

COMMUNITIES OF ROMANS AND ITALIANS ABROAD: REFLECTIONS ON THEIR ELUSIVE NATURE AND ORGANIZATION

By Sophia Zoumbaki

Summary: This paper focuses on groups of Romans and Italians attested outside Italy, in all parts of the Roman *oecumene*, from the Iberian Peninsula and Britain to Asia Minor and the eastern frontier in Syria as well as from the Rhine and Danube to northern Africa. Groups of Romans and Italians are attested at different times in various places, in towns of varying legal status, of various size and importance, even in villages or settlements next to camps of legions. The duration of their presence and the terms adopted for their (self-)definition also display a certain variety. Out of an abundant source material and numerous local particularities that require a closer examination, I will attempt to focus on those data that could elucidate the nature, the legal status, and the organization of these groups. Taking all this into account, I will reassess the possibility to classify groups of Romans and Italians abroad as private associations, as they are often mentioned in the related bibliography, the term used either consciously or just with the intention to show that these groups were clearly visible and identifiable in the host-societies.

*...The men who sailed, and found, and fought,
They too can delve and build,
And carve the image of their thought...
...Fearless of war, yet keener still
To bridge the drift, and mine the hill,
And lead the harvest home...*

(Lance Fallaw, "Cives Romani",
in *Silverleaf and oak*, London 1906)

Lance Fallaw worked as an itinerant journalist in the early 20th century in South Africa where he met people of the white race pursuing high profit through the exploitation of the land's rich natural resources. To

these people he dedicated his poem “Cives Romani” alluding to the fact that it was not for the first time in human history that people in such a rush to search for the “horn of plenty” left their homes for remote and unknown lands. From the 3rd c. BC onwards, people defined as *cives Romani* / Ῥωμαῖοι or *Italici* / Ἰταλικοί spread en masse outside Rome and Italy, in every part of the Roman *oekumene*, from Spain to Asia Minor and from the Danube to North Africa.

Written sources mention Romans and Italians abroad as individuals or groups, while in some cases their presence can also be deduced from numismatic and archaeological finds. This paper focuses on groups of immigrant Romans and Italians in an attempt to shed light on their nature, their legal status and internal organization, namely issues which remain to a large extent elusive despite the considerable number of related inscriptions as well as a few literary texts available. From the first examinations of the topic in the 19th century, scholars debated whether we are dealing with loose, shapeless groups or with organized collectivities structured in an associational form.¹ In the related bibliography,

- 1 Schulten (1892: 71-82) and Kornemann (1892: 50-61) define the groups of Romans and Italians as associations. On the contrary, Hatzfeld (esp. 1912: 146-83, mainly 146-47) does not accept an associational organization of Italians and Romans focusing especially on the most important community of Delos; Ferguson 1911: 355-356, 396-397 also saw a “loose group” in the Italians of Delos and Poland 1909: 111 did not identify generally communities of Romans and Italians abroad with associations. Generally on the topic see also Morel 1877; Kornemann 1900; Hatzfeld 1919; Wilson 1966; Gogniat Loos 1994; Van Andringa 2003; Purcell 2005. On “associations” of Roman citizens in Greece, see Ramgopal 2017; in Asia, see Güler 2020. Several unpublished doctoral theses are also to be mentioned: E. Pétry-Beauzon, *L'intégration des Italiens dans le monde grec: IIe-Ier av. J.C.*, Paris EPHE, 2003; M. Bourigault, *Les ciues Romani consistentes et leurs pratiques religieuses dans l'Occident romain d'après l'épigraphie*, thèse sous la direction de Mme Rita Soussignan. Laboratoire: CREAAH, Université du Maine (see https://www.academia.edu/5047685/La_citoyenneté_romaine_en_question_sinstaller_dans_les_provinces_de_lEmpire); M. De Taeye, *De conventus civium Romanorum. Over verenigingen van Romeinse burgers in de westelijke provincies van het Romeinse Rijk tijdens het Principaat*, Universiteit Gent 2008-2009; a Leiden MA thesis by Hermann Roozenbeek known to me by a reference of Onno Van Nijf 2009: 14; L. Eberle Pilar, *Law, Land, and Territories: The Roman Diaspora and the Making of Provincial Administration*, Diss. University of California, Berkeley 2014; S. Ramgopal, *Romans Abroad: Associations of Roman Citizens from the 2nd Century BCE to the 3rd Century CE*, Univ. of Chicago 2016.

these groups are frequently named “associations,” “collegia,” or “clubs.” Some of these references are obviously general or superficial and do not intend to use these terms in their legal sense, but only aim at showing that these groups were clearly visible and identifiable in host-towns; other scholars do recognize in them organizational features of private associations. It is therefore imperative to undertake a systematic examination of this intricate historical phenomenon on the basis of concrete criteria which will enable us to recognize associational characteristics in the groups of Romans and Italians residing abroad. This would require a definition of clear and indisputable criteria for the classification of a collectivity as a private association. A basic set of associational features can be recognized by a mere look at the contents of the fundamental work of Poland 1909. Over the past two decades, much progress has been achieved on this study including serious attempts to define significant characteristics of private associations,² the most recent endeavour being the extensive and systematic consideration of clearly demarcated features of private associations undertaken by the Copenhagen Associations Project on the basis of an exhaustive analysis and systematic registration of an enormous bulk of evidence.³

Before I proceed to the examination of these criteria in the collectivities of Romans and Italians abroad, an overview of the chronological and geographical diffusion and a comparative observation of these groups are necessary. In the following overview, I don't aspire to offer an exhaustive presentation of the evidence, since there is abundant source material and numerous local particularities that require closer

- 2 A part of the related bibliography focuses mainly on a taxonomy of associations and on the question of classification of Christian groups, but refers also to general descriptions of associations: see selectively Ascough 2002; 2008 with a review of earlier bibliography; Ascough 2015; Harland 2013: 13-14 and 19-69. Gabrielsen 2009 attempts a definition of the basic features of public and private associations; see also Gabrielsen & Thomsen 2015.
- 3 See the Inventory of the Copenhagen Associations Project <http://copenhagenassociations.saxo.ku.dk/capinventory/> and the principles of this examination as they are described by Gabrielsen & Thomsen 2015: 10-12, who stress that “a set of reliable criteria can presumably be established only *after* the extant material has been thoroughly examined.”

investigation. I will try firstly to focus on the earliest attestations of collectivities of Italians and Romans abroad and secondly to stress those elements that could elucidate uncertainties related to the nature and internal organization of the groups in question, in the hope that it will produce comparisons and might finally provide a helpful pattern for this specific research.

Geographical and chronological overview

Groups of Romans and Italians are attested in towns of varying legal status, of various sizes and importance, even in villages or settlements next to military camps. All of this is further characterized by a great diversity: The groups appear at different times in various places; for how long they were attested and how they are (self-)identified varied as well.

First, it must be stressed, that attestations of Romans and Italians as collectivities are not to be found at every place where the presence of individuals of this origin is known through references in the local epigraphic record or in literary sources. A striking example is Athens. The presence of Italiote Greeks from the Classical period and of Romans from the 2nd c. BC onwards is evident in numerous Athenian inscriptions and in literary texts, yet they never appear collectively in these sources⁴. Further, whereas in some regions individual Romans and Italiote Greeks are attested as early as the 3rd or the 2nd c. BC, their collective attestations –wherever they are to be found– are dated to much later, as it will be shown below.

The overview that follows, does not offer a full record of the attestations of Romans and Italians settled in every part of the Roman world, but only an introduction to the complexity of the phenomenon which

4 Cf. Kapetanopoulos 1965: 50-51 and nn. 24-25, who stresses the fact that the community of Roman residents in Athens is so far not attested as a separate group; epigraphic evidence which could be regarded as an indication of the opposite, such as the extremely fragmentary inscription from Sicily *CIL X 7350* which has been restored as *[c(ives) R(omani) et A]thenienses*, is according to Kapetanopoulos to be associated with Delos. On Romans in Athens see Follet 2002; for an open access data base of Roman and Italian residents in Athens see <https://romanattica.eu/dbs/romansdb.html>.

is to be observed in different periods at different places where different circumstances prevailed and led to specific evolutions. All these local particularities will not be analyzed here; there will be a reference to them, if this can contribute to our main question on the nature of the alien groups. For this purpose, it is important to take into consideration the first epigraphic attestations of Roman and Italian communities in each region; this is the focus of this overview.

Epigraphic mentions form a more official and direct source for the (self-)definitions of these groups, while their references in literary sources do not necessarily reflect the manner in which they were consciously and officially differentiated within a host community. From this point of view, archaeological finds, although they can also point to the massive presence of people of Italian origins at various places, cannot be taken here into consideration, since they cannot contribute to our basic question on the nature of the resident groups. We need, therefore, to focus mainly on written evidence of their (self-)definitions as distinct groups and on indications of their internal organization. The following overview aims at showing how these communities spread out of their homeland, settled in new residences and began to appear in the local epigraphic record; it will be clear that they had to face different political and social realities, to which they adapted in various ways.

SICILY

The earliest attestations of groups of Romans and Italiote Greeks outside the Italian peninsula are encountered on Sicily. People *Italici generis* existed already there, when Scipio Africanus came to Syracuse in 205 BC, and according to Livy, they had seized properties by force during the war.⁵ The date of their first epigraphic attestation is however disputed. If an inscription from Halaesa is correctly dated to 193 BC,⁶ it would be the earliest epigraphic attestation of *Italicei* as a group which moreover takes a collective action. This date is based on the identification of the individual honoured by the *Italicei* with L. Cornelius Scipio, the praetor

5 Livy 29. 1, 16. On the early presence of *Italici* on Sicily see Wilson 1966: 19-22.

6 *CIL* I² 612; *CIL* X 7459 = *ILS* 1864; *ILLRP* 320: *Italicei* | *L. Cornelium Sc[ip]i[one]m* | *honoris caussa*. Wilson 1966: 20 and n. 1 and Prag 2011: 91, n. 53 accept the date to 193 BC. On *negotiatores* in inscriptions in Sicily, Amela Valverde 2006.

of Sicily in 193 BC and *consul* of 190 BC. However, E. Badian⁷ expressed some hesitation and instead, he was inclined to identify L. Cornelius Scipio with the homonymous *praetor* of 78 BC. In any case, the presence of Italians in Sicily in the 2nd c. BC is further mentioned by Diodorus Siculus (34-35.2, 27 and 32), who refers to Ἰταλιῶται/Ἰταλικοί landowners, stock-breeders and slaveowners, when the slave revolt of 134 BC took place.⁸ *Cives Romani* and *Italici* are still mentioned in Sicily in literary and epigraphic sources of the 1st c. BC.⁹ It is characteristic that inscriptions attest to *Italicei* and *cives Romani* in the important harbours of Agrigentum and Panhormos, on the southern and northern coast of Sicily respectively.¹⁰

THE EASTERN AND SOUTHERN PART OF THE ROMAN WORLD

The Greek mainland, Asia Minor, the Balkan Peninsula, the Aegean and Cyprus
Although Romans and Italians¹¹ are already in the 3rd c. BC present in towns of the East – e.g. on the western coast of the Greek mainland and

7 Cf. Badian 1967: 94 n. 1 (review of Wilson 1966).

8 Wilson 1966: 20 discerns Ἰταλιῶται, perhaps Italian-Greek, from Ἰταλικοί, of Italic origin.

9 From the literary sources see selectively some Ciceronian passages: *Verr.* 2.5.10 (for the Roman community at Lilybaeum): *Testes enim sunt qui in consilio fuerunt, testes publicae tabulae, testis splendidissima civitas Lilybitana, testis honestissimus maximusque conventus civium Romanorum: fieri nihil potest, producendi sunt. Itaque producuntur et ad palum alligantur*; 2.15: *cives Romani, qui in Sicilia negotiantur*; 2, 153: *quantum ab negotiatoribus qui Syracusis, qui Agrigenti, qui Panhormi, qui Lilybaei negotiantur*; 5, 158: *omnium civium romanorum qui in Sicilia negotiantur*; it is interesting that Cicero (*Verr.* 4.138) also mentions a *conventus Siculorum* in Rome.

Cf. also Kornemann 1892: Appendix 97-98; Wilson 1966: 55-67; Frascchetti 1981; Pinzone 1999: 381-402.

10 An inscription from Rome mentions *Italici* in Agrigentum honouring Pompeius Magnus, cos 70 BC: *CIL I² 2710 = CIL VI 40903 = ILLRP 38 (AE 1937, 11): [Cn.] Pompeio | Magno | [i]mperatori | [I]talicei qui | Agrigenti | negoti[antur]*. An inscription from Terracina refers to *cives romani* in Panhormos of Sicily: *CIL I² 836 = ILLRP 387 = ILS 8962 (AE 1900, 178): M(anio) Sabidio M(ani) f(ilio) | leg(ato) | cives Romani in | Sicilia Panhormi qui | negoti-antur*.

11 On *Italioi* in the East see Nochita 2012; generally, on Romans and *Italici* in the East see Hatzfeld 1919; Cassola 1971; Van Nijf 2009.

the Ionian Islands¹² as well as on Rhodes in the Aegean –,¹³ their first collective epigraphic attestations are to be dated to the 2nd c. BC.

The first systematic and frequently recurring epigraphic mentions of a community comprising Romans and Italians are to be found on Delos in a period extending from 167 BC to the first half of the 1st c. BC.¹⁴ Delos is certainly, as it has been several times stressed in the related bibliography, a unique case, since the island flourished during this period as a duty-free port under Athenian supervision, being an ideal multi-ethnic environment for traders from many parts of the Mediterranean and from the East. The violent events of 88 BC, known as “Ephesian vespers,” namely the massive massacre of individuals of Italian origins by the King of Pontus, Mithridates VI and his followers in towns of the province of Asia and on Delos,¹⁵ and the ravage of the island by the pirate Athenodoros in 69 BC put a tragic end to its prosperity. The massacre of 88 BC reveals that by the late 2nd/early 1st c. BC, many thousands of Romans and Italians resided in the East, even if we accept that the number of victims given by ancient sources, ranging from 80,000 to 150,000, is exaggerated.¹⁶

Beyond Delos, Italians and Romans are documented, in some cases already in the early 2nd c. BC, at various locations as distinct groups

12 Zoumbaki 2011; 2012; 2018.

13 E.g. *Lindos* II, 92, ca. 250 BC.

14 For a prosopography of Romans on Delos see Hatzfeld 1912 and supplement to his catalogue by Ferrary 2002b.

15 Cic. *Flac.* 60: *revocarem animos vestros ad Mithridatici belli memoriam, ad illam universorum civium Romanorum per tot Urbis uno puncto temporis miseram crudelemque caedem....*

App. *Mithr.* 21: Ἐφεσίων δὲ καὶ τὰς Ῥωμαίων εἰκόνας τὰς παρὰ σφίσι καθαιρούντων, ...; 23: Καύνιοι Ῥοδίοις ὑποτελεῖς ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀντιόχου πολέμῳ γενόμενοι, καὶ ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἀφεθέντες οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ, τοὺς Ἴταλοὺς ἐς τὴν βουλαίαν Ἔστιαν καταφυγόντες ἔλκοντες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐστίας, τὰ βρέφη σφῶν πρῶτα ἔκτεινον ἐν ὄψει τῶν μητέρων, αὐτὰς δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐπ’ ἐκείνοις... τοιαύταις μὲν τύχαις οἱ περὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν ὄντες Ἴταλοὶ καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι συνεφέροντο, ἄνδρες τε ὁμοῦ καὶ βρέφη καὶ γυναῖκες, καὶ ἐξελεύθεροι καὶ θεράποντες αὐτῶν, ὅσοι γένους Ἴταλικοῦ. ᾧ καὶ μᾶλλον δῆλον ἐγένετο τὴν Ἀσίαν οὐ φόβῳ Μιθριδάτου μᾶλλον ἢ μίσει Ῥωμαίων τοιάδε ἐς αὐτοὺς ἐργάσασθαι.

16 Val. Max. 9.2.3; Memnon 22. 9; Plu. 24.4. Cf. App. *Mithr.* 28 (Archelaos, Mithridates’ general, killed about 20,000 men on Delos, the majority of them being Italians).

within local societies, yet during this period they did not act collectively as instigators of significant actions. They participated in local life, but are only to be found in inscriptions set up by others. For example, they were invited as a group to events, such as festivals or public banquets, e.g. the one organized on Amorgos by the endowment of Kritolaos¹⁷. Scattered mentions of *Rhomaioi parepidemountes* or *paragenomenoi* are also encountered in the 2nd c. BC in Eretria,¹⁸ Amyzon,¹⁹ Klaros,²⁰ Pergamon,²¹ Chios²² and later at other places.

Sulla's victory over Mithridates marks a crucial turning point in Roman presence in the East, as the subsequent restoration of the order facilitated the reactivation of the Roman communities in the region,²³ with the exception of Delos, since the island never regained its earlier vigour. During the 1st c. BC and the 1st c. AD, attestations of Roman communities in the eastern Mediterranean reach their peak. Stray epigraphic occurrences of Roman communities in Asia Minor date to the first half of the 1st c. BC, but from the second half of the 1st c. BC their number increases, especially in the most important towns of the region,²⁴ mainly in Ephesos where a Roman community of a considerable

17 IG XII 7, 515, ll. 55-58: ... [το]ῖς τε πολίταις πᾶσιν τοῖς παρα[[γε]νομένοις εἰς τὴν Αἰγιά[λη]ν [καὶ παροίκους καὶ] ξένοις τοῖς παρα[[γε]νομένοις, Ῥωμαίων αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ὑψί[ων].... On the participation of Romans in public banquets, cf. Robu 2019; Vlamos 2023: 181-90.

18 IG XII 9, 234, ll. 29-30 (ca. 100 BC): τοὺς τε πολίτας καὶ | Ῥωμαίων τοὺς παρεπιδημοῦντας.

19 Robert 1983: 204-10, no. 23, ll. 19-20 (BE 1984, 424; Piejko 1985: 617-18 [review of Robert 1983]) (ca. 190-180 BC): Ῥωμαίων τε παρεπιδημοῦν[των].

20 Robert 1989: 63-66, col. I, ll.15-16; SEG 39, 1244 (after 120/119 BC): τοὺς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν παραγινομένους Ῥωμαίων.

21 Kirbilher 2007: 20. Cf. OGIS 764; IGR IV 294: Ῥωμαίων τοῖς ἐπιδημοῦσιν.

22 Sarikakis 1975; Moretti 1980; Derow & Forrest 1982; cf. SEG 30, 1073; 60, 930; cf. Salvo 2013: τοὺς παραγινομένους Ῥωμαίων, τοῖς παρεπιδημοῦσι Ῥωμαίων.

23 Cf. Kirbihler 2016: esp. 217-25.

24 There follow attestations from Asia Minor from the 1st c. BC:

Adramytteion: 1. Schwertheim 1992: 126-28, no.1 (last quarter of the 1st c. BC?): οἱ πραγματευόμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι. 2. Schwertheim 1992, 128-29, no.2 (last quarter of the 1st c. BC?): [οἱ πραγματευόμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι]

Attaleia: SEG 6, 646 (7-4 BC): οἱ συνπολιτευόμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι

size and importance existed, as the epigraphic evidence for individual members of this community as well as collective mentions of Roman

- Ephesos:** 1. *CIL* III 14195; *IEph* 2058 (70–45 v. Chr.): [*Italicei, quei*] [*Ephesi negotiantur*].
 2. *IEph* 658 (AE 1990, 938) (37 BC): [*Italicei or cives Romani ?*] *quei Ephesi [negotiantur]*.
 3. İplikçioğlu, Engelmann & Knibbe 1989, 235–36, no. B 2; Alpers & Halfmann 1995: 1320 (36 BC): *conventus c. [R.] quei Ephesi negotiantu[r]*.
- Knidos:** Chaviaras 1910: 425, no. 1 (*BE* 1912, 63) (second half of the 1st c. BC): τοῖ κατοικ[εῦντες] [ἐν ταῖ πό]λει Ῥωμαῖοι
- Milyas, Pisidia:** Bean 1959: 116, n. 87 (bl. C); Hall 1986: 137, no. 1 (*SEG* 36, 1207), (5/4 BC): Μιλυάδεις καὶ οἱ πραγματευόμενοι [π]αρ' αὐτοῖς Ῥωμαῖοι.
- Pergamon:** 1. *IGR* IV 450 (1st c. BC): [κατοικ]οῦμένοις Ῥωμαῖοις]. 2. *OGIS* 764; *IGR* IV 294: Ῥωμαίων τοῖς ἐπιδημοῦσιν.
- Priene:** 1. *IPriene* 112 (84–1 BC): ἐν δ]ὲ ταῖς ἐορταῖς καὶ τοῖς πολεῖταις πᾶσιν καὶ παροίκοις [καὶ κα]τοίκοις καὶ ξένοις καὶ Ῥωμαίοις. 2. *IPriene* 113 (84–1 BC): δειπνιεῖν γὰρ τοὺς πο[λ]ίτας πάντας κατὰ φυλὰς καὶ τοὺς ἐφηβευκότας τῶν παροίκων καὶ κατρίκων καὶ Ῥωμαίους πάντας καὶ τοὺς παρεπιδημοῦντας Ἀθηναίων τε καὶ Θηβαίων καὶ Ῥοδίων καὶ Μιλησίων καὶ Μαγνήτων καὶ Σα[μ]ίων καὶ Ἐφεσίων[ν.] ἔτι δὲ καὶ Τραλλιανῶν 3. *IPriene* 55 (128/7 BC): Ἴωσι καὶ Ῥωμαίοις 4. *IPriene* 123: πολίτας ἅπαντας καὶ τοὺς ἐφηβευκότας τῶν παροίκων καὶ [Ῥ]ωμαίους ἅπαντας.
- Sardeis:** *SEG* 46, 1521; 52, 1174 (early 1st c. BC): Italic[ei, quei Sardibus] nego[tiantur]/Ἰταλικο[ῖ] οἱ ἐν ταῖς? Σάρδεσιν] πραγμα[τευόμενοι].
- Smyrna:** *ISmyrna* 534 (2nd/1st c. BC): ἡ γερουσία | οἱ κάτ<ο>κοι | οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι | οἱ θιασῶται
- Lesbos:** *CIL* III 7160: *cives Romani qui Mythileneis negotiantur* (31 BC)
- Chios:** *SEG* 22, 507; *IGRR* IV.943; *SIG*³ 785; cf. Sherk 1969: no. 70; Marshall 1969; Bitner 2014: οἱ τε παρ' αὐτοῖς ὄντες Ῥωμαῖοι τοῖς Χείων ὑπακούωσιν νόμοις (under Sulla); cf. Appian, *Mith.* 46 (...πρῶτα μὲν ἐδήμεισε τὰ ὄντα Χίους τοῖς ἐς Σύλλαν φυγοῦσιν, ἐξῆς δ' ἔπεμπε τοὺς τὰ Ῥωμαίων ἐρευνησομένους ἐν Χίω...), 47 (ἐγκτήματα Ῥωμαίων on Chios)
- Kos:** 1. *IG* XII 4.2, 1026; *AE* 1947, 55; *ILLRP* 408: [*c(ives) R(omani) qui C(oi) negotiantur*]. 2. *IGR* IV 1087; *IG* XII 4.2, 1142: ...τοῖ κατοικεῦντες | ἐν τῷ δάμωι τῶν Ἀλεντίων καὶ το[ῖ] | ἐνεκτιμμένοι καὶ τοῖ γεωργεῦντε[ς] | ἐν Ἀλεντι καὶ Πέλη, τῶν τε πολεϊτᾶν | καὶ Ῥωμαίων καὶ μετοίκων... Cf. Tac., *Ann.* 4.14 for Romans during the First Mithridatic War.

In the 1st c. AD the evidence from Asia Minor proliferates. For a list – not complete – of groups of Romans in Asia Minor see Harland 2014: esp. 79–80. Generally on Romans and Italiote Greeks in Asia Minor see Ferrary 2002; Kirbihler 2007; Terpstra 2013: 171–220. On Ephesos, Magnesia and Tralles, Apamea see Terpstra 2013: 194–207 and 207–19 on the Roman settlers' social position.

residents show.²⁵ Roman communities are epigraphically attested from the first half of the 1st c. BC on the Greek mainland too,²⁶ from the Peloponnese up to Macedonia and the Aegean Thrace.

25 See Terpstra 2013: 194-97; Kirbihler 2016.

26 Attestations from the Greek mainland dated to the 1st c. BC/1st c. AD:

Thespiiai: 1. Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ πραγματευόμενοι ἐν Θεσπιαῖς (*I.Thesp* 373; 1st c. BC). 2. Θεσπι[έω]ν οἱ παῖδες καὶ παροίκων [κα]ὶ Ῥωμα[ίω]ν τῶν πραγ[ματευ]ομένων (*IG* VII 1862; 1st c. BC)

Locris, Opous: [ὁ] δῆμος Ὀπουντίων καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες ἐν Ὀποῦντι (*IG* IX 1² 5, 1935; 1st c. BC ?)

Pagai (Megaris): [- -] εἰς τὰν [δαπάναν τ]ὰν τᾶς θυσίας εἰς τὸ δεῖπνον [ο]ἶνον τοῖς τε π[ο]λίταις καὶ παροίκους καὶ Ῥωμαῖ[οις] τοῖς πα[ροικοῦσι] καὶ δούλοις πᾶ[σιν] (...) ; ll. 27-28: (...) καὶ ἐδίπνισε τοὺς πολεῖτας πάντ[ας κ]αὶ παροίκους καὶ τοὺς [παρεπιδ]αμοῦντας Ῥωμαίων | καὶ τοὺς πάντων τούτων δούλους [καὶ το]ῦς υἱοὺς αὐτῶν κα[ὶ τὰ δ]οῦλα παιδάρι[α] (*IG* VII 190, ll. 15-16; cf. *SEG* 50, 480; 64/3-56/5 BC)

Eretria: *IG* XII 9, 234, ll. 29-30 (ca. 100 BC): τοὺς τε πολίτας καὶ | Ῥωμαίων τοὺς παρεπιδημοῦντας

Argos: 1. *Italicei quei negotian[tur Argeis]/* Ἴταλ[οὶ οἱ ἐν Ἄργει] πραγματευόμενοι (*IG* IV 604; 67 BC). 2. *Italici quei Argeis negotiantur* (*CIL* I² 746; *ILLRP* 320; *CIL* III 531; *ILS* 867; 69 BC). 3. Ῥωμ[αῖ]οι οἱ ἐν Ἄργει κατοικ[οῦν]τ[ες] (*IG* IV 606; 1st c. AD). 4. [Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ] πραγματευ[όμενοι ἐν] Ἄργει (*IG* IV 605; 1st c. AD?)

Aigion: *Italicei quei Aegei negotiantur* (*ILLRP* 370; *ILGR* 80; Rizakis 2008: no. 131; ca. 74 BC)

Pellene: ἡ πόλις τῶν Πελληνέων καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ κ[α]τοικοῦντες (Rizakis 2008: no. 193; Early Imperial period)

Gytheion: *cives Romani in Laconica qui habitant, negotiantur/* Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν τῆς Λακωνικῆς πραγματευόμενοι (*ILGR* 40; first half of the 1st c. AD)

Boiai: ἡ πόλις καὶ οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι (*SEG* 29, 383; Augustan period)

Mantineia: 1. ἡ πόλις τῶν Ἀντιγονέων καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ π[ρ]αγματευόμενοι ἐν αὐτᾷ (*IG* V 2, 268; 10 BC-AD 10). 2. ἡ πόλις τῶν Ἀντιγονέων καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ πραγματευόμενοι ἐν αὐτᾷ (*IG* V 2, 307; 10 BC-AD 10)

Megalopolis: ἔδοξε τοῖς συνέδροις καὶ τ[ῷ δάμ]ω [κ]αὶ Ῥωμαίοις τοῖς πραγματευομένοις ἐν Μεγάλ[α] πόλει (*IG* V 2, 515; after AD 14)

Olympia: 1. [τὸ κοινὸν τ]ῶν Ἀχαιῶν καὶ τῶν [Ῥωμαίων οἱ ἐγγαιοῦντες] (*SEG* 17, 197; 100-70 BC). 2. Τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν καὶ τῶν Ῥωμ[αί]ων τῶν ἐγγαιούντων (*SEG* 17, 198; 100-70 BC). 3. ἡ πόλις ἢ τῶν Ἡλείων καὶ Ῥωμ[αίων] οἱ ἐγγαιοῦντε[ς] (*InO* 335; Augustan period)

Messene: 1. ... σὺν τοῖς τετιμαμένοις ἐν ταῖ φυλαῖ Ῥωμαίοις... (*IG* V 1, 1433; 1st c. BC). 2. ἀπόλοιπα Ῥωμαίων (*IG* V 1, 1434, 1st c. BC/1st c. AD). 3. [Οἱ πραγματευ]ταί

Ῥωμαῖοι (Themelis 2009: 76-78 [SEG 59.415]; 2013, 70-71; Augustan/Tiberian period). 4. Ἄ πόλις καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ ἐν αὐτᾷ κατοικοῦντες (Themelis 2013: 68-69; perhaps of AD 2/3). 5. [Ἄ πόλις καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ ἐν αὐτᾷ κατοικ]οῦντες (ll. 14-15), ἄ πόλις καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ [ἐν αὐτᾷ] κατοικοῦντες (l. 34), Ῥωμαῖοι in ll. 12, 30 (Themelis 2013: 70-75; AD 2/3). 6. Ῥωμαίους τοὺς ἐν αὐτᾷ κατοικοῦντας (Migeotte 1985 [SEG 35, 343]; ca. AD 3-14). 7. Ephobic catalogues of the 1st c. AD where Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ ξένοι are mentioned (Themelis 2005, 55-56; 2015, 112).

