

SCIENTIA DANICA · SERIES H · HUMANISTICA · 8 · VOL. 9

# Private Associations and the Public Sphere

Proceedings of a Symposium held  
at the Royal Danish Academy of  
Sciences and Letters, 9-11 September 2010

*Edited by*

*Vincent Gabrielsen*

*and*

*Christian A. Thomsen*

1742

Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab  
The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters

DET KONGELIGE DANSKE VIDENSKABERNES SELSKAB

udgiver følgende publikationsrækker:

THE ROYAL DANISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND LETTERS

issues the following series of publications:

	AUTHORIZED ABBREVIATIONS
Scientia Danica. Series B, Biologica <i>Formerly: Biologiske Skrifter, 4°</i> (Botany, Zoology, Palaeontology, general Biology)	Sci.Dan.B
Scientia Danica. Series H, Humanistica, 4 <i>Formerly: Historisk-filosofiske Skrifter, 4°</i> (History, Philosophy, Philology, Archaeology, Art History)	Sci.Dan.H.4
Scientia Danica. Series H, Humanistica, 8 <i>Formerly: Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser, 8°</i> (History, Philosophy, Philology, Archaeology, Art History)	Sci.Dan.H.8
Scientia Danica. Series M, Mathematica et physica <i>Formerly: Matematisk-fysiske Meddelelser, 8°</i> (Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Astronomy, Geology)	Sci.Dan.M
<i>Oversigt, Annual Report, 8°</i>	Overs.Dan.Vid.Selsk.

**Correspondence**

Manuscripts are to be sent to

The Editor

Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab

H. C. Andersens Boulevard 35

DK-1553 Copenhagen V, Denmark.

Tel: +45 33 43 53 00 · Fax: +45 33 43 53 01.

E-mail: [kdvs@royalacademy.dk](mailto:kdvs@royalacademy.dk).

[www.royalacademy.dk](http://www.royalacademy.dk)

Questions concerning subscription to the series should be directed to the Academy

Editor Marita Akhøj Nielsen

© 2015. Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the copyright owner.

Private Associations and the Public Sphere.  
Proceedings of a Symposium held at the Royal Danish Academy  
of Sciences and Letters, 9-11 September 2010

# Abstract

Recent years have seen renewed scholarly interest in private associations of the Greek and Roman world. As scholars have come to realise the number and diffusion of private associations in the ancient world questions arise as to their wider social, political, religious and economic significance.

*Private Associations and the Public Sphere* collects eleven chapters each pursuing this question in a particular geographic and historical context. In doing so, the authors have aimed not only to document and analyse various forms of interaction between private associations and the public sphere, but also to register the outcomes and interpret their wider historical significance.

# Private Associations and the Public Sphere

Proceedings of a Symposium held  
at the Royal Danish Academy of  
Sciences and Letters, 9-11 September 2010

*Edited by*

*Vincent Gabrielsen*

*and*

*Christian A. Thomsen*



Scientia Danica. Series H, Humanistica, 8 vol. 9

DET KONGELIGE DANSKE VIDENSKABERNES SELSKAB

Private Associations and the Public Sphere  
Proceedings of a Symposium held at the Royal Danish Academy  
of Sciences and Letters, 9-11 September 2010

© Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab 2015  
Printed in Denmark by Special-Trykkeriet Viborg a-s  
ISSN 1904-5492 · ISBN 978-87-7304-389-9



Submitted to the Academy March 2014  
Published December 2015

# Contents

I

VINCENT GABRIELSEN – CHRISTIAN A. THOMSEN  
Introduction: Private Groups, Public Functions?  
page 7

2

ILIAS ARNAOUTOGLOU  
Cult Associations and Politics:  
Worshipping Bendis in Classical and Hellenistic Athens  
page 25

3

MATTHIAS HAAKE  
Philosophical Schools in Athenian Society from the Fourth to the  
First Century BC: An Overview  
page 57

4

MARÍA PAZ DE HOZ  
Associations of Physicians and Teachers in Asia Minor:  
Between Private and Public  
page 92

5

ALEXANDRU AVRAM  
Newly Published Documents Concerning Cult Associations  
in the Black Sea: Some Remarks  
page 122

6

STÉPHANIE MAILLOT  
Foreigners' Associations and the Rhodian State  
page 136

7

JONATHAN S. PERRY

'L'État intervint peu à peu':

State Intervention in the Ephesian 'Bakers' Strike'

page 183

8

KORINNA ZAMFIR

The Community of the Pastoral Epistles -

A Religious Association

page 206

9

MATT GIBBS

The Trade Associations of Ptolemaic Egypt:

Definition, Organization and their Relationship with the State

page 241

10

THOMAS KRUSE

Ethnic *Koina* and *Politeumata* in Ptolemaic Egypt

page 270

11

DOROTHY J. THOMPSON

The Ptolemaic *Ethnos*

page 301

12

PHILIP F. VENTICINQUE

Courting the Associations: Cooperation,

Conflict and Interaction in Roman Egypt

page 314

General Index

page 341

Index Locorum

page 345



# Introduction: Private Groups, Public Functions?

*Vincent Gabrielsen and Christian A. Thomsen*

*Do not form either hetaireiai or synodoi without my sanction; for such associations (systaseis) may be an advantage in other kinds of constitution (politeiai), but in the monarchies they are a danger.<sup>1</sup>*

Such was the advice given by the Athenian orator Isocrates in the late 370s BC to Nicocles the king of Salamis in Cyprus. It is debatable whether everybody would have agreed with him that these associations were potentially harmful only to monarchies. In democratic Athens the *hetaireia*-clubs had gained notoriety for their part in overthrowing the democracy in 404 BC.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, the term *hetaireia* came to denote a politically oriented association and continued to carry a derogatory flavour for a long time: echoing Isocrates in the early second century AD, Dio Chrysostom speaks of *hetaireiai* as something one would not wish to be associated with (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 50.23, cf. Philon, *Flacc.* 1.4).

However, Isocrates' advice sets the spotlight on the uneasy relationship between private associations and a most pre-eminent representative of the public sphere, the state: a relationship that stretched not only from co-operation to coexistence, but even to outright rivalry. Around 170-160 BC, the Ionian-Hellespontine branch of the association of the Dionysiac *technitai* became embroiled in a serious conflict with the city of Teos;<sup>3</sup> in 186 the Roman

1. Isoc. *Nicocles* 54, tr. adapted from G. Norlin, Loeb Classical Library, 1980.

2. Thuc. 8.54.4, cf. 8.48.3 (*xynomosis* ['conspiracy'] and *hetaireia* are synonyms); Lys. 12.43-47, 76; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 34.3. See Calhoun 1913; Jones 1999, 223-27. For *synodos* as a term describing a kind of association: *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1012, l. 15 (112/11 BC). *Systasis* in the sense of association: Dem. 45.67; Polyb. 23.1.3.

3. Le Guen 2001: I, 243-50, no. 47; Aneziri 2003, 387-91, no. D12.

Senate passed strict regulations about the activities of associations of Dionysiac worshippers, banning their gathering in Rome and Italy, followed in 64 BC by another senatorial ban on associations allegedly involved in politically subversive activities.<sup>4</sup> But these and further such instances must be juxtaposed with numerous others in which associations – for example, those sporting military or naval branches – are seen to be assisting the state and performing distinctly beneficial public roles.<sup>5</sup>

Whatever the exact nature of the relationship, its very manifestation in the historical record, alongside the interaction conditioning it, seems to constitute a topic worthy of further investigation. The present volume is the result of a collective endeavour to undertake such an exploration. The eleven chapters it assembles originated in the international conference *Private Associations and the Public Sphere in the Ancient World* held at the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters in September 2010. A principal aim has been not only to document and analyze the various forms of interaction between private associations and public sphere; but also to register the outcome of this interaction and interpret its wider historical significance. Our undertaking has been guided by the realization that private associations (Greek: *koina*; Latin: *collegia*, *sodalicia*, *corporā*) can no longer be assigned a marginal place among the *curiosa* of ancient cultural or social life.<sup>6</sup> They represent a dynamic phenomenon with an eminently central place in the history of ancient societies.<sup>7</sup> This is also recognized by theologians and scholars of the New Testament, who explore the possible connection between associations and the Jesus groups.<sup>8</sup> Previous discussions of our particular topic do exist. These have tended to focus on the Roman world (including its eastern part in Imperial times), at the expense of the Classical and Hel-

---

4. 186 BC: *ILS* 18 (= *FIRA* I<sup>2</sup> 30): *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus*. 64 BC: Asconius, *Pis.* 7; Asconius, *Corn.* 67.

5. E.g. Association of Cretan mercenaries serving on Cyprus: *SEG* 30.1640 (ca. 142–131 BC); Association of a warship crew in Hellenistic Rhodes: *IG* XII 1, 43 (1st cent. BC). See Launey 1987, 1001–36; Gabrielsen 2001.

6. As, for instance, Tod 1932; Fischer 1988.

7. See, e.g., van Nijf 1997; Verboven 2007; Liu 2009; Gabrielsen 2009; Rohde 2012.

8. Kloppenborg and Wilson 1996; Harland 2003; Öhler 2011.

lenistic worlds, and almost exclusively concern only one aspect, the governmental attitudes towards associational activity.<sup>9</sup> In aggregate, the studies presented here aim to widen the perspective, by including the experience of not only the Roman, but also the non-Roman world. In introducing them here, we briefly draw up the thematic and conceptual coordinates indicating their position within the historiography pertaining to this subject.

We begin by addressing the central concepts introduced by the title of this volume: private associations and the public sphere. Neither is far from unproblematic qualifier. For clarity's sake, our Greek sources, no less than the Latin ones, often distinguish between public (*demosion*, *koinon*), private (*idion*) and sacred (*hieron*), whether the specific reference is to physical space, institutions, functions, actions etc.<sup>10</sup> However, as a spate of recent studies rightly argues, the dividing-line between especially private and public is less clear-cut than we have been accustomed to think.<sup>11</sup> These counter-currents force us to reflect on the question *What is a private association?* As well as its corollary *What is really the public sphere with which it interacts?* Approaches to both of these questions vary. We begin with the associations.

On the question of *What is a private association?* the papers of our volume, for entirely justifiable reasons, could not possibly respond to the preliminary findings of the *Copenhagen Associations Project*, which

---

9. Linderski 1968; Gracco-Ruggini 1973; Ausbüttel 1982; Cotter 1996; De Ligt 2000; Arnaoutoglou 2002; Liu 2005. On the relatively rich historiography of the Roman *collegia*, see Tran 2001; Perry 2006.

10. E.g. Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 6.1 (*idia* and *demosia* for debts), 43.6 (for matters discussed in the Assembly); *IG I<sup>3</sup> 84*, l. 36 (*oikia demosia*); Arist. *Pol.* 1267b 33ff. (division of city territory into *hiera*, *demosia/koine* and *idia*). References to *hiera* or *hiera kai hosia* in the Attic Orators: e.g. *Dem.* 24.120; *Is.* 6.47. See Lewis 1991. Additionally, *demoteles* is used for sacrifices (*Hdt.* 6.57.1) and festivals (*Thuc.* 2.15.2); Pirene-Delforge 2005. Macé (2012) treats the historical development of these and related terms.

11. Arnaoutoglou 1998; de Polignac and Schmitt-Pantel 1998; Belayche and Mimouni 2003; Dasen and Piérart 2005. From a philosophical perspective: Geuss 2001, who (p. 106) refutes the idea that there existed a single substantive distinction between public/private, though he still finds it useful, provided the specific context in which it is used is made clear.

was launched in April 2011.<sup>12</sup> One of the tasks with which this project is currently engaged is the preparation of a comprehensive, electronically accessible inventory of all known private associations in the Greek-speaking world from *ca.* 500 BC to *ca.* AD 300 (*CAP Inventory & Database*). Constructing a set of reliable criteria on which to identify the bodies to be included in the inventory became a matter of highest priority. Two circumstances, however, make this task difficult. Firstly, certain indications urge us to be alert to the possibility—indeed, the likelihood—that the phenomena under investigation were evolving during the long time-span covered by the project. Consequently, any general definitions that might be valid for, say, the fourth century BC cannot automatically be assumed to apply to later or earlier periods as well. Secondly, a set of reliable criteria can presumably be established only *after* the extant material has been thoroughly examined and the projected inventory of the private associations has been compiled; otherwise we would inevitably be committing the error of putting the proverbial cart before the horse. Additionally, since geographical variants occur, what is valid in one place or on a given time may not be valid in another place at the same time; and this is one of the sides of the fact that the ancient associations were phenomena very much embedded in the societies where they were active. Much as we would like to have a solid definition, these difficulties cannot be overcome at present. As an interim solution, the following definition and criteria are used.

A private association in the Greek-speaking world is an organization that possesses one or more of the following characteristics.<sup>13</sup>

1. **Proper name.** In addition to describing itself (or being described by others) through the use of the word for ‘association’ (e.g. Greek *koinon*), an association may be distinguished by its proper name. Moreover, besides the all-encompassing term for association (e.g. *koinon*) and a proper name, an association is very often identified by the use of a descriptive term that is shared by several other associations. In many cases that term is proven to belong exclusively to

---

12. <http://copenhagenassociations.saxo.ku.dk>.

13. The following summarizes *CAP Inventory Guidelines*, section 1.

non-state organizations: e.g. Greek *thiasos/thiasitai*, *eranos/eranistai*, *orgeones*, etc. In certain instances, however, private associations are seen to use a descriptive term that is also used by (and sometimes is better known for) groups of citizens forming a subdivision of the state (e.g. *phratría*).<sup>14</sup>

2. **Organization.** A private association possesses some internal organization, which determines the distribution of functions among the membership and assists the association in its activities. Internal organization is important also as an indication of **durability**, or at least of *intended* durable existence (as opposed to ephemeral existence). It is particularly the criterion of organization that distinguishes private *associations* from other kinds of network or looser, non-permanent groups (e.g. a group of individuals united only for the purpose of making a dedication).<sup>15</sup>

3. **Membership.** A private association has a clearly defined membership separating those individuals who share in the duties and privileges of membership from those who do not. The rules for membership entrance and exit are made and enforced by the association itself and, crucially, membership in a private association is not a requirement for citizenship. It is in this regard that private associations distinguish themselves from the associations of the state (i.e. state subdivisions): in the latter, enrolment is compulsory, relies on birth or naturalization and regards membership of the group in question as proof of possession of citizenship.<sup>16</sup> Here it should be noted that we deliberately avoid the term *voluntary association*. Though ‘voluntary’ is occasionally used in a technical sense for the absence of *state-coerced* membership in associations, this technical sense is potentially at odds with the literal sense of ‘voluntary’

---

14. Carbon 2005, 3 (early Hellenistic): ἡ φρατρία τῶν Δαρρῶνιστων. Bresson 2013 on *INapoli* no. 44 (194 AD), A, line 9: γνῶμη ἀπάντων φρητόρων (association of the Phratry of *Artemisioi*), and no. 43 (late 1st BC - early 1st AD: association of the Phratry of *Aristaioi*).

15. In Fröhlich and Hamon 2013, such non-associations are simply referred to as ‘groupes’, a rather amorphous description.

16. Jones 1991.

resulting in much conceptual ambiguity. This is all the more undesirable since the literal sense is for some cases clearly an inappropriate description.<sup>17</sup> Therefore, although in spite of its own imperfections, *private* associations is to be preferred. Even though the contributions to this volume originated before the above preliminary criteria were constructed, they all employ a notion of private association that is quite in accord with these criteria.

A final note on private associations leads us to a few remarks on the public sphere. Emphatically, private here means essentially *non-state* rather than *non-public* and it is perhaps on this that the contributions collected in this volume stand out from previous scholarship on the subject. P. Foucart, E. Ziebarth, F. Poland and J.P. Waltzing – the founding fathers of research in this field – identified the public sphere almost exclusively with the state.<sup>18</sup> The ground had already been prepared by the Roman jurists of the second century AD, who in defining the *collegia* stressed the likeness of their organization to that of the state (their passing of resolutions, possession of common finances and a hierarchy of magistrates, etc.), but at the same time also underlined their character as bodies different from the state.<sup>19</sup> Hence, several modern studies made it their purpose to establish the legal parameters of the division between *koina/collegia* and the

---

17. The *koinon tou andreiou ton syggenon*, founded by Epikteta, included members of her family who were pressured to join: *IG XII* 3, 330 (Thera: ca. 200-190 BC). In another case, an association honouring an individual with membership extended the privilege to include his wife and descendants: *IG XII* 3 Suppl., 1296 (Thera, 160-146 BC), ll. 21-25: δεδόχθαι Λάδαμον Διονυσοφά[νου] καὶ αὐτὸν καὶ γυναῖκα καὶ ἐγγόνου[ς] εἶναι θιασίτας, καὶ μετουσίαν ἀφ[τοῖς] [ᾧ]ντ[ερ] καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θιασίτ[αις] μέτε[σιν]. A Demotic papyrus attests to the regulation of the Theban libationists (in Greek: *choachytai*) who declare that anyone who has worked as a libationist for ten year ought to join the association lest he is banned from performing the job: de Cenival 1972, 103-35. See also Thompson in this volume.

18. Foucart 1873; Ziebarth 1896; Poland 1909; Waltzing 1895-1900.

19. Gaius, *Dig.* 3.4.1; 47.22.4, cf. *Lex XII Tab.* 8.27. Cf. de Robertis 1971, 41-55. *Dig.* 47.22.4 makes also reference to Solon's law regarding the right of several bodies to pass resolutions, on condition that these do not go against the enactments of the state (*demosia grammata*). See Jones 1999, 33-50.

state,<sup>20</sup> simultaneously grappling with the intricate issue of whether the former were recognized as a ‘juristical person’.<sup>21</sup> More importantly, perhaps, to indicate that the associations belong to a sphere different from the state’s *public* sphere early scholarship constructed a typological template that still lives on today: it classifies associations into the categories of cult/religious, professional, military, political (e.g. the *hetaireiai*) and social or convivial (e.g. associations of *eranistai*).<sup>22</sup> This classification is almost exclusively based on the name of an association. But as F. Poland himself warned, the name of an association is a poor guide to its purpose or purposes.<sup>23</sup> Furthermore, as many studies have pointed out, since practically every association was devoted to cult worship, all associations were in some sense ‘cult-associations’.<sup>24</sup> That said, names are nevertheless important and a good indication of how an association *conceived of*

20. De Robertis 1971; Ausbüttel 1982 16-17, 92-3.

21. Radin 1910; Kamps 1937; Endenburg 1937, 1-23; Finley 1952, 88-9, 100-6, with notes, and 275 n. 5; von Gierke 1977; Ustinova 2005. Only Ziebarth (1896, 166-83) held that ancient associations were endowed with juridic personality, cf. also Baslez 1998. On this issue it has been customary to follow the distinction of modern German law between *Verein* and *Vereinigung*. While *Verein* is reserved for the voluntary and durable union established by natural or juridical persons around the pursuance of a common purpose, whereby the body so formed obtains legal capacity and juridical personality, *Vereinigung* can also designate – and when is contrasted to *Verein*, it does designate – a looser form of association that lacks legal capacity and juridic personality: *Juristisches Lexikon* (§2 Abs. 1 Vereinsgesetz) [electronic ed.] = BGH Urteil vom 21.1.2001 (Az.: II ZR 331/00); *Gablers Wirtschaftslexikon s.v. ‘Verein’*. See Poland 1909, 164; Endenburg 1937, 1-8, followed by Finley 1952 275 n. 4; but cf. Rohde 2012, 13 n. 9.

22. **Religious** associations (*Kultvereine, associations cultuelles*): e.g. De Cenival 1972 (Egypt); Suys 2005; Egelhaaf-Gaiser and Schäfer 2002; Chiekova 2008 (Black Sea). **Professional** associations (*Berufsvereine, associations professionnelles*): van Nijf 1997; Dittmann-Schöne 2001; Zimmermann 2002. **Military** associations: Launcey 1987, 1001-36. **Social clubs (e.g. *eranistai*)**: Jones 1999, 30, 307 (referring to Arist. *EN* 11601a, 8.9.4-6), but see Thomsen 2015. See also Waltzing 1895-1900: vol. 1, 32-3; Ausbüttel 1982, 29.

23. Poland 1909, 6: ‘Der Name einer Gennossenschaft braucht aber doch nicht ihren Zweck anzudeuten’. Cf. also Gabrielsen 2001, 218.

24. Leiwo 1997; Wilson 1996, 7; Bendlin 2002, 15 with n. 30; Scheid 2003. Rohde (2012, 14 n. 14) notes the problems caused by this categorization, but chooses to ignore them.

*itself* – its self-representation – and also how it *wished to be identified* by outsiders. Thus, as long as certain issues remain unresolved, and as long as no alternative typological template has been widely accepted, the papers of this volume – for the purpose of clarity of exposition, above all – follow tradition, in the full knowledge that the bodies they treat, whatever their description, were in fact multi-purposed and multi-functional.<sup>25</sup>

Precisely these capacities potentially explain two interlinking features observed in recent studies. One is the rich, outward flow of activity that firmly established associational presence in various spheres of city life: the cultic activities of associations are pronounced in the evidence, but economic activities are also readily observable; examples include the associational involvement in money lending through the management of endowments<sup>26</sup> and the central role of associations in the crafts and trade of the Mediterranean world.<sup>27</sup> Together all these activities are evidence of the second feature, a remarkable degree of *societal* integration.<sup>28</sup> Societal integration is to be contrasted with the social integration for which associations have often and rightly been regarded as an important vehicle, bringing together members of different walks of life—perhaps most importantly, citizens and foreigners.<sup>29</sup> By societal integration, furthermore, we mean both the ability of private associations established by foreigners or other population groups to penetrate traditional barriers (particularly sturdy in the Greek-Hellenistic *polis*) and so become part of the social fabric of their host society; *and* the transformation and redrawing of those boundaries. To illustrate this we offer briefly three examples, two from Athens, one from Rhodes:

---

25. See, e.g., Kloppenborg 1996; Gabrielsen 2001, 237; Liu 2009, 4-5; Arnaoutoglou 2011.

26. Sosin 2002; Gabrielsen 2008; Liu 2008.

27. van Nijf 1997, 16-17, *contra* Finley 1973/1985, 137-38 (guilds were an integral element in the medieval city, but not in the ancient). See also Gabrielsen 2001; Verboven 2011. For Egypt: van Minnen 1987, 49-51; Monson 2006; Gibbs 2001.

28. van Nijf 1997, esp. 28; Bendlin 2002; Baslez 2007; Gabrielsen 2009; Rodhe 2012, 32-59. See also the papers in Hasenohr and Müller 2002 and in Fröhlich and Hamon 2013.

29. Baslez 2007. For the involvement of elite citizens: Tran 2006; Thomsen 2013.



(i) When, in 138/7 BC, the Athenian *orgeones* worshipping Aphrodite honoured Serapion from Heraclea, their *epimeletes*, they justified their award by mentioning (among other things) that Serapion had performed good-omen-producing sacrifices ‘on behalf of the association of the *orgeones*, including their children and wives, and on behalf of the *demos* of the Athenians’.<sup>30</sup>

(ii) In the later fourth century, the Thracian association of *orgeones* worshipping Bendis (a deity integrated into the Athenian state pantheon) not only had officially recognized public duties in connection with the celebration of the goddess’ festival, but also resolved to make their sanctuary (the *Bendideion*) public by allowing non-members (whom they call ‘private individuals’, *idiotai*) to use it and to offer sacrifices to Bendis for a fee.<sup>31</sup>

(iii) Among the bodies honouring Hieroboula, the wife of Kallistratos, priest of Athena in Lindos in AD 23, is one that, on this particular occasion, seems to act like a federation of associations, for it actually consists of ‘all the *eranoi* associations that were in existence simultaneously during the priesthood of Kallistratos’.<sup>32</sup>

Societal integration of the sort exemplified here is the result of successful enrolment of human energies within an organizational framework geared to planning and implementing collective action; in the Rhodian example, the enrolment is seen to have moved to a higher level, from that of the individual association to that uniting all the associations in the city – a *koinonia koinonion*, as it were. Above all, however, societal integration is the boon (the essential side-effect?) derived from the investment of association-generated resources in *extra*-associational beneficiaries, such as high-status individuals; kindred networks; larger population segments; sanctuaries and their functionaries; or states and their representatives, imperial rulers included. The reciprocity sparked by this helped perpetuate

---

30. *MDAI(A)* 66 (1941) 228, no. 4.

31. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361. See also Arnaoutoglou in this volume.

32. *I.Lindos* 420a. ll. 26-28, cf. Thomsen 2013, 150.

the process, as patronage, benefaction, honorary awards, cultural and religious transfers and economic exchanges each provided the impetus. The overall result was thus the creation of a *public-ness* different from, and considerably larger than, that commonly circumscribed by the state.<sup>33</sup> By duplicating the organization and many of the functions of the state, in short, the associational phenomenon succeeded in becoming simultaneously the creator and a consumer of a rather novel form of public space. In it, just as the traditional distinctions between *demosion*, *idion* and *hieron* were amalgamated, so, too, the time-honoured, but hitherto separate, notions of the ‘citizen’ (*ho polites*), the ‘worshipper’ (*ho metechon tou hierou/ton hieron*) and the ‘private individual’ (*ho idiotês*) merged to form a single notion: the ‘associate’ (*ho metechon ton koinon/tou koinou*). Whether the inspiration for labelling this new space should come from such more recent coinages as that of *Öffentlichkeit* or *Civil Society* remains to be seen.<sup>34</sup> For present purposes, however, we can perhaps make do with the (admittedly not wholly satisfactory) description *the fourth space*. Yet, whatever its name, it, too, can now be said to make a strong claim to ‘the public sphere’ with which the associations of this volume’s chapters are seen to have interacted. We provide a brief overview:

Ilias Arnaoutoglou (Chapter 1) opens the volume with the Athenian Bendis associations and the Athenian state’s interest in the Thracian goddess. The introduction of Bendis to Athens in the fifth century has been ascribed to Athenian interests in securing the support of the Odrussian king Sitakles, but based on attestations of the worship of Bendis in Thrace Arnaoutoglou argues in favour of associating the importation of the goddess with Athenian territorial ambitions in the area of what would be Amphipolis. Arnaoutoglou reviews the evidence for the Athenian and Salaminian Bendis associations whose members (in the Thracian orgeones of the Piraeus) kept the memory of Athens’ fifth-century infatuation for the Thra-

---

33. For the description ‘the corporate state’: Thomsen 2013.

34. *Öffentlichkeit*: Habermass 1962, cf. Bendlin 2002, 18. *Civil Society*: Taylor 1991, cf. Thomsen 2013, 142-155.

cian goddess alive well into the third century. Matthias Haake (Chapter 2) examines the legal status of the so-called philosophical schools as well as various aspects of their internal organization. These schools were a wholly private phenomenon, but caught the eye of the state in the years following the expulsion from Athens of Demetrios of Phaleron. The Athenians decreed to make leadership of the schools subject to formal approval by the boule and demos, but the decision was quickly overturned. The successful challenge to Sopholes' Law, Haake argues, might well have been based on the Solonian law of associations (Gaius, *Dig.* 3.4.1), by which associations were free to have their own rules as long as they did not conflict with those of the state. If so, Haake argues, then we are justified in seeing the philosophical schools as associations. This receives further support from various aspects of internal organisation. The role of professional associations in education in the cities of Hellenistic and Imperial Asia Minor is the subject of Maria Paz de Hoz's contribution (Chapter 3). The evidence for professional associations of teachers is discussed in detail and with it various aspects of their internal organisation. The associations were awarded a space in public sanctuaries and formed ties with members of the local elite, who in many cases had personal interests in the education of their fellow citizens. Alexandru Avram (Chapter 4) offers a discussion of a handful of newly published inscriptions from the Black Sea which offer insights into local cult associations, including the early attestation (perhaps second century BC) in Tanais. A few inscriptions invite a renewed discussion of the 'family metaphor' in private associations and its importance in establishing social hierarchies.

Stéphanie Maillot (Chapter 5) offers a study of the foreigners' associations in Hellenistic Rhodes. Apart from a few ethnic associations attested, most foreigners' associations mixed foreigners of different origins in one association. Maillot discusses various aspects of organisation and activities, among them funerary activities. On analogy with citizens' associations the foreigners' associations formed close ties with prominent members of the community and played a vital role in forming a social platform for wealthy foreigners in Rhodes. Jonathan S. Perry (Chapter 6) revisits the Ephesian

bakers' strike and provides an overview over modern scholarship of this central text. A central question treated is the nature of the group, in which Perry detects an embryonic organisation which played a role in the strike. The state response to the strike, Perry suggests, was not directed at the bakers as such, but at their leaders and was an attempt to drive a wedge between the bakers and those who commanded their loyalty. Consequently, the incident should be seen as part of a struggle for the loyalty of the bakers between the state and members of the local elite. Korinna Zamfir (Chapter 7) discusses the organisation of early Christian *ekklesiai* as they are presented in the Pastoral Epistles. In spelling out the organisation and matters pertaining to membership Zamfir compares the *ekklesiai* to associations and finds many similarities. The Pastoral Epistles admonish members of the *ekklesiai* to submit to state authorities and display a concern for maintaining the wider social order.

Professional associations again take centre stage as the volume turns to Egypt. Matthew Gibbs (Chapter 8) discusses various aspects of their organisation and situates the professional associations within the Ptolemaic economy. Gibbs points to sporadic, and still poorly understood, interest in the associations on behalf of the state and its representatives in Ptolemaic Egypt, but also identifies important areas of the economy in which professional associations are likely to have played a part as a force of organisation, especially transport and supply. One other crucial function of the Egyptian professional associations vis-à-vis the state is suggested by Dorothy J. Thompson's treatment of the Ptolemaic state's use of associations in connection with taxation (Chapter 9). The *ethnos*, which signified a group subject to tax within the Ptolemaic administration, Thompson argues, was based on private associations and adopted by the state to ease the process of collecting taxes and maximizing the revenue (as well as tax-farmer profits). These associations were largely organized around a shared occupation with pronounced social and religious aspects and served several purposes in organizing work and resolving disputes within the occupation and between the associations and outsiders, wholly independently of the state. But the associations ensured the payment of taxes by members and punished members for failing to pay, in effect lending their private or-

ganizational muscle to the state and its (private) tax-collectors. A similar role is ascribed to the *politeumata*. The ethnic *politeumata* are treated extensively by Thomas Kruse (Chapter 10), who discusses several aspects of organisation. Though essentially units of public administration, the *politeumata* enjoyed considerable autonomy in regulating the affairs of their members, soldiers of common origin and their dependents. Kruse raises the possibility that the *politeumata* originated in private military *koina* (attested both in Cyprus and in Egypt), which over time were formally recognized and granted privileges of self-government. The place of professional associations in Egyptian society is taken up again by Philip Venticinque (Chapter 11), but this time in the Imperial period. In spite of open hostility towards associations in the upper echelons of Roman administration, Venticinque points to a remarkable civic presence of associations and apparently good relations with local notables. Local officials relied on the associations for organizing labour and goods, not just for carrying out their official tasks, but also for their private benefactions to the community. Cooperation was not always smooth, and Venticinque adduces evidence from legal disputes that suggests that the importance of associations for the running of affairs provided these with a base from which to assert themselves and hold their own as partners of the local elite.

It remains for us to express our warmest thanks to the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters and the Carlsberg Foundation for their generous financial support. Thanks are also due to the colleagues who accepted our invitation to peer-review the contributions collected here and also to the two peer reviewers of the press. Furthermore, we would like to thank our colleagues in the *Copenhagenm Associations Project*, Dr. Stella Skaltsa and Dr. Mario C.D. Paganini, for their generous help during the preparation of the contributions for publication. Last but not least, we extend our thanks to the contributors themselves and all the conference participants.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aneziri, S. 2001, *Die Vereine der dionysischen Techniten im Kontext der hellenistischen Gesellschaft*. Historie Einzenschriften 163. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Arnaoutoglou, I. 1998, 'Between *koinon* and *idion*: legal and social dimensions of religious associations in ancient Athens', in P. Cartledge, P. Millett and S. von Reden (eds.), *Kosmos. Essays in order, Conflict and Community in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 68-83.
- Arnaoutoglou, I. 2002, 'Roman Law and *Collegia* in Asia Minor', *RIDA* 49, 27-44.
- Arnaoutoglou, I. 2011, 'Craftsmen Associations in Roman Lydia – A tale of two cities', *AncSoc* 41, 257-290.
- Ausbüttel, E. M. 1982, *Untersuchungen zu den Vereinen im Westen des römischen Reiches*. Frankfurter althistorische Studien 11. Kallmünz: Franz Steiner.
- Baslez, M.-F. 1998, 'Les associations dans la cité grecque et l'apprentissage du collectif', *Ktéma* 23, 431-439.
- Baslez, M.-F. 2007, 'Le question des étrangers dans les cités grecques. Intégration et partenariat économique', *Pallas* 74, 213-236.
- Belayche, N. and Mimouni, S.C. (eds.), 2003, *Les communautés religieuses dans le monde gréco-romain. Essais de définition*. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences religieuses 117. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Bendlin, A. 2002, 'Gemeinschaft. Öffentlichkeit und Identität: Forschungsgeschichtliche Anmerkungen zu den Mustern sozialer Ordnung in Rom', in Engelhaaf-Gaiser and Schäfer 2002, 9-40.
- Bresson, A. 2013, 'The *chōrai* of Munatius Hilarianus or Neapolitan phratries as *collegia*', *Mediterraneo Antico* 16:1, 203-222
- Calhoun, G.M. 1913, *Athenian Clubs in Politics and Litigation*. Bouletin of the University of Texas 262, Austin, Texas: The University of Texas.
- Carbon, J.-M. 2005, 'ΔAPPQN and ΔAIMON: A New Inscription from Mylasa', *EA* 38, 1-6.
- Chickova, D. 2008, *Cultes et vie religieuse des cités grecques de Pont gauche (VIIe – Ier siècles avant J.-C)*. Europäische Hochschulschriften 38, Archäologie, vol. 76. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Cotter, W. 1996, 'The *Collegia* and Roman Law. State restrictions on voluntry associations, 64 BCE – 200 CE', in Kloppenborg and Wilson 1996, 74-89.
- Dasen, V. and Piérart, M. (eds.), 2005, 'Ἱδία καὶ δημοσία. *Les cadres 'privés' et 'publics' de la religion grecque. Actes du IXe colloque du Centre international d'Étude de la religion grecque antique (CIERGA), tenu à Fribourg du 8 au 10 septembre 2003*. Centre international d'étude de la religion grecque antique. Kernos Suppl. 15. Liège: Centre International d'Étude de la Religion Grecque Antique.
- de Cenival, F. 1972, *Les associations religieuses en Égypte d'après les documents démotiques*, 2 vols. Publications de l'Institut française d'archéologie orientale du Caire.

- Bibliothèque d'étude 46. Cairo: Institut française d'archéologie orientale.
- de Polignac, F. and Schmitt-Pantel, P. (eds.) 1998, *Public et privé en Grèce ancienne: lieux, conduites, pratiques*. Ktèma 23. Strasbourg: Université March Bloch. Centre de recherches sur le Proche-Orient et la Grèce antiques.
- De Ligt, L. 2000, 'Governmental Attitudes towards Markets and Collegia', in Lo Cascio, E. (ed.), *Mercati permanenti e mercati periodici nel mondo romano. Atti degli Incontri capresi di storia dell'economia antica (Capri 13-15 ottobre 1997)*. Bari: Edipuglia, 237-252.
- de Robertis, F.M. 1971, *Storia delle corporazioni e del regime associativo nel mondo romano*. Bari: Adriatica.
- Dittmann-Schöne, I. 2001, *Die Berufsvereine in den Städte des Kleinasiens*. Theorie und Forschung, Geschichte 16. Regensburg: Roderer, S.
- Eckhardt, B. **(forthcoming)** 'Organisierter Pluralismus. Vereins-, Stadt- und Reichsreligion im antiken östlichen Mittelmeerraum', in D. Gerster, A. Reuter and U. Willems (eds.), *Ordnungen religiöser Pluralität. Wirklichkeit – Wahrnehmung – Gestaltung*. Religion und Moderne 3. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus Verlag.
- Egelhaaf-Gaiser, U. and Schäfer, A. (eds.) 2002, *Religiöse Vereine in der römischen Antike. Untersuchungen zu Organisation, Ritual und Raumordnung*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Endenburg, P.J.T. 1937, *Koinonia en Gemeenschap van Zaken bij de Grieken in den klassieken Tijd*. Diss. Univ. of Utrecht. Amsterdam.
- Finley, M.I. 1952, *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500-200 BC: the Horos-Inscriptions*, New Brunswick-New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- M.I. Finley 1973/1985, *The Ancient Economy, Updated Edition With a Foreword by Ian Morris*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Fisher, N.R.R. 1988, 'Greek Associations, Symposia, and Clubs', in M. Grant and R. Kitzinger (eds.), *Civilizations of the Ancient Mediterranean: Greece and Rome*, New York: Scriber's, 1167-97.
- Foucart, P. F. 1873, *Des associations religieuses chez les grecs. Thiasos, éranes, orgéones*. Paris. Reprinted, New York: Arno Press, 1975.
- Fröhlich, P. and Hamon, P. (eds.) 2013, *Groupes et associations dans les cités grecques (IIIe siècle av. J.-C. – IIe siècle apr. J.-C.) Actes de la table ronde de Paris, INHA, 19-20 juin 2009*. Hautes Études du Monde Gréco-Romain 49. Geneva: Librairies Droz.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2001, 'The Rhodian Associations and Economic Activity', in Z. Archibald, J. Davies, V. Gabrielsen and G.J. Oliver (eds.) *Hellenistic Economies*. London and New York: Routledge, 215-244.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2008, 'The Public Banks of Hellenistic Cities', in Verboven, Vanderpe and Chankowski 2008, 115-130.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2009, 'Brotherhoods of Faith and Provident Planning: The

- Non-Public Associations of the Greek World', in I. Malkin, C. Constantakopoulou and K. Panagopoulou (eds.) *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean*. London and New York: Routledge, 176-198.
- Geuss, R. 2001, *Public Goods, Private Goods*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gibbs, M. 2011, 'Trade Associations in Roman Egypt', *AncSoc* 41, 291-315.
- Gracco-Ruggini, L. 1973, 'Stato e associazioni professionali nell'età imperiale romana, in *Akten des VI. Internationalen Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik*. Munich, 273-274.
- Habermass, J. 1962, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit. Untersuchungen zur einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt a. Main: Suhrkamp.
- Harland, P.A. 2003, *Associations, Synagogues and Congregations. Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Müller, C. and Hasenohr, C (eds.), 2002, *Les Italiens dans le monde grec, II<sup>ème</sup> siècle av. J.-C. - I<sup>er</sup> siècle ap. J.-C. Circulation, activités, intégration. Actes de la Table ronde École normale supérieure Paris 14-16 mai 1998*. BCH Suppl. 41. Paris and Athènes: de Boccard.
- Jones, N.F. 1991, 'Enrollment Clauses in Greek Citizenship Decrees', *ZPE* 87 (1991) 71-102.
- Jones, N.F. 1999, *The Associations of Classical Athens: The Response to Democracy*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kamps, W. 1937, 'Les origines de la fondation culturelle dans la Grèce ancienne', *Archive d'histoire du droit orientale (AHDO)* 1, 145-179.
- Kloppenborg, J.S. 1996, 'Collegia and Thiasoi: Issues in function, taxonomy and membership', in Kloppenberog and Wilson 1996, 16-30.
- Kloppengborg, J.S. and Wilson, S.G. (eds.) 1996, *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Launey, M. 1987, *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques. Reimpression avec addenda et mis à jour en postface par Y. Garlan, P. Gauthier and C. Orrieux*. Paris: De Boccard.
- Le Guen, B. 2001, *Les associations de Technites dionysiaques à l'époque hellénistique*, 2 vols. Nancy: Association pour la Diffusion de la Recherche sur l'Antiquité - De Boccard.
- Leiwo, M. 1997, 'Religion or other reasons? Private Associations in Athens', in J. Frösen (ed.) *Early Hellenistic Athens. Symptoms of a Change*. Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 6. Helsinki: The Finnish Institute at Athens, 103-117.
- Lewis, D.M. 1991, 'Public Property in the City', in O. Murray and S. Price (eds.) *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 245-263.
- Linderski, J. 1968, 'Die Senat und die Vereine', in M. Andreev *et al.* (eds.), *Gesellschaft und Recht im griechisch-römischen Altertum: eine Aufsatzsammlung*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 94-132.
- Liu, J. 2005, 'Local Governments and Collegia: A new appraisal of the



- evidence', in J.-J. Aubert and Z. Várhelyi (eds.), *A Tall Order. Essays in Honor of William V. Harris*. Munich and Leipzig: K.G. Saur, 285-316.
- Liu, J. 2007, 'The Economy of Endowments.: The Case of the Roman Collegia', in Verboven, Vandorpe and Chankowski 2008, 231-256.
- Liu, J. 2009, *Collegia Centonariorum: The Guilds of Textile Dealers in the Roman West*. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 34. Leiden and Boston: Brill Academic Press.
- Macé, A. (ed.) 2012, *Choses privées et chose publique en Grèce ancienne. Genèse et structure d'un système de classification*. Collection HOROS. Grenoble. Éditions Jérôme Millon.
- Monson, A. 2006, 'The Ethics and Economics of Ptolemaic Religious Associations' *AncSoc* 36, 221-238.
- Öhler, M. (ed.) 2011, *Aposteldekret und antikes Vereinswesen. Gemeinschaft und ihre Ordnung*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Perry, J.S. 2006, *The Roman Collegia: The Modern Evolution of an Ancient Concept*. Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava, Supplementum 277. Leiden: Brill Academic Press.
- Pirene-Delforge, V. 2005, 'La cité, les *dèmetelè hiera* et les prêtres', in Dasen & Piérart 2005, 55-68.
- Poland, F. 1909, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*. Fürstlich Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig. Historisch-Nationalökonomischen Sektion 23:38. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.
- Radin, M. 1910, *The Legislation of Greeks and Romans on Corporations*, New York: Columbia University.
- Rohde, D. 2012, *Zwischen Individuum und Stadtgemeinde. Die Integration von Collegia in Hafenstädten*. Studien zur Alten Geschichte 15. Mainz: Verlag Antike.
- Scheid, J. 2003, 'Communauté et communauté. Réflexions sur quelques ambiguïtés d'après l'exemple des thiasos de l'Égypte romaine', in Belaysche and Mimouni 2003, 61-74.
- Sosin, J. 2002, 'Two Attic Endowments', *ZPE* 138, 123-128.
- Suys, V. 2005, 'Les associations culturelles dans la cité aux époques hellénistiques et impériale', in Dasen and Piérart 2005, 203-18.
- Taylor, C. 1991, 'Modes of Civil Society', *Public Culture* 3:1 (1991) 95-118.
- Thomsen, C.A. 2013, *The Corporate Polis. The politics of association in Hellenistic Rhodes (323 BCE - 64 CE)*, PhD dissertation, University of Copenhagen.
- Thomsen, C.A. 2015, 'The *Eraniatai* of Classical Athens', *GRBS* 55:1, 154-175.
- Tod, M.N. 1932, 'Lecture III: Clubs and Societies in the Greek World', in M.N. Tod, *Sidelights on Greek History: Three lectures on the Light Thrown by Greek Inscriptions*. Oxford: Blackwell, 71-93.
- Tran, N. 2001, 'Le collège, la communauté et le politique sous le Haute-Empire romain. Historiographie du droit à la fin du XIXe siècle, "tradition

- sociologique” et quelques recherches contemporaines’, *Cahiers du Centre Glotz* 12, 181-198.
- Tran, N. 2006, *Les membres des associations romaines: le rang social des collegiati en Italie et en Gaules, sous le haut-empire*. Collections de l’École française de Rome 367. Rome: École française de Rome.
- Ustinova, Y. 2005, ‘*Leges et consuetudines*: Voluntary Cult Associations and the Greek Law’, in Dasen and Piérart 2005, 177-90.
- Verboven, K. 2011, ‘Professional Collegia: Guilds or Social Clubs?’, *AncSoc* 41, 187-195.
- Verboven, K., Vandorpe, K. and Chankowski, V. (eds.) 2008, *Pistoi dia tèn Technèn. Bankers, Loans and Archives in the Ancient World. Studies in Honour of Raymond Bogaert*. Leuven: Peeters.
- van Minnen, P. 1987, ‘Urban Craftsmen in Roman Egypt’, *MBAHG* 6.1, 31-88.
- van Nijf, O. 1997, *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*. Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology 17. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.
- von Gierke, O.F. 1977, *Associations and Law. The Classical and Early Christian Stages*. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.
- Waltzing, J.-P. 1895-1900, *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu’à la chute de l’Empire d’Occident*, 4 vols. Louvain: Peeters.
- Wilson, S.G. 1996, ‘Voluntary Associations: An overview’, in Kloppenborg and Wilson 1996, 1-15.
- Ziebarth, E. 1896, *Das griechische Vereinswesen*. Fürstlich Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig, Historisch-Nationalökonomischen Sektion 21:34. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.
- Zimmermann, C. 2002, *Handwerkervereine in griechische Osten des Imperium Romanum*. Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseums Mainz. Forschungsinstitut für Vor- und Frühgeschichte 57. Mainz: Verlag des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums in Kommission bei Rudolf Habelt.

# Cult Associations and Politics: Worshipping Bendis in Classical and Hellenistic Athens

*Ilias Arnaoutoglou*

## 1. Introduction

In ancient Athens there was not any linear, causal relation between the politics of the city-state and private cult associations. Instead, there was a firm connection linking the introduction of a foreign cult with the Athenian *polis*; Athenians reserved the right to grant the necessary means to groups of foreigners, defined as *ethne*, in order to make veneration of their deities possible. This was the case with the traders from Kition and the Egyptians, both of whom are referred to in inscription *IG II<sup>3</sup> 337 (333/32)*.<sup>1</sup> The entrance of Thracian Bendis into the Athenian pantheon followed the oracular path, not via the traditional Delphic route but through the oracle of Zeus in Dodona. Accounts of her introduction in Athens usually treat her as an exotic goddess who came from a distant land. Recent scholarship has focused on the marginality of the cult in the Attic landscape and on the ‘otherness’ of the goddess.<sup>2</sup> Scholars have been

---

1. The decree concerns the grant of *enktesis* to the traders from Kition; the Egyptians are mentioned as a precedent in ll. 42-45, therefore their *enktesis* antedate that of the Kitians. For the inscription see also *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 280; Michel 104; Tod II 189; *LSCG* 34; *SIRIS* 1; Schwenk (1985, no. 27); Rhodes – Osborne, *GHI* 91; *IKition* T159; *SEG* 24.98; 25.67; 35.239; 36.154; 39.84; 42.229 & 1803; 46.2361; 47.26, 961, 2320; 49.100, 2471; 52.93; 53.365(4) & 2180; 54.151 & 1535; 55.30; *BE* 1964, no. 82; Poland (1909, no. E2). Translations: Le Guen (1991, 81); Brodersen (1996, 262); Kearns (2010, 337). For the decree see Rhodes – Lewis (1997, 26). I am indebted to Vincent Gabrielsen who provided the occasion to deal with the thorny subject and to the anonymus referee whose remarks prompted me to clarify certain points. All remaining infelicities are mine.

2. See Montepaone (1990), Stavrianopoulou (2005) and Deoudi (2007). Blomart

struggling to come to terms with the meteoric rise of Bendis to the pantheon of deities whose cult was sponsored by the Athenian *polis*, and the equally resounding retreat from the epigraphic limelight. Before I proceed to a discussion of the sources about Bendis' worship in Athens, let me put forward my working hypothesis. The introduction and the oscillation of Bendis' (public and private) cult between front scene and backstage depended largely on the maneuvering of the Athenian *polis* in the inter-*poleis* politics. To put it bluntly, the addition of Bendis into the group of publicly funded cults as well as her temporary prominence was due to the political dynamics over time. The topics to be discussed include 1) the way we understand her 'Thracian' background through inscriptions and reliefs found in central-southern Bulgaria, northern Greece and the European part of Turkey, 2) the date and the circumstances of the deity's adoption by the *polis*, and 3) the epigraphic dossier concerning her cult by non-public groups in the fourth and third centuries.

## 2. Bendis at home?

Research associates Bendis with Thrace on the basis of mainly Athenian pieces of evidence; nevertheless our knowledge about Bendis in Thrace comes from two different kinds of sources, epigraphic (in particular onomastics) and archaeological, most often dated in the Roman era.<sup>3</sup> Epigraphic testimonies of theophoric Bendis-names

---

(2000-2001, 19-20) and (2001) argued that the cult of Bendis in Athens has all the characteristics of 'alterité'; he also claims that the Athenian version of the cult has got the label 'Thracian' not referring to the origin but as a synonym of the 'strange', the 'alien'. Further in Blomart (2002b) it is argued that Bendis received the treatment of a metec.

3. See recently Goceva (2003, 171) who doubts whether Bendis should be considered a Thracian deity 'étant donné qu'il n'en subsiste aucun vestige en Thrace même. Son nom ne se trouve mentionné nulle part. On ne le rencontre même comme épithète à l'époque romaine et on n'emploie jamais en Thrace son iconographie sous sa variante grecque, bien qu'on accepte que les représentations des dieux barbares, qui n'ont pas de noms et ne sont appelés que Theoi, selon Hérodote, sont créées à l'époque hellénistique sous l'influence grecque'. She suggests that Bendis' cult came to Athens from Bithynia. However, Goceva's suggestion cannot account for the public worship of a Bithynian deity, the lack of Bendis personal names in Bithynia (e.g.

constitute a reliable indication about the spread of the cult because personal names, thanks to their conservatism, preserve the attachment to an old, pre-Greek cult, when other pieces of evidence (e.g. dedications or statues) may disappear or are prone to syncretism.

According to the onomastic evidence, Bendis appears to have been popular in clusters in Hellenistic – Roman Maroneia and Byzantion, and in imperial Thasos, Philippoi, and Philippopolis (mod. Plovdiv).<sup>4</sup> Apart from these nuclei, Bendis-names are attested in an area delimited to the north by the upper course of Evros (Marica) river, south by the Aegean Sea, east by the Black Sea and west by the middle and lower course of Strymon (Struma) river.<sup>5</sup> Five

---

see *LGN* v.1) and its abundance in the European shore of Bosphorus, and finally the place name in the vicinity of Philippopolis (see below note 7).

4. Maroneia: *IaegThrace* 268 (2nd /1st century): Βενδ[ις]/ Μη[τρο]/φάνο[υς]/ *vacat*/ [ό δ-] ήμο[ς]; *IaegThrace* 279 (2nd century AD): Βενδ[ις] Δουκίλου γ[υνη]/ Μηγόδοτος Ίσιδ[ό]ρου/ *vacat*/ ό δ[η]/μο[ς]; *IaegThrace* 379 (Imeros, 3rd century AD): Αλέξανδρος Ταρούλου ό και Βέβιος, Βενδ[ι]ον Πούφο<υ>/<Ζ>ώσιμος Ταρούλο<υ>/ *vacat*/ ό δ[η]μο[ς]; *IaegThrace* 386 (Asomatoi, 3rd century AD): Ίουλιανός Δολέου Βένδ[ι] Βίζου τη πενθερά μνείας/ χάριν. Byzantion: *I. Byzantion* 11 (3rd century): Όλυμπιόδωρος Μενιδιόδρου; *ISamothrace* 27, 5 (Robert, *OMS* 6, 603-5) (Byzantion?, Hellenistic): [Βε]νδιδωρος; *I. Byzantion* 296 (3rd century AD): Αύρ. Μενδ[ι]ας Φύλωνος. Thasos: *BCH* 91 (1967) 41 (Imperial): Βενδ[ις] Εύτωχι[νο]ς; *BCH* 97 (1973) 159 no. 11 (Imperial): Βενδ[ι]ος Διέου; *BCH* 97 (1973) 161 no. 13 (Imperial): Βενδ[ι]ς Νικομάχου; *IG XII*, 8 478 (Imperial): Ζόη Βενδιδ[ο]ς/ χαίρει; Dunant – Pouilloux, *Recherches sur Thasos*, II, 178 no. 13 (Imperial): Βενδ[ι]ς [---]τος [προσφιλ[ι]ς] χ[ε]ρ[ε]; *IG XII* (8) 622 (3rd century AD): Βενδ[ι]ος Τυ — — — / Αύρ(ήλιος) Εύτωχο[ς]; *IG XII Suppl.* 460 (Imperial): Διογένης/ Βενδιδ[ο]ς/ προσφιλ[ι]ς/ χαίρει; *IG XII Suppl.* 493 (Imperial): Βενδ[ι]ς Ζευστάδος; *IG xii Suppl.* 504 (Imperial): [Β]ενδ[ι]ς [— —]. Philippoi: Collart (1937, 442 n. 1) (Imperial): --- *Valeriae quae et Bendis uxori*; Pilhofer (2000: no. 134) (Imperial): *B[en]/dis Ruffa mari]/to ...*; Pilhofer (2000, no. 638) (Eletheroupolis, Imperial): *Bendis Sauciles filia*; Pilhofer (2000, no. 649) (Georgiane, Imperial): *Bendi Paibis filiae uxori*. Philippopolis: *IGBulg* 956 (Imperial): Βενδ[ι]ος Βάσσου άγαλ[μα — —]/ ΙΕΡ[Ι] — — —]; *IGBulg* 1344 (Burdapa, Imperial): Βενδ[ι]ζητα εύχην; *IGBulg* 1347 (Burdapa, Imperial): Οενδ[ι]ς Δρωδηγους/ εύχα[ριστή]ριον.

5. An exception being *IGBulg* 861 (Markianopolis, Imperial): Βισδης Αντόνης/ Βενδικου. For the above regions see *AD* 26 (1971) Chron. 260 (Ainos, 3rd /2nd century): Διοσκουρίδης Βενδιφάνου; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 9223 (Lysimacheia, 3rd century): Βενδιδώρα Βηρεισιάδου Λουσιμαχίς Μηνοφίλου γυνη; *IGBulg* 1801 (Hadrianoupolis-Duganovo, Imperial): Φλ(αβία) Βενδ[ι]ς σύνβ[ι]ς ένθ[ά]δε — — —]/ ΠΕΡ[Ι]Κ[ — — —]; *IGBulg* 1828 (Hadrianoupolis-Kaminski Dol, Imperial): άγαθ[η] τύχη/ [Βε]νδ[ι]ς Απολλοδώρο[υ]/ [τ]ῆ τέκν[ω] Απολλοδώρο[υ]/ [άνε]θηκεν. χε[ρ]ε, παροδε[ι]τα/ εντόχε; perhaps *IGBulg* 2141 (*IGBulg* 5863, Blatshritsa

inscriptions reveal sanctuaries or place names connected to Bendis, like the boundary stone in Pilhofer (2000, no. 517) (Philippoi-Protsotsani, Imperial): [*B*]endidei/*sacr(um)*, which most likely records the boundaries of a sanctuary (or property) of Bendis, an intriguing reference to a *Mendideum* in Byzantion<sup>6</sup> or three inscriptions dated in AD 211/2 from the area north of Philippopolis which designate the boundaries of land belonging to a locality called *Bendipara*<sup>7</sup> (*-para* being a standard Thracian ending for a village, e.g. *Bessapara*, *Skap-topara*). Bendis-names are also attested in scattered places in mainland Greece, Asia Minor, and the Black Sea region.<sup>8</sup>

---

(mod), Imp): [Μ]ουκατραλις ἔθαπεν θυγατέρα/ Μενδραν ἔνθα φύλητήν/ [ἦν] π[α]ιδεύσας, ἔτεσιν θ, *IGBulg* 2292 (Laskarevo (mod.), Imperial): Δεβαβενός Δειδικουρου γ[υ]νή]; *ILBulg* 176 (Breste (mod), 3rd century AD?): *Bendina Bitua*. Detschew (1955) has argued that Bendis' cult was widespread in the region between the middle and lower Strymon (Struma) and Nestos (Mesta) followed by Popov (1975b, 58), Popov (1975a, 296), Popov (1976, 118ff) and Gerasimova-Tomova (1980). Fol (1986) thinks more likely the assimilation of Artemis with Bendis in the region Strymon – Nestos after the arrival of Artemis; however, recently Goceva (2003, 171) has expressed doubts about this concentration, since the theophoric names are too few and all of the Roman era. For the iconography of Bendis in reliefs from middle Strymon see Cerkeзов (1997, 57-59) and the figure in the funerary banquet of *IGBulg* 2311 table 153 (Vranja, AD 198) and 2346. It remains to be shown that in this area Artemis is not the Hellenized Bendis (Popov 1976, 122), see most recently Marcaccini (1995, 36) and Manov, M. (2008) *La vie dans les établissements situés le long de la cours moyen du Strymon du IVe/IIIe siècles a.C. au IIIe siècle p.C. sur la base des monuments épigraphiques antiques*, Sofia (in Bulgarian with an English summary) (= *BE* 2010, no. 430), where a collection of Artemis-names from the area.

6. Livy 38.41: *Romanorum primum agmen extra saltum circa templum Mendidium castra loco aperto posuit* (pertaining to events in 188). See also reference to a *Bendideion* in Alexandria: Synesios, *Ep.* 4.1; *Historia Alexandri Magni*, Recensio γ' 31.36; *Suda* A 2572: Ἀνουβίδειον τόπος τις Βενδίδειον δὲ. Lucian, *Icar.* 24.26 and Scholia in Luc. 21.8.4-5: καὶ ἡ Δωδώνη τότε καὶ ἡ Πίσσα λαμπραὶ καὶ περιβλεπτοὶ πᾶσιν ἦσαν, ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦ καπνοῦ τῶν θυσιῶν οὐδὲ ἀναβλέπειν μοι δυνατόν· ἐξ οὗ δὲ ἐν Δελφοῖς μὲν Ἀπόλλων τὸ μαντεῖον κατεστήσατο, ἐν Περγᾶμω δὲ τὸ ἱατρεῖον ὁ Ἀσκληπιὸς καὶ τὸ Βενδίδειον ἐγένετο ἐν Θράκῃ καὶ τὸ Ἀνουβίδειον ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ τὸ Ἀρτεμίσιον ἐν Ἐφέσῳ.

7. *IGBulg* 5534 (between Stroevo and Trud): κατὰ θεῖαν/ ἀπόφα/σιν τε/θέντες/ ὑπὸ Κ(οῖντου) Ἀ/τρίου Κλο/νίου πρε/σβ(ευτοῦ) Σεββ(αστῶν)/ ἀντιστρ(ατήγου)/ διὰ Μουκί/ου Οὐήρου/ ὄρου/ ἀγροῦ Βεν/δυπαρων, also in *IGBulg* 1455 (Stroevo (mod.)) and *IGBulg* 1472 (Kaloyanovo (mod.)).

8. For a study of the *Bendis* onomastics see Masson (1988) and Parissaki (2007).

Archaeological remains, especially statuettes as votive offerings<sup>9</sup> or depictions on funerary monuments, convey the impression that the cult of Bendis was spread in an area delimited by the Haemos mountain range and the northern Aegean Sea.<sup>10</sup> The rock cut reliefs on the acropolis of Philippoi pose a different question; most of them are dated in the Imperial era and it is not quite clear whether the depiction of a hunting deity refers to Bendis, to Greek Artemis, to Roman Diana or it is the result of an iconographic-religious syncretism of the three.<sup>11</sup>

The nature and the function of Bendis in her native religious system, be it Thracian or Bithynian, remains largely a matter of speculation. It was suggested that Bendis originates in a powerful Eastern Mother of the Gods figure that developed into the Phry-

---

Mainland Greece: *IG XII Suppl.* 585 (Eretria, 2nd century): Βενδιδόρα, *Eretria* 6, 33-34, Bern 1978 (3rd century): Ζηνίβενδης, *MH* 45 (1988) 7: Βενδιδορος Θηβαῖος; *I.Oropos* 565 (3rd/2nd century): Βενδιδόρα/ Σώτου, *SEG* 42.580, 78 (Kalindoia, AD 68-98) Βενζης Διοσκοουρίδου and *IG X*, 2.1 446 (Thessaloniki, 2nd century AD): Μενδης, Asia Minor: *SEG* 16.505 (*BE* 1958, no. 395, Troas-Gergis, 3rd century): Βενδιδόρα/ Μητροφάνου/ Γεργισίου, *AM* 6 (1881) 122 no. 4 (Kyzikos, Imperial): Μενδᾶς, Black Sea: *CIRB* 663 (Pantikapaion, 1st - 2nd century AD): Βενζει θυγάτηρ Μοκαπορευος χάρει, Solomonik, *NEPKh* 147 (Chersonasos Taurica, 3rd century): Μενδικό [Ηρ]αίου Σαννίωνος γυνά. *SEG* 52.1221 (NW Bithynia, Imperial): Ταλάρις Δα[---]/εως ἀνέθ[ηκεν]/μηνός Δί[ου Βεν]/δίδει. Λ[---]/κατὰ ἐπι[τα]/γήν δῶρ[ον], and the occurrence of the month Βενδ(ίδειος) in the calendar of Klaudiopolis, ca. AD 130 (*I. Klaudiopolis* 7), suggesting a cult in that month (see also the 14th-century *chartophylax* Andreas Libadenus who in his work *Nomina mensum* refers to Βενδιαῖος as the name of a month in Bithynia). See Popov (1976, 297), Goceva (1978); Bendis on coin from Bithynia (*LIMC* s.v. *Bendis* 96 no. 6); in Thessaly, Moustaka (2009).

9. See a moulded terracotta from Tanagra (mid 4th century), now in Paris, Louvre CA 159, *LIMC* s.v. *Bendis* 97 no. 10.

10. Popov (1975), Gerasimova-Tomova (1980), Cerkezov (1997) and Deoudi (2009).

11. In contrast to an earlier hypothesis supported by Collart (1937, 443) that the different Dianas of the Roman era were but ‘des formes particulières de la déesse thrace, vers laquelle continuaient d’affluer, après tant d’autres, les hommages des colons romains’, Collart - Ducrey (1975, 222-5), followed by Marcaccini (1995, 9 n.6), remain skeptical on the identity and origin of the deity depicted on the rock cut reliefs. Ducrey (1976, 155-6) thinks that in most of these reliefs the Roman Diana is depicted; Popov (1976, 299) is not inclined to see in Bendis the Greek Artemis. See also Abrahamsen (1995).

gian Kubiliya, the ‘Thracian’ Bendis etc.<sup>12</sup> She was identified with a protector of nature, therefore prone to be blended with the figure of Artemis by the Greeks; almost all the available information we have about Bendis was mediated by Greek sources (authors, artists, inscriptions). Therefore, their examination seems imperative.

### 3. Bendis and the Greeks

Whatever the origin and the routes that Bendis and her cult followed in the Mediterranean world, more solid evidence appears once the Greeks were acquainted with her. The sixth-century composer of iambs from Ephesos, Hipponax was the first to record Bendis as daughter of Zeus and homologous to Kybele.<sup>13</sup> Sometime in the mid fifth century, perhaps in the late 440s, the Athenian comic poet Kratinos in his comedy *Thracian women* calls Bendis δῖλογχον Βένδιν, and a few years later Aristophanes in the lost comedy *Lemnian women* labels her μεγάλη θεός.<sup>14</sup> The most prominent and extant pas-

12. Popov (1976) and Goceva – Popov (1986). See also Hsch. A 1155: Ἀδμήτου κόρη Ἐκάτη τινές δὲ τὴν Βενδῖν.

13. Hipponax, *IEG* frg. 127West: : καὶ Διὸς κούρη Κυβήβη καὶ Θρεϊκίη Βενδῖς; also Hsch. K 4372. Herodotus does not mention her by name, Hdt. 5.7: Θεοὺς δὲ σέβονται μούρους τοῦσδε, Ἄρεα καὶ Διόνυσον καὶ Ἄρτεμιν. οἱ δὲ βασιλέες αὐτῶν, πάρεξ τῶν ἄλλων πολιτῶν, σέβονται Ἑρμῆν μάλιστα θεῶν, καὶ ὀμνύουσι μόνον τοῦτον, καὶ λέγουσι γεγονέναι ἀπὸ Ἑρμῆος ἑσθλοῦς; see discussion in Popov (1976, 115-7).

14. Kratinos’ fragment: Hsch. Δ 1847: δῖλογχον τὴν Βενδῖν. οὕτω Κρατῖνος ἐν Θράτταις (*PCG* IV Cratinus, F85K-A) ἐκάλεισεν, ἦτοι ὅτι δύο τιμὰς ἐκληρώσατο, οὐρανιαν τε καὶ χθονίαν (λόγχαζ γὰρ ἐκάλουν τοὺς κλήρους) ἢ ὅτι δύο λόγχαζ φέρει, κυνηγετικὴ οὖσα. οἱ δὲ ὅτι δύο φῶτα ἔχει, τὸ ἴδιον καὶ τοῦ ἡλίου. τὴν γὰρ σελήνην Βενδῖν καὶ Ἄρτεμιν νομίζουσιν. Phot. Δ 590: Δῖλογχον Βενδῖν διαπλάσσειται παρὰ τισιν ἢ Ἄρτεμιν δύο λόγχαζ ἔχουσα παρὸ καὶ Ἀθήνησι πομπεούντες δύο λόγχαζ ἔχουσι τοῖς Βενδιδαίοις, ἢ δύο τιμῶν λελογχῖαν, οὐρανιαν καὶ ἐπιγείων. ἢ τὴν δύο λαμπάδας ἔχουσαν λόγχαζ δὲ καὶ ἔγχη τὰς δάδας λέγεσθαι. See also Str. 10.3.16: Τοῦτοις δ’ ἔοικε καὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῖς Θραξὶ τὰ τε Κοτύττια καὶ τὰ Βενδιδαία, παρ’ οἷς καὶ τὰ Ὀρφυκὰ τὴν καταρχὴν ἔσχε. Τῆς μὲν οὖν Κόττωος τῆς ἐν τοῖς Ἡδωνοῖς Αἰσχόλος (*TGF* III F57) μέμνηται καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὴν ὀργάνων. Aristophanes’ fragment: Hsch. M 456: μεγάλη θεός Ἀριστοφάνης ἔφη τὴν Βενδῖν Θρακία γὰρ ἢ θεός. Phot. M 162: μεγάλην θεὸν Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Λημνίαις (*PCG* III (2) F384K-A) ἴσως τὴν Βενδῖν Θράκιος γὰρ. See also Hsch. B 514: Βενδῖς ἢ Ἄρτεμιν Θρακιστὶ παρὰ δὲ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἑορτὴ Βενδιδαία and Phot. B 126: Βενδῖς Θρακία δαίμων ὀπαδὸς Ἀρτέμιδος. Διὸ καὶ οἱ ἀγείροντες αὐτὴν δῖλογχιδίῳ ἔχρῳντο. See also Simms (1988, 60).



sage, rich in information about the celebration of *Bendideia* in Athens, is provided by Plato in the introduction to his *Republic*. The festivities included a procession of Athenians and Thracians, a night torch-race relay on a horseback (something that perhaps was indeed a novelty) and all night long celebration.<sup>15</sup> In the narrative of the events leading to the ousting of the Thirty tyrants and the restoration of democracy in Athens in 403, Xenophon locates the sanctuary of Bendis in Peiraeus, next to that of Artemis Mounychia.<sup>16</sup>

Archeological evidence include an Attic red-figure *skyphos* (475-

15. Pl. *Resp.* 327a-b: Κατέβην χθές εἰς Πειραιᾶ μετὰ Γλαύκωνος τοῦ Ἀρίστωνος προσευξόμενος τε τῆ θεῶ καὶ ἅμα τὴν ἑορτὴν βουλόμενος θεάσασθαι τίνα τρόπον ποιήσουσιν ἅτε νῦν πρῶτον ἄγοντες, καλὴ μὲν οὖν μοι καὶ ἡ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων πομπὴ ἐδοξεν εἶναι, οὐ μὲντοι ἦττον ἐφαίνετο πρέπειν ἢν οἱ Θρηῆκες ἔπεμπον. προσευξάμενοι δὲ καὶ θεωρήσαντες ἀπῆμεν πρὸς τὸ ἄστυ. 328a-b: καὶ ὁ Ἀδείμαντος, «ἄρά γε, ἦ δ' ὅς, οὐδ' ἴστε ὅτι λαμπράς ἐσται πρὸς ἐσπέραν ἀφ' ἕππων τῆ θεῶ»; «ἀφ' ἕππων;» ἦν δ' ἐγὼ· «καινὸν γε τοῦτο. λαμπράδια ἔχοντες διαδώσουσιν ἀλλήλοις ἀμιγλώμενοι τοῖς ἕπποις; ἢ πῶς λέγεις;» «οὕτως;» ἔφη ὁ Πολέμαρχος, «καὶ πρὸς γε παννυχίδα ποιήσουσιν, ἢν ἄξιον θεάσασθαι· ἐξανασησόμεθα γὰρ μετὰ τὸ δεῦπνον καὶ τὴν παννυχίδα θεασόμεθα. καὶ συνεσόμεθα τε πολλοῖς τῶν νέων αὐτόθι καὶ διαλεξόμεθα. ἀλλὰ μένετε καὶ μὴ ἄλλως ποιεῖτε.» See Kearns (2010, 338-9). For the question of the dramatic date see Nails (1998), a detailed examination of the arguments for the proposed dates; Planeaux (2000-2001) argues for a date in 429/8, while Sakurai – Notomi (2006) for 412. See also the comments of Procl. in Pl. *Politeia*, 1.18.8 & 10 & 12-13 & 15 & 17; 1.19.3; in Pl. *Tim.* 1.8.31; 1.26.12-14; 1.84.27; 1.85.4 & 27 & 29.

16. X. *HG* 2.4.11.7: Οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Φυλῆς ἔτι μὲν ἐπεχειρήσαν μὴ ἀνέναι αὐτούς, ἐπεὶ δὲ μέγας ὁ κύκλος ὢν πολλῆς φυλακῆς ἐδόκει δεῖσθαι οὕτω πολλοῖς οὔσι, συνεσεπράθησαν ἐπὶ τὴν Μουνυχίαν. Οἱ δ' ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεως εἰς τὴν Ἰπποδάμειον ἀγορὰν ἐλθόντες πρῶτον μὲν συνετάξαντο, ὥστε ἐμπλήσαι τὴν ὁδὸν ἢ φέρει πρὸς τε τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Μουνυχίας Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ τὸ Βενδίδειον· καὶ ἐγένοντο βάθος οὐκ ἔλαττον ἢ ἐπὶ πενήκοντα ἀσπίδων. Οὕτω δὲ συντεταγμένοι ἐχώρουν ἄνω. For a collection of the circumstantial evidence for Thracian support for Thrasybulos in the events following Phyle see Middleton (1982). The remains of the sanctuary of Artemis Mounychia were studied by Palaiokrassa (1991) (location of Bendideion [1991, 36 n. 21]) and von Eickstedt (1991: 114 & 176-7). For the affinities between Artemis, Hekate and Bendis in myth and ritual see Viscardi (2010). For later sources see Lucian, *J. Tr.* 8: εὐκαίσι δ' οὖν, ὃ Ζεῦ, οἱ βαρβαρικοὶ προεδρεύουσιν μόνον ὡς τοὺς γε Ἑλληνας ὄρας ὅποιοί εἰσι, χαρίεντες μὲν καὶ εὐπρόσωποι καὶ κατὰ τέχνην ἐσχηματισμένοι, λίθινοι δὲ ἢ χαλκοὶ ὅμως ἅπαντες ἢ οἱ γε πολυτελέστατοι αὐτῶν ἐλεφάντινοι ὀλίγον ὅσον τοῦ χρυσοῦ ἐπιστίλβον ἔχοντες, ὡς ἐπικεχράνθαι καὶ ἐπηγνάσθαι μόνον, τὰ δὲ ἔνδον ὑπόξυλοι καὶ οὔτοι, μυθὼν ἀγέλας ὅλας ἐμπολιτευόμενας σκέποντες· ἢ Βενδῆς δὲ αὕτη καὶ ὁ Ἄνουβις ἐκείνοσι καὶ παρ' αὐτῶν ὁ Ἄττις καὶ ὁ Μίθρης καὶ ὁ Μῆν ὀλόχρυσοι καὶ βαρεῖς καὶ πολυτίμητοι ὡς ἄληθες.

425) depicting Bendis together with Themis, a red-figure *kylix* (475-425) in which Bendis is running holding a spear, a red-figure bell-shaped *krater* dated ca. 370, in which the goddess in her Thracian cap approaches a seated Apollo with Hermes in the background; Bendis is also portrayed with her traditional attire in the reliefs of two honorary decrees, *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1255 and 1256.<sup>17</sup>

Traditionally scholarship regards the introduction of Bendis into the Athenian pantheon as an event of the late 430s. Some have connected it to the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war and the alliance with Sitalkes, king of the Thracian tribe of Odryseis, while other associated the goddess with the plague, although Bendis was not considered as a healing deity.<sup>18</sup>

The interpretation advanced by Nilsson (1942), i.e. introduction of the cult as public between 431/30-429/8 throws light into the political underpinnings of the case; nevertheless, it unduly favours the alliance with the king of the Odrysians Sitalkes as the decisive factor

17. See Goceva – Popov (1986, 96-97) and Deoudi (2007). *Skyphos*: *CVA* Deutschland 54, Tübingen 5, pl. 21, (Deutschland 2638), München 1986 (*LIMC* s.v. *Bendis* 96 no. 2). *Kylix*: *CVA* Italy 34, Verona 1, 3I, pl. 3, 1b (Italia 1531), Roma 1961, see *LIMC* s.v. *Bendis* 96 no. 1 and Tsiafakis (2000, 386-8). *Krater*: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Massachusetts, USA, Boston 1983.553. Decrees: 1255 in the British Museum BM 2155 (Smith (1904: iii 226-7); *LIMC* s.v. *Bendis* 96 no. 3), London and 1256 in Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek IN 462, Copenhagen (*LIMC* s.v. *Bendis* 96 no. 4) with Nilsson (1942, 169-71), Popov (1977), Simms (1988, 66-67) and Güntner (1994, 77-78).

18. Bendis, despite Simms (1988, 61), was most probably known among Athenians earlier than the 440s. Political motivation: Nilsson (1942, 170, 178-83), (1951, 45), followed by Ferguson (1944, 98), Schwenk (1985, 286-7), Garland (1987, 119), Simms (1988, 61) and Parker (1996, 173). Popov (1975b) rightly attributes particular importance to the role of the local Thracian tribe of Edonians, Archibald (1998, 458) interprets the preferential treatment of Bendis as part of an effort to establish contact with the Odrysian elite, cf. Pache (2001) who remarks that Bendis' popularity was due to a somewhat more complex process of assimilation, her appeal goes much deeper and lasts much longer than is warranted by diplomatic concessions or palliative in times of crisis. Healing deity: Ferguson (1949, 157-62) and Planeaux (2000-2001, 179-82). Combination of both: Beschi (2002, 15). For whatever it's worth there is no aetiological myth for the introduction of Bendis' cult (also Garland [1992, 112] and Parker [2005: 380-1]) as for example there was for the Mother of the Gods, see Ruiz Perez (1994), Blomart (2002a) and an overview in Xagorari-Gleissner (2008, 20-24). For aetiology in religious events see Kearns (2010, 67-70).

and underestimates another particular dimension of Athenian policy.<sup>19</sup> A direct association between Bendis and the Athenian-Odryian alliance should demonstrate, at least, that the kingdom of the Odrysians extended or had under control the region where Bendis was popular; however, historians agree now that the tribes living in the eastern bank of Strymon were, at most, allied to Odrysians.<sup>20</sup> The Athenians tried twice to establish a colony in the lower Strymon, near the site of later Amphipolis, an area providing access to fertile lands, timber and minerals (especially silver and gold) of the Pangaiion mountain (already known by the time of Peisistratos in mid sixth century).<sup>21</sup> In the second quarter of the fifth century they have made their presence felt twice; first in 476 with Kimon besieging the Persians at Eion<sup>22</sup> at the estuary of Strymon (eventually conquering it) and the second one in 465 when they have managed to establish a

19. For an updated approach see Archibald (1998, 97), (1999: 456-8), Pache (2001) and Lambert (2010, 161). Cf. Wijma (2007, 2) regarding the introduction of Bendis as a more gradual process. Political overtones in the cult of *Meter Theon* in late 5th century, Blomart (2002b, 29-31).

20. Accounts of the extent of the Odrysian kingdom: Archibald (1998, 114-7), Veligianni-Terzi (2004, 126-7) and Zanni, Gay-des-Combes & Zannis (2007).

21. Aristl. *Ath. Pol.* 15 with Rhodes (1981, 207): καὶ πρῶτον μὲν συνῶκισε περὶ τὸν Θερμαῖον κόλπον χωρίον ὃ καλεῖται Ραϊκηλος, ἐκείθεν δὲ παρήλθεν εἰς τοὺς περὶ Πάγγαιον τόπους, ὄθεν χρηματισάμενος καὶ στρατιώτας μισθωσάμενος, ἔλθων εἰς Ἐρέτριαν ἑνδεκάτῳ πάλιν ἔτει τότε πρῶτον ἀνασώσασθαι βίᾳ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπεχειρεῖ... See Popov (1975b, 56); Wijma (2007, 2) on Peisistratos' mercenaries as constituting the first community of Thracians in Athens.

22. Hdt. 7.107: τῶν δὲ ἐξαιρεθέντων ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων οὐδένα βασιλεὺς Ξέρξης ἐνόμισε εἶναι ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν εἰ μὴ Βόγην μόνον τὸν ἐξ Ἡΐονος, τοῦτον δὲ αἰνέων οὐκ ἐπαύετο, καὶ τοὺς περιόντας αὐτοῦ ἐν Πέρσῃσι παῖδας ἐτίμα μάλιστα, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἄξιος αἴνου μεγάλου ἐγένετο Βόγη· ὃς ἐπειδὴ ἐπολιορκέετο ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων καὶ Κίμωνος τοῦ Μιλτιάδου, παρεὼν αὐτῷ ὑπόσπονδον ἐξελεθεῖν καὶ νοστήσαι ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην, οὐκ ἠθέλησε, μὴ δειλίῃ δόξειε περιεῖναι βασιλεί, ἀλλὰ διεκαρτέρες ἐς τὸ ἔσχατον. ὥς δ' οὐδὲν ἔτι φορβῆς ἐνὶ ἑνὶ τῷ τείχεϊ, συννήσας πυρὴν μεγάλην ἔσφαξε τὰ τέκνα καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὰς παλλακὰς καὶ τοὺς οἰκέτας καὶ ἔπειτα ἐσέβαλε ἐς τὸ πῦρ, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τὸν χρυσὸν ἅπαντα τὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεος καὶ τὸν ἄργυρον ἔσπειρε ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους ἐς τὸν Στρυμόνα, ποιήσας δὲ ταῦτα ἐαυτὸν ἐσέβαλε ἐς τὸ πῦρ. οὕτω μὲν οὗτος δικαίως αἰνέεται ἔτι καὶ ἐς τὸδε ὑπὸ Περσέων. Thuc. 1.98 with Hornblower (1991, 149-50): Πρῶτον μὲν Ἡΐονα τὴν ἐπὶ Στρυμόνι Μήδων ἐχόντων πολιορκία εἶλον καὶ ἠνδραπόδιαν, Κίμωνος τοῦ Μιλτιάδου στρατηγούτου (also D. S. 9.60.2; Plut. *Kimón* 7) with Collart (1937, 64-67), Isaac (1986, 18-21 and 60-62) and Zahrt (2007).

settlement at *Hennea Hodoi* but the whole mission ended up in tatters with the massacre at Drabeskos.<sup>23</sup> The settlement called Amphipolis was established finally in 437/6 by Athenians and other Greeks led by the Athenian *Hagnon*, son of *Nikias*<sup>24</sup> (*LGPN* (II) 22). It is also significant to remind that one of the major deities of Amphipolis was Artemis Tauropolos, already worshipped in two Athenian demes;<sup>25</sup> it is difficult to ascertain why the Athenians chose Artemis unless there were aware of similarities with a local deity or deities. So, one can fairly assume that a) even before the successful establishment of Amphipolis, the Athenians were acquainted with the adjacent area, its inhabitants and their cults, and b) the introduction of Artemis Tauropolos may have facilitated and even accelerated her identification

23. Hdt. 9.75: αὐτὸν δὲ Σοφάναε χρόνῳ ὕστερον τούτων κατέλαβε ἄνδρα γενόμενον ἀγαθόν, Ἀθηναίων στρατηγέοντα ἅμα Λεάγρῳ τῷ Γλαύκωνος, ἀποθανέντῳ ὑπὸ Ἡδώνων ἐν Δάτῳ περὶ τῶν μετάλλων τῶν χρυσεῶν μαχόμενον. Thuc. 1.100.2-3 with Hornblower (1991, 155-6): καὶ ναυοὶ μὲν ἐπὶ Θάσον πλεύσαντες οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ναυμαχία ἐκράτησαν καὶ ἐς τὴν γῆν ἀπέβησαν, ἐπὶ δὲ Στρυμόνα πέμψαντες μυρίους οἰκίτορας αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ζυμμάχων ὑπὸ τοῦς αὐτοῦς χρόνους ὡς οἰκιοῦντες τὰς τότε καλουμένας Ἐννέα ὁδοῦς, νῦν δὲ Ἀμφίπολιν, τῶν μὲν Ἐννέα ὁδῶν αὐτοὶ ἐκράτησαν, ἃς εἶχον Ἡδωνοὶ, προελθόντες δὲ τῆς Θράκης ἐς μεσόγειαν διεφθάρησαν ἐν Δραβήσκῳ τῇ Ἡδωνικῇ ὑπὸ τῶν Θρακῶν ζυμπάντων, οἷς πολέμιον ἦν τὸ χωρίον ζαὶ Ἐννέα ὁδοὶ κτιζόμενον. Thuc. 4.102.2-3 with Hornblower (1996, 320-7): τὸ δὲ χωρίον τοῦτο ἐφ' οὗ νῦν ἡ πόλις ἐστὶν ἐπέειρασε μὲν πρότερον καὶ Ἀρισταγόρας ὁ Μιλήσιος φεύγων βασιλεία Δαρεῖον κατοικήσαι, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ Ἡδώνων ἐξεκρούσθη, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἔτεσι δύο καὶ τριάκοντα ὕστερον, ἐποίκουσ μυρίους σφῶν τε αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τὸν βουλόμενον πέμψαντες, οἱ διεφθάρησαν ἐν Δραβήσκῳ ὑπὸ Θρακῶν. καὶ αὐθις ἐνὸς δέοντι τριακοστῷ ἔτει ἐλθόντες οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, Ἄγνωνος τοῦ Νικίου οἰκιστοῦ ἐκπεμφθέντος, Ἡδῶνας ἐξελάσαντες ἔκτισαν τὸ χωρίον τοῦτο, ὅπερ πρότερον Ἐννέα ὁδοὶ ἐκαλοῦντο. ὀρμῶντο δὲ ἐκ τῆς Ἡϊόνος, ἣν αὐτοὶ εἶχον ἐμπόριον ἐπὶ τῷ στόματι τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἐπιθαλάσσιον, πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι σταδίου ἀπέχον ἀπὸ τῆς νῦν πόλεως, ἣν Ἀμφίπολιν Ἄγνων ὠνόμασεν, ὅτι ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρω περιρρέοντος τοῦ Στρυμόνος (διὰ τὸ περιέχειν αὐτὴν) τείχει μακρῷ ἀπολαβὸν ἐκ ποταμοῦ ἐς ποταμὸν περιφανῆ ἐς θάλασσαν τε καὶ τὴν ἡπειρον ὄκισεν. Also D. S. 12.68. See Perdrizet (1910, 12-13) and Isaac (1986: 23-31).

24. See Isaac (1986, 36-40) and Malkin (1987: 81-84).

25. Cult of Artemis Tauropolos in Athens in the deme of *Halai Aixonidai*, *SEG* 34.103 (second half of the 4th century); in *Halai Araphenidai*, *SEG* 55.252, 10 (mid 4th century). Papastavru (1936, 51) followed by Isaac (1986, 55) calls Artemis Tauropolos 'die thrakische Gottheit'; cult in Amphipolis, *SEG* 40.525 (5th/4th century), *horos* of sanctuary; deity mentioned in *SEG* 28.534 (3rd century); sanctuary, *SEG* 27.245 (*SEG* 33.499) (118); dedication of king Perseus, *SEG* 31.614 (179); dedication of a priestess, *AD* 26 (1971) B2, 471 no. 4 (1st century) and *SEG* 28.536 (Imperial).

with a local deity with similar features. Furthermore, one of the strategies used by the Athenians to legitimize their claims on land was the appropriation of a deity of the area they want to annex or colonize. If this is so, then the introduction of Bendis into the Athenian pantheon would have been simultaneously expedient and easier once it appeared as another form of Artemis (or under the guise of Artemis). Having met Bendis on their first attempts to establish a colony in that area, the Athenians endorsed her cult in Athens as part of their strategy to legitimize their claim to establish a colony and appropriate the adjacent lands.<sup>26</sup> Therefore, the introduction of Bendis' cult into the publicly funded celebrations may not be explained by the overtly political motives spelled out by Nilsson, but by something more ambiguous and perhaps cynical such as a move to usurp the main religious figure of an area and its population in order to appear as legitimate claimant. Acquiring a stake in the lower Strymon could provide Athenians with a privileged position in negotiating with the king of Odrysians, Sitalkes, at the dawn of the Peloponnesian war. Consequently, in order to date the entrance of Bendis into the pantheon of the Athenian *polis*, there is no need to be constrained by the date of the treaty with Sitalkes. It might have happened even before the successful establishment of the colony in Amphipolis, in 437/6. Certainly, the cult of Bendis by individuals (Athenians and 'Thracians') in Attica could have started even earlier. A major problem, however, to antedating the introduction of Bendis in the Athenian pantheon remains; before embarking on the colonizing expedition in the lower Strymon the oracle at Delphoi was consulted,<sup>27</sup> while inscription *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1283, 4-7* (240/39, archon *Polystratos*) refers to an oracle from Dodone, according to which land and sanctuary was granted to the *ethnos* of Thracians. If the introduction of the cult happened at a time when Athenians could consult Delphoi, why the Athenians had chosen to consult Dodone and not Delphoi?

---

26. For this strategy see Nilsson (1951, 33 on Salamis and 44 on the Athenian empire). For the Salaminian *genos* see Robertson (1992, 126-8), Taylor (1997), Lambert (1997), (1999), and Ismard (2010, 224-38). For the case of Amphiaraios when Oropos was granted to Athenians, see Sineux, P. (2007) *Amphiaraios. Guerrier, devin et guérisseur*, Paris.

27. See Bowden (2005, 122) and Parker (1996, 340 n.4).

Scholars assumed that the consultation of the Dodone oracle is directly associated with the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war and the unqualified support of the Delphian oracle for the Spartans.<sup>28</sup> An alternative way to explain the discrepancy is to assume that there were two different consultations regarding Bendis' cult, one to Dodone during a period of strained or even severed relations between Athens and Delphoi and one to Delphoi associated with the colonizing expedition.<sup>29</sup>

While the riddle seemed insoluble, an inscription found in 1936 promised a breakthrough; three fragments of a decree, now *IG I<sup>3</sup> 136*, were discovered in the southwest slope of Mounichia hill in Piraeus and published by N. Pappadakis. Since only fragments A and C join it is difficult to establish with any degree of certainty any continuous text, isolated words convey the impression that it concerns the (re-)organization of a festival to honour Bendis (ll. 8 (partly restored), 13, 35, 39 (restored)) while Thracians had a role to play (l. 15 Θραῖττα). In particular, it seems that apart from the customary prayers at the beginning of the assembly's business (εὔχασθαι), there are isolated references to enemies (τῶν πολεμίων), a statue (τὸ ἄγαλμα), a tax or levy (ἐπαρχεῖς), and all night festival ([- - τ]έν παννυχίδα ποῖν ὅς [κάλλιστα---]), the question to an oracle about the wife of a priest (εἶτε χρὲ γυναῖκα hieréōs), the demand to Athenians to attend the procession ([... c.8 ... Ἀθηναίων πάντων πεμφσάντων), public sacrifice with ten sacrificial victims and their hides (λαμβάνεν τῶν δημοσίου θυο[μένον ...]. [ ...c.7 ... ἀπ]ὸ δέκα hieréion

28. Thuc. 1.112-118 with Hornblower (1991, 181-96), Ferguson (1949, 161) and Parke (1967, 149).

29. For the oracle of Dodone see Parke (1967) with a selection of the questions to the oracle. Eidinow (2007) presents a list of all the known questions by collectivities and individuals. The contacts between Athens and Dodone are discussed in 272-3 n. 37. Examples of questions by collectivities concerning worship in Parke 5 (= Eidinow 10, ca. 330-320) and Parke 6 (= Eidinow 8, end of the 4th century). For the role of oracles in the foundation of new cities and the introduction of cults, see Parker (1985) and Kearns (2010, 328-9). For the relationship between Athens and Delphoi, see Giuliani (2001, 106-9) and on the importance of asking the oracle of Dodone, Stavrianopoulou (2005, 148-9). Note that Athenian access to Delphoi was severely hampered after 446 when Boiotians recovered control of the route.

τὰ δὲ ἄλλα δέρματ[α ... *c.28* ...]), allotment by *hieropoioi* ([ ... *c.5* ... τὸ λοιπὸν κληρὸν περὶ τοῦτον τὸς ἱερο[ποιός ... *c.23*... ]), state officials (κολακρέται, πολεταί)<sup>30</sup> were involved, the council is designated as having absolute power (τὲν βολὲν αὐτοκράτορα ἔναι).<sup>31</sup> Scholars argued about the position of the fragments and their date. Initially, based on the editor's proposition, it was thought that it included two decrees dated before 429, concerning the introduction of the public cult of Bendis. J. Bingen argued rather convincingly that the inscription preserves one decree dated most likely in 413/2 or thereabout and it concerns reforms introduced in the public celebration and regulation of Bendis' cult.

However, the interpretation is again stained with uncertainties once one tries to reconcile the inscription with the passage from Plato's *Republic* 327a-b quoted above. Does the description composed in the early fourth century pertain to the introduction of the public cult, to a reformed celebration (reflected in *IG I<sup>3</sup> 136*) or the setting provides only a dramatic background? Planeaux (2000-2001) has vigorously argued recently that the description in the introductory chapter of *Republic* concerns the inauguration of the public cult, which took place in 429 (based on *IG I<sup>3</sup> 383*, frg. V, 142-143).<sup>32</sup> The situation is getting more complicated since it is believed that the steps towards the inauguration of the public cult are reflected in

30. Ismard (2010, 261) sees in these *polis* magistrates 'un rôle financier dans l'animation du culte'; however, the role of these officials relates to the publication of the decree.

31. Ed. pr. Pappadakis (1937). See also Nilsson (1942, 183-8), Roussel (1943), Ferguson (1949: 134-5), Bingen (1959); review in Simms (1988, 64-65). *Terminus ante quem*: 411 (abolition of *kolakretai*, *Pasiphon* of *Phrearrhioi*, *LGPN* (II) 3). *Terminus post quem*: the word *polemion* dates it in the post-431 period (outbreak of the Peloponnesian war). Ferguson (1949, 133): the three fragments record the inauguration by the Athenians of the public cult of Bendis. Bingen (1959, 35 [reforms]; 36-37 [date of the decree, ca. 413/2]) followed by Simms (1988: 66), Parker (1996: 172) and Lambert (2010: 162). Subsequent literature in *SEG* 10.64; 17.5; 19.19; 21.52; 24.12; 29.17; 36.137; 38.287; 39.324; 41.251; 45.231; 46.21; 47.64; 49.51 & 861; 50.1759; 53.31; 54.2100; and Ismard (2010, 261-2).

32. What significantly weakens Planeaux's argument is the absence of Polemarchos and Kephalos from Athens in the period between ca. 430 to ca. 412, see Simms (1988, 59). Cf. Stavrianopoulou (2005, 147) the introduction of Plato's *Republic* introduces new festivities on an existing celebration.

a decree of the *orgeones* of Bendis when Polystratos was archon (dated now in 240/39), *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283.4-7: ἐπειδὴ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων δεδωκότος τοῖς Θραξῶσι μόνους τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν τὴν ἔγκτησιν καὶ τὴν ἴδρυσιν τοῦ ἱεροῦ κατὰ τὴν μ[α]ντείαν τὴν ἐγ Δωδώνης καὶ τὴν ποντὴν πένπειν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐστίας τῆς ἐκ τοῦ πρυτανείου, (*since the demos of the Athenians has granted solely to the Thracians, among the other ethnē, the right to acquire land and to found a sanctuary according to the oracle from Dodone and to perform the procession from the hearth of the Prytaneion ...*). What, however, the decree makes clear is that only the grant of land and sanctuary were accorded in accordance with an oracle from Dodone. The institution of a procession starting from the hearth of the *polis*, the *prytaneion*, was probably authorized by the Athenian *demos* at a later stage.<sup>33</sup> Therefore, I think that the following reconstruction of events seems more probable: sometime even before 437/6 an oracle from Dodone sanctions the grant of land and sanctuary to the Thracians,<sup>34</sup> which was duly implemented by the Athenians; sometime between 437/6 and 429/8 the cult of Bendis is incorporated into the public pantheon and in ca. 413/2 a second consultation of an oracle about modifications to the celebrations is reflected in the Platonic passage and in *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 136.

From 429/8 onwards the public cult of Bendis appears well established. Bendis' name is securely restored in the accounts of the treasurers of the other gods (concerning the reception of their property in Acropolis) of the same year, *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 383, frg. V, 142-143: Ἀδρα[στείας]/ καὶ Βε[νδίδος] and in the accounts of *logistai* for the year 423/3, *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 369, 67-68: [Ἀδρασ]τείας 86 δρ., τ[όκος τούτο ...]/ [Βενδ]ίδος 86 δρ. τόκος τού[το ---].<sup>35</sup> In Lycourgan Athens, in 331/30 her festival procured a considerable amount of money, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1496, col. IV frg. A, 86: ἐγ Βενδιδέων παρὰ ἱεροποιῶν, 457 δρ., while the dedication in

33. See ll. 6-7 and 10-12; similar interpretation by Ferguson (1944, 97-98). For the social implications of procession see Burkert (1985, 99-101), Graf (1996) and Parker (2005: 178-80).

34. Cf. Marcaccini (1995, 33) who thinks that *enktesis* was granted 'poco prima del 430'.

35. For the treasurers of the other gods see Linders (1975). For *logistai* in classical Athens see Adam-Magnissali (2004, 119-21) and in Hellenistic Athens see Fröhlich (2004, 79-80).



*SEG* 39.210 (ca. 300): λαμπάδι νικήσας Δᾶος/ Βενδίδι ἀνέ/θηκεν<sup>36</sup> concerns most likely a victory in the torch relay competition during the public festival. At the same time individuals bearing a Bendis name are attested in classical and Hellenistic Athens, but not in significant numbers. The fragmentary inscription *Ag.* 16, 329<sup>37</sup> (dated to the late 2nd or early 1st century) is the latest reference to Bendis and Deloptes.

#### 4. Bendis' *orgeones* and *thiasotai*

Most scholars associate the participants in the ritual procession with the associations of *orgeones* and *thiasotai* of Bendis; some go as far as to claim that similar corporate groups existed in 429.<sup>38</sup> However, this assumption is not based on any explicit evidence; it relies mostly on the Platonic *Republic* and on the reference to the ritual duties mentioned in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283.<sup>39</sup> Nevertheless, the same inscription explicitly designates as subject of the obligation to perform the ritual celebration an entire *ethnos*, the Thracians (whatever that meant in fifth- and fourth-century Athens).<sup>40</sup> The participants in the pro-

36. See Themelis (1989) where 3 statuettes are published. In the same period a few examples of Bendis-names occur, see *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 10 (401/400) Βενδιφάνης σκαφη--, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4866 (4th-3rd century?): Βενδιδώρα Ζήνωνος θυγάτηρ εὐζαμένη ἀνέθηκε τιη θεῶι, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 9223 (3rd century): Βενδιδώρα Βηρεισάδου Λυσιμαχίς Μηνοφίλου γυνή.

37. [— — — ]ων[-2-3]/ [— — — ]πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς. *vacat/ vacat o.o4m.*/ [— — — ]ι τεῖ Βενδίδι καὶ τῷ Δηλόπτει[- - - ]/ [— — — ]οἱ Θραῖκες ἐπειδὴ ἡ βουλή κ[αὶ ὁ δῆ]/[μοῦς — — — ] ἐμίσηθωσαν Ἀθηναίους [- 2.5 - ]/ [— — — ]τοῖς[— — — ]. See also Behrend (1970, no. 42); *Ag.* 19, L16; *SEG* 19.125; 41.103; *BE* 1961, no. 264. It is noteworthy that Pausanias (1.1.4) does not mention anything about the *Bendideion* in the vicinity of Artemis Mounychia's temple.

38. E.g. Planeaux (2000-2001, 169 and 174).

39. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283, 11: δς κελεύει τοὺς Θραϊκας πέμπειν τὴμ πομπὴν; and 22-26: ὁ[πρὸς ἂν τοῦ] τῶν γινόμενων καὶ ὁμονοῶντος παντὸς τοῦ ἔθ[νους αἱ τ]/ε θυσίαι γίνονται τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὅσα πρ[οσῆκει]/ κατὰ τε τὰ πάτρια τῶν Θραϊκῶν καὶ τοὺς τῆς πόλ[εως νόμου]/ς...

40. See *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283, 4-5, 11, 22-26 (above n.39). Wilhelm (1902, 130) was convinced that these *orgeones* were Thracians. Who was qualified as Thracian in the mindset of the average Athenian? A Greek from the colonies in the Aegean coast (despite his or her distinctive *ethnikon*) could have been considered as Thracian too? Ferguson (1949, 162-3) while commenting on the honorary inscription *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2947 (3rd/2nd century): στεφανοῦσιν/ *vac.*/ οἱ ὀργεῶνες/ Ἀσκλάπωνα/ Ἀσκλάπωνος/ Μαρωνίτην./ *vac.*, notes that

cession were taking part as members of that ill-understood community and not *qua* members of particular corporate groups. The community of the Thracians included not only the worshippers of the group in Peiraieus but also those in the city of Athens. Perhaps members of these groups have had a leading role in the celebrations. Moreover, the designation *orgeones* for worshippers of Bendis occur only in the last third of the fourth century and after. Moving away from the composition of the procession, the main question concerns the corporate designation *orgeones* assigned to the Thracian worshippers. Since Ferguson scholars have thought that the title *orgeones* (associated with Athenian citizenship) was a privilege granted to the Thracians together with the public endorsement of Bendis' cult.<sup>41</sup> Recently Lambert (2010) has put forward a refined interpretation, which essentially builds upon Ferguson's main idea. In particular, in a thorough, fresh reading on *gene* and their relation to priesthoods, Lambert argues that while the Athenians before 451/0 were appointing priests and priestesses for *polis* cults from among *gene* members, after the introduction of Perikles' citizenship law they were selecting individuals to perform priestly duties from among 'all Athenians', in conformity to the democratic principle. In the question of how to fill the priesthood of Bendis adopted by the *polis*, Lambert claims that priests and priestesses were appointed

---

Maroneia was for Athenians a Thracian city; as to the names he remarks 'They are all Hellenic. There is not a distinctively Thracian name in the lot ... but we must always bear in mind that the Thracian partisans of Bendis in Athens may have belonged, in some parts at least, to the Greek cities in the Thraceward parts (...). I wonder if Nymphodoros of Abdera, *proxenos* of Athens, Sitalkes' brother-in-law, the Greek was chiefly instrumental in bringing Athens and Sitalkes together (Thuc. 2.29), was wholly uninterested in the founding of the shrine of Bendis in the Piraeus'. See also Simms (1988, 69), Steinhauer (1993, 40 n.36) and Arnaoutoglou (2003, 59-60) who has touched upon this question with no further elaboration. Compare the names in inscription IG II<sup>2</sup> 1956 (a casualty list of mercenaries?) of the late fourth century with Thracian names (a correction in SEG 56.212) in ll. 1, 21-23, 25-30, 37-38, 40, 42-43 and 185; see Fraser (1993, 445-8); cf. Bayliss (2004) for the date.

41. The privileged status is associated with the performance of a *polis* function, see Ferguson (1944, 104), (1949, 155-7), Simms (1988, 68), Planeaux (2000-2001, 175, 177) and Stavrianopoulou (2005, 150-1).

from groups of *orgeones*.<sup>42</sup> The first objection, which cannot be answered, concerns whether there were organized group of *orgeones* so early. Assuming that Wilhelm's distinction between citizen and Thracian *orgeones* holds,<sup>43</sup> from which group of *orgeones*, the citizen or the Thracian, priests would have been selected? If from among the Thracian *orgeones*, it would mean that 'Thracians' could, in theory, perform sacrifices on behalf of the Athenian *polis*, something unheard so far. If from among the citizen *orgeones*, it would be an exception from a consistent policy implemented since the 450s, so convincingly expounded by Lambert. The public cult of Bendis is not a peculiar case that requires extraordinary arrangements; accepting the goddess as part of the official Athenian pantheon meant that she should have been honoured by Athenians in the same way as the one correctly identified by Lambert for other public cults, i.e. 'among all Athenians'. Since we do not know anything about any secret ancestral knowledge being transmitted or revealed to initiates, the involvement of Thracians could have been restricted to the performance of apparently Thracian elements, which include the torch relay on horseback and the contingent of 'Thracian' worshippers in the procession. What, however, remains deeply problematic and perhaps elusive is the appropriation (and the reasons for that) of the title *orgeones* by the group of Bendis worshippers in the late fourth century. Ferguson likened the involvement of *orgeones* in Bendideia with that of *Salaminioi genos* in *Oschophoria*;<sup>44</sup> nevertheless it re-

---

42. Lambert (2010, 163) 'In such circumstances one can see that none of the conventional modes of appointing this polis priesthood would seem appropriate. A priest selected from a *genos*, a deme (Piraeus would have been the obvious one in this case) or from all Athenians would exclude the Thracians. To involve them a new system for appointing the priest was needed, and that chosen was one which drew on the model of the pre-existing *orgeones*-groups. As we saw above, these groups seem to have performed a similar role to *gene* in that they were groups within phratries, might administer shrines for which they supplied priests, and to which they provided access for other groups of worshippers. They do not, however, seem to have shared in the strong ideology of autochthonous origins and descent from Ur-Athenians which characterised the *gene*, and in that respect were eminently suitable to be adapted to administer a cult in which foreigners were to have a significant role.'

43. However, see now the objections in Ismard (2010, 263-70).

44. Ferguson (1944, 155) and (1949, 104). On the differential degree of involvement of

mains to be assessed whether the performance of a public function (the procession in this case) can dilute the otherwise 'private' nature of the association of *orgeones*.<sup>45</sup> The association seems to have been proud of its link with the *polis* (see *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1283, 6, 10, 25), despite the fact that the Athenian *polis* did not fund any activities of the group or show any sign of mingling in the association's business. Therefore, I would be reluctant in regarding the performance of a public function as an implicit (even less an explicit) intrusion of the *polis* in the realm of the private cult associations.

The epigraphic evidence for the associations of worshippers called *orgeones* and *thiasotai* appear for the first time in the second half of the fourth century and were found in Peiraius (close to Mikrolimano or to Zea) or Salamis (Akropolis and the port). In particular, inscription *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1255,<sup>46</sup> the earliest testimony of a group of *orgeones* of Bendis, records an honorary decree, proposed by a certain *Olympodoros* (*LGPN* (II) 16), for three *hieropoioi*,<sup>47</sup> all Athenian citizens, for their performance in taking care of the procession and the distribution of meat (following a sacrifice) in the archonship of *Phrynichos* (337/6). The *orgeones* award them a golden crown worth 300 dr. Less than ten years later in the archonship of *Kephisophon* (329/8) the same probably group of *orgeones* decided to honour two *epimeletai* (superintendents) of the sanctuary, *Euphyes* (*LGPN* (II) 1) and *Dexios* (*LGPN* (II) 6),<sup>48</sup> and erected a stele whose text is recorded in inscrip-

---

*genē* in festivals see now Sourvinou-Inwood (2011). On the festival of *Oschophoria* see Parker (2005, 211-8).

45. See, however, Ismard (2010, 273) in an attempt to disentangle the question from the polarity private – public and suggests the notion of a developed network of Bendis cult associations with its centre in Peiraius and peripheral groups in Salamis, Athens and Laurion.

46. Also Schwenk (1985, no. 13); *SEG* 35.239; 46.2363; 49.162; Poland (1909, no. A6E).

47. [Ἀντιφάνην Ἀντι]σθένους Κυ[θήρη]/[Ιον, (*LGPN* (II) 52) Ναυσίφιλον] Ναυσινίκο[υ Κεφ]/[αλήθεν, (*LGPN* (II) 1) Ἀριστομέ]νην Μοσχ---5---]. For *hieropoioi* see Garland (1984, 117-8), in private cult associations Arnaoutoglou (2003, 107).

