ΕΠΕΤΗΡΙΣ ΚΕΝΤΡΟΥ ΕΡΕΥΝΗΣ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΥ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥ
ΠΑΡΑΡΤΗΜΑ
37 (4) — 2003

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ
ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Thusias heneka kai sunousias.

Private religious associations in Hellenistic Athens

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

ΕΠΕΤΗΡΙΣ ΤΟΥ ΚΕΝΤΡΟΥ ΕΡΕΥΝΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΣ
ΤΟΥ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΥ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥ

ΤΟΜΟΣ 37
ΠΑΡΑΡΤΗΜΑ 4

*

ACADEMY OF ATHENS

YEARBOOK OF THE RESEARCH CENTRE
FOR THE HISTORY OF GREEK LAW

VOLUME 37
SUPPLEMENT nº 4

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Ilias N. ARNAOUTOGLOU

Thusias heneka kai sunousias.

Private religious associations in Hellenistic Athens

37
Academy of Athens
Athens 2003

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Editor: E. Karabelias

© Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν

Κέντρο Ἐρεύνης τῆς Ἱστορίας
τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Δικαίου
Ἀναγνωστοπούλου 14 – 10673 Ἀθήνα
Τηλ. 210-3664607, 210-3664627-629
Fax 210-3664628

Academy of Athens
Research Centre for the History
of Greek Law
14, Anagnostopoulou str. – 106 73 Athens
Tel. 210-3664607, 210-3664627-629
Fax 210-3664628

e-mail: keied@academyofathens.gr

ISSN 1105-0055 • ISBN 960-404-034-0

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

ἐγὼ γὰρ οἶμαι πάντας ἀνθρώπους
φέρειν ἀξιοῦν παρ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν
βίον αὐτοῖς ἔρανον παρὰ πάνθ'
ὅσα πράττουσιν

Demosthenes 21 (*Against Meidias*) 101

To the memory of my father

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ
ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

CONTENTS

Abbreviations 11
Preface 17
Introduction 19

When is a group an association? 22
Associations and scholars 25
On method 27

Chapter One: Pieces of Evidence 31
Orgeones 31
Literary evidence 33
Philochoros on *orgeones* 37
Dig. 47.22.4 44
(i) Text 45
(ii) Content of the provision 51
(iii) Date 52
Epigraphical evidence 58
Thiasotai 61
Epigraphical evidence 64
Eranistai 70
Literary evidence 72
Inscriptions 76

Chapter Two: The Structure of the Groups 89
Membership 96
Assemblies 102
Offices 103
Nomenclature 103
Duration 104
Honours 105
A. *Hieropoioi* 107
B. *Epimeletai* 108
C. *Grammateus* 109
D. *Tamias* 110

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

E. *Hiereia* 113
Vocabulary and values in honouring 115

Chapter Three: Looking for the Rules... 119
Legal historians and juristic personality 120
The theoretical background 123
The life of an association 125
What is in the name of a group? 130
Property as an indicator of legal personality 133
The conceptual horizon of the associates 138

Chapter Four: Cult Associations on the Ground 145
Cult associations and society 145
Cult associations and patronage 157
Cult associations and marginality 159

Conclusions 165

Περίληψη 167

Appendix 1: Epigraphical Testimonia 171

Appendix 2: Athenian Cult Associations: A Prosopography 187

Rererences 207

INDEX OF SOURCES 221
A. Literary Sources 223
B. Epigraphical Sources 225
C. General Index 228

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

ABBREVIATIONS

Ag. 16 = Woodhead, A.G. (ed) (1997) *Inscriptions: The decrees*, Princeton (The Athenian Agora: Results of excavations conducted by the Athenian School of Classical Studies in Athens 16).

Ag. 19 = Lalonde, G.V., M.K. Langdon & M.B. Walbank (eds) (1991) *Inscriptions: Horoi, Poletai records, leases of public lands*, Princeton (The Athenian Agora: Results of excavations conducted by the Athenian School of Classical Studies in Athens 19).

AM = *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung*, 1- (Athens 1876-1939, Berlin 1951-).

ANRW = *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, 1- (Berlin 1972-).

APMA = Μαλούχου, Γ.Ε. & Β. Μπαρδάνη (1992) (επιμ.) *Ἀρχεῖον τῶν Μνημείων τῶν Ἀθηνῶν καὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς* 1, Ἀθῆναι (Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας 127); Μαλούχου-Νταϊλιάνα, Γ.Ε. (1994) (επιμ.) *Ἀρχεῖον τῶν Μνημείων τῶν Ἀθηνῶν καὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς* 2, Ἀθῆναι (Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας 136); Μαλούχου-Νταϊλιάνα, Γ.Ε. (1998) (επιμ.) *Ἀρχεῖον τῶν Μνημείων τῶν Ἀθηνῶν καὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆς* 3, Ἀθῆναι (Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας 177).

ARSP = *Archiv für Rechts- und Sozialphilosophie*, 1- (Stuttgart, 1906-).

BE = J. and L. Robert et al. *Bulletin Épigraphique* (in *REG* 1938-).

Behrend = Behrend, D. (1970) *Attische Pachturkunden. Ein Beitrag zur Beschreibung der μίσθωσις nach den griechischen Inschriften*, München (Vestigia. Beiträge zur alten Geschichte 12).

CCIS = Lane, E.N. (1985) *Corpus Cultis Iovi Sabazii II. The other monuments and literary evidence*, Leiden (Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romaine 100).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

CIRB = Struve, V.V. et al. (eds) (1965) *Corpus Inscriptionum Regni Bosporani*, Moscow.

DAGR = Daremberg, Ch. & E. Saglio (eds) (1877-1911) *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines*, 4 vols, Paris (reprint 1968, Graz).

DGE = Schwyzer, E. (ed) (1923) *Dialectorum Graecarum Exempla epigraphica potiora*, Leipzig (reprint Hildesheim 1960).

Dubois, *IGDOlbia* = Dubois, L. (ed) (1996) *Inscriptions Grecques Dialectales d'Olbia du Pont*, Genève (Hautes Études du Monde Gréco-Romain 22).

FGrHist = Jacoby, F. (ed) (1926-58) *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, vols I-IIIC, Berlin/Leyden.

Finley = Finley, M.I. (1951) *Studies in land and credit in ancient Athens*, reprint 1985, Oxford.

FIRA = Riccobono, S. (ed) (1941) *Fontes Iuris Romani Anteiustiniani*, vols. 3, reprint 1968-69, Firenze.

FRA = Osborne, M.J. & S.G. Byrne (eds) (1996) *The Foreign Residents of Athens. An Annex to the Lexicon of Greek Personal Names: Attica*, Louvain (Studia Hellenistica 33).

Helly, *Gonnoi* = Helly, B. (1973) *Gonnoi*, 2 vols, Amsterdam.

IApameia = Corsten, Th. (ed) (1987) *Die Inschriften von Apameia (Bithynien) und Pylai*, Bonn (IK 32).

IBeroia = Gounaropoulou, L. & M.B. Hatzopoulos (eds) (1998) *Επιγραφές Κάτω Μακεδονίας. Α. Επιγραφές Βέροιας*, Athens.

ICret = Guarducci, M. (ed) (1935-50) *Inscriptiones Creticae*, 4 vols, Roma.

ID = Plassart, A. et al. (eds) (1926- 72) *Inscriptions de Délos*, 7 vols, Paris.

IEG = West, M.L. (ed) (1989-92) *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, 2 vols, Oxford.

IG = *Inscriptiones Graecae*, 1873- , Berlin.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

IKios = Corsten, Th. (ed) (1985) *Die Inschriften von Kios*, Bonn (IK 29).

IKyme = Engelmann, H. (ed) (1976) *Die Inschriften von Kyme*, Bonn (IK 5).

ILindos = Blinkenberg, Chr. (ed) (1941) *Lindos II. Inscriptions*, 2 vols, Copenhagen.

IMagn = Kern, O. (ed) (1900) *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, Berlin.

IMyl = Blümel, W. (ed) (1987) *Die Inschriften von Mylasa*, 2 vols, Bonn (IK 34-5).

IPriene = Hiller von Gaertringen, F. (ed) (1906) *Inschriften von Priene*, Berlin.

IPrusa ad Olympum = Corsten, Th. (ed) (1991) *Die Inschriften von Prusa ad Olympum*, 2 vols, Bonn (IK 39-40).

IrhodPer = Blümel, W. (ed) (1991) *Die Inschriften der rhodischen Peraia*, Bonn (IK 38).

ISmyrna = Petzl, G. (ed) (1982) *Die Inschriften von Smyrna*, 2 in 3 vols, Bonn (IK 23-24).

Kerameikos 3 = Peek, W. (1941) *Inschriften, Ostraka, Fluchtafeln*, Berlin (Kerameikos Ergebnisse 3).

Laum, *Stiftungen* = Laum, B. (1914) *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike. Ein Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte*, 2 vols, Leipzig-Berlin.

Lawton = Lawton, C.L. (1995) *Attic document reliefs. Art and politics in ancient Athens*, Oxford.

Le Guen = Le Guen-Pollet, B. (1991) *La vie religieuse dans le monde grec du Vème au IIIème siècle avant notre ére. Choix de documents épigraphiques traduits et commentés*, Paris.

LGPN ii = Osborne, M.J. & S.G. Byrne (eds) (1994) *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* II. Attica, Oxford.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

LSAM = Sokolowski, F. (ed) (1955) *Lois Sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*, Paris.

LSCG = Sokolowski, F. (ed) (1969) *Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques*, Paris.

LSCS = Sokolowski, F. (ed) (1962) *Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques. Supplément*, Paris.

LSJ = Lidell, H.G., R. Scott, & H.S. Jones (eds) (1940) *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed., Oxford.

Michel = Michel, Ch. (ed) (1900-12) *Recueil d'inscriptions grecques*, Bruxelles.

NChoix = Institut Fernand-Courby, *Nouveaux Choix d'inscriptions grecques*, Paris 1971.

OGIS = Dittenberger, W. (ed) (1903-5) *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, 2 vols, Leipzig.

PCG = Kassel, R. & C. Austin (eds) (1983-) *Poetae Comici Graeci*, 6 vols, Berlin-New York.

Peek, *GVI* = Peek, W. (1955) (ed) *Griechische Versinschriften*, Berlin.

P.Grenf. = I. Grenfell, B.P. (ed) (1896) *An Alexandrian erotic fragment and other Greek papyri*, Oxford; II. Grenfell, B.P. & A.S. Hunt (eds) (1897) *Greek Papyri, series II, New classical fragments and other Greek and Latin Papyri*, Oxford.

Petrakos, *Rhamnous* = Πετράκος, Β.Χ. (1999) *Ο δήμος του Ραμνούντος. Σύνοψη των ανασκαφών και των ερευνών (1813-1998). ΙΙ. Οι επιγραφές*, Αθήνα (Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας 182).

Pleket = Pleket, W. (ed) (1964) *Epigraphica I: Texts on the economic history of the Greek world*, Leiden (Textus Minores 31).

PMGF = Davies, M. (ed) (1991) *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta. I: Alcman, Stesichorus, Ibycus post D.L. Page*, Oxford.

Poland = Poland, F. (1909) *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, Leipzig.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Pouilloux, *Rhamnonte* = Pouilloux, J. (1954) *La forteresse de Rhamnonte*, Paris (BEFAR 179).

RE = *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumwissenschaft*, 66 vols with 15 Supplements (Stuttgart, 1894-1980).

RIJG = Dareste, R., B. Haussoullier & Th. Reinach (eds) (1894-1904) *Recueil des Inscriptions Juridiques Grecques*, 2 vols, Paris.

SB = *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*, vols 1- , Wiesbaden.

Schwenk = Schwenk, C.J. (1985) *Athens in the age of Alexander; the dated laws and decrees of the Lycourgan era 338-322 B.C.*, Chicago.

SEG = *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, vols 1- , Amsterdam.

SGDI = Collitz, H & F. Bechtel (eds) (1884-1915) *Sammlung der griechischen Dialektinschriften*, 3 vols in 4, Göttingen.

SIRIS = Vidman, L. (ed) (1969) *Sylloge Inscriptionum Religionis Isiacae et Sarapiacae*, Berlin (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten).

Syll^3 = Dittenberger, W. (ed) (1915-24) *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 4 vols, 3rd ed., Leipzig.

Tataki, *Macedonians* = Tataki, A.B. (1998) *Macedonians abroad. A contribution to the prosopography of ancient Macedonia*, Athens (Meletemata 26).

Tod, *GHI* = Tod, M.N. (ed) (1933-48) *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 2 vols, Oxford.

Tracy, *ADT* = Tracy, S.V. (1995) *Athenian Democracy in Transition. Attic letter-cutters of 340-290 B.C.*, Berkeley.

Tracy, *ALC* = Tracy, S.V. (1990) *Attic Letter-Cutters of 228 to 86 B.C.*, Berkeley.

Wilhelm, *ABGI* = Wilhelm, A. *Abhandlungen und Beiträge zu griechischen Inschriften* (1895-1951), 2 vols, Leipzig 1984.

Wilhelm, *AGI* = Wilhelm, A. *Akademieschriften zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* (1895-1951), 3 vols, Leipzig 1974.

ZPE = *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 1- (Bonn, 1967-).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

PREFACE

This study started as a vague title in Thessaloniki, mid-summer of 1989. I had just finished a postgraduate course on Legal History and the time had come to choose a PhD topic. Frenzied searches through bibliographies and indexes left me with the impression that everything had already been written. Associations triggered my interest, since I knew so little about them and no recent work on them was available. Thanks to the generous support of the Department of Classics of Glasgow University I was given a three-year scholarship (1990-1993) and I submitted the thesis in June 1993 under the title "Forms and legal features of religious associations in Athens". Prof. D.M. MacDowell supervised the thesis, with the love of detail, an open mind and above all a common sense approach which several times trimmed fanciful theorizing down to its size. The thesis' examiners, Dr. P. Millett and Dr. R. Knox, saved me from errors and sweeping statements. Since then a big file remained on my desk and it was growing fast. My work at the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* in Oxford may have taken a considerable part of my time but made me more circumspect in the use of epigraphic material and provided a different kind of stimuli to reconsider some ideas and interpretations. Over the years different parts of the thesis have been presented in seminars in the University of Glasgow (Dept. of Classics), in the University of Durham (Dept. of Classics), Cambridge University (Seminar of Ancient History directed by P. Cartledge & P. Millett), University of Liverpool (Seminar of Ancient History organized by Prof. J. Davies & Dr. Gr. Oliver) and the Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki (Dept. of History & Archaeology organized by Prof. J. Touloumakos & Prof. Chr. Veligianni-Terzi). Some parts of the book have been published in *ZPE* 104 (1994) 103-10, *Ancient Society* 25 (1994) 5-17 and in Cartledge, P., P. Millett & S. von Reden (eds) (1998) *Kosmos. Essays in order, conflict and*

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

community in classical Athens, 68-83, Cambridge. My return to Greece in the summer of 1999 was a *nostos* for the book, too. I had the time to revise, correct the text and incorporate the proliferating bibliographical references available to the end of 2002. Translations of the epigraphical testimonies are mine, unless otherwise stated, while for the literary evidence I used the translations of the Loeb edition, appropriately modified. All dates are B.C. unless stated otherwise.

Long gestation usually incurs debts and multiplies mistakes. My debts are exceeding a metaphorical "overdraft", but in hope of not forgetting too many, I would like to thank Prof. D.M. MacDowell, Dr. R. Knox in Glasgow, Dr. P. Millett and Dr. P. Cartledge in Cambridge for their patience and critical comments, Prof. R. Parker, Prof. R. Osborne, and Dr. S.D. Lambert in Oxford for their comments on earlier drafts of this book, and the participants in the above seminars whose questions helped me to maintain or reconsider my interpretations. Prof. M.J. Osborne has kindly and promptly communicated the unpublished, as yet, results of his investigation on the mid 3rd-century Athenian archons. With Prof. Onno van Nijf in Cambridge and in Oxford I had long discussions over the social importance and role of associations. Dr. Graham Oliver has kindly offered to read the manuscript before publication and saved me from several errors. Finally, I should thank E. Karabelias who accepted to publish the thesis as a supplement to the Yearbook of the Research Centre for the History of Greek Law. Responsibility for any remaining mistakes is, of course, mine.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

INTRODUCTION

'The eve of their commencing, the 'Anastenarides' gather at the "konaki" of their chief, where they engage in their spiritual preparation for the ordeal by means of meditation and censing. The music, performed incessantly, has the purpose of inducing the holy frenzy of the fire - walkers, who, entranced, start dancing around the holy icons, while they tread on the burning pieces of charcoal and incense until they trample them out.

In the morning of Saint Constantine's name - day (i.e. 21st of May), after the sanctification has been performed, the sacrifice of the sacred animal is enacted in the precincts of the church. The animal is bought with money raised among the believers. After its slaughtering, the victim is cut to pieces and distributed among the households of those who will perform the fire-walking. Next, the procession of dancers holding the icons visit the village's houses, while at noon they stop to rest. In the evening, the village square having been prepared for the ceremony, the chief of the group gives the order for them to leave the "meghalo konaki" accompanied by the music-players and head towards the square. There, they raise the icons and walk into the fire dancing. After having trampled out the embers, they will withdraw and return the icons back to the 'konaki'." (Chryssocheris (1996: 360-61)[1]

The ritual fire –walking performed by the *Anastenarides* is by no means unique. Originally from northeast Thrace (today in Bulgaria) fire– walking was common in the 19th century in Thrace and Asia Minor and was brought to Greece by the Greek-speaking refugee populations in the mid 1920s. The whole ritual is performed by a group of people loosely organised around "chief *Anastenaris*". Participants make donations to the group and these donations constitute the sacred property of the group. They meet usually at a private house (*konaki*) used as a private sanctuary

1. See also Danforth, L.M. (1989) *Firewalking and religious healing: the Anastenaria of Greece and the American firewalking movement*, Princeton.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

or in consecrated outdoor places called *hagiasmata*. They have their own sacred equipment (knife, scarves, musical instruments and icons). Their relation to the established Orthodox Church was rather tumultuous; in the first decades of their re-settlement in Eastern Macedonia their ritual was condemned as pagan and banned (although clandestinely performed), while later it was treated as an innocent, although potentially disrupting, custom. There may be several similarities between the above description and religious associations in ancient Athens. However, I cannot claim that *Anastenarides* is a direct descendant of ancient religious groups, but their case provides important pieces of evidence on how an informal group centered around the performance of a ritual might have worked and related with a modern central institution, the Church.

The description of Anastenaria and its relation to the Orthodox Church demonstrates neatly the variety of religious experiences. To talk of cult groups in the modern world is to evoke images of suspicious methods of recruitment, thought-control, extravagant behaviour, strong if not blind loyalty to a presumed wise leader and from time to time, mass murders or mass suicides. The distorting and sensationalist approach of today's mass media underscores the alleged "otherness" of the experience of belonging to a cult group. However, this image is a direct consequence of monotheistic religions, with a fixed set of beliefs, scriptures and hierarchical structure. In such a context deviation leads, most of the time, to heresy and exclusion. Closed systems of belief foster the creation of equally close-knit heretical systems (or sects) struggling for survival, and, often resulting in what seems irrational self-destruction. [2]

Armed with similar expectations, observers would be disappointed at the cult groups in ancient Athens, although extravagant behaviour in religious context was never entirely absent. However, it can hardly be argued that sects existed in ancient Athens. Freyburger et al (1986: 14) suggested the term *sect*, in the sense of "association cultuelle marginale", as best describing these groupings but this term does not seem appropriate for classical and Hellenistic Athens. First of all, there is no clear evidence of separation of these groups from wider communal life; it will be demonstrated that membership in more than one of these groups was possible. Secondly, to assume the marginal character of these associations is to beg the question about their standing in the society. Finally, and most decisively, the "otherness" of Greek religion, with its emphasis on ritual rather than creed, its openness and flexibility in accommodating differences, along with

2. See Wilson (1970) for a discussion of sects in a modern setting. Many of his observations are relevant to cult associations.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

political or diplomatic considerations, created the necessary legitimate space" for various private cult associations.[3]

Private cult associations in antiquity pose another set of problems, that of their relation to the wider societal organisation. Scholarly interest in the organisation of Athenian society has focused for the last two decades mainly on the study of the basic political units introduced by Cleisthenes' reform, that is, *demes*, tribes and *trittyes*.[4] At the same time, Oswyn Murray and Pauline Schmitt-Pantel in a series of articles have pointed out the significance of *symposion* and banquet as practices by which the social and political identity of the participants was continuously confirmed in the archaic and classical era. In this mould, Fisher (1988), devotes an analysis of considerable length to *symposion*, but only a few pages to cult associations.[5]

This approach polarises artificially the situation of the Athenians as either members of civic subdivisions in which political equality was prominent or members of the Athenian elite dining in a private context. To a certain extent it reproduces the public - private dichotomy first introduced in post-enlightenment social theory. However, between these two forms of collective human activity there is a missing link, which connects the political "being", the citizen, with the individual in a banquet. I will argue that the different private cult associations were one of the loci of convergence, and that they played a variety of social roles in Athenian society, bringing Athenians into contact with other Greeks and non-Greeks. Private cult associations filled a vacuum in the social continuum, and through regular gatherings, sacrifices, banquets, social intimacy reinforced the civic and collective spirit of their members, whether citizens or foreigners. They also reproduced the dominant social values and legitimised the existing social order. In parallel, cult associations "engage in temporal and spatial structuring to ensure that their members ... internalize rhythms and norms"[6] which was intersecting with those of the *polis*. In other words, private cult associations set a rhythm of living for their members through their annual calendar, introducing celebrations in the form of sacrifices, contests, or other rituals. These rhythms cut across those of the *polis* and

---

3. For Athenian religion see Parker (1996) and Garland's (1996: 91) observation that religious power was a prerogative shared out by a number of corporations.

4. Demes: Osborne (1985), Whitehead (1986); *trittys*: Siewert, P. (1982) *Die Trittyes und die Heeresreform des Kleisthenes*, München (Vestigia 33), Traill (1986); *phyle*: Jones (1999).

5. Schmitt-Pantel (1990) has rightly noted that sacrifices, especially city-wide, had and promoted a more egalitarian outlook.

6. Reed (1992: 6).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

we need to examine whether tensions arose. At the same time the same associations redefined space through the consecration of different sites and developed a feeling of belonging.

Private cult associations and their legal and social structure, that is "the way groups are organised and how various positions in the group are related"[7] have been marginalized until very recently; they deserve a closer examination in the light of new considerations about social life in ancient Athens. Athenians and foreigners (metics or aliens) identified themselves to a large extent through participation in associations of different kinds, in which the religious aspect had a prominent position. The reason for the primacy of religion cannot be fully investigated here; but it provided a sense of identity through the regular repetition of rituals, and the sharing of the same rhythm of life. Religion in ancient Athens can be described as an open system of beliefs and practices, having an essentially votive character, with a variety of major and minor cults, no official priesthood, and freedom for participants to worship any deity. These features, as well as the fact that a cult association offered a network of acquaintances and friends, who could help in a financial difficulty, in legal procedures, or in the conclusion of a contract, made private cult associations a focus of sociability.

Before embarking on the examination of the relevant pieces of evidence it is necessary to discuss the way in which the associations can be defined, the relevant terminology, the various methodologies adopted by earlier studies and the inevitable methodological constraints imposed by the nature of the available evidence.

When is a group an association?

Most scholars avoid defining associations as the object of their study. However, most of them employ, explicitly or implicitly, a model of association similar to the one defined by Robertis (1938) as a voluntary union of persons pursuing a permanent, common goal, organised in a system of reciprocal relations.[8] Core elements of an association according to this definition are: i) the voluntary character of membership, ii) a common, permanent cause to be pursued and iii) a system of reciprocal relations among the members.

The voluntary character is emphasized in order to distinguish groups

---

7. Baron et al. (1992: 5).

8. Robertis (1938: 7) "una riunione volontaria di persone perseguenti uno scopo comune permanente, in un sistema di reciproche relazioni di cui ciascuno sia ben cosciente".

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

linked by kinship or formed by obligatory participation, from other groups whose members are associated with links of a different kind. But its applicability throughout the classical and the Hellenistic period is questionable. Membership in demes was required for acquiring Athenian citizenship and based on kinship. *Demes*, tribes and *trittyes* in their classical format were Cleisthenes' brainchild, but they were not created in a vacuum; most probably Cleisthenes relied on existing local demarcations and groupings. The Athenian phratries, however, constitute a puzzling example, because membership was not compulsory and yet there is evidence of patrilinear membership, as well as of regionality.[9]

Moreover, one may wonder to what extent participation in private cult associations was really voluntary, taking into account the need for forming alliances, family traditions and continuity, religious, social and political allegiances. The voluntary character of membership is a useful conceptual tool for the investigation of the associative life in late Antiquity and premodern Europe, when membership to certain *collegia* was sanctioned as compulsory.[10]

At the other end of the methodological spectrum, Jones (1999: 30-32) has adopted a different approach. Instead of providing a definition, Jones opts for four defining grades (orientation, membership, duration and purpose), implicit in Aristot. *EN* 8.9.4 (1160a), and grades associations of classical Athens on a scale, "public-private", "voluntary-nonvoluntary", "temporary-permanent", "expressive-instrumental". These are not rigid, black and white criteria, but represent different polarities. In this way, Jones constructs a wide, inclusive category of "association", into which constitutional groups (*demes*, tribes), transient political clubs (*hetaireiai*) or commercial ventures, and religious groupings (*orgeones*) are subsumed. The main problem, however, with Jones' attempt is that while he claims to break the impossibility of providing a definition, he uses the elements of the inadequate definitions to provide a new flexible account.[11]

Association is a more complex phenomenon including, among others things, questions of endurance in time, autonomy, organisational plan etc. In this respect, Smith (1974: 94), in an essay on comparative politics, offers

---

9. Hedrick (1991); Lambert (1993) argues strongly in favour of membership in phratry as an essential precondition for citizenship. See also Ogden (1996: 152-53) and Jones (1999: 195-220).

10. For similar objections see also Brown (1974: 33) and Wilson (1997: 1).

11. Kloppenborg (1996: 26) suggests a three-fold categorisation of associations in Graeco-Roman antiquity according to membership: i) those associated within a household, ii) those formed around a common trade, and iii) those formed around the cult of a deity.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

a definition of the concept of "public" which we can apply to associations in ancient Athens as well. Central to Smith's thesis is the claim that government concerns regulation of common affairs and that the critical element of government is its public character. Therefore, according to Smith, an aggregate of people is qualified as "public" when it is enduring or perpetual, it has defined rules of membership, organisation, a set of external relations and a body of common affairs, autonomy and established procedures for regulation of any affair. These features, which are present in ancient Athenian private cult associations, can be divided into two categories: one concerns its internal organisation and the other comprises a set of rules governing the relation with the social context. Cult associations need to keep a balance in their internal affairs and present a certain, attractive image in society. The particular traits of being attractive depend largely on the predominant cultural values of the society in which cult associations function. In other words, the association can hardly avoid the dominant organisational model of the society. Associations therefore can be regarded as structures for administering common affairs.[12]

However, in the theory of modern organisations a number of alternative approaches have been elaborated. Organisations can be considered as negotiated orders, in which interaction between individual members is the constituting element, the force for periodical re-examination and re-evaluation of the organisation and its norms. Organisations can be regarded as structures of power and domination, which assure the protection and advance of the prevailing economic and socio-political interests in the society. In this respect, organisations are venues of power struggle for the control of ideas. Finally, organisations can be viewed as symbolic orders, that is creations produced and reproduced through symbolic construction, mediation and interpretation of their members: an organisational culture is set up through the generation of values, ceremonies, rituals and ideologies, which help the participants to make sense of their membership. However, organisations and their culture remain fluid due to the constant re-interpretation of their ideologies. These conflicting analytical frameworks advance the study of ancient Athenian associations by indicating that a single interpretative model should not be imposed on the evidence. In this study I will consider private cult associations primarily as social structures (or in Smith's terms "public"), which create and reflect a symbolic order but at the same time constitute loci in which members compete for power.

12. See Brown (1974) for a criticism of Smith's theory of corporateness in social sciences.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Associations and scholars[13]

Digest 47.22.4 preserves an allegedly Solonian regulation on the freedom of associations to arrange their own affairs. This provision in Justinian's comprehensive collection of Roman jurisprudence introduced in A.D. 533, attracted the attention of legal commentators as early as the 17th century,[14] but associations in the ancient world caught the imagination of scholars and individuals only in the late 19th century. Prior to this, interest was shown only in *eranoi* as credit associations.[15]

The Romanists have exercised considerable influence on the way ancient Greek associations have been treated. They have effectively set the methodological framework according to the Pandectist tradition.[16] A comparison will illustrate this point. Waltzing (1895) starts his study of Roman associations with the question of autonomy, foundation and dissolution and then continues with membership, hierarchy, offices and officers and finally finances. In a similar way, Poland (1909), after studying the different names used for associations and their deities, devotes his third chapter (pp. 271-329) to the foundation of the associations and their membership, his fourth chapter (pp. 330-452) to organisational affairs (constitution, administration, officers, honours and penalties) and his fifth chapter (pp. 453-498) to finances.

There are two reasons for the surge of interest in the 19th century; by the 1890s a considerable number of inscriptions from the ancient Greek world had been published; and more significantly, the late 19th century saw much socio-political debate about the primacy of the individual or of the group as the component of the society.[17] Foucart (1873) was the first to provide an *ad hoc* account of private cult associations. He was concerned not only with legal features but with the implications of the activities of these groups for society as a whole. However, he followed a positivist agenda in dealing with cult associations. This approach was also followed later by the two most prominent scholars of ancient Greek associations, Ziebarth (1896) and Poland (1909). The structure of their books reflects the structure of the part of their

---

13. See also the very selective review in Jones (1999: 21-24).

14. See Caillemer (1872: 3 n. 2).

15. M. van Holst (1832) *De eranis veterum graecorum* mentioned in Caillemer (1872: 3).

16. For a similar assessment of the history of Roman *collegia*, see Nijf (1998: 5-9).

17. In this respect see the highly polemical work of C.O. Ward (1888) *The ancient lowly*. The author's interpretation is almost always biased, if not incorrect, since he tries to demonstrate that cult associations in antiquity represented organisations of the non-priveleged strata of the population, organised for their benefit and usually assumed forms similar to that of author's contemporary trade unions. Brief historiographical account in Seland (1996: 111).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

contemporary civil codes concerning associations.[18] The methodological implications of this approach will be discussed below; what I would like to underline here is that their contribution should not be underestimated. Poland (1909) copiously collected and classified all the available material and his book still provides the only collection of epigraphical evidence on associations in the ancient Greek world.[19] The holistic character of their enquiries into the associative life in antiquity was able to build a general theory on ancient associations (either legal or historical).

W.S. Ferguson was the first to proceed to a detailed analysis of a particular association. In his article "The Attic Orgeones" he discussed all the pieces of evidence concerning exclusively *orgeones* in ancient Athens. In this way he singled out certain particularities of these groups and a dichotomy in the worship of local heroes and imported deities, the former characterized by sacrifices, the latter by imported ritual.

In more recent times, associations have been considered in the context of other problems. For example, problems of land and real security have led to new considerations about the role of *eranistai* and other groups in the economic life of ancient Athens.[20] The never ending interest in political history and political groupings (*hetaireiai* and *synomosiai*) has helped to crystallise our view of these groups, as transitory alliances of individuals in the assembly.[21] At the same time historians of ancient Greek religion began to elaborate their own opinion about cult associations. Nilsson (1955), the most distinguished historian of religion of his generation, made claims about the Mycenaean origin of hero cults transferred through *orgeones* to archaic and classical Athens.[22]

---

18. See the German civil code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch) art. 21-59 and the Greek Civil Code art. 61-106.

19. Similar assessment by Seland (1996: 111).

20. See Fine, J.V.A. (1951) *Horoi. Studies in Mortgage, Real Security, and Land Tenure in Ancient Athens*. Baltimore (Hesperia Supplement 19); Finley (1951), Hammond (1961), Vondeling (1961), Maier (1969), Benvenuti, P. (1980) *Eranos*, Diss. Padova, Millett (1991) and Cohen (1993).

21. Sartori, F. (1957) *Le eterie nella vita politica ateniese del VI e V secolo A.C.* Roma, Ghinatti, F. (1970) *I gruppi politici ateniesi fino alle guerre persiane*, Roma, and Pecorella-Longo, Ch. (1971) *"Eterie" e gruppi politici nell'Atene del IV secolo a. C.*, Firenze, Aurenche, O. (1974) *Les groupes d'Alcibiade, de Leogoras et de Teucros*, Paris, Jones (1999: 222-26) and MacGlew, J.F. (1999) "Politics on the margins: the Athenian hetairiai in 415 B.C." *Historia* 48, 1-29. For the nature of *hetaireiai*, see Meier (1984: 45-62); Strauss (1986) and Hansen (1991).

22. The recent accounts of Athenian religion by Burkert (1987), Parker (1996) and Mikalson (1998) avoid the extremes of Nilsson's interpretations and introduce a sensible approach in the study of religious associations.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

The last twenty-five years have been a period of intensive research on *demos*, citizenship, public functions and institutions.[23] At the same time, certain social attitudes and models of behaviour have been re-evaluated and are now seen from a different perspective, namely that of the preponderance of sociability over other aspects of social life. In this context, private cult associations are regarded not only as strongholds of traditional piety, but venues where social relations are forged, or broken, and social values are reproduced.

On method

1. Garland (1987: 102) in the most recent study of Peiraeus, relegates evidence about associations to the category of inscriptions full-of-cliches, which repeat with predictable regularity the honours attributed to officials. But these inscriptions were not designed to convey information on politics, history, society or religion. By contrast, Whitehead (1993) using similar material, mainly from demes, shows how such evidence can reveal underlying cardinal social values. Although these inscriptions are repetitive and highly stylised, they explain more about the expectations and the values of both the individuals and the groups. The problem is how to read this material or, to put it differently, what questions to ask and to try to answer. Our epigraphical sources have been written and published in order to honour the individuals, to keep their memory alive and to motivate others to emulate them. As such they encapsulate the most treasured values of Athenian society.

2. It was suggested that the treatment of private cult associations as diverse as *orgeones*, *thiasotai*, *eranistai*, *Asklepiastai* etc. as one category might be misleading. However, cult association is a broad-based and descriptive category. The main criteria for inclusion are, i) independence from the *polis*, ii) the preponderance of cultic activities, and iii) the self - perception of individual members and the identification of the group they belong to as something distinguishable from other similar groups.[24] Therefore, cult association is nothing more than a Weberian ideal type, useful in pinpointing the divergence of societal organisational models.

3. The majority of scholars have assumed that private cult associations developed in Athens largely from the second half of the 4th century and

---

23. *Genos*: Bourriot (1976) and Jones (1999: 242-48); tribe. Roussel (1976) and Jones (1999: 151-94); phratry. Lambert (1993) and Jones (1999: 195-220); *naukraria:* Billigmeier. J. & A. Dusing. (1981) " The origins and the function of naukraroi at Athens" *TAPhA* 111. 11-16 and the summary in Manville (1990: 75-76); *trittys*. Traill (1986).

24. For a similar categorisation. see Schmitt-Pantel (1990: 205).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

onwards.[25] Certain factors are presumed to have contributed to this effect, among others, the decline of the city-state as an autonomous political unit on the international stage, the cosmopolitanism of the extended Greek world and the increase in the importance of commerce and trade in the culturally unified basin of the eastern Mediterranean.

This approach dates back to the 19th century and is based a) on the fact that the majority of documents come from the second half of the 4th century and the 3rd century so that it is difficult to trace any manifestations of collective activity that existed earlier, and b) on the assumption that any kind of collective activity will resemble our contemporary forms, such as trade unions, clubs, charity associations etc.

However, the preponderance of 4th- and 3rd-century inscriptions in the record is merely an aspect of the more general fact that the majority of all inscriptions found are dated to the 4th century or later. The "epigraphic habit" is developing and spreading in different sections of Athenian society in the early Hellenistic era, as the amount of decrees published by demes and tribes proves. No special conclusions can be drawn, therefore, about private cult associations.[26] For an earlier period, there is only speculation.[27] Cult associations undoubtedly existed before the 4th century; they may have been scattered all around Attica in local shrines or *hiera*,[28] following their own rhythm of communal living and thus being imperceptible. For the majority of the surviving inscriptions come from the urbanised centres of Athens and Peiraieus and their immediate surroundings, and not all associations had the means to erect a monument. Furthermore, as Humphreys (1978: 256) suggested, the particular circumstances accompanying the outbreak of the Peloponnesian war (plague, concentration of the rural population inside the walls, increase of social mobility) may have led to the loosening or even breaking of traditional alliances and allegiances. Several allegations of intrusions into the civic body reveal that the security

---

25. An excellent case is made by Swiderek (1990: 264); see also Garland (1996: 97-99), Pakkanen (1996: 23), Kloppenborg (1996: 17) and Jones (1999: 222). For individualism in Hellenistic religion, see Martin (1994).

26. For similar conclusion see Hedrick (1999: 391) and Jones (1999: 8-9). For scepticism on cult associations as Hellenistic phenomenon, see Bourriot (1987: 436) and Mikalson (1998: 2-3 & 155).

27. The graffito Νεομηνιαστέων from Olbia in modern Ukraine (Dubois, *IGDOlbia* 96, end of the 6th century) provides an indication for the existence of religious groups (public or private and to what extent organised are still unknown).

28. See the case of *orgeones* from the rural deme of Prospalta (*IG* II² 2355), the association of *Mesogeioi* (*IG* II² 1246 with Parker (1996: 306) and Jones (1999: 237-39)) and the *archaia psephismata* mentioned in *Ag.* 16, 161.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

mechanisms of the pre-war order had lost their effectiveness.[29] Survival in an urban context meant sometimes fostering new contacts, while preserving some old, indispensable ones. Any explanation of the sudden emergence of private cult associations in the epigraphical record should take into account these historical events.

4. Ambitious attempts at a holistic approach to associations in antiquity ignore crucial limits in terms of space and time. It is untenable to claim that associations in Athens had identical functions with associations in Asia Minor, Delos, Rhodes or Egypt. It is also evident that testimonies of the 2nd or the 3rd century A.D. cannot help us to understand analogous phenomena of the 4th or 3rd century. Building the picture of private cult associations in the ancient Greek world is largely a Sisyphian task. Such groups are, more often than not, vehicules for the expression of local identities and particularities; accordingly, their legal standing might have been different from place to place. Therefore, it would be prudent to recognize from the very beginning the existing geographical and chronological discontinuities in the record and not to try to fill in the gaps in our information with likelihoods and parallels, which could be misleading.

5. Scholars usually assume that the terms *orgeones*, *thiasos-thiasotai* and *eranos-eranistai* can be used interchangeably since it is difficult on the basis of epigraphical material to distinguish the terms neatly.[30] I think it preferable to follow the nomenclature used by the groups themselves; it is part of their self-definition. There is no need to lump *orgeones* together with *thiasotai* or other groups if they call themselves *orgeones*.

This book explores three different categories of question in the respective chapters. In chapter 1, I discuss the available literary and epigraphical evidence for private cult associations calling themselves *orgeones*, *thiasotai*, *eranistai* or a name deriving from the worshipped deity. In chapter 2, I examine the organisational structure of these groups. In chapter 3, a more technical theme, namely questions of legal standing, will be tackled. Was there any place for associations in the idiosyncratic legal framework of the

---

29. Recently Brashear (1993: 41) has critisized the view that the surge of associations is due to the expansion of urban life and the consequent "impersonalization" of human relationships. However, his structural-evolutionist contention about associations as mainly "Männerbund" is not convincing.

30. See Parker (1996: 333). Several scholars (e.g. Littman (1990: 21), Pakkanen (1996: 47), Mikalson (1998: 141)) use the terms *thiasos* and *thiasotai* interchangeably; but in Hellenistic Athens associations of *thiasotai* very rarely called themselves *thiasoi*. Others, on the basis of *IG* II² 1316 and a lemma in Photios' *Lexicon* (θ 60), identify *orgeones* with *thiasotai* (e.g. Goceva (1974: 81), Petrocheilos (1992), Lambert (1993: 75 n.70), Pakkanen (1996: 52)).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Athenian city? To what extent can we apply modern concepts about autonomy? Can we speak about state indifference? How did these groups conduct their business? Was there any particular mode of founding and dissolving an association? In chapter 4, problems of social standing of the group will be tackled; what was the social status of the group's members? What were the social relations among the members and the underlying values? Were private cult associations agents of integration or contexts of marginality? Was there a case of patronage and/or *euergetism*? At the end an alternative approach will be explored, according to which the social importance of these groups is underscored. It may seem odd but I decided to leave aside any questions of rituals and celebrations of religious associations, since they are better treated in their natural context, in books about religion. I also omitted the treatment of cult associations set up by virtue of a testament, such as the 3rd-2nd century foundations from Kos, Halikarnassos and Thera; they are the by-product of commemoration for the dead and are all attested outside Athens.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

CHAPTER ONE

PIECES OF EVIDENCE

A. ORGEONES

The first type of cult association I am going to examine appears in the documentation under the name *orgeones*. The name itself has caused considerable discussion about its origin and connection with the social history of early Athens. Therefore, it seems necessary to review, if only briefly, the origin of the word and the literary testimonia which can provide evidence about the meaning of the word at a given historical moment, enabling us to map out the shifts in the meaning.

The great majority of evidence for *orgeones* comes from Attica. The only references from outside Athens come either from a neighbouring area (Megara), or from a city closely related to Athens (Teos), or from Athenian clerouchies (Lemnos).[1] The exceptional character of these pieces of evidence confirms that *orgeones* were a mainly Athenian type of association, linked with the social, religious, political and historical particularities of this area.

---

1. Megara: *IG* VII 33 (1st century): [Οἵδ]ε ὀργεῶ[ν]ες [τ]ῶν [θεῶν] /Σάτυρος Φιλίππο[υ] /Φιλοκράτης Φιλίππου /Φωκιάδης Τεισίου /Καλλένικος Εὐθύμου. This inscription was recorded by Cyriacus of Ancona in Megara and it is now lost. An Athenian origin cannot be excluded, notwithstanding the names in ll. 4-5. Teos: the inscription in *BCH* 4 (1880) 164ff (= Michel 1307) (middle of the 2nd century), which refers to ὀργεῶνες οἱ σὺν Ἀθηνοδότωι Μητροδώρου, and a fragment from Antimachus' Λύδης Γενεά (see below) are the only evidence for ὀργεῶνες in Asia Minor. Their value as evidence of non-Athenian ὀργεῶνες associations can be doubted although Teos was a member of the first Athenian league [e.g. *IG* I^3 262 col. II. 12 (451/0)] and hence influences cannot be excluded. Lemnos: *IG* XII (8) 19 and 21 (= Finley 107-108, 110) (end 4th century).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Orgeones are to be distinguished, as Ferguson (1944: 73) first suggested, into *orgeones* of heroes and *orgeones* of gods and goddesses.[2] The cult criterion is a safe one as far as it concerns the typology: it offers clear-cut, relatively homogeneous and easily distinguishable categories. But it does not take account of chronological variation and implies that both types of *orgeones* existed in parallel all the time. However, *orgeones* of gods and goddesses did not appear before the last decades of the 5th century. Archeological evidence suggests that *orgeones* of heroes may have existed as early as the late 6th or 5th century but that they did not last later than the 3rd century. The introduction of cult associations in historical time establishes a vertical distinction into types of *orgeones* developed earlier and those introduced later, a distinction that cuts across Ferguson's classification. Like any classification, the chronological distribution suggested above cannot claim universality or applicability under all circumstances. Its advantage lies in the disclosure of a chronological pattern of activity, which implies a number of organisational differentiations.

As early as the 2nd century A.D. attempts were made to find a satisfactory etymological origin for *orgeones*. Harpocration in his *Dictionary of the Ten Orators* proposed three possible origins, i) from *orgia* meaning sacral rites, ii) from *oregein to cheire* meaning a sacral gesture, in the context of worship and iii) from *orgas* meaning fertile land dedicated to gods and, therefore, remaining uncultivated.[3] Modern explanations do not seem to go further. *Orgia*, as Chantraine (1968: 816) points out, is considered as the most probable origin of the word, referring to Dionysiac cult; but there is no evidence of any *orgeones* of Dionysus earlier than the 2nd century (*IG* II^2 1325 and 1326). An attempt to derive the word from *oregein* presents more difficulties, since there is the stem *oreg-* instead of *orge-*.

It has, also, been suggested that the origin of *orgeones* can be traced back to the Mycenaean era. In particular, the editors of the land tenure tablets from Pylos claimed that the word *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo* is an earlier form of the Homeric *orgiones*.[4] This interpretation was severely criticised on linguistic

---

2. See more recently Ustinova (1996: 230) for an implicit use of Ferguson's categories.

3. Similarly *LSJ* s.v. ὀργάς and Chantraine (1968: 815). For a location of the famous *orgas* see Ober, J. (1987) *Fortress Attica. Defense of the Athenian land frontier 404-322 B.C.*, 225-26. Leiden. Discussion of *hiera orgas* and the attico-megarian border: Daverio Rocchi, G. (1988) *Frontiera e confini nella Grecia antica*, 186-94. Roma. For a possible connection with *orgeones*, Talamo (1992: 40).

4. Ventris, M. & J. Chadwick (1956) *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, 2nd ed. 1973. Cambridge: Er 312.7: *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo e-re-mo to-so-jo pe-ma* (the unencumbered land of the cult association seed at so much, p. 266) and Un 718.11: *o-da-a wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo ka-ma* (and similarly the estate of the cult association will give, p. 282-83).

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

grounds[5] and other interpretations were put forward.

The likeliest explanation is that the word *orgeones* did not originally designate participants in a group, as the meaning of the word in the classical era and later implies. Rather, it denoted those people who perform certain mystic or other kind of rituals (*orgia*)[6] in a sacred place (*orgas*), priests or divinators. The words *orgia*, *orgas* and *orgeones* may be related because all are associated with a sacral quality. The existence of water in these sacred places would have facilitated some kind of purification rituals. This interpretation has the advantage of conforming essentially to the meaning of the word in the early literary references. The common origin of these words should be the stem **Ferg-*, from which the words *erdo* and *ergon* come. A derivation from *orgia* cannot be excluded a priori, but one should bear in mind that in that case these *orgia* do not have any relation with the Bacchic ones.

The attempt to trace certain hints of the earlier meaning and possible function of *orgeones* from etymology does not offer any decisive evidence for or against any interpretation. The centre of the investigation must shift to the use of the word in literary testimonia.

Literary evidence

In the historical era the word *orgeones* occurs in poetry and oratory; the earliest occurence is in the 7th-century *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. The Hymn has caused fervent discussions about its textual integrity and its date.[7] Lines 388-390: "And then indeed Phoibos Apollon pondered in his mind what kind of men he should bring in to celebrate his rites and be his ministers (*orgionas*) in rocky Pytho" reveal a link between *orgionas* and a kind of priesthood, brought from Crete, in the service of Apollo, at Delphi.[8]

---

5. For criticism see Palmer, L.R. (1963) *The interpretation of Mycenaean Greek texts*, 214. Oxford; for suggestions see Deroy, L. & M. Gerard (1965) *Le cadastre Mycènien de Pylos*, 58-64. Rome and the brief discussion in Aura-Jorro, F. (ed.) (1993) *Diccionario Micenico* II s.v. (with earlier bibliography).

6. See the recent discussion in Motte & Pirenne-Delforge (1992: 119-40) according to which ὄργια cannot be interpreted uniformly as ceremonies but can signify in some cases cult objects used in celebrations. They also claim that in archaic and classical times *orgia* were connected with *orgeones*.

7. For a general discussion of all these matters see Janko, R. (1982) *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns. Diachronic development in epic diction*, Cambridge and for the latest attempts to date precisely the poem or the compilation of two Hymns and to decide the authorship of the Delian part see Burkert, W. (1979) "Kynaithos, Polycrates and the Homeric Hymn to Apollo" in Bowersock, G.W., Burkert, W. & M.C.J. Putnam (eds) *Arktouros. Hellenic studies presented to B.M.W. Knox*, 153-62, Berlin.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Orgionas qualifies the noun *anthropous*, which in its turn is the subject of *therapeusontai*, meaning to serve, and the object of *eisagagoito* meaning to introduce. In this way the poet offers a clue about the role of these persons as being appointed by the divine will; they are the most able to take care of the sacral affairs of the oracle and of the god. This is reflected also in the lexicographers and especially in Harpocration, who comments "the poets were calling by this name simply the priests".[9] The word appears with a similar meaning in Aeschylus' *Mysoi*,[10] Antimachus' lost tragedy *Lydes Genea*,[11] Hermesianax's *Leontis*[12] and Cl. Aelianus' *Peri Pronoias*.[13]

I. There are three references to 4th-century orators, who according to the lexicographers, composed speeches in which one of the litigants is an association of *orgeones*. In particular, according to Harpocration, Isaeus wrote a speech entitled *Against orgeones*, from which two brief fragments dealing with property disputes are preserved; in Lysias' *On the estate of Theopompos* there was a mention of this word. Finally, according to the

---

8. *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 388-390: καὶ τότε δὴ κατὰ θυμὸν ἐφράζετο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων/ οὓς τινας ἀνθρώπους ὀργίονας εἰσαγάγοιτο / οἳ θεραπεύσονται Πυθοῖ ἔνι πετρηέσσῃ, as translated by Athanassakis, A.N. (1976) *The Homeric Hymns*, 26. London.

9. Harp. o 28: οἱ μέντοι ποιηταὶ ἔταττον τοὔνομα ἁπλῶς ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν. The comment is repeated in Phot. s.v. and Sud. o 511.

10. *TrGF*, vol. 3, frg. 144: ποταμοῦ Καΐκου χαῖρε πρῶτος ὀργεών, εὐχαῖς δὲ σῴζοις δεσπότας παιωνίαις (Farewell, first priest of river Kaikos, with your healing prayers may you save lords).

11. *IEG* II, 40 no. 67: Γενεᾷ Καβάρνους θῆκεν ἀβακλέας ὀργειῶνας (Kabarnos' descendants were appointed as glorious priests). Recently in a poem inscribed on stone from the 2nd-century Halikarnassos, published by Isager, S. (1998) "The pride of Halikarnassos. Editio princeps of an inscription from Salmakis" *ZPE* 123, 1-23 (now in *SEG* 48.1330, *BE* 1999, no 490 and 2000, nos 60 & 569 and the remarks of Lloyd-Jones, H. (1999) "The pride of Halicarnassos" *ZPE* 124, 1-14 and *ZPE* 127 (1999) 63-65) the form ἀγακλέας ὀργειῶνας is preserved in lines 11-12: Ζεὺς δὲ πατὴρ Γῆς υἷας ἀγακλέας ὀργειῶνας/ θῆκεν, οἳ ἀρρήτων πρόσπολοί εἰσι δόμων (Father Zeus made the sons of Earth famous ritual attendants who guard the secret dwelling). Note the similarity of the spelling ὀργειῶνας in the Homeric Hymn and the passages from Halikarnassos and Teos. For an interpretation of Καβάρνους see *LSJ* s.v. and Chantraine (1968: 477).

12. In Powell, J.U. (ed) (1925) *Collectanea Alexandrina*, 98 ll.17-20, Oxford (= Ath. 13.597d): ἥ τε πολὺν μύστῃσιν Ἐλευσῖνος παρὰ πέζαν εὐασμὸν κρυφίων ἐξεφόρει λογίων, Ῥάριον ὀργειῶνα νόμῳ διαπομπεύουσα Δήμητρᾳ· γνωστὴ δ' ἐστὶ καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδῃ (and she, beside Eleusis' strand, expounded to the initiates the loud, sacred voice of mystic oracles, as she duly escorted the priest through the Rarian plain to honour Demeter and she is known even in Hades). Note that the word ὀργιαστὶς occurs in two 1st-century inscriptions (*IG* II^2 3507 and 3508) in an Eleusinian cult context.

13. Frg. 10, ed. Teubner, Leipzig 1866 (Sud. o 511): τῶν ἐξ Ἐλευσῖνος ὀργεώνων εἷς (Of the priests from Eleusis, one).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

anonymous compilator of *Names of Legal actions*, Dinarchus mentioned *orgeones* in two of his speeches.[14]

Apart from these fragments, the occurrence of the word in the speech of Isaeus concerning the estate of Menekles (*On the estate of Menekles*, §§14, 16, 17 and 45), composed in c. 355, is crucial, since it unveils a very different meaning of the word. The last three passages[15] have little to contribute in the discussion about *orgeones*. They reveal that manifestations of solidarity among the members of this particular type of association were expected, such as testifying or otherwise supporting in litigation. This expression of solidarity seems to be a common feature of almost any kind of association at that time, since it exists already among *phrateres* and among *demotai*.[16] It is significant that even the name of the worshipped deity is not mentioned. Probably the name of a minor deity and its orgeonic association was not at all important in this case or it was a well-known affiliation; participation in the association was the most predominant feature.

In my opinion Isaeus, *Peri Menekleous klerou*, 14 is the key.[17] The speaker claims that his father, being healthy and sane, adopted him, introduced him to his *phrateres* and registered him to his deme and *orgeones*. Introduction

---

14. Lys. frg. 58 (ed. Thalheim); Is. frg. 35.26-27 (ed. Thalheim); Din. frgs. 13.1, 18.3, 65.2 (ed. Conomis).

15. §16: καὶ ὡς ἀληθῆ λέγω ταῦτα, τῆς μὲν ποιήσεως ὑμῖν τοὺς φράτορας καὶ τοὺς ὀργεῶνας καὶ τοὺς δημότας παρέξομαι μάρτυρας (To prove the truth of these statements, I will produce before you, as witnesses, the phratores, the *orgeones* and the demesmen). § 17: ὡς δὲ ἐποιήσατο, οἵ τε φράτορες καὶ οἱ δημόται καὶ οἱ ὀργεῶνες ὑμῖν μεμαρτυρήκασιν (That he did adopt a son, the phratores, the demesmen and the *orgeones* have provided evidence) and § 45: καὶ τούτων ὑμῖν τούς τε φράτορας καὶ τοὺς δημότας καὶ τοὺς ὀργεῶνας παρεσχόμην μάρτυρας (and of these things I produced before you the evidence of the phratores, the demesmen, and the *orgeones*).

16. See also the same kind of solidarity among γεννῆται in Is. 7 (*On the estate of Apollodoros*) 26: Οὕτω μὲν οὐχ οἱ γεννῆται μόνον καὶ φράτορες γεγόνασι μάρτυρες τῆς ἐμῆς ποιήσεως (In this way, not only members of genos and of phratry witnessed my adoption) and among θιασῶται Is. 9 (*On the estate of Astyphilos*) 30: αὐτοὶ ὑμῖν οἱ θιασῶται μαρτυρήσουσιν (the thiasotai themselves will testify for you). Solidarity among φυλέται, Jones (1999: 169-72). Witnesses in courts, Humphreys, S.C. (1985) "Social relations on stage: Witnesses in classical Athens" *History and Anthropology* 1, 313-69 and especially 340-46, 350-56. Rationale of adoption, Rubinstein (1993: 62-87). Legal elements in Isaeus ii, Avramovic (1997: 47-58).

17. §14 ἀλλ' ὑγιαίνων, εὖ φρονῶν, εὖ νοῶν, ποιησάμενος εἰσάγει με εἰς τοὺς φράτορας παρόντων τούτων, καὶ εἰς τοὺς δημότας με ἐγγράφει καὶ εἰς τοὺς ὀργεῶνας (but when he was sound in body and mind, and fully aware of what he was doing, he adopted me and introduced me to his phratores in the presence of my opponents and enrolled me among the demesmen and the *orgeones*).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

to the group of *orgeones* was clearly optional, since only registration to the deme was strictly necessary for citizen status. It is still arguable whether introduction to a phratry was necessary for citizenship. If this is the case, why is the testimony of fellow *orgeones* put forward so prominently? According to Lambert (1993: 75) this paragraph shows that *orgeones* were sub-groups of phratries and that the rule preserved in Philochoros' fragment (see below) meant that introduction to the phratry would have been automatic; that the real test of credentials would have taken place in the group of *orgeones*.

Nevertheless, in other parts of the speech the speaker refers extensively to the results of adoption, which will not only provide an heir for the endangered *oikos* but someone who will continue the adopter's name, provide a decent burial and perform commemorative rites over the tomb.[18] The recurrence of these religious-ritual duties in inheritance cases proves that they were not empty gesture but were taken seriously into account. The cultic element in phratries was limited to the worship of *Zeus Herkeios*, *Athena Phratria*, *Apollon Patroos*; participation in other groups besides phratry may have provided local religious identity. Membership in the same cult association is one more proof that the adoptee retains intact the religious allegiances of his adopter. Thus, the testimony of *orgeones* has great weight for Isaeus' case and this is the reason why the speaker invokes repeatedly their testimony. In other words, the importance of this passage for the speaker does not, as Wyse (1904) thought, lie in the procedure of admission to the association as a proof of citizen status but in the assured continuity (familial and religious) of the *oikos* of the deceased. Finally, *orgeones* are mentioned in the Aristotelian *Eudemian Ethics* as an

18. Is. 2 (*On the estate of Menekles*) 36: καὶ ἐγὼ μὲν ὁ ποιητὸς ἐκεῖνόν τε ζῶντα ἐθεράπευον, καὶ αὐτός καὶ ἡ ἐμὴ γυνή, θυγάτηρ οὖσα τουτουί Φιλωνίδου, καὶ τῷ ἐμῷ παιδίῳ ἐθέμην τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἐκείνου, ἵνα μὴ ἀνώνυμος ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ γένηται, καὶ τελευτήσαντα ἔθαψα ἀξίως ἐκείνου τε καὶ ἐμαυτοῦ, καὶ ἐπίθημα καλὸν ἐπέθηκα, καὶ τὰ ἔνατα καὶ τἄλλα πάντα ἐποίησα τὰ περὶ τὴν ταφὴν ὡς οἷόν τε κάλλιστα, ὥστε τοὺς δημότας ἐπαινεῖν ἅπαντας (I, the adopted son, with the aid of my wife, the daughter of Philonides here, tended Menekles while he lived and gave his name to my little son, in order that his family might not lack a representative. On his death I buried him in a manner befitting both him and myself, and I erected a fine monument to him and celebrated the commemorative ceremony on the ninth day and performed all the other rites at the tomb in the best manner possible, so that I won the praise of all the members of my deme); also 10 and 46. For the importance of the sacral duties, Harrison (1968-71:1.123); see also Rubinstein (1993: 68-75) and Lambert (1993: 75). This passage of Isaeus cannot give credence to Bruck's (1926: 240) view that *orgeones* were for the humble people what *gene* were for the noble.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

example of an association and *orgeonika* in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistai* as a category of feast.[19]

It is evident, from all these passages, that an identification of *orgeones* with some kind of priesthood was the dominant feature of the meaning of the word, at least in a poetical context, as late as the Hellenistic era.[20] Poets may have used it to give the audience an impression of tradition by using words with their old, vague, and legendary meaning, as Poland (1909: 13) already remarked. It should be noticed that only in our late sources are *orgeones* associated with the cult of Demeter. Also only in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* is the word associated with the Apollonian cult. Demeter's cult was connected with initiation and mysteries and in this respect the word may denote the persons performing these rites and may have been adopted by poets for that reason. The occurrence of the word in the Homeric Hymn in connection with Cretan priests may well imply the importation of certain rites of purification from Crete.[21] However, the occurences in the 4th-century lawcourts speeches point to another feature of *orgeones*, namely their role as contexts of solidarity and sociability for their members. It is this characteristic which comes to the forefront of the investigation when a fragment from Philochoros' *Atthis* and a passage in Justinian's *Digest* 47.22.4 are examined.

Philochoros on orgeones

FGrHist 328, F35a: περὶ δὲ τῶν ὀργεώνων γέγραφε καὶ Φιλόχορος· τοὺς δὲ φράτορας ἐπάναγκες δέχεσθαι καὶ τοὺς ὀργεῶνας καὶ τοὺς ὁμογάλακτας οὕς καὶ γεννῆτας καλοῦμεν (about *orgeones* Philochoros too has written "and the phratores shall compulsorily admit the *orgeones* and the *homogalaktes*, whom we also call *gennetai*").

The fragment of Philochoros raises more questions than it answers, and

---

19. Aristot. *EE* 8.9.3 (1241b 25): Αἱ δ' ἄλλαι κοινωνίαι εἰσὶν μόριον τῶν τῆς πόλεως κοινωνιῶν, οἷον ἡ τῶν φρατέρων ἢ τῶν ὀργέων<ων> ἢ αἱ χρηματιστικαὶ [ἔτι πολιτεῖαι] (The other partnerships are a constituent part of the partnerships of the state - for example that of phrateres or *orgeones*, or business partnerships). Ath. 5.185e-186a: τῶν δὲ νῦν δείπνων προνοοῦντες οἱ νομοθέται τά τε φυλετικά δεῖπνα καὶ τὰ δημοτικὰ προσέταξαν, ἔτι δὲ τοὺς θιάσους καὶ τὰ φρατρικὰ καὶ πάλιν τὰ ὀργεωνικὰ λεγόμενα. (The lawgivers, providing for the dinners we have today, ordained both the tribe and the deme dinners, and moreover for the thiasoi, the phratry dinners, and again those which are called "orgeonic"). Fisher (1988: 1180) claims that the *thiasoi* and *orgeones* mentioned in this passage have some connection with phratries.

20. See Kearns (1989: 74).

21. See Defradas (1954: 71) about the association of the Delphic oracle with Crete and purification in general.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

therefore, it is important to remind some fundamental facts. We deal with a fragment, severed from any kind of context; we do not know whether it was part of a historical narrative or a digression; we do not know whether it is a verbatim quotation of a law or a paraphrase. Keeping in mind these troubling reminders we can briefly review the scholarly discussion about the historical context of the fragment, its date and nature.

We can distinguish two main streams. The first starts off with two postulates: a) that all Athenians were either *orgeones* or *gennetai*: *orgeones* constituting the mass of commoners and *gennetai* the nobility, and b) that participation in the phratry meant full citizenship. These social groups were marked with particular interests and features, such as the preservation of the privileged position of *gennetai* in the phratry. In this context three evolutionary stages of the traditional interpretation can be detected. First, the Philochorean fragment was considered as recording the answer to the demand of commoners to be registered in the phratries, as a measure of establishing political and social equality.[22] According to the second scenario, this fragment guaranteed protection for the commoners or *orgeones*. Although they were members of the phratries, since Draco's law on homicide (*IG* I^3 104) presupposes the existence of *phratores* for every Athenian, they were threatened with exclusion by different means.[23] Finally, the most elaborate hypothesis in this group sees in the fragment the outcome of an unsuccessful attempt of *gennetai* to expel *orgeones* from the phratries; because *orgeones* were afraid of being expelled again, a law was issued in order to safeguard their position. Here one may include, also, the view, which considers the Philochorean fragment as a means of naturalization of aliens. According to Hammond (1961: 176-98), *orgeones* were naturalized aliens, refugees of the Dorian invasion and the Ionian migration.[24] Therefore, the population of Attica consisted of *gennetai*, that is native citizens, and *orgeones*, naturalized aliens and their descendants. Other scholars wanted to interpret this confrontation in religious terms where *gennetai* were the protectors of the official religion and *orgeones* were the deprived mass of clanless, and therefore vulnerable, commoners limited to the traditional worship of chthonic deities.[25]

---

22. See Francotte (1907: 10), Radin (1910: 47), Jacoby, *FGrHist* III B, 322, Hammond (1961: 80-81), and Ehrenberg (1968: 55).

23. See Guarducci (1935: 16), Jeanmaire (1939: 139), Pantazopoulos (1948: 101), Hignett (1952: 391), Wade-Gery (1958: 152), and Helly, B. (1970) "La convention de Basaidai" *BCH* 94, 188.

24. Followed by Will (1972: 566) and Biscardi (1982: 49 and 90). Ustinova (1996) speaks of integration.

25. Nilsson (1951: 160-61), Jones (1956: 165) and Vernant (1965: 357). Recently,

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

As for the exact date of the law mentioned in the fragment, those who accept this view agree that it comes from a digression of Philochoros' narrative about the events between the years c. 464 and c. 400, but that originally it belonged to the context of the Solonian legislation.[26]

The second interpretation differs radically and is based on Andrewes' (1961: 1-15) criticism of the traditional view. In particular, he expressed four decisive objections to the traditional interpretation of the fragment:

1. The phrase *epanagkes dechesthai* must mean that *phratores* have no other choice but to accept *orgeones* and *gennetai* in their structure. Thus, every candidate would be admitted, without any prior scrutiny.
2. The epigraphic evidence implies that *orgeones* were fairly small groups with wealthy members in their ranks. In any case, it is impossible to include the whole of the commoners.
3. Andrewes describes the *post* and *ante quem* limits of the period covered in the fourth book of Philochoros' *Atthis* as between 464 and 395/4 and, in general, he maintains that it included the events between Ephialtes' reform and the end of the Peloponnesian War.
4. He reveals the incongruity of the traditional interpretation, according to which *gennetai*, being the nobles, had a powerful influence over admissions to phratries; but the provision in the fragment is intended to protect *gennetai* from such a change against them in the future. The object of the verb *dechesthai* is both *orgeones* and *homogalaktes*, which mean that the implied privileged position of *gennetai*, a principle of the traditional interpretation, cannot be justified. Long before Andrewes,

---

Talamo (1992: 33-43) expressed the view that *orgeones* were "gruppi di confine e di margine" in pre-Solonian Athens.

26. In favour of the Solonian origin of the law mentioned in the Philochorean fragment are: Guarducci (1935: 16), Ferguson (1944: 69), Pantazopoulos (1948: 101), Nilsson (1951: 159 and 1955: 710), Jacoby *FGrHist* III B Suppl. 1.321, Wade-Gery (1958: 152), Oliver, J. (1980) "From gennetai to curiales" *Hesperia* 49, 36, n.19 (now in Oliver, J.H. (1983) *The civic tradition and Roman Athens*, 1-33, Baltimore), Talamo (1992: 37) and Ustinova (1996: 239). Recently, Theodoridis, Chr. (2002) "Eine unbeachtete Buchangabe zum Bruchstück des Philochoros über die attischen Orgeonen" *ZPE* 138, 40-42, has brought forward a fragment of the 3rd book including a reference to *orgeones*, which supports a Solonian origin. The Cleisthenian origin of the fragment is supported by Toepffer, J. (1889) *Attische Genealogie*, 9, Berlin, Rohde (1893: 139) followed by Ferguson (1911: 216), Busolt-Swoboda (1920-26: 2.252), Thomson (1949: 107), Will (1972: 566-67), Leiwo (1997: 105) and Sakellariou, M. (1999) *Ἡ Ἀθηναϊκὴ Δημοκρατία*, 100, Herakleio. Others avoid taking a firm position on the problem, e.g. Hignett (1952: 390), or support the view that this fragment includes a provision that probably was repeated more than once, De Sanctis (1898: 345) and Levêque, P. & P. Vidal-Naquet (1964) *Clisthène l' Athénien*, 44, n.4 and 5, Paris.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Busolt-Swoboda (1920-26: 2.252) realized this inaccuracy and elaborated a more sophisticated theory, according to which the Philochorean fragment had a double purpose; first, to ensure the admission of *orgeones* and second, to protect the status of *gennetai*, in a possible future change.

Andrewes (1961: 13) suggested that the fragment of Philochoros' has to be considered as a clause from the same law as a fragment in Krateros (*FGrHist* 342 F4), which he dated in the 430s as a result of the Periclean legislation on citizenship.[27] The fragment is supposed to concede to *orgeones* and *gennetai* the privilege of being registered in the phratries without any prior scrutiny. In the same school of thought we can include Lambert (1993: 46-49). He also considers the Philochorean fragment as part of the Periclean law on citizenship, firmly dated in the 450s. He regards *orgeones* and *gennetai* as sub-groups of the phratries.

Bourriot[28] proposed a different approach, regarding especially the notion of *genos* and the relation between *gennetai* and *homogalaktes*.[29] Although he shares Andrewes' objections about the composition of the Athenian population exclusively from *orgeones* and *gennetai*, he believes that the Athenian citizens in the 4th century could be divided into three categories: a) those who were members only of phratries, b) those who were in addition members of *orgeones* and c) those who were *gennetai* as well as members of phratries, according to the evidence, mainly from Isaeus. For Bourriot, Philochoros' fragment is not a law but rather "un adage", that is, a long standing custom[30] and he has freely translated it as follows: "Phra-

---

27. For the text of this law, see *AthPol* 26.4 and Plu. *Per*. 37.2-5. Andrewes' interpretation is followed by Patterson (1981) and with some reservations by Davies (1996: 625). Cf. Talamo (1992: 35).

28. For a summary of Bourriot's (1976) book in English see Smith, R.C. (1985) "The clans of Athens and the historiography of the archaic period", *EMC/CV* 29, 51-61.

29. Bourriot (1976: 663ff and 1367ff) believes that the name *gennetai* designated the members of the royal and sacerdotal families, while the name *homogalaktes* qualifies rural communities. His primary evidence about the identification of the latter comes from Aristot. *Pol*. 1252. Littman (1990: 19) suggests that the word *homogalaktes* designates the common matrilineal descendance of the members of a *genos*. His view relies exclusively on anthropological parallels from Nuer society but no evidence for Athens is provided. See also Derks (1995), who, having criticized severely the earlier views on *homogalaktes* and their social-institutional role, argues for a literal interpretation of the term as sharers of the same milk, in other words signifying the nomadic-pastoralist element. However, he does not deal with the problem posed by Philochoros' fragment.

30. Wilamowitz (1893: 2.269-74) expressed a similar view about it. He maintained that it is a part of a phratry law; the main objection concerns the coercive nature of the preserved text in the phrase ἐπάναγκες δέχεσθαι. Cf. Nilsson (1951: 159) and Roussel (1976: 133).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

phores will register compulsorily all the people who were recognised as legitimate children in other trustworthy instances" (p. 656).

The use of the verb *dechesthai* is justified partly by the use of the type *mk eisdechesthai* in two cases of candidates being rejected from a phratry.[31] For *orgeones* and *homogalaktes* there was no need to be scrutinised again, since they had been recognised as legitimate in the context either of *orgeones* or *gennetai*. Thus the registration of *orgeones* and *gennetai* in its registers was a simple, time saving formality.

Both theories display certain drawbacks in the assessment of the social implications resulting from the fragment. It is difficult to accept the dominant principle of the traditional theory identifying commoners with *orgeones* and *gennetai* with the nobility, not only because of lack of evidence, but also because there were different classes of commoners and different classes of nobility. In fact, this statement seems quite simplistic and arbitrary, since it summarizes the social problem in archaic Athens, in terms of "poor" and "rich". There is no doubt that in archaic times Athens was characterized by continuous social strife. But, this does not justify us in conjecturing and building whole theories about the political role of *orgeones* based on scarcely satisfactory evidence, or in identifying them with vague class terms.[32]

Taking into account the more recent theory, we should remark, first of all, its inaccuracy in failing to consider *orgeones* of gods. In particular, the supporters of this opinion seem to ignore Ferguson's (1944: 68) argument that since 430 (or for some since the last decade of the 5th century) the title *orgeones* was borne by Athenian and Thracian devotees of Bendis; according to this theory, Thracians could be demanding their admission to phratries with the summary procedure, invoking their title as members of an *orgeones* group.[33] It can be argued that the distinction between citizen

---

31. Bourriot (1976: 626) invokes Is. 6 (*On the estate of Philoktemon*) 22: ἐπειδὴ δέ οὔθ' ὁ ὑὸς αὐτῷ Φιλοκτήμων συνεχώρει οὔθ' οἱ φράτορες εἰσεδέξαντο, ἀλλ' ἀπηνέχθη τὸ κούρειον (when, however, his son Philoktemon refused to agree to this and the *phratores* would not admit the boy, and the victim for the sacrifice of admission was removed from the altar) and 8 (*On the estate of Ciron*) 20: μήτε τοὺς φράτορας εἰσδέχεσθαι ἡμᾶς, ἀλλὰ κατηγορεῖν καὶ ἐξελέγχειν (or that the *phratores* would have admitted us and not rather objected and justified their objection).

32. Typical of such interpretation, sometimes militant, is the interpretation proposed by Pantazopoulos (1948: 97-128), Nilsson (1951: 160) and recently, with some reservations, by Vamvoukos (1979: 106) where *orgeones* are identified with the "progressive" and democratic element in Athens, and it is stressed that they had political affinities and contributed much to the establishment of democracy. Cf. Roussel (1976: 147).

33. So Leiwo (1997: 105) "it would be impossible that non-citizens could acquire citizenship by forming associations of which the members called themselves orgeones" and Mikalson (1998: 140). Lambert (per litt.) suggested to me four possible or likely

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

orgeones and foreign *orgeones* was well established and it did not leave space for the intrusion of foreigners to phratries via membership of an *orgeones* group. However, it is difficult to perceive how the setting up of a religious association in the 5th century, based presumably on the principle of voluntary participation, could be integrated into the system of phratries. In other words, were the citizens of the orgeonic associations of Bendis, already members of some phratries, re-allocated to new subdivisions of phratries? Have they kept their phratry affiliation intact and become part of a new *orgeones* group outside phratry structures? Moreover, it remains open to discussion how much the above rule would have facilitated the introduction of new members into phratries thus straining the already inefficient procedures of enrollment. Besides, scrutiny of legitimacy among *gennetai* was not always strict; in one case it is reported that *gennetai* admitted members on the basis of the father's statement (the *Kerykes*, And. 1 (*On the Mysteries)* 127) and in another case the rule of the phratry was conveniently bent in order to accommodate the capriciousness of an old man (Is. 6 (*On the estate of Philoktemon*) 20).

It is also difficult to accept Andrewes' view about the eminence and the prosperity of *orgeones*, since the epigraphic evidence (see below) proves that rich orgeonic associations were the exception rather than the rule.

