I of the collegium fabrum, Sarmizegetusa).
case in the *tabula patronatus* prepared by the *collegium centonariorum* for the family of Coretius Fuscus (Sentinum): he was described as the **[sp]lendidum decurione(m) patriae n(ostrae) sed et patronum trium coll(egiorum) princip(ialium)** (no. 68). Similarly, the *collegium fabrum* of Fidentia chose the patron of the *collegium dendrophorum* as its patron (*AE* 1991.713; AD 206). The sharing of patrons is the principal reason why certain *collegia*, such as the *fabri*, *centonarii*, and *dendrophori*, are mentioned together in epigraphy. This by no means constitutes a justification for seeing these *collegia* as having the same functions. This phenomenon of multiplicity, in many cases, could easily be attributed to the small pool of high ranking or rich individuals in the municipalities from which the local *collegia* chose their patrons. Not only could these individuals afford to patronize multiple collectivities, they must also have had extensive financial involvement in various businesses, leading to potential connections between them, a variety of craftsmen/tradesmen, and the *collegia* to which they belonged.

The number of client-*collegia*, along with the grouping(s) of collectivities, differed from patron to patron. The number of collectivities one person could patronize, of course, would depend on that person’s financial capacity and/or political influence. One person could function as the patron of all the *collegia* (**omnia collegia**) in a given municipality. We have four such cases, from Dertona, Lugudunum, Mevania, Brixia.71 Dertona and Mevania were relatively smaller urban centers; presumably, there were not very many *collegia* there. In fact, only two or three *collegia* have been attested in each city so far. As an important and prosperous commercial center, Lugdunum had a variety of *collegia*.72 Gaius Ulattius Meleagrus, who was the patron of the city, had to limit his client-*collegia* to the *corpus* of the *seviri Augustales* and all the *corpora* with a legal right to assemble (**omnium corpor(um) Lug(uduni) licite coeuntium**, *CIL* XIII. 1974), which may still have been a large number. With the exception of Gaius Ulattius Meleagrus, who was an *Augustalis*, all the other patrons of **omnia collegia** were high magistrates of municipalities, and two of them were of equestrian rank. It may be of some interest to consider the case of Sex. Valerius Sex. f. Fabia Poblicola Vettillianus, who patronized all the *collegia* in Brixia

---

72 Seventeen different types of *collegia* have been attested in Lugdunum so far (Cf. Cracco Ruggini 1971: 112 n. 116.)
and whose connections we happen to know well, due to the chance survival of many related inscriptions.

Sex. Valerius Sex. f. Fabia Publicola Vettillianus was *eques Romanus equo publico, flamen perpetuus, sacerdos urbis Romae aeternae, curator and patron of civitates Vardagates and Dripsinates, omnibus honoribus perfunctus*.\(^\text{73}\) Since a public dedication to his grandson, L. Valerius Catullus, is datable to the end of the second century or the beginning of the third century AD, Sextus Valerius Sex. f. Fabia Publicola Vettillianus was probably active in the last quarter of the second century AD (*InscrIt* 10.5.273). In this period, *omnia collegia* in Brixia may have included the *collegi of the centonarii, fabri, dendrophori, iumentarii, nautae, pharmacopoleae publici, praecones, fullones (?), iuvenes*, and others.\(^\text{74}\) The Sexti Valerii held many important magistracies and religious priesthoods in Brixia in the second and third centuries AD. Sextus Valerius Sex. f. Fabia Publicola Vettillianus was perhaps the son or brother of Sex. Valerius Sex. f. Publicola Priscillianus, who put up a memorial monument to his parents. His father, whose name is lost, was an equestrian with public horse and *decurio* of Brixia, Verona, Tridentum, and [Nic]omedia (*CIL* V.4485 = *ILS* 6716 = *InscrIt* 10.5.276; *CIL* V.4486 = *InscrIt* 10.5.277): the *ordo* of Brixia awarded him a gilded equestrian statue and a public funeral; his wife, Clodia Q. *fil.* Procilla, was a priestess of Diva Plotina. The name Priscillianus among the Valerii may have come from Bivonia P. *fil.* Priscilla, who was married to Sex. Valerius Sex. f. Fab. Rufus, *praef(ectus) i(ure) d(icundo), q(uaestor)*, and was honored with a public funeral (*funere publico honorata*) (*CIL* V.4487 = *InscrIt* 10.5.278). Their son, Sex. Valerius Sex. f. Fab. Primus, was an *amicus* of M. Nonius Macrinus, consul of AD 154 (*CIL* V.4361 = *InscrIt* 10.5.150). The Nonii were the most prominent family in Brixia in the second and third centuries, supplying consuls and enjoying extensive connections with other elite families.\(^\text{75}\) The Nonii apparently had a close relationship with the Valerii. In fact, the wife of Sextus Valerius Sex. f. Fabia Publicola Vettillianus was one Nonia M. *fil.* Arria Hermionilla. So we are talking

---

\(^{73}\) *CIL* V.4484 = W 522 = *InscrIt* 10.5.275, with image. For the most recent discussions of the title *curator rei publicae*, see Boatwright 2000: 73–78; Mollo 2000: 134–35.


\(^{75}\) For the Nonii, see *CIL* V.3342, 4340, 4341, 4345, 4355; VI.1982/3, 1603, 2129; *InscrIt* 10.5. 127–136 with notes on p. 80–82. Cf. Albertini 1953: esp. 15–17; Garzetti 1977: esp. 183–84; Mollo 2000: 133.
about a group of interrelated elites, who had significant influence in local society, in other cities, and even in Rome.

It is questionable whether for such a well connected person as Sextus Valerius Sex. f. Fabia Poblicola Vettillianus, patronage of collegia would have constituted an important step in his social and political advancement. It is most likely the other way around, and the existence of such powerful figures and families put other, lesser potential patrons at a serious disadvantage. Inscriptions attest to the frequent interactions between the various collegia and other members of the local elite. But none of the latter is known to have had the title of collegial patron. In fact, among the more than a hundred people in Brixia who had senatorial, equestrian, or municipal careers, together with the nearly a hundred seviri and seviri Augustales, only three bore the title of patronus collegii/collegiorum. From this data, it would seem that a very low percentage of the influential local families took up the title of collegial patron, or at least advertised it. However, this picture may be balanced by the outstanding prominence of the collegial patrons who are attested. We have already seen the connections and the prominence of Sextus Valerius Sex. f. Fabia Poblicola Vettillianus. Marcus Nonius M. f. Fabia Arrius Paulinus Aper, patron of the collegium dendrophorum (sic!), belonged to the Nonii, whose prominence I have already indicated. Paulinus Aper himself was certainly related to, and was perhaps the younger brother or son of, M. Nonius Arrius Mucianus, cos. AD 201. His wife, [P]acula, may have been the daughter or sister of L. Roscius Aelianus Paculus Salvius, cos. AD 223. Finally, the third collegial patron attested in Brixia, Sex. Sextius Onesigenes, patron of the collegia fabrum, centonariorum, and dendrophorum, was a sevir Augustalis with decurial badges. He must have been exceptionally wealthy. In sum, the title of collegial patron, in the case of Brixia in the late second and early third century AD, seems to indicate the center of power and wealth in the local context.

The situation was made more complex by the fact that prominent collegia such as the collegia centonariorum often shared patrons not only with other collegia, but also with larger and/or more prominent

76 Mollo 2000: 30–193, 199.
77 M & A 2000: 35–37; Waltzing III: 138–39. Altogether, there are 48 inscriptions mentioning 11 different collegia at Brixia; but only three collegial patrons are attested.
78 Mollo 2000: 134.
collectivities, such as plebes, vici, Augustales, and even civitates. In Sestinum, for example, L. Dentusius Proculinus, of equestrian rank, was patron of the coll(egium) cent(onariorum) as well as of the (se)viri Aug(ustales) and plebs urb(ana) (no. 71; AD 198–211). In Pisaurum, Caedius T.f. Atilius Crescens, eq(uo) p(ublico), was patron of Pisaurum, the sexviri Augustales, the collegia of the fabr(i), cent(onarii), navicularii, dendr(ophori), vicim(agistri), iuvenes forense, studii Apollinar(is), and Gunthar(iii?) (no. 80). In Ariminum, C. Faesellius Rufinus, of the equestrian order, patronized the city, the vicani vici Dianensis, and the collegia fabrum, centonariorum, and dendrophorum (no. 112). In Parma, in addition to being the patron of the local collegia fabrum, centonariorum, and dendrophorum, a man of military career was also patron of the city itself, along with two other municipia (no. 119).79

Not only can patronage be shared, but benefactors and benefactions can also be shared. A tricky question, perhaps, is whether or to what extent the multiplicity of patronage and benefactions contributed to/facilitated the connection between different collectivities. It is conceivable that the sharing of patrons provided more opportunities for socialization between different collegia. Such social occasions might have included banquets, distributions of handouts, and the funerals of common patrons. Certainly cooperation between collegia in honoring their patrons was not rare.80 In Auximum, the collegium fabrum and the collegium centonariorum put up identical inscriptions to honor their joint patron, Q. Plotius Maximus Trebellius Pelidianus (no. 59, CIL IX.5835 = ILS 1415); in Falerio, the collegia fabrum, centonariorum, and dendrophorum jointly put up an inscription for the father of their common patron, T(itus) Cornasis (?) Cornasidus (?) Vesennus Clemens (no. 56); in Salona, the collegium fabrum and the collegium centonariorum put up an honorific inscription for their equestrian patron and praefectus and paid for the inscription through subscription (no. 10).

For that reason alone, the multiplicity of patronage may be viewed as an actively contributing element to the connection between different collegia. But this is far from the whole story. It seems that depending on the occasion, patrons of multiple collectivities could choose to bestow benefactions on all, some, or none of the collegia under his or her patronage. For example, in an inscription dedicated by the vicani vici Dianensis to their equestrian patron C. Faesellius Rufionus, who was

---

79 For more examples, see nos. 15, 16, 22, 26, 72, 74, 78, 79, 81, 82, 101, 110, 113.
80 See also nos. 58 and 128 (tria collegia, Cemelenum, early third century AD).
also the patron of Ariminum and the *collegia fabrum, centonariorum*, and *dendrophorum*, it was recorded that he donated 20,000 sesterces to the *vicani* for the purchase of an estate (*ad emptionem possessionis*), from the yield of which distributions should made on his birthday; in addition, on account of the dedication, he gave 4,000 sesterces to the *vicani* (no. 112). The *collegia* under his patronage were not mentioned from this occasion, although it may be that the composition of the *vicani* overlapped with that of the *collegia* to some extent, such that some or many *collegiati* actually benefited from the benefaction. It is also possible that C. Faesellius Rufionus have granted material benefits to the *collegia* separately. If so, the relevant inscriptions have been lost; if not, we might reasonably suspect some tension between different collectivities under the same patronage.

Philip Harland (2003a) lays out three aspects of such tension: (1) the resources of benefactors were not limitless, and groups of various kinds were contestants as potential beneficiaries; (2) associations advertised their connections by monumentalizing instances of contact with important people in civic, provincial, and Imperial networks; (3) the epigraphic records inform us only of the ‘winners’ in these contests, not the ‘losers’. I would add a fourth aspect, namely that competition for patrons could be manipulated by the patrons themselves. One form of manipulation evidenced by inscriptions is that in establishing a donation to a given *collegium*, the patron sometimes included a clause demanding the transference of the gift to an alternate *collegium* or group if it was not used as stipulated.81 In Ameria (Umbria), for example, Iulia M. f. Felicitas, wife of C. Curiatus Eutyches, a local magistrate, gave 5,000 sesterces to the *arka* of the *collegium centonariorum* so that they might hold a banquet on her birthday out of the interest. Should this distribution not be celebrated on the stipulated day, the total amount of money would then belong to the *familia publica* (no. 62).

Patrons were formally coopted by the *collegia*. How did the selection process work? What were the factors that contributed to the final establishment of a patronage relationship? Our most valuable sources for this analysis are the *tabulae patronatus*, which articulate the motivations behind the choice of a particular patron, the qualifications of patrons, and the *collegia’s* expectations of them. Sixteen collegial patronage tablets (Table 6.2, *tabulae patronatus*) dating to between AD 166 and 348 have survived, among which four concern the *collegia*

81 Liu 2008.
centonariorum (Luna, Ostra, Sentinum, Laus Pompeia) and one concerns the joint collegium of the fabri and centonarii (Regium Lepidum). The practice of presenting bronze tablets to patrons in recognition of their acceptance of the relationship was doubtlessly modeled on official practices. As far as content is concerned, these tablets supposedly reproduced the wording of the decretum collegii of cooptation. The collegial tabulae strove to imitate the dignity of the official tabulae by using highly formulaic language with an elevated tone. The collegia do not seem to have favored the word clientela; it featured in only two of the 16 collegial tabulae. Instead, the collegia chose to portray their position in the patron-collegia relationship with dignified and less straightforward vocabulary. The frequency of incorrect forms and ungrammatical structures in the tabulae, however, betrays the limited literary competence of the collegiati.

Although this sample of tabulae is by no means large, it nonetheless provides some idea of the diversity of the motivations and qualifications for patronage, especially for the period from the mid-second century to the mid-fourth century AD. These tablets show that the connection between collegia and would-be patrons or their families sometimes predated the patrons’ formal cooptation. Quite often, new patrons were chosen from among the family members of existing patrons. Two bronze patronage tablets that were found at Sentinum but from the collegium centonariorum of Ostra (no. 69; December, AD 260) and of Sentinum (no. 68; August, 261 AD) respectively illustrate this point. The main text of no. 69 begins by praising the considerable affec-
Table 6.2. *Tabulae/tesserae patronatus collegiorum* (chronological)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Collegia under Patronage</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laus Pompeia (Regio XI)</td>
<td>AD 166</td>
<td><em>collegium centonariorum</em></td>
<td>Sartori 1987: 191–201; AE 1987.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regium Lepidum (Regio VIII)</td>
<td>AD 190</td>
<td><em>collegium fabrum et centonariorum</em></td>
<td>No. 117; CIL XI.970 = ILS 7216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puteoli (Regio I, Campania)</td>
<td>AD 196</td>
<td>corpus dendrophororum collegium fabrum</td>
<td>CIL X.1786 = ILS 1676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volsinii (Regio VII, Etruria)</td>
<td>AD 224</td>
<td><em>collegium fabrum</em></td>
<td>CIL XI.2702 = ILS 7217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pola (Regio X)</td>
<td>AD 227</td>
<td><em>collegium dendrophororum</em> collegium fabrum</td>
<td>CIL V.56 = CIL V.61 = InsrIt 10. 1. 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavinium (Regio I)</td>
<td>AD 228</td>
<td><em>collegium dendrophororum</em></td>
<td>David Nonnis 1995, with images = AE 1998.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corduba (Spain)</td>
<td>AD 247</td>
<td>corpus fabror(um) subedianor(um)</td>
<td>AE 1983.530 B.b. = 1985.564 b. No. 100; CIL XI.1354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luna (Regio VII)</td>
<td>AD 255</td>
<td><em>collegium centonariorum</em> collegium fabrum</td>
<td>CIL XI.6335 = ILS 7218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisaurum (Regio VI, Umbria)</td>
<td>AD 256</td>
<td><em>collegium centonariorum</em> collegium fabrum</td>
<td>CIL IX.1681 = ILS 7219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneventum (Regio II)</td>
<td>AD 257</td>
<td>studi iuvenes cultorum dei Herculis maiores</td>
<td>No. 69; CIL XI.5750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostra (Regio VI, Umbria)</td>
<td>AD 260</td>
<td><em>collegium centonariorum</em> collegium fabrum</td>
<td>CIL XI.5748 = ILS 7220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentinum (Regio VI, Umbria)</td>
<td>AD 260</td>
<td><em>collegium centonariorum</em></td>
<td>CIL XI.5749 = ILS 7220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luna (Regio VII)</td>
<td>AD 261</td>
<td><em>collegium centonariorum</em></td>
<td>No. 68; CIL XI.5749 = ILS 7222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corduba (Spain)</td>
<td>AD 348</td>
<td>collegium fabrum subidian(!)orun</td>
<td>AE 1983.391 (fragment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The text continues—a kinsman of Carenus Vibianus (*ad genus <iaeus*) and partner of his honor, Coretius Victorinus, who was elected patron a long time ago [*aeum (sic!) iandudum lectum*], should be honored with...
a bronze tablet as a public acknowledgement (*publica testificatio*). It is not clear how Carenus Vibianus and Coretius Victorinus were related to each other, and why the former only received honorary mention but not a patronage tablet at the moment. But this Coretius Victorinus is very likely to have been the brother of Coretius Fuscus, who had been elected patron of the *collegium fabrum* of Sentinum five months earlier, on the first day of July. As Coretius Fuscus’ mother was Memmia Victoria, Coretius Victorinus may have taken his *cognomen* from their mother. We know from another tablet that later in August, 261 AD, Coretius Fuscus was not only a *splendidus decurio* but also patron of *tria collegia principalia* of Sentinum (no. 68). Coretius Fuscus, his wife and son were elected patrons by the *collegium centonariorum* with a certificate (*per duplomum*) some time ago; but now (*nunc*) the *collegium* decided to present to them a bronze patronage tablet.

![Chart 6.1](chart.png)

*Chart 6.1. Stemma: Coretius Fuscus and his family, Sentinum.*

Without doubt, Coretius Fuscus and Coretius Victorinus belonged to a wealthy local family. As already discussed in the previous chapter, the Coretii may have been a rising power in Sentinum around the 260s. The *gentilicium* Coretius was not represented among the delegations (*legati*) of the *collegia* who were to present the tablets to Coretius Victorinus and Coretius Fuscus. The *collegium centonariorum* of Sentinum clearly

---

87 I thank Eleni Manolaraki for discussing this text with me.

88 *Tabula Patronatus, CIL XI. 5748 = ILS 7220 = W 505 = Gordon 1983: no.78, with translation. This inscription also honors Coretius Fuscus’ mother, Memmia Victoria.*
aimed at consolidating an ongoing relationship between the *collegium* and the family of Coretius Fuscus, with an expectation of continued benefits (no. 68). The focus was on acknowledging and perpetuating *beneficia*—which, according to recent studies, does not seem to have fundamentally different meanings from *merita*, and “could signify either political or financial achievement.” It is interesting to note that all three *tabulae patronatus* date to within a little over than a year. It is quite likely that Coretius Fuscus’ recent promotion to *decurio* may have triggered these ‘diplomatic’ activities. Note that 14–16 collegial delegates were appointed to present the tablets. This not only added to the ceremonial aspects of the act, but was also intended to highlight it in the public sight.

Familial traditions and/or the continuation of a family business played a role in the ‘inheritance’ of the patron-*collegium* relationship.

---

89 Erga amore beneficia praestita susceperimus, nunc etiam in futurum non dissimilia, quae nunc sentimus, perpetuo ex domum eorum processura pari adfectionem speramus. Parallels: The *studium iuvenum cultorum dei Herculis* of Beneventum and the *collegium fabrum* of Pisaurum had similar intentions. (CIL IX.1681 = ILS 7219, AD 257): *plus speramus beneficia iberiora pos(t) se consequiutos, cius in praeterito summa(m) dignationem sensimus*. Cf. Cracco Ruggini 1971: 127–28 n. 142.) The latter, perhaps at different stages, elected Petronius Victorinus, (clarissimus) i(uvenis), his wife Setina Iusta, their son Petronius Atempius Victorinus junior, and the latter’s elder brothers (maiores fratres) as patrons so that “knowing our love they may deem it worthy to supply and support us with everlasting glory.” (CIL XI.6335 = ILS 7218, AD 256): *Quod offerri ei per q(uin)q(uennales) n(ostros), set (sic!) et plurimos colleges placuisse, hocque testimonium incidi in tabulam aeneam et quam primum eis offerri, ut in plenum intellelegentes amorem numeri nostri perpetua gloria ornare et fovere nos dign(e)n(tur)*. For the prominent ancestors of Petronius Victorinus, see Cracco Ruggini 1971: 128–29 n. 143. He was perhaps descended from Marcus Cornelius Fronto, *cos. AD 143; Atempius Victorinus, consul for the second time in AD 183; and Marcus Atempius Fronto, *cos. AD 199 (ILS 1129, 7364)*. We are not informed of the ages of the patrons’ sons. But judging from the inscriptions commemorating the death of very young patrons of collegia, there seem to have been no age limits for the assumption of such a title. ([CIL XIV.341 = ILS 6144 (12 years old), CIL V.5275, CIL X.1697 = ILS 1226 (clarissimus puer) ])


91 Gordon (1983: no. 78) suspected, however, that the possible death of Memnia Victoria, mother of the brothers in question, in or shortly before AD 260, may have been the cause.

92 I give two more parallels below: the direct reason why the *collegium dendophorum* coopted Servilius Diadorus as patron was to “show gratitude to the good, worthy man” (*bono viro benemerenti gratias agere*), because he set up a foundation of 20,000 sesterces that enabled the members of the *collegium* to enjoy annual *sportulae* on his birthday out of the yearly interest of 1,000 sesterces (AE 1998, 282); the tablet from the *collegium fabrum* of Volsinii describes the virtues of the patroness-elect, Ancharia Luperca, as such: *honesta matrona, sanct(a)e indolis et disciplinae caerimonis etiam praedit<is>(a) femina. One of the reasons for her election, the tablet claims, was pro
But our sources do not always point definitively to the quasi-hereditary relationship. Neither does prior benefaction seem to have been a prerequisite for the election of a patron. Tutilius Iulianus is a case in point (no. 118). Described as a man distinguished for his manner of life, his moderation and his innate modesty, Tutilius Iulianus was elected patron of the fabri and centonarii of Regium Lepidum in AD 190 so that “the evidence of the iudicium of the collegium may serve as an example to others, ut sit ceteris exemplo iudici nostri testimonium.” What ceteris referred to is not immediately clear. Who were ‘the others’? Did it refer to the other potential benefactors or other collegia in town that were competing for potential benefactors in the same pool? As the patronage tablet was to be displayed in Tutilius Iulianus’ house, it would have been seen mostly by Iulianus’ peers and his clients. The language of the hortatory clause gravitated towards the iudicium nostrium (our judgment) rather than the virtues of the patron elect. What iudicium, then? Did it signify the collegium’s decision to elect Tutilius Iulianus patron and present him with a patronage tablet or their ability to identify a worthy patron? The text later mentions the lateness of the recognition (tardae cogitationis) and hopes Iulianus would forgive it. The nature of the ‘delay’ is nowhere revealed to us. In any case, the

morum eiusmod castitatae et iam prisciae consuetudinis sanctitatae. However, her connections seem to have been more important in determining her cooptation. In fact, the quinquennales of the collegium began their recommendation by acknowledging the long-time benefactions of her husband, himself a patron of the collegium. Shortly thereafter, the quinquennales mentioned Ancharia Luperca’s father, whose sons had held all kinds of magistracies in Volsinii. (CIL XI.2702 = ILS 7217: quanto amore quantaque affectione Laberius Gallus, p(rimi)p(ilaris), v(ir) e(gregius), erga col(leg)ium n( ostrum) agere instituerit, beneficia eius iam nudum in nos conlata confirmant. Et ideo Anchariam Lupercam uxorem eius, filiam Anchari quondam Celeris b(onae) M(emoriae) [or perhaps b(ene) m( erenti)] v(ir), cüti proles et prostaia omnibus honoribus patriæ n(ostre) sincera fide functa est. See Cracco Ruggini 1971: 122 n. 129 for parallels of the expressions in the last sentence: CIL VIII.9047 = ILS 2767; CIL X.4755, X 5349.) Finally, the tabula states explicitly that the collegium elected Ancharia Luperca in honor of her husband and in memory of her father. (CIL XI.2702: in honorem Laberi Galli, p(rimi)p(ilaris), e(gregii) v(iri), mariti eius, patroni collegi n(ostris), et in memoriam Anchari quondam Celeris, patris eius, dignissimam patronam cooptemus.) It is not clear what relationship existed between the collegium and Ancharius Celer. In this case, the consolidation of an ongoing relationship intertwined with the extension of connections to other prominent local families.

93 Sometimes, there might have been a time lag between the election of the patron and the formal presentation of the tablet. But in some cases, apologizing for tarda cogitatio may simply be a polite gesture on the part of the client(-to-be). I owe this point to Professor Richard Talbert.
hortatory clause might have been prompted by a peculiar circumstance rather than been a generic exhortation.\textsuperscript{94} The \textit{collegium centonariorum} of Luna in AD 255 listed three qualifications that the desired patrons should fulfill (no. 100). The first was that they must be ‘endowed with distinguished honors, \textit{hon[oribus] ill[ustribus] praedit(os)’}. In other words, the \textit{collegium} was looking for a magistrate of high rank. In addition, the desired patrons must be ‘men of good manner of life and full of moderation, \textit{bon(ae) vit(ae), mansuet[u]d(ine) plenos’}. Lucius Cot(tius?) Proculus, ‘a distinguished man, a senator of local origin, and a man of simple life’, was duly chosen.

In those cases where the formal cooptation of a patron was not based on an ongoing relationship, a series of questions may arise concerning the selection process: Did the \textit{collegia} and the patron-candidates have contact with one another before the cooptation was formally proposed and voted on at collegial meetings? How did \textit{collegia} approach a potential patron? Did they use members of the \textit{collegia} who were personal clients of the potential patron as middlemen, if such members existed? Or did they more frequently acquire new patrons through the connections of existing patrons? Did the patrons sometimes offer to patronize a \textit{collegium}, making the cooptation a pure formality? There is evidence to show that \textit{collegia} may actively seek relationship with the elite. In Vici-tia, the \textit{collegium centonariorum} offered a statue for the wife of L. Lartius Maximus, \textit{IIIvir i(ure) d(icundo), adl(ectus) aer(arius), pont(ifex)}, who paid for it (no. 145). In Brixia, the \textit{centonarii} put up a statue for Baebia M. f. Nigrina, a niece of T. Vibius Varus, consul of AD 134 (no. 152). In both cases, the \textit{collegium} might have been courting the goodwill of important local families.\textsuperscript{95} Whether the exchanges of courtesies would lead to more serious relationship is hard to tell. That the desired patron might sometimes reject collegial cooptation is implied in such expressions as \textit{si cum nob(is) patr(onom) adsumam(u)s, petendumq(ue) de benignit[at(e)] s(ua) et s(ua) benevolentia, ut eo anim(o) suscipe(re) dignet(ur) hoc decretum voti(v)um consens(us) n(ostri)} in the patronage

\textsuperscript{94} Forbis (1996: 9) thinks that the \textit{collegium} considered Tutilinus Iulianus as an \textit{exemplum} of virtue, and that the purpose of his election was to foster patronage through \textit{exemplum}. The formula \textit{sit exemplo ceteris} is quite rare in Latin epigraphy. I only know of one other example (in \textit{AE} 1998. 282). The hortatory formulae are much more common in Greek honorific inscriptions, especially in the Hellenistic period.

\textsuperscript{95} “Their eyes were directed upwards, at what would please and attract their social superiors.” (Lendon 2005: 101)
tablets (no. 100; cf. no. 118). But how often did the patron(s)-elect turn down the cooptation? The gap of our sources causes uncertainty and serious difficulty for the reconstruction of how patronage relationships between potential patrons and the collegia came to be established. Presumably, specific scenario varied from case to case depending on the status of the patrons and the position of the collegia, as well as on their particular concerns at the time.

**Conclusion**

Like the associative phenomenon itself, the phenomenon of collegial patronage was multifaceted. The motivations and expectations of the collegia in choosing a patron, as well as the manifestations of the patron-collegia relationship, were diverse. So, too, were the qualifications of the patrons. For such types of collegia as the collegia centonariorum, the non-material benefits, such as the protection of these collegia’s legal rights, seems to be the more important aspect of the patronage relationship. Certain types of collegia may have been in more favorable positions in the competition for patrons than others. The majority of the known patrons are those of the collegia fabrum. No doubt one reason for this is the wide geographical distribution of this type of collegium. But even within the same city, the number of recorded patrons of the collegium fabrum usually exceeds that of the other types of collegia. Furthermore, the percentage of shared patrons among the total number of known patrons of a particular collegium in a particular city tends to be lower in the case of the collegium fabrum than the collegium centonariorum. Therefore, looking at the two collegia side by side, it seems that the former had an easier time acquiring patrons.96 It is noteworthy that competition existed not only between collegia but perhaps also between

---

96 The frequency of sharing patrons with other collegia: in Colonia Apulensis, three out of six known patrons of the collegium fabrum were shared with other collegia, while two out of the three known patrons of the collegium centonariorum were shared with other collegia; in Aquileia, three out of the six known patrons of the collegium fabrum were shared with other collegia, while all the three known patrons of the collegium centonariorum were shared with other collegia; in Pisaurum, three out of the ten known patrons of the collegium fabrum were shared with other collegia, while all the three patrons of the collegium centonariorum were shared with other collegia.
potential patrons and benefactors. The case of Brixia would suggest that only the wealthiest and most influential citizens of Brixia were able to obtain the title of *patronus collegii/collegiorum*. Organizations such as the *collegia centonariorum* were viewed as agents that could confer honor and prestige. The possession of the title of collegial patron was recognized as part of one’s public career. It is, therefore, reasonable to envisage a two-way selection process in the formation of patronage relationship, at least in some instances. The exchanges of honor tokens, in the form of statues and honorific inscriptions from the *collegia* to the benefactors or potential patrons, and in the form of various gifts from the benefactors to *collegia*, may have been to a certain extent part of a courting game.

The complexity of the social network involving *collegia* can also be illustrated by the case of Colonia Apulensis (Apulum I). I choose Apulum for two reasons: first, the decent number and relative chronological concentration of relevant inscriptions; second, its provincial location, which makes it a good case for the understanding of the less studied cities outside of Italy. Chart 6.2 illustrates the distribution of patrons and *collegia* at Colonia Apulensis. This chart makes it easy to locate the center of the network. Most of the patrons known to us were those

97 The correspondence of Servilius Diodorus, equestrian and Laurens Lavinas, who established a perpetual foundation of 20,000 sesterces for the *collegium dendrophorum* of Lavinium, also points to the ‘spirit of emulation’. The last sentence of Diodorus’ letter acknowledging his acceptance of the patronage tablet offered by the *collegium* is an exhortation that his generosity may serve as an example for those of his priestly colleagues who desired the honor of patronizing the *collegium dendrophorum* [maxime cum ea re exemplo sit ceteris consacredotalibus meis optantibus a vobis honorem patronatus]. (Nonnis 1995–96: 250; AE 1998.282). For parallels of the competition that existed among the consumers of honors themselves in the Hellenistic period, see the materials from Rhodes cited by Gabrielsen 2001: 227.

98 Cf. Harries 2003: 128 on city patrons: “Public acknowledgement of patronage by the *populus* was not merely an optional ego-boost to patrons but an essential part of the confirmation of status in the highly pressurised environment of aristocratic competition for honours and office. Patronage, then, was, as it always had been, a two-way process and the ‘favor pupuli’ was of far more than symbolic importance.”

99 Colonia Apulensis—Publius Aelius Rufinus: patron of *collegium fabrum* (CIL III.975); Lucius Septimius Nigrinus: patron of *collegium fabrum* (CIL III.984); Fabia Lucila: (mater) *collegia fabrum* and *centonariorum* (no. 3); Publius Aelius Genialis: patron of *collegium centonariorum* (no. 4); Publius Aelius Strenuus: patron of *collegia fabrum*, *centonariorum*, and *nautarum* (no. 5); Marcus Aurelius Chrestus: patron of *collegium fabrum* (CIL III.1212 = IDR III.5.444 = ILS 7255); Gaius Nummius Certus: *collegia fabrum* and *dendrophorum* (CIL III.1217 = IDR III.5.599). I thank Giovanni Ruffini for the diagram.
of the collegium fabrum. Only one patron each has been attested for the dendrophori and the nautae, and both were also patrons of other collegia. All of those who patronized multiple collegia were of equestrian rank: Publius Aelius Strenuus and Gaius Nummius Certus were both equites Romani; Fabia Lucila (no. 3) was the daughter-in-law of an eques. Publius Aelius Rufinus (CIL III.975) was a decurio of Municipium Septimium Apulense (Apulum II), but patronized the collegium fabrum of Colonia Apulensis. Furthermore, two of the patrons of the collegium fabrum of Municipium Apulense held positions in Sarmizegetusa, where the collegium fabrum was particularly large and prominent.100

The Roman collegia were not only integral to the social network, but also contributed to shaping the social relationships in municipal contexts. The network created by patronage was not static, but rather a dynamic set of relationships and interactions characterized by plurality, cooperation, selection, and competition. In many places where the pres-

100 CIL III.1051 = IDR III.5.165 = ILS 7144; CIL III.7805 = ILS 7145 = IDR III.5.446a = AE 1996.1276a.
ence of the *collegium centonariorum* has been attested, the *centonarii* seem to be at prominent intersections of this dynamic process. It is not to say, however, that the *centonarii* always attracted high-ranking patrons. Sassina is a case in point, where the highest-ranking patrons that we know of were *Augustales*, while no one above the decurial rank was known to be patrons of the *centonarii*. 
A noticeable tendency in recent scholarship emphasizes the universality of the convivial, religious, and funerary functions among all kinds of associations throughout human history. These components were as basic and integral among the Roman collegia as they were among the Hellenistic associations, and the Medieval and early modern guilds and confraternities. Indeed, the convivial, religious, and funerary activities are the best attested aspects of the collegia centonariorum. In many instances, these activities were so intimately interrelated that it is impossible to draw a meaningful dividing line between them. The funerary feasts, for example, intersected all three spheres. For instance, the overwhelming majority of perpetual foundations donated to the collegia centonariorum were testamentary, and as such were earmarked for annual banquets and other commemorative activities in honor of particular dead. Graveside feasts or banquets held on such religious festivals as Parentalia and Rosalia had strong religious connotations and ritual significance. Such infrastructures such as temples and scholae owned by collegia may serve multiple purposes. Because of the intertwining relationship between feasting, religious ceremonies, and burials, I treat them together in this Chapter. Central to this Chapter are not

---


3 Parentalia were celebrated February 13–21, with offerings to the shades of ancestors (Ovid Fast. 2.533–616). Rosalia were also often connected with the commemoration of the dead.

4 See Bollman 1998 for discussions of the designs of the collegial meeting places.
only the forms of these activities but also their meanings to both the *collegium* as an entity and to the collegial members as individuals.

**Convivial Activities**

The central importance of convivial activities in the collective life of the *collegia* might be demonstrated by the inclusion of (elaborate) rules concerning banquets in the *collegium* bylaws, the presence of dining rooms in the collegial meeting-places (*scholae*), and the attention that convivial activities received from outsiders, especially the Christian writers. Much of the Christian criticism of *collegia* was centered on the riotousness and drunkenness of their banquets. This was, in fact, one of the ways in which Christian authors discredited pagan practices and argued for the pursuit of the ‘true’ *collegia*. “To eat and drink well among pleasant company seemed to strike at the very essence of what a collegium was all about,” wrote John F. Donahue in his study on the Roman community at table. The emphasis on the importance of convivial activities to *collegia* is certainly justifiable; but to focus on the pleasure aspect is perhaps too simplistic an approach to the collegial feasts. A wide range of social and religious dimensions are internal to the convivial activities of *collegia*.

*Collegia* did not hold banquets whenever they wanted. Rather, the occasion and the organization of banquets, as well as the manner of dining, seems to have been carefully regulated by the *collegium* bylaws. Banquets, therefore, would constitute special occasions invested in the

---

5 For general observations concerning *collegia* and feasting in the Roman times, see Bollman 1998 on the archaeological features of club-houses. She notes that many clubhouses had halls and restaurants (*tabernae*); Dunbabin 2003: 97; Donahue 2004: 126–36. For Medieval parallels, see Farnhill 2001: 17; Rosser 1996b: esp. 446.

6 Philo *In Flacc*. 136–37; *Leg.* 312–13; Tert. *Apol.* 39.6–7, 15–19; August. *Ep.* 23.6. In discussing the feasting of *collegia*, scholars often cite Varro *Rust.* 3.2.16: *aut collegiorum cenae, quae nunc innumerabiles excandefaciunt annonam macelli*. Here, *collegia* were blamed for driving up the prices of foodstuffs with their feasts (Cf. Dunbabin 2003: 73). However, it is not clear what kind(s) of *collegia* were being referred to here or whether *collegia* were used in a technical sense. *Collegia* here could refer to the priestly colleges, the organizations of the *apparitores* (clerks) rather than the guilds of the craftsmen and/or tradesmen.

7 Donahue 2004: 85.

8 In fact, the following statement concerning the convivial activities of the Medieval fraternities seems also applicable to the many of the collegial feastings in the Roman world: “One can regard the guild feast, for example, as an event of social, political, economic and religious significance. Indeed, to draw attention to one of these areas alone would certainly be to misconceive it.” (Farnhill 2001: 13) For a dense probe into the meanings of feastings among Medieval confraternities in England, see Rosser 1994b: 431: eating and drinking as “defining activities of the guilds”.

elements of commensality and formality. The most common occasions for collegial banquets were the celebrations of patrons’ birthdays, the anniversary of the founding of the collegium, the birthdays of the patron deities, the dies natalis of the emperor and empresses, and the dies imperii of the reigning emperor. Apart from these regular occasions, there were essentially two other types of collegial feasts, namely, group participation in 1) public banquets given by patrons or benefactors to celebrate the dedication of statues or the establishment of endowments, and 2) funerary and commemorative feasts for members or testators who set up foundations for commemorative activities on their birthdays or such relevant festivals as Parentalia and Rosalia. As far as the collegia centonariorum are concerned, these last two types of feasting feature prominently in the epigraphic record. But there is no reason to doubt that these collegia also had their own stipulated days or occasions for conviviality. The birthday of Augustus may have been such an occasion for the collegium centonariorum of Rome in the first century AD (no. 41). But since collegia seldom put up inscriptions in commemoration of such routine celebrations and none of the collegial bylaws of the collegia centonariorum have survived, we do not know the details of these regular convivial events.

9 Nos. 64, 121, 130, 141, 179, 219.
10 Specific details concerning the feasts themselves can only be supplied from the parallels from other collegia. I list some general observations here, while not suggesting that the observations made from other types of collegia universally apply to the collegia centonariorum. Hierarchy within the collegium was not only asserted, but also displayed in various ways, such as in unequal portions of food or hierarchical seating arrangements. Titles such as duplicarius (a person eligible for a double share) among various collegia also indicated that entitlement to a larger portion of food was taken as a manifestation of distinction, privilege, and relative status. [CIL III 1494 (ob duplam sportulam collat(an) sibi); CIL III 7960 (ob honorem dupli); CIL XIV 256 (sesquiplic(arius)). Cf. Waltzing I: 489.] All the surviving collegial bylaws contain regulations in relation to eating and drinking. Some include detailed rules concerning the unequal distribution of food or sportulae according to rank within the collegium. The Lex colleg(i) Asculapi et Hygiae contains the most detailed regulations known in this regard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy share occasion</th>
<th>quinquennalis, pater and mater collegii</th>
<th>the immunes and two curatores collegii</th>
<th>Populus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep. 17, n(atali) Antonini Aug(usti); Jan. 8th</td>
<td>3 denarii</td>
<td>2 denarii</td>
<td>1 denarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 8th, n(atali) collegii; Feb. 20th; dies rosae, dies violari</td>
<td>6 denarii</td>
<td>4 denarii</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 sextarii (wine)*</td>
<td>6 sextarii (wine)</td>
<td>3 sextarii (wine)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mater did not receive wine.
Feasts were occasions when religion and social life closely intertwined. Religious rituals, including sacrifices, often preceded or accompanied the banquets. In fact, in many cases, religious rituals and banquets were simply different stages of the same events. This can be convincingly illustrated by a case from Cemelenum (no. 130): Etereia Aristolais put up a statue for her son, P. Etereius P. Q(urina) Quadratus. Upon its dedication, she gave banquets to the *coll(egium)] cent(onariorum)* according to custom (*ex mor[e]*). She also set up a foundation, which the *collegium* accepted on the condition that each year on Quadratus’ birthday, out of the interest of the foundation, the *collegium* should sacrifice with *ansare* and cake in the place where his remains were located, hold a banquet in the temple according to custom (*ex more*), put up roses at a fitting time, and clean and put garlands on the statue.11

Communal feasts could be held indoors or outdoors. Collegial meeting-places sometimes included one or more *triclinia* (dining rooms). The meeting-place of the *collegium* *centonaiorum* of Sentinum was called *domus*, and it had a *triclinium* where such important collegial events as the election of patrons might take place (no. 68, AD 261). Archaeological finds from the *schola* of the *collegium centonaiorum* of Aquincum include all kinds of ceramics, among which are storage and preparation vessels as well as mortars, jugs, and cups.12 These may have been used for banquets or religious rituals or both. Sometimes the

---

11 This intertwining of religion and conviviality is confirmed by other documents from a variety of associations, widely distributed both geographically and chronologically. See the bylaws of the *cultores Dianae et Antinoi* (*CIL XIV.2112 = ILS 7212*). See also a group of extraordinarily interesting graffiti about the religious (including sacrificial) and convivial (including drinking) activities of the iron-workers’ corporation from Hermontis (Lajtar 1991: 53–70, esp. 66).

12 Zsidi 1997: 52.
schola contained more than one triclinium. Because of its large size, the collegium of the shipbuilders at Ostia had four triclinia in their schola. It is conceivable that the collegia centonariorum at Mediolanum and Ravenna, with their hundreds of members, had multiple dining rooms.\textsuperscript{13} The collegium centonariorum at Brigetio, Pannonia Inferior, was to dine (ad epulas) at a portico in AD 217 (no. 218). The portico was built by Q. Ulp(ius) Felix, an Aug(ustalis) and possibly pater of the collegium, perhaps as an addition to the two gates (portae) of the fortress that were near a fountain or temple of Salus.\textsuperscript{14} The spot is very likely a heavy traffic location. Dining in the portico, then, would certainly attract public attention, which might serve to enhance the public image or respectability of the collegium in question.

Details about the organization of feasts among the collegia centonariorum are lacking. Needless to say, however, depending on the occasion and the size of the collegium, feastmaking would involve varied amount of preparation. Parallels from other collegia suggest that the responsibility of ‘feastmaking’ belonged to the magistri cenarum, as in the case of the cultores Dianae et Antinoi, or to curators, as in the case of the negotiatores eborariae aut citriariae (merchants of ivory and citrus wood).\textsuperscript{15} In both cases, the positions seem to have been liturgies.\textsuperscript{16} These collegial feasts had social significance for both the individual participants and the collegium as a whole. When participating in public banquets with other groups from a broad range of social ranks, collegia as groups were usually ranked below the decurions, the Augustales, but above the plebes.\textsuperscript{17} In Cemelenum (no. 131), a person, whose name has been lost, distributed two denarii each to the decurions, the Augustales, and the officiales, but one denarius each to members of the collegia, which undoubtedly included the collegium centonariorum. The person also

\textsuperscript{13} For the possible identification of the meeting place of the fabri and centonarii at Mediolanum, see Bollman 1998 A 79: 429–31.
\textsuperscript{14} For discussion of this inscription, see Marwood 1988: 95–96 n. 5. Cf. CIL III.11042 = RIU II.503.
\textsuperscript{15} CIL VI.33885 = ILS 7214.
\textsuperscript{16} The convivial activities of the Medieval confraternities provide strikingly similar parallels to the collegial feasts in the Roman times and a lot more details. In some confraternities, the position of ‘feastmaker’ had special importance and was often a stepping-stone to the highest magistracy within the confraternity. This post involved some responsibility and could be a difficult job to carry out: it involved not only cooking, washing, and the purchases of foodstuffs, but also the collection of contributions, etc. (Farnhill 2001: 53)
\textsuperscript{17} Duncan-Jones 1982: 141–43; van Nijf 1997: 154.
offered bread and wine to the diners, and distributed oil to men and women alike. Such a hierarchical setup is central to van Nijf’s analysis of the similarity between the social settings for the operation of the Eastern and Western associations, as well as the established place of associations in public commensality during the Roman period.18

Religious Activities

The term ‘religious’ refers to those aspects of collegium activity concerned with ritual and cultic practices. Religious activities were by no means limited to associations focusing on the cults of particular deities.19 In fact, even in the cases of those so-called cult associations, their religious dimensions were much wider than the particular cults around which they allegedly revolved. For the majority, if not all, of the Roman collegia, three types of religious activities should be noted: the cult of the Genius of a collegium, the worship of patron god(s) and/or goddess(es), and corporate participation in emperor worship. I shall return to these three elements among the collegia centonariorum shortly below. But before that, I wish to draw attention to certain other indications of the religious elements in the collegia. Priestly titles such as flamen, sacerdos, and pontifex have been attested in a handful of cultic and occupational associations.20 C. Atilius C. f. Tertullius, for example, seems to have been both pon[tif(ex)] and c[ur]at(or) arc(ae) of the coll(egia?) fabr(um) et cent(onariorum) of Mediolanum in the 70th year of the collegial era (no. 188). In collegia where there were both priests and magistrates, there was perhaps a division of duties between the administrative and priestly positions.21 In collegia lacking priestly offices, religious ceremonies were perhaps performed by the chief magistrates.22 Some collegia

19 Kloppenborg and Wilson, eds., 1996: passim, esp. 7, 13 (Wilson). Any sharp distinction between cultic associations and other ‘types’ of associations is certainly problematic and anachronistic. Cf. Mouritsen 2007: 242 note 32. But I also agree with Mouritsen on the following point: “It is still possible to distinguish between institutions with specific cultic responsibilities and those without.”
20 CIL VI.355 (collegium Isidis); no. 174, no. 161(sacerdos of the collegium iuvenum of Brixia); CIL II.2229 ([fa]milia publica, Corduba); CIL II.1326 (Pontifex: sacrae curiae, Acipino, Hispania).
22 This was the case with the collegium of the cultores Dianae et Antinoi of Lanuvium. Despite its title, which suggests cultic origins, the collegium did not have priestly positions. The quinquennalis was charged with the duty to “conduct worship with [incense]
regularly used temples (\textit{templa} or \textit{aedes}) as meeting-places. In fact, the \textit{collegium fabrum et centonariorum} at Regium Lepidum had a temple of its own (no. 117, AD 190). This temple must have been the center of their religious activities; but its function was by no means exclusively cultic, for this was apparently also the place where the \textit{collegium} held their conventions, passed decrees, and discussed important issues, such as the election of patron(s).\textsuperscript{23} In Cemelenum, a funerary foundation (no. 130, already discussed above) stipulated that the \textit{collegium centonariorum} should sacrifice and then feast in an unspecified temple. It is not clear whether this temple was the \textit{collegium}'s regular meeting place or whether it belonged to the \textit{collegium}. Waltzing, followed by Bollmann, thinks that the \textit{templum} in no. 142 from Patavium, whose front the patron of the \textit{collegium centonariorum} decorated with fountains and marble statues, was perhaps the meeting-place of the \textit{collegium} in question.\textsuperscript{24} This may be the case, but needs further confirmation. In Aquincum, the musical instrument (\textit{hydra}) donated by Gaius Iul(ius) Viatorinus to the \textit{collegium centonariorum} (no. 206, AD 228) may well have been used for music in religious ceremonies.\textsuperscript{25} In the sections to follow, I shall elaborate on the various religious activities of the \textit{collegia}.

