Romanization and Isomorphic Change in Phrygia: the Case of Private Associations*

BENEDIKT ECKHARDT

ABSTRACT

Romanization in the province of Asia did not manifest itself in linguistic or cultural changes, but is very visible in a trend towards corporate organization. In the cities of western and southern Phrygia, professional associations developed that were able to gain a prominent position alongside the civic institutions. It is possible to relate this process to incentives provided by Roman law. In the villages surrounding these cities, and especially in the rural areas of northern and eastern Phrygia, the conditions were different, but there are several indications that a new preference for formal organization and its epigraphic representation developed here as well.

Keywords: Phrygia; Romanization; isomorphism; Roman law in the provinces; voluntary associations; *collegia*; epigraphic evidence

I INTRODUCTION

'Romanization' is a debated concept.[1] In the past few decades, the whole idea of what 'becoming Roman' meant to indigenous populations, and the efforts local élites (rather than Roman administrators) put into the process, has been reformulated from a 'post-colonial' perspective in different disciplines.[2] It seems impossible nowadays to conceive of Romanization as a centrally organized process towards political, social, legal or religious unification. The spread of Roman culture, of institutions, artefacts, language, forms of medial representation and more, nevertheless calls for explanation, and 'Romanization' remains the most plausible term to encompass the questions that arise. For the Western provinces, its use seems to be well established. But for Asia Minor, the absence of Latin and the continuity of Greek social structures have been adduced to counter the claim that the region underwent a process of 'Romanization' comparable to the Western provinces; according to this view, the influence of Roman culture in the cities of Asia can be reduced to matters of taste and style.[3] As it should be admitted that Romanization is a meaningful concept only if it covers cultural transfers that go beyond the partial adaptation of architectural models or clothing styles, this line

* This article is based on a seminar paper given at a meeting of the Copenhagen Associations Project in February 2014. I thank Vincent Gabrielsen and his staff for creating a stimulating environment and an insightful discussion. The article has profited a lot from remarks by Andrew Lepke, and from the helpful suggestions of three anonymous reviewers. Special thanks are due to Kimberley Czajkowski for correcting my English.

[1] cf., among others, the contributions by Woolf 1998; Le Roux 2004; Alföldy 2005.

[2] On the perils involved in this paradigm shift, cf. Versluys 2014 (and the responses in the same volume).

[3] Sartre 2007. But cf. the more differentiated treatments by Woolf 1994 and, from another angle, Price 1984: 53–77.

JRS 106 (2016), pp. 147–171. © *The Author(s) 2016.*
Published by The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.
doi:10.1017/S0075435816000290

of argument raises legitimate questions about the use of the term with respect to the Eastern provinces.

Cultural transfers of a more influential sort can be argued to be found in the organizational structure of a society, or more precisely, the forms of social aggregation that are chosen by its inhabitants. Among these, private associations are a promising test case. From the beginning of the epigraphic record for regions such as Gaul or Spain, *collegia* are attested, and there is little doubt that they were regarded by all actors involved as an element of the Roman civic order. The Lex Irnitana anticipates that in a Roman *municipium*, people might want to gather in *collegia*, and specifies the conditions applicable.[4] In the imperial era, specialized professional *collegia* were regarded as an age-old Roman institution — Plutarch and other authors attribute their introduction at Rome to Numa.[5] Verboven, in a study of *collegia* in the Western provinces, has aptly stated that in the second century, 'les collèges tenaient une place centrale au sein du modèle de la cité authentiquement romaine'.[6] And since associations tended to replicate the Roman civic order on a smaller scale, every single one of these privately-founded groups could act as an agent of 'Romanization'.[7]

However, what seems evident for the Western provinces — that every form of collegiate organization is a result of Roman influence and follows Roman models — seems *a priori* false for the Greek East. After all, private associations are widely attested in Greece from the fourth century B.C.E. onwards, Egyptian associations seem to have existed even earlier, and the body of evidence from Hellenistic Asia Minor is constantly growing.[8] When Gaius discusses the regulations on *sodalitates* in the Twelve Tables, he cites a Solonian precedent.[9] While everyone would still agree that the epigraphic record of associations in the Roman era is different from earlier periods, the claim that the Roman provincial administration triggered the evolution of private associations in cities like Ephesos or Smyrna has little to recommend itself. In what may be the most thoughtful treatment of the problem, Cracco Ruggini has in fact reached the opposite conclusion: given the Roman anxiety about the dangers of collegiate organization, and the long-standing tradition of Greek and Anatolian private associations, apparent similarities of Greek and Roman *collegia* and *synodoi* in the imperial era cannot be due to Roman influence. Rather, the successful co-operation of civic bodies and associations in Greek cities, based on their 'compenetrazione di interessi', served as a model for the Roman state. The latter slowly came to accept the advantages of this sort of associational organization, and adapted it in Italy and the Western provinces; however, due to the different economic and mental framework provided by the Roman social order, this transplantation resulted in the creation of ever less private, more state-controlled organizations, until *collegia* became hereditary tax units.[10] The direction of cultural transfer would thus be from East to West, from Asia Minor to Spain, with Rome as a mediator.

This view, if correct, would provide further arguments in favour of a sceptical approach towards 'Romanization' in Asia Minor. It cannot, however, stand unchallenged. Some of Cracco Ruggini's arguments are based on traditional assumptions no longer held by the

[4] *AE* 1986, 333, § 74; cf. Mentxaka 1995/96; Liu 2005: 286–96.
[5] On the traditions, cf. Gabba 1984.
[6] Verboven 2012: 15.
[7] cf. the insightful remarks by Ando 2010: 20–1, 43–5 (who does not speak of Romanization).
[8] On the spread of associations in Greece: Gabrielsen 2007. On the earliest evidence from Egypt: Çenival 1988. Recent additions from Hellenistic Asia Minor include *SEG* 54, 1117 (Darronistai of Mylasa); 57, 1188 (Heroistai near Koloe in Lydia); 58, 1640 (association of smiths, probably from Tlos); 60, 1332 (Asklepiastai near Pergamon).
[9] *Dig.* 47.22.4.
[10] Cracco Ruggini 1976 (quotation at p. 469).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435816000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

majority of scholars, e.g. the view that Greek cities in Asia Minor preserved a pre-Hellenic, Anatolian social structure with civic subdivisions based on professions.[11] In addition, recent research has done much to undermine the sharp distinction between state-controlled Western *collegia* and the 'contractual' associations of the East. Like their Eastern counterparts, professional *collegia* in Gaul or Spain actively sought integration into the public sphere, and employed terminology that served to bolster their claim to represent more than just their individual members' interests in business opportunities and sociability.[12] Finally, more attention should be given to both the chronology of the epigraphic evidence and to regional differences. The aim of this paper is to study the connection between associations and Romanization in one particular region, Roman Phrygia, in order to address the relevant issues in more detail than can be done in a general treatment of 'Asia Minor'.

The choice of Phrygia may at first sight seem unfortunate. While all regional classifications are constructs to some degree, 'Phrygia' is a case where this becomes especially relevant. A glance at the geographical situation is sufficient to suggest that the cities of southern Phrygia, like Hierapolis, Laodikeia, or Apameia, had much more in common with cities like Miletus, Magnesia and Priene than they had with the villages and small cities in the highlands of northern and eastern Phrygia.[13] Observations on the impact of Greek culture in the Hellenistic period (visible early on in the Lycus valley, almost absent in central and northern Phrygia) bolster this impression.[14] But these differences within the region, and especially the differences with regard to the degree of Hellenization before the Roman conquest, make Phrygia especially interesting for an analysis of the connection between Romanization and associations — after all, the continuity of Greek culture is an important part of the debate. And although practically all epigraphic evidence comes from the imperial era, the possibility of tracing traditions that are neither Greek nor Roman in origin is more realistic in Phrygia than almost anywhere else, given the Phrygian origin of terms such as *bennos* or *doumos*. This means in turn that the findings presented here are often specific to this particular region. But as comparative data will be adduced, they can also serve as the basis for some more general insights.

II THE SPEARHEADS: RESIDENT ALIENS AND OLD MEN

When looking for privately organized multipliers of Roman values, the obvious starting point is the groups of resident Romans, known in Asia Minor as 'the Romans doing business' (*hoi pragmateuomenoi Rhōmaioi*), 'the Romans living here' (*hoi katoikountes Rhōmaioi*) or the like.[15] The influx of Italians reached Phrygia with a considerable delay compared to the coastal regions of Asia Minor.[16] But the impact was profound. In first-century C.E. Apameia, the *katoikountes Rhōmaioi* were a very influential group that regularly appeared alongside the *dēmos* and *boulē* in civic decrees. In this city, resident Romans seem to have had privileged access to the most important magistracies; an inscription from 45/46 C.E. stresses the fact that all five archons were now Roman citizens; four of them came from Italy.[17] Due to its geographical position, Apameia was the most important transfer site for long-distance trade in Phrygia. This naturally

[11] e.g. Ramsay 1895–97: 105–6; against this idea, cf. Van Nijf 1997: 184–5; Harland 2014: 185.
[12] cf. for the East, Van Nijf 1997 (Sommer 2006 does not lead any further); for the West, Tran 2012.
[13] Extensive evidence for this is adduced by Thonemann 2011.
[14] cf. Thonemann 2013a: 15–24.
[15] See now Terpstra 2013: 179–221.
[16] cf. Kirbihler 2007: 24, 30.
[17] *IGR* IV 792. Cf. on the evidence, Terpstra 2013: 203–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435816000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

attracted businessmen from abroad; they were responsible for the wealth of a city that otherwise had very little to offer, at least according to the literary sources.[18] Grouped together in one organization, these Romans could easily play an important rôle in civic politics. By doing so, they perhaps responded at least in part to the needs of the local population, who offered political posts as investment incentives.

The case of Apameia may be special in some respects, but resident Romans are found all over western Phrygia, and we may assume that their political influence in the respective cities depended on similar considerations. The formal traits of this arrangement certainly varied from city to city. In Hierapolis, Romans are not normally mentioned as a decision-making body in civic decrees. But an inscription from the third century does record a joint decision by the council, the people, the *gerousia*, the *synedrion tōn Rhōmaiōn*, the *neoi* and the *synodoi* (probably referring to the associations of Dionysiac artists).[19] They honour a person who has served, *inter alia*, as *konbentarchēs* of the Romans, a Latinism unattested outside Hierapolis. While the resident Romans did not have the same institutional standing as in Apameia, their affairs were treated as civic affairs in Hierapolis as well. In another inscription for a *konbentarchēs*, the honours are conveyed by the *boulē* and *patris*; the *boulē* honours him as its *boularchos*, while the *patris* refers to his general benevolence, which apparently includes taking over the leadership of the Romans.[20] This is all the more interesting because the term *synedrion* could easily be taken to refer to a private association, and the general situation — foreign merchants joining forces — was a constitutive element for many associations in the Hellenistic period. The decrees clearly show that the resident Romans regularly gained political influence beyond what could be expected of a mere private network. But they show us the result rather than the origin of a development that presumably had its roots in the spread of private networks — networks which were explicitly labelled 'Roman' by all parties involved.

A similar argument can perhaps be made for a rather different form of corporate organization that had its roots in the late Hellenistic period, but spread rapidly and with a new political focus only in the imperial era, namely the assemblies of old men (*gerousiai*). In many cities of Asia Minor, the *gerousia* is mentioned alongside the *dēmos* and *boulē* (and at times the resident Romans) in civic decrees. It was tied to the gymnasium, and although its character as an élite club sharply distinguishes it from the traditional Greek conception of age classes,[21] the *gerontes* were still treated as one in official parlance (e.g. the gymnasiarch *pasēs hēlikias*, 'of all age classes'). The *gerousia* also appeared, albeit not too frequently, as a personified civic institution both in the form of statues and on coins, as did the *dēmos* and *boulē*.[22] Phrygia could be said to lead the way here: the earliest epigraphic evidence for a statue group comes from a Phrygian city, as does the earliest coin showing *gerousia* personified.[23]

[18] cf. the stimulating chapter in Thonemann 2011: 99–129.

[19] *AvH* 32. On the date (not before 214–17 C.E.), see Ritti 2003: 198, based on her restoration [ἡ νεωκόρος βουλή] in l. 1. The term σύνοδος is applied only to the Dionysiac artists in Hierapolis; it is therefore unlikely that αἱ σύνοδοι refers to the city's many professional associations (regularly called ἐργασίαι). The artists regularly appeared alongside civic institutions, especially when their own affairs were concerned: *AvH* 36 (*SEG* 35, 1380) contains honours for a poet decreed by the βουλή, δῆμος, γερουσία and ἡ εἰροτάτη σοίνοδος καὶ ὐ ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἱερονῖκαι; *SEG* 35, 1381 (honours for a comic actor) was originally set up by the βουλή, δῆμος and γερουσία (who honour their πολίτης), but later supplemented with a reference to the σύνοδος; cf. on this Jones 1987.

[20] Published by Ritti 2003: 194–6.

[21] cf. Zimmermann 2007: 1524–6.

[22] Thoroughly investigated by Martin 2013.

[23] Statue group: Varinlioğlu 2006: 363–8, no. 4 (*SEG* 56, 1490; Akmoneia, 68 C.E.); in a group of the δῆμος, πόλις and γερουσία, the latter seems to take the place that one would have expected the βουλή to take, as noted by Giannakopoulos 2013: 23–4. Coin: Martin 2013: 143 (Tiberiopolis, time of Hadrian).