The main problem is (i) the consideration, implicit or explicit, of *orgeones* as guarantors of legitimacy and their role as sub-groups of phratries, and (ii) the interpretation of Philochoros' fragment as a law or part of one. Evidence for proposition (i) is scarce, as Lambert (1993: 75), the main proponent of such a link, has recently admitted.[34] However, this inadequacy does not seem to hamper tentative interpretations. It is debatable whether the introduction of the adoptee to *orgeones*, as mentioned in Is. 2 (*On the estate of Menekles*) 14, had more to do with the validity of the adoption itself, as Lambert's hypothesis implies, than with proving the continuation of the religious allegiances of the deceased, as I have argued above. Andrewes' and Bourriot's approach presupposes the endowment of *orgeones* and *gennetai* with the prerogative of scrutinizing the legitimacy of the offspring of their members. However, the available evidence on citizenship does not confirm such a function; phratries remained the competent body for assessing and conferring legitimacy.

---

solutions; most of them consider the citizen *orgeones* of Bendis as being outside the phratry system. I would agree that Bendis' *orgeones* were outside the phratry system, because I do not share Lambert's conviction that they were sub-groups of the phratries.

34. Motte & Pirenne-Delforge (1992: 137) express a similar view. Cf. Jones (1999: 215) who thinks that even if some *orgeones* groups were part of a phratry, "they must have remained functionally independent of one another".

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Moreover, Lambert assumes that Perikles' citizenship law had a seamless and complete form, providing a general and impersonal rule (*AthPol* 26,4), procedures (Crateros' frg), exceptions (Philochoros' frg) and other features similar to modern laws; however, the piece-meal character of legislation in ancient Athens is well known (e.g. Todd 1993: 56). Given the uncertain nature of the Philochorean fragment (narrative, quotation or paraphrase) and that different phratries had different procedures of admission, it is fair to question the assumption of the rule preserved in the fragment of Philochoros as part of the Perikles' citizenship law.

Given that fundamental questions about the fragment of Philochoros remain unanswered, I prefer to consider it as a regulation and not as part of a law on citizenship. If *orgeones* were sub-groups of phratries, why did they have to be readmitted? Their names would have been recorded in the register of the phratry, unless it was destroyed or lost. The Philochorean fragment may have been part of a *nomos* of one or of several phratries, which aimed at accelerating a particular scrutiny, possibly at the end of the 5th century or very early in the 4th century. The need to facilitate enrolment arises only in exceptional circumstances when the normal procedures of admission are under considerable strain. Such a consideration underlines the temporary and specific character of the measure and avoids many of the pitfalls of the proposed dating and its association with citizenship.[35] In this context *epanagkes* would mean obligatorily and hence automatically but only for a specific occasion.[36] Phratries had to admit these individuals who

35. An interesting insight is provided by *LSCG* 173.8-12 (= *SGDI* 3705; *Syll*^{3} 1023; Michel 1003; *DGE* 253) from Halasarna of Kos, dated at the end of the 3rd or beginning of the 2nd century. There, the *phylai* participating in the sanctuaries of Apollo and Herakles, decided, after a proposal by Euphiletos, son of Parmeniskos, to register the names of the worshippers ἐπει/δὴ συνβαίνει δυσεπι/γνώστος ἦμεν τὸς ἀ/ναγεγραμμένος τῶι θε/ῶι διὰ τὸν χρόνον.

36. Since Andrewes' article the interpretation of *epanagkes* as automatically was never questioned. However, in a recently published agreement of *isopoliteia* between Xanthos and Myra in Lycia of the end of the 2nd century, the registration of the citizens of Xanthos to Myra (and vice versa) is described as follows, *SEG* 44.1218, 15-23 and 23-31: κατὰ ταὐτὰ δὲ καὶ ὅσοι/ ἂν Μυρέων βούλωνται προσγράφεσθαι πρὸ[ς]/ τὸ ἐν Ξάνθωι πολίτευμα οἴσουσιν γράμ/ματα παρὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων πρὸς τοὺς Ξαν/θίων ἄρχοντας καὶ μεθέξουσιν πάντων κα/θότι καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι Ξάνθιοι μετέχουσιν καὶ χρη/ματιοῦσιν ἐν [ἧ]ι ἂν φυλῆι ἢ δήμωι βούλωνται / καὶ οἱ πρυτάνεις προσγραφέτωσαν αὐτοὺς/ εἰς φυλὴν καὶ δῆμον ἐπάναγκες παραχρῆμα. (Similarly, citizens of Myra wishing to register as citizens of Xanthos, they have to carry letter from the officers of Myra to the officers of Xanthos, and they will participate in everything the citizens of Xanthos take part and they are going to be registered in any tribe or deme they wish; and the prytaneis will register them obligatorily in a tribe and deme immediately). In this document, the clause *epanagkes* does not preclude a process of controlling the credentials of the future citizens of Xanthos. The same may

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

could somehow prove that they were members of *orgeones* or *gennetai*; the choice of the phratry belonged to the individual but it was not separate from regional affiliations. The rule applied to those who were already members of *orgeones* and not to prospective *orgeones*.

Dig. 47.22.4

The beginning of the passage *Dig.* 47.22.4 mentions that what follows is from Gaius' fourth book on the legislation of Twelve Tables,[37] which appeared in the 2nd century A.D. The author remarks on similarities between the Roman *sodales* and the Greek *hetaireiai*[38] and cites the *lex soloniana*.

ἐὰν δὲ δῆμος ἢ φράτορες ἢ ἱερῶν ὀργίων † ἢ ναῦται † ἢ σύσσιτοι ἢ ὁμόταφοι ἢ θιασῶται ἢ ἐπὶ λείαν οἰχόμενοι ἢ εἰς ἐμπορίαν, ὅ, τι ἂν τούτων διαθῶνται πρὸς ἀλλήλους, κύριον εἶναι ἐὰν μὴ ἀπαγορεύσηι δημόσια γράμματα. (If the inhabitants of a district, or precinct, or sacred rites, or sailors, or members of groups dining together or providing for their burial, or members of religious club, or individuals engaged in some enterprise for plunder or trade, whatever they agree between themselves shall be valid unless forbidden by public statutes).[39]

ἱερῶν ὀργίων μηνυταὶ Sheltema et al. (1985) (eds), *Scholia Basilicorum*, B.IX, 3620-21 and Tondo (1976: 81): ἱερῶν ὀργίων θύται Mommsen (1870: 2.793 n.3) and Busolt -Swoboda (1920-26: 2.252 n.2): ὀργεῶνες ἢ ναυκραρίαι ἢ γεννῆται Meier (1848) *Index Scolarum*: ἢ <ὀργεῶνες> ἢ <ναυ-

---

have been true for the fragment of Philochoros; in other words registration could proceed only if proof of belonging to an *orgeones* or *homogalaktes* association was produced.

37. For a restoration of what the text in the Twelve Tablets might have been, see Crawford, M.H. (ed) (1996) *Roman Statutes*, 2, 694-95, London (BICS Suppl. 64). See also Wieacker (1988: 302) for previous bibliography and D'Ippolito, F. (1992) "Gaio e le XII Tavole" *Index* 20, 279-89. For the relation between the Solonian legislation and the Roman code of Twelve Tables see Ferenczy, E. (1984) "La legge delle XII tavole e le codificazioni greche" in *Sodalitas. Scritti in onore di Antonio Guarino*, 4, 2001-12, Napoli and Martini, R. (1999) "XII Tavole e diritto greco" *Labeo* 45, 20-37. The alleged study of the Solonian legislation by the Roman *decemviri* before the introduction of the legislation of Twelve Tables is ruled out.

38. For the relation between the Greek *hetaireiai* and Roman *sodales* see Sartori, F. (1958) "Il diritto di associazione nell'età soloniana ed una notizia di Gaio (D. 47.22.4)" *Iura* 9, 100-104 who assumes that the generic Greek term ἑταιρεῖαι corresponds exactly to the Roman *sodales*. Further, he distinguishes ἑταιρεῖαι from συνομωσίαι, which denotes the political club and is exempted from the regulation. Cf. Ciulei, C. (1967) "D. 47.22.4" *ZRG* 97, 371-75.

39. Lambert (1993: 87) in his translation of the text "or thiasotai whose purpose is trade or piracy" correlates θιασῶται with ἐπὶ λείαν οἰχόμενοι ἢ εἰς ἐμπορίαν.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

ἱεροραρίαι> Jones (1999: 34): ἱερῶν ὀργεῶνες Hermann, *Griechische Privatalterumer*, 69.10, 2nd ed., Gilbert *Griechische Staatalertum* I, 236 and Liebarth (1896: 167): ἢ ὀργεῶνες ἢ γεννῆται Hermann-Thalheim *Griechisches Rechtsaltertum*, 4th ed., 111, Wilamowitz (1881: 278), Ruschenbusch (1966: 99) and Martina (1968: 167): ἱερῶν ὀργειῶν(ες) Radin (1910: 42): ἱερῶν ὀργίων μύσται Hammond (1961: 80 n.20): ἱερῶν ὀργίων κοινωνοὶ ἢ ναῦται van Holst (1832) *de Eranis veterum graecorum*, 37 and P.J.T. Endenburg (1937) *Koinoonia en Gemeenschap van Zaken bij de Grieken in den Klassieken Tijd*, 163, Amsterdam : ἢ θιασῶται ἱερῶν ὀργίων ἢ ναῦται ἐπὶ λείαν οἰχόμενοι De Sanctis (1898: 843 n.82) : ἢ ἱερῶν ὀργίων συνθύται Guarducci (1935: 333): ἢ ἡρώων ὀργεῶνες ἢ γεννῆται Ferguson (1944: 64): - ἐρχόμενοι Sch.Bas.: - <τινες> Wilamowitz ibid: - διαθῶνται τι Sch.Bas.: - ἀπαγορεύηι Sch.Bas.: ὑπαγορεύηι Hatzopoulos (1971: 24): - δημόσια πράγματα Sch.Bas.

(i) Text: The most difficult point of this law concerns the restoration of the phrase *hieron orgion e nautai*.[40] We can classify the proposed emendations in two groups. The first attempts to restore the text preserving the words *hieron orgion* and replacing only the word *nautai* with the word *thutai*,[41] which the Suda (o 510) gives as a synonym to *orgeones*. The second group connects the words *hieron orgion* with *orgeones* and replaces the former, while Wilamowitz adds the word *gennetai*. The emendation suggested by De Sanctis readjusts, quite freely, a portion of the text, but keeps the word *nautai*. Finally, Hammond (1961) proposed *mustai* instead of *nautai*.

Radin's paleographical interpretation of the corruption is interesting; he thinks that the initial form was *hieron orgeiones*, but the last two letters were abbreviated into a small, final -s and later copyists preserved the form *hieron orgeion*. This interpretation, however, is nothing more than an intelligent guess.

---

40. *Nautai* as a group is attested in a late 6th-century inscription from Eretria. Euboia; *SEG* 34.898: [T]ō[ν] hερμῆν ἀειναῦται /hιδρύραντο ἐπὶ τῆς Τιμανδρίδεο καὶ Τιμα/ρχίδεο καὶ Σκύθεο/ ἀρχῆς (This stele of Hermes the *aeinautai* have set up when Timandrides. Timarchides and Skythes were archons). Similar groups appear again in Hellenistic times. *IG* IX (9) 909, 923. Cf. Vélissaropoulos (1980: 22-26) who sees a group of officials not a professional association.

41. Guarducci (1935: 334) suggested the reading συνθύται on the basis of *IG* II² 2360 (mid 2nd century). But Roesch (1982: 113) has established the connection of συνθύται with Boiotia and provided several parallels from Boiotia e.g. *IG* VII 533, 689, 1785, 1790, 2463, *SEG* 36.487 (late 3rd century), *SEG* 26.614 (3rd/2nd century), *SEG* 32.453 (2nd century). *IG* II² 2360 is considered now a "pierre errant" from Anthedon (Boiotia) (*SEG* 32.454) and *ABSA* 95 (2000) 508 E16.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

As for the other proposed emendations, it should be noticed that Wilamowitz's addition of *gennetai*, only on the grounds that they could not be absent from such a law, is not convinicing, since *phuletai* (members of pre- as well as post-Cleisthenian *phulai*) are also absent. The absence of *gennetai* in itself implies, according to Radin that another particular law was introduced for them. Such a claim presupposes a radical intervention of the city in the formation of its constituent parts unknown to us. Moreover, Bourriot's conclusion, about *gennetai* before the 4th century as a term designating only the royal and sacerdotal families of Athens, makes this interpretation even more hazardous and fragile.[42] Jones (1999: 318-20) brought forward the reading *naukrariai* already proposed by Maier in 1848 and taken up recently by Lambert (1993: 250 n.27). However, this reading presupposes the "Solonian" origin of the law, something that is not absolutely certain and seems to be in conflict with *demoi*, which they apparently replaced. Ferguson's emendation[43] seems too sophisticated and implausible, since it is based totally on Seleucos' testimony (Ruschenbusch F76b) about the priority of *heroon* over *theon*, so Hammond's criticism of the restoration seems justified.[44] But Hammond's proposal is already under fire since Radin (1910: 37) wrote that "neither *thutai* nor *mustai* conform to the Greek usage, for the *orgia* were not wholly or even principally sacrifices but rather a dramatic ritual and *mustai ton orgion* is pure tautology ". However, such a phrase appears in E. *HF* 613 and therefore this emendation cannot be excluded a priori.[45]

I have deliberately left last what seems to be, at least paleographically, the most plausible emendation, the reading *hieron orgion menutai* preserved in a scholion in *Basilica* lx 32.3-4, a 10th-century compilation of the Justinianean *Digest*. According to Heimbach[46] the scholia in this book of *Basilica* originates in the index on the *Digest* drafted by Dorotheos, a jurist and member of the committee which carried out the compilation, soon after the publication of the *Digest*. The scholiast had a copy of this index and

---

42. Jones (1999: 318-20) rejects Wilamowitz's *gennetai* as well as Radin's query about the omission of *phyletai* because they had little associational activity in pre-Cleisthenian Athens.

43. Followed by Finley (1951: 88 n.3) and Whitehead (1986: 13-14).

44. Hammond (1961: 80 n.20) comments upon the way that Ferguson treats the manuscript. saying: "he changes three words. adds an η. substitutes 23 letters and generally treats the manuscript quite freely ".

45. E. *HF* 613: τὰ μυστῶν δ' ὄργι' ηὐτύχησ' ἰδὼν. For an interpretation of this line see Motte & Delforge-Pirenne (1992: 125).

46. Heimbach. C.G.E. (1850) *Basilica* Libri LX. V. 669. and VI. 12 and 330. See as well H.J. Scheltema et al. B.VIII. p.VI. 1983. For Dorotheos' commentary of the *Digest* see Mortreuil. J.A.B. (1843-44) *Histoire du droit byzantin*. 2. esp. 130-31. Paris.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

supplied the quotation. Already Mommsen (1870: i, lxxv n.1) assumed that the reading *menutai* was the alternative to the corrupt reading of the Florentine manuscript.[47] The Florentine manuscript of the *Digest* is dated in the mid 6th[48] or, at latest, early 7th century A.D., while the manuscript with the scholia to the legislation of *Basilica* is written in the 12th century. Therefore it seems to me that the emendation ἱερῶν ὀργίων <μ>ην{α}υ-τάι[49] is the most economical since it presupposes the least alteration of the manuscript. The emended phrase would mean "those who reveal (or explain) sacral rites".

The best articulated reconstruction on the basis of the above emendation was made by Tondo (1976: 4). Tondo integrated this emendation into a broader context in which the performers of Eleusinian mysteries could not have been excluded from such a law if *thiasotai* (connected with the cult of Dionysus) were mentioned. In this respect, *hieron* and *orgion* are regarded as two different sacral activities handed down by Demeter to her Eleusinian protegés (*Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 473ff). Further, on the basis of the testimony of Lactantius, *Nat*. 5.25, Tondo establishes the revelatory character of the functions of *Eumolpidai*, the *genos* encumbered with the performance of the ritual.

My objection to Tondo's argumentation is two-fold. Firstly, the word *menutes* is used exclusively, at least in the classical and Hellenistic period, to denote the informer either in general[50] or in a legal sense.[51] In late antiquity *menutes* signifies not only the person who reveals, the informer, but it is also used metaphorically (e.g. to qualify an event as announcing a

---

47. Although we cannot exclude the possibility that the reading μηνυταί is an effort of the *Basilica* scribe to comprehend the reading of the *Digest*. For a brief summary of the problems connected with the manuscript of the *Digest* see Wieacker (1988: 122-28).

48. For a date of the manuscript see Wilson, N.G. (1992) "A Greek paleographer looks at the Florentine Pandects" *Subseciva Groningiana. Studies in Roman and Byzantine law* 5. 1-6. He suggests that the manuscript was written in the beginning of A.D. 537 since it contains in folio 10 verso a laudatory epigram for Justinian. Purpura, G. (1999) *Diritto, papiri e scrittura*, 152-57, Torino suggests a date between AD 533 and 557. (available also on the Internet, http://www.archeogate.org/iura/d_romano/pub/purpura/littera/index.html)

49. So Tondo (1976: 81). Another possible reading may be the combination ἱερῶν ὀργίων(ες) ἢ (ἱερῶν) <μη>ν{α}υταί meaning roughly the performers of sacral rites or the revealers of them. Of course there is no guarantee that the reading of the *Basilica* scholion is not a misunderstanding of the text on the part of the scholiast.

50. E.g. Thuc. 1.132. 3.2.3. 7.50.2. Plb. 30.4.16. D.H. *Ant Rom* 3.6.4.

51. E.g. Antiphon 5 (*About Herodes' murder*) 34. And. 1 (*On the Mysteries*) 19. Lys. 6 (*Against Andocides*) 13. 22. 43-45. 12 (*Against Eratosthenes*) 32. 13 (*Against Agoratos*) 2. 14 (*Against Alcibiades*) 37. D. 18 (*On the Crown*) 284. Din. 2 (*Against Aristogeiton*) 95. Plb. 30.4.16. Ach. Tat. *Leukippe and Kleitophon* 7.6.5. App. *BC* 4.5.33. J. *BJ* i 485 and 599. Plu. *Per*. 31.5.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

major disaster).[52] However, it is not used in connection with religious activities. Secondly, even if we assume that the legislator by using the expression *hieron orgion menutai* meant the *genos* of *Eumolpidai*, it is surprising that he did not explicitly state it but preferred this circumlocution. In inscriptions from Hellenistic (*IG* II² 1230, 1231, 1235) and Imperial Athens (*SEG* 26.233, 33.185 and 187) *Eumolpidai* are referred to either as *genos* or simply with their name, and their members encumbered with expounding the sacral law were called *exegetai*.[53]

Almost all the remaining textual alterations that occur in *Scholia Basilicorum* probably originate in explanatory glosses.[54] This is the case in the replacement of *oichomenoi* with *erchomenoi*, the object *ti* to the verb *diathontai*, the emendation of the aorist *apagoreusei* to the present form of *apagoreuei* and the reading *pragmata* instead of *grammata*.

Hatzopoulos proposed the emendation of *apagoreuei* to *upagoreuei* and the deletion of *me*; according to his suggestion the decisions of an association were binding for its members only when these decisions were registered in the public archives of the city. Hatzopoulos, regarding *demosia grammata* as a form of city's register, where any important contract or treaty or any other act was preserved, maintained that the associations' constitution and its amendments were also preserved there, in a public place, accessible to everyone who wanted to be a member. Similar procedure was followed in the cases of naturalization, where the new citizen could choose his own deme or phratry. Hatzopoulos claimed that this registration was an obligation imposed by the *polis* on the associations, in order to have their autonomy recognized.

Hatzopoulos invokes, and seems to confuse, two different kinds of

---

52. For example of such and other usages see Lib. 1.134. 15.50. Lyd. *Ost*. 9b. 54.

53. Oliver, J.H. (1950) *The Athenian expounders of the sacred and ancestral law*, Baltimore and Garland (1984: 114-15). According to Oliver this γένος was providing answers upon request on questions concerning sacral and ancestral law. From the 4th century onwards certain individuals were elected to serve as ἐξηγηταί; earlier the assembly of the whole γένος was providing the answers. The earliest reference is in *SEG* 30.61:A.38 (367-348). Mommsen (1870: 4), while admitting the plausibility of μηνυταὶ (vol. I, p. LXXV n.1), emends the text in vol. II, p.793. I suspect that though *menutai* may have been the original word used in the *Digest* it is not very likely that it appeared in the original regulation. A reading like ἱερῶν ὀργίων(ες) ἢ <ἐξηγη>ταί would mean "performers of rites or expounders". I cannot offer a definite explanation but I can venture a suggestion. Pollux in two instances (Γ 95 and E 154) refers to *menusis* as synonym to *exegesis*. If at the end of the 2nd century A.D. *menusis* was synonymous with *exegesis*, then it could be reasonable to substitute *menutai* for *exegetai* when the latter became obsolete.

54. Contra Tondo (1976: 81 n.5) who claims that these readings may indicate an independant textual tradition.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

evidence. On the one hand, the publication of the assembly's decisions and other acts concerning the policy and the finance of the city-state is well attested.[55] On the other hand, the publication of the honorary decrees issued by *orgeones* or other cult associations usually took place in the sanctuary and not in a public archive. Such decrees were part of a motivation process addressed mainly to the members as well as a way of publicising a decision taken by the members. The only evidence for the theory of an archive is *IG* II² 1327.26-27 (178/7): "and the *epimeletai* shall inscribe this decree on a stone stele and they shall erect it in the *Metroon*".[56] The reference to a *Metroon* has caused considerable misunderstanding, due to the fact that at the end of the 5th century the official cult of Cybele took place in the same building as the meetings of the *Boule*. When a new building was erected for the needs of the *Boule*, the Old *Bouleuterion* was used as an archive together with the sanctuary of Cybele. The particular decree comes from Peiraeus and, as Ferguson suggested, it was probably erected in the temple of the Cybele in Peiraeus and not in the *Metroon* in Athens.[57]

The phrase *demosia grammata* meaning public archive is attested in a decree of the year 362 (*IG* II² 120.17) and in the mid 4th-century speeches of Aischines 3 (*Against Ktesiphon*) 24 and Demosthenes 18 (*On the crown*) 55. However, its use becomes more widespread from the 2nd century onwards.[58]

---

55. See examples for ancient Athens in *LSJ* s.v. γράμμα and for the law-code of Gortyn e.g. col.VI. 15; col.IX. 16; col.XI. 20. However, in an inscription from Paros [*SEG* 33.679 (ca. 175-150)] public archives are designated as μνημονικά γράμματα. The literature on archives in ancient Athens in connection with the predominantly oral character of the archaic society is summarized in Georgoudi, S. (1987) "Manières d'archivage et archives de cités" in Detienne, M. (ed) *Les savoirs de l'écriture en Grèce ancienne*. 221-51, and Thomas (1989). About the date of the institution of a central archive see West, W.C. (1989) " The public archives in Fourth-Century Athens" *GRBS* 30. 529-43 and Sickinger (1999). See also Rhodes, P.J. (2001) "Public documents in the Greek states: Archives and inscriptions" *G & R* 48. 33-44 (Part I) and 136-53 (Part II). Archaeological remains and their date and function are discussed by Miller, S.G. (1995) "Old Metroon and Old Bouleuterion in the Classical Agora of Athens" 133-56 and Leslie Shear Jr. T. (1995) "Bouleuterion, Metroon and the Archives at Athens" 157-90 in Hansen, M.H. & K. Raaflaub (eds) *Studies in the ancient Greek polis*. Stuttgart (Historia Einzelschriften 95).

56. *IG* II² 1327.26-27 (178/7): ἀ[να]γράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν στήλει λιθίνει/ [τοὺς] ἐπιμελητὰς καὶ στῆσαι ἐν τῶι Μητρώιωι.

57. Ferguson (1944: 108). Location of *Metroon* in Peiraeus. Garland (1987: 146).

58. *IG* II² 120. 15-17 (362/1): ἀντιγράφεσθαι δὲ τὸγ γραμματέα τὸγ κατὰ /[πρ]υτανείαν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους γραμματ<τε>έας τοὺς ἐπὶ τοῖ/[ς δ]ημοσίοις γράμμασιν. D. 18 (*On the crown*) 55: τῶν νόμων οὐκ ἐώντων πρῶτον μὲν ψευδεῖς γραφὰς εἰς τὰ δημόσια γράμματα καταβάλλεσθαι. See also *Syll*³ 684 (c. 139). 976 (2nd century) and 1232 (58/9). *SEG* 12.255 (1st century A.D.). *IMyl* 107 (2nd/1st century). 109 (76). *IG* XII (5) 721 (2nd century). *IG* XII (7) 515 (2nd century) and *IPriene* 113 (84).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

The reference to *demosia grammata* in Demosthenes and in *IG* II² 120 clearly relates to the building where public records were kept, the use of the term in Aischines is more ambiguous. In particular, Aischines claims that

> "If now I prove nothing more than this, rightly Ktesiphon would be convicted because it is not my prosecution which convicts him but the public archives".[59]

In this case, *demosia grammata* understood as public archives or records cannot convict anybody; it is *demosia grammata* as an expression of what is stored, the laws and decrees of the *polis*, that will convict. Similarly, *Dig.* 47.22.4 provides that the decisions of the associations will be valid unless they contravene *demosia grammata*, which cannot refer to the public archives themselves but to what was stored there. Therefore, I think that the expression *demosia grammata* refers to the decrees and the laws of the *polis* in contrast to private documents, which are called *sunthekai* (e.g. *SEG* 24.203, 26-27). The law assumes that there will be someone, individual or collective body, who will supervise and control the activities of associations, to see whether they conform with the laws of the *polis*. There is no need for it to be a magistrate or a collective body appointed on a permanent basis, but possibly anybody willing to do so (*ho boulomenos*).

Hatzopoulos seems to be inconsistent in one more respect; if he considers the law as genuinely Solonian then he should date the existence, the organisation and the functions of the public archive in Athens to the 6th century. However, our evidence for this institution indicates a date near the end of the 5th century.

(ii) Content of the provision: The law is regarded by the majority of scholars as acknowledging the freedom of the members to administer their own affairs unless their decisions violate the law of the *polis*. It is not clear from the letter of the law whether the individual's right to associate (which in the modern era always precedes the autonomy of the group) was acknowledged earlier, as Ziebarth argued. It is more likely that, given the lack of legal abstraction, the right to associate did not need an acknowledgement. The extent of the corporate autonomy granted remains problematic; according to Ziebarth it was limited to the property relations of the group. Property affairs may have been the most prominent business but other aspects, such as admissions, honours, festivals and celebrations

---

59. Aisch. 3 (*Against Ktesiphon*) 24: Οὐκοῦν εἰ μηδὲν ἔτι περαιτέρω δείξαιμι, δικαίως ἂν ἁλίσκοιτο Κτησιφῶν· αἱρεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν οὐχ ἡ κατηγορία ἡ ἐμή, ἀλλὰ τὰ δημόσια γράμματα.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

remained under the jurisdiction of the group. Jones (1999: 35-45) claims that the "Solonian law on associations had a validating and a regulating aspect". Validation is provided by the clause "whatever they decide, shall be valid" which recognizes the decisions of the association concerning its business as binding.[60] The phrase "unless public laws do not prohibit" sets the limits and regulates the self-governance of the above clause.[61] These two clauses, however, look inextricably linked.

There is only a limited number of subjects to which this right is granted. Ferguson argued that only associations of citizens were subject to this regulation, while Jones (1987) claimed that the law was a stimulus for the formation of associations by foreigners, attributing this law to the context of the alleged Solonian effort to attract craftsmen in 6th-century Athens. Recently Jones (1999: 34) argued that "given a date of composition in early 6th century, the law represents an attempt to assemble a complete catalog of associations in existence". Furthermore, the "Solonian" enumeration resembles the description of Aristotle, an indication sufficient for Baslez (1992) and Jones (1999) to claim that the Aristotelian description relies on the "Solonian" law; but it is fairly possible that the law of the *Digest* owes as much to the Aristotelian enumeration. Besides, some groupings, such as *eranistai*, *phuletai*, *gennetai* are not mentioned in the provision of the *Digest* but are included in the Aristotelian essay.

(iii) Date: The dating of this provision involves two separate questions; first the date of the law in the preserved form and second whether there was a regulation about associations issued by Solon. Any answer to the second one is highly speculative; since we have no other information on any similar activity of Solon, it does depend on how much faith we place on the tradition of the *Digest*. In the first question, I think we can provide a possible date; so far, three opinions have been put forward:

1. The first one, following the tradition of the *Digest*, alleges that it is

---

60. From the epigraphical evidence in support of the validating aspect, laws referred to in *IG* II² 1177 are more likely to be deme ordinances. However, I cannot see how the decision of arbitrators in *IG* II² 1289 confirms the validating aspect of the "Solonian" law. The *dikastai* are probably private arbitrators appointed by the disputing groups; their decision, endorsed by the *orgeones* group, may be informed by a regime of corporate autonomy but it does not validate anything. Public and not private arbitration was the initial stage in state's legal process, Jones (1999: 40).

61. The evidence for the regulating aspect of the law are not convincing: *ennoma* in *IG* II² 337 refers to the request for the grant of *enktesis*; the decrees in Aisch. 1 (*Against Timarchos*) 27 and 41-45 can be understood without recourse to the "Solonian" law.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Solonian.[62] Although some scholars expressed certain reservations about this date, it seems still to be the prevailing opinion.

2. The second view supports the Cleisthenic origin of the law on the grounds that the word *demos*, which occurs in the law's text, cannot designate anything else except the Cleisthenic *demos*.[63]
3. A third opinion is based on Wilamowitz's doubts about the authenticity of the law in the preserved form, and especially about the existence of *demoi* in pre-Cleisthenian Athens. Whitehead, together with other scholars,[64] asserts that this law, in the preserved form, is "a conflation of archaic elements with later ones".

3a. An alternative interpretation of the origin of the law in its preserved form must account for the alleged archaisms, which according to many scholars are the wording referring to piracy and commerce. In particular,

---

62. The majority of the scholars seem to accept the Solonian origin of the law: Foucart (1873: 47), Beauchet (1897: 4.343), Radin (1910: 50), Lipsius (1905: 768), Tod (1932: 72), San Nicolò (1913-15: 2.17), Vinogradoff (1920-22: 2.120), Ferguson (1944: 64-68), Pantazopoulos (1946: 26ff) and "Orgeones" *Polemon* 3 (1948) 100, Jones (1956: 161), Vamvoukos (1979: 103), Leiwo (1997: 104) and Jones (1999: 34). Caillemer (1872), Poland (1909) and Ziebarth (1896) avoid taking any explicit position, while De Sanctis and Guarducci (1933: 332) support with reservations the Solonian origin of this law. Ducos (1976: 36), followed by Wieacker (1988: 302 n.80 and 81), argued, unconvincingly in my opinion, that the provision in the Digest may be Solonian, preserved by commentators and compilators of decrees in the Hellenistic era and then passed to Roman jurisconsults like Labeo and then to Gaius. While for other quotations of Solonian laws in the work of Gaius there is some kind of confirmation, for this provision there are no other traces. Although it is not a conclusive argument, this law is conspicuous by its absence from the preserved accounts of the Solonian legislation. In P. Oliva's (1988) *Solon - Legende und Wirklichkeit*, Konstanz (Xenia. Konstanzer althistorische Vorträge und Forschungen 20) as well as in K. Raaflaub's (1996) "Solone, la nuova Atene e l'emergere della politica" in Setis, S. (ed) *I Greci. Storia, cultura, arte, società 2.Una storia greca I.Formazione*, 1035-82, Torino it is not even mentioned. Even Plutarch, who had access to works lost to us, in his life of Solon, especially the indexes to Solon's *axones*, remains silent on this subject. One can argue, with Ruschenbusch, E. (1994) "Plutarchs Solonbiographie" *ZPE* 100, 351-80, that Plutarch in compiling Solon's biography was interested in the moral dimension of Solon's character; however, on another occasion Plutarch reports the legendary foundation of professional associations by Numa (*Num.* 17). About the historicity of this account see Richard, J.-C. (1978) "Sur les prétendues corporations numaiques: à propos de Plutarque, Num. 17.3" *Klio* 60, 423-28, who claims that the reported organisation reflects developments of later periods and Gabba, E. (1984) "The collegia of Numa: Problems of method and political ideas" *JRS* 74, 81-86.

63. See Busolt-Swoboda (1920-26: 2.252) and Davies (1996: 635) for a date in the 5th-4th century.

64. Ferguson (1944: 66), Bravo (1980: 857) and Whitehead (1986: 15). However, Jones (1999: 311-12) claimed that in this law *demos* is not the constitutional segment but a territorial unit larger than the Cleisthenian creation.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

the phrase *epi leian oichomenoi* was interpreted as a reference to piracy.[65] However, this expression has a more general meaning, namely plundering, in sea or on land and not specifically piracy.[66] It can be assumed that another aspect of the alleged archaic character of this expression is its rarity at a later date. However, the expression *epi leian* recurs regularly in the literature of the early 4th century and onwards.[67] It occurs 5 times in the work of Xenophon, once in Isocrates' *Panegyricus* 149,[68] in Polybius' *History* 1.23.3, in Polyaenus' *Stratagemata* 3.14.1 and finally in Dio Cassius' *Roman History*. From this review of the evidence it seems that the phrase *epi leian oichomenoi* was used throughout antiquity meaning "seeking plunder" and it was by no means archaic in in character. The riddle is not so much stylistic as substantial. How could a law allow and regulate plundering? The law does not explicitly regulate plundering. In order to normalize and regulate the division of spoils, it tacitly accepts the practice of plundering. This may sound monstrous to a modern reader (though it is a reality in war torn regions) but it was fairly common in classical and late antiquity for soldiers, before or after a battle or during an expedition, to plunder in order to have the necessary provisions.[69] Aristotle in his *Politics*

---

65. See Ormerod, H.A. (1924) *Piracy in the ancient world. An essay in Mediterranean history*, 67-8. London. Recently de Souza, P. (1999) *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman world*, 3. Cambridge argued that the terms λῃστής and πειρατής had the same meaning. Piracy did not cease to exist even in Augustan times; it continued as a low-key, low-intensity activity; see Braund, D. (1993) "Piracy under the Principate and the ideology of imperial eradication" in Rich, J. & G. Shipley (eds) *War and Society in the Roman world*, 195-212. London.

66. The term *peirateia* appears for the first time in the 260s (*SEG* 24.154 and *IG* XII (7) 386 from Amorgos).

67. In 5th-century inscriptions mention of λῃστεία, λῃΐζω occurs in agreements between allies of the Athenian empire like *IG* I^3 41, 67 and 75. Cf. *SEG* 40.362 (Messenia, ca. 460).

68. Once in *HG* 3.2.2, in *An*. 5.1.8, 5.1.17, 6.6.2 and most significantly in 6.6.5: ἐτύγχανε δὲ τὸ στράτευμα ἔξω ὂν ὅτε ἀφίκετο καὶ ἐπὶ λείαν τινὲς οἰχόμενοι ἄλλοσε εἰς τὸ ὄρος εἰλήφεσαν πρόβατα πολλά. (It so happened that the army was out foraging when he (i.e. Klearchos) arrived, while certain individuals had gone in quest of plunder to a different place in the mountains and had secured a large number of sheep). Isocr. *Panegyricus* 149: ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ οὐκ ἐπὶ λείαν ἐλθόντες (because they had not come in order to plunder).

69. For the vocabulary developed in order to describe the different kind of plundering see Pritchett (1991: 77-86); cf. Bravo (1980: 824-37). Trundle (1999) in examining the construction of identity among mercenaries notices that "payment of a salary, of food, or of common plunder recognized belonging to the community under arms". In X. *An*. 3.3.18 and in 5.1.12 there is a reference to a common fund. Groups of mercenaries, usually from the same locality, used to act as a quasi-organised association. See also the Hellenistic regulation "on orderliness with respect to the prizes of war" from Amphipolis in Hatzopoulos, M. B. (2001) *L'organisation de l'armée macédonienne sous les*

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

1.3 (1256b) clearly describes war as a means for acquiring possessions, while in *EN* 8.9.5 (1160a 14-18) he describes among other *koinoniai*, those formed by "co-soldiers desiring either money or victory or a city ".[70] The importance attributed to plundering is underlined by the fact that there are agreements, collected by Pritchett (1991: 363-68), between states concerning the sharing of booty. Finally, if the provision was related to Solon, one would expect the ionic form *leis* instead of *leia*.

The second part of the argument about the archaic character of the provision rests upon the use of the term *emporia*. In particular, it is claimed that in early epic poetry *emporos* means "the traveller by ship, the passenger" and *emporia* means "trade, commerce".[71] The occurence of the term *emporia* instead of *emporos* in this provision is an archaism. However, in a fragment of Semonides of Amorgos[72] from the 7th century the word *emporos*, with the meaning of trader, instead of passenger, traveller is used. Later in antiquity both expressions were used interchangeably (e.g. *AthPol* 11.1). The expression used in *Dig*. 47.22.4 may be explained as a stylistic variation aiming to complete the air of a "true" Solonian provision.

The traditional dating seems to ignore the problem of the preservation of the allegedly Solonian provision through the major reorganisation following the oligarchic interludes of 410 and 404/3. According to the sources the reorganisation included the revision of all the laws. How can we be sure that the allegedly Solonian law was not affected or in which way it was altered?

3b. It can be argued, very tentatively, that *FGrHist* 341 F1 (= Ruschenbusch F76b) provides a piece of evidence in favour of a Solonian regulation on associations:

> "Seleukos, in the index of the Solonian *axones*, says that the associations in honour of heroes or gods are called *orgeones*".[73]

However, what the fragment clearly points out is that on one of the *axones*,

---

Antogonides. Problèmes anciens et documents nouveaux. Athens (Meletemata 30) and Juhel. P. (2002) " 'On orderliness with respect to the prizes of war': The Amphipolis regulation and the management of booty in the army of the last Antigonids" *ABSA* 97. 401-12.

70. συστρατιῶται εἴτε χρημάτων εἴτε νίκης ἢ πόλεως ὀρεγόμενοι. See also many inscriptions referring to κοινά συνστρατευσαμένων, συστρατευσάμενοι (e.g. *IG* XII (1) 75 and 105. *ILindos* 292 from Rhodes and *SEG* 45.1825 from 1st-century Patara, Lycia), σύσκανοι etc.

71. See Vélissaropoulos (1980: 35-36).

72. *IEG* II 16: κἀλειφόμην μύροισι καὶ θυώμασιν καὶ βακκάρι καὶ γὰρ τις ἔμπορος παρῆν.

73. Σέλευκος δ' ἐν τῶι ὑπομνήματι τῶν Σόλωνος ἀξόνων ὀργεῶνάς φησι καλεῖσθαι τοὺς συλλόγους ἔχοντας περί τινας ἥρωας ἢ θεούς.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

on which Solonian legislation was inscribed, the word *orgeones* appeared. Whether the word occured in a regulation concerning associations or in another context (e.g. cultic regulations) cannot be determined.

3c. A solution to the problem of dating this provision may be found in the context of what is preserved in the sources as the restoration of the "Drakonian and Solonian" legislation during Hadrian's reign.[74] Hadrian visited Athens three times, in A.D. 124/5, 128/9, and 131/2 and, among other economic and social measures, a major legislative reorganisation is attributed to him.[75] Gaius was contemporary with this development and probably had easy access to the allegedly "Solonian" laws or even to the whole of the Hadrianic restoration of the ancestral constitution in Athens. Gaius was evidently well acquainted with the so-called Solonian legislation for he cites in the same commentary the provisions on the borders, which were well known in the eastern Mediterranean, ["De confinio" in *Dig.* 10.1.13 = Ruschenbusch F60a and similarly *P.Hal.* I, 1.84].

The provision can be regarded as a conflation, but not necessarily as a conflation of later and earlier forms of groupings, as scholars have assumed. I think it is possible to interpret it not only as a vertical, diachronic stratification of different groups with roots in archaic and/or classical era but rather as a horizontal, synchronic arrangement of associations, operating in imperial Athens. The reasons for doing so are the following:

i) The mention of *homotaphoi*, an institution found mostly in Rome (*collegia tenuiorum*) but unknown in Athenian society,[76] with the exception of a passage in Aeschines[77] where the word has no technical meaning,

---

74. Patterson (1981: 18) and Triantaphyllopoulos (1985: 196) seem to follow such an interpretation. Cotter (1997: 84-85) suggests that a big part of Gaius' *Institutes* reflects Trajan-Hadrianic policies.

75. A major indication is provided by the fact that *Annius Pythodoros* bears the title of νομοθέτης from A.D. 119/120 to A.D. 125/6. For evidence see Oliver (1989: nos 83 (*IG* II² 1101), 85 (*IG* II² 1102) and 92 (*IG* II² 1100)). The reorganisation included the reduction of the council from 600 councillors to 500, the reorganisation of prytanies on a sounder financial basis, the ban on councillors from collecting taxes, the foundation of the Panhellenion, the introduction of a new tribe, a change in the calendar, and a program of rebuilding. For details see Geagan, D.J. (1979) "Roman Athens: Some aspects of life and culture I. 86 B.C. - A.D. 267" *ANRW* 7.1, 371-437. Bauman (1989: 281-86) and Kapetanopoulos, E. (1992-98) "The reform of the Athenian constitution under Hadrian" *Horos* 10-12, 215-37.

76. In Rhodes and elsewhere, associations were buying land for burial purposes on behalf of their members, Fraser (1977: 60-61), Kloppenborg (1996: 22) and Nijf (1998: 48-55).

77. Aesch. 1 (*Against Timarchos*) 149: ἀναγίγνωσκε δὴ ἃ περὶ τοῦ ὁμοτάφους αὐτοὺς γενέσθαι λέγει ἐν τῷ ὕπνῳ ὁ Πάτροκλος (now read what Patroklos says in the dream about their common burial).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

seems to support the proposed interpretation. Radin (1910: 44) tried, unsuccessfully, to establish the existence of such groups in Athens[78] on the grounds that members of *gene* "buried their dead together from immemorial custom" and that *heria* are identical with the burial associations mentioned in D. 57 (*Against Euboulides*) 28 and 67. This interpretation is seriously undermined by the archeological evidence[79] and the occurrence of *heria* in *AthPol* 55.3, in which *heria* refers to family tombs in the context of the scrutiny of candidates for office.

ii) *Sussitoi* were unknown in ancient Athens but well known in the neighbouring Boiotia (e.g. *SEG* 32.505, ca. 300).[80]

iii) The law tacitly admits the possibility of tension arising between the state authority and the authority of the mentioned groups; the Roman era provides the only precedent of steadily increasing state intervention in the associative life in antiquity.[81] In Athens the only similar controversy concerns the prohibition of the political groupings aiming at the overthrow of democracy (known as *eisaggeltikos nomos* in Hyp. 4 (*Against Philippides*) 8 and D. 46 (*Against Stephanos II*) 26).[82] It can be argued that the very existence of this *eisaggeltikos nomos* refutes my suggestion. But this provision concerns the role of *hetaireiai* aiming at the overthrow of democracy, and is not a general provision banning any sort of associations. It

---

78. Contra Ziebarth (1896: 17 n.4), Poland (1909: 56) and Hatzopoulos (1971: 52). See also Davies (1996: 640) and Jones (1999: 317).

79. The archeological evidence is summarized by Humphreys, S.C. (1980) "Family tombs and tomb-cult in ancient Athens" *JHS* 100, 96-126 who concludes that the material consists of what may be called family tombs rather than tombs of a wider group like *gene*. See also Matthaiou, A.P. (1987) "Erion Lukourgou Lukophronos Boutadou" *Horos* 5, 31-44. Jones (1999: 317) suggests that in D. 57 (*Against Eubulides*) 67 a group of *homotaphoi* may be lurking.

80. Contra Hatzopoulos (1973: 49): "Doch scheinen in Griechenland keine Vereine unter der Namen syssitoi existiert zu haben". See also Roesch (1982: 104 and 143 no. 18). Davies (1996: 638-40) and Jones (1999: 316) who speculates about the possibility of "more or less formally organised messes" in Athens on the basis of the *ephebes* and soldiers camping and eating together. *BE* 1978, no. 322 reports a graffito on an Attic *kantharos* of the 4th century. See also *IG* IX (2) 332 = Helly, *Gonnoi* no. 159 (3rd century); *AM* 68 (1953) 14-16 (Samos, 2nd-1st century); *ILindos* 292 (c. 80); *OGIS* 712 (Alexandreia, beginning of 2nd century A.D.); *SB* v 8689 (Siwa Oasis). For *sussitoi* in late Roman Alexandreia, see Buraselis, K. (1995) "Zu Caracallas Strassmassnahmen in Alexandrien (215/6)" *ZPE* 108, 166-88 esp. 173-79.

81. Duff (1938: 95-128) provides a useful summary of the policy of the Roman state in view of the freedom to associate. For the text of S.C. *de Bacchanalibus* see *FIRA* I, no. 30; no. 46 (1st/2nd century A.D.) preserves part of a S.C. *de collegiis*.

82. See Hansen, M.H. (1975) *Eisangelia. The sovereignty of the people's court in Athens in the fourth century B.C. and the impeachment of generals and politicians*, 12-20, Odense.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

is though, indicative that when Athenians felt their regime threatened, they did not have any qualms to ban associations.

Therefore it seems that *Dig*. 47.22.4 can be satisfactorily interpreted as a rule that guaranteed to Athenians their right to have autonomous associations in the framework of the autonomy enjoyed by Athens in Roman times, in a context where the right of establishing associations was highly restricted and regulated by the Roman authorities. There is no need to assume that this provision was new. It is quite possible that a similar rule may have been found by the legislative committee appointed by Hadrian, reformulated and believed to be Solonian in the atmosphere of reviving the lost glory of Athens. An appropriate context might have been what our sources call the reintroduction of the Draconian and Solonian legislation initiated by Hadrian. This provision confirmed that Athenian associations would not be subjected to interventions by the Roman authorities.

The above analysis of the literary evidence suggests the existence of a dichotomy in the use of the word *orgeones* in the sources. In the evidence occurring in a poetical context *orgeones* means, without exception, persons performing some rituals. In evidence coming from other literary genres, *orgeones* denote invariably portions of the population connected either by a social qualification (commoners, foreigners etc) or, what seems to me more plausible, by religious identities and through them with local identities. Indeed, the latter is the only element that associates the late sources with the earlier and gives us a coherent picture of a possible evolution and continuity. The ritual identity led to forging a religious and at the same time a local identity, whose essential component was a particular cult.

Epigraphical evidence

The epigraphical dossier of *orgeones* includes mostly honorary decrees, for which Ferguson's (1944) study is still fundamental, while new pieces of evidence (*Ag*. 16, 235; 245 and *SEG* 21.528) do not substantially alter the picture of the group. The publication of the dossier of documents from the sanctuary of Herakles Pankrates announced by Kalogeropoulou (1982) may provide some much needed information about the context of the associational activity and the particular features of the group's activity.[83] It is important to comment upon *IG* II² 1289, *SEG* 12.100 and the distinction between citizen *orgeones* and Thracian *orgeones* of Bendis.

IG II² 1289 is dated sometime between 255 and 235 and contains the

83. Vikela (1994) studied the reliefs from the sanctuary and their typology.

ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

decision of arbitrators over a dispute about the way of exploiting the property of the group, lines 3-7:

> τάδε διέλυσαν οἱ δικασταὶ [ἐπιτρεψάν]/ των ἀμφοτέρων· τὰ μὲν κτήματ[α εἶναι τῆς]/ θεοῦ καὶ μηθενὶ ἐξεῖναι μήτ' [ἀποδόσθαι]/ μήτε ὑποθεῖναι, ἀλλὰ ἐκ τῶν π[ροσόδων θύ]/ειν τὰς θυσίας (the following is what the arbitrators, chosen by both parties, decided: the property shall belong to the goddess and nobody shall be allowed to sell, or mortgage it, but, from the income, they shall perform the sacrifices).

What is striking in the inscription is the use of the word *dikastai* instead of the more usual *diaitetai* or *dialytai* in what is an unambiguous case of private arbitration. The use may have been simply rhetorical... Ferguson (1944: 84 n.31) claimed that the submission of the disagreement in arbitration implies that disposal of the property and disbandment of the association was possible. However, in this inscription we cannot speak of disposal of property, but more probably of a dispute over the most beneficial way to exploit property. The fact that the dispute led to arbitration demonstrates how strongly the property was considered as inalienable. As for dissolving the cult association, there is no such distinct possibility in the decision. Roebuck (2001: 296-97) in discussing the procedural aspects of this inscription claims that the *dikastai* mentioned in the inscription may be a remnant of an ancient assembly for the resolution of disputes. But the inscription does not preserve any indication that there was such a permanent panel. The settlement of the dispute described in *IG* II² 1289 seems to be closer to the dispute of Salaminioi, in which two branches of this *genos*, having appointed individuals, resolved their dispute over cultic activities.[84]

SEG 12.100 preserves the list of claims on a confiscated property and the sale of mines for the year 367/6. In this year the property of a certain *Theosebes*, son of *Theophilos* of *Xypete* was confiscated because he was accused for impiety and fled before the end of the trial. On that property there were secured three claims, one by the *Medontidai phrateres* with *Kichonides* of *Gargettos*, one by *Isarchos*, son of *Philon* of *Xypete* and one by *Aischines* of *Melite* and the *orgeones*. The first and the last were securing loans (*prasis epi lusei*, strictly a sale with a redemption clause) contracted by *Theophilos*, the father, while the second one was a claim for the expenses of *Theosebes*' parents' funeral.[85] Lambert (1993: 318-19) is probably right in arguing that

84. See Lambert (1997b).

85. For a discussion of the information on the costs of funeral, see Oliver, G.J. (2000) "Athenian funerary monuments: Style, grandeur, and cost" in Oliver, G.J. (ed) *The*

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Iarchos was the demarch, the person responsible for the burial of people whose relatives did not provide for burial and for which he was entitled to claim the expenses. However, I disagree about the interpretation of *koinon orgeonon* as a subdivision of the phratry. Lambert (1993: 319) sees as "unexpected for him to take out a *prasis epi lusei* with a group of orgeones which did not belong to his own phratry". Nevertheless, it was possible for anyone with the necessary acquaintances to borrow money from three different phratries and to secure it on the same property, as in Finley 41 or to raise money from a group of *Dekadistai* and *eranistai* (Finley 32) and mortgage the same real estate. Therefore, I do not think it was so unexpected for *Theophilos* to borrow money from a *koinon orgeonon* unrelated to his phratry.

There were at least two *orgeones* associations of Bendis in the beginning, and three after 260/59; two in Peiraeus, one of citizens and one of Thracians, and one of Thracians in Athens after 260/59.[86] The only clear evidence about this distinction is the extract from Plato's *Republic* where the procession of the natives is mentioned to in parallel with that of the Thracians; *IG* II² 1283 testifies the intention of some devotees of Bendis in Athens to build a sanctuary and participate in the procession.[87] Ferguson (1944: 98), followed by Simms (1988: 69), adopted Wilhelm's distinction of the *orgeones* associations[88] based on i) the date of the assembly, and ii) the kind of the crown. Wilhelm (1902) claimed that documents which are dated on the 8th day of the month, or in which a crown from oak leaves is mentioned, belong to the Thracian *orgeones* (*IG* II² 1283, 1284), while those dated on the 2nd day of the month (*IG* II² 1361) or which award a crown of olive leaves (*IG* II² 1324), belong to the citizen *orgeones* association. However, one should wonder what "Thracian" means, since the Athenians were calling Thrace the area from the Thermaic gulf to Byzantion. The onomastic evidence of the "Thracian" *orgeones* is almost entirely Greek, an

---

epigraphy of death. Studies in the history and society of Greece and Rome, 59-80 esp. at 61-65. Liverpool.

86. The foundation of a Thracian *orgeones* association (*IG* II² 1283) in Athens was due to the political circumstances and the Chremonidian war, according to Gauthier, Ph. (1979) "La réunification d' Athènes en 281". *REG* 92, 397. *IG* II² 1283 is the decree with which the ritual order is re-established.

87. *IG* II² 1283.7-9: καὶ νῦν οἱ/ ἠι[ρη]μένοι ἐν τῶι ἄστει κατασκευάσασθαι ἱερὸν οἴοντα/ι. For the dramatic date see Nails, D. (1998) "The dramatic date of Plato's Republic" *CJ* 93, 383-96 who thinks impossible to pin down a precise date. However, Planeaux (2000-01) dates the introduction of Bendis in the 430s. See Burkert (1985: 99-101) for *pompe* creating a transitory identity for the participants.

88. Wilhelm, A. (1902) "Inschrift aus den Peiraeus" *JÖAI* 5, 132-34 (now in *ABGI* 1, 164-66). Cf. Shwenk (1985: 67) and Mikalson (1998: 140 n. 11).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

indication that the Thracian *orgeones* were not that Thracian after all.[89] Wilhelm's hypothesis cannot account for i) *IG* II² 1255 from Peiraeus, an honorary decree for three citizens, in which there is no mention of a date and the crowns are golden, of only 100 dr. each; ii) *IG* II² 1256 also from Peiraeus, in which two *epimeletai* are honoured with a golden crown of 100 dr. each and they are called by their names[90] only without any patronymic or demotic in contrast with the full identification of the honoured in *IG* II² 1255; the stele is decorated with a relief depicting Bendis accompanied by a bearded male figure, more likely to be *Deloptes*.[91] Deloptes, who was worshipped as a consort of the goddess, is also portrayed in *IG* II² 1324 and *Ag*. 16, 329. Therefore, it is likely that *IG* II² 1256 might have been issued by the citizen *orgeones* in Peiraeus. As for *IG* II² 1255, the fact that the honoured persons are citizens makes it slightly more probable that the group that honoured them were the citizen *orgeones*.

B. THIASOTAI

In contrast to the limited geographical distribution of *orgeones*, associations of *thiasotai* seem to be ubiquitous. The evidence shows that the terms *thiasos* and *thiasotai* for an association cover a vast geographical area, extending from Sicily (*SEG* 35.1009) to the colonies in North Pontus [*CIRB* 75-76, 79-80, 82-83, 87-90, 93, 96, 98, 137, 987-88, 1016, 1054, 1129, 1132-34, 1136, 1230, 1259-60a, 1262-64, 1266, 1277-78, 1282, 1287-88, 1290 & *SEG* 42.709],[92] Scythia Minor (Callatis: *SEG* 45.909), Egypt [*P.*

89. I could find only one, possibly Thracian, name, Δᾶος, a winner in a torch-race (*lampas*), in an inscription of the 4th/3rd centuries on an *anathema* dedicated to Bendis. [*Horos* 7 (1989) 23-29 = *SEG* 39.210]. The only other "Thracian" is a certain *Asklapon*, son of *Asklapon* of Maroneia (*IG* II² 2947 and *FRA* 3533). The existence of theophoric names of Bendis [*IG* II² 4866: Βενδιδώρα Ζήνωνος, (*LGPN* ii (1)); 9223: Βενδιδώρα Βηρεισάδου Λυσιμαχὶς (*FRA* 3388)] does not imply necessarily a connection with the private cult associations. Similar assessment in Mikalson (1998: 141 n.11). See also Steinhauer (1993: 40 n. 36).

90. Poland (1909: 307) claims that the honoured may have been foreigners.

91. For the iconography of Bendis see Ğerkezov, V. (1997) "Iconography of the Thracian goddess Bendis in the tombstones with a 'funeral feast' from southern Thrace" *Eirene* 33, 53-66. Noteworthy is the remark that the cult of Bendis is localized in the area between the rivers Strymon (Struma) and Nestos (Mesta), an area of intense Athenian interest in the 5th century BC. However, the onomastic evidence on *Deloptes* comes mainly from Byzantion, *CIRB* 17, Dubois, *IGDOlbia* 18, Tod, *GHI* ii 160 and *BE* 1962, no. 193.

92. For religious associations in the Greek colonies of north Pontus, mainly in the 2nd and 3rd century A.D., see Ustinova, Y. (1991) "The thiasoi of Theos Hypsistos in Tanais" *History of Religions* 31, 50-80 and Ustinova, Y. (1999) *The supreme gods of the Bosporan*

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Grenf. i 31], Asia Minor [*SEG* 27.1384, 32.1170, *IApameia* 33-35, *ISmyrna* 534, *IKyme* 30, *IKios* 20, *IrhodPer* 302A & *IPrusa ad Olympum* 1036], mainland Greece [Macedonia: *SEG* 31.633 & *IBeroia* 22, Thessaly: *AM* 16 (1891) 261, Peloponnese: *SEG* 26.473, Lokris: *IG* IX (1)^2 670], Aegean islands [Lesbos: *SEG* 26.909, Aegina: *SEG* 36.305, Keos: *IG* XII (5) 606, Delos: *ID* 1519, Tenos: *RIJG* i 7, Rhodes: *Syll*^{3} 1114], Crete [*ICret* iv 174] and Cyprus [*SEG* 39.1526 & 42.1312]. They appear over an extensive period, since the earliest evidence appears in the 6th century and the latest in the 3rd or 4th century A.D.[93] Such an expanse, both in space and time, is likely to cause differences and peculiarities. I do not aim to cover this entire period but I shall limit my research to the clarification of evidence from Attica in the classical and Hellenistic era. Evidence from other regions and periods, however, may prove useful in the understanding of these associations.

It is usually assumed that the words *thiasos* and *thiasotai* describe the same entity and that they are always associated with the Dionysiac cult. In the following section I will cast doubt on this hypothesis, which relies mainly on the variable and inconsistent use of these terms in both the literary and epigraphical record.[94]

The earliest epigraphical evidence come from Rhodes, Aegina and Sicily[95] where *thiasos* means simply a group of people without any apparent link with the Dionysiac cult. *Thiasos* occurs also in a fragment of a poem from the 7th century by Alkman

---

kingdom. Celestial Aphrodite and the most High God. Leyden. For the religious associations in Thrace and the lack of *thiasoi-thiasotai*, see Slavova, M. (2002) "Mystery clubs in Bulgarian lands in antiquity. Greek epigraphical evidence" *Opuscula Atheniensia* 27, 137-47.

93. Poland (1909: 20) followed by Ferguson (1944: 67) remarked that in Attica there is a concentration of "Thiasotendekreten" in the period 301-277. However, the available evidence does not confirm this assumption. Documents, where an association of *thiasotai* is present, cover a period of more than a century, while the latest trace comes from the imperial era. Cf. Vinogradoff (1920-22: 2.127).

94. See the most recent account in Lambert (1993: 81) who does not support any link with Dionysos. Leiwo (1997: 104) notices the effort to avoid using the term *thiasos* even by *thiasotai*. *Thiasoi* do not appear in Sappho's poems. Parker, H.N. (1993) "Sappho schoolmistress" *TAPhA* 123, 309-51 and especially 338-39.

95. Rhodes: *Syll*^{3} 1035 a) τõ Κόχλιος θιάσο (6th/5th century); Aegina: *SEG* 36.305, 2 θίhασον (510-500); Sicily: *SEG* 35.1009 (500-480): τοῦτον τὸν σqῦφον Πόρqος ἀποδίδοτι ἐς τὸν θίασον τõν π[..]ν· αἰ δὲ φίλει Φρύναν, οὐκ ἄλλος κ' ἄγε· ho δὲ γράπσας τὸν ἀννέμο<ν>τα πυγίξει (Porkos dedicated this skyphos to the group of p[...]n; if he loves Phryna, nobody else will chase her; the writer of this will sodomize the reader); discussion of the inscription in *SEG* 38.948, 39.987, 40.783, 41.1876, 42.819 and 49.1288.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

"and at the meals and banquets of the messes it is right to strike up the paean in the presence of the feasters."[96]

From the context it is clear that *thiasos* denotes an activity of the institutionalised gatherings of Spartan men (*andreia*); these two activities (*thoina* and *thiasos*) should start with the singing of a paean, a propitiatory song, according to Calame (1977: 148). For Guarducci (1935: 333 n.3) *thiasos* indicates a banquet; in this case there is a pleonasm since both *thoina* and *thiasos* mean the same thing. More recently Calame (1977: 363-67 and 1983: 532) identified *thiasos* with lyric chorus, a group of persons gathered for dancing on the occasion of worship.[97] One more aspect of the activities in *thiasoi*, and its close association with Sparta, appears again in the 5th century in a poem of Critias, a well-known pro-Spartan Athenian;

"this also is a custom at Sparta and a set practice to drink from the same wine-bearing cup, and not to give toasts, pledging them by name, nor send them round in the circle of the *thiasos* from left hand to right."[98]

This fragment describes a particular practice of drinking in a *thiasos* in Sparta. From both fragments it is clear that *thiasos* in Sparta describes a particular function of members of *syssitia*, that is of the adult male population of Sparta in full rights. It is not an autonomous unit. Drinking is one of the major activities in these gatherings but it is by no means, on the basis of this fragment, the only activity. The word occurs in Poll. *Lexicon* (Book 6.7-8) as one of *sympotika onomata* and there is a mention in Phot. δ 27 = Sud. δ 125 = *PCG*

96. *PMGF* F98 (= Str. 10.4.18): [ἐν] θοίναις δὲ καὶ ἐν θιάσοισιν ἀνδρείων παρὰ δαιτυμόνεσσι πρέπει παιᾶνα κατάρχην. See the challenging interpretation of the fragment by Carter (1997). who claims that Greek *thiasoi* might have been a similar to Semitic *marzeah* group devoted to ancestors' cult.

97. Calame's argument was largely based on the structural similarity between the choruses of the archaic era and the confraternities of the Hellenistic era. Both were performing some sort of rites and had the same nomenclature. Therefore. Calame concluded that *thiasos* may have had a similar institutional standing to *syssitia* and that singing in *syssitia* indicate that something similar was happening in *thiasoi*. Calame's assertion that the *thiasos* of the archaic era can be identified with that of the Hellenistic era is not convincing. Calame uses and transposes pieces of evidence from different regions and different periods of time. without explaining what can reconcile evidence from Hellenistic Pergamos or Amorgos with archaic Sparta. Alkman's testimony refers specifically to men's groups. functioning in a social setting completely different from that of the allegedly "similar" groups in Hellenistic cities. In this context, *thiasoi* seem to be the name of particular gatherings of the members of *syssitia* and cannot claim an equal standing as *syssitia*.

98. *IEG* II. 54 no. 6 (= Ath. 10.432d): καὶ τόδ' ἔθος Σπάρτηι μελέτημά τε κείμενόν ἐστι· πίνειν τὴν αὐτὴν οἰνοφόρον κύλικα, μήδ' ἀποδωρεῖσθαι προπόσεις ὀνομαστὶ λέγοντα, μήδ' ἐπὶ δεξιτερὰν χεῖρα κύκλωι θιάσου.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

II².2 122, ii of the word *thiasotai* as a synonym of *daitales* and *daitumones*, including only one of the possible semantic dimensions.

In Greek literature of the classical era, the words *thiasos* and *thiasotai* occur in almost all the literary genres, historiography, tragedy, and comedy to denote a group and the followers respectively.[99] In the forensic speeches of the 4th century, *thiasos* designates, with some contempt, the groups of humble and noisy people, who worship foreign deities, especially those of Thracian and oriental origin.[100] At the same time, we have the first instances of *thiasotai* as members of a private cult association; this is the meaning in Isaeus 9 (*On the estate of Astyphilos*) 30 as well as in Aristotle's *EN* 8.9.5 (1160a 19) and in *Oec.* 2.2.3 (1346b 13-19).[101] The lexicographers seem to preserve this range of possible meanings when they define the word *thiasotai* as *kuriōs oi peri ton Dionyson* (Sud. θ 379) and *ekalounto oi*

---

99. Historiography: Hdt. 4.79; tragedy: E. *Ba.* 56. 115. 547-49. 584. 680. 978. 1179-80. *IT* 1059-61 and *Ph.* 795-97; comedy: Ar. *Frogs* 156-7 and *Thesmophoriazousai* 39-42. For *thiasotai* see *Wasps* 728-30 and *Wealth* 508. It is interesting to notice that the scholia identify *thiasotai* with dancers (see *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem* ed. Deubner. Paris 1855. *Thesmophoriazousai* 41. *Frogs* 327. *Wealth* 508. *Wasps* 728).

100. D. 18 (*On the crown*) 260. 19 (*On the false embassy*) 199. 281. Cf. *Scholia Demosthenica* (ed. Dilts). Leipzig 1983-86. For an interpretation underlining the on-going feud between Demosthenes and Aischines and the use of litigation as means to protract the feud. Cohen (1995: 75-82). For the wording see also the accusation against Phryne.

101. Is. 9 (*On the estate of Astyphilos*) 30: καὶ εἰς τοὺς θιάσους τοὺς Ἡρακλέους ἐκεῖνον [αὐτὸν] εἰσήγαγεν ἵνα μετέχοι τῆς κοινωνίας. αὐτοὶ ὑμῖν οἱ θιασῶται μαρτυρήσουσιν. (He also introduced him to the thiasoi of Herakles in order that he might become a member of this association. The members will bear witness to this for you). Lambert (1999) links these *thiasoi* with the *thiasoi* of *IG* II² 2345. Aristot. *EN* 8.9.5 (1160a 19): ἔνιοι δὲ τῶν κοινωνιῶν δι' ἡδονὴν δοκοῦσι γίγνεσθαι, <οἷον> θιασωτῶν καὶ ἐρανιστῶν. αὗται γὰρ θυσίας ἕνεκα καὶ συνουσίας. (And some associations appear to be formed for the sake of pleasure (they provide). such as the *thiasotai* and the *eranistai*; these are unions for sacrifice and social intercourse). Aristot. *Oec.* 2.2.3 (1346b 13-19): Βυζάντιοι δὲ δεηθέντες χρημάτων τὰ τεμένη τὰ δημόσια ἀπέδοντο, τὰ μὲν κάρπιμα χρόνον τινά, τὰ δὲ ἄκαρπα ἀεννάως, τά τε θιασωτικά καὶ τὰ πατριωτικὰ ὡσαύτως, καὶ ὅσα ἐν χωρίοις ἰδιωτικοῖς ἦν· ὠνοῦντο γὰρ πολλοῦ ὧν ἦν καὶ τὸ ἄλλο κτῆμα. τοῖς δὲ θιασώταις ἕτερα χωρία τὰ δημόσια, ὅσα ἦν περὶ τὸ γυμνάσιον ἢ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἢ τὸν λιμένα. (The people of Byzantium being in need of funds leased public land. cultivated for a number of years. the uncultivated in perpetuity. Similarly. they sold land belonging to *thiasotai* and to ancestral cults. even those owned privately; for the owners of the surrounding land were ready to give a high price for them. To the *thiasotai* they gave such other public lands around the gymnasium or the market or the harbour); see di Donato. R. (1980) "Aspetti del diritto di proprietà in Grecia secondo L. Gernet" *ASNP* 10 (4). 1298-99 and 1315. For the term θιασωτικά see a fragmentary inscription of the first half of the 3rd century from Thasos in *IG* XII Suppl. 356.5: ἢ θιασιτικὰ ἢ χωριτικὰ. a document possibly concerning a regulation of debts.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

koinonountes tōn thiasōn (they were called those participating in *thiasoi* (Sud. θ 380) and *thiasotēs, o choreutēs* (Sud. θ 379).

The use of the words in the literature does not display any clear-cut distinction between the two. The word *thiasos* is used to describe in the beginning a social gathering, in which drinking was only one activity, and only after the 5th century the Bacchic group; even then it can still mean any group of people or worshippers or even a group of half-human creatures, such as Centaurs. The word *thiasotai* in the late 5th and early 4th century denotes principally the followers of a cult and only later in the 4th century private cult associations.[102] The wide range of possible meanings attributed to *thiasos* and *thiasotai* indicate that these words may describe different patterns of communal living, whose common feature was conviviality, later on exemplified by a distant or close connection with Dionysus.

Epigraphical evidence

In Attica, the term *thiasos* is epigraphically attested for the first time in *IG* I^3 1016, a dedication of the early 5th century.[103] Unfortunately its fragmentary state does allow more than one plausible restoration and little certainty. What is important, however, is that *thiasos* in this inscription is related to religious activity and it may be connected with the *thiasoi* of Isaeus as Lambert (1999) has recently suggested. At the turn of the 5th century *thiasos* occurs in the decrees of *Demotionidai*, *IG* II^2 1237.77 and 105. The inscription consists of three different decrees, the first issued in 396/5, the second soon afterwards, and the third sometime after the 360s. The word *thiasos* appears twice in the second decree and is clearly understood as a sub-division of the phratry, given the responsibility in the first instance, for the registration, or not, of a member's new born child, and for penalties in case of proved intrusions, for those members, who deceived or tried to deceive the phratry.[104] The members of this subdivision are called *thiasotai*.

The next piece of evidence comes from the reading of a decree inscribed on a cult-table, published initially as *IG* II^2 1246. Dow and Gill (1965: 111-12) read the palimpsest inscriptions and in the subsequent publication in *SEG* 22.122, 4 and 123, [3] the phrase *en to thiasoi* occurs designating the

---

102. For the use in texts of the Roman era see also Lucian *Fug.* 4. *Deor. Con.* 3. *D.Deor.* 271. D.C. *Historia Romana* 58.12.5 and 56.46.1. Philostr. Jun. *Im.* 884.20.

103. *IG* I^3 1016 (c. 500-480): - - ε - μ - ὸ [hερα]κλέο[ς]/ hίδρυε ὁ θίασος [Ἐ]τιονιδῶν (... of Herakles, the *thiasos* of Etionidai set up).

104. The bibliography about this set of decrees is large. Major modern works include Hedrick (1990), Lambert (1993), Rhodes (1997), and Polito, M. (1997) "Su I.G. II^2 1237: le procedure di ammissione alla fratria" *Miscellanea Greca e Romana* 21, 149-77.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

place where the *stele* should have been erected. According to the editors, *thiasos* has not any specific or technical sense; it is simply the earliest evidence of the word meaning cult association. In the temple of *orgeones* nobody could have been misled by this reference. However, *thiasos* in this inscription is used as a parallel to *hieron* and *Metroon*; it describes the place not the group. In this respect this inscription provides an interesting example of semantic diversity of *thiasos* as "group" and as "the place where a group is assembled".[105]

The word *thiasos* appears again in a document of the mid-4th century (*IG* II² 1177) and in three documents of the 3rd century (*IG* II² 1275, II² 1297 and II² 4985). Poland (1909: 20) assumed that the terminological difference between the terms *thiasos* and *thiasotai* describe two different structures, *thiasoi* designating the Athenian citizenry (athenische Bürgerbevölkerung), while the phrase *thiasotai* and *koinon thiasoton* refers to a more recent type, which possibly consists of foreigners and in which the religious element is underlined. It is my contention that a tacit distinction underlies the use of the words *thiasos* and *thiasotai* in these documents. In particular, the word *thiasos* is used less frequently than *thiasotai* and has a religious, solemn connotation, the group as a worshipping community, possibly wider than the *koinon*, while *thiasotai* or *koinon thiasoton* describes the group as an organized structure. Terminological inconsistency, for which ancient Athenians are reknown, is not an adequate explanation since the word *thiasos* is widely used in literary evidence of this era.

IG II² 1297 (236/5) is an honorary decree in favour of Sophron because he was responsible for convening the group (*sunegage ton thiason*).[106] *Thiasos* appears only once in the decree, while the association is described either by the word *thiasotai* (l.9, 15), or with the phrase *koinon* (l.1-2). Similarly in *IG* II² 1275 (325-275), a decree regulating among other things, the burial of a member of an association of *thiasotai* (1-7), the mutual aid among the

105. The text is republished in Gill (1991) with further comments; Ustinova (1996) seems to have misunderstood the comment while Parker (1996: 333) insists that *thiasos* describes the group. There is a parallel use of the expression ἐν τῶι θιάσωι in the foundation of Poseidonios from the 3rd-century Halikarnassos, *LSAM* 72.44-45: τὰ δὲ κώιδια πωλούντων ἐν τῶι θιάσωι (and the hides shall be sold in the *thiasos*).

106. *IG* II² 1297.2-5 ἐπειδὴ Σώφρων καλῶς καὶ φ[ιλ]οτί/μως συνήγαγε τὸν θίασον, ἐπέδωκεν δὲ καὶ στή/λην ὥστε ἀνατεθῆναι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν βουλόμενο/ς αὔξειν τὸ κοινὸν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων· (since Sophron well and zealously convened the *thiasos* and gave a stele in order to be dedicated in the temple, desiring to increase the treasury from its own). Mikalson (1998: 149) thinks that the ascription of this inscription to *Artemis Kalliste* is groundless; it is more likely that the *thiasotai* of *IG* II² 1297 and 1298 worshipped Artemis.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

members (7-9), the strict application of the decree's provisions (9-12) and the penalty in case of infringement (14-17), the word occurs only once in l.5-6: "or whoever from the group was in friendly terms [with the deceased]."[107] In the same document, there is a mention of *koinon* (l.17), when it is needed to describe the body, which inflicts penalties in case of disobedience while the subject of activities like ratifying a regulation (l.13) or prosecuting an infringer (l.15) is described by the term *thiasotai*. More ambiguous is the case of *IG* II² 1177 (mid 4th century),[108] which preserves part of the decision of the deme of Peiraeus to keep the *Thesmophorion* in proper condition and in order during the enumerated festivals. Among other prohibitions, it is not allowed for anybody to convene *thiasoi* in the premises of *Thesmophorion*.[109]

In these cases, it is inexpedient to suggest that these three terms could be used interchangeably as Tod (1906: 331 n.2) assumed, and interpret the term *thiasos* as the whole of *thiasotai* without any qualification. The use of three different terms was not something meaningless. Each had a particular connotation, depending on the context. *Thiasos* as a technical term was used cautiously and sparingly only when there was a religious function to be performed. The ban in *IG* II² 1177 does not concern the numerous, informal or formal, associations of Peiraeus but their religious functions in proximity to the *Thesmophorion*; they had to be cautious and avoid the building called *Thesmophorion*.[110] Therefore, *thiasos* does not designate in general any group of *thiasotai*. The same is true for *IG* II² 1297 in which *thiasos* refers explicitly to the strictly religious aspect of the association. It means the group of people coming together (that is the reason for the use of the verb *sunegage*) for a specific religious ceremony. Sophron is honoured as the one who convened the group and for his zeal in increasing the available funds of the group. His title, *archeranistes*, implies that he might have been the head of an *eranos* raised among the members of the group.[111]

---

107. *IG* II² 1275.5-6: ἢ ὃς ἂν οἰκειότατος εἶ τοῦ θιάσου. Similar practice in Roman Egypt discussed by Boak (1937: 218).