\textbf{Worship of Patron Deities}

It was common for a \textit{collegium} to have one or more patron deities.\textsuperscript{26} In fact, quite a few occupational \textit{collegia} adopted the name of their patron deities as part of the name of their \textit{collegia}.\textsuperscript{27} However, we do

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{and wine" (ILS 7212; Beard, North and Price II: 292–94 n. 12.2) Cf. Waltzing I: 390. See also a group of interesting graffiti about the religious activities of the iron-workers’ corporation at Hermonthis (Lajtar 1991: 53–70).
\item \textsuperscript{24} Waltzing IV: 439; Bollmann 1998: 477 C 76.
\item \textsuperscript{25} For the discussion and reconstruction of the remains of this instrument, identified as an organ, see Walcker-Mayer 1972; Zsidi 1997; Markovits 2003: 170–72.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Waltzing I: 203–05. For Medieval parallels of patron saints, see Swanson 1989: 49 (e.g., the Guild of St. John the Baptist of the Tailors in fifteenth-century York, the mercers’ Holy Trinity guild).
\item \textsuperscript{27} For example, \textit{mensores frumentarii Cereris Augustae} (Ostia, CIL XIV.409); veterans—Marteneses, Martiales, Martis cultores; \textit{collegium vestiariorum}—Mercury; \textit{collegium venatorum}—Diana; \textit{collegium fabrum} Veneris (Salona, CIL III.1981); \textit{collegium
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
not know exactly how collegia chose their patron deities. It does not always seem to be the case that the patron god/goddess of a particular collegium was that of the trade associated with the collegium. One of the collegia sagariorum (dealers and/or makers of saga, or outer-cloaks) of Rome, for example, took Hercules, the patron deity of the first cohort of the Praetorian Guards, as its own patron deity (CIL VI.339). As I have discussed in Chapter 4, this collegium may have had a role in supplying the Praetorians with clothing. Another group of sagarii at Rome, located near the [Th]e[ater of Marcellus, styled themselves very differently as cultores domus Aug(ustae) (CIL VI.956).

As far as the collegia centonariorum are concerned, none of the dedications made by the collegia as collectivities to their patron deities have survived. However, four dedications made by individuals to various gods or goddesses may have been closely connected with the corporate worship of the collegia, although none of these connections can be firmly established. In Cemelenum, C. Cassicus C. f. Claudia Paternus, patron of the collegium utriclarior(um), dedicated a statue of Mercury. On the same day, he gave doles (sportulae) and oil to the collegium fabrum utriclariorum et centonariorum (no. 133). It is possible but not certain that the fabri, the utriclarii and the centonarii in question were connected with the worship of Mercury, the god of business. In Aquincum in AD 210, the magister of the coll(egium) centonariorum made a votive dedication to the pagan god Sedatus Aug(ustus) (no. 205). But there was no indication of whether he did this for himself or on behalf of the collegium. Again in Aquincum, P. Ael(ius) Annianius made a votive offering to I(upiter) O(ptimus) M(aximus) and Lib(er) P(ater) for his own health (pro salute sua) and that of five vexil-
larii (standard-bearers) of the collegium centonariorum (no. 208). I(upiter) O(ptimus) M(aximus) was the most widely worshipped god in Pannonia. It would not be surprising if Jupiter was taken as the patron god of the collegium. In Brigetio in AD 217, Q. Ulp(ius) Felix built a porticus and dedicated it to Apollo and Hygia. As already mentioned above, he gave this portico to the collegium centonariorum as a place to dine (no. 218). Felix was an Aug(ustalis) and perhaps also a curator of the temple of Apollo Grannus, if the restoration of a fragmentary inscription (CIL III.10972) is accepted: [cura?]tor loci (= [templi Apollinis]) Gran[ni]. According to another fragmentary inscription, Felix may have borne the title of pater of the collegium (no. 219, AD 220). But the particular relationship between the collegium and Apollo and Hygia, the gods of health, is not clear.

Corporate Worship of the Emperors

In Rome, L. Sextilius Seleucus, a decurio of the collegium centonariorum, set up a foundation of 5,000 denarii, the interest of which—600 denarii—was to be paid out (erogentur) from the collegial treasury every year on the birthday of the deified Augustus, natali divi Augusti (no. 41). This reference to divus Augustus is of some interest, for as it will become clear in the discussion below, corporate worship of the deified emperor was much rarer than the worship of the living members of the imperial family. In opposition to an earlier scholarly assertion that there was no cult of the living emperor(s) in Rome, Ittai Gradel (2002) has recently demonstrated that such worship existed in private cults, both in the provinces and in Rome. His thesis can be reinforced by the rich material attesting to the fact that emperor worship was an integral part of the activities of many Western collegia. This material was collected by J.-P. Waltzing more than a hundred years ago, but has never been systematically investigated or incorporated into any study of collegia or imperial cults. Nor has Ittai Gradel exploited the

29 It concerned a Q. Ulp(ius) F[--- and his benefactions to a collegium, most likely the collegium centonariorum [cf. l. 3 ce]nt(onariorum]. The restoration F/elix is fairly reasonable. This inscription was contemporary with and very similar to no. 218, both ending in consular dating formulae.
30 Gradel 2002: passim, esp. 223.
31 Waltzing VI: 585–602; 660–61. See also San Nicolo 1972 (1912): 26–9, 46–61 (esp. PLond. 2710); Meiggs 1960: 325–27: "some form of imperial cult [was] common to all
role of collegia in his discussion of corporate worship of the emperor. Although Chapter 9 of his book Emperor Worship and Roman Religion is titled ‘Corporate Worship’, it focuses primarily on particular groups of cultores (worshippers), especially those of the emperors’ household or Lares (cultores Augusti, cultores domus divinae, cultores domus augustae or larum aug(ustorum), etc.).

It is Philip Harland’s recent studies (2003 b and c) of the Roman associations in Asia Minor that have brought to the fore the widespread corporate forms of worship of the living emperor(s) (Sebastoi = Latin Augusti) and the imperial family among a variety of associations. Similar to Gradel’s approach, Harland draws attention to emperor worship in private settings as well as in its multiple cultural, social, and religious dimensions. Through extensive analysis of cases from Ephesus, Miletos, and Pergamon, Harland has been able to show that cultic honours for members of the imperial family were an integral and ongoing component of the life and identity of various occupational associations, the cult-associations of various deities, and those “that participated directly in the rites of the provincial cult, such as the associations of hymnodists or singers who sang hymns to the Sebastoi/emperors as gods in provincial celebrations.” One of his key cases was that of the Demetriasts in Ephesus, among whom the annual mysteries and sacrifices performed to Demeter Karpophoros and Thesmophoros coexisted with those to the Sebastoi gods. Sometimes, associations took the epithet ‘emperor-loving’, as in the case of the ‘emperor-loving goldsmiths’ of Miletos.

guilds”; Cracco Ruggini 1973: 281–82; Ausbüttel 1982: 54–5. But all the discussions of the role of collegia in the imperial cults have been very brief. For earlier works on the imperial cult, see, e.g., Taylor 1931; Liebeschuetz 1979; and above all Fishwick’s works. For criticism of earlier works on imperial cults, see Price 1984: 7–22; Alföldy 1996: 255–56; Gradel 2002; Harland 2003: 119–21. Fishwick: II.1. 538 felt it easy to dismiss the roles of collegia in the imperial cults: “Imperial busts were also in the hands of colleges whose primary concern was not directly with the cult of the emperor.” Price did notice the presence of emperor worship among associations (1984: 50 n. 122, 85, 88, 90, 105, 118, 190–91); however, he did not bring that into focus. Liertz 1998 provided a limited discussion of the corporate worship of the emperors.

34 IEph 213 (AD 88–89), 1595, IEph 4337 = SEG IV.515 (AD 19 and 23); cf. IEph 1210, 1270 [c. AD 90–110]. Harland 1996: 332–33; 2003b, c.
35 For more examples, see those assembled by Harland 1996: 325–40: the mystai (initiates) of Dionysos set up an inscription in honor of Hadrian (IEph 275); a village near Ephesus honored a local religious association by dedicating an inscription “to the gods of our [father]s and to the Šebastoi gods” (IEph 3817); “the silversmiths of the
Based on S. Price’s anthropological approach to imperial rituals as a “way of conceptualizing the world” and as part of “a system whose structure defines the position of the emperor,” Harland approaches “the performance of sacrifices, mysteries, or other rituals for emperors in the group setting” not as “an outward and meaningless statement of political loyalty” but as “a symbolic expression of a worldview held in common by those participating.”

Although Harland’s discussion is geographically confined to Asia Minor, its theoretical framework has much wider implications and opens up avenues for the comparative analysis of the material concerning the Roman collegia in the West. The Western collegia displayed imperial statues in the collegium scholae, made dedications to the reigning emperor(s) and empress(es), put up statues for the priests of the divae or divi, held banquets on the dies natalis of the reigning emperors and members of the imperial family, and performed religious rites or put up inscriptions for the well-being (pro salute) of the emperor and the entire imperial family. As far as the collegia centonariorum are concerned, their involvement in emperor worship was also manifold.

As already mentioned above, the collegium centonariorum of Rome attached particular importance to the birthday of divus Augustus (no. 41). In Suasa, the collegium centonariorum seems to have made a dedication, in conjunction with L. Burbuleius Matutinus, a sexvir, to the reigning emperor, Antoninus Pius (no. 75). The schola of the

---

39 CIL X.444 = ILS 3546 = FIRA III.40 = Flambard 1987: 218 n. 2.2.
40 The inscription may be restored as: Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) T(ito) Aelio | Hadriano Antoni|no Aug(usto) Pio, co(n)s(uli) IIII, p(atri) p(atiae), colleg(ium) | centonar(iorum) Suasanor(um) | L(ucius) Burbuleius Matutinus, | sexvir. Is it possible to restore college(io) in l. 3? Also, no. 195 from Mediolanum may have been a dedication made by the collegia fabrum et centonariorum to the emperor Caracalla or Commodus. But the inscription is too fragmentary for the restoration to be certain.
collegium centonariorum of Colonia Apulensis, Dacia, was dedicated to the well-being of Septimius Severus and his two sons (no.2): pro salute Aug(ustorum duorum) n(ostrorum). Questions may arise as to whether these collegia had particular reasons to honor these emperors. A case from Hispalis, Baetica, may be suggestive (no.33): the local corpus centonariorum made a dedication to Antoninus Pius because it was with his permission that the collegium came into being. indu[lgentia ei[us] [c]ollogio hominum] [--- dumtax]at [c]onstituto. This case suggests that the collegia sometimes honored emperors because of their (direct) involvement in the important milestones of collegial life. In such cases, the cultic element may have been minimal. However, this was perhaps not true of most collegial dedications to imperial family members, especially since parallels from other types of collegia show that a collegium could honor a series of emperors and empresses over a long period of time without any indication of direct contact or interaction between the collegium and the imperial family.41 But it is unclear whether all these dedications were associated with the vota on imperial anniversaries, because the collegial dedications did not usually provide exact dates. Future discoveries of dedications by the collegia centonariorum will help us determine whether honoring members of the imperial family was an ongoing component of the collegial life.

In any case, it is possible to note some differences between the way the collegia honored the emperors and the way they honored patrons or patron deities. The pro salute type of inscriptions deserves particular attention, for among collegial dedications, the pro salute type was usually made to the emperor and very seldom to patrons or other individuals.42 Patrons were usually honored for their benefactions and/or virtues, while in honoring the imperial family, pro salute (or sometimes saluti) was almost always uniform language used by the collegia. G. Alföldy summarized the rationalization behind the worship

41 Collegium scabillariorum of Puteoli: CIL X.1642 (AD 139, to Antoninus Pius), 1643 [AD 140, Faustina Aug(usta)], 1649 (AD 161, Marcus Aurelius).
42 The exceptional case is CIL XIII.5474: fabri ferrari residing in Dibio (modern Dijon) made a votive dedication to I(upiter) O(ptimus) M(aximus) and Fortuna Redux, pro salute, itu et reditu of Tib(erus) Fl(avius) Vetus (?), their patron. Among the inscriptions that mentioned the collegia centonariorum, there were two dedications pro salute of an individual and a city respectively, but neither was dedicated by the collegia: no. 220 (pro salute T. Fl. Martini, who was among others a praef(ectus) coll(egii) cent(ornariorum) of Mursa; dedicated by his freedman); no. 227 (pro salute Saurie[n]sium, dedicated by a dec(urio) of Savaria and praefectus or patron of the collegia? fabr(um) centon(ariorum); terminus post quem AD 133).
of the *salus imperatoris* as such: the emperor “could guarantee the *salus* of his subjects only when his own *salus* was secured.”⁴³ In this connection, the *pro salute imperatoris* type of dedication marked a distinction between the way the *collegia* perceived their relations with the emperors and the way they perceived their relations with secular patrons. The inscriptions recording dedications to the emperors may have been accompanied by their statues. It is important to note that imperial statues were not just works of art, but differed significantly from ordinary honorific portraits in that the imperial image was able to serve as “a potent focal point for evocations of the emperor,” “could be the medium for divine portents,” and could function as a place of asylum. To do something in front of an imperial statue was tantamount to having done it in front of the emperor himself.⁴⁴ In this way, to put up an imperial statue or to display it in the collegial *schola* or a public place immediately had a different meaning than the dedications made to secular patrons and benefactors.

In Brixia, several inscriptions have survived of dedications made by the *collegium centonariorum* to the priests/priestesses of the deified members of the imperial family.²⁵ But since these *flamines* or *sacerdotes* usually came from prominent local families, it is difficult to say whether the *collegium* made dedications to them because of their roles in the imperial cults, because of their elevated social status, or both. At any rate, judging from the material we possess, some kind of emperor worship clearly existed among the *collegia centonariorum*.

*The Cult of the Genii Collegiorum*

Waltzing collected eighty-eight inscriptions recording the worship of *Genii* among a variety of Western *collegia*.⁴⁶ The cult of the *Genii collegiorum* seems to have been a phenomenon peculiar to the West; there are no known parallels in the East. In this connection, this cultic phenomenon deserves more attention than it has been given in the secondary literature about associations or religion. In order to talk meaningfully about the *Genii* of *collegia*, let us first look at the general

---


⁴⁴ Evidence has been collected and discussed by Price 1984: 194–96.

⁴⁵ *Aemiliae C(ai) f(iliae) Aequae, sacerd(oti) divae Plotinae* (no. 155); *Clodiae P(ublii) f(iliae) Secundae, sacerd(oti) diuae Matidiae collegia fabror(um) et cen(tonariorum)* (no. 172).

role and significance of Genius worship in Roman religion and society. A Genius, or ‘life-force’, was a generative and protective deity. The cult of Genius was possibly one of the oldest elements of Roman religion, and it persisted until a law of Theodosius I restricted the cult of Genius together with those of Lares and Penates (CTh 16. 10.12, AD 392). Despite all the scholarly attention that has been devoted to such deities as Iupiter, Isis, and Bacchus, the Genii were in fact the most widely worshipped gods in the Roman world, among civilians and soldiers alike. All kinds of things, places, people, and institutions had their own particular Genii.

Like other deities, the Genii could be propitiated by offerings and/or sacrifices on festal occasions. In household shrines, there would be two figures—a man representing the Genius of the paterfamilias, and a woman representing the Iuno (female Genius) of the matrona. While the worship of the Genii of places or households was a private matter, the cults of certain Genii, such as the Genius of the Roman people (Genius publicus Populi Romani or Genius Publicus), constituted a part of the official religion. A Genius could have priest(s), and colleges might be organized around the cult of a particular Genius, such as that of a city or province. This brief introduction serves to show that the worship of Genii was an important element of Roman religion and society, and that it convincingly illustrates how deeply religion was embedded in the daily life of ancient society.

Collegia sometimes honored the personal Genii of their patrons or magistrates. In Industria, for example, the c(ollegium) c(entonariorum) and the c(ollegium) f(abrum) made identical dedications to the Genii of their shared patrons, Q. Serto[rius Syne[rgus iu]nior and Q. Serto[ius

---

47 For the translation, see Gradel 2002: 37.
48 DizEpig (L. Cesano) III: 459–81 (best source for the cult of Genii); Otto, RE VII.1: 1162 ff. For more recent collections of references, see Perea Yébenes 1999: 419–21; Gradel 2002: 372–75. The worship of Genius centuriae was particularly prominent in the army. Of the divinities most frequently invoked among the military, 44.7% were Genii. (Perea Yébenes, 1999: 412) Others included Iupiter (10.6%), Minerva (17%), Mars (6.6%), Hercules (4.2), et al. Cf. Speidel, and Dimitrova 1978: esp. 1544–46.
49 Thus, we hear of the Genius of a person, a family, a centuria, a cohort, a legion, an army, a people, a city, a province, a locality (theater, bath, campus, house, castrum, horreum, schola, etc.), the emperor, the Empire, and so on. Deities, too, had their Genii. Cf. DizEpig (L. Cesano) III: 479; Speidel and Dimitrova 1978: 1547–48.
50 Orr 1978: 1571.
52 Sacerdotes Genii municipii have been attested in Thuburbo Maius (AE 1961.72, Tunisia).
53 IA 213: cultores Genii Aquilae; a collegium Gen(ii) p(rovinciae) P(annoniae) is attested in Carnuntum (CIL III.4168).
Severus (no. 123 and CIL V.7469). In Mediolanum, the twelve centuries or the twelfth centuria of the coll(egia?) fabr(um) et centon(arioum) made a dedication to the Gen(ius) and Hon(or) of Magius Germanius Statorius Marsianus, a man of equestrian rank with public horse, who also held the titles of decurion, and curator of the collegial treasury (arka Titiana), and to the Iuno of his wife Cissonia Aphrodite, both patrons of the coll(egia?) (no. 193). The pairing of Genius and Honor is also attested by several other inscriptions put up by various collegia.\(^{54}\) Since the inscriptions honoring a patron’s Genius were primarily dedicated by freedmen, slaves, or clients, Ittai Gradel has argued that the Genius cult “expressed a position of abject social inferiority for the worshippers in relation to the person honored.”\(^{55}\) This ‘cliental’ nature of the Genius cult also seems to hold true as far as the collegial worship of personal Genii is concerned.

The cult of the Genius collegii, however, was of very different nature: it was associated with the group identity of a collegium and may also have contributed to reinforcing such identity. As far as the collegia centonariorum are concerned, there are only four inscriptions that attest to the phenomenon of the worship of Genius collegii.\(^{56}\) But there is little doubt that the cult of Genius collegii was by no means limited to these four collegia centonariorum. It would also be reasonable to say that not only each collegium but also each of the subdivisions within a collegium might have had their own Genii.\(^{57}\) The meeting-places of the collegia, too, possessed their own Genii.\(^{58}\)

Not all dedications to the Genii collegii were made by the relevant collegia. Some were made by individual member(s) or even by individuals outside of the collegia. In Alba Pompeia, for example, Sempronia Sabina and Iulia Sabina, the mother and sister, respectively, of Salvius

\(^{54}\) CIL XII.1815, Vienna: Genio et Honori utriclarior(um); nos. 164, CIL V.5612, 5892, 7468. These are not included in Gradel’s catalogue (Appendix 1).

\(^{55}\) Gradel 2002: 42.

\(^{56}\) Genii of the collegia centonariorum: dedication by Gavius Fel(ix) Petron to the Genius collegii cent(onariorum) (no. 116; Forum Corneli, Regio VII); no. 125, Alba Pompeia, Regio IX; altar dedicated to the Genius collegii (no. 23; Vasio, Gallia Narbonensis); an altar was dedicated to Nem[ausus] Aug(ustus), n(umines) deorum, as well as to the G[enius] of the c(ollegia) c[en]ti(tonariorum) et dendrophor(um). The two collegia seemed to share one Genius. Since the altar has been lost, it is impossible to re-examine the stone and see whether the original reading was correct (no. 32; Nem-ausus, Gallia Narbonensis).

\(^{57}\) Cf. CIL III.7905 (Sarmizegetusa, Dacia): Genio dec(uriae) XIII coll(egii) fabr(um).

\(^{58}\) Cf. CIL VIII.2601. 2 (Lambaesis): Genius scholae.
Cincius Sempronianus, a Roman eques, made a dedication to the Genius of the collegium centonariorum in memory of him (no. 125). Statues of the Genius collegii were one form of gift that the collegia tended to receive from benefactors or members.59 We do not seem to have any remains of such statues. But the iconographic representations of the Genius collegii were most likely anthropomorphic, perhaps similar to those of personal Genii or the Genii of military units.60

To sum up the religious components of the collegia centonariorum so far. The religious elements of collegial activities were not limited to a single dimension. In the course of the discussion above, I have listed three aspects that have been attested among the collegia centonariorum—the worship of patron deities, corporate worship of deified or living emperors and the other imperial family members, and the cult of the Genii collegiorum. These aspects were central to the collective life and group identity of the collegia centonariorum, and doubtless among many other kinds of collegia, too.

At this point, it becomes quite relevant to discuss two ancient references pointing to governmental tolerance of religious activities among collegia. These two documents are a senatorial decree cited in the bylaws of the worshippers (cultores) of Diana and Antinous of Lanuvium (CIL XIV.2112 = ILS 7212, AD 136) and an imperial rescript or mandate preserved in Dig. 47.22.pr.-1 (Marcianus). The most recent studies of CIL XIV.2112 = ILS 7212 have questioned Mommsen’s restorations, which have been used for more than a century as the basis of the theory that the so-called collegia funeraticia were granted the right to assemble en bloc by a senatorial decree.61 A. E. Gordon’s reexamination of the

---

59 Cf. CIL XII.1814 (Vienna).
60 The personal Genius usually appeared as a youth in a toga, with head sometimes veiled and sometimes bare, carrying a drinking cup. The Genii of military units were usually represented as young, nude, and beardless. The image usually held a horn of plenty and a libation bowl (patera). See Speidel and Dimitrova 1978: 1547; Perea Yébenes 1998: 874–80. The Genius of locality was usually represented by a snake, the symbol of the fruitfulness of the earth and of perpetual youth (Verg. Aen. 5.84–85; Gell. NA 6.1.3). Cf. Orr 1978: 1573. For the iconography of the imperial Genii, see Hänlein Schäfer 1996: 73–96.
61 The restored text published in CIL XIV is as follows (bold mine):

(10) KAPUT.EX.S.C.P.R
(11) quibus [coire co]venire collegiumq(ue) habere liceat. Qui stipem menstruam
conferre vo
(12) len[t in fun]era, in it collegium coeant; neq(ue) sub specie eius collegi nisi semel
in men
(13) se c[oeant co]nferendi causa, unde defuncti sepeliantur.

For the use of the older version, see W 2311; FIRA III 99–105 n. 35. For English translations of this text, see Lewis and Reinhold 1955: II 273–75; Johnson et al. 1961:
stone showed that the restoration as provided by Mommsen was not the only possible restoration, nor even a legitimate one. Particularly, Mommsen’s restoration is too short for the space; and the reconstruction volen[t in fun]era in line 12 is questionable, as the reading of an ‘E’ before ‘RA’ is by no means certain. A ‘C’ is perhaps more likely.62 Following Gordon, Ausbüttel and De Ligt respectively have proposed two new restorations:

Ausbüttel 1982: 27–28:

(10) kaput ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) p(opuli) R(omani)
(11) [quibus permissum est, co]venir collegium qua habere liceat. Qui stipem menstruum conferre vo
(12) [lent ad facienda sa]cra, in it (sic) collegium coeant; neq(ue) sub specie eius collegi nisi semel in men
(13) [se coeant stipem conferendi causa, unde d]efuncti sepellantur.

De Ligt 2000: 246–47:

(10) kaput ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) p(opuli) R(omani)
(11) qui[bus res tenuior est, co]venir collegium qua habere liceat. Qui stipem menstruum conferre vo
(12) [lent ad facienda sac]ra, in it (sic) collegium coeant; neq(ue) sub specie eius collegi nisi semel in men
(13) se c[oeant stipem conferendi causa, unde d]efuncti sepellantur.

Clause from the Decree of the Roman People
[Those who are authorized] may assemble and maintain a collegium. Those who [wish] to make monthly contributions [for religious purposes] may assemble in this collegium; but they may not [assemble] under the pretext of such a collegium except once a month for the sake of making [contributions] from which the deceased may be buried.

Clause from the Decree of the Roman People
[Those who are relatively poor] may assemble and maintain a collegium. Those who [wish] to make monthly contributions [for religious purposes] may assemble in this collegium; but they may not [assemble] under the pretext of such a collegium except once a month for the sake of making [contributions] from which the deceased may be buried.


In both versions, the focus of the senatorial decree becomes religion; the funerary aspects become part of the activities *ad facienda sacra*. In my opinion, these types of restorations are to be preferred, because they are not only palaeographically more correct in light of A. E. Gordon’s reexamination of the stone, but they also harmonize better with the fact that, in this inscription, the regulations concerning the worship of Diana and Antinous—the funds, occasions, and rules for collegial banquets (*cenae, epula*)—were even lengthier than those concerning burials.\(^63\) Special funds, for example, were set aside for the celebration of the ‘birthdays’ of Diana and Antinous. It was also decreed that on their ‘birthdays’, the highest magistrate (*quinquennalis*) should place oil for the *collegium* members in the public bath [*balinio (sic!) publico*] before the banquet.\(^64\) Plus, these new restorations would make it easier to explain why there were two convivial meetings in August (13th and 20th): while gatherings for the collection of dues may be limited to one per month, meetings for religious purposes were not thus prohibited. This was also in accord with the legal regulations preserved in Dig. 47.22.1.pr.-1, which did not mention burials but referred to monthly contributions and assembly for religious purposes:

*Mandatis principalibus praecipitur praesidibus provinciarum, ne patiantur esse collegia sodalicia neve milites collegia in castris habeant. Sed permittitur tenuioribus stipem menstruum conferre, dum tamen semel in mense coeant, ne sub praetextu huiusmodi illicitum collegium coeat. Quod non tantum in urbe, sed in Italia et in provinciis locum habere divus quoque Severus rescripsit. 1. Sed religionis causa coire non prohibentur, dum tamen per hoc non fiat contra senatus consultum, quo illicita collegia arcentur.* (bold mine)

Provincial governors are directed by Imperial instructions not to tolerate *collegia sodalicia* and that soldiers are not to form *collegia* in camp. But the lower orders (*tenuiores*) are allowed to pay a monthly fee, as long as they meet only once a month, lest an unlawful *collegium* be formed under this pretence. This applies not only at Rome but also in Italy and the provinces, stated the deified Severus in a rescript. 1. But assembly for

\(^{63}\) Already noticed by Waltzing I: 46–47; more recently Donahue 2004: 131–32. But scholarly discussions and sourcebooks often cover only the sections that discuss matters concerning funerary aspects. This tends to give a misleading impression that this *Lex collegii* was only concerned with burials.

\(^{64}\) Although the discussion is often superb and well balanced in Beard, North, and Price 1998, I do not think the authors are entirely justified in saying that “the association’s rules emphasise what seem to us the non-religious aspects of the association; and no greater weight is apparently given to the birthdays of the two deities than to those of the four local dignitaries” (272).
religious purposes should not be prohibited, provided that it does not violate the senatorial decree by which the illegal collegia are dissolved.

These were excerpted from Book Three of the Institutiones by Marcianus, a third century jurist. They constitute the opening paragraphs of Dig. 47.22 de collegiis et corporibus. The heterogeneous origins of the texts preserved in Dig. 47.22.1.pr.-2 have recently been emphasized. Nor is the chronology certain. The regulation concerning the assembly for monthly contributions may have been in force no later than the reign of Hadrian, as the senatorial decree in CIL XIV.2112 = ILS 7212 (AD 136) seems to suggest, and was then reiterated in the third century. Scholarly opinions do not agree on the meaning of tenuiores in the excerpt. While earlier scholars think that it indicated economic status and referred to the poor(er); more recently, scholars tend to think that it should be interpreted as indicating a legal and social status, and that it was a synonym for humiliores, as opposed to honestiores. As far as Dig. 47.22.1.1 (sed religionis causa coire non prohibentur) is concerned, it is not entirely clear whether this regulation was part of the Severan rescript that immediately preceded it in the text or of the Imperial mandates to the provincial governors (mandatis principalibus praecipitur praeidisibus provinciarum) mentioned in the prologue to Dig. 47.22.1. Here, religionis causa perhaps referred to the religious activities of any kind of collegia, rather than to religious collegia, as a type. There is nothing surprising, in the Roman context, about occupationally-based associations having extensive religious dimensions.

In addition, the re-reading of the two legal documents (CIL XIV.2112 = ILS 7212 and Dig. 47.22.1.pr.-1) cited above has led to further discussion of the so-called ‘funerary clubs’. These two texts were the bases on which Mommsen coined the term collegia funeraticia. Mommsen, followed by Waltzing and De Robertis, believed that collegia funeraticia constituted a discrete legal category under the Roman Empire, and that the collegia tenuriorum were by definition collegia funeraticia. The validity of this idea has now been seriously challenged by a re-appraisal of the evidence. The emerging consensus emphasizes funerary activities as only one of the important functions of all kinds of ancient associations. Dig. 47.22. pr.-1

65 E.g., de Ligt 2001: 345–58.
was not about what types of collegia should be allowed but rather provided guidelines for the provincial governors concerning what types of collegial activities could be tolerated.

Funerary Activities

Some associations initially existed as a result of shared tombs or enclosures; for others, the sharing of burial grounds came as the result of the existence of a collegium. According to Ausbüttel, about one-fifth of all known Italian associations were directly involved in the funerals of their members. Van Nijf’s data shows that about one-third of the total epigraphic production of the associations in the Roman East records funerary activity of some sort. Among the c. 300 inscriptions regarding the funerary aspects of various collegia from different parts of the West, fifty came from the collegia centonariorum in sixteen places. This sample, modest though it is, confirms the general observation that “the participation of associations in funerals could take a wide variety of forms,” including the maintenance of a collegial graveyard, the erection of inscribed tombstones for the deceased, the contribution of money for burials, (compulsory) attendance at the funerals of deceased members, giving funerary banquets, the performance of recurrent funerary rituals for the deceased, or some combination thereof.

Several collegia centonariorum seem to have possessed collegial burial grounds, at least at a certain point in their history. The graveyard of the collegium centonariorum of Interamna Praetuttiorum, Picenum, for example, was 30 feet wide and 40 feet deep (1200 ft²): Collegio Centonariorum | Interamnitium Praetut(i)orr | in front(e) p(edes) | XXX agro p(edes) XL. (no. 54) Specification of dimensions and a

---

69 Ausbüttel 1982: 59.
71 For a collection of the materials, see Perry 1999: # 1–279. To this data, omissions and new discoveries should be added (e.g., RepMolise III; InscrIt 10.5.299; AE 1977.267; W. 442 = Pais 194; AE 1927.129; CIL XIII.1734; IDR 269; the many epitaphs recently recovered from Aquincum).
73 This is the only inscription that gives the size of a collective graveyard of a collegium centonariorum, but it is one of 67 inscriptions that attest to the existence of collective graveyards among various collegia, and one of 27 inscriptions (among the 67) that have complete records as to the dimensions of collegial burial plots (Perry 1999: # 251–79; in addition, AE 1977.267; W. 442 = Pais 194); no. 141, CIL XIII.1734).
description of a monument or burial plot could serve as social control against trespassing and downsizing at a later date. For my purpose, it is more important to know how this graveyard compared with the other tombs in terms of scale. Interestingly, it was the third largest of all the graveyards whose sizes are epigraphically attested in Picenum (Regio V). Data from other Italian regions except Regio X also point to the rarity of tombs larger than 1000 ft². Therefore, it is reasonable to suggest that by regional standards, the graveyard of the collegium centonariorum must have been a noticeable monument. Since the phrase collegium centonariorum was in the dative case in the inscription, the tomb may have been a gift from a wealthy member and/or patron. The scale of the graveyard would have had the effect of projecting (if not intended to project) the distinction of the benefactor and/or the collegium itself in the local context.

In Rome, the columbarium measuring 384 ft² on the Via Salaria accommodated at least six members of the collegium centonariorum. As I have already discussed at length in Chapters 1 and 5, all of these collegiati seem to have been related to the original owners of the tombs. But not all of those interred inside the columbarium were affiliated with the collegium centonariorum. There was also another tomb at Rome inside which, among others, two centonarii were buried, both of them freedmen of one Marcus Octavius. Both tombs appear to have been family tombs.

In Sassina, nine epitaphs datable to the second century AD were put up by the collegium centonariorum. Since all of them used similar or even identical formulae, it is likely that most, if not all, of these epitaphs were originally incorporated into a larger group, perhaps a collegial graveyard. The collegium centonariorum was not the only collegium in Sassina that provided collegial burials. The collegium fabrum of the

---

74 A global and synthetic analysis of the many samples is a desideratum for any comparative studies of land use, funerary customs, and the relationship between social status and the physical dimensions of the tombs. Yet, to date, there have been only sporadic studies on regional samples of the in frente p. X in agro p. Y formula. Cébeillac 1971: 102–05 provided an analysis of the sizes of tombs in Ostia (including Isola Sacra); Eck (1983: 82–83) has collected data from Rome, CIL V and CIL XI: among a sample of 1,451 Roman tombs which mention (at least) frontes, only 34 exceed 30 pedes in frente; among 506 tombs from CIL V and 278 from CIL XI, 94 and 27, respectively, had frontes larger than 30 pedes.


76 Nos. 86–90, 91, 93, 95, and 97.
Sassina did so as well.\textsuperscript{77} The \textit{col(legium) mulionum} clearly had a collective burial ground, as marked by a stele bearing the inscription \textit{Loc(us or a) col(legii) mulionum}, as well as by the discovery of such relevant instruments as a \textit{flagellum mulionicum} at the site where the inscription was found.\textsuperscript{78}

In Brigetio, Pannonia, the \textit{collegium centonariorum} may have had a collegial \textit{sepulchrum} in the early third century AD (no. 219). At Cammuni (Regio X), the \textit{coll(egia) fabr(orum) et cent(onariorum)} gave \textit{p(edes) X} for the memory of Medius Crescens (no. 176). In Verona, Marcus Metellus Hadrianus, a \textit{magister candidatus} of the \textit{collegium centonariorum}, built a tomb for himself while still alive, but the plot for the graveyard was purchased by the decree of the \textit{collegium (ex decreto aeorum locus emptus)} (no. 146). These two cases may suggest that the \textit{collegia centonariorum} in Cammuni and Verona did not possess communal graveyards, but contributed to their members’ burials by granting to them already-purchased burial plots. This, of course, is not necessarily the only interpretation. It is also possible that Marcus Metellus Hadrianus chose not to be buried in the collegial graveyard, but the \textit{collegium} decided to buy a burial plot in his honor. In Aquincum and Ulcisia Castra, the \textit{collegia centonariorum} together with the \textit{collegia fabrum} put up tombstones for several veterans. But it is not clear whether these \textit{collegia} possessed common burial grounds in either city. In Brixia, Volsinii, and Mediolanum, the \textit{collegia centonariorum} all had funerary activities, which will be discussed further below.

Now how were the collective graveyards organized spatially? Since archaeological discoveries of the graveyards of the \textit{collegia centonariorum} are lacking, any reconstruction of the spatial organization of these tombs will have to depend on parallels. There were regional variations in the structure and layout of collective tombs. Particularly noteworthy are three types—the \textit{columbaria} found in Rome, Ostia (including Isola Sacra), and Puteoli, which were the best known; the \textit{columellae} of Pompeii; and the enclosure-tombs of Aquileia.\textsuperscript{79} All collective tombs featured an enclosed space, but only the \textit{columbaria} had rows of niches laid out horizontally on the walls, or \textit{arcosolia} for sarcophagi. The capacity of a collective graveyard is not always easy to gauge, since the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{77} \textit{CIL XI.6512: D M Q. Baebi Nepotis CFMS BM.}
\item \textsuperscript{78} \textit{AE} 1984. 377. According to Ortalli 1982: 201–07, the size of this tomb may have been 30–40x20 ft\textsuperscript{2}.
\item \textsuperscript{79} For these three types of collective tombs, see Hope 1997: 69–88; Hope 2001: 55; Graham 2006.
\end{itemize}
arrangement of interior space can be manipulated in different ways. Variations on the size of the niches or *arcosolia* and/or the number of cremation urns (*ollae*) that could be accommodated in each niche would result in different numbers of slots being available in tombs of a similar size.\(^{80}\) A preference for cremation or inhumation might also change the way the interior was arranged. In many tombs dated to the second or third century AD, cremation and inhumation coexisted. In any case, the well-preserved *columbaria* from Isola Sacra, most of which date to the second century AD, provide some sense of the capacity of collective tombs. Tomb 87, which measured 330 ft\(^2\), contained twenty-five burial slots. A tomb of between 1,000–1,600 ft\(^2\) might accommodate around 150 *formae* (inhumation burials).\(^{81}\) Theoretically, therefore, depending on whether cremation or inhumation was the dominant practice, the graveyard of the *collegium centonariorum* of Interamna Praetuttiorum (no. 54; 1,200 ft\(^2\)) could contain anywhere between 100 and several hundreds of burial slots. Unfortunately, however, we do not know its internal organization, or the date of its first use and the length of its use.

How did the *collegia centonariorum* fund these funerary activities? Due to lack of explicit records, we have once again to depend on parallels. There were at least two different ways of financing collegial funerals: 1) Members could be required to pay entrance fees and monthly dues (*stips menstrua*), so that upon their death, a fixed burial allowance would be issued from the communal funds; 2) Upon the death of a member, each surviving member could be required to pay a stipulated fee (*collatio stipis*) to cover the cost of the burial plot and other related fees.\(^{82}\) Donations of graveyards or burial slots might help to reduce burial-related costs.\(^{83}\) Benefactors sometimes provided plots for the exclusive use of the *collegia*; but in some cases, benefactors reserved allotments

---

\(^{80}\) In Isola Sacra, for example, Tomb 78, which was about half the size of Tomb 87, had as many burial slots as the latter. Although a larger tomb, Tomb 54 did not have more burial slots than Tomb 55, because the niches in Tomb 54 were much bigger than those in 55. For statistics, see Hope 1997: 74 Table 1.


\(^{82}\) For example, the *Lex familiae Silvani* (AD 60, Sabine; *AE* 1929, 161; Carroll 2006: 45) stipulated: *Qui ex ea familia decesserit, ut ei conferant singuli (sestertios) VIII.*

\(^{83}\) *Epigraphica* 28 (1966) 189 n. 20 (Mutina, *de suo dedit*); *CIL* VI.1944 (Ateste); IX.4673, 2654 (Aesernia); X.4085 (Venafrum), 5386 (Aquinum); V.81 (Pola); XI.4669 (Tuder); IA 679; --- *iter(um) da[--- | l]ib(ertis) lib(er)t(abus) q(ue) p(osteris) q(ue) eor(um)] | et college(is) (IA 692).
in their own private graveyards for collegial members. It is not clear whether special arrangement could be made for members who were willing to pay more for a larger or more desirable slot within the collegial graveyard. Hierarchy clearly existed in the collective tombs that housed patrons and their freedmen, as shown by the different sizes and decorations of the niches or tombstones. Van Nijf reasonably suggests that collegial graveyards might have been hierarchically arranged as well. However, we do not now know exactly how this hierarchical arrangement worked. One way to make a special arrangement may have been by will (ex testamento), that is, to appoint the collegium as heir so that it might carry out one’s wishes. We have several cases of ex testamento burials, but the particulars are elusive.

Why did collegia provide burials? Why would a member want to be buried by his collegium? Lack of relatives or friends was apparently not always the answer. Rather, it seems that, depending on the situation, collegia could be comparable to friends, relatives, or heirs to the deceased. An abundance of material attests to cooperation between collegia and the family members of the deceased in arranging their burials. This collegial cooperation in making burial arrangements may take various forms, such as erecting tombstones in conjunction with friend(s) or family members of the deceased, contributing money, granting a burial slot, or some combination thereof. In Brixia, M. Cornelius Aequus and Quinta, parents of M. Cornelius Proculus, commemorated their son in conjunction with the collegium centonariorum (no. 160). In Aquincum, Iul(ius) Athenodorus, who died at the age of thirty-five, seems to have been buried by his mother, Eughenia; but the collegium centonariorum contributed 300 denarii to his burial (no. 204). In Brixia, Primus Valerius Magirra was perhaps commemorated by collegia fabrum et centonariorum, in conjunction with his amici and his grandfather, Magius Valerius Surio. A friend (amicus) of Magirra’s, M. Publ(icius) Valentinus, provided the burial plot (locum sepultur(a)e

---

84 In Patavium, for example, Carrius Optabus built a large tomb (2,050 ft²) for himself, his freedmen, his son, his friends, a man named Titus Saufeius, and sodales carpentarii (AE 1927.129).


86 It was common for all kinds of collegia to participate in the funeral by contributing cash. Perry (1999, chapter 4) collected 39 inscriptions attesting to such a phenomenon. E.g., CIL XI.445 (Lucania, collegium dendrophorum, amount uncertain), CIL II.3114 (Ercavica?, Spain, sodales Claudiani, 200 sesterces); CIL III.1504 (Sarmizegetusa, Dacia, collegium fabrum, 400 denarii), CIL XI.8099 (Atina, amount unspecified).
feasts, religion and burials

While Magirra’s grandfather, Surio, put up his tombstone (aram posuit) (no. 167). But since colleg. fabr. et cent. in line 3 could also be restored as colleg(iati) fabr(um) et cent(onariorum), we cannot be sure whether Magirra’s case points to a kind of elaborate collaboration between collegia, friends, and family.

Furthermore, as in many other types of associations in the Roman West and East, the family members—or at least the spouses—of the collegati centonariorum, seem to have had access to collegial burials. In Sassina, for example, fulfilling the will of C. Longarenius Lupus, the collegium centonariorum put up a tombstone for him and his wife, Flavia Sabina (no. 90). In Mediolanum, L. Pullius Valerius, together with the fifth centuria (or five centuriae) buried his grandfather, a d(ecurialis?) of the collegia fabrum et centonariorum, and grandmother, Statoria Pupa (no. 190). The burial ground was granted by decree of the collegia or the centuriae in question.

Were cost/affordability and demographic pressure major reasons for collective burials, as Keith Hopkins believed? N. Purcell (1987), followed by van Nijf (1997), disputes such a logistical and functionalist approach to the phenomenon of collective burials. As they have pointed out, one of the serious drawbacks to Hopkins’s discussion is that it centered on the situation at Rome, which was, in fact, atypical in many respects. Van Nijf argues that being buried by a collegium was less a matter of necessity than a conscious choice to meet, in Purcell’s terms, ‘the standard of dying’. In van Nijf’s analysis, collegial membership could be an expensive privilege. This statement is dependent on his approach to collegium members as ‘plebs media’. However, as I have discussed in Chapter 5, within the middling sort, there were still a wide range of the social and financial status of collegium members. The situation may vary from collegium to collegium, from region to region, and even from member to member within the same collegium. Therefore, collegial burials may not mean the same thing to members of differing economic circumstances. In this connection, we should

87 Cf. InscrIt 10.5.182.
88 Waltzing 1: 277; van Nijf 1997: 47 with further references.
91 See also Oliver 2000: 9–11. For a parallel, see Banker 1988 on the development of lay confraternities in the thirteenth century not as a response to crises but as a reflection of people’s desire to experience a ‘socialized death’, or death in a community.
perhaps not downplay the concern for funerary costs in every case. In other words, economic considerations should not be excluded as a factor that may have contributed to the phenomenon of collegial burials, especially since the evidence shows that not every member was necessarily buried by his/her collegium.

It is by no means rare to find members, especially magistrates, of an association buried in the family tomb that they built for themselves, their wives, their freed(wo)men and their descendants. As far as the collegia centonariorum are concerned, there are twelve such cases. In Ravenna (no. 107), M. Caesius Eutyches, a dec(urio) of the seventeenth decuria of the c(ollegium) c(entonariorum) and his wife, Tullia Ferusa, built a tomb for themselves while alive. They imposed the considerable fine of 30,000 sesterces, payable to the imperial fiscus, on anyone who built anything else in front of their tomb. Marcus Cocceius M.f. Camilia Erotianus, a decurion of the collegium centonariorum of Ravenna, built a tomb for both himself and his wife while alive (no. 108); Lucius Lucilius Successus, a freedman and a quinquennalis of the collegium centonariorum at Aesseria (no. 50), did the same thing. In Mediolanum, a curator of the joint treasury of the collegia(? ) fabrum and centonariorum perhaps also built a tomb for himself while alive. He imposed a fine of 15,000 sesterces, payable to the second centuria of the collegia(?), for desecration of the tomb (no. 196). In Mevania (no. 64), Gaius Attius Ianuarius, a freedman, one of the Six in charge of sacred matters, 9 vir Valetudinis, left 1,000 sesterces to the collegium centonariorum, of which he himself was apparently a member (collegio suo). He stipulated that from the income of this sum, no fewer than twelve men should dine at his tomb on the dies Parentaliorum every year and that the collegium centonariorum should take care of this. He seems to have been a self-commemorator, though his collegium was involved in keeping up the yearly ceremonies. In Salona (no. 6), Aurelius Quintianus, a decurio of the joint collegium of the fabri and centonarii, built a tomb while alive for himself and his wife. He added that whoever should want to open the tomb after their death would have to pay 25 denarii to the decuria to which Quintianus himself had belonged. In Stojnik in Moesia Superior, Aurelius Bardibalus, a dec(urio) coll(egii) centonariorum, while alive, built a tomb for his deceased wife Aelia Lucia and himself (no. 229).

