

This article was downloaded by: [Aristotle University of Thessaloniki]

On: 05 December 2013, At: 03:31

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Mediterranean Historical Review

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/fmhr20>

Brotherhoods of Faith and Provident Planning: The Non-public Associations of the Greek World

Vincent Gabrielsen

Published online: 16 Jun 2008.

To cite this article: Vincent Gabrielsen (2007) Brotherhoods of Faith and Provident Planning: The Non-public Associations of the Greek World, *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 22:2, 183-210

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518960802005737>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

Brotherhoods of Faith and Provident Planning: The Non-public Associations of the Greek World

Vincent Gabrielsen

Taking a broad view of the private associations in the Greek-speaking world, this article assesses their historical significance. It argues that whereas organizational life in the Classical city-state was dominated by the public associations of citizens, in the Hellenistic period this area was enriched with the emergence of numerous private associations, many of which included non-citizens. Since these new units duplicated the organization and functions of the polis, the result was an expansion of the 'civic' space into a new area, and the spreading of sameness over a wide geographical expanse. Accompanying that argument is a discussion of the networking capabilities of private associations in the areas of religion, economy and politics.

Keywords: Hellenistic History; Private Associations; Polis Organization; Traders' Diasporas; Foreigners; Religion; Trade; Economy

Introduction

I begin with three short life stories. Strabo tells us the story of his contemporary Hybreas, one of the two notable men in Mylasa. As a young man, Hybreas inherited from his father only a wood-carrying mule and a mule driver. But he gave himself to studying rhetoric with Diotrephes of Antiocheia, and soon earned the post of *agoranomos* at his home city. An incumbent of this post, he then decided to embark on a political career, and by joining 'those frequenting the market', the *agoraiotai*, he quickly rose to a position of great power in the city of Mylasa.¹ The Danish storyteller and poet Hans Christian Andersen (whose mother is said to have washed other people's clothes to pay for his education) was equally well 'connected', though

Correspondence to: Vincent Gabrielsen, Saxo-Institute, Department of History, University of Copenhagen, Njalsgade 80, DK2300 Copenhagen S, Denmark. Email: gabriels@hum.ku.dk

hardly to any *agoraioi*. In 1847, during his visit to London, Andersen was elected visiting member of the very prestigious London club, *The Athenaeum*. In his diary, the Dane registered his fascination at the club's cosmopolitan and luxurious interior ('the servants were wearing silken stockings'), but at the same time he also complained that he had to pay the exorbitant price of 3 shillings for one lamb chop and half a glass of mineral water—albeit served on a silver tray.² The American founding father, Benjamin Franklin, himself of artisan and farming stock, was in 1727 the founder-member of a club 'of mutual improvement' named the *Junto* (or Leather Apron Club), whose purpose was 'to debate questions of morals, politics and natural philosophy and to exchange knowledge of business affairs', and he later established a number of other clubs for discussion of good causes and new knowledge.³ Actually, the multitude of new clubs and societies which proliferated in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in England, France, America, and elsewhere are now shown to have played a central role in the ongoing modernization process of the social and political life.⁴

Franklin became a Deist, Andersen led the life of an ardent Protestant, and only heavens know to which gods or god our Hybreas from Mylasa offered up his sacrifices—at a guess, Zeus *Agoraios*. At any rate, religious preoccupations most certainly filled some space in these men's lives. All three, moreover, pursued personal goals, or gained advancement, via membership of more or less tightly knit groups of a private nature. Lastly, like many of their contemporaries, all three knew quite well what institutionalized personal relations within 'societies' meant, and what such links could do for them. However, none of these men would have spoken of his connections as 'networks'.

The Greek word *diktyon* means 'net'; *diktyodes* or *diktyoeides* (or *diktyoton*) refer to something with the form of a net; the verb *diktyoomai* means 'to be caught in a net'; *diktyarchountes*, attested in second-century AD Parion (Troas), are officials in an association of 'fishermen', not a 'network' in the modern sense.⁵ Still, despite the lack of a special Greek term, most, I believe, will agree that it is both legitimate and highly relevant to direct our attention towards such phenomena in the ancient world that can reasonably be categorized under the general modern description 'networks'. The ones I have chosen for treatment here are the non-public associations of the ancient Greek-speaking world.

The evidence concerning these non-public associations, mainly inscriptions and papyri, has grown noticeably since Franz Poland published his fundamental study on the subject almost a hundred years ago.⁶ In recent years, ancient historians have started taking a strong interest in specific types of associations, or in the associations of a particular area, or again in single aspects of associational life—religion being a dominant one.⁷ That interest is now shared also by theologians, especially those among them who explore possible connections between the associations of the classical world and the Pauline or early Christian congregations.⁸ Characteristically, it is this latter group of scholars, as well as historians of the Roman period,⁹ who now

stand out for their willingness to venture into thematically far-reaching questions and to give a panoramic view of an eminently complex historical phenomenon.

In this article, using material from various parts of the Greek-speaking world, I shall attempt to offer a rather wide-ranging assessment of the networking capabilities of the ancient non-public associations; though, for reasons that will become apparent shortly, chronologically the stress will be on Hellenistic times. Treatment of the ancient 'brotherhoods' *sui generis* can of course only be undertaken at the cost of leaving out individual features, deviations and local nuances, all of which underline particularity and difference. Still, while all these may prove most useful in a different kind of study, the overall topic to be treated here requires a more generalizing approach: networks and their workings, often straddling several social, juridical, or geographical borders, are less likely to reveal much of themselves in a narrowly focused study that builds on local- or type-specific evidence alone.

I proceed from the contention that there are at least three good reasons for including the non-public associations in an analysis of networks in the Greek-speaking world.

Two of them have mostly to do with current trends. One is the political and theoretical debate which has been going on since the 1980s, and which is mostly fuelled by the efforts of several countries to delegate an assortment of governmental responsibilities to private actors: it is about the ability or efficiency of private organizations to take over specific public functions (e.g. in the field of welfare), and also in fending off the worst depredations of global capitalism;¹⁰ also, one may add the resurgence of 'communitarism' in American political theory—that is, the conception of the community as a mediating force between individual and state. Flowing almost directly from these debates is the next trend: the revived interest among historians of medieval and later times in gaining a better understanding of the history of private associations.¹¹ Whether ancient historians would want to respond to the first of these trends is a matter of personal choice. But to abstain from engaging in the scholarly discourse generated by the second trend is to insist on an unjustified disciplinary isolationism that denies the experience of the ancient world the opportunity of making its own contribution to the study of a significant historical phenomenon. In 1981, G. E. M. de Ste Croix complained, 'The treatment of corporations in existing works is wholly inadequate, being merely systematic and not historical'.¹² It is time to give the 'historical' its due. My third reason, a more substantive one compared with the other two, provides also the principal justification for my topic. It therefore needs to be laid out in some more detail.

Public and Private Associations

A brief and even superficial comparison between the world of the Classical Greek *polis* and its successor in Hellenistic times is enough to make that reason apparent. In the Classical period, the *dominant* (but not the only) way in which the populations of the Greek *poleis* had come to be organized consisted of membership of units,

or associations, that were not only subordinate to the main socio-political unit, the *polis*, but also integral parts of it. Societal organization at that time was almost coterminous with, and certainly under the primacy of, the *political*, and had 'citizenship' as well as the smooth functioning of the public sphere as its pre-eminent concerns. In Aristotle's well-known formulation, 'the *polis* is an association (*koinonia*) of citizens centred around the constitution (*politeia*)'.¹³ This larger association rested on, and drew nourishment from, a variety of smaller associations (*koinoniai*), all of which were politically oriented microcosms that cooperated to energize the life of their parent unit, the *polis*.¹⁴ Regardless of whether they had a territorial basis (e.g. *demes*, *komai*, *ktainai*, etc.), or were constituted on a predominantly non-territorial criterion (e.g. *phylai*, *phratries*, *patrai*, *syngeneiai*, *hekatostyes*, etc.), they all were *public subdivisions*. One of their main functions was to tie their members to the big *polis*-association (*koinonia*).¹⁵ A significant side effect of all this was that, with the occasional exception of military service,¹⁶ and of course with the partial exception of those few groups of foreign worshippers that were slowly emerging in the later fifth century (see below), non-citizens remained not only political outsiders,¹⁷ but also a rather amorphous and—associationally speaking—parentless group, floating in free space.¹⁸

In Hellenistic times, citizen-manned, public organizations were still in place.¹⁹ Whether or not their importance overall was in decline (one supposedly starting either early on or from c.130 BC) is an issue pending systematic investigation. Yet any preliminary assessment of that issue, including the present one, will have to take into account a number of clear indications to the effect that in several Hellenistic *poleis* public subdivisions continued to hold a central place, both within traditional political structures and, as something new, within those freshly created structures that came to define the relationship between *poleis* and monarchs.²⁰ Thus, in quite a number of Hellenistic *poleis*, not decline but renewal and reorientation are evidenced as the prevailing features.

In any case, a notable novelty is that the associational sinews that traditionally and predominantly held together the public sphere had now attained a vibrant and assertive counterpart which filled a fairly large part of the picture. These are the *private*, or, as has become customary to call them in English, *voluntary* associations.²¹ One of their general characteristics—and the main criterion that justifies our uniting into a single treatment groups of various descriptions—is that they normally had no formal (i.e. constitutional) affiliation to the *polis*, even though they all remained subject to *polis* law.²² Another general characteristic is that they distanced themselves from prevailing juridical distinctions between status categories, freely admitting as members both citizens and all categories of non-citizens—that is, foreigners, women and in some cases slaves as well.²³ In short, population groups other than the politically privileged one, the citizens, had finally begun organizing themselves—at first sporadically and at a low key (see the case of Athens below), then systematically and on a large scale—into discrete but clearly recognizable *koinoniai*. With this, political 'outsiders' gradually found a home in collectives possessing a distinctly familiar organizational form. They thus acquired for real societal space of their own.

It is almost exclusively from epigraphic evidence that we know of a variety of types and individual names. Beginning for good in the later fourth century BC, the non-public associations of the Greek-speaking world placed themselves into one among several broader categories or types: for instance, into *therapeutai*, *speirai*, *systemata*, *syntheis*, *syntechniai*, *synergasiai*, or into what were much more common in Hellenistic times, *eranoi* and *thiasoi*. While the latter two are attested from the start (see p. 191 below), some of the others make their appearance only gradually and as late as in Imperial times, so that by about the beginning of the first century BC a fairly rich typology had come into existence. Within each of these types, then, individual associations are distinguishable by their name, more often than not a composite one. Typically (and disregarding local idiosyncrasies), it consists of at least one, and frequently more, theophoric elements—for example, Apolloniastai, Hermaistai, Athenaistai, Sabaziastai (or Sabazioi) and so on. Such theophoric elements are then often joined by an ethnic or a geographic designation. Occupational descriptions, on the other hand, are both late to enter the names and few and far between initially (cf. p. 195 below). Finally, the theophoric, ethnic, or other elements may be accompanied by a personal name, which usually is the name of the *ktistes*, the founder or president of the association.²⁴

Typology and individual names can thus be perceived as two distinct tiers. Each of them began for real to grow richer and more varied in the course of the Hellenistic period.²⁵ But even before that, their individual manifestations (i.e. the specific types and names) did much to underline the *distinctiveness*, *diversity* and *exclusiveness* of the groups which they designated; types and especially names, in short, were among the features that ensured that no association was like another. But at the same time these groups were also endowed with a counter-tendency, one strongly underlining *generic affiliation*, *inclusiveness*, and, above all, *sameness*. A principal factor producing these latter—organizational make-up—will be mentioned shortly. Here, suffice it to note a related one—namely, the existence of a third and higher tier which embraced all types and all names. For each non-public association described itself (and was described by others) also by use of the generic description, *koinon*—that is, ‘commonalty’ or ‘association’, pure and simple; beginning at the highest level, the hierarchy of tiers was, for example, *koinon*, *eranos*, specific name of association. As is known, especially in Hellenistic times, the term *koinon* was often used to describe also the main political community itself—whether a federal state, an *ethnos*, a *polis*, or even a kingdom (e.g. *to koinon ton Makedonon*)—and its public subdivisions.²⁶ Thus, in addition to imposing a certain measure of sameness among the plethora of non-public associations, this higher tier (i.e. the *koinon*) situated these associations en bloc right at the side of the public ones, the two becoming in effect terminologically indistinguishable.²⁷

As they emerged, multiplied and spread like fire, primarily within urban centres, they enlarged tremendously the field within which people could act, connect, do business and communicate in a particular and considerably more effective way—that is, as members of one or more organizations. This resurgent ‘club-ism’ is, I think, a change worth examining closer. What might have been the factors that caused it?