108. Also in Michel 144; *LSCG* 36; Poland A9; *SEG* 25.143; 33.1575bis; 36.181; 37.101, 42.1803, 44.20, 47.2320, 48.2185 and 49.2490.

109. *IG* II² 1177.3-6: [ὅπως ἂν μ/ηδ]εὶς ἀφέτους ἀφιεῖ μηδὲ θιά[σο/υς] συνάγει μηδὲ ἱερὰ ἐνιδρεύω[ν/ται] (so that nobody shall dismiss dedicated (people), nor shall convene religious groups nor shall found a sanctuary).

110. Poland (1909: 19), Radin (1910: 54), Vinogradoff (1920-22: 2.125-26) and *LSCG* 36. Contra Ziebarth (1896: 167).

111. Note that in *IG* II² 1298.17-20 the newcomers have to pay their share in a permanent fund called ἔρανος run by a κοινὸν θιασωτῶν; ἀναγράφ/ειν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐπεισιόντων συνθιασωτῶν/ τὰ ὀνόματα ἐπὰν καταβάλωσιν τὸ ἐπιβάλλο/[ν] αὐτοῖς τοῦ ὑπάρχοντος ἀργυρίου κατὰ τὸ/[ν ν]ό[μον] ἐν τῶι ἐράνωι· (to write down the names of the

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Finally in *IG* II² 1275 *thiasos* designates the members of the group responsible for announcing the death of a co-member. But death incurred religious obligations to the relatives of the deceased. On such an occasion the group is self-designated using a name of religious character. *Thiasotai* and *koinon* are the expressions used in order to denote the association in other instances. In other words, the word *thiasos* has a specific sacral connotation. The only possibility was the limited interchangeable use of the terms *thiasotai* and *koinon*.[112]

In *IG* II² 4985 (3rd century), a dedication to the concord of a *thiasos*,[113] whose wording resembles closely that of *IG* II² 1261, it is possible that *thiasos* means the community of the worshippers and not only the organized worshippers.[114]

We have a relatively clear picture of the structure and prosopography of the *thiasotai* of Bendis for a thirty-year long period (272/1-241/0). The dossier includes five honourary decrees, *IG* II² 1317, 1317b, *SEG* 2.9-10 and 44.60, which come from Salamis and present certain similarities.[115] In particular, there are striking similarities, between *IG* II² 1317 and 1317b, on

---

admitted *sunthiasotai*, when they pay their share of the existing fund according to the law in the *eranos*;).

112. An interesting case with the use of both terms, side by side, appears in *IG* II² 2347 (second half of the 4th century) from Salamis: Τούσδε ἐστεφάνωσαν οἱ θια[σ]ῶται φιλοτιμίας ἕνεκεν τῆς εἰς ἑαυτοὺς (in corona) Φιλιστίδην, Σωσίβιον. Τούσδε ἐστεφάνωσεν τὸ κοινὸν τῶν θιασωτῶν ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ δικαιοσύνης τῆς εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν θιασωτῶν (names). See Golden, M. (1979) "Demosthenes and the age of majority in Athens" *Phoenix* 33, 25-38 who claims, unconvincingly, that this inscription is a document issued by a *thiasos*-part of a phratry. In contrast, *IG* XII (5) 606 (= Michel 999, *SIRIS* 158) a 2nd-century honourary decree of *Sarapiastai* from the nearby Keos shows a wide use of the term *thiasos* (ll. 4, 6, 13) instead of *koinon*, which is wholly absent, or *Sarapiastai* (appearing in ll. 1 & 10 only). The expression συνάγω θίασον appears in 2 other instances from Asia Minor; *LSAM* 48.3-4: μὴ ἐξεῖναι δὲ μηδὲ/ συναγαγεῖν τὸν θίασον μηθενὶ πρότερον τοῦ δημοσίου (Miletos, 276/5) and in the 2nd-century re-inscribed text of *IMagn* 214: καὶ ἡ μὲν Κοσκὼ συνήγαγεν/ θίασον τῶν Πλατανιστηνῶν.

113. *IG* II² 4985 Ὁμονοίας τοῦ θιάσου. See also Thériault, G. (1996) *Le culte d'Homonoia dans les cités grecques*, 35-36, Lyon (Collection de la Maison de l'Orient Méditerannéen 26, Série épigraphique et historique 3).

114. The word *thiasos* appears once more with the same meaning in the beginning of the 2nd century in *IG* II² 2948.5-6: [Ἀ]νθ' ὧν, ὦ Διόνυσ', ὧν Ἴλαος οἶκον ἅμ' αὐτοῦ/ [καὶ] γενεὴν σώιζοις πάντα τε σὸν θίασον. The inscription can be linked with *IG* II² 1325 and 1326, because they have been discovered in the same place and in *IG* II² 2948.2 there is a reference to Dionysius, the leader of the *orgeones* of *IG* II² 1325 and 1326.

115. Steinhauer (1993: 33) reports, according to Dow, St. (1936) "New kinds of evidence for dating Polyeuktos" *AJA* 40, 65-70, that *IG* II² 1317b, *SEG* 2.9, 10 have been executed in the same workshop.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

the one hand, and *SEG* 2.10 on the other; they concern the place where they were found, on the acropolis of Salamis, the date of their assembly,[116] the structure of their board of administration, where the same offices occur in all the documents, with the exception of the mutilated *IG* II² 1317, and the same number of *epimeletai*, three in each inscription. In these documents the association follows the same practice, of honouring their officers collectively. Last but not least, a prosopographical remark concerning the identification of certain members of the administration in the above mentioned period: *Nikias* appears in all the three documents either as *epimeletes* (*IG* II² 1317b.11) or as *tamias* (*IG* II² 1317.7) or as a member proposing a decree (*SEG* 2.10, 3), *Stratokles* is *grammateus* in all three documents, *Dokimos* appears in *SEG* 2.9 and 10, *Rhythmos*, a shortened form of *Eurhythmos*, is honoured as *epimeletes* in *SEG* 2.10, 11 and proposes the honouring of other officials in *IG* II² 1317b.2, and *Menon*, who is an *epimeletes* in *IG* II² 1317b.11, may have been *epimeletes* also in *IG* II² 1317.7-8.[117] It is reasonable to conclude from these facts that these three documents were issued by the same association.

However, there are some difficulties in considering *SEG* 2.9 and 44.60 as issued by the same association. They come from Salamis but they were found in the harbour area. They have the same structure of the board of administration, that is three *epimeletai*, *grammateus* and *tamias*, and they honour en bloc their officers. They assemble at the same date in *Skirophorion*. A certain *Dokimos* appears in both *SEG* 2.9 and 10 as an official. It is very likely that he may have been an official in both groups. Nevertheless, the documents cannot be fully understood in the context of the previous three, because in *IG* II² 1317b the names of officials honoured in the archonship of *Hieron* (249/8) do not correspond to the names of the officials mentioned in *SEG* 2.9, 18-21. The practice of honouring *in corona* the priest appears in *SEG* 2.10 and *IG* II² 1317b and it may be due to a possible split in the existing association of *thiasotai* in the acropolis of Salamis. The group adopted this practice in order to distinguish itself from the homonymous group in the harbour. The publication of the decree *SEG* 44.60 by Steinhauer (1993) highlighted the problem once more. The decree

---

116. μηνὸς Σκιροφοριῶνος, δευτέραι ἱσταμένου. As a result, I think that in the first line of *IG* II² 1317 we should read μηνὸς Σκιροφοριῶνος, δευτέρα[ι ἱσταμένου, ἀγορᾶι κυρίαι --] as in *IG* II² 1317b, *SEG* 2.10 and 44.60. Cf. *SEG* 3.127. The editors of *IG* II² 1317 restored μηνὸς Σκιροφοριῶνος, δευτέρα[ι ἀγορᾶι κυρίαι —] thinking probably of the average number of letters per line.

117. So, in *IG* II² 1317.7-8 we may read [...Μένω?]να ἐπιμελητὴν as suggested by Dragoumis in *Athena* 30 (1918) 376 ff.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

is dated to the year of the archon *Lysiades* (248/7? according to Steinhauer or 241/0 according to Osborne (2003)). With the decree the *thiasotai* association honour their *epimeletai* and *grammateus* because of the performance of sacrifices according to the custom and the proper administration of the group's affairs. Steinhauer (1993) has demonstrated that there were two *thiasotai* associations worshipping Bendis in the mid-3rd century Salamis. Their rise and fall are connected with the installation of a Macedonian garrison on the hill of Mounychia in Peiraeus, the political manoeuvres of Athens at the same time to re-establish the democratic tradition and liberate Peiraeus. However, modifications in the archons' list of the mid third-century Athens (for which see Osborne (1999: 80)) and in particular, the ascription of archon Lysiades to 241/0 by Osborne (2003) undermine the elegant solution elaborated by Steinhauer. The break in the attribution of honours recorded in *SEG* 2.9 is more likely to be due to internal, possibly financial, difficulties of the association. More boldly, one could suggest, on the basis of the new dates, that the break of the old *thiasotai* association took place in the late 250s, and the newly created group (*SEG* 2.9 and 44.60) did not have, initially, the financial means to honour every year their officials; this interpretation accounts adequately for the appearance of *Nikias*, *Stratokles* and *Dokimos* in documents of both groups. They simply have followed the split group (*SEG* 2.9 and 44.60).

IG II² 1318, a badly mutilated document assigned by Tracy to the year 212/11, does not contain the names and the titles of the officers, but it is fair to assume that they were probably *epimeletai* since there are indications of their being more than one (6: *dedokasin* and 8: *autoi[s]*). Their duties are described in the same way as in *SEG* 2.9, 10 and *IG* II² 1277 and, finally, they were scrutinized for the administration of the association's financial affairs. *IG* II² 1319, assigned to the period 229-203, is an even less well preserved text and the only possible conjecture concerns the number of the honoured persons. It seems, from the space remaining in the last two lines, that more than two officials were honoured with this decree.

SEG 24.156 (237/6) is a decree honouring *Paidikos* for preserving, through the Demetrian war (239-229), the collected *eranos*,[118] while *IG* II² 1298 provides another instance of an *eranos* in an association of *thiasotai*. The word *eranos*, in this context does not mean an association, but a kind

118. This mutilated stone led Robert (1969: 14-23) to conclude that "Ce thiase était exactement un eranos". Although his epigraphical remarks are accurate, the assumption concerning the nature of the association is misleading. *Eranos* does not have anything to do with associations but it means a fund collected among the members of the group. The group's members continue to call themselves *thiasotai*.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

of amicable loan collected among the associates and existing for the needs of a co-associate.

A group of *thiasotai* appear in a 4th-century dedication (*SEG* 24.223) from the area near Eleusis[119] erected "when Antiphanes was priest" followed by the names of 18 members. Among the names there are some panhellenic like *Konon*, *Apollonides*, *Kallistratos* but also some indicating low status like *Lydos*, *Midas*, *Daos*. In the 3rd century a *thiasotai* association bestowed honours to a certain *Euaggelos* of Sounion (*Ag*. 16, 231).

Finally, the epigaphical dossier of *thiasotai* includes *IG* II² 1278 (272/1) whose attribution to a *koinon thiasoton* depends on a doubtful reading by Wilhelm and *Ag*. 16, 223, a decree of 227/6 honouring a certain Nikomachos, son of Nikon for his aid to the group, in which the restoration of *thiasotai* rests upon a suggestion made by Merritt.[120]

As far as our epigraphical evidence goes, it is clear that the word *thiasos* is used either to designate a subdivision of the phratry, at least in the 4th century, or to indicate a religious function of any group of *thiasotai* in which non – *thiasotai* could take part. The term *thiasotai* is used in general to describe not only the members of a phratry's *thiasos*, but also to define a private cult association, acquiring in this way a broader sense. In this respect, it is misleading to equate *thiasos* with *thiasotai* without further qualification.

C. ERANISTAI

Whereas *orgeones* and *thiasotai* are directly connected with cult practices, the association of *eranistai* with cult is usually underplayed, in favour of their involvement in the provision of loans.[121] Nevertheless, the available evidence for *eranistai* as a cult group is not negligible; it ranges from the second half of the 4th century to the 2nd century A.D. and includes a few honorary decrees, dedications, a law from the Roman era, 19 *horoi*,[122] and

---

119. In the museum of Eleusis lies an unpublished *thiasotai* dedication (Inv. No. E153).

120. *IG* II² 1278: Wilhelm, A. (1905) "Ἀττικὰ ψηφίσματα" *AE*, 215-252 (now in Wilhelm, *ABGI* 2, 41-42): "εἴπερ ὀρθῶς ἐξέλαβον τὸ ἐν στ. 8 τελευταῖον γράμμα ὡς θῆτα". *Ag*. 16, 223: Merritt, B.D. (1961) "Greek inscriptions" *Hesperia* 30, 227 no. 6.

121. Leiwo (1997: 106-08) overstresses this activity and reaches some far-fetched conclusions about the financial activities of *eranistai*.

122. In chronological order: *SEG* 32.236, 41.127, Finley 71, 114, 32, 30, 40, 42, 43, 44, 70, 112, 113, 31A-B, 78A, 114A, 163A, *Ag*. 19H.94 and *SEG* 48.173. On *horoi* as monuments see Ober, J. (1995) "Greek Horoi. Artifactual texts and the contigency of

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

17 entries among the numerous freedmen's *phialai* [*catalogi paterarum argentearum* (*IG* II² 1553-1572)].[123]

This section is devoted to the study of the term *eranistai* and *koinon eraniston* in relation to *eranos*. The main question concerns the possibility to identify a) *eranos* and *eranistai*, and b) *eranistai* with cult associations whose name ends in *–stai*, which appear in the 3rd century and later. The interpretation of *horoi* and freedmen's bowls will play a considerable role in this attempt, since these documents are the most numerous and important testimonies about the nature of the *koina eraniston* and their features.

Eranos as an expression of a collective activity, namely that of banqueting, is present already in Homer.[124] In classical Athens the word occurs in comedy (e.g. Ar. *Ach*. 614-17 and *Lys*. 651-53), tragedy (e.g. E. *Supp*. 363 and *Hel*. 388) and in the orators (e.g. Antiphon *Tetralogies* 2B.9, D. 21 (*Against Meidias*) 101 and 184, Hyp. 5 (*Against Athenogenes*) 14). It is even more frequent in the 3rd century. Its meaning and semantic evolution from the period before the Peloponnesian War up to the early Christian era is traced in the exhaustive work of Vondeling (1961).[125]

Caillemer, in one of his lectures,[126] distinguished between the principal two meanings of the word *eranos*. In Homer it meant a picnic, but this meaning was altered as early as the 5th century.[127] Caillemer pointed out that the meaning of the word in the classical era describes a society with religious purposes and "une société du secours mutuel".

Foucart (1873: 3) was the first to explain that there were two kinds of

---

meaning" in Small, D.B. (ed) *Methods in the Mediterranean Archaeology: historical and archaeological views on texts and archaeology*, 91-123, Leyden (Mnemosyne Suppl. 153).

123. See the list compiled by Vondeling (1961: 118-19). I do not reproduce the tables here, since only in *SEG* 18.36 and 25.178 new readings and restorations of the existing entries are mentioned without adding anything new. Studies on different aspects are reported in *SEG* 27.7; 35.248; 38.53; 39.168; 41.99 & 258; 43.1221, 44.67-68 & 259, 46.180 & 2261 and 48.144, 151 & 2116bis.

124. E.g. *Od*. 1.226 and 12.1415.

125. Cf. *TR* 75 (1962) 447-80 and *Labeo* 11 (1965) 220-24. Vondeling's book remains the fundamental study on *eranos*; for an account of the published work following Vondeling's, see Millett (1991: 294-95 n.33). For a different approach, underlining an anthropological-psychological aspect, see Gernet (1968: 21-61 and especially 46).

126. Reprinted in Caillemer (1872). According to Lipsius (1905-15: 730, n.197) this distinction was first made by van Holst (1832) *De eranis veterum Graecorum inprimis ex jure Attico*, 73ff, Leyden. Caillemer's lecture is an attempt to undermine van Holst's - largely unknown - view of *eranos* as an association without a solidarity fund for its members.

127. See Vondeling (1961: 15-27 and 258). In the 5th century *eranos* means either a loan (Antiphon *Tetralogies* 2B.9, Ar. *Ach*. 615) or generally a sum of money collected for a concrete purpose (Ar. *Lys*. 653).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

eranoi coming from the original Homeric meaning. He called the first civil (éranes civiles), whose aim was the grant of interest-free loans, and the second religious (éranes religieux). Foucart (1873) distinguished between the different contents of the word but not between the terms *eranistai* and *eranos*. Most scholars still regard Foucart 's distinction as holding good. It may appear under different names but the core of the distinction is the same.[128] It is important to seek the reasons for such a distinction, because confirmation of this principle will have considerable impact on the problem of identifying and interpreting the status of these associations.

Beauchet (1897: 4.258 and 354) was the first who tried to establish this distinction. He pointed out that there was a difference in the terminology, concerning not only the titles of officers, but also the essential function of these groups. In particular, he remarked that when there is a mention of "eranos-loan" there are expressions like *eranizomenos*, *eranizontes*, *plerotai* (D. 21 (*Against Meidias*) 101 and Hyp. 5 (*Against Athenogenes*) 13), *sullegein eranon* (D. 18 (*On the crown*) 312 and Antiphon *Tetralogies* 2B.9) and the rest. On the other hand in "eranos-club" there are such terms as *arch(i)eranistes*, *proeranistria*, *eranistai*, *koinon eraniston* and the like.

All in all, the prevailing opinion considers *eranistai* to be members of an *eranos* raised by friends of the debtor and without any technical meaning. A re-examination of the available evidence will test the validity of this view.

Literary evidence

The word *eranistai* occurs for the first time in the 6th century in a fragment from the work of Pherekydes (*FGrHist* 3 F11).[129] Although the passage is preserved only through a scholion on Apollonios Rhodios *Argonautika*, IV 1515 and it is of dubious reliability, it appears to be the first testimony of *eranistai* and it means participants, of a noble status, in a banquet.

In the 5th century the word occurs in a fragment of the Aristophanic *Olkades* (*PCG* III.2, frg. 419). In the 4th century there is the reference in Aristotle's work and in the 3rd century, among others, in Euphro (*PCG* V,

---

128. See also Beauchet (1897: 4.258) Ziebarth (1896: 16), Poland (1909: 28), San Nicolò (1913-15: 2.214-15), Finley (1951: 100), Vondeling (1961: 82-83), Maier (1969: 75), Millett (1991: 153) and Harris (1992: 311).

129. *FGrHist* 3 F11: Περσέως δὲ πυθομένου ἐπὶ τίνι ὁ ἔρανος εὐωχεῖται, τοῦ δὲ φήσαντος ἐπὶ ἵπποι, Περσεύς εἶπεν ἐπὶ τῆι τῆς Γοργόνος κεφαλῆι. μετὰ δὲ τὸν ἔρανον τῆι ἑξῆς ἡμέραι, ὅτε οἱ ἄλλοι ἐρανισταὶ τὸν ἵππον ἀπεκόμιζον, καὶ Περσεύς. (When Perseus asked what would be the counter-gift for the feast, and he said a horse, Perseus said the head of Gorgon. The sixth day after the feast, when the other banqueters brought each one a horse, Perseus did as well).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

frg. 9) where *eranistai* are qualified as *surphetos* and the names of persons (*Dromon*, *Kerdon*, *Soterides*) mentioned imply a sort of newly rich people, who pay as much as they asked for.[130]

In all these passages the connection of *eranistai* with a dinner (or the preparation of it) is evident. Therefore, *eranistai* means the people (nobles earlier, common later) who sit together for dinner, while the element of reciprocity is conspicuously lacking. This meaning is present also in Arist. *EN* 4.2.20 (1123a 20-22).[131] In this passage the feasting of *eranistai*, tentatively translated as club, is likened to a wedding banquet, implying that the lavishness in the former case is something excessive, a feature of newly rich people. However, in Arist. *EN* 8.9.5 (1160a 19-20)[132] the meaning assigned to *eranistai* is slightly different, since it means an association of people coming together for pleasure rather than for religion. Phrases like *hestiasen eranistas* or *hestion eranistas* and in general the connection of *eranistai* with a feast seems to persist from the 6th to the 1st century (*IG* II² 1343).[133]

Another reference to *eranistai* concerns their alleged connection with *eranikai dikai* mentioned in *AthPol* 52.2. The current orthodoxy holds that this procedure concerns only loans and debts created by the non-payment of the loan.[134] The introduction of this special procedure was probably a necessity, so that the decision over pending cases would be accelerated by inclusion among the monthly cases (*dikai emmenoi*) and the confidence of the people in this kind of credit would not be undermined, since it constituted a substantial method of raising capital, especially in an emergency.

The identification of the term *eranos* with the term *koinon eraniston*,

---

130. *PCG* iii.2 frg. 419 (Aristophanes): πρώιην ἐρανιστὰς ἑστιῶν ἤψησ' ἔτνος (the day before yesterday feasting banqueters he prepared a thick soup). *PCG* v frg. 9. 1-2 (Euphro) (= Ath. 377d): ὅταν ἐρανισταῖς, Καρίων, διακονῇς, οὐκ ἔστι παίζειν οὐδ' ἃ μεμάθηκας ποιεῖν (when you are serving banqueters, Karion, it is not allowed either to play, or to do things you have learned).

131. Arist. *EN* 4.2.20 (1123a 20-22): ἐν γὰρ τοῖς μικροῖς τῶν δαπανημάτων πολλὰ ἀναλίσκει καὶ λαμπρύνεται παρὰ μέλος, οἷον ἐρανιστὰς γαμικῶς ἑστιῶν (he spends a great deal and makes a tasteless display on unimportant occasions; for instance, he gives a dinner to his club on the scale of a wedding banquet). Cf. Arist. *MM* 1.26 (1192b 2).

132. Arist. *EN* 8.9.5 (1160a 19-20): ἔνιαι δὲ τῶν κοινωνιῶν δι' ἡδονὴν δοκοῦσι γίγνεσθαι <οἷον> θιασωτῶν καὶ ἐρανιστῶν. αὗται γὰρ θυσίας ἕνεκα καὶ συνουσίας. (and some associations appear to be formed for the sake of pleasure, for example religious associations and dining-clubs, which are unions for sacrifice and social intercourse).

133. Millett (1991: 155).

134. See among others Lipsius (1905: 734), Harrison (1968-71: 2.22), Maier (1969: 168), Cohen (1973: 21) and (1992: 209), Rhodes (1981: 585), Millett (1991: 154) and Harris (1992: 312, n.12). Contra, Caillemer (1872: 31), Beauchet (1897: 4.357) and Reinach (1892: 807) and recently Jones (1999: 36) who sees in them cases in which *eranoi*-clubs could not enforce their decision.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

which is predominant among scholars,[135] is due to lexicographers and scholiasts; they preserved the quite late meaning of the word *eranos* and *eranistes*. Most of the lexicographers explain the word as follows: "*Eranistes* is the one who takes part in a friendly loan and pays the contribution which he owes every month".[136]

An example will illustrate the problem. Plato in his *Laws* 915E says that

"about friendly loans, let anyone who wants to collect contributions as friend from friends; in case of any disagreement concerning the friendly loan, act on the assumption that no legal remedy is provided about it".

The scholiast commented, a few centuries later,

"*eranos* is a monthly contribution, or the feast made up by contributions or a banquet or a dinner in which each one brings something. And *eranistai* are the contributors paying the contributions and the participants in it".[137]

From a mere comparison of both texts, the distortion caused by the scholiast is evident. *Eranos* in the Platonic text means loan and not meal or feast. And the ideal legislation, on disputes springing from friendly loans, does not provide any legal remedy. Contrary to the scholion, *eranos* was not the monthly contribution, but rather the capital gathered. And the misleading comment goes on, introducing the word *eranistai* as members of such a collection of money, while in the text the terms are *philon* and *philois*, underscoring the friendly character. It is noteworthy that the scholion provides for *eranos* two explanations, that is feast or contribution, but identifies *eranistai* only with the members of a loan. Saunders in his translation of Plato's *Laws* translated *eranos* as "contributions to clubs" without taking into account the fact that there is no mention of members of any club, but simply of friends. The Platonic statement is, in that respect, quite clear; friendly loans, whether in the context of associations or friendly circles, should not be recovered by juridical means.

A similar case can be seen between, on the one hand the passage in

---

135. Most recently see Pakkanen (1996: 47) and Mikalson (1998: 141).

136. Harp. ε 129. Phot. s.v., Sud. ε 2892. EM. s.v.: Ἐρανιστὴς μέντοι κυρίως ἐστὶν ὁ τοῦ ἐράνου μετέχων καὶ τὴν φορὰν ἣν ἑκάστου μηνὸς ἔδει καταβάλλειν εἰσφέρων. Pollux (3.129. 6.7-8. 8.37. 101. 144 and 157) collected only the contexts in which the word occurs.

137. Pl. *Laws* 915E: ἐράνων δὲ πέρι, τὸν βουλόμενον ἐρανίζειν φίλον παρὰ φίλοις· ἐὰν δέ τις διαφορὰ γίγνηται περὶ τῆς ἐρανίσεως, οὕτω πράττειν ὡς δικῶν μηδενὶ περὶ τούτων μηδαμῶς ἐσομένων, and *Sch. Plat. in Leg.* 915E: ἔρανός ἐστιν εἰσφορά τις ἑκάστου μηνὸς ἢ ἐκ συμβολῆς δεῖπνον, ἢ εὐωχία, ἢ ἀνὰ μέρος δεῖπνον. καὶ ἐρανισταὶ οἱ τε τὴν εἰσφορὰν αὐτὴν εἰσφέροντες καὶ οἱ κοινωνοὶ ταύτης.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Acharnians and the fragment from *Olkades* (*PCG* III.2 frg. 419) on the other. Aristophanes in *Acharnians*, in a vicious attack against Lamachos, complains that while decent, ordinary Athenians are never sent on embassies, fellows like the son of Coesyra and Lamachos do so; and he continues with character -killing in lines 614-17:

> " They say no. Instead it's Lamachus and the son of Coesyra who go - although the other day, on account of loans and debts, all their friends were warning them to "stay clear" as if they were emptying slops in the evening".[138]

In the fragment from *Olkades* it is clear that the word *eranistai* means the banqueteers. How can we identify *eranos* and *eranistai* when the former refers clearly to loans and debts and the latter occurs in the context of a banquet? Nevertheless, Vondeling (1961: 73) is convinced, not by the substantial semantic difference of the terms, but by the scholion to Ar. *Ach.* 615.

So far, it has been shown that the semantic field of the word *eranos* and *eranistai* is different. *Eranos* initially meant a feast to which the participants are contributing. In that case *eranistai* would mean simply the participants in the feast, and that is how the word is used in Pherekydes' fragment (*FGrHist* 3 F11). The element of contribution soon faded, and then *eranistai* signified the participants in any meal. This seems to be the meaning of the word in the passages of the comedians, while in the 4th century the word *eranos* means exclusively a friendly loan. The long fragment of Euphro clarifies another aspect, namely that the participants did not contribute anything to the meal, since a *mageiros* instructs his assistant how to serve in such gatherings. The reciprocity, evident in the original meaning, was replaced, possibly by rotating meals provided by the friends. Furthermore, the repetition of the feast-gatherings on a regular basis, with an ordinary and simple organization and preparation led to the establishment of quasi-associative links among the members, combined with the concept of *philia*, whereas the traditional meaning of participating in a banquet did not die out easily. Therefore, *eranistai* means the participants in a feast, which in the course of time crystallized and possibly institutionalized taking the form of an association, similar to other kinds of association, which already existed. The adoption of a religious pretext is already evident in the 3rd century.

---

138. Ar. *Ach.* 614-17: οὔ φασιν, ἀλλ' ὁ Κοισύρας καὶ Λάμαχος, οἷς ὑπ' ἐράνων τε καὶ χρεῶν πρώην ποτε, ὥσπερ ἀπόνιπτρον ἐκχέοντες ἑσπέρας, ἅπαντες "ἐξίστω" παρήνουν οἱ φίλοι.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Inscriptions

Epigraphical evidence, contemporary to the above described shifts, may prove this diversity and may confirm Vondeling's (1961: 82) argument that *eranos* obtains a meaning which amounts to *koinon eraniston* only after the 2nd century[139] What remains to be clarified is the relation between *eranos* and *koinon eraniston* before this *terminus post quem*.

The epigraphical evidence for *eranistai* in Attica consists largely of *horoi* and freedmen's bowls.[140] Therefore, the interpretation of *koina eraniston* mentioned there is of crucial importance.

The most thorough analysis of *horoi* is that of Finley (1951).[141] For Finley (1951: 101) the important question to be asked is "which meaning is to be assigned to the eranists of the horoi". His answer is short but coherent and well supported; "from the outset, the available evidence argues in favor of the eranos-loan". His arguments can be summarized in five points:

a. "Eranos almost invariably means loan (or the lending group) and not club; the earliest use that may rendered "club" or "society " is in the passage in Arist. *EN* 1123a 22" (101).

b. " The earliest epigraphical documents of *eranos*-associations date in the middle of the 3rd century. The one dated *horos* mentioning *eranistai*, in contrast, is no 71 of the year 309/8. Furthermore, all indications point to 250 as more or less the terminal date for the *horoi* generally, as we have seen" (101).

c. " The internal evidence of the horoi is largely inferential, but it supports the loan interpretation". Then he studies briefly *horos* Finley 40 (= *IG* II² 2721) in which there is a *plerotes* and *suneranistai*. He claims "*plerotes* is a technical word for a contributor to an eranos-loan" and in this *horos* "Leochares, we may safely assume, was the head of the group of men who made the loan" without presenting any decisive evidence, and he concludes: " There can be no question of a club in this instance"

d. He points out two peculiarities: a) "*eranoi* always stand alone as the

---

139. Vondeling's conclusions are largely founded on evidence from Rhodes.

140. The word *eranos* is possibly attested in a long, fragmentary and "serpental" inscription of the 7th century from Tiryns (Peloponnese) for which see *SEG* 30.380; 34.296; 35.275; 36.347; 41.294; 43.1735; 44.1275, 45.2262 and 48.2132.

141. The most recent discussion of *horoi* is in the introduction by Millett in the reprint of Finley (1951). Millett (1991) uses Finley's conclusions as far as they concern *eranistai* emphasizing the role of the informal procedures for raising loans. For a summary of recently published articles on *horoi* see Millett (1991: 222-24). The list provided by Millett (1991: 295 n.34) includes documents from Amorgos (Finley 8) and Lemnos (Finley 110) but Finley 78A is omitted.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

creditors, whereas the associations more often than not appear in combination" and b) "not a single one of the ten horoi refers to a written instrument or contract. That fact may be no more than a statistical accident but the more probable explanation is that it reflects the friendly character of the transaction, the underlying philanthropic ethic" (102).

i.e. "They (the historians opposed to such an interpretation) must explain finally how the *eranos*-societies differed so radically in purpose, constitution, and, above all, financial position, as to be able to make loans ranging as high as 6,000 drachmas, when phratries, *orgeones*, and the rest, could do so rarely, if ever" (101).[142]

The conclusion is that *eranistai* means members of an *eranos*-loan; then the inevitable question is why property was given as real security. The raison d'être of these stones, according to Finley (1951: 103), is "special circumstances that would occasionally induce the man in need of a large sum of cash to offer some realty as a guaranty, especially if he were a man of substantial property".

Ten years later, but still unknown in wider academic circles, Vondeling (1961: 137-42) put forward strong objections against Finley's interpretation. In particular, he argued that

i. Finley's distinction between religious (cult) bodies and *eranoi* cannot be sustained because the latter had a religious function to perform,

ii. The *eranistai* mentioned in *horoi* can mean associations, since our epigraphical evidence about them is extended well beyond the end of the 4th century and it is contemporary with Arist. *EN* 4.2.20 (1123a 22), in which the meaning of association is already present (138),

iii. The sums of money for which a security has been put up are not so considerably bigger for *eranoi* than for the other forms of associations (139),

iv. That the case of Finley 40 is compatible with the consideration of *eranistai* as association (139-140), and

v. The lack of any contract proves little, because it does not seem to be a uniform practice in the rest of the *horoi* (141).

He concludes that in *horoi*, *koina eraniston* are essentially associations, which appeared with their head officer and that hypothecation was a part of their activities. In one of the latest discussions about borrowing and lending Millett (1991: 155-6) has pointed out that

> [Vondeling's evolutionary] scheme is attractive in the prominence given to reciprocity, its culmination in closed groups of eranists seems to

142. A similar argument but not so much elaborated was expressed by Poland (1909: 29).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

diminish the range of mutual support in fourth-century society. But in his preoccupation with the formal side of eranos-credit, Vondeling is in danger of overlooking the detailed evidence for the raising of an eranos-loan. When pieced together, the material makes it clear that mutual assistance between citizens meant far more than predetermined groups of eranists.

From the discussion emerges a quite sharp division of opinions about *eranistai*; Finley followed by Millett (1991: 153-59) considers them as casual gatherings of, primarily, wealthy people, while Vondeling tries to prove that financial activities were a part of the day-to-day life of *eranistai* associations. But both authors fail to make clear what is the meaning of the terms *eranistai* and *eranos* respectively. In particular:

1. Finley is right in his remark that "eranos means loan". But the point is not so much the meaning of *eranos* as the meaning of *eranistai*. In this respect, Finley fails to provide any evidence to prove that *eranistai* means members of an *eranos*-loan.

2. The earliest epigraphical evidence for *eranistai* associations comes not from the middle of the 3rd century but almost a century before: two dedications [*IG* II² 2935 (324/3) and *SEG* 41.171 (300/299)], a decree [*IG* II² 1265 (300)], and most important a mention in a *tabula poletarum* [*IG* II² 1583 = *Ag* 19, P14 face B, col. III 384-85 and 395 (c. 350)]. One cannot doubt Kirchner's restoration, which is fairly plausible since in similar documents the group of *Eikadeis* is present. Poland (1909: 29) had already rejected their validity as proofs of the existence of *eranistai* associations and considered them as groups of loose structure; Finley (1951) and Millett (1991) seemed to overlook them.[143] However, mere denial or disregard cannot account for the organized association of *IG* II² 1265 and *SEG* 41.171, in which groups of *eranistai* honour their officials. Furthermore, the purpose of a dedication to Zeus of Friendship made by *eranistai* as a casual group (*IG* II² 2935) or of another dedication in Laureion by slaves working in the mines and designating themselves as *eranistai* (*IG* II² 2940, end of the 2nd century), or finally the dedication on the tomb of one Artemidoros from Seleukeia (*IG* II² 10248, 3rd century) remains unclear. I think that loose, ad hoc groups would not proceed in such costly demonstrations of intimacy.[144] Thus, it is not, at all, improbable that *eranistai* mentioned in *horoi* are actually associations and not simply lending groups.

---

143. Parker (1996: 337) doubts that "a society exists whenever *eranistai* appear, even if the context is religious".

144. For other examples of a later era see *SEG* 21.633 (first half of the 2nd century) and Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203, a catalogue of *eranistai* from Rhamnous (41/40).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

3. The lack of any contract or any agreement, due to the friendly character of the loan, is not a sound argument, because such an explanation can fit as well in the context of an association, in which friendly loans could be arranged, without any documents being drafted.

4. While in 13 out of 18 cases there is the standard phrase *eranistais tois nasta*, in the remaining cases there are considerable differences. The two sets of exceptions are the following:

a) Finley 44 and *Ag.* 19 H.84, in which there is a simple reference to *eranistai* without any further specification, because creditors and debtor were probably well known, and

b) Finley 40 and Finley 114A, in which the terminology is totally different from the rest of the *horoi*. In Finley 40 a loan of 3,000 drachmas has been concluded between the unknown borrower and *Leochares*, who is designated as *plerotes*, and his *suneranistai*. In Finley 114A there is a loan called *eranos* of 500 drachmas and a woman is designated as *plerotria*.[145] These differences cannot be explained away by considering them as a unique case, which, however, provides enough ground to found a whole interpretation of *eranoi*. The term *suneranistai* is found again in the late *SEG* 31.122 (A.D. 121/22) and like the terms *sumprutaneis* or *sunepheboi* cannot mean anything more than "fellow eranists" and I do not think it is substantially different from *eranistai*. The terms *plerotes*, *-tria* in the literature mean the contributor as well as the head of an *eranos*[146] while *eranos* means, everywhere at that period, a friendly loan. These rare and exceptional words cannot support Finley's view that the groups mentioned in *horoi* were ad hoc groups granting exclusively loans without interest.

5. The recently published *horos*, Finley 163A[147] could be an important pie-

145. See the recent discussion and restoration in Harris (1992) (= *SEG* 42.149). The older view is accepted by Leiwo (1997: 111).

146. Harris (1992: 312 n.11) claims, on the basis of D. 21 (*Against Meidias*) 101, 184, 185, 25 (*Against Aristogeiton I*) 21, Hyp. 3 (*For Euxenippus*) 7, 9, 11, that *plerotes* denotes not the contributor but the collector on behalf of the borrower. However, the evidence he uses is, at least, ambiguous. The passages from Hypereides put *plerotai* on the same footing with *chrestai* that is creditors; creditors in case of an *eranos* loan are all the contributors not only one person. In D. 21 (*Against Meidias*) 184-85: ἐγὼ νομίζω πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἐράνους φέρειν παρὰ τὸν βίον αὐτοῖς, οὐχὶ τούσδε μόνους οὓς συλλέγουσί τινες καὶ ὧν πληρωταὶ γίγνονται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλους (I consider that all men contribute to loans throughout their life for their own benefit - not just these loans which people collect and which have contributors, but others too. As translated by MacDowell (1990)) the identification of collector and contributor may seem possible but it is by no means the only likely because a few lines below Meidias is described as *plerotes* [i.e. contributor] to an *eranos* of insolence.

147. Finley 163A: ὅρος οἰκιῶν καὶ περιοικίου ἀπο{τ}τιμήματος ἐρανισταῖς τοῖς μετὰ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

ce of evidence to the contrary. In particular, this inscription gives some credit to Finley's interpretation and casts doubts on Vondeling's statement that *eranistes* never means a member of an *eranos*. The crucial point is to define the exact meaning of *eranos* and *eranistai* in this *horos*. *Eranos* means a sum of money - a talent in this case - lent by a group of people;[148] it is not a *daneion*, the standard Greek term for loan. This friendly loan was secured with the hypothecation of the house and the surrounding plot. *Eranistai*, on the other hand, imply a group of people, one of whose activities was the grant of *eranos* loans; nothing in the *horos* implies that this group of *eranistai* had provided only this loan. In this document *eranistai* existed before the loan was made and probably after it. In this case, it was difficult to raise so large a sum as a talent only among friends, but the intervention of a more established network such as an association could constitute a decisive factor in this attempt.

6. Finley's (1951: 106) contention that the picture emerging from the *horoi* depicts the world of the wealthy Athenians is not wholly convincing. A prosopographical examination of the *horoi* set up by *eranistai* discloses only one prominent figure, that of Νεοπτόλεμος Ἀντικλέους Μελιτεὺς (*LGPN* ii (8)). For the remaining names there is no further evidence.[149]

7. The putting up of security is not due to the willingness of the borrower, but rather to a practice, identified in other societies and concerning social distance, in terms of kinship, between the lender(s) and the borrower(s). When there is a close relation, then there is no need for security, but in cases of distant relations putting up securities is more likely. In our evidence, even if the participants were considered as friends, the security was thought necessary, presumably because of the amount of the loan.

8. Millett's criticism is preoccupied by the relative preponderance of informal types of mutual assistance between friends over the *eranistai* associations. But since these associations were merely expressions and forms related to a joint pleasure, mutual assistance and the particular concept of friendship, there must have been several possibilities of concluding friendly loans. In Athenian society of the 4th century there are no signs of bipo-

---

Μνησιθέου Ἀλωπεκῆ(θεν) τοῦ ἐράνου τοῦ τα[λ]αντιαίου (*Horos* of houses and surrounding plot (given) as security to the *eranistai* with Mnesitheos of Alopeke for the one talent loan). See Finley (1951: xviii) and Harris, E.M. (1993) "Apotimema: Athenian terminology for real security in leases and dowry agreements" *CQ* 43, 73-95.

148. Cohen (1992: 208-15) rejects the gratuitious character of *eranos*-loan and underlines its periodicity in repaying and the multiplicity of lenders.

149. The identification of Μνησίθεος Ἀλωπεκῆθεν in Finley 163A (*LGPN* ii (19)) with the homonym witness mentioned in D. 21 (*Against Meidias*) 82 and that of Βλεπαῖος in *Ag.* 19 H.94 (*LGPN* ii (2)) with the banker mentioned by Demosthenes in 21 (*Against Meidias*) 215 and 40 (*Against Boiotos* II) 52 is uncertain.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

larity between informal networks of mutual assistance and "predetermined groups of eranists", since the latter are a development of these informal networks. In other words, the existence of informal groups of lenders does not preclude lending by an association of *eranistai*.

Therefore, the meaning of *eranistai* in *horoi* is more likely to be members of an association, with the possible exception of Finley 40, and not an *ad hoc* group of lenders. The word *eranos* and its terminology *plerotes*, *plerotria* suggest a loose and perhaps *ad hoc* group, while the majority of *horoi* refer to *eranistai* associations.[150]

The second important group of documents is the well-known freedmen's bowls. It contains nearly 200 entries, among them 17 in which there is a mention of *koinon eraniston*. These silver bowls were offered by manumitted slaves after their victory in a special legal procedure called *dike apostasiou*.[151] They are dated, more or less, in the last third of the 4th century. The question again concerns the nature of *koina eraniston*.

According to Finley (1951: 103-106) *koinon eraniston* in these records does not refer to anything else than to an "eranos-loan, an ad hoc group of people" from whom the slave borrowed money in order to buy his or her freedom. Finley argued that the traditional theory that the manumitted slaves belonged to the associations is untenable for three reasons: 1. these references to groups are earlier than the first epigraphical evidence of *eranos*-clubs, 2. there was no apparent reason for any association to own slaves with the skills mentioned in these inscriptions; and 3. the occurrence of two names of individuals in *IG* II^2 1558.37:

> "Nikias, seller of incense, living in Peiraeus, having avoided Philokrates, son of Epikrates of Eleusis and the *koinon eraniston* those with Theophrastos son of Bathyllos of Cholargos, bowl weighing 100"

and *IG* II^2 1559.26:

> "Bion, living in Melite, engraver of gems, having avoided Chairippos, son of Chairedemos of Halaia and the *koinon eraniston* those with Chairippos of Halaia, bowl weighing 100"

---

150. Similar opinion expressed by Gernet (1968: 47 n.144 and 51) and recently by Cohen (1992: 208 n.111). I do not agree with Cohen (1992: 208) on the use of the terms *eranos* and *eranistai* as having the same meaning.

151. The word *eranos* appears similarly in inscriptions from Delphi (e.g. *RIJG* 2.16) and Boiotia (e.g. *Syll*^{3} 1207); cf. Albrecht (1978). For the legal procedure see Harrison (1968-71: 1.182-3). Harrison's statement that "in seventeen cases an *eranos*, usually with a named leader is mentioned" is inaccurate since in these seventeen entries there is only *koinon eraniston* mentioned. Millett (1991: 296 n.39) follows essentially Harrison's view. See the summary in Todd (1993: 191-92).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

instead of one plus the expression *koinon eraniston* makes it difficult to accept the view that these *koina* were actually associations.[152]

Instead, Finley (1951: 105) argues that in these cases where two names of individuals occur, the one is the name of the freer and the second of the head of the loan group. His argument stems from [D.] 59 (*Against Neaira*) 31, where Neaira is collecting an *eranos* in order to buy her freedom. Finley claims that Phrynion would be the head of this *eranos*, which was collected by Neaira in order to buy her freedom, since Neaira was a slave and has no right to participate in any transaction in her own name. Phrynion was the decisive contributor for Neaira's enfranchisement. In *IG* II² 1558.37, according to Finley, Theophrastos is, generally speaking, in a position analogous to Phrynion's.[153]

Vondeling (1961: 126-132) considers these documents as "the public proof of their (slaves') exemption from paramone-duty" and maintains that in these records we have a loan to the slave by a *koinon* and in return the slave should perform certain duties in the society. He does not accept Finley's third argument on the ground that if Phrynion was the head of such an *eranos*, he could not be called *eranistes*, since the latter means always a member of an association, but never a member of an *eranos*. Instead Vondeling (1961: 132) proposes that

> We should consider *koina eraniston* as associations of people who have provided the total or partial sum needed by the freedman to effect *apolysis* of *paramone* and to have this fact registered. So *koina eraniston* are especially found where the freedman himself was unable to pay and the master was impecunious or unwilling to pay; and at the time of the release they procured the ransom for the latter, who in turn, stood security for the slave to his association; the registration here indicates that the former slave has discharged all his obligations and has thus attained full freedom.

On the one hand, I think that Finley's (1951: 101) objection is not sustainable since as I have shown, *eranistai* associations existed already in the second half of the 4th century and some of them may have included

---

152. *IG* II² 1558A.37: Νικίας λιβανωτο(πώλης) ἐμ [Π]/ει(ραιεῖ) οἰκ[ῶ]ν ἀποφυγῶν/ Φιλοκράτη Ἐπικράτο(υς)/ Ἐλευσί(νιον) καὶ κοινὸ(ν) ἐρα/νιστῶν τῶμ μετὰ Θεοφ/ράστου Βαθύλλου Χολ/αργέως, φιάλ(η) σταθμο(ῦ) [:H]; *IG* II² 1559A.26: Βίων ἐμ Μελ(ίτει) οἰκῶ(ν) δακ/τυλιογλύ(φος) ἀποφυγών/ Χαίριππον Χαιρεδή/μου Ἀλαιέ(α) καὶ κοι(νὸν) ἐρ/ανι(στῶν) τῶν μετὰ Χαιρίπ/πο(υ) Ἀλαιέ(ως), φιάλη σταθμο(ῦ): H.

153. Millett (1991: 158) offers a similar explanation.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

slaves as members. On the other hand, I would agree with Finley (1951: 102) that there is no evidence of associations owning slaves in Athens and in Attica in general. But I cannot see any reason for wealthy Athenians to contribute to the collection of 100 drachmas. The suggestion that an association was helping freedmen is not improbable, if we consider that the group would have an advantage in the allegiance of the freed person, since some of them may have been already members of these groups as it seems to be the case in *IG* II² 2937.[154]

From the remaining pieces of evidence, *IG* II² 1266, an inscription dated in c. 322, has no trace or any mention of *eranistai*; instead Wilhelm (1942) has read a decree of the tribe *Pandionis*.

Raubitschek (1981: 95), in the *editio princeps* of a decree of *Herakliastai en Limnais* of the year A.D. 121/22 (*SEG* 31.122), claims that

> Under these circumstances it may be best to assume that the two inscriptions (*SEG* 31.122 and *IG* II² 1369) were set up in Paiania because Eucharistos was at home there. This would mean that *IG* II² 1369 should also be connected, if not with him, then at least with his son or grandson. (95-6)

Although both *SEG* 31.122 and *IG* II² 1369 were found in the same area, they do not seem to have much in common. In particular, i) *IG* II² 1369 is the common decision of *philoi andres* while *SEG* 31.122 is the decision and order of an *archeranistes*; ii) on the one hand, *SEG* 31.122 reveals an association orientated to financial activities together with religious ones, having a complex structure aiming at the guarantee and maintenance of their financial activities. On the other hand, *IG* II² 1369 is brief and regulates essential parameters of the associative life.[155] In this respect, it is quite improbable to suggest that a sudden shift to the interests and to the

---

154. *IG* II² 2937 (4th century) οἵδε ἀνέθεσαν... followed by eleven names is similar to 2940 (end of 4th century), a dedication to Men Tyrannos from eleven people, on grounds of three common names (Καδους, Τίβειος, Καλλίας) and the same place of origin (Laureion). Lauffer (1979: 189) considers *IG* II² 2940 as the earliest testimony for a slave-association. The restoration of *IG* II² 2940 is very doubtful; the one adopted in the edition of *IG* II² followed Bourguet [*BCH* 18 (1894) 532] although Perdrizet [*BCH* 20 (1896) 55-106 and especially 85] had raised considerable arguments against it. Peek proposed an alternative restoration in *AM* 67 (1942) 44 no 57. Two slaves are also mentioned in *IG* II² 1335.

155. Wilhelm, A. (1896) "Ein attisches Vereinsgesetz" *Serta Harteliana* 231-35. Wien (now in Wilhelm, *ABGI* 2. 231-35) suggests that the document belongs to an *eranos* of *heroistai* (In unserer Urkunde haben wir es aber vermutlich geradezu mit einen ἔρανος von ἡρωϊσταὶ zu thun).

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

orientation of the association occurred; iii) There are certain differences in the ways in which these documents regulate some aspects of the organization and the activities in the association. For example, the fines in *IG* II² 1369 are five times higher than in *SEG* 31.122, although the chronological gap between them is not considerable; in *IG* II² 1369 there is no reference to an entrance fee but only to a certain procedure called *dokimasia*, while in *SEG* 31.122 there is no procedure but instead only a fee. The board of officials is totally different in these two inscriptions; the only common ground they have is the existence of an *archeranistes*. Even this superficial similarity is undermined seriously by the fact that in *SEG* 31.122 this office seems to be life-long while, in *IG* II² 1369 it is annual.

As a result I think that there is no good reason for relating these two documents as Raubitschek (1981: 96) suggested. Their common origin may suggest a geographical link, but nothing more can be safely asserted.

The terminology applied by the associations, as far as it concerns the description of the collectivity and of the members, may prove illuminating. In the earliest documents of *eranistai* there is a constant use of the term *koinon eraniston* or *eranistai* (*IG* II² 1265.1, 2, 5, 10, 12 and 1291.2, 9, 11, 15, 20 and 27). In two of the latest documents, *IG* II² 1369.10-12 and *SEG* 31.122, 44 *eranos* appears to denote the association or the assembly. The reason for this transformation is not clear, but it may be connected with a change in the actual funding, which in this era is heavily dependent on a single, prominent figure. A similar tendency can be observed among other associations in *-stai*.[156] It is not clear whether in cases where the term *synodos* occurs, the contribution of an individual to the establishment of the association was primary and in those cases where *koinon* or other alternatives occur, other forms of foundation were used.

Another significant problem arising from the indiscriminate use of the term *eranistai* concerns their relation with the associations, which designate themselves with a collective noun coming from their cult and the ending *-stai*.[157] Foucart (1873: 3) claimed that in these cases the groups are using

---

156. Compare for example *IG* II² 1292.2, 10, 12, 17, 22, 28, 1322.11, 1339.3-6, 15, 1343 and *SEG* 18.33, 9, 10, 12, 16. The differentiation is considerable and the trend to abandon the expression *koinon* is evident.

157. Parker (1996: 333) suggests the neologism *theastai* to describe all these groups. Although potentially misleading - one may think that there were such groups called *theastai*! - it is a solution. Parker includes in this category Διπολιασταὶ (who owned land sold in the second half of the 4th century, Lambert (1997a: F11A, 5-9), the Menandrian Παιανισταὶ/Πανισταὶ, and the Lysian Ἰθύφαλλοι, Αὐτολήκυθοι, Κακοδαιμονισταὶ. With the exception of the first group, the evidence of the remaining ones suggests a rather provisional organization, which falls outside the scope of this work.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

those names in order to be distinguished from other similar *eranistai*. Poland (1909: 30)[158] tried to explain this particularity by citing titles of officials of these associations, in which there is the stem *-eran-* like *archeranistes* (*IG* II² 1322.21, 1339.4 and 1343.33), *proeranistria* (*IG* II² 1292.23 and 29) and above all *IG* II² 1335.4-6: "It seemed appropriate to *Sabaziastai* to write the names of *eranistai* on a stone stele".[159]

It is difficult to adopt such a generalization when there is no conclusive evidence. In the earliest documents of this kind there is no mention of *eranistai*.[160] If, in these cases, they considered themselves as *eranistai*, they should have used this term. Considering some documents in which both *eranistai* and another title occur (*IG* II² 1343, *SEG* 31.122) it seems implausible that in the above mentioned cases the association, although it considers its members as *eranistai*, designates itself as e.g. *Asklepiastai* only.[161]

Poland's argument based on the officers' titles is not convincing, since, on the one hand, *archeranistes* occurs in *IG* II² 1297.10 (237/6), where the group is self-designated as *koinon thiasoton*, and on the other hand, the title *archeranistes* does not appear in any document of *koinon eraniston* before the 1st century A.D. (*IG* II² 1345.3).[162]

Furthermore, the title *proeranistria* is possibly a honorific title, devised in order to praise the contribution of *Nikippe* to the association of *Sara-*

---

158. Followed by Vondeling (1961: 259 n.2), Maier (1969: 83) and Raubitschek (1981: 96). However, Dow (1937) throughout his article never qualifies *Sarapiastai* as *eranistai*.

159. ἔδοξεν τοῖς Σαβαζιασταῖς, ἀνα/γράψαι τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἐρανι/στῶν ἐν στήληι λιθίνηι. *IG* II² 2932 (342/1) is supposed to belong to the association of II² 1335 (101/100) according to the editor: "sunt ieropoioi Sabaziastarum", because probably both found in Peiraeus. But in *IG* II² 1335 there is no reference to ἱεροποιοί; only an ἱερεὺς is mentioned. Moreover the considerable chronological gap, separating these documents, does not allow further identification; Mikalson (1998: 146) expressed similar objections, while Parker (1996: 339) remains sceptical. For a collection of the inscriptions referring to *Sabazios*, see Lane (1985-89).

160. *IG* II² 1322.11 (c. 229) δεδόχθαι τοῖς Ἀμφιεραΐσταις and 18, *IG* II² 1292.2, 10, 12, 17, 22 (216/5) and Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59 (post 216/5) Σαραπιασταὶ, *SEG* 18.33, 7 and 9 (212/1-174/3) [τ]ὸ κοινὸ[ν τῶν Ἀ]σκληπιαστῶν and *IG* II² 2960 (2nd century) Ἀσκληπιασταὶ.

161. See the reservations expressed by Aleshire (1989: 69).

162. For a more detailed discussion see Arnaoutoglou, I. (1994) " Ἀρχερανιστὴς and its meaning in inscriptions" *ZPE* 104, 107-10. Since then two pieces of evidence seem to confirm the hypothesis that ἀρχερανίστρια (*AJA* 64 (1960) 269 (51/50 BC)) and ἀρχερανιστὴς (Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203 (41/40)) appear in somewhat earlier documents of *eranistai* associations. Leiwo (1997: 108-9) recognizes that ἀρχερανιστὴς as title of official exceeded the confines of *eranistai* associations.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

piastai.[163] The only seemingly convincing argument is the identification of *Sabaziastai* and *eranistai* in *IG* II² 1335.4-6. But *eranistai* in this case may well mean "contributors to an (eranos-)loan", since the document is dated in 101. The use of the term *eranistai* to denote members of association persists throughout the 1st century and onwards; for example *IG* II² 1345.26 "*hestiasen tous eranistas*", *IG* II² 1366.21-22:

> "and those who want to convene an *eranos* on the name of Men Tyrannos, let them have good luck; similarly *eranistai* (i.e. the members of *eranos)* will give the appropriate (offerings) to the god",

and *SEG* 31.122: 8-9: "and without fail let him be (made to be) expelled after his fellow *eranistai* have cast a vote" [translated by Raubitschek (1981)].[164]

From the overall account, we can draw three main conclusions:

1. The term *eranos* has nothing to do with associations, at least till the 1st century in Attica.[165] Only in the 1st century does the term *eranos* designate a group of *eranistai* and other features of the associative life like an assembly. Evidence for this evolution is provided by three inscriptions, in which an *eranos* is mentioned in the framework of an existing association, *orgeones* (*IG* II² 1298.18-20), *thiasotai* (*IG* II² 1327.13-14) and *eranistai* (*IG* II² 1291.5, 7, and 15).[166]
2. The terms *eranistai* or *koinon eraniston* designate from their first occurrence, in inscriptions, members of an association and an association respectively. It was quite possible for such an association to be involved in financial matters.[167]

---

163. Dow (1937: 193-5), Dunand, Fr. (1973) *Le culte d' Isis dans le bassin oriental de la Méditerranée*, vol. 2 Le culte d'Isis en Grèce, 7. Leiden (EPRO 26) and Pakkanen (1996). Cf. Leiwo's (1997: 112) wrong reading of ἀρχερανίστρια in this inscription. *IG* II² 1292 (215/4) is not a constitution as erroneously stated by Dow (1937: 191). It is an honorary decree since several officials are honoured for their services to the association, while there is no mention of regulating any important affairs. For a similar case see *AJA* 64 (1960) 269 and *BCH* 84 (1960) 655, a partially published inscription dated c. 59 in which an *archeranistria* is mentioned.

164. *IG* II² 1366.21-22: τοὺς δὲ βουλομένους ἔρανον συνάγειν Μηνὶ Τυράννωι ἐπ' ἀγαθῆι τύ[χηι]· ὁμοίως δὲ παρέξουσιν οἱ ἐρανισταὶ, τὰ καθήκοντα τῶι θεῶι; *SEG* 31.122, 8-9: καὶ ἐξάνανκα πραττέσθω τῶν συνερανιστῶν ψῆφον λαβόντων ἐκβιβάσαι.

165. Vondeling (1961: 82) based on evidence from Rhodes claims that the term *eranos* appears since the 2nd century. However, his statement cannot be applied to Athens. In his final account of the word *eranos* and its meanings, he realizes this but the only evidence he provides for Attica are the late *IG* II² 1366, 1369 and *SEG* 37.103. See also Gernet (1999: 44).

166. Similarly, Parker (1996) stated that often *thiasotai* and associations in *-stai* depended upon *eranoi*.

167. In this respect I agree with Vondeling (1961: 129) and Harris (1992: 311).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

3. There is no strong evidence for an identification of different associations having names in *-stai* with *eranistai* before the 1st century. Their main differences lay in their insistence on using a particular term and on the adoption of a slightly different structure, in which the preponderance of the individual is evident. After this date, it is possible to identify them, since both types seem to have the same structure (*IG* II² 1335, 1343, 1369 and *SEG* 31.122).

However, it should be pointed out that the distinction between *eranos* and *eranistai* before the 1st century cannot prove that these two forms never included the same persons. The structure of associations prompted their members to such gestures of benevolence; some of them may have had the backing of the association (*eranistai*) and some may not (*eranos*).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ
ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

CHAPTER TWO

THE STRUCTURE OF THE GROUPS

In the previous chapter I have examined and established distinctions concerning the evidence and the nomenclature of cult associations in Athens. I have demonstrated the dichotomy in the use of the word *orgeones*, the distinctive meaning of *thiasos* in inscriptions, the late appearance of *eranos* signifying an association and the distinct nature of the associations in *Asklepiastai* etc from *eranistai* associations. In this section my interest will focus on the surviving, first-hand evidence provided by these associations. Their inscriptions, though highly stylised, are testimonies not only of their activities (worship, solidarity, help, honouring), but of group-processes (selection for offices, accountability) as well as collective values (piety, benefaction, justice, and virtue).

In terms of setting up associations, there are significant problems for non-Athenian associations. For an association had to have a temple or a sanctuary where worship could be performed and to put in place the necessary safeguards for the performance of these acts. Non-Athenians were not able to own property unless special permission was granted (*enktesis*). Therefore, *enktesis*, official approval and *asebeia* are all fundamental issues for non-Athenian associations.

The right to acquire land by non-Athenians was granted on approval by the assembly. *IG* II² 337 (333/2), a well-known document of the Lycourgan era, grants a plot of land (*chorion*) to the merchants from Kition of Cyprus

---

1. See also *Syll*³ 280; Michel 104; Tod II 189; *SIRIS* 1; Schwenk 27; *SEG* 35.239; 36.154; 39.84; 42.229 & 1803. 46.2361. 47.26. 961 & 2320. 49.100 and Pečirka (1966) on grants of *enktesis*. Mikalson (1998) associates the Kitieis of this inscription with the *thiasotai* of *IG* II² 1261.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

in order to build a sanctuary.[1] In the first meeting the assembly delegated the Council to consider the affair, to consult with the Kitieis and to make a recommendation (ll. 1-25); in the following meeting the assembly granted the request (ll. 26-45). Some scholars have suggested that the grant of *enktesis* meant approval and introduction of the cult[2] whereas others have asserted that the permission concerns only the acquisition of land and nothing else.[3] There is no need to consider these opinions as necessarily contradictory; they simply point to different aspects of the same process. The resolution of the assembly allowed only the acquisition of a plot of land where the Kitieis could build a sanctuary; at the same time this resolution tacitly acknowledged, if not approved, the introduction of the cult of the Kitieis.[4] It is remarkable that in this decree there is no mention of a cult association; the recipients of the grant are traders from Kition of Cyprus.[5] The same is true for the Egyptians (*IG* II² 337.43-45: a temple of Isis) and the Thracians (*IG* II² 1283.4-5, 26: references to the *ethnos* of Thracians). This might have been a result of associating religious needs with an ethnic group, and hence tolerating the corresponding cult, instead of individuals, as such, being associated with a religious practice.[6]

The grant of *enktesis* to certain groups had this double function, namely of allowing, on the one hand, the acquisition of land, where religious rites would be performed and, on the other hand, acknowledging the compatibility of this cult or any other activity held by the group with those of the city. In this way the Athenian polis, while it has not outlawed any association directly, could have hampered the acquisition of the necessary space, which would have allowed the transformation of the cult into a reality to be seen and experienced.

---

2. Foucart (1873: 127-28), Ziebarth (1896: 168) and Versnel (1990: 122).

3. Poland (1909: 81), Radin (1910: 52) followed by Jones (1999: 40), Baslez (1989: 14) and (1996a: 42 n. 24).

4. See Parker (1996: 337-38).

5. One may conjecture with Leiwo (1997: 115) that the Kitieis were already organized as a cult group for help and support to their fellow citizens. Petrocheilos (1992: 47) assumes another grant of *enktesis* for the group of *orgeones* of *IG* II² 1273 without adducing any evidence. But it is possible that they were sharing the same sanctuary with other groups. In my opinion, this way of identification is concomitant with the fact that *enktesis* was granted always to individuals; a cult association could not have been regarded as such a person, so the right was granted to the totality of members, i.e. Kitieis and Egyptians.

6. See Rudhardt (1992: 220) who claims that lack of an abstract definition of religion in Greek antiquity made difficult to categorize and question foreign religions; Parker (1996: 158-63). Baslez (1996a: 40), on the example of Oriental cults, observed that there was never persecution of a cult or an ethnic group but only of a particular sanctuary.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Once *enktesis* was assured and the temple or the sanctuary was built, the devotees had to cope with another danger, namely that of being prosecuted, individually and not en masse, for impiety (*asebeia*). Foucart (1873: 127-28) claimed that these associations, while they were legal as such, could have been considered as illegal if they did not have the authorization of the state for the cult.

In modern legal systems a prosecution can be initiated only if the criminal conduct is clearly defined in a law or in another statutory act. Thus, the first problem concerns the existence of a legally prescribed conduct as impious. Some scholars have claimed that a) the decree of Diopeithes preserved in Plu. *Per*. 32 is the first instance of definition of impiety[7] and b) the testimony of Josephus *Ap*. ii 267-68 about the existence of a law against the introduction of new gods in Athens reaffirms the existence of legislation against impiety in Athens.[8] However, both testimonies are of a late period and made by non-Athenians; more or less six centuries separate Plutarch and Josephus from classical Athens. The decree of Diopeithes [*LGPN* ii (3)] cannot be found in any other source of the period or later, although Diopeithes himself figures prominently in some Aristophanic comedies (e.g. *Knights* 1085, *Wasps* 380, *Birds* 988).[9] Josephus' testimony seems to be better attested, since there is a reference to Ninos in a scholion to Demosthenes.[10] Yet again there is uncertainty whether that person was convicted for

---

7. Plu. *Per*. 32. 1: καὶ ψήφισμα Διοπείθης ἔγραψεν εἰσαγγέλεσθαι τοὺς τὰ θεῖα μὴ νομίζοντας ἢ λόγους περὶ τῶν μεταρσίων διδάσκοντας, ἀπερειδόμενος εἰς Περικλέα δι' Ἀναξαγόρου τὴν ὑπόνοιαν. (And Diopeithes put forward a decree to impeach those who did not believe in gods or teach doctrines about the heavens, directing suspicion against Perikles by means of Anaxagoras). For the historicity of the account see Rudhardt (1960: 90-91), MacDowell (1978: 200), Ostwald (1986: 532), Garland (1992: 139-41) and (1996). Cf. Wallace, R.W. (1996) "Private lives and public enemies. Freedom of thought in classical Athens" in Boegehold, A.L. & A.C. Scafuro (eds) *Athenian identity and civic ideology*, 127-55, Baltimore.

8. J. *Ap*. ii 267-68: Νῖνον γὰρ τὴν ἱέρειαν ἀπέκτειναν, ἐπεί τις αὐτῆς κατηγόρησεν, ὅτι ξένους ἐμύει θεούς· νόμῳ δ' ἦν τοῦτο παρ' αὐτοῖς κεκωλυμένον καὶ τιμωρία κατὰ τῶν ξένον εἰσαγόντων θεὸν ὥριστο θάνατος (they put Ninos the priestess to death, because someone accused her of initiating people into the mysteries of foreign gods; this was forbidden by their law, and the penalty decreed for any who introduced a foreign god was death). Existence of law of impiety: Foucart (1873: 132-35), Rudhardt (1960: 92-93), and Versnel (1990: 128). Baslez (1996a: 40) does not accept the genuiness of the law mentioned above; she considers it a 4th-century creation.

9. Dover (1975: 146-47), Baslez (1989: 13), and Cohen (1991: 212).

10. Sch. 495a in D. 19 (*On the false embassy*) 281: λέγει δὲ τὴν Νῖνον λεγόμενην. κατηγόρησε δὲ ταύτης Μενεκλῆς ὡς φίλτρα ποιούσης τοῖς νέοις. That this scholion is reliable is confirmed by the title of Dinarchus' speech *Κατὰ Μενεκλέους*, preserved by Dionysios of Halikarnassos, in which it is noted that ὁ μὲν γὰρ κρινόμενός ἐστι Μενε-

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

introducing new gods, that is for impiety according to Josephus, or for sorcery or as magician as the scholiast implies. Therefore, I think that the references to any law in the modern technical sense are not convincing. Ruschenbusch has already pointed out that what the ancient sources call "law" might be a general statement of the type "If someone commits impiety,...".[11] Moreover, as Cohen (1991: 208) pointed out impiety was a culturally determined, flexible concept associated with any contravention of the dominant political and social order.

There is much more difficulty in explaining actual cases. In the last quarter of the 5th century, according to late sources, there is almost a pogrom against the sophists, among whom are Protagoras, Anaxagoras, Prodikos, Diagoras of Melos, and later on in the end of the 4th century Aristotle and Demades.[12] Socrates is, of course, the most eminent example of those prosecuted for impiety. There are numerous detailed discussions of Socrates' case, some underlining especially the political character of the trial and the role that the continuous defamation of Socrates' activity in comedy played in his conviction. Some have thought that the accusation of impiety was simply the pretext since there was not any other means to prosecute him for his relation with prominent oligarchs or opportunists like Alcibiades.[13]

More solid ground for my purpose is offered by the cases of Phryne and Theoris, while the evidence for Ninos has been discussed above. All of

---

κλῆς ὁ τὴν ἱέρειαν Νῖνον ἑλών. So. Menekles [*LGPN* ii (9)], a well known, probably, "sykophant", prosecuted successfully, in the mid 4th century, a priestess called Ninos; for the accusation there are diverging details. However, the name of the priestess was known to the scholiast probably from D. 39 (*Against Boiotos I*) 2 καὶ Μενεκλέα τὸν τὴν Νῖνον ἑλόντ' ἐκεῖνον and 40 (*Against Boiotos II*) 9. Josephus claims that it was for impiety while according to the anonymous scholiast it was sorcery. In my opinion the testimony of the scholiast is more reliable, since he mentions a specific crime, probably drawn from a larger and detailed collection of scholia, and not a general statement about impiety, which might be a misunderstanding. Cf. Parker (1996: 162-63) and Dickie (2001: 52-53).

11. Ruschenbusch, E. (1957) "Dikasterion panton kalon" *Historia* 6, 266-74.

12. For a detailed discussion of the evidence concerning these cases see Dover (1975), Parker (1996: 207-9), O'Sullivan (1997) who underlines the political aspect of these trials, Bodéüs, R. (2002) "L' impiété d' Artistote" *Kernos* 15, 61-65 and Hartmann, U. (2002) "Griechische Philosophen in der Verbannung" in Goltz, A., Luther, A. & H. Schlange-Schöningen (eds) *Gelehrte in der Antike. Alexander Demandt zum 65. Geburtstag*, 59-86, Köln.

13. See Brickhouse, T.C. & N.D. Smith (1989) *Socrates on Trial*, Oxford, Cohen (1991) and Hansen, M.H. (1995) *The trial of Sokrates: from the Athenian point of view*, Copenhagen (Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, historisk.-filosofiske Meddelelser 71).

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

them occurred in the second half of the 4th century. Theoris is referred to as *mantis*. For the accusation against her there are conflicting pieces of evidence.[14] Demosthenes claims that Theoris was condemned as *pharmakis* while, almost a century later, Philochoros assures us that she was convicted on the ground of impiety. This ambiguity may be well explained if we consider the highly effective, emotive character of an accusation for impiety and its long lasting effect in the memory of the citizens. Theoris and Ninos may have been sorcerers or magicians, but the label of impious, when attached, led to their death. This may have been even more likely if there was not any definition of impiety in law but it was left to the perception of the jury to decide whether any action was impious or not.

Phryne seems to offer the least controversial example of prosecution for impiety.[15] For Foucart (1873: 136 and 1902: 217) her case together with Josephus' testimony is enough proof that there was a law punishing impiety. But the preserved text is clear, Phryne behaved shamelessly in a temple, she introduced a new god and convened illegal confraternities of men and women. Any one of these acts may have challenged the dominant morality, but all together they could support a *graphe asebeias*. If impiety had been defined in law, Euthias would not have proceeded to explain the deviant conduct. The need of the prosecutor to specify the criminal conduct

---

14. D. 25 (*Against Aristogeiton*) 79: ἀλλ' ἐφ' οἷς ὑμεῖς τὴν μιαρὰν Θεωρίδα, τὴν Λημνίαν, τὴν φαρμακίδα, καὶ αὐτὴν καὶ τὸ γένος πᾶν ἀπεκτείνατε (the filthy sorceress Theoris of Lemnos, whom you put to death on that account with all her family); b) Plu. *Dem*. 14.6: κατηγόρησε δὲ καὶ τῆς ἱέρειας Θεωρίδος ὡς ἄλλα τε ραδιουργούσης πολλὰ καὶ τοὺς δούλους ἐξαπατᾶν διδασκούσης καὶ θανάτου τιμησάμενος ἀπέκτεινε (He also accused the priestess Theoris of many misdemeanours, and particularly of teaching the slaves to practice deceit; and by fixing the penalty at death he brought about her execution); and c) *FGrHist* 328 F60: Θεωρίς· Δημοσθένης ἐν τῶι Κατ' Ἀριστογείτονος, εἰ γνήσιος μάντις ἦν ἡ Θεωρίς, καὶ ἀσεβείας κριθεῖσα ἀπέθανεν ὡς καὶ Φιλόχορος ἐν ς' γράφει [Theoris. Demosthenes in his speech against Aristogeiton if genuine; Theoris was a *mantis* and being prosecuted for impiety executed, as Philochoros writes in the sixth book]. See Collins, D. (2001) "Theoris of Lemnos and the criminalization of magic in fourth-century Athens" *CQ* 51, 477-93, who claims that Theoris was executed for poisoning. Dickie (2001: 50-52) and Trampedach (2001).

15. The actual accusation against Phryne may be preserved in the summary of Euthias' speech as emended by Foucart (1902: 218): Ἐπέδειξα τοίνυν ὑμῖν ἀσεβῆ Φρύνην, κωμάσασαν ἀναιδῶς <ἐν Λυκείωι>, καινοῦ θεοῦ εἰσηγήτριαν, θιάσους ἀνδρῶν ἐκθέσμους καὶ γυναικῶν συναγαγοῦσα. (So, I have proved that Phryne is impious, by reveling shamelessly <in the temple of Apollon Lykeios>, by introducing a new god, and convening outlawed confraternities of men and women). Cooper (1995) claims that the alleged relationship of Hypereides with Phryne, as well as the disrobing in court, is part of a fictitious account blending traditional enmity to public orators with *topoi* about their preferences; the whole accusation of impiety had political overtones.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

implies that there was not any fixed account of what constituted impiety. Thus, I do not think that Phryne's case can support the claim for the existence of a law on impiety. Moreover, if there was any law forbidding the introduction of foreign cults, denoting these acts as impious, then it would be difficult to explain the "flourishing" of associations worshipping foreign deities in the 4th and 3rd centuries.

It is remarkable that apart from philosophers and the particular case of Socrates in which more than one factor led to his conviction, the remaining cases concern priestesses or persons with ritual duties. The prominent role of a priestess in a cult might have considerable impact on the devotees and her prosecution may have been a source of deterrence and open disapproval of a new cult. Therefore, priestesses, because of their active involvement in the cult, were easier targets for any prosecutor than the devotees.

The introduction of a new deity confronted the religious beliefs and practices of the Athenians and it would have been very easy for anyone (citizen or not) to be prosecuted on the grounds that he or she introduced new gods and did not believe in the gods of the city.[16] In these dangerous circumstances, there were two ways of escape: either to connect the new deity with one of the Greek pantheon with the active support of his or her priesthood, usually devising an *aition*, and/or to introduce the cult by an oracular response as the Thracians (*IG* II^2 1283.4) and the devotees of the Mother of the Gods did. In that way, the worshippers and the priesthood of a new deity would escape any prosecution and at the same time they would attract more new devotees; but the danger of assimilation to existing cults was always present.[17] This pattern was followed a) in Bendis' case, where she is identified, at least pictorially, with Artemis, b) in the worship of the Mother of the Gods, who had been earlier identified with Rhea or Demeter, and c) in the case of a Syrian deity worshipped as Aphrodite.[18]

On a more technical level, Maier (1969: 76) claimed that the foundation of an *eranistai* association could result either from the initiative of an individual[19] or from a jointly issued decision of members. The argument in

---

16. Baslez (1996a: 43), on the example of Oriental cults, claims that litigation does not concern the introduction of a foreign cult or the foundation of a private sanctuary. Confrontation with public authorities is circumstantial.