But besides these seemingly unambiguous signs of the public nature of the *gerousia* (which would still let it appear as a Romanized institution, but not one that would be of interest in our context), other evidence justifies the conclusion that it was in fact an institution at the border between public and private. Unlike civic *boulai*, the foundations of *gerousiai* could be the result of private initiative, as in the case of Lycian Patara, where C. Iulius Demosthenes of Oinoanda, one of the most prominent Lycian benefactors, established the *gerousia* as a part of his own regional network.[24] Also in Lycia, the city of Sidyma decided in the time of Commodus to establish a *systēma gerontikon*, and to choose a prominent citizen to present this idea to the proconsul (who replied that it deserved praise, not permission).[25] The same situation could perhaps be reconstructed for Phrygian Apameia.[26] This seems to imply that new *gerousiai* could be officially recognized as legal associations, presumably on the basis of the Lex Iulia de collegiis.[27] As regards conditions of membership, entering a *gerousia* could involve similar procedures to entering an association, such as payment of an entrance fee and preliminary screening of candidates.[28] An inscription from Akmoneia (64 C.E.) is remarkable precisely because it records an unusual process: a certain Demades is entrusted 'with the introduction of a name without a fee'; after he has chosen the freedman Karpos, the other members vote that Karpos should 'partake in the *gerousia* on completely equal terms'.[29] Apparently, Demades is rewarded for some benefaction with the right to inscribe one of his friends (or dependants) into the *gerousia*; the closest parallels in procedure come from the regulations of associations from Delos and Athens.[30] In Phrygian Sebaste, an inscription records the admission of seventy-one persons into the (newly-founded?) *gerousia* in 99 C.E. — among them is a whole family of Iulii, including women and children.[31] Women were not normally represented in politics or the gymnasium,[32] but they could apparently find their place in the exclusive 'clubs of elders' that proliferated under Roman rule.

All this hardly fits a categorization of *gerousiai* as civic bodies equivalent to the *boulai*. But in conjunction with the political importance accorded to the *gerousiai* by many cities, it does fit the model developed above for the 'resident Romans' rather well: a closed circle of Romanized (or simply Roman) people within a given city assumed a corporate identity,

[24] Engelmann 2012: 191–2, no. 11, ll. 7–8: καὶ συστησαμένου τὴν γερουσίαν (in an inscription honouring his son).

[25] *TAM* II 175, ll. 5–6. In l. 14, this σύστημα is simply called γερουσία. *TAM* II 176 is the first list of members (οἱ πρώτως καταταγέντες ἰς τὴν γερουσίαν, ll. 2–4). Cf. on the case, Giannakopoulos 2008: 30–6.

[26] In *IGR* IV 783, οἱ γέροντες (l. 1) honour Lucius Atilius Proclus the younger, because he headed a delegation to the emperors concerning 'the foundation (κτίσις)'; in ll. 11–12, he is called 'advocate (συνήγορος) of the *gerousia*'; cf. the rules on agency and advocacy of *corpora* in *Dig.* 3.4. *IGR* IV 782 contains honours decreed by the [σ]εμνό[τ]α[τ]ο[ν συνέδριο]ν τῶν γερό[ντ]ων for its κτίστης Tiberius Aelius Saturninus Marinianus. It is possible that κτίσις refers not to the proper introduction, but to a change of organization of the *gerousia* in order to obtain privileges; cf. the discussion by Giannakopoulos 2008: 41–2.

[27] For this explanation of the text from Sidyma, cf. Benndorf and Niemann 1884: 73; the legal basis is not elucidated by Giannakopoulos 2008: 33–4. For similar cases, see below.

[28] Entrance fee: *IK Ephesos* 13, ii l. 8. 16 (if ἰς γερουσίαν really means taxation on entrance fees; cf. Zimmermann 2007: 1527). Preliminary screening: *IG* VII 2808 B, ll. 9–10 (Hyettos, after 212 C.E.); *Ath. Mitt.* 32 (1907), 293, no. 18 b/c, ll. 4–5 (Pergamon, imperial era; cf. Feyel 2009: 372–3).

[29] Varinlioğlu 2006: 368–71, no. 5, ll. 1–5 (*SEG* 56, 1489): … καὶ νῦν δεδόχθ[αι] | ἐπιτραπῆναι τῷ Δημάδῃ εἰσαγωγὴν ὀνόμα|τος ἀσυμβόλου, οὗ καὶ εἰσαγαγόντος Καρ|πὸν ἀπελεύθερον, ἐψηφίσθαι μετέχειν α[ὐ]||τὸν τῆς γερουσίας <ἐ>π' ἴσῃ πάντων.

[30] *IG* II² 1337 (Athens, 57/56 B.C.E.), ll. 15–18 (those who have contributed 30 drachmae may introduce a new member); *I. Delos* 1520 (153/52 B.C.E.), l. 36 (the benefactor may invite two people of his choice to a festival dedicated to himself). Evidence for benefactors designated ἀσύμβολος in associations (but without the extension to others) is adduced by Giannakopoulos 2013: 17–18.

[31] Paris 1883: 452–6, no. 2 (who argues that these women were exceptionally included because of their high status).

[32] I do not find compelling the evidence adduced by Tsouvala 2015.

thus accumulating influence and network effects. As such groups could hardly be bypassed by civic government, and could in fact use their accumulated prestige to the good of the city, they were incorporated into the decision-making process. Under Roman influence, new forms of corporate organization were created that quickly found their place in the institutional order of Phrygian cities. Romans and 'old men' were the most successful groups, but there were certainly others, especially in the early phase of Roman rule, some of them of a rather curious nature. Thus, in 6/7 C.E., the 'Greek and Roman women' of Akmoneia decided to honour the high priestess Tatia.[33] We should not press Thonemann's assumption that the Romanized élite of Akmoneia consciously followed the model of the Augustan *ordo matronarum* in giving its women the authority to issue their own decrees. But it is clear enough that the presence of a new Italian élite in the more important Phrygian cities (and the influence of Roman institutions such as merchant co-ordination or the senate itself) had a profound impact on the development of new patterns of social organization. Some of the results remained exceptional and did not persist, such as the association of Greek and Roman women. Others, like the associations of resident Romans and the exclusive clubs of elders, profoundly shaped the political and cultural landscape of Phrygian cities. These cases set the stage for our enquiry. They show that what we are looking for was a very real phenomenon in Roman Phrygia.

III CLAIMING A PLACE: PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS AND ISOMORPHISM

Professional associations have a key rôle in the studies by Verboven and Cracco Ruggini noted above, and they certainly deserve it. The phenomenon as such is not entirely Roman. In Egypt, there is earlier evidence for professional associations, and a new inscription from (probably) Lycian Tlos that records a funerary foundation involving a *koinon tōn chalkeōn* proves that they were already known in Asia Minor in the second century B.C.E.[34] Still, in the Hellenistic period, associations that chose a common profession — and not a common cult — as their main identifying statement were extremely rare.[35] The exception from Tlos may actually be explained through Egyptian influence, as Lycia was under Ptolemaic control in the third century B.C.E.[36] In the imperial era, professional associations are known from almost all areas; they are often the only form of the associative phenomenon attested in a given city.[37] The change seems severe and needs to be explained.

In Phrygia, Hierapolis stands out with roughly twenty professional associations attested in published or unpublished inscriptions.[38] This unusual situation is certainly explained by both the epigraphic habit and the state of excavation, as comparison with the two other textile centres of the Lycus valley shows. In Laodikeia, a city that was no less important for textile production and whose social milieux show clear signs of Romanization,[39] the evidence is meagre indeed. Two professional associations are known from one insecurely

[33] *MAMA* XI 99; cf. Thonemann 2010.
[34] *SEG* 58, 1640; cf. Parker 2010: 111.
[35] Stressed by Gabrielsen 2007.
[36] Parker 2010: 111 is sceptical. But of the three other Hellenistic associations known from Lycia, two, both from Limyra, can easily be linked to Egypt, namely the θίασος of Sarapiastai (*SEG* 55, 1463bis) and the recently published βασιλισταί (Wörrle 2015), who consisted of Ptolemaic mercenaries and carried a name that is unattested outside Ptolemaic contexts. *TAM* II 604 (a θίασος from Tlos) is too fragmentary to draw conclusions.
[37] On professional associations in the East, see especially Van Nijf 1997; Zimmermann 2002. Dittmann-Schöne 2001 and Royer 2006 are useful for their (largely identical) collections of data.
[38] cf. Ritti 1995, who also mentions a number of inedita. The available evidence is conveniently presented by Dittmann-Schöne 2001: 219–31; Royer 2006: 335–64. Add *SEG* 56, 1501 (Ritti 2006: 48–51).
[39] cf. Kearsley 2011. On the importance of textile production in the Lycus valley, cf. Erdemir 2011.

reconstructed inscription.[40] One or two other *synergasiai* with unknown specification are attested in fragmentary seat inscriptions from the theatre, and a new inscription reads *topos bapheōn*, 'place of the dyers'.[41] But from Hierapolis, more than 600 inscriptions are known, while the number for Laodikeia is clearly below 100; in addition, most Hierapolitan associations are known from funerary endowments recorded on sarcophagi from the northern necropolis, while in Laodikeia, this genre of texts is absent. For Kolossai, not a single association is securely attested.[42]

Honorific decrees give us an insight into the activities and the status of professional associations within Phrygian cities. It is noteworthy that not a single inscription is concerned simply with honouring a benefactor of the association; instead, all honoured persons represent the Roman order in one way or another. A good example is Lucius Egnatius Quartus, a Roman military commander who was honoured by the *synergasia* of fullers in Akmoneia as founder of the city and a true patriot; his benefactions towards the association are mentioned last and not specified any further.[43] The same person was honoured by the official civic institutions of Akmoneia.[44] The fullers also honoured Titus Flavius Montanus, a friend of the procurator Vibius Lentulus, as *praefectus fabrorum, archiereus Asias, sebastophantēs* and *agōnothetēs*.[45] That he had also done something for the association seems to be little more than a pretext. Perhaps the benefactor did not wish this rather irrelevant dimension of his public life to divert attention from his main achievements. The result, in any case, was that the association inscribed itself into the Roman order by establishing (and publicly demonstrating) contact with one of its more prominent representatives. In Hierapolis, both the purple-dyers and the wool-washers erected almost identical inscriptions in honour of Claudius Zotikos Boas, first *stratēgos, archiereus* etc.; the associations are not said to have received any benefactions themselves.[46] Professional associations could, of course, profit from building projects carried out in the city. In Laodikeia, the fullers and the wool workers were involved in an honorific decree for someone who erected a market hall.[47] But what seems to have mattered most to professional associations was their self-presentation as quasi-official institutions.[48] In Apameia, they even served as civic agents. A number of honorific decrees from the first and second century, all issued by the *dēmos*, the *boulē* and the *katoikountes Rhōmaioi* for prominent Romans, were to be set up by professional associations, namely, the shopkeepers, businessmen and artisans of two commercial streets.[49]

Professional associations thus took part in the representation of their respective cities *vis-à-vis* Roman officials and benefactors. They profited from networks established by

[40] Three according to *CIG* 3938, ll. 2–4: ἡ [ἐργασία] τῶν γναφέ[ων καὶ βαφέων καὶ] ἁπλουργῶν. The stone is lost; there is only a problematic drawing by E. Chishull. Corsten in *IK Laodikeia* 50 gives the following text (with an unnumbered additional line at the beginning): - - - | IC[- - -] | ἐνπορίου N[- - -] | τῶν γναφέ[ων καὶ] | ἁπλουργῶν [ἀνέσ]||τησαν α[ἰ τῆς νε]||ωκόρου [μητροπό]λεως] τῆ[ς] Ἀσίας | Λαοδηκαίων | [πόλεως φυλαί]. Perhaps the text dealt with a 'new factory of the fullers and the workers of raw wool' ([τοῦ] ἐνπορίου ν[έου] in ll. 1–2). On the meaning of ἁπλουργοί, cf. Huttner 2008: 141–3.

[41] Seat inscriptions: *IK Laodikeia* 32; 33. Τόπος βαφέων: Şimşek 2007: 123.

[42] The existence of an ἀρχερμηνεύς (*SEG* 57, 1382) does not require the existence of 'translator associations' (Erdemir 2011: 119); it is rather a civic office (cf. Cadwallader 2007: 115–16). *MAMA* VI 47 is a funerary relief for one Glykon set up by the ἑταῖροι; they may be a 'legally formalized' association (as argued by Trainor 2008: 17–18), but could also be an informal group of friends.

[43] *SEG* 6, 167 (found at Themenotyrai, but cf. Thonemann 2010: 174 n. 37). On his career, cf. Ott 1995: 119–21.

[44] *IGR* IV 642; Varinlioğlu 2006: 362–3, no. 3 (= *SEG* 56, 1492).

[45] *IGR* IV 643+1696; cf. Dittmann-Schöne 2001: 224; Royer 2006: 332–4.

[46] *AvH* 40; 41.

[47] See above, n. 40.

[48] cf., along the same lines, Cracco Ruggini 1976: 468; Van Nijf 2003: 314–17.