In these seven cases, the deceased seem not to have been buried by their collegia, although membership in the local collegia centonari-
orum (or the joint collegia of the fabri and centonarii, as in the cases of Mediolanum and Salona) seems to have been their only affiliation. It could be argued that these members were not buried by their collegia because the collegia centonariorum in these cities did not perform funerary functions. However, since all four of these self-commemorators held elevated positions within their collegia and appear to have been relatively well-to-do, it seems reasonable to draw some connection between the wealth of the members and their burial extra collegium. In other words, the desirability of collegial burial declined in proportion to wealth, and collegial members with more favorable social and financial circumstances might have opted not to use the collegial burial plots or funerary funds, even when these services were available.

In all five of the other cases, however, the self-commemorators in question all had multiple affiliations. Gaius Samicius Firmus was a sevir Claudialis maior while holding magistracy in the collegium dendrophorum, the collegium centonariorum, and some other associations at Verona. He apparently had an equally well-to-do wife who built a tomb for both of them (no. 149). Gaius Valgius Victorinus, both a sevir Augustalis and a member of the collegium centonariorum of Aquae Sextiae, was also commemorated by his wife (no. 21). Also in Aquae Sextiae, Sex(tus) Pu[blic(ius) Anten(or), a freedman of the colonia (coloniae) Aq[uens(is)] libertus), belonged to both the corpus sevirorum Augustalium and the corpus centonariorum. He built a tomb for himself and his wife while alive (no. 20). Gaius Rusonus [T]outius Incitatus, a sevir Augustalis of Lugdunum, nauta Araricus (shipper on the Saône), a former magistrate among the centonarii living in Lugdunum, and a negotiator frumentarius, was buried by his freedman (no. 15). Lucilius Domesticus Valerianus, an optio cent(uria tertiae) [e]x coll(egio) fab(rum) et cent(onariorum), was buried by his father, Lucilius Domesticus (no. 187).

Since these self-commemorators were all either magistrates within their collegia or Augustales, their cases support the point that the resources of a collegiatus might have been a significant factor in his decision to be buried privately or by a collegium. There is one notable exception to this ‘rule’. In Sassina, one of the nine tombstones put up by the collegium centonariorum was for L. Destimius Epigonus, an Augustalis (no. 86). His epitaph was as simple and uniform as the other eight. More archaeological finds of tombstones and collegial graveyards will no doubt clarify for us whether rich members were
Chapter Seven

routinely buried by their collegia (whether in the communal burial ground or elsewhere) or not. It may be helpful to note that among the rich collegia of the shippers (navicularii or nautae), collegial burials were rare. Nor are collective graveyards attested for the corpora of the Augustales in various cities. Being financially capable, the shippers and Augustales could afford individual burials with their own families (in the extended sense of the word), which made collegial burials neither necessary nor desirable.

It is, however, not my intention to argue that collegial burials had no other function than simply to provide decent, affordable burials, which could have included a tombstone, a burial slot, commemorative services, and/or the presence of collegiati at the funeral. Collegial burials may have contributed to providing a sense of belonging, and to reinforcing group identity. These tombs, especially the large ones like that of the collegium centonariorum of Interamna Praetuttiorum mentioned above, could also serve as a good advertisement of the importance of the collegia. In addition, collective tombs may have provided the members with more occasions for socialization. Archaeological, epigraphic, and literary sources have all confirmed that dining benches (klinai/lecti), or even formal triclinia (sometimes with hearth and well) were often integral elements of Roman tombs in the Imperial period. These were used for the funerary or commemorative banquets on such festivals as Parentalia and Rosalia. Since no collegial graveyards have survived to this day in good condition, we still await future archaeological and

---

93 The phenomenon of richer members being buried outside of collegia was not limited to the collegia centonariorum, but was also found in other types of collegia. Cf. CIL III.1583 (Drobeta?, Dacia), 2108 (Narona, Dalmatia; Aurelius Ursacius Salonitanus, member of the collegium Veneris, and his wife, while alive, prepared their sarcophagi), 3980, 4894, W. 441; CIL V.8143, 3415, 4015, 5275, 5902, 4048 (immunes recepti in collegium fabrum), 578; VI.2192, 2239, 2584, 9004 = ILS 7249; IX.5450 = ILS 7248; XII.982, 1005; XIII. 13, 23, 26, 29, 66, 67, 78, 79, 96, 98,1939, 2009.

94 For archaeological evidence for the presence of dining facilities in tombs, see, for example, Bragantini 1990: 62–70 on Isola Sacra, with fig. 12 (benches), fig. 13 (triclinium), fig. 16 (seats); for epigraphic evidence, CIL VI. 14614 = ILS 7931 (Rome), CIL VIII. 21269 = ILS 8118 (Caesarea, Mauretania), D’Arms 2000 (Misenum): Text B lines 23–24: et epulari volo magistrtus qui tunc erunt ea die in triclin<io quod est super sepulchrum; recently Dunbabin 2003: 103–40, especially 127–28; Stehmeier (2007: 215–23) suggests that the importance of traclinia/biclinia in the graveyards declined after the second century, since other places, especially the club houses of the collegia provided venues for various collegial activities. Trimalchio (Petron. Sat. 71) mentions a dining-room in describing his fantasy tomb.
epigraphic finds to confirm for us whether such dining facilities were a regular feature of collegial tombs. On the other hand, inscriptive
evidence points to the existence of collegial activities that centered around the common graveyard. In Brigetio in AD 220, for example,
Q. Ulp(ius) F[elix?, who might have been a *pater collegii*, assumed the
fees for the (annual?) ceremonies of Rosalia and (those?) over the grave
(*ad* *rosalia annua?* *itemque ad sepulcrum a solo inpendio*). It is not
terribly clear whether the *sepulcrum* mentioned here was the tomb of Q. Ulp(ius) F[elix? or the graveyard of the *collegium* (no. 219). The
latter is more plausible, since the inscription seems to be recording Q. Ulp(ius) F[elix?’s benefactions to the *collegium*, and it does not use *eius* after *sepulcrum* to specify his ownership of the tomb.

In the militarily heavy provinces, collective burials for veterans might have been of particular meaning.95 In Aquincum, for example, a series
of epitaphs was put up by various *collegia* either jointly or separately
for the veterans of *legio II adiutrix*, which stationed there through-
out most of the second and third centuries.96 These veterans, like the
civilian immigrants, came from different regions of the Empire. The
*collegium fabrum* together with the *collegium centonariorum* put up
epitaphs for the veteran I(ulius) Rufus originally from Dalmatia (*do(mo)*
*D[alm]a[t]a*, no. 221), C. Seconius Paternus *do(m)o* *Nemes* (no. 212), and C(a)esern(i)us Zosimus, *nat(ione) Cilix* (no. 214). These last two
were not specified as veterans. Other *collegia* such as the *collegium
veteranorum*, *collegium cultorum*, and *collegium Cereris* also participated
in providing burials for veterans and immigrants.97 The deceased all
seem to have lived to a very advanced age. No heir or family members
were mentioned.98

96 For the stylistic aspects of these epitaphs, mostly (mass produced) wreath stelae,
see Mócsy 1974: 181.
97 *AE* 2002. 1207 = *Lupa* 6142; *CIL* III. 10540 = *Lupa* 2969; *AE* 1906. 108 = *RIU* V.
1232 (Intercisa); *RIU* VI. 1309 = *Lupa* 10064; *CIL* III. 10511 = *Lupa* 3018: a veteran
was buried by his freedwoman in the name of (*nomine*) the *collegium Cereris*.
98 It is not to say that all the veterans were buried by *collegia*. Some of them were
certainly buried by heirs or family members. E.g., *AE* 1969/70. 482 (Aquincum).
Conclusion

Although the defining character of the *collegia centonariorum* may be ‘occupational’, in the sense that their members were supposedly recruited on the basis of a shared occupation, collegial activities were multiple and varied. Convivial, religious, and funerary activities were not only identifiable within these *collegia*, but were also closely related to each other. Collegial involvement within each of these three spheres may be multifaceted. In the case of religion, for example, there were at least three aspects of the religious activities of the *collegia*—the cult of the *Genii collegiorum*, the cult of the patron deities of *collegia*, and corporate participation in the worship of the emperor. These cultic elements were identifiable within the *collegia centonariorum* as well as many other *collegia* that are labeled ‘occupational’.

The convivial, religious and funerary activities contain multiple layers of meaning for both the *collegium* as a whole and for the *collegiati* as individuals.

Firstly, to a great extent, these activities can be approached as forms of socialization, and manifestations of both collegial solidarity and a means to maintain and negotiate such solidarity. Solidarity, however, does not necessarily mean equality. But feasts, burials, and religious ceremonies were not secluded events for the social consumption of the collegial members alone. Since many *collegia* functioned in small or medium sized towns, the preparations towards collegial banquets, the ceremonies around communal tombs, and so on could hardly escape the townspeople’s notice. These activities and processes can therefore be seen as important occasions for each group’s image-building. It should not be forgotten that the funding, venues, and even causes for the convivial, religious, and funerary activities among *collegia* were sometimes if not often provided by the benefactors. In this connection, these activities can also been seen as media through which *collegia* maintained and displayed their social connections.

Secondly, the appeal of these functions as material benefits and security network cannot be underestimated, though they may have varied significance to members of different social or economic status. Take collegial burial for instance: richer members might choose not to be buried in the collective graveyard. In that case, it is not so much individual identity was being emphasized over group identity as their financial situation made it less crucial to depend on collegial burial.
Thirdly, and very importantly, the social events as occasions for social contact and information exchange must be considered. Our sources tell us almost nothing about what the collegial members talked about at the banquets, and other communal meetings. Yet, if the lively discussions at Trimalchio’s dinner-party are of any guide, a wide range of topics—children, family, business opportunities, investment, estates, gladiatorial games, and many more—may come up. The convivial, religious, and funerary activities provide a unique ambiance for social contact among collegial members, as well as between them and the benefactors/patrons. As such, these activities should be seen as social processes in their own right. In these processes the occupational and the socioeconomic aspects of the collegia became intertwined. It is, therefore, inappropriate to overemphasize any one aspect to the neglect of the others. Nor is it justifiable to reduce these collegia to purely ‘social’ bodies, simply because their ‘social’ activities figure prominently in the evidence pertaining to collegia.

---

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE FOURTH CENTURY: CONTINUITY AND CHANGE

In AD 367, the centonarii of Forum Popilii (Regio I) dedicated an honorific inscription to their patron Minucius Aeterius Fabens (no. 48). The inscription, in front of which a statue of Fabens would be set up, twice referred to deus: maiestate dei (Ll. 3–4) and sedem dei (L. 9). The singular deus, which was very rarely used in similar contexts, and the late date of the inscription, will lead to a reasonable deduction that the religious practice of the collegium may have been Christianized. In this example, the phenomenon of patronage continued but the religious aspect may have become different. Valuable epigraphic sources like this, however, gradually taper off in the fourth century. The papyrological sources from Egypt indicate that guilds gradually became units for collecting artisans’ and traders’ taxes. The fourth century saw the institutionalization of the guilds’ fiscal obligations. Whether the same process also occurred in the West is far from clear. For the West, our main sources for the collegia come from the Theodosian Code. The legal sources leave no doubt that the collegia centonariorum not only still existed, but also continued to function actively. It has often been said that by tightening the state control of the collegia membership, the fourth-century legislation changed the nature of the relationship between collegia and the state. However, it remains to be determined to what extent this ‘change’ is actually a reflection of the Roman past, as opposed to being simply a modulation in the evidence available to us. This Chapter traces the continuity and change among the collegia centonariorum by taking a close look at the legal material.

1 Carrié 2002: esp. 332; cf. Freu 2007: 382. For multiple examples of the goldsmiths as collectors of chrysargyron, see Bagnall and Worp 1985: 67–70. Many price declarations from the professional groups have survived on papyri, but they all have post-Diocletian dates, meaning that the artisan guilds were required to file price schedules only after the Price Edict had been promulgated in Egypt.
2 Purcell 1992: 179.
The Centonarii in the Theodosian Code

For a long time, the key word for the discussion of the relationship between state and collegium in this period has been *cristallizzazione*. De Robertis spoke of ‘*un vasto sistema vincolistico*’;³ the word Zwangskollegien was also used to describe the collegia in the fourth century AD and beyond. However, the picture suggested by these terms, and drawn mainly on the basis of legal sources, may be both misleading and only partially true. This possibility was pointed out even before the image of the so-called Later Roman Empire underwent a general revision. Based on papyrological and epigraphic evidence of the freedom to change occupations in the fourth and fifth centuries, A. H. M. Jones (*LRE*) and R. MacMullen both warned against an overgeneralized and oversimplified understanding of the situation.⁴ Cracco Ruggini invited attention to the stratification of collegia during this period as well as to the treatment of different collegia by the state.⁵ Indeed, the degree of governmental oversight varied from collegium to collegium. In the *Theodosian Code*, there are only three laws addressed directly to the collegia centonariorum, as opposed to the dozens directed at those that served the annona. As far as membership in the collegia centonariorum is concerned, governmental intervention and control did exist, but only in a limited way. Until perhaps very late, there seems to have been no regulation demanding the sons of the collegiati to stay in the collegia centonariorum;⁶ unlike in the cases of the navicularii (shippers) and

---

³ De Robertis 1971 II: 135.
⁴ MacMullen 1964: 49–53. It is also wrong to assume that Byzantium inherited a regimented and highly regulated guild system. The *Book of the Prefect/Eparch* dating from the sixth century was mostly concerned with food supply and luxury trades (jewelry, silk, perfume, etc.). It did not cover all the crafts. Nor was it essentially about the mandatory organization of guilds. For a recent edition and commentary of the document, see Koder 1991. For a brief introduction and English translation, see Boak 1929: 597–619. For a critical understanding of the document along with an excellent discussion of the organization of craftsmen in Byzantium, see Maniatis 2001: 339–69.
⁶ For such regulations imposed on other types of collegia, see *CTh* 14.4.5 (AD 389), 14.3.5 (AD 364); *Nov. Maior*. 7.7 (AD 458). *CTh* 14.7.1.1 (AD 397), may have had some impact on the mobility of the descendants of collegiati. This law (14.7.1.1), like several others, provides criteria to determine the *origo* of children whose maternal and paternal *origines* compete. As far as the *agnatio* (descent) of a collegiatus is concerned, the father’s status prevails unless the mother was a *colona* or ancilla. Cf. Sirks 1993a: 172.
the *pistores* (bakers and millers),\(^7\) the patrimony of the members of the *collegia centonariorum* did not seem to have been bound to their services; and there is no indication in our sources that the *necessaria opera publicis utilitatis* of the *collegia centonariorum* were ever transformed into *munera*.

As we discuss the regulations concerning *collegia*, it is important to keep in mind some technical aspects of the compilation of the *Theodosian Code*.\(^8\) The laws in the *Theodosian Code* reflect Imperial policies and concerns from Constantine to Theodosius II. Textual problems are less serious here than with Justinian’s *Digesta*, although the editors could and often did make alterations to the texts available to them, and specific circumstances leading to individual rulings were usually not revealed.\(^9\) The *code* was intended to collect laws that had ‘the force of edicts’ or general application (*editorum viribus aut sacra generalitate*), as defined in AD 429; in 435, this goal was reiterated in similar terms *omnes edictales generalesque constitutiones*.\(^10\) The editors of the *Code*, however, must have repeatedly had to grapple with deciding which laws to include and which to exclude from the category of *generalitas*. As for the purpose of the *Code*, the *Acts of the Senate* that were prefixed to the *Theodosian Code* reveal its scholarly and professional interests (*scholastica intentio*), which means that the obsolete rules were not automatically excluded.\(^11\) Scholarly opinions differ, however, as to whether that was the case with the *Theodosian Code* published in AD 438. J. Matthews is of the opinion that the final version compiled was

---

7 CTh 13.5.5 (AD 326); 14.4.7 (AD 397). Cf. CTh 13.6.2 (AD 365), 4.8.4 (AD 367), 14.3.8 (AD 308); Nov. Val. 28 (AD 450). For the development of the *munus naviculariorum* (introduced in the early third century AD) as *munus patrimonii* (by the end of the third century AD), see Sirks 1989: 109–10.


10 For discussions of the complexities in the concept of *generalitas*, see Cod. Iust. 1.14.2–3. For discussions of the complexities in the concept of *generalitas*, see Matthews 1993: 25–29; 2000: 66–71: ‘“General laws” are not like categorical moral imperatives..., precepts to be observed by all at every time and in every place, but enactments on specific subjects, large or small, *to be obeyed in all relevant circumstances*’; Honoré 1998: 129: “A law is general if, judging by form or content, the emperor intends it to apply widely; but there is a presumption that when he replies to a petition from a private individual or a consultation by a judge he means to confine the reply to the person or case that has prompted it.”

11 “The term *scholasticus* indicates not just an academic, but an advocate or pleader at law.” (Matthews 2000: 57–58)
true to the initial project, while B. Sirks suggests that it may have been less ambitious than was initially envisaged.\textsuperscript{12} B. Sirks believes that the \textit{Code} was compiled “with a definite bias towards legal practice and its demands.”\textsuperscript{13} For my purpose, it is not crucial to determine whether the three rulings concerning the \textit{centonarii}—that is, \textit{CTh} 14.8.1, 14.8.2, and 12.1.162—were still in force when the \textit{Code} was being composed, especially since many of the constitutions preserved in the \textit{Theodosian Code} may have dubious effectiveness in practice to begin with. In the section that follows, I will be concerned with the light these three passages shed on the nature and experience of the \textit{collegia centonariorum} in the fourth century.

\textit{CTh} 14.8.1

\begin{quote}
\textit{IMP. CONSTANTINUS A(UGUSTUS) AD EVAGRIUM PRAEFFECTUM PRAETORIO. Ad omnes iudices litteras dare tuam convenit gravitatem, ut, in quibuscumque oppidis dendrofori fuerint, centonariorum adque fabrorum collegis adnectantur, quoniam haec corpora frequentia hominum multiplicari expediet. DAT. XIIII KAL. OCTOB. NAISSO, ACCEPTA VII ID. NOVEMB. CONSTANTINO A. IIII ET LICINIO IIII CONSS.}
\end{quote}

Emperor Constantine Augustus to Evagrius, Praetorian Prefect. Your Gravity shall give letters to all the judges to the effect that in whatever towns there may be \textit{dendrophori}, they shall be annexed to the \textit{collegia} of the \textit{centonarii} and \textit{fabri}, because it is expedient that these groups should be increased by large numbers of men. (November 6, 329 AD)\textsuperscript{14}

This passage has long been used to support the arguments that the \textit{collegia fabrum}, \textit{centonariorum} and the \textit{dendrophorum} shared the same public service (presumably fire-fighting) and that \textit{CTh} 14.8.1 represents a decision finally to unite these \textit{collegia} into one.\textsuperscript{15} However, this theory makes me uneasy, for several reasons. First of all, the verb used here is \textit{adnectere}, not \textit{iungere} or \textit{miscere}.\textsuperscript{16} As J.-M. Salamito has already

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{12} For the treatment of obsolete rulings, see Matthews 1993: 19–44; Sirks 1993b: esp. 57, 62; Honoré 1998: esp. 142–50 (for a very helpful discussion on the scholarly, and political and practical reasons for including obsolete and conflicting rulings).

\textsuperscript{13} Sirks 1993b: 62.

\textsuperscript{14} For the date of \textit{CTh} 14.8.1, given as 329 here instead of 315 in Pharr’s \textit{Theodosian Code}, see the most recent discussion in Salamito 1987: 993–97. \textit{Centonarii} were translated as ragmen in Pharr.

\textsuperscript{15} Maué 1886: 15; Waltzing: I 242.

\textsuperscript{16} For \textit{iungere} and \textit{miscere}, see \textit{CTh} 14.4.10.1–2 (July 28, 419 AD). The cattle collectors (pecuarii) were to be united (\textit{iungantur}) with the swine collectors (\textit{suarii}), \textit{sub hac}
argued, *adnectere* does not involve or imply the disappearance of the independent existence or identities of these *collegia*. How to join the *dendrophori* to the *collegia fabrum* and *centonariorum*, then? The details were not supplied in the extant portion of the edict quoted in *CTh* 14.8.1. The most helpful parallel is provided by Symmachus’ *Relatio* 44: the *navicularii* assigned some of their members to the *mancipes salinarum* (volentibus iisdem certi homines mancipibus iurgerentur; voluntas naviculariorum nonnullos mancipibus deputavit), who were involved in the transportation of wood to Rome and whose large numbers had been reduced due to the irregular granting of exemptions. But since *CTh* 14.8.1 did not supply any details of the arrangement, we are also left with the question of whether the law was enforceable at all.

As a matter of fact, while none of the laws after AD 329 were addressed to these *collegia* collectively, there were several laws addressing specific problems relating to each type individually. *CTh* 14.8.2 (AD 369) and 12.1.162 (AD 399), which will be discussed below, were directed at the *corpora centonariorum* alone, meaning that their independent identity was still officially recognized. A number of laws were directed at the other two types of *collegia*. There is no doubt that these *collegia* retained their individual identities, which points to the difference between them in terms of their purposes, services, and/or composition. The *centonariorum adque fabrorum collegia* mentioned in *CTh* 14.8.1 cannot be understood as the plural form of *collegium centonariorum et fabrorum*, but rather as ‘the *collegia centonariorum* and the *collegia fabrorum*’.

The justification for joining the *dendrophori* to the *fabri* and *centonarii* was *quoniam haec corpora frequentia hominum multiplicari expediet*. *Haec corpora* almost certainly refers to *centonariorum adque fabrorum collegiis*, which immediately precedes the *quoniam* clause. Therefore, *CTh* 14.8.1 emphasizes the particular importance of the *collegia fabrum* and *collegia centonariorum*. But why should these *collegia* be augmented (*multiplicari*)? Is it because the existence of these types of *collegia* was threatened by decreasing enrollment? Or is it because the services of the members were in higher demand at that particular historical moment? It may be possible to connect this measure with the Imperial concern

---

*tamen condicione decerti corpora volumus miscere, ut rescissis privilegiis, quae impetrasse dicuntur, mixtae corporum vices alternis fungantur officis.* Salamito 1987: 1002.

17 Salamito 1987: 1003; already in De Robertis 1971 II: 204.

18 Salamito 1987: 1002, however, thinks that the *centonarii* and the *fabri* formed a single *collegium* in each city (*collegium centonariorum et fabrorum*).
about the shortage of skilled workmen. This concern can be seen in
*CTh* 13.4.1–4 (AD 334, 337, 344, and 374), wherein Constantine and
later emperors granted privileges and protection to certain craftsmen
(*artifices artium*).19 These craftsmen fell into two main categories: build-
ing-related decorators, builders and smiths, and textile-related artisans
(*fullones, linarii, pelliones*).20 Since, as we discussed earlier in Chapter 2,
the *centonarii* were a collective name for the textile artisans and trades-
men, then their significance can perhaps be understood by analogy.

But why should the *collegia fabrum* and *centonariorum* be augmented
by the *dendrophori*? Carrié believes that this question has some bearing
on whether or not “à l’époque tardive tous les membres d’une profes-
sion faisaient ipso facto partie du collège correspondant.”21 He suspects
that in the early fourth century AD the *collegia fabrum* and *collegia
centonariorum* must have included all those in the relevant trades; oth-
erwise, it would be difficult to understand why these *collegia* would be
supplemented by ‘outsiders’.22 Why, then, did the ‘outsiders’ have to be
the *dendrophori*? There may be a very simple answer, namely that the
*collegia dendrophorum* were the only other *collegia* whose widespread
diffusion approached that of the *collegia fabrorum* and *centonariorum*.
More importantly, because of their intimate association with the cult
of Magna Mater, the *dendrophori* were not deemed particularly use-
ful and came to be viewed with increasing suspicion with the rise of
Christianity. As a matter of fact, *CTh* 16.10.20.2, an imperial constitu-
tion in AD 415, suppressed the *dendrophori*, together with other ‘pagan’
groups, by cutting off their financial sources. Perhaps, *CTh* 14.8.1 was
also intended to weaken the *dendrophori* by attaching them to the
groups that were considered more ‘useful’. This ruling, then, can be
seen as another example of how the legislative text represented “not
only prescriptive legal formulas but also descriptive pronouncements
of an emperor’s moral and ideological priorities.”23 It is perhaps owing
to this ideological aspect that this ruling was selected to be included in
the *Theodosian Code*.

---

19 *CTh* 13.4 concerns the exemptions of artisans (*De excusationibus artificum*). See
also *Cod. Iust.* 10.66.
20 Business was good, but skilled craftsmen were in short supply. Cf. Garnsey 1998a:
86 especially in relation to the situation of the building business in fifth-century Sardis.
21 Carrié 2002: 314.
22 Carrié 2002: 315.
To what extent were the *collegiati centonariorum* limited in terms of mobility? *CTh* 14.8.2 shows that there was cause for concern when collegiati left the *collegia* to join the *curia*, and that the task of preventing collegiati from withdrawing to the *curia* was assigned to the *collegia* themselves:

*IMPPP. VAL(ENTINI)ANUS, VALENS ET GRATIANUS AAA. AD OLYBRIUM P(RAEFECTUM) U(RBIS). Ne quis ex centonariorum corpore subtrahere se possit ad curiam, poena eidem corpori proposita, nisi ilico de eius abscessu querellam deposuerit. DAT. V KAL. FEB. TRE(VIRIS) VALENTINIANO N. P. ET VICTORE V. C. CONSS.*

Emperors Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian to Olybrius, Urban Prefect. No one from the *collegium centonariorum* shall be able to withdraw himself to a *curia*. A penalty is established for the aforesaid *corpus* unless it (the *corpus*) immediately makes a complaint about such withdrawal. January 28, 369 AD. (translation was adapted from Pharr’s)

What were the implications of this law? In order to answer this question, we need to look at the nature and functions of the *curia* (municipal council) in the fourth century. The *curiales* or *decuriones*, that is, the members of the *curia*, were expected to discharge a variety of municipal duties, including tax collection. The qualifications for membership were threefold: origin or domicile in the city concerned, free birth, and property (normally in the form of land) qualification. The social and economic status of the *curiales*, however, varied widely from city to city, as well as within the same city. Membership in the *curia* carried honor and prestige, although the honor aspect declined over time. The greater landlords would try to seek immunity from the obligations of *curiales*. *CTh* 14.8.2 may suggest that there were *centonarii* who owned enough lands to be eligible for curial membership. This, however, was not necessarily the only scenario, especially since keeping the *curia* afloat became a serious challenge for some cities, and even the relatively poor could be recruited into the *curia*. *CTh* 14.8.2 may suggest that (some of) the *centonarii* saw the condition of *curiales* as preferable to that of *centonarii*. What, then, was the aim of preventing *centonarii* from joining the *curia*, if (at least some of) the cities were also struggling with

---

24 For general descriptions, see Jones, *LRE*: 725, 737–40; Mitchell 2007: 180–82. For legal regulations concerning the *curiales*, see, for example, *CTh* 12.1.53 (AD 362), 137 (AD 393).
a shortage of eligible curiales? It was a measure perhaps intended not so much to curb upward social mobility as to keep a sufficient number of centonarii in service—the richer ones in particular.

Since the ruling was addressed to the Urban Prefect, or the prefect of the city of Rome, a question arises as to whether the corpus centonariorum only referred to the corpus centonariorum of Rome or, rather, this type of organization in general. We cannot assume that the former situation was the case. It must be noted that the duties of the Urban Prefect extend far beyond the City of Rome. In addition, the Urban Prefect may just have been one of the recipients of this ruling. In other words, the letter may have been issued to other officials as well. 

Concern over the shortage of available collegiati is a recurring theme in the Theodosian Code. But already in the Solva inscription (no. 36), the emperors had warned the recipients of their rescript that although the richer members of the collegia centonariorum should be forced to perform compulsory public services, the number of collegiati should not be reduced on account of this [non propter hos minue(n)dus numerus]. The Imperial rescript recorded in the Solva inscription implies that if eligible, the richer members of the collegium centonariorum would not be barred from entering the decuria, but that their immunity as collegiati was not transferable to their new status of decuriones; and/or that, if the decuriones chose to join a collegium centonariorum in order to avoid their decurial duties, these members should be forced to take up public munera. But CTh 14.8.2 moved even further in that it explicitly aimed at forbidding the centonarii from leaving (subtrahere se) the collegium to join the curia. The imperial power in the fourth century thought of the centonarii as more desirable as skilled craftsmen collegiati than as curiales. Despite the shortage of curiales, therefore, the imperial authority preferred not to reduce the supply pool for the centonarii. Such an approach is also attested by the treatment of the

---

25 For the officium of the Urban Prefect, see in general Sinnigen 1957; and 1959.
26 Cf. Grubbs 1995 (repr. 1999): 46: "When the addressee in the Code is the governor of a province or the urban prefect (praefectus urbi) of Rome, for example, we cannot be sure if the law was sent to other officials elsewhere or only to that province of city." Matthews 2000: 68: the members of the editorial commissions "will certainly have realized that many of the texts recovered were versions, addressed to particular officials and with limited territorial application, of laws expressed in more general terms which had not been recovered."
navicularii. A rescript from Pertinax (AD 193) confirms that members of the corpora naviculariorum who became decuriones must undertake public munera. In the case of non-voluntary appointments, however, a decree of Septimius Severus ruled that the navicularrii should not be forced to become decuriones. CTh 13.5.11 (AD 365), an edict from the emperors Valentinian and Valen to Symmachus, the then Urban Prefect, stipulated that whosoever should escape his obligations as a member of the corpus naviculariorum to ‘attain undue honors’ must be dragged back to his corpus. These three Imperial rulings were directed at different scenarios. All of them indicate, however, that in the eyes of the imperial government, the navicularii were more valuable as shippers (ship-masters) involved in transporting goods than as decurions.

Is it possible that CTh 14.8.2 was in fact a response to a specific circumstance or challenge? Quite likely. It should not be forgotten that the later half of the fourth century witnesses a number of frontier defense activities and even military crises. In fact, a series of edicts from Valentinian and Valens in the late 360s and early 370s were apparently connected with the emperors’ mobilization of manpower, goods and animals for military operations. The funding for and the supply of military clothing were certainly among the major concerns for Valentinian and Valens. Three of the five laws concerning vestis militaris preserved in the Theodosian Code (7.6.1–3) came from their reigns (AD 365, 368, and 377), with the other two coming from Arcadius’ and Honorius’ times (AD 396 and 423). For the clothing supply, the case of Egypt shows that by the early fourth century, responsibility for the purchase of uniforms evolved into a liturgy, and around the 320s, the vestis militaris became a pure tax, assessed in proportion to landholdings.

27 Dig. 50.6.6.13 (Callistratus 1. Cogn.): Eos, qui in corporibus allecti sunt, quae immunitatem praebent naviculariorum, si honorem decurionatus adgnoverint, compel lendos subire publica munera accepi: idque etiam confirmatum videtur rescripto Divi Pertinacis.

28 Dig. 50.2.9.1 (Paulus 1. decr.); Sirks 1991: 95.

29 CTh 13.5.11 (AD 365): quisquis ex naviculariorum corpore defugiens solita munia ad honores indebitos venit, in corporis sui consortia revertatur.

30 CTh 7.4.15 (AD 369), 10.20.4 (AD 368), 11.17.1 (AD 367). For the military operations during the reign of Valens, see Lenski (2002)'s meticulous studies.

31 CTh 7.6.2 = Cod. Iust. 12.39.1 (November 18, 368 AD) addressed to Auxonius, Praetorian Prefect orders that omnis canon vestium must be delivered to the Imperial largesses from September 1st to April 1st.
The proceeds were used to pay for the requisition of uniforms. The law in the *Theodosian Code* concerning the proportion of *vestis militaris* to land covers only the Eastern provinces. It is not entirely clear whether the same kinds of changes also occurred in the West. Nevertheless, the establishment of state-run woolen and linen factories in both the East and the West indicates a much higher level of direct governmental involvement in the control of military supplies. We do not know whether these state factories were established in response to the deficiency of supply from private sources or simply because the state thought this would be a more efficient system for organizing supplies. It would be difficult to measure the percentage of clothing procured from private producers outside the *gynaecea* and *lynphea*. But private producers may have remained important sources of supply throughout the fourth and the fifth century. The Imperial authorities were keen to ensure sufficient supplies turned up for requisition or in the market especially in times of military crisis. It is against this general background that the value of the *centonarii* in the eyes of the Imperial authorities can be understood.

In order to prevent the *centonarii* from leaving the guild (*corpus*) for the *curia*, the emperors employed the *corpus* as a mechanism of control. Punishment was designated for the *corpus*’ failure to promptly report the fleeing of its members. However, we do not know the nature or severity of the punishment. J. Harries believes that infringement of laws restricting the migration of individuals, such as *decuriones* or members of guilds, from the status (and obligations) to which they were born resulted in no punishment at all, “apart from the return of the delinquent to his original status (which, to some, might seem punishment enough, but would hardly deter those prepared to take their chance of not being caught).”

---

32 Carrié 1993; Sheridan 1998, esp. 86–105; for a summary of such evolution and changes, see Bagnall 2000: 88. For *vestis militaris* in general, see Sheridan 1998; for bibliography on *vestis militaris*, see also P.Dubl. 20.

33 *CTh* 7.6.3, from Valens, Gratianus, and Valentinianus to Modestus, Pretorian Prefect (AD 377).


35 A later law, *CTh* 7.6.5 (AD 423), indicates that five-sixth of the tax revenues for military clothing should be issued to the soldiers in money, and one-sixth would go to the *gynaecea*. Jones, *LRE*: 837, 1351 with notes 32–33. Sheridan 1998: 102.

36 Harries 1999: 81–82.
CTh 12.1.162

No known law forbids members of the collegia centonariorum to give up membership or to join other types of collegia. There is, however, at least one specific regulation (CTh 12.1.162) that restricts access to the membership of the collegia centonariorum:

*IDEIM AA. (that is, Arcadius and Honorius) BENIGNO VICARIO URBIS ROMAE. ne relictis urbibus plures sese ad corpus centonariorum transferant, spectabilitas tua, quoscumque et ubicumque latentes curiis atque collegis debitos adprobart, matura execuctione restitutat, si quidem tot existentibus legibus, quae occultatores certa feriri poena voluerunt, executiones praestare iudices conveniat, non referre. DAT. KAL. DEC. MEDIOLANO THEODORO CONS.*

Emperors Theodosus, Arcadius, and Honorius to Benignus, Vicar of the City of Rome. In order that more men may not ‘desert their cities’ and betake themselves to the corpus of centonarii, Your Respectability shall restore such persons, whoever they may be and wherever they may hide, with swift execution to the municipal councils and the guilds to which you prove that they are due. Of course, since there exist so many laws which provide for the infliction of certain punishment upon harborers of fugitives, judges must grant execution of such punishment and not refer the cases. December 1, 399 AD. (translation Pharr; quotation marks, mine)

This ruling, addressed to the vicarius urbis Romae, involves a reverse situation to the one that was mentioned in CTh 14.8.2 discussed earlier. Judging from the phrase *plures sese ad corpus centonariorum transferant*, membership in the corpora centonariorum seems to have been quite attractive to the curiales and members of other types of collegia. The key to understanding CTh 12.1.162, I think, lies in the appropriate interpretation of *relictis urbibus*. Does it mean ‘the cities having been abandoned’ in a literal sense? If so, then the corpora centonariorum must be seen to have a strong geographical association; that is, they were only found outside the cities. Could it be that the bases of these corpora shifted to suburban or rural areas? The answer must be no, since such an assumption contradicts CTh 14.8.1.1 (in quibuscumque oppidis), as well as a much later law, Nov. Maior. 7.3 (ut collegiatis extra

---

37 For the wide range of duties of the office of the vicarius Urbis Romae, see, for example, CTh 10.4.1–2, 11.1.25, 12.1.68 and 77 (finance); 7.13.3 and 4 (military recruiting); 8.5.22 (the public post); 1.15.7 (law). His duties were by no means limited to the city of Rome. Cf. Sinnigen 1959.
territorium civitatis suae habitare non liceat; AD 458). An alternative explanation is perhaps more sensible. In my opinion, relictis uribus should not be interpreted literally; rather, it should be taken to mean something along the lines of ‘the municipalities not having been served’. In other words, relictis uribus should be understood by analogy with such expressions as relictis curiis, fugiens curiam, munis oppidaneis improbe destitutis, obsequia publica declinantes, and so on. It is also important to read CTh 12.1.162 in the general context of CTh 12.1, which concerns the decuriones and compulsory municipal services. In this section, the terms munera civica/municipalia/oppidanea, civile munus, publici oneris necessitas, utilitas civitatum, decurionatus onera, and curialia munia/munia patriarchum are all interchangeable. The Code mentions several ways in which decuriones could avoid such munera: by taking up military posts (ad militiae praesidia confugiunt), by being employed by Imperial service, by becoming clergymen (ad clericorum nomen obsequiumque confugere), by ‘lurking under the shadows of the powerful (sub umbra potentium latitare)’, and so on. Transferant ad corpus centonariorum was just another way for decuriones and others to avoid liturgies.

CTh 12.1.62 (AD 364), which is 35 years earlier than CTh 12.1.162, indicates a similar situation with regards to the collegia fabrorum.

IDEM AA. (that is, Valentinian and Valens) AD SYMMACHUM PRAEFECTUM URBI. Municipalis, qui ad fabrorum collegium alia officia illusurus irrepsit, statui pristino reformetur, nec in posterum decurionum quis originem trahens ad hoc officium aspirare audeat. DAT. IIII ID. DEC. MEDIOLANO DIVO IOVIANO ET VARRONIANO CONSS.

It seems that the attempts to limit mobility increased in the latter half of the fourth century. The motives behind these measures are perhaps twofold. On the one hand, the Imperial government wanted to maintain the sizes of the collegia centonariorum and fabrum; on the other hand, it did not want to do so in such a way as to reduce the pool of decuriones or other types of collegia.

38 CTh 12.1.1–2, 7, 12, 14–15, 17, 42, 45–46; 12.1.46, 53, 57, 63 in particular, are good examples of the interchangeability of these terms.
39 CTh 12.1.22 (AD 336), 12.1.10 (AD 325), 12.1.11 (AD 325), 12.1.45 (AD 358; Africa).
40 CTh 16.2.3 (AD 320).
41 CTh 12.1.146 (AD 395); also see CTh 12.1.50.2 (AD 362).
The punishment imposed on collegia that accepted ‘fugitives’ is specified as set by “so many laws which provide for the infliction of certain punishment upon harborers of fugitives” (tot existentibus legibus, quae occultatores certa feriri poena voluerunt). How were occultatores (concealers/harborers) punished? There were indeed many laws addressing the problem of individuals harboring ‘fugitives’. These harborers ran the risk of being fined, or losing their property and status. Perhaps the collegia, by analogy, suffered loss of collegial property and privileges? As usual, we simply do not know how the law was executed.

Collegiati and Potentes in Late Antiquity

As far as the centonarii are concerned, the latest dated inscription (AD 367) from the centonarii is an honorific inscription for Minucius Aetereius Fabens, patron of the collegium centonariorum of Forum Popilii (no. 48). Fabens is specified as having held all kinds of offices in the city, as well as positions at Rome (in urbe sacra administrationem administravit). In general, in the fourth century, patronage was still an active element in the life of collegia. Several very elaborate honorific inscriptions for patrons date to after the reign of Diocletian. As far as the city of Rome and its ports are concerned, the Urban Prefects (praefecti urbis), who were now in charge of collegia, were featured prominently among the collegial patrons. Symmachus’ family provides a noteworthy example. Symmachus’ own writings as well as the inscriptions all

42 E.g., CTh 7.18 De desertoribus et occultatoribus eorum (military); 7.18.1 (AD 365); 7.19 De satisfiatibus et subafrinsibus et occultatoribus eorum; 7.19.1pr.–1 (AD 399); 12.1.76 (AD 371).
43 CTh 12.1. 146; Cod. Iust 10.32.31 (occultatoribus talium praeter iacturam existimationis etiam rerum discrimeni incumbat; AD 371).
44 CIL VI.1692 = ILS 1242 (AD 352, collegium suariorum, collegium pistorum to L. Aradius Valerius Ploculus Populonius, praefectus urbi); CIL VI.1759 = ILS 1272 (AD 389, mensores Portuenses to praefectus annonae); CIL VI.1693 = ILS 1241, See also AE 1972.75 (around AD 380) and AE 1972.76 (around AD 371–76), both from Capua.
45 CIL VI.1682–1683 = ILS 1220–1221 (AD 334); CIL VI.1690 = ILS 1240; CIL VI.1692 = ILS 1242; CIL 1693 = ILS 1241. See also the examples mentioned above. Cf. Friggeri: 139.
46 Seen from CTh 14.2.1 (AD 364), Symmachus’ father, the then Urban Prefect, had perhaps resisted a levy or tax on various Roman collegia. Symmachus himself, in several dispatches to the emperors, refused to impose new obligations, such as the collatio equorum, on the Roman collegia. Esp. Symm. Relat. 14. A group of honorific inscriptions was put up for Symmachus’ father-in-law, Memmius Vitasius Orfitus, Urban Prefect, by the corpus pistorum magnariorum et castrensariorum (CIL VI.1739,
presented the praefecti urbis as intermediaries between the emperors and the collegia. N. Purcell has addressed this phenomenon in relation to changes in social composition in Late Antiquity:

But the dependence advertised is now on the grandest figures of the increasingly circumscribed Roman aristocracy. With, for instance, the disappearance of the ordo equester, subtlety in the modulation of the show of gratitude and obsequence was becoming harder to achieve. The patrons were more uniform, and so were the clients.47

The meaning of patrocinium and patronus also underwent some changes in this period. In the Theodosian Code, patronage meant protection, particularly against the interests of the Imperial government.48 The term ‘patronus’ also acquired a new meaning: it was used to refer to a high-ranking member of a given collegium.49

We have been focusing on the patronage of collegia as collectivities. Another phenomenon that may have been at work at the same time, and may complicate the problem, is the personal patronage of individual members of collegia. For the first three centuries AD, we have hardly any explicit information about this type of patronage among collegiati. Did personal patronage tend to have a negative or a positive impact on the solidarity of the collegium? Our meager sources permit no definitive answer. But it is not inconceivable that individual members of collegia might sometimes have used their own patrons to advance benefits for themselves or collegia. For the later period, the Theodosian Code and the writings of Symmachus attest to many cases of irregular exemptions for collegiati obtained through the interference of powerful individuals.50

The effect of the umbra potentium51 was not only to render Imperial legislation ineffectual, but also to weaken the solidarity among members of the collegium. Many of the laws in the Theodosian Code were apparently reactions to these irregular exemptions. Therefore, it is with good reason that some scholars are now of the opinion that both the oft-mentioned decrease in collegial membership and the compulsory measures

---

47 Purcell 1999: 146.
48 E.g., CTh 11.24.1 (De Patrocinis Vicorum).
49 CTh 14.3.2; 14.3.7 (AD 364–67); 14.3.12 (patron of breadmakers); 14.23.
50 Obreptivis supplicationibus, e.g., CTh 14.4.2 (AD 334); CTh 14.4.10 (July 29, 419 AD).
51 CTh 12.1.146 (AD 395).
so frequently alluded to in the ancient sources should be attributed to ‘more possibilities of escaping the duties (and saving money)’ rather than to economic or demographic crises.\textsuperscript{52} Approaching the problem from a very different perspective, J. Harries believes that “the complaints increased in volume” not because “there was actually more to complain about,” but because of “the willingness of those with access to the late antique media of communication to complain about such behaviour, and to encourage others to do so.”\textsuperscript{53} It is J. Harries’s contention that “Imperial tirades against officials therefore should be analysed as a part of a wider phenomenon, which might be termed a ‘culture of criticism’”.\textsuperscript{54} But why did such ‘willingness’ become stronger in Late Antiquity? To what extent was it prompted by the many changing aspects of Roman society? There was a changing relationship between the emperors and the aristocrats and magistrates due to the increased attempts at ‘micromanagement’ of affairs by late Roman emperors since Diocletian, who substantially multiplied the provinces and increased the bureaucracy. Could the ‘culture of criticism’ be taken as a sign of better access to appeal to the governor and/or the emperor? It is difficult to be assertive on this point. One may even argue that the increased volume of criticism was partly due to better preservation of Imperial rulings sent to specific localities or officials from the fourth and early fifth centuries because of the \textit{Theodosian Code}. The way these Imperial rulings were formulated was intended to present a paternalistic image of the emperors who were seriously concerned with injustice.\textsuperscript{55} One would hope to see more discussion of these questions, although such an endeavor would be outside the scope of the present study.\textsuperscript{56} In any case, the highly rhetorical style of the citations in the \textit{Theodosian Code} makes it difficult to take them as factual indicators, or an accurate measurement of tensions.