17. See Versnel (1990: 110).

18. In order to fight mistrust, cult associations ensured maximum publicity for their activities, Baslez (1996b: 220-21). Another strategy to avoid contact with *polis* authorities was the sharing of sanctuaries as in the case of Herakles Pankrates temple, where *orgeones*, *thiasotai*, and *eranistai* associations are attested and possibly the *thiasotai* and *orgeones* associations of the Mother of the Gods in Peiraeus.

19. See Vondeling (1961: 91-92).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

favour of an individual effecting a foundation rests upon ambiguous expressions such as "since Diokles held together the group of *Amphiaraistai*" (*IG* II² 1322.1-2), or "being responsible of the above gathering and the assembly was built by him he endured on the office of *archeranistes*" (*IG* II² 1343).[20] In the discussion on *thiasotai* associations I have suggested that the expression *synago thiason*, which appears, most often, in early Hellenistic Athens does not have a technical meaning and does not necessarily mean "to found a group". In areas outside Athens and especially in late Hellenistic Delos, we encounter often expressions like *sunago koinon*, *sunago thiasitas*,[21] phrases which denote those who had the initiative to institute the worship of the deity, central to the existence of the group.[22] The phrase *sunecho ten synodon* used in *IG* II² 1322 does not point to a foundation but to the fact that Diokles, through his generosity, held together the group of *Amphiaraistai*, preventing it from falling apart and disappearing; and he was the one who contributed for the rebuilding of Amphiaraos' sanctuary. The second pattern used for establishing an *eranistai* association, that is by the common will of the members, is attested quite late.[23]

The question of dissolution demonstrates once more the complex nature of cult associations. Cult groups were not only associations, but had a cultic, religious dimension, which could not have been ignored. Any act of disestablishing a cult or closing a sanctuary (or I would add dissolving a group devoted to the cult) could mean dishonouring the god or the god-

---

20. *IG* II² 1322.1-2: ἐπειδὴ Διοκλῆς συνῆ/χε τῶι Ἀμφιαράωι σύνοδον; *IG* II² 1343.10-13: γενηθεὶς δ[ὲ]/ καὶ παραίτιος τῆς ἄνωθεν συλλογῆς καὶ/ τὴν σύνοδον αὐτὸς κτίσας ἀρχερανισ[τ]/ῆς ὑπέμεινεν.

21. Delos: *IG* XI (4) 1227 (3rd/2rd century): Τὸ κοινὸν τῶν δεκαδιστῶν καὶ/ δεκαδιστριῶν ὧν συνήγαγεν Ἀρίστων; *IG* XI (4) 1343 (3rd/2rd century): [Σαρα]πιαστα[ὶ οὓς συνήγαγε]ν Μόνιμο[ς...]; *ID* 2225 (end 2nd century): Διονύσιος Ἑρμογένου ... ἀ[πὸ τῶν θι]ασιτῶν Ἁγνῆς θεοῦ οὓς συνήγαγε; *BCH* 92 (1968) 359-74 (c. 166): τὸ κοινὸν τῶν θιασιτῶν τῶν Σύρων τῶν εἰκαδιστῶν οὓς συνήγαγε ἡ θεὸς. Baslez (2001: 242) points out that associations of semitic origin "sont toujours considérées comme étant de fondation divine".

22. In a 1st-century A.D. inscription from Iasos in Asia Minor we can see the uses of the term συνάγω; *Iasos* 116. 8-12: συνα/γαγὼν τούς τε οἰκείους καὶ τοὺς/ ἑταίρους καὶ τοὺς φίλους παρεκά[λε]/σεν συναγαγεῖν τιμῶντας/ Ἰσοκράτην δαίμονα ἀγαθὸν (Having gathered his relatives and his comrades and his friends, he requested to come together in honouring Isokrates, a benign god). Baslez (1992: 287ff) underlines the voluntary disappearance of the founder; Parker (1996: 185-86) on the role of individual in the foundation of cults.

23. *IG* II² 1369.24-27: ἄρχων μὲν Ταυρίσκος, ἀτὰρ μὴν Μου/νιχιὼν ἦν/ ὀκτ[ω]καιδεκάτη δ' ἔρανον σύναγον/ φίλοι ἄνδρες/ καὶ κοινῇ βουλῇ θεσμὸν φιλίης ὑπέ/γραψαν (Tauriskos was archon, the eighteenth of Mounichion, friends found a club and signed an institution of common friendship).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

dess and may ensue his or her wrath. At an institutional level, there is no trace of even one provision concerning dissolution; as Mikalson (1998: 4) quite appropriately pointed out, it is more like a case of "benign neglect". This peculiarity can also be attributed to the conviction of the associates that the continuation of their activities was guaranteed, through the introduction of their offspring into the association (*IG* II² 1361, 1368, *SEG* 31.122) or the introduction of members promising considerable benefactions (*epi philotimiais*)[24] to the association (*IG* II² 1369.40; also II² 1252, II² 1256, II² 1261, etc.).

Membership

Membership in cult associations was not always determined on the basis of notional equality, especially in a society in which gender and status were decisive for the positioning of the individual. Therefore, issues of gender and status would have influenced the image of a cult association and possibly shaped their policies as far as recruitment and access to offices.

According to Ferguson (1944: 77) the only evidence about membership in *orgeones* associations of heroes concerns the participation of adult males. Women were excluded from the association and its structure, but could participate in the sacrifices and the feasts. Membership was probably hereditary, in the sense that the father's membership was necessary for the admission of his son (Kearns 1989: 73 and *IG* II² 2355). Provided that participation in cultic activities defined, more or less, the identity of the member, one may wonder whether women could be considered as members (or even something less than full members) since they were participating in the cultic feast.[25] However, we have no information about their participation in the decision-making procedures of the group.

Prosopographical evidence and the reference to maidens in *Ag.* 16, 161,[26] to golden crowns in *IG* II² 1252 and 1253 and to the sacrifice of an ox (*Ag.* 16, 161) led Ferguson (1944: 78-9) and Andrewes (1961: 1 n.5) to suggest that *orgeones* of heroes in the 4th century were apparently groups of well-off people.[27] But the existence of a maiden was not a sign of wealth,

---

24. See Robert, L. (1979) "Deux inscriptions de l'époque impèriale en Attique" *AJPh* 100, 153-59 and now in *Opera Minora Selecta* 5, 123-29, 1989, Amsterdam.

25. Participation: Poland (1909: 305) claims that members had to be citizens. Women in *orgeones* associations: Kearns (1989: 74) and Lambert (1993: 75 n.6).

26. *Ag.* 16, 161 (beg 3rd century) provides the earliest evidence. It mentions ἀρχαῖα ψηφίσματα being re-inscribed, and Ferguson (1944: 76) dates them to the 5th century.

27. Followed recently by Ustinova (1996: 233) and Mikalson (1998: 153). Cf. Lambert (1993: 76 n. 80).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

the crowns are rather exceptional and the ox was bought for sacrifice only once a year. In addition, among the honoured people no prominent personality appears; the most eminent of them is *Antikles Memnonos Meliteus*, nephew of *Neoptolemos Antikleous Meliteus* [*LGPN* ii (8)], one of the wealthiest Athenians of the 4th century according to D. 21 (*Against Meidias*) 215. One more wealthy member of an *orgeones* association passed unnoticed; *Aischylos Diphilidou Prospaltios* is a member of the Prospaltian *orgeones* of Asklepios (*IG* II² 2355) and an ancestor of his may appear in Finley 17 as having lent the substantial amount of 3,240 drachmas. Less renowned are: *Kalliades Philinou Peiraieus*, proposer of *IG* II² 1176 (324/3), *Lysimachides Lysimachou Acharneus*, eponymous archon for the year 339/8, and *Kleiainetos Kleomenous Meliteus*, who served as arbitrator in 325/4.

There are not enough documents among the preserved decrees to offer conclusive evidence about the way or ways of joining an *orgeones* association of foreign deities. Ziebarth (1896: 141) suggested that two qualifications were necessary for membership in an association of this kind: citizenship (bürgerliche Qualität) and moral qualities (moralische Qualität). But the *orgeones* of the Mother of the Gods (*IG* II² 1327) did not consist exclusively of citizens. As for the moral standards, Ziebarth did not offer any examples except the late *IG* II² 1366 and 1369, which can hardly apply to the social context of the Hellenistic era.

The information provided by the associations themselves is far away from the criteria set out by Ziebarth. Money contributions consistently appear in almost all the documents concerning admission. *IG* II² 1361 from the third quarter of the 4th century, is attributed by Ferguson (1944: 98) to citizen *orgeones*, where the pattern of joining the *orgeones* association is described as follows: "so that the *orgeones* of the temple may be as many as possible, anybody who wishes to join shall be allowed to participate in the temple having paid [...] *drachmas* and his name shall be inscribed on a *stele*, and those inscribed are to be scrutinized by the *orgeones*".[28] *SEG* 36.228 may be such a stele. It contains the names of 13 newly admitted members of the *synodos* of Herakles in the year of the archon Aristaichmos (159/8)

---

28. *IG* II² 1361.20-23: ὅπως δ' ἂν ὡ/[ς πλ]εῖστοι ὦσιν ὀργεῶνες τοῦ ἱερο[ῦ], ἐξεῖναι [τῶι] βουλομένωι εἰσεν[έ]γκαντι/ [... δ]ραχμὰς μετεῖναι αὐτῶι τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ εἰς τὴν στήλην ἐγγράφεσθαι, τ[οὺς/ δὲ γεγραμ]μένους εἰς τὴν στήλην δο[κιμά]ζειν τοὺς ὀργεῶνας. Wilhelm (1942) notes that in l. 22 we should read: τ[οὺς/ δ' ἐγγραφομ]μένους εἰς τὴν στήλην δο[κιμά]ζειν τοὺς ὀργεῶνας. An εἰσαγωγὴ of a relative is mentioned in the *orgeones* (*Dionysiastai*) of *IG* II² 1326.42 but no more details are provided. For a possible parallel see the 4th-century inscription from Tenos (*IG* XII Suppl. 303) entitled Νόμος εἰσαγωγῆς. In this document the legitimacy of the introduced has overwhelming importance implying that the group may have been a sub-division of the citizen body.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

and it has been erected at the expense of the priest of the group.[29]

IG II² 1361 clearly defines the reason for accepting new members and the procedure to follow. First, the candidate should pay a certain sum of money, the exact amount is unknown, and then he shall be registered in a list recorded on a column; only the candidates whose names have been recorded on the column would pass to the second stage of the scrutiny, which was held by the members of the association. We do not know anything about the content of this scrutiny, whether it was similar to the one held in *demes* or to others taking place in religious groups connected with purification or abstinence.[30] Ferguson (1944: 99-100) alleged that a new pattern of recruitment is introduced by this provision. As an argument *ex silentio*, he claimed that before the second half of the 4th century the admission to *orgeones* associations was hereditary. His main argument comes from *IG* II² 1361.1-2: "[—-] as many as are inscribed on the stele or their descendants"[31] which implies that the association had inscribed on a stele the names of its members. Ferguson's point concerns the existence of a stele with the names of the members and their descendants. First of all, the fragmentary condition of this part of the inscription makes any interpretation difficult. To assume that lines 1-2 have any connection with membership or joining the association would be rather hazardous in view of lines 22-23. The content of the inscription is articulated in sections; in each of them a different subject is treated. So, *IG* II² 1361.1-2 cannot concern sacrifices (l.4-8), repairs to the sanctuary (l.8-12), finances or the mode of joining the association (l.20-24) with which the document deals below. The association probably kept one updated stele: any application had to be registered and in case of unsuccessful scrutiny the name had to be erased. The mention of descendants can be explained as participants in sacrifices or other associative functions in which they may have had a share, as in the *orgeones* of heroes (see above).

Membership in *thiasotai* associations did not depend upon any previous qualification. The payment of a contribution is the only known prerequisite

---

29. *SEG* in l. 8 suggests Πέτρων Οἰκογένης; one may rightly wonder with Parker (1996: 341 n. 46) whether it should not have been Πέτρων οἰκογενὴς.

30. See also *IG* II² 1283. 29-31: καὶ ἐάν τινε[ς βούλωνται τῶν ἐν τῶι ἄστει]/ ὀργεώνων ἐπεισιέ[ναι εἰς τοὺς ὀργεῶνας, ἐξεῖναι αὐτοῖ]/ ς εἰσιέναι.

31. Foucart (1873: 189) read: ιε...[7]...χεναι...[5]..ιε...[5]..ας ὁπόσοι ἐν τῆ[ι στή]/λη[ι ἐ]γ[γεγρα]μμένοι εἰσὶν ἢ το[ὺς τ]ούτων ἐκγόνους; *IG* II² 1361.1-2: [----]εναικε[---]ας ὁπόσοι ἐν τῆ[ι στή]/λη[ι ἐ]γ[γεγρα]μμένοι εἰσὶν ἢ το[ὺς τ]ούτων ἐκγόνους; Wilhelm (1942) read [- - - ὀργεῶν]ας ὁπόσοι ἐν τῆ[ι στή]/λη[ι ἐ]γ[γεγρα]μμένοι εἰσὶν ἢ το[ὺς τ]ούτων ἐκγόνους; Sokolowski in *LSCG* 45 read [- - -]χεναι....[8].... ιε....[8].... ας ὁπόσοι ἐν τῆ[ι στή]/λη[ι ἐ]γ[γεγρα]μμένοι εἰσὶν ἢ το[ὺς τ]ούτων ἐκγόνους.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

(*IG* II² 1298).[32] It seems that even the scrutiny (of religious character) of the *orgeones* is not the rule. However, in *eranistai* associations of the 2nd century A.D. it seems that there were at least two different modes: one required a special procedure during which the officials of the association would examine the candidate to see if he was *hagnos* (pure), *eusebes* (pious) and *agathos* (good in character);[33] the second involved the payment of an entrance fee. It was possible for those who were already members to introduce their children (*SEG* 31.122, 38).[34]

Some of the known members in associations of *thiasotai* were non-Athenians, but for the majority of the members there is no evidence at all.[35] *SEG* 2.9 is the only decree in which the names of officers are preserved for three (250/49-248/7) and two (245/4-244/3) consecutive years respectively. It reveals in this way the structure of relationships among the members and the decisive factors leading to the selection of officials in an association. In this record certain names appear again and again, like the name *Thallos*, which occurs three times as *epimeletes* (in the years 250/49, 248/7, and 245/4) or the name *Batrachos*, which also occurs three times: twice as *grammateus* (250/49 and 244/3) and once as *tamias* (249/8), and again elected as a member of the committee for the erection of that stele.[36] The same is true

---

32. Freyburger et al. (1986: 67) claim that there was a *dokimasia* for the admission. But there is no trace in the evidence for associations of *thiasotai*. The only evidence for admission concerns entrance fees and it comes from *IG* II² 1298.16-20: ἀναγράφ/ειν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐπεισιόντων συνθιασωτῶν/ τὰ ὀνόματα ἐπὰν καταβάλωσιν τὸ ἐπιβάλλο/[ν] αὐτοῖς τοῦ ὑπάρχοντος ἀργυρίου κατὰ τὸ/[ν ν]όμ[ον] ἐν τῶι ἐράνωι. (And inscribe the names of the newly admitted co-*thiasotai*, when they pay their share of the existing capital according to the law into the fund).

33. *IG* II² 1369.31-34: [Μη]δενὶ ἐξέστω ἰσι[έν]αι ἰς τὴν σεμνοτάτην/ σύνοδον τῶν ἐρανιστῶν πρὶν ἂν δοκι/μασθῆ εἴ ἐστι ἀ[γν]ὸς καὶ εὐσεβὴς καὶ ἀγ/α[θ]ὸς. (Nobody is allowed to enter the most august *synodos* of *eranistai* before he is tested whether he is pure and pious and virtuous). Similarly the society of *Iobakchoi* was considering whether the candidate was worthy and suitable to the group (*IG* II² 1368.36-37: εἰ ἄξιος φαίνοιτο καὶ ἐπιτήδειος τῷ Βακχείῳ).

34. Introduction of sons: *SEG* 31.122, 38-39: ἐὰν δέ τις τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἐράνου τέκνον [τ]ίσι θέλῃ ἰσάγιν/ διδότω ὑϊκοῦ Μ. Payment of entrance fee: *SEG* 31.122, 39: ἐὰν δέ τις ἐμβῆναι θέλῃ διδότω ὑϊκοῦ ΜΛΓ; *IG* II² 1339.15-17: ὁμ[οί/ως δὲ ἔδοξ]ε ἐμβιβάζειν ἐξεῖναι τοῖς [τε/λοῦσιν ἔραν]ον δραχμῶν τριάκοντα.

35. See for example *IG* II² 1263: Δημήτριος Σωσάνδρου Ὀλύνθιος, *IG* II² 1271: Μῆνις Μνησιθέου Ἡρακλεώτης, *IG* II² 1273: Κεφαλίων Ἡρακλεώτης and Σωτήριχος Τροζήνιος. But in *IG* II² 1261, 1262, 1277, 1297, 1298, 1301, 1317, 1317b, 1318, 1319, 1323, 2347, 2936, 2939, 2943, 4013, *SEG* 2.9, 10, 24.156, 223 and 44.60 there is no reference or hint to any particular polis. The example of *IG* II² 1323, however, reveals that there were Athenian citizens among their ranks and most probably metics [*IG* II² 1261 according to Foucart's conjecture in *BCH* 3 (1879) 510].

36. *Batrachos* appears again in *SEG* 44.60 as proposer of the honourary decree.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

for *Krates* (246/5 and 244/3) and *Archepolis* (249/8 and 246/5). So in a period of six years, four persons seem not simply to participate in the administration of the association, but to conduct virtually all its activities and administer its survival. The mode of selection was actually conducive to the association's survival, which was guaranteed through the generous and benevolent aid of the wealthier members,[37] who in return received these offices.

There is no clear reference to women being members of an *orgeones* association of heroes or foreign deities. However, we know that, in the *orgeones* of the Mother of the Gods, there was an office of *hiereia*, to which a woman was allotted every year from the womenfolk. Women carrying the titles of *phialephoroi* and *zakoroi* were performing ritual duties. In the *orgeones* association of Bendis the wives of the members participated in the banquets after the sacrifice and a portion of the sacrificed animal was given to them, and in the last third of the 5th century they could be elected as priestesses (*IG* I^3 136). We do not know whether the selection presupposed the woman's individual participation in the association's life, as seems to be the case in *IG* II^2 1314, or whether her husband's membership[38] was sufficient to qualify for selection, as it seems to be the case in *IG* II^2 1316. It seems possible that at an earlier stage participation of the husband was necessary and only later could women participate on their own right. Men and women were equally welcomed to *thiasotai* association; the lists of some of them (*IG* II^2 1297, 1298, 2347)[39] are explicit about women's participation. In *IG* II^2 1298 women are becoming *hiereiai* of Artemis but this is our only epigraphical evidence about women holding a post in a *thiasotai* association. In *eranistai* associations and *Asklepiastai* etc. women are to be found in the lists but not among the officials, with the exception of *proeranistria* Nikippe (*IG* II^2 1292.23) and *archeranistria* Thaleia in *AJA* 64 (1960) 269.[40]

---

37. Similarly see Burkert (1987: 32).

38. Ferguson (1944: 109 n.53), following Poland (1909: 298), maintains that women did not participate in the associations *ipso jure* but "through being wives, sisters, daughters of members". Contra Foucart (1873: 6) who claims that women played a considerable role in an association's life.

39. Apart from these lists, which refer explicitly to *thiasotai*, *IG* II^2 includes *IG* II^2 2346, II^2 2348-49, II^2 2351-52 and II^2 2356 with the heading *catalogus thiasotarum*? There is no internal evidence to associate these lists with *thiasotai* associations. *IG* II^2 2343 contains the names of 15 individuals, perhaps, members of a *thiasos* of Herakles, see Lind, H. (1990) *Der Gerber Kleon in den "Ritten" des Aristophanes*, 132-64, Frankfurt; for *IG* II^2 2345, see Lambert (1999).

40. In the *eranistai* association of *IG* II^2 2354, 13 out of 23 members are women and in II^2 2358, 36 names out of 94 are feminine.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

The personal status of the individual was decisive in the 5th and 4th centuries in the *orgeones* association of Bendis but it seems that in Hellenistic times it did not play any particular role. So, in cult associations we find citizens (*IG* II² 1335), metics and foreigners (possibly *IG* II² 1261 and II² 1291, 1297, *SEG* 41.171 and 247)[41] and slaves (*IG* II² 1335.58 and possibly 46, 51, and 64, II² 1327.33 and 2940, *SEG* 36.228). In associations like *Asklepiastai* etc, two documents imply exclusive or the dominant participation of citizens.[42] It appears that there was a subtle but decisive shift from citizenship via payment of a fee to individual moral qualities as a prerequisite for membership in a cult association. However, such an evolutionary approach is flawed because it establishes chronological barriers between practices, which could have been continued irrespective of general trends; this point is well illustrated by the group of *orgeones Dionysiastai* (*IG* II² 1325) which in the 2nd century consisted exclusively of citizens.

The question of a member's expulsion does not seem to have occupied an important place in the earlier documents and, consequently, we do not have any evidence from that period. Maier (1969: 78) claimed that there are no traces of provisions for the expulsion of members. But he seems to disregard at least three provisions of a later era. From these provisions it is evident that there were mainly two causes for the expulsion of a member. In the earliest document the non-payment of the contribution could lead to this measure as mentioned in *SEG* 31.122, 42-45:

> "the dues are to be brought to the treasurer without fail for the making of loans; he who does not bring his dues is to pay as fine double the amount; he who does not pay at all is to be expelled." [Translation by Raubitschek (1981)]

and *IG* II² 1339.13-14: "if they do not give the contribution it was resolved that they should not participate in the *eranos*", which, however, was exceptional. But the culprit of disorder and quarrels could be expelled either from the assembly or from the association as in *IG* II² 1369.40-42: "if somebody is seen to initiate fights or troubles, let him be expelled from the *eranos*" and *SEG* 31.122, 8-9: "and without fail let him be expelled after his fellow *eranistai* have cast a vote". [Translation by Raubitschek (1981)][43]

---

41. Among the 33 foreigners attested there are individuals from Boiotia (Thebes), Aigina, Peloponnese (Troizen), Macedonia (Olynthos), Thrace (Maroneia), Asia Minor (Miletos, Herakleia Pontika, Apameia), Middle East (Antiocheia, Samareia) and Pontos (Amisos).

42. In Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59 as well as in *IG* II² 1322.30-40 all the listed contributors are citizens, except a Νίκων Ἀστακηνός; in II² 1335, 13 are foreigners, 36 citizens, 1 public slave, and 3 "bare" names implying servile status out of 53 names. In *IG* II² 2353, 2960 and *SEG* 18.33 all the preserved names belong to citizens. In contrast, see *IG* II² 2358 in which only 4 citizens are attested for certain.

43. *IG* II² 1369.40-42: εἰ δέ τις μά/χας ἢ θορύβους κεινῶν φαίνοιτο / ἐκβαλλέσθω

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Assemblies

All cult associations appear to hold monthly meetings. The time of the meeting is designated with, for example, the expression *Mounichionos agorai kyriai*. Most of the decrees are dated in *Mounichion* (April/May) and *Skirophorion* (June/July) at the end of the calendar year. The decrees of *orgeones* association of the Mother of the Gods are all dated, with one exception, in *Mounichion*.[44] *Orgeones Dionysiastai* held assemblies in *Posideon* (December) (*IG* II² 1325 and 1326). The *thiasotai* associations of Bendis met to honour their officials in the month of *Skirophorion* (June/July) (*IG* II² 1317, 1317b, *SEG* 2.10, 44.60) with the exception of *SEG* 2.9, passed in *Anthesterion* (February/March), in which the officials of previous years are honoured. The *orgeones* association of Bendis met on the 8th of *Hekatombaion* (July/August) to regulate the procession (*IG* II² 1283) and on the 8th day of *Skirophorion* (*IG* II² 1284) to honour officials. The *orgeones* of Aphrodite assembled in *Thargelion* (May/June) and *Skirophorion*. A uniform dating system is followed, according to which the documents of almost all the associations are dated with the name of the eponymous archon of the city.[45]

However, these dates are given only in connection with the honouring of officials, normally close to the end of their term in office (usually after the annual festivities), and they cannot help us to determine the frequency of other meetings.[46] Only in the *orgeones* association of Bendis is there an explicit clause sanctioning monthly meetings. In this respect the terms *agora kyria*, which occurs in the majority of our records, and *agoran kai syllogon poein* raise questions concerning their meaning in an associative context.

τοῦ ἐράνου; *SEG* 31.122. 8-9: καὶ ἐξάνανκα πραττέσθω τῶν σ/[υ]νερανιστῶν ψῆφον λαβόντων ἐκβιβάσαι; *SEG* 31.122. 42-45: τὰς δὲ φορὰς/ καταφέριν τῷ ταμίᾳ ἐπάναγκες ἰς τὰς ἐγδόσις· ὁ δὲ μὴ κατενένκας/ ἀποτινέτω τὸ διπλοῦν ὁ δὲ μὴ δοὺς τὸ κάθολον ἐξέρανος/ ἔστω; *IG* II² 1339.13-14: ἐὰν δὲ μὴ διδ[ῶσι/ τὴν φορὰν, ἔ]δοξεν μὴ μετέχειν αὐτο[ὺς/ τοῦ ἐράν]ου, ἐὰν μή τινι συμβῆι διὰ πέ[ν/θος ἢ διὰ ἀ]σθένειαν ἀπολειφθῆναι. Similarly in *IG* II² 1368.80-82, 89-90, 99-102.

44. See *IG* II² 1314, 1315, 1327, 1328 and 1329 but not in *IG* II² 1316 where the date is *Hekatombaion*. This is due to the exceptional character of the decree, in which the priestess and her husband are honoured. *Mounichion* seems to be the preferred month for honouring officials for other associations, too [*IG* II² 1277 (*thiasotai*), 1334 (*orgeones*), 1335 (*Sabaziastai*), 1345 (*eranistai*), 1369 (*eranistai*), *SEG* 31.122 (*Herakliastai*)]. The reason may be that festivals held earlier in the spring and officials were honoured in the next monthly meeting.

45. Contra Ziebarth (1896: 147). In *IG* II² 1317b the archon's name is followed by the priest's name; *SEG* 24.223, a dedication of a *thiasotai* association, is dated by the priest's name only.

46. Similar scepticism expressed by Jones (1999: 161-64) about regular monthly meetings of members of *phylai*.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

The Athenian *ekklesia* in the second half of the 4th century was convened on four regular occasions in the period of each prytany and the term *ekklesia kyria* was used to designate only the first meeting.[47] It is, then, probable that, by analogy, the phraseology was adopted by the associations and denoted the first meeting of each month. In this case, there must have been, at least, one meeting per month. Ziebarth (1896: 144) claimed on the basis of *IG* II² 1361 that the day of the assembly was constitutionally fixed. This assertion depends on the way we interpret this particular document. In my opinion *IG* II² 1361 cannot be considered as a constitution in a modern legal sense, since it does not contain fundamental rules for the function of the association. Hence I do not think that the date of the assembly was constitutionally fixed.

The second phrase *agora kai syllogon poein* implies a distinction between *agora* and *syllogos*; assuming that the first term describes the ordinary assemblies of the association every month, the second can designate neither an extraordinary meeting, since these two meetings are held on the same day, nor a religious ceremony for the same reason. However, the term *syllogos* as synonym to *agora* occurs in a late 4th-century decree of *Paraloi*, *IG* II² 1254.18-23:

> ὅτι δ' ἂν ἀ[ν]/αλώσωσιν εἰς τὴν ἀναγρα[φὴ]/ν τῆς στήλης καὶ τὴν στάσιν/ λογισαμένους, ὅταν π[ρ]ῶτ[ο]ν/ σύλλογος γένηται, ἀ[πο]λαβ[ε]/ῖν παρὰ τῶν Παράλων (and whatever they spend for inscribing and setting up the stele, they shall give account and they will be refunded by the Paraloi at the time of the first assembly).

Therefore, the expression *agoran kai syllogon poein* refers to the regular monthly meeting.[48]

Offices

Nomenclature: In the *orgeones* associations of heroes the man responsible for the sacrifice was called *hestiator* (*Ag.* 16, 161.12) or *histiator* (*IG* II² 1259.1-2). Ferguson's (1944: 78) assumption that this post was "an assignment which rotated among the *orgeones* in some settled order" can be neither refuted nor confirmed from the available evidence. The only indica-

---

47. See Hansen (1989: 177-92), Errington, R.M. (1994) "Ἐκκλησία κυρία in Athens" *Chiron* 24, 209-14 and Rhodes, P.J. (1995) "Ekklesia kyria and the schedule of assemblies in Athens" *Chiron* 25, 187-98.

48. Poland (1909: 331 n.+) suggested that *syllogos* simply reinforces the meaning of *agora* and he later claimed (in *RE* s.v.), on the basis of Thuc. ii 22.1, that *syllogos* here is simply a pleonasm; see also Hansen (1989: 195-209) and Pakkanen (1996: 53). The term appears also in *P. Lond.* 2710 (mid-1st century B.C.), for which see Nock et al. (1936).

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

tion is that the office was held annually, at least in the *orgeones* of Amynos, Asklepios and Dexion[49] but there is no evidence about either election by lot or appointment or rotation in a settled order. Apart from *hestiator*, there was in some cases an *hiereus*, a *tamias* and an officer called *mnemon* (recorder), attested only in *Ag.* 16, 161.9-10, responsible for the preservation of the ancient decrees.[50] Probably these offices were held in the same manner as *hestiator*. The duty of *tamias* was the administration of all financial matters concerning the association, like the purchase of the sacrificial animal and the collection of the annual rent of the leased orgeonic property (*IG* II² 2499.18-24).

In contrast, *orgeones* of goddesses, *thiasotai* and *eranistai* associations had similar and numerous offices and officers. Officers were allotted or elected in the first assembly of the members every year, probably for a one-year term in office. The terms designating the method of selection of an officer are: *lachousa* (allotted), a term used exclusively for an *hiereia* or for any other sacerdotal office[51] and *hairetheis* (elected) for the remaining officers.[52] There were also the neutral terms *genomenos* and *katastatheis*, designating that someone has been in office.[53]

Duration: Although the offices were in principle held annually, it was not uncommon for certain officials to hold the same office in more than one year;[54] whether they were in office in consecutive years is not clear. Zie-

---

49. *IG* II² 1259.1-2: ἐπειδὴ οἱ ἱστιά[τορ]ες οἱ ἐπὶ Θευφράστου ἄρχοντος (since the *hestiatores* of the year of archon Theuphrastos).

50. Priest: *IG* II² 1289.6-8: ἀλλὰ ἐκ τῶν π[ροσόδων θύ]/ειν τὰς θυσίας τὸν ἱερέα μετ[ὰ τῶν ὀργεώ]/νων κατὰ τὰ πάτρια. (But from the income the priest shall perform the sacrifices together with the *orgeones* according to the custom). Treasurer: *IG* II² 2499.19-20: τῶι ἀεὶ ταμιεύοντι. *Mnemon*: In various demes there is an officer called *hieromnemon*, while Arist. *Pol.* 1321b 35-40 refers to *mnemones* as the officers whose task was the recording of various contracts, public or private suits, etc. Cf. Jones (1999: 250).

51. *Hieropoioi: IG* II² 1261, 1263; *hiereus: IG* II² 1273.

52. E.g. *tamias* (*IG* II² 1271 and probably 1273), *grammateus* (*IG* II² 1263), *epimeletai* (*IG* II² 1301), special committees (*SEG* 2.9 and *IG* II² 1282).

53. Poland (1909: 417) argues that the expression καθίστημι etc designates officers appointed. But it was also possible that sometimes an appointment was hidden behind an expression of election or allotment. This term is ascribed to officials of previous years, who were elected (*SEG* 2.9-10, *IG* II² 1277, 1278), while the term γενόμενος is connected with a sacerdotal office (*IG* II² 1261, 1297 and 1298).

54. *IG* II² 1323.5-8 and 11-13: ἐπειδὴ Θέων καταστα θεὶς τ[α]/ μία[ς ε]ἰς τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν ἐπὶ Νικ[ο]φῶντος ἄρχοντος λελειτούργηκ[ε]/ν ἔτη πλείω (since Theon was elected as treasurer in the year of the archon Nikophon, he stayed in office for several years). For *grammateus*, *IG* II² 1263, 1284, 1329; for *epimeletai*, *SEG* 2.9-10; for *tamias*, *IG* II² 1278, 1325, 1327; for *hiereiai*, *IG* II² 1298, 1334; for *hieropoioi*, *IG* II² 1261.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Barth (1896: 147) maintained that such cases were exceptional, but it is possible that in the course of time this exception might have become the rule. It is possible, but not definitely proven, that in *IG* II² 1273B the office of *hiereus* was shorter than a year, since in the decree there is a mention of the year and the month "when *Nikias* was archon on the month of *Boedromion* (September/October)" when the priest was allotted, while in *IG* II² 1273A the meeting for honouring *Soterichos* of Troizen for his *epimeleiai* in building takes place in the same year but on the month *Anthesterion*. The long period between election and honouring of the priest was perceived as an oddity; it can be explained either as prolonging the term in office of the priest for reasons unknown to us or as a belated honouring.[55] At the end of the 2nd century, at least in one case, a person was at the same time *grammateus*, *tamias* and *epimeletes* (*IG* II² 1335).

After the end of the term in office, the officers, and especially *tamias* (*IG* II² 1271), *grammateus* (*IG* II² 1263, 1284, 1292), and *epimeletai* (*SEG* 2.9), had to be scrutinised about the way they had administered the association's affairs, and especially those involving financial matters.[56]

Honours: The pattern of honouring in *thiasotai* associations seems different from that of *orgeones*, with all the officials of one year honoured in one decree, instead of each one separately. The reason for such an arrangement may have been dictated by historical and financial necessities. Most *thiasotai* associations (13 out of 22 cases) have frequently employed this pattern. Thus, it is more difficult to distinguish through a general, multi-clausal statement, the duties of each official. This practice is met in the following documents: a) *SEG* 2.9 and *IG* II² 1317 where *epimeletai*, *grammateus* and *tamias* are honoured,[57] b) *SEG* 2.10 and *IG* II² 1317b where

---

55. The alleged oddity was explained as semestral allotment of officials (Ferguson 1944: 107. n.49) with the assumption that such an arrangement was convenient for merchants and without any precedent in Attica or as a monthly rotation in this office (Kirchner. *IG* II²). Foucart (1873: 206) urged caution.

56. *SEG* 2.10. 6-8: καὶ τοὺς λόγους ἀπέδω/καν τῶν ἀνηλωμένων (and they gave account of the expenses). *IG* II² 1277.16: δεδώκασιν δὲ λόγον καὶ εὐθύνας πάν/των ὧν διωικήκασιν (they gave account about everything they have administered) and *IG* II² 1271.8-9: ἀνένκλητον παρέχων ἑαυτὸν πᾶσ/ι τοῖς θιασώταις (he provided himself unblemished to all the *thiasotai*).

57. *SEG* 2.9. 3-6: καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως ἐπιμε/μέληνται τῶν τε θυσιῶν ὡς αὐτοῖς πάτριόν ἐστιν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων/ ὅσων αὐτοῖς ὁ νόμος προστάττει καὶ τοὺς λόγους ἀποδεδώκα/σι (they took care well and zealously of the sacrifices as it is customary to them and of the rest as the law prescribes and they were scrutinized for their term in office) and in *IG* II² 1317.2-5: [... καλῶς καὶ φιλοτί]/μως ἐπεμελήθησαν τῶν τε θυσ[ιῶν ὧ]ν π[ροσῆκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν]/ περὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν θιασωτῶν καὶ [προσανήλωσαν ἀργύριον παρ' ἑαυ]/τῶν (they took care well and zealously of the sacrifices which they had to

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

in addition to the officials of the previous document, an *hiereus* is honoured,[58] c) *SEG* 44.60 where *epimeletai* and *grammateus* are honoured,[59] d) *IG* II² 1323 where the honours bestowed on *grammateus* and *tamias* were inscribed on the same stele,[60] e) *IG* II² 1277 where *epimeletai* and *tamias* are honoured[61] and e) in *IG* II² 1278 where an *epimeletes*, *tamias*, *antigrapheus*, *grammatophylax* are honoured and 1282, in which the supervisory committee for the building of an annexe is honoured.[62]

---

perform and of all the remaining affairs of the association of *thiasotai* and they spent money from their own revenue).

58. *SEG* 2.10. 4-8: καλῶς καὶ φιλοτί/μως ἐπεμελήθησαν τῶν τε θυσιῶν τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τῶν ἄλ/λων ἁπάντων τῶν περὶ τὸ κοινὸν καὶ τοὺς λόγους ἀπέδω/καν τῶν ἀνηλωμένων, (they took care well and zealously of the sacrifices to the gods and all the other affairs of the association and their accounts of the expenses have been checked) and *IG* II² 1317b.4-6: ἐπεμελήθησαν τῶν/ τε θυσιῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων τῶν περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Βεν/δῖδος (they took care of the sacrifices and all the other affairs of the temple of Bendis).

59. *SEG* 44.60. 2-4: ἐπειδή οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ καὶ ὁ γραμματεὺς ἐπε/μελήθησαν τῶν θυσιῶν τοῖς θεοῖς καθ' ἃ πάτριόν ἐστι, καὶ τῶν ἄ/λλων πάντων ὧν οἱ νόμοι προστάττουσιν (since the superintendents and the secretary took care of the sacrifices to the gods as it is customary and of everything else the ordinances require).

60. *IG* II² 1323.8-14: μεμέρικεν δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰς θ[υ]/σίας ἐν τοῖς καθήκουσι χρόνοις ἀπρ[ο]/φασίστως, δέδωκεν δὲ καὶ τοῖς μετα[λ/λ]άξασιν τὸ ταφικὸν παραχρῆμα· ὁ[μ]ο[ί]/ως δὲ καὶ ὁ γραμματεὺς λελειτούρ[γ/η]κεν ἔτη πλείω καὶ διατελοῦσ[ιν εὖ/νους ὄντες τῶι κοινῶι τῶν θια[σωτῶν] (he has allocated funds for sacrifices readily in the proper time. he has given money for the burial of the deceased members immediately; similarly the secretary performed his duties for many years and both continue to be favourable).

61. *IG* II² 1277.6-17: τοῦ τε ἱεροῦ ἐπιμ[εμέ]ληνται καλῶς κ/αὶ φιλοτίμως κα[ὶ] τ[ὰς] θυσ[ία]ς ἔθυσαν π/ᾶσα[ς κ]ατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὰ νόμιμα, ἐπε/κόσμησαν δὲ κα[ὶ] τ[ὴ]ν θεὸν καὶ τὸν βωμὸ/ν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὠικοδόμησαν, καὶ εἰς ταῦτα/ ἐπιδεδώκασιν παρ' ἑαυτῶν [3]Δ⌜ δραχμὰ/ς, καὶ ποτήρ[ιο]ν ἀργυροῦν ποησάμενοι/ παρ' ἑαυτῶν ἀνέθηκαν τῆι θεῶι ὁλκὴν [3]ΔΗΗ/// δραχμὰς, ἐπιμεμέληνται δὲ καὶ τ/ῶν ἀπογενομένων καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμω/ς, δεδώκασιν δὲ λόγον καὶ εὐθύνας πάν/των ὧν διωικήκασιν (they took care of the sanctuary well and zealously and they performed the sacrifices according to the ancestral tradition and the customs. they adorned the statue of the goddess and they built the shrine from the beginning and they gave for these 65 drachmas of their own and they. having had a silver cup weighing the equal of 62 drachmas and 3 obols made at their own expense. dedicated it to the goddess. they took care of the deceased members well and zealously and they were scrutinized for all they have administered).

62. *IG* II² 1278.2-5: ἔδοσαν [δὲ καὶ ταφικὸν τοῖς/ μεταλλάξασιν τὸ γεγραμ]μένον ἑκάστωι κατ[ὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ πα/ρα]δε[δ]ώκασι[ν] ἀργυρ[ί]ου περιὸν Χ⌈ΗΗ[3]ΔΔ· ἐπε[μελήθησαν δὲ καὶ/ τῶ]ν [ἄ]λλων ἁπάντων [μ]ετὰ τῶν ἡγεμόν[ω]ν/ κα[λῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως ...] (they gave the prescribed sum of money for the burial of each of the deceased according to the custom and they have handed over surplus money amounting to 1770 drachmas and they took care of everything else together with the *hegemones* well and

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

A. *Hieropoioi*:[63] In *IG* II² 1255 three citizens are honoured for having carried out properly their duties; they included taking care of the procession and the distribution of meat.[64] In *IG* II² 1361, they appear to hold a monthly meeting on the 2nd day of the month with the *epimeletai* for administrative purposes.[65] Ferguson (1944: 102) maintained that these *hieropoioi* were officers appointed by the city, as happened in the festival of *Panathenaia*, and only for the Athenian *orgeones*.[66] But it would be unusual if public officers were involved in the administration of an *orgeones* association forming, together with *epimeletai*, the executive board of this particular association. *Hieropoioi* as officials of the city had the task of helping in the organisation of the four-year festivals;[67] but in the *orgeones* of Bendis they seem to participate actively, not only in the organization of the *Bendideia*, but also in the administration of the association. The title is taken, perhaps by analogy, from the name of officers appointed for preparing the festival of *Panathenaia*.

A similar case is probably that of *IG* II² 2932 (342/1), a dedication of two *hieropoioi* of Sabazios. There is no reason to suggest that in the middle of the 4th century Sabazios had a public cult in Athens. *Hieropoioi* were of-

---

zealously), and *IG* II² 1282.6-10: τῆς προσοικοδομίας τοῦ/ ἱερ[οῦ τοῦ] Ἄμμωνος τό τε ἔ[ρ]γον καλὸν καὶ/ [ἄ]ξιο[ν τ]οῦ [θε]οῦ ἐποίησαν κ[α]ὶ ἐπεστάτησα[ν/ καλῶς καὶ φ]ι[λ]οτίμως καὶ λόγον ἀπέδω/[καν τοῦ ἀναλ]ώματος (they built the annexe to the temple of Ammon, a good piece of work and worthy of the God, and they supervised well and zealously and they have been scrutinized about the expenditure). It is my impression that the unusual board of officials mentioned in *IG* II² 1278, together with the mention of *hegemones* and the uncertainty of the reading *thiasotai*, may imply that the document is not coming from a *thiasotai* association. The same is true for *IG* II² 1282 where the term *thiasotai* is restored.

63. *Orgeones*: *IG* II² 1255, 1361 and *Ag*. 16, 245; *thiasotai*: *IG* II² 1261, 1263 and 1297; *eranistai*: *IG* II² 1265, 1291, and *AJA* 64 (1960) 269; *Sarapiastai*: *IG* II² 1292, Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59. For *hieropoioi* in demes, see Whitehead (1986: 142); in phratries, Lambert (1993: 235); in *phylai*, Jones (1999: 188).

64. *IG* II² 1255.4-6: [καλῶς ἐπεμε]λήθησαν καὶ φιλ[ο/τίμως τῆς τε πο]μπῆς καὶ τῆς κρε[α/νομίας καὶ τῶν] ἄλλων πάντων· (they took care properly and zealously of the procession and the distribution of the meat and everything else). Similarly in *IG* II² 1292, 13-15 and Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59.26-28: καλεῖν δὲ αὐτὸν/ καὶ εἰς τὰς θυσίας τοὺς ἱεροποιοὺς οἷς ἂν ἡ/ λειτουργία καθήκει.

65. *IG* II² 1361.16-17: ἀγο[ρὰν δὲ κ]αὶ [ξ]ύ[λλ]ογον ποεῖν τοὺς ἐπιμελητὰς καὶ τοὺς ἱεροποιοὺς ἐν τῶι ἱερ/[ῶι] πε[ρὶ τῶν κοιν]ῶν τῆι δευτέραι ἱσταμένου τοῦ μηνὸς ἑκάστου (the *epimeletai* and the *hieropoioi* are to call a meeting and an assembly in the temple for the common affairs on the second day of each month).

66. See Veligianni-Terzi (1997: 150); however, Schwenk (1985: 66-67) objects to Ferguson's interpretation.

67. See Garland (1984: 117-18).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

ficers in Bendis' citizen *orgeones* band from an early date and their duty was to take care of the annual procession and the distribution of the animal sacrificed for the feast, jointly with the *polis*-appointed *hieropoioi*. This office corresponds to that of *hestiatores* of the earlier type of the *orgeones* association of heroes, since both were responsible for *kreanomia*. But it seems that this office was abolished in the organisation of relatively late *orgeones* associations and that the priest was charged with their duties. Ziebarth (1896: 195) suggested that *hieropoioi* originally had financial duties of which they were deprived by the introduction of *tamiai*. But one should remark that a) *hieropoioi* are known only in the *orgeones* of Bendis during the 4th and 3rd centuries but not later and b) there are cases where *hieropoioi* are working together with *tamiai* (*Ag*. 16, 245 and *IG* II² 1284).

B. *Epimeletai*: [68] This office occurs in almost all the *orgeones*, *thiasotai* and *eranistai* associations until the last decades of the 3rd century. Typical duties include the supervision of the construction and establishment of a statue or a picture of the honoured person or the obligation to mention the honoured person in certain religious and sacral occasions; in addition, they were responsible for the settlement of any inconvenience arising in the everyday life of the association.[69] In some cases they were taking care of

---

68. *Orgeones*: *IG* II² 1256, 1314, 1316, 1324 and *AM* 66 (1941) 228 no. 4; *thiasotai*: *IG* II² 1261, 1262, 1277, 1278, 1282, 1317, 1317b, *SEG* 2.9, 10 and 44.60; *eranistai*: *AJA* 64 (1960) 269, *IG* II² 1291, and *SEG* 41.171; *Asklepiastai* etc *IG* II² 1292, 1335. For *epimeletai* in demes, see *IG* II² 1206.12-16 (Acharnai, end 4th century) and Whitehead (1986: 139-49); in phratries, *SEG* 32.50 (beg of 3rd century) and Lambert (1993: 235); *phylai*, Jones (1999: 174-78).

69. *IG* II² 1256.4-6: καλῶς/ καὶ φιλοτίμως ἐπεμελήθησαν καὶ ἀξίω/ς τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ὀργεώνων, (they took care well and zealously of the affairs of the goddess and of the *orgeones*); *IG* II² 1324.2-10: [τῆς τοῦ ἱερο]ῦ ἐπισκε[υῆς π]ροέσ[τηκε κα/θάπε]ρ προσῆκ[ο]ν ἦν, ἔπεμψε [δὲ]/ [καὶ] τὴν πομπὴν ἀξίως τῆς θε[οῦ/ φ]ιλοτιμηθεὶς ἐμ πᾶσι τούτοις κ[αὶ]/ προσαναλώσας ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων καὶ τ[ῶ]/ν λοιπῶν δὲ ὧν καθῆκεν ἐν τῶι ἐν[ι]/αυτῶι ἐπεμελήθη καλῶς καὶ εὐσχη/μόνως (he supervised duly the repair of the temple, supervised well the procession of the goddess showing zeal in all these matters and spending his own money, and took care, well and properly, of the rest of the *orgeones*' affairs during the year); *IG* II² 1301.3-8: [ἐπεμε/λήθησαν ψηφι]σαμένων τῶ[ν θιασωτῶν ὅπως ἂν ἐπι/σκευασθεῖ τὸ μ]αγειρεῖον καὶ τ[---/---ἐπι]διδόντες μετὰ [πάσης φιλοτιμίας --- / δραχμὰς ?ἐκ] τῶν ἰδίων, τὴν π[ᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενοι/ ὅπως συντε-λε]σθεῖ τὰ ἐψηφισμέ[να ...] (in accordance with the vote of the *thiasotai*? they took care of the repair of the kitchen, and – giving zealously – drachmas ? of their own, and they were at pains so that the decision will be implemented); *IG* II² 1318.3-9: [αὐ]τὸς δὲ ἐπηγγείλα[το ἐκ τῶν/ ἰδ]ίων εἰς ἅπαντα τὰ [προσή/κ]οντα τῶι κοινῶι μερ[ιεῖν,]/ δεδώκα-σιν δὲ καὶ λόγ[ον καὶ]/ εὐθύνα[ς ἁπά]ντων τ[ῶν ὠικο]/νομημένων αὐτοῖ[ς ἐν τῶι/ ἐν]ι-αυτῶι (he promised that from his own income he would give everything that is appropriate to the association and they have been scrutinized for their term in office).

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

sacrifices. In extraordinary circumstances they could perform more difficult tasks, as for example in the case of the decree in *AM* 66 (1941) 228 no. 4.[70] In the *orgeones* association of the Mother of the Gods they are responsible for the inscription of the decrees. In some *thiasotai* associations *epimeletai* arranged the provision of the association with everything necessary for the ceremonies and had specific duties including the carrying out of certain projects as in *IG* II² 1301.The number of *epimeletai* was normally three (*IG* II² 1327), although in the honorary decrees usually only one is honoured.[71]

C. *Grammateus*:[72] Normally, the duty of *grammateus* was to supervise with the *epimeletai* the inscribing of the decrees (e.g. *IG* II² 1255, 1284) and to do everything else that is prescribed in the laws;[73] in fact, we do not know exactly what the laws, probably in the sense of the association's ordinances or customs, ordered. It was not unusual for a *grammateus* to provide exceptional services to an *orgeones* association as in *IG* II² 1329.[74] It

---

70. See *AM* 66 (1941) 228 no. 4.4-12: τάς τε θυσίας ἔθυσεν τοῖς θεοῖς τὰς καθηκούσας ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι καὶ [ἐ]/καλλιέρησεν ὑπέρ τε τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ὀργεώνων καὶ παίδων καὶ γ[υναι]/κῶν καὶ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ἐπεμελήθη δὲ καὶ τῶν ὀργε[ώνων]/ καλῶς καὶ εὐσχημόνως ἐν ὅλωι τῶι ἐνιαυτῶι, ἐθεράπευσεν [δὲ καὶ τοὺς]/ θεοὺς ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων, ἐκονίασεν δὲ καὶ τὰ βάθρα τὰ ἐν τῶι ἱε[ρῶι σταθέντα]/ καὶ τὸν λουτρῶνα τὸν ἀνδρεῖον, ὑπομείνας δὲ καὶ πᾶσα[ν τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν]/ ἐπέδωκεν τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν καλῶς καὶ εὐσχημόνω[ς περὶ πλείστου ποι]/ούμενος τὴν εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν καὶ τὴ[ν πρὸς τοὺς ὀργεῶνας]/ φιλοτιμίαν· (he performed the appropriate sacrifices to the gods in the temple and he benefited the *orgeones* and the children and the women and the Athenians and he took care of the *orgeones*' affairs well and properly during the whole year, he contributed to the worship of the gods from his own resources, he replastered the bases of statues in the temple and the men's bath, he remained in office and gave all attention to the *orgeones* well and properly, attaching the greatest importance to piety to the gods and zeal towards the *orgeones*).

71. Similarly in *phylai*, Jones (1999: 186).

72. *Orgeones*: *IG* II² 1255, 1284, and 1329; *thiasotai*: *IG* II² 1263, 1277, 1278, 1317, 1317b and 1323, *SEG* 2.9-10 and 44, 60; *eranistai*: *AJA* 64 (1960) 269, *IG* II² 1291 and 1369, *SEG* 41.171; *Asklepiastai* etc: *IG* II² 1292, 1322, 1335; *Iobakchoi*: *IG* II² 1368.

73. *IG* II² 1284.23-27: διώ[ικηκεν τὰ πρ]/οσταττόμεν' αὐτῶι ὑ[πὸ τ]ῶν νόμων ὀρθ/ῶς καὶ δικαίως ἀν[έγκ]λητον αὑτὸν παρέ/χων καὶ [περὶ] ὧν οἰκονόμηκεν λόγον καὶ/ [εὐθύ]ν[α]ς δέδωκεν, (he rightly and honestly fulfilled his duties, which were prescribed by laws, without giving any cause for blame and he rendered accounts of his management).

74. *IG* II² 1329.6-19: οὐθὲν ἐνλέλοιπεν φιλο/τιμίας συναύξων τε διατετέλεκεν τοῖς ὀρ/γεῶσιν τὴν σύνοδον, πεφρόντικεν δὲ καὶ θερα/πήας τοῦ ἱεροῦ πλεονάκις, οὐκ ἀπολέλιπται δὲ/ οὐδ' ἐν ἐπιδόσει οὐδεμιᾶι, εἰσήνενκεν δὲ καὶ/ ψηφίσματα ἐπὶ τῶι συνφέροντι ἵνα συνσταλῶ/σιν αἱ λίαν ἄκαιροι δαπάναι, ἐφρόντισεν δὲ τοῦ καὶ/ τοὺς δημοτικοὺς μετέχειν τῶν δεδομένων ὑπὸ/ τῶν ὀργεώνων φιλανθρώπων, διατετέλεκεν δὲ καὶ/ συνλειτουργῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀγερμοῖς καὶ ταῖς στρώσε/σιν ταῖς ἱερήαις, προευχρήστηκεν δὲ καὶ διά-

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

was possible to be re-appointed for several successive years, as in *IG* II² 1284 and 1329.[75] In *thiasotai* associations, the *grammateus* is honoured jointly with other officials and the only instance from which we can assess his duties is *IG* II² 1263.7-13: "well and justly he took care of all the common affairs and he presented the accounts correctly and justly and he gave account of the businesses he administered and the businesses he delegated to others who have managed affairs of the group".[76]

D. *Tamias*: The duty of *tamias* was the administration of all the financial matters relating to the association, including the provision of money for the erection of a monument of an honorand.[77] One source of income for an *orgeones* association was the leasing of the temple, which seems to be common practice for the *orgeones* of a hero. There is only one reference in *IG* II² 1361.9-11, in which it is ordered that the *orgeones* of Bendis should repair their temple using the monthly rent and the sale of water from a spring. Another source was the different fines imposed on members (*IG* II² 1361.13, 20) or on officials (*IG* II² 1328.13-14, 18-19), the fees paid for a sacrifice by a non-*orgeon* or by *orgeones* (*IG* II² 1361.19) and the fees for the registration in the association.[78] The *tamias* had to administer properly

---

φορον/ πλεονάκις ἄτοκον ἀποδημοῦντος τοῦ ταμίου, ἐπαγ/γέλεται δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον συνφροντι/εῖν εἰς ὃ ἂν αὐτὸν παρακαλῶσιν οἱ ὀργεῶνες· (he did not fall short in zeal, he continuously helped the association to expand, he took care of the temple 's repair several times, he took part in all the exceptional contributions, he proposed beneficial decrees aiming to reduce the association's inappropriate expenses, he took care that the general public should also receive a share of the benefactions donated by the *orgeones*, he participated in the collection of money and in the sacral spreadings, several times he lent money without any interest, when the treasurer was away and he promises that he will help the group in the future for whatever purpose the *orgeones* call upon him).

75. *IG* II² 1329 is the only instance of *grammateus* in the *orgeones* association of the Mother of the Gods. For the possibility of re-appointment see Poland (1909: 420-21). Garland (1987: 130) suggested, without, however, providing any evidence, that in the *orgeones* of the Mother of the Gods the *grammateus* was appointed rather than elected.

76. *IG* II² 1263.7-13: καλῶς καὶ δι/καίως ἐπεμελήθη τῶν κοινῶν πάντω/ν καὶ τοὺς λογισμοὺς ἀπέδωκεν ὀρθ/[ῶ]ς καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐθύνας ἔδωκεν/ ὧν τε αὐτὸς ἐκυρίευσεν καὶ [[τ]]ἃ πρὸς/ τοὺς ἄλλους ἐξελογίσατο ὅσοι τι τ/ῶν κοινῶν διεχείρισαν.

77. *Orgeones: IG* II² 1324, 1325, 1326, 1327, 1328, and 2499; *thiasotai*: *IG* II² 1263, 1284, 1316, 1317, 1317b, 1323, *SEG* 2.9-10 and 44.60; *eranistai*: *AJA* 64 (1960) 269, *IG* II² 1265, 1291 and 1369, *SEG* 31.122 and 41.171; *Asklepiastai* etc: *IG* II² 1292, 1322, 1335, 1339, 1343, and *SEG* 18.33; *Iobakchoi IG* II² 1368.123, 146. For *tamias* see in demes, Whitehead (1986: 143); in *phylai*, Jones (1999: 174-78). Pakkanen (1996: 58-59) claims, erroneously, that *tamias* hold usually a low-status position in cult associations, with the exception of *Sarapiastai* of *IG* II² 1292. However, there is no evidence of any hierarchy among the officers of cult associations.

78. Poland (1909: 493).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

these sums, so as to pay for the sacrificed animal(s) and also for the erection of statues, for portraits and crowns. He may have been also the head of an *eranos*, that is of a loan raised among the members of the association;[79] he was also the person responsible for leasing the estate of the association.[80] In *thiasotai* associations his duty was to take care of the financial affairs of the association, giving money for the erection of the columns and the crowns.[81] But the association itself is responsible for exacting the money of fines and penalties, which, moreover, are characterized sometimes as sacral. Ziebarth (1896: 152) assumed without any evidence that the wealthy members of the association were appointed as *tamiai*. However, the documents reveal that financial help to the association did not come exclusively from *tamiai*; *grammateis* may have well financed certain activities and promised assistance in the future (e.g. *IG* II² 1329). *IG* II² 1284.32 disproves Ziebarth's assumption that the appearance of

---

79. *IG* II² 1327.5-16: εἵς τε τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβῶς διατελε[ῖ]/ καὶ κοινεῖ τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν καὶ ἰδίαι ἑκάστωι εὔχρησ/τον αὑτὸν παρασκευάζων καὶ φιλοτιμούμενος τάς/ τε θυσίας τοῖς θεοῖς θύεσθαι τὰς καθηκούσας/ καὶ εἰς ταῦτα προεισευπορῶν πλεονάκις ἐκ τῶν ἰ/δίων καί τισιν τῶν ἀπογεγονότων οὐχ ὑπάρχοντος/ ἀργυρίου τῶι κοινῶι προϊέμενος εἰς τὴν ταφὴν τοῦ/ εὐσχημονεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ τετελευτηκότας, καὶ/ εἰς τὰς ἐπισκευὰς δὲ προ-αναλίσκων καὶ τοῦ ἐρά/νου τοῦ ἀργυρηροῦ ἀρχηγὸς γενόμενος συναχθῆ/ναι, καὶ τὰ ἄρι-στα συνβουλεύων καὶ λέγων διατελεῖ/ καὶ ἐμ πᾶσιν εὔνουν ἑαυτὸν παρασκευάζων, (he is continuously pious, he makes himself helpful to the *orgeones* both as a group and as individuals, he zealously contributes several times from his own resources to the customary sacrifices to the gods, he contributes also to the common fund for some of the deceased when money is not available for their burial, to maintain their decorum even after death, and he also advanced funds for repairs and he was the responsible person for the collection of loan and he continually speaks and advises excellently and he is favourable to everyone). *Eranos* in *thiasotai* associations also appears in *IG* II² 1298 and *SEG* 24.156.

80. Poland (1909: 490) rightly discards the theory of drafting a budget as one of the duties of the secretary.

81. However, see the exceptional *IG* II² 1271.4-14: καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως πάσ/[ας τὰς] ἐπιμελείας ὑπέστη καὶ τό τε πρόστωιον καὶ/ [τ]ὸ [ἀ]έτωμα τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Λαβραύνδου ἐπε/[τέ]λεσεν ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ κοινὰ καλῶς καὶ δικαί/ως διεχείρισεν ἀνένκλητον παρέχων ἑαυτὸν πᾶσ/ι τοῖς θιασώταις ἔκ τε τῶν πρότερον χρόνων καὶ ἀφ' οὗ ε/ἰς τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς ταμιείας εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἰ/δίων τῶν ἑαυτοῦ προσανήλωσεν ἀργύριον ἀπροφασί/στως εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν φανερὰν ποιούμενος τὴν εὔνοιαν ἣν ἔχει εἰς τοὺς θιασώτας καὶ τὴν ἱερωσύνην ἀξίως ἱερε/ώσατο τοῦ θεοῦ· (he undertook well and zealously all the concerns, he built the portico and the gable of the temple of Zeus Labraundos, worthy of the God, he administered the common affairs well and honestly, providing himself blameless to all the *thiasotai* from the previous years and since he entered the treasurership, and from his own income spent money readily, making evident his goodwill to the *thiasotai* and he performed worthily the duty of the priest of the God).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

tamias in the 2nd century meant the abolition of *hieropoios*, since it bears testimony to the existence of a *tamias* already in the late 4th century.[82]

In *orgeones* associations of heroes the leasing of the property is quite common. The lease guaranteed i) the preservation of the temple in a good condition[83] or the garden's integrity,[84] ii) easy access on the day or days of celebration,[85] and iii) an annual income to the association.[86] It seems that this pattern of use was spread among the different *orgeones* associations. It may have been the only available way of exploitation of the property, as *IG* II² 1289 implies.[87] However, *thiasotai* associations present a different pi-

82. Poland (1909: 376).

83. *SEG* 24.203. 28-30: χρῆ/σ{θ}αι δὲ τῶι ἱερῶι κα/θαρῶι. See also *IG* XII (8) 265 & *BCH* 61 (1937) 380ff.

84. *IG* II² 2499.14-18: ἐπι/[μ]ελήσεται δὲ καὶ τῶν δένδρων τῶν/ ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι πεφυκότων, καὶ ἄν τι ἐγ/λείπει, ἀντεμβαλεῖ καὶ παραδώσει/ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀριθμὸν (he will take care also of the trees which have grown in the temple, and if any of them is missing, he will replace it and he will give back the same number of trees). Cf. Jordan, B. & J. Pewn (1984) "On the protection of sacred groves" in *Studies presented to St. Dow*, 153-59, Durham, N.C. (*GRBS* Suppl. 10). See also the lease of phratry *Dyaleis*, *IG* II² 1241 from ancient Myrrhinus in 300/299. Lambert (1993: 299 T5).

85. *IG* II² 2499.24-30: ὅταν δὲ/ θύωσιν οἱ ὀργεῶνες τῶι ἥρωι τοῦ Βο/ηδρομιῶνος, παρέχειν Διόγνητον τ/ὴν οἰκίαν, οὗ τὸ ἱερόν ἐστιν, ἀνεωιγ/μένην καὶ στέγην καὶ τὸ ὀπτάνιον/ καὶ κλίνας καὶ τραπέζας εἰς δύο τρ/ίκλινα (when the *orgeones* are sacrificing to the hero, in the month of Boedromion, Diognetos will provide the building, where the shrine is, open and a covered shelter and the kitchen and couches and tables for two sets of three couches). *IG* II² 2501.6-9: τεῖ δὲ τετρά[δι ἐπὶ/ δέκα ὅ]ταν ἱεροῖς ἁπαντ(ῶ)σιν παρέχει(ν) αὐτοὺς τοῖς ὀργεῶ[σι τὸ ἱε/ρὸν ἀν]εωιγμένον (καθ') ἡμέρα(ν) καὶ ἐστεφανωμέν[ον, τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα τοῦ/ θεοῦ ἀλ]ηλειμμένον καὶ [τὰ καλύ]μματα ἀποδ(εδυ)μένο[ν...] (the fourteenth day of the month when they meet for sacred rites they will provide to the *orgeones* the temple open all the day decorated with garlands, and the statue of the god anointed and without its coverings). Cf. Kearns (1989: 75).

86. In our three complete leases we have the following amounts of money as rent: *IG* II² 2499: 200 dr. annually, *IG* II² 2501: 50 dr. annually and *SEG* 24.203: 20 dr. annually. Pantazopoulos (1948) has suggested that the anonymous hero mentioned in *SEG* 24.203 (333/2) should be identified with the hero-doctor of *IG* II² 839 and II² 840, on the ground of the closeness of the place where these inscriptions have been found. However, the cult of the hero-doctor is known to have been a public cult. In *IG* II² 839 and 840 it is the city that authorizes the destruction of certain votive offerings. In contrast, in *SEG* 24.203 the group of ὀργεῶνες is responsible for the administration of their property. It is fairly possible that public and private cult of the hero-doctor existed side by side. Cf. Dow, St. (1985) "The cult of the Hero Doctor" *BASP* 22, 33-47.

87. *IG* II² 1289.3-7: τάδε διέλυσαν οἱ δικασταὶ [ἐπιτρεψάν]/των ἀμφοτέρων· τὰ μὲν κτήματ[α εἶναι τῆς]/ θεοῦ καὶ μηθενὶ ἐξεῖναι μήτ' [ἀποδόσθαι]/ μήτε ὑποθεῖναι, ἀλλὰ ἐκ τῶν π[ροσόδων θύ]/ειν τὰς θυσίας (the following is what the arbitrators, chosen by both parties, decided: the property is to belong to the goddess and nobody is to be allowed to sell, or mortgage it, but they are to perform the sacrifices from the income). Wilamowitz,

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

cture; their income, which eventually may have taken the form of an *eranos* (*IG* II² 1298), depended heavily on the entrance fees of the new members, the regular and exceptional contributions of their members, either in cash or in kind (*IG* II² 1271, 1277, and 1282), and the penalties exacted in case of a violation of a decree's terms by an official (*IG* II² 1263, 1273 and 1297) or by any member (*IG* II² 1275). On the other hand the expenditures were increased not only because of the annual honouring of officials (*IG* II² 1261, 1263, 1278 and 1317b), but also because of the restoration or preservation of the temple or other premises (*IG* II² 1301). In some cases, there is a reference that money for the burial of a deceased member was provided by an eminent member of the group (*IG* II² 1277.14-16, 1323.11, 1275.6-7 and [1278]). It is important to notice that *thiasotai* associations do not appear in records of leases, securities or purchases except in one document (Finley 43 & *ZPE* 110, 77-79), where an *horos* was placed by *thiasotai*. The fact that a large part of *thiasotai* were not Athenian citizens, explains why they could not acquire any land.

E. *Hiereia*: This is the only office reserved for women and, as far as we know, only in the association of the Mother of the Gods,[88] although priestesses are mentioned in *IG* I³ 136, *IG* II² 1283, 1361.7, and 2361 as well. Although in some associations there is an *hiereus* besides *hiereiai*, we do not hear anything about their activities, apart from the fact that "he took care of the temple of the Mother of the Gods well and zealously and of the *thiasotai*".[89]

---

quoted by Ferguson (1944: 85), proposed that in l.9 we should read ὁ προφήτης; but, since there is not such an office in any *orgeones* association, we should accept Ferguson's restoration ὁ ἑστιάτωρ. Wilhelm (1951: 127-28) suggested the following reading in ll. 15-17: ὡς [τοῦ τι τῶν ἑαυτῆς προσό]δων λαμβάνον[τος παρανόμως προσκρού]ειν ἑαυτεῖ [δοκοῦντος?] But it seems to me that in this context the above suggested restoration makes no sense. Lines 3-8 of the inscription provide a summary of the decision of the arbitrators, while ll. 9 onwards record the endorsement of the decision by the goddess and her functionaries; therefore after the sanction of what is prohibited it is time to shift to the approved pattern of administration of the sacral property. Along these lines, J. Sosin in *ZPE* 138 (2002) 125-28 offers the following restoration, "ὥσ[τε τὸν ἱερέα ἐκ τῶν προσό]/δων λαμβάνον[τα μετὰ τῶν ὀργεώνων θύ]/ειν ...". For the possibly semitic identity of *theos*, see Baslez (2001: 243).

88. *IG* II² 1314, 1315, 1316, 1334, 1337 and *Ag.* 16, 235. For *hiereiai*, see Simon, S.J. (1991) "The functions of priestesses in Greek society" *CB* 67, 9-13 and Turner, J.A. (1983) *Hiereiai. Acquisition of feminine priesthoods in ancient Greece*. Diss. University of California, St. Barbara.

89. *IG* II² 1273.30-32: καλῶς καὶ φι/λοτίμως ἐπιμεμέληται τοῦ τε ἱεροῦ τῆς/ Μητρὸς τῶν Θεῶν [κ]αὶ τῶν θιασωτῶν. See also *AJA* 64 (1960) 269; *IG* II² 1273, 1283, 1297, 1317b, 1335, 1343, 1361 and 2361; *SEG* 2.10, 24.223.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Her duties were to perform all religious and ritual acts,[90] to preserve the temple in a good condition and to make it accessible to the members of the association. An assistant, also always a woman, called *zakoros* usually was helping *hiereiai* (*IG* II² 1328). In *IG* II² 1316 the priestess was assisted by her husband. The office of *hiereia* was exclusively reserved for women, who were elected by lot every year, with the possibility of re-election.[91] In *IG* II² 1328, an order is given that the *hiereia* should appoint a *zakoros* from among the *hiereiai* of the previous years, and a woman to be appointed as *zakoros* for life. A priestess is to be appointed in *IG* I³ 136 as well as priests, for whose activity no honorary decree survives.

In certain documents and especially in *IG* II² 1369, 2361 and *SEG* 31.122, there is a series of other officials of minor importance;[92] they were

---

90. *IG* II² 1314.5-7: κ[α]λῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς/ τὴν ἱερωσύνην ἐξήγαγεν καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ/ ἐφιλοτιμήθη ὅσα προσῆκεν τεῖ θεῶι, (she fulfilled piously her duties as priestess and was zealous in the other duties which concerned the goddess); *Ag.* 16. 235: [... καλῶς καὶ εὐσ]εβῶς τὴν ἱερω[σύνην/ ἐξήγαγεν καὶ τὰς θυσ]ίας τὰς καθηκού[σας ἔ/θυσεν καὶ τὰ λοιπ]ὰ ἐφιλοτιμήθη ... [ἐπεμ]ελήθη δὲ τῆς στ[ρώ/σεως τῆς κλίνης τῶν Θεῶ]ν μετὰ πάσης [σπου/δῆς καὶ προθυμίας ...] (she fulfilled her duties as priestess piously and well, she made the appropriate sacrifices and was zealous in her other duties...and she took care of preparing the bed of the Goddesses eagerly and zealously); *IG* II² 1315.6-16: τά/ τε εἰσιτητήρια ἔθυσεν καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς/ θυσίας [[τ]]ἃς καθῆκεν θύειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ/ κοινοῦ, ἔστρωσεν δὲ καὶ κλίνην εἰς/ ἀμφότερα τὰ Ἀττίδεια καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πα/ρεσκεύασεν καλῶς καὶ ἱεροπρεπῶς οὐ/θὲν ἐνλείπουσα φιλοτιμίας καὶ τὸν ἐ/νιαυτὸν καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς διατέλε/σεν θεραπεύουσα τὰς θεὰς καὶ ἀνοίγου/σα τὸ ἱερὸν ἐν ταῖς καθηκούσαις ἡμέ/ραις· (she carried out her initial and appropriate sacrifices for the association, and she prepared the couch for both the Attideia and she made the rest of the preparation well and reverently without lack of zeal and she spent the year worshipping the Goddesses well and piously, opening the temple the days due); *IG* II² 1334.7-11: [καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς τὴ]ν ἱερωσύνην διεξήγαγεν προ/[νοουμένη τῆς περὶ τὸ ἱε]ρὸν εὐκοσμίας καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐ/[φιλοτιμήθη ὅσα καθῆ]κον ἦν τεῖ θεῶι, ἔθυσεν δὲ καὶ/ [τὰς καθηκούσας θυσίας] ἀλύπως τε πρὸς πάντας ἀν/[εστράφη τοὺς ὀργεῶνας] (she fulfilled the priesthood well and piously, taking care of good order around the temple, and she zealously performed all the other appropriate duties to the goddess and she sacrificed the necessary sacrifices and she conducted herself towards all the *orgeones* without giving offence); *IG* II² 1316.8-13: καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως ἐπεμελήθησαν [τῆς] ἱε[ρ]/ει[ωσ]ύνης καὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ἐπεμελήθησαν δὲ καὶ τῶν ὀ/ργεώνων ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀναλωμάτων, ἀπέφηναν [δὲ τῶι]/ κοινῶι καὶ τὰ ἀναθήματα τὰ ἐφ' αὑτῶν ἀνατεθέντ[α ὀ]/ρθῶς καὶ δικαίως, ἀπέδωκαν [δ]ὲ κα[ὶ τ]ὴν π[ρόσοδο]ν [τὴ/ν γ]ε[ν]ομένην ἐφ' αὑτῶν [δικ]αίως· (they took care well and zealously of the priesthood and of the temple, they took care of the *orgeones* from their own expenditure, they displayed to the association their offerings rightly and honestly and they, also honestly gave back the grant which they had received).

91. This is the case in *IG* II² 1334.

92. In *SEG* 31.122 besides *archeranistes* and *tamias*, several other offices occur, like *pannychistai* (1.24), *praktores* (1.27), *eglogistai* (1.30) and *streptoi* (1.32), with sometimes

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

obliged to conform to certain regulations concerning the proper performance of their duty, and threatened with heavy fines in case they did not. It should be noted that the board of cult associations becomes more numerous in the Roman era.