[49] *IGR* IV 790; 791 (l. 26: κατὰ τῆς πόλεως ψήφισμα); *MAMA* VI 180 (I and II).

official institutions, because they acted in ways that deliberately obscured the boundaries between public and private. A further indication is the appropriation of public space. The seat inscriptions of *synergasiai* from the theatre in Laodikeia have already been mentioned. Another example comes from the small theatre of Aizanoi, where seats were reserved for the *phylai*, but also for the association of stone-cutters.[50] That professional associations could be put on display in this way as part of the institutional inventory of a city is known from other locales in both the Eastern and Western provinces.[51] For Aizanoi, it has been suggested that the seats were periodically sold by the city;[52] this would mean that the association of stone-cutters had to actively invest in its integration into the civic order. Additional evidence comes, again, from Hierapolis. The theatre was the place where the association of dyers set up a statue of *Boulē* personified.[53] And the most prominent association of Hierapolis, the purple-dyers, added a postscript to a dedicatory inscription on the architrave that recorded their contribution to the adornment and enlargement of the theatre.[54] The funerary inscriptions also point in the same direction. Professional associations received endowments just like the *gerousia*; they could also be named as the recipients of fines to be paid for the violation of graves, alongside (or instead of) the Roman *fiscus*.[55] It is not quite clear how such rules were put into practice, but we see that founders of funerary endowments treated professional associations on a par with official institutions.

We hardly know anything about the internal structure of Phrygian professional associations. No laws have survived, and no officials are mentioned.[56] The one exception to this rule is revealing for our purposes. Professional associations in Hierapolis could have a management board that represented the association on certain occasions. Some inscriptions from the late second and the third century do not mention the *ergasia*, but the *proedria* of purple-dyers. This 'management board' can be named as the recipient of funerary endowments just like the association itself. Like the *ergasia*, the *proedria* can carry the epithet *semnotatē*; in one case, we find the designation *synedrion tēs proedrias tōn porphyrabaphōn*.[57] Management boards are also attested for the *ergasia* of linen-weavers, where the *progegrammenoi* of the association shall receive and distribute the sum of an endowment, and for the association of metal-workers, where the designation in an as yet unpublished inscription is *proestōtes*.[58] While individual leading positions are, of course, known from Greek associations from the Hellenistic period onwards, these officials did not form a management board that could act separately from the other members. But we know the phenomenon from Italian

[50] Wörrle 2011: 144 publishes a photo.
[51] cf. Van Nijf 1997: 216–40. The relationship between φυλαί and professional associations is elucidated (and at the same time obscured) by the inscriptions from the Odeon of Gerasa, where an original order that incorporated only the φυλαί was (in the third century C.E.?) changed to incorporate at least one professional association, the λινουργοί; cf. Agusta-Boularot/Seigne 2004: 534–6, 547–51. For another φυλὴ λινουργῶν, cf. *SEG* 40, 1063 from Saittai.
[52] Wörrle 2011: 144–5 (on the use of ἀπολαμβάνειν in the seat inscriptions).
[53] *SEG* 41, 1201.
[54] Ritti 1985: 109–13 (= *AE* 1985, 804).
[55] cf. for the same argument Cracco Ruggini 1976: 469.
[56] A possible exception is *SEG* 54, 1323 (purple-dyers), where οἱ κατὰ ἔτος ἐπιμεληταί ('the annually appointed *epimelētai*') appear alongside the management board (προεδρία, see below). But they may be identical to the members chosen by lot (οἱ κληρωθέντες ll. 9–10) in order to fulfil the conditions of this particular endowment (an annual banquet at the grave).
[57] *AvH* 227b, ll. 1–3 (τὸ συνέδριον τῆς προεδρίας τῶν πορφυραβάφων); *SEG* 46, 1656 (*AvH* 342), l. 4 (ἡ σεμνοτάτη προεδρία τῶν πορφυραβάφων); *SEG* 54, 1323, l. 7 (ἡ προεδρία τῶν πορφυραβάφων). Cf. on the term, Zimmermann 2002: 38–9 ('ein Kollegium von Vereinsvorständen').
[58] Weavers: *SEG* 56, 1501 (Ritti 2006: 48–51). No names are given before the text, so the literal meaning of προγεγραμ<μ>ένοι makes no sense; in addition, the group is supposed to distribute money to the other members. Metal-workers: mentioned by Ritti 1992/93: 54 n. 29.

inscriptions of the second and third century. Associations could be divided into *ordines*, following the civic model: there could be an internal *ordo decurionum*, distinguished from the *populus* and with the authority to make its own decisions, and *magistri* were often taken as one class inside the association.[59] Liebenam's assumption that in the West, such management boards were called *praesidium*, is incorrect,[60] although the analogy to the Hierapolitan *proedria* would be tempting. But the separate designation and activities of a management board in at least some professional associations from Hierapolis is an important sign of Roman influence.[61] It shows that *collegia* were indeed among the private organizations which, through their mimicry of accepted norms and institutions, 'naturalised and legitimated the basic postulates of a Roman social order'.[62]

The religious practice of professional associations could also be influenced by Roman models, but only in an indirect way. The well-known funerary endowment of Publius Aelius Glaukon and Aurelia Amia illustrates the problem well: Glaukon left 200 denarii to the management board of the purple-dyers for them to celebrate 'the feast of unleavened bread' from the interest; he also left 150 denarii to the association of carpet-weavers, who were supposed to spend one half on the feast of the Kalends and the other on the 'feast of the fiftieth day'.[63] The religious calendar of these two associations was determined by the conditions of the endowment. The donor decided which feasts mattered most — Glaukon gives 200 denarii for Passover, but only 75 for the other two feasts, to be celebrated by a less prestigious association.[64] *Collegia* in the West celebrated the New Year's feast,[65] but this is not clear evidence of Romanization of associations (rather than of the donors themselves). Funerary endowments often refer to the typical dates of *collegia* festivals in the West, like the feast of the Kalends or the Rosalia, but they also often mention the specific desires of the donor.[66]

Professional associations in Phrygian cities were not official institutions like the resident Romans of Apameia. But they did approach this status as closely as they could, and were

[59] cf. Liebenam 1890: 182–3, 191–5.

[60] Liebenam 1890: 199. He refers to *CIL* XII 1877 (Vienna): 'L(ucio) Aquilio | L(uci) fil(io) Volt(inia) | Severiano | aedili | IIvir(o) aerar(ii) | fabri tignuari(i) | Viennenses | pra[e]sid(i)o suo'. This only attests to an individual leading position; the same is true for *CIL* VI 1625 (Rome), an honorific decree by the 'negotiatores olearii ex Baetica for M(arco) Petroni[o M(arci) f(ilio)] | Quir(ina) Honorat[o, | …] amico optimo et praesidio su[o]'.

[61] The closest parallel is perhaps the 'leadership of ten men (δεκανεύειν)' in associations of Thracian Philippopolis: in a decree of the τέχνη καπήλων, two δεκανεύοντες are mentioned (*IGBulg* III 917), and the προμέτρης Chrestos was leader of the ten (δεκανεύσας) when he dedicated a statue of Heracles to the ἱερώτατον συνεργίον (*IGBulg* III 1401bis). Cf. Velkov 1980: 135. Latin influence (*decuria, decuriones*) can be expected in this region. Another example from Herakleia Pontika has been published by Kolb 2003: the δεκάνιον Λεαδειτῶν honours its ἔκδικος; the type of group is unclear, but it may well be another case of a management board of a professional association (ibid., 118). Cracco Ruggini 1976: 468 draws a sharp distinction between the 'oligarchic' Western *collegia* and the 'contractual' ones in the Greek East; I agree with the basic distinction, but the evidence from Philippopolis and Hierapolis points to the influence of Roman models. She does note the case of the Hierapolitan purple-dyers on p. 471 (and p. 491 n. 113), but dismisses it as isolated.

[62] Ando 2010: 43.

[63] *SEG* 46, 1656 (Ritti 1992/93) supersedes the edition in *AvH* 342. Cf. also Ameling 2004: 414–22, no. 196.

[64] Ameling 2004: 421 is certainly correct in refuting assumptions about the Jewishness of the purple-dyers and the carpet-weavers (*contra* Miranda 1999: 141–3). Harland 2006: 235–9, arguing for the presence of a significant number of Jews in both associations, gives an overview of earlier assumptions. While there may obviously have been Jews in these associations, the inscription cannot prove it; celebrating the feast of unleavened bread and Pentecost were Glykon's conditions for receiving the endowment.

[65] *CIL* VI 10234; 33885; cf. Ausbüttel 1982: 53–4.

[66] Van Nijf 1997: 64 regards the celebration of the Rosalia as 'a deliberate statement of (assumed) Roman cultural identity'. This may be true, but it is not necessarily a statement made by the association. On Western *collegia* celebrating the Rosalia, cf. Ausbüttel 1982: 69; on terminology and the rite's distribution in the Greek East, cf. Kokkinia 1999: 209–17. Another example for special wishes of a donor in Hierapolis may be the enigmatic 'burning of the *papoi* (ἀποκαυσμὸς τῶν παπων)', carried out by an association of shepherds in response to an endowment by M. Aurelius Diodoros Koreskos (*AvH* 227b).

treated by donors and others as part of the Roman civic order. The process was not limited to Phrygia; examples from Lydia lead to similar conclusions.[67] In the terms of neo-institutional economics, all this can be described as a process of institutional isomorphism. As defined by DiMaggio and Powell, 'isomorphism is a constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions'.[68] The environmental conditions in our case were determined by the Romanization of Phrygian cities. DiMaggio and Powell distinguish between three mechanisms of isomorphic change: coercive, mimetic or normative. For Roman Phrygia, the mimetic aspect was perhaps the most important one; it is normally a result of insecurity with regard to new environmental conditions. Organizations model themselves after other organizations that are observed as successfully coping with the common environment.[69]

One factor contributing to insecurity is a lack of clear legal regulations. Roman laws on *collegia* certainly fit this criterion. The recent trend to see them as rather irrelevant for Asia Minor needs to be reassessed.[70] There is sufficient evidence for knowledge and application of Roman law at least in the larger cities of Asia Minor, and a recent find from Miletus has provided unambiguous proof that the ratification of associations by the emperor described in the *Digest* was practised in Asia Minor at least in the time of Hadrian.[71] The well-known case of Bithynian Nikomedeia, where Pliny wanted to create an association of *fabri* but was forbidden to do so by Trajan, can no longer be dismissed as an exception; together with the official ratification of the *neoi* of Kyzikos and the *gerousia* of Sidyma, the relevance of this aspect of Roman law for Asia Minor seems to be established for the second century at least.[72] We should therefore assume that the *Digest* is correct in stating that the general ban on *collegia*, a result of their activities during the late Republican civil war, was applicable to the provinces as well, and that certain *collegia*, those designated *licita*, could undergo a process of ratification and receive official recognition of their *utilitas publica*.[73]

However, the precise criteria are unclear, and a number of other rules (especially the exemption for *tenuiores* and assemblies *religionis causa*) add to the general confusion.[74]

[67] These considerations may in fact explain the designation of professional associations as φυλαί in Saittai and especially Philadelphia, which has been taken to reflect age-old Anatolian social divisions (Cracco Ruggini 1976: 471), but more likely represents a desire to incorporate professional groups into a Romanized civic order. On Lydian professional associations, cf. Arnaoutoglou 2011; a survey of the use of φυλή for associations is given by Kunnert 2012: 23–35.

[68] DiMaggio and Powell 1983: 149.

[69] DiMaggio and Powell 1983: 151–2.

[70] Arnaoutoglou 2002; Harland 2003.

[71] Knowledge of law: Kantor 2009. New find from Miletus: Ehrhardt and Günther 2013 (Hadrian's ratification of an οἶκος ναυκλήρων). The very brief reply seems to suggest standard practice. Cf. *Dig.* 3.4.1pr (Gaius), where *navicularii* are explicitly mentioned. That the process of ratification was modified under Hadrian seems to be suggested by a new inscription from Ostia (121 C.E.; Laubry and Zevi 2012), which also gives a new legal context for the well-known introduction to *CIL* XIV 2112 (136 C.E., Lanuvium).

[72] Plin., *Ep.* 10.34.1; *CIL* III 7060; *TAM* II 175.

[73] On regulations during the civil war, cf. Ausbüttel 1982: 85–92. For the general ban, cf. *Dig.* 47.22.1pr (Marcianus): '… ne patiantur esse collegia sodalicia neve milites collegia in castris habeant … quod non tantum in urbe, sed et in italia et in provinciis locum habere divus quoque severus rescripsit.' On ratification, cf. *Dig.* 50.6.6.12 (Callistratus): 'Quibusdam collegiis vel corporibus, quibus ius coeundi lege permissum est, immunitas tribuitur: scilicet eis collegiis vel corporibus, in quibus artificii sui causa unusquisque adsumitur, ut fabrorum corpus est et si qua eandem rationem originis habent, id est idcirco instituta sunt, ut necessariam operam publicis utilitatibus exhiberent'; cf. *Dig.* 3.4.1pr (Gaius); 47.22.3.1 (Marcianus).