And what can we say of its consequences? Some modern historians refer to this change as the ‘associational phenomenon’ (*il fenomeno associativo*),²⁸ and emphasize the way it enriched the religious, social, and cultural life of the ancient world.²⁹ A large body of inscriptions confirms their view. Almost everywhere, city life (most conspicuously, its civic and religious spheres) gained fresh vigour from such an unprecedented wave of organized conviviality, commensality, mutual aid, and cult worship; in the cities of the Roman East, it is now argued, public ceremonial and local politics were likewise affected to a noticeable degree.³⁰ To all these, we should finally add the contribution of associations to the architectural embellishment of urban centres and their *necropoleis*, the remains of which are still visible in several places.³¹

Nevertheless, we can and should go further than this. Historically, I propose, this mushrooming of private associations was the carrier of a societal transformation of the first order; not of the sudden and sensational kind—a revolution, as such—but rather one of those quiet yet block-building transformations that seem to fit, albeit in their own way, the newly introduced concept of ‘industrious revolutions’.³² It resulted in institutional innovations which, far from undermining the *polis*, came to enrich it with new networks and fields of activity. Associational proliferation and activity created a huge repository of institutional potential, whose special properties were to connect, communicate, and energize. Whenever they were released (and as far as we can see, they started to be so in the period c.330–300 BC), these properties profoundly affected forms of organization within the three principal fields of religion, economy, and politics. Within the space of this short article, I shall attempt to exemplify that potential, though not, as it would have been ideal, with equal weight on all three of these fields; rather, the stress will be on the political. Here, I can only be suggestive, offering some interpretations rather than documenting a case.

Expanding the Civic Space

In his analysis of the relevant documents, Franz Poland observes that, in the way they were organized, the private associations were true imitations of the *polis*; indeed, he even notes that, to some extent, the real *polis* and its private replicas exhibit a parallel institutional development.³³ This very correct observation, however, needs now to be followed by a crucial question: why would anyone about to create an alternative to the public organizations choose to make his private ‘club’ the spitting image of the quintessential public organization, the *polis*? The minimalist answer—‘He knew of nothing else’—is inadequate; for there *were* alternatives to the kind of *polis* (namely, the democratic one), which nearly all non-public associations mimicked,³⁴ including those that might exist in oligarchic governed *poleis*. The view to be preferred is, instead, that the choice of model was conscious from the start, the result of careful deliberation; that is, the founders of the early private associations in particular, and at least a majority amongst the founding members, not only had a clear conception of, but also agreed on, which organizational structure was to be preferred and which were to be discarded. Their choice seems to have rested on a conviction about the model’s

manifestly enduring and very positive characteristics, so as to be copied almost wholesale; rather than acting merely at random or instinctively, founders and their memberships largely built their organizations through careful planning and with a long-term perspective in mind. *Provident thinking*, in other words, was there from the beginning; the accuracy with which the *polis* was copied, as well as the rejection of any one of the utopias in circulation or a combination thereof (see note 34), is one clear reflection of this. Certainly, in a few cases, copying reached dimensions that may seem extraordinary. Yet, for the most part, it remained within reasonable limits, making its intended point that the copyist was the mirror image of, but at the same time something different from, the *polis*.

All associations, for instance, had equipped themselves with a ‘constitution’, *nomoi* (i.e. their by-laws), and a ‘civic bureaucracy’—that is, an assortment of financial, priestly and other officials (*tamiai*, *epistatai*, *epimeletai*, etc.), all assisted by secretaries (*grammateis*). This whole group of offices (*archai*) was headed by the president of the *koinon*: the *archeranistes*, or *archithiasites*, or *archisynagogos*, or, more rarely, the *proeranestria* (if a female president).³⁵ As far as one can tell, *polis* terminology and *polis* ideology (indeed, the ideology of the democratic *polis*) permeates every single aspect of their activities and overall make-up. The members—collectively termed ‘the multitude’ (*to plethos*) and divided into ‘private individuals’ (*idiotai*) and ‘office-holders’ (*archontes*)—act like ‘citizens’ in nearly all respects. Above all, they hold assemblies (*ekklesiai*, *sylogoi*), at which they pass formal resolutions (*psephismata*) in the name of the whole body—for instance, ‘it was resolved by the *koinon* of [name of respective association]’. These resolutions, borrowing heavily from the structure, formulas and rhetoric of public decrees, are (sometimes) published on stone slabs. Stelai recording the honours bestowed either on distinguished members or on benefactors (*euergetai*) outside the membership are equally replete with real-life-*polis* vocabulary, and count for much of the associations’ epigraphic output. Membership is chiefly defined by a set of duties and privileges. A standard privilege in many associations is that deceased members are buried at the expense of the association, and within its own cemetery, where commemorative events—punctuated with crowning ceremonies, other awards of honours and feasting—take place on a regular basis. Rather than terminating membership, death-cult made it continue in the afterlife, embracing the brotherhood’s ‘burial-grounds-sharing’ members (*homotaphoi*); death-cult worship, too, elevated especially prominent members (typically the founder) to the status of hero. Many non-public *koina*, therefore, possessed property, as a minimum a burial plot (*taphiai*, *topoi*) and a sanctuary (*hieron*), or a clubhouse (*andron*).³⁶ Thus endowed with its own constitution, officials, institutions, and a kind of a territorial base, each of these private brotherhoods posed as a ‘little republic’. That such a minute copying was occurring more or less simultaneously in various places strongly suggests one thing: the provident planning—indeed, the rational thinking—that lay behind the emergence and development of the model itself, the *polis*,³⁷ was imported together with the model’s institutional trappings.

So, at the same time as new *poleis* (i.e. newly founded cities) were emerging and flourishing across the Hellenistic East, 'little private republics' were cropping up in the old and new parts of the Greek-speaking world. As a result, by about 150 BC, city-states and federations (and kingdoms, too) found in their midst a resourceful and energetic 'other' that consisted of a profusion of private clubs. What was the relationship between the power of the State and the private look-alikes that took root within its purview?

This is a very complex question that cannot be treated satisfactorily here. Suffice it simply to note that, even in those instances in which the prevailing relationship of symbiosis or cooperation between State and non-public associations gave way to tension or conflict (see final section below), the overall result remained that described by John Davies more than twenty years ago—namely, that the *polis*, among other things because of the profusion of private associations, was 'transformed and revitalized'.³⁸ That relationship had deep roots in the past, since private associations and in particular wide-ranging personal networks of various descriptions had contributed greatly to the earlier transformation and revitalization of the *polis*. Simply put, in expanding its field of activities as a civic society and consolidating its *public* sphere (i.e. our 'common thing', *to demosion*), the early Archaic *polis*, while it did create brand new institutions, also cannibalized a good number of *privately organized* networks, which, after some refurbishment and perhaps even re-naming, it then presented as its own (i.e. as 'public'). The terms *proxenos* and *proxenia* may offer one illustration of how the State converted into public the private connections of a resourceful foreigner by establishing a special, privileged relation with him (cannibalization of a private network); and also how, in order to put that relationship into a public institutional setting, it borrowed heavily from the ways of the older *xenia* custom (cannibalization of a pre-existing social institution that spawned personal networks via 'ritualized friendships').³⁹ Wherever the evidence permits it, as it does in the case of Athens, we can trace parts of the process through which the Archaic or early Classical city-state sought to consolidate its 'statish-ness'—that is, its gradual imposition of an overarching *demosion*—by means of defining itself vis-à-vis its constituent parts (i.e. the public units), and also by means of distancing itself from its private competitors, thus establishing its superiority over them all. One text is especially relevant and deserves citing in full.

If a deme or members of a phratry or *orgeones* of heroes or members of a *genos* or messmates or funerary associates (*homotaphoi*) or *thiasotai* or those sailing away for booty or for trade make arrangements in these matters amongst themselves, they shall be valid (*kyrion einai*) unless forbidden by the laws (*demosia grammata*).⁴⁰

This is the well-known clause from Solon's law, known from the Roman jurist Gaius, who is quoted in Justinian's *Digest* 47.22.4. One interesting thing about this law is that it still lumps together bodies, which were to become clearly separated due to the growing distinction between 'public' and 'private'. Even more interesting, however, is the fact that it gives us the approximate point of time at which the concept

of 'by-laws', as something separate from 'the laws', was beginning to emerge in Athens. What is seen happening here in one *polis* was part of a larger current leading to increasingly greater political centralization, a greater measure of 'statish-ness' in the Greek world. Under this more centralized form of State, personal networks—built on kinship, friendship, cult worship, marriage, patronage, professional occupation (including the quest for profit), or even armed violence—did not really disappear. Quite a number of them submerged under (though without necessarily being absorbed by) the 'political' and its *demosion*, where they maintained some form of existence, until they began surfacing again in the late fourth century. Again, of all the places in the Greek-speaking world in which private associations proliferated in Hellenistic times, only Athens offers sufficiently rich pre-300 BC evidence so as to enable us to view the development within a broader historical perspective. What can be seen with adequate clarity is that the breakthrough is a real one, not just the product of our unevenly distributed evidence.⁴¹

The earliest securely datable piece of evidence for a *koinon* of *eranistai* at Athens, a dedication to Zeus Philios, is from 324/3 BC,⁴² the earliest known decrees issued by such a body from c.300 BC.⁴³ Also from the year 324/3 BC is the first securely datable document of a regular association, which is attested already in c.342/1 BC and which describes itself neither as an *eranos* nor as a *thiasos*, but simply as 'the *koinon* of the *Eikadeis*'.⁴⁴ Except for two previous appearances (see below), *koina* of the *thiasos* type begin to enter the picture for good in the later fourth century—their earliest known decree dating from 302/1 BC,⁴⁵ the earliest securely dated document with named foreigners from 301/0 BC.⁴⁶ It is in the third century, however, that the number of non-citizen *koina* increases dramatically. So it all seems to begin not long before 340–330 BC, for then to gather momentum during the following three decades. What was there before that can somehow be related to these new, private organizations?