Vocabulary and values in honouring

In *orgeones* associations of heroes officials, after the end of their term in office, were honoured, usually by a crown of olive leaves. The causes for honouring them are described as follows:

- *IG* II² 1252.2-3: "because they are virtuous men about the common affairs of *orgeones*"; ibid 7-8: "because of virtue and righteousness shown to the gods and to the common affairs of the *orgeones*";
- *IG* II² 1253.4-5: "because they have been men of justice about the common affairs of *orgeones*"; ibid 7-8: "praise them for their righteousness";
- *IG* II² 1259.4-6: "they took care well and zealously of the common affairs and the sacrifices".[93]

Only in the third case there is a clear statement about the reason for the honours. In the first two cases the reasons are not so explicit; but it must mean that the men named have contributed in one way or another to the well-being of the association. Ferguson (1944: 86-7) claims that it was a fair inference that they were also *hestiatores* and that the same was doubtless true of the two men honoured in *IG* II² 1253. But I do not think that this is a valid inference, since the terminology in *IG* II² 1252 and II² 1253 is totally different from that used in *IG* II² 1259. In particular, in *IG* II² 1252 and II² 1253, the honorands are honoured because of their conduct as *agathoi* and *dikaioi* towards *orgeones*, while in the third there is a clear state-

---

quite obscure duties. It is worthwhile to note the way of selection of certain of them either by lot or by the *archeranistes*; in case of refusal to perform their duty, fines were inflicted. In *IG* II² 2361 among the numerous priestesses there are a *pater orgeonikes synodou*, a *hippos*, an *epithetes*, and a *stephanephoros*. In *IG* II² 1368 beside the standard offices the following are also attested: *archibakchos*, *anthiereus*, *eukosmos*, *hippos*, *boukolikos*, *Dionysos*, *Kore*, *Palaimon*, *Aphrodeite* and *proteuruthmos*. In *IG* II² 1369 *prostates*, *omoleitor*, *syndikoi* are attested. For *omoleitor* see *IG* II² 4817 of the Roman era and *SEG* 36.548 (Epirus, 3rd century); also Masson, O. (1963) "Anthroponymie grecque et dialectologie" *RPh* 37, 216-18 (also in *RPh* 54 (1980) 226-32) and S. Fedalto (1994) "Λητῆρες· ἱεροὶ στεφανηφόροι e la saga di Atamante" *RIL* 128, 359-77.

93. *IG* II² 1252.2-3: ἐπειδή εἰσιν ἄνδρες/ ἀγαθοὶ περὶ τὰ κοινὰ τῶν ὀργεώνων; *IG* II² 1253.4-5: [ἐπειδὴ ---]/δωρος καὶ Ἀντ[--- /ἄν]δρες δίκαιοι γεγόνασι περὶ τὰ κοινὰ/ τῶν ὀργειώνων; ibid 7-8: ἐπαινέ/σαι αὐτοὺς δικαιοσύνης ἕνεκα; *IG* II² 1259.4-6: καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως ἐπιμε[μέ]/ληνται τῶν [τε κ]οι[ν]ῶ[ν] κα[ὶ] τῶν θυσιῶ[ν].

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

ment about the successful fulfilment of the officials' duties (e.g. *thusiai*). So, if in *IG* II² 1252 and II² 1253 those honoured are officers, would we not expect some indication of their duties, as there is in *IG* II² 1259, in parallel with a reference to their exceptional services? There is also a difference in the attributed honours: in the first two decrees a golden crown is mentioned, while the third one speaks only of a frugal crown of olive leaves.

Certainly, the possibility exists that the honorands in *IG* II² 1252 and II² 1253 are not members of the associations, but since the honour of being crowned was an incentive to members to serve the association, it seems unlikely that the association would bestow such an expensive honour on a non-member.[94] Moreover, the right of free libation (*IG* II² 1252.11) could concern only a member of the association.

However, in the first case (*IG* II² 1252), the contribution of the honorands seems to have been more significant, since the value of the gold crown is estimated at 500 dr., the right to free libation is granted to them and to their descendants and a sum of money collected from all the *orgeones* is to be devoted to a sacrifice and the erection of a memorial.[95]

Honouring a member, normally an ex-official, includes a) the use of the infinitives *epainesai* and *stephanosai*; b) the reason for such an action, which sometimes escapes from total formality and uniformity and provides us with some hints either about the position of the honorand in the association's structure or about his or her services to the association;[96] and c) the value of the crown and/or of the special honour.

The underlying theme of honouring was always related to the well - being of the group; praiseworthy qualities of the individual reflect (not only at an abstract level) on the group as well. It is clear, for example, that *hiereiai* in the *orgeones* of the Mother of the Gods were honoured for their *eusebeia* to the deities and for their *philotimia* to the group. *Eusebeia* appears as a worth honouring quality of all those people whose activity was related with some sort of sacral or cultic activity as in *IG* II² 1277, 1297, 1324, 1327, 1329, Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59[97] and *AM* 66 (1941) 228 no. 4. *Eunoia*

---

94. *Sarapiastai* in Rhamnous (Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59) honoured with a golden crown Apollodoros, son of Sogenes of Otryne, although it is not clear whether Apollodoros was a member, a *Sarapiastes* himself, or a sympathiser.

95. *IG* II² 1252.10-13: εἶναι δ' αὐτοῖς καὶ/ ἀτέλειαν τοῦ χοῦ ἐν ἀμφοῖν τοῖν ἱεροῖν/ καὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐγγόνοις· δοῦναι δὲ καὶ εἰς/ θυσίαν καὶ ἀνάθημα αὐτοῖς ὅτι ἂν δόξει/ τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν (they and their descendants are to have the right of free libation in both sanctuaries; and they are also to be given for sacrifice and dedication whatever the *orgeones* think fit).

96. For a recent discussion of forms of disclosure see Hedrick (1999: 413ff).

97. The honoured in Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59 decree donated land to the group for

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

usually describes the attitude of an individual aiding the cult association without having a duty to do so as in *IG* II² 1271, 1273, 1284 and 1319. It is worth pointing the use of the term *andragathia* used only in *IG* II² 1261, a honourary decree for a breast-plate maker (*thorakopoios*); this term as well as the term *philotimia* in the record of public documents designates the intense public activity of a person for the profit of the community. This activity, in the case of an association, was orientated to the well - being of the group and of the members individually (see the terms *koinei* kai *idiai* used in the inscriptions).[98] The qualities *aretes kai dikaiosynes* appear throughout the late 4th and 3rd century (*IG* II² 1252, 1263, 1316, [1317], *SEG* 2.10, 41.171, and 44.60). Equally widely spread is the use of the term *philotimia* either alone or in conjunction with *eunoia* (*IG* II² 1273, 1284, 1291, 1301) *dikaiosyne*, (*IG* II² 1278, 1284, 1322), *eusebeia* (*IG* II² 1314, 1315, 1324, *SEG* 18. 33) and *arete* (*IG* II² 1277, 1297, 1327, 1329, 1334).

The real reason for attributing honours varies between successful fulfilment of regular duties (this is the case in *IG* II² 1255, 1261 and all the records concerning priestesses) and extraordinary services, beyond the call of duty (this is the case in e.g. *IG* II² 1263, 1271, 1277, 1329 and Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59). In the course of time, it becomes evident that honours bestowed for exceptional services become more common, an indication that associations were increasingly dependant upon benefactors, occasional or not. The honours bestowed vary according to the period and to the services provided: exceptional services are rewarded with a crown (*IG* II² 1263, 1273, 1297 and Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59), *eikon*, solemn pronouncement and crowning of an *eikon en pinaki* (e.g. *IG* II² 1271, 1327), while the performance of regular duties are rewarded usually with a crown only (e.g. *IG* II² 1255).

The bestowal of honours was not only a formal and standardized custom; its purpose was twofold, in the first place to honour the official and in this way to increase his or her social esteem among the members of the association or in an even larger community, and secondly to encourage others to act as officials in the association. In addition, as Whitehead (1986: 250) has concisely pointed out in the context of *demes*, the incitement is addressed not only to wealthy members, but to less prosperous as well, to contribute according to their potential. This feed-back procedure is revealed clearly by the explicit phraseology of *IG* II² 1324.10-12:

---

erecting a sanctuary. For the content of *eusebeia*, see Burkert (1985: 272-75).

98. Whitehead (1983: 55-74), Bourriot, F. (1995) *Kalos kagathos-kalokagathia: d' une terme de propagande de sophistes à une notion sociale et philosophiique: étude d'histoire athènienne*, 2 vols, Hildesheim (Spudasmata 58) and Veligianni-Terzi (1997).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

"so that the *orgeones* may be seen as rewarding worthily those who give zealous service"

and 19-23:

"and so that all the remaining members of the association may strive to be pious to the gods and zealous towards the *orgeones* knowing that they will receive proper honours from the *orgeones*".

Competition was the motivating force and honour the reward.[99]

In the preceding pages I have discussed the potentialy disruptive process of founding a cult association, the rules governing membership, the quite typical structure of administration patterned along the lines of the *polis* administration and the values revealed in the ritual of honouring. It emerged that cult associations were tightly connected with the organisational apparatus of the *polis*; in what follows I will assess their socio-legal aspect in the light of the above depiction.

99. *IG* II² 1324.10-12: ὅπως ἂν οὖν καὶ οἱ ὀργεῶνες/ φαίνωνται χάριτας ἀξίας ἀποδιδόν/τες τοῖς ἀεὶ φιλοτιμουμένοις and 19-23: ἵνα καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς τῶν ὀργεώνων ἅπασιν ἐ/φάμιλλον εἶ τοῖς βουλομένοις πρ/ὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβεῖν καὶ πρὸς/ τοὺς ὀργεῶνας φιλοτιμεῖσθαι, εἰδότας ὅτι καταξίας χάριτας κομι/οῦνται παρὰ τῶν ὀργεώνων and Burkert (1987: 44). For the power of group norms see Baron et al. (1992: 11).

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

CHAPTER THREE

LOOKING FOR THE RULES...

In the previous chapters we have examined the use of the terms *orgeones*, *thiasotai* and *eranistai*, and we have traced their structure and their activities. Certain ambiguities as well as similarities were pointed out concerning mainly the foundation and the strategies for ensuring the existence of associations, thus avoiding abandonment of their cult and *de facto* dissolution. These strategies included different patterns of recruiting members, bestowing honours and privileges and prompting the generosity of their wealthier members.

In this section I shall attempt to show that the modern legal background of associations, which still relies on the 19th century debate about legal personality, is entirely irrelevant to the Athenian experience. Although recent research seems to ignore or prefers to consider this a self-evident truth, I believe that it has to be scrutinised and have its irrelevance convincingly demonstrated. A new interpretation should rely, primarily, on the available evidence. The results of this investigation not only point to Athenian cult associations as a quasi-legal phenomenon, but give credence to the Aristotelian theory of associations as a part of the *polis*. In this respect, I shall try to show that through the use of an analytical model based on the most essential features of the Athenian *polis*[1] we can understand the associations' function and their impact on Athenian society.

My argumentation will concentrate on the ways legal historians have

---

1. Foucart (1873: 51) and Ziebarth (1896: 193) first noted the organisational similarity between *polis* and association, but neither of them proceeded to an examination based on this model. Poland (1909: 337) has expressed reservations about the importance attributed to these similarities.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

explained the associative phenomenon and their theoretical background, and on an assessment of variables such as the relation between *polis* and associations, the mechanisms of setting up an association, the naming modes and their significance, and the right on property, on which, it was thought, the legal personality of cult associations was firmly grounded. The last section will be devoted to the exploration of the parallelism between *polis* and association as a product and, at the same time, a limit in ancient Athenian legal thought.

Legal historians and juristic personality

The question of juristic personality in Greek and especially Athenian law appeared in early scholarship as an annex to the consideration of juristic personality in Roman law and in the Pandectist tradition.[2] It was thought that associations in ancient Greece were subjected to the same constraints as in the contemporary west European societies. Nobody put it better than Wescher (1865: 220) who wrote about *eranistai* associations:

> Les sociétés d'éranistes, libres de s'administrer intérieurement elles-mêmes, étaient tenues de se faire autoriser par l'état, et elles ne devenaient des personnes civiles, capables de plaider en justice, que lorsqu'elles avaient obtenu la reconnaissance officielle.

Already Caillemer (1872: 11) had brought forward two objections concerning not the legal position of *eranistai* but the mediation of the state in the official recognition of the associations: a) Wescher's interpretation relies heavily on the Roman model, which is foreign to Athens, and at any rate restrictions, statutory or administrative, appeared in Roman law only after 186 (*senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus*);[3] b) the only reference to state

2. From the abundant bibliography about juristic personality in Roman law see: Carolsfeld (1933). Duff (1938: 129-58). the summary provided by Wilcken, U. (1953) *Die Quellen des römischen Rechts*, 789-94. Wien. and Kaser, M. (1968) *Roman Private Law*, 77-79. transl. by R. Dannenbring, Durban. *Collegia* and Roman law: Robertis (1971); Albanese, B. (1979) *Le persone nel diritto privato romano*, Palermo; Biscardi, A. (1980) "Rappresentanza sostanziale e processuale dei "collegia" in diritto romano" *Iura* 31, 1-20; Robertis (1984); Salerno, F. (1984) "Collegia adversus rem publicam" in *Sodalitas. Scritti in onore di A. Guarino*, 2, 615-31, Napoli; Randazzo, S. (1991-92) "Senatus consultum quo illicita collegia arcentur (D. 47.22.1.1)" *BIDR* 33-34, 49-88; Robertis (1995) and Cotter (1996).

3. Similar measure was taken by the Ptolemies in Hellenistic Egypt; see the fragmentary document in Lenger, M.-T. (1964) *Corpus des Ordonnances des Ptolemées*, no. 50 (131-125). Brussels, reprint 1980. For *S.C. de Bacchanalibus* see *FIRA* I no. 30 and similarly no. 46. For the Bacchanalia affair see Pailler, J.-M. (1988) *Bacchanales. La répression de 186 av. J.C. à Rome et en Italie. Vestiges, images, tradition*, Paris (BEFAR 270). Carolsfeld

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

control of associations occurs in Isoc. *Nicocles* 54, (written between 372 and 365).[4] The passage makes it clear that monarchies are connected with the control of associations, while democracies, it is implied, favour their foundation. Presumably, Caillemer was convinced that an association and especially *eranistai* had a juristic personality; he disagreed with Wescher only about the mode of obtaining it.[5]

Ziebarth (1896: 179-83) deserves special mention since he was the first to attemp to interpret associations in terms of the thinking then current and

(1933: 236-66) and Duff (1938: 95-128) provide a useful summary of the policy of the Roman state on associations.

4. Isoc. *Nicocles* 54: Ἑταιρείας μὴ ποιεῖσθε μηδὲ συνόδους ἄνευ τῆς ἐμῆς γνώμης. αἱ γὰρ τοιαῦται συστάσεις ἐν μὲν ταῖς ἄλλαις πολιτεῖαις πλεονεκτοῦσιν, ἐν δὲ ταῖς μοναρχίαις κινδυνεύουσιν. (Do not form political societies or unions without my sanction; for such associations may be an advantage in the other forms of government, but in monarchies they are a danger). For a distinction between *sunodos* and the rest of the terms denoting a collectivity see Poland (1909: 158-63) who claims that this term refers to an association with profane aims and not to a religious one. Also, Arist. *Pol.* 5.9.2 (1313a34-b7): ἔστι δὲ τά τε πάλαι λεχθέντα πρὸς σωτηρίαν, ὡς οἷόν τε, τῆς τυρρανίδος, τὸ τοὺς ὑπερέχοντας κολούειν καὶ τοὺς φρονηματίας ἀναιρεῖν, καὶ μήτε συσσίτια ἐᾶν μήτε ἑταιρίαν μήτε παιδείαν μήτε ἄλλο μηθὲν τοιοῦτον, ἀλλὰ πάντα φυλάττειν ὅθεν εἴωθε γίνεσθαι δύο, φρόνημά τε καὶ πίστις, καὶ μήτε σχόλας μήτε ἄλλους συλλόγους ἐπιτρέπειν γίνεσθαι σχολαστικοὺς καὶ πάντα ποιεῖν ἐξ ὧν ὅτι μάλιστα ἀγνῶτες ἀλλήλοις ἔσονται πάντες (ἡ γὰρ γνῶσις πίστιν ποιεῖ μᾶλλον πρὸς ἀλλήλους). (These are both the measures mentioned earlier to secure the safety of a tyrrany as far as possible - the lopping off of outstanding men and the destruction of the proud, - and also the prohibition of common meals and clubs and education and all other things of this nature, in fact the close watch upon all things that usually engender the two emotions of pride and confidence, and the prevention of the formation of study-circles and other conferences for debate and the employment of every means that will make people as much as possible unknown to one another (for familiarity increase mutual confidence);) attributes the suppression of associations to tyrannical regimes.

5. Similarly Guiraud (1893: 382) claimed that "En principe, toute corporation pouvait prendre naissance sans autorisation préalable" and that "elles jouissaient de la personnalité civile dans toute sa plenitude". Beauchet (1897: 4. 163, 343 and 348-49) is equally convinced that an association in antiquity was considered as "personnalité morale", having the right to acquire land and to dispose of it, to sue and to be sued. Radin (1910: 22), while criticizing previously expressed opinions, implies that juristic personality did exist in ancient Athens. Lipsius (1905: 799) thinks that both the associations of citizens and the associations of non-citizens were regarded as juristic persons. Using evidence drawn mainly from procedure he claims that it was possible for an association to sue and to be sued, exercising these functions through certain officials. For San Nicolò (1913-15: 2. 8-10) the question of legal personality of associations depends on the ways of acquiring it. Kahrstedt (1934: 187-89) states, without further examination, that the associations mentioned in *Dig.* 47.22.4, as well as the associations of freed slaves, were regarded as "juristische Person". Poland (1909) curiously avoided this question altogether.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

attributed to them unquestionable "juristic personality". Central to his argument is a conceptualisation of association as an entity, which carries name and property and therefore can be legally represented.

Vinogradoff (1920-22: 2. 122) saw in the example of *eranoi* an evolution from "occasional association" to the "enduring life of moral persons". He claimed that "the constitutive elements of a 'moral person' were clearly at hand" but he does not clarify what these elements were. One can assume that they were a) the permanent character of the association and b) a supra-individual personality, which was provided by the personification of hero-worship. Although these traits are quite obscure, his conclusion that "the Greek 'moral and juridical person' had reflected and continued to reflect the religious or quasi-religious personification of the social side of human life" (127) has been unjustifiably ignored.

However, this interpretation soon was succeeded by scepticism and was replaced by an approach underlining the lack of the concept of juristic personality in the Greek world. Bolkestein (1923: 115), in the context of a theoretical debate about the character of the ancient Greek economy, asserted categorically that the modern concept of legal personality and its application in the form of corporate companies to the world of trade and commerce was unknown in the Greek world. Finley (1951: 89) was the first, to my knowledge, to question the accuracy of ownership of property as a criterion for assessing juristic personality, while reporting merely his belief that "the modern institution of the juristic person was largely unknown in the Greek cities".[6]

The unequivocal rejection of juristic personality gradually eroded as scholars were looking into specific questions of nomenclature or legal representation rather than principles. In this respect, Kränzlein (1963: 136-37) examined the ambiguous terminology of the epigraphical sources, where either the members of the association or a collective name appears as owner, and concluded that the question of legal personality was not addressed by the associations.[7]

---

6. Followed by Jones (1956: 162-66) who confirmed that "the concept of the corporate person in our sense never found expression in any specific term" and that the collective feature of association was far more important than the corporate and Harris (1992: 339). Cohen (1992: 63) argues against Finley's core assumption that the differentiation of terminology substantiates the claim for the non-existence of the concept of legal personality in ancient Athens.

7. For Harrison (1968-71: 1. 242) while "the Athenians never achieved the convenient fiction of regarding a group of joint owners as a single person juristically. They remained joint several owners", nevertheless "associations of Athenians could sue and be sued in a lawcourt" (2. 284). What remains unresolved is the question of legal representation and its practicalities; in the same vein, Jones (1999: 12).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

So far, three attempts have been made in order to trace a precursor to the notion of juristic personality in ancient Athens. Maier (1969: 98-104), made the most coherent study of the problem in connection with *koina eraniston* and *eranoi*. He claimed that it is possible to see in the term *eranos*, a term different from *koinon eraniston*, a precursor of a modern association. Ioatzopoulos, (1973: 73-115 and especially in 81-113) although he admitted that the modern idea of juristic personality was unknown in ancient Greece, traced a third abstract person in the form of the deity honoured (*IG* II² 1361, *IG* XII (9) 191 and *IIasos* 152). He suggested that under this formula a precursor of juristic personality appears, since in its name fines are paid and in some cases the real estate of the association belongs to it. Biscardi (1958 and 1982) concluded that the concept of juristic person was not totally unknown to Athenians. In particular, he saw that the concept of juristic personality would have existed in an embryonic form, in the plurality of legal sub-systems of the *polis*, such as demes, phratries, etc. (Biscardi 1982: 11). These legal sub-orders had a distinctive character that may enable us to attribute to them an elementary form of legal personality.

The theoretical background

Modern theories about juristic personality were the main source from which legal historians drew, implicitly or explicitly, their fundamental perceptions of the legal person. So, it is expedient in this part to review in brief the two main theories, fictional and realistic.[8]

The basic assumption of the fictional theory can be summarized in the principle that since only people are natural or physical persons, that is subjects of rights and duties in law, anything else cannot be but artificial.[9] Together with the concession theory, which regards the state as the sole source of juristic personality, the fictional theory formed the basis of the orthodox continental view on associations.[10] The fictional approach to the problem of juristic personality ignores, among others, two fundamental facts: a) that, even in modern civil law codes, not only physical persons but also the unborn or the deceased are regarded as bearers of rights and duties and b) the belief in the exclusivity of the individual as subject of

---

8. For a more detailed and comprehensive account of these theories see Duff (1938: 208-20), Dias, R.W.M. (1970) *Jurisprudence*, 3rd ed., London, Strangas (1993), and Mitsopoulos (2001).

9. For a criticism of this concept see Nekam (1938).

10. von Savigny, C. (1842) *System des heutigen römischen Rechts*, 2.236ff and Heiman (1977: 26). For other theories in the same mould see Jhering, R. von (1858-78) *Geist des römischen Rechts*, Leipzig.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

rights and duties, some of them inalienable, the individual as legal person is a product of philosophical considerations, influenced by the political philosophy of the Enlightenment.

The second category includes the so-called realist theory, whose main expounder was Otto von Gierke.[11] His theory emanates from an *a priori* belief that humans have an associative nature, or as Heiman (1976: 16) puts it: "To Gierke, men's will and right to associate are so fundamental that they appear almost as a natural law, a basic human attribute and a fundamental expression of individuality." This associative nature of human beings leads to the formation of associations, not on the basis of a contractual unity, but rather on the basis of an organic one. A historical perspective reinforces the consideration of the group as prior to the individual. So every group is not the mere aggregation of individuals and their wills but "has a real and independent communal life, a conscious will, and an ability to act that are distinct from the lives and wills of its individual members." In this respect, "the organized group had an independent personality of its own" (Heiman (1976: 6)).

So, the main theoretical debate was confined to the problem of whether the concept of a juristic person is a fictitious or a real one. However, recent research suggests that the origin of the concept of an association as a person cannot be traced earlier than the Middle Ages. It was the socio-economical structure of the medieval city, the feudal context, and the influence of the Church, that led to the formation of such a concept.[12] Moreover, political motives were also behind the bitterly opposed theories, which had to do with the legitimacy of the emerging nation-state.[13]

None of the above-mentioned theories can provide a sufficient interpretative scheme for the Attic association, since the social, religious and economic conditions were radically different. The political structure of the Athenian city consisted of individuals not guilds.[14] The ideas about work

---

11. The monumental work of Otto von Gierke (1864) *Das deutsche Genossenschaftsrecht* has been only partly translated into English by Maitland F.W. (1900) *Political theories of the Middle Ages*. Cambridge. Barker. E. (1934) *Natural Law and the Theory of Society. 1500-1800*. Cambridge and Heiman (1976).

12. For a concise discussion of the role of guilds in medieval city and the difference of the latter from the ancient city-state see Weber. M. (1896) *The agrarian sociology of ancient civilizations*. transl. by R.I. Frank. 340. London 1988; see also Bolgar (1982) and Bouckaert (1991: 156-78).

13. For an evaluation of the political. social and ideological consequences of this debate see Orestano (1968: 39-41).

14. Hasebroek (1933: 30). Finley (1973: 138). Meier (1980: 58) and Bouckaert (1991: 162-64) for the role of guilds in the development of the concept of juristic personality.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

and commerce in Athens, where such activities were largely, but not exclusively, in the hands of metics and freedmen, were in contrast with medieval ethics. Legal historians trying to answer the question of juristic personality in ancient Athens adopted a misleading approach and, consequently, the range of their possible answers was confined to a simple yes or no. In order to avoid this unhistorical impasse, I think that we need to modify the question to be asked. But this attempt will be made after the criticism of the grounds on which legal historians tried to found their opinion about juristic personality or what they tried to identify as precursors.

The life of an association

Historians have claimed that in antiquity there were two modes of establishing an association; either through the "spontaneous" or "sponsored" gathering of the first members or by a testament. However, in Athens there is no case of an association founded by virtue of a testament, except the philosophical schools of the Hellenistic era.[15] The only available evidence (*IG* II² 1369.25-27: "Friends have convened an *eranos* and they signed with common willingness an institution of friendship") comes from a late period, around the 2nd century A.D. and in principle agrees with the preponderance attributed by Poland to the foundation by the members' consent.

Ziebarth (1896: 171) implied the existence of a contract among the members of an association, by which they are obliged to conform to the association's objectives and the association has disciplinary power over them. The idea that behind the association lies a contract seems to be corroborated by Aristotle. In *Nicomachean Ethics* 8.12.1 (1161b15-16) he claims that some associations seem to be founded on contract.[16] However, any, explicit or implicit, agreement among the members of an association cannot be regarded as a contract; such a principle requires that the agreement will provide the basis for enforcement. The allegedly "contractual foundation" of

---

15. See Ziebarth (1896: 140). Poland (1909: 271) saw as more important the first of the two modes, and later San Nicolò (1913-15: 2. 6) identified two different modes based on the preponderant role of an individual. For the philosophical schools and their relation to *Dig.* 47.22.4. Jones (1999: 227-33).

16. Arist. *EN* 8.12.1 (1161b15-16): ἐν κοινωνίᾳ μὲν οὖν πᾶσα φιλία ἐστὶν, καθάπερ εἴρηται· ἀφορίσειε δ' ἄν τις τήν τε συγγενικὴν καὶ τὴν ἑταιρικήν. αἱ δὲ πολιτικαὶ καὶ φυλετικαὶ καὶ συμπλοϊκαὶ, καὶ ὅσαι τοιαῦται, κοινωνικαῖς ἐοίκασι μᾶλλον· οἷον γὰρ καθ' ὁμολογίαν τινὰ φαίνονται εἶναι. (All friendship, as we have said, involves community; but the friendship between relatives and between comrades may be set apart as being less in the nature of partnership than are the friendship between fellow-citizens, fellow-tribesmen, shipmates, and the like; since these seem to be founded as it were on a definite compact).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

cult associations cannot satisfy this criterion, since we do not know of any relevant action (*dike*). And it is now clear that there was no doctrine of contract, similar to the modern legal term, developed in ancient Athens. The explanation of the founding of an association with the device of a contract may have suited 19th-century Hamburg, but was not valid for ancient Athens.

Ziebarth (1896: 144-5) also claimed that the first and most important duty of the assembly was to give a constitution to the association. Further on, he asserted that these constitutions were called *nomoi*. Amendments were possible to the original constitution, but Poland (1909: 338) correctly dismisses this assumption. I believe that Ziebarth's claim remains unsubstantiated if we take into account not only the fact that he is using evidence from different places (Athens, Thera) and periods of time (Hellenistic and Principate), with substantially different legal traditions, but also the problem of the exact meaning of the word *nomos*. For this purpose a review of the terms used to denote the decision of the association such as *nomos*, *psephisma* and *dogma* is needed.

The term *dogma* appears in documents of cult associations in the 1st century and onwards (*IG* II² 1343.38-9 and 45, II² 1368 and especially *SEG* 31.122, 3-4) and it means, almost always, decision. The other two terms are not distinguished by a clearly drawn line and in some cases they are overlapping. In almost all the documents, the clause "to inscribe this decree" or a similar wording is included. From these pieces of evidence one can fairly assume that every decision of an association taken by the assembly of its members is designated as *psephisma*. Not only honorary decrees belong to this category, but, also, decrees concerning the regulation of matters connected with the function of the association (e.g. *IG* II² 1327.26, 1261.52-3, 1328.19 and *Ag.* 16, 161, 8-9). *Nomos* appears in 13 enactments of which 7 are honorary decrees (*SEG* 2.9, 44.60, *IG* II² 1282, 1284, 1291, 1298 and 1325) and 6 are decrees on other subjects (*IG* II² 1275, 1278, 1283, 1326, 1361 and 1369). In detail:

1. *IG* II² 1275.12-14: ἐπειδὰν δὲ κυρώσωσι τὸν νό/μον οἱ θιασῶται, μηθὲν εἶναι τοῦ νόμου κυριώτερ/ον· εἰὰν δέ τις παρὰ τὸν νόμον ἢ εἴπει ἢ πράξει ... (and when the *thiasotai* approve the law, nothing shall be superior to the law and if anyone says or does anything against the law...),
2. *IG* II² 1278.2-3: [... τὸ]ν νόμον, ἔδοσαν [δὲ καὶ ταφικὸν τοῖς/ μεταλλάξασιν τὸ γεγραμ]μένον ἑκάστωι κατ[ὰ τὸν νόμον...] (the law, they gave money for the burial of each dead according to the law (or custom)),
3. *IG* II² 1282.10-12: ἐπαινέσαι καὶ στεφ[α/νῶσαι ἕκαστον] αὐτῶν θαλλοῦ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

στεφάνωι κ[α/τὰ τὸν νόμον ...] (to praise and crown each of them with a crown from olive tree leaves, according to the law),

4. *IG* II² 1283.9-11:ὅπως ἂν οὖν φα/[ίν]ωνται καὶ οἱ ὀργεῶνες τῶι τε τῆς πόλεως νόμωι πειθαρ/χοῦντες (in order that *orgeones* will be seen to obey to the laws of the *polis*) and ll.25-26: κατά τε τὰ πάτρια τῶν Θραικῶν καὶ τοὺς τῆς πόλ[εως νόμου]/ς (according to the customs of Thracians and the laws of the *polis*),
5. *IG* II² 1284.23-24: διώ[ικηκεν τὸ πρ]οσταττόμεν' αὐτῶι ὑ[πὸ τ]ῶν νόμων ὀρθ/ῶς καὶ δικαίως (he administered the affairs prescribed by the laws rightly and justly),
6. *IG* II² 1291.3-6: [... διεχείρισε τὸ ἀ/ρ]γύριον τ[ὸ] κοινὸ[ν ὃ παρακατέθεν?]/το αὐτῶι οἱ ἐρανιστ[αὶ κατὰ τοὺς νό]/μους τοὺς κοινούς τ[ῶν ἐρανιστῶ]/ν (he administered the common money deposited by *eranistai* according to the laws of *eranistai*),
7. *IG* II² 1298.16-20: ἀναγράφ/ειν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐπεισιόντων συνθιασωτῶν/ τὰ ὀνόματα ἐπὰν καταβάλωσιν τὸ ἐπιβάλλο/[ν] αὐτοῖς τοῦ ὑπάρχοντος ἀργυρίου κατὰ τὸ/[ν ν]ό[μον] ἐν τῶι ἐράνωι (and to write the names of the joining *thiasotai* when they pay the appropriate amount of money, according to the law, in the fund),
8. *IG* II² 1325.27-28: ἐπαινέσαι Διονύσιον Ἀγαθοκλέους Μαραθώνιον καὶ στεφα/[νῶσαι κιττοῦ στεφάνωι κ]ατὰ τὸν νόμον ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν καὶ καλοκαγαθίας (to praise Dionysios, son of Agathokles of Marathon and crown (him) with an ivy-leaves crown according to the law (or custom) because of his virtue and generosity),
9. *IG* II² 1326.21-23: ἀνθ' ὧν ἐπιγνόντες οἱ Διονυσιασταὶ ἐτίμησαν/ αὐτὸν ἄξιον ὄντα καὶ ἐστεφάνωσαν κατὰ τὸν/ νόμον (knowing these *Dionysiastai* have honoured him for being worthy and crowned him according to the law); l.30: περὶ ὧν καὶ ὁ νόμος τῶν ὀργεώνων καλεῖ πρῶτον (and the law of *orgeones* calls first), and l.44: μεθέξοντα τῶν κοινῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμον (to participate in the common activities according to the law),
10. *IG* II² 1361.13: [ἐὰ]ν δ[έ τι]ς [ε]ἴπ[ηι] ἢ ἐπιψηφίσηι παρὰ τόνδε τὸν νόμον (if anybody proposes or puts to the vote against this law),
11. *IG* II² 1369.10: Νόμος ἐρανιστῶν (Law of *eranistai*),
12. *SEG* 2.9, 4-6: οἱ καθιστάμενοι εἰς τὰς ἐπιμελείας καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως ἐπιμε/μέληνται τῶν τε θυσιῶν, ὡς αὐτοῖς πάτριόν ἐστιν, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων/ ὅσων αὐτοῖς ὁ νόμος προστάττει καὶ τοὺς λόγους ἀποδεδώκα/σι (those appointed took care well and generously of the sacrifices, as it is customary, and of the rest, which the law sanctions and they gave account),
13. *SEG* 44. 60, 3-5: ἐπειδὴ οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ καὶ ὁ γραμματεὺς ἐπε/μελήθη-

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

σαν τῶν θυσιῶν τοῖς θεοῖς καθ' ἃ πάτριόν ἐστι καὶ τῶν ἄ/λλων πάντων ὧν οἱ νόμοι προστάττουσιν, (since the *epimeletai* and the secretary have taken care of the sacrifices to the gods as it is customary and of everything else as the laws ordain)

First of all it is clear that a *nomos* is never called *psephisma* and is never ratified in a psephismatic form. On the other hand, a *psephisma* may include passing references to *nomoi*. In the latter cases (*IG* II² 1278, 1282, 1284, 1291, 1325, 1326, *SEG* 2.9 and 44.60) the word *nomos* refers to regulations concerning the activity of the officers during their term in office, but it is not clear whether it refers to any particular decision of the group or simply to what is customary.

Secondly, in case 10 the demonstrative *tonde* provides us with a clue about the content of the word because it shows that these documents are considered as *nomoi*. Passage eleven also helps in deciding the content of a *nomos* of an association. It includes provisos about introduction of new members, the appointment of officials and fines imposed for disorderly behaviour. In all three cases, *nomos* includes provisions concerning the arrangement of current affairs. Some of the regulated activities, like the sacrifice in the case of the introduction of a new member, have a more permanent character than others, like the sale of water and the rent of a house. But these rules do not have the general, abstract and impersonal character of a modern constitution.[17] The chronological span and its telegraphic brevity cannot justify any analogy drawn between the modern technical term constitution and this one. In number four *nomos* clearly refers to the law of the city. In honorary decrees (*IG* II² 1282, 1284, 1291, 1298, 1325, *SEG* 2.9 and 44.60) *nomos* denotes that the performance of the duties of officials conformed to the prescribed way; the accomplishment of especially sacral duties did not need to have been dictated by a written rule, but by custom.

Therefore, *nomos* in the context of the Athenian associations could be better understood as a set of rules applied to all members, without distinction, regulating common activities,[18] while *psephisma* denotes any de-

17. The *nomoi* of associations in Graeco-Roman Egypt usually included provisions on electing the leader, regulation of dues (regular and extraordinary), meetings, rules of conduct, regulation of mutual assistance and funerals; see Boak (1937: 213).

18. Meaning of νόμος in late Ptolemaic Egypt as not implying "a single exhaustive ordinance". Nock et al. (1936: 44). For the meaning of νόμος in general and its difference from θεσμός see Ostwald, M. (1969) *Nomos and the beginnings of the Athenian Democracy*. Oxford. For a distinction between νόμος and ψήφισμα see Quass, F. (1971)

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

cision of the assembly of the members, which concerns individuals. *Nomos* has nothing to do with constitution, if that term includes the founding act of an association.

Finally, from the surviving acts of establishing a "trust"[19] it is clear that if a constitution was needed for the foundation of an association, it could have been drawn up since the technique was known.

Cult associations were based on relations characterized as *philia* rather than on any other formal grounds. The concept of *philia* is not something ideal, but it is materialized in the day-to-day life and interaction among neighbours and fellows and it constitutes, to a considerable degree, the cornerstone of the civic life in Athens.[20] Even in the late *IG* II² 1369 the members describe their society not as a *koinon* but as a *thesmon philies*. If we take into account both the lack of a formal constitution and the role of *philia*, it is comprehensible that the establishment of a cult association may not need a formal act, as Wilamowitz (1881: 275) has already pointed out, but a kind of a cult regulation arranging details of the cult, the performers of the ritual and the participation of the devotees was enough. In other cases, it may have to conform to local customs or to particular traditions.

Dissolution is generally regarded as the opposite end of foundation. However, such a contrast is meaningless in a context where no foundation exists. It is not accidental then that we do not have any act of dissolution; the only surviving provision concerns the prohibition of dissolution.[21] In

---

Nomos und Psephisma, 23-43. München. Lepri-Sorge, L. (1974) "Ai confini fra 'psephisma' e 'nomos' " in Biscardi, A. (ed) *Symposion 1974* (Cargnano am Gardsee 5-8.06.1974), 307-26. Köln 1979. and Hansen (1983: 161-76).

19. See *Syll*³ 1044 [(3rd century) Halikarnassos] and 1106 [(c. 300) Kos]. Kamps, W. (1937) "Les origines de la fondation cultuelle dans la Grèce ancienne" *AHDO* 1, 145-79, is the starting point for a modern legal discussion on "fondation". See also, Manzmann, A. (1956) "Die Rechtsform der griechischen Stiftung" *RIDA* 3, 119-34. For Roman trusts, see Johnston, D. (1988) *The Roman law of trusts*, Oxford.

20. The concept of φιλία is the subject of the 8th and 9th book of Arist. *NE*, in which different types of associations are considered as friendships based on utility. See the commentary of Gauthier, R.A. & J.Y. Jolif (1959) *L'Ethique à Nicomaque* 2.2, 696-99, Louvain and Price, A.W. (1989) *Love and friensdhip in Plato and Aristotle*, 131-61, Oxford. An account of the importance of this concept in everyday life is offered by Fisher (1976: 18-20), Konstan, D. (1997) *Friendship in the classical world*, Cambridge and its impact on economic affairs by Millett (1991: 109-27). A lively example of expected attitudes and actual conduct among φίλοι occurs in (Lys.) 8 (*Against synousiastai*) 2 (friends are expected not to harm friends), 10-12 (friends as intermediaries for business) and 18 (co-associates as witnesses).

21. *IG* XII (3) 330 col.viii 254-67 (Thera, 210-195) with Wittenburg, A. (1990) *Il testamento di Epikteta*, Trieste. Poland (1909: 275) remarked that because of the close connection between religion and associations "man meist in naiver Weise an ein

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

this respect Ziebarth's (1896: 140) assertion that "Die Majorität hat also über die Auflösung zu entscheiden" seems to be without basis.

What is in the name of a group?

The variation of terms describing the association has been noticed since the early days. Sometimes a plural name like *orgeones*, *thiasotai*, *eranistai* is used, while elsewhere there are only expressions like *koinon orgeonon*, *koinon thiasoton*, *koinon eraniston*.

The adoption of an individual name by groups of people was not unknown in ancient Athens,[22] but it seems that cult associations stuck to the use of the cult-name, a practice loaded with historical significance, for which we are very badly informed. A reason for this may lie in the fact that the individual name of associations distinguishes them from similar groups; but *orgeones*, *thiasotai* and *eranistai* denote types of associations and not names. If one of these groups had wanted to make clear its different character, it would have used the worshipped deity as a marker and not as a name; so the *orgeones* of the Mother of the Gods were different from those of Bendis, but both were *orgeones*. Names like *Asklepiastai* etc. may work as distinctive elements of the identity of the group, but we cannot determine if they considered themselves as *orgeones*, *thiasotai*, *eranistai* or as something distinct from all of these.

Is it therefore possible to consider the use of a particular name or phrase as an indication of juristic personality?[23] The analysis that follows is

---

Aufhören der Genossenschaft von vornherein nicht denken wollte". See also Nock et al. (1936: 79). However, there is an act of self-dissolution of an association from Alburnus Maior in Roman Dacia (*FIRA* III no. 41, A.D. 167), due to lack of members.

22. For the use of a separate name besides the name showing the character of the group see: i) D. 54 (*Against Konon*) 39: ἑταίρους εἶναι μειράκι' ὄντας καὶ Τριβαλλοὺς ἐπωνυμίαν ἔχειν (they were intimates when they were young and bore the nickname *Triballoi*), ii) D. 54 (*Against Konon*) 14: οἳ παίζοντες οἷς ἄνθρωποι νέοι σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ἐπωνυμίας πεποίηνται, καὶ καλοῦσι τοὺς μὲν ἰθυφάλλους, τοὺς δὲ αὐτοληκύθους (sons of respectable persons, who in sport after the manner of young men, have given themselves nicknames, such as *Ithyphalloi* or *Autolekythoi*) and iii) Lys. (ed. Thalheim) frg. 73.2 (= Ath. 12.551d-552b): οὐ μετὰ τούτου ποτε Ἀπολλοφάνης καὶ Μυσταλίδης καὶ Λυσίθεος συνειστιῶντο μιὰν ἡμέραν ταξάμενοι τῶν ἀποφράδων ἀντὶ δὲ νουμηνιαστῶν κακοδαιμονιστὰς σφίσιν αὐτοῖς τοὔνομα θέμενοι. (Did not Apollophanes and Mystalides and Lysitheus regularly dine together with my opponent, arranging one of the days that it is impious to name, and giving themselves, in place of *noumeniastai* (devotees of the new moon), the name *kakodaimonistai* (devotees of the evil spirit) as translated by S.C. Todd (2000) *Lysias*, Austin, Texas).

23. See a similar examination of the material in Graeco-Roman Egypt in San Nicolò (1913-15: 2. 110-19).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

confined to the discovery of possibly regular patterns with which cult associations expressed their identity. From a merely quantitative aspect, it is clear that the phrase *edoxen/ dedochthai tois orgeosi /thiasotais/ eranistais*, is widely used both in terms of number and span of time. It appears in 32 documents, while the expression *edoxen/ dedochthai toi koinoi* occurs only in 10 documents, all dated in the second half of the 3rd century and onwards.[24] The preponderance of the former type is an indication that the concept of an association as something entirely different from the mere totality of members is far from being well established. Although so characteristic, these pieces of evidence are not conclusive, since it is possible that this predominant use may merely be due to stylistic reasons. It is necessary to look at the ways, the activities and the qualities, in connection with which each expression is used.

Before that I should make clear that I have taken into account the term *koinon* only when it was used together with one of the associations' plural names or when it referred to such a type. This remark is essential since *koinon* is used quite freely in order to denote the treasury[25] or the common affairs of the group.[26]

The term *koinon* is used throughout only in 3 decrees (*IG* II² 1317b, 1343 and 1345) and in a dedication (*IG* II² 2347). In these documents it replaces any reference to the ambivalent plural name. Since all these enactments are dated in the second half of the 3rd century and the Roman era it cannot be assumed that this use reflects any significant change in the way that Athenians perceived the collective entity.

Considering first the cases where the group is the subject of certain activities, one can remark that the activities performed only by *orgeones / thiasotai / eranistai* and activities performed both by *koinon* and by *orgeones* etc. are not very distinct; but only the plural name is used when there is a reference to sacrifice (*IG* II² 1273.14-15 and II² 2499.24-25), passing a law (II² 1275.12-13), inflicting a penalty (II² 1328.11-12), or scrutinizing future members (II² 1361.23). The expression *orgeones* etc is also used when the association is referring to activities underscoring particular gratitude (*IG* II²

---

24. *IG* II² 1297 (236/5). II² 1298 (248/7). II² 1317b (249/8). II² 1334 (71). II² 1339 (57/6). II² 1343 (37/6). II² 1345 (A.D. 53/4). Petrakos. *Rhamnous*. 59 (after 216/5). *SEG* 2.9 (245-43). *Ag*. 16. 223 (227/6).

25. *IG* II² 1261.50. II² 1262. II² 1263.17-18. II² 1292.27-28. II² 1297.5-6. II² 1316.23-24. II² 1327.10-11 and 29. II² 1343.18. and *SEG* 18.33. 20.

26. *IG* II² 1252.19-20. 1255. 1263.8 and 12-13. II² 1271.7-8. II² 1291.4-6. II² 1343.23-24 and II² 1361.14-17. Similar remarks were made by Poland (1909: 489) and Jones (1956: 163).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

1329) or even a request (*IG* II² 1329.19). The type *koinon* is used, among others, in the provisions of selecting (*SEG* 2.9) and honouring officials (*IG* II² 1261.18). As far as the cases in which the association receives services are concerned, it seems that, although there is quite a wide range of services ascribed to the association under both expressions, still some were considered only on an individual rather than collective level. In this respect, whenever there is a reference to an individual's quality as *eunous*, *euchrestos*, *dikaios* or *agathos*, then the phrase *koinon* is used (*IG* II² 1252, II² 1253, II² 1323 and II² 1345) as the recipient of these services. But when certain qualities are ascribed or actual deeds are mentioned, then there is a balanced use of both modes (e.g. *IG* II² 1261 and II² 1265).

The use of *koinon* in documents reveals some differences compared to the term *thiasotai*. In particular, I think that we have to recognise two degrees of publicity, one at the level of *polis* and the other within the group. In documents drafted by *polis* authorities and/or published in a *polis* – wide audience, the word *koinon* appears (*IG* II² 1583, *SEG* 12.100 and in freedmen's bowls). It was claimed that the individuals accompanying any references to the group in these documents designate the leader of the group.[27] However, I think that there is another, more plausible interpretation: these individuals were representing the group, as a kind of *syndikos*, usually with powers delegated by the assembly of the group. Similar cases are provided by *IG* II² 1258, among *phuletai* (*SEG* 3.117 (303/2) and D. 23 (*Against Aristokrates*) 206), in demes (*IG* II² 1196.17-18) and in phratries (Lambert (1993: 195 n. 33).[28] In the remaining 6 instances when the copy of the resolution or transaction was to be erected in the precinct of the association (*IG* II² 1273.24-25, II² 1275.12-13, II² 1328.11-12, II² 2499.2 and 36-37, 2501, and *SEG* 24.203) or in the secured property (*horoi*) the plural name is used. This duality informs us on how the *polis* perceived an association as a *koinon* and how the group described itself. It may be explained by the different angle from which the *polis* viewed these groups, underlining especially their communal element, while the members were highlighting the religious-individual element. The use of plural name is exclusive when sacral activities are mentioned (*IG* II² 1273.14-15, II² 1292.12-13 and II² 2499.24-25). The remaining occurrences of the word *koinon* refer to corporate activities; in these instances, *koinon* designates the recipient of *philotimia*, *euergesia* and the like (*IG* II² 1261, 1262, 1263, 1265,

27. Most recently see Lambert (1996). Cf. Behrend (1970: 105) for the role of the officer mentioned in leases as intermediary.

28. See the recent but brief article of Andriolo, N. (2002) "*Syndikoi*" *DHA* 28 (2), 11-18.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

1297, 1291, 1297, 1314, 1318, 1323, 1327, 1337, 2347, *SEG* 18.33, and *Ag.* 16, 223).

The distinction, although loose, might have relied upon the concepts of collective and individual acts, shared by the members of the association. It was unlikely that the associates would perceive that the generosity of any benefactor could be addressed only to members individually (*idiai*) and not to all of them as a group (*koinei*). This points to a fundamental feature of ancient Greek thought, that of polarity. Multitude and individual are two extremes, which serve to identify each other. In this respect, the use of the word *koinon* is accurate since it signifies, as Poland (1909: 164) already noticed, only a group of people without any other particular connotation. The implication for cult associations is that their members did not lose their individuality.[29] The abstraction from conceivable and touchable realities to more composite entities was limited to those activities, which occurred regularly and had a highly formal and public character in the context of the associative life. In conclusion, we cannot allege that the existing regular patterns in the use of the name for an association can constitute a decisive proof in favour of the name as an indication of juristic personality. The naming pattern did not follow one pre-determined model but complied with different needs in different contexts.

Property as an indicator of legal personality

Facing an impasse in their attempt to find evidence proving the existence of juristic personality in ancient Athens, scholars have thought that property would be a safe indicator of juristic personality. If associations had property they should have obtained it somehow, but since only persons could legally obtain real estate, the associations were regarded as persons.[30]

Finley (1951: 89) expressed doubts about such an approach, asserting that whether these groups were endowed by law with legal personality "cannot be determined by the relative frequency or infrequency of group

29. Compare Finley (1951: 90) "For demes, tribes, and gene the collective proper noun (e.g. the Phlyasians) was considered sufficient identification as a rule." Although an exhaustive study of the naming pattern cannot be undertaken here, Finley's statement is essentially true; but one should take into account the exceptions such as *IG* II² 1178, 1198 and 2500, where the word *demos* is employed.

30. A more elaborate form of this statement can be found in Ziebarth (1896: 180), for whom central point of juristic personality is the right to property. The property of an association consisted mostly of real estate; "With the legal capacity to acquire property (Vermögensrechtsfähigkeit) the association acquires at the same time the ability to undertake legal action alone, which it uses in the acquisition and disposal of real estate."

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

holding of real property or of group participation in the taking and giving of land as security." However, after this cautious statement, a series of studies appeared which tried to establish a link between joint ownership and the property of associations.

Taubenschlag (1955: 62), Kränzlein (1963: 136) and Harrison (1968-71: 1.241) claimed that there is no hint of juristic person, but only joint ownership. The problem with this view is that it disregards the fact that common property seems to be inalienable.[31] Joint ownership conflicts with the character of inalienability and renders the property alienable by individuals.

Hatzopoulos (1973: 84), following essentially Ziebarth, claims that

> in the preservation of this capital (formed by contributions and fines) which served the aims of the association, exists the basis of the idea of an independent and self-sufficient legal capacity to acquire property (Vermögensrechtsfähigkeit) with a legal base and property. This legal capacity is dependent on the members. The Greeks called this legal capacity *koinon* and its items of property *koina*. They express more, when they ascribe the objects to a deity, which under different names dominated nearly every association.[32]

Hatzopoulos reaches this conclusion after having cited three inscriptions from different places and periods;

- *IG* II² 1361.13-16: [ἐὰ]ν δ[έ τι]ς [ε]ἴπ[ηι] ἢ ἐπιψηφίσηι παρὰ τόνδε τὸν νόμον ὀφειλέτω:[a] :δραχμὰς τῆι/ [θεῶι] ὅ τ[ε εἰπὼν καὶ] ὁ ἐπιψηφίσας καὶ μὴ μετέστω αὐτῶι τῶν κοινῶν. ἀναγράφειν δ[ὲ αὐτὸν ὀφείλο]ντα τῆι θεῶι τοῦτο τὸ ἀργύριον εἰς τὴν στήλην τοὺς ἐπιμελητά[ς] (If somebody proposes or puts to vote against this law, he shall owe 50 drachmas to the goddess both the proposer and the one who puts the matter to the vote, and shall not allowed be to take part in the common activities, the *epimeletai* shall inscribe his name as debtor of the goddess for this amount of money on a stele),
- *IG* XII (9) 191A.56-57 (Eretria, 4th century): [... ἐὰν δέ τις λέγει ἢ γρά]φει ἢ ἐπιψηφίζει παρὰ τοὺς ὅρκ[ους, ὡς ἀκυροῦν δεῖ τὰς συνθήκας, ἄτιμο/ς ἔστω καὶ τὰ χρήματα αὐτοῦ ἱερὰ ἔσ]τω τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Ἀμαρυσί[ας ...] (if somebody says or suggests or put to vote a decree against the oaths taken, that the contract should be annulled, he shall lose his citizen status and his property shall belong to the goddess Artemis Amarysia) and

31. Cf. *IG* II² 1289 and 1599.

32. For a similar conclusion see Duff (1938: 133) quoting Mommsen.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

- *IIasos* 152.19-22 (Iasos, mid 2nd century): ὃς δὲ τῶν/ νεμηθέντων ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους μὴ παραγένηται εἰς Ἰασὸν ἢ μὴ [ἐπιτε]/λ[έ]σηι τοὺς ἀγῶνας, ἀποτεισάτω τῶι κοινῶι τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τε/χνιτῶν Ἀντιοχ[εί]ας δραχμὰς χιλίας ἱερὰς ἀπαραιτήτους τοῦ θεοῦ, (and he, who although allotted by the assembly, will not be in Iasos or will not perform the contests, he shall pay to the group of Dionysiac technitai 1,000 drachmas of Antiocheia, which are to be sacred and which the god may not be asked to remit).

This evidence, according to Hatzopoulos, suggests that the creditor is not a natural person, but a separate, supra-natural person, the deity. Similarly there was not any personal, mutual remedy to any dispute, which arises between members, but it was considered as an offence against the deity and only the deity's representatives had the right to sue. He attributes this concept to the older social structure of Attica and its organization in *phratries* and *gene*, whose property was inalienable by their members and membership in these units was connected with the use of the land. Apart from the artificial connection of the system with archaic Athens, Hatzopoulos' suggestion is not entirely erroneous. His remark that certain fines are to be paid in the name of the deity honoured by the association occurs in some cases like[33]

1. *IG* II² 1273.21-25: ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ἱερεὺς μὴ στεφανώσ/ει ἢ μὴ ἀνείπει καθάπερ γέγραπται, ἀπ/οτινέτω : [ ] : δραχμάς παραχρῆμα ἱερὰς τ/[ε]ῖ Μητρὶ τῶν Θεῶν, ἡ δ' εἴσπραξις ἔστω τ/[ο]ῖς θιασώταις καθάπερ καὶ τἄλλα ὀφε/ιλήματα (and if the priest will not crown or pronounce as it is prescribed, he shall pay immediatelly 50 drachmas sacred to the Mother of the Gods, and the exaction will be made by *thiasotai* as for the other debts),
2. *IG* II² 1289.4-5: τὰ μὲν κτήματ[α εἶναι τῆς] θεοῦ (the land will belong to the goddess) and l. 9: ἀπαγορεύει δὲ καὶ ἡ θεὸς (the goddess prohibits),
3. *IG* II² 1297.17-18: ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀναγορεύσωσιν, ὀφει/λέτωσαν τέτταρας δραχμὰς ἱερᾶς τῆι θεῶι (and if they do not pronounce, they will owe four drachmas sacred to the goddess) and
4. *AM* 66 (1941) 228 no. 4.18-19: ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀναγορεύσω[σιν ἢ μὴ στεφανώσωσιν, ἀποτεῖσαι/ δρ]α[χμ]ὰς : [ ] : ἱερὰς τῆι Ἀφροδίτε[ι ...] (and if

33. Deity as recipient of money. D. 58 (*Against Theokrines*) 14; *Hesp*. 5 (1936) 393-413 no. 10.153-85 (346/5). the sacred money of Aias; Lambert (1997a: F13A. 5-9 Herakles. F12B. 7-13 Herakles Plousios. F14. 9-10 Hero Alkimachos). For sacred ownership see Isager (1992).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

they will not proclaim or crown, they shall pay 50 drachmas sacred to Aphrodite ...).

But in some other inscriptions this clause is entirely absent or replaced by another provision.[34] This is the case in

1. *IG* II² 1263.43-45: ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀναγο/ρεύσωσι, ἀποτινέτωσαν τῶι κοινῶι :[Δ] : δραχμὰς (and if they will not proclaim, they shall pay to the group 50 drachmas),
2. *IG* II² 1292.16-17: ἀποτεισάτω ἕκαστος αὐ[τῶν .../ δ]ραχμὰς ἱερὰς τοῖς Σαραπιασταῖς (each of them shall pay ? sacred drachmas to *Sarapiastai*), and
3. *IG* II² 1328.11-14: κύριοι ἔ[σ]τωσαν οἱ ὀργεῶνες ζημιοῦντε[ς τὴ]ν [π]α[ρ]αβαίνουσά[ν]/ τι τῶν γεγραμμένων μέχρι δραχμῶν π[εν]τήκον[τα κα]ὶ εἰσπραττ[όν]/των τρόπωι ὅτωι ἂν [δύνωνται ...] (the *orgeones* will have the authority to punish the infringer with a fine up to 50 drachmas and receiving it by all the available means).

It does not seem then that there was any consistent use of terms, and therefore these occurrences cannot stand as proof of Hatzopoulos' theory. It seems quite possible that these references to the deity as the recipient of the payment or owner of property may aim merely at compelling the debtors to pay their fines or contributions, by regarding the debts as sacred, and therefore the non-payers as impious and insolent to the deity.[35] Moreover, in three of the above - mentioned inscriptions, the fine is inflicted upon officials, a fact that reinforces this interpretation.

In the corpus of inscriptions concerning the activity of cult associations in Athens, there is no transaction, which concerns the purchase or the sale of any association's real property, with only one exception.[36] The property

---

34. The discrepancy regarding the recipient of the fine was noticed first by Poland (1909: 450). He remarked that in the earlier documents the fine is payable to the deity while in the later to the association. Nevertheless, I think that such a distinction is hazardous because of the inadequacy of the preserved evidence and the inconsistency of the terminology used.

35. Compare *IG* II² 1289. in which the real property is said to belong to the goddess and consequently no alienation of it is allowed. Clearly in this case there is a manipulation in order to avoid the sale of the common property and discredit the supporters of such a move. In close connection with that belief lies the fact that most of the precincts were built on (re)consecrated plots of land. Pollock, F. & F.W. Maitland (1895) *The history of English law* I. 499-500 London (reprint 1968) mention that in medieval England saints were perceived as owners of land.

36. *IG* II² 1599 with new readings in Lambert (1997a). It preserves very likely the record of the sale of orgeonic property; the state retains one per cent of the price as tax.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

of an association is very rarely alienated in any way. The sacred character of the common property rendered it *de facto* inalienable. Associations may have claims on the property of other people but no one has any claim to associations' property. It was not impossible for associations to sell certain movable commodities in order to gain money for the restoration of the temple (*IG* II² 1361).[37]

Consequently, we can fairly deduce that the acquisition of land followed more than often other than the current legally defined patterns.[38] The association possibly acquired real property by donations[39] or gifts (*IG* II² 1325) made by members or non-members, through the confiscation of the secured property of a debtor (*SEG* 12.100), or, taking into account the predominantly religious character of the associations, through the reconsecration of a place where a tomb or a temple existed before.[40] Last but not least, the *polis* could grant the right to acquire a plot of land, as happened in *IG* II² 337, especially when the applicants were foreigners. The only income from the real property comes from leasing, as it appears from three leasing contracts of the 4th century all of them concerning *orgeones*.[41] In

---

The regular character of this procedure has been disputed by Lewis, D. "The Athenian Rationes Centesimarum" in Finley, M.I. (ed) (1973) *Problèmes de la terre en Grèce ancienne*. 187-212. Paris. Cf. Rosivach, V. (1993) "The rationes centesimarum (IG 2² 1594-1603+)" *Eirene* 28, 49-61 who suggests that these documents record long-term leases and not sales.

37. See a similar prohibition concerning an ἑστιατόριον and its equipment from the 5th-century Sikyon in Peloponnese, *SEG* 11.244 (with *BE* 1941, no 55): πολεῖν δὲ/ μεδὲ συναλάζεσθαι ἐξέστο.

38. Finley (1973: 121) and Humphreys (1985: 213). Lambert (1993: 198 n.49) in discussing the evidence for phratries, notes that buying property was probably a rare occurence.

39. Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59, 11-16: καὶ νῦν γραψάντων τῶν ἐν Ῥαμν[οῦν]/τι ταττομένων πολιτῶν ὑπὲρ τόπου ὅς [ἦν]/ ἴδιος αὐτοῦ καὶ βουλομένων πρίασθαι ὥστ[ε]/ ἱερὸν κατ[α]σκευᾶσαι τῶι τε Σαράπιδι καὶ τε[ῖ/ Ἴ]σιδι, ἀποδόσσθαι μὲν οὐκ ἠβουλήθη, ἔδωκε δὲ (ἄ)/νευ τιμῆς (and now, the citizens appointed in Rhamnous having written for the grant of a plot of land, which belonged to him, and they were willing to buy it so that a sanctuary to Sarapis and to Isis to be built, he did not want to sell it but he gave it without asking for money).

40. See for example the excavations on the Acropolis on the site of *Amyneion* (Körte (1896)) and the fact that shrines were founded on Mycenaean tombs on the Acropolis or in the Agora. In this respect see Thompson, W. (1978) "Minor shrines in Athens" in *Athens comes of age. From Solon to Salamis*, 96-108, Princeton. Poland (1909: 455-57) pointed out that older associations usually did not possess large fields (*temene*) but simply an *hieron* with an altar.

41. *IG* II² 2499, 2501 and *SEG* 24.203. For an assessment of the social and economic importance of these documents see Osborne (1988: 292). Recently Ustinova (1996)

ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

these contracts, there are minutely arranged details about the maintenance and the integrity of the plot and the temple, as well as the exploitation and the offered easements. But property matters are an indecisive factor in our attempt to assess the juristic personality of the ancient Athenian association. The property transactions cannot provide us with sufficient and solid evidence about juristic personality.

The conceptual horizon of the associates

The examination of the question of juristic personality has shown that such a concept had not entered into the, otherwise unsystematized, legal vocabulary of ancient Athens. Therefore, any examination of the legal features of Athenian associations based on or presupposing the concept of juristic personality is going to fail. A modification of the question to be asked is the first thing that a new approach should resolve. Following the example of Romanists, I think that we have to study the solutions given by the Athenians to situations for which we speak of legal personality; we have to ask how Athenian cult associations regulate the transference of property or conclude their contracts of lease, when such a need arise, what were the name patterns that the associations themselves were using, and finally whether we have any evidence about the legal representation of an association in a lawcourt or in an arbitration procedure in Athens and if so, what the actual practice was.[42]

From the material assessed above it is clear that cult associations did not innovate, but rather followed the example of other groups of the Athenian society. As far as the handling of property relations is concerned, their mode of action was based on their officials, who were responsible for the representation of the group in the conclusion of any contract. The name pattern does not suggest any innovation either; the collectivity is not formally distinguished from the totality of its members. Last but not least, the question of judicial representation cannot be answered since there is only one inscription [*IG* II² 1258, (324/3)], which hints at the mode of

---

associated the practice of property leasing with "the underdevelopment of the notion of the corporate person".

42. For a similar methodological attitude, but with a broader aspect and perspective, see Orestano (1968: 80-88) and Robertis (1984: 1259); for a more theoretical tone, see Hart, H.L. (1954) "Definition and theory in jurisprudence" *Law Quarterly Review* 70, 37-60 especially p. 50. This approach in the context of Roman law can be very effective, since there is an authority, which grants specific rights to groups. In Greek *poleis*, in contrast, the sole authority, the assembly of citizens did not seem to be concerned with authorization.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

representation in the lawcourts. Although *IG* II² 1258 does not come from an association of *orgeones*, *thiasotai*, or *eranistai*, I think it is useful to review its content. The association of *Eikadeis*[43] decided to honour one of its members, a certain *Polystratos* son of Diodoros, because he took the initiative to prosecute for perjury some co-associates, who were harming the association; the association decided to elect three members to help the prosecutor. Despite the lack of important information about the allegations, the pattern of action emerges clearly; in case of slander or other activities against the interest of the association, the association's defence depended upon the initiative of its members. I think that this is an example of the association's structural inability to intervene as such.[44]

One may argue that the occurrence of the term *koinonikai* among the *dikai* introduced to *eisagogeis* for adjudication in *AthPol* 52. 2 implies that associations had the right to appear in court, and therefore enjoyed a degree of legal personality.[45] The term *koinonikai* occurs also in D. 14 (*On symmories*) 16 composed in 355. There the young Demosthenes explains who will be exempted from the proposed reorganisation of the *symmoriai* system. There is a general agreement about the meaning of *koinonikai* in that passage, namely that it denotes the joint ownership of the paternal property by the brothers. Demosthenes thought that it should be exempted in case the division produced two shares exempt from *liturgies*.[46] An identification of the Aristotelian *koinonikai dikai* with the Demosthenic *koinonikai* avoids the reef of juristic personality altogether. It seems to me that there are two good reasons for doing so: 1) in the list of suits enumerated as *emmenoi*, actions concerning the return of dowries are included. There is no reason why differences concerning patrimony should have been excluded and 2) the special rapid character and adjudication of these cases, in which suits are accepted every month would precipitate the issue of decisions in otherwise long lasting disputes.

In order to understand and to assess the conditions that did not favour the development in ancient Athens of a concept similar or identical to that

---

43. Also in Michel 974. Schwenk 78. Other pieces of evidence for *Eikadeis*: *IG* II² 2631. 2632; *Ag*. 19 P26. 384 & 395; Lambert (1997a: F13A. 12-16) all property related. See the comments on the group by Parker (1996: 336-37) and Lambert (1997b).

44. Similarly in *IG* II² 1205. a late-4th century honorary decree of the deme of Epikephisioi. the elected by the *demotai* prosecutors of a certain Neokles are honoured because of their performance in the legal proceedings.

45. See Lipsius (1905: 771) and Cohen (1973: 14). Beauchet (1897: 4.353) saw in the term κοινωνικαὶ "les actions entre associés". Harrison (1968-71: 2. 22 n.8) and Rhodes (1981: 586) justifiably expressed doubts about the plausibility of the traditional interpetation.

46. Lipsius (1905: 575 n. 102) and Biscardi (1982: 209).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

of modern juristic personality, we should start by clarifying the approach to this contemporary concept.

Juristic personality designates any entity, an individual or a group, bearing rights and duties in the context of a legal system, that is a structured set of socially adopted norms, whose application is guaranteed by the use of physical or other types of coercion. In other words, the pure form of juristic personality presupposes a one-to-one relationship between a physical and a legal person; every physical person is considered legal as well. Exception to this rule are the cases of inheritance rights to the unborn and property rights of the deceased. In the origin of this doctrine lies the philosophical conviction that individuals are the only bearers of rights and duties.

Nevertheless, in ancient Athens, we know that there were no such convictions and philosophical principles. What today is called legal personality and/or legal capacity was then determined by each individual's status. Status was a matter of sex (male-female), of birth (citizen-foreigner) and of personal freedom (free-slave).[47] These divisions include further distinctions on each side. In this respect, a citizen could acquire land, while a metic or a foreigner could not, unless specially privileged. A male citizen could sue in his own name, while a female needed the tutelage of a male relative. Citizenship entitled individuals to enjoy full rights.[48] A one-to-one relationship between physical and legal person cannot be found in Athenian law. A citizen could have been deprived of certain legal rights without losing his status as citizen, as in partial *atimia*[49] in which case he was treated as having diminished legal capacity. At the same time, a slave would have worse treatment than a citizen, as in testifying in cases of homicide.[50]

An alternative approach to associations should take into account the predominantly social importance of these groups and the theoretical scheme in which Arist. *NE* 8.9.4 (1160a 8-14) includes his theory of associations. According to Aristotle, associations are only parts, molecules *(moria)* of the whole political community, of the *polis*.[51] The latter was organized on the

---

47. For an exposé of the different statuses in the Athenian society see MacDowell (1978: 64-83) and Todd (1993: 167-201).

48. For norms of citizenship see Whitehead (1991).

49. A similar interpretation is elaborated for Roman law by Tur (1987: 117).

50. See Grace (1973). She claims that the normative field of the law on homicide included solely citizens. This kind of segregation was cutting across several other enactments.

51. Αἱ δὲ κοινωνίαι πᾶσαι μορίοις ἐοίκασι τῆς πολιτικῆς. A similar statement is repeated in *EE* 7.9.3 (1241b.25). For definition of πολιτικὴ κοινωνία see *Pol.* 1.1 (1252a).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

basis of the general interest (*to koinei sumpheron*) while the former were organized on the grounds of particular interests (*kata ta mere tou sumpheronton*), for example money (*chrematon*), victory (*nikes*), conquering a city (*pleos oregomenoi*), pleasure (*edone*), sacrifice (*thusia*), conviviality (*sunousia*). Associations based on particular interests are perceived actually as hierarchically inferior to the political community (*hupo ten politiken heoikasin einai*). It is the political community, which provides them with the context and the material for development. It is the community of citizens that sets the exemplary collective behaviour, which particular associations follow; it is the *polis*, which sets the pace and the variants of the collective life. In this respect, the Aristotelian theory provides us with the model, according to which these associations are organized; associations are replicas or mirror-images of the *polis*.[52] The democratic *polis* alone provides the proper context for the flourishing of associations and informs their organization.

The emergence of the Athenian state from the Dark Ages did not need a formal act. The villages came together under the initiative of the legendary Theseus, around a shrine, that is the Acropolis, which became the centre of the new political entity.[53] In the same manner, associations can be established on a local level around a consecrated plot of land or one granted by the city or the shrine of a hero. There are cases where these shrines were simply tombs of the Mycenaean era.[54] Nearly every cult association has both sacerdotal and secular offices, almost all of them annual with a special procedure for the complete discharge of the officials, similar to *euthuna* of the city magistrates. They were appointing their officials following the same methods and distinctions (allottment for sacerdotal, election for secular offices). Members joined associations after a scrutiny analogous, in broad lines, to that for deme affiliation. Associations issued decrees and statutes concerning the regulation of day-to-day activities or taking up new initiatives and bestowing honours, using a similar, if not identical, phraseology to that of the *polis*. The close connection between the organization of the city and that of an association reveals that the pattern of political activities and organization in Athens influenced decisively that of cult associations. The conceptual horizon of the Athenians, which was reproduced on every occasion was that of the *polis*, if it is true that mem-

---

52. MacMullen (1974: 76-77), Osborne (1990: 276) and Seland (1996: 112). LeGuen, B. (2001) *Les associations de technites dionysiaques à l'époque Hellénistique* II, 81, Paris (Études d'archéologie classique 12) examining the decrees of *Dionysiakoi technitai* associations has reached the same conclusion.

53. Polignac (1984: 153-57).

54. Polignac (1984: 128) and Kearns (1992: 67-71).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

bers carry in collective formations their bag of rules as Honoré (1975: 165) suggested. For the associations of metics and foreigners, the adoption of a similar organization may have been a "must" for social acceptance and at the same time it constituted an imitation and an imaginary participation in a civic life, from which their exclusion was institutionalised.

Apart from this essential resemblance, the problem of the juristic personality remains unanswered. Taking into account the previous analysis it was very unlikely that a concept like the modern juristic personality could have been developed in ancient Athens. It is difficult to imagine in the context of a society of low technological and financial development, like the Athenian society, collective bodies being vested with juristic personality, when citizens were considered as an entirety of political and legal rights.[55] In other words, being a citizen meant having rights and duties, above all, towards the city and only secondly as an individual.[56] This suggestion is reinforced by the mode with which associations are represented in different circumstances and especially in property transactions; only the intervention of an individual renders possible the participation of the association. Groups of citizens were considered as having the same rights as individual citizens. Groups of foreigners had to face the same institutionalised constraints as individual foreigners. The ambiguity in the use of names implies also that the association was not perceived as something totally different from its members. However, one may argue that the phrase in *IG* II^2 1263.15-16 and in II^2 1327.5-6: "he continues to be pious to the group of *orgeones* and to each one individually "[57] may imply a distinction between the community and the individuals. It is true that on several occasions the group was distinguished from its members, but this is not to suggest that such a distinction reflects any legalised delimitation of the term. Additionally one may also wonder why such a distinction does not appear in the significant legal documents and other manifestations of relations with non-members and is limited only to such formal expressions.

The examination of the evidence so far has demonstrated that a modern approach based on the notion of juristic personality is totally incompatible with the available documentation. But that does not necessarily imply any degree of primitiveness or underdevelopment; cult associations were treated as *de facto* subjects of rights and duties in law.

In this respect, cult associations are to be considered as structured col-

---

55. For the primacy of the political see, Rahe, P.A. (1984) " The primacy of politics in classical Greece" *AHR* 89, 265-93 and especially 268.

56. Veyne (1976: 192), Saxonhouse (1983: 363) and Baslez (1984: 17).

57. εὐσεβῶς διατελεῖ καὶ κοινεῖ τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν καὶ ἰδίαι ἑκάστωι.

ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

lective entities, whose study is not restricted by the modern concept of juristic personality and the deficiencies of a formalistic approach. Therefore, there is no need to look for acts of foundation and dissolution or for an official name or for the method and the implications of acquiring property. Attempts to trace precursors usually tend to underline only particular aspects of group activity. The quasi-legal aspect of cult associations is better expressed in terms of patterns borrowed by the *polis* and its constitutents. Private cult associations succeeded in defending their interests and managing their property without the notion of juristic personality. Cult associations were autonomous factors of social life, centres of civic activity, in which established beliefs are reassured and socially expected attitudes are rewarded. In the case of non-citizens, these associations delimit their particularity, and at the same time, reproduce civic virtues and attitudes, which make possible their tolerance or, in the course of time, their integration in civic society.

However, recently Jones (1999: 45-50) in an effort to assess the function of associations in classical Athens has put their integrative function on the backstage. Instead, he has interpreted some of their functions as a response to four essential features of the Athenian democracy; egalitarianism, direct rule, minority citizen participation and exclusion of non-citizens.

According to Jones, associations in Athens were an antidote to a rampant ideology and practice of egalitarianism, they "provided opportunities for differentiation on the basis of ability, energy or other personal attainment". Nevertheless, the same levelling process was at work in associations where allotment was used to fill offices. What seems to be more important in the dossier of cult associations in Hellenistic times is the economic prowess of an individual.

Phyle was largely a response to the principle of direct rule, because the councillors were acting as representatives of their fellow-*phyletai*. However, in cult associations, most of the decisions were taken by the assembly, following the principle of direct rule. Even, if Jones' interpretation about the role of *phyle* is accepted, the remaining associations adhered to the direct rule axiom.