[74] *Dig.* 47.22.1pr (Marcianus): 'sed permittitur tenuioribus stipem menstruam conferre, dum tamen semel in mense coeant'; 47.22.1.1: 'sed religionis causa coire non prohibentur, dum tamen per hoc non fiat contra senatus consultum, quo illicita collegia arcentur.' For a traditional view on *tenuiores*, cf. Randazzo 1998, who also argues (239) that *religio* refers to funerals. But the term is used in a less technical sense (cf. Bendlin 2005), and *tenuiores* are not a well-defined category of people. It is also not epigraphically attested, and attempts to restore a reference to the *tenuiores* in the SC that introduces *CIL* XIV 2112 (Lanuvium, 136 C.E.) are

In addition, the sheer number of associations known from Roman Asia Minor casts doubt on the idea that they all had to apply for official sanction. But were they really the *collegia* discussed in the *Digest*? From the epigraphic evidence, it seems that the ratification process was an option for official groups such as the *gerousia*, the *neoi*, or certain professional associations with high relevance for a city; in each known case, the process was officially initiated not by the association itself, but by civic or Roman magistrates.[75] These groups, with fixed numbers, names and purposes, became the 'legitimate *collegia*', to be treated henceforward *ad exemplum rei publicae*.[76] As there is no indication that, for example, all the professional associations of Hierapolis underwent a similar process, the question remains how the continued existence of associations without such official legitimacy fits into this picture.

It seems best to categorize them as a class of associations not directly addressed in Roman law — associations that wanted to show their usefulness to the Roman order and profited from it in certain ways, but were not fully integrated into the system of concessions and privileges that characterized the *collegia licita*. If the endowments of Hierapolis, often directed towards more than one professional association, could be taken to indicate the deceased's membership in several *collegia* (forbidden for the *collegia licita* since the days of Antoninus Pius), they would fit this picture well, but it is not clear whether or not this inference can legitimately be drawn.[77] Such professional associations would have actively sought integration into the civic and the Roman order, but could never be absolutely certain that their usefulness was duly acknowledged, and there even remained the (albeit remote) possibility that unfavourable circumstances might lead a Roman governor to dissolve them. The predictable reaction of such groups to these uncertainties would be mimetic isomorphism: in observing successful models of corporate organization within a Roman civic order, models that were themselves based on the *exemplum rei publicae*, they became multipliers of that order, duplicating the state, its organizational ambitions and its values.

Insisting on the rôle of Roman law is not to deny that local middle classes had their own reasons to act as they did. While Roman law offered incentives to participate in an imperial world order, its effect on local societies was not — and could not be — planned on a grand scale; it was one factor among others that motivated decisions.[78] The craving of the middle classes for status and recognition (what has been called '*ordo*-making') has to be taken into

problematic; cf. Bendlin 2011: 231–4. Laubry and Zevi 2012: 311–12 consider the possibility of inserting them into a gap in a fragmentary SC from Ostia (121 C.E.), but judge this reconstruction to be too insecure.

[75] This may be regarded as an inversion of the argument made by De Ligt 2001. He rightly notes that cases like the νέοι from Kyzikos, the γερουσία of Sidyma or, from the West, the Augustales of Brixia (*CIL* V 4428) point to a category of 'semi-public *collegia*', but argues that these had to ask for permission because they had at least some members who were not *tenuiores*; in contrast, the professional associations who asked for permission were not 'semi-public' and did consist of *tenuiores*, but simply wanted to meet more often than once a month. I hold that νέοι, γερουσίαι, Augustales, and professional associations all 'required' permission for the same reason, namely that they wanted to be treated as official *collegia*. They all were 'semi-public' or perhaps simply 'public', which also explains the involvement of third parties (Pliny proposing the establishment of the Nikomedeian *fabri* to Trajan — *contra* De Ligt 2001: 347 n. 13, nothing is known about their own 'eagerness to establish a *collegium*'; the cities of Miletus and Sidyma asking for permission for their respective corporations of ship-owners and old men).

[76] *Dig.* 3.4.1.1 (Gaius): 'Quibus autem permissum est corpus habere collegii societatis sive cuiusque alterius eorum nomine, proprium est ad exemplum rei publicae habere res communes, arcam communem et actorem sive syndicum, per quem tamquam in re publica, quod communiter agi fierique oporteat, agatur fiat.'

[77] *Dig.* 47.22.1.1 (Marcianus): 'Non licet autem amplius quam unum collegium licitum habere.' The regulation concerns only *collegia licita*, cf. Ausbüttel 1982: 103–4. Ritti 1995: 71 rightly cautions against the assumption that the Hierapolitan endowments to associations were always made by members.

[78] Liu 2005 points to local diversity and stresses the need to give up the focus on centralist government through repressive laws. This may be granted, especially as it fits recent trends in the study of Roman imperial law well, but it does not touch upon the issue of how Roman law may have worked as an incentive.

account; the same is true for the increased possibilities of drawing prestige from craft and workmanship in the second and third centuries, visible in epigraphic data from all over the Empire.[79] But the rapid spread of an institution that is virtually unattested before the Roman period has to be related both to Roman models of civic organization and to Roman law, and institutional isomorphism is a useful concept for taking into account the perspectives of both actors and organizations.

So does Romanization imply the professionalization of the associative order? It may be expected that isomorphic change was much more difficult to manage for cult associations than it was for professional workers. The Roman civic order offered incentives to develop corporate forms of organization, but clearly favoured groups of common public interest. In searching for cult associations, we often have to go beyond south-western Phrygia, into less accessible regions.

IV CULT ASSOCIATIONS AND VILLAGE COMMUNITIES

In contrast to the professional associations discussed above, associations whose members primarily defined themselves as adherents of a certain cult are difficult to find in the cities of western and southern Phrygia. Even the rich finds of Hierapolis hardly include anything of relevance. The significance of one *hieros thiasos* is in fact unclear; it may have been an association, or a civic institution established for emperor worship.[80] Other interpretations appear outdated: the *sēmiaphoroi* of Apollon Archegetes are probably a priestly college, not an association with secret symbols,[81] and the *ergasia thremmatikē* was a professional association of shepherds rather than a cult association caring for metaphorical 'sheep', Christian or otherwise.[82] It should be emphasized that speaking of cult associations as a type does not mean going back to a division of associations according to their 'purposes', as was common in very early research on Greek associations.[83] Professional associations were also cult communities. But there are differences in the ways a group described itself in public monuments. In the cities discussed so far, no association is known that explicitly described itself as a cult association.[84]

[79] *Ordo*-making: Van Nijf 1997. Prestige drawn from labour: Tran 2013 (focused on the West, but incorporating some evidence from the Eastern provinces as well).

[80] *SEG* 33, 1135; cf. discussion by Ritti 1983: 180.

[81] *AvH* 153, ll. 4–5. Secret symbols: Ramsay 1895–97: 114; against this idea, cf. Ziebarth 1896: 55, 67 (who opts for a military background); they are called a 'priesthood' by Cichorius (*AvH*, p. 42).

[82] *AvH* 227b (Ritti 1995: 70 mentions another attestation in an as yet unpublished inscription). Ramsay 1895–97: 118–19 thought that the group consisted of Christians ('sheep' as followers of Jesus). Other scholars have related the ἐργασία θρεμματική to θρέπτοι, arguing that the group consisted of adopted slaves or was a benevolent society taking care of foundlings (Waltzing 1895: 184–5, 307; Van Nijf 1997: 61 n. 152). The term ἐργασία certainly points to a professional association. Cichorius (*AvH*, p. 48), followed by Poland 1909: 119, argued that the group was 'die Genossenschaft der Herdenbesitzer'; this view is also taken by Ritti 1995: 73 and Dittmann-Schöne 2001: 241–2. Such revisions have not affected the Hierapolitan documents alone: an association of 'angel-lovers' (φιλανγέλων συνβίωσις), known from a votive offering to Hosios and Dikaios deposited in a highly frequented sanctuary between Kotiaion and Aizanoi, has recently turned into an association of vine-lovers (φιλανπέλων) — perhaps a professional association, or a drinking club. Cf. Malay 2005 (*SEG* 31, 1130 + 55, 1418).

[83] cf. on the problem of typologies, Kloppenborg 1996; Harland 2003: 25–44. Recently, Steinhauer 2014 has returned to the older model of strict functional differentiation between professional and religious associations.

[84] In light of the recent and justified trend towards integrating Jews and Christians into the history of voluntary associations (cf. especially Harland 2003), this assessment needs to be qualified. Christians had their own cemeteries, but did not participate in the epigraphic trend towards corporate representation, perhaps not least due to special laws that did not allow such publicity to appear desirable; they are left out of consideration here. Jewish communities are epigraphically better attested; the evidence is conveniently assembled by Ameling 2004: 342–448. Only a small number of these inscriptions refer to communal organization. In some cases,

One possible exception from Laodikeia paves the way for a more thorough investigation. A relief showing Zeus and Hermes was dedicated as a votive offering by the secretary — written γαματεύων — of the *psapharoi*.[85] Iconographic and onomastic indications suggest that the monument actually comes from Thiunta, a village north of Hierapolis.[86] The 'dry ones' could be argued to be a cult association for Zeus and Hermes, but the designation remains incomprehensible. It might therefore be the name of one of the many Phrygian village communities. This touches upon an old question: how do we distinguish villages from private associations, and is that distinction always justified? Poland was willing to cautiously accept the idea that villages could 'wholly adapt the form of cult associations'.[87] As has often been noted, Phrygia as a whole is characterized by village communities and rural sanctuaries rather than by the great centres of textile production in the south.[88] Needless to say, no professional associations are to be expected outside the larger cities — economic specialization does not characterize the social history of rural Anatolia. But the epigraphic representation of villages and their religion took over modes and formulae from the cities,[89] and it is worth asking whether or not some reflection of the desire to 'get organized' (and hence isomorphism) can be deduced. The existence of little-understood village *gerousiai* seems to be a case in point;[90] cult associations might be another. In order to avoid unnecessary speculation in a field that already abounds with insecurities, the analysis will be limited to associational terminology found in villages.

Phratra, Hetaireia, Synbiōsis

Two *stēlai* from Thiunta, a village north of Hierapolis, show the twenty-four members of a 'brotherhood', *phratra*.[91] In both cases, the *dēmos* of Thiunta has honoured the 'brotherhood around (*peri*)' two chief officials, whose names have changed in the second inscription. The brotherhood has repeatedly distributed oil for eight days and, according to the second inscription, organized a nocturnal ceremony for Zeus. One of the leaders in the first inscription is an *agōnothetēs*, one of the members is a *paraphylax*; in the first inscription, one member is recorded not only with his name, but with the additional information that he has bought the place for the *stēlē*. The term *phratra* seems to imply more than a mere festive gathering or an organizing committee. In addition, at least two persons in the second inscription can be identified as sons of

Jews are shown to follow the regular patterns of behaviour towards professional associations; cf. the endowments of Publius Aelius Glaukon (above, n. 63) and Aurelius Aristeas (Ameling 2004: 357–62, no. 171, from Akmoneia). Only Hierapolis yields occasional evidence showing that the local Jewish community could act like associations at least with regard to grave care; cf. Miranda 1999; Ameling 2004: 398–440. But the terminology still differs from all other associations (especially Ameling 2004: 432, no. 205, ll. 4–5: δώσει τῇ κατοικίᾳ τῶν ἐν Ἱεραπόλει κατοικούντων Ἰουδαίων, with the copy deposited not in the civic archive, but ἐν τῷ ἀρχίῳ τῶν Ἰουδαίων; 436, no. 206, ll. 5–6: ἀποτείσει τῷ λαῷ τῶν Ἰουδαίων; the term λαός is never used by non-Jewish associations). The Jewish community of Hierapolis seems to stress its separation from the city rather than its involvement in civic affairs; this may in fact have been the reason for an individual Jew like Glaukon entrusting the care of his grave to the purple-dyers and the carpet-weavers instead.

[85] *IK Laodikeia* 63.

[86] Suggested by Corsten in *IK Laodikeia* ad loc.; cf. also Ritti 2002: 51–2.

[87] Poland 1909: 84–5 ('eine Erscheinung Kleinasiens […], über die das Urteil notwendig sehr vorsichtig ausfallen muß, die uns aber in merkwürdiger Weise die mächtige Einwirkung des genossenschaftlichen Treibens vor Augen stellt. Sehen wir doch kleinere *politische Einheiten* ganz die *Formen des Kultvereins* annehmen').

[88] cf. Ricl 2003.

[89] Repeatedly stressed by Chiai 2009; Schuler 2012.

[90] Schuler 1998: 225 argues that they were 'vereinsartig organisiert'. The phenomenon is restricted to larger and more ambitious villages (227–9).

[91] Ramsay 1895–97: nos 30–1; for full discussion with drawings, see Ramsay 1927: 196–211. No photo was made, and the stones are now lost. Cf. Ritti 2002: 48–51.

members in the first inscription, and further links are plausible.[92] The presence of a *paraphylax* in a *phratra* from Thiunta raises interesting questions, as this official should have been operating from Hierapolis; he may have been a local who came to prominence in the nearby city.[93] In any case, a close connection between the village and the cult group is evident, leading to mutual expectations: the *phratra* hosts the *pannychis*, and is honoured by the *dēmos*.

