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Abstract

This thesis compares how four religions moved through four ancient diasporas (c. 300 BCE–100 CE): Syrian (Delos), Phoenician (Delos), Thracian (Athens), and Judaean (Corinth). While problematizing these two concepts, it nevertheless shows that being in diaspora was the catalyst for new formulations of group identities, and that the worship of deities and associated cultural practices became more central for groups in diaspora. Often community boundaries evolved to include outsiders with no shared ethno-geographical background, for whom membership became mediated through shared worship.
Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my supervisor, John Kloppenborg, for his guidance throughout this project and his countless corrections and insights. Thanks also to my committee members, Judith Newman and Kevin O’Neill. This project was undertaken with the generous support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Thanks to the University of Toronto, especially to the Department for the Study of Religion and the Anne Tannenbaum Centre for Jewish Studies. Thanks to Jens Schröter and the Theologische Fakultät at the Humboldt University of Berlin and the Canadian Institute in Greece for hosting me while undertaking the research. Thanks to my external examiner, Laurence Welborn, and to my internal examiner, John Marshall. Thanks to my long-suffering wife, Carolyne, who pushed me forward throughout this project, and to my children, Claire, Sophie, and Josée. Finally, I would like to dedicate this to the memory of Helen Mo, my friend and colleague.
# Table of Contents

Acknowledgments ..................................................................................................................... iii

List of Figures .......................................................................................................................... ix

Chapter 1 Liminal Identities and Limiting Categories .......................................................... 1

1.1 Diaspora Theory and Reflections of Nationalism ............................................................. 6

1.1.1 Diaspora in Antiquity ................................................................................................. 13

1.1.2 Religion as Diasporic Consolation ............................................................................. 17

1.2 Religious Studies and Identity Problems ......................................................................... 18

1.3 A World with no Fences: Immigrant Associations beyond Diaspora and Religion .......... 27

1.4 Liminal Identity—Crossing Boundaries of Identity ......................................................... 31

1.4.1 Citizenship, Ethnos, and Liminal Identity .................................................................. 32

1.4.2 Constructing Liminal Identity ................................................................................... 36

1.5 Conclusion ....................................................................................................................... 43

Chapter 2 Social Groups as Trust Networks ......................................................................... 45

2.1 Immigrants, Associations, and Economy ........................................................................ 47

2.2 The Immigrant Association and Trust .......................................................................... 56

2.3 The Economic Implications of Shared Gods (NIE) ...................................................... 61

2.4 How Trust Networks Drive Identity and Expansion ...................................................... 71

2.4.1 How Trust Drives Identity (Networks of Trust and Social Grouping) ....................... 71

2.4.2 Framing Group Expansion as Network Bending ....................................................... 74

Chapter 3 The Thracian Bendis in Athens ............................................................................. 80
3 The Thracian Bendis in Athens ..................................................................................................................81
  3.1 Relations between Athens and Thrace and Bendis’ Entry .................................................................82
  3.2 What Were Orgeōnes? ..........................................................................................................................88
      3.2.1 Overview ......................................................................................................................................88
      3.2.2 Two Associations of Bendis ......................................................................................................91
  3.3 The Problem with the Piraeus ..............................................................................................................94
  3.4 Expanding Membership by the City’s Power ......................................................................................98
      3.4.1 The Lycurgan Era and Beyond (c. 336–323 BCE) and Economic Restructuring ..................98
      3.4.2 Shared Profits: IG II² 1361 Opening Membership and Raising Money .............................101
      3.4.3 Orgeōnes and their Income .......................................................................................................103
      3.4.4 Rituals of Membership ..............................................................................................................110
  3.5 Mixed Associations and (Re)Inventing the Thracian Ethnos .........................................................115
      3.5.1 Mixed Associations......................................................................................................................115
      3.5.2 A New Temple in Athens and Ritualized Ethnic Unity ..........................................................118
  3.6 Rituals of Trust ...................................................................................................................................123
  3.7 Conclusions .........................................................................................................................................134

Chapter 4 Syrian and Phoenician Associations on Delos: Membership .................................................136

4 Syrian and Phoenician Associations on Delos: Membership .................................................................137
  4.1 Levantine Groups and the Marzēah ......................................................................................................138
  4.2 Historical Background: Phoenician and Syrian deities .....................................................................140
      4.2.1 Atargatis at Home and Abroad ....................................................................................................140
      4.2.2 Phoenician Deities and Acculturation .......................................................................................143
  4.3 Network Bending: Syrians ...................................................................................................................146
      4.3.1 The Three Phases of the Cult ......................................................................................................146
      4.3.2 Phase 1: Syrians and their Families ............................................................................................147
6.2.1 Network Bending ........................................................................................................235

6.3 Luke—Inventing Jewish Diaspora and Gentile Mission ..............................................267

6.3.1 Inventing a Corinthian Diaspora ..............................................................................267

6.3.2 Diaspora and the Invention of Christian Origins ......................................................272

Chapter 7 Thesis Conclusions ...........................................................................................282

7 Thesis Conclusions ............................................................................................................283

Bibliography ........................................................................................................................289

Appendices ..........................................................................................................................327

Appendix A: Greek Names Mentioned in the Sanctuary by City of Origin (With Line Numbers) .............................................................................................................................327

Alexandria ..........................................................................................................................327

Antioch ...............................................................................................................................327

Askalon ...............................................................................................................................328

Athens .................................................................................................................................328

Damascus ..........................................................................................................................331

Ephesus ..............................................................................................................................331

Herakleia ............................................................................................................................331

Hierapolis ..........................................................................................................................331

Karpasia ............................................................................................................................332

Laodikeia ...........................................................................................................................332

Marathus ............................................................................................................................332

Neapolis ............................................................................................................................333

Unknown ............................................................................................................................333

Appendix B: Phase 2 Membership (By Date) ....................................................................336

Appendix C: Phase 3 Syrians (By Date) .............................................................................338

Appendix D: Romans (With Line Numbers by Date) .........................................................339
List of Figures

Figure 1: Inscriptions Mentioning Bendis Associations in Athens ........................................... 93

Figure 2: Descendants of Apollonios of Hierapolis................................................................. 155

Figure 3: Family Tree of Apollonios of Hierapolis ................................................................. 156

Figure 4: Potential Families in the Syrian Sanctuary............................................................... 159

Figure 5: Aristarchos son of Isodoros Family Tree ................................................................. 161

Figure 6: Descendants of Glaukios of Antioch....................................................................... 162

Figure 7: Family Tree of Dorotheos ......................................................................................... 163

Figure 8: Other Families in the Syrian Sanctuary................................................................. 164

Figure 9: Origins Map of Dedicants in the Syrian Sanctuary on Delos............................... 174

Figure 10: Other Families in the Beirutian Sanctuary ............................................................. 179

Figure 11: The list of the Bastageis ......................................................................................... 205

Figure 12: People Holding the Office of Archithiasitēs ......................................................... 215

Figure 13: Names of People Mentioned in Relation to Corinth ............................................ 238
Chapter 1
Liminal Identities and Limiting Categories
1 Liminal Identities and Limiting Categories

In the sparkling waters of the Greek Mediterranean, just off the coast of the much larger island of Mykonos, lies the tiny island of Delos. Its size belies its importance in the history of the Greek and Roman empires. The birthplace of Artemis and Apollo, it stood at the crossroads of Rome, Athens, Egypt, Asia Minor, and the Levant. Chief among the Cyclades, its golden age as a trade hub lasted for nearly a century, from the time when the Romans granted it free-port status in 166 BCE. The soul of the island was embodied in Greek mythology, undergirded by the stone pillars which rose from the depths of the earth to hold it while Leto gave birth. Its ritual purity was paramount, shown by the nearby island of Rhenia where the bodies of Delians were taken to preserve its purity.¹ Birth and death were forbidden. When it emerged as a trade hub in the second century BCE, visitors were dwarfed by the statues of gods, benefactors, and statesmen as they walked along the ancient Dromos. This sacred street was a shoulder-to-shoulder wall of honourable figures, each constructed more lavishly than the last to compete for the attention of those passing.²

This is the island upon which the remains of two of the groups studied in this thesis were found. The first, a group dedicated to the Syrian goddess, Atargatis, was founded by immigrants from the Syrian city of Hierapolis around 166 BCE. By the end of that century, the once immigrant cult had its priesthood controlled by the city of Athens. From the inscriptions, we can infer that it still attracted Syrians, but also many Romans (slave and free) and Athenians left their mark on the sanctuary. Over half a century, the once-immigrant group evolved from a club of traders

¹ Str. Geo. 10.5.2-5
from Syrian cities to a collective that attracted a wide mix of ethnicities who gathered together through common worship. The second group from Hellenistic Delos, who called themselves a collective of traders, sailors, and middlemen from Beirut who worshipped Poseidon, seem to have retained a common ethnic core to their association. Yet they built relationships with two important Roman benefactors and added into their worship a new goddess named for the trade city that brought them their wealth: Roma. This group kept its boundary lines of ethnicity (for the most part) but nevertheless started worshipping a new goddess.

Two further examples of immigrants and worship complete this study. First, it will deal with the worship of the Thracian goddess, Bendis, in Athens who seems to have come into the city with Thracian immigrants sometime in the sixth century BCE but whose worship was taken up by Athenians. Finally, I will close with the example of Christ worship in Corinth, using the issues raised in the earlier chapters to frame questions of Judaean and Gentile identity in that city, arguing that all evidence points to Corinth being an initially-Gentile congregation into which Judaean immigrants entered. Yet, as chapter six explores, its history is inextricably tied to an idea of diaspora. This is because Luke’s historiographical approach to the book of Acts, written over half a century after the entry of Christ worship into Corinth and of dubious historical accuracy, invented a Judaean diaspora from which Christianity emerges.

This dissertation will therefore highlight some of the problems migration poses for the study of diaspora and religion, while also trying to understand the ways in which human migrations bring with them gods and rituals which are occasionally adopted by others who do not share their cultural background. Or, leaving aside the two problematic terms of religion and diaspora (which will be dealt with below), how do immigrants carry deities to new places, how does their
worshipping and ritual life evolve in a new location, and what effect does ethnicity have on cultic experience? Moreover, it will explore whether there are factors within the immigrant experience that naturally pushed a group’s deities and their ritual life to the forefront of their engagement with the outside world and why outsiders came to worship gods and goddesses that were formerly national.

I argue that, if we see the ways in which immigrant associations construct their identity in the ancient world, we will see that those things formerly under the rubric of religion, particularly rituals and the worship of deities, become the primary method by which these communities cross lines of difference and negotiate their relationship with the outside world. For two of the groups in question, the Syrians and the Corinthian Christ group, both of these things help to create new ritual practice across evolving trust networks and especially across mixed ethnicities; the relationship with the newcomers is strengthened through worshipping a common deity and creating hybrid rituals of trust to solidify the group. Secondly, two of these groups are immigrant groups which tend towards more exclusive ethnic membership: the Thracians and the Beirutians. Yet even these groups use their deities and ritual practices to engage with the host community, especially to build social capital, and as a result changes occur in their ritual and worshipping lives. In the case of the Thracians, it also results in the Athenians adopting the worship of their goddess.

Yet studying the relationship between cultic practice and the ethnic identity of immigrants is a difficult order. On the one hand, the field of diaspora studies has used the Jewish diaspora as its ideal type for decades. In this chapter, I will argue that the relationship between modern studies of diaspora and their archetype of ancient diaspora is incompatible; in particular, because modern
diaspora theory is incapable of dealing with what has been called religion because of its birth from modern nationalism. On the other hand, as I discuss below, religious studies has rejected religion as a second-order category, especially in studies of antiquity in which it is now common to speak of the Judaean ethnos rather than the Jewish religion or Judaism. This shift is correct, but it still creates a need to theorize the moments when cultic practices move beyond an ethnos or when former outsiders use these same ritual practices or the worship of a deity to enter the trust network of a previously ethnus-based group. Paradoxically, both of these lenses, religion and diaspora, make it difficult to approach people on the border, those who might have once been called converts to a diasporic religion, since it is certain that such exchanges happened.