Associations were also alternative to the physical (availability of space limits attendance of the assembly) and social (distance, occupation) constraints in the decision-making processes of the Athenian democracy. Therefore, "in these typically isolated and introverted village associations will be found the alternative and compensating forum of political activity available for those citizens excluded from city life by the accident of their place of residence". Although I have to admit that associations may have been an alternative, this cannot mean that they were stepping stones for a career at city-level politics.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Finally, the last point concerns the exclusion of non-citizens. Jones claims that "it is self evident that so large a segment of the population of Athens, living in such close proximity with members of the citizen elite, might be stirred to find or devise forms of group activity to compensate for their exclusion from the numerous collectivities." However, the stirring did not lead to the formation of associations of whatever kind exclusively for women or minors; instead women participated in *orgeones* associations via their husbands (*Ag*. 16, 161) and foreigners set up their cult associations in early Hellenistic Athens following the organizational model of the Athenian state.

To sum up, Jones' thesis may be a provoking and intelligent interpretation but it relies on an extremely wide definition of what an association is and loses sight of the essential similarities between associations and *polis*. Private cult associations far from being a response to the essentials of Athenian democracy, were a part of it.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

CHAPTER FOUR

CULT ASSOCIATIONS ON THE GROUND

The preceding legal approach has emphasized the inadequacy of an understanding based on formalistic grounds and especially on the concept of juristic personality as an analytical tool. At the same time it has revealed the connection between cult associations and the civic life in Athens. This particular feature can be a decisive parameter in a re-evaluation of the social importance and the role played by these associations.

After the 4th century the *polis* in the classical Athenian form became gradually less and less an independent political unit in the Greek world. The outcome of this progressive erosion of power, prestige and financial muscles became clear after the 2nd century and the subjugation to the Romans.[1] This era is the peak of another particular type of government, the administration of cities by their notables, as Veyne (1976) has suggested. The questions, to which this section is devoted, concern a) whether it is possible to apply the concept of "euergetism", as it has been expounded by Veyne, to the study of religious associations; b) whether we can see any examples of patronage in the relation between the wealthy members and the rest; and c) whether cult associations, far from being centres of civic culture, were venues of people living at the margins of the society.

Cult associations and society

In the 19th century the impact of religious associations on the social life of Athens and of Athenians was assessed on mainly moralistic grounds.

---

1. See Veyne (1976: 256) for the decline of the city-political unit as a factor leading to the development of "euergetism". Cf. *BE* 1978, no. 346.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Early scholarship considered it worth investigating whether the sudden rise of religious associations in Athenian society constituted a trend towards moral improvement or to moral regress.[2]

Wescher (1865: 219-25) claimed that in Hellenistic times, people abandoned the official religion, the religion of the *polis*, in favour of cults "promoted" or "patronized" by religious associations. The features of these cults were freedom, spontaneity and fraternity. They admitted women and sometimes slaves in their organisation, they promoted mutual assistance among their members, and the conditions of admission focused on the candidates' moral qualities rather than on any other qualification. Wescher concluded that aim of these cult associations was the moral improvement of their members.

Foucart (1873: 140-51), in a devastating criticism of Wescher's view, rejected this interpretation and instead considered the bulk of religious associations as promoting the superstitions of the poor and exploiting their spiritual needs. He saw a major difference between traditional religion and the cult of associations. The former is rationalised, controls the passions of the devotees and supervises the outbreaks of the religious feeling in the celebrations. The latter, in contrast, encourages all these traits that traditional religion has diminished, gathering people from the lowest social layers. Religious associations represent, as far as cult is concerned, symbols of a grotesque naturalism, a stage that traditional religion has overcome long ago. Foucart (1873: 186) concluded that the development of cult associations constituted a giant leap backwards.[3]

Poland (1909: 499-513) objected to Foucart's excessive interpretation; the religious basis of the associations as it is revealed through the use of oaths and the need for purity is undeniable. But this religiosity does not lead to disorder or to outrageous behaviour, because decent conduct (anstandiges Verhalten) was needed. Moreover, there was a continuous effort for ensuring concord among the members, as appears in certain inscriptions. Last but not least, these features are underscored by the care for the dead, which can be expressed as burial provided by the group and the existence of a cemetery. All these elements constitute a picture of religious associations which is not relevant to Foucart's groups of charlatans and vagabonds, seers and *metragurtai*, superstitious devotees and courtesans, who are but a step back in the history of humankind.

---

2. For Foucart (1873: 152) the ultimate question is whether «cette participation (des femmes et des gens de basse condition) était un progrès moral pour l'humanité».

3. For the tendency of historians in the 19th and early 20th century to deal with the vagabonds and the criminals of the past, see Schmitt (1978: 278).

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

This brief summary of views illustrates the culturally biased treatment of the Athenian cult associations. The approach of the 19th-century scholar has the disadvantage of employing modern pre-conceptions about moral progress or moral regress in the assessment of the situation in ancient Athens. What seems to be neglected is the fact that such concepts are formed by the Judeo-Christian morality, which is considerably different from that of Greek antiquity.

The approach by Foucart, and to a lesser degree by Wescher, is biased in the sense that it links progress with rationalization and order, a view heavily indebted to the then dominant positivist approach to the study of society. Foucart (1873) revealed another bias when he connected traditional Athenian religion with these features. But it is very well known that in ancient Athens people were not free of superstitions,[4] and that certain festivals were the institutionalized form of general disorder, expressed once a year and sometimes only on a symbolic level.[5] Certain festivities (*Adonia*, *Thesmophoria* etc.) were reserved for celebration by women, irrespective of status and social milieu. The breach of the established order is apparent during festivals celebrated by women, when they were allowed to perform religious rituals on behalf of the community in Athens. But the disorder was not connected only with the breach of the traditional female image; groups of men after the celebrations at the City Dionysia resorted to disorderly celebrations as well.[6]

The above remarks cast doubt on whether a moral approach is the best way to understand the social importance of associations. For such an approach seems doomed to overestimate or to underestimate the social realities, since it relies heavily, on the one hand, on our negative or positive prejudices about progress and its nature, and on the other hand, on the way we understand religion in ancient Athens and its role in the society.

If we want to look at religious associations as social factors, as embodiments of sociability and organization of social activities of the individuals, we may examine their function in the society of the *polis*, as an integral part of it. Do they follow the gradual decline of the *polis*? Do they depend on a handful of notables, as Veyne (1976) implies? Or do they retain a mixture of superficial independence together with economic dependence on

---

4. Nilsson, M.P. (1940) *Greek Popular Religion*, 102-20, New York and Meijer, P.A. (1981) "Philosophers, intellectuals and religion in Hellas" in Versnel, H.S. (ed) *Faith, Hope and Worship: aspects of religious mentality in the ancient world*, 216-62, Leiden (Studies in Greek and Roman religion 2). Magical spells: Gager, J.G. (ed) (1992) *Curse tablets and binding spells from the ancient world*, Oxford.

5. For example, the αἰσχρολογία at Στένια, for which see Burkert (1985: 105).

6. Parke (1977: 188).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

one or more of their most wealthy - and for this reason most prestigious - members? Finally, what is the cohesive force that keeps the members of an association together, or to put it differently, what is the associative link and how is it forged?

Veyne (1976: 209ff) suggested that from the second half of the 4th century until the Imperial period Greek *poleis*, such as Athens or Ephesos, were essentially not governed by their citizens, but by their notables, men of a certain economic power and prestige in the local community, through the people's assembly. Euergetism describes the situation in which communities (cities and I would add *collegia*) expected the rich to contribute from their wealth to the public expenses. This expectation was not disappointed: the rich contributed indeed, spontaneously or, at least, willingly. This contribution had neither the character of redistribution of wealth, since it happened in different degrees and occasionally, nor of a mechanism for attaining social equilibrium,[7] nor of philanthropy, nor of exchange of goods since there is not any expectation of goods to be given in return, nor of tax, nor of patronage, since it was addressed to all the citizens. It is *sui generis*, it is a particular product of the system of liturgies and of the absence of any regular direct taxation in classical antiquity,[8] together with the prevailing attitudes and values in a face-to-face society. Veyne distinguishes three kinds of *euergesiai*: 1. those provided by the notables without their being under any definite obligation to do so and he calls it "voluntary euergetism" (liberalités), 2. those provided on the occasion of their (the notables') election to a public "honour", a municipal magistracy or function (*ob honorem*), and 3. the establishment of a cult of ancestors through the donation of property for such purposes (foundations). Veyne (1976: 291-93) considered cult associations as multi-functional units providing for their members the opportunity to banquet and to secure a decent funeral. He saw that these groups constituted a potential "audience" for the notables since the same civic set of values was predominant.[9]

---

7. Veyne (1976: 218) «L' evergetisme est extérieur au problème social par ses motifs, ses oeuvres et ses effets».

8. The Athenian εἰσφορά was irregular capital levy, imposed only in exceptional cases, often in case of war. Cf. Finley (1973: 175) and for a historical overview, Thomsen, R. (1964) *Eisphora. A study on direct taxation in ancient Athens*, Copenhagen (Humanitas 3).

9. Veyne (1976: 346 n.199) claimed that "Comme la cité, le collège procure un public auprès duquel le mécène peut se mettre en valeur; il constitue une organisation que des leaders feront marcher à leur propres frais pour y avoir le plaisir de diriger et d'organiser; il est le lieu d'une dynamique de groupe où chacun se sent des devoirs envers ses confrères et a quelque pudeur à ne pas s'immoler lui-même lorsque les autres immolent; enfin, comme la cité, le collège poursuit des valeurs qui peuvent intéresser un mécène". Similarly Nijf (1998: 120) on the value *collegia* had for benefactors.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

The challenge is to see if we can apply this model, originally elaborated for the study of cities and supported by a multitude of epigraphical material, to the study of cult associations in Athens.

Gauthier (1985: 1) has pointed out that the notion of *euergesia* may have existed in the 5th century as well, if we are to give credit to literary references. But it shows a peak during the late Hellenistic era, that is the second half of the 2nd century and the imperial period.[10] The evidence from Athenian cult associations seem to fit this chronological pattern since lavish expenditures, repairs to buildings and other activities are paid for by individuals in the 3rd and 2nd century (e.g. *IG* II² 1271, 1325, 1326, 1327, 1343). Furthermore, Gauthier (1985: 30) perceives "euergetism" as a two-fold concept including *sensu stricto* what Veyne (1976) claims and in a larger sense when the notables were trying to prove their "excellence" in public activities (i.e. liturgies, public offices, subscriptions). Secondly, the mechanism through which the notables promised and carried out their promise is important to Veyne's theory. In the beginning a contribution to the city was secured through *epaggeliai* (pollicitations) and *epidoseis*.[11] In the context of associations, there are two references to such a promise, one in the fragmentary *thiasotai* decree *IG* II² 1318.3-5, in which the honoured "promised that he will give his share from his income to everything suitable to the group" and in *IG* II² 1329.17-19 in which the honoured has already contributed in *epidoseis* and now "he promises that in the future he will take care of everything that the *orgeones* will ask him".[12] As we can see, the object of these promises varies; a building, the repair of the temple or the cash-flow in the association's treasury. Their content is deliberately vague and general, so that individuals would be encouraged to help the association in the very next financial difficulty.

In the epigraphical dossier of cult associations there is not a single reference to the term *euergetes* as a title attributed to an honoured person by any cult association. An individual may be called *eunous* (friendly), *dikaios* (just), *philotimos* (loving honour), *agathos* (virtuous), *euchrestos* (useful) but never *euergetes* (benefactor). However, there is a passing reference to *euergetai* in *IG* II² 1277.24-27: "to proclaim their crowns and their praise in every

---

10. See Gauthier (1985: 67-68).

11. For ἐπίδοσις see Kuenzi, A. (1923) *Ἐπίδοσις*. Bern (New York, reprint 1979) and Migeotte, L. (1992) *Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités grecques*. Genève (Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 17).

12. *IG* II² 1318.3-5: [αὐ]τὸς δὲ ἐπηγγείλα[το ἐκ τῶν/ ἰδ]ίων εἰς ἅπαντα τὰ [προσή/κ]οντα τῶι κοινῶι μερ[ιεῖν] and *IG* II² 1329.17-19: ἐπαγ/γέλεται δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον συνφροντι/εῖν εἰς ὃ ἂν αὐτὸν παρακαλῶσιν οἱ ὀργεῶνες.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

sacrifice together with the other benefactors".[13] Instead of the term *euergetes*, cult associations in their documents prefer to use verbal forms like *euergetein* or *euergeteisthai*. A likely explanation has already been advanced by Gauthier (1985); at the level of rhetoric, individual members owed their allegiance first and foremost to the group, they were expected to benefit the association without any recompense. As we have already seen, in reality associations were attempting to motivate their members by promises of reward equal to the contribution.

The type of "euergetism" designated as *ob honorem* may be behind some selections of officials. The preserved documents simply enumerate the activities of the officials during their term in office, without any hint of the reason that led to their selection. But we can fairly assume that when an association needed money for a certain project, be it repair, refurbishment or new cult objects, then one of the members who could afford such largesse would have been elected. So, though not explicitly confirmed, this pattern of selection may have been predominant. This scheme provides an explanation for the recurring names in *IG* II² 1317, 1317b, *SEG* 2.9 & 10, and 44.60. They were simply a group of prestigious and comparatively well-off people who could afford largesse in order to receive honours, which in their turn would increase their prestige among the associates.

Associative life seems to involve four more features of the model of "euergetism". In particular, the contribution, made by the honoured person, is addressed to all the members and never to a section only. The phrase "*koinei kai idiai*" encompasses this duality. Simultaneously, the very fact of contribution signifies a dichotomy between "the haves" and "the have-nots", even within a group where this division is magnified. At a more formal level, there is a reference to the numbers of votes cast in favour of or against the proposal for honouring at the closing part of the decree. In *IG* II² 1343 the associates unanimously voted the proposed honours to one of the most eminent members of the association.[14] Finally, cult associations in the closing part of their decrees do not humiliate themselves, but rather underline the expected behaviour of the rest of the members, adopting a patronizing style.

---

13. *IG* II² 1277.24-27: ἀναγορεύεσθαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς σ/τεφάνους αὐτοῖς καὶ τὸν ἔπαι-νον καθ'/ ἑκάστην τὴν θυσίαν μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων εὐ/εργετῶν.

14. It is described more vividly in *IG* II² 1368.20-24: καὶ ἐπερώτησεν ὁ πρό/εδρος Ῥοῦφος Ἀφροδεισίου· ὅτῳ δοκεῖ/ κύρια εἶναι τὰ ἀνεγνωσμένα δόγμα/τα καὶ ἐν στήλῃ ἀναγραφῆναι, ἀράτω/ τὴν χεῖρα. Πάντες ἐπῆραν. (And the presiding Rouphos, son of Aphrodeisios asked; anyone who thinks that the decisions read should be adopted and be inscribed on a stele, shall raise his hand. Everybody raised his hand). See also *IG* II²

Ακαδημία Αθηνών/ Academy of Athens

Veyne's (1976: 263) remark that during the 4th century the crowns, little by little, came to be made from gold rather than from leaves, is not confirmed for the associations, in which there is the exactly opposite tendency. There are golden crowns only in the 4th century (*IG* II² 1252, 1253, 1255, 1256) and in one instance in the 3rd century (*IG* II² 1316); in the rest of the documents there is the usual olive-leaf crown.

From Gauthier's (1985: 77-125) analysis it emerges that in decrees of the Athenian *polis* there is a certain gradation of the honours attributed to *euergetai*. The *megistai timai*, that is statue, *sitesis* in the *prytaneion*, and *proedria* were not associated with any specific act and were attributed only to "great" benefactors, usually late in their life, if not posthumously.[15] Honours like praise, crown or the inscription of a name on stone were awarded more freely. In associations a different pattern is observed. In the late 4th century honours are confined only to crowning, either with a golden crown or with one of olive leaves, depending upon the contribution of the honoured person. In two exceptional cases, in *IG* II² 1252 a combination of honours occurs, a golden crown, a dedication and the right to free libation, and in *IG* II² 1263 a dedication, an olive-leaves crown and a solemn proclamation. The activities for which the associates are honoured in *IG* II² 1252 are not mentioned at all, while in *IG* II² 1263.7-19 they are recounted at considerable length. A striking similarity in the documents dated to the 3rd century is the almost uniform use of the olive crown, apart from *IG* II² 1284 (oak leaves crown), 1316 (golden crown), and Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59 (golden). In addition to the crowning, the erection of a statue (*eikon*)[16] and the solemn pronouncement (*anagoreusis*)[17] occur more frequently, while references to *anathema* are in decline.[18] A particular

---

1343.44-46: τῶ[[ι]]ν ψή/φων αἷς ἐδόκει τόδε τὸ δόγμα κύριον εἶναι ἐξήκον[τα]/ αἷς δὲ οὐκ ἐδόκει οὐδεμία.

15. For a re-appraisal of Gauthier's thesis see Kralli, I. (1999-2000) "Athens and her leading citizens in the early Hellenistic period (338-261 B.C.): The evidence of the decrees awarding the highest honours" *Archaiognosia* 10, 133-62.

16. *IG* II² 1271 and 1314.

17. *IG* II² 1273, 1282, 1292, 1297, 1314 and 1315.

18. According to *LSJ* ἀνάθημα means "that which is set up; hence, like ἄγαλμα, votive offering set up in a temple". The practice of associations consisted of providing money for the erection of a monument. Therefore, ἀνάθημα may have two aspects; it may be mentioned in a general way as it happens in *IG* II² 1252, 1261, 1262, 1263, 1278, 1317, 1324 or in a specific term in the form of εἰκόνα in *IG* II² 1271, 1314, 1327, 1329 and 1334. From our evidence it seems likely that the followed practice in the 4th century was a general statement about ἀνάθημα, but during the 3rd century and onwards a specific reference to the kind of the offered ἀνάθημα. This evolution suggests that importance was attributed to the long-lasting effect of honouring.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

honour occurring in *IG* II² 1292, 1297 and *SEG* 24.156 consists of putting a ribbon around the head of the honoured man. Combined honours are usually attributed to those persons who had committed themselves to the well-being of the association and had contributed considerable efforts and money to its prosperity. Therefore, in the 3rd century cult associations seem to have elaborated a system of honours, according to which simple crowning was attributed to fulfilment of duties, whereas combined honours were awarded for more substantial contribution. Significantly in the documents of the 2nd century there are only combined honours, among which the award of a portrait or a statue and the public proclamation playing are important.

It is clear, then, that there was a moderate honouring system corresponding to the financial potentialities of the association. In this context there was an evolution from inscriptions with vague references to attributed honours to inscriptions in which not only the bestowed honours are enumerated in detail, but the contribution of the honoured person is praised; at the same time, there was a gradual passage from golden crowns of the 4th century to olive-leaves crowns in the 3rd century. What purpose did these changes serve? The aim of this honouring system was to increase the prestige enjoyed by the honoured person, according to their generosity; I think that these changes were aiming at the increase of the bestowed honours and at their longevity in the course of time. Manifestations of honours like crowning, erecting a statue and solemnly mentioning the name on every occasion are surely more lasting in the memory of the participants than a golden crown alone.[19]

Veyne's perspective about the extent of "euergetism" as a social phenomenon of the Hellenistic and Imperial era corresponds to some extent with the evidence from associations. But I do not think that it can be fully applied to cult associations. It is hard to imagine a different social order of people in an association; certainly a small number of persons, or sometimes even only one person, concentrated several or all offices in their hands (*IG* II² 1335.10-13). The cases of *Simon*, son of *Simon* of *Poros* and *Dionysios*, son of *Agathokles* of *Marathon* illustrate the point very vividly. *Simon* participated in two different associations, in the *orgeones* of Meter [*epimeletes*: *IG* II² 1327.32 (178/7) and *rogator*: 1328.9 (183/2)] and in the quite elitist *orgeones* (*Dionysiastai*) [*IG* II² 1325.10 (185/4)]. He is never qualified as *euergetes* but he was probably one of the few members of the *orgeones* of the Mother of the Gods who could support the association financially and

19. See also Nijf (1998: 117-18) on the durability of monuments objectifying the benefactors' generosity.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών/ Academy of Athens

whose advice would be endorsed.[20] Dionysios had built the temple and donated a considerable amount of money to the *Dionysiastai* for cult objects. His wishes were respected after his death. On the level of associations the moral obligations, the pursuit of ambition (*philotimia*) and honour are dynamic factors, which at any moment decide who will take an office.

In this respect, the contribution made by Veyne (1976) to the understanding of cult associations is valuable, in as far as it integrates associations into the context of social attitudes and behaviour, dominant in the society of the *polis*, and reveals concealed hierarchies, competition and the strategies of these groups to channel it. However, the model of "euergetism" disregards the appeal of these groupings to ordinary people, citizens and/or metics, men and/or women. It does not account for the processes of providing a sense of belonging and the forging of the associative link.

A sharper insight into associations as a social phenomenon is offered by Schmitt-Pantel (1990: 199-213). Under the general, and maybe misleading, term "rituals of conviviality" stemming from the different practices occurring in collective activities, she classifies meetings where sacrifices, meals with meat and communal drinking are taking place. The groups in which such activities occur are a point of contact between the individual and the city; in these groupings, a process of socialization is working; that is, they provide a context where individuals are learning and practising certain social norms, attitudes and values in every aspect of communal and political life by extension. At the same time social inequalities are reflected in the function of these groups. For Schmitt-Pantel (1990: 206- 7) the repetition of these rituals worked as the melting pot and was the forging power of the group's identity and cohesion.[21] This kind of analysis highlights the integrative character of cult associations. One may question the validity of this approach on the ground that it concentrates mainly on associations of citizens, who were more susceptible to these values while it leaves open the question of the foreigners following and imitating the same pattern. I do not think that there were exclusive associations of foreigners, at least in the Hellenistic era; in almost every association we find citizens as members,

---

20. Cf. Poland (1909: 495) and Baron et al. (1992: 8) about the disproportionate impact of individuals with high status on the decision making of the group.

21. See the comment of R. Osborne & S. Hornblower (eds) (1994) *Ritual, Finance, Politics. Athenian Democratic Accounts presented to David Lewis*, 5, Oxford. "By regular participation in all these ritual activities the social body became imperceptibly schooled in the pleasures of acting in accordance with schemes whose assumptions it might never consciously articulate"; similarly, Nijf (1997: 126). Wilson (1970: 22) found evidence for the socialization of young people in modern sects.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

but it is citizens who are most often the benefactors of the group.[22] Therefore, associations, even of predominantly foreign members, felt obliged to follow the organizational structure of the Athenian *demos*.

Baslez (1984: 331-53) offers an answer to this point, claiming that the city, and especially a city having ports, offers to alien residents (traders, sailors etc) a focal point, "un foyer de sociabilité". The process of integration started on a local level, in the political and cultural life of the locality. Through different gatherings and festivities on various occasions, the foreigners reconstruct part of their original rhythm of living and at the same time they participate in the local rhythm of living.[23] But I think that Baslez (1988: 147) stretches the evidence to the extreme when she claims that the communities of foreigners were nothing but faithful to a religious practice and to a structure of sociability characteristic of their country of origin, that is the ritual communal banquet. These groupings can be described, according to Gauthier's (1981: 169) terms, elaborated for the function of citizenship in Athens and Rome, as structures of integration in contradistinction to structures of participation. Citizenship in the ancient Greek city may have been a structure of participation in the political life but membership of cult associations made possible a meaningful reconstruction of the world of individual members in accordance with the prevailing cultural concepts. Moreover, foreigners developed a network of friendships and acquaintances, which could serve them during their residence in the city, as guarantors or mentors.

This integrative process was effectuated via what might be called "symbolic violence". By "symbolic violence" I mean the imposition of systems of symbolism and meaning (i.e. culture) upon groups or classes in such a way that they were experienced it as legitimate. Cult associations used and promoted the core civic ideas of excellence (*arete*), of contribution to the common good, righteousness (*dikaiosune*), of piety (*eusebeia*), and of ambition (*philotimia*). The proceedings of the group were conducted with

---

22. Out of 20 documents for which full identification of the honoured person is available, in 13 cases citizens (*IG* II² 1252, 1255, 1322, 1325, 1327, 1329, 1343, Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59, *Ag.* 16, 231 and *SEG* 18.33) or wives of citizens (*IG* II² 1315, 1316 and *Ag.* 16, 235) together with their husbands are honoured. The remaining 7 cases are foreigners and/or metics (*IG* II² 1263, 1271, 1273, 1291, 1337, *SEG* 41.171 and *AM* 62 (1941) 228 no. 4).

23. Baslez (1984: 346) "Étendant sans cesse son recrutement et ses objectifs, collaborant avec les pouvoirs publics, l'association facilite l'intégration de l'étranger. La participation à un groupe structuré donne en effet aux membres le moyen de jouir d'un faisceau des droits supérieurs à celui des métèques". Orientals, Baslez (1996: 42); worshippers of Isis, Pakkanen (1996: 52).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

procedures familiar to the citizens (assemblies, proposals, voting and honouring) the use of which gave the opportunity to non-citizens to practice in them, regarded otherwise as the privilege of citizens. In this way, civic values were inculcated and the social status quo was legitimized in the minds of non-citizens. In this respect, "the discourse of Athenian democracy" i.e. the process of communication between citizens in different venues of Athens, permeated and dominated the discourse of cult associations, and therefore increased the chances of smoother social integration of non-Athenians. Furthermore, this legitimate (and self-legitimising) imposition of values constitutes a kind of "cultural hegemony" and cult associations were acting, deliberately or otherwise, as agents of acculturation. In this respect, it is tempting, if conjectural, to attribute to cult groups a role in the easing of social tensions, and the preservation of social stability, in ancient Athens.[24]

So far, we have seen three main attempts to understand the role and the function of religious associations in Athenian society. The associative phenomenon is not fully explained by "euergetism" alone, nor by the concept of "ritual of conviviality", nor even as an assimilative context for the foreigners. Associations were multi-functional units of people, irrespective of their origin, in which each of the above mentioned features played a significant role.[25] Within them traits of "euergetism" occur, together with functions linked with civic, political, educational and finally assimilative forces, which rendered possible the slow, but smooth, integration into a new cultural context. Their cohesive link was the satisfaction of certain socio-religious needs, like worship, networks of acquaintances and friends, in one word sociability. Though not at all economically independent, they retained an air of "paternalism", an attitude, which appears especially in the motivation clause of their honorary decrees. The discourse of cult associations (or what Ziebarth (1896) called "Vereinssprache"), as revealed in their decrees, was highly egalitarian and tried to channel the individual's desire for distinction to the common causes.

One should not, however, run away with the impression that cult as-

---

24. Discourse of Athenian democracy. Ober (1989: 336-40); social tension. Ober (1993: 148). Similar function of preserving the social equilibrium in the Roman empire. Kloppenborg (1996: 26).

25. The variety of functions performed by cult associations is rightly pointed out by Baslez (1992: 284); sometimes it is exaggerated by Leiwo (1997: 111).

26. Disagreements and tension developed such as how to exploit resources (*IG* II² 1289), or cases of defamation against the group (*IG* II² 1258). The dispute in (Lys.) 8 (*Against synousiastai*) appears to arise from lack of support in transactions but probably concerns an unstructured group of people (*synousiastai*). Hierarchy. Nijf (1997: 247).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

sociations constituted an exclusively harmonious context, groups of happy people celebrating at different dates. Cult associations were a reproduction of the social system, which gave birth to them. Even among associates, tensions and competition for honours could develop, and it is likely that a hierarchy of wealth and prestige emerged.[26] Members were expected to behave in an orderly manner. Later, possibly under the influence or pressure from Roman authorities, disorder was penalized as in *SEG* 31.122, 5-8:

> "If anyone during a meeting enters a fight, let him pay on the following day a fine of 10 *drachmai*, if he started it and of 5 *drachmai*, if he participated in it, and without fail let him be expelled after his fellow *eranistai* have cast a vote"

as well as anti-collective conduct,[27] whilst conforming to the prevailing norms was constantly praised and rewarded, symbolically or otherwise.[28] These inequalities were reflected in the ritual of awarding honours, which, among other things, constituted a ritual of passage, from the ranks of ordinary men to the ranks of the privileged individuals as Bourdieu (1992: 79-89) suggested. The honorific system created a deep and insurmountable distinction between the honoured and not just those who have not been honoured but those who were never going to qualify, especially in those cases where the award of honours was associated with a certain economic prowess. Simultaneously, the honouring resulted in an adjustment of the attitudes of the honoured, as well as in the attitudes of the other members towards him to conform to his new status. It is not accidental that the award of honours invariably includes crowning since, as Pitt-Rivers (1965: 25) pointed out "the rituals by which honour is formally bestowed involve a ceremony which commonly centres upon the head of the protagonist". The reason for pursuing honour is not so much based on a materialistic approach, but rather on a

---

27. *SEG* 31.122. 5-8: ἐάν τις ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ/ μάχην ποιήσῃ, τῇ ἐχομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀποτινέτω προστείμ/ου ὁ μὲν ἀρξάμενος δραχμὰς δέκα ὁ δὲ ἐξακολουθ/ήσας δραχμὰς πέντε καὶ ἐξάνανκα πραττέσθω τῶν σ/[υ]νερανιστῶν ψῆφον λαβόντων ἐκβιβάσαι. Similar provisos in *IG* II² 1368.73-94. II² 1369.40-44. and *IG* IX (1)² 670 from Physkos (W. Lokris) of the 2nd century A.D. Comparable regulations appear earlier in Graeco-Roman Egypt. for which see Boak (1937: 217). The statutes of late medieval English confraternities present interesting similarities with these provisions; see McRee. B.R. (1987) "Religious guilds and regulations of behaviour in late medieval towns" in Rosenthal. J. & C. Richmond (eds) *People, politics and community in the later Middle ages*. 108-22. Gloucester. Comparative studies for guilds in medieval Europe. Nijf (1998: 17 n.62).

28. I do not know what this otherwise could include but in *IG* II² 1263.16-19 a μισθὸς is mentioned: καὶ ψηφισα/μένων τῶν θιασωτῶν μισθὸν αὐτῶι δ/ίδοσθαι ἐκ τοῦ κοινοῦ καὶ τοῦτον ἐ/πέδωκε τοῖς θιασώταις. (And the *thiasotai* having voted to grant him a salary from the common treasury also he gave it back to the *thiasotai*).

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

sense of personal fulfillment in exhibiting the activities socially sanctioned as praiseworthy.[29] That is the most plausible reason for the parallel existence of honorific decrees for the successful fulfillment of duties and of other decrees praising generous contributions.

One more aspect may be brought into discussion in this point. Bourdieu (1980: 118) has expounded the concept of symbolic capital as a misrecognised economic capital in a society where the accumulation of wealth in terms of money economy was considered as a-social. Associations were a venue in which accumulation of this kind of symbolic capital was highly desirable and was promoted. This symbolic capital would later on be converted into economic capital, through such media as hired labour, witnesses in transactions, middlemen, etc. Therefore, mere participation in a cult association may have provided members with access to capital (*eranistai* groups), land (through leasing), witnesses in transactions ([Lys.] 8 (*Against synousiastai*) 10) and the necessary support (or lack of it) in litigation (as in Is. 2 (*About the estate of Menekles*) 14 and D. 44 (*Against Leochares*) 3 and contra [Lys.] 8 (*Against synousiastai*) 2, 18).

Cult associations and patronage

The interplay between egalitarianism and hierarchy, inherent in Athenian cult associations, led Gallant (1991: 143-69) to the conclusion that these groups were venues for patron-client relations.[30] Gallant's central viewpoint regards associations in ancient Greece as the most likely structure for the meeting and the reciprocal satisfaction of the needs of peasant-clients and their patrons. His starting point is that clientelism is rife in cultures where an ideology of social equality, an ethos of reciprocity and obligation and the concept of "Limited Good" exist. Moreover, patron-client relations flourish in socio-political settings characterised by weak central authorities and control, differential access to resources, usually on an ascriptive basis,

---

29. See Hatch, E. (1989) "Theories of social honor" *American Anthropologist* 91, 341-53 with a discussion of theories on social honor. See also MacMullen (1974: 77).

30. For a more detailed treatment of the relation between cult associations and patronage see my article "Associations and patronage in ancient Athens" *AncSoc* 25 (1994) 5-17. In the bibliography cited there I would add Meier (1984), Mossé (1987), Mossé, Cl. (1994) "Peut-on parler de patronage dans l'Athènes archaique et classique?" in Annequin, J. & M. Garrido-Hory (eds) *Religion et anthropologie de l'esclavage et des formes de dépendance: actes du XXème colloque du GIREA* (Besançon, 4-6 novembre 1993), 29-36, Paris, Zelnick-Abramowitz, H. (2000) «Did patronage exist in classical Athens?» *L'Antiquité Classique* 69, 65-80; for patronage relations in professional associations in the Roman East, see Kloppenborg (1996: 27) and Nijf (1997: 107-11).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

and a system of ideas whose pillars are equality and reciprocity. The clientelistic relationship aimed at ensuring subsistence to the peasant "at the lowest premium possible"; in this respect, the relationship should be perpetuated and an appropriate context found. Associations provided exactly that framework. While in modern Greek society the institution of godparenthood (through marriage and baptism) is practiced to that effect, in ancient Athens associations of a different kind were used. According to Gallant, associations were formed at a supra-village level and their membership cut across economic strata and class boundaries. The associative activity was focused on different ritual(s), accompanied usually by communal practices like sacrifices followed by banquets. Their structure micked kinship. Gallant evokes evidence coming, mainly, from demes, for which he claims that "co-membership in deme enforced the bonds of residential solidarity". Accordingly, "the deme provided an ideal venue for elite-peasant contact and for the display of beneficence and patronage by the former not only to the deme as corporate entity, but to individual members as well". Gallant considers organisations like *phratries*, *orgeones*, *thiasoi* as groups based on fictive kinship bonds. These links combined with ceremonies created or strengthened the moral obligation to give support in times of crisis. This interpretation though challenging has certain weak points.

First of all, in classical and Hellenistic Athens there was no differentiated access to the kind of vital resources mentioned by Gallant, namely land and capital, markets and political power. Theoretically, political power, land and markets were available to all the Athenians citizens as early as the middle of the 5th century. The participation of citizens in the assembly, in the juries, in the council, on their own right and by allotment made difficult the construction of large and effective networks of clients. However, it will be short sighted to deny the existence of differentiated access to the centres of political authority. Allotment may have been the rule but election was the mode of selection for the most important posts. There were officers elected by the assembly (e.g. *strategoi*) and the role of the different networks of *philoi* was of utmost importance in securing the election of the candidate.

There were no institutionalised obstacles for the citizens involved in commerce or the cultivation of land. Almost every Athenian owned a plot of land for subsistence farming. Nevertheless, the unequal distribution of wealth in Athenian society generated inequalities, although this was not allowed to hamper, at least overtly, the rights of the Athenian citizen.

In ancient Athens, the principle that access to resources was ascriptive and depended on criteria such as ethnicity, wealth or juridical status sounds irrelevant, for it is well known that all Athenian citizens were enti-

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

tled to share these resources; notwithstanding the Solonian classification, which eventually was blurred, there was no distinction among Athenians that could limit the access to essential resources in the 5th century.

Gallant's approach to associations as a unified conceptual category is challenged by the variety of these groups. There were groups formed by the *polis* (*demes*, tribes), there were cult associations (e.g. *orgeones*, *thiasotai*, *eranistai*) and informal groupings (e.g. companions in *symposia*). Gallant relies mainly on material from *demes*. Although sometimes similarities and analogies can be traced, there is a significant difference: membership in *demes* was compulsory and patrilinear; while membership in *phratries* was patrilinear but its compulsory character is still debated; membership in other cult organisations may have been patrilinear but was not compulsory. Moreover, the case of demes cannot support the claim of residential solidarity; although the majority of the citizens may have been residents in the deme of their forefathers, many were registered in a different deme from the one in which they were living. From the above, I think it is clear that the cult associations were not the likeliest venue for the development of patron-client relationship.

Cult associations and marginality

A competing reinterpretation of the position of cult associations would like to underline their marginal character. One can base the marginal character of cult associations either on the marginal position of Peiraieus,[31] the par excellence (but not exclusive) "seat" of cult associations or on the marginal status of their members. The fundamental pitfall of such a conceptualisation lies in the untold or sometimes assumed definition of marginality; anything that does not form part of the mainstream society is considered, almost automatically, as marginal. In this interpretative context, cult associations having their base in Peiraieus and including many non-Athenians are ideally placed in the landscape of marginality in ancient Athens.

This approach disregards the nature of the available evidence on the basis of which we construct our concept of mainstream Athenian society. Our perception relies heavily, if not exclusively, on lawcourt speeches, which reflect to a large extent the interests, values, prejudices of the Athenian elite. In this world there is only a marginal place for traders, foreigners, peasants,

---

31. Reden, S. von (1995) "Piraeus - A world apart" *G & R* 42, 24-37 and von Reden, S. (1998) "The well-ordered *polis*: topographies of civic space" in Cartledge, P., Millett, P. & S. von Reden (eds) 170-90.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

women and slaves. It is natural that the elite would try to belittle or discredit the participation of these people in the cultural process. It can be argued that the "marginal" socio-political position of Peiraeus and its ethnic mixture corroborates the claim for marginality as a suitable conceptual tool for the understanding of cult associations. But as J. Roy points out this depiction of Peiraeus owes very much to the biased accounts of our evidence.[32]

My second objection concerns the participation of such a population strata in cult associations. Membership of such groups, as far as the surviving and published material allows, was definitely male- and citizen-centered. Although the available evidence is not always easy to classify, there are 611 persons attested of which 501 men and 110 women. Classification according to status produces even more distinct results: among the 611 persons there are 179 citizens, 33 foreigners, 3 *isoteleis*, 2 slaves and 394 cases of unidentifiable status. These numbers have to be treated with caution, since the full publication of only one inscription from an *eranistai* association dated in the 1st century could alter, possibly dramatically, the picture.[33]

The precarious preponderance of the citizenry among the members of cult associations directly challenges the allegedly marginal character of these groups. It is true, however, that among these citizens we can find few members of the propertied classes. In particular there are, *Antikles*, son of *Memnon* of *Melite*, nephew of the well known *Neoptolemos*, son of *Antikles* of *Melite*, *Dionysios*, son of *Agathokles* of *Marathon* and his family (contributions in *IG* II² 2332, 2333), *Diopeithes*, son of *Diopeithes* of *Sphettos*, (*APF* 4328) *trierarch* in 349/8 (*IG* II² 1620) and *rogator* of a decree in 346/5 (*IG* II² 218), *Epiteles* of *Keramos*, buyer of a mine for 20 dr. in 367/6 (*Ag*. 19, P5, 44), *Aischylos*, son of *Diphilides* of *Prospalta*, probably a descendant of the wealthy namesake in Finley 17, *Agathaios*, son of *Agatharchos* of *Prospalta* and grand-father of *Agathaios*, an *agonothetes* honoured in mid 3rd-century (*IG* II² 780 & 784) and *Kalliades*, son of *Philinos* of *Peiraieus*, active probably in the local politics and proposer in mid 4th-century decree *IG* II² 1176. What is important, however, is the similarity between the pattern of the participation in *demes* and in cult associations. As Whitehead (1986: 317-26) has shown, such eminent citizen figures do not seem to participate in the life of their demes. In the same vein, cult groups betray no signi-

---

32. Roy. J. (1998) "The threat from the Piraeus" in Cartledge. P., Millett. P. & S. von Reden (eds) 191-202. See the remarks about the distribution of cult associations in Athens and Peiraieus in Mikalson (1998: 152).

33. An inscription containing a list of 140 persons was partially published in *AJA* 64 (1960) 26 and reported in *BCH* 80 (1960) 655.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

ficant number of the elite. This does not necessarily imply that cult associations were marginal groupings; what it shows, in my opinion, is that such groups were peripheral to the needs of the *polis*-wide elite.

Central to the marginality-centred approach is the insufficiently defined concept of marginality. The terms "marginal(e)" or "marginalité" were used by Freyburger et al. (1986: 14) for cults and cult associations which were not recognised as public by the city of Athens. In this respect, the Thracian association of Bendis or the associations worshipping the Mother of the Gods are to be regarded as mainstream groups, although many scholars would disagree with that designation. Such a wide-ranging usage diminishes the value of marginality as an heuristic concept.

Marginality may be used either in an empirical, "topological" sense, meaning persons or ideas that do not belong to the mainstream society, to the majority, or in a technical, sociological sense meaning "the lack of participation of individuals and groups in those spheres in which, according to determined criteria, they might be expected to participate. By participation we mean the exercise of roles conceived of in the broader sense."[34] According to this definition women, metics and slaves cannot be considered as marginal since they played their prescribed roles according to social norms and expectations. The criteria determined by Athenian society did not envisage the participation of these categories in the political process. Consequently, I believe that the only people who could be regarded as marginal in Athenian society, according to the above definition, would be all male citizens who were expected to participate, but did not, either because they did not want to (*apragmones*) or because they were, temporarily or permanently, excluded from the civic body (*atimoi*).

It could be argued that a glimpse into modern pre-1994 South Africa can provide a possible model of marginality. In a study of a black group in South Africa, Dickie-Clark[35] argued that although the coloureds are culturally the same as the whites, their associations are far poorer and ill-served than those of the whites. The reason lies in the institutionalized inequality of these groups, which in its turn yields inequality in education, leisure time, motivation, etc. Applying such a model to an Athenian context, one

---

34. Germani, G. (1980) *Marginality*, 49. New Jersey. See also the definition provided by Weiler (1988: 16) "Es sind Personen oder Gruppen, die Normen der Gesellschaft, in der sie leben, nicht anerkennen bzw. nicht einhalten oder nicht einhalten können und aufgrund dieser Ablehnung bzw. Unfähigkeit (infolge sog. nichtkonformen Verhaltens) von der Majorität nicht als gleichwertig akzeptiert werden".

35. Dickie-Clark (1966) *The marginal situation. A sociological study of a coloured group*, 132-33. London.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

would expect that groups consisting exclusively of foreigners were impoverished too; however, much of our evidence comes from associations including both citizens and foreigners. The Thracian *orgeones* of Bendis (e.g. *IG* II² 1255 and 1283) follow their indigenous rituals (torch race on a horse-back) and honour their officials in the Athenian way with a crown of ivy leaves.[36] In this respect it is more helpful to concentrate on the internal divisions promoted by the status of their members; it is not, for example, incidental that the great majority of the honoured members are of citizen status. This remark seems to suggest that divisions in the association's membership were more likely to be according to wealth rather than according to ethnicity or status.

What I think is important for a definition of marginality is to shed our modern preconception about the simplistic duality mainstream - marginal. We have to allow for individuals and groups who may not have been considered members of a particular socio-economical elite but were aspiring to its value-system. In my opinion the question of a satisfactory definition of "marginality " in Greek antiquity remains open. But following the example of Geremek (1971: 2-3) who uses the judicial records of late medieval Paris to establish the dominant perception of the marginal people as those "of no use to anyone", I think it is possible to consider as marginal all these people who could not share (whether they were expected to do so or not) the values of the community in which they live.[37] This definition not only provides a simple criterion, but one flexible enough not to consider as marginals all those individuals who were aspiring (or liked to be seen to aspire) to qualities confined to the elite of the community. In this respect, it may be possible to regard women, metics, foreigners and slaves as not necessarily marginal in comparison to male citizens, in spite of their institutionalized lesser status. This line of investigation suggests that cult associations, although peripheral to the interests and needs of the Athenian elite, cannot be regarded as marginal, since they seem to aspire to, use and promote civic values like *arete* and *philotimia*.[38]

---

36. However, Montepaone (1991) in discussing the introduction of Bendis' cult in Athens and the way Athenian intellectuals treated it underlines its peripheral character, implicit in the ritual procession. For the *thiasotai* association of Bendis, Steinhauer (1993: 39).

37. Geremek (1971: 300) " The fundamental reasons for their (i.e. marginals') status, or, rather, their lack of status, have been shown to be many. The lack of anchorage in society and in life was essentially expressed in their consistent non-participation in production, in ties of dependence and in guilds, and by their refusal to belong to a family cell, and by their lack of settled residence." Along the same lines, Schmitt (1978: 280).

38. Cult associations did not have a marginal character. Baslez (1996: 37); contra

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

To sum up, cult associations were multi-functional groups, creations of the wider society in which they appear. They both reflected the dominant social order and helped replicate the conditions necessary for the preservation of this social order. In these groups "euergetism", understood not necessarily as political system but mainly as cultural phenomenon, was rife. They were assimilative contexts for citizens and foreigners alike and, at the same time, re-enforced existing divisions and hierarchies; but they did not become likely venues for widespread patron-client relationships as it has been recently suggested. Cult associations occupied a peripheral, but not necessarily marginal, place in the social geography of ancient Athens.

Motte & Pirenne-Delforge (1992: 140). The world of trade remained in the periphery of the world of *polis*. Mossé, Cl. (1983) "The world of the emporium in the private speeches of Demosthenes" in Garnsey, P.D.A., Hopkins, K. & C. Whittaker (eds) *Trade in the ancient economy*, 61. Berkeley.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ
ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

CONCLUSIONS

The study started with a brief description of Anastenaria and the loose organisation of the group celebrating the annual festivities. The relocation of the performers and the tension in their relation with the established local Orthodox church did not wipe out the traditional festival. This is important and instructive about the endurance of cults, in a hostile environment.

I have argued that it is possible (and indeed desirable) to study cult associations in their own right -without ignoring that boundaries established by qualifiers such as cult or professional are usually artificial-; *orgeones*, *thiasotai*, *eranistai*, *Asklepiastai*, etc can be drawn together, on the basis of their intense cult activity, that sets them apart from phratries and *phylai*. Flexibility and plasticity are the two distinctive features of the associative life in antiquity, features resulting to a large extent from their multi-functional character. These features make feasible for modern scholars to construct a research tool called "association", which includes groups with distinctive features, such as demes, phratries, *phylai*, *orgeones*, *thiasotai*, etc. In this respect, one may argue for associations as a response to democracy, without taking into account the egalitarian discourse of associations, the adoption of *polis* practices, nomenclature, values, attitudes, and the ethos of the wider political community.

The organisational centre of cult associations was the cult of a deity, often of foreign origin, but usually with an Athenian or, broadly speaking, a Greek equivalent. The structure of these associations was modelled on the example of the *polis*, confirming that this model constituted the actual conceptual horizon of Athenians. In this context, I have traced an explanation for the absence of the concept of juristic personality, essential in modern scholarship, but not found in the ancient Greek legal experience. In ancient Athens the legal and political sphere were identical, citizens had rights and duties towards the city only in their quality as citizens. The protection of non-

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Athenians was minimal and mostly based either on bilateral agreements or on the grant of citizenship in individual cases. Legal capacity was decided on the basis of the status and gender of the individual; a physical person was not necessarily a legal person, too. This conclusion stresses the collective character of Athenian associations rather than the corporate. Thus, associations are not something entirely different from the aggregate of their members. The arrangement of property relations reflects this conclusion. When the association had to deal with non-members, its name was designated by the official's name first and the type of the association following. When it dealt with members, a designation like *orgeones* or *thiasotai* was sufficient. It also emerged that all the associations were set up for eternity, following not necessarily the formal methods dictated by the legal theory of the 19th century.

Cult associations were the intermediate point of contact for citizens between the city functions and the family life. For the foreigners, they were a meeting place where links with their homeland were kept alive. At the same time, new alliances were forged and non-Athenians were initiated into the political functions of the host *polis*. In these associations solidarity and social distinction went hand in hand, poor and wealthy members shared the meat of the sacrificed animal, which may have been provided from the purse of the wealthy or from the common contribution of all the members. Social distinction were based on the wealthy members' ability to pay the expenditures of certain functions; often, this practice led to the allocation of different offices to them, for several consecutive years, through the mechanism of the annual renewal of the term in office. Nobody can doubt the symbolic value of these offices and their influence on the prestige of the individuals, but it is worth mentioning that the fossilised ways of selection recall the omnipotence of the assembly. The range of the relationships developed among the members of these associations was presumably large, extending from help and assistance to asymmetrical patron-client relation, although the evidence for the latter is not adequate.

Cult associations were structures of participation (or imagined participation) for a significant segment of the *polis* population, which was institutionally excluded from the administration of the *polis* affairs. What cult associations offered to non-Athenians -and to some extent to Athenians in Hellenistic times- is a sense of belonging, when traditional mechanisms of building and preserving an identity were weakening. Nevertheless, cult associations were not a framework into which social differentiation was blurred or abolished, but it survived in more refined forms and through a democratic-egalitarian discourse.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Η μελέτη ξεκινά με μια σύντομη περιγραφή του εθίμου των Αναστενάρηδων και της χαλαρής οργανωτικής δομής της ομάδας των Αναστενάρηδων. Η υποχρεωτική μετακίνηση των Αναστενάρηδων και η αντιπαράθεση τους με την καθεστηκυία Ορθόδοξη εκκλησία δεν κατάφερε να εξαφανίσει τη γιορτή. Η αντοχή του εορτασμού μέσα σ' ένα εχθρικό περιβάλλον για δεκαετίες αποτελεί ένα σημαντικό όσο και διδακτικό γεγονός για την ικανότητα λατρειών και εορτασμών να επιβιώνουν κάτω από αντίξοες συνθήκες.

Τα λατρευτικά σωματεία μπορούν να μελετηθούν ως τέτοια, δίχως να αγνοείται το γεγονός ότι επιθετικοί προσδιορισμοί, όπως λατρευτικό ή επαγγελματικό, είναι συνήθως τεχνητοί. Οι σύλλογοι *οργεώνων, θιασωτών, ερανιστών, Ασκληπιαστών* κλπ. μπορούν να θεωρηθούν ως μια ομάδα, με κοινό στοιχείο την έντονη λατρευτική δραστηριότητα, η οποία τους διακρίνει από τις *φρατρίες* και τις *φυλές*. Δεν προσπαθώ να εξισώσω *ὀργεῶνες, θιασῶται* και *ἐρανισταὶ*. Είναι όλα λατρευτικά σωματεία αλλά θα πρέπει να γίνει σεβαστή η ονοματολογική διαφοροποίηση που μαρτυρούν οι πηγές μας. Η επωνυμία τους αποτελεί την έκφραση του αυτοπροσδιορισμού τους ως συλλόγων.

Μεθοδολογικά θα περιοριστώ στην εξέταση αποκλειστικώς αθηναϊκών δεδομένων. Τα τιμητικά ψηφίσματα των λατρευτικών συλλόγων μπορεί να είναι ομοιογενή σε μορφή και περιεχόμενο, εντούτοις είναι πλούσια σε αξίες και σύμβολα, όπως αποδεικνύεται από τη μελέτη του Whitehead (1993). Η χρήση παραλλήλων θα είναι φειδωλή, θα προσπαθήσω να μην υποκαταστήσω την έλλειψη πληροφοριών με ψήγματα πρακτικών και ρυθμίσεων από άλλα μέρη του ελληνόφωνου κόσμου, εάν δεν υπάρχει χρονολογική ή κάποια άλλη αντιστοιχία.

Το τελευταίο μεθοδολογικό σημείο αφορά την αντιμετώπιση των λατρευτικών συλλόγων ως αμιγώς ελληνιστικό φαινόμενο. Είναι αλήθεια ότι

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

τα στοιχεία που μας παρέχει η δραστηριότητα των λατρευτικών συλλόγων χρονολογούνται από τις τελευταίες δεκαετίες του 4ου αιώνα έως και τα αυτοκρατορικά χρόνια. Το γεγονός, όμως, αυτό δεν αποτελεί ικανή απόδειξη της θέσης ότι τα λατρευτικά σωματεία αποτελούν ίδιον γνώρισμα της ελληνιστικής περιόδου, διότι ο εν γένει όγκος του επιγραφικού υλικού από την Αθήνα χρονολογείται στον 4ο και 3ο αιώνα. Λατρευτικοί σύλλογοι μπορεί να υπήρχαν διασκορπισμένοι σε ολόκληρη την Αττική, χωρίς ιδιαιτέρως πολύπλοκη οργάνωση, χωρίς ιδιαίτερη επιγραφική δραστηριότητα και να εξαφανίστηκαν δίχως να αφήσουν ίχνη κατά τη διάρκεια ή μετά το τέλος του Πελοποννησιακού πολέμου και την αναστάτωση που προκλήθηκε.

Στην παρούσα μελέτη ασχολούμαι με τα κοινωνικά και δικαιϊκά χαρακτηριστικά των λατρευτικών σωματείων της Αθήνας και μόνο. Η μελέτη των σωματείων στο σύνολο του ελληνόφωνου κόσμου της ανατολικής Μεσογείου, κατά το αξιοζήλευτο παράδειγμα των Ziebarth (1896) και Poland (1909), είναι πλέον εξαιρετικά δύσκολο έως αδύνατο να ολοκληρωθεί από ένα άτομο.

Η προσέγγιση διαρθρώνεται σε 4 κεφάλαια. Στο πρώτο κεφάλαιο επανεξετάζονται οι γραμματειακές και επιγραφικές πηγές και προτείνεται α) νέα προσέγγιση στην αξιολόγηση του Φιλοχόρειου αποσπάσματος (*FGrHist* 328 F35a), β) μια νέα ενδεχόμενη χρονολόγηση για την αποδιδόμενη στο Σόλωνα διάταξη του Πανδέκτη (*Dig.* 47.22.4), γ) η εννοιολογική διαφοροποίηση των όρων *θίασος* και *θιασώται* στα επιγραφικά κείμενα της ελληνιστικής περιόδου, όπου ο όρος *θίασος* χρησιμοποιείται με φειδώ και σηματοδοτεί τη θρησκευτική κοινότητα, ενώ ο όρος *κοινόν θιασωτών*, σημαίνει την οργανωμένη λατρευτική κοινότητα, δ) η διάκριση των όρων *έρανος* και *ερανισταί*, όπου ο όρος *έρανος* υποδηλώνει το *κοινό ερανιστών* μόνο μετά τον 1ο αιώνα π.Χ. και τέλος ε) η αυτόνομη αξιολόγηση των σωματείων με επωνυμία που πηγάζει από τη λατρευόμενη θεότητα (*Ασκληπιασταί, Αρτεμισιασταί* κλπ.).

Στο δεύτερο κεφάλαιο εξετάζεται η οργάνωση των σωματείων, η παροχή έγκτησης γής, η πιθανότητα δίωξης για ασέβεια μελών ή αξιωματούχων με λατρευτικά καθήκοντα, οι συνελεύσεις των συλλόγων, η οργανωτική δομή με τους αξιωματούχους και το σύστημα απονομής τιμών, όπως αυτά αποκαλύπτονται από το σύνολο των επιγραφικών μαρτυριών.

Στο τρίτο κεφάλαιο διερευνώνται τα δικαιϊκά χαρακτηριστικά των λατρευτικών σωματείων ενώ οι κοινωνικές παράμετροι της δραστηριότητας τους εξετάζονται στο τέταρτο κεφάλαιο. Πρώτα απ' όλα, τα λατρευτικά σωματεία ιδρύονταν με σκοπό να διαρκέσουν στον ιστορικό χρόνο, κυρίως χάρη στην φιλοτιμία των μελών τους. Το οργανωτικό κέντρο των λατρευτικών σωματείων ήταν η λατρεία κάποιας θεότητας, συχνά ξένης,

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

αλλά συνήθως αντίστοιχης με μιά αθηναϊκή. Η οργανωτική δομή αυτών των σωματείων έχει ως πρότυπο την πόλη-κράτος, η οποία αποτελούσε κατο όριο στην οργανωτική εμπειρία των Αθηναίων. Σ' αυτό το πλαίσιο αναζητήθηκε μία εξήγηση για την απουσία της έννοιας της νομικής προσωπικότητας, θεμελιώδους έννοιας στη σύγχρονη δογματική, αλλά μάλλον ανύπαρκτης στην αρχαία ελληνική νομική πρακτική. Στην αρχαία Αθήνα της κλασικής και ελληνιστικής περιόδου, η νομική και η πολιτική σφαίρα δεν ήταν αυτονομημένες, οι άρρενες πολίτες είχαν δικαιώματα καιυποχρεώσεις μόνον υπό την ιδιότητα τους ως πολίτες. Η νομική προστασία μη-Αθηναίων ήταν μερική και βασιζόταν είτε σε διμερείς συμφωνίες των πόλεων είτε στην παροχή της ιδιότητας του πολίτη. Επομένως, η νομική ικανότητα του υποκειμένου εξαρτιόταν από την ιθαγένεια, το status και το φύλο του. Ένα φυσικό πρόσωπο δεν ήταν απαραίτητα και νομικό πρόσωπο. Έτσι και τα λατρευτικά σωματεία στην Αθήνα θα πρέπει να υποθέσουμε ότι είχαν διαφορετική αντιμετώπιση όταν αποτελούνταν από αθηναίους πολίτες ή τους είχαν παραχωρηθεί διάφορα δικαιώματα από το κυρίαρχο όργανο της πόλης, την εκκλησία του δήμου. Αυτό το συμπέρασμα υπογραμμίζει το συλλογικό παρά τον οργανωμένο νομικό χαρακτήρα των σωματείων. Τα λατρευτικά σωματεία δεν γίνονται αντιληπτά ως κάτι διαφορετικό από το σύνολο των μελών τους. Η χρήση επωνυμίας αντανακλά το παραπάνω συμπέρασμα· όταν τα σωματεία απευθύνονταν στην ευρύτερη κοινωνία της πόλης, χρησιμοποιούσαν επωνυμία με βάση το όνομα κάποιου αξιωματούχου και τον τύπο του σωματείου, δηλ. ο Χ *μετά των οργεώνων*. Όταν όμως απευθύνονταν στα μέλη τους, επωνυμία όπως *οργεώνες* ή *θιασώται* ήταν αρκετή.

Τα λατρευτικά σωματεία υπήρξαν φορείς ευεργετιστικών πρακτικών κυρίως κατά την ύστερη ελληνιστική περίοδο, όταν υπάρχουν μαρτυρίες για *επαγγελίες*. Τα λατρευτικά σωματεία υπήρξαν το ενδιάμεσο σημείο επαφής των πολιτών μεταξύ της πόλης και της οικογένειας. Για τους ξένους, τα σωματεία αποτελούσαν έναν τόπο συνάντησης, όπου οι δεσμοί με την πατρίδα τους διατηρούνταν ζωντανοί ταυτόχρονα, όμως, μπορούσαν να συνάψουν νέες γνωριμίες, συμμαχίες και επαφές και να μυηθούν στις πολιτικές λειτουργίες της πόλης, από τις οποίες ήταν θεσμικά αποκλεισμένοι. Στα λατρευτικά σωματεία, αλληλεγγύη και κοινωνική διάκριση συνυπήρχαν, φτωχά και πλούσια μέλη μοιράζονταν το κρέας του θύματος, το οποίο μπορεί να είχε αγοραστεί με τα χρήματα των πλουσίων μελών ή από τις συνδρομές όλων των μελών. Η κοινωνική διάκριση θεμελιώνεται στην ικανότητα των ευπόρων μελών να πληρώνουν τα έξοδα κάποιων σωματειακών δραστηριοτήτων. Συχνά αυτή η πρακτική οδηγούσε στην απόδοση αξιωμάτων για αρκετά χρονιά στη σειρά, μέσω της ετήσιας εκλογής στο αξίωμα. Κανείς δεν μπορεί ν' αμφιβάλλει για τη

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

συμβολική αξία αυτών των αξιωμάτων και την επίδραση τους στο γόητρο των ατόμων, αλλά οι αποστεωμένοι τρόποι εκλογής θυμίζουν την παντοδυναμία της συνέλευσης των μελών. Η ποικιλία των σχέσεων που αναπτύσσονταν ανάμεσα στα μέλη τους ήταν μεγάλη, εκτεινόμενη από βοήθεια και συνδρομή έως και α-συμμετρικές σχέσεις πελατειακού τύπου, αν και τα στοιχεία για το τελευταίο δεν είναι αρκετά.

Τα λατρευτικά σωματεία αποτέλεσαν δομές συμμετοχής (ή φαντασιακής συμμετοχής) για ένα σημαντικό κομμάτι του πληθυσμού της πόλεως, το οποίο ήταν θεσμικά αποκλεισμένο από την διοίκηση των υποθέσεων της πόλης. Αυτό που πρόσφεραν τα λατρευτικά σωματεία στους μη-Αθηναίους –και ως ένα βαθμό στους Αθηναίους κατά την ελληνιστική περίοδο– είναι μία αίσθηση ότι ανήκουν κάπου, όταν οι παραδοσιακοί μηχανισμοί δημιουργίας και διατήρησης μιας ταυτότητας αδυνάτιζαν. Όμως, τα λατρευτικά σωματεία ποτέ δεν αποτέλεσαν ένα πλαίσιο όπου η κοινωνική διαφοροποίηση εξασθενούσε ή καταργήθηκε, αλλά αντιθέτως επέζησε με πιο εκλεπτυσμένες μορφές και μέσω ενός δημοκρατικού-εξισωτικού λόγου.

Η μελέτη ολοκληρώνεται με δύο παραρτήματα: στο πρώτο συλλέγονται όλες οι επιγραφικές μαρτυρίες περί λατρευτικών συλλόγων στην Αττική ενώ στο δεύτερο καταγράφονται όλα τα άτομα που εμφανίζονται να συμμετέχουν στη σωματειακή ζωή.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

APPENDIX 1

EPIGRAPHICAL TESTIMONIA

The catalogue includes all published documents of private religious associations, arranged alphabetically according to the main publication. Other publications, comments on date and a brief summary are provided in brackets. The dating system of the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* is followed. The list is different in purpose and content from Appendix III in Garland (1987: 228-41) and Mikalson (1998: 145-51). It overlaps in as far as it includes decrees of cult associations.*

1. *AD* 50 (1995) [2000] B1, 35 (*SEG* 48.130) (3B): Found: Kerameikos. Unpublished honorary decree for an *epimeletria* of Agathe Thea.
2. *Ag*. 16, 130 (-) (c. 300 BC): Found: Agora. Decree of an *orgeones*? association in honour of a certain *Mnesarchos*.
3. *Ag*. 16, 161 (*SEG* 21.530; 49.160; *LSCS* 20; *BE* 1944, no. 67; 1950 no. 71) (F3B): Found: Agora. Decree of *orgeones* of Echelos. *Lysias*, son of Periandros of Plotheia was the mover. It orders to list the debtors and to reinscribe older regulations. New rules on sacrifices and shares of meat are introduced.
4. *Ag*. 16, 202 (-) (M3B): Found: Agora. Fragmentary decree mentioning [*era*]*nistai*.
5. *Ag*. 16, 223 (*SEG* 21.532; *BE* 1962, no. 107) (227/6 BC): Found: Agora. Archon: Theophilos. Honorary decree for a certain *Nikomachos*,

---

* Two more fragmentary inscriptions published in *Hesp*. 51 (1982) 43-45 no. 3 (= *SEG* 32.72) and 54-56 no. 11 (= *SEG* 32.113) may belong to a college or a brotherhood. according to the first editor.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

son of Nikon for his and his children's aid to the group. It is not certain that this is a *thiasotai* association.

6. *Ag*. 16, 230 (*Hesp*. 15 (1946) 214 no. 43; Tracy, *ALC*, 44) (c. 229-203 BC): Found: Agora. Fragmentary honorary inscription for a certain *Philistion*, *tamias* of a group of *thiasotai*?
7. *Ag*. 16, 231 (*SEG* 21.533) (c. 215 BC): Found: Agora. An association of *thiasotai* honours a certain *Euaggelos* of Sounion.
8. *Ag*. 16, 235 (*SEG* 17.36; 32.348; 39.195; *BE* 1957, no. 175) (212/11 BC): Found: Agora. Honorary decree of the *orgeones* association of the Mother of the Gods? for a priestess *Hiero*[kleia] who fulfiled her duties in the year of the archon Euandros.
9. *Ag*. 16, 245 (*SEG* 21.531; Tracy, *ALC*, 252) (c. 100 BC): Found: Agora. Dubious fragmentary decree of *orgeones*.
10. *Ag*. 16, 324 (*SEG* 21.535; *BE* 1962, no. 107; Tracy, *ALC*, 201-3) (112/11 BC): Found: Agora. Archon: Dionysios meta Paramonon. Honorary decree of the worshippers of *Megaloi Theoi* for a certain *Eunikos*.
11. *Ag*. 16, 325 (*SEG* 21.536; *BE* 1962, no. 107; Tracy, *ALC*, 201-3) (111/10 BC): Found: Agora. Archon: Sosikrates. Honorary decree of the worshippers of *Megaloi Theoi* for an Alexandrian.
12. *Ag*. 16, 329 (*Ag*. 19 L. 16; *SEG* 19.125; 41. 103; *BE* 1961, no. 264; Behrend 42) (2/1B): Found: Agora. Tentatively restored reference to *orgeones*.
13. *Ag*. 16, 330 (*Hesperia* 3 (1934) 37 no. 25; *BCH* 58 (1934) 93-96) (F1B): Found: Agora. Honorary decree of *thiasotai*?
14. *Ag*. 19 H.84 (Finley 71) (309/8 BC): Found: Agora. *Horos* of land mortgaged to *eranistai* for 700 dr.
15. *Ag*. 19 H.89 (Finley 78A) (350-250 BC): Found: Agora. *Horos* of a house mortgaged to *eranistai* those with *Pythodoros*.
16. *Ag*. 19 H.94 (Finley 31A-B; *SEG* 34.160) (350-250 BC): Found: Agora. *Horos* of house? and land mortgaged to *eranistai* those with *Blepaios* for 1,300 dr.
17. *AJA* 64 (1960) 269 (*BCH* 84 (1960) 655; *BE* 1961, no. 295) (50 BC): Found: Acharnai. Archon: Leukios Rhamnousios the younger. Partly published list of *eranistai*, with officials: *grammateus* Demetrios, *tamias* Kallistratos, *hieropoios* Apollonios, son of Antiochos, *archeranistria* Thaleia, and a priest of Herakles Theodoros, son of Metrodoros of Paiania.
18. *AM* 66 (1941) 228 no. 4 (Lawton 61) (138/7 BC): Found: Athens. Archon: Timarchos. Decree of *orgeones* association of Aphrodite in honour of *Serapion*, son of Poseidonios from Herakleia (Pontika?) for

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

his aid in rebuilding the temple and fulfilment of his duties.

19. *AM* 67 (1942) 31 no. 30 (*BE* 1952, no. 54) (2A): Found: Markopoulo/Keratea (mod). Dedication to a *ktistes eranou* Chrysippos and a *tamias* Eisidotos.

20. Finley 30 (*IG* ii² 2699; Poland A42) (350-250 BC): Found: Spata (mod). *Horos* of house and land mortgaged to the *eranistai* those with *Aristophon* for a talent.

21. Finley 31 (*IG* ii² 2700; Poland A40) (350-250 BC): Found: Attica. *Horos* of house and land mortgaged to the *eranistai* those with *Philon* for 2,000 dr.

22. Finley 32. 8-10 (*IG* ii² 2701; *Syll*³ 1196; Michel 1374; *SEG* 46.770-773; 47.26; Poland A43) (350-250BC): Found: Spata (mod). *Horos* of land and house given as security to *Dekadistai* for 130 dr.

23. Finley 32. 10 (*IG* ii² 2701; *Syll*³ 1196; Michel 1374; *SEG* 46.770- 773; 47.26; Poland A43) (350-250BC): Found: Spata (mod). *Horos* of land and house given as security to the *eranistai* those with *Theopeithes*.

24. Finley 40 (*IG* ii² 2721) (350-250 BC): Found: Eleusis. *Horos* of land mortgaged to *Leochares* designated as *plerotes* and his *suneranistai*.

25. Finley 42 (*IG* ii² 2719; Poland A41) (350-250 BC): Found: Dekeleia (mod). *Horos* of land mortgaged to the *eranistai* those with *Demulos* for 1,200 dr.

26. Finley 43 (*IG* ii² 2720; *SEG* 46.227; Poland A23) (F4B): Found: Athens. *Horos* of land mortgaged to the *thiasotai* those with *Demotes*? for 100 dr.

27. Finley 44 (*IG* ii² 2722) (350-250 BC): Found: ? *Horos* of land? mortgaged to *eranistai*.

28. Finley 70 (*IG* ii² 2743; Poland A39) (350-250 BC): Found: Peiraieus. *Horos* of land mortgaged to the *eranistai* those with *Pantaretos* for 1,800 dr.

29. Finley 112 (*IG* ii² 2763; Michel 1376; Poland A38) (350-250BC): Found: Pikermi (mod). *Horos* of land sold to *eranistai* those with *Kalliteles* for 420 dr.

30. Finley 113 (*IG* ii² 2764; Poland A43A) (350-250BC): Found: Peiraieus. *Horos* of land and house sold to *eranistai* for 3,000 dr.

31. Finley 114 (-) (350-250 BC): Found: Athens. *Horos* of house sold to *eranistai* those with *Timostratos* for 2,000 dr.

32. Finley 114A (*SEG* 42.149; *ZPE* 131 (2000) 101-105) (350-250 BC): Found: Athens. *Horos* of a house mortgaged to *Diotimos* of Melite as pledge for a loan of 500 dr.

33. Finley 163A (-) (350-250 BC): Found: Pikermi (mod). *Horos* of

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

house and of the surrounding land given as security to *eranistai* those with *Mnesitheos* for an *eranos* of a talent.

34. *Hesp.* 16 (1947) 63 no. 1 (*BE* 1948, no. 54) (233/2 BC): Found: Agora. Archon: Antimachos. Fragmentary dedication of *thiasotai*; 9 names survive.
35. *IG* i³ 1016 (*SEG* 47.26 & 33) (F5B): Found: Peiraeus. Fragmentary inscription mentioning a *thiasos* associated with Herakles.
36. *IG* ii² 1249 (Poland A70) (F4B): Found: Athens? Decree of a cult association? of an unknown type. *Epimeletai* are mentioned.
37. *IG* ii² 1252+999 (*Syll*³ 1096; Michel 966; *SEG* 14.82; 26.135 = *BE* 1976, no. 176; *SEG* 39.149; 46.2363; 47.194; 49.159 & 220; *BE* 1956, no. 86; Poland A1c) (S4B): Found: Akropolis (*Amyneion*). Honorary decree for *Kalliades* and *Lysimachides*, sons of Philinos of Peiraeus, for being generous to the *orgeones* of Amynos, Asklepios and Dexion.
38. *IG* ii² 1253 (Michel 967; *SEG* 26.135; 46.2363; 49.159 & 220; *BE* 1956, no. 86; Poland A1d) (S4B): Found: Akropolis *(Amyneion)*. Honorary decree of *orgeones* of Amynos, Asklepios and Dexion for a certain —-*doros* and *Ant*—-.
39. *IG* ii² 1255 (Schwenk 13; *SEG* 35.239; 46.2363; 49.162; Poland A6E) (337/6 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Decree of the *orgeones* of Bendis? honouring *Antiphanes*, son of Antisthenes of Kytherra, *Nausiphilos*, son of Nausinikos of Kephale, and *Aristomenes*, son of Mosch—, *hieropoioi* of the year of the archon Phrynichos for fulfilment of their duties.
40. *IG* ii² 1256 (*Syll*³ 1095; Michel 980; Schwenk 52; Lawton 47; *SEG* 39.324; 45.231; 46.2363; 47.30; 49.162; Poland A3a) (329/8 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Kephisophon. Honorary decree for *Euphyes* and *Dexios*, *epimeletai* of the *orgeones* of Bendis.
41. *IG* ii² 1258 (Michel 974; Schwenk 78; *APMA* 2, 34 no. 169; 3, 144 no. 704; *SEG* 46.2363; 47.26; Baslez (2001); Poland A62a) (324/3 BC): Found: Markopoulo near Oropos (mod). Archon: Hegesias. Honorary decree of *Eikadeis* for *Polyxenos*, son of Diodoros, because he initiated legal action against members for verbal injury and election of three members to assist him.
42. *IG* ii² 1259 (Michel 1548; *SEG* 49.159; Poland A1e) (313/2 BC): Found: Akropolis (*Amyneion*). Archon: Theophrastos. Honorary decree of the *orgeones* of Amynos, Asklepios and Dexion for *Antikles*, son of Memnon, *Kleitophon*, son of Demophilos, *hestiatores*.
43. *IG* ii² 1261A-C (*Syll*³ 1098; Michel 975-78; *APMA* 1, 91 no. 344; *SEG* 16.108; 47.26; Poland A13a-b) (A: 302/1-B: 301/300-C: 300/299 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archons: A. Nikokles. B. Klearchos, C. Hegemachos. Three decrees of a *thiasotai* association (of Aphrodite?) ho-

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

nouring *Stephanos*, son of Mulothros, breast-plate maker, who has been an *epimeletes* and an *hieropoios*.

44. *IG* ii² 1262 (Michel 1550; *SEG* 45.129; 46.165; Poland A14) (301/300 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Klearchos. Honorary decree of the *thiasotai* association of Tynabos for their *epimeletai*, *Drakon* and *Kittos*.

45. *IG* ii² 1263 (Michel 976; *SEG* 45.130; Poland A15) (300/299 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Hegemachos. Decree of *thiasotai* association in honour of *Demetrios*, son of Sosandros of Olynthos, for his duties as *epimeletes*.

46. *IG* ii² 1265 (Poland A32; Tracy, *ADT*, 136) (c. 320-296 BC): Found: Akropolis. Decree of an *eranistai* association honouring a certain *Nikon* and *Agathon*.

47. *IG* ii² 1266 (*SEG* 39.329; 45.119; Wilhelm (1942); Tracy, *ADT*, 132) (c. 322 BC): Found: Athens? It is not an *eranistai* decree as envisaged in *IG* but a tribal decree of Pandionis.

48. *IG* ii² 1271 (Michel 977; *SEG* 47.26; Poland A16) (299/8 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Euktemon. Decree of a *thiasotai* association to honour *Menis*, son of Mnesitheos from Herakleia (Pontika?) for his help in repairing the temple.

49. *IG* ii² 1273A-B (Michel 978; *APMA* 2, 89 no. 239; *SEG* 28.108; 30.96; 39.152 & 310; 40.295; 44.58; 47.26; 49.14; Osborne (1999); Poland A17) (281/80 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: A: Ourios? Two decrees of a *thiasotai* association honoring a certain *Soterichos* from Troezen (Peloponnese) for his help and *Kephalion* from Herakleia (Pontika?) for fulfiling his duties as priest.

50. *IG* ii² 1275 (Michel 1549; *LSCS* 126; *SEG* 21.534) (325-275 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Fragmentary regulation of a *thiasotai* association, including clauses on mutual help, attending members' funerals and adherence to the rules.