First of all, already in the fifth century, there were a variety of all-citizen (or at least citizen-dominated) clubs: for example, those of 'fellow-diners', 'fellow-drinkers', and 'hero cult worshippers', all existing side by side with the socially suspect performers of particular rites, the hell-fire clubs of rich youngsters (calling themselves *Autolekythoi*, *Ithyphaloi*, and *Triballoi*), the more serious religious groups of *Nouminiastai*, *Tetradistai*, and *Dekadistai*, and a few others of a similar description.⁴⁷ Neither these nor the politically oriented and more cohesive *hetaireiai* (set up 'for mutual support in lawsuits and in elections', Thuc. 8.54.4), nor again the so-called philosophical schools, enjoyed anything like a firm organizational structure, or (perhaps apart from the latter) a noteworthy degree of permanency.⁴⁸ The same applies to the only groups of *eranistai* to make themselves visible in our sources before 324/3 BC, the ad hoc groups of lenders who provided an interest-free loan to a particular individual.⁴⁹ Finally (and still since the fifth century), there were two other kinds of citizen groups, each with a somewhat firmer organization than most of the above and a strong preoccupation with hero-cult worship, but also with an attachment to the *polis* organization as subgroups of the Athenian *phratries*. One of these consisted of groups of *orgeones*, the other of groups of *thiasoi*.⁵⁰

Compared with the public associations, each of these was feeble. But together they constituted a substantial, strongly religion-oriented organizational undergrowth that was both thickening and transforming during the fourth century. It was mainly out of this undergrowth that the private, more tightly organized and differently composed groups that proliferated in the post-300 period would gradually arise. In this transition, religion, it seems, was the main door into and a supreme carrier of associational efflorescence. A full-fledged, independent (i.e. private) *thiasos* association appears on record for the first time in the fifth century (the '*thiasos* of *Etionidai*' worshipping Herakles), and again in the early fourth century, each time marking the emergence of an alternative to the still-dominant phratry-dependent *thiasoi*.⁵¹ By 400 BC, too, the Thracian émigré community at Athens had used the cult of their native goddess Bendis (now recognized as an Athenian public cult) to institute the first non-citizen groups of *orgeones* of Bendis, which thus came to co-exist with the citizen *orgeones* worshipping the goddess; in a document of a later date, the Thracian group (of the Piraeus) referred to its establishment as an official act of the Athenian People, who, in accordance with an oracle from Dodona, had granted the Thracians, 'alone of the *ethne*', the privilege to own real estate and to institute a shrine.⁵² Not only did similar groups of non-citizen *orgeones* crop up in due course (e.g. those of the Great Mother), eventually appropriating the term *thiasos* so as to become a '*thiasos* of *orgeones*',⁵³ but the Thracian *orgeones* of Bendis themselves saw it fit to vote measures that aimed at expanding their membership, 'so that there may be as many *orgeones* of the shrine as possible'.⁵⁴

Thus, in the late fifth and early fourth centuries, new blueprints for 'club-ism' were being created, in time to be taken over and improved by other consumers of organizational life. Regarding formal organization and mode of associational governance, however, the institutional structures of the democratic *polis* continued to be the uncontested model. In 333/2 BC, Cypriot merchants from Kition, by decree of the Athenian People, obtained permission to establish a shrine of Aphrodite and to own the plot of land on which to build it; even prior to their getting a positive official response, the Kitian merchants are seen to be acting as if they already possessed associational identity, fittingly giving their original petition the form of an enactment which they collectively had passed 'in a lawful manner' (*hoi Kitioi emporoi edoxan ennoma*). In all this, they clearly were using blueprints created by others—for instance, such groups as that of Thracian émigrés just mentioned, and certainly a specific group of Egyptians, who in 333/2 had already been granted official permit to institute a shrine for Isis.⁵⁵ A few years later (in 324/3), as we saw above, the first genuine private association appears on the extant record. In two of his works on ethics, Aristotle, not having Athens particularly in mind, gave *eranoi* and *thiasoi* as examples of private associations which are organized 'for sacrifice and social intercourse', and associations of seafarers as examples of 'profit-motivated' (*chrematistikai*) organizations.⁵⁶ During the second half of the fourth century BC, at Athens and elsewhere, a new kind of *eranoi* had come to join the *thiasoi* as *koinoniai* of the non-public kind.

This significant transformation in the post-Alexander period—for which I coined the concept of ‘industrious revolution’—had therefore two aspects. A backward-looking aspect, in as much as the full-fledged personal network was being brought back in again. And a forward-looking aspect, in as much as private clubs were using, within their purview, the very techniques of the *polis* in order to challenge the *polis*’ own elitist ideology of exclusivity and, more importantly, its near-monopoly of organizational life. In short, individuals at large—including the privileged category of the citizens—were claiming back their privately organized and run networks. They wanted to be able again to set up, command, and put to good use resourceful *koinoniai* that were neither organically connected to nor governed by the power of the State.

A Powerful ‘Other’

As soon as they began achieving this, hitherto under-exploited reserves of intellectual energies, professional skills and collectively endowed loyalties started to become utilized, or stood ready to be utilized. In the long run, the result was a noticeable enlargement of the total associational space and, by virtue of this, a much greater degree of interconnectedness, locally and especially trans-regionally. The State and its constituent parts had now to share a number of time-honoured prerogatives with a potentially powerful ‘other’ that duplicated their functions. Neither the re-emergence of this ‘other’, nor the specific organizational form it took, came about by accident or as a by-product of something else; they resulted from careful planning. So did also the momentous spreading of the phenomenon after about 300 BC. What were the most significant consequences of this *koinonio*-mania? Here, I briefly sketch four such consequences.

Firstly, a most immediate one was that direct and close connections became established between individuals who had hitherto been separated not so much by ‘physical distance’, though such distance did matter, but by ‘social distance’, traditionally kept in place by strictly upheld distinctions in legal status, gender, wealth, or ethnic origin. The ‘associational culture’ spread vertically, both up and down the social and gender ladders, to cater for the specific needs of men and women. City elites, quickly recognizing the potential of this sprawling club-ism, linked themselves to it, either by making specific associations the targets of their personal benefactions (*euergesiai*), or by becoming card-carrying members, or, again, by founding their own clubs—as Benjamin Franklin and others were to do centuries later. Governments, on their part, befriended this private ‘associational culture’ as soon as they realized what kind of resources could be tapped from it (but see also point 4 below). One example of this will suffice: elsewhere, I discuss the evidence showing the role played by private associations in one Hellenistic state’s endeavours to secure manpower for its army and especially navy. Further evidence suggests that this trend applied to a larger geographical area. What apparently exercised a special appeal were the advantages of having well-organized and mostly foreign reserves of fighting personnel ‘in residence’, at a time when manpower demand was extremely high almost everywhere.⁵⁷

The reverse movement (i.e. fighters clubbing for outgoing activity) is attested twice, in Aristotle's description of *koinoniai* of 'fellow soldiers' (*systratiotai*)—who united 'for what is advantageous in warfare, whether money or victory or the seizure of a city' (Arist. *Eth.Nic.* 8.9.5 [1160a]; cf. note 56 above)—and in the earlier mention, by Solon's law, of 'those going away for booty' as a body making its own binding written agreements. With this, we have already moved on to instances showing the downward spread of the 'associational culture'. Less affluent men and women, and even slaves, could find a number of their needs catered for through membership. Promises such as the one made by the 'law' of a third-century *thiasos* could not but exercise a special attraction to the privileged and the unprivileged alike: 'and if someone is wronged, he is to be helped by them all and by all their friends.'⁵⁸ Those standing ready to help are of course one's associates.

Second, another consequence issued from the fact that the 'little private republics' proved highly industrious in the production and diffusion of 'sameness'; they made it spread laterally across a large geographical expanse, where it seems to have travelled mostly by merchant ship. But at the same time, private associations also took 'sameness' out of its cradle—the public sphere—and into the one sphere, the non-public one, which had stood out for its lack of it. The result was a considerable expansion of the space, within which a particular set of values and a special mode of communication, the *civic* ones, reigned. The members of brotherhoods, meaning also the members of *different* brotherhoods all over the Greek-speaking world, had acquired now a common language that enrolled them into one (almost universally valid) political culture, a uniform way of thinking, articulating their wishes and acting within well-defined collectives. Their issuing of decrees, their cult worship, their obsession with receiving benefactions and granting honours, their statues, crowns, and other kinds of dedicatory objects, all this and more besides united all those who were members of small, private units under one world view and under a single mode of social expression—a harmonizing, or one should rather say, homogenizing trend that customarily was, and *is*, dear to imperial powers.⁵⁹ Yet the basic values they fostered were apparently also dear to everybody else, since all brotherhoods practised an undemanding, ground-level conviviality that embodied notions of equality, freedom, participation, and all else that has the sweet scent of *demokratia*. As receptacles of personal networks, associations contributed to altering the image of their home political communities, making them look more egalitarian, socially more porous and juridically less secluded. In short, a principal part of the transformation I am describing consisted precisely of this intrusion of *civic* and, indeed, democratic ideals, culture and modes of expression into regularly held, private gatherings.

A third consequence underscores the fundamental importance of religion in a major field of economic activity. Two observations bring this out clearly. First, private *koina* with a name openly advertising their special attachment to a professional occupation appear relatively late—around 150 BC, to become numerous only from the first century onwards—and those who do so are initially (from c.150 to 60 BC) dominated by professionals in a specific area, seaborne commerce.⁶⁰ Second, theophoric names,

as well as theophoric elements *in* names, not only dominate almost entirely until c.150 BC, but they go on being prominent features also after they have been joined by professional designations.⁶¹ All this has been correctly interpreted as reflecting not the unimportance of profession as a focal point in associational life, but the far greater importance of religion; rather than evidencing the actual preoccupations of brotherhoods (or the vocational status of their members) at different periods of time, naming practices attest to carefully made choices in the mode of self-identification.⁶² Religion, in short, remained a solid mainstay at all times. Why? What, besides individually felt religiosity, might have been the reason or reasons why *koina* uniting ‘shippers’ (*naukleroi*) and ‘merchants’ (*emporoi*) not only went on using names that identified them as devotees of various deities (*Poseidoniastai*, *Apolloniastai*, *Hermaistai*, *Athenaistai*), but also placed great emphasis on their acting religiously, and being seen as acting so?

Only one aspect of this vast issue will be mentioned here briefly: the propensity of manifest religious devotion, that is, a person’s demonstration of ‘faith’ as a means of creating broad-based ‘faith in other people’, or, to use its secular name, ‘trust’. Religiosity was expressed in the punctilious observance of cult and the unrestrained demonstration of devotion, and these were regarded as the defining characteristics of the ‘pious’ man (*eusebes*); and pious men were, as a rule, perceived to be upright, conscientious, and dependable people.⁶³ ‘For thirty years I have kept safe the gold of foreigners and citizens, always with exemplary honesty’, reads the second-century epigram on a banker’s tombstone from Rhodes, and it further inform us that this banker’s ‘exemplary honesty’ owed to his possession of a ‘divinely sanctioned sense of justice’ (*hosia dikaiosyne*).⁶⁴ This could not be but a dependable man.

In another Hellenistic trade centre, Athens, a group of *thiasotai* solemnly pledged in their ‘law’ to assist each other, ‘so that it may be visible to all that we are piously disposed (*euseboumen*) both towards the gods and towards our friends’ (*IG II*² 1275, early third century, lines 8–10; cf. above p. 194). Piety towards the gods was more or less a given; but piety towards men, something ordinarily in short supply, could never be taken for granted. At Athens, like elsewhere, professionals worshipping the Great Gods (the *Dioskouroi*) united to form the ‘House of Shippers’ (*oikos naukleron*), an association whose members, besides repeatedly stressing their piety (*eusebeia*) and strict observance of their cultic obligations, formally held assemblies (*agora kyria en toi oikoi*) at which they passed decrees (one of 112/111 and another of 111/110 BC survive in a fragmentary state).⁶⁵ The very similar groups formed by merchants’ diasporas on Delos—the *naukleroi*, *emporoi*, and *ekdocheis*, who placed themselves under the religious patronage of Poseidon, Apollon, and Hermes—have been the subject of detailed study.⁶⁶ On Rhodes, similar groups of professionals were in the late first century BC making experiments (which were to prove successful) in lessening ‘occupational distance’, as they appear to have forged relationships of trust and cooperation between quite untraditional partners: an affluent diasporic group of ‘shippers’ (*naukleroi*) had merged with another such group of ‘farmers’ (*georgoi*) to form a single, fairly articulate body based in Lindos; there, they attended to their

common professional interests as well as their pious devotion to the local Athena, and all the while they, still as a group, were rising to a privileged civic position within their home city.⁶⁷ Such clubs endowed their members with an identity that brought closer three (usually) separate notions—that of the ‘worshipper’, the ‘citizen’ and the ‘pursuer of profit’ (i.e. the members of what Aristotle called *chrematistikai koinonai*, see note 58 above).