After criticizing the effectiveness of diaspora theory for studying the movement of deities and ritual practices in antiquity, and highlighting how advances in religious studies prompt an opportunity to re-theorize this spread, I finish this chapter by introducing the model of private associations in antiquity, which allows us to study social groups without necessary reference to their diasporic or religious qualities. Studying these four groups as associations with an ethnic and/or immigrant component rather than as displaced nation-state diasporas makes it possible to track changes in a group’s constituting logic from a common ethnus and the entry of outsiders. Since even immigrant associations are not bounded vessels of national identity, but rather a point of entry to and exchange with to a new host, we can therefore understand them liminally—as groups positioned between two realities. In this sense, we can recover some valuable insights from diaspora theory towards how groups construct and enact identities in relation to local realities.
The next chapter will then lay out a theoretical model which studies social groups as networks of trust, focusing on the boundaries of these networks and how they expand or contract—a process I have called “network bending.” In effect, by seeing the ways in which the shape of a trust network changes, we can account for how an association formed around a common homeland and ancestral deity can bend to bring in new people and create rituals to solidify group trust with newcomers, just as we can account for associations which kept ethnic boundaries, and groups which would later attract ethnic members.

1.1 Diaspora Theory and Reflections of Nationalism

The first problem in approaching the question of immigrant worship in antiquity comes from the field of diaspora studies itself. While this relatively young field has long imagined that the ancient Jewish diaspora is archetypal for diaspora theory, one element can only be a product of modern nationalism: its explicit separation of religion from diaspora. Diaspora theory treats religion as a subset of national identity—a resource for diaspora communities to draw upon. In antiquity, the gods and ritual practices which we will approach in the following chapters are somehow wound up in or related to an ethnos. They were not optional “resources” to draw upon, but rather must be dealt with in creating diaspora identity and space. Furthermore, where “diaspora” is invoked, it is often an inherently theological category, as we shall see. In each of these case studies, there are points at which it would be impossible theoretically to separate diaspora and religion, even if we accepted those categories.

Two vignettes illustrate the indebtedness of diaspora studies to modern nationalism and, subsequently, make the application of diaspora studies to antiquity of dubious value. First, during the Jewish prayer book reforms which took place in nineteenth-century Germany, a curious
evolution in the prayers took place. The reformers decided that it was now appropriate to remove any reference to a state or a nation from the prayers.³ They would no longer pray for a nation to which to return; the locus of their identity was now made completely spiritual instead of geographical. Their home and their nation was Germany. Furthermore, the term diaspora was notably rare in literature in French, German, and English in the first half of the nineteenth century; its use was mainly by Christians who employed the term either polemically against Jews or spiritually in reference to themselves. Where it was invoked, it was often done by biblical scholars who had to wrestle exegetically with the term’s presence in the New Testament (Jas 1:1; 1 Pet 1:1).⁴

The second vignette: After several forays into studies of diaspora in the 1960s and 70s, a specific field of diaspora studies emerged in the late 1980s. William Safran, one of the pioneers of modern diaspora theory and himself a World War II refugee in America, attempted to focus the young field around some typological basics in order to make it productive for comparative


⁴ So Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg, the scholar of oriental languages and biblical studies, in his exegesis of the term in 1 Peter writes: “Without hesitation Peter applies (the term diaspora) to Christians, the true Jews . . . Here also there lies at the foundation the idea that the Christian Church is the true seed of Abraham, the true Israel, that the unbelief of the seed of Abraham and of Israel excludes, whilst faith incorporates, and that the Jews are only Israel which is after the flesh, Israel merely in appearance,” Commentary on Ecclesiastes, with Other Treatises, trans. D.W. Simon, vol. 6, Clark’s Foreign Theological Library, Third Series (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1860), 435; The term also is invoked by eighteenth-century Christian groups in reference to themselves, notably, the Moravian church in America in their writings commonly invoked the term diaspora to refer to their missionary activities among the Lutheran churches in Germany, who they believed to be in error. Moravian publications often use the term to speak of the diaspora of “awakened or believing souls” who lived within European Protestant communities which were seen as reprobate, see Henry A. Schultz, “Introductory Remarks,” ed. Henry A. Schultz, The Moravian Church Miscellany 1.1 (1850): 5; Edmund De Schweinitz, The Moravian Manual: Containing an Account of the Protestant Church of the Moravian United Brethren, or Unitas Fratrum (Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston, 1859), 67–68.
studies. Drawing on the Jewish diaspora as the archetype, he proposed the following basics for an ideal type of diaspora.

(Diaspora is an) expatriate minority community whose members share several of the following characteristics: 1) they or their ancestors, have been dispersed from a specific original “center” to two or more “peripheral,” or foreign, regions; 2) they retain a collective memory, vision, or myth about their original homeland—its physical location, history, and achievements; 3) they believe that they are not—and perhaps cannot be—fully accepted by their host society and therefore feel partially alienated and insulated from it; 4) they regard their ancestral homeland as their true, ideal home and as the place to which they or their descendants would (or should) eventually return—when conditions are appropriate; 5) they believe that they should, collectively, be committed to the maintenance or restoration of their original homeland and to its safety and prosperity; and 6) they continue to relate, personally or vicariously, to that homeland in one way or another, and their ethnocommunal consciousness and solidarity are importantly defined by the existence of such a relationship.⁵

The archetypal model for this diaspora was fairly quickly identified as the Jewish exile to Babylon, and the Jewish experience more universally in history. From the nineteenth-century prayer book reforms which withdrew the concept of a nation from communal prayer, to Safran’s typology which understood the Jewish diaspora as the archetype of diaspora theory, framed in relation to territory and separation from it, some shift had occurred.

The most logical source of this shift was the evolution of the term diaspora itself over nearly a century, coming into sharp focus after the holocaust and the subsequent foundation of the state of Israel. One of the earliest defining moments was the birth of modern nationalism, especially European biological nationalism and the subsequent emergence of the Zionist movement. Changes in the understanding of the nation would frame the new meaning of diaspora which was refracted decades later into the subsequent diaspora theory. Growing out of the new sciences,

especially biology and young concept of race, nineteenth-century European nationalism offered new ways to define groups of people, through biology and blood. Inherently othered through this racial nationalism, the earliest Zionists did not reject the new theories of racial identity, but instead used them to create the new concept of the Jewish race. This racial identity for Jews offered what had long been impossible, a way to envision a united Jewish community beyond borders, language, geography, and culture; Jewish unity through blood became a vision for some early Zionists, including Nathan Birnbaum, Martin Nordau, and Martin Buber (Shlomo Sand says that Theodore Herzl is the exception here). This national identity fit naturally with the goal of statehood. Furthermore, it promised unification beyond religious divides, as well as making a place for secular Jews in this imagined community. This is not to say that Jewish religion was excluded from the Zionist project. It would play an important role in new Jewish movements in the twentieth century such as re-constructionism, but for some Zionists nationalism offered a

6 Shlomo Sand, *The Invention of the Jewish People*, trans. Yael Lotan (London and New York: Verso, 2009), 250–70. Sand shows that the question of race has had a counterpart in Israeli genetic research which extended into the twenty-first century, Sand, *The Invention of the Jewish People*, 273–77. There were voices which challenged biological identity, such as Ernest Renan, who argued that Jewish racial identity was problematized by the question of conversion from as early as Josephus and Cassius Dio. This would lead to his conclusion that the Ashkenazi were not Semitic but had converted. *Le Judaïsme comme race et comme religion* (Paris: Lévy, 1883), 12, 16.


8 So came some rejection of Zionism from Judaism, for example, the young Reform movement issued the Pittsburgh Platform in 1885, part of the declaration of which stated: “We consider ourselves no longer a nation, but a religious community, and therefore expect neither a return to Palestine, nor a sacrificial worship under the sons of Aaron, nor the restoration of any of the laws concerning the Jewish state.” See, Michael A. Meyer, *Response to Modernity: A History of the Reform Movement in Judaism* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1995), 387–88, Quote from 388; In the same way there has always been a strong critique of Zionism among elements in the Orthodox movement, particularly for its grounding in secular nationalism, see Jeffrey S. Gurock, *American Jewish Orthodoxy in Historical Perspective* (Hoboken, NJ: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1996), 117–34; So Jacob Klatzkin, the Lithuanian-born philosopher who studied in Germany with Herman Cohen, saw in Jewish nationalism a way beyond Judaism: “(Jewish Nationalism’s) real beginning is *The Jewish State*, and its basic intention, whether consciously or unconsciously, is to deny any conception of Jewish identity based on spiritual criteria,” see Jacob Klatzkin, “Boundaries: Judaism Is Nationalism,” in *The Zionist Idea: A Historical Analysis and Reader*, ed. Arthur Hertzberg (New York: Atheneum, 1972), 319.
more inclusive way of being a part of the world-wide Jewish community. It was a way to imagine a Jewish identity without need of theological definitions.

This birth of Jewish nationalism and its counterpart in the Zionist focus on Palestine, especially through the 1897 launch of the World Zionist Congresses, would have an indelible effect on the idea of diaspora. It necessitated the inclusion of territory in the discussion of Jewish identity, and reframed the modern vision of homeland. From here, the concept of diaspora again multiplied in Jewish thought from the new frontier of those farmers who were rapidly buying up land in Palestine. Diaspora was reframed as an other to statehood, positioned dialectically to the emerging dream of a nation in its land, and even those Jews who stood against Zionism had to reconcile with the nationalist implications directed at their new position as the diaspora and defend its legitimacy. An excellent summary of the outcome of this diaspora-state binary has been offered by Noam Pianko, who says,

---


10 An interesting manifestation of the twentieth-century racial nationalism were the worldwide PEN clubs, founded to promote a Jewish literary culture, which devolved into competition between the Hebrew of Palestine and the Yiddish of the diaspora. See, Allison Schachter, Diasporic Modernisms: Hebrew and Yiddish Literature in the Twentieth Century (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 3–28. She claims that Yiddish was rejected by Zionists as a “reviled, effeminate culture of diaspora,” while Hebrew represented the new Jewish masculinity (9).

11 Seen also, for example in the Aliyah policy through the July 5, 1950 Law of Return, in which any Jew could be granted immediate citizenship in Israel—Diaspora is therefore an alternative to citizenship. For an overview of the law, its subsequent revisions and challenges, and the political theory behind it, see Ayelet Shachar, “Citizenship and Membership in the Israeli Polity,” in From Migrants to Citizens: Membership in a Changing World, ed. T. Alexander Aleinikoff and Douglas Klusmeyer, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 2013), 386–433, she observes that the law of return is a manifestation of the nineteenth-century Zionist ideology of nationalism beyond the borders of nation. Also Caryn S. Aviv and David Shneer, New Jews: The End of the Jewish Diaspora (New York: NYU Press, 2005), 9–15; On voices for the legitimacy of the diaspora, see Israel Zangwill, who writing in The Menorah Journal, a venue for the secular Jewish voice produced by students at Harvard, territorialism was a contemporary move to a Zionism which wanted a Jewish state, but not necessarily in Palestine. Zangwell at times favoured other territorial solutions, such as the Uganda Plan, see Meri-Jane Rochelson, A Jew in the Public Arena: The Career of Israel Zangwill (Detroit: Wayne State University Press,
by defining itself in opposition to nation-state nationalism, diaspora is actually the flip side of assumptions about nationalism. The binary construction of diaspora theory as the antithesis to national sovereignty thus paradoxically limits the construction of diaspora to the very discourse it attempts to overcome (i.e., nationalism) this rubric leaves the Jews perceived as linked to Zionism's nation-state identity, rather than identities of stateless and disenfranchised populations.  