51. *IG* ii² 1277 (*Syll*³ 1099; Michel 969; Poland A18) (278/7 BC): Found: Pnyx. Decree of *thiasotai* association in honour of *Eukles*, *Thallos*, *Zenon*, *epimeletai* and *Ktesias*, secretary for repairs and replacement of sacred objects of the year when Demokles was archon.

52. *IG* ii² 1278 (Poland A22C) (272/1 BC): Found: Athens? Archon: Glaukippos. Decree of a *thiasotai*? association honouring several officials.

53. *IG* ii² 1282 (*Syll*³ 1105; Michel 1552; *APMA* 1, 79 no. 362; Poland A71) (262/1 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Antipatros. Decree of a *thiasotai*? association honouring those with *epimeletes Aphrodeisios* for additional building work in the temple of Ammon.

54. *IG* ii² 1283 (Michel 1551; *LSCS* 46; Le Guen 7; *SEG* 24.155; 25.99;

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

29.136; 41.582; 42.1803; 46.1472 & 2371; 49.162; Planeaux (2000-01); Osborne (1999); Poland A3c) (269/68 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon Polystratos. Decree of the *orgeones* association of Bendis regulating the procession from Athens to Peiraeus.

55. *IG* ii² 1284A-B (Osborne (1999); Poland A3d-e) (A: F3B-B: 242-239 BC): Found: Peiraeus? Archon: B: Lykeas. Two honorary decrees of the *orgeones* of Bendis, honouring for benevolence A: *Olympos*, son of Olympiodoros and B: *Eukleides*, son of Antimachos the secretary.

56. *IG* ii² 1289 (*SEG* 13.45; 37.1782bis; *BE* 1944, no. 67; 1953, no. 55; Behrend 41; *Hesp*. 57 (1988) 314; *ZPE* 138 (2002) 123-28; Baslez (2001); Poland A73) (255-235 BC): Found: Athens. Decision of arbitrators on a property dispute of *orgeones*. Selling or hypothecating the property is prohibited, only option to lease it. A certain *Kallistratos* is mentioned.

57. *IG* ii² 1291 (*SEG* 33.1570; 44.255; Poland A33) (S3B): Found: Athens? Honorary decree of *eranistai* association for the treasurer *Aischulion*, son of Theon, *isoteles* and the secretary, for his financial aid.

58. *IG* ii² 1292 (Michel 1553; *HThR* 30 (1937) 188-97; *OpAth* 3 (1960) 51 no.2; *SIRIS* 2; *SEG* 28.365; 49.183; *BE* 1970, no. 260; Poland A34) (215/4 BC): Found: Athens. Archon: Diokles. Honorary decree of *Serapiastai* for their officials, *Nikippe proeranistria*, *Zopyros tamias*, *Theophanes grammateus*.

59. *IG* ii² 1294 (*AJA* 77 (1973) 195-96; *BE* 1973, no. 138; Poland A6C) (M3B): Found: Athens. A fragmentary document where *orgeones* are mentioned in connection to Zeus.

60. *IG* ii² 1297 (Michel 1554; *SEG* 44.255; 47.26, 157, 255; Osborne (1999); Poland A22A) (236/5 BC): Found: Athens. Archon: Kimon. Honorary decree of a *thiasotai* association for *Sophron* the *archeranistes* for his initiative to convene the worshippers and help financially the group. It is followed by a list of names.

61. *IG* ii² 1298 (Michel 970; *SEG* 38.129; 47.26, 157; *APMA* 1, 81 no. 292; Osborne (2000); Poland A19) (248/7 BC): Found: Athens. Archon: Diomedon. Decree of *thiasotai* association honouring the secretary and the treasurer and ordering to inscribe i) the names of the priestesses and other officials who perform their duties, and ii) the names of the new members who have to pay a portion to the fund (*eranos*). A fragmentary list of names survives.

62. *IG* ii² 1301 (*SEG* 47.35; *BE* 1973, no. 147; Poland A21) (220/19 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Menekrates. Honorary decree of a *thiasotai*? association.

63. *IG* ii² 1314 (Michel 981; *SEG* 28.365; 44.255; 47.215; *BE* 1938, no.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

104; 1958, no. 175; Poland A2b) (213/2 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Herakleitos. Honorary decree of the *orgeones* association of the Mother of the Gods for the priestess *Glaukon* on the performance of her duties.

64. *IG* ii² 1315 (Michel 982; *SEG* 28.365; 36.327; 44.255; 48.1040; *BE* 1958, no. 175; Baslez (2001); Poland A2e) (211/10 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Aischron. Honorary decree of the *orgeones* association of the Mother of the Gods, honouring the priestess *Krateia* and her husband? *Hieronymos*, for performing her religious duties.

65. *IG* ii² 1316 (Michel 983; *SEG* 44.58 & 265; 49.14; Poland A2c) (272/1 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Lysitheides. Honorary decree of the *orgeones* association of the Mother of the Gods for the priestess *Zeuxion* and her husband *Agathon* for their benevolence to the group. Interesting feature of the inscription is the use of the word *thiasotai* in the crowns but *orgeones* in the text of the decree.

66. *IG* ii² 1317 (Michel 1557; *SEG* 3.127; 47.237; Osborne (1999); Poland A20) (272/1 BC): Found: Salamis. Archon: Lysitheides. Decree of the *thiasotai* association of Bendis honouring *Nikias* the treasurer, *Stratokles* the secretary, and —-*sias* an *epimeletes*.

67. *IG* ii² 1317b (Michel 1879; *SEG* 44.60; Osborne (1999); Osborne (2000)) (249/8 BC): Found: Salamis. Archon: Hieron. Decree of *thiasotai* association of Bendis, honouring their officials en bloc (*Charinos* treasurer and priest, *Stratokles* secretary, *Nikias*, *Menon*, *Nikarchos*, *epimeletai*). The name of the priest is mentioned in the dating formula.

68. *IG* ii² 1318 (Tracy, *ALC*, 68; Poland A22) (212/11 BC): Found: Athens? Fragmentary decree of a *thiasotai* association honouring officials, possibly *epimeletai*.

69. *IG* ii² 1319 (*SEG* 28.356; 44.255; Poland A22B; Tracy, *ALC*, 44 & 262) (c. 229-203 BC): Found: Athens? Fragmentary decree of an association of *thiasotai* honouring a certain *Kte*[*s*—-]. An *archeranistes* is mentioned at the end of the decree.

70. *IG* ii² 1322 (Michel 1556; Laum, *Stiftungen* II, 20a; Pouilloux, *Rhamnonte*, 145-47; Petrakos, *Rhamnous*, 167; *SEG* 3.128; 33.145; 38.132; 40.139 & 295; 47.26; 49.4; *BE* 1942, no. 50; Tracy, *ALC*, 243) (c. 229 BC): Found: Rhamnous. Decree of *Amphiaraistai* those with *Diokles* i) ordering the raising of funds to repair the sanctuary, and ii) praising *archeranistes Diokles*, secretary *Kalliteles*, son of Kallias of Lamptrai, and treasurer *Archestratos*, son of Archinos of Erchia.

71. *IG* ii² 1323 (*Syll*³ 1103; Michel 971; *SEG* 32.348; Poland A21) (194/3 BC): Found: Athens. Archon: Dionysios. Decree of a *thiasotai* association honouring the treasurer *Theon* and an unnamed secretary.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

72. *IG* ii² 1324 (Michel 1558; *SEG* 49.162; *BE* 1950, no. 94; Poland A3b; Tracy, *ALC*, 110) (c. 190 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Decree of the *orgeones* association of Bendis honouring a certain *Stephanos* for the conduct of the procession and repair of the sanctuary.
73. *IG* ii² 1325 (*Syll*³ 1100; Michel 987; *SEG* 32.348; 47.26; Poland A4a-b) (185/4 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Eupolemos. Decree of *orgeones* association called also *Dionysiastai*, honouring *Dionysios*, son of Agathokles of Marathon. It is preceded by a list of 15 members. The beginning of a second decree survives.
74. *IG* ii² 1326 (*Syll*³ 1101; Michel 986; Laum, *Stiftungen* II, 20; *LSCG* 49; *SEG* 25.160; 47.26; 49.2477; Poland A4c) (176/5 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Ippakos. Decree of *Dionysiastai orgeones* listing the benefactions of the dead *Dionysios*, son of Agathokles of Marathon, ordering the passage of the priesthood for life to his son *Agathokles* and heroizing the deceased.
75. *IG* ii² 1327 (Michel 984; *SEG* 28.365; 32.348; 33.1570; 40.295; 41.86; 49.14; Poland A2d) (178/7 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Philon. Decree of the *orgeones* association of the Mother of the Gods honouring the treasurer *Hermaios*, son of Hermogenes of Paiania. Three *epimeletai* (*Neon* of Cholargos, *Simon* of Poros and *Ergasion*) are mentioned at the bottom at the document.
76. *IG* ii² 1328A-B (Michel 1559; *LSCG* 48; *SEG* 25.159; 32.348; 40.295; 49.14; Tracy, *ALC*, 126; Poland A2g-h) (A: 183/2-B: 175/4 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: A: Hermogenes - B: Sonikos. Two decrees of the *orgeones* association of the Mother of the Gods. The first regulating the decoration during celebrations and for auxiliary religious personnel. The second honours *Metrodora*, a *zakoros* and grants her the privilege to perform these duties for life.
77. *IG* ii² 1329 (*Syll*³ 1102; Michel 985; *SEG* 36.327; *APMA* 1, 101 no. 366; Baslez (2001); Poland A2i) (175/4 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Sonikos. Decree of an *orgeones* association honouring *Chaireas*, son of Dionysios of Athmonon for his benefaction during his secretaryship and his overall attitude.
78. *IG* ii² 1333 (*BE* 1926, p. 265; Tracy, *ALC*, 189) (c. 130-117 BC): Found: Akropolis. Fragmentary honorary? decree of a group. *Epimeletai*, *tamias* and *grammateus* are mentioned and a *grammateus* Dionysios.
79. *IG* ii² 1334 (*APMA* 3, 272 no. 111; Poland A2f) (c. 71/70 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Zenion. Decree of an *orgeones* association honouring *Onaso*, daughter of Theon the priestess for the performance of her duties.
80. *IG* ii² 1335 (Michel 972; *CCIS* ii 51; *SEG* 47.26; Tracy, *ALC*, 244;

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Poland A48a & 72) (101/100 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Medeios. List of 52 *eranistai* set up by a group of *Sabaziastai*, with *hiereus*, secretary, treasurer and *epimeletes*.

81. *IG* ii² 1336 (Poland A58) (2A): Found: Keratea (mod). Fragmentary decree mentioning a *synodos* (*Dionysiakoi technitai*?).

82. *IG* ii² 1337 (Michel 1561; *SEG* 16.111; 47.26; Poland A2k) (97/6 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Herakleitos. Decree of the *orgeones* association of the Syrian Aphrodite honouring *Nikasis*, daughter of Philiskos of Corinth.

83. *IG* ii² 1339 (Michel 1562; *SEG* 42.1803; 47.26; *APMA* 3, 98 no. 465; *REG* 113 (2000) 188-92; Poland A46) (57/6 BC): Found: Akropolis. Archon: Diokles Diokleous. Regulation of *Heroistai* for those who want to participate in sacrifices.

84. *IG* ii² 1343 (*Syll*³ 1104; Michel 973; *SEG* 39.311; 44.255; 45.229; 47.26; 48.20; Poland A47a) (37/6 BC): Found: Athens. Archon: Theopithes. Honorary decree of *Soteriastai* for *Diodoros*, son of Sokrates of Aphidnai, for his benefactions and contribution to the well-being of the group.

85. *IG* ii² 1344 (Poland A56) (c. AD 28/9): Found: Menidi (mod). Archon: Oinophilos? Fragmentary decree of an association mentioning *tamiai* and the hero Amphiaraos.

86. *IG* ii² 1345 (*SEG* 44.255; Poland A49) (AD 53/4): Found: Akropolis. Archon: Dionysodoros. Honorary decree of an *eranistai* association for a certain *Nikias* of Prasiai.

87. *IG* ii² 1351 (Poland A6D) (AD 170): Found: Athens? Archon: Harpalianos. Decision of an *orgeones* association to inscribe the names of members?

88. *IG* ii² 1361 (Michel 979; *LSCG* 45; Le Guen 6; *APMA* 1, 101 no. 359; *SEG* 25.167; 42.1803; 47.26; *BE* 1942, no. 32; Poland A2a; Behrend 37; Tracy, *ADT*, 129) (c. 330-324/3 BC): Found: Peiraeus. Decree of the *orgeones* association of Bendis regulating admissions, sacrifices, funds for repairs and meetings.

89. *IG* ii² 1366 (*Syll*³ 1042; Michel 988; *LSCG* 55; *APMA* 2, 93 no. 255.2; *SEG* 15.116; 28.233; 29.138; 33.149 & 1597; 39.153; 42.195; 47.2340; *BE* 1964, no. 138; Poland A51ab) (1A): Found: Sounio. Sacral law for the cult of Men, where the setting up of an *eranos* is mentioned.

90. *IG* ii² 1368 (*Syll*³ 1109; Michel 1564; *LSCG* 51; *SEG* 17.38; 32.254 & 1570; 34.113 & 269; 35.111; 36.199; 37.141; 38.2011; 41.104 & 1752; 42.124; 43.1215; 44.175; 45.232; 49.483 & 2357; Poland A59) (AD 178): Found: Athens. Archon: Ar. Epaphrodeitos. Decision of

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Iobakchoi on a range of subjects such as admission, discipline, offices, duties of officials.

91. *IG* ii² 1369 (Michel 1563; *LSCG* 53; *SEG* 25.175; 29.139; 31.122; 44.255; 45.2351; Poland A50) (S2A): Found: Liopesi (mod). Archon: Tauriskos. A law (*nomos*) of *eranistai* regulating admission and disciplinary matters.
92. *IG* ii² 1553 col. I, 8-10 (*SEG* 46.180; 48.151 & 2116bis; 49.22; *BE* 1946/47, no. 87a; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): A Rhamnousian with a *koinon eraniston* is mentioned.
93. *IG* ii² 1553 col. I, 20-23 (*SEG* 46.180; 48.151 & 2116bis; 49.22; *BE* 1946/47, no. 87a; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): *Synete* who lives in Keiriadai, avoided *Nikodemos* of Leukonea and *koinon eraniston*.
94. *IG* ii² 1556 B, 27 (*SEG* 46.180; 48.151 & 2116bis; 49.22; *BE* 1946/47, no. 87a; 1960, no. 137; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): A *koinon eraniston* is mentioneed.
95. *IG* ii² 1557 B, 106 (*SEG* 46.180; 48.151 & 2116bis; 49.22; *BE* 1946/47, no. 87a; 1960, no. 137; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): A *koinon eraniston* is mentioned.
96. *IG* ii² 1558 A, 37-43 (*SEG* 18.36; 46.180; 48.151 & 2116bis; 49.22; *BE* 1946/47, no. 87a; 1960, no. 137; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): *Nikias*, a frankincense dealer, living in Peiraeus avoided *Philokrates*, son of Epikrates of Eleusis and the *koinon eraniston* with *Theophrastos*, son of Bathyllos of Cholargos.
97. *IG* ii² 1559 A col. II, 26-31 (*SEG* 18.36; 46.180; 48.151 & 2116bis; 49.22; *BE* 1946/47, no. 87a; 1960, no. 137; 1971, no. 250; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): *Bion*, a gem engraver, living in Melite avoided *Chairippos*, son of Chairedemos of Alai and the *koinon eraniston* those with Chairippos.
98. *IG* ii² 1566 A, 27-29 (*SEG* 46.180; 48.151 & 2116bis; 49.22; *BE* 1946/47, no. 87a; 1960, no. 137; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): A [*koinon era*]*niston* is mentioned.
99. *IG* ii² 1568 B, 18-20 (*SEG* 46.180; 48.151 & 2116bis; 49.22; *BE* 1946/47, no. 87a; 1960, no. 137; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): A *koinon eraniston* is mentioned.
100. *IG* ii² 1568 B, 21-23 (*SEG* 46.180; 48.151 & 2116bis; 49.22; *BE* 1946/47, no. 87a; 1960, no. 137; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): A *koinon eraniston* is mentioned.
101. *IG* ii² 1569 A col. III, 18-21 (*SEG* 46.180; 48.151 & 2116bis; 49.22; *BE* 1946/47, no. 87a; 1960, no. 137; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): A *koinon eraniston* is mentioned.
102. *IG* ii² 1570, 25-26 (*SEG* 46.180; 47.237; 48.151 & 2116bis; 49.22; *BE*

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

1946/47, no. 87a; 1960, no. 137; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): A *koi*[*non eraniston*?] is mentioned.

103. *IG* ii² 1570, 57-59 (*SEG* 46.180; 47.237; 48.151 & 2116bis; 49.22; *BE* 1946/47, no. 87a; 1960, no. 137; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): A *koi*(*non*) *era*[*niston*] is mentioned.

104. *IG* ii² 1570, 60-62 (*SEG* 46.180; 47.237; 48.151 & 2116bis; 49.22; *BE* 1946/47, no. 87a; 1960, no. 137; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): A [*koi*(*non*) *er*]*ani*[*ston*] is restored.

105. *IG* ii² 1570, 82-84 (*SEG* 46.180; 47.237; 48.151 & 2116bis; 49.22; *BE* 1946/47, no. 87a; 1960, no. 137; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): *Glaukias* living in Hephaistiadai avoided *Euthudemos* son of Euthu— and a *koinon eraniston*.

106. *IG* ii² 1571, 8-10 (*SEG* 46.180; 48.151 & 2116bis; 49.22; *BE* 1946/47, no. 87a; 1960, no. 137; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): A freedman living in Melite avoided a certain —*stratos*, son of Sosistratos of Oa and a *koinon eraniston*.

107. *IG* ii² 1571, 11-14 (*SEG* 46.180; 48.151 & 2116bis; 49.22; *BE* 1946/47, no. 87a; 1960, no. 137; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): [*koinon eraniston*] is restored.

108. *IG* ii² 1572, 8-11 (*SEG* 46.180; 48.151 & 2116bis; 49.22; *BE* 1946/47, no. 87a; 1960, no. 137; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): A *ko*[*inon eranist*]*on* is mentioned.

109. *IG* ii² 1583 (*SEG* 13.46; 28.125; 36.209; 41.100; *Ag.* 19 P. 14; Tracy, *ADT*, 107) (c. 330 BC): An *eranistai* association is mentioned in *tabula poletarum*.

110. *IG* ii² 1596 (*SEG* 48.152; *ZPE* 125 (1999) 93-130; Poland A62c) (c. 340-320 BC) Found: Athens. *Eikadeis* are mentioned in a *tabula centesimarum*.

111. *IG* ii² 1599 (*SEG* 21.574; 40.151ter; 47.174; 48.152; Poland A6A; Tracy, *ADT*, 159) (c. 340-320 BC): *Orgeones* association is mentioned in a *tabula centesimarum*.

112. *IG* ii² 2343 (Michel 1547; *SEG* 33.161; 35.131 & 137; 39.192; 42.143; 47.26; Poland A11) (F4B): Found: Athens. A cult table where the names of 12 members of a *koinon thiasoton* with the priest of Herakles *Simon* of Kydathenai are inscribed. Possible connection with Is. ix 30.

113. *IG* ii² 2345 (*SEG* 21.632; 39.204; 40.171; 44.251; 47.33, 55, 156, 165, 187-89, 211, 273; 49.188; Poland A10) (F4B): Found: Athens. A list of names organized in 6 groups headed by an individual's name and the word *thiasos*.

114. *IG* ii² 2346 (-) (F3B): Found: Athens? Catalogue of *thiasotai*?

115. *IG* ii² 2347 (Michel 989; *SEG* 47.188; Poland A12) (S4B): Found:

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Salamis. A dedication of *thiasotai* association with names in crowns.

116. *IG* ii² 2348 (-) (S4B): Found: Athens. Catalogue of *thiasotai*?
117. *IG* ii² 2349 (-) (4B): Found: Athens. Catalogue of *thiasotai*?
118. *IG* ii² 2351 (-) (F3B): Found: Peiraeus. Catalogue of *thiasotai*?
119. *IG* ii² 2352 (-) (F3B): Found: Athens. Catalogue of *thiasotai*?
120. *IG* ii² 2353 (Poland A53b; Tracy, *ALC*, 44 & 262) (c. 215 BC): Found: Akropolis. Catalogue of 11 *Asklepiastai*? all citizens.
121. *IG* ii² 2354 (*SEG* 47.26; Poland A35; Tracy, *ALC*, 246) (S2B): Found: Akropolis. List of 23 names of an *eranistai* association.
122. *IG* ii² 2355 (Michel 1004; *SEG* 47.26; *APMA* 2, 33 no. 162; Poland A5) (S3B): Found: Keratea (mod). List of *orgeones* of Asklepios, all from the deme of Prospalta.
123. *IG* ii² 2356 (-) (3B): Found: ? Catalogue of *thiasotai*?
124. *IG* ii² 2358 (Michel 1560; *SEG* 44.255; 47.26; Poland A45) (M2B): Found: Chalandri (mod). List of members of an association with an *archeranistes* and a priest.
125. *IG* ii² 2359 (Poland A74; Tracy, *ALC*, 246) (c. 100 BC): Found: Kerameikos. Catalogue of *thiasotai*?
126. *IG* ii² 2361 (*Syll*³ 1111; *BE* 1961, no. 264; Poland A7) (AD 200-211): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Cl. Phocas Marathonios. List of *orgeones* of Belela and a list of priestesses.
127. *IG* ii² 2481 (*SEG* 28.225; 32.220; 39.194; *BE* 1946/47, no 102) (2A): Found: Athens. List of *Paianistai*.
128. *IG* ii² 2499 (*Syll*³ 1097; Michel 1356; *LSCG* 47; Le Guen 8; *SEG* 34.1739; 42.1803; *SEG* 49.2401 και 2490; *BE* 1989, no. 261; Behrend 39; Austin (1981: no. 130); Poland A1A) (306/5 BC): Found: Athens. Archon: Koroibos. Lease of the temple of Egretes by the *orgeones* association, for 10 years. Rent: 200 dr. per year.
129. *IG* ii² 2501 (*BE* 1938, no. 92; 1944, no. 67; Behrend 40; Poland A6) (S4B): Found: Athens. Life long lease of the temple of Hypodektes by the *orgeones* association. Rent: 50 dr. per year.
130. *IG* ii² 2935 (Michel 1603; *SEG* 47.26; Poland A29) (324/3 BC): Found: Akropolis. Archon: Hegesias. Dedication of *eranistai* to Zeus Philios.
131. *IG* ii² 2936 (Poland A25) (S4B): Found: Akropolis. Dedication of *thiasotai* followed by 5 names.
132. *IG* ii² 2939 (*IG* ii² 4339; Michel 1597; *SEG* 47.26; Poland A24) (4B): Found: Athens. Dedication of a certain *Bakchios* to Athena Ergane, on the occasion of being crowned by a group of *thiasotai*.
133. *IG* ii² 2940 (*SEG* 29.162 & 163; 42.152; 47.26; *BE* 1952, no. 54; Poland A30) (S2B): Found: Laurion. Dedication of *eranistai* followed by a list of 11 names.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

134. *IG* ii² 2942 & 9132 (Michel 1708; Poland A51b & 52) (345 BC): Found: Akropolis. *Artemisiastai* honour a certain *Mousaios* from Cyrene.
135. *IG* ii² 2943 (*SEG* 47.2342; *BE* 1969, no. 369; Poland A75) (3B): Found: Peiraeus. Dedication of *thiasotai* honouring *Nikon*, son of Nikophon and *Hermogenes*, son of Hermaphilos.
136. *IG* ii² 2947 (*BE* 1950, no. 71; Poland A6B; Tracy, *ALC*, 70) (c. 212 BC): Found: Athens. *Orgeones* honour *Asklapon*, son of Asklapon from Maroneia.
137. *IG* ii² 2948 (Michel 1637; *SEG* 38.173; Poland A4d; Tracy, *ALC*, 110) (c. 190 BC): Found: Peiraeus. A poem with invocation of Dionysus. More likely to be connected with *IG* ii² 1325-36 and the *orgeones Dionysiastai*.
138. *IG* ii² 2960 (Poland A53C) (2B): Found: Acharnai (mod). In a group of *Asklepiastai*, the *archeranistes Antiochos*, son of Menandros is honoured by his parents.
139. *IG* ii² 2963 (*Syll*³ 1100; *BE* 1938, no. 98; Poland A54) (AD 212/3): Found: Peiraeus. Archon: Dionysios, son of Dionysios of Acharnai. Mention of *Paianistai* Mounichiou Asklepiou.
140. *IG* ii² 4013 (Poland A27) (Imp.): Found: anc. Lamptrai. *Thiasotai* honouring *Epigenes*.
141. *IG* ii² 4707 (Poland A57) (1B): Found: Athens. Dedication to Zeus Naios and the *synodos* by *Melpon*, son of Kallixenos of Probalinthos.
142. *IG* ii² 4817 (*SEG* 41.340; 45.2351; *BE* 1948, no. 64; Poland A60) (2A): Found: Kalyvia (mod.). List of officers and members of *oi peri ton eponumon Aristoboulon*.
143. *IG* ii² 4985 (Michel 1570; *SEG* 46.2292; Poland A26) (3B): Found: Athens? Dedication of a *thiasos* to *Homonoia*.
144. *IG* ii² 10248 (Michel 1851; Poland A44) (3B): Found: Athens? Dedication to a certain *Artemidoros* of Seleukeia by a group of *eranistai*.
145. *IG* ii² 13173 (Peek, *GVI* 1982; Poland A28). (3A): Found: Spata (mod.). Fragmentary epigram mentioning *thiasous*.
146. *Kerameikos* 3, no. 6 (Tracy, *ALC*, 187-91) (c. 130/29-117/6 BC): Found: Kerameikos. Honorary decree of a *synodos* for an Anthedonian, moved by *Argeios*, son of Asklapion.
147. Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59 (*SEG* 49.61; *BE* 2001, no. 497) (after 216/5 BC): Found: Rhamnous. Honorary decree of a *koinon Sarapiaston* for *Apollodoros*, son of Sogenes of Otryne.
148. Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203 (*SEG* 40.161; 43.59; 49.4; *BE* 1995, no. 253) (41/40 BC): Found: Rhamnous. Archon: Nikandros. List of at least 12 *eranistai*. An *archeranistes Kephisodotos* is mentioned.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

149. *SEG* 2.9 (*AE* 1915, 1-4; *Athena* 30 (1918) 376 ff; Michel 1880; *SEG* 44.60; 47.237; Osborne (1999); Osborne (2000); Osborne (2003a); Osborne (2003b)) (245/4 BC): Found: Salamis. Archon: Kudenor. Decree of *thiasotai* of Bendis honouring officials and ordering a committee (*Batrachos*, *Krates*, *Dokimos*) to inscribe their names.
150. *SEG* 2.10 (Michel 1881; *SEG* 44.60; Osborne (1999); Osborne (2000)) (251/0 BC): Found: Salamis. Archon: Thersilochos. Honorary decree for *epimeletai* (*Rhythmos*, *Onesimos*, *Ophelion*) of the Bendis *thiasotai* association for dutiful term in office.
151. *SEG* 12.100, 30-35 (*NChoix* 26; *Ag*. 19 P. 5; *SEG* 13.46; 28.118; 31.128; 37.110 & 1782; 40.151bis; 41.100; 46.202, 770-73; 48.145) (367/6 BC): Found. Agora. Claim of the *orgeones* association those with *Aischines* of Melite on the property of *Theosebes*, whose property was confiscated and sold.
152. *SEG* 18.33 (*IG* ii² 1293; *BE* 1960, no. 132; Poland A53a) (212/11-174/3 BC): Found: Asklepieion. Honorary decree for *Alkibiades* of Thorikos issued by a group of *Asklepiastai* for his benefactions to the group.
153. *SEG* 18.36 (*SEG* 49.2468 bis; Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): A *Lysichares* and a *koinon eraniston* is mentioned.
154. *SEG* 21.528 (*IG* ii² 1242; *LSCS* 125; Lambert (1993: 294-98)) (4/3B): Found: anc. Dekeleia. Tentative restoration of *orgeones* in ll.8-9.
155. *SEG* 21.633 (Tracy, *ALC*, 255; *BE* 1964, no. 117) (F2B): Found: Agora. A dedication of an association of *eranistai* to a hero. List of 10 names survives.
156. *SEG* 21.776 (*SEG* 39.229; *BE* 1962, no. 107) (1A) Found: Athens. Dedication to Asklepios and Hygeia by *thera*[*peutai*].
157. *SEG* 22.122 (*IG* ii² 1246; *BE* 1966, no. 146) (after 316/5 BC): Found: anc. Bate. Fragmentary decree of an *orgeones* association inscribed on a cultic table.
158. *SEG* 22.123 (*IG* ii² 1246; *BE* 1966, no. 146) (3B): Found: anc. Bate. On the same cult table as above, a fragmentary decree probably issued by the same *orgeones* association.
159. *SEG* 24.156 (*SEG* 32.149 & 348; *BE* 1970, nos 260-61; Osborne (1999)) (237/6 BC): Found: Eleusis. Honorary decree for a certain *Paidikos*, who helped in various ways a *thiasotai* association in the archonship of Aristion, followed by a list of names.
160. *SEG* 24.203 (*NChoix* 27; Pleket 43; Schwenk 32; *SEG* 35.239; *BE* 1950, no. 72a; Behrend 38) (333/2 BC): Found: Athens. Lease of a garden belonging to the *orgeones* those with *Charops* of Phaleron (of the hero-doctor?) to *Thrasyboulos* of Alopeke for 30 years. Rent: 20 dr.
161. *SEG* 24.223 (*BE* 1969, no. 211) (4B): Found: Mauraki, nr Eleusis.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Dedication of *thiasotai* association made when priest was a certain *Antiphanes* followed by a fragmentary list of names.

162. *SEG* 25.178. 5-10 (Tracy, *ADT*, 79) (c. 340-320 BC): A [*koin*]*on era-ni*[*ston*] is mentioned.
163. *SEG* 31.122 (*SEG* 36.198; 39.311; 48.2171) (AD 121/22): Found: Liopesi (mod). Archon: T. Fl. Konon. Regulation of *Herakliastai* of Limnai concerning the use of a fund, disciplinary matters, admittance and officials. *Archeranistes*, *Markos Aimilios Eucharistos* of Paiania.
164. *SEG* 32.232 (-) (Imp): Found: Hiera Odos. Boundary stone of the temple of *Paianistai*.
165. *SEG* 32.236 (*SEG* 40.175) (350-250 BC): Found: Soureza (mod). *Horoi* for a workshop and slaves given as security to *eranistai*.
166. *SEG* 32.244 (*SEG* 47.26; *BE* 1982, no. 167) (c. 330-325 BC): Found: anc. Ikarion. Mention of a group *Hebdomaistai*.
167. *SEG* 36.228 (*SEG* 47.26) (159/8 BC): Found: ? Archon: Aristaichmos. List of 13 members (citizens and foreigners) admitted to the *synodos* of Herakles, whose priest was *Sosandros*, son of Philinos of Kydathenai.
168. *SEG* 37.103 (*SEG* 44.255) (52/1 BC): Found: Marousi (mod). Archon: Lysandros. Mention of an *archeranistes*.
169. *SEG* 41.82 (-) (300-280 BC): Found: Athens. Unpublished decree of the *eranistai* association of Herakles Pankrates.
170. *SEG* 41.83 (-) (280 BC): Found: Athens. Unpublished decree of the *thiasotai* association of Herakles Pankrates, mentioning a secretary and a treasurer.
171. *SEG* 41.84 (-) (?): Found: Athens. Unpublished decree of the *orge-ones* association of Herakles Pankrates, with a list of names, citizens from Phlyous and Probalinthos.
172. *SEG* 41.127 (*SEG* 43.55; 49.4 (= Petrakos, *Rhamnous*, 188); *BE* 1997, no. 222) (4B): Found: Rhamnous. *Horos* of a house sold to the *eranistai* those with *Xenopeithes*.
173. *SEG* 41.171 (-) (300/299 BC): Found: Athens. Archon: Hegemachos. Dedication of a stele to Herakles Pankrates by officials (*Konon* of Herakleia secretary, *Mus* treasurer, *Dionysodoros* of Miletos, *Eunostos* of Thebes, *Demophilos* of Herakleia, *Dionusios epimeletai*) of an *eranistai* association.
174. *SEG* 44.60 (Osborne (1999); Osborne (2003a); (2003b)) (241/0 BC): Found: Salamis. Archon: Lysiades. Honorary decree of the *thiasotai* association of Bendis for the officers of the group, for sacrificing according to the custom and administrating the association's affairs according to the ordinances.
175. *SEG* 48.173 (-) (350-250 BC): Found: Agrileza (mod). *Horos* of property given as security to *eranistai*.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ
ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

APPENDIX 2

ATHENIAN CULT ASSOCIATIONS: A PROSOPOGRAPHY

I have followed abbreviations and the dating system of *LGPN*. For individuals without an *LGPN* reference I used the information provided in *FRA*. I have included anyone whose name is restored with some degree of confidence. Addenda in *LGPN* ii are available on line in the following address: www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk/online/downloads/v2addenda/v2addk.html

1. Ἀγαθαῖος Ἀγαθάρχου Προσπάλτιος [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2355 (S3B)
2. Ἀγάθαρχος Ἀμειψίου Προσπάλτιος [*LGPN* ii (21)] — *IG* II² 2355 (S3B)
3. Ἀγαθοκλῆς [*LGPN* ii (161)] — *IG* II² 2348 (S4B)
4. Ἀγαθοκλῆς [*LGPN* ii (164)] — *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 63 no. 1 (233 BC)
5. Ἀγαθοκλῆς δημόσιος [*FRA* 7400] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
6. Ἀγαθοκλῆς Ἐπιεικίδης [*LGPN* ii (56)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
7. Ἀγαθοκλῆς Χολαργεύς [*LGPN* ii (47)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
8. Ἀγαθοκλῆς Διονυσίου Μαραθώνιος [*LGPN* ii (84)] — *IG* II² 1325 (185 BC), 1326 (176 BC)
9. Ἀγάθων [*LGPN* ii (71)] — *IG* II² 2348 (S4B)
10. Ἀγάθων [*LGPN* ii (74)] — *IG* II² 1265 (c. 320-296 BC)
11. Ἀγάθων [*LGPN* ii (77)] — *IG* II² 2351 (F3B)
12. Ἀγάθων [*LGPN* ii (81)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
13. Ἀγάθων [*LGPN* ii (82)] — *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 63 no. 1, 7 (233 BC)
14. Ἀγάθων [*LGPN* ii (83)] — *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 63 no. 1, 8 (233 BC)
15. Ἀγάθων Ἀγαθοκλέους Φλυεύς [*LGPN* ii (44)] — *IG* II² 1316 (272 BC)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

16. Ἀγήσανδρος Φίλωνος Δαιδα(λιδῶν) [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
17. Ἀγνή Νίκωνος Μαραθωνία [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2960 (2B)
18. Ἀθηνόδοτος Οἰναῖος πρεσβ. [*LGPN* ii (5)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
19. Ἀθηνόδοτος Οἰναῖος νεώτ. [*LGPN* ii (6)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
20. Ἀθηνόδωρος [*LGPN* ii (152)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
21. Αἰθέριον [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
22. Αἰνήσιον [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
23. Αἰσχίνης Μελιτεύς [*LGPN* ii (59)] — *SEG* 12.100 (367 BC)
24. Αἰσχυλίων Θέωνος ἰσοτελής [*LGPN* ii (5)] — *IG* II² 1291 (S3B)
25. Αἰσχύλος Διφιλίδου Προσπάλτιος [*LGPN* ii (41)] — *IG* II² 2355 (S3B)
26. Ἀλεξικράτης Ἀναφλύστιος [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
27. Ἀλεξίων [*LGPN* ii (17)] — *IG* II² 2358 (150BC)
28. Ἀλκιβιάδης Ἡρακλείτου Θορίκιος [*LGPN* ii (26)] — *SEG* 18.33 (212 BC)
29. Ἀμεινίας Ἀμειψίου Προσπάλτιος [*LGPN* ii (38)] — *IG* II² 2355 (S3B)
30. Ἀμμία [*LGPN* ii (8)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
31. Ἀμφίστρατος [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *SEG* 21.633 (F2B)
32. Ἀμμωνία [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
33. Ἀνδρίσκος [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *SEG* 24.223, 6 (4/3B)
34. Ἀνδρίσκος [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *SEG* 24.223, 8 (4/3B)
35. Ἄνδρων Σωσάνδρου Ἀμαξαντεύς [*LGPN* ii (14)] — *IG* II² 1325 (185 BC)
36. Ἀνθεμίων Αἰσχύλου Προσπάλτιος [*LGPN* ii (23)] — *IG* II² 2355 (S3B)
37. Ἀντιγενίδης Λαμπτρεύς [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *Ag.* 16, 235 (212 BC)
38. Ἀντίγονος [*LGPN* ii (38)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
39. Ἀντικλῆς Μέμνονος [*LGPN* ii (26)] — *IG* II² 1259 (313 BC)
40. Ἀντίμαχος Παυσανίου Οἰναῖος [*LGPN* ii (53)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
41. Ἀντιοχίς [*LGPN* ii (8)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
42. Ἀντίοχος Μενάνδρου Μελιτεύς [*LGPN* ii (58)] — *IG* II² 2960 (2A)
43. Ἀντιφάνης [*LGPN* ii (21)] — *SEG* 24.223 (4/3B)
44. Ἀντιφάνης ἐξ Οἴου [*LGPN* ii (64)] — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59 (after 216/5 BC)
45. Ἀντιφάνης Ἀντισθένους Κυθήρριος [*LGPN* ii (52)] — *IG* II² 1255 (337 BC)
46. Ἀντιφῶν [*LGPN* ii (79)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
47. Ἀπελλῆς Κολωνῆθεν [*LGPN* ii (24)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
48. Ἀπολλόδωρος [*LGPN* ii (236)] — *SEG* 24.223 (4/3B)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

49. Ἀπολλόδωρος Τρικορύσιος [*LGPN* ii (211)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
50. Ἀπολλόδωρος Ἀπολλωνίου Λαμπτρεύς [*LGPN* ii (134)] — *IG* II² 1325 (185 BC)
51. Ἀπολλωνία [*LGPN* ii (22)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
52. Ἀπολλωνία Ζωσίμου ἐκ Βησαίων [*LGPN* ii (9)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
53. Ἀπολλωνίδης [*LGPN* ii (58)] — *SEG* 24.223 (4/3B)
54. Ἀπολλωνίδης [*LGPN* ii Add (3)] — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203 (41 BC)
55. Ἀπολλώνιος [*LGPN* ii (514)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
56. Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀντιόχου [*LGPN* ii Add (4)] — *AJA* 64 (1960) 26 (58 BC)
57. Ἀπολλωνίς [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
58. Ἀργεῖος Ἀσκλαπίωνος [*LGPN* ii (6)] — *Kerameikos* 3, no. 6 (c. 130/29-117/6 BC)
59. Ἀρέσκουσα Κίττου ἐξ Αἰθαλιδῶν [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
60. Ἀρέτη [*LGPN* ii (7)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
61. Ἀριστόβουλος — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203, 19 (41 BC)
62. Ἀριστόβουλος [*LGPN* ii (80)] — *IG* II² 4817 & *AM* 62 (1937) 9 no. 9 (2/3A)
63. Ἀριστόδημος Διονυσίου [*LGPN* ii (16)] — *IG* II² 1282 (262 BC)
64. Ἀριστοδίκη [*LGPN* ii (7)] — *IG* II² 1328 (176 BC)
65. Ἀριστομάχη [*LGPN* ii (44)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
66. Ἀριστόνικος Ὀῆθεν [*LGPN* ii (20)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
67. Ἄριστος [*LGPN* ii (9)] — *SEG* 21.633 (F2B)
68. Ἀριστοτέλης [*LGPN* ii (69)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
69. Ἀριστοτέλης Παιανιεύς [*LGPN* ii (40)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
70. Ἀριστοφῶν Εἰρεσίδου [*LGPN* ii (21)] — Finley 30 (350-200 BC)
71. Ἀριστώ [*LGPN* ii (10)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
72. Ἀρίστων Χολαργεύς [*LGPN* ii (63)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
73. Ἄροπος Σελεύκου [*LGPN* ii (12)] — *IG* II² 1339 (57 BC)
74. Ἀρσάκης [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
75. Ἀρτεμιδώρα [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
76. Ἀρτεμίδωρος [*LGPN* ii (85)] — *SEG* 24.156 (238 BC)
77. Ἀρτεμίδωρος [*LGPN* ii (90)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
78. Ἀρτεμίδωρος Σελευκεύς [*FRA* 6608] — *IG* II² 10248 (3B)
79. Ἀρτεμισία [*LGPN* ii (20)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
80. Ἀρτέμων [*LGPN* ii (129)] — *SEG* 2.9 (245/4 BC)
81. Ἀρτέμων [*LGPN* ii (118)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
82. Ἀρτέμων [*LGPN* ii (120)] — *SEG* 21.633 (F2B)
83. Ἀρτέμων Λαοδικεύς [*FRA* 3232] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

84. Ἀρχέβιος Ἀναγυράσιος [*LGPN* ii (6)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
85. Ἀρχέπολις [*LGPN* ii (8)] — *SEG* 2.9 (245/4 BC)
86. Ἀρχέστρατος [*LGPN* ii (85)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
87. Ἀρχέστρατος Αἰσχίνου Ἐρχιεύς [*LGPN* ii (48)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
88. Ἀρχέτιμος [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *SEG* 24.223 (4/3B)
89. Ἀσκλάπων Ἀσκλάπωνος Μαρωνίτης [*FRA* 3533] — *IG* II² 2947 (c. 212 BC)
90. Ἀσκληπιάδης [*LGPN* ii (301)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
91. Ἀσκληπιάδης Θεοδότου — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203, 24 (41 BC)
92. Ἀσκληπιάς [*LGPN* ii (11)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
93. Ἀσφαλίων [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *SEG* 24.223 (4/3B)
94. Ἄττας [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *SEG* 36.228 (159/8 BC)
95. Ἄττις [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *SEG* 24.156 (238 BC)
96. Αὐτοκλῆς Ἀγαθαίου Προσπάλτιος [*LGPN* ii (38)] — *IG* II² 2355 (S3B)
97. Ἀφθόνητος Ἀφθονήτου Ῥαμνούσιος — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59 (after 216/5 BC)
98. Ἀφροδισία [*LGPN* ii (23)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
99. Ἀφροδίσιος [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 1282 (262 BC)

100. Βακχίδης [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
101. Βάκχιος [*LGPN* ii (51)] — *IG* II² 2939 (S4B)
102. Βάκχιος Μιλήσιος [*FRA* 4092] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
103. Βάκχις Εὐτυχίδου [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
104. Βάτραχος [*LGPN* ii (12)] — *SEG* 2.9 (245/4 BC); 44.60 (241/0 BC)
105. Βιθυς [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
106. Βίοττος [*LGPN* ii (15)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
107. Βίων Φρεάρριος — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59 (after 216/5 BC)
108. Βλεπαῖος [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *Ag.* 19 H.94 (350-200 BC)
109. Βότρυς [*LGPN* ii (7)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)

110. Γλαυκίας [*LGPN* ii (37)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
111. Γλαυκίας Ἀντιοχεύς [*FRA* 671] — *SEG* 36.228 (159/8 BC)
112. Γλαῦκον [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1314 (213 BC)
113. Γλαῦκος [*LGPN* ii (66)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
114. Γλυκέρα Ἀθήναιου ἐκ Λαμπτρέων [*LGPN* ii (11)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
115. Γλύκη Ἑρμέρωτος ἐκ Γαργηττίων [*LGPN* ii (6)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
116. Γνάθις [*LGPN* ii (5)] — *Ag.* 16, 223 (227 BC)

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

111. Γνώμη [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)

112. Δαμιανός Δαμᾶ Ἀχαρνεύς [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
113. Δάμων [*LGPN* ii (24)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
114. Δᾶος [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *SEG* 24.223 (4/3B)
115. Δᾶος [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *SEG* 24.156 (238 BC)
116. Δᾶος [*LGPN* ii (5)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
117. Δεινίας Διφιλίδου Προσπάλτιος [*LGPN* ii (49)] — *IG* II² 2355 (S3B)
118. Δεξίθεος Κριτοφάντου Προσπάλτιος [*LGPN* ii (13)] — *IG* II² 2355 (S3B)
125. Δέξιος [*LGPN* ii (6)] — *IG* II² 1256 (329 BC)
126. Δημητρία (Μεσσία) Κογνίτου ἐκ Πρασιέων [*LGPN* ii (11)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
127. Δημήτριος [*LGPN* ii (667)] — *IG* II² 2351 (F3B)
128. Δημήτριος [*LGPN* ii (732)] — *SEG* 2.9 (245/4 BC)
129. Δημήτριος [*LGPN* ii (670)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
130. Δημήτριος [*LGPN* ii (669)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
131. Δημήτριος [*LGPN* ii Add (11)] — *AJA* 64 (1960) 269 (58 BC)
132. Δημήτριος [*LGPN* ii Add (1)] — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203 (41 BC)
133. Δημήτριος ἰσοτελής — *SEG* 41.247 (4/3B)
134. Δημήτριος Ἁλωπεκῆθεν [*LGPN* ii (160)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
135. Δημήτριος Ἁμαξαντεύς [*LGPN* ii (290)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
136. Δημήτριος Παιανιεύς [*LGPN* ii (412)] — *SEG* 36.228 (159/8 BC)
137. Δημήτριος Ἀρτεμιδώρου Λαμπτρεύς [*LGPN* ii (341)] — *IG* II² 1343 (37 BC)
138. Δημήτριος Ἀντιοχεύς [*FRA* 684]—- *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
139. Δημήτριος Ὀλύνθιος [*FRA* 5889; Tataki, *Macedonians*, 133 no. 32] — *IG* II² 1263 (300 BC)
140. Δημόκλεια [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
141. Δημοκλῆς Εὐπυρίδης [*LGPN* ii (31)] — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59 (after 216/5 BC)
142. Δημοκράτης [*LGPN* ii (10)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
143. Δημόκριτος [*LGPN* ii (18)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
144. Δημότης — Finley 43 & *ZPE* 110 (1996) 77-83 (350-200 BC)
145. Δημόφιλος Ἡρακλεώτης [*FRA* 1850] — *SEG* 41.171 (300 BC)
146. Δημύλος Λαμπτρεύς [*LGPN* ii (4)] — Finley 42 (350-200 BC)
147. Διογένης Ἀμφιτροπῆθεν [*LGPN* ii (56)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
148. Διογένης Μακεδών [*FRA* 3470; Tataki, *Macedonians*, 298 no. 54] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
149. Διοδότη [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 2358, 39 (150 BC)
150. Διοδότη [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *IG* II² 2358, 57 (150 BC)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

151. Διόδοτος [*LGPN* ii (85)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
152. Διόδοτος Ἁλιμούσιος [*LGPN* ii (36) — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
153. Διοδώρα [*LGPN* ii (9)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
154. Διόδωρος Σουνι(εύς) [*LGPN* ii (155)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
155. Διόδωρος Σωκράτους Ἀφιδναῖος [*LGPN* ii (59)] — *IG* II² 1343 (37 BC)
156. Διοκλῆς [*LGPN* ii (223)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
157. Διοκλῆς Κολωνῆθεν [*LGPN* ii (118)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
158. Διοκλῆς Δίωνος Ἀμαξαντεύς [*LGPN* ii (106)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
159. Διονυσία [*LGPN* ii (27)] — *IG* II² 2358, 37 (150 BC)
160. Διονυσία [*LGPN* ii (28)] — *IG* II² 2358, 38 (150 BC)
161. Διονυσία Ἄμμω [*LGPN* ii (29)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
162. Διονύσιος — *SEG* 41.171 (300 BC)
163. Διονύσιος [*LGPN* ii (915)] — *IG* II² 1291 (M3B)
164. Διονύσιος [*LGPN* ii (918)] — *SEG* 24.156 (238 BC)
165. Διονύσιος [*LGPN* ii (919)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
166. Διονύσιος [*LGPN* ii (142)] — *IG* II² 1368 (AD 175/6)
167. Διονύσιος [*LGPN* ii (981)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
168. Διονύσιος Τ— [*LGPN* ii (917)] — *IG* II² 1298, 7, 24 (248/7 BC)
169. Διονύσιος Εὐπυρίδης [*LGPN* ii (333, 334) — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
170. Διονύσιος Ἑρμεῖος [*LGPN* ii (366)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
171. Διονύσιος Φλυεύς [*LGPN* ii (662)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
172. Διονύσιος Ἀγαθοκλέους Μαραθώνιος [*LGPN* ii (487)] — *IG* II² 1325 (185 BC), 1326 (176 BC), 2948 (F2B)
173. Διονύσιος Διονυσίου Μαραθώνιος [*LGPN* ii (488)] — *IG* II² 1326 (176 BC)
174. Διονύσιος Λαοδικεύς [*FRA* 3245] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
175. Διονυσογένης Διονυσίου Παιανιεύς [*LGPN* ii (569)] — *IG* II² 1325 (185 BC)
176. Διονυσόδωρος [*LGPN* ii (208)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
177. Διονυσόδωρος Σημαχίδης [*LGPN* ii (153)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
178. Διονυσόδωρος Χολαργεύς [*LGPN* ii (75)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
179. Διονυσόδωρος Ζωπύρου Ἁλωπεκῆθεν [*LGPN* ii (56)] — *IG* II² 1315 (211 BC)
180. Διονυσόδωρος Μιλήσιος [*FRA* 4322] — *SEG* 41.171 (300 BC)
181. Διοπείθης Διοπείθους Σφήττιος [*LGPN* ii (52)] — *IG* II² 2501 (S4B)
182. Διοσκουρίδης [*LGPN* ii (68)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
183. Διότιμος [*LGPN* ii (79)] —-*SEG* 2.9 (245/4 BC)
184. Διότιμος Δημητρίου Κηφισιεύς [*LGPN* ii (51)] — *IG* II² 1343 (37 BC)

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

188. Δίων [*LGPN* ii (99)] — *IG* II² 1297, 25 (236 BC)
189. Δίων [*LGPN* ii (100)] — *IG* II² 1297, 37 (236 BC)
190. Δίων Ἀντιλόχου Λαμπτρεύς [*LGPN* ii (58)] — *IG* II² 1325 (185 BC)
191. Δόκιμος [*LGPN* ii (13, 14)] — *SEG* 2.9 (245/4 BC), 2.10 (251/0 BC)
192. Δορκάς [*LGPN* ii (6)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
193. Δόρκιον [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *IG* II² 1298 (248/7 BC)
194. Δράκων [*LGPN* ii (13)] — *IG* II² 1262 (301 BC)
195. Δωριεύς [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
196. Δωρίς [*LGPN* ii (8)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
197. Δωρίων [*LGPN* ii (12)] — *IG* II² 1298 (248/7 BC)
198. Δωρίων [*LGPN* ii (11)] — *IG* II² 1292 (215 BC)
199. Δωρόθεος [*LGPN* ii (125)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
200. Δωρόθεος Ὀῆθεν [*LGPN* ii (89)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
201. Δῶρος [*LGPN* ii (10)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)

202. Εἰρηναῖος Μενάνδρου [*LGPN* ii (83)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
203. Εἰρηναῖος Ἀντιοχεύς [*FRA* 772] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
204. Εἰρηναῖος νεώτ. [*FRA* 773] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
205. Ἔπαινος Φαληρεύς πρεσβ. [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
206. Ἔπαινος Φαληρεύς νεώτ. [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
207. Ἐπαφρόδιτος Μιλήσιος [*FRA* 4413] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
208. Ἐπιγένης [*LGPN* ii (17)] — *IG* II² 4013 (Imp.)
209. Ἐπικαρπία [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
210. Ἐπικλῆς [*LGPN* ii (29)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
211. Ἐπικράτης [*LGPN* ii (122)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
212. Ἐπικράτης [*LGPN* ii (143)] — *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 63 no. 1 (233 BC)
213. Ἐπιτέλης [*LGPN* ii (5)] — *SEG* 32.236 (350-200 BC)
214. Ἐπιχάρης Κράτωνος Σκαμβωνίδης [*LGPN* ii (63)] — *IG* II² 1325 (185 BC)
215. Ἐργασίων [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *IG* II² 2351 (F3B)
216. Ἐργασίων [*LGPN* ii (8)] — *IG* II² 1327 (178 BC)
217. Ἐργασίων Σαμαρίτης [*FRA* 6521] — *IG* II² 2943 (3B)
218. Ἑρμαῖος Ἑρμογένου Παιανιεύς [*LGPN* ii (10)] — *IG* II² 1327 (178 BC)
219. Ἑρμαῖς Εὐτύχου [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2361 (200-205 AD)
220. Ἑρμέρως Ἀσμένου Γαργήττ(ιος) [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
221. Ἑρμογένης Ἑρμοφίλου [*LGPN* ii (71)] — *IG* II² 2943 (3B)
222. Ἕρμων [*LGPN* ii (32)] — *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 63 no. 1 (233 BC)
223. Ἕρμων [*LGPN* ii (33)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
224. Ἔρως Σμαράγδου Ἀραφήνιος [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

222. Ἐρωτίς [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
223. Ἐρωτίς [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
224. Εὐάγγελος Σουνιεύς [*LGPN* ii (20)] — *Ag.* 16, 231 (c. 215 BC)
225. Εὔαξις [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1328 (175 BC)
226. Εὐβουλίδης [*LGPN* ii (47)] — *IG* II² 1292 (215 BC)
227. Εὐβουλίδης [*LGPN* ii (51)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
228. Εὔβουλος Σημαχίδης [*LGPN* ii (66)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
229. Εὐεργέτης [*LGPN* ii (12)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
230. Εὐκλείδης [*LGPN* ii (71)] — *IG* II² 2349 (4B)
231. Εὐκλέων [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
232. Εὐκλῆς [*LGPN* ii (102)] — *IG* II² 1277 (278 BC)
233. Εὐκλῆς [*LGPN* ii (103)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
234. Εὐκλῆς Πύρρου ἰσοτελής — *SEG* 41.247 (4/3B)
235. Εὔκολον [*LGPN* ii (6)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
236. Εὐκτήμων Εὐμαρίδου Στειρεύς [*LGPN* ii (46)] — *IG* II² 1327 (178 BC)
237. Εὐμένης [*LGPN* ii (35)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
238. Εὔνικος Θεομνήμονος Προσπάλτιος [*LGPN* ii (20)] — *IG* II² 2355 (S3B)
239. Εὔνοστος Θηβαῖος [*FRA* 2411] — *SEG* 41.171 (300 BC)
240. Εὐξενίδης [*LGPN* ii (8)] — *SEG* 24.223 (4/3B)
241. Εὔξενος [*LGPN* ii (33)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
242. Εὔπλοια Εὐπορίστου ἐξ Ἀθμονέων [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
243. Εὐπορία [*LGPN* ii (7)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
244. Εὐπορία Φιλωνί [*LGPN* ii(6)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
245. Εὔπορος Πειραιεύς [*LGPN* ii (61)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-205)
246. Εὔπορος Εὐπόρου [*LGPN* ii Add (2)] — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203 (41 BC)
247. Εὔπραξις [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
248. Εὐρύστρατος Κικκυνεύς [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
249. Εὐτυχᾶς [*LGPN* ii (6)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
250. Εὐτυχίδης [*LGPN* ii (108)] — *SEG* 2.9 (245/4 BC)
251. Εὐτυχίδης [*LGPN* ii (96)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
252. Εὐτυχίς [*LGPN* ii (8)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
253. Εὐτυχίς [*LGPN* ii (11)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
254. Εὐφραῖος [*LGPN* ii (15)] — *SEG* 21.633 (F2B)
255. Εὐφραντᾶς Εὐτυχίδου [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
256. Εὐφράνωρ [*LGPN* ii (38)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
257. Εὐφρόνιος Φαληρεύς [*LGPN* ii (23)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
258. Εὐφροσύνη Φίλωνος Δαιδαλ(ιδῶν) [*LGPN* ii (7)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

255. Εὐφρόσυνος Φίλωνος Δαιδαλ(ιδῶν) [*LGPN* ii (17)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
260. Εὔφρων Ἀναγυράσιος [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
261. Εὐφύης [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1256 (329 BC)
262. Εὐχάριστος (M. Αἰμίλιος) Παιανιεύς [*LGPN* ii (16)] — *SEG* 31.122 (AD 121)
263. Ἔφεσος [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)

264. Ζεύξιον [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1316 (272 BC)
265. Ζηνίων Διοτίμου Μαραθώνιος [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *IG* II² 1339 (57 BC)
266. Ζήνων [*LGPN* ii (114)] — *IG* II² 1277 (278 BC)
267. Ζήνων [*LGPN* ii (116)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
268. Ζήνων Ζηνοδότου Ἐρικεεύς [*LGPN* ii (43)] — *IG* II² 1323 (194 BC)
269. Ζήνων Ἀντιοχεύς [*FRA* 823] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
270. Ζώβιος Ἡρακλεώτης [*FRA* 1935] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
271. Ζωπύρα [*LGPN* ii (9)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
272. Ζώπυρος [*LGPN* ii (135)] — *IG* II² 1292 (215 BC)
273. Ζώπυρος Ἀφιδναῖος [*LGPN* ii (30)] — *SEG* 36.228 (159/8 BC)
274. Ζωσάριον Ῥόδωνος ἐκ Στειριέων [*LGPN* ii (6)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-205)
275. Ζώσιμος [*LGPN* ii (361)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)

276. Ἡδεῖα [*LGPN* ii (20)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
277. Ἡδεῖα [*LGPN* ii (21)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
278. Ἡδίστη [*LGPN* ii (25)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
279. Ἡραῖς [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
280. Ἡρακλείδης [*LGPN* ii (224)] — *IG* II² 2351 (F3B)
281. Ἡρακλείδης [*LGPN* ii (227)] — *SEG* 21.633 (F2B)
282. Ἡρακλείδης Φιλω [*LGPN* ii (230)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
283. Ἡρακλείδης Μαραθώνιος [*LGPN* ii (113)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
284. Ἡρακλείδης Θεοδώρου Παιονίδης [*LGPN* ii (129)] — *IG* II² 1325 (185 BC)
285. Ἡράκλειτος [*LGPN* ii (76)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
286. Ἡσυχία [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
287. Ἡφαιστίων [*LGPN* ii (23)] — *IG* II² 2349 (4B)
288. Ἡφαιστίων [*LGPN* ii (26)] — *SEG* 24.223 (4/3B)

289. Θάλεια [*LGPN* ii Add (1)] — *AJA* 64 (1960) 269 (58 BC)
290. Θάλλος [*LGPN* ii (34)] — *IG* II² 1277 (278 BC)
291. Θάλλος [*LGPN* ii (41)] — *SEG* 2.9 (245/4 BC)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

292. Θεογενίδης Κριτοφάντου Προσπάλτιος [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *IG* II² 2355 (S3B)
293. Θεοδόσιος Ἀχαρνεύς [*LGPN* ii (6)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
294. Θεοδόσιος Ἀγνούσιος [*LGPN* ii (11)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
295. Θεόδοτος [*LGPN* ii (12)] — *SEG* 21.528 (3B)
296. Θεόδοτος [*LGPN* ii Add (2)] — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203 (41 BC)
297. Θεόδοτος Τιμησίωνος Φλυεύς [*LGPN* ii (83)] — *IG* II² 1325 (185 BC)
298. Θεοδώρα [*LGPN* ii (16)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
299. Θεόδωρος Μητροδώρου Παιανιεύς [*LGPN* ii Add (4)] — *AJA* 64 (1960) 269 (58 BC)
300. Θεοκλῆς [*LGPN* ii (59)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
301. Θεόκοσμος [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
302. Θεομένης Ῥαμνούσιος [*LGPN* ii (6)] — *IG* II² 1322 with *SEG* 3.128 (c. 229 BC)
303. Θεόμνηστος Θεαγενίδου Προσπάλτιος [*LGPN* ii (42)] — *IG* II² 2355 (S3B)
304. Θεόξενος [*LGPN* ii (44)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
305. Θεοπείθης Ἰκάριος [*LGPN* ii (9)] — Finley 32 (350-200 BC)
306. Θεόπροπος [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *IG* II² 1298 (248/7 BC)
307. Θεότιμος Ῥαμνούσιος [*LGPN* ii (46)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
308. Θεοφάνης [*LGPN* ii (32)] — *IG* II² 2349 (4B)
309. Θεοφάνης [*LGPN* ii (35)] — *IG* II² 1292 (215 BC)
310. Θεόφαντος Θεαγενίδου Προσπάλτιος [*LGPN* ii (10)] — *IG* II² 2355 (S3B)
311. Θεόφιλος [*LGPN* ii Add (3)] — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203 (41 BC)
312. Θεόφιλος Λαμπτρεύς [*LGPN* ii (132)] — *IG* II² 1322 with *SEG* 3.128 (c. 229 BC)
313. Θέων [*LGPN* ii (25)] — *IG* II² 1323 (194 BC)
314. Θέων Ὀῆθεν [*LGPN* ii (15)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
315. Θηβαγένεια [*LGPN* ii Θηβαλένεια] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
316. Θρασύβουλος Ἀλωπεκῆθεν [*LGPN* ii (7)] — *SEG* 24.203 (333 BC)
317. Θράσων [*LGPN* ii (49)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)

318. Ἰάσων Χολαργεύς [*LGPN* ii (31)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
319. Ἱερόκλεια [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *Ag.* 16, 235 (212 BC)
320. Ἱέρων [*LGPN* ii (87)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
321. Ἱερώνυμος [*LGPN* ii (48)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
322. Ἱλάρα [*LGPN* ii (8)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
323. Ἰνδόν [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
324. Ἱππόμαχος Μελιτεύς [*LGPN* ii (7)] — *IG* II² 1253 (S4B)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

325. Ἱπποδρόμος [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *SEG* 36.228 (159/8 BC)
326. Ἰσιάς [*LGPN* ii (15)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
327. Ἰσίδοτος — *AM* 67 (1942) 31 no. 30 (2A)
328. Ἰσοκράτης Σατύρου Κυδαθηναιεύς [*LGPN* ii (16)] — *IG* II² 1325 (185 BC)

329. Καλλιάδης Φιλίνου Πειραιεύς [*LGPN* ii (47)] — *IG* II² 1252 (S4B)
330. Καλλίας [*LGPN* ii (246)] — *SEG* 21.633 (F2B)
331. Καλλικράτης Διονυσίου Μαραθώνιος [*LGPN* ii (70)] — *IG* II² 1326 (176 BC)
332. Καλλικράτης Τιμησίωνος Κηφισιεύς [*LGPN* ii (56)] — *IG* II² 1325 (185 BC)
333. Κάλλιστος Εὐπόρου Τρινε [*LGPN* ii (11)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
334. Καλλίστρατος [*LGPN* ii (159)] — *SEG* 24.223 (4/3B)
335. Καλλίστρατος [*LGPN* ii (17)] — *IG* II² 1289 (255-235 BC)
336. Καλλίστρατος [*LGPN* ii Add (4)] — *AJA* 64 (1960) 269 (58 BC)
337. Καλλιτέλης [*LGPN* ii (6)] — Finley 112 (350-200 BC)
338. Καλλιτέλης [*LGPN* ii (20)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
339. Καλλιφῶν — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203, 20 (41 BC)
340. Κεφαλίων Ἡρακλεώτης [*FRA* 1999] — *IG* II² 1273 (281 BC)
341. Κηφισόδοτος Εἰτεαῖος [*LGPN* ii Add (1)] — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203 (41 BC)
342. Κιλλώ [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
343. Κίττος [*LGPN* ii (15)] — *IG* II² 1262 (301 BC)
344. Κίτος [*LGPN* ii (14)] — *SEG* 24.223 (4/3B)
345. Κλείδαμος — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203, 22 (41 BC)
346. Κλεῖππος Αἰξωνεύς [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *IG* II² 1328 (183 BC)
347. Κλειτοφῶν Δημοφίλου [*LGPN* ii (8)] — *IG* II² 1259 (313 BC)
348. Κλεοδωρίδης Ῥαμνούσιος [*LGPN* ii (2)?]— Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59 (after 216/5 BC)
349. Κλεονίκη (Κορνηλία) ἐκ Μαραθωνίων [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
350. Κλεοπάτρα [*LGPN* ii (19)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
351. Κλεοφῶν [*LGPN* ii (22)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
352. Κλέων Λεωκράτους Σαλαμίνιος [*LGPN* ii (54)] — *IG* II² 1263 (300 BC)
353. Κόϊντος Προβαλίσιος [*LGPN* ii (12)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
354. Κόμψη [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 1298 (248/7 BC)
355. Κόμων [*LGPN* ii (5)] — *SEG* 24.223 (4/3B)
356. Κόνων [*LGPN* ii (55)] — *SEG* 24.223 (4/3B)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

357. Κόνων Ἡρακλεώτης [*FRA* 2008] — *SEG* 41.171 (300 BC)
358. Κράτεια [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1315 (211 BC)
359. Κράτης [*LGPN* ii (34)] — *SEG* 2.9 (245/4 BC)
360. Κράτης [*LGPN* ii (32)] — *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 63 no. 1 (233 BC)
361. Κριτόφαντος Θεαγενίδου Προσπάλτιος [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 2355 (S3B)
362. Κριτόφαντος Θεομνήμονος Προσπάλτιος [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2355 (S3B)
363. Κρίτων Χαιροκλέους Κειριάδης — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203, 8 (41 BC)
364. Κτησίας [*LGPN* ii (43)] — *IG* II² 1277 (278 BC)
365. Κτησίβιος [*LGPN* ii (10)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
366. Κτησικλῆς — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203, 21 (41 BC)
367. Κτήσιππος [*LGPN* ii (13)] — *SEG* 2.9 (245/4 BC)
368. Κτήσων [*LGPN* ii (29)] — *IG* II² 1297, 35 (236 BC)
369. Κτήσων [*LGPN* ii (30)] — *IG* II² 1297, 41 (236 BC)
370. Κυχραῖος [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)

371. Λαῖς [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
372. Λαμέδων [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
373. Λαμέδων νεώτ. [*LGPN* ii (5)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
374. Λαμίδιον [*LGPN* ii (9)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
375. Λεόντιον [*LGPN* ii (5)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
376. Λεπτίνης Εὐπέρσου [*LGPN* ii (20)] — *IG* II² 2943 (3B)
377. Λεύκιος Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἀζηνιεύς [*LGPN* ii (27)] — *IG* II² 1343 (37 BC)
378. Λεύκων [*LGPN* ii (7)] — *IG* II² 1273 (281 BC)
379. Λέων Σίμου Ἐλαιούσιος [*LGPN* ii (36)] — *IG* II² 1325 (185 BC)
380. Λεωχάρης [*LGPN* ii (8)] — Finley 40 (350-200 BC)
381. Λήναιος Μιλήσιος [*FRA* 5049] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
382. Λυδός [*LGPN* ii (5)] — *SEG* 24.223 (4/3B)
383. Λυσανίας [*LGPN* ii (70)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
384. Λυσανίας Ἰωνίδης [*LGPN* ii (28)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
385. Λυσίας Περιάνδρου Πλωθεύς [*LGPN* ii (72)] — *Ag.* 16, 161 (F3B)
386. Λυσιμαχίδης Φιλίνου Πειραιεύς [*LGPN* ii (15)] — *IG* II² 1252 (S4B)
387. Λῦσις Παλληνεύς [*LGPN* ii (19)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
388. Λυσίστρατος [*LGPN* ii (95)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)

389. Μᾶαρκος [*LGPN* ii (11)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
390. Μαρθίνη Κορνηλιανοῦ ἐξ Οἴου [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

391. Ματρώνα [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
392. Μειδόκριτος Ἀνδροκλέους Προσπάλτιος [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2355 (S3B)
393. Μειδόνικος Ἀνδροκλέους Προσπάλτιος [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2355 (S3B)
394. Μελέαγρος (*LGPN* ii (3)] — *SEG* 36.228 (159/8 BC)
395. Μέλιττα [*LGPN* ii (19)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
396. Μέλιττα [*LGPN* ii (18)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
397. Μέλπων Καλλιξένου Προβαλίσιος [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 4707 (1B)
398. Μένανδρος [*LGPN* ii (142)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
399. Μενέδημος Μακεδών [*FRA* 3476; Tataki, *Macedonians*, 367 no. 40] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
400. Μενεκλῆς [*LGPN* ii (58)] — *SEG* 24.156 (238 BC)
401. Μενεκράτης [*LGPN* ii (110)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
402. Μενεκράτης Πιθεύς [*LGPN* ii (87)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
403. Μενέμαχος Παιανιεύς [*LGPN* ii (12)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
404. Μενέχαρμος [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
405. Μενίσκος [*LGPN* ii (23)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
406. Μένων [*LGPN* ii (68)] — *IG* II² 1317b (249/8 BC)
407. Μένων [*LGPN* ii (63)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
408. Μῆνις Μνησιθέου Ἡρακλεώτης [*FRA* 2068] — *IG* II² 1271 (299 BC)
409. Μηνόδοτος [*LGPN* ii (28)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
410. Μηνόφιλος Μελιτεύς [*LGPN* ii (32)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
411. Μητρίχη [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
412. Μητροδώρα [*LGPN* ii (5)] — *IG* II² 1328 (183 BC)
413. Μητροδώρα [*LGPN* ii (6)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
414. Μητροφάνης [*LGPN* ii (15)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
415. Μίδας [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *SEG* 24.223, 4 (4/3B)
416. Μίδας [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *SEG* 24.223, 7 (4/3B)
417. Μνάσων [*LGPN* ii (9)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
418. Μνήσαρχος [*LGPN* ii (16)] — *Ag.* 16, 130 (c. 300 BC)
419. Μνησιγείτων [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *Ag.* 16, 130 (c. 300 BC)
420. Μνησίδημος [*LGPN* ii (5)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
421. Μνησίθεος Ἀλωπεκῆθεν [*LGPN* ii (19)] — Finley 163A (350-200 BC)
422. Μνησικλείδης Ἰκαριεύς [*LGPN* ii (9)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
423. Μόνιμος Δημητρίου Ἀμισηνός [*FRA* 484] — *SEG* 37.103 (52 BC)
424. Μοσχίων [*LGPN* ii (86)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
425. Μουσαῖος Κυρηναῖος [*LGPN* i (2) & *FRA* 3143] — *IG* II² 2942; 9132 (3B)
426. Μυρτασώ [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2349 (4B)
427. Μυρτίλος [*LGPN* ii (6)] — *IG* II² 2349 (4B)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

428. Μῦς — *SEG* 41.171 (300 BC)
429. Μῦς [*LGPN* ii (10)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
430. Μύστα [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)

431. Ναυσίφιλος Ναυσινίκου Κεφαλῆθεν [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1255 (337 BC)
432. Νεικόμαχος, Αὐρ. [*LGPN* ii (25)] — *IG* II² 1368 (AD 175/6)
433. Νεμειάς [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
434. Νεοπείθης Κολωνῆθεν [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
435. Νεοπτόλεμος Μελιτεύς [*LGPN* ii (8)] — *SEG* 32.236 (350-200 BC)
436. Νέων [*LGPN* ii (26)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
437. Νέων Χολαργεύς [*LGPN* ii (10)] — *IG* II² 1327 (178 BC)
438. Νίκανδρος [*LGPN* ii (53)] — *SEG* 24.156 (238 BC)
439. Νίκαρχος [*LGPN* ii (17)] — *IG* II² 1317b (249/8 BC)
440. Νικασίς Φιλίσκου Κορινθία [*LGPN* iiiA (1) & *FRA* 2983] — *IG* II² 1337 (97 BC)
441. Νίκη Ἀττικοῦ ἐκ Παιανιέων [*LGPN* ii (7)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
442. Νίκη Μηνοφίλου ἐκ Μελιτέων [*LGPN* ii (6)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
443. Νικησώ [*LGPN* ii (7)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
444. Νικηφόρος Μηνοδώρου Σουνι(εύς) [*LGPN* ii (15)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
445. Νικίας [*LGPN* ii (198)] — *IG* II² 1317 (272 BC)
446. Νικίας [*LGPN* ii (213 & 214)] — *IG* II² 1317b (249/8 BC), *SEG* 2.10 (251/0 BC)
447. Νικίας Νικίου Πρασιεύς [*LGPN* ii (144)] — *IG* II² 1345 (AD 53)
448. Νικίππη [*LGPN* ii (5)] — *IG* II² 1292 (215 BC)
449. Νικόμαχος Νίκωνος [*LGPN* ii (16)] — *Ag.* 16, 223 (227 BC)
450. Νικομώ Μαρκιανοῦ ἐκ Παιανιέων [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
451. Νικοστράτη Ἐπικτήτου ἐξ Ἀχαρνῶν [*LGPN* ii (12)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
452. Νικόστρατος [*LGPN* ii (202)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
453. Νίκων [*LGPN* ii (122)] — *IG* II² 1265 (c. 320-296 BC)
454. Νίκων [*LGPN* ii (128)] — *SEG* 24.156 (238 BC)
455. Νίκων [*LGPN* ii (129)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
456. Νίκων Ἀστακηνός [*FRA* 1283] — *IG* II² 1322 & Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 167 (c. 229 BC)
457. Νίκων Νικοφῶντος [*LGPN* ii (151)] — *IG* II² 2943 (3B)
458. Νουμήνιος [*LGPN* ii (62)] — *IG* II² 1298 (248/7 BC)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

469. Νουμήνιος [*LGPN* ii (63)] — *SEG* 24.156 (238 BC)
470. Νουμήνιος [*LGPN* ii (64)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)

471. Ξενοπείθης [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *SEG* 41.127 (4B)
472. Ξενοκλείδης Σουνιεύς [*LGPN* ii (14)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
473. Ξένων [*LGPN* ii (66)] — *SEG* 2.9 (245/4 BC)
474. Ξένων [*LGPN* ii (64)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)