Larisa: 1. Ἴταλικοὶ ἐν Λαρίση (unpublished, mentioned by Bouchon 2007, 271; 86/5 BC). 2. Τηβεννοφοροῦντες (Arvanitopoulos 1910, no. 3, col. 344-349 [dated the text to the early 2nd c. BC]; Bouchon 2007; early 1st c. BC)

Beroia: οἱ ἐνκεκτημένοι Ῥωμαῖοι (*IBeroia* 59; 57-55 BC)

Idomene: οἱ συμπραγμ[α]τευόμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι (Josifovska 1959 [SEG 19, 438], AD 41-44)

Edessa: Gounaropoulou, Paschidis & Hatzopoulos 2015: 180: οἱ συνπρα[γ]ματε<υ>όμενο[ι] Ῥωμαῖο[ι] (1st c. AD)

Thessaloniki: 1. [οἱ συμπραγματευόμενοι] Ῥωμαῖο[ι] (*IG X 2.1, 32*). 2. [οἱ συμπραγμ[α]τευόμενοι Ῥ]ωμαῖοι (*IG X 2.1, 33*). 3. [οἱ συμπρ]αγματευόμε[νοι] Ῥωμαῖ[οι] (Velenis 1996 [SEG 46, 812])

Styberra (nowadays Republic of North Macedonia): οἱ συνπραγματευόμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι (*IG X 2. 2, 330*)

Akanthos: οἱ συνπραγματευόμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ οἱ παροικοῦντες (Tod 1918-19: 67-97, 85-86, no. 13 [SEG 1, 282]; Samsaris 1985-1986: 33-44; Hatzopoulos and Loukopoulou 1996: 348; Kloppenborg & Ascough 2011: 297-99)

Maroneia: γνῶμη βουλευτῶν καὶ ἱερέων καὶ ἀρχόντων καὶ Ῥωμαῖω[ν τῶν ννν] [τ]ῆν πόλιν κατοικοῦντων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν πολιτῶν ἀπά[ντων] (Loukopoulou *et al.* 2005: E 180, AD 41/2 or 46).

Amphipolis: 1. [οἱ κα]τοικοῦν[τες] Ῥωμαῖοι (?) (Nigdelis and Anagnostoudis 2017: 305-311, ca. 30 BC). 2. A further unpublished inscription from Amphipolis, known to me from the reference by Nigdelis 2018: 102-3 and n. 40 and Arnaoutoglou 2020: n. 48: *cives Romanei quei Amphipolis negotiantur*.

Kalindoia: [Ῥωμαῖο]ι οἱ κατοικο[ῦντες] (Paschidis, Martín González, Athanasiadis and Graikos 2023: no. 177, AD 14-37)

Macedonia, Crestonia, precise origin unknown: [οἱ συμπρ]αγματευόμενο[ι] Ῥωμαῖοι (Paschidis, Martín González, Athanasiadis & Graikos 2023: no. 65, AD 41-54).

Ainos (nowadays Turkey): Ῥωμαῖοι κατοικοῦν[τες] (Başaran 2022: 145-46).

On communities of Romans in various regions of the Greek mainland and the adjacent islands, see Donati 1965 (Aegean); Müller & Hasenohr 2002 (including contributions on Athens [Follet], Boiotia [Müller], Thessaloniki [Rizakis], Asia Minor [Fer-

Despite the hostilities stimulated by Pontic forces and their followers during the Mithridatic Wars and despite some other minor cases of hostilities against Romans in Greek towns,²⁷ the tide of Roman immigrants to the East could not be stopped. Given their economic success and their privileged position due to their relation to the dominating power, the role of Romans in social and economic life of their host societies became increasingly important. Romans gradually integrated into local communities. They were accepted into the local institution of the *ephebeia*,²⁸ which was a decisive step in their gradual integration into the public life of the host town. This signifies that Romans were established as complete familial units and, at least, intended to live there indefinitely. A further indication of their consolidation in their newfound residences is the participation of Roman women in public life, as in the case of a joint honour of an *archiereia* in Akmoneia (Phrygia) by Greek and Roman women.²⁹ Grants of *enktesis* and the opportunity to own real estate as well as involvement in rural economy (e.g. in Chios, Kos, Beroia, Olympia, see ns. 24 and 26) fostered closer connections of Roman residents with towns of Greece proper and of the province of Asia.

Further north, Romans were apparently encountered in the 2nd/1st c. BC in areas of what is today north and north-western Bulgaria. This is to be deduced from stray mentions of individual Romans in written

rary], Rhodes and Caunos [Bresson], Delos [Hasenohr, Deniaux, Baslez, Mavroyannis]); especially on Delos see Hatzfeld 1912 and supplement to his catalogue by Ferrary 2002b; on Thessaloniki see Rizakis 1986; on Macedonia see Youni 2013, on Thrace see Samsaris 1985–1986; on Chalkidiki see Loukopoulou 1996; on the Peloponnese see Zoumbaki 1998/1999; on the Cyclades see Zoumbaki 2014; on western Greece and Ionian islands see Zoumbaki 2011; 2012; 2018; 2019.

27 E.g. cf. Dio 54.7 (Cyzicus, 20 BC); 60. 24 (Rhodes, AD 43).

28 For example in ephebic catalogues of Messene (Peloponnese), Romans appear under the rubric *Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ ξένοι*, listed after the ephebes of local tribes, see Themelis 2005: 55–56; 2015: 112. On the admission of Romans to ephebeia and the other activities in the gymnasium, see Zoumbaki 2023.

29 On the women of Akmoneia see Thonemann 2010; Edelmann-Singer 2013 (AD 6/7). An analogous case is to be seen in a bilingual inscription recording the joint action of the wives of *coloni* and *incolae* in the Roman colony of Dion (Macedonia): *colonarum et incolarum coniuges* | *Anthestiae P(ublii) l(ibertae) Iucundae honoris causa* | *Κολώνων καὶ παροίκων αἱ γυναῖκες Ἀνθεστῖαι Ποπλίου | ἀπελευθέραι Ἰουκούνδαι ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν*. Cf. Padermalis 1984: 277 (AE 1998, 1210; SEG 34, 631).

sources or from archaeological and numismatic finds that indicate either the pass of Roman soldiers or trade and economic transactions with the West.³⁰ Their collective epigraphic occurrences in this region are however of a later date. An inscription from Bizye (Thrace), which records divine honours offered to the King Kotys, displays difficulties in its restoration.³¹ Luigi Moretti interpreted divine honours paid to the king as an action on the part of private Romans who needed royal protection, as they resided in a foreign land: [β]ασιλέα Κό[τυ]ν βασιλέως Ῥησκουπόρεως υἱ[ὸν] | Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ πρότως κατακληθέντες εἰς | [Βιζύ]ην τὸν ἑατῶν θεόν; this restoration seems to have been widely accepted. Romans are still later attested in this region as collectivities.³²

References in literary sources show that at least in the second half of the 1st c. BC Roman settlements existed on the western part of the Balkan Peninsula as well, specifically on the Dalmatian coast.³³ In fact, Caesar mentions a *conventus* of Roman citizens only in Lissus and Salona,³⁴ while the existence of such communities in Narona, Epidaurum and Iader can

30 Velkov 1981: 474.

31 Dawkins & Hansluk 1905/1906: 177-78; Dessau 1913: 700; Kalinka 1926: 118-19; Sullivan 1979: 196; Moretti 1984: 266-67 (*SEG* 34, 702); cf. Delev 2016.

The restoration of the third line is crucial for the understanding of the text and specifically of the role of the Romans. Dawkins and Hansluk restored it as εἰς | κῆνσον, Kalinka as εἰς [ἄρ(?)]χῆν and Moretti suggested εἰς | [Βιζύ]ην. Moretti's restoration is accepted by Delev 2016, who attempts a historical reconstruction of the events connected with the King Kotys dating the inscription to the second half of the 1st c. BC, more possibly after the sea-battle at Actium.

The word κατακαλῶ/κατακαλοῦμαι means according to Liddell-Scott (s.v.) "call-down, call upon, invoke, appeal to, call back, recall."

32 E.g. *IBulg* I² 58 from Odessos (AD 79-81): ... πολεῖταις κ[αὶ] Ῥωμαῖοις καὶ ξένοις.

33 Wilson 1966: 70-71 for a presentation of more indirect evidence; cf. also Wilkes 1962: 320-35, 346-49; Dzino 2010: 84, 88-89, 95, 120-21, 183 (with earlier bibliography).

34 Lissus: Caes. *B Civ.* 3.29.1 *quo facto coventus civium Romanorum, qui Lissum obtinebant ...*; 3.40.5: *Lissum expugnare conatus, defendentibus civibus Romanis, qui eius conventus erant...* Salona: Caes. *B Civ.* 3.9.2-3 *conventum Salonis cum neque pollicitationibus neque denuntiatione periculi permovere posset, oppidum oppugnare instituit. est autem oppidum et loci natura et colle munitum. sed celeriter cives Romani ligneis effectis turribus sese munierunt ...*

be deduced from indirect indications.³⁵ An inscription of the Imperial period (*CIL* III 2733) refers to a *summus curator* of the Roman settlers of the whole province Dalmatia.

Although the earliest epigraphic attestation of Roman *negotiatores* on Cyprus, an inscription from Paphos, has been dated to the late 2nd c. BC, a date in the 1st c. BC, perhaps in the first half of the 1st BC, is more likely.³⁶ However, contacts of the island with Italy go back to the 3rd c. BC, as imported amphorae show.³⁷ Moreover, Cicero (*Att.* 114.6) informs us that by his age “*ne cives Romani pauci qui illic negotiantur ius sibi dictum negarent*”. A further inscription from Paphos is perhaps to be dated to the Augustan age,³⁸ while an epigraphic attestation of Romans in Salamis is of an undetermined date.³⁹

In the 1st c. BC Romans also appear on Crete.⁴⁰ Their relatively late attestation is explained by Jean Hatzfeld as a result of the conflicts among Cretan towns, of Cretan piracy as well as of rumours about cruelty of Cretans; Ioannis Tzamtzis stressed in addition to these factors the

35 See Dzino 2010: 89 and n. 47 for references; Matijašić 2018.

36 *CIL* III 12101; *ILS* 7208; *IGR* III 965; Mitford 1961, 41, no. 113 (*SEG* 20, 212); Moretti 1981: 263 (*SEG* 31, 1360): [*cives · Romani · qui · Pa*]phi · negotiantur... [οἱ πραγματευόμενοι ἐν Πάφῳι ν Ῥωμαῖοι. Mitford dated the inscription to the late 2nd c. BC (followed by Krigos 2008: 32 n. 181), Moretti on the basis of the lettering some decades later, up to the middle of the 1st c. BC; Christina Kokkinia and Anne Kolb who study the inscriptions of Palaipaphos date the attestations to the 1st c. BC based on the lettering and historical criteria (personal communication, for which I am grateful).

37 Bajtler 2021 for amphorae and stoppers of Adriatic production; cf. Kaldeli 2013 for the broader exchange network of Cyprus. Generally on the Roman presence on Cypus see Zoumbaki, Karambinis 2022, 252-253.

38 *CIL* III 12101=*ILS* 7208: *M. Vehilio pontif(ici) proco(n)s(uli) ciues R(omani) Paphiae dio-cen(seos)*.

39 *CIL* III 6051; Pouilloux, Roesch, Marcillet-Jaubert 1987: 29, no. 58; Krigos 2008: 1443, no. Αμμ. 59: [*cives Rom*]ani · qui · in Salam[ine] | [*negot*]iantur.

40 On Roman presence on Crete see Zoumbaki & Karambinis 2022: 252-53. A Roman community is documented in Gortys: *IC* IV 290 (1st c. BC): [- - -] | [*c(ives) R(omani) qui Gortynae*] negotiāntur. | Doiae L(ucii) f(iliae) Pro[cillae] c(ives) R(omani) qui | Go[r]tynae negotiāntur. On Roman *negotiatores* in Gortys see Magnelli 1998; Tzamtzis 2013: 173-78 on this inscription and 182-187 on the inscription *IC* IV 278 recording a *c(onventus) c(ivium) R(omanorum) q(ui) G(ortynae) c(onsistunt)* under L. Septimius Severus, which according to Tzamtzis included also indigenous bearers of Roman citizenship. Cf. also the fragmentary inscription *IC* IV 291: *c(ives) R(omani)] qui Gortyna[e] negotiāntur*].

Ptolemaic presence which did not encourage massive Roman integration, despite the fact that isolated traders were settled on Crete, as thorough prosopographic studies by Martha Baldwin-Bowski show.⁴¹

Africa, Palestina, Syria and places far beyond the eastern frontier

The Roman presence in Africa is to be dated to before the Third Punic War (149-146 BC), as Appian's reference to Italian residents in Carthage shows.⁴² Later, in 112 BC, during the war between Adherbal and Jugurtha, *Italici* (Sall. *Iug.* 26.1) – also called *togati* (21.2) – resident at Adherbal's capital Cirta, were massacred along with Numidians.⁴³ Sallust refers further (*Iug.* 47) to the *oppidum Numidarum Vaga*, a much frequented place of trade, where numerous Italians resided and traded, “*ubi et incolere et mercari consueuerant Italici generis multi mortales*”; they are apparently to be identified with the *negotiatores* who are mentioned by Sallust.⁴⁴ In Utica, the important port that became the seat of the governor of the province Africa, Roman merchants were active by the late 2nd/early 1st c. BC, since by this time Marius enjoyed their support (Sall. *Iug.* 64-65), while thereafter Marian army families were settled “in compact groups ... on large allotments of land in the valley of the middle Bagradas ... Uchi Maius, Thibaris, and Thuburnica and perhaps others.”⁴⁵ Roman residents, still to be encountered in Utica some years later, offered their support to Pompeius (Cic. *Lig.* 3) and were humiliated by Caesar who refers to them as “*conventus qui is ex variis generibus constaret*” (*B Civ.* 2. 36). In 47 BC, Caesar (*B Afr.* 36.2) mentions *negotiatores* and *aratores* in Thysdra.⁴⁶ Further, he refers to *qui cives Romani contra populum Romanum arma tolerant* (*B Afr.* 97) in Thapsus and Hadrumetum, who were punished with the payment of enormous fines. Although literary

41 Hatzfeld 1919: 159-60; Tzamtzis 2013: 173-204; cf. Baldwin-Bowsky 1999. Prosopographic and ceramic studies show that Romans are to be found also in other places of Crete beyond Gortys, as e.g. in Eleutherna at the latest from the second half of the 1st c. BC, see Baldwin-Bowsky 2009a: 157-223 and a general presentation, 2009b: 207-13.

42 Appian, *Punica* 92; Wilson 1966: 43-54.

43 Löffl 2014, also on the impact of this massacre on the political life in Rome.

44 See Eberle Pilar 2017: 325-27.

45 Wilson 1966: 45.

46 Cf. Cadiou 2015: 234.

sources, such as those mentioned above, refer to Romans and *Italici* as collectivities residing at various places in North Africa as early as the 2nd c. BC, epigraphic attestations occur much later. In a bilingual inscription from Delos *Alexandreae Italicei quei fuere / οί ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείαι [παραγενόμενοι Ἴταλικοί]* honoured the legate C. Marius in 99 BC.⁴⁷ With the exception of an inscription from Cyrene⁴⁸ dated to 67 BC – where a community of Romans is still later attested –,⁴⁹ all remaining inscriptions from Africa are dated to the Imperial period, at the earliest under Augustus or Tiberius.⁵⁰ Collectivities of Romans in Africa are still to be found in the 2nd and early 3rd c. AD.⁵¹ Certainly Roman traders were numerous at crucial locations around the Mediterranean. This arises from evidence recording individual entrepreneurs or groups of merchants who were obviously Romans, although the definition *cives*

47 ID 1699=ILLRP 343.

48 Cyrene: Reynolds 1962: 98, 4; 101-3 (SEG 20, 715): [*cives Romani qui Cyre*]nis negotiantur.

49 Casperini 1971: 15-16.

50 The earliest inscriptions are: **Suo**, Africa proconsularis: AE 1937, 71; *ILTun* 682: *cives Romani qui Suo morantur* (AD 4-19).

Siagu, Africa proconsularis: a dedication to Augustus by Roman businessmen, AE 1912, 51; 1978, 836; *ILS* 9495; *ILAf* 306; Cadotte 2007, 517, no. 176: *cives Romani qui Thinissut negotiantur* (under Tiberius).

51 All evidence is collected by Beschta 2009 and is not reproduced here. A few more attestations, where the exact meaning of *cives Romani* is not, however, fully clear:

Pagus Fortunalis, Africa proconsularis: AE 1909, 158; *ILAf* 301; cf. Stoll 2015: 162: *cives Romani pagani veter(ani) pagi Fortunalis / quorum parentes beneficio divi Augusti / [---] Sutunurca agros acceperunt p(ecunia) p(ublica)* (AD 206).

Hr El Haouaria, Africa Proconsularis: AE 1997: 1642; Saastamoinen 2010: no. 339: *decuriones c(ives) R(omani)*, which is perhaps to be understood as *decuriones c(ivium) R(omanorum)* (AD 195-198)

Oppidum Thisiduens, Africa Proconsularis: *CIL* VIII 1269: *decuriones c(ivium) R(omanorum) et [mun]icipes [T]hisiduenses* (AD 117-138); cf. Van Andringa 2003: 56. On decurions in Africa see Ben Romdhane 2011.

Aubuzza, Africa Proconsularis: *CIL* VIII 16367: [*cives Romani qui*] *Aubuzza consistunt*

Tipasa, Mauretania Caesarensis: AE 1848, 40: *cives Romani cul/tores Larum et / imaginum Aug(usti) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(ecerunt)* (AD 119)

An interesting case is the double community of **Thugga** (Tunisia), where from the Augustan period until its development as a *municipium* (AD 205), Roman citizens (*pagus*) and Thuggenses (*civitas*) coexisted, see Thomson 1965 and Khanoussi, Ritter & von Rummel 2004-2005 with bibliography.

Romani or *Italici* is not included in their name, such as two *mercatores qui Alexandr[ia]i Asiai Syriai negotiantu[r]* mentioned in an inscription from Puteoli (of the Augustan age?).⁵² Thus, Romans should have been based in Alexandria and other commercial posts in northern Africa, forming part of a wide network of trade and communications across the Mediterranean and further in the East, links in this trade chain being also the merchants settled in southern Asia and Syria.⁵³ The important economic hub of Alexandria was the terminal port for the imported products from the Red Sea, which from Coptos traveled via Nile; this was one of the trade routes which brought here goods not only from the Red Sea region, but also from other parts of Africa as well as from Arabia, India and further east as far as China.⁵⁴ From Alexandria the imported items were channelled to further markets – Rome being the biggest consumer –, either as raw materials or as (re)manufactured products.⁵⁵ Literary sources, papyri, and inscriptions attest to Roman individuals engaged in various branches of this business or generally to Roman interest in

52 *CIL* X 1797, referring to two individuals, L. Calpurnius L. f. Capitolinus and C. Calpurnius L.f.

53 De Romanis & Maiuro 2015; Tchernia 2016: 42-51.

54 On the items, volume, routes and generally on the organization of this commerce see Young 2001; especially 16-22 on the trade routes, 24-80 on the origin of imported products and the role of Egypt in their trade. On Roman trade via the Red Sea in the 2nd c. AD see Nappo 2015; on Roman trade with lands further in the East see Terpstra 2015; Terpstra 2017; Galli 2017, all with earlier bibliography.

Products imported from the East are frequently defined as “luxury items”, a definition which is not generally appropriate, since also materials for medical use or other everyday uses were also imported, see Young 2001: 13-16; certainly also luxurious goods were also brought from exotic lands, such as pearls, silk etc.; especially on pearls’ import from India, Sri Lanka and the Persian Gulf as well as the routes of this trade see McLaughlin 2014; Schörle 2015; on silk see Galli 2017: 5-7 with previous bibliography and an appendix of ancient sources.

On taxes on imported goods in Egypt see Nappo & Zerbini 2011. On the importance of Nile as a means of transportation see Adams 2017.

55 On the role of Alexandria in the eastern trade see Young 2001: 45-47. On manufacturing of raw materials or reprocessing of items in Alexandria see Young 2001: 20-21, 47; Galli 2017: 6-7.

goods coming from the East and show that Roman merchants were stationed in Alexandria and other places in Egypt and were also involved in the trade network that reached as far as Far East.⁵⁶

Roman merchant communities were apparently installed even further in the East, although they are not explicitly mentioned in written sources, as e.g. the communities that apparently existed in Muziris and Arikamedu in India, if we judge from a number of indirect indications.⁵⁷ Even for the areas of Palestine and Syria attestations of Roman communities are rare. It is unclear whether Caesar, in referring to tax-farming in these regions (*B Civ.* 3. 32, 6: *neque minus ob eam causam civibus Romanis eius provinciae, sed in singulos conventus singulasque civitates certae pecuniae imperabantur*), alludes to such communities. In any case, in the age of Tiberius, Roman residents were among the crowd in Jerusalem, who witnessed the Apostles' preaching in various languages (*Acts* 2.11: ... καὶ οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι ...). Although important routes of the Eastern trade passed over Syria, especially via Palmyra⁵⁸ and Bostra, epigraphic attestations of communities of Romans are extremely rare and of a later date. In Syria, Roman residents are for the first time collectively attested under Marcus Aurelius. In an inscription from Bostra they appear as *cives Romani consistentes Bostrae* dedicating a temple for the well-being and victory of the emperor.⁵⁹ It is probably not a coincidence that Bostra is situated on Via Traiana, a *limes* road that connected the town with the port of Aela in the Gulf of Aqaba, and on one of the Eastern *limites* of the Empire, where military units were based;⁶⁰ thus Bostra was an important location for both trade routes and defence. As will be discussed below, *cives Romani consistentes* are to be found in numerous inscriptions of the northern *limites*, at similarly crucial points on the frontier and on natural routes of commerce and communication. *Limites* were devel-

56 Young 2001: 48-54; Galli 2017: 5. Ῥωμαῖοι are mentioned in several papyri, e.g. *BGU* 5.1210, *BGU* 9: 1894.

57 Young 2001: 26-27; Nappo 2021.

58 Young 2001: 123-68; Meyer, Seland & Anfinset 2016.

59 *IGLSyr* XIII 2, 9475: *cives Romani consistentes Bostrae*; cf. Stoll 2015: 162.

60 Generally on the emergence and function of the *limites* see Thorne 2007: 228-32, on the *limes* of the East see Wheeler 2007 (on Bostra see pp. 250, 252). On the role of Bostra see Young 2001: esp. 107-10.

oped in the East in regions with a Hellenized or semi-Hellenized advanced infrastructure and political as well as social patterns, while in a great part of the western and northern areas a lower stage of political and societal development prevailed.

THE WESTERN AND NORTHERN PART OF THE ROMAN WORLD

In the western part of the Roman world, epigraphic attestations of Romans as collectivities appear only from the 1st c. AD, although their presence at earlier dates in various places is verified by literary sources and archaeological finds.⁶¹

The Iberian Peninsula

Romans became familiar with Spain in the late 3rd c. BC during their fight against Carthage. The first centre of Roman settlers was formed, when Scipio in 206 BC gathered soldiers wounded at the battle at Ilipa, a town north of Seville, which was renamed to Italica (Appian, *Iber.* 38) and was to become later the homeland of two Roman emperors, Trajan and Hadrian. It was the beginning of several Roman foundations in the Iberic peninsula, which attracted a large number of Romans and Italians due to the rich natural resources⁶². In the Guadalquivir valley a colony,

61 For a short overview of the first contacts of Romans with the western part of the Mediterranean, see Naco del Hoyo, Principal & Dobson 2022.

62 Bandelli 2002: 105-42. The size of the Italian population of Spain is evident in Strabo's (3.5 [168]) reference to the settlement of 3,000 of these men from Spain to Balearics in 122 BC; cf. Wilson 1966, 22.

On an overview of the Romanization of Spain and emigration of population from Italy to the Iberian peninsula see Tsirkin 1993: esp. about a Roman settlement that sprang into existence after Cato installed a camp in 195 BC at Emporion, on an connection of a wave of migration with M. Iunius Silanus around 100 BC (p. 277); Carthago Nova "attracted Romans and Italics immediately after its seizure, as has been testified by the findings of Campanian vessels back to 250-180 B.C." and these people were also drawn to the region by the rich mines whose exploitation by Italians is verified by the stamps on lead ingots (pp. 281-82); for Italian migration to Baetis, foundation of Italica and Corduba, but also their establishment in rural areas outside of these towns (p. 293); generally on questions related to the Italian migrants see pp. 302-5.

Corduba, was established at some disputed date, most probably in the first half of the 2nd c. BC, and a small number of outstanding locals were admitted into the colony (Strabo 3.2.1 Ῥωμαίων καὶ ἐπιχωρίων ἄνδρες ἐπίλεκτοι).⁶³ The exploitation of Sierra Mořena mines in Baetis valley attracted Romans already in 197 BC.⁶⁴ During the first period a co-existence of Romans and Italians with locals in the valley is evident, but in clearly divided settlements. Rich mines were exploited by Italians in Carthago Nova too (Strabo 3.2.10), as is verified by stamps on lead ingots.⁶⁵ Over time Roman entrepreneurs were involved not only in the exploitation of mines, but also of further sea- and land-resources, such as olive oil production in Baetica.⁶⁶ Gradually, both Roman settlers and the indigenous elite exploited the land's abundant resources.⁶⁷

The merging of Romans with locals in Spain becomes quite clear in Caesar's speech in Hispalis, who makes no distinction between them (*B Hisp.* 42). Caesar's prevalence marked the establishment of *coloniae* at several places where Roman communities existed before. As previously noted by Kornemann and further analysed by other scholars, in the Romanized regions of the Iberic Peninsula and in the southern part of Gaul, settlements of private individuals from Italy were apparently absorbed into Caesarean or Augustan colonies or *municipia*, generally mentioned

On Valentia, its foundation in the second half of the 2nd c. BC (possibly 138 BC), its intense trade (as the extensive *horrea* show) and its Roman-Italic character see Ribera i Lacomba 2006. On the controversial situation of Tarraco, which is described by Pliny (3. 21) as *opus Scipiorum*, see Ruiz de Arbulo 2006.

Generally on Roman towns in the region of Valencia see Abad Casal 2014. On early Roman towns of Hispania Tarraconensis see Abad Casal, Krey & Ramallo Asensio 2006. On Roman towns in Catalonia see Guitart i Duran 2010.

63 Wilson 1966: 24 and Funari 1994: 90 (152 BC); Bandelli 2002: 107 (between late 3rd and early 2nd c. BC); Jiménez & Carillo 2011. Caesar, *B Civ.* 2.19.3 speaks of a *conventus* (Tsirkin 1993: 308: "i.e. the Roman citizens' community") in Corduba. On settlements in the Guadalquivir valey see Adab Casal 1975.

64 Strabo 3.2.9; Plin. *HN* 34.165; Diod. 5.36; Liv. 32.28.11; cf. Tsirkin 1993: 299, 302-3; Rowan 2013. On Romans in Baetis see also Wulff Alonso 1994; García Vargas 2019.

65 Tsirkin 1993, 281-82; Diaz Ariño & Antolinos Marin 2013; Stefanile 2015; Panzram 2020: 224-27.

66 For the rich olive-oil production of the region see Strabo 3.2.6. Curchin 1982; for more bibliography see Zoumbaki 2021: nn. 36 and 38.

67 On the economy of Baetica see Funari 1994.

by Pliny⁶⁸ as *oppida civium Romanorum*.⁶⁹ This pattern is observed in various instances in Spain where clusters of Italians evolved into towns, some of which became capitals of *conventus iuridici*.⁷⁰

All this resulted in the acculturation of the locals to the Roman way of life, μικρὸν ἀπέχουσι τοῦ πάντες εἶναι Ἴωμαῖοι (Strabo 3.2, 15).⁷¹ Nevertheless, despite the presence of individuals from Italy in Spain dating back to the late 3rd c. BC and progressively expanding in various locations, explicit epigraphic attestations of Roman collectivities are hardly to be encountered. In the first half of the 1st c. AD in Tarraconensis, *cives Romani qui negotiantur in Bracaraugustae* are mentioned.⁷² Tarraconensis is regarded as the area which displays the largest sample of Italians or their descendants during the Imperial period.⁷³ However, no other inscription from Iberia explicitly mentions a Roman community under a

68 E.g. Pliny, *N.H.* 3.3 *Citerioris Hispaniae ... , quarum mentione seposita civitates provincia ipsa praeter contributas aliis CCXCIII continet, oppida CLXXVIII, in iis colonias XII, oppida civium Romanorum XIII, Latinorum veterum XVIII, foederatorum unum, stipendiaria CXXXV* (“Hither Spain ... but the province itself contains, besides 293 states dependent on others, 189 towns, of which 12 are colonies, 13 are towns of Roman citizens, 18 have the old Latin rights, one is a treaty town and 135 are tributary”).

69 Kornemann 1900: 1186-87; Wilson 1966: 38-39; Sherwin-White 1973: 225-36. According to Sherwin-White, *oppida civium Romanorum* in Spain as well as in Africa and in the northern part of the Roman world were amalgams of immigrant Roman citizens from central Italy, who formed ‘convental’ associations (in Sherwin-White’s words) within the native townships, as well as of enfranchised native inhabitants.

70 Generally on the huge Italian population in Spain and the development of their communities, see García Fernández 1991: esp. 32; Rodríguez Neila 2017: 372. For *conventus civium Romanorum* in Spain, which developed in capitals of *conventus iuridici*, see Arrayás Morales 2004: 297-98, who mentions a *conventus civium Romanorum* in Tarraco and more *conventus* in Spain; see also Abascal Palazón 2006: 68-70 (with earlier bibliography) on the existence of a *conventus civium Romanorum* at Icosium, which is based on Pliny’s (*NH* 3.19) mention of the contribution of Icositani to the Augustan colony of Ilici.

71 Wilson 1966: 24-25; Funari 1994: 88-91. On the spread of Romanization in Spain and the adaptation of local elites see Klein 2007-2008. On the development of bilingualism in Iberia in the Republican period, see Lowe 2014.

72 *CIL* II 2423 (AD 42-44); cf. Haley 1991: 28 who interprets them as “Spanish-Roman citizens” citing views identifying them as Italians.

73 Haley 1991: 28-30, 113-17 cites several individual Italians attested in Baetica and Tarraconensis.

formal definition, such as *conventus civium Romanorum* or *cives Romani qui*
...

Gallia and the northern frontier

Romans were active in Gallic and Germanic regions as well. The early foundation of a colony at the important port of Narbonne (118-116 BC) reveals the interest of the Roman state in the area and archaeological finds and graffiti testify to the presence of individuals from the Italian peninsula.⁷⁴ Huge quantities of Italian amphoras discovered in excavations and shipwrecks point to extensive wine imports into Gaul from approximately 150 BC to the late 1st c. BC.⁷⁵ Cicero reports a *civibus Romanis qui negotiantur in Gallia*, a group that was numerous and dominant in every kind of entrepreneurial endeavor in Gaul; he further reports of individual profit-seekers in the region, such as Sextus Naevius in his *Pro Quinctio*.⁷⁶ Caesar refers to *cives Romani* settled at Cenabum and Cabillonum in Gaul for the purpose of conducting trade and highlights instances of trade with various Gallic and Germanic tribes.⁷⁷ This indicates that by the 1st c. BC, Roman traders had already established residency in Gaul. However, in the epigraphic record of the Gallic provinces, as also in Germania Superior, Romans are not attested as collectivities before the 1st c. AD.⁷⁸

There is a similar situation along the north frontier stretching from Britain to the *limes*-line of the Rhine and Danube, encompassing namely the regions from modern Scotland to the Black Sea. Along the *limes* of the Rhine and Danube, namely in the provinces of Germania, Raetia,

74 Christol 2002: 44; 2020.

75 Kay 2014: 141-47, 186.

76 Cic. *Font.* 11 *Referta Gallia negotiatorum est, plena civium Romanorum. Nemo Gallorum sine cive Romano quicquam negoti gerit, nummus in Gallia nullus sine civium Romanorum tabulis commovetur ... est praeterea <maximus> numerus civium Romanorum atque <equitum> hominum honestissimorum; Quinct.* 12.

77 Caesar *B Gall.* 7.3.1 (*Cenabum signo dato concurrunt civesque Romanos, qui negotiandi causa ibi constiterant*); 7.42.3; 7.55.5 (*quique eo negotiandi causa convenerant*); for further mentions of traders in Gaul and Germania, e.g. *B Gall.* 1.39; 2.15; 3.1; 4.2-3, 4.5, 4.20-21; 6.37; 7.42, 7.45. Cf. Riggsby 2006: 97, 189.

78 For example *AE* 2000, 948 (Lugdunum); *CIL* XIII 1194 = *ILS* 197 (Avaricum), cf. Gmyrek 1998, 39; *CIL* XIII 6797 (Mogontiacum). Cf. Van Andringa 1998.

Noricum, Pannonia, Dacia and Moesia,⁷⁹ Romans were in full action already in the 1st c. BC, yet their communities are epigraphically attested only from the 2nd c. AD. Regional studies have shown that from about the mid. 1st c. BC Dacia was full of Roman merchants and other specialists who partially worked for local kings and chieftains.⁸⁰ However, groups of Romans are attested in inscriptions of Dacia as well as of Moesia and Pannonia only from the 2nd c. AD and continued to exist until late in the 3rd century.

Romans are to be found as a collectivity in Britain as well; it is clear that they were civilian Romans who lived in a village (*vicus*) near the Fort Veluniate, although they are not called *cives Romani*, but *vikani consistentes castello Veluniate*,⁸¹ while *vicani* are mentioned in three more inscriptions from Britain.⁸² It is questionable, whether they are to be identified with *cives Italici et Norici* who appear in an inscription of an altar erected by the *milites* of the Legio VI from Castlecary; the late date (AD 140-190) makes the reference problematic and it is not to be excluded that the definition *cives Italici et Norici* refers to the origins of the soldiers, as Mann suggested,⁸³ and not to civilians.

Along the *limes* where castles and legionary camps were installed, Roman communities of civilians were settled next to them. Civilian settlements in the vicinity of legion quarters initially consisted of merchants, grocers, wine-traders, manufacturers who earned their living through trade activities with soldiers and perhaps with natives who lived beyond the *limes*; Roman merchants were in some cases active in

79 For the emergence and function of the *limites* see Thorne 2007: 228-232. For a general overview on the situation in the regions of the northern *limes* see (selected out of an extend bibliography): Dacia: Oltean 2007; Ardevan and Zerbini 2007; Cupcea 2011; Nemeti and Nemeti 2014. Dalmatia: Wilkes 1962; Pannonia: Kovács 2013; especially on the role of Roman army see Petculescu 2006; Avram 2007; Ruscu 2014; Matei-Popescu 2014.

80 Parvan 1928: 153-54.

81 Richmond & Steer 1959.

82 Salway 1967: 10-11 with an analysis of the terms *vicus*, *vicanus*, *consistentes*, and *canabae*; cf. also Salway 1993: 417. A discussion of those people living at the frontier see Birley 1979: 107-14.

83 *CIL* VII 1095; *RIB* 2148; cf. Birley 1952: 178; Mann 1963: 487-88.

those remote lands even before Roman legions arrived⁸⁴. Civilians who followed the Roman army lived in *canabae*, settlements developed near the military camps, and *vici*⁸⁵. The land surrounding a fortress was determined as *intra leugam* (i.e. the perimeter of a Gallic *leuga* = 2.2 km).⁸⁶ In some cases a civilian settlement, a *vicus*, was founded *extra leugam*.⁸⁷ Roman citizens frequently lived together with peregrine communities in *vici* and are defined as *cives Romani consistentes*. Some *vici* bearing names, such as *Vicus Quintionis*, *Vicus Secundini* etc., were apparently named after Roman settlers, perhaps their founders.⁸⁸ In the course of time, *veterani* were also settled at the places where initially traders and manufacturers lived; gradually soldiers were not obliged to live in the quarters of the legion and became inhabitants of the civilian settlements too.⁸⁹ Romans who lived there were named *cives Romani consistentes ad legionem*, *cives Romani consistentes ad canabas / (in) canabis* or later *canabenses* (“people of the *Canabae*”), *cives Romani consistentes vico* ... In some inscriptions *veterani* and *cives Romani consistentes* appear side by side. How far these settlements were under the jurisdiction of the military commanders is a subject of discussion.⁹⁰ Furthermore, there is a lengthy and ongoing debate on the legal status of these communities, especially whether they possessed the *domicilium* of the places where they are attested, but closer investigation has shown that their exact legal status varied.⁹¹ Hence, certain settlements are defined as *canabae*,

84 On the organization and administration of the *canabae* see Reid 1913: 196–99; Vittinghoff 1971; Petrikovits 1979; Petrikovits 1981; Piso 1991; Bérard 1992: 80–88. On the interaction of Romans with people beyond the northern frontier, see various contributions in Wells 2013.

85 Hanel 2007.

86 For an extensive discussion of *intra leugam* see Piso 1991, 139–141.

87 Kovács 2013, 132.

88 See Parvan 1928: 184.

89 Reid 1913: 196–97; Hanel 2007: 412–13; Handy 2009: 218.

90 Piso 1991: 138 the military authorities exercised no administration on the *canabae*, but were certainly interested in everything running outside, but close to, the legionary camps.

91 Mommsen 1910: 188 argued that these people did not possess the *domicilium* of the places in question and that’s why they are not defined through the region where their settlement was located, but only through the *canaba* of the *legio* with which they were connected. On this question see also Gagliardi 2006: esp. 433–35.

others as *vici*, some of them continued to exist even after the withdrawal of military forces, others were developed as *municipia*. Gradually some of these settlements resembled to towns, as they were supplied with buildings, such as theatres, *porticos* etc., and their administrative staff included *magistri*, *aediles*, *quaestores*, even a local senate called *ordo*.

The role of the army for the “Romanization” of the frontier area, especially after the organization of Moesian *limes* by Vespasian, was pivotal.⁹² The presence of Roman settlers in these regions was important for local societies, as army and traders who accompanied military units introduced monetized economy and markets as an institutional phenomenon into these regions.⁹³ It is, in any case, evident that not only the local inhabitants “underwent a process of “Romanization,” but there is also a noticeable assimilation of Roman settlers into indigenous life.⁹⁴ The strategic placement of these regions at crossroads connecting the Roman *oecumene* with the external world, combined with the presence of extensive navigable rivers, undeniably attracted Romans due to their commercial significance. This was apparently the situation with an association of worshippers of Cybele in Tomis, *matrem Romanorum subscriptorum*.⁹⁵ In this context, we are dealing with a religious association which did not encompass the entirety of the Roman residents in Tomis, but only a number of individuals, all of whom were Roman citizens originating from Asia Minor. Their presence in this strategic commercial location on the Black Sea was certainly motivated by the lucrative opportunities it presented. Vasile Parvan’s (1928: 184) words, “Danube, with its tributary the Save, had once again done its duty as a highway between the Adriatic and the Black Sea”, stress the importance of this region for commerce. The maritime line of shipping in the Black Sea from Tomis and other outlets towards the commercial centres in Bithynia, functioned further as a connection with the eastern provinces.⁹⁶

92 Petculescu 2006: esp. 31.

93 Verboven 2007; in the same sense also Parvan’s (1928: 184-85) comments.

94 Hoehn 2009.

95 Bounegru 2000: esp. 128-29; cf. *CAPInv*. 1205.

96 Bounegru 2014.

What arises from the overview of Romans and Italians abroad?

From this short and general overview of the expansion and gradual proliferation of groups of Romans and Italians outside the Italian peninsula, it arises that we are dealing with a phenomenon that displays no uniformity in chronological terms. Moreover, we have to take into consideration that these communities are dispersed in a world –the Roman world– whose parts lack uniformity in historical background, traditions, settlement patterns, urban development, civic and public life, and culture. The old tradition of the *poleis* with their fully developed civic institutions, especially in the East (yet not everywhere, as there were local diversities, e.g. in Asia Minor⁹⁷), co-existed in the vast Empire with under-urbanized regions where different forms of settlements and administration prevailed. The Roman world comprised a mosaic of communities: *civitates stipendiariae*, *municipia*, colonies and the territories included *vici*, *pagi* and smaller nuclear communities (e.g. *castella*). Our knowledge about these forms of settlement is not always adequate⁹⁸, especially in Rome's western and northern provinces during the Republic. The status of various communities is being debated, whilst epigraphic and literary sources only allow us to gain a very patchy image of the organization of these regions which were to a large degree urbanized only under Roman rule.

The establishment of Roman nuclei in all these diverse environments was not an instantaneous event but rather a long-lasting process giving rise to various modes of coexistence between Romans and indigenous populations. This evolutionary process is evident e.g. in Pliny's *oppida civium Romanorum* in Spain, Africa and Dalmatia, which have been interpreted as amalgams of enfranchised native inhabitants and immigrant Roman citizens.⁹⁹ A different evolution is to be observed in a variety of settlements at the north frontier, ranging from colonies and *civitates peregrinae* to military *vici* which were developed in the interior of provinces along important communication routes and along the *limes*, in

97 E.g. for Phrygia see Thonemann 2013: esp. 31-37.

98 Edmondson 2006: esp. 256-260.

99 Cf. n. 69 above. Sherwin-White 1973: 225-36, 344-50; on *oppida* in Germania Superior, Raetia and Noricum see also Pazmany 2019: 13-49.

proximity to castles and legionary camps. The fact that these people settled on the borders of the Roman world, frequently among locals with different administration structures and cultural background, led them to organize themselves in common with veterans who decided to establish themselves permanently on these lands after their retirement. It is evident that in many cases they cooperated with veterans and local populations in order to erect honorific monuments or buildings. They appear, however, as separate groups in the inscriptions and they are still mentioned as *cives Romani consistentes* even after the *Constitutio Antoniniana* (e.g. *IScM* I 349, AD 246). Although in some cases it is feasible to identify some officeholder of the host settlements as originating from the milieu of Roman residents and despite the fact that locals acquired Roman citizenship or worshipped Roman deities along with Roman civilians and veterans, namely despite the hints of an integration of Romans into local societies and the adaptation of local people –at least of a part of them– to Roman status and culture, it is remarkable that in official texts Romans keep on advertising a separate identity. An attachment to Rome is also evident in dedications set up by these communities to Jupiter Optimus Maximus and sometimes to Juno Regina *pro salute* of some emperor. It is remarkable that Roman residents are only rarely connected with cults related to commerce, such as Hermes/Mercury, despite their economic activities (for an exception see e.g. *CIL* XIII 7222 = *ILS* 7077).¹⁰⁰

The catalytic role played by the Roman and Italian settlers in the Iberian Peninsula is evident, for instance, in Strabo's writings about the region. Their presence is said to have brought, together with the fertility of the land, civilization and an urban lifestyle to the Turdetanians as also among the Celts (3.2, 15: τῆ δὲ τῆς χώρας εὐδαιμονία καὶ τὸ ἡμέρον καὶ τὸ πολιτικὸν συνηκολούθησε τοῖς Τουρθητανοῖς, καὶ τοῖς Κελτικοῖς δὲ διὰ τὴν γειτνίασιν). The co-existence of Romans with locals in the

100 Bourigault 2007: 85 stresses the fact that festivals and religious actions where *cives Romani consistentes* are involved are always important cults for Rome, imperial cult as well as Jupiter Optimus Maximus, Juno, and Terra Mater and only rarely cults related to commerce. Van Andringa 2003: 55 for Roman cults implanted by Roman residents in their new settlements, e.g. in Lausanne; 57 for Turda in Dacia and Carnuntum.

Iberian Peninsula, coupled with the high degree of the assimilation of the indigenous population, particularly the elites, into the Roman realities, resulted in a relatively swift transformation of society. This situation is described by Strabo (3.2, 15) as μικρὸν ἀπέχουσι τοῦ πάντες εἶναι Ῥωμαῖοι. From this point of view, it is understandable why groups of Romans in Spain are hardly explicitly mentioned in our sources as distinct enclaves within local societies.

Integration of Roman and Italian residents into local communities followed a different path in regions with a long tradition of civic life. In the eastern part of the Roman world, *poleis*, especially the most important commercial centres, interacted for centuries with foreigners who passed by or settled, and often granted them certain privileges either as individuals (*proxenia*, *proedria*, *ges enktesis* etc.) or as groups (for example the permission to possess some places in order to conduct their own cult activities, e.g. the Kitian merchants residing in Athens, *IG II² 337*). Therefore, in Greek *poleis*, Romans could readily find their place in an already existing pattern of social development. The settlement of a considerable number of Romans in the *poleis* certainly involved some adaptation to the reality of life in the host towns on the part of these settlers. It is clear that Roman residents were interested in establishing themselves economically, in cultivating relations with local society and authority, in acquiring certain rights and privileges that might encourage and support both their professional activities and their gradual integration into the host community.¹⁰¹

Evidently, Italians and Romans who ventured far from Italy, motivated by diverse reasons and enticed by various opportunities, were compelled to acclimate themselves to diverse environments. Consequently, their settlements evolved diversely, and their communities may display different features.¹⁰² However, in order to perceive the phenomenon of the Roman diaspora it is useful to specify the common characteristics of the divergent groups of Romans and Italians abroad and to shed light onto their nature and formation.

101 On their strategies see Zoumbaki 2023.

102 For a comparative assessment of the fundamental features of the Roman diaspora in the eastern and western parts of the Mediterranean, see Zoumbaki & Karambinis 2022: 253-55.

Specific features of the groups of Romans and Italians abroad: An analysis in the light of the basic characteristics of private associations

Since our sources provide hardly any direct information about the character of the Roman communities attested in numerous diverse settlements in the Roman world, it is important to consider every enlightening indication as to whether they are to be regarded as entities with a concrete legal status and an organization based on certain prescribed regulations, namely whether they are to be defined as private associations. In this respect, the attestations are to be analyzed on the basis of the criteria for categorizing a group as an association by Gabrielsen and Thomsen (2015: 10-12), namely on the basis of their name and further descriptive terms, internal organization, membership and durability.

Proper name and accompanying terminology: The proper names of the collectivities of Romans and Italians abroad, along with further descriptive elements are crucial for our examination. Of special importance are inscriptions set up by the host communities or by the groups themselves, which, as official documents, accurately reproduce the precise (self-)definition of these groups. The various definitions of the groups can be summarized in the following table.

ROMANS	Greek	Latin
Simple mention	Ῥωμαῖοι	Cives Romani
Descriptive definition of the group	Κονβέντος Ῥωμαίων τὸ συνέδριον τῶν Ῥωμαίων	Conventus civium Romanorum
Terms stressing residence	Ῥωμαῖοι παρεπιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι παραγινόμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι κατοικοῦντες / Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ ἐξ ἀρχαίου κατοικοῦντες	Cives Romani qui ... consistunt Cives Romani con- sistentes Cives Romani qui ... morantur Cives Romani qui ... habitant

		Cives Romani ... di- ocen(seos) Cives Romani + epi- thet derived from a toponym
Terms stressing occupation	Ῥωμαῖοι (συμ)πραγματευόμενοι [πραγματευ]ταί Ῥωμαῖοι ἐνγαιοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι γεωργεῦντες (Ῥωμαῖοι ἐνκεκτημένοι)	Conventus civium Romanorum/ cives Romani qui in ... negotiantur
Terms in partitive genitive	Ῥωμαίων οἱ ναύκληροι καὶ ἔμποροι Ῥωμαίων οἱ κατοικοῦντες, οἱ καταπλέοντες (εἰς τὴν νῆσον) ἔμποροι καὶ ναύκληροι (καὶ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι ἐν τῇ τραπέζι)	
Terms stressing political status (?)	Ῥωμαῖοι συμπολ(ε)ιτευόμενοι	
ITALIANS	Greek	Latin
Simple mention	Ἰταλικοί	Italic(e)i
Terms stressing residence	Οἱ ἐν ... παραγινόμενοι Ἰταλικοί Ἰταλικοί οἱ... κατοικοῦντες	
Terms stressing occupation	Ἰταλικοί οἱ ἐν ... πραγματευόμενοι	Italicei ... quei ne- gotiantur

The definitions of communities of Romans and Italians abroad always include a ethnic name, *Romani/Italic(e)i* or Ῥωμαῖοι/Ἰταλικοί. It is remarkable that in Latin inscriptions these groups are never called simply *Romani*, but always *cives Romani*, which is probably not an expression of

mere ethnic identity but rather of legal status. It is, however, questionable, whether the Greek rendering Ῥωμαῖοι always indicates a legal status or points to an ethnic origin or to a more complicated identity which comprised a number of characteristics stressing a special relationship of these people with Rome, such as origin from Italy, Latin language skills, use of Roman practices in their transactions etc.¹⁰³ Individual Italians, where they did not mention their particular town of origin, in Greek as a rule defined themselves as Ῥωμαῖος, since Italicus/Ἰταλικός was never used in singular.¹⁰⁴ Self-definitions of individuals in private bilingual documents are to be taken into consideration: in the Latin version the specific town of origin is accurately mentioned, whereas the Greek version always gives the origin as Ῥωμαῖος.¹⁰⁵ Therefore, Ῥωμαῖος might not necessarily in such cases indicate their legal status. It is moreover significant that even in certain official documents set up by Greek *poleis*, individuals defined as Ῥωμαῖος lack a Roman name and consequently, as it seems, Roman citizenship.¹⁰⁶ This possibly shows

103 On Ῥωμαῖοι who did not possess Roman citizenship, see Brunt 1971: 205-9.

104 There is, as far as I know, only a gravestone of Χρησίμου Ἰταλιώτα from Argos Amphiloichikon in Epirus (3rd c. BC): SEG 32.562; Antonetti 2011.

105 As far as private bilingual documents are concerned, there are two characteristic examples. In a funerary bilingual inscription from Athens, the deceased, a member of the prominent family of Porcii, defines himself as [M(arcus) Por]cius [M(arci) f(ilius) Cato Tus]cula(nu)s / [Μᾶρκο]ς Πόρκιος [Κάτων Ῥ]ωμαῖος (IG II² 10163). In a bilingual gravestone from Rheneia the deceased is mentioned as Q. Avili G. f. Lanuvine / Κόιντε Ἀύλλιε υἱὲ Ῥωμαῖε (EAD XXX 495). Apart from questions regarding specific status of the towns of origin –Tusculum being a municipium with full privileges of citizenship (see Astin 1972), Lanuvium a town of problematic status, perhaps a *civitas sine suffragio* (see e.g. Mouritsen 2007: 157; Capogrossi Colognesi 2014: 99 n. 4) –, it is striking that the Greek version renders the origin generally as Ῥωμαῖος and omits accurate mention of the hometown.

See also Hasenohr 2007a: 222-23 on the use of Ῥωμαῖος on Delos.

106 A characteristic example is Νίκανδρος Μενεκράτεος Ῥωμαῖος attested in a catalogue of *proxenoi* at Delphi in 173/2 BC (Syll³ 585; SGDI 2581 [SEG 17.236; 19.383]). In a list of *technitai* of Dionysos from Argos (first quarter of the 1st c. BC) an individual is mentioned as [Δημ]ήτριος Δημητρίου Ῥωμαῖος (Vollgraff 1919: 252). An entry in one of the temple inventories of Delos is: ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος στεφάνιον [ἀργυ]ροῦν δάφνης, ἀνάθημα Ἀχιλλέως Ῥωμαίου... (ID 1442, B. l. 47).

that Greeks tended to define as Ῥωμαῖος individuals from Italy in general, irrespectively of their personal status or the status of their town of origin. It is perhaps useful to recall that the term “Hellenes” in Hellenistic Egypt could include people of non-Greek origin, such as Hellenized Jews.¹⁰⁷

The exact meaning of Ῥωμαῖος/Ῥωμαῖοι both for individuals and for groups remains therefore an open question. We should further mention Claire Hasenohr’s observation that *Italici*/Ἰταλικοί never appear in Delian inscriptions recording common actions with Athenians and other foreigners or “other Hellenes”, but in such cases Ῥωμαῖοι are recorded. Here are, however, some exceptions where *Graec(e)i*/Ἕλληνες and *Italici*/Ἰταλικοί/Ἰταλοί are jointly mentioned.¹⁰⁸ Taking all this into consideration, we should bear in mind that collective definitions as Ῥωμαῖοι could also include people who were not *cives Romani*. The question regarding the exact meaning of Ῥωμαῖος/Ῥωμαῖοι and the purpose of its use in various documents as well as its implications for individual or collective identities, extends, however, beyond the scope of this paper.

Only two descriptive terms of the collectivities under examination are included in their definitions, *conventus*/κονβέντος and τὸ συνέδριον, and both are rarely used. The Greek terms κονβέντος and τὸ συνέδριον τῶν Ῥωμαίων¹⁰⁹ seem simply to render in Greek the term *conventus*. Kornemann regarded the term *conventus* as equivalent to the Greek σύνοδος and stressed that *conventus* implies a durable community (“dauernde Gemeinschaft”).¹¹⁰ That the communities were durable, is evident from their repeated occurrences. However, the term σύνοδος is never used to define groups of Romans and Italians,¹¹¹ and similar terms which

107 See Thompson 2001, Sanger 2013: 60 and Kruse 2015: 291, 297 with previous bibliography on the topic.

108 Cf. Hasenohr 2007a: 224. Exceptions are *ID* 1620, 1694-96, 1698.

109 Κονβέντος Ῥωμαίων: Thyateira: 1. *TAM* V 2, 1002; *IGR* IV 1169 (τοῦ τῶν Ῥωμαίων κονβέντου); 2. *TAM* V 2, 1003: κουρατορεῦσ[αντα κονβέντου Ῥω]μαίων. Τὸ συνέδριον τῶν Ῥωμαίων appears only once in an inscription from Hierapolis in Phrygia, *Alt.v.Hierapolis* 32. On the term *synedrion* see Arnaoutoglou 2016: 283.

110 Kornemann 1900: 1181.

111 Scherrer 2007: 68 and n. 41 wonders, whether τῆι συνόδωι in a very fragmentary inscription from Ephesos (*IEphesos* 859) is to be identified with the *conventus civium*

are frequently used for private associations, such as *collegium*, *koinon*, *thiasos* etc., are never encountered in the sources in connection with Romans and Italians abroad either. As studies by historians of law have shown,¹¹² the term *conventus*, when it does not imply juridical districts of the Roman Empire, means nothing more than an assembly of Romans sojourning in a region. Purcell, however, refers to the “institution of *conventus*”, which “enabled Roman communities to adopt something of the style of a formal body politic.”¹¹³ Moreover, we have to stress that although the term *conventus* (*civium Romanorum*) is very frequently used in the related bibliography in order to define all these communities, it does not appear abundantly in inscriptions, even in the West: specifically, only a handful of inscriptions from the region of the Helvetii,¹¹⁴ one from Masculula in Tunisia¹¹⁵ and two Latin inscriptions from Ephesos¹¹⁶ refer to *conventus*, while the Greek versions κοινβέντος Ῥωμαίων

Romanorum of the town, but there is neither a parallel of this definition nor an internal argument of the text leading to this clue.

112 Berger 1953: 416.

113 Purcell 2005: 95.

114 CIL XIII 5026 = ILS 7011 = RISch I, 51 = AE 2000, 1029 (Lausanne): *Soli, Genio, Lunae / sacrum ex voto / pro salute Augus/torum, P. Clod(ius) Corn(elia tribu) / Primus, curator vika/nor(um) Lousonnensium (bis), / (se)vir Augustal(is), c(urator) c(ivium) R(omanorum) / conventus Hel(vetici) d(e) s(uo) d(edit).*

CIL XIII 11478 = RISch I, 105 (Avenches): cf. Lamoine 2009: 134, no. 32: *D(ecimus) Iul(ius) C(ai) f(ilius) Fa[b(ia)] | Consors sac(erdos) augustal(is) mag(ister) | cur(ator) c(ivium) R(omanorum) conen(tus) Hel(vetici) ex vis[u].*

CIL XIII 5013 (Nyon): [- - -]no f. *Corn(elia tribu) / [- - -]antabro / cur(ator) c(ivium) R(omanorum) convent(us) / Helvetic(i), (duo)viro, / Iuliae C. fil(iae) Marcellae / Corneliae Q. filiae Marcellae.*

CIL XII 2618 = RISch I, 21 (Geneva): [- - -]pojntifex trium[vir / loc(or)um] publ(icorum) perse]q(uendorum), *c(urator) c(ivium) R(omanorum) con(ventus) Hel[vetici] - - -].*

115 CIL VIII 15775; ILS 6774/5; ILTun 1668: *[Div]o Augus[to] | sacrum | conventus | civium Romanor(um) | et Numidarum qui | Mascululae habitant.*

116 The term is restored in several Ephesian inscriptions, but it is preserved in the following texts:

İplikçioğlu, Engelmann & Knibbe 1989: 235-36, no. B 2; Alpers & Halfmann 1995: 1320 (35 BC): *conventus c. [R.] quei Ephesi negotiantu[r].*

IEph 3019 (AD 43/44): *conventus c(ivium) R(omanorum) qui in Asia negotiantur.*

and συνέδριον τῶν Ῥωμαίων are to be encountered only in two inscriptions from Thyateira and in one from Hierapolis in Phrygia.¹¹⁷ The lack of descriptive terminology impedes our understanding of the nature of these groups.

The proper names of these collectivities often include a reference to their places of residence. It can be a *canaba* (e.g. *IScM* V 154: *veterani et cives Romani consistentes ad canabas legionis V Macedonicae*), a *vicus* (e.g. *IScM* I 324: *cives Romani consistentes in vico Quintionis*), a town (e.g. *IC* IV 278: *cives Romani qui Gortynae consistunt*), a region (e.g. *ILGR* 40: Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν τῆς Λακωνικῆς πραγματευόμενοι), a wider administration unit (e.g. *CIL* XI 7288 = *ILLRP* 445: [- - qui in diocesi Synna]dica negotiantur) or a province (eg. *CIL* III 12266 from Rhodes: *cives Romani qui in Asia negotiantur*). In some Latin inscriptions the residence is implied by an epithet derived from a toponym, such as *cives Romani Suenses* (*CIL* VIII 25850), *c(i)v(es) R(omani) Miciens(es)* (*IDR* III 3, 81).

Geographical references to the groups' residences are followed in Latin by verbs or participles, *qui ... consistunt*, *morantur*, *habitant* or *consistentes*, in Greek normally rendered as participles, παρεπιδημοῦντες, κατοικοῦντες, παραγινόμενοι. Leaving aside epithets derived from toponyms (e.g. *Suenses*, *Micienses*), which apparently do not bear a legal nuance, and the term παραγινόμενοι which seems to mean simply "present", it is questionable, whether the remaining terms have any legal implications. As for Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ κατοικοῦντες, in Latin *cives Romani qui ... habitant*, the question arises as to whether we are dealing with equivalents of *cives Romani qui ... consistunt/cives Romani consistentes*, which are merely used as variations of Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ παρεπιδημοῦντες, or a different legal status is to be deduced. Inscriptions from Delos¹¹⁸ mentioning both terms, οἱ κατοικοῦντες καὶ παρεπιδημοῦντες, show that there must be a difference between the two notions, perhaps the difference between

117 Κονβέντος; 1. *TAM* V 2, 1002; *IGR* IV 1169 (τοῦ τῶν Ῥωμαίων κονβέντου); 2. *TAM* V 2, 1003: κουρατορεύσ[αντα κονβέντου Ῥω]μαίων. Συνέδριον: *Alt.v.Hierapolis* 32 (τὸ συνέδριον τῶν Ῥωμαίων).

118 Cf. for example *IDelos* 1659 (85-78 BC): Ἀθηναίων καὶ Ῥωμαίων καὶ | τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Δήλῳ καὶ | οἱ παρεπιδημοῦντες ἔμποροι καὶ ναύκληροι etc.

permanent settlers and temporary residents. If they have chosen to settle in a host-town on a permanent basis, it might imply that they are not a community at the margin of a town, but they have acquired the so-called *ius incolatus*, the right of *domicilium*. Van Andringa argues that Roman *consistentes* could become *incolae*, if they received the right of *domicilium* and thus they could participate actively in local life.¹¹⁹ He rejects, however, Kornemann's and Schulten's view that *consistentes* received automatically the *ius incolatus*, since these two notions, *consistentes* and *incolae*, are not identical, while only the latter implies a legal status. Thus, the Roman κατοικοῦντες may have become *incolae*, which is a step above simple *consistentes*. However, several indications point to the fact that *incolae* are rendered in Greek as πάροικοι,¹²⁰ a term which, to my knowledge, occurs only once in relation with resident Romans, in a restored – thus not ascertained – text from Oropos (IG VII 190 Ῥωμαί[οις τοῖς πα]ροικοῦσι). Moreover, it is not clear, whether the use of all these variations in inscriptions was conscious and accurate. A bilingual inscription from Prymnesos¹²¹ (Phrygia), for instance, should make us doubtful about the use of these terms. The Latin version of this inscription refers to *c(ives) R(omani) [qui (ibi) nego]tiantur*, whereas the Greek version is ο[ἰ κατοικοῦν]τες Ῥωμαῖοι; although both versions of the text are restored, the ending of the participle leaves no doubt that the Greek text does not include the word πραγματευόμενοι, which is the usual Greek rendering of *qui ... negotiantur*.¹²²

119 Van Andringa 1998: 172; Van Andringa 2003: 53-54. Generally on *incolae* and *domicilium* and the previous bibliography see Hermon 2007 and Licandro 2007.

120 Gagliardi 2006; Gagliardi 2017: esp. 397-98 points to the meaning of an inscription from Dion published by Pantermalis 1984: 277 (AE 1998, 1210; SEG 34, 631): *Colonnarum et incolarum coniuges | Anthestiae P(ublii) l(ibertae) Iucundae honoris causa.* Κολώνων καὶ παροίκων αἰ γυναῖκες Ἀνθεστῖαι Ποπλίου | ἀπελευθέραι Ἰουκούνδαι ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν, where *incola* and πάροικος seem to be used as equivalents. Gagliardi further cites the jurist Pomponius (*liber singularis enchiridii*, in D. 50.16.239.2): “*Incola*” est, qui aliqua regione domicilium suum contulit: quem Graeci πάροικον appellant. Nec tantum hi, qui in oppido morantur, incolae sunt, sed etiam qui alicuius oppidi finibus ita agrum habent, ut in eum se quasi in aliquam sedem recipiant.

On *katoikountes* on Delos see Müller 2017: esp. 98-99.

121 CIL III 7043; ILS 976; IGR IV 675 (cf. SEG 36, 1200).

122 On the vocabulary of these definitions see Verboven 2002.

Beyond the term *πραγματευόμενοι*, the variation *συμπραγματευόμενοι* is also to be found (see Idomene, Edessa, Thessaloniki, Styberra and Akanthos, n. 26 above), perhaps indicating that Romans engaged in business cooperatively or dealing with locals. It remains unclear whether a less common term, *Ῥωμαῖοι συμπολ(ε)ιτευόμενοι*,¹²³ simply denotes Romans residing in and interacting with a local community or whether they were regarded as fellow-members of a town. In any case, the term *συμπολ(ε)ιτευόμενοι* requires closer examination, especially as to whether an allusion of a political status is to be traced in it, since it recalls the term *sympoliteia*. In the unpublished Leiden MA thesis by Hermann Roozenbeek, known to me only through a reference by Van Nijf 2009, it is stated that the Roman communities were linked to the cities in a kind of *sympoliteia* (joined citizenship) – a suggestion rejected by Van Nijf.¹²⁴ The question has been posed by C. Brélaz¹²⁵ who examines the term *συμπολ(ε)ιτευόμενοι* along with the term *colonus/κολωνός* and takes into account indications for the existence of several types of *coloniae* in the provinces. He inclines to the view that in the case of *συμπολ(ε)ιτευόμενοι* we are dealing with associations considered not merely “à l’égal de corps constitués, mais comme des entités quasi politique, à la manière de *politeumata*”. In fact, communities of Romans and Italians share some common elements with *politeumata*¹²⁶ which are attested in the Hellenistic period in the Ptolemaic Kingdom, in the outer

123 E.g. **Isaura**: IGR III 294: [Ἰσα]υρέων ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος οἱ τε συμπολιτευόμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι. **Amisos**: IGRR IV 314: Ἀυτοκράτορα Καίσαρα | θεοῦ υἱὸν θεὸν Σεβαστὸν | ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀμισσηνῶν καὶ οἱ | συμπολιτευόμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι || τὸν ἑατῶν σωτῆρα καὶ κτίστην.

124 In an unpublished Leiden MA thesis, Hermann Roozenbeek argued that “these groups of Roman residents and traders *must* have had a kind of more formal status” and went on suggesting that “these *conventus* were linked to the cities in a kind of *sympoliteia* (joined citizenship), which would have given them a separate status and a close link to the city at the same time”. Onno Van Nijf expressed his hesitation to accept such a formal status, a *sympoliteia*, for all Roman communities, mainly because these groups sometimes extended beyond the limits of an individual town, as is shown, for example, by the attestations of groups of Roman residents in the province of Asia (e.g. CIL III 12266 from Rhodes).

125 Brélaz 2016.

126 Sängler 2013 generally on *politeumata*; Kruse 2015 on *politeumata* in Egypt.

Ptolemaic possessions and in regions under Ptolemaic influence; yet important differences between *politeumata* and collectivities of Romans and Italians exist as well: whereas the *politeumata* are characterized by the presence of a military component, the clear internal structure of self-administration, the connection with some districts in the towns, these features are not recognizable in the groups of Romans called συμπολ(ε)ιτευόμενοι and generally in groups of Roman/Italian residents abroad (see below, under the criterium Organization). Recent research has shown that *politeumata*, even if they arose as associations of compatriots in a foreign land, they could not be regarded as associations anymore after they received the privileged status of the *politeumata*.¹²⁷ Brélaz seems to accept Broughton's suggestion to regard συμπολιτευόμενοι of Attaleia as a community whose origins are to be found in the sale of portions of the *ager publicus* in the town, a view held also by St. Mitchell for the συμπολιτευόμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι of Isaura.¹²⁸ Brélaz does not exclude however the possibility that the term has no legal nuance, but just underlines the role of Romans in the host town and is used simply as a variant of *negiatores* and *conventus civium Romanorum*.¹²⁹

In more cases groups of resident Romans assumed an almost parallel status with civic institutions, as they appear side by side with public bodies.¹³⁰ Although no specific term, such as συμπολιτευόμενοι is employed, they clearly co-operated with public bodies, such as the *boule* and the *demos* or even super-civic bodies, the *koina*, such as the Koinon of the Achaeans (Olympia: *IvO* 335; *SEG* 17, 197 and 198). This indicates that these communities had already obtained an important position in the public life of the host-towns. Mentions of Ῥωμαῖοι along with civic bodies and subdivisions, such as tribes (e.g. in the ephebic lists from Messene, see above n. 26), do not display characteristics of an association. Private associations placed side by side with official bodies or civic

127 Sanger 2013: 62-63.

128 Mitchell, 1978: 313-314.

129 Brelaz 2016. See also Broughton 1935 and Mitchell 1978.

130 See for example **Apameia**: *IGR* IV 794: ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ [δῆμος καὶ οἱ] κατοικοῦντες Ῥω[μαῖοι]; **Iasos**: *Iasos* 90: ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος καὶ οἱ νέοι καὶ ἡ γερουσία καὶ οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ ἐν Ἰασῶι πραγματευόμενοι; **Maroneia**: Loukourouli *et al.* 2005, E 180: γνῶμη βουλευτῶν καὶ ἱερέων καὶ ἀρχόντων καὶ Ῥωμαῖω[ν τῶν νυν] [τ]ῆν πόλιν κατοικούντων καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν πολιτῶν ἀπά[ντων]...

subdivisions are not to be found in the sources, with certain exceptions which however do not imply cooperation or placement at the same level. An exception is to be recognized in some epitaphs where public bodies and private *thiasoi* are attested in separate wreaths engraved on the funerary stelae.¹³¹ However, we are not dealing with common actions in these cases, but rather with a simple collection of public and private bodies that honour the memory of a prominent deceased individual. Moreover, we are not dealing with official civic, but rather with private texts whose layout on gravestones was based on private initiative. Furthermore, private associations in the plural, οἱ σύνοδοι, can rarely be found next to public bodies, as in an inscription from Hierapolis,¹³² but that is again different from the mention of a single *synodos* taking action along with public institutions.

A definition whose exact use is obscure as well, τηβεννοφοροῦντες, is attested only in one inscription from Thessaly and probably renders in Greek the term *togati*,¹³³ a term which is also used by Sallust to define *Italici* (Sall. *Iug.* 21.2) resident at Adharbal's capital Cirta in Africa.

The occupations of Italians and Romans are not frequently mentioned in the titles of the groups and where they are mentioned, they are as a rule very general, e.g. πραγματευόμενοι, *qui in ... negotiantur*.¹³⁴ More concrete definitions are only exceptionally used, as in the case of those engaged in agriculture, ἐνγαιοῦντες and γεωργεῦντες¹³⁵; the definition ἐνκεκτημένοι¹³⁶ shows that they have acquired the right to own land (*enktesis*), which perhaps implies their intention to engage in agriculture, yet ἐνκεκτημένοι is not the definition of an occupation, but of a privileged status in a Greek *polis*. Some closer mentions of occupations are to

131 E.g. Aigina: *IG IV* 44-46; *IG IV* 2, 974. Cf. however, Poland 1909: 26, 104 argues that these *thiasoi* are rather to be regarded as public subdivisions.

132 *Alt.v.Hierapolis* 32: [ἡ λαμπροτάτη βουλή(?)] | [καὶ] ὁ λαμπ[ρ]ό[τατος] | [δῆ]μος Ἱεραπόλε[ως] | καὶ ἡ γερουσία | καὶ τὸ συνέδριον | τῶν Ῥωμαίων καὶ ο[ἱ ν]ομοῖ καὶ αἱ σύνοδοι[...]

133 Arvanitopoulos 1910: no. 3, col. 344-49; cf. Bouchon 2007; Eberle Pilar 2017: 338.

134 On the term *negotiatores* see Eberle Pilar 2017.

135 Olympia: ἐνγαιοῦντες: *SEG* 17.197 and 198 (100-70 BC) and *IvO* 335 (Augustan period); cf. Zoumbaki 1994. Kos: γεωργεῦντες; *SGDI* III 1, 3698; *IGR* IV 1087. On Italians and Romans engaged in agricultural economy in Greece proper see Zoumbaki 2013.

136 Beroia: *IBeroia* 59 (57-55 BC).

be found in the use of partitive genitive in order to single certain professional groups out of a wider Roman population of a place, as e.g. on Delos (Ῥωμαίων οἱ ναύκληροι καὶ ἔμποροι).

The term κατακληθέντες which is included by certain scholars in the terminology used to define groups of Romans in Greek inscriptions,¹³⁷ should be rather expelled from our examination. It is attested only in an inscription from Bizye (Thrace), which records divine honours offered to the King Kotys and displays difficulties in the restoration of the crucial word that follows the participle κατακληθέντες εἰς...¹³⁸ Whatever restoration of the crucial gap of the inscription accepted, the word κατακληθέντες ('those who called upon, invoked', see n. 31) followed by the preposition εἰς seems not to form a fixed label, but to be associated with a concrete action on the part of the Romans, obviously in connection with Kotys. Furthermore, the adverb πρώτως (οἱ πρώτως κατακληθέντες εἰς ...), seems to accentuate the Romans' attitude towards the king.

Therefore, upon scrutinizing the proper names and accompanying descriptive terminology assigned to collectivities of Romans and Italians, it becomes evident that the terms commonly employed to delineate private associations, such as *synodos*, *thiasos*, *koinon*, *collegium*, etc., are never utilized in reference to these groups of Romans. Although the term *conventus* does sporadically appear, it primarily denotes an assembly of Roman settlers and is never employed to delineate private associations. Moreover, the accompanying definitions consistently emphasize factors such as place of residence, occupation, and potentially the political standing of the groups under consideration.

Membership: In our sources there is no allusion to rules for entrance (or exit) to the communities of Romans and Italians. This raises several questions, as to whether all people permanently or temporarily settled

137 Van Nijf 2009; Ramgopal 2017: 410 n. 15.

138 Dawkins & Hansluk 1905/1906, 177-78, Dessau 1913: 700; Kalinka 1926: 118-19; Sul-livan 1979: 196; Moretti 1984: 266-67 (*SEG* 34, 702); cf. Delev 2016.

For the restoration of the third line see n. 31 above

at a certain place were automatically members, whether every newcomer joined the group, whether joining these groups or staying out of them were real options. William Ramsay argued that Paul's idea of the unified universal church and the local churches was analogous to the Roman view that "every group of Roman citizens meeting together in a body (*conventus civium Romanorum*) in any part of the vast Empire formed a part of the great conception of 'Rome' ... Any citizen who came to any provincial town where such a group existed, was forthwith a member of the group ..." ¹³⁹ In a different way, Fabiène Gogniat-Loos regards groups of Romans as equivalents of British clubs during the expansion of the Commonwealth. ¹⁴⁰ A further question which has been posed is whether local individuals who obtained Roman citizenship were considered members of the groups under examination. According to certain scholars, ¹⁴¹ *cives Romani consistentes* did not automatically integrate new Roman citizens into the *conventus*, while others expressed the view that they were included in the groups as new members. ¹⁴² The term "*cives Romani consistentes*" seems in any case to exclude that new bearers of Roman citizenship originating from the host communities could be integrated as new members of the *conventus*, since they were not *consistentes* but citizens of their hometowns. ¹⁴³

All aforementioned different views show that the situation, as it arises from written sources, is far from clear. If we are dealing merely with an ethnic group, there could perhaps be no limitation as far as entrance or exit were concerned, but if we are dealing with an organized

139 Ramsay 1898: 125.

140 Gogniat-Loos 1994: 25.

141 E.g. Bourigault 2007: 84.

142 E.g. from the earlier bibliography see Mitteis 1891: 145 ("... eines Clubs römischer Bürger, der sich durch den Hinzutritt von Provinzialen, welche das Bürgerrecht erlangt hatten, verstärkte") and from the recent bibliography see Tzamtzis 2013: 185-86.

143 So also Van Andringa 2003: 50-51 rejecting older views on this issue. Van Andringa further points to the fact that during the Republic *cives Romani* and *Italici* came from Italy, while during the Imperial period the term *cives Romani* can comprise citizens originating also from other provinces, as the inscription from Celeia (*CIL* III 5212) shows.

association whose members were registered and had concrete obligations, then entrance and exit from it could not be left uncontrolled. Such data are not however available, not even for large and important communities of Romans and Italians, as e.g. on Delos where there is abundant epigraphic material dating to a relatively short period of time, from 167 BC to the first quarter of the 1st c. BC. Prosopographic and onomastic studies on Delos show that there were constantly new arrivals and departures of Romans and Italians.¹⁴⁴ A wider onomastic study by Olli Salomies has shown that new immigrants continued to move from the West to the East, still in the 2nd and 3rd c. AD¹⁴⁵. If this is the case with all Roman communities abroad, then we are dealing with groups without a concrete body of members, but with free-floating entities that came and went.

A close examination of individual Romans and Italians who are encountered outside Italy from the 3rd c. BC onwards makes clear that we are dealing with groups that were not homogenous with regard to their internal composition. This heterogenous, mobile and opportunistic diaspora included Italians and Romans, freeborn and freedmen, from Rome, from Italy or from Roman enclaves outside Italy, such as the colonies. Especially characteristic are inscriptions showing the provenance of Roman residents in a province, such as an inscription from Celeia mentioning *cives Romani ex Italia et aliis provinciis in Raetia consistentes*, and another from Agro Valeria, which mentions *cives Romani ex Italia et aliis provinciis in Pannonia consistentes*.¹⁴⁶ Since members of the communities under examination may originate from various places in Italy and beyond, these groups did not consist of compatriotes in the narrow sense of the word; they were not like numerous other communities of compatriotes who, on the basis of common origin and cultural ties, formed homogenous enclaves in the foreign towns where they happened to be hosted. As for their occupations, they seem to have been diverse as well. Inscriptions only rarely mention their occupations in a general way, e.g. *negotiatores*, *πραγματευόμενοι*, while only *ἐνγαϊοῦντες*

144 Wilson 1966: 111-13

145 Salomies 2007: 1279-80.

146 Celeia: *CIL* III 5212; *ILS* 1362a (AD 157-162). Agro Valeria: *Jahrbücher der Literatur* 1818-1849, 58.

and γεωργεῦντες are more concrete definitions. It is in any case evident that they were engaged in various professions and profitable business, “they turned a hand to pretty well anything that could bring in a nice profit and can appear almost anywhere, where reasonably ordered commercial conditions could be found.”¹⁴⁷

Thus, neither ethnic nor professional nor social homogeneity is to be recognized in the composition of the groups of Romans and Italians abroad. The question arises: What did they actually share as members of a group? What was the common identity that could be claimed, since their common identity was neither based on common cultural background, nor on common occupations, not even on the provenance from Italy? What bound them together was rather the pursuit of profit in a foreign land and their relationship to Roman power, either bearing the legal status of a Roman citizen or being slaves acting as agents of Roman citizens, sometimes indeed of high ranking members of Roman society.

Organization: Closely related to the question of membership is the problem of the organization of communities of Romans abroad. In an attempt to perceive whether they were organized as private associations, it is crucial to examine whether they had an internal hierarchy, administration, and officeholders who would be responsible for various aspects of their communal life.

From the eastern part of the Mediterranean only a handful of inscriptions offer some information about officials whose titles show that they exercised some coordinative duty in the context of the groups of Italians and Romans. These indications are to be found in inscriptions of Asia Minor. From the Greek mainland and the islands of the Aegean no inscription reveals any hint of an organization and hierarchization within these communities, not even on Delos where numerous related inscriptions have been preserved. In an inscription from Tralles (*I.Tral* 145, 1st c. AD [?]), a certain Ti. Iulius Claudianus is mentioned as γραμματεύσαντα καὶ τῆς φιλοσεβάστου γερουσίας καὶ τῶν φιλοσεβάστων νέων καὶ Ῥωμαίων. In a further inscription from Tralles, Ti. Claudius Panychus Eutyclus Coibilus (?) is mentioned as κουρατορεύσαντα τῶν Ῥωμαίων (*I.Tral* 77, 2nd c. AD). It is remarkable that both individuals from Tralles

147 Errington 1988: 143.

have an impressive *cursus honorum* including numerous civic offices.¹⁴⁸ In two inscriptions from Thyateira¹⁴⁹ – perhaps referring to one and the same individual – the title *κουρατορεύσαντα τοῦ τῶν Ῥωμαίων κονβέντου* is to be encountered among the numerous titles of the honoree(s): One of these inscriptions (TAM V 2, 1002; IGR IV 1169) originates from a monument which was erected by the *skytotomoi* for T. Flavius Alexander, son of Metrophanes, of the tribe Quirina; the other inscription (TAM V 2, 1003) is so fragmentary that both the dedicants and the honoree are not preserved, but it is possible that it refers to T. Flavius Alexander too. An inscription from Hierapolis refers to C. Agelleius Apollonides as *κονβεντα[ρ]χήσαντα τῶν Ῥωμα[ί]ων* among numerous other offices.¹⁵⁰ A further inscription from Hierapolis dated to AD 211 (or 213)-217 records the impressive *cursus honorum* of C. Memmius Eutychus, which includes the office of *Ῥωμαίων κωουέντα[ρ]χον*.¹⁵¹ As for the term *curante* mentioned in an inscription from Gortys (Crete), which refers to *conventus civium Romanorum*, it is rather to be excluded from the this discussion, since it probably concerned not an officeholder

148 *ITral* 145: στεφανηφόρον καὶ γραμματέα | τοῦ δήμου, βουλαρχήσαντα, | εἰρηναρχήσαντα, ἀγορανομί[σ]αντα, σιτωνήσαντα ἀπὸ | [Ἀλεξ]ανδρείας δῖς, χρυσοφορήσαντα, [πα]ραφυλάξαντα, | παν[ηγ]υριαρχήσαντα, ἀργυροταμιεύσαντα, δεκαπρωτεύσαντα, | γραμματεύσαντα καὶ τῆς φιλοσεβάστου | γερουσίας καὶ τῶν φιλοσεβάστων | νέων καὶ Ῥωμαίων, ὑποσχόμενον | καὶ εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν κίονας εἴκοσι, | σκουτλώσαντα δὲ καὶ μουσώσαντα | καὶ ταύτην τὴν ἐξέδραν ἀντ' οὐδενός· | ἀναθέντα καὶ τῆι Κλαυδίαι βουλῆι | ἀργυρ[ί]ου ὥστε λαμβάνειν καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος ἐνθάδε ἕκαστον βου[λ]ευ[τῆ]ν [τῆ] γενεθλίῳ αὐ[τ]οῦ ἡμέρᾳ σν' ...

ITral 77: στρατηγήσαν|τα τὴν νυκ|υ|τερινὴν στρα|τηγίαν, δεκαπρωτεύσαν|τα, ἀργυροταμιεύσαντα, | ἐκδανείσαντα, κουρατο|ρεύσαντα τῶν Ῥωμαίων, | σιτωνήσαντα ἀπὸ Αἰγύ|πτου καὶ ἔπεργον ποιήσαν|τα εἰς τὸν σεῖτον καὶ δόντα | εἰς τὸ δημόσιον βφκ', νε|ωποιήσαντα, στρατηγήσαν|τα, ἀγορανομήσαντα φιλο|τείμως, ἀναθέντα δὲ ἐκ τῶν | ἰδίων καὶ τὰς ἐν τῇ ὄψαριο|πώλει<δι>μαρμαρίνας τραπέ|ζας ἰβ' <σύν> ταῖς βάσεων <ι>β'...

149 TAM V 2, 1002; IGR IV 1169, ll. 6-7: *κουρατορεύσαντα [τοῦ τῶν Ῥωμαίων κονβέντου]*. TAM V 2, 1003, ll. 5-6: *κουρατορεύ[σ]αντα κονβέντου Ῥω[μ]αίων*.

150 *Alt.v. Hierapolis* 32: (ll. 10-23) ἄνδρα τῶν ἀρίστων βο|υ|λευτῶν, στρατη[γῆ]||σαντα τῆς πόλεω[ς] | καὶ ἀγορανομή[σ]αν|τα καὶ δε<ε>καπρωτε[ύ]||σαντα καὶ κονβεντα[ρ]||χήσαντα τῶν Ῥωμα[ί]ων καὶ ἐλαιοθετή||σαντα καὶ ἐξεταστή[ν] | γενόμενον καὶ ἐρ[γε]||πιστατήσαντα | καὶ εἰς χρίας κυρ[ια]||κὰς εὐχρηστο[ν]||γενόμενον

151 Ritti 2003 (SEG 53, 1464); Ritti 2008 (SEG 58, 1510).

charged with some duty in the context of the *conventus*, but a civic officeholder charged with caretaking of the erection of the monument,¹⁵² as in other monuments it is often mentioned *sub cura ... curagentibus* etc.¹⁵³

The exact content of all these offices, *grammateus*, *curator* and *conventarches*, is not known and their rare occurrences prevent a deeper understanding of the competences. The past participles γραμματεύσαντα, κουρατορεύσαντα, κονβενταρχήσαντα probably show that the offices were of a limited term. In none of the aforementioned cases is there an indication that the officeholders in question belonged to the communities of Romans. On the contrary, it arises that they were outstanding citizens of the host towns, since they had also held numerous civic and religious offices. It is therefore evident that they did not belong to a group separate from the citizens of the town. The fact, for example, that the individual from Tralles attested as a *grammateus* of the Romans was simultaneously *grammateus* of the town's *gerousia* and the *neoi* excludes the possibility that he was a member of a private group of Romans, but seems to be rather a citizen and officeholder of the *polis*. It is further remarkable that all these magistrates were responsible for several sectors of public life related to economy and especially to the market, such as *agoranomos*, *sitones*, *argyrotamias*, *ekdaneisas*, whilst some of them undertook embellishments of the market-place of the town, supplied the market with grain in times of shortage or are honoured by professional groups, e.g. the *skytotomoi* (leather-workers) honour T. Flavius Alexander in Thyatira. All this probably reveals the personal interest of these officials in the proper functioning of the market. Therefore, there could not be more appropriate persons to undertake offices related to the activity of Roman businessmen. In several cases, groups of Romans honoured officeholders, e.g. *agoranomoi*, who facilitated their economic activities.¹⁵⁴ As the expansion of Italians and Romans out of Italy was motivated by the pursuit of profitable opportunities, this state of affairs is

152 IC IV 278; cf. Tzamtzis 2013: 185.

153 Similarly e.g. Africa Proconsularis, Tunisia, Siagu: *IL Afr.* 306; ILS 9495: *Augusto deo / cives Romani / qui Thinissut / negotiantur / curatore L. Fabricio.*

154 We mention, for example, IG IV 606 from Argos, an honorific inscription erected by the Ῥωμ[αῖ]οι οἱ ἐν Ἄργει κατοικ[κ]οῦντ[ε]ς for Tib. Claudius Diodotos, who held

quite understandable. It seems, therefore, that all officeholders mentioned above did not belong to the communities of Romans, but were prominent locals.

Although the Latin term *curator* is attested in the context of private associations,¹⁵⁵ it is clear from the evidence analysed above that the aforementioned *κουρατορεύσας* of the Roman *conventus* in Thyateira was a civic magistrate and not a member of the *conventus*. Since the Latin word *curator* is often rendered in Greek as *epimeletes*,¹⁵⁶ we can assume that the office of *κουρατορεύσας* in Thyateira could be an equivalent of the *epimeletes*. An *epimeletes* of the foreigners (*epimeletes ton xenon*) is attested in Rhodian inscriptions; Xenophon refers to τῶν μετοίκων ἐπιμέλεια in Athens and to the possibility of founding there an office called *metoikophylax*; the office of *xenophylax* existed on Chios as well (late 1st c. BC).¹⁵⁷ All this shows that control of the foreigners was an important issue, especially for towns that hosted numerous foreign communities. No state could leave foreigners totally uncontrolled, the *praetor peregrinus* in Rome being a typical case.¹⁵⁸ Especially in Rome's important harbours, Ostia and Puteoli, local patrons and *curatores* were responsible for outsiders involved in trade.¹⁵⁹

among other offices, the office of *agoranomos*. His further mention as [τ]ὸν ἐ[πιτ]ρόπων εὐεργέταν is to be connected either with *procuratores* of the imperial property or with managers of some private –certainly considerable– piece(s) of property.

155 See Verboven 2007a: 23–24. Terpstra 2013: 128. On this office see also Arnaoutoglou 2011: 266–67 and n. 26 who reviews the earlier bibliography, refers to the *curatores* of associations, but stresses the fact that the evidence for *curatores* of the Roman communities abroad is meagre and avoids giving a definite answer about the duties of the *curator* in the context of groups of Romans.

156 Mason 1974: 5.

157 Rhodes: *IG XII 1*, 49 (188/7 BC) and Pugliese Caratelli 1939–1940: no. 7 (early 1st c. BC); cf. the analysis and references to related bibliography by Maillot 2015: 156–158, also pointing to Xen. *Vect.* 2.1 (καὶ εἰ μετοικοφύλακας γε ὥσπερ ὄρφανοφύλακας ἀρχὴν καθιστάμεν) as well as to a Rhodian *epimeletes* of Samian refugees to Rhodes after the founding of the Athenian cleruchy on Samos. Chios: three inscriptions published by Studniczka 1888 and discussed by Robert 1929: 35–38.

158 Roselaar 2019: 124–25.

159 Terpstra 2013: 167–68: “groups of traders from distant communities organized themselves along lines of geographical provenance; some of their members settled

Equivalent competences had probably the *curator* in inscriptions related to Roman communities in the West. In the 1st c. AD, at the earliest under the Julio-Claudians, some inscriptions from the capital of the tribal confederation of the Helvetii, Aventicum (Avenches), and a few more inscriptions from other places of the region of the Helvetii, namely from Lausanne, Geneva and Nyon, show that a *curator* was in charge of the *conventus*.¹⁶⁰ *Curatores* are attested in *tres Galliae*, Aquitania, Narbonensis and Lugdunensis, and in Germania Superior.¹⁶¹ William Van Andringa who has studied thoroughly the Roman *conventus* in *tres*

in Rome. These groups had ties locally: they had local patrons and local curators; at least a number of them maintained a communal building, sometimes with a religious function"; cf. 201-2 the pattern fits in the East.

- 160 **Aventicum** (Avenches): *CIL* XIII 11478 = *RIS* 105 (Julio-Claudian period): *D. Iul(ius) C(ai) / ffilius) Fa[b(ia tribu)] / Consors, sac(erdos) Augustal(is), mag(ister ou -ratus), / cur(ator) c(ivium) R(omanorum) conven(tus) / Hel(vetici)*.

AE 1967, 32 (1st c. AD?): [- -]dio Quir(ina tribu) [F]lavo, magis[tro ou -trato, — cu]ratori civium R(omanorum)

Lousonna (Lausanne): *CIL* XIII 5026 = *RIS* 51 (AD 150-250): *Soli, Genio, Lunae / sacrum ex voto / pro salute Augus(torum), P. Clod(ius) Corn(elia tribu) / Primus, curator vikanor(um) Lousonnensium (bis), / (se)vir Augustal(is), c(urator) c(ivium) R(omanorum) / conventus Hel(vetici) d(e) s(uo) d(edit)*.

AE 1946, 255 (2nd c. AD ?): *Herculi / sacr(um) / C. Maec(ius) Firm[u]s / (se)vir Aug(us-talis), / c(urator) c(ivium) R(omanorum) desi[g(natus)] / ex voto*.

Genava (Geneva): *CIL* XII 2618 (Imperial period): *c(urator) c(ivium) R(omanorum)*

Noviodunum (Nyon): *CIL* III 5013 (Imperial period): [- -]no f. Corn(elia tribu) / [— C]jantabro / cur(atori) c(ivium) R(omanorum) convent(us) / Helvetic(i), (duo)viro, / Iuliae C. fû(iae) Marcellae / Corneliae Q.filiae Marcellae

- 161 Douarnenez: AE 1952/22 (Imperial period): *c(urator) c(ivium) R(omanorum)*; cf. Eveillard and Maligorne 2009.

Lugdunum: AE 1980/639; AE 2000/948 (1st c. AD): *curator civium Roma]noru[m]*

CIL XIII 1667 (Imperial period): *c(urator) c(ivium) R(omanorum)*

Avaricum (Bourges): *CIL* XIII 1194; *ILS* 197; *ILTG* 338; cf. Gmyrek 1997: 39 A. 5 (AD 38-41): *c(urator) c(ivium) R(omanorum)*

Ausci (Auch): *CIL* XIII 444 (Imperial period): *cur(ator) c(ivium) R(omanorum)*

Mediolanum Santonum (Saintes): *CIL* V 5747; cf. Kakoschke 2002, no. 1.109 (Imperial period): *Curator civium Roman[orum] Mogontiaci*

Vesunna (Périgueux, France): 1. *CIL* XIII 950-951; *ILA*, Pétrucos, 19: *c(urator) c(ivium) R(omanorum)*, 2. *CIL* XIII 954; *ILA*, Pétrucos, 21: *c(urator) c(ivium) R(omanorum)*, 3. *CIL* XIII 965; *ILA*, Pétrucos, 49: *c(urator) c(ivium) R(omanorum)*

Seysell: *CIL* XII 2564 (Imperial period): *cur/[a]tor civi[u]m Roman[---]*

Galliae and at several places of the plateau of the Helvetii, observes that local notables or freedmen, just as much as foreigners to the host-towns of *conventus*, could serve as *curatores*.¹⁶² Therefore, according to Van Andringa, a *curator* was not necessarily a member of the *conventus* – in fact in no case can he confirm that a *curator* belongs to the *conventus* –, but someone who could defend their interests in front of local authorities.

Hence, it seems that both in the East and in the West, *curatores* were not members of the foreign communities, but locals originating from the host-towns or from the wider region. It was perhaps important for the Roman residents that prominent individuals from the elites of the host-cities defended their interests and represented them in front of the authorities, given the fact that in some cases local populations were especially hostile against them.¹⁶³ The curator's role was on the one hand to represent the foreigners in their transactions and dealings with local authorities, and on the other to supervise foreign communities, being basically the local authorities' eyes and ears. That foreigners had the right to defend their economic interests, even if they did not have the *domicilium*, is shown by certain articles of the Justinianic Digest.¹⁶⁴ It is probable that they could defend their interests through the *curatores* and this seems to be a pattern that fits both in the East and the West.

In some cases, a *summus curator*, in charge of whole provinces, is attested: a *summus curat(or) c(ivium) R(omanorum) provinc(iae) Aquitaniae*),¹⁶⁵ a *summus curator* of the province *Gallia Lugdunensis*,¹⁶⁶ a *summus*

162 Van Andringa 1998: 167-75.

163 Bourigault 2012: 22-23 for some examples.

164 Van Andringa 1998: 171-72. Cf. for example *Dig. V 1.19.1* (Ulpian): *Si quis tutelam vel curant vel negotia vel argentariam vel quid aliud, unde obligatio moritur, certo loci administravit: etsi ibi domicilium non habuit, ibi se debet defendere et, si non defendat neque ibi domicilium habeat, bona possideri patietur.*

165 Lugdunum (Lyon): *CIL XIII* 1900; *AE* 1974, 422; cf. Wierschowski 2001, 315-16; Burdand 2005, II, 492-494; Lamoine 2009, no. 79: *PATRONO / OMNIVM CORPOR summo / curat(ori) c(ivium) R(omanorum) provinc(iae) Aquit(aniae)* (imperial period).

166 Lugdunum (Lyon): *CIL XIII* 1921; *ILS* 7024; cf. Koortbojian 1993: 54; Herz 2003: 134 n. 6; Walser 1993: 114, no. 45: *summus curator c(ivium) R(omanorum) provinc(iae) Lug(dunensis)* (imperial period).

*c[urat(or) c(ivium) R(omanorum) prov(inciae) Dalm(atiae)]*¹⁶⁷ from the colony of Aequum (modern Sinj in Croatia). In an inscription from Lugdunum, where *[c]ives Romani in tri[b]us provinci(i)s Galli(i)s [c]onsistentes* honour the Emperor Elagabalus, the three *summi curatores*, one for each province, are mentioned.¹⁶⁸ Lothar Wierschowski¹⁶⁹ regards the office of *summus curator* as an honorary one and thus not to be taken literally as the supervisor of all Roman settlers of a province. However, since it has been observed¹⁷⁰ that *summi curatores* of the Gallic provinces are obviously prominent individuals engaged in commerce, their role was perhaps to represent Roman settlers in front of the governor, thus not in front of local authorities, but at a higher level. All these inscriptions which refer to *summi curatores civium Romanorum* demonstrate that Roman settlers could be united in wider collectivities comprising whole provinces. From Asia Minor there are some inscriptions from the capital of the province Ephesos,¹⁷¹ Smyrna,¹⁷² Laodicea,¹⁷³ and Rhodes,¹⁷⁴ which refer to Roman residents of the whole province Asia. An even higher level of a union of Roman settlers is apparently revealed by the inscription from Lugdunum mentioned above, where *cives Romani* settled in all three Gallic provinces are attested as *[c]ives Romani in tri[b]us provinci(i)s Galli(i)s [c]onsistentes* (ILTG 221; AD 220-221).

In rare cases there is also a reference to a *quaestor*. It is, however, unknown whether it was a function of the community of the Roman settlers, as it is not always clear what *cives Romani* without the participle

167 CIL III 2733; cf. Galsterer 1971a: 79-89 (AE 1977, 613); Galsterer 1971b: 736; Schäfer 1989: 410 no. C95.

168 ILTG 221 (AD 220-221): ... *[c]ives Romani in tri[b]us provinci(i)s Galli(i)s | [c]onsistentes ... sum|[m]is curatoribus Iulio |[S]aturnino prov(inciae) Lugud(unensis), | [-]ilio Sabino provinc(iae) {Belgic}ae, Auentinio Veris|[simo pr]ovinc(iae) Aquitanic(ae)*. See also Van Andringa 1998.

169 Wierschowski 2001: 316.

170 Van Andringa 1998: 175.

171 *conventus c(ivium) R(omanorum) qui in Asia negotiantur* (IEph 3019), *[cives Romani] qui in Asia habitant* (IEph 697 A). Cf. Also restorations in IEph 409; 1517.

172 *Ismyrn* 642: [οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας?] πραγματ[ε]υόμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ Ἑλληνας[ες].

173 IGR 4, 860: οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ Ἑλληνας καὶ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Λαοδικέων.

174 CIL III 12266) to *c(ives) Romani qui in Asia negotiantur*. On Romans on Rhodes see Bresson 2002 and on associations of foreigners –including Romans– on Rhodes see Maillet 2015: 138-39.

consistentes in such cases means, as e.g. the obscure mention of *q(uaestor) c(ivium) R(omanorum) c(ivitatis) N(erviorum)*.¹⁷⁵ In Germania Superior, in Mogontiacum (Mainz) the *q(uaestor) c(urator) c(ivium) R(omanorum) m(anticulariorum) neg(otiatorum) Mog(ontiacensium)*, L. Senilius Decmanus, defines himself as *c(ivis) T(aunensis)*.¹⁷⁶ This text relates perhaps to a group which seems to be a professional association that formed part of the entirety of Roman settlers.¹⁷⁷

So far we checked attestations of communities of Romans and Italians in the context of towns, provinces or groups of provinces. As we have seen, Roman communities are encountered also along the *limes*, in settlements next to legion camps, in *canabae* or *vici*. There, Roman civilians earned their living by conducting trade with the soldiers or with foreign populations of these remote lands under the protection of the Roman army and often lived along with soldiers and peregrines as well as with veterans who after their retirement frequently joined the nearby settlements.

The organization of the Roman communities in these regions depended on the form of the various settlements where they resided. There is no common pattern of the development of the civilian settlements near military quarters¹⁷⁸ and their organization's form depended on several factors, the number of the inhabitants being one of them.¹⁷⁹ Carnuntum for instance, the settlement of veterans and other Romans in the *canabae* of the Legio XIV Gemina, was a small settlement with an elementary organization, as Ioan Piso has shown based on evidence from the inscriptions of Pfaffenberg; in other cases, veterans and the *cives Romani* were organized as quasi Roman municipalities possessing *magistri*, *aediles*, *quinquennales*, *quaestores*, even an *ordo decurionum*, and in

175 Bagacum, Gallia Belgica (Bavay, France): *CIL* III 3573; Lamoine 2009, 185, no. 83 (1st c. AD?). Barrande-Emam 2012: 59 classifies this office as a municipal one; cf. e.g. *d(ecurio) c(ivium) R(omanorum) Mog(ontiaci)* or *Mog(ontiacensium)* (*CIL* XIII 6733; *ILS* 7079), where a civic authority is to be understood, see n. 181 below.

176 *CIL* XIII 7222; Lamoine 2009: 188, no. 91.

177 Cf. Andreau 1987: 248: "Il est probable que ces manticularii negotiatores, dont le collège faisait partie du conventus de citoyens romains de Mogontiacum."

178 Mommsen 1910; Piso 1991.

179 Piso 1991: 162.

some further cases, the settlements next to the legions' quarters developed into *municipia* or *coloniae*.¹⁸⁰ So, Carnuntum was incorporated into the nearby Colonia Septimia Carnuntina and in the 3rd c. AD *cives Romani consistentes* have already disappeared from the epigraphic record, which is not surprising, as they were not *consistentes* anymore, but they had acquired ownership rights on the land where they lived. Ioan Piso offers the same explanation for the disappearance of *consistentes* in an inscription of AD 276 from Mogontiacum, where Marcellinus Placidinus is attested as *d(ecurio) c(ivium) R(omanorum) Mog(ontiaci)* or *Mog(ontiacensium)*.¹⁸¹ This is also shown by the inscription recording the veteran T. Florius Saturninus, *allectus in ordi[n]em c(ivium) R(omanorum) ... Mog[ontiaci]*;¹⁸² it is rather the *ordo* of the town meant here and Gabriele Wesch-Klein¹⁸³ regards this inscription as an indication that T. Florius Saturninus “took up political life in Mainz as a member of the city council after he finished his military service as a standard bearer.”

A considerable number of settlements of *cives Romani consistentes* are attested in inscriptions of Scythia Minor.¹⁸⁴ Alexandru Avram discerned the following categories of *cives Romani consistentes* in this area:¹⁸⁵ 1. *cives Romani consistentes* in a peregrine town; 2. *cives Romani consistentes* near a camp, either the *canabae* of the legionary camps (to be identified with those later called *canabenses*) or a *vicus* of a station of the Danubian fleet (*cives Romani consistentes vico classicorum*); 3. *veterani et cives Romani consistentes* in rural communities defined in inscriptions as *vici*; 4. *cives Romani consistentes*, sometimes along with veterans, “en «double commu-

180 Piso 1991: 138 with bibliography; 160 on the organization in Carnuntum.

181 *CIL* XIII 6733; *ILS* 7079. Rushforth (1930: 122) also stresses that most of the *canabae* were converted into *municipia* or *coloniae* before the 3rd c., the community at Mainz being singularly late at receiving municipal rights (not before Diocletian); Piso 1991: 161–62.

182 *CIL* XIII 6769 = *ILS* 7078: *T. Florius Saturninus vet(eranus) ex sig(nifero) leg(ionis) XXII pr(imigeniae) p(iae) f(idelis) Alexandrianae, m(issus) h(onesta) m(issione), allectus in ordi[n]em c(ivium) R(omanorum)..Mog[ontiaci]*. Cf. the remark of the n. 51 above on *decuriones civium Romanorum*.

183 Wesch-Klein 2007: 448.

184 Bounegru 1986; 2006: 73–80; Avram 2007.

185 Avram 2007.

nauté» avec des peuples thraces colonisés, *Bessi et Lai*”. Avram attempted to trace the differentiations in administration of the settlements of various status. *Canabae* and *vici* in Scythia Minor were also administered by *magistri*, whilst *quaestores*¹⁸⁶ are attested in some *vici*. It is not clear, whether *magistri* were members of the local population or of the Romans. Avram believes that in double communities, one of them was elected from the group of Romans and the other from the colonized Thracians. Further, he stresses the fact that a *quinquennalis* is at the head of *canabae* at Troesmis¹⁸⁷, where also *decuriones* are to be found, while the senate of the *civitas Troesmensium* is called *ordo* and that of *canabae* is called *curia*. He argues that it is to discern between *consistentes ad canabas* and Roman citizens *consistentes* in the *civitas Troesmensium*; “Pour ce qui est de ces derniers, on les verrait volontiers comme des *cives Romani consistentes qui negotiantur* (comme ceux de Callatis).”¹⁸⁸ It is further unclear what the phrase “*circa* + Accusative of a proper name” in an inscription from Callatis (*IScM* III 83) means: *civibus R(omanis) consistentibus Cal/latis* (sic) *circa C(aium) Iulium / Procuclum quinquennal(em) perpetuom*. Although this formulation seems to be an equivalent of Greek expressions using περί+accusative of a proper name, it remains unclear what exactly this “*circa*” in connection with the *cives Romani consistentes* means. It is in any case important that all these offices belonged to the administration of the various settlements where Romans lived along with other populations and not alone to the communities of Roman traders who followed the army in search for profit.

Several questions arise in regard to the relationship between *cives Romani consistentes* and the other groups, especially veterans. Do the inscriptions recording veterans and *cives Romani consistentes* imply that two different groups united into a single entity, or is it an indication that the two groups joined each other just for the erection of some monuments? Mommsen perceived this as a union of the veterans and the other Roman citizens, since the capacity of a veteran is closely related

186 See e.g. Avram 2007: no. 16. On the administration of *vici* in Moesia Inferior, see Aparaschivei 2015.

187 Avram 2007: no. 6.

188 Avram 2007: 98.

to the acquisition of Roman citizenship.¹⁸⁹ Matthieu Bourigault regards the *veterani* as a separate group recognised by the emperor and rewarded with concrete privileges.¹⁹⁰ In any case, they collaborated with civilian Romans as well as with locals for the erection of honorific monuments or for building activities under the supervision of officeholders, either of the Roman imperial administration or of the local administration of the settlements where they lived, as a rule of two *magistri*, but also of *quaestores*.

It is important for our examination that in all these cases of the region of the *limes* and in the various categories of settlements of Scythia Minor, it is not the groups of private Roman settlers that were organized in a way resembling Roman municipal administration, but rather the common settlements of Roman veterans and civilians –both Roman and indigenous civilians–, which gradually developed in some cases into *municipia* or *coloniae civium Romanorum*. The administration staff of these mixed settlements, either Romans or members of local populations, is thus not to be considered as an indication of internal organization and hierarchization of the groups of private Romans residents and is certainly not a comparable phenomenon with the situation in the nuclei of private Roman settlers at more urbanized places. Despite indications that some officials mentioned in inscriptions, e.g. from *vici* or *canabae* of Scythia Minor, were members of the groups of Romans, their offices are part of the administration of the settlements where they lived along with other groups (veterans, soldiers, indigenous inhabitants), and not exclusively of the immigrant Roman communities. So, in these cases Roman communities were not organized as private associations. Although *magistri*, *curatores*, *quinquennales* and *quaestores*, are functionaries also to be found in the context of private associations¹⁹¹ – as it is known that

189 Mommsen 1910: 192: “Selbstverständlich ist die Bezeichnung *veterani et cives Romani* nicht gegensätzlich zu nehmen, sondern in dem Sinn, ,die Veteranen und die übrigen römischen Bürger‘; schon deshalb, weil wenigstens faktisch mit der Veteranenqualität der Besitz des römischen Bürgerrechts verbunden war. Darum nennt auch die Mehrzahl der Inschriften die Canabenses einfach *cives Romani*.”

190 Bourigault 2007: 84.

191 This is shown, for example, in the *Lex eborariorum et citriariorum*, the statute of the association of dealers of ivory and citrus wood (AD 117-138, found in Trastevere),

private clubs were often structured on the model of the civic administration both in East and West¹⁹²—, it is clear that all these offices attested in inscriptions of *canabae*, *vici* and *civitates* in the region of the frontier did not concern the group of Roman residents.

In municipalities developed at places near the northern frontier, it is remarkable that in many cases Roman settlers continue to appear as a separate group until late in the 3rd c. AD. The term *consistentes* continues to occur, although it does not reflect anymore the fact that all Roman inhabitants are temporary residents, since in some cases *consistentes* are attested for generations.¹⁹³ It is further remarkable that *cives Romani consistentes* in Scythia Minor co-operated with local populations, such as Lai or Bessi, but they continue to appear separately from them even after the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, when Roman citizenship was granted to all free inhabitants of the Empire. Perhaps by maintaining their title, they continued to stress their different origin,¹⁹⁴ to declare their attachment to Rome, to advertise their old Roman citizenship as opposed to the newly acquired Roman citizenship of the majority of the local population.¹⁹⁵

From the analysis attempted above it is clear that groups of Romans have to be examined separately in each region. The groups of Romans abroad display a primary stage of organization, as they appear as collectivities with some common identity, being repeatedly active, as a rule along with other collective bodies and local institutions in order to erect

CIL VI 33885; cf. Bäumlér 2014 with bibliography. See also Verboven 2009 on magistrates of *collegia*, esp. 160–62 on *magistri*.

192 Especially on the situation in the West see Edmondson 2006: 274.

193 Reid 1913: 199.

194 Cf. *ILTG* 221 from Lyon (dated to AD 220/221) analysed by Van Andringa 1998; cf. also Van Andringa 2003: 51.

195 Bourigault 2007: 80 suggests “Ainsi, même si les *Lai* devinrent, dès 212, citoyens romains, ils restaient attachés à leur cité d’origine (où *origo* et *domicilium* pouvaient se confondre) et en étaient membres à part entière à la différence des *cives Romani consistentes* qui n’étaient que présents sur le territoire de la cité mais qui restaient attachés à Rome. Il nous semble donc que les *Lai* et les *cives Romani consistentes* avaient la même existence civique, le même statut et seule l’*origo* permettait de les différencier.”

honorific monuments or to make dedications to divinities. For such actions it would be expected that a collective decision had to be taken. It is further expected that there was a common treasury or at least that some of the members were charged to collect ad hoc monetary contributions. In an inscription from Africa Proconsularis¹⁹⁶ *cives Romani qui Suo morantur* erected a monument in honour of Germanicus, but it is mentioned that it was financed by the individual who took care for its erection. In a further inscription from Mactar, it is declared that a monument was erected by the *cives Romani et civitas p(ecunia) s(ua)*,¹⁹⁷ while in Avula Roman residents financed building works *s(ua) p(ecunia)*.¹⁹⁸ In these cases it is not clear, whether they had a constantly fed common treasury or they raised money for this purpose. Mentions of a *quaestor* –which could perhaps indicate to the existence of a treasury– are, as we have already seen, extremely rare and problematic, as to whether they are to be associated with groups of Romans abroad or with the political administration of the host communities. As the groups of Romans are attested in numerous inscriptions recording dedications to deities or the erection of monuments in honour of various benefactors and other sumptuous actions, it seems evident, that there would be at least ad hoc fund-raising in these groups, since a treasury is not attested.¹⁹⁹

No property of Romans as collectivities is recorded in the sources. Neither a special sanctuary nor a burial-plot nor a clubhouse of Romans and Italians abroad have been recognized so far. The suggestion to recognize the so-called “Agora of the Italians” on Delos as the headquarters of the Italians on the island has been strongly doubted. The title “Agora of the Italians” is in any case epigraphically not attested.²⁰⁰ This is a

196 *ILTun 682: Germanico / cives Romani / qui Suo morantur / C(aius) Aufidius Macer / d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(aciendum) c(uravit).*

197 Picard 1966; *AE 1966, 514*; Saastamoinen 2010: 85: [- - -] *Caes(ari) Aug(usto) [3] / [3] ci]ves Rom(ani) et civit(as) p(ecunia) s(ua) f(aciendum) c(uraverunt).*

198 Saastamoinen 2010: 210: ... *cives Romani Al/menses aedem et porticus s(ua) p(ecunia) f(ecerunt) / L(ucio) Volussenio Pastore et C(aio) Iulio Rogato / curatoribus*

199 On funding various monuments as well as on assemblies of these groups, see Müller 2017 for the case of Delos.

200 In the fragmentary inscription *ID 2612* the text of l. 2 has been restored as [τῆς Ἴτ]αλικῆς π[αστάδος], which is in any case not certain. Rauh 1992: 300 does not exclude the restoration of the word π[αλαίστρας] and interprets this architectural

large architectural complex that has been regarded as a slave-market, a *schola*, a meeting place of the Italians and Romans. More recent research seems to recognize in it a multifunctional building ensemble which might have also been used as an unofficial meeting place, however not exclusively of the Italians, but of greater parts of the multi-ethnic Delian society, as it is shown by the Greek or bilingual inscriptions found there, by the type of its decoration and the various origins of the contributors for its construction or repair (ID 2612).

As for laws in possession of the groups of Roman settlers – an element that could point to an advanced degree of internal organization – , no evidence is available. There is no document recording regulations of various aspects of groups' life and activity. Given the considerable number of related inscriptions from various places, the absence of this kind of documents would be somehow surprising, if we take for granted that these groups were private associations.

The officeholders mentioned in inscriptions related to the groups in question can hardly be identified as prominent members of the groups, but they are rather officers of the host communities, charged with the supervision or representation of the Roman settlers, as deduced from the preceding analysis. Furthermore, as an important element of the “associative order,” as Koen Verboven calls it,²⁰¹ is what he aptly analysed as a framework offering a possibility for internal distinction within the associations to individuals of humble origin who would hardly have an opportunity for social mobility in the wider context of the public life of a town. Although social mobility of individual Roman

complex as a multifunctional recreational facility with bath, gladiatorial arena and a *palaestra* which perhaps also functioned as a banquet hall; its function as a slave-market cannot be excluded, but it does not seem to have been the aim of the primary design. Trümper 2008: 361-64 suggests that the Latin version of the name of this architectural complex could be *porticus Italica* or *porticus Italicorum* and interprets its initial function as a garden surrounded by colonnades (pp. 61-104), with later additions of facilities such as baths, which could also be used not only for leisure and walking, but also as an unofficial meeting place, not exclusively of the Italians, but of other parts of the multi-ethnic Delian society as well, as the Greek or bilingual inscriptions found there and its sculptural decoration imply.

201 Verboven 2007a.

settlers has been verified by prosopographic studies,²⁰² it is remarkable that in the numerous honorific inscriptions where Romans appear as instigators of the honour, the honourees are hardly to be recognized as members of their group.²⁰³ Even in cases of certain honourees who are likely to originate from the milieu of the *negotiatores*, they are fully integrated in the host society and they appear as outstanding citizens of the town and not as members of the community of Romans. Verboven's examples are taken from professional or religious *collegia* whose members were Roman businessmen, but the apparent hierarchization or distinction or upward mobility is to be observed in the context of the *collegia* and not in the communities of Romans or Italians. There is thus no hint of an internal distinction or hierarchization, as it is detectable in private associations.

Beyond the elementary stage of collective actions, no further concrete organization is to be observed and no internal hierarchization is traceable within the groups of Romans and Italians abroad. The diversity of the political and social realities of the regions where Roman and Italian communities were settled, the variety of their (self-)definitions and the various ways of interaction with locals may point to different types or degrees of internal organization. Yet the evidence available does not allow us to observe a clear-cut internal structure. Moreover, there is no hint of introversion or inward-looking attitude, no trace of a close societal space of their own, as it is often observed in private associations.

Durability: The recurrent attestations of groups of Romans in one region show the durability of their unions, yet their first appearance and duration vary from place to place. On the Greek mainland, in the 2nd c. AD, no Roman community seems to be attested anymore. In the majority of the regions of Asia Minor groups of Romans are still attested in the 2nd c. AD, but not long afterwards. Remarkable from this point of view is an inscription from Konana mentioning Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ ἐξ ἀρχαίου κατοικοῦντες, if it is correctly dated to the 3rd/4th c. AD (SEG 2, 744). How-

202 E.g. Spawforth 2002.

203 Zoumbaki 2017.

ever, the lack of attestations does not necessarily mean that communities of Romans were dissolved and departed for other destinations. Perhaps the absence is instead to be interpreted as a matter of integration and acculturation into local societies, which were in their turn already “Romanized” to a large degree. By contrast, the attestations in Danubian provinces survive until late in the 3rd c. AD. There, Roman communities maintained and advertised persistently their identity and their special status in local life. In all cases where durable Roman communities existed, an evolutionary process is almost always evident: either they were absorbed into local societies and disappeared, as in several cases in the East, or they continued to be visible, yet as consistent part of settlements which developed over the course of time, as at the Danube frontier.

Closely connected with the durability of these groups is the question in regard to their foundation and dissolution. The process of foundation of these groups is completely unknown and there is no evidence for a process for a dissolution of them either. We do not know whether they were founded by one or more individuals acting in a private capacity or whether they were encouraged, promoted, and protected by the Roman state or by the host-state.

Host-states in the East from earlier on used to mention in their official documents foreign residents separately from the body of citizens. This does not presuppose any official foundation or organization of such groups.²⁰⁴ A major problem remains the role of the Roman state behind

204 An interesting inscription from Nysa shows how a *collegium* of Nysaeans was founded in Rome by a prominent citizen, T. Aelius Alcibiades: Clerc 1885 (*BE* 1924, 355; *SEG* 4.418; *BE* 1930, 209) (AD 138-161): (ll. 35-38) ... τό τε κολλήγιον καλούμενον ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ πολειτῶν ἐν τῇ βασιλευσῆ Ῥωμαίων πόλει συστησάμενος ... In Rome and its harbours traders originating from the same town or province were united in *stationes* and played a vivid role in economic and social life. Another important inscription contains a letter of the members of the Tyrian *statio* in Puteoli to their hometown asking for aid in order to alleviate some economic problems (*IG* XIV 830; cf. Verboven 2011). From both documents, from Nysa and Puteoli, it is evident that the *collegia* had a close relation to their motherland. This relation is frequently stressed by the implantation of their own cults, of *patrioi theoi*, into the

the collectivities under examination. Rome was certainly interested in maintaining secure communication and trade routes,²⁰⁵ as revealed by the Roman campaign in 228/7 BC, whose aim was to wipe out Illyrian pirates in the Adriatic Sea, who according to Polybius (2.8.1) robbed and killed Italian merchants sailing in the Mediterranean. It seems further that in some cases businessmen went hand in hand with army,²⁰⁶ as was e.g. the case with traders who followed the legions in the Danubian provinces. However, it cannot be argued that the expansion of Roman traders abroad was centrally planned as part of a mercantilist policy or that their activities were canalized by Roman authorities. On the other hand, it would stretch reality to argue that Roman citizens were not favoured by Roman magistrates who administered the provinces where they sojourned or at least that they did not facilitate the handling of their affairs. Cicero who was *quaestor* in Sicily in 75 BC elucidates this sort of relationship very well.²⁰⁷ J.-L. Ferrary²⁰⁸ has argued that Romans were attracted mainly to towns where representatives of Roman rule were based, who could protect them in case of problems. It could be added that even civilian Romans at the remote frontiers of the empire, settled next to camps of the Roman army, certainly not only in order to trade with the soldiers, but also to secure their protection.

Before we proceed to the conclusions of this analysis, it is perhaps useful to refer to two points which were important factors of the life of Roman

foreign lands. Whether there was an analogous process for the foundation of organized Roman communities abroad, is unclear. On the *stationes* see Moretti 1958, Noy 2000, Ricci 2005.

205 Shipley 2000: 371-72.

206 For example, traders accompanied Roman military units in Africa during the First Punic war, cf. Pol. 1.83.7ff.; Pol. 14.7.2ff; cf. Alföldy 2011: 55. See also Baldwin-Bowski 2001.

207 *On behalf of Plancius* 64: *negotiatoribus comis, mercatoribus iustus, mancipibus liberalis, sociis abstinens* ("I had been affable to the traders, just to the merchants, liberal to the citizens of the municipal towns, moderate as regards the allies"). Cf. also Verr. 2.2.6. Cf. Van Andringa 2003: 52 on requests of Romans from the central authority in Rome during the Republican period (evidence from Chios and Lesbos mainly on taxation) and in the Imperial period (mainly financial and commercial issues).

208 Ferrary 2001.

and Italian communities abroad, namely their professional occupations and their religious behavior, and examine whether these communities can be identified as professional or religious associations.

Communities of Romans and Italians abroad and their common features with professional associations

As the motives behind the movement of Romans and Italians outside the Italian peninsula were mainly economic, they were engaged in various professional activities. The occupations of these people ranged from trade, transportations, banking, shipping, tax-farming, in sum, they exploited various local resources and opportunities for profit that were available in each given place.²⁰⁹ In a second phase, concomitant with their integration into the community, they also invested in land and engaged in agricultural activities.

Actually, the epigraphic documents related to collectivities of Romans abroad mention as a rule only rarely and in a general way their professional engagements. As already mentioned, the only definitions which describe in some concrete way their occupations are those showing their involvement in agriculture, ἐνγαιοῦντες and γεωργεῦντες, while the term ἐνκεκτημένοι shows their right to own land.²¹⁰ The most frequent definition of their activities is πραγματευόμενοι/*qui negotiantur*, while the restored word [πραγματευ]ταί in an inscription from Messene (Peloponnese) perhaps shows the engagement of the resident Romans in transport.²¹¹

In some cases, Romans who were active in various sectors of economy were organized as professional associations. Professional associations whose members seem to be exclusively Romans, as a rule include no ethnic identifier in their title. This pattern is exemplified for instance by the ἐλαιοπῶλαι/*olearii* of Delos. Their members, at least those

209 On the engagements of Romans and their strategies and networks see Rice 2016.

210 On rural activities of Roman residents see Zoumbaki 2013; Eberle Pilar & Le Quéré 2017.

211 Themelis 2009: 76-78; 2013: 70-71.

charged with caretaking of the erection of a temple of Heracles, originated from Italy,²¹² yet the association's name includes no ethnic identifier. In certain cases, the use of Latin overtly indicates that members of specific professional associations were predominantly or exclusively Roman, e.g. the *collegia saccariorum* in harbour towns of the Adriatic Sea²¹³ or the slave traders in Ephesos,²¹⁴ yet ethnic labels are absent from their titles. In further cases, it is obvious that only a part of the resident Romans was engaged in a particular profession; this arises from the partitive genitive Ῥωμαίων, which accompanies their occupations in Greek inscriptions (see table above) or from the composition of the text in Latin inscriptions, e.g. in the case of *c(ivium) R(omanorum) m(unicipalium) n(eg)otiariorum) Mog(ontiacensium* in Mogontiacum (Mainz) in Germania Superior, whose association according to Andreau “faisait partie du conventus de citoyens romains de Mogontiacum.”²¹⁵

So, the use of the Latin language, Roman cults or other indirect indications point to the Italian origin of the members of some association. It is moreover clear that *collegia* including mainly Romans, played on the one hand an important role in the “Romanization” of the western provinces²¹⁶ and on the other hand, provided their members important advantages to tackle their business.²¹⁷ Such associations stress their common occupations which overshadow their common origin. Therefore, professional associations could form a specific part of the groups of Roman residents, but there is no indication that communities of Romans were in their entirety presented as associations.

212 *Olearii*: ID 1712. Ἐλαιοπώλαι: 1. ID 1713. 2. Jouguet 1899: 74-77, no. 17; Hatzfeld & Roussel 1909: 492, n. 2. Cf. Zoumbaki 2021. Generally on *olearii* see also Panciera 1980.

213 Deniaux 2012.

214 *IEphesos* I, 3025: [*qui i*]n *statario ne[g]otiantur*; cf. Scherrer 2007: 65.

215 *CIL* XIII 7222; Lamoine 2009: 188, no. 91. Cf. Andreau 1987: 248.

216 Verboven 2009.

217 Broekaert 2011.

The religious profile of the groups of Romans and Italians abroad and their common features with cult associations

As we deduced, it appears that particular segments of communities comprising Roman and Italian residents, rather than the communities as a whole, established professional associations. These *collegia* did not define themselves as associations of Romans and Italians, but as professionals engaged in specific sectors of the economy. Let's now investigate whether the entire body of Roman/Italian residents in a given location could establish a religious association.

Thriving economic centres which attracted foreigners, such as Delos, Rhodes, Athens/Piraeus, are ideal fields in order to study how foreign communities were organized, what their features were, and how they interacted with their environment. Koen Verboven specifies the basic features of *collegia* of foreigners who resided especially at major centers of economic life: cult, commemoration and conviviality. Especially in regard to associations whose members were foreigners to a place, common worship has been considered as the most significant element that overshadows other copulative elements of these groups and creates networks of trust open even to "ethnic or professional outsiders."²¹⁸

Businessmen' and traders' associations active on Delos and Rhodes were based on common cults as supreme bonds of trust, this being the most important condition in economic transactions.²¹⁹ Associations of this sort on Rhodes only rarely claimed an ethnic or cultural homogeneity, few had a common profession, but they had common cults –yet rarely of their *theoi patrioi*; indeed they accumulated several cults (including Rhodian) which were mentioned in their titles.²²⁰ M.-F. Baslez investigated the organization of foreigners on Delos and stressed their common cults, mainly of their *theoi patrioi*, as a crucial element of their communal life.²²¹ Under the imposing label of religion, associations

218 Quotation from Trümper 2006: 117; cf. also Baslez 1977; 2008: esp. 335–42.

219 Gabrielsen 2009: 188–89; see also Rauh 1993, Trümper 2006, Kay 2014.

220 Maillot 2015.

221 Baslez 1977: esp. 206–12; 2008: 338.

made up of foreigners were bound together, both on Rhodes and Delos.²²² It is remarkable that out of all common elements, their label stresses their common cult, only sometimes combined with their common geographical and ethnic origin as well as common profession. Claire Hasenohr²²³ examined whether the deities worshipped by Romans and Italians on Delos were perceived as Greek or Roman. Her results lead to the conclusion that certain deities were perceived as Greek: Apollo is the ancient lord of Delos, the cult of Dea Roma was already founded by non-Romans and Poseidon worshiped by the *Poseidoniastai* is rather a Greek version, since he was not one of the most popular deities in Italy and his cult was served by the Italians in the old Delian sanctuary of the god; other deities are rather to be regarded as Roman: Hermes, as a rule associated with Maia, is the Roman interpretation of the god, namely Mercurius,²²⁴ to whom Italians dedicated two small temples on Delos, while *Lares Compitales* certainly represent a totally Roman cult,²²⁵ Hasenohr stresses that Italians on Delos used a “Greek” religious profile or a religious syncretism in order to integrate into numerous other levels of local life, while the identity used by them on an official level was not their ethnic identity, but the “superior identity” of their relationship with the power of Rome.²²⁶

Therefore, associations established by Roman members on the basis of some common cult, as the remarkable cases of the *Hermaistai*, *Apolloniastai*, *Poseidoniastai* and the *Competalistai* of Delos²²⁷ – in Latin called all *magistri* –, stress their common worship, but they never mention explicitly their common Italian origin. This taken into account, Jean Hatzfeld

222 Cf. Maillot 2015: 138 on this analysis.

223 Hasenohr 2007a: 227–28.

224 Hasenohr 2008.

225 Hasenohr 2003 with earlier bibliography.

226 Hasenohr 2007a: 229–32.

227 On the organization of these *collegia* and the role of *magistri* see Boak 1916, Flam-bart 1982, Hasenohr 2002. Hasenohr suggests that Italians gathered periodically in order to vote for honours for benefactors and once a year they elected the new *collegia* of *magistri* (*Hermaistai*, *Apolloniastai*, *Poseidoniastai* and *Competalistai*) whose competences were mainly related to cult, but perhaps also the coordination and representation of their compatriots (p. 76). She also stresses, however, the lack of a single text related to the administration of this big association.

observed that Romans and Italians on Delos were grouped in religious *collegia*, but excluded any organization of a common ethnic group of them²²⁸ and rejected the existence of an association of “Romans” with a concrete activity, an autonomous organization, its own finances, with a president and representatives in front of local magistrates. Kornemann, on the contrary, accepted that *magistri* were the head of the major association of the *Italici*; Ferguson differentiated his view and stated that six *magistri*, the sacral officers of Hermes and Maia, the *Hermaistai*, stood at the head of the “loose group” of the *Italici* who were not a guild, given that membership to them did not depend on payment of a fee, but on Italian origin²²⁹. Claire Hasenohr²³⁰ presented a thorough comparative analysis of the *Italici* with the Phoenician residents on Delos, the *Heracleistai* of Tyros and the *Poseidoniastai* of Berytus. She points to differences in respect to their features and internal organization, but she focuses on certain common elements and finally draws the conclusion, that *Italici* are to be recognized as an association, similar to those of the *Heracleistai* of Tyros and the *Poseidoniastai* of Berytus. Common elements stressed by Hasenohr pertain to cult activities of those groups, to the dedication of statues or altars to deities, to the organization of religious ceremonies, to the openness of these groups to external relationships and euergetism.

However, all these elements stressed by Hasenohr are in fact indisputably common between Phoenician associations on the one hand and the *Hermaistai*, *Poseidoniastai*, *Apolloniastai* and *Competaiastai* encountered on Delos on the other, not the *Italici* as a whole. On the contrary, the differences between the Phoenician cult associations and the *Italici* are striking: 1. The fact that the *Heracleistai* of Tyros are called *synodos* and the *Poseidoniastai* of Berytus are called *koinon*, whereas *Italici* never bear a title of this kind, is according to Hasenohr to be explained by the lack of systematic use of the term *collegium* in Italy. 2. The fact that there is no attestation of *Italici* organized around a specific cult is neglected, since the *collegia* of *Hermaistai*, *Poseidoniastai*, *Apolloniastai* and *Competaiastai* include exclusively Italians. 3. The heads of these *collegia* are the

228 Schulten 1892: 71-82; Kornemann 1892: 50-61; Hatzfeld 1912: 146-83, esp. 146-47.

229 Kornemann 1892: 59; Ferguson 1911: 355-56, 396-97 (quotation from p. 397).

230 Hasenohr 2007b.

magistri, but functions such as *archithiasites*, *grammateus*, treasurer, which are attested in the Phoenician associations, are absent in the Italian *collegia* and certainly in the group of the *Italici*. 4. The Poseidoniasts of Berytus owned a clubhouse in the quartier of Skardana, while the *Italici* were established at various places of the island (“Les Italiens, pour leur part, se sont établis en plusieurs endroits”), but Hasenohr accepts the identification of the so-called “Agora of the Italians” as their main headquarters, despite the fact that she admits that many features of this complex are not compatible with a clubhouse, the most important being the absence of a shrine (This seems incompatible with the fact that several times in Hasenohr’s article cult is generally regarded as the chief element of an association). Recent research seems to recognize in the so-called “Agora of the Italians” a multifunctional architectural complex which might have also been used as an unofficial meeting place, however not exclusively of the Italians, but of greater parts of the multi-ethnic Delian society. 5. Two inscriptions recording donations (in one case a *laconicum*, namely the dry sweating room of Roman baths, in the other case it is not mentioned what was donated) of *magistri* to *Italiceis* cannot to be used as a proof that the *magistri* were officeholders of an association of *Italici*, since donations of certain individuals to Romans and Italians settled in a region were not uncommon.²³¹

Taking all this into account, it seems irrelevant to define the *Italici* of Delos as an association similar to the Phoenician religious associations. Within the community of the Italians of Delos, religious *collegia*, such as *Hermaistai*, *Poseidoniastai*, etc. were active, but the Italian community as a whole displays no characteristics of a religious *collegium*. Whereas the worshipers of these associations were clearly of Roman and Italian origin, they did not mention their origin and are not to be identified with the whole western community of the island.

In the East, groups defined as *cives Romani*/*Ῥωμαῖοι* and *Italici*/*Ἰταλικοί* are often present at popular local festivals or dedicate monuments to divinities, including deified emperors and Dea Roma frequently in cooperation with authorities of the host towns or other foreigners or groups active in the towns. It is not the community of Romans and Italians who introduced the cults of the emperors and Roma, but the cults

231 E.g. *ID* 1685 (a *porticus*); *IThesp* 373 (a gymnasium).

pre-existed.²³² Participation of Romans in local cults, such as Aphrodite Paphia in Cyprus or Apollo on Delos, and their dedications to local deities seem to be placed in the context of their strategy to integrate into local societies. In none of these cases did cults play a central role in the group's identity. This is the situation even with Roman cults which were introduced by Roman settlers into the western and northern provinces. Common Roman deities, such as Jupiter Optimus Maximus, Juno Regina, Hercules Invictus, sometimes along with members of the imperial family, received dedications from the resident Romans along with veterans and local populations, but these cults do not seem to have been interwoven in the groups' identity.

To move further with Verboven's basic features of *collegia* of foreigners – cult, commemoration and conviviality –, there is no trace of commemoration and conviviality on the part of Roman and Italian communities abroad. Although there is evidence for common festivities organized by associations whose members were exclusively or mainly Romans and Italians (e.g. the Competalists on Delos), such events are not organized generally by *cives Romani* or *Italici*. There is not a single attestation of a deceased member of the community of the *cives Romani* or *Italici* receiving any post mortal care or honour, not a single attestation of a gathering of the communities devoted to commemoration or conviviality.

From the observations exposed above, it arises that parts of Roman collectivities abroad organized themselves in minor associations of a religious or a professional profile, which were active within the Roman or Italian communities settled at various places. However, groups that call themselves simply *cives Romani*/*Ῥωμαῖοι* or *Italici*/*Ἰταλικοί*, do not adopt a common cult and do not use it in their common definition. The impression is given that under the umbrella of the communities of Romans and Italians several associations developed, yet not a single one seems to have comprised the whole body of Roman or Italian settlers and to have labelled itself as such.

232 Scherrer 2007: 66-70 also argues for the fact that there was in Ephesos no special cult of *divus Iulius* for the *conventus civium Romanorum*. On imperial cult in Ephesos see Kirbihler & Zabrana 2014: esp. 125-28 on the involvement of resident Romans.

Conclusions

Returning to our initial question, as to whether characteristics of private associations are to be recognized in groups of Romans and Italians abroad, we can reassess the results that arose from the analysis we attempted.

From the abundant epigraphic material related to the topic, it arises that Roman communities, as the other communities of foreigners, remained a clearly distinct group within the host societies. They were clearly recognizable bodies and their repeated occurrences show that they had a durable presence. Their visibility was not due to their exclusive membership of socially privileged individuals, since they included various status categories, but on their label “Ρωμαῖοι.” No further descriptive term is regularly used to define these collectivities; the term *conventus* which is to be found in some cases, is never used otherwise to define an association and seems to mean merely an assembly of Roman settlers.

It is both in the East and the West evident that Romans aimed at their consolidation in the host regions. In the East it is pursued through integration and acculturation, in the West through distinction and continuous advertisement of the superior Roman identity.

For their establishment in the foreign lands, they adopted various strategies, which perhaps points to a primary organization of their communities. The particular strategies adopted by them vary from place to place and from period to period. A common pattern of their collective strategies is the constant reminiscence of their presence in the public space through the erection of honorific monuments (for local benefactors, for Roman magistrates or for the imperial family), through their dedications –mainly along with other bodies– and their participation in local events, such as festivals, or in the gymnasium, even in the ephebic training in the East.

These strategies presuppose an elementary level of organization, the holding of a – loose at least – assembly²³³ at which certain resolutions would have passed for vote. However, no resolution in the form of a decree has been preserved. We ignore whether they assembled at regular

233 For reflections on such assemblies on Delos, see Müller 2017: 102-4.

intervals and what the schedule of such gatherings could contain. No regulation of their internal life, no clear-cut internal organization and no officeholders are attested. Where certain officeholders appear in connection to these groups, they were not members of the groups, but rather officeholders of the host communities charged with supervision or representation of Roman residents. Membership and regulations governing these groups are totally unknown. We completely ignore whether there were concrete rules for entrance and abandonment of the group, responsibilities of the members, such as prescribed monetary fees. The erection of monuments certainly presupposes expenditures. In the extremely rare cases of a reference to a *quaestor*, it remains unclear whether it was a function of the group of the Roman settlers or of the local community. Sometimes it is mentioned that certain individuals took over the costs of the erection of some monument. In the vast majority of attestations, there is no mention at all, which perhaps indicates that there were ad hoc collections of money, yet this remains a hypothesis, since there is no explicit or indirect reference to such actions.

All this points to an elementary level of organization. Could this be regarded as a sufficient condition to define these collectivities as voluntary associations? From the analysis attempted above, despite the diversity of the evidence from region to region and from period to period, we can generally observe that these collectivities lack significant characteristics of private associations. On the contrary, communities of Romans display in some cases characteristics which are not common in private associations. It is remarkable that they appear, especially in the East, as instigators of common actions with civic bodies and authorities, almost placing themselves on the same level. In the West they also place themselves on the same level with veterans and local populations. All this is unusual for private associations.

The role of religion is especially important for the classification of groups as private associations, since religion was a central element in all associations. In the East, no specific Roman cults were introduced by the groups of Romans and Italians; they were attached to local cults or to cults related with Rome, which however pre-existed. Where Roman cults were introduced, as on Delos, it was never the *Italici* or *cives Romani* as a

whole that were centred around them, but religious or professional *collegia* which were composed of members of Italian origin. However, the members of these *collegia* did not define themselves as associations of Romans and Italians, but as worshipers or professionals. In the West and on the northern frontier, Roman cults were implanted, but as a rule they were not served by private Roman residents alone, but also by veterans and by local populations. Although these cults could function as an advertisement of their Roman identity, they never appear in the label, in the name of the groups. It seems, that under a large umbrella of collectivities of Roman and Italian immigrants numerous minor groups with pure associational organization could develop, network, conduct business and establish themselves in local societies.²³⁴

Commemoration and conviviality which were central elements of private associations, do not appear in the context of the communities of Romans and Italians. Neither in the West nor in the East a clubhouse of Romans and Italians has been with certainty identified as such, neither in epigraphic record nor in archaeological remains. No hint of internal distinction within the groups of Roman residents is to be observed, no member of the community stands out or receives special honours.

Lack of evidence for all these issues does not necessarily rule out the possibility that all this existed. However, this lack of evidence does not allow us to fill the gaps of our knowledge with imagination or arbitrary statements. Thus, our source material does not preserve any clear indication of a common board of officials, of institutions, constitution, regulations, of the existence of headquarters of the groups of Romans and Italians abroad. All these basic features of private associations are absent. At any rate, they are recognizable collectivities displaying an elementary organization which in no case appears in such a clear-cut structure as in private associations.

Certainly, various questions remain open and many details concerning the very nature of these groups remain elusive. Historically assessed,

234 Harland 2014: 80 suggests that multiple associations of Romans existed within the broad group of Italian and Roman settlers in a town “In larger centres, such as Ephesos in Ionia, there may have been more than one Italian association at a time”; these associations differentiated from the other associations of Romans according to their occupation.

the emergence and diffusion of Romans and Italians abroad took place during the Hellenistic and Roman period, namely a period of flourishing of the associational phenomenon, of an intense and vigorous presence of associations in every aspect of public life, which “enlarged tremendously the field within which people could act, connect, do business and communicate in a particular and considerably more effective way –that is, as members of one or more organizations” (Gabrielsen 2009: 180). It is possible that groups of Romans adopted various isolated features out of a wide range of mechanisms of the associational activity, which could be energized at will, where it was appropriate. Private associations perhaps affected, for example, the form of self-presentation and the rooting of groups of Romans in the host communities. However, collectivities of Romans and Italians tend to assimilate themselves rather to civic bodies than to *collegia*, as their verbose placement side by side with civic bodies shows. It is perhaps part of this verbose language that they in some cases call themselves *sympoliteuomenoi*, an allusion to their “political” place in the host towns. However, they are not civic bodies, not civic authorities, and on the basis of all previous remarks, they cannot be classified as private associations either, but they remain in a grey zone between private and public, between organized and loose entities.

What encourages and unites these people abroad is neither a common ethnic origin nor a common legal status nor a common cultural background nor a common religious faith, but only their relationship with Rome. This gives them a feeling of superiority and security or just allows them to advertise an identity of superiority in order to cover the uncertainty and anxiety about their establishment away from home. This identity of superiority is totally based on their relation to Rome, although their ethnic and social origins vary. As a rule they are of humble descent.²³⁵ Their powerful lords, sometimes closely related to the ruling class in Rome, could function as a safety net and protective shield for the immigrants. Thus, they counted only on their relation to the

235 Our sources reveal individuals of noble origin who were involved in business as well, but they as a rule preferred not to establish themselves in distant provinces and they sent out agents, often their slaves or freedmen. Equites involved in business: Nicolet 1966: 376-79; examples in Asia Minor Kirbihler 2007: 27 n. 56. On the social status of businessmen see Rice 2016: 108-10, on freedmen see Broekaert 2016.

power of Rome and this, regardless of cost and risk, drove them “to seas and lands they had never seen before”, to use Cicero’s comment:

‘Poor men of humble birth sail across the seas to shores they have never seen before, where they find themselves among strangers, and cannot always have acquaintances to vouch for them. Yet such trust have they in the single fact of their citizenship that they count on being safe, not only where they find our magistrates, ... and not only among their own countrymen ...: no wherever they find themselves, they feel confident that this one fact will be their defence’ (*Verr.* 5.167).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abad Casal, L. 1975. *El Gualdaquivir, vía fluvial Romana*. Sevilla.
- Abad Casal, L. 2014. ‘Ciudades Romanas en la Comunidad Valenciana. Una introduction’ in M. H. Olcina Domènech (ed.) *Ciudades Romanas Valencianas. Actas de las jornadas sobre ciudades romanas Valencianas. Actualidad de la investigación historicoarquelógica, celebradas en el MARQ los días 3 y 4 de diciembre de 2013*. Alicante, 19-28.
- Abascal Palazón, J.M. 2006. ‘Los tres viajes de Augusto a Hispania y su relación, promoción jurídica de ciudades’ *Iberia* 9, 63-78.
- Adams, C. 2017. ‘Nile River Transport under the Romans’ in A. Wilson & A. Bowman (eds.) *Trade, Commerce, and the State in the Roman World*. Oxford, 175-208.
- Alföldy, G. 2011. *Römische Sozialgeschichte*. Stuttgart (4th edition).
- Alpers, M. & H. Halfmann 1995. *Supplementum Ephesium* (in Zusammenarbeit mit J. Mansfield & C. Schäfer). Hamburg.
- Amela Valverde, L. 2006. ‘Pompeio Magno. Italicei qui Agrigenti negotiantur’ *Gerión* 24. 1, 195-206.
- Andreau, J. 1987. *La vie financière dans le monde romain. Les métiers de manieurs d’argent (IVe siècle av. J.-C. - IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)* (BEFAR 265). Paris & Rome.

- Antonetti, C. 2011. 'Un Italiota ad Argo di Anfilochia' in G. de Sensi Sestit & M. Intieri (eds.) *Sulla rota per la Sicilia: l'Epiro, Corcira e l'Occidente*. Pisa, 391-407.
- Aparaschivei, D. 2015. 'Some Remarks Concerning the Rural Vici and their Administration in Moesia Inferior Province' in S. Cociş et al. (eds.) *Ad finem imperii Romani. Studies in Honour of Coriolan H. Opreanu* (Bibliotheca Ephemeris Napocensis 8). Cluj-Napoca, 27-43.
- Arrayás Morales, I. 2004. 'Tarraco, capital provincial' *Gerión* 22, 2004, 291-303.
- Ardevan, R. & L. Zerbini 2007. *La Dacia Romana*, Soveria Mannelli (Catanzaro).
- Arnaoutoglou, I. 2011. 'Craftsmen Associations in Roman Lydia – A Tale of Two Cities?' *ASoc* 41, 257-90.
- Arnaoutoglou, I. 2016. 'Hierapolis and its Professional Associations: A Comparative Analysis' in A. Wilson & M. Flohr (eds.) *Urban Craftsmen and Traders in the Roman World*. Oxford, 278-98.
- Arnaoutoglou, I. 2020. 'An Outline of Legal Norms and Practices in Roman Macedonia (167 BCE–212 CE)' in K. Czajkowski & B. Eckhardt, in collaboration with M. Strothmann (eds.) *Law in the Roman Provinces*. Oxford, 284-312.
- Arvanitopoulos, A. 1910. 'Θεσσαλικά ἐπιγραφαί' *AE*, 344-49.
- Ascough, R.S. 2002. 'Greco-Roman Philosophic, Religious, and Voluntary Associations' in R.N. Longenecker (ed.) *Community Formation in the Early Church and the Church Today*. Peabody, MA, 3-24.
- Ascough, R.S. 2008. "'Map-maker, Map-maker, Make Me a Map": Re-describing Greco-Roman "Elective Social Formations"' in W. Braun & R. T. McCutcheon (eds.) *Introducing Religion: Festschrift for Jonathan Z. Smith*. London, 68-84.
- Ascough, R. 2015. 'What Are They Now Saying about Christ Groups and Associations?' *Currents in Biblical Research* 13, 207-44.
- Avram, A. 2007. 'Les cives Romani consistentes de Scythie mineure: état de la question' in R. Compatangelo-Soussignan & C.-G. Schwentzel (eds.) *Etrangers dans la cité romaine. "Habiter une autre patrie": des incolae de la République aux peuples fédérés du Bas-Empire*. Rennes, 91-109.

- Badian, E. 1967. Review of *Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome*. Manchester & New York 1966, by A.J.N. Wilson. *Gnomon* 39, 92-94.
- Baitler, M. 2021. 'Adriatic Wine Amphorae in Nea Paphos' *Études et Travaux* 34, 13-41,
- Baldwin-Bowsky, M. 1999. 'The Business of Being Roman: The Prosopographical Evidence' in A. Chaniotis (ed.), *From Minoan Farmers to Roman Traders: Sidelights on the Economy of Ancient Crete*, Stuttgart, 305-47.
- Baldwin-Bowsky, M. 2001. 'When the Flag Follows Trade: Metellus, Pompey, and Crete' in E. Dabrowa (ed.) *Roman Military Studies* (Electrum 5). Cracow, 31-72.
- Baldwin-Bowsky, M. 2009a. 'Setting the Table at Roman Eleutherna: Italian Sigillata Stamps from Sector I' in P. Themelis (ed.) *Ancient Eleutherna. Sector I*, vol. I. Athens, 157-98.
- Baldwin-Bowsky, M. 2009b. 'Downstairs, Upstairs: Tonnius and Other Romans at Eleutherna, Sector I' in P. Themelis (ed.) *Ancient Eleutherna. Sector I*, vol. I, Athens, 201-23.
- Bandelli, G. 2002. 'La colonizzazione romana della Penisola Iberica da Scipione Africano a Bruto Callaico' in G. Urso (ed.) *Hispania terries omnibus felicio. Premesse di esiti di un processo di integrazione*. Pisa, 105-142.
- Barrande-Emam, H. 2012. *Les pratiques funéraires liées à la crémation dans les ensembles funéraires des capitales de cité au Haut Empire en Gaule Belgique: Metz-Divodurum, Bavay-Bagacum, Thérouanne-Tervanna*. Thèse de doctorat Univ. Lumière-Lyon 2.
- Başaran, S. 2022. 'Ainos (Enez) – Forschungen der Universität Istanbul in der thrakischen Hafenstadt' in T. Schmidts & I. Triantafillidis (eds.) *Mare Thracium. Archaeology and History of Coastal Landscapes and Islands of the Thracian Sea during Antiquity and the Byzantine Era*. Mainz, 137-52.
- Baslez, M.-F. 1977. *Recherches sur les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des religions orientales à Delos* (Collection de l'Ecole normale supérieure de jeunes filles 9). Paris.
- Baslez, M.-F. 2008². *L'étranger dans la Grèce antique*. Paris (1st edition 1984).
- Bäumler, A. 2014. 'Prestigekohärenz bei römischen Festen? Vergemeinschaftung und Distinktion bei Festen von römischen Vereinen am Beispiel der lex collegia eborariorum et citriariorum (CIL 6, 33885)' in

- B. Backes & C. von Nicolai (eds.) *Kulturelle Kohärenz durch Prestige*. Munich, 59-82.
- Bean, G.E. 1959. 'Notes and Inscriptions from Pisidia. Part I' *Anatolian Studies* 9, 67-117.
- Ben Romdhane, H. 2011. *Décurions et Magistrats dans les communautés Africo-romaines de la Zeugitane*. Thèse Univ. De Tunis.
- Bérard, F. 1992. 'Territorium legionis: camps militaires et agglomérations civiles aux premiers siècles de l'empire' *CCGG* 3, 75-105.
- Berger, A. 1953. *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series vol. 43, part 2). Philadelphia (reprint of Clark-New Jersey 2004).
- Beschauch, A. 2009. 'Le conventus civium romanorum en Afrique: à propos de la lecture de l'inscription CIL, VIII, 15775 (note d'information)' *CRAI* 153.4, 1537-1542.
- Birley, E. 1952. 'Noricum, Britain and the Roman Army' in *Festschrift für Rudolf Egger* I. Klagenfurt, 175-88.
- Birley, A.R. 1979. *The People of Roman Britain*. London.
- Bitner, B. 2014. 'Augustan Procedure and Legal Documents in RDGE 70' *GRBS* 54, 639-64.
- Boak, A.E.R. 1916. 'The Magistri of Campania and Delos' *CPh* 11, 25-45.
- Bouchon, R. 2007. 'Les «porteurs de toge» de Larissa' *Topoi* 15.1, 251-84.
- Bounegru, O. 1986. 'Über die "cives romani consistentes" von Skythia Minor' *MBAH* 5.1, 59-73.
- Bounegru, O. 2000. 'Der westliche Pontosraum und seine Handelsbeziehungen in der römischen Kaiserzeit' *Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica* 7, 121-39.
- Bounegru, O. 2006. *Trafiquants et navigateurs sur le Bas Danube et dans le Pont Gauche à l'époque romaine* (Philippika 9). Wiesbaden.
- Bounegru, O. 2014. 'The Black Sea Area in the Trade System of the Roman Empire' *Euxeinos* 14, 8-16.
- Bourigault, M. 2007. 'Le droit des autres: les cives Romani consistentes' in A. Maffi & L. Gagliardi (eds.) *I diritti degli altri in Grecia e a Roma*. Sankt Augustin, 78-87.
- Bourigault, M. 2012. 'La citoyenneté romaine en question: s'installer dans les provinces de l'Empire' *Traversce* 11, 17-35.

- Brélaz, C. 2016. 'De communautés de citoyens romains sur le territoire des cités grecques: statut politico-administratif et régime des terres' in F. Lerouxel & A.V. Pont (eds.) *Propriétaires et citoyens dans l'Orient romain*. Bordeaux, 69-85.
- Bresson, A 2002. 'Italiens et Romains à Rhodes et à Caunos' in C. Müller & C. Hasenohr (eds.) *Les Italiens dans le monde grec, IIe siècle av. J.-C.- Ier siècle ap. J.-C. Circulation, activités, intégration. Actes de la Table ronde Ecole normale supérieure Paris 14-16 mai 1998* (BCH Suppl. 41). Athens, 146-62.
- Broekaert, W. 2011. 'Partners in Business. Roman Merchants and the Potential Advantages of Being a *collegiatus*' *AncSoc* 41, 221-56.
- Broekaert, W. 2016. 'Freedmen and Agency in Roman Business' in A. Wilson & M. Flohr (eds.) *Urban Craftsmen and Traders in the Roman World*. Oxford, 222-53.
- Broughton, T.R.S. 1935. 'Some Non-Colonial Colonies of Augustus' *TAPhA* 66, 18-24.
- Brunt, P.A. 1971. *Italian Manpower, 225 B. C.-A. D. 14*. Oxford.
- Burnand, Y. 2005. *Primores Galliarum: sénateurs et chevaliers romains originaires de Gaule de la fin de la République au IIIe siècle. I. Méthodologie*. Brussels.
- Cadiou, F. 2015. 'Praesidia et castella dans les sources littéraires/Praesidia and castella in the literary sources' *Revista d'Arqueologia de Ponent* 25, 231-43.
- Cadotte, A. 2007. *La romanisation des dieux. L'interpretatio romana en Afrique du Nord sous le Haut-Empire*. Leiden & Boston.
- Capogrossi Colognesi, L. 2014. *Law and Power in the Making of the Roman Commonwealth* (transl. by L. Kopp). Cambridge (Italian edition Mulino 2009).
- Casperini, L. 1971. 'Le iscrizioni del Casareo e della Basilica di Cirene' *QuadArchLibia* 6, 1971, 3-22.
- Cassola, F. 1971. 'Romani e Italici in Oriente' *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 4-5, 305-22.
- Chaviaras, N. 1910. 'Ἐπιγραφαὶ Κνιδίας Χερσονήσου' *BCH* 34, 425-28.
- Christol, M. 2002. 'Narbonne: Un autre emporion à la fin de l'époque républicaine et à l'époque augustéenne' in C. Müller & C. Hasenohr (eds.)

- Les Italiens dans le monde grec: IIe siècle av. J.-C. – Ier siècle ap. J.-C.: circulation, activités, intégration. Actes table ronde, Ecole normale supérieure, Paris 1998.* Athens, 41-54.
- Christol, M. 2020. 'Ports, trade and supply routes in western Europe. The case of Narbonne' in P. Arnaud & S. Keay (eds.) *Roman port societies. The evidence of inscriptions.* Cambridge, 241-65.
- Clerc, M.A. 1885. 'Inscription de Nysa' *BCH* 9, 124-31.
- Cupcea, G. 2011. 'Veteran Settlement and colonia Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa' in I. Piso et al. (eds.) *Scripta Classica. Radu Ardevan sexagenarii dedicate.* Cluj-Napoca, 247-55.
- Curchin, L. 1982. 'Jobs in Roman Spain' *Florilegium* 4, 32-62.
- Dawkins, R.M. & F.W. Hansluk 1905/1906. 'Inscriptions from Bizye' *ABSA* 12, 175-83.
- De Blois, L. & E. Lo Cascio (eds) 2007. *The Impact of the Roman Army (200 B.C. – A.D. 476): Economic, Social, Political, Religious and Cultural Aspects. Proceedings of the Sixth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, 200 B.C. – A.D. 476), Capri, March 29 – April 2, 2005 (Impact of Empire 6).* Leiden & Boston.
- Delev, P. 2016. 'Cotys Son of Rhascuporis' in *Monuments and Texts in Antiquity and Beyond. Essays for the Centenary of Georgi Mihailov (1915-1991).* Sofia, 119-29.
- Deniaux, E. 2012. 'Les saccarii des ports de l'Adriatique, activités professionnelles et structures collégiales' in M. Dondin-Payre & N. Tran (eds.) *Collegia. Le phénomène associatif dans l'Occident romain.* Bordeaux, 221-27.
- De Romanis, F. & M. Maiuro 2015 (eds.) *Across the Ocean: Nine Essays on Indo-Mediterranean Trade* (Columbia studies in the classical tradition 41). Leiden & Boston.
- Dessau, H. 1913. 'Reges Thraciae qui fuerint imperante Augusto' *Ephemeris Epigraphica* 9, 696-706.
- Díaz Ariño, B. & J.A. Antolinos Marín 2013. 'The organization of mining and metal production in Carthago Nova between the Late Republic and Early Empire' *Athenaeum* 101.2, 535-53.
- Donati, A. 1965. 'I Romani nell' Egeo. I documenti dell' età repubblicana' *Epigraphica* 27, 3-59.
- Dzino, D. 2010: *Illyricum in Roman Politics 229 BC-AD 68.* Cambridge.

- Eberle Pilar L. & E. Le Quéré 2017. 'Landed traders, trading agriculturalists? Land in the economy of the Italian diaspora in the Greek East' *JRS* 107, 27-59.
- Eberle Pilar L. 2017. 'Making Roman Subjects: Citizenship and Empire before and after Augustus' *TAPA* 147.2, 321-70
- Edelmann-Singer, B. 2013. 'The Women of Akmonia – Revisited' in B. Edelmann-Singer & H. Konen (eds) *Salutationes – Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte und Ihrer Diskussion. Festschrift für Peter Herz zum 65. Geburtstag* (Region im Umbruch 9). Berlin, 109-25.
- Edmondson, J. 2006. 'Cities and Urban Life in the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire 30 BCE-250 CE' in D.S. Potter (ed.) *A Companion to the Roman Empire*. Oxford, 250-80.
- Errington, R. M. 1988. 'Aspects of Roman Acculturation in the East under the Republic' in *Alte Geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Festschrift für K. Christ zum 65. Geburtstag*. Darmstadt, 140-57.
- Eveillard, J.-Y. & Y. Maligorne 2009. 'Une statue de Neptune Hippius à Douarnenez (Finistère)' in V. Gaggadis-Robin, A. Hermary, M. Reddé & C. Sintès (eds.) *Actes du Xe colloque international sur l'art provincial romain, May 2007, Arles. Aix-en-Provence*, 557-63.
- Ferguson, W.S. 1911. *Hellenistic Athens. An Historical Essay*. London.
- Ferrary, J.-L. 2001. 'Rome et la géographie de l'hellénisme: réflexions sur les "hellènes" et "panhellènes" dans les inscriptions d'époque romaine' in O. Salomies (ed.) *The Greek East in Roman Context. Proceedings of a colloquium organised by the Finnish Institute at Athens, May 21-and 22, 1999*. Helsinki, 19-36.
- Flambard, J.-M. 1982. 'Observations sur la nature des magistris italiens de Délos' in F. Coarelli, D. Musti & H. Solin (eds.) *Delo e l'Italia*. Rome, 67-77.
- Follet, S. 2002. 'Les Italiens à Athènes (IIe siècle av. J.-C. – Ier siècle ap. J.-C.)' in C. Müller & C. Hasenohr (eds.) *Les Italiens dans le monde grec: IIe siècle av. J.-C. – Ier siècle ap. J.-C.: circulation, activités, intégration. Actes table ronde, Ecole normale supérieure, Paris 1998*. Athens, 79-88.
- Fraschetti, A. 1981. 'Per una prosopografia dello sfruttamento: Romani e Italici in Sicilia (212 – 44 a.C.)' in A. Giardina & A. Schiavone (eds.) *Società romana e Produzione schiavistica. I. L'Italia. Insediamenti e forme economiche*. Rome & Bari, 51-77.

- Funari, P.P.A. 1994. 'Baetica and the Dressel 20 Production. An Outline of the Province's History' *DHA* 20.1, 87-105.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2009. 'Brotherhoods of Faith and Provident Planning: The non-Public Associations of the Greek World' in I. Malkin, C. Constantakopoulou & K. Panagopoulou (eds.) *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean*. London & New York, 176-98.
- Gabrielsen, V. & C. Thomsen 2015. 'Introduction: Private Groups, Public Functions?' in V. Gabrielsen & C. Thomsen (eds.) *Private Associations and the public Sphere. Proceedings of a Symposium held at the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 9-11 September 2010*. Copenhagen, 7-24.
- Gagliardi, L. 2006. *Mobilità e integrazione delle persone nei centri cittadini romani. Aspetti giuridici. I. La classificazione degli incolae*. Milan.
- Gagliardi, L. 2017. 'Ἰ πάροικοι di Grecia e Macedonia in età ellenistica e nella prima età romana' in A.D. Rizakis, F. Camia & S. Zoumbaki (eds.) *Social Dynamics under Roman Rule. Mobility and Status Change in the Provinces of Achaia and Macedonia*, Proceedings of a conference held in Athens, May 30th-31st 2014. Athens, 388-405.
- Galli, M. 2017. 'Beyond Frontiers: Ancient Rome and the Eurasian Trade Networks' *Journal of Eurasian Studies* 8, 3-9.
- Galsterer, H. 1971a. 'CIL III 2733 und die Entstehung der Kolonie in Aequum' *ZPE* 7, 79-89.
- Galsterer, H. 1971b. Review of *Dalmatia. History of the Provinces of the Roman Empire*. Band 2. London 1969, by J.J. Wilkes. *Bonner Jahrbücher* 171, 729-38.
- García Fernández, E. 1991. 'El ius latii y los municipia latina' *Studia historica. Historia antigua* 9, 29-42.
- García Vargas, E. 2019. 'The Economy and Romanization of Hispania Ulterior (125-25 BCE): The Role of Italians' in G.C. Andreotti (ed.) *Roman Turdetania. Romanization, Identity and Socio-Cultural Interaction in the South of the Iberian Peninsula between the 4th and 1st Centuries BCE*. Leiden & Boston, 164-85.
- Gmyrek, C. 1997. *Römische Kaiser und griechische Göttin. Die religiös-politische Funktion der Athena/Minerva in der Selbst- und Reichsdarstellung der römischen Kaiser* (Nomismata 2). Milan (printed 1998).
- Gogniat-Loos, F. 1994. 'Les associations de citoyens romains' *Etudes de Lettres* 1994.2, 25-36.

- Gounaropoulou, L., P. Paschidis & M.B. Hatzopoulos 2015. *Επιγραφές Κάτω Μακεδονίας*, τεύχος β', μέρος α'. Athens.
- Guitart i Duran, J. 2010. 'The Origin of the Earliest Roman Cities in Catalonia: An Examination from the Perspective of Archaeology' *Catalan Historical Review* 3, 9-30 (in Catalan on pp. 147-62 of the same journal).
- Güller, Y.S. 2020. *The Negotiatores Associations in the Province of Asia during the Late Republican and Early Imperial Period*. Diss. Koç University.
- Haley, E.W. 1991. *Migration and Economy in Roman Imperial Spain*. Barcelona.
- Hall, A.S. 1986. 'R.E.C.A.M. Notes and Studies no. 9: The Milyadeis and their Territory' *Anatolian Studies* 36, 137-57.
- Handy, M. 2009. *Die Severer und das Heer*, Graz.
- Hanel, N. 2007. 'Military Camps, *Canabae*, and *Vici*. The Archaeological Evidence' in P. Erdkamp (ed.) *A Companion to the Roman army*. Malden & Oxford, 395-416.
- Harland, P. 2013². *Associations, Synagogues and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. Ontario (1st ed. Minneapolis 2003).
- Harland, P. 2014. *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary. II. North Coast of the Black Sea, Asia Minor*. Berlin & Boston.
- Hasenohr, C. 2002. 'Les colleges des magistri et la communauté italienne de Delos' in C. Muller & C. Hasenohr (eds.) *Les Italiens dans le monde grec: IIe siècle av. J.-C. - Ier siècle ap. J.-C.: circulation, activités, intégration. Actes table ronde, Ecole normale supérieure, Paris 1998*. Athens, 67-76.
- Hasenohr, C. 2003. 'Les Compitalia à Délos' *BCH* 127.1, 167-249.
- Hasenohr, C. 2007a. 'Les Italiens à Délos: entre romanité et hellénisme' in *Pallas* 73 (*Identités ethniques dans le monde grec antique*), 221-32.
- Hasenohr, C. 2007b. 'Italiens et Phéniciens à Délos: organization et relations de deux groupes d'étrangers résidents (IIe-Ier siècles av. J.-C.)' in R. Compatangelo-Soussignan & C.-G. Schwentzel (eds.) *Etrangers dans la cité romaine. "Habiter une autre patrie": des incolae de la République aux peuples fédérés du Bas-Empire*. Rennes, 91-109.
- Hasenohr, C. 2008. 'Mercure à Délos' in A. Bouet (ed.) *D'orient et d'occident. Mélanges offerts à Pierre Aupert*. Bordeaux, 27-38.
- Hatzfeld, J. & P. Roussel 1909. 'Fouilles de Délos, exécutées aux frais de M. le Duc de Loubat: inscriptions' *BCH* 33, 472-552.

- Hatzfeld, J. 1912. 'Les Italiens résidant à Délos mentionnés dans les inscriptions de l'île' *BCH* 36, 5-218.
- Hatzfeld, J. 1919. *Les trafiquants italiens dans l'Orient hellénique*, Paris.
- Hatzopoulos, M.B. & L. Loukopoulou 1996. *Recherches sur les marches orientales des Temenides (Anthemonte-Kalindoia)*, IIe partie (Meletemata 11). Athens.
- Hermon, E. 2007. 'Des communautés distinctes sur le même territoire: quelle fut la réalité des *incolae*?' in R. Compatangelo-Soussignan & C.-G. Schwentzel (eds.) *Etrangers dans la cité romaine. "Habiter une autre patrie": des incolae de la République aux peuples fédérés du Bas-Empire*. Rennes, 25-42.
- Herz, P. 2003. 'Zur Geschichte des Kaiserkultes in Kleinasien. Die Kultorganisation für die *cives Romani*' in G. Heedemann & E. Winter (eds.) *Neue Forschungen zur Religionsgeschichte Kleinasiens, Elmar Schwertheim zum 60. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Bonn, 133-48.
- Hoehn, J. 2009. *When the Old World Was the New World: Roman Acculturation of Indigenous Customs in Western Europe*. B.A. thesis University of Wisconsin Eau Claire.
- Jiménez, A. & J.R. Carillo 2011. 'Corduba/Colonia Patricia: the colony that was founded twice' in R. Sweetman (ed.) *Roman colonies in the first century of their foundation*. Oxford, 55-74.
- İplikçioğlu, B., H. Engelmann & D. Knibbe 'Neue Inschriften aus Ephesos XI' *ÖJh* 59, Beibl. 162-238
- Josifovska, B. 1959: "База са посветом П. Мемију Регулу [Base avec la dédicace à P. Memius Régulus]" *ŽAnt* 9, 285-90.
- Jouguet, P. 1899. 'Fouilles du port de Délos: inscriptions' *BCH* 23, 56-85.
- Kakoschke, A. 2002. *Ortsfremde in den römischen Provinzen Germania inferior und Germania superior. Eine Untersuchung zur Mobilität in den germanischen Provinzen anhand der Inschriften des 1. bis 3. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (Osnabrücker Forschungen zu Altertum und Antike-Rezeption 5). Möhnese.
- Kaldeli, A. 2013. *Roman amphorae from Cyprus: integrating trade and exchange in the Mediterranean*. Doctoral thesis Institute of Archaeology, University College London.
- Kalinka, E. 1926. 'Altes und Neues aus Thrakien' *JÖAI* 23, Beibl., 118-208.

- Kapetanopoulos, E. 1965. 'Romanization in the Greek East: The Evidence of Athens' *BASP* 2.2, 47-57 (<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.0599796.0002.002:03>)
- Kay, P. 2014. *Rome's Economic Revolution*. Oxford.
- Kirbihler, F. 2007. 'Die Italiker in Kleinasien, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Ephesos (133 v. Chr.-1. Jh. n. Chr.)' in M. Meyer (ed.) *Neue Zeiten – Neue Sitten. Zu Rezeption und Integration römischen und italischen Kulturguts in Kleinasien*. Vienna, 19-35.
- Kirbihler, F. 2016. *Des Grecs et des Italiens à Éphèse: les mutations d'une capitale de province (70 av. J.-C.-73 apr. J.-C.)*. Bordeaux.
- Kirbihler, F. & L. Zabrana 2014. 'Archäologische, epigraphische und numismatische Zeugnisse für den Kaiserkult im Artemision von Ephesos' *JÖAI* 63, 101-31.
- Khanoussi, M., S. Ritter & P. von Rummel 2004-2005. 'The German-Tunisian Project at Dougga: First Results of the Excavations South of the Maison du Trifolium' *Antiquités africaines* 40-41, 43-66.
- Klein, S. 2007-2008. 'The Indigenous Role in the Romanization of Hispania Following the Augustan Conquests' *Hirundo* 6, 25-31.
- Kloppenborg, J.S. & R.S. Ascough 2011. *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary. I. Attica, Central Greece, Macedonia, Thrace*. Berlin & New York.
- Kornemann, E. 1892. *De civibus romanis in provinciis imperii consistentibus*. Berlin.
- Kornemann, E. 1900 'Conventus' *RE* IV 1, col. 1173-1200.
- Kovács, P. 2013. 'Territoria, pagi and vici in Pannonia' in W. Eck, B. Fehér & P. Kovács (eds.) *Studia epigraphica in memoriam Géza Alföldy* (Antiquitas I 61). Bonn, 131-54.
- Koortbojian, M. 1993. 'Fra Giovanni Giocondo and his Epigraphic Methods' *Kölner Jahrbuch* 26, 49-55.
- Krigos, A. 2008. *Οι ελληνικές και λατινικές επιγραφές ρωμαϊκής περιόδου από την Κύπρο*. Doctoral thesis University of Cyprus.
- Kruse, T. 2015. 'Ethnic *Koina* and *Politeumata* in Ptolemaic Egypt' in V. Gabrielsen & C. Thomsen (eds.) *Private Associations and the Public Sphere. Proceedings of a Symposium held at the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 9-11 September 2010*. Copenhagen, 270-300.
- Lamoine, L. 2009. *Le pouvoir locale en Gaule romaine*. Clermont-Ferrand.

- Licandro, O. 2007. 'Domicilium e incolae tra repubblica e principato' in R. Compatangelo-Soussignan & C.-G. Schwentzel (eds) *Etrangers dans la cité romaine. "Habiter une autre patrie": des incolae de la République aux peuples fédérés du Bas-Empire*. Rennes, 43-76.
- Löffl, J. 2014. *Negotiatores in Cirta. Sallusts Iugurtha und der Weg in den jugurthinischen Krieg*. Berlin.
- Loukopoulou, L. 1996. 'The Fortunes of the Roman conventus of Chalcidice' in A.D. Rizakis (ed.) *Roman Onomastics in the Greek East. Social and Political Aspects*. Athens, 143-47.
- Loukopoulou, L. et al. 2005. *Επιγραφές της Θράκης του Αιγαίου μεταξύ των ποταμών Νέστου και Έβρου (Νομοί Ξάνθης, Ροδόπης και Έβρου)*. Athens.
- Lowe, B. 2014. 'Bilingualism and Language Contact in Republican Iberia', *Epigraphica* 76, 299-334.
- Magnelli, A. 1998. 'Magistrati e uomini d'affari, tra I secolo a.C. e I d.C., in un'inedita iscrizione gortinia' in M. Khanoussi, P. Ruggeri & C. Vismara (eds.) *L'Africa Romana. Atti del XII convegno di stud di studio Olbia, 12-15 dicembre 1996*. Sassari, 1291-1305.
- Maillot, S. 2015. 'Foreigners' Associations and the Rhodian State' in V. Gabrielsen & C. Thomsen (eds.) *Private Associations and the Public Sphere. Proceedings of a Symposium held at the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 9-11 September 2010*. Copenhagen, 136-82.
- Mann, J.C. 1963. 'The Raising of New Legions during the Principate' *Hermes* 91, 483-89.
- Marshall, A.J. 1969. 'Romans under Chian Law' *GRBS* 10, 255-71.
- Mason, H. 1974. *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions. A Lexicon and Analysis*. Toronto.
- Matei-Popescu, F. 2014. 'The Western Pontic Greek Cities and the Roman Army' in V. Cojocaru & C. Schuler (eds.) *Die Außenbeziehungen pontischer und kleinasiatischer Städte in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit. Akten einer deutsch-rumänischen Tagung in Constanța, 20.-24. September 2010*. Stuttgart, 173-208.
- Matijašić, R. 2018. 'Res Gestae (28.1) and the Establishment of Roman Colonies on the Eastern Adriatic' in M. Miličević Bradač & D. Demicheli (eds.) *The Century of the Brave. Roman Conquest and Indigenous Resistance in Illyricum during the time of Augustus and his Heirs. Proceeding of the International Conference Zagreb, 22-26.9. 2014*. Zagreb, 69-76.

- McLaughlin, R. 2014. *The Roman Empire and the Indian Ocean. The Ancient World Economy and the Kingdoms of Africa, Arabia and India*. South Yorkshire.
- Meyer, J.C., E.H. Seland & N. Anfinset (eds.) 2016 *Palmyra: City, Hinterland and Caravan Trade between Orient and Occident. Proceedings of the Conference held in Athens, December 1-3, 2012*. Oxford.
- Migeotte, L. 1985. 'Réparation de monuments publics à Messène au temps d'Auguste' *BCH* 109, 597-607.
- Mitschell, S. 1978. 'Roman Residents and Roman Property in Southern Asia Minor' in E. Akurgal (ed.) *Proceedings of the Xth International Congress of Classical Archaeology*. Ankara, 311-18.
- Mitford, T.B. 1961. 'The Hellenistic Inscriptions of Old Paphos' *ABSA* 56, 1-41.
- Mitteis, L. 1981. *Reichsrecht und volksrecht in den östlichen Provinzen des römischen Kaiserreichs*. Leipzig.
- Morel, C. 1877. *Les associations de citoyens romains et les curatores civium Romanorum conventus Helvetici*. Lausanne.
- Moretti, L. 1958. 'Sulle "stationes municipiorum" del Foro Romano' *Athenaeum* n.s. 36, 106-16.
- Moretti, L. 1981. 'Epigraphica 22: Due documenti di età romana da Cipro' *RFIC* 109, 260-68.
- Moretti, L. 1984. 'Thrakika' *Athenaeum* 62, 260-68.
- Mommsen, T. 1910. 'Die römischen Lagerstädte' in *Gesammelte Schriften* VI. Berlin, 176-205.
- Mouritsen, H. 2007. 'The Civitas Sine Suffragio: Ancient Concepts and Modern Ideology' *Historia* 56, 141-58.
- Müller, C. & C. Hasenohr (eds.) 2002. *Les Italiens dans le monde grec: IIe siècle av. J.-C. - Ier siècle ap. J.-C.: circulation, activités, intégration. Actes table ronde, Ecole normale supérieure, Paris 1998*. Athens.
- Müller, C. 2017. "'Les Athéniens, les Romains et les autres Grecs": groupes et phénomènes de recomposition sociale dans la "colonie" athénienne de Délos après 167 av. J.-C.' in A.D. Rizakis, F. Camia & S. Zoumbaki (eds.) *Social Dynamics under Roman Rule. Mobility and Status Change in the Provinces of Achaia and Macedonia. Proceedings of a conference held in Athens, May 30th-31st 2014*. Athens, 85-117.

- Ñaco del Hoyo, T., J. Principal & M. Dobson (eds.) 2022. *Rome and the North-Western Mediterranean. Integration and Connectivity c. 150-70 BC*. Oxford & Philadelphia.
- Nappo, D. & A. Zerbini 2011. 'On the fringe: Trade and Taxation in the Egyptian Eastern Desert' in O. Hekster & T. Kaiser (eds.) *Frontiers in the Roman World. Proceedings of the Ninth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Durham, 16-19 April 2009)*. Leiden, 61-77.
- Nappo, D. 2015. 'Roman Policy on the Red Sea in the Second Century CE' in F. De Romanis & M. Maiuro (eds.) *Across the Ocean: Nine Essays on Indo-Mediterranean Trade* (Columbia studies in the classical tradition 41). Leiden & Boston, 55-72.
- Nappo, D. 2021. 'A Case of Arbitrage in a Worldwide Trade: Roman Coins in India' in C. Rosillo-López & M. García Morcillo (eds.) *Managing Information in the Roman Economy*. London, 249-82.
- Nemeti, S. & I. Nemeti 2014. 'Civic Space and Municipal Statuses in Potaissa' in S. Cociş (ed.) *Gedenkschrift zum hundersten Geburtstag von Kurt Horedt*. Cluj-Napoca, 85-98.
- Nicolet, C. 1966. *L'ordre équestre à l'époque républicaine (312-43 a. C)*. T. 1. *Définitions juridiques et structures sociales*. Paris.
- Nigdelis, P. 2018. 'Amphipolis' Devastation in the 1st Century BC: Myth or Reality?' in *Students and Colleagues for Professor Fanula Papazoglu*. Belgrade, 91-105.
- Nigdelis, P. & P. Anagnostoudis 2017. 'New Honorific Inscriptions from Amphipolis' *GRBS* 57.2, 295-324.
- Nocita, M. 2012. *Italiotai e Italikoi. Le testimonianze greche nel Mediterraneo orientale* (Hesperia 28). Rome.
- Noy, D. 2000. *Foreigners at Rome. Citizens and Strangers*. London.
- Oltean, I.A. 2007. *Dacia. Landscape, Colonisation and Romanisation*. New York.
- Padermalis, D. 1984. 'Οι επιγραφές του Δίου' in *Πρακτικά του Η' Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Ελληνικής και Λατινικής Επιγραφικής*. Αθήνα 3-9 Οκτωβρίου 1982, vol. A. Athens, 271-77.
- Pancieria, S. 1980. 'Olearii' in J.H. D'Arms & E.C. Kopff (eds.) *The Seaborne Commerce of Ancient Rome: Studies in Archaeology and History* (Mem. Amer. Acad. Rome 36). Rome, 235-50.

- Panzram, S. 2020. 'Living Like a Cosmopolitan? On Roman Port City Societies in the Western Mediterranean' in P. Arnaud & S. Keay (eds.) *Roman Port Societies. The Evidence of Inscriptions*. Cambridge, 216-40.
- Parvan, V. 1928. *Dacia. An Outline of the Early Civilizations of the Carpatho-Danubian Countries*. Cambridge.
- Paschidis, P., E. Martín González, G. Athanasiadis & I. Graikos 2023. *Επιγραφές Αμφαξίτιδας (μεταξύ του Αξιού ποταμού και της ορειογραμμής Βερτίσκου - Κερδυλλίων) τεύχος Α': Επιγραφές Κρηστωνιάς, Μυγδονιάς, Ανθεμούντα*. Athens.
- Pazmany, K. 2019. *Between Mountains and Frontiers: the Roman Settlement System in the Provinces of Germania Superior, Raetia and Noricum*. Diss. Leiden.
- Petculescu, L. 2006. 'The Roman Army as a Factor of Romanisation in the North-Eastern Part of Moesia Inferior' in T. Beckker-Nielsen (ed.) *Rome and the Black Sea Region: Domination, Romanisation, Resistance*. Aarhus, 31-41.
- Petrikovits, H. von 1979. 'Militärisches Nutzland in den Grenzprovinzen des römischen Reiches' in *Actes du VIIe Congres International d'Epigraphie grecque et latine (Constantza 1977)*. Bucharest & Paris, 229-42.
- Petrikovits, H. von 1981. 'Die Canabae legionis' in *150 Jahre Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, 1829-1979. Festveranstaltungen und Internationales Kolloquium, 17.-22. April 1979 in Berlin*. Mainz, 165-75.
- Picard, G.-C. 1966. 'Le conventus civium Romanorum de Mactar' in *Africa I*, 65-84.
- Pinzone, A. 1999. 'L'immigrazione e i suoi riflessi nella storia economica e sociale della Sicilia del II sec. a.C.' in M. Barra Bagnasco, E. De Miro & A. Pinzone (eds.) *Magna Grecia e Sicilia. Stato degli studi e prospettive di ricerca. Atti dell'incontro di studi, Messina, 2-4 dicembre 1996* (Pelorias, 4). Messina, 381-402.
- Piso, I. 1991. 'Die Inschriften vom Pfaffenberg und der Bereich der Canabae legionis' *Tyche* 131-69.
- Piso, I. 2005. *An der Nordgrenze des römischen Reiches. Ausgewählte Studien (1972-2003)* (Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien 41). Stuttgart.
- Piejko, F. 1985. Review of *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie, I: Exploration, monnaies et inscriptions*. Paris 1983, by J. Robert & L. Robert. *Gnomon* 57, 608-21.

- Poland, F. 1909. *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*. Leipzig.
- Pouilloux, J., P. Roesch & J. Marcillet-Jaubert 1987. *Salamine de Chypre XIII. Testimonia Salamina 2, Corpus Epigraphique*. Paris.
- Prag, J. 2011. 'Provincia Sicilia: Between Roman and Local in the Third Century BC' in E. Garcia Riaza (ed.) *De fronteras a provincias. Interacción e integración en Occidente (ss. III-I a.-C.)*. Palma de Mallorca, 83-96.
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. 1939-1940. 'Per la Storia delle Associazioni in Rodi antica' *ASAA* n.s. 1-2, 145-200.
- Purcell, N. 2005. 'Romans in the Roman World' in K. Gallisky (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge, 85-105.
- Ramgopal, S. 2017. 'One and Many: Associations of Roman Citizens in Greece' in A.D. Rizakis, F. Camia & S. Zoumbaki (eds.) *Social Dynamics under Roman Rule. Mobility and Status Change in the Provinces of Achaia and Macedonia. Proceedings of a conference held in Athens, May 30th-31st 2014*. Athens, 407-25.
- Ramsay, W.M. 1898. *St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen*. London.
- Rauh, N.K. 1992. 'Was the Agora of the Italians an Etablissement du Sport?' *BCH* 116. 1, 293-333.
- Rauh, N.K. 1993. *The Sacred Bonds of Commerce: Religion, Economy, and Trade Society at Hellenistic Roman Delos, 166-87 B.C.* Amsterdam.
- Reid, J. 1913. *The Municipalities of the Roman Empire*, Cambridge.
- Reynolds, J. 1962. 'Cyreanica, Pompey and Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus' *JRS* 52, 97-103.
- Ribera i Lacomba, A. 2006. 'The Roman Foundation of Valencia and the Town in the 2nd-1st c. B.C.' in L. Abad Casal, S. Keay & S.F. Ramallo Asensio (eds.) *Early Roman Towns in Hispania Tarraconensis* (Journal of Roman Archaeology Suppl. Series, 62). Portsmouth, RI, 75-89.
- Ricci, C. 2005. *Orbis in urbe. Fenomeni migratori nella Roma imperiale*, Roma.
- Rice, C. 2016. 'Mercandile Specialization and Trading Communities: Economic Strategies in Roman Maritime Trade' in A. Wilson & M. Flohr (eds.) *Urban Craftsmen and Traders in the Roman World*. Oxford, 97-114.
- Richmond, I. A. & K.A. Steer 1959. 'Castellum Veluniate and Civilians on a Roman Frontier' *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland* 90, 1-6.
- Riggsby, A. 2006. *Caesar in Gaul and Rome: War in Words*. Austin.

- Ritti, T. 2003. 'La neocoria di Hierapolis di Frigia' in *Epigraphica. Atti delle giornate di studio di Roma e di Atene in memoria di M. Guarducci*. Rome, 177-215.
- Ritti, T. 2008. 'La carriera di un cittadino di Hierapolis di Frigia: G. Memmios Eutychos' *CCG* 19, 279-308.
- Rizakis, A.D. 1986. 'Η κοινότητα των «συμπραγματευομένων Ρωμαίων» της Θεσσαλονίκης και η ρωμαϊκή οικονομική διείσδυση στη Μακεδονία' in *Αρχαία Μακεδονία IV. Θεσσαλονίκη, 21-25 Σεπτεμβρίου 1983*. Thessaloniki, 511-24.
- Rizakis, A.D. 2008. *Achaïe III. Les cités achéennes : Epigraphie et histoire* (Meletemata 55). Athens.
- Robert, L. 1929. 'Trois inscriptions de l'Archipel' *REG* 42, 20-38.
- Robert, L. & J. Robert 1983: *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie. Tome I. Exploration, histoire, monnaies et inscriptions*. Paris.
- Robert, L. & J. Robert 1989. *Clarus I. Décrets hellénistiques*, Fascicule I. Paris.
- Robu, A. 2019. 'La participation des Rhômaïoi à la vie civique et religieuse des cités grecques (iie-ier siècles a. C.): continuités et adaptations institutionnelles' in M. Dana & I. Savalli-Lestrade (eds.), *La cité interconnectée dans le monde gréco-romain (ive siècle a. C.-ive siècle p. C.: transferts et réseaux institutionnels, religieux et culturels aux époques hellénistiques et impériale*. Bordeaux, 327-38.
- Rodríguez Neila 2017. 'Colonia Patricia (Corduba), capital de la Bética' *Gerión* 35, 272-398.
- Roselaar, S. 2019. *Italy's Economic Revolution: Integration and Economy in Republican Italy*. Oxford.
- Rowan, C. 2013. 'The Profits of War and Cultural Capital: Silver and Society in Republican Rome' *Historia* 62.3, 361-86.
- Ruiz de Arbulo, J. 2006. 'Scipionum opus and Something More: An Iberian Reading of the Provincial Capital (2nd-1st c. B.C.)' in L. Abad Casal, S. Keay & S.F. Ramallo Asensio (eds.) *Early Roman Towns in Hispania Tarraconensis* (Journal of Roman Archaeology Suppl. Series, 62). Portsmouth, RI, 33-43.
- Ruscu, L. 2014. 'Becoming Roman? Shifting Identities in the Western Pontic Greek Cities' in V. Cojocaru et al. (eds) *Interconnectivity in the Mediterranean and Pontic World during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods, In Memory of Professor Heinz Heinen* (Pontica et Mediterranea III), 473-88.

- Rushforth, G.McN. 1930². *Latin Historical Inscriptions Illustrating the History of the Early Empire*. Oxford & London.
- Saastamoinen, A. 2010. *The Phraseology and Structure of Latin Building Inscriptions in Roman North Africa*. Helsinki.
- Salomies, O. 2007. 'Social and Geographical Mobility: Westerners in the East. Onomastic Observations' in *XII Congressus internationalis epigraphiae graecae et latinae: Provinciae Imperii Romani inscriptionibus descriptae, Barcelona, 3-8 Septembris 2002, Acta II*. Barcelona, 1269-80.
- Salvo, I. 2013. 'Romulus and Remus at Chios Revisited: A Re-Examination of SEG XXX 1073' in P. Martzavou & N. Papazarkadas (eds.) *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis. Fourth Century BC to Second Century AD*. Oxford, 125-37.
- Salway, P. 1967. *The Frontier People of Roman Britain*. Cambridge (reprint of the first edition 1965).
- Salway, P. 1993. *A History of Roman Britain*. Oxford.
- Samsaris, D. 1985-1986. 'Οι Ρωμαίοι και η Χαλκιδική' *Μακεδονικά* 25, 33-46.
- Sänger, P. 2013. 'The Politeuma in the Hellenistic World (Third to First Century B.C.): A Form of Organisation to Integrate Minorities' in J. Dahlvik, C. Reinprecht & W. Sievers (eds.) *Migration and Integration – wissenschaftliche Perspektiven aus Österreich (Jahrbuch 2)*. Vienna, 51-68.
- Schäfer, T. 1989. *Imperii insignia, sella curulis und fasces. Zur Repräsentation römischer Magistrate* (MDAI[R] 29, Ergänzungsheft). Mainz.
- Scherrer, P. 2007. 'Der *conventus civium Romanorum* und kaiserliche Freigelassene als Bauherren in Ephesos in augusteischer Zeit' in M. Meyer (ed.) *Neue Zeiten – Neue Sitten. Zu Rezeption und Integration römischen und italischen Kulturguts in Kleinasien*. Vienna, 63-75.
- Schörle, K. 2015. 'Pearls, Power, and Profit: Mercandile Networks and Economic Considerations of the Pearl Trade in the Roman Empire' in F. De Romanis & M. Maiuro (eds.) *Across the Ocean: Nine Essays on Indo-Mediterranean Trade* (Columbia studies in the classical tradition 41). Leiden & Boston, 43-54.
- Schulten, A. 1892. *De Conventibus civium romanorum sive de rebus publicis civium Romanorum mediis inter municipium et collegium*. Berlin.
- Schwertheim, E. 1992. 'Neue Inschriften aus Adramyttion' *EA* 19, 125-34.
- Sherk, R. 1969. *Roman Documents from the Greek East*. Baltimore.

- Sherwin-White, A.N. 1973. *The Roman Citizenship*. Oxford (1st ed. 1939).
- Shibley, G. 2000. *The Greek World after Alexander, 323-30 BC*. London & New York.
- Spawforth, A.J.S. 2002. 'Italian Elements among Roman Knights and Senators from Old Greece' in C. Müller & C. Hasenohr (eds.) *Les Italiens dans le monde Grec, IIe siècle av. J.-C. – Ier siècle ap. J.-C.: circulation, activités, intégration. Actes table ronde, Ecole normale supérieure, Paris 1998*. Athens, 101-7.
- Stefanile, M. 2015. 'Gentes procedentes de Campania en la explotación de las minas de Carthago Nova' in *Phicaria. III Encuentros internacionales del Mediterráneo. Minería y Metalurgia en el Mediterráneo y su periferia oceánica*. Mazarrón, 170-80.
- Stoll, O. 2015. *Ehrenwerte Männer: Veteranen im römischen Nahen Osten der Kaiserzeit. Eine Studie zur Wirtschafts-, Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte der nährhöchlichen Provinzen anhand papyrologischer und epigraphischer Zeugnisse*. Berlin.
- Studniczka, F. 1888. 'Aus Chios' *MDAI(A)*, 160-201.
- Sullivan, R.D. 1979. 'Thrace in the Eastern Dynastic Network' *ANRW* 7.1, 2 (Principat), 186-211.
- Tchernia, A. 2016. *The Romans and Trade*. Oxford.
- Terpstra, T. 2013. *Trading Communities in the Roman World. A Micro-Economic and Institutional Perspective*. Leiden & Boston.
- Terpstra, T. 2015. 'Roman Trade with the Far East: Evidence for Nabataean Middlemen in Puteoli' in F. De Romanis & M. Maiuro (eds.) *Across the Ocean: Nine Essays on Indo-Mediterranean Trade* (Columbia studies in the classical tradition 41). Leiden & Boston, 73-94.
- Terpstra, T. 2017. 'Communication and Roman Long-Distance Trade' in F.S. Naiden & R.J.A. Talbert (eds.), *Mercury's Wings. Exploring Modes of Communication in the Ancient World*. Oxford, 45-61.
- Themelis, P. 2005. 'Ανασκαφή Μεσσήνης' *PAAH*, 39-65.
- Themelis, P. 2009. 'Ανασκαφή Μεσσήνης' *PAAH*, 61-98.
- Themelis, P. 2013. 'Ανασκαφή Μεσσήνης' *PAAH*, 67-95.
- Thompson, L.A. 1965: "Uterque ordo" in Inscriptions of "Municipium Thuggens" *Latomus* 24. 1, 150-54.

- Thompson, G.J. 2001. 'Hellenistic Hellenes: The Case of Ptolemaic Egypt' in I. Malkin (ed.) *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Center for Hellenic Studies colloquia 5). Washington D.C., 301-22.
- Thonemann, P. 2010. 'The Women of Akmonēia' *JRS* 100, 163-78.
- Thonemann, P. 2013: 'Phrygia: An Anarchist History, 950 BC-AD 100' in P. Thonemann (ed.) *Roman Phrygia: Culture and Society*. Cambridge, 1-40.
- Thorne, J. 2007. 'Battle, Tactics, and the Emergence of the *Limites* in the West' in P. Erdkamp (ed.) *A Companion to the Roman Army*. Malden & Oxford, 218-34.
- Tod, M.N. 1918-1919. 'Macedonia VI. Inscriptions' *ABSA* 23, 67-97.
- Torelli, M. 2008. 'Un italico nel regno di Ierone II: Cn. Modius e il suo balneum di Megara Iblea' *Sicilia Antiqua* 4, 99-104.
- Trümper, M. 2006. 'Negotiating Religious and Ethnic Identity: The Case of Clubhouses in Late Hellenistic Delos' in I. Nielsen (ed.) *Zwischen Kult und Gesellschaft. Kosmopolitische Zentren des antiken Mittelmeerraums als Aktionsraum von Kultvereinen und Religionsgemeinschaften. Akten eines Symposiums des Archäologischen Instituts der Universität Hamburg (12.-14. Oktober 2005)*. Hamburg, 113-50.
- Trümper, M. 2008. *Die "Agora des Italiens" in Delos: Baugeschichte, Architektur, Ausstattung und Funktion einer späthellenistischen Porticus-Anlage* (Internationale Archäologie 104). Rahden.
- Tsirkin, J.B. 1993. 'Romanization of Spain: Socio-Political Aspect (II). Romanization in the Period of Republic' *Gerión* 11, 271-312.
- Tzamtzis, I. 2013. *Creta Romana (Τάλως ΚΑ')*. Chania.
- Van Andringa, W. 1998. 'Observations sur les associations de citoyens romains dans les trois Gaules' *CCGG* 9, 165-75.
- Van Andringa, W. 2003. 'Cités et communautés d'expatriés installées dans l'empire romain: les cas des *cives Romani consistentes*' in N. Belayche & S. Minmouni (eds.) *Les communautés religieuses dans le monde gréco-romain. Essais de définition*. Turnhout, 49-59.
- Van Nijf, O. 2009. 'Staying Roman – Becoming Greek: the Roman Presence in Greek Cities' (draft version) <https://www.scribd.com/document/19963374/Onno-van-Nijf-Staying-Roman-becoming-Greek-working-paper>
- Velenis, G. 1996. 'Συμπραγματευόμενοι Ρωμαίοι σε μια νέα επιγραφή της Θεσσαλονίκης' *Tekmeria* 2, 8-15.

- Velkov, V. 1981. 'Thrace and Lower Moesia during the Roman and Late Roman Epoch' *Klio* 63, 473-83.
- Verboven, K. 2002. 'Ce que *negotiari* et ses dérivés veulent dire' in J. Andreau, J. France & V. Chankowski (eds.) *Vocabulaire et expression de l'économie antique*. Bordeaux, 89-118.
- Verboven, K. 2007. 'Good for Business; The Roman Army and the Emergence of a 'Business Class' in the Northwestern Provinces of the Roman Empire (1st century BCE-3rd century CE)' in L. De Blois & E. Lo Cascio (eds.) *The Impact of the Roman Army (200 BC-AD 476): Economic, Social, Political, Religious and Cultural Aspects. Proceedings of the 6th workshop of the network Impact of Empire, Capri 2005 (Impact of Empire 6)*. Leiden & Boston, 295-313.
- Verboven, K. 2007a. 'The Associative Order: Status and Ethos among Roman Businessmen in Late Republic and Early Empire' *Athenaeum* 95, 861-93.
- Verboven, K. 2009. 'Magistrates, Patrons and Benefactors of *Collegia*: Status Building and Romanisation in the Spanish, Gallic and German Provinces' in B. Antela-Bernandez & T. Naco del Hoyo (eds.) *Transforming Historical Landscapes in the Ancient Empires. Proceedings of the first workshop Area of Research in Studies from Antiquity (Barcelona 2007)*. Oxford, 159-67.
- Verboven, K. 2011. 'Residents Aliens and Translocal Merchant *Collegia* in the Roman Empire' in O. Hekster & T. Kaizer (eds.) *Frontiers in the Roman World. Proceedings of the Ninth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Durham, 16-19 April 2009)*. Leiden & Boston, 335-48.
- Vittinghoff, F. 1971. 'Die rechtliche Stellung der *canabae legionis* und die Herkunftsangabe *castris*' *Chiron* 1, 299-318.
- Vlamos, A. 2023. 'Les communautés de Romains sont-elles solubles dans la cité? Cités égéennes, Rhômaïoi et l'imperium Romanum aux IIe et Ier siècles avant notre ère' *DHA* 26.1, 177-99.
- Vollgraff, W. 1919. 'Novae Inscriptiones Argivae' *Mnemosyne* 47, 252-70.
- Walser, G. 1993. *Römische Inschriftkunst: römische Inschriften für den akademischen Unterricht und als Einführung in die lateinische Epigraphik*. Stuttgart.
- Wells, P.S. 2013. *Rome beyond its Frontiers: Imports, Attitudes and Practices (JRA supplementary series 94)*. Portsmouth.

- Wesch-Klein, G. 2007. 'Recruits and Veterans' in P. Erdkamp (ed.) *A Companion to the Roman Army*. Malden & Oxford, 435-50.
- Wheeler, E. 2007. 'The Army and the *Limes* in the East' in P. Erdkamp (ed.) *A Companion to the Roman Army*. Malden & Oxford, 235-66.
- Wierschowski, L. 2001. *Fremde in Gallien – Gallier in der Fremde. Die epigraphisch bezeugte Mobilität in, von und nach Gallien vom 1. bis 3. n. Chr. (Texte-Übersetzungen-Kommentare)* (Historia Einzelschriften 159). Stuttgart.
- Wilkes, J.J. 1962. *Studies in the Roman Province of Dalmatia*. Theses Durham.
- Wilson, A.J.N. 1966. *Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome*. Manchester & New York.
- Wulff Alonso, F. 1994. 'Realidades sociales en la Bética y en Italia en el siglo II a.C.: una propuesta de reflexión conjunta' in C. González Román (ed.) *La sociedad de la Bética. Contribuciones para sue studio*. Granada, 535-50.
- Young, G.K. 2001. *Rome's Eastern Trade. International Commerce and Imperial Policy 31 BC-AD 305*. London & New York.
- Youni, M. 2013. 'Negotiators in Roman Macedonia' in *ANTIKNHΣΩP – Τιμητικός τόμος Σπύρου Ν. Τρωιάνου*, vol. 1. Athens, 349-57.
- Zoumbaki, S. 1994. "Ῥωμαῖοι ἐνγαιοῦντες. Römische Grundbesitzer in Eleia' *Tyche* 9, 213-18.
- Zoumbaki, S. 1998/99. 'Die Niederlassung römischer Geschäftsleute in der Peloponnes' *TEKMERIA* 4, 112-76.
- Zoumbaki, S. 2011. 'The Presence of Italiote and Romans in Aetolia, Acarnania and the Adjacent Islands from the 3rd c. BC to the Beginning of the Imperial Age' in G. De Sensi Sestito & M. Intrieri (eds.) *Sulla rotta per la Sicilia: L'Epiro, Corcira e l'Occidente*. Pisa, 523-38.
- Zoumbaki, S. 2012. 'The Exploitation of Local Resources of Western Greece by Roman Entrepreneurs (3rd-1st c. BC)' *RBPH* 90, 77-92.
- Zoumbaki, S. 2013. 'In Search of the Horn of Plenty: Roman entrepreneurs in the agricultural economy of the province of Achaia' in A.D. Rizakis & I.P. Touratsoglou (eds.) *Villae rusticae. Family and Market-Oriented Farms in Greece und Roman Rule. Proceedings of an International Congress held at Patrai, 23-24 April 2010* (Meletemata 68). Athens, 52-73.
- Zoumbaki, S. 2014. "'At the Mercy of Waves and Storms ...": Roman and Italiote Traders and Settlers in the Cyclades' in G. Bonin & E. Le Quéré

- (eds.) *Pouvoirs, îles et mer. Formes et modalités de l'hégémonie dans les Cyclades antiques (VIIe s. a.C.-IIIe s. p.C.)*. Bordeaux, 317-30.
- Zoumbaki, S. 2017. 'Romans in the *poleis* of Greek Mainland and Adjacent Islands: The Evolution of their Relations in the Light of Honorific Text' in A. Heller & O. van Nijf (eds.) *The Politics of Honour in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire*. Leiden & Boston, 245-70.
- Zoumbaki, S. 2018. 'Where East Meets West: Island Societies of the Ionian Sea under Roman Rule' in A. Kouremenos (ed.) *Insularity and Identity in the Roman Mediterranean*. Oxford, 77-107.
- Zoumbaki, S. 2019. '«Ποιος σαλπάρει από ένα ιταλικό λιμάνι για να μιλήσει για χοίρους;»: Διασχίζοντας την Αδριατική προς αναζήτηση ευκαιριών στη Θεσπρωτία' (= "Who Sets out from an Italian Harbor and Explains Swine-Herding?": Crossing the Adriatic in Search of Opportunities in Thesprotia') in I. Chouliaras & G. Pliakou (eds.) *Θεσπρωτία I*. Ioannina, 373-88 (with an English summary).
- Zoumbaki, S. 2021. 'Μια *mensa ponderaria* από τη Δήλος στην Αίγινα και ένα σωματείο Ρωμαίων εμπόρων' (= 'A *mensa ponderaria* from Delos, now on Aigina, and an association of Roman traders') in A. Sfyroera et al. (eds.) *Ἐξοχος ἄλλων. Τιμητικός τόμος για την καθηγήτρια Εύα Σημαντώνη Μπουρνιά*. Athens, 271-84 (with an English summary).
- Zoumbaki, S. & M. Karambinis 2022. 'The Roman and Italian Economic Diaspora as a Factor of Connectivity between Italy and the Eastern Mediterranean, 150-70 BC' in T. Naco del Hoyo, J. Principal & M. Dobson (eds.) *Rome and the North-Western Mediterranean. Integration and Connectivity c. 150-70 BC*. Oxford & Philadelphia, 247-58.
- Zoumbaki, S. 2023. 'The Participation of Romans in the life of the Gymnasium in Greek *Poleis* of the East and their Integration into the Culture and Society of the Host Communities' in M. Barbanera, A. Caruso & R. Nicolai (eds.) *DIASPORA. Migrazioni, incontri e trasformazioni nel Mediterraneo antico*. Rome 223-52.

Sophia Zoumbaki

Institute of Historical Research, NHRF, Athens

szoumpa@eie.gr