

---

## *Magistrates, patrons and benefactors of collegia: status building and Romanisation in the Spanish, Gallic and German Provinces\**

Koenraad Verboven (Ghent University)

---

This is a preprint version. For reference purposes please use:

**In: I.B. Antela-Bernárdez; T. Naco del Hoyo (eds.), *Transforming historical landscapes in the ancient empires (Proceedings of the first workshop Area of Research in Studies from Antiquity, Barcelona 2007)*, Oxford, John and Erica Hedges, 2009, p. 159-167 (British Archaeological Reports, International Series 1986)**

### Abstract

---

Social historians are becoming increasingly aware that voluntary associations provide the ‘missing link’ between the civic elites and the ‘lower classes’. This raises an important question: how did the Roman *collegia* contribute to the Romanisation of the (Western) provinces? Romanisation is the outcome of a confrontation between cultures. There are major differences between provinces in how Romanisation took place.

I will argue that status-achievement through *collegia* was markedly more significant in the Gallic and German provinces than in the Spanish provinces. The associations in the Gallic and German provinces were a major factor in the integration of local elites and business men into the ‘New Roman Order’. They do not seem to have had this prime importance in the Spanish provinces.

### Collegia, social status and civic life

---

After years of neglect from social historians, the study of voluntary associations (*collegia*) has again become popular in the field of social history the last decade. Scholars have begun to realise that voluntary associations may provide the ‘missing link’ between the civic elites and the ‘lower classes’<sup>1</sup>.

The idea of a Roman ‘middle class’ acquired a flavour of impropriety since Hill’s unfortunate characterisation of the *ordo equester* as such, and the subsequent demolition of this thesis by Brunt and Nicolet<sup>2</sup>. Yet, the concept leaps to mind when surveying recent evolutions in the study of the *collegia*. While scholars traditionally have no difficulty in accepting the existence of a *plebs media* that enjoyed a reasonable standard of living, the classical view of Roman society is that of an extremely polarised society, in which power, influence and wealth converged into the hands of a senatorial and equestrian elite. At a local level, landholding aristocracies (patronised and otherwise supported by Roman officials) set the tone. They are thought to have controlled status achievements, wealth distribution and political offices; in other words, to have monopolised both symbolic and real power. The *plebs media* in this view had little chance of rising into the aristocracy or of influencing political decisions. Opportunities for upward social mobility were haphazard and largely a matter of selection from above. Against this view, I have argued elsewhere that the *collegia* supported an ‘associative order’ which provided an institutionalised trajectory for upward social mobility<sup>3</sup>.

Local and imperial aristocracies formed a distinctive ‘class’ of their own. Of course, there was a vast distance between municipal elites and the imperial aristocracy. The imperial elites lived in a social universe of their own, distinct from that of the *civitates* and *municipia/coloniae*. Nevertheless, members of the *ordo decurionum* were legally and ideologically considered *honestiores*. The only non-aristocrats to share this privileged position, were veteran soldiers,

As a rule (there were some exceptions), the members and officers of voluntary associations, were excluded from this ‘class’ of *honestiores*. Some may have enjoyed personal relations with local aristocrats, but they did not – as

---

\* I would like to thank Linacre and Merton college and the Classics Faculty of Oxford who kindly received me as Visiting Senior Member of Linacre College during Hillary Term in 2007, which greatly facilitated this study. Special thanks are due to dr. Katherine Keats-Rohan and dr. Jonathan Prag.

<sup>1</sup> An important step in this direction was van Nijf 1997. See also Tran 2006 ; Verboven 2007.

<sup>2</sup> Brunt 1988 ; Nicolet 1966-1974.

<sup>3</sup> Verboven 2007.

a rule – circulate in aristocratic circles. They weren't normally invited to private dinner parties of aristocrats. Conversely, any self respecting aristocrat would not frequent private dinners given by officers of *collegia*.

Socially, therefore, *collegiati* were excluded from the 'upper class'. However, the divide was not so clear cut or so deep as Roman ideology would have us believe. Some *collegium*-officers – particularly in the major trading centres as Lugdunum or Ostia – possessed fortunes surpassing those of many *decuriones*. They never gained recognition as fully respectable members of the aristocracy, because they were freedmen or simply because they were uneducated businessmen lacking the respectability and composure of a born aristocrat. But these were handicaps that disappeared as one generation replaced by the next. Some *magistri* did succeed in entering the *ordo decurionum*. Similar mechanisms of exclusion coupled with rare acceptances, may be established for the nobility and successful traders and bankers in Early Modern Europe. No one finds difficulty in describing these wealthy wannabes as a 'bourgeoisie' elite ; another unseemly expression for the ancient world.

At the bottom end, membership of a *collegium* or office holding in a *collegium*, served to distinguish members and officers socially from those who were unable to participate in the activities of *collegia*. *Collegiati* formed a distinct category within society. Membership of an association was a modest luxury. It cost time and money. Moreover, *collegiati* were respectable because they were an integral part of social life in the cities: they participated in processions, set up honorary inscriptions and indulged in electoral propaganda. Thus, they participated in highly visible ways to 'making the city work', which gave their officers leverage to influence local political decisions as spokesmen of the respectable citizen class. It is this expression of civic identity and political relevance that justifies that we grant them a collective identity as 'middle classes', 'bourgeoisie', '*plebs media*' or whichever other catchy concept our community of scholars finds fit.

However, this raises another important question: how did *collegia* contribute to the Romanisation of the western provinces ? *Collegia* were an essential ingredient of Italian cities and it comes as no surprise that the spread of the Italian-type municipalities entailed the spread also of the Italian-type voluntary associations. However, Romanisation is not just the imposition from above of a new way of life ; it is the outcome of a confrontation between two cultures, of which one has proven to be dominant.

Romanisation is a broad concept, but one of its most defining characteristics was the establishment of *civitates* centred on a capital-city, with villages and sometimes secondary towns on its territory. Along with this political model and inseparable from it was the implementation of the Roman social order that defined various criteria (birth, wealth, education, citizenship, freedom, ...) mapping social positions and classifying people accordingly. The social institutionalisation of this social order in the provinces was the ultimate Roman achievement which ensured the stability of the empire.

This paper deals with how a particular aspect the 'associative order' manifested itself in the Spanish and the Gallic-German provinces, viz. the potential of the Italian-type voluntary associations as status-allocating institutions. We can witness this process of status acquisition directly in honorary and other inscriptions. I will argue that status-construction and status-achievement through office holding in *collegia*, patronage over *collegia* and benefactions to *collegia* was markedly more significant in the Gallic and German provinces than in the Spanish provinces. The associations in the Gallic and German provinces were a major factor in the integration of local elites and business men into the 'New Roman Order', they do not seem to have had this prime importance in the Spanish provinces, with the – admittedly important – exception of the *corpus oleariorum ex Baetica* and the river *collegia* of the *Baetis*.

## Towards a new taxonomy.

In order to understand status acquisition through *collegia* it is important to realise the great diversity between voluntary associations. The taxonomy proposed by Mommsen and other 19<sup>th</sup> c. scholars, focused on presumed differences in functions: *collegia funeraticia* religious associations, professional associations. It is now generally agreed that such a taxonomy is not very adequate. *Collegia* were typically multifunctional: all *collegia* were religious communities, all *collegia* were involved in the funerals of their members and all *collegia* fostered an internal sociability, which found its expression in regular banquets and drinking parties. Kloppenborg and Harland proposed alternative classifications based on the social profile and connections of the *collegiati*<sup>4</sup>.

Both in the old and new taxonomies 'professional *collegia*' appear as the most robust type. Many *collegia* identify themselves expressly as associations whose members share a common profession. Callistratus refers to the *collegia fabrum* as associations into which a person was accepted on the grounds of his trade (*artificii sui causa*). The *lex collegii* of the association of *citrarii et eborarii* excluded anyone who was not a *negotiator eborarius aut citrarius*<sup>5</sup>. However, inscriptions show that not all 'professional' *collegia* barred outsiders. The

<sup>4</sup> Mommsen 1843: 1-32 ; Waltzing 1895-1900: I, p. 3-56; against this Ausbuttel 1982: 29-32 ; Kloppenborg 1996 ; Harland 1996: 28-52 ; Tran 2006: 10-15.

<sup>5</sup> Dig. 50.6.6(5).12; CIL 6.33885 (p 3896) = AE 1891, 00014.

rule mentioned in the Digest that privileges granted to members of specific professional association applied only to those members actively engaged in that profession, indicates that not all members of professional *collegia* were ‘professionals’<sup>6</sup>.

From the viewpoint of status construction it does not make sense to single out professional associations. Even the most relentless modernist should acknowledge that no trade in itself conferred prestige in Roman society. There is no reason to assume that all professional *collegia* were equally honourable or more (or less) honourable than purely religious associations.

Nevertheless differences existed. It is hardly helpful to claim that, for instance, the *corpus mercatorum Cisalpinorum et Transalpinorum* which controlled the land routes over the Alps was the same type of social organisation as that of for instance the *cultores Minervae* of Tarracona, known only from two modest inscriptions. Their *magister* Marius Gamicus can hardly be put on a par with for instance C. Sentius Regulianus, barge-skipper and dealer in wine and oil, affiliated to the *annona* as *diffusor olearius*, president of the *olearii ex Baetica*, president and patron of the *vinarii Lugduni consistentes*, patron of the *nautae Ararici*<sup>7</sup>.

The social status which a *collegium* conferred upon its members, magistrates and patrons depended on the collective prestige it enjoyed. Therefore, instead of distinguishing between ‘types’ of *collegia*, it seems better use a classification based on various degrees of prestige enjoyed by *collegia*. From this viewpoint, I have distinguished 6 classes:

- *Collegia annonaria*: linked to the imperial *annona*.
- *Collegia Romae et Ostiae-Portus*: enjoy special position as associations of the capital
- *Collegia provincialia*: associations that deploy activities surpassing the local level.
- *Collegia municipalia splendida*: These are *collegia* closely linked to the city and its institutions. They may have served as fire brigades or civic guards. The prime examples are the *collegia* of *fabri*, *centonarii* and *dendrophori*. But, locally other associations may have fulfilled similar roles. For instance, the somewhat mysterious associations of the *utriclarii* seem to have generally enjoyed a somewhat similar standing as the *tria collegia principalia*. Also included in this category are the *collegia iuvenum*<sup>8</sup>.
- *Cives Romani consistentes*, *Cives Romani qui negotiantur*: associations of Roman citizens among non-Roman communities. A special variant of these are the so-called Campano-Delian associations (see below).
- Other (‘ordinary’ *collegia*, military *collegia* ....): these may have enjoyed some standing in their local communities, depending on local conditions, but were not inherently very prestigious.

Inevitably, the state of our documentation will not always allow us to range a particular association in a specific class and there might be some overlap between categories, but I believe that a taxonomy of status is more useful than a taxonomy based on functionality or membership profile.

## Collegia in the Spanish provinces

Santero’s catalogue comprises 122 inscriptions numbering 108 *collegia*<sup>9</sup>. But this number should be reduced considerably. A large part of Santero’s list are so-called *collegia domestica* or *cultores larum* composed of *conliberti* and *conservi*. *Societates monumenti* who contributed to build funeral monuments are excluded in the text, but included in the list<sup>10</sup>. Rural districts of *compagani* and *centuriae* as well are included in the list as *collegia*. All funerary inscriptions mentioning a *sodalis* are included in his list, even when the dedicator was a private individual and not a group or collectivity<sup>11</sup>. Last but not least, associations of Spanish merchants in Italy are included as Spanish *collegia*, such as the *mercatores olei Hispani / negotiatores olearii ex Baetica* and the *negotiantes Malacitanorum*<sup>12</sup>. If we cut down the list to only those associations that can positively be identified

<sup>6</sup> Dig. 50,6,6,12 (Callistratus). Cf. AE 1920, 69-70 (= 1983, 731).

<sup>7</sup> On the *corpus mercatorum Cisalpinorum et Transalpinorum* cf. Walser 1991 ; Alföldi 1952 ; Verboven 2007: 876-877 ; on the *cultores Minervae* see Santero 1978: 50 ; RIT 41 ; CIL 2.4085 (p. 972) = RIT 39 ; Marius Gamicus is mentioned in RIT 41; on Regulianus cf. infra.

<sup>8</sup> On the *utriclarii* see Rougé 1959 (connected to river trade, raft-men); Lafer 2000: 58-60, 191-192 (fire brigades) ; Kneissl 1981 (wine dealers) ; Leglay 1964 (producers of leather bags, connected with wine trade). Note that the *utriclarii* are typically denoted by *utriclarii + [name city]*; see also AE 1965, 144 = 1976, 1142 recording an endowment *collegiorum? ce]nton[ari]or(um) et utri[cu]la[r]ior(um) --- et] / d[endrophor]or(um)*. AE 1967, 281 (a handout to the *collegio fabrum utric(u)la[r]iorum et centonariorum* (note the singular *collegio* !); AE 1965, 164 = AE 2003, 1142: a dedication by the *fabri et utriclarii Lattarenses*; CIL 12.700: a patron of freedman status of the *fabror(um) naval(ium) utriclar(iorum) / et centonar(iorum)*. On the *collegia iuvenum* see Ginestet 1991 ; Jaczynowska 1978.

<sup>9</sup> Santero 1978: 151-181.

<sup>10</sup> For instance the *conlatores* of CIL 2.657, excluded on p. 75.

<sup>11</sup> For instance CIL 2.823 (Santero no. 52); CIL 2.6109 (Santero no. 51).

<sup>12</sup> CIL 6.1625; 1935; 9677.

as such and cannot be reduced to collective actions by family or geographic districts we are left with only 69 associations for the Spanish provinces as a whole (including the *cives Romani qui Bracaraugustae negotiantur*)<sup>13</sup>.

Conspicuous among the Spanish *collegia* are associations of the Campano-Delian type. These are early associations of Roman immigrants that served as organisations of Romans in the absence of Roman civic institutions. They are characterised by large bodies of *magistri* (9 and 10 are recorded in Carthago Nova), often (but not always) of slave or freedman status. Associations of this type are well known from Delos and Campania (mainly Capua and Minturnae). In Capua before the establishment of the *Colonia Iulia* in 59 BCE, they compensate for the lack of city rights, which it lost as punishment for its support to Hannibal. On Delos they are closely connected to communities of the *cives Romani consistentes*<sup>14</sup>.

Campano-Delian associations are recorded in Carthago Nova (2 inscriptions) and its surroundings (1 inscription from Mazzaron) and from Tarraco (1 inscription) and its surroundings (El Burgo del Ebro, 1 inscription). They date to the early first century or late second century BCE.

One of the inscriptions from Carthago Nova lists ten *magistri*, of which 5 slaves and 5 freedmen, who preside over the construction of port installations financed by their association<sup>15</sup>. The other lists nine *magistri*, of which three slaves, four freedmen and two freeborn<sup>16</sup>. The inscription from Mazzaron is set in *opus signinum* on a pavement floor and records the construction of the floor under supervision of *magistri*, of whom two names are partly preserved. One appears to have been a slave<sup>17</sup>. The servile status of these *magistri* indicates that they represented particular associations rather than the community of Roman citizens established in Carthago Nova as a whole.

The site of Mazzaron is closely connected to the exploitation of the silver and lead mines<sup>18</sup>. The link with mining operations is apparent also from the name of one of the nine *magistri* in the second inscription from Carthago Nova: P(h)ilippus (or P(h)ilemo), slave of M. and C. Pontilenus. The implication of the Pontilieni in Spanish silver and lead mining may be deduced from lead ingots carrying their name. Their family originated from Picenum and became one of the most prominent families of Carthago Nova in the late Republic and early Principate<sup>19</sup>.

The two inscriptions from Tarraco and Burgo del'Ebro are much more fragmentary and uncertain, but they too appear to attest freedmen *magistri*, which again argues against their identification as representatives of a Roman citizen migrant community<sup>20</sup>.

Campano-Delian associations disappear with the end of the Republic. Presumably the establishment of Roman colonies and other imperial institutions (such as those related to the emperor cult) reduced the role of voluntary associations in structuring migrant communities. Under the reign of Claudius we find a group of *cives Romani qui negotiantur Bracaraustae*, who honour C. Caetronius Miccio (probably) when he was *legatus Augusti* of Hispania Citerior in 43-44 CE<sup>21</sup>.

Compared to the Gallic and German provinces *collegia municipalia splendida* are not well attested in the Spanish provinces. *Centonarii* are recorded only in Hispalis and (perhaps) Tarraco<sup>22</sup>. *Fabri* are found in Barcino, Tarraco, among the Viatenses (?) and possibly in Miranda<sup>23</sup>. In Corduba an association of *fabri subaediani* is attested on two *tabulae patronatus*. One dates to the fourth century (349 CE), the other is dated to 247 CE, but the authenticity of the latter is doubtful. No *dendrophori* are attested in the Iberian peninsula<sup>24</sup>.

The use of these *collegia* to claim or advertise social status is even less prominent. One very mutilated epitaph of a Terentius Candidus possibly mentions his connection with the *fabri* of the Viatenses<sup>25</sup>. A Numerius Aufustus Homuncio acts as benefactor of the *collegium fabrum* in Barcino by donating a statue with marble base in

<sup>13</sup> *CIL* 2.2423.

<sup>14</sup> Flambard 1982 ; Flambard 1983 ; Hasenohr 2002 ; Diaz Ariño 2004.

<sup>15</sup> *CIL* 2.3434 = *CIL* 2.5927 = *ELRH* C10; cf. Diaz Ariño 2004, p. 467-468.

<sup>16</sup> *CIL* 2.3433 (p 952) = *ELRH* C50.

<sup>17</sup> *HEp*-01.487 = *ELRH* C52. Cf. Ramallo 1985: 82 ; Ramallo 1986: esp. 186.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Diaz Ariño 2004, p. 467; Ramallo 1985, p. 82; Ramallo 1986, p. 186.

<sup>19</sup> Abascal – Ramallo 1997: 236, 460-465 ; Domergue 1990: 322.

<sup>20</sup> *HEp*-11.621 = *ELRH* C105 ; Ferreruele e.a. 2003 ; Diaz Ariño 2004: 465-466 ; *CIL* 2.4309 (p 973) = *ELRH* C62 ; Diaz Ariño 2004, p. 469.

<sup>21</sup> *CIL* 2.2423.

<sup>22</sup> *CIL* 2.1167 ; *CIL* 2.4318.

<sup>23</sup> *CIL* 2.4498 (p. 981); *CIL* 2.4316 (p. 973) ; *CIL* 2.2924; *RIT* 00351.

<sup>24</sup> *CIL* 2.2211 (p 1049) ; *AE* 1983, 530b.

<sup>25</sup> *RIT* 351.

honour of Minerva Augusta<sup>26</sup>. A certain Murrius Thales does the same for the *fabri* of Tarraco by donating a sundial<sup>27</sup>. Neither of these men are otherwise known and their actions are probably directed internally to the their *collegia*.

Three *collegia iuvenum* are attested with certainty, one dedication to Iuventus, may hide a fourth one. Again this is very few compared for instance to the 18 listed by Ginestet for the Gallic and German provinces. Two examples of status affirmation through these *collegia iuvenum* are recorded. In Nescania, two *curatores* of a *collegium iuvenum Laurensium*, L. Calpurnius Gallio and C. Marius Clemens, dedicate a temple to Jupiter Pantheus Augustus in a public location. At Léon, Lollianus the *atsetor iuventutis* is honoured<sup>28</sup>.

The lack of recorded *collegia* and clear ‘collegiate’ status affirmation may be due to epigraphic habit, but because inscriptions themselves testify status, we must conclude that collegiate status mattered less in the Spanish provinces than elsewhere.

The only Spanish *collegia* that stand out as prominent status-generators are associations which contributed directly or indirectly to the Roman *annona*. The Baetican *collegia* related to river transport (*scapharii Romulae consistentes*, *scapharii qui Romulae negotiantur*, *lyntrarii*) appear to have played an important role, which can undoubtedly be related to their contribution to the *annona*<sup>29</sup>.

A 2<sup>nd</sup> century inscription from in the port of Hispalis erected by the *lyntrarii* of Canama, Naevia and Oducia, honours C. Aelius C. f. C. n. Quir. Avitus as patron of all the *lyntrarii* of the Baetis river<sup>30</sup>. The *scapharii Hispalenses* honour the distinguished knight Sex. Iulius Possessor *ob innocentiam iustitiamque eius singularem*, in his capacity as *procurator Augustorum ad ripam Baetis*, or as *adiutor praefecti annonae*<sup>31</sup>.

The most important ‘Spanish’ association, however, is only in part Spanish. The *olearii ex Baetica* had their headquarters in Rome or in Ostia-Portus, although they certainly owned offices also in Baetica. Thus the *diffusor olearius* Iulius Hermesianus seems to have been *curator* of the *statio Romulae* of the *corpus* in Hispalis, where he received two bronze statues with marble base: one from his son and grandson on a public location donated by the city council and one from the *corpus splendidissimum* of *olearii* for which his son reimbursed the costs.<sup>32</sup>

These ‘grand’ associations conferred enormous prestige in their members’ *patriae*, but they belong to the category of the *collegia annonaria* and Roman-based *collegia* and transcend the local and provincial reality. The same may be said of the *negotiantes Malacitanorum* who had their *statio* in Ostia<sup>33</sup>. The Spanish olive oil trade was crucial to the *annona*, but the Iberian peninsula was important also for the export of *garum*, wine and minerals to Italy. Two imperial *constitutiones* by Constantine I confirm the privileges granted to the Spanish *navicularii*<sup>34</sup>.

The overwhelming majority of associations that are recorded in the Spanish provinces (like anywhere else) were quite modest. Locally, however, some associations enjoyed more influence or commanded more respect than others. This may have been the case for the associations of Asian and Syrian merchants in Malaca, that honoured Ti. Claudius Iulianus as patron, *prostates* (probably *praefectus*) and benefactor at sometime between 50 and 300 CE<sup>35</sup>. It was certainly the case for the association of Assotani residing in Barcino, who added their inscription in honour of L. Licinius Secundus in a series of at least 22 similar inscriptions set up on the forum of Barcino, by among others the counsels of Barcino, the Iamontani and the Ausotani.<sup>36</sup> Neither association, however, is very typical.

<sup>26</sup> CIL 2.4498 (p. 981).

<sup>27</sup> CIL 2.4316 (p. 973).

<sup>28</sup> CIL 2(2)-05.840 = CIL 02, 02008 (p 878) (Nescania); IRPLEon 194 (Legio), Santero 1978: 102-103; CIL 2.2564 (La Coruña); dedication to Iuventus: CIL 2.45, see Ginestet 1991: 206.

<sup>29</sup> On the *scapharii* see De Salvo 1992: 130-131; 166-171.

<sup>30</sup> CIL 2, 1175, cf. Santero 1978: 135, 137-139; Blázquez 2007: esp. 181; Chic García G. e.a. 2001; Chic García 1992: 11.

<sup>31</sup> CIL 2.1180 = AE 1991, 993; cf. Remesal 1991; Blázquez 2007: esp. 181.

<sup>32</sup> HEP-10.576 = AE 2001, 1186; CIL 2(2)-05, 1180 = CIL 2.1481; CIL 6.20742; cf. Chic García e.a. 2001; Le Roux 1986; Rico 2003; Tchernia 1980.

<sup>33</sup> CIL 6.9677.

<sup>34</sup> CTh. 13.5.4; 13.5.8.

<sup>35</sup> CIL 2, p. 251; on the office of *praefectus (collegii)* see Waltzing 1895-1900: II 352-353; Royden 1988: 16; on ‘prostataes’ as Greek equivalent for ‘praefectus’ see Mason 1974: 81-82.

<sup>36</sup> CIL 2.4540 (p 955, 982); Piernavieja 1977-1978: 437-443; Santero 1978: p. 124-125.

## The Gallic-German provinces

The situation in the Gallic-German provinces was very different. Geographically, associations are frequent in Narbonnese Gaul, the city of Lugdunum and the German provinces.

Only one Campano-Delian association is attested in Tolosa in Narbonnese Gaul, where an inscription lists twelve *magistri* (only 8 names are partially preserved) who presided over the construction of a building (probably religious) with *solarium*. Six *magistri* were slaves, at least one other was a freedman<sup>37</sup>.

Typical for Belgica and the German provinces were the so-called *curiae*. These were indigenous associations related to the cult of the *Matres* and named (like the *Matres* themselves) after rural districts (*pagi*) or bynames of deities. They are clearly rooted in indigenous society, as may be deduced from the peregrine status and the non Latin names of most of their worshippers, but their origins are unclear. The oldest attestations date to the later 1<sup>st</sup> century CE, the youngest to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century CE<sup>38</sup>. Although they were mostly indigenous associations, the *curiae* clearly served as vehicles of Romanisation. The language of their inscriptions is Latin and their most conspicuous monument is a cult pillar found at Vienne-en-Val in honour of Jupiter, Mars, Vulcan and Venus with a typically roman iconography<sup>39</sup>.

However, the most prominent *collegia*, typical of the Gallic provinces were the trade and river associations, whose influence and activities far transcended the level of cities. They date mostly to the second and third centuries CE. Their theatre of action was provincial and supra-provincial. As capital of the Tres Galliae, Lugdunum was their main seat. Their patrons and magistrates often belonged to the *ordo decurionum* or the *ordo augustalium*<sup>40</sup>.

L. Helvius L. f. Volt. Frugi was twice *curator* of the *nautae Rhodanici* (?), before becoming *duumvir* of Vienna and patron of the *nautae Rhodanici et Ararici*. A glimpse of his network can be gauged when we consider his family connections. His wife, Nameria Titulla, may be linked (as *patrona* ?) to Namerius Euprepes, who was *magister* of the *hastiferi* of Vienna. Another *decurio* of Vienna, P. Helvius Masso, from approximately the same period, resided in Grenoble (Cularo/Gratianopolis), where he set up a funeral monument for himself and a separate one for his wife, Apronia Sabini f. Casata. The barge skipper L. Helvius Victorinus, as well, was no doubt related in some way to Frugi<sup>41</sup>.

Apronia Sabini f. Casata in turn may be related to C. Apronius Blandi f. Raptor, a citizen and a *decurio* of the Treveri, based in Lugdunum as a wine merchant (*negotiator vinarius in cannabis (Lugduni consistentes)*) and barge skipper on the Saône (*nauta Araricus*). He was patron of the corporation of the *negotiatores vinarii Lugduni consistentes* and (like Helvius Frugi) of the corporation of the *nautae Ararici*. The corporation of the *vinarii* honoured him with a statue. On the occasion of the statue's erection Raptor distributed 5 sesterces to each member<sup>42</sup>.

The career of M. Inthatus M. f. Vitalis resembles that of Apronius Raptor. He had been a wine merchant and barge skipper on the Arar, twice *curator* and *quaestor* or *quinquennalis* of the *negotiatores vinarii Lugduni consistentes*. He was elected patron of the association of the *nautae Ararici* and patron of the local *equites*, the *seviri augustales*, the *utriclarii* and the *fabri Lugduni consistentes*. Although he never achieved decurionate status, he was given the privilege of *consessum cum decurionibus* at Alba Helvorum in Narbonnese Gaul. He too received a statue in his honour from the association of the wine merchants and distributed ten sesterces at this occasion<sup>43</sup>.

Similarly, the anonymous wine merchant from AE 1900, 203 had been *curator* of the association of the *vinarii Lugduni consistentes*, *curator* of the *seviri Lugduno consistentium*, *sevir augustalis* of the colonia of Lugdunum and of the colonia of Nemausus and received the *ornamenta decurionatus* at Nemausus<sup>44</sup>.

Q. Iulius Severinus, was a notable from the Sequani among whom had fulfilled all offices, before becoming *inquisitor trium Galliarum*. He was elected patron by the associations of *nautae Rhodanici et Ararici*. His *patria* set up two honorary statues for him, one in Lyon, the other possibly in Vesontio, the capital of the Sequani.

<sup>37</sup> CIL 12.5388; Labrousse 1968: 104, 210.

<sup>38</sup> Rüger 1972 : 251-260 ; Scheid 1999 : 402-423. On the names of the *Matres* see Neuman 1987.

<sup>39</sup> AE 1968, 00308 = AE 1969/70, 00401; Rüger 1972 : 254, no. 5) ; Debal 1969 : 211-220 Debal 1972 ; Picard 1970 : 182-185.

<sup>40</sup> See De Salvo 1992: 128-144 ; Rougé 1965.

<sup>41</sup> CIL 13.1918 (Helvius Frugi); 12.2220 (Nameria Titulla) ; 12.1814 (Namerius Euprepes) ; 12.2243 (Helvius Masso) ; 12.2259 (Apronia Casata).

<sup>42</sup> CIL 13.1911 ; AE 1904, 0176 = CIL 13.11179 ; cf. Wierschowski 2001 : 318-319, no. 443 ; Krier 1981 : 31-32, no. 7-8 ; Tran 2006 : 76-77.

<sup>43</sup> CIL 13.1954 ; cf. Wierschowski 2001 : 327-328, no. 454 ; Christol 1992 : 126, n. 16 ; Christol 2003 : 334.

<sup>44</sup> AE 1900, 203 ; cf. Wierschowski 2001: 431-432, no. 624 ; Christol 1992: 125-131.

Noteworthy is the decision of the *ordo decurionum* of the Sequani to record his election as patron of the two associations on a par with his 'national' offices and his office as *inquisitor trium Galliarum*<sup>45</sup>.

The wine merchants and barge skippers of the Rhone and the Saône, were connected with the *corpus splendidissimum mercatorum Cisalpinorum et Transalpinorum* that controlled the trade routes over the Alps. Q. Otacilius Pollinus, an important notable from Aventicum who had received three times immunity from taxation from Hadrian, represented the Helvetii at the *concilium Galliarum*, where he won the office of *inquisitor Galliarum*. In addition to being patron of the Helvetii, he was patron both of the *venalicii Cisalpinorum et Transalpinorum* and of the *nautae Ararici et Rhodanici*<sup>46</sup>.

The list may be extended but the examples above suffice to make our point. On a provincial level large associations of traders and barge skippers dominated trade throughout the Gallic and German provinces and served as prime status allocators. Local aristocracies were linked to the associations through ties of patronage that were made prominently visible in the capital of the Gauls, Lugdunum. The same local aristocracies were replenished from the ranks of the provincial associations.

Provincial associations not only formed a network among themselves; through their officers and patrons they were closely linked also to the illustrious municipal associations. For instance, the businessman (*negotiator*) M. Sennius Metilus, a citizen from Trier, was member of the *corpus splendidissimum mercatorum* and *praefectus* of the *fabri tignuarii* of Lugdunum<sup>47</sup>.

C. Primius Secundus, a native Celt (as may be deduced from his *gentilicium* derived from a *cognomen*) had begun his career as *faber tignuarius*, climbed all the ranks of the association of *fabri tignuarii Lugduni consistentes (omnibus honoribus functus)* and eventually became the association's patron. He became *sevir augustalis* (although probably an *ingenuus*) and was later elected *curator* of the *collegium* of *augustales*. He eventually became *praefectus* of the association of the *nautae Rhodanici*. His son became *corporatus inter fabros tignuarios*, and *curator* of the *seviri augustales* of Lyon<sup>48</sup>.

The class of *collegia municipalia splendida* is well attested in the Gallic and German provinces<sup>49</sup>. The examples of Sennius Metilus and Primius Secundus show their links to provincial *collegia*. In some cases these illustrious *collegia* appear linked in turn to some of the more modest professional associations.

Claudius Myron instructed his heir to build a burial monument dedicated to the *Genius* of the *splendidissimum corpus fabrorum tignariorum* and of the *artifices tectorum* in Lugdunum. While it seems unlikely that the *artifices tectorum* were a mere subdivision of the *corpus fabrorum tignariorum*, the connection between both is hardly surprising<sup>50</sup>. A similar link may be provided by C. Rusonius Myron, who was an *honoratus* of the *seviri augustales* and the *centonarii* at Lyon and a *corporatus* of the *sagarii* at Lyon or Viennes<sup>51</sup>.

However connections existed also with the imperial level, particularly through the associations of the *navicularii* at Arles, whose connections to the imperial *annona* are well documented in a bronze table containing a copy of an official letter addressed to them in 201 CE by the *praefectus annonae* concerning a complaint they had raised against the *procurator Augusti*<sup>52</sup>.

Despite his presumably freedman status, M. Frontonius Euporus became *curator* of the *corpus naviculariorum maritimorum Arelatensium*. He was *sevir augustalis* at Aquae Sextiae and patron of the *utriclarii* of Ernaginum (in my view a an illustrious municipal association) and of the *nautae Druentiorum*<sup>53</sup>. His office no doubt brought him into contact with the patrons of the association of *navicularii marini*, such as perhaps (the date is not clear) C. Cornelius Optatus, *flamen et duumvir* d'Arles<sup>54</sup> and the Roman knight Cominius Bonus Agricola Laelius Aper *praefectus cohortis tertiae Bracaraugustanorum, tribunus legionis I Adiutricis, procurator Augustorum ad annonam provinciae Narbonensis et Liguriaie, praefectus alae milliariae in Mauretania Caesariensi*<sup>55</sup>.

<sup>45</sup> CIL 13.1695 ; cf. Wierschowski 2001 : 303, no. 424.

<sup>46</sup> CIL 13.11480-11492 = AE 1995, 1141. On the Otacilii see Reynolds 1969 ; Frei Stolba 1988 ; Herzig 1972-1973; Herzig 1973-1974; Herzig 1973 ; Herzig 1974: 67-68. On the *corpus mercatorum Cisalpinorum et Transalpinorum* see above n. 7.

<sup>47</sup> CIL 13.2029. Wierschowski 2001: 355, no. 492; Krier 1981: 48-50, no. 15 ; Walser 1991: 173-174.

<sup>48</sup> CIL 13.1966.

<sup>49</sup> For a recent list see Liu 2004: 85-92.

<sup>50</sup> CIL 13.1734; Waltzing 1895-1900: 565, no. 2083.

<sup>51</sup> CIL 12.1898 (p 829). This is a crucial inscription to link the *centonarii* with the textile trade, see now Liu 2004: 38-45.

<sup>52</sup> CIL 3.14165, 8. Cf. De Salvo 1992: 403-409 ; Christol 1982 ; Christol 1984 ; Sirks 1984: 98-99.

<sup>53</sup> CIL 12.982 (p 820) = AE 1998, 876 ; Christol 2003 : 330 ; Christol 1971 : 648-651. On the *utriclarii* as an illustrious associations cf. supra.

<sup>54</sup> CIL 12.692 ; AE 1991, 1193.

<sup>55</sup> CIL 12.672 (p 817) = AE 1987, 753 ; cf. Alföldy 1980: 278 ; Alföldy 1986: 173-180 ; Christol -Demougin 1984: 163-170 ; Pavis D'Escurac 1976: 129-134 ; Devijver 1976-2001: I, 287-288, no. 220 ; Pflaum 1960-1982: I, 507-508, no. 186.

The most spectacular example of social success through associations is C. Sentius Regulianus. He started his career as a wine merchant in Lugdunum, where he rose through the ranks of the *corpus vinariorum Lugduni consistentium* to the office of *curator*. He was co-opted patron of the *nautae Ararici* and married Ulatii Metrodora, freedwoman of the influential Lugdunese family of the Ulatii, which numbered several priests of the temple of *Roma et Augustus* and the *Ara Caesarum* in their ranks. Sentius Regulianus became patron of the *seviri augustales Lugduni consistentes*. At some point in his life Regulianus started dealing in Baetican olive oil and was accepted as member of the *corpus oleariorum ex Baetica*. He again rose through the ranks of the association and became *curator*. His commitment in the *corpus oleariorum ex Baetica* drew the attention of the imperial *annona* who instituted him as *diffusor olearius* in Rome. Probably around the same time or shortly later he received the dignity of *eques Romanus*. He died in Rome where two of his freedmen were commissioned by Regulianus's wife, children and grandfather to supervise the erection of his funeral monument. This odd arrangement suggests that although Regulianus resided in Rome when he died, he still had his main residence in Lugdunum, where his family lived<sup>56</sup>.

A multitude of 'common' *collegia* are attested in the Gallic and German provinces, but they only rarely appear in clearly status affirming or enhancing inscriptions. Locally, some *collegia* could be important enough to influence the allocation of status. Thus a certain Servandus was given permission by the city counsel of Cologne to erect a monument in honour the *Domus Divina* on a public location, on behalf of the *pistores Coloniae Agrippinensis consistentes*<sup>57</sup>.

Early in Flavian era, the *salinatores* of the Morini and the Menapii set up two honorary inscriptions for the *centurio primuspilus*, L. Lepidius Proculus *ob merita eius*, in his home town Ariminum. It isn't clear, however, whether the *salinatores* formed a genuine Roman type *collegium*. They may have been tax collectors linked to the the Roman army<sup>58</sup>.

The *Condeates Lugduni* and the *Arecarii Lugduni* were patronised together with the *nautae Ararici et Rhodanici* by two Gallic nobles representing their tribes as *allecti arcae Galliarum*, L. Besius Superior, from the Viromandui<sup>59</sup> and Tauricius Florens of the Veneti (who was also patron of the *nautae Ligerici*)<sup>60</sup>. Being mentioned as clients of such important men at such a top-location was highly honourable for the *collegia* in question. However, although the nature of the *arecarii* and the *condeates* is not clear, they were probably closely connected to the *Arca Galliarum* and its administration<sup>61</sup>.

A *curator* or *patronus* of the *nautae Ararici et Rhodanici*, Marullius Marcellinus, is mentioned as patron of an association of Valentini on his epitaph in Saint-Blaise (Gallia Narbonensis). But the inscription is known only through a garbled manuscript and was in any case very fragmentary<sup>62</sup>.

We should beware to conclude that modest *collegia* were unable to obtain patronage or benefactions from important men. The patron of the *ferrarii Dibione consistentes* and the *lapidarii pago Andomo consistentes*, Ti. Flavius Vetus, appears to have been an influential man. He was honoured by his clients with an *ara votiva* to Jupiter and Fortuna Redux upon his return from a voyage which he probably undertook on their behalf<sup>63</sup>.

Modest *collegia* were unable to honour their patrons as splendidly and conspicuously as important *collegia*, while conversely the patrons themselves and others found it unnecessary to mention such modest clients on their epitaphs or public monuments. Consequently links between common and illustrious *collegia* through shared patronage have little chance of being recorded.

<sup>56</sup> *CIL* 6.29722 ; Le Roux 1986 : 269 ; Rico 2004 : 428 ; Rémy 1973 ; Vallat 1981 : 262-263. Another freedmen of the Ulatii family, C. Ulatius Meleager is attested as *sevir augustalis* and patron of all *collegia licita* of Lyon. These certainly included the three *collegia principalia* of the *fabri*, the *dendrophori* and the *centonarii* *CIL* 13.01974. Cf. Rémy 1973 : 92 ; Vallat 1981 : 262-263.

<sup>57</sup> *CIL* 13.8255 = *RSK* 155.

<sup>58</sup> *CIL* 11.390-391 ; cf. Wierschowski 1995: 200.

<sup>59</sup> *CIL* 13.1688 = *AE* 1974, 421 ; Wierschowski 2001: 302-303, no. 423 ; Rougé 1974.

<sup>60</sup> *CIL* 13.709 ; Wierschowski 2001: 303-304; Rougé 1974.

<sup>61</sup> The *condeates* derive their name from the district at the confluence of Rhône and Saône, where the *Ara Romae et Augusti* and the *arca Galliarum* was located. Waltzing 1895-1900: 86 thought both they and the *arecarii* were local boatmen, but nothing supports this idea. Audin 1986: 74 believes that they were 'les passeurs de la Saône à Condate survivant à la construction d'un pont en dur sous la forme d'une corporation de mainteneurs de traditions immémoriales'. He thinks *arca* was a type of boat, or possibly we should read *helciarum* which refers to the rigging of the boat. None of this is very convincing. Recently Bérard, more plausibly, suggested at a session of the research program 'Empreinte te Rome', held at the Université Catholique de Louvain in 2007, April 25th) that the 'ar(e)carii' were staff attached to the 'Arca Galliarum'.

<sup>62</sup> *CIL* 12.2438.

<sup>63</sup> *CIL* 13,5474 ; *CIL* 13, 05475.

## Conclusion

---

Voluntary associations are not only recorded more often in the Gallic and German provinces than in the Spanish provinces, they had a distinctively more important role in allowing indigenous elites and lower class businessmen to acquire status positions within the Roman 'New Order'.

Whereas in the Spanish provinces the imperial *annona* was the only driving force that defined the *corpus oleariorum* as a major 'gateway' to status positions, the Gallic and German provinces show a much denser and multi-functional network of voluntary associations fulfilling this role. The associations formed an integral, semi-institutional part of how the Gallic and German provinces were organised and how 'Romanised' society functioned. Thus, they shaped a 'middle class' with wealth, political influence and clear opportunities for upward mobility.

## Bibliography

---

- J. M. Abascal– S. F. Ramallo, *La ciudad de Carthago Nova: la documentacion epigrafica. 2 vol.* (Murcia, 1997)
- Alföldi, 'La corporation des Transalpini et Cisalpini à Avenches', *SP* 16 (1952), 3-9
- G. Alföldy, 'Beiträge zur Prosopographie von Concordia', *Aquileia Nostra* 51 (1980), 258-327
- G. Alföldy, 'Zur Nomenklatur und Laufbahn eines römischen Ritters aus Concordia', *ZPE* 63 (1986), 173-180
- Audin, *Gens de Lugdunum* (Bruxelles, 1986)
- F. M. Ausbüttel, *Untersuchungen zu den Vereinen im Westen des römischen Reiches* (Kallmünz, 1982)
- J.M. Blázquez, 'Inscripciones de olearii en Hispalis', *Acta XII Congressus Internationalis Epigraphicae Graecae et Latinae (Barcelona, 3-8 Sept. 2002)* (Barcelona, 2007), 179-184
- P. A. Brunt, 'The Equites in the late Republic', *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays* (Oxford, 1988)
- G. Chic Garcia – E. García Vargas – A.S. Romo Salas – M.A. Tabales Rodriguez, 'Una nueva inscripción annonaria de Sevilla: M. Iulius Hermesianus, *diffusor olei ad annonam urbi*', *Habis* 32 (2001), 353-374
- G. Chic Garcia, 'Los Aelii en la producción y la difusión del aceite Bético', *MBHG* 11 (1992), 1-22
- M. Christol, 'Les naviculaires d'Arles et les structures du grand commerce maritime sous l'empire romain', *PH* 22 (1982), 5-14
- M. Christol, 'Remarques sur les naviculaires d'Arles', *Latomus* 30 (1971), 643-663
- M. Christol, 'Nîmes et les marchands de vin romains', Fr. Berard François – Y. Le Bohec (edd.), *Inscriptions latines de Gaule Narbonnaise (Actes Table Ronde, Centre d'Etudes romaines, 1990)* (Lyon – Paris, 1992)
- M. Christol, 'Activité économique, appartenance à l'élite et notabilité : les collèges dans la Gaule méridionale et la vallée du Rhône', M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni – L. Lamoine (edd.), *Les élites et leur facettes. Les élites locales dans le monde hellénistique et romain* (Rome, 2003)
- M. Christol – S. Demougin, 'Notes de prosopographie équestre', *ZPE* 57 (1984), 163-170
- J. Debal, 'Les découvertes de Vienne-en-Val (Loiret) en mai 1963', *Revue Archéologique du Centre* 8 (1969), 211-220
- J. Debal, 'Les découvertes de Vienne-en-Val (Loiret), de 1968 à 1970', *RA* (1972), 178-184
- L. De Salvo, *Economia privata e pubblici servizi nell'impero romano : i corpora naviculariorum* (Messina, 1992)
- H. Devijver, *Prosopographia militiarum equestrum quae fuerunt ab Augusto ad Gallienum* (Leuven, 1976-2001)
- Diaz Ariño, 'Heisce magistris. Aproximación a los collegia de la Hispania republicana a través de sus paralelos italianos y delios', *Gerion* 22 (2004), 447-478
- Domergue, *Les mines de la Péninsule Ibérique dans l'antiquité romaine* (Rome, 1990)
- Ferreruela– J. F. Mesa – J. A. Mínguez – M. Navarro, 'Una inscripción republicana de la sede de una posible corporación en la Cabañeta (El Burgo de Ebro, Zaragoza): Nuevos datos sobre la ocupación Romana del Valle del Ebro', *AEA* 76 (2003), 217-230
- J.-M. Flambard, 'Observations sur la nature des magistris italiens de Délos', F. Coarelli – D. Musti – H. Solin (curr.), *Delo e l'Italia* (Roma, 1982)
- J.-M. Flambard, 'Les collèges et les élites locales à l'époque républicaine d'après l'exemple de Capoue', M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni (ed.), *Les 'bourgeoisies municipales Italiennes aux IIIe et Ier siècles av. J.-C.* (Coll. Int. CNRS, Naples 1981) (Paris – Naples, 1983)

- R. Frei Stolba, 'Q. Otacilius Pollinus: inquisitor III Galliarum', P. Kneissl – V. Losemann (edd.), *Alte Geschichte und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (Darmstadt, 1988), 186-201
- P. Ginestet, *Les associations de jeunesse dans l'occident Romain* (Bruxelles, 1991)
- Ph. A. Harland, *Associations, Synagogues and Congregations. Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society* (Minneapolis, 2003)
- Hasenohr, 'Les collèges de magistri et la communauté italienne de Délos', C. Müller – C. Hasenohr (edd.), *Les Italiens dans le monde grec : IIe siècle av. J.-C. - Ier siècle ap. J.-C. : circulation, activités, intégration* (Actes table ronde, École normale supérieure, Paris, 1998) (Athènes, 2002)
- H. E. Herzig, 'Eine neue Otacilier-Inschrift auf der Engehalbinsel Bern', *Jahrbuch der Schweizerischen Gesellschaft für Ur- und Frühgeschichte* 57 (1972-1973), 175-182
- H. E. Herzig, 'Die Familie der Otacilier in Aventicum', *Jahrbuch des Bernischen Historischen Museums* 53-54 (1973-1974), 35-41
- H. E. Herzig, 'Die Otacilier-Inschrift von der Engelhalbinsel Bern', *Helvetia Archaeologica* 4 (1973), 7-11
- H. E. Herzig, 'Otacilius Seccius Duovir', *Pro Aventico* 22 (1974), 67-68
- M. Jaczynowska, *Les associations de la jeunesse sous le Haut-Empire* (Wroclaw, 1978)
- J. S. Kloppenborg, 'Collegia and thiasoi. Issues in function, taxonomy and membership', in: J. S. Kloppenborg – Wilson S. (edd.), *Voluntary associations in the Graeco-Roman world* (London & New York, 1996), p. 16-30
- P. Kneissl, 'Die utricularii. Ihre Rolle im gallo-römischen Transportwesen und Weinhandel', *BJ* 181 (1981), 169-204
- J. Krier, *Die Treverer ausserhalb ihrer Civitas. Mobilität und Aufstieg* (Trier, 1981)
- M. Labrousse, *Toulouse antique des origines à l'établissement des Wisigoths* (Paris, 1968)
- R. Lafer, *Omnes collegiati, <concurrere>! Brandbekämpfung im Imperium Romanum* (Frankfurt am Main, 2001)
- M. Leglay, 'Autour des corporations d'Alba', in: *BSAF* (1964), 140-152
- P. Le Roux, 'L'huile de Betique et le prince sur un itinéraire annonaire', *REA* 88 (1986), 247-271 Th. Mommsen, *De sodaliciis et collegiis Romanorum* (Kiel, 1843)
- J. Liu, *Occupation, Social Organization, and Public Service in the Collegia Centonariorum in the Roman Empire (First Century BC – Fourth Century AD)* (Columbia University PhD, 2004)
- H. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions. A Lexicon and Analysis* (Hakkert, 1974)
- G. Neuman, 'Die germanische Matronen-Beinamen', G. Bauchhenss – G. Neuman (edd.), *Matronen und verwandte Gottheiten. Ergebnisse eines Kolloquiums veranstaltet von der Göttinger Akademiekommision für die Altertumskunde Mittel- und Nordeuropas* (Bonn – Köln, 1987), 103-132
- Nicolet, *L'ordre équestre à l'époque républicaine. (312-43 av. J.-C.) 2 Vols.* (Paris, 1966-1974)
- H. Pavis D'Escurac, *La préfecture de l'annone, service administratif impérial, d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (Rome, 1976)
- H. G. PFLAUM, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain* (Paris, 1960-1982)
- G. Picard, 'Les fouilles de Vienne-en-Val (Loiret)'. *CRAI* (1970), 176-191
- F. Piernavieja, 'El 'collegium assot(an)orum' y otros similares', *AEA* 50-51 (1977-1978), 437-443
- S. F. Ramallo, 'Inscripciones sobre pavimentos de época republicana en la Hispania romana', *Epigrafía hispánica de época romano-republicana* (Zaragoza, 1986)
- S. F. Ramallo, *Mosaicos romanos de Carthago Nova (Hispania Citerior)* (Valencia, 1985)
- J. Remesal, 'Sextus Iulius Possessor en la Bética', *Homenaje al Dr. Michel Ponsich*, Gerion Anexos III (Madrid, 1991), 281-295
- Rémy, 'Une grande famille ségusiave: les Ulattii', *Revue Archéologique de l'Est du Centre-Est* 25 (1973), 95-110
- J. Reynolds, 'Q. Otacilius Pollinus of Aventicum', *Pro Aventico* 20 (1969), 53-57; pl. 14-16;
- Rico, 'Mercatores, negotiatores et diffusores olearii', *REA* 105 (2004), 413-433
- J. Rougé, 'Utricularii', *CH* 4 (1959), 285-306
- J. Rougé, 'Les relations de Lyon et de la mer ; Les relations de Lyon et de la mer, à propos du CIL XIII, 1942', *Actes du 89ème congrès national des sociétés savantes. Section d'archéologie* (Lyon, 1964) (Paris, 1965)
- J. Rougé, 'Les rapports de Lyon avec l'ouest - nord-ouest Gaulois: à propos de trois inscriptions', *Revue Archéologique de l'Est et du Centre-Est* 25 (1974), 137-146
- H. L. Royden, *Magistrates of the Roman Professional Colleges in Italy from the First to the Third Century A.D.* (Pisa, 1988)

- Chr. Ruger, Gallisch-Germanische Kurien', *Epigraphische Studien. Sammelband IX* (Bonn, 1972), 251-260
- J. Santero Santurino, *Asociaciones populares en Hispania Romana* (Sevilla, 1978)
- J. Scheid, 'Aspects religieux de la municipalisation', M. Dondin-Payre – M.-T. Raepsaet Charlier (edd.), *Cites, Municipales, Colonies. Les processus de municipalisation en Gaule et en Germanie sous le Haut-Empire* (Paris, 1999), 381-423
- B. Sirks, *Food for Rome, The Legal Structure of the Transportation and Processing of Supplies for the Imperial Distributions in Rome and Constantinople* (Amsterdam, 1984)
- Tchernia, 'D. Caecilius Hospitalis et M. Iulius Hermesianus (CIL VI,1625b et 20742)', *Producci3n y comercio del aceite en la Antigüedad. Primer congreso Internacional I, Universidad Complutense* (Madrid, 1980), 155-160
- N. Tran, *Les membres des associations romaines : le rang social des collegiati en Italie et en Gaules, sous le Haut-Empire* (Rome, 2006)
- J.P. Vallat, 'La cite des Segusiaves  l'poque romaine', S. Walker (ed.), *Rcentes recherches en archologie gallo-romaine et palochrtienne sur Lyon et sa rgion* (Oxford, 1981), 167-278 (esp. 262-263)
- O. Van Nijf, *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East* (Amsterdam, 1997)
- K. Verboven, 'The associative order, status and ethos of Roman businessmen in Late Republic and Early Empire', *Athenaeum* 95 (2007), 861-893.
- G. Walser, 'Corpus mercatorum Cisalpinorum et transalpinorum', *MH* 48 (1991), 169-175
- J.-P. Waltzing, *Etude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu' la chute de l'Empire d'occident. 4 vol.* (Bruxelles & Louvain, 1895-1900)
- L. Wierschowski, *Die regionale Mobilitt in Gallien nach den Inschriften des 1. bis 3. Jh n. Chr.* (Stuttgart 1995)
- L. Wierschowski, *Fremde in Gallien - 'Gallier' in der Fremde. Die epigraphisch bezeugte Mobilitt in, von und nach Gallien vom 1. Bis 3. Jh. n. Chr.* (Stuttgart, 2001)