From 112/111 BC, too, dates the decree passed at Athens by a *synodos* of ‘shippers and merchants’ that worshipped Zeus Xeinios. This decree’s existence and general content is known only indirectly, through a *polis* decree issued by the Athenian Council as a response to the petition of the *synodos* for permission to post ‘a shield with the painted image of its own *proxenos*’ by his office building—their *proxenos* turns out to be a named Athenian, who at the same time was an elected state official, the overseer (*epimeletes*) of the harbour of Piraeus. What kind of distance is lessened here is revealed not so much by the fact that this private, Piraeus-based, Zeus-worshipping group of ‘shippers and merchants’, much like a foreign state, had a *proxenos* in Athens; or that this *proxenos* occupied a post of key importance for their trade; or, again, that the Council did grant them permission to post the picture within a public area. More striking than all of these is the fact that, by validating the association’s decree through the formal act of *epikyrosis* (‘ratification’), the Council interacted with this private club constitutionally, as if it was one of the subdivisions of the Athenian state.⁶⁸

The strong and persisting emphasis on religion turned the membership of every association from notional ‘citizens’ to a group of ardent ‘worshippers’. Whatever the origin, special qualities or ritual demands of individual cults, the fact that they were being actively worshipped by private brotherhoods made the religiosity of their membership constantly visible to the outside world. As a result, the equation between an ‘associate’ and a ‘pious man’ was becoming all the more self-evident. As repositories of religiosity and piety, associations created plenty of ‘faith in other people’, trust, particularly the variety which was—and in a way still is—in very high demand—namely, *long-distance trust*. This was another way in which the private associations proved to be industrious. Here, ‘sameness’ was being generated and spread by the near addiction of every ‘little republic’ to religion. Trust over long distances was not least needed by diasporas of every description—commercial trust and information-sharing trust being the most vital ones. All in all, the strong emphasis on religion, too, seems to have been the result of provident planning.

Finally, there was the ever-present flirting with power, a factor that lay dormant for most of the time, but which, when awakened, tended to become quite serious indeed. Certain cases of excessive *polis* mimicking, though they do stand out for the sheer pretensions, must be set aside as completely harmless. The whole membership of a club founded by a native of Kyzikos residing on Rhodes was organized into mock public subdivisions—that is, into three *phylai* (just like the Rhodian state), each headed by a *phylarchos* and a *gymnasiarchos*, and all three competing in annually held events (*agones*) that were presided over by elected *agonothetai*; the *phylai* of this second-century BC association were named after the founder, his wife and their

granddaughter.⁶⁹ Such trends persisted. In second-century AD Philadelphia (Lydia), associations are attested that styled themselves ‘the sacred *phyle* of wool-weavers’ (*he hiera phyle ton eriourgon*) or ‘the sacred *phyle* of shoemakers’ (*he hiera phyle ton skyteon*), while in nearby Saittai there was a ‘*phyle* of linen-weavers’ (*he phyle ton linourgon*).⁷⁰ From a much earlier date, finally, private clubs had equipped themselves with entire sets of *polis* legal processes—terminology and all—for use within their own, closed-circuit judicial systems; a good example is offered by a decree of the *Haliadai* and *Haliastai koinon* in second-century Rhodes.⁷¹ Cannibalization, it seems, had now changed direction.

Our evidence for the ‘serious’ cases comes from widely dispersed dates. In the early second century AD, there are the anxieties expressed in Pliny the Younger’s correspondence with Emperor Trajan about the *collegia* in the Roman east.⁷² A petition for the establishment of a *collegium* of fire-fighters (*fabri*) in Nikomedia was denied for fear of fostering seditious ideas: ‘Whatever title we give them, and whatever our object in giving it,’ writes Trajan, ‘men who assemble for a common purpose will all the same become a political association before long’ (Pliny, *Ep. Tra.* 10.33, 34). Regarding the petition from the free city of Amisos (in Pontus) to establish a private *eranos*-association, Pliny is advised not to try to prevent this, ‘especially if the contributions [sc. of their members] are not used for riotous and unlawful assemblies’ (Pliny, *Ep. Tra.* 10.92, 93; cf. 10.96, 97). Fears for the subversive character of Greek-inspired associations (said to be involved in a conspiracy against the Roman state) are attested as far back in time as 186 BC, when the Senate introduced strict regulations about the activities of Dionysiac cult groups (i.e. banning their gatherings) in Rome and Italy, a measure to be followed in 64 BC by another senatorial ban of associations allegedly involved in anti-constitutional activity;⁷³ later (towards the end of the second century AD), Ephesos was hit by a bakers’ riot.⁷⁴ Centuries earlier, Thucydides had put on record the aggressive activism exhibited by a number of fiercely anti-democratic *hetaireiai* in late-fifth-century Athens, upper-class led and manned clubs, which, with assistance from young bullies, played a part in the overthrow of democracy (see note 48 above).

What brings such chronologically distant phenomena and events together under one historical structure is a particular characteristic, perhaps the associational culture’s most important one: its ability to unite powerful networks of organizations and interests that can be used—and indeed *were* used—to achieve political mobilization: ‘fellow spirits’ could meet, share information, make plans, summon courage and act. Governments, which had befriended club-ism because of its resourcefulness in the first place, had also good reasons to feel uneasy with its superb capabilities of mobilizing people and stirring up action.⁷⁵

Chronologically sandwiched between the Classical Athenian *hetaireia* and the *collegia* in the Roman imperial provinces is the extensive, famed and powerful network of the Dionysiac Technitai, the professional actors and other performing artists, who from about 300 BC were responsible for the major Greek festivals and competitions. Since they, and particularly the evidence relating to them, are treated in depth in two

recent and almost simultaneously published monographs, I shall limit my account to highlighting only a few, essential features.⁷⁶

First of all, *Dionysiakoi Technitai* is the common name of four principal units, each with a distinct associational status (a *koinon*), and each with its own sub-branches: (1) the *Isthmian-Nemean* unit, with its Peloponnesian, Boiotian, Euboian and Macedonian branches; (2) the *Athenian* unit, with its strong Delphic connection; (3) the *Egyptian* unit, with its Cypriot branch; and finally, the largest of all four, (4) the *Ionian-Hellespontine* unit, with its special attachment to the cities of Teos and Pergamon. The second feature is that, thanks to their specialization in (as well as responsibility for) a politically and religiously vital field—that is, the Pan-Hellenic festivals and competitions—these multi-branched *koina* developed very close bonds of cooperation (e.g. participation in ambassadorial missions) and patronage with their host governments and with ruling powers.

The third feature, finally, relates to the remarkable amount of political clout that was attained by the largest of these associations, the Teos-based *Ionian-Hellespontine koinon*. Briefly, its members (a) enjoyed a special kind of citizenship within Teos that is nearly unparalleled in the Classical Greek or Hellenistic world; (b) they had their legal cases tried not by the ordinary Teian courts, but by a special court, the *koinodikion*, which was composed of Dionysiac Technitai and Teian citizens; (c) a recently discovered tetradrachm in the Attic standard (with a Dionysos head on the obverse and the legend *ton peri ton Dionyson techniton* on the reverse; see also Psoma, this volume) attests to the fact that the Technitai issued their own currency;⁷⁷ and finally, as inscriptional evidence shows, (c) they claimed as their own, at least ‘their own’ in a fiscal sense, part of the territory of Teos—that is, the harbours and the urban centre, *polis*. Not unexpectedly, a conflict broke out between the *koinon* of the Technitai and the city of Teos. When King Eumenes II of Pergamon intervened with a settlement proposal, he urged the two parties to merge by means of a *synoikismos*—that is, the kind of merger normally carried out by political communities only. If our evidence ever provided an example of a private body which made a serious attempt at ‘state-building’, this is it!⁷⁸

Certainly, this particular historical event, the association of the Technitai of Asia Minor itself, and possibly also the entire organization of the *Dionysiakoi Technitai*, are all highly exceptional. Nevertheless, they go some way towards illustrating how much power-potential could be stored in the associational crucible, and also how far those willing to activate that potential could get. Most other *koina*, however, avoided such ‘overstretching’, going on being industrious in a much less spectacular, albeit no less effective, way.

Notes

- [1] Strabo 14.2.24 [659]. It cannot be decided whether *agoraioi* here means ‘political leaders’ (i.e. ‘speakers in the agora’) or (as in Diod. 20.82.4–5, 84.5–6, 97.5) ‘marketeters’ (i.e. ‘those buying and selling’). In inscriptions, the word usually refers to those frequenting the market

- place, perhaps a loosely organized group: *IGBulg* I² 15(2) and (3), cf. *IGBulg* III (1) 1415. *Agoraios* as a cult epithet: Theoi *Agoraioi*: *SEG* 42.561; Herakles *Agoraios*: *IGBulg* V 5636; Zeus *Agoraios*: *IG* X (2) 2, 252; *IG* XII (8) 361; *IC* I (9) 1. I would like to thank the two anonymous readers who commented on the paper and made a number of useful suggestions and corrections. Below, I consider the two specific points they raise regarding my main argument.
- [2] Hans Christian Andersen, *Dagbøger, 1825–1875*, esp. vol. 3, edited by H. Vang Lauridsen and T. Gad (1974), 234–35 (25/26 July 1847).
 - [3] Benjamin Franklin, *Autobiography*; L.W. Labaree *et al.*, *Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, 280. Cf. Clark, *British Clubs and Societies*, 390, 401, 413.
 - [4] England and America: Allen, *Clubs of Augustan London*; Clark, *British Clubs and Societies*. Elsewhere: Françoise, *Sociabilité et société bourgeoise*.
 - [5] *I. Parion*, *Die Inschriften von Parion*, 5; cf. Poland, *Geschichte*, 360 n. ++.
 - [6] Poland, *Geschichte*, criticizing his predecessor, Ziebarth, *Das griechische Vereinswesen*. See also Rasmussen, *Peri ton Eranon*; Foucart, *Des associations religieuses*; Tod, 'Clubs and Societies in the Greek World'; Fisher, 'Greek Associations'. Associations of Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: San Nicolò, *Ägyptisches Vereinswesen*; de Cenival, *Les associations religieuses en Égypte*.
 - [7] Athens: Ferguson, 'Attic Orgeones', 'Orgeonika'; Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 333–42; Lambert, *Phratries of Attica*; Jones, *Associations of Classical Athens*, 221–67, 307–10; Leiwo, 'Religion or Other Reasons?' Rhodes: Pugliese Carratelli, 'Per la storia delle associazioni'; Gabrielsen, *The Naval Aristocracy*, 123–29; Gabrielsen, 'The Rhodian Associations'. Delos: Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes*; Rauh, *The Sacred Bonds of Commerce*. Individual aspects: e.g., Radin, *Legislation of Greeks and Romans*; Vondeling, *Eranos*; Arnaoutoglou, 'Between *koinon* and *idion*'; Arnaoutoglou, *Thusias heneka*.
 - [8] Kloppenborg and Wilson, *Voluntary Associations*; Harland, *Associations, Synagogues and Congregations*; Harland, 'Spheres of Contention'; Ascough, *Paul's Macedonian Associations*.
 - [9] Roman World and Greek East: Liebenam, *Zur Geschichte*; Waltzing, *Étude historique*; Ausbüttel, *Untersuchungen zu den Vereinen*; van Nijf, *The Civic World*; Perry, *The Roman Collegia*. Physical environment of associations: Bollmann, *Römische Vereinshäuser*.
 - [10] Green, *Reinventing Civil Society*, with Ferdinand Mount's review in *Times Literary Supplement* 15 October 1993, 12–14.
 - [11] Thrupp, 'The Gilds'; MacKenney, *Tradesmen and Traders*.
 - [12] De Ste.-Croix, *Class Struggle*, 597.
 - [13] Arist. *Pol.* 1274b32–1276b15. Cf. Hansen, *Polis and City-State*, 133–34; Hansen, *Polis*, 110.
 - [14] Arist. *Eth.Nic.* 1160a: 'But all associations (*koinoniai*) are parts of the state (*politike koinonia*).'
 - [15] General studies: Jones, *Public Organization*; Murray, 'Rationality and the Greek City'; Hansen, *Polis*, 102, 114–15. Studies on specific public subdivisions: Osborne, *Demos*; Whitehead, *Demes of Attica*; Siewert, *Die Trittyen Attikas*; Trail, *Demes and Trittys*; Gabrielsen, *Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes*, 29–31, 116–20 (*demes* and *ktoinai* of Rhodes); Roussel, *Tribu et cité (phylai)*; Lambert, *Phratries of Attica*; Gabrielsen, *Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes*, 141–49; Cordano, *Le tessere pubbliche* (*phratries*, *patrai* in Attica, Rhodes, Camarina and elsewhere); Shipley, *A History of Samos*, 184–85 (*hekatostyes* in Samos); Jones, *Associations of Classical Athens* (public associations of classical Athens). On the status of the Athenian *gene*: Bourriot, *Recherches*, 25–26, 199–235, 526–47, with 1180–1346, 1349–61; Roussel, *Tribu et cité*, 65–78; Smith, 'The Clans of Athens', 51–61; Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 56–66, 284–327; Jones, *Associations of Classical Athens*, 242–49 (except fragment 3 of [Arist.] *Ath.Pol.*, whose value is dubious, none of the other Athenian groups attested as *gene* were public associations proper); Gabrielsen, *Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes*, 149–51 (*diagoniai* of Rhodes).
 - [16] Military service by metics and mercenaries: Parke, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers*; Whitehead, *Ideology*, 82–86; McKechnie, *Outsiders in the Greek Cities*, 79–100; Bettalli, *I mercenari*; Burckhardt, *Bürger und Soldaten*. Navy: Gabrielsen, 'Socio-Economic Classes', 204–12.

- [17] Athens: Whitehead, *Ideology*. Greek world: Whitehead, 'Immigrant Communities'; McKechnie, *Outsiders in the Greek Cities*; Lonis, *L'étranger*, esp. Gauthier, 'Métèques'. Fugitives: Seibert, *Die politischen Flüchtlinge*.
- [18] In his mid-fourth-century BC treatise on how Athens can increase her revenues, Xenophon includes proposals for improving the care (*epimeleia*) to be shown to those foreigners who lived permanently in Athens and also to those who came on short business visits there (Xen. *Vect.* 2–3). Xenophon has many good recommendations, including the building of lodging houses for ship owners and houses and shops for retail traders (3.12–13), but he has not a single recommendation regarding organizations that would ensure a stronger attachment of non-citizens to the Athenian *polis*.
- [19] Heuss, *Stadt und Herrscher*; Jones, *The Greek City*, 95–112, 157–69; Orth, *Königlicher Machtanspruch*, 179–80; Gauthier, 'Les cités hellénistiques' (1984); Gauthier, 'Les cités hellénistiques' (1993); Gruen, 'The Polis'; Billows, 'Cities'. Cf. also Savali, 'I neocittadini'.
- [20] See e.g. Billows, 'Cities', 209; *contra* Green, 'The Polis', 155–70 (general decline compared with the classical city-states); cf. also Hansen, *Polis*, 133. Jones (*Associations of Classical Athens*, 302–06) argues for a decline of the public associations of Classical Athens after the Macedonian takeover; so also Lambert, *Phratries of Attica*, 275, for the Athenian phratries. Possible differences in *polis*-organization before and after c.130 BC: Gauthier, 'Les cités hellénistiques' (1993), 212. Public subdivisions still serving traditional purposes: Blümel, 'Vertrag zwischen Latmos und Pidasä'; Jones, 'The Union of Latmos and Pidasä': *phylai* and *phratoriai* into which citizens are distributed in the treaty (*sympoliteia*) between Latmos and Pidasä (323–313 BC). According to the *politikos nomos*, citizens of Alexandria were registered in demes: *P. Hal*, lines 245ff. In Eumenes II's grant of *polis* status to Tyriaion (Phrygia, 180s BC), the distribution of citizens to *phylai* is mentioned together with 'laws', 'the council' and 'the magistrates': *SEG* 47.1745; Jonnes and Riel, 'A New Royal Inscription'. Public subdivisions attain a new role in the relationship between *polis* and monarch, particularly in the structure of cultic honours: *SEG* 41.1003 II, lines 19–24 (c.203 BC), and Sahin, 'Ein neues Dekret', 13–18 (*symmoriai* of Teos for Antiochos III and his family); *SEG* 41.75, cf. Habicht, *Gottmenschentum*, 152 (deme of Rhamnous for Antigonos Gonatas); cf. also *I. Ilion* 31 and *OGIS* 11.24.26 (*phylai* of Ilion and of Priene, respectively, and their relation to royal cult). *I. Iasos* 5 (c.196 BC) is a decree of an Iasian *phyle* which is independently honouring Antiochos III and his family. Finally, *phylai* and other public subdivisions appear to be of vital importance for the functioning of the *polis* of Rhodes: Gabrielsen, *Naval Aristocracy*, 24–31, 112–23, 141–54.
- [21] The term 'voluntary' association seems to be a nineteenth-century coinage: Black, *The Association*, 1, 28–29; Langford, *A Polite and Commercial People*, 553.
- [22] Poland, *Geschichte*, 330–37.
- [23] Poland, *Geschichte*, 289–98, 328–29.
- [24] Poland, *Geschichte*, 74–75, 78, 366.
- [25] Poland, *Geschichte*, 5–172; Waltzing, *Étude historique*, IV, 1–242, esp. 236–42.
- [26] Treux, 'Koinon', 39–46; cf. Poland, *Geschichte*, 163–67. Federations: Larsen, *Greek Federal States*, xiv, 4–10, 193, 196; Corsten, *Vom Stamm zum Bund*, 15–16.
- [27] Note e.g. the inclusion of *IG XII*, 1 155d (a second-century BC decree of the private *koinon* of *Haliadai* and *Haliastai* from Rhodes) among the public decrees in Rhodes and Lewis, *The Decrees*, 266.
- [28] De Robertis, *Storia delle corporazione*; cf. van Nijf, *Civic World*, 9–11.
- [29] A recent assessment: the papers in Kloppenborg and Wilson, *Voluntary Associations*.
- [30] Van Nijf, *Civic World*, 243–47; Harland, *Associations*; Porena, 'Forme di partecipazione'.
- [31] The *necropoleis* of Rhodes: Fraser, *Rhodian Funerary Monuments*; Patsiada, 'Rhodiakē taphikē architektonikē'. The house of the *Poseidoniastai* on Delos: Bruneau and Ducat, *Guide de Délos*, 116, with fig. 20.

- [32] De Vries, 'The Industrial Revolution'. De Vries introduced the concept 'industrious revolutions' in the context of economic history, and in order to stress the substantial contribution to the economy made by a long series of changes in the pattern of household consumption and household organization under the 'old regime'. Here, 'industrious revolutions' is used in a broader context than the specifically economic one, but still in such a way as to underline the contribution of small-scale and piecemeal institutional innovations that are pursued and accomplished by a plurality of actors or societal units. Even though they are dispersed over a wider area, these units interact with each other, sometimes directly, at other times indirectly, but always (or mostly) in such a way that innovations introduced by one of them to a degree build on those already made by others; the main unit to which the changing patterns of consumption are here related is not the 'household', but the 'privately organized group'; and what is 'consumed' are not foodstuffs and other material goods, but the variety of advantages and benefits ingrained in associational life.
- [33] Poland, *Geschichte*, 337–38.
- [34] Alternatives to existing *poleis* were posited by several ancient thinkers, among others Aristophanes (*Birds*, *Ecclesiazousai*), and Plato (*Republic*, *Kritias*, *Laws*): on these and further utopias, see now the papers collected in Hansen, *The Imaginary Polis*, esp. the editor's introduction on pp. 9–24; and, of course, alongside *poleis* with a democratic constitution there were also those with an oligarchic constitution as well as those governed by a tyrant (or *strategos*)—for example, Syracuse under Hieron (478–66) and in 404 BC, when one Dionysios was elected *strategos* (Diod. 13.95.1), cf. the proposal to elect Praxagora as *strategos* in Aristophanes' *Eccl.* 247–48. On the 'non-*polis*' regions of Greece, discussed in the Manchester Seminar Series 'Alternatives to the Democratic *Polis*', see Davies, 'The "Origins"', 27, with his n. 21.
- [35] See the detailed study of Poland, *Geschichte*, 337–423; more generally, Wilson, 'Voluntary Associations'; Gabrielsen, 'The Rhodian Associations'.
- [36] Detailed modern treatment of this aspect: van Nijf, *The Civic World*, 38–55.
- [37] Murray, 'Cities of Reason'; Davies, 'The "Origins"', together with the other papers collected in Mitchell and Rhodes, *Development of the Polis*, esp. Osborne, 'Law and Laws' (pp. 74–82).
- [38] Davies, 'Cultural, Social and Economic Features', 304–15 (section 'The Polis Transformed and Revitalized').
- [39] *Xenia*: Herman, *Ritualised Friendship. Proxenia*: Gschnitzer, 'Proxenos'; Marek, *Die Proxenie*; cf. Wallace, 'Early Greek *Proxenos*', 189–208. A concrete example consists of the personal, overseas network of *xeniai* shared by leading Spartiates, in the late Archaic and early Classical periods, which, as S. Hodkinson correctly notes, 'gives a real meaning to Irad Malkin's recent phrase, "the Spartan Mediterranean": Hodkinson in Mitchell and Rhodes, *Development of the Polis*, 93. This is one part of my brief answer to the scepticism expressed by one of the two anonymous readers of this article about my argument, that in expanding its public sphere (*to demosion*) the early *polis* cannibalized a number of private networks. The other (and briefer) part simply consists of a reference to the concise analysis offered by Davies, 'The "Origins"', esp. 29–31.
- [40] For the text given here, see Ferguson, 'Attic Orgeones', 62–66, and Whitehead, *Demes of Attica*, 13. Extensive discussion (with further references) in Jones, *Associations of Classical Athens*, 33–45, 311–20, who argues for a somewhat different text (his p. 34). Arnaoutoglou ('Between *koinon* and *idion*', 72–3) doubts that this law clause is from Solon's time and that it can tell us anything about the relationship between state and associations in classical times; the same doubt is also expressed by one of the two anonymous readers. Decisive proof of the text's early (i.e. Archaic) origin is of course unattainable, but I agree with Ferguson, 'Attic Orgeones'; Whitehead, *Demes of Attica*; and most recently Ismard, 'Les associations', that, rather than being a later fabrication, the text transmits an early Athenian law-clause. What matters, however, is that the political centralization, as well as the subordination of public units and private

associations to *polis* law, which is reflected in the text, is a process amply documented by independent, contemporary evidence—see, for example, the papers in Hansen, *Ancient Greek City-State*; and Osborne, ‘Law and Laws’.