Also in the area of Hierapolis, the *hetaireia* of the Arzimneis, again headed by two persons introduced by *peri*, made a dedication to the gods of the Motaleis.[94] The monument contains representations of seventeen persons, one of whom (the third in the list) is called a priest. The *dēmos Motaleōn* is known from other epigraphic evidence; Arzimneis should be regarded as a regional designation as well.[95] Does this mean that the *hetaireia* was an association based in a village that honoured the local gods of another village? The process would be easier to envisage if the *hetaireia* was a subdivision of the Arzimneis, who for diplomatic reasons honoured the gods of a neighbouring village. Something political also seems to be at stake in another monument of this sort, from the area of Dionysopolis: the 'brotherhood of the Saloudeis and the Melokometai' unites men from two villages who seem to have joined forces in honouring someone.[96] In this case, the *phratra* has been named after the villages, not after its leaders. Two similar monuments have been preserved only partially; they contain a few names, but the designation of the groups has not survived.[97]

The political context casts doubt on the assumption that *phratra* or *hetaireia* were used in such monuments to designate private cult associations.[98] One should also ask how large the population of such villages was. For the Byzantine period, Thonemann has calculated an average population of twenty-five to twenty-seven inhabitants for villages with corporate institutions and a functioning communal life in the Maeander valley.[99] Numbers in the imperial era were certainly higher, but a group of seventeen to twenty-four men could still represent a significant part of the male population. As there seem to be no brothers or father-son pairs in the group at the same time, twenty-four men may well represent twenty-four families. Similar calculations may lead to a

[92] No. 14 in the first list (Apollonios Mikketou) and no. 13 in the second (Zeuxios Apolloniou Mikketou); no. 9 in the first list (Diodoros IV Gorgion) and no. 2 (one of the leaders) in the second (Athenagoras Diodorou Gorgionos; he might in turn be the father of the leader mentioned first, Diodoros Athenagorou). Almost certain is the pair Eiollas Zeuxidos (first list no. 18) and Zeuxios II Iolla (second list no. 9). A number of other links are plausible, e.g. Zosimos Alexandrou and Euxenion Zosimou. Cf. Ramsay 1927: 208–9.

[93] Robert 1983: 62–3 thinks that the παραφύλαξ was sent from Hierapolis to ensure that the village festival was carried out in an orderly fashion. On the competence of παραφύλακες, cf. Brélaz 2005: 133–41. He argues (135 n. 289) that the presence of the παραφύλαξ links the whole φράτρα to Hierapolis. In my view, the local context is the dominant one; see below.

[94] Published by Robert 1983: 46–52 (*SEG* 34, 1298). His assumption that the stele originally contained representations of twenty-four members like the ones from Thiunta was based on an inadequate photo; the monument is in fact completely preserved. Cf. Chuvin 1987 (reproducing a photo and a letter by P. Dessalle).

[95] On the Motaleis and other villages with 'their' θεοί cf. Schuler 1998: 248–9.

[96] Ramsay 1895–97: 156, no. 64. The main activity commemorated by the stele is not totally clear. L. 1 has ἀνέθηκεν, apparently without an object (thus referring to the stele); l. 2 has the 'leaders of the Melokometai' honour someone (presumably the person mentioned before, who can hardly be regarded as the object of ἀνέθηκεν, a possibility considered by Ramsay). On the capacity of religion to foster 'village fraternity', cf. Mitchell 1993: 1.185–7.

[97] *SEG* 34, 1299; 44, 1087.

[98] As assumed by Robert 1983: 50.

[99] Thonemann 2011: 263–4. Schuler 1998: 225 has already raised the problem of the size of the *phratra* and argued that they united 'einige oder gar alle Mitglieder der dörflichen Elite'. The size of Phrygian families in the imperial era is relevant to the argument, but must remain uncertain. Gnoli and Thornton 1997: 162 and others have calculated an average of only four members of the nuclear family based on the funerary inscriptions. But Thonemann 2013b: 125–7 points to the problems involved, as the data are filtered through both the epigraphic habit and funerary customs.

reassessment of an inscription from Kayılı, a village close to Akmoneia, where 'the *synbiōsis*', consisting of nineteen men, 'splendid and noble Achaeans', dedicated an altar to Zeus Alsenos so that he might be kind towards the village.[100]

The number of members seems too high for mere private associations, at least within a rural context. We should entertain the possibility that these groups represented the villages as cult communities before their gods. To be sure, in some cases, a verbal distinction is drawn between the group and the village.[101] While the qualifying genitive (the *hetaireia of* the Arzimneis) is not decisive (we would also expect 'the *dēmos* of' …), other formulae distinguish either the dedicant from the beneficiary (the *synbiōsis* vs. the *katoikia*) or the honorand from the body that conveys the honours (the *dēmos* of Thiunta vs. the *phratra*). But this does not run counter to the idea that such groups united male inhabitants — perhaps a select group in larger villages like Thiunta, almost all of them in smaller ones — who acted on behalf of the whole village population, represented their communities before the local gods, and thus legitimately claimed to be 'the' cult association of a given village. The peculiar visual representation of the members in several inscriptions, with its blending of individual elements (names, beards, priestly status) with stereotypical ones, unparalleled in other regions, may have had a double function in this regard: it honoured the men thus represented, but at the same time it named the persons responsible. The creation of corporate identities using established terminology would also have facilitated the representation of villages in the context of trans-local rural cults, well attested in Phrygia and neighbouring regions.[102]

Ramsay, who took the Phrygian *phratrai* as private associations, argued that they were an age-old Anatolian institution.[103] More recent findings provide us with some comparative data. Cult groups that called themselves *phratrai* are known from other regions in both Asia Minor and the Near East, and although it is not always clear whether or not they were civic subdivisions, at least in some cases the private nature of the group is probable. In Phrygia, the term *phratores* is used in a not very informative inscription from (possibly) Dorylaion, and in a difficult text from Orkistos, where it refers to a group of unclear status involved in a dedication.[104] Another inscription, presumably from the area of Hierapolis, records a memorial for a certain Diodoros set up by 'his own *phratra*', which allows for several interpretations.[105] Two inscriptions use designations close to the one employed by the *dēmos* of Thiunta in order to define organizations of unclear status.[106] But the group of monuments discussed here differs from these in style and content.

[100] *SEG* 40, 1192 = *MAMA* XI 110 (215/16 C.E.; trans. P. Thonemann). On the Achaean claim, cf. Weiß 2000.
[101] Stressed by Schuler 1998: 224–5.
[102] cf., e.g., Chiai 2009: 142 (Apollon Lairbenos); Price 1984: 97–8 (Xenoi Tekmoreioi near Antioch in Pisidia).
[103] Ramsay 1927: 190–211.
[104] Dorylaion: *MAMA* IX 89 (found at Aizanoi, but cf. the commentary ad loc.). Orkistos: *IGR* IV 548 (third century C.E.): οἱ περὶ τὴν γειτο|νίασιν τοῦ χ[ώ]ρου | Αὐρ. Ἀντιόχου Παπᾶ | κληρονόμοι καὶ | {καὶ} Αὐρ. Ἀπελλᾶς | Ἀλεξάνδρου μετὰ | καὶ πάντων τῶν | {τῶν} περὶ αὐ|τοὺς φρα|τόρων ὑπὲρ | τοῦ κυρίου | ἡμῶν τύχη[ς] | καὶ νείκης | καὶ ἐων[ί]ου διαμο|νῆς ἀνεστήσαμεν | θεῷ εὐχ[ήν]. A grammatically consistent translation would have to posit three actors: The κληρονόμοι from the neighbourhood of the land of Aurelius Antiochus, the individual Aurelius Apellas, and all the φράτορες around 'them', i.e. men in some way related to either the κληρονόμοι or Aurelius Apellas. I regard as irrelevant for this debate the groups of ἑταῖροι who bury their comrades (e.g. *MAMA* VI 47; Ritti and Baysal 2008: 199, no. 99; 216–18, no. 137), because it is unclear whether or not they had an organized form.
[105] Published by Ritti and Baysal 2008: 178, no. 84. This could be an association, as the editors argue, but cf. no. 83, where ὁ χῶρος ὁ Πανοσκοπιατῶν sets up a memorial for a certain Diogenes — presumably a village community (on the term χῶρος, cf. Schuler 1998: 53–5). Diodoros' φράτρα could be a representation of his village. A third option would be to see the φράτρα as a group of relatives; for a similar use of ἰδία, see below, n. 140.
[106] Ramsay 1895–97: no. 506 (area of Sebaste; 169/70 C.E.): the φράτρα of (genitive, not περί) Heliophon son of Antiochos and Pompeius son of Marcus made a dedication to Men Askaenos (no list of members); *MAMA* IV 230

It is evidently possible that communal action *vis-à-vis* the gods took place in pre-Roman institutions. But the choice of terminology as well as the epigraphic commemoration that starts in the second century C.E. seems to betray the influence of Roman models. If villages observed the epigraphic trends of the cities, as we know they did, but could not follow the trend towards *ordo*-making due to lack of social diversification, terms like *hetaireia* or *phratra* were useful not least for their ambiguity: they could refer to private associations,[107] but did not have to, and they signalled close ties among the members more clearly than a term like *koinon*. Villages searching for prestigious ways to epigraphically represent (a significant part of) their male population as a cult group could have made far less convincing choices.

Mystai

The search for cult associations has thus uncovered an inherent — and perhaps consciously created — ambiguity in the epigraphic evidence. We may hope to reach safer ground when discussing another phenomenon that is important in Phrygia, but also known from other regions of Asia Minor, namely, the spread of 'initiates' (*mystai*) in the imperial era.[108] In Phrygia, the first peculiarity to note is that there are hardly any *mystai* in the larger cities where one would expect to find them. One *hierophantēs* of Dionysos Kathegemon is now known from Hierapolis, but there is no indication that he belonged to an association.[109] Inscriptions from other regions are more likely to have been set up by associations. In a village next to Akmoneia, the '*mystai* of the first, holy *thiasos*' dedicated their meeting place to Dionysos Kathegemon, and a group of *mystai* from Apollonia honoured an otherwise unknown person.[110] In a village 10 km north-east of Sebaste, 'the initiates' set up a bust for Dionysos Kathegemon and published a list of members (second/third century C.E.); only the names of the two priests and their respective sons have survived, but they indicate leadership by local élites.[111] Further evidence comes from rather remote places in the Upper Tembris valley, between Nakoleia and Dorylaion. A number of quite similar, four-sided altars from the second and third century were erected for Zeus Dionysos by groups of initiates, but also by individuals.[112] It has been argued that these monuments attest 'an old local cult, which was taken up, and perhaps enlarged, in Roman times'.[113] While the old age of a cult for Zeus Dionysos in this region cannot be proven, the organization of worship is decidedly Roman, if the use of associational terminology characteristic of Romanized regions is regarded as an indication. Altars are set up by a group of *mystai* that had a priest, a *hierophantēs* and a *speirarchēs*, by *neoi mystai* who underline either the recent creation

(Tymandos; third century C.E.): οἱ περὶ Αὐρ. Ἀρτέμωνα Ἑρμοκλ[έ]ους φράτρα Μηνὶ Πλουριστρέων εὐχήν (one leader; note the grammatically inconsistent designation, resulting from the combination of two well-established ways of naming a group: οἱ περί + personal name on the one hand, the corporate term φράτρα on the other).

[107] Both ἑταιρείαι and φράτορες are mentioned in *Dig.* 47.22.4 (Gaius supposedly citing Solon; against authenticy, cf. Arnaoutoglou 1998: 72–3).

[108] Poland 1909: 36–41; cf. Belayche 2013.

[109] Published by Miranda 2003, who tends towards seeing him as the functionary of an association (170).

[110] Akmoneia: *MAMA* VI 239; the numeral seems to indicate that there were other associations in the region; cf. Poland 1909: 172. Apollonia: *MAMA* IV 167 (first or second century C.E.).

[111] Published by Drew-Bear and Naour 1990: 1947–9 (*SEG* 40, 1223). The two priests are T. Flavius Fortunatus and Dionysios son of Menandros; the first is a Roman citizen, the second may belong to the family of Menandros son of Dionysios and Dionysios son of Dionysios, who belonged to the γερουσία of Sebaste in 98/99 C.E. (cf. Drew-Bear and Naour, ibid.). This does not, however, mean that the inscription belongs to the last quarter of the first century, as assumed by Jaccottet 2003: 166–7.

[112] Haspels 1962; Cole 1991; Jaccottet 2003: 152–60.

[113] Haspels 1962: 287. Contrast Cole 1991: 46–8.

of the group or the age of the members, and, in one case, by a family that honoured its deceased father, assisted by a *hiera speirē*.[114]

It is in this context that we again encounter designations with a strong local flair. The *mystai Koroseanoi neobakchoi* dedicated an altar to Zeus Dionysos 'for themselves and the village'; other dedications were made by *Ptolemēnoi mystai* and *Krēouerēnoi mystai*.[115] The attributes clearly refer to villages otherwise unknown. Given the frequency of references to 'initiates' in Asia Minor and the inflation of cultic language with vocabulary derived from the mysteries,[116] there is little reason to believe that all these μύσται had undergone formal procedures of initiation.[117] The spread of μύσται-terminology in Asia Minor was probably influenced by the privileged rôle accorded to the mysteries in the representation of 'imperial religion'.[118] These groups could be the only associations of their — otherwise epigraphically unattested — villages. But in light of the evidence discussed above, it is tempting to assume that this is another case of villages describing themselves (or rather a representative part of the male population) as a cult community by applying corporate terminology that was known to be acceptable in Roman contexts.