475. Ὀλύμπιχος [*LGPN* ii (40)] — *IG* II² 1292 (215 BC)
476. Ὀλύμπιχος [*LGPN* ii (39)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
477. Ὄλυμπος Ὀλυμπιοδώρου [*LGPN* ii (28)] — *IG* II² 1284 (M3B)
478. Ὀνασώ Θέωνος [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *IG* II² 1334 (71 BC)
479. Ὀνησίκριτος Διοκλέους Πειραιεύς [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *IG* II² 1329 (175 BC)
480. Ὀνησιμίδης Ῥαμνούσιος [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
481. Ὀνήσιμος [*LGPN* ii (95)] — *IG* II² 2348 (S4B)
482. Ὀνήσιμος [*LGPN* ii (115)] — *SEG* 2.10 (251/0 BC)
483. Ὀνήσιμος [*LGPN* ii (99)] — *SEG* 21.633 (F2B)
484. Ὀνήσιμος [*LGPN* ii (102)] — *IG* II² 2358, 14 (M2B)
485. Ὀνήσιμος νεώτ. [*LGPN* ii (103)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
486. Ὀνήσιμος [*LGPN* ii (104)] — *IG* II² 2358, 77 (M2B)
487. Ὀνύχιον [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)

488. Παιδέρως Ἔρωτος Ἀραφήνιος [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
489. Παίδικος [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *SEG* 24.156 (238 BC)
490. Πάμφιλος [*LGPN* ii (138)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
491. Πάμφιλος Κεφαλῆθεν [*LGPN* ii (54)] — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
492. Παντάρετος Ἀλωπεκῆθεν [*LGPN* ii (4)] — Finley 70 (350-200 BC)
493. Παράμονος Παρμενίσκου Ἐπιεικίδης [*LGPN* ii (20)] — *IG* II² 1314 (213 BC)
494. Παράμυθος [*LGPN* ii (12)] — *SEG* 24.156 (238 BC)
495. Παρθενίων [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
496. Παρνασός [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
497. Παυσανίας [*LGPN* ii (49)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
498. Περιγένης [*LGPN* ii (12)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
499. Περσίς [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
500. Πέτρων [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *SEG* 36.228 (159/8 BC)
501. Πλούταρχος Αἰγινήτης [*LGPN* iiiA (1) & *FRA* 202] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
502. Πολέμαρχος Φαληρεύς [*LGPN* ii (9)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

493. Πόπλιος Φυλάσιος [*LGPN* ii (46)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
494. Πόρος [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
495. Πριμιγένης Γαργήττιος [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
496. Πρῖμος Καλλίστου [*LGPN* ii (67)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
497. Πυθέας [*LGPN* ii (36)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
498. Πυθόδωρος Ἀθμονεύς [*LGPN* ii (41)] — *Ag.* 19 H.89 (350-200 BC)
499. Πυθοκλῆς [*LGPN* ii (41)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
500. Πύθων [*LGPN* ii (33)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
501. Πύρρος [*LGPN* ii (48)] — *IG* II² 2349 (4B)
502. Πύρρος [*LGPN* ii (54)] — *SEG* 2.9 (245/4 BC)
503. Πυρρῖνος [*LGPN* ii (6)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
504. Ῥόδιππος Ῥαμνούσιος [*LGPN* ii (7)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
505. Ῥοῦφος Ἀφροδεισίου [*LGPN* ii (7)] — *IG* II² 1368 (AD 175/6)
506. Ῥύθμος [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1317b (249/8 BC), *SEG* 2.10 (251/0 BC)
507. Ῥύνδαξ [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *SEG* 24.223 (4/3B)

508. Σαραπίων [*LGPN* ii (36)] — *IG* II² 2358, 29 (150 BC)
509. Σαραπίων [*LGPN* ii (37)] — *IG* II² 2358, 71 (150 BC)
510. Σάρδιον [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
511. Σάτυρος Μενίσκου Αἰξωνεύς [*LGPN* ii (27)] — *IG* II² 1337 (97 BC)
512. Σέλευκος [*LGPN* ii (38)] — *IG* II² 1292 (215 BC)
513. Σεραπίων Ποσειδωνίου Ἡρακλεώτης [*FRA* 2173] — *AM* 66 (1941) 228 no. 4 (138 BC)
514. Σήραμβος Αἰθαλίδης [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
515. Σιγή [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC) with *SEG* 47.157
516. Σιλανίων [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
517. Σιμάλη [*LGPN* ii (6)] — *IG* II² 1298 (248/7 BC)
518. Σῖμον [*LGPN* ii (11)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
519. Σῖμος [*LGPN* ii (27)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
520. Σίμων [*LGPN* ii (50)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
521. Σίμων Σίμωνος Πόριος [*LGPN* ii (43)] — *IG* II² 1325 (185 BC), 1327 (178 BC), 1328 (183 BC)
522. Σίνδης [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *SEG* 36.228 (159/8 BC)
523. Σόλων Ἑρμογένου Χολαργεύς [*LGPN* ii (15)] — *IG* II² 1325 (185 BC)
524. Σόφον [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
525. Σπερχειός [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *SEG* 36.228 (159/8 BC)
526. Στέφανος [*LGPN* ii (100)] — *IG* II² 1324 (c. 190 BC)
527. Στέφανος Μυλωθροῦ [*LGPN* ii (99)] — *IG* II² 1261 (302-299 BC)
528. Στρατοκλῆς [*LGPN* ii (52)] — *IG* II² 1317 (272 BC)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

539. Στρατοκλῆς Ἐλευσίνιος [*LGPN* ii (23 & 54)] — *IG* II² 1317b (249/8 BC), *SEG* 2.10 (251/0 BC)
540. Στρατονίκη [*LGPN* ii (16)] — *IG* II² 2358, 34 (M2B)
541. Στρατονίκη [*LGPN* ii (17)] — *IG* II² 2358, 92 (M2B)
542. Στρύμων [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
543. Σύμμαχος [*LGPN* ii (36)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
544. Σύμμαχος [*LGPN* ii (37)] — *SEG* 21.633 (F2B)
545. Σύμμαχος Δάτου [*LGPN* ii (41)] — *IG* II² 2943 (3B)
546. Συμφέρουσα — *AM* 67 (1942) 31 no. 30 (2A)
537. Σύρος [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
538. Σώδας Ποτάμιος [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *SEG* 36.228 (159/8 BC)
539. Σωκλῆς [*LGPN* ii (11)] — *IG* II² 1316 (272 BC)
540. Σωμένης Οἰναῖος [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
541. Σώσανδρος Φιλίνου Κυδαθηναιεύς [*LGPN* ii (19)] — *SEG* 36.228 (159/8 BC)
542. Σωσίας Ἱπποκράτους [*LGPN* ii (4))] — *IG* II² 1283 (269/8 BC), 1284 (F3B)
543. Σωσίβιος [*LGPN* ii (62)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
544. Σωσίβιος [*LGPN* ii (64)] — *SEG* 36.228 (159/8 BC)
545. Σωσίβιος [*LGPN* ii Add (1)] — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203 (41BC)
546. Σωσιγένης [*LGPN* ii (89)] — *IG* II² 1298 (248/7 BC)
547. Σωσιγένης Προβαλίσιος [*LGPN* ii (7)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
548. Σωσιγένης Ἀπαμεύς [*FRA* 1151] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
549. Σῶσος Μαρωνίτης [*FRA* 3553] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
550. Σωτᾶς Ἀναγυράσιος [*LGPN* ii (12)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
551. Σωτηρίδης [*LGPN* ii (12)] — *IG* II² 1297, 26 (236 BC)
552. Σωτηρίδης [*LGPN* ii (13)] — *IG* II² 1297, 28 (236 BC)
553. Σωτηρίδης [*LGPN* ii (11)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
554. Σωτηρίς [*LGPN* ii (5)] — *IG* II² 2348 (S4B)
555. Σωτήριχος Ἀντιοχεύς [*FRA* 1052] — *SEG* 36.228 (159/8 BC)
556. Σωτήριχος Τροζήνιος [*LGPN* iiiA (7) & *FRA* 7169] — *IG* II² 1273 (281 BC)
557. Σώφρων [*LGPN* ii (10)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)

558. Τίβειος [*LGPN* ii (10)] — *SEG* 2.9 (245/4 BC)
559. Τιμαγόρας Ῥαμνούσιος [*LGPN* ii (6)] — *SEG* 36.228 (159/8 BC)
560. Τιμοκλείδης Ἕρμειος [*LGPN* ii (8) — *IG* II² 1322 (c. 229 BC)
561. Τιμοκλῆς [*LGPN* ii Add (2)] — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203 (41 BC)
562. Τιμοκράτης [*LGPN* ii (124)] — *SEG* 21.633 (F2B)
563. Τιμόστρατος Ἀμαξαντεύς [*LGPN* ii (17)] — Finley 114 (350-200 BC)
564. Τρύφων Τρύφωνος — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203, 23 (41 BC)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

565. Τυχαρώ Φίλωνος ἐκ Δαιδαλιδῶν [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)

566. Ὑάκινθος Εὐτυχίδου [*LGPN* ii (10)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
567. Ὑψίστη Φίλωνος ἐκ Δαιδαλιδῶν [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)

568. Φαῖδρος [*LGPN* ii (31)] — *IG* II² 2351 (F3B)
569. Φαῖδρος Μιλήσιος [*FRA* 5558] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
570. Φειδίας [*LGPN* ii (36)] — *IG* II² 1298 (248/7 BC)
571. Φιδοκλῆς Τιμέου [*LGPN* ii Add (1) Φιλοκλῆς] — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203 (41 BC)
572. Φιλαινίς [*LGPN* ii (7)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
573. Φίλη [*LGPN* ii (36)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
574. Φιλικόν [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
575. Φιλῖνος [*LGPN* ii (119)] — *SEG* 24.223 (4/3B)
576. Φίλιππος Φιλίππου Ἰκαριεύς [*LGPN* ii (77)] — *IG* II² 1343 (37 BC)
577. Φιλιστίδης [*LGPN* ii (78)] — *IG* II² 2347 (S4B)
578. Φιλιστίων [*LGPN* ii (13)] — *Ag.* 16, 230 (c. 229-203 BC)
579. Φιλοκλῆς Ἐρχιεύς — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59 (after 216/5 BC)
580. Φιλοκράτης Ξυπεταιών [*LGPN* ii (153)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
581. Φιλοκύδης Κηφισοδότου Εἰτεαῖος — Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203, 25 (41 BC)
582. Φιλόξενος [*LGPN* ii (74)] —-*SEG* 24.156 (238 BC)
583. Φιλόξενος [*LGPN* ii (75)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
584. Φιλόστρατος Κολωνῆθεν [*LGPN* ii (55)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC), 2984 (106/5 BC)
585. Φιλόστρατος Διονυσίου Πόρος [*LGPN* ii (77)] — *IG* II² 1325 (185 BC)
586. Φίλων [*LGPN* ii (28)] — Finley 31 (350-200 BC)
587. Φίλων [*LGPN* ii (275)] — *IG* II² 2351 (F3B)
588. Φίλων [*LGPN* ii (278)] — *SEG* 24.156 (238 BC)
589. Φίλων [*LGPN* ii (279)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
590. Φίλων [*LGPN* ii (280)] — *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 63 no. 1 (233 BC)
591. Φίλων [*LGPN* ii (298)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
592. Φίλων Ἀλαιεύς [*LGPN* ii (107)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
593. Φιλωνίδης [*LGPN* ii (85)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
594. Φιλωνίδης Ιφισ [*LGPN* ii (86)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
595. Φιλώτιον [*LGPN* ii (5)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)

596. Χαιρέας Διονυσίου Ἀθμονεύς [*LGPN* ii (18)] — *IG* II² 1329 (175 BC)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

597. Χαλῖνος [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
598. Χάρης [*LGPN* ii (48)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
599. Χαρίας [*LGPN* ii (104)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
600. Χαρῖνος [*LGPN* ii (56)] — *IG* II² 1317b (249/8 BC)
601. Χάρις [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 2354 (S2B)
602. Χάροπον [*LGPN* ii (1)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
603. Χάροψ Φαληρεύς [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *SEG* 24.203 (333 BC)
604. Χοιρίνη [*LGPN* ii (7)] — *IG* II² 1297 (236 BC)
605. Χρήσιμος [*LGPN* ii (10)] — *IG* II² 2358 (M2B)
606. Χρυσέρως [*LGPN* ii (2)] — *IG* II² 2361 (AD 200-211)
607. Χρύσιππος — *AM* 67 (1942) 31 no. 30 (2A)
608. Χρύσιππος [*LGPN* ii (4)] — *IG* II² 1368 (AD 175/6)

609. Ὠκυμένης Προβαλίσιος [*LGPN* ii (3)] — *IG* II² 1335 (103 BC)
610. Ὠφελίων [*LGPN* ii (8)] — *IG* II² 2348 (S4B)
611. Ὠφελίων [*LGPN* ii (12)] — *SEG* 2.10 (251/0 BC)

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

REFERENCES

Albrecht, K.-D. (1978) *Rechtsprobleme in den Freilassungen der Böotier, Phoker, Dorier, Ost- und Westlokrer. Untersucht mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der gemeinschaftlich vorgenommenen Freilassungsakte*, Paderborn (Rechts- und Staatswissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Görres-Gesellschaft 26).

Aleshire, S.B. (1989) *The Athenian Asklepieion. The people, their dedications and the inventories*, Amsterdam.

— (1991) *Asklepios at Athens. Epigraphic and prosopographic essays on the Athenian healing cults*, Amsterdam.

Anderson, R.T. (1971) "Voluntary associations in history" *American Anthropologist* 73, 209-22.

Andrewes, A. (1961) "Philochoros on phratries" *JHS* 81, 1-15.

Austin, M.M. (1981) *The Hellenistic world from Alexander to the Roman conquest. A selection of ancient sources in translation*, Cambridge.

Avramovic, S. (1997) *Iseo e il diritto attico*, Napoli (Diaphora 4).

Banton, M. (1968) "Voluntary associations. (I) Anthropological aspects" in Sills, D. (ed) *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, 16, 357-62, New York.

Baron, R.S., Kerr, N.L. & N. Miller (1992) *Group process, group decision, group action*, Buckingham.

Baslez, M-F. (1984) *L'étranger dans le monde antique*, Paris.

— (1988) "Les communautés d'Orientaux dans la cité grecque: Formes de sociabilité et modèles associatifs" in Lonis, R. (ed) *L'étranger dans le monde grec* (Actes du colloque organisé par l'Institut d'Études anciennes, Nancy, Mai 1987), 139-58, Nancy.

— (1989) "Tolérance et intolérance religieuses dans la cité grecque" *Revue de la societé Ernest Renan* 38, 10-18.

— (1996a) "Les immigrés orientaux en Grèce: tolérance et intolérance de la cité" *Cahiers Glotz* 7, 39-50.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

— (1996b) "Place et rôle des associations dans la cité d'Athènes au IVème siècle" in P. Carlier (ed) *Le IVe siècle av. J.-C. Approches historiographiques*, 281-92, Nancy.
— (1998) "Les associations dans la cité grecque et l'apprentissage du collectif " *Ktema* 23, 431-40.
— (2001) "Entre traditions nationales et intégration: les associations sémitiques du monde grec" in Ribichini, S., Rocchi, M & P. Xella (eds) *La questione delle influenze vicino-orientali sulla religione greca. Stato degli studi e prospettive della ricerca* (Atti del Colloquio Internazionale Roma, 20-22 maggio 1999), 235-47, Roma.
Bauman, R.A. (1989) *Lawyers and politics in the early Roman empire. A study of relations between the Roman jurists and the emperors from Augustus to Hadrian*, München (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 82).
Beauchet, L. (1897) *Histoire du droit privé de la république athénienne*, 4 vols, Paris.
Biscardi, A. (1955) "Sul regime della comproprietà in diritto attico" *Studi in onore di U.E. Paoli*, 105-44, Firenze.
— (1958) "Idées maîtresses du régime de l'indivision en droit grec" *RD* 36, 321-48.
— (1982) *Diritto greco antico*, Milan.
Boehringer, D. (2001) *Heroenkulte in Griechenland von der geometrischen bis zur klassischen Zeit. Attika, Argolis, Messenien*, Berlin (Klio Beihefte NF 3).
Boak, A.E.R. (1937) " The organization of gilds in Greco-Roman Egypt" *TAPhA* 68, 212-20.
Bolgar, V. (1982) " The fiction of the corporate fiction. From Pope Innocent IV to the Pinto case" in Graveson, R.H., Krenzer, K., Tune, A. & K. Zweigert (eds) *Festschrift für Imre Zajtay*, 67-96, Tübingen.
Bolkestein, H. (1923) *Economic life in Greece's golden age*, new revised edition by E.J. Jonkers, Leiden 1958.
Bouckaert, B. (1991) "Corporate personality: Myth, fiction or reality?" *Israel Law Review* 125, 156-86.
Bourdieu, P. (1980) *The logic of practice*, transl. R. Nice, 1990, London.
— (1992) "Rites of institution" in Peristiany, J. & J. Pitt-Rivers (eds) 79-89.
Bourriot, F. (1976) *Recherches sur la nature de génos. Étude d'histoire sociale athénienne. Periodes archaïque et classique*, 2 vols, Paris - Lille.
— (1987) "La sociabilité dans les villages grecs antiques" in Thelamon, F. (ed) 429-39.
Brashear, W.M. (1993) *Vereine im griechisch-römischen Ägypten*, Konstanz (Xenia. Konstanzer Althistorische Vorträge und Forschungen 34).
Bravo, B. (1980) "Sylân. Représailles et justice privée contre des étrangers

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

dans les cités grecques (Étude du vocabulaire et des institutions)" *ASNP* 10.3, 857-987.

Brown, D.E. (1973) "Voluntary association: A further comment" *American Anthropologist* 75, 309-10.

— (1974) "Corporations and social classification" *Current Anthropology* 15, 29-52.

Bruck, E.F. (1926) *Totenteil und Seelgerät im griechischen Recht. Eine entwicklungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Verhältnis von Recht und Religion mit Beiträgen zur Geschichte des Eigentums und des Erbrechts*, München (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 9).

Bruit Zeidman, L. & P. Schmitt-Pantel (1989) *Religion in the ancient Greek city*, transl. P. Cartledge, Cambridge.

Burkert, W. (1985) *Greek religion*, translated by J. Raffan, Oxford.

— (1987) *Ancient mystery cults*, Cambridge, Mass.

Busolt, G. & H. Swoboda (1920-26) *Griechische Staatskunde*, 2 vols, München.

Caillemer, E. (1872) "Le contrat de société à Athènes" in *Études des antiquités grecques*, New York 1978.

Calame, C. (1977) *Les choeurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque*, 2 vols, Roma (English translation as *Choruses of young women in ancient Greece. Their mythology, religious role and spiritual function*, London 2001).

— (1983) *Alcman*, Roma.

Campbell, J.K. (1964) *Honour, family and patronage*, Oxford.

Carolsfeld, L. (1933) *Geschichte der juristischen Person*, München.

Carter, J.B. (1997) "*Thiasos* and *marzeah*. Ancestor cult in the age of Homer" in Langdon, S. (ed) *New light on a Dark Age. Exploring the culture of geometric Greece*, 72-112, Columbia, Mo.

Cartledge, P. (1998) " The economy (economies) of ancient Greece" *Dialogos* 5, 4-24.

Cartledge, P., Millett, P. & S. von Reden (eds) (1998) *Kosmos. Essays in order, conflict and community in classical Athens*, Cambridge.

Chantraine, P. (1968-80) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*, Paris.

Christophilopoulos, A.P. (1979) *Nomika Epigraphika II*, Athens.

Chryssoheris, I. (1996) "Anastenaria. A tradition contested" in Karpodini-Dimitriadi, E. (ed) *Ethnography of European traditional cultures. Society, cultural tradition, built environment*, 357-63, Athens.

Cohen, D.D. (1991) *Law, sexuality, and society. The enforcement of morals in classical Athens*, Cambridge.

— (1995) *Law, violence, and community in classical Athens*, Cambridge.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Cohen, E.E. (1973) *Ancient Athenian maritime courts*, Princeton.
— (1992) *Athenian economy and society. A banking perspective*, Princeton.
Cooper, C. (1995) "Hypereides and the trial of Phryne" *Phoenix* 49, 303-18.
Cotter, W. (1996) " The collegia and Roman law. State restrictions on voluntary associations, 64 BCE-200CE" in Kloppenborg & Wilson (eds), 74-89.
Davies, J.K. (1996) "Strutture e suddivisioni delle poleis archaiche: tribu, fratrie, ghene e ripartizioni minori: loro natura. I quadri istituzionali della vitta cittadina" in Settis, S. (ed) *I Greci. Storia, cultura, arte, societa. 2. Una storia greca I.Formazione*, 599-652, Torino.
Defradas, J. (1954) *Les thèmes de la propagande delphique*, 2nd ed., Paris 1972.
Derk, H. (1995) "A note on *homogalaktes* in Aristotle's *Politika*" *DHA* 21, 27-40.
Dickie, M.W. (2001) *Magic and magicians in the Greco-Roman world*, London.
Dover, K.J. (1975) " The freedom of the intellectual in Greek society " in *The Greeks and their legacy*, 135-58, Oxford 1988.
Dow, St. (1937) " The Egyptian cults in Athens" *HThR* 30, 188-97.
Dow, St. & D.H. Gill (1965) " The Greek cult table" *AJA* 69, 103-14.
Ducos, M. (1976) *L'influence grecque sur la loi des Douze Tables*, Paris.
Duff, P.W. (1938) *Personality in Roman private law*, Cambridge.
Ehrenberg, V. (1960) *The Greek state*, London.
Ferguson, W.S. (1911) *Hellenistic Athens*, London.
— (1944) " The Attic orgeones" *HThR* 37, 61-140.
— (1949) "Orgeonika" in *Commemorative studies in honor of Theodore Leslie Shear*, 130-63, Princeton (*Hesperia Suppl.* 8).
Finley, M.I. (1951) *Studies in land and credit in ancient Athens*, reprint 1985, introduction by P. Millett, Oxford.
— (1973) *The ancient economy*, 2nd ed., London 1992.
— (1975) *The use and abuse of history*, reprint 1990, London.
— (1983) *Politics in the ancient world*, Cambridge.
— (1985) *Ancient History. Evidence and models*, reprint 1987, London.
Fisher, N. (1976) *Social values in classical Athens*, London.
— (1988) "Greek associations, symposia, and clubs" in Grant, M. & R . Kitzinger (eds) *Civilization of the Ancient Mediterranean*, II, 1167-99, New York.
Fornis, C. & J.-M. Casillas (1997) " The social functions of the Spartan syssitia" *AHB* 11, 37-46.
Foucart, P. (1873) *Les associations religieuses chez les Grecs. Thiases, éranes, orgèons*, Paris (reprint 1978, New York).
— (1902) "L' accusation contre Phryne" *RPh* 26, 216-18.
Fraser, P.M. (1977) *Rhodian funerary monuments*, Oxford.
Freyburger M. et al. (1986) *Sectes religieuses en Grèce et à Rome*, Paris.

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Gallant, T.W. (1991) *Risk and survival in ancient Greece. Reconstructing the rural domestic economy*, London.
Garland, R. (1984) "Religious authority in archaic and classical Athens" *ABSA* 79, 75-123.
— (1987) *The Piraeus. From the fifth to the first century B.C.*, London.
— (1992) *Introducing new gods. The politics of Athenian religion*, London.
— (1996) "Strategies of religious intimidation and coercion in classical Athens" in Hellstrom, P. & B. Alroth (eds) *Religion and power in the ancient Greek world* (Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1993), 91-99, Uppsala (Boreas - Uppsala studies in ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern civilizations 24).
Garnsey, P. (1984) "Religious toleration in classical antiquity" in Sheild, W.J. (ed) *Persecution and toleration* (Papers read at the twenty-second summer meeting and the twenty-third winter meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society), 1-27, Oxford (Studies in Church History 21).
Gauthier, Ph. (1981) "La citoyenneté en Grèce et à Rome: participation et intégration" *Ktema* 6, 167-79.
— (1985) *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*, Athènes (BCH Suppl. 12).
Gill, D. (1991) *Greek cult tables*, New York.
Geremek, B. (1971) *The margins of society in late medieval Paris*, transl. J. Birrell, Cambridge 1987.
Gernet, L. (1968) *Anthropologie de la Grèce antique*, Paris.
— (1999) "Eranos" (presentazione, traduzione e commento di Andrea Taddei) *Dike* 2, 5-61.
Goceva, Z. (1974) "La culte de la déesse thrace Bendis à Athènes" *Thracia* II, 81-86, Sofia.
Grace, E. (1973) "Status distinctions in the Draconian law" *Eirene* 11, 5-30.
Guarducci, M. (1935) "Orgeones e tiasoti" *RFC* 13, 332-40.
Guiraud, P. (1893) *La propriété foncière en Grèce jusqu'à la conquête romaine*, Paris.
Hammond, N.G.L. (1961) "Land tenure in Athens and Solon's seisachtheia" *JHS* 81, 76-98.
Hands, A.R. (1968) *Charities and social aid in Greece and Rome*, London (Aspects of Greek and Roman life).
Hansen, M.H. (1983) *The Athenian ecclesia I: A collection of articles, 1976-1983*, Copenhagen.
— (1989) *The Athenian ecclesia II: A collection of articles, 1983-1989*, Copenhagen.
— (1991) *The Athenian democracy in the age of Demosthenes. Structure, principles, and ideology*, transl. J.A. Cook, London.
Harris, E.M. (1992) "Women and lending in Athenian society" *Phoenix* 46, 309-21.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Harrison, A.R.W. (1968-71) *The law of Athens*, 2 vols, Oxford.
Hasebroek, J. (1933) *Trade and politics in ancient Greece*, transl. by Fraser, L.M. & D.C. MacGregor, London.
Hatzopoulos, C. (1971) *Enoseis prosopon* (offprint).
Hatzopoulos, C. (1973) *Personae collectivae nach attischen Recht*, diss. Freiburg i. B. (Summary in Greek in *Nomiko Bema* 28 (1980) 944-56 & 1331-38)
Hedrick, Ch. W. (1990) *The decrees of the Demotionidai*, Atlanta (APA-American Classical Studies).
— (1999) "Democracy and the Athenian habit" *Hesperia* 68, 387-425.
Heiman, G. (ed & tr) (1976) *Otto Gierke. Associations and law. The classical and early Christian stages*, Toronto.
Henry, A. (1996) "The hortatory intention in Athenian state decrees" *ZPE* 112, 105-19.
Herrmann, P. (1978) "Genossenschaft. A. Griechisch" in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 10, 83-99.
Hignett, C. (1952) *A history of the Athenian constitution to the end of the fifth century B.C.*, Oxford.
Humphreys, S.C. (1978) *Anthropology and the Greeks*, London.
— (1985) "Lycurgus of Butadae: An Athenian aristocrat" in Eadie, J.W. & J. Ober (eds) *The craft of the ancient historian. Essays in honor of Chester G. Starr*, 199-251, London.
Honoré, A. (1975) "What is a group?" *ARSP* 61, 161-79.
Isager, S. (1992) "Sacred and profane ownership of land" in B. Wells (ed) *Agriculture in ancient Greece*. (Proceedings of the 7th International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, Athens, 16-17 May 1990), 119-22, Stockholm (Acta Instituti Atheniensi regni Suecia ser. 4.42).
Jeanmaire, H. (1939) *Couroi et courètes. Essai sur l'éducation spartiate et sur les rites d'adolescence dans l'antiquité hellénique*, Lille (reprint 1975 New York).
Jones, J.H. (1956) *The law and the legal theory of Greeks*, Oxford.
Jones, N.F. (1987) "The regulation of associations in classical Athens" *AAPhA*, 137.
— (1999) *The associations of classical Athens. A response to democracy*, New York.
Kahrstedt, U. (1934) *Staatsgebiet und Staatsangehörige in Athen*, reprint 1969, Aalen.
Kalogeropoulou, A. (1987) "Apo to iero tou Pagkratous sten Athena" in *Praktika tou H' Diethnous Sunedriou Hellenikes kai Latinikes Epigraphikes* (Athena 3-9.10. 1982), II, 298-304, Athens.
Kearns, E. (1989) *The heroes of Attica*, London (BICS Supplement 57).
— (1992) "Between god and man: Status and function of heroes and their

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

sanctuaries" in *Le sanctuaire Grec*, 65-107, Genève (Entretiens Hardt 37).
Kornemann, E. (1924) "Koinon" *RE* Supplbd 4, cols 914-41.
Kloppenborg, J.S. (1996) "Collegia and thiasoi. Issues in function, taxonomy and membership" in Kloppenborg & Wilson (eds) 16-30.
Kloppenborg, J.S. & S.G. Wilson (eds) (1996) *Voluntary associations in the Graeco-Roman world*, London.
Körte, A. (1896) "Die Ausgrabungen am Westabhange der Akropolis" *MDAI.A* 21, 287-332.
Kränzlein, A. (1963) *Eigentum und Besitz im griechischen Recht des fünften und vierten Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Berlin (Berliner Juristische Abhandlungen 8).
Lambert, S.D. (1993) *The phratries of Attica*, 2nd ed., Ann Arbor, Michigan 1998 (Michigan monographs in classical antiquity).
— (1996) "Notes on two Attic horoi" *ZPE* 110, 77-83.
— (1997a) *Rationes centesimarum. Sales of public land in Lykourgan Athens*, Amsterdam (Archaia Ellas 3).
— (1997b) " The Attic genos of Salaminioi and the island of Salamis" *ZPE* 119, 85-106.
— (1999) "*IG* II² 2345, thiasoi of Herakles and the Salaminioi again" *ZPE* 125, 93-130.
Lane, E.N. (1985-89) *Corpus Cultis Iovis Sabazii (CCIS)* II. *The other monuments and literary evidence*, III. *Conclusions*, Leyden (EPRO 100).
Lauffer, S. (1979) *Die Bergwerkssklaven von Laureion*, 2 vols, Wiesbaden.
Lecrivain, Ch. (1905) "Orgeones" in *DAGR*, 235.
— (1919) " Thiasos" in *DAGR*, 257-66.
Leiwo, M. (1997) "Religion, or other reasons? Private associations in Athens" in J. Frosen (ed) *Early Hellenistic Athens. Symptoms of a change*, 103-18, Helsinki (Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 6).
Littmann, R. (1990) *Kinship and politics in Athens, 600-400 B.C.*, New York.
Lipsius, J.H. (1905) *Das attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren mit Benutzung des attischen Prozesses*, Leipzig.
Longo, O. (1983) "Eranos" in Froidefond, C. (ed) *Mélanges Edouard Delebecque*, 247-58, Marseille.
MacDowell, D.M. (1978) *The law in classical Athens*, London (Aspects of Greek and Roman life).
— (1990) *Demosthenes Against Meidias (Oration 21)*, Oxford.
MacMullen, R. (1974) *Roman social relations*, London.
Maier, G. (1969) *Eranos als Kreditinstitut*, diss. Erlangen.
Manville, P.B. (1990) *The origins of citizenship in ancient Athens*, Princeton.
Martin, L.H. (1994) " The anti-individualistic ideology of Hellenistic culture" *Numen* 41, 117-40.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Martina, A. (1968) *Solone. Testimonianze sulla vita e l'opera*, Roma.
Meier, Ch. (1980) *The Greek discovery of politics*, transl. by D. McLintock, London.
— (1984) *Introduction à l'anthropologie politique de l'antiquité classique*, Paris.
Meritt, B.D. (1981) "Mid-third century Athenian archons" *Hesperia* 50, 78-99.
Mikalson, J.D. (1998) *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*, Los Angeles.
Millett, P. (1991) *Lending and borrowing in ancient Athens*, Cambridge.
Mitsopoulos, G. (2001) *Le problème de la notion de fiction juridique*, Athènes.
Mommsen, Th. (1870) *Digesta Iustiniani Augusti*, 2 vols, Berlin.
Montepaone, Cl. (1990) "Bendis Tracia ad Atene: L' integrazione del "nuovo" attraverso forme dell' ideologia" *A.I.O.N.* 12, 103-21.
Mossé, Cl. (1987) "Égalité démocratique et inégalités sociales. Le débat à Athènes au IVème siècle" *Mètis* 2, 165- 76 & 195-206.
— (1994-95) "Les relations de 'clientèle' dans le fonctionnement de la démocratie athénienne" *Mètis* 9-10, 143-50.
Motte, A. & V. Pirenne-Delforge (1992) "Les mots et les rites. Aperçu des significations de orgia et de quelques dérivés" *Kernos* 5, 119-40.
Murray, O. & S. Price (eds) (1990) *The Greek city. From Homer to Alexander*, Oxford.
Nekam, A. (1938) *The personality conception of the legal entity*, Cambridge, Mass.
Nijf, O.M. van (1997) *The civic world of professional associations in the Roman East*, Amsterdam (Dutch Monographs on ancient History and Archaeology 17).
Nilsson, M.P. (1951) *Cults, myths, oracles and politics in ancient Greece*, reprint 1986, Göteborg.
— (1955) *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, 2nd ed., München 1961.
Nock, A.D. (1924) " The historical importance of cult-associations" *CR* 38, 105-9.
Nock, A.D., Skeat, Th.C. & C. Roberts (1936) " The gild of Zeus Hypsistos" *HThR* 29, 39-88.
O'Sullivan, L.-L. (1997) "Athenian impiety trials in the late 4th century BC" *CQ* 47, 136-52.
Ober, J. (1989) *Mass and elite in democratic Athens. Rhetoric, ideology, and the power of the people*, Princeton.
— (1993) " The polis as society. Aristotle, John Rawls and the Athenian social contract" in Hansen, M.H. (ed) *The ancient Greek city-state*, 129-60 (Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 1) and now in Ober, J. (1996) *The Athenian revolution: Essays on ancient Greek democracy and political theory*, 161-87, Princeton.
Ogden, D. (1996) *Greek bastardy in the classical and Hellenistic periods*, Oxford (Oxford Classical Monographs).

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Oliver, J.H. (1989) *Greek constitutions of early Roman emperors from inscriptions and papyri*, Philadelphia (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 178).

Orestano, R. (1968) *Il "problema delle persone giuridiche" in diritto romano*, Torino.

Osborne, M.J. (1989) " The chronology of Athens in the mid third century B.C." *ZPE* 78, 209-42.

— (1999) "Voyaging through strange seas of thought – The study of Athenian inscriptions" *Praktika tes Akademias Athenon* 74, 67-80.

— (2000) "Philinos and the Athenian archons of the 250s BC" in Flensted-Jensen, P., Nilsen, Th. H. & L. Rubinstein (eds) *Polis and politics. Studies in ancient Greek history presented to M.H. Hansen on his sixtieth birthday, August 20, 2000*, 507-20, Copenhagen.

— (2003a) " The Athenian archon Diomedon and his successors" *ZPE* 143, 95-100.

— (2003b) "Shadowland: Athens under Antigonos Gonatas and his successor" in *The Macedonians in Athens 323-229 BC* (Athens, May 2001) [forthcoming]

Osborne, R.G. (1985) *Demos. The discovery of classical Attica*, Cambridge.

— (1988) "Social and economic implications of the leasing of land and property in classical and Hellenistic Greece" *Chiron* 18, 279-323.

— (1990) " The Demos and its divisions in classical Athens" in Murray, O. & S. Price (eds) 265-93.

Ostwald, M. (1986) *From popular sovereignty to the sovereignty of law: Law, society, and politics in fifth-century Athens*, Los Angeles.

Pakkanen, P. (1996) *Interpreting early Hellenistic religion. A study based on the mystery cult of Demeter and the cult of Isis*, Helsinki (Papers and monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 3).

Pantazopoulos, N.I. (1946) *Ai ellenikai koinoniai. Prolegomena eis to attikon somateiakon dikaion*, Athenai (Sumbolai eis ten ereunan ths istorias tou ellenikou kai tou romaikou dikaiou os kai ton allon dikaion tes archaiotetos 3) [now in *Anticharisma ston Nikolao I. Pantazopoulo*, A, 205-80, Thessalonike 1986 (Epistemonike Epeterida tes Scholes Nomikon kai Oikonomikon Epistemon APTh 19)]

— (1948) "Orgeones" *Polemon* 3, 97-128. [now in *Anticharisma ston Nikolao I. Pantazopoulo*, A, 311-39, Thessalonike 1986 (Epistemonike Epeterida tes Scholes Nomikon kai Oikonomikon Epistemon APTh 19].

Parke, H.W. (1977) *Festivals of the Athenians*, London (Aspects of Greek and Roman life).

Parker, R. (1996) *Athenian religion. A history*, Oxford.

Patterson, C. (1981) *Perikles' citizenship law of 451/0 B.C.*, New York.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Pečirka, J. (1966) *The formula for the grant of enktesis in Attic inscriptions*, Prague (Acta Universitatis Carolinae Philosophica et Historica).
Peristiany, J. (ed) (1965) *Honour and shame. The values of Mediterranean society*, London.
Peristiany, J. & J. Pitt-Rivers (eds) (1992) *Honor and grace*, Cambridge.
Petrocheilos, I. (1992) "Anathematika glupta tes Kubeles apo ton Peiraia" *AE* 131, 21-65.
Pitt-Rivers, J. (1965) "Honour and social status" in Peristiany (ed) 21-77.
Placido, D. (1992) "La formation de dépendances à l'intérieur de la 'polis' après la guerre du Peloponnése" *Index* 20, 147-52.
Planeaux, C. (2000-01) " The date of Bendis' entry into Attica" *CJ* 96, 165-92.
Poland, F. (1909) *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, Leipzig.
Polignac, F. (1984) *La naissance de la cité grecque*, Paris.
Prandi, L. (1982) *Ricerche sulla concessione della cittadinanza ateniese nel V sec. A.C.*, Milano.
Pritchett, W.K. (1991) *The Greek state at war*, vol. 5, Berkeley.
Radin, M. (1910) *The legislation of Greeks and Romans on corporations*, diss. University of Columbia.
Raubitschek, A.E. (1981) "A new Attic club (eranos)" *The J.P. Getty Museum Journal* 9, 93-98 and in Obbink, D. & P.A. van der Waerdt (eds) (1990) *The School of Hellas*, 134-43, Oxford.
Reed, M. (1992) *The sociology of organizations*, London.
Reinach, T. (1892) "Eranos" in *DAGR*, 805.
Rhodes, P.J. (1981) *A commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford.
— (1997) "Deceleans and Demotionidae again" *CQ* 47, 109-20.
Robert, L. (1969) "Inscriptions d'Athènes et de la Grèce centrale" *AE* 1-58 and now in *Opera Minora Selecta* 7, 720-29, Amsterdam.
de Robertis, F.M. (1938) *Il diritto associativo romano dai collegi della repubblica alle corporazioni del Basso Impero*, Bari.
— (1971) *Storia delle corporazioni e del regime associativo nel mondo romano*, Bari.
— (1984) "La capacità giuridica dei collegi romani e la sua progressiva contrazione" in *Sodalitas. Scritti in onore di A. Guarino*, 4, 1259-67, Napoli.
— (1986) "Autonomia statuaria e personificazione giuridica nel regime associativo romano" in *Études offertes à Jean Macqueron*, 36-39, Marseille.
— (1989) "Leges cultorum pagane e statuti confraternali cristiani: Riferibilità ad un comune modello statuario e organizzativo" *SDHI* 55, 28-40.
— (1995) "Dai collegia cultorum pagani alle medievali congregationes fratrum attraverso il superamento della discriminazione giustinianea in pro dei tenuiores" *SDHI* 61, 433-45.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Roebuck, D. (2001) *Ancient Greek arbitration*, Oxford.
Roesch, P. (1982) *Études béotiennes*, Paris.
Rohde, E. (1891-94) *Psyche. Seelenkult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen*, transl. by W.B. Hillis, London 1925.
Roussel, D. (1976) *Tribu et cité. Études sur les groupes sociaux dans les cités grecques aux époques archaïque et classique*, Paris- Besançon (Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon - Centre de recherches d'histoire ancienne 23).
Rubinstein, L. (1993) *Adoption in IV. century Athens*, Copenhagen (Opuscula Graecolatina 34).
Rudhardt, J. (1960) "La définition du délit d'impiété d'après la législation attique" *MH* 17, 87-105.
— (1992) "De l'attitude des Grecs à l'égard des religions étrangères" *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 209, 219-38.
Ruggini, L.C. (1976) "La vita associativa nelle città dell'Oriente greco: tradizione locali e influenze romane" in Pippidi, D.M. (ed) *Assimilation et résistance à la culture Gréco-Romaine dans le monde ancien: travaux du VIe congrès international d' études classiques* (Madrid, septembre 1974), 426-91, Bucharest-Paris.
Ruiz-Perez, A. (1994) "Un oracle relatif à l'introduction du culte de Cybèle à Athènes" *Kernos* 7, 169- 77.
Ruschenbusch, E. (1966) *Solonos Nomoi. Die Fragmente des solonischen Gesetzeswerkes mit einer Text- und Überlieferungsgeschichte*, Wiesbaden (Historia Einzelschriften 9).
de Sanctis, G. (1898) *Atthis. Storia della repubblica ateniese dalle origini alla età di Pericle*, 3rd ed., Firenze 1975.
San Nicolò, M. (1913-15) *Ägyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer*, München (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 2).
— (1932) "Guilds" in Seligman, E.R.A. (ed) *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, 7, 204ff, New York.
Saxonhouse, A.W. (1983) "Classical Greek conceptions of public and private" in Benn, S.I. & G.F. Gaus (eds) *Public and Private in social life*, 363-84, London.
Schmeller, Th. (1995) *Hierarchie und Egalität. Eine sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchung paulinischer Gemeinden und griechisch-römischer Vereine*, Stuttgart (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 162).
Schmitt, J.-C. (1978) "L' histoire des marginaux" in Le Goff, J. (ed) *La Nouvelle Histoire*, 277-305, Paris 1988.
Schmitt-Pantel, P. (1990) "Collective activities and the political in the Greek city " in Murray & Price (eds) 199-214 [French version in Thelamon, F. (ed) 279-89].

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Schneider, C. (1967-69) *Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus*, 2 vols, München.
Schwenk, C.J. (1985) *Athens in the age of Alexander; the dated laws and decrees of the Lykourgan era 338-322 B.C.*, Chicago.
Sealey, R. (1990) *Women and law in classical Greece*, London.
— (1994) *The justice of the Greeks*, Ann Arbor.
Seland, T. (1996) "Philo and the clubs and associations of Alexandria" in Kloppenborg & Wilson (eds), 110-27.
Shipton, K. (2000) *Leasing and lending. The cash economy in fourth-century BC Athens*, London (BICS Suppl. 74).
Sickinger, J.P. (1999) *Public records & archives in classical Athens*, NC. (Studies in the history of Greece and Rome)
Simms, R.S. (1986) *Foreign religious cults in Athens in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.*, diss. University of Virginia.
— (1988) "The cult of the Thracian goddess Bendis in Athens and Attica" *AncW* 18, 59-76.
Sinclair, R.K. (1988) *Democracy and participation in Athens*, Cambridge.
Smith, M.G. (1974) *Corporations and society*, London.
Steinhauer, G. (1993) "Neotera stoicheia gia ton salaminio thiaso tes Bendidos" *AE* 132, 31-47.
Strangas, J. (1993) "Les implications philosophiques de la notion de sujet du droit" *Archives de Philosophie du Droit* 34, 123-57.
Strauss, B.S. (1986) *Athens after the Peloponnesian war. Class, faction and policy 403-386 BC*, London.
Sventsitskaya, V.S. (1985) "Private associations in the Greek cities of the Hellenistic and Roman times" *VDI* 175, 43-61. (in Russian)
Swiderek, A. (1990) "La cité grecque et l'évolution de la mentalité religieuse dans les premiers temps de l'époque hellénistique" *Eos* 78, 259-72.
Talamo, C. (1992) "Solone e il banchetto pubblico, la terra, la fratria" *Miscellanea Greca e Romana* 17, 19-43.
Taubenschlag, R. (1955) *The law of Graeco-Roman Egypt in the light of papyri (332 B.C.-640 A.D.)*, Warszawa.
Taylor, M.C. (1997) *Salamis and the Salaminioi. The history of an unofficial Athenian demos*, Amsterdam (Archaia Ellas 5).
Thelamon, F. (ed) (1987) *Sociabilité, pouvoirs et société* (Actes du Colloque de Rouen, novembre 1983), Rouen (Publications de l'Université de Rouen 110).
Tod, M.N. (1932) *Ancient Inscriptions: Sidelights on Greek History*, reprint 1974, Chicago.
— (1906) "A statute of an Attic thiasos" *ABSA* 13, 328-38.
Todd, S. (1993) *The shape of Athenian law*, Oxford.
Tondo, S. (1976) "Diritto ateniese a Roma" *Atti e Memorie dell'Accademia Fiorentina di scienze e lettere "La Colombaria"* 41, 55ff.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Tracy, S.V. (1988) "Two Attic letter-cutters of the third century: 286/5-235/4 B.C." *Hesperia* 57, 303-22.
— (1990) *Attic letter-cutters of 229 to 86 B.C.*, Oxford.
— (1995) *Athenian democracy in transition. Attic letter cutters of 340-290 B.C.*, Oxford.
Traill, J.S. (1986) *Demos and trittys. Epigraphical and topographical studies in the organization of Attica*, Toronto.
Trampedach, K. (2001) "›Gefährliche Frauen‹. Zu athenischen Asebie-Prozessen im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr." in von den Hoff, R. & St. Schmidt (eds) *Konstruktionen von Wirklichkeit. Bilder im Griechenland des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, 137-55, Stuttgart.
Triantaphyllopoulos, J. (1985) *Das Rechtsdenken der Griechen*, München (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 78).
Trundle, M.F. (1999) "Identity and community among Greek mercenaries in the classical world: 700-322 BCE" *AHB* 13, 28-38.
Tur, R. (1987) "The 'Person' in law" in Peacocke, A. & G. Gillett (eds) *Persons and Personality*, 116-29, Oxford.
Vamvoukos, A. (1979) "Fundamental freedoms in classical Athens" *RIDA* 26, 89-124.
Vanderpool, E. (1968) "Three inscriptions from Eleusis" *AD* 23A, 1-9.
Veligianni-Terzi, Chr. (1997) *Wertbegriffe in den attischen Ehrendekreten der klassischen Zeit*, Stuttgart (Heidelberger althistorische Beiträge und epigraphische Studien 25).
Vélissaropoulos, J. (1980) *Les nauclères grecs. Recherches sur les institutions maritimes en Grèce et dans l'Orient hellénisé*, Paris – Genève (Hautes Études du monde Grèco-Romain 9).
Vernant, J.-P. (1965) *Mythe et pensée chez les Grecs*, new edition 1988, Paris.
Versnel, H.S. (1990) *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman religion. I.Ter Unus: Isis, Dionysos, Hermes: three studies in henotheism*, Leiden (Studies in Greek and Roman religion 6).
Veyne, P. (1976) *Le pain et le cirque. Sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique*, Paris.
Vikela, E. (1994) *Weihreliefs aus dem Athener Pankrate-Heiligtum am Ilisos. Religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung und Typologie*, Berlin (MDAI.A 16).
Vinogradoff, P. (1920-22) *Outlines of historical jurisprudence*, 2 vols, Oxford.
Vondeling, J. (1961) *Eranos*, Groningen.
Ustinova, Y. (1996) "Orgeones in phratries: A mechanism of social integration in Attica" *Kernos* 6, 227-42.
Wade-Gery, G. (1958) *Essays in Greek History*, Oxford.
Waltzing, J.P. (1895) *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains*, 3 vols, Louvain.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Weiler, I. (1988) "Soziale Randgruppen in der antiken Welt. Einführung und wissenschaftsgesichtliche Aspekte. Ausgewählte Literatur zur historischen Randgruppenforschung" in Weiler, I. (ed) (1988) *Soziale Randgruppen und Aussenseiter im Altertum*, 11-24, Graz.

Wescher, C. (1865) "Notice sur deux inscriptions de l'île de Thera, relatives à une société religieuse" *RA* 12, 214-27.

Whitehead, D. (1983) "Competitive outlay and community profit: *philotimia* in democratic Athens" *C & M* 34, 55-74.

— (1986) *The demes of Attica 508/7-c.250 B.C. A political and social study*, Princeton.

— (1991) "Norms of citizenship in ancient Greece" in Molho, A., Raaflaub, K. & J. Emlen (eds) *City-states in classical Antiquity and medieval Italy*, 135-54, Stuttgart.

— (1993) "Cardinal virtues. The language of public approbation in democratic Athens" *C & M* 44, 37-77.

Wieacker, F. (1988) *Römische Rechtsgeschichte: Quellenkunde, Rechtsbildung, Jurisprudenz und Rechtsliteratur, I.1 Einleitung, Quellenkunde, Frühzeit und Republik*, München (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 10.3).

Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, U. (1881) "Antigonos von *Karystos*" in *Philologischen Untersuchungen* 4, Berlin.

— (1893) *Aristoteles und Athen*, 2 vols, Berlin.

Wilhelm, A. (1909) *Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde*, Wien (Sonderschriften des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien 7).

— (1942) "Attische Urkunden V. Teil" *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, philos.-historische Klasse Bd. 220.5 (now in *AGI* 1, 619-807).

— (1951) *Griechische Inschriften rechtlichen Inhaltes*, Athenai (Pragmateiai Akademias Athenon 17) (now in *AGI* 3, 391-501).

Will, E., Mossé, Cl. & P. Goukowsky (1975) *Le monde grec et l'Orient. II. Le IV^e siècle et l'époque hellénistique*, 2nd ed., Paris 1985.

Wilson, B. (1970) *Religious sects. A sociological study*, London.

Wilson, S.G. (1996) "Voluntary associations. An overview" in Kloppenborg & Wilson (eds) 1-15.

Wyse, W. (1904) *The speeches of Isaeus*, Cambridge.

Ziebarth, E. (1896) *Das griechische Vereinswesen*, Leipzig.

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

INDEX OF SOURCES

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

A. LITERARY SOURCES

Aischines
1 (*Against Timarchos*) 149: 55 n.77
3 (*Against Ktesiphon*) 24: 49-50

Andocides
1 (*On the mysteries*) 127: 42

Aristophanes
Acharnians 614-617: 71, 75
Lysistrata 651-653: 71

Aristotle
AthPol 26.4: 40 n.27, 43
— 52.2: 73, 139
— 55.3: 56
EE 7.9.3 (1241b 25): 37 n.19, 140 n.51
EN 4.2.20 (1123a 20-22): 73, 76-77
— 8.9.4 (1160a 8-14): 140-141
— 8.9.5 (1160a 14-18): 54
— (1160a 19-20): 63, 73
— 8.12.1 (1161b 15-16): 125
Oec. 2.2.3 (1346b 13-19): 63
Pol. 1.1 (1252): 40 n.29, 140 n.51
— 1.3.10 (1256b): 53-54
— 5.9.2 (1313a 34-b7): 121 n.4

Athenaeus
Deipnosophistai 5.185e-186a: 37 n.19
— 10.432d: 62 n.98
— 13.597d: 34 n.12

Basilica 60.32.3-4: 46

Demosthenes
14 (*On the symmories*) 16: 139
18 (*On the crown*) 55: 49
— 260: 63
— 312: 72
21 (*Against Meidias*) 82: 80 n.149
— 101: 71-72, 79 n.146
— 184-185: 71, 79 n.146
— 215: 80 n.149, 97
23 (*Against Aristokrates*) 206: 132
25 (*Against Aristogeiton I*) 21: 79 n.146
— 79: 93 n.14
39 (*Against Boiotos* I) 2: 92 n.10
40 (*Against Boiotos* II) 9: 92 n.10
— 52: 80 n.149
46 (*Against Stephanos* II) 26: 56
54 (*Against Konon*) 14: 130 n.22
— 39: 130 n.22
57 (*Against Eubulides*) 28: 56
— 67: 56
59 (*Against Neaira*) 31: 82

Digest 10.1.13: 55
— 47.22.4: 25, 37, 44-57, 121 n.5, 125 n.15, 168

Dinarchus
frg. 13 (Conomis): 35 n.14
— 18 (Conomis): 35 n.14
— 65 (Conomis): 35 n.14

Euripides
HF 613: 46 n.45

FGrHist 3 (Pherekydes) F11: 72, 75
— 328 (Philochoros) F35a: 37-44, 168
— F60: 93 n.14
— 341 (Seleukos) F1: 54-55
— 342 (Krateros) F4: 40, 43

Harpocration
ε 129: 74 n.136
ο 28: 34 n.9

Homeric Hymn to Apollo 388-390: 33, 34 n.8

Hypereides
3 (*For Euxenippos*) 7-11: 70 n.146
4 (*Against Philippides*) 8: 56
5 (*Against Athenogenes*) 13-14: 71-72

IEG 2, 16: 54 n.72
— 40 no 67: 34 n.11
— 54 no 6: 62 n.98

Isaeus
2 (*On the estate of Menekles*) 14: 35-36, 42, 157
— 16: 35 n.15
— 17: 35 n.15

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

2 (*On the estate of Menekles*) 36: 36 n.18
— 45: 35 n.15
6 (*On the estate of Philoktemon*) 20: 42
— 22: 41 n.31
7 (*On the estate of Apollodoros*) 26: 35 n.16
8 (*On the estate of Kiron*) 20: 41 n.31
9 (*On the estate of Astyphilos*) 30: 35 n.16, 63
frg. 35 (Thalheim): 35 n.14

Isocrates
Nicocles 54: 121
Panegyricus 149: 53

Josephus
Against Apion 2.267-268: 91

Lysias
8 (*Against synousiastai*) — 155 n.26
— 2: 129 n.20, 157
— 10-12: 129 n.20, 157
— 18: 129 n.20, 157
frg. 58 (Thalheim): 35 n.14
— 73 (Thalheim): 130 n.22

PCG
iii.2 (Aristophanes) frg. 419: 72-73, 75
— 122 ii: 62
v (Euphro) frg. 9: 72-73

Photios
Lexicon δ 27: 62
— θ 60: 29 n.30

Plato
Laws 915E: 74

Plutarch
Demosthenes 14.6: 93 n.14
Perikles 32.1: 91
— 37.2-5: 40 n.27

PMGF F98: 62 n.96

Pollux
Γ 95: 48 n.53
E 154: 48 n.53

Scholia in D. 19 (*On the false embassy*)
281: 91 n.10

Scholia in Pl. *Laws* 915E: 74

Strabo
Geography 10.4.18: 62 n.96

Suda
ε 2892: 74 n.136
δ 125: 62
θ 379-380: 63-64
ο 510: 45
– 511: 34 n.9, 34 n.13

TGrF 3, frg. 144: 34 n.10

Xenophon
Anabasis 6.6.5: 53 n.68
HG 3.2.2: 53 n.68

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

B. EPIGRAPHICAL SOURCES

Entries in Appendix 1 are not indexed.

Ag. 16. 161: 28 n.28. 96. 103-104. 126
— 223: 70. 131 n.24. 133
— 231: 154 n.22
— 235: 57. 113 n.88. 114 n.90. 154 n.22
— 245: 57. 107 n.63. 108
— 329: 60
Ag. 19. H.84: 70. 79. 80 n.149

AJA 64 (1960) 269: 85 n.162. 86. 100. 107 n.63. 108 n.68. 109 n.72. 110 n.77. 113 n.89. 160 n.33

AM 16 (1891) 261: 61
— 66 (1941) 228 no. 4: 108 n.68. 109. 116. 135-136. 154 n.22

BCH 4 (1880) 164ff: 31 n.1
— 92 (1968) 359-74: 95 n.21

CIRB 17: 60 n.91

Dubois, *IGDOlbia* 96: 28 n.27. 60 n.91

Finley 17: 97. 160
— 32: 59
— 40: 70 n.122. 76-81
— 41: 59
— 43: 70 n.122. 113
— 44: 70 n.122. 79
— 107: 31 n.1
— 108: 31 n.1
— 110: 31 n.1
— 114A: 70 n.122. 79
— 163A: 70 n.122. 79-80

IApameia 33-35: 61

IBeroia 22: 61

ICret. iv 174: 61

ID 1519: 61
— 2225: 95 n.21

IG i³ 104: 38
— 136: 100. 113-114
— 262: 31 n.1
— 1016: 64

IG ii² 120: 49-50
— 337: 51 n.61. 89-90
— 839: 112 n.86
IG ii² 840: 112 n.86
— 1176: 97. 160
— 1177: 51. 65-66
— 1178: 133 n.29
— 1196: 132
— 1198: 133 n.29
— 1205: 139 n.44
— 1206: 108 n.68
— 1237: 64
— 1241: 112 n.84
— 1246: 28 n.28. 64
— 1252: 96. 115-117. 131 n.26. 132. 151. 153 n.22
— 1253: 96. 115-116. 132. 151
— 1254: 103
— 1255: 60. 107. 109. 117. 131 n.25. 151. 153 n.22. 162
— 1256: 60. 96. 108 n.68-69. 151
— 1258: 132. 138-139. 155 n.26
— 1259: 103-104. 115-116
— 1261: 67. 89. 96. 99 n.35. 101. 104 n.51. 53-54. 107 n.63. 108 n.68. 113. 117. 126. 131 n.25. 132. 151 n.18
— 1262: 99 n.35. 108 n.68. 131 n.25. 132. 151 n.18
— 1263: 99 n.35. 104 n.51-52 & 54. 105. 107 n.63. 109 n.72. 110. 113. 117. 131 n.25-26. 132. 136. 142. 151. 154 n.22. 156 n.27
— 1265: 78. 84. 107 n.63. 110 n.77. 132
— 1266: 83
— 1271: 99 n.35. 104 n.52. 105. 111 n.81. 113. 117. 131 n.26. 149. 151 n.16 & 18. 154 n.22
— 1273: 90 n.5. 99 n.35. 104 n.51-52. 105. 113. 117. 131-132. 135. 151

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

n.17, 154 n.22
IG ii² 1275: 65-67, 113, 126, 131-132
— 1277: 69, 99 n.35, 102 n.44, 104 n.53, 105 n. 55, 106, 108 n.68, 109 n.72, 113, 116-117, 133, 149, 150 n.13
— 1278: 70, 104 n.53-54, 106, 108 n.68, 109 n.72, 113, 117, 126, 128, 151 n.18
— 1282: 104 n.52, 106-107, 108 n.68, 113, 126, 128, 151 n.17
— 1283: 59, 90, 94, 98 n.30, 102, 113, 126-127, 162
— 1284: 59, 102, 104 n.54, 105, 108-111, 117, 126-128, 151
— 1289: 51 n.60, 57-58, 104 n.50, 112, 134 n.31, 135, 136 n.35, 155 n.26
— 1291: 84, 86, 101, 107 n.63, 108 n.68, 109 n.72, 110 n.77, 117, 126-128, 131 n.26, 133, 154 n.22
— 1292: 84 n.156, 85-86, 100, 105, 107 n.63-64, 108 n.68, 109 n.72, 110 n.77, 131 n.25, 132, 136, 151 n.17, 152
— 1297: 65-66, 85, 99-101, 104 n.53, 107 n.63, 113, 116-117, 131 n.24-25, 133, 135, 151 n.17, 152
— 1298: 65, 66 n.111, 69, 86, 99-100, 104 n.53-54, 111 n.79, 113, 126-128, 131 n.24
— 1301: 99 n.35, 104 n.52, 108 n.69, 109, 113, 117
— 1314: 100, 102 n.44, 108 n.68, 113 n.88, 114 n.90, 117, 133, 151 n.16-18
— 1315: 102 n.44, 113 n.88, 114 n.90, 117, 151 n.17, 154 n.22
— 1316: 29 n.30, 100, 102 n.44, 108 n.68, 110 n.77, 113 n.88, 114, 117, 131 n.25, 151, 154 n.22
— 1317: 67-69, 99 n.35, 102, 105, 108 n.68, 109 n.72, 110 n.77, 117, 150, 151 n.18
— 1317b: 67-69, 99 n.35, 102, 105, 106 n.58, 108 n.68, 109 n.72, 110 n.77, 113, 131, 150
— 1318: 69, 99 n.35, 108 n.69, 133, 149
— 1319: 69, 99 n.35, 117
— 1322: 84 n.154, 85, 95, 101 n.42, 109 n.72, 110 n.77, 117, 154 n.22
— 1323: 99 n.35, 104 n.54, 106, 109 n.72, 110 n.77, 113, 132-133
IG ii² 1324: 59-60, 108 n.68-69, 110 n.77, 116-117, 118 n.99, 151 n.18
— 1325: 32, 67 n.114, 101-102, 104 n. 54, 110 n.77, 126-128, 137, 149, 152, 154 n.22
— 1326: 32, 67 n.114, 97 n.128, 102, 110 n.77, 126-128, 149
— 1327: 49, 86, 97, 101, 102 n.44, 104 n.54, 109, 110 n.77, 111 n.79, 116-117, 126, 131 n.25, 133, 142, 149, 151 n.18, 152, 154 n.22
— 1328: 102 n.44, 110, 114, 126, 131-132, 136, 152
— 1329: 102 n.44, 104 n.54, 109-111, 116-117, 132, 149, 151 n.18, 154 n.22
— 1334: 102 n.44, 104 n.54, 113 n.88, 114 n.90, 114 n.91, 117, 131 n.24, 151 n.18
— 1335: 83 n.154, 85-87, 101, 102 n.44, 105, 108 n.68, 109 n.72, 110 n.77, 113 n.89, 152
— 1337: 113 n.88, 133, 154 n.22
— 1339: 84 n.156, 85, 99 n.34, 101-102, 110 n.77, 131 n.24
— 1343: 73, 84 n.156, 85, 87, 95, 110 n.77, 113 n.89, 126, 131, 149-150, 154 n.22
— 1345: 85-86, 102 n.44, 131-132
— 1361: 59, 96-98, 103, 107, 110, 113, 123, 126-127, 131, 134, 137
— 1366: 86, 97
— 1368: 96, 99 n.33, 101 n.43, 109 n.72, 110 n.77, 114 n.92, 126, 150 n.14, 156 n.27
— 1369: 83-84, 87, 95 n.23, 96-97, 99 n.33, 101, 102 n.44, 109 n.72, *110* n.77, 114, 125-127, 129, 156 n.27
— 1558.37: 81-82
— 1559.26: 81-82
— 1583: 78, 132
— 1599: 134 n.31, 136 n.36
— 2343: 100 n.39
— 2345: 63 n.101, 100 n.39
— 2346: 100 n.39
— 2347: 67 n.112, 99-100, 131.133
— 2348: 100 n.39
— 2349: 100 n.39
— 2351: 100 n.39

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

IG ii² 2352: 100 n.39
— 2353: 101 n.42
— 2354: 100 n.40
— 2355: 28 n.28, 96-97
— 2356: 100 n.39
— 2358: 100 n.40, 101 n. 42
— 2360: 45 n.41
— 2361: 113-114
— 2499: 104, 110 n.77, 112 n.84-86, 131-132, 137 n.41
— 2500: 133 n.29
— 2501: 112 n.85-86, 132, 137 n.41
— 2932: 85 n.159, 107
— 2935: 78
— 2936: 99 n.35
— 2937: 83
— 2939: 99 n.35
— 2940: 78, 83 n.154, 101
— 2943: 99 n.35
— 2947: 60 n.89
— 2948: 67 n.114
— 2960: 85 n.160, 101 n.42
— 4013: 99 n.35
— 4817: 115 n.92
— 4866: 60 n.89
— 4985: 65, 67
— 9223: 60 n.89
— 10248: 78

IG vii 33: 31 n.1
— 533: 45 n.41
— 689: 45 n.41
— 1785: 45 n.41
— 1790: 45 n.41
— 2463: 45 n.41

IG ix (1)² 670: 61, 156 n.27

IG ix (2) 332: 56 n.80

IG xi (4) 1227: 95 n.21
— 1343: 95 n.21

IG xii (3) 330: 129 n.21

IG xii (5) 606: 61, 67 n.112

IG xii (8) 19: 31 n.1

IG xii (8) 21: 31 n.1
— 265: 112 n.83

IG xii (9) 191: 123, 134
— 909: 45 n.40
— 923: 45 n.40

IG xii Suppl. 303: 97 n.28
— 356: 63

IIasos 116: 95 n.22
— 152: 123, 135

IKios 20: 61

IKyme 30: 61

ILindos 292: 54 n.70, 56 n.80

IMagnesia 214: 67 n.112

IPrusa ad Olympum 1036: 61

IrhodPer 302A: 61

ISmyrna 534: 61

LSAM 48: 67 n.112
— 72: 65 n.105

LSCG 173: 43 n.35

Michel 1307: 31 n.1

OGIS 712: 56 n.80

P. Grenf. I 31: 61

Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 59: 85 n.160, 107 n.63-64, 116-117, 131 n.24, 137 n.39, 151, 154 n.22
Petrakos, *Rhamnous* 203: 78 n.144, 85 n.162, 101 n.42

SEG 2.9: 67-69, 99-100, 102, 104 n.52-53 & 55, 105, 108 n.68, 109 n.72, 110 n.77, 126-128, 131 n.24, 132, 150
— 10: 67-69, 99 n.35, 102, 104 n.53 &

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

55. 105. 106 n.58. 108 n.68. 109 n.72. 110 n.77. 113 n.89. 117. 150
SEG 3.117: 132
— 11.244: 137 n.37
— 12.100: 57-59. 132. 137
— 18.33: 84 n.156. 85 n.160. 101 n. 42. 110 n.77. 117. 131 n.25. 133. 154 n.22
— 36: 71 n.123
— 21.528: 57
— 633: 78 n.144.
— 22.122: 64
— 123: 64
— 24.156: 69. 99 n.35. 111 n.79. 152
— 203: 50. 112 n.83 & 85. 132. 137 n.41
— 223: 70. 99 n.35. 102 n.46. 113 n.89
— 26.473: 61
— 614: 45 n.41
— 909: 61
— 27.1384: 61
— 31.122: 79. 83-87. 96. 99. 101. 102 n.44. 110 n.77. 114. 126. 156
— 633: 61
— 32.150: 108 n.68
— 453: 45 n.41
— 454: 45 n.41
SEG 32. 505: 56
— 1170: 61
— 33.679: 49 n.55
— 34.898: 45 n.40
— 35.1009: 60-61
— 36.228: 97. 101
— 305: 61
— 487: 45 n.41
— 37.103: 86 n.165
— 39.210: 60 n.89
— 1526: 61
— 41.171: 78. 101. 108 n.68. 109 n.72. 110 n.77. 117. 154 n.22
— 42.709: 60
— 1312: 61
— 44.60: 68-69. 99 n.35. 102. 106. 108 n.68. 109 n.72. 110 n.77. 117. 126-128. 150
— 1218: 43 n.36
— 45.909: 60
— 1825: 54 n.70
— 48.1330: 34 n.11

*Syll*³ 1035: 61 n.95
— 1044: 129 n.19
— 1106: 129 n.19
— 1144: 61

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

C. GENERAL INDEX

The terms association, *eranistai*, *koinon*, *orgeones*, *thiasotai* are not indexed.

Acculturation: 155
Admission: 36, 41, 43, 50, 96-99, 146
Adoption: 35-36, 42
Agathos: 115, 132, 149
Amphiaraistai: 85 n.160, 95
Anagoreusis: 151
Anathema: 60 n.89, 151
Andragathia: 117
Antigrapheus: 106
Aphrodite: 94, 102
Apollo: 33
Arbitration: 51 n.60, 58, 138
Archeranistes: 66, 72, 83-85, 86 n.163, 100, 115 n.92
Arete: 117, 154, 162
Artemis: 94, 100
Asebeia (impiety): 89, 91-94, 136
Assembly: 59, 68, 86, 102-103, 126, 129, 132, 143, 155
Atimia: 140, 161

Bendis: 41, 57, 59-60, 67-69, 94, 100-102, 107-108, 110, 130, 161

Citizenship: 27, 36, 38, 40, 42-43, 97, 101, 140, 154
Collegia: 23, 148
Constitution: 48, 103, 126, 128-129
Contract: 22, 48, 77, 79, 125-126, 137-138
Crete: 33, 37, 61
Crown: 59-60, 96-97, 111, 115-117, 151-152, 156, 162
Cybele: 49

Dekadistai: 59
Deloptes: 60
Delos: 29, 61
Delphi: 33, 81 n.151
Deme, *demotai*: 21-23, 27-28, 35, 52, 66, 98, 108 n.68, 110 n.77, 117, 123, 132, 133 n.29, 139 n.44, 158, 160
Demeter: 37, 47, 94
Demosia grammata: 48-50
Dikaios: 115, 132, 149
Dikaiosyne: 117, 154
Dike apostasiou: 81
Dionusiastai: 97 n.28, 101-102, 152-153
Dissolution: 25, 58, 95-96, 119, 129-130, 143
Dokimasia: 84, 97-98
Donation: 137

Eikadeis: 78, 139
Eisaggeltikos nomos: 56
Egalitarianism: 143, 157
Egypt: 29, 60
Emporia (commerce): 52, 54, 122, 125, 158, 163
Enktesis: 89-91
Epaggelia: 149
Epidosis: 149
Epimeletai: 60, 68-69, 99, 105-109, 152
Eranikai dikai: 73
Eranos: 25, 66, 68-69, 71-87, 111, 113, 122-123
Euchrestos: 132, 149
Euergesia, euergetes: 96, 117, 132, 149-150, 152
Euergetism: 30, 145, 148-150, 152-153, 155, 163
Eunoia: 116-117, 132, 149
Eusebeia (piety): 89, 116-117, 154
Euthyna: 141
Expulsion: 101

Fines: 84, 110-115, 123, 156
Foundation: 25, 59 n.86, 94-95, 119, 125-130, 143
Freedmen: 83, 125

Gaius: 44, 52 n.62, 55
Gender: 96, 100, 140
Genos, *gennetai*: 27, 38-42, 44-48, 51, 56, 135
Generosity: 95, 119
Grammateus: 68-69, 99, 105-106, 109-111

Hadrian: 55, 57

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Halikarnassos: 30, 65, 129 n.19
Hestiator: 103-104, 108, 113 n.87, 115
Hetaireiai: 23, 26, 44, 56
Hiereia (priestess): 94, 100, 104, 113-117
Hiereus (priest): 68, 85 n.159, 104, 106, 108, 113
Hieropoios: 85 n.159, 107-108, 112
Homogalaktes: 39-41
Homotaphoi: 55
Honours: 50, 105-119, 141, 151-156
Horoi: 26, 70-71, 76-81, 113, 132-134

Iasos: 95, 135
Integration: 30, 143, 153-154
Iobakchoi: 99 n.33, 109 n.72, 110 n.77

Keos: 61, 67 n.112
Kinship: 23, 80, 158
Kition (Cyprus): 89-90
Koinoniai: 54
Koinonikai: 139
Kos: 30, 129 n.14

Lease: 110-113, 137-138, 157
Legal personality: 119-125, 130, 133-134, 139-140, 142-143, 145
Legitimacy: 42
Lemnos: 31, 76 n.141
Litigation: 35, 157
Loan: 70, 72-82, 111

Marginality: 30, 159-163
Megara: 31
Membership: 20, 22-25, 36, 96-101, 118, 135, 154, 158-160, 162
Menutai: 46-48
Mesogeioi: 28 n.28,
Metic: 99 n.35, 101, 125, 140, 142, 153, 161-162
Metroon: 49
Mnemon: 103
Mother of the Gods (*Meter Theon*): 94, 97, 102, 109, 110 n.75, 113, 116, 130, 152, 161
Mustai: 45-46

Naturalization: 38, 48
Nautai: 45
Ninos: 91
Nomos: 43, 126-129

Olbia: 28 n.27
Orgas: 32-33
Orgia: 32-33, 45

Paraloi: 103
Patronage: 145, 157-159
Perjury: 139
Phialai exeleutherikai (freedmen's bowls): 71, 76, 81-83
Phialephoroi: 100
Philia (friendship): 80, 129, 154
Philotimia: 116-117, 132, 149, 153-154, 162
Phratries, *phratores*: 23, 27, 35-36, 39-44, 48, 58-59, 64, 70, 108 n.68, 112 n.84, 123, 132, 135, 158-159
Phryne: 92-94
Phyle, phyletai: 21, 23, 27-28, 46, 51, 102 n.46, 108 n.68, 109 n.71, 110 n.77, 132, 143
Piracy: 52-54
Plerotes, plerotria: 72, 76, 79, 81
Plunder: 53-54
Prasis epi lusei: 58
Priesthood: 37
Proeranistria: 72, 85, 100
Property: 58-59, 76-81, 89-91, 122, 133-138, 143

Reciprocity: 73, 75, 157-158
Rhodes: 29, 61, 76 n.139

Sabaziastai: 85-86
Salamis: 67-69
Sarapiastai: 67 n.112, 85, 110 n.77, 116 n.94
Sect(s): 20
Slaves: 82-83, 101, 140, 146, 160-162
Sociability: 22, 27, 37, 147, 154-155
Social order: 21, 163
Social values: 21, 27
Solidarity: 35, 89
Sparta: 61
Status: 30, 96, 101, 140, 147, 160, 162
Sunthekai: 50
Syllogos: 103

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

Symbolic capital: 157
Symbolic order: 24
Symbolic violence: 154
Symposion: 21, 159
Syndikos: 132
Synodos: 84, 95, 97
Syssitoi: 56

Tamias: 99, 104-106, 108, 112
Tenos: 61, 97 n.28
Teos: 31
Thasos: 63 n.101
Theoris: 92-93
Thera: 30
Thesmophorion: 66
Thiasos: 29, 37 n.19, 61-67, 70, 89, 95, 100 n.39, 158
Thutai: 45-46
Trittys: 21, 23

Witness: 35-36, 157
Women: 96, 100, 113-114, 144-147, 153-154, 160-162

Zakoros: 100, 114

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Ακαδημία Αθηνών / Academy of Athens

THE FOURTH SUPPLEMENT OF THE THIRTY-SEVENTH VOLUME OF
THE YEARBOOK OF THE RESEARCH CENTRE
FOR THE HISTORY OF GREEK LAW
OF THE ACADEMY OF ATHENS
WAS PRINTED IN SIX HUNDRED COPIES
IN DECEMBER 2003 BY «G. ARGYROPOULOS LTD»
ON CHAMOIS MODO 100gr. PAPER

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑ
ΑΘΗΝΩΝ