- [41] Jones, *Associations of Classical Athens*, 5–7, 13, 222–23, 302–4, 307–10. Cf. Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 335, 338. The point I make in the text holds true even if one assumes that private associations—despite of our lack of evidence to that effect—did exist in considerable numbers also in the fifth century—the reason why they are not documented in the fifth century supposedly being the non-survival of the relevant documents. However, if they really existed before c.400 in the form and numbers in which they are known after c.350 BC, then we also have to assume that we are dealing with units that were signally introvert, epigraphically absolutely mute and historiographically utterly unnoticed; I consider that assumption to be erroneous. The suggestion of one anonymous reader, that private associations appeared for the first time at Athens and from there spread to the rest of the Greek-speaking world, seems to me to be unlikely for two reasons: (a) Aristotle (*Eth.Nic.* 1160a20–22) speaks of *eranoi* and *thiasoi* in general—that is, without having specifically Athens in mind, and at a time when especially the *eranos*-type of association is still something relatively new at Athens (cf. below); (b) at about that time, the Athenians used *eranos* about two different institutions, the *eranos*-loans (e.g. Dem. 53.8) and the private *eranos*-associations (e.g. *IG II²* 2935, of 324/3 BC), see note 49 below. Thus, one can equally posit the opposite scenario—that is, that developments in fourth-century Athens were being influenced by developments elsewhere.
- [42] *IG II²* 2935. A fuller list of documents in Parker, *Athenian Religion*, Appendix 4, 333–42; and Jones, *Associations of Classical Athens*, Appendix 1, 307–10.
- [43] *IG II²* 1265 (of a year between 320 and 296 BC) and *SEG* 41.82 (c.300–280? BC).
- [44] *IG II²* 1258 (324/3 BC). Earlier mention: *Agora XIX*, no. P26 (of c.342/1 BC). The decree of the *Eikadeis* stood within the shrine of Apollon Parnessios. *IG II²* 2631 and 2632 are two *horoi* of the property of this *koinon*. By ‘regular’ association I mean that this one was organized like the other private *koina*.
- [45] *IG II²* 2347 (‘post med. s. IV’) evidences the activities of the association. *IG II²* 1261 (*SEG* 16.108) carries three decrees of the *thiasos*, dated to 302/1, 301/0 and 300/229 BC.
- [46] *IG II²* 1262 (301/0), 1263 (300/299) 1271 (298/7), 1273 (281/0), cf. 2943, 2352.
- [47] For an overview, see Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 333–36; see also O. Murray in Murray, *Symptotica*, 149–61.
- [48] *Hetairiai*: Hyp. 4.8 (c.330–324 BC) refers to a law forbidding the formation of a *hetairikon* for the purpose of overthrowing the democracy. See generally, Calhoun, *Athenian Clubs*; Sartori, *Le eterie*; Welwei, ‘Polisbildung’; Jones, *Associations of Classical Athens*, 223–27. Philosophical schools as *koinoniai*: Arist. *Eth.Nic.* 9.17 (1164b); Theophrastus apud Diog. Laert. 5.53, with Lynch, *Aristotle’s School*, who, however (p. 127), rejects the dominant view that the Peripatos and other Athenian schools were organized as *thiasoi* devoted to the cult of Muses; cf. Jones, *Associations*, 227–34; Mason, ‘*Philosophiae*’ (philosophical schools in later periods).
- [49] On these *eranoi*: Finley, *Studies in Land and Credit*, 100–6, 289–93; Vondeling, *Eranos*; Millett, *Lending and Borrowing*, 153–59. On the *eranoi* attested in the *horoi*-inscriptions Finley (*Studies*, 102–3) writes: ‘there is no genuine evidence of any kind for the alternative view that they are societies’. This statement cannot be correct for the post-330 BC period. [Arist.] *Ath.Pol.* 52.2 mentions lawsuits concerning *eranoi* and *koinoniai* (*eranikai* and *koinonikai dikai*). Since a clear separation is made here between terms which in the case of non-public associations proper were nearly synonymous (i.e. *eranoi* associations were also called *koina*), the *eranoi* here are very probably the ‘friendly loan groups’, see also Jones, *Associations*, 16 n.62, 222–23, 307–8, *pace* Ziebarth, *Das griechische Vereinswesen*, 179. As to the *koinonikai dikai*, they may concern any kind of ‘jointly own property’—see e.g., Dem 14.16: *ta koinonika* (here a category of property exempt from the trierarchy).

- [50] *Orgeones*: special connection to phratries, *FGrHist* 328: Philochoros F 35a; see Andrewes, 'Philochoros'; Isaios 2.14. See Roussel, *Tribu et cité*, 134; Lambert, *Phratries of Attica*, 74–77; Jones, *Associations*, 215, 250; and esp. Ferguson, 'Attic Orgeones', 73–95, nos. 1–12 (his 'class A' documents concerning *orgeones of citizens*); and Ferguson, 'Orgeonika', 130–63. *Thiasoi*: *IG II²* 1237 (as sub-groups of the *Dekeleieis*). See Lambert, *Phratries of Attica*, 81–93; Jones, *Associations*, 216–20. Jones (*Associations*, 218) suggests that 'the segmental relation of subgroup to phratry was a loose one and that in fact admission to or participation in the activities of the subgroup was tolerated in the cases of persons who would not qualify as bona fide *phrateres*'—these persons he identifies as women and non-citizens (219–20). However, the sources adduced in support of this are late, and the argument about a loose segmental relation is not entirely convincing.
- [51] *IG I³* 1016 (mid-fifth century BC); *IG II²* 2343 (early fourth century BC), on both documents, see Jones, *Associations*, 308.
- [52] Pl. *Resp.* 1.327a: 'Thracian' and 'local' (i.e. citizen) worshippers of Bendis, c.411 BC; *IG II²* 1283 (of 261/0 BC): decree of the Thracian *orgeones* in Piraeus, referring to the time at which their group and their shrine were established (lines 4–6). Ferguson ('Orgeonika', 132, cf. Jones, *Associations*, 257) dates the existence of this shrine to 429/8 BC. For documents of the citizen *orgeones* of Bendis: *IG II²* 1361, 1324, see Ferguson, 'Attic Orgeones', 98–99. See also Simms, 'Cult of the Thracian Goddess Bendis', 59–76; Jones, *Associations*, 43, 256–57. The epigraphic evidence for the worship of Bendis in the Piraeus is catalogued by Garlan, *The Piraeus*, 231–33, nos. 37–46.
- [53] *Orgeones* of the Great Mother: *IG II²* 4609 (late fourth century BC, our earliest possible evidence for the existence of the group), 1314, 1315, 1316 (272/1); see Ferguson, 'Attic Orgeones', 107–15. *Orgeones* attested for the first time as forming a *thiasos* (in the Hellenistic sense of the word): Dow and Gill, 'Greek Cult Table', esp. 112, a palimpsest text underneath the *orgeones* decree *IG II²* 1246 (early third century BC) and dated to a year after 316 BC.
- [54] *IG II²* 1361.20–23 (late C4 BC); cf. Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 337–38, with 170–1.
- [55] *IG II²* 337, esp. lines 33–5, 42–5. Parker, *Athenian Religion*, 337: 'Both groups [sc. the Kittian *emporoi* and the Egyptian worshippers of Isis] must have constituted a *koinon* or *thiasos* of some kind.'
- [56] In *Eth.Eud.* 7.9.3 (1241b), after mentioning the *koinoniai* of body and soul, master and slave, etc., Aristotle writes: 'the other types of *koinoniai* are a part of the *koinoniai* of the *polis*, such as (those of) *phrateres* or *orgeones* [OCT: *orgeon*; Dietsche: *orgeonon*] or business partnerships (*hai chrematistikai* [sc. *koinoniai*]). Arist. *Eth.Nic.* 8.9.4–6 (1160a): (4) 'But all *koinoniai* resemble parts, as it were, of the *koinonia* of the *polis*. For people travel for some advantage and to secure some of the necessities of life. And the *koinonia* of the *polis*, too, it seems, was originally formed and continues to endure for the sake of advantage. For it is at this that lawmakers take their aim; and they say that justice consists in what is advantageous to the community. (5) Now, the other *koinoniai* aim at some particular advantage (*sympheron*): for example, sailors (*ploteres*) at what is advantageous on a voyage for income from goods (*pros ergasian chrematon*) or some such thing; fellow soldiers (*systratiotai*) for what is advantageous in warfare (*tou kata ton polemon*), whether money or victory or the seizure of a city; and likewise *phyletai* and *demotai*. [And some *koinoniai* seem to come into existence for the sake of pleasure (*hedone*) – *koinoniai* of *thiasotai* and *eranistai*. For these (are organized) for the sake of sacrifice and social intercourse, respectively (*thysias heneka kai synousias*)];' trans. Jones, *Associations*, 28. The text within brackets is regarded as authentic, but possibly in the wrong place.
- [57] Gabrielsen, 'Rhodian Associations', 222, for comparison with the kleruchic *katoikiai*. See more generally Chanotis, *War in the Hellenistic War*, 78–101.
- [58] *IG II²* 1275 (early third century BC).
- [59] This point is well brought out, for imperial Rome, by Cracco-Ruggini, 'La vita associativa'.

- [60] Poland, *Geschichte*, 106–27, esp. 113; van Nijf, *The Civic World*, esp. 8. and index s.v. ‘occupations’. Those involved in seaborne commerce: Vélissaropoulos, *Les naulères grecs*, 91–124. The *koinon* of the merchants from Kition mentioned above might have been one of the earliest examples with a name revealing professional identity.
- [61] Foucart, *Des associations religieuses*, 1–22; Poland, *Geschichte*, 173–74, 246–47; Pugliese Carratelli, ‘Per la storia’.
- [62] Davies, ‘Cultural, Social and Economic Features’, 283: ‘That such groups took cult form and theophoric names not only reveals what sort of self-identification was most important (or most acceptable in the host town) but also suggests that many of the similarly named associations attested on Rhodes from the later third century onwards had comparable origins and functions.’ Cf. van Nijf, *The Civic World*, 8, 40.
- [63] Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 272–75.
- [64] Maiuri, *Nuova silloge epigrafica*, 29–32, no. 19 (Rhodes).
- [65] B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 30 (1961) 229–30, nos. 28 and 29. Improved text: Robert, ‘Deux décrets’, 7–14 [= L. Robert, *OMS VII*, 713–20], esp. p. 7: ‘piously’ (*eusebos*) in line 7 of the first decree (securely restored) and line 6 of the second. Robert cites further evidence for such *oikoi* of *naukleroi* in Athens (e.g. *IG II²* 2350) and elsewhere; cf. Vélissaropoulos, *Les naulères grecs*, 104–6.
- [66] Vélissaropoulos, *Les naulères grecs*, 106–10, and esp. Rauh, *Sacred Bonds*.
- [67] The first group to appear on record is that of the ‘farmers’ residing at Lindos: *I.Lindos* 229 (137 BC), lines 3–4 (line 4 ought to be read as: *kai ge[orgeunton en] tai [Lindiai]*). The merger is attested in *I.Lindos* 384b (ca. 9 BC), lines 15–17: *[toi katoikeu]ntes en Lindia poli kai georgeuntes/ [kai] areuntes en ta Lindia philodoxias* etc., which now can be fairly securely restored to read: *[toi katoikeu]ntes en Lindia poli kai georgeuntes/ [kai naukl]areuntes en ta Lindia philodoxias* etc.; cf. *I.Peraia* (IK 38) 514 (163/4 AD). Privileged position of the *georgeuntes* group: *I.Lindos* 349 (38 BC), i.e. honours awarded to a priest of Athana Lindia exclusively by public bodies and officials, with the sole exception of the *georgeuntes*, who, furthermore, are listed *before* the twelve Lindian demes. That they were a single group of wealthy foreign landowners (or managers of large agricultural estates) residing in Lindos: Gabrielsen, *Naval Aristocracy*, 129.
- [68] *IG II²* 1012 (*Syll.³* 706), esp. lines 22–23: *ten boulen epikyrosai heautoi psephisma*, to be compared to the fourth-century resolution regarding the petition of the Kitian *emporoi* (*IG II²* 337, cf. above p. 192), in which the Athenian Assembly simply acknowledges that the petition is made ‘in a lawful manner’. On the State’s ratification (*epikyrosis*) of decrees issued by its public subdivisions: Gabrielsen, ‘Subdivisions of the State’. On the decree of this *synodos*, see also Vélissaropoulos, *Les naulères grecs*, 104.
- [69] *IG XII*, 1, 127, cf. Gabrielsen, ‘Rhodian Associations’, 231–32.
- [70] *IGR* 4, 1632, cf. Waltzing, *Étude historique* III, 51, no. 146 (*eriourgoi*); Waltzing, *Étude historique* III, 52, no. 147 (*skyteis*). Saittai: Kolb, ‘Sitzstufeninschriften’, esp. 115, 117, nos. 36–41; *SEG* 40. 1063. See Poland, *Geschichte*, 154; van Nijf, *The Civic World*, 20, 184, 233.
- [71] *IG XII*, 1 155 d (I i), lines 90–103. I am indebted to Dr Lene Rubinstein for drawing my attention to the degree to which *polis* legal procedures are imitated in these lines.
- [72] On Roman law and *collegia*: Cotter, ‘The Collegia’; Arnaoutoglou, ‘Roman Law’ (citing further works), who rightly points out that Roman restrictions of, or bans on, associations were temporary and localized.
- [73] *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus*: *ILS* 18 (= *FIRA I²* 30), cf. Pailler, *Bacchanales*; Beard, North, and Price, *Religions of Rome*, 92–8. The ban of 64 BC (lifted in 58 BC): Asconius, *Pis.* 7; Asconius, *Corn.* 67; cf. de Robertis, *Storia delle corporazione*, 83–108; Ausbüttel, *Untersuchungen*, 85–86.