This hypothesis may also shed some light on yet another enigmatic corporate designation, from Amorion in eastern Phrygia. A certain Antipater made endowments to ensure the commemoration of his deceased daughter Kyrilla.[119] The recipient is a group called *phylēs Dios mystai*, 'initiates of the tribe of Zeus'. This could be an association for Zeus, but no cult of Zeus is provided for in the inscription, although it appears that the group came into being for the purpose of the endowment.[120] Might we be dealing with *mystai* from a civic *phylē*?[121] Since both public and private groups could be involved in private grave care, the case must remain open. But this might be another example of the overlap between kinship terminology, institutions of villages, and corporate designations taken over from the (Graeco-)Roman civic order.

Bennos, Doumos

The conclusions reached so far touch upon the question of how indigenous, pre-Roman traditions were transformed under Roman rule. As all available data stem from the Roman period, reconstructions of ancient Phrygian institutions are obviously liable to ungrounded speculation. The supposed origins of professional associations in ancient Anatolian societal subdivisions has been mentioned above; more specific arguments

[114] [Μύστ]αι with functionaries: Drew-Bear 1978: no. 1 (*SEG* 28, 1187); [ν]έοι μύσται: *MAMA* V p. 183 (*SEG* 20,37; Jaccottet 2003: 153–4); σπείρη: *MAMA* VI p. 151, no. 207 (*SEG* 41, 1171): Ἀγαθῇ Τύχῃ. | Αὐρήλιοι | Ἐπιτύνχανος κα[ὶ] | Ἐπίνικος σὺν τῇ μη|τρὶ Τερτύλλῃ πατέρα | Τελέσφορον ἀπε<ε>ι|έρωσαν. | ἔτους τλδ' (249/50 C.E.) | σὺν τῇ εἱερᾷ εἰσ|πείρῃ ἧς καὶ εἰρ[ο]|φάντης. The latter inscription purportedly comes from Akmoneia and is still attributed to that city by Jaccottet 2003: 163–4, but probably comes from the Upper Tembris valley; cf. Mitchell 1993: 2.47.

[115] Κοροσεανοί: Haspels 1962: 286 (Jaccottet 2003: 154–5); Πτολεμηνοί: *MAMA* V KB 6 (Jaccottet 2003: 152–3); Κρηουερηνοὶ: read ΚΗΙΟΥΕΡΗΝΟΙ by Haspels 1971: no. 139; cf. for other readings Jaccottet 2003: 156, who follows the proposal by Frei reproduced here.

[116] On 'Mysterisierung' in the imperial era, cf. Auffarth 2013: 433–6; Belayche 2013.

[117] This is not to enter the question of 'real' vs. 'pseudo'-mysteries in the imperial era; cf. Jaccottet 2006: 219–20.

[118] Cults labelled 'mysteries' were likely to be supported by the Roman provincial administration; cf. the documents discussed by Petzl 2009.

[119] Ramsay 1889: 17–23, no. 1; Laum 1914: nos 175–6.

[120] This is denied by Kunnert 2012: 28, because whoever does not participate in the gatherings will be excluded from the revenues, not from other activities of the association. But it is not clear that there were such other activities. Lines A 13–14 could be taken as evidence for the recent creation of the group: τ[οῖ]ς συνεστῶ[σιν] ἀπὸ ἄρτι [μ]ύσταις.

[121] Kunnert 2012: 26–8 objects to the idea that there was a civic φυλὴ Διός, because 'initiates' always defines a select, exclusive group. But the terminological inflation has to be taken into account; in addition, the μύσται are not grammatically identified with the φύλη.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435816000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

include the idea that the washers of Roman Hierapolis are to be connected to Hittite temple slaves, supposedly organized in associations more than a millennium earlier.[122] The use of Neo-Phrygian terms, albeit problematic in itself, may serve as a more trustworthy guide to indigenous concepts. In the case of associations, we are again led to the north and east of Phrygia.

Several inscriptions from Phrygia and a few from Bithynia mention *to bennos* and Zeus Bennios. Due to the work of Drew-Bear and Naour, it is now generally acknowledged that *bennos* was a cult association, to be derived from indo-european *bendnos* ('covenant, union, association').[123] This interpretation has led to a satisfactory understanding of almost all the relevant monuments. An altar from the area of Aizanoi may serve as an example: 'Tryphon, son of Meniskos, (has set up the altar) for Zeus and the *benneitai*'.[124] The text is perfectly intelligible if *bennos* is an association; *benneitai* are its members. In a village near Nakoleia, two brothers dedicate a crown to the *bennos* of Zeus Bronton.[125] A text from Krateia in eastern Bithynia also shows that a *bennos* could be the source of benefactions, appropriately returned through the erection of an altar dedicated to Zeus Bennios.[126] And in a metrical text from Midas City, *benneuein* designates a positive state, possibly harmony and unity among citizens.[127] Problems nevertheless remain. The first is one that we have already encountered above. Again in the area of Nakoleia, a certain Markos, son of Markos, dedicated a crown to Zeus Bronton and the *bennos Sereanon*. The Sereanoi are a village west of Nakoleia, not an association, so the question of villages posing as associations is raised yet again.[128] A similar, but earlier case is a dedication made by a private person to the *bennos Soēnōn* for the victory of Trajan.[129] The second problem is raised by the endowment of a certain Skymnos from the very east of Phrygia, on the border with Pisidia. He left 100 denarii to the village, 'in order that from the interest a *bennos* is made in honour of Zeus Kalakagathios, for the fruits'.[130] In this case, *bennos* seems to be a regular feast, to be financed *ek tokou* like the annual coronation of graves in Hierapolis — not an

[122] Justly criticized by Ritti 1995: 68–9.

[123] Drew-Bear and Naour 1990: 1956–61, 1987–91; cf. Schwabl 1999: 346–8. Earlier attempts had relied on Celtic *benna*, 'wagon' (especially Ramsay 1927: 182–9).

[124] *MAMA* X 304 (second century C.E.).

[125] *SEG* 40, 1221 (after 212 C.E.): Αὐρήλιοι | [Ἑ]ρμῆς Δημ|[ᾶ]δος σὺν | Ἀνδρέᾳ δὶς | Ἀβουαδεινεῖ|ται ἐστεφάνω|σαν τὸ βέννος | Διὸς Βροντῶντος.

[126] *SEG* 36, 1150: ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ · Διὶ Βενίῳ ἐπηκόῳ Ἀπολλώνιος Σαινιανὸς ἀντὶ τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ βέν|νους εὐεργεσιῶν εὐσεβείας ἕνεκα καὶ τε[ιμ]ῆς τῆς πρὸς τὸ βέννος τὸν βωμὸν ἀνέθηκα.

[127] *MAMA* I 390; cf. the translation for πατρὶς ἐμὴ βέννευε by Schwabl 1999: 354 n. 22: 'Mein Vaterland, sollst verbunden sein …'. Drew-Bear and Naour 1990: 1991 had taken the verb to mean 'les activités de l'association'.

[128] *MAMA* V 176: Μᾶρκος | Μάρκου | Διὶ Βροντῶν|τι καὶ Βεννει | Σερεανῶ στ|έφανον. Cf. *MAMA* V 175, where the same procedure is mentioned without the term βέννος. Drew-Bear and Naour 1990: 1998–2000 speculate that *SEG* 40, 1221 might refer to the same association, the only one in the territory of the Sereanoi. But the parallel between *MAMA* V 175 and 176 seems to point not to associations, but to a village in its capacity as cult community.

[129] *SEG* 40, 1229 (for the reading βέννει Σοηνῶν, see Drew-Bear and Naour 1990: 1989, against Βεννεισοηνῶν [*CIG* 38571]). This case is especially interesting because the Soenoi are also attested in later inscriptions: in the mid-third century C.E., they had a κοινὸς δῆμος together with the Moiteanoi (*MAMA* X 114, 244–47 C.E.), but later apparently possessed the status of a πόλις (*IGR* IV 605, a dedication by ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος Σοηνῶν); for the development, see Strubbe 1975: 235 (but note the rebuttal of his *terminus ante quem* for *IGR* IV 605 by Drew-Bear and Eck 1976: 294 n. 12). Leaving aside this last stage, a tentative explanation could base itself on an observation by Schuler 1998: 222, namely that villages could be united in a common δῆμος for political purposes, but remain separate entities in the cultic sphere. In this case, βέννος instead of δῆμος may have marked the difference on a terminological level. But this reconstruction must remain insecure, as it is not clear that the κοινὸς δῆμος of the Soenoi and the Moiteanoi existed in the time of Trajan.

[130] *SEG* 6,550: Ὁ αὐτὸς Σκύ|μνος καὶ ἔτι | ἐπικαταλεί|πω τῇ κώμῃ | (δηνάρια) ρ'ἐκ τόκου | γείνεσθαι βέ<ν>|νος Δεῖ Καλα|καγαθίῳ ὑ|πὲρ καρπῶν.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435816000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

association.[131] It therefore seems that the meaning of the word was rather broad; it could designate a cult community, but also a feast or festive assembly.[132] The argument that a *bennarchēs* must always be the leader of an organization is not sufficient to rule out this possibility.[133]

The evidence does not allow for a history of the *bennos* to be written, as all relevant inscriptions seem to be roughly contemporary (second/third century C.E.). But it is perhaps possible to develop a plausible historical scenario in which the meaning 'festival' or 'festive gathering' is the original, indigenous, pre-Roman one. In this sense, *bennos* was a Phrygian term to designate cult communities, without a clear distinction between the participants of the feast and the feast itself. When in the Roman period models of corporate organization that were based on membership became widespread, some inhabitants of northern Phrygia adapted their indigenous terminology to match new social structures; βεννεῖται could now designate formal organizations. The process could be described as a re-interpretation of Phrygian traditions under Roman influence. But the original meaning was not forgotten, and so the village of the Sereanoi could describe itself as a cult community by using the term *bennos*, and Skymnos could expect to be understood when he ordered that a regular *bennos* should be performed out of the interest on his endowment.

This hypothetical scenario may be strengthened by pointing to the parallel development of the Syrian *marzeah/marzeha*. In Ugaritic texts and the Old Testament, but also in inscriptions from the fourth and third century B.C.E., the term may mean both a group of people and a feast.[134] Under Hellenistic and Roman influence, it came to designate organizations with defined membership, as in Nabatean inscriptions of the first century B.C.E.[135] The evidence from Roman Palmyra suggests that both meanings could co-exist.[136] Romanization could lead to a certain formalization of indigenous religious life, but the results were often hybrids, as should perhaps be expected.

The persistence of local peculiarities in less Romanized areas such as northern Phrygia shows the limits of this process. Even here, Roman law was present in one way or another,[137] but the incentives it provided must have been less relevant for both sides than they were in the coastal cities of Asia Minor, or the assize centres of central and southern Phrygia. One last example may illustrate the difference: this concerns another indigenous term, *doumos*. That the word is Phrygian in origin is now generally accepted. It clearly designates 'cult associations', often related to the cult of Cybele in inscriptions from Lydia, Serdica and Thessalonike.[138] In Phrygia itself, the term is

[131] Contrast Drew-Bear and Naour 1990: 1991 and Schwabl 1999: 349, who argue that γείνεσθαι refers to the founding of an association.
[132] That the basic meaning is 'feast' was argued by Şahin 1978 (780–1 on the endowmen of Skymnos).
[133] In Phrygia and elsewhere, there were also πανηγυριάρχεις, without anyone arguing that a πανήγυρις was an association. For βεννάρχης = σπειράρχης, see Drew-Bear and Naour 1990: 1991. The term βεννάρχης is attested twice: in *I. Nikaia* 1206 (131/2 C.E.), the δῆμος Μοσσυνεανῶν καὶ Συνλαντηνῶν honours Okktaios son of Okktaios, βεννάρχης ἐκ προγόνων, its benefactor δὶα βίου, and an unpublished inscription from eastern Phrygia mentions a βεννάρχης θεοῦ Ἀντηνῶν (cf. the information given by Drew-Bear and Naour, ibid.). The first case is difficult to reconcile with the view that βέννος always means a cult association; the assumption that Okktaios was the organizer of a regular feast (cf. Şahin in *I. Nikaia*, p. 287) fits the impression of a civic office conveyed by the decree (through the standard formulae ἐκ προγόνων, δὶα βίου) much better (comparable perhaps to an ἀγωνοθέτης). In the second case, the identity of the Ἀντηνοί is unclear, but they were probably a village. The assumption that the βεννάρχης θεοῦ Ἀντηνῶν was responsible for organizing a festival for the main god of that village is not far-fetched. In both cases, the alternative would rather not be the 'normal' private associations envisaged by Drew-Bear and Naour, but the model developed above for φράτρα etc.
[134] McLaughlin 2001 discussed the biblical texts and also assembled (9–64) most of the extra-biblical evidence.
[135] e.g. *RES* 1423 (*mrzḥ*' of Obodas); Negev 1963: 113–17, no. 10 (*mrzḥ*' of Dushara).
[136] The normal translation for *mrzḥ*' was συμπόσιον. Cf. Kaizer 2002: 229–34.
[137] Mainly through procuratorial jurisdiction; cf. Kantor 2013: 158–61.
[138] The evidence is assembled by Polito 2004.

attested only twice.[139] In a very fragmentary dedication from a rural sanctuary at Phyteia, the meaning may be 'household';[140] more interesting for us is a bilingual inscription from Dorylaion:[141]

> ε---γ/τεντουμενος | νιοισιος ναδροτος | ειτου Μιτραφατα | κε Μας Τεμρογε|ιος κε Πουντας | Βας κε ενσταρνα | [*vac.*] δουμθ κε οι ουθ|βαν αδδακετ ορου|αν. Παρεθέμην τὸ | μνημεῖον τοῖς προ|γεγραμμένοις θε|οῖς κὲ τῇ κώμῃ·| ταῦθ' ὁ πατὴρ Ἀσκληπιός.
>
> [Greek part]: I have set up this memorial before the above-mentioned gods and the village. The father Asklepios has done this.