The concept of diaspora was now firmly rooted in a discussion about nationalism. The diaspora and the state had become mutually reliant, each implicated in the success of the other, and this was eventually echoed in Safran’s typology. Where the state was nationalist and territory-based, it forced the diaspora to be the absence of those things: two competing models of being: territorial and non-territorial. 

The anti-Semitism, which remained following Jewish emancipation, was a catalyst of the Zionist movement, ever since the early Zionists engaged with it through the Dreyfus affair, but the rise of the Nazis brought a new urgency to the project. More than ever before, diaspora was understood as suffering, danger, and crisis, and homeland promised escape and refuge. This put American Jews in a strange relation to the potential state. In 1936, Samuel Dinin, a Russian-born Jew who taught at Jewish Theological Seminary, building on the work of Mordecai Kaplan,

2010), 151–70. He argues that “The Jewish State is something in the future — something to be generated in the womb of time: the Diaspora is actually here. The rise of the State would indeed affect the Diaspora, but it is as much calculated to fortify and prolong its existence as to curtail it. . . . But would it? Would not the effect be the contrary? Has not the very effort to create the State reanimated the Diaspora? Would not the young creation radiate back some of its vitality to the parent?”, Israel Zangwill, “The Territorial Solution of the Jewish Problem,” The Menorah Journal 5.9 (1919): 62.


13 Paul Goodman, Zionism and the Jewish Diaspora (English Zionist Federation, 1921), grounds the diaspora firmly in the necessity of nation, drawing widely from Hebrew Bible imagery.
agreed that those Jews living under the Nuremberg laws had to escape diaspora. But Dinin complained that Zionists had distorted the vision of the diaspora as a whole into galut, “The diaspora becomes a place from which the Jews must escape, and the more quickly the better.” Dinin’s reaction was against what he saw as the unwillingness of Zionists to recognize the creativity and vibrancy of the diaspora, and the idea that Jewish life was somehow more authentic while lived within the bounds of a state. With the horrors of the Holocaust and the birth of the State of Israel, the dialectical relationship between diaspora and state was complete. As Jon Stratton puts it:

(‘The Jews’) entry into modernity has entailed a renovation of their experience in terms of the nation-state, which has produced in the Jewish subject this new psychic economy, one expressed in complex ways in the ideology of a ‘Jewish diaspora.’ Jews had to learn to be modern; they also had to learn to be diasporic.

Little by little, diaspora had become a dual way of existence for Jews and the other to this new state; new constructs of identity required engagement with the state. The transformation was complete, and diaspora became a way to imagine the absence from a nation state.

14 Dinin, “Palestine and the Diaspora,” 48; The effect of the rumours and eventual confirmation on American Zionists was to strengthen their resolve towards establishing a state where Jews would be protected, they thus conceived a state as a rescue plan for Europe’s Jews, see Aaron Berman, Nazism, the Jews and American Zionism, 1933-1988 (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992), 96–123; There was a movement towards Zionism among American Protestants as well, Caitlin Carenen, “The American Christian Palestine Committee, the Holocaust, and Mainstream Protestant Zionism, 1938–1948,” Holocaust and Genocide Studies 24.2 (2010): 273–96.


16 There was a rehabilitation and reimagining of the Jewish diaspora post-holocaust, at the same time as the World Jewish Council was reframing the position of the diaspora both in world affairs and in relation to Israel, see Zohar Segev, The World Jewish Congress during the Holocaust: Between Activism and Restraint, New Perspectives on Modern Jewish History 7 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2014), 168–216.


18 Gurock, American Jewish Orthodoxy in Historical Perspective, 117–34.
1.1.1 Diaspora in Antiquity

While the modern idea of diaspora emerged in tandem with nationalism and especially the foundation of the state of Israel, as we have seen, the ancient Jewish diaspora would retain an important position in diaspora theory. Scholars of the new diaspora theory undertook a type of historicism. They drew on the “psychic economy” of the Babylonian exile and, to a smaller extent, the wider community of Jews in antiquity living outside of their homeland in centers like Alexandria and Rome. Diaspora theory would rest on this archetypal Jewish diaspora, understood most evocatively in the biblical image of Jews weeping by the rivers of Babylon (Psalm 137:1). This creates three problems for attempting to use diaspora theory to study antiquity:

1. While the ancient Jewish diaspora ironically became the symbol for displacement and alienation from the nation-state, the lack of the nation state in antiquity makes it impossible to identify any diaspora in antiquity that fits the modern conception.

2. Because of its roots in the nation state, diaspora theory cannot properly account for what has been termed religion—even though the uses of diaspora in Jewish and Christian literature are primarily theological.

---

19 Important examples of the nationalist threads throughout the field include James Clifford, for whom diaspora can exist in relation to the nation-state, which is a defined and usually stable entity, whereas diaspora is a product of longing and imagination. Clifford says that diasporas also subvert and transverse the nation state and, furthermore, they cannot be “exclusively nationalist” because they exist in complex “transnational networks;” he says that homecoming is the negation of diaspora. See “Diasporas,” Cultural Anthropology 9.3 (1994): esp 307. Also Rogers Brubaker, who complained about the overuse of the term diaspora presents an informed typology (recognizing the challenge of socially-constructed identities), yet still proposes that diaspora suggests a relation to home, relation to present, and future return “The ‘Diaspora’ Diaspora,” Ethnic and Racial Studies 28.1 (2005): 1–19. Also, Kim D. Butler, “Defining Diaspora, Refining a Discourse,” Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies 10, no. 2 (2001): esp. 192-4, echoes the three identifiers Brubaker cites: scattering (to at least two locations), relationship to home, some identity self-awareness, that is, they should be “consciously part of an ethnonational group.” To this she adds the temporal element, which demands awareness of diaspora processes and formation rather than mono-temporal moments.
3. Instead, diaspora theory makes religion a type of resource diasporic people can draw on—a subset of national identity.

In opposition to the modern binary of the secular nation-state and the diaspora, the invocation of the term in antiquity is a theological interpretation of perceived choseness. The roots of modern ideas about diaspora are in the Septuagint (LXX) (the Greek term diaspora, as has been well noted, is not synonymous with the Hebrew galut: exile), combined with exile motifs from the Hebrew Bible, which taken together create an ahistorical field of study. The use of diaspora in the Greek in antiquity was employed just as much by Christ-following Judeans as otherwise, and in chapter six I will examine how Luke invents a Judaean diaspora (without using the word) when composing the historical novel of Acts. It was widespread in some early Christian literature, from which an example is instructive. Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, uses the image of the diaspora to frame the relationship of Christ-followers to Jews. In Justin’s work, there is no clear division between physical and spiritual understandings of land and territory. So in his description of the Promised Land, he invokes Joshua and Moses as


22 The Letter of James opens with an address, real or fictive, to the twelve tribes in diaspora (ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ) (Jas 1:1 [NRSV]). Likewise, the pseudepigraphical letter of 1 Peter 1:1 imagines an audience among the “exiles of the dispersion (NRSV)” (ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς), and the author includes a list of their (real or imagined) audience communities: Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. In several first-century Judaean writings, diasporic scattering is seen as a punishment for sin (T.Ash. 7; Philo, Conf. 197; De Praem. 115 [here the scattering is of the wisdomless soul]).
allegories of the Jewish law and Christ: Moses (the law) brought the people to the edge of the Promised Land; Joshua (Jesus) brought them into it. He describes the future return of Christ as a cessation of the spiritual landlessness in which the Christ-groups find themselves:

Jesus Christ will return the diaspora of the people, and will divide the good land to each of them, but not in the same ways. Because (Joshua) gave them a temporary inheritance, since he was neither Christ who is God, nor the Son of God; but he (Jesus) will give us an eternal possession after the holy resurrection (Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho, 113.17–22 [My Translation]).

Justin’s strategy of invoking the category of diaspora for Christ followers unfolds throughout the work. He argues that God does not hear the prayers of the Jews in the dispersion, and that those scriptures which refer to the Gentiles glorifying God’s name (Mal 1:10–12) show that God no longer accepts the sacrifice of the Jews. He interprets Malachi 1:11, “in every place incense is offered to my name,” as now referring to Christians rather than Jews, since he argues that Jews did not inhabit every nation on earth but Christians did. This universal inhabitation, which he says the Jewish diaspora never achieved, is in fulfillment of the promises made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Therefore, when he says that Christ will gather the diaspora of Israel, he imagines this to be the future gathering of the church.

Justin’s comments on diaspora take place in a world in which Jews and Christians are not fixed groups and, as such, are rhetorical attempts to create a Judaean other. In his efforts to differentiate which group is the proper inheritor of divine promises, Justin does not make the

23 NRSV
24 Dial. 117.
25 Dial. 119–121.
26 Is 49:6; Dial. 121.
diaspora a uniquely Jewish phenomenon, contrasted with Christian freedom from territory or centrality of belief.27 Rather, his strategy is to discharge chosen-ness from what he perceives as a Jewish other, and place this identifier on the Christ-followers; he suggests that they are a better diaspora. Since they are more universally displaced, he imagines that they are the inheritors of the promises of God. Diaspora is therefore synonymous with chosen-ness; for Justin it is a theological category based in a supersessionist claim on the concept of diaspora.28 It is useful to quote Phil Cohen here, whose definition of diaspora does accurately reflect Justin’s use of the term: “A chosen people are evicted from their birthright; their ensuing state of alienation is overcome by laying claim to principles of hope bound up with the homeland; after a heroic struggle, these hopes are realized in a final redemptive moment of homecoming.”29 This vision, through the eyes of Justin, is claimed by the Christ followers, and although spiritualized, the promise of homecoming (ie. the return of Christ) remains. Justin and Trypho’s struggle (although we can only read Justin’s side of it) is not over land versus belief, or even law or grace, but rather which of their groups, as they try to articulate mutual separation, is the proper heir to the ancient promises of God. As the work of Isaiah Gafni shows, ancient Jews fluctuated between seeing diaspora as divine blessing and seeing it as divine punishment, but nobody could imagine diaspora without being some way directed by God.30 The spheres of action represented by the categories of religion and diaspora are so interconnected for Justin and Trypho that it is

27 See the discussion of the Parting of the Ways in chapter six.
30 Gafni, Land, Center and Diaspora.
impossible to separate them, a deep-rooted entwinning that diaspora study and its focus on the nation state cannot untangle.

1.1.2 Religion as Diasporic Consolation

So far I have identified a two-part problem: first that diaspora theory is based in modern nationalism and, following this, that the secular nation-state diaspora cannot be projected onto antiquity as a useful historical lens, as if the Jewish diaspora experience has only ever been about separation from a nation. Studies which make this Jewish diaspora their archetype do so only through the advances in modern nationalism.31 Ironically, although modern diaspora studies are indebted to ideas of diaspora in antiquity, which are actually theological, they have not adequately been able to situate religion in relation to diaspora. Thus religion is often relegated to the place of a resource to help people to cope with diaspora.32 This approach makes religion simply a consolation prize for territorial loss: a psychological balm that is an alternative to being

---

31 Manuel Vásquez, “Studying Religion in Motion: A Networks Approach,” MTSR 20, no. 2 (2008): 157–58; Benedict R. Anderson, Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism (London: Verso, 1983), 6–12. Here 6. Part of the difficulty with situating religion in modern diaspora-nationalism must also be Anderson’s insistence that national systems replaced religious systems after the enlightenment; the new diaspora is a strange sort of secular beast, which resists theological interpretation. It cannot be seen as either a blessing or a curse, it can only ever be the misery of unfulfilled statehood and, consequently, despair has become the diasporic emotion, Jumana Bayeh, The Literature of the Lebanese Diaspora: Representations of Place and Transnational Identity (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 172–74.