\textsuperscript{52} Sirks 1989: 79–112, following Millar.
\textsuperscript{53} Harries 1999: 96–97.
\textsuperscript{54} Harries 1999: 97.
\textsuperscript{55} I owe these points to Judith Evans-Grubbs.
\textsuperscript{56} Serena Connolly’s forthcoming book with Indiana University Press, \textit{Lives behind the Laws. The World of the Codex Hermogenianus}. 
In the fourth and at least early fifth centuries, the *collegia centonariorum* continued to be considered important organizations by the authorities. As early as AD 329 (*CTh* 14.8.1), Constantine expressed concerns over maintaining the size of the *centonarii* and the *fabri* in the cities. In AD 369, an edict (*CTh* 14.8.2) charged the *corpora centonariorum* with the obligation of reporting the *centonarii* who departed to join the *curia*. At the heart of the issue, however, was not that the *centonarii* should not aspire to the status of *curiales*, but that for the Imperial authorities, their values lied more in their services as textile suppliers, which they were not to abandon for the purpose of joining the *curia*. That the membership in these *collegia* provided immunity and other privileges made it also attractive to richer citizens, who wished to avoid decurial duties. However, although concern over the shortage of available *collegiati* was a recurring theme in the *Theodosian Code*, the authorities were also concerned with the shrinking pool of *decuriones*. In order to maintain a sufficient pool of members for both, the authorities took measures to discourage the wealthier echelon from moving freely between the *curia* and the *collegia centonariorum*. This seems to be the general attitude, although specific edicts might have been prompted by military emergencies or specific situations. Yet, the actual stories may have been quite complicated, especially since exceptions could be (secretly) arranged and irregular exemptions could be granted through the intervention of powerful personages. The membership composition of these *collegia* may have become quite different in the fourth and fifth centuries, in that there may have been more wealthier members than in the earlier centuries, and that these members may have formed a distinct group within the *collegia*.
Inscriptions were a particular genre of writing: they were public, and the content was highly selective. Among all of the extant inscriptions related to the centonarii, 46 were honorific tituli set up by the collegia themselves; five were metal tablets presented to the patrons; 50 were epitaphs for members, out of which 22 were put up by the collegia. Over 100 other inscriptions were neither put up by the collegia nor by the members, but among them the collegium centonariorum was mentioned, in most cases, as a recipient of gifts, or client of a patron. Banquets, decent burials, wealth, and social connections: these subjects stand out in this corpus of epigraphic evidence. These are exactly the kinds of things by which these centonarii wanted the society at large to remember them. In the eyes of the public authorities, however, the value of the collegia centonariorum lied in their utilitas publica, public service(s). Neither the centonarii nor the legal texts about them bothered to explain in what way(s) they were considered to be of public use. Glaring holes like this permeate our sources. One can take the very cautious road by saying that anything that is not evidenced in the sources is not convincing in terms of the writing of history, even though it is consistent with historical plausibility. Or alternatively, one may follow an equally reasonable principle, that is, anything that is consistent with historical plausibility should not be ruled out until it is proven wrong. I have chosen to take the second route. What this book strives to provide is an exercise that pushed the available sources to their fuller, if not their fullest, potential. I do not claim that the reconstructions proposed in this book offer the last word on the origins and characters of the collegia centonariorum. But it represents an advancement from past treatment of the data in several ways. In particular, I have taken into full account the chronological, geographical and circumstantial factors—with due considerations of distortions caused by the imperfect state of our sources—that might have influenced the development and the character of the collegia centonariorum.

The first important point of this book is that the centonarii could be/are to be identified as artisans and tradesmen in low-to-medium quality woolen. The members of the collegia centonariorum were recruited on the basis of their trade, though this does not necessarily mean that every
single member was related to the textile economy. The production and consumption of textiles is the most important non-agrarian economic activity, after building. But textiles have remained a commodity “which has been prominent in the scholarship of the post-classical Mediterranean, but which has attracted few ancient historians.” Indeed, in the current discussions on the nature, scale, and structure of the Roman economy, unlike staples or pottery, the production, distribution and consumption of textile products have remained quite secondary. This was partly because the archaeological evidence was too fragmentary, and partly because the earlier studies of the textile economy in the Roman West depended heavily on the scattered anecdotal references to the artisans and tradesmen in textiles. The ‘rediscovery’ of the centonarii as textile craftsmen and tradesmen will have significant implications for understanding the Roman textile economy in particular, and the Roman economy in general. For scholars of socio-economic history, this dataset of the centonarii will not only substantially increase the visibility of urban craftsmen and tradesmen in textiles, but will also bring to the forefront the point that they did not operate in isolation from each other. It also helps us envisage a larger scale of urban-based production and trade of textiles in places where the collegia centonariorum are attested.

The collegia centonariorum certainly did not develop everywhere. In fact, their development in a given place is indicative of the importance of the mode of production based on urban workshops. In Gallia Belgica and Southern Italy, where estate-based productions took precedent, the guilds of textile craftsmen and tradesmen are hardly seen. Compared with the estate-centered mode of production, the urban-based, commercially oriented textile production may have had a more dynamic impact on all of the various levels and stages of the textile economy, from the acquisition of raw materials and production of various textile products, to the distribution of the finished products. In particular, the urban craftsmen and tradesmen in textiles would have had to depend on the rural areas for the supply of raw materials such as wool, and on a large number of scattered laborers for the semi-processed materials such as yarn and strings. Household self-sufficiency in textiles cannot have been farther from the reality. But more importantly, these urban craftsmen and tradesmen can be seen as active agents in constructing

---

1 Horden and Purcell 2000: 351.
the socio-economic relationships between cities and countrysides, between a wide net of consumers and producers. This aspect would have been particularly true in places where there were a large number of the centonarii (e.g., Mediolanum and Ravenna).

The collegium centonariorum first appeared at Rome; outside of Rome, the earliest such organizations were to be found in northern Italy, southern Gaul, and cities along the Danubian frontier. The relatively early origin and clustering of the collegia centonariorum in these regions may well have resulted from the pressures of textile demands from both Rome, and the military on the frontier, where there was a concentration of consumers. It is no mere coincidence that a collegium centonariorum at Patavium—a major textile-export center at least in the Early Empire—was formed as early as the reign of the Julio-Claudians. The distribution pattern of the collegia centonariorum provides a forceful example of the economic impact of Rome as a metropolis and the military with high buying power.

The economic stimuli for the formation of these collegia, however, do not fully explain these collegia’s durability over a long period of time. The collegia centonariorum belonged to the privileged types of associations. This leads us to the second point of this book, which concerns the role of the Roman authorities in facilitating the continued development of the collegia centonariorum. I have stressed the double role of the Roman authorities in both controlling and validating collegia. The law was not only a tool of control but also a mechanism of differentiation, separating the collegia with utilitas publica and those without, and providing the former with protection. Certain types of collegia including the collegia centonariorum obtained official recognition from very early on, enjoying not only ius coeundi and over time the accompanying legal capacities like the status of universitas, but eventually also various privileges. When various factors such as the identification of cento as woolen of low-medium quality, the importance of northern Italy and southern Gaul as supply centers for both Rome and the military at least in the Early Empire, the relatively early development and clustering of collegia centonariorum in these regions, and the early governmental recognition of their necessaria opera utilitatis publicis are considered together, these jigsaw puzzle pieces fall into place quite nicely. Quite possibly, like the guilds of textile artisans and dealers in Egypt, one of the collegia centonariorum’s public utilities was in the area of facilitating military purchase or requisitioning. In the course of the second century during the Pax Romana, fire-fighting service may have been accrued to
the *collegia centonariorum* in certain places (e.g., Mediolanum, Brixia, and Comum). However, the increasing occasions of military operations and the heightened pressure on the Danube frontier after the late second century probably led the authorities to (re-)emphasize these *collegia* as useful frameworks to facilitate military supply.

The *collegia centonariorum* continued to enjoy *beneficia* including *vacatio* (immunity) from at least the late second century AD through the end of the fourth century. These privileges such as immunity from compulsory public services attracted wealthy 'refugees', which may have caused potential conflict between the *collegia* and the local authorities, who needed personnel to take up various liturgical or onerous posts such as the *decuriones* or *curiales* after the late second century. Indeed, the relationship between these *collegia* and the local ruling bodies was rather complicated, especially since the *collegia* also counted on their patrons, the majority of whom came from the local elite, to defend their benefits and rights. From the second century to the fourth century AD, the Imperial rulings addressing issues arising from such conflict followed the general principle of protecting the rights of bona fide *centonarii*, preventing 'outsiders' from misusing the membership in *collegia*, and, at the same time, assuring a sufficient supply pool for the *collegia centonariorum*. It is reasonable to say that the *collegia centonariorum*, like a small number of other types of *collegia*, such as the *collegia fabrum*, could not have achieved a level of prominence and durability without governmental support. The favorable legal provisions provided particularly positive framework for the development of selected types of *collegia*. It is often emphasized that the nature of the Roman government was reactive rather than proactive. There is certainly much truth in this claim. The Romans' treatment of *collegia*, however, shows that it is not always easy to distinguish reactive responses from proactive measures. In addition, reactive measures, once in place, became the context and infrastructure that would shape, limit, or facilitate future development and activities.

How the *collegia centonariorum* were viewed by the authorities, however, was not the same as what they meant to the collegial members. *Necessaria opera utilitas publicis* may be gateways or passes to rights and various privileges, they did not necessarily encompass all of the

---

2 For the reactive nature of the Roman government, see most importantly Millar 1992.
functions of the *collegia* in the eyes of the members. The third important point that this book highlights is that there is no monolithic explanation of the activities, the social compositions of the *collegia centonariorum*, or their socio-economic importance in the urban scene. The chronological and regional variations in their activities, social compositions, sizes, history, and public services have been the main theme that runs through the book. Once they were founded and began to spread, a variety of *ad hoc* functions easily accrued. The *collegia centonariorum* became recipients of gifts, property owners, and organizations, through membership of which one could obtain privileges from the government. While in some places such as Mediolanum, there were members of the equestrian rank, in other places such as Sassina, the members seemed to have generally come from below the decurial rank. Against this background of diversity, the influence of this type of *collegium* and the value of its membership may have varied to members of different socio-economic standings, and also by location. The *gentilicia* of *collegiati* were not all common names in local and regional contexts. A small percentage of the names of *collegiati* known to us from inscriptions are infrequently attested overall. The implications of these phenomena are not easy to gauge. One possibility is that *collegia* were more important as support structures for those craftsmen and tradesmen who were immigrants, and/or were not backed by elite families. But the compensatory value of the collegial membership was outweighed by the wide range of tangible or potential benefits (immunity from compulsory public services, access to credit and various amenities, socialized burials, and so on) that came with the membership. As I have shown throughout the book, the value of the membership in the *collegia centonariorum* went far beyond simply providing social satisfaction to freedmen and others who did not have access to a ‘public’ career. Nor, contrary to popular belief, were freedmen always a regular or dominant element in the *collegia centonariorum*. In the cities of the frontier provinces, the veterans and ‘foreigners’ (*peregrini*) were much more visible in the epigraphic records left by these *collegia*.

The fourth point of this book is to steer away from any sharp dichotomy between the social dimensions of these *collegia* and their economic dimensions, both related and unrelated to the occupations of the members. There are two aspects to this point: one concerns the *collegia centonariorum* as recipients, consumers, and managers of donations of all kinds, many of which were stipulated for religious, commensal and
funerary activities; the other pertains to the possible impact of social activities on work-related arrangements.

The collegial activities were funded by collegiate funds and endowments from members and non-members alike. Endowments, in the form of cash foundations and revenue-generating properties, had significant impact on the organization and activities of *collegia* and their economic and financial roles in society. For example, the close connection between the *fabri* and the *centonarii* in various places including Mediolanum and Brixia may have been brought about by shared endowments. The *collegia* could effectively pool resources not only from members but also from large and small benefactors. These resources can be accumulated and transmitted over a long period of time, as shown by the case of Mediolanum. The accumulation of resources provided these *collegia* with opportunities to expand their economic involvement and interests outside the realm of their occupation(s). The resources of these *collegia* and their influence in the urban context mutually reinforced each other, which contributed to their sustained importance for the members and for the civic life in many Western centers.

It has not been the goal of this book to seek evidence for such economic activities as price-fixing, the division of trading areas, or monopoly for the *collegia centonariorum*. Our evidence, by nature, could not have revealed these aspects, if they had indeed existed. Even if they could be revealed, we would still be faced with interpretive challenges, for these regulatory measures are not by themselves decisive indices for a range of problems including the scale of the economy, and the intensity of competition. The Medieval and Early Modern cases have shown that regulatory functions may have been brought about by causes as diverse as privileges granted by the authorities, and narrowness of the market. What I have tried to show throughout this book is that a sharp demarcation and polarity of the *collegia’s* social activities and economic dimensions is not only methodologically problematic, but also stifles a proper understanding of the patterns of interactions between urban craftsmen/tradesmen. Collective activities such as burials, religious ceremonies, and banquets were certainly of pivotal importance for sociability, as well as for maintaining and displaying their connections with patrons and benefactors. Conceivably, however, these activities were much more than mere occasions for socializing or pleasure, but would have provided important occasions for information diffusion and discussions with respect to work, apprenticeship, marriage, price,
and so on. It is to be regretted that it is particularly in this area that our sources are relentlessly parsimonious.

The legal status, the possession or lack of privileges, and the geographical and temporal distributions differed from one type of collegia to another. Such elements as the social and economic status and the occupation(s) of the members, the particular religious affiliations, and the extent of influence in the local society also varied from collegium to collegium. In view of all these variables, more case studies of different types of collegia will help generate new interpretative frameworks of the associative phenomenon in the Roman Empire. The patchy state of our evidence, which has presented many methodological and interpretative difficulties for the study of this book, should be emphasized once again. In particular, it has been difficult to determine to what extent certain patterns that emerge from the available material should be attributed to chance survival of evidence. I welcome the opportunity to check the patterns of my findings against new data and new insights.

“Learning is a treasure, and a trade doesn’t die (Litterae thesaurum est, et artificium nunquam moritur),” says Echion, centonarius, one of Trimalchio’s guests. He may be a fictional character who belongs to the world of literary creation, but the other centonarii that we know from inscriptions would have probably agreed with him. Indeed, it is with their artificium that their wealth (however modest), public services, beneficia, and the popularity of their guilds rested.

---

3 Cf. Morley 2007:76.
4 Petron. Sat. 46.8.
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APPENDIX A

CATALOGUE OF INSCRIPTIONS ABOUT THE
COLLEGIA CENTONARIOUM

*CIL, ILS, AE, Waltzing, M. &. A., and provincial and regional epigraphic corpora such as InscrIt, IDR, ILJug, are the main basis for the compilation of this corpus. For the list of the corpora and reference works that are used towards the corpus, see the Abbreviations.*

The epigraphic texts in this collection are arranged alphabetically by province. The inscriptions under a given province are arranged by *CIL* numbers, except for those under *Italia*, which are arranged by Augustan regio. For each inscription, the following information is provided: the number of the inscription within this catalogue; city of origin; references to publications of the inscription in standard corpora or journals (if known); archaeological context (if known); important editions or discussions; plausible date (if dating is possible); references to images (if available); citations regarding identity of the individual(s) mentioned in the inscription within the standard prosopographical works. The text of each inscription is presented with abbreviations expanded insofar as they are known. Translations are provided for select inscriptions, particularly those less formulaic ones. A brief note about the peculiarities of an inscription is sometimes included.

“?” indicates inscriptions whose relevance to the *collegia centonarioum* is possible but not certain. Appendix C discusses these inscriptions.

“*” indicates inscriptions whose authenticity has been disputed.

*Africa Proconsularis*

1. ?Uthina. *CIL* VIII.10523; *CIL* VIII.12424; *ILS* 7260; W 1399; *Uthina* I. 29. Cippus of white marble.

[B]ultiae Hortensiae | Surdinaiae Antoniae | [Post]umae, flam(inicae) perp(etuae), | [curi]ae universae et | [cent?]onarii et subaedian(i) | [ob a]tsiduam et frequen[ten](t(em)) | in] universos cives suos | liberalitatem. L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).
NOTES: This inscription mentions [curi?]ae universae et [cent?]onarii et subaedian(i), who put up an inscription in honor of a priestess for her continuous and frequent generosity. *DizEpigr* (L. Cesano) II: 182 doubted the restoration [cent]onarii, but did not provide an alternative. Other possible restorations for -onari are (legi)onari, (regi)onari, (quaesti)onari, or (stati) onari. The inscription was found at Aïn Sigal, which is 4 km south of Udhna (ancient Uthina), and 27 km north of Zaghuan. It is now attributed to Uthina because of geographical proximity. For the most recent discussion, see *Uthina* I: 66–67 ad no. 29. Uthina was founded as a colony of veterans perhaps under Augustus (*Uthina* I: 42–43). The inscription may be dated to the third century based on the nomenclature of the person being honored here. L.4, *atsiduam* for *adsiduam*.

**Dacia**


Pro salute Aug(ustorum) n(ostrorum)| L(ucii) Sept(imii) Severi Pii Pert(inacis) et M(arii) A(urelii) Antonini imp(eratorum) | ] | [[Gaes(aris)f]], coll(egium) centonae(rum) scholam cum aetoma| pecunia sua fecit, dedicante | L(ucio) Pomp(onio) Liberale co(n)s(ulari) Dac(iarum) III.

Trans: For the well-being of our emperors Lucius Septimius Severus Pius Pertinax and Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, and Publius Septimius Geta with the title Caesar, the collegium centonariorum built a meeting hall with pediment. Lucius Pomponius Liberalis, consularius of the three Dacian provinces, was the dedicator.

NOTES: In Piso’s version (1993: 161 no. 34 and *IDR* III. 5. 425), the first line reads: Pro salute Aug[gg(ustorum)], as he did not think there was enough space for N N (for nostrorum) in the broken corner. Geta was, however, still Caesar (l. 4) but had not acquired the title of Augustus yet. Geta’s name was deliberately erased from the inscription. But the traces are clear enough. For L. Pomponius Liberalis, see also *AE* 1944. 74 = IDR III.3. 47.

3. Apulum. *CIL* III.1207; *W* 236; *IDR* III. 5. 483.

P(ublio) Ael(io) P(ublii) f(ilio) Pap(ricia)| Silvano, | Ilvir(alis) et sacerd(otalis) | [co]|[[oniae] A[p(ulensis)], | equ(uiti) R(omano), e(gregiae) m(emoriae) v(iro), | Fabia Lucilla, e(gregiae) m(emoriae) v(iri) filla, | mater coll(egium) | fabr(um) et cent(onerorum) coloniae s(upra) s(critae), | socero sui | amantissi| mo.
4. Apulum. CIL III.1208; W 237; IDR III. 5. 440.

P(ublio) Ael(io) P(ublii) fil(io) Pap(iri) Geniali, dec(urioni) | et pontifici | col(oniae) Apul(ensis), pa|tron(o) colleg(ii) | cent(onariorum), P(ublius) Ael(ius) | Euthymus | libert(us).

NOTE: For Publius Aelius Genialis, see also CIL III. 5.215 and 259.

5. Apulum. CIL III.1209; W 238; ILS 7147; IDR III. 5. 443. After Severus Alexander. Large marble statue base.

P(ublio) Ael(io) P(ublii) fil(io) Pap(iri) | Strenuo, eq(uo) | p(ublico), sacerd(oti) arae | Aug(usti), auguri et | II vir(ali) col(oniae) | Sarm(izegetusae), augur(i) | col(oniae) Apul(ensis), dec(urioni) | col(oniae) Dro(b(etarum), pat|ron(o) collegior(um) | [fabr(um) cento|nar(iorum) et naut(arum), conduc|tori] pas|culi, salinar(um)] | et com|mer|ci|or(um), Rufinus | eius.

NOTE: The dating clue is the post of sacerdos arae Augusti, which seems to have started in Severus Alexander’s reign (IDR III.5: 343 ad no. 443).

Dalmatia


[Aur|elius] Quintianus, dec(urio) coll(egiorum) fab(rum) et | [ce]nt(onariorum), qui vixit ann(is) p(lus) m(inus) LI, mens(ibus) V, d(iebus) X, [viv]us sibi posuit, et Aur(eliae) Iannuari(a)e, | [co]niugi suae; cot (sic!) si quis aeam arcam | [po]st mortem eorum aperire vo[lu]eri[t, inferet] decuriae meae (denarios) XXV.

7. Salona. CIL III.8842; W 309.

--- col[leg.] | cen[tonariorum]?

8. ?Salona. CIL III.8843; W 310.

--- cent?onar [---] ---[Alexand---


T(ito) Fl(avio) Herennio | Iasoni eq(uiti) R(omano)dec(urioni) | col(oniae) Sal(onitanae) pont(ifici) | aed(ili) praef(ecto) coll(egiorum) | fab(rum) et cent(onariorum) fil(io) | Herenni laso|nis v(iri) e(gregii) patroni | col(oniae)
Sal(onitanae) ob amore(m) | patriae quem ob | merita sua cons(utus est et erga | honorificentiam | quam civibus exhi(bet. coll(egia) s(upra) s(critpa).


M(arco) Ulpio M(arci) f(ilio)) Sabino eq(uiti) R(omano) dec(urio) Col(oniae) Sal(onitanae) | (duo)viro iure | dicundo, pref(ectus) bis| coll(egiorum) fabr(orum) et cen[t(nariorum),| patrono col(legiorum)] | s(upra) s(critpa) ob industrim| adque (!) sing(ula)rem | eius innoccenti|am et integritatem | defensionem|que ex aere col|lato coll(egia) s(upra) s(critpa).]

11. Salona. ILJug 2115.

---] | [--- fabr(um) et cen[t(ionariorum) ---] | [--- Fl(avius) Crescen[s ---] | [--- e]t Fl(avius) Veru[s ---] | [---


---fabrum et centon[ar(iorum)] | vivus sibi p(osuit)

Gallia Lugdunensis

13. Lugdunum. CIL XIII.1805; W 2087. Latter half of the second century. PIR² F 541.

Curante Fulvio | Aemiliano, c(larissimo) v(iro), | loca quae Iulius Ianu|arius rei p(ublicae) donaverat, | centonari(i) suo impen|dio restituerunt.


15. Lugdunum. CIL XIII.1972; W 2098. Late second or third century AD.

D(is) M(anibus) et quieti aeternae[---] [T]outi(i) Incitati, IIIIIIvir(i) | Aug(ustalis) Lug(udunensis) et naut(ae) Arar(ico), item | centonario Lug(uduni) consis|tent(i)

16. Lugdunum. *CIL* XIII.1974; W 2099. Sarcophagus. Late second or third century.

(Dis) M(anibus) | et memoriae aeternae | C(ai) Ulatti Meleagri, IIIIIvir(i) Aug(ustalis) | c(olonia) C(opia) C(laudia) Aug(usta) Lug(uduni), patrono eiusdem | corpor(is), item patrono omnium | corpor(um) Lug(uduni) licite coeuntium, | Memmia Cassiana coniunx | sarcofago condidit et s(sub) a(scia) d(edicavit).


Fragmentary epitaph for a young man, mentions the *centonarii*.

NOTE: It was found near the church of Divajeu (Drôme) and reported by M. André Blanc in *Gallia* 1 (1958): 384. Yet, neither the transcript nor the image of the inscription were provided. I was not able to track down the inscription.


*Cn(aeo) Val(erio) Cn(aei) f(ilio) Quir(ina) | Pomp(ieiopoli?) Valeriano, | equo p(ublico) honorato | a sacratissimis imp(eratoribus) | Antonino et Vero | Aug(ustalis), auguri perpetuo, | ob quem honorem (sestertium) C (milia) n(uumnum) r(ei)p(ublicae) dedit, | agonothet(ae) agon[i]s co[r]ona[to et] pro[pheta t(ae) optime | de se merito, centon[a]r(i) | corp(orati) Massil(ienses) pa[trono]. | [L(ocus)] d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).}

20. Aquae Sextiae. *CIL* XII.523; W 1956; *ILN* III. 36, with image and revised reading. Late second or third century.
Sex(tus) Punic(ius) colon(iae) Aq[uens(is)] | libertus Anten(or), | IIIIIVir Aug(ustalis) corp(oratus), item [cor][pora(tus) centona(rius), sibi [et]] Mercatiae [---]rinilla[e, uxo]ri, piissimae in suo[s] viv(us) f(ecit).

21. Aquae Sextiae. CIL XII.526; W 1957; RAN 16 (1983) 166, with image; ILN III. 37, with image. Late second or third century.

D(is) M(anibus) | C(aii) Valgi | Victorini, | IIIIIIvir(i) Aug(ustalis), | item | ex numero | colle(gii) centon(ariorum), | Iulia Marcina | co(n)iugi | piissimo.

22. Arelate. CIL XII.700; W 1965; ILS 6985; Carroll 2006: 251–52 (with image, Fig. 73). Funerary altar. Early second century.

D(is) M(anibus) | G(ai) Paqui Optati | lib(erti) Pardalae, IIIIII | Aug(ustalis) col(oniae) Iul(iae) Pat(erna) Ar(elatensis), | patron(i) eiusdem| corpor(is), item patron(i) | fabror(um) naval(ium), utricular(iorum) | et centonar(iorum), C(aius) Paqui | Epigonus cum liberis suis | patrono optime merito.


Genio | collegi cen|tonarior(um) | Vas(iensium) r(es) p(ublica) r(estituit).


D(ecimo) Valer(io) | Valenti|no tess(erario) | [Q]uinta Centon(ia?) | ex testa|mento | etius.


[D(is)] M(anibus) | C(aii) Petr[on]i(i) C(aii) f(iii) | Vol(tinia) Iunio[ris]; | decur(ioni) Albe[n(sium)]; | iuueni inno[centi], | patron(o) IIIIII[ur(orum)] | et centonari[or(um)] | Petroni(i) Barba[---] | et Nice paren[tes].

27. Vienna. CIL XII.1898; CIL XIII. 299; W 1898; ILN V.1.124. Late second or third century.


D(is) M(anibus). | Mocciae C(ai) f(iiiae) | Silvinae, | centonari(i) | Ugernenses | ob merita.


D(is) M(anibus). | T(ito) Craxxio | Severino, | collegium | centonari[or]iorum (sic!) | M(agistro) s(uo) collegae[qu(e)] p(osuit) ex | fun[eraticio].

NOTE: This is the version in AE 1999.1032 = HGL XV.378, which notes that the reading of N after FU in line 9 is uncertain. Earlier reading was as follows: D(is) M(anibus). | T(ito) Craxxio | Severino, | collegium | centonari[or]iorum (sic!) | M(agistro?) s(uprascripti?) or m(unicipii) S(estantionis) colle[gi(??)] eq(uo) p(ublico) ex[or(nato)] | ex V [decuriis?]. We have no other information about this T. Craxxius Severinus (Christol 2003: 141–12). Craxxius is probably a variant form of Craxius, Crassius (four times in CIL XII), Crassius, and Crasius.

30. Nemausus. CIL XII.3232; W 2029; ILS 5082 contains the first half but omitted reliqua nimis lacera; IG XIV. 2495; INimes 26; PH143314; IGF 101 (with extensive bibliography and the most recent commentary; for the images of the fragments, see XXII: Figs. 104–106). Hadrian’s reign.
NOTES: This bilingual inscription contained several fragments. It had the basic formulaic features of an honorary inscription. Thus, on the occasion of the five-year competition, the sacred association of Neapolis decreed to honor Titus Iulius Dolabella, son of Titus, of the Voltinia tribe, chief magistrate, high priest, prefect of the night-watch and arms. This association was specified as the sacred Hadranic association of artists, actors, and musicians under the patronage of the emperor Caesar Trajan Hadrian Augustus, the New Dionysos. As usual, the reasons for honoring Dolabella emphasized his virtue and distinguished family but not the specific benefactions that the association may have had obtained from him: “Dolabella was a distinguished man, not only because of the reputation of his family in his very illustrious (hometown?) and the dignity of his life, but also because of his word and the greatness of his soul.” Unfortunately, the text before centonarii was mentioned here; but it seems possible that Dolabella was a patron of the centonarii.
---]nio plac[---][---]aris vacation[em?]][---][---]s]ingulis colleg[is] [---][---] (sestertium) m(ille) n(ummum) singuli h[onorati?] [---][---]Februarias[---]][---] uteretur a [---][---] pecuniaq]ue? Sua it[---]

NOTE: At the beginning of line 2, O. H. Hirschfeld conjectures: [fabris tign] aris or [centon]aris.

32. Lansargues. Between Nemausus and Sextantio. CIL XII.5953; W 2045. HGL XV.1170 no. 2088; CCCA V.112 no. 326. Altar with inscription, now lost.


Hispania


NOTE: HEp IV. 805 restores lines 5–6 as follows: [Senatus populusq(ue) Romanus permisit collegiu]m haberi centonaria[m Romulae | atque a lege Iulia hoc constituit corpus]e Hispa[i]lensium ho[m]i]num [dumtaxat (tot)]. But as the editors have noted, “La restitución de ll. 5–6 es muy hipotética.”

35. ?Tarraco. CIL II.4318; W 79; RIT 436; Santero Santurino 91.

---]l [colleg[---][---]d(e) s(uo) f(ecit).

NOTES: W.79 did not give a restoration. DizEpigr: II 182 listed this among the inscriptions relating to the centonarii. Cent- may read cent(uria-). But it
might well be colleg(ia) [fabr(um)] (et) cent[onoriorum]. However, although col(legium) fabr(um) has been attested in Taracco (CIL II.4316), the collegium centonariorum is otherwise unknown in the Spanish cities except Hispalis. [An inscription from Elche, Spain, reads: colleg[---]gen[---]r. econ (Memorias de los Museos Arquelógicos Provinciales, Madrid 4 (1943) 189; Santero Santurino 1978: 21). It has been suggested that GEN should be understood as CEN in this inscription. This restoration would point to the existence of a collegium centonariorum in Elche (Santero Santurino 1978: 58, 120). However, I do not see any justification for this interpretation.] Given this fact, and especially the fragmentary condition of the inscription, it might be better to leave the question open.

Noricum


Trans: [Imp( erator) Caes(ar) L( ucii) | Sept( imius) | Severus] | Pert( inax) | P( ius) | [Aug( ustus) | and | I]mp( erator) Caes(ar) | M(arci) | Aur(elius) | Antoninus | Pius | Aug( ustus) | [to the provincial governor, name uncertain]. The privileges which on the orders of the Senate or any Emperor have been granted to the collegia centonariorum should not be rashly rescinded. [But whatever the laws sanctify, let it be preserved, and let those who you state [are enjoying] their wealth without burden be compelled [to undertake public] obligations; nor should the privilege of the collegia benefit [either those who] do not practice [that occupation] or those who possess resources which are greater than the prescribed limit. The [legal] remedy should be applied to [such people]; but the number of the (members) should not be reduced on their account. Otherwise, let [all the others enjoy] an exemption which it is not appropriate to remove from the privileges of the collegia?. 93 names in seven columns follow. The collegial members put up this inscription in honor of Marcus Secundus Secundinius, father (of the collegium?), with their (own money), approved by a decree of the city of Solva, on October 14th, during the consulship of Imperator Antoninus-for the second time-and Geta (AD 205). Ursinus [took care of putting this up---].

Italia

37. Urbs Roma. CIL VI.7861; ILS 7243; W 951. Via Salaria.

L(ucius) Octavius L(uci) l(ibertus) Secundus | maior, mag(ister) quinqu(e)ennalis) | conl( egi) cent(onariorum) lustr( i XI et) | decurio; | vixit ann(is) LV; | L(ucius)
Octavius Primigenius, vixit ann(is) LVIII; L(ucius) Octavius Secundus, vixit ann(is) [---] | fratres viatores coll(egi) centonariorum.

38. Urbs Roma. CIL VI.7862; W 952; Royden 1988: 185 no. 256.

L(ucius) Tuccius Mario [---], | quinquennal(is---

39. Urbs Roma. CIL VI.7863; W 953.

L(ucius) Octavius Attae l(ibertus) | Cerdo, dec(urio) conl(egi) cent(onariorum). | Octavia L(ucis) l(iberta) Chrysis, Cerdo vern(a) vixit a(nnis) XI et m(ensibus) XI die(bus).

40. Urbs Roma. CIL VI.7864; W 954.

L(ucius) Octavius L(ucis) l(ibertus) Diomedes, | dec(urio) conl(egi) cent(onariorum).

41. Urbs Roma. CIL VI.9254; W 1003; ILS 7244. Found in Campus Martius.

Collegio |centonariorum | [---] | cum basi marmorea et ceriolarib(us) duobus aereis habentibus effigi|em Cupidinis tenentis calathos, | L(ucius) Sextilius Seleucus decurio d(onom) d(edit).

Hoc amplius ark(ae) reipublicae collegii s(upra) s(critpi) | donum dedit (denario rum milia) V, ut ex usuris | centesimis eius quantitatis, | quae efficit annuos (denarios) DC die | VIII kal(endas) Octobr(es) natali divi | Augusti erogentur ex ark(a).

Trans: Lucius Sextilius Seleucus, a councilman (decurio) (of the collegium), gave [words missing] to the collegium centonariorum, with a marble base and two bronze candlesticks bearing an effigy of Cupid holding baskets.

In addition, he gave 5,000 denarii to the treasury of the above-mentioned collegium, the interest of which (at the rate of 12%)—600 denarii—is to be paid out from the collegial treasury every year on September 23, the birthday of the deified Augustus.

42. Urbs Roma. BullComm 1888: 398 n.3 a–c; AE 1889.10; W 1356; CIL VI.33837; ILS 7242; Royden 1998 no. 254. Via Labicana.

M(arcus) Octavius M(arci) l(ibertus) | Attalus centonar(ius) | a turre Mamilia. || M(arcus) Octavius M(arci) l(ibertus) | Marcio, | mag(ister) conl(egi)
centon(ariorum). \(\mid\) P(ublius) Veturius P(ubli) l(ibertus) \(\mid\) Minio, \(\mid\) Calpurnia (mulieris) et Octavi l(iberta) Salvia.

43. Urbs Roma. CIL VI.37784a; AE 1914.138. Via Pinciana.

\(P(ubi)\ Vibi(i)\ |\ Felicis| collegio(!) centonarioru(m)\ | vix(it) ann\| XXXXV.

Regio I

44. ?Praeneste. CIL I. 1457.

cen\(\mid\)tonaries mac\(\mid\)i. \(\mid\) Urecemni(us) L(uci) l(ibertus) Sotr... \(\mid\) CDA TESSL ICV\[---\

45. Nola. CIL X.1282; W 1652.

---\]eni in or[---\]|lanorum[---\]| Campaniae [---\]| trimonii[---\] | [---c]entonar[---\

46. Cales. CIL X.3910; W 1729. Later half of the second century AD.

D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum). \(\mid\) M(arco) Cornelio \(\mid\) M(ari) fil(i) M(ari) nep(oti) Publ(ilia) \(\mid\) Iusto Acutiano, \(\mid\) (quattuor)vir(o) q(uin)q(uennali) i(ure) d(icundo), quaes(tori) nei p(ublicae), \(\mid\) q(uaestori) alim(entorum), cur(atori) op(era) p(ublicorum), cur(atori) viae \(\mid\) Faler(nae), augur(i), praefeco Tib(eri) \(\mid\) Statili Severi, quaglato(i) \(\mid\) et patron(o) colleg(i) centro(nario)rum, \(\mid\) M(ari) Cornelii Acutianus \(\mid\) et Chrysippus et Iusta \(\mid\) patri optimo \(\mid\) fecerunt.

NOTE: The inscription was seen at Capua. But Mommsen thought that it came from Cales. Tiberius Statilius Severus, cos. AD 171 (PIR S. 609).


Aristonicen(is) \(\mid\) ossa hic bene \(\mid\) quiescunt.

NOTE: The earlier reading was Aristoni(s) cent(onarii)\(\mid\) ossa hic bene \(\mid\) quiescunt.


Aeterii. \(\mid\) Minucio Aeterio \(\mid\) Fabente maiestate \(\mid\) dei tractatum mentibus nostris esit (!) merita eius omnibus onoribus gestis patrie (!) nostre \(\mid\) etiam et in urbe
sacra administrat[ionem] administravit. Digno patrono cento[nari(i)] statuam [ante] sedem dei ponendam cens(uerunt), [a(n)e d(iem)] VI idus Maias, Lupicino et Iovino v(iris) c(larissimis) co(n)s(ulibus).

Regio II


D(is) M(anibus). | C(aio) Marcio | Hilaro, | ex tribus colleg[is] (collegae) fec(erunt).

Regio IV

50. Aesernia. CIL IX.2686; W 1535.

L(uicus) Lucilius L(uici) l(ibertus) | Successus, | quinqu(e)nnalis) colleg(i) | centonar(orum), sibi et | Fanniae Leae con(iugi) | v(ivus) f(ecit).

51. Aesernia. CIL IX.2687; W 1536.

Gavilliae Optat[ae] | contubernali, | matri colleg[i] | centonaria[rum].

52. ?Marsi Antinum. CIL IX.3837; W 1565; Letta and D’Amato 1975: 314–15 no. 183, with tav. 66; Forbis 237.

Q(uinto) Novio Q(uinti) f(ilio) Serg(ia) | Felici, patrono | municipi Antino; | huic culto[res] [ce?]nto[nari?] [--- ara?]m | [et statuam honor(is)?] | [causa posuerunt?] b(ene) m(erenti).

NOTES: The main body of the inscription is seriously effaced (Letta and D’Amato 1975: 314–15). For lines 4–6, Mommsen, followed by Waltzing, suggested the reading huic culto[res] centonari || dendrof(ori) aram. He dotted OF in line 6. More recent editors of this inscription have not suggested alternative restoration, but have showed their doubts by using a less confident format: huic culto[res] [ce?]nto[nari?] [et dendrof(ori) ara]m. What they were able to trace was only a letter that might be an N followed by TO in the middle of l.5 and an M at the end of l.6. Therefore, dendrofori might not even be a necessary restoration in l.6; and centonari might not be the only restoration possible in l.5. [Could [ca]nto[res] be plausible? For a collegium of cantores Graeci in Rome. See CIL I.2519 = ILS 771.] Besides, it is odd to see the combination cultor[es] centonari, although we do have an example of
cultores fabrorum (CIL X.4855, Venafrum, Campania). The Quinti Novii Sergia tribu were a most prominent local family during the first and second centuries (CIL IX.3836–3841; Clemente 172 n. 54; Forbis: 168 n. 144).

Regio V (Picenum)

53. Interamna Praetuttiorum. CIL IX.5077.

[---] primo |[---]cio| [centon]ariorum

54. Interamna Praetuttiorum. CIL IX.5084.

Collegio Centonariorum | Interamnittium Praetut(t)ianorum | in fronte P. | XXX agro P.XL

NOTE: P stands for p(edes). The pes was a Roman measurement of length and distance. A pes was slightly shorter than a foot (1 pes = 29.57 cm, according to Dilke 1971).

55. Firmum Picenum. CIL IX.5368; W 1602. Second or third century.

Allienae T(iti) f(iliae) Berenice, | C(aius) Vettius Potus | uxor | sanctissimae et | C(aius) Vettius Polus | matri | piissimae, patr(onae) | col(legiorum) fabr(um) et cent(onariorum). | L(ocus) d(ecretum) d(ecurionum).


T(ito) Cornasidio | T(iti) f(ilio) Fab(ius) Sabino, e(gregiae) m(emoriae) v(iro), | proc(uratoris) Aug(usti) Daciae Apulensis, proc(uratoris) | Alpium Atractianum(um) et Poeninarum(um) | jur(e) glad(ii), subpraef(ecto) class(is) pr(aetoriae) Raven(natis), | praefecto alae veter(anorum) Gallor(um), trib(uno) leg(ionis) II | Aug(ustae), praeft(co) coh(ortis) I Mont(anorum) P(iae) C(onstantis), auguri, Lau(renti) | Lavin(at), aed(illi), (duum) viro q(uin)iq(uennali), q(uaestori) p(ecuniae), | collegia fabrum centon(ariorum) dendrophor(orum), | in honorem | T(iti) Cornasidi | Vesenni Clementis, | fili eius, equo publ(ico), L(aurentis) | Lavin(at), patroni plebis et collegio(rum); qui ab ipsis oblatum | sibi honorem statuae in | patris sui nomen memo|r|amque transmisit.

57. Ricina or Trea?. AE 1911.173; SupIt 18 (2000) T 7; Me&A 74.

---|coll(egi-) fabr[um et] | [cent?]on[ariorum---]---

L(ucio) Naevio L(ucii) f(ilii) Vel(ina) | Frontoni, | pat(rono) mun(icipii) et | collegior(um), | collegium | fabrum et centonarior(um).

59. Auximum. CIL IX.5836; W 1610; Forbis 273; Osimo, Catalogo 8, tav. 78, with image. PIR P 509; Pflaum, Carrieres 1 n. 152. Trajanic/early Hadranic date.

Q(uinto) Plotio Maximo | Col(lina) Trebellio Pel|diano, eq(uo) pub(lico), | trib(uno) leg(ionis) II Traian(ae) Fort(is), | trib(uno) coh(ortis) XXXII volun|t(ariorum), | trib(uno) leg(ionis) VI Uc|tric(is), | proc(uratori) Aug(usti) pro magis|tro |uigetae) hered|itatium), | praefectto) uchecu|lum), | q(uennali), p(atrono) c(oloniae) et suo, pon|t|t, | coll(egium) cent(onari|orum) Auxim(atium) | ob eximium in |u|cip(es) suos amorem. | L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

NOTE: The inscription was found in the forum of Auximum. See CIL IX.5835 = ILS 1415 for the identical inscription put up by the collegium fabrum.

60. Auximum. CIL IX.5839; ILS 2084–85; W 1611; Forbis 270; Osimo, Catalogo 4 tav. 119, with image. AD 137.

C(aiio) Oppio C(aii) f(ilii) V[el]in(a) | Basso, p(atrono) c(oloniae), | pr(aefecto) Auximo leg(ionis) IIII Fl(aviae) Fel|icis), evoc(ato) Aug(usti) | ab actis fori, b(eneficiario) pr(aefectorum) pr(aetorio), | signif(ero), option(i), tesse(rario) coh(ortis) II pr(aetoriae), mil(itii) coh(ortis) XIII | et XIII urbanarum, | coll(egium) cent(onari|orum) Auxim(atium) | patr(ono) ob merita eius. | L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum). Posita VI k(alendas) Iul(ias) | L(ucio) Aelio Caesare II | P(ublio) Coelio Balbino co(n)s(ulibus).

NOTES: The Caio Oppii were a prominent Auximian family. C. Oppius Bassus was probably the brother of C. Oppius Sabinus Severus, cos. AD 130 (PIR O 78); Caius Oppius Sabinus was consul of AD 84 (PIR O 77; Osimo 157). In Osimo 157, the reference to the image is mistakenly given as tavola 75b, the dedication being to the same person but the text that of CIL IX.5840.

61. Auximum. CIL IX.5843; W 1612; Forbis 274; Osimo, Catalogo 35 tav. 95b, with image; Cancrini and Delplace and Marengo AVX 8 with image (fig. 51). After AD 161–166.
T(ito) Saleno T(itil) f(ilio) Vel(ina tribu) | Sedato, veterano | Aug(ustorum duorum) accept(a) (h)onesta | mission(e) ex coho(rite) XIII urba(na), | pr(atori) q(uin)i(q)uennali), quaestori rei p(ublicae) Auximat(ium), | patrono colleg(i) centonar(iorum), | Masueta lib(erta), patrono optimo; | cuius dedicatione decurionibus | sig(ulis) VIII n(ummos) et colonis | sing(ulis) IIII n(ummos) dedit. | L(oco) d(ato) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

Regio VI (Umbria)

62. Ameria. CIL XI.4391; W 1877; Forbis 284.

Iuliae M(arci) f(iliae) Felicitati, | uxori C(ai) Curiati Eutychetis | IIII vir(i), magistrae Fortu(nae) Mel(ioris), coll(egium) centonar(iorum) | ob merita eius; equo honore | contenta sumptum omnem | remisit et ob dedic(ationem) ded(it) sing(ulis) XX n(ummos), et hoc amplius | arkae eorum intul(it) V m(ilia) n(ummum) | ut die natalis su
d(i) ex usuris eius summae epulantes imperpetuum divider(entur); | quod si divisio die s(upra) s(critto) celebrata non fuerit, tunc pertineb(it) omn(is) summa | ad familiam publicam.

63. Ameria. CIL XI.4404; W 1878.

---cu---r(ator--) pec(uniae) ann(onariae). | [cur(ator--) K]a(lendarii) r(ei) p(ublicae) Amer(inanorm), | [---]patron(o) VI vir(u)m, | [praef]ecto c(ollegii) centonar(iorum), | [col(legii)] scabill(ariorum), col(legii) | [fabr]um tignar(iorum) | [---]ob merita; | [cuius dedicat]ione bis epu[lantes] HS XL n(ummmum) dedit, | et HS---, ut die natalis su| [epulanti]b(us) in perpetuum | [dividerentur, ar]kae eorum | [intulis HS---

64. Mevania. CIL XI.5047; W 1890.

C(aius) Attius (Caiae) (libertus) | Ianuarius, | VI vir s(acris) f(aciundis), VIII| vir Val(etudinis); | hic collegio suo cento|nariorum legavit (sestertium mille), ex | cuius reditu quodannis | die parentaliorum ne minus | homines XII ad rogum suum | vescerentur | cura coll(egii) cent(onariorum).


C(aius) Scetanus T(itil) f(ilius) | cent(onum or onarius) merc(ator).

NOTE: for a similar title, see mercator panucularius (CIL XII.5973, Narbo).

L(ucio) Succonio L(ucii) f(ilio) Pal(atina) | Prisco, IIII vir(o) i(urai) d(icundo),
q(uestori) a(erarii), | omnium corpor(um) patr(ono), | item Trebis decur(ioni),
pont(ifici), | IIII vir(o) i(urai) d(icundo), patron(o) mun(icipii), | decuriae (quatt-
tor) scabillar(iorum) | veteres a scaena | amantissimo sui | ex aere conlato. |
H(onore) a(cepto) i(mpensam) r(emisit).

NOTE: This inscription does not explicitly mention the collegium/corpus cen-
tonariocorum. But the omnia corpora of which L. Succonius Priscus was patron
would have included the centonarii.


D(is) M(aniu)s.| C(aio) Scaefio | C(ai) f(ilio) Sulpiciano, | patrono municipi
et colle(giorum) III, IIII vir(o) j(urai) d(icundo) q(uin)nam), | q(uestre
iterum), advoc(ato) rep(ublicae), | Setoria Olympias | coniugi incom|parabili
b(ene) me(erenti).