It seems clear that δουμθ is a dative, which makes κώμη the Greek equivalent.[142] So even a Phrygian term that is used elsewhere to designate cult associations is used in Phrygia itself only to qualify a village as a religious corporate actor.[143] The evidence for both *bennos* and *doumos* thus strengthens the observations made above: instead of the social fragmentation that Romanization caused in the cities of western and southern Phrygia, the main parts of the region, while not unaffected by the trend towards corporate representation, stand out for their use of terms and concepts that indicate social cohesion. If villages employed terminology from the sphere of associations, their aim was not to establish a segregative social order. The spread of terminology and concepts of corporate organization was nevertheless related to Roman influence. It reflects the tendency to assume a corporate identity that could be displayed on stone. But it was not a cultural transfer that profoundly changed the realities of village life. The villages and their élites followed the urban attempts to 'get organized', but at their own pace, and according to their own priorities.

V CONCLUSION

Romanization was a process that affected the institutional inventory of cities. I have argued here that the field of 'private' corporate organization is an important indicator for the changes brought about by Roman rule. Apart from the 'resident Romans' and corporations of old men, evidence from the cities in western and southern Phrygia clearly shows the growing importance of groups modelled on the Roman *collegia*. Professional associations, almost unattested in Asia Minor before the Roman period, became an important part of civic life, often acting as junior partners of the official political bodies. The influence of Roman ideals of social organization seems to explain this process better than other models.

For rural Anatolia, different results are to be expected due to the different economic and social framework. The evidence does, however, show an awareness of current urban forms of Romanization both within and outside Phrygia, and a desire to adapt them to the very different conditions of rural life.[144] The view that a frustrated Phrygian population used

[139] Excluding *MAMA* V 183, where the reconstruction [… ἀδελφι]|δοῦ μου is likely. Cf. on earlier discussions Polito 2004: 24–5.
[140] Drew-Bear *et al.* 1999: 137, no. 167: […]ς ὑπὲρ ἰδίου δούμου | [- - -]τη|ς [Διὶ - -]νῷ | [ε]ὐχήν; for the interpretation, see Neumann 2002.
[141] *MAMA* V p. 182; new edition and translation in Woudhuizen 2008/2009: 213.
[142] cf. Kretschmer 1900. He also argued that Ενσταρνα was the name of the village, but more recent discussions see *enstar* as analogous to ἐνίστημι: Lubotsky 1997: 123; Woudhuizen 2008/2009: 213.
[143] This explanation presupposes that κώμη should be understood as 'village' and not as 'religious association', and that the understanding of δοῦμος should be based on the Greek parallel, because this is the text that we completely understand (contrast the above-mentioned treatments, which give priority to δοῦμος = association and argue from here). That the 'father' mentioned in the text is not the leader of an association (Lubotsky 1997: 120, 128), but the father of the deceased has already been noted by Polito 2004: 29.
[144] cf. for similar observations in other fields Schuler 2012: esp. 90–1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435816000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

local religious traditions to shut itself away, and to express rejection of the dominant Graeco-Roman culture,[145] does not adequately address the influences of that very culture that have been noted here. It is rather an example of a 'celebration of the local' triggered by the imposition of an imperial superstructure, visible in many different manifestations throughout the Empire.[146]

Recent debates both on associations and Romanization have often focused on desires for status and representation, which leaves responsibility for the process solely to the local actors. These categories have successfully illuminated the data, and the model envisaged here takes these developments into account. It is nevertheless necessary to look for legal incentives as well, not least because recent findings have added to our knowledge about Roman laws on associations. We should certainly avoid the pitfall of taking the fragments of legal expertise preserved in the *Digest* as timeless and normative, but it is also not satisfactory to deny any influence of Roman law on the development of associations in the East. We should take into account the fact that Roman law provided not only guides for restrictive action, but also incentives that local groups could respond to on their own terms.

This finally raises the question of whether or not there was a masterplan. Were the developments discussed here the planned result of a centrally administered policy of Romanization? The answer to this simple form of the question will have to be an emphatic no. Still, the idea that Roman administrators were not uninterested in the effects of institutional isomorphism, namely isomorphic pressure that would lead to a certain structural unification, seems to me to have some explanatory value — not least because in less diverse regions than Phrygia, the model is likely to work even better. Thus, the professionalization of the associative order in the Ionian cities, especially Ephesos or Smyrna, is fairly evident. Creating adaptive pressures without having to exert them directly is a reasonable political strategy. While Roman governors certainly were unable (and probably did not try) to precisely predict the outcome of such a strategy, a case for centrally-managed impulses for Romanization can and should be made.

Universität Bremen
benedikt.eckhardt@uni-bremen.de

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agusta-Boularot, S., and Seigne, J. 2004: 'La vie civique de Gerasa de la Décapole. L'apport des inscriptions du "théâtre" nord de Jerash (Jordanie)', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome* 116, 481–569

Alföldy, G. 2005: 'Romanisation – Grundbegriff oder Fehlgriff? Überlegungen zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Erforschung von Integrationsprozessen im römischen Weltreich', in Z. Visy (ed.), *Limes XIX*, Pécs, 25–56

Ameling, W. 2004: *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis. Band II: Kleinasien*, Tübingen

Ando, C. 2010: 'Imperial identities', in T. Whitmarsh (ed.), *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World*, Cambridge, 17–45

Arnaoutoglou, I. N. 1998: 'Between *koinon* and *idion*: legal and social dimensions of religious associations in ancient Athens', in P. Cartledge, P. Millett and S. von Reden (eds), *Kosmos. Essays in Order, Conflict and Community in Classical Athens*, Cambridge, 68–83

Arnaoutoglou, I. N. 2002: 'Roman law and *collegia* in Asia Minor', *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité* 49, 27–44

Arnaoutoglou, I. N. 2011: 'Craftsmen associations in Roman Lydia – a tale of two cities?', *Ancient Society* 41, 257–90

[145] Gnoli and Thornton 1997: 190–1.
[146] cf. Ando 2010 (18 for the quotation).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435816000290 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Auffarth, C. 2013: 'Mysterien (Mysterienkulte)', *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 25, 422–71
Ausbüttel, F. 1982: *Studien zu den Vereinen im Westen des römischen Reiches*, Kallmünz
AvH: C. Humann *et al.* (eds), *Altertümer von Hierapolis* (1898), Berlin
Belayche, N. 2013: 'L'évolution des formes rituelles: hymnes et mystèria', in L. Bricault and C. Bonnet (eds), *Panthée: Religious Transformations in the Graeco-Roman Empire*, Leiden, 17–40
Bendlin, A. 2005: '"Eine Zusammenkunft um der religio willen ist erlaubt … "? Zu den politischen und rechtlichen Konstruktionen von (religiöser) Vergemeinschaftung in der römischen Kaiserzeit', in H. G. Kippenberg and G. F. Schuppert (eds), *Die verrechtlichte Religion. Der Öffentlichkeitsstatus von Religionsgemeinschaften*, Tübingen, 65–107
Bendlin, A. 2011: 'Associations, funerals, sociality, and Roman law: the collegium of Diana and Antinous in Lanuvium (CIL 14.2112) reconsidered', in M. Öhler (ed.), *Aposteldekret und antikes Vereinswesen. Gemeinschaft und ihre Ordnung*, Tübingen, 207–96
Benndorf, O., and Niemann, G. 1884: *Reisen in Lykien und Karien*, Vienna
Brélaz, C. 2005: *La Sécurité publique en Asie Mineure sous le Principat (I^{er}–III^{ème} s. ap. J.-C.). Institutions municipales et institutions impériales dans l'Orient romain*, Basel
Cadwallader, A. H. 2007: 'A new inscription, a correction and a confirmed sighting from Colossae', *Epigraphica Anatolica* 40, 109–18
Cadwallader, A. H., and Trainor, M. (eds) 2011: *Colossae in Space and Time. Linking to an Ancient City*, Göttingen
Çenival, F. de 1988: 'Papyrus Seymour de Ricci: le plus ancien des règlements d'association religieuse (4ème siècle av. J.-C.) (Pap. Bibl. Nationale E 241)', *Revue d'Égyptologie* 39, 37–46
Chiai, G. F. 2009: 'Die Ortsgebundenheit des Religiösen: Das Paradigma der ländlichen Heiligtümer Phrygiens in der Kaiserzeit', in C. Auffarth (ed.), *Religion auf dem Lande. Entstehung und Veränderung von Sakrallandschaften unter römischer Herrschaft*, Stuttgart, 133–60
Chuvin, P. 1987: 'Une stèle des Motaleis, sur le territoire de Hièrapolis', *Revue archéologique*, 107–8
Cole, S. G. 1991: 'Dionysiac mysteries in Phrygia in the imperial period', *Epigraphica Anatolica* 17, 41–9
Cracco Ruggini, L. 1976: 'La vita associativa nelle città dell'Oriente greco: tradizioni locali e influenze romane', in D. M. Pippidi (ed.), *Assimilation et résistance à la culture gréco-romaine dans le monde ancien*, Bucharest, 463–91
De Ligt, L. 2001: 'D. 47,22,1,pr.-1 and the formation of semi-public collegia', *Latomus* 60, 340–58
DiMaggio, P. J., and Powell, W. W. 1983: 'The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields', *American Sociological Review* 48, 147–60
Dittmann-Schöne, I. 2001: *Die Berufsvereine in den Städten des kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasiens*, Regensburg
Dondin-Payre, M., and Tran, N. (eds) 2012: *Collegia. Le phénomène associatif dans l'Occident romain*, Paris
Drew-Bear, T. 1978: *Nouvelles inscriptions de Phrygie*, Zutphen
Drew-Bear, T., and Eck, W. 1976: 'Kaiser-, Militär- und Steinbruchinschriften aus Phrygien', *Chiron* 6, 289–318
Drew-Bear, T., and Naour, C. 1990: 'Divinités de Phrygie', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II, 18, 3, 1907–2044
Drew-Bear, T., Thomas, C., and Yildizturan, M. 1999: *Phrygian Votive Steles*, Ankara
Ehrhardt, N., and Günther, W. 2013: 'Hadrian, Milet und die Korporation der milesischen Schiffseigner. Zu einem neu gefundenen kaiserlichen Schreiben', *Chiron* 43, 199–220
Engelmann, H. 2012: 'Inschriften von Patara', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 182, 179–201
Erdemir, H. 2011: 'Woollen textiles: an international trade good in the Lycus valley in antiquity', in Cadwallader and Trainor 2011, 104–29
Feyel, C. 2009: *Δοκιμασία. La place et le rôle de l'examen préliminaire dans les institutions des cités grecques*, Paris
Gabba, E. 1984: 'The *collegia* of Numa: problems of method and political ideas', *Journal of Roman Studies* 74, 81–6
Gabrielsen, V. 2007: 'Brotherhoods of faith and provident planning: the non-public associations of the Greek world', *Mediterranean Historical Review* 22, 183–210

Giannakopoulos, N. 2008: *Ο Θεσμός της Γερουσίας των Ελληνικών Πόλεων κατά τους Ρωμαϊκούς Χρόνους. Οργάνωση και Λειτουργίες*, Thessalonike
Giannakopoulos, N. 2013: 'The gerousia of Akmonia', *Gephyra* 10, 13–31
Gnoli, T., and Thornton, J. 1997: 'Σώζε τὴν κατοικίαν. Società e religione nella Frigia romana. Note introduttive', in R. Gusmani, M. Salvini and P. Vannicelli (eds), *Frigi e Frigio*, Rome, 153–200
Harland, P. 2003: *Associations, Synagogues and Congregations. Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*, Minneapolis
Harland, P. 2006: 'Acculturation and identity in the Diaspora: a Jewish family and "pagan" guilds at Hierapolis', *Journal of Jewish Studies* 57, 222–44
Harland, P. A. 2014: *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translation, and Commentary. Vol. II: North Coast of the Black Sea, Asia Minor*, Berlin
Haspels, C. H. E. 1962: 'Relics of a Dionysiac cult in Asia Minor', *American Journal of Archaeology* 66, 285–87
Haspels, C. H. E. 1971: *The Highlands of Phrygia. Sites and Monuments*, Princeton
Huttner, U. 2008: 'Die Färber von Laodikeia und Hierapolis. Eine Nachricht aus dem Corpus der Alchemisten', *Marburger Beiträge zur antiken Handels-, Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte* 26, 139–57
Jaccottet, A.-F. 2003: *Choisir Dionysos. Les associations dionysiaques ou la face cachée du dionysisme*, Vol. 2, Zürich
Jaccottet, A.-F. 2006: 'Un dieu, plusieurs mystères? Les différents visages des mystères dionysiaques', in C. Bonnet, J. Rüpke and P. Scarpi (eds), *Religions orientales – culti misterici. Neue Perspektiven – nouvelles perspectives – prospettive nuove*, Stuttgart, 219–30
Jones, C. P. 1987: 'Sophron the comoedos', *Classical Quarterly* 37, 208–12
Kaizer, T. 2002: *The Religious Life of Palmyra. A Study of the Social Patterns of Worship in the Roman Period*, Stuttgart
Kantor, G. 2009: 'Knowledge of law in Roman Asia Minor', in R. Haensch (ed.), *Selbstdarstellung und Kommunikation. Die Veröffentlichung staatlicher Urkunden auf Stein und Bronze in der römischen Welt*, Munich, 249–65
Kantor, G. 2013: 'Law in Roman Phrygia: rules and jurisdictions', in P. Thonemann (ed.), *Roman Phrygia. Culture and Society*, Cambridge, 143–67
Kearsley, R. A. 2011: 'Epigraphic evidence for the social impact of Roman government in Laodicea and Hierapolis', in Cadwallader and Trainor 2011, 130–50
Kirbihler, F. 2007: 'Die Italiker in Kleinasien, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Ephesos (133 v. Chr.–1. Jh. n. Chr.)', in M. Meyer (ed.), *Neue Zeiten – Neue Sitten. Zu Rezeption und Integration römischen und italischen Kulturguts in Kleinasien*, Vienna, 19–35
Kloppenborg, J. S. 1996: 'Collegia and thiasoi. Issues in function, taxonomy and membership', in J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson (eds), *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, London, 16–30
Kokkinia, C. 1999: 'Rosen für die Toten im griechischen Raum und eine neue ῥοδισμός-Inschrift aus Bithynien', *Museum Helveticum* 56, 204–21
Kolb, A. 2003: 'Δεκάνιον – ein hapax legomenon', *Epigraphica Anatolica* 36, 115–19
Kretschmer, P. 1900: 'Bilinguis aus Dorylaion', *Athenische Mitteilungen* 25, 445–6
Kunnert, U. 2012: *Bürger unter sich. Phylen in den Städten des kaiserzeitlichen Ostens*, Basel
Laubry, N., and Zevi, F. 2012: 'Inscriptions d'Ostie et phénomène associatif dans l'empire romain: nouveaux documents et nouvelles considérations', *Archeologia Classica* 63, 297–343
Laum, B. 1914: *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike. Ein Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte. Band 2: Urkunden*, Leipzig
Le Roux, P. 2004: 'La romanisation en question', *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 59, 287–311
Liebenam, W. 1890: *Zur Geschichte und Organisation des römischen Vereinswesens. 3 Untersuchungen*, Leipzig
Liu, J. 2005: 'Local governments and collegia: a new appraisal of the evidence', in J.-J. Aubert *et al.* (eds), *A Tall Order. Writing the Social History of the Ancient World. Essays in Honour of William V. Harris*, Leiden, 285–316
Lubotsky, A. 1997: 'New Phrygian inscription no. 48: palaeographic and linguistic comments', in R. Gusmani, M. Salvini and P. Vannicelli (eds), *Frigi e Frigio*, Rome, 115–30
Malay, H. 2005: 'Φιλάνπελοι in Phrygia and Lydia', *Epigraphica Anatolica* 38 (2005), 42–4
Martin, K. 2013: *Demos – Boule – Gerousia. Personifikationen städtischer Institutionen auf kaiserzeitlichen Münzen aus Kleinasien*, Bonn

McLaughlin, J. L. 2001: *The marzēaḥ in the Prophetic Literature. References and Allusions in Light of the Extra-Biblical Evidence*, Leiden
Mentxaka, R. 1995/96: 'El derecho de asociación en Roma a la luz del cap. 74 de la "Lex Irnitana"', *Bulletino dell'istituto di diritto romano* 37/38, 199–218
Miranda, E. 1999: 'La comunità giudaica di Hierapolis di Frigia', *Epigraphica Anatolica* 31, 109–56
Miranda, E. 2003: 'Dioniso Kathegemon a Hierapolis di Frigia', in *Epigraphica. Atti delle Giornate di Studio di Roma e di Atene in memoria di Margherita Guarducci (1902–1999)*, Rome, 165–76
Mitchell, S. 1993: *Anatolia. Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor* (2 vols), Oxford
Negev, A. 1963: 'Nabatean inscriptions from 'Avdat (Oboda) II', *Israel Exploration Journal* 13, 113–24
Neumann, G. 2002: 'Ein neuer Beleg für Doumos', *Historische Sprachforschung* 115, 57–8
Ott, J. 1995: 'Die Kommandeure der norischen Hilfstruppen', *Tyche* 10, 107–38
Paris, P. 1883: 'Inscriptions de Sébaste', *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 7, 448–57
Parker, R. 2010: 'A funerary foundation from Hellenistic Lycia', *Chiron* 40, 103–21
Petzl, G. 2009: 'Bedrohter Kultvollzug: Hilfe von höherer Stelle', in Á. Martínez Fernández (ed.), *Estudios de epigrafía griega*, La Laguna, 377–86
Poland, F. 1909: *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, Leipzig
Polito, M. 2004: *Il δοῦμος. Un'associazione sacra in zone di contatto*, Naples
Price, S. F. 1984: *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge
Ramsay, W. M. 1889: 'Inscriptions d'Asie Mineure', *Revue des Études Grecques* 2, 17–37
Ramsay, W. M. 1895–97: *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* (2 vols), Oxford
Ramsay, W. M. 1927: *Asianic Elements in Greek Civilisation*, London
Randazzo, S. 1998: 'I "*collegia tenuiorum*", fra libertà di associazione e controllo senatorio', *Studia et Documenta Historiae et Iuris* 64, 229–44
Ricl, M. 2003: 'Society and economy of rural sanctuaries in Roman Lydia and Phrygia', *Epigraphica Anatolica* 35, 77–101
Ritti, T. 1983: 'Epigrafi dedicatorie imperiali di Hierapolis di Frigia', *Rendiconti dell'Accademia dei Lincei* 38, 171–82
Ritti, T. 1985: *Hierapolis. Scavi e richerche I: fonti letterarie ed epigrafiche*, Rome
Ritti, T. 1992/93: 'Nuovi dati su una nota epigrafe sepolcrale con stefanotico da Hierapolis di Frigia', *Scienze dell'Antichità* 6/7, 41–68
Ritti, T. 1995: 'Associazioni di mestiere a Hierapolis di Frigia', in B. Maria Giannattasio (ed.), *Viaggi e commerci nell'antichità. Atti VII Giornata Archeologica*, Genova, 65–84
Ritti, T. 2002: 'Documenti epigrafici dalla regione di Hierapolis', *Epigraphica Anatolica* 34, 41–70
Ritti, T. 2003: 'La neocoria di Hierapolis di Frigia', in *Epigraphica. Atti delle Giornate di Studio di Roma e di Atene in memoria di Margherita Guarducci (1902–1999)*, Rome, 177–215
Ritti, T. 2006: *An Epigraphic Guide to Hierapolis (Pamukkale)*, Istanbul
Ritti, T., and Baysal, H. H. 2008: *Denizli-Hierapolis Arkeoloji Müzesi. Yunanca ve Latince Yazılı Eserlerin Kataloğu*, Naples
Robert, L. 1983: 'Les dieux des Motaleis en Phrygie', *Journal des Savants*, 45–63
Royer, A. 2006: *Associations professionnelles et groupes de gens de métier dans les cités grecques d'Asie Mineure à l'époque impériale (I^er–V^e siècles ap. J.-C.)*, Dissertation Lyon
Şahin, S. 1978: 'Zeus Bennios', in S. Şahin, E. Schwertheim and J. Wagner (eds), *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasiens. Festschrift für Friedrich Karl Dörner zum 65. Geburtstag am 28. Februar 1976*, Leiden, 771–90
Sartre, M. 2007: 'Romanisation en Asie Mineur?', in G. Urso (ed.), *Tra Oriente e Occidente. Indigeni, Greci e Romani in Asia Minore*, Pisa, 229–45
Schuler, C. 1998: *Ländliche Siedlungen und Gemeinden im hellenistischen und römischen Kleinasien*, Munich
Schuler, C. 2012: 'Inscriptions and identities of rural population groups in Roman Asia Minor', in J. K. Davies and J. Wilkes (eds), *Epigraphy and the Historical Sciences*, Oxford, 63–100
Schwabl, H. 1999: 'Zum Kult des Zeus in Kleinasien (II). Der phrygische Zeus Bennios und Verwandtes', *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 39, 345–54
Şimşek, C. 2007: *Laodikeia (Laodikeia ad Lycum)*, Istanbul
Sommer, S. 2006: *Rom und die Vereinigungen im südwestlichen Kleinasien (133 v. Chr.–284 n. Chr.)*, Hennef
Steinhauer, J. 2014: *Religious Associations in the Post-Classical Polis*, Stuttgart
Strubbe, J. H. M. 1975: 'A group of imperial estates in central Phrygia', *Ancient Society* 6, 229–50

Terpstra, T. T. 2013: *Trading Communities in the Roman World. A Micro-Economic and Institutional Perspective*, Leiden
Thonemann, P. 2010: 'The women of Akmoneia', *Journal of Roman Studies* 100, 163–78
Thonemann, P. 2011: *The Maeander Valley. A Historical Geography from Antiquity to Byzantium*, Cambridge
Thonemann, P. 2013a: 'Phrygia: an anarchist history, 950 BC–AD 100', in P. Thonemann (ed.), *Roman Phrygia. Culture and Society*, Cambridge, 1–40
Thonemann, P. 2013b: 'Households and families in Roman Phrygia', in P. Thonemann (ed.), *Roman Phrygia. Culture and Society*, Cambridge, 124–42
Trainor, M. 2008: *Epaphras. Paul's Educator at Colossae*, Collegeville
Tran, N. 2012: 'Associations privées et espace public. Les emplois de publicus dans l'épigraphie des collèges de l'Occident romain', in Dondin-Payre and Tran 2012, 63–80
Tran, N. 2013: *Dominus tabernae. Le statut de travail des artisans et des commerçants de l'Occident romain (Ier siècle av. J.-C.–IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)*, Rome
Tsouvala, G. 2015: 'Women members of a gymnasium in the Roman East (IG IV 732)', in J. Bodel and N. Dimitrova (eds), *Ancient Documents and their Contexts*, Leiden, 111–23
Van Nijf, O. M. 1997: *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*, Amsterdam
Van Nijf, O. M. 2003: 'Les élites comme patrons des associations professionnelles dans l'orient romain', in M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni and L. Lamoine (eds), *Les Elites et leurs facettes. Les élites locales dans le monde hellénistique et romain*, Rome, 307–21
Varinlioğlu, E. 2006: 'Five inscriptions from Acmonia', *Revue des Études Anciennes* 108, 355–73
Velkov, V. 1980: 'Zur Entwicklung des Handwerks in den Städten Thrakiens und Untermösiens', in V. Velkov, *Roman Cities in Bulgaria. Collected Studies*, Amsterdam, 131–6
Verboven, K. 2012: 'Les collèges et la romanisation dans les provinces occidentales', in Dondin-Payre and Tran 2012, 13–46
Versluys, M. J. 2014: 'Understanding objects in motion. An archaeological dialogue on Romanization', *Archaeological Dialogues* 21, 1–20
Waltzing, J.-P. 1895: *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'Occident, Vol. I*, Bruxelles
Weiß, P. 2000: 'Eumeneia und das Panhellenion', *Chiron* 30, 617–39
Woolf, G. 1994: 'Becoming Roman, staying Greek. Culture, identity and the civilizing process in the Roman East', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 40, 116–43
Woolf, G. 1998: *Becoming Roman. The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul*, Cambridge
Wörrle, M. 2011: 'Aizanoi's theatre in use: an epigraphic approach', in A. N. Bilgen *et al.* (eds), *Archaeological Research in Western Central Anatolia*, Kütahya, 140–50
Wörrle, M. 2015: 'Die ptolemäische Garnison auf der Burg von Limyra im Licht einer neuen Inschrift', in B. Beck-Brandt, S. Ladstätter and B. Yener-Marksteiner (eds), *Turm und Tor. Siedlungsstrukturen in Lykien und benachbarten Kulturlandschaften*, Vienna, 291–304
Woudhuizen, F. C. 2008/2009: 'Phrygian & Greek', *Talanta* 40/41, 181–217
Ziebarth, E. 1896: *Das griechische Vereinswesen*, Leipzig
Zimmermann, C. 2002: *Handwerkervereine im Griechischen Osten des Imperium Romanum*, Mainz
Zimmermann, K. 2007: 'Les origines de la gérousie de l'époque impériale', in M. Mayer i Olivé, G. Baratta and A. Guzmán Almagro (eds), *XII Congressus Internationalis Epigraphiae Graecae et Latinae. Provinciae Imperii Romani Inscriptionibus Descriptae*, Barcelona, 1523–7