32 For example, John Armstrong, one of the first theorists of diaspora, in 1976 argued that the Jews were the archetypal diaspora, always powerless, but that such archetypal diasporas rely on “sacral resources” without a strong state and its mythos for foundation, see “Mobilized and Proletarian Diasporas,” The American Political Science Review 70.2 (1976): 393–408. This is an interesting contention, and seems to implicitly rely on the idea that the Torah operated as a sort of surrogate for homeland for Jews, a claim also implicitly made by Alain Médaim, who argued in 1993 that diaspora had lost its “caractère exceptionnel,” using the Jews as an archetype. See, “Diaspora/Diasporas. Archétype et typologie,” Revue européenne de migrations internationales 9, no. 1 (1993): 64; On the use of religion as a resource to build diaspora identity, see Seán McLoughlin, “Religion, Religions, and Diaspora,” in A Companion to Diaspora and Transnationalism, ed. Ato Quayson and Giresh Daswani (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), 126–28.
in one’s homeland. In this trope, the secularization of *diaspora* as an area of study means that *religion* is disjointed in the process, and occupies a subordinate place in diaspora theory as one element of diaspora identity—thus matching the relationship of religion to the Western nation-state. But for Justin, and presumably for the subaltern Trypho, worship does not exist as a subset of diaspora life; there is no need to use religion instead of territory. Rather, the debate about who is the true *diaspora* shows that each invokes the term as a reference to a theological understanding of their displacement over and against others’ displacement and future hope in intertwined with themes of providence, chosen-ness, answer to prayers, and a future apocalyptic re-gifting of land to the children of God. In other words, *diaspora* (at least in antiquity) does not need to be expanded to capture *religion* or remade to include it or have *religion* subordinated to it, what would be termed in modernity as *religion* is an interstitial element in the history of the term diaspora. The separation of religion from diaspora is as artificial as the parted ways between Jews and Christians (chapter six). Diaspora in antiquity was a theological claim which was meant to assert the uniqueness of one’s group in the eyes of the divine.

1.2 Religious Studies and Identity Problems

If we return to the initial problem of studying *religion* in relation to *diaspora*, the former is as problematic as the latter. Religious studies has appropriately moved away from the model of World Religions, arguing that decontextualized and universal systems of belief, theology, and ritual are specifically built upon the paradigm of Protestant Christianity. This has reverberated

---

33 Boyarin and Boyarin, “Diaspora,” 712. Rejecting Zionism as “the subversion of Jewish culture and not its culmination” they read beyond the binary and argue that lack of power, which was accepted and theologized by a young Rabbinic movement, was the gathering point of diaspora: “the renunciation . . . of temporal power was to our minds precisely the most powerful mode of preservation of difference and, therefore, the most effective kind of resistance (722).”
into studies of antiquity through the removal of the concept of religion from ancient life as anything other than an etic term, as well as the deconstruction of an idea of a specific Jewish religion, “Judaism,” in the field of Jewish studies; this has been followed by a terminological shift to the word Judaean instead of Jew.

It was Wilfred Cantwell Smith who penned the early death knell for religion as a useful category of inquiry which would reverberate into studies of antiquity. He argued that the enlightenment moved our understanding of religion away from personal piety, and towards propositional and abstract truth:

... religion is something that one believes or does not believe, something whose propositions are true or are not true, something whose locus is in the realm of the intelligible, is up for inspection before the speculative mind ... a legacy of it is the tendency still today to ask, in explanation of ‘the religion’ of a people, What do they believe?—as though this were a basic, even the basic question.  

The shift in meaning for the term religion, Smith claimed, was from essential and transcendent systems of thought reflected in Hegel’s work; we relate to religion as to a “system of ideas” which can be compared cross-culturally. For moderns, the word religion therefore refers to personal piety, a noumenal and/or socio-historical manifestation of the divine, and a sphere of human activity, comparable to politics. While his work has been critiqued, it represents the

37 James L. Cox, “Before the ‘After’ in ‘After World Religions’—Wilfred Cantwell Smith on the Meaning and End of Religion,” in After World Religions: Reconstructing Religious Studies, ed. Christopher R. Cotter and David G. Robertson (London: Routledge, 2016), xii–xvii; Russel McCutcheon says that Cantwell Smith’s mistake was a desire to re-orient religion away from belief back towards something more universal, he uses Foucault’s ideas on discipline to argue that the construction of religion will always be a discourse of power, and we can never simply
beginning of the end of the World Religions model, and it has resonated widely through the new
field of religious studies, with critiques of its categorical imperialism that echoes European
physical imperialism and colonialism. The genealogy of propositional belief within Christianity
generally and its reflection in world religions is thus usually assigned to the enlightenment at
some point. For Talal Asad, the centering of propositional belief comes through the “Natural
Religion” movement, seen in Edward Herbert’s ideas of “a set of beliefs to which believers gave
assent,”39 and Kant’s articulation of the numen and phenomenon: classification of religion thus
became an ordering practice for different phenomena of the divine.40 This would combine with
the privatization of religious belief in Modernity,41 since “it is pre-eminently the Christian church
that has occupied itself with identifying, cultivating, and testing belief as a verbalizable inner
condition of true religion.”42

correct a category and end up with the real nature of human religion. The Discipline of Religion: Structure,

38 Richard King, Orientalism and Religion: Postcolonial Theory, India and “The Mystic East” (London and New
York: Routledge, 1999); Tomoko Masuzawa, The Invention of World Religions, Or, How European Universalism
Was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005); Hent de Vries, “Why
100; Jason Ananda Josephson, The Invention of Religion in Japan (University of Chicago Press, 2012), 1–2. 45, he
observes that the concept of religion in Japan was not a native category, but was created through the political entente
between the American navy and local elites. In his estimation, the interaction was one in which both parties
mutually created one another and castigated the other as heretic: “both parties were simultaneously inquisitors and
ethnographers, attempting to interrogate the other with the sense that the other promoted something defective.”

39 Talal Asad, “The Construction of Religion as an Anthropological Category,” in Genealogies of Religion:


42 Ibid., 48; Also Russell T. McCutcheon, Manufacturing Religion: The Discourse on Sui Generis Religion and the
Politics of Nostalgia (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); Catherine Bell, “Paradigms behind (And before)
This dismantling of the category of *religion* has had particular resonance among those who study Jews in antiquity. While diaspora studies has been reimagining the Jewish diaspora as territorial-based, as a counterpart to a Jewish state, an evolution away from speaking of Jewish religion in antiquity has simultaneously followed the deconstructive trends in religious studies. Scholars through the twentieth century were faced with the difficult task of trying to identify whether ancient Jews were an ethnicity, a religion, or something else, and what the marker of *Ioudaios* next to someone’s name meant. It is not possible or fruitful to survey all of these, but I will briefly present here two examples from the past two decades, and a third in more depth. Shaye Cohen (1999) argues that in the second century BCE “Judaism” emerged as an “ethno-religion” and that the term *Ioudaios* could be used to mark either geographic origin (Judaean), religious or cultural background (Jew), or political allegiance (connected to the Judaean state). Up until this point, Cohen argues, the marker of *Ioudaios* was used to denote geographical origins. But the Maccabean revolt would drastically redraw the lines of what *Ioudaios* referred to, the challenge


to territorial identity which also caused a refocusing of the *Ioudaioi* so that they were now also the people who worshipped “the God in Jerusalem.” Yet the “ethnic” in “ethno-religion” would remain a vital component to the identity of the *Ioudaioi*, marked by the Romans’ view of Jews as an *ethnos* which created the ability to have an *ethnarch* of the community in Alexandria (below), a distinction which Josephus reports. The crux of the difficulty of identity for Cohen is conversion: circumcision provided cultic access to aliens, but did not make one a native; the Torah admires foreigners who worship *yhwh*, but does not make them Israelites. (This is true also for Greeks. Herodotus imagined that there were four markers for Hellenes, says Cohen, blood, language, gods, and lifestyle), but Hellenization can adapt an individual in all of these areas except one: blood. Converts thus remained second-class members of Judaean societies, since they could only have one half of the ethno-religious equation. Cohen’s argument is useful. Even considering the problematic nature of a category of *religion*, it accurately reflects and grapples with the difficulty of understanding the choice by outsiders to worship the deity of an *ethnos* which will occupy the following chapters.

Daniel Boyarin argued that the discussions of orthodoxy and heresy, over time, would come to distinguish Christianity and Judaism from one another and that Early Christians were creating

48 8.144.2
religion through the construction of proper belief, an action which was mirrored by the Rabbis.\textsuperscript{51} Boyarin says that Judaism “both is and is not a ‘religion’”; while it marks a similar space in society as Christianity, it is not “a faith that can be separated from ethnicity, nationality, language, and shared history.”\textsuperscript{52} For Boyarin, the challenges and redefinitions of group lines offered in the birth of Christianity would evolve towards what we see as religion: “Groups that are differentiated in various ways by class, ethnicity, and other forms of social differentiation become transformed into ‘religions’ in large part, I would suggest, through discourses of orthodoxy/heresy.”\textsuperscript{53} As the Christians were re-defining heresy, there emerged a simultaneous movement among the rabbis, who developed their own understandings of heresy (as we have seen above with Justin Martyr).\textsuperscript{54} Boyarin’s work properly captures the shifting of identity within both Christianity and Judaism to proper belief, yet he also captures that Jewish identity was never solely about belief. His work pushes the emergence of Judaism as a uniquely religious identity later than Cohen’s, but also rests in a different sort of interpretation of religion from Cohen. Where Cohen sees ethno-religion as rooted in the temple worship, Boyarin’s idea about the emergence of Judaism is through competing systems of understanding the world, both Christian and Jewish, and their occasional mutual attempts to separate from one another (the success of which is discussed above).\textsuperscript{55}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{52} Boyarin, \textit{Border Lines}, 8.
\item \textsuperscript{53} Boyarin, \textit{Border Lines}, 2.
\item \textsuperscript{54} Boyarin, \textit{Border Lines}, 5–6.
\item \textsuperscript{55} Boyarin, \textit{Border Lines}, 18.
\end{itemize}
Yet perhaps the most prominent answer to the question of Jewish religion in antiquity has been given by Steve Mason (2007), who published an article redefining the field of Jewish Studies in antiquity: “Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History.” In it, he attempts to dismantle the uses of Jew, and especially Judaism, as legitimate descriptors for the Ioudaioi in antiquity. Mason’s idea hinges on several arguments. First, he argues that the use of the Greek word Ioudaismos (Ἰουδαϊσμός) which emerges in 2 Maccabees (2:21; 4:26; 8:1; 14:38) as a counterpart to Hellenismos (2 Macc 4:13) does not refer to a religious paradigm of Judaism, as might an English word ending with –ism, but rather refers to following Judaean customs, just as Hellenism refers not to a religion, but to following Greek customs. He argues that the use of Ioudaismos as a system of thought would not emerge until the third century, especially by Christian thinkers like Tertullian, Origen, and Eusebius. Tertullian is the most important of these voices and, as Mason observes, Tertullian’s view of iudaimus is projected backwards to cover all of the activity of Judaeans until the coming of Christ and, critically for our discussion, Mason shows that Tertullian views landlessness as the punishment for sin and evidence of the supersessionism of Christianity: “Crucial here is Tertullian’s decoupling of the Judaean people from its land and legitimacy, therefore from what had made it different in kind from Christian belief.” He goes on to say that “for Christian authors, Judaismus is Judaean culture deprived of all that had made it compelling to Judaizers, an ossified system flash-frozen

with the arrival of Jesus, which will now suffer . . . by comparison with Christianismus.”