68. Sentinum. CIL XI 5749; W 1899; ILS 7221; Buonocore 1988: 125 no.7.10;

Imp(eratore) Gallieno Aug(usto) III et Volusiano co(n)s(ulibus) | XV kal(endas)
Septembres, | Sentini, in triclini(o) domus c(olegii) c(entonarioi), numerum
habenti|bus sequella eiusdem colleg(i), ibi referentibus Casidio | Severo patre
n(umeri) n(ostrum) erat | Heliarion parente: cum sit | oportetum crebris be-
neficiis et adfectionem amoris | [erg]a n(umerum) n(osrum) ex(h)abitibus adsis-
tere et munificentia[m] | [eo]rum, sicut opportunitas testimonium perhiberet, | [re]
munerare, igitur si cunctis videtur Coretius Fuscum, | [sp]lendidum decurione(m)
patriae n(osrae) sed et patronum trium | coll(egiorum) principalinum et Vesa(m)
Martinam coniugem eius | patronam, sed et Coretiu(m) Sa[b]inum filium
eorum iam prid[e]m patronos per duplom a numero n(ostro) cooptatos, nunc
tabulum | aercam patronatus eis offerri, ut merito honore pro meri|tis innot-
escat, q(uid) f(ieri) p(laceret), d(e) e(a) r(e) i(ta) c(uncti) c(ensuerunt):|| quod
in praeteritum Coreti Fusci, patroni, V[e]siae <siae> Martin(a)e, | patron(a)e,
et Coreti Sabini, fili eorum, erga amore beneficia praes|tita susceperimus, nunc
etiam in futurum non dissimilia, quae | nunc sentimus, perpetuo ex domum
eorum processura parti adfectionem speramus adque ideo consentiri relationi
b(onorum) v(irorum) Casidi | Severi patris n(umeri) n(ostrum) et Heli Peregrini
parentis, et ad remunerandam | eorum benevolentia(m), quo laudium adque
pulchrioris digne honorem | sibi oblatum suscipere dignentur, decretem et in
tabula aerea | perscriptum eis qua et a nobis profectum est, legatosque | fieri,

Trans: On August 18th, in the consulship of the Emperor Gallienus and Volusianus, in the dining hall of the house of the collegium centonariorum in Sentinum, Casidius Severus, father of our collegium, and Heldius Peregrinus, parent (of the collegium), make the motion: it is befitting to support those who show frequent benefactions and disposition of love towards us, and to remunerate their munificence, as the favorable timing bears witness. Therefore, if it seems good to all to present a bronze patronage tablet to Coretius Fuscus, illustrious councilman of our city and patron of the three main collegia, and his wife Vesia Martina, our patroness, together with Coretius Sabinus, their son-who have long ago been elected by our collegium as patrons by means of a written document—so that their patronage becomes known with well-deserved honor in accordance with their merits, concerning this matter, a concensus is reached:

Since in the past we have receiveed outstanding benefactions from Coretius Fuscus, our patron, from Vesia Martina, our patroness and from Coretius Sabinus their son, in agreement with their love, we now hope that also in the future similar things to what we experience now will perpetually come forth from their house with the same affection. We agree to accept the proposal of the good men, Casidius Severus, our father, and Heldius Peregrinus, (our) parent, and to remunerate their benevolence so that they deem worthy to accept the honor that is offered them more gloriously and beautifully. The decree is carved in a bronze tablet for them. It is decided that (the following) delegates are to present the tablet to the patrons in a worthy manner: Satrius Achilles, Satrius Clemens, Voesidenus Maviellinus, Vassidenus Verinus, Casidius Severus, [H]eldius Primus, Heldius Peregrinus, Brittius Maximus, Aelius Honoratus, Apro[n]ius Hilarinus, Aetrius Terminalis, Gavius Felicissimus, Satrius Ianuarius, Casidius Romul|lus, Aetrius Verna, Satrius Ursus.

NOTES: This patronage tablet and no. 69 below are both full of grammatical errors, and awkward syntax. The composers may have over-stretched their literary ability in an attempt to sound formal and majestic. The formulations such as q. f. p., d. e. r. i. c. c. were borrowed from public documents. The translation here is partially based on Hemelrijk’s (2008: 132–33). The same Coretius Fuscus was also the recipient of another patronage tablet presented by the collegium fabrum (CIL XI. 5748 = ILS 7220 = W 505, AD 260). He was very likely the brother of Coretius Victorinus (no. 69, Ostra). Coretius Victorinus may have
taken his cognomen from their mother, Memmia Victoria (CIL XI. 5748 = ILS 7220). Ostra and Sentinum were neighboring cities.


P(ublio) Cornelio Saeculare II et C(aio) Iunio Donato II Co(n)s(ulis, qarto dic) Non(as) Dec(embres) Ostr(a)e in municipio, coll(egium) centon(ariorum), cum schola sua frequentes scribundo adfuissebant, ibique referente T(ito) Vessidio For|tunato q(uin)q(euennale), universor(m) consensu verba sunt facta: | quanto amore quantaque munificentia n(umerum) n(ostrum) Carenums Vibi|anus ornasse pala(m) est, cius ins(ipris) beneficis ad | remunerandam aeius adfectionem qu(a)erere remedia | debere, sed pr(a)ecipuum a(d)que laudabilem communis voti | repertum, consilium, ut Coretium Victorinum ad genus ae[ius et honor]e[s] pertinentem, vel hac o(b)latione munere|mus. | et patronum aeum iandudum lectum publica testificatione manifestetur: iigitur si cunctis vedetur tabulam aeream | continentem testimoniorum circa eum nostr(a)e adfectionis | ieoque Q R Q F R. de <a>ea r(e) u(niversi) I(ta) censuerun: | placere Coretio Victorino patrono n(umeri) n(ostri) tabul(a)em ve[r]ba decreti nostri offerri per Vessidium Fortuna|tum, Cornelium Tertium q(uin) q(uennales), Publibulum Maximinum, Aure|lium Ursinum, Valerium Iustum, Coc|ceium Mercuriale, Antistium Maxim|um Octavium Clementem, Petronium Felicem, | Vessidium Filiquarium, Octavium Tau|rum, Satrenum Superum, Vessidium Verecundum(m) | Statium Faustum legatos.| Feliciter.

70. Iguvium. CIL XI.5818; W 1902.

---] Merop(e---]|---| centon(ariorum?) | Lantlanvsca (sic!).

71. Sestinum. CIL XI.6014; ILS 6645; W 1903; Forbis 331. AD 198–211.

L(ucio) Dentusio L(ucii) f(ilio) Pap(iria) Proculino, eq(uo) p(ublico), curat(ori) kal(endarii) Tif(ernatium) Mat(auenium) dat[o] a[b] imp(eratoribus) Sever[o] o et An[i]onino Aug(ustis), aed(i|i), IIIIvir(o), | flam(ini), auguri, patron(o) coll(eii) cent(onariorum), IIIIIIvir Aug(ustales) et plebs urb(ana), ob pleraq(u)e | merita eius patrono. | Cuius dedicatione dec(urionibus | denarios) III, sevir(is) et pleb(i denarios) II | cum pane et vino dedit. | L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

72. Sestinum. AE 1946.216; G. Bonfante A|JA 49 (1942): 61; Me|A 78.

L(ucio) Atinati L(ucii) f(ilio) Cl(ustomina tribu) Ver|o aedil(i|i), qua|e|stoi, III vi|ro id(em) patro|no pleb(is) item | coll(egiorum) fabr(um) et |
cent(onariorum), sexviri | Augustal(es) et | plebs urbana. | L(ocus) d(atus) d(creteo) d(ecurionum).

73. Urvinum Mataurense. CIL XI.6053; W 1906; Trevisiol 17 no. 4. AD 180–92.

C(aio) Vesnio C(ai) f(ilio) Stel(latina) Vindici, aedil(i), IIIvir(o) viarum curandarum, tribun(o) milit(um)| legionis VIII Aug(ustae),| quo militante cum liberata | esse nova obsidione | legio Pia Fidelis Constans | Comoda cognominata est, | ipse ut devotissimus imp(eratori) | Commodo Aug(usto) Pio Felici oblato honore quaestor | designatus est annorum XXIII. | Divisit ob dedication(em) bigae | decurion(ibus) singu(lis) (denarios) V, | collegiis omnibus (denarios) III, plebei et honore usis (denarios) III. | L(oco) d(ato) d(creteo) d(ecurionum).

74. Urvinum Mataurense. CIL XI.6070; W 1907; Trevisiol 26 no. 23.


75. Suasa. CIL XI.6162; W 1913. AD 145–61.

Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) T(ito) Aelio | Hadriano Anton|no Aug(usto) Pio, co(n) s(uli) IIII, p(atri) p(atriae), colleg(ium) | centonar(iorum) Suasanor(um) | L(ucius) Burbuleius Matutinus, | sexvir.

76. Suasa. CIL XI.6164; W 1914. RE, Ranius 2; PIR R 18. Late second to mid-third century.

Q(uinto) Ranio Terenti[o] | Honoratiano Festo, | cl(assicos) m(emiae) v(iro), quaest(ori) prov(incae) | Siciliae, aed(ili) cur(uli), praef(ori) tutel(ari), praef(ecto) aer(arii) mil(itaris), leg(ato) | Lyciae Pamphyliae(iae), leg(ato) leg(ionis) | II Adiut(ricas), | proco(n)s(uli) Lyciae Panf(iliae), | secundum verba testam(entii) | eius, ordo sexviral(ium), | collegium fabr(um), collegium centon(ariorum) [---]

77. Fanum Fortunae. CIL XI.6231; W 1918; Trevisiol 143–44: no. 9.

D(is) M(anibus) | T(ito) Flavio Eutiche|ti, sev(iro) Aug(ustali), colle(giato) f(abrum) F(anestrium), | idem cent(onario) colle(giato), d|endo(phoro): posuer(unt) | T(itus) Flavius Verus pa|tri et Flavia Nea | b(ene) m(erenti).
78. Fanum Fortunae. CIL XI.6235; W 1919; Trevisiol 145: no. 12. Limestone.

---nepoti [---] | [splendido equiti Rom[ano, | patrono] coloniae et IIIIII [virum | Augustali]um, item fabrum [cen]tonariou]m dendroforum | collegiatorum set (sic!) et [---] | [---]rum civ[ium---]] | [---]m ob sigu[lare---

79. Ocricum. AE 1899.93; W 2429; ILS 7365; CIL XI.7805; Forbis 308. AD 247–48?

Romuli. | M(arco) Iulio Ulpio M(arci) f(ilio) | Velina Cleopatro, pa|trono civit(atis) et collegi | centonariou]m Romuliorum, patri MM | Claudiorum Ulpio]rum Cle]opatri et Sabini, eq]uitum) RR(omanorum),| v[iro optimo, ob merita et | innocenti(a)e eius honoris | gratia, amatoures; qui ad r|oburandum consensum ama|torum suorum donavit eis| s(estertium) X m(ilia) n(ummum), et ob dedicatione(m) sin|gulis discumbentibus et epul(antibus) | s(estertios) XXX n(ummos). L(oco) d(ato) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

On the other side:


NOTES: The cognomen of the person honored here seems to be Cleopatrus rather than Cleopater, as some suggested. The dative is Cleopatro, and the genitive is Cleopatri. MM in line 6 stands for duorum Marcorum. The names of the consuls were deliberately erased.

80. Pisaurum. CIL XI.6362; W 1924; ILS 7364; Forbis 317; Pisaurum I. 73 (with image of the monument); Trevisiol 79 no. 45. Late second or third century AD.

Zminthi. | T(ito) Caedio T(itii) f(ilio) Cam(iila) | Atilio Crescenti, | eq(uo) p(ublico), patr(ono) col(oniae) et | primario viro, q(uaestori), II vir(o) et | II vir(q) q(uinna) q(uennali), patr(ono) VI vir(orum) August(alium), | itemq(ue) collegiorum fabr(um), cent(onariou]m, navic(ulariorum), | dendr(ophororum), vicim(agistrorum), iuvenum foren|sium, item studiori]m Apollinar(is) et Gunthar(ii?), cives, amici | et amatores eius, quorum | nomina inscripta sunt, | ob eximiam benignamq(ue) erga | omnes cives suos affectio|nem sinceramq(ue) et incomparal|ibem innocentiam eius | patrono dignissimo. | Cuius dedicatione sing(ulis) (sestertios) n(ummos) XXXX | adiecto pane et vino cum epul(antur) dedit. | L(oco) d(ato) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).
On the right side:

Uttenius Amand(us), | Vinnius Paulinian(us), | Poppaedius Valens, | Latron(ius) Festinan(us), | Saluvius Felicissim(us), | Latron(ius) Faustinus, | Sertorius Secundin(us), Sertorius Secundin(us) iun(ior).


C(aio) Mutteio C(ai) f(ilio) Pal(atina)| Quinto Severo, q(uaestori), II vir(o), q(uaestori) alimentor(um),| curatori calendar(ii)| pecuniae Valentini[a]n(ae) HS DC (milia),| patrono VIvir(orum) August(alium) et| colleg(iorum) fabr(um), centonar(iorum), navicular(iorum), | decuriones et plebs urbana | ex divi[sion]e epularum,| ob merita.| L(o)co d(ato) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

NOTE: The text given here is Mennella’s version (1981: 237). Walting had a different reading of Line 4: pecuniae Valentini nummum sestertium DC (milium). The different readings and restorations hardly affect the meaning of the text, however.

82. Pisaurum. CIL XI.6378; W 1928; Forbis 323; Pisaurum I. 89 (with image); Trevisiol 85–86 no. 57. Marble base.

C(aio) Valio| Polycarpo | ornamenta decurio|natus inlustratus(sic!) a| splendidissimo or|dine Arimin(ensi), patron(o) | VII vicorum item coll[egior(um)] fabr(um) cent(onariorum) | dendr(ophororum) colon(iae) Arim(ensis), | item ornamenta decurio|natus inlustratus a | splendidissimo ordine Pisaurens(ium), patrono collegior[um] fabr(um), cent(onariorum), dendr(ophororum), naviculariorum) | et vicimag(istrorum) colon(iae) Pisaur(ensis), | plebs Pisaur(ensis) ob merita. Cuius | dedicat(ione) sportulas decur(ionibus denarios) V, | itemq(ue) col|legiis (denarios) II, plebi (denarios singulos) dedit. | L(o)co d(ato) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ublice).

83. Pisaurum. CIL XI.6379; W 1929; Pisaurum I. 90; Trevisiol 86 no. 58. The lower right side of a large marble slab.

---centon|arior(um) Pisaur(ensis)| [---qu]od opus| [---VIvir(-) Augustal[---] | [---] honoratus| [---] sui HS CC (milia) dedit.

84. Sassina. CIL XI.6515; W 1932.
D(is) M(anibus) | C(ai) Caesi C(ai) l(iberti) | Chresimi, | V(liv)ir(i) Aug(ustalis), | patron(i) coll(egii) | centonar(iorum) m(unicipii) S(assinatis). | Tingetana lib(erta).


On the face:

D(is) M(anibus) | Cetraniae| P(ubli) f(iliae) Severinae, | sacerdoti | divae Marcianae), | T(itus) Baebius Gemelli|nus Augustalis | coniugi sanctiss(imae).

On the left side:

Caput ex testamento | Cetraniae Severinae. | Collegis dendrophorum, fabrum, centonariorum municipii | Sassi(natis) | (sestertium) sena milia n(umnum) dari | volo; fideiq(ue) vestrae collegiali (sic!) committo, uti | ex reditu (sestertium) quatern(orum) m(ilium) | n(umnum) omnibus annis prid(ie) | idus Iun(ias) die natalis | mei oleum singulis | vobis dividatur et | ex reditu (sestertium) binum | milium n(umnum) Manes | meos colatis. Hoc ut ita faciatis fidei | vestrae committo.

86. Sassina. CIL XI.6523; W 1934. Second century.

D(is) M(anibus) | L(uci) Destimi | Epigoni | Augustalis | colleg(ium) centonariorum | m(unicipii) S(assinatis) b(ene) m(erenti).

87. Sassina. CIL XI.6525; W 1935.

D(is) M(anibus) | C(ai) Gigen|ni Festivi | c(ollegium) c(entonariorum) m(unicipii) S(assinatis) b(ene) m(erenti).

88. Sassina. CIL XI.6526; W 1936.

D(is) M(anibus) | C(ai) Gigen|ni Ianuari, patron(i) | c(ollegium) c(entonariorum) m(unicipii) S(assinatis) b(ene) m(erenti).

89. Sassina. CIL XI.6527; W 1937.

D(is) M(anibus) | Gigenniae Vere|cundae | c(ollegium) c(entonariorum) m(unicipii) S(assinatis) b(ene) m(erenti).
90. Sassina. CIL XI.6529; W 1938.

D(is) M(anibus) | C(ai) Longare|ni Lupi et | Flaviae Sabinae | coniugi eius; | ex testam(ento) Lupi | c(ollegium) c(entonariorum) m(unicipii) S(assinatis) b(ene) m(erenti) | posuit.

91. Sassina. CIL XI.6533; W 1939.

D(is) M(anibus). | C(ai) Sas|sinati | C(ai) f(ilio) Pup(lilia) | Poly|carpi|ano, | c(ollegium) c(entonariorum) m(unicipii) S(assinatis).


D(is) M(anibus) | Sex(ti) Tetti Sex(ti) l(iberti) | Herme, | Vl|viri, patr(oni) | c(ollegii) c(ent(onariorum) | m(unicipii) S(assinatis); | Torasia C(ai) f(ilia) | S|abin|a | c(oniugi) in|com|parabili et sibi v(iva) p(osuit). | Have, Herme, home bone.

93. Sassina. CIL XI.6535; W 1941.

D(is) M(anibus). | C(ai) Vaberi | Eutychi | c(ollegium) c(entonariorum) m(unicipii) S(assinatis) b(ene) m(erenti).

94. Sassina. CIL XI.6536; W 1942.

D(is) M(anibus) | L(uci) Uafri | Nicephori, | medico (sic!), pa|tron(o) c(ollegii) c(entonariorum) m(unicipii) S(assinatis); | Flavia Pieris | marito optumo | et sibi viva p(osuit).

95. Sassina. CIL XI.6538; W 1943.

D(is) M(anibus) | P(ubli) Voluseni | Genialis | c(ollegium) c(entonariorum) m(unicipii) S(assinatis) b(ene) m(erenti).

96. Sassina. CIL XI.6542; W 1944. Fragment of a marble tablet.

---se[---] | ---li cent(onariorum?---] | deio [---] | mis[---]

97. Sassina. AE 1980.422; G. Susini, RAL 10 (1955): 271–272, no. 21 with image (fig. 16); Sarsina Tavola XVII (image); M&A 76. Second century.

D(is) M(anibus) | Sex(ti) Rasi(i) | Aphrodi|si, c(ollegium) c(entonariorum) m(unicipii) S(assinatis) b(ene) m(erenti).

Q(uinto) Velcennae | L(ucii) f(ilio) Stel(latina) | Proculo, | decurioni | Mevaniolae, | c(ollegium) c(entornariorum) m(unicipii) M(evaniolae) patrono; | honore contentus | impendium remisit et | dedicatione statuae | numer(o) coll(egii) ipsorum | sportul(as) dedit | singul(is) denarios binos. | L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

**Regio VII Etruria**


L(ucii) Allio L(ucii) f(ilio) | Stel(latina) Volusiano | trib(uno) laticlauio | leg(ionis) XII Fulminat(ae) | Certae Constantis, | quaestori | prou(inciae) Baeticae, | aedili Ceriali, | colleg(ia?) fabrum| et centonario(um) patrono optimo.

100. Luna. *CIL* XI.1354; W 1825. AD 255. Bronze patronage tablet.

*Imp(eratore) P(ublio) L[icinio Valeria]no Aug(usto) ter(tium) et Gallien[o Aug(usto) iterum co(n)s[ulibus]---] Febr(u)ar(ias) | in co[nventu cum frequenti adesse]t? n(umerus) cent(onariorum) | ib[ique referentibus--- i]o Mirone et F(lavio) Festo iun(iore) mag(istris) | q(uod) v(erba) f(acta) s(unt): ess[e tute]l(ae) i[n perpetuum] coll(egii) n(ostro), si eos patr(onos) nobis | coopt(amus), hon[oribus] ill(us) praeedit(os), bon(ae) vit(ae), manus[et] d(ine) | ple-nos: ergo, cu[m] sit L(ucius) Cot(tius)? Proculus, vir splen[didus], cu[m]ul(atus) | ([l]at[iicus?) spl(endidae) civitatis n(ostrae) Lunenis(is), homo simplic(ius) vita: unde cre|dim(u)s grandi cumulo repleri num(erus) n(ourum), si cum nob(is) | patron(um) cooptem(u)s: q(uod) i(fieri) p[lacet], d(e) e(a) r(e) t(a) c(ensuerunt): placere cunctis universisq(ue) tam | salubri relationi magistror(um) nostr(orum) consentiri, praesertim | cum sit et dignitate accumulat(um) (us) et honore fascium repletus, | unde satis abundeq(ue) gratulari possit n(umerus) n(oster), si cum nob(is) patri(onum) a[dsum(u)s], petendumq(ue) de benignit(at(e)) s(ua) et s(ua) benevolentia, ut eo anim(um) | suscipe(re) dignet(ur) hoc decretum voti(v) um consens(us) n(ostri), quam (sic!) et | nos gloriosi gaudentesq(ue) offering(u)s, tabulamq(ue) aenam | huius decreti n(ostri) scriptura adfigi praecipiat, ubinam iesserit, testem futurum in aevo huius consensus nos|tri: relationem. Censuerunt. | Feliciter.

101. Perusia. *CIL* XI.1926; W 1841; *ILS* 6616. Late second or early third century.
On the left side:

*Dedic(atum) Idibus Iul(iis) | Imp(erator) M(arco) Aurelio Antonino Aug(usto) Pio Fel(ice) II | [--]*

On the face:

*C(aio) Vibio C(aii) f(ilio) L(ucrii) n(epoti) Tro(mentina) | Gallo Proculeiano, | patrono Perusinorum, | patrono et curatori r(ei) p(ublicae) Vet(tonensium), iudici de (quinque) dec(urii), aedil(i), patrono collegi centon(ariorum), | Vibius Veldumnianus | avo karissimo; ob cuius | dedicationem dedit | decurionibus (denarios) II, plebi (denarios singulos). | L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).*

NOTE: Vibius Veldumnianus was the father of C. Vibius Trebonianus Gallus, emperor from AD 251–253.

102. ?Clusium. *CIL XI.2114; W 1843.*

[--] | [pra]et. XV pop. | [--]coh. I v[ig.] | [--]o col(legii?) c(entonariorum?) | [--]

NOTE: The incision was not deep. The stone is badly damaged. The text was restored by E. Bormann (*CIL XI* p. 376, *ad CIL XI.2114*), followed by Waltzing, as such: [--] | [pra]et. XV pop. | [--]coh. I v[ig.] | [patron?]o col(legii?) c(entonariorum?) | ---. This restoration is necessarily dubious due to the very fragmentary nature of the surviving portion and the uncertainty in reading a C after COL.

103. Sorrinenses Novenses. *CIL XI.3009; W 1855; ILS 6595; Forbis 396.*

*M(arco) Aurelio Elaini filio | Marcello, | pontif(iici) iur(e) dic(undo) Sorr(inensium) Nov(ensisium), | quae(stori) arc(ae) publicae, | patron(o) coll(egiorum) fabr(um) et cent(onariorum); | huic prim(o) omnium splendid(us) | ordo ex sportul(is) suis ob mer(ita) eius | statuam ponendam censuer(unt); | cuius ob dedicationem dedit | decurionibus pane(m) vinu(m) et (denarios) X; | hoc ampl(ius) ob hon(orem) sibi oblatum | (sestertium quinque milia) n(ummum) popul(o) in annonam perpetuo| dedit. L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum). C(uram) a(gente) T(it) Severo.*


[--- | coll(egia)] fabr(um) | [et] centonar(iorum) | optimo | patrono.

_D(is) M(anibus).| Bebio Fest[iv|o] | col(legae) sodal[es] | c[oll(egi) c|en[t(ona-]
|rionum)?] | fec(erunt).

Regio VIII (Aemilia)

106. Ravenna. *CIL* XI.124; *ILS* 6666; *W* 1791. After the latter half of the second century.

*M(arco) Aur(elio) Demetri[o] | Surapammoni, eq(uo) | pub(lico)], | auguri, 
dec(urioni) m(unicipii) R(aven(natis), pat[rono] | coll(egiorum) fabr(um) et 
cent[ona(riorum)].

107. Ravenna. *CIL* XI.125; *ILS* 8242; *W* 1792. AD 161–66 or 198–211.

*M(arcus) Caesius Eutyches, | dec(urio) c(ollegii) c(entonario-]
rum) m(unicipii) R(aven(natis) dec(uria|e ur|iarum) XVII, | et Tullia Ferusa, | coniux karissima, 
| vivi sibi posuer(unt); | si quis ante hanc arcam quid | aliud posuer(it) vel 
condider(it), | dabit fisco Aug(ustorum) N.N.(i.e.nostrorum duorum) (sestertium) 
XXX (milia) n(ummmum).

108. Ravenna. *CIL* XI.133; *W* 1795.

*M(arcus) Cocceius M(arci) f(ilius) | Cam(ilia) Erotianus, | dec(urio) col(legii) 
cent(onario-|rum) m(unicipii) R(aven(natis, sibi et | Valeriae Benign(a)e, coniug(i) 
| incomp(arabili), cum qua vix(it) ann(os) XX, | vivus posuit.


_{elivi | [--- de]c(urio) c(ollegii) c(entonario-|rum) | [---]}p[---]

110. Ariminum. *CIL* XI.377; W 1802; Forbis 408. No later than the early third century. *PIR*² C 1357; *RE* 7, Cornelius n. 151.

_C(ai) Cornelio | C(aii) f(ilio) Quirin(a) | Felici Italo, iurid(ico) per Flamin(iam) 
et Umbri[am], leg(ato) prov(inciae) Achaiae, praet(ori), | patrono colo-

_niae, | vicani vicorum (septem) et | col|l(eg)ia fabr(um) cent(onario-|rum) 
dendr(ophorum) | ur|b(ium) iuridictus eius, ob eximiam | moderationem et in 
sterilitate | annonae laboriosam erga ipsos fidem | et industriam, ut et civibus 
anno[m(ae)] | superesset et vicinis civitati|bus subveneretur. | L(ocus) d(atus) 
d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).
111. Ariminum. CIL XI.378; ILS 1381; W 1804; Forbis 409. AD 138–61. PIR² F 105; RE 12, Faesellius; Pflaum, Carrières 1 n. 153.

L(ucio) Faesellio | L(uici) filio An(iensi tribu) | Sabiniano | proc(uratori) i[m]p(eratoris) Anton(ini) | Aug(usti) Pii prov(inciae) Pan(noniae) in(ferioris), | proc(uratori) XX [h]er(editatum) region(is) | Campaniae | Apuliae | Calabr(iae), | [e]quo pub(lico), aug(uri), IIIvir(o), | IIvir(o) quinquennali), | [f]la[m(uni)], | patrono co(loniae), | colleg(ium) co[n(teriorum)] | patrono opt(imo) et rarissimo. | Honor(e) accep[t(um)] impens(um) remiss(it). | L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

112. Ariminum. CIL XI.379; ILS 6664; Forbis 415. Second or third century.

C(aio) Faesellio C(aii) filio An(iensi) Rufioni | Rufioni | eq(uo) pub(lico), L(aurenti) Avianati, | cur(atoris) reip(ublicae) Forodru(entinorum), patr(ono) co(loniae) Arim(ini) | item(q[uo]) vicarorum | vicorum (septem) | et coll(egiorum) fabr(um) et cent(onariorum), optimo et rarissimo civi, quod liberalitates in patriam civesque a maioribus suis tributas exemplis suis superaverit, dum et annonae populi inter c[etera beneficia] saepe subvenit et praeterea singulis vicis munificentia sua (sestertium) XX (milia) n(ummum) ad | emptionem possessio(nis), cuius de | reeditu die natalis sui sporturar(um) diviso semper celebretur, | largitus sit: ob cuius dedicationem | (sestertios) n(ummos) IIII vicar(um) divisit; | vicani vici Dianensis.

On the right side:

Proseri.

113. Ariminum. CIL XI.385; W 1806; Forbis 410. Terminus post quem, AD 97; no later than the early third century.

L(ucio) Betutio L(uici) f(ilio) Pal(atina tribu) Furiano | p(rimo) p(ilo) leg(ionis) I Ital(icae), IIvir(o) | quinquennali), IIvir(o) i(ure) d(icundo), IIIvir(o) | aedili cur(uli), pontif(ici), | flamini divi Nervae, | patrono colon(iae), | colleg(ium) centonarior(um) | amantissimo patriae. | L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

NOTES: Cf. CIL XI.386 = ILS 6659 = Forbis 411, CIL XI.387 = ILS 6660 = Forbis 412 for the dedication made by other groups to the same person.

114. Ariminum. CIL XI.406; W 1811; Forbis 418.
NOTES: For line 2, Forbis supplies Luperc(alium) Laur(entium) La(vin(atium))--.

115. Ariminum. CIL XI.418; W 1812; Forbis 419.

C(aio) Sentio C(aii) f(ilio) | Pal(atina) Valerio | Faustiniano, | (duum) viro, (trium)viro, augur(i), | vicani viorum (septem) | collegia fabr(um) et | centonaria(rum), | ex aere conlato, | quod in honore (duum)viratus | industriae administrato | omnibus plebis desideriis | satisfecit. | Locus datus d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

116. Forum Cornelii. CIL XI.668; W 1814.

Genio | colleg(ii) cent(onariorum) | Gavius Fel(ix) Petron.

117. Regium Lepidum. CIL XI.970; ILS 7216; W 1819; FIRA 3 39; Forbis 421; Bollmann 1998: 477 C 72. AD 190.

Imp(erator) Caes(are) M(arco) Aurelio | [Commodo] Antonino Aug(usto) Pio | Felice VI, M(arco) Petronio Septimi ano co(n)s(ulibus). | x kal(endas) April(es), | in templo collegi fabrum | et centonaria(rum) Regiensium. | Quod referentibus P(ublio) Saenio Marcellino et C(aio) Aufidio | Dialogo quaestoribus v(eria) f(ecerunt) |: Tutilius Iulianus, virum et vita et modestia et ingenia verecunda ornatum et liberalem, | oportere collegi nostri patronum cooptari, ut | sit ceteris exemplo iudici nostri testimonium. | Quid f(ieri) p(laceret), d(e) e(a) r(e) I(ta) c(ensuerunt): | Salubri consilio tam honesta(m) relatione(m) a quaestorib(us) | et magistris collegi nostri factam et singuli et un(iversi) sentim | et ideo excusandam potius honesto viro | Iuliano huius tardae cogitationis nostrae necessitat(em) | petendumque ab eo, libenter suscipiat collegi n(ostri) patro(nal(em)) | honorem tabulamque aereum cum inscriptione huius decre|[ti]n domo eius poni. Censuerunt.

Trans: On March 23rd when Imperator Caesar M(arco) Aurelius [Commodus] Antoninus Augustus Pius Felix and M(arco) Petronius Septimianus are consuls, the former for the sixth time, at the temple of the guild of the fabri and the centonarii of Regium. The quaestors Publius Saenius Marcellinus and Gaius Aufidius Dialogus proposed: Tutilius Iulianus, a noble man distinguished for
his manner of life, his moderation, and his innate modesty, should be elected patron of our guild, so that the evidence of the decision of the association may serve as an example to others. They have thus decided on that matter: each and every of us feel that the quaestors and the magistrates of our association made a sound and honorable proposal, and that, therefore, the necessity of our belated consideration should rather be excused by the honorable man Iulianus, and that he should be asked to willingly take the honor of being patron of our guild and that a bronze tablet with the inscription of this decree should be placed in his house. They have resolved.

118. Brixellum. CIL XI.1027; W 1820; ILS 6671.

D(is) M(anibus) | T(itii) Legi Iucundi. | (se)viri Aug(ustalis) et Decimiae Thal|liae eius, | Filetus libertus. | His epul(a)e debentur | a collegio centona|riorum Brixellano|rum.


---]] prae(fecto) leg(ionis) XX Valer(iae) | Victr(icus), primop(ilo) leg(ionis) | X Gemin(ae) piae fidel(is), | cent(urioni) legion(um) IIII Scythic(ae), XI Claud(iae), XIII Gem(inae). | VII Gemin(ae). | patr(ono) col(oniae) Iul(iae) Aug(ustae) Parm(ensis), | patr(ono) municipiorum Forodruent(inorum) et Foro|novanor(um), patron(o) collegior(um) fabr(um) et cent(onariorum) et | dendrophor(orum) Parmen(sium), | colleg(ium) cent(onariorum) | merenti.

120. Placentia. CIL XI.1230; W 1824.

Q(into) Albino | Ouff(entia) | Secundino | Q(uinti) f(ilio) Q(uinti) n(epoti) Q(uinti) pron(epoti) Mestrio Aebutio | Tulliano, eq(uiti) R(omano) eq(euo) p(ublico), | accens(o) ve[l(ato)], flam(ini) | divi magn(i) Anton(ini), | Ilvir(o) i(ure) d(icundo) m(anum) p(otestate), cur(atori) r(ei) p(ublicae) | Parmens(ium), repunc-tori | splendid(issimorum) collegiorum | fabrum et cent(onariorum) c(oloniae) A(ntoninianae/ureliae) A(ugustae) F(eliciis) M(ediolanensis). | Collegia s(upra) s(critpa) patrono.

NOTE: The provenance of this inscription is not entirely certain. One source attributed it to Parma, see Bormann’s notes ad CIL XI.1230. Flamen divi magn(i) Anton(ini), i.e. Caracalla deified by Macrinus, which gives the terminus post quem for the inscription (c. AD 217–218); CCAAFM gives c. AD 260 as a terminus ante quem.
Regio IX (Liguria)

121. Clastidium. CIL V.7357; W 588. Latter half of the second or third century.

Atiliae C(ai) f(iliae) | Secund(iae) con|iu|g(i) castissim(ae) | pudicissima eq ue
sibique opsequentissimae, | quae vixit annis XVII, m(ensis) VII, d(iebus) VII, item | C(ai) Atili Secundi et Serr(iae?) M(arci) lib(ertae) Valerian|nae socerorum karissimor(um), | M(arcus) Labik(anus) Memor | vivos posuit, | et
in memoriam eorum rosa et | amarantho et epulis perpetuo co|l|endam colleg|io centonar(iorum) Placent(inorum) | consist(entium) Clastidi[---.

122. Vardagate. CIL V.7452; W 591.

C(ai) Avilio Severo | et Aviliae C(ai) f(iliae) | Severae c(ollegium) c(entonariorum) | Vard(agatensium) d(e) p(ecunia) S(u)a f(ecit).

123. Industria. CIL V.7470; W 594. Second or third century.

Genio | Q(uinti) Serto\ri Syne\rgi iu\nioris et | Genio | Q(uinti) Serto\ri Seve|ri, patro[norum], | c(ollegium) c(entonariorum) Ind(ustriensium).

NOTE: See CIL V. 7469 for an identical inscription put up by the c(ollegium) f(abrum) Ind(ustriensium).

124. Industria. CIL V.7485; W 595. Second or third century.

C(ai) Lollio | C(ai) lib(erto) Pal(atina) | Agraulo | colleg(ium) | centonar(iorum), | q(uo) h(onore) c(ontentus) i(mpensam) r(emisit).

NOTE: C. Lollius C. lib. Pal. Agraulus was a sevir and Augustalis, see CIL V. 7486 = AE 1993. 733, which was put up by his fellow freedman: C(ai) Lollio C(ai) lib(erto) | Pal(atina) Agraulo | VViv(o) et Aug(ustralis) | C(aius) Lollius | Heliodorus | colliberto.


Genio | c(ollegii) c(entonariorum) Alb(ensium) Pomp(eianorum), | in memoriam | S(alvi) Cinci Sem(proniani, eq(uitis) R(omani) | eq(uo) pub(lico), Sempronia Sabina mat er | et Iulia Sabina soro | d(e) p(ecunia) s(u)a p(osuerunt).

126. ?Pollentia. CIL V.7618; InscrIt 9.1.131, with image; Me&A 55. Fragment of a marble base.

NOTE: Antonio Ferrua suggested the restoration of [cent(onariorum)] in line 4 after (col)l. fabr(um) (InscrIt 9.1: 72 ad no. 131). This is quite possible, but not necessarily the only choice. (Col)l. fabr(um) may have been followed by a place name, such as Poll(entionorum), as the parallel coll(egium) dendr(ophorum) Poll(entinorum) would suggest (cf. CIL V.7617).

127. ?Vada Sabatia. CIL V.7776; W 602. With hederae.

C(ollegium?) c(entonariorum?) S(abatinorum?)

NOTE: Only the bottom half of the S has survived. Waltzing (III 164 ad no. 602) suggested reading C(ollegium?) c(entonariorum?) S(abatinorum?)---. His suggestion is certainly plausible, but uncertainty remains due to the extremely fragmentary condition of the inscription.

Alpes Maritimae

128. Cemelenum. CIL V.7881; ILS 1367; W 605. PIR A 1276. c. AD 239.

M(arco) Aurelio Masculo | v(iro) e(gregio) | ob eximiam praesidatus | eius integritatem et | egregiam ad omnes homines | mansuetudinem et urgentis | annonae sinceram praebitionem | ac munificentiam et quod aquae | usum vetustae lapsum requi|situm ac repertum saeculi | felicitate cursui pristine | red-diderit, | coll(egia tria), | quib(us) ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) c(oire) p(ermisuum) | est, | patrono digniss(imo).

129. ?Cemelenum. CIL V.7905; W 607; IANice 64.

---] [integritati [---]] bene merita [---]|Q(uinto) Domitio Q(uinti) f(ilio) [---]|no, II viro, amp[liatori ur][bis et collegio|rum (trium)], | civitas Cemen[elensis]. | Cuius publication[ne decurio]|nibus et (se)vir ep|ulum--- et | collegis tribus | et [officialibus? et] | populo omni oleum [dedit].| L(ocus) d(atus) d(creto) d(ecurionum).

130. Cemelenum. CIL V.7906; ILS 8374; W 608; IANice 71.
P(ublio) Etereio P(ublii) f(ilio) Q(urina) Quadrato | Etereia Aristolais mater | statuam posuit, | ob cuius dedicat(ionem) col[l(egio)] cent(onariorum) | epul-\[lum\] ex mor[e] d[edit], item denarios[---] L, | [it]a ut ex usur(is) quod ann(is) in perpet(uum) | die natal(i) Quadrati V id(us) Apr(iles), | ubi reliquiae eius condita\[e\] sunt, | sacrificium facerent ansare et libo | et in templo ex more epu-\[lamentur\] | et rosas suo tempore deducerent | et statuam tergerent et coro\[narent\]; \[quod\] se facturos receperunt.

131. ?Cemelenum. CIL V.7920; W 610; IANice 78.

[---] [ma]tri piissima[e] posuit, ob | cuius dedicationem decurio[nibus et (se) | vir(is) Aug(ustalibus) u[rb]anis et of\[ficia\]lis bisos di\[vis\]it, item | col\[legiis\] (i.e. de\[narios\] singulos), et recumbentibus | panem et vinum prae\[buit\] et o\[leum\] | populo viris ac mulieribus pr\[o\]m\[isce\] dedit. L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).


Patronus III collegi\[orum\] splen\[didiss(\imae)\] ci\[u\]tat(is) Cemenel\[ensium\]. T(ito) Decimio | Titulliani fil(io) | Quir\[ina\] tribu Nepoti, | [---] s\[acerd\(oti\)] | [---] dec\[urioni\], | [Titullianus] | et C[---] a Auita pare\[nt\]s fil(io) dignis\[i\]simo posuerunt), | l(oco) d(ato) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

133. Cemelenum. AE 1967.281; IANice 66 (for image, see Plate XVIII 83). Late second or early third century AD.

Signum Mercuri | C(aius) Cassius C(ai) f(ilius) Claudia | Paternus, decurio, patronus | collegi utriclar\[ior\]um, donum d(edit) d(edicauit), | qua die collegio fabrum utriclar\[ior\]um et centonar\[ior\]um sportulas et oleum dedit.

Italy Regio X (Venetia)


Apollini | Baleno Aug(u sto), | in honorem| C(ai) Petti C(ai) f(iliii) Pal(atina)| Philtati, eq(uo) p(ublico), | praef(ecti) aed\(ilio\) pot\(estate\), | praef(ecti) et patroni | collegior\[um\] | fab\(r\)um et cent\(onarior\)um, | Dio\[cles\] lib(ertus) | donum dedit. | L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

135. Aquileia. CIL V.1012; ILS 6686; W 427; Forbis 435. Terminus post quem, AD 211.
C(aio) Valer(io) C(ai) f(ilio) | Vel(ina) Eusebeti, | IIII vir(o) i(ure) d(icundo), IIII v(iro) i(ure) d(icundo) q(uin)q(uennali), | patron(o) Sept(imianorum) Aureli(anorum) | Aug(ustalium) sex(virum), patron(o) | coll(egiorum) cent(onariorum) et dend(rophororum) Aquil(eiensium), | ob insignem eius erga se | largition(em) et liberalita[tem] | suffrag(iis) univers(is) ex aere [coll(ato)], | coll(egium) fab(rum) | patron(o) dignissim(o). | L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

136. ?Aquileia. IA 682.

---] Urbi[co ---] | cent(onariorum?) q(uin)-[q(uennali---] | Victo fr(ater-)

137. Aquileia. CIL V.1019; W 428; IA 683 with image; Alfsöldy 1984: 103–04, no. 106.

---|--|--uxoris|--|--ma]rmoribus ex|struxit cum sig|no aereo effi[giem?--sig] nis marmoreis|--|--e verva aqua |--|--cas]tello publico | |--|--o et cetera in | |--|--curavit fecitque opus |--|--collegium? cent]onariorum |--|--t in tuition |--|-- item praece|--|--e suae (sestertium duo milia) n(ummum) dedit.

138. Aquileia. CIL V.1020; W 429; IA 688; Alfsöldy 1984: 103 no. 105.

---]| collegia fabr(um) et cent(onariorum) | statua]m aurat(am) ponend(am) | [decreverunt] honore | [contentus su]mptus | [remisit].

139. Feltria. CIL V.2071; W 453; ILS 6691; Alfsöldy 1984: 118, no. 156.

C(aio) Firmio C(ai) f(ilio) | Menen(ia) Rufino, | eq(uo) pub(lico), Lauren(ti) | Lav(inati), dec(urioni), flamin(i),|patrono colle|giorum fab(rum), cent-|onariorum),| dendr(ophororum) Feltriae, | itemque Berusens(ium): | colleg(ium) fabr(um) Alti|natium patrono.

NOTE: C. Firmius Rufinus may have been the patron of the three types of collegia at both Feltria and Berua (Regio XI). Or he may have been the patron of the three types of collegia and the patron of the city Berua.


Imp(eratori) Caesa[ri] | ][---]] | [P(io) F(elici)] Au[g(usto) pontif(ici)] m(ax(imo))| trib(unicia) pot(estate) II p(atri) p(atriae) co(n)s(uli) II / pr[o]
c[o(n)s(uli)] / ordo Feltrinorum | Severo et Rufino co(n)s(ulibus) | V k(alendas) Sept(embres) | acceperunt col(legia) fab(rum) et cc(entonariorum) | (denario-rum) quingenta milia, computata | usura anni uni(us) centensima (!) u[n]a | (denario-rum) LX (milia), de qua usura per singulos an(nos) | die V idu(s) lan(uarias) natale ipsius ex usura s(upra) s(cripta) | at memoriam Hos(tilii) Flaminini refriger[- ---] SE[- ---] debunt et IIII vir[- ---] et sex princ[ipal---] | et off[i---] pub[lic---] spor(tularum) no(mine) aureos den(arios) et sil(iquam) sing(ulam); neic (!) non et per ros(am) at (!) memor(iam) eius | refrigerar(e) deveb(unt) (!). N(---) CCCLXII.

141. Altinum. Orelli 4070; CIL V.2176; W 456; ILS 8369; for image, see Buonopane 2003b: fig. 1, d.

L(u[cius] Ogius) Patroclus, secutus | pietatem | col(legio) cent(onariorum) | hortos cum aedificio huic se[---]pul[turae] in[---]ctos | vivos donavit, ut | ex reditu eor(um) lar[gius] rosae et esc(a)e | patrono suo et | quandoque sibi ponerentur.


M(arcus) Iunius | Sabinus, | IIIIvir aedil|ciae potestat(is) | e lege Iulia | munici-pali, | patronus | collegi centonariorum, | frontem templi | vervis et hermis | marmoreis pe|cunia sua orna|vit et tuition(i) | dedit (sestertium duo milia). | N. CCXXXXII.

Trans: M. Iunius Sabinus, quattorvir with the power of aedile by virtue of the Julian law on cities, the patron of the collegium centonariorum, used his own money to decorate the temple front with fountains and marble statues and donated 2,000 sesterces for the maintenance. The 242th year of the Patavian Era.


---] | colle[gium] | [c]entonar[iorum] | [pa]tron[---] | [---]
144. Vicetia. *CIL* V.3111; *W* 465; Alföldy 1984: 123 no. 176. AD 136–.

\[
\text{[Matidia, | divae Matidia Aug(ustae)] | filiae, | divae Sabinae Aug(ustae)] sorori, | divae Marcianae Aug(ustae)]| nep(o)ti, | [c]olleg(ium) cent(onariorum) m(unicipii) Vic[etini].
\]

NOTE: Waltzing connected this inscription to *CIL* V.3112 = *ILS* 501, a dedication made in AD 242 to Gordian ex liberatitate Matidiarum. But see G. Alföldy, “Ein Senator aus Vicetia.” *ZPE* (39) 1988: 266 notes 33 and 34.