48. It was suggested that the personal names imply a servile status, e.g. Popov (1975, 61), Schwenk (1985, 256); cf. the statistical analysis in Vlassopoulos (2010) and a traditional approach in Arnaoutoglou (2011).

tion *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1256*.<sup>49</sup> They were awarded a golden crown, worth 100 dr. each, because they have taken care well and zealously of the goddess and her worshippers.

Inscription *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1361* (now dated ca. 330-324/3) is considered a *lex sacra* issued by the citizen *orgeones*.<sup>50</sup> It contains regulations about the dues to be paid to a priest and priestess for sacrificing (ll. 4-8),<sup>51</sup> the use of the income generated by corporate assets (lease of a house and sale of water) for repairs (ll. 8-12), fines for those not abiding by the decision of the group (ll. 13-14), the sanction of regular meetings in the sanctuary on the second day of each month convened by the *hieropoioi* and the *epimeletai* (ll. 14-17),<sup>52</sup> the payment of two dr. by each *orgeon* to *hieropoioi* for sacrifices<sup>53</sup> (with a fine of the same value for

49. Also *Syll<sup>3</sup>* 1095; Michel 980; Meyer (1989, A107); Güntner (1994, G4); Schwenk (1985, no. 52); Lawton (1995, no. 47); *SEG* 35-73, 239; 39-324; 45-231; 46-2363; 47-30; 49-162; *BE* 1987, no. 168; Poland (1909, no. A3a).

50. Also Michel 979; *LSCG* 45; Behrend (1970, 37); Le Guen (1991, no. 6); *SEG* 25.167; 42.1803; 47-26; 50-22; 54-212; *BE* 1942, no. 32; *Hópoς* 17-21 (2004-2009) 103-4; *APMA* 1, 101 no. 359; Tracy (1995: 129); Poland (1909: no. A2a). See now Ismard (2010, 269) who challenges the above ascription.

51. On fees and taxes in cults see Sokolowski (1954).

52. The question whether the three *hieropoioi* of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255* and *1361* were members of the annually appointed board by the *polis* as suggested by Ferguson (1944, 98-99 n.43) and Simms (1988, 69), or they are members of the *orgeones* group (Parker 1996, 171 n.65; Arnaoutoglou 2003, 107-8; Ismard 2010, 265, 268) is still open for debate. Schwenk (1985, 67) insisted on the inconclusiveness of the evidence. However, given the responsibility of the Thracian *ethnos* to organize the procession, the main event of the publicly funded *Bendideia* festival it should not come as surprise the award of honours to *polis-hieropoioi*; what is really troubling is the possible involvement of *polis* appointees in the day-to-day running of the group, something not attested in any other private association. *Hieropoioi* appear also in (a) an honorary decree of the deme of *Halimousioi* for *Charisandros*, son of *Charisios*, *SEG* 2.7, 6-10 (ca. 330-325): ἐλομένον αὐτὸν τῶν δημοτῶν καὶ <ἐπ>ὶ τὰς ἱεροποιίας ὅσας οἱ δημόται προσέταξαν, (b) *SEG* 55.252, 10 from the deme *Halai Araphenidai* (mid 4th century), (c) the Marathonian Tetrapolis (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 2933*, mid 4th century, four *hieropoioi*), (d) cult associations (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1261*, 1263, 1265, 1291, 1292, 1297) and (e) a dedication to Artemis, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2859* (archon Philippides, 3rd century, by 4 *hieropoioi*, 2 citizens, an *isoteles* and a foreigner). Simms (1988, 71) points out the involvement of *hieropoioi* in the administration of the citizen association of Bendis in Peiraieus, while noting the absence of similar interference in the Thracian *orgeones* association.

53. The association of the fee with the income from the sale of the hides after the

those not complying) and rules about those wishing to join the group (ll. 17-23).

Inscriptions *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1284A and B<sup>54</sup> record on a single stele two decrees of the *orgeones* of Bendis, the first one is dated on the basis of the letter style between 251- ca. 240, the second one was issued in the archonship of *Lykeas* (241/40). *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1284A has its upper part missing, so there are no details about the date and the position of the person honoured, a certain *Olympos*, son of *Olympiodoros* (*LGN* (II) 28). He was crowned with an oak leaves crown because he has proved himself zealous and benevolent towards the sanctuary and the members of the group; this allows us to surmise that he may have contributed financially to the cost of repairs or renovation. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1284B was issued on the eighth day of *Skirphorion* (June/July)<sup>55</sup> following a motion by *Sosias*, son of *Hippokrates* (*LGN* (II) 40). *Eukleides* son of *Antimachos* (*LGN* (II) 74) having been elected secretary for several years not only has administered properly the affairs of the association but he rendered account of his overall administration and underwent a successful scrutiny of his financial dealings. The existence of a secretary, a treasury, the date of the meetings and the award of an oak leaves crown, taken together with the mover of the decree, point to the likely fact that this group should be identified with the one of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283.

One of the richest in details and information inscriptions is *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283,<sup>56</sup> dated in the archonship of *Polystratos* (240/39). *Sosias*, son

sacrifice (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1496, 334/3) put forward by Ferguson (1944, 101) is now undermined by the re-dated *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361 in the period ca. 330-324.

54. Also *SEG* 46.2363; 53.156; Tracy (2003, 125); Poland (1909, no. A3d-e).

55. The day of the monthly meeting, 8<sup>th</sup> day of *Skirphorion* (June/July), does not agree with the date of monthly meetings stipulated in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361, 14-17. Because of this discrepancy, Wilhelm (1902, 132-3) thought that we should distinguish between the Thracian associations (meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup> of the month and awarding oak-leaves crowns) and Athenian associations (meeting on the 2nd of the month and awarding olive crowns), and was followed by Ferguson (1944, 98-99) and Simms (1988, 69). This distinction, however, cannot account for *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255 and 1256, unless one assumes that *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361—a decree dated later than the above-mentioned honorary decrees—introduced reforms in the date of meetings and the type of crowns, cf. Arnaoutoglou (2003, 59-60) and Ismard (2010, 263-5).

56. Also Michel 1551; *LSGS* 46; Le Guen (1991, no. 7); *SEG* 24.155; 25.99; 29.136;

of *Hippokrates* (already attested in *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 1284B) in a meeting on the eighth day of the month *Hekatombaion* (July/August) introduced a motion that the group agrees to a request submitted by the Thracian *orgeones* of the *asty* to participate in the traditional procession from *Prytaneion* to Peiraicus, to be greeted by the *epimeletai* of the group in Peiraicus and be provided with water, sponges and bowls in the *Nymphaion* and breakfast in the sanctuary, the priests and priestesses to address the usual prayers including the *orgeones* of the *asty* (Thracians, Athenians or both). On top of that, *orgeones* from the *asty* are to have privileged treatment once they approach the group and have privileged access to membership. However, wealth of detailed information does not necessarily imply accuracy; the *orgeones* of Bendis, as it has already been suggested, were economical with the truth on two counts: a) they may have been the earliest but they were not the only ones awarded *enktesis*, in 333/2 the traders from Kition got the same privilege and before them the Egyptians;<sup>57</sup> and b) they were not only the Thracians to perform the procession from *prytaneion* to Peiraicus; according to Plato's *Republic* there was an Athenian contingent. Despite these inaccuracies, the decree reveals the existence of two groups of *orgeones*, οἱ ἐν τῷ ἄστυ (‘those in the *asty*’) and τοὺς ἐκ Πειραιῶς (‘those from the Piraeus’), both subsumed under the ethnic designation Thracians (ibid. II. 4, II, 25-26). It is not known whether the former constituted an organized group as they did not have and only intended to built an *hieron* (probably in the *asty*).<sup>58</sup> It is also clearly envisaged the possibility of membership

---

41.582; 42.1803; 46.1472 & 2371; 49.162; 53.31; *BE* 1981, no. 239; Tracy (2003, 85); Poland (1909, A3c); Planeaux (2000-2001); Ismard (2010, 263-4) adopting the old dating of the decree in 269/8. Wilhelm (1902) remains fundamental.

57. Noted also by Parker (1996, 170) and Lambert (2010, 163 n. 118). It is noteworthy that the traders from Kition, while referring to the Egyptian precedent, appear to ignore the Thracian (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 337, 42-45); perhaps the Egyptian case was much more recent. One could argue, as Nilsson did, that the exclusivity claimed by the Thracians does not refer to the grant of *enktesis* only but it includes the combined grants of *enktesis*, building a sanctuary and participating in the public festival, see Simms (1982, 62). Despite its vagueness, the expression reveals the perception of the Thracians in Peiraicus that they were enjoying a privilege vis-à-vis other foreign *ethne*.

58. Wilhelm (1902, 130) notes the identification of *orgeones* with the Thracian *ethnos* and the fact that the grant of *enktesis* seems to have included the acquisition of

in both *orgeones* of *asty* and Peiraieus. Reading behind the lines of the decree, it is repeatedly stressed the duty of the whole Thracian *ethnos* – recipient of *enktesis* (ibid. I. 4)<sup>59</sup> – to observe the traditional cultic rules (ibid. I. 25) as well as the laws of the *polis* about the procession (ibid. I. 11), living either in Athens or in Peiraieus. It is noteworthy that the *koinon* is served by a priest, a priestess and *epimeletai*, just as in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1361*.

The latest piece evidence of the corporate existence of Bendis *orgeones* is the honorary decree *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1324*, issued ca. 190. The *orgeones* honoured a certain *Stephanos* (*LGN (II) 100*) because he financed the repair of the sanctuary of Bendis and Deloptes, took care of the proper performance of the procession and everything befitting his position. This display of zeal (*philotimia*) to the *orgeones* and piety (*eusebeia*) to the gods earned *Stephanos* an olive leaf crown and a suitable place in the sanctuary to erect the dedication. The secretary of the group is ordained to have the decision inscribed and erected next to the dedication, while the treasurer is to allocate the necessary funds.<sup>60</sup>

Bendis' worshippers were not active only in Athens and its port. Five inscriptions originating in two groups of *thiasotai* from the third-century Salamis provide not only considerable amount of information about them,<sup>61</sup> but also contribute to the establishment of

effectively two plots of land, one in Peiraia in the second half of the 5th century and one in Athens in mid 3rd century.

59. *Enktesis* was required by the Thracian worshippers only; citizen *orgeones* were not bound by that restriction. There is also the possibility that both groups hold their meetings at the *Bendideion*.

60. See also Michel 1558; *SEG* 46.2363; 49.162; *BE* 1950, no. 94; Tracy (1990, 110); Poland (1909, no. A3b). It is difficult to ascertain the office or the offices that *Stephanos* held; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* restores ἐπιμελητής but the contribution and the circumlocutions used point to the post of *hieropoios*, treasurer or secretary; see *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255*, 5 and 1284B.

61. According to Osborne (2004-2009). Acropolis-group: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317* (archon Lysitheides, 272/1); Michel 1557; *SEG* 3.127; 46.2363; 47. 237; 53.9, 157; Osborne 2004-2009, 658); *BE* 1926, p. 266; 1938, no. 83; Poland 1909, no. A20, *SEG* 2.10 [archon Thersilochos (251/0); Michel 1881; *SEG* 44.60; 53.162; Tracy (2003, 123-4); Osborne (2004-2009: 660); *ZPE* 171 (2009) 91 (date); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317b* (archon Hieron, 249/8); Michel 1879; *SEG* 44.60; 46.2363; 53.9; *PAA* 74 (1999) 67-80; Tracy (2003, 125); Osborne (2004-2009, 661)]. Harbour-group: *SEG* 2.9 (archon Kydenor, 245/4);



a consistent chronology of mid third century Athens.<sup>62</sup> All of them – except *SEG* 2.9, a decision to honour officials for successive years – are honorary decrees for the annually elected officials of the associations. Among the documents of the Akropolis group the earliest is *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317, passed during the archonship of *Lysitheides* (272/1), while the remaining are dated in mid third century. They were all discussed in meetings on the second day of *Skirophorion* (June/July), the exception being again *SEG* 2.9 which was passed on the third day of *Anthesterion* (February/March).<sup>63</sup> The evidence, then, suggests that there was a fixed date for regular meetings in both groups but that a group could also convene on any other day. The associations were run by an executive board comprising a treasurer, a secretary<sup>64</sup> and three *epimeletai* (superintendents), while in the Akropolis group an *hiereus* is mentioned. Officers were honoured for taking care of the sacrifices, of every other corporate business and accounting for

---

Michel 1880; *SEG* 44.60; 47.237; 50.1; 53.159; *BE* 2004, no. 163; Tracy (2003, 123-4); Osborne (2004-2009, 662); *ZPE* 171 (2009) 92 (date); *SEG* 44.60 (archon Lysiades, 244/3); *SEG* 53.9, 158; *PAA* 74 (1999) 67-80; *ZPE* 143 (2003) 95-100; Tracy (2003, 127); Osborne (2004-2009, 661); *ZPE* 171 (2009) 92 (date). This distinction implies that there should have been two sanctuaries (however modest) in third-century Salamis. See, however, Taylor (1997, 111-12) who identifies only one. For a thorough discussion of the findspots, dates and the historical setting see Steinhauer (1993) and most recently Osborne (2004-2009).

62. Osborne 1989; 1999; 2000; 2003b; 2003a; 2004; 2004-2009.

63. Note that the second of the month was prescribed as the day for regular meetings in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361, 16-17 too. There is a number of similarities between the *thiasotai* of Salamis and the *orgeones* of Peiraeus as far as their organizational structure (*epimeletai*, secretary, treasurer and an *hiereus*), the kind of honours (olive crown). Is it an indication of the affiliation between the group in Salamis' Akropolis and the one in Peiraeus? Or we may consider the Salaminian groups as offshoots of the Peiraeus group? See Steinhauer (1993, 40-41). The hypothesis of Foucart (1873, 209) and Wilhelm (1902, 131) that the stones were transferred from Peiraeus to Salamis has been now abandoned.

64. *SEG* 2.10, 11-12 should be read γραμματέα Στρατοκλήην Ἐλευσίνιον. The priest (*hiereus*) remains anonymous, corresponding to the vacant wreath beneath, see Osborne (2004-2009: 664 n.12). In *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317b, 1-2 the priest appears in the dating formula and holds the office of treasurer. An *hiereus* with a demotic is also attested in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1297, IV 44 (archon Kimon, 236/5). For the officials in Athenian cult associations see Arnaoutoglou (2003: 107-115)

the money they had administered (*SEG* 2.10), because of their care for the sacrifices and the sanctuary of Bendis (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317b), because they took care of the sacrifices, the business of the group and accounted for their administration (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317 and *SEG* 2.9) or for holding the sacrifices to the gods ‘as it is traditional’ and took care of all the remaining affairs as dictated by the rules of the group (*SEG* 44.60).<sup>65</sup> Usually, officials were awarded an olive leaf crown (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317b and *SEG* 44.60) with an amount of 15 dr.<sup>66</sup> Certain individuals appear in several inscriptions, such as *Nikias* (*LGPN* (II) 198, 213-14) and *Stratokles* (*LGPN* (II) 23, 54) both under different titles in inscriptions *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317, 1317b and *SEG* 2.10;<sup>67</sup> *Rhythmos* (*LGPN* (II) 1) in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317b and *SEG* 2.10; *Batrachos* (*LGPN* (II) 12) features in *SEG* 2.9 and *SEG* 44.60; while *Dokimos* (*LGPN* (II) 13-14) in *SEG* 2.9 and 2.10.<sup>68</sup> The decision in *SEG* 2.9 sanctions the election of a committee of three members (*Batrachos*, *Dokimos*, *Krates*) encumbered with inscribing the decree, the honours and with accounting for the money spent for that purpose. In the list of have-been officials several names occur for successive years such as *Batrachos* (twice *grammateus*, *tamias*), *Thallos* (*LGPN* (II) 41) (thrice *epimeletes*),<sup>69</sup> *Krates* (*LGPN* (II) 34) (twice *tamias*), *Archeopolis* (*LGPN*(II) 8) (twice *grammateus*). Finally, in the harbour-group irregularities are observed concerning the number of officials, e.g. during *Polyeuktos*’ archonship there were two *epimeletai*, in *Diomedon*’s year there were four *epimeletai* and no treasurer while in *Eurykleides*’ year there are no *epimeletai* at all. These irregularities taken together with the exceptional character of inscrip-

65. The phrase ‘as it is traditional’ appears also in *SEG* 2.9.

66. The amount is attested in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317b, 7, *SEG* 44.60, 8 and restored in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317, 9 by Osborne (2004-2009, 658).

67. It is unusual but not improbable that *Nikias* and *Stratokles* are board members of the group in 270s (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317) and again in 250s-240s (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317b, *SEG* 2.10). Indicative of the inconsistent way of identifying individuals is the fact that in *SEG* 2.10 *Stratokles* is designated as coming of Eleusis, while in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317b as plain *Stratokles*.

68. See Osborne (2004-2009, 668 n.33). To Parker (1996, 171) ‘many ... members sound from their names like slaves or ex-slaves’.

69. Despite Ismard (2010, 267 n.292), it is not possible to relate *Thallos* of *SEG* 2.9 with the one in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255, since the inscriptions are far removed chronologically and the name is not that rare.

tion *SEG* 2.9 reveal a shortage of willing candidates due either to economic difficulties or to the initial structural fragility of the group,<sup>70</sup> especially if Osborne's (2004-2009, 668) claim that it was founded when *Polyeuktos* was archon (250/49) is accepted.

In this essay I have tried to recapitulate most of the aspects of the recent discussion about Bendis, her cultores in classical and Hellenistic Athens and their corporate organization. Bendis, probably an indigenous form of the Mother of Gods figure of the southern Thracian area, was made known in Athens by the mid fifth century. For reasons we do not yet understand well, but surely connected with the Athenian tapping of resources in the estuary of Strymon, it was given a place in the pantheon of the Athenian *polis*, earlier than 429. A reorganization of her festival, probably reflected in Plato's *Republic*, took place in the closing years of 410s. Cult associations devoted to her worship are attested epigraphically since the late fourth century, have been active in Peiraieus (*orgeones*) and Salamis (*thiasotai*) to the early second century. *Orgeones* in Peiraieus seem to have been organized in a citizen and a Thracian grouping. Despite the fact that they were encumbered with the performance of a procession during Bendideia, they have not lost their primarily private nature as an association. Their structure and discourse follows the blueprint of other similar associations and espouses the rhetoric and values of the Athenian *polis*.<sup>71</sup>

---

70. Arnaoutoglou (2003, 68-69) envisaged the possibility of a split in the old Acropolis group (without further elaboration); this would explain (a) the coexistence for a few years of both groups, (b) *Dokimos* appearing as official in both groups (cf. Osborne 2004-2009, 668 n. 33), and (c) organizational similarities (date of meetings, composition of executive board). However, it is still not possible to confirm it.

71. Three articles and a monograph related to topics discussed here have appeared after I submitted the article for publication. On the cult of *oikistes* Hagnon: I. Asmonti 2012, 'Gli ecisti di Anfipoli', *Aristonothos* 6, 111-118. On the cult of Artemis *Tauropolos* in Amphipolis: M. Mari 2012, 'La conciliazione degli opposti. Il culto e il santuario di Artemide *Tauropolos* ad Anfipoli', *Aristonothos* 6, 119-166 (available online <http://riviste.unimi.it/index.php/aristonothos/>), M. Mari 2013, 'Culti e identità (mutanti) di una *polis* greca: il caso di Anfipoli', in M. Palma and C. Vismara (eds.) *Per Gabriella. Studi in ricordo di Gabriella Braga*. vol. 3. Cassino, 1169-1227 and S. Wijma 2014. *Embracing the Immigrant: The participation of metics in Athenian polis religion (5th-4th cent. BC)*. Historia Einzelschriften 233. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrahamsen, V. A. 1995, *Women and Worship at Philippi. Diana/Artemis and Other Cults in the Early Christian Era*. Portland, Maine: Astarte Shell Press.
- Adam-Magnissali, S. 2004, Έλεγχος και λογοδοσία των αρχών στην αθηναϊκή δημοκρατία. Athens: Αντ. Ν. Σάκκουλας.
- Archibald, Z. H. 1998, *The Odrysian Kingdom of Thrace. Orpheus Unmasked*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Archibald, Z. H. 1999, 'Thracian Cult - from Practice to Belief', in G. R. Tsetschkladze (ed.) *Ancient Greeks West and East*. Mnemosyne Suppl. 196. Leiden: Brill, pp. 427-468.
- Arnaoutoglou, I. N. 2003, Thusias heneka kai sunousias. *Private Religious Associations in Hellenistic Athens*. Academy of Athens: Yearbook of the Research Centre for the History of Greek Law 37, 4. Athens: Academy of Athens.
- Arnaoutoglou, I. N. (2011) "'Ils étaient dans la ville, mais tout à fait en dehors de la cité". Status and identity in private religious associations in Hellenistic Athens', in O. M. van Nijf and R. Alston (eds.) *Political Culture in the Greek city after the Classical Age*. Leuven: Peeters, pp. 27-48.
- Asheri, D. 1990, 'Herodotus on Thracian Society and History', in G. Nenci and O. Reverdin (eds.) *Hérodote et les peuples non Grecs. Neuf exposés suivis de discussions*. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 35. Geneva: Librairie Droz, pp. 131-169.
- Bayliss, A. J. 2004, 'New Readings on a List of Mercenaries from Athens', *ZPE* 146, 85-90.
- Behrend, D. 1970, *Attische Pachturkunden. Ein Beitrag zur Beschreibung der Misthosis nach den griechischen Inschriften*. Vestigia 12. München: Beck.
- Beschi, L. 2002, 'Culti stranieri e fondazioni private nell'Attica classica: alcuni casi', *ASAA* 80, 13-42.
- Bingen, J. 1959, 'Le décret SEG x 64 (Le Pirée, 413/2?)', *RBPH* 37, 31-44 (= *Pages d'épigraphie grecque I. Attique - Égypte (1952-1982)*, 17-26, Bruxelles 1991).
- Blomart, A. 2000-2001, 'Identité culturelle, altérité et religions étrangères: exemples antiques de Mithra, Bendis et la Mère des dieux', *Itaca* 16-17, 9-22.
- Blomart, A. 2001, 'Une déesse nommée Bendis. Réalité thrace ou création athénienne?', in *Πρακτικά ΙΑ' Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Κλασσικών Σπουδών: Καβάλα 24-30 Αυγούστου 1999: εις μνήμην Νικολάου Α. Λιβαδάρα*. Vol. 1. Athens: Εθνική Οργανωτική Επιτροπή του ΙΑ Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Κλασσικών Σπουδών της F.I.E.C., pp. 31-47.
- Blomart, A. 2002a, 'Des dieux à l'image des citoyens ou comment les dieux étrangers étaient «naturalisés» dans le monde grec et romain', in S. Ratti (ed.), *Antiquité et citoyenneté. Actes du colloque international tenu à Besançon les 3, 4 et 5 novembre 1999*. Paris: Broché, pp. 325-339.

- Blomart, A. 2002b, 'La Phrygienne et l'Athénien. Quand la Mère des dieux et Apollon Patrôos se rencontrent sur l'*agora* d'Athènes', in F. Labrique (ed.) *Religions méditerranéennes et orientales de l'antiquité. Actes du colloque des 23-24 avril 1999, Institut des sciences et techniques de l'antiquité (UMR 6048), Université de Franche-Comté, à Besançon*. Besançon: Institut français d'archéologie orientale, pp. 21-34.
- Bowden, H. 2005, *Classical Athens and the Delphic Oracle. Divination and Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brodersen, K. 1996, *Historische griechische Inschriften in Übersetzung*, vol. 2: *Spätklassik und früher Hellenismus (400-250 v. Chr.)*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Burkert, W. 1985, *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cerkezov, V. 1997, 'Iconography of the Thracian goddess Bendis in the Tombstones with a 'Funerary Feast' from Southern Thrace', *Eirene* 33, 53-66.
- Collart, P. 1937, *Philippes, ville de Macédoine depuis ses origines jusqu'à la fin de l'époque romaine*. EFA. Travaux et mémoires 5. Paris: E. de Boccard.
- Collart, P. and P. Ducrey 1975, *Philippes I: Les reliefs rupestres*. BCH Suppl. 2. Athens: École Française d'Athènes.
- Deoudi, M. 2007, 'Bendis – kulturell geprägten Geschichte einer thrakischen Göttin', in Iakovidou (2007) 120-129.
- Deoudi, M. 2009, 'Bendis' neue Heimat in der Fremde', *Ancient East and West* 8, 223-234.
- Detschew, D. 1955, 'Der Artemis Kult im Gebiet des mittleren Strymon', in *Serta Kazaroviana. Commentationes gratulatoriae Gabrielo Kazarov septuagenario oblatae*. BIAB 19, vol. 2. Sofia, pp. 95-109.
- Ducrey, P. 1976, 'Quelques reliefs et dessins rupestres de Philippes de Macédoine', in *Mélanges d'histoire ancienne et d'archéologie offerts à Paul Collart*. Cahiers d'archéologie Romande 5. Lausanne: Bibliothèque historique vaudoise, pp. 147-60
- Eidinow, E. 2007, *Oracles, Curses and Risk among the Ancient Greeks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ferguson, W. S. 1944, 'The Attic *Orgeones*', *HThR* 37, 61-140.
- Ferguson, W. S. 1949, 'Orgeonika', in *Commemorative Studies in Honor of Theodore Leslie Shear*. Hesperia Suppl. 8. Baltimore: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, pp. 131-163.
- Fol, A. 1986, 'Artemis (in Thracia)', in *LIMC* ii (1). Zürich: Artemis, pp. 771-774.
- Fraser, P. M. 1993, 'Thracians Abroad: three Documents' in *Αρχαία Μακεδονία V. Ανακοινώσεις κατά το πέμπτο διεθνές συμπόσιο, Θεσσαλονίκη 10-15 Οκτωβρίου*

1989. *Αφιέρωμα στη μνήμη Μανόλη Ανδρόνικου*, vol. 1. Thessalonike: Ίδρυμα Μελετών Χερσονήσου του Αίμου, pp. 443-454.
- Fröhlich, P. 2004, *Les cités grecques et le contrôle des magistrats (IVe-Ier siècle avant J.-C.)*. Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 33. Genève: Droz.
- Garland, R. 1984, 'Religious Authority in Archaic and Classical Athens', *ABSA* 79, 75-123.
- Garland, R. 1987, *The Piraeus from the Fifth to the First century B.C.* London: Duckworth.
- Garland, R. 1992, *Introducing New Gods. The Politics of Athenian Religion*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Gerasimova-Tomova, V. 1980, 'Sur le culte de Bendis en Thrace et le vêtement de femme thrace', *Arch* (Sofia) 22, 27-34.
- Goceva, Z. 1974, 'Le culte de la déesse thrace Bendis à Athènes', *Thracia* 2, 81-86.
- Goceva, Z. 1978, 'Der Bendiskult und die Beziehungen zwischen Thrakien und Kleinasien', in M. T. de Boer and T. A. Edridge (eds.), *Hommages à Maarten J. Vermaseren. Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain* 68. Leiden: Brill, pp. 397-404.
- Goceva, Z. 2003, 'La culte de la grande déesse-mère en Thrace'. *Thracia* 15, 169-178.
- Goceva, Z. and D. Popov 1986, 'Bendis', in *LIMC* iii (1). Zürich: Artemis, pp. 95-97.
- Graf, F. 1996, 'Pompei in Greece. Some Considerations about Space and Ritual in the Greek Polis', in R. Hagg (ed.), *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis. Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Ancient Greek Religion, Athens, 16-18 October 1992*. Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae, 80. 14. Stockholm: Institut Jonsered, pp. 55-65.
- Güntner, G. 1994, *Göttervereine und Götterversammlungen aufattischen Weihreliefs. Untersuchungen zur Typologie und Bedeutung*. Beiträge zur Archäologie 21. Würzburg: K. Triltsch.
- Giuliani, A. 2001, *La città e l'oracolo. I rapporti tra Atene e Delfi in età arcaica e classica*. Milano: Vita e Pensiero.
- Hornblower, S. 1991, *A commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 1: *Books I-III*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hornblower, S. 1996, *A commentary on Thucydides*, vol. 2: *Books IV-V.24*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Iakovidou, A. (ed.) 2007, *Thrace in the Graeco-Roman World. Proceedings of the 10<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Thracology, Komotini - Alexandroupolis, 18-23 October 2005*, Athens: Κέντρο Ελληνικής και Ρωμαϊκής Αρχαιότητας - Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών.
- Isaac, B. 1986, *The Greek settlements in Thrace until the Macedonian Conquest*. Studies of the Dutch Archaeological and Historical Society 10. Leiden: Brill.

- Ismard, P. 2010, *La cité des réseaux. Athènes et ses associations VI<sup>e</sup> – I<sup>er</sup> siècle av. J.-C.*  
Publications de la Sorbonne: Histoire ancienne et médiévale 105. Paris:  
Publications de la Sorbonne.
- Kearns, E. 2010, *Ancient Greek Religion. A Sourcebook*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lambert, S. D. 1997, 'The Attic *genos* Salaminioi and the island of Salamis',  
*ZPE* 119, 85-106.
- Lambert, S. D. 1999, 'IG II<sup>2</sup> 2345, *thiasoi* of Herakles and the Salaminioi again',  
*ZPE* 125, 93-130.
- Lambert, S. D. 2010, 'A *Polis* and its Priests: Athenian Priesthoods before and  
after Pericle's Citizenship Law', *Historia* 59, 143-175.
- Lawton, C. L. 1995, *Attic Document Reliefs. Art and Politics in Ancient Athens*. Oxford:  
Oxford University Press.
- Le Guen-Pollet, B. 1991, *La vie religieuse dans le monde grec du V<sup>ème</sup> au III<sup>ème</sup> siècle  
avant notre ère. Choix de documents épigraphiques traduits et commentés*. Toulouse:  
Presses Universitaires de Mirail.
- Linders, T. 1975, *The Treasurers of the Other Gods in Athens and their Functions*. Beiträge  
zur klassischen Philologie 62. Meisenheim a. Glan: Hain.
- Malkin, I. 1987, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*. Studies in Greek and  
Roman religion 3. Leiden: Brill.
- Marcaccini, C. 1995, 'Il ruolo dei Traci nell' immaginario greco di V-IV sec.  
a.C. Tra storiografia ed iconografia', *RSA* 25, 7-53.
- Masson. O. 1988, 'Les noms théophores de Bendis en Grèce et en Thrace',  
*MH* 45, 6-12 (= *Onomastica Graeca Selecta* 2, 605-612, Paris).
- Meyer, M. 1989, *Die griechischen Urkundenreliefs*, MDAI(A) Beih. 13. Berlin: Mann.
- Middleton, D. M. 1982, 'Thrasylbulos' Thracian support', *CQ* 32, 298-303.
- Montepaone, Cl. 1990, 'Bendis thracia ad Atene: l'integrazione del «nuovo»  
attraverso forme dell'ideologia', *AION (Arch)* 12, 103-121 (= *Mélanges Levêque*,  
6, 201-219, Paris 1992).
- Moustaka, A. 2009, 'Bendis in Thessalien - Zu zwei Varianten eines Münzty-  
pus der Stadt Phalorea', in R. Einicke, St. Lehmann, H. Löhr, G.  
Mehnert, A. Mehnert and A. Slawisch (eds.), *Zurück zum Gegenstand*.  
*Festschrift für A. E. Furtwängler*. vol. 2. Langenweißach: Beier & Beran, pp.  
345-350.
- Nails, D. 1998, 'The dramatic date of Plato's *Republic*', *CJ* 93, 383-396.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1942, 'Bendis in Athen', *From the collections of the Ny Carlsberg  
Glyptothek* 3, 169-188 (= *Opuscula selecta linguis Anglica, Francogallica Germanica  
conscripta* 3, 55-80, Lund 1960).
- Nilsson, M. P. 1951, *Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics in Ancient Greece*. Lund: C. W.  
K. Gleerup.
- Osborne, M. J. 1989, 'The Chronology of Athens in the mid Third Century  
B.C.', *ZPE* 78, 209-242.

- Osborne, M. J. 1999, 'Voyaging through strange seas of thought – The study of Athenian inscriptions', *PAA* 74, 67-80.
- Osborne, M. J. 2000, 'Philonos and the Athenian Archons of the 250s BC', in P. Flensted-Jensen, Th. H. Nielsen and L. Rubinstein (eds.), *Polis and Politics. Studies in Ancient Greek History Presented to M. H. Hansen on his Sixtieth Birthday, August 20, 2000*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, pp. 507-520.
- Osborne, M. J. 2003a, 'The Athenian Archon Diomedon and his Successors', *ΖΡΕ* 143, 95-100.
- Osborne, M. J. 2003b, 'Shadowland: Athens under Antigonos Gonatas and his Successor', in O. Palagia and S.V. Tracy (eds.) *The Macedonians in Athens, 323-229 B.C. Proceedings of an International Conference Held at the University of Athens, May 24-26, 2001*. Oxford: Oxbow, pp. 67-75.
- Osborne, M. J. 2004, 'The Archons of IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273', in A. Matthaïou (ed.), *Αττικά έγγραφα. Πρακτικά συμποσίου εις μνήμην Adolf Wilhelm (1864-1950)*. Athens: Ἑλληνική Ἐπιγραφική Ἐταιρεία, pp. 199-211.
- Osborne, M. J. 2004-2009, 'Five Hellenistic Decrees of the Salaminian *thiasotai* of Bendis', *Horos* 17-21, 657-672.
- Pache, C. O. 2001, 'Barbarian Bond: Thracian Bendis among the Athenians', in S. R. Asirvatham, C. O. Pache and J. Watrous (eds.), *Between Magic and Religion. Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and Society*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 3-12.
- Palaiokrassa, L. 1991, *Τὸ ἱερό τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος Μουνιχίας*. Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθῆναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἐταιρείας 115. Athens: Ἡ ἐν Ἀθῆναις Ἀρχαιολογική Ἐταιρεία.
- Pappadakis, N. 1937, 'Ἱερός νόμος Βενδιδαίων', *AE* 1937 [1956], 808-823.
- Papastavru, J. 1936, *Amphipolis. Geschichte und Prosopographie*. Klio Beih. 37. Leipzig: Dieterich.
- Parissaki, M.-G. 2007, 'Tracing Cults in Aegean Thrace: the Evidence of Personal Names', in Iakovidou (2007) 451-455.
- Parke, H. W. 1967, *The Oracles of Zeus. Dodona, Olympia, Ammon*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Parker, R. 1985, 'Greek States and Greek Oracles,' in P. Cartledge and F. D. Harvey (eds.), *Crux. Essays in Greek history presented to G. E. M. de Ste. Croix on his 75<sup>th</sup> birthday*. London: Duckworth, pp. 298-326.
- Parker, R. 1996, *Athenian Religion. A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parker, R. 2005, *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Perdrizet, P. 1910, 'Scaptésylé', *Klio* 10, 1-27.
- Pilhofer, P. 2000, *Philippi*. Vol. 2: *Katalog der Inschriften von Philippi*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 119. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr.



- Planeaux, Chr. 2000-2001, 'The Date of Bendis' Entry into Attica', *CJ* 96, 165-192.
- Poland, F. 1909, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*. Fürstlich Jablonowski'sche Gesellschaft zu Leipzig 38. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Popov, D. 1975a, 'Essence, origine et propagation du culte de la déesse thrace Bendis', *DHA* 2, 289-303.
- Popov, D. 1975b, 'The Cult of Bendis in Athens', *Bulgarian Historical Review* 3, 53-64.
- Popov, D. 1976, 'Caractéristique et localisation du culte de Bendis', *Études Balkaniques* 2, 114-126.
- Popov, D. 1977, 'Le relief de Copenhague' *Arch* (Sofia) 19, 1-13.
- Rhodes, P. J. 1981, *A commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rhodes, P. J. with D. M. Lewis 1997, *The Decrees of the Greek States*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Robertson, N. 1992, *Festivals and Legends: The Formation of Greek Cities in the Light of Public Ritual*. Phoenix Suppl. 31. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Roussel, P. 1943, 'A propos d'un décret attique relatif à la déesse Bendis', *REA* 45, 177-182.
- Ruiz Perez, A. 1994, 'Un oracle relative à l'introduction du culte de Cybèle à Athènes', *Kernos* 7, 169-177.
- Sakurai, M. and Notomi, N. 2006, 'The Dramatic Date of Plato's *Republic*', in I. Kiichiro (ed.), *How should 'History of Greek and Roman Literature/Philosophy' be Rewritten in Consideration of the New Trend of Greek and Roman History?* Tokyo: Tokyo University, 11-58. (in Japanese)
- Schwenk, C. J. 1985, *Athens in the Age of Alexander: the Dated Laws and Decrees of "the Lykourgan Era" 338-322 B.C.* Chicago: Ares.
- Simms, R. R. 1988, 'The Cult of the Thracian Goddess Bendis in Athens and Attica', *AncW* 18, 59-76.
- Smith, A. H. 1904, *A Catalogue of Sculptures in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum*, vol. 3. London: British Museum.
- Sokolowski, F. 1954, 'Fees and Taxes in the Greek Cults', *HThR* 47, 153-164.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, Chr. 2011, *Athenian Myths and Festivals. Aglauros, Erechtheus, Plynteria, Panathenaia, Dionysia*, edited by R. Parker. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stavrianopoulou, E. 2005, 'Gemeinsam feiern, getrennt verehren: zum Kult der thrakischen Göttin Bendis in Attika', in C. Ambos, St. Hotz, G. Scweddler and St. Weinfurter (eds.), *Die Welt der Rituale: von Antik bis heute*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, pp. 144-155.
- Steinhauer, G.A. 1993, 'Νεότερα στοιχεία για τὸν σαλαμίνιο θίασο τῆς Βενθίδος', *AE* 132, 31-47.

- Taylor, M. C. 1997, *Salamis and the Salaminioi. The History of an Unofficial Athenian Demos*. Αρχαία Ελλάδα - Monographs on Ancient Greek History & Archaeology 5. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben.
- Themeles, P. 1989, 'Βάθρο ἀναθήματος στη Βενδίδα', *Horos* 7, 23-29.
- Tracy, S. V. 1990, *Attic Letter-cutters from 229 to 86 B.C.*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 6. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tracy, S. V. 1995, *Athenian democracy in transition. Attic letter-cutters of 340 to 290 B.C.*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 20. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tracy, S. V. 2003, *Athens and Macedon. Attic letter-cutters of 300 to 229 B.C.*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 38. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tsiafakis, D. 2000, 'The Allure and Repulsion of Thracians in the Art of Classical Athens', in B. Cohen (ed.), *Not the Classical Ideal: Athens and the Construction of the Other in Greek Art*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 364-389.
- Veligianni-Terzi, Chr. 2004, *Οι Ελληνίδες πόλεις και το βασίλειο των Οδρυσών από Αβδήρων πόλεως μέχρι Ίστρον ποταμού*. Thessalonike: Adelphoi Kyriakide.
- Viscardi, G. P. 2010, 'Artemide Munichia: aspetti e funzioni mitico-rituali della dea del Pireo', *DHA* 36, 31-60.
- Vlassopoulos, K. 2010, 'Athenian slave names and Athenian social history', *ZPE* 175, 113-144.
- von Eickstedt, K.-V. 1991, *Beiträge zur Topographie des antiken Piräus*. Βιβλιοθήκη της ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἐταιρείας 118. Athens: Ἡ ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικὴ Ἐταιρεία.
- Wijma, S. M. 2007, 'Religion and Integration. Thracian Bendis and her Worshipers in Classical Athens', *Archäologie on line* 2007, [www.archaologie-online.de/bibliothekl/tagungsberichte/2007/introduction-new-gods/religion-and-integration/](http://www.archaologie-online.de/bibliothekl/tagungsberichte/2007/introduction-new-gods/religion-and-integration/) (last consulted on 15/7/2011) (= 'Polisreligie en polislidmaatschap in klassiek Athene. Bendis en haar Thrakische aanbidders', *Lampas* 44 (2011), 211-229).
- Wilhelm, A. 1902, 'Inscript aus den Peiraieus', *JÖAI* 5, 127-139 (= *Kleine Schriften II: Abhandlungen und Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* 1, 164-176, Leipzig 1984).
- Xagorari-Gleissner, M. 2008, *Meter Theon: Die Göttermutter bei den Griechen*. Mainz: Rützen.
- Zanni, D., Gay-des-Combes, L. and Zannis, A.G. 2007, 'Les Thraces autonomes de la région comprise entre le Strymon et le Nestos', in Iakovidou 2007, 745-754.
- Zahrnt, M. 2007, 'Athens Ambitionen an Thrakiens Südküste während der Pentekontätie', in Iakovidou 2007, 737-744.

# Philosophical Schools in Athenian Society from the Fourth to the First Century BC: An Overview

*Matthias Haake*

## 1. Introduction

In *On the Cities in Greece*, a *periegesis* written in the third century by a certain Heraclides Criticus, the author mentions the high presence of philosophers in the cityscape as one of the remarkable aspects of contemporaneous Athens:<sup>1</sup> in public, they offered intellectual pleasure and recreation to the interested people living in Athens.<sup>2</sup> Athens and philosophers, philosophy and Athens – since antiquity this connection has often been considered as an almost natural symbiosis. One of the most famous depictions of this ‘imaginaire’ can be grasped in Raphael’s fresco *La scuola di Atene* in the Stanza della segnatura in the Vatican palaces: discussing, reading and musing philosophers, walking around or sitting on the ground – a cheerful re-

---

1. For critical readings of the manuscript in various stages and valuable comments I am deeply indebted to Ilias Arnaoutoglou (Athens), Tiziano Dorandi (Paris), Ann-Cathrin Harders (Bielefeld), and Paulin Ismard (Paris); I am especially grateful to Vincent Gabrielsen (Copenhagen), the *spiritus rector* of the association project, for inviting me to participate in the Copenhagen conference whose participants contributed essentially to the sharpening of the arguments. Last, but by no means least, I am much obliged to Marie Drauschke and Anna Linnemann (both Münster) for improving the English text. The following outline is necessarily a restricted one since an entire exploration of the topic would require a monographic study which is a true *desideratum*. Fröhlich and Hamon 2013; Canevaro and Lewis 2014, 103–110 and Dresfeler 2014 appeared too late to be taken into account. Unless otherwise indicated, all dates are BC.

2. Heracl. Crit. 1,1 Arenz; on this passage, see Arenz 2006, 56–64 and Haake 2007, 14–15; on Heraclides’ description of Athens in general, see Perrin 1994, 197–202.

public of ‘hommes de lettres’.<sup>3</sup> Athens, as the thirteenth-century Arabian scholar Ibn Abī Uṣaybi‘a has written in the lemma on Aristotle in his *Sources of Information about the Generations of Physicians*, was called the ‘city of philosophers’.<sup>4</sup>

The image of Athens as *the* city of philosophy is in no small measure an idealised construct, but it is by all means an efficacious one since antiquity.<sup>5</sup> Yet, between the fourth and the first centuries, the relationship between Athens and the philosophers living in the city was troubled on various occasions. To name but a few examples: Socrates’ sentence to death in 399,<sup>6</sup> the philosophers’ short-time exodus from Athens between 307/6 and 306/5,<sup>7</sup> or even the emigration of many philosophers from Athens to Rome and elsewhere during the nineties and eighties of the first century.<sup>8</sup> Nonetheless, without gainsaying sporadic troubled moments in the relationship between Athens and philosophers especially in the course of the fourth century, it can be stated that Athens was from the early fourth century onwards and throughout the Hellenistic period generally ‘the place to be’ for philosophers and philosophising people from all over the Mediterranean World. As interesting as this matter might be: it is not the issue of the present investigation to discuss the conditions of this hitherto not satisfyingly resolved circumstance.<sup>9</sup> However, since philosophising in antiquity was generally not a hermitic, but a convivial practice, the strong presence of philosophers and philosophising people in Athens directs to a crucial aspect which is deeply enmeshed in the topic ‘Athens and philoso-

---

3. On Raphael’s *La scuola di Atene*, see, e.g., Most 1999.

4. See Düring 1957, 214 (5).

5. See Habicht 1994, 246–47; Haake 2007, 168–70 and more detailed Primavesi 2009. See also di Branco 2006, 199–240.

6. See Hansen 1995; Parker 1996, 199–217; Wolpert 2002, 63–65; Millett 2005 and Haake 2009, 121–23.

7. See, e.g., Korhonen 1997, 75–85; O’Sullivan 2002 and especially Haake 2007, 16–43 as well as Haake 2008.

8. See, e.g., Ferrary 1988, 434–95 and Haake 2007, 271–73; see also Ludlam 2003, 34–35.

9. On the development of the ‘intellectual field’ in Athens, see Azoulay 2007, 175–93; see also Lynch 1972, 63–65 and Haake 2009, 116 n. 17.

phy': the forms and structures of philosophising groups and the so-called philosophical schools in Athens, whose most prominent exponents are the Academy, the Peripatus, the Stoa and the Garden of Epicurus; nevertheless, there are other philosophical groups in Athens such as the Cynics, various ephemeral schools as well as those which are counted among the Minor Socratics.<sup>10</sup>

Before analysing the phenomenon of the so-called philosophical schools in the Athenian *kosmos* from the fourth to the first century which is the aim of the current contribution, it is necessary to deal with the following crucial, but often unconsidered questions: what was a philosophical school in antiquity generally?<sup>11</sup> And what defined the so-called philosophical schools in Athens in particular? By answering these two questions, it is important to have in mind the relative 'Schwammigkeit des Begriffs der antiken Philosophenschule'.<sup>12</sup>

Yet, a philosophical school in antiquity can be generally understood as an institution, which means – at least in the widest sense – as 'a complex of positions, roles, norms and values lodged in particular types of social structures and organising relatively stable patterns of human activity with respect to fundamental problems in producing life-sustaining resources, in reproducing individuals, and in sustaining viable societal structures within a given

---

10. In this context, see the remarks by Dorandi 1999, 61; see also Cambiano and Repici 1993, 527–35.

11. For a careful analysis of the Greek terms *scholē*, *diatribe* and *hairesis* which were used by ancient authors to describe philosophical schools, see Glucker 1978, 159–92. Despite their respective difficulties, Wilken 1971; Meeks 1983, 81–84 and Ascough 2002 are worth reading.

12. For the quotation, see Laks 2005, 21; on this aspect in general, see, e.g., Sedley 1989, 97–103; 117–19; Natali 2003, 40–41; Mitsis 2003 and Bénatouil 2006, 415. The flabbiness of the term 'philosophical school' originates not least from two aspects: firstly, no general consensus on the essential categories to conceptualise philosophical schools in Antiquity is currently reached in modern scholarship where descriptive approaches are dominating; secondly, the history of philosophy as written by ancient authors (and often influencing modern attempts) is predominantly the history of individuals which has its initial point in a 'founding father' and his philosophical construct of ideas and which continues with records regarding his 'successors' and their respective enhancements of the particular doctrines. In this context, see Mansfeld 1999, 16–26; see also Döring 1987.

environment'.<sup>13</sup> This ample categorisation of philosophical schools facilitates the subsumption of two different, but interrelated facets of the term 'philosophical school' – the one relatively broad, the other more narrow. On the one hand, there were the various schools of 'constructs of ideas' such as *the* Pythagoreans, *the* Academics / *the* Platonists, *the* Peripatetics, *the* Stoics or *the* Epicureans. These schools, covering a huge spectrum of implementations that need to be distinguished,<sup>14</sup> were not necessarily attached to a certain place, but consisted of all philosophical followers in the Mediterranean world after their respective formation.<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, there were the locally embedded schools which consisted of larger or smaller communities of different perpetuity and which were places of philosophical theorising and teaching; in this context one might refer to *the* Academy, or *the* Peripatus, to *the* Stoa as well as to *the* Garden of Epicurus or *the* school of Clitomachus in the Palladium in Athens; but there was also a huge amount of philosophical schools beyond Athens elsewhere in the Mediterranean world.<sup>16</sup>

Against this background, four major aspects have to be taken into account in different detail regarding the so-called philosophical schools in Athens between the fourth and the first centuries: firstly, in which way were the philosophical schools organised regarding their legal status; secondly, how were the philosophical schools internally organised; thirdly, was there anything like a collective identity of the members and followers of each philosophical school and, if so, what was the respective base for the particular identities; fourthly, what were the modes of interaction between philosophers and philosophical schools on one side and the Athenian political institutions as well as the Athenian public on the other side. The investigation submitted here is chronologically limited

---

13. For this definition of the term 'institution', see Turner 1997, 6. In this context, the instructive thoughts of Mitsis 2003 should be mentioned.

14. See Natali 2003, 41.

15. In this context, see Mason 1996, 31.

16. The particular organisational structures of these philosophical schools as well as the forms of their legal and social situation differed throughout antiquity and have to be analysed separately.

to the period between the fourth and first centuries for two reasons: on the one hand, the development of philosophical schools as institutions with an internal organisational structure began in Athens in the fourth century with the establishment of Plato's Academy;<sup>17</sup> on the other hand, the demise of the philosophical schools in Athens and the city's loss as being 'the one and only' metropolis of philosophising in the Mediterranean World in the first century marks a *caesura*.<sup>18</sup> Although this statement may give at first glance the impression of a steady situation regarding the structure of the philosophical schools in Hellenistic Athens, it is necessary to emphasize that 'the schools without exception underwent an evolution (...) over the centuries of their existence, although it is not always clearly documented.'<sup>19</sup>

In principle, the following aspects are crucial for the subsequent considerations. Firstly, it is by no means 'natural' or self-evident that philosophers constituted communities which were not only more or less loose and sometimes temporary unions around a charismatic figure – like Socrates and his partisans –, but intentionally stable institutions with a more or less developed organisational structure which were intended to be continued after the death of the founding philosopher;<sup>20</sup> one might refer exemplarily to the Academy and the Epicurean Garden respectively.<sup>21</sup> Secondly, philosophers at Athens were never united in one group *qua* philosophers, but – at least partially due to the highly competitive character of Greek phi-

---

17. On the foundation of the Academy, see, e.g., Erler 2007, 51-52.

18. See Frede 1999, 790-93; Sedley 2003 and Ferrary 2007, 45-46. In this context, one should also have in mind the externally as well as internally caused changes in the socio-political conditions shaping the constitution of Athens between 'city-state and provincial town' in the first century; see Habicht 2006, 327-99 with 485-503. On the philosophical schools in Roman Imperial Athens, see, e.g., Camp 1989 and Hahn 1989, 119-36.

19. See Dorandi 1999, 56 and 59 (for the quotation).

20. On philosophers and philosophising persons as well as on the respective social and political conditions in the sixth and fifth centuries, see, among others, Collins 1998, 82-89; Martin 2003; Scholz 2003; Laks 2005; Prince 2006, 432-42, 444-51; Scholz 2006, 37-48; Nightingale 2007 and Wallace 2007.

21. See below, p. 72-77.

losophy and the vehement rivalry between the philosophic protagonists<sup>22</sup> – they constituted various separate and competing entities of highly diverse perpetuity and of different inner structures.<sup>23</sup>

## 2. Philosophical schools and the question of their legal status

In the context of the much disputed field of Athenian law, the question of the legal character of the philosophical schools in late Classical and Hellenistic Athens is most controversial.<sup>24</sup> On one side, this is due to the rare and exceedingly corrupt relevant source material;<sup>25</sup> on the other side, this is caused by the lack of a fully developed and abstract concept of the juristic or corporate person as for associations in ancient Greek law – an aspect that is not always sufficiently considered.<sup>26</sup>

For almost a century, it was more or less the orthodox point of view among classicists that the Athenian philosophical schools, above all the Academy and the Peripatus, were organised as *thiasoi* dedicated to the cult of the Muses.<sup>27</sup> This conceptualisation of the philosophical schools as religious associations was based upon the well-attested cultic worship of the Muses in the philosophical

22. On this aspect, see Gehrke 2004, 478–79 and Azoulay 2009, 305–10; see also Collins 1998, 80–109.

23. See, e.g., Natali 1983 and Dorandi 1999, 61.

24. See Ismard 2010, 186. For the current concern, it is neither the aim nor is it necessary to give an entire and detailed overview on the history of research regarding the legal status of the philosophical schools in Athens; therefore, only the most important approaches are mentioned in the following outline. Further references can be easily found in the quoted literature; see, however, most recently Ismard 2010, 186–87.

25. For the sources regarding the field of Hellenistic philosophy, see, e.g., Mansfeld 1999.

26. In this context, see, e.g., Ustinova 2005, 177–80.

27. See Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1881, 263–91; Ziebarth 1896, 69–74 and Boyancé 1936, 231–327; on the prevailing character of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's achievements see, e.g., Habicht 1994, 232 and Ismard 2010, 186 n. 209. On 'private religious associations' in Athens, see Parker 1996, 333–42 and Arnaoutoglou 2003; see also Leiwo 1997 with the appropriate criticism of Kloppenborg and Ascough 2011, 6–7.



schools.<sup>28</sup> Approximately at the same time as the *thiasoi*-thesis emerged, a competing attempt to conceptualise the philosophical schools was also developed: according to this, the philosophical schools (in Athens), especially the Academy and the Peripatus, were compared with modern research facilities and universities.<sup>29</sup> It was with good reason that this approach never became accepted to a greater extent.<sup>30</sup> Only since the 1970s, the notion of the philosophical schools as religious associations has been vigorously and validly criticised amongst other aspects due to the fact that none of the philosophical schools has ever been denoted *thiasos* by any ancient author.<sup>31</sup> Yet, until now, a new *communis opinio* in respect of the legal status as well as the organisational form of the philosophical schools in Athens has not resulted from this debate.<sup>32</sup> The most sweeping and widely accepted hypothesis for nearly three decades was at the same time the first in the course of the anti-thiasotic turn: according to its proponents, philosophical schools were not *thiasoi*, but ‘private organizations (...) detached from governmental regulation’ without any ‘official legal status at all’ and ‘secular organizations formed for an educational purpose’.<sup>33</sup> Despite the mostly positive

---

28. On the cultic worship of the Muses in two of the philosophical schools, the Academy and the Peripatus, see, e.g., Boyancé 1936, 249–327 and Scholz 1998, 16–17. See Jackson 1971, 15, 20–24, 32–33 on prayers to the Muses as literary element in the Platonic dialogues. It is worth mentioning in this context that in the Imperial Period a ‘priest of the Philosophical Muses’ is attested epigraphically; see Meritt 1946, 233 no. 64 = *SEG* 21.703. However, nothing else is known about this priesthood since there is no further evidence; see Oliver 1979; Camp 1989, 50–51 and Hahn 1989, 122. On Harpocraton’s reference to Theophrastus’ will in his lemma on *orgeonas* (Harp., s.v. ὀργεῶνας), which is for various reasons difficult to interpret, see Sollenberger 1983, 54–55; Ustinova 2005, 180 and Ismard 2010, 198.

29. See Usener 1884.

30. See, e.g., Lynch 1972, 65–67 and Laks 2005, 25–26.

31. See Lynch 1972, 109–10.

32. See Gottschalk 1972, 329 n. 2; Lynch 1972, 106–21; Glucker 1978, 229–30; Jones 1999, 227–34 and Ismard 2010, 186–87.

33. For the quotations, see Lynch 1972, 130, 129, 128. Affirmatively commented on Lynch’s approach, among others, Glucker 1978, 229–30; Habicht 1994, 232; Korhonen 1997, 81–82 and – more cautiously – Sedley 1998, 472; for further references, see Ismard 2010, 187 n. 217. Critically or at least sceptically commented on this approach, among others, Isnardi Parente 1986, 352–57; Natali 1991, 100–04; Müller

reception of this hypothesis, it is not without inconsistencies – one might refer to the insufficient attempts to explain the annulation of the so-called law of Sophocles in 306/5<sup>34</sup> as well as to the patrimonies of some of the philosophical schools and their endorsements over several generations.<sup>35</sup> Resting predominantly upon a passage from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, a new suggestion was brought into play at the very end of the last millennium: according to this suggestion, the philosophical schools in Athens are to be counted among the *koinonai*.<sup>36</sup> On *koinonai*, usually translated more or less accurately with 'communities' or 'associations',<sup>37</sup> Aristotle has written in the *Nicomachean Ethics*:

For in every *koinonia* there seems to be some justice, and some kind of *philia*<sup>38</sup> also. At any rate, fellow-voyagers and comrades-in-arms are called *philo*i, and so are members of other *koinonai*. And the extent of their *koinonia* is the extent of their *philia*, since it is also the extent of the justice found there. (...) But while brothers and companions have everything in common, what people have in common in other types of *koinonai* is limited, more in some *koinonai* and less in others since

---

1994, 68 n. 45; Dorandi 1999, 54–55 and Scholz 1998, 16–17 n. 17; see also Ismard 2010, 186–87. Scholz's conclusion that the sacrifices to the Muses by the members of the Academy (as well as by other 'teaching personnel' in the gymnasia) were credentials of their loyalty towards the Athenian citizenry is, however, not compelling. The reference of Scholz 1998, 17 n. 17 to Aeschin. *In Tim.* 10 regarding the Athenian philosophical schools should be at the very last considered as uncertain; see in this context Morgan 1999, 49. On cults of Muses in Athenian educational institutions and gymnasia, see Fisher 2001, 130–34, esp. 132, *ad loc.* and Parker 2005, 251–52.

34. See Lynch 1972, 103–04, 109–10; 117–118; 128–29, 153; for some critical remarks, see Jones 1999, 229 esp. n. 36 and Ustinova 2005, 180 esp. n. 20. For the interpretation of the so-called law of Sophocles in its historical context, see below on p. 67–71.

35. See Ismard 2010, 187.

36. See Jones 1999, 228–29; this point of view has been accepted by Ustinova 2005, 180; Haake 2007, 32; Gabrielsen 2007, 184 with 195 n. 48 and Haake 2008, 105.

37. See, e.g., Finley 1970, 8; see also the remarks by Ismard 2010, 14–15.

38. Millet 1991, 114 by quoting Goldhill 1986, 82, describes the meaning of *philia* in the following words: '(...) *philia* (...) represents (...) a way of marking a person's position in society by his relationships. The appellation or categorization *philos* is used to mark not just affection, but overridingly a series of complex obligations, duties and claims.'

some *philiai* are more and some are less. (...) All *koinonai* would seem to be part of the political *koinonia*. For people keep company for some advantage and to supply something contributing to their life. Moreover, the political *koinonia* seems both to have been originally formed and to endure for advantage; (...) The other types of the *koinonia* aim at partial advantage. Voyagers, for example, seek the advantage proper to a journey, in making money or something like that, while comrades-in-arms seek the advantage proper to the war, desiring either money or victory or a city; and the same is true of fellow-tribesmen and fellow-demesmen. Some *koinonai* – religious societies and *eranistai* – seem to arise for pleasure, since these are respectively for religious worship and companionship. All these *koinonai* seem to be subordinate to the political *koinonia*, since it aims at some advantage close at hand, but at advantage for the whole life.<sup>39</sup>

Even if Aristotle does not mention philosophers or philosophical schools in the quoted text or in any related passage, it is a plausible suggestion to subsume philosophical schools under the wide-ranging Aristotelian concept of *koinonai*<sup>40</sup> consisting of what one might

39. Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1159b26–60a23: ἐν ἀπάσῃ γὰρ κοινωνίᾳ δοκεῖ τι δίκαιον εἶναι, καὶ φιλία δὲ· προσαγορευοῦσι γοῦν ὡς φίλους τοὺς σύμπλους καὶ τοὺς συστρατιώτας, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις κοινωνίαις. καθ' ὅσον δὲ κοινωνοῦσιν, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτόν ἐστι φιλία· καὶ γὰρ τὸ δίκαιον. (...). ἔστι δ' ἀδελφοῖς μὲν καὶ ἐταίροις πάντα κοινά, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοις ἀφορισμένα, καὶ τοῖς μὲν πλεῖοις τοῖς δ' ἐλάττω· καὶ γὰρ τῶν φιλιῶν αἱ μὲν μᾶλλον αἰ δ' ἦττον. (...) αἱ δὲ κοινωνίαι πᾶσαι μορίοις εἰκόσασιν τῆς πολιτικῆς· συμπορευόμεναι γὰρ ἐπὶ τινὶ συμφέροντι, καὶ ποριζόμεναι τι τῶν βούλων γὰρ ἐπὶ τινὶ συμφέροντι, καὶ ποριζόμεναι τι τῶν εἰς τὸν βίον· καὶ ἡ πολιτικὴ δὲ κοινωνία τοῦ συμφέροντος χάριν δοκεῖ καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς συνελθεῖν καὶ διαμείνειν (...) αἱ μὲν οὖν ἄλλαι κοινωνίαι κατὰ μέρη τοῦ συμφέροντος ἐφίενται, οἷον πλοῦτηρες μὲν τοῦ κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον πρὸς ἐργασίαν χρημάτων ἢ τι τοιοῦτον, συστρατιώται δὲ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον, εἴτε χρημάτων εἴτε νίκης ἢ πόλεως ὀρεγόμενοι, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ φυλάται καὶ δημόται. ἔναι δὲ τῶν κοινωπιῶν δι' ἡδονὴν δοκοῦσι γίνεσθαι, θιασωτῶν καὶ ἐρανιστῶν· αὐταὶ γὰρ θυσίας ἔνεκα καὶ συνουσίας, πᾶσαι δ' αὐταὶ ὑπὸ τὴν πολιτικὴν εἰκόσασιν εἶναι· οὐ γὰρ τοῦ παρόντος συμφέροντος ἡ πολιτικὴ ἐφίεται, ἀλλ' εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν βίον. – The translation is taken from Millett 1991, 114–15; for the constitution of the text and a commentary, see Gauthier and Jolif 1959, 697–99. On the quoted passage, see also Jones 1999, 27–33; Bendlin 2002, 19–20; Arnautoglou 2003, 125–44; Vlassopoulos 2007, 86–88 and Ismard 2010, 13–15. One might refer in this context also to Arist. *Eth. Eud.* 1242a1–19; see Schofield 1998, 40–43 and Jones 1999, 28.

40. Otherwise, but inconclusively, see Lynch 1972, III; against Lynch's explanations, see Jones 1999, 229 n. 35.

call ‘public subdivisions’ as well as ‘voluntary associations’ because of two reasons:<sup>41</sup> firstly, there are two sections in the *Nicomachean Ethics* where Aristotle ‘uses the verb corresponding to the noun *koinonia* (i.e. κοινώνειν) of those participating in philosophical activity’;<sup>42</sup> secondly, Aristotle did not aim to present an entire catalogue of *koinonai* or a clear definition of this term in the quoted passage, but rather to propound a theoretical framework combined with a delineation that contains various examples. This descriptive approach by Aristotle originates from the peculiar circumstance that in the language of Greek law no term for the phenomenon of associations ever existed.<sup>43</sup> In the case of Athens, this circumstance manifests itself in the formulation in the so-called Solonian law on associations.<sup>44</sup> Yet, against the background that ‘the testimony of non-philosophical texts supports Aristotle’s conception of *koinonai*, incorporating associations of all kinds’,<sup>45</sup> it is a legitimate undertaking to consider the Aristotelian conception of *koinonai* not simply as a philosophical construct beyond social reality, but to apply it to the world of ancient Athens and, furthermore, to use it with all necessary methodological elaborateness in modern research on associations in Classical and Hellenistic Athens.<sup>46</sup>

At first glance, subsuming the philosophical schools in Athens under the *koinonai*, the voluntary or – less appropriate – non-public or also private associations, might appear to be an aspect of little

---

41. See, e.g., Gabrielsen 2007, 178–79.

42. See Jones 1999, 228 who refers to Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1164b2–3 and 1172a1–8. Furthermore, it is worth reconsidering in this context that also Theophrastus in his will also uses the word *koinonountes* to designate those of his friends who should inherit the garden, the walk as well as the houses adjacent to the garden and who might wish to philosophise together (Diog. Laert. 5.52–53); thus, the *koinonountes* are those who should constitute the core of the Peripatus after the scholar’s death. See again Jones 1999, 228 and also Ismard 2010, 197–98.

43. See, e.g., Hadzopoulos 1975, 6–7 and Ismard 2007, 61. One should also have in mind, what Finley 1970, 8 has pointed out: ‘Obviously no single word will render the spectrum of *koinōnīai*.’

44. *Dig.* 47.22.4 = Ruschenbusch 2014, 145 F 76a; see also below n. 57.

45. See Millett 1991, 115. For an exhaustive study on *koinonai*, see Endenburg 1937.

46. In this respect, see, e.g., Gabrielsen 2007, 179; see also Vlassopoulos 2007, esp. 86–88. Differently, however, Ismard 2007, 61 and Ismard 2010, 13–15.

importance; yet, its consequences are considerable as in general the *koinoníai* certainly ‘had no formal (*i.e.* constitutional) affiliation to the *polis*’, but ‘they all remained subject to *polis* law’.<sup>47</sup> The crucial point is how and to what extent the Athenian law treated associations in general and the philosophical schools in particular. The solution to this aspect comes along with the explanation of the successful proceedings against the so-called law of Sophocles in 306/5.<sup>48</sup> This law, decreed in the previous year, is one of the most neuralgic points in the history of philosophers in Athens and at the same time the most important starting point to explain the legal status of the philosophical schools in Athens. This complex has often been explained unpersuasively,<sup>49</sup> due to the difficult source material since the relevant text passages by Alexis, Athenaeus, Diogenes Laertius and Pollux do not easily result in a coherent conclusion.<sup>50</sup> Nevertheless, it can be argued convincingly that the so-called law of Sophocles, which was resolved immediately after the expulsion of Demetrius of Phalerum from Athens in the course of a series of politically motivated anti-Macedonian acts by Athenian democratic partisans,<sup>51</sup> decreed ‘that no philosopher should preside over a school except by permission of the *boule* and the *demos*, under penalty of death’.<sup>52</sup> This

---

47. So Gabrielsen 2007, 179; for a general overview on voluntary associations, see Wilson 1996.

48. Sophocles, son of Amphiclides, of Sounion is otherwise unknown; see Haake 2007, 19 n. 26. The statement of Ustinova 2005, 187 that ‘[b]ehind Sophocles stood Xenocrates and the Academy (*cf.* Athen., XIII, 610e), rivaling the Peripatos in philosophy as well as in politics’ is not correct.

49. See, e.g., Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1881, 270–72; Lynch 1972, 117–18 as well as O’Sullivan 2002, 252–53 and 260–61.

50. See Kassel–Austin, *PCG* II Alexis *fr.* 99 *ap.* Ath. 13.610e; Ath. 13.610e–f; Diog. Laert. 5.38 and Poll. *Onom.* 9.42; for a detailed interpretation, see Haake 2008, 89–89 and 94–96.

51. For the historical context and the political background of the so-called law of Sophocles, see in greater detail and with further references Haake 2007, 16–43 and Haake 2008, 97–103. On the political climate in Athens after the expulsion of Demetrius of Phalerum, see Habicht 2006, 85–93 with 424–27.

52. Diog. Laert. 5.38 (transl. by R.D. Hicks): (...) μηδένα τῶν φιλοσόφων σχολῆς ἀφηγεῖσθαι ἂν μὴ τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ δόξῃ· εἰ δὲ μὴ, θάνατον εἶναι τὴν ζημίαν. – See Haake 2008, 94–96. The true meaning of ἀφηγεῖσθαι is not clear.

clause reflects the aforementioned unawareness of Greek law with respect to associations as juridical persons, since it is not directed against philosophical schools as institutions, but against the philosophers acting as ‘heads’ of philosophical schools. Even if this was not the regulation of the decree, its effect was the exodus of all philosophers from Athens.<sup>53</sup> However, this situation did not last for long because a certain Philo, a man related to the Peripatus,<sup>54</sup> successfully initiated a procedure of illegality against the so-called law of Sophocles.<sup>55</sup> Even if it is not known from ancient sources which Athenian law was violated by the so-called law of Sophocles, it can be plausibly suggested that it was a law cited by the Roman jurist Gaius in his tract on the Law of the Twelve Tables: the so-called Solonian law on associations.<sup>56</sup> According to Gaius, this law was of the following content:

If the inhabitants of a district, or precinct, or (performers?) of sacred rites, or sailors, or messmates, or individuals providing for their burial, or members of religious groups, or individuals engaged in some enterprise for plunder or trade, whatever they agree between themselves shall be valid unless forbidden by public statutes.<sup>57</sup>

It must be conceded that the suggestion that the repealing of the law of Sophocles in 306/5 was connected with the so-called Solonian law on associations, is based upon two improvable, but plausible

53. This can be inferred from Ath. 13.610e; Diog. Laert. 5.38.

54. On Philo, see, e.g., Haake 2007, 29.

55. The philosophers’ return to Athens is only mentioned by Diog. Laert. 5.38.

56. *Dig.* 47.22.4; see Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1881, 279; Whitehead 1986, 13–14; Habicht 1994, 237; Jones 1999, esp. 39 and 229; Ustinova 2005, 186–87; Haake 2007, 30–32 and Haake 2008, 103–04.

57. *Dig.* 47.22.4 = Ruschenbusch 2014, 145 F 76a: ἐὰν δὲ δῆμος ἢ φράτορες ἢ ἱερῶν ὀργίων ἢ † ναῦται † ἢ σύσσιτοι ἢ ὁμόταφοι ἢ θιασῶται ἢ ἐπι λείαν οἰχόμενοι ἢ εἰς ἐμπορίαν, ὅ, τι ἂν τούτων διαθῶνται πρὸς ἀλλήλους κύριον εἶναι μὴ ἀπαγρεύσει δημόσια γράμματα. – The Greek text follows Arnaoutoglou 2003, 44; the translation is basically that by Arnaoutoglou (2003, 44), but also uses some elements of his translation presented in oral contribution at Copenhagen. For discussions of the partially corrupt Greek text, see, e.g., Radin 1910, 36–51; Jones 1999, 33–35 and 311–20; Arnaoutoglou 2003, 44–50; Ustinova 2005, 183–85 and Ismard 2010, 44–57.

conditions: firstly, this law, whose Solonian origin as well as its dating are a matter of controversy, must have been generally valid regarding its central elements at the end of the fourth century;<sup>58</sup> secondly, this law must have been applicable to the philosophical schools.<sup>59</sup> Provided that both conditions are the case: How did the so-called law of Sophocles violate the so-called Solonian law on associations? It seems reasonable to assume that Philo referred to the *patrios politeia*, and thus to the figure of Solon, and argued successfully along the line that presiding over a school was not forbidden by public statutes.<sup>60</sup>

However, assuming that the so-called Solonian law on associations was violated by the so-called law of Sophocles and that the latter was therefore annulated, then it is possible to explain a noticeable fact, too: although there is some literary evidence that prove the unproblematic establishment of philosophical schools in Athens between the fourth and the first centuries, there is only marginal

---

58. It should be stressed that in respect to the current concern it is not of any relevance whether the so-called Solonian 'law on associations' is genuinely Solonian or not; the crucial point is that this law was valid in the last decade of the 4th century. See in this context Haake 2007, 31–32 and Haake 2008, 104. It has been pointed out that Gaius' explanations in the *Digests* reflect his contemporary legal reality; see, e.g., Bendlin 2002, 10 n. 5. Yet, this conclusion does not spare the question for the original historical setting as well as the original content and wording of the law attributed to Solon. To mention just two positions put forward recently in the ongoing scholarly debate, one might refer to the controversial points of view of Arnaoutoglou 2003, 44–57 and Ismard 2010, 45–56. For further references regarding the discussion of *Dig.* 47.22.4, see, e.g., Haake 2007, 30–32 and Haake 2008, 104. See furthermore Scafuro 2006 as well as Rhodes 2006 for the ongoing discussion on the possibilities and limitations of the identification of Solonian laws.

59. On the one hand, this means that the law was not exclusively valid for those types of associations mentioned, but that it was applicable to all *koinonai*; its content was therefore descriptive, but not definitive. See Jones 1999, 39 as well as 229 and see furthermore Haake 2008, 105. On the other hand, this implies that the philosophical schools were subsumed under the *koinonai*. In this context, it might be worth reconsidering once again the cryptic and much discussed *dikai koinonikai* attested in the Aristotelian *Constitution of Athens* (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 52.2). See the controversial points of view by Lipsius 1908, 771–72; Harrison 1968, 22; Harrison 1971, 242–43; Cohen 1973, 14; Rhodes 1992, 586; Arnaoutoglou 2003, 139 and Ismard 2007, 62–66.

60. Haake 2008, 105.

proof which depicts the foundation of a philosophical school in a detailed manner, and there is not a single piece of evidence suggesting any difficulty in the process of founding a philosophical school at all.<sup>61</sup> Against the background of the so-called Solonian law, this finding, which is consistent with our information about other types of associations, becomes evident:<sup>62</sup> since the rules of the philosophical schools did not affect Athenian law, neither founding nor heading a philosophical school was generally a concern of Athenian political or legal institutions. Yet, two aspects can be deduced from this point. Firstly, this matter of fact makes clear that the exceptional political circumstances of 307/6 provided the necessary conditions for the initial success of Sophocles and his law. Even if Demetrius of Phalerum, who dominated Athens between 317/6 and 307/6, was by no means a ‘philosopher-ruler’, his contacts with philosophers in general and Peripatetics in particular were sufficient to discredit philosophers as politically untrustworthy, oligarchic and philo-Macedonian partisans after Demetrius’ expulsion from Athens. These charges were in no way innovative, but topics in the arsenal of anti-philosophical polemics.<sup>63</sup> But only in the climate of 307/6

61. Exemplarily, one might refer to the foundation of philosophical schools by Cleitomachus in the Palladium in 140/39 (Phld., *Hist. Acad.*, col. XXXV, ll. 1–11 ed. Dorandi; see Brittain 2001, 46–47) and a certain Charmadas in the Ptolemaeum at c. 130 (Phld., *Hist. Acad.*, col. XXXII, ll. 6–10 ed. Dorandi; see Brittain 2001, 47) respectively; next to these Academic philosophers the Stoic Aristo of Chius is worth to be mentioned: He established his own school in the Cynosarges at an unknown time in the early second third of the third century (Diog. Laert. 7.161; see Ioppolo 1980). A thorough analysis of the literary accounts on the foundation of philosophical schools in Athens and elsewhere in the Classical and Hellenistic periods is still missing.

62. See, e.g., Ustinova 2005, 184–85.

63. These allegations were part of the apology for Sophocles written by Demosthenes’ nephew Demochares and held in the course of the proceedings regarding the legality of the law of Sophocles in 306/5; see Democh. frg 1 Marasco = *BNJ* 75 Demochares F 1 ed. Dmitriev *ap.* Ath. 11.508f–509b; Democh. frg. 2 Marasco = *BNJ* 75 Demochares F 2 ed. Dmitriev = Aristocl. frg. 2.6 Chiesara *ap.* Euseb. *Præp. Ev.* 15.2.6; Democh. frg 3a ed. Marasco = *BNJ* 75 Demochares F 3a ed. Dmitriev *ap.* Ath. 5.215c and – slightly different – Democh. frg 3b Marasco = *BNJ* 75 F 3b ed. Dmitriev *ap.* Ath. 5.187d. Even if Demochares’ oration failed, it is plausible to assume that its charges against philosophers, who were members of various schools, reflected the public attitude in



was it possible to ‘transform’ these political charges into a law regarding all philosophers instead of referring to the single charges of *asebeia* against individual philosophers.<sup>64</sup> Secondly, the successful procedure of illegality against the law of Sophocles in 306/5 which attested that philosophical schools were generally not a concern of Athenian political or legal institutions resulted not only in the return of the philosophers who had left Athens in the previous year, but it should also be regarded as a factor in the context of the foundation of two new philosophical schools in the following years: the Stoa and the Garden of Epicurus.<sup>65</sup>

Even if it should become plausible that the philosophical schools in Athens are to be subsumed under the general concept of *koinonai*, it is necessary to ask at the end of this chapter for possible differences between the various philosophical schools in Athens in respect of their legal structure, since the ‘*koinonai*-status’ of the philosophical schools does not essentially imply that they were organised in an identical juridical form.<sup>66</sup> In this context, the testaments of various Academic, Peripatetic and Epicurean scholarchs,<sup>67</sup> are of crucial significance and have been discussed for more than a century.<sup>68</sup> These legal documents, altogether eight in number, are handed

---

307/6 when the Sophoclean law was decreed by the Athenians. On Demochares’ polemics against philosophers, see the detailed analysis by Haake 2007, 32–40; see also the commentary by Marasco 1984, 163–76 and see most recently Dmitriev’s commentary within the framework of his BNJ-edition of Demochares.

64. On trials of *asebeia* against philosophers in the 4th century, see, e.g., Scholz 1998, 62–68; Haake 2006, 344–48; Haake 2007, 21 n. 34; Haake 2008, 100 and Haake 2009, 121–24; see also O’Sullivan 1997 and Mari 2003.

65. See, e.g., Haake 2007, 42–43 and Haake 2008, 106.

66. See, e.g., Maffi 2008, 124.

67. It seems worth noting that words with the stem *σχολαρχ-* are very rarely attested in ancient Greek texts; according to the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, there are less than a dozen pieces of evidence. Therefore, the term scholarch, common in modern literature, should not be considered in the first instance as an ancient concept, but as an expression of modern homogenising terminology for a phenomenon labeled variously by ancient authors.

68. See, among others, especially Bruns 1880; Gottschalk 1972; Clay 1973; Glucker 1978, 226–55; Dimakis 1987; Dorandi 1992 and Ismard 2010, 188–204.

down by Diogenes Laertius and in a papyrus from Herculaneum.<sup>69</sup> In the course of a renewed discussion of the associational character of the Athenian philosophical schools it has recently been suggested on the basis of the scholars' testaments that the Academy, the Peripatus and Epicurus' Garden were associations in the form of testamentary foundations,<sup>70</sup> and that it is necessary to distinguish between the scholars of the schools and their private property and the proprietaries of the landed estate of the schools.<sup>71</sup> If this attractive suggestion, which is admittedly rich in prerequisites, is true,<sup>72</sup> a much debated aspect would be solved, too: the difficulty regarding the often debated right of *enktesis* of scholars who were mostly not Athenians, but metics.<sup>73</sup>

---

69. For the testament of Plato, see Diog. Laert. 3.41-43; for the Academic scholars Crantor and Arcesilaus the existence of wills is attested, See Diog. Laert. 4.25 and 4.43-44. The testaments of the following Peripatetic scholars are handed down: Aristotle (Diog. Laert. 5.11-16; see Arist. *priv. script. frag.*, p. 35-42 Plezia), Theophrastus (Diog. Laert. 5.51-57 = Theophr. frag. 1 [p. 40-47] Fortenbaugh - Huby - Sharples), Strato of Lampsacus (Diog. Laert. 5.61-64 = Strato frag. 10 Wehrli = Lyco frag. 4 [p. 30-33] Stork - Fortenbaugh - Dorandi - van Ophuijsen) and Lyco of Alexandria Troas (Diog. Laert. 5.69-74 = Lyco frag. 15 Wehrli = Lyco frag. 1 [p. 20-27] Stork - Fortenbaugh - Dorandi - van Ophuijsen). Next to Epicurus' testament (Diog. Laert. 10.16-21 = Epicur. frag. 1 [p. 12-17] Arrighetti<sup>2</sup>) the wills of the Epicurean scholars Polystratus (*PHerc.* 1780, frags. VIIIc, VIIIId, VIIIe and VIIIi) and Dionysius of Lamprae (*PHerc.* 1780, frag. VII) are known, too; see Tepedino Guerra 1980, 18-21. From A.D. 121 and A.D. 125 respectively, two letters by the empress Plotina regarding legal aspects of the Epicurean scholar's succession and testament to the Epicureans from Athens are known; see, e.g. with detailed, but divergent interpretations and restorations of the texts Follet 1994 (= *SEG* 43.24) and van Bremen 2005 (= *SEG* 55.249).

70. See Ismard 2010, 186-204, esp. 203: 'Dans le cadre de fondations testamentaires, ces associations (*i.e.* les écoles philosophiques [M.H.]) pouvaient être gestionnaires directs de patrimoines, qui avaient été affectés à perpétuité en vue d'une destination précise (le Lycée et peut-être l'Académie), ou indirects, par l'intermédiaire des héritiers du fondateur (le jardin d'Épicure).'

71. See again Ismard 2010, 203.

72. Unfortunately, it would go beyond the scope of this article to discuss in detail the conceptualisation of the Platonic, Peripatetic and Epicurean schools in Athens as testamentary foundations.

73. See, e.g., O'Sullivan 2002, esp. 254-57.

However, even as testamentary foundations the Academy, the Peripatus and Epicurus' Garden would be part of the world of Athenian *koinonai*.<sup>74</sup> But what about the other philosophical schools? Due to the fact that there is, for example, no evidence for any estate in connection with the Stoa<sup>75</sup> – if not to bring up the already mentioned ephemeral philosophical schools – it is compelling to infer that the Athenian philosophical schools must have been organised differently in respect to their specific legal status within the framework of *koinonai*.

### 3. The Athenian philosophical schools: their organisational structure

One of the main characteristics of voluntary associations is the fact that they were generally organised like 'true imitations of the *polis*',<sup>76</sup> although 'they distanced themselves from prevailing juridical distinctions between status categories'.<sup>77</sup> How can the situation of the philosophical schools be described in terms of these statements? To begin with a general remark regarding the relevant sources: their condition allows only for some cursory views, but they do not offer a complete image. Calling to mind the fragmentary evidence concerning the internal structure of the Athenian philosophical schools, one has to admit that it is not possible to describe them as 'true imitations of the *polis*'. Nevertheless, the sidelights already mentioned confirm that at least the Academy, the Peripatus and Epicurus' Garden had a more or less elaborated, but distinct internal structure with different 'administrative functions'.<sup>78</sup> What all these schools, probably also the Stoa, had in common was the fact that each of them was headed by one person, in Greek labelled occasionally *prostates* or *archon*, but hardly

---

74. Differently, however, Ismard 2007, 61 and Ismard 2010, 13–15.

75. See Ludlam 2003, 36–38 and Bénatouil 2006, 417. The opinion that the Stoa was organised comparably to the Academy, the Peripatus and Epicurus' Garden is widely accepted, but by no means certain; however, see Steinmetz 1994, 495.

76. See Gabrielsen 2007, 181 and already Poland 1909, 337–40.

77. See Gabrielsen 2007, 179.

78. A short, but careful overview on the 'organization and structure of the philosophical schools' has been presented by Dorandi 1999.

ever *scholarches*.<sup>79</sup> This person was responsible for the philosophical affairs of the respective school in Athens,<sup>80</sup> but not for the school's real estate.<sup>81</sup> In contrast to the institutions of the *poleis*, being head of a philosophical school had no temporal restriction, but was in general taken on for life; there are only few examples of 'retirement'.<sup>82</sup> Besides the scholarchs, who always acted as sole 'office holders',<sup>83</sup> it is possible to identify one further office. The respective 'office holder' is also called *archon*, but he is obviously to be distinguished from the scholarch. According to Diogenes Laertius, Aristotle, following the example of the Academic Xenocrates, 'made it a rule in his school that every ten days a new *archon* should be appointed'.<sup>84</sup> Even if it is often suggested and widely accepted that Athenaeus, referring to Antigonos of Carystus' *Life of Lyco*, relates some details regarding the Peripatetic 'archonship', this point of view should be considered at least partially as doubtful.<sup>85</sup> According to Athenaeus,

a person was required to assume the standard duties in Aristotle's school (that is, to supervise the behavior of the new students) for 30 days, and on the final day of the month he had to collect nine obols from every new student and offer a dinner not only on the individuals who had contributed money, but to anyone Lycon might invite as well, along with whatever older men visited the school regularly. (...) In addition, he had to make a sacrifice and take care of the rites in honor of the Muses.<sup>86</sup>

79. See Dorandi 1999, 58; for a sceptical view with regard to the existence of a Stoic scholarch in a literal sense, see Ludlam 33. On the Greek word *scholarches*, see above on p. 71 n. 67.

80. See, e.g., Steinmetz 1994, 495 and Dorandi 1999, 58. As already mentioned, this view is called in question by Ludlam 2003, esp. 35–36 regarding the Stoa; see also Mitsis 2003, 465.

81. See above, p. 72.

82. See Dorandi 1999, 58.

83. See Dorandi 1999, 58.

84. Diog. Laert. 5.4 (= Xenocr. Phil. *test.* 27 ed. Isnardi Parente and Dorandi): ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ σχολῇ νομοθετεῖν μιμούμενον Ξενοκράτην, ὥστε κατὰ δέκα ἡμέρας ἄρχοντα ποιεῖν. The translation is by R.D. Hicks. On this passage see, e.g., Isnardi Parente and Dorandi 2012, 219 *ad loc.*; Lynch 1972, 82 and Ismard 2010, 198.

85. See Isnardi Parente 1982, 289 and Dorandi 2002, 50 n. 115.

86. Antig. Car. *fig.* 23 Dorandi *ap.* Ath. 12.547e–f: ἔδει γὰρ ἄρξαι τε τὴν νομιζομένην ἐν τῷ

The mode of appointment is known only in the case of the scholars: they could be either nominated by their predecessor or elected by the members of the school. Remarkably, both modes are traceable in one and the same school – at least in the Academy.<sup>87</sup> Speaking of ‘members’, an important group comes into play which leads to the question of membership in the philosophical schools. The knowledge of how membership in philosophical schools was organised is rather limited, and it is only possible to make some general statements. Firstly, membership in the philosophical schools was not restricted to male Athenian citizens, but was open to metics and even women as well as slaves; yet, whereas women and slaves are only rarely attested as members in the philosophical schools, there were numerous metics.<sup>88</sup> This phenomenon is a general characteristic of associations<sup>89</sup> – and in the case of the philosophical schools it should therefore not be interpreted by referring to philosophical theorems on human nature, but first and foremost with regard to comparable contemporary social practices. However, this does not mean that the established social order was completely turned upside down within the philosophical schools: nei-

---

περιπάτω ἀρχὴν (αὕτη δ' ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς εὐκοσμίας τῶν ἐπιχειρούντων) τριάκονθ' ἡμέρας, εἶτα τῆ ἔνη καὶ νέα λαβόντα ἀφ' ἑκάστου τῶν ἐπιχειρούντων ἑννέα ὀβολοὺς ὑποδέξασθαι μὴ μόνον αὐτοὺς τοὺς τὴν συμβολὴν εἰσενεγκόντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ οὓς παρακαλέσειεν ὁ Λύκων, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐπιμελῶς συναντῶντας τῶν πρεσβυτέρων εἰς τὴν σχολήν, (...) ἱεροποιησαί τε καὶ τῶν Μουσειῶν ἐπιμελητὴν γενέσθαι. The translation is by S.D. Olson. On this passage, see the various approaches by Lynch 1972, 112–14; Scholz 1998, 16–17 n. 17; Dorandi 2002, 50 n. 116 and Ismard 2010, 198–99.

87. See Dorandi 1999, 58.

88. See Dorandi 1999, 58. On some alleged female Epicureans, see, however, Haake 2007, 295–96 who argues that they were hetaerae interested in philosophers, but not in philosophy.

89. On this general characteristic see Gabrielsen 2007, 179: ‘Another general characteristic is that they (*i.e.* the voluntary associations; M.H.) distanced themselves from prevailing juridical distinctions between status categories, freely admitting as members both citizens and all categories of non-citizens – that is, foreigners, women and in some cases slaves as well.’ Thus, the Athenian associations were ‘true imitations of the *polis*’ (Gabrielsen 2007, 181) regarding their institutional organisation, but they did not adopt the social and political stratigraphy of the *polis* in respect of their membership. This fact seen individually does not imply anything about the modes of inner-associational hierarchies.

ther a female nor a slave member is ever attested as scholar of one of the philosophical schools which were dominated by free-born male Athenians and non-Athenians who originated mostly from the upper classes of the *poleis* of the Mediterranean world or the Black Sea region. This is not surprising since philosophising was from the very beginning an integral part of a male elitist habitus.<sup>90</sup> Secondly, it seems reasonable to differentiate between various groups within and surrounding the philosophical schools: permanent members, temporary members, listeners of philosophical lessons and a group which might be labelled as ‘friends and followers’. At least, it is to establish that nothing is known about any regulation or forms of membership in any of the philosophical schools. Thirdly, there is some sporadic evidence for internal distinctions within the Academy, the Peripatus, the Stoa and the Epicurean Garden.

In the Academy and the Peripatus the younger and the older students are attested as distinct groups.<sup>91</sup> With respect to the Stoa for instance, it is known that there were teachers who taught introductory courses.<sup>92</sup> As for the Epicurean Garden the ‘functional’ groups of *philosophoi*, *philologoi*, *kathegetai* and *syntheis* are known; however, this should not lead to the conclusion that a very elaborated and hierarchical internal differentiation existed in Epicurus’ school. Rather, next to the ‘big four’, namely the ‘models’ Epicurus, Metrodorus, Hermarchus and Polyaeus, there was one group which formed the core of the Garden after the deaths of the Epicurean founding fathers: the *sophoi*, the wise men.<sup>93</sup>

This broad overview illustrates that the Athenian philosophical schools were not ‘true imitations of the *polis*’.<sup>94</sup> Yet, at least for the Academy, the Peripatus and Epicurus’ Garden some organisational

---

90. See, e.g., Haake 2009, 132; see also Perrin-Saminadayar 2003.

91. See Dorandi 1998, 58. For the Academy, one might refer to Phld. *Hist. Acad.*, coll. VI, l. 41 and XVIII, ll. 4–6 ed. Dorandi; as for the Peripatus, see Diog. Laert. 5.70–71.

92. Phld. *Hist. Stoic.*, col. LXXVII, ll. 2–3 ed. Dorandi; in this context, see, e.g., Haake 2012, 52.

93. See Dorandi 1999, 57 and Haake 2007, 310–11; see Scholz 1998, 304 n. 181 with a different interpretation of evidence.

94. This quotation is taken from Gabrielsen 2007, 181.

structures can be grasped which refer in some sense to a ‘typical’ associational character of the philosophical schools even if the image is rather sketchy. Beyond question, one of the most important aspects regarding the internal organisational structures of the philosophical schools in Athens are the differences between the various philosophical communities. It might be a worthwhile undertaking to analyse in greater detail the nexus between the organisational characteristics of the different philosophical schools, the opportunity to have some real estate at their disposal or not, and the question of the schools’ educational and constructional infrastructure, the manner of generating income, the issue of a fixed meeting place in cases where estate and infrastructure were lacking, the size of the philosophical schools, and their persistence.

#### 4. The Athenian philosophical schools as social entities

What held the Athenian philosophical schools together at the core? To answer this question, it is necessary not only to emphasise the organisational aspects of the philosophical schools, but also to underline social practices and theoretical, in a way ‘ideological’, frameworks which provide the basis for the forming and possibly the perpetuation of a collective identity of a philosophical school as a particular entity.<sup>95</sup>

Not surprisingly, the philosophical doctrines constituted the central element of the identity of a philosophical school that distinguished one philosophical school from another. However, in this context the role and the consequences of written and oral impartation of the philosophical theories regarding the stability of a philosophical school need to be investigated further. An important part is undoubtedly played by a characteristic form of discussion in the philosophical quarrels between the various philosophical schools competing with each other: the invective.<sup>96</sup> In order to distinguish

---

95. One might refer in this context to the general, but highly instructive remarks by Bendlin 2002 and Galli 2003.

96. In this context, see the instructive explanations by Owen 1983 and Brunschwig 2003.

one philosophical school from another two further aspects are of some importance: language and dress.<sup>97</sup> Both elements found their use on various occasions. Next to the doctrinal and behavioural aspects as well as the common philosophising, there are a number of collective acts to create and to orchestrate a community. These acts were by no means influenced by philosophy, but reflect ‘traditional’ practices of communities not merely in the ancient world: first and foremost, the common meals in the philosophical schools are to be mentioned which are attested for the Academy, the Peripatus and Epicurus’ Garden.<sup>98</sup> In addition to this, the ritual acts, which are attested for these three philosophical schools, are of fundamental importance: sacrifices not only to the Muses, but also to the founder of a philosophical school – quasi to its *heros ktistes*.<sup>99</sup>

Again, it has to be admitted that the extant pieces of evidence are mostly restricted to the Academy, the Peripatus and Epicurus’ Garden. But a careful re-reading of the relevant source material is a promising proposition – also in respect to other philosophical groups in Hellenistic Athens. After all, this may be the case, too, in terms of the aforementioned fragmentation of the philosophical schools in the late second and early first centuries: besides the external influences in this process, the condition of their inner coherence needs further investigation.

## 5. Athenian politics, the Athenian public and the philosophical schools in Athens

If one ponders on the relationship between the city of Athens and the philosophical schools situated in the city, then this field is not restricted to politics, but also includes the public perception of the philosophical schools. Since the fifth century, philosophers were

---

97. On language as medium of distinction between schools of thought, see Burke 1995 in general and Haake 2007, 108 with n. 403 in particular. In terms of clothes, see the short remarks by Haake 2009, 125–26. A detailed analysis as to the clothing of philosophers does not exist.

98. See, e.g., Scholz 1998, 22.

99. See Clay 1986; Dorandi 1998, 57 and Bendlin 2002, 9–10; see the general remarks by Arnaoutoglou 2011, 42–44.



onstage in Athens – and this is true in a triple sense. On the one hand, philosophers were part of the ordinary public life in the Agora and the gymnasia; on the other hand, various types of philosopher constituted an integral component of the comic stage repertoire and, finally, philosophers were visibly present in the form of statues in Athenian public space.<sup>100</sup> To grasp the social and political position of philosophers in Athens, these three aspects have to be considered in combination with four events which best illustrate the changing position of philosophers and philosophy: the so-called and already mentioned law of Sophocles, the famous embassy to Rome in 155, the philosophical lectures as part of the ephebic curriculum after 122/1 and the philosophers who left Athens in the early first century.

In 155, the heads of the Academy, the Peripatus and the Stoa, Carneades of Cyrene, Critolaus of Phaselis in Lycia, and Diogenes of Babylon, were sent to Rome. The reason for this embassy was a conflict between Athens and the small Boeotian city Oropus. In the course of this conflict, the Athenians were judged by the Achaean city of Sicyon, which had been established as arbiter by the Romans, to pay a penalty of 500 talents to Oropus. The aim of the Athenian embassy to Rome was to decrease this immense amount. Leaving the Roman context of this embassy aside, the three philosophers were very successful from an Athenian point of view: They achieved a reduction of the penalty down to 100 talents. As a result of their success, the three philosophers seem to have been awarded the right of Athenian citizenship. The reason for choosing the three scholars as ambassadors lay in their social esteem by the Athenian public. Therefore, it is justified to say that in the middle of the second century, philosophers were generally perceived as distinguished members of the public life of Athens.<sup>101</sup> That this was not always the case has already been mentioned by reference to the events in 307/6,

---

100. On philosophers in Attic comedy, see still Weiher 1913; see also more generally Imperio 1998. In respect of the presence of statues of philosophers in the Athenian public, see, e.g., Zanker 1995, esp. 46–49, 62–66, 93–132 and 168–86.

101. On the famous Athenian embassy of 155 to Rome, see, e.g., Ferrary 1988, 351–63; Habicht 2006, 291–96 and Haake 2007, 106–17 and 255–59; see now also Powell 2013. It is noteworthy that no Epicurean philosopher was sent to Rome.

when in the course of a number of anti-Macedonian processes and acts after the liberation from the 'rule' of Demetrius of Phalerum, a law was proposed which caused a one-year-exodus of all philosophers from Athens until the annulation of the law.<sup>102</sup> From this starting point, it was a long way to the 120s, when the participation in philosophical lectures became for some 80 years part of the ephebic curriculum as it is known from the so-called ephebic inscriptions. This aspect is part of a reform of the Athenian ephebate in the 120s, when it became possible for foreigners to participate in the Athenian ephebate. In the course of the ephebate, the ephebes visited lectures by various philosophers in the Athenian gymnasia. Unfortunately, it is completely unknown whether and in which way the participation of the ephebes in the philosophical lectures was regulated and organised.<sup>103</sup> During the period when the ephebes participated in philosophical lessons, in the late 90s and early 80s, turbulent incidents shook the eastern Mediterranean as well as Athens.

In 88, the Peripatetic philosopher and Mithridatic supporter Athenion came to power in Athens. After a short rule and a disastrous military campaign by his companion, the Peripatetic Apellicon of Teus, Athenion's traces are lost in the darkness of history. He was for a short time succeeded by an Epicurean philosopher named Aristion – until Sulla conquered Athens in 87.<sup>104</sup> In spite of these 'philosophical tyrants', nothing comparable to the events of 307/6 happened to the philosophers. That a great number of them had left Athens since the 90s was caused by the difficult circumstances in general and the attractive alternatives elsewhere in Greece, in Southern Italy and, above all, in Rome. However, visiting philosophical lectures remained an element of the ephebic curriculum until 38/7, and during the Imperial period Athens again became a centre for practicing philosophy.<sup>105</sup>

---

102. See above on p. 70.

103. See in detail Haake 2007, 44–55 and Perrin-Saminadayar 2007, 261–66.

104. See Ferrary 1988, 435–86; Habicht 2006, 327–45 and Haake 2007, 271–73;

105. On philosophy and philosophers in Imperial Athens, see, e.g., Hahn 1989, 119–36.

## 6. The philosophical schools in Athenian society: final remarks

In the context of a project regarding Greek associations, the topic ‘philosophical schools in Athens between the fourth and the first century’ is admittedly a wide field, wherefore the preceding remarks are necessarily restricted to an outline. Although it should be taken for granted that the philosophical schools in Athens are to be counted among the Aristotelian *koinonai*, the preceding explanations have made obvious that philosophical schools share some characteristics with other types of associations, but that there is also a considerable number of differences. The main reason for these differences originates – as can be assumed with good reason – in the primary concern of the philosophical schools: philosophising together, which has nothing to do with a profession, but is first and foremost a social practice based on *scholē*, that is leisure. Despite this shared concern, it is important to emphasise that the philosophical schools in Athens – though being *koinonai* – differed from each other in many respects; exemplarily, one might refer to the above-mentioned disparities as to the organisational structures, their possessions or their ‘infrastructure’. Nevertheless, if one is not inclined to conceptualise philosophical groups completely as phenomena *sui generis*, it is hardly surprising in a world full of associations that philosophising groups adapted associational elements as a model for their own purposes.

In order to clarify that the issue of philosophical schools in the context of the world of associations is far from being closed, an agenda for further research will conclude this contribution. In undertaking this, two important aspects need to be kept in mind: firstly, due to the extant ancient sources the perspective on philosophical schools is quite Athenocentric. However, this should not lead to neglecting other places where philosophical schools existed under different conditions, too, like Rhodes, Tarsus, Olympia or even Alexandria. Therefore, a complete investigation of the philosophical schools in the ancient Mediterranean world starting with their emergence in the Archaic period and ending with their expiring in Late Antiquity is a true *desideratum*. Secondly, stronger than to date,

prospective analyses of philosophical schools require a combination of philosophical, legal, organisational and group sociological approaches. In doing so, one important point is to deal with the position of the philosophical schools between 'private' and 'public'; it is reasonable to expect that such an undertaking will also cast a new and differentiated light on the concept of 'private' and 'public' in the Ancient world.<sup>106</sup>

Yet, notwithstanding the important results which were achieved in the course of the last 150 years or so, an analysis of the ways in which the philosophical schools were embedded in their respective historical and local context, in line with the parameters already mentioned, will result in fresh insights regarding their associational character and will also make a new diachronic and supra-local panorama of the philosophical schools in the ancient Mediterranean world possible.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arenz, A. 2006, *Herakleides Kritikos "Über die Städte in Hellas". Eine Periegesis Griechenlands am Vorabend des Chremonideischen Krieges*. Quellen und Forschungen zur antiken Welt 49. Munich: Herbert Utz Verlag.
- Arnaoutoglou, I.N. 2003, *Thusias heneka kai sunousias. Private Religious Associations in Hellenistic Athens*. Academy of Athens: Yearbook of the Research Centre for the History of Greek Law 37, 4. Athens: Academy of Athens.
- Arnaoutoglou, I.N. 2011, "Ils étaient dans la ville, mais tout à fait en dehors de la cité." Status and Identity in Private Religious Associations in Hellenistic Athens', in O.M. van Nijf and R. Alston (eds.), *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age*. Groningen-Royal Holloway studies on the Greek city after the Classical Age 2. Leuven, Paris and Walpole/MA: Peeters Publishers, pp. 27-48.
- Ascough, Richard 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: Hendrickson Publishers, pp. 3-19.
- Azoulay, V. 2007, 'Champ intellectuel et strategies de distinction dans la première moitié du IVE siècle: de Socrate à Isocrate', in J.-C. Couvenhes and S. Milanezi (eds.), *Individus, groups et politique à Athènes de Solon à Mithridate*.

---

106. In this context, see the well-thought-out considerations by Moos 1998.

- Actes du colloque international, Tours 7 et 8 mars 2005*. Tours: Presses Universitaires François Rabelais, pp. 171–99.
- Azoulay, V. 2009, 'Une éloquence de combat: querelles intellectuelles et appel à la violence chez Isocrate', in V. Azoulay and P. Boucheron (eds.), *Le mot qui tue. Une histoire des violences intellectuelles de l'Antiquité à nos jours*. Époques, collection d'histoire Scyssel: Champ Vallon, 303–21.
- Bénatouïl, T. 2006, 'Philosophical Schools in Hellenistic and Roman Times', in M.L. Gill – P. Pellegrin (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Philosophy*. Blackwell Companions to Philosophy 31. Malden/MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, pp. 415–29.
- Bendlin, A. 2002, 'Gemeinschaft, Öffentlichkeit und Identität: Forschungsgeschichtliche Anmerkungen zu den Mustern sozialer Ordnung in Rom', in U. Egelhaaf-Gaiser and A. Schäfer (eds.), *Religiöse Vereine in der römischen Antike. Untersuchungen zu Organisation, Ritual und Raumordnung*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 13. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, pp. 9–40.
- Boyancé, P. 1936, *Le culte des Muses chez les philosophes grecs. Études d'histoire et de psychologie religieuses*. Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 141. Paris: E. de Boccard.
- Brittain, C. 2001, *Philo of Larissa. The Last of the Academic Sceptics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bruns, K.G. 1880, 'Die Testamente der griechischen Philosophen', *ZRG* 1, 1–52.
- Brunschwig, J. 2003, 'Aspects de la polémique philosophique en Grèce ancienne', in G. Declercq, M. Murat and J. Dangel (eds.), *La parole polémique*. Colloques, congrès et conférences sur l'époque moderne et contemporaine 11. Paris: Honoré Champion Éditeur, pp. 25–46.
- Burke, P. 1995, 'The Jargon of the Schools', in P. Burke and R. Porter (eds.), *Languages and Jargons. Contributions to a Social History of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 22–41.
- Cambiano, G. and Repici, L. 1993, 'Atene: le scuole dei filosofi', in G. Cambiano, L. Canfora and D. Lanza (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica. Volume I: La produzione e la circolazione del testo. Tomo II: L'ellenismo*. Rome: Salerno Editrice, pp. 527–51.
- Camp, J.M. 1989, 'The Philosophical Schools of Roman Athens', in S. Walker and A. Cameron (eds.), *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire. Papers from the Tenth British Museum Classical Colloquium*. Bulletin supplement (University of London. Institute of Classical Studies) 55. London: Institute of Classical Studies, pp. 50–55.
- Canevaro, M. and Lewis, D. 2014, 'Khoris oikautes and the obligations of Freedmen in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Athens', *Incid.Antico* 12, 91–121.
- Clay, D. 1973, 'Epicurus' Last Will and Testament', *AGPh* 55, 252–80.

- Clay, D. 1986, 'The Cults of Epicurus', *CERC* 16, 11–28.
- Cohen, E.E. 1973, *Ancient Athenian Maritime Courts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Collins, R. 1998, *The Sociology of Philosophies. A Global Theory of Intellectual Change*. Cambridge, MA and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Di Branco, M. 2006, *La città dei filosofi. Storia di Atene da Marco Aurelio a Giustiniano. Con un'appendice su 'Atene immaginaria' nella letteratura bizantina*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki.
- Dimakis, P.D. 1987, 'Note al testamento di Epicuro,' in *Studi in onore di Arnaldo Biscardi VI*. Milan: Istituto editoriale Cisalpino, pp. 471–92.
- Döring, K. 1987, *Historia Philosopha. Grundzüge der antiken Philosophiegeschichtsschreibung*. Freiburg i.Br. and Würzburg: Ploetz Verlag.
- Dorandi, T. 1992, 'Precisazioni sul testamento di Epicuro,' *Labeo* 38, 55–62.
- Dorandi, T. 1999, 'Organization and Structure of the Philosophical Schools,' in K. Algra, J. Barnes, J. Mansfeld and M. Schofield (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 55–62.
- Dorandi, T. 2002, *Antigone de Caryste. Fragments. Texte établi et traduit*. Collection des universités de France. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Dressler, J. 2014, *Wortverdreher, Sonderlinge, Gottlose. Kritik an Philosophie und Rhetorik im klassischen Athen*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Düring, I. 1957, *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition*. *Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia* 5. Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag.
- Endenburg, P.J.T. 1937, *Koinoonia. En gemeenschap van zaken bij de Grieken in den klassieken tijd*. Amsterdam: H.J. Paris.
- Erler, M. 2007, *Platon*. Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie, begr. von Friedrich Ueberweg. Hrsg. von Helmut Holzhey 1; Philosophie der Antike, edited by H. Flashar 2, 2. Basel: Schwabe Verlag.
- Ferrary, J.-L. 1988, *Philhellénisme et impérialisme. Aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique, de la seconde guerre de macédoine à la guerre contre Mithridate*. Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 271. Rome: École française de Rome.
- Ferrary, J.-L. 2007, 'Les philosophes grecs à Rome (155-86 av. J.-C.)', in A.M. Ioppolo and D.N. Sedley (eds.), *Pyrrhonists, Patricians, Platonizers. Hellenistic Philosophy in the Period 155-86 BC. Tenth Symposium Hellenisticum*. Elenchos 47. Naples: Bibliopolis, pp. 17–46.
- Finley, M.I. 1970, 'Aristotle and Economic Analysis', *P&P* 47, 3–25.
- Fisher, N. 2001, *Aeschines. Against Timarchos. Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Clarendon Ancient History Series. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Follet, S. 1994, 'Lettres d'Hadrien aux Épicuriens d'Athènes (14.2.-14.3.125): SEG 3.226 + IG II<sup>2</sup> 1097', *REG* 107, 158–71.