- [74] Buckler, 'Labour Disputes'; *I.Ephesos* 215. For a silversmiths' riot when Paul was visiting Ephesos: *Acts* 19.23–8; cf. van Nijf, *The Civic World*, 15, 238–39.
- [75] Aneziri, *Die Vereine*, 159–64, 194 n. 120: honours voted to kings, prominent Romans, public officials in kingdoms or cities and royal courtiers. Cf. Le Guen, *Les associations de technites* II, 80–81.
- [76] Le Guen, *Les associations de technites*; Aneziri, *Die Vereine*.
- [77] Lorber and Hoover, 'An Unpublished Tetradrachm', 59–68 (pls. 15–17), who propose the date c.155–154 BC. I am indebted to Dr Panos Iossif, who brought the coin and the relevant publication to my attention.
- [78] On all of the above points, except (c), see Welles, *RC* 53, now Le Guen, *Les associations* I, 243–50, no. 47; and Aneziri, *Die Vereine*, 387–91, no. D12: Letter of Eumenes II (before 158 BC), esp. IIA, lines 3–5 (*koinodikion*), IIIA, lines 5–8 (proposal that the parties conclude a *syntheke* with a view to a *synoikismos*, cf. e.g., Welles *RC* 3/4, for Antigonos I's arrangement of a *synoikismos* between Lebedos and Teos), IIC, lines 10–15 (fiscal division between the parties of the harbours, *polis* and *chorai* of Teos). The power-political aspects are particularly emphasized by Le Guen, *Les associations* II, 77–82, 100–02. See also Aneziri, *Die Vereine*, 155, 187–88, 292, 302–4, 307–16 (99–100: *koinodikion*).

References

- Allen, R. J. *The Clubs of Augustan London*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1933.
- Andersen, H. C. *Dagbøger, 1825–1875*, 12 vols, edited by H. Vang Lauridsen, T. Gad, and K. Weber. Det Danske Sprog-og Litteraturselskab. Copenhagen: Gad, 1971–76.
- Andrewes, A. 'Philochoros on Phratries'. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 81 (1961): 1–15.
- Aneziri, S. *Die Vereine der dionysischen Techniten im Kontext der hellenistischen Gesellschaft. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte, Organization und Wirkung der hellenistischen Technitenvereine*. Historia Einzelschriften, no. 162. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2003.
- Arnaoutoglou, I. 'Between *koinon* and *idion*: Legal and Social Dimensions of Religious Associations in Ancient Athens'. In *Kosmos. Essays in Order, Conflict and Community in Classical Greece*, edited by P. Cartledge, P. Millett, and S. von Reden, 68–83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . 'Roman Law and *Collegia* in Asia Minor'. *Revue internationale des droits de l'Antiquité* 49. (2002): 27–44.
- . *Thusias heneka kai synousias. Private Religious Associations in Hellenistic Athens*. Yearbook of the Research Centre for the History of Greek Law, no. 37, Suppl., no. 4. Athens: Academy of Athens, 2003.
- Ascough, R. *Paul's Macedonian Associations: The Social Context of Philipians and 1 Thessalonians*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, no. 161. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Ausbüttel, E. M. *Untersuchungen zu den Vereinen im Westen des römischen Reiches*. Frankfurter althistorische Studien, no. 11. Kallmünz: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1982.
- Beard, M., J. North, and S. Price. *Religions of Rome*. Vol. 1: *A History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Bettalli, M. *I mercenari nel mondo Greco*. Vol. 1. Pisa: ETS, 1995.
- Billows, R. 'Cities'. In *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*, edited by A. Erskine, 196–215. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.
- Black, E. C. *The Association: British Extraparliamentary Political Organization, 1769–1793*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.
- Blümel, W. 'Vertrag zwischen Latmos und Pidasas'. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 29 (1997): 135–42.

- Bollmann, B. *Römische Vereinhauser. Untersuchungen zu den Scholae der römischen Berufs- kult-, und Augustalen-kollegien in Italien*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1998.
- Bourriot, F. *Recherches sur la nature du génos. Études d'histoire sociale athénienne—periode archaïque et classique*. Lille and Paris: Atelier Reproduction des Theses, 1976.
- Bruneau, P. *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*. BEFAR, no. 217. Paris: De Boccard, 1970.
- Bruneau, P. and J. Ducat. *Guide de Délos*. 2nd ed. Paris: De Boccard, 1966.
- Buckler, W. H. 'Labour Disputes in the Province of Asia'. In *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay*, edited by W. H. Buckler and W. M. Calder, 27–50. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1923.
- Burckhardt, L. *Bürger und Soldaten: Aspekte der politischen und militärischen Rolle athenischer Bürger im Kriegswesen des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* Historia Einzelschriften, no. 101. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1996.
- Burkert, W. *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1987.
- Calhoun, G. M. *Athenian Clubs in Politics and Litigation*. Bulletin of the University of Texas. Humanistic Series, no. 14. Austin, 1913. Reprinted. New York: Burt Franklin, 1970.
- Chaniotis, A. *War in the Hellenistic War: A Social and Cultural History*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2005.
- Clark, P. *British Clubs and Societies, 1580–1800: The Origins of an Associational World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Cordano, F. *Le tessere pubbliche dal tempio de Atene a Camarina*. Rome: Istituto Italiano per la storia antica, 1992.
- Corsten, T. *Vom Stamm zum Bund: Gründung und territoriale Organisation griechischer Bundesstaaten*. Studien zur Geschichte Nordwest-Griechenlands, no. 4. Munich: Oberhummer Gesellschaft, 1999.
- Cotter, W. 'The Collegia and Roman Law: State Restrictions on Voluntary Associations, 64 BCE—200 CE'. In *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, edited by J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson, 74–89. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Cracco-Ruggini, L. 'La vita associative nelle città dell'Oriente Greco: tradizioni locali e influenze romane'. In *Assimilation et résistance à la culture gréco-romaine dans le monde ancien. Travaux du VIème Congrès International d'Études classiques. Madrid, Septembre 1974*, edited by D. M. Pippidi, 463–91. Bucarest and Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1976.
- Davies, J. K. 'Cultural, Social and Economic Features of the Hellenistic World'. In *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. 7, part I: *The Hellenistic World*, edited by F. Walbank, A. E. Astin, M. W. Frederiksen, and R. M. Ogilvie, 257–320. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- . 'The "Origins of the Greek Polis"'. In *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, edited by L. G. Mitchell and P. J. Rhodes, 24–38. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.
- de Cenival, F. *Les associations religieuses en Égypte d'après les documents démotiques*. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire, 1972.
- de Robertis, F. M. *Storia delle corporazione e del regime associativo nel mondo romano*. Bari: Adriatica, 1971.
- de Ste. Croix, G. E. M. *The Class Struggle in the Ancient World from the Archaic Age to the Arab Conquests*. London: Duckworth, 1981.
- de Vries, J. 'The Industrial Revolution and the Industrious Revolution'. *Journal of Economic History* 54, no. 2 (1994): 249–70.
- Dow, S. and D. H. Gill. 'The Greek Cult Table'. *American Journal of Archaeology* 59 (1965): 104–14.
- Ferguson, W. S. 'The Attic Orgeones'. *Harvard Theological Review* 37 (1944): 61–140.
- . 'Orgeonika'. *Commemorative Studies in Honor of Theodore Leslie Shear*. Hesperia Suppl., no. 8, 130–63. Princeton, NJ: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1949.

- Finley, M. I. *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens, 500–200 BC*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1952.
- Fisher, N. R. E. 'Greek Associations, Symposia, and Clubs'. In *Civilizations of the Ancient Mediterranean: Greece and Rome*, edited by M. Gant and R. Kitzinger, 1167–97. New York: Charles Scribner Sons, 1988.
- Foucart, P. F. *Des associations religieuses chez les grecs. Thiasos, éranes, orgéones*. Paris, 1873. Reprinted. New York: Arno Press, 1975.
- Françoise, E., ed. *Sociabilité et société bourgeoise en France, en Allemagne, et en Suisse 1750–1850*. Paris: Recherche Sur Les Civilisations, 1986.
- Franklin, B. *Autobiography*, edited by J. A. Leo Leway and P. M. Zall. New York: Norton, 1986.
- Fraser, P. M. *Rhodian Funerary Monuments*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Gabrielsen, V. 'Subdivisions of the State and their Decrees in Hellenistic Rhodes'. *Classica et Mediaevalia* 45 (1994): 117–35.
- . *The Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes*. Studies in Hellenistic Civilization, no. 6. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1997.
- . 'The Rhodian Associations and Economic Activity'. In *Hellenistic Economies*, edited by Z. H. Archibald, J. K. Davies, V. Gabrielsen, and G. J. Oliver, 215–44. London: Routledge, 2001.
- . 'Socio-Economic Classes and Ancient Greek Warfare'. In *Ancient History Matters. Studies Presented to Jens Erik Skydsgaard on His Seventieth Birthday*. *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici*, Suppl., no. 30, edited by K. Ascani, V. Gabrielsen, K. Kvist, and A. Holm Rasmussen, 203–20. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2002.
- Garlan, R. *The Piraeus from the Fifth to the First Century BC*. London: Duckworth, 1987.
- Gauthier, P. 'Les cités hellénistiques: épigraphie et histoire des institutions et des régimes politiques'. In *Acts of the Eighth International Conference on Greek and Latin Epigraphy, Athens, 3–9 October, 1982*, 82–107. Athens: Musée Épigraphique, 1984.
- . 'Météques, périèques et paroikoi: bilan et points d'interrogation'. In *L'étranger dans le monde grec*, 2 vols, edited by R. Lonis, 23–46. Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1988.
- . 'Les cités hellénistiques'. In *The Ancient Greek City-State*, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre, no. 2. Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser, no. 67, edited by M. H. Hansen, 211–31. Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 1993.
- Green, D. G. *Reinventing Civil Society: The Rediscovery of Welfare Without Politics*. London: IEA Health and Welfare Unit, 1993.
- Green, P. *Alexander to Actium: The Hellenistic Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Gruen, E. S. 'The Polis in the Hellenistic World'. In *Nomodeiktēs. Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*, edited by R. M. Rosen and J. Farrel, 339–54. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993.
- Gschntzner F. s.v. 'Proxenos'. *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* Suppl. XIII (1973): 629–730.
- Habicht, C. *Gottmenschen und griechische Städte*. 2nd ed. Zetemata, no. 14. Munich: Beck, 1970.
- Hansen, M. H., ed. *The Ancient Greek City-State. Symposium on the Occasion of the 250th Anniversary of the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, July 1–4 1992*. Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser, no. 67. Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 1993.
- . *Polis and City-State. An Ancient Concept and its Modern Equivalent*. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre, no. 5. Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser, no. 78. Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 1998.

- . *The Imaginary Polis. Symposium, January 7–10, 2004*. Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre, no. 7. Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser, no. 91. Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 2005.
- . *Polis: An Introduction to the Ancient Greek City-State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Harland, P. A. *Associations, Synagogues and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- . 'Spheres of Contention, Claims of Pre-eminence: Rivalries among Associations in Sardis and Smyrna'. In *Religious Rivalries and the Struggle for Success in Sardis and Smyrna*. Studies in Judaism and Christianity, no. 18, edited by R. Ascough, 53–63. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2005.
- Herman, G. *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Heuss, A. *Stadt und Herrscher des Hellenismus in ihren staats- und völkerrechtlichen Beziehungen*. Klio Beiheft. no. 39. Leipzig: Akademie Verlag, 1937.
- Inscriptionen von Parion*, edited by P. Frisch. *Die Inscriptionen von Parion*. Inscriptionen griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien, no. 25. Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt, 1983.
- Ismard, P. 'Les associations en Attique de Solon à Clisthène'. In *Individus, groupes et politique à Athènes de Solon à Mithridate. Actes du colloque international, Tours, 7–8 mars 2005*, edited by J.-C. Couvenhes and S. Milanezi, 17–34. Tours: Presses Universitaires François Rabelais, 2007.
- Jones, A. H. M. *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1940.
- Jones, C. P. 'The Union of Latmos and Pidas'. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 31 (1999): 1–7.
- Jones, N. F. *Public Organization in Ancient Greece. A Documentary Study*. Memoires of the American Philosophical Society, no. 176. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1987.
- . *The Associations of Classical Athens: The Response to Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Jonnes, L. and M. Riel. 'A New Royal Inscription from Phrygia Paroreios: Eumenes II Grants Tyriaion the Status of a Polis'. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 29 (1997): 1–29.
- Kloppenborg, J. S. and S. G. Wilson, eds. *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Kolb, F. 'Sitzstufeninschriften aus dem Stadion von Saittai (Lydien)'. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 15 (1990): 107–19.
- Labaree L. W., E. R. Cohn, B. B. Oberg, and W. B. Willcox. *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, Vol. 9. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Lambert, S. D. *The Phratries of Attica*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993.
- Langford, P. A. *Polite and Commercial People: England 1727–1783*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Larsen, J. A. O. *Greek Federal States: Their Institutions and History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Le Guen, B. *Les associations de technites dionysiaques à l'époque hellénistique*. Vol. 1: *Corpus documentaire*, II: *Synthèse*. Études d'Archéologie Classique 11–12. Nancy: De Boccard, 2001.
- Leiwo, M. 'Religion or Other Reasons? Private Associations in Athens'. In *Early Hellenistic Athens. Symptoms of a Change*, Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens, no. 6, edited by F. Rösén, 103–17. Athens: Finnish Institute at Athens, 1997.
- Liebenam, W. *Zur Geschichte und Organisation des römischen Vereinswesens: 3 Untersuchungen*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1890.
- Lonis, R., ed. *L'étranger dans le monde grec*, 2 vols. Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1988–92.
- Lorber, C. C., and O. D. Hoover. 'An Unpublished Tetradrachm Issued by the Artists of Dionysos'. *The Numismatic Chronicle* 163 (2003): 59–68.
- Lynch, J. P. *Aristotle's School: A Study of a Greek Educational Institution*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.
- MacKenney, R. R. *Tradesmen and Traders: The World of the Guilds in Venice and Europe, c. 1250–c. 1640*. Totowa: Barnes and Noble Books, 1987.

- G. Maier. 'Eranos als Kreditinstitut.' Diss., Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1969.
- Maiuri, A. *Nuova silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos*. Florence: Le Monnier, 1925.
- Marek, C. *Die Proxenie*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlagsgruppe, 1984.
- Mason, S. N. 'Philosophiae: Greco-Roman, Judean and Christian'. In *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, edited by J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson, 31–58. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- McKechnie, P. *Outsiders in the Greek Cities in the Fourth Century BC*. London and New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Meritt, B. D. 'Greek Inscriptions'. *Hesperia* 30 (1961): 229–32, nos. 28 and 29.
- Millett, P. *Lending and Borrowing in Ancient Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Mitchell, L. G., and P. J. Rhodes, eds. *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Murray, O. 'Cities of Reason'. In *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*, edited by O. Murray and S. Price, 1–25. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Murray, O. *Symptotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- . 'Rationality and the Greek City: The Evidence from Kamarina'. In *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community*, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre, no. 4. Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser, no. 75, edited by M. H. Hansen, 493–504. Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 1997.
- Orth, W. *Königlicher Machtanspruch und städtische Freiheit. Untersuchungen zu den politischen Beziehungen zwischen den ersten Seleukidenherrschern (Seleukos I., Antiochos I., Antiochos II) und den Städten des westlichen Kleinasien*. Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, no. 71. Munich: Beck, 1977.
- Osborne, R. *Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attika*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- . 'Law and Laws: How do we Join Up the Dots?'. In *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, edited by L. G. Mitchell and P. J. Rhodes, 74–82. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Pailler, J.-M. *Bacchanales. La répression de 186 avant J. -C. à Rome et en Italie*. BEFAR, no. 270. Rome: De Boccard, 1988.
- Parke, W. H. *Greek Mercenary Soldiers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Parker, R. *Athenian Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Patsiada, V. 'Rhodiakē taphikē architektonikē'. In *Rhodos 2.400 Chronia: He polis tes Rhodou apo ten Idrysi tes mechri ten katalepsi apo tous Tourkous (1523)*, Vol. 1, 127–36. Athens: Ypourgeio Politismou, 1999.
- Perry, J. S. *The Roman Collegia: The Modern Evolution of an Ancient Concept*. Mnemosyne Suppl., no. 277. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Poland, F. *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*. Fürstlich Jablonowskichen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig. Historisch-Nationalökonomischen Sektion 23: 38. Leipzig: Teubner, 1909.
- Porena, P. 'Forme di partecipazione politica cittadina e contatti con il potere imperiale'. In *Politica e Partecipazione nelle Città dell'Impero Romano*, edited by F. Amarelli, 13–92. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 2005.
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. 'Per la storia delle associazioni in Rodi antica'. *Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiani in Oriente* 22 n.s. 1–2 (1939–40): 147–200.
- Radin, M. *The Legislation of Greeks and Romans on Corporations*. New York: Columbia, 1909.
- Randazzo, S. 'Senatus consultum quo illicita collegia arcentur (D. 47, 22, 1, 1)'. *Bollettino dell'Istituto di Diritto Romano* 33–4 (1991–92): 49–88.
- Rasmussen, F. L. K. *Peri ton Eranon*. Copenhagen, 1833.
- Rauh, N. K. *The Sacred Bonds of Commerce: Religion, Economy, and Trade Society in Hellenistic and Roman Delos*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1993.
- Rhodes, P. J. and D. M. Lewis. *The Decrees of the Greek States*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

- Robert, L. 'Deux décrets d'une association à Athènes'. *Archaiologike Ephemeris* (1969): 7–14.
- Roussel, D. *Tribu et cité. Études sur les groupes sociaux dans les cités grecques aux époques archaïque et classique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1976.
- Sahin, S. 'Ein neues Dekret der Symmoria zu Ehren ihre Prostatai in Teos'. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 5 (1985): 13–18.
- san Nicolò, M. *Ägyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer*, 2 vols. Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrus Forschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, no. 2. Munich: Beck, 1913–15.
- Sartori, F. *Le eterie nella vita politica ateniese del VI e V secolo a.C.* Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1957.
- Savali, I. 'I neocittadini nelle città ellenistiche'. *Historia* 34 (1985): 387–431.
- Seibert, J. *Die politischen Flüchtlinge und Verbannten in der griechischen Geschichte.*, 2 vols. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliches Buchgesellschaft, 1979.
- Shipley, G. *A History of Samos 800–188 BC*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Siewert, P. *Die Trittyen Attikas und die Herresreformen des Kleisthenes*. *Vestigia*, no. 33. Muchen: Beck, 1982.
- Simms, R. R. 'The Cult of the Thracian Goddess Bendis in Athens and Attica'. *Ancient World* 18 (1988): 59–76.
- Smith, R. C. 'The Clans of Athens and the Historiography of the Archaic Period'. *Échos du Monde Classique. Classical Views* 4 (1985): 51–61.
- Thrupp, S. 'The Gilds'. In *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe, III: Economic Organization and Policies in the Middle Ages*, edited by M. Postan, E. E. Rich, and E. Miller, 230–80, 624–34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Tod, M. N. 'Clubs and Societies in the Greek World, Lecture Three'. In *Sidelights on Greek History: Three Lectures*, edited by M. N. Tod, 71–93. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1932.
- Trail, J. S. *Demes and Trittys. Epigraphical and Topographical Studies in the Organization of Attica*. Toronto: Athenians, 1986.
- Treaux, J. 'Koinon'. *Revue des Études Anciennes* 89 (1987): 39–46.
- van Nijf, O. M. *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*. Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology, no. 17. Amsterdam: Gieben, 1997.
- Vélissaropoulos, J. *Les naucrères grecs: Recherches sur les institutions maritimes en Grèce et dans l'Orient hellénisé*. Hautes Études du Monde Gréco-Romain, no. 9 Geneva and Paris: Droz and Champion, 1980.
- Vondeling, J. *Eranos*. Groningen: J. B. Wolters, 1961.
- Wallace, M. B. 'Early Greek Proxenoí'. *Phoenix* 24 (1970): 189–208.
- Waltzing, J.-P. *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu'à la chute de l'Empire d'Occident*, 4 vols. Louvain: Peeters, 1895–1900.
- Welwei, K.-W. 'Polisbildung, Hetairos-Gruppen und Hetairien'. *Gymnasium* 99 (1992): 481–500.
- Whitehead, D. *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic*. Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, Suppl., no. 14. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Association, 1977.
- . 'Immigrant Communities in the Classical Polis: Some Principles for a Synoptic Treatment'. *L'Antiquité Classique* 53 (1984): 47–59.
- . *The Demes of Attica 508/7—ca. 250 BC*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Wilson, S. G. 'Voluntary Associations: An Overview'. In *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*, edited by J. S. Kloppenborg and S. G. Wilson. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Ziebarth, E. *Das griechische Vereinswesen*. Fürstlich Jablonowskichen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig, Historisch-Nationalökonomischen Sektion 21: 34. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1896.