Mason’s other move, drawing on the field of religious studies and the removal of religion as a discrete category of action antiquity, is to argue that religion is a Protestant Christian imposition on other cultures and therefore not an accurate way to describe what ancient Judaeans did. He thus concludes: “The Ioudaioi of the Graeco-Roman world remained an ethnos: a people associated with a place and its customs.”

I have engaged with Mason’s work because it has had a disproportionate effect on the field of the study of ancient Jews, or now Judaeans. Mason is correct in its criticism that Ioudaismos was never a system of belief and that Ioudaios was a marker of territory, and he is not alone in signalling a change. He correctly observes that the Greek ethnos is not simply a stand-in for modern ethnicity. It reflects numerous things: common heritage, ancestral traditions, and origins as well as national deities, sacrifices, ritual life, shrines, temples, and cults. Ioudaioi therefore becomes a marker of relation to land and culture, within which those things formerly labelled as religion are bound up.

Yet what must be accounted for is the point at which worship of those national deities moves beyond the lines of the *ethnos*. As we will see in the case studies presented below, the elimination of *religion* in antiquity as a discrete category of being creates a new reality which must be dealt with, namely, that a network of trust that began as members of an *ethnos* outside of their homeland can evolve and be redrawn to include former ethnic outsiders or to cross ethnic differences. Furthermore, in the cases of the Syrians on Delos, the Judaeans in Corinth, and the Thracians in Athens, the worship of deities and common ritual practices are precisely the mechanisms by which lines of difference are crossed and former outsiders become insiders. So, we have something that has been seen as a *religious* process, namely conversion and/or adoption of a new *religion* by outsiders, which must now be understood in the absence of category of *religion*. The way to accomplish this, as I will argue in the next chapter, is to focus on the creation of group trust and the bending of subsequent trust networks rather than to obsess about the particular bond—such as ethnos, geographical origins, or deities—that create the trust network in the first place. This allows us to follow the movement of deities outside of their original *ethnos* because of expanding social relationships rather than by conversion to a *religion*. Furthermore, it is useful to note that we see a shift that has typically been associated with religion and specifically Christianity (the move away from particularism) as being a natural by-product of acculturation and creation of new ways of being by immigrants, and in chapter six I will challenge the narrative that Judaeans were particularist while Christians were universalizing.

---

1.3 A World with no Fences: Immigrant Associations beyond Diaspora and Religion

In order better to address the ways in which immigrant groups could spread cultic and ritual practices in antiquity, especially beyond the bounds of the group, we can begin with the effective reframing of voluntary social groups in antiquity as private associations—a subtle shift that allows us to frame groups holistically without focussing extensively on their *ethnos* or worshipping life—in essence whether they were *religious* or *diasporic*. In particular I will use the term immigrant associations throughout this thesis, which is not to essentialize the membership of an association as only immigrants, but rather to understand them as being founded by immigrants. While the label of associations is likewise an *etic* term, it nevertheless allows us to reframe group identity in such a way that does not privilege founding logic and allows us to trace fluctuations in constructs of identity. Associative practices, associations, or private associations, as used in the study of religions of Mediterranean antiquity have become a way to speak of certain formalized social groups in antiquity which met under titles such as, in Greek, *koinon, synodos, phratra,* and *thiasos*. The term *associative practices* is perhaps the most useful descriptor for these to avoid the essentialization that might follow from calling a community an *association*. Nevertheless it has become customary to call them associations. These groups occupied a wide range of social spaces and functions from the ancient Athenian

---

polis to the Roman city. The term association is used to identify social groups of which members were drawn from social networks. Philip Harland identifies these networks as having five origins: 1. the household, 2. the neighbourhood, 3. the workplace, 4. the sanctuary or temple, and 5. a common geographical location. These were not mutually exclusive. A group comprised of people from a common origin living in a new place might therefore share an ethnos, a deity, and perhaps even a trade—as is the case with the Poseidonists from Beirut in chapters four and five. So great was the expansion of associations in the Hellenistic age that early scholars who studied them would sometimes see their proliferation as linked to the demise of the classical polis, yet there is now consensus among scholars that they were a complementary and integral part of belonging in the Greek poleis. While not identical across every polis and region, there is remarkable homogeneity to practices across time and place which offer benefits for study of any


68 Harland, Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judaic, and Cultural Minorities, 32.

type of privately organized group in antiquity whether it might be seen to be meeting for reasons of trade, shared cult, or shared geographic or ethnic origin. In the Greek *poleis*, private associations mimicked functions of city life, borrowing roles and language from civic vernacular.\(^70\) Associative practices included a number of activities, such as venerating a common deity, sharing meals together,\(^71\) and burying members.\(^72\) They created moral worlds for themselves, and members were expected to follow certain behavioral practices and show piety and devotion to the gods and to the association.\(^73\) Often members gathered around a shared trade. These groups were funded by various means, including membership fees and charges for meals, but frequently part of the funding was provided by benefaction, which attached the group to important and wealthy members of the *polis*.\(^74\) These wealthy benefactors could take up both real and symbolic positions within an association. There were regional variations in associative practices, for example, in Egypt associations appear to have occasionally imitated temple life


rather than city life, but imitating various social structures is the common denominator for most Greek associations.\textsuperscript{75}

Associations that had some relationship to an ethnicity transverse religion and diaspora, offering more useful ways across and beyond the boundaries of these categories, especially as they relate to migration. Networks comprised of shared ethnicity, gods, and trade were nearly always interwoven so that things could move across them, whether the worship of a particular god or a product. Associations actually show how varied networks could be and how fluid the identity which underlay them was. In the Hellenistic city, these associations frequently provided effective middle spaces for immigrants to enter into civic life through blending home practices and worship of deities in the communal form of the association which was recognizable to the city, occurring in what Ilias Arnaoutoglou calls “assimilative contexts.”\textsuperscript{76} They frequently provided a way for immigrants to access the resources of the city through the mediation of citizens\textsuperscript{77} In the case of immigrants from the Levant, the Hellenistic associations looked similar to a type of associative practice which was known as the marzêah in West Semitic languages, a social


grouping similarly based around banqueting, and they often incorporated home elements of these groups into their new Hellenistic forms.  

Associations, therefore, place significant demands on our categories, crosscutting religion and diaspora. They are useful for comparative work, as seen throughout the literature cited in this section. Finally, they were occasionally networked and interconnected; this is true of all of the case studies below. In sum, associative practices are a way to think about widespread, formulaic social gatherings and groupings, which could include many things, such as those groups formerly labelled as diasporic or religious, under their rubric. (In the next chapter, I will describe how associations could function as a trust network.)

1.4 Liminal Identity—Crossing Boundaries of Identity

The goal of this thesis therefore will be to examine the points at which identity shifts and boundaries are crossed. By this I do not mean emic boundaries, although immigrant groups may have recognized when they brought into their groups or formed new relationships with outsiders.


In the next chapter I will outline a way for imagining these shifts as network bending. But first I would like to explore the ways in which immigrant associations naturally push at the boundaries of our *etic* categories. Furthermore, since I understand immigrant associations as a reference point for interaction with the outside world rather than a container of diasporic identity, focusing on immigrant associations as a category is by its nature a study in liminality.

### 1.4.1 Citizenship, Ethnos, and Liminal Identity

Having identified immigrant associations as a useful lens through which to study immigrants and the spread of cultic practices, we can begin to articulate the role for *ethnos* deities and cultic practice which are omitted by *diaspora theory* as well as creating a way to study the transfers of these deities beyond their initial *ethnos*. It allows us to properly envisage middle ground and slippage between the things that could define a group. In fact, this middle ground between categories as well as the general position of immigrant associations in between various matrices of power, suggests that studying liminality is the most effective method for understanding the points at which networks of trust evolve and bend (next chapter). It is the people who stand on the edge of categorical boundary lines who are erased by categories; they are “the dangerous ones in between” as John Gager calls them in reference to the parting of the ways question between Jews and Christians. 80 Associative practices begin to show, as will be shown through this thesis, how complicated it is to understand the relationship between ethnicity and social groupings.

---

I would like to focus the remainder of this chapter on the issue of immigrant associations and liminality. In this sense, immigrants are liminal—both in their relationship to home and host but also that they are crossing thresholds of transformation—we see them in moments where their group identity is being remade. Nowhere is this moment of transformation more visible than in their worship of *ethnos* deities, which is transformed in a new place. The Greek word *limēn* (ὁ λιμήν) generally refers to a harbour, although it is sometimes metaphorized as a gathering-place or safe place.⁸¹ Its Latin cousin, *limen*, refers to a threshold or a boundary between two places.⁸² Of course, the concept of the liminal has been well-employed in ritual theory ever since the works of Arnold van Gennep and Victor Turner as a middle ground in between ritual transformations.⁸³ The groups under evaluation here fit both meanings of *limen/limēn*. They settled in harbours, retaining connections to elsewhere while either forging new relations with a host city or trying to retain independence. Their identity was therefore liminal in the second sense of the word; they existed in a threshold-like environment, living on the edge of transition: acculturation, assimilation, and preservation.⁸⁴ In addition to this, all except (perhaps) the Thracians were in the middle of broad trans-Mediterranean trust networks (which were occasionally trade-based), a problem which the next chapter will address. It is this liminality which demands that we tread carefully when constructing models with which to study immigrants.

⁸¹ LSJ, s.v. “λιμήν.”
⁸² Cassel’s Latin Dictionary, s.v. “limen.”
Immigrants and the associations they formed were first of all liminal because of their place as strangers in Greek cities, and the uncertain social status which this position could bring. Claire Préaux identifies three sources of strangers in the ancient city: first, the short-term visitors to the city such as actors or diplomats, the long term settlers who had ongoing relations with the community, such as traders or mercenaries, and finally unwanted strangers who were considered as a type of enemy to the city. It is with the second group, particularly as traders that I am interested. There are numerous vectors of identity which could be implicated in the social life of ancient immigrants, but there are especially two important ones for framing immigrants’ liminal status: citizenship and *ethnos*. Citizenship was the mode of belonging in a Greek city. To be a citizen was not only to have access to the rights and privileges that came with citizenship, but also to be a member of the class of people by whom the logic of the city was made up.

Immigrants did not have a secure place in the self-definition of the *polis*, embodied in Aristotle’s idea that the citizens share (*meteinaï*) the city. Philip Manville defines the *polis* as follows:

The Greek polis was a politically autonomous community of people living in a defined territory comprising a civic center with surrounding arable countryside. Its society included both agricultural and non-agricultural labourers who were organized by a centrally located authority to defend the state, contribute to its material needs, share in the unified worship of the gods, and decide matters of public policy and personal disputes. Since the polis was in essence its citizens, clear boundaries between the member and non-member existed; within the boundaries of membership, defined by a fixed constitution, the citizens had the right to participate in the community’s deliberative and/or judicial functions whose exercise normally took place in the civic center.

---

Yet citizenship was not, after all, strictly defined, and was more complicated and nuanced than we might imagine, the lines of identity were difficult to ascertain.\textsuperscript{88} It was often solidified in ways of belonging in sub-groupings of the city, including the city mandated divisions in Athens which created associations,\textsuperscript{89} and it was created and enacted in the social and ritual life of the \textit{polis}.\textsuperscript{90} For settled foreigners in Greek cities, life without citizenship often required different types of engagement with the city.

