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This paper studies the meaning and function of the titles “patroness” and “mother” of collegia in Italy and the Latin-speaking provinces of the Roman Empire in the first three centuries CE. It is investigated why some collegia co-opted female patrons or appointed “mothers.” What was expected from these women and was there any difference between a “mother” and a patroness of a collegium? On the basis of epigraphic evidence it is argued that patrona collegii and mater collegii were no empty titles but denoted distinct functions exercised by different classes of women. Whereas patronesses were, as a rule, outsiders to the collegium they patronized, “mothers” were mostly social climbers from within the ranks of the collegia. Though both types of women acted on behalf of the collegium, they did so in a different way. Moreover, they were honored differently. Collegia, therefore, had good reasons to distinguish between the titles they gave them.

On the 23rd of January in 224 CE the association of builders (collegium fabrum), one of the three main Roman collegia, met in their schola (clubhouse) in Volsinii to discuss an important issue: the co-optation of a new patron. The chief magistrates of the collegium, the quinquennales, made the following proposition:

quanto amore quantaque affectione Laberius Gallus p(rimi)p(ilaris)v(ir)e(gregius)erga / colleg(eg)ium nost(rum)agere instituerit bene vita eius iam dudum in nos / conlata conam et ideo Anchariam Lupercam uxorem / eius filiam Anchari quondam Celeris b(onae)m(emoriae)v(iri)

I am very grateful to the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) for its financial support. I also thank the anonymous readers for Classical Antiquity for their thoughtful comments. All dates in this article are CE.

1. For Roman collegia the extensive study by Waltzing 1895–1900, though of course outdated, is still fundamental; Mennella and Apicella 2000 provide a supplement to his collection of epigraphic sources, but only for Italy. For recent studies of Roman collegia in the imperial period in Italy and the Latin-speaking West, see Ausbütel 1982, Patterson 1992 and 1994, Kloppenborg and Wilson
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cuius proles et / prosapia omnibus honoribus patriae (n)ostrae) sincera
fide func tua est in honorem eorum et pro morum eius castitatae (!) / et
iam prisci consuetudinis sanctitatae (!) patrona / collegi(i) n(ostri)
cooptemus statuam etiam ei aeream iuxta eundem Laberium Gallum
maritum suum in schola collegi(i) n(ostri) / ponamus qu(uid) d(e) e(a) r(e)
f(ii)er) p(laceret) u(niversi) i(ta) c(ensuerunt) recte et merito retulisse /
q(uin)q(uennales) n(ostrors) ut Anchariam Lupercam honestam matronam
sanctitatem et disciplinae caerimoni(i)os etiam praedit(am=IS) fem-
inam / in honorem Laberi Galli p(rimi)p(ilaris) e(gregii) v(ir) mariti eius
patroni collegi(i) / n(ostri) et in memoriam Anchari quondam Celeris
patris eius / dignissimam patronam cooptemus statuamque ei aeream /
in schola collegi(i) n(ostri) iuxta eundem Laberium Gallum maritum /
sum ponamus ut eius erga {a} nos pietas et nostra erga eam vo/luntas
publica etiam visionem {m} conspiciatur tabulam quoque patrocinalem in
domo eius adfigid.

CIL XI, 2702 = ILS 7217

With how much love and affection Laberius Gallus, *primipilaris* (centu-
rium of the first maniple) and a distinguished man (= of equestrian rank),
has made it his practice to act towards our collegium is confirmed by
his benefactions which he since long has showered on us. Let us there-
fore co-opt as a *patrona* of our collegium his wife, Ancharia Luperca,
the daughter of the late Ancharius Celer, of blessed memory, whose oFF-
spring and family fulfilled all magistracies of our city in a sincere and
trustworthy manner. Let us co-opt her in honor of them and because of
the chastity of her morals and the purity of her traditional habits. Let us
also set up for her a bronze statue in the clubhouse of our collegium next
to that of her husband, Laberius Gallus. When asked for their opinion
all unanimously decided that: our chief magistrates (*quinquennales*) have
rightly and deservedly proposed that we should co-opt Ancharia Luperca,
an honorable *matrona* (= of equestrian rank) of a pure character and habit,
dowed with feelings of religious veneration, in honor of her husband
Laberius Gallus, *primipilaris*, a distinguished man and a patron of our
collegium, and in memory of her father, the late Ancharius Celer, as a
most worthy patroness, and that we should erect a bronze statue of her
in the clubhouse of our collegium next to that of her husband, Laberius
Gallus, so that her devotion towards us and our goodwill towards her will
be visible for all in the public view, and also that a *tabula patronatus* is to
be attached to (a wall) in her house.

The bronze plaque with this decree was found in the *tablinum* of a Roman house in
Bolsena (ancient Volsinii), which apparently belonged to Ancharia Luperca and
Laberius Gallus. We may assume that, some time after drafting the decree and
assuring themselves of the consent of their prospective patroness, the members of the collegium sent delegates to her house to offer her the bronze tabula patronatus confirming, and commemorating, the co-optation. She hung it on a wall in the tablinum, where it would be in full view. So far, there is no difference between the co-optation of male and female patrons. The reasons for co-opting her, however, seem very much influenced by gender: Ancharia Luperca is praised for typically female virtues (chastity and pristine virtue) and she is co-opted not in the first place—or so it seems—for her own merits, but in honor of her deceased father and her husband, both of whom had considerable merits for the collegium and the city, her husband being a patron of the collegium himself. How should we understand her patronage and that of women like her?

It is well known that in their procedure of co-opting patrons—as in their organization generally—collegia imitated the cities. Like city patrons most patrons of collegia were men, but not exclusively so: among the numerous patrons of a collegium (in some cases more than ten at a time), a few women do appear. This makes one wonder about the role of gender in the patronage of collegia. Why did some of these “essentially masculine societies” co-opt women among their patrons? What did collegia expect of their patronae and how did they phrase their expectations? What services did patronesses provide and what benefits did they reap? And what is the relationship between these patronesses and the puzzling “mothers” of collegia? Should we assume that both were purely honorific titles bestowed on a woman on account of her male relatives, or do they imply an actual function? And, if so, were these titles used for the same function? Or do the differences between them point to distinct functions exercised by (different classes of) women?

In this paper I restrict myself to patronesses and “mothers” of collegia in Italy and the Latin-speaking provinces of the Roman Empire in the first three centuries CE. From the Republican period no evidence for female patronage or “motherhood” of collegia survives, nor is there any from late antiquity, when, moreover, the collegia changed in substance. We should not forget,
however, that the limitation of the evidence to the first three centuries CE may be connected with the Roman “epigraphic habit”\(^6\) rather than with an actual absence of women from collegia in earlier or later periods. In my discussion of collegia I follow recent opinion defining them as voluntary associations of the lower (but not the actually poor) and middle classes\(^7\) of urban society that are organized on the basis of a communal profession, cult or location. Collegia provided fellowship, sociability and communal burial, a collective social identity as well as an opportunity for the members to fill magistracies and positions of honor in the collegium, which were beyond their reach in the public life of their cities.\(^8\) The Latin terminology is varied; it includes—apart from collegium—such terms as sodalicium, sodalitas, corpus and, for its membership, ordo (confusingly also used for the ordo decurionum of the collegium), populus and numerus, further cultores (with the name of the patron god) and the name of the members in the plural (e.g. fabri or centonarii). To elucidate differences and similarities between them, patronesses and “mothers” of collegia will be discussed separately; both will be set against the background of male patronage and “fatherhood” of collegia.

SELECTING THE EVIDENCE

Compared to male patrons of collegia (almost four hundred are known) patronesses and “mothers” of collegia have left relatively few traces. Moreover, they have hardly received any scholarly attention, but were mostly listed among male patrons without attention to gender or to the difference between their titles.\(^9\) Critically reviewing earlier lists and adding new finds, I have collected fourteen patronesses and twenty-one inscriptions mentioning twenty-six “mothers” of collegia from the cities of Italy and the Latin-speaking provinces (see tables).\(^10\)

---

7. Or, less anachronistically, the plebs media, see van Nijf 1997: 18–23.
8. See Kloppenborg 1996, Aebiütel 1982, Patterson 1992 and 1994, van Nijf 1997. The rigid division by Walzing 1895–1900 in professional, religious and burial associations is now generally discarded; most modern scholars agree that the boundaries between these associations are blurred, collegia combining professional and cultic interests with conviviality and communal burial. Nevertheless, for the sake of convenience I will here use the conventional terms “professional” and “religious” associations (distinguished on the basis of their names).
9. Clemente 1972 lists 292 inscriptions mentioning male and female patrons (including “mothers” and “fathers”) of collegia, most of them mentioning more than one patron. Walzing 1895–1900: vol. IV, 388–406 lists 249 patrons (including women), 18 “mothers” (pp. 369–370) and 23 “fathers” (pp. 372–73) of collegia. Saavedra Guerrero 1995 and 1998 briefly discusses 57 patrons (among whom three women) and some “mothers” of collegia. For the use of familial terminology (especially “father,” “mother” and “brother”) in associations and synagogues in the Greek East, see Harland 2005 and 2007.
10. Walzing 1895–1900: vol. IV, 369–70 (18 “mothers”) and 373 (11 patronae) and Clemente 1972: 13 patronae and 14 inscriptions mentioning matres collegiorum. However, both include matres synagogae (CIL V, 4411= InscJt X, 5, 204 = ILS 6724 and CIL VI, 29756) and several other patronesses who are excluded here for various reasons (see the following note).
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My main criterion is that a woman has to be explicitly called patrona or mater of a collegium, or to be addressed as such by a collegium.11 Thus, honorific statues set up by collegia for women, who are not explicitly called patronae in the inscription, are omitted12 and the same holds for inscriptions praising women only for their benefactions to collegia.13 Though sometimes compared to collegia, synagogues (and the matres synagogarum) are also left out, as are the domestic associations of slaves and freed(wo)men from the same household. Yet, I do list a patrona and a mater of the Augustales, though their collegium is organized on a somewhat different basis.14

DISTRIBUTION AND SOCIAL STATUS

First, we must investigate the distribution of our evidence, and the social status and family background of the women in question. As regards the inscriptions

11. This excludes Laberia Hostilia Crispina, who is addressed as patrona by the women of her town (mulieres Trebulanae: AE 1946, 106, see Hemelrijk 2004), but also Allia Candida (CIL II, 3229 = ILS 7308) and Valeria Curtiliana (CIL X, 5904), since it is uncertain whether they were patronae of collegia or of their clients and freedmen only. Titia Valeria (CIL IX, 3183) is not listed, since the abbreviation patron, allowing both patron(i) and patronae, makes it possible—and perhaps even likely—that not she, but her husband was a patron of the sevirii Augustales. Though listed by Saavedra Guerrero 1998: 132 among the “mothers” of collegia, matres sacrorum of collegia are left out, since this seems to be a religious function; cf., for instance, Sempronia Salsula and Valeria Paulina, matres sacrorum of a collegium devoted to the cult of Jupiter Hammon Barbarus Silvanus in Carthago (CIL VIII, 24519 = AE 1899, 46 = ILS 4427). For the same reason, I exclude Regina Paterna, mater nata et facta (a grade of initiation?), who dedicated an altar to Semele and her divine sisters ob honorem sacri matratus (CIL XIII, 8244 = ILS 3384, Colonia Agrippinium, Germ. Inf., early 3rd cent.). Finally, Cornelia Procula (CIL XIV, 2112 = ILS 7212 = AE 1983, 181) is excluded, since she seems to be honored as the mother of the patron and benefactor of the collegium salutare Dianae et Antinoi, rather than as a mother of the collegium itself.

12. The best known example is Eumachia, who—without being explicitly addressed as such (CIL X, 813)—has been called a patroness of the fullers, because of the statue they set up for her in her building at the forum of Pompeii; see Castrén 1975: 95 and Severy 2003: 246; Jongman 1988: 184 is rightly cautious, Waltzing 1895–1900: vol. IV, 388–406 and Clemente 1972 do not include her in their lists of patrons of collegia. For other women honored with a statue by a collegium without being addressed as patronesses, see, for instance, CIL V, 4324 = InscrIt X, 5, 110, CIL V, 4355 = InscrIt X, 5, 145, CIL V, 4387 = InscrIt X, 5, 180 and CIL XI, 405.


14. For the collegium of the Augustales, D’Arms 2000; for a distinction between official collegues, such as that of the Augustales, and “private” collegia, see Kloppenborg 1996: 16–17. For synagogues as collegia, see Richardson 1996; for “mothers” of synagogues, see Brooten 1982: 57–72: she discusses six inscriptions, all from Italy; for parental titles in synagogues in the Greek East, see Harland 2007. Associations of slaves and freed(wo)men of grand households are mainly found in Rome, especially, but not exclusively, among the large staffs of members of the imperial family. In inscriptions, such domestic collegia are sometimes hard to distinguish from their civic counterparts, since they were similarly organized having the same magistracies and positions of honor; see Kloppenborg 1996: 23. When in doubt, I have excluded the inscription from my list: thus, Grania (CIL VI, 10346) is excluded, since she was either a patrona of the decurions of the Vigiles (night patrol) in Rome (who were not organized as a collegium) or of a domestic association; see Waltzing 1895–1900: vol. IV, 296.
mentioning _patronae of collegia_, it strikes the eye that, with one exception, all come from Italy, especially central Italy (see table 1). Though this agrees with the predominance of Italy in our evidence for male patrons of _collegia_—and for _collegia_ in general—the geographical range of patronesses seems even more restricted: no patronesses of _collegia_ are attested in Rome or in the provinces of Gallia and the Balkan and Danube regions, which yield ample evidence for male patrons and for _collegia_ in general. The evidence for “mothers” of _collegia_ is spread somewhat wider: six inscriptions come from Roman cities in the Danube regions (Dacia and Moesia Inferior), and single instances from respectively Dalmatia and Hispania Tarraconensis (table 4). Moreover, the Italian evidence includes inscriptions from the city of Rome.

Most inscriptions mentioning patronesses and “mothers” of _collegia_ can be dated in the second and early third centuries, which is in line with the epigraphic evidence for male patrons and for _collegia_ in general (and with the peak of the Roman “epigraphic habit” in most regions of the Latin West). Thus, apart from their numbers, female patrons do not differ markedly from male ones, but their restriction to Italy (with one exception) and their absence from Rome make their geographical range somewhat narrower than that of male patrons. Inscriptions for “mothers” of _collegia_, however, are distributed more widely: both in numbers and in geographical range they are similar to those for “fathers” of these associations.

A conspicuous difference between patronesses and “mothers” of _collegia_ is their social status. Like their male peers, quite a few patronesses of _collegia_ were members of the equestrian or senatorial elite (table 1); one of them (Egnatia Certiana) even was daughter of a consul. Due to the brevity or fragmentary state of the inscription the social rank of some of them is unknown, but their _filiation_ is proof of their free birth.

A conspicuous difference between patronesses and “mothers” of _collegia_ is their social status. Like their male peers, quite a few patronesses of _collegia_ were members of the equestrian or senatorial elite (table 1); one of them (Egnatia Certiana) even was daughter of a consul. Due to the brevity or fragmentary state of the inscription the social rank of some of them is unknown, but their _filiation_ is proof of their free birth. Compared to them, the social rank of “mothers” of _collegia_ was considerably lower (table 4): apart from two women of equestrian...
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and one of decurial (or perhaps equestrian) rank, all seem to have belonged to the sub-elite classes; many were of freed descent or freedwomen themselves, one possibly of slave status. In some names their foreign origin shines through suggesting that they were freed or recently Romanized citizens. Apparently, they were recruited from the same classes of society as the members of *collegia*. The few “mothers” who were of high rank were appointed solely by the three most prominent *collegia*, the *fabri* (builders), *centonarii* (textile workers or traders) and *dendrophori* (“tree-carriers,” connected with the cult of Magna Mater), privileged *collegia* that also attracted wealthy citizens—even of the decurial class—as members.19 This conspicuous difference in social status between patronesses and “mothers” of *collegia* suggests that the distinction between the two titles was deliberate. Different titles were given to women of distinct classes.20 Why this was done and whether these titles indicated different functions, or were perhaps purely honorific, will be discussed below.

A FAMILY AFFAIR?

Many *collegia*, especially the larger among them, had more than one patron at a time. Thus, our patronesses were probably not the only ones patronizing a *collegium* and, in fact, in some inscriptions also other patrons are mentioned (see table 2). Some of these patrons and patronesses appear to have been related by blood or marriage. Thus, Ancharia Luperca was co-opted as a *patrona* of the *collegium fabrum* of her hometown in recognition of her husband, who was a *patronus* of the same *collegium*. Setina Iusta was co-opted by the *collegium fabrum* of Pisaurum together with her younger son Petronius Auffidius Victorinus, her husband and older sons already being its patrons. The statue base in honor of Rutilia Paulina probably stood next to that of her brother, who was similarly praised by the *seviri Augustales* of Corfinium for his patronage.21 Finally, Cissonia Aphrodite was a *patrona* of the *collegium fabrum et centonariorum* of Mediolanum together with her husband, and Vesia Martina, her husband Coretius

19. Ausbüttel 1982: 77. The *fabri*, *centonarii* and *dendrophoroi* were the three most important *collegia* in the towns of Italy and the western provinces; together, they were sometimes indicated as the *collegia tria*, or *collegia principalia*; see, for instance, *CIL* V, 7881 and 7905. *CIL* XI, 5749, Patterson 1994: 234–38. For the opinion as they had a civic role as firefighters, Waltzing 1895–1900: vol. II, 194–208 and 351–55, Meiggs 1973: 320, Ausbüttel 1982: 71–78, Kloppenborg 1996: 24 and Mennella and Apicella 2000: 22–24; this notion has recently been challenged by van Nijf 1997: 176–81, 1999 and 2002, and Perry 2006: 7–18.

20. Pace Herzig 1983: 90 who, on the basis of evidence from Ostia, assumes that both *patronae* and *matres* belonged to the middle classes of Roman society and that they were appointed by religious *collegia* only, but Ostia may have been an exception in this respect. Saavedra Guerrero 1998 discusses the question whether *matres* were wealthy women whose relatively low social status debarred them from being co-opted as patronesses.

21. *CIL* IX, 3181: *C(aio) Rutilio C(ai) f(ilio) / Pal(atina) Gallico / ordo Augustal(ium) / patrono / merita / patris et ipsius / p(osuit); *RE* 1A, Rutilius (19), col. 1262.
Fuscus and their son Coretius Sabinus were patrons of the *collegium centonariorum* of Sentinum. This raises the question whether patronage of *collegia* was a family affair and perhaps even hereditary, men—and in some cases women—of wealthy upper-class families being chosen for the sake of their families rather than for their personal merit. However, though some inscriptions seem to point in this direction, we should not overestimate the role of the family. Of course, members of wealthy and influential families were preferred as patrons both by their cities and by *collegia*. But like municipal patronage, patronage of *collegia* was not hereditary: each patron was co-opted personally by an official decree of the *collegium*. The fact that patronage or benefactions performed by relatives are sometimes mentioned in the co-optation decree seems meant to honor the prospective patron(ess), and perhaps to stimulate emulation, rather than indicate that it was based on a notion of hereditary patronage.

For “mothers” of *collegia* a different picture appears. Apart from being listed sometimes together with patrons, more than one “mother” may be appointed by the same *collegium*. As a rule, no family relationship between individual “mothers,” “fathers” or “daughters” of *collegia* can be established. Thus, there is no indication that “motherhood” was a hereditary title or one that was given to the wife of a “father.” Instead, two other connections stand out: “mothers” of elite rank were sometimes related to patrons of *collegia*, whereas among “mothers” of sub-elite class a relationship with other officials of the same *collegium* seems more telling (table 5). For example, in honor of the late Memmia Victoria, *mater* of the *collegium fabrum* of Sentinum, her son Coretius Fuscus was co-opted as a patron of this association, and Egnatia Salviana was appointed as “mother” by the *dendrophori* of Lavinium at the same time as they co-opted her husband as their patron. At first sight, there seems to have been some confusion as to the titles “patroness” or “mother” for Memmia Victoria: though addressed as *mater numeri nostri* (“mother” of our club) in the *tabula patronatus* for her son, Memmia Victoria is later grouped with her relatives as patrons of the *collegium*. Yet, even here the distinction between the titles is firmly upheld: as a patron, Coretius Fuscus is presented with the bronze *tabula patronatus*, whereas Memmia as a “mother” seems to have received no such tablet, and the same holds for Egnatia Salviana and her husband. Thus, the distinction between patron(esse)s and “fathers” and “mothers” of *collegia* is evidenced by material means: patron(esse)s were festively presented with the *tabula patronatus* by a

---

22. *CIL* IX, 1684: patron *ab avo et maioribus*; also children were sometimes co-opted as patrons, see *CIL* XIV, 341 (a boy of twelve). For a similar role of the family in civic patronage, see Hemelrijk 2004: 216–20.

23. *CIL* XI, 5748 = *ILS* 7220: *ut per ordinem generis sui omnes in numerum nostrum appellarentur* (“in order that all of her family in succession will in our club be called patrons of our association”); her son, Coretius Fuscus, her daughter-in-law Vesia Martina and her grandson, Coretius Sabinus, were patrons of the *collegium centonariorum*; see *CIL* XI, 5749 = *AE* 1992, 562 = *ILS* 7221. Coretius Victorinus, probably a relative (a brother?) of Coretius Fuscus, was their patron as well; see *CIL* XI, 5750.
delegation from the collegium, whereas no commemorative tablet is known for patres and matres of collegia.

THE CO-OPTING COLLEGIA

Which collegia appointed patronesses or “mothers”? Are patronesses and “mothers” perhaps to be found especially in “religious” associations or in collegia that had women among the members? In broaching these questions we should keep in mind that our evidence for the membership of collegia is scarce and depends mainly on the fortuitous survival of alba collegii (membership lists). Yet, the evidence allows us to draw a distinction between collegia co-opting patronesses and those appointing “mothers.” As appears from tables 1 and 2, patronesses were not co-opted especially by “religious” associations or by collegia with female members. On the contrary, seven patronesses were co-opted by the fabri and centonarii, the nautae (shippers) and the parasiti (actors), all of which were “professional” associations without—as far as we know—female members.

An exclusively male membership is also commonly assumed for the sodalicium iuvenum Herculanorum, an association of young men deriving its name from the cult of Hercules, and—perhaps too easily—for the Augustales. Nothing is known of the membership of the tricliniares, a collegium deriving its name from its convivial activities. By contrast, only three “religious” associations are known to have co-opted patronesses: the cultores Iovis Latii (devoted to the cult of Jupiter Latius), the collegium (h)astoforum Ostiensium (connected with the cult of Bellona) and the cultores collegii Larum (worshipping the Lares). In only one of these are female members attested: the incomplete album collegii of the “worshippers of Jupiter Latius” lists three women among twenty-four men. Apart from this, women are found among the members of the unidentified collegium patronized by Valeria Severina (table 2). In short, no predominance of “religious”

24. Meiggs 1973: 327; according to Ausbultel 1982: 42, female members are found especially in religious collegia.
25. As has been said above (n.8) the term “professional” association should be taken loosely: persons with other professions could also occasionally be accepted as members; see Ausbultel 1982: 35–36. This holds especially for the fabri, centonarii and dendrophori, who according to van Nijf 1997: 179, 1999 and 2002 were not primarily occupational associations but formed a status group for “the most ambitious and wealthy craftsmen in town”; see also Ausbultel 1982: 74–75 who argues that the collegium of the centonarii was not merely a professional association, but rather a privileged group of collegiati.
26. Exceptions do occur: the Augustales of Misenum adlected a benefactress, the widow of a former Augustalis and benefactor, as a member of their association; see D’Arms 2000. They also had female priests; see AE 1993, 477: Cassia Victoria was sacerdos Augustalium and benefactress of the Augustales of Misenum, and AE 2001, 854: Marcia Polybiane is listed in the album of the Augustales of Liternum as sacerdos Augustalium. CIL XIV, 3657 = InscrIt IV, 1, 212 is set up in honor of Claudia Rufina who was adlected as a member of the college of Augustales in Tibur.
27. The collegium patronized by Valeria Severina lists fifteen men and six women (AE 1946, 120 = CIL II, 5812), who according to Clemente 1972: 160 were the wives of some of the male members. Since wives are not normally mentioned in such lists, it seems more likely that they were female
associations or of collegia with female members is found. Instead, most evidence for female patronage comes from the wealthiest and most important “professional” collegia—such as the fabri, the centonarii and the nautae—and from prestigious civic organizations such as the iuvenes and the Augustales. We may assume that these distinguished groups were well placed to co-opt high-ranking women from families that enjoyed public prominence.

When one examines the collegia appointing “mothers” (table 4), a different practice emerges. First, “religious” collegia—such as the collegium cannonophorum, that of the dendrophori and the dumus (all three connected with the cult of Magna Mater), the collegium Liberi patris and the collegium Aesculapii et Hygiae—play an important role, appointing eleven “mothers” in all. Further, four “mothers” were appointed by a type of collegium that does not appear in our list of patronesses: associations of people bound by a common origin or status, such as the collegium Asianorum in Napoca (Dac.), the collegium Romanorum in Tomis (Moes. Inf.), the collegium [Rom?]janense maius in Laminium (Hisp.Tar.) and the collegium vernaculorum (of house-born slaves and freedmen?) in Salona (Dalm.). In both kinds of collegia there may have been a mixed-gender membership and in several of them female members have actually been ascertained. Thus, the album of the collegium Asianorum in Napoca lists seventeen female members (among whom one mater collegii) and that of the collegium dendrophorum in Luna two filiae of the collegium (and three “mothers”). Mixed membership of the dendrophori is attested in an inscription of Regium Iulium in honor of eight women, two of whom were sacerdotes of the collegium and in a fragmentary Greek inscription from Serdica (Thrac.) showing the names of six female members and a μητηρ δενδροφόρων. Lastly, an album collegii Bacchii vernaculorum in Nicopolis ad Istrum (Moes. Inf.) lists some female members. Reasoning from analogy, we may perhaps assume that there were female members also in the collegium vernaculorum of Salona, which had Placidia Damale, who is also called Rufina, as its “mother.” Moreover, the (incomplete) album of an unidentified collegium...
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in Classis that lists five “mothers” also passes down the names of seven female members (table 5). Compared to them, only few “mothers” have been found in “professional” associations (see table 4: fullones (fullers), fabri navales (ship-builders), fabri and centonarii). Thus, unlike the collegia co-opting patronesses, those appointing “mothers” seem mainly to have been the ones that were open to women as members. In combination with their social rank, this perhaps suggests that, unlike patronesses, matres were often chosen from among the (relatives of) members of the collegium in question.30

BENEFAC TIONS AND PUBLIC HONOR

This brings us to the question of why women were co-opted as patronesses or “mothers” of collegia. What services did they provide and how were they rewarded? Let us start with tangible benefactions, the donation of money or goods: were patronesses and “mothers” of collegia actually benefactresses spending their wealth on their collegia? And what was the relationship between their financial generosity and the public honors or privileges they received? According to the general opinion there was a close relation between benefactions conferred by patrons and the public honor they received.31 Yet, as I have argued elsewhere, this relationship between benefactions and public honor, though important, may have been less direct or straightforward than is usually assumed. Benefactions were not the only, nor even the main, reason for enjoying public honor; high social rank or a prestigious public office was crucial.32 In this connection, the difference in public honor between patronesses and “mothers” is significant. As can be seen in table 3, we have only very little evidence for benefactions performed by patronesses of collegia: Blassia Vera contributed to a distribution of bread, wine and money to celebrate the dedication of an unknown monument and, together with two male colleagues, Iscantia Prima restored the temple of the collegium. Apart from them, Aurelia Crescentia and Vesia Martina are praised in general terms for their generosity (beneficia and munificentia). The merita for which some patronesses are praised do not make clear whether financial benefactions or other services are meant; it is even possible that no services had as yet been performed.33 They will be discussed in the next section. That so few patronesses are praised for (specific) benefactions is the more remarkable, since our evidence

30. See also Kloppenborg 1996: 25 and Meiggs 1973: 318. Similarly, Brooten 1982: 69 assumes that a mater synagogae was “an older, venerable member of the community.”
32. Hemelrijk 2006; for the recipients of public statues, see Alföldy 1979 and 1984.
33. For beneficia and merita in honorific inscriptions, see Forbis 1996: 12–21.
for patronesses of *collegia* consists mostly of honorific inscriptions and *tabulae patronatus*, types of inscriptions that—one would expect—were typically suited to record such benefactions.

This brings us to the public honor they received. In this respect our patronesses are well represented: almost all were honored with a public statue, an honorific inscription on some unknown monument, or with a bronze tablet. These marks of honor stand in no apparent relation to tangible benefactions: on the contrary, almost all public statues and honorific tablets were awarded to patronesses of whom no benefactions are known (table 3). That hardly any benefactions are recorded in these inscriptions does not, however, mean that patronesses of *collegia* did not perform any. In his study of *collegia* in the eastern part of the Roman Empire, Onno van Nijf points out that the honorific language used for patronage deliberately obscures the connection between generosity and public honor: “It was important (because more prestigious) for patrons that they should not be perceived as having bought the honors awarded to them.”

A similar practice may have been at work in the Latin West. Indeed, in dedicating a public statue to their patroness or in offering her a *tabula patronatus*, *collegia* almost completely ignored the economic side of their relationship. Instead, as we shall see in the next section, they referred to the favors or services they enjoyed—or hoped for—in the vaguest possible terms, emphasizing the moral qualities of a patroness, her high social status or simply the fact that she was their patroness. This is surely part of the conventions of honorific language, but it may also reflect feelings as to who was entitled to receive a public statue and for what reason.

Let us now turn to the benefactions performed by “mothers” and the rewards they received. Here, we have more to go on (table 6). Alone, or together with a *pater* or a magistrate of the *collegium*, “mothers” of *collegia* donated altars or statues (Domitia Civitas, Flavia Nona, Iunia Zosime, Pomponia Victorina), contributed to a fund for the communal celebration of their birthdays (Claudia Arria) or donated land and buildings and set up a foundation of 50,000 sesterces (Salvia Marcellina). The substantial benefactions of the last-mentioned “mother” easily rival the most generous donations from male patrons of *collegia*.

Unlike patron(esse)s, however, “mothers” of *collegia* did not enjoy public honor. Instead, they were honored within the *collegium* itself: the birthday of Claudia Arria was celebrated by the *collegium*, Salvia Marcellina shared in the

34. With the term “public” honor I mean statues and other honorific monuments paid for by the city or by a civic collectivity, such as a *collegium*, and set up in a public place (which required permission from the city council, though this is not always mentioned in the inscription; see Eck 1992). Though a *tabula patronatus* was displayed in the house of the patron(ess), *tabulae patronatus* are included here because they were publicly presented by an official delegation consisting of the leading members of the *collegium*.


36. Ausbüttel 1982: 44: gifts of money by patrons amounted to 2,000–50,000 sesterces; see also Clemente 1972: 215–20. For an insightful discussion of the impact of benefactions on *collegia*, see Liu 2007. (I am very grateful to the author for allowing me to read her article before publication.)
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...distributions of the collegium on an equal footing with the chief magistrate, the quinquennalis, and the pater ... and she is mentioned respectfully throughout the statute of the association, which was displayed in the clubhouse. In fact, as the chief benefactor of the collegium her name is mentioned first of all. Moreover, the names of “mothers” received a place of honor in the membership lists (alba collegii). These alba, which were carved on large marble or limestone plaques attached to the wall of the schola, were modelled on the hierarchically organized alba decurionum of the towns. By their monumental size and the place they occupied in the schola they were in full view for the members during their meetings and banquets. Thus, the alba did not simply list the membership, but also confirmed and perpetuated the internal hierarchy of the collegium. The place “mothers” occupy in the alba collegii reflects their high position: their names usually follow those of the patrons of the collegium and either precede all other positions of honor, or are carved after some of the magistrates or immunes (a position of honor entailing exemption from contributions), but before the ordinary members. In one case (Epipodia, who may have been of slave status) the mater only heads the list of female members of the collegium.

In respect of their benefactions and the public honor they enjoyed, patronesses and “mothers” of collegia were poles apart: patronesses left hardly any record of tangible benefactions, but almost all of them were publicly honored. By contrast, despite her benefactions no “mother” seems to have enjoyed public honor. Public honor, it appears, was closely bound up with high social standing but only indirectly related to tangible benefactions. The superior status of patronesses in the outside world was reflected by their position of honor within the collegium; the bronze statue of Ancharia Luperca in the schola of the collegium fabrum duly reminded the members of her importance. Moreover, we may assume—though no evidence survives—that the names of patronesses were carved among, or

37. CIL VI, 10234 = ILS 7213: at the birthday of Antoninus Pius the quinquennalis, the pater and the mater of the collegium were to receive three denarii each, the immunes and curatores each two and the ordinary members each one. At the anniversary of the collegium the quinquennalis, the pater and the mater of the collegium were to receive six denarii each, the immunes and curatores each four (and the ordinary members each two?). Since Salvia Marcellina was the main donor of the capital from the interest of which the distributions were made, the share she received may not have been representative for that of “mothers” in general.


39. AE 1977, 265b: the five “mothers” are listed after the patrons but before the amatores, the scribes and the ordinary male members; the female members are mentioned last. CIL XI, 1355 = ILS 7227: side B, which is broken at the top, lists 29 names of men (patroni?) followed by two immunes, three “mothers,” two filiae, some male members and one bisellarius. CIL XIV, 256 = AE 1955, 182 = IPOsitie-B, 344: 13 patrons followed by 6 quinquennales, 1 mater, 14 honorati (ex-magistrates) and ca. 320 plebei (ordinary members). AE 2001, 854: the mater and the sacerdos Augustalium are listed as the last two of the patroni allecti, immediately to be followed by the corporati. CIL III, 7532 = ILS 4069: the “mother” heads the list of (male) members. CIL III, 870 = ILS 4061: under the name of the “spirarches” (the leader of the collegium), which extends over two columns, the left column lists 27 male members; the right one 16 female members headed by the mater (Epipodia) who, according to Saavedra Guerrero 1998: 132n.26, was of slave status.
immediately after, those of male patrons at the top of the *alba collegii*. In the case of “mothers” things were different: though a *mater collegii* occupied a place of honor in the hierarchy of the *collegium*, there are no signs that she had a similar position in the city. Because of her modest social status, statues and other signs of public honor were beyond her reach. Yet, privately funded monuments show that being a *mater collegii* was a source of pride: the title was carved on their tombs (Claudia, Gavillia Optata, Marcia Basilissa, Placidia Damale) or added to their names when they dedicated a statue or altar (Fabia Lucilla, Flavia Nona, Iunia Zosime). These inscriptions make clear that the women in question wished themselves to be represented, and remembered, as “mothers” of *collegia*. In her own circles, and probably in the eyes of most of her fellow citizens, the title *mater collegii* was an important aspect of a woman’s social identity and enhanced her status and prestige.

**PATRONESSES OF COLLEGIUM:
EXPECTATIONS AND TERMS OF PRAISE**

As we have seen, patronesses and “mothers” differed in many respects. In these last two sections dealing with the services they may have provided for their *collegia*, they will therefore be discussed separately: patronesses in this section and “mothers” in the next. Before addressing the question what *collegia* expected from their patronesses, let us briefly turn to the evidence for male patrons. Due to the fluid nature of Roman patronage, the duties and responsibilities of patrons of collectivities, such as cities and *collegia*, cannot be precisely defined, but most scholars agree that, apart from generous benefactions, defense of the clients’ interests figures prominently. This may comprise protection of (economic) interests, legal help or advice, intercession on behalf of clients, mediation in the case of conflicts and “brokerage” that gives the clients access to the patron’s connections with wealthy and highly placed individuals.40 These tasks are confirmed by the more outspoken *tabulae patronatus* presented to male patrons of *collegia*, which, apart from mentioning the patron’s generosity, speak of the “defense” and “protection” (*defensio* and *tutela*) the *collegium* hopes to receive.41 Most inscriptions, however, are notoriously vague as to the precise

---


41. *AE* 1991, 713: a *tabula patronatus* of the *collegium fabrum* of Fidentia (It.) speaks of their time-honored custom to co-opt patrons pro defensione (et) tutela nostri and praises the prospective patron for his *innumerabilia beneficia*; CIL XIV, 4144 = ILS 6173: an honorific inscription for a *patronus et defensor* of the *collegium lenunculariorum* in Ostia, who is praised ob insignem eius in defendendis et in tuendis eximiam diligentiam. CIL VI, 1649: *patrono et defendori*. The *tabula patronatus* for C(aius) Servilius Diodorus, which was copied on his statue base set up by his wife, Egnatia Salviana, expresses thanks for his benefaction (a donation of 20,000 sesterces from the interest of which distributions were made to the members of the *collegium*) and the hope that
services or benefits a patron might provide, praising him for his moral and civic qualities instead.\textsuperscript{42} This does not mean that nothing was expected from him. Like patronage of individuals, which is usually presented as disinterested friendship,\textsuperscript{43} patronage of collectivities draws on the language of friendship and emotional relations. By presenting the patron as a disinterested friend the profitable side of patronage is masked. Moreover, by stressing their mutual emotional ties the collegium raises itself to the level of the patron. Let us, with this in mind, take a fresh look at the inscriptions for patronesses, first the honorific inscriptions and then the co-optation decrees. How did the collegia praise their (prospective) patronesses and in what terms did they phrase their expectations?

The honorific inscriptions on statue bases and other public monuments set up for patronesses are usually very brief, praising the patroness in general terms only. Two kinds of praise can be distinguished: words referring to her merits as a patroness and epithets publicizing her moral qualities (Tables 2 and 3). The last-mentioned kind is rare: apart from Aurelia Crescentia, who is praised as a pudicissima femina (very chaste woman), no traditional female virtues are found in honorific inscriptions set up by collegia for their patronesses.\textsuperscript{44} Instead, quite a few patronesses are praised for their merits, albeit in very vague terms. Apart from terms denoting financial benefactions, discussed in the previous section, various terms connected with their merita are used. Merita is a generic term covering possible donations and other services to the collegium, both those fulfilled in the past and those hoped for in the future. For instance, when Aurelia Crescentia is praised ob merita et beneficia, we may understand these words as indicating material benefactions and unidentified “other” services for the benefit of the city and the collegium. Similarly, Rutilia Paulina is praised for her merita and those of her father. The active form (merens) refers to the patrons’ merits in an indirect way, suggesting that they deserve the honor awarded them. Thus, the anonymous patroness is addressed as a patronae bene merenti (well-deserving patroness), Cissonia Aphrodite and her husband are honored as patronis plura merentibus (patrons who deserve more) and Valeria Severina and her male colleagues as patronis merentissimis et felicissimis et pr(a)estantissimis et pientissimis (very deserving, propitious, excellent and devoted patrons). The problem with these terms is that we cannot make out their exact meaning, nor whether they are used for services performed or in order to encourage a patroness to live up to the expectations in the future.

Let us therefore look at these inscriptions from a different perspective: that of the collegia setting up the inscriptions. Through these formulaic phrases the

\begin{itemize}
\item He will deign to accept them in his patronage (nos et in clientela sua recipere dignatur); see AE 1998, 282 = AE 2000, 243.
\item Saller 1982.
\item Alliena Berenice is honored as the “purest wife” (uxor sanctissima) and a “most devoted mother” (mater piissima), but this is in an inscription set up by her husband and son.
\end{itemize}
dedicators drew attention not only to the actual, or desired, merits of the patroness, but also to the gratitude of the collegium, which by setting up a statue with an honorific inscription showed itself to be a worthy client. The “gift” of a public statue probably incited the patroness to reciprocate, thus strengthening the notion of patronage as an ongoing relationship. Setting up a public statue with inscription enhanced the prestige of both dedicator(s) and recipient: since a person’s prestige and (informal) social status depended on its recognition by the public, public acknowledgement of the merits, the high rank and the personal virtues of a patron(ess) was of prime importance. Moreover, a public statue perpetuated the memory of the person thus honored. But the collegium also profited: by publicizing its relationship with a highly placed person it raised itself to the level of the honorand, with whom they were associated in the inscription. Such “status association” is the more rewarding when the patron(ess) in question is of higher rank. As we have seen (table 1), most patronesses did indeed belong to the elite. The concern for their high rank is reflected in the epithets honestissima (most distinguished) and praestantissima (most excellent), which in honorific inscriptions are mainly used for persons of respectively equestrian and senatorial rank. Drawing attention to the social status of the women in question, such terms are highly appropriate for women like Aurelia Crescentia, and Egnatia Certiana who, as the inscription proudly asserts, was the daughter of a consul.

Compared to the honorific inscriptions the co-optation decrees on tabulae patronatus for Ancharia Luperca, Setina Iusta and Vesia Martina are much longer and the terms of praise more exuberant. Let us start with the tabula patronatus for Setina Iusta. Meeting in their schola in Pisaurum in 256 CE the collegium fabrum drafted a decree co-opting Setina Iusta and her youngest son as patrons of the collegium. After humbly paying their respect to her husband, Petronius Victorinus, who was already a patron of the collegium, the assembled members decided “that we co-opt as our patroness also his wife Setina Iusta, of senatorial rank, a woman of incomparable chastity, who takes pride in the very large number of her sons” (ut et Setinam Iustam c(larissimam) f(eminam) coniu/gem ei/us incomparabilis pudicitiae plurimo numero filiorum gloriantem ... patronam nobis / cooptari: CIL XI, 6335 = ILS 7218). As appears from the text that follows, her elder sons were already patrons of the collegium, like her husband, so that now the entire family was included in the patronage. In its wording, the decree shows great deference to the exalted rank of the patrons: wherever possible, the “splendor of the family” and the senatorial status of its members are emphasized. Apparently, the association set great store by the patronage of this family and, indeed, they

45. This term is borrowed from van Nijf 1997: 60, 155 and 245, though I use it in a slightly different sense.
46. Forbis 1996: 27 and 69; of course, there is a moral side to honestissima (most honorable) too.
caught a big fish: the family was of high senatorial rank and had had several consuls among its members.47

The importance of the family is reflected in the care they spent on the decree: it is written in a highly ornate and somewhat tortuous style, which poses many difficulties to the translator and which, considering the numerous mistakes both in spelling and in grammar, was somewhat beyond the capacity of the dedicators. The tabula patronatus itself is as ornate as their words: it consists of an unusually large bronze plaque with a head of Medusa in relief in the triangular top and set in an ornamental frame in the form of a temple façade with Corinthian columns on ship’s prows flanking the text. It was found in the remains of an impressive Roman building, probably the family’s house, in Pisaurum, where it must have hung on the wall. What did the collegium expect from the patronage of this family, especially from that of Setina Iusta, to whom this tablet was offered?

At first sight, the decree is rather vague as to motives and expectations. It speaks of the “incomparable love towards our club and worthiness” (incomparabili amor (i=E) et in numerum nostrum dignation (i=E)) of Petronius Victorinus, “in deference to whose dignity,” the collegium asserts, “with favorable mind and vote we hasten to co-opt also his wife Setina Iusta, of senatorial rank, as our patroness” (obsequio dignitati eius . . . prono animo et voto properamus . . . et Setinam / Iustam c(larissimam) f(eminam) coniugem eius patronam . . . cooptasse nos). The tone of deference is striking: the patroness and patrons are addressed in adulatory terms, the collegium rejoices time and again in their patronage and no opportunity is omitted to draw attention to the distinction and senatorial rank of the family. By stressing their own obsequium (obedience, compliance) and the dignitas of their patrons, the social superiority of the patrons and the social distance between the patrons and the collegium are brought out in an unusually emphatic way. Moreover, various words expressing haste to achieve the patronage lend it a feeling of urgency.48

47. For example: in claritatem domus / Petroni Victorini c(larissimi) i(uvenis) patroni nostri (“towards the illustrious house of Petronius Victorinus, a young man [i.e. roughly between 20 and 40 years old] of senatorial rank and our patron”); pro generis claritate proque senatoria dignitatis eis / [Petronii Victorini c(larissimi) i(uvenis)] (“in agreement with the splendor of his family and with the senatorial dignity of Petronius Victorinus, a young man of senatorial rank”). Each time a name is mentioned, the addition c(larissimus) i(uvenis), c(larissima) f(eminam) or cc(larissimi) pp(ueri) draws attention to the senatorial status of the members of this family. For Petronius Victorinus and his family, see PIR² P 317 and 318 (stemma); RE 19 Petronius (77).

48. For obsequium, see Forbis 1996: 54; for obedience (oboedire) as a term used for clients and freedmen, see Fronto, ad V erum 2.7. The collegium wishes to show “full obedience of the love of our club towards the illustrious house of Petronius Victorinus” (plena obsequia amoris numeri nostri in claritatem domus / Petroni Victorinit) and is “in obedience submitting to his worthiness in all respects” (obsequio dignitati eius in omnibus parentes). The dignitas and dignatio of Petronius Victorinus are recorded constantly: dignatio (e=F)iuis, proque senatoria dignitatis eis /IS, dig/nationi(e=E) dignitati eius; his “incomparable” love towards the collegium is only paralleled by the “incomparable” chastity of Setina Iusta. The collegium “rejoices” (laetamur) in its patrons and its happiness even increases (gaudium . . . amplificari) by the co-optation; when the boys grow up the happiness (felicitas) — of
At the very end of the decree the expectations of the collegium are expressed. Presenting the new patrons “as quickly as possible”—through a delegation of the chief magistrates (quinquennales)—with the tabula patronatus, the collegium expresses the hope “that fully understanding the love of our club they [i.e. Setina Iusta and her youngest son] deign to adorn us with perpetual glory and favor us” (quam primum eis offerri ut in / plenum intellegentes amorem numeri nostri perpetua gloria ornare et fovere nos digne (n)tur). Favor and fame are what the collegium expects from their highly placed patrons. “Favor” may include services ranging from financial benefaction to legal protection or (political) intervention on behalf of the collegium; “perpetual glory” can be found in beautiful buildings or other possible benefactions bestowed by the patron(ess), but also in the high status of the patron(ess) which reflects on the collegium in question. By associating themselves with this high-ranking patroness and her son, the collegium hopes to share in their prestige and that of their family. The “status association” they desired to achieve is underlined by subtle linguistic means: the collegium uses the same terms for the (prospective) patrons and patroness as for themselves. Thus, they speak of the amor of Petronius Victorinus towards the collegium and of that of the collegium towards the prospective patron(ess), and various words denoting glory are used both for the patron(ess) and for the collegium itself.

A few years later, in 261 CE, the collegium centonariorum of nearby Sentinum duly presented Vesia Martina, together with her husband and son, with a tabula patronatus. Referring in their decree to their “frequent benefactions and disposition of love towards our club” (crebris beneficiis et adfectionem amoris / [erga] n(umerum) n(ostri) exhibentibus) and desiring “to remunerate their munificence” the chief magistrates proposed “that Coretius Fuscus, illustrious decurio of our town 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 co-opted by our club as patrons by means of a written document, are now presented with a bronze tabula patronatus, so that (their patronage) becomes known with well-deserved honor in accordance with their merits” (munificientia(m) / [eo]rum . . . [re]munerare icitur(!) si cunctis videtur Coreti Fuscum / [sp]lendidum decurione(m) patriae n(ostri) sed et patronum trium / coll(egiorum) principalium et Vesia(m) coniucem(!) eius / patronam sed et Coretiu(m)

49. Amor of the collegium towards the patrons: “the love of our club towards the illustrious house of Petronius Victorinus” (amoris numeri nostri in claritatem domus / Petroni Victorini); the incomparable amor of Petronius Victorinus towards the collegium: cuius incomparabili amor(=E) et in numerum nostrum. The glory of the collegium: demonstrari glorius “it is glorious to demonstrate (our love to, etc.);” Setina Iusta “glories” in the number of her sons (gloriantem); her younger son is “made glorious” (adscribi gloriae) by his unanimous co-optation as a patron; the new patrons are to lend “perpetual glory” (perpetua gloria) to the collegium.
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Sa(b=D)inum filium eorum iam prid(e=I)m / patronos per duplumum a numero
n(ostro) cooptatos nunc tabulam / aerem patronatus eis offerri ut merito honore
pro meritis innotescat, CIL XI, 5749 = AE 1992, 562 = ILS 7221). Accepting the
proposal the members expressed their motives and expectations as follows: “Since
in the past we have accepted admirable 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 things not dis-
similar from what we experience now, will perpetually come forth from their house
with the same feeling of affection, and . . . to remunerate their benevolence—in
the hope that they deign to accept the honor that is offered them more glori-
ously and beautifully—the decree is also carved in a bronze tablet” (*quod in
praeteritum Coreti Fusci patroni V(e=P)siae{iae} Martin(a)e / patron(a)e et
Coreti Sabini fil(i)i eorum erca(!) amore(!) beneficia praesitita susceperimus
nunc etiam in futurum non dissimilia quae / nunc sentimus perpetuo ex domum(!)
eorum processura pari adfectione{m} speramus . . . et ad remunerandum / eorum
benevolentia(m) quo lautius adque pulchrius dicentur(!) honorem / sibi oblatum
sus{i}cipere {dignentur} decretum et in tabula aerea / perscriptum eis). Then the
names follow of sixteen delegates, who “in a worthy manner” [*dicne(!)] were
to present the tablet to the patrons.

Compared to the decree for Setina Iusta and her son this text is more straight-
forward, almost business-like, in its wishes and expectations. We learn that Vesia
Martina, her husband and her son had been patrons of the *collegium* for some time
before they were festively presented with the bronze tablet in recompense for their
numerous benefactions. For the *collegium* the ceremonious presentation provided
an ideal occasion to remind the patrons, and the public, of their frequent and
outstanding benefactions, munificence and other merits (*beneficia, munificentia*
and *merita*), which—so the *collegium* hoped—they would continue showering
on them in the future. The association gratefully reciprocated with the “well-
deserved honor” (*merito honore*) of a *tabula patronatus*, thus showing itself to
be a worthy client. At the same time, however, the relationship is presented as one
of disinterested friendship: the patrons are supposed to be motivated by feelings
of love, affection and benevolence (*amor, adfectio, benevolentia*) towards the
*collegium*. Thus, apart from underlining their noble characters, the *collegium*
raises itself to the level of its high-ranking patrons with whom it was bound in
a relation of mutual love and respect.

Like the other two, the *tabula patronatus* for Ancharia Luperca, quoted
in the beginning of this article, places the prospective patroness firmly in the
bosom of her family. She is co-opted in honor of her husband, patron of the
same *collegium*, and in memory of her late father, whose relatives were local
magistrates (apparently he himself was not). After mentioning her husband’s
“love and affection” (*amor and adfectio*) towards the *collegium*, which were
manifested by his benefactions (*beneficia*), the decree proposes to co-opt her in
honor of her husband and father, and because of her traditional female virtues.
Moreover, a bronze statue of her is to be erected in the clubhouse next to that of her husband and she is to receive a bronze tablet containing the decree. Despite the ample praise for her feminine virtues, the actual reason for co-opting her was not—we may suspect—her traditional female virtuousness (on which more below), but the hope that she would live up to the generosity of her husband.\textsuperscript{50} This is suggested by the words at the end of the decree: “so that her devotion (\textit{pietas}) towards us and our goodwill (\textit{voluntas}) towards her will be visible for all in the public view.” \textit{Pietas} is a multivalent word referring to a person’s dutiful conduct towards the gods, one’s relatives and, here, the \textit{collegium}. Like \textit{amor} and \textit{adfectio}, \textit{pietas} could be manifested by benefactions; together with \textit{voluntas}, which is mostly used for the feeling of good will in beneficiaries, it points to a patronal relationship in which financial generosity may have played an important part.\textsuperscript{51}

Considered together, the three \textit{tabulae patronatus} from roughly the same period and area (third-century central Italy) show remarkably similar traits, part of which seems to be bound up with gender. First, all three decrees firmly place the patronesses in the context of their families: Ancharia Luperca is co-opted in honor of her husband and father, Setina Iusta is co-opted together with her youngest son, her husband and elder sons being patrons already, and Vesia Martina received her \textit{tabula patronatus} in conjunction with her husband and son. Yet, we should not conclude from this that \textit{patrona} simply was an honorific title for the wife of a patron involving no duties or expectations for herself. As we have seen above (n.22) men could also be co-opted as patrons because of their family; Vesia Martina’s husband was even explicitly co-opted in honor of his mother, Memmia Victoria (see the following section). The (local) prominence of these highly placed families probably incited the privileged associations of the \textit{fabrici} and \textit{centonarii} to co-opt as many members as possible; yet, each of them was a patron(ess) in his, or her, own right. Gender expectations may have been involved in a different way: husbands or fathers are regularly mentioned in inscriptions for women both for reasons of traditional propriety and for indicating their social status, which women received from their father or husband.\textsuperscript{52} Therefore, when co-opting a woman as their patroness, \textit{collegia} could hardly fail to mention the social status and merits of their nearest male relatives.

Second, traditional female virtues take a prominent place in the co-optation decrees of two of the patronesses whose \textit{tabulae patronatus} have been preserved. The decree for Ancharia Luperca is the most explicit in this respect: she is said to have been co-opted because of the chastity of her morals (\textit{castitas morum}) and her old-fashioned purity of custom (\textit{sanctitas priscae consuetudinis}), and she is honored for her pure character and habit (\textit{sancta indoles et disciplina}) and

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{50} See also Forbis 1996: 85–87.
  \item \textsuperscript{51} For \textit{voluntas} and \textit{pietas}, see Forbis 1996: 52 and 58.
  \item \textsuperscript{52} See Hemelrijk 1999: 11–12 and 2004.
\end{itemize}
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her religiosity (caeremoni(i)s praedita femina). Also setina iusta is honored for typically female virtues: the decree mentions her incomparable chastity (incomparabilis pudicitia) and alludes to her fertility by mentioning her numerous sons (plurimo numero filiorum) in whom she takes great pride (possible daughters go unmentioned). However, no typically female virtues are recorded for vesia martina nor are they prominent in the honorific inscriptions on statue bases: as we have seen, only aurelia crescentia is honored as a “most chaste women” (pudicissima femina) among other qualifications referring to her social status and benefactions. when they do appear, these domestic virtues should not mislead us, nor should we believe that they point to a life confined to house and family. Rather, being socially acceptable terms for honoring a roman woman, they fit in with the common praise of a male patron for his character and moral excellence.

Lastly, the benefits the collegia hoped to gain from their patronage are alike and may be summarized by the hope expressed in the decree for setina iusta: perpetua gloria ornare et solvere nos. favor and fame were the main assets a collegium hoped to achieve from male patrons; in this respect patronesses did not markedly differ from their male counterparts. Merita, beneficia, munificentia, but also amor, affectio and benevolentia, are common terms of praise for male and female patrons, as is the praise for their dignitas and pietas. Yet, there is a slight difference in emphasis between the three tabulae patronatus discussed here, which seems to be connected with the social status of the patroness in question. The decree for setina iusta shows the greatest deference, which agrees with her elevated senatorial rank. No benefactions are referred to—and indeed one would not expect a collegium to mention such banal a thing as financial generosity vis-à-vis so highly placed a person. Part of the “perpetual glory” that setina iusta was expected to bring to her collegium was probably found in the mere fact that she accepted the patronage. By linking her name with theirs—so the collegium must have thought—the prestige of her high social status rubbed off on them. Her favors may, of course, have comprised financial generosity, but the influence and authority she commanded on account of her high rank and connections may have been more important to the collegium.

A more down-to-earth attitude is displayed towards vesia martina. She had already demonstrated her value as a patroness before she was presented with a tabula patronatus: this mentions services (beneficia, munificentia, merita) both rendered, and hoped for in the future. Yet, also in her case, patronage did not merely consist in bestowing benefactions; the amor, affectio and benevolentia for which she—and her male relatives—are praised, present the relationship as a personal and emotional one. By thus associating itself with a woman of high social standing the collegium hoped to share in her prestige. Such “status association” is also found in the co-optation decree for ancharia luperca. Like her husband, whose amor and affectio were manifested by beneficia, she was probably expected to display her pietas towards the collegium by benefactions. But that was not all. The fact that she is addressed as a dignissima patrona (most worthy patroness)
draws attention to her merits and generosity as a patroness as well as to her social prominence and personal influence. Yet, when compared to Setina Iusta, who was of senatorial rank, the co-optation decrees of these equestrian patronesses put a greater emphasis on benefactions.

Though the precise relationship between a *collegium* and its patron(ess) will never be fully discovered—and may have varied from person to person—the main outlines seem clear: as a rule, patronesses of *collegia* were wealthy, upper-class women, often of equestrian or senatorial rank, and—like most male patrons—outsiders to the *collegium* they patronized. They were expected to favor their *collegium* by bestowing benefactions, by using their influence or connections on behalf of the association, and by lending it prestige through “status association.” Being a patroness, therefore, implied a greater range of activities than merely conferring financial benefactions, of which, as we have seen, we know very little. Inscriptions set up by *collegia* in honor of benefactresses confirm the notion that there was a difference between benefactresses and patronesses: patronesses might perform benefactions, but benefactresses were not necessarily patronesses.

**MATER COLLEGII: HONORIFIC TITLE OR OFFICE?**

The title *mater collegii* is puzzling, even more than that of *patrona*: it does not give us any information about what was expected of her. Should we interpret it in a mainly honorific sense, such as the titles *mater castrorum* (mother of the army) and *mater castrorum et senatus et patriae* (mother of the army, the senate and the country), titles given to some of the empresses, particularly to Faustina the younger and Julia Domna? These titles presented the empresses as protectresses of the Roman army and the Empire in general. Though by their wealth and their access to the emperor the empresses could—and sometimes did—


54. For some benefactresses of *collegia*, who are not addressed as patronesses: *CIL X*, 7 = *AE* 1985, 305: *ob munificentiam earum / quae dendrophoros / honoraverunt* (follow the names of eight women); *CIL XI*, 405: *ob munificentiam*; *CIL XI*, 4391: donation of a capital sum from the interest of which banquets and distributions were held.

55. For these titles, see Temporini 1978: 61–78 and 2002: 250 and 276, Levick 2007: 42 and 93–94; Kuhoff 1993 connects the introduction of Julia Domna’s title in Rome with the fall of her enemy Plautianus. Two inscriptions from central Italy in the same period honor municipal women as *mater municipii* or *municipalis*, see *AE* 1998, 416 and *CIL XI*, 5752. Both women were of considerable value to their cities: they were priestesses of the imperial cult and were praised for their benefactions, but their titles do not seem to imply an actual function. According to her funerary inscription L(ucia) Fonteia Concordia, who died at the age of seventy, was called “mother” by her fellow citizens (*quem (!) / semper cives matrem appellavere*), perhaps because of her (unknown) worth to the city, but possibly also because of her old age and offspring (she lived to see her great-grandsons); see *CIL XI*, 2538 = *ILCV* 1578 (Clusium, It. 7, 3rd c.). In Asia Minor in the Roman period (especially in the 2nd and 3rd centuries CE) the not very common title “mother” of the city, or of civic bodies such as the council or the *gerousia*, was mostly given to women of very high standing or to very generous benefactresses, see van Bremen 1996: 167–70 and appendix 3.
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wield considerable power, these titles do, of course, not imply actual military or administrative functions. Rather, they point to a symbolic protection much like that of a patron saint—though, when called upon, the empress could bestow very real benefactions. Should we interpret the title “mother” of a collegium in a similar vein, or did it actually involve certain duties and responsibilities towards the collegium?

Several arguments point to the latter. Firstly, the social distance that is essential for the relation between the empress and the army or the inhabitants of the Empire at large, is lacking for the relationship between the mater collegii and the members of the collegium. As we have seen, “mothers” were mostly of the same social class as members of collegia. More particularly, they were mainly appointed by collegia that were open to women as members, and the evidence suggests that, unlike patronesses, “mothers” were usually recruited from among the members or their relatives. Secondly, when bestowing benefactions “mothers” cooperated on an equal footing with male members (Claudia Arria) and officials of the collegium: Domitia Civitas (with a pater) and Pomponia Victorina (with a quinquennalis). The gifts of Salvia Marcellina even amply surpass those of her brother-in-law, who was pater of the same collegium (tables 5 and 6).56 The close cooperation of a “mother” of a collegium with its members or officials confirms that she was one of them. This suggestion finds further support in the place that “mothers” occupied in the alba collegii, which puts them on a level with, or immediately below, male officials in the internal hierarchy of the collegium.

Thirdly, matres are attested in equal numbers as patres of collegia (supra n.17), but there is no indication that these “mothers” and “fathers” of collegia were, as a rule, related by blood or marriage. On the contrary, insofar as we know their respective husbands and wives, they did not bear the title pater or mater (see table 5).57 Thus, there is no reason to suppose that “mothers” received their titles as the wives of patres, as is often too easily assumed when husband and wife bear similar titles.58 We may reasonably conclude that pater and mater were parallel, but distinct, titles. As far as we are informed of the duties of patres, they seem to have been involved in the administration of the collegium: in the tabula patronatus for Vesi Martina a pater and a pares made the proposition to co-opt her. Apparently, they acted as the chief magistrates of the collegium having

56. Saavedra Guerrero 1998: 133 assumes that it concerns a summa honoraria for her office as mater collegii, but there is no evidence to confirm this view.

57. Also Sallustia Crispina (CIL XIV, 912), wife of the pater Q. Domitius Aterianus (CIL XIV, 37), does not bear the title mater.

58. For pertinent criticism of this way of reasoning, see Brooten 1982; for a more sober account, reaching the same conclusions, see van der Horst 1991: 89–110. For the same problem regarding the titles of priestesses of the imperial cult, see Hemelrijk 2005. In a recent contribution Harland 2007 convincingly argues that in the Greek East parental metaphors (“father” and “mother”) were used as a way of honoring important benefactors and leaders, or other functionaries, of associations and synagogues.
the authority to bring official propositions before its members, a function that is usually fulfilled by the *quinquennales*. In an *album collegii* in Luna (It.) and a votive inscription in Poetovio (Pan. Sup.) the names of the *patres* are recorded after those of the patrons, but before the decurions of the *collegium*, or after the *praefecti* (the chief magistrates), but before the *quaestores*. Apparently, *patres* were usually counted among the magistrates of an association, though we must allow for local differences. May we infer that also *matres collegii* had some kind of official function?

This brings us to our fourth point: their activities. Unfortunately, inscriptions only very rarely inform us of functions or tasks, also of those of male officials. One inscription, however, does give us a hint: when the *collegium [Rom?]ianense maius* of Laminium (Hisp. Tar.)—and her clients and freedmen—set up a statue for Allia Candida, Licinia Macedonica, the “mother” of the *collegium*, was in charge of the proceedings. Supervision of the erection of statues and of honorific and votive inscriptions was one of the duties of magistrates of *collegia*; we find also a *pater* overseeing the dedication of an altar. Thus, Licinia Macedonica acted as an official of the *collegium*.

Last but not least, we should consider the terms of praise used for “mothers” of *collegia*. Do they throw light on what was expected from them? In comparison with the honorific language used for patronesses, the praise for “mothers” was much less exuberant: in most cases only her bare title is mentioned without additional epithets (table 6). This is partly due to the difference between the types of inscriptions for patronesses and “mothers”: mainly public honorific inscriptions and *tabulae patronatus* for patronesses, and *alba collegii*, funerary and dedicatory inscriptions for, and by, “mothers” (cf. tables 2 and 5). Yet, this is itself the result of their dissimilar qualifications for receiving public honor. The lack of honorific epithets for “mothers,” therefore, is not surprising. It agrees also with the common epigraphic practice for male officials (but not for

---

59. *CIL* XI, 5749 = *AE* 1992, 562 = *ILS* 7221: *Sentini in triclini(o) domus (collegii) c(entinariorum) numerum habentibus sequella eiusdem collect(iti) ibi referentibus Casidio / Severo patre n(umeri) n(ostri) et Heldio Perecrino(!) parente*. For similar conclusions see Brooten 1982: 64–72 and Harland 2007.

60. See respectively *CIL* XI, 1355 = *ILS* 7227 (Luna, It. 7) and *CIL* III, 4045 = *ILS* 7304 = *AIJ* 341 (Poetovio, Pann. Sup.). In Potaissa in Dacia a *pater* and a *quaestor* of the *collegium Isidis* made a dedication to Isis on behalf of their *collegium*, *CIL* III, 882 = *ILS* 4361.

61. *CIL* II, 3229 = *ILS* 7308 (Laminium, Hisp. Tar.): *curante / Licinia / Macedonica mater*. For the term *curante*, *curantibus*, or *curam agentibus* used for the magistrates in charge see, for instance, *CIL* VI, 868 and 1117, *CIL* XIV, 102, 128, 160, 168, 169, 4365, 5344, 5345.

62. For the tasks of magistrates of *collegia*, see Royden 1988: 231–32; for the dedication of an altar to Jupiter Optimus Maximus by the *collegium veteranorum* of Aquileia sub *patre Tibrated*, see *CIL* V, 784 = *InscrAqu* I, 247. According to Clemente 1972: 160 Licinia Macedonica, *flaminica perpetua* of Laminium (*CIL* II, 3231), is the same person as our “mother” of the *collegium*, but we cannot rule out the possibility that she was a relative, or even a freedwoman, with the same name. Whereas the freeborn status of the *flaminica perpetua* is indicated by her filiation, the “mother” lacks such proof of free birth.
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patrons!) of collegia, who are mostly indicated with their name and office only. Thus, epigraphically, “mothers” were treated in the same way as male officials of collegia.

There are two exceptions, which—not unexpectedly—concern “mothers” of elite rank. The “motherhood” of Egnatia Salviana and Memmia Victoria was recorded on tabulae patronatus for their male relatives (husband and son). The text of the (lost) tabula patronatus for C(aius) Servilius Diodorus, husband of Egnatia Salviana, is known because it was carved on his statue base together with a dossier of letters about his foundation of 20,000 sesterces on behalf of the collegium. In gratitude for his benefaction, the members of the collegium unanimously decided “to co-opt him as patron and Egnatia Salviana, his wife, as mater and to ask him to accept the bronze tablet of patronage” (placet itaq(ue) universis patron(um) eum, Egnatiam Salvianam, / eius (uxorem), matrem cooptemus et petamus ab eo ut tabulam aeneam patrona/ti suscipere, AE 1998, 282 = AE 2000, 243). As appears from this decree, Egnatia Salviana was co-opted in honor of her husband; there is no indication that she was a member or official of the collegium herself.

Conversely, the collegium fabrum of Sentinum co-opted Coretius Fuscus, son of Memmia Victoria, as their patron “because of the honor and dignity of the late Memmia Victoria, of blessed memory, mother of our association” (in honore a(t=D)que dignitate Memiae Victoriae quon/dam {INDOLES} m(e=V)oriae femin(a)e matris numeri nostri) and for “the example of the devotion of his parents and of the honorable conduct of his mother” (ex/emplo pietatis parentium et matris honorific{i}entia CIL XI, 5748 = ILS 7220). In this decree for her son Memmia Victoria is posthumously praised for her dignitas, pietas (together with her husband) and honorificentia. Though these terms may be roughly translated as “dignity,” “piety” or “devotion,” and “honor” or “honorable conduct,” their precise meaning and value for contemporary Romans is less easy to establish. In her book on Municipal Virtues in the Roman Empire, E. Forbis regards honorificentia as a term of respect used mostly for patrons and in the case of Memmia Victoria referring to “both her generosity and her status.” Yet, the collegium uses the same word for the honor they themselves bestowed on Coretius Fuscus, thus suggesting that there were a close relationship and shared values between the mater, the patron and the collegium. Similarly, the words splendor and splendidus are repeatedly used both for Coretius Fuscus’ “illustrious” (= equestrian) birth and standing and to denote their own “most illustrious” collegium. By this terminological correspondence the fabri symbolically raised themselves to the level of this high-ranking family.

63. Forbis 1996: 56; ut / potius honorific{i}entia nostrae modum intel/legat (“in order that he [= Coretius Fuscus] may better understand our way of bestowing honor”).
64. For the high rank of Coretius Fuscus: vir splendidus Coretius Fuscus and Coretius Fuscus splendidus natus; for their own collegium: splendidissimum n(umerum) n(ostrum) and splendoris sui.
Finally, the *dignitas* ascribed to Memmia Victoria denotes her high status and authority. The word is commonly used for highly placed persons, who exercise their influence for the benefit of the dedicator, i.e. the *collegium*. Her *pietas* and that of her husband may have been expressed by their munificence or other good deeds for the *collegium*. Taken together, Memmia Victoria is praised both for her high status and for her beneficent activities towards the *collegium*, which may have comprised financial generosity and the use of her personal influence. In combination with her high social status, the terms of praise used for her, and the activities that they suggest, resemble those of patron(esse)s more closely than those of “mothers” of collegia. Seen in this light the confusion of the decree, addressing her as “mother” of the association but grouping her with her male relatives as patrons (supra n.23), is not surprising.

Each of these arguments may be indecisive in itself, but taken together they strongly suggest that, as a rule, a “mother” of a *collegium* was a female official who was probably recruited from among the female members of the association, or from the relatives of male officials. Unlike patronesses, therefore, she was one of them. A “mother” may have been elected for her wealth, her social prominence, or for her character and achievements. To distinguish her from “daughters” of collegia—a rare title that appears only once in the inscriptions dealt with here (see table 5)—we may expect that she was an adult woman, perhaps even elderly, and probably also a mother in the biological sense. Her tasks resembled those of “fathers” and, in view of the inscription of Licinia Macedonica, included the supervision of the erection of statues and inscriptions in the name of the *collegium* and perhaps other administrative and religious duties. From the example of Salvia Marcellina we may gather that a “mother” may have been involved in funding, and perhaps organizing, banquets and feasts for the *collegium*. It is possible that Salvia Marcellina did not participate in the banquets she paid for, for she shared in the distributions of money but not—so it seems—in those of wine. Through her foundation, however, she exerted a considerable influence on the organization of the *collegium*, the rules of which were put down in the *lex collegii* heading her name.

---

65. For *pietas* and *dignitas*, see Forbis 1996: 56–59 and 79–81.
66. For her share in the distributions, see n.37 supra. However, she is not mentioned among the recipients of the distribution of wine. Ausbittel 1982: 57 assumes that this was connected with the ancient prohibition for women to drink wine, see Plin. *NH* 14. 88–90. Assuming that she did not share in the distribution of bread as well (but the inscription does not actually say so), Flambard 1987: 238 believes that she did not participate in banqueting. Considering the negligent redaction of the inscription, however, the absence of her name among the recipients of wine may well be due to an omission by the stonemason.
67. Liu 2007 convincingly argues that substantial donations, such as those from Salvia Marcellina, greatly influenced the organization of collegia, in some cases even amounting to a reorganization of the association. Indeed, the entire *lex collegii* is about regulating the use of the interest of the foundation, for which Salvia Marcellina laid down the conditions. This is an interesting field for further study.
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The language of family affection that speaks from the title mater perhaps points to a role in supervising and, possibly, socializing (new) members. It also suggests a position of authority, since in Roman family relations a mother was a powerful person, who supervised the education of her children, maintaining discipline and instilling them with traditional values.68 As a “mother” of an association she may have been especially involved with the female members, but not exclusively so, since not all collegia appointing “mothers” had female members. Because of their modest social status “mothers” of collegia were no public figures; they received no public statues or monuments. Perhaps to compensate for their deficiency in social standing, benefactions play a greater role in their relationship with their collegia, than in that of the patronesses. Salvia Marcellina is a case in point: apart from land, several buildings and a marble statue, she donated a large sum of money to her collegium for feasting, precisely stipulating the conditions under which it was to be used (table 6).

The three “mothers” of elite rank are exceptions: they were only co-opted by the most privileged collegia (the fabri, centonarii and dendrophori) and differed from the other “mothers” in that they belonged to families of high social standing, some of whose male members were patrons of collegia (tables 4 and 5). Also the social distance between them and the associations, the benefits expected of them and the way they are praised, add to the similarity between them and patronesses of collegia.

CONCLUSIONS

The small number of inscriptions for patronesses and “mothers” of collegia compels us to be cautious in drawing conclusions: we do not know whether they are in any way representative of the inscriptions that were once erected for them, nor how they relate to the unknown number of patronesses and “mothers” who never received an inscription at all. Moreover, like all inscriptions, they present only glimpses of the persons honored or recorded, which are tailored to the purpose of the inscription, not to modern questions. The choice of what was worthy of recording in stone or bronze—as a lasting record not only for contemporaries but also for future generations—shows how people chose to present themselves, or desired to be presented by others, in the eyes of the public or of a specific group (e.g. the members of a collegium). In this respect, the inscriptions confirm that being a patroness or a “mother” of a collegium was an important element of a woman’s social, or public, identity.

Few though they may be, the inscriptions are remarkably consistent: they strongly suggest that patrona and mater collegii were no empty titles but denoted distinct functions exercised by different classes of women. As we have seen, there were great differences between patronesses and “mothers” of collegia in almost

all aspects discussed here. Patronesses were the more prestigious of the two: they were, as a rule, from families of the (local) elite and—like most male patrons—outsiders to the collegia they patronized. They were mainly co-opted—sometimes together with male relatives—by the more prominent or privileged associations of their towns, most of which had no women as members. Though few in numbers as compared to the almost four hundred male patrons known to us, and though almost totally restricted to Italy (outside Rome), they closely resemble male patrons of collegia in all other respects. Of course, a patroness could not give legal help or political protection in her own person but—apart from bestowing benefactions—she could use her influence and connections for the benefit of the association and enhance its prestige by publicly accepting the co-optation. Women of senatorial and equestrian families must have been especially important in this respect. In gratitude for their patronage, collegia rewarded them with tabulae patronatus, public statues and honorific inscriptions, praising them for their generosity and other merits, their love and devotion to the well-being of the association, their high social status and their personal (female) virtues. The exchange between a patroness and a collegium was, at least partly, symbolic. Both conferred honor upon each other: the patroness by showing her love for the association and the association by publicly recognizing her merits, social status and moral excellence.

Unlike patronesses, most “mothers” of collegia were of modest, some even of humble, social background, but in individual cases their wealth may have compensated for their lack of status. They were mostly co-opted by collegia that were organized on the basis of a common cult, origin or status and which often had women among their members; they were probably recruited from among these female members or from the relatives of male members and officials. “Mothers” are attested in equal numbers and in roughly the same areas as “fathers” of collegia: primarily central Italy (including Rome) and the Roman cities of the Balkan and Danube regions. Their activities resemble those of “fathers” and other male officials, probably including the supervision of inscriptions set up by the collegium, the organization of banquets and distributions, and perhaps other tasks of which, unfortunately, we are not informed. Like “fathers” and other officials, they were expected to contribute to the association by donating money and other benefactions. Though “mothers” did not enjoy public honor—which was the preserve of the (local) elite—they received recognition from the collegium: the honorable title mater collegii was bestowed on them and their names were given a place of honor in the monumental alba collegii. We do not know whether they were appointed for life or for a certain period, but the title remained with them throughout their lives: it was mentioned with pride both in the inscriptions they set up during their lifetimes and on their tombs. Thus, for a woman of sub-elite rank, being a mater collegii enhanced her social prestige.

As regards their precise activities much remains in the dark, but the general picture is clear: in accordance with their social standing patronesses and “mothers” of collegia fulfilled distinct functions, which closely resembled those of their
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male counterparts, the patrons and “fathers” of collegia. They were only a tiny minority in the predominantly male associations: female patrons form a small percentage of all patrons known to us and, though “mothers” are attested in equal numbers as “fathers” of collegia, no other collegiate offices were open to them. Yet, the fact that they are attested, shows that in the Roman world gender was not an impenetrable bar keeping women from civic associations. Wealth, social status and perhaps personal commitment or achievement competed with gender as criteria for participating in civic life.
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**Table 1: Patronesses of *collegia***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Social status</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Province*</th>
<th>Date (all dates CE)</th>
<th>Patroness of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliena Berenice</td>
<td><em>CIL IX</em> 5368</td>
<td></td>
<td>Firmum Picenum</td>
<td>It. (5)</td>
<td>2nd c.</td>
<td><em>collegium fabrum et centonariorum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancharia Luperca</td>
<td><em>CIL XI</em>, 2702 = <em>ILS</em> 7217</td>
<td></td>
<td>Volsinii</td>
<td>It. (7)</td>
<td>224</td>
<td><em>collegium fabrum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelia Crescentia</td>
<td><em>CIL IX</em>, 4894 = <em>ILS</em> 6554 = <em>AE</em> 2001, 908</td>
<td>equestrian</td>
<td>Trebula Mutuesca</td>
<td>It. (4)</td>
<td>243</td>
<td><em>tricliniares</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blassia Vera</td>
<td><em>CIL XI</em>, 6310 = <em>ILS</em> 3082</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pisaurum</td>
<td>It. (6)</td>
<td>2nd c.</td>
<td><em>cultores Iovis Latii</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat[—]lia V[erecunda]</td>
<td><em>CIL V</em>, 5295</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comum</td>
<td>It. (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>collegium nautarum</em> Comensium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cissonia Aphrodite</td>
<td><em>CIL V</em>, 5869 = <em>ILS</em> 6730</td>
<td>equestrian</td>
<td>Mediolanum</td>
<td>It. (11)</td>
<td>mid 3rd c.</td>
<td><em>collegium fabrum et centonariorum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egnatia Certiana</td>
<td><em>CIL IX</em>, 1578</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beneventum</td>
<td>It. (2)</td>
<td>2nd–3rd c.</td>
<td><em>parasiti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iscantia Prima</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1948, 31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>It. (1)</td>
<td>211(^{70})</td>
<td><em>collegium (h)astoforum Ostiensium</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Ulpia Sossia Calligona</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1956, 77 = <em>AE</em> 1958, 177</td>
<td>equestrian</td>
<td>Tibur</td>
<td>It. (1)</td>
<td>late 2nd–early 3rd c.</td>
<td><em>sodaliciu iuvenum</em> Herculaniorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutilia Paulina</td>
<td><em>CIL IX</em>, 3182</td>
<td>senatorial</td>
<td>Corfinium</td>
<td>It. (4)</td>
<td>late 1st–early 2nd c.</td>
<td><em>seviri Augustales</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setina Iusta</td>
<td><em>CIL XI</em>, 6335 = <em>ILS</em> 7218</td>
<td>senatorial</td>
<td>Pisaurum</td>
<td>It. (6)</td>
<td>256</td>
<td><em>collegium fabrum</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In parentheses: the regio of Italy

\(^{69}\) She was also a patroness of the city; see Kajava 1990: 30 and Hemelrijk 2004.

\(^{70}\) See Bollmann 1998: 322.
HEMELRIJK: *Patronesses and “Mothers” of Roman Collegia*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patroness</th>
<th>Date/Source</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valeria Severina⁷¹</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1946, 120 = <em>CIL</em> II, 5812</td>
<td>Segisamum, Hisp. Tar.</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>unidentified collegium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesia Martina⁷²</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> XI, 5749 = <em>AE</em> 1992, 562 = <em>ILS</em> 7221</td>
<td>Sentinum, It. (6)</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>collegium centonariorum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> V, 4432 = <em>InscrIt</em> X.5, 225</td>
<td>Brixia, It. (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>cultores collegii Larum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁷¹ Engesser 1957: 110 no. 299 assumes that she was a *patrona* of the city, but see Kajava 1990: 29n.6 and Hemelrijk 2004: 213n.23

### Table 2: Patronage and collegiate functions of relatives of patronesses, non-related patrons and female members of the collegium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Inscription and monument</th>
<th>Archaeological details*</th>
<th>Patronage and collegiate functions of relatives</th>
<th>Non-related patrons and female members**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliena Berenice</td>
<td>honorific statue base</td>
<td>1.22 × 0.71 × (ca. 0.60) m</td>
<td>husband: patron of the same collegium.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancharia Luperca</td>
<td>tabula patronatus</td>
<td>large bronze plaque: 0.70 × 0.48 m, with triangular top, found in the tablinum of a Roman house</td>
<td>husband: patron of the same collegium.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelia Crescentia</td>
<td>honorific statue base</td>
<td>limestone base: (0.71) × (0.56) × 0.68 m, re-cut for re-use</td>
<td>husband: patron of the city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blassia Vera</td>
<td>album collegii?</td>
<td>two fragments of a large limestone plaque: (0.33) × (0.58) × 0.15 m and (0.50) × (0.34) × 0.15 m; letters badly damaged</td>
<td>Two male patrons: Marcus Fremedius Severus and Publius Seneca Cornelius. Female members: Vibia [C]ari[t]e, Victria Capria, Suedia Lea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat[—–]lia V[erecun]da</td>
<td>honorific statue base</td>
<td>re-used: square hole in the middle of the inscription</td>
<td>patron: C(aius) Messius Fortunatus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cissonia Aphrodite</td>
<td>honorific inscription</td>
<td>husband: patron, decurio and curator arkae(1) of the same collegium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egnatia Certiana</td>
<td>honorific statue base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Max. dimensions of respectively height, width and depth (if known). In parentheses: incomplete fragment.

** Patrons and female members of the collegium mentioned in the same inscription. Listed are only patrons who—as far as we know—were not related to the patroness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iscantia Prima</td>
<td>building</td>
<td>Inscription found in the temple of Bellona, near the schola of the hastiferi</td>
<td>Two male patrons: C(aius) Rubrius Fortunatus and C(aius) Rubrius Iustus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Ulpia Sossia Calligona</td>
<td>honorific statue base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutilia Paulina</td>
<td>honorific statue base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setina Iustina</td>
<td>tabula patronatus</td>
<td>Large bronze plaque with triangular top and ornamental frame found in a Roman building; (without frame): 0.90 x 0.68 x 0.05 m; (with frame): 1.55 x 1 m</td>
<td>Her youngest son is co-opted together with her; her husband and their older sons were already patrons of the same collegium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valeria Severina</td>
<td>bronze tessera</td>
<td>Bronze plaque: 0.30 x 0.22 m</td>
<td>Four male patrons: G(aius) Sempronius Flavus, G(aius) Severius Pressus, G(aius) Valerius Lupus and G(aius) Turellius Cassianus. Female members: Anti(stia) Caliope, Val(eria) Donata, Botia, Valeria Britta, Val(eria) Avana, Oct(avia) Severa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vesia Martina</td>
<td>tabula patronatus</td>
<td>Bronze plaque: 0.65 x 0.44 x 0.06 m</td>
<td>Her husband and son were patrons of the same collegium, her husband also being patron of the fabri and dendrophori (tria collegia principalia).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>honorific inscription</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: patronesses of *collegia*: title, justification, benefactions and public honor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dedicator(s)</th>
<th>Title and justification</th>
<th>Benefactions</th>
<th>Public honor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliena Berenice</td>
<td>husband and son</td>
<td><em>uxori</em> / <em>sanctissimae</em> ... <em>matri</em> / <em>piissimae patronae</em> / <em>collegii</em> fab(rum) et cent(onariorum)</td>
<td>public statue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancharia Luperca</td>
<td>collegium fabrum</td>
<td>patronam / <em>collegii</em> n(ostr), co-opted in honor of her husband and father and because of her castitas, sanctitas prisciae consuetudinis, sancta indoles et disciplina and because she was a caerimoni(i)s praedita femina. She is called a dignissima patrona and praised for her pietas towards the collegium.</td>
<td>bronze tabula patronatus (and bronze statue in the <em>schola</em> of the <em>collegium</em> next to that of her husband)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelia Crescentia</td>
<td>citizens and <em>tricliniares</em></td>
<td><em>honestissimae</em> et <em>pudicissimae</em> feminae patro(nae) ... ob merita et beneficia saepe in se conlata</td>
<td>public statue dedicated on her birthday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blassia Vera</td>
<td><em>Iovis Latii</em> <em>cultores</em></td>
<td><em>patroni</em></td>
<td>together with a male patron she distributed bread, wine and half a denarius to each member of the collegium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat[—]la V[erecun]da</td>
<td><em>Iovis Latii</em> <em>collegium nautarum Comensium</em></td>
<td><em>patroni</em></td>
<td>public statue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Other Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cissonia Aphrodite</td>
<td>collegium fabrum et centonariorum</td>
<td>patronis / plura merentibus</td>
<td>unidentified honorific monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egnatia Certiana</td>
<td>parasiti</td>
<td>patronae praestantissimae</td>
<td>public statue?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iscuntia Prima</td>
<td>the three patrons</td>
<td>patroni (h)astoforum Ostiensium</td>
<td>together with two male patrons she restored the temple (of Bellona?) that had fallen in ruins from old age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Ulpia Sossia Calligona</td>
<td>sodalium iuvenum Herculanorum</td>
<td>patronae</td>
<td>public statue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutilia Paulina</td>
<td>seviri Augustales</td>
<td>patronae / ob merita patris et / ipsius</td>
<td>public statue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setina Iusta</td>
<td>collegium fabrum</td>
<td>patronam . . . n(umeri) n(ostr), co-opted because of her husband, the number of her sons and her incomparabilis pudicitia, and in the hope that they perpetua gloria ornare et fo/vere nos digne&lt;n&gt; tur</td>
<td>bronze tabula patronatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valeria Severina</td>
<td>cives of an unidentified collegium</td>
<td>patronis merentissimis et felicissimis / et pr(a)estantissimis et pientissimis . . . Valerit(ae) Severin(a)e patron(a)e nostr(a)e</td>
<td>bronze plaque in honor of Valeria Severina and four male patrons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dedicator(s)</th>
<th>Title and justification</th>
<th>Benefactions</th>
<th>Public honor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vesia Martina</td>
<td>collegium centonariorum</td>
<td>Vesia Martina, her husband and son are honored for their beneficia, munificentia and merita and for their adfectio, amor and benevolentia towards the collegium; hopes are expressed that these will continue in the future.</td>
<td>beneficia and munificentia (not specified)</td>
<td>bronze tabula patronatus (they were already patrons per duplum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>cultores collegii Larum</td>
<td>patronae / bene merenti</td>
<td></td>
<td>public statue?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Table 4: Matres collegiorum**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Mater of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> IX, 5450 = <em>AE</em> 1999, 599 = <em>ILS</em> 7248</td>
<td>freedwoman</td>
<td>Falerio Piceni</td>
<td>It. (5)</td>
<td>sodalicium fulionum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Arria</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> XIV, 326</td>
<td>freedwoman?</td>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>It. (1)</td>
<td>2nd–3rd c.?</td>
<td>collegium dendrophorum73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitia Civitas</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> XIV, 37 = <em>ILS</em> 4114</td>
<td>freedwoman</td>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>It. (1)</td>
<td>late 2nd–early 3rd c.</td>
<td>collegium canophorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egnatia Salviana</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 1998, 282 = <em>AE</em> 2000, 243</td>
<td>equestrian</td>
<td>Lavinium</td>
<td>It. (1)</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>collegium dendrophorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epipodia</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> III, 870 = <em>ILS</em> 4061</td>
<td>slave?74</td>
<td>Napoca</td>
<td>Dacia</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>collegium Asianorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavia Festa</td>
<td><em>AE</em> 2001, 854</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liternum</td>
<td>It. (1)</td>
<td>late 2nd c.</td>
<td>Augustales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabia Lucilla</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> III, 1207 = IDR III 5, 2, 483</td>
<td>equestrian</td>
<td>Apulum</td>
<td>Dacia</td>
<td>3rd c.</td>
<td>collegia fabrum et centonariorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavia Nona</td>
<td><em>IScM</em> II, 160 and <em>AE</em> 1964, 23075</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tomis</td>
<td>Moes. Inf.</td>
<td>180–192 or 211–217</td>
<td>dumus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavillia Optata</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> IX, 2687</td>
<td>freedwoman</td>
<td>Aesernia</td>
<td>It. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>collegium centonariorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusebia Prima,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurelia Herais,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lartia Felicitas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Sera Chreste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iunia Zosime</td>
<td><em>CIL</em> XIV, 69</td>
<td>freedwoman</td>
<td>Ostia</td>
<td>It. (1)</td>
<td>2nd–3rd c.?</td>
<td>collegium dendrophorum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

73 See Meiggs 1973: 327.
### Table 4: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Mater of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lepidia Iulia, Titinia Crispina and Numitoria Felicitas</td>
<td>CIL II, 1355 = ILS 7227</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luna</td>
<td>It. (1)</td>
<td>2nd–3rd c.?</td>
<td>collegium dendrophorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licinia Macedonica</td>
<td>CIL XI, 3229 = ILS 7308</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laminium</td>
<td>Hisp.Tar.</td>
<td></td>
<td>collegium [Rom?]anense maius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macia Menophile</td>
<td>CIL XIV, 256 = AE 1955, 182 = IPOSiste-B, 344</td>
<td>freedwoman?</td>
<td>Ostia / Portus</td>
<td>It. (1)</td>
<td>early 3rd cent.?</td>
<td>collegium fabrum navalium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Basilissa</td>
<td>CIL III, 7505 = ILS 2311 = AE 1888, 11 = IScM2 V, 160</td>
<td></td>
<td>Troesmis</td>
<td>Moes. Inf.</td>
<td>after 170</td>
<td>collegium dendrophorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memmia Victoria</td>
<td>CIL XI, 5748 = ILS 7220</td>
<td>decurial / equestrian(?)</td>
<td>Sentinum</td>
<td>It. (6)</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>collegium fabrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menia Iuliane</td>
<td>CIL III, 7532 = ILS 4069 = IScM2 II, 129</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tomis</td>
<td>Moes. Inf.</td>
<td>late 2nd–early 3rd c.</td>
<td>collegium Romanorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placidia Damale, quae et Rufina</td>
<td>CIL III, 8833</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salona</td>
<td>Dalm.</td>
<td>2nd–3rd c.</td>
<td>collegium vernaculorum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomponia Victorina</td>
<td>CIL VI, 8796 = ILS 1700</td>
<td>freedwoman?</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>It. (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>collegium Liberipatris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvia Marcellina</td>
<td>CIL VI, 10234 = ILS 7213</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>It. (1)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>collegium Aesculapii et Hygiae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5:** Patronage and collegiate functions of relatives of “mothers,” non-related “fathers,” “mothers” and “daughters” and female members of the collegium.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Inscription and monument</th>
<th>Archaeological details*</th>
<th>Patronage and collegiate functions of relatives</th>
<th>Patres, matres, filiae and female members**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>funerary stele</td>
<td>limestone stele (1.60 × 0.505 × 0.10 m); decorated on top with a bird between two roses, a lion and a bear</td>
<td>her husband and sons were magistrates (magister, quaestor) of the collegium fabrum, her husband holding these offices with the fullers as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Arria</td>
<td>list of contributors to a fund</td>
<td>incomplete marble plaque; 0.75 × (0.55) m, possibly from the schola of the dendrophori</td>
<td>the mater and other (male) contributors are listed according to the order of their birthdays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitia Civitas</td>
<td>statue base with dedicatory inscription</td>
<td>small marble base for a statuette of Attis</td>
<td>pater: Q. Domitianus Aterianus (perhaps a freedman from the same household; he was married to a Sallustia Crispina; see CIL XIV, 912).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egnatia Salviana</td>
<td>statue base set up by Egnatia Salviana for her husband</td>
<td>marble base inscribed on three sides: 1.61 × 0.96 × 0.80 m</td>
<td>husband: benefactor and patron of the same collegium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Max. dimensions of respectively height, width and depth (if known). In parentheses: incomplete fragment.

** “Fathers,” “mothers,” “daughters” mentioned in the same inscription who—as far as we know—were not related to the “mother.”
### Table 5: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Inscription and monument</th>
<th>Archaeological details</th>
<th>Patronage and collegiate functions of relatives</th>
<th>Patres, matres, filiae and female members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epipodia</td>
<td>album collegii</td>
<td>incomplete marble plaque</td>
<td></td>
<td>the last column lists 16 female members headed by the mater: Epipodia mater / Valentina / Augusta / Asclepiodote / Tiberina / Maximina / Tzinta / Iustina / Cornificia / Longa / Cornelia / Vera / Hilara / Groca / Rufina / Victorina / Paula / (some names seem to have been added later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavia Festa</td>
<td>album Augustalium</td>
<td>incomplete marble plaque</td>
<td>pater: T(itus) found in three pieces: 1.94 × 1.01 × 0.04 m</td>
<td>Vettulenus Nepos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabia Lucilla</td>
<td>funerary stele(?) for her father-in-law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavia Nona</td>
<td>votive altars</td>
<td>fragments of two limestone altars: 1.01 × 0.74 × 0.12– 0.145 m and 1 × 0.60 × 0.60 m, letters badly worn</td>
<td>pater: Aurelius Valerianus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavillia Optata</td>
<td>funerary inscription</td>
<td>incomplete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herois</td>
<td><em>album</em> of <em>collegii</em></td>
<td>Large marble plaque: 1.78 × 0.68 × 0.074 m; inscribed on both sides. Side B lists 14 male patrons, 5 <em>matres</em>, 12 <em>amatores</em>, 2 scribes, 55 male members followed by 7 female members: Statia Sura / Iulia Victoria / Tullia Naevia / Volusena Procula / Aurelia Valeria / Ocletia Sabina / Dia Aphrodite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cysenia, Eusebia Prima, Aurelia Herais, Lartia Felicitas, Sera Chreste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iunia Zosime</td>
<td>votive inscription</td>
<td>Small marble column for a silver statuette Plaque B: 29 men (patrons?), 2 <em>immunes</em>, 3 <em>matres</em>, 2 <em>filiae</em>: Iulia Probit(a) and Fl(avia) Athenais, followed by 5 male members among whom 1 <em>bisellarius</em> <em>dendrophorum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepidia Iulia, Titinia Crispina, Numitoria Felicitas</td>
<td><em>album</em> of <em>collegii</em></td>
<td>Two marble plaques, both incomplete. A. lists the members of the <em>collegium fabrum tig(nariorum)</em> and B. those of the <em>collegium dendrophorum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licinia Macedonica</td>
<td>statue base for Allia Candida</td>
<td>Marble base 13 male patrons, 6 <em>quinquennales</em>, 1 <em>mater</em> followed by 14 <em>honorati</em> and ca. 320 pleb(ei)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macia Menophile</td>
<td><em>album</em> of <em>collegii</em></td>
<td>Incomplete marble plaque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Basilissa</td>
<td>votive stele</td>
<td>Broken in two, (1.33) × 0.60 × 0.15 m son: patron of the same <em>collegium</em> (see further table 2 under Vesia Martina, his wife)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memmia Victoria</td>
<td><em>tabula patronatus</em> for her son</td>
<td>Bronze plaque, ca. 0.60 × 0.40 m son: patron of the same <em>collegium</em> (see further table 2 under Vesia Martina, his wife)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Inscription and monument</td>
<td>Archaeological details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menia Iuliane</td>
<td>marble stele crowned by a fronton; <em>album collegii</em></td>
<td>Lower part broken off: (1.05) × 0.85 × 0.33 m. Decoration of the fronton: horseman with dog chasing a boar and a snake coiled around a tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placidia Damale</td>
<td>funerary stele</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomponia Victorina</td>
<td>statue base with votive inscription</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvia Marcellina</td>
<td><em>lex collegii</em></td>
<td>Large marble plaque: 0.70 × 1.19 × 0.05 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Table 6: Matres collegiorum: title, justification, benefactions*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dedicator(s)</th>
<th>Title and justification</th>
<th>Benefactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>sons</td>
<td>matri / sodalic(ii) fullon(um) . . . parentib(us) / piisimis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Arria</td>
<td>collegium?</td>
<td>matri(is)</td>
<td>she contributed HS 6,000(?) to a fund for the communal celebration of their birthdays by the members of the collegium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitia Civitas</td>
<td>Domitia Civitas and a pater of the collegium cannophorum</td>
<td>mater</td>
<td>together with a pater of the collegium she donated a statue of Attis to the collegium cannophorum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Egnatia Salviana | collegium dendrophorum | she is co-opted as mater in recognition of the benefaction of her husband who is co-opted as patron in the same inscription  

| Flavia Nona | Flavia Nona, a pater dumi and a vexillarius (standard-bearer) of the association | mater dumi | they dedicated votive altars to Cybele(?) in the name of the initiates (sacrati dumi) |
| Gavillia Optata | her contubernalis | matri colleg(ii) / centonarior(um) | |

* no public honor is attested in the inscriptions  

77 See Alfoldy 2000: 7–16, who, however, mistakenly assumes that both were co-opted as patrons of the city.
Table 6: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dedicator(s)</th>
<th>Title and justification</th>
<th>Benefactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herois Cy(s)enia, Eusebia Prima, Aurelia Heras, Lartia Felicitas, Sera Chrestes</td>
<td>unidentified collegium</td>
<td>matres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iunia Zosime</td>
<td>Iunia Zosime</td>
<td>mater</td>
<td>she donated a statuette of Virtus of two pounds of silver to the dendrophori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lepidia Iulia, Titinia Crispina, Numatoria Felicitas</td>
<td>collegium dendrophorum</td>
<td>mat(res)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licinia Macedonica</td>
<td>collegium [Rom*fanense maius</td>
<td>matre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macia Menophile</td>
<td>collegium fabrum navalium</td>
<td>mater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Basilissa</td>
<td>sister-in-law</td>
<td>matre / dendrophorum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memmia Victoria</td>
<td>collegium fabrum</td>
<td>matris numeri nostri; her son is co-opted as patron in honore atisque dignitate Memmiae Victoriae quondam in\l\lles m\l\moriae femin\l\l&gt;e . . . exemplo pietatis parentium et matris honorific\l\l}entia(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menia Iuliane</td>
<td>collegium Romanorum</td>
<td>matrem Romanorum subscriptorum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placidia Damale</td>
<td>husband</td>
<td>matrit / vernacular\l\l} optimae / et incom/parabili feminae \l\l}uxori fidelissimae / et piissimae /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomponia Victorina</td>
<td>M. Aurelius Successus and Pomponia Victorina</td>
<td>mat(er) / coll(egii)</td>
<td>together with a quinquennalis of the collegium she dedicated a statue to Liber</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Salvia Marcellina, *collegium Aesculapi et Hygiae* matri collegi(i) in memory of her late husband she donated a piece of land with a shrine, a pergola, a marble statue of Aesculapius and a roofed terrace for banqueting, and HS 50,000 from the interest of which the sixty members of the *collegium* were to receive *sportulae* of money or food on fixed days. Zeno, *pater* of the *collegium*, donated HS 10,000.
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