

Gerión, 9, 1991, p. 163-174). Also, on a more abstract level, a “contextualizing” approach needs to consider the body of laws as one of the many economic institutions governing Roman society and analyze the interaction with other institutions (see most recently Frier, B.W. and D.P. Kehoe, *Law and economic institutions*, in W. Scheidel, I. Morris and R. Saller [eds.], *The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman world*, Cambridge, 2007, p. 113-143). – The third chapter discusses letting and hiring of objects (*res*), both movable and immovable property in rural and urban settings. Similar to the previous chapter, Du Plessis offers many stimulating thoughts on liability and division of labour, but sometimes fails to comprehend the consequences of his legal analysis for the economy of the Roman empire at large. For instance, he duly notes the rarity of laws establishing risk and liability in letting and hiring of commercial spaces (p. 155 and 171-172), but does not attempt to explain this phenomenon. It is in cases like this that historians applaud the willingness to introduce a “contextualizing” approach to Roman legal sources, but at the same time recognize the difficulties of combining specialized knowledge and expertise in finally assessing the relationship between Roman law and day-to-day economic transactions. Despite these minor remarks, the book offers an accessible and commendable introduction to a complex section of Roman law. Latin texts are quoted and translated, so the reader can easily follow and check Du Plessis’ analysis. The up-to-date bibliography contains references to all relevant literature and a user-friendly index of sources and subjects facilitates exploring the topics discussed. It is therefore a pity that the publisher of this interesting series devoted so little attention to typographical errors, which regularly occur and sometimes reduce the pleasure of reading through Du Plessis’ book.

Wim BROECKAERT

Monique DONDIN-PAYRE et Nicolas TRAN (Éd.), *Collegia. Le phénomène associatif dans l’Occident romain*. Bordeaux, Ausonius, 2012. 1 vol. 17 x 24 cm, 312 p., ill. (SCRIPTA ANTIQUA, 41). Prix : 25 €. ISBN 978-2-35613-067-9.

Fashioning what would become –and in many respects remains– the standard framework surrounding the Roman *collegia*, J.-P. Waltzing (in fin-de-siècle Liège) employed various forms of the word “public”. In his estimation, the *collegium* was itself “une république, une cité”, “une petite république organisée” that was liberally encouraged by the larger state apparatus until these little groups became, “peu à peu, des institutions officielles, chargées d’un service public...” (*Étude historique*, 1, p. 513-515). Throughout the intervening century of scholarship on the *collegia*, studies of “le phénomène associatif” –or “il fenomeno associative”, as it was better known from the work of F. M. De Robertis for several decades after the 1930s– were intimately bound up in the analysis of “l’utilité publique” of collegial assembly. Accordingly, the mainly inscriptional and legal attestations of these associations have been stretched out and combed over for their implications for a broader political, economic, and social context. This present volume collects twelve papers –with one on the actual use of the word “public” in collegial texts– on the associative phenomenon, but it departs radically from most analyses in that it (notionally) addresses only those *collegia* found in the Western provinces and not in Italy or the city of

Rome itself. The overall goal of the book, as laid out in the Introduction, is to trace the role of the *collegium* as a vehicle of Romanization in certain specific regional settings. These case studies are heavily concentrated on the German and Gallic provinces, but there are also investigations of collegial behavior in parts of Iberia, the Adriatic port of Dyrrhachium, and Egypt. It seems unfortunate that a wider loom was not employed in constructing this patchwork of studies, since records attesting collegial life in, for only a few examples, Dacia, the Pannonias, Britain, or North Africa might have made this a more comprehensive study of the college “conçu comme un aspect de la ‘romanisation’”. Nevertheless, there are more fundamental problems that mar this project, many of which are unfortunately shared by any study of the *collegia* in any geographic context. Several of the papers observe that it is difficult, if not impossible, even to identify *collegia*, given the dizzying array of terminological varieties one finds in both the standard epigraphic corpora and new discoveries. S. Demougin (p. 155-164) and C. Schmidt Heidenreich (p. 165-181) point to the paucity of surviving records and their often lacunose quality in their studies of, respectively, colleges in Belgic Gaul and military colleges in the Germanies and Rhaetia. Lack of certainty concerning the identification of collegial meeting-places in Spain threatens to capsize the tentative conclusions of B. Goffaux, p. 199-219), and A. Vincent’s admission of a total absence of musicians’ associations outside Italy is somehow turned to a hopeful conclusion, namely that they “attendent sans doute, aujourd’hui encore, leur inventeur” (p. 183-198). Even when a set of evidence can be delineated, difficulties of interpretation set in. C. Freu (p. 229-246) sensibly comments that terms recording associations in Egypt are usually too vague to indicate the level or specific functions of the workers who were nominally organized within them. While epigraphy can be “prolix” (Vincent, p. 183) in respect to some groups, it can also be “souvent trop silencieuse pour apprécier pleinement leur fonctionnement” (N. Laubry, p. 123). This silence may occasionally be “un silence éloquent” (Demougin, p. 155), but it is more often the fact that the documents we possess, while suggesting their social and cultic role, “demeurent muettes sur leurs autres compétences” (Schmidt Heidenreich, p. 168). While the majority of the papers make only tentative conclusions, cautiously picking through a small (or even a hypothetical) set of documents and entering into minute investigations about whether an individual text should or should not be included, a few stretch the threads beyond what they will bear. N. Tran’s investigation of the deployment of the word *publicus* and its variants in epigraphic texts (p. 63-80) begins promisingly enough, but the mere use of this term does not necessarily prove that colleges were “fermement ancrés dans l’espace public”. It seems a fair argument that “public” did not always signify “collective”, but rather that the *collegiati* intended their actions to be viewed in public, seen plainly and evaluated in a public space. On the other hand, the documents we have were inscribed and thus, by definition, already designed for public consumption –and we should always be cautious about believing that they are fully accurate and complete records of collegial action as a result. Moreover, as the term “public” is so crucial to Tran’s argument, some mention of the practice of the *funus publicum* (of which there is a recent and comprehensive study by G. Wesch-Klein [Stuttgart, 1993]) should be made and connected to civic structures and rituals more comprehensively. K. Verboven (p. 13-46) contends that the *collegia* played a more important role in Romanizing the

Gallic and German provinces than in Iberia. However, he also argues that the connections between *collegia* and Romanization varied widely by region and that the relative absence of *collegia* in a province (Baetica, for example) does not necessarily indicate a lower level of Romanization. While the focus on regional variation is important, one should also take into account the varying levels of excavation and the fact that, by any estimate, we possess only a tiny fragment of what might have survived from any region of the empire. Using the numbers of *collegia* to draw firm conclusions about levels of Romanization, either within a province or comparatively across provinces, seems to be pushing the boundaries of the evidence, but much of the remainder of the article, investigating the college as an agent of social mobility, also seems overreaching. Nevertheless, the paper's strongest contention –and one borne out by Dondin-Payre's paper (see below)– is that the colleges “jouaient un rôle moteur dans l'intégration des élites et des populations indigènes” (p. 33). N. Laubry's analysis (p. 103-133) of inscriptions attesting burial by, or with the participation of, a college –but only “en Narbonnaise et dans les Trois Gaules”– exemplifies some of the more worrying tendencies of this volume. In the first place, even the identification of texts for his limited corpus, given the many obstacles in reading and interpreting the surviving texts, precludes any degree of certainty. Moreover, his set of 33 texts, a third of which are marked as “douteuses ou discutables”, may be incomplete. The catalog omits a text from Nemausus (*CIL* 12.3347 add.), recording a burial by a *grex Ga(llicus) Memphi et Paridis* with three men named *administrantibus*, and a text found at Vence (*CIL* 12.22) is mentioned only in two footnotes (p. 106, n. 20, and p. 117, n. 99), even though it claims a burial contribution by a *collign(ium) iuvenu(m) Nemesiorum*. Aside from the incompleteness of the catalog, the article is fundamentally flawed in its conception. One would imagine that a regional study, explicitly confined to one delineated region, should not draw on *comparanda* from Italy and Rome so often as this article does. In fact, only a comprehensive study of burial by *collegium* across the empire –or at least across Italy and the western provinces– would yield optimal results. (The paper also contains a few small errors, including “A.” for “F.” Ausbüttel on p. 103 and “*NA 2” for “*AQ 2” on p. 108, n. 35). The best of these papers, offered by F. Bérard (p. 135-154) and M. Dondin-Payre (p. 81-101), manage to make the “mute stones” cry out, drawing on a modest set of relatively similar inscriptions and offering original and plausible hypotheses on their basis. Bérard collects dedicatory and funerary monuments mentioning the members and patrons of two, or perhaps three, groups known as the *nautae Rhodanici* (sailors on the Rhône), the *nautae Ararici* (sailors on the Saône), and the *corpus nautarum Rhodanicorum et Araricorum*. Although the paper does not touch explicitly on Romanization, it focuses attention on these associations' professional activities and suggests a level of commercial acuity that is rarely attributed to the associative phenomenon. Its most interesting, if necessarily tentative, speculation is that the third group reflects “une fusion temporaire des deux *corpora*” (p. 144), perhaps to coordinate their activities in a practical sense. A temporary merger of this type would thus underscore the role of *collegia* in developing a specialization, in terms of geography, technique, or both: an intriguing line of thought that could yield further profit. Dondin-Payre's analysis of fourteen texts concerning religious *curiae* in the northwestern provinces is a model of precision, originality, and logical presentation. Addressing a group like the

curia Amratnina, she compares the well-attested *Matronae Amratnineae* in the region and surmises that *curia* was a Latin rendering of “un mot celto-germanique” (e.g. “corios”), meaning something like “armée, troupe, groupe” (p. 89, with n. 22). Drawing on a series of maps and tables classifying the inscribed names by linguistic origin, she hypothesizes that these *curiae* were means of promoting the interests of the most promising indigenous citizens “déjà engagées dans la romanisation” (p. 95). These *collegia* are therefore evidence of a dynamic fusion of native deities with Roman religious concepts and document the process of Romanization in action. One of these texts, a dedication to the god *Entarabus* and to the Genius of the *curia Ollodagus/a* (might this be a derivative of a Germanic word like “Alltag”, by the way?), represents a lost opportunity to reference the founder of collegial studies himself. Alerting readers to a newly discovered inscription from Trèves, Waltzing connected this dedication to the god *Intarabus* by a *collegium fabrum dolabrariorum* to similar *dolabrarii* in Italy. Accordingly, it would appear that Waltzing, in 1909, was already evaluating *collegia* as agents of “Romanization”, *avant la lettre?*

Jonathan S. PERRY

Jan Dirk HARKE, *Corpus der römischen Rechtsquellen zur antiken Sklaverei (CRRS)*. Teil III. *Die Rechtspositionen am Sklaven*. 2 : *Ansprüche aus Delikten am Sklaven*. Stuttgart, F. Steiner, 2013. 1 vol. 20,5 x 29,5 cm, XII-219 p. (FORSCHUNGEN ZUR ANTIKEN SKLAVEREI. BEIHEFT 3). Prix : 44 €. ISBN 978-3-515-10144-8.

Le plébiscite aquilien, dit loi Aquilia, daté du milieu ou de la seconde moitié du III^e s. av. n. è., aurait contenu trois chapitres dont le premier visait le délit consistant à tuer l’esclave d’autrui ou certains quadrupèdes. L’auteur du délit était condamné à dédommager le propriétaire. Un troisième chapitre avait en vue les dégâts matériels causés à toute espèce de *res*, donc aussi aux esclaves. Il s’avère que les deux chapitres en question avaient pour but la protection du patrimoine plutôt que la répression de la violence. La loi Aquilia était une loi de circonstance à objet limité. Les préteurs et les juristes ont dû étendre successivement le domaine des actions qui la sanctionnaient. Selon J. Harke, cette activité des juristes romains et la réflexion qui la soutient mettent en lumière la manière technique avec laquelle la jurisprudence romaine s’occupait de phénomènes quotidiens douloureux. Il est vrai que, pour ce qui est des esclaves, les aspects patrimoniaux passaient avant les aspects humains et la résolution des problèmes qui se posaient se faisait avec une impressionnante subtilité. Les textes rassemblés dans ce volume du *CRRS* concernent donc les droits qu’ont les propriétaires lorsque leurs esclaves sont victimes d’un délit : homicide, blessure corporelle, corruption de l’esclave, vol, acte de brigandage, chantage, enlèvement et autres comportements illégaux. Dans une partie intitulée « Introduction », l’auteur étudie les différents délits dont sont victimes les esclaves, les bénéficiaires des droits nés de la perpétration de ces délits, les conditions dans lesquelles ces droits sont octroyés, le contenu de ces droits. Il passe ensuite aux sanctions. La seconde partie regroupe les sources. Les textes rassemblés, traduits et commentés proviennent de la loi des XII Tables, des *Institutes* de Gaius, des *Digesta* (Ulpian semble s’être particulièrement intéressé au sujet, ainsi que Paul dans une moindre mesure), des