The second component of liminal identity which is important for our study is \textit{ethnos}. Often imagined by ancients as fixed (seen perhaps most clearly in Herodotus’ famous idea of Greekness as being about blood, language, lifestyle, and cultic practice) the \textit{ethnos} as a group was in fact not fixed but was socially constructed. Jonathan Hall’s instrumentalist work on ethnicity therefore suggests that ethnic groups (\textit{ethnē}) are a “self-ascribing and self-nominating social collectivity that constitutes itself in opposition to other groups of a similar order”; further, they often share “a myth of common descent and kinship, an association with a specific territory and a shared sense of history.”\textsuperscript{91} An immigrant in antiquity, in the context of Greek cities, was perceived as a member of an \textit{ethnos}: a group somehow bounded together which might include

\begin{flushright}


\end{flushright}
common territorial origin, gods, rituals, and perhaps a common foreign language. The construction of space, including for and by foreigners, was often directed by myths of kinship and tribal belonging (myths which were implicated in constructing citizenship as well). While ideas about *ethnē* evolved over time, they were fairly persistent in the areas of Greece with which this study deals well into the Roma era.

1.4.2 Constructing Liminal Identity

The image of the liminal immigrant and their difficult location within various social matrices indicates why partitions such as *religion* or *diaspora* are so limiting and why theory must account for shifting identity and evolving trust networks. The immigrant association’s position of liminality demands the adaptation of old and creation of new modes of being as the group adapts to its new place in the world and engages with the world around. While I have objected to the model of *diaspora theory* that draws upon the ancient Jewish diaspora as its archetype, I nevertheless think that spatial approaches to diaspora are useful for studying liminality, since spatiality recognizes the reality of different poles and pulls in an immigrant group—even in antiquity (this is not physical space, i.e., a temple, but *diaspora space* is used to articulate relational space which constructs imagined identities between home and host). Therefore I am not so much interested in the spaces in which groups met, but much more the imagined space in which group identity is formed. Those who theorize about diaspora space, often imagine it in

---

92 Manville, “Toward a New Paradigm of Athenian Citizenship”; Lee E. Patterson, *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010). Cities were metaphorically built on these myths, they extend into citizenship and foreign relations, and they would often ally first with cities who shared their ethnic divisions: Dorian, Aeolian, Achaean, or Ionian.

93 The Panhellenic movement saw a sort of revival of *ethnos* thinking in the Roman era, as Panhellenes wanted to rebuild Greek *ethnos* lines (IG VII 2711; also BE 1980, no. 367), see James H. Oliver, “Panachaeans and Panhellenes,” *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 47.2 (1978): 185–91;
such liminal terms, constructed in series of connections between here and there,\textsuperscript{94} in imagined spaces and ideas about “home” and “nation” which operate “across space”,\textsuperscript{95} articulating temporal identities which are disjunctive to linear time and look backwards and forwards easily.\textsuperscript{96} Avtar Brah imagines diaspora space as intersectional,\textsuperscript{97} positionality is how an immigrant is situated within border and diaspora in conjunction with the “politics of location.”\textsuperscript{98} She says that the concept of diaspora “refers to multi-locality within and across territorial, cultural, and psychic boundaries”.\textsuperscript{99} Social location therefore becomes a fundamental part of diaspora and the ways in which such groups construct themselves.\textsuperscript{100} The imaginative space that a group identifies is important. In chapter six, this will be the imagined koinōnia which Paul understands to be an isolationist form of community for both Judaean and Gentile Christ followers. In chapter five, we will see the ways in which the Aramaic language and Syrian temple practices were brought into the actual ritual space of the community on Delos—thus signifying the way the community constructed its imagined space as a hybridization of Syrian and Athenian modes of worship.


\textsuperscript{97} A. Brah, “Diaspora, Border and Transnational Identities,” in \textit{Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities} (New York: Routledge, 1996), 205. “Diasporic space is the intersectionality of diaspora, border, and dis/location as a point of confluence of economic, political, cultural, and psychic processes. It is where multiple subject positions are juxtaposed, contested, proclaimed, or disavowed.”

\textsuperscript{98} Brah, “Diaspora, Border and Transnational Identities,” 201.

\textsuperscript{99} Brah, “Diaspora, Border and Transnational Identities,” 194.

Furthermore, as will become apparent in the following chapters, the spatial aspects of these associations, whether physical space or the socio-spatial ideals of identity, positionality is not simply created \textit{ex nihilo}, but is constructed in complicated power relationships between home and host. In the case of Paul, we can take this further to dissect his own power relationship with the community which shapes his theology and practice—a luxury we do not have for the other groups. For all of these associations, their local identities are constructed in-between both \textit{here} and \textit{there}.\footnote{101} In the case of immigrant groups, the \textit{here} or the local is not simply constructed by immigrants, but has been evolving for centuries before they arrive. Societies often have expectations about the place and role of newcomers, what their communities and lives will look like, and even law or policy governing their integration. Previous immigrants may have already established places of worship, cross-community connections, and ritual forms, into which newcomers enter and with which they must engage.\footnote{102} Constructing locality, or the \textit{here}, is

\footnote{101} This is not to be confused with here, there, and anywhere, which is employed as a spatial theory by J.Z. Smith, “Here, There, and Anywhere,” in \textit{Prayer, Magic, and the Stars in the Ancient and Late Antique World}, ed. Scott Noegel, Joel Walker Walker, and Brandon Wheeler (Pennsylvania: Penn State Press, 2010), 21–36. He uses these terms to describe three localities of religion; the home, the state, and all things in between (ie. associations).

\footnote{102} In her study of Somali immigrants in both London and Toronto, Rima Berns-McGown identified one of the major factors in the ease with which immigrants may settle and acculturate to a new environment: government policies towards immigrants. She identifies the Canadian policy of multiculturalism as an important framework for new immigrants, and argues that it ultimately makes their transition much smoother. In addition to this, both diasporas, London and Toronto, saw Somali settlers step into existing Muslim communities, downplaying their Somali identity in favour of their Muslim identity. In contrast to the Somali Sufi practices, these groups took on more conservative views of their religious practices, many women wearing the hijab or jilbab, for example, which were not commonly worn in Somalia. Berns-McGown sees this as women feeling a sense of agency in an unfamiliar new environment and confusing diaspora experience. However, she says it’s not just that that Muslim religion has been “strengthened” but it has been “redefined” in the new space, see \textit{Muslims in the Diaspora: The Somali Communities of London and Toronto} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), esp. 226-8; Camilla Gibb observes a similar phenomenon in the Ethiopian Harari, who immigrated from the city of Harar. The Islam practiced in Harar follows a Wali tradition which has something like a cult of saints which, since it is considered heretical within the transnational Sunni communities to which they belong in Toronto, is often dropped. She likewise observes that young women often adopt the hijab, not popular in Harar, yet also adopt their identity to the Canadian context with relatively liberal views on physical discipline and paternity issues, see “Religious Identification in Transnational Contexts: Being and Becoming Muslim in Ethiopia and Canada,” \textit{Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies} 7.2 (1998): esp. 261-3.
always done within a defined realm of possibilities, many of which are outside of the immigrants’ control. This was true in the ancient *polis*, when immigrant groups had to navigate pre-established community forms and functions and inscribe them into their self-understanding.

For example, the home deities and cultic lives of immigrants were usually appended to their *ethnos* as “ancestral law”: a clearly defined mode of immigrant difference in the *polis*. In Athens, as in other Greek cities, citizens of the *polis* engaged with their city through a series of subgroups, including the *oikos* (household/family) which was the first point of contact with deities (such as Hestia, the goddess of the hearth), the *phylai*, or tribes, into which each city member was born, and the *demes*, which would become important points of contact with the city after the Kleisthenes reforms (507/8BCE); citizenship was closely attached to these forms of belonging. Yet it was within the subgroups of the city’s *phylai*, the *phratriai* (brotherhoods) existed, and within them further subgroups which existed for ritual practices, sacrifices, and banqueting, which were apparently the groupings within which the first immigrant associations emerged. I will explore these divisions in Athens more thoroughly in the chapter on Bendis, but for my purposes here it is necessary to recognize that associations provided pre-existing civic channels through which foreigners could enter and participate in the Greek city, and learn and

---

103 Préaux, “Les étrangers à l’époque hellénistique.”
enact civic rituals. Furthermore, as mentioned above, associations were a point of contact for foreigners and citizens to interact.

Of course, the impact of a new place, the here, on immigrant associations is not merely an imprint of power upon the group, but rather the forging of relationships to power. Associations, including immigrant associations, also engaged in honouring those who funded them, competing for benefactors to a nearly sycophantic level, and proudly displaying the names and faces of benefactors in wood and stone. Even the economic life of associations was thus wrapped in layers of ritualized and theologized significance. The social structures of associations thus, in many ways, dictated the entry of immigrants into a polis and their role in that polis. That immigrants entered a space which was constructed for them and acted on them is evidence of a common trope in diaspora studies; spatial relations are always relations of power. Yet the here into which immigrants stepped was also a place in which mutual meanings and significances could blend together harmoniously, as shown in the example of the Phoenicians worshipping Roma in the introduction above. The sacred island of Delos was a center of cultic life, but it was

---

108 Arnaoutoglou, “Associations and patronage in Ancient Athens.” He argues that associations were not patronage based (ie. reciprocally beneficial to both patron and benefactor), but relied on unequal power relations; on competing for benefactors, see Harland, “Spheres of Contention.” In IG II² 1292=GRA 26 (215/4 BCE), for example, an association of Sarapiastai honour the treasurer of their group, and announce that this is done so that it will promote rivalry (l. 18-9: ὅπος ἂν ἐφάμιλλον ᾖ), since members will see and know that this is what happens to benefactors.
109 A. Brah, “Diaspora, Border and Transnational Identities,” in Cartographies of Diaspora : Contesting Identities (New York: Routledge, 1996), 175–207; This was also addressed above to some extent with the issue of contested academic space, see Kim Knott, “Inside, Outside and the Space in-between: Territories and Boundaries in the Study of Religion,” Temenos 44, no. 1 (2008): 41–66; “Religion, Space, and Place: The Spatial Turn in Research on Religion,” Religion and Society 1.1 (2010): 36. The spatial turn in the study of religion, Knott says, has been focused on the poetical ideations of space, the politics of religion, and how space is constructed and contested. She observes that religious studies has become interested in the relationship between space and power, but has yet to interrogate the theoretical implications between space and religion.
also an economic hub; the landscape of Delos, as we shall see, was full of ritual and mundane significance. The six kilometer stretch of walls which joined the inland-Athens with its harbour, the Piraeus, was a protective stone corridor intended to enable access to the harbour while under attack, yet these walls became the site of various civic parades for the gods, including the torchlight run of the Thracian goddess Bendis (below).

The other side of liminality, in addition to the acting of the power of here on an immigrant association, are the ways in which they brought elements of home into a new place. The creation of identity in a new place, the here, occurs with a measured interaction with a perceived identity from another place, there. It is in this adaptation of a perceived other place to new environs that novelty occurred, as immigrants invoked home practices, rituals, and deities in their new environment, which in itself transformed that environment.\(^{110}\) This inclusion of the there or otherness in immigrants’ built environments does not necessarily indicate anything real about their homeland, but rather the ways in which practices and ideas from elsewhere as well as the ideals of elsewhere (the idealized invocation of another place) contribute to the construction of immigrant space. What is important is how immigrant associations use real and imagined places, whether Syria, Jerusalem, Heaven, or Rome, to create local space and communal boundaries, to justify the birth and/or longevity of one’s own community, orienting themselves to the world around. For example, two inscriptions from Delos present a group who identified themselves as “The Israelites on Delos who offer sacrifices at the temple at Mount Gerizim (in Samaria)” (οἱ ἐν

\(^{110}\) Clifford, “Diasporas,” 308. It is something like James Clifford’s “diaspora discourse,” in which “community consciousness and solidarity that maintain identifications outside the national time/space in order to live inside.”
Aside from the interesting possible discussions of Samaritans in relation to Judaeans, we are presented here with a group on Delos who, in their descriptions of themselves, incorporate another place. The sacrifices at Mount Gerizim, whether real or imagined, here transliterated into a new Greek word from the Hebrew (har Grz ‘n/m), are an integral part of their identity in a new place. Another example comes from Serapion A, one of three sanctuaries to the god Serapis on Delos. Archeologists discovered that the priests of Serapis built a Nilometer there for their services, a large pit into which water could flow with stairs down into the water. These stairs would be used to measure the water.