- Frede, M. 1999, 'Epilogue', in K. Algra, J. Barnes, J. Mansfeld and M. Schofield (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 771-97.
- Fröhlich, P. and Hamon, P. 2013, 'Histoire sociale et phénomène associative dans les cités grecques d'époque hellénistique et impériale,' in P. Fröhlich and P. Hamon (eds.), *Groupes et associations dans les cités grecques (III<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C. - II<sup>e</sup> siècle apr. J.-C.)*. Actes de la table ronde de Paris, INHA, 19-20 juin 2009. Geneva: Librairie Droz, pp. 1-27.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2007. 'Brotherhoods of Faith and Provident Planing: The Non-public Associations of the Greek World', in I. Malkin, C. Constantakopoulou and K. Panagopoulou (eds.), *Greek and Mediterranean Networks in the Mediterranean*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 176-203.
- Galli, M. 'Ἐπεὶν σῶμα: rituale e struttura comunicative nello spazio associative antico', *MediterrAnt* 6, 1-23.
- Gauthier, R.A. and Lolif, J.Y. 1959, *L'Éthique à Nicomaque. Introduction, traduction et commentaire. Tome II: Commentaire - deuxième partie. Livres VI-X. Aristote*. Traductions et Études. Louvain and Paris: Publications Universitaires de Louvain and Éditions Béatrice-Nauwelaerts.
- Gehrke, H.-J. 2004, 'Die "Klassische" Antike als Kulturepoche - Soziokulturelle Milieus und Deutungsmuster in der griechisch-römischen Welt', in Friedrich Jäger und Burkhard Liebsch (eds.), *Handbuch der Kulturwissenschaften, Band I: Grundlagen und Schlüsselbegriffe*. Stuttgart and Weimar: Verlag J.B. Metzler, pp. 471-89.
- Glucker, J. 1978, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*. Hypomnemata, Untersuchungen zur Antike und zu ihrem Nachleben 56. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Goldhill, S. 1986, *Reading Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gottschalk, H.B. 1972, 'Notes on the Wills of the Peripatetic Scholars', *Hermes* 100, 314-42.
- Haake, M. 2006, 'Ein athenisches Ehrendekret für Aristoteles? Die Rhetorik eines pseudo-epigraphischen Dokuments und die Logik seiner "Geschichte"', *Klio* 88, 328-50.
- Haake, M. 2007, *Der Philosoph in der Stadt. Untersuchungen zur öffentlichen Rede über Philosophen und Philosophie in den hellenistischen Poleis*. Vestigia 56. Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck.
- Haake, M. 2008, 'Das "Gesetz des Sophokles" und die Schließung der Philosophenschulen in Athen unter Demetrios Poliorketes', in H. Hugonnard-Roche (ed.), *L'enseignement supérieur dans les mondes antiques et médiévaux. Aspects institutionnels, juridiques et pédagogiques. Colloque international de l'Institut des Traditions Textuelles (Fédération de recherche 33 du C.N.R.S.)*. Paris:

- Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, pp. 89-112.
- Haake, M. 2009, "Doing Philosophy" – Soziales Kapital versus politischer Mißkredit? Zur Funktionalität und Dysfunktionalität von Philosophie für die Elite im sozialen und politischen Raum des klassischen Athen', in C. Mann, M. Haake, and R. von den Hoff (eds.), *Rollenbilder in der athenischen Demokratie. Medien, Gruppen, Räume im politischen und sozialen System. Beiträge zu einem interdisziplinären Kolloquium in Freiburg i. Br., 24.-25. November 2006*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, pp. 113-45.
- Haake, M. 2012, 'Der Panaitiosschüler Paramonos aus Tarsos, der kappadokische König Ariarathes VI. und eine rhodische Inschrift. Zu *Rhodiaka I* 1 = SEG 33.642 und Philod. *Stoic. Hist.* col. LXXIV, ll. 5 s. u. col. LXXVII, ll. 1-3', *Epigraphica* 74, 43-58.
- Habicht, C. 1994, 'Hellenistic Athens and her Philosophers', in C. Habicht (ed.), *Athen in hellenistischer Zeit. Gesammelte Aufsätze*. Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck, pp. 231-47.
- Habicht, C. 2006, *Athènes hellénistique. Histoire de la cité d'Alexandre le Grand à Marc Antoine. Traduit de l'allemand par Martine et Denis Knoepfner*. 2nd edn. Histoire. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Hadzopoulos, C. 1975, *Personae collectivae nach attischem Recht*. Freiburg: Selbstverlag.
- Hahn, J. 1989, *Der Philosoph und die Gesellschaft. Selbstverständnis, öffentliches Auftreten und populäre Erwartungen in der hohen Kaiserzeit*. Heidelberger althistorische Beiträge und epigraphische Studien 7. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Hansen, M.H. 1995, *The Trial of Sokrates – from the Athenian Point of View*. The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters. Historisk-filosofiske meddelelser 71. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Harrison, A.R.W. 1968, *The Law of Athens*, vol. I: *The Family and Property*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Harrison, A.R.W. 1971, *The Law of Athens*, vol. II: *Procedure*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Imperio, O. 1998, 'La figura dell'intellettuale nella commedia greca', in A.M. Belardinelli, O. Imperio, G. Mastromarco, M. Pellegrino and P. Totaro (eds.), *Téssere. Frammenti della commedia greca: studi e commenti*. Studi e commenti 12. Bari: Adriatica Editrice, pp. 43-130.
- Ioppolo, A.M. 1980, *Aristone di Chio e lo stoicismo antico*. Naples: Bibliopolis.
- Ismard, P. 2007, 'La construction du fait associative en droit athénien et les limites de la notion de personnalité juridique', *Dike* 10, 57-83.
- Ismard, P. 2010, *La cité des réseaux. Athènes et ses associations, VI<sup>e</sup>-I<sup>er</sup> siècle av. J.-C.* Publications de la Sorbonne: Histoire ancienne et médiévale 105. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.
- Isnardi Parente, M. 1982, *Senocrate – Ermodoro. Frammenti. Edizione, traduzione e*



- commenti*. Naples: Bibliopolis – edizioni di filosofia e scienze s. p. a.
- Isnardi Parente, M. 1986, 'L'Accademia antica. Interpretazioni recenti e problemi di metodo', *RF* 114, 350-78.
- Isnardi Parente, M. and Tiziano D. 2012, *Senocrate e Ermodoro. Testimonianze e frammenti. Edizione, traduzione e commento a c. di Margherita Isnardi Parente. Edizione rivista e aggiornata a c. di Tiziano Dorandi*. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale.
- Jackson, B.D. 1971, 'The Prayers of Socrates', *Phronesis* 16, 14-37.
- Jones, N.F. 1999, *The Associations of Classical Athens. The Response to Democracy*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kloppenborg, J.S. and Ascough, R.S. 2011, *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations, and Commentary*, vol. I: *Attica, Central Greece, Macedonia, Thrace*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 181. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kloppenborg, J.S. and Wilson, S.G. (eds.) 1996, *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Korhonen, T. 1997, 'Self-Concept and Public Image of Philosophers and Philosophical Schools at the Beginning of the Hellenistic Age', in J. Frösén (ed.), *Early Hellenistic Athens: Symptoms of a Change*. Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 6. Helsinki: Vammalan Kirjapaino Oy, pp. 33-101.
- Laks, A. 2005, 'Die Entstehung einer (Fach)Disziplin: Der Fall der vorsookratischen Philosophie', in G. Rechenauer (ed.), *Frühgriechisches Denken*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 19-39.
- Leiwo, M. 1997, 'Religion, or Other Reasons? Private Associations in Athens.' in J. Frösén (ed.), *Early Hellenistic Athens: Symptoms of a Change*. Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 6. Helsinki: Vammalan Kirjapaino Oy, pp. 103-17.
- Lipsius, J.H. 1908, *Das Attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren II.1*. Leipzig: O.R. Reisland.
- Ludlam, I. 2003, 'Two Long-Running Stoic Myths: a Centralized Orthodox Stoic School and Stoic Scholarchs', *Elenchos* 24, 33-55.
- Lynch, J.P. 1972, *Aristotle's School. A Study of a Greek Educational Institution*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Maffi, A. 2008, 'Lo statuto giuridico delle scuole filosofiche greche nel III sec. a.C.', in H. Hugonnard-Roche (ed.), *L'enseignement supérieur dans les mondes antiques et médiévaux. Aspects institutionnels, juridiques et pédagogiques. Colloque international de l'Institut des Traditions Textuelles (Fédération de recherché 33 du C.N.R.S.)*. Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, pp. 113-25.
- Mansfeld, J. 1999, 'Sources', in K. Algra, J. Barnes, J. Mansfeld and M. Schofield (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3-30.

- Marasco, G. 1984, *Democare di Leuconoe. Politica e cultura in Atene fra IV e III sec. a.C.* Florence: LICOSA Sansoni S.r.l.
- Mari, M. 2003, 'Macedonians and pro-Macedonians in Early Hellenistic Athens: Reflections on ἀσέβεια', in O. Palagia and S. V. Tracy (eds.), *The Macedonians in Athens 322-229 B.C. Proceedings of an International Conference Held at the University of Athens, May 24-26, 2001*. Oxford: Oxbow, pp. 82-92.
- Martin, J. 2003, 'Bedingungen der frühgriechischen Philosophie', in K. Piepenbrink (ed.), *Philosophie und Lebenswelt in der Antike*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, pp. 22-35.
- Mason, S. 1996, 'Philosophiai. Graeco-Roman, Judean and Christian', in Kloppenborg and Wilson 1996, 31-58.
- Meeks, W. A. 1983, *The First Urban Christians. The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Meritt, B.D. 1946, 'Greek Inscriptions', *Hesperia* 15, 169-253.
- Millett, P. 1991, *Lending and Borrowing in Ancient Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Millett, P. 2005, 'The Trial of Socrates Revisited', *European Review of History* 12, 23-62.
- Mitsis, P. 2003, 'The Institutions of Hellenistic Philosophy', in A. Erskine (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 464-76.
- Morgan, T.J. 1999, 'Literate Education in Classical Athens', *CQ* 49, 46-61.
- Most, G.W. 1999, *Raffael. Die Schule von Athen. Über das Lesen der Bilder*. kunststück. Frankfurt a.M.: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Müller, C.W. 1994, 'Platons Akademiegründung', *Hyperboreus* 1, 56-73.
- Natali, C. 1983, 'Aspetti organizzativi di alcune scuole filosofiche ateniesi,' *Hermes* III, 52-69.
- Natali, C. 1991, *Bios theoretikos. La vita di Aristotele e l'organizzazione della sua scuola*. Ricerca (Società editrice il Mulino). Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Natali, C. 2003, 'Schools and Sites of Learning', in J. Brunschwig and G.E.R. Lloyd (eds.), *The Greek Pursuit of Knowledge*. Cambridge MA., London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, pp. 40-66.
- Nightingale, A.W. 2007, 'The Philosophers in Archaic Greek Culture', in H. A. Shapiro (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece*. Cambridge Companions to the Ancient World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 169-98.
- Oliver, J.H. 1979, 'Flavius Pantaenus, Priest of the Philosophical Muses', *HThR* 72, 157-60.
- O'Sullivan, L. 1997, 'Athenian Impiety Trials in the Late Fourth Century', *CQ* 47, 136-52.

- O'Sullivan, L. 2002, 'The Law of Sophocles and the Beginnings of Permanent Philosophical Schools in Athens', *RhM* 145, 251-62.
- Owen, G.E.L. 1983, 'Philosophical Invective', *OSAPh* 1, 1-25.
- Parker, R. 1996, *Athenian Religion. A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parker, R. 2005, *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Perrin, É. 1994, 'Héracléidès le Crétois à Athènes: les plaisirs du tourisme culturel', *REG* 107, 192-202.
- Perrin-Saminadayar, É. 2003, 'Des élites intellectuelles à Athènes à l'époque hellénistique? Non, des notables', in M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni and L. Lamoiné (eds.), *Les élites et leurs facettes: les élites locales dans le monde hellénistique et romain*. Collection ERGA 3; Collection de l'École française de Rome 309. Rome and Clermont-Ferrand: Presses Universitaires Blaise Pascal, pp. 383-400.
- Perrin-Saminadayar, É. 2007, *Éducation, culture et société à Athènes. Les acteurs de la vie culturelles athénienne (229-88): un tout petit monde*. Paris: De Boccard.
- Poland, F. 1909. *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*. Fürstlich Jablonowski'sche Gesellschaft zu Leipzig 38. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Powell, J.G.F. 2013, 'The Embassy of the Three Philosophers to Rome in 155 BC', in C. Kremmydas and K. Tempest (eds.), *Hellenistic Oratory. Continuity and Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 219-47.
- Prince, S. 2006, 'The Organization of Knowledge', in K. H. Künzl (ed.), *A Companion to the Classical Greek World*. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 432-55.
- Primavesi, O. 2009, 'Athen', in M. Hose and C. Levin (eds.), *Metropolen des Geistes*. Frankfurt a.M. and Leipzig: Insel Verlag, pp. 102-25.
- Radin, M. 1910, *The Legislation of the Greeks and Romans on Corporations*. New York: The Faculty of Philosophy in Columbia University.
- Rhodes, P.J. 1992, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rhodes, P.J. 2006, 'The Reforms and Laws of Solon: an Optimistic View', in J.H. Blok and A.P.M.H. Lardinois (eds.), *Solon of Athens. New Historical and Philological Approaches*. Mnemosyne, Bibliotheca Classica Batava, Supplementum 272. Leiden, Boston: Brill, pp. 248-60.
- Ruschenbusch, E. 2014, *Solon: Das Gesetzeswerk: Fragmente. Übersetzung und Kommentar. Herausgegeben von Klaus Bringmann*, 2nd edn. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Scafuro, A.C. 2006, 'Identifying Solonian Laws', in J.H. Blok and A.P.M.H. Lardinois (eds.), *Solon of Athens. New Historical and Philological Approaches*. Mnemosyne, Bibliotheca Classica Batava, Supplementum 272. Leiden, Boston: Brill, pp. 175-96.
- Schofield, M. 1998, 'Political Friendship and the Ideology of Reciprocity', in

- P. Cartledge, P. Millett and S. von Reden (eds.), *Kosmos. Essays in Order, Conflict and Community in Classical Athens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 37-51.
- Scholz, P. 1998. *Der Philosoph und die Politik. Die Ausbildung der philosophischen Lebensform und die Entwicklung des Verhältnisses von Philosophie und Politik im 4. und 3. Jh. v. Chr.* Frankfurter althistorische Beiträge herausgegeben von Klaus Bringmann und Manfred Clauss, Band 2. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Scholz, P. 2003, 'Philosophizing before Plato: On the Social and Political Conditions of the Composition of the *Dissoi Logoi*', in W. Detel, A. Becker and P. Scholz (eds.), *Ideal and Culture of Knowledge in Plato. Akten der 4. Tagung der Karl-und-Gertrud-Abel-Stiftung vom 1.-3. September 2000 in Frankfurt*. Philosophie der Antike 15. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, pp. 201-30.
- Scholz, P. 2006, 'Bios philosophikos. Soziale Bedingungen und institutionelle Voraussetzungen des Philosophierens in klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit', in C. Rapp and T. Wagner (eds.), *Wissen und Bildung in der antiken Philosophie*. Stuttgart and Weimar: J.B. Metzler'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, pp. 37-58.
- Sedley, D. 1989, 'Philosophical Allegiance in the Greco-Roman World', in Miriam Griffin and Jonathan Barnes (eds.), *Philosophia Togata I. Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 97-119.
- Sedley, D. 1998, 'Le scuole filosofiche e le città', in S. Settis (ed.), *I Greci. Storia - Cultura - Arte - Società. 2: Una storia greca*, vol. III: *Trasformazioni*. Turin: Giulio Einaudi editore, pp. 467-82.
- Sedley, D. 2003, 'Philodemus and the Decentralisation of Philosophy', *CErc* 33, 31-41.
- Sollenberger, M.G. 1983, 'Diogenes Laertius 5.36-57: The *Vita Theophrasti*', in W.W. Fortenbaugh, P.M. Huby and A.A. Long (eds.), *Theophrastus of Eresus: On His Life and Work*. Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities 2. New Brunswick NJ., Oxford: Transaction Books, pp. 1-62.
- Steinmetz, P. 1994, 'Die Stoa', in *Die hellenistische Philosophie*, edited by H. Flashar. Philosophie der Antike 4; Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Basel: Schwabe & Co AG Verlag, pp. 491-716.
- Tepedino Guerra, A. 1980, 'Il *kepos* epicureo nel PHerc. 1780', *CErc* 10, 17-24.
- Turner, J. 1997, *The Institutional Order. Economy, Kinship, Religion, Polity, Law, and Education in Evolutionary and Comparative Perspective*. New York: Longman.
- Usener, H. 1884, 'Organisation der wissenschaftlichen Arbeit. Bilder aus der Geschichte der Wissenschaft', *Preussische Jahrbücher* 53, 1-25.
- Ustinova, Y. 2005, 'Lege et consuetudine: Voluntary Cult Associations in the Greek Law', in V. Dasen and M. Piérart (eds.), Ἱδιὰ καὶ δημοσίᾳ. *Les cadres «privés» et «publics» de la religion grecque antique. Actes du IX<sup>e</sup> colloque du Centre International d'Étude de la Religion Grecque Antique (CIERGA), tenu à Fribourg du 8*

au 10 septembre 2003. Kernos Suppl. 15. Liège: Centre International d'Étude de la Religion Grecque Antique, pp. 177–90.

- van Bremen, R. 2005, “Plotina to all her friends”: The Letter(s) of the Empress Plotina to the Epicureans in Athens’, *Chiron* 35, 499–532.
- Vlassopoulos, K. 2007, *Unthinking the Greek Polis. Ancient Greek History beyond Eurocentrism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- von Moos, P. 1998, ‘Die Begriffe “öffentlich” und “privat” in der Geschichte und bei den Historikern’, *Saeculum* 49, 161–92.
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. 1881, *Antigonos von Karystos*. Philologische Untersuchungen 4. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Wallace, R.W. 2007, ‘Plato’s Sophists, Intellectual History after 450 and Sokrates’, in L.J. Samons II (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Pericles*. The Cambridge Companions to the Ancient World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 215–37.
- Weiber, A. 1913, *Philosophen und Philosophenspott in der attischen Komödie*. Munich: Selbstverlag.
- Whitehead, D. 1986, *The Demes of Attica. 508/07 – ca. 250 B.C. A Political and Social Study*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wilken, R. L. 1971, ‘Collegia, Philosophical Schools, and Theology’, in S. Benko and J.J. O’Rourke (eds.), *The Catacombs and the Colosseum*. Valley Forge: Judson Press, pp. 268–91.
- Wilson, S.G. 1996, ‘Voluntary Associations. An Overview’, in Kloppenborg and Wilson 1996, 1–15.
- Wolpert, A. 2002, *Remembering Defeat. Civil War and Civil Memory in Ancient Athens*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Zanker, P. 1995, *Die Maske des Sokrates. Das Bild des Intellektuellen in der antiken Kunst*. C.H. Beck Kulturwissenschaft. Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck.
- Ziebarth, E. 1896, *Das griechische Vereinswesen*. Fürstlich Jablonowski’sche Gesellschaft zu Leipzig 34 Leipzig: S. Hirzel.

# Associations of Physicians and Teachers in Asia Minor: Between Private and Public

*María Paz de Hoz*

## 1. Introduction. Questions of definition

Distinguishing between private and public responsibilities in Greek education from as early as Archaic times on is a difficult task.<sup>1</sup> From the beginning, education was conceived of mainly as civic education, the education of youths as citizens of a Greek community. The objective of this contribution is to analyse professional associations dealing with education in Asia Minor, focusing on their private/public character and their relationship with the state, and comparing them with other professional associations. Let it be stated at once that my conclusion is in agreement with the general assessment of N.F. Jones when speaking of associations: ‘(...) we should think of “public” and “private” not as mutually exclusive “either/or” alternatives but rather as opposing extremes on a continuum possessing infinite intermediate gradations.’<sup>2</sup>

I will try to situate the *synodoi* of teachers (*paideutai*) and physicians (*iatroi*) along this continuum. The term *paideutai* (παιδευταί) is attested in Imperial times as referring to a teacher of *paidēs* (παῖδες) as well as to a teacher of ephebes (ἐφήβοι) and *neoi* (νέοι, youngsters). In official documents, sometimes it seems to refer to *gramma-*

1. Griffith 2001: 25, cf. 24. This essay is part of the research project FFI2011-25506, which is financed by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation. I am grateful to Professor Vincent Gabrielsen for inviting me to the International Symposium *Private Associations and the Public Sphere in the Ancient World* that was celebrated in Copenhagen September 2010. I also thank the anonymous referee for his/her helpful comments.

2. Jones 1999: 31. See further the Introduction to this volume.

*tikoi* (γραμματικοί), at other times to *grammatikoi* and *sophistai* (σοφισταί), or even *philosophoi* (φιλόσοφοι), so that sometimes it is impossible to know if only one certain category of teachers is meant. The fact that the profession of *grammatici* and *rhetores* was not separated originally (Suet. *De gramm. et rhet.* 4), that they were called *praeceptores* or *professores*,<sup>3</sup> and that later on, in the Latin official documents concerning these professions, *grammatici* and *rhetores* are mentioned, together with *medici* and sometimes even *philosophi*, is probably evidence of the meaning of *paideutai* as comprehensive of *grammatikoi* and *sophistai* in the Greek official documents (see *infra*).<sup>4</sup> It is in public, sometimes official, documents where physicians appear together with teachers, and it is also in an official document where we have the first probable mention of associations of teachers and also, though not the first, of physicians. The fact that in Roman Imperial official documents both categories appear together induce us to believe that both professions were seen as related in Antiquity. The ancient evidence for the conception of the work of *grammatikoi* and *sophistai* is well mirrored by Herzog, when he reconstructs part of Vespasian's decree (on which see below) as follows: [... τὸ μὲν τῶν γραμματικῶν καὶ ῥητόρων, οἱ τὰς τῶν νέων ψυχὰς πρὸς ἡμερότητα καὶ πολιτικὴν ἀρετὴν παιδεύουσιν]. *Iatroi* (ἰατροί) were indeed not only the teachers of future physicians, but played also an important role in the diffusion of *paideia*. The abundant evidence for physicians who were also philosophers, poets, or historians in Asia Minor, especially in the second and third centuries, substantiates their importance as educators and intellectuals. A physician had, in fact, to be a theorist and a philosopher to be publicly recognised.<sup>5</sup> And, most important,

---

3. Cf. Herzog 1935: 979.

4. Cf. Bowersock 1969: 32-3. For the sense of σοφισταί in literary and epigraphic texts, the difference between sophist and *rhetor*, and the importance of the sophist as teacher cf. Puech 2002: 10-15. On the link between philosophical schools and associations, see further Haake in this volume.

5. Cf. Samama 2003: 77f. (with bibliography for the relation between medicine and philosophy), and nos. 194, 231, 294, 321, 341, 334, 329, 365, etc. See also nos. 461, 478 (from Rome) and especially 290 (= TAM II 910), the case of the poet, philosopher and doctor Herakleitos of Rhodiapolis in Lycia (2nd cent. AD). Cf. Massar 2005: 197-9, for the importance of the ἀκροάσεις in order to be engaged in a foreign city in

both were intellectual professions for the public service. Both professions appear together already in an edict of Caesar from 46 BC (*SEG* 8.13), and it is also by this time that medicine is recognized as *ars liberalis*.<sup>6</sup> The similarities in the attested associations of both professional categories is another reason to believe that they were similarly conceived in Imperial times, and to treat them together as examples of private associations directly related with the public sphere.

Though there are many cases where references to teachers and physicians could be references to their respective professional associations, they could also be just references to professional groups. In the cases, nevertheless, where such groups are referred to as *synodos* (σύνδοξ), *synedrion* (συνέδριον), or *hoi apo Mouseiou* (οἱ ἀπὸ Μουσειου), *hoi paideutai hoi syn Sylla* (οἱ παιδευταὶ οἱ σὺν Σύλλᾳ) etc., and where they have a common centre such as the Mouseion, a group-head, or are participating in such typical associative activities such as tomb protection and the organization of *agones*, I think we can see them and treat them as professional associations (Poland 1909, 105, 157, 206). How these associations come into being and why are central issues in this study, and also the most important ones in an investigation of the relation between these private associations and the state.

In order to analyse the private/public character of these associations and their relation with other professional associations, I have split this opposition into a series of other oppositions that are, in my view, especially significant for this analysis: these include private vs. public initiative; voluntary vs. obligatory; not restricted vs. restricted; instrumental vs. expressive; local vs. translocal; no intervention of local or imperial politics vs. intervention of politics; mainly professional activity vs. different social activities (religious, funerary etc.); private benefactors vs. the state as benefactor; pri-

---

Hellenistic times; Percy 1993 for the relation between medicine and rhetoric, especially clear in the period of the sources attesting to these professional associations, the period of the second sophistic.

6. Cf. Herzog (1935: 979-980), who also emphasizes the close relation of the medical scientific character to philology in the ancient Medicine.



vate administration vs. public administration; private finances vs. public finances; the use of private space vs. the use of public space; private performances vs. participation in civic performances; sectarian politics vs. acceptance of the political system; hierarchical stratification vs. not hierarchical stratification.<sup>7</sup>

## 2. Private decision and official promotion in the constitution of the intellectual associations

Hellenistic sources show that intellectual education in this period was offered privately or as a result of a *gymnasiarch's* or *paidonomos'* personal initiative, and depended on the chance presence of grammarians, philosophers, historians, doctors or other travelling scholars. They often received honorary inscriptions from beneficiary groups such as the ephebes and *neoi*, or from the *boule* (council) and the *demos* (People) for their work in educating the youth, and they were awarded privileges such as *proxenia*, citizenship, *proedria*, etc. In Roman times they began to be awarded privileges more systematically as members of professional categories. With a few exceptions, it is from this time on that we find the first evidence of these professionals forming an association. As the reader will see in this paper, teachers' associations are known to have existed in Rhodes, Ephesos, Smyrna, and indirectly in Pergamon in Imperial times; physicians' associations are attested in Ephesos and Smyrna in the second century AD. Though there is an important medicine school in Cos in Hellenistic times, and abundant epigraphic evidence for Coan physicians, I think there is no confirmation of the existence of an association of physicians there, as Samama implies from some inscriptions.<sup>8</sup> An honorary decree to a chief-physician (ἀρχιατρός) in Alexandria dedicated by *to plethos ton en Alexandreiai [. . . . .]menon iatron* (τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ [. . . . .]μένων ιατρῶν) has been adduced as evidence for an association of physicians in Alexandria

7. For some of these oppositions the information is nevertheless y sometimes unavailable or very scarce; see further the Introduction to this volume. For the other professional associations I mainly base my argument on Dittmann-Schöne 2001.

8. Samama 2003: no. 122, n. 9.

already in 7 AD, probably in relation to the Mouseion.<sup>9</sup> Both types of association were highly likely to have existed in some Anatolian cities.<sup>10</sup>

As in the cases of most professional associations, we have almost no information about the origin of those formed by intellectuals. One of the first, if not *the* first, piece of evidence for an association of *paideutai* appears in an inscription from Rhodes (*IG XII,1* 918, Lindos, 1st-2nd cent. AD) which records the honour bestowed on a certain Apollonios from Pergamon *hypo Sylleion Lolleion paideutan ton syn Syllai* (ὕπο Συλλείων Λολλείων παιδευτᾶν τῶν σὺν Σύλλᾳ). Poland considers Sylla the president of the association and, like Lolleios, also a sort of honorary member.<sup>11</sup> If we consider that in Rhodes, unlike Hellenistic Athens or Delos, it was frequent for associations to take the name of the founder,<sup>12</sup> I would propose to see in this inscription evidence for the creation of a private association of teachers. Apollonios may be a benefactor, but he may also be a *paideutes* from Pergamon established in Lindos.<sup>13</sup> In that case, the association may have had the initiative of inviting, receiving and honouring itinerant professionals in the city. A variety of sources allow us to presume that in the case of craftsmen the association was an expansion of the family profession. Although the profession of physician as a family profession is well known in Hellenistic and Roman times,<sup>14</sup> nothing leads us to suppose that the expansion of a family profession would be the origin of intellectual associations.

Official documents concerning these associations may give us a clue partly to the reason or reasons for their establishment, partly to their position in the private-public spectrum. The earliest securely

9. Römer 1990; Samama 2003: no. 394, n. 9.

10. Associations of physicians in Alexandria: Samama 2003: no. 394, of 7 BC; cf. Römer 1990: 81-88.

11. Poland 1909: 75, cf. 75-6, for such denominations of associations including a proper name with preposition.

12. Baslez 1998: 437.

13. For a state foundation established in Rhodes, from a donation by the Pergamene king Eumenes II, with the purpose of paying the salaries of *paideutai*, see Polyb. 31.31.1-3, with Gabrielsen 1997: 80-1.

14. Samama 2003: nos. 132, 183, 187, 188, 247, 252, 292, 313.

dated reference to associations of teachers and physicians side by side is found in an official document, an edict of Vespasian (of 75 AD) found in Pergamon.<sup>15</sup> It grants privileges whose main points are the following three: exemption from the obligation of billeting and paying taxes (ll. 4-5), protection against injury and arrest (ll. 6-8), and the right to meet in sacred spaces where they enjoy *asylia* (13-15):

(...) κελεύω μήτε ἐπισταθμεύεσθαι

5 [αὐτοὺς μήτε εἰσ]φορὰς ἀπαιτεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ τρόπῳ.  
[Εἰ δέ τις τῶν ὑπ'] ἐμῆν ἡγεμονίαν ὑβρίζειν ἢ κατεγγυ-  
[ᾶν ἢ ἄγειν τινὰ τῶ]ν ἱατρῶν ἢ παιδευτῶν ἢ ἱατρᾶλειπ-  
[τῶν τολμήσουσιν,] ἀποτισάτωσαν οἱ ὑβρίσαντες Διὶ Κα-  
[πετωλίῳ] (...)

13 ἔξὸν δὲ αὐτοῖς

[ἔστω καὶ συνόδου]ς ἐν τοῖς τεμένεσι καὶ ἱεροῖς καὶ  
15 [ναοῖς συνάγειν ὅ]που ἂν αἰρῶνται ὡς ἀσύλοις. ὃς δ' ἂν  
[αὐτοὺς ἐκβιάζῃ]ται, ὑπόδικος ἔστω δήμῳ Ἰωμαίων  
[ἀσεβείας τῆς εἰς τ]ὸν οἶκον τῶν Σεβαστῶν (...)

(...) I order that no billeting be made

5 [against them and no] taxes be demanded of them in any way.  
[And if anyone under] my rule [dares] to injure or to compel  
them to put up security [or take (forcibly to court?) any] of the  
physicians or teachers or medical practioners,  
those guilty of their insolence shall pay a fine to Jupiter Ca-  
[pitolinus] ...].

13 And they (ther physicians and teachers) are permitted  
[to assemble in their association] in precincts (of temples) and  
in shrines and  
15 [in temples] wherever they choose with right of sanctuary;

15. Herzog 1935; Oliver 1989; no. 38 (*FIRAI* 73). The reference (ll. 7-8) to ἱατρᾶλειπ[τες] together with παιδευταῖ and ἱατροί as beneficiaries of the imperial policy in this case has been explained by assuming a probable debt that Vespasian had with one of those professionals, who, however, never appear in this context and in official documents, and for whom there is only one other epigraphic mention: Samama 2003: 12.

whoever [drives them out by force] shall be subject to legal action by the Roman People  
 [on a charge of sacrilege to] the house of the Augusti (...)  
 (transl. Sherk 1988, 127, no. 84)

The first 10 lines have been reconstructed in order to give an idea of the probable content as deduced from the reference to it in the *Digesta* (27.1.6.8; 50.4.18.30) and the preserved part of the edict. They seem to have referred to the two main conditions for the constitution of associations as established by the *lex Iulia de collegiis* (of 55 BC),<sup>16</sup> the *utilitas publica* and the *religionis causa*. The restoration of σύνοδοι (l. 14) is based on the fact that individual *asylia* existed already, so that it only makes sense in reference to corporations. It is also based on the analogy with the *synodos* of the *technitai* and the *lex Iulia de collegiis*.<sup>17</sup> Underneath the edict, a rescript of Domitian is engraved in an attempt to avoid the avarice of teachers and physicians who want to teach slaves just to increase their earnings.

One very damaged Ephesian inscription dated in the first century AD (*I.Eph* 1386) has been interpreted as a possible regulation of the prices and behaviour of physicians.<sup>18</sup> If this interpretation is correct, we would have here, together with the rescript of Domitian, another possible clue to understanding one of the main functions of this sort of professional *collegia* and perhaps a reason for their constitution.

It is interesting that the first regular headquarters attested as headquarters of such associations are the second century AD Mouseia in Asia Minor.<sup>19</sup> An inscription which is assumed originally to have stood at the Mouseion of Ephesos, and which dates from the beginning of the second century AD, seems to be a copy of three

---

16. Mainly, Suet. *Iul.* 42; Asc. *Corn.* 75, and possibly *CIL* VI 2193 (*ILS* 4966; *FIRA* III 38). The intent and application of *lex Iulia* are, however, issues still debated: see, e.g. Linderski 1968: 99-100; Arnaoutoglou 2002, 32; Liu 2005, 296-99 (who is sceptical about its existence).

17. Herzog 1935: 1001-2.

18. Cf. Samama 2003: no. 203 with note 21.

19. See, however, the use of the word *synodos* for the Alexandrian Mouseion in Strabo 17.1.8. On the Mouseia see below.

*senatus consulta* from 42 or ca. 32 BC exempting teachers, sophists and physicians from taxes:<sup>20</sup>

[— ἄτινα ἐκ τούτων τῶν ἀγ]-  
 ρῶν ἐξάγεται ἢ φ[έρεται] ἢ καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγροὺς εἰσάγ[εται]  
 ἢ εἰσφέρεται, τούτων πάντων εἰσαγώγιον καὶ ἐξαγώγιον μὴ  
 πρᾶσσονται μηδὲ τέλους ὀνόματι. ...

- 7 ...ὅταν τις τῶν τριῶν ἀνδρῶν  
 ἐπὶ τῆς καταστάσεως τῶν δημοσίων πραγμάτων  
 ἐπιτηρῶ ἢ διατάγματι δηλώσαι, δεδόχθαι μηδένα  
 10 τούτων τοῖς παιδευταῖς καὶ τοῖς σοφισταῖς ἢ τοῖς  
 [ἰ]ατροῖς εἰσφορὰν ἐπιτιθέναι τούτους τε ἀτελεῖ[ουσ]  
 εἶναι βεβουληθῆσαι ἢ[—]εν ποιητέον, [ὁ]-  
 πως περὶ τούτου τοῦ πρ[ά]γματος διατ[ά]γματι δηλώσο-  
 μεν, καλῶς ἔχον ἐστίν. ...

Things driven or taken out from this territory, or driven or taken into this territory won't be subject to importation or exportation taxes, not even (to a payment) under the title of (road- and port-?) taxes. (...) Each time that by the restitution of public affairs one of the triumviri takes care of this question making clear by way of an edict, that no one of them shall impose an expenditure to teachers, sophists or physicians, and that he wants these persons to be exempted from taxes, [---] as we will declare in an edict, this will be well done.

If, as Bringmann states, the translation and publication of these *senatus consulta* rested not on an official decision but on a private one of the teachers, sophists and physicians of the Mouseion, we may infer

20. Knibbe 1981; *I.Ephesos* 4101; *SEG* 31.952; Bringmann 1983, who has dated the inscription in Trajan's time - basing his suggestion on the text in the right column of the same inscription: *I.Ephesos* 4101A, a decree of the Ephesians in relation to the rendering of accounts by the person in charge of finances in the Mouseion. But S. Şahin's proposal of a date not before Hadrian (Şahin 1999 [*I.Perge*] p. 214 with n. 33) is much more in accordance with the other evidence for Mouseia in Asia Minor. Cf. Laffi 2006 for a new edition and thorough commentary of the inscription.

that they are acting as a professional corporation.<sup>21</sup> The first *senatus consultum* (Il.1-7) establishes the privileges that shall be awarded to these professions; the second one (Il. 7-14) makes the triumvirate responsible for the fulfilment of that concession; the third one (Il. 15-22) presents the decree that the Senate wishes to publish, apparently addressed to the main Roman local magistracies and the presidents of the local organisations delegated with the charging of taxes and customs fees.<sup>22</sup>

Being free of *εἰσαγωγίον καὶ ἐξαγωγίον* (Il. 2-3) meant a tax exemption for crossing frontiers on journeys, a concession especially valuable for professions with a well-known itinerant character. We know of other measures adopted in Rome in the first century BC and the beginning of the first century AD that aimed to promote the mobility of intellectuals, their permanence in Rome and also the relations among schools, although these measures mostly focused on Rome.<sup>23</sup>

Later on, as is well known, Trajan and Hadrian confirmed some of these privileges for the whole empire, except for that of exemption from frontier-taxes, which was never again granted to these professionals in Imperial times. The privileges awarded from the first century AD onwards are mainly those of exemption from liturgies, taxes and billeting. Though none of the words meaning 'association' appear in the edicts of these or later emperors granting privileges to these professionals, it is precisely at this time that spe-

---

21. Bringmann 1983, but see Knibbe 1981; Laffi 2006: 504

22. Bringmann 1983: 64.

23. Knibbe 1981: 4. As Suetonius says (*De gramm. et rhet.* 32), in 46 BC Cesar awarded civil rights to the foreign doctors and professionals of the *artes liberales* living in Rome. The following senatorial decisions seem nevertheless to be temporary and show that the triumvir edict had also been temporary and limited to Rome, the other communities being free to award those professions tax-exemptions. In many cases, itinerant professionals were exempted from taxes through ad hoc resolutions issued by the person in charge of education or the *gymnasion* in order to promote their visit (see, e.g., Jacobsthal 1908: 379-81, no. 2). It is noteworthy that in *Cyrene*, already in 322-307 BC, Ptolemy I granted exemption from holding offices related to the Myrioi to public physicians, *παιδοτρίβαι*, and teachers of bow-shooting, riding and fighting, together with other professions in charge of public services: Samama 2003: no. 453.

cific evidence for the existence of associations of teachers and physicians comes to light. If we take into account that by this time the honorary inscriptions to itinerant scholars almost disappear; that the term *demosios* (δημόσιος) for the public doctor is replaced by the term *archiateros* (ἀρχιατρός, 'chief-physician'); that the evidence of *paidonomoi* or *gymnasiarchoi* looking after teachers and paying their salary stops; and that the first evidence for Mouseia in Asia Minor starts appearing; then, such changes in the nature of the privileges as those noted above can perhaps be related to a concurrent change from the itinerant character of the profession to an established one.<sup>24</sup> This change may have been achieved by the professionals themselves through their forming corporations; or, the other way round, it may have been promoted by imperial policy, which considered the fixed and organised establishment of such professionals in the cities as a basic instrument for education and thus indirectly the Hellenization/Romanization of the Greek East. In any case, associations may have played an important role in this evolution. The general aim of the professionals to have an established position in their local communities or in the main intellectual cities may be one of the reasons that led to the edict of Antoninus Pius limiting the number of physicians, rhetoricians and grammarians who enjoyed exemption from liturgies (*aleitourgia*) in each city (cf. Herennius Modestinus, *Excuses*, Books 2 and 4).<sup>25</sup>

The fact that the *iatroi*, *paideutai* and *sophistai* of the Mouseion in Ephesos published a two-centuries-old concession of privileges induces us to believe that one of the motives for the establishment of these corporations was to obtain privileges from the local communities where they lived, using the beneficial Roman policy towards

---

24. The importance of getting a group of students in a concrete place as opposed to the itinerant way of education can be seen for instance in the inscription of Epikrates from Herakleia (*IG XII 6*, 128) from as early as *ca.* 200 BC. He succeeded in staying in Samos, where he created a group of students (σχολάζοντες), cf. Diog. Laert. 5.52.

25. For the concession of privileges to teachers and physicians in Roman times cf. Herzog 1935; Bowersock 1969: 30-42; Bringmann 1983: 69-73; Samama 2003: 72-3. For Hadrian's politics towards grammarians, rhetors and philosophers, see Fein 1994: 282-298, 326-9. A much damaged edict of a proconsul also found at Ephesos seems to mention rights of teachers and sophists: *I.Ephesos* 216.

them as an argument. The information about local policy regarding the establishment of these associations is so scarce that it seems to have consisted simply of a confirmation of the imperial policy in this area, a confirmation that was provided after a request had been made by the professionals themselves. The use by these associations of public space, such as the Mouseion, induce us, however, to believe that the local policy also accepted and maybe promoted these corporations. The grant of permission to associate does not seem to have been a problem. The edict of Vespasian (quoted p. 97 above, esp. ll. 13-14) did not grant this kind of permission, as Herzog (1935) argued, but rather permission to meet in certain places. That there was no systematic ban on non-public associations by imperial policy in the East, as has been postulated with reference to the *Lex Iulia de collegiis*, has been already demonstrated by some scholars.<sup>26</sup> In any case, the *synodoi* of teachers and physicians fulfilled the two main conditions for the formation of lawful associations according to the *Lex Iulia: utilitas publica* and (indirectly) *religionis causa*; and, like the other professional associations in Asia Minor, they did not have a sectarian character.

It is probably not a coincidence that, by the same time as the Mouseia and intellectual associations made their appearance in Asia Minor, mainly in Hadrian's reign and following years, the *synodoi* of the Dionysiac Artists (*hoi peri ton Dionyson technitai*) saw a revival.<sup>27</sup> During this period, the evidence for contests (*agones*), and concretely musical and theatrical contests (*mousikoi* and *thymelikoi agones*), increases noticeably.<sup>28</sup>

The privileges awarded to teachers and physicians were privileges already awarded by the Delphic Amphictyony to the Dionysiac *technitai* of Athens in 279/8 or 278/7 BC (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 399; Le Guen

---

26. Cracco-Ruggini 1976; Arnaoutoglou 2002.

27. Le Guen 2001; Aneziri 2003.

28. See further Şahin 1999: 213-219, on the establishment of numerous Mouseia in the cities of Asia Minor in the second century AD (concretely in post-Hadrian and especially in Antoninian and Severian times), and on the relation of their emergence with Hadrian's policy of panhellenism as well as with the general intellectual movement known as second sophistic.



2001, T2), confirmed in 130 BC (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 692; Le Guen 2001, T6). Almost two centuries after that, Hadrian, who confirms the privileges of teachers and physicians, also issues an edict bestowing privileges on the general *synodos* of *technitai*.<sup>29</sup> The terms of this edict survive in fragmentary form in three papyri from the third century. In it Hadrian confirms the privileges of *asylia*, *proedria*, freedom from military service, from liturgies, exemption from taxes for whatever they transport for their private use as well as for use in the contests, exemption from jury-duty, from the obligation of providing sureties, and from special taxes; the right to meet, no obligation to quarter foreigners and the right not to be arrested.<sup>30</sup>

It is well known that the associations of *technitai* developed as intermediaries between the cities and their profession in order to negotiate contracts. A similar reason may lie behind the development of physicians' and teachers' associations. For those practitioners of professions who wished to have an established position, the association was surely a way of attaining privileges and having the chance of being recognised by the community and by the state.

The associations of these professionals share a special feature with the *synodoi* of Dionysiac *technitai*. That both types of associations had a strong professional similarity is made obvious by their common devotion to the Mousai.<sup>31</sup> Moreover, both played an important role in the education offered in the cities and, in imperial times, also in the diffusion of Hellenic education in the East. The frequency with which we find philosophers, rhetoricians, *neoi* and

29. For the privileges awarded to *technitai*, see Aneziri 2003: 243ff.

30. Κεφ[ά]λαιον ἐκ διατάγματος θεοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ περὶ τῶν δο[θ]εισῶν δωρεῶν τῇ συνόδῳ· ὧν δὲ εἰσὶν ἀσυλία, προεδρία, ἀστρατία, λειτουργιῶν δημοσίων ἀτέλεια, ἀτελῆ ἔχειν ὅσα ἂν ἐπάγ[ω]νται χρεῖας ἰδίας ἢ τῶν ἀγόνων ἐν[εκα], μὴ κρίνειν, μὴ καθισ[τ]άνειν ἐγγυητ[ά]ς, ἀνεισοφορίας αὐτῶν, { οὖν } συνθυσίας, μὴ δέχεσθαι πρὸς ἀνάγκην ξένους, μὴ εἰργεσθαι[ι] μηδὲ ἄλλη τινὶ φρουρᾷ c. 11|ῶθεις ἢ θανάτῳ ὑπευθνη (...): Oliver 1989: 240-2, no. 96 A-C; Frisch 1986: nos. 1, 3, 4. Further evidence for Hadrian's interest on the *technitai*: Petzl and Schwertheim 2006: esp. 8-16, 24-25.

31. For the close relation of the associations of *technitai* to the Mousai, see Poland 1909, 206. Several documents (Le Guen 2001: T 73-75) render it possible that the Mouseion in Syracuse, which was near the theatre, served as the headquarters of the *synodos* of the *technitai*.

gymnasiarchs as members of, or otherwise related to, *synodoi* of *technitai* is not surprising.<sup>32</sup> In fact, they trained youths in the arts and skills that the *technitai* practiced. The *technitai*, like poets and rhetoricians, were often chosen as ambassadors of the community,<sup>33</sup> while the physicians of Ephesos, like *synodoi* of *technitai*, organised *agones*. There was nevertheless a great difference. The *technitai* were concerned with the visible, festive, propagandistic part of education. They played a main role in the events that showed the power of a city and gave it international standing and prestige. The teachers and physicians, in contrast, were only concerned with the private, local side of education, and it was only as individuals that they were honoured for representing their city. It is not surprising, therefore, that our evidence on internal organisation and state intervention is much richer in the case of the *technitai synodoi* than in the case of associations of physicians and teachers.

### 3. Hierarchy and internal organization

As in the case of other professional associations, where a president and a *grammateus* normally sufficed,<sup>34</sup> the establishment of teachers and physicians associations does not seem to aim at reproducing a complex hierarchical structure, where the members could achieve social prestige.

---

32. See, e.g., Le Guen 2001: T 124 (Elaia, 129 BC); *I.Priene* III, l. 175 (C1 AD).

33. Le Guen 2001: 80ff., with the references (in the index) to the activities of Menekles from Teos in Crete, or to those of Dymas from Iasos in Samothrace. For poets and rhetors as ambassadors, see the examples in Puech 2002.

34. The only attested offices are those of the president, *epimeletes* ('superintendent') and *grammateus* ('secretary'). Regarding the office of the president, *proedria* is attested in Egypt and in the Roman West since Severian times, but in Asia Minor only in the case of the association of the *porphyrobaphoi* in Hierapolis (Poland 1909: 126, 157, 415). Some associations have a particular term for the president, generally one with the component ἀρχ- (e.g. the ἐμποριάρχαι in Apameia: Poland 1909: 107, 114). See also Dittmann-Schöne 2001: 36, esp. n. 118 for ἀρχ- (e.g. in ἀρχεραμιστής, ἀρχικωνηγός, ἀρχιβάφθης, ἀρχιμύστις, ἀρχιβούκολος, ἀρχιθυσίτης etc.), and for πρωτ- (e.g. in πρωταυτάρχοι, Laodikeia Catacecaumene and Aphrodisias).

There is only indirect evidence for associational officers in the *synodoi* of teachers. In a possible reference to a physicians' association of the methodical school in Smyrna we find the term *προστάτης*, which could possibly designate the president of the association.<sup>35</sup> However, the term is used for patron in other professional associations. In Ephesos, the president is indicated with the expression *archon ton iatron* (ἄρχων τῶν ἰατρῶν: *I.Eph* 719, 1162+Add. p. 24), but much better attested is another office for physicians, the *archiatros* (ἀρχιατρός), a term that has been a matter of discussion.<sup>36</sup> It seems to have replaced the term *demosios* and, though in some cases the *archiatros* could be the head of an association (as we know of similar terminology in other associations, mainly cultic ones), he seems to be in most cases the physician recognised by the state as a public doctor.<sup>37</sup> In this sense, his function as an important intermediary between the state and the private professionals of the corporation makes his role as head of the association very probable. As Nutton has pointed out, the change from the transient public doctors of the Hellenistic age to the citizen *archiatroi* of the Roman period reflects the increasing stability of many medical families in the East.<sup>38</sup> As we already mentioned, the association of physicians at this time probably had something to do with this quest for privileges and stability. In fact, the only place where associations of physicians have been assumed in Hellenistic times is Cos.<sup>39</sup> An important school in relation to the Asclepion there promoted the stability of the profession.

35. *I.Smyrna* 537; Samama 2003, no. 195, first-second century AD): ἰητήρ μεθόδου, Ἀσιατικέ, προστάτα, χαῖρε.

36. *I.Eph* 622, 719, 1038, 1161-1163, 1165, 1167, 3055, 4350III.

37. See, e.g., *I.Ephesos* 3055: ἀρχιατρός τῆς [E]φεσίων πόλεως. It is possible that from the time of Antoninus Pius on, the *archiatroi* were among the physicians exempted from liturgies.

38. Nutton 1977: 191-226, esp. 200. For the reasons for engaging foreigners as public doctors in Hellenistic times, cf. Massar 2005: 283-5, who adduces as an important one the power that a native doctor could achieve in the city.

39. E.g. Samama 2003: no. 122, though I think there is no confirmation of the existence of such associations.

Though the post of *archiatros* was increasingly maintained in the same families,<sup>40</sup> making competition in small communities almost impossible, the medical association in big cities was probably a way to access the official post, and in any case, the circle of this profession that by this time was mainly a profession of intellectuals from the upper class.<sup>41</sup>

#### 4. Spaces related to the associations

There is no evidence for the use of a private space by associations of teachers and physicians. In the edict of Vespasian, we have seen above (p. 97), permission was granted to teachers and physicians to meet in sacred places. The Asklepieion seems to be a seat of the physicians association in Ephesos (*I.Eph* 719), and probably of physicians together with other intellectuals in Pergamon (see below p. 111-112).<sup>42</sup> But the main attested seat of these associations is the Mouseion. In fact, apart from the general term *synodos*, attested for the *paideutai* of Smyrna (*I.Smyrna* 215), and *synedrion* for the *iatroi* of Ephesos (*I.Eph* 2304),<sup>43</sup> the only specific denominations for these groups are *hoi paideutai hoi syn Syllai* (παιδευταὶ οἱ σὺν Σύλλα) from Lindos (*IG* XII 1, 918); and *hoi peri to Mouseion* (οἱ περὶ τὸ Μουσεῖον: *I.Eph* 2065, 3068, cf. 3239) or *hoi apo Mouseiou* (οἱ ἀπὸ Μουσεῖου: *I.Eph* 1162, 2304, 4101A) in Ephesos.<sup>44</sup> Mouseia related to *synodoi* of intellectuals were

40. *I.Ephesos* 622; Samama 2003: no. 240 (Philadepheia, C2-3 AD); Nutton 1977: 43 (Heracleia), 57 (Thyateira).

41. Nutton 1977: 202.

42. For the special relation in Hellenistic times between the physicians of Cos and the Asklepieion, see Samama 2003: nos. 122 (they were in charge of exposing in the *abaton* the sacral regulations concerning other cults), and 121 (they appear right after the cult personnel and the Nestorides, but before musicians and craftsmen, in the list of distributions of sacrificial meat in a cult calendar). Though I think that these mentions of physicians in relation to the Asklepieion are not a confirmation of their association; rather they are a confirmation of the existence of the notion of professional corporations.

43. The reference to a τόπος συμβιώσεω[ς-] in relation to an *iatros* in Hypaipa (*I.Ephesos* 3818, C3-4 AD) has been interpreted as possible evidence for a medical association, see Samama's (2003) comment on no. 242.

44. The Ephesian Mouseion could also be the centre of philosophical schools, as an honorary inscription to an eclectic philosopher from the Mouseion leads us to

presumably to be found also in Smyrna and Pergamon in the second and third centuries AD.<sup>45</sup>

The Mouseion of Ephesos was the association centre for teachers and physicians. Nevertheless, physicians are more prominent in the evidence from this Mouseion. This circumstance, together with the existence of specific events related to the Mouseion and involving medical demonstrations, the *agones asklepiadai*, may explain the difference between the expressions (*iatroî*) *apo tou Mouseiou* and *peri tou Mouseion*, used in the case of the *paideutai*. The latter perhaps assembled there but surely taught in the *gymnasion* and/or in private centres.<sup>46</sup>

The Mouseion of Ephesos was probably also the centre where new doctors were trained, as perhaps the one in Smyrna was the law school of the city.<sup>47</sup> The association in the Mouseion gave private teachers and physicians the opportunity to become known and considered, and to attain privileges. In Ephesos the public doctors, *archiatroi*, were probably the presidents of the Mouseion, and the intermediaries between private physicians and the state. This symbiosis between the public and the private we know already from the philosophical schools (*see also* Haake in this volume). As N.F. Jones stated concerning the Athenian schools, ‘a private school (was) housed in a public space, whether agora, or stoa, or gymna-

---

suppose (*I.Ephesos* 789), though the ethnic *Alexandreus* could mean that the person honoured was a philosopher from the Alexandrian Mouseion.

45. *I.Smyrna* 191 (*IGR* 4.618); *I.Pergamon* VIII 3.38.

46. See Dow 1960 with comments and a bibliography on previous discussion about the meaning of the expression οἱ περὶ τὸ Διογένειον in some Attic inscriptions dating from the end of the second cent. BC to ca. 260 AD. The correct understanding of this designation could help us understand the two different expressions related to the Ephesian associations, but there seems to be no agreement on the question. For Dow, this expression refers to a separate staff of the *ephebeia* that includes all officials, trainers etc., who were associated with the Diogeneion not for a single year, but for life. Another school of thought holds that the expression refers to students of pre-ephebic age at the *ephebeia* institution, which in its latest years extended its age-range: Reinmuth 1959. In Oliver’s view (1934: 191-6), ‘one should explain the phrase περὶ τὸ Μουσεῖον as indicating not only the professors ἀπὸ τοῦ Μουσειου but also those that without holding official appointments had the privilege of teaching there’.

47. Massar (2005: 192-93) considers it possible that physicians were active in the Hellenistic Mouseion of Alexandria.

sium'; and he subscribes to Lynch's view that the use of public space in and of itself gave the central government a powerful source of leverage over the philosophers.<sup>48</sup> An honorary inscription of the *boule* and *demos* to a person who, among other things, decorated the Mouseion in Ephesos (*I.Eph* 690) shows the public importance of this institution.

In the case of Smyrna, the reference to the city archive as Mouseion induce us to consider the institution as public in nature.<sup>49</sup> This function of the archive as Mouseion is probably related to the place as the seat of lawyers. This we know from an inscription from Temenothyrai in Phrygia (*IGR* 4.618) dedicated to a member of the tribunal of provincial governors. This individual is also said to have been ἐπὶ τῆς λαμπροτάτης μητροπόλεως Συμυρνάων πόλεως ἡγησάμενος Μουσειῶν ἐπὶ τῶν νόμων ἐνπεριρία (the director of the Mouseion of the brilliant metropolis, the city of Smyrna, because of his knowledge of the law), which means that he, a lawyer, was the director of the Mouseion because it was the archive of the city.<sup>50</sup> It is most probable that the Mouseion was the school of law, but there is no evidence that it was also the seat of the *synodos* of *paideutai* (*I.Smyrna* 215), though this seems quite probable judging from the Ephesian evidence. There is no evidence that the lawyers were associated in any sort of corporation either.

The fact that there is no reference to a priest, that the Mouseia do not appear in the literary sources as a public institution, and that that of Ephesos and the one in Smyrna are clearly different in organisation and functions, all three features induce me to believe that these Mouseia were not created as exact copies of the Alexandrian Mouseion. The other mentions of Mouseia in Asia Minor have been interpreted as references to the Alexandrian Mouseion, but only in cases where it is explicitly stated, or where the expression τῶν ἐν Μουσειῷ σειτουμένων ('those dining in the Mouseion') is

48. Jones 1999: 227-234, who refers (234) to Lynch 1972: 130-4.

49. *I.Smyrna* 191: τῆς αὐτῆς τῆς <ἐπ>ιγραφῆς ἀντι[ι]γραφοῦν κεῖται ἐν τῷ ἐν Ζμύρνῃ ἀρχεῖῳ τῷ [καλοῦ]μένῳ Μουσειῷ ('a copy of this inscription lies in the archive of Smyrna which is called Mouseion').

50. Robert 1937: 146-48. Lemerle 1935: 131-40.

used, are we able to be certain of it.<sup>51</sup> In other cases, there is no reason to reject the existence of local Mouseia.<sup>52</sup>

The use of public space by the intellectual associations could denote an official character of these associations, but we know that many craftsmen's associations were allowed to meet in temples or public spaces. This was, for instance, the case with the Ephesian smiths' use of the Hephaistos temple (Dittmann-Schöne 2001: 42-3) and with many tradesmen's guilds use of the port temple (Dittmann-Schöne 2001: 47). This custom is indicated by descriptions such as τοῦ ἐμπορίου (of the market-place), ἐπὶ τοῦ λιμένος (in the harbour), περὶ τὸν βείκον (by the measure jar), ἐπὶ τῆς θερμαίας πλατείας (in the street of the thermal baths).<sup>53</sup> As in the case of the philosophical schools, the use of public space was probably a way to control the private associations and ensure their public utility.

The granting of public space by the state to these professional associations is directly related to the state policy towards associations attested through the official concession of privileges already mentioned. Even though it is not so well attested, and may have been a much rarer practice, consuls and emperors issued official grants of privileges to other types of professional associations.<sup>54</sup>

---

51. Such is the case of Phronton in Hamidiye, north-east Lydia, *TAM* V,1 498: τῶν ἐν τῷ/ Μουσειῷ (sic!) σειτου/μένων φιλοσόφων τῶν Ἀλεξανδρῶν/[ῶν -]. Cf. the inscription from Philippi: Κλωδιανὸν ἀπὸ ἐπιτρόπων τῶν ἐν Μουσειῷ σειτουμένων (Lemerle 1935: 131-140, with commentary on other evidence for Mouseia). The reference to the Mouseion in the funerary inscription of Ailios Dionysios, a known grammarian and sophist described in the inscription as [φι]λοσόφος ἀπὸ Μουσειῷ in Halikarnassos (B. Haussoullier, *BCH* 4 [1880] 405-406, no. 21), is probably a reference to the Mouseion in Alexandria, where he had studied.

52. Şahin considers also these Mouseia as local Mouseia: see his comment to *I.Perge* 193, with references to most of them and considerations of date and context.

53. Dittmann-Schöne 2001: 49. Sites of different professional associations are attested in the Stoa of Servilius in Ephesos. The asiarch M. Fulvius Publicanus Nikephoros grants the space between the columns by the reconstruction of the columnata to at least seven associations (e.g. *I.Ephesos* 445, 2078, 2080; on this use of the *intercolumnia*: *Lib. Or.* 11.254). An edict by the emperor Zeno orders the occasional construction of association seats in public spaces: Dittmann-Schöne 2001: 45 and 64, where other evidence for official permission to associations to use public spaces is cited.

54. Dittmann-Schöne 2001: 64, 59.

## 5. Patrons (*patrones*) and benefactors (*euergetai*) of associations

A main link between the state and a professional association – particularly when one considers the latter’s practical and economic significance – are the individuals who became patrons and benefactors of associations. In an inscription from Ephesos *hoi peri to Mouseion paideutai* (οἱ περὶ τὸ Μουσεῖον παιδευταί) honour an asiarch as ‘their benefactor and founder of the fatherland’ (τὸν ἑαυτῶν εὐεργέτην/ καὶ κτίστην τῆς πατρίδος: *I.Eph* 2065, 2nd cent. AD). The same association honours, by decree of the *boule*, a *lampadarchissa* of Artemis (*I.Eph* 3068), which may demonstrate the relationship of the *paideutai* with the temple of Artemis, in whose *temenos* a *gymnasion* is known to have existed. In Smyrna, the *synodos* of the *paideutai*, together with the *neoi* of the Mimmermeion and the *gerousia*, honoured Poplios Petronios Achaikos, probably a benefactor of these associations, with decrees and a golden crown (*I.Smyrna* 215).

Benefactors and patrons could achieve important economic and social concessions for the association while they themselves gained prestige in the community as a result of their beneficial activity. In many cases, the official status of benefactors made them a useful instrument of state policy, even through their apparently private donations.

## 6. Extra-professional activities

This public face of associations is also revealed by their extra-professional activities. One of the best known among them, the preservation and protection of tombs, has also a clearly extra-associational character in Asia Minor, if we consider that only in some cases, which are limited to certain geographical areas, do the associations arrange and pay for the burial of their members (Dittmann-Schöne 2001: 83-5). Most frequently, a member of the community (who may or may not be a member of the association) would prepare his burial place in life and give instructions that the association, which was to inherit it, should take care of its maintenance and protection.<sup>55</sup>

---

55. Dittman-Schöne 2001: 82-93, for evidence especially stemming from Ephesos and



Those associations that are better attested to have performed that duty were usually also the most prestigious ones in the cities.

‘The physicians in Ephesos, those from the Mouseion’ (οἱ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ Μουσείου ἰατροί) carried responsibility for the tomb of an important doctor, who was a friend of the emperor. The doctor, perhaps a member of the association, had bequeathed to its membership forty thousand and six hundred denaries (*I.Eph* 2304). In the inscription from Smyrna already mentioned above (*I.Smyrna* 215), the *synodos* of *paideutai* appears not to have any direct involvement in the burial of the deceased as such, but is simply mentioned for having passed a decree honouring its benefactor, or perhaps one of its members, who had arranged his burial privately.

The other well-known extra-professional activity is a religious one. Most associations had their own tutelary divinity, to which they devoted most of their cultic activity. Cult officials of associations are, nevertheless, scarcely attested, and the same applies to their worship of other cults within the city. In the case of the physicians, the relation to Asklepios is well attested and well explained, but always in relation to the Asklepieion, not to the Mouseion. An honorary inscription to an *archiatros*, who was also *epitropos* of Trajan and a priest, was set up by ‘the physicians who sacrifice to the ancestor Asklepios and to the *Sebastoi*’ (*I. Eph* 719; 102-114 AD). In this case, the association of physicians defines itself as worshippers of the god Asklepios, which emphasises the cultic aspect of this association and may also indicate that its seat was in the sanctuary of Asklepios, the find-spot of the inscription.<sup>56</sup> However, this association may be the same as the one known as *hoi apo tou Mouseiou iatroi* (‘the physicians from the Mouseion’), the *archon* of the physicians and the priest (of Asklepios: cf. *I.Eph* 1162) being the same as those in an inscription of this *synodos* (*I.Eph* 4101). A relation between the cult of Asklepios and an ‘intellectual’ association is also to be supposed in the case of the famous incubatory sanctuary of the god in Pergamon, where Aelius Aristides spent so much time. The repeat-

---

Hierapolis, and for isolated evidence from other cities of the northern and western Anatolian coast.

56. Samama 2003: 328, no. 205.

ed use of the term *therapeutai* in this context, in inscriptions as well as in the speeches of Aelius Aristides, induced Herzog to believe in the existence of an association with the name *therapeutai*.<sup>57</sup> From Aelius Aristides (*Or.* 50.19) we know that one of these *therapeutai* was Rhosander, a member of a well-known Platonic philosophical school, to which other visitors of the Asklepieion also belonged.<sup>58</sup> Further proof of this intellectual aspect can be found in the current reference to sophists in the inscriptions from the place, as well as in the existence within the sanctuary of both a theatre and a library offered by a benefactor, Flavia Melitine, who was honoured by the *boule* and *demos* of Pergamon (*I.Perg* VIII 3, 38).<sup>59</sup> The evidence of a Mouseion (*I.Perg* VIII 3, 152) in the city makes it probable that there were two independent intellectual associations, which surely had some or many of their members in common (cf. the commentary on *I.Perg* VIII 3, 152). The cultic aspect of the associations of teachers is only indirectly attested through the relation of these professionals to the *gymnasion* and the groups of *neoi*, ephebes and *paides* and through the direct evidence of the attachment of this institution to the cults of Herakles, Hermes and the Mousai. The honorary inscription dedicated by the *synodos* of *paideutai* in Ephesos to the *lampadarchissa* of Artemis may reflect the attachment of the *synodos* to the main cult of the city, though this is not strictly necessary. Neither the cult of the Mousai nor any other cult is attested in relation with the Mouseion in the Anatolian cities, except in Perge, where it is connected with the Alexandrine Mouseion.

The role of the association of *iatroi* at Ephesos as a medical school and as a centre of diffusion of *paideia* is shown by the organization of medical contests (*agones*) in the disciplines of *syntagma*, *cheirurgia*, *problema* and *organon* (*I.Eph* 1161, 1162, 1164, 1165, 1167, 1168; Samama 2003, no. 210-215). There is no explanation of what one had to demonstrate when competing in each of these disciplines. We may suppose they

---

57. Herzog 1935: 1007-8.

58. One of them, Pryllianus, is called 'from the temple'. For the possible intellectual associations in the Asklepieion, see Remus 1996: 152, 159-60.

59. Habicht 1969: 15, 17 (cited by Remus 1996: 160), who describes the Asklepieion as the 'Zentrum des geistigen Lebens' in the city, indeed in the province of Asia.

were demonstrations of medical skill in preparing medication (*pharmaka*) or writing medical treatises (the probable meanings of *syntagma*), in surgery (*cheirurgia*), in diagnosis (*problema*) and in making or using medical instruments (*organa*).<sup>60</sup> In any case, they demonstrate the unity of theory, surgery and pharmacology that reminds us of Galen's insistence on an integral knowledge and skill for a good doctor,<sup>61</sup> and of the important relation of physicians to *paideia*. The *agones* were dated by the priest of Asklepios, the president of the association of physicians and the *agonothetes*. They were organised in the *gymnasion* and a *gymnasiarchos* of the physicians was appointed during the days of the *agones* (*I.Eph* 1162, ll. 12-13, cf. 1164, 1165). The fact that *archiatroi* were often winners of different demonstrations (cf. *I.Eph* 1162) allows us to suppose that the *agones* were not for students of medicine, but for doctors. Even if they were not official examinations of civic physicians but the usual challenge matches in the context of civic festival, as Barton states, these *agones* were probably significant in the election of the public doctors of the city.<sup>62</sup> It is surely not a coincidence that they date from the reign of Antoninus Pius (138-161 AD), the emperor who restricted the right to enjoy exemption from liturgies to a certain number of physicians and teachers in each city.

## 7. Representation of these associations in the community

There is really no evidence that associations of craftsmen and intellectuals in Asia Minor participated in public festivals. Most of the evidence presented by O. van Nijf comes from the West, while the

---

60. Cf. Barton 1994: 148 and n.72; Nutton 1995: 7-8; 1979, 187-88; Samama 2003: 70-1. Barton (loc. cit.) assumes that the proofs consisted on free choice on medical theme on which to speak, surgical demonstrations, a theme chosen by judges, and medical instruments, though his assessment that 'The order with words before deeds is notable' is based in a false order, and for that reason is void. Nutton (1995) interprets the proofs as submission of novel inventions, of a drug (*σύνταγμα*) or an instrument (*ὄργανον*), and resolution of a medical and surgical problem; or, alternatively, drug prescription (*σύνταγμα*), manipulation or bandaging (*χειρουργία*), some form of diagnosis and the use of instruments.

61. Gal., *De opt. med. cogn.*, cited by Nutton 1995: 8.

62. Barton 1997: 148 and n. 72.

evidence from the East is always indirect or concerns Dionysiac *technitai*, athletes and other sorts of associations which were professionally related to festivals.<sup>63</sup> It is significant that there is no mention of professional associations either in the foundation of Demosthenes of Oinoanda (*SEG* 38:1462) or in that of Salutaris in Ephesos (*I.Eph.* 27). *Topoi*-inscriptions securing seats in theatres or latrines for these associations surely have a symbolic value, as van Nijf (1997) has stated, but also a practical one. The *topoi*-inscriptions in the Ephesian latrines of the Vedius gymnasium can probably be explained by the fact that this gymnasium was near the Servilius stoa, where many professional associations had their headquarters.

In some cases the reference to teachers and physicians as professional groups may be a reference to an association. Professional associations appear frequently at public distributions and banquets in the Roman West. Though it is not usual in the Roman East, and there is no evidence in imperial Asia Minor, we have some examples in Hellenistic Cos, which are probably related to the change that took place in the physicians' profession from an itinerant to an established one. These professionals appear among the recipients of sacrificial meat together with other associations: the *nestorides*, and the flute players, the smiths and potters.<sup>64</sup> In first-century BC Priene, however, only foreign physicians and teachers appear among the recipients of sacrificial meat (*I.Priene* III; Samama, no. 226). They are listed together with other foreign professionals such as the *theoroi*, *technitai* of Dionysos, masseurs and physical trainers, and together with the ephebes of the city.<sup>65</sup>

These examples, together with evidence from the Black Sea dating from imperial times, suggest that it is possible that public distributions to these professions also occurred in Anatolia. A female

---

63. van Nijf 1997: 131-46.

64. *I.Cos* 37 (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1025; Samama 2003: no. 121, mid C4 BC). For the *Nestorides* as possible association of disciples honouring Nestor, who, as Asklepios, had received medical teachings from Chiron, see Samama 2003, 224, n. 4.

65. See the donations made by a *paidonomos* to the *paides* at the end of his term of office in Carian Hydai: *I.Mylasa* 909. The inclusion of the *paidutai* among the recipients surely helped this profession to become a respectable group in society, cf. van Nijf 1997: 175, n. 131.

gymnasiarch named Aba was honoured in Istros for her distributions to physicians and teachers, together with other social, cultic and professional associations. Lines 25-30 of the relevant inscription (*I.Histriae* 57; *SEG* 30.796, ca. 150-200 AD) read:<sup>66</sup>

(... ) τοῖς μέν γάρ/ βουλευταῖς πᾶσιν καὶ γερουσιασταῖς καὶ Ταυ/ριασταῖς  
καὶ ἰατροῖς καὶ παιδευταῖς καὶ τοῖς ἰδίᾳ/ καὶ ἐξ ὀνόματος καλουμένοις ἐκ δύο  
κατ' ἄνδρα/ δηναρ[ί]ων/ διανο[μ]ήν, ἦν οὐπω τις ἄλλη πρότερον,/ ἔδωκεν (...)

... for all members of the *boule* and the *gerousia* and for the *Tauriastai* (i.e. worshippers of Poseidon), the physicians, the teachers and all those who have been individually invited, she has distributed two dinars per person, what nobody had done before...

Teachers and physicians are here distinguished from those 'individually invited' (τοῖς ἰδίᾳ καὶ ἐξ ὀνόματος καλουμένοι), and appear after the *bouleitai*, *gerousiastai* and *tauriastai*, but before the cultic and professional associations of the *hymnodoi* (hymn singers), builders, craftsmen and traders of the Sacred Avenue, and the *Herakleleistai* (II.31-33: ἔτι μὴν καὶ ὑμνωδοῖς καὶ τέ/κτωσιν καὶ ἱεροπ[λα]τείταις καὶ Ἡρακλειασταῖς). It seems that for the benefactress Aba, the most prestigious group of professionals consisted of physicians and teachers.<sup>67</sup> We don't know if they constituted an association or not, but the fact that they appeared together with professional associations makes it probable that they were also one, or at least they were conceived as one by the community.

66. See van Nijf 1997: 170-188, on the professional associations in this inscription, and Robert 1989: 195-266, esp. 205-8, on *IGBulg* I<sup>2</sup>, 15(3).

67. See also the case of Dionysopolis in Moesia, where a gymnasiarch is honoured, among other things, for having made distributions to the *boule* and the visiting *bouletai* from a league of five cities, the *agoraioi*, *iatroi* and *paideutai*: *IGBulg* I<sup>2</sup> 15(2) (early third cent. AD, after 212) and 15(3), which includes *hymnodoi* and foreign traders.

## 8. Conclusions

There seems to be no important distinction between associations of physicians and teachers and other sorts of professional associations. The main difference is probably the different status of the members. Grammarians, sophists, rhetoricians and physicians in Asia Minor belonged to the middle and upper classes, some of them even to the elite.<sup>68</sup> The higher recognition many of them received is nevertheless much clearer in individual references to such professionals. When they join together as an association they seem to become an entity similar to other associations in its internal organisation, but also in its rights and obligations towards the community. Reference to membership of a private person is only found in documents erected by the association or addressed to the association as such, but usually not as a sign of identity in private documents of its members. The naming of an association after its founder is very rare, as are also inscriptions honouring individuals who are members of an association. Most of our evidence is about the relationship of associations with their patrons, benefactors, the community and the state. Speaking of the circle of Aelius Aristides, Remus (1996, 148) writes: 'By virtue of their birth, means, and education they had little need to resort to such organization to attain the ends - social and professional - that motivated persons beneath them in the social scale to form voluntary associations.' That rhetoricians and physicians who apparently did not need to join such associations did in fact join them is a sign of their main practical professional interest and, at the same time, of the associations' significance not for the individual but for the *koinon*. As Baslez states, 'ce n'était donc pas le triomphe de l'individualisme, comme on l'a dit parfois, mais plutôt la dissociation du collectif et du politique, confondus dans la cité depuis ses origines'.<sup>69</sup>

I think there is no evidence for assuming that teachers, physi-

---

68. The social status of members of craftsmen's and traders' associations ranges from the lower class to the middle one, the Roman citizens being nevertheless more numerous than the members of the lowest classes: see Dittmann-Schöne 2001.

69. Baslez 1998: 439.

cians, craftsmen or tradesmen joined associations to compensate a social lack or to achieve a social status they could not achieve otherwise, though sometimes such a thing could be, and surely was, a consequence of their membership. I think the symbolic and social value of associations that define themselves in terms of their occupational activities must not be overstressed in detriment to their professional value. The associations of teachers and physicians were constituted with a professional, not social, restrictive membership. The aim was clearly professional: to gain recognition and privileges that allowed them to exercise their profession, to have an established position and the possibility of access to public office and, finally, to be related to an institution where they could have intellectual discussions and find students. Therefore their association was probably only theoretically voluntary. It seems very probable that a teacher or a physician in Ephesos or Smyrna had to join the professional association in order to attain the privileges that their profession claimed and to have the chance of being recognised publicly as a teacher or physician. Membership in such associations offered them the possibility of becoming a public physician or teacher. Public, here, means 'recognised by the state' as the community's physician, sophist, etc. In many professions, the decision of associating was surely a private decision, but the state not only did not oppose the establishment of these associations, but probably even granted them privileges in order to stimulate their creation. In the case of teachers and physicians this is, as we have seen, very probable. The state also offered them a public space in which they adopted the official ritual which is represented in the monumental epigraphy, the displaying of statues and the institution of benefaction and patronage that allowed them to satisfy their professional needs. Honorary dedications and tomb protection were inherent to this kind of *koinon*. The association was guaranteed by the state as an important link in the community and a representative element of it. The community could benefit of the professional skill of its members, but also of its role protecting their tombs or in order to be honoured by being its patron or benefactor. For the state, the establishment of such associations guaranteed the provision of education and health care, much like the existence of an association of bakers

in Ephesos (Dittmann-Schöne 2001: II.1.29) guaranteed the bread supply of the population, or, again, the existence of the association of linen-weavers in Lydian Saittai (Dittmann-Schöne 2001: no. III 3.1-III.3.11) ensured the exploitation of a most important economic resource of the region.

It is not simply as a matter of form when physicians are honoured ‘for having attended the community in a private and in a public capacity’ in the third and especially in the second century BC.<sup>70</sup> A significant example is the case of Onasandros, a physician who learnt the profession from a teacher and public physician (διδάσκαλος, ἰατρὸς δημόσιος) of Cos. He became so well-known in the deme of Halasarna for his medical skill that after being an appointed medical assistant for many years, he opened his private practice (*iatreion*) where he generously attended everyone, letting his private interest come second to his public function.<sup>71</sup> On the basis of the *Lex Iulia*’s requirement of *utilitas publica* from associations, Herzog has reconstructed the lines 5-6 of Vespasian’s edict (see p. 97 above) as follows: [Ἐπειδὴ τὰ τοῖς ἐλευθέροις πρέποντα ἐπιτηδεύματα / ταῖς τε πόλεσι κοινῆι καὶ ἰδίᾳ χρήσιμα καὶ τῶν θεῶν ἱερὰ νομίζεται] (Because the professions that are suitable to free persons are considered useful for the cities publicly as well as privately, and sacred to the gods). The insistence on public service, which we find in Hellenistic honorary decrees, seems to have been also a principal reason for the imperial (and probably local) policy towards these professions and for the steps taken to make the associations become a framework uniting private and public dimensions.

From the moment an association of teachers and physicians was founded, the private/public opposition no longer seemed to have

70. Samama 2003: nos. 106 (Halicarnassus) and 129 (Cos). See also the later evidence of Samama 2003: no. 245 (Robert and Robert 1954: no. 70B), ll. 11-12 (Herakleia Salbake, C1 AD): παρασχόμενον τοῖς πολειταῖς καὶ δημοσίᾳ καὶ ἰδῆ κοινῶς.

71. Samama 2003: no. 137 (*SEG* 41. 680, Halasarna, C2 BC), ll. 24-38, cf. Samama 2003: no. 067, a nearly contemporary decree of Amphissa in Locris, in which a physician is honored for his work for the common health, treating everybody on equal terms (ll. 15-17): τῶν ἐγγειρισθεῖσαν ἀπὸ πίστιν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας ἐφ’ ἴσου καὶ πο[θ’ / ἀπ]αντας εὐνοικῶς διαφυλάξας (... favourable preserving the confidence entrusted to him in relation to the common health, in equal conditions, and for everybody).



any more significance for the association and its representation in the community. If somebody had asked a pedestrian in an Ephesian street if the teachers that assembled in the Mouseion constituted a private or a public *synodos*, I wonder if he would have known how to answer.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aneziri, S. 2003, *Die Vereine der dionysischen Techniten im Kontext der hellenistischen Gesellschaft: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte, Organisation und Wirkung der hellenistischen Technitenvereine*. Historia Einzelschriften 163 Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Arnaoutoglou, I.N. 2002, 'Roman Law and collegia in Asia Minor', *RIDA* 3rd Ser. 49, 27-44.
- Barton, T.S. 1994, *Power and Knowledge. Astrology, Physiognomics, and Medicine under the Roman Empire*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press: Michigan.
- Baslez, M.-F. 1998, 'Les associations dans la cité grecque et l'apprentissage du collectif', *Ktema* 23, 431-439.
- Bowersock, G.W. 1969, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bringmann, K. 1983, 'Edikt der Triumvirn oder Senatsbeschluss? Zu einem Neufund aus Ephesos', *EA* 2, 47-76.
- Cracco-Ruggini, L. 1976, 'La vita associativa nelle città dell'Oriente greco: tradizioni locali e influenze romane', in D.M. Pippidi (ed.), *Assimilation et résistance à la culture gréco-romaine dans le monde ancien. Travaux du VIe Congrès International d'Études Classiques, Madrid, Septembre 1974*. Bucarest and Paris: Editura Academiei, pp. 463-491.
- Dittmann-Schöne, I. 2001, *Die Berufsvereine in den Städten des kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasiens*. Theorie und Forschung 895. Regensburg: S. Roderer Verlag.
- Dow, S. 1960, 'The Athenian *Ephêboi*; Other Staffs, and the Staff of the Diogeneion', *TAPhA* 91, 381-408.
- Fein, S. 1994, *Die Beziehungen der Kaiser Trajan und Hadrian zu den litterati*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 26. Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner.
- Frisch, P. 1986, *Zehn agonistische Papyri*. Abhandlungen der rheinisch-westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Sonderreihe Papyrologia Colonien-sia 13. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Gabrielsen, V. 1997, *The Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes*. Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 6. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Griffith, M. 2001, 'Public and private in early Greek institutions of education', in Yun Lee Too (ed.), *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Leiden, Boston and Cologne: Brill, pp. 23-84.

- Habicht, Chr. 1969, *Altertümer von Pergamon*, vol. VIII.3: *Die Inschriften des Asklepieions*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter (= *I.Perg VIII.3*).
- Herzog, R. 1935, 'Urkunden zur Hochschulpolitik der römischen Kaiser', *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse* 32, 967-1019.
- Jacobsthal, P. 1908, 'Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon 1906-7. II, Die Inschriften', *MDAI(A)* 33, 375-420.
- Jones, N.F. 1999, *The Associations of Classical Athens: The Response to Democracy*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kloppenborg, J. S. and Wilson, S. G. (eds.) 1996, *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Knibbe, D. 1981, 'Quandocumque quis trivm virorum rei pUBLICAE constitvendae... Ein neuer Text aus Ephesos', *ZPE* 44, 1-10.
- Laffi, U. 2006, 'Iscrizione di Efeso in onore di insegnanti, sofisti, medici (I. Ephesos, 4101)', in B. Virgilio (ed.), *Studi Ellenistici XIX*. Pisa and Rome: Fabrizio Serra Editore, pp. 453-522.
- Le Guen, B. 2001, *Les associations de Technites dionysiaques à l'époque hellénistique*, 2 vols. *Études d'Archéologie Classique XI-XII*. Nancy: Association pour la diffusion de la recherche sur l'antiquité.
- Lemerle, P. 1935, 'Inscriptions latines et grecques de Philippes', *BCH* 59, 26-164.
- Linderski, J. 1968, 'Der Senat und die Vereine', in N.M. Andreev, J. Irmscher, E. Pólay and W. Erkallo (eds.) *Gesellschaft und Recht im griechisch-römischen Altertum*, vol. 1. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Liu, J. 2005, 'Local Governments and Collegia: A New Appraisal of the Evidence', in J.-J. Aubert and Z. Várhelyi (eds.) *A Tall Order. Writing the Social History of the Ancient World. Essays in Honor of William V. Harris*. Munich and Leipzig: K.G. Saur, pp. 296-299.
- Lynch, J.P. 1972, *Aristotle's School: A study of a Greek Educational Institution*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Massar, N. 2005, *Soigner et servir. Histoire sociale et culturelle de la médecine grecque à l'époque hellénistique*. Paris: De Boccard.
- Nutton, V. 1977, 'Archiatri and the Medical Profession in Antiquity', *PBSR* 45, 191-226.
- Nutton, V. (ed.) 1979, *Galen, On Prognosis. Text, Translation, Commentary*. *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum V 8,1*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Nutton, V. 1995 'The Medical Meeting Place', in Ph. J. van der Eijk, H.F.J. Horstmannshoff and P.H. Schrijvers (eds.), *Ancient medicine in its Socio-Cultural Context. Papers Read at the Congress held at Leiden University, 13-15 April 1992*. Vol. 1. *Clio Medica* 27. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi, pp. 3-25.

- Oliver, J.H. 1934, 'The MOYΣEION in Late Attic Inscriptions', *Hesperia* 3, 191-196.
- Oliver, J.H. 1989, *Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors from Inscriptions and Papyri*. Memoires of the American Philosophical Society 178. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Pearcy, L.T. 1993, 'Medicine and Rhetoric in the Period of the Second Sophistic', *ANRW* 2.37-1, pp. 445-456.
- Petzl, G. and E. Schwertheim, E. 2006, *Hadrian und die dionysischen Künstler. Drei in Alexandria Troas neugefundene Briefe des Kaisers an die Künstler-Vereinigung*. Asia Minor Studien 58. Bonn: Habelt.
- Poland, P. 1909, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*. Fürstlich Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig 23. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Puech, B 2002, *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d'époque impériale*. Textes et Traditions 4. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin 1.
- Reinmuth, O.W. 1959, "A Diogenes' College" in Athens?', *TAPhA* 90, 209-223.
- Remus, H. 1996, 'Voluntary Association and Networks: Aelius Aristides at the Asclepieion in Pergamum', in J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson 1996, 146-175.
- Robert, L. 1937, *Études anatoliennes: recherches sur les inscriptions grecques de l'Asie mineure*. Paris: De Boccard.
- Robert, L. 1989, *Opera Minora Selecta. Epigraphie et antiquités grecques* vol. 5. Amsterdam: A.M. Hekker.
- Römer, C. 1990. 'Ehrung für den Arzt Themision', *ZPE* 84, 81-88.
- Roueché, Ch. 1993, *Performers and partisans at Aphrodisias in the Roman and late Roman periods: A Study Based on Inscriptions from the Current Excavations at Aphrodisias in Caria*. J.R.S. Monograph 6. London: Society for the promotion of Roman Studies.
- Şahin, S. 1999, *Die Inschriften von Perge I*. (Inscripfen griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 54), Bonn: Habelt (= *I.Perge*).
- Samama, É. 2003, *Les médecins dans le monde Grec: Sources épigraphiques sur la naissance d'un corps médical*. Écoles pratiques des Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 31. Geneva: Librairie Droz.
- Sherk, R.K. (ed.) 1988, *The Roman Empire: Augustus to Hadrian*. Translated Documents of Greece and Rome 6. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Nijf, O.M. 1997, *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben.

# Newly Published Documents Concerning Cult Associations in the Black Sea: Some Remarks

*Alexandru Avram*

Several inscriptions published in the last years provide new information about private cult associations in the cities of the Black Sea region in Hellenistic and Roman times. A few remarks will be presented here.

Askold Ivantchik carefully published three very fragmentary inscriptions from Tanais which date from the second century or the first half of the first century BC.<sup>1</sup> All the documents have been passed by a local *thiasos*.

1. Ivantchik 2008 b, 94-95, no. 1. Tanais, 2nd cent. or first half of the 1st cent. BC.

-----  
 [ - - - - - θι]ασεῖτ[αι οἱ περὶ ἱερέα τὸν δεῖνα τοῦ δεῖνος]  
 [ - και πατέρα συ]νόδο[υ τὸν δεῖνα τοῦ δεῖνος - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - και] φιλά[γαθον τὸν δεῖνα τοῦ δεῖνος - - - - - ]  
 4 [ - - - - - και νε]οκόρ[ον - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - - - ],ν Κυ[ - - - - - ]  
 -----

1. Ivantchik 2008 b. See also the Russian version of the same paper, Ivančik 2008 a (with abstract in English).

2. Ivantchik 2008 b, 96-100, no. 2. Tanais, 2nd cent. or first half of the 1st cent. BC.

-----  
*vac.* Δ[----- ἐλλη]-  
*vac.* νάρχ[?-----]  
 Ἀπολλώ[νιος-----]  
 4 Δημήτρι[ος -- καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ]  
 θιασῖται [-----]  
 Τανάει χρ[-----]  
 Σφανος Πι[-----]  
 8 Σαυρου Πο[-----]  
*vac.* Η[-----]  
 Ἀρτεμίδ[ωρος τοῦ δεῖνος --]  
 Ἐστιαῖος[τοῦ δεῖνος ----]  
 12 Δ...ΝΥ[-----]  
 -----

3. Ivantchik 2008 b, 100-103, no. 3. Tanais, 2nd cent. or first half of the 1st cent. BC.

-----  
 [Ἐπὶ τοῦ δεῖνος -- ]δῶρου [ἐλληνάρχου?]  
 [----- ἔ]δοξε το[ῖς θιασ(ε)ίταις· *vel sim.* ἐπανέσαι]  
 [τὸν δ. τοῦ δ. καὶ στ]εφανοῦ[σθαι χρυσῶ ?]  
 4 [στεφάνω τήν τε εἰκόν]α ποή[σασθαι αὐτοῦ]  
 [καὶ ἀναθεῖναι ---- ]φ *vac.*  
 [-----] δέ τῶν [-----]  
 [-----]ΣΤΑΣ ΣΥΣΤ[----]  
 8 [-----] οὐδ' ἰδιο[-----]

These inscriptions are important, despite their fragmentary character. First of all, their early date requires attention. Though the known inscriptions from Tanais are not earlier than the Roman period, the paleographic features of the recently published ones show without any doubt that these documents belong to the Hellenistic period.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, we are informed that a *thiasos* existed at that

2. For the Greek character of Tanais and its resistance to Sarmatian influences, see Heinen 2005, 180: 'Mit Recht hat man von einer zunehmenden Sarmatisierung des

time in this rather isolated city populated both by *Hellenes* and *Tanaitai*, and led respectively by a *hellenarches* and an *archon*. This association included in its staff among others a *pater synodou*, convincingly restored in the first document,<sup>3</sup> as well as a *neokoros*, attested by the same inscription.<sup>4</sup>

A *thiasos* managing the cult of Theos Hypsistos<sup>5</sup> is well known in Tanais from later inscriptions,<sup>6</sup> and other inscriptions<sup>7</sup> seem to have been erected by the same association, although they do not mention the name of the god. However, Theos Hypsistos is not attested before the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD, which rules out the possibility that the newly attested *thiasos* of the middle or later Hellenistic period could be connected with this later series of documents. Ivantchik tried, therefore, to find another solution. He insisted on the word *Τανάει* (no. 2, l. 6) and developed the idea that a cult of Tanais ('most likely a river god') existed in the city, that the inscription is a dedication to this river god (see the dative) and that the *thiasos* is connected to this cult. Furthermore, Tanais would not be, in his opinion, the official name of the city, insofar as this community is attested by Alexander Polyhistor (*FGrH* 273 F 36; cf. Steph. Byz., s. v. *Τάναϊς*; Str. II.2.3; Ptol. 3.5.12, 5.9.16, 8.18.5) under the name of *Ἐμπόριον*.<sup>8</sup> The cult of the river god Tanais is, by the way, the only point where I do not agree with the editor's views. First of all, it would be, in my opinion, rather strange that the name of the god to whom the offering was

---

Bosporanischen Reiches, gerade auch in Tanais, gesprochen. Doch die Strukturen der Stadt und ihrer Vereine waren griechisch, genauso wie die freilich nicht immer einwandfreie Sprache ihrer Inschriften. Das zeugt von der außerordentlichen Lebenskraft griechischer Tradition am Rande der Steppe'.

3. See *CIRB*, 95-96, 98-100, 104, 105 from Panticapaion and 1261, 1263, 1277, 1282, 1288 from Tanais.

4. See *CIRB* 59 and 1054 (*νάκορος*) with the editor's commentary.

5. See in general Mitchell 1999. For Theos Hypsistos in the Bosporan Kingdom see especially Ustinova 1999; cf. Bowersock 2002; Heinen 2006, 52-53.

6. *CIRB* 1260, 1260a, 1261, 1277-1280, 1282, 1284, 1287-1287.

7. *CIRB* 1262-1268, 1276, 1290, 1291.

8. Ivantchik also adduces *CIRB* 1237, in which he translates 'sent by the king to Emporion' and argues that 'Emporion was indeed a designation for a city within the Bosporan kingdom', but the article in the sequence εἰς τὸ ἔμποριον rules out such possibility.

addressed occurs after so many names of (leading?) members of the *thiasos*. The inscriptions referring to Theos Hypsistos all begin with the god's name in dative, followed by the names of the leading and ordinary *thiasitai* who made the dedication. Secondly, I find no parallel for a *thiasos* organized around the cult of a river god.

Without having a concrete suggestion for the restoration, I wonder if we are not invited to try [ἐν] Τανάει. So, the god remains unknown, while 'in Tanais' could be understood as a supplementary precision in a context, which is unfortunately unclear.

*Thiasoi* are not widely attested in the Hellenistic period on the North shore of the Black Sea. I can adduce only the private associations from Olbia: the Βορειακοὶ θιασῖται<sup>9</sup> and the obscure [ἰ]ερεῖς Εὐρησιβ[ιάδαι καὶ θι]ασῖται connected to the cult of Zeus *Soter*.<sup>10</sup> The *thiasos* of Tanais provides new evidence for private cult associations in this area in the Hellenistic period. On the other hand, taking into account the rather complex organization of this *thiasos* – including a *pater synodou*, a *neokoros* and, most probably, if the restoration can be accepted (no. 2, l. 1-2), the *hellenarches* himself, i.e. the chief magistrate of the Greek community in Tanais –, this association seems to have been founded for a divinity of central importance. Several candidates come to mind, first of all, of course, Dionysos. However, the sparse evidence on pre-Roman cults at Tanais does not allow speculation on the identity of the god.

I would like to add a last remark on this question. If the restoration [ἔ]δοξε τῶ[ις θιασ(ε)ῖταις] in no. 3 is correct, we might ask if the association was really a private one. A *thiasos* passing a decree and using the same formulas as public documents seems to be rather public than private.<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless, it is not certain that no. 3 be-

9. *IGDOP* 95 (c. 300 BC): perhaps a 'thiase apollinien qui pouvait avoir des rapports avec les associations orphiques'.

10. *I.Olbiae* 71 = *IGDOP* 11 (end of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC): 'thiase gentilice des prêtres de Zeus Sôter'.

11. A good parallel would be furnished by some decrees passed by the Bactic *thiasos* from Callatis: *I.Kallatis* 35-36 = Jaccottet 2003, nos. 54-55; *I.Kallatis* 42-46 = Jaccottet 2003, nos. 56-60. A.-F. Jaccottet, speaking about the 'rôle ambigu, à la fois privé et public, joué par les thiasites callatiens' (Jaccottet 2003, 129), accepts my conclusions (Avram 2002, 70-71, 74-76).

longs to the same series as nos. 1 and 2;<sup>12</sup> accordingly, any speculation on this matter would be unproductive.

A number of other relevant inscriptions come from the Western shores of the Black Sea and date from the imperial period. One of them is a funeral monument from the end of Hadrian's reign found in Tomis.

4. Bărbulescu and Câteia 2007. Tomis, end of Hadrian's reign.<sup>13</sup>

Μ(άρκῳ) Ἀντωνίῳ  
 Μαρκιανῷ πα-  
 τρὶ νομίμῳ  
 4 καὶ ἱερεῖ σωτεί-  
 ρης Ἐκάτης κτλ.

The editors commented mainly on the cult of Hecate in this region and on the office held by the *πατὴρ νόμιμος*, 'dont l'attribut νόμιμος confirme la légitimité'. This title is attested only in a group of three dedications on statues from the *mithraeum* of Sidon dated to 390/391 AD<sup>14</sup> and in a Latin inscription from Aquileia.<sup>15</sup> Moreover, one of the dedicatory statues from Sidon represents a *Hecate Triformis (Triceps)*; thus, we have decisive proof for the connection between the cult associations devoted to this goddess and the *pater nomimos*.

Philip A. Harland remarked that parental metaphors were widespread especially in the Greek East and that 'such terminology was an important way of expressing honour, hierarchy, and belonging within the association or community, and it could also pertain to functional leadership roles (rather than mere honours) in certain

12. I also remark that the restoration [ἐπιανέσαι] makes the second line too long. The insertion of this verb is doubtful.

13. The monument had been first published and commented from an archaeological point of view by S. Conrad (Conrad 2004, 160-161, no. 132) through the courtesy of the Museum of National History and Archaeology of Constanța, nevertheless, without the permission to publish also the inscription.

14. *CIMRMI* 76, 78/79 and 84/85; cf. *BE* 2003, 576 and *SEG* 51, 1591-1593.

15. *CILV* 764 = *ILS* 4251 = *CIMRMI* 739: *pater nomimos*.



cases'.<sup>16</sup> He does not discuss the inscriptions from Sidon and Aquileia mentioning the *pater nomimos*, to whom the newly discovered monument from Tomis should be added, but he gives many other interesting examples of 'fathers' in cult associations. Unfortunately, not all of them are convincing. He insists, for example, on the decree of a *thiasos* in Callatis,<sup>17</sup> which, in his opinion, is 'in honour of Ariston, who is called "father", as well as "benefactor" of the cult society and founder of the city (πατὴρ ἐὼν εὐεργέτα καὶ κτίστα τῆς πόλιος καὶ φιλοτείμου τοῦ θιάσου)'.<sup>18</sup> Not only did he misunderstand the text of the inscription, but he surely did not read my detailed commentary on this inscription, although he cites my corpus (*I.Kallatis*). The decree passed by the *thiasitai* is in fact for an Ariston (II), son of a homonymous Ariston (I), and the right translation is 'whose father is a benefactor and founder of the city and a honorary member of the *thiasos*'. Thus, the 'father' is here not a parental metaphor, but obviously the real father of the beneficiary of the decree. Nor should the titles of *euergetas* and *ktistas tas polios* be connected with Ariston's (I) membership within the *thiasos*, but with his public activities.

More convincing are the other examples found by Harland in several inscriptions from the Roman period in Macedonia, in Thrace and on the North shore of the Black Sea.<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless, one of the main conclusions of his study, namely that the title of 'father' or 'mother' in the cult association would express a functional rather than a merely honorific role remains, as I submit, unproven. Several inscriptions from Panticapaion<sup>20</sup> and Tanais<sup>21</sup> mention the pair *hierus* and *pater synodou*, every time in this order. Therefore, we are invited to identify these as the highest-ranking members of the association, and not that 'one of its leaders was known as the "father of the synod" or simply "father", alongside other standard functionaries

---

16. Harland 2007, 57.

17. *I.Kallatis* 35 = Jaccottet 2003, no. 54 (c. 12-15 AD).

18. Harland 2007, 69-70; cf. my critical point of view in *BE* 2008, 363.

19. Harland 2007, 69-72.

20. *CIRB* 96, 98-100, 104, 105.

21. *CIRB* 1261, 1263, 1277, 1282, 1288.

such as the priest (ἱερεὺς).<sup>22</sup> On the other hand, we also have in Panticapaion an inscription, where the *hiereus* and the *pater synodou* seem to be the same person.<sup>23</sup> To this evidence, the inscription of Tomis mentioned above should be added (a person having been both *pater nomimos* and *hiereus*). The possibility that a person may be in the same time *hiereus* and *pater* shows in my opinion that the first term addresses the functional leadership, while the second one is merely an honorific title. The rare epithet *nomimos* only adds a symbolic legitimacy. The cult association could confer on one of its leaders (i.e. the *hiereus*, the *archiereus* etc.) the honorific title of *pater* of the association. How then should we explain then the pair *hiereus* and *pater synodou* revealed by the Bosporan inscriptions mentioned above? Perhaps the ‘priest’ should be understood as an *archiereus* (see an analogy in Histria which I shall discuss below). There were perhaps more priests in every association but only one of them had the leading position in the board. Thus, the *pater* could be his predecessor in this position. Anyway, the newly published inscription from Tomis adds a new argument against any attempt to establish a functional hierarchy starting from the title of ‘father’ of the association.<sup>24</sup>

Another inscription which may contribute to a better understanding of the internal organization within private cult associations was found in nearby Histria (Istros). Alexandru Suceveanu recently published several inscriptions discovered during his excavations at a basilica from the 6<sup>th</sup> century AD. Among them, we find a fragmentary catalogue of winners at a musical competition organized by a local association.

---

22. Harland 2007, 72.

23. *CIRB* 95.

24. Cf. also Jaccottet 2003, 65-66: ‘Notons que ce titre apparaît à une date tardive dans les associations et qu’il se retrouve dans des collèges aussi différents que les orgéons de Béléla, dans une association thrace, chez les Paianistes de Rome, ou chez les Dendrophores de Tomis. Ce titre qui place celui qui le porte à la tête de l’association, comme dans la hiérarchie mithriaque, provient peut-être d’une influence romaine au travers du *pater collegii* largement attesté’ (she follows here Poland 1909, 372).

## 5. Suceveanu 2007, 149.

-----  
 [...Λί]λλου καὶ Ὑ[γ]ιαίνων ----- ]  
 [........]υ ἀρχιέρεια [----- ]  
 [...Πά]πᾶς Ἀναξίμην[ου ----- ]  
 4 [...θία]σον ὕμνωδ[ῶν ----- ]  
 [ -- ]των ἀ' χορω[στατούντος (sic) ----- ]  
 [...νεικήσα]ντες ἐπ[ὶ ἀγωναθέτου ----- ]  
 [...ἱερωφαν]τούντω[ν (sic) ----- οἶδε συναγω]-  
 8 [νισάμενοι ----- Ἰουκού]νδου, Φ[λ(άβιος)]  
 [----- ] Οὔλπ[ιος -- ]  
 [----- ]ου, Μει[δίας - ]  
 [----- Δά]δα, Ἰο[ύλ(ιος) - ]  
 12 [----- ]υ[----- ]  
 [----- ]μ[----- ]  
 -----

Unfortunately, Suceveanu's edition is far from satisfactory and it is accompanied by a rather surprising translation: '... le fils de Lillas et Hygiainon ... la prêtresse ... Papas, le fils d'Anaximénès ... l'association (bachique) des chanteurs (*sic*) ... ayant pour la première fois comme chef d'orchestre (*sic*) ... vainqueurs pendant l'agonothésie de ... et des hiérophantes ... ont participé au concours les suivants : ... le fils de Iucundus, Flavius ... Ulpius ..., Meidias ... le fils de Dada, Iulius ...' The editor adds that this inscription, 'de quelques générations plus ancienne, autrement dit de la période des Antonins, que la plupart des inscriptions histriennes concernant les associations dionysiaques (*IScM* I 99-100, 167, 199, 208, 221), pourrait nous apporter, pour la première fois, la preuve de l'existence d'un θίασος à Histria, assimilable ou non avec l'association (σπεῖρα) des « anciens Dionysiastes » de l'époque des Sévères'.

I noted few years ago<sup>25</sup> that in l. 5 [τὸν ἀ]γῶνα χορῶ[v], 'the competition between the choruses, should be restored. Epigraphic parallels are provided mainly by inscriptions from Halicarnassus, Delos and Termessus,<sup>26</sup> while the same expression occurs in Plutarch

25. *BE* 2008, 379 (no. 6) with further other critical views.

26. Halicarnassus: *GIBM* 902 (cf. *SEG* 28, 839). Delos: *IG XI* 4, 1150. Termessus: *TAM*

(*Vit. Alex.* 67.8.2: ἀγῶνας χορῶν). The first visible letter is obviously a *gamma* (not a *tau*), furthermore, the word χορω[στατούντος] (*sic*) restored by Suceveanu is unattested.

The first letters of the text (a genitive of a personal name) might belong to the name of the governor of Moesia Inferior. All the documents of private cult associations from the Roman period in Histria and Tomis are introduced by the common formula ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος (*vel* τῶν αὐτοκρατόρων) κτλ. *e.g.* τύχης τε καὶ νείκης καὶ αἰωνίου διαμονῆς κτλ. καὶ κρατίστου ὑπατικοῦ κτλ. Therefore, we might identify at the beginning of the text the name of Ovinus Tertullus, the governor of 198-202, which occurs in a similar position in an inscription from Tomis.<sup>27</sup> A *hedera* after [- -]λλου indicates that we have there the end of the introductory sequence. Then, we can continue by supposing another sequence introduced by ὑ[πέρ] and referring to the name of an unknown ἀρχιτέρεια, daughter of a man whose name belongs to the second declension (genitive in -[ο]υ). For my restorations of the next lines, I rely on another Histrian inscription published by the same association of the σπεῖρα Διονυσιαστῶν πρεσβυτέρων (this formula being attested in *I.Histriae* 199). *I.Histriae* 100, the beginning of which is missing, gives [- -] καὶ τοῦ [κρατίστου ὑ]πατικοῦ Ἰουλίου [Γαιτουλικ]οῦ, ὑμνωδοὶ πρεσβύτε[ροι οἱ πε]ρὶ τὸν μέγαν θεὸν Διόνυσον. The dedication *I.Histriae* 167 has ὑμνωδοὶς πρεσβυτέροις ἱερoneϊκῆς τοῖς περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον. I suggest, therefore, to insert the broken word [- ]σον (l. 4) in the common formula [οἱ περὶ τὸν μέγαν θεὸν Διόνυ]σον ὑμνωδ[οὶ πρεσβύτεροι]. Thus, we no longer have a [θία]-σος, as cautiously suggested by Suceveanu, but the *speira* which is attested by the other inscriptions of the same series. Since these all date to the middle of the 2nd century AD to the end of the Severan time, it is not surprising that the new document, dated to 198-202 by Ovinus Tertullus' governorship, belongs to the same series. In my opinion, the text must be restored as follows:

[Ἐπὲρ τῆς τῶν θειοτάτων αὐτοκρατόρων ---- ]  
 [(*e.g.* *Septimius Severus and Caracalla*) κτλ. ---- ]

III 154 and 163 (in both instances ἀγῶνα χορῶν).  
 27. *I.Tomis* 82.

- [-- *numerus versusum incertus* ----- ]  
 [e.g. τύχης τε καὶ νείκης καὶ αἰωνίου διαμονῆς κτλ.]  
 [----- καὶ κρατίστου ὑπατικοῦ Ὀουεινίου]  
 [Τερτύ]λλου καὶ ὑ[πέρ τῆς δεῖνα τῆς ----- ]  
 [...ο]υ ἀρχιερεία[ς ----- ]  
 [...Πα]πας Ἀναξιμέν[ου καὶ οἱ περὶ τὸν μέγαν θεόν]  
 4 [Διόνυ]σον ὑμνωδ[οὶ πρεσβύτεροι ----- ]  
 [τὸν ἀ]γῶνα χορῶ[ν ----- νει]-  
 [κήσα]ντες ἐπ[ὶ ἀγωναθέτου ----- ]  
 [προστ]ατούντω[ν δὲ ----- ]  
 8 κτλ.

We have thus a catalogue of winners at a choral competition. Several other documents of the same *speira* mention among its leading members an *archiereus*, a *hiereus* (perhaps the same as the *archiereus*), a *pater*, an *agonothetes*, more *prostatai* and a *grammateus* and among the special officials a *mesochoros*, a *chorostates* and a *mousarchos*.<sup>28</sup> The last office seems to be attested only by these Histrian inscriptions and by a fragment of *Lyrica adespota*.<sup>29</sup> The other offices are rather common and the new inscription does not add anything to them. Nevertheless, attention is required by the mention of an *archiereia*. This is, to my knowledge, the first occurrence of a woman holding such an office in a Dionysiac association. In her remarkable book devoted to the Dionysiac cult associations, Anne-Françoise Jaccottet draws the attention to the contradiction between the common presence of women in the mythical *thiasoi* and the modest evidence for the same matter in real associations. As for their functions within the associations, ‘il faut aussi remarquer que les fonctions de tête réservées aux femmes sont toujours en rapport exclusif avec l’aspect

28. *Archiereus*: *I.Histriae* 207. *Hiereis*: *I.Histriae* 99-100 (= Jaccottet 2003, nos. 64-65), 199 (= Jaccottet 2003, no. 66). *Pateres*: *I.Histriae* 99-100 (= Jaccottet 2003, nos. 64-65). *Agonothetes*: *I.Histriae* 100 (= Jaccottet 2003, no. 65), 207. *Prostatai*: *I.Histriae* 99-100 (= Jaccottet 2003, nos. 64-65; in the first of these inscriptions A.-F. Jaccottet rightly replaces [ἱεροφάν]την of *I.Histriae* through [προστά]την), 207. *Grammateus*: *I.Histriae* 167 (= Jaccottet 2003, no. 63). *Mesochoros*: *I.Histriae* 100 (= Jaccottet 2003, no. 65), 167 (= Jaccottet 2003, no. 63), 207. *Chorostates*: *I.Histriae* 100 (= Jaccottet 2003, no. 65). *Mousarchos*: *I.Histriae* 100 (= Jaccottet 2003, no. 65), 167 (= Jaccottet 2003, no. 63).

29. *PMG*, fr. 23, 1, 2: τῶι μουσάρχῳι.

religieux du collège. Si une femme peut être prêtresse, cistaphore, *archibassara* etc., jamais elle ne sera spirarque. La femme est en principe incapable socialement d'assurer la direction administrative d'une association. Par contre, le rôle religieux qui lui est dévolu souligne la haute compétence qui lui est attachée, tout particulièrement dans le domaine dionysiaque.<sup>30</sup> To the examples collected and discussed by Jaccottet, in which women have (or seem to have) leading positions in Dionysiac associations,<sup>31</sup> the catalogue of a *speira* from Thessalonike should be now added, in which we find (col. II) among other women a μήτηρ σπείρας.<sup>32</sup>

If the woman whose name remains unknown is the *archieira* of the *speira*, then [Πα]πας<sup>33</sup> Ἀναξιμέν[ου] must be its *pater*. A parallel can be found in an inscription which reveals the formula [ἡ] σπείρα Διονυσιαστῶν πρεσβυτέρων· οἱ περὶ πατ[έρ]α Ἀχιλλέα Ἀχιλλᾶ καὶ ἱερέα Αὐρ(ήλιον) Βίκτορα Κάστου.<sup>34</sup> Above, I expressed my opinions about the title of *pater* in religious associations. I add that apart from this Histrian inscription and one more fragmentary document coming from Nicopolis ad Istrum,<sup>35</sup> where a πατήρ σπείρης is mentioned, no other example of *pater* related to an association called *speira* is known to me. We have, on the other hand, as we have seen, a μήτηρ σπείρας in Thessalonike. Moreover, a Latin inscription put up by the association of *Asiani* in Napoca (Dacia Porolissensis) from 235 AD mentions the pair *Germanus spirar[ch]es Tattario Epipodia mater*, and then, arranged in two separate columns, the men and the women who were members of the *speira*.<sup>36</sup> Therefore, this last inscription and the documents from Histria might suggest a duality at the head of a *speira*: a *pater* (or a *meter*, both taken in an honorific meaning, perhaps former *archieiris*) and a *hiereus* (taken as *archieirus*, see above).

30. Jaccottet 2003, 90.

31. Jaccottet 2003, nos. 22, 62, 70, 71, 146, 147, 182, 188.

32. *SEG* 49, 814 = *AE* 1999, 1430; cf. *SEG* 51, 886.

33. The restoration of this name is not certain. I prefer to write without accent, not being able to choose between Πάπας and Παπᾶς. *LGN IV*, s. v. Πάπας, registers 18 occurrences in Thrace. See for this name Robert 1963, 513-514.

34. *I.Histriae* 99 = Jaccottet 2003, no. 64.

35. *IGBulg* II 671.

36. *CIL* III 870 = *ILS* 4061 = Jaccottet 2003, no. 71.

A last remark concerns the members of the Histrian *speira*. The first occurrence of this association seems to be *I.Histriae* 207, an inscription which is dated, on prosopographical grounds, to the reign of Antoninus Pius. Among the *prostatai* we find M. Ulpius Artemidoros, the ‘first pontarch’ and Histria’s most prominent citizen in that time,<sup>37</sup> and T. Cominius Euxenides *neoteros*, another pontarch.<sup>38</sup> M. Ulpius Artemidoros is called  $\nu\acute{\omicron}\delta[\zeta \tau\eta\zeta \pi]\acute{\omicron}\lambda\epsilon\omega\zeta$ , a title which obviously has nothing to do with his activities within the association, but which was conferred to him by the political authorities of the city.<sup>39</sup> The *catalogi* being rather rare at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, we are poorly informed about the Histrian elite during this period. Nevertheless, the presence of personalities like M. Ulpius Artemidoros among the *prostatai* of the association in the early years of its activity invites us to suppose that this *speira* was rather attractive for the Histrian elite. Since the competitions organized by this private association were, as it seems, open to non-members,<sup>40</sup> the *speira* was of some help to the city’s officials: it organized, at least partially, contests which would normally have been staged by the city’s authorities. As in other cities of the Western Black Sea coast or Asia Minor, benefactors of the imperial period seem to demonstrate their generosity through private foundations, professional or cult associations rather by assuming offices in the boards of the city.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Avram, A. 2002, ‘Der dionysische *thiasos* in Kallatis. Organisation, Repräsentation, Funktion’, in U. Egelhaaf-Gaiser and A. Schäfer (eds.), *Raum und Gruppe. Religiöse Vereine in der römischen Antike. Untersuchungen zu Ordnung, Ritual und Raumordnung*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 13. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, pp. 69-80.

37. The same M. Ulpius Artemidoros also appears in *I.Histriae* 137, 178-180 (with commentary), 193. Cf. Avram, Bărbulescu and Ionescu 2004, 360-361 with note 22.

38. See about his family Ruscu 2004, 907-910.

39. Cf. Canali de Rossi 2007, 100-101 no. 207 (with the wrong reference ‘proviene invece da Tomi’).

40. So far the *speira* put very much emphasis on promoting these contests by publishing so many documents concerning them.

- Avram, A., Bărbulescu M. and Ionescu M. 2004, 'À propos des pontarques du Pont Gauche', *AWE* 3.2, 354-364.
- Bărbulescu, M. and Câteia A. 2007, 'Pater nomimos în cultul Hecatei la Tomis', *Pontica* 40, 245-253.
- Bowersock, G. W. 2002, 'The Highest God with Particular Reference to North Pontus', *Hyperboreus* 8.2, 353-363.
- Canali de Rossi, F. 2007, 'Filius publicus': υἱὸς τῆς πόλεως *e titoli affini in iscrizioni greche di età imperiale*. Studi sul vocabolario dell'evergesia 1. Roma: Herder Editrice e Libreria.
- Conrad, S. 2004, *Die Grabstelen aus Moesia Inferior. Untersuchungen zu Chronologie, Typologie und Ikonographie*. Leipzig: Casa Libri Autorenservice H.-C. Mannschatz.
- Harland, Ph. A. 2007. 'Familial Dimensions of Group Identity (II): "Mothers" and "Fathers" in Associations and Synagogues of the Greek World', *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38.1, 57-79.
- Heinen, H. 2005, 'Aus der Geschichte von Tanais in römischer Zeit', *EurAnt* 11, 175-182.
- Heinen, H. 2006, *Antike am Rand der Steppe. Der nördliche Schwarzmeerraum als Forschungsaufgabe*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Beiheft 5/2006. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Ivančik, A.I. 2008a, 'Tri nadpisi fiasov ellinističeskogo vremeni iz Tanaisa (Novye dannye o greko-iranskom zvanmodejstvii v Tanaise dopolemonovskoj epokha)', *VDI* 2, 57-72.
- Ivantchik, A. 2008b, 'Greeks and Iranians in the Cimmerian Bosphorus in the Second/First Century BC: New Epigraphic Data from Tanais', in S.M.R. Darbandi and A. Zournatzi (eds.), *Ancient Greece and Ancient Iran: cross-cultural encounters. 1st International Conference, Athens, 11 - 13 November 2006*. Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation 2008, pp. 93-107.
- Jaccottet, A.-F. 2003, *Choisir Dionysos. Les associations dionysiaques ou la face cachée du dionysisme*. Zürich: Akanthus.
- Mitchell, S. 1999, 'The Cult of Theos Hypsistos between Pagans, Jews, and Christians', in P. Athanasiadi and M. Frede (eds.), *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 81-148.
- Poland, F. 1909, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*. Fürstlich Jablonowski'sche Gesellschaft zu Leipzig 38. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Robert, L. 1963, *Noms indigènes en Asie Mineure gréco-romaine*. Bibliothèque archéologique et historique de l'Institut français d'archéologie d'Istanbul 13. Paris: A. Maisonneuve.
- Ruscu, L. 2004, 'Families at Histria, Tomis and Callatis: Two Prosopographical Notes', in L. Ruscu, C. Ciongradi, R. Ardevan, C. Roman and



- C. Găzdac (eds.), *Orbis antiquus. Studia in honorem Ioannis Pisonis*. Bibliotheca Musei Napocensis 21. Cluj-Napoca: Nereamia Napocae Press, pp. 907-911.
- Suceveanu, A. 2007, 'Inscriptions', in A. Suceveanu, G. Milošević, O. Bounegru, C. Mușețeanu et G. Poenaru Bordea A. Bâltâc, M. Dima and I. Iațcu, *Histria XIII. La basilique épiscopale*. Histria: les résultats des fouilles 13. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Romane, pp. 145-153.
- Ustinova, Y. 1999, *The Supreme Gods of the Bosporan Kingdom. Celestial Aphrodite and the Most High God*. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 135. Leiden: Brill.

# Foreigners' Associations and the Rhodian State

*Stéphanie Maillot*

## 1. Introduction

Two kinds of phenomena are particularly noteworthy in Hellenistic Rhodes: the importance of foreigners—numerically speaking—and the importance of associations, *koina* of the *eranos* type, since we know about more than a hundred such groups, dated mainly to the second and first centuries BC. This chronology confirms the conclusions of recent studies based on Rhodian commerce and amphora trade,<sup>1</sup> conclusions that discredit the view about the so-called ‘long twilight of Rhodes’ after 167:<sup>2</sup> after the declaration of the *emporion* of Delos as a free port following the Roman victory on Perseus of Macedonia, Rhodes was still an independent city-state, a prosperous and active cultural and commercial center, and a naval power.<sup>3</sup>

It is central to our understanding of Rhodian society in this period not only to determine the possible existence of links – and to describe the nature of these links – between the two phenomena, but also to shed light on the importance of the relations between associations of foreigners and the city-state in the Hellenistic age.<sup>4</sup> Most of these associations were established at Rhodos, the *emporion* and eponymous capital of the city-state. But they are also attested in the ancient cities on the island (Lindos and Kamiros) as well as in the Peraia (Rhodes’ continental territory in Caria) and some of the

1. Lund 1999; Rauh 1999; Finkielsztein 2001b. See also Gabrielsen 1993.

2. The expression is used by Berthold (1984, 233) as the title of his last chapter, where the author describes the ‘decline’ of Rhodes after the Third Macedonian War.

3. See the latest syntheses about Hellenistic Rhodes: Gabrielsen 1997; Wiemer 2002.

4. On the associative phenomenon in Rhodes, see Pugliese Carratelli 1939-40; Gabrielsen 1994a, 1994b and 1997, 123-129; Maillot 2005.

islands that were incorporated into the Rhodian state, among others, Nisyros, Telos, Symi and Chalke.

Associations of foreigners were the very type of private groupings which could not be ignored by a city-state. In Classical times, most cities welcomed foreigners, but placed severe limitations on their residence and rights, notably those relating to access to justice and property rights. This remains unchanged in Hellenistic times. The citizen-body of a city-state is still a very exclusive group, even if contacts and mobility are greater and more important than before. We must therefore ask whether the grouping together of foreigners in associations was under the supervision of specific state institutions, and how the official and juridical recognition of such associations operated. One has then to consider the degree to which such groups became integrated into the public and civic life, particularly by adopting *polis* practices in their internal workings, and by participating in certain aspects of the civic life.

## 2. Definitions: what is an association of foreigners?

Associations of foreigners are a major issue for our understanding of the associative phenomenon and of Hellenistic societies as a whole. Historiographically, they have played an important role in the renewal of studies on ancient Greek and Roman associations that has taken place since the 1980s. This renewal has partly its origin in the new social history developed in the United States in the 1970s, above all in *community studies* and *ethnic studies*.<sup>5</sup> This kind of history places greater importance on the specificities of the historical experience by the community. The methodological foundations for this culturalist approach consists of the importance ascribed to the values and customs imported by migrants and subsequently used by them to describe their relations to the new society they are living in. This is the general framework within which the paradigm of the foreigners' association is constituted and has to be understood. A case in point are the works of M.-F. Baslez, which are centered on the evidence relating to the *koinon* of the *Poseidoniastai Berytiosi* (Posei-

---

5. See, e.g., Fishman 1985; Hollinger 1995; Green 2002, 25-26, 53-59.

doniasts from Beirut) *emporoi* (merchants) *naukleroi* (ship-owners) *kai ekdocheis* (and ware-house-men), or to that relating to the *koinon* of the *Herakleistai Tyrioi emporoi kai naukleroi* at Delos. According to Baslez, during this period of demographic growth at Delos, the common interest on which these new groups were based was, in fact, their members' origin from the same place. Ethnic community is thus an exact rendering of the generic term *koinon* as applied by the Heraclists from Tyre and the Poseidoniasts from Beirut'.<sup>6</sup> In this kind of analysis, foreigners' associations are based on three factors: (1) common geographical origin and ethnic exclusivity; (2) common profession; and (3) common cult, that is, the worship on foreign soil of the group's *theoi patrioi*, a practice usually regarded as an element of the so-called oriental religious feeling, one believed to emphasize more mysticism and less on ritual.

The associations of foreigners in Rhodes nevertheless present a very different picture. Only a small minority acknowledge a foreign geographical origin, even fewer a common origin: we find a *koinon* of *Lapethiastai* from the Cypriot city of Lapethos and a group of *Paphioi* (who, however, do not use the generic term *koinon*) at Lindos;<sup>7</sup> two groups use the regional ethnic *Syroi* (from Syria): a *koinon* of *Aphrodisiastai Syroi*, on the island of Nisyros,<sup>8</sup> and the *Adoniastai* [*Aphrodisiastai*] *Asklapiastai Syroi*, on Symi;<sup>9</sup> groups of *Herakleotai* appear at the capital city of Rhodos and Chalke,<sup>10</sup> and, finally, some Roman *nego-*

6. Baslez 1977, 207. See also Baslez 1984, 338: 'certains groupements expriment des solidarités exclusives, nationales ou professionnelles. Ils font une politique dont il s'agit d'apprécier le caractère particulariste et revendicatif'.

7. *Lapethiastai*: IG XII 1, 837; *Paphioi*: I.Lindos II, 392b, l. 8, 394, l. 5.

8. IG XII 3, 104 (imperial period).

9. IG XII 3, 6 (1st cent. BC).

10. Rhodos: *Herakleotai*, Maiuri 1916, 139, no. 10 = Pugliese Carratelli 1939-40, no. 19 (1st half of the 2nd cent. BC); *Herakleotai* [...]*Joneioi*, IG XII 1, 158; *Herakleotai Poseidaniastai Polemoneioi hoi syn Agathameroi*, Pugliese Carratelli 1986-87, no. 12. Chalke: *Herakleotai Xouriastai*, IG XII 1, 963. The contexts in which the ethnic *Herakleotai* appears and its combination with cultic names shows that it is used for associations of the *eranos* type and not simply for indicating the city of Herakleia. For when cities are honouring someone, the word *polis* is used, see, e.g., Maiuri, *NS* 18. Doubts remain as to the identification of the city from which the *Herakleotai* living in Rhodes came. There are a number of cities called Herakleia (Herakleia) in the Hellenistic world: for a list,

*tiatores, cives Romani qui negotiantur*, are attested at Rhodes.<sup>11</sup> Very few associations declare a profession common to all its members: for instance the *cives Romani qui negotiantur*, the group of teachers of the *Sylleioi Lolleioi paidoutai hoi syn Syllai*,<sup>12</sup> a group of *Haliastai Athanaistai Hermaistai Aristeideioi hoi synergaxamenoι ton hippodromon* (i.e. 'those who built the hippodrome'),<sup>13</sup> a *koinon* of public slaves, *Diosatabyriastai hoi tas polios douloi*,<sup>14</sup> and some resident farmers at Lindos, the *katoikeuntes kai georgeuntes en Lindia polei*.<sup>15</sup> Notably, there are no associations of *emporoi* or *naukleroi*, except the particular case of the *katoikeuntes kai georgeuntes en Lindia polei*, who are also once attested as *nauklareuntes*.<sup>16</sup> One should add the fact that the divinities worshipped are very seldom *theoi patrioi*. The few cases known are: the *koinon* of the *Meniastai* at Lindos, who worship the Phrygian god Men; the *Herakleotai Xouriaistai*, who probably worship the Nabatean Dusares; the *Aphrodisiastan Basileias Aphroditas koinon*, who probably worship the Phoenician Astarte.<sup>17</sup> Most associations accumulate in their names an impressive number of divinities, for instance the *koinon* of the *Soteriastai*

---

see Robert 1973, 438 n. 18; Robert 1978, 477-490. The Rhodian evidence offers no means for an identification. Geographical proximity, though, suggests Herakleia on the Latmos, which had ties to Rhodes. An independent city after Apamea in 188 BC, this Herakleia is allied with Rhodes, and the treaty signed in 185 BC with its neighbour Miletus indicates that Herakleia and Miletus, though they became allies, pledge not to act counter to their respective treaties with Rhodes (*Syll<sup>b</sup>* 633). This political situation could explain an emigration from Herakleia to Rhodes and at the same time an affirmation of ethnic or civic identity.

11. *CIL* III Suppl. 2, 12266 (end of 1st cent. BC). See Bresson 2002.

12. *IG* XII 1, 918 (1st/2nd cent. AD).

13. *NuovoSuppl.Epigr.Rhod.* I, no. 3 (2nd cent. BC). Some doubt remains about the sense of *synergaxamenoι*: one thinks of the Delian expression *hoi ten tetragonon [agoran] ergazoumenoi*, where *ergazoumenoi* means 'traders' (Roussel, *ID* 1709), or more precisely, 'those who make business' there.

14. *IG* XII 1, 36.

15. See below 168-92.

16. *I.Rhod. Per.* 510 (Bresson, *RecueilPéré* 27), ll. 9-10.

17. *Meniastai*: *IG* XII 1, 917; *Herakleotai Xouriaistai* at Chalke: *IG* XII 1, 963; *Aphrodisiastan Basileias Aphroditas koinon*: Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 8 (1st cent. BC). The expression *theoi patrioi* is not attested in Rhodes. It is known in the neighbouring island of Astypalia through the *koinon* of the *thiasos* of Atargatis and the ancestral gods: *IG* XII 3, 178 (3rd cent. BC or later).

*Asklapiastai Poseidoniastai Herakleistai Athanaistai Aphrodisiastai Hermaistai Matros Theon*, comprising the cults of a savior god (probably Zeus), Asklepios, Poseidon, Herakles, Athena, Aphrodite, Hermes and the Mother of Gods.<sup>18</sup>

Given all this, how are we to identify groups as associations of foreigners? Some rare and valuable documents provide indications for the composition of such associations, since they comprise lists of members with foreign ethnics. Some of these documents record internal subscriptions (*epidoseis*). One example concerns the subscription solicited by an unknown *koinon* to finance the repair of the common cemeteries;<sup>19</sup> a second concerns the subscription solicited by the *Samothraikiastai Aristobouliastai Hermaïstai Panathenaïstai hoi syn Ktesiphonti* (i.e. ‘those together with Ktesiphon from Chersonesos’) for the acquisition of a plot of land.<sup>20</sup> To these we should add an inscription

18. *IG XII 1*, 162 (2nd cent. BC). See Morelli 1959.

19. Konstantinopoulos 1966, 56 (195 BC, cf.), ll. 1-16: ‘In the priesthood of Sodamos, the twelfth of the month Hyakinthios, when Xouthos of Antiocheia was *archeranistes*, the following have been elected to be in charge of the building of the enclosure of the graves: Dionysos of Ephesos, Zoilos of Gargaron, Matrodoros of Ephesos; they wrote up the names of those who promised to give money and have given it. The following, willing to participate to the construction of the enclosure of the graves and its gates, in accordance with the decree of the *koinon*, have promised to give money’ (there follow the names of eight erantists from Antioch, Ephesos, Ilios, Cappadocia, Sicyon and Gargaron).

20. Kontorini 1989, 73, no. 10 (172/170 BC). Of the 32 contributors attested in this list, 24 have an ethnic from another city (Athens, Cyzicus, Amisos, Ephesos, Miletus, Halicarnassos, Herakleia, Phaselis, Etenna in Pisidia, Selge, Chios, Samos, Thera, Laodiceia, Alexandria) or another region (Cilicia, Pisidia, Lucania and Armenia). Seven have the ethnic *Rhodios/Rhodia*. This does not mean that the civic rights of these individuals were recently acquired, or restricted (so Hiller von Gærtringen 1941, 731-840; Meyer 1937, 560-582). The use of the ethnic *Rhodios/Rhodia* was not a means through which Rhodian citizens reaffirmed their legal status in contexts where foreigners are the majority (so Pugliese Carratelli 1953; Kontorini 1989), but probably an indication – self-consciously and voluntarily provided by the persons concerned – of belonging to the socio-professional group of the sculptors working in Rhodes: see Gabrielsen 1994b, who shows that *Rhodios/Rhodia* is attested only in sculptor signatures and in connection with members of *koina* – two groups that overlap in our inscriptions. Other examples of subscription documents, in which the list of contributors is not preserved, are: *IG XII 1*, 9, an unknown *koinon* headed by an

of a peculiar type: a list of the *agonothetai* and *gymnasiarchoi* who had presided over the organization of internal competitions of the *koinon* of *Asklapiastai Nikasioneioi Olympiastai*, an association founded by one Nikasion from Cyzicus; the document includes also a list of the *euergetai* and *euergetides* of the *koinon*.<sup>21</sup>

At this point one should also mention a few lists of foreigners and subscriptions by foreigners, which may or may not have been issued by associations,<sup>22</sup> as well as an interesting subscription list for a public purpose, in which the majority of contributors are foreigners.<sup>23</sup> There is a mention of one Philocrates from Ilion who in an-

---

individual from Kibyra; Maiuri 1925-1926, no. 5 (1st cent. BC), an unknown *koinon*, headed by an individual from Laodikeia and presumably including among its members A Laodikean and an Ephesian; *IG XII* 1, 937, the *koinon* of the *Dionysiastai Athanaïstai Dios Atabyriastai Euphranôrëioi hoi syn Athenaioi Knidioi* (Lindos, 1st cent. AD), whose head Athenaios comes from Cnidus.

21. *IG XII* 1, 127 (beginning of the 2nd cent. BC). The name of the *koinon* can be deduced from another document: Hiller von Gaertringen and Saridakis 1900, no. 108. *IG XII* 1, 127 comprises 43 names of which 28 have a foreign ethnic (7 from Antioch, 4 from Soli, 2 from Alexandria; other cities or regions are Cyzicus, Ilion, Lysimacheia or Alexandria in the Troad, Chios, Cnidus, Symbra, Phaselis, Selge); 10 persons carry the ethnic *Rhodos*, of which 5 are known as sculptors from other texts.

22. The list of foreigners, *Suppl. Epigr. Rhod.* I, no. 63 (Jones 1992, 124-25; end of 2nd - beg. of 1st cent. BC) mentions 35 foreigners, from Asia Minor (Halicarnassos, Aphrodisias, Stratoniceia, Nysa, Antiocheia on the Maeander, Caunos, Tabai, Herakleia, Termessos, Rhodiapolis), Phrygia (Epictetos, Dara, Apamea Kibotos), Greece and the islands (Athens, Megalopolis, Cos, Paros) and Syria (Damas, Seleucia on the Tigris). Subscription list of foreigners: Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 21 (1st cent. BC) has at least 164 foreigners (21 metics, 3 persons in possession of *epidamia* [see p. 154], 4 public slaves). Of these 164 persons, 36 are women coming from Asia Minor (Smyrna, Ephesos, Sardeis, Myndos, Cnidus, Halicarnassos, Mylasa, Alabanda, Caunos, Herakleia, Phaselis, Perge, Soli), the islands (Cos, Samos, Paros), the Black sea region (Cyzicus, Nicomedia), continental Greece (Athens, Argos), Syria and Phoenicia (Antioch, Laodikeia, Apameia), Egypt (Philadelphia, Alexandria) and the West (Rome, Tyndaris). Subscription list of foreigners, perhaps slaves: Papachristodoulou 1989, 134, no. 10 (1st cent. BC). Dedications put up by groups of foreigners: Maiuri, *NS* 8 (2nd cent. - 1st cent. BC) and 37 (1st cent. BC). Subscription-list of foreign women: Maiuri 1916, 134-135, no. 1 (Migeotte 1993; end of 2nd - begin. of 1st cent BC), with 21 contributors: 12 foreigners and 9 citizens.

23. Jacopi 1932, no. 6 (beg. of 1st cent. BC). The list comprises 21 subscribers, of whom 8 have foreign ethnics, 7 are metics and 6 are citizens from Camiran demes.

other inscription is mentioned as an *euergetes* of the *Isiastai*, the *synthytai Rhodiaistai epidamiastai*, the *Hermaistai Thesmophoriastai* and the *Matioi ktoinetai eranistai Philokrateioi*.<sup>24</sup>

Other criteria indicate that most members of a given association were foreigners, even when no list of members is preserved. The following categories probably comprise associations of foreigners.

1. Associations bearing the name of a foreigner and being structured around him. They use his name in two ways, either in the formula *hoi syn* (+ name), or as the basis for an adjectival derivation. The case of the *eranistai Samothraikiastai Aristobouliastai Hermaistai Panathenaïstai hoi syn Ktesiphon* (i.e. those assembled around one Ktesiphon from Chersonesos) has already been mentioned. We can add the *Soteriastai hoi syn Damatrioi Selgei*,<sup>25</sup> the *Dionysiastai Athanaïstai Dios Atabyraïstai Euphranoreioi hoi syn Athenaioi Knidioi*,<sup>26</sup> the *Sylleioi Lolleioi paideutai hoi syn Syllai*,<sup>27</sup> the *Dios Xeniaistai [Pan]athanaïstai Lindiastai hoi syn Gai[o]i*,<sup>28</sup> and the *koinon of the Aphrodisiastai Hermogeneioi*, which is known from a decree honouring the founder, Hermogenes of Phaselis, and an exceptional document listing the land-property titles of the *koinon*.<sup>29</sup>

2. Associations which have a foreigner as their main magistrate. A famous example is Dionysodoros of Alexandria, who was *archeranistes* of the *koinon* of *Haliadai kai Haliastai* for twenty-three years (and an *euergetes*-member for no less than thirty-five years) and *archeranistes* of the *koinon* of the *Paniastai* for 18 years.<sup>30</sup>

---

The citizens give a total of 20,000 drachmas, the foreigners a total of 4,700 drachmas (at a maximum), but the second biggest amount in the list (3,000 drachmas) comes from an individual from Antioch; the estimated grand-total, including now lost amounts, is estimated at 35,000 drachmas.

24. *IG XII 1*, 157 (beg. of 1st cent. BC).

25. *AD 23 B* (1968) 445.

26. *IG XII 1*, 937 (1st cent. BC).

27. *IG XII 1*, 918 (1st cent. AD).

28. *IG XII 1*, 161.

29. Jacopi 1932, 214, no. 53 and Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 18 (120 BC, cf. Finkielsztejn 2001a). The *Hermogeneioi* appear also without the mention *Aphrodisiastai* in Maiuri, *NS* 28. See below note 109.

30. *IG XII 1*, 155 (159/8 BC, cf. Finkielsztejn 2001a). See Gabrielsen 1994a.



3. Associations honouring their *euergetai* members who are also foreigners. For instance Dionysodoros of Alexandria, who was honoured as *euergetes* by the *Dionysiastai*, the metic Charixenos of Andros, *euergetes* of the *Aphrodiastai Hermaistai*,<sup>31</sup> Sosikles of Crete, *euergetes* of the *eranistai Adoniazontes*,<sup>32</sup> Ariston of Syracuse, *euergetes* of the *koinon of Sabaziastai*,<sup>33</sup> Stratonika of Halicarnassos, *euergetes* of the *Haliadai Haliastai*, probably the same association as the one who honours Dionysodoros of Alexandria,<sup>34</sup> Protimos of Sidon and Doros of Media, *euergetai* of a unknown *koinon*,<sup>35</sup> the Galatian Karpos, *euergetes* of an unknown *koinon*.<sup>36</sup> These inscriptions are quite numerous.

What do these documents tell us about the nature and workings of associations of foreigners? First of all, these groups are not based on an exclusive ethnic criterion: members may have immigrated from all parts of the ancient world, thought often from the southern part of Asia Minor, of course, but also from the northern part (Troas, Bithynia, Pontus), Syria and Phoenicia, continental Greece, the islands and even from some more remote regions (the West, Africa, Arabia, Armenia). This ethnic mix is comparable, in every detail, to the composition of the whole population of foreigners attested at Rhodes in the last three centuries BC. More than 1085 foreigners bearing some 214 different ethnic names can be recorded in the epigraphical sources.<sup>37</sup>

Of course we find persons of the same origin in the same association, be they linked by family ties or not,<sup>38</sup> but more important, it

---

31. Maiuri, *NS* 42.

32. Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 1 (2nd cent. BC).

33. Kontorini 1983 no. 8 (end of 2nd - beg. of 1st cent. BC).

34. *IG XII* 1, 156 (mid-2nd cent. BC).

35. Maiuri, *NS* 192-193.

36. Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 11 (1st cent. BC).

37. About 600 persons are mentioned in Morelli's list (1955), subsequently enlarged by Sacco (1980). On the importance of foreigners in Rhodes, some comparisons are possible with Delos: 1,626 persons with 254 ethnic names in Tréheux's list (1992); or with Athens: 1,259 foreigners bearing 197 ethnic names attested in 3,300 funerary inscriptions covering 800 years: Vestergaard 2000.

38. See for example the *koinon* of *Asklapiastai Nikasioneioi Olympiastai*, founded by Nikasion of Cyzicus, *IG XII* 1, 127 (with note 21 above): in this list of *euergetai* appear Nikasion's wife Olympias of Soli, his sons Dion and Demetrios (both Rhodian

seems, is the phenomenon of mixed marriages. On fifty funerary monuments for couples of foreigners where the husband is a member of a *koinon* – as in most of the cases – twelve attest to mixed marriages.<sup>39</sup> These facts surely show that such unions were crafted in Rhodes and are a sign as well as a result of the numerical importance of foreigners living in the city and the integration between foreigners of diverse origin. I think therefore that we must underline the ethnic mix of Rhodian associations, thereby adding to the social mix known from other Hellenistic associations: i.e. the inclusion of women and children, free men, freedmen and slaves. Some associations include Rhodian citizens, as shown by the use of the demotic or the ethnic *Rhodios* (see p. 140 above). The majority, however, are foreigners.<sup>40</sup>

Members of associations do not claim a common origin they do not have. This is probably the reason why they worship an impressive number of divinities, some of which are specifically Rhodian. Even when common origin forms part of the name used by an association in official documents, a closer look reveals that it does not constitute a grounds for exclusion: for instance, the association of *Herakleotai* is known, among other documents, from the funerary stele of a member who came from Phaselis.<sup>41</sup> Nor do members of (Rhodian) associations in general proclaim a common profession either. Prosopography is often the only way to detect any common professional activity by the members: that the association founded

---

citizens), his daughter Olympias and Basilis, his granddaughter or daughter-in-law. The *koinon* is organized in three *phylai* called *Nikasioneis*, *Olympeis* and *Basileis*; the origin of these names is quite clear. See Maillot 2009.

39. *IG XII 1*, 157 and Jacopi, 1932, 214, no. 6 (see above notes 22, 23); *IG XII 1*, 158; 164; 165; 384; 385 (end of the Hell. period); *I.Lindos II*, 683 (1st cent. BC); Maiuri, *NS* 41, 46; Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 19 (*I.Rhod.Per.* 169 (2nd cent. BC); *I.Rhod.Per.* 57 (two cases, end of 1st-beg. of 1st cent. AD)). We must also take into account the inscriptions that permit us to establish family alliances through onomastics and prosopography: we have found more than 33 mixed marriages for 64 couples of foreigners. See Maillot 2005.

40. This kind of mix is also attested in Athens, another cosmopolitan centre: Ismard 2010, 348-352. There is, however, no comparable use there of an ethnic like *Rhodios* in a context of predominantly foreign members.

41. *IG XII 1*, 158.

by Nikasion of Cyzicus, the *Asklapiastai Nikasioneioi Olympiastai*, has many members who were sculptors is something known from other texts (see note 21 above).

It is impossible to apply to the associations of Rhodes the model devised by M.-F. Baslez for Delos. Baslez holds that the primary function of the associations of foreigners, at Delos as elsewhere in the Greek world, was to introduce foreign cults and thus make their diffusion easier.<sup>42</sup> But as has been demonstrated, associations of foreigners at Rhodes are not based on a common ethnic origin, expressed through cults or by any other means, which then would allow us to speak about *communautarisme* or religious sects. Foreigners are all non-Rhodians, in a strictly juridical sense, and this fact does not have any consequence in terms of ethnic or cultural homogeneity. The level to which non-Greek foreigners were also foreigners in a cultural sense is very difficult to establish. This is possible only through case studies taking into account all aspects of the Hellenization of the communities they came from, among which the degree of adaptation of social and political institutions of Greek origin, what some called 'poliadization'.<sup>43</sup> Foreigners associations at Rhodes do not privilege the original culture of their members, but are based on the common experience of expatriation on arrival in a new society, at Rhodes itself. Accordingly, one should expect them to rest on multiple networks – geographical, familial, or professional.<sup>44</sup> Such associations, uniting as they did people from different parts of the Greek world and the hellenized (or non-hellenized) *ethne* of the eastern Mediterranean, were the products of the very society they formed. Therefore, they can be seen as representing, not so much international, wide-ranging networks, but rather local networks in big exchange centers – their aim being to ease their members' establishment and integration in the Greek world. On the other hand, and even though there is as yet no clear proof of it at Rhodes, it is quite probable that some among these mixed and multiethnic

---

42. Baslez 1977, 197.

43. On the notion of 'poliadisation' as the adoption of institutions characteristic of the civic institutions see Couvenhes and Heller, 2006.

44. Maillot 2009.

groups, constitute the formal side (i.e. the institutionalization) of international exchange networks.<sup>45</sup> However, many of them probably comprised not only merchants, but also representatives of various other professions, nationalities and statuses, probably including not a few freedmen.

These findings from Rhodes invite us to pursue further the modification of Baslez's 'Delian model', which has been initiated by Monika Trümper.<sup>46</sup> They suggest that we should radically change our view about the juridical, political and psychological aspects of the relationship between *privaste* associations and the state.

### 3. The internal organization of associations

Many aspects of the internal organization of associations of foreigners confirm what has just been said about their composition. Here again they do not follow the path of particularism but imitate the organisation and institutions of the city-state.

At the head of the *koinon* we find a magistrate bearing the title *archeranistes*, i.e. President of the association. Texts do not say anything about the mode of selection, but he can stay in office for several years. Dionysodoros of Alexandria was *archeranistes* of the *koinon* of *Haliadai kai Haliastai* for twenty-three years and held the same office in the *koinon* of the *Paniastai* for eighteen years.<sup>47</sup> Whatever the mode of selection, the fact that an *archeranistes* could remain in office for so many years leads to the conclusion that this post was held by

---

45. See Vlassopoulos 2009.

46. Trümper 2006, 117: 'The picture which emerges from the epigraphic evidence is that of a thoroughly hellenized Phoenician association: in their epigraphic habit, exclusive use of the Greek language, organization, interpretatio Graeca of their patron god Poseidon, and cult and honorific practices, the Poseidoniasts betray a comprehensive knowledge of and adaptation to Greek-Hellenistic customs and culture. This can even be seen in the earliest datable inscription. There was obviously a certain permeability in membership and an opening to ethnic and professional outsiders, but the extent of outside membership cannot be determined. (...) Therefore, not only the association itself, but also its clubhouse (...) would have been far less secluded than was often suggested in literature.'

47. *IG XII 1*, 155, l. 83 and 108.

important members and was less accessible to modest members of the association, who are called *idiotai*. The President of the association was assisted by *archontes* (officials). These were probably elected, as suggested by the use of such formulas as the one in the decree of the *Haliadai kai Haliastai*: *kai toi archontes oi te enestakotes kai oi meta tauta aei airoumenoi*.<sup>48</sup> According to the same document, the officials could propose decrees (which perhaps reveals a probouleutic function), and they presided over official ceremonies at which members were honoured. An *epistates* (superintendent), helped by *logistai* (accountants), functioned as a treasurer: together, these officials were responsible for purchasing the crowns for the *euergetai* and for looking after the finances of the *koinon* in general. The *grammateus* (secretary) was responsible for writing up the decrees and for recording the dealings of the association. A *hierokaryx* (sacred herald) was in charge of the official proclamations during assemblies, called *sylogoi*. There is not any attestation of a Council, whether termed *boule* or something else. It is possible to see the *archontes* (officials) themselves as a Council, especially if they had probouleumatic functions, and if the *epistates* can (as his title seems to indicate) be seen as their head. In that case, the institutions of *koina* would indeed be very similar to those of the *polis*. This general picture is above all based on the decree of the *Haliadai kai Haliastai* for Dionysodoros of Alexandria (*IG XII 1, 155*). Other documents attest to magistracies named *epimenioi*<sup>49</sup> and *episkopoi*,<sup>50</sup> but we are not able to say anything about their functions. The distribution of particular tasks was not very strict, however, as the same task could be performed by different officials. The official proclamation of honours, for instance, could be the responsibility of the *epistates* or the *hierokaryx*;<sup>51</sup> so, too, the purchase of honorific crowns could be done by the *archeranites*, or the *logistai*, or again the *epistates*.<sup>52</sup>

The decrees issued by *koina* are called *pséphismata* and in all respects imitate the formulae of civic decrees. They are ratified by the whole

---

48. ll. 20-21.

49. See the decree of the *Sabaziastai* for Ariston of Syracuse: Kontorini 1983, no. 8.

50. See the decree of the *Diosoteriastai Zenoniastai*: Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 2 (2nd-1st cent. BC).

51. *IG XII 1, 155*, ll. 30-31.

52. *IG XII 1, 155*, ll. 52-55.

membership, the *eranistai*, who are also called *to plethos* (the multitude).<sup>53</sup> Any member of the association, *archon* (official) or *idiotes* (private individual), is entitled, in writing, to propose resolutions.<sup>54</sup> Decrees are clearly distinguished from *nomoi* (laws), which are the statutory law, ‘the highest law’ (*megistos nomos*), or ‘the unchanged law’ (*akinetos nomos*).<sup>55</sup> No inscription with the text of such an ‘unchanged law’ of a *koinon* has been discovered to date. Thus we can only surmise that, among other things, it determined the nature of honorary crowns to be awarded in accordance with the nature of the acts to be recompensed by such honours; additionally, it presumably prescribed the penalties to be meted out for transgressing the law. Essentially, these penalties seem to have been of a financial nature.<sup>56</sup>

Decrees of associations are dated with reference to the Rhodian eponymous magistrate, the priest of Halios. Whenever the name of this eponymous magistrate is known, we can date the decrees with precision.<sup>57</sup> It is therefore the civic calendar of Rhodes, which constitutes the official frame in which the assemblies and festivities of our groups are inscribed: these are deliberative assemblies (*syllogoi*), and the religious gatherings (*synodoi*), which can last for several days. During the *synodoi*, the sacrifices are performed, the *euergetai* (living or dead) are crowned, honours are officially proclaimed and the monetary contributions to be paid by the *eranistai* to the finance these honours are collected.<sup>58</sup>

Associations not only adopt the institutions and practices of the city, but also its system of values. They reward with symbolic or material honours such personal qualities as *arete* (excellence) *eunoia* (benevolence) and *philodoxia* (love of glory). Heading the material

---

53. *IG XII 1*, 155, l. 6.

54. *IG XII 1*, 155, ll. 97-98.

55. See the formulas *kata tode to psaphisma kai kata tous nomous* (ibid., ll. 25-26), and *toi ek tou nomou megistoi* (ibid. l. 103).

56. See ibid. ll. 101-3.

57. By contrast, the inscription of the *koinon* of the *thiasos* of *Atargatis* and the ancestral gods at *Astypalaia* is dated by the name of the priest of the *koinon*: *IG XII 3*, 178. In this case, a priesthood internal to the *koinon* is attested, which is never the case in the Rhodian *koina*.

58. *IG XII 1*, 155, ll. 20-38.

honours is exemption of an *eranistes* from the *eranos*, the annual contribution to the *koinon*. Such exemption can be granted several times, and sometimes it is given for life.<sup>59</sup> Then come the crowns, the value of each standing in equal proportion to the acts for which the individual is honoured, and probably also to his wealth; simultaneously, the value of crowns reveals the financial capabilities of a *koinon*: a golden crown, for instance, can cost as much as ten gold staters.<sup>60</sup> A Heracleot who had performed a *choregia* (probably a public liturgy rather than one internal to the association) was honoured with seven gold crowns by four different *koina*,<sup>61</sup> but crowns of foliage are profusely attested, too.<sup>62</sup> The award of crowns was a standard honour inspired from the public area. The frequency of the practice was such that in one instance complex mechanisms for selling the crown, after it had been awarded at annual ceremonies, were set up by the *koinon of the Haliadai kai Haliastai*.<sup>63</sup> The wealthiest *koina* also honoured their honorands with one or more bronze statues, which probably were to be seen within their cemeteries or houses.<sup>64</sup>

---

59. Maiuri, *NS* 46 (funerary monument of Dionysodoros of Alexandria and his brother Iakchos, mid-2nd cent. BC).

60. This is the value of the crown awarded by the the *Pamiastai* to Dionysodoros of Alexandria: *IG XII 1*, 155, ll. 77-78, and also that of the crown offered by the *Syllioi Lolleioi paidoutai hoi syn Syllai* to Apollonios of Pergamon: *IG XII 1*, 918.

61. Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 6 (1st cent. BC), see appendix, no. 38. The most striking example are the 29 gold crowns and 5 foliage crowns given by 26 different associations of various categories (military groups, civic subdivisions, private associations, etc.) to a single person, probably a citizen, whose name is not preserved: Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 19 (1st half of the 2nd cent. BC). On crowns see Appendix.

62. We find regularly specification of the leaves (ivy, oak, poplar, myrtle), which are often depicted on the rectangular funerary altars: Fraser 1977, 27, 68. Several golden crowns have been found in the Rhodian necropoleis: Kaninia 1994-95, who offers a typology of crowns, and a hypothesis about the possible relationship of ivy crowns and chthonic aspects of the Dionysiac cult. See also Filimonos and Giannikouri 1999. A very interesting document is the list of crowns attributed to at least seven foreigners from different cities (Ephesos, Antioch, Halicarnassos, Alexandria), discovered in the eastern part of the Rhodian necropolis: Maiuri, *NS* 45. This document can be interpreted as the register of crowns for *euergetai* of associations.

63. *IG XII 1*, 155, ll. 53-66.

64. Plutarchos of Apameia received a bronze statue from the *Aphrodisiastai Soteriastai*:

Among symbolic honours, the most important is that of *euergesia*, the official title of *euergetes* of the *koinon*. This title and other honours are officially proclaimed (through the act of *anagoreusis*) at various festive occasions,<sup>65</sup> or during the *synodoi*. This *anagoreusis tan timan* (proclamation of the honours) took place during the honorand's lifetime and after his death. The honours awarded by the *koina* were therefore to a high degree symbolic in character. Their posthumous proclamation at ceremonies expressed the desire to create a common history for the *koinon* and to ensure its continuity 'for ever' (*eis ton aei chronon*).

Is there something specifically Rhodian here? The code of honours and the attending agonistic spirit were common to all ancient Greek cities; additionally, the political vocabulary used by associations of foreigners belonged to a cultural *koine*, since many associates were of Greek origin. Two features nevertheless stand out and must be stressed: the use of the Rhodian civic calendar by the associations; and the importance of the title of *euergetes* in the Rhodian *koina*. Leaving aside such very prominent figures as the Hellenistic monarchs and the Roman emperors, we know of twenty cases of *euergetai* in the Rhodian epigraphic corpus, all of which appear in non-civic – that is non-state – inscriptions, and none in public decrees. Of those twenty cases, eighteen are foreigners and seven concern *euergetai* of *koina*; and both of the two Rhodian citizens honoured in this way receive their titles from associations.<sup>66</sup> By

---

see appendix no. 1; an Herakleot received two from the *koinon of the Aristobouliastai Soteriastai Hephaiastiastai Agathodaimoniastai Menekrateioi hoi syn Menekratei*: see appendix no. 38; Hermogenes of Phaselis received one from the *Aphrodisiastai Hermogeneioi*: appendix no. 3.

65. For example, at the celebration of the *Adonia* festival (*kath' hekasta Adonia*) for the *koinon of the eranistai Adoniazontes*: Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 1.

66. These citizens are the priest of Athana Lindia, Mikythos son of Mikythos, *euergetes* of the *Hermaistai Alkimedonteioi* (*I.Lindos* II, 251: 115 BC), who probably are named after the *stratagos* Alkimedon son of Alkistratos: *IG* XII 1, 50, l. 1; and the priestess of Athana Lindia, Nikassa daughter of Myonides, wife of the priest of Athana Lapheides son of Lapheides. Nikassa is titled *euergetes* and *soter* in the dedication of her bronze statue by a group of foreigners, the *katoikeutes en Lindia polei*: *I.Lindos* II, 394 (the bronze statue of Nikassa is also mentioned in *I.Lindos* II 392a).



comparison, the epigraphic corpus of Athenian cult associations offers not a single reference to the term *euergetes*.<sup>67</sup>

The frequent use of the title *euergetes* by the Rhodian *koina* of foreigners may be explained in three ways. Firstly, it can be an example of the more general theory, put forth by Gauthier, according to which Greek city-states awarded the title *euergētēs* only to foreigners, never to their own citizens.<sup>68</sup> Secondly, the Rhodian practices may be interpreted as an additional indication of the 'personalization' (understood as the creation of personal distinctions) characterizing the associative phenomenon in Rhodes. These groupings were certainly very far from the experience of egalitarianism typifying the (Athenian-style) radical democracy: while we do not know how the principal magistrate of an association was appointed, we do know that he sometimes is also both the founder and an *euergetes* of the association, and that he can remain in office for many years. Many of these associations must have been something akin to clientela-groupings, or groupings led by a charismatic figure (in the Weberian sense), as is shown by the use of a personal name in the name of some associations. This is not to say that the personal qualities of *arete* (excellence) and *eunoia* (benevolence) are by nature aristocratic rather than democratic,<sup>69</sup> for birth has nothing to do with the title of *euergetes*. On the other hand, wealth and integration in the Rhodian society are doubtless the foundations of this associational 'meritocracy', which has a strong oligarchic flavour.

Thirdly (and finally), an explanation of Rhodian practices ought to take into account two remarkable circumstances: that some *euergetai* are the recipients of honours from both private and public bodies, that is, from private associations and subdivisions of the state, respectively; and that, while some of those honoured with the title *euergetes* clearly are members of the associations honouring them, others are not necessarily members of these particular bodies. This is, for instance, the case with the metic Philokrates of Ilion (appendix no. 10), the metic Euphrosynos of Idyma (appendix no. 37) and,

---

67. Arnaoutoglou 2003, 149-150.

68. Gauthier 1985, 27-30.

69. See the remarks of Gauthier 1985, 129 n. 1.

in a most impressive way, of a person whose name is not preserved, but who received at least thirty-one golden crowns and five foliage crowns from twenty-four bodies of both public and private nature (appendix no. 39). This, however, is not something peculiar to foreign *euergetai*, for the same practice can be observed with some high-ranking officers of the Rhodian navy who are also patrons of associations.<sup>70</sup> Therefore, the phenomenon described here does not fit in the notion of what French scholarship calls 'évergétisme de relai'; the central idea behind this notion being that those unable to become part of the *state-managed* memory by receiving the official title of *euergetes* from the *polis* would turn to the *privately-managed* memory, i.e. primarily the family and the association.<sup>71</sup> These features rather pertain to a political and social mode of participation that is not adequately captured by our traditional vocabulary of 'public' and 'private', since it occurs in a different space, one which V. Gabrielsen and C.A. Thomsen have labeled 'the fourth space' (see Introduction to this volume).

#### 4. The legal framing of associations and their recognition by the law of the *polis*

What institutions were set up by the city-state of Rhodess to deal with the remarkable development of associations of foreigners? Certainly, the public associations, which were exclusive to citizens, were under state control, and the foreign population was subject to some form of supervision; on arrival to Rhodes, foreigners were under an obligation to register as such. The existence of different terms for foreigners residing in Rhodes must reflect different statuses: metics (*metoikoi*), those with a foreign mother (*matroxenoi*), those in possession of *epidamia* and those simply called residents (*ka-toikountes*).

The *metoikos* status appears frequently in inscriptions (66 persons use the term *metoikos*) but not in any systematic way. We know of

---

70. See below notes 130, 131.

71. On 'évergétisme de relai', see Schmitt-Pantel, 1982.

persons who, like Damo of Perge,<sup>72</sup> had received the right to own realty (*enktesis*), but who are not called *metoikoi*. No *metoikos* is recorded with the name of his deme of residence, and most foreigners are distinguished as such through mention of their ethnic, even when it is clear that they are permanent residents, rather than itinerant foreigners. This must be compared to the probable disappearance from Athens of the juridical status of the metic after the end of the third century,<sup>73</sup> an evolution presumably linked to the decline of Attic demes as the fundamental units of Athens' public organization, and probably also the loci for the collection of the *metoikion*.<sup>74</sup> Nevertheless, we do not know of any *metoikos* in Rhodes who was registered in a deme, and this leads to the conclusion that demes were not involved in the registration of foreigners. This may be confirmed by the expression *metoikos apo Rhodou*, which appears only once in the Rhodian epigraphic corpus, and which could suggest that *metoikoi* were registered by a central *polis* institution.<sup>75</sup> Moreover, the great number of foreigners who do not have the status of *metoikos* could indicate the existence of a different mode of registration from that based on the deme as the unit in which the *metoikion* was collected.

Some *metoikoi* mention their *prostates*. Four documents present the formula using the verb *prostatego*.<sup>76</sup> This institution remains obscure. The non-systematic mention of the *prostates* has been interpreted by K.M. Kolobova as indicating that membership of an association exempted one from the obligation to have a *prostates*.<sup>77</sup> The official membership lists of associations would have been a satisfactory instrument of control for the state. However, there is not one single document from an association which could be characterized as an

---

72. Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 21 AIII, l. 11.

73. The last explicit mention of the *metoikos* status in the Athenian epigraphic record is in IGII<sup>2</sup> 554, l. 11 (306/305 BC).

74. Whitehead 1977, 77. On the declining importance of the Attic demes: Ismard 2010, 338-43.

75. Kontorini 1989, no. 16.

76. Jacopi 1932, no. 6 (left column), ll. 17-18, and (right column) ll. 21-23, 31-36.; Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 21 AIII, ll. 31-32.

77. Kolobova 1966, 65-72, on which see Gauthier 1972, 132 n. 85.

official list of members. It seems therefore possible to advance another hypothesis: possibly, usage of the verb *prostateuo*, instead of the substantive *prostates*, aimed at indicating that the *prostates* had a permanent responsibility for the *metoikos*, and that this responsibility fell onto a *polis* magistracy.<sup>78</sup>

Those in possession of *epidamia* deserve special mention. As recipients of *epidamia*, an institution peculiar to Rhodes,<sup>79</sup> these foreigners were privileged with the right of residence in Rhodian territory. This right seems to have been granted to a limited number of foreigners, the majority of whom are attested as members of associations. We know of thirty-one grants of *epidamia* from exclusively private inscriptions; no public decrees attest to this institution. Since an Ephesian is recorded in possession of both *epidamia* and *enktesis*, we can infer that the *epidamia* status in itself did not include the right to own realty (*enktesis*). This status was obviously superior to that of *metoikos*: on his funerary inscription, Philokrates of Ilion is described as possessing *epidamia*, whereas in an earlier subscription list he features simply as a *metoikos*.<sup>80</sup> The same funerary inscription reveals also the existence of an association of *epidamiastai*, the *koinon synthytan Rhodiastan Epidamiastan*, which confirms the importance attached to being granted that status. The members of this association united around the cult of the goddesses *Rhodos* and *Epidamia*, the personification of the privilege they had been granted.<sup>81</sup> Whenever

78. This magistracy need not necessarily have had a commercial function in the *emporion* of Rhodes, as Rauh (1993, 36-37, 125) suggests on the basis of a comparison with the *prostatai emporiou* in Naukratis.

79. In these cases, the word always appears in the formula: '(proper name), ὅτι ἡ ἐπίδαμια δέδοται' ('to whom *epidamia* has been granted'). In other cases, the word appears as the object of the verb *ποιεῖν* and has the non-technical meaning 'to stay for a brief time': see Lévy 1987, 47-67, 54 n. 38.

80. *IG XII 1*, 157; Jacopi 1932, 214, no. 6.

81. The cult of the goddess *Rhodos* is well attested: a document from Cos ordains that tax-farmers should sacrifice to Aphrodite, Poseidon, Kos and Rhodos (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1000; Vreken 1953). In the treaty between Rhodes and Hierapytna (ca. 200 BC), there is a provision about a sacrifice to Halios and Rhodos (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 581; *IC III*, 3, A1, l. 3). An altar of Halios and Rhodos has been found in Lindos (*I. Lindos II*, no. 140). On the hypothesis of a personified goddess *Epidamia* and the importance of political personifications in Hellenistic times, see Robert 1967, 12.

the social position of the persons possessing the *epidamia* can be established, it is seen to be rather high (a *proxenos*, a banker, three sculptors, a wealthy contributor). Three of them are members of the same *koinon*: Nikasion of Cyzicus, Satyros of Ephesos and Theon of Antiocheia;<sup>82</sup> two appear in the same list of foreigners: Mnaseas of Chios and Apollonios of Alexandria;<sup>83</sup> two partake in the same dedication;<sup>84</sup> four feature as contributors to the same public subscription, in which foreigners abound;<sup>85</sup> and three of them appear in another subscription.<sup>86</sup> Fourteen among them knew one or more of the other *epidamia*-holders and belonged to the same social circles. This 'little world' has been materialized into associations, a suggestion supported partly by the fact that two of the relevant documents were issued by *koina*,<sup>87</sup> partly by the possibility that one of the three subscriptions belonged to a *koinon*.<sup>88</sup>

What can be concluded from all this? Associations enabled some of their members to make themselves known, thus functioning as a mechanism of societal integration. Alternatively, by honouring particularly those among their members who already had an important position in Rhodian society, they helped these individuals to enhance even more their social standing: proof of this 'inequality' is provided by the disparity of the amounts given by contributors to the two subscriptions mentioned above.<sup>89</sup> This second possibility

---

82. *IG XII 1*, 127 (beg. of the 2nd cent. BC).

83. Maiuri, *NS* no. 8. The editor takes this document to be a subscription list, but no monetarty contributions are recorded.

84. *I.Lindos II*, no. 130.

85. Jacopi 1932, no. 6. There are two lost names with the ethnics *Antiocheus* and *Astypalaieus*, in addition to Menis of Oroanda and Philinos son of Nikomedes from Megara. The *Antiocheus* paid the sum of 3,000 dr., the second largest on the list, on his own behalf and on behalf of his daughter and wife.

86. Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 21. The purpose of the subscription is unknown. The persons concerned are an Ephesian, Timotheos of Soli and Simalos of Mylasa.

87. *IG XII 1*, 157 and 127.

88. Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 21.

89. In Jacopi 1932, no. 6: whereas the *epidamia*-holder from Antiocheia (as also another Antiochean) paid 3,000 dr., most of the other foreigners gave less than 300 dr.; the largest sum (10,000 dr.) comes from an individual who might be a foreigner. In the subscription of the *eranistai Samothraikiastai Aristobouliastai Hermaistai Panathenaistai hoi syn*

seems more probable. Well-established foreigners had the opportunity to form associations thereby creating an organizational framework of social life which they could share with newly arrived or less well-established foreigners.

Some foreigners attained a *de facto* privileged personal status, which subsequently could become visible in the role they played within *koina*. But did the Rhodian state recognize and interact with these groups? Was there any authority specifically charged with the control of associations of foreigners? It has been suggested that such control was exercised by a board of magistrates attested only at Rhodes, the *epimeletai* of foreigners.<sup>90</sup> Many hypotheses have been proposed for this poorly known function. M. Launey thought the *epimeletai* of foreigners were in charge of the recruitment of mercenaries.<sup>91</sup> Others, notably G. van Gelder and D. Morelli, thought they were judiciary magistrates acting as judges for foreigners.<sup>92</sup> According to L. Criscuolo, they were in charge of the grant of the public honour of *xenia* to important foreigners.<sup>93</sup> K. M. Kolobova<sup>94</sup> holds that every *metoikos*-member of an officially recognized association would have been automatically placed under the jurisdiction of this board of magistrates, which consequently was in charge of establishing the official list of associations and perhaps of their members, too. This last hypothesis is attractive but very difficult to substantiate.

---

*Ktesiphonti*, which aimed at the purchase of a plot of land, three persons (Kallipos of Athens, Ktesiphon of Chersonesos and Thyrsos of Cyzicus) gave 680 dr. out of a total of 930 dr., while most of the other contributors gave 5 dr.: Kontorini 1989, no. 10.

90. This magistracy is attested in two documents: a list of magistrates with the entry *epimetaitonxe[non]*, followed by the names of 5 persons, *IG XII 1, 49 (Syll.<sup>3</sup> 619: (188/187 BC, cf. Schmidt 1957, 182, for the date); and a dedication for Ploutarchos son of Heliodoros, mentioning that he had been in charge of the *epimeleia ton xenon*: Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 7, l. 9 (beg. of 1st cent. BC). Plutarchos is also known as a sculptor originating from Apameia (see appendix no. 1), and as holder of quite many other offices.*

91. Launey 1987, 27 n. 7.

92. van Gelder 1900, 231-32; Morelli 1955, 132; Oehler 1907, 167. *Contra*: Criscuolo 1982, 135-47; Gauthier 1972, 151-52.

93. Criscuolo 1982, 145-47.

94. Kolobova 1966, 65-72.

Most scholars, though, support a general interpretation, which actually seems more plausible: these *epimeletai* were magistrates controlling the foreigners and their possessions, notably imports, investments, and realty.<sup>95</sup> From this point of view an interesting parallel is to be found in the magistracy of the *metoikophylakes* proposed by Xenophon, when he deals with the care which the Athenians ought to take of their metics (*ton metoikon epimeleia*: Xen. *Vect.* 2.1).<sup>96</sup> Each of these *metoikophylakes* should – according to Xenophon – draw up lists of *metoikoi*, and the city would honour those with the longest lists. Probably, Xenophon thinks of a kind of test (*dokimasia*) used for deciding who is to be awarded the right of residence,<sup>97</sup> since these magistrates would be responsible for registering the foreigners, protect them and support their establishment in Athens, particularly through grants of *enktesis*.

Additionally, one may point out the following. Firstly, there is one text, which is not taken into account by any of the studies mentioned above: it is the Rhodian copy of a Samian decree honouring a Rhodian, Akamas son of Damonikos, for having been in charge of the *epimeleia* of the Samian refugees in Rhodes in 366, that is, after the founding of an Athenian clerouchy on Samos.<sup>98</sup> This shows that the *epimeleia* of the foreigners must be attributed a wide significance, and not be limited to a particular privilege or a particular judiciary procedure.

Secondly, whichever their exact functions, the *epimeletai* of the foreigners in Rhodes had strong links with the associations. Two

---

95. Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, 197; Gauthier 1972, 254 n. 126. Préaux 1958, 185: 'L'existence de magistrats civils [*i.e.* les épimélètes des étrangers] spécialement chargés des problèmes relatifs aux étrangers (on songe au polémarque d'Athènes et au préteur pérégrin de Rome que les documents grecs appellent στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ξένων prouve tout à la fois l'importance de ceux-ci au sein de la ville de Rhodes et le soin que mettait la cité à leur assurer elle-même, mais en dehors d'elle, une organisation.'

96. Whitehead 1977, 125-29.

97. A *dokimasia* of citizenship by public courts is attested at Athens: Osborne 1976; Osborne 1981-1983 vol. 1, 151-163. Xenophon compares *metoikophylakes* with *orphanophylakes*, who are not documented by other sources. On *dokimasiai* in Hellenistic times see Feyel 2009.

98. Maiuri, *NS* 1.

*epimeletai* have integrated *koina* into their circle of ‘clients’. The one, Aristombrotidas son of Aristombrotidas,<sup>99</sup> belongs to a famous family from Camiros. He is attested as taking part in a public subscription together with a *koinon* of *Sarapiastai* from *Camiros*,<sup>100</sup> and another text attests to his being honoured with golden crowns by several associations: the *Asklapiastai* of *Camiros*, the *Hermaistai* of *Camiros*, the *Sarapiastai* of *Camiros*, the *Kouraistai* of *Kytelos* and the *Triktoinoi hoi en Leloi*.<sup>101</sup> The other *epimeletes* is a very active sculptor, Ploutarchos son of Heliodoros, originally from Apamea. He received many honours from the *koinon* of the *Aphrodisiastai Soteriastai*, of which he was an *euergetes* and probably also a member.<sup>102</sup>

These documents do not allow us to say anything about the function of *epimeletai*, but they emphasize the mediatory role played by associations—and the framework they provided—in the relations between foreigners, the city and its most important figures. In any case, associations of foreigners were among the close relations of important civic magistrates, some of whom might (like Ploutarchos mentioned above) themselves be of foreign origin.

A question central for the status of foreigners is their access to ownership of property, particularly land and buildings. Besides elucidating the relationship between associations and the state, this question brings to the fore the intricate issue of property owned collectively by a private body. According to our evidence, foreigners associations do not have to ask their host state for an authorization to exist, but they do have to ask for permission to own land or houses.<sup>103</sup> At Rhodes, inscriptions show that the greatest concern was

99. *IG XII* 1, 49, l. 51. The military career of Aristombrotidas appears in Pugliese Carratelli 1986-1987, no. 1, while his prestigious religious offices are listed in Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 3 (*Tit. Cam.* 84 and 3 E c, l. 3r).

100. *Tit. Cam. Suppl.* 157b B.III, 7-13: Ἀριστομβροτίδας [Α]ριστομβροτίδα Ἀ[ρ]ιο[ς] (...) καὶ Σαρα[πι]αστῶν τῶν ἐν Κ[α]μίροις κοινόν. Here *kai* means ‘together with’.

101. *Tit. Cam.* 84.

102. See appendix, no. 1.

103. Examples from elsewhere include the Egyptians and the traders from Kition (Cyprus) who were granted permission by the Athenian Assembly to own land at Athens, on which to build a sanctuary of Isis and a sanctuary of Aphrodite, respectively: *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 337 (333/2 BC); and the separate grants of *enktesis* to the Thracians



possession of a common cemetery, the *koinoi topoi* or *koinoi taphoi*. This concern had both psychological and practical sides. While we know too little about the religious aspirations, cultural practices and economic activities of associations, we do know for certain they all showed great concern with the acquisition and maintenance of a common cemetery. The number of funerary monuments of *eranistai*, references to the location of cemeteries in their decrees, the frequent appearance of tombs as the purpose of subscriptions and not least the archaeological remains associated with such cemeteries – all go to show just how important they were thought to be.<sup>104</sup> Of the fifty-two documents attesting to one or more associations in the capital city of Rhodes, twenty-five are funerary inscriptions,<sup>105</sup> four are subscription lists with a clear funerary purpose<sup>106</sup> and five are decrees

---

(*IG* II<sup>2</sup>1283) and the Sidonians (Baslez-Briquel-Chatonnet 1991, 229-240) in the Piraeus. The petition made by the association of the *Tyrioi Herakleistai emporoi kai naukleroi* on Delos to the Athenian Assembly and Council concerned the donation to the association of a plot of land, on which to construct a *temenos* of Herakles: *ID* 1519 (153/2 BC), esp. l. 13. The petition was brought to Athens by the association's ambassador, Patron son of Dorotheos (*ibid.* l. 16).

104. On the Rhodian necropoleis, see Fraser 1977; Patsiada 1996, 14-22; Fabricius 1999, 165-196.

105. Hiller von Gaertringen 1896, 43, no. 12; *IG* XII 1, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 384, 385; Maiuri 1916, 127, no. 4; Maiuri, *NS* no. 39, 40, 41, 43, 46, 192, 193; Maiuri 1925-1926, no. 6; *Suppl. Epigr. Rhod.* I no. 17; Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, nos. 8, 11; Pugliese Carratelli 1986-1987, no. 12; *I. Lindos* II, 683. We should also that funerary monuments were especially popular among the foreign population: of the ca. 100 inscribed round altars from Rhodes registered by Berges (1996), 49 can be attributed to foreigners or slaves; the majority of the rectangular altar, too, belong to foreigners (Fabricius 1999, 180-181).

106. (1) An unknown *koinon* for the enclosure of the cemetery (Konstantinopoulos 1966). (2) The *eranistai Samothraikiastai Aristobouliastai Hermaistai Panathenaistai hoi syn Ktesiphonti*: since the stone was found in the ancient necropolis, the purpose of the subscription was probably the purchase of a plot to be used as cemetery (Kontorini 1989, no. 10). (3) An unknown *koinon* for the repair of the enclosure and the *mnameia*, which had been damaged during an earthquake (*IG* XII 1, 9). (4) An unknown *koinon*: Maiuri 1925-1926, no. 5. To this group of documents belongs also *IG* XII 1, 937 (Lindos), of the *koinon* of the *Dionysiastai Athanaistai Dios Atabyriastai Euphranoreioi hoi syn Athenaioi Knidioi*.

showing the importance of cemeteries;<sup>107</sup> thirty-nine of these have been found in the necropoleis of the capital city of Rhodos. The common cemeteries were also places of assembly, religious ceremonies (during which the monuments of *euergetai* were crowned) and feasts; there, too, the associations displayed decrees and honorary funerary monuments.<sup>108</sup>

Here one may raise the question about the legal status of the association: was it regarded as a corporation, i.e. a body possessing juristic personality, and by extension, did the concept of collective property exist? This question has been at the center of a long debate (see also Introduction in this volume).<sup>109</sup> A particularly interesting

---

107. (1) Decree of the *Sabaziastai* for Ariston of Syracuse 'who had taken care of the *taphoi*' (Kontorini 1983, no. 8). (2) Honours by the *Artemisiastai* to Chrysippos of Merops for helping to bury a dead member (Peek 1969, no. 2). (3) Decree of the *Haliadai kai Haliastai* for Dionysodoros of Alexandria, which details the honours to be accorded to him posthumously at his tomb (*IG XII 1*, 155). (4) Decree of the *Aphrodisiastai Hermogeneioi* for Hermogenes of Selge about the land plots and the cemetery of the *koinon*. (5) Decree of the *Diosoteriastai Zenoniastai*, which mentions their tombs (*taphiai*) (Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 2).

108. The crowning of the funerary monuments is attested by the decree for Dionysodoros of Alexandria, *IG XII 1*, 155, ll. 88-89. This ritual is confirmed by the 'bosses' (round projections) on the upper surface of some funerary monuments, on which the crowns were placed, cf. Fraser 1977, 15-16, 19-24, 42, 68; figs. 37 a-d, 38, a-d. Among 75 rectangular altars, 28 have two bosses, 6 one, while one monument has three bosses.

109. See Arnaoutoglou 2003, 119-144, with exhaustive bibliography on the question of property (pp. 120-23, 133-38), and the conclusion that 'property matters are an indecisive factor in our attempt to assess the juristic personality of the ancient Athenian association'. Against the idea of collective property see: Ustinova 2005, 177-190; Ismard 2010, 141-185. More recent studies see a form of juristic recognition which does not correspond to modern conceptions of a legal entity. Hatzopoulos (1973) hypothesizes a recognition of associative property through a divinity, i.e. the property in question belongs to a deity. Arnaoutoglou (2003) rejects the possibility of an explicit juristic recognition and, on the analogy of public associations, thinks that the recognition was *de facto*: associations would be a quasi-legal phenomenon. Ismard (2010, 141-185) bases his view on an examination of the *hekatoste* inscriptions, which record the tax on sales of land by some associations in the second half of the 4th century BC (Lambert 1997); *contra* Arnaoutoglou (2003, 136), he holds that the land of associations was alienable, and that associations were the real owners and managers of public land at Athens. The Athenian *polis* would never have existed as a juristic

Rhodian inscription sheds some light on the issue. It is the decree of the *Aphrodisiastai Hermogeneioi*, which ordains the writing up of the *amphouriasmoi ton eggaion ton hyparchonton toi koinoi*, 'the land property titles possessed by the *koinon*'. On the reverse (face B) of the stele one of these *amphouriasmoi* (property titles) is detailed.<sup>110</sup> This *koinon* was probably founded by the metic Hermogenes of Phaselis, from whom it took its name, and is administrated by three *archontes*: Hermogenes himself, the metic Menogenes of Galatia and Theudotos of Arabia. The real property of the *koinon* consists of land plots, a house (worth 12,000 dr.) located in the capital city of Rhodos, and a common cemetery. The *amphouriasmos* on face B of the stele is a very difficult text, but the following seems reasonably clear. The *koinon*, represented by its treasurer Nikasion of Lindos, has made three payments to Sostratos of the deme Brygindarioi. Theaidetos from the deme of Astypalaea guarantees that the *amphouriasmos* will be surrendered to Perdiccas of Argos, a member of the *koinon*. In all operations, the name of the *koinon* is associated with some of the officials with a part in the operation, whether the three *archontes*<sup>111</sup> or the treasurer Nikasion of Lindos.<sup>112</sup>

The presence of these persons – significantly, mentioned in a strictly juridical context – is probably justified by the role they assumed during the acquisition of property, particularly so the treasurer who is a citizen. The *koina* of foreigners had to find ways in which to include among their memberships persons with real property rights. This perhaps explains the position of Nikasion of Lin-

---

person (a *personne morale*, according to French law), its mode of existence being simply the plurality of its subdivisions; associations would have been recognized through an 'imperfect fiction' by which an association was linked to one of its members (Ismard 2010, 159). A parallel to this form of recognition is seen in the boards of magistracies, where the name of a magistrate sometimes is heading the name of the whole board.

110. Maiuri 1921-1922, 223-232 (SEG 3.674; Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, 158-161, no. 18, fig. 13, with a juridical commentary by V. Arangio-Ruiz, pp. 161-165; cf. Fraser 1977, 60-61.

111. Lines 1-2, and esp. 19-20: Ἀφροδισιαστῶν Ἑρμογενείων κοινῶι Ἑρμο[γ]ῆ[νει] Φασηλίται μετοίκωι καὶ Μηνογένει Γαλάται μετοί/κωι καὶ Θευδότωι Ἀραβί: ἔ[χ]ετε. Cf II. 6-7: Ἑρμογένης καὶ Μηνογένης καὶ Θεύδοτος καὶ Ἀφροδισιαστῶν/ Ἑρμογενείων κοινόν.

112. Lines 20-21: Νικασί/ων Νικασίωνος Λινδοπολίτας καὶ Ἀφροδισιαστῶν Ἑρμογενείων κοινόν.

dos as a treasurer. The fundamental fact is that a *koinon* had to transact jointly with one or more of its members in order to have access to real property.<sup>113</sup>

## 5. The integration of *koina* into civic and political life

Integration of the *koina* of foreigners can be initially examined by looking at their relation to the *polis* subdivisions, especially the *ktoina*. At Rhodes, the *ktoina* seems to be a public unit of a territorial character. Additionally, it has a religious function, which is pronounced in the evidence from Kamiros.<sup>114</sup> The *ktoina* has probably also a role in the defense of the territory, which is supervised by an *epistates*.<sup>115</sup>

From the first century BC onwards, foreigners honoured by associations of the *eranos* type are also honoured by *ktoinai*, of which they sometimes are members. Philokrates of Ilion, already mentioned above, appears as *metoikos* in a first-century subscription, as *epidamia*-holder, and member of many *koina*, one of which is a *koinon* of *epidamiastai*. Moreover, he was the founder of a the *Matioi ktoinetai eranistai Philokrateioi*, that is, *eranistai* who belong to the *ktoina* of the *Matioi*. Two other occurrences are relevant. In an inscription from Syme (from the first century BC or or first century AD) a *metoikos* from Idyma in Caria is honoured by two *koina* (the *Samothraikiastai Aphrodisaistai Borboritai* and the *Adonistai Aphrodisiastai Syroi*) and by two *ktoinai*.<sup>116</sup> In an inscription of a later date (151-300 AD) from Phoinix in the Peraea, the *metoikos* Philoumenos is honored by the *koinon* of the *ptoina* (i.e. *ktoina*), of which he has been *epistates*.<sup>117</sup> All

113. This conclusion is in line with the hypothesis of Ismard (2010, 145) about a 'forme de responsabilité collective sous la forme d'un sujet irréductiblement pluriel'.

114. *Tit. Cam.* 109 (*IG XII*, 1 694).

115. See, e.g., the second-century BC decree of the the *ktoina* of the *Potidaieis* on Karpathos, *I.Lindos II*, col. 1009 (Segre 1933, 379-82; *IG XII* 1, 1033). On the state subdivisions of Rhodes, see Gabrielsen 1994c, and 1997, 141-154, Appendix II, 'The *Patrai*, *Diagoniai*, and *Ktoina*'.

116. *IG XII* 3, 6; *SGDI* 4288: 1st cent. BC (Hiller von Gaertringen *apud IG XII* 3, 6; Guarducci 1935, 423 n. 8), but 1st cent. AD (Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, 185).

117. Durrbach and Radet 1886, 261 n. 10; *I.Rhod.Per.* 110; Bresson, *RecueilPéree* 159. On the form *ptoina*, see Robert 1978, 403, no. 64a.

this can be explained by the circumstance that after the first century BC the *ktoina* included foreigners residing in its territory, and also that some of its members formed private associations. They thereby took over a mode of association especially favoured by foreigners. This does not mean that the *ktoina* as an institution ceased to exist or that it transformed into an association of the *eranos* type. In fact, *ktoinai* and associations of *ktoinatai* are attested simultaneously.

Private associations were active in public life by participating in public subscriptions together with citizens. In the first part of the second century, the association of the *Sarapiastai* of Camiros contributed to a subscription together with Aristombrotidas son of Aristombrotidas, an important man from Camiros, who had held the most important civic and military offices, one of which was that of *epimeletes* of the foreigners.<sup>118</sup> At Camiros we know also a public subscription by associations.<sup>119</sup> At Lindos, a public subscription of 115 BC aimed at providing a dedicatory golden crown for Athana, Zeus Polieus and Nike and includes six associations subscribing with one Timapolis.<sup>120</sup> It is not sure that every association attested here is a group of foreigners but their importance in that part of public life is, indeed, noteworthy.

The important participation of foreigners in subscriptions in the capital city of Rhodes needs to be stressed as well. We already mentioned a public subscription of importance (one amounting to 35,000 dr.) in which we find six citizens from two demes of Camiros and at least fifteen foreigners: the largest single contribution (3,000 drachmas), among those that are preserved, is paid by a foreigner from Antioch who had received the *epidamia*; the highest contribution of a citizen reaches only 2,000 drachmas. Though probably not a subscription by an association, the *euergetes* and founder of a *koinon* Philokrates of Ilion is taking part in it (*IG XII 1*, 157).

Worth mentioning are also a subscription by women, the major-

118. *Tit. Cam. Suppl.* no. 157b, fig. 23. Cf. Migeotte 1992, no. 44. The aim of the operation was probably the construction or repair of a building.

119. Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 4 with fig. VIII 1 (and *Tit. Cam.* no. 159a, fig. 119); Migeotte 1992, no. 46.

120. *I. Lindos* II, 2; see Migeotte 1992, no. 40, 117-121.

ity of whom are foreigners;<sup>121</sup> a subscription by foreigners for a unknown purpose;<sup>122</sup> and four subscriptions of *koina* of foreigners for funeral purposes.<sup>123</sup> These documents show sometimes very big differences between the financial capacities of contributors. But others reveal a more balanced situation: the already mentioned and very long list of foreign subscribers, mentioned above,<sup>124</sup> contains 74 sums; two are each of 100 drachmas, but the overwhelming majority differs from five to fifty drachmas, with an average amount of 23 drachmas. It is instructive to compare the sums relating to this subscription (the preserved total amount from which is 1,858 drachmas paid by 164 persons who made 74 contributions) with those relating to a subscription at Camiros, among the participants in which we find Aristombrotidas son of Aristombrotidas and other prominent citizens: the 1,200 drachmas collected were paid by 120 persons who belonged to 70 families, the individual contributions ranging from five and one hundred drachmas. Equally wide ranging contributions are observable in the Lindian public subscription solicited for the clothing and treasury of Athana Lindia: 1,445 drachmas were collected through 69 contributions amounting from five to two hundred drachmas.<sup>125</sup>

Foreigners use the same financial means as citizens do, on a comparable scale and on the basis of a similar spectrum of fortunes. In some subscriptions, they give the most important sums.

It would be of considerable interest to define the role of associations of foreigners in the Rhodian army. We know numerous cases of military associations of *synstrateusamenoï* centred on military leaders.<sup>126</sup> A good example is provided by Theaidetos and his son Astymedes, who have both been admirals of the Rhodian fleet<sup>127</sup> and ambassadors to Rome on several occasions, notably during and af-

---

121. Migeotte 1993.

122. Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 21 (1st cent. BC).

123. See above note 106.

124. Pugliese Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 21.

125. *I.Lindos* no 2; see Migeotte 1992, no. 40, 117-121.

126. Gabrielsen 1997, 94-97, 123-128; Gabrielsen 2013, 77-79.

127. Berthold 1984, 44.

ter the Third Macedonian War.<sup>128</sup> The two were the founders or Benefactors (*euergetai*) of the association of *Apolloniastai Theaideteioi Astymedeioi*.<sup>129</sup> We know that *Pausistrateioi* bears the name of an individual who had served as admiral of the Rhodian fleet approximately at the same time as Theaidetos:<sup>130</sup> Livy informs us that many young Rhodians took up military service because of their great prestige of Pausistratos. We also know of an *Apolloniastai Antiocheioi systrateusamenoï koinon*, founded by the commander of a squadron, Antiochos,<sup>131</sup> and of the *Aphrodisiatai Halikiotai Polykleioi* and the *Polykleioi Boarsai*, founded by Polykles, the holder of important military and civic offices.<sup>132</sup> The importance of the associative phenomenon in the naval forces is one of the bases of the analysis of Rhodian society provided by V. Gabrielsen's *The Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes*. In this perspective, the Rhodian state would have been a *de facto* aristocracy dominated by great families, who had monopolized the most important priesthoods of Halios and of Athana Lindia, and who provided generals for the army and admirals for the navy. Military associations were part of this social network as a clientele to this 'aristocracy' and, apart from their psychological dimension as groups of comrades in arms, had a practical function of recruit-

---

128. Theaidetos was a priest of Halios: *IG XII 1*, 1135. In early 180 BC he led the Rhodian delegation sent to Rome to discuss the future of Lycia at the end of the Antiochic War (Polyb. 22.5); he led many delegations to Rome around 168, after the Third Macedonian War, at one of which he petitioned for Roman clemency towards Rhodes (Polyb. 28.2, 3; 16, 3; 29.11.2; 30.5.4 and 21.1-2, where Polybius says that Theaidetos was a *navarchos*). Astymedes was sent to Rome as a member of the delegation led by his father (Polyb. 30.4.1; 30.5.1; 30.22.3; 21.6.1; 21.72. 20); he was again sent to the senate in 164; he is attested as a priest of Athana Lindia in 154 (*I.Lindos II*, nos. 1 and 217); he was admiral and ambassador to Rome during the Second Cretan War (Polyb. 33.15.3).

129. *IG XII 1*, 163.

130. A fragment of Polybius (21.7.[5]), quoted by the *Souda*, s.v. 'Pyrphoros', informs us that he was a *navarchos* towards the end of the war against Antiochos in 190 BC. He was killed in Samos in the same year. He is supposedly the first military commander to have used a *pyrphoros* (a fire throwing device), which was a specifically Rhodian invention: Livy 37.11.13, 37.30.3. Cf. van Gelder, 1900, 138 ff.

131. *IG XII 1*, 43; Maiuri, *NS* 18, ll. 26-27.

132. Maiuri, *NS* 18, ll. 23-24, 27.

ment *milieux*.<sup>133</sup> This interpretation is indisputable, but it seems likely that foreigners participated in this phenomenon on a scale equal to their integration in the Rhodian army. Livy (33.18.3) tells us about the strong presence of foreigners in the Rhodian army and about what he calls ‘allied troops’; the treaties with Hierapytna and Olous of around 201 or 200 BC, after the First Cretan War, contain clauses about the organization of the recruitment of mercenaries.<sup>134</sup>

But we must stress the difficulty of linking foreigners and their associations with the Rhodian army in the epigraphical corpus. No inscription allows us to link a foreigner firmly to an association of an explicitly military character, something which is usually indicated by the participial form *strateuomenoi*. The case of the *Panathenaistai* groups is a good example.<sup>135</sup> The *Panathenaistai strateuomenoi* correspond quite clearly to a ship’s crew<sup>136</sup> and appear in a number of inscriptions between 121 BC and the beginning of our era;<sup>137</sup> but this is done only in the context of honours given to civil or military mag-

133. Gabrielsen 1997, 126.

134. Treaty with Hierapytna: *ICIII*, 3, A1; treaty with Olous: *SEG* 23.547 and a similar treaty with Chersonesos, a city on the north coast of Crete: Chaniotis 1991, 258-60. Cf. Gabrielsen 1997, 54, 170-71, nn. 86-90.

135. These groups are named after the *Panathenaia*. It would be an exaggeration to suppose, following *I.Lindos* II, col. 797, that these are associations of seamen sent as *theoroi* to the Athenian *Panathenaia*. This is how Blinkenberg (*ibid.*) explains the non-doric form of the term. Reference to a local festival called *Panathenaia* is made in inscriptions from Camiros: *Tit.Cam.* 106, 110B, ll. 54-56 (194 BC), and 159, ll. 1-7 (1st half of 2nd cent. BC).

136. This is quite clear when the name appears in the formula *strateuomenoi en triemiolia ha onoma...* or ‘*enpleontes en...*’, or with a specification of the kind of the ship (*aphraktos* or *kataphraktos*): *I.Lindos* II, 420; Maiuri 1916, 142, no. 11; *AD* 18 A (1963) nos. 1 and 7.

137. See *I.Lindos* II, col. 796, appendix to the commentary of no. 420a; *I.Lindos* II, 300a, l. 7 (121 BC); 292, l. 7 (88-85 BC); 303, ll. 4, 11 (*ca.* 90-70 AD); 391, l. 32 (10 AD); no 392a, l. 13 and b, l. 6-7 (10 AD); 394, ll. 6-7 (10 AD.); 420 a, ll. 10-14 (23 AD); Jacopi 1932, 190, no. 19, l. 12 (*ca.* 100 BC); Maiuri, *NS* 18, l. 19 (*ca.* 80 B.C.); *IG XII* 1, 107, ll. 2-3 (*ca.* 50 AD); *JÖAI* 4 (1901) 161, l. 11 (Augustan era); *AE* 1913, 10, no. 9, l. 5 (Augustan era). We can add *AD* 18 A (1963), no. 1, l. 1 (*ca.* 50 BC) and no. 7, l. 11 (1st cent. BC); Maiuri 1916, 142, no. 11 = *SEG* 3.679; and without *strateuomenoi*, but with the mention of the military term *dekas*. Jacopi 1932, 210, no. 48; *SEG* 15.497 (*ca.* 100-50 BC). One of these texts gives the names of seven members of *Panathenaistai strateuomenoi syskanoi*, who call themselves *sysitoi*, all being citizens: *I.Lindos* II, 292.



istrates. On the other hand, they are known as associations that include some foreigners, but without the mention of *strateuomenoi*; in this latter case they often include cults of other divinities such as Herakles, Halios, Hermes, the Samothracian Gods and Zeus Xenios.<sup>138</sup> Most studies conclude that all *Panathenaistai* were in fact military groups,<sup>139</sup> while insisting on the exclusion of foreigners from the Rhodian naval forces. But if so, how are we to explain the presence of some foreigners in the membership of the *Panathenaistai*? Launey supposed that these groups assembled mercenaries fighting on land,<sup>140</sup> but it appears quite doubtful that the important Rhodian naval forces would not have included foreigners or even slaves. Another possible hypothesis, based on an observation by V. Gabrielsen, would be that foreigners constitute that part of a crew which is normally invisible in the surviving documents. Gabrielsen points out that the surviving inscribed lists of Rhodian crews are not official lists but parts of honorific/dedicatory texts, and therefore do not necessarily reflect the real composition of a crew—rowers, for instance, are never mentioned—but the personal and social ties of an elite.<sup>141</sup> We could then suppose that the *Panathenaistai* honouring

---

138. In seven cases we find foreigners as members of an association called *Panathenaistai* or as the recipients of honours by such a group: Philiskos of Antioch was honoured by the *Panathenaistai Herakleistai* and the *Haliastai Panathenaistai* (Maiuri, *NS* 39); Moschion of Phaselis was honoured by the *Samothraikiastai*, the *Panathenaistai* and the *Aphrodisiastai* (Maiuri, *NS*, 43); Kratippos of Kyaneai made a dedication to the *koinon* of the *Panathenaistai kai Herakleistai* (*IG XII* 1, 36); Aphrodisios of Phaselis was honored by the *koinon* of the *Panathenaistai* (*IG XII* 1, 159); Ktesiphon of Chersonesos was *euergetes* of the *koinon* of the *eranistai Samothraikiastai Hermaistai Panathenaistai hoi syn Ktesiphonti* (Kontorini 1989, no. 10: 172/170 BC); Agathoboulos of Pladasa was honoured by the *Panathenaistai* in an inscription from Chalke (*IG XII* 3, 962); and one Gaius gave his name to the *koinon* of *Dios Xeniaistai Panathanaistai Lindiastai hoi syn Gaiou* (*IG XII* 1, 161): significantly, this *koinon* appears in a funerary inscription together with other *koina* as worshippers of *Apollon Stratagios*.

139. Gabrielsen 1997, 124; Launey 1987, 1018-1022; *I.Lindos* II, col. 796.

140. Launey 1987, 1018-1022.

141. Gabrielsen 1997, 96. Cf. the crew lists in Segre 1936, 227-44; *Suppl.Epigr.Rhod.* I 62 (3rd-2nd cent. BC); *NuovoSuppl.Epigr.Rhod.* I 4 (1st cent. BC); Pugliese Carratelli 1986-1987, no. 16; Jacopi 1932, no. 5 (probably 1st cent. BC); Maiuri, *NS* 5 (Hellenistic); *I.Lindos* II, 88 (265-260 BC) and 421a (25-30 AD); Kontorini 1983, no. 6 (2nd-1st cent. BC). A few foreigners are sometimes listed at the end of a document.

foreigners are groups parallel to those of citizen-soldiers, adopting a kind of sociability from which they are otherwise excluded. They would not mention their military function because they would not be allowed to do so, or at least would not have a legitimate right to do so, because they are not part of the fighting crew, but a merely a force of traction.<sup>142</sup> On the other hand, we cannot exclude the possibility that the *Panathenaistai* could be the crews of merchant ships, and not military.

One last possibility is that the absence of the title *strateuomenoi* could be the effect of an epigraphic habit. In fact, five of seven attestations of foreigners linked to *Panathenaistai* are funerary inscriptions, whereas the documents attesting *Panathenaistai strateuomenoi* are dedicatory inscriptions for citizens' statues. In this case a final remark is necessary: the aforementioned hypotheses do not really take into account the fact that these associations named themselves after a festival with competitions. It is probable that these groupings were based on a common participation to athletic contests named *Panathenaia* and therefore fostered a form of solidarity akin to that of the gymnasium. The crucial question is, however, whether in Rhodes foreigners had access to the gymnasium.<sup>143</sup> It should be noted that modern historians sometimes use the expressions 'foreign soldiers' and 'mercenaries' as equivalents.<sup>144</sup> But it is important to distinguish between foreign soldiers recruited for a specific task and foreign residents participating in the common war effort. If all *Panathenaistai* were soldiers, then we can safely assume that foreign residents were enlisted in the Rhodian army.

In contrast with the hypothetical military groups of foreigners, the relationship between prominent Rhodians and another type of groups of foreigners, 'those who live (*katoikeuntes*) in Lindos and

---

142. This hypothesis is nevertheless difficult to reconcile with the case of Ploutarchos of Apamea, honoured by *Aphrodisiastai Soteriastai* who mention all offices he assumed, civil or military, see above note 90.

143. On the participation of foreigners in Rhodian festival contests, see Maiuri, *NS* 35 (late 3rd cent. BC); Kontorini 1975. From Rhodes we do not have documents similar to the ephobic lists of Athens or to the dedications made by foreign ephebes on Delos.

144. Bettali 1995, 123-47.

farm (*georgeuntes*) in the Lindian countryside (*en tai Lindiai*), is more evident. They are attested through thirteen Lindian inscriptions,<sup>145</sup> one of which informs us that the group included also 'shippers' (*nauklareuntes*).<sup>146</sup> The dates of these inscriptions range from 137 BC to the end of the first century AD. The group of the *katoikeuntes georgeuntes kai nauklareuntes xenoi* is also attested by five inscriptions from the Lindian deme of *Physkioi* in the Peraia,<sup>147</sup> and one inscription from the island of Telos.<sup>148</sup> They appear always as dedicants of statues for Lindian notables alone;<sup>149</sup> they are also listed among various boards of religious magistrates, military associations, civic subdivisions and other *eranoi* associations. Are they really an association (*koinon*)? In one of the relevant inscriptions the word *koinon* is restored.<sup>150</sup> But the fact that the *katoikeuntes* of Lindos join other boards and associations in voting honours for the priests of Athana Lindia and their families – awarding golden statues and crowns, bronze statues and golden images – leads us to conclude that they possessed the organization required for engaging in such acts and therefore formed a *koinon*. Two inscriptions mention the honours granted by the *katoikeuntes* and 'all the other *eranoi*', which indicates that the *katoikeuntes*, too, are considered as an *eranos*.<sup>151</sup>

---

145. *I.Lindos* II, 229 (137 BC); 249 (117-116 BC); 264 (before the 1st cent. BC); Jacopi 1932, no. 48 (69 BC); *I.Lindos* II, 300a (121 BC); 349 (38 BC); 391 (10 AD); 392a-b (10 AD); 394 (10 AD); 420 (23 AD); 425 (1st cent. BC), and the decree *IG XII 1*, 762 (23 AD); *SGDI* 4155; Sokolowski 1969, 245, no. 20.

146. *I.Lindos* II, 384 (ca. 80 AD); Habicht, 1990. Cf. Bresson 2004.

147. Bresson, *RecueilPéris* 27, 28 and 29 (all three from the beg. of 1st cent. BC), 32 (97-150 AD), 35 = *I.Rhod.Per.* 514 (163 AD). These inscriptions are from the Roman imperial period.

148. Peek 1969, no. 48.

149. In the inscriptions of the Peraia and in *I.Lindos* II, no. 425 (1st cent. BC).

150. *I.Lindos* II, 300a (121 BC), where they are also called *Athanaistai*.

151. In the dedicatory inscription of a statue for Hieroboula, spouse of a priest of Athana Lindia (*I.Lindos* II, 420, of 23 AD), the last lines confirm that Hieroboula has received a crown from all *eranoi* existing when her husband Kallistratos was priest, and these are the groups mentioned in the preceding lines including the *katoikeuntes*; an unpublished inscription mentioned in a note by Pugliese Carratelli (1939-1940, 175, n. 4, 10 AD) is said to have recorded the honours granted to Nikassa priestess of Athana Lindia (on whom see *I.Lindos* II, 392a, 394, 10 AD), listing among the

Are they foreigners? Certainly, the word *katoikeutes* has several meanings.<sup>152</sup> However, a Lindian decree of 23 AD, which aims at ‘augmenting the honors to Dionysos’ during *Dionysia* festival, mentions the appointment of six foreigners (*xenoi choregoi*), who are to be chosen ‘from among the *katoikeutes* and *georgeutes* in the city of Lindos (*ek ton katoikeunton kai georgeunton en Lindia polei*)’.<sup>153</sup> A list of *katoikoi* has also been discovered at Lindos.<sup>154</sup> Bresson has stressed that the names of the *katoikoi* attested at Lindos—as well as those of the *metoikoi* appearing on the same stone—have many common points both with the names of amphora producers attested on amphora stamps and with the ‘monétaires rhodiens’ at the end of the second century BC.<sup>155</sup> The city would have appealed to wealthy foreigners at this date, among which were some freedmen, to finance its monetary emissions either by way of performing a liturgy or by purchasing from the state the right to issue coins. The inscription regulating the appointment of *choregoi* for the *Sminthia* festival clearly indicates that some of these *xenoi katoikeutes* were wealthy. The case of Lindos does not seem to support the hypothesis of Papazoglou,<sup>156</sup> who contrasts the *enektemenoi* (foreigners having been granted the right of *enktesis*) and the *katoikeutes* (residents without that right): the fact that *choregoi* are taken among them goes against their identification as dependent labourers on the land owned by the citizens.

## 6. Conclusion

It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of the associative phenomenon to civic, social and political life of Rhodes. It is found among the citizen and foreign population. Associations formed by citizens are centred around an elite occupying the most prestigious and strategic functions, priestly as well as military,

---

honouring bodies ‘the *katoikeutes* and all other *eranoi*’.

152. See Hommel, 193; Papazoglou, 1997, 166.

153. *IG XII 1*, 762 (23 AD); *SGDI* 4155; Sokolowski, 1969, 245, no. 20.

154. *I.Lindos II* no. 278.

155. Bresson 2001.

156. Papazoglou 1997, 167.

whereas foreigners group themselves in associations that are centred around persons who stand out not only for their wealth, but, to be sure, also for their integration into the economic networks of Rhodes. Even if professional activities remain very obscure, due to the nature of sources, one need only think of the large number of sculptors present at Rhodes.<sup>157</sup>

The presence of associations with predominantly foreign members in the public life is an indisputable consequence of the state's favorable attitude towards foreigners. The social or 'societal'<sup>158</sup> integration of associations is caused, or facilitated, by their mixity and the juridical and social mobility of foreigners. This led to the formation of a new elite, which formalized existing networks into *koina*, took active part in civic life and remained close to Rhodian notables. A striking example of the integration of an elite of foreigners in Rhodes comes from the second-century BC: Dionysios of Arados, titled *euergetes*, was the son of the *proxenos* Zenon of Arados and his wife Astis of Sidon. Dionysios dedicated two statues of his mother, one to Athana Lindia on the acropolis of Lindos (a work executed by the sculptor Phyles of Halicarnassos, who himself had received the title of *euergetes*);<sup>159</sup> the other in the capital city of Rhodes on a monument on which also stood two statues of citizens' wives.<sup>160</sup>

Among these well-established foreigners we find some figures known from diverse documents, some of them unparalleled in the Rhodian epigraphic *corpus* and indeed in our record on the Hellenistic *koina* as a whole: Ploutarchos of Apamea, a sculptor who had held the highest civic posts (one of which was the *epimeleia* of the foreigners); Nikasion of Cyzicus, father of naturalized Rhodian sculptors, who had assembled forty-six individuals around his family-like association; Philokrates of Ilion, holder *epidamia*, who gave his name to a group that corresponds to a civic subdivision, the

---

157. On the associations as economic networks, see Gabrielsen 2009.

158. See the Introduction of this volume.

159. *I.Lindos* II, 132.

160. *IG XII* I, 104; *I.Lindos* II, col. 376. The father Zenon, *proxenos* of Arados, is also known from a dedication to Zeus Soter (*IG XII* I, 32) and a dedication to Athana Lindia on behalf of his children: *I.Lindos* II, 120; his daughter was called *Rhodias*.

*ktoinatai*; Hermogenes of Phaselis, the founder of the association whose property titles are preserved in a separate inscriptions; and finally, Dionysodoros of Alexandria, President of several *koina* for over twenty years.

The members of *koina* have generally very different financial capacities. The concern with common cemeteries reflects one of their uses of common resources, and collective possession of property is, of course, fundamental for foreigners and slaves, since neither of these status categories, *as individuals*, had the right to right own realty. Associations of foreigners seem to have been part of the Rhodian *eunomia* ('good order') celebrated by Strabo (14.2.5 [652]) and have certainly played a role in the attempts at social regulation. For the Rhodian state they were a means of controlling different segments of the urban population, particularly of securing the stable supply of a foreign workforce. Moreover, they constituted a component of the elite's sphere of influence and at the same time the organizations encompassing a foreign 'aristocracy' settled at Rhodes. Associations were the centre of political practices that had adopted democratic procedures and values; they provided an institutionalized framework to different types of networks among the foreign population, whether professional or familial. All in all, they offered themselves as ideal places for foreigners to mingle with each other and with the citizen population. As such, they proved useful for the foreigners and for the Rhodian State.

## Appendix :

### Crowns in the context of foreigners' associations

1. The sculptor Ploutarchos son of Heliodoros, who first signed with the ethnic *Apameus* (*I.Lindos* II, 131d, before 91 BC) and then obtained Rhodian citizenship (*I.Lindos* II, 287, 131b, 197d; 308b; *IG XII 1*, 48, 108 and 844; Kontorini 1989, no. 2; Jacopi, 1932, 105, no. 2), received three golden crowns from the *Aphrodisiastai Soteriastai*: Pugliesse Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 7.
2. The metic Charixenos of Andros received a leaves crown from the *koinon* of the *Aphrodisiastai kai Hermaistai*: Maiuri, *NS* 42.
3. Hermogenes of Phaselis: a leaves crown and two golden crowns

from the *Aphrodisiastai Hermogeneioi*: Jacopi 1932, no. 53; Pugliesse Carratelli 1939-1940, nos. 7, 19.

4. Sosikles from Crete: a leaves crown from the *eranistai Adoniazontes*: Pugliesse Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 1.

5. Ariston of Syracuse: a leaves crown from the *Sabaziastai*: Kontorini 1983, no. 8.

6. Chrysippos of Merops: a leaves crown from the *Artemisiastai*: Peek 1969, no. 2.

7. Dionysodoros of Alexandria: a golden crown, 'the biggest allowed by the law', from the *Haliadai kai Haliastai*; a golden crown from the *Dionysiastai*; and a white poplar leaves crown and a golden crown of ten staters from the *Paniastai*: IG XII 1, 155.

8. An unknown person: four golden crowns and two leaves crowns from six *koina*, the *Haliastai Athanaistai Hermaistai Aristedeioi*, the *Dios Soteriastai Sarapiastai*, the *Sarapiastai*, the *Meniastai Aphrodisiastai*, the *Soteriastai Asklapiastai Poseidaniastai Herakleistai Athanaistai Aphrodisiastai Hermaistai Matros Theon* and the *Hestiastai*: IG XII 1, 162.

9. Stratonika of Halicarnassos: a leaves crown by the *Haliadai and Haliastai*: IG XII 1, 156.

10. Philokrates of Ilion: two golden crowns from the *Hermaistai Thesomophoriastai* and from the *Matioi ktoimetai eranistai Philokrateioi*: IG XII 1, 157.

11. A foreigner from Phaselis: a golden crown from the *Herakleotai [--]oneioi*: IG XII 1, 158.

12. Aphrodisios of Phaselis: a leaves crown from the *Panathanaistai*: IG XII 1, 159.

13. Damas of Lydia: a leaves crown from an unknown *koinon*: IG XII 1, 160.

14. An unknown person: three golden crowns and two leaves crowns from various *koina*, the *Dios Xenistai Dionysiastai G[.]ioneioi*, the *Panathanaistai*, the *Soteriastai Dios Xenistai Panathanaistai Lindiastai hoi syn Gai[o]i*, the *[Dios]Atabyriastai Agathodaimoniastai Philonieoi*, the *Dionysiastai Chairemonieoi* and the *koinon of Apollon Stratagios*: IG XII 1, 161.

15. A foreigner married with Thallo of Syria: a golden crown from the *Poseidoniastai and Asklapiastai*: IG XII 1, 164.

16. A foreigner from Laodikeia: a leaves crown from the *Isiastai*: IG XII 1, 165.

17. Korinthos of Samos: a leaves crown from the *Diosatabyriastai Agathodaimoniastai Philoneioi*: *Suppl. Epigr. Rhod.* I no. 17.
18. Philiskos of Antiocheia: a leaves crown from the *Haliastai Panathenaistai* and a golden crown from the *Panathenaistai Herakleistai*: *NS* 39.
19. A foreigner: two golden crowns from the *Aphrodisiastai Basileias Aphroditas koinon* and the *Aphrodisiastai Theuphaneioi*: Pugliesse Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 8.
20. Karpos of Galatia: a golden crown from the *Diossoteriastai*: Pugliesse Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 11.
21. Chrysippos of Bargylia: a golden crown from the *Diossoteriastai*: *I. Lindos* II, 683.
22. Iakchos of Alexandria (brother of Dionysodoros of Alexandria): a leaves crown from an unspecified *koinon*: Maiuri, *NS* 46.
23. Marsyas of Ephesos: a leaves crown from the *Herakleistai Poseidonaistai*: Maiuri, 1925-1926, no. 6.
24. Isidoros of Antiocheia: a leaves crown from the *Athanaistai Lindiastai Diodoreioi*: Maiuri, *NS*, 41.
25. Protos of Perinthios: two golden crown from the *Diodoreioi* and the *Diophanteioi*: Maiuri, *NS* 40 (on the correction Περιθίου, see Hiller von Gaertringen 1926, 197; De Sanctis 1926, 59).
26. Moschion of Phaselis: a golden crown from the *Samothraikiastai* and two leaves crowns from the *Panathenaistai* and the *Aphrodisiastai*: Maiuri, *NS* 43, 1st cent. BC.
27. Ktesiphon of Chersonesos: a golden crown from the *eranistai Samothraikiastai Aristobouliastai Hermaistai Panathenaistai hoi syn Ktesiphonti*: Kontorini 1989, 73, 10.
28. Hephaistion of Antiocheia: a leave crown from the *Meniastai*: *IG XII* 1, 917.
29. An unknown person: a golden crown from the *Dionysiastai Athanaistai Dios Atabyriastai Euphranoreioi hoi syn Athenaioi Knidioi*: *IG XII* 1, 937 (1st cent. BC).
30. Apollonios of Pergamon: a golden crown of ten staters from the *Sylleioi Lolleioi paideutai hoi syn Syllai*: *IG XII* 1, 918 (1st cent. BC).
31. An unknown person: a golden crown from an unnamed *koinon*, one of whose magistrates comes from Cyrene: *I. Rhod. Per.* 128 (120-51 BC).



32. Zenon of Selge: two golden crowns and two leaves crowns from the *Asklapiastai Theoneioi*: *I.Rhod.Per.* 169 (2nd cent. BC).
33. Alexandros of Kephallenia: a golden crown from the *Adoniastai Aphrodeisiastai Asklapiastai en Aulais*: *I.Rhod.Per.* 57 (2nd half of the 2nd cent. BC-1st half of the 1st cent. BC).
34. Epaphrodeitos of Cos: a golden crown from the *Heroistai Samothraikiastai*: *I.Rhod.Per.* 57 (2nd half of the 2nd cent. BC-1st half of the 1st cent. BC).
35. A foreigner from Pladasa: crowns from the *Aphrodisiastai* and the *Panathenaistai*: *IG XII 3*, 962 (Chalke).
36. An unknown person: a crown from the *Herakleotai* and the *Xouristai*: *IG XII 3*, 963 (Chalke).
37. the metic Euphrosynos of Idyma: three golden crown from the *Samothraikiastai Aphrodisiastai Borboritai*, a golden crown from the *Adoniastai [Aphrodisiastai] Asklapiastai Syroi*: *IG XII 3*, 6 (Syme, 1st cent. BC).
38. An Herakleot: a crown from the *koinon of the Aristobouliastai Soteriastai Hephaiastiastai Agathodaimoniastai Menekrateioi hoi syn Menekratei*, the *Diosoteriastai Zenoniastai*, the *Aphrodisiastai Epitynchanonteioi kai Aphrodisiastai Meneteioi* and the *Hermaistai Athanaistai Haliadai Haliastai*: Pugliesse Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 6 (1st cent. BC).
39. An unknown person: 31 golden crowns and 5 leaves crowns from at least 24 associations, private as well as and 'public': Pugliesse Carratelli 1939-1940, no. 19 (1st half of the 2nd cent. BC).

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arnaoutoglou, I. 2003, *Thusias heneka kai sunousias. Private Religious Associations in Hellenistic Athens*. Academy of Athens: Yearbook of the Research Centre for the History of Greek Law 37, 4. Athens: Academy of Athens.
- Avram, A. 2007, 'Some Thoughts about the Black Sea and the Slave Trade before the Roman Domination (6th-1st Centuries BC)', in V. Gabrielsen and J. Lund (eds.), *The Black Sea in Antiquity. Regional and Interregional Economic Exchanges*. Black Sea Studies 6, Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, pp. 239-251.
- Baslez, M.-F. 1977, *Recherches sur les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des religions orientales à Délos*. Collection de l'École normale supérieure de jeunes filles 9. Paris: École normale supérieure de jeunes filles.
- Baslez, M.-F. 1984, *L'étranger dans la Grèce antique*. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles lettres'.

- Baslez M.-F. and Briquel-Chatonnet, F. 1994, 'Un exemple d'intégration phénicienne au monde grec: Les Sidoniens au Pirée à la fin du IVE siècle', in *Atti del II Congresso internazionale di Studi Fenici e Punici (Roma, 9-14 novembre 1987)*, vol 1. Rome: Consiglio nazionale delle ricerche, pp. 229-240.
- Berges, D. (with contributions by V. Patsiada and J. Nollé) 1996, *Rundaltäre aus Kos und Rhodos*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann.
- Berthold, R. 1984, *Rhodes in the Hellenistic Age*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Bettali, M. 1995, *I mercenari nel mondo greco. I: dalle origine alla fine del V sec. a. C.* Studi e testi di storia antica 5. Pisa: Edizioni ETS.
- Blümel, W. 1991, *Die Inschriften der rhodischen Peraia*. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 38. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Rheinisch-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Bonn: R. Habelt.
- Bresson, A. 1997, 'Remarques préliminaires sur l'onomastique des esclaves dans la Rhodes antique', in M. Moggi, G. Cordiano and M. Pettinato (eds.), *Schiavi e Dipendenti nell'Ambito dell' "Oikos" e della "Familia"*. *Atti del XXII Colloquio GIREA, Pontignano (Siena), 19-20 novembre 1995*. Studi e testi di storia antica 8. Pisa: ETS, pp. 117-126.
- Bresson, A. 2001, 'Les monétaires rhodiens du II<sup>ème</sup> s. a.C. : onomastique et société', in A. Bresson and R. Descat (eds.), *Les cités d'Asie Mineure Occidentale au IIe siècle a.C.* Bordeaux: Editions Ausonius, pp. 197-211.
- Bresson, Alain. 2002, 'Italiens et Romains à Rhodes et à Caunos', in C. Müller and C. Hasenohr (eds.), *Les Italiens dans le monde grec, II<sup>ème</sup> siècle av. J.-C. - I<sup>er</sup> siècle ap. J.-C. Circulation, activités, intégration. Actes de la Table ronde École normale supérieure Paris 14-16 mai 1998*. BCH Suppl. 41. Paris-Athènes: École française, pp. 146-162.
- Bresson, A. 2004, 'Dédicaces de Lindos et de Rhodes pour Titus Flavius Aglôchartos', in L. Robert and S. Follet (eds.), *L'hellénisme d'époque romaine, nouveaux documents, nouvelles approches (I<sup>er</sup> s. a. C. - III<sup>e</sup> s. p. C.)*. *Actes du colloque international à la mémoire de Louis Robert, Paris, 7-8 juillet 2000*. Paris: De Boccard, pp. 225-232.
- Chaniotis, A. 1991, 'Vier kretische Staatsverträge. Verträge zwischen Apera und Kydonia, einer ostkretischen Stadt und Melos, Olus und Lyttos, Chersonesos und Rhodos', *Chiron* 21, 241-64.
- Couvenhes, J. C. and Heller, A. 2006, 'Les transferts culturels dans le monde institutionnel des cités et des royaumes à l'époque hellénistique', in J.-C. Couvenhes and B. Legras (eds.), *Transferts culturels et politique dans le monde hellénistique. Actes de la table ronde sur les identités collectives (Sorbonne, 7 février 2004)*. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne. pp. 16-52.
- Criscuolo, L. 1982, 'Nuove considerazioni sugli stranieri a Rodi: gli ΕΠΙΜΕΛΗΤΑΙ ΤΩΝ ΞΕΝΩΝ', *Epigraphica* 44, 135-147.
- De Sanctis, G. 1926, 'Epigraphica. V-VII', *RFIC* 54, 49-74.

- Durrbach F. and Radet, G.A. 1886, 'Inscriptions de la Pérée rhodienne', *BCH* 10, 245-69.
- Fabircius J. 1999, *Die hellenistischen Totenmahreliefs. Grabrepräsentation und Wertvorstellungen in ostgriechischen Städten*. Palmaubaum Texte 3. Studien zur antiken Stadt 3. Munich: Friedrich Pfeil.
- Feyel, C. 2009, ΔΟΚΙΜΑΣΙΑ. *La place et le rôle de l'examen préliminaire dans les institutions des cités grecques*. Association pour la diffusion de la recherche sur l'Antiquité. Travaux et mémoires. Études anciennes 36. Nancy-Paris: De Boccard.
- Filimonos, M. and Giannikouri A. 1999, 'Grave offerings of Rhodes : Pottery and Jewellery', in Gabrielsen 1999, 205-226.
- Finkielsztejn, G. 2001a, *Chronologie détaillée et révisée des éponymes amphoriques rhodiens de 270 à 108 av. J.-C., Premier bilan*. BAR IntSer 990. Oxford: David Brown Book Company.
- Finkielsztejn, G. 2001b, 'Politique et commerce à Rhodes au IIe siècle a.C.: le témoignage des exportations d'amphores', in A. Bresson and R. Descat (eds.), *Les cités d'Asie Mineure occidentale Occidentale au IIe siècle a.c.* Bordeaux: Editions Ausonius, pp. 181-196.
- Fishman, J.A. 1985, *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Fraser, P.M. 1977, *Rhodian Funerary Monuments*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gabrielsen, V. 1993, 'Rome and Rhodes after the Third Macedonian War', in P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannedstad, J. Zahle and K. Randsborg (eds.), *Center and Periphery in the Hellenistic World*. Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 4. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, pp. 132-161.
- Gabrielsen, V. 1994a, 'The Associations honouring Dionysodoros from Alexandria', *C&M* 45, 137-160.
- Gabrielsen, V. 1994b, 'The Status of *Rhodiioi* in Hellenistic Rhodes', *C&M* 43, 43-69.
- Gabrielsen V. 1994c, 'Subdivisions of the State and their decrees in Hellenistic Rhodes', *C&M* 45, 117-135.
- Gabrielsen, V. 1997, *The Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes*. Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 6. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Gabrielsen, V. (ed.) 1999, *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture and Society*. Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 9. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2009, 'Brotherhoods of Faith and Provident Planning: The non-Public Associations of the Greek World', in Malkin, Constantakopoulou and Panagopoulou 2009, 176-198.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2013 'The Navies of Classical Athens and Hellenistic Rhodes: An Epigraphic Comparison', in C. Brélaz and S. Fachard (eds.), *Pratiques militaires et art de la guerre dans le monde grec antique: études offertes à Pierre Ducrey à*

- l'occasion de son 75<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*. Revue des Études Militaires Anciennes 6. Paris: Éditions A et J. Picard, pp. 63-79.
- Gauthier, P. 1972, *Symbola, Les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques*. Annales de l'Est., Mémoire 42. Nancy: Université de Nancy II.
- Gauthier, P. 1985, *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*. BCH Suppl. 12. Athens: Ecole française d'Athènes, Paris: De Boccard.
- Green, N.L. 2002, *Repenser les migrations*. Le noeud gordien. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Guarducci, M. 1935, 'Note di antichità rodie, I: le ktoinai ; II: le synnomai', *Historia* 9, 420-435.
- Habicht, C. 1990, 'Ein kaiserzeitliches Familiendenkmal aus Lindos', *ZPE* 84, 113-120.
- Hatzopoulos C. 1973, *Personae collectivae nach attischen Recht*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Freiburg i. Br.
- Hiller von Gaertringen, F. 1896, 'Inscriptionen aus Rhodos', *MDAI(A)* 21, 39-66.
- Hiller von Gaertringen, F. and Saridakis, S. 1900, 'Inscriptionen aus Rhodos', *MDAI(A)* 25, 107-110.
- Hiller von Gaertringen, F. 1926, 'Nachtrag zu Maiuri, Nuova Silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos', *Gnomon* 2, 193-198.
- Hiller von Gaertringen, F. 1941, 'Rhodos', *RE* Suppl. V, 731-840.
- Hollinger, D. A. 1995, *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hommel, H. 1932, 'Metoikoi', *RE* XV.2, 1413-58.
- Ismard, P. 2010, *La cité des réseaux, Athènes et ses associations VIe-Ier siècle av. J.-C.* Publications de la Sorbonne: Histoire ancienne et médiévale 105. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.
- Jacopi, G. 1932, *Nuove Epigrafi dalle Sporadi Meridionali*. Rodi: Istituto storico-archeologico.
- Jones, C. P. 1992, 'Foreigners in a Hellenistic Inscription of Rhodes', *Tyche* 7, 123-32.
- Kaninia, E. 1994-95, 'Χρυσά στεφάνια από τη νεκρόπολη της αρχαίας Ρόδου', *AD* 49-50, 97-132.
- Kolobova, K.M. 1966, 'Les métèques dans la Rhodes hellénistique', *Vestnik Drevney Istorii* 92, 65-72.
- Konstantinopoulos, G. 1966, 'Rhodiaka I', *AD* 21A, 51-61.
- Kontorini, V. 1975, 'Les concours des grandes Erethimia à Rhodes', *BCH* 99, 97-117.
- Kontorini, V. 1983, *Inscriptions inédites relatives à l'histoire et aux cultes de Rhodes au IIe et au Ier s. av. J.-C.* Archaeologia transatlantica 6. Publications d'histoire de l'art et d'archéologie de l'Université catholique de Louvain 42. Rhodiaka

1. Institut supérieur d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art, Collège Érasme.  
Louvain-la-Neuve and Providence IR.
- Kontorini, V. 1989, *Anekdotas epigraphas Rhodou II (Inscriptions inédites de Rhodes II)*. Athens.
- Lambert, S.D. 1997, *Rationes centesimarum. Sales of Public Land in Lykourgan Athens*. Archaia Hellas 3. Amsterdam: Brill Academic Publication.
- Launey, M. 1987. *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques. Réimpression avec addenda et mise à jour, en postface par Yvon GARLAN, Philippe GAUTHIER, Claude ORRIEUX*, vol. 1, 2nd ed. Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d' Athènes et de Rome 169. Paris: De Boccard.
- Lévy, E. 1987, 'Métèques et droit de résidence', in R. Lonis, *L'étranger dans le monde grec. II actes du deuxième colloque sur l'étranger, Nancy, 19-21 septembre 1991*. Travaux et mémoires. Études anciennes 7. Nancy: Presses universitaires de Nancy, pp. 47-67.
- Lund, J. 1999, 'Rhodian Amphorae in Rhodes and Alexandria as Evidence of Trade', in Gabrielsen 1999, 187-204.
- Maillet, S. 2005, *The cult associations of foreigners in the region of Rhodes at the Hellenistic Age*. Ph.D. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Clermont-Ferrand.
- Maillet, S. 2009, 'Une association de sculpteurs à Rhodes au II<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C. : un cercle d'intégration à la société rhodienne', in L. Bodiou, V. Mehl, J. Oulhen, F. Prost and J. Wilgaux (eds.), *Chemin faisant. Mythes, cultes et société en Grèce ancienne. Mélanges en l'honneur de Pierre Brulé*. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, pp. 39-58.
- Maillet, S. 2012, 'Les associations à Cos', in P. Fröhlich and P. Hamon (eds.), *Groupes et associations dans les cités grecques (III<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J.-C. - II<sup>e</sup> siècle apr. J.-C.)*. Actes de la table ronde de Paris, INHA, 19-20 juin 2009. École pratique des études, science historique et philologiques III. Haute études du monde gréco-romain 49. Geneva: Librairie Droz, pp. 199-226.
- Maiuri, A. 1916, 'Nuove iscrizioni greche dalle Sporadi meridionali', *ASAA* 2, 133-179.
- Maiuri, A. 1921-1922, 'Un nuovo decreto di associazioni a Rodi', *ASAA* 3-4, 223-232.
- Maiuri, A. 1925-1926, 'Nuovi supplementi al « Corpus » delle iscrizioni di Rodi', *ASAA* 8-9, 313-322.
- Malkin, I., Constantakopoulou, C. and Panagopoulou, K. (eds.), *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean*. London and New York: Routledge
- Meyer, E. 1937, 'Peraia' (2), *RE* XIX 1, 560-582.
- Migeotte, L. 1992, *Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités grecques*. École pratique des hautes études 4<sup>e</sup> section. Sciences historiques et philologiques 3. Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 17. Genève and Québec: Droz.

- Migeotte, L. 1993, 'Une souscription de femmes étrangères', *BCH* 117, 349-358.
- Morelli, D. 1955, 'Gli stranieri in Rodi', *SCO* 5, 126-190.
- Morelli, D. 1959, *I culti in Rodi*, *SCO* 8. Pisa: Libreria Goliartica editrice.
- Oehler, J. 1907, 'Epimeletai', *RE* VI.1, 162-171.
- Oertel, F. 1921, 'Katoikoi', *RE* XI.1, 1-26.
- Osborne, M. J. 1976, 'Athenian Grants of Citizenship after 229 BC', *AncSoc* 7, 107-125.
- Osborne, M. J. 1981-83, *Naturalization in Athens: A corpus of Athenian decrees granting citizenship*. Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren 1. Brussels: AWLSK.
- Papachristodoulou, I. C. 1989, Οι αρχαίοι Ροδιακοί δήμοι. Ιστορική επισκόπηση: Η Ιαλυσία. Athens: Η Βιβλιοθήκη της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογική Εταιρείας 110. Η εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία (*E en Athenais Archaiologike Etaireia*).
- Papazoglou, F. 1997, *Laoi et paroikoi. Recherches sur la structure de la société hellénistique*. Centre d'études épigraphiques et numismatiques de la Faculté de philosophie de l'Université de Belgrad 1, Études d'Histoire Ancienne 1. Belgrade.
- Patsiada, V. 1996, 'Grabzirke und Grabmonumente', in Berges 1996, 84-109.
- Peek, W. 1969, *Inschriften von den dorischen Inseln*. Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-Historische Klasse 62, 1. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. 1939-1940, 'Per la Storia delle Associazioni in Rodi antica', *ASAA* n.s. 1-2, 145-200.
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. 1953, 'Sullo stato di cittadinanza in Rodi', *Studi in onore di Vincenzo Arangio-Ruiz nel XLV anno del suo insegnamento*, vol. 4. Naples: Jovene, pp. 485-491.
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. 1952-1954a, 'Supplemento epigrafico Rodio', *ASAA* n.s. 14-16, 247-316.
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. 1952-1954b, 'Tituli Camirenses Supplementum', *ASAA* n.s. 14-16, 211-246.
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. 1955-1956, 'Nuovo supplemento epigrafico Rodio', *ASAA* n.s. 17-18, 157-181.
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. 1986-1987, 'Epigrafi del tetrapilo di Rodi', *ASAA* n.s. 64-65, 267-93.
- Préaux, C. 1958, 'Les étrangers à l'époque hellénistique (Egypte-Délos-Rhodes)', in *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin pour l'histoire comparative des institutions*, vol. 9, Bruxelles: De Boeck Université, pp. 141-193.
- Rauh N. 1993, *The Sacred Bonds of Commerce: Religion, Economy, and Trade Society at Hellenistic Roman Delos, 166-87 B. C.* Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Rauh, N. 1999, 'Rhodes, Rome and the Eastern Mediterranean Wine Trade', in Gabrielsen 1999, 162-186.

- Robert, L. 1967, *Monnaies grecques, types, légendes, magistrats monétaires et géographie*. Centre de recherches d'histoire et de philologie de la IVe section de l'École pratique des hautes études 1. Hautes études numismatiques 2. Geneva: Droz.
- Robert, L. 1973, 'Sur des inscriptions de Délos', *Études déliennes, publiées à l'occasion du centième anniversaire de début des feuilles de l'École française d'Athènes à Délos*. BCH Suppl. 1. Paris: De Boccard, pp. 438-442.
- Robert, L. 1978, 'Héraklée et les Étoliens', *BCH* 102, 477-490.
- Sacco, G. 1980, 'Sul alcuni etnici di stranieri in Rodi', *Rendiconti Morali*, 25, 517-528.
- Schmidt, H. 1957, *Rom und Rhodos*. Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 40. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Schmitt-Pantel, P. 1982, 'Évergétisme et mémoire du mort. À propos des fondations de banquets publics dans les cités grecques à l'époque hellénistique', in G. Gnoli and J.-P. Vernant (eds.), *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*, Paris and Cambridge: Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme and Cambridge University Press, pp. 177-188.
- Segre, M. 1933, 'ΚΡΗΤΙΚΟΣ ΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ', *RFIC* 61, 365-392.
- Segre, M. 1936, 'Dedica votiva dell'equipaggio di una nava rodia', *Clara Rhodos* 8, 225-244.
- Sokolowski, F. 1969, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques*. École française d'Athènes, Travaux et mémoires des anciens membres étrangers de l'École et de divers savants 18. Paris: De Boccard.
- Tréheux, J. 1992, *Inscriptions de Délos, Index, tome I : Les étrangers à l'exclusion des Athéniens de la clérouquie et des Romains*. Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres. Paris: De Boccard.
- 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)*. Hephaistos 24. Hamburg: Augsburg Camelion-Verlag, pp. 113-150.
- Ustinova, Y. 2005, 'Lege et consuetudine: Voluntary cult associations in the Greek law', in V. Dasen and M. Piérart (eds.), *Ἱδία καὶ δημοσία. Les cadres 'privés' et 'publics' de la religion grecque. Actes du IXe colloque du Centre international d'Étude de la religion grecque antique (CIERGA), tenu à Fribourg 8 au 10 Septembre 2003*. Centre international d'étude de la religion grecque antique. Kernos Suppl. 15. Liège: Centre International d'Étude de la Religion Grecque Antique, pp. 177-190.
- Van Gelder, G. 1900, *Geschichte der alten Rhodier*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Vélissaropoulos, J. 1980, *Les nauclères grecs, recherches sur les institutions maritimes en*

*Grèce et dans l'Orient hellénisé*. Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 9.

Geneva and Paris: Droz and Minard.

- Vestersgaard, T. 2000, 'Milesian Immigrants in Late Hellenistic and Roman Athens', in G. J. Oliver (ed.), *The Epigraphy of Death, Studies in the History and Society of Greece and Rome*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, pp. 81-89.
- Vlassopoulos, K. 2009, 'Beyond and Below the Polis: Networks, Associations and the writing of Greek History', in Malkin, Constantakopoulou and Panagopoulou 2009, 12-23.
- Vreken, G.A.L. 1953, *De lege quadam Coorum*. Gronningen: M. de Waal.
- Wiemer, H.-U. 2002, *Krieg, Handel und Piraterie. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des hellenistischen Rhodos*. Klio. Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte, Beihefte, Neue Folge, 6. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Whithehead, D. 1977, *The ideology of the Athenian Metic*. Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society 4. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.



# ‘L’État intervint peu à peu’: State Intervention in the Ephesian ‘Bakers’ Strike’

*Jonathan S. Perry*

A comprehensive reconsideration or even a recasting of the interactions among State authorities—standing in for ‘the public’—and the non-public associations would seem a desirable goal for scholarly endeavours at present.<sup>1</sup> My own recent book touched on the connexions between associations and conceptualisations of Statism, particularly in Fascist Italy,<sup>2</sup> but I have expanded on these themes in a piece that has now appeared within an *Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World*, on the collegia in their wider contexts.<sup>3</sup> When I was introducing ‘collegia’ to a general readership, it occurred to me that the famous story of striking bakers in Ephesus should be incorporated, but I found it difficult to do so—beyond noting J.-P. Waltzing’s mention of the story and his all-too-predictable reaction to the notion of restive collegiati. In Waltzing’s time and place, fin-de-siècle, industrialised Liège, it was natural for someone of essentially bourgeois sensibilities to downplay the notion of strikes, with their latent or overt tendency toward violence, at least when negotiation alone does not lead to the optimal result.

The inadvisability of strikes was subsumed within Waltzing’s larger argument concerning the consequences of State intervention

---

1. I wish to express my sincerest thanks to Professor Gabrielsen for the honour of an invitation to speak in Copenhagen and for the opportunity to address certain points at greater length in this forum. Many thanks are also owed to the anonymous reviewer of this piece, for careful analysis and provocative questions, as well as to those who have heard versions of this paper in Copenhagen and Calgary, *inter alios*, Jesper Carlsen, Kasper Evers, Matthew Gibbs, Brent D. Shaw, Dorothy J. Thompson and Christian A. Thomsen.

2. Perry 2006, especially for the discussion of Fascist ‘Corporativismo’ in Chapter 3.

3. Perry 2011, 499–515.

in workers' assemblies and even, from time to time, their grumbling about such interventions. Drawing inspiration from industrial Belgium (which I investigated for my book's second chapter) Waltzing argued that it was in the best interests of both the power élite and the wider membership of trade unions to cooperate. In both Roman and modern cities it was preferable, he claimed, to expend energy in cooperation rather than conflict, with the classes trusting each other and bowing mutually to a higher purpose. In short, *collegia* were, in Waltzing's frequently—even repetitiously—expressed opinion, useful to the State, but only if they were encouraged to continue managing their financial houses as they saw fit, with very little or no interference from political authorities. In its turn, the State, at least until the third century CE, benefited from allowing the *collegia* to preserve their traditional freedoms; loyalty was engendered, and a rising tide lifted all boats. Wise emperors refrained from either micromanaging or overregulating the *collegia*, and workers, for their part, had little interest in protesting working conditions or behaving contumaciously to secure their basically reasonable advantages. By contrast, state intervention in Late Antiquity would leave in its wake the destruction of both the associations' liberties and their efficacy. Waltzing's vision, and especially the unwillingness of workers to strike, formed the standard lens through which organised labour was examined throughout much of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. For one example, Rostovtzeff commented, 'If strikes were infrequent, that was due to the low standard of industry and not to the docile mood of the workmen and to the employment of slaves.'<sup>4</sup> In 1963, MacMullen noted the paradox that, despite their 'extremely rare' presence in ancient sources, strikes are 'quite often mentioned in modern works'. Here, though, the reluctance to strike was explicable 'due to the existence of servile labor and due more especially to the highly organized and eventually compulsory form into which the state dragooned the labor force.'<sup>5</sup>

These themes of licence and suppression can, in their essential

---

4. Rostovtzeff 1957, I:350. Rostovtzeff was skeptical of the evidence collected by Buckler 1923 concerning strikes in the Empire; see extended note at II:621-622.

5. MacMullen 1963, 269.

formulation, be traced back to Waltzing's *Étude historique*. The section in which the so-called 'Bakers' Strike' text appears develops the 'Economic or Professional Purpose' which drew a collegium together. Waltzing essentially answers the question with a negative. Strikes are one example, to his thinking, of the general lack of attention paid to the practical details of the profession which had furnished the group's name. Waltzing notes that unions do not express, at least in extant sources, concerns about apprenticeship or quality control of the craft. 'La vie familiale' is all that motivated and sustained organisations of this sort, and a Princeps stood to gain loyal subjects by encouraging and not browbeating (or foot-tattooing) them. This conclusion rendered it difficult for Waltzing to explain the significant correspondence between Trajan and Pliny on the authorisation of collegia in Bithynia. For Waltzing, Trajan was, despite appearances, an emperor who wished to authorise collegia, especially those that were useful to the state and 'sans danger'.<sup>6</sup> In short, local conditions in Bithynia forced him to resist his natural and more generous impulses. Another text, first published in 1899 and incorporated into the later volumes of the *Étude historique*, seemed to imply that local conditions were not always favourable to Roman officials and that the placid surface of government could be disrupted by, at least, the hanging threat of collective action. This inscription, a copy of a letter written by the praefectus annonae around 200 CE to a provincial subordinate at Arles, notes that the 'navicularii marini' of the area have given indications that they will cease operations if their grievances are not addressed. Waltzing laid stress on the 'cessaturi' in the inscription, which in his estimation signaled that the threat had merely been posed and not yet put into effect.<sup>7</sup>

Given this line of argument, Waltzing was obliged to address a text that seemed to concern actual striking workers as more than a

---

6. Waltzing 1895-1900, I:123-128.

7. For the text and extensive commentary see Waltzing 1895-1900: III:526 and IV:616-623. The key phrase reads, *cum quadam denuntiatione cessaturi propediem obsequi[i], si permaneat iniuria*. Many thanks to Kasper Evers for drawing my attention to this document.

‘curious example’—and its recent publication, only a decade earlier, would probably have made its contents familiar to Waltzing’s readers. ‘Il serait intéressant,’ he observed, ‘de savoir si les travailleurs n’avaient jamais recours aux moyens violents et si les grèves, par exemple, étaient connues dans le monde romain. Les auteurs n’en parlent pas, mais l’épigraphie fournit un exemple curieux.... Cet édit prouve que les boulangers de Magnésie étaient associés et que l’association les avait mis en état d’affamer la ville et de troubler l’ordre.’<sup>8</sup> This stern reprimand addressed to ‘the bakers of Magnesia’ was first discovered in Magnesia on the Maeander and then published in *BCH* in 1883.<sup>9</sup> Until the 1910s, it was generally believed that the bakers were based at Magnesia, but the inscription was subsequently securely identified with Ephesus and has been interpreted in that civic context ever since. Fontrier also introduced in his *BCH* commentary the concept of ‘une grève des boulangers’.<sup>10</sup> As such, it has been adduced as an instance of resistance among workingmen, at least for some time and sufficiently to terrify the State into clamping down—or more accurately into threatening to do so in the future. The text has been published in many venues (though not always perfectly) and translated for many more. American students often encounter it when learning about collegia, since the text is included in the Lewis/Reinhold primary source reader used in ancient Roman history classrooms throughout the country.<sup>11</sup> In its original form (with some modifications) the text may be rendered thus:<sup>12</sup>

[...]δὲ καὶ κατὰ συνθήκην πα[ταγησ]άντων [.....]  
 λικ[.....]  
 [βαί]νειν ἐνίοτε τὸν δῆμον ἰς ταραχὴν καὶ θορύβους ἐνπίπτειν διὰ τὴν  
 σ[μικρο-?]

8. Waltzing 1895-1900, I:191-192.

9. Fontrier 1883.

10. *Ibid.*, 506: ‘Fin de l’édit d’un gouverneur romain adressé aux habitants de Magnésie à l’occasion d’une grève des boulangers de cette ville.’

11. Lewis and Reinhold 1990, II:250-251.

12. The text is adapted from Merkelbach 1978. Other publications include *SEG* 4.512 and *I.Eph* 215, as well as Buckler 1923.

- λογον καὶ ἀθρασίαν τῶν ἀρτοκόπων ἐπὶ τῇ ἀγορᾷ· στάσεων ἐφ’ οἷς ἐχρῆν  
[αὐ-]  
τοὺς μεταπεμφθέντας ἤδη δίκην ὑποσχεῖν· ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ τῇ πόλει συμφέ[ρον  
χρῆ]
- 5 τῆς τούτων τιμωρίας μᾶλλον προτιμᾶν, ἀναγκαῖον ἡγησάμην διατάγ[ματι]  
αὐτοὺς σωφρονίσαι· ὅθεν ἀπαγορεύω μῆτε συνέρχεσθαι τοὺς ἀρτοκ[ό-]  
πους κατ’ ἐταιρίαν μῆτε προεσθηκότας θρασύνεσθαι, πειθαρχεῖν δὲ π[άν-]  
τως τοῖς ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινῆ συμφέροντος ἐπιταττομένοις καὶ τὴν ἀ[ναγ-]  
καίαν τοῦ ἄρτου ἐργασίαν ἀνευδεῖ παρεῖχειν τῇ πόλει· ὡς ἂν ἄλλῃ τις αὐ-]  
10 τῶν τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦδε ἢ συνιών παρὰ τὰ διηγορευμένα ἢ θορύβου τινὸς [καὶ  
στά-]  
σεως ἐξάρχων, μεταπεμφθεὶς τῇ προσηκούσῃ τιμωρία κολασθῆ[σεται]  
ἂν δὲ τις τολμήσῃ τὴν πόλιν ἐνεδρεῦων ἀποκρύψαι αὐτόν, δεκνείφ[ίας  
ἐπὶ πο-]  
δὸς προσσημωθήσεται· καὶ ὁ τὸν τοιοῦτον δὲ ὑποδεξάμενος [τῆ]  
αὐτῇ τιμωρία ὑπεύθυνος γενήσεται....

[Thus it happens] at times that the people are plunged into trouble and tumults by the [petty?]

speaking and recklessness of the bakers in the agora, for which disturbances they ought already to have been hauled into court and subjected to judgement. Since, however, it is necessary to put the benefit to the city ahead of the punishment of these individuals, I deemed it a pressing matter to bring them to their senses with an edict. Wherefore I forbid the bakers to assemble in a faction or to be emboldened by their leaders, but rather to obey in every detail the measures that have been set in place for the common good and that it is their job to ensure that the city is sufficiently supplied with bread and not in need of it. From this time forward, if any of them should be caught in the act of assembling contrary to the regulations or heading up any tumult and disorder, he shall be hauled into court and punished with the appropriate penalty. Should anyone undertake to conceal himself and set upon the city unawares, he shall be branded on the [foot?] with the word “Decuria”. And the person who shelters such a man will be liable to the same penalty.

Nevertheless, it must be admitted from the start that this is a rather problematic text. It is fragmentary, with a missing right edge that

obscures crucial phrases at the end of each line, and various readings have been proposed and challenged throughout the century. Merkelbach gives a sense of the complexity involved, in his brief analysis of the text for *ZPE*, suggesting that it was originally composed in Latin and then translated into Greek.<sup>13</sup> Merkelbach complains of the needlessly convoluted grammar in the Greek, but one should note that there is also a small mistake in his edition: ‘κρύψαι’ should be ἀποκρύψαι’. Such a reading conforms with all the other versions and the original transcription of the text given in its 1883 publication.

In the remainder of this paper, I shall explore two points regarding this text and the wider ‘interests’ we may share with these Bakers. First, I shall examine the conclusions of the leading scholars who have written on the theme of strikes and the non-public associations, especially in light of the questions addressed elsewhere in this volume. Second, I wish to propose my own interpretation of the text based on some of its wording and the larger phenomenon of collegia-State interaction. In this portion of the paper, I shall also knead in commentary on Labour-State relations in the early decades of the twentieth century, seeing what new food for thought may arise.

From the outset, though, we should comment on some peculiarities of the text itself. Most striking is that the magistrate passing the edict is not named and that the governor seems simply to be protesting his unwillingness actually to inflict these penalties. In fact, he insists, he has been forced into drastic measures by the recklessness and stupidity of the bakers themselves.<sup>14</sup> ἀρτοκόποι also seems an odd choice, rather than ἀρτοποιοί, but bakers’ associations

---

13. Merkelbach 1978, 165: ‘Dieser Erlass des Statthalters ist offenbar zunächst lateinisch abgefasst und dann ins Griechische übersetzt, und solche Texte sind bekanntlich oft der Schrecken des Schreckens für den griechischen Epigraphiker (jedenfalls für mich), weil die Regeln der griechischen Grammatik nur noch eingeschränkt gelten und man oft den Sinn erst erkennen kann, wenn man den auf dem Stein erhaltenen griechischen Text probeweise ins Lateinische zurückübersetzt.’

14. On the – for the most part and officially – cordial and quiescent interactions between Roman authorities and local government in Ephesus, see Dmitriev 2005, 265-286.

were not uncommon in Asia Minor. There is an epigraphic reference to a ‘collegium pistorum’ in Thyatira,<sup>15</sup> as well as a dedicatory inscription made to a prominent local élite by ‘οι ἀρτοκόποι’ in that city.<sup>16</sup> The recipient (together with his extended family) of this lengthy honour dating to the second half of the third century is recorded as C. Julius Julianus Tatianus, and among his various listed offices is agoranomos. Perhaps his service in this office had brought him into contact with bakers in the agora, a factor that also seems to appear in the Ephesian document? Dittmann-Schöne includes one other reference to bakers in her collection of professional associations in the cities of imperial Asia Minor, specifically a simple marker ἀρτοκόπων Μιλησίων preserved in Didyma.<sup>17</sup> She interprets this as indicating ‘einen größeren reservierten Verkaufsbereich in der Markthalle von Didyma’ for the bakers in neighbouring Miletus. Accordingly, references to other bakers’ organisations in the surrounding cities would suggest cooperation—at least in official terms—with civic authorities.

In a related concern, it is also unclear from the text whether the bakers in question are actual workers in the trade or perhaps the owners of baking establishments in the city. One thinks particularly of Eurysaces, the freedman baker who had come up in the world sufficiently to celebrate his accomplishments with an impressive monument near the Porta Maggiore.<sup>18</sup> However, there is certainly room here to accommodate bakers at a lower end of the industry within Ephesus. A similar difficulty is posed by those identified in a series of inscriptions from Roman Italy by the seemingly simple term ‘lanarius/lanarii’. While one might conclude with Waltzing that they were ‘ouvriers en laine’, at what stage of production should we place them? H. von Petrikovits has observed that, because Latin terms do not always distinguish ‘producers’ and ‘salesmen’ in a particular industry, the lanarii could have played either role,<sup>19</sup> and Su-

15. Among others, *CIG* 3495.

16. The text has been published as *TAM* V.2, 966, and it has been tabulated as ‘III.1.18’ in Dittmann-Schöne 2001, 185.

17. *I. Didyma* 522; Dittmann-Schöne’s II.6.1, p. 172.

18. A systematic illustrated study of the monument may be found in Petersen 2003.

19. von Petrikovits 1981, 69 and 100.

zanne Dixon explains more succinctly, ‘The word tells us only that they did something with wool’.<sup>20</sup> While the textile industry may have been, in Dennis Kehoe’s valuation, ‘a basic component of the economic life of many ancient cities’, the fundamental unit of production in the industry was small-scale and within the reach of many civic entrepreneurs. ‘The major capital outlay for this industry, the purchase of a loom, was relatively modest, and it seems likely that many weaving establishments consisted of little more than a space within a private house’.<sup>21</sup> In his analysis of professional textile-production and textile-sales associations in imperial Asia Minor, Pleket found it similarly frustrating to determine whether they were primarily designed for ‘Geselligkeit oder Zünfte’, given the impossibility of knowing which groups, specifically, are represented in the documents. Unlike guild documents from the Middle Ages, the details of the production, maintenance of standards of production, expectations of salespeople, etc. simply do not appear in texts from this period.<sup>22</sup>

Moreover, the severity of the penalty also leaps out at one, but observe that the details are based on a restoration of the text. As it stands, the precise word or formula to be branded on the foot (which is also restored) is obscure. Analysing the phenomenon of branding and tattooing, C.P. Jones concluded that the evidence for branding in the Roman period was ‘ambiguous’, although he did not address this document. Cicero had joked that a ‘K’ for ‘kalumniator’, a false accuser, might be ‘attached’ to the heads of his enemies, making them unlikely to forget the ‘Kalends’ in future. Nevertheless, this penalty—another one threatened but not carried out?—‘could be tattooed as well as branded’.<sup>23</sup> Even if the full word were to be incised into the violator’s flesh, there seems to have been confusion concerning how to spell ‘decuria’.<sup>24</sup> And must it be the foot? This seems in-

---

20. Dixon 2000-2001, 9.

21. Kehoe 2007, 564-565.

22. Pleket 2008, 537-538.

23. Jones 1987, 153.

24. Buckler 1923 comments on the peculiarity of the language here, suggesting that this is a clumsy transliteration from the Latin that might have been placed on a branding-iron. He also speculates, comparing a line of Herodas, that the ‘branding’



dicated by the delta that opens the next line of text, but perhaps another word would fill the space as effectively? As I reconstruct it, it should be the speakers' mouths that have offended, but, given the state of the document, this is difficult to prove.

Nevertheless, the most curious item of all is the absence of any indication of the specific grievance that has initiated this shadowy 'grève'. W.H. Buckler, in his 1923 analysis of 'Labour Disputes in the Province of Asia', drew attention to this odd fact in his commentary on the inscription, one of (merely) four he could muster for the purpose.<sup>25</sup> Beginning the piece with a comment that we know too little about the lives of artisans in Greco-Roman towns, and that evidence 'as to their conflicts with employers [is] surprisingly meagre,' he proceeds to detail the tiny number of inscriptions, scattered between the second and fifth centuries, that give any indication of workers' collective action. Choosing to leave aside Egypt, 'owing to the peculiarity of its labour conditions',<sup>26</sup> Buckler could find only four instances of actual labour unrest, codified in four inscriptions from Asia province. Our text is the first of these, and the final one is a declaration of contract by a Sardinian builders' union from 459 CE.<sup>27</sup> The article is organised as an examination of each text and then a summary of general conclusions. He begins by noting the modern parallels, while also cautioning against the temptation of pursuing these too closely: 'For convenience "union" will here denote an association of artisans, and "strike" a deliberate abandonment of work by any group of workers, but these terms are not meant to imply that a union or a strike was in the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> century what is connoted in the 20<sup>th</sup> by the same word.' In short, he argues,

---

might actually have been a tattoo applied with needles and ink. In any event, 'Here it was doubtless an official device for identifying a dangerous character.' (p. 46).

25. Buckler 1923.

26. On the large number of associations in Egypt and evidence of their activities, see especially Arnaoutoglou 2005.

27. Buckler's analysis of this document has been superseded by Garnsey 1998. Garnsey questions Buckler's assertion of an actual union reflected in the text and the 'pay scale' for builders Buckler detected in it, and he goes on to mine the document for information concerning how 'good' business was for builders, even at this late date.

‘we shall do well to approach our texts with scepticism, and to refrain from reading into them modern ideas.’<sup>28</sup> Buckler also makes the important observation (p. 29) that ‘as a rule only things of good report were commemorated in stone’. Because labour disputes were likely to have been regarded as ‘discreditable’, their absence in the inscriptional record may be explained in simple terms. In my article for the *Oxford Handbook* I also drew attention to this point: a lacuna of inscriptional commentary on disputes and economic resolutions by an association’s membership may be nothing more than a reasonable attempt to avoid the prying eyes of the élite.<sup>29</sup> Why, after all, should they have advertised their internal deliberations on stone?

Buckler then provides a text, with translation, coupled with a series of pointed questions, including, ‘Were the workmen, as in modern cases, opposed to the master-bakers, or had all bakery workers been protesting against some grievance affecting their trade as a whole? Was it Employees vs. Employers, or Bakers vs. The Authorities? Was the friction purely industrial?’<sup>30</sup> Note here that Buckler has underscored the problem of identifying which class was represented by the bald category ‘Bakers’, at least in the authority’s understanding of the term. Furthermore, he adds: ‘Three points are noteworthy: (1) the offenders were not punished, but merely warned what punishment to expect in case of any future disobedience; (2) no penalty was threatened in the event of another strike; (3) while the bakers’ union was forbidden to hold seditious meetings (ll. 7-8, 11), there was no ban upon its ordinary business and no threat of its dissolution.’ This final point is quite significant and has often been ignored. The governor presumably had it in his power to disband the association since, as Buckler observes, all industrial unions except three (regarded as ‘vitaly necessary to the city’s well-being’) would be dissolved for disorderly conduct at Alexandria in 215 (p. 33, n.1).

---

28. Buckler 1923, 27-28.

29. Perry 2011, 503.

30. Buckler 1923, 32.

Nevertheless, on this occasion, the authority merely chose to warn the group and perhaps, specifically, its leadership. Why did he restrain his hand? Buckler does not answer this question directly, but his summary of the findings from all four inscriptions reveals his general reaction. According to his analysis, labour strikes 'occurred from time to time' and, while '[t]heir causes and their objects remain obscure', they 'proceeded unchecked by the authorities' provided, naturally, that they were 'not disorderly.'<sup>31</sup> But at what point does a work stoppage constitute a threat to the general welfare? Bakers are, of course, in a position to cause real suffering among the populace rather quickly. But the precise means by which they would 'suspend work' would also be a function of their standing in the profession. Does it necessarily mean they would stop baking bread? Or would they simply disrupt the food supply by other means, perhaps by choking off transportation from outside the city, raising prices summarily, or—most likely of all—creating scarcity by hoarding their product and driving prices up?

Dio Chrysostom reacted to threats from his neighbours in Prusa by protesting that he had not hoarded grain and thereby contributed to a food shortage.<sup>32</sup> Imogen Dittmann-Schöne quotes this document and suggests that the so-called 'Bakers' Strike' here might better be described as 'eine Arbeitsverweigerung' ('a refusal to work/suspension of work') or an 'Arbeitsunterbrechung' ('interruption of work') rather than a 'Streikaktion', strictly speaking.<sup>33</sup> Regardless of the precise means of disrupting the chain of bread, at the milling, baking, or distribution phases, it is not difficult to imagine a riot ensuing in short order. In his study of the food supply in the Roman Empire, Garnsey notes that this unnamed official 'could hardly ignore' the riots 'into which Ephesus was plunged as a result of a bakers' strike.' (Notice that he has presumed a riot has actually taken place, which the text does not explicitly state.) Under such circumstances, 'state intervention' would clearly be warranted in or-

---

31. *Ibid.*, 45.

32. Compare Erdkamp 2008, on other interventions by state authorities in Asia Minor in the event of grain shortages, pp. 116-118.

33. Dittmann-Schöne 2001, 71 and 143.

der to prevent further disruption to the supply of a critical resource.<sup>34</sup> One can see here the temptation that lay before a government official—‘nationalising’ the group in the interest of ‘public utility’ would squelch private initiative, but it would also ensure the continuation of one of the city’s most important supply lines.

This is the theme to which Ramsay MacMullen turned in the 1960s, first in an article and then in his *Enemies of the Roman Order*. In his ‘Note’ on Roman strikes, MacMullen broadens the definition of ‘strike’ considerably, to include rural work stoppages, work abandonment and other instances of labour unrest, for which there is a great deal of evidence beyond the four inscriptions Buckler had plucked out. One thinks here of a parallel development in the history of slavery, as scholars of antebellum American slavery and K. R. Bradley were steadily expanding the notion of ‘resistance’ in the period.<sup>35</sup> A work slow-down, theft, willful destruction of property, running away, etc. all constituted options of resistance, and a slave revolt, or a workers’ riot, may not have been the only—or even the preferred—means of expressing dissatisfaction with working conditions.

MacMullen stresses the importance of the chronological framework in evaluating the text. It was precisely in the second century (our text seems to date from late in the second century) that the state was taking the first tentative steps toward intervening in collegia—a move that would culminate in the tying of workers to their associations under direct state control in Late Antiquity. This is, of course, basically Waltzing’s argument, but MacMullen puts it colourfully here: ‘The state, in trying to make the fullest use of these resources, had to apply both the stick and the garrote, compulsion and concession, and of these, both (strangely) strengthened the condition of labor so far as economic factors permitted. Compulsion produced organization, which in turn could be used to extract

---

34. Garnsey 1988, 259.

35. Bradley 1994, especially Chapter 6: ‘Resisting Slavery’. For an assessment of the ‘goldenage’ of American scholarship on antebellum slavery and its impact on his own thinking, see Bradley 2008.

further concessions.’<sup>36</sup> These findings are reinforced in his book on social unrest in the Empire generally. Here, he avers:<sup>37</sup>

The rarity of this recourse shows how wide a gulf separates ancient “trade associations” or “unions” from their modern equivalents.... If anything can be said on the basis of the evidence—a dozen strikes scattered over four centuries—it is only this: that their potential as a weapon of aggression was never realized, in drawn-out campaigns, and that their defensive use, such as it was, appeared more clearly in the period when, by the government’s own policy, the internal organization of societies had been more firmly articulated.

Thus, MacMullen stresses internal organisation as a precondition for coordinated labour action. Furthermore, ‘Precisely these groups of workers came handiest to the ambition of a demagogue, presumably because they were the best regimented and most responsible to their own leaders; while, in descending order of notoriety, weavers or builders or the poor peasants likewise compacted by law into hereditary professions to serve the public interest used their sense of solidarity to go out on strike.’<sup>38</sup> Accordingly, the State had only itself to blame: workers had been ineffective in resisting their betters until they possessed a rigid internal hierarchy that could coordinate their activities vis-à-vis an aggressively interventionist State.

Dittmann-Schöne drew a similar conclusion in her analysis of the invariably symbiotic relationship between professional associations and government authorities in Asia Minor, while also underscoring the inadvisability of appropriating comparative evidence from more recent times. Unable to coordinate their activity across great distances due to difficulties of communication, it is impossible to imagine, in her estimation, a concentrated strike action, such as one might see today or even in the late nineteenth or twentieth centuries. We should not envision representatives from local unions sent to some central steering committee elsewhere, as members of

---

36. MacMullen 1963, 270.

37. MacMullen 1966, 176.

38. *Ibid.*, 178.

city associations were instead ‘selbständig’ units incapable of inter-city, regional or provincial coordination.<sup>39</sup>

The same concepts of State and association interaction emerge, further developed, in the most recent study of this text, by Ilias Arnaoutoglou, in an important 2002 article composed of two parts.<sup>40</sup> The first stresses the proliferation of *collegia* in the East, making a significant complement to most work (like my own) that centres upon Rome and the Western provinces. This portion is a chronological survey of the evidence for *collegia* in the East, demonstrating the relative freedom of action accorded to these associations, without interference from Roman authorities. He then turns to the implementation of Roman law in regard to *collegia* in the East. The Trajan-Pliny correspondence is convincingly explained here as a reaction to ‘the recent, violent past of the *provincia* Bithynia-Pontus’. In other words, local conditions and Trajan’s prejudice against this particular province influenced his decision and only in this specific respect. I would add something more: perhaps Trajan’s exasperation with yet another letter from Pliny has prompted him to take a firmer line?

Nevertheless, Trajan’s complaint about how all associations, regardless of their stated purpose, ultimately devolve into ‘hetairiae’ is a significant one. Arnaoutoglou’s article argues that the Ephesian text is not a blanket ban on associations but rather, as in Bithynia, a reaction to a local problem with merely short-term application. Also it is clear that the governor is targeting the leadership of the organisation and commenting on the ‘embryonic internal organisation’ within it. The baker strike inscription remains a crucial piece of evidence, as it remains, in this analysis, ‘Our sole testimony for a Roman intervention in associative life’.<sup>41</sup> Focusing new attention on

---

39. Dittmann-Schöne 2001, 71-72.

40. In a recent piece, Arnaoutoglou 2011 has also dealt with the issue of ‘sociability’ vs. ‘guild’ concerns by suggesting that associations might have pursued both social and professional interests simultaneously. Their interests may not be precisely what we, or even medieval guild-members, would consider strictly ‘economic’, in the sense of preserving their crafts. However, they may have been economically driven, as they attempted to enmesh themselves in the economic life of their cities.

41. Arnaoutoglou 2002, 39.

the inscription and comparing the riots accompanying Paul's visit to Ephesus, Arnaoutoglou posits that the unnamed Roman administrator reacted so strongly to the 'unrest' occasioned by the bakers because of the group's 'embryonic, if not non-existent, internal organisation'. In this sense, and building upon the findings of van Nijf concerning the willingness of collegial leaders to imbibe existing notions of social hierarchy, the bakers' associations were being 'used to exercise disciplinary power over their misbehaving members' (p. 43). Thus, the official lost nothing in his action—since he hoped to reduce 'the threat of social unrest due to the activity of associations, without any immediate cost to the Roman administration.' (43)

I have made a similar argument concerning the co-opting of collegial élites by state élites in my *Oxford Handbook* chapter. The classic works on Roman social relations (especially those by MacMullen and Alföldy) reinforced the social aspects of a complex dance between collegium members and their social betters. As suggested by the pioneering works in this field, there would seem to be two especially productive and illuminating avenues to pursue, specifically in respect to the collegia. First, we might ask how the members of these associations created their own 'mini-societies', forming new networks of social interaction among these generally lower-stratum individuals. And second, we might explore how these societies interacted with other similar groupings in their cities, and particularly with political elites, who also possessed most of the social goods to which the urban poor aspired. If we concede that the collegia were organised for broad social advancement, rather than for narrow financial gain, how did they set out to accomplish this and, more importantly, what concessions were made by both parties to the exchange? The best approaches to the available evidence have sought to combine two basic methods, evaluating on the one hand the interior and on the other hand the exterior dynamics relating to collegium members. Work by John Patterson, Onno van Nijf (especially), and Koen Verboven emphasises the legitimacy of this approach.<sup>42</sup> Accordingly, collegial rituals and meetings reinforced existing pat-

---

42. Patterson 2006, 262f; van Nijf 1997 and van Nijf 2003; Verboven 2007.

terns of organisation, and, by mimicking the epigraphic habits of their social betters and of State officials, the leaders of collegia ‘internalised and reproduced’ the hierarchy of their cities.

I would suggest, however, that there is another, far less optimistic, but perhaps more realistic, way to evaluate the interaction of collegia and socio-political élites. If the members of a collegium went out of their way to imitate the élite, might this not be perceived as an instance of their subjection to the local hierarchy, and an attempt by that hierarchy to reinforce the lower status of the group? Consider, for example, an intriguing historical parallel that van Nijf has introduced (in a 2002 Festschrift article in honour of H.W. Pleket)<sup>43</sup> illuminating the possible connexions between private associations and civic hierarchies. Comparing the Dutch civic guards (the ‘schutters’) of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, he concluded that membership in groups of this sort provided an outlet for self-expression and ‘a focus for their sociability’ for men of middle rank, who were effectively forbidden access to the higher reaches of the civic aristocracy. However, by shifting our focus and evaluating this interaction from the top down, one might conclude that the political élite had other motives in mind while allowing this sociable group a wide berth. Seen from this angle, it is particularly telling that city authorities offered the schutters subsidies for clothes, sashes and drink, on the occasions of their parades (p. 321). One might wonder whether these concessions were designed deliberately to stress their subordinate relation to the State, in case their sociability made them think too much of themselves. Pleket himself offered a pleasing image of the status of collegial aspirations and their limits in his 2008 article on this sort of ‘sociability’. While the associations were keen to be considered an element of a staid, quiescent political structure, they were actually operating ‘in der “grauen Zone”’ between the civic élite and the upper reaches of ‘the people’.<sup>44</sup>

To illuminate this grey zone somewhat, I would point out an alternative path to the bakers’ edict. The tone of the magistrate’s decision, and the specific punishments he threatens to mete out, indi-

---

43. van Nijf 2002.

44. Pleket 2008, 540.



cate that he has detected a complex internal organisation in the bakers' associations, and that he is as a result deliberately targeting the groups' officers. He contrasts those who would assemble the restive bakers and stir them up with insidious speeches with those who, like himself, are charged with seeing to the 'common' good of the city, appealing to the rank-and-file membership to distance themselves from their leaders. Protesting that he is personally reluctant to antagonise the bakers, the administrator claims he is only attempting to render them wiser with his actions. Thus, the opposite of wisdom would be to listen to any speeches proposing a work stoppage, which would never be in the community's, or even the bakers', best interests, especially over the long term.

By my reading, the text of the inscription deals deliberately with the notion of political *speech*, rather than with any economic or even social actions that might be taken by the membership. The image that has risen to the fore of the governor's mind is that of the speaker haranguing an audience of workers, whipping them up into a frenzy that could be ungovernable—even by the collegial leadership. Along these lines, note that the word *σύλλογον* has been restored, but there have been other plausible candidates. Wilhelm had suggested *σικρολόγον*, thus 'recklessness in complaints about trifling matters'.<sup>45</sup> Buckler agreed with Calder's proposal of *σκαϊολόγον*, citing a parallel case in the *Book of the Prefect*, rendering it something like 'recklessness in evil speaking'.<sup>46</sup> Regardless of the precise restoration, one should pay close attention to the notion of political speech here. Notice the tone of the words used throughout the text, like *ταραχή* and *θόρυβος* (used twice). The Liddell and Scott compares the Latin 'tumultus', and cites examples of both words in political contexts: Plutarch's *Life of Caesar* for *ταραχή* and Thucydides for *θόρυβος*.<sup>47</sup> The sound of the word is the rumble of the crowd, inflamed by the speaker, and preparing for action as a result of what they have heard. It is probably important, in this context, to remember that the government official is specifically anxious to avoid un-

---

45. Merkelbach 1978, 165.

46. Buckler 1923, 46.

47. Liddell, Scott and Jones 1976, s.v. 'ταραχή' and 'θόρυβος'.

rest 'in the agora'. Perhaps he fears disruptive speech in a part of the city accustomed to forensic exercises of a flammable type? If this were the case, then threatening the speaker who roused the more docile members of his group into action, especially in the public square, would seem a logical approach. Accordingly, then, it was in the governor's interest to detach the average collegiatus from the organisational élite. In spite of his stated reluctance, he really is targeting these dangerous speakers, and he wants to make sure that the other bakers recognise that he is on their side.

Thus, collegial association may have been a tool, not created but ultimately wielded by the State, in order to organise and control a potentially restive urban population, engendering loyalty, of a sort, in the process. These lessons were not lost on the government of Fascist Italy: throughout the country, 'Dopolavoro' organisations were instituted, to provide relaxation, moral uplift and, of course, ideological indoctrination 'after work'.<sup>48</sup> One might compare the 'clubs' of employees that are sometimes formed by a modern corporation, perhaps in order to divert attention from a dwindling pot of resources and to improve—or to monitor?—staff morale. One wonders how much consolation such associations can provide as the Domitianic thunderbolts of lay-offs assault a present-day corporation.

As is my wont, I think a further detour into modern historiography is in order, specifically to the early decades of the twentieth century. In his famous *The Ancient Lowly*, published in 1900, C. Osborne Ward commented that the second-century bakers were not 'lawless and dangerous', promoting no 'bread riot', but merely 'a strike, such as frequently occur among the trade unions now.'<sup>49</sup> Waltzing seemed, in his estimation, 'to think this strike of the bakers an inimical onslaught against good order because it was the plea of the governor to suppress it with a violent hand, in order that the inhabitants might be furnished their bread with regularity. We are inclined to think that the supply of bread for this city might have

---

48. On the Dopolavoro and other institutions of 'leisure' in Fascist Italy, see especially DeGrazia 1981.

49. Ward 1900: II:85, with n. 4.

been a public function for there was no other source whereby to supply them.' Several writers in the early part of the last century thought that labour and government had complementary interests, yet both needed to preserve their freedom of action in order to realise them most effectively.

This leads one to Father T.A. Finlay, a Jesuit priest and 'economist' who commented on this incident in a 1911 speech. Finlay was born in Dublin in 1848, in the midst of the Famine, joined the Jesuit order and eventually became Chair of Political Economy at the National University of Ireland and President of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland, between 1911 and 1913. He retired in 1930 and lived on another decade, during which he was fêted by an annual lecture. His obituary insists that Father Finlay rigorously applied economic principles, but always within a Christian framework. As a committed Christian (and not as a Marxist, presumably) his approach to 'political economy' inevitably hinged on ethical concerns. The Society he addressed had been founded in 1847, to study, especially, the effects of the Famine and to make recommendations to the government to ameliorate living conditions for Ireland's poor. As the organisation's President, he addressed the Society on 28 November 1911, incorporating the striking bakers into his analysis. Strikes were rare in the Empire, he conceded, but that fact should not obscure the legitimate aspirations of working people, since the securing of patronage was also, in its way, a means of obtaining leverage: 'To protect their interests the unions adopted, as a rule, a more effectual and less dangerous policy: they placed themselves under the patronage of some man of high rank and potent influence; they paid him honour during his life by erecting statues and other memorials to perpetuate his fame, and in return they enjoyed his protection while he lived, and often benefited by substantial bequests after his death.'<sup>50</sup> This yields a solution that sounds a great deal like Corporatism, organising labour and employers into a seamless mechanism striving for the benefit of all: 'To fulfil its beneficent functions adequately it [the Labour Association] must

---

50. Finlay 1911/12: 513. Further on the Reverend Finlay, see G. O'Brien's obituary, *The Economic Journal* 50.197 (1940): 157-159.

be free. But free with an ordered freedom, with a liberty which cannot be abused to the prejudice of the general well-being.' (p. 522).

Nevertheless, the 1910s witnessed another conceptualisation of 'the general well-being', and an utterly novel approach to the 'old relations of human sympathy and Christian kindness between master and man.' This rebellion, perhaps as in second-century Asia Minor, hinged on an isolated speaker upon whom an agitated group could fixate. Let us compare a scene from the Smolny Institute for Girls in St. Petersburg, which had become the headquarters of the Bolsheviks in 1917 and would serve for the planning of the October coup. (It is now the office of the city's mayor.) A remarkable moment in Lenin's—and Trotsky's—life occurred in 1917 when Lenin came to address the assembly, which was described as being in a 'tumultuous' mood. Trotsky's rendering of the scene stresses the spellbinding quality of Lenin's performance and his uncanny ability to connect with a crowd:<sup>51</sup>

Lenin, whom the Congress has not yet seen, is given the floor for a report on peace. His appearance in the tribune evokes a tumultuous greeting. The trench delegates gaze with all their eyes at this mysterious being whom they had been taught to hate and whom they have learned without seeing him to love. Now Lenin, gripping the edges of the reading stand, let little winking eyes travel over the crowd as he stood there waiting, apparently oblivious to the long-rolling ovation, which lasted several minutes. When it finished, he said simply, 'We shall now proceed to construct the socialist order.'

And in this respect, at least, there is a fortuitous København connexion. The Workers' Museum in central Copenhagen was once guarded by a statue of Lenin, but, succumbing to the protests of the past national government, it has been moved to the back of the museum. Could it be the case that Lenin, like a tumultuous baker, still possesses such power nearly a century later?

---

51. Trotsky 2008, 853-854.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arnaoutoglou, I. 2011, 'Craftsmen Associations in Roman Lydia—A Tale of Two Cities?' *AncSoc* 41, 257-290.
- Arnaoutoglou, I. 2005, 'Collegia in the Province of Egypt in the First Century AD', *AncSoc* 35, 197-216.
- Arnaoutoglou, I. 2002, 'Roman Law and *collegia* in Asia Minor', *RIDA* 49, 27-44.
- Bradley, K. 2008, 'Roman Slavery: Retrospect and Prospect', *Canadian Journal of History/Annales canadiennes d'histoire* 43, 478-500.
- Bradley, K. 1994, *Slavery and Society at Rome*. Key themes in ancient history. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buckler, W.H. 1923, 'Labour Disputes in the Province of Asia', in W.H. Buckler and W.M. Calder (eds.), *Anatolian Studies, Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay*. Publications of the University of Manchester 160. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 27-50.
- De Grazia, V. 1981, *The Culture of Consent: Mass Organization of Leisure in Fascist Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dittmann-Schöne, I. 2001, *Die Berufsvereine in den Städten des kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasiens*. Theorie und Forschung. Geschichte. Regensburg: Roderer Verlag.
- Dixon, S. 2000-2001, 'How do you count them if they're not there? New perspectives on Roman cloth production', *Opuscula Romana* 25-26, 7-17.
- Dmitriev, S. 2005, *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Erdkamp, P. 2008, 'Grain funds and market intervention in the Roman world', in R. Alston and O.M. van Nijf (eds.), *Feeding the Ancient Greek City*. Groningen-Royal Holloway studies on the Greek city after the Classical Age 1. Leuven: Peeters, pp. 109-125.
- Finlay, T.A. 1911, 'Labour Associations in their Relation to the State', President's Address Read on November 28th 1911. *Journal of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland* 12.92, 511-522.
- Fontrier, A.M. 1883, 'Inscriptions d'Asie Mineure. Philadelphie et Magnésie du Méandre', *BCH* 7, 501-506.
- Garnsey, P. 1998, 'An Association of Builders in Late Antique Sardis', in P. Garnsey and W. Scheidel (eds.), *Cities, Peasants and Food in Classical Antiquity: Essays in Social and Economic History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 77-87.
- Garnsey, P. 1998, *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses to Risk and Crisis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, C.P. 1987, 'Stigma: Tattooing and Branding in Graeco-Roman Antiquity', *JRS* 77, 139-155.

- Kehoe, D.P. 2007, 'The early Roman empire: Production', in W. Scheidel, I. Morris and R. Saller (eds.), *The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 543-569.
- Lewis, N. and Reinhold, M. 1990, *Roman Civilization: Selected Readings*. 3rd edn, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Liddell, H.G., Scott, R. and Jones, H.S. 1976, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Abridged from Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- MacMullen, R. 1966, *Enemies of the Roman Order: Treason, Unrest, and Alienation in the Empire*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- MacMullen, R. 1963, 'A Note on Roman Strikes', *CJ* 58: 6, 269-271.
- Merkelbach, R. 1978, 'Ephesische Parerga (18): Der Bäckerstreik', *ZPE* 30, 164-165.
- Patterson, J.R. 2006, *Landscapes and Cities: Rural Settlement and Civic Transformation in Early Imperial Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Perry, J.S. 2011, 'Organized Societies: Collegia', in M. Peachin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World*. Oxford Handbooks. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 499-515.
- Perry, J.S. 2006, *The Roman Collegia: The Modern Evolution of an Ancient Concept*. Mnemosyne, Bibliotheca Classica Batava, Suppl. 277. Leiden: Brill Academic Press.
- Petersen, L.H. 2003, 'The Baker, His Tomb, His Wife, and Her Breadbasket: The Monument of Eurysaces in Rome', *ABull* 85: 2, 230-257.
- Pleket, H.W. 2008, 'Berufsvereine im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien: Geselligkeit oder Zünfte?' in P. Mauritsch, W. Petermandl, R. Rollinger and C. Ulf (eds.), *Antike Lebenswelten. Konstanz—Wandel—Wirkungsmacht. Festschrift für Ingomar Weiler zum 70. Geburtstag*. Philippika 25. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, pp. 533-544.
- Rostovtzeff, M. 1957, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Trotsky, L. 2008, *The History of the Russian Revolution*. Translated by Max Eastman. Chicago: Haymarket Press.
- van Nijf, O.M. 1997, *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*. Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology 17. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.
- van Nijf, O.M. 2002, 'Collegia and Civic Guards: Two Chapters in the History of Sociability', in W. Jongman and M. Kleijwegt (eds.), *After the Past: Essays in Ancient History in Honour of H. W. Pleket*. Mnemosyne, Bibliotheca Classica Batava, Suppl. 233. Leiden: Brill Academic Press, pp. 305-339.
- van Nijf, O.M. 2003, 'Les élites comme patrons des associations professionnelles dans l'Orient Romain', in M. Cécéillac-Gervasoni and L. Lamoine

- (eds.), *Les élites et leurs facettes: Les élites locales dans le monde hellénistique et romain*. Collection ERGA 3. Collection de l'École française de Rome 309. Rome: École française de Rome; Clermont-Ferrand: Presses universitaires Blaise-Pascal, pp. 307-321.
- Verboven, K. 2007, 'The Associative Order: Status and Ethos of Roman Businessmen in [the] Late Republic and Early Empire', *Athenaeum* 95, 861-893.
- von Petrikovits, H. 1981, 'Die Spezialisierung des römischen Handwerks', in H. Jankuhn, W. Janssen, R. Schmidt-Wiegand and H. Tiefenbach (eds.), *Das Handwerk in vor- und frühgeschichtlicher Zeit*. Vol. 1. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse 3, 122-123. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, pp. 63-131.
- Waltzing, J.-P. 1895-1900, *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains, depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'Occident*, 4 vols. Louvain: C. Peeters.
- Ward, C.O. 1900, *The Ancient Lowly: A History of the Ancient Working People from the Earliest Known Period to the Adoption of Christianity by Constantine*. Chicago: Charles H. Kerr and Co.

# The Community of the Pastoral Epistles – A Religious Association

*Korinna Zamfir*

## 1. Introduction

Many ancient societies and groups bear names that correspond to what modern scholarship defines as private or voluntary associations (*thiasoi, eranoi, collegia* etc.), or may be described as such with a reasonable degree of certainty.<sup>1</sup> The earliest Christian communities / *ekklēsiai* were not designated by any of these typical terms, nonetheless they shared some similarities with such societies. There is no consensus among New Testament scholars on whether the *ekklēsiai* could be regarded as associations. This comparison is often rejected on apologetic grounds, and differences are emphasised to such a degree as to make any assimilation of the Christian *ekklēsiai* to associations impossible.<sup>2</sup> However, the idea that these communities functioned as religious associations is not really a modern one. Early Christian writers from the second to the fourth century referred

---

1. I wish to thank Vincent Gabrielsen for the opportunity to present a paper at the Symposium on Private Associations and the Public Sphere in the Ancient World in September 2010 and for including my contribution in this volume. I also need to thank the anonymous reviewer who read my paper for the suggestions and corrections and for checking the language of this essay.

2. Judge (2005, 501-524) produces an almost caricatural portrait of cultic associations, denying them any real concern with religion, any doctrine, any capacity to transform the community. He questions the religious motivation for joining associations (see his depiction of the association of Sunion [Sokolowski, 53], pp. 506-507). '[N]either correct belief nor good behavior was part of what we choose to call "religion" in antiquity' (Judge 2005, 513). Conversely, Christian churches represent an intellectual and 'socially activist' religion, uninterested in cult properly speaking, identified here with sacrificial cult; 'their fundamentally innovatory remodelling of life puts them at the opposite end of the social scene from the classical cults' (Judge 2005, 514).



to Christian communities in terms of religious associations. They did so partly in a polemical or apologetic context (repeating criticism by non-Christians),<sup>3</sup> partly in a natural way of speaking about these communities.<sup>4</sup> The same language was used by non-Christian authors.<sup>5</sup>

In an often quoted passage, Tertullian applied the features of religious associations to Christian churches,<sup>6</sup> to argue that they had to be accepted just as the *licitas factiones* were (*Apol.* 38.1), since they posed no threat to the social, political and moral order. Describing the Christian community, he mentioned precisely the features and functions of religious associations (*Apol.* 39): cult (without antisocial features), respect for ethical requirements, charity towards community members, burial of deceased members and a respectable organisation. Tertullian tackled these issues not without a polemical-apologetic edge. He contrasted superior Christian morals with alleged Greco-Roman immorality and opposed the holiness and moderate character of the Christian (eucharistic) meal (*coena nostra*) to the excesses related to conviviality in many associations (the *Salii*, the Hercules-devotees, the Apaturia, Dionysia, the Attic mysteries, the Sarapis-cult).

Although early Christian authors did not regard such comparison to be unconceivable, it was not until the late 19<sup>th</sup> century that New Testament scholars started to consider the analogy between

3. Origen., *C. Cels.* 1.1 (PG 11, 652A, ANF 4): Celsus accuses Christians of forming secret, illegal associations (*synthekas*, συνθήκας), a charge rejected by Origen (these *synthekai* are directed against the laws of the devil). Celsus assimilates Christians to members of foreign, ecstatic, superstitious or secretive cults (the Metragyrtae, the members of the Mithras-cult, the Sabbazians; 1.9, PG 11, 672A). Origen emphasises that Jesus appeared to the members of his cult (*thiasotai*, θιασώται; 3.23; PG 11, 945B). See also Lactant., *Div. Inst.* 5.1 (*cultores Dei summi*, PL 6,548A).

4. Euseb., *Hist. eccl.* 1.3.12: Christ committed to his *thiasota* (θιασώταις) 'the uncovered virtues'; cf. also 1.3.19 (PG 20, 73.59; 76.63; NPNF 2.1, 106-107); 10.1.8: a 'splendid day [...] illuminated [...] the churches of Christ (ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ Χριστοῦ) [...]. And not even those without our communion (τοῖς ἔχουθεν τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς θιάσου) were prevented from sharing in in the same blessings' (NPNF 2.1, 777).

5. Lucian, *De mort. Peregr.* 11 (the Christian leader as *thiasarches*); Celsus (Origen., *C. Cels.* 3.23, PG 11, 945B: Christians as *thiasotai*, θιασώται). See also Schmidt 1965, 515-516.

6. *Apol* 38-39, CSEL 69 (1939), 90-95; ANF 3, 67-70.

*ekklēsiai* and associations.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, from the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century research on associations in the Greco-Roman world has been increasingly received and applied in New Testament scholarship, in the social analysis of earliest Christianity.<sup>8</sup> Today many New Testament scholars think that ancient associations, notwithstanding the broad variety of their aims, structures and statutes, are social formations that may provide some insight into the way early Christian communities have functioned.

In this paper I argue that, although New Testament sources dealing with Christian, more specifically Pauline communities, are less explicit, certain texts allow us to infer that as early as the first-century Asia Minor communities were organised as religious associations. To this purpose I examine the ways in which features of ancient associations are reflected in the structure and functioning of the community addressed by the Pastoral Epistles. I analyse its organisation, membership, offices, internal regulations, as well as its interaction with society and the attitude toward the state.

The Pastoral Epistles [PE] are a corpus of three letters (1 and 2 Timothy, Titus) traditionally attributed to Paul, yet in fact pseudonymous writings<sup>9</sup> most likely composed by the same (unknown) author, probably in a community of Western Asia Minor,<sup>10</sup> toward the end of the first century. According to the underlying (fictitious) narrative, Paul has left two of his prominent disciples, Timothy and Titus, in Ephesus and Crete, respectively, to organise the local communities, to ensure continuity in ministry by appointing local leaders, to silence the opponents who teach a different doctrine and promote a different lifestyle, and to establish norms of behaviour for officials and for members, for men and women, for the wealthy and

---

7. Heinrici 1876; 1896, 5-9; Hatch 1882.

8. Barton and Horsley 1981, 7-41; Klauck 1995, 49-57; Kloppenborg and Wilson 1996; Ascough 2003; Harland 2003a; Gutsfeld and Koch 2006; Dunn 2009, 608-617.

9. Dibelius and Conzelmann 1972; Brox 1969; Roloff 1988; Oberlinner 1994; Wolter 1988; Collins 2002; Weiser 2003; Merz 2004.

10. Roloff 1988, 42-43; Oberlinner 1994: XLVI, 10; Weiser 2003, 59-61 (probably Ephesus); Wolter 1988, 22.

for slaves. The author is particularly interested in delineating group identity by emphasising the importance of established officials in leading the community, by adherence to what he calls sound doctrine and to contemporary social norms.

Before assessing the character of this Christian community, it is essential to consider the very different nature of the sources on associations on the one hand, and early Christian *ekklesiai* on the other.<sup>11</sup> For associations, inscriptions and some papyri have preserved the bylaws, lists of members and officials, the honorific decrees for benefactors, the epitaphs of members, but with few exceptions they provide very little insight into the day-to-day life of the group. Conversely, New Testament sources offer snapshots of the life of Christian communities; they may formulate some (often circumstantial) regulations, but hardly any statutes, except maybe for the household and station codes<sup>12</sup> of the deutero- and trito-Pauline epistles.<sup>13</sup> These differences account for many of the difficulties encountered when comparing Christian *ekklesiai* to associations.

---

11. Rightly, Downs 2008, 77-78.

12. The household codes establish the norms of behaviour for the members of a household, and list pairs of addressees: husband and wife, parents and children, masters and slaves. Such codes are typically found in Col 3,18-4,1 and Eph 5,21-6,6. New Testament scholars trace back the roots of household codes to ancient literature on household management (Balch [1982]; Gielen [1990]), against earlier opinions that household codes were inspired by Stoic duty lists (Weidinger [1928]). Station codes regulate the behaviour of various groups in the community (e.g. the officials), and may be found in the PE (Verner 1983, 90, 92; Wagener 1994, 62; Marshall 1999, 232-236).

13. The corpus of thirteen epistles attributed to Paul comprises seven genuine epistles (Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, Philemon), as well as pseudonymous writings composed at various stages after the death of the apostle. There is no consensus about the authorship of the latter. The debated letters are sometimes classified, based on their similarities and the probable time of their composition, into deutero- and trito-Pauline. The first group includes Colossians, Ephesians and 2 Thessalonians, the latter the Pastoral Epistles. See Klauck 2006, 324.

## 2. The *ekklesia* in the Pastoral Epistles. Organisation and functioning

To briefly rehearse the matter, private associations were groups or societies that transcended the private sphere (the *oikos*) and were not part of the political structures of the *polis*. They were founded on private initiative and members joined freely to achieve various common aims.<sup>14</sup> These groups were rather well organised and developed statutes and offices that frequently reproduced those of the *polis*. Undoubtedly, every element of this definition may be challenged.<sup>15</sup> Many associations were household-based and their (first) members were the free individuals (commonly relatives) and the slaves of an *oikos*. The private character of associations may also be debated, since, as Gabrielsen and Thomsen show in the Introduction to this volume, some originally private associations acquired a marked public dimension over time and carried out functions otherwise pertaining to the public sphere. The private/public dichotomy may also be simplistic, and Gabrielsen and Thomsen rightly argue that associations created a sort of ‘fourth space’. Further, even the voluntary character of membership is sometimes debatable, due to legal, social and religious coercive factors. The sphere of associations may perhaps not be assimilated to modern civil society. Yet, it is striking that many associations engaged the private initiative and action of

---

14. From the 19<sup>th</sup> century onwards associations were commonly classified according to their functions, into professional, religious and funerary associations (*collegia funeraticia*, a term coined by Mommsen, and assimilated to the *collegia tenuiorum* of Marc., Dig. 47.22.3.2). Mommsen 1843, 87-93; Waltzing 1895, 3-48 (religious), 141-153, 256-300 (funerary), 161-194, *passim* (professional); Kloppenborg 1996, 18; Ascough 2003, 20-21; Sirks 2006, 23-25. However, all associations fulfilled various functions (van Nijf 1997, 10; Gabrielsen 2001, 217), and irrespective of their main activity all had a religious dimension (Waltzing 1895, 195-211, Poland 1909, 5; Wilson 1996, 13; Kloppenborg 1996, 18). This makes the traditional taxonomy rather inappropriate. The classification proposed by Harland (2003a: 29-50), based on the type of underlying networks and connections (household, ethnic, geographic, neighbourhood, occupational and cultic) seems more apposite. I use the term religious association to refer to those groups that were mainly based on cultic relations.

15. See the discussion of these issues by Gabrielsen and Thomsen in this volume.

individuals within self-organising structures other than those of the *polis* in order to produce outcomes that shaped the larger society.

Ancient associations shared territorial proximity, a professional and/or religious community of interests, a cult, conviviality, and the duty to provide for the needs, in particular for the burial of members.<sup>16</sup> Common meals had a major role in forming and delineating group-identity. They also expressed and consolidated rank and internal hierarchy,<sup>17</sup> and often had a religious meaning.<sup>18</sup>

### 2.1. *Main features of the ekklesia*

Early Christian communities were analogous to private religious associations,<sup>19</sup> insofar as they were rather well-defined socio-religious groups, with a distinct (although evolving) constitution, whose members joined voluntarily for the purpose of achieving religious and social aims. One may of course wonder how voluntary the membership of relatives and slaves of an *oikos* was, but this was not a specifically Christian problem.

1. In the case of the PE the *religious dimension* is rather obvious. It appears in the worship of God and of Jesus Christ the Saviour (Tit 1,4; 2,10-13; 3,4-6; 2 Tim 1,10), in the focus on the mystery of faith (1 Tim 3,9) and on piety (*eusebeia*, 1 Tim 3,16), issues that hardly need further elaboration. The religious element is also expressed in the regulations concerning behaviour at worship (1 Tim 2,1-9) and the performance of rites like baptism (Tit 3,5), an initiation rite,<sup>20</sup> and the introduction to office through the imposition of hands (1 Tim 4,14; 2 Tim 1,6). From earlier texts, like 1 Corinthians, it is evident that the cult comprised the Eucharistic celebration as well, i.e. a cultic meal that resulted in communion with Christ and among members and shaped the identity of the community (10, 16-17), in connection with a more profane side of conviviality (11,20-23.33-

16. van Nijf 1997, 11; Garnsey and Saller: 1997, 101.

17. van Nijf 1997, 53-54.

18. Wilson 1996, 12.

19. Contemporaries may well have perceived Christian communities as household based mystery cults (Klauck 2003, 225; Betz 2004, 88-89).

20. Betz 2004, 107-118.

34).<sup>21</sup> Strikingly, this aspect, so central to any ancient association, is not mentioned in the PE. Yet, in view of multiple references in other New Testament texts, it is probable that by the end of the century the Eucharist was celebrated in all Christian communities (although there may have been local variations in terms of frequency and of rite).

2. *Participation in other cults* or associations does not seem to be a main issue for the author, unless one takes the anti-Jewish polemic as an indicator of demarcation from Judaism.<sup>22</sup> Participation in non-Jewish cults is never mentioned, but this is no proof of exclusivity or of free involvement in other cults.<sup>23</sup>

3. The community of the PE was concerned with the *welfare of its members*, looking after the destitute widows (1 Tim 5,4-8,16) and encouraging better-off members to care for the less fortunate (1 Tim 5,16; 6,17-18). A passage regulating admission to the community of widows (1 Tim 5,9-10) lists among other criteria the deeds of charity.<sup>24</sup> Burial of deceased members as an obligation of the community, a feature of many associations,<sup>25</sup> is nowhere mentioned in the PE (or in the Corpus Paulinum), yet certain passages in Acts (5,6.10; 8,2)

21. Theissen 1974, 188; Ebel 2004, 171, noting the role of the meal in community-formation and communication.

22. On this feature of the PE: Weidemann 2008, 49-54.

23. The commonly evoked Christian exclusivity (McCready 1996, 62, 66) may be true with respect to the ideal, yet reality was certainly different. Christians hardly broke all their ties to society and its religious life (Borgen 2004, 30-59). Paul's position concerning participation in sacrificial meals is telling for the Corinthian situation. Although he warns against idolatry (1 Cor 10, 14-21) and against scandalising the 'weak' (8,7-13; 10,28-29), he does not regard participation in meals offered by non-Christians a real threat to Christian identity (8,4-5). The very fact that he has to address the topic shows that some Christians did not regard participation in such meals as a repudiation of their religious identity. Ascough lists a number of associations that prohibited their members to leave the group and join another one (2003, 85, 88-90).

24. On widows as a community: Spicq 1969, 532-533; Dibelius 1955, 58; Roloff 1988, 292-293; Oberlinner 1994, 221-222, 231, 233-234; Verner 1983, 163-165.

25. The identification of the *collegia tenuiorum* with the *collegia funeraticia*, just as the existence of the latter is contested (van Nijf 1997, 10, 31-69; Perry 2006: esp. 30-35; Kloppenborg 1996, 20-23; Ascough 2003, 21, 24-25).

suggest that Christians also regarded this task as their duty toward community members. Probably, this was not different in the community of the PE.

4. The *ekklesia* was more than likely founded by Paul several decades before. This is suggested by the location of the epistles in the area of Pauline mission, by the references to persons known from Paul's entourage, and by the exceptional authority he is assigned in the epistles. (The author of the PE wrote these fictitious letters in the name of Paul, who was obviously an authority for the addressees). In establishing *ekklesiai* Paul acted very much like any other founder of private cults.<sup>26</sup> The fact that the PE were written several decades after the death of the founder created a rather special situation, compared to that of associations whose founders still actively influenced the community.<sup>27</sup> From this (and only this) perspective, the situation was comparable to that of testamentary associations. Nonetheless neither the community nor the letters served the commemoration of the founder, as in testamentary associations. 2 Timothy, although apparently a testament, aimed only on the surface to preserve the memory of Paul. The founder evoked in the epistles was turned into a paradigmatic character whose authority was used to support the drafting and/or rethinking of the statutes.

5. The community is *designated* as *ekklesia* (ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος), i.e. as assembly of a community belonging to the living God, or, otherwise, the οἶκος Θεοῦ (1 Tim 3,15).<sup>28</sup> The theophoric appellation links *ekklesia* and *oikos* to the worshipped deity.

The Christian *ekklesia*<sup>29</sup> has been derived from the Septuagint [LXX], as a translation of the Hebrew *qahal*, designating the (new) people of God.<sup>30</sup> However, the LXX more often translates *lqh* with

26. Betz 2004, 87-88, 99, 117. On individuals' role in founding and reforming associations: Poland 1909, 272-274.

27. On these associations: Ascough 2003, 32-34; Klauck 1995, 53-54.

28. In the authentic and deutero-Pauline epistles the most frequent term, the *ekklesia*, commonly refers to the community or gathering of members in a specific location or *oikos* (κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν; Rom 16,5; cf. Col 4,15), or the *ekklesiai* of God assembled in various areas (1 Thess 2,14; cf. Gal 1,22; 1 Cor 1,2),

29. Schmidt 1965, 501-536; Roloff 1993, 83-85.

30. Dunn 2009, 600.

*synagogē*. This contradicts the hypothesis that Christians were compelled to use *ekklēsia* to refer to their community.<sup>31</sup> Moreover, the political connotations of the term are obvious. In the Greek East it was expectedly associated with the public assembly of the free citizens of the *polis*; the translators of the LXX must have been aware of this meaning. More importantly, the term is not entirely unknown in the language of voluntary associations.<sup>32</sup> Here *ekklēsia* is mostly functional, denoting the gathering or ‘business meeting’ of members. In earliest Christianity the term was very likely used in a functional sense as well, to denote the coming together of the community (e.g. for worship).<sup>33</sup>

*Oikos* was also used for associations, denoting both the association and the locale of meetings.<sup>34</sup> It is not by accident that already earlier the authentic and deuterio-Pauline epistles designated the Christian community as the *ekklēsia* assembled in a specific *oikos* (Rom 16,5; cf. Col 4,15). This term is therefore again of some interest, as it approaches the community of the PE to household-based or household-like associations. These comprised the members of a household<sup>35</sup> and persons from outside the *oikos*. Such was the often quoted association in Philadelphia (Lydia), founded by a certain Dionysios, demanded by Zeus to allow entrance into his *oikos* to men and women, slaves and free, to perform rites of purification, sanctification and mysteries.<sup>36</sup> Several other examples of associations with

31. Rightly critical of this hypothesis: Ascough 2003, 73-74.

32. Ascough 2003, 74; Harland 2003b: 498: *ID* 1519 = CIG 2271, second cent. CE (the assembly of the *synodos* of merchants and shippers); *OGIS* 488 (the assembly in Kastollos near Philadelphia, second/third cent., but it may refer to the *ekklēsia* of the village: Buckler 1937); *IGLAM* 1381, 1382, from Pamphilian Aspendus; cf. also Poland 1909, 332: the Tyrian Herakleistai of Delos, and the ἀλειψόμενοι of Samos, *IG* XII.6 1. For *ekklēsia* as assembly, see also the decree of the *koimon* of Dionysiac *technitai* (Magnesia Mai., *I. Magnesia* 89. 9).

33. For *ekklēsia* as a *nomen actionis*: Roloff 1993, 85; Dunn 2009, 599-600.

34. Poland 1909, 459-463; Sokolowski 1955, 55. The *oikos* of the Theoi Megaloi appears in two inscriptions from Athens (112-110 BCE), Vélissaropoulos 1980, 105-106. See also *IG* XII.8 230 (Samothrace) (οἶκος θεοῦ μεγάλου); *I. Magnesia* 94. 3, 6.

35. Kloppenborg 1996, 23.

36. The association of Philadelphia dedicated to Zeus Eumenes and Hestia: *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 985; Sokolowski 1955, 53-58 (doc. 20); Barton and Horsley 1981, 7-41. Stowers argued that



a religious character founded in an *oikos/domus* are known.<sup>37</sup> Such associations could not always be identified with a household strictly speaking. Barton and Horsley have appropriately shown that even the association of Philadelphia was open to outsiders, as well.<sup>38</sup> These examples show that the *oikos* could be the centre and point of departure for a religious association that went beyond the limits of the household, a situation largely comparable to that of the early Christian communities.

These considerations allow us to regard the community of the PE, designated as ἐκκλησία θεοῦ and οἶκος Θεοῦ, as a religious association modelled after the household, which incorporated members belonging to more than one household. All the more so, as its officials – the *episkopoi* and *diakonoι*<sup>39</sup> – had a position analogous to that of the heads of households (1 Tim 3,4-5.12). This designation is understandable, as at an early stage Christian communities were probably gathering in the house of better-off members, though other

---

this was a household cult, not an association (Stowers 1998, 287-301). Yet the sharp distinction between these two entities is hardly convincing. Even Stowers admits the participation of friends, guests and relatives living outside the household in this cult (Stowers 1998, 288-289; Downs 2008, 84, n. 43). Moreover, while oaths could be made by members of a household, one wonders why a guest entering the *oikos* would take an oath sustaining the stability of a household foreign to him/her. Further, entering this *oikos* is conditional (it depends on respecting the regulations), but joining a household was not, neither for women, nor for slaves. As to the text, Dittenberger (in *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 985) restores τὰς θυσίας (l. 13) and τὰ μυστήρια (l. 41); Sokolowski, Barton and Horsley have τὰ μυστήρια in both lines; for other options, see Stowers 1998, 289, n. 31: τὰ ἱερά (Wilamowitz-Moellendorff; yet, admittedly too short, just as τὰς θυσίας), τὰ ἱερόθυσια (preferred by Stowers). Stowers wishes to discard the possibility that this cult celebrates mysteries.

37. To mention only a few: the association established by an Egyptian priest of Sarapis on Delos (second cent. BCE), *IG* XI.4 1299; an association dedicated to Sarapis and Isis in the Lokrian Opus, in the house of Sosinike, *IG* X.2 255, cf. Ascough 2003, 30-31; the second-cent. CE Dionysiac association established by Pompeia Agrippinilla in Tusculum, which included kin, slaves, freed persons, men and women: Alexander 1932, 240-242; Lietzmann 1933, 311; Meeks 1983, 31; Cancik 2007, 35-36.

38. Barton and Horsley 1981, 16-17; Sokolowski 1955, 55.

39. On these officials and the possible origin of these designations in the language of associations see further section 1.3: Statutes and offices.

settings were also possible.<sup>40</sup> Because of the conversion of some *oikoi*, at an initial stage, there was some overlap between *oikos* and *ekklesia*. Kloppenborg parallels with good reason formulae like κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησία in the Pauline corpus (Rom 16,5; cf. Col 4,15: τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῆς [Νυμφῆς] ἐκκλησίαν), with the set phrase *collegium quod est in domo Sergiae L(uci) f(iliae) Paullinae* that appears in a good number of Roman inscriptions, arguing that early Christian communities functioned as domestic *collegia*.<sup>41</sup> The claim that the *oikos* model embraced by 1 Timothy has nothing to do with the social gatherings of *collegia*, or with meetings of a philosophical *thiasos*, but should be seen merely as 'the *private invitation of a host* to the fellow Christians in his district of the city',<sup>42</sup> is in no way convincing.

6. It is not clear whether the members of this community referred to themselves as *Christianoi*, a term with a theophoric resonance reminding of the theophoric name of many ancient associations. Yet the term is attested only in *Acts* 11,26; 26,28; 1 *Pet* 4,16, and not in the PE.<sup>43</sup>

To sum up, this *ekklesia* was a community dedicated to the worship of God and Jesus Christ that had been founded some decades ago by Paul. Members joined freely (with the caveat that the freedom of slaves and subordinated family members was probably more limited), and pursued both religious and social aims, even when in the PE there is no explicit reference to conviviality and to the burial of deceased members. The designations of the community, though not the most typical, also appear in the case of other (religious) associations.

## 2.2. Membership

The *ekklesia* is comparable to religious associations with a *heterogeneous membership* in terms of gender and of social standing.

40. Horrell 2004, 349–369; Dunn 2009, 602–603, 606–608.

41. Kloppenborg 1996, 23, cf. *CIL* VI.9148–9149, 10260–10264; Mommsen 1843, 94. Whether the latter was indeed a Christian collegium that met in the house of Sergia Paullina, granddaughter of Sergius Paulus, the proconsul whom Paul allegedly converted in Cyprus (*Acts* 13,7–12), as argued by Sordi (1984, 222), is less certain.

42. Lampe 2003, 374, emphases in the original.

43. On the apparently external, hostile origin of the appellation: Horrell 2007.

1. The proliferation of associations in the Greek East was often associated with the decline of the classical polis, leading to the dissolution of political and social life, to geographic dislocation, uprootedness, and a shallow religious life.<sup>44</sup> Consequently associations provided opportunities and social status to the marginalised, to those excluded from political and social advancement, men and women of lower condition, foreigners, freedmen and slaves (*collegia tenuiorum*), who created a parallel polis.<sup>45</sup> There is some truth in this assessment, if one considers the social condition of the poor, of slaves and foreigners. Yet it would be mistaken to regard the associations as havens of the marginalised, who could in no other way obtain recognition.<sup>46</sup> This stereotyped view is contradicted by many associations that counted better-off members as well, some even representatives of the elites.<sup>47</sup> Moreover, *tenuior* is a relative term that did not designate the poor, but the one whose means, though not insignificant, did not suffice to make him qualify for public offices involving a much more important financial burden.<sup>48</sup> It would be mistaken to generally identify membership of *collegia* with the marginalised,<sup>49</sup> and one should not overlook their civic, political and socio-economic impact.<sup>50</sup>

---

44. For a criticism of the 'decline of the polis' theory: Harland 2003a: 89-112; id. 2006, 21-49.

45. Kloppenborg 1996, 17-18; Meeks 1983, 31; Ascough 2003, 25; Walker-Ramisch 1996, 134.

46. Meeks 1983, 31; Ascough 2003, 25; Walker-Ramisch 1996, 134.

47. van Nijf 1997, 21-22; Sirks 2006, 30-31, Ascough 2003, 59; Bendlin 2002, 12. On Mithraism: Rüpke 2007, 113-115. Referring to the *collegium Lanuvianum*, Garnsey and Saller note that the membership fee and monthly dues (generally club dinners) envisaged 'modestly prosperous men'; the impoverished could not afford membership (1997, 101).

48. Sirks 2006, 31-32.

49. Wilson 1996, 13-14. On social heterogeneity: Harland 2003a: 27-28, 34, 42-44, 46-47.

50. Due to better-off members or patrons, associations could voice their interests (Walker-Ramisch 1996, 133; van Nijf 1997, 20-22). They created a social network that enhanced common action. Several associations carried out important building projects, contributing to the development of urban centres. Some acquired significant wealth and influence. On this issue: Gabrielsen 2007, 188, 193-194, 197-

The community of the PE was *socially heterogeneous*. Most of its members were probably non-elite, poor, free, freedmen and slaves. However, a number of passages show that some members were wealthy. The rich (πλούσιοι) are exhorted to avoid conceit and excessive reliance on wealth and are demanded to use their means for benefactions (1 Tim 6,9-10. 17-19).<sup>51</sup> Women are demanded to give up expensive adornment and lavish lifestyle (1 Tim 2,9; 5,6).<sup>52</sup> Social stratification is also suggested by the slave paraenesis (Tit 2,9-10; 1 Tim 6,1-2), implying that some members held slaves.<sup>53</sup> The application of the *oikos* paradigm to the church (1 Tim 3,15) and the use of the topos of household management in the station codes also shows that the wealthy were influential members of the community. The officials (the *episkopos* and *diakonos*) must have been aware of the responsibilities and social expectations pertaining to the status of a head of household.<sup>54</sup> The *episkopos* (overseer) and the *diakonos* were expected to be good managers of their own household, a requirement seen as the natural prerequisite for community leadership (1 Tim 3,4-5.12; Tit 1,6).

The heterogeneous social structure was responsible for the *internal tensions* between better-off and socially inferior members, as reflected in the exhortations addressed to slaves (1 Tim 6,1-2; Tit 2,9). These were warned against despising their masters on account of their shared Christian brotherhood. This means that some members, and clearly the author, feared the rebellion of their Christian slaves. Significantly, in the PE there is no exhortation to masters to treat their slaves as brothers and sisters in faith. The ἀδελφός (*adelphos*)-terminology is used in 1 Timothy to underpin the ideology of fuller service and submission.<sup>55</sup>

---

198; Gabrielsen 2001, 176-177, passim.

51. Kidd 1990, 15-16.

52. Spicq 1969, 292, n. 3, 419-420, 423-425; Verner 1983, 171, 180; Kidd 1990, 102-103.

53. Holding a small number of slaves did not make one the representative of the elite (Meggitt 1998, 129-131). Yet people owning even a few slaves were financially better placed than the truly destitute. Should a master of only a few slaves have run out of funds, he could still sell or rent out the slaves (Martin 2001, 55).

54. Verner 1983, 91, 105, 133, 152-153, 155; Kidd 1990, 83; Oberlinner 2007, 306.

55. Horrell 2001, 307, 309. Merz shows how 1 Tim 6,1-2 rejects any egalitarian

2. It is often assumed that contrary to ancient associations Christian communities had a deeper sense of fraternity and equality, overriding social inequality.<sup>56</sup> Yet this is problematic on two counts. On the one hand, members of various associations were bound by ties of fictive kinship, given their shared (professional or religious) interests and their belonging to the community.<sup>57</sup> Kinship and friendship language was not uncommon in associations, as shown by the *adelphos* or *philos* terminology.<sup>58</sup> Fraternal love (*philadelphia*)<sup>59</sup> and affection (*philostorgia*)<sup>60</sup> were not unknown. On the other hand, while the sentiment of Christian brother(sister)hood may have been rather intense at earlier stages, the PE reinforced social order, as shown by the slave paraenesis.<sup>61</sup> In addition, the emergence of offices (1 Tim 3,1-7; Tit 1,5-7) created an internal hierarchy. Hence, this community was comparable to associations which combined egalitarianism due to fictive kinship and hierarchy, in view of the heterogeneous social composition and of the internal struc-

---

conclusion that might have been derived from Phlm 16, confirming the privileges of the masters (Merz 2004, 257-267; Merz 2006, 113-132).

56. Cf. Gal 3,28; Rom 12,4-5; 1 Cor 3,8; 10,17; 12,12-13; Phil 2,2. McCready 1996, 62-63.

57. Waltzing 1895, 329-330; Poland 1909, 54-55; Harland 2005, 491-513; Wilson 1996, 2, 13; Ascough 2003, 76-77.

58. Harland (2005, 497-510) has numerous examples. The members of a first-cent. CE association of Lamos (Kilikia) *I.KilikiaBM* 2,201; those of an association of Sinope (Pontus) dedicated to Theos Hypsistos; the *mystai* of the Eleusian mysteries; priests or other cult officials in associations of Halikarnassos and Mylasa (*IGLAM* 503 a-b; *ἱερεῖς ἀδελφοί*; cf. *I.Mylasa* 544). The pater or mater collegii seem to be important members. Poland 1909, 371-373; Harland 2007: esp. 61, 69-75; Hemelrijk 2008, 120-122 passim (probably officials); Kloppenborg 1996, 25. In a *synodos* from Tanais dedicated to Theos Hypsistos the leader is called pater; members of another *thiasos* are called brothers (CIRB 1263, 1277, 1282, 1288, 1284, Harland 2005, 502-503).

Harland has several other examples. The members of the Mithraic associations are called *fraters*, while the *patres* are top officials: Beck 1996, 180.

59. A Latium association dedicated to Hygeia: Harland 2005, 500 (cf. *IG XIV* 902a, p. 694 [addenda]).

60. The commemoration of a deceased member by a *thiasos* of Tlos (Lycia): *IG XIV* 902a, Harland 2005, 500. A third-cent. Thessalonian association warns the 'brothers' against opening the tombs of members: *IG X.2.1* 824, Harland 2005, 501.

61. Already in the household codes (Col 3,18-4,1; Eph 5,23-69), and in the slave-paraenesis of 1 Pet 2,18-25.

ture.<sup>62</sup> Belonging together bridged, but did not eliminate social differences.

As a matter of fact, one may hardly contrast Christian egalitarianism with the hierarchical structure of associations. In the PE fictive kinship and egalitarianism gradually lost ground to the hierarchic perspective. The *adelphos* terminology in 1 Tim 6,2 is a reminiscence of the egalitarian dimension, reflecting a self-understanding of the members as brothers and sisters in the household of God, certainly owing to the Pauline inheritance. Yet precisely this dimension was problematic for better-off members, and if not theoretically rejected, it was practically neutralised. The fraternal perspective was replaced by one of patriarchy.

3. In terms of *gender*, some associations only accepted members of one sex, others were inclusive.<sup>63</sup> The often-quoted religious association from Philadelphia, dedicated to Zeus Eumenes and Hestia, was gender-inclusive,<sup>64</sup> just as several other associations.<sup>65</sup> In a good number of associations women held offices and priesthoods, or they were founders and patrons.<sup>66</sup>

The community of the PE included men and women alike, as opposed to certain ancient gender-exclusive associations, but not unlike many inclusive ones. However, the PE are extremely negative about the participation of women in the life of the community.<sup>67</sup>

4. The *ethnic* composition is unknown. The fictitious character of the setting makes it difficult to draw any conclusions from the names

62. Mithraism is one of the eminent examples. Beck 1996, 180; id., 2006, 180-181, 191; Rüpke 2007, 113. Another good example of social heterogeneity is provided by the Philadelphian association (of *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 985): Barton and Horsley 1981, 22.

63. On women in associations: Poland 1909, 289-298; Kloppenborg 1996, 25.

64. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 985; Sokolowski 1955, no. 20; Barton and Horsley 1981, 8-10.

65. The mysteries of Andanya, the *dendrophori* of Magna Mater (Regium Iulium), the Dionysian *thiasoi* all over the empire (the Tusculanean association founded by Pompeia Agripinilla; the one of Amphipolis [Macedonia]; the *collegium Asianorum* in Napoca; the *collegium Bachii* in Nikopolis [Moes. Inf.], the *collegium Romanorum* in Tomis). Alexander 1932, 240-242; Ascough 2003, 54-59; Hemelrijk 2008, 123-125.

66. Poland 1909, 295, 345-346; Hemelrijk 2008, 120-122 *passim*.

67. See further section 1.3: Statutes and offices on the exclusion of women from offices.

mentioned in the epistles. The community was probably made up essentially of Gentile Christians, but we cannot know more. If the reference to Jewish myths and to those of the circumcision (Tit 1,10.14) was not merely meant to create the 'feel' of authenticity, there may have been a minority Jewish (Christian) group. We cannot know whether there were foreigners or resident aliens among the members. But if the *philoxenia* demanded from the *episkopos/presbyteros* (Tit 1,8; 1 Tim 3,2) was not simply a conventional virtue of the official, it may well be that the community admitted Christians coming from other geographic areas. All the more so as other sources – admittedly earlier than the PE – still know of itinerant teachers. (The PE focus on local leaders). There is no reason to suppose that Christians were less mobile than their contemporaries.

### 2.3. Statutes and offices

It is a commonplace that associations were modelled after the *polis*, in terms of organisation, offices and hierarchy.<sup>68</sup> The (assembly of the) association drafted statutes and decrees.<sup>69</sup> Associations elected their officials, attended to religious duties and common celebrations, managed their finances, and settled conflicts within the association.<sup>70</sup> In doing so, associations actually mirrored the structures and functioning of the *polis*.

1. In an analogous manner the *ekklesia* organised itself, established bylaws, appointed officials, performed religious celebrations, and certainly managed finances. Important parts of 1 Timothy and Titus may be regarded as an attempt to shape the *statutes* of the group. Such are the church orders and/or station codes, i.e. the regulations concerning offices (Tit 1,5-9; 1 Tim 3,1-7.8-13; 5,9-14.17-20) and the roles of the members, in particular women (1 Tim 2,9-15; 5,14; Tit 2,3-5) and slaves (Tit 2,9-10, 1 Tim 6,1-2).

2. As an important element of their organisation, all associations

---

68. Walker-Ramisch 1996, 134; Ascough 2003, 25; Gabrielsen 2001, 217; Gabrielsen 2007, 188-190; Garnsey and Saller 1997, 101.

69. Gabrielsen 2007, 189.

70. Walker-Ramisch 1996, 133.

had a number of officials, bearing a broad variety of titles.<sup>71</sup> Offices led to the creation of an internal hierarchy, often expressed in the regulations concerning benefits received by officials, in particular at common meals. At gatherings officials received honorary allotments according to the internal hierarchy.<sup>72</sup> The *quinquennales* of the *cultores Dianae et Antinoi* in Lanuvium, as well as the officials of the Roman *collegium Aesculapi et Hygiae*, received a double or triple share of the meal portions, occasional allotments in food, wine or money.<sup>73</sup> The officials of the Athenian *Iobacchoi* may also have enjoyed preferential treatment at meals, if the order of the officials named as receiving alimentary allotments can be taken to suggest such a hierarchy.<sup>74</sup>

The role of officials (the *episkopos/presbyteroi*,<sup>75</sup> and the *diakonoi*; Tit 1,5-7; 1 Tim 3) increased in the PE, compared to earlier periods.<sup>76</sup> The names of these offices were attested in associations.<sup>77</sup> The *episkopos* could be a supervisor of cultic or financial matters.<sup>78</sup> The *dia-*

---

71. *Epistatai*, *archontes*, *epimeletai*, *episkopoi*; the president as *archeranistes*, *archithiasites*, *archisynagogos*, female *proeranistria*. Other offices include the *tamias*, *diakonos*, *grammateus*, *curator*, or are referred to with terms employed for public magistracies (*prytanis*, *gymnasiarch*). Cultic functions are exercised by priest(esse)s. Poland 1909, 337-423; Ascough 2003, 79-83; Meeks 1983, 31; Gabrielsen 2007, 189.

72. Waltzing 1895, 305-306, 367, 402-403; Kloppenborg 1996, 22; Schöllgen 1989, 236-237.

73. *ILS* 2.7212 (= *CIL* 14.2112); van Nijf 1997, 54; Schöllgen 1989, 237-238; Klauck 1995, 57; Garnsey and Saller 1997, 101; Theissen 1974, 190.

74. *IG* II<sup>a</sup> 1368, cf. also van Nijf 1997, 54.

75. On the integration of two terms of different origins (*episkopos* and *presbyteros*) in the PE and in *Acts* 20: Oberlinner 1994, 248-250; Brown 1992, 1345; Schneider, G. 1982, 294-296.

76. In Paul's lifetime offices are not as developed as in many Greco-Roman associations, probably in view of their recent establishment. Local officials (the *proistamenoi* in the early 1 Thess 5,12; the *episkopoi* and *diakonoi* in Phil 1,1) play an important role in the community, but we do not know much of their actual tasks.

77. Poland 1909, 373, 377, 381 (*episkopoi*); Beyer 1935, 604-617, esp. 607-610; Ascough 2003, 80-81 (*episkopoi*). For Egyptian *presbyteroi*, see Thompson in this volume.

78. Beyer 1935, 608-609; Poland 1909, 377, 381, 448; Ascough 2003, 80-81. *Episkopoi* (Dion and Melleipos) as financial officers of an association of Thera lend money and use the interests to finance a festival (*IG* XII.3 329, second cent. BCE). *Episkopoi* as financial officials of a temple are recorded in *IGL* 1990. An *episkopos* of a Dionysiac *synodos* is charged with the bestowal of honours (*ID* 1522). At Lindos *episkopoi* appear



*konos*, male or female, had various auxiliary roles.<sup>79</sup> One may not presume a single pattern of attributions for one specific office designation, since (with some exceptions) the same title could refer to different functions in different associations. One may assume with good reason that in the PE the offices of *episkopos/presbyteros* and *diakonos* (1 Tim 3,2.8.11-12; Tit 1,5.7) were taken from the practice and language of associations. Yet, one may not draw any conclusion about the role of the officials with the same name in (different) Christian communities. Candidates for office had to be scrutinised (δοκιμαζέσθωσαν in 1 Tim 3,10), a requirement reminding the scrutiny to which candidates for office were submitted in public life and sometimes in associations.<sup>80</sup>

3. As opposed to many other religious associations, priesthoods are entirely absent, probably because of the lack of sacrificial rites proper. A *tamias* is not mentioned, yet, as the community looked af-

---

in lists of various officials (along priests, prytnes, *grammateis* and *hypogrammateis*, treasurers and others); I.Lindos II 208 (160 BCE); 378 (27 BCE); Spicq 1969, 441. See also *IG XII.1* 731 (a list of officials of a religious association of Ialysos, Rhodes); *IGBulg IV*. 2214 (a list of officials of an *oikos* dedicated to the Olympian gods, Pautalia [Kystendil], Shatrovo); *IScM I*, 58 (Istros, second cent. BCE, decree bestowing honours on Meniskos). Although Poland (1909, 377) had argued for the relative rarity of the title and cautioned against tracing back the Christian office to the world of associations, the term is more frequent than he supposed.

79. For *diakonois* performing various offices connected to the cult, see Poland 1909, 42-43, 71, 165, 391-392; Ascough 2003, 82-83; *CIG* 1739b, *IG IV* 774 and 824, both from Troizen, third cent. BCE; *IG IX.1* 486; *RIG* 1226 (cf. also *CCAA*, 95-96, no. 289, Kyzikos, first cent. BCE, *diakonois* take part in an offering to Magna Mater); *I. Magnesia* 217 (first cent. BCE, *diakonois* set up a statue to Hermes); *CIG* 1800 (an association of *diakonois* dedicated to an Egyptian deity). Associations from Metropolis, Lydia (*CIG* 3037) and Kyzikos (Mouseion 93) have male and female *diakonois*. For a *diakonos* among other religious officials see also *IG IX.1*<sup>2</sup> 2:247; 2:251; 2:248, all from Thyrrheum, Acarnania, second cent. BCE. *Diakonois* may also denote the members of a cult-association (Ambrakia; Poland 1909, 42-43).

80. *Dokimasia*, a procedure typical of Athenian democracy and generally of public life, was also applied in associations. See the second-cent. CE Athenian *eranos*: *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1369, ll. 31-36: [μη]δενι ἐξέστω ἰσι[έν]αι ἰς τὴν σεμνοτάτην/ σύνδοδον τῶν ἐραριστῶν πρὶν ἂν δοκι/μασθῆ εἴ ἐστι ἀ[γν]ός και εὐσεβής και ἀγ/α[θ]ός· δοκιμα[ξέ]τω δὲ ὁ προστάτης [και]/[ὁ] ἀρχεραγιστής και ὁ γ[ρ]αμματεὺς και[ι]/ [οἰ] ταμίαι και σύνδικοι. For the admission of the Iobacchoi, see also *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1368.32-37.

ter the destitute widows (1 Tim 5,1), there must have existed a fund and someone to manage it.<sup>81</sup>

4. Leaders probably came from better-off householders.<sup>82</sup> The aspiration to the position of *episkopos* is described as *kalon ergon* (1 Tim 3,1), a perception that corresponds to contemporary views on public office having a strongly liturgical dimension,<sup>83</sup> performed by the better-off for the benefit of the community.<sup>84</sup> The *bathmos kalos* (βαθμὸς καλός), a noble standing acquired by the *diakonoi* (1 Tim 3,13), may also be read in this light.<sup>85</sup> Leaders were expected to attest qualifications and abilities similar to those demanded from political leaders or from heads of private associations.<sup>86</sup> The concern of the *episkopos* with hospitality and common welfare matches the same pattern of public service.<sup>87</sup> Besides, the leader had to dispose of certain means to provide hospitality.<sup>88</sup>

5. While many religious associations were gender-inclusive in terms of leadership as well,<sup>89</sup> in marked contrast to these, in the community of the Pastorals women could probably exert auxiliary roles (the female *diakonoi*, and the widows), but were excluded from leadership. Female *diakonoi* are dealt with ambiguously (*gynaiques* in 1 Tim 3,11).<sup>90</sup> Widows belonged to a community probably engaging in charity. The author strived to reduce their influence. The patriarchal character of the *oikos*-ecclesiology (1 Tim 3,16) restricted the public role of women (1 Tim 2,11-12; 5,11-14) and limited their responsibilities to traditional female roles (motherhood and domestic

---

81. That administering finances was the task of the *episkopos* (Hatch 1882, 39-41), as in many associations, is possible, but difficult to know.

82. Verner 1983, 128-134, 151-157.

83. Spicq 1969, 428-429.

84. Verner 1983, 151, 155-156, 160; Kidd 1990, 84-85.

85. Verner 1983, 155-156,

86. Oberlinner 2007, 306.

87. Spicq 1969, 428; Oster 1987, 82.

88. MacDonald 1988, 212.

89. Waltzing 1895, 349; Poland 1909, 295, 345-346; Ascough 2003, 33-34; 54-59.

90. On *gynaiques* as *diakonoi*: Spicq 1969, 460; Roloff 1988, 164-165; Oberlinner 1994, 139-142; Marshall 1999, 492-494; Collins 2002, 90-91.

tasks ).<sup>91</sup> In doing so, the author restricted the roles that were carried out by women in the lifetime of Paul.<sup>92</sup>

6. The *financial aspect of holding offices* also deserves consideration. The passages referring to this aspect are quite ambiguous. ‘Timothy’ is exhorted to honour the true widows (1 Tim 5,3). The expression *cheras tima* (χήρας τίμα) is understood either as instruction to give financial support to widows with no relatives,<sup>93</sup> or as remuneration for officials (*Amtsehre/-besoldung*, cf. 5,17).<sup>94</sup> Worthy presbyters are said to deserve double honour (*diple time* in 1 Tim 5,17). Given the reference to material/financial reward in the context (v. 18 is an allusion to 1 Cor 9,9-14 endorsing the right of the ministers of the gospel to material reward), *time* is often taken to refer to a remuneration for the services of the *presbyteroi*.<sup>95</sup> Yet *time* cannot refer to an established routine of paying salaries to professional clergy, a practice attested only from the end of the second century.<sup>96</sup> The practice of paying wages, properly-speaking, would also contradict ancient mentality and practice according to which offices were undertaken at one’s own expense. All the more so as the *presbyteroi/episkopoi* presumably came from the better-off. Therefore some commentators read this *diple time* (διπλή τιμή) against the background of granting allotments

---

91. On the consequences of the *oikos* model: Roloff 1988, 214-216; Wagener 1994, 65, 113, 235-245; Oberlinner 2007: esp. 304-306

92. Dautzenberg 1983, 160-162, 167-181; Bieringer 2007, 221-237, 316-336; Schrage 1995, 506; Lindemann 2000, 240-241.

93. Quinn and Wacker 2000, 430; Roloff 1988, 287; Fiore 2007, 102. Kidd (1990, 103) and Marshall (1999, 582) assume that τίμα implies an expression of honour involving material support for the destitute widows.

94. Wagener 1994, 148. Dibelius and Conzelmann (1972, 73-74) read 5, 3 only as an instruction to honour the widows. Schneider, J. (1969, 180) thinks that honour has a material aspect as well.

95. Schneider, J. 1969, 178; Wilson 1979, 53 (stipend); Roloff 1988, 308 (‘Ehre’ and ‘Besoldungsleistung’); Verner 1983, 156 (‘financial support of regular church officers’); Wagener 1994, 144; Fiore 2007, 102 (at 1 Tim 5,3), yet more cautious with respect to the remuneration of the presbyters (111). Dibelius and Conzelmann understand διπλή τιμή as an approval of presbyters holding two offices, for double financial compensation (1972, 78).

96. Schöllgen 1989, 232-239; Oberlinner 1994, 252; Fiore 2007, 111.

to officials of voluntary associations, according to the internal hierarchy.<sup>97</sup>

7. *Time/tima* (τιμή/τιμιά) is very common in honorary inscriptions and decrees for office holders and benefactors.<sup>98</sup> *Time* (τιμή) means honouring the official and/or benefactor by giving a – mostly material – return on benefactions. In the Pastorals (*tima/time*) should also be understood as recognition of the honour to which prominent groups and officials, the widows and the presbyters were entitled, honour that more than likely had a material expression. Whether these honours meant a larger share in community meals, honorific seats, or something else is difficult to tell. The *diple time* (διπλή τιμή) to which presbyters were entitled may suggest that these were worthy of higher consideration compared to other members of the community, maybe to widows,<sup>99</sup> if one takes into account that in associations, provision with double or triple share in various allowances was a recognition of one's rank.<sup>100</sup>

8. Well-to-do members and especially *patrons* of associations acted as benefactors, sponsored the meals, bequeathed, built and equipped shrines and meeting places, and donated funerary plots.<sup>101</sup> They were also patronage brokers, providing legal defence in court,<sup>102</sup> or forwarding the interests of professional associations.<sup>103</sup> Patronage was also important for Christian communities, if one

97. Schöllgen 1989, 236-237. Somewhat similarly Quinn and Wacker 2000, 460-461 (a honorarium, the gift of food).

98. See e.g. the reference to Titus Aelius Marcianus Priscus, leader of the festival in honour of Artemis in Ephesus: Oster 1987, 74. The bestowal of honours on benefactors is often introduced with ἄξιός τιμῆς, comparable to 1 Tim 5,17. See e.g. the honorary decree for Dionysius, at Mylasa (ll. 2-5; Harrison 2002, 1). For women: *I.Ephesos* III 630a, 681, 892.

99. Oberlinner 1994, 254.

100. Oberlinner 1994, 245-247, 251-254.

101. On the roles and obligations of patrons: van Nijf 1997, 48, 82-111; Garnsey and Saller 1997, 101. On female patrons: van Nijf: 113, 123-124, 149-150; Hemelrijk 2008, 115-162. On the financial contribution of benefactors: Ascough 2003, 62-64; 79; Barclay 2006, 113-127. Even associations that collected membership dues were largely dependant on benefactors (Ascough 2003, 62).

102. van Nijf 1997, 77, 95-100 (brokers).

103. van Nijf 1997, 84-95.

considers that the better-off hosted community gatherings, offered hospitality to other Christians and provided support in various other ways.<sup>104</sup> In the community of the PE the wealthy were also expected to act as benefactors: they were to share their wealth for the benefit of the community (ἀγαθοεργεῖν, πλουτεῖν ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς, εὐμεταδότους εἶναι, κοινωνικούς, 1 Tim 6,18).<sup>105</sup> Better-off women were expected to take care of the destitute widows they hosted in their house (1 Tim 5,16).

### 3. Interaction with the state. Attitudes toward the *polis* and toward civic authorities

1. The author of the Pastorals promotes respect for and submission to civil authorities (1 Tim 2,1-2; Tit 3,1), encouraging thereby a positive attitude toward society and social order.<sup>106</sup>

This deference to authorities is probably inspired by Paul's exhortation in Rom 13,1-8.<sup>107</sup> Paul urges Roman Christians to submit unconditionally to authorities (ἐξουσίας ὑπερεχούσας ὑποτασσέσθω, 13,1). As their power comes from God, submission is ultimately obedience to the divine will. Civil authorities are guardians of legality and morality. For this reason Christians are expected to fulfil their obligations toward the state.<sup>108</sup> We do not know what made Paul

104. One may consider the service of Stephanas and his *oikos* (1 Cor 16,15), of Phoebe, *prostatis* of many (Paul included: Rom 16,1-2), the role of Prisca and Aquila, co-workers of Paul hosting a household church, just as Philemon and Apphia (Phlm 1-2), Nympha (Col 4,15), and Onesiphoros (2 Tim 1,16).

105. Kidd 1990, 127-129. For μεταδίδωμι and derivatives referring to benefactors: *SIG* 2.762 (Dionysopolis, first cent. BCE); *I.Priene* 55 (ll. 22, 24: the *koinon* of the Ionians for priest Dionysios Ameniou, 128/7 BCE); *I.Priene* 113 (Aulus Aemilius Zosimos, 84/01 BCE).

106. Dibelius 1955, 32-33: 'das Ideal christlicher Bürgerlichkeit'; Dibelius and Conzelmann 1972, 8, 39-41; Roloff 1988, 383-384; Wilson 1979, 42; Harland 2003a: 230-232.

107. Oberlinner 1994, 69; Oberlinner 1996, 161-162.

108. Schlier 1977, 386-393; Wilckens 1989, 28-66. The passage may take over an early Christian *topos* (Wilckens 1989, 31). I am not convinced that Rom 13 would contain a hidden transcript reflecting resistance to the imperial order (*pace* Elliott 1997, 184-204).

write this paraenesis that puzzles commentators with its optimistic view of the state and of Roman authority. It may have been part of his missionary strategy, and it clearly antedated the Neronian persecution.<sup>109</sup>

The PE show even stronger deference for (Roman) authorities. Tit 3,1 catches up with Paul's exhortation in Romans ('remind them') without motivating the need to submit to authorities (*archais exousias hypotasessthai*, ἀρχαῖς ἐξουσίαις ὑποτάσσεσθαι). This attitude is the first in the list of virtues to which Christians should subscribe, followed by readiness for good deeds, forestalling slander, meekness and gentleness toward everyone. Submission has a unifying function in the worldview of the Pastorals; it is required in the family, in the church and in society.<sup>110</sup>

1 Tim 2,1-2 goes further, demanding public prayers for all humans, chiefly for civil authorities (ὕπερ βασιλέων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων), obviously for the emperor and the representatives of the imperial government. The twofold motivation given is different from that proposed by Paul in Romans. First, submission to authorities may provide for Christians the likelihood of a quiet and peaceful life (*eremon kai hesychion bion*, ἡρεμιον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον), in piety (*eusebeia*) and dignity (*semnotes*).<sup>111</sup> Respect for authority is thereby connected with social peace. Second, compliance with the worldly powers is congruent with the universal saving will of God (vv. 3-4). In Titus and 1 Timothy such deference toward authorities indicates a concern for respectability and hope for earning the esteem of the outsiders. This positive attitude toward authority and society suggests that Christian allegiance is compatible with civic loyalty. How-

109. Viviano 2009, 237-238. Roman (Jewish) Christians had already been affected by Claudius' decision to expel the Jews and probably Jewish Christians (Wilckens 1989, 36, cf. Suet., *Claud.* 25.4).

110. Oberlinner 1996, 162-163.

111. On the political significance of *eusebeia/pietas* in the imperial propaganda from Augustus up to the second century: Standhartinger 2006. The theological dimension of *eusebeia* in this context is slightly overstated by Marshall (1999, 423). I do not see how prayer would imply a hope for the rulers' conversion (pace Marshall 1999, 422).

ever, the ideal of good citizenship may not go so far as to deny the ultimate fidelity to Christian faith.<sup>112</sup>

M. Gill discovers in this passage elements of polemic against the imperial cult.<sup>113</sup> He rightly notes that the exhortation takes up language and practice connected to the imperial cult<sup>114</sup> (prayer for the authorities as an expression of *eusebeia*,<sup>115</sup> and hope that civic loyalty will secure a peaceful existence). Yet one wonders whether the references to the one saviour God and to Christ as sole mediator (2, 3-5) are indeed as political and polemical as he argues.<sup>116</sup> Gill's arguments rest on the fact that these divine and Christological attributes challenge the imperial cult that assigns a divine character as well as a mediating and salvific function to the emperor. Actually, one may not be sure whether 1 Timothy is inspired by the traditional Old Testament depiction of God as saviour, mediated by the LXX,<sup>117</sup> whether it takes over a title of prestigious deities,<sup>118</sup> or whether it assigns to the (Jewish) Christian God the title of the emperor and other officials and benefactors.<sup>119</sup> Given the religious use of the term

112. These views are shared with Acts, which is a political apology directed at Christian readers, demonstrating the fairness of Roman rule and its role in securing social order. Nevertheless, it also expects Christians to remain faithful. The PE manifest a similar acceptance of the political rule, limited by the demand to preserve Christian fidelity (Wilson 1979, 36-52).

113. Gill 2008.

114. Gill 2008, 141-144, 147-152.

115. So also Price 1984, 3, 232.

116. Spicq 1969, 251; 346, 360, 573-574; Roloff 1988, 355; Collins 2002, 59-61; Gill 2008, 152-156, 158-160. Collins asserts that 1 Tim 2 emphasises the humanity of Christ against the claimed divinity of the emperor. Yet, this is difficult to sustain: for that purpose one would emphasise the *divinity* of Christ against the *human* nature of the emperor.

117. *Soter* (σωτήρ) for God may be traditional, drawn from the LXX. In this particular text it may merely be used as a *nomen agentis* (Dibelius and Conzelmann 1972, 41).

118. *Soter* (σωτήρ) was the attribute of various divinities: Zeus, Asclepius, Athena or Artemis: Poland 1909, 238; Price 1984, 39, 225; also *I.Ephesos* 3402; *Milet* VI 1 308; *I.Stratonikeia* 1122; *I.Tralleis* 10; IG II<sup>2</sup> 2869; *I.Ephesos* 26; 2928 with add. p. 22; 1265; *I.Magnesia* 79; Manganaro 1965, no. 24.

119. To Asia Minor Christians *soter* may have brought to mind the title of emperors or other officials (Augustus: Price 1984, 54; Claudius: Scramuzza 1940, 261-266 θεός;

both in Hellenistic Judaism and in the Greek-speaking world, the term could simply be a title of God. Even if the author *was* inspired by the imperial cult, this does not mean that *soter* is used polemically. Writers commonly applied to God titles borrowed from the political sphere (God as king and ruler of the earth in the OT; Greek gods and goddesses as kings or queens<sup>120</sup>), not because they wished to defy the rule of earthly monarchs, but simply because they described God (the gods) with the title of the highest known authority. It is therefore possible that God is perceived as *the* saviour of all humans, just as officials are saviours of a city and the emperor is the saviour of the empire.

Respect for and obedience to authorities was an essential virtue in ancient societies. This attitude was trusted to secure social concord and the very existence of a state.<sup>121</sup> *Hesychia* (ἡσυχία) marked the assent of the masses to the decisions of political leaders.<sup>122</sup> These convictions are shared by the PE. In 1 Tim 2,2, *hesychia* is directed against involvement in political turmoil. Christians, as loyal citizens, should respect the social and political hierarchy, avoiding to be charged with unruliness. It is difficult to tell whether this has to do with the attempt of the Roman authorities to restrain associations, in order to prevent social and political disruption.<sup>123</sup> From an inner perspective, this position resulted from the loss of the sense of eschatological immediacy. At any rate, this expression of loyalty also shows that the attitude of this community (or at least of the

---

σωτήρ και εὐεργέτης: *IGRR* IV.584, Aezani; σωτήρ τῆς οἰκουμένης: *IG* XII.2 541, Erebus, Lesbos; σωτήρ και εὐεργέτης: *IGRR* 4.1099, Halasarna, Cos]. See also Vespasian (I.Iasos 602). For senators, and for Titus Flaminus, Price, 42, 46-47. A search on *soter* (σωτήρ) in the epigraphic database of the Packard Institute of Humanities shows numerous cases where the term is used for benefactors and/or lower officials. Therefore the term in itself need not be taken as indicative of the imperial cult.

120. Neyrey 2005, 66-67.

121. Plut., *Prae. ger. reip.* 20-21, *Mor.* 816A-F.

122. Plut., *Fab.* 9.2; Alc. 26.2.9.

123. Plin., *Ep.* 10.33, 34; 10.92, 93; 10.96, 97. On legal regulations and on Roman fear of illicit and disruptive actions of *collegia*: Waltzing 1895, 115-121, 132-140; Cotter 1996, 74-89; Sirks 2006, 21-40; Ascough 2003, 42-46. The impact of restrictive Roman legislation in the Eastern provinces has been challenged: Arnaoutoglou 2002, 27-44; Harland 2003a: 161-173. See also Perry in this volume.



author) did not differ so much from that of contemporary associations.<sup>124</sup>

2. Nothing is known about the way in which the state, through the local representatives of the imperial government, related to this *ekklesia*. The group was probably too insignificant to attract much attention. Whether the exhortations to submit to authorities and the wish for a quiet life, discussed above, indirectly reflect some sort of pressure from the local authorities is merely a matter of speculation.

#### 4. Summary. Was the community of the Pastoral Epistles a religious association?

This essay has explored the features of the *ekklesia* of the PE, to check the hypothesis that this community can be assimilated to a private religious association. To sum up, religious associations were established on private initiative, sometimes by a single founder, and members were tied together by a common cult. These associations could bear specific names (*thiasos, mystai, cultores*), yet other, less specific appellations were also known. The name often carried a theophoric element. Religious associations were frequently related to the structures of the *oikos*. Although subject to state control, generally such associations were not part of the public cult. They had a more or less established organisation, officials and statutes. In terms of gender, religious associations were more frequently gender-inclusive, compared to professional ones. Members not infrequently belonged to various social strata.

The community envisaged by the PE was more than likely founded by Paul, whose role was analogous to that of numerous other persons who established religious associations. Members joined freely, because of their common devotion to and worship of God and Jesus Christ. Their community is named *ekklesia Theou* and *oikos Theou*, both clearly theophoric. Whereas the origin of the term *ekklesia* is debated, it is not unknown in associations. The *oikos* (*do-*

---

124. On the participation of associations in the imperial cult: Harland 2003a: 115-136. The PE would certainly not promote participation in the imperial cult.

*mus*) is rather common as a reference to associations, and some religious associations even bear the name of *oikos* of the worshipped god(s) (e.g. the *oikos* of the *Theoi Megaloi*), just as the Christian *ekklesia* does.

The *ekklesia*, though replicating in a sense the *oikos*, includes members belonging to more than one household. Both men and women, better-off householders and slaves can be members. The ethnic and geographic heterogeneity is difficult to assess. In the PE we find merely a reminiscence of the *adelphos* terminology so typical of the authentic Pauline epistles, and even that is used for an ideological purpose. This challenges the often quoted contrast between the familial relations in Christian communities and the alleged lack of such dimension in associations.<sup>125</sup>

Two aspects very typical of associations, namely conviviality and the burial of deceased members, are not mentioned. Yet New Testament scholars would probably not conclude from this silence that the Eucharist was not celebrated in this community or that Christians were unconcerned about the decent burial of their fellows.

The station codes and church orders of the PE may be regarded as drafts of statutes. Yet, these writings pertain to a different genre than the bylaws of some known associations. One should not therefore expect to find any full-fledged statutes here. In terms of organisation, the institutionalisation is more advanced compared to the lifetime of the founder, not only because of the offices, but also because of the emphasis on the exclusive authority of officeholders. The offices named here (*episkopoi*, *diakonoi*) can be found in associations, as well.

The PE report about the attitude to be displayed toward the state. The author expects members to submit to civil authorities, moreover, to organise public prayers on their behalf, in the hope that Christians may live a quiet life, in *eusebeia*. Whereas some modern authors discover signs of anti-imperial polemic, in fact these epistles express loyalty toward Roman authorities. It may well be that this loyalty is motivated by the hope to avoid censure. At any

---

125. McCready 1996, 64.

rate, we do not find here anything of the harsh anti-Roman, anti-imperial polemic of the Book of Revelation.<sup>126</sup>

The PE, as otherwise other New Testament writings, do suggest a marked concern with teaching, probably to a greater extent than in Greco-Roman associations. This concern is largely due to the Jewish roots of the Christian faith, and as such should not be used to oppose Christian communities to associations. Although Judaism was deeply concerned with teaching, Jewish communities were also organised as associations. On the other hand, it would be anachronistic to project our perception of doctrine (that inevitably includes the system of Christian dogmas developed through centuries) into the first century, and to regard the Christian *ekklesiai* as a sort of theological institutes.

Christian communities developed within a given society and from its members. At the formative stage, these inevitably drew from the experience of their society. In terms of organisation, early Christian communities come very close to religious associations. The community of the PE is a good illustration of this point.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, C. 1932, 'A Bacchic Inscription of the Second Century A. D.', *BMM* 27: 11, 240-242.
- Arnaoutoglou, I.N. 2002, 'Roman Law and Collegia in Asia Minor', *RIDA* 49, 27-44.
- Ascough, R.S. 2003, *Paul's Macedonian Associations. The Social Context of Philippians and 1 Thessalonians*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe 161. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Balch, D. 1981, *Let Wives Be Submissive. The Domestic Code in 1 Peter*. Society of Biblical Literature monograph series 26. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- Barclay, J. M. 2006, 'Money and Meetings: Group Formation among Diaspora Jews and Early Christians', in A. Gutsfeld and D.-A. Koch (eds.), *Vereine, Synagogen und Gemeinden im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 25. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, pp. 113-127.

---

126. For the sectarian, anti-Roman character of Revelation, and its contrast to the PE and 1 Peter: Harland 2003a: 239-264.

- Barton, S.C. and Horsley, G.H.R. 1981, 'A Hellenistic Cult Group and the New Testament Churches', *JAC* 24, 7-41.
- Beck, R. 2006, 'On Becoming a Mithraist', in L.E. Vaage (ed.), *Religious Rivalries in the Early Roman Empire and the Rise of Christianity*. Studies in Christianity and Judaism 18. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, pp. 175-194.
- Beck, R. 1996, 'The Mysteries of Mithras', in Kloppenborg and Wilson 1996, 178-180.
- Bendlin, A. 2002, 'Gemeinschaft, Öffentlichkeit und Identität: Forschungsgeschichtliche Anmerkungen zu den Mustern sozialer Ordnung in Rom', in U. Egelhaaf-Gaiser and A. Schäfer (eds.), *Religiöse Vereine in der römischen Antike: Untersuchungen zu Organisation, Ritual und Raumordnung*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 13. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, pp. 9-40.
- Betz, H.D. 2004, 'Transferring a Ritual: Paul's Interpretation of Baptism in Romans 6', in Engberg-Pedersen 2004, 84-118.
- Beyer, H.W. 1935, 'ἐπίσκοπος', in G. Kittel, G.W. Bromiley and R.E. Pitkin (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 2. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, pp. 604-617.
- Bieringer, R. 2007, 'Women and Leadership in Romans 16. The Leading Roles of Phoebe, Prisca, and Junia in Early Christianity', *East Asian Pastoral Review* 44: 2-3, 221-237 and 316-336.
- Borgen, P., 2004, "'Yes", "No", "How Far?": The Participation of Jews and Christians in Pagan Cults', in Engberg-Pedersen 2004, 30-59.
- Brown, R.E. 1992, 'Early Church,' in R.E. Brown, J.A. Fitzmyer and R.E. Murphy (eds.), *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, pp. 1338-1353.
- Brox, N. 1969, *Die Pastoralbriefe. Regensburger Neues Testament* 7, 2. Regensburg: Pustet.
- Buckler, W. H. 1937, 'A Charitable Foundation of A. D. 237', *JHS* 57: 1, 1-10.
- Cancik, H. 2007, 'Haus, Schule, Gemeinde: Zur Organisation von "fremder Religion" in Rom (1.-3. Jh. n. Chr.)', in J. Rüpke (ed.), *Gruppenreligionen im römischen Reich. Sozialformen, Grenzziehungen und Leistungen*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 43. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, pp. 31-48.
- Collins, R. F. 2002, *1 & 2 Timothy and Titus: A Commentary*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Cotter, W. 1996, 'The *Collegia* and Roman Law. State Restrictions on Voluntary Associations 64 BCE-200CE', in Kloppenborg and Wilson 1996, 74-89.
- Dautzenberg, G. 1983, 'Zur Stellung der Frauen in den paulinischen Gemeinden', In G.H. Dautzenberg, H. Merklein and K. Müller (eds.), *Die Frau im Urchristentum. Quaestiones disputatae* 95. Freiburg: Herder, pp. 182-224.

- Dibelius, M. 1955, *Die Pastoralbriefe*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 13. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Dibelius, M. and Conzelmann, H. 1972, *The Pastoral Epistles. A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. Hermeneia—a critical and historical commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Downs, D.J. 2008, *The Offering of the Gentiles: Paul's Collection for Jerusalem in its Chronological, Cultural, and Cultic Contexts*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe 248. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Dunn, J.D.G. 2009, *Beginning from Jerusalem. Christianity in the Making*, vol 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Ebel, E. 2004, *Die Attraktivität früher christlicher Gemeinden: die Gemeinde von Korinth im Spiegel griechisch-römischer Vereine*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe 178. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Elliott, N. 1997, 'Romans 13:1-7 in the Context of Imperial Propaganda', in R.A. Horsley (ed.), *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, pp. 184-204.
- Engberg-Pedersen, T. (ed.), *Paul in his Hellenistic Context*. Academic Paperback. London: T&T Clark.
- Fiore, B. and Harrington, D.J. 2007, *The Pastoral Epistles. First Timothy, Second Timothy, Titus*. Sacra pagina series 12. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2007, 'Brotherhoods of Faith and Provident Planning: The Non-Public Associations of the Greek World', *MHR* 22, 183-210.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2001, 'The Rhodian Associations and Economic Activity', in Z.H. Archibald, J. Davies, V. Gabrielsen, G.J. Oliver (eds.), *Hellenistic Economies*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 215-244.
- Garnsey, P. and Saller, R. 1997, 'Patronal Power Relations', in R.A. Horsley (ed.), *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, pp. 96-103.
- Garnsey P. and Saller, R. 1987, *The Roman Empire: Economy, Society, and Culture*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Gielen, M. 1990, *Tradition und Theologie neutestamentlicher Haustafelethik. Ein Beitrag zur Frage einer christlichen Auseinandersetzung mit gesellschaftlichen Normen*. Bonner Biblische Beiträge 75. Frankfurt: Anton Hain.
- Gill, M. 2008, *Jesus as Mediator: Politics and Polemic in 1 Timothy 2:1-7*. Oxford, New York: Peter Lang.
- Gutsfeld, A. and Koch, D.-A. 2006. *Vereine, Synagogen und Gemeinden im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 25. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Harland, P.A. 2003a, *Associations, Synagogues and Congregations. Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress.

- Harland, Ph.A. 2003b. 'Christ-bearers and Fellow-initiates: Local Cultural Life and Christian Identity in Ignatius' Letters', *J ECS* 11, 481-499.
- Harland, Ph.A. 2005, 'Familial Dimensions of Group Identity I. "Brothers" (ἀδελφοί) in Associations of the Greek East', *JBL* 124, 491-513.
- Harland, Ph.A. 2006, 'The Declining Polis? Religious Rivalries in Ancient Civic Context', in L.E. Vaage (ed.), *Religious Rivalries in the Early Roman Empire and the Rise of Christianity*. Studies in Christianity and Judaism / Études sur le christianisme et le Judaïsme 18. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, pp. 21-49.
- Harland, Ph.A. 2007, 'Familial Dimensions of Group Identity II. "Mothers" and "Fathers" in Associations and Synagogues of the Greek World', *J SJ* 38, 57-79.
- Harrison, J.R. 2002, 'A Share in all the Sacrifices', *New Docs* 9, 1-3.
- Hatch, E., 1882, *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches: Eight Lectures Delivered before the University of Oxford, in the year 1880*. Bampton lectures. London: Rivingtons.
- Heinrici, C.F.G. 1876, 'Die Christengemeinden Korinths und die religiösen Genossenschaften der Griechen', *ZWT* 19, 465-526.
- Heinrici, C.F.G. 1896, *Der erste Brief and die Korinther*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hemelrijk, E. 2008, 'Patronesses and "Mothers" of Roman *Collegia*', *CLAnt* 27: 1, 115-162.
- Horrell, D.G. 2004, 'Domestic Space and Christian Meetings at Corinth: Imagining New Contexts and the Buildings East of the Theatre', *NTS* 50, 349-369.
- Horrell, D.G. 2001, 'From ἀδελφοί to οἶκος θεοῦ: Social Transformation in Pauline Christianity', *JBL* 120, 293-311.
- Horrell, D.G. 2007, 'The Label Χριστιανός: 1 Peter 4:16 and the Formation of Christian Identity', *JBL* 126, 361-381.
- Judge, E.A. 2005, 'Did the Churches Compete with Cult Groups?' in J.T. Fitzgerald, Th.H. Olbricht and L.M. White (eds.), *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*. Society of Biblical Literature. Novum Testamentum. Supplements 115. Leiden, Boston: Brill, pp. 501-524.
- 'Kidd, R.M. 1990, *Wealth and Beneficence in the Pastoral Epistles: A "Bourgeois" Form of Early Christianity?* Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 122. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Klauck, H.-J. 1995, *Die religiöse Umwelt des Urchristentums I. Stadt- und Hausreligion, Volksglaube*. Studienbücher Theologie 9,1. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Klauck, H.-J. 2003. *Religion und Gesellschaft im frühen Christentum. Neutestamentliche*

- Studien. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, 152. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Klauck, H.-J. and Bailey, D.P. 2006, *Ancient Letters and the New Testament: A Guide to Context and Exegesis*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.
- Kloppenborg, J.S. 1996, 'Collegia and *Thiasoi*: Issues in Function, Taxonomy and Membership,' in Kloppenborg and Wilson 1996, 16-30.
- Kloppenborg, J.S. and Wilson, S.G. (eds.) 1996, *Voluntary Associations in the Greco-Roman World*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lampe, P. 2003, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries* (*Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten*, transl. M. Steinhauser). London: T&T Clark, Continuum.
- Lietzmann, H. 1933, 'Notizen', *ZNAW* 32: 310-315.
- Lindemann, A. 2000, *Der erste Korintherbrief*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 9, 1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- MacDonald, M.Y. 1988, *The Pauline Churches. Socio-historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings*. Monograph series, Society for New Testament Studies 60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Manganaro, G. 1965, *Le iscrizioni delle isole Milesie*. Rome: Istituto Poligrafico di Stato.
- Marshall, I.H. 1999, *The Pastoral Epistles*. International critical commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. London, New York: T&T Clark.
- Martin, D.B. 2001, 'Review Essay: Justin J. Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 84, 51-64.
- McCready, W. 1996, 'Ekklesia and Voluntary Associations', in Kloppenborg and Wilson 1996, 59-73.
- Meeks, W. 1983, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press.
- Meggitt, J.J. 1998, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*. Studies of the New Testament and its world. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Merz, A. 2004, *Die Fiktive Selbstausslegung des Paulus: Intertextuelle Studien zur Intention und Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe*. *Novum Testamentum et orbis antiquus*, Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 52. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Merz, A. 2006, 'Fictitious Self-Exposition of Paul: How Might Intertextual Theory Suggest a Reformulation of the Hermeneutics of Pseudepigraphy', in Th.L. Brodie, D. MacDonald and S.E. Porter (eds.), *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice*. New Testament monographs 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, pp. 113-132.
- Mommsen, Th. 1843, *De collegiis et sodaliciis Romanorum*, Kiel: Libraria Schwersiana.

- Neyrey, J.H. 2005, "First", "Only", "One of a Few", and "No One Else". The Rhetoric of Uniqueness and the Doxologies in 1 Timothy', *Biblica* 86: 59-87.
- Oberlinner, L. 1994, *Die Pastoralbriefe. Kommentar zum ersten Timotheusbrief*. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 11, 2. Freiburg: Herder.
- Oberlinner, L. 1996, *Die Pastoralbriefe, Kommentar zum Titusbrief*. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 11.3. Freiburg: Herder.
- Oberlinner, L. 2007, 'Gemeindeordnung und rechte Lehre. Zur Fortschreibung der paulinischen Ekklesiologie in den Pastoralbriefen', *ThQ* 187, 295-308.
- Oster, R. 1987, 'Holy days in honour of Artemis', *New Docs* 4, 74-82.
- Perry, J.S. 2006, *The Roman Collegia: The Modern Evolution of an Ancient Concept*. Mnemosyne, Bibliotheca Classica Batava., Suppl. 277. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Poland, F. 1909, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*. Fürslich Jablonowski 'sche gesellschaft zu Leipzig 38. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Price, S.R.F. 1984, *Rituals and Power. The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quaß, F. 1993, *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens. Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Quinn, J.D. and Wacker, W.C. 2000, *The First and Second Letter to Timothy*. Eerdmans critical commentary. Grand Rapids, MI, Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Rüpke, J. 2007, *Gruppenreligionen im römischen Reich. Sozialformen, Grenzziehungen und Leistungen*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 43. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Roloff, J. 1993, *Die Kirche im Neuen Testament*. Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Roloff, J. 1988, *Der erste Brief an Timotheus*. EKK, Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 15. Zürich, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- Schlier, H. 1977, *Der Römerbrief*. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6. Freiburg: Herder.
- Schmidt, K.L. 1965, 'ἐκκλησία,' in G. Kittel, Bromiley, G.V. and Pitkin, R.E. (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 3. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, pp. 501-536.
- Schneider, G. 1982, *Die Apostelgeschichte II*, Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 5, 2. Freiburg: Herder.
- Schneider, J. 1969, 'τιμή, τιμάω.' In G. Kittel, G.W. Bromiley and R.E. Pitkin (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. 8. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, pp.170-177.



- Schöllgen, G. 1989, 'Die  $\delta\upsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\ \tau\iota\mu\acute{\eta}$  von 1 Tim 5,17', *ZNTW* 80, 232-239.
- Schrage, W. 1995, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther 2. 1Kor 6, 12-11, 16*. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 7, 2. Solothurn, Düsseldorf: Benzinger, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner.
- Scramuzza, V.M. 1940, 'Claudius Soter Euergetes', *HSPH* 51, 261-266.
- Sirks, B.A.J. 2006, 'Die Vereine in der kaiserlichen Gesetzgebung', in A. Gutsfeld and D.-A., Koch (eds.), *Vereine, Synagogen und Gemeinden im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 25. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, pp. 21-40.
- Sokolowski, F. 1955, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*. Travaux et mémoires des anciens membres étrangers de l'École et de divers savants 9. Paris: De Boccard.
- Sordi, M. 1984, *I cristiani e l'impero romano*. Di fronte e attraverso 118. Milano: Jaca Book.
- Spicq, C. 1969, *Saint Paul. Les Épîtres Pastorales I*. Etudes Bibliques. Paris: Gabalda.
- Standhartinger, A. 2006, 'Eusebeia in den Pastoralbriefen. Ein Beitrag zum Einfluss römischen Denkens auf das entstehende Christentum', *NT* 48, 51-82.
- Stowers, S.K. 1998, 'A Cult from Philadelphia: Oikos Religion or Cultic Association?' in A.J. Malherbe, F.W. Norris, J.W. Thompson (eds.), *Early Church in Its Context: Essays in Honor of Everett Ferguson*. Novum Testamentum. Supplements 90. Leiden: Brill, pp. 287-301.
- Theissen, G. 1974, 'Soziale Integration und Sakramentales Handeln', *NT* 16: 3, 179-206.
- Van Nijf, O.M. 1997, *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*. Dutch monographs on ancient history and archaeology 17. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Vermaseren, M.J. 1987, *Corpus cultus Cybelae Attidisque I*. Asia Minor. Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain 50. Leiden: Brill.
- Verner, D.C. 1983, *The Household of God. The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles*. Society of Biblical Literature 71. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- Viviano, B. 2009, 'The Christian and the State in Acts and Paul (Acts 25,16 and Rom 13,1-7). Roman Fairness Revisited', in D. Marguerat (ed.), *Reception of Paulinism in Acts - Réception du paulinisme dans les Actes des apôtres*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 229. Leuven: Peeters, pp. 227-238.
- Wagner, U. 1994, *Die Ordnung des Hauses Gottes: der Ort von Frauen in der Ekklesiologie und Ethik der Pastoralbriefe*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe 65. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

- Walker-Ramisch, S. 1996, 'Graeco-Roman Voluntary Associations and the Damascus Document. A Sociological Analysis', in Kloppenborg and Wilson 1996, 128-145.
- Waltzing, J.-P. 1895-1896. *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'occident*, vols. 1-2. Louvain: Peeters.
- Weidemann, H.-U. 2008, 'Titus, der getaufte Heide', in H.-U. Weidemann and W. Eisele (eds.), *Ein Meisterschüler. Titus und sein Brief: Michael Theobald zum 60. Geburtstag*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 214. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, pp. 31-54.
- Weidinger, K. 1928, *Die Haustafeln: Ein Stück urchristlicher Paränese*. Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 14. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrich.
- Weiser, A. 2003, *Der zweite Brief an Timotheus*. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 16, 1. Düsseldorf, Zürich: Benzinger, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- Vélissaropoulos, J. 1980, *Les Naoclères grecs. Recherches sur les institutions maritimes en Grèce et dans l'Orient hellénisé*. Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 9. Genève: Droz, Paris: Minard.
- Wilckens, U. 1989, *Der Brief an die Römer. Röm 12-16*. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6, 3. Zürich: Benzinger, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- Wild, R.A. 1990 'Pastoral Letters', in R.E. Brown, J.A. Fitzmyer and R.E. Murphy (eds.), *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, pp. 891-902.
- Wilson, S.G. 1996, 'Voluntary Associations. An Overview', in Kloppenborg and Wilson 1996, 1-15.
- Wilson, S.G. 1979, *Luke and the Pastoral Epistles*. London: S.P.C.K.
- Wolter, M. 1988, *Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 146. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

# The Trade Associations of Ptolemaic Egypt: Definition, Organization and their Relationship with the State

*Matt Gibbs*

## 1. Introduction

This chapter considers the trade associations of Ptolemaic Egypt, and will deal specifically with three issues.<sup>1</sup> First, the question of definition: What defined these groups as associations and as private, voluntary collectives? Second, the organization of these groups will be examined: Were they imitations of the state or were they based on another model? Finally, the relationship between these collectives and the Ptolemaic administration will be considered, with particular relevance to their legal status and their position in part of the economy of Hellenistic Egypt.

To start, trade associations themselves, in their most simple form, were collective bodies comprising individuals linked and identified by occupation or involvement in a trade, although they likely had a variety of interests that ranged broadly across economic, social, and religious spheres. The tradition was certainly long-lived too; the *fenomeno associativo* in Egypt has a significant history,

---

1. The paper that forms the basis of this chapter was presented at the ‘Public Associations and the Public Sphere in the Ancient World’ symposium, held on September 9-11 2010, at the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, Copenhagen. For the invitation and hospitality, I thank Vincent Gabrielsen, Christian Ammitzbøll Thomsen, and Sofie Sidor. For their comments, advice, and help, I thank the participants at the symposium, and in particular Colin Adams, Peter Fibiger Bang, Boris Chrubasik, Jennifer Cromwell, Georgy Kantor, Andrew Monson (who was also generous enough to share his research with me), Jonathan S. Perry, Pauline Ripat, Dorothy Thompson, Christian Ammitzbøll Thomsen, and Conor Whately.

particularly in the form of trade and socio-religious collectives. They appeared as early as the Saite period, continued through the Ptolemaic period and into the fourth and fifth centuries AD.<sup>2</sup> The associations in Egypt probably owed their origins not only to earlier Pharaonic precursors, but also to Greek antecedents, given the existence of trading links between Egypt and the Mediterranean world (to be discussed later).<sup>3</sup>

The primary form of evidence for Hellenistic Egypt, the papyri, offer a rather different view of the *fenomeno associativo* than is usually provided by the epigraphic evidence in the ancient Mediterranean, and although epigraphic texts concerning associations in Hellenistic Egypt do exist, the papyri are much more prevalent.<sup>4</sup> The epigraphy associated with associations was typically created, not through any obligation to the state, but for disseminating and recording what the issuing association deemed necessary and desirable to be known in broader circles of society.<sup>5</sup> Very few of the papyri represent an attempt to glorify or honour the associations themselves (although the regulations, or *nomoi*, could perhaps be seen in such a light). Much of the evidence concerning the associations in Hellenistic Egypt consists largely of *nomoi*, letters, a variety of transactions, and state administrative documents that can be broadly divided into ‘private’ and ‘public’ spheres of interest: ‘private’ in the sense of internal documentation that would rarely have been disseminated to non-members (so, for instance, the *nomoi* of these associations); and ‘public’, with regard to the papyri that illustrate the relationship between the associations and Graeco-Egyptian society as a whole (for example, contracts between the administration and associations). Moreover, on occasion, the division between these spheres can be blurred, and ‘private’ documentation can appear in the ‘public’ context (as in the case of legal proceedings).

---

2. See de Cenival 1972; 1986; Muszynski 1977; Donker Van Heel 1996; Pestman 1993; Monson 2006; 2007a; 2007b; Monson and Arlt 2010; Gibbs 2008; Venticinque 2009. See further the chapter by Venticinque in this volume.

3. On Egypt's external trade: Manning 2010, 23; 2007, 442; Austin 1970, 35-40.

4. E.g. *I.Fayoum* I 6 (104 BC); II 119 = *SB* I 5022 (second-first century BC).

5. Gabrielsen 2001, 219.

Consequently, the very difference in the nature of the evidence can lead to some difficulty in establishing firm criteria for defining associations in Hellenistic Egypt. Perhaps most the significant problem is one of terminology: How are trade associations identified, and how did they identify themselves?

## 2. Definitions

The evidence reveals an almost bewildering array of terms for, and in connection with, associations generally: for instance, *synodos*, *koinon*, *thiasos*, and *ethnos*.<sup>6</sup> As a result, the terminology of these groups can be incredibly confusing, especially when attempting to distinguish and examine a single feature in the activities and interests of a particular group or groups;<sup>7</sup> in fact, most of these collectives likely had several socio-economic and socio-religious interests.<sup>8</sup>

In some instances either this terminology was not used, suggesting that the association preferred the use of an occupational designation (or, of course, that the context required it), or was used in conjunction with an occupational designation: the *naukleroi Hippodromitai*;<sup>9</sup> the *pantes hoi ek tou ethnous nekrotaphoi*.<sup>10</sup> These difficulties are not only inherently linked to the way in which these groups portrayed themselves, but are also indelibly connected to the manner in which the state administration and other individuals in Ptolemaic society chose to deal with the associations themselves. As such, any line of distinction between trade and cultic association is difficult to draw; there were similarities between their organisation and

---

6. E.g. *I.Fayoum* III 204 (68 BC); III 205 (51 BC); *SB* I 4224 (ca. 41 BC); *SB* V 7835 = *P.Lond.* VII 2193 (69-58 BC?); *P.Enteux.* 21 (218 BC); *O.Bodl.* I 312 (late third century BC); *P.Ryl.* II 65 (67 BC?). On issues of terminology, see further the Introduction to this volume.

7. A case in point: *I.Fayoum* II 134 (79 BC): *synodos georgon idion* (σύνοδος γεωργῶν ιδίων).

8. The problem is certainly not found in Egypt alone; see e.g. Gabrielsen 2001, 218 (and n.12) and the Introduction to this volume.

9. *BGU* VIII 1741 = *SB* IV 7405.6 (63 BC).

10. *P.Ryl.* II 65.3 (67 BC?): πάντες οἱ ἐκ τοῦ ἔθνους νεκροτάφοι; *P.Köln* VI 290 (213 BC), for ἔθνος in this context cf. Thompson 2001, 1262; 2008, 32; and in this volume.

dedications.<sup>11</sup> The problem lies, then, in the rather fluid identities of these collectives in their relationships to their own members, to the state administration, and to society generally.

What does appear to distinguish the trade associations considered here from simple loose groups of crafts- and tradespeople united for one-off events or transactions are specific forms of regular *collective* activity. Of course, not all forms of collective activity lead to the existence of trade associations.<sup>12</sup> Some instances likely point to loose groups of crafts- and tradespeople banding together for a singular purpose. For example, a group of individuals who were involved in the retail sale of papyrus, around the turn of the second and first century BC, designated themselves simply as ‘contractors of the retail sale of papyrus rolls’ when dealing with the *epistates*, the *archiphylakites*, and other officials in Tebtunis;<sup>13</sup> a text, from the third century BC, likely concerning the transport of grain seems to infer that four *naukleroi* collectively performed a singular contract for the state, that they were not connected through any links based on an association, and that the execution of the contract was likely a one-time affair.<sup>14</sup> The evidence does, however, reveal clear instances of concerted united action by trade associations: dedications,<sup>15</sup> the creation of *nomoi* or allusions to them in other documents,<sup>16</sup> the contracting of, and payments for, services rendered over periods of time.<sup>17</sup> Moreover, the fact that on occasion (and often on more than one occasion) the state administration identified, recognized, and dealt with these groups as unified collectives is telling: even in situ-

11. Clarysse and Thompson 2006, vol. 2, 204 and n.458.

12. Adams, Adams 2007, 183-85.

13. *SB* XII 11078 = *SB* VI 9629.2-3 (ca. 100 BC): οἱ ἐξείληφότες τὴν διάθεσιν τῶν χαρτῶν. Cf. Lewis 1973, 134-39.

14. *BGU* X 1933 (ca. 230 BC), with *BL* VI, 18; cf. Hauben 1971, 272-75 (and *BGU* VIII 1741 = *SB* IV 7405; *BGU* VIII 1742 = *SB* IV 7406; *BGU* VIII 1743 + XIV 2368). The inference is caused by the use of the first person plural ὁμολο[γ]οῦμεν (7). Then ‘they’ acted as a loose collective, and were not represented by officials.

15. Perhaps *I. Fayoum* II 134 (79 BC).

16. E.g. *PSI* VI 599 (mid third century BC), and *BL* VIII: 399; *P.Ryl.* II 65 (67 BC?); *P.Entreux.* 20 (221 BC); 21 (218 BC); *P.Stanford Green dem.* 21.7 (Monson and Arlt 2010, 115); *P.Berl.Spieg.* 3115 = *P.Assoc.* p.103-07 (110-107 BC).

17. E.g. *P.Hib.* I 67 (228 BC); I 68 (ca. 228 BC).

ations where associations generally were to be dissolved, the state administration still acknowledged their presence.<sup>18</sup>

Given the differences in the forms of evidence between Egypt and the Mediterranean at large, and in the data that they provide, the trade associations of Ptolemaic Egypt should be defined by the following criteria: first, self-identification (including identification by the state administration) illustrating a level of longevity. Second, specific defined collective actions and activities: for instance, the composition and application of association *nomoi* governing a wide-range of members' behaviour, agreed to by the members themselves; continued contracts between associations, or their representatives, and other parties (including the state administration); and other socio-religious activities, often noted in the *nomoi*, that all appear under the auspices of an 'association' designated by occupation.

The trade associations of Hellenistic Egypt were voluntary, or private, associations. The terms 'voluntary' or 'private' have been typically used to distinguish these forms of associations from those sponsored by the *polis* or state, or from other institutions where membership was automatic.<sup>19</sup> In fact, one of the general characteristics of the private, or voluntary, associations of the Mediterranean was that, typically, they had no formal affiliation to the *polis* or state in which they operated, despite the fact that they remained subject to the laws of these *poleis* or states.<sup>20</sup> This is certainly the case in Egypt, although there are examples of trade associations dealing with the officials of the Ptolemaic administration, most notably, the *naukleroi Hippodromitai* of Memphis, and the state farmers.<sup>21</sup> In these cases, however, it is unclear whether the affiliation was anything beyond the completion of a contract between the association and the state administration.

---

18. E.g. P.Tebt. III 700 = C.Ord.Ptol. 50 = C.Ptol.Sklav. I 11 (124 BC).

19. Wilson 1996, 1.

20. Gabrielsen 2009, 179 and San Nicolò 1972, vol. 2, 6-7. A second characteristic - that the members of these associations distanced themselves from the prevailing juridical distinctions between categories of status (cf. Gabrielsen 2009, 179) - is unfortunately difficult to see in Hellenistic Egypt.

21. See pp. 251-54 and pp. 260-61.

In Egypt, at least, participation in a trade association does not appear to have been a formal prerequisite for practicing crafts- or trades-people at any level under the Ptolemies. The foundation of an association appears to have been set in motion by either the *voluntary* action of several individuals who shared a common notion or set of ideals, or perhaps under the guidance of a single person who could influence the collective membership with their own personal principles.<sup>22</sup> The voluntary act can be seen in the agreeing to, if not the signing of, the *nomoi* that governed the behaviour of the members of these collectives generally.<sup>23</sup> The extant Graeco-Egyptian *nomoi* of trade associations (and associations generally) reveal a startling array of collective activities, ranging from commensality, funerary activity, through to socio-economic interests. They also bear a startling resemblance not only to one another, but also to those regulations that governed associations in other areas of the Mediterranean. More interesting is that, although the member's initial endorsement was voluntary, once these regulations were agreed upon and signed, they seem to have become legally binding and authoritative.<sup>24</sup>

Given the nature of an association based primarily on occupational links, the only necessary requisite for membership was likely active participation in the profession with which the association itself was concerned. Consequently exclusivity, as an inherent aspect of a trade association's membership, would probably have been a dominant factor in admission. Yet evidence for this aspect in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods, and in particular the latter is rather insignificant. Nonetheless, the available data often seem to illustrate a single profession amongst the members: for example, there is little in the ordinance concerning the association of *choachytai* at Thebes to suggest it was made up of more than a single profession.<sup>25</sup>

In some instances, however, there does seem to have been infor-

---

22. San Nicolò 1972, vol. 2, 6-7; cf. *IG III 1*, 23, 29 (first century AD).

23. *P.Ryl.* II 65 (67 BC?); *P.Enteux.* 20 (221 BC); 21 (218 BC); *P.Stanford Green dem.* 21.7 (Monson and Arlt 2010, 115); de Cenival 1972, 166.

24. *P.Enteux.* 21 (218 BC); *P.Siut* 10591 rt VI (170 BC); *P.Ryl.* II 65 (67 BC?).

25. *P.Berl.Spieg.* 3115 = *P.Assoc.* p.103-07 (110-107 BC)



mal pressure on non-members by particular trade associations, and there are examples of the implementation of regulations that attempted to enforce mandatory participation.<sup>26</sup> The demotic statutes of the association of *choachytai* at Thebes noted that all those who had turned sixteen years of age or had practised for ten years should join the collective, otherwise they were to be pointedly excluded from practising the trade.<sup>27</sup> Whether membership in a trade association was hereditary (like the practice of a specific trade may have been) is another aspect that remains unclear, but is certainly one that is related to this discussion; in these cases familial links could be entwined with occupational connections. The most interesting and most damaging consequence of hereditary collective membership is that it effectively restricted admission to those individuals belonging to particular families. The suggestions that members of the same family belonged to the same association at the same time, and that membership could only be passed through familial links are by no means new. This is particularly true in light of the hereditary tendency of occupations not simply in Hellenistic Egypt, but in ancient societies generally.<sup>28</sup> There are certainly several examples of associations and trade collectives that treated membership as transferable through and between families.<sup>29</sup> An example, dating to the early first century BC, in the form of a professional oath illustrates that two families of ‘god’s sealers’, possibly equivalent to either the Greek *nekrotaphoi* or *entaphiastai*, had joined together to become a sin-

26. MacMullen 1974, 70ff.; Pavis d’Ecurac 1990, 117-18.

27. *P.Berl. Spieg.* 3115 = *P.Assoc.* p.103-07 (110-107 BC); Pestman 1993, 196-201; Thompson 1988, 156, n.8; Muhs 2001, 15-16, n.31. Cf. perhaps *P.Ryl.* II 65 (67 BC?): The νεκροτάφοι ask that the accused pay the fines specified in the Demotic ordinance and that they ‘receive the proper penalty’; was the penalty exclusion? See lines 10-13: ἡξίουσιν συντάξει καταστήται τοὺς ἐγκαλουμένους καὶ ἐπαναγκάσαι αὐτοὺς συνεχομένους ἀποδοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὰ διορισμένα ἐπίτιμα καὶ τᾶλλα τὰ εἰς τὸ βασιλικόν, τυχεῖν δ’ αὐτοὺς ὄν προσήκει. On the *choachytai* (χοαχόται), the *pastophoroi Amenophios tou en tois Memnoneiois* (παστοφόροι Ἀμενώφιος τοῦ ἐν τοῖς Μεμνονεῖοις) (*UPZ* II 191 [111 BC]; 192 [110 BC]; 193 [110 BC]; Pestman 1993, 193-95); Derda 1991, 26.

28. Clarysse and Thompson, 2006, vol. 2, 203-4.

29. *W.Chr.* 110A 12-15 (110 BC); San Nicolò 1972, vol. 2, 28; Roberts, Skeat and Nock 1936, 54; *P.Berl. Spieg.* 3115 = *P.Assoc.* p.103-07 (110-107 BC); *OGIS* 51 = *SB* V 8855 (ca. 246 BC); *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1109 (AD 178); *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1112 (AD 212); *IGR* IV 353d, 17-18.

gle trade association.<sup>30</sup> A clause in a text concerning an association of weavers, from the late first century BC, notes ‘the principal lady together with the women of the elders and the women of all the weavers of Coptos, who are confirmed/recorded together with their children and the children of their children’; this likely refers to the wife of the president, the wives of the elders, as well as the wives of all members, alongside their children.<sup>31</sup>

Nevertheless, even in spite of such attempts at the informal monopolisation of particular areas of trade by associations, independent crafts- and trades-people continued to flourish under the Ptolemies, as did the voluntary and private trade associations. Their regulation does not appear to have interested the state, perhaps because they had been incorporated into administrative tax structure with, one assumes, very little trouble; they offered the state an effective means of using a social institution that was already established, and this seems to have reflected Ptolemaic practice generally.<sup>32</sup>

### 3. Forms of Organization

It is generally considered that the associations of the ancient Mediterranean imitated the state in their organization and their dealings with their members and with others. Poland, in his seminal study of associations, proposed that private collectives typically emulated the organization of the *polis*; in fact, he noted that both the polis itself and these private ‘imitations’ paralleled one another in terms of development.<sup>33</sup> It is a statement that certainly holds true in several circumstances. Even so, the approach has recently been reconsidered and developed, bearing in mind that there were alternatives to the *polis* and its organization in the Hellenistic Mediterranean.<sup>34</sup> The resulting view is that the founders of these early private (or volun-

30. *PAsh. dem.* I 18 (70-60 BC); Reymond 1973, 130-31; Thompson 1988, 156.

31. *Stud. Demotica* V 158 = *PBM dem.* 1325.8-9 (31-30 BC); Farid 1995, 32ff.; cf. Allam 2002.

32. Clarysse and Thompson, 2006, vol. 2, 204.

33. Poland 1909, 337-38.

34. Gabrielsen 2009, 181.

tary) associations had a clearly imagined and agreed upon organizational structure that was preferred above all others.<sup>35</sup>

This structure is perhaps, at least in part, reflected in the extant *nomoi* of the associations. Do these *nomoi* reflect the laws of the Greek *poleis* of Egypt or the laws of the state administration? It is difficult to say, but it is worth noting that the origin of associations based on occupation in Egypt is considered to have been Greek in nature, while the comparable Egyptian socio-religious collectives grew from an independent tradition.<sup>36</sup> Despite this, the similarities between the Demotic and Greek regulations may suggest a common institution that, in all likelihood, was derived from Greek precedents, since these collectives appear to reflect the widespread distribution and mobility of Greeks, as well as Greek culture and influence, during the period immediately before – and throughout – the Hellenistic era.<sup>37</sup>

Whether or not this secular Greek model was brought to Egypt with the influx of Hellenic society and culture, the crux is that the examples from Egypt were adapted for use in this Hellenistic-Egyptian context;<sup>38</sup> this model, or aspects of it, could be grafted onto the existing traditional indigenous institutions. The Hellenic influence of the Ptolemaic period instilled the natural characteristics of traditional Greek institutions in the Egyptian collectives, and caused the apparent cultural shift in associations that stemmed from an indigenous custom.<sup>39</sup>

---

35. *Ibid.*, 181 and n.34 therein.

36. Muhs 2001, 4-5; cf. Roberts, Skeat and Nock 1936, 84-87; de Cenival 1972, 139-41; Muszynsky 1977, 145-46, 160-61. For socio-religious associations, see de Cenival 1986; 1988; Bomann 1991, 69-75.

37. Muhs 2001, 5.

38. Bowman 1996, 111; Monson 2007a, 196; Muhs 2001, 5-6.

39. Rostovtzeff 1941, vol. 3, 1590, n.25; Bowman 1996, 111; Muhs 2001, 5; e.g. the associations of mortuary priests, crocodile- and falcon-mummy bearers: *P.Lille dem.* I 29 = *P.Assoc.* p.3-10 (223 BC); *P.Mil.Vogl. dem.* inv. 77-78 (178 BC), in Bresciani 1994, 49-68; *P.Cair.* II 30606 = *P.Assoc.* p.45-51 (157 BC); *P.Hamb. dem.* 1 = *P.Assoc.* p.59-61 (151 BC); *P.Cair.* II 31179 = *P.Assoc.* p.63-68 (147 BC); 30605 = *SB* I 4458 = *P.Assoc.* p.73-78 (145 BC); 30619 = *P.Bürgsch.* 20 = *P.Assoc.* p.93-97 (137 BC); *P.Berl.Spieg.* 3115 = *P.Assoc.* p.103-07 (110-107 BC); On the links between Roman and Hellenistic associations, and the earlier Pharaonic Egyptian and Greek collectives: Boak 1937, 219-20; Roberts, Skeat and

It was not the *polis* that was at the forefront of Hellenistic Egypt administration, but the administrative district, or the nome. It was an organizational unit that had existed prior to Alexander the Great, and formed the foundation for both the Ptolemaic and later, the Roman administrative state and bureaucracy.<sup>40</sup> There were three branches of administration within this organizational unit, at least in the third century BC: that of the *nomarch* (with the *toparch* and *komarch* at local levels),<sup>41</sup> who was responsible for agricultural production; the *oikonomos*, and subordinate *antigraphais*, who supervised finances; and the *basilikos grammateus*, assisted by the *topogrammateis* and *komogrammateis* at the local levels, who were responsible for records. The official in Alexandria to whom all of these nome officials were subordinate, was the *dioiketes*, the chief financial officer for the Ptolemaic kingdom. Furthermore, the Ptolemies developed a military administration, headed by the *strategos*. The position itself developed out of necessity from the king's maintenance of a mercenary army, and the distribution of land to them to provide an income in times when they were not required. Control of these military cleruchs fell to the *strategoï*, and over time the authority of the traditional bureaucracy diminished as these soldiers relied on their commanders and officers rather than the civil authority.<sup>42</sup> At the village level, in the Fayum at least, all but the smallest villages had a village headman (the *komarch*) and most had a *komogrammateus*, who represented the state administration.<sup>43</sup> These officials were supported, in part, by the village *presbyteroi* who were likely integrated into the administrative bureaucracy by the second century BC; they were relied upon for the system of rents and tax collection,<sup>44</sup> and were probably responsible to higher administrative officials.<sup>45</sup>

---

Nock 1936, 85-97; de Cenival 1972, 139-42; Muszynski 1977, 146-74.

40. Manning 2010, 147.

41. For the confusion surrounding the title of *nomarch*, see Rowlandson 2010, 241.

42. Bagnall 1976, 3-4.

43. Clarysse and Thompson, 2006, vol. 2, 112.

44. *P.Tebt.* I 40 (117 BC); Tomsin 1952, 95-130; 467-527; Allam 2002, 12-15; Thompson, 2001, 1261-62; Manning 2003, 50.

45. Crawford 1971, 105; Monson 2007c, 370; Verhoogt 1998, 70-105; Bonneau 1993, 154-74.

In point of fact, with regard to the state administration, there certainly seems to have been a considerable overlap between the terminology used to refer to officials of the Ptolemaic bureaucracy and the trade associations: these collectives had their *presbyteroi*, their own leading men, and their own *grammateis*.

Committees of *presbyteroi*, or elders, can be found in several instances.<sup>46</sup> Notable among them are the *presbyteroi* in the associations of royal, or state, farmers,<sup>47</sup> as is their appearance in an association of 'carriers' and in a collective of 'administrators';<sup>48</sup> the latter are often connected to the transportation of grain.<sup>49</sup> There were also six *presbyteroi* and one *hiereus* who represented a collective of millers in Alexandria in the late third century BC.<sup>50</sup> Moreover, a group of elders can be found in an association of weavers at Coptos,<sup>51</sup> and in a corporation of *choachytai* at Thebes, and although perhaps not at the top of the hierarchy, were clearly entrusted with certain responsibilities.<sup>52</sup>

As to the identities of these *presbyteroi*, we can only speculate; we are occasionally given their names, but more often than not, we are given little else. If the extant evidence is anything to go by, then these councils of elders were not present in all trade associations. We can perhaps assume that they were generally members of the associations that they represented, as is clear in some cases;<sup>53</sup> they may have been senior, or at least more experienced. Where they ap-

---

46. Tomsin 1952, 95-130; 467-527.

47. For the suggestion that these farmers constituted trade associations, cf. San Nicolò 1972, vo. 1, 157-78, and Monson 2007c, 370. See e.g. *PTébt.* I 43 (118 BC); I 40 (117 BC); I 48 = *W.Chr.* 409 (ca. 118-112 BC); *PTébt.* III 788 (143 BC); *P.Grenf.* II 37 (second/first century BC).

48. *P.Erasm.* I 12 (152 BC); I 13 (152 BC?).

49. Rostovtzeff 1922, 125, n.94; Préaux 1939, 146, n.1.

50. *OGIS* 729 (221-205 BC). The *presbyteroi* here are preceded by Amenneus, apparently the priest of the collective. It is possible that Amenneus was a member of the *presbyteroi* as well as the *hiereus*; however, the position of his name within the inscription may suggest otherwise.

51. *Stud.Demotica* V 158 = *P.BM dem.* 1325 (31-30 BC).

52. *P.Berl.Spieg.* 3115 = *P.Assoc.* p.103-07 (110-107 BC); de Cenival notes that one of the elders was in charge of wine (1972, 167-68).

53. *Stud.Demotica* V 158 = *P.BM dem.* 1325 (31-30 BC); Allam 2002, 18.

pear in relation to trade associations, they seem to have played a central role in the guidance and running of the collective. That a committee of the more experienced and older members existed should be no surprise; these individuals had most likely been active participants in both the association itself and the profession for some time. As such, their experience may have been invaluable to the association as a whole.

The terminology associated with the leading men of the trade collectives appears to have varied. The extant evidence suggests that only one chief official served at any given time, although the length of tenure may well have varied.<sup>54</sup> According to the Demotic evidence, a single president, assisted by four elders, administered the affairs of a collective of weavers in Coptos,<sup>55</sup> and a chief official (although supported by a second-in-command and a small number of elders) governed a collective of *choachytai* at Thebes.<sup>56</sup> On some occasions, in the Greek texts, they were called *prostatai*,<sup>57</sup> with perhaps the most notable appearing as leading officers of the *naukleroi Hippodromitai* of the first century BC, who provided declarations of shipments that were carried for the state.<sup>58</sup> The title can be found frequently in the comparable evidence,<sup>59</sup> while it also appears to denote minor police officials (such as the *prostates phylakiton*),<sup>60</sup> and ad-

54. Gibbs 2008, 90-93.

55. *Stud. Demotica* V 158 = *P.BM dem.* 1325 (31-30 BC).

56. *P.Berl. Spieg.* 3115 = *P.Assoc.* p.103-07 (110-107 BC).

57. In fact, *προστάτης* and the related *προστώς*, cf. San Nicolò 1972, vol. 2, 60. For further examples (including comparable evidence), see *OGIS* 130 (second century BC); *SB* I 3939 (date unknown); Cf. for the repayment of an *eranos* loan and the appearance of a *prostates* in such a context, e.g. *BGU* IV 1134 (10 BC); IV 1135 (10 BC?); IV 1136 (11/10 BC?); IV 1165 (20/19 BC?).

58. *BGU* VIII 1741 = *SB* IV 7405 (64/63 BC); *BGU* VIII 1742 = *SB* IV 7406 (64/63 BC); *BGU* VIII 1743 + XIV 2368 (63 BC); cf. Vélissaropoulos 1980, 113-15; Thompson 1988, 60-61; Fraser 1972, 187-88.

59. *P.Ryl.* IV 580.7 (78/49/27 BC?): on dating, see Richter 1991, 252. Here, the officials of the association are mentioned (a *προστάτης* and a *γραμματεὺς*), presumably in support of Heracleides' decision to reassign his burial benefit (*ταφικόν*); *I.Fayoum* II 119 = *SB* I 5022 (second/first century BC). Cf. *P.Ryl.* IV 590 (51-30 BC?): here the chief official was assisted by a *γραμματεὺς*.

60. *SB* I 4309.25 (third century BC); Bauschatz 2013, 94.

ministrators of a specific type of land, the revenue from which, although paid to the state, was set aside for the maintenance of the king's children.<sup>61</sup> On other occasions, the term *hegoumenos* can be found: Petcharmotes is identified as the *hegoumenos* of the *notophoroi* at Kaine in a text concerning the transport of grain.<sup>62</sup> The use of this term (and the related *hegemon*) seems to be common in socio-religious associations and by branches of the administration in Ptolemaic Egypt,<sup>63</sup> but it is important that the military aspects of this title not be overlooked.<sup>64</sup>

The most common overlap came in the form of the secretary or *grammateus*.<sup>65</sup> Various types of secretaries worked in the state administration, assisting officials at almost all bureaucratic levels. But outside the governmental organization, there are several examples where they can be found acting as subordinate officers in trade associations,<sup>66</sup> and in comparable socio-religious collectives.<sup>67</sup> In the mid-first century BC, both Eudemos and Onnophris can be

---

61. *P.Tébt.* I 81 v 19 (second century BC): οἱ προστάται τῆς κερχωρισμένης προσόδου. It is unclear whether the land represented a permanent endowment for the king's children, or whether they retained it when they came to the throne (cf. *P.Tébt.* I App. i, no. 7).

62. *P.Erasm.* I 13 (152 BC?).

63. See, for example *SB V 7835 = P.Lond.* VII 2193.6, 14 (69-58 BC?) and Roberts, Skeat and Nock 1936, 39-88; *P.Tébt.* II 573 v (first century BC-first century AD); III 731 (153-152 BC/142-141 BC). The use of this term seems far more common in the Roman period: e.g. *P.Mich.* V 245.43 (AD 47); II 1241 ii 19 (AD 46-49); II 1231 xxi 31 (AD 45-46); *P.Carlsb.* 53 = *SB XX 15023.12-13* (AD 92); cf. Daniel 1979, 41-46; Llewelyn and Nobbs 1997, 624-25 on *P.Grenf.* II 73 = *C.Pap.Hengstl.* 63 = *W.Chr.* 127 (late third century AD).

64. *P.Yale* I 33 = *P.Hib.* I 44 (253 BC); *OGIS* 731 = *SB V 8925* (205-193 BC); Fischer-Bovet 2014, 155-56.

65. The ὑπηρέτης also appears in the state administration (ὑπηρέτης στρατηγού, cf. Strassi 1997, 25-71), but rarely in the context of trade associations (a ὑπηρέτης γεωργῶν in *P.Tébt.* I 45 = *M.Chr.* 40 [113 BC]). There are, however, comparable Ptolemaic examples, e.g. *SB V 7835 = P.Lond.* VII 2193 11 (69-58 BC?); cf. Roberts, Skeat and Nock 1936, 50, 80.

66. For *grammateis* working for collectives of royal, or state, farmers cf. *P.Tébt.* III 848 (early second century BC); III 927 (ca. 140 BC); III 1067 (204-180 BC?); IV 1129 (123 BC); *P.Erasm.* I 6 (second century BC); *P.Fay.* 18A (first century BC).

67. *P.Ryl.* IV 580 (first century BC).

found acting as *grammateis* of the *naukleroi Hippodromitai* and the *ktenotrophoi* (cattle-breeders) of Bacchias, respectively.<sup>68</sup>

The most common form of leadership model appears to have been based on a single president, although the terminology that was used in conjunction with this official's position was varied. Often this individual was supported by a subordinate, typically a *grammateus* (or at least an assistant of sorts). Further, occasionally a council of *presbyteroi* was also used; these individuals would fulfil a variety of roles, from the guidance of the association itself, through to responsibilities for particular areas of collective life.

That there was a degree of correspondence between the terminology used for officials in the state bureaucracy and those in trade associations is certainly true, but to posit any more than that is difficult. It could perhaps be argued that the officials in these collectives were reflections of those that worked for the state administration, but to argue this definitively would perhaps push the evidence too far. The fluid nature of the terminology itself in the context of trade associations, however, may echo the changeable nature of the organization of the state civic and military administration itself; there certainly were changes made during the three centuries of Ptolemaic rule, and conceivably this may be reflected in the rather fluid nature of the officials of these associations.

#### 4. Forms of Interaction

In considering the forms of interaction between these trade associations and the state, it would perhaps be best to start with the evidence that may illustrate the view of associations held by the Ptolemaic administration. Most significant is *P.Tebt.* III 700, which contains an official receipt for the payment of, and the appropriate taxes on, two purchases of land by Ammonios, son of Taurinos, that had been put up for auction by the government.<sup>69</sup> More importantly, the manuscript also contains copies of official documentation, including a royal decree of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II concerning

68. See p. 245 and p. 21, and *P.Fay.* 18B (first century BC).

69. *P.Tebt.* III 700 = *C.Ord.Ptol.* 50 = *C.Ptol.Sklav.* I II (124 BC).



the property of various associations in Alexandria; at least part (perhaps even all) of the land that was purchased by Ammonios had belonged to an association, hence the relevance of the decree. By the order of the administration, all gymnasia, *politeumata* (?), and other associations (in this case, *synodoi*) of Alexandria, were ordered to declare all of their landed property in the *chora*. Furthermore, the decree ordered the sale, through auction, of this property, apparently for the profit of the *Idios Logos* and the crown, in consequence of the dissolution of these associations.<sup>70</sup>

The reasons for this *prostagma* and the precise nature of the provisions of the text are unfortunately lost; the text is severely mutilated.<sup>71</sup> Yet there are a few observations that we can make. The first is one of terminology: What *exactly* is meant by *synodos*? The term is typically used as a general term to indicate any sort of association, ranging from socio-religious groups to trade collectives, and this is perhaps the point here.<sup>72</sup> Second, given that the *prostagma* ordered that associations had to make a declaration of land and property owned, and that they were to be dissolved following the promulgation of this decree, then it stands to reason that in this period associations were acknowledged and permitted, at least in Alexandria, by the state prior to implementation of this decree. Third, these associations had been allowed to own land and property both in the capital itself, and in the *chora*.

What concerns us here though is the state's actions towards these associations, and the possible reasons that underpinned them. At the time when this document was written, civil *stasis* had already engulfed parts of Egypt,<sup>73</sup> and by the close of the 120s, the kingdom was in tatters; a fact undeniably demonstrated by the amnesty de-

70. Otto and Bengston 1938, 67ff.; Rostovtzeff 1941, vol. 3, 1541-42; Taubenschlag 1955, 647.

71. Lenger 1980, 120.

72. Roberts, Skeat and Nock 1936, 72.

73. See Hölbl 2001, 194-204; Huß 2001, 596-625; Thompson 1992, 311-14. Disturbances at Alexandria were almost certainly caused by the action of Euergetes II: *SB V 7803* = *SEG 8.370* (second century BC); Diod. Sic. 33.28c; Just. 38.8.13-15; Val. Max. 9.2.ext.5. See also *P.Tebt.* I 5 = *C.Ord.Ptol.* 53 (118 BC); Huß 2001, 621-22, n.219; 180-81.

cree of 118 BC, that marked the reconciliation of the royal family.<sup>74</sup> The complaint of the priests of Souchos to a local official, that the land was unsown, and that both their temple (and more significantly for the administration) that royal interest was suffering, was perhaps typical of the problems that occurred, at least in the south of the kingdom.<sup>75</sup>

Concerning the clauses in *P.Tebt.* III 700 relating to the *synodoi*, we are left with an interesting historical context, but little direct evidence. Despite the damage to the text, it seems relatively clear that the ownership of the property by the associations concerned had given rise to difficulties or abuses that needed correcting, and this was not the first time that these problems had arisen; the document also contains a reference to a previous decree bearing on the same subject, implying that this decree was unlikely to refer to a permanent ban. It is possible to infer that these *synodoi* were dissolved on account of some sort of collective strike or activity that was deemed unacceptable in the eyes of the Ptolemaic administration that likely affected the productivity of the land, or at least the proceeds that would have gone to the administration in the form of taxation. It seems entirely plausible that due to the civil unrest in Alexandria and Egypt at this time, Euergetes II's 'firm hand' may have been a result of a considered decision not only to bring a cessation to the *stasis*, but also perhaps, as Lenger has suggested, to curb the financial strength of associations in Alexandria and perhaps even beyond.<sup>76</sup>

Occasionally, the control of particular groups in Egypt does seem to have interested the Ptolemaic administration. At some point perhaps between 215-205 BC (although the king and the dating of the document have been recently questioned),<sup>77</sup> Ptolemy IV Philopator (?) decreed that those individuals who performed the rites of Dionysos in the *chora* of Egypt were to travel to Alexandria, within a defined time limit, and were required to register them-

---

74. *P.Tebt.* I 5 = *C.Ord.Ptol.* 53; McGing 1997, 296.

75. Thompson 1992, 313; *W.Chr.* II (after 123 BC).

76. Lenger 1980, 120.

77. Capponi 2010, 115.

selves.<sup>78</sup> They were to register the individuals (from three generations before) who had introduced them to the cult,<sup>79</sup> and to hand in their copies of the books concerning the mysteries, after having inscribed their names on them. The reasons behind the edict are difficult to establish, and several suggestions have been mooted: that the king wanted to unify the countless mystery cults in Egypt by establishing an official cult of Dionysos; that he aimed to register those who participated in the *chora* with the intention to limit, maintain control, or simply to get rid of them; that the king, whoever it was, was in financial need and hoped to introduce a tax on priests, and this edict represented an attempt to assess those liable, in order that the cult of Dionysos might be promoted; or that the edict simply represents ‘the desire to exercise control over the activities of this group of performers’.<sup>80</sup> Whatever the king’s motive, and one suspects that any definitive answer is impossible, what seems clear is that any of these reasons suggest a measure of control.

That state control and the suppression of associations (or loose collectives of tradespeople) – at least when warranted – was likely at the heart of some of these measures is perhaps illustrated by the difficulties for the local and state administration caused by groups of workers: at Philadelphia in the third century BC, Zenon received a threat from the *chomatophylakes*, who were owed wages for the previous two months and had not received their grain allowance for the past month;<sup>81</sup> they threatened to run off if they were not paid what they were owed, adding that the canal had already filled up. In another example, dating to the mid-third century BC, Panakestor sent

---

78. *SB* III 7266 = *BGU* VI 1211 = *Sel.Pap.* II 208 = *C.Ord.Ptol.* 29 (215-205 BC).

79. Cf. *Liv.* 39. 8-19; *CIL* XIV 2112, I, 10-13 = *ILS* 7212; *FIRA* III 35. The parallel is also drawn by Schubert (2000, 163, no. 55), while Burnet stresses the affiliation between Dionysos and Osiris (2003, 50-51, no. 4).

80. Bagnall and Derow 2004, 261, no. 160; de Ligt 2000, 242; and *contra* Roberts, Skeat and Nock 1936, 43, n.10; Harland 2003, 163; but cf. Lenger 1980, 68-70. On Ptolemy IV’s use of Dionysos for royal self-representation, see *FGrHist* 631 Satyros F1 and Ma 2008, 376. On the Bacchanalia and Rome’s difficulties, see Bispham 2007, 91-95.

81. *PSI* IV 421 = *C.Pap.Hengstl* 3 (mid-late third century BC). Zenon was a private secretary to Apollonios, the *dioiketes* to Ptolemy II, and acted as overseer for the Apollonios’ estates at Philadelphia; cf. Orrieux 1983.

a letter to Zenon, which referred to recent difficulties involving groups of workers.<sup>82</sup> The problem lay with the valuation of land following a survey, and a resulting strike by the farmers, who apparently refused to agree to any valuation set by Apollonios or his men (including Panakestor), whether fair or unfair, and claimed that they would rather renounce their rights to the crops; they alleged that Apollonios had made an agreement with them about the payment of one-third of the harvest.<sup>83</sup> Eventually, after four days, when Panakestor returned to Philadelphia, accompanied by Damis, in an attempt to convince the farmers to return to the land, Apollonios' men offered them the chance to present their own lower valuation; an opportunity the farmers accepted. Also from the mid-second century BC, a letter from Antiochos to Dorion notes that the *latomoi* from a quarry at Kephalaë had deserted; Antiochos ordered Dorion to find the offenders and then send them to him under guard.<sup>84</sup> At the turn of the second century BC, a group of royal farmers, in protest at the conduct of Marres, the *topogrammateus*, who was trying to extort money from their wives, chose to go on strike and took refuge in the neighbouring villages.<sup>85</sup>

In this light, the relationship between the laws of the state and the regulations of these associations proves intriguing. From the *nomoi* themselves, one can assume that the notion of internal jurisdiction was very important. Disputing members would presumably seek redress through the *nomoi* that all of the members had agreed upon, before going to the state to resolve the issues.<sup>86</sup> In a famous

---

82. *PSI V* 502 = White 1986, no. 18 = Burnet 2003, no. 50. Cf. Rostovtzeff 1922, 75-77; Orrioux 1983, 85, 119-20; and for dating, *BL IX*, 315 (cf. *P.Cairo.Zen.* III 59327 = *C.Ptol. Sklav.* II 138 III [249 BC]).

83. See *PTébt.* I 26 (114 BC) for a similar example.

84. *P.Hib.* I 71 = *C.Ptol.Sklav.* II 219 (245 BC).

85. *PTébt.* I 41 (105-90 BC). See also *PSI V* 490 (257 BC) (and Messeri Savorelli and Pintaudi 1995, 115); *PTébt.* I 24 (117 BC); perhaps *PTébt.* III 731 (153-152/142-141 BC). For possible implications and resolutions of labour action, see *PTébt.* I 18 (115-114 BC); I 61b.194-98 (117 BC); Cuvigny 1985, 55-60; Verhoogt 1998, 144, 189. See also Monson 2012, 148-151.

86. There are examples of associations adjudicating small disputes outside Egypt, cf. *SEG* 52.1197.

example, at Siut in 170 BC, two brothers were trying to sue one another.<sup>87</sup> The conflict was brought before the *laokritai* – a panel of three Egyptian judges taken from the priestly class before whom the Egyptians could resolve civil law disputes according to hereditary law and in Demotic – who decided the case; but the interesting point is that the younger brother’s argument may have referred to a ‘statute of the elders’ and to an association to which both he and his elder brother belonged.<sup>88</sup> The decision of the *laokritai* did not take this into account.

There are two other significant cases involving association *nomoi* in similar legal contexts. The first, a comparable example from the late third century BC illustrating the attempts of two individuals, Therous and Teos, to receive redress following the failure of an association’s promised funeral expenses, proves interesting. They pleaded with the king to order Diophanes, the *strategos*, to contact Ptolemaios, the *epistates*, so that they could receive the *taphikon* apparently promised to Therous’ sister and Teos’ wife, Soeris, who was the priestess of an association of women from Kerkethoeris for four years.<sup>89</sup> The association had apparently refused to pay. Diophanes seems to have dealt with the complaint, and ordered Ptolemaios, the *epistates*, to deal with the issue. If Ptolemaios was not able to do this, he was to send the case to Diophanes who presumably would see that the case was tried in the correct manner.<sup>90</sup>

The second concerns the judicial sentence pronounced by the *chrematistai* – a judicial court consisting of three members (delegated by the king to try civil and fiscal cases) and a clerk, with jurisdiction over one or several nomes in combination – involving an association of *nekrotaphoi*.<sup>91</sup> What is clear from the text is that all of the members agreed to ‘an Egyptian contract’ (a set of Demotic

---

87. *P.Siut* 10591 rt VI 3-4.

88. Seidl 1962, 155; but see Allam 2002, 19 and Capponi 2010, 115 for the uncertainty over the phrase itself.

89. *P.Enteux.* 21 (218 BC).

90. Cf. *P.Enteux.* 20.9 (221 BC). Here the *strategos* orders the local official to verify the contents of the collective’s *nomos* (τὸν θιαστικὸν νόμον, cf. 20.5), so that the latter might follow it.

91. *P.Ryl.* II 65 (67 BC?).

regulations?),<sup>92</sup> that this contract contained fines to be paid to the association itself and to the treasury in the event that this agreement was contravened, and finally that the pact was indeed broken. The petitioning members ask that the accused, a certain Petosiris and others with him, be subject to the fines applicable in the Demotic contract. The appeal was likely unsuccessful, but how the case came before the *chrematistai* (due to the lack of details) is a mystery, particularly given that suits of this kind were to be brought before the *laokritai*; in 118 BC, Ptolemy VII Euergetes II had not only defined the competencies of these two courts according to the language of the documents that were at the root of the case, but also prohibited the *chrematistai* from taking cases between Egyptians.<sup>93</sup>

In all three instances, the cases were passed to courts or to senior members of the state administration (although clearly dealt with finally by local officials). The supposition then is that an association's ordinance, regulations, and agreements, signed collectively by the members, took the form of private contracts and were enforceable as such. Whether these associations had a clearly defined legal and juristic identity cannot be assured, but they certainly could complain to the state concerning infringements of their regulations to seek and acquire redress.

Outside the legal sphere, these associations found a place in the economy of the kingdom. In this context, there were several ways in which trade associations could be useful to the state. One was transport, and in particular the transport of grain from the localities of Egypt to Alexandria in the north of the kingdom. Here, we find the *naukleroi Hippodromitai* operating out of Memphis, engaged in the transport of grain alongside the state administration.<sup>94</sup> A second was supply and collection, particularly of grain, where the government seems to have relied not only on individuals, but also on

92. *P.Ryl.* II 65.3.

93. *PTébt.* I 5 = *Sel.Pap.* II 210 = *Jur.Pap.* 75.207-20 (118 BC); Monson 2012, 123-24.

94. *BGU VIII* 1741 = *SB IV* 7405 (64/63 BC); *BGU VIII* 1742 = *SB IV* 7406 (64/63 BC); *BGU VIII* 1743 + *XIV* 2368 (63 BC), and also perhaps *P.Erasm.* I 12 (152 BC); I 13 (152 BC?). It has been argued that this collective of *naukleroi* was not a private group of traders employed by the state but an organization created by it for the transport of grain (Rostovtzeff 1922, 125, n.94).

groups to supply and collect both revenues and extraordinary levies. For instance, a petition by the *komarch* and the *presbyteroi* of farmers notes that 1,500 artabas of wheat were to be delivered to the treasury, and for 80 artabas of wheat that were ‘imposed in connection with the king’s visit’.<sup>95</sup>

The most obvious use of these associations would have been in the system of carefully monitored monopolies. These typically involved productive industries, such as papyrus, certain fabrics, salt, and oil, and included the manufacture, import, export, and sale of these products.<sup>96</sup> The monopolies themselves were likely an attempt to secure a maximum return from the land and the products manufactured, with minimum investment.<sup>97</sup> This strict regulation of production and an exorbitant charge set against private imports enabled the administration to fix an artificially high level; this led to an increase in the amount of government revenue. These monopolies were apparently put up for auction in the villages of the *chora*,<sup>98</sup> and presumably the method for the distribution of these concessions was similar in the cities.<sup>99</sup> Typically, the contractors agreed to produce a fixed amount of product within a specified period of time for a fixed price; raw materials and tools were provided in several cases.<sup>100</sup>

Although there are problems of precise definition here, and we cannot be sure that the groups here are in fact trade associations, there are tantalising hints at a deeper form of organization behind the scenes in several interesting examples. In the third century BC,

95. *P.Tébt.* I 48 = *W.Chr.* 409.5-9 (ca. 118-112 BC), cf. *P.Tébt.* I 5.59 (118 BC).

96. Wallace 1938, 181; von Reden 2007, 95; Manning 2007, 445. For Ptolemaic interest, see *P.Rev.Laws* (259 BC); *P.Tébt.* III 703 = *Sel.Pap.* II 204 (ca. 210 BC); Bingen 1978; 2007, 157-88.

97. Manning 2007, 445; von Reden 2007, 150.

98. *P.Cair.Zen.* II 59247 = *SB* III 6747 (252 BC).

99. Caution is to be advised; the procedures concerning the tender of concessions in the Ptolemaic *dorea* may have been rather different. Contracts here could be farmed out, but the underlying system is still unclear, cf. *P.Cair.Zen.* II 59220 = *SB* III 6816 (254 BC); II 59241 = *SB* III 6991 = *C.Pap.Jud.* I 9a (253 BC); von Reden 2007, 145, n.74.

100. *P.Mich.* I 36 (254 BC); *P.Cair.Zen.* II 59199 (254 BC); see also *P.Cair.Zen.* II 59202 (254 BC); *P.Col.Zen.* I 34 (254 BC); Manning 2007, 445; von Reden 2007, 146-47.

a group of weavers, with several assistants, proposed to produce a fixed amount of cloth in a specific time period, in this case, a piece of cloth (presumably a talent-weight) every six days; they asked for a specific payment per completed piece to cover their necessary costs (such as washing) and wages, but also offered an alternative: a daily wage, as well as an initial payment apparently to cover the costs of a *hyperetes*, which was to be deducted from their wages.<sup>101</sup> Furthermore, in two documents from the Heracleopolite nome, payment was authorised by Asclepiades (probably the local *oikonomos* or his *antigraphus*) for groups of weavers at both Ancyronpolis and Choibnotmis for a variety of fabrics manufactured for the government;<sup>102</sup> interestingly here, the prices paid can be compared with those fixed in *P.Rev.Laws.* 46.18-20.

## 5. Conclusion

Although problems remain with the range of terms used to describe these groups (particularly in the Greek papyri), there is enough evidence to suggest that the trade associations of Ptolemaic Egypt were private and voluntary associations. Their organization appears to have a fluidity that may have reflected the changeable nature of the state administration at the regional and local levels. There were ways in which these groups may have imitated civic life, for example, in their *nomoi* and their officials, and it is fair to say that there were certainly considerable similarities between the terminology used to refer to the latter and the titles of particular administrative offices, but to push the evidence further than that at this stage would be unwise.

With regard to their relationship with the state itself, we are more fortunate. Although control over particular associations may have interested the administration at specific times, there is little evidence

---

101. *PSI* VI 599 (mid third century BC); *BL* VIII: 399; Orrieux 1983, 142; Clarysse and Vandorpe 1995, 64; Rowlandson 1998, no. 201b. Interestingly, von Reden (2007, 147) suggests that the *hyperetes* in this case was a supervisor. Cf. *SB* XII 11078 = *SB* VI 9629 (ca. 100 BC).

102. *P.Hib.* I 67 (228 BC); I 68 (ca. 228 BC).



for any sort of permanent regulation of these organizations. The reasons behind the decrees considered above may have more to do with their narrow historical context rather than any enduring control over associations generally, despite collectives of workers (associations presumably among them) clearly causing problems at the local and regional levels; the evidence for these groups that dates to the periods after these decrees were promulgated stands against any form of permanent ban. Moreover, the trade associations were useful to the administration, and the introduction of all-encompassing prohibitions would have certainly caused problems for the state. The *nomoi* of the trade associations (and collectives generally), in some cases, appear to have been taken as private contracts. But it is worth noting that the state or its legal institutions did not acknowledge these regulations artlessly: the administration, at least theoretically, could dispense justice in whichever way it saw fit. Furthermore, these groups could prove valuable to the economy, particularly in the areas of transport and supply, both of which were concerns for the state. Particular areas of the economy do appear to have been tailor-made for the state exploitation of trade associations, but despite inferences, there is little definitive evidence for their use in the system. In all, the relationship between the state and the trade associations in Ptolemaic Egypt was reciprocal, and although it seems to have varied between hostility, indifference, and support, it may well have aided some of the fiscal policies of the state, and also provided (at least, most of the time), an environment favourable for the survival and longevity of such associations.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, C.E.P. 2007, *Land Transport in Roman Egypt*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Allam, S. 2002, 'Elders (Πρεσβύτεροι), Notables, and Great Men', in K. Ryholt (ed.) *Acts of the Seventh International Conference of Demotic Studies, Copenhagen, 23-27 August 1999*. CNI Publications 27. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, pp. 1-6.
- Austin, M.M. 1970, *Greece and Egypt in the Archaic Age*. Cambridge Philological Society Supplement 2. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.

- Bagnall, R.S. 1976, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 4. Leiden: Brill.
- Bagnall, R.S. and Derow, P. 2004, *The Hellenistic Period. Historical Sources in Translation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bauschatz, J. 2013, *Law and Enforcement in Ptolemaic Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bingen, J. 1978, *Le papyrus revenue laws: tradition grecque et adaptation*. hellénistique. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Bingen, J. 2007, *Hellenistic Egypt. Monarchy, Society, Economy, Culture*, edited with an introduction by Roger S. Bagnall. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bispham, E. 2007, *From Asculum to Actium: The Municipalization of Italy from the Social War to Augustus*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boak, A.E.R. 1937. 'The Organization of Gilds in Greco-Roman Egypt', *TAPhA* 68, 212-20.
- Bomann, A.H. 1991, *The Private Chapel in Ancient Egypt. A Study of the Chapels in the Workmen's Village at El Amarna with Special Reference to Deir el Medina and Other Sites*. London: Kegan Paul International.
- Bonneau, D. 1993, *Le regime administratif de l'eau du Nil dans l'Égypte grecque, romaine, et byzantine*. Probleme der Ägyptologie 8. Leiden: Brill.
- Bowman, A.K. 1996, *Egypt after the Pharaohs: 332 BC - AD 642. From Alexander to the Arab Conquest*. London: British Museum Press.
- Bresciani, E. 1994, 'Nuovi statuti demotici di "confraternite" dalla necropoli dei coccodrilli a Tebtynis (*P.Vogl.* demot. Inv. 77 e Inv. 78)', *EVO* 17 (*Acta Demotica: Acts of the Fifth International Conference for Demotists, Pisa 4th-8th September 1993*), pp. 49-68.
- Burnet, R. 2003, *L'Égypte ancienne à travers les papyrus: vie quotidienne*. Paris: Pygmalion.
- Capponi, L. 2010, 'Aristoboulos and the Hieros Logos of the Egyptian Jews', in T. Gagos and A. Hyatt (eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th International Congress of Papyrology*. Ann Arbor, July 29–August 4, 2007. American Studies in Papyrology Special Edition. Ann Arbor: The Scholarly Publishing Office, The University of Michigan Library, pp. 109-120.
- Clarysse, W. and Thompson, D.J. 2006, *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt*, 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarysse, W. and Vandorpe, K. 1995, *Zénon, un homme d'affaires grec à l'ombre des pyramides*. Ancorae 14. Louvain: Presses universitaires de Louvain.
- Crawford, D.J. 1971, *Kerkeosiris: An Egyptian Village in the Ptolemaic Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cuvigny, H. 1985, *L'arpercentage par espèces dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque d'après les papyrus*

- grecs*. Papyrologica Bruxellensia 20. Bruxelles: Fondation égyptologique Reine Elisabeth.
- Daniel, R.W. 1979, 'Notes on the Guilds and Army in Roman Egypt', *BASP* 16. 1-2, 37-46.
- de Cenival, F. 1972, *Les associations religieuses en Égypte d'après les documents démotiques*. Bibliothèque d'étude 46. Cairo: IFAO.
- de Cenival, F. 1986, 'Comptes d'une association religieuse Thébaine datant des années 29 à 33 du roi Amasis (*P.Démot.* Louvre E 7840 Bis)', *REgypt* 37, 13-29.
- de Cenival, F. 1988, 'Papyrus Seymour de Ricci: Le plus ancien des règlements d'association religieuse (4ème siècle av. J.-C) (Pap. Bibl. Nationale E 241)', *REgypt* 39, 37-46.
- de Ligt, L. 2000, 'Governmental Attitudes to Markets and Collegia', in E. Lo Cascio (ed.), *Mercati permanenti e mercati periodici nel mondo Romano: atti degli incontri capresi di storia dell'economia antica (Capri 13-15 ottobre 1997)*. Bari: Edipuglia, pp. 237-52.
- Derda, T. 1991, 'Necropolis Workers in Graeco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Greek Papyri', *JJP* 21, 13-36.
- Donker Van Heel, K. 1996, *Abnormal Hieratic and early Demotic Texts collected by the Theban Choachytes in the Reign of Amasis: Papyri from the Louvre Eisenlohr Lot*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Leiden University.
- Farid, A. 1995, *Fünf demotische Stelen aus Berlin, Chicago, Durham, London und Oxford: mit zwei demotischen Türinschriften aus Paris und einer Bibliographie der demotischen Inschriften*. Berlin: Achet Verlag.
- Fischer-Bovet, Chr. 2014, *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*. Armies of the Ancient World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fraser, P.M. 1972, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2001, 'The Rhodian Associations and Economic Activity', in Z.H. Archibald, J.K. Davies, V. Gabrielsen, and G.J. Oliver (eds.), *Hellenistic Economies*. London: Routledge, pp. 215-44.
- Gabrielsen, V. 2009, 'Brotherhoods of Faith and Provident Planning: The Non-Public Associations of the Greek World', In I. Malkin, Chr. Constantakopoulou, and K. Panagopoulou (eds.), *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean*. London: Routledge, pp. 176-203.
- Gibbs, M. 2008, *Professional and Trade Associations in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Oxford.
- Harland, Ph.A. 2003, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Hauben, H. 1971, 'An Annotated List of Ptolemaic Naukleroi with a Discussion of BGU X 1933', *ZPE* 8, 259-275.
- Hölbl, G. 2001, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*. London: Routledge.

- Huß, Werner. 2001, *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit 332-30 v. Chr.* München: Beck.
- Lenger, M.-Th. 1980, *Corpus des ordonnances des Ptolémées (C. Ord. Ptol.)*. 2nd rev. Académie Royale de Belgique. Memoires de la classe des lettres 64:2. Brussels: Académie Royale de Belgique.
- Lewis, N. 1973, 'The Text of SB VI, 9629 Reconsidered', *CE* 48, 95, 134-39.
- Llewelyn, S.R. and Nobbs, A.M. 1997, 'P.Grenf. II 73: A Reconsideration', in B. Kramer, W. Luppe, H. Maehler, and G. Poethke (eds.), *Akten des 21 Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin, 13-19.8.1995*, vol. 2. Archiv für Papyrusforschung, Beiheft 3. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, pp. 613-630.
- Ma, J. 2008, 'Paradigms and Paradoxes in the Hellenistic World', in B. Virgilio (ed.), *Studi ellenistici XX*. Pisa and Rome: Fabrizio Serra Editore, pp. 371-385.
- MacMullen, R. 1974, *Roman Social Relations, 50 BC to AD 284*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Manning, J.G. 2003, *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt. The Structure of Land Tenure 332-30 BCE*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Manning, J.G. 2007, 'Hellenistic Egypt', in W. Scheidel, I. Morris, and R. Saller (eds.) *The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 434-459.
- Manning, J.G. 2010, *The Last Pharaohs: Egypt under the Ptolemies, 305-30 BC*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- McGing, B.M. 1997, 'Revolt Egyptian Style. Internal Opposition to Ptolemaic Rule', *APF* 43, 273-314.
- Messeri Savorelli, G. and Pintaudi, R. 1995, 'Zenoniana', *ZPE* 107, 113-120.
- Monson, A. 2006, 'The Ethics and Economics of Ptolemaic Religious Associations', *AncSoc* 36, 221-238.
- Monson, A. 2007a, 'Private Associations in the Ptolemaic Fayyum: The Evidence of the Demotic Accounts', in M. Capasso and P. Davoli (eds.), *New Archaeological and Papyrological Researches on the Fayyum: Proceedings of the International meeting of Egyptology and Papyrology: Lecce, June 8<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> 2005*. Papyrologica Lupiensia 14. Galatina: Congedo, pp. 179-196.
- Monson, A. 2007b, 'Religious Associations and Temples in Ptolemaic Tebtunis', in J. Frösén, T. Purola, and E. Salmenkivi (eds.), *Proceedings of the 24th International Congress of Papyrology, Helsinki, 1<sup>st</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> August 2004, vol. 2*. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 122. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, pp. 769-779.
- Monson, A. 2007c, 'Royal Land in Ptolemaic Egypt: A Demographic Model', *JESHO* 50, 4, 363-397.
- Monson, A. 2012, *From the Ptolemies to the Romans: Political and Economic Change in Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Monson, A. and Arlt, C. 2010, 'Rules of an Egyptian Religious Association

- from the Early Second Century BCE', in H. Knuf, C. Leitz, and D. von Recklinghausen (eds.) *Honi soit qui mal y pense. Studien zum pharaonischen, griechisch-römischen und spätantiken Ägypten zu Ehren von Heinz-Josef Thissen*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 194. Leuven: Peeters, pp. 113-122.
- Muhs, B.P. 2001, 'Membership in Private Associations in Ptolemaic Tebtunis', *JESHO* 44. 1, 1-21.
- Muzsynski, M. 1977, 'Les associations religieuses en Égypte d'après les sources hiéroglyphiques, démotiques et grecques', *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 8, 145-174.
- Orrieux, Cl. 1983, *Les papyrus de Zénon: l'horizon d'un Grec en Égypte au III<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.C.* Paris: Macula.
- Otto, W.G.A. and Bengtson, H. 1938, *Zur Geschichte des Niederganges des Ptolemäerreiches. Ein Beitrag zur Regierungszeit des 8. und des 9. Ptolemäers*. Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Abt. Neue Folge 17. Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, in Kommission bei der C.H. Beck'schen Verlagsbuchhandlung München.
- Pavis d'Escurac, H. 1990, 'Dénominations des organisations artisanales dan l'occident romain', *Ktema* 15, 109-120.
- Pestman, P.W. 1993, *The Archive of the Theban Choachytes (Second Century BC). A Survey of the Demotic and Greek Papyri contained in the Archive*. Studia Demotica 2. Leuven: Peeters.
- Poland, F. 1909, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*. Fürstlich Jablonowski'sche Gesellschaft zu Leipzig 38. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Préaux, Cl. 1939, *L'économie royale des Lagides*. Bruxelles: Édition de la Fondation égyptologique Reine Élisabeth.
- Reymond, E.A.E. 1973, *Catalogue of Demotic Papyri in the Ashmolean Museum*, vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richter, M. 1991, 'Bemerkungen zu SB XVI', *ZPE* 86, 251-258.
- Roberts, C., Skeat, Th.C., and Nock, A.D. 1936, 'The Guild of Zeus Hypsistos', *HTR* 29. 1, 39-88.
- Rostovtzeff, M.I. 1922, *A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century BC: A Study in Economic History*. Madison: University of Wisconsin.
- Rostovtzeff, M.I. 1941, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rowlandson, J. 1998, *Women and Society in Greek and Roman Egypt: A Sourcebook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rowlandson, J. 2010, 'Administration and Law: Graeco-Roman', in A.B. Lloyd (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Egypt*, vol. 1. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 237-254.
- San Nicolò, M. 1972, *Ägyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer*, 2 vols.

- Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und Antiken Rechtsgeschichte 2. Munich: Beck (reprint of 1915 edn.).
- Schubert, P. 2000, *Vivre en Égypte gréco-romaine: une selection de papyrus*. Vevey: Editions de l'Aire.
- Seidl, E. 1962, *Ptolemäische Rechtsgeschichte*, 2nd edn. Glückstadt: J.J. Augustin.
- Strassi, S. 1997, *Le funzioni degli υπηρέται nell'Egitto greco e romano*. Schriften der Philosophisch-Historischen Klasse der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften 3. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Taubenschlag, R. 1955, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri, 332 B.C.-A.D. 640*. 2nd edn. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Tomsin, A. 1952, 'Étude sur les προσβύτεροι des villages de la χώρα égyptienne', *BAB* 38, 95-130; 467-532.
- Thompson, D.J. 1988, *Memphis under the Ptolemies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Thompson, D.J. 1992, 'Egypt, 146-31 BC', in J. A. Crook, A. Lintott, and E. Rawson (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 2nd edn, vol. IX: *The Last Age of the Roman Republic, 146-43 BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 310-326.
- Thompson, D.J. 2001, 'Ethne, Taxes and Administrative Geography in Early Ptolemaic Egypt', in I. Andorlini *et al.* (eds.), *Atti del XXII Congresso internazionale di Papirologia, Firenze, 23-29 agosto 1998*, vol. 2. Florence: Istituto papirologico G. Vitelli, pp. 1255-63.
- Thompson, D.J. 2008, 'Economic Reforms in the Mid-Reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus', in P. McKechnie and Ph. Guillaume (eds.) *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World*. Mnemosyne Supplements 300. Leiden: Brill, pp. 27-38.
- Vélissaropoulos, J. 1980, *Les naulères grecs. Recherches sur les institutions maritimes en Grèce et dans l'Orient hellénisé*. Genève. Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 9. Geneva and Paris: Droz and Minard.
- Venticinque, Ph.F. 2009, *Common Causes: Guilds, Craftsmen and Merchants in the Economy and Society of Roman and Late Roman Egypt*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Chicago.
- Verhoogt, A.M.F.W. 1998, *Menches, Komogrammateus of Kerkeosiris: The Doings and Dealings of a Village Scribe in the Late Ptolemaic Period (120-110 B.C.)*. *Papirologica Lugdano-Batava* 29. Leiden: Brill.
- von Reden, S. 2007, *Money in Ptolemaic Egypt. From the Macedonian Conquest to the End of the Third Century BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wallace, Sh.L. 1938, *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press and Oxford University Press.

White, J.L. 1986, *Light from Ancient Letters*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Wilson, S.G. 1996, 'Voluntary Associations: An Overview', in J.S. Kloppenborg and S.G. Wilson (eds.), *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 1-15.

# Ethnic *Koina* and *Politeumata* in Ptolemaic Egypt

*Thomas Kruse*

## 1. Introduction

The publication, by James Cowey and Klaus Maresch, of the documents of the Jewish *politeuma* in the nome metropolis of Heracleopolis in Middle Egypt, dating from the second century BCE in 2001 (P.Polit. Iud.),<sup>1</sup> most certainly marked an important turning point in the ongoing debate on the extent of autonomy Jewish communities enjoyed in classical antiquity in general and notably in Ptolemaic Egypt.<sup>2</sup> But it has also reopened the discussion among scholars about the role which ethnic based organisations like ethnic *koina* and *politeumata* played for the integration, autonomy or (to say the least) self-administration of foreign ethnic groups like (but not only) the Jews in the countries where they resided. In particular in Ptolemaic Egypt and in possessions of the Ptolemies outside Egypt.<sup>3</sup> The ‘challenge’ the papyri of Heracleopolis represent was just recently illustrated by a long article published by Bradley Ritter in 2011 in which the author tries to reinterpret the *politeuma* of Heracleopolis in opposition to (as far as I see) the unanimous scholarly

---

1. The citations of papyrus editions and other papyrological works follow the ‘Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri Ostraca and Tablets’ easily accessible in the WWW under the following link: <http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/texts/clist.html>. I wish to express my warm thanks to Vincent Gabrielsen for his friendly invitation to participate in this volume and for his enduring patience during the long time I prepared this article.

2. There is no room here to outline this scholarly debate for useful overviews concerning Egypt see Kasher 1985; P.Polit. Iud. p. 3-9; Honigman 2003. Arzt-Grabner 2012.

3. For a most recent recapitulation of the problem of ethnic minorities in Hellenistic Egypt, see Thompson 2011.



perception in which this institution was perceived ever since the publication of the texts more than ten years ago. The present article therefore considers itself not only as a discussion of Ritter's assumptions but also as a reassessment of the role of ethnic *koina* and *politeumata* in Ptolemaic Egypt and the way in which these two institutions might have interrelated.

## 2. The politeuma of the Jews in Heracleopolis

Let us begin first with the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis. Its full official designation appears in P.Polit. Iud. 8, a petition of a Jew named Theodotos concerning an unrepaid loan which he gave to a Jewish woman. The petition is addressed τοῖς ἄρχουσι τὸ λζ (ἔτος) τοῦ ἐν Ἡρακλέους πόλει πολίτευ[μα]τος τῶν Ἰουδαίων – 'To the archons of the *politeuma* of the Jews in Heracleopolis who are in office in the 37th year' (i.e. of Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II = 134/133 BCE).<sup>4</sup> We learn by this, that the *politeuma* was a community of Jews, which was located in Heracleopolis and headed by officials, who were according to the institutional model of the Greek polis called *archontes* and functioned for a period of one year.<sup>5</sup> In the other petitions in P. Polit. Iud. shorter variants of the address formula appear. Some of them are simply addressed 'to the archons' (τοῖς ἄρχουσι)<sup>6</sup> or (alternatively) 'to the archons of the year so-and-so' (τοῖς τὸ [year number] (ἔτος) ἄρχουσι).<sup>7</sup> In others there figure as addressees 'the *politarches* and the *politeuma*' (e.g. Ἀλεξάνδρῳ πολιτάρχῃ καὶ τῷ

4. P.Polit. Iud. 8,4-5. For the year numbers in the P.Polit. Iud. documents which (since there appears a 37th and 38th year) quite probably were all written in the reign of Ptolemy VIII between 144/143-133/132 BCE cf. the remarks of the editors in the introduction (P.Polit. Iud. p. 2).

5. Naming magistrates according to political institutions and their serving for a limited period was of course also the case for magistrates of private associations, for Ptolemaic Egypt see e.g. P.Tebt. III.2 894, an account of a private club where there is mentioned the governing body of this association called ἀρχή consisting of a committee of six (or about six) persons, who served for the period of one year (see Fragment 1 verso l. 54 and the remarks of the editors in their introduction).

6. See P.Polit. Iud. 4,2; 7,1; 11,1.

7. See P.Polit. Iud. 3,1; 5,1; 6,1; 9,1; 10,1; 12,1; 13,1; 14,1.

πολιτεύματι)<sup>8</sup>, the latter meaning in an abstract form the council of archons – the exact size of which we do not know – which was presided over by an official bearing the title of *politarches*, who presumably also functioned for a period of one year<sup>9</sup> and somehow played a role of a *primus inter pares* within the collective body of leading officials of the *politeuma*.

The petitions of P.Polit. Iud. reveal quite far reaching legal and executive competences of the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis which indicate a formal administrative authority<sup>10</sup> and therefore clearly prove that such associations could indeed play an important official (i.e. administrative and political) role which was denied by many scholars before the papyri from Heracleopolis became known.<sup>11</sup> Most of the petitions concern complaints and legal disputes about private contracts (leases<sup>12</sup> loans,<sup>13</sup> labor<sup>14</sup> and sale<sup>15</sup> contracts etc.) by means of which the petitioners seek to initiate legal action against the other party which they accused of having violated the agreement; that is to say: the accused person should be summoned by the authorities of the *politeuma*, who were then to arrange

8. P.Polit. Iud. 1,1-2 and 2,1-2 (135 BCE).

9. According to P.Polit. Iud. 17, which was written in Tybi year 27 (i.e. 26 January-24 February 143 BCE), a certain Euphranor functioned at this time as *politarches*, whereas the Straton who is mentioned in P.Polit. Iud. 18 (written around Toth year 29 = 28 September-27 October 142 BCE) as leading official of the *politeuma* and is unofficially called κριτής most probably also held the office of *politarches* (see P.Polit. Iud. p. 138).

10. The competences of the Jewish *politeuma* of Heracleopolis in my opinion therefore clearly extend beyond the scope of those of the functionaries of private associations, even if one admits that the Demotic rules of certain religious associations in Ptolemaic Egypt suggest that they could also mediate legal disputes of their members (see P.Assoc. passim).

11. See e.g. Bowman and Rathbone 1992: 109: ‘... there was no need for status groups with communal privileges and duties (sc. in Ptolemaic Egypt). Although “associations” called *politeumata* and *koina* are found in the towns and villages, they were religious and cultural groupings, capable of attracting the patronage of powerful individuals but with no official role’.

12. P.Polit. Iud. 12.

13. P.Polit. Iud. 8.

14. P.Polit. Iud. 9.

15. P.Polit. Iud. 5; 11.

for oral proceedings. But there is also an accusation of *hubris*,<sup>16</sup> and we learn moreover that the officials of the *politeuma* could conduct investigations of unexplained deaths<sup>17</sup>, and even had the right to arrest certain wrongdoers, even though we are not told the reason for the imprisonment of the relevant individuals.<sup>18</sup>

Most of the petitioners call themselves Ἰουδαῖοι and in most cases their opponents are Jews as well. But among the latter there are also people of non-Jewish origin who are called ‘those from the harbour’ (οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρμου). This means that the *politeuma* of the Jews in Heracleopolis could in certain cases also settle legal disputes between a Jewish complainant and a non-Jewish opponent and obviously had some competence over the harbour area of the town, a fact that may be due to the probable military origin of the *politeuma* to which we will refer again a bit later. In some cases the petitioner designates himself as ‘one of the people of the *politeuma*’ (τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πολιτεύματος) as does Andronikos who submitted the petition P.Polit. Iud. 1, in which he complains about a certain Nikarchos (an ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρμου), who has publicly insulted him ‘in the presence of some other people, both members of the *politeuma* and people of another tribe’’ (παρόντων τινῶν καὶ πολιτῶν καὶ ἀλλοφύλων).<sup>19</sup> The ἀπὸ τοῦ πολιτεύματος should be the actual members of the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis and as such they could also be called πολῖται being full members of a political body like the citizens of a Greek polis.<sup>20</sup> Thereby they obviously sought to stress the separation from all other people not being members of the *politeuma*, the ἀλλόφυλοι, which in this context

16. P.Polit. Iud. 1.

17. P.Polit. Iud. 6.

18. P.Polit. Iud. 2 is a petition to the *politarches* and the *politeuma* by a Jew who asks for being released from prison while P.Polit. Iud. 17 is a piece of correspondence between officials of the *politeuma* ordering that certain imprisoned people of the village of Tebetnoi should be released.

19. P.Polit. Iud. 1,16-18.

20. Because of the usage of this terminology I would consider it a bit too premature when D. Thompson most recently characterized the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis as a ‘corporate structure which, though it enjoyed the name of *politeuma*, was not in fact a political structure in our sense’ (Thompson 2011, 110). Though, it may not have been one in ‘our sense’, it seems to me, that the Jewish *politeuma* could very well be perceived as ‘political’ by its contemporaries.

of course also bears the connotation of ‘non-Jew’.<sup>21</sup> The other petitioners, however, who figure in the P.Polit. Iud. documents and are simply styled as Ἰουδαῖοι are Jews residing either in Heracleopolis or in the Heracleopolite nome, but could also address the officials of the *politeuma* if they sought legal action against another Jew. Maybe because they (at least the ones who resided in the nome metropolis itself) were associated in some way with the *politeuma* (as were the συμπολιτευόμενοι of the ethnic *koina* of the Ptolemaic mercenary troops in Cyprus)<sup>22</sup> or they simply were subordinate to the authority of the *politeuma*.

That the territorial competence of the Jewish *politeuma* extended beyond the area of the city of Heracleopolis is proved by petitions to the *politeuma* by Jews residing in villages of the Heracleopolite nome<sup>23</sup> as well as by correspondence between the officials of the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis and Jewish elders (*presbyteroi*) of certain villages of the Heracleopolite nome.<sup>24</sup> These documents show that these Jewish village *presbyteroi* (who were obviously allowed to conduct proceedings in legal disputes between Jews on the village level) after having acted as a sort of court of first instance could bring certain cases before the *politeuma*. Village Jews on the other hand could appeal to the *politeuma* officials in Heracleopolis as to a higher level of jurisdiction after already having had a first hearing of their case before the Jewish village *presbyteroi*. The authority of the *politeuma* of the Jews in Heracleopolis could even be appealed to by Jews from outside the Heracleopolite nome as is attested by P.Polit. Iud. 8 (already cited above) which is a petition of a Jew residing in the neighbouring Oxyrhynchite nome to the archons of the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis.

As Aryeh Kasher in his review essay on the P.Polit. Iud. already has pointed out, the documents of the *politeuma* of the Jews in Heracleopolis fully confirm the perceptions of the character of such ethnic *politeumata* held among scholars before the papyri from Hera-

---

21. See also the commentary of the editors on P.Polit. Iud. 1,17-18.

22. On these see section III below.

23. P.Polit. Iud. 9.

24. P.Polit. Iud. 18-20.

cleopolis became known<sup>25</sup> and for which the concise definition by Smallwood may serve as an instructive example: ‘A politeuma was a recognized and formally constituted corporation of aliens enjoying the right of domicile in a foreign city and forming a separate, semi-autonomous civic body, a city within a city; it had its own constitution and administered its own internal affairs as an ethnic unit through officials distinct from and independent of those from the host city.’<sup>26</sup> In addition to that, the Heracleopolitan papyri provide clearcut proof for the previously much debated question whether or not Jewish *politeumata* existed in Ptolemaic Egypt and that we in fact have to trust the information given in the so called ‘Letter of Aristeas’ about the existence of a Jewish *politeuma* in Ptolemaic Alexandria at the time when the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible (the so called Septuaginta) was composed; a source that was hitherto dismissed by many scholars as legendary fairy tale.<sup>27</sup> Further, the documents in P.Polit. Iud. also dispelled the doubts that the Jewish garrison and settlement in Leontopolis in the Nile Delta

25. Kasher 2002.

26. Smallwood 2001: 225-226.

27. Aristeas (ed. Wendland) 308-311: Τελείωσιν δὲ ὅτε ἔλαβε, συναγαγὼν ὁ Δημήτριος τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Ἰουδαίων εἰς τὸν τόπον. οὗ καὶ τὰ τῆς ἑρμηνείας ἐτελέεσθη, παρανέγνω ἅσι, παρόντων καὶ τῶν διερμηνευσάντων, οἵτινες μεγάλης ἀποδοχῆς καὶ παρὰ τοῦ πλῆθους ἔτυχον, ὡς ἂν μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν παραίτιοι γεγονότες. ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸν Δημήτριον ἀποδεξάμενοι παρεκάλεσαν μεταδοῦναι τοῖς ἡγούμενοις αὐτῶν μεταγράψαντα τὸν πάντα νόμον. καθὼς δὲ ἀνεγνώσθη τὰ τεύχη, στάντες οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ τῶν ἑρμηνέων οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πολιτεύματος οἱ τε ἡγούμενοι τοῦ πλῆθους εἶπον· ἵεπει καλῶς καὶ ὁσίως διηρμήνευται καὶ κατὰ πᾶν ἠκριβωμένως, καλῶς ἐστίν, ἵνα διαμένη ταῦθ' οὕτως ἔχοντα καὶ μὴ γένηται μηδεμία διασκευή. ‘When the work was completed, Demetrius (i.e. Demetrius of Phaleron) collected together the Jewish population in the place where the translation had been made, and read it over to all, in the presence of the translators, who met with a great reception also from the people, because of the great benefits which they had conferred upon them. They bestowed warm praise upon Demetrius, too, and urged him to have the whole law transcribed and present a copy to their leaders. After the books had been read, the priests and the elders of the translators and the Jewish community (*hoi apo tou politeumatatos*) and the leaders of the people stood up and said, that since so excellent and sacred and accurate a translation had been made, it was only right that it should remain as it was and no alteration should be made in it.’ The similarities between the Jewish *politeumata* of Alexandria and Heracleopolis are e.g. stressed by Honigman 2003.

founded by Onias III or (more probably) Onias IV was in fact a *politeuma* as was presumed by some scholars in particular because of a metrical burial inscription most probably originating from this site for a Jew named Abramós of whom is said that he had functioned as *politarches*.<sup>28</sup>

The judicial competences of the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis are apparently modeled according to those of the regular administrative officials which were defined by the famous legal historian Hans-Julius Wolff as the Ptolemaic ‘Beamtenjustiz’ (designating jurisdiction exercised by single administrative officials as opposed to that of the regular law courts).<sup>29</sup> Thus the prerogatives of the *politeuma* could (potentially) interfere with the administrative and judicial competences of the Ptolemaic officials and therefore had to be integrated in the existing scheme of the local administration. Hence the establishment of a *politeuma* as that of the Jews in Heracleopolis is to be considered as inconceivable without the formal authorization through a privilege of the king.<sup>30</sup> Against this background the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis obviously was not just a private association of certain individuals with a common ethnic origin, but rather a public institution of the Ptolemaic government and part of the local administrative level of the Heracleopolite nome. As such it stands in my opinion not only de facto but also de iure closer to a political community and thereby to the sphere of the state than to that of a private association.

---

28. Horbury and Noy 39 (= CPJ 1530A,5-7): ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀρχῆ | πανδήμῳ ἐθνικῆ ἑστέφετ' ἐν σοφίᾳ | δισοῶν γάρ τε τόπων πολιτάρχων αὐτὸς ἑτείμῳ. The inscription (which unfortunately cannot be dated accurately) shows that there must have existed more than one Jewish *politeuma* in Lower Egypt, see also Honigmann 2003, 65-66; for a recent study on the temple of Onias and the Jews of Leontopolis see Capponi 2007.

29. Wolff 1962, 113-193; see also P.Polit. Iud. p. 13-15.

30. See also Smallwood 2001, 225: ‘It (sc. the *politeuma*) had to be officially authorized by the local ruler or civic body, presumably by a written charter setting out its rights and constitution, though no example of such a document survives.’

### 3. Ritter's thesis: A *politeuma* not of the Jews but as the 'civic body' of Heracleopolis?

The perception of the Jewish *politeuma* of Heracleopolis as it is outlined above was first established by the editors of the P.Polit. Iud. and became since then widely accepted among scholars in the past ten years. Most recently, however, Bradley Ritter challenged this view in a long article<sup>31</sup> by arguing that the *politeuma* in the papyri from Heracleopolis was not actually that of the Jews but rather the 'civic body of Heracleopolis'.<sup>32</sup> Its president was according to Ritter the *politarches*. The *archontes*, however, who also figure as addressees of the petitions in P.Polit. Iud., were to be the leaders not of the *politeuma* but of the Jews, whose jurisdiction is nevertheless supposed to have been extended 'somewhat beyond the Jewish community proper'<sup>33</sup> and was even a jurisdiction 'over' the *politeuma* as the supposed 'civic body' of the nome metropolis of Heracleopolis.<sup>34</sup> This seems a provocative in light of the address in P.Polit. Iud. 8,4-5 which very clearly states that the archons represent the *politeuma* of the Jews: τοῖς ἀρχουσι τὸ λζ (ἔτος) τοῦ ἐν Ἡρακλέους πόλει πολιτεῦ[μα]τος τῶν Ἰουδαίων, which was translated by the editors: 'An die Archonten des Politeuma der Juden in Heracleopolis, die im Jahr 37 im Amt sind.'<sup>35</sup> Since even Ritter admits that 'this interpretation is at first sight unexceptionable'<sup>36</sup> he has first of all to invalidate the argument for the identification of the Jewish *politeuma* drawn by the editors from this translation of the phrase and all the other scholars hitherto dealing with the subject and has to find a convincing different translation of the address in P.Polit. Iud. 8. Ritters whole argumentation stands and falls with the success of this endeavour, and

31. Ritter 2011.

32. Ritter 2011, 10 and passim.

33. Ritter 2011, 12.

34. Ritter 2011, 12: 'if the politeuma is in fact the civic body of Heracleopolis, then Theodotos (i.e. the petitioner in P.Polit. Iud. 8) is pointing to the Jewish archons' jurisdiction over it.'

35. P.Polit. Iud. p. 102; see also Kruse 2006, 168.

36. Ritter 2011, 11.

– to anticipate the results of what follows – it falls; and this failure is inescapable.

Ritter states that the translation of Cowey and Maresch ‘minimizes or even ignores the apparently close connection made in the original between the politeuma and Heracleopolis. Accordingly, they posit a direct connection between the Jews and Heracleopolis (‘die Juden in Heracleopolis’) which is not made in the original text’.<sup>37</sup> This statement is simply not true, because the editors do exactly what Ritter blames them for having ignored, that is to say: they fully take account of the fact that the *politeuma* is closely connected with Heracleopolis by translating correctly ‘Politeuma der Juden in Heracleopolis’. The German ‘in’ in this translation most certainly refers to the fact that the *politeuma* is located ἐν Ἡρακλέους πόλει as the Greek text clearly states and it obviously does not refer to the Jews as residents of Heracleopolis as Ritter assumes. Ritter’s interpretation might be due to an insufficient understanding of the German translation and for him it might have been perhaps clearer if Cowey and Maresch would have translated: ‘das in Heracleopolis befindliche Politeuma der Juden.’ But this would of course be a rather inelegant and awkward German.

After this first misconception the second one follows immediately, since Ritter continues: ‘Instead, I would suggest that the phrase be translated ‘to the archons of the Jews, of the politeuma in Heracleopolis, for the year 37’. Any translation should retain the basic syntactic structure of the original text, and Heracleopolis is to be associated primarily with the *politeuma*, not with the Jews’.<sup>38</sup> The last statement is presumably due to Ritter’s peculiar understanding of the German translation of the editors – superfluously decorated with an unjustified advice (apparently addressing the editors), as to how to deal adequately with ancient texts. Moreover, this advice falls back on the advisor himself, since Ritter’s translation in fact does not retain ‘the basic syntactic structure of the text’ as he falsely claims it would do. Quite contrary to this claim Ritter’s translation evidently destroys the syntactic structure of the Greek phrase by

---

37. Ritter 2011, II.

38. Ritter 2011, II.



establishing an artificial block in the grammatical relations when he puts τοῖς ἄρχουσι at the beginning of the phrase together with τῶν Ἰουδαίων at the end of the sentence and at the same time assuming that this (supposed) grammatical dependency is separated in the middle by τοῦ ἐν Ἡρακλέους πόλει πολιτεύματος. Ritter obviously presumes that the hierarchic positions of the single syntactic elements of the address of P.Polit. Iud. 8 are arbitrarily interchangeable. By this disregard of the rules of the Greek language Ritter changes the clear hierarchy in the grammatical relations of the phrase, i.e. the petition is addressed (1) to the archons who are in office in the year 37 (τοῖς ἄρχουσι τὸ λζ (ἔτος)), who are (2) those of the *politeuma* located in Heracleopolis (τοῦ ἐν Ἡρακλέους πόλει πολιτεύματος) which is (3) an association of the Jews (τῶν Ἰουδαίων). There can be no doubt that the second genitive clause (τῶν Ἰουδαίων) is grammatically dependent from the first genitive clause (τοῦ ἐν Ἡρακλέους πόλει πολιτεύματος) which in turn of course depends on τοῖς ἄρχουσι, thereby allowing only one possible sensible translation of the phrase: ‘To the archons of the *politeuma* of the Jews in Heracleopolis.’

Since, as I have shown, Ritter fails to offer a satisfactory alternative translation of P.Polit. Iud. 8,4-5 (which is impossible anyway), all his other arguments on the (supposed) ‘body’ (*politeuma*) of Heracleopolis, its (supposed) *politarches* and their relation with the (supposed) leaders of the Jews (the archons) fail as well. There is therefore no need here to discuss them in greater detail. At the end of this section I nevertheless just briefly want to raise three more fundamental objections against Ritter’s thesis. Objections which I think would remain valid, even if one were to follow his erroneous interpretation of the address formula of P.Polit. Iud. 8.

(1) In a longer part of his article Ritter tries to deny that the *politarches* and the archons both belonged to the *politeuma* by hinting at the fact that they do not appear together in the address of any petition in the P.Polit. Iud.<sup>39</sup> Instead these petitions are addressed either to the archons or to the *politarches* and the *politeuma* together. This led Ritter to assume that the *politeuma* and the *politarches* have to be distinguished as a different body from the Jews and their archons. As

---

39. Ritter 2011, 29-33.

an additional backup for this assumption Ritter points out that the texts which involve the *politarches* and the *politeuma* concern other topics (e.g. an accusation of *hybris* or the imprisonment of wrongdoers) than the petitions directed to the archons, which are only related to the violation of private contracts. In Ritter's opinion this suggests that the *politeuma* was not responsible for Jewish affairs but had much broader executive competences and has therefore to be identified with the 'civic body of Heracleopolis', while the Jewish archons could only deal with the matters of private law and legal disputes involving Jews. In a hitherto unedited papyrus in the collection of the Bayrische Staatsbibliothek in Munich, however, there is preserved a petition of a Jew from a Heracleopolitan village which is addressed 'To the *politarches* Straton and the archons' (Στράτωνι πολιτάρχῃ καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσι).<sup>40</sup> This provides a clear-cut proof that both the *politarches* and the *archontes* together were the leading officials of the *politeuma* and that also the *politarches* was concerned with Jewish affairs. The Munich papyrus equally proves (as was already pointed out above), that the different address formulas of the petitions in P.Polit. Iud. (archons alone or *politarches* and the *politeuma* together) are merely variants of style which are due to the taste of the individual writers but does not imply that we have to deal with two different institutions. The Munich papyrus instead just offers a third variation (i.e. an address to the *politarches* and the archons) and Ritter's statement that 'our only evidence, then, that links the Jewish archons and the *politeuma* is ultimately ambiguous'<sup>41</sup> is therefore to be considered as completely unfounded.

(2) Throughout his article Ritter never provides a satisfactory explanation as to how we should imagine the relationship between his supposed 'civic body of Heracleopolis' (*politeuma*) on the one hand and the Jewish archons on the other. Ritter also has to postulate such a relation because one cannot deny the obvious fact that even by accepting his interpretation of the address in P.Polit. Iud. 8, this same address clearly establishes a close connection between the

---

40. Pap. Graec. Mon. 287+293; this papyrus will to be edited by the present author in P.Münch. IV (forthcoming).

41. Ritter 2011, 17.

archons and the *politeuma*, because the archons are designated as τοῦ ἐν Ἡρακλείου πόλει πολιτεύματος. There is an apparent contradiction in Ritter's interpretation that the archons of the Jews should be somehow connected with the *politeuma*, but the *politeuma* should not be that of the Jews. A contradiction the author does not seem fully aware of. Are we to assume that the archons are at the same time leaders of the Jewish community and members of the 'civic body of Heracleopolis'? This Ritter does not say explicitly but rather he gets himself tangled up in contradictions when he characterizes the address of P.Polit. Iud. 8 as a 'reference to archons of the *politeuma* (the civic body of Heracleopolis), who were at once further described as archons of the Jews'.<sup>42</sup> Now the confusion is complete: What is meant by designating the archons as those 'of the *politeuma*' who were 'further described as archons of the Jews'? Does 'further described' mean that the archons belonged to the *politeuma* or not? Their designation as 'archons of the *politeuma*' by Ritter seems to imply that. But how could they on the other hand simultaneously be 'archons of the Jews', who 'were there to govern local Jews'?<sup>43</sup> Moreover, the address of P.Polit. Iud. 8 according to Ritter points 'to the Jewish archons jurisdiction over [the *politeuma*]',<sup>44</sup> while at the same time they should have formed 'a Jewish board of archons with a distinct jurisdiction over Jews, but one officially recognized also by the local population'.<sup>45</sup> What is this supposed to mean? How could Jewish archons have exercised 'a jurisdiction over' a 'civic body' (*politeuma*) of Heracleopolis and at the same time have a 'distinct jurisdiction over Jews'? And why should non-Jewish residents of Heracleopolis and members of its civic body (supposedly named *politeuma*) have accepted such a jurisdiction over themselves by Jewish archons? According to Ritter the *politeuma* played a very important administrative role, since 'the authority of the *politeuma* and its politarches extended fairly widely throughout the nome'.<sup>46</sup>

---

42. Ritter 2011, 13.

43. Ritter 2011, 13.

44. Ritter 2011, 12 (see also *ibid.* 13).

45. Ritter 2011, 13.

46. Ritter 2011, 13.

If this would have been the case, one wonders, what the officials of the local administration would have said to all this, under whose authority (most notably that of the nome strategus) the Heracleopolite nome was placed.

(3) The third objection concerns Ritter's assumption that there actually existed a 'civic body of Heracleopolis' called *politeuma* in second-century BCE Egypt. It is an assumption that in my opinion seems to be due to a certain unfamiliarity with the political and administrative institutions of Ptolemaic Egypt. First of all the fact has to be stressed that we have no other evidence for the existence of such a supposed 'civic body' in any nome metropolis of Ptolemaic Egypt, whether in Heracleopolis or elsewhere in the Egyptian *chora*. One may, of course, take refuge in the standard excuse of the accidental preservation of our source material. But would it not seem somehow strange that we do not hear of any other such 'civic body' (called *politeuma*) of the residents of an Egyptian nome metropolis for three centuries? And would it not be even more strange (if one considers the sizeable amount of administrative correspondence in our evidence), that our sources should remain totally silent of any bureaucratic interaction between such a supposed 'civic body' or at least its leaders and the very well documented administrative officials of the local bureaucracy and their day to day routine? Moreover, if one takes into account that the *politeuma* as the 'civic body of Heracleopolis' according to Ritter should have played an important role in the local administration and is characterized by him as an 'important association with the governmental apparatus of the nome capital'<sup>47</sup> What Ritter seems to assume here is the existence of a political body of at least a privileged part of the residents of Heracleopolis headed by a leader bearing the title of *politarches* and with administrative and judicial competences in the town itself and the nome. This would imply that the nome *metropoleis* as early as in the second century BCE had certain rights in administering their own affairs. But such a 'civic body' designated as *politeuma* is not heard of in any of our extant sources and most probably did not exist in any nome metropolis of the Egyptian *chora* in Ptolemaic Egypt.

---

47. Ritter, 2011, 13.

The reason for this is that these towns clearly lacked the status of self-governing political communities of citizens, because they were not *poleis* in the legal and constitutional sense of the word. That *-polis* was indeed a component of the (Greek) names of most of these Egyptian nome *metropoleis*, of course means nothing in terms of their legal status.<sup>48</sup>

It had to wait until the Roman takeover of Egypt before such competences of local self-administration slowly developed in the Egyptian nome *metropoleis* because the Romans instigated a process of ‘municipalization’, first through the introduction of municipal honorary offices (*archai*) in the first and second century CE and the accompanying formation and separation of a municipal elite in the nome metropolis. This process then culminated in the formal introduction of town councils (*boulai*) under the Severan emperors in the early third century CE which raised the nome *metropoleis* of the Egyptian *chora* to equal status with the other Greek *poleis* in the Roman East. In the Ptolemaic period, however, only the capital Alexandria and the cities of Naukratis in the Nile Delta and Ptolemais Hermiou in Upper Egypt were *poleis* in the legal sense of the word and enjoyed the right of self-administration. The nome *metropoleis* of the *chora*, however (though they certainly formed administrative, religious and cultural centres), which Dorothy Thompson so aptly described as ‘non-political *poleis*’,<sup>49</sup> were placed under the administration and jurisdiction of the centralized bureaucracy of the country, which at the local level was first and foremost represented by the nome strategus and his staff.

Quite contrary to the existence of ‘civic bodies’ in the nome *metropoleis* supposed by Ritter there are indeed attestations of ethnic based *politeumata* in Ptolemaic Egypt. They were known long before the publication of the P.Polit. Iud. such as the *politeuma* of the Idu-maeans in Memphis or that of the Cretans in the Arsinoite nome

---

48. Nevertheless, Ritter (2011, 28) assumes the opposite by stating: ‘Heracleopolis status as a polis was real, and in this case the integration of the word polis into the very name of the city is not coincidental. However limited its governmental machinery, it was a polis.’

49. Thompson 2011, 103.

(Fayum). One could also mention in this context the *politeuma* of the Jews of the town of Berenike in neighbouring Kyrenaika which (though not attested before the reign of Augustus) most probably was established already under the Ptolemies. We will deal further with these and other associations of ethnic communities in Egypt and the Ptolemaic realm presently. So far their mere existence in the Ptolemaic period in my opinion makes the assumption that also the *politeuma* in second century BCE Heracleopolis was such an ethnic based community (i.e. of Jews) much more probable than its identification with a imaginary ‘civic body of Heracleopolis’ made by Ritter.

This erroneous identification is also fostered by the fact that Ritter not only seem to be not very familiar with the administration of Ptolemaic Egypt in particular, but also with the political institutions of the Greek and Hellenistic world in general. Throughout his article there can be observed in my view an insufficient differentiation between the use of the term *polis* in the simple meaning of ‘town’ and *polis* as the technical and legal term for a self administrating city-state or local unit of a state, which the Egyptian nome *metropoleis* certainly were not. This imprecise and inconsistent handling of the ancient legal, administrative and political terminology is presumably also responsible for Ritter’s questionable thesis that the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis is the ‘civic body’ of the nome metropolis of Heracleopolis. Thereby Ritter quite obviously does not take into account that the collective denomination of a citizen body (or its institutions) in the Greek world is always made according to the pattern ‘city (or council and people) of (e.g.) the Athenians’. The people are the institution. That is to say: a *politeuma* of the citizens of an existing town most certainly would not be styled as a *politeuma* ‘in’ that same town.

According to Ritter’s assumption one would therefore rather expect a denominaton like ‘the *politeuma* of the Heracleopolitans’ (πολίτευμα τῶν Ἡρακλεοπολίτων), but not ‘the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis’ as it is designated in the address of P.Polit. Iud. 8: τὸ ἐν Ἡρακλέους πόλει πολίτευμα (sc. τῶν Ἰουδαίων). In other words: designating a *politeuma* by merely pointing to the location of the *politeuma* (as Ritter obviously assumes was done in P.Polit. Iud. 8), but not

saying who the people are who actually constitute the *politeuma* does not make much sense in terms of ancient political, constitutional or legal terminology.

But naming its location and the people who in fact are the *politeuma* as is certainly the case in P.Polit. Iud. 8 renders perfect sense if one wants to designate a body consisting of people sharing a common foreign ethnic origin and residing (or are hosted) in an already existing community and thereby forming somehow ‘a city in the city’. Thus the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis was that of the Jews residing there and therefore it was described as τὸ ἐν Ἡρακλέους πόλει πολίτευμα τῶν Ἰουδαίων.<sup>50</sup>

#### 4. Ethnic *politeumata* in Egypt

Although Ritter in my opinion clearly fails to disprove the existence of a Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis, he is no doubt right in pointing to the fact that the papyrus documents in P.Polit. Iud. reveal unprecedented judicial and executive competences of such an association which were hitherto not heard of in the known sources which attest ethnic *politeumata* in Egypt.<sup>51</sup> The *politeuma* of the Idumaeans of Memphis for example is only known through an honorary decree (designated as *psephisma*) which is preserved in an inscription from 112-111 BCE.<sup>52</sup> This decree by which a prominent Ptolemaic official named Dorion was honoured was passed in a meeting of the *politeuma* together with other Idumaeans residing in Memphis and apparently associated with it, which took place in the sanctuary of the ‘Upper Apollonieion’.<sup>53</sup> Dorion who is functioning as *strategus* and priest of the Idumaeans guards (ιερεὺς τοῦ πλῆθους τῶν μαχαροφόρων) is honoured for his financial aid in the embellishment

50. In a very similar way the *politeuma* of the Jews of Berenike in Kyrenaika is described as τὸ πολίτευμα τῶν ἐν Βερενίκη Ἰουδαίων in two inscriptions (Lüderitz 1983, no. 70 and 71).

51. Ritter 2011, 10: ‘... the supposed Jewish politeuma of Heracleopolis is more extensive in scope than any other such institution for which we have evidence.’

52. I.Prose 25 (=OGIS II 737).

53. I.Prose 25.1-4: ἐπὶ συναγωγῆς | τῆς γενηθείσης ἐν τῷ ἄνω Ἀπολλ[ω]νιεῖοι τοῦ πολιτεύματος καὶ τῶν | ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως Ἰδουμαίων.

of the said sanctuary and therefore should at certain sacrificial events receive a palm branch and his name is to be included in the sacred hymns which are sung on such occasions. Quite similarly the only hitherto attested activity of the *politeuma* of the Jews of Berenike in Kyrenaika are two honorary decrees for two of its benefactors recorded in two inscriptions from the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius.<sup>54</sup> The *politeuma* of the Cilicians in Krokodilopolis (the capital of the Arsinoite nome) and that of the Boeotians in the nome metropolis of Xoïs in the Nile Delta are merely attested through second-century BCE dedicatory inscriptions which mention them as either addressee or donor of the dedication.<sup>55</sup> A *politeuma* of Phrygians in Alexandria is known through a dedication to Zeus Phrygios by a former priest of this association dating from the year 3 BCE.<sup>56</sup> Also in Alexandria there is attested a *politeuma* of soldiers (for whom no ethnic origin is given) which was headed by a *prostates* and set up a dedication to Zeus Soter and Hera Teleia in 112/11 or 76/75 BCE.<sup>57</sup>

Another fragmentary Alexandrian inscription provides evidence for a *politeuma* of Lycians located there.<sup>58</sup> The text is the beginning of a copy from the minutes (*hypomnematismoi*) of the *procurator* of the Idios Logos concerning the decision in a legal dispute between the *politeuma* and a scribe of a *komogrammateus* over the supervision of graves or burial places (*mnematophylakia*) belonging to the *politeuma*. The inscription was presumably set up because the final decision of the official was one in favour of the *politeuma*. Although the text dates from the reign of the Roman emperor Hadrian the *politeuma*

54. Lüderitz 1983, no. 70 (9/8 or 7/6 BCE) and 71 (24/25 CE).

55. I.Fay(ο)um 15 (= SB IV 7270) (Medinet el-Fayum, 125-100 BCE): Dedication of a pylon to Zeus, Athena and to 'the politeuma of the Cilicians' (καὶ τοῖς πολιτεύματι τῶν Κιλίκων, ll. 5-6); SEG 2:871 (Xoïs, ca. 165 BCE): Dedication on behalf of (ὑπέρ) Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II to Zeus and other gods by the Boeotian Kaphisodoros, *archisomatophylax* and strategus of the Xoite nome and 'priest of the politeuma' (ἱερεὺς τοῦ πολιτεύματος, i.e. of the Boeotians) and his two sons Metrophanes and Ptolemaios καὶ οἱ ἐπισυνηγμένοι ἐν Ἐόει Βοιωτοῖ [καὶ] οἱ σ[υ]μ[πο]λιτευόμενοι (ll. 11-13).

56. I.Alex.Ptol 74 (= OGIS II 658 = IGRR I 458 = SB V 7875): ἱερατεύσας τοῦ πολιτεύματος τῶν Φρυγῶν.

57. SEG 20:499,3-7: τὸ πολιτεῦμα | τῶν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ φερομένων στρατιῶν τῶν ὄν προστάτης (there follow the name of the *prostates* and that of a *grammateus*).

58. I.Alex.Ptol 24 (= I.Prose 61 = IGR I 1078 = SEG 2:848; 124 CE).



very probably existed already in the Ptolemaic period since the Romans had no need or motive to allow new foundings of such ethnic *politeumata* which under their rule had lost their original political and military functions and were reduced to the status of private associations.

Since it is true that these inscriptions do not give the slightest hint, that these *politeumata* had functions or competences similar to those which possessed the Jewish *politeuma* of Heracleopolis, they cannot, however, serve as evidence for the opposite, either, because inscriptions are set up with the intention to eternalize people and their achievements while the petitions and the other documents in the P.Polit. Iud. are the accidental leftovers of a bureaucratic day to day business and administrative routine, normally not destined to be cut in stone. But this incomparableness of our source material of course leaves us with a methodological problem if one wants to evaluate the role other *politeumata* than that of the Jews of Heracleopolis played in the social and political life of Ptolemaic Egypt.

Not in an inscription, but in a papyrus document from Tebtynis in the Arsinoite nome there appears a *politeuma* of Cretans.<sup>59</sup> This unfortunately very fragmentary papyrus is a piece of official correspondence written about 145 BCE and concerning the transfer of a military settler (κάτοικος) of the cavalry named Asklepiades to the fifth hipparchy. In this procedure two officials named Sosos and Aigyptios designated as ‘appointed by the *politeuma* of the Cretans’ (προχειρισθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ πολιτεύματος τῶν Κρητῶν)<sup>60</sup> were involved, though this was clearly not their main function because the latter must have been mentioned in the lacuna in ll. 9-10 of the papyrus. Because of the fragmentary state of the document the exact nature of this involvement remains unclear, but it was quite probably due to the fact that the removal of Asklepiades to the fifth hipparchy came along with his admission to the *politeuma* of the Cretans.<sup>61</sup>

The information for the *politeuma* of the Cretans in Krokodilopolis like those for that of the Idumaeans in Memphis and the Boeoti-

59. P.Tebt. I 32 (= W.Chr. 448; cf. BL I 423; VIII 489; XI 270).

60. P.Tebt. I 32,9 cf. l. 17.

61. See also Schubart 1910, 64-65.

ans in Xoïs or the *politeuma* of the Jews in Leontopolis clearly points to a military background for the establishment of these and presumably the other ethnic *politeumata* in Ptolemaic Egypt as well as in Ptolemaic possessions outside Egypt (as perhaps in Sidon in Phoenicia).<sup>62</sup> That also the origin of the *politeuma* of the Jews in Heracleopolis was military in essence is suggested by the fact that (as has been already noted above) the authority and judicial competences of this *politeuma* obviously were not restricted to Jewish residents of Heracleopolis and the Heracleopolite nome but also extended over legal disputes between Jews and residents of the harbour area, a distance of some 1.5 km to the west of the town on the bank of the Bahr Yussuf (as the Arabs called the western branch of the Nile in Middle Egypt). This can be explained best by assuming that not only a great number of Jews were residing in the harbour area of Heracleopolis,<sup>63</sup> but also that the *politeuma* of the Jews was linked in some way to the remarkable military activities that took place in Heracleopolis and the Heracleopolite around the middle of the second century BCE. About this time the Heracleopolite was developed into some form of military stronghold with a fortress (*phrourion*) both in the metropolis itself and in its harbour – where there was even stationed a *trihemiolia* i.e. a type of a smaller warship – and with several minor *phrouria* across the countryside of the nome.<sup>64</sup> A dossier of papyrus documents informs us about the activity of the (presumed) first commander (*phrourarchos*) of the harbour-fortress named Dioskurides,<sup>65</sup> and these documents prove that not only the military but also the civilian residents of the harbour area

---

62. In this town there are attested *politeumata* of Pisidians, Caunians and Pinarensians who set up burial inscriptions (see Ruppel 1926, 311) for deceased soldiers who were members of the relevant *politeuma* and as such (like the members of the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis) called *politai*. But it is to be admitted that it is not sure that these funerary stelae indeed date to the period of Ptolemaic control over this city which lasted till the end of the third century BCE, and a date to the following Seleucid dominion cannot therefore be excluded (see also below n. 85).

63. See P.Polit. Iud. p. 12.

64. For the military activities in the Heracleopolite nome around the middle of the second century BCE and their interpretation see Kruse 2011.

65. P.Phrur. Diosk.

of Heracleopolis were placed under the authority of the *phourarchos*.

We cannot of course be sure at present if the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis was established at the same time as the *phourion* in the harbour area of the town, but this assumption would gain some probability if one presumed that the largest part of the garrison of the harbour fortress indeed consisted of Jews.<sup>66</sup> Maybe the *phourarchos* and the *politeuma* of Jews exercised some sort of joint authority over the harbour and its inhabitants though we presently cannot determine exactly how both of them were related to one another. That Jews in general played an important role in the Ptolemaic military, and especially in the time of the dynastic conflict between the royal siblings Ptolemy VI, Cleopatra II and Ptolemy VIII around the middle of the second century BCE is evident from literary sources (in particular Flavius Josephus) as well as from several papyrus documents.

The evidence for the Idumaeans in Memphis that we have discussed above, suggests that not all people sharing this ethnic origin and residing in Memphis belonged to the *politeuma*, but that with the actual members of the latter (consisting of the Idumaeen guards designated as the *πλήθος τῶν μαχαροφόρων*) there were associated *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως Ἰδουμαῖοι* – ‘the Idumaeans of the town (i.e. Memphis)’. These Idumaeans are to be identified, as Dorothy Thompson very convincingly has argued,<sup>67</sup> with the civilian members of the Idumaeen community of Memphis like e.g. the relatives of the soldiers, and such civilians were very probably also the *συμπολιτευόμενοι* as were those which are described as the associates of the *politeuma* of the Boeotians in Xoïs and of some ethnic *koina* of Ptolemaic mercenary troops in Cyprus (with which we will deal again a bit later). This would mean that the membership in an ethnic *politeuma* would normally be restricted to soldiers of a common ethnic origin garrisoned in a specific locality (and perhaps their male offspring) while the civilians of the same origin were only associated with such a (military) *politeuma*. Though it would be perhaps not wholly implausible, that to the group of such *sympoliteuomenoi* there could also be

66. See Kruse 2011, 261.

67. Thompson 1984, 1072-1073.

admitted certain civilians who did not share the ethnic origin of the members of the *politeuma* but were willing to accept its authority, as e.g. merchants and other civilians residing in the same area as the *politeuma* members and the other *sympoliteumenoí*.<sup>68</sup> Such a group of explicitly designated associates of the *politeuma* is indeed not attested for the *politeuma* of the Jews in Heracleopolis. But I think that a certain division in actual *politeuma* members and other people in some way associated with it can be detected there as well, since also in Heracleopolis the actual members of the Jewish *politeuma*, who were designated as ‘those of the *politeuma*’ (οἱ ἐκ τοῦ πολιτεύματος) or just as ‘citizens’ (πολίται), are separated from other Jews; who did not bear this designation, but by petitioning its officials they obviously acknowledged the authority of the *politeuma*.

Although, then, according to the argument above, it seems highly probable that the *politeuma* of the Jews in Heracleopolis had a military origin, are we thus to presume that also the other known ethnic *politeumata* in Ptolemaic Egypt and beyond (i.e. in areas under Ptolemaic rule), for which such a military background is either evident or can be plausibly assumed, had such far reaching administrative and legal competences as are attested in the papyri from Heracleopolis? The fact that such prerogatives are unprecedented in the case of the other *politeumata*, is no proof that these associations actually did not possess them because our papyrological source material for the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis and the epigraphic evidence for the other *politeumata* are incomparable, as we have already pointed out. And even dismissing this incomparability and supposing that only the *politeuma* in Heracleopolis had such competences would leave us with the problem of explaining why only the Heracleopolitan Jews should have possessed such special prerogatives by means of which their *politeuma* actually appears as a vital part of the local administration, while the other *politeumata* could

---

68. This was indeed already proposed by W. Dittenberger (in his commentary on *OGIS* I 143) for the συμπολιτεύόμενοι who are mentioned together with the *koinon* of Thracians and that of Ionians in Cyprus (see also below): *Sine dubio ei mercenarii, qui origine ad nullam ex eis gentibus pertinebant, quae concilia sua habebant in exercitu Cyprio, tamen alicui ex illis sodalitatibus se aggregabant. Hi sunt οἱ συμπολιτεύόμενοι.*

merely pass honorary decrees and deal with their internal religious and cultic affairs. One could therefore argue that the opposite assumption is equally justifiable, that is to say: since the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis as well as the other ethnic *politeumata* in Egypt was of military origin, all these associations should have possessed (in principle) the same competences of self-administration. Otherwise, we would have to assume that there existed different types of *politeumata* and the Jews (all of them or only those in Heracleopolis?) were allowed to establish *politeumata* with considerably wider competences than those which enjoyed the other military ethnic associations of this kind.

One might of course defend such a view by supposing a certain *Sonderstellung* of the Jews among the other foreign ethnics in Ptolemaic Egypt, because the Jews could be considered as ‘special’ not only on account of being foreigners, but also on account of their monotheistic religion and of their specific laws ultimately originating from this religion. It certainly goes without saying that the papyrus documents from the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis confront us with a very deeply Hellenized Jewish population, whose members of course spoke perfect Greek, used in their contracts the formulas of Greek law and reverted to specific Jewish legal customs only in very particular cases, as in the application of Jewish matrimonial law, a fact revealed in the petition about the breaking of an engagement in P.Polit. Iud. 6. Robert Kugler, however, has just recently demonstrated very convincingly that also in other petitions in the P.Polit. Iud. there might possibly be identified certain elements of ‘Judean legal reasoning’ gleaming through the Greek legal terminology.<sup>69</sup>

Taking this altogether one might therefore argue that the Jews considered such legal competences with which their *politeuma* in Heracleopolis was provided as a suitable means for the preservation of their ethnic identity. On the other hand, one could suppose that the other foreign ethnic groups in Ptolemaic Egypt (Cilicians, Phrygians, Cretans or whatever) shared more or less comparable legal and religious ideas and practices, which were common in the Hel-

---

69. See Kugler 2010; 2011; 2014.

lenistic world by that time. Therefore, they could be presumed to have felt a lesser need for such far-reaching competences as those enjoyed by the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis. Consequently, they may have been more inclined to accept the normal jurisdiction of the Ptolemaic officials than exercising it by themselves, even though they could have done so, provided that it was theoretically possible for all *politeumata* to exercise such prerogatives as those possessed by the *politeuma* of the Jews in Heracleopolis. But all these assumptions could equally be altogether erroneous, and the Jews of Heracleopolis could have just been rewarded by the Ptolemaic king for their important role in the military establishment at that time, and perhaps in particular for their support to one (or two?) of the Ptolemaic siblings, who were currently fighting against one another, by granting the Jews a *politeuma* equipped with wider competences. Until further evidence comes to light – especially for the activity and competences of ethnic *politeumata* other than that of the Jews of Heracleopolis, and as long as the latter remains the only *politeuma* for which such far-reaching competences are attested, such assumptions remain speculative.

##### 5. Ethnic *koina* in Cyprus and ethnic *politeumata* in Egypt: One and the same or two distinct institutions?

Besides the above discussed ethnic *politeumata* there existed in the Ptolemaic realm associations of foreign ethnics which are designated as *koina*. With one exception (to be dealt with presently), all these *koina* figure as associations of the foreign mercenary troops stationed in Cyprus, by far the longest lasting possession of the Ptolemaic dynasty outside Egypt.<sup>70</sup> All of these *koina* are known from inscriptions (dating from the second half of the second century BCE) they themselves had set up in honor of the Ptolemaic governor of the island or members of his family. Such an association is usually and uniformly described as ‘*koinon* of the [there follows the name of the ethnic group] stationed on the island [or: in Cyprus]’, as for example in the case of the *koinon* of the Ionians designated as *κοινὸν τῶν ἐν*

70. On the military organisation of Ptolemaic Cyprus see also Bagnall 1976, 49-57.

τῆι νήσωι τασσομένων Ἴώνων.<sup>71</sup> In addition to the Ionians such a *koinon* is attested for ‘the Achaeans and the other Greeks’,<sup>72</sup> the Cilicians<sup>73</sup>, the Cretans<sup>74</sup>, the Lycians<sup>75</sup> and the Thracians<sup>76</sup>, while for one such *koinon* the name of the ethnic group is not preserved anymore.<sup>77</sup>

Together with the *koinon* of the Ionians and that of the Thracians there is mention of people associated with it and designated as *sym-politeuomenoi* (κοινὸν τῶν ΝΝ καὶ τῶν συμπολιτευομένων).<sup>78</sup> Quite similarly such associates appear alongside the *politeuma* of the Boetians in the Egyptian nome metropolis of Xoïs in the Nile Delta which we have mentioned earlier.<sup>79</sup> It seems, that these associations consisted on the one hand of a *koinon* in the narrower sense of the word, the members of which being the active soldiers sharing the same ethnic origin, while on the other hand certain other people (presumably civilians) were associated with them.

Dorothy Thompson has argued in her above-mentioned article on the Idumaeen *politeuma* in Memphis, published in 1984, that the ethnic *koina* of the mercenary garrisons of Cyprus are more or less to be put on the same level as the *politeumata* in Egypt, a case which had

71. Mitford 1961, 31,84 (= OGIS I 145 = SEG 13:579; Palaiaphos, 123-118 BCE): κοινὸν τῶν ἐν τῆι νήσωι τασσομένων Ἴώνων καὶ τῶν συνπολιτευομένων.

72. OGIS I 151 (= IvO 301; Olympia, 158-146 BCE): οἱ ἐν Κύπρω[ι] στρατεούμε[ν]οι Ἀχαιοὶ κ[α]ὶ οἱ ἄλλοι Ἑλληνας.

73. Mitford 1961, 31,83 (= OGIS I 157 = SEG 13:578; Palaiaphos, 123-118 BCE): κοινὸν τῶν ἐν τῆι νήσωι τασσομένων Κιλίκων; see also Mitford 1961, 34,91 (= OGIS I 148 = SEG 38:584; 114-107 BCE).

74. Pouilloux, Roesch and Marcillet-Jaubert 1987, 76 (= SEG 30:1640 = OGIS I 153; cf. SEG 37:1394; Salamis, 146-116 BCE): κοινὸν τῶν ἐν τῆι νήσωι τασσομένων Κρητῶν.

75. Mitford 1961, 30,80 (= OGIS I 162 = SEG 13:580; Palaiaphos, 123-118 BCE): κοινὸν τῶν ἐν τῆι νήσωι τασσομένων Λυκίων; see also Mitford 1961, 29,76 (= OGIS I 147 = SEG 13:575; Palaiaphos, 127-124 BCE); Mitford 1961, 27,73 (= SEG 20:203; Palaiaphos, 142-131 BCE); Mitford 1961, 29,77 (= OGIS I 146; Palaiaphos, 131-127 BCE); Mitford 1961, 30,79 (= SEG 13:577; Palaiaphos, 123-118 BCE); Mitford 1961, 30,81 (= SEG 13:583; Palaiaphos, 123-118 BCE).

76. Pouilloux, Roesch and Marcillet-Jaubert 1987, 80 (= OGIS I 143 = SEG 13:554; Salamis, ca. 116 BCE): κοινὸν τῶν ἐν Κύπρωι τασσομένων Θραικῶν καὶ τῶν συμπολιτευομένων.

77. SEG 13:573 (Nea Paphos, shortly after 127 BCE).

78. See above nn. 69 and 74.

79. See above section III.

been already made in 1924 by Ernst Kornemann in his Pauly-Wissowa article on κοινόν, where he argues (by pointing at the συμπολιτεύόμενοι of the *koina* in Cyprus) that the appearance of the designation *koinon* alongside the designation *politeuma* would prove that such ethnic associations had a status somehow in the middle between a private association and a civic body: ‘Wie die Bezeichnung κ(οινόν) neben πολιτεύμα beweist, handelt es sich hier ... um ein Mittelding zwischen Verein und Stadtgemeinde, rechtlich dem Verein, faktisch der Stadtgemeinde näher stehend ...’.<sup>80</sup> Though a similarity clearly exists between the *politeumata* in Egypt and the ethnic *koina* found in Cyprus,<sup>81</sup> one could ask – provided that ethnic *koina* and *politeumata* should have had indeed the same legal status – why at the same time and in the same state two different names for the same thing should have been used.

Thompson held that in Cyprus the military ethnic communities were named *koina* rather than *politeumata*, ‘thereby avoiding confusion with *politeumata* of the more traditional type on the island’.<sup>82</sup> Though Thompson does not name these ‘*politeumata* of the more traditional type’, presumably the author refers to the political communities (*poleis* etc.) which already existed before the Ptolemaic rule over the island. One wonders, however, how and in what way these preexisting indigenous political bodies could have been ‘confused’ with newly founded *politeumata* consisting of foreign mercenary soldiers from outside Cyprus.

That there indeed existed a difference between ethnic *koina* and *politeumata* was however argued by Walter Ruppel, who in a long article, which was published already in 1926, but since then somehow has fallen into oblivion, meticulously analyzed the history and usage of the term *politeuma*. Ruppel considered the *koina* of the mercenary soldiers in Cyprus as military clubs (‘Militärvereine’) whereas he defined the *politeumata* as associations under public law (‘öffentlich-rechtliche Körperschaften’) and identified them as military divisions (‘Regimenter’). The latter view cannot of course be main-

80. RE Suppl. IV (1924) 914-941 s.v. Κοινόν, *ibid.* 916-917.

81. See also Honigman 2003, 64-65.

82. Thompson 1984, 1073-1074.



tained anymore in the light of the documents from the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis.<sup>83</sup> But I think that precisely because of these documents, as well as because of the prerogatives enjoyed by the *politeuma* they attest, the assumption that ethnic *koina* and *politeumata* were associations of different character has gained more probability. I would therefore propose that, compared to a *politeuma*, a *koinon* had an inferior position and that the privilege granted to an ethnic group of soldiers to organize itself as a *politeuma* is to be considered as an important enhancement of status. This enhancement of status would mainly have consisted in the delegation of such legal competences and executive prerogatives, which was endowed upon the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis. Maybe we can detect the scant traces of the promotion of an ethnic *koinon* to a *politeuma* by the fact that in Alexandria there is attested between 186 and 180 BCE a *koinon* of Lycians (so far the only evidence for such an ethnic *koinon* in Egypt) setting up a statue with an honorary inscription for a Ptolemaic official,<sup>84</sup> while in 124 CE an association of Lycians in Alexandria is designated as *politeuma*.<sup>85</sup> Provided that (as was already noted above) the foundation of this *politeuma* goes back to the Ptolemaic period, it could be assumed, that an already existing *koinon* of Lycians was promoted to a *politeuma*.

Since these competences made such an ethnic association organised as a *politeuma* a political body which could exercise official functions on the level of local administration, one could presume that this may have been the reason for avoiding the establishment of such associations in Cyprus, because these would have rivalled the existing pre-Ptolemaic political communities on the island (which were allowed to retain their rights of self-administration under Ptolemaic rule) and could therefore have become a potential danger for the social and political peace between the indigenous population and the Ptolemaic garrison. In the Egyptian *chora*, however,

---

83. Already Schubart 1910, 64-65 had, however, with regard to the *politeuma* of the Cretans in Krokodilopolis (see above section III), made a distinction between the military detachment itself and its 'politischen Verband' or 'politischer Organisation' (i.e. the *politeuma*).

84. *SEG* 27:1029 (= *OGIS* I 99 = *SB* V 8274).

85. *I. Alex. Ptol* 24 (= *I. Prose* 61 = *IGRR* I 1078 = *SEG* 2:848; see also above section III).

where such traditional political communities (as e.g. the Greek *poleis*) were practically non-existent, this danger could have been considered as much less important. It is true, though, that in the territory of Alexandria there must have existed quite a number of *politeumata*,<sup>86</sup> but as a multicultural community and royal residence of the Ptolemies this city was a very special case anyway.

One has to admit, however, that the points raised above of course do not provide clearcut proof that ethnic *koina* and *politeumata* were different institutions and one has (as is so often the case in our disciplines) to hope for further evidence to answer this question with more certainty. I would think, though, that in the light of the Heracleopolitan *politeuma*-papyri the argument that there really existed some differences between ethnic based *koina* and *politeumata* after all has gained some plausibility; unless one is inclined to consider the Jewish *politeuma* of Heracleopolis as a curious and unique special case among all other known *politeumata*.

## 6. Conclusions

It seems that most ethnic *koina* and *politeumata* in Ptolemaic Egypt and in the possessions of the Ptolemies outside Egypt are not attested until the second century BCE.<sup>87</sup> At least the growth of their number appears to gain a certain momentum in this period in particular from the middle of the second century onwards, when the ethnic *koina* of the mercenary troops in Cyprus and the *politeuma* of

---

86. This is not only illustrated by the Alexandrian *politeumata* mentioned above (see section III), but also through P.Tebt. III.1 700,38 ss. (cf. BL V 147; IX 358; Tebtynis, 124 BCE), where there is cited a royal decree concerning the property of several types of associations in Alexandria. Explicitly mentioned are *gymnasia*, *synodoi* and *politeumata*, and since the text is very fragmentary there must have been mentioned at least one more (perhaps *koina*?). Because of the fragmentary state of the papyrus however the matter of these regulations, which otherwise would be presumably quite illuminating for the legal status of such associations, remains largely obscure.

87. A possible exception were possibly the *politeumata* attested for Sidon, if the relevant inscriptions should indeed date to the period until the end of the third/beginning of the second century BCE, during which the Ptolemies ruled over the town, and not to the succeeding Seleucid period (see also above section III). Although, as far as I know, ethnic *politeumata* are hitherto unattested in the Seleucid kingdom.

the Jews in Heracleopolis are established. This could be explained by the tough times the Ptolemies were facing in this period in which the dynasty encountered a crisis of its legitimacy because of their final defeat in the numerous wars against their Seleucid archenemy which deprived the Ptolemies of Syria-Phoenicia (Koile Syria), the revolts of its indigenous Egyptian subjects, the internal dynastic strife between the Ptolemaic siblings and, last but not least, the loss of freedom for an independent foreign policy in the eastern Mediterranean as a result of the Roman hegemony.

In these hard times the Ptolemies could quite possibly have perceived themselves as being forced to make a certain offer to the foreign ethnic groups which constituted an important pillar of their military organisation to ensure their future support.<sup>88</sup> That is to say, an offer for a greater autonomy by at least granting them the right to organise themselves as a *koinon* or even as a *politeuma*; thereby strengthening their ethnic identity and (especially in the latter case) allowing them to form political bodies of ‘citizens’ with considerable legal and executive prerogatives, not only destined to administer the internal affairs of their own community, but also allowing them to play an official role on the local level of administration. At the same time the organisation of the foreign ethnics as *politeumata* clearly emphasized (not only on an institutional level, but on other levels, too) a separation from the vast majority of the indigenous Egyptian subjects of the Ptolemaic rulers and could thus have reinforced in the eyes of these ‘Greek’ (i.e. long since Hellenised) ethnic communities a certain feeling of superiority over the Egyptians. In Egypt they were called *Hellenes* (‘Greeks’) and among them also the Hellenised Jews are clearly to be counted.<sup>89</sup> The second century saw a great number of Jews migrating to Egypt because of the internal religious quarrel in Israel between supporters of a greater Hellenisation of the Jewish cult and their orthodox opponents (and of course the fatal interference in these matters by the Seleucid king). They were also invited by the friendly attitude which Ptolemy VI

---

88. See also Thompson 2011, 110.

89. For a recent study on the conception of the ethnic designation ‘Greek’ in Ptolemaic Egypt see Thompson 2001.

showed towards their people, for whom the favouring of the Jews might of course have been also a strategic political option directed against the Seleucids. For these Jews then, of whom a great number joined the Ptolemaic army, the offer of *politeumata* might have been particularly attractive. The political aims of establishing the ethnic *politeumata* in Ptolemaic Egypt may thus be described in a somehow paradox way as integration by separation and privilege.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arzt-Grabner, P. 2012, 'Die Stellung des Judentums in neutestamentlicher Zeit anhand der Politeuma-Papyri und anderer Texte,' in J. Herzer (ed.), *Papyrologie und Exegese. Die Auslegung des Neuen Testaments in Licht der Papyri. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament II 341*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, pp. 127-158.
- Bagnall, R.S. 1976, *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt*. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 4. Leiden: Brill.
- Bowman, A.K., and Rathbone, D. 1992, 'Cities and Administration in Roman Egypt,' *JRS* 82, 107-127.
- Capponi, L. 2007, *Il tempio di Leontopoli in Egitto. Identità politica e religiosa dei Giudei di Onia (c. 150 a.C. - 73 d.C.)*. Pisa: ETS.
- Honigman, S. 2003, 'Politeumata and Ethnicity in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt,' *AncSoc* 33, 61-102.
- Horbury, W. and Noy, D. 1992, *Jewish inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt: with an index of the Jewish inscriptions of Egypt and Cyrenaica*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasher, A. 1985, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt. The Struggle for Equal Rights*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 7. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Kasher, A. 2002, 'Review Essay: James M.S. Cowey and Klaus Maresch, Urkunden des Politeuma der Juden von Herakleopolis (144/3-133/2 v. Chr) (P. Polit. Jud.). Papyri aus den Sammlungen von Heidelberg, Köln, München, und Wien. Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Papyrologica Coloniensia, vol. 29. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, 2001,' *Jewish Quarterly Review* 93: 257-268.
- Kruse, T. 2008, 'Das politeuma der Juden von Herakleopolis in Ägypten,' in M. Karrer and W. Kraus (eds.), *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.-23. Juli 2006*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament I 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, pp. 166-175.

- Kruse, T. 2011, 'Die Festung von Herakleopolis und der Zwist im Ptolemäerhaus,' in A. Jördens and J.F. Quack (eds.), *Ägypten zwischen innerem Zwist und äußerem Druck. Die Zeit Ptolemaios VI. bis VIII. Internationales Symposium Heidelberg 16.-19. 9. 2007*. Philippika 45. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, pp. 255-267.
- Kugler, R. 2010, 'Dorotheos Petitions for the Return of Philippa (P. Polit. Jud. 7): A Case Study in the Jews and their Law in Ptolemaic Egypt,' in T. Gagos and A. Hyatt (eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th International Congress of Papyrology. Ann Arbor, July 29 - August 4, 2007*. American Studies in Papyrology, Special Edition. Ann Arbor: Scholarly Publishing Office, The University of Michigan Library, pp. 387-395.
- Kugler, R. 2011, 'Dispelling an Illusion of Otherness? Juridical Practice in the Heracleopolis Papyri,' in D. Harlow et al. (eds.), *The 'Other' in Second Temple Judaism. Essays in Honor of John J. Collins*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, pp. 457-470.
- Kugler, R. 2014, 'Judean Marriage Custom and Law in Second-Century BCE Egypt: A Case of Migrating Ideas and a Fixed Ethnic Minority,' in P.A. Sängler and R. Ast (eds.), *Minderheiten und Migration. Antike, Zeitgeschichte, Gegenwart*. Studien zur historischen Migrationsforschung 31. Paderborn: Schöningh.
- Lüderitz, G. 1983, *Corpus jüdischer Zeugnisse aus der Cyrenaika mit einem Anhang von Joyce M. Reynolds*. Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients, Reihe B, 53. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert.
- Mitford, T.B. 1961, 'The Hellenistic Inscriptions of Old Paphos,' *BSA* 56, 1-41.
- Ritter, B. 2011. 'On the "πολίτευμα" in Heracleopolis,' *SCI* 30, 9-37.
- Pouilloux, J., Roesch, P. and Marcillet-Jaubert, J. 1987, *Salamine de Chypre XIII. Testimonia Salaminia 2: Corpus épigraphique*. Paris: de Boccard.
- Ruppel, W. 1926, 'Politeuma. Bedeutungsgeschichte eines staatsrechtlichen Terminus,' *Philologus* 82, 268-312 and 433-454.
- Schubart, W. 1910, 'Spuren politischer Autonomie in Aegypten unter den Ptolemäern,' *Klio* 10, 41-71.
- Smallwood, E.M. 2001, *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian. A Study in Political Relations*. 2nd edn. Boston, Leiden: Brill.
- Thompson Crawford, D.J. 1984, 'The Idumaeans of Memphis and the Ptolemaic politeumata,' in *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia (Napoli, 19-26 maggio 1983)*. Napoli: Centro Internazionale per lo Studio dei Papiri Ercolanesi, pp. 1069-1075.
- Thompson, D.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.: Center for Hellenic Studies, Trustees for Harvard University.

- Thompson, D.J. 2011, 'Ethnic Minorities in Hellenistic Egypt,' in O.M. van Nijf and R. Alston (eds.), *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age*. Groningen-Royal Holloway studies on the Greek city after the Classical Age 2. Leuven, Paris, Walpole: Peeters.
- Wolff, H.-J. 1962, *Das Justizwesen der Ptolemäer*. Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 44. München: C.H. Beck.

# The Ptolemaic *Ethnos*

*Dorothy J. Thompson*

From Herodotus on Egyptian society was recognised by Greeks as highly stratified and hereditary in nature. Occupations were regularly inherited; family and profession were not to be separated. Though different commentators used different categories, it is clear that alongside the rulers and the administration, the priests, those who worked raising animals or on the land, and the military formed the major groups within the population, and of course there were many others.<sup>1</sup> An appreciation of the embedded structure of this society is of relevance to my subject here – the definition and differing roles of what was known as *ethnos* in Egypt under the Ptolemies following its late fourth century BC conquest by Alexander of Macedon. How far may the categories of public or private be applied to the Ptolemaic *ethnos* and what was the nature of relations between *ethne* and the Ptolemaic state? Some preliminary definitions are in order.

*Ethnos* is a term with many meanings, and an investigation of these touches most of the issues of this volume. The first *ethnos* to be considered here is that which signified a group subject to tax within the Ptolemaic administration. Already in fourth-century BC Athens, the term *kata ethnos* ('by category') was used for a listing of objects stored in the Chalkotheke;<sup>2</sup> from third-century BC Egypt the

1. Hdt. II 164–66, seven *genea* in Egypt: priests, soldiers (*machimoi*), cowherds, swineherds, tradesmen (*kapeloi*), interpreters and ship-captains, cf. Diod. Sic. I 73–4, rulers together with priests, those providing revenues and soldiers (tied to land through *klerouchia*) plus herdsmen (including those who raise poultry), farmers and skilled workers (*technitai*); Strabo XVII 1.3 (C 787), priests, soldiers and farmers. See Hdt. VI 60.1, for family inheritance of professions.

2. IG II<sup>2</sup> 120.14 (353/2 BCE), *kata ethnos* record of objects in the Chalkotheke; cf. Dem. XXIII 146; LXI 4, for *ethnos* as an identifiable group.

same term (in the form *kat' ethnos*) was applied to a record of taxable groups subject to the salt-tax, which functioned as a poll-tax. So, for example, in one record from a tax district of the Themistos division of the Arsinoite nome, broken down into seven constituent villages, numbers are given for 1,579 adult taxpayers. As is usual in these registers, the overall total comes first; in this case the total figure is first subdivided into men and women, followed by a further breakdown by *ethnos*.<sup>3</sup> The first listed group is what we might expect an *ethnos* to be: the Greeks or *Hellenes*, who are recorded in four out of the seven villages. However, as becomes clear from other contemporary texts, rather than signifying the post-conquest settlers of Egypt from Greece, in third-century BC Egypt *Hellenes* were rather those who enjoyed a tax-privileged status; this was a category which included not only ethnic Greeks (in our sense) but also some Egyptians.<sup>4</sup> The next group, however, is different; here we find farmers (in all seven villages), who as we might expect form a sizeable segment of the inhabitants, and farmers are followed by sifters, beekeepers, gooseherds, Isis priests, policemen, and so the list continues. An *ethnos* here is an occupational group, a taxable category defined by the state. As such it was certainly not a private association, though I hope to show that those defined as an *ethnos* for tax-purposes were often coterminous with members of trade or cult associations, who joined in social and religious, as well as in professional activities in both their public and their private lives. The more regular *ethnos*, as we currently understand the term, signifying those who shared an ethnicity, with all that that implies in terms of background, culture and religion is, as will be explored below, also relevant to an enquiry about different groups within the state, and in how they were differentiated from or interacted with it. In Hellenistic Egypt, I shall suggest, in many areas and many re-

3. *P.Count* 3.148 (229 BCE), *touton kat' ethnos*. For *ethnos* in the sense of group or category, cf. *P.Bodl.* I 59b.1 (third cent. BCE); *P.Tébt.* III 701.297 (236 BCE); *P.Köln* VI 260.3 (213 BCE); VII 315b.3 (late third cent. BCE); *P.Count* 16.3-7 (third cent. BCE); 51.4 (181/80 or 157/6 BCE); *P.Paramone* 6.14 with note (185/4 BCE); *UPZ* II 162 = *P.Tor.Chouach.* 12.ii.24 (117 BCE); *P.Ryl.* II 265.1 (67 BCE).

4. On 'tax-Hellenes', see Thompson 2001, 307-11; Clarysse and Thompson 2006, 2:138-40.



spects, boundaries between what was private and what public were hard to define.

*Ethnos* as a tax-category was defined by the state, but the evidence of tax-registers implies the prior existence of occupational and ethnic groups that were based on shared family and profession rather than any official definition. Other tax-registers, as for instance in the following example, provide detailed lists of names of adults who shared an occupation:<sup>5</sup>

- 294      **dog-burier** (*kynotaphos*)  
 295      **Petosiris son of Herieus**  
          Nempnophris (his) wife, total 2, of whom 1 (male)  
          **brewers** (*zytopoioi*): Pasis  
          Teroys (his nurse)  
          Petosiris son of Pasis  
 300      Tetosiris (his) wife, total 4, of whom 2 (male)  
          **fullers** (*stibeis*): Petosiris  
          Thethosiris (his) daughter, total 2, of whom 1 (male)  
          Psintaes son of Kollouthes  
          Tanaibis (his) wife, total 2, of whom 1 (male)  
 305      Stotoetis son of Teos  
          Senyris (his) wife, total 2, of whom 1 (male)  
          Harpsalis son of Petosiris  
 etc. . . .  
 315      total 14, of whom 7 males  
          **bathhouse manager** (*balaneus*): Pasys  
          Tekoys (his) mother  
          Orsenouphhis (his) son, total 3, of whom 2 (male)  
          **oil-sellers** (*elaiopolai*): Sochotes  
 320      Thasis (his) wife  
          (his) father, total 3, of whom 2 (male)

Occupational registers like this formed the basis of the numbers in the summary records introduced earlier and their relevance to the

5. *P.Count* 6.294-307, 314-21 (ca. 232 BCE). For a classification of tax-registers, see Clarysse and Thompson 2006, 2:350-56.

current enquiry is two-fold. First, their very existence implies the involvement of occupational groups in their compilation; the information they contain must in some form have been made available to officials involved in drawing up these registers. Secondly, we may have an indication of those so involved in the form that these listings take. It is noticeable that in many of the occupational registers, as here in lines 297 (the brewer Pasis), 301 (the fuller Petosiris), 316 (the bathhouse manager Pasys) and 319 (the oil-seller Sochotes), the man at the head of the list, unusually for a household head, is not further defined by his father's name.<sup>6</sup> These men would appear to be well-known in the community and are likely also to have been the representatives of their groups, on whose cooperation the relevant officials relied. Sometimes, though not in these registers, we learn of their titles, like the *grammateis* or *presbyteroi* of the farmers.<sup>7</sup> Such occupational groups, it seems clear, had an existence *outside* the official context; they probably also had designated individuals to represent them in their dealings with the state, men like the brewer Pasis or the fuller Petosiris.

Whereas, therefore, in *P.Count* 3.148 *ethnos* signifies a group defined for the purposes of tax-collection, a group of interest to the administration and so perhaps a public rather than a private category, the way in which these groups were actually listed, as may be seen in the details just provided of *P.Count* 6, implies some form of corporate existence outside the official context. Further texts may illustrate this further. One interesting text from a little later, from the village of Oxyrhyncha in the south Fayum, preserves a letter about the regular auction of tax-collecting concessions:<sup>8</sup>

Metrodoros to Apollonios, greetings. We shall be in Oxyrhyncha on the 26th at day-break for the sale of the concessions (πρᾶσις τῶν) and t[he cont]racts (συντάξεις). Therefore collect the occupa-

6. For other examples of simple names at the head of a category, see *P.Count* 6.3710 (swineherd), 384 (miller), 499 (garland [maker]), 543 (Isis priest), 604 ([sacred animal] burier).

7. *Grammateis*: *P.Tébt.* IV 1129.1-2 (123 BCE); *P.Fay.* 18 a.1 (first cent. BCE); cf. San Nicolò 1915: I, 73-5, in other associations. *Presbyteroi*: *P.Tébt.* I 13.5 (114 BCE); 40.17-18 (117 BCE); 43.8-9 (118 BCE); *P.Grenf.* II 37 = *W.Chr.* 169.3-4 (108 BCE).

8. *P.Köln* VI 260 (9 March 213 BCE).

tional groups (τὰ ἔδουη) in the afore-named village on the [2]6th, so we are not held up in the striking of agreements. Farewell. Year 9, according to the financial year, Year [10, Tybi . ].

Verso (Hand 2) Year 10 Tybi 26, Metrodoros [...] on the sale of concessions.

(Hand 1) To Apollo[nios].

A little background seems required, since in the way the tax-system was organised we meet a Ptolemaic innovation. Tax-farming, with the auction or sale of collecting-concessions, was a new and integral part of the Ptolemaic system. The tax-farm was, of course, practised in Athens and it may have been standard in other parts of Greece. What is not found elsewhere is the mixed system that appears in Ptolemaic Egypt, where the tax-farm was combined with the use of state officials in the actual process of tax-collection. For whereas it was the successful bidder, the *telones*, who together with his personal guarantors became financially responsible for the state's tax-income, it was state-employees, *logeutai*, who actually collected in the tax. This forms an unusual combination of state and private enterprise in which, no doubt, there were double cuts to be taken, double extra levies on the tax-payer and two sides to keep happy. Just how this worked in practice is a matter for the imagination but we can assume that the Ptolemaic administration knew what it was doing in developing its own version of the tax-farm. We cannot know the detail of the pressures resulting in this system but we can imagine that it was still important under the new Greek regime to keep some elements of an existing system in play. This, I suspect, is why state-employed collectors continued to be involved and why the *ethne*, in the sense of occupational groups with their own representatives and structures, were needed at the auction. Not only were their representatives involved in drawing up the registers that would be needed by any potential tax-farmer, but it was only with their cooperation that anyone taking on a concession might hope to fulfil his contract. And there may be more to it. Those who took on the tax-concessions for the different trade-taxes – the oil-tax, for instance, the beer-tax, the tax on fishing or on weaving cloth – may well have come from among the ranks of such trades. Outsiders would have little hope of getting in the taxes. It was those in the

know from among the relevant groups – the *ethne* – who were crucial to the Ptolemies for the smooth working of their tax regime. The presence and participation of members of these groups was needed as back-up for the auction, to see fair play and to witness the deals.

And so the successful annual auction of taxes needed a gathering of the local *ethne*. The job of state officials was to make sure that the auction saw a full house, that the entertainment that went with it was good, and that all left content with what was agreed. ‘There’s quite a crowd that’s come to town’, one Demetrios wrote to Zenon some thirty years earlier, ‘because they are auctioning off the tax-concessions, and they are looking for fragrant wine.’ Demetrios then advised Zenon on how to get rid of what remained of a batch of sour wine by mixing it up with some good wine<sup>9</sup>. Besides revealing sharp practice, his letter also sheds light on the sort of occasion that was expected of the tax-auction. A good crowd in attendance, the excitement of the bidding, wine in abundance, and the cooperation of those *ethne* who would later pay, all played a part in maximising the tax-revenue of the Ptolemies.

*Ethnos* need not necessarily designate a group defined by the state; the term is variously used and an *ethnos* can, as just seen, play a social role. A further, somewhat later text, illustrates the use of *ethnos* to designate a group that is recognised in an official context but is not necessarily one created by the state. *P.Ryl.* II 65 treats a dispute over the professional rights of necropolis workers, *nekrotaphoi*, which was finally adjudicated at the level of the Greek courts by the Greek legal arm, the *chrematistai*. Things had started with an Egyptian contract drawn up between the whole corporation of funerary workers,<sup>10</sup> but some of their number had ignored the agreement, resulting in further proceedings. The outcome of the dispute is unknown but for our purposes two aspects are of interest: first, the way in which the parties to the original contract are described

9. *PLBat.* XX 30 (242 or 241 BCE).

10. *P.Ryl.* II 65.3 (67 BCE?), πάντες οἱ ἐκ τοῦ ἔθνους νεκροτάφοι, translated by the editors as ‘the grave-diggers belonging to the association’. For an *ethnos* of *choachytai* (another group of funerary workers) with an *epistates*, cf. *UPZ* II 162 = *P.Tor.Choach.* 12.ii.24 (117 BCE).

and, secondly, the identification of those involved as *nekrotaphoi*, those involved in the traditional Egyptian death industry.

We should, I think, with the original editors, understand the phrase ἐκ τοῦ ἔθνους as defining the *nekrotaphoi* ('from the body of the *nekrotaphoi*') in the same way as ἐκ τῆς κώμης in the phrase οἱ ἐκ τῆς κώμης γεωργοί is used to signify the village farmers. The *ethnos* of the *nekrotaphoi* was clearly a recognised group, who might act as a corporation in a legal context. But, secondly, this was also a traditional group, and as such was typically Egyptian. *hiera ethne*, priestly or cultic groups, is a phrase which occurs more than once in Ptolemaic inscriptions and papyri.<sup>11</sup>

The organization of different funerary workers into trade associations was a standard feature of this industry and the rules of these associations are quite frequently found written in Egyptian demotic. A professional oath from Hawara of a group of such workers in the first century BC records two families grouped together to form a single professional association with eleven members.<sup>12</sup> Members promised to refrain from collecting corpses over which they had no rights, to perform their funerary duties, to anoint with unguents, and to take responsibility for mummification within specified localities. Provision was made for the payment of taxes, and penalties laid down for non-compliance. Similarly from Thebes, from the temple complex of Amon at Djeme, the demotic rules of the association of those known in Greek as *choachytai* (demotic *w??h-mw*) specify that anyone who had practised as a *choachytes* for a period of ten years should join the association, and after sixteen years non-members were to be frozen out of practice; members and their families were protected in both life and death, and regular meetings were held for communal, but strictly limited, drinking.<sup>13</sup> The use of demotic for these rules probably implies that these were Egyptian associations, whose composition and practices are known to have

11. *P.Count* 16.3-7 (third cent. BCE); *OGIS* I 90.16-17 (196 BCE).

12. *P.Ash.dem.* 18 (70-60 BCE).

13. *P. Berlin dem.* 3115 (110-107 BCE), with de Cenival 1972, 103-35. For further examples, see de Cenival 1972; Monson and Arlt 2010. For communal drinking, cf. *P.Mich.* V 245.34-5 (47 CE), the salt merchants of early Roman Tebtunis join for a mug of beer each month.

predated the conquest of Egypt by Alexander.<sup>14</sup> How far these groups of Egyptian funerary workers were coterminous with those listed in tax-registers as an *ethnos* cannot be known for sure, but it seems likely that this was often, if not always, the case. Public and private usage may here coincide.

This was not a phenomenon limited to traditional groups of funerary workers. Other professional groups are also known, who may or may not be coterminous with an *ethnos* in the sense of a tax-category. The *naukleroi* from Memphis known as *hippodromitai* probably shared risks in their transport of grain, as they did a Levantine background.<sup>15</sup> As a group they had a *prostates*, Apolophanes followed by Malichos in 64/3 BC, and a *grammateus* named Eudemos. Similarly a first-century BC group of textile workers known from a demotic stele from Coptos had both male and female representatives, whose title is translated as ‘elders’.<sup>16</sup> The terminology used for responsible officials in these as in other groups is far from standard. It is similar to that found also in cult associations (normally called *synodoi* in Greek), which are not a prime concern of this chapter.<sup>17</sup> It should, however, be noted, in the context of the questions considered here, that when in trade or occupational associations overlap is found with administrative or state official terminology (as, for instance, in the case of *grammateus*) the terms that are used tend to be too general to allow comment on borrowings either way. This, as will shortly be seen, is in contrast to the case of the *politeumata*.

A further category of groups who are represented by their own officials are the different ethnic groups – ethnic that is in the modern sense – who were part of the multicultural society of Hellenistic Egypt.<sup>18</sup> How such officials were chosen is not known but their appointment was presumably made within their relevant communities, whom they might guide and represent in both internal and ex-

14. Monson 2007a and 2007b.

15. *BGU VIII* 1741–3 (64/3 BCE); cf. Hauben 1992.

16. *PBM dem.* 1325 (31 BCE), ed. Farid 1995.

17. E.g. *I.Fay.* II 119 (first cent. BCE?), *synodos* of *neaniskoi* from the Osireion, with *archiereus* and *prof[states]*; Rowlandson 1998, 56–57, nos. 28 (demotic) and 29 (Greek, called *thiasos*), both female; Monson 2007b, with important discussion.

18. See Thompson 2011; 2012, chapter 3.

ternal affairs. Such for instance were the *timouchoi* of the Hellenomemphites, the East Greek settlers in Memphis, who had originally come to Egypt as mercenaries in the seventh century and were later moved from the Delta to Memphis by the pharaoh Amasis.<sup>19</sup> Arabs, who within the tax structure formed a further privileged group, also had their representatives. A group of Arabs, for instance, found working in the new town of Philadelphieia in the mid-third century BC had decadarchs, who represented their interests to local officials, together with elders (*presbyteroi*).<sup>20</sup> Other ethnic communities had elders too. We know of *presbyteroi* within the rural Jewish communities of the Herakeopolite nome in Middle Egypt, whose responsibilities included first level adjudication of disputes. In cases where a dispute continued reference might be made to the *politarches* of the Jews in the capital of the nome. This was the most senior representative of this community, whose authority over the local Jewish community was accepted by the Ptolemaic state. Unlike the annually appointed Jewish *archontes*, the *politarches* apparently held office for more than a year at a time. Like other minority communities, that of the Jews of Middle Egypt in the second half of the second century BC was in many respects a self-regulating, self-controlling entity with its own para-governmental officials made up of members joined in background, marriage within the group and, especially, in religion.<sup>21</sup> They were more than simply an association.

In Egypt, those within what was termed an *ethnos* were more often linked by occupation. Profession, however, could be reinforced by marriage within the community, as may be seen in the names from the tax-registers, by residence often within a particular quarter, by culture and also by cult and religion. The beekeepers, for instance, of the Arsinoite nome had their own temple near the capital there, while members of a cultic group found making dedica-

19. *UPZ* I 149.16–18, 37, cf. *Hdt.* II 178, East Greeks at Naukratis (with *prostatai*); Hermeias in Athen., *Deipn.* IV 149 f.

20. *PSI* V 538.1, 3–4 (third cent. BCE), requesting an *epistates*. For tax-status, see Clarysse and Thompson 2006, 2:159–161.

21. *P.Polit.Jud.*, see index VI, cf. Honigman 2003; Kruse 2010; Thompson 2011, 110–112, with appendix.

tions often shared an occupation.<sup>22</sup> A shared profession was certainly not the case for *all* the Jews of Herakleopolis, but the core and probable origin of their community was a military settlement of the type called a *politeuma*.

In the *politeumata* of Egypt we meet a particular form of community, which, though initiated by the state as part of army reforms in the mid second century BC, also developed some form of independent existence within the state.<sup>23</sup> In this respect then *politeumata* may be compared to the *ethne* of the tax registers. *Politeumata* were communities of ethnic military groups which are known only from the reign of Ptolemy VI onwards. And alongside a *politeuma* came the community of army families associated with the main body, who in several texts are actually labelled *hoi sympoliteuomenoi* ('those sharing in the *politeuma*').<sup>24</sup>

Before the publication of the Herakleopolite texts of *P.Polit.Jud.* by James Cowey and Klaus Maresch in 2001 most of our evidence for this military development came from inscriptions. Inscriptions commonly illuminate a different segment of life than do the papyri; they record decisions, dedications or honorific decrees, meant as more permanent records by those who put them up than what was written on papyrus. From inscriptions, therefore, and now from the Herakleopolite papyri we begin to have a sense of how widespread these *politeumata* and related communities were, how they worked and what their role may have been within the Ptolemaic state.

As well as 'the *politeuma* of the Jews in Herakleopolis' we know of those of the Idumaeen sabre-bearers in Memphis, of Boeotians in Xoïs in the Delta, of Cretans in the Arsinoite nome, and so on.<sup>25</sup> In Ptolemaic Cyprus similar military communities appear in inscriptions as *koina*. The terminology found in use within the *politeumata* is

22. *PTébt.* III 853.26–27 (ca. 173 BCE); Clarysse and Thompson 2006, 2:204–205, n. 459.

23. So Thompson 2011, 109–111. On the *politeumata*, see further Kruse in this volume.

24. *I. Hermoupolis* 5.2–3; 6.3 (78 BCE); *SEG* 14.848.32–33 (156 B.C.), Xoïs; *OGIS* I 145.4–5 (123–118 BCE); 143.6 (ca. 121 B.C.), in Cyprus, associated with *koina*.

25. *P.Polit.Jud.* 8.5 (133 BCE), Herakleopolis; *OGIS* II 737 (112/11 BCE), Memphis; *SEG* 14.848 (156 BCE), Xoïs; *PTébt.* I 32.9, 17 (145 BCE?), Arsinoite nome; see further Kruse 2010, 97, n. 16.



certainly that of Greek civic communities, as indeed is the term itself, though, as I have argued before,<sup>26</sup> these communities possessed no *political* independence or power. They were primarily social units enjoying a degree of independence in community affairs which probably served to strengthen the identity of the unit. Members of a *politeuma* might meet together with others of their community to discuss internal matters or to decide on collective action.

In one case this meeting was called a *synagoge*.<sup>27</sup> Decisions, couched in the language of a Greek decree might be *pséphismata*, as in the case of an honorific decree from Memphis passed by the *politeuma* there of Idumaeans *machairophoroi* together with ‘those Idumaeans from the city’, in favour of a certain Dorion, *strategos* and priest in their community, whose benefactions they acknowledge. At great personal cost, the decree records, he had paid for the plastering and whitewashing of the temple of Apollo, here most probably the Idumaeans deity Qos. Along with other honours, they had decreed that at their regular sacrifices Dorion was to receive a branch (*thallos*), possibly a palm-branch, in accordance with their *patrios nomos* (‘ancestral custom’); his name was to be included by their priests and psalmists in their hymns, and at feasts held by the *politeuma* he was to be crowned on each occasion with a splendid crown; a stone stele recording this decree was to be set up in the most prominent part of the temple, with a copy to Dorion himself so he might appreciate the gratitude extended to him by the whole settlement, here called the *polis*. In the language of a Greek civic decree, this Semitic military community honours Dorion in their own way – with (palm)-branch, psalms and a splendid festive crown, according to their *patrios nomos*.<sup>28</sup> Like the Jews of Herakleopolis, this military *politeuma* and its wider associated members, bound by ties of ethnicity, social practice and especially religion, functioned as a real community.

Vocabulary can, however, be deceptive, and in a centrally controlled monarchic state, like that of the Ptolemies, outside the Greek *poleis* of Alexandria, Naukratis, and Ptolemais in the south, *political*

26. Thompson Crawford 1984; Thompson, 2011; 108–13, 2012, 94–96.

27. *OGIS* II 737.1 (112/11 BCE).

28. *OGIS* II 737 (112/11 BCE).

independence was non-existent. All came under the central administration but at the same time *politeumata*, which owed their existence to the state, enjoyed a fair degree of independence in non-political matters. And what is particularly striking here is the adoption of the terminology not of the Ptolemaic administration but of the Greek *polis* in a state where traditional *poleis* were rare. Realities had changed, but the legacy of Greece was strong, especially among the recent and not so recent immigrants, who came to fight in Egypt. In *politeumata*, therefore, as perhaps also in the Ptolemaic *ethnos*, some degree of independence was exercised by entities defined by the state. The line between public and private was far from clear.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Clarysse, W., and Thompson D.J. 2006, *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (corr. paperback 2008).
- de Cenival. F. 1972, *Les associations religieuses en Egypte d'après les documents démotiques*. Bibliothèque d'étude 46. Cairo: IFAO.
- Farid, A. 1995, *Fünf demotische Stelen aus Berlin, Chicago, Durham, London und Oxford mit zwei demotische Türinschriften aus Paris und einer Bibliographie der demotischen Inschriften*. Berlin: Achet Verlag.
- Hauben, H. 1992, 'Les nauclères "phéniciens" de Memphis (63 av. J.-C.)', in T. Hackens and G. Moucharte (eds.), *Numismatique et histoire économique phéniciennes et puniques. Actes du colloque tenu à Louvain-la-Neuve, 13-16 mai 1987*. Studia Phoenicia 9. Louvain-la-Neuve: Seminaire de Numismatique Marcel Hoc, pp. 321-331.
- Honigman, S., 2003, 'Politeumata and Ethnicity in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt', *Ancient Society* 33, 61-102.
- Kruse, T. 2010, 'Das jüdische politeuma von Herakleopolis in Ägypten. Zur Methode der Integration ethnischer Gruppen in den Staat der Ptolemäer', in V.V. Dement'eva and T. Schmitt (eds.), *Völk und Demokratie im Altertum*. Bremer Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 1. Göttingen: Edition Ruprecht, pp. 93-105.
- Monson, A. 2007a, 'Private Associations in the Ptolemaic Fayyum: the Evidence of Demotic Accounts', in M. Capasso and P. Davoli (eds.), *New Archaeological and Papyrological Researches on the Fayyum. Proceedings of the International meeting of Egyptology and Papyrology: Lecce, June 8<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> 2005*. Papyrologica Lupiensia 14. Galatina: Congedo, pp. 179-196.
- Monson, A. 2007b, 'Religious Associations and Temples in Ptolemaic

- Tebtunis', in J. Frösén, T. Purola, and E. Salmenkivi (eds.), *Proceedings of the 24th International Congress of Papyrology, Helsinki, 1<sup>st</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> August 2004*, vol. 2. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 122. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, pp. 769-779.
- Monson, A. and Arlt, C. 2010, 'Rules of an Egyptian Religious Association from the Early Second Century BCE', in H. Knuf, C. Leitz, and D. von Recklinghausen (eds.), *Honi soit qui mal y pense. Studien zum pharaonischen, griechisch-römischen und spätantiken Ägypten zu Ehren von Heinz-Josef Thissen*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 194. Leuven: Peeters, pp. 113-122.
- Rowlandson, J. 1998, *Women and Society in Greek and Roman Egypt. A Sourcebook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- San Nicolò, M. 1915, *Ägyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer*. 2 vols. Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 2. Munich: C. H. Beck (reprint 1972).
- Thompson Crawford, D.J. 1984, 'The Idumaeans of Memphis and the Ptolemaic *politeumata*', in *Atti del XVII Congresso di Papirologia (Napoli 19-26 maggio 1983)*. Naples: Centro Internazionale per lo Studio dei Papiri Ercolanesi, pp. 1069-1075.
- Thompson, D.J. 2001, 'Hellenistic Hellenes: the case of Ptolemaic Egypt', in I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 301-322.
- Thompson, D.J. 2011, 'Ethnic Minorities in Hellenistic Egypt', in R. Alston and O. van Nijf (eds.), *The Political Culture of the Greek Classical City after the Classical Age*. Leuven: Peeters, pp. 101-114.
- Thompson, D. J. 2012, *Memphis under the Ptolemies*. 2nd edn. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

# Courting the Associations: Cooperation, Conflict and Interaction in Roman Egypt

*Philip F. Venticinque*

## 1. Introduction

After enjoying some initial success as governor in Egypt, Aulus Avilius Flaccus made one mistake after another, at least according to Philo's less than flattering account.<sup>1</sup> During the final year of his difficult time in Alexandria, Philo characterized Flaccus as someone unable to navigate the mine field of local groups and their concerns successfully. Alexandria in the first century CE certainly was a complicated place on any number of levels. Civil unrest was a reality. Relations between Greek, Jewish, and Egyptian populations were tense. Alexandrian Greeks in particular had developed a reputation for feelings of cultural, social, and political superiority. So much so that Dio could poke fun at the lofty esteem and high regard in which they held themselves.<sup>2</sup> Beyond the account of social, political, and religious strife, in his narrative Philo indicates what difficulties might confront a governor and has painted a portrait of what an ideal governor would be in negative relief: essentially, all that Flaccus was not. Forced to deal with conflict and competition between vocal and influential elite and non-elite constituencies drawn from

---

1. Philo discusses Flaccus and the events that occurred during his term in two works: *In Flaccum* and *Legatio ad Gaium*. Philo himself, as a prominent member of the Jewish community in Alexandria, and a member of a prominent and well connected family, was involved in the matters he discusses. On Flaccus and his term, see Alston 1997 and on unrest in Alexandria, see Harker 2008, 9-47; on riots and unrest in general, see B. Kelly 2007.

2. Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 32.

all corners of the Alexandrian community, Flaccus managed to satisfy no one – including the emperor.<sup>3</sup>

Couched in the language of propriety, duty, and justice, the jurists describe the task of any governor as keeping the peace and preventing unlawful activities or the misappropriation of goods and services by any party.<sup>4</sup> The larger concern of facilitating the extraction of tax revenue and resources from a province perhaps looms in the background.<sup>5</sup> To succeed, governors and other officials needed to manage the different elite and non-elite groups like those Flaccus faced and somehow deal with conflict between these groups.<sup>6</sup>

The various associations organized around common professional or religious activities were influential constituencies not only in Alexandria but also in cities and villages throughout Egypt and the Roman world. Among the actions taken by Flaccus that garnered praise from Philo was his decision to disband the associations – groups that counted among their numbers some of the more influential members of the Alexandrian Greek elite. Philo asserted that, in his view, associations only held feasts and sacrifices as a pretext to cover up the intrigue, and drunkenness, that emanated from their regular meetings.

ἔδικαζε τὰ μεγάλα μετὰ τῶν ἐν τέλει, τοὺς ὑπεραύχους καθήρει, μιγάδων καὶ συγκλυδῶν ἀνθρώπων ὄχλον ἐκώλθεν ἐπισθνήσασθαι τὰς τε ἑταρείας καὶ συνόδους, αἱ αἰεὶ ἐπὶ προφάσει θυσιῶν εἰσιτιῶντο τοῖς πράγμασιν ἔμπαροινουῶσαι, διέλθε τοῖς ἀφηνιάζουσιν ἐμβριθῶς καὶ εὐτόνως προσφερόμενος.

He judged important cases with the help of those in authority, humbled the arrogant and prevented any motley promiscuous horde of

3. On provincial mismanagement, see Brunt 1961.

4. Among other examples discussing the role of governors excerpted in the *Digest*, see Ulpian, *Opinions*, book 1 (*Dig.* 1.18.6) and Ulpian, *Duties of Proconsul*, book 7 (*Dig.* 1.18.13). The handbook for governors and proconsuls became a popular genre among the jurists, see Burton 2001, 256-7.

5. Sharp 1999.

6. Kokkinia 2004; on administration of provinces in general and the role of governors see also Burton 2001 and 2004.

people from combining in opposition. The sodalities and clubs, which were constantly holding feasts under pretext of sacrifice in which drunkenness vented itself in political intrigue, he dissolved and dealt sternly and vigorously with the refractory.<sup>7</sup>

Philo and Flaccus were not alone in their attitude towards these groups. Associations were often viewed as sources of unrest and discord in ancient communities.<sup>8</sup> Roman attitudes expressed in literary texts indicate as much. Cicero, Tacitus, and Suetonius linked associations with unrest and sedition during the late republic and first century CE.<sup>9</sup> Trajan's reported response to requests for sanctioning an association voiced concerns about potential violence and conspiracy.<sup>10</sup> The jurists also laced their discussions of associations with similar feelings of anxiety.<sup>11</sup> In his *Institute*, for instance, Marcian reminded governors that they were 'directed by imperial instructions not to tolerate secret social *collegia*'. Marcian went on to suggest that if such groups existed for the benefit of *homines tenuiores*, individuals should be limited, ideally, to membership in a single group.<sup>12</sup>

Based on these texts, it would seem that the relationship between associations and the authorities was fraught with difficulty, complications, and conflict on all sides. Interactions between associations and the Roman government has been a focus of intense interest and debate since the earliest studies of associations.<sup>13</sup> Literary texts and juristic commentaries with their language of anxiety and fear have set the tone, producing a top-down history of legal and economic relations between associations, local elites, and imperial officials. Conflict with elites and strategies to compensate for exclusion from society on the basis of elite fears have dominated the discussion. Perhaps the debate focused on the juristic categories of licit and illicit *collegia* in which scholars since Mommsen have been engaged

---

7. Philo, *In Flacc.* 4; trans. F. H. Colson, Loeb 1941.

8. MacMullen 1992.

9. Cicero, *Pis.* 9; Tacitus, *Ann.* 14.17; Suetonius, *Aug.* 32.

10. Pliny, *Ep.* 10.33, 10.34.

11. *Dig.* 3.4.1 and *Dig.* 47.22.

12. *Dig.* 47.22.1, trans. Watson, et al.

13. Mommsen 1843; Waltzing 1895-1900; Poland 1909; on the historiographical traditions of the study of associations, see Perry 2006 and in this volume.

illustrates this point. Parsing associations into these categories as a way of understanding relations between a given association and the authorities only goes so far as an interpretive tool. Relying on a dichotomy between licit and illicit associations – the sober and the disruptive – as a lens through which to interpret their activities limits our understanding of the complex relationships associations developed and maintained with local elites, imperial officials, and other constituencies.

While recent studies of associations in Asia Minor, Italy, and Egypt have begun to probe the place associations occupied in their communities, questions remain.<sup>14</sup> How associations interacted, cooperated, or competed with other groups and members of the local elite, and the role imperial officials and Roman legal structure might have played has been less of a concern. Given the nature of the evidence these are hard questions to answer. Even honorific inscriptions that document connections between elites and associations obscure the details that lie behind a statue saluting a *gymnasiarch* for his generous supply of oil or dedications by merchants thanking an official for efforts to secure market space.

Taken together, inscriptions and papyri provide insight into the various stages of what were ongoing relationships and offer a counter-point to the literary and legal sources. In what follows, I will examine several examples of how cooperation and conflict between associations, individual craftsmen and merchants, and local elites and imperial officials played out in contracts, receipts, petitions, and other documents to help understand the view from below (see also Gibbs in this volume). These texts document, at least in part, moments when craftsmen and merchants chose to cooperate with or to challenge individuals, other associations, local elites, and imperial officials in different ways. A good deal was invested from the associations' perspective, in the choice of cooperation or conflict, as economic activities were embedded in larger networks of social, economic, and political obligations. As a result, associations and local elites had to make choices based on a number of factors. Both

---

14. Van Nijf 1997; Harland 2003; Hawkins 2006; Gibbs 2008 and 2011; Liu 2009; Venticinque 2009 and 2010; Arnaoutoglou 2011.

sides risked and wagered a certain amount of social, economic, and political capital when deciding to cooperate or not; those lower on the social and economic pyramid likely wagered more. Documentary evidence invites us to investigate the nuance that existed in these relationships and provides an opportunity to study how associations and the elites managed cooperation and how associations used law, legal rhetoric, and reputations for usefulness and past cooperation to their advantage when conflict occurred.

## 2. Coordination and Cooperation

Whether or not action against the associations of Alexandria proves that Flaccus desired to impose a Roman policy of control is unclear. If Flaccus had been acting on a specific policy, it would seem to have had little effect during his term or after. Papyri and inscriptions from the first century and beyond attest to the presence of associations in communities large and small throughout Egypt.<sup>15</sup> References to official restrictions on groups and their activities in Egypt are few. Nothing exists in Egypt quite like the prohibition for people to ‘take part in an assembly (*coetus*) in that *municipium* or to form a society (*sodalitium*) or a college (*collegium*)’ contained in the *lex Irnitana*, a copy of the Flavian municipal law from Spain.<sup>16</sup> Besides Philo’s report, a second-century copy of the *Gnomon of the Idios Logos* (*BGVV* 1210) mentioned associations (*sunodoi*) in a single section.<sup>17</sup> The text stipulates a fine of 500 drachmas imposed either upon associations or potentially only on their officials; it is not clear.<sup>18</sup> There is no indication of what would cause such a fine, nor does the *Gnomon* make evident under what circumstances officials or the association would be fined. Failure to meet tax requirements seems a likely guess, in light of the fiscal focus of the *Gnomon*, but there is no way

15. For information about associations in Egypt and Asia Minor, specifically during the first century CE, see Arnaoutoglou 2002 and Arnaoutoglou 2005; for a discussion of associations in Roman and Late Roman Egypt, see Venticinque 2009.

16. *lex Irnitana*, §74; for text and translation see J. Gonzalez and M. Crawford 1986.

17. On the *Gnomon* see Swarney 1970.

18. *BGVV* 1210 (*BLXI*, 26), section 108 (after 149 CE): ο[ἰ] σὺ]νοδοῦν νέμοντες κατεκ[ρίθ]-  
ησ[α]ν ἐκ (δραχμῶν) φ, ἐνίστε μόν[οι] οἱ [π]ρο[σ]τάται.



to be certain.<sup>19</sup> The inclusion of associations in the text does indicate that interactions between associations, their officers, and the authorities could become complicated (and costly), but there does not seem to have been any unilateral restriction or elimination of these groups in Egypt during this period.

Like everywhere else in the Roman world, groups in Egypt tended to be organized around a common trade or merchant activity. Others organized themselves around a specific deity or religious activity, like the association of Harpocrates operating in first-century Tebtunis, but groups like these probably had some larger economic focus as well.<sup>20</sup> A typical Egyptian association, referred to most commonly as a *sunodos*, *koinon*, or *plethos* was not necessarily large. Groups usually had membership of 10 to 25 individuals, although some elsewhere, like the builders or caulkers in Ostia during the second century boasted membership numbers of 200 or 300.<sup>21</sup> But as in other locations numerous associations were active. Tebtunis, a village of a few thousand in the Fayum, had associations of dyers, fullers, weavers, builders, wool-dealers, goldsmiths, and salt-merchants in the mid-first century. Associations were an important constituency in larger communities as well. A set of price-declarations from the early fourth century indicate that Oxyrhynchus was home to at least 33 different groups.<sup>22</sup>

Local notables may not have approached these groups with the same anxiety as members of the Roman elite projected in their writings. Steep costs of membership excluded participation by many of the nameless, faceless, rabble rousing crowd, the *homines tenuiores* mentioned by Pliny and Marcian, who they assumed relied on associations for social and economic support. An association charter from first-century Tebtunis (*P. Mich.* V 243) indicates monthly dues totaled 144 drachmas a year. Such a sum would have potentially supported grain provisions for a family of four (depending on a

---

19. Liu 2005, 291.

20. *P. Mich.* V 246 (I CE); *P. Oslo.* III 143 (I CE).

21. On group composition and make up in general, see Gibbs 2008 and Venticinque 2009.

22. See *P. Oxy.* LIV, Appendix II, 230-232 for a list of price declarations.

number of seasonal and regional variables in price, not to mention variations on consumption across age and gender lines).<sup>23</sup> Other first-century receipts and accounts suggest that groups spent large sums on regular banquets in addition to dues. The head of a group of weavers in Tebtunis paid 92 drachmas for one celebration, and the association of Harpocrates collected 235 drachmas from its members.<sup>24</sup> To say the least, membership in associations was probably not an option for the truly poor and marginalized members of society.

Some influential individuals on the local level may have even belonged to or maintained relationships with associations. Kronion, who managed the *grapheion* in Tebtunis and filled his days with preparing contracts, copying leases, and cataloging transactions, seems also to have been engaged in association activities.<sup>25</sup> Kronion's personal records show that if he did not belong to an association he at least had ties to one. Payments to a man identified as the *hegoumenos* of an association (*sunodos*) and another to an association for wine might have been his regular association contributions.<sup>26</sup>

---

23. For estimates on the cost of grain in first-century Egypt, see Duncan-Jones 1990, 144-145.

24. *P. Mich.* II 121, Recto IV, vi, preserves a copy of an agreement between the *hegoumenos* and *grammateus* of the weavers of Kerkesoucha Orous to pay 92 drachmas for the cost of beer, presumably for association banquets, to five other members listed here within three months; *P. Mich.* V 246 is a list of contributions, perhaps for a banquet, made by the members of the association of Harpocrates in Tebtunis during the first century.

25. On the management of the *grapheion* see Husselman 1970.

26. *P. Mich.* II 127, col. I, line 20 records a payment to a man identified as Patron the *hegoumenos* of an association (*sunodos*). There are other payments of four drachmas to a Patron, son of Tyrannos, at *P. Mich.* II 127, col. II, line 13 and 33, including a 'contribution for the sixth year' of four drachmas. Whether or not these are the same individuals showing repeated interaction with the association is unclear. *P. Mich.* II 127, col. I, lines 20 and 30 (CE 45/46); line 30 records a payment or contribution of two *keramia* at 36 obols, not specifying what it might be. If it was wine, the price would seem to be in line with other entries recording the cost of wine at 14, 16, 17, 18, 20 and 22 obols per *keramia*, although the price of one *keramion* of wine is listed as four drachmas at *P. Mich.* II 127, col. I, line 21.

Associations also maintained a public presence in cities and towns throughout the Hellenistic and Roman world. Some associations possessed meeting houses (*scholae*), others managed spaces and stalls in marketplaces, and paid taxes for the access.<sup>27</sup> Associations also engaged and participated in the wider social, economic, and political community through honorific inscriptions praising local elites as detailed in Onno van Nijf's excellent study of these practices in Asia Minor.<sup>28</sup> During the first and second centuries, for instance, the dyers of Thyatira honored market officials, civic priests and priestesses, the *prytanis* and members of the council, and a provincial imperial high priest.<sup>29</sup> The wool-workers in Ephesos honored Publius Vadius Antoninus, a Roman senator and member of a prominent local family, in the second century.<sup>30</sup> Honorific activities such as these indicate civic participation by associations and suggest that relationships of some sort developed between associations and local elites. Such a public display also may have signaled, or tried to lay claim to, an increased level of esteem based on their ties to influential individuals, who also likely reaped some positive benefits from the affiliation. While a lack of trust towards association members, and craftsmen and merchants in general, was the rule in literary texts, some associations may have occupied positions of influence, if not trust, on a local level.

Statues and inscriptions erected by an association honoring the efforts of a local official on their behalf represent the seemingly successful conclusion of a social, economic, or political transaction. Craftsmen and merchants contributed to the successful endeavors of officials honored by local councils and other bodies, even if not explicitly mentioned in the inscription as one of the groups bestowing honors. The people and local officials of Oxyrhynchus, along with the resident Alexandrian and Roman citizens, honored a gym-

---

27. On *scholae*, see Bollmann 1998; Hermansen 1982; on market taxes see *SB XVI* 12695 and discussion in J. R. Rea 1982.

28. van Nijf 1997, 73-130; see also Harland 2003 and now Arnaoutoglou 2011. Waltzing 1895-1900 remains a useful compendium of inscriptions documenting the honorific activity of associations as well.

29. Harland 2003:143-147; see also Arnaoutoglou 2011, 265-270.

30. *I.Eph* 728; On Vadius Antoninus and his family, see Kalinowski 2002.

nasiarch with a statue, full size portrait, and three shields for his efforts to repair the baths, supply oil for the gymnasium, and provide funds for shows.<sup>31</sup> The formulaic language of honorific inscriptions and decrees can obscure the complexities that went into earning that statue, as well as the economic, and contractual, relationships that developed between officials and associations during the process. Without the help or coordination of efforts by craftsmen and merchants this gymnasiarch in Oxyrhynchus might have been less successful.

As mentioned in the honorific decree by the people of Oxyrhynchus, upkeep of baths and maintenance of buildings were major concerns. Local magistrates relied on associations to complete this work. In order keep the baths operational, officials entered into contracts with various associations. Repairs called for coordination among a number of craftsmen, such as the group of lead workers hired by the *prytanis* of Oxyrhynchus during the third century.<sup>32</sup> According to the contract, an uncertain number of men supervised by two lead workers worked on the pipes at the baths. Bronzsmiths and glass workers also completed work on the local gymnasium.<sup>33</sup>

In order to fulfill large orders for garments and linen needed by local temples or the military, the local officials routinely entered into contracts with groups of weavers and linen merchants.<sup>34</sup> This was the situation in the Fayum village of Philadelphia where an association of weavers was contracted to produce military garments in 138 CE. The weavers received an advanced payment of 24 drachmas out of 148 total through a banker from four officials to help offset costs related to producing one white tunic, four white Syrian cloaks, and one white blanket for the hospital at the military camp.<sup>35</sup> Minutes of a late third-century council meeting in Oxyrhynchus also

31. *P. Oxy.* III 473 (138-160 CE).

32. *P. Oxy.* XLIV 3185 (III CE); see also *P. Oxy.* XLIV 3173 (222 CE), *P. Oxy.* XLIV 3176 (222-234 CE), and *P. Oxy.* I 84 (316 CE).

33. Bronzsmiths: *P. Laur.* IV 155 (late III CE); for glassworkers: *P. Coll. Youtie* II 81 (326 CE) = *P. Oxy.* XLV 3265.

34. On the supply and production of military clothing see Sheridan 1998.

35. *BGU* VII 1564 (138 CE); see also *P. Ryl.* I 189 (128 CE). On military clothing, requisition, and payments, see Sheridan 1998, 82-86.

mention work undertaken by weavers and merchants to provide linen for local temples at the behest of the council.<sup>36</sup>

Maintaining the food supply also required some negotiation. Cooperation, defined contractually though it may have been, between elite and non-elite was necessary. An agreement between six local officials (*eutheniarchai*) in Oxyrhynchus provides an example.<sup>37</sup> According to this text, each official agreed to pay for grain, animals, and presumably other costs for bakeries and milling workshops to assure a certain amount of production for the month. This contract represents one of what would have been many interactions throughout the year and records the type of cooperation that existed between local elites, bakers, and millers.

Despite evidence of cooperation, conflict did exist between associations, local elites, and imperial officials. Conflict did not always lead to riots, however; sometimes tension might not even be readily apparent. Often what was left out of a document or an inscription can point the way towards conflict in a community and the role that associations may have played as influential constituencies. Certain groups, for instance, may have felt differently than the dyers in Thyateira about the numerous people they honored. Other associations may not have considered Vedius Antoninus or his family so praiseworthy. Letters indicating imperial support and approval for Vedius' public building projects addressed to the council, magistrates, and people of Ephesos have been interpreted as a response to tensions in the community regarding his plans.<sup>38</sup> If this was the case, Vedius Antoninus was not alone. Dio claimed that he fell afoul of certain members of the elite and associations in his hometown over his civic improvement plans.<sup>39</sup>

Whether there was tension or not, associations like the woolworkers that honored Vedius clearly asserted a connection to a powerful and influential person and faction in local politics. Vedius An-

---

36. *P. Oxy.* XII 1414 (270-275 CE).

37. *P. Oxy.* VI 908 (199 CE).

38. *I. Eph* 1491-1493; on these texts see Kalinowski 2002, 109-121, Burton 2001, 257-8, Eck 1998, 369-71; for an alternate reading of *I. Eph* 1491 removing the tension between Vedius Antoninus and the council see Kokkinia 2003, 203-206.

39. Dio, *Or.* 40.8-9.

toninus and his family supported and may have appealed strategically to specific groups of craftsmen and merchants in their dealings with the local elites as Kalinowski has suggested.<sup>40</sup> Honoric activity in this sense signals more than a passive acceptance of a dominant social and political order. Associations like those in Ephesos or in Prusa, even in a small way, appear to have been part of the larger political process and negotiations taking place on the ground. They could be important factors for local elites like Vedius or Dio in establishing their own power and influence, something which probably caused tension with other elites and non-elites alike.

### 3. Conflict, Tensions, and Strategy

When tensions escalated, negotiations became complicated, or contracts were broken, craftsmen and merchants had a number of options to make their voice heard. Although open conflict and violence was not the norm, even in Egypt, groups of craftsmen did take to the streets in displays of displeasure and dissatisfaction.<sup>41</sup> It is Ephesos and Asia Minor, however, and not Egypt that has become the *locus classicus* of violence and unrest sponsored by associations (see also Perry in this volume).<sup>42</sup> The occupation of the theater in Ephesos by the silversmiths reported in the Acts of the Apostles has been one of the usual starting points.<sup>43</sup> Spurred to action by a leading craftsman named Demetrius, said to have employed many others, the silversmiths apparently seized two supporters of Paul and occupied the theater in response to perceived attacks on their livelihood and the cult of Artemis. Paul and his followers had been too good at convincing people to turn away from traditional cult at Ephesos, at least according to Acts. Religion and the spread of Christianity aside, the actions of the silversmiths were provocative and potentially dangerous.

The decision Demetrius and his apparently belligerent and nu-

---

40. Kalinowski 2002, 128-135.

41. *P. Bremner* 63 (117 CE).

42. MacMullen 1963; on Roman responses to unrest and riots see now Kelly 2007.

43. *Acts* 19: 23-41.

merous friends made was deliberate and called for weighing a certain amount of risk and uncertainty. A response from the Roman authorities could have been brutal. Any stored up capital with the local elites might also have been lost, especially if Roman intervention became a reality. The local elites occupied a precarious position too. They had to deal with the silversmiths and their complaints (and likely those of other groups), preserve order, and, hopefully, prevent Roman involvement. The craftsmen probably knew how difficult they were making it for the council. The council member called on to address them makes this clear in his comments: we all are in danger of being charged with *stasis* and we will not be able to give a proper account of this gathering.<sup>44</sup> In other words, this will be hard to explain if the Romans find out. The silversmiths and the elite must have both understood this. In that case, associations probably used disruptions and public displays sparingly and strategically as part of managing their ongoing social, political, and economic relationships with local elites.

The silversmiths likely pushed the questions of Artemis' importance and their own importance versus other groups (Christian or otherwise) as far as it could go. Although they left after several hours without any definitive resolution, the silversmiths perhaps went away more than empty handed. Demetrius and the silversmiths may have been trying to gauge what support and influence they had amongst the local elites in a real-time way – not measured in honorary inscriptions or favorable responses to petitions. By their actions and choice not to refer the matter to the Romans, the council may have signaled that they agreed with the silversmiths who had been shouting 'Great is Artemis of the Ephesians!' in the theater. Not only did the councilors also think that Artemis was, in fact, great, but they might have thought that the silversmiths could not be dismissed unilaterally, at least at this point in time. The proconsul who settled the disturbance the bakers caused in Ephesus in the second century may have been operating in a similar fashion.<sup>45</sup>

---

44. Acts 19:40, και γάρ κινδυνεύομεν ἐγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως περὶ τῆς σήμερον μηδενὸς αἰτίου ὑπάρχοντος, περὶ οὗ οὐδὲ δυνησόμεθα ἀποδοῦναι λόγον περὶ τῆς συστροφῆς ταύτης.

45. *I.Eph.* 215, with SEG 28.863.

He maintained that although he could punish the bakers severely, in light of their importance to the welfare of the city, he would not do so. If this was the case, the silversmiths might have gotten the response they wanted, and managed to avoid any punitive measures or involvement of the Romans.

The secretary of the council's statement acknowledged their presence and suggests that they had some standing. More than this, the secretary's warning to take their complaints to the imperial courts or the local council before, essentially, everyone gets in trouble is also illuminating.<sup>46</sup> Going to the courts or to the council were the other two options associations could make use of, and likely made use of more often than occupying the theater. In fact, the jurists seem to suggest that the right of an association to petition and have their complaints heard was and should have remained a given.<sup>47</sup>

I am less interested in the specifics of the uproar than in the decision made to occupy the theater and the response offered by the secretary of the council for how this episode can inform our reading of the papyrological evidence. Going to the council or the courts was exactly what craftsmen, merchants, and associations did in Egypt. A third-century transcript of council proceedings in Oxyrhynchus offers an example of associations taking their complaints and concerns to the local elites.<sup>48</sup> The council had contracted the linen merchants and weavers to produce garments for the local temples. Problems arose during production. The associations claimed that initial funds allocated by the council would not cover increased costs for labor and materials. Rather than march through the streets, both the weavers and linen merchants went to the council and asked for more money, where advocates spoke on their behalf. The weavers may have made a better case (or had more influential advocates) because the council allocated the full amount requested. The merchants, on the other hand, received only half.

When associations of dyers and fullers in the Arsinoite nome

---

46. *Acts* 19: 38-39.

47. *Dig.* 3.4.1.1

48. *P. Oxy.* XII 1414 (270-275 CE).



were unhappy with their tax assessment, they also chose not to start a riot. Instead, protesting what they deemed an unfair and incorrect tax assessment, the fullers and dyers took full advantage of the legal process and petitioned for a review.

[ - ca. 60 - έτους] Αντωνίνου καὶ Οὐήρου τῶν [κυρίων Σεβαστῶν - ca. 31 -] νυν[  
 . . . . ἀπὸ] τοῦ Ἀρ[σινοίτ]ου καὶ προσελθόντων Λονγεῖ- [νος ρήτωρ εἶπεν· - ca. 23  
 - οἱ μὲν] εἰ[σὶ] γναφεῖς οἱ δὲ] βαφεῖς τὴν ἐργασίαν, δίδονται δὲ ὑπὲρ τέλους  
 [- ca. 13 -] χειρω[να]ξί[ου ὑπὸ μὲν τῶ]ν γναφέων ἐτήσια δραγμαῖα χίλια  
 ἐνενήκοντα δύο ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν βαφέων [διακόσσια ὄγ]δοήκοντα ὀκτὼ κατὰ τὸν [γν]  
 ὠμονα καὶ τὴν συνήθειαν. Μαξίμου δὲ τινος κατασταθέντος ἐξεταστοῦ [ἐν  
 πλέονι αὐ]τοῦς ἢ ἔδει παραγράψαντος ἐνέτυχον τῷ ἡγεμόνι καὶ ἀνέπεμψεν  
 αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ Κράσσον τὸν κράτιστον [διοικητ]ήν, ὃς μεταπεμψάμενος τὸν τοῦ  
 νομοῦ ἐγλο[γ]ιστὴν ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν εἰκοσαετ[ί]αν τὴν ὑπὸ χεῖρα  
 [ἐπισκέψασθαι,] προσφωνήσαντός τε αὐτοῦ μηδὲν πλέον δεδῶσθαι τοῦ κατὰ  
 τὸν γνώμονα κατὰ ταῦτα ἠθέλησεν αὐ [τοὺς τὴν ἀ]πόδοσιν ποιήσασθαι καὶ  
 οὕτως μέχρι τούτου ἀπέδωσαν. ἐπεὶ οὖν νῦν κατ[α]σταθεῖς τις ἐπιτηρητῆς  
 Ἰο[τέλους χειρωναξί]ο(?)ν βούλετα[ι πλέον ἢ κατὰ τὸν γνώμονα αὐτοῦς  
 ἀπαιτεῖν ἐνέτ]υχον τῷ στρατηγῷ π[α]ρατιθέμενοι [- ca. 11 - καὶ ἐπε]ὶ μηδὲν  
 ὑπὸ τοῦ [στρατη]γοῦ ἐπ[ο]ύθη ἐδέησεν αὐτοὺς ἐντυχεῖν σοι. Πρώταρχος ρή-  
 [τωρ εἶπεν· . . . . . κα]τὰ τὰ δόξαντα Κρ[άσσ]ω - ca. 9 -]τ. [. . . . ἐ]ξετάσεως  
 ἦχθη περὶ τούτου εἶδος τῷ κρα [τίστ]ω Λιβερ[ά]λι καὶ ὑπέγραψεν μὴ ἀπ[αιτεῖν  
 Σευηρ]ιανὸς εἶπεν· παρόντος τοῦ ἐγλογιστοῦ ὄ[ς] καὶ ἐντυξε[- ca. 14 -]ν τὸν  
 ἐγλογιστῆ[ν . . . . (hand 2) ἀνέ]γγων. 15[(hand 1) - ca. 18 -]. [. . . . τ]ων [. . . ]ξί  
 . . . . βαφέων] καὶ γναφέων ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀρσινοεῖτου παρόντος Ἐρμί[ου τοῦ  
 ἐγλογιστοῦ τοῦ Ἀρσι]νοεῖτου [Λονγεῖ]νος ρή[τ]ωρ εἶπεν· ἐχθὲς ἐν[έ]τυχόν σ[οι]  
 οἱ συνηγορούμενοι [- ca. 12 - ἥ]ερὶ ὧν οἱ] δ[ε] ὄντως ἀπα[ι]τοῦνται ὑπὸ ἐ]  
 πιτηρητοῦ ἀσχολήματος χειρωναξίου καὶ ἐπὶ ε- [- ca. 15 - ἦ]χθαι τῷ [κρ]α[τ]  
 ἰστ[ῳ] Λιβερ[ά]λι καὶ ὑπογεγ[ρά]φθαι περὶ π[λ]έονος πρὸς αὐτοὺς μὴ ζητεῖσθαι  
 [- ca. 27 -]. [- ca. 15 -] τὸ ἀκριβὲς μάθης, δεόμεθα οὐ[ν] παρ[ο]ν[τ]α αὐ-20[τὸν  
 (?) - ca. 30 - Ἐρμί]ου ἀναγόν[τ]ος τὸ ἀχθὲν εἶδος Λιβερ[ά]λι Σευηριανὸς [εἶ]πεν·  
 [- ca. 17 -]. [. . . .]. [. . . .]τ. [. . . .]νν[- ca. 14 -]ος τοῦ ἐπιτηρητοῦ τῷ κρατίστῳ  
 ἐπιστρ[α]τήγῳ. [- ca. ? -] (hand 2) ἀνέγγων.

in the ... year of Antoninus and Verus the Lords Augusti, the fullers and dyers from the Arsinoite nome having been summoned and having appeared, Longinus, advocate, said: 'Of these men some are fullers and other dyers by trade, and for the tax on trades 1092 drachmas yearly are paid by the fullers and 1088 by the dyers ac-

ording to tariff and custom. A certain Maximus who was appointed inspector having wrongly entered a larger sum against them than was due they appealed to the prefect, who referred them to his highness the *epistrategos* Crassus. The latter summoned the *eklogistes* of the nome and ordered him to verify the accounts of the last twenty years, and, when he reported that no more had been paid than was sanctioned by the tariff, decided that they should pay on this scale, and they have done so up to the present time. A superintendent of the tax upon trades has now been appointed who wishes to demand from them a larger amount than that of the tariff, and they therefore petitioned the strategos, adding a statement ..., but as nothing was done by the strategos they were obliged to appeal to you.' Pro-tarchos, advocate, said: "... in accordance with the decision ... a report on the subject was laid before his highness Liberalis, who made an endorsement that they should not be required to pay." Severianus said: "When the *eklogistes* is present ..."49

Attempts by local officials to collect exorbitant amounts was a common complaint. Several petitions by individual craftsmen allege similar overzealous tax collection and seek relief.<sup>50</sup> These associations, again represented by an advocate, appear to have brought their dispute to the highest levels of provincial government on different occasions. At one point their case prompted the *epistrategos* (one of three regional officials with oversight of multiple nomes) to order a review of twenty years worth of financial records. While within the purview of provincial officials, any sort of review was likely burdensome and speaks to some of the influence these associations and their advocates had. On the basis of the review and past precedent, the fullers and dyers once again seem to have won the day, although the precise outcome is difficult to ascertain due to the state of the text. Precedent, conforming to established norms, a reputation for fulfilling tax requirements, and perhaps friends more influential than the tax collectors seem to have been on their side.

The weavers of Philadelphia might have found themselves in a similar situation. When last we met this group, they had been con-

---

49. *P. Tébt.* II 287, *BLX*, 276 (161-169 CE; trans. Grenfell and Hunt).

50. *P. Oxy.* LXXIII 4953 (48 CE); see also *P. Oxy.* II 284 (50 CE) and 285 (50 CE).

tracted by local elites to complete a number of items for the military. Things have become more complicated in the intervening time. The following year (139 CE), this same group claimed that they did not have enough weavers to fulfill new orders. It appears that four of their number had been tasked with other duties. In response, they sent a petition to the *strategos* of the nome (an official chosen from wealthy local elites but serving as the ranking civil official in a nome other than his own) seeking exemptions and relief from what might have been efforts by local elites to over burden them.

Δίῳνι στρατηγῷ Ἀρσινοεῖτ[ου] Ἡρακλειδ[ου μερίδος] παρὰ γερδίων κόμης Φιλαδελφεία[ς. ἐπειδὴ εἰλήφα-] μὲν ὑπογύως ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου ἀργυρίῳ[υ (δραχμὰς) -ca.?- , ἵνα ἴμα-] τισμὸν δημοσίων κατασκευάσωμεν. [ -13-14- ] μὲνοι ὄντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἐρ[γ]ασ[ια]ς ἀνδρῶν [ -12-13- ] τηκότες ἀπαρτίσαι τὸ κεκελευσμέν[ον -10-11- ] τούτων τέσσαρες ἐδόθησαν εἰς ἐπι . [ -13-14- ] ἔνεκα τῆς χρείας ἀφηρέθησαν ἀφ' ἡμῶν καὶ εἰς Ἀλεξάν-]δρειαν ἐπορεύθησαν καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐ[ -8-10- ] εἰγενό-μεθα, ἀναγκαιῶς ἐπὶ σὲ κατεφύγαμεν [καὶ αἰτ]οῦμεν. ἐάν σοι δόξῃ, ἐπιτρέψαι ἐαθῆναι ἡμᾶς τοὺς [κατα]λειπομέ-νους ἀπὸ τῆς τέχνης ἀπερισπάστο[υς] ἀ[πὸ πασῶν] χει-ῶν, ὅπως τὸν ἐγδεδομένον ἱματισμὸν . . . τελ]έσωμεν καὶ παραδῶμεν καὶ μάλιστα ὅτι ἐπῖκε[ιται ἡ]μῖν ἐτέρου δη-μοσίου ἱματισμοῦ ἔγδοσις, ἣν πάλιν ἡμεῖς ἀπαρτίσαι δεή-σει, ἵν' ὄμ(εν) πεφύλανθρωπημένοι. ἦμεν δ[ὲ] πρότερον ἄνδρες] δεκαδύο, ἐξ ὧν οἱ τέσσαρες ἀπεσπᾶσθησα[ν, ὥστε ν]ῦν [εἴν]αὶ ἡμᾶς ἄνδρες ὀκτώ.

To Dio, *strategos* of the Arsinoite nome, division of Heraclides from the weavers of the villiage of Philadelphia. There was recently sent us from the public treasury a sum of money with orders for us to make clothing for the state, and our group of artisans, reduced as it is to a small number, considered it an answer to its prater to be able to execute the orders received. But now four among us have been assigned to escort duty [on the grain boats]. They have been taken from us to perform compulsory public service and have departed for Alexandria; thus our appeal to you and to beg you, if you deem it proper, to give orders that we, who have hitherto been left to our trade, be left alone and undisturbed by other public service, so that we may make and deliver the clothing ordered (especially as we expect a further order to fill for the state), and so that we may thus be the beneficiaries of your benevolence. We were twelve

men in number, of whom four have been removed, so that we now remain only eight.<sup>51</sup>

This petition indicates some of the strategy that might have been involved in disputes with local elites. Local elites were not the only ones that could turn to the Roman authorities. If associations were unable to negotiate as the delegate of the council implored at Ephesos, they could use their rights to petition, just as the weavers have done here. This may have involved a certain amount of risk – not of violent repression as the silversmiths risked, but economic and legal risks (see also Perry in this volume). Responses from officials, in theory bound by law, precedent, and custom (κατὰ τὸν γνώμονα καὶ τὴν συνήθειαν) as the advocate of the fullers and dyers asserted, could be random and unpredictable.<sup>52</sup> To shield themselves as much as possible, associations like the weavers made use of rhetoric, precedent, and reputation for past services when making their case. The weavers reminded the *strategos* of their utility and service to the state, and the expectations that they will complete even more this year once they receive this small boon. In doing so, they challenged the local elites, and emphasized their participation in the process of administration – not their opposition to it.

The rhetoric of utility was a common theme.<sup>53</sup> A man named Isidorus, who claimed to be a weaver and a proprietor of a large workshop staffed by many people, asserted his usefulness and past services to avoid what appears to be an official post in Alexandria. During a hearing to extricate himself from this service held before an imperial official, his advocate Eudaemon invoked past precedent and claimed that people like Isidorus had received exemptions because of their ‘usefulness’ (οἱ δὲ τοιοῦτοι ἀφείθησαν διὰ τὸ χρησιμο[ν] εἶναι τῷ ταμε[ί]ῳ).

ἔτους λβ Λουκίου Αἰλίου Αὐρηλίου Κομμόδου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου Φαμενώθ  
ιζ ἐντυχόντος· Ἰσιδώρου Εὐδαίμων ῥήτωρ εἶπεν· Ἐπίμαχος Γαίου ὑποστράτηγος  
δέλτα γράμματος ἀνέδωκεν τὸν ἡμέτερον ἀνθ’ αὐτοῦ ἐργαστηριάρχην ὄντα

51. *BGV VII* 1572 (139 CE), lines 1-18; trans. Lewis and Reinhold, vol. 2, 373-4.

52. *P. Tébt.* II 287, line 5. 161-169.

53. Callistratus cites public utility as a justification for exemption from *munera* (*Dig.* 50.6.6.12); for further discussion of law and public utility see Liu 2009, 97-124.

λινούφρον πολλοὺς ἐργαζομένους ἐν τῇ ἐργασίᾳ ἔχοντα. οἱ δὲ τοιοῦτοι ἀφείθησαν διὰ τὸ χρησιμο[ν] εἶναι τῷ ταμει[ί]ῳ καὶ παρακαλῶ [δὲ] κελεῦσαί σε τῷ [Ἐπιμ]-  
 ἄχῳ ἕτερον [ἀνθ' αὐτοῦ] ἀναδ[οῦναι κ]αὶ ἀναγν[ώσομαι ὑπό]μνημ[α Μακρίν]-  
 ου κε[χρ]ο[ν]ισμένον εἰς τὸ κβ Φαρμουῦθι. Ἱππίας ῥήτωρ εἶπεν· ὁ Ἐπίμαχος φησιν  
 μὴ εἶναι αὐτὸν λινούφρον ἀλλὰ μυροπόλιν εὐσχήμονα ἄνθρωπον. Τουλιανὸς  
 εἶπεν· κατὰ τὰ ἔφ' ὁμο[ί]ων κριθέντα εἰ ἐστὶν ἐργαστηριάρχης λινούφ[[ων]] τῷ  
 αὐτῷ παραδείγ[μ]ατι χρῆσασθαι δύναται κα[ὶ] ἀξιοῦν ἀ[ν]τ' αὐτο[ῦ] ἕτερον  
 ἀν[αδοθῆ]ναι].

On the petition of Isidorus, Eudaemon his advocate, said: 'Epimachus son of Gaius, assistant *strategos* of the fourth district, has nominated my client in place of himself. My client is a foreman weaver who has many workmen in his factory, and men in his position have in the past been exempted because they are useful to the Treasury and now I urge you to order Epimachus to nominate someone else in place of himself and I will now read a report of Macrinus dated to the twenty-second year, Pharmouthi.' Hippias the advocate said: 'Epimachus asserts that Isidorus is not a weaver but a perfumer and a well-to-do man.' Julianus said: 'According to decisions given in similar cases if he is a foreman weaver he can use the same precedent and in turn nominate someone else instead of himself.'<sup>54</sup>

Tension between local elites and wealthy craftsmen may have resulted in Isidorus' nomination to a post in the first place. Craftsmen sometimes received immunities that local elites craved, potentially leading to enmity. It seems possible that in this case Epimachus, clearly someone influential, might have been trying to foist an onerous burden upon Isidorus. How he may have upset Epimachus is unclear, as is the nature of the relationships both advocates, Eudaemon and Hippias, presumably also members of the local elite, had with the others involved.

The text provokes interesting questions that will likely remain unanswered, including whether or not Isidorus was actually a perfume merchant or a weaver. Whether Isidorus had belonged to an association also is uncertain, although he matches the profile for membership: not just a weaver but one who employed many other

54. *P. Oxy* XXII 2340, lines 3-24 (*BL V*, 81 and *BL VII*, 148), trans. Roberts, adapted according to the suggestions of Youtie 1964, 316-318.

craftsmen, not unlike Demetrius in Ephesos. Isidorus' economic capacity does not appear to be in question, however, nor does he seek relief because of poverty. Instead, Isidorus made use of precedent and the rhetoric of utility to the state and the public treasury in an attempt to secure his exemption.

Finally, *P. Ryl.* IV 654 preserves evidence of an early fourth-century dispute between the weavers and the builders, who had tried to impress a weaver into their association.

[ . . . ] pago . civitat[is Oxur]unch[i]tarum [A]polinar[i]us dix(it):  
 [λινούφο]ς τὴν τέχνην ἐστίν, σύνδ[ικον] δὲ εἶναι δεῖ τοῦ τὴν ἐργασίαν πληροῦν-  
 [τος· ἔσ]τιν γὰρ αὐτῷ συνεργὸς Παῦλο[ς] οὗτος μαθητὴς μὲν τυγγάνων, εἰς  
 5[ἄσκησιν] δὲ τῆς τέχνης ἀφικόμενος, οὗτοι δὲ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ὡς οὐκ ὀλίγα [ταῖς  
 δημ]οσίαις τυγγάνουσι χρεῖαις χρήσιμοι [[ο]] καὶ σὺ ὁ ἐμὸς δεσπότης συν-  
 [οῖδας. τ]ῷ γὰρ ἀναβολικῶ πλείστα συντελοῦσι, καὶ ὅσα περ ἀπὸ τούτων ἀπερ-  
 [γάξεσθα]ι δεῖ. ἀλ<λ>' οἱ οἰκόδομοι δικαιοῦσι τῆς τοσαύτης ἐπείγουσας χρεῖας  
 [ὡς ἀργού]ς τούτους μόνον συνορᾶν. τὸν γὰρ δὴ βοηθούμενον οἰκ[ό]δομον  
 10[ποιῆσ]αι σπουδάζουσι λινούφον τυγγάνοντ' ἀπράγμονα τολμοῦντες  
 παρα[ν]ομώτατον. τῆς μὲν γὰρ τέχνης ἦν μεμάθηκεν ἀποσπῶσι, ἑτέρα[ν] δὲ  
 τὴν τῶν οἰκοδόμων ἐκδιδάξαι βούλονται. ἐπὶ γυναιῶν τῇ οἰκίᾳ φυλαχθῆναι δεῖ  
 αὐτὸν {προσῆκει} ἵνα μηδεμίαν ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκοδόμων πάσχει βίαν. προνοεῖσθαι  
 τούτου τὸν στρατηγὸν καὶ τὸν λογιστὴν ἀξιοῖ.

15Maximianu[s] v(ir) p(erfectissimus) iuridicus Aeg(ypti) dix(it):  
 λογιστὴς καὶ σ[τ]ρατηγὸς προνοήσονται εἰς τὰ ὑπ[ὸ] τοῦ]τ[ων] κατηγορημένα εἰ  
 τὴν] τέχνην ἐκμεμάθηκεν καὶ ἤδη ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἐργασίᾳ ἐστὶν εἰς ἑτέραν  
 μῆμεταφέρεσθαι τέχνην.

...of the city of Oxyrhynchus, Apolinarius said: 'He is a linen weaver by trade, and he is bound to be a *sundikos* in court for a man plying the same trade. For he has as fellow worker this Paul who, although an apprentice, has come to him for practice of the weaving trade. These men are in their own right of no small usefulness to the public services, and you, my lord, know—for they contribute abundantly to the *anabolicum*—how very much they have to produce. But the builders think it right, in a time of such pressing need, always to discuss only their own interests. For they are bent on making my client into a builder although he is a peaceful linen weaver, daring to perpetrate a very great wrong in the process. They are taking him

away from the craft that he has learned, and they wish to teach him another, the builders' craft. Inasmuch, therefore, as he must be preserved for his own craft, it is fitting, in order that he suffer no violence from the builders, that the *strategos* and the *logistes* make provision for him. This is his request.'

Maximianus, *vir perfectissimus, iuridicus Aegypti*, said: 'The *strategos* and the *logistes* will make provision, in respect of his charges, that if he has learned the craft and is already in this trade, he is not to be transferred to another.'<sup>55</sup>

While some have suggested that this text provides evidence of the government's desire to restrict social or economic movement, this dispute came to the attention of the local authorities on the basis of a petition alleging violence by the builders.<sup>56</sup> The builders' perspective is not known, but Paul the young and peaceful weaver might have found himself in the middle of a larger conflict between what were likely both influential, and useful, associations. In order to carry the day, however, the weavers and their advocate had to make sure that they appeared more useful, and peaceful, than the useless and violent builders, and they employed familiar rhetoric to do it.

#### 4. Conclusions

The texts considered here suggest that Roman officials were confronted with a complex fabric of factions and special interest groups, including local elites and associations. Decisions made to disband or take action against associations may have had repercussions. While Philo praised the association-busting measures of Flaccus, it will be remembered that some of the members of the associations he disbanded happened to be influential and wealthy members of the Greek elite who contributed to his downfall. According to Philo's account, as everything began to fall apart for Flaccus, two figures helped lead the charge in opposition – the same people he

---

55. *P. Ryl.* IV 654 (302-309 CE), *BLX*, 171 and XI, 191; trans. Roberts and Turner; on text see Youtie 1958: 397-401.

56. van Minnen 1987, 80; see also Carrié 2002, 319.

blamed for spurring the governor onto his lawless ways: Lampon and Isidorus. Philo depicted both as unsavory characters who enjoyed some significant standing in Alexandria's Greek community. Lampon was apparently wealthy and had served as a *gymnasiarch*. Isidorus, on the other hand, seems to have had a great deal of influence with the associations.<sup>57</sup> In any context, disbanding associations may have amounted to taking action against the very people that local elites and imperial officials relied upon: people who occupied a relatively more powerful position than anonymous agricultural laborers, merchants, or craftsmen.

The unrest in Alexandria or the occupation of the theater in Ephesos would seem to confirm Roman anxiety about the influence these groups could wield. But it is difficult to match up any of these stories or anecdotes of repression with a legal policy enforced in Egypt, Asia Minor, or throughout the empire. If not an actual uniform Roman policy, the approval of actions taken against associations found in the writings of Philo, Pliny, Suetonius, and the jurists may at least suggest an underlying historiographical point: good governors and rulers were supposed to keep an eye on associations. As reported by Suetonius, among the actions Augustus took to restore order upon assuming power included dissolving *collegia* not recognized by law or tradition.

*Pleraque pessimi exempli in perniciem publicam aut ex consuetudine licentiaque bellorum civilium durauerant aut per pacem etiam extiterant. nam et grassatorum plurimi palam se ferebant succincti ferro, quasi tuendi sui causa, et rapti per agros uiatores sine discrimine liberi seruique ergastulis possessorum supprimebantur, et plurimae factiones titulo collegi noui ad nullius non facinoris societatem coibant. igitur grassaturas dispositis per oportuna loca stationibus inhiuit, ergastula recognouit, collegia praeter antiqua et legitima dissoluit.*

Many pernicious practices militating against public security had survived as a result of the lawless habits of the civil wars, or had even arisen in time of peace. Gangs of robbers openly went about with swords by their sides, ostensibly to protect themselves, and

---

57. Philo, *In Flacc.* 125-140.



travelers in the country, freemen and slaves alike, were seized and kept in confinement in the workhouses of the land owners; numerous leagues, too, were formed for the commission of crimes of every kind, assuming the title of some new guild. Therefore to put a stop to brigandage, he stationed guards of soldiers wherever it seemed advisable, inspected the workhouses, and disbanded all guilds, except such as were of long standing and formed legitimate purposes.<sup>58</sup>

In characterizing these measures in this way, Suetonius' account made a connection with Julius Caesar who he maintained had dissolved certain associations as part of his reforms (*cuncta collegia praeter antiquitus constituta distraxit*).<sup>59</sup> What we see in the works of Philo, Pliny, Suetonius, and the jurists may be literary short-hand for painting an official, governor, or emperor as effective in upholding or re-establishing Roman order, and not necessarily a description of a strict Roman policy regarding associations. Good Roman rulers set things right, follow tradition, and maintain order. Control of associations in communities, rhetorically at least, was part of this idea of rule. In reality, these anecdotes may suggest that there was in fact good reason to appeal to and cultivate ties with associations depending on circumstances.

This is not to say that it was all historiographical convention. Restrictions or limits imposed on associations discussed by the jurists and examples of conflict initiated by craft and merchant groups should not be entirely discounted when discussing interactions between associations, local officials, and imperial authorities. Conflict, however, may not have been the defining feature of their relationships. Resorting to conflict and causing unrest was a strategic decision and employed sparingly. Associations and their members instead relied on the rhetoric of utility to the state and reputations earned from previous successful service in attempts to get their way. Some associations were also likely more influential than others: weavers in Egypt, a famed center of linen production, probably had

---

58. Suetonius, *Aug.* 32.1; trans J. C. Rolfe, revised and updated by D. W. Hurley, Loeb 1998.

59. Suetonius, *Iul.* 42.3.

a certain amount of clout they did not have elsewhere. Such extensive use of the legal system and of advocates (who may or may not have been members of the association) might also suggest an elevated level of status for certain groups.

Ultimately associations and local elites operated and transacted their business within a certain number of constraints. In many respects a particular association (and its network of members) was one of a few suppliers of a particular service or product, if not the only one. Those associations that realized their influential position may have capitalized on it. Similarly, local elites, whether members of distinguished families like Veditius Antoninus or village scribes like Kronion, may have benefited from their ties to associations or association members. When there was a need for garments or construction, local elites by necessity had to deal with the weavers and builders they knew. Whether this prompted something akin to a prisoner's dilemma is worth considering, but the limited amount of choices on all sides contributed to the complexity of the relationship, the need to compromise, and the potential for conflict. Robert Axelrod's study of cooperation has shown that basic reciprocity (tit-for-tat) is the most beneficial for all involved in iterative scenarios - defecting on the part of the local elites or association members may have had a short term benefit, but may have not proven successful in the long run.<sup>60</sup>

Roman provincial officials and their reactions to and interpretation of a particular situation added a level of complication to the equation that elites and associations had to take note of as well. Defecting (however construed) carried risks; the silversmiths in Ephesos could have been dealt with more harshly, the weavers of Oxyrhynchus could very well have been disappointed with the outcome of their negotiations with the council, and the fullers and dyers may not have had their tax burden alleviated. Associations employed the rhetoric of utility, legal precedent, and potentially influential advocates acting on their behalf to help mitigate risks of defection. It is important to remember that the texts considered here only describe a brief snap-shot of the negotiations between the

---

60. Axelrod 2006.

parties involved in a particular transaction, and often only one side at that. These situations must have played out over the course of interactions between professional groups and other local constituencies in a larger context, asymmetrical though the power relations were, in which all sides stood to benefit and could be useful in protecting mutual interests.

Associations participated actively in the economy and society of their local communities in a number of ways, not limited to the symbolic realm of honorific exchange. Even in this respect, an economic and political relationship existed beyond the formulaic language. Associations were not always in agreement either. The dispute between the weavers and the builders indicates that while there is a tendency to see these groups as an undifferentiated mass, tensions existed. Associations may also have taken sides in disputes with other groups and influential factions, and were likely courted to do so by the parties involved. In this sense, more than passively accepting a dominant social or political order imposed from above, associations played a part of the process, even in a small way, by forging alliances with elites, working with them to support their own projects, and likely receiving preferential treatment. Part of the process until a letter arrived from the governor, or in the case of Vedus Antoninus, the emperor. Vedius Antoninus and the emperor helped make the dominant political and legal order clear to everyone.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alston, R. 1997, "In Flaccum": Ethnicity and Social Space in Roman Alexandria', *R&G* 44, 165-175.
- Arnaoutoglou, I.N. 2002, 'Roman Law and *collegia* in Asia Minor', *RIDA* 49, 27-44.
- Arnaoutoglou, I.N. 2005, 'Collegia in the Province of Egypt in the First Century CE', *AncSoc* 35, 197-216.
- Arnaoutoglou, I.N. 2011, 'Craftsmen Associations in Roman Lydia - A Tale of Two Cities?', *AncSoc* 41, 257-290.
- Axelrod, R.M. 2006, *The Evolution of Cooperation*. Revised Edition. New York: Basic Books.
- Bollmann, B. 1998, *Römische Vereinshäuser: Untersuchungen zu den Scholea der römischen Berufs-, Kult- und Augustalen-Kollegien in Italien*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.

- Bowman, A.K. 1986, *Egypt After the Pharaohs 332 BC-AD 642: from Alexander to the Arab conquest*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Brunet, P.A. 1961, 'Charges of Provincial Maladministration under the Early Principate', *Historia* 10, 189-227.
- Burton, G.P. 2001, 'The Roman Imperial State (A.D. 14 - 235): Evidence and Reality', *Chiron* 31, 249-280.
- Burton, G.P. 2004, 'The Roman Imperial State, Provincial Governors and the Public Finances of Provincial Cities, 27 B.C. - A.D. 235', *Historia* 53, 312-342.
- Carrié, J.-M. 2002, 'Les associations professionnelles à l'époque tardive: entre *munus* et convivialité', in J.-M. Carrié and R.L. Testa (eds.), *Humana Sapit. Mélanges en l'honneur de Lellia Cracco Ruggini*. Bibliothèque de l'Antiquité tardive 3. Turnhout: Brepols, pp. 309-322.
- Duncan-Jones, R. 1990, *Structure and Scale in the Roman Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eck, W. 1998, 'Inchriften auf Holz. Ein unterschätztes Phänomen der epigraphischen Kultur Roms', in P. Kneissl and V. Losemann (eds.), *Imperium Romanum: Studien zur Geschichte und Rezeption. Festschrift für Karl Christ zum 75. Geburtstag*. Stuttgart: F. Steiner Verlag, pp. 203-17.
- Gibbs, M. 2008, *Professional and Trade Associations in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Oxford.
- Gibbs, M. 2011, 'Trade Associations in Roman Egypt: their *Raison D'Être*', *AncSoc* 41, 291-315.
- Gonzalez, J. and Crawford, M. 1986. 'The Lex Irnitana: A New Copy of the Flavian Municipal Law', *JRS* 76, 147-243.
- Harker A. 2008, *Loyalty and Dissidence in Roman Egypt. The Case of the Acta Alexandrinorum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harland, P.A. 2003, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Hawkins, C. 2006, *Work in the City: Roman Artisans and the Urban Economy*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Chicago.
- Hermansen, G. 1982, *Ostia: Aspects of Roman City Life*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.
- Husselman, E. 1970, 'Procedures of the Record Office of Tebtunis in the First Century AD', in D.H. Samuel (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology, Ann Arbor, 13-17 August 1968*. American studies in papyrology 7. Toronto: A. M. Hakkert, pp. 223-38.
- Johnson, A.C. 1936, *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian*. An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome, vol. 2, edited by Tenney Frank. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Kalinowski, A. 2002, 'The Vedii Antonini: Aspects of Patronage and Benefaction in Second-Century Ephesos', *Phoenix* 56, 109-49.
- Kelly, B. 2007, 'Riot Control and Imperial Ideology in the Roman Empire', *Phoenix* 61, 150-176.
- Klein, D. B. (ed.) 1997, *Reputation: Studies in the Voluntary Elicitation of Good Conduct*. Economics, cognition, and society. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Kokkinia, C. 2004, 'Ruling, Inducing, Arguing: How to Govern (and survive) a Greek Province', in L. De Ligt, E.A. Hemelrijk and H. W. Singor (eds.), *Roman Rule and Civic Life: Local and Regional Perspectives*. Impact of Empire 4. Amsterdam: Gieben, pp. 39-58.
- Liu, J. 2005, 'Local Government and Collegia: A New Appraisal of the Evidence', in J.-J. Aubert and Z. Varhelyi (eds.), *A Tall Order: Writing Social History of the Ancient World. Essays in honor of William V. Harris*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 216. Munich: K. G. Saur, pp. 285-316.
- Liu, J. 2009, *Collegia Centonariorum. The Guilds of Textile Dealers in the Roman West*. Amsterdam: Brill
- MacMullen, R. 1963, 'A Note on Roman Strikes', *CJ* 58, 269-271.
- MacMullen, R. 1992, *Enemies of the Roman Order: Treason, Unrest, and Alienation in the Empire* London, New York: Routledge.
- Mommsen, T. 1843, *De collegiis et sodaliciis Romanorum*. Kiel: Libraria Schwersiana.
- Perry, J.S. 2006, *The Roman Collegia: The Modern Evolution of an Ancient Concept*. Mnemosyne, Bibliotheca Classica Batava, Suppl. 277. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Poland, F. 1909, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*. Fürslich Jablonowski'sche Gesellschaft zu Leipzig. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Rea, J.R. 1982, 'P. Lond. Inv. 1562 Verso: Market Taxes in Oxyrhynchus', *ZPE* 46, 191-209.
- Sharp, M. 1999, 'Shearing Sheep: Rome and the Collection of Taxes in Egypt, 30 BC - AD 200', in W. Eck (ed.), *Lokale Autonomie und römische Ordnungsmacht in den kaiserzeitlichen Provinzen vom 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert*. Schriften des Historischen Kollegs 42. München: R. Oldenbourg Verlag.
- Sheridan, J.A. 1998, *Columbia papyri IX: the Vestis Militaris Codex*. American Studies in Papyrology 39. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Swarney, P.R. 1970, *The Ptolemaic and Roman Idios Logos*. American Studies in Papyrology 8. Toronto: A. M. Hakkert.
- van Minnen, P. 1987, 'Urban Craftsmen in Roman Egypt', *MBAH* 6: 31-88.
- van Nijf, O. 1997, *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*. Dutch monographs on ancient history and archaeology 17. Amsterdam: Gieben.

- Venticinque, P.F. 2009, *Common Causes: Guilds, Craftsmen, and Merchants in the Economy and Society of Roman and Late Roman Egypt*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. University of Chicago.
- Venticinque, P.F. 2010, 'Family Affairs: Guild Regulations and Family Relationships in Roman Egypt', *GRBS* 50, 273-294.
- Waltzing, J.-P. 1895-1900, *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains, depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'Occident*. 4 vols. Louvain: C. Peeters.
- Youtie, H.C. 1958, 'Notes on Papyri and Ostraca', *TAPA* 89, 374-407.
- Youtie, H.C. 1964, 'Notes on Papyri', *TAPA* 95, 303-332.
- Zimmermann, C. 2002, *Handwerkervereine im Griechischen Osten des Imperium Romanum*. Monographien (Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum Mainz. Forschungsinstitut für Vor- und Frühgeschichte) 57. Mainz: Verlag des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums.

# General Index

- Alexander (of Macedon), 250, 301, 308.
- Alexandria (Egypt), 28 n. 6, 81, 95, 96 n. 10, 99 n. 20, 106 n. 45, 107 n. 48, 108, 140 n. 20, 141 n. 22, 149 n. 62, 155, 250-1, 255-6, 260, 275 n. 27, 286, 295-6, 311, 314-5, 318, 321, 329-30, 334. *See also* Dionysodoros of Alexandria.
- Amphipolis, 33-35, 49 n. 71, 220 n. 65
- Antioch (on the Orontes), 140 n. 19, 141 nn. 21 and 23, 149 n. 62, 155 with n. 89, 163, 167 n. 138, 174
- Apamea (Syria), 138 n. 10, 141 n. 22, 158, 168 n. 142, 171.
- Apollo, 32, 165, 167 n. 138, 173, 285, 311.
- Aphrodite, 14, 154 n. 81.
- Aristophanes, 30.
- Aristotle, 65-6, 74, 81.
- Arsinoite nome, 284, 286-7, 302, 309-10, 326-7, 329.
- Artemis, 27 n. 5, 29-31, 34-5, 39 n. 37, 43, 49 n. 71, 110, 112, 160 n. 107, 173, 226 n. 98, 229 n. 118, 324-5.
- Arados, 171 with n. 160.
- Asklepios, 111, 113, 114 n. 65, 140, 229 n. 117.
- Athena, 15, 140, 150 n. 66, 163-5, 169, 171, 229 n. 118, 286 n. 55.
- Athens, 7, 14, 25-49, 57-82, 96, 140 n. 20, 141, n. 22, 143, n. 37, 144 n. 40, 150, 155 n. 89, 157, 158 n. 103, 160 n. 190, 168 n. 143, 214 n. 34, 305.
- Augustus, 228 n. 111, 229 n. 119, 284, 286, 334.
- Bendis, 15, 25-49.
- benefactor, 94, 96, 110-12, 116-7, 127, 133, 209, 226-7, 229 with n. 119, 286.
- Berenike, 284-6.
- Bithynia, 26 n. 3, 143, 185, 196.
- Black Sea, 27-28, 28 n. 8, 76, 114, 122-33, 141 n. 21.
- Byzantion, 27-28.
- Caesar (C. Julius), 94, 199, 335.
- Celsus, 207 nn. 3-5.
- Chalke 137-8, 139 n. 17, 167 n. 138, 175.
- Chios, 140 n. 20, 141, n. 22, 155
- Christians, 212 n. 23, 213-4, 216, 221, 227-32 .
- Cicero, 190, 316.
- citizen, citizenship, 11, 14, 40-3, 46 n. 59, 49, 63 n. 33, 75, 79, 92, 95, 116 n. 69, 133, 137, 140 n. 20, 141 nn. 22 and 23, 144, 149 n. 61, 150-2, 157 n. 97, 161, 163-4, 166 n. 137, 168, 170-2, 229, 273, 283-4, 290, 297, 321.
- Cleopatra (II), 286 n. 55, 289.
- Crete, 104 n. 34, 143, 166 n. 134, 173, 208.
- collegium*, 8, 9 n. 9, 12, 98, 184-6, 188, 196-200, 206, 210 n. 14, 212 n. 25, 216-7, 230 n. 123, 316-7, 334-5.
- Cyprus, 7, 8 n. 5, 158 n. 103, 216 n. 41, 274, 289, 290 n. 68, 292-7, 310 with n. 24.
- Delos, 96, 129, 136, 138, 143 n. 37, 145, 158 n. 103, 168, 214 n. 32, 215 n. 37.
- Demetrios of Phaleron, 67, 70, 80, 275 n. 27.

- democracy, democratic, 7, 31, 40, 67,  
     151, 172, 223 n. 80.  
 Dio Chrysostom, 7, 193, 314.  
 Dionysiac *technitai*, 7, 102-3, 114, 214 n.  
     32.  
 Dionysodoros of Alexandria, 142-3,  
     146-9, 160 nn. 107 and 108, 172-4.  
 Dionysos, 114, 125, 170, 256-7.  
 Dodona, 25, 35-36 with nn. 29, 38.  
 economy, economic, 14-5, 18, 49, 110,  
     118, 171, 185, 190, 192, 194, 196 n.  
     40, 199, 201, 217, 241, 243, 246,  
     260, 263, 316-9, 321-2, 330, 332-3,  
     337.  
*ekklisia*, 206-33.  
 elite, 14 n. 29, 32 n. 18, 116, 133, 167,  
     170-2, 184, 189, 198, 200, 192, 197,  
     217, 283, 314-9, 321, 323-6, 329-37.  
*emporoi*, 138, 158 n. 103 see also  
     merchants  
 ephebes, *ephebeia*, 80, 92, 95  
 Ephesos, 95, 101, 104-12, 114, 117-8,  
     140 n. 19, 141 n. 22, 149 n. 62, 155,  
     174, 183-202, 208, 226 n. 98, 321,  
     323-5, 332, 334, 336.  
*eranos*, *eranistai*, 10, 13 n. 36, 15, 65, 136,  
     138 n. 10, 140 n. 19, 142-3, 146,  
     148-9, 150 n. 65, 155 n. 89, 159,  
     162-3, 167, 169-70, 173-4, 206, 222,  
     223 n. 80.  
*euergesia*, *euergetes*, 110, 127, 141-3,  
     147-52, 160, 163, 165, 167, 171. See  
     also benefactor.  
 festivals, 15, 36, 38-9, 41 n. 44, 43 n.  
     52, 45 n. 57, 49, 113-4, 150 n. 65,  
     166 n. 135, 168, 170, 222 n. 78, 226  
     n. 98.  
 Flaccus (A. Avillius), 314-6, 318, 333.  
 Halicarnassos, 118 n. 71, 129 with n.  
     26, 140 n. 20, 141 n. 22, 143, 149 n.  
     62, 171, 173.  
 Hekate, 31 n. 16  
 Helios (Halios), 148, 154 n. 81, 165,  
     167.  
 Herakleia, 101 n. 25, 138 n. 10, 140 n.  
     20, 141 n. 22.  
 Herakleopolis, 270-2, 274, 276-82,  
     283 n. 48, 284-97. 310-1.  
 Herakleopolite nome, 262, 274, 276 .  
 Herakles, 112, 140, 158 n. 103, 167,  
     207.  
 Hermes, 32, 112, 140, 167, 223 n. 79.  
*hetairaia*, 7, 13, 196.  
 Hipponax, 30.  
*iatroi*, see physicians  
 Idyma, 151, 162, 175, 189.  
 Ilion, 140 n. 19, 141 with n. 21, 151,  
     154, 162-3, 171, 173.  
 Isis, 158 n. 103, 215 n. 37, 302, 304 n.  
     6.  
 Isocrates, 7.  
 Judaism, 212, 230.  
 Kamiros, 136, 158, 162-4, 166 n. 135.  
 Kition, 25, 45 n. 57, 158 n. 103.  
*koinomia*, 64-6, 71, 73, 81.  
 Koptos, 248, 251-2, 308.  
 Kos, 95, 105, 106 n. 43, 114, 118, 141 n.  
     22, 154 n. 81, 175  
 Kratinos (poet), 30.  
 Krokodilopolis, 286, 288, 295 n. 83.  
 Kyzikos, 140 n. 20, 141, 143 n. 38, 145,  
     155 with n. 89, 171, 223 n. 79.  
 Laodikeia, 140 n. 20, 141 n. 22, 173.  
 Lenin (V.I.), 202.  
 Leontopolis, 275, 276 n. 28, 288.  
 Lindos, 15, 96, 106, 136, 138-9, 154 n.  
     81, 161, 163, 168-71, 222 n. 78.  
 Lydia, 173, 214, 223 n. 79.  
 Magnesia (Mai.), 186, 214 n. 32.  
 Maroneia, 27, 39 n. 40.  
 membership, members 11-12, 45-46,  
     75-6.



- Memphis, 245, 260, 284-5, 288-9,  
 294, 308-11.  
 merchants, 138, 146, 214 n. 32, 290,  
 307 n. 13, 317, 319, 321-6, 331,  
 334-5.  
 metics, 25 n. 2, 72, 75, 141 nn. 22-3,  
 143, 151-7, 161-2, 170, 172, 175.  
 Miletos, 138 n. 19, 140, 189.  
 Mother of the Gods, 32 n. 18, 49, 140.  
 Muses, 62, 63 nn. 28 and 33, 74, 78.  
*naukleroi*, 138-9, 158 n. 103, 243-5, 252,  
 254, 260, 260 n. 94, 308.  
 Naukratis (Egypt), 154 n. 78, 283,  
 309 n. 19, 311.  
*neoi*, 92, 95, 103, 110, 112.  
 Nisyros, 137, 138.  
 Odrysians (Odryseis), 32-35  
*oikos*, 210-6, 218, 223-5, 225 n. 91, 227  
 n. 104, 231-2.  
 Olympia, 81.  
*orgeones*, 10, 14-15, 38, 39-49,  
 Oxyrhynchus, 319, 321-3, 326, 332,  
 336,  
*paideutai*, *see* teachers  
 patron, patronage, 15, 105, 110, 116-7,  
 152, 201, 217 n. 50, 220, 226 with  
 n. 101, 272 n. 11,  
 Paul, 197, 208, 213, 216, 222 n. 76,  
 225, 227-8, 231, 324, 333-4.  
 Peiraius, 40, 45-46  
 Pergamon, 95-7, 106-7, 111-2, 149 n.  
 60, 174.  
 Perge, 112, 141 n. 22, 153.  
 Phaselis (Lycia), 79, 140 n. 20, 141 n.  
 22, 142, 144, 149 n. 64, 161, 167 n.  
 138, 172-4.  
*phratria*, 11, 41 n. 42.  
 Phrygia, 108, 141 n. 22, 286.  
 Philadelphia (Egypt), 141 n. 22,  
 257-8, 309, 322, 328-9; (Lydia),  
 214-5, 220.  
 Philippi, 27-28.  
 Philippopolis, 27.  
 Philo (of Alexandria), 314-6, 318,  
 333-5.  
 physicians, 92-119.  
 Plato, 31, 37, 49, 61.  
 Pliny, 185, 196, 319, 324, 335  
*politeuma*, 255, 270-98, 308, 310-12.  
 Poseidon, 115, 140, 146 n. 46, 154 n. 81  
 Prusa, 193, 324.  
 Ptolemais, 283, 311.  
 Ptolemy (I), 100 n. 24, (IV), 256,  
 257 n. 80, (VI), 286 n. 55, 289,  
 298, 310, (VIII), 254, 256, 260,  
 271,  
 Rhodes, 8 n. 5, 14, 81, 95-6, 136-72,  
 222 n. 78. *See also* Lindos,  
 Kamiros  
 Rome, 8, 58, 79 with n. 101, 80, 100  
 with n. 24, 141 n. 21, 164, 165 n.  
 128, 196, 257 n. 80  
 Salamis (island), 35 n. 26, 42, 46 with  
 n. 61, 47 n. 63, 49. (Cyprus), 293  
 nn. 74 and 76.  
 Samos, 101 n. 25, 140 n. 20, 141 n. 22,  
 157, 165 n. 130, 174, 214 n. 32.  
 Sarapis, 207, 215 n. 37.  
 Selge, 140, n. 20, 141 n. 22, 142, 160 n.  
 107, 175.  
 Sidon, 126-7, 143, 171, 288, 296 n. 87.  
 Sinope, 219 n. 58.  
 Smyrna, 95, 105-11, 117, 141 n. 22.  
 Socrates, 58, 61.  
 Solon (of Athens), 12 n. 19, 68-9 with  
 n. 58.  
 Syme, 137-8, 162, 175.  
*synodos* (association), 7, 92, 98, 99 n.  
 20, 102-6, 108, 110-12, 124-8, 214 n.  
 32, 219 n. 58, 222 n. 78, 243,  
 255-6, 296 n. 86, 308, (assembly),  
 148, 150.

- Syracuse, 103 n. 32, 143, 147, 160 n.  
     107, 173.  
 Syria, 138, 141 n. 22, 143, 173, 297.  
 Suetonius, 316, 334-5  
 Tanais, 122-7, 219.  
 Tarsos, 81.  
 teachers, 76, 92-119, 139, 221.  
 Tebtunis, 244, 307 n. 13, 319-20.  
 Telos, 137, 169.  
 Teos, 7.  
 Termessos, 129 with n. 26, 141 n. 21.  
 Tertullian, 207.  
 Thasos, 27  
 Thebes (Egypt), 246-7, 251-2, 307.  
 Theos Hypsistos, 124-5, 219 n. 58.  
 Thera, 12 n. 17, 140 n. 20, 222 n. 78  
*thiasos, thiasotai (thiasitai)*, 10, 39,  
     46-49, 62-3, 122-5, 127, 131, 139 n.  
     17, 148 n. 57, 206, 207 nn. 3-5, 216,  
     219 n. 58 and 60, 220 n. 65, 231,  
     243, 308 n. 17.  
 Xenophon, 31, 157 with n. 97.  
 Zeus, 25, 30, 125, 140, 163, 167, 171 n.  
     160, 214 with n. 36, 220, 229 n.  
     118, 286 with n. 55.

# Index Locorum

## I. INSCRIPTIONS

### *Agora*

16, 329: 39

19 L16: 39 n.37

### *Archaiologikon Deltion*

18 (1963) A1, 7: 166 nn.136, 137

21 (1966) A1, 51-61: 140 n.19; 159  
n.106

23 (1968) B1, 445: 142 n.25

26 (1971) B2, 471, no. 4: 34 n.25

### *Archaiologike Ephemeris*

1913, 10: 166 n.137

### *ASAA* 2 (1916) 133-79

I: 141 n. 22

4: 159 n.105

10 (= *ASAA* n.s. 1-2, 1939-40, no.  
19): 138 n.10; 149 n.61

11: 166 nn.136, 137

### *ASAA* 8-9 (1925-26) 313-22

5: 140 n.20; 159 n. 106

6: 159 n.105; 159 n.105

### *ASAA* n.s. 1-2 (1939-40) 145-200

I: 143 n. 32; 150 n.65; 158 n.99; 173

2: 147 n.49; 160 n.107

3: 158 n. 99

4: 163, n.118

6: 149 n.61; 175

7: 155 n.89; 172; 173

8: 139 n.17; 159 n.105; 174

11: 143 n.36; 159 n.105; 174

18: 142 n.29; 160 n.109

19 (= *ASAA* 2, 1916, no. 10): 138  
n.10; 149 n.61; 173; 175

21: 141 n.22; 153 nn.72, 76; 155  
nn.86, 88; 164 nn.122, 124

### *ASAA* n.s. 64-65 (1986-87) 267-934

12: 138 n.10; 159 n.105

14: 167 n.141

### Aneziri 2003 (p. 19 above)

12 (= Le Guen 2001, no. 47): 7 n.3

### Bărbulescu and Câteia 2007 (p. 134 above): 126

### *BCH*

4 (1880) 405: 109 n.52

7 (1883) 501-6: 186 n.9

91 (1967) 41: 27 n.4

97 (1973) 159, 161: 27 n.4

99 (1975) 97-117: 168 n.143

### Bresson, *RecueilPéré*

27 (= *I.Rhod.Per.* 510): 139 n.16

28: 169 n.147

29: 169 n.147

32: 169 n.147

35 (= *I.Rhod.Per.* 514): 169 n.147

159 (= *I.Rhod.Per.* 110): 162 n.117

### *BSA* 56 (1961)

73 (= *SEG* 20.203): 293 n.75

76 (= *OGIS* 147): 293 n.75

77 (= *OGIS* 146): 293 n.75

80 (= *OGIS* 162): 293 n.75

- 81 (= *SEG* 13.583): 293 n.75  
 83 (= *OGIS* 157): 293 n.73  
 84 (= *OGIS* 145): 293 n.71  
 91 (= *OGIS* 48): 293 n.73
- Canali de Rossi 2007 (p. 134 above)  
 207: 133 n.39
- CIG*  
 1739: 223 n.79  
 1800: 223 n.79  
 2271 (= *ID* 1519): 214 n.32  
 3037: 223 n.79  
 3495: 189 n.15
- CIL*  
 III  
 870: 132 n.36  
 III *Addenda*  
 12216: 139 n.11  
 14165,08 (p 2328,78): 185 with n.7
- V  
 764 (= *CIMRM* I 739): 126 n.15
- VI  
 2193 (*FIRA* III 38): 98 n.1  
 9148 - 9149: 216 n.41
- XIV  
 2112 (= *ILS* 7212): 257 n.79
- Chaniotis 1991 (p. 176 above): 166  
 n.134
- CIMRM*  
 I  
 76: 126 n. 14  
 78 - 79: 126 n.14  
 84 - 85: 126 n.14  
 739 (= *CIL* V 764): 126 n.15
- CIRB*  
 59: 124 n.4  
 77: 124 n.3; 125 n.23
- 95: 124 n.3; 128 n.23  
 96: 127 n.20  
 98-100: 124 n.3; 127 n.20  
 104: 124 n.3; 127 n.20  
 105: 127 n.20  
 663: 28 n.8  
 1054: 124 n.4  
 1237: 124 n.8  
 1260: 124 n.6  
 1260a: 124 n.6  
 1261: 124 n.3  
 1263: 124 nn.3, 7; 219 n.58  
 1264: 124 n.7  
 1266: 124 n.7  
 1277-1280: 124 nn.3, 6; 219 n.58  
 1278: 124 nn.3, 6  
 1282: 124 nn.3, 6; 219 n.58  
 1284: 219 n.58  
 1288: 124 nn.3, 6, 7  
 1290: 124 n.7
- Clara Rhodos* 8 (1936) 227: 167 n.141
- Collart 1937 (p. 51 above)  
 no. 1: 27 n.4
- Dunant, C. and Pouilloux, J.,  
*Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes du  
 Thasos* (Paris, 1954)  
 178, no. 13: 27 n.4
- FIRA*  
 I  
 73: 97 n.15; 98; 102  
 III  
 38 (= *CIL* VI 2193): 98 n.17
- GIBM*  
 902: 129 n.26

- Hesperia* 15 (1946) 233, no. 64 (= *SEG* 21.703): 63 n.28
- I.Alex.Ptolem.*  
 24 (= *I.Prose* 61): 286 n.58; 295 n.85  
 74 (= *OGIS* 658): 286 n.55
- I.Byzantion* 11: 27 n.4
- I.Cos* 37 (= *Syll.* 3 1025): 114 n.65
- I.Didyma* 522: 189 n.17
- I.Ephesos (I.Eph)*  
 26: 229 n.118  
 27: 114  
 215: 325 n.45  
 216: 101 n.25  
 445: 109 n.54  
 622: 105 n.36; 106 n.41  
 630a: 226 n.98  
 681: 226 n.98  
 690: 108  
 719: 105 and n.37; 106; 111  
 728: 321 n.30  
 789: 106 n.45  
 892: 226 n.98  
 1038: 105 n.37  
 1161: 105 n.37; 112  
 1162+Add. p. 24: 105; 106; 111; 112; 113  
 1163: 105 113 n.37  
 1164: 112;  
 1165: 112; 113  
 1167: 105 n.37; 112  
 1168: 112  
 1386: 9  
 1491 - 93: 323 n.38  
 2065: 106; 110  
 2078: 109 n.54  
 2080: 109 n.54  
 2304: 106; 111  
 2928 + add. p. 22: 229 n.118  
 3055: 105 n.37  
 3068: 106; 110  
 3239: 106  
 3402: 229 n.118  
 3818: 106 n.43  
 4101 (= *SEG* 31.9252): 99 n.21; 106; 111  
 4101A: 99 n.21;  
 4350 III: 105 n.37
- I.Fay(ō)um*  
 I  
 15: 286 n.55  
 II  
 119: 308 n.17  
 134: 243 n.7; 244 n.15  
 590: 252 n.59  
 III  
 204: 243 n.6  
 205: 243 n.6
- I.Hermoupolis*  
 5: 310 n.24  
 6: 310 n.24
- I.Histriae*  
 57 (= *SEG* 30.796): 115  
 99: 131 n.28; 132 n.34  
 100: 130; 131 n.28  
 137: 133 n.37  
 167: 130-31; 131 n.28  
 199: 130  
 178-80: 133 n.37  
 207: 131 n.28; 133
- I.Kallatis*  
 35-35 (Jaccottet 2003, 54-55): 125 n.11, 127 n.17

- 42-46 (Jaccottet 2003, 56-60): 125  
n.11
- I.Klaudioupolis* 7: 28 n.8
- I.Lindos* II  
1: 165 n.128  
2: 163, n.118; 164 n.124  
88: 167 n.141  
120: 171 n.160  
130: 155 n.84  
131: 172  
132: 171 n.159  
140: 154 n.81  
197:172  
208: 222 n.78  
217: 165 n.128  
229: 169 n.145  
249: 169 n.145  
251: 150 n.66  
264:169 n.145  
278: 170 n.154  
287: 172  
292: 166 n.137; 169 n.151  
300: 166 n.137; 169 n.145; 169  
n.150  
303: 166 n.137  
349: 169 n.145  
376: 171 n.160  
378: 222 n.78  
384: 169 n.146  
391: 166 n.137; 169 n.145  
392a-b: 138 n.7; 150 n.66; 166  
n.137; 169 n.145  
394: 138 n.7; 150 n.66; 166 n.137;  
169 nn.145, 151  
420a.26-8: 15 n.32; 166 n.136; 166  
n.137; 169 nn.145, 151  
421a: 167 n.141  
425: 169 n.145; 169 n.149  
683: 159 n.105; 174  
col. 1009: 162 n.115
- I.Magnesia*  
79: 229 n.118  
89: 214 n.32  
94: 214 n.32  
217: 223 n.79
- I.Mylasa*  
544: 219 n.58  
909: 114 n.65
- I.Napoli*  
43: 11 n.14  
44: 11 n.14
- I.Oropos* 565: 28 n.8
- I.Pergamon (I.Perg)*  
VIII 3.38: 107 n.46; 112  
VIII 3.152: 112
- I.Perge* 193: 109 n.53
- I.Priene*  
55: 227 n.105  
104 n.33; 114  
113: 227 n.105
- I.Prose*  
25 (= *OGIS* 737): 285 nn.52, 53;  
61 (*I.Alex.Ptolem.* 24): 286 n.58;  
1295 n.85
- I.Rhod.Per.*  
57: 175  
110 (= *Bresson, RecueilPéré* 159): 162  
n.117  
128: 174  
169: 175  
510 (= *Bresson, RecueilPéré* 27): 139  
n.16  
514 (= *Bresson, RecueilPéré* 35): 169  
n.147

- I.Samothrake* 27, 5: 27 n.4  
n.55; 46 n.60; 48 n.69  
1256 (= *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1095): 32 and n.17; 43  
and n.49; 44 n.55
- I.Smyrna*  
191 (*IGR* 4.618): 107 n.46; 108  
n.50  
215: 106; 108; 110  
537: 105 n.36
- I.Stratonikeia* 1122: 229 n.118
- I.Tomis* 82: 130 n.27
- I.Tralleis* 10: 229 n.118
- IAegThrace*  
279: 27 n.4  
268: 27 n.4  
379: 27 n.4  
386: 27 n.4
- IC III, 3A1* (= *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 581): 154 n.81; 166  
n.134
- ID (I.Delos)*  
1519 (= *CIG* 2271): 158 n.103; 214  
n.32  
1522: 222 n.78  
1709: 139 n.13
- IG*  
**I**<sup>3</sup>  
136: 36-7; 38  
369: 38  
383: 37  
**II**<sup>2</sup>  
10: 39 n.36  
120: 301 n.2  
337 (= *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 280): 25; 45 n.57; 158  
n.103  
554: 153 n.73  
1012.15: 7 n.1  
1255: 32 and n.17; 42; 43 n.52; 44  
n.55; 46 n.60; 48 n.69  
1256 (= *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1095): 32 and n.17; 43  
and n.49; 44 n.55  
1261: 43 n.52; 44  
1263: 43 n.52  
1265: 43 n.52  
1283: 35; 38; 39 and nn.39, 40; 42;  
44-6; 158 n.103  
1284A-B: 44; 45; 46 n.60  
1291: 43 n.52  
1297: 43n.52; 47 n.64  
1317 + 1317b: 46 n.61; 47 and n.64;  
48 and nn.66, 67  
1324: 46  
1361: 15 n.31; 43 and n.52; 44 n.55;  
47 n.63  
1368: 222 n.74  
1369: 223 n.79  
1496: 38; 43 n.53  
1956: 39 n.40  
2859: 42 n.52  
2869: 229 n.118  
2933: 43 n.52  
2947: 39 n.40  
4866: 39 n.36  
9223: 27 n.5; 39 n.36
- III** 1  
23: 246 n.22  
29: 246 n.22
- IV**  
774: 223 n.79  
824: 223 n.79
- IX** 1  
486: 223 n.79
- IX** 1<sup>2</sup>  
247: 223 n.79  
248: 223 n.79  
251: 223 n.79
- X** 2, 1  
255: 215n.37  
446: 28 n.8  
824: 219 n.60

- XI 4  
 1150: 129 n.26  
 1299: 215 n.37
- XII 1  
 9: 140 n.20; 159 n.106  
 32: 171 n.160  
 36: 139 n.14; 167 n.138  
 43: 165 n.131  
 49: 172  
 49: 155 n.89; 158 n.99  
 50: 150 n.66  
 104: 171 n.160  
 107: 166 n.137  
 108: 172  
 127: 141 n.21; 143 n.38; 155 nn.82,  
 87  
 155: 142 n.30; 146 n.47; 147, with  
 nn.48, 51, 52; 148 nn.53-56, 58;  
 149 nn.59, 60 63; 160 nn.107,  
 108; 173  
 156: 143 n.34; 159 n.105; 173  
 157: 142 n.24; 144 n.39; 154 n.80;  
 155 n.87; 159 n.105; 173  
 158: 138 n.10; 144 n.39; 159 n.105;  
 173  
 159: 159 n.105; 167 n.138; 173  
 160: 159 n.105; 173  
 161: 142 n.28; 159 n.105; 167 n.138;  
 173  
 162: 140 n.18; 159 n.105; 173  
 163: 165 n.129  
 164: 144 n.39; 159 n.105; 173  
 165: 144 n.39; 159 n.105; 173  
 384: 144 n.39; 159 n.105  
 385: 144 n.39; 159 n.105  
 731: 222 n.78  
 762: 169 n.145; 170 n.153  
 837: 138 n.7  
 844: 172  
 917: 139 n.17; 174  
 918: 96; 106; 139 n.12; 142 n.27;  
 149 n.60; 174  
 937: 140 n.20; 142 n.26; 159 n.106;  
 174  
 963: 138 n.10; 139 n.17  
 1033: 162 n.115  
 1135: 165 n.128
- XII 2  
 541: 229 n.119
- XII 3  
 6: 138 n.9; 162 n.116; 175  
 104: 138 n.8  
 178: 139 n.17; 148 n.57  
 329: 222 n.78  
 330: 12 n.17  
 962: 167 n.138; 175  
 963: 175
- XII 6  
 1: 214 n.32  
 128: 101 n.25
- XII 8  
 478: 27 n.4  
 820: 214 n.34
- XII Suppl.  
 460: 27 n.4  
 493: 27 n.4  
 504: 27 n.4  
 585: 28 n.8  
 1296: 12 n.17
- XIV  
 902a + add. p. 694: 219 nn.59, 60
- IGBulg*
- I<sup>a</sup>  
 15(3): 115 n.67  
 15(2): 116 n.68
- II  
 861: 27 n.5  
 870: 132 n.35
- III  
 956: 27 n.4  
 1344: 27 n.4



- 1347: 27 n.4  
 1455: 28 n.7  
 1472: 28 n.7  
 1801: 27 n.5  
 1828: 27 n.5
- IV  
 2141: 27 n.5  
 2214: 222 n.78  
 2292: 27 n.5  
 2311: 27 n.5
- V  
 5534: 28 n.7  
 5863: 27 n.5
- IGLAM*  
 503: 219 n.58  
 1381: 214 n. 32  
 1382: 214 n.32
- GR*  
*I*  
 IV  
 353d: 247 n.29  
 584: 229 n.119  
 618 (= *I.Smyrna* 191): 107 n.46; 108  
 1099: 229 n.119
- ILBulg*  
 176: 27 n.5
- ILS* 2  
 7212 (= *CIL* XIV 2112): 222 n.73
- ILS* 18 (*FIRA* I<sup>2</sup> 30): 8 n.4
- IscM* (*ISM*)  
 58: 222 n.78  
 99-100: 129  
 167: 129  
 199: 129  
 208: 129  
 221: 129
- Ivantchic 2008b (p. 134 above)  
 1: 122, 126  
 2: 123, 125, 126  
 3: 123, 125
- Jacopi 1932 (po 178 above)  
 2: 172  
 5: 167 n.141  
 6: 141 n.23; 144 n.39; 153 n.76; 154  
 n.80; 155 nn.85, 89  
 19: 166 n.137  
 48: 166 n.137; 169 n.145  
 53: 142 n.29; 173
- Jacobsthal 1908 (p. 120 above)  
 2: 100 n.24
- Jaccottet 2003 (p. 134 above)  
 22: 132 n.31  
 54-55 (= *I.Kallatis* 35-35): 125 n.11,  
 127 n.17  
 56-60 (= *I.Kallatis* 42-46): 125 n.11  
 62: 132 n.31  
 70: 132 n.31  
 71: 132 n.31  
 146: 132 n.31  
 147: 132 n.31  
 182: 132 n.31  
 188: 132 n.31
- JIGRE* 39: 276 n.28
- JÖAI* 4 (1901) 161: 166 n.137
- Kontorini 1983 (p. 178 above)  
 6: 167 n.141  
 8: 143 n.33; 147 n.49; 160 n.107;  
 173
- Kontorini 1989 (p. 179 above)  
 2: 172

- 10: 140 n.20; 155 n.89; 159 n.106;  
167 n.138; 174  
16: 153 n.75
- Le Guen 2001 (p. 22 above)  
2: 102-3  
6: 103  
47( = Aneziri 2003, D12): 7 n.3  
73: 103 n.31  
74: 103 n.31  
75: 103 n.31  
124: 104 n.33
- Lüderitz 1983 (p. 299 above)  
70: 286 n.54  
71: 286 n.54
- Maiuri, *NS*  
1: 157 n.98  
5: 167 n.141  
8: 141 n. 22; 155 n.83  
18: 138 n.10; 165 nn. 131-32; 166  
n.137  
28: 142 n.29  
35: 168 n.143  
37: 141 n.22  
39: 159 n.105; 167 n.138; 174  
40: 159 n.105; 174  
41: 159 n.105; 174  
42: 143 n. 31; 172  
43: 167 n.138; 174  
45: 149 n.62  
46: 149, n.59; 159 n.105; 174  
192-93: 143 n.35; 159 n.105
- MDAI(A)*  
6 (1881) 122, no. 4: 28 n.4  
21 (1896) 39, no. 12: 159 n.105  
66 (1941) 228, no. 4: 15 n.30
- Milet VI 1*  
308: 229 n.118
- NEPKh* 147: 28 n.8
- NuovoSuppl.Epigr.Rhod. I*  
3: 139 n.13  
4: 167 n.141
- OGIS*  
51 (= *SB V* 8855): 247 n.29  
90: 307 n.11  
99 (= *SEG* 27.1029): 295 n.84  
130: 252 n.57  
143: 290 n.68  
145: 310 n.24  
151: 293 n.72  
488: 214 n.32  
658 (= *I.Alex.Ptolem.* 74): 286 n.55  
729: 251 n.50  
731: 253 n.64  
737: (= *I.Prose* 25): 285 nn.52, 53;  
310 n.25; 311 nn.27, 28
- Oliver, *Greek Constitutions*  
96A-C: 103 n.31
- Papachristodoulou 1989 (p. 180  
above)  
10: 141 n.22
- Peek 1969 (p. 180 above)  
2: 160 n.107; 173  
48: 169 n.148
- Philippi II*  
134: 27 n.4  
638: 27 n.4  
649: 27 n.4
- Salamine XIII*

76: 293 n.74

80: 293 n.76

## Samama 2003 (p. 93 above)

106: 118 n.71

122: 95 n.8; 105 n.40

129: 118 n.71

132: 96 n.13

137: 118 n.72

183: 96 n.13

187: 96 n.13

188: 96 n.13

194: 93 n.5

195: 105 n.36

203: 98 n.19

205: III n.57

210-15: 112

226: 114

231: 93 n.5

240: 106 n.41

245: 118 n.71

247: 96 n.13

252: 96 n.13

292: 96 n.13

294: 93 n.5

313: 96 n.13

321: 93 n.5

329: 93 n.5

333: 93 n.5

341: 93 n.5

453: 100 n.24

365: 93 n.5

394: 96 nn.9, 10

461: 93 n.5

478: 93 n.5

290 (= TAM II 910): 93

## SEG

2.7: 43 n.52

2.9: 46 n.61; 47; 48 and nn.65, 69;

49

2.10: 46 n.61; 47 n.64; 48 and n.67

2.871: 286 n.55

4.512: 186 n.12

8.13: 94

8.370: 255 n.73

10.43: 72 n.69

13.573: 293 n.77

14.848: 310 nn.23, 25

16.505: 28 n.8

19.125: 39 n.37

20.499: 286 n.57

21.703 (= *Hesperia* 15 [1946] 233,  
no. 64): 63 n.28

23.547: 166 n.134

27.245: 34 n.25

27.1029 (= *OGIS* 99): 295 n.84

28.534: 34 n.25

28.536: 34 n.25

30.796 (*I.Histriae* 57): 115

30.1640: 8 n.5

31.614: 34 n.25

31.9252 (= *I.Ephesos* 4101): 99 n.21

33.499: 34 n.25

38.1462: 114

39.210: 39

40.525: 34 n.25

41.103: 39 n.37

42.580: 28 n.8

43.103: 34 n.25

44.60: 46 n.61; 48 and n.66

46.2363: 44 n.54

49.814: 132 n.322

52.1197: 258 n.86

52.1221: 28 n.8

53.156: 44 n.54

55.252: 34 n.25; 43 n.52

55.249: 72 n.69

## Suceveanu 2007 (p. 135 above)

149: 129

*Suppl. Epigr. Rhod.* I

17: 159 n.105; 174  
62: 167 n.141  
63: 141 n.22

*Syll.*<sup>3</sup>

280 (= *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 337): 25; 45 n.57; 158  
n.103  
399: 102-3  
581 (*IC III*, 3A1): 154 n.81; 166  
n.134  
633: 138 n.10  
692: 103  
985: 214 n.36; 220 nn.62, 64  
1000: 154 n.81  
1025 (= *I. Cos* 37): 114 n.65  
1095 (= *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1256)  
1109: 247 n.29  
1112: 247 n.29

*TAM*

## II

910 (= Samama 2003, 290): 93 n.5

## III

154: 129 n. 26  
163: 129 n.26

## V,2

966: 189 n.16

## VI,1

498: 109 n.52

*Tit. Cam.*

3: 158 n.99  
84: 158 nn.99, 101  
106: 166 n.135  
109: 162 n.114  
110: 166 n.135  
157: 158 n.100  
159: 166 n.135

*Tit. Cam. Suppl.*

157: 163, n.118  
159: 163, n.118

## II. PAPYRI

*BGU*

## IV

1134: 252 n.57  
1135: 252 n.57  
1136: 252 n.57  
1165: 252 n.57

## V

1210: 318 with n.18

## VII

1564: 322 n.35  
1572: 329 - 30; 330 n.51

## VIII

1741: 243 n.9; 244 n.14; 252 n.58;  
260 n.94; 308 n.15  
1742: 244 n.14; 252 n.58; 260 n.94  
1743: 244 n.14; 252 n.58; 260 n.94

## X

1933: 244 n.14

## XIV

2368: 244 n.14; 252 n.58; 260 n.94

*BL*

## V

81: 331 n.54  
147—: 296 n.86

## VI

18: 244 n.14

## VII

148: 331 n.54

## VIII

399: 262 n.101

## IX

315: 258 n.82

## X

171: 333 n.56

XI

191: 333 n.56

*O.Bodl.*

I

312: 243 n.6

*P.Ash.dem.*

I

18: 248 n.30; 307 n.12

*P.Berl. dem.* 3115: 307 n.13

*P.Berl. Spieg.*

3115: 244 n.16; 246 n.25; 247 n.27;  
247 n.29; 249 n.39; 251 n.52;  
252 n.56

*P.Bodl.*

I

59b: 302 n.3

*P.Bremmer* 63: 324 n.41

*P.BM dem.*

1325: 308 n.16

*P.Cair.*

II

30605: 249 n.39

30606: 249 n.39

30619: 249 n.39

31179: 249 n.39

*P.Cairo Zen.*

I

34: 261 n.100

II

59199: 261 n.100

59202: 261 n.100

59220: 261 n.99

59241: 261 n.99

59247: 261 n.98

III

59327: 258 n.82

*P.Carlsb.* 53: 253 n.63

*P.Coll.Youtie*

II

81: 322 n.33

*P.Count*

III

148: 302 n.3; 304 et passim

VI

294-307: 303 n.5

314-21: 303 n.5

379: 304 n.6

384: 304 n.6

499: 304 n.6

543: 304 n.6

604: 304 n.6

XVI

3-7: 302 n.3; 307 n.11

*P.Fay*

18A-B: 253 n.66; 254 n.68; 304 n.7

*P.Enteux*

20: 244 n.16; 246 n.23; 259 n.90

21: 243 n.6; 244 n.16; 246 n.24;

259 n.89

*P.Erasm.*

I

6: 253 n.66

12: 260 n.94; 260 n.94

13: 253 n.62

*P.Grenf.*

- II  
 37: 251 n.47; 304 n.7  
 73: 253 n.63  
*P.Hamb. dem.* I: 249 n.39
- P.Hib*  
 I  
 67: 244 n.17; 262 n.102  
 68: 244 n.17; 262 n.102  
 71: 258 n.84
- P.Köln*  
 VI  
 260; 302 n.3; 304 n.7  
 290: 243 n.10  
 VII  
 315b: 302 n.3
- P.Laur.*  
 IV  
 155: 322 n.33
- PLBat.*  
 XX  
 30: 306 n.9
- P.Lille dem.*  
 I  
 29: 249 n.39
- P.Mich.*  
 I  
 36: 261 n.100  
 II  
 121r iv 6: 320 n.24  
 123r xxi 31: 253 n.63  
 127: 320 n.26  
 124r ii 19: 253 n.63  
 V  
 243: 319
- 245: 253 n.63; 307 n.13  
 246: 319 n.20; 320 n.24  
*P.Mil.Vogl.dem.*  
 Inv. 77-78: 249 n.39
- P.Oslo*  
 III  
 143: 319 n.20
- P.Oxy.*  
 I  
 84: 322 n.32  
 II  
 284: 328 n.50  
 285: 328 n.50  
 III  
 473: 322 n.31  
 IV  
 908: 323n.37  
 XII  
 1414: 323n.36; 326 n.48  
 XXII  
 2340: 331 n.54  
 XLIV  
 3173: 322 n.32  
 3176: 322 n.32  
 3185: 322 n.32  
 LXXIII  
 4953: 328 n.50
- P.Paramone*  
 VI  
 4: 302 n.3
- P.Polit.Iud.:* 270-98; 309 n.21; 310; 310  
 n.25
- P.Prur.Diosk.:* 289 n.65
- P.Rev.Laws*

- 46: 262
- P.Ryl.*
- I  
189: 322 n.35
- II  
65: 243 nn.6, 10; 244 n.16; 246  
nn.23, 24; 247 n.27; 259 n.91;  
260 n.92  
265: 302 n.3; 306
- IV  
580: 252 n.59; 253 n.67  
654: 332; 333 n.55
- Pap.Graec.Mon.* 287+293: 280 n.40
- PSI*
- IV  
421: 257 n.81; 257 n.81
- V  
490: 258 n.85  
502: 258 n.82  
538: 309 n.20
- VI  
599: 244 n.16; 262 n.101
- P.Siut.*  
10591 rt VI: 246 n.24; 259 n.87
- P.Stanford Green dem.*  
21.7: 244 n.16; 246 n.23
- P.Tebt.*
- I  
5: 255 n.73; 256 n.74; 260 n.93;  
261 n.95  
13: 304 n.7  
18: 258 n.85  
24: 258 n.85  
26: 258 n.83
- 32: 287 nn.59, 60; 310 n.25  
40: 250 n.44; 251 n.47  
41: 258 n.85  
43: 251 n.47  
45: 253 n.65  
48: 251 n.47; 261 n.95  
61b: 258 n.85  
81: 253 n.61
- I App. I  
7: 253 n.61
- II  
287: 327 - 28; 328 n.49; 330 n.52  
573: 253 n.63  
894: 271 n.5
- III  
700: 245 n.18; 254 n.68; 256; 296  
n.86  
701: 302 n.3  
703: 261 n.96  
731: 253 n.63; 258 n.85  
853: 310 n.22  
788: 251 n.47  
848: 253 n.66  
927: 253 n.66  
1067: 253 n.66  
1129: 253 n.66
- IV  
1129: 304 n.7
- P.Yale*
- I  
33: 253 n.64
- SB*
- I  
3939: 252 n.57  
4224: 243 n.6  
5022: 252 n.59
- III  
7266: 257 n.78
- V

- 7803: 255 n.73  
 7835: 243 n.6; 253 nn.63, 65  
 8855 (= OGIS 51): 247 n.29
- XII  
 11078: 244 n.13; 262 n.101
- XVI  
 12695: 321 n.27
- Stud.Demotica*
- V  
 158: 248 n.31; 251 nn.51, 53; 252  
 n.55
- UPZ
- I  
 149: 309 n.19
- II  
 162: 302 n.3; 306 n.9  
 191: 247 n.27  
 192: 247 n.27  
 193: 247 n.27
- W.Chr.*  
 110A: 247 n.29
- III. ANCIENT AUTHORS**
- Acts*  
 5.6.10: 212  
 8.2: 212  
 11.26: 216  
 13.7.12: 216 n.41  
 19.23 - 41: 324 n.43; 325 n.44; 326  
 n.46  
 20: 222 n.75
- Aeschines  
 1.10: 63 n.33
- Aelius Aristides
- Orationes*  
 50.19: 112
- Alexis  
 Frg. 99 (Kassel-Austin, *PCG* II):  
 67 n.50
- Antigonus (of Carystus)  
 frg. 23 (ed. Dorandi): 74 n.86
- Aristeas  
*Ad Philocratem epistula* (ed. Wend-  
 land) 308-11: 275 n.27
- Aristotle  
*Ethica Eudemia*  
 1242a: 65 n.39  
*Ethica Nichomachea*  
 1159b: 64-5; 65 n.39  
 1160a (8.9.4-6): 13 n.22; 64-5; 65  
 n.3  
 1164b: 66 n.42  
 1172a: 66 n.42  
*Politica*  
 1267b33ff.: 9 n.10
- [Aristotle] *Athenaion Politeia*  
 6.1: 9 n.10  
 15: 33 n.21  
 43.6: 9 n.10  
 43.3: 7 n.1  
 52.2: 69 n.59
- Privatorum scriptorum fragmenta  
 (ed. Plezia)  
 p. 35-42: 72 n.69
- Asconius  
*In Pisonem*  
 7: 8 n.4  
*Pro Cornelio*



- 67: 8 n.1  
75: 98 n.17
- Athenaeus, *Dipnosophistae*  
4.149-50: 309 n.19  
11.508f-509b: 70 n.63  
12.547c: 74 n.86  
13.610e-f: 67 n.50; 68 n.53
- Cicero, *In Pisonem*  
9: 316 n.9
- Demochares (ed. Marasco)  
fig. 1: 70 n.63  
fig. 2: 70 n.63
- Demosthenes  
23.146: 301 n.2  
24.120: 9 n.10  
41.4: 301 n.2  
45.67: 7 n.1
- Digesta*  
1.18.6: 315 n.4  
1.18.13: 315 n.4  
3.4.1: 12 n.19; 17; 316 n.11; 326 n.47  
27.1.6: 98  
47.22.1-4: 12 n.19; 66 n.44; 68 and  
nn.56-57; 69 n.58; 207 n.14;  
316 nn.11, 12  
50.4.18: 98  
50.6.6.12: 330 n.53
- Dio Chrysostomus, *Orationes*  
32: 314 n.2  
40: 323n.39  
50.25: 7
- Diodorus Siculus (D.S.)  
1.73-74: 301 n.1  
12.68: 34 n.23
- 33.28c: 255 n.73  
60.2: 33 n.22
- Diogenes Laertius  
3.41-43: 72 n.69  
4.25: 72 n.69  
4.43-44: 72 n.69  
5.4: 74 n.84  
5.11-16: 72 n.69  
5.38: 67 n.50; 68 nn.53, 55  
5.51-57: 72 n.69  
5.52-53: 66 n.42; 101 n.25  
5.61-64: 72 n.69  
5.70-71: 76 n.91  
7.161: 70 n.61  
10.16-21: 72 n.69
- Dionysius (of Lamtrae)  
Frg. VII (PHerc.): 72 n.69
- Epicurus  
Frg.1 [pp. 12-17] (ed. Arrighetti<sup>2</sup>):  
72 n.69
- Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*  
10.1.8: 207 n.4  
13.12: 207 n.4  
13.19: 207 n.4
- FCrH*  
273 Alexander Polyhistor F 36:  
124  
631 Satyros F 1: 257 n.80
- Harpocration, *Lexicon*  
*Orgeonas*: 63 n.28
- Heracleides Criticus (ed. Arenz)  
1,1: 57 n.1
- Herodotus

- 2.164-66: 301 n.1  
 178: 309 n.19  
 5.57: 30 n.13  
 6.57.1: 9 n.10  
 6.60.1: 301 n.1  
 7.107: 33 n.22  
 9.75: 34 n. 23
- Hesychius, *Lexicon*  
 B 514: 30 n.14  
 Δ 1847: 30 n.14  
 K 4372: 30 n.13  
 M 456: 30 n.14
- Hipponax (IEG) frg. 127 (ed. West):  
 30 n.13
- Justinus  
 38.8.13-15: 255 n.73
- Isacus  
 6.47: 9 n.10
- Isocrates  
 2. *Nicoles* 54: 7 n.1
- Lactantius  
*Institutiones divinae*  
 5.1: 207 n.3
- Libanius  
*Orationes*  
 II: 109 n.52
- Livy  
 37.11.13; 165 n.128  
 37.30.3: 165 n.128  
 38.41: 28 n.6  
 39.8-19: 257 n.79
- Lucian  
*De morte peregrini*  
 II: 207 n.5  
*Icaromenippus*  
 24.26: 28 n.6  
*Juppiter Tragoedus*  
 8: 31 n.16
- Lyc0 (of Alexandria Troas)  
 frg. 15 (ed. Fortenbaugh,  
 Dorandi, Ophuijsen]: 72  
 n.69
- Lysias  
 12.43-47: 7 n.1
- Origen  
*Contra Celsum*  
 1.1: 207 n.3  
 1.9: 207 n.3  
 3.23: 207 n.4
- Paul, *Epistles*  
*Colossians*  
 3.18 - 4.1: 209 n.12; 219 n.61  
 4.5: 227 n.104  
*1 Corinthians*  
 3.8: 219 n.56  
 9.9 - 14: 225  
 10.14.21: 212 n.23  
 10.16-17: 211; 219 n.56  
 11.20-23: 211  
 11.33-34: 211-12  
 12.12 - 13: 219 n.56  
 16.15: 227 n.104  
*Ephesians*  
 5.21-6.6: 209 n.12  
 5.23-69: 219 n.61  
*Galatians*  
 3.28: 219 n.56  
*Philemon*  
 1-2: 227 n.104

- 16: 218 n.55  
*Philippians*  
 1.1: 222 n.76  
 2.2: 219 n.56  
*Romans*  
 4.15: 214; 216  
 13.1 - 8: 227  
 16.5: 214  
*1 Thessalonians*  
 5.12: 222 n.76  
*2 Thessalonians*
- [Paul] *Pastoral Epistles*  
*1 Timothy*  
 2.1-9: 211; 218; 219; 227; 228  
 2.2: 230  
 2.9-15: 221  
 3.1 - 7.8-13: 221; 222; 224; 227  
 3.2: 221; 223  
 3.4 - 5.12: 215; 218  
 3.9: 211  
 3.10: 223  
 3.11 - 12: 224  
 3.13: 224  
 3.14-16: 211; 213; 218; 224  
 5.1: 224  
 5.3: 225 with n.95  
 5.4.8, 16: 212;  
 5.6: 218  
 5.9-10: 212; 221  
 5.11 - 14: 221; 224  
 5.16: 227  
 5.17: 225; 226 n.98  
 6.1-2: 218 with n.55; 220  
 6.9-10: 218  
 6.17-18: 212; 227  
*2 Timothy*  
 1.10: 211  
 1.16: 227 n.104  
 6.1-2: 218  
*Titus*
- 1.4: 211  
 1.5 - 9: 221; 222; 223  
 1.6: 218  
 1.8: 221  
 1.10.14: 221  
 2.3 - 5: 221  
 2.9 -13: 211; 218; 221  
 3.1: 228  
 3.4-6: 211
- Pausanias  
 1.1.4: 39 n.37
- Philodemus  
*Academicorum Historia (P.Herc. 1021)*  
 (ed. Dorandi)  
 col. VI: 76 n.91  
 col. XXV: 70 n.61  
 col. 18: 76 n.91  
 col. XXXII: 70 n.61  
*Stoicorum Historia* (ed. Dorandi)  
 col. LXXVII: 76 n.92
- Philo, *In Flaccum*  
 1.4: 7  
 4: 316 n.7  
 125 - 40: 334 n.57
- Plato, *Respublica*  
 327a-b: 31 n.15; 37  
 328a-b: 31 n. 15
- Plinius, *Epistulae*  
 10.33, 34: 230 n.123; 316 n.10  
 10.92, 93: 230 n.123  
 10.96-7: 230 n.123
- Plutarch  
*Alcibiades* 26.2.9: 230 n.122  
*Alexander* 67.8.2: 129-30  
*Fabius* 9.2: 230 n.122

- Kimon* 7: 33 n.22
- [Plutarch], *Moralia*  
816A-F: 230 n.121
- PMG (ed. Page) frg. 23,1,2: 131 n. 29
- Pollux, *Onomasticon*  
9.42: 67 n.50
- Polybius  
16.3: 165 n.128  
21.1.2: 165 n.128  
21.6.1: 165 n.128  
21.7.[2]: 165 n.128  
21.7.[5]: 165 n.130  
22.5: 165 n.128  
23.13: 7 n.1  
28.2.3: 165 n.128  
29.11.2: 165 n.128  
30.4.1: 165 n.128  
30.5.1-4: 165 n.128  
30.22.3: 165 n.128  
31.31.1-3: 96 n.13  
33.15.3: 165 n.128
- Polystratus  
frgs. VIIIc-e, VIIIi (*P.Herc.*  
1780): 72 n.69
- Proclus  
*in Platonis Republicam commentarii*  
(ed. Kroll)  
1.18.8: 31 n.15  
1.18.10-17: 31 n.15  
1.19.3: 31 n.15  
*in Timaeum commentarii* (ed. Kroll)  
1.8.31: 31 n.15  
1.26.12-14: 31 n.15  
1.84.27: 31 n.15  
1.85.4, 27, 29: 31 n. 15
- Ptolemaeus (Claudius)  
3.5.12: 124  
5.9.16: 124  
8.18.5: 124
- Stephnus of Byzantium  
Tanais: 124
- Strabo  
10.3.16: 30 n.14  
11.2.3: 124  
17.1.3: 301 n.1
- Strato (of Lampsacus)  
frg. 10 (ed. Wehrli): 72 n. 69
- Suetonius  
*Augustus*  
32.1: 316 n.9; 335 n.58  
*De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*  
4: 93  
32: 100 n.24  
*Iulius Caesar*  
42.3: 98 n.17; 335 n.59  
*Claudius*  
25.4: 228 n.109
- Synesios, *Epistolae* 4.1: 28 n.6
- Tertullian, *Apologeticum*  
38.1: 207 with n.6  
39: 207 with n.6
- Theophrastus  
frg. 1 [pp. 40-7] (ed. Forten-  
baugh, Huby and Sharples):  
72 n. 69
- Thucydides  
1.98: 33 n.22  
1.100: 34 n. 23

1.112-18: 36 n.28  
2.15.2: 9 n.10  
2.29: 39 n.40  
4.102: 34 n. 23  
8.48.3: 7 n.1  
8.54.4: 7 n.1

Xenocrates

Phil.Test. 27 (ed. Ismardi Parente  
and Dorandi): 74 n.84

Xenophon

*Hellenica* (HG)

2.4.11: 31 n. 16

*De Vectigalibus*

2.1: 157

## General guidelines

The Academy invites original papers that contribute significantly to research carried on in Denmark. Foreign contributions are accepted from temporary residents in Denmark, participants in a joint project involving Danish researchers, or those in discussion with Danish contributors.

## Instructions to authors

Please make sure that you use the stylesheet on our homepage [www.royalacademy.dk](http://www.royalacademy.dk). All manuscripts will be refereed. Authors of papers accepted for publication will receive digital proofs; these should be returned promptly to the editor. Corrections other than of printer's errors will be charged to the author(s) insofar as the costs exceed 15% of the cost of typesetting.

Authors receive a total of 50 free copies and are invited to provide addresses of up to 20 journals to which review copies could profitably be sent.

Manuscripts can be returned, but only upon request made before publication of the paper. Original photos and artwork are returned upon request.

## Manuscript

### *General*

Book manuscripts and illustrations must comply with the guidelines given below. The digital manuscript and illustrations plus one clear printed copy of both should be sent to the editor of the series. Digital manuscripts should be submitted in a commonly used document format (contact the editor if you are in doubt), and the illustrations should be sent as separate files. Please do not embed illustrations within text files.

A manuscript should not contain less than 48 printed pages. This also applies to the Sci.Dan.M. where contributions to the history of science are welcome.

### *Language*

Manuscripts in Danish, English, German and French are accepted; in special cases other languages too. Linguistic revision may be made a condition of final acceptance.

### *Title*

Titles should be kept as short as possible, preferring words useful for indexing and information retrieval.

### *Abstract, Summary*

An abstract in English is required. It should be of 10-15 lines, outline main features, stress novel information and conclusions, and end with the author's name, title, and institutional and/or private postal address. - Papers in Danish must be provided with a summary in another language as agreed between author and editor.

### *Manuscript*

Page 1 should contain title, author's name and the name of the Academy. Page 2: Abstract, author's name and address. Page 3: Table of contents if necessary. Consult a recent issue of the series for general layout. Indicate the position of illustrations and tables. A printout must accompany manuscripts submitted electronically.

### *Figures*

All illustrations submitted must be marked with the author's name. It is important that the illustrations are of the highest possible quality. Foldout figures and tables should be avoided.

### *References*

In general, the editor expects all references to be formally consistent and in accordance with accepted practice within the particular field of research. Bibliographical references should be given in a way that avoids ambiguity.



Det Kongelige Danske Videnskaberne Selskab  
The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters

Scientia Danica. Series H, Humanistica, 4

Sci.Dan.H.4

VOL DKK

- 3 Helle Salskov Roberts: *Sūkās XI - The Attic Pottery and Commentary on the Greek Inscriptions found on Tall Sūkās. Publications of the Carlsberg Expedition to Phoenicia 14* 2015. 165 pp. Lavishly ill. 280.-
- 4 Mirjam Gelfer-Jørgensen: *Pietro Krohn - Danmarks Kunstneriske Puls. Kunst · Teater · Museum.* 2014. 114 pp. Rigt ill. 240.-
- 5 Vagn Fabritius Buchwald: *Jernets Danmarkshistorie.* 2015. 344 pp. Rigt ill. 300.-

Scientia Danica. Series H, Humanistica, 8

Sci.Dan.H.8

VOL DKK

- 4 Minna Skafte Jensen: *Writing Homer. A study based on results from modern fieldwork.* 2011. 440 pp. Ill. 300.-
- 5 *Aristotle's Categories in the Byzantine, Arabic and Latin Traditions.*  
Edited by Sten Ebbesen, John Marenbon & Paul Thom. 2013. 340 pp. 240.-
- 6 Harald Høffding: *Personlighedsprincippet i filosofien. Forelæsninger ved Helsingfors Universitet i foråret 1911.* Oversat fra svensk og med indledning af Mogens Blegvad, udgivet og forsynet med kommentarer og efterskrift af Carl Henrik Koch. 2013. 76 pp. 150.-
- 7 Sten Ebbesen, David Bloch, Jakob Leth Fink, Heine Hansen and Ana María Mora-Márquez: *History of Philosophy in Reverse. Reading Aristotle through the Lenses of Scholars from the Twelfth to the Sixteenth Centuries.* 2014. 220 pp. 200.-
- 8 Mogens Herman Hansen: *Hvad er en stat?.* 2014. 152 pp. 120.-
- 9 *Private Associations and the Public Sphere.* Proceedings of a Symposium held at the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 9-11 September 2010.  
Edited by Vincent Gabrielsen & Christian A. Thomsen. 2015. 363 pp. 240.-
- 10 Mogens Herman Hansen: *Political Obligation in Ancient Greece and in the Modern World.* 2015. 76 pp. 80.-

Priser ekskl. moms / Prices excl. VAT

Printed in Denmark by Specialtrykkeriet Viborg  
ISSN 1904-5492 · ISBN 978-87-7304-389-9

