

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.¹

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.² 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;³ 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 II²* 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.⁴ 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.⁵

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.⁶ They represent a dynamic phenomenon with an eminently central place in the history of ancient societies.⁷ This is also recognized by theologians and scholars of the New Testament, who explore the possible connection between associations and the Jesus groups.⁸ 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* I² 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.⁹ 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.¹⁰ 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.¹¹ 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 I³ 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 2011.¹² 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.¹³

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*).¹⁴

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).¹⁵

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.¹⁶ 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 Δαρφρονιστῶν. 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.¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ 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.¹⁹ 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,²⁰ simultaneously grappling with the intricate issue of whether the former were recognized as a ‘juristical person’.²¹ 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*).²² 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.²³ Furthermore, as many studies have pointed out, since practically every association was devoted to cult worship, all associations were in some sense ‘cult-associations’.²⁴ 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; Aubüttel 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.²⁵

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 endowments²⁶ and the central role of associations in the crafts and trade of the Mediterranean world.²⁷ Together all these activities are evidence of the second feature, a remarkable degree of *societal* integration.²⁸ 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.²⁹ 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’.³⁰

(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.³¹

(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’.³²

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* II² 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.³³ 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.³⁴ 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 *ekklēsiai* as they are presented in the Pastoral Epistles. In spelling out the organisation and matters pertaining to membership Zamfir compares the *ekklēsiai* to associations and finds many similarities. The Pastoral Epistles admonish members of the *ekklēsiai* 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, 'Ἰδία 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^{ème} siècle av. J.-C. - I^{er} 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.