Rather than simply feed the basin with a pipe to ensure a steady water supply, the designers specifically engineered the chamber to that the rising and falling of the local water supply would be reflected in the Nilometer, thus imitating the changing levels of the Nile at home, all of which were under the control of the god Serapis. The incorporation of the rising of the Nile as an important part of the rituals on Delos shows that this practice of spiritualizing the Nile at that location was vital to constructing locality and, interestingly, as non-Egyptians came to worship at the Serapeion the Nilonic water cycles would thus become part of their experience in

111 SEG 32:810 (250-175BCE); 32:809 (150-50).
113 In addition to this, one of these inscriptions, SEG 32:810, honours a benefactor named Menippos, who has furnished and dedicated God’s prayer house, a proseuchē, at his own expense (κατ̣ασκευάσαντα καὶ ἀναθέντα ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἐπὶ προσευχῇ τοῦ θ̣ε̣[οῦ]). Seán McLoughlin, drawing on Vasquez’ work, suggests that religions create a “historical transcendence,” they are “superlocative” spaces, which are necessary as diasporas lose contact and understanding of home, yet do not completely fit in the new space. They must create ways of understanding their space and boundary crossing, McLoughlin, “Religion, Religions, and Diaspora,” 135–36.
worshipping the deity of a place to which, perhaps, they had never been. In this context, the *there* can also be ritualized, with sacred and mundane practices or places of given a new life.\textsuperscript{115} Of course, *there* can also be recreated in social structures from the home environment which are imitated in an immigrant community, as we see among the Levantine immigrants that I study below.

I draw attention to *novelty* because it stands in stark contrast to any idea of ghettoized ethnicity protected by diaspora. Instead, the groups below will show instances of crossing boundaries as well as preserving home practices, and in doing so will create new ways of being: some of which no longer look like immigrant identity. In the same way, I will argue in chapter six that the challenge to Paul’s Christ group in Corinth was not a Gentile challenge to an existing diaspora community, but rather the challenge of Hellenistic Judaean s who wished to mix with Corinthian society. In response, Paul advocates for the incorporation of ritual forms. The Thracians in chapter three create parading, washing, and praying rituals that bind together two separate groups, and in so doing create new ritual enforcement of a shared ethnicity. Therefore, throughout this study I will be mindful of the points where these groups are creative and innovative in their own constructs of identity and in relationship to the world around.

1.5 Conclusion

I have argued throughout this chapter that the modern approaches to the study of identity are marred by the politicized lenses of *diaspora* and *religion*, and while it is not necessary to eliminate completely those words from our vocabulary, the four associations in what follows will

show us how flexible and malleable group identity could be in the ground. The siloing of identity into diasporic or religious creates problems identifying the boundaries of groups and is particularly inappropriate for the study of antiquity, where diasporic, religious, ethnic, cultic, trade, family, and civic groups are often intertwined and not mutually exclusive.

Where we do see diaspora invoked, it is vastly different from the ways in which diaspora theorists invoke the term, while religion is notoriously absent as an emic concept. Diaspora and religion are at least partially manufactured fields of study, as historical artifacts they become ossified categories of meaning. The goal of the next chapter will be to reframe changes of identity in a way that does not rely on categories of religion or diaspora.
Chapter 2
Social Groups as Trust Networks
2 Social Groups as Trust Networks

The goal of chapter one was to challenge the partitioning of identities into categories of *diaspora* and *religion*, through identifying how poorly these map onto ancient evidence. In contrast, it suggests that studies of associations are an alternative way of looking at groups that might have been formerly considered diasporic and/or religious, drawing also from the common trust spheres of the family, the country of origin, and the common trade. These areas overlap and combine, and it is possible to see the logic that underlies the group’s identity changing over time. This is the problem which will be addressed in this chapter. Here I try to undermine partitions of identity further. Immigration is not merely a question of one social identity interacting with another in a new place, rather it happens in the sphere of both the social and economic; migrants and economy are intrinsically linked. In particular, the following chapters will focus on processes through which outsiders entered immigrant groups and worshipped their gods and/or groups reshaped their own identity with a view towards building social capital with outsiders. In at least two cases, this adaptation towards outsiders seems to be a result of business sensibilities and the need to expand boundaries arising from trade. Furthermore, we can usually detect no “conversion” behind bringing outsiders into the group (although this may well be a result of our sources), although the groups are changed by their interactions with outsiders.

Three questions arise from this: Why did outsiders choose to enter the trust networks of the Thracians in Athens, the Phoenician and Syrian groups on Delos, and the Christ groups in Corinth, how did this change the makeup of these groups, and how did the underlying logic of group identity or the narratives the group tells about itself change? In answering these questions,
I suggest that we may gain leverage on the problems of group identity relating to *religion* and *diaspora* in chapter one.

The goal of this chapter is to reframe immigrant groups (and indeed associations generally), not as defined by common worship, nationality, neighbourhood, family, or trade, but rather as networks of trust. By focusing on the group as a trust network we can take account of the ways in which groups could evolve their unifying principles over time: for example, the Syrian goddess begins as an ethnic association and moves towards mixed membership around the worship of a deity. Drawing upon the work on social capital by both Pierre Bourdieu and Robert Putnam as well as Charles Tilly’s work, this chapter will reframe associations as *trust networks* in which social capital both tied groups together and allowed them to form bridging trust within their societies and across long-distance networks. These trust networks are not fixed entities, but were rather always evolving both their relationships to one another and outside of the group as well as the symbolic capital, rituals, and worship by which group trust was enacted and preserved.

## 2.1 Immigrants, Associations, and Economy

This chapter will discuss the fundamental role of the creation of trust in social groupings, which will—in the following chapters—provide a way to understand how these groups are constructed, how boundaries are maintained, and how their membership could evolve. The reason for focusing group constitution around trust, specifically a trust network, instead of imagining associations constructed in some fixed identity-category (ethnicity, religion, family) is that it allows us to track the points at which the constituting logic of a group can shift. A significant part of this shift for two Delian groups, the Phoenicians from Beirut and the worshippers at the sanctuary of the Syrian goddess, was bound up in economic relationships which had an
observable effects on the groups’ makeup and/or practice. For the Phoenicians and Syrians on Delos, their social and ritual identities and practices were closely tied to their commercial lives; for these two groups the question of immigrant identity is not only a question of social or cultural identity, but also economic. In what follows, I will use trust as the constituting factor for both the economic and social relationships of the groups (which are one and the same for Syrians).

For their role in the ancient economy, the two Delian associations of Syrians and Phoenicians might be labelled, according to diaspora studies, as trade diasporas: immigrant communities networked together, connected to a home place, which facilitated the flow of goods or business of some sort. That there was trading activity at these sanctuaries is clear, although it is not clear what they were trading (chapters four and five). However, their commercial energy was clearly directed towards the economic superpower emerging in the second-century BCE Mediterranean: Rome. Paul’s Corinthian community may fit under this description as well, I suggest in chapter six that there was a long-distance trust undergirding the Corinthian Christ group which likely predates Paul and certainly extends beyond his own sphere of influence and some of the group members clearly shared Judaean heritage. However, in my view it is not possible to connect the

---

1 In diaspora theory the trade diaspora is made up Trade diasporas, as defined by Philip Curtin, are communities that are made up of people, usually those who live outside of the bounds of the normal community, who conduct trade between societies, as “an interrelated net of commercial communities forming a trade network, or trade diaspora,” see Philip D. Curtin, Cross-Cultural Trade in World History, Studies in Comparative World History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 2–3, quote 2. Maximizing their ethnic network and the mutual trust entailed within it, they work themselves out of a business as connections are made from the wider society to their sources, and the traders at this point may either return home, or may further assimilate into the host culture as a non-trade diaspora; See also Gabriel J. Felbermayr, Benjamin Jung, and Farid Toubal, “Ethnic Networks, Information, and International Trade: Revisiting the Evidence,” Annals of Economics and Statistics 97/98 (2010): 41–70. Robin Cohen, Global Diasporas: An Introduction (New York: Routledge, 2008), 97–98. Cohen invoked Weber’s term “Pariah capitalism,” which Weber uses of Jews in the Protestant Work Ethic.

2 With a caveat that all the members were not of the Judaean ethn but, then, neither were the “Syrians” on Delos.
Corinthian Christ group to shared economic activity, other than the inter-group exchanges such as the offering for Jerusalem or the financial support for a leader (chapter six).

The relevance of the ancient economy to the study of associations (for my purposes immigrant associations) may not be immediately apparent, especially since they were organizations which traded in status and honour, praising and crowning benefactors, celebrating faithful members, and embodying their status-practices into communal ritual activities such as feasts and meetings. From their social activities, it is tempting to place associations in the model of the ancient economy, or lack thereof, initially proposed by Moses Finley. In particular, he built on two theorists: Max Weber’s *Ideal Types* and his interest with social status, and Karl Polanyi’s claim that the market could only become disembedded from society in modern economies (thus it was socially embedded in antiquity). Finley’s claims about the ancient economy can be simplified

3 Finley’s work defined the work of many historians in the twentieth century. It was at the center of most discussions of the ancient economy, most notably framed in two dichotomies: primitivism vs. modernism and substantivism vs. formalism. The first of these is the debate as to whether the economy in antiquity was primitive (operating completely differently from the modern economy) or modern (operating in much the same way). The idea of the primitive economy was developed by Karl Bücher, in *Die Entstehung der Volkswirtschaft: sechs Vorträge* (Tübingen: H. Laupp’schen Buchhandlung, 1893). It was translated into English as *Industrial Evolution*, trans. S. M. Wickett (New York: H. Holt, 1901). His idea of primitive economies was linked to an anthropological notion of progress from the “primitive man” . . . “who follows only the prompting of the moment; his conduct is purely impulsive, mere reflex so to speak. . . such hand-to-mouth existence cannot be burdened with *conceptions of value* [sic] (20-1).” This primitive person, in his mind, was only interested in the “*need for nourishment* (44).” He was answered by Eduard Meyer who imagined that the ancient economy had the trappings of the modern one, “Die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung des Altertums,” *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik / Journal of Economics and Statistics* 9 (64).5 (1895): 696–750. See also E. Meyer, *Kleine Schriften zur Wirtschaftlichen und politischen Geschichte des Altertums*, 2 vols. (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1910); Also Moses I. Finley, ed., *The Bücher-Meyer controversy* (New York: Arno Press, 1979).

for the current discussion, into three elements that are useful for describing associative practices.  

1. Following the work of Johannes Hasebroek, he argued that people were most interested in the pursuit of status, which was juxtaposed with disinterest in increasing wealth through profit or investment. Wealth was valuable because of its relation to social status.

2. Markets were local and mainly agrarian; of course, long-distance trade happened in some places, but supply and demand were not regionally interdependent nor were prices influenced in fluctuations in production elsewhere.