145. Vicetia (from Chiuppano to the north of Vicetia). *CIL* V.3137; *ILS* 6695; *W* 3137; Alföldy 1984: 124, no. 181.

\[
\text{L(ucius) Lartiu[s] Maximus, | IIIIvir i(ure) d(icundo), | adl(ectus) aer(arius), pont(ifex), | uxori | statuam oblatam a | collegio cent(onariorum) m(unicipii) Vic(etini) d(e) p(ecunia) s(ua) p(osuit).}
\]


\[
\text{D(is) M(anibus). | M(arcus) Metellus Hadrianus | v(ivus) f(ecit) sibi, | magister collegi centona|riorum candidatus; ex de|creto aeorum locus emptus.}
\]


\[
\text{V(ivus) f(ecit) | M(arcus) Veronius | E(paphroditus), | (se)vir Aug(ustalis), | mag(ister) [c]olle[gi] cent(onariorum), | Veroniae Calliste.}
\]


\[
\text{---rum convi---} |[---ne quod haec---][---cuiusdam sacr---][---]um casibus excuba[nt?---][---collegium centonario[rum---][---]obis fuisse qu[---][---]e idcirco et [---][---]uros q[---][---]der---}[---vi f---]
\]

NOTE: The restoration [---arcendis igni]um cited by several scholars is pure speculation.


\[
\text{Turrania | Stratonis si|bi et C(aio) Samic|io Firmo(?) marito | optimo, servir(o) C(laudial) mai|or(i), | mag(istro) (?)| coll(egi) | dendr(ophorum), coll(egi or egiato) cent(onariorum), | nutritori(?) et Sami|ci(?) Virian[---] VI | [---.}
\]
150. Brixia. CIL V.4324; IB 130; InscrIt 10.5.110. Terminus post quem, AD 134 to the later half of the second century.

Baebiae | M(arci) f(iliae) Nigrinae, | T(iti) Vivi Vari | consularis | sororis filiae | college(ium) cent(onariorum). | T(itulo) u(sa).

NOTE: Vivi for Vibi. For T. Vibius Varus, legate of Cilicia (AD 131–133), consul ordinarius or suffectus (AD 134), see Alfoldy 1999: 310 no. 12.

151. Brixia. CIL V.4333; ILS 6717; W 490; IB 139; InscrIt 10.5.120; Forbis 442; Mollo 2000. LIII. Late second or early third century. PIR G 13.

L(uicio) Gaboni Arunculeio Valeriano, | v(iro) e(gregio), eq(uitia) R(omano), sacerd(oti) et principal(i), | omnib(us) honorib(us) funct(o), | patri et avo senator(um), | curatori suo, | ob merita, | coll(egia) fabr(um) et cent(onariorum).
| L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

152. Brixia. CIL V.4368; W 494; ILS 6725; IB 174; InscrIt 10.5.157. AD 117–38.

P(ublio) C(lodio) P(ublii) f(ilio) | Fab(ia) Surae, | (quaestori), flamini divi | Traiani, pontif(ici), | (duum)viro quin(quennali), | trib(uno) leg(ionis) | II adiutric(is) piae fid(elis), | curat(ori) rei p(ublicae) Bergom(atium) | dat(o) ab imp(erator) Traiano, | curat(ori) rei p(ublicae) Comens(ium) | dat(o) ab imp(erator) Hadriano, | collegia | fabr(um) et cent(onariorum).


Coll(egium) cent(onarioum) | L(uicio) Cornelio | Mario, pictori, | et rosam in perpet(uum).

NOTE: Pictor could also be part of L. Cornelius Marius’ name. For Pictor as a cognomen, see Kajanto 1965: 321; Piccottini 1993: 117 (col. II/7). Gregori (1999: 245) thinks that pictor was occupation rather than a name.

154. Brixia. CIL V.4386; W 495; IB 192; InscrIt 10.5.999. First century AD?

C(aio) Aemilio | C(ai) f(ilio) Fab(i)ao | Proculo | q(uaestori), adlecto | inter II viral(es), | flam(ini) divi Aug(usti), | collegia | fabr(um) et cent(onariorum).
| [Ti]tul(o) usus.

155. Brixia. CIL V.4387; IB 193; InscrIt 10.5.180, with image. Terminus post quem, AD 129.
Aemiliae | C(ai) f(iliae) | Aequae, | sacerd(oti) divae | Plotinae, | colleg(ium) cent(onariorum). | Titulo usa.

156. Brixia. CIL V.4396; IB 202; InscrIt 10.5.189.

Bedasiae Q(uinti) f(iliae)| Iustae | collegia | fabr(orum) et centonarior(um) | C(aius) Lucretius Annianus | maritus titulo usus | l(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

157. Brixia. CIL V.4397; IB 203; InscrIt 10.5.190.

Bittaliae | P(ubli) f(iliae) | Festae | collegia | fabr(orum) et cent(onariorum) | titul(o) usa.

158. Brixia. CIL V.4406; W 502; IB 212; InscrIt 10.5.200. Second century.

L(ucio) Claudio | L(ucii) f(ilio) Fab(ia) Sabiniano, | equo public(o), | collegia | fabr(um) et cent(onariorum) | Titul(o) usus.

159. Brixia. CIL V.4408; W 503; IB 214; InscrIt 10.5.202; Forbis 447.

Coll(egia) fabr(um) | et cent(onariorum) | Q(uinto) Clodio | Ursino | ob honor(em) | quaest(urae) eius.

160. Brixia. CIL V.4415; W 506; IB 221; InscrIt 10.5.208, with image. First century AD.

Dis Manib(us) | M(arci) Corneli M(arci) f(iliii) | Proculi | coll(egiati or egium) centon(ariorum) | et M(arco) Cornelio | Aequo patri et | Quintae matri.

161. Brixia. CIL V.4416; W 507; IB 222; InscrIt 10.5.209; Forbis 448; Mollo 2000: 115 no. CLXXXIII.

Collegia| fabr(um) et cen(tonariorum) | L(ucio) Cornelio | Prosodico VIvir(o) | Aug(ustali) Brixiae et Veron(ae), sacerd(oti) | colleg(i) iuvenum Brixian(orum) | primum intitutis (sic!) | ob merita eius, honore | contentus inpendium remis(it) | [d]atis in tut(ela) (statuae) HS (nummis) D.

162. Brixia. CIL V.4422; W 509; IB 228; ILS 7257; InscrIt 10.5.216, with image.

Fabriciae | Centoniae | Arethusa uxori | optimae, et Chresime | filiae carissim(ae) | Fabricius Centonius | collegiorum lib(ertus) | C(h)resimus.
163. Brixia. *CIL* V.4426; *IB* 510; *IB* 232; *InscrIt* 10.5.221; Forbis 451.

Coll(egio) cent(onariorum) Sex(tus) Helvius Leo, | ob merita erga se | collat(a).

164. Brixia. *CIL* V.4449; *IB* 516; *IB* 255; *InscrIt* 10.5.238; *AE* 1919. 85; Royden 1988 no. 316; *AE* 2004. 161. Second century.

Gen(io) | et hon(ori) | Primi Pam|pii Secundi | et L(uci) Atili | Exorati | VI|vir(orum) Aug(ustalium) et | M(arci) Vetti|di | Aquilei|sis | VI|v(i) Aug(ustalis) | quinque|n(nalis) | et in omnib(us) coll(egiis) | magisterio per|functus (sic!), d(atis) in tutel|am) | HS n(ummis mille), ut d(ie) k(alendis) Febr(uariis) | sacrific|etur, et in profusione(m sestertii) n(ummis mille) [P]ob(licius?) A|rtemi|sius qui et [---]sco,| Ortensius Firmian(us), | Valerius Surian(us), et | Publilius Vitalis, et | Adi|cius Primian(us), | qui magister(i)o eo(rum) | offic(i)o functi sunt. | magistri s(upra) s cripti) titul|o honoris usi, | dat|is in tutelam | (sestertiis) n(ummis) M, | ut ex usur(is) eor|um) | quodann(is) die | III id(us) April(es) per | officiales sa|rificetur, et | oleo et prop|inatione) | dedicaver|unt).

NOTE: See Mollo no. CCIX for the problem of restoration.

165. Brixia. *CIL* V.4452; *IB* 517; *IB* 258; *InscrIt* 10.5.239. Second century.

Petroniae | Q(uinti) f(iliae) | Baebianae, | colleg(ium) | cent|onar(iorum). | Titul(o) usa.

166. Brixia. *CIL* V.4454; *IB* 518; *InscrIt* 10.5.241, with image. Second century.

--- | L(ucii) fil(iae) | Picatiae, | collegia | cent(onariorum) et fabr(um). | L(ocus) d(atus) d(erecto) d(ecurionum).

167. Brixia. *CIL* V.4483; *IB* 521; *IB* 289; *InscrIt* 10.5.274, with image.

Primo Valerio | Magirrae, | colleg(ia) fabr(um) et cent(onariorum), qui vixit | ann(orum) XXXIII, mens(ium) II, dierum XXIII, | plenus pro|bitate pientissimus inf|licissim(us), quo defuncto | amici dolent; M(arcus) Pub|licius) Valentinus | amicus locum sep|tultur(a)e dedit, |[Magius Valerius Surio aram posuit | nepoti suo pientissimo inf|licissim(o) | et [ ---

NOTE: Colleg. fabr. et cent. in line 3 could also be restored as colleg(ia) fabr(um) et cent(onariorum) or colleg(iati) fabr(um) et cent(onariorum).

168. Brixia. *CIL* V.4484; *IB* 522; *InscrIt* 10.5.275, with image; *IB* 290. Late second century.
Sex(to) Valerio Sex(ti) | fil(io) Fab(ia) Poblicol(a)e | Vettilliani (sic!) | eq(uiti) R(omano) eq(uo) p(ublico), | flaminiis perpetui (sic!), sacerd(oti) | urbis Romae aeter(nae), cura|tori et patrono civitatium | Vardagatensium et Dripsin|atium, patrono colleg(iorum) omnium, | omnibus honoribus perfuncto, | v(iro) b(ono), qui vixit sine ulla querella cum | coniuge sua infra scripta annis n(umero) XLV |, et Noniae M(arcii) f(iliae) Arriae Hermionill(a)e | summa pietate; ab eis dilectus avis | rarissim(is) M(arcus) Annius Valerius Catullus nepos.

169. Brixia. CIL V.4491; W 525; IB 297; InscrIt 10.5.283, with image; Mollo 2000 nos. CCXCVI, CCXVIII. First century AD?

Collegium | centonar(iorum) | C(aio) Vibio Iusto et | C(aio) Vibio Burdoni | (se)viro Aug(ustali).

170. Brixia. CIL V.4477; W 520; IB 283; InscrIt 10.5.266. Second century.

Coll(egia) fabr(um) et cent(onariorum) | Sex(to) Sextio Onesigeni, | ornamen- | tis | decurionalibus | Brixiae, (se)vir(o) Augustali(i), | patrono collegiorum | fabror(um) et centonarior(um) | et dendrophororum.

171. Brixia. CIL V.4498; W 526; IB 304; InscrIt 10.5.289, with image. Second century.

---] | colleg(ium) cent(onariorum).| Titulo usa.


Clodiae | P(ublii) f(iliae) | Secundae, | sacerd(oti) diuae | Matidiae, | collegia | fabror(um) et cen|tonariorum).

173. Brixia. CIL V.4488; W 523; IB 294; InscrIt 10.5.279, with image; Mollo 2000: 300. Third century.

[D(is) M(anibus) Valerii---] |, qui et Mannuli, | et Va[l]eriae Aprillae. C(aius) | Valerius Primitiv(us) | parentibus bene | merentibus et sibi | et conjugi suae | Acutiae Ursae. | qui legaverunt | coll(egii) fabris (sic !) et cent(onariorum) | HS n(umnum) II (milia), et (h)oc ampli(um) | tabernas cum cenac(ulis) | coll(egio) centonariorum, | quae sunt in vico Herc(ullio), | [ut inde fiant] profusiones in perpetu(um) | per off(iciales c(ollegii) cent(onariorum). | Quod [si] mi (sic!) voluptati sati(s) | non fecerit, iubio (sic!) | castellum (h)abere Ingenan(orum?). | Quae r[e]ddunt d(enarios) CC, ut | ex d(enariis) C profusio nobis fiat et ex | d(enariis) C tute[la] taber[na]rum s(upra) s(crittarum).
174. Brixia. *CIL* V.4459; *W* 519; *IB* 265; *InscrIt* 10.5.996; Mollo 2000: 66 no. XXXI.

*M(arco) Publici[o] | M(arci) f(ilio) Fab(ia) Sextio | Calpurniano | [eq]uo public[o] | flam(ini) dii Iul(i) | prae(fecto) aed(i)cia pot(estate) | quaestor(i) aerar(ii) | sacerd(oti) iuven(um) Brixianor(um) | defensori rei p(ublicae) Brixianorum | collegia centon(ariorum) et fabror(um) | l(ocus) d(atus) d(creto) d(ecurionum).

175. ?Brixia. *InscrIt* 10.5.1219.


176. Cammuni. Bonafini, *Epigraphica* 17 (1955) 100–03, with image; *AE* 1959.93; *InscrIt* 10.5.1211, with image; *Me*-A 20. Late second or early third century AD.

Mem(oriae) | Medi | Crescen(tis) | coll(egia) fabr(orum) | et cent(onariorum) | P(edes) X.


Q(uinto) Dec(io) Q(uinti) f(ilio) Cl(audia) | Mett(io) Sabina|no, eq(uo) public(o), | Laur(entii) Lav(inati), q uaestori), aed(ili), | Il vir(o) iter(um) patr(ono) | coll(egiorum) fab(rum) et cent(onariorum), | prae(fecto) coll(egii) fab(rum), curat(ori) r(ei) p(ublicae) Polens(ium), | ordo Polens(ium), | iustissimo | innocentissimoq(ue). | L(ocus) d(atus) d(creto) d(ecurionum).

**Italy Regio XI (Transpadana)**

178. Bergomum. *CIL* V.5128; *ILS* 6726; *W* 537; Limentani 1991: 234 no. 47 (with image); M. Vavassori, *Le antiche lapidi di Bergamo e del suo territorio*, Bergamo, 1994: 152 no. 16 (with image); Forbis 478. Second or third century.

P(ublio) Mario | Vot(utia) | Luperciano, | eq(uitii) R(omano) eq(uo) pub(lico), omn(ibus) | honor(ibus) municipal(is) | adept(o), iudici de select(is), | sacerd(oti) Caeninen(si), coll(egiorum) fabr(um), cent(onariorum), dend(rophorum) m(unicipii) B(ergomatum) patron(o), | cuius eximia liberalitas post | multas
largitiones huiusque | enituit, ut lucar Libitinae | redemptum a rep(ublica) sua
universis | civibus suis in perpetuum remitteret. Huius tot et tam | ingentia
merita ita | remuneranda censuerunt, | ut effigiem illius perpetua | veneratione
celebrarent. | L(oco) d(ato) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

NOTE: The lucar Libitina mostly likely was a sum of money paid to the
community in the name of the goddess Libitina for funeral privileges. (Libitina,

179. ?Comum. CIL V.5272; IRComo Mc09. Late second-third century.

Albiniae | Vetti fil. | Valerianae | Pudicissimae f(e)min(ae) | P. Appius—Eutyches|
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ad cuius | --- | vivus summa reditu die | et | propin(ationem) ex (denariis) DCCL praebant item | lectisternium
tempore parentalior(um) ex (denariis) CC | memoris eiusdem Valerianae et
Appi Valerian(i) | fil. eius per officium(tum) tesserario(um) quodannis pona|tur
et parentetur item coronae myr|t(eae) ternae et tempore ros(a|rum) Iul(i)
ternae eius ponantur, | micatae diilis (sic!) ex (denariis) L profundantur; | Item
Appius Eutychus maritus eiusdem | Valerianae scholae veillario(um) largitut
| est (sestertium) XXX | (milia) n(ummum) ex cuius summa reditu quod(annis
die s(upra) scripto) natalis eius ante statuam lectist(ernium) | ex (denariis)
CCL ponant, sport(ulas denarios) CCL inter prae|sent(es) sibi divid(ant), oleum
et propin(ationem) per rosam praebant.| L(ocus) D(atus) D(ecreto) C(ollegi)
F(abrum) C(entonariorum).

NOTE: LDDCFC, however, could also be expanded as L(ocus) D(atus) D(ecreto)
C(ollegi) F(abrum) C(omensium).

180. Comum. CIL V.5283; W 542; IRComo Mp01. Second or third century.

[---]| et | C(aio) Cassio | Paulo, f(ilio) eor(um), | collegium | centonar(iorum).

181. Clivio. Ager Comensis. Orelli 4071; CIL V.5446; W 548; ILS 7252; Reali
century. Lost.

L(ucio) Apicio | Bruttidio | Sotericho, | (se)vir(o) urba(ano). | quaestori | anni
primi, | cur. praesidi, | et Albuciae | Sex(ti) fil(iae) | Exoratae eius, | centuria
centonar(iorum) | dolabrar(iorum) scalar(iorum). | L(oco) d(ato) d(ecreto)
c(ollegiit).

T(itus) Tadius | T(iti) f(ilius) Ou(f(entina) | Catianus, (se)vir urb(anus), | q(uestor) collegi | centonarior(um) | anni quo curia | dedicata est, | sibi et Tadiis | Cassiano et | Secundus fil(iis), | (sex)viris urb(anus) et | Terentiae Valerianae | uxori. L(oco) d(ato) d(eco) c(ollegii). | Et in tutel(um) | dedit (sestertium) m(ille).

183. Comum. CIL V.5658; W 554; IRComo Mh04, with image. Second century.


L(ucio) Valerio | Valeriano | et L(ucio) Valerio | Tertullino, | fil(io) eus, | et | Albuciae M(arci) f(ilia) | Secundae matri | Valerian | colleg(ium) centonarior(um) | Albucia M(arci) f(ilia) | Secunda | impend(ia) remiserunt | et in tutelam | dedit (sestertium) m(ille).


L(ucius) Crist[---]C(aius) Pomp[---] | curatore[s] anni XXXX.

186. Mediolanum. CIL V.5612; W 553. AD 246–268.

Bericricenioni Val[entini, pontif(icus)], | decuria (secunda) ex c(enturiae) (quarta); | M(arci) Macrini Valerian, | centuria (duodecima), | L(uci) Scri[ ]oni Petroniani, | decuria pr(ima) [e]x c(enturiae) (duodecima); | Salvi Vitalis Secundi, | centuria pr(ima): | curatorib(us) ar[k(ae) T]i[t(ianae)] | coll(egii) fabr(um) et centonarior(um) | c(oloniae) A(ureliae/antoniniana) A(ugustae?) [M(ediolaniensis)] ann(oi) CXXXVII. | Concordiae eorum.

187. Mediolanum. CIL V.5701; W 556; ILS 7251. Third century AD.

Lucili | Domestici | Valerian, | option(is) cent(uriae) III | [e]x coll(egii) fabr(um) et cent(onariorum), qui vixit ann(is) XXVIII, dies | VIII, hor(as) III

NOTE: This is one of the three inscribed texts that Mommsen recorded in CIL V. 5701. There are two other texts on the sides, one of which is a fragmentary verse (CLE 103), which does not seem to be connected with this particular inscription. Desseau did not see the verse.

188. Mediolanum. CIL V.5738; ILS 7250; W 557. AD 179–201.

---]| et dis cum Iove, | C(aius) Atilius C(ai) f(ilius) Ouf(entina) | Tertulli[n]us, | pon[ti(ex)] et c[ur]at(or) | arc(ae) coll(egii) fabr(um) | et cent(onariorum) m(unicipii M(ediolanensis) ann(i) LXX, et allect(us) eidem | coll(egio), et centurio c(enturiae septimae), | cum Attilia C(ai) f(ilia) Veneria | coniug(e) v(otum) s(olvit) aram | cum aedicula.

189. Mediolanum. CIL V.5854; W 563. Third century.

Mem(oriae) | Coelii | Ben. Co|ll(egia?) fabr(um) et | cent(onariorum) m(unicipii) M(ediolanensis).


[D(is) M(anibus) L. Pulli Nata?]lis d(ecurialis) coll(egii) et Statoriae Pupae. L. Pullius Valerius avis pientiss(imis) et cent(uria or uriae) VI.| L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) c(ollegii or enturiae).


---] Pieta[---] | [---]ae. M.f. N[---] colleg ce|nton---


Mem(oriae) | C(ai) Cassi| Agathem|ri collegium | fabrum et | [cento-nariorum?---.


Innocenti cum Encratio, vivas! | Gen(io) et hon(ori) | Magi Germani Statori | Marsiani, eq(uitis) R(omani) eq(uo) p(ublico), dec(urioni) dec(uriae quintae) | ex c(enturia quarta) coll(egiorum) fabr(um) et centon(ariorum), | curator(is)
ark(ae) Titiannaе coll(egiorum) s(upra) s(criptorum) | anni CLI colon(iae) G(allieniannaе) A(ugustae) F(elicis) Med(iolaniensis), | et Iunoni | Cissoniae Aphrodite eius: | c(enturiae duodecim) ex coll(egia) s(upra) s(cripta) patronis | plura merentibus. | Innocenti, qui sic agis, bene vivas!


---] | [--- patron(-) collegiorum | [fabr(um) et cent(onoriorum), c]urator(-) | [r(ei) p(ublicae) dat(-) ab Imp)ratore | [Caes(are) M(arco) Aureli(io) Comm]odo Ant][onino Pio Felici Aug(usto) ---] ther[m(as)] | [---Mediolan]ens[es] | [---.


[Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) M(arco) Aurelio Comm]odo | [Antonino Au]g(usto) | [Pio Sarmat(ico) German(ico)] Max(imo) | Britann(ic)(o) Max(imo) p(ontifici) max(imo) | [trib(unicia) pot(estate) XVI imp(eratori) I] I co(n)s(uli) IIII p(atri)p(atiae) | [coll(ia) fabrum et cent(?)]t(oniorum) Mediolanense | [---].

NOTE: According to this restoration, the inscription should be dated by the fourth consulship of Caracalla, ad 213. But there is an alternative supplement, which would change the date to 184, when Commodus held his fourth consulship and first acquired the title Britannicus: [Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) M(arco) Aureli]o | [Antonino Au]g(usto) | [Pio Felici Parth(ico)] Max(imo) | Britann(ic)(o) Max(imo) p(ontifici) max(imo) | [trib(unicia) pot(estate) XVI imp(eratori) I] I co(n)s(uli) IIII p(atri)p(atiae) | [coll(ia) fabrum et cent(?)]t(oniorum) Mediolanense | [---]. In either case, the inscription is too fragmentary for us to be certain whether the inscription concerns the fabri or the centonarii. But see Bollmann 1998: 431.


---] | Secundus, cur(ator)] | II colleg(iorum?) fab(rum) | et centonariorum arces | Titianae c(oloniae) A(---) A(ugustae) M(ediolani). [Si quis alienauerit hanc ar] c(um) | in qua humari li[cue]r[it aut in eam] idem | seu[erit, coll(egio) fabr(um) et cento]n(arorum) | c(oloniae) A(---) A(ugustae) Mediol(ani) (sestertium) XV (milia) [n(umnum) ad] (centuriam) secundam d[are] uolet, ut a[---].

197. Ticinum. Pais 870; Pais 1298; W 575; ILS 6742; EAOR II. 11; AE 2002. 265.
Tullio Marc(i?) | lib(erto) Achilleo | decurioni | ornamentario, | cultori d(omus) d(ivinae), | q(un)q(uennali) i[t]e(rum) | c(ollegiorum?) f(abrum?) c(entonariorumque?), it(em?) | curatore (sic!) | mun(is) | Tulliani, | Aelius [A]sclepiades | amic[o] kariss(imo).

198. Novaria. CIL V.6515; W 577.

D(is) M(anibus). | Alfolloni (quattuor)vir(o) iur(e) dic(undo), | pat(rono) coll(egii) cen(tonariorum), pat(rono) iuvenum.

199. Augusta Taurinorum. CIL V.7171; W 586.

---|A vil. centon(ario?) | Vidia Nepotiana | mater infelicissima.

Italy Regio XI (Alpes Cottiae)

200. ?Segusio. CIL V.7263; W 587.

--- cent(onariorum) | Segusino | --- suo fec---


Pannonia Inferior

202. Aquincum. CIL III.3554; W 321; Lupa 2735. Epitaph. Late first or early second century AD.

C(aius) Iulius V[aler?]ius | Donatus vet(erus) leg(ionis) | II adi[(utricis), a[n(norum) L]X, coll(egia) fab(rum) et cento(nariorum) pos(uerunt).

203. Aquincum. CIL III.3569 + 10519; W 322; Lupa 2968 with image. Epitaph. Late first or early second century AD.
C(ai) Val(erio) C(ai) fil(io) Cla(u)di(a) Secundo Aem(ona?) vet(erano) leg(ions) II ad(triciis), an(norum) LX; H(ic) s(itus) e(st); coll(egia) fabr(um) et cento(niariorum) pos(uerunt).

**204.** Aquincum. *CIL* III.3583; *W* 324; *Lupa* 2736. Sarcophagus. Third century.

*D(is) M(anibus)* | C(aii) Iul(ii) Filetionis domo | Africa, medico, qui vi|xit ann(is) XXXV, C(aius) Iul(ia) Filet|us et Iul(ia) Euthe|nia parentes | filio karis-simo f(acindum) c(uraverunt); | et Iul(io) Athenodoro, fratri eius, | qui vixit ann(is) XXXV, Eute|nia; is ad quem sepultura | coll(egium) cent(oniariorum denarios) CCC contulit.

**205.** Aquincum. *CIL* III.10335; *W* 325; *RIU* VI. 1497; *Lupa* 6080 with image. Votive dedication. AD 210.

*Sedato Aug(usto) sacrum, Publi|us Ael(ius) Crescens, | magister coll(egii) centonarior|um, v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito), Fausti|no et Rufino | co(n)s(ulibus).*


*C(aius) Iul(ius) Viatorinus| dec(urio) col(oniae) Aq(uinci), aedi|licius praef(ectus) coll(egii)| cent(onariorum), hydram coll(egio)| s(upra) s(cripto) de suo d(onum) d(edit), Modes|to et Probo co(n)s(ulibus).*

NOTES: Gaius Iulius Viatorinus, a councilman of Aquincum, and aedile and prefect of the *collegium centonariorum*, donated an musical instrument (*hydra*) to the said *collegium*. The inscription and the remains of the *hydra* were discovered by Lajos Nagy in 1931. For the discussion and reconstruction of this rather famous instrument, thought to be one of the first attested organs in the ancient world, see Walcker-Mayer 1972; Zsidi 1997; Markovits 2003: 170–72.

**207.** Aquincum. *NotSc* 1936: 283; *AE* 1937. 140; *RIU* VI.1306; *Lupa* 3192 with images.

*D(is) M(anibus) | P(ublio) Ael(io) P(ublii) f ilio) Fa|voriano| coll(egium) cent(onariorum) *


M(arco) Baeb[idi?---] fil(io) Tro[mentina (tribu) [Front?]oni Ae|quo ex [Dalm(atia), arm(orum)] custo|di, uet(erano) l[eg(ionis) II Adi|tricis,] an(norum) L, | h(ic) s(itus) e(st). Dasimi|us [---, ujet(eranus) leg(ionis) ei|u[s]|dem, her[es, qui] fuit in | coll(egio) uet(erinorum) c[oll(egio)] opti|? mi(?) uet(erani?)| [l]eg(ionis) eiusd[em, secun|dum | [u]olunt[atem te]stament(i) | [fa(ciendum) cur(auit)].

NOTE: T. Nagy, “Anecdota Aquincensia,” ArchÉrt 94 (1967) 69 (AE 1967.367) proposes a different restitution for lines 6–7: Her[es b(ene) m(erenti) qui| fuit in coll(egio) uet(erinorum) c[enton(arium)] m(agister) (primus) uet(erin|orum).


[I]ul(ius) Martialis | h(ic) s(itus) e(st) | col(legia) fabr|um| et centona|riorum) | f(aciendum) c(uraverunt).

211. Aquincum. Németh: 28 no. 59; Lupa 2832 with images.

D(is) M(anibus) | C(aio) Caereio | Sabino vet(erano) | leg(ionis) II ad(iutricis) | coll(egia) fab(rum) et / cent(onarium) p(onendum) c(uraverunt)

212. Aquincum. Németh: 32 no. 67; Lupa 2835 with images. (Trajanic date)

C(aio) Secconio | Paterno | dom(o) Nemes | ann(orum) LXX | coll(egium) fabr(um) | et cento|narium) p(osuerunt)


Rusticius | Quintus | ann(orum) LX h(ic) s(itus) e(st) | coll(egia) fab(rum) et | cento|narium) p(osuerunt)


C(a)esern(i)us Zosi|mus ann(orum) LXXX nat(ione) | Cilix h(ic) s(itus) e(st) | col(legia) fab(rum) et cento|narium) p(osuerunt).

D(is) M(anibus) | quieti aeternae P(ublii) Aeli(i) Respectiani ex coll(egio) cent(onariorum) P(ublii) Aeli(i) q(uon) d(am) | Domiti(i) vet(erani) libert(i) qui | vix(it) an(nos) XXX Aelias Fortu/nata et Ingenua col(libertae) collocaverunt | optamus s(it) t(ibi) t(erra) l(evis).

216. Aquincum. Lupa 6655 with image.

D(is) M(anibus) | C(aio) Atilio Fl(avia) Sir|mio(o) Vitali vet(erano) | leg(ionis) II ad(iutricis) ann(orum) | LX h(ic) s(itus) e(st) coll(egia) | fabr(um) et cent(onariorum) p(osuerunt).

217. Cibalis. CIL III.10253; W 317.

---]de [-] P(ublius) Ael(ius) Va[-] Cibal. qu[-][fabr. col[-][cento co[-]---

218. Brigetio. AE 1944.110; RIU II.377; Lupa 8041. November 5, 217 AD.

Apollini et Hygiae | Q(uintus) Ulp(ius) Felix Aug(ustalis) m(unicipii) | Brig(etionis) porticum | a portis II ad fon|tem Salutis a solo inpendi(i)s | suis fecit et | ad epulas privileg(io) colleg(ium) cento|n(ariorum) | haberi iussit. Praef(ecto) Iul(io) Sabino | q(uin)q(uennale) Pr(a)esente et Extric(ato) co(n) s(ulibus) Noni(s) No(vembribus).

219. Brigetio. CIL III.11042 (with image); RIU II.503; Lupa 7034 with image; cf. AE 1944.110. AD 220.


I(oui) O(ptimo) M(aximo) | pro salute T. Fl(avi) | Martini, d(ecurionis) c(oloniae) M(ursae), | praef(eccti) coll(egii) cent(onariorum), | Il(uir) design(ati), | Fl(avius) Philippus, | libert(us) | u(otum) s(oluit) l(ibens) m(erito).

221. Ulcisia Castra. ArchÉrt 50 (1937) 86, 215; AE 1939.8; RIU III.908; Lupa 3162 (with images).
I(ulius) Rufus do(mo) D[alm]a[ta] | vet(eronus) leg(ionis) II Ad(iutricis) an(norum) LX | coll(egia) fabr(um) et cento(nariorum) pos(uerunt).

222. Ulcisia Castra. AE 1939.9; RIU III.897; Lupa 3157 with images. Late first–mid second century AD.

Cl(audio) Trophimo| ann(is) LXXX.| H(ic) s(itus) e(st).| Coll(egia) fabr(um) |et cent(onaiorum) pos(uerunt).

Pannonia Superior

223. Carnuntum. CIL III.4496a = 11097; ILS 7245; AE 1983. 768; Lupa 9563 with image.

[---] V)ale(n)s e[t Flav]i us) Adauctoris, | m)agistri col(legiorum?) uet[e]ranorum(m) (et?) centonariorum(m), im]pensis | s(uis) p(osuerunt).

224. Ig. CIL III.10738; W 329; AIJ 127, with image; RINMS 79 with image; CCCA 36 no.113; Lupa 3667 with images

C(aius) Bassidius C(ai)f(ilius), Cl(audia) | Secundus, aed(ilis) i(ure) d(icundo) | bis, q(uaestor) p(ecuniae) p(ublicae), (duo)vir iur(e) d(icundo), patr(onus) | coll(egii) dedrofo(rorum), | praefectus et | patronus coll(egii) centonariorum | (duo)vir i(ure) d(icundo) q(uin)q(uennalis).

225. Savaria. AE 1965.294; RIU I.119; Steindenkmäler von Savaria no. 26; Buócz: 48 no. 31; Lupa 7970 with image. Votive altar.

M(ercurio) A(ugusto) s(acrum) | G(aius) Iul(ius) Maximi[s] dec(urio) co]ll(oniae) C(laudiae) Savariae | (ae)diilicius et | pr(a)effectus coll(egiorum) | fabror(um) cent(onariae) | v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) l(aetus) m(erito).

226. Savaria. AE 1965.296 ; RIU I.118; Lupa 7904 with image.

---] ex [---] de [---] colleg[iorum] | fabrorum | centon[riorum] | faciendum cur(avit) | ex s(uo) no[mine---

NOTES: RIU I.118 provides a different reading and restoration for the last readable line: ex s(estertiis) n(ummis) (mille).

Tituli Romani in Hungaria reperti, Suppl. 2005 no. 3 (with image); Lupa 7998. Severan date.

[IO (oui) O(ptimo) M(aximo) Depu]lsori [p(ro salut[e] | Sauarie]nsium po[rticu]m | exed?]ra quam L(ucius) O[ctauius M(arci) f(ilius) | Fausti]nianus dec(urio) [c(oloniae) C(laudiae) S(auariensium), praef(ectus) or patr(onus)] | col(legiorum) fabr(um) (et) ] centon(aria) rum, [quaest(ori) cius, aed(ilicius), | (duo)ur i(ure) (et) d(icundo), (du)ur q(uin)]q(ennalis), fl[amen coloniae---] ---].


228. Siscia. CIL III.10836; AJJ 528, with image; Lupa 5731 with images. Marble altar. Third century.

Idib(us) Aug(ustis) | Herculi | C(aius) Ingenui|us C(ai) fil(ius) Quir(ina) | Rufinianus | dec(urio) col(oniae) S(ectimiae) S(isicianorum) | Aug(ustae) quaest(or) | r(ei) p(ublicae) praef(ectus) c(ollegii) c(entonariorum) | et Ingenu|a Rufina | cum suis d(ederunt) d(edicaverunt).

Moesia Superior

229. Stojnik (modern name). IMS 1. 121 with image.

D(is) M(anibus) | Aeliae Luciae vix|it annis XLV Aurel(ius) | Bardibalus dec(urio) coll(egii) cent(onariorum) coniugi | et Aurel(ius) Lucilius ma|tri b(ene) m(erenti) et sibi vi|vi posuerunt.

The following inscription was classified as falsa in the CIL but scholars have argued in favor of its authenticity:


Ti. Claudius | Ti. L.| Syntrophus | vestiarius | centonarius h(ic) s(itus) e(st).

The following inscriptions were classified as falsae. For inscriptions that were first reported by Ligorio but were not independently reported by other authors, the authenticity is to be doubted unless proved otherwise. On the problem of sixteenth-century forgeries, see F. F. Abbott, “Some Spurious Inscriptions and Their Authors,” CPh 3 (1908): 22–30; G. Vagenheim, “Pirro Ligorio e le false iscrizioni della collezione di antichità del cardinale Roldolfo Pio di
231. Salernum, Latium et Campania, Regio I. CIL X. *124.

Libero patri | Sex(tus) Messius) Sex(ti) f(ilius) Stel(latina) Titi|anus VIIvir epul IIIIvir | munie patron | corpor fabr dendrophor | et centonianor | et M(arcus) Gavius M(arci) f(ilius) Stel(latina) Flac|cus IIIIvir(1) curator q q | d dl d d d.

232. Asculum, Picenum, Regio V. CIL IX.5189; noted as ficticius on CIL IX. p. 699; CIL X: 36 *810.

Q(uinto) Iunio Q(uinti) f(ilio) Ouf(entina) Severiano | veterano Aug(usti) n(ostrae) accep(ta) (h)onestae | missione quaestori rei p(ublicae) Ascul(ianorum) | patrono colleg(iorum) centonarior(um) | et dendrophorum Ti|burt(ianorum) | Mansueta liber|ta patrono optimo | cuius dedicatione statuae | cenam dedit decurionibus | sing(ulis) VIII num(mum) et popu|lis) | sing(ulis) |(denarios) II(milia) II num(mum)um divisit | l(ocus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum).

233. Ravenna. CIL XI. 6*; CCID 456; Speidel 1978: no. 43. Preserved only by Ligorio.

Iovi Optimo Maximo | Dolicheno sacrum | C(aius) Ceranius C(ai) f(ilius) Callystus | p(raefectus) class(is) Ravenn(atis) | p(raefectus) colleg(iorum) | dendr(ophorum) | et centonar(iorum) IIIIvir | quinquen(nalis).


Iovi O. M. Iunoni et Minervae| D Capitolini cust sacr | L. Pliminius L. f. Quir. Aurelianus | eq. public, p(raefectus) equit. tribunus | II uir colon, fauentin. II uir quin|quenn. IIII vir augustalis aedil | patronus et pontif p(raefectus) | corpor collegior dendroforor | et centonarior municip| L D D D.

NOTE: This inscription was first reported by Ligorio as inscribed in bronze. Rossini did not come to a conclusion about its authenticity, but simply said “Se fossimo sicuri della sua autenticità, avremmo qui la memoria di un personaggio illustre, che, tra le molte cariche onorifiche che copriva, aveva anche quella di duoviro.”
**APPENDIX B**

**GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE MOST WIDELY ATTESTED TYPES OF COLLEGIA**

F: *collegium fabrum* (builders, carpenters, smiths)
C: *collegium centonariorum* (craftsmen and/or tradesmen of cloth and clothing)
D: *collegium dendrophorum* (worshippers of Magna Mater)
T: *collegium fabrum tignariorum* (builders and carpenters)
N: *collegium nautarum* or *naviculariorum* (river shippers or sea-going shippers/ship-owners)
U: *collegium utriclariorum* (muleteers/land transportators)
FS: *collegium fabrum subaedianorum* (builders)
F+D, etc.: different types of *collegia* mentioned together in inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITALIA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urbs Roma</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>FS, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latium Vetus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castrimoenium-Bovillae</td>
<td>D³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabii</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavinium</td>
<td>D⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portus</td>
<td>F⁵</td>
<td>C?</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praeneste</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibur</td>
<td>F⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tusculum⁷</td>
<td>F(?)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>T(?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velitrae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verulae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 This table is based on Waltzing IV; *DizEpig* (L. Cesano) II: 180–82; *M & A*: 86–92; Lafer 2001: 241–92. Errors in their lists are noted wherever they occur. New additions are also marked. Question marks indicate uncertainty regarding the existence of certain *collegia*.
2 For *collegium fabrum* and *collegium fabrum tignariorum*, see Pearse 1974: 124–25. 'Builders' made up the bulk of the *collegium fabrum tignariorum* and at least a good part of the membership of the *collegium fabrum*. But the members of the *collegium fabrum* were not merely 'builders'.
3 *AE* 1927.115 = *CCCA* III.464.
4 *AE* 1998.282 (AD 227); not listed in *M & A*.
5 *AE* 1983. 106 (AD 218).
6 At *M&A* 2000: 89, Tibur is listed under *Regio IV*.
7 Although from Tusculum, *CIL XIV*. 2630 = *ILS* 7237 (cf. *AE* 2000. 19) concerns the *collegium fabrum* and *collegium fabrum tignariorum* of Rome.
### Geographical Distribution: Collegia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regio I</th>
<th>Latium Adiectum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antium</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casinum</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereatae Marianae</td>
<td>T&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minturnae</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signia</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regio II</th>
<th>Campania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arpinum?</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cales</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baiae</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumae</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum Popili</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nola</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puteoli</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suessula</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venafrum</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regio III</th>
<th>Apulia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluturara</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civitas ignota Apuliae</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herdonia</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luceria</td>
<td>D&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regio IV&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Lucania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atina</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebrum</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F + D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volceii</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laviano</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regio IV&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Bruttii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regium Iulium</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regio IV&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Lucania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesernia</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allifae</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telesia</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paeligni</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corfinium</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antinum</td>
<td>C&lt;sup&gt;?&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>8</sup> AE 1968.119; Panciera 1967: 18–61, esp. 39, fig. 5, and 46–47.

<sup>9</sup> AE 2001. 879b.

<sup>10</sup> Waltzing IV: 78. His list had several mistakes: 1) Regio III appeared twice. The second instance should read Regio IV; 2) Collegium centonariorum has not been attested in Telesia; collegium fabrum tigunariorum should be listed instead; 3) Volsinii and Bergomum were accidentally omitted in the collegium centonariorum list; 4) Ticinum was missing.
### Regio V (Picenum)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Other Entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alba Fucens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carsioli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auximum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>F+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falerium</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>F+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firmum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>F+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interamna Praetuttiorum</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricina</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>F+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toletinum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>F+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbs Salvia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regio VI (Umbria)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Other Entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ameria</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asisium</td>
<td>F?</td>
<td>C?</td>
<td>D?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carsulae</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanum Fortunae</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum Sempronii</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iguvium</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mevania</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mevaniola</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocriculum</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oстра</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisaurum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sassina</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentinum(^{11})</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sestinum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suasa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuficum(^{12})</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urvinum Mataurense</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regio VII (Etruria)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>C?</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Other Entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clusium</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faesulae</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferentium</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luna</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perusia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisae</td>
<td>T, FN</td>
<td>T+FN(^{14})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serrinenses Nov. (Sorrina)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veii</td>
<td>F?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volsinii</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{11}\) The *collegium dendrophorum* appeared in both Waltzing IV: 78 and *M&A* 91. This was based on the assumption that *tria collegia* referred to the *collegium fabrum*, *collegium centonariorum*, and *collegium dendrophorum*. But no specific reference has been found to the presence of the *collegium dendrophorum* in Sentinum. See the discussion of *tria collegia* in Appendix C.

\(^{12}\) *CIL XI.5716 = EAOR II.17; AE 2004. 535.*

\(^{13}\) *CIL XI.1355; AE 1983. 390.*

\(^{14}\) *CIL XI.1436 = ILS 7258.*
### Regio VIII (Aemilia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Type 3</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ariminum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F+C+D, F+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixellum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faventia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidentia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F+D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum Corneli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F+C+D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F+C, F+D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regium Lepidum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>F+C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regio IX (Liguria)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Type 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alba Pompeia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Bagiennorum</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasta</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industria</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollentia</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vada Sabatia</td>
<td>C?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vardagate</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regio X

#### Venetia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Type 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Altinum</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellunum</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixia</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cammuni</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feltria</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantua</td>
<td>F?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patavium</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tridentum</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicetia</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histria</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parentium</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pola</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tergeste</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regio XI

#### Transpadana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Type 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bergomum</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berua</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comum</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laus Pompeia</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novaria</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

15 *CIL* V. 4048.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Taurinorum</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticinum</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpes Maritinae</td>
<td>F+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemenelum</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinae</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpes Cottiae</td>
<td>F+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segusio</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallia Lugudunensis</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustodunum</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum Sequisiavorum</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambarii(^{(16)})</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugudunum</td>
<td>F+C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gallia Aquitana**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vellavorum ager</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gallia Narbonensis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apta Julia</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquae Sextiae</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alba Augusta Helviorum</td>
<td>D(^{(17)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arelate</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baeterrae</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massilia</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latara</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narbo</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemausus</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugernum</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valantia</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valanum</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasio</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>F+C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divajeu</td>
<td>D?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gallia Belgica**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Traverorum</td>
<td>F+D(^{(18)})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Macedonia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dyrrachium</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippopolis</td>
<td>D?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moesia Inferior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gergina</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novae (Staklen, Bulgaria)</td>
<td>D(^{(19)})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomi</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troesmis</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulpia Oescus</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(16)}\) CIL XIII. 2543 = ILAin 106.
\(^{(18)}\) CIL XIII. 11313, *fabri dolabrarii*. I argue that this is a variant name for *fabri tignarii*.
\(^{(19)}\) AE 1929.120.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Province</th>
<th>Towns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moesia Superior</td>
<td>Ratiaria: F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stojnik (modern name): C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dacia</td>
<td>Apulum: F, C, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deva: F&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarmizegetusa: F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tibiscum: F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drobeta: F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalmatia</td>
<td>Asseria: F, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narona: F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salona: F, C, D, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iader: F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doclea: F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gromiljak: F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epetium: F&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pannoniae</td>
<td>Aquincum: F, C, D&lt;sup&gt;22&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ulcisia Castra: F, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colonia Aelia Mursa: FS&lt;sup&gt;23&lt;/sup&gt; C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brigetio: C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cibalis: F, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odiavum: F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pannonia Inferior</td>
<td>Ad Fines: F&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carnuntum: F, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emona: F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ig: C, D, C+D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siscia: C, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savaria: F, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vindobona: F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poetovio: F&lt;sup&gt;25&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noricum</td>
<td>Aelium Cetium: F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virunum: FS&lt;sup&gt;26&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germaniae</td>
<td>Flavia Solva: C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany Superior</td>
<td>Amsoldingen: D, T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>20</sup> AE 1903. 64.
<sup>21</sup> CIL III. 14231.
<sup>22</sup> AE 1969/70. 483: ---/CL[-]/m(-) fieri c[uravit] ad(?) hoc(?) / opus col(legium) de[ndr(ophorum)] co[ntrul] nummum) CCCL.
<sup>23</sup> AE 1913.137 = ILJug 3105.
<sup>24</sup> ILJug III. 3113 (collegium fabrorum).
<sup>25</sup> AI 364.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquensis civitas</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mogontiacum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunensium civitas</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civitas Auderiensium</td>
<td>D&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nida</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germania inferior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipium Batavorum</td>
<td>T&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britannia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noviomagus Regnorum</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquae Sulis</td>
<td>F&lt;sup&gt;29&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durocubrivae&lt;sup&gt;30&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>D?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcino</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgos</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corduba</td>
<td>FS&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispalis</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarraco</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauretania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesarea</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numidia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirta</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuicul</td>
<td>D&lt;sup&gt;32&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambaesis</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusicade</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thamugadi</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitifis</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proconsularis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathago</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thugga</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uthina</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzacena</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mactaris</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>27</sup> AE 1962. 232.
<sup>28</sup> Nesselhauf and Lieb 1959: 120–229.
<sup>31</sup> Fabri subidiani (sc. Subaediani): CIL XI.2211; AE 1983.530 B.b = 1985.564 b (ad 247).
<sup>32</sup> Toutain 1910: 275–78; Vermaseren 1977: 129.
One immediate problem that we encounter in collecting a corpus to study the phenomenon of the collegium centonariorum is whether or not the heavily abbreviated col. c., c.cent., col./coll. cent., and cc should be restored as collegium centonariorum. There is no doubt that in many cases, we can make such restoration with confidence. Those inscriptions in which both the abbreviated and the complete forms of collegium centonariorum are used provide convincing evidence for such restoration. In an inscription from Brixia (no. 173), for example, coll. cent., coll. centonariorum, and c. cent. all apparently refer to the same collegium centonariorum.\(^1\) In cases where any of these abbreviations are juxtaposed with collegium fabrum, in either its complete or abbreviated forms, the restoration collegium centonariorum can be assumed [e.g., acceperunt coll(egia) fab(rum) et c(entonariorum) (denariorum) quingenta milia; no. 140]. This is because there are dozens of parallels in which the collegium fabrum and the collegium centonariorum are mentioned together, either as joint recipients of benefits or as joint dedicators.

As to the abbreviation C C, the restitution is more dependent on context. Standing alone, C C might have meanings as diverse as ducenarius, Caiai (duo), Caesares (duo), colonia Claudia, colonus/coloni coloniae, clarissimus consul, etc.\(^2\) That it sometimes represents collegium centonarorun can be established in the following way:

\[
\]

\[
\text{Genio } Q(inti) Sertori Syner[gi iunioris et ] Genio Q(uinti) Sertori Se[veri, patro[norum, ] C F [Ind(ustriesium)]. } \text{(CIL V.7469)}
\]

These two inscriptions from Industria are identical in format and content. Parallels are found in Ariminum and Auximum, where the coll(egium) fabr(um) (CIL XI.386, CIL IX.5835 = ILS 1415) and the coll. centonarior(um)/cent. (nos.

\(^1\) No. 64 from Mevania, provides a convincing case: the complete form collegio suo centonariorum was used in lines 4–5, while the abbreviated form coll. cent. was used in line 9.

\(^2\) For a list, see Almar 1990: 446; Limentani 1991: 488. Cf. also C C N (CIL II.1980, Abdera, Spain): possibly cultores collegii followed by the name of a god/goddess (Waltzing III: 7 no. 47).
113, 59) put up identical honorific inscriptions for their common patrons. By analogy, the C F and C C in the two inscriptions cited above should refer to the collegium fabrum and the collegium centonariorum, respectively. The presence of the latter in Industria is attested by no. 124. In the same way, the formulae C C M S and C F M S, generally with a horizontal bar on top of M and S respectively, from Sassina and C C M R from Ravenna could be understood as c(ollegium) c(entonariorum) m(unicipi) S(assinatis), c(ollegium) f(abrum) m(unicipi) S(assinatis), and c(ollegii) c(entonariorum) m(unicipii) R(avennatis), respectively, especially since the presence of these collegia in Sassina and Ravenna has been confirmed by several other inscriptions. And c(ollegii) c(entonariorum) Alb(ensium) Pomp(eianorum), c(ollegium) c(entonariorum) Vard(agatensium) and c(ollegium) c(entonariorum) m(unicipii) M(evaniolae) are all acceptable expansions—although the presence of the collegia centonariorum is not otherwise attested in Alba Pompeia, Vardagate, or Mevaniola, it is well attested in their neighboring cities. In all of these cases, the name of the collegium is followed by the name of the municipium, which helps to eliminate other possible restorations, such as coloni coloniae, clarissimus consul, and so on.

Is it possible that in these cases C C represents another type of collegium with a C-initial, such as cantores, caupones, cisiarii, culinari, coriaii, cannoforii, to name just a few? Such a possibility cannot be ruled out, though it seems to me slight. It is my belief that a collegium had to be well known and prominent to use heavy abbreviation in inscriptions. The nauvicularii/nautae provide a good case—they sometimes distinctively used N with a bar on top of it to mark their identity. There is, however, no independent evidence to show that the collegia of the caupones, cisiarii, culinari, coriaii, and cannoforii were widespread or had incurred much attention in the Roman world.

I return now to those cases in which restorations are less certain. Dispute occurs, for example, in restoring CIL III.8829, from Salona of Dalmatia, which is a very fragmentary epitaph. Mommsen suggested col|legi magn| et cent|enarius, while Hirschfeld was inclined to read col|-- cent|onairoum. This uncertainty, however, does not prevent us from adding Salona to our map, for, fortunately, there are other inscriptions relating to the collegium centonariorum from this place (nos. 6–11). In cases where there is only one

---

5 For a list of such collegia, see Waltzing IV: 85–87. Very few inscriptions have survived to inform us of other collegia with C-initials, which makes it difficult to judge their status either in a particular town or in general.

4 Cf. Waltzing III: 99 no. 304; IV.161. Cf. also CIL XIV.2045, W 1371 for collegium magni. Cent may also be cent|uri|--.

5 InscrIt X.5.693, a very fragmentary inscription, may also have referred to cent(onarii?). InscrIt X.5: 347 ad 693 (Albinus Garzetti): "Videntur in fine fortasse memorati centonarii, unde titulum collegiorum fuisse conciere licet." But this is hardly certain.
such inscription in a particular municipality, the dubious reading, of course, makes it difficult to decide whether to include a place in our map or exclude it. The following inscriptions are those that would provide the only evidence for the presence of collegia centonariorum in the relevant places, if their restoration were not of dubious nature: no. 1 (Uthina), no. 18 [Divajeu (Drôme), France], no. 35 (Taracco, Spain), no. 52 (Marsi Antinum), no. 102 (Clusium), no. 126 (Pollentia), and no. 127 (Vada Sabatia). Specific problems concerning the reading and restoration of these inscriptions are noted in Appendix A. In general, the fragmentary conditions of these seven inscriptions make readings uncertain. As a result, the presence of the collegia centonariorum in Africa Consularis, Divajeu, Tarraco, Marsi Antinum, Clusium, Pollentia, and Vada Sabatia, can be neither confirmed nor refuted definitively.

Another type of problem concerns the terminology tria collegia and, consequently, the broader question of the phenomenon of the tria collegia. The term tria collegia appears six times in four cities total. It has long been assumed that tria collegia (or III collegia, collegia III) refers to the collegium fabrum, the collegium centonariorum, and the collegium dendrophorum; so is it used as a technical term by epigraphists in referring to these collegia. It is true that these three types of collegia appear together in a dozen inscriptions, and all three were among the most prominent of the Roman collegia. But none of the six inscriptions mentioning III collegia specified what the three collegia were. In Asissium (Umbria), the term collegia III is epigraphically attested (no. 67), but none of the names of the local collegia have survived. Therefore, it is unclear what collegia III refers to. In Ligures Baebiani, where the term collegia tria appears in one recently recovered inscription (no. 49), the presence of collegium centonariorum has not been otherwise attested, although the collegium fabrum and the collegium dendrophorum have been linked by the sharing of the same patron (CIL IX.1459). In Cemenelum, where the term collegia tria appears in three inscriptions, it may very likely refer to the collegium centonariorum, the collegium fabrum, and the collegium utriculariorum. This grouping also turns up in two other cities, Alba Augusta Helviorum (no. 25) and Arles (no. 22), in the nearby region.

In Sentinum, one Coretius Fuscus was named as the patron of tria collegia principalia (no. 68). Since we know that he was the patron of the collegium fabrum and the collegium centonariorum of Sentinum, it is almost certain that these two collegia were among the tria collegia principalia. However, the presence of collegium dendrophorum has not yet been otherwise attested in

---

6 Tria coll (egia) principalia (no. 68); III colleg(ia) splendidiss(ima) civitat(is) Cemenel(ensium) or collegia III quib (us) ex s (enatus) c (onsulto) c (oire) p (ermissum) (nos. 128, 129, 132, Cemenelum); no. 67 (Asissium); no. 49 (Ligures Baebiani).

7 No. 103. Another inscription (IANice 73) from the same city possibly mentions [coll(egia)] (quattuor), but the reading is uncertain.
Sentinum. Instead, there was evidently a close relationship between the local collegium centonariorum, the collegium fabrum, and the cultores dei Solis Invicti Mithrae.\(^8\)

Is it possible that any three collegia of local importance could constitute tria collegia in local terminology? Can we suppose that the collegium centonariorum was a regular element that constituted tria collegia? Our sample is too small to yield a clear answer. But if tria collegia had a universally accepted meaning, one might ask why there are so few examples of the use of this terminology, and why none of them come from major cities such as Lugudunum, Mediolanum, or Aquileia. It is perhaps not safe to exclude the possibility that the meaning of tria collegia may vary in different regions, if not in different cities in any given region. If this is accepted, then regional factors should be taken into account when it comes to deciding whether tria collegia should be taken as an indication of the presence of the collegium centonariorum in Assisium and Ligures Baebiani, where this type of collegium is not confirmed by other sources. Assisium belonged to the Augustan Regio VI (Umbria). The presence of the collegium centonariorum has been attested in 14 other cities in this region, and its prominence in local life can hardly be doubted, making a strong case for the inclusion of the collegium centonariorum among the tria collegia of Assisium. Ligures Baebiani, however, is quite a different case, in that there is no explicit epigraphic evidence for the presence of the collegium centonariorum either in Regio II or in neighboring Regio III. This makes me hesitant to associate the collegium centonariorum with the tria collegia of Ligures Baebiani. But of course, it would be a circular argument to deny completely the possibility of such an association. If the tria collegia in Ligures Baebiani did include the collegium centonariorum, no. 49 would simply be the first piece of evidence for the presence of the collegium centonariorum in Regio II of Italy.

Fortunately, the uncertainties just described affect only a small number of inscriptions, so that they do not substantially alter the general picture of the geographical distribution of the collegia centonariorum.

---

\(^8\) CIL XI.5748, 5749 (no. 68), 5750 (no. 69), 5737. CIL XI.5748 (collegium fabrum) and no. 68 (collegium centonariorum) honor the same patron. The names of three legates (Aetrius Romanus, Casidius Ruginus, Statius Velox) from the collegium fabrum were also members of the Cultores Solis Invicti Mithrae (XI.5737, 5748). For discussions, see Chapter 5.
APPENDIX D

ANCIENT REFERENCES TO CENTO/CENTUNCULUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucil. 1.747</td>
<td>sarcinatorem esse summum, suere centonem optume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucil. 1.1061</td>
<td>culcitulae accedunt privae centonibus binis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato <em>Agr.</em> 2.3</td>
<td>Cum tempestates pluiae fuerint centones, cuculiones familia&lt;m&gt; oportuisse sibi sarcire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato <em>Agr.</em> 59</td>
<td>Quotiens cuique tunicam aut sagum dabis, prius veterem accipito unde centones fiunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato <em>Agr.</em> 10.5</td>
<td>Quo modo oletum agri iugera CCXL instruere oporteat… centones pueris VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato <em>Agr.</em> 11.5</td>
<td>Quo modo vineae iugera C instruere oporteat… centones pueris VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato <em>Agr.</em> 135.1</td>
<td>Romae tunicas, togas, saga, centones, sculponeas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cato <em>Oratio</em> 18, frag. 1 (Festus l. 18)</td>
<td>servi, ancillae siquis eorum sub centone crepuit, quod ego non sensi, nullum mihi vitium facit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caes. <em>B Civ.</em> 2.9</td>
<td>nequid ignis hostium nocere posset centones quae insuper iniecerunt ne aut tela tormentis missa tabulationem perfingerent aut saxa ex catapultis latericium discuterent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caes. <em>B Civ.</em> 2.10.6</td>
<td>coria autem ne rursus igni ac lapidibus corrumpantur centonibus conteguntur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caes. <em>B Civ.</em> 3.44.7</td>
<td>…magnusque incessenat timor sagittarum, atque omnes fere milites aut ex coactis aut ex centonibus aut ex coriis tunicas aut tegimenta fecerant, quibus tela vitarent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisenna in <em>Non.</em></td>
<td>Poppis aceto madefectis centonibus integuntur, quos supra perpetua classi suspense cilia susbtentundunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livy 7.14.7</td>
<td>Mulis strata detrahi iubet binisque tantum centunculis relictis agasones partim captivis partim aegrorum armis ornatos imponit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. <em>Ep.</em> 80.8</td>
<td>in centunculo dormit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petron. <em>Sat.</em> 7.2</td>
<td>Divinam ego putabam et—subinde ut in locum secretiorem venimus, centonem anus urbana reiecit et &quot;hic&quot; inquit &quot;debes habitare.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Petron. Sat. 14.7–8
Patchwork?
Sed nullo genere par erat causa nostra, et cociones, qui ad clamorem confluxerant, nostram scilicet de more ridebant invidiam, quod pro illa parte vindicari videbant pretiosissimam vestem, pro hac pannuciam ne centonibus quidem bonis dignam.

Petron. Sat. 15.7–8
Shabby clothing
Indignatus enim rusticus, quod nos centonem exhibendum postularemus, misit in faciem Asculti tunicam et liberatos querella iussit pallium deponere, quod solum litem faciebat—et recuperato, ut putabamus, thesauro in deversorium praecipites abimus praeclusisque foribus ridere acumen non minus cocionum quam calumniantium coepimus, quod nobis ingenti caliditate pecuniam reddidissent.

Pliny HN 9.181
Felt?/piece of cloth?/bag?
Tum ille paulum ultra digitos in esca iaculatus hamum singulos involat verius quam capit, ab umbra navis brevi conatu rapiens ita ne ceteri sentiant, alio intus excipiente centonibus raptum ne palpitatioulla aut sonus ceteros abigat.

Columella Rust. 1.8.9
Protective clothing
cultam vestiamque familiam magis utiliter quam delicate habeat munitamque diligenter a vento, frogore pluuiaque, quae cuncta prohibentur pellibus manicatis, centonibus confectis vel sagis cucullis.

Juv. 6.120
Bedding?/blanket?/veil?
sic, nigrum flavo crinem abscondente galero, intravit calidum veteri centone lupanar et cellam vacuum atque suam; tunc nuda papillis prostitut auratis titulum mentita Lyciscae ostenditque tuum, generose Britannice, ventrem.

Apul. Met. 1.6
Sutilis centunculus

Apul. Met. 7.5
Pacthwork
sed plane centunculis disparibus et male consarcinatis semiamictum, inter quos pectus et ventre crustata crassitie relucitabant.

Apul. Met. 9
Patchwork
Nec mora nec cunctatio, sed calculis omnibus ducatum latrines unianimes ei deferunt, vestemque lautiusculam proferunt sumeret, abiecto centunculo divite.

Apul. Apol. 13
Multicolored costume?
Si choragium thymelicum possiderem, num ex eo argumentarere etiam uti me consuessa tragoedi syrmate, histrionis crocota…mimi centunculo?

Irenaeus 2.14.2
(latter half of the second century AD)
Patchwork
Haec congregant et quasi centonem consarcientes

Tert. De praescr. haeret. 39.5
Patchwork poem
Homero centones etiam uocari solent qui de carminibus Homeri propria opera more centonario ex multis hinc inde compositis in unum sarcint corpus.

Dig. 33.7.12
(Ulpianus)
Fire-fighting instrument
Acetum quoque, quod extinguendi incendii causa paratur, item centones sifones, perticae quoque et scalar, et formiones et spongias et amas et scopas centineri plerique et Pegasus aiunt.
ancient references to cento/centunculum

Dioecletian *Edictum de pretiis* 7.52–53
Horse blanket

Vegetius *Epit. rei mil.* 4.14
Coarse/thick protective covering

Vegetius *Epit. rei mil.* 4.15

Vegetius *Epit. rei mil.* 4.17
Protective covering

Vegetius *Epit. rei mil.* 4.18
Protective covering

Vegetius *Epit. rei mil.* 4.23
Buffer

Amm. Marc. 20.11.13
Protective covering

Amm. Marc. 19.8.8
A piece of woolen/arming hat under helmet

Auson. *Cent. Nupt.* 24
Patchwork poem

Auson. *Cent. Nupt.* 3
Patchwork poem

Auson. *Cent. Nupt.* 46
Patchwork poem

*De materia ac tabulates testudo contextur, quae, ne exuratur incendio, coriis vel ciliciis centonibusque vestitur.*

*Extrinsecus autem, ne inmisso concremetur incendio, crudis ac recentibus coriis vel centonibus openitur.*

*(about the machine called Vineae or causiae) Turres autem dicuntur machinamenta ad aedificiorum speciem ex trabibus tabulatisque compacta et, ne tantum opus hostili concremetur incendio, diligentissime ex crudis coriis vel centonibus communita; quibus pro modo altitudinis additur latitude.*

*Quod si oppidani exire non audeant, ad maiores ballistas malleolos vel falaricas cum incendio destinant ut perruptis coriis vel centonibus intrinsecus flamma condatur.*

*Adversum arietes etiam vel falces sunt plura remedia. Aliquantu centones et culcitas funibus chalant et illis opponent locis qua caedit aries ut impetus machinae, materia molliore fractus, non destruat murum.*

*et Persae aggerum altitudine iam in sublime porrecta machinae que ingenti hore perculsi, quam minores quoque sequebantur, omnes exurere vi maxima nitebantur et assidue malleolos atque encendiaria tela torquent laborant in cassum ea re, quod umectis scortis et centonibus erant operatae materiae plures, aliae unctae aliumine diligenter, ut ignis in eas laberetur innocius.*

*et quia per austum arida siti reptantes aquam diu quaeritando profundum paene vidimus pueum et neque descendendi pro altitudine nec restium aderat copia, necessitate docente postrema indumenta lintea, quibus tegebamus, in oblongos discidimus pannulos, unde explicato fune ingenti centonem, quem sub galea unus ferebat et nostris, ultimae aptavitam summati—funem coniectus aquas que hauriens ad peniculi modum facile sitim, qua urgebamus, extinxit.*

*Et si pateris, ut doceam docendus ipse, cento quid sit, absoluam… Harum verticularum variis coagmentis simulatur species mille formarum*

*centonem vocant, qui primi hac concinnatione luserunt.*

*quae si omnia ita tibi videbuntur, ut praecceptum est, dices me composuisse centonem.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auson.</td>
<td>Cent. Nupt. 43</td>
<td>Patchwork poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrobr.</td>
<td>Sat. 1.6.30</td>
<td>Blanket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August.</td>
<td>De civ. D. 17.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rufinus of Aquileia</td>
<td>Apophthegmata Patrum, De abbate Simone 2</td>
<td>Rags? felt? coarse clothes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isid.</td>
<td>Etym. 1.39.25</td>
<td>Patchwork poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurikios</td>
<td>Strategikon 1.2 (sixth century)</td>
<td>Felt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Dorotheus</td>
<td>Instructions 45.15–16 (second half of the sixth century)</td>
<td>Shabby clothes/felt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrillicus Scythopolitanus</td>
<td>Vita Sabae 33, 44, 51 (sixth century)</td>
<td>Felt/rags/coarse clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vita S. Gregorii 2.6</td>
<td>Ninth century</td>
<td>Patchwork song</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Auson. Cent. Nupt. 43**

Patchwork poem

Hoc ergo centonis opusculum ut ille ludus tractatur, pari modo sensus diversi ut congruant, adoptiva quae sunt, ut cognata videantur, alinea ne interlucceant: arcessita ne vim redarguant, densa ne supra modom protuberent, hulca ne pateant.

**Macrobr. Sat. 1.6.30**

Blanket

Tremellius qui ex viliço rem comperisset, scrophae cadaver sub centonibus collocat, super quos uxor cubabat; quae testimonem vicino permittit... cum ventum est ad cubiculum, verba iurationis concipit: nullam esse in villa sua scropham, "nisi istam," inquit, "quae in centonibus iacet," lectulum monstrat.

**August. De civ. D. 17.15**

Omnia enim ponere uitandae prolixitatis causa prohibeo; uereor autem ne, cum aliquam elegero, multis, qui ea nouerunt, uidear magis necessaria praeterisse; deinde (quia testimonium, quod profertur, de contextione totius psalmi debet habere suffragium, ut certe nihil sit quod ei refragetur, si non omnia suffragantur), ne more centonum ad rem, quam volumus, tamquam versiculos deperepere uideamur, uelut de grandi carmine, quod non de re illa, sed de alia longeque diuerse reperiatur esse conscriptum.

**Rufinus of Aquileia**

Apophthegmata Patrum, De abbate Simone 2

Rags? felt? coarse clothes?

Ait: Etiam, parabo me. Igitur gestans centonem [κεντόνιον in the Greek version] suum, et accipiens in manus panem cum caseo, surgens, sedit

**Isid. Etym. 1.39.25**

Patchwork poem

Centones apud Grammaticos vocari solent, qui de carminibus Homeri seu Vergilii ad propria opera more centonario ex multis hinc inde composites in unum sarciunt corpus

**Maurikios, Strategikon 1.2**

(sixth century)

Felt

χρὴ φόρειν γονυία ἥγουν νοβερονίκια ἐπὸ κεντούκλων πλατέα πάνο, ἔχοντα μανίκια φαρδέα

**St. Dorotheus, Instructions 45.15–16**

(second half of the sixth century)

Shabby clothes/felt

Δύναται ἀρκεσθῆναι ἐνι κεντωνίωι καὶ ξητεὶ λανέτων

**Cyrillicus Scythopolitanus, Vita Sabae 33, 44, 51**

(sixth century)

felt/rags/coarse clothing

Frequent juxtaposition of Ψίαθος and κεντωνίον

**Vita S. Gregorii 2.6**

Ninth century

Patchwork song

In domo domini more sapientissimi Salomonis propter musicae compunctionem dulcedinis antiphonarium centonem cantorum studiosissimus numis utiliter compilavit.
APPENDIX E

CATALOGUE OF MEMBERS OF THE
COLLEGIUM CENTONARIUM

Notes on presentation: “?” indicates uncertain affiliation; “*” marks magistrates (including quinquennales, magistres, curatores, praefecti, decuriones, etc.) of collegia; “L” indicates freedman status; Q(uin)q(uennalis), legatus, decurio, curator, etc., refer to positions within collegia, unless otherwise specified; in the “References” section, only selected publications, especially in standard corpora, are listed. For more references, see Appendix A; for detailed analysis and discussions of the following data, see Chapter 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status and titles</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?Fabia Lucila</td>
<td>mater coll(egiorum) fabr(um) et cent(orniorum) coll(oniae); P. Ael(ius) P. f. Pap(eria) Silvanus, II vir(alis) et sacerd(otalis) [col(oniae) A[p(uli)], equ(ites) R(omanus), socer (of Lucila)</td>
<td>CIL III.1207</td>
<td>Apulum, Dacia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*[Au]r(elius) Quintianus</td>
<td>dec(urio) coll(egii) fab(rum) et [ce] nt(oniorum)</td>
<td>CIL III.2107</td>
<td>Salona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?C. Iul(ius) V[aleri?]ius Donatus</td>
<td>vet(eras) leg(ionis) II adiutricis, coll(egia) fab(rum) et cento(niorum) pos(uerunt).</td>
<td>CIL III.3554</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Baeb[ibius?] Tromentina Dasimius</td>
<td>vet(eras) of legio II Adi(utrix),] qui fuit in coll(egio) uet(erasorum) c[enton(ariorum)] m(agister) (primus) uet(erasorum)?</td>
<td>AE 1965.43; AE 1967.367</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Publius Ael(ius) Crescens</td>
<td>magister coll(egii)</td>
<td>CIL III.10335</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?C. Iul(ius) Filetio</td>
<td>Brother of Iul(ius) Athenodorus, son of C. Iul(ius) Filetus and Iul(ia) Eughenia</td>
<td>X? CIL III.3583</td>
<td>Aquincum, Sarcophagus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*C. Iul(ius) Viatorinus</td>
<td>dec(urio) col(oniae) Aq(uinci), aedilicus, praef(ectus) col(egii) cent(orniorum)</td>
<td>AE 1934.118 (AD 228)</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?P. Ael(ius) P. Favorianus</td>
<td></td>
<td>AE 1937.140; RIU VI.1306</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Ael(ius) Annianius</td>
<td></td>
<td>AE 1937.194</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status and titles</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Ul(pius) Victorinus</td>
<td>vexillarius</td>
<td>AE 1937.194</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Aur(elius) Antoninus</td>
<td>vexillarius</td>
<td>AE 1937.194</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dub(jus?) Florentinus</td>
<td>vexillarius</td>
<td>AE 1937.194</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Veg(etius?) Septimius</td>
<td>vexillarius</td>
<td>AE 1937.194</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Vibul(l) i(us?) Stat(ius) Filu(mus?)</td>
<td>vexillarius</td>
<td>AE 1937.194</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?[---I]ul(ius) Martialis</td>
<td>col(legia) fabrum et centona(riorum) facciendum c(uraverut)</td>
<td>Lupa 2829</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?C. Val(erius) C. fil. Cla(u) di(a) Secundus Aemon(a)</td>
<td>vet(eranus) leg(ionis) II ad(iutricis); coll(egia) fabr(um) et cento(nariorum) pos(erunt).</td>
<td>CIL III.3569 + 10519</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?C. Caereius Sabinus</td>
<td>vet(eranus) leg(ionis) II ad(iutricis); coll(egia) fabr(um) et cento(nariorum) pos(erunt).</td>
<td>Lupa 2832</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?C. Secconius Paternus</td>
<td>dom(o) Nemes; coll(egium) fabr(um) et cento(nariorum) posuit</td>
<td>Lupa 2835</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Rusticius Quintus</td>
<td>coll(egia) fabr(um) et cento(nariorum) pos(eurunt)</td>
<td>Lupa 2842</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?C(a)esern(i)us Zosimus</td>
<td>nat(ione) Cilix; coll(egia) fabr(um) et cento(nariorum) pos(eurunt)</td>
<td>Lupa 2847</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Aeli(us) Respectianus</td>
<td>ex coll(egio) cento(nariorum); P(ublii) Aeli(i) q(uon)dam Domiti(i) vet(eroni) libert(us) qui vix(it) an(nos) XXX Aelias Fortunata et Ingenua con(ibertae) collocaverunt</td>
<td>X Lupa 2904</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?C. Atilius Fl. Sirmi(us) Vitalis</td>
<td>vet(eranus) leg(ionis) II ad(iutricis); coll(egia) fabr(um) et cento(nariorum) pos(eurunt)</td>
<td>Lupa 6655</td>
<td>Aquincum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?I. Rufus</td>
<td>do(mo) Dalmat(i);a; Vet(eranus). Leg. II. Ad(iutricis); coll(egia) fabr(um) et cento(nariorum) pos(erunt).</td>
<td>AE 1939.8</td>
<td>Ulcisia castra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Cl. Trophimus</td>
<td>Vet(eranus). Leg. II. Ad(iutricis); coll(egia) fabr(um) et cento(nariorum) pos(erunt).</td>
<td>AE 1939.9</td>
<td>Ulcisia castra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Status and titles</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*T. Flavius Martinus</td>
<td>D(ecurio) c(oloniae) M(ursae), praef(ectus) coll(egii) cent(onariorum), (duo)vir design(atus)</td>
<td>AE 1987. 828 (after AD 133)</td>
<td>Colonia Aelia Mursa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulius V ale(n)s</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>agister col(legiorum) uet[e]ranoru(m)(et) centonarioru(m)</td>
<td>CIL III.4496a = 11097; ILS 7245</td>
<td>Carnuntum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavius Adauct(us)</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>agister col(legiorum) uet[e]ranoru(m)(et) centonarioru(m)</td>
<td>CIL III.4496a = 11097; ILS 7245</td>
<td>Carnuntum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Bassidius C. f. Cl(audia) Secundus</td>
<td>aed(ilis) i(ure) d(icundo) bis, q(uaestor) p(ecuniae) p(ublicae), (duo)vir iur(e) d(icundo), patr(onus) coll(egii) dedrofo(rorum), praefectus et patronus coll(egii) centonariorum, Ilvir i(ure) d(icundo) q(uin)q(uennalis)</td>
<td>CIL III.10738; AIJ 127</td>
<td>Ig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Q. Ulpius Felix</td>
<td>Aug(ustalis); [cult or cura?]tor loci ( = [templi Apollinis] Gran[ni]?), pater coll(egii)?</td>
<td>X CIL III.10972, 11042</td>
<td>Brigetio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*G. Ingenuius G. fil. Quir(ina) Rufinianus</td>
<td>dec(urio) col(oniae) Scerptimiae Sisciiae Aug(ustae), quaest(or) r(ei) p(ublicae), praef(ectus) c(ollegii) c(entonariorum)</td>
<td>CIL III.10836</td>
<td>Siscia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*L(ucius) O(ctorius) M(arci) f(ilius) Fausti(nianus)</td>
<td>dec(urio) c(oloniae) C(laudiae)</td>
<td>AE 1990.803</td>
<td>Savaria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*G. Iul(ius) Maximus</td>
<td>dec(urio) col(oniae) C(laudiae) Savariae, aediliciu(s) et pr(a)eff(ectus) coll(egiorum) fabr(orum) cent(onariorum)</td>
<td>AE 1965.294</td>
<td>Savaria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 names (see Table 5.2)</td>
<td>There is space for 93 names, but one of the names is completely missing.</td>
<td>AE 1966.277; RIS 149 (AD 205)</td>
<td>Solva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Secundius Secundinus</td>
<td>pater (collegii)</td>
<td>AE 1966.277; RIS 149 (AD 205)</td>
<td>Solva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*C. Pettius C. f. Pal(atina) Philtatus</td>
<td>eq(uo) p(ublico), praef(ectus) aed(ilicia) pot(estate), praef(ectus) et patronus collegiorum fabr(um) et cent(onariorum)</td>
<td>CIL V.749 = IA 131</td>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*M. Metellus Hadrianus</td>
<td>magister collegi centonariorum candidatus</td>
<td>X? CIL V.3411</td>
<td>Verona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Status and titles</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*M. Veronius Epaphroditus</td>
<td>(se)vir Aug(ustalis), mag(ister) [c]ol[le]gi c[e]nt(onariorum)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CIL V 3439</td>
<td>Verona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Samicius Firmus</td>
<td>servir Cl(audialis) maior, [mag(ister) (?)] coll(egi) dendr(ophororum), coll(egi or egiatus) cent(onariorum), nutritori(?) et Sami[ci(?)] Virian[---] VI ----(?); his wife was Turrania Stratonis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calzolari 1989: Verona</td>
<td>Verona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Gabo Arunculeius Valerianus</td>
<td>v(ir) e(gregius), eq(ues) R(omanus), sacerd(os) et principal(is), omnib(us) honorib(us) funct(us), pater et avus senator(um), cur[ator coll(egiarum) frab(um) et cent(onariorum)]</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL V.4333;</td>
<td>Brixia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?M. Vettidius Aquilei[es]is</td>
<td>(se)vir Aug(ustalis) quinquen(nalis), in omnib(us) coll(egiis) magisterio perfunctus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CIL V.4449;</td>
<td>Brixia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?M. Cornelius M. f. Proculus</td>
<td>His father and mother were M. Cornelius Aequus and Quinta.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL V.4415; ILS 6717; IB</td>
<td>Brixia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Sex(tus) Helvius Leo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL V.4426; W 510; IB 232; Inschr 10.5.221</td>
<td>Brixia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Primus Valerius Magirra</td>
<td>His grandfather was Magius Valerius Surio.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CIL V.4483;</td>
<td>Brixia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?L. Cornelius Marius</td>
<td>Pictor (or Pictor)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inschr 10.5.299</td>
<td>Brixia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*L. Apicius Bruttius Soterichus</td>
<td>(se)vir urb(anus), quaestor anni primi, cur. praesidi, et, centuria centonar(iorum) dolabra[r(orum)] scalar[i]or(um); His wife was Albuciae Sex. fil. Exorata.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CIL V.5446; (found in Clivium)</td>
<td>Comum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*T. Tadius T. f. Ouf(entina) Catianus</td>
<td>(se)vir urb(anus), q(uaestor) collegi centonar(iorum) anni quo curia dedicata est. (Tadii Cassianus et Secundus fil(ii), (se)vir urb(an); Terentia Valeriana, uxor)</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL V.5447; ILS 7253</td>
<td>Comum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*L. Crist[---]</td>
<td>curator anni XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL V.5578</td>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*C. Pomp[---]</td>
<td>curator anni XXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL V.5578</td>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bericricenionius Valentinus</td>
<td>pontif(ex), decuria (secunda) ex c(enturia) (quarta); curator ar[k(ae) T][i][t(ianae)] coll(egii) fabr(um) et centon(ariorum) c(oloniae) A(ureliae?) A(uugstae?) [M(ediolaniensis)] ann(i) CXXXVII</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL V.5612 (second century)</td>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*M. Macrinus Valerianus</td>
<td>Centuria (duodecima); curator ar[k(ae) T][i][t(ianae)] coll(egii) fabr(um) et centon(ariorum) c(oloniae) A(ureliae?) A(uugstae?) [M(ediolaniensis)] ann(i) CXXXVII</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL V.5612 (third century)</td>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Status and titles</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*L. Scribonius Petronianus</td>
<td>decuria pr(ima) [e] x c(enturia) (duodecima); curator ar[k(ae) T]i[t(ianae)] coll(egii) fabr(um) et centon(ariorum) c(oloniae) A(ureliae?) A(ugusta?) [M(ediolaniensis)] ann(i) CXXXVII</td>
<td>CIL V.5612</td>
<td>(third century)</td>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Salv(i?)us Vitalis Secundus</td>
<td>centuria pr(ima); curator ar[k(ae) T]i[t(ianae)] coll(egii) fabr(um) et centon(ariorum) c(oloniae) A(ureliae?) A(ugusta?) [M(ediolaniensis)] ann(i) CXXXVII</td>
<td>CIL V.5612</td>
<td>(third century)</td>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lucilius Domesticus Valerianus</td>
<td>optio cent(uriae tertiae) [e] x coll(egio) fabr(um) et cent(onariorum); his father was Lucilius Domesticus.</td>
<td>CIL V.5701</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*C. Attilius C. f. Ouf(entina) Tertulli[n]us (contius, Atilia C. f. Veneria)</td>
<td>pon[tif(ex)] et c[ur(ar)] arc(ae) coll(egii) fabr(um) et cent(onariorum) m(unicipii M(ediolaniensis) ann(i) LXX; allect(us) eidem coll(egio), et centurio c(enturiae septimae)</td>
<td>CIL V.5738</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coelius Ben(?)</td>
<td>Coll(egia) fabr(um) et cent(onariorum) m(unicipii M(ediolanensis)</td>
<td>CIL V.5854</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?L. Pullius Nata(?) lis (wife Statoria Pupa; grandson L. Pullius Valerius)</td>
<td>d(ecurialis?) coll(egii)</td>
<td>CIL V.5888</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*---] Sec[undus</td>
<td>cur(ator)] II colleg(iorum?) fab(rum) et centonariorum arces Titianae c(oloniae) A(--?) A(ugusta?) M(ediolani)</td>
<td>AE 1997.534;</td>
<td>(second century)</td>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Magius Germanius Stator Marsianus, ?Cissonia Aphrodite</td>
<td>eq(ues) R(omanus) eq(uo) p(ublico), dec(urio) dec(uriae quintae) ex c(enturiae quarta) coll(egiorum) fabr(um) et centon(ariorum), curator ark(ae) Titianae coll(egiorum) s(upra) s(criptorum) anni CLI colon(iae) G(allieniannae) A(ugusta) F(elicis) Med(iolanensis), patroni c(enturiae duodecim) ex coll(egia) s(upra) s(cripta)</td>
<td>CIL V.5869; ILS 6730</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Tullius Marc(elli?) lib. Achilles</td>
<td>decurio ornamentarius, cultor d(omus) d(iviniae), q(uin)q(uennali) i[t]er(um) c(ollegerit?) fabr(um) c(entonariorumque?), curator muner(is) Tulliani, Aelius [A]sclepiades amic[o] kariss(imo)</td>
<td>X ILS 6742</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ticinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Status and titles</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*L. Octavius L. l. Secundus major</td>
<td>mag(ister) quinquennial et decurio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CIL VI.7861; ILS 7243</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*L. Tuccius Mario[---]</td>
<td>[magister?] quinquennial[is]</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL VI.7862</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*L. Octavius Primigenius</td>
<td>viator</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL VI.7861; ILS 7243</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*L. Octavius Secundus</td>
<td>viator</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL VI.7861; ILS 7243</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*L(ucius) Octavius Attae l. Cerdo</td>
<td>dec(urio)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CIL VI.7863</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*L. Octavius L.l. Diomedes</td>
<td>dec(urio)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CIL VI.7864</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*L. Sextilius Seleucus</td>
<td>decurio</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td>CIL VI.9254; ILS 7244</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*M. Octavius M. l. Marcio</td>
<td>mag(ister)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>AE 1889.10; ILS 7242</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Octavius M. l. Attalus</td>
<td>centonar(ius) a turre Mamilia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>AE 1889.10; ILS 7242</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publius Vib(i)us Felix</td>
<td></td>
<td>X?</td>
<td>CIL VI.37784; AE 1914.138</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*L. Lucilius L. l. Successus</td>
<td>quinquennalis; husband of Fannia Lea</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CIL IX.2686</td>
<td>Aesernia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satrius Achilles</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td>CIL XI.5749; ILS 7221</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satrius Clemens</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>X?</td>
<td>CIL XI.5749; ILS 7221</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voesidenus Maviellinus</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XI.5749; ILS 7221</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vassidenus Verinus</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XI.5749; ILS 7221</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casidius Severus</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XI.5749; ILS 7221</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status and titles</th>
<th>L References</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[H]小孩edius Primus</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>X? CIL XI.5749; ILS 7221 (AD 261)</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heldius Peregrinus</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>X? CIL XI.5749; ILS 7221 (AD 261)</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelius Honoratus</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>CIL XI.5749; ILS 7221 (AD 261)</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britius Maximus</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>CIL XI.5749; ILS 7221 (AD 261)</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetius Terminalis</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>CIL XI.5749; ILS 7221 (AD 261)</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavius Felicissimus</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>X? CIL XI.5749; ILS 7221 (AD 261)</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satrius Ianuarius</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>X? CIL XI.5749; ILS 7221 (AD 261)</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casidius Romulus</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>X? CIL XI.5749; ILS 7221 (AD 261)</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetius Verna</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>X? CIL XI.5749; ILS 7221 (AD 261)</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apro[n]ius Hilarinus</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>X? CIL XI.5749; ILS 7221 (AD 261)</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satrius Ursus</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>CIL XI.5749; ILS 7221 (AD 261)</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Flavius Eutiches</td>
<td>sev(ir) Aug(ustalis), colle(giatus) f(abrum) F(anestrium), idem cent(onarius) colle(giatus), dendro(phorus)</td>
<td>X CIL XI.6231</td>
<td>Fanum Fortunae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Destimus Epigonus</td>
<td>August(alis)</td>
<td>X CIL XI.6523</td>
<td>Sassina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Gigennius Festivus</td>
<td>X? CIL XI.6525</td>
<td>Sassina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Gigennius Ianuarius</td>
<td>patronus</td>
<td>X? CIL XI.6526</td>
<td>Sassina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status and titles</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Longarenus Lupus</td>
<td>husband of Flavia Sabina</td>
<td>CIL XI.6529</td>
<td>Sassina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C(aius) Sassinatus C. f.</td>
<td>CIL XI.6533</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sassina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pup(ilia) Polycarpianus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigennia Verecunda</td>
<td></td>
<td>X? CIL XI.6527</td>
<td>Sassina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Vamberius Eutyches</td>
<td></td>
<td>X CIL XI.6535</td>
<td>Sassina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Volusenus Genialis</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XI.6538</td>
<td>Sassina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex(tus) Rasi(i) us Aphrodisius</td>
<td></td>
<td>X? AE 1980.422 (second century)</td>
<td>Sassina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*i]us(?) Miro mag(ister)</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XI.1354 (AD 255)</td>
<td>Luna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*F(lavius) Festus jun(ior) mag(ister)</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XI.1354 (AD 255)</td>
<td>Luna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*M(arcus) Caesius Eutyches dec(urio) dec(uriae or uriarum) XVII; his wife was Tullia Ferusa</td>
<td>X CIL XI.125 (AD 161–66 or 198–211)</td>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*M. Cocceius M. f. Cam(ilia) Erotianus dec(urio)</td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XI.133</td>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*P. Saenius Marcellinus</td>
<td>quaestor collegi fabrum et centonariorum Regiensi</td>
<td>CIL XI.970; ILS 7216 (AD 190)</td>
<td>Regium, Lepidum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*C. Aufidius Dialogus</td>
<td>quaestor collegi fabrum et centonariorum Regiensi</td>
<td>X? CIL XI.970; ILS 7216 (AD 190)</td>
<td>Regium, Lepidum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*T. Vessidius Fortunatus</td>
<td>q(uin)q(uennalis)</td>
<td>X? CIL XI.5750 (AD 260)</td>
<td>Ostra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cornelius Tertius</td>
<td>q(uin)q(uennalis)</td>
<td>CIL XI.5750 (AD 260)</td>
<td>Ostra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publilius Maximinus</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>CIL XI.5750 (AD 260)</td>
<td>Ostra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelius Ursinus</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>CIL XI.5750 (AD 260)</td>
<td>Ostra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Status and titles</td>
<td>L References</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius Iustus</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>CIL XI.5750 (AD 260)</td>
<td>Ostra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocceius Mercurialis</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>X? CIL XI.5750 (AD 260)</td>
<td>Ostra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antistius Maximus</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>CIL XI.5750 (AD 260)</td>
<td>Ostra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octavius Clemens</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>X? CIL XI.5750 (AD 260)</td>
<td>Ostra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petronius Felix</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>X? CIL XI.5750 (AD 260)</td>
<td>Ostra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessidius Filoquirius</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>X? CIL XI.5750 (AD 260)</td>
<td>Ostra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octavius Taurus</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>X? CIL XI.5750 (AD 260)</td>
<td>Ostra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satrenu(s) Superus</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>CIL XI.5750 (AD 260)</td>
<td>Ostra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessidius Verecundu(s)</td>
<td>legatus</td>
<td>X? CIL XI.5750 (AD 260)</td>
<td>Ostra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statius Faustus</td>
<td>Legatus</td>
<td>CIL XI.5750 (AD 260)</td>
<td>Ostra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?L. Burbuleius Matutinus</td>
<td>sevir</td>
<td>CIL XI.6162; W 1913 (AD 145–61)</td>
<td>Suasa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Q. Albinus Ouf(entia)</td>
<td>eq(ues) R(omanus) eq(uo) p(ublico), accens(o) ve(l(ato)), flam(en) divi</td>
<td>CIL XI.1230 (after AD 216/217)</td>
<td>Medio-lanum? or Placentia?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secundinus Q. f. Q. n. Q. pron(epos)</td>
<td>magn(i) Anton(ini), Ilvir j(ure) d(icundo) m(anumittendi) p(otestate), cur(ator) r(ei) p(ublicae) Parmens(ium), repunctor splendidissimorum collegiorum fabrum et cent(onariorum) c(oloniae) A(ntoninianae/ureliae) A(ugustae) F(elicis) M(ediolaniensis)</td>
<td>CIL XI.1230 (after AD 216/217)</td>
<td>Medio-lanum? or Placentia?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Attius Ianiarius (Caiae) (libertus)</td>
<td>VI vir s(acris) f(acundis), VIII vir Val(etudinis)</td>
<td>X CIL XI.5047</td>
<td>Mevania (Umbria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rufinus</td>
<td>q(uin)q(uennalis)</td>
<td>AE 1987.464 (AD 166)</td>
<td>Laus Pompeia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Q. Minicius Eua[r]istus?</td>
<td>q(uin)q(uennalis)</td>
<td>X? AE 1987.464 (AD 166)</td>
<td>Laus Pompeia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status and titles</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*C?*iarinus</td>
<td><em>quaestor arc(ae) colleg(ii)</em></td>
<td>X?</td>
<td>AE 1987.464 (AD 166)</td>
<td>Laus Pompeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*?</td>
<td><em>curator</em></td>
<td>X?</td>
<td>AE 1987.464 (AD 166)</td>
<td>Laus Pompeia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*U</td>
<td>lpius Nundinus</td>
<td><em>curator</em></td>
<td>AE 1987.464</td>
<td>(AD 166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*T. Craxxius Severinus</td>
<td><em>m(agister?) s(uus)</em></td>
<td>CIL XII.2754</td>
<td>Ager Volcarum (Gallia</td>
<td>(second century)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex(tus) [P]u[bl]ic(tus) Anten(or)</td>
<td><em>colon(iae) Aq[uens(is)] libertus, IIIIII vir Aug(ustalis) corp(oratus), item [cor]pora(tus) centona(rius)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CIL XII.523</td>
<td>Aquae Sextiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Val[gi]us Victorinus (Julia Marcina co(n)junx)</td>
<td><em>(se)vir Aug(ustalis)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XII.526</td>
<td>Aquae Sextiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Moccia C. f. Silvina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIL XII.2824</td>
<td>Ugernum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*C. Ruson[ius] Muron</td>
<td><em>(se)vir A[ug(ustalis)] Lug(uduni) honoratus, centonarius ho[no][ratus, sagarius [cor][poratus</em>]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CIL XII.1898</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*[T]outius Incitatus</td>
<td><em>(se)vir Aug(ustalis) Lug(udunensis), naut(a) Arar(ico), centonarius Lug(uduni) consistens honoratus, negotiator frumentarius</em></td>
<td>CIL XIII.1972</td>
<td>Lugdunum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mu</td>
<td>natius Felix</td>
<td><em>(se)vir [A]ug(ustalis) Lug(uduni), eiusdemque corporis curator, dendrophorus Aug(stalis) Lug(duni) eiusdemque corporis curat(or), patronus centonarior(um) Lug(uduni) consist(entium), omnib(us) honorib(us) apud eos f(uncto)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CIL XIII.1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---] Attalus</td>
<td>[(se)vir Aug(ustalis)] Lug(uduni), neg[otiator s]eplasi(arius), n[autes] Rhodan(ici?)], corpor(atus inter cen)tona[rios Luguid(uni)] c[ont][]istentes*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>AE 1982. 702</td>
<td>Lugdunum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Aurel(ius) Bardibalus</td>
<td><em>dec(urio) coll(egii) cent(onariorum)</em></td>
<td>IMS 1.121.</td>
<td>Stojnik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AE = Annales Epigraphicae
CIL = Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum
LA = Laus Pompeia
LUG = Lugdunum

Additional references: Stojnik, IMS.1.121.
### APPENDIX F

**CATALOGUE OF MULTIPLE PATRONAGE (FIRST-THIRD CENTURIES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Name and references</th>
<th>Collegia under patronage</th>
<th>Status of patron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apulum</td>
<td>Fabia Lucila (CIL III.1207 = W 236)</td>
<td>(mater of) fabri, centonarii</td>
<td>socer P. Aelius Silvanus, eq. p., duoviralis et sacerdotalis coloniae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apulum</td>
<td>P. Aelius Strenus (CIL III.1209 = ILS 7147)</td>
<td>fabri, centonarii, nautae</td>
<td>eq. p., sacerdos arae Augusti, augur, Ilviralis coloniae Sarmizegetusae, augur coloniae Apuli, decurio coloniae Drobetarum, conductor pascui, salinarum et commerciorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apulum</td>
<td>C. Mummius Certus (CIL III.1217)</td>
<td>fabri, dendrophori</td>
<td>Eq. R., augur coloniae Apuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>C. Pettus Philtates (CIL V.749 = ILS 4873 = W 416)</td>
<td>fabri, centonari</td>
<td>Eq. R., praefectus aedilicia potestate, praefectus collegiorum fabrum et centonariorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquileia</td>
<td>C. Valerius Eusebes (CIL V.1012 = ILS 6686)</td>
<td>fabri, centonarii, dendrophi, sexviri Augustales Septimi Aureli</td>
<td>IVvir I. D., IVvir QQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salona</td>
<td>M. Ulpius Sabinus (AE 1922.39)</td>
<td>fabri, centonarii</td>
<td>Eq. R., decurio, Ilvir I. D., praefectus bis collegii fabrum et centonariorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ig</td>
<td>C. Bassidius Secundus (CIL III.10738)</td>
<td>dendrophi, centonarii</td>
<td>aedilis I. D. bis, quaeator pecuniae publicae, Ilvir I. D., praefectus collegii centonariorum, Ilvir QQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feltria</td>
<td>C. Firmius Rufinus (CIL V.2071 = ILS 6691)</td>
<td>fabri, centonarii, dendrophi (Feltria, Berua); fabri (Altinum)</td>
<td>Eq. R., Laurens Lavinias, decurio, flamen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixia</td>
<td>Sex. Sextius Onesigens (CIL V.4477 = W 520)</td>
<td>fabri, centonarii, dendrophi</td>
<td>ornamenta decurionalia, Ilvir Augustalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Name and references</td>
<td>Collegia under patronage</td>
<td>Status of patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixia</td>
<td>Sex. Valerius Publicola Vettilianus (CIL V.4484, 4485 = ILS 6716 = W 522, CIL V.4486, 4487)</td>
<td>collegia omnia</td>
<td>Eq. R., eq. p., flamen perpetuus, sacerdos urbis Romae, curator et patron civitatum Vardagatensium et Dripsinatium, omnibus honoribus perfunctus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergomum</td>
<td>P. Marius Lupercianus (CIL V.5128 = ILS 6726 = W 537)</td>
<td>fabri, centonarii, dendrophori</td>
<td>Eq. R., eq. p., omnibus honoribus municipalibus adeptus, iudex de selectis, sacerdos Caeninensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novaria</td>
<td>Alfollo (CIL V.6515)</td>
<td>centonarii, iuvenes</td>
<td>IVvir I. D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dertona</td>
<td>C. Metilius Marcellinus (CIL V.7375 = ILS 6744)</td>
<td>collegia omnia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industria</td>
<td>Q. Sertorius Syngerus junior, Q. Sertorius Severus (CIL V.7469–70)</td>
<td>fabri, centonarii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemenelum</td>
<td>M. Aurelius Masculus (CIL V.7881 = ILS 1367)</td>
<td>collegia tria</td>
<td>v.e., praeses Alpium Maritimarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemenelum</td>
<td>C. Cassius Paternus (AE 1967.281)</td>
<td>fabri, utriclarii, centonarii</td>
<td>decurio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>Q. Mettius Sabinianus (CIL V.8667 = W 446)</td>
<td>fabri, centonarii</td>
<td>eq. p., Laurens Lavin, quaestor, aedilis, Ilvir iterum, praefectus collegii fabrum, curator reipublicae Polensium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix F (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Name and references</th>
<th>Collegia under patronage</th>
<th>Status of patron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ligures Baebiani</td>
<td>C. Amarfius Saturninus (CIL IX.1459)</td>
<td><em>dendrophori, fabri</em></td>
<td>veteranus, Aug(ustorum) nost(orum duorum) ex legione secunda Parthica, decurio et omnibus honoribus functus, pater et avus decurionum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firmum Picenum</td>
<td>Alliena Berenice (CIL IX.5368)</td>
<td><em>fabri, centonarii</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falero Piceni</td>
<td>T. Cornasidius Vesennius Clemens (CIL IX.5439 = ILS 1368 = W 1605)</td>
<td><em>fabri, centonarii, dendrophori</em></td>
<td>eq. p., Laurens Lavinas, patronus plebis, filius Titi Cornasidii Sabini, Eq. R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trea</td>
<td>L. Naevius Fronto (CIL IX.5633)</td>
<td><em>fabri, centonarii</em></td>
<td>patronus municipii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auximum</td>
<td>Q. Plotius Maximus Trebellius Pelidianus (CIL IX.5836 = W 1610; CIL IX.5835 = ILS 1415)</td>
<td><em>centonarii, fabri</em></td>
<td>eq. p., tribunus legionis II trajanae Fortis, tribunus cohortis XXXII voluntariae, tribunus legionis VI Victrici, procurator Augusti pro magistro vigesimae hereditatium, praefectus vehiculorum, quinquennalis, patrono coloniae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venafrum</td>
<td>Quintilianus (CIL X.4865)</td>
<td><em>collegia urbis venafrae</em></td>
<td>rector Samniticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidentia</td>
<td>Virius Valens (AE 1991.713 = Me-A 33)</td>
<td><em>dendrophori, fabri</em></td>
<td>decurio, omnibus honoribus perfunctus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>M. Aurelius Detrius Sarapammonis (CIL XI.124 = ILS 6666)</td>
<td><em>fabri, centonarii</em></td>
<td>eq. p., augur, decurio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenna</td>
<td>G. C. Mansuanius Consortius (AE 1957.138 = Me-A 71)</td>
<td><em>fabri, dendrophori</em></td>
<td>omnibus decurionalibus ornamentis decoratus, IIIIVir quinquennalis, procurator iuvenum Ioviensium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regium Lepidum</td>
<td>Tutilius Iulianus (CIL XI.970 = ILS 7216; AD 190)</td>
<td><em>fabri, centonarii</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Name and references</td>
<td>Collegia under patronage</td>
<td>Status of patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td><em>CIL XI.1059 = W 1822</em></td>
<td><em>fabri, centonarii, dendrophori</em></td>
<td>praefectus legionis XX Valeriae Victrics, primus pilus legionis X Geminae piae fidelis, centurio legionum III Scythicae, XI Claudiae, XIII Geminae, VII Geminae, patronus coloniae Iuliae Augustae Parmensis, patronus municipiorum Fororoduentonorum et Foronovanorum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Placentia | Q. Albinus Secundinus Mestrius Aebutius Tulianus  
(CIL XI.1230 = W 1824) | *fabri, centonarii of Mediolanum*                              | Eq. R., eq. p., accensus velatus, flamen divi magni Antonini, IVvir I. D. municipii Placentini, curator rei publicae Parmensium, repunctor collegiorum fabrum et centonariorum Mediolaniensis |
| Volsinii  | *AE 1985.385 = M&A 90 = Forbis 398* | *fabri, centonarii*                                           |                                                                                 |
| Sorrinenses Novenses | M. Aurelius Marcellus (CIL XI.3009 = ILS 6595 = W 1855) | *fabri, centonarii*                                           | pontifex I. D. Sorrinensium Novensium, quaestor arcae publicae |
| Oriculum  | M. Iulius Ulpius Cleopatrus (CIL XI.7805 = ILS 7365 = W 2429) | *centonarii, amatores Romulii*                                | patronus civitatis, pater equitum romanorum |
| Carsulae  | L. Egnatius Victorinus Sagittius (CIL XI.4580 = ILS 6634) | *fabri, iuvenes, Augustales*                                  | IVvir I. D. qq., editor iuvenalium |
| Mevania   | L. Succonius Priscus (CIL XI.5054 = ILS 5271 = W 1891) | *corpora omnia*                                               | IIIvir I. D., q(uaestor) ar(arii), patronus Trebis decurioni, pontifex, patronus municipii |
| Asisium   | C. Scaefius Sulpicianus (CIL XI.5416 = W 1893) | *collegia tria*                                               | patronus municipi, IIIvir I. D. qq., q(uaestori iterum), advocatus reipublicae |
| Sentinum  | Coretius Fuscus (CIL XI.5748–49 = ILS 7220–21; AD 260–261) | *tria collegia principalia* (including the collegia centonariorum et fabrum) | decurio |
| Sestinum  | L. Atinas Verus (AE 1946.216 = M&A 78) | *fabri, centonarii*                                           | aedilis, quaestor, IIIvir, patronus plebis |
| Urvinum Mataurense | *CIL XI.6070 = W 1907* | *collegia plura*                                              | patronus municipii |
### Appendix F (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Name and references</th>
<th>Collegia under patronage</th>
<th>Status of patron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fanum Fortunae</td>
<td>CIL XI 6235</td>
<td>dendrophori, fabri, Seviri Augustales, centonarii</td>
<td>Eq. R., patronus coloniae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisaurum</td>
<td>T. Caadius Atilius Crescens (CIL XI.6362 = ILS 7364)</td>
<td>fabri, centonarii, navicularii, dendrophori, vicimagistri, iuvenes forenses, studia Apollinaris et Gunthar(um?), Seviri Augustales</td>
<td>eq. p., patronus coloniae et primarius vir, quaestor, Ilvir, Ilvir q.q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisaurum</td>
<td>C. Mutteius Quintus Severus (CIL XI.6369 = W 1925 = AE 1982. 266; after Nerva)</td>
<td>fabri, centonarii, navicularii, Seviri Augustales</td>
<td>q(uaestor), Ilvir, quaestor alimentorum, curator calendarii pecuniae Valentini HS DC milium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisaurum</td>
<td>C. Valius Polycarpus (CIL XI.6378 = W 1928)</td>
<td>VII vici, fabri, centonarii, dendrophori (Ariminum); fabri, centonarii, dendrophori, navicularii, vicimagistri (Pisaurum)</td>
<td>ornamenta decurionatus inlustratus a splendidissimo ordine Ariminensi, ornamenta decurionatus inlustratus a splendidissimo ordine Pisaurensium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariminum</td>
<td>C. Faesellius C. filius An(iensis) Rufionus (CIL XI.379 = ILS 6664)</td>
<td>vicani vici Dianensis, fabri, centonarii, dendrophori</td>
<td>Equro publico, L(aurens) L(avinas), cur(ator) rei p(ublicae) Forodr(uentinorum), part(onus) col(oniae) Arim(iti)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferentium</td>
<td>Lucius Allius Volusianus (AE 1972.179 = MeA 32; after AD 175)</td>
<td>fabri, centonarii</td>
<td>tribunus laticlavius legionis XII Fulminatae Certae Constantis, quaeestor provinciae Baeticae, aedilis Ceriali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arelate</td>
<td>C. Paquius Pardala, (CIL XII.700 = ILS 6985, cf. CIL XII.747)</td>
<td>Serviri Augustales, fabri navales, utriclarii, centonarii</td>
<td>libertus of Optaus, VIvir Augustalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugdunum</td>
<td>C. Sentius Regalianus (CIL VI.29722 = ILS 7490)</td>
<td>negotiatoris vinarii Luguduni in cannabis consistentes, nautae Ararici, seviri Luguduni consistentes</td>
<td>Eq. R., diffusor olearius ex Baetica, curator eiusdem corporis, negotiator vinarius, curator eiusdem corporis, nauta Araricus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugdunum</td>
<td>C. Apronius Raptor (CIL XIII.1911 = ILS 7033; AE 1904.176)</td>
<td>negotiatoris vinarii Luguduni consistentes, nautae Ararici</td>
<td>decurio a Treviri, nauta Araricus, negotiator vinarius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugdunum</td>
<td>M. Inthatius Vitalis (CIL XIII.1954 = ILS 7030)</td>
<td>nautae Arare navigantes, utriclarii, fabri, negotiatoris vinarii Luguduni in cannabis consistentes, seviri</td>
<td>negotiator vinarius, curator eiusdem corporis bis, quinquennalis; patronus equitum Romanorum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Name and references</th>
<th>Collegia under patronage</th>
<th>Status of patron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lugdunum</td>
<td>L. Besius Superior</td>
<td>nautae Ararici et</td>
<td>viromandus, Eq. R., omnibus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(CIL XIII.1688 = ILS</td>
<td>Rodanici, Condeates et</td>
<td>honoribus apud suos functus, allector arkai Galliarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7021</td>
<td>Arecaarii Luguduni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consistentes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugdunum</td>
<td>L. Tauricius Florens</td>
<td>nautae Ararici et</td>
<td>Venetus, Allector arka Galliarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(CIL XIII.1709 = ILS</td>
<td>Ligerici, Condeates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7020</td>
<td>et</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugdunum</td>
<td>C. Marius Ma[---]</td>
<td>nautae Rhodanici Arare</td>
<td>VIVir Augustalis Puteolorum,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(CIL XIII.1960)</td>
<td>navigantes, utriclarii,</td>
<td>curator eiusdem corporis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sexviri Augustales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>omnium corpora Lugduni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>licitem coeuntia, sexviri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Augustales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aventicum</td>
<td>CIL XIII.11480 = AE</td>
<td>venallicor(um) corp(us)</td>
<td>omnibus honoribus apus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1972.352</td>
<td>Cisalpinorum et</td>
<td>sua[s funt]o, [er] immunitate a div[o] [Hadriano d]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transalpinorum,</td>
<td>on[ato] inquis[i]tori (trium) Galliar(um)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[nautae Arari]cor(um)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Rho]danicor(um)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alba Augusta</td>
<td>AE 1965.144</td>
<td>centonarii, utriclarii,</td>
<td>magister or patronus?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helviorum</td>
<td></td>
<td>dendrophori, fabri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>T. priferius Paetus</td>
<td>ordo corpororum qui</td>
<td>v.c., cos. suff., proconsul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germinus</td>
<td>(CIL XIV.246 = W</td>
<td>pecuniam ad ampliandum</td>
<td>Africae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosianus</td>
<td>2227; CIL XIV.250 =</td>
<td>templum contulerunt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W 2231)</td>
<td>lenuncularii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>T. Prifernii T.f. Paetus</td>
<td>ordo corpororum qui</td>
<td>v.c., cos. suff. AD 146, son of T. priferius Paetus Germinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosianus f.</td>
<td>(CIL XIV.246 = W</td>
<td>pecuniam ad ampliandum</td>
<td>Rosianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2227; CIL XIV.247 =</td>
<td>templum contulerunt, an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W 2228; CIL XIV.248</td>
<td>unknown collegium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= W 2229; CIL XIV.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250 = W 2231)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>M. Sedatius Severianus</td>
<td>ordo corpororum qui</td>
<td>v.c., cos. AD 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(CIL XIV.246 = W</td>
<td>pecuniam ad ampliandum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2227; CIL XIV.247 =</td>
<td>templum contulerunt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W 2228; CIL XIV.248</td>
<td>lenuncularii, two unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= W 2229; CIL XIV.</td>
<td>collegia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250 = W 2231)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>M. Sedatius M.f.</td>
<td>ordo corpororum qui</td>
<td>v.c., son of M. Sedatius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severus Iulius</td>
<td>(CIL XIV.246 = W</td>
<td>pecuniam ad ampliandum</td>
<td>Severianus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginus</td>
<td>2227; CIL XIV.247 =</td>
<td>templum contulerunt, two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W 2228; CIL XIV.248</td>
<td>unknown collegia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= W 2229)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Name and references</td>
<td>Collegia under patronage</td>
<td>Status of patron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>C. Allius Fuscianus (CIL XIV.246 = W 2227; CIL XIV.249 = W 2230; CIL XIV.250 = W 2231)</td>
<td><em>ordo corporatorum qui pecuniam ad ampliandum templum contulerunt; an unknown collegium, lenuncularii</em></td>
<td><em>v.c., cos. suff., second century</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>P. Aufidius Fortis (CIL XIV.303 = W 2258, 4620, cf. 4621–4622)</td>
<td><em>mensores frumentarii, urinatores</em></td>
<td><em>decurio adlectus, duovir, quaestor aerae Ostis III, praefectus fabrum tignuariorum Ostis, decurio adlectus Africae Hippone Regio, qq. perpetuus mercatororum frumentarii, patronus coloniae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>Cn. Sentius Cn.f. Cn. n. Terentina (tribu) Felix (CIL XIV.409 = ILS 6146 = W 2282, Thylander B 339, CIL XIV.5374, Levick 2002, no. 247)</td>
<td><em>scribae cerarii et librarri et lictores et viatores, praecones, argentarii, negotiatores vinarii ab urbe, mensores frumentarii, scapharii, lenuncularii trajectus Luculi, dendrophori, togati a foro et de sacomar(is?), liberti et servi publici, olearri, iuvenes cisiani, veterani Augusti, beneficiarii procuratoris Augusti, piscatores propolae</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>C. Veturius Testius Amandus (CIL XIV.4144 = ILS 6173, AD 147)</td>
<td><em>quinque corpora lenunculariorum Ostiensium</em></td>
<td><em>Eq. R., patronus et defensor quinque corporum lenunculariorum Ostiensium, qq. corporis splendidissimi codicariorum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>P. Flavius Priscus (CIL XIV.4452 = ILS 9507, XIV.5340, AD 249)</td>
<td><em>Pistores, mercatores frumentarii Ostienses</em></td>
<td><em>v.e., provectus ad centena, pontifex et dictator Albanus, qq. censorship potestate, patronus coloniae, sacerdos Geni coloniae</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>C. Granius Maturus (CIL XIV.362–364 = ILS 6135, 4458, 4651, 4715)</td>
<td><em>mensores frumentarii, curatores navium marinorum et annalium Ost., dendrophori</em></td>
<td><em>decurio gratis adlectus, Ilvir, qq. perpetuus</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX LOCORUM

This index does not include all the epigraphic, papyrological, legal, or literary sources used in the book, but only the more important primary sources.

Inscriptions

AE 1916.45=1966.277=RIS 149 (Appendix A catalogue no. 36), 34, 48, 57, 59, 109, 110, 157, 196, 220, 286, 401
AE 1934.118=1944.129 (Appendix A catalogue no. 206), 45, 153, 156, 253, 399
AE 1937.194 (Appendix A catalogue no. 208), 255, 378, 399–400
AE 1944.110=RIU II. 377 (Appendix A catalogue no. 218), 45, 203, 251, 255, 380
CIL II. 1167 (Appendix A catalogue no. 33), 105, 258, 339
CIL III. 1174=ILS 7255a (Appendix A catalogue no. 2), 48, 157–58, 258, 332
CIL III. 1207 (Appendix A catalogue no. 3), 3, 217, 220, 243, 244, 332, 399, 409
CIL III. 1209=ILS 7247 (Appendix A catalogue no. 5), 158, 229, 243, 333, 409
CIL III. 1212=IDR III.5.2.444=ILS 7255, 158, 243
CIL III. 3583 (Appendix A catalogue no. 204), 205, 270, 378, 399
CIL V. *50=AE 2003.696 (Appendix A catalogue no. 230), 79, 382
CIL V. 908=IA 2747, 51, 151, 202
CIL V. 2864=ILS 5406 (Appendix A catalogue no. 142), 36, 38, 41, 130, 253
CIL V. 5446=ILS 7252 (Appendix A catalogue no. 181), 2, 149–50, 195, 373, 402
CIL V. 5447=ILS 7253 (Appendix A catalogue no. 182), 149, 374, 402
CIL V. 5612 (Appendix A catalogue no. 186), 43–44, 141, 143, 194, 374, 402–03
CIL V. 5738=ILS 7250 (Appendix A catalogue no. 188), 43–44, 140, 143, 193, 252
CIL V. 7469, 361–62, 391, 410
CIL V. 7470 (Appendix A catalogue no. 123), 261, 362, 391
CIL V. 7881=ILS 1367 (Appendix A catalogue no. 128), 103, 105, 225, 363, 410
CIL VI. 339=ILS 7315, 75, 77, 83, 130, 183, 254
CIL VI. 4416=2193=ILS 4966, 102, 105
CIL VI. 7860, 38, 182, 267
CIL VI. 10234=ILS 7213, 177, 253
CIL VI. 33885=ILS 7214, 61, 167, 204, 251
CIL IX. 5084 (Appendix A catalogue no. 54), 1, 167, 170, 266, 269, 345
CIL X. 4724 (Appendix A catalogue no. 48), 37, 49, 279, 291, 343
CIL XI. 970=ILS 7216 (Appendix A catalogue no. 117), 146, 237, 253, 360, 406, 411
CIL XI. 1354 (Appendix A catalogue no. 100), 225, 237, 241–42, 356, 406
CIL XI. 2702=ILS 7217, 236–37, 240
CIL XI. 5737=ILS 4215, 186–87, 189, 191, 394, 412
CIL XI. 5748=ILS 7220, 186–87, 188, 191, 221, 236–38, 349–50, 394, 412
CIL XI. 5750 (Appendix A catalogue no. 69), 186–88, 191, 236–37, 349–50, 394, 406
CIL XII. 1898 (Appendix A catalogue no. 27), 75, 77, 83, 134, 207, 337, 408
CIL XIII. 1974 (Appendix A catalogue no. 16), 231, 335, 414
INDEX LOCORUM

CIL XIV. 2112=ILS 7212, 163, 168, 176, 218, 250, 253, 262, 265
ILeph 18d, 256; 20, 257; 22, 257; 213, 256; 276, 256; 719, 257; 1210, 256; 1270, 256; 1478, 84; 1595, 256; 3801, 256; 3817, 256; 4337, 256
RIB 91 (=CIL VII.11), 51, 115; 194, 144

Legal sources

Cod.Iust., 1.14.2–3, 281; 1.22, 111–12;
10.48 (47) 7, 78; 10.66, 284; 11.29, 115; 12.39.1, 287
Dig. 1.12.1.14, 98, 107; 1.15.1, 126;
1.15.3.4, 150–51; 1.15.4, 129; 2.4.10.4, 106, 177; 3.4.1. pr., 99, 103–04, 106, 113; 3.4.7.1, 106; 4.2.9.1, 106;
10.4.7.3, 107; 11.29, 115; 12.39.1, 287

Papyri and wooden tablets

BGU I.9, 73; I.118, 84; III.814, 117; VII. 1564, 95, 113, 115; VII.1572, 112–13; 1666, 72; XV. 2471, 85
P. Frisch 1986: 50–73 no. 3, 110, 163; 98–99 no. 6, 163
P. Mich. II. 121, 72; III. 172, 81; V. 245, 15; VIII. 467–68, 117
P.Oxy. I 43v, 129; II 322 and 384, 81; II 245, 85; II 275, 92; II 357, 85; III 530, 72; IV 725, 81; IV 736, 72–74, 81; IV 737, 81; XII 1414, 86, 211; XII 1435, 52; XIX 2228, 85; XIX 2230, 84, 113; XXVII 2476, 110, 163; XXXI 2598, 67; XLI 2977, 81; XLI 3201, 72; XLVI 3313, 109; LV 3776, 85; LV 3778–3779, 85; LXIII 4353, 84; LXIII 4393, 221; LXIV 4434, 84, 113; LXVI 4534, 85
P.Oxy. Hels. 29, 81
P. Phil. 1, 112; 10, 112, 114
P.Ryl. II. 128, 72; II. 189, 95, 113, 115; IV. 654, 114, 118
RomMiliRec 63, 95, 116–18, 121
T.Vindol. II 255, 95, 121; III 603–05, 121; III 607, 73

Literary sources

Ammianus Marcellinus 19.8.8, 66–67, 86, 397; 20.11.13, 397
Apul. Met. 1.6, 396; 7.5, 396; 9, 63, 396; Apol. 13, 64, 396
Asc. Corn. 75, 101, 111; Pis. 7–8, 40
Caes. BCiv 2.9, 66, 395; 2.10.6, 66–67, 395; 3.4.4, 7, 66–67, 395
Cass. Dio 38.13.2, 40, 102; 53.24.4, 126; 54.2.3, 129; 74.2.1, 48
Cic. Cat. 1.8, 151; Clu. 94, 216; Comm. Pet. 30, 40; Pis. 4.9, 40, 102; Planc. 36

and 45–48, 40; Pro Sest. 34 and 55, 40; Sull. 52, 151
Oratio 18, frag. 1.395
Columella Rust. 1.8.9, 65–66, 396; 7.2.3, 82; 12, Preface 9–10, 92; 12.3.6–7, 75
Mart. 6.11, 95; 6.17, 174; 11.7–8, 76;
12.5.9.6, 80; 14.128, 93; 14.129, 95–96;
14.143, 131; 14.147, 93, 95; 14.152, 95; 14.150 and 157–58, 82
Petron. Sat. 7.2, 68, 395; 12–13, 72;
14.7–8, 64, 396; 15.7–8, 64, 396;
45–46, 1; 46.8, 301; 71, 274; 78, 127, 160
Pliny the Younger, Ep. 10.33, 2, 60,
101–02, 114, 126, 128; Ep. 10.34, 2,
98, 101, 114, 126, 128; Pan. 54.4, 114
Pliny HN 3.34, 95; 3.138, 145; 8.48, 66;
8.73, 66; 8.190–91, 82, 93–94; 8.192,
66; 8.193, 93–94; 9.181, 396; 19.7, 85;
21.57, 94; 28.91, 70; 34.1, 8, 100, 144
Plut. Crass. 2; Num. 17.2, 8, 100; Quaest. Rom. 97, 183
SHA Alex. Sev. 52, 118; Alex. Sev.
18.33.2, 228; Aurel. 34.4, 203; Aurel.
45, 86; Comm. 19.1, 48; Gall. 86, 203;
Pertinax 3.3, 90
Strab. 4.1.2, 134; 4.4.3, 76, 90; 4.6.2,
81, 93; 5.1.7, 81, 93–94; 5.1.8, 137;
5.1.12, 81, 93, 95, 131, 137; 6.3.6.9, 82;
17.1.41, 85
Suet. Aug. 31.3, 102; 32.1, 41, 100–01;
83, 93; Claud. 18–19, 113; Iul. 42, 40;
Ner. 54, 136; Gramm. 18.1, 174
Symmachus Relat. 14, 114, 291; 14.3,
113, 128, 130; 44, 283
Tac. Ann. 1.17, 117; 1.70, 116; 1.9–17,
57; 3.25, 216; 4.72, 57; 16.8, 192
Varro, Ling. 9.28.39, 82; Rust. 1.16.3,
109; 2.4.11, 95; 2.11.8, 82; 3.2.16, 248
Vegetius Epit. rei mil. 2.11, 117; 2.59.2,
66–67; 4.14, 66–67, 397; 4.15, 66–67,
397; 4.17, 66–67, 397; 4.18, 66–67,
397; 4.23, 66–67, 397
GENERAL INDEX

aerarius, aerarii (bronze-workers), 8, 143–45, 192
Minucius Aeterius Fabens, 279, 291, 343
Africa Proconsularis, 30, 35, 55, 77–78, 83, 331, 393
album, alba (see membership list)
ambulativa, 126, 154
Ameria, 38, 139, 144, 156, 235, 347, 386
Antoninus Pius, 46–47, 51, 53, 103, 105–06, 158, 226, 257–58
apparitores, 248
Apprentice, 13, 81 (contracts), 84, 92, 211
Apulia, 30, 35, 53, 76, 82, 90, 145, 385
arcarius, 177
Arelate, 94, 96, 135–36, 336, 388, 413
artex, 59–62, 135, 284
artificium, 1, 8, 58–62, 110–11, 161, 301
Asconius, 40, 101–102
Augusta Treverorum (modern Trier), 133, 152, 156, 199, 206
Augustales (see also se(x)viri and se(x)viri Augustales), 3 (corpus of), 7, 9–10, 32, 64, 133, 144, 149, 156 (collegium of), 163–65, 167, 169, 173–75, 177, 185, 194, 207, 211, 213, 219–20, 231, 234, 245, 251, 253, 273–74, 412
Augustus, 38–39, 41, 72, 92, 100, 126, 145, 190, 249, 255, 257, 332, 342
Auximum, 31, 45, 234, 346, 386, 391, 411
bardocullus, bardoculli, 93
beneficia (benefits, see also immunitas, vacatio), 48, 58–62, 109–12, 123–24, 157, 160, 171, 226, 239
Bericricion(i)us Valentinus, 194–95, 374, 402
The Book of the Prefect, 280
Callistratus, 8, 58–60, 109–11, 161, 166, 287
M. Cocceius M. f. Cam(ilia) Erotianus, 175, 272, 358, 406
Caracalla, 46, 48, 57, 59, 109, 132, 142, 157, 194, 196, 225–26, 257, 361, 376
Carnuntum, 152–53, 155, 202, 207, 260, 381, 389, 401
Cemelenum, 31, 103, 105, 136–37, 234, 250–51, 253–54, 363–64
cento, centones (see also centunculum, centuncula), 2–3, 63–69, 73, 77, 125, 129, 150, 395–98
centunculum, centuncula, 63, 65, 67–69, 395–97
Christian criticism of collegia, 248
Cicero, 26, 38, 40, 76, 228
cisarius, cisarii, 10, 177, 254, 392
collegia fabrorum (see also fabri), 2, 3, 8–9, 24, 29, 32, 34, 36, 58–59, 61,
GENERAL INDEX 421

Commodus, 48, 49, 59, 123–24, 157, 160, 202, 257, 360, 376
conductor, 159, 229, 409
consistentes, 132–33, 164, 206, 230, 408, 413–14
Constantine, 281–82, 284, 294
Constantinople, 112, 128, 130
'Consumer city', 87
contubernalis, 178, 217, 344
Corduba, 77–79, 144, 236–37, 252, 390
Coretius Fuscus, 139, 188, 190–91, 221, 231, 238–39, 349, 393, 412
Coretius Sabinus, 190, 238, 349
Coretius Victorinus, 190, 237–38, 349
corpus habere, 104, 106, 123
L. Cot. Proculus, 241, 356
cultores dei Solis Invicti Mithrae, 186–87, 191, 198–99, 206, 394
cultores Dianae et Antinoi, 105, 163, 176, 250–52, 262, 264
curator collegii/corporis, 43–44, 108
curator instrumenti, 149
curator of named foundations/endowments, 43 (arka Titiana), 141, 165, 261, 350, 353
curator of city, 47, 53, 221
curator operum publicorum, 114–15, 229
curator praesidii, 148–49, 150
curator reipublicae, 232, 357, 368, 372, 410–13
decurio, decuriones (decurions), 46, 48,
defensor, 104, 150, 228, 415 (of collegia); 42, 372 (reipublicae)
dolabra, 2, 150–51
dolabarius, dolabrarii, 3, 150–52, 156, 388

Echion, 1, 160, 301
Egypt, 14–15, 27, 81, 84–86, 95, 97, 111, 113–16, 119, 121, 125, 129, 150, 159, 211, 250, 279, 287, 297

Entrance fees, 162–63, 250, 269
Epigraphic habit, 25, 26 (epigraphic culture), 32, 34–36 (local or regional pattern of epigraphic culture), 37, 90, 203, 227


eranoi, 101–02
Euergetism, 10, 18, 213–15, 217–19

Fabia Lucila, 179, 217, 243, 244, 399, 409

fabricae, 117 (military), 118
Fabricius Centonius collegiorum libertus C(h)resimus, 147–48, 177–78, 369
C. Faesellius C.f. Rufionus, 234, 359, 413
L. Faesellius L.f. Sabinianus, 46

Fanum Fortunae, 31, 46, 139–40, 164, 175, 207, 351–52, 386, 405, 413
Feasts, feastings, 141, 178, 218, 221, 247–53, 276
Feast-maker (among Medieval confraternities), 251
Fred, 66–69, 71, 74, 84, 91, 147, 205, 398
Fire-fighting, 114, 125–60, 396
fiscus, 122, 131–32, 168, 272, 358
Flavia Solva, see Solva
Forum Popilii, 37, 49, 279, 291, 343
Freedwomen, 38, 178, 185, 203, 275
Fulleries (fullonicae), 70, 88–89, 155 fullo, fullones (fuller, fullers), 10, 36, 70, 73, 88–89, 177, 232, 284
Funerary activities, 6, 247, 265–77, 300
Funerary monuments, 45 (funerary formula), 48, 50, 90, 95, 105, 127, 145, 147, 154, 168, 176, 184, 355
Funerary clubs (see also collegia funeraticia), 265
funeraticium, 168, 176

L. Gabo Arunculeius Valerianus, 147, 164, 207, 368, 402
Gaius (jurist), 11, 73, 81, 99, 104, 106, 171
Gallia Belgica, 35, 78, 82, 90–91, 296, 388
Gallia Cisalpina, 90, 95, 167
Gallia Lug(u)dunensis, 31, 47, 49, 77–78, 132, 135, 334, 388, 408
Gardens, 108 (as gifts), 109 (garden-tomb)
gausapa, gausapae, 93–94
Gavillia Optat[a], 178, 217, 344
Genius, 53, 135, 179, 218, 252, 259–62 (Genius collegii), 276, 336, 360, 362, 391
gerdioi, 81, 84, 113
Gigennia Verecunda, 178, 184, 354, 406
C. Gigennius Festivus, 184, 405
C. Gigennius Ianuarius, 184–85, 222, 405
graveyards, 167 (size), 268 (collective tombs)
guilds (Medieval, Early Modern), 13–17, 19–20, 22, 62, 70, 84, 206, 209, 211, 213, 247–48
Gyneceum, gyneaeca, 86, 118, 145, 288
Hispalis, 31, 47, 103, 105, 229, 259, 339–40, 390
hydra, 45, 253, 378
immunitas (immunity, see also vacatio), 2, 48, 58–60, 109, 175, 226, 287
ingenius, ingenui, 171, 173–76, 182, 185, 200, 210
institor, 78, 171, 177
Interamna Praetuttiorum, 1, 167, 170, 266, 269, 274, 345, 386
Iulia M.F. Felicitas, 235
Iupiter Maximus Optimus, 54, 193, 254–55, 258
ius coeundi, 58, 102–04, 106–07, 109, 111, 123, 227, 297
iuvences, 42, 139, 156, 230, 232, 234, 237, 410, 412–13
Julius Caesar, 40, 65, 68, 100–01, 103
Justinian’s Digesta, 26, 37, 98–99, 103, 109, 204, 281
lanarius, lanarii, 57, 78, 82, 84, 92, 94–95, 147, 205
lanificium, 91
Late Antiquity, 26–27, 146, 250, 291–93
Latium, 30, 32, 35, 76, 78, 165, 169, 383–85
Lavinium, 221, 236–37, 243, 384
legatus, legatii (of collegium), 166, 170, 176, 186–91, 238, 349–50, 404–07
legio II adiutrix, 45, 202, 275, 368, 399
lex collegii (collegial bylaws), 10, 15, 105, 176–77, 209, 218, 248–50, 262, 264
Lex irnitana, 26, 99
Ligures Baebiani, 29, 34, 344, 385, 393–94, 404, 411
Linen, 65, 67, 71, 74, 85–86, 89, 114, 118, 137, 288
linypheum, linyphea, 86, 118
lodices, 93, 113
Lucania, 30, 35, 53, 90, 270, 385
Luna, 175, 225, 230, 236–37, 241 (patron of the collegium centonariorum of), 356, 386, 406
lustrum of collegium, 38–39, 182
Magnus Mater, 52–54, 153, 179, 284, 384
Marcomannic War, 157, 202
Marcus Aurelius, 3, 45–48, 105–07, 124, 132, 169, 177, 208, 226, 243, 258
mater, matres of collegia, 178–79, 191, 217, 220–21, 238, 243, 249, 332, 399, 409
Membership list (album, alba), 105, 133, 162, 166, 179–80, 186, 189, 192, 196–98, 200–01, 209, 218
Memmia Victoria (mother of Coretius Fuscus), 191, 238
Mevania, 31, 70, 76–77, 139, 144, 167, 170, 175, 231, 272, 347–48, 386, 391, 407, 412
Military supply, 116–19, 121, 123–25, 154, 157, 159, 288, 298
Mode of production, 90–91, 296
munus, munera, 112, 115, 226, 281 (munus navicularium, munus patrononii), 286–87, 290
musicians, 100, 102 (symphoniacii, tibicines, and fidicines), 138–39, 338
negotiator frumentarius, 133, 273, 335, 408
Nemauus, 31, 78, 137–38, 144, 223, 337–39, 388
New institutional economics, 18, 21–22
Nomenclature, 30, 37, 153, 172, 177, 332
The Nonii of Brixia, 232–34
L. Octavius Attae l. Cerdo, 342, 404
L. Octavius l. Secundus maior, 182, 341
L. Octavius l. Diomedes, 342, 404
L. Octavius Primigenius, 181–82, 342, 404
L. Octavius Secundus, 181–82, 342, 404
M. Octavius Carpus, 75, 183
M. Octavius M. l. Attalus, 76, 182, 184, 342, 404
M. Octavius M. l. Marcio, 76, 182, 342, 404
Lucius Ogius Patroclus, 108–09, 366
‘omnes collegiati’, 3, 130
opera necessaria (see also utilitas publica), 58–62, 109, 111–16, 123, 281, 297–98
Oxyrhynchus, 72–73, 87–88, 113
paenula, paenulae, 93, 119
parens of collegia, 178, 187–88, 220–21
parentalia, 170, 247, 249, 272, 274, 347, 373
pater, patres of collegia, 166, 170, 178, 187–88, 196, 202, 210, 220–21, 227, 249, 251, 255, 275, 401
Patronage (see also tabula patronatus), 146, 163, 166, 170, 176, 178, 186, 188, 191, 213–45, 279, 291, 292, 295, 349, 356, 409
patron deities of collegia, 253–55, 258, 262, 276–77
Paulus (jurist), 70, 73, 89, 106–07, 118, 126, 150, 287
pectinarius, pectinarii, 57, 147, 205
peregrini among collegial members, 176, 196, 198–200, 208, 299
Petronius, author of Satyricon, 1, 47, 64, 72, 127, 160, 396
Pliny the Younger, 2, 26, 60, 98, 101–03, 114, 126, 128, 164, 192, 204
Po Valley, 81, 93–94
Pollentia, 29, 47, 82, 362, 387, 393
Pompeii, 36, 50 (informal groupings at), 76–80, 83 (sagarii), 87–88 (scale of textile production at), 90, 92, 268 (columellae)
L. Pomponius Liberalis, 48, 332
praefectus praesidiorum et privatorem, 138
praefectus vigilum et armorum, 138
praefectus vigilum, 135
Praetorian Guards, 116, 130, 183, 254
‘Producer city’, 87
pro salute, 48, 126, 254, 257–59, 332, 379–82
Puteoli, 6, 11, 76, 105, 133, 144, 165, 169, 203, 236–37, 258, 268, 373, 385
Regium Lepidum, 78, 94, 146, 175, 236–37, 240, 253, 360, 387, 406, 411
repunctor, 142–43, 165, 194, 222, 407, 412
Rome, 6, 9, 22, 29–31 (collegium centonariorum in), 35–36, 38–39
(fire-fighting at), 129, 130 (textile tradesmen and craftsmen at), 134–35, 138, 142 (collegium tignariorum of), 144, 147, 149, 152, 159 (lack of interactions between the centonarii and fabri at), 152 (membership lists from), 164 (collegium centonariorum of), 167, 169, 172, 175–76 (collegial members of freedman status at), 178–80, 181–84 (centonarii at), 188 (a rare name in), 195 (some common names in), 202, 207 (membership in multiple collegia), 208–09, 219, 222–23, 225, 227, 228, 230, 233, 249, 253–55, 257 (collegium centonariorum of), 264, 267 (columbarium related to centonarii), 268, 271, 274, 283, 286 (Urban Prefect), 289 (vicarius Urbis Romae), 291, 297 (demand and supply), 341–43 (inscriptions related to centonarii from), 344, 384, 404 (names of centonarii from)
rosalia, 109, 204, 247, 249, 274–75, 380
C. Ruson[ius] Muron, 134, 206, 337, 408
C. Ruson[ius] Secundus, 134, 337
sagarius, sagarii (see also collegia sagariorum), 75–77, 79, 82–83, 87, 89, 134, 145, 183, 209, 254, 337, 408
sagum, saga, 63, 76–77, 119, 395
sarcinator, sarcinatores, sardinatotrix, sardinatotrices, 73, 87, 395
Sarmizgetusa, 34, 51, 152, 156, 158, 203, 222, 228–29, 230, 244, 261, 270, 333, 389, 409
C(aius) Sassinatus C.f. Pup(lilia) Polycarpianus, 174–75, 185, 406
Savaria (Pannonia), 31, 34, 152, 155–57, 207, 258, 381, 389, 401
scalarii, 3, 150, 152
schola, scholae (see also collegial meeting places), 6, 140, 149
Secondhand clothing (see also used clothing), 70–74, 80
The Secundinii (Igel), 90–91
M. Secundius Secundinus, 196, 202, 227, 341, 401
Sedatus Augustus, 45, 254, 378
'Service city', 87
Senator, 37, 45, 47, 147, 164, 219–20, 233, 241, 367–68, 402
senatus consultum (senatorial decree), 40, 97, 99, 102–05, 262, 264–65
Septimius Severus, 46, 48, 57, 59, 107, 109, 132, 157, 196, 226
Sestinum, 31, 234, 350, 386, 412
L. Sextilius Seleucus, 129, 183–84, 255, 342, 404
Sheep-rearing, 81–83, 90, 94, 96
Social capital, 13, 19–21, 23, 180
societas, societates, 10–11, 22, 41, 104, 106, 144
Spinning, 74–75, 83–84, 91–92, 211
Suetonius, 40, 100–01
summa honoraria (of collegial magistrates), 167 (of collegial magistrates)
tabula patronatus (patronage tablet), 186, 188, 214, 216, 221, 225, 231, 235–40, 348–50, 356, 360
Tarraco, 29, 144, 339, 390, 393
tenuiores, 9, 58, 163 (within collegia), 170, 263–65
textor, textores, 73, 80, 81
Theodosian Code, 26, 37, 124, 279–93
Timgad, 87–88
Trajan, 44–45, 48–49, 60, 98, 101–02, 113–14, 128, 204, 254
Transaction costs, 20–23
Transpadana, 30, 32, 43, 81, 121, 144, 181, 372, 387
Trea, 46, 345–46, 386, 411
tria collegia, 2, 50–53, 55, 136, 139, 234, 238, 385–86, 388, 393–94, 404, 412
triclinium, triclinia (dining rooms), 250–51, 274, 348
Trimalchio, 1, 274, 277, 301
Trust networks, 19–20
L. Tuccius Mario[---, 182, 342, 404
G. Ulattius Meleagrus, 217, 231, 335, 414
Ulpianus (jurist), 2, 11, 66, 69–70, 73, 75–76, 78, 81, 89, 98–100, 106, 113, 129, 177, 396
universitas, 106–08, 228, 297
Used clothing (see also secondhand clothing), 64, 71
Uthina, 29, 331–32, 390, 393
utric(u)larius, utric(u)larii, 3, 42, 103, 133, 135–37, 206, 230, 254, 261, 336, 364, 368, 384, 393
vacatio, 58, 60, 62, 102, 109–110, 113, 226, 298, 339–40
Verna (as name), 174, 176, 186, 188, 191, 349, 405
Vesia Martina (wife of Coretius Fuscus), 190, 238, 349
vestiarius, vestiarii, 75, 77–80, 82–83, 87, 89, 91, 154, 177, 253, 382
vestis militaris, 86, 287–88
vexillarius, vexillarii (of collegium), 203, 379, 400
Vienna (Gallia Narbonensis), 61, 77, 134, 164, 204, 228, 261–62, 337, 388, 408
Vindolanda, 116–17, 121, 159
Women, 13, 75–76, 91–92, 163, 178–80, 185, 200, 211, 217, 220, 252
Wool, 68, 75, 81–85, 89–96, 128, 147, 296
Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition publishes monographs by members of the Columbia University faculty and by former Columbia students. Its subjects are the following: Greek and Latin literature, ancient philosophy, Greek and Roman history, classical archaeology, and the classical tradition in its medieval, Renaissance and modern manifestations.

3. RIGINOS, A.S. *Platonica*. The Anecdotes concerning the Life and Writings of Plato. ISBN 90 04 04565 1
4. BAGNALL, R.S. *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*. 1976. ISBN 90 04 04490 6
6. SCHEIN, S.L. *The Iambic Trimeter in Aeschylus and Sophocles*. A Study in Metrical Form. 1979. ISBN 90 04 05949 0


www.brill.nl/csct