



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Patronesses and "mothers" of Roman collegia

Hemelrijk, E.

DOI

[10.1525/ca.2008.27.1.115](https://doi.org/10.1525/ca.2008.27.1.115)

Publication date

2008

Published in

Classical Antiquity

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Hemelrijk, E. (2008). Patronesses and "mothers" of Roman collegia. *Classical Antiquity*, 27(1), 115-162. <https://doi.org/10.1525/ca.2008.27.1.115>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

EMILY HEMELRIJK



Patronesses and “Mothers” of Roman *Collegia*

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 . 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 *collegia*, 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 the association of builders (*collegium fabrum*), one of the three main Roman *collegia*,¹ 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 adfectione Laberius Gallus p(rimi)p(ilaris) v(ir)
e(gregius) erga / coll(eg)ium n(ostrum) agere instituerit bene cia eius
iam dudum in nos / conlata con rmant et ideo Anchariam Lupercam
uxorem / eius liam 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 .

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 Ausbüttel 1982, Patterson 1992 and 1994, Kloppenborg and Wilson

Classical Antiquity. Vol. 27, Issue 1, pp. 115–162. ISSN 0278-6656(p); 1067-8344 (e).
Copyright © 2008 by The Regents of the University of California. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press's Rights and Permissions website at <http://www.ucpressjournals.com/reprintInfo.asp>.
DOI:10.1525/CA.2008.27.1.115.

cuius proles et / prosapia omnibus honoribus patriae n(ostrae) sincera de func/ta est in honorem eorum et pro morum eius castitatae (!) / et iam priscae consuetudinis sanctitatae (!) patronam / collegi(i) n(ostri) cooptemus statuam etiam ei aeream iuxta eun/dem Laberium Gallum maritum suum in schola collegi(i) n(ostri) / ponamus q(uid) d(e) e(a) r(e) f(ieri) p(laceret) u(niversi) i(ta) c(ensuerunt) recte et merito retulisse / q(uin)q(uennales) n(ostros) ut Anchariam Lupercam honestam matronam sanc/t(a)e indolis et disciplinae caerimoni(i)s etiam praedit(am=IS) feminam / in honorem Laberi Galli p(rimi)p(ilaris) e(gregii) v(iri) 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 / suum ponamus ut eius erga{a} nos pietas et nostra erga eam vo/luntas publica etiam visione{m} conspiciatur tabulam quo/que patrocinalem in domo eius ad gi.

CIL XI, 2702 = ILS 7217

With how much love and affection Laberius Gallus, *primipilaris* (centurion 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 therefore co-opt as a *patrona* of our *collegium* his wife, Ancharia Luperca, the daughter of the late Ancharius Celer, of blessed memory, whose offspring 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, endowed 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

1996, Egelhaaf-Gaiser and Schäfer 2002; for *scholae* of *collegia*, see Bollmann 1998; for *collegia* in the Greek East, see van Nijf 1997; on modern scholarship of Roman *collegia* since Mommsen see Perry 2006, and on women in *collegia*, Hirschmann 2004.

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.² 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.³ 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”⁴ 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?⁵

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. 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,

2. Between the formal consent of the patron(ess) and the presentation of the bronze *tabula patronatus* considerable time might elapse, as appears from the example of Vesia Martina (*CIL* XI, 5749 = *AE* 1992, 562 = *ILS* 7221), who together with her husband and son was co-opted first *per duplum* receiving her *tabula patronatus* only much later.

3. For the organization of *collegia* reflecting that of the city, Kloppenborg 1996: 26, Patterson 1994: 234–36, Bendlin 2002: 10–12; Meiggs 1973: 314–15. For civic patronage in the Latin West, see Harmand 1957, Duthoy 1984a and b; for *tabulae patronatus* and the co-optation of municipal patrons, see Nicols 1980; for patronesses of cities: Nicols 1989 and Hemelrijk 2004.

4. Meiggs 1973: 319.

5. For *pater*, *mater* and *filia* as purely honorific titles: Waltzing 1895–1900: vol. I, 447–48; for *pater* and *mater* as equivalent to *patronus* and *patrona*, Liebenam 1890: 218; Clemente 1972 indiscriminately lists *matres collegii* among the (male and female) patrons of *collegia*; also Waltzing 1895–1900: vol. I, 430 suggests that they may have been the same persons. Kloppenborg 1996: 25 distinguishes between patrons on the one hand and “fathers” and “mothers” on the other, suggesting that “fathers” and “mothers” were “members of the collegium in some official position.”

however, that the limitation of the evidence to the first three centuries 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 classes⁷ 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 fulfil 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 *sodalitium*, *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

6. MacMullen 1982; for an excellent summary of modern discussion of the Roman “epigraphic habit,” see Bodel 2001: 6–10.

7. Or, less anachronistically, the *plebs media*, see van Nijf 1997: 18–23.

8. See Kloppenborg 1996, Ausbüttel 1982, Patterson 1992 and 1994, van Nijf 1997. The rigid division by Waltzing 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. Waltzing 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. Waltzing 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 = *InscrIt* X, 5, 204 = *ILS* 6724 and *CIL* VI, 29756) and several other patronesses who are excluded here for various reasons (see the following note).

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, honorary 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 *patron(ae)*, makes it possible—and perhaps even likely—that not she, but her husband was a patron of the *severi Augustales*. Though listed by Saaavedra 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 Reginia Paterna, *mater nata et facta* (a grade of initiation?), who dedicated an altar to Semele and her divine sisters *ob honorem sacri matris* (CIL XIII, 8244 = ILS 3384, Colonia Agrippinensium, 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.

13. For instance, CIL X, 7 = AE 1985, 305; *pace* Kloppenborg 1996: 25.

14. For the *collegium* of the *Augustales*, D’Arms 2000; for a distinction between official colleges, 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 status 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.¹⁵ 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).¹⁶ 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.¹⁷

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.¹⁸ Compared to them, the social rank of “mothers” of *collegia* was considerably lower (table 4): apart from two women of equestrian

15. The third volume of the study by Waltzing 1895–1900 contains 890 inscriptions for Italy (without Rome), 766 for Rome, 190 for Gaul, 165 for the Balkan and Danube regions, 99 for the African provinces, 55 for the Spanish provinces, 40 for Germania and 11 for Britain. The majority of the 292 inscriptions listed by Clemente 1972 are from Italy (218, including 24 from Rome and 47 from Ostia and Portus), 37 stem from Illyria, 24 from Gallia, 7 from Africa, 5 from the Spanish provinces and one from Macedonia. For the geographical distribution of the more than two thousand inscriptions mentioning *collegia* in the Latin West, see also Ausbüttel 1982: 32–33: two-thirds of the evidence stems from Italy, especially central Italy. Of course, new inscriptions have appeared since: for instance, Kulikowski 2004: 54 counts more than 100 inscriptions pertaining to associations in the Spanish provinces.

16. Cf. Clemente 1972, Bollmann 1998: 17, Meiggs 1973: 332, Patterson 1994: 235–36. I am not concerned with the question of the origin of the use of familial terminology in associations; recent contributions by Harland 2005 and 2007, however, make clear that in the Greek East active family language was both earlier and more widespread than in the Latin-speaking world.

17. Waltzing 1895–1900: vol. IV, 372–73 lists 23 *patres* of *collegia*, mostly from central Italy and the Balkan and Danube regions.

18. Exceptions are Blassia Vera, Iscantia Prima and Valeria Severina. The lack of a filiation does not necessarily mean that these women were freedwomen since from the second century onwards the filiation was used less and less frequently; see Royden 1988: 59.

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 Aulus 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 Cornium 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 *dendrophori* 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 that they had a civic role as *regentes*, 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) filio / Pal(atina) Gallico / ordo Augustal(ium) / patrono ob 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.²² 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*.²³ 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 underlined 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 n(ostrum) / patroni in collegium 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?²⁴ 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.²⁵ An exclusively male membership is also commonly assumed for the *sodalitium iuvenum Herculanorum*, an association of young men deriving its name from the cult of Hercules, and—perhaps too easily—for the *Augustales*.²⁶ 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)astorum 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).²⁷ In short, no predominance of “religious”

24. Meiggs 1973: 327; according to Ausbüttel 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 Ausbüttel 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 Ausbüttel 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 cannophorum*, that of the *dendrophori* and the *dumus*²⁸ (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?]anense 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 μήτηρ 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 Ru na, as its “mother.”²⁹ Moreover, the (incomplete) *album* of an unidentified *collegium*

members of the *collegium*. On the basis of the occupations of some of the members Kulikowski 2004: 55 calls it “an association of cobblers and textile workers,” but the name of the association has not come down to us and they may have gathered for different reasons, such as a communal cult.

28. *Dumus*, the Latin transcription of the Greek δοῦμος is used for religious associations (cf. *CIG* 3439 Lydia: ἱερὸς δοῦμος) connected with the cult of Cybele; cf. also *IG Bulg.* IV, 1925: a woman with the Roman name Οὐαλερία who was μήτηρ δενδροφόρων of a (possibly all-female) ἱεροῦ δοῦμου in Serdica (Thrac.; late 2nd—early 3rd c.); see also Tacheva-Hitova 1983: 116–18 no. 101, and *infra* n.29.

29. For the *collegium Asianorum* in Napoca, see *CIL* III, 870 = *ILS* 4061: 27 male and 17 female members; for the *album collegii* of the *collegium dendrophorum* of Luna see *CIL* XI, 1355 = *ILS* 7227; for the inscription set up by the *dendrophori* of Regium Iulium (It.), see *CIL* X, 7 = *AE* 1985, 305; for the Greek inscription of a ἱεροῦ δοῦμου in Serdica (Thrac.), see *IG Bulg.* IV, 1925: a marble tablet with the names of the members in three columns; only the lower part of the second and most of the third column are preserved bearing the names of female members and a *mater dendrophorum*. The second column of a Greek *album collegii* in Tomis from 200–201 is headed by two women, a μήτηρ δενδροφόρων and an ἀρχιραβδουχίσα (a female leader of the wand-bearers),

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

BENEFACTIONS 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

see Tacheva-Hitova 1983: 93–95 no. 48; among the male magistrates there is a *πατήρ*. For the *album collegii Bacchii vernaculorum*: *CIL* III, 6150 = 7437 (Nicopolis ad Istrum; Moesia inf., 227). Lastly, an (all-female?) *collegium canofoarum* in Saepinum (It.) set up a tombstone for a female member; see *CIL* IX, 2480.

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.”

31. See, for patrons of *collegia*, van Nijf 1997: 82–95, 117 and 119, Clemente 1972: 215–20, Patterson 1992: 21.

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.³⁴ 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.”³⁵ 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*.³⁶

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*.

35. Van Nijf 1997: 119.

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.)

distributions of the *collegium* on an equal footing with the chief magistrate, the *quinquennalis*, and the *pater*³⁷ 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*.³⁸ 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*.³⁹

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.

38. Van Nijf 2002: 332–33. For *alba decurionum*, see Salway 2000 and Chastagnol 1978.

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 = *IPOstie-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 *COLLEGIA*:
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

40. See, for the nature and function of municipal patronage, Nicols 1980, Duthoy 1984a and b, Salway 2000: 140–48; for city patronesses Hemelrijk 2004. For patrons of *collegia*, Clemente 1972: 220–23, Royden 1988: 15–16 and van Nijf 1997: 95–100.

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 n(ostra)* 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 d[efend]endis se et in tuendis / eximiam diligentiam*. *CIL* VI, 1649: *patrono et defensori*. 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.⁴² This does not mean that nothing was expected from him. Like patronage of individuals, which is usually presented as disinterested friendship,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.⁴⁴ Instead, quite a few patronesses are praised for their merits, albeit in very vague terms. Apart from words 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

he will deign to accept them in his patronage (*nos et in clientela sua recipere dignatur*); see *AE* 1998, 282 = *AE* 2000, 243.

42. Van Nijf 1997: 93, 96, Forbis 1996: 9 and 12.

43. Saller 1982.

44. 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.

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 promoted: 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”⁴⁵ 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.⁴⁶ 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 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 eius 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 dignitat(e=IS) / [Petr]onis 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(emina)* or *cc(larissimi) pp(ueri)* draws attention to the senatorial status of the members of this family. For Petronius Victorinus and his family, see *PIR*² 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 Verum* 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 Victorini*) 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)ius*, *proque senatoria dignitat(e=IS)*, *dignation(i=E) dignitati eius*; his “incomparable” love towards the *collegium* is only paralleled by the “incomparable” chastity of Setina Iusta. The *collegium* “rejoices” (*laetatur*) 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 fo/vere 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.⁴⁹

A few years later, in 261, 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 / [erg]a n(umerum) n(ostrum) 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” (*munificentia(m) / [eo]rum . . . [re]munerare icitur(!) si cunctis videtur Coretium Fuscum / [sp]lendidum decurione(m) patriae n(ostrae) sed et patronum trium / coll(egiorum) principium et Vesia(m) Martinam coniucem(!) eius / patronam sed et Coretiu(m)*

the parents and the *collegium*, we may assume—increases. Of course, the co-optation was decreed unanimously: *u(niversorum) c(onsensu)* and *prono consensu*, and “with favorable mind and vote” (*prono animo et voto*). For the frequent references to their high rank, see n.47. For expressions of haste: “we hasten” (*properamus*) and “as soon as possible” (*quam primum*).

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(i=E) et in numerum nostrum*. The glory of the *collegium*: *demonstrari gloriosum* “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*.

Sabinum filium eorum iam pridem / patronos per duplimum a numero n(ostro) cooptatos nunc tabulam / aeream 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 dissimilar 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 gloriously and beautifully—the decree is also carved in a bronze tablet” (*quod in praeteritum Coreti Fusci patroni Vesiae Martinae / patronae et Coreti Sabini filii eorum erca amore beneficia praesentia susceperimus nunc etiam in futurum non dissimilia quae / nunc sentimus perpetuo ex domum eorum processura pari affectione speramus . . . et ad remunerandam / eorum benevolentia quo lautius adque pulchrius dicentur honorem / sibi oblatum suscipere 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 straightforward, 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, affectio, 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 *affectio*) 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.⁵⁰ This is suggested by the words at the end of the decree: “so that her devotion (*pietas*) towards us and our goodwill (*voluntas*) towards her will be visible for all in the public view.” *Pietas* is a multivalent word referring to a person’s dutiful conduct towards the gods, one’s relatives and, here, the *collegium*. Like *amor* and *adfectio*, *pietas* could be manifested by benefactions; together with *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.⁵¹

Considered together, the three *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 *tabula patronatus* in conjunction with her husband and son. Yet, we should not conclude from this that *patrona* simply was an honorary 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 *fabri* and *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.⁵² Therefore, when co-opting a woman as their patroness, *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 *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 (*castitas morum*) and her old-fashioned purity of custom (*sanctitas priscae consuetudinis*), and she is honored for her pure character and habit (*sancta indoles et disciplina*) and

50. See also Forbis 1996: 85–87.

51. For *voluntas* and *pietas*, see Forbis 1996: 52 and 58.

52. See Hemelrijk 1999: 11–12 and 2004.

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 fo/vere 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, adfectio* 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, adfectio* 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 *adfectio* 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 patrons⁵³—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.⁵⁴

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?⁵⁵ 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—

53. Royden 1988: 15–16, Clemente 1972.

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; Kuho 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 appellaverunt*), 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) 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.

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 Vesia Martina a *pater* and a *parens* 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*.⁵⁹ 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*.⁶⁰ 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?]anense 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.⁶¹ 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*.⁶²

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 c(ollegii) c(entonariorum) numerum habentibus sequella eiusdem collec(ii!) 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 / Macedonice matre*. 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 *su/b patre T(itiano)*, see *CIL* V, 784 = *InscrAqu* I, 247. According to Clemente 1972: 160 L(icinia) 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.

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 itaque universis patronum eum, Egnatiam Salvianam, / eius (uxorem), matrem cooptemus et petamus ab eo ut tabulam aeneam patronati 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 aequae dignitate Memmiae Victoriae quondam {INDOLES} memoriae femin(a)e matris numeri nostri*) and for “the example of the devotion of his parents and of the honorable conduct of his mother” (*exemplo pietatis parentium et matris honorificentia 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*.⁶³ 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.⁶⁴

63. Forbis 1996: 56; *ut / potius honorificentia nostrae modum intellegat* (“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 splendide natus*; for their own *collegium*: *splendidissimum numerum nostrum* 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*.⁶⁵ 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.⁶⁶ 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.⁶⁷

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. Ausbüttel 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.

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

68. Dixon 1988.

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 honorary 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

: *Patronesses and “Mothers” of Roman Collegia*

143

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.

University of Amsterdam
E.A.Hemelrijk@uva.nl

TABLES

Table 1: Patronesses of *collegia*

Name	Corpus	Social status	City	Province*	Date (all dates CE)	Patroness of
Alliena Berenice	<i>CIL</i> IX, 5368		Firmum Picenum	It. (5)	2nd c.	<i>collegium fabrum et centonariorum</i>
Ancharia Luperca	<i>CIL</i> XI, 2702 = <i>ILS</i> 7217	equestrian	Volsinii	It. (7)	224	<i>collegium fabrum</i>
Aurelia Crescentia ⁶⁹	<i>CIL</i> IX, 4894 = <i>ILS</i> 6554 = <i>AE</i> 2001, 908	equestrian	Trebula Mutuesca	It. (4)	243	<i>tricliniares</i>
Blassia Vera	<i>CIL</i> XI, 6310 = <i>ILS</i> 3082		Pisaurum	It. (6)	2nd c.	<i>cultores Iovis Latii</i>
Cat[—]ia V[erecun]da	<i>CIL</i> V, 5295		Comum	It. (11)		<i>collegium nautarum Comensium</i>
Cissonia Aphrodite	<i>CIL</i> V, 5869 = <i>ILS</i> 6730	equestrian	Mediolanum	It. (11)	mid 3rd c.	<i>collegium fabrum et centonariorum</i>
Egnatia Certiana	<i>CIL</i> IX, 1578	senatorial	Beneventum	It. (2)	2nd–3rd c.	<i>parasiti</i>
Iscantia Prima	<i>AE</i> 1948, 31		Ostia	It. (1)	211 ⁷⁰	<i>collegium (h)astoforum Ostiensium</i>
Marcia Ulpia Sossia Calligona	<i>AE</i> 1956, 77 = <i>AE</i> 1958, 177	equestrian	Tibur	It. (1)	late 2nd–early 3rd c.	<i>sodalitium iuvenum Herculanorum</i>
Rutilia Paulina	<i>CIL</i> IX, 3182	senatorial	Cor nium	It. (4)	late 1st–early 2nd c.	<i>seviri Augustales</i>
Setina Iusta	<i>CIL</i> XI, 6335 = <i>ILS</i> 7218	senatorial	Pisaurum	It. (6)	256	<i>collegium fabrum</i>

* 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.

: *Patronesses and “Mothers” of Roman Collegia*

145

Valeria Severina ⁷¹	AE 1946, 120 = <i>CIL</i> II, 5812	Segisamum	Hisp.Tar.	239	unidenti ed <i>collegium</i>
Vesia Martina ⁷²	<i>CIL</i> XI, 5749 = AE 1992, 562 = <i>ILS</i> 7221	equestrian	Sentinum	It. (6) 261	<i>collegium</i> <i>centonariorum</i>
unknown	<i>CIL</i> V, 4432 = <i>InscrIt</i> X,5, 225		Brixia	It. (10)	<i>cultores</i> <i>collegii Larum</i>

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

⁷² Her name is spelled as Vasia Martina by Forbis 1996: no. 328 and Raepsaet-Charlier 2005: 202.

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

Name	Inscription and monument	Archaeological details*	Patronage and collegiate functions of relatives	Non-related patrons and female members**
Alliena Berenice	honorific statue base	1.22 × 0.71 × (ca. 0.60) m		
Ancharia Luperca	<i>tabula patronatus</i>	large bronze plaque: 0.70 × 0.48 m, with triangular top, found in the <i>tablinum</i> of a Roman house	husband: patron of the same collegium.	
Aurelia Crescentia	honorific statue base	limestone base: (0.71) × (0.56) × 0.68 m, re-cut for re-use	husband: patron of the city	
Blassia Vera	<i>album collegii?</i>	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		Two male patrons: M(arcus) Fremedius Severus and P(ublius) Seneka Cornelius. Female members: Vibia [C]ari[t]e, Vicria Capria, Suedia Lea.
Cat[—]ia V[errecun]da	honorific statue base	re-used: square hole in the middle of the inscription		patron: C(aius) Messius Fortunatus
Cissonia Aphrodite	honorific inscription		husband: patron, <i>decurio</i> and <i>curator arcae(!)</i> of the same <i>collegium</i>	
Egnatia Certiana	honorific statue base			

* 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.

: *Patronesses and "Mothers" of Roman Collegia*

147

Iscantia Prima	building inscription	found in the temple of Bellona, near the <i>schola</i> of the <i>hastiferi</i>		two male patrons: C(aius) Rubrius Fortunatus and C(aius) Rubrius [Iu]stus
Marcia Ulpia Sossia Calligona	honorific statue base			
Rutilia Paulina	honorific statue base			
Setina Iusta	<i>tabula patronatus</i>	large bronze plaque with triangular top and ornamental frame found in a Roman build- ing; (without frame): 0.90 × 0.68 × 0.05 m; (with frame): 1.55 × 1 m	her youngest son is co-opted together with her; her husband and their older sons were already patrons of the same <i>collegium</i> .	
Valeria Severina	bronze <i>tessera</i>	bronze plaque: 0.30 × 0.22 m		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
Vesia Martina	<i>tabula patronatus</i>	bronze plaque: 0.65 × 0.44 × 0.06 m	her husband and son were patrons of the same <i>collegium</i> , her husband also being patron of the <i>fabri</i> and <i>dendrophori</i> (<i>tria collegia principalia</i>)	
unknown	honorific inscription	incomplete		

Table 3: patronesses of *collegia*: title, justification, benefactions and public honor

Name	Dedicator(s)	Title and justification	Benefactions	Public honor(s)
Alliena Berenice	husband and son	<i>uxori</i> / <i>sanctissim(ae)</i> ... <i>matri</i> / <i>piisimae</i> <i>patr(ona)e</i> / <i>col(legii)</i> <i>fab(rum) et</i> <i>cent(onariorum)</i>		public statue
Ancharia Luperca	<i>collegium</i> <i>fabrum</i>	<i>patronam</i> / <i>collegi(i) n(ostr)i</i> , co-opted in honor of her husband and father and because of her <i>castitas</i> , <i>sanctitas priscae</i> <i>consuetudinis</i> , <i>sancta indoles</i> <i>et disciplina</i> and because she was a <i>caerimoni(i)s</i> <i>praedita femina</i> . She is called a <i>dignissima patrona</i> and praised for her <i>pietas</i> towards the <i>collegium</i> .		bronze <i>tabula</i> <i>patronatus</i> (and bronze statue in the <i>schola</i> of the <i>collegium</i> next to that of her husband)
Aurelia Crescentia	citizens and <i>tricliniaries</i>	<i>honestissim[ae] /</i> <i>et pudicissim(a)e</i> <i>femin(a)e</i> <i>patro(nae) ... ob</i> <i>merita et</i> <i>be[ne]ficia saepe</i> <i>/ [i]n se conlata</i>	<i>beneficia</i> (not speci ed)	public statue dedicated on her birthday
Blassia Vera	<i>cultores</i> <i>Iovis Latii</i>	<i>patroni</i>	together with a male patron she distributed bread, wine and half a <i>denarius</i> to each member of the <i>collegium</i>	
Cat[—]ia V[er]ecun[da]	<i>collegium</i> <i>nautarum</i> <i>Comensium</i>	<i>pa[t]r[o]n[is]</i>		public statue

: Patronesses and “Mothers” of Roman Collegia

149

Cissonia Aphrodite	<i>collegium fabrum et centona- riorum</i>	<i>patronis /plura merentibus</i>	unidenti ed honoru c monument
Egnatia Certiana	<i>parasiti</i>	<i>patronae praestantissimae</i>	public statue?
Iscantia Prima	the three patrons	<i>patroni (h)astoforum Ostiensium</i>	together with two male patrons she restored the temple (of Bellona?) that had fallen in ruins from old age
Marcia Ulpia Sossia Calligona	<i>sodalicum iuvenum Herculanorum</i>	<i>patronae</i>	public statue
Rutilia Paulina	<i>seviri Augustales</i>	<i>patronae / ob merita patris et / ipsius</i>	public statue
Setina Iusta	<i>collegium fabrum</i>	<i>patronam . . . n(umeri) n(ostri), 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 fovere nos digne<n>tur</i>	bronze <i>tabula patronatus</i>
Valeria Severina	<i>cives of an unidenti ed collegium</i>	<i>patronis merentissimis et felicissimis) / et pr(a)estantissimis et pietissimis . . . Valeri(a)e Severin(a)e patron(a)e nostr(a)e</i>	bronze plaque in honor of Valeria Severina and four male patrons

150

Volume 27/No. 1/April 2008

Table 3: (continued)

Name	Dedicator(s)	Title and justification	Benefactions	Public honor(s)
Vesia Martina	<i>collegium centona- riorum</i>	Vesia Martina, her husband and son are honored for their <i>beneficia</i> , <i>munificentia</i> and <i>merita</i> and for their <i>adfectio</i> , <i>amor</i> and <i>benevolentia</i> towards the <i>collegium</i> ; hopes are expressed that these will continue in the future.	<i>beneficia</i> and <i>munificentia</i> (not speci ed)	bronze <i>tabula patronatus</i> (they were already patrons per <i>duplomum</i>)
unknown	<i>cultores collegii Larum</i>	<i>patronae / bene merenti</i>		public statue?

Table 4: *Matres collegiorum*

Name	Corpus	Social Status	City	Province	Date	Mater of
Claudia	<i>CIL</i> IX, 5450 = <i>AE</i> 1999, 599 = <i>ILS</i> 7248	freedwoman	Falerio Piceni	It. (5)		<i>sodalitium fullonum</i>
Claudia Arria	<i>CIL</i> XIV, 326	freedwoman?	Ostia	It. (1)	2nd–3rd c.?	<i>collegium dendrophorum</i> ⁷³
Domitia Civitas	<i>CIL</i> XIV, 37 = <i>ILS</i> 4114	freedwoman	Ostia	It. (1)	late 2nd–early 3rd c.	<i>collegium canno-phorum</i>
Egnatia Salviana	<i>AE</i> 1998, 282 = <i>AE</i> 2000, 243	equestrian	Lavinium	It. (1)	228	<i>collegium dendrophorum</i>
Epipodia	<i>CIL</i> III, 870 = <i>ILS</i> 4061	slave? ⁷⁴	Napoca	Dacia	235	<i>collegium Asianorum</i>
Flavia Festa	<i>AE</i> 2001, 854		Liternum	It. (1)	late 2nd c.	<i>Augustales</i>
Fabia Lucilla	<i>CIL</i> III, 1207 = IDR III 5, 2, 483	equestrian	Apulum	Dacia	3rd c.	<i>collegia fabrum et centonariorum</i>
Flavia Nona	<i>IScM</i> ² II, 160 and <i>AE</i> 1964, 230 ⁷⁵		Tomis	Moes. Inf.	180–192 or 211–217	<i>dumus</i>
Gavillia Optata	<i>CIL</i> IX, 2687	freedwoman	Aesernia	It. (4)		<i>collegium centonariorum</i>
Herois Cy[s]enia, Eusebia Prima, Aurelia Herais, Lartia Felicitas and Sera Chreste	<i>AE</i> 1977, 265b	freedwomen	Classis	It. (8)	287–304	unidenti ed <i>collegium</i>
Iunia Zosime	<i>CIL</i> XIV, 69	freedwoman	Ostia	It. (1)	2nd–3rd c.?	<i>collegium dendrophorum</i>

⁷³ See Meiggs 1973: 327.⁷⁴ Saavedra Guerrero 1998: 132n.26.⁷⁵ Tacheva-Hitova 1983: 78–80 no. 14.

Table 4: (continued)

Name	Corpus	Social Status	City	Province	Date	Mater of
Lepidia Iulia, Titinia Crispina and Numitoria Felicitas	<i>CIL</i> II, 1355 = <i>ILS</i> 7227		Luna	It. (1)	2nd– 3rd c.?	<i>collegium dendro- phorum</i>
Licina Macedonica	<i>CIL</i> XI, 3229 = <i>ILS</i> 7308		Laminium	Hispania Tarraconensis		<i>collegium [Rom?]anense maius</i>
Macia ⁷⁶ Menophile	<i>CIL</i> XIV, 256 = <i>AE</i> 1955, 182 = <i>IPOstie-B</i> , 344	freedwoman ?	Ostia / Portus	It. (1)	early 3rd cent. ?	<i>collegium fabrum navaliium</i>
Marcia Basilissa	<i>CIL</i> III, 7505 = <i>ILS</i> 2311 = <i>AE</i> 1888, 11 = <i>IScM</i> ² V, 160		Troesmis	Moesia Inf.	after 170	<i>collegium dendro- phorum</i>
Memmia Victoria	<i>CIL</i> XI, 5748 = <i>ILS</i> 7220	decurial / equestrian(?)	Sentinum	It. (6)	260	<i>collegium fabrum</i>
Menia Iuliane	<i>CIL</i> III, 7532 = <i>ILS</i> 4069 = <i>IScM</i> ² II, 129		Tomis	Moesia Inf.	late 2nd –early 3rd c.	<i>collegium Romanorum</i>
Placidia Damale, quae et Ru na	<i>CIL</i> III, 8833		Salona	Dalmatia	2nd– 3rd c.	<i>collegium vernacu- lorum</i>
Pomponia Victorina	<i>CIL</i> VI, 8796 = <i>ILS</i> 1700	freedwoman?	Rome	It. (1)		<i>collegium Liberi patris</i>
Salvia Marcellina	<i>CIL</i> VI, 10234 = <i>ILS</i> 7213		Rome	It. (1)	153	<i>collegium Aesculapii et Hygiae</i>

⁷⁶ Clemente 1972: 195. Though the inscription reads Macia, her name is spelled as Maecia by Meiggs 1973: 319 and Marcia by Saavedra Guerrero 1998: 134.

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

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

* 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)

Name	Inscription and monument	Archaeological details	Patronage and collegiate functions of relatives	<i>Patres, matres, filiae</i> and female members
Epipodia	<i>album collegii</i>	incomplete marble plaque		the last column lists 16 female members headed by the <i>mater</i> : Epipodia mater / Valentina / Augusta / Asclepiodote / Tiberina / Maximina / Tzinta / Iustina / Corni cia / Longa / Cornelia / Vera / Hilara / Greca / Ru na / Victorina / Paula / (some names seem to have been added later)
Flavia Festa	<i>album Augustalium</i>	incomplete marble plaque found in three pieces: 1.94 × 1.01 × 0.04 m		<i>pater</i> : T(itus) Vettulenus Nepos
Fabia Lucilla	funerary stele(?) for her father-in-law			
Flavia Nona	votive altars	fragments of two limestone altars: 1.01 × 0.74 × 0.12–0.145 m and 1 × 0.60 × 0.60 m, letters badly worn		<i>pater</i> : Aurelius Valerianus
Gavillia Optata	funerary inscription	incomplete		

: Patronesses and “Mothers” of Roman Collegia

155

<p>Herois Cy[s]jenia, Eusebia Prima, Aurelia Herais, Lartia Felicitas, Sera Chreste</p>	<p><i>album collegii</i></p>	<p>large marble plaque: 1.78 × 0.68 × 0.074 m; inscribed on both sides.</p>	<p>Side B lists 14 male patrons, 5 <i>matres</i>, 12 <i>amatores</i>, 2 scribes, 55 male members followed by 7 female members: Statia Sura / Iulia Victoria / Tullia Naevia / Volusena Procula / Aurelia Valeria / Oclatia Sabina / Dia Aphrodite</p>
<p>Iunia Zosime</p>	<p>votive inscription</p>	<p>small marble column for a silver statuette</p>	
<p>Lepidia Iulia, Titinia Crispina, Numitoria Felicitas</p>	<p><i>album collegii</i></p>	<p>Two marble plaques, both incomplete. A. lists the members of the <i>collegium fabrum tig(nariorum)</i> and B. those of the <i>collegium dendro- phorum</i></p>	<p>Plaque B: 29 men (patrons?), 2 <i>immunes</i>, 3 <i>matres</i>, 2 <i>filiae</i>: Iulia Probit(a) and Fl(avia) Athenais, followed by 5 male members among whom 1 <i>bisellarius dendrophorum</i></p>
<p>Licina Macedonica</p>	<p>statue base for Allia Candida</p>	<p>marble base</p>	
<p>Macia Menophile</p>	<p><i>album collegii</i></p>	<p>incomplete marble plaque</p>	<p>13 male patrons, 6 <i>quinquennales</i>, 1 <i>mater</i> followed by 14 <i>honorati</i> and ca. 320 <i>pleb(ei)</i></p>
<p>Marcia Basilissa</p>	<p>votive stele</p>	<p>broken in two, (1.33) × 0.60 × 0.15 m</p>	
<p>Memmia Victoria</p>	<p><i>tabula patronatus</i> for her son</p>	<p>bronze plaque, ca. 0.60 × 0.40 m</p>	<p>son: patron of the same <i>collegium</i> (see further table 2 under Vesia Martina, his wife)</p>

Table 5: *(continued)*

Name	Inscription and monument	Archaeological details	Patronage and collegiate functions of relatives	<i>Patres, matres, filiae</i> and female members
Menia Iuliane	marble stele crowned by a fronton; <i>album collegii</i>	Lower part broken o : (1.05) × 0.85 × 0.33 m. Decoration of the fronton: horseman with dog chasing a boar and a snake coiled around a tree		1 <i>mater</i> followed by 11 male members (with their birthplaces)
Placidia Damale	funerary stele			
Pomponia Victorina	statue base with votive inscription			
Salvia Marcellina	<i>lex collegii</i>	Large marble plaque: 0.70 × 1.19 × 0.05 m	brother-in-law (P. Aelius Zeno): <i>pater</i>	

Table 6: *Matres collegiorum*: title, justification, benefactions*

Name	Dedicator(s)	Title and justification	Benefactions
Claudia	sons	<i>matri / sodalic(ii) fullon(um) . . . parentib(us) / piisimis</i>	
Claudia Arria	<i>collegium?</i>	<i>matr(is)</i>	she contributed HS 6,000(?) to a fund for the communal celebration of their birthdays by the members of the <i>collegium</i>
Domitia Civitas	Domitia Civitas and a <i>pater</i> of the <i>collegium cannophorum</i>	<i>mat(er)</i>	together with a <i>pater</i> of the <i>collegium</i> she donated a statue of Attis to the <i>collegium cannophorum</i>
Egnatia Salviana	<i>collegium dendrophorum</i>	she is co-opted as <i>mater</i> in recognition of the benefaction of her husband who is co-opted as patron in the same inscription ⁷⁷	
Epipodia	<i>collegium Asianorum</i>	<i>mater</i>	
Fabia Festa	<i>Augustales</i>	<i>mat(er) Aug(ustalium)</i>	
Fabia Lucilla	Fabia Lucilla	<i>mater coll(egiorum) / fabr(um) et cent(onariorum)</i>	
Flavia Nona	Flavia Nona, a <i>pater dumi</i> and a <i>vexillarius</i> (standard-bearer) of the association	<i>ma/ter dumi</i>	they dedicated votive altars to Cybele(?) in the name of the initiates (<i>sacra ti dumi</i>)
Gavillia Optata	her <i>contubernalis</i>	<i>matri colleg(ii) / centonarior(um)</i>	

* no public honor is attested in the inscriptions

⁷⁷ See Alföldy 2000: 7–16, who, however, mistakenly assumes that both were co-opted as patrons of the city.

Table 6: (continued)

Name	Dedicator(s)	Title and justification	Benefactions
Herois Cy[s]enia, Eusebia Prima, Aurelia Herais, Lartia Felicitas, Sera Chreste	unidenti ed <i>collegium</i>	<i>matres</i>	
Iunia Zosime	Iunia Zosime	<i>mater</i>	she donated a statuette of Virtus of two pounds of silver to the <i>dendrophori</i>
Lepidia Iulia, Titinia Crispina, Numitoria Felicitas	<i>collegium</i> <i>dendrophorum</i>	<i>mat(res)</i>	
Licina Macedonica	<i>collegium</i> <i>[Rom?]anense</i> <i>maius</i>	<i>matre</i>	
Macia Menophile	<i>collegium</i> <i>fabrum navalium</i>	<i>mater</i>	
Marcia Basilissa	sister-in-law	<i>matre</i> <i>/ dend(ro)phorum</i>	
Memmia Victoria	<i>collegium fabrum</i>	<i>matris numeri nostri;</i> her son is co-opted as patron <i>in honore</i> <i>a(t)que dignitate</i> <i>Memmiae Victoriae</i> <i>quondam indoles</i> <i>m[e]moriae</i> <i>femin<a>e . . .</i> <i>exemplo pietatis</i> <i>parentium et matris</i> <i>honorific{i}entia(e)</i>	
Menia Iuliane	<i>collegium</i> <i>Romanorum</i>	<i>matrem Romanorum</i> <i>subscriptorum</i>	
Placidia Damale	husband	<i>matri / vernaculor(um)</i> <i>optimae / et</i> <i>incom/parabili feminae /</i> <i>uxori fidelissi/mae</i> <i>et piissimae /</i>	
Pomponia Victorina	M. Aurelius Successus and Pomponia Victorina	<i>mat(er) / coll(egii)</i> <i>Liberi patris</i>	together with a <i>quinquennalis</i> of the <i>collegium</i> she dedicated a statue to Liber

: *Patronesses and “Mothers” of Roman Collegia*

159

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.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alföldy, G. 1979. "Bildprogramme in den römischen Städten des Conventus Tarraconensis: das Zeugnis der Statuenpostamente." *Revista de la Universidad Complutense (Homenaje a Garcia Bellido IV)* 18: 127–275.
- . 1984. *Römische Statuen in Venetia et Histria. Epigraphische Quellen*. Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse 3. Heidelberg.
- . 2000. *Provincia Hispania Superior*. Philosophisch-historische Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 19. Heidelberg.
- Ausbüttel, F. M. 1982. *Untersuchungen zu den Vereinen im Westen des römischen Reiches*. FAS 11. Kallmünz.
- Bendlin, A. 2002. "Gemeinschaft, Öffentlichkeit und Identität: Forschungsgeschichtliche Anmerkungen zu den Mustern sozialer Ordnung in Rom." In U. Egelhaaf-Gaiser and A. Schäfer, eds., *Religiöse Vereine in der römischen Antike*, 9–40. Tübingen.
- Bodel, J. ed. 2001. *Epigraphic Evidence. Ancient History from Inscriptions*. London.
- Bollmann, B. 1998. *Römische Vereinshäuser. Untersuchungen zu den Scholae der römischen Berufs-, Kult- und Augustalen-Kollegien in Italien*. Mainz.
- Bremen, H. C. van, 1996. *The Limits of Participation. Women and Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Amsterdam.
- Brooten, B. J. 1982. *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue. Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues*. Brown Judaic Studies 36. Chico CA.
- Castrén, P. 1975. *Ordo populusque Pompeianus. Polity and Society in Roman Pompeii*. Rome.
- Chastagnol, A. 1978. *L'album municipal de Timgad*. Antiquitas 3, vol. 22. Bonn.
- Clemente, G. 1972. "Il patronato nei collegia dell' impero Romano." *Studi Classici et Orientali* 21: 142–229.
- D'Arms, J. H. 2000. "Memory, Money and Status at Misenum. Three New Inscriptions from the collegium of the Augustales." *JRS* 90: 126–44.
- Dixon, S. 1988. *The Roman Mother*. London.
- Duthoy, R. 1984a. "Sens et fonction du patronat municipal durant le principat." *AC* 53: 145–56.
- . 1984b. "Scenarios de co-optation des patrons municipaux en Italie." *Epigraphica* 46: 23–48.
- Eck, W. 1992. "Ehrungen für Personen hohen soziopolitischen Ranges im öffentlichen und privaten Bereich." In H.-J. Schalles, H. von Hesberg and P. Zanker, eds., *Die römische Stadt im 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr. Der Funktionswandel des öffentlichen Raumes. Kolloquium in Xanten vom 2. bis 4. Mai 1990*, 359–76. Cologne.
- Egelhaaf-Gaiser, U., and A. Schäfer, eds. 2002. *Religiöse Vereine in der römischen Antike*. Tübingen.
- Engesser, F. 1957. "Der Stadtpatronat in Italien und den Westprovinzen des römischen Reiches bis Diokletian." Ph. diss. Universität Freiburg.
- Flambard, J. M. 1987. "Éléments pour une approche financière de la mort dans les classes populaires du haut-empire. Analyse du budget de quelques collèges funéraires de Rome et d'Italie." In F. Hinard, ed., *La mort, les morts et l'au-delà dans le monde romain*, 215–44. Actes du colloque de Caen, 20–22 novembre 1985. Caen.
- Forbis, E. P. 1996. *Municipal Virtues in the Roman Empire. The Evidence of Italian Honorary Inscriptions*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 79. Stuttgart and Leipzig.

- Harland, P. A. 2005. “Familial Dimensions of Group Identity: ‘Brothers’ (ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ) in Associations of the Greek East.” *JBL* 124: 491–513.
- . 2007. “Familial Dimensions of Group Identity (II): ‘Mothers’ and ‘Fathers’ in Associations and Synagogues of the Greek World.” *JSJ* 38: 57–79.
- Harmand, L. 1957. *Un aspect social et politique du monde Romain: le patronat sur les collectivités publiques des origines au Bas-Empire*. Publ. de Clermont, 2e serie Fasc. 2. Paris.
- Hemelrijk, E. A. 1999. *Matrona docta. Educated Women in the Roman Élite from Cornelia to Julia Domna*. Londen.
- . 2004. “City Patronesses in the Roman Empire.” *Historia* 53.2: 209–45.
- . 2005. “Priestesses of the Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Titles and Function.” *Antiquité Classique* 74: 137–70.
- . 2006. “Priestesses of the Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Benefactions and Public Honour.” *Antiquité Classique* 75: 85–117.
- Herzig, H. E. 1983. “Frauen in Ostia. Ein Beitrag zur Sozialgeschichte der Hafenstadt Roms.” *Historia* 32: 77–92.
- Hirschmann, V. E. 2004. “Methodische Überlegungen zu Frauen in antiken Vereinen.” In L. de Ligt, E. A. Hemelrijk and H. S. Singor, eds., *Roman Rule and Civic Life: Local and Regional Perspectives (Proceedings of the fourth workshop of the international network Impact of Empire, Leiden, June 25–28, 2003)*, 401–14. Amsterdam.
- Horst, P. van der, 1991. *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs*. Kampen.
- Jongman, W. M. 1988. *The Economy and Society of Pompeii*. Amsterdam.
- Kajava, M. 1990. “A New City Patroness?” *Tyche* 5: 27–36.
- Kloppenborg, J. S. 1996. “*Collegia* and *Thiasoi*. Issues of Function, Taxonomy and Membership.” In J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson, eds., *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, 16–30. London.
- Kloppenborg, J. S. and S. G. Wilson, eds. 1996. *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*. London.
- Kuho, W. 1993. “Julia Aug. Mater Aug. N. et castrorum et senatus et patriae.” *ZPE* 97: 259–71.
- Kulikowski, M. 2004. *Late Roman Spain and its Cities*. Baltimore and London.
- Levick, B. 2007. *Julia Domna. Syrian Empress*. London.
- Liebenam, W. 1890. *Zur Geschichte und Organization des römischen Vereinswesens. Drei Untersuchungen*. Leipzig.
- Liu, J. 2007. “The Economy of Endowments: The Case of the Roman *Collegia*.” In K. Verboven, K. Vandorpe and V. Chankowski, eds., *Pistoi dia tèn technèn. Bankers, Loans and Archives in the Ancient World. Studies in Honour of Raymond Bogaert*, 231–56. *Studia Hellenistica* 44. Leuven.
- MacMullen, R. 1982. “The Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire.” *AJPh* 103: 233–46.
- Meiggs, R. 1973. *Roman Ostia*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Mennella, G. and Apicella, G. 2000. *Le corporazioni professionali nell’Italia romana. Un aggiornamento al Waltzing*. Naples.
- Nicols, J. 1980. “*Tabulae Patronatus*: A Study of the Agreement between Patron and Client-Community.” *ANRW* II.13: 535–61.
- . 1989. “*Patrona civitatis*: Gender and Civic Patronage.” In C. Deroux, ed., *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*. Vol. V, 117–42. Coll. Latomus 206. Brussels.

- Nijf, O. M. van, 1997. *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*. Amsterdam.
- . 1999. "Verenigingsleven en stedelijke identiteit: de rol van *fabri*, *centonarii* en *dendrophori*." *Lampas* 32.3: 198–210.
- . 2002. "Collegia and Civic Guards: Two Chapters in the History of Sociability." In W. Jongman and M. Kleijwegt, eds., *After the Past. Essays in Ancient History in honor of H.W. Pleket*, 305–39. Mnemosyne Suppl. 233. Leiden.
- Patterson, J. R. 1992. "Patronage, *collegia* and Burial in Imperial Rome." In S. Bassett, ed., *Death in Towns. Urban Responses to the Dying and Dead, 100–1600*, 15–27. Leicester.
- . 1994. "The *collegia* and the Transformation of the Towns of Italy in the Second Century AD." In *L'Italie d'Auguste à Dioclétien. Actes du colloque international organisé par l'École française de Rome*, Rome 25–28 mars 1992, 227–38. *ColloFR* 198. Rome.
- Perry, J. S. 2006. *The Roman Collegia. The Modern Evolution of an Ancient Concept*. Mnemosyne suppl. 277. Leiden and Boston.
- Raepsaet-Charlier, M.-Th. 2005. "Les activités publiques des femmes sénatoriales et équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain." In W. Eck and M. Heil, eds., *Senatores populi Romani. Realität und mediale Präsentation einer Führungsschicht. Kolloquium der Prosopographia Imperii Romani vom 11.–13. Juni 2004*, 169–212. *HABES* 40. Stuttgart.
- Richardson, P. 1996. "Early Synagogues as *collegia* in the Diaspora and Palestine." In J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson, eds., *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, 90–109. London.
- Royden, H. L. 1988. *The Magistrates of the Roman Professional Collegia in Italy from the First to the Third Century AD*. Pisa.
- Saavedra Guerrero, M. D. 1995. "La *cooptatio patroni* o el elogio de la *virtus* en el patronato colegial." *Athenaeum* 83: 497–507.
- . 1998. "Honor y poder en la ciudad romana: el caso de las *matres collegiorum*." *Latomus* 57: 127–35.
- Saller, R. P. 1982. *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*. Cambridge.
- Salway, B. 2000. "Prefects, *patroni*, and Decurions: a New Perspective on the Album of Canusium." In A. E. Cooley, ed., *The epigraphic landscape of Roman Italy*, 115–71. *BICS Suppl.* 73. London.
- Severy, B. 2003. *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire*. London and New York.
- Tacheva-Hitova, M. 1983. *Eastern Cults in Moesia Inferior and Thracia (5th century BC–4th century AD)*. *EPRO* 95. Leiden.
- Temporini, H. 1978. *Die Frauen am Hofe Trajans. Ein Beitrag zur Stellung der Augustae im Principat*. Berlin and New York.
- . ed. 2002. *Die Kaiserinnen Roms. Von Livia bis Theodora*. Munich.
- Waltzing, J.-P. 1895–1900. *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'Occident*. Vols I–IV. Louvain.