3. The idea of investment was absent, which also required a surplus of savings.

These three elements of Finley’s work are precisely those issues which touch the study of immigrant associations, especially those involved in pan-Mediterranean trade. Finley’s approach in his time was contrasted by Michael Rostovtzeff, who rooted his own economic analysis of


8 Finley, The Ancient Economy, 1–17, esp. 16–17.

antiquity in the study of material culture which, he thought, indicated a high level of trade and specialization (Rostovtzeff even imagined an elementary capitalism in antiquity). Finley, by comparison, read the literature of antiquity and saw nobles vying for class, wealth as a social good, and little in terms of cross-cultural markets, the foundations of an ancient market economy, or robust trade in goods beside wheat.

At face value, Finley’s work might seem a constructive way to think about associations, especially as vehicles for the pursuit of status. We might simply see them as proof-positive of Finley’s understanding of the economy, since (even from their material evidence) most associations seem more interested in honour practices than finance. Yet there are three significant developments which challenge the idea that associations were interested in status rather than profit. The first development is a rise in challenges levelled especially at Finley’s work. While I will not discuss these in depth here, they usually focus on either Finley’s biases or the ways in which historical evidence directly contradicts Finley’s claims. The second


11 Although Richard P. Saller, “Framing the Debate over Growth in the Ancient Economy,” in The Ancient Economy: Evidence and Models, ed. Joseph Gilbert Manning and Ian Morris (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007), 223–38, makes the case that Finley and Rostovtzeff are closer together than people realize and that it is their followers who created the divergence (esp. 225-7); S. C. Humphreys has a Finleyan explanation for what he saw as stunted development in the Athenian economy, that there were potential investments but that people had a mental block against exploiting them, S. C. Humphreys, Anthropology and the Greeks (London: Routledge, 1978), 150.

development which challenges Finley’s ideas has been shifts in the field of economics, especially with the theoretical developments around social capital and New Institutional Economics which I will draw from below. These studies allow us to connect honour and status directly to business and trading networks, rather than accepting that they happened in lieu of interest in profit.\textsuperscript{13}

The third and final development is a wave of new scholars who study the economies of Greece and Rome (for my purposes) as market economies. This is to some extent necessary for all of my case studies, but especially with the Syrian temple on Delos, the rise of which, I will argue in chapter four, coincided with the opening of the silk routes. While there is some disagreement about when the ancient Greek economy emerged,\textsuperscript{14} it is relatively safe to say that by the fifth-

reads the European feudalism of the middle ages into the ancient economy, thus overemphasizing the autarky of \textit{poleis} and imagining totalitarian leadership as widespread in antiquity, see ““The Ancient Economy”: The Problem and the Fraud,” \textit{The European Legacy} 7.5 (2002): 599. He also is critical of what he calls Finley’s \textit{oikos} and Meyer’s \textit{superoikos}, essentially that the household was a constrained economic system, whether it was the small-scale household bent on subsistence (Finley) or the state which a power rules like his own \textit{oikos} (600–2). The impact of Finley’s model, Derks says, are studies in which cities do not trade, they consume but do not produce; A second and more productive line of critique, however, is challenging Finley’s ideas with contrary historical evidence, a project to which this thesis will contribute. For example, Edward Cohen’s work on ancient banking (below); Also Robin Osborne’s work on interrelated markets which shows a high movement of pots through the economy from archaic Athens, see “Pots, Trade and the Archaic Greek Economy,” \textit{Antiquity} 70.267 (1996): 31–44; For another example, Kevin Greene’s work argues that three particular levels of technology in antiquity challenge Finley’s ideas: first, a rapid increase in coinage in the early Roman economy which moved beyond simply government needs; second, the ease and speed of transport on the Mediterranean; and finally a high level of access to metals, stone, and pottery, the latter of which evidences complicated trading patterns, see \textit{The Archaeology of the Roman Economy} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 169–71. In a more recent work, Greene argues that Finley shared many of his tendencies with A.H.M. Jones (A. H. M. Jones, “Ancient Empires and the Economy: Rome,” in \textit{Third International Conference of Economic History, Munich 1965}, ed. M. I. Finley (Paris: Mouton, 1965), 103–4), his predecessor at Cambridge (who thought trade was minimal), but “reinforced them with a Weberian interpretation that subordinated all economic activity to the pursuit of social status, see Greene, “Technological Innovation and Economic Progress in the Ancient World,” here 32.. This led Finley to hold texts written by the senatorial class, for example, in much higher esteem than any forms of material evidence.

\textsuperscript{13} Here there is an inherent contradiction in Finley’s work, who draws on Polanyi in relation to an “embedded economy,” but still says that the social was not economic.

\textsuperscript{14} Carl Hampus-Lyttkens puts the emergence of such an economy even earlier, coming in the centuries following the Mycenaean collapse, based on the surplus of iron, the ability of farmers to control their own surplus (following
fourth centuries B.C.E., Athens was part of a Mediterranean market economy. In this case, I define “market economy” at a basic level, meaning that there was a relatively free transfer of wealth and material goods, which happened organically in response to supply and demand (as opposed to being planned); this coincided with a rise in regional and long-distance trade, coinage, and production specialization. Of course, the Roman economy has attracted even more attention than the Greek, since here Finley’s ideas are easily challenged by the prevalence of long-distance trade, the easily identifiable presence of comparative advantage (such as the grain trade with Egypt, below), and the existence of Roman banking institutions around the Mediterranean. The majority of the current study takes place in the Roman economy, as Delos in the second century B.C.E was largely birthed and sustained by Rome and its hunger and, of course, Roman Corinth comes at its height. For my work on the Roman economy, I rely especially on the work of Peter Temin. His (2001) initial foray into the study of the ancient economy, particularly the Roman economy, argued that there were significant market transactions in antiquity under relatively free conditions, and from this there was inter-regional, price equilibrium. He followed this (2004) by arguing that the financial systems of the Roman Empire, compared to the economies of the eighteenth century (which were also market economies which were different from modern economies), created financial institutions which


15 Osborne, “Pots, Trade and the Archaic Greek Economy.”


17 Institutions, here, is in the sense of Institutional economics (below).
were profitable for growth. Finally, his recent monograph in the study of the Roman economy is *The Roman Market Economy* (2013). In it, he draws on Frederick Pryor’s concept of three modes of behaviour (who drew on Polanyi’s idea that all human economies are made up of exchanges in the forms of reciprocity, redistribution, and exchange). While the Roman economy had many “non-centric transfers” which have no price (such as taxes in kind on grain), or reciprocal exchanges (where prices are fixed or, at least, not tied to market), Temin shows convincingly that the Roman economy was not simply a feudal economy which survived on resource transfers. Economies are usually divided into the category of planned vs. market; planned economies are those in which production and price are dictated by some oversight (such as the USSR), while market economies are undirected, the production and exchange of goods are organic, and price responds to supply and demand. The Roman economy was primarily the latter, although with certain government interventions and institutions which were attempts to regulate the market (Diocletian’s price edict might be an extreme example of this). Temin therefore proposes the following statements on the Roman economy:

a. We must be cautious applying economics to antiquity, yet many of the basics (he gives the examples of supply and demand and comparative advantage) still apply.

b. There was a market economy in ancient Rome.

---


c. The Pax Romana had a remarkable effect on Mediterranean trade, creating safe and fast shipping routes, and spurring on regional specialization in production. (This is visible even before the Pax Romana, since their control of the Mediterranean in the second century BCE had a similar stabilizing impact on Delian trade.)

d. Romans had a high standard of living because of “extensive markets, comparative advantage, and technological change.”

e. Rome’s economy is constantly being uncovered through new discoveries, and our knowledge is always expanding.  

These points can be supplemented through the recent work of Keith Hopkins, in a revised edition of his ideas which was published in 2007 (after his death). Hopkins outlines five principles which we can bring to a study of the ancient economy: the economy is made up of “logical relationships”; economic variables (he uses the example of taxes and trade) are interdependent; while not infallible, economic models on a macro scale are more useful than detailed regional economic studies, since a region may not reflect the economy as a whole; economic history is limited by “finite variables,” for example, the production of the Roman economy is not unlimited; changing one factor changes all others; a higher population affects production, supply, demand, etc.; and, finally, he suggests that the economic model should fit broadly within accepted truths about antiquity.  

21 Temin, The Roman Market Economy, 2.

2.2 The Immigrant Association and Trust

For the purposes of studying the role of associations in the ancient economy, some of the most productive advances have come through changes in economics (the second shift mentioned above). Here advances in the study of social capital (how social relationships first enable a society to function and then how they affect exchange) and New Institutional Economics (how economic institutions stabilize exchange and correct inherent problems like trust and transaction costs). These are being taken up by those working on ancient associations, and are creating a new understanding of various types of associations relationships to their respective cultures and economies.23 But before moving to the interrelationships of groups with the economy, it is necessary to first articulate upon what grounds a social group, or association for our purposes, is held together. Perhaps one of the most useful formulations is the idea of social capital as first

---

23 Monson, “The Ethics and Economics of Ptolemaic Religious Associations.” He uses Tilley’s “trust network” idea (below) to suggest that associations offered numerous resources, especially shared values and norms and therefore connections to economic resources (234). He says that in a trust network people are “willing to put resources at risk” (237). Wim Broekaert argues that Roman collegia created both horizontal and vertical economic protection: in some cases they offered protection from competition or underselling, or limiting what someone could put on the market, and allowing members to form attachments to wealthy patrons who would share interests, see “Partners in Business: Roman Merchants and the Potential Advantages of Being a Collegiatus,” A5 41 (2011): 221–56. The association, he says, was a place for sharing of trade information, thus reducing knowledge costs and increasing efficiencies, especially through “protection against fraud and predation, assistance in selecting and monitoring agents and business relations, pooling finance and information” (251); Philip Venticinque, Honor Among Thieves: Craftsmen, Merchants, and Associations in Roman and Late Roman Egypt (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2016), 35–68. He argues that craftsmen and merchant collegia, particularly in Roman Egypt, should be considered as economic entities (35–49). He uses Tilley’s model of trust networks to argue that associations created the trust required for economic exchange. In particular, associations proved effective at diminishing transaction costs (26–7); also Philip F. Venticinque, “Risk Management: Social Capital and Economic Strategies on Late Roman Estates in Oxyrhynchus,” Historia 63.4 (2014): 463. Cameron Hawkins takes a similar approach in his recent monograph, although he takes the argument a step further in tying collegia to a period of economic growth in the early empire, especially by “mitigating transaction costs” without the need to create “integrated firms.” Cameron Hawkins, Roman Artisans and the Urban Economy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016). esp. 129: “Professional collegia clearly provided important benefits to their members for most of their history, and they just as clearly permitted the Roman economy to sustain a level of specialization and intensive human capital that may not otherwise have been achievable. They were, however, unable to drive ongoing growth over the long run, for the simple reason that many inhabitants of Roman cities could not take advantage of what collegia had to offer,” and 124: “Collegia had the potential to stimulate intensive growth because, by mitigating transaction costs, they supported a greater degree of specialization than would have been possible otherwise, and thus contributed to the thick market externalities that were crucial to growth in preindustrial economies.”
advanced by Pierre Bourdieu, which describes the capital to be derived from social relationships, which he places alongside cultural and economic capital:

Social capital is the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition – or in other words, to membership in a group – which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectivity-owned capital, a ‘credential’ which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word. These relationships may exist only in the practical state, in material and/or symbolic exchanges which help to maintain them. They may also be socially instituted and guaranteed by the application of a common name (the name of a family, a class, or a tribe or of a school, a party, etc.) and by a whole set of instituting acts designed simultaneously to form and inform those who undergo them; in this case, they are more or less really enacted and so maintained and reinforced, in exchanges. Being based on indissolubly material and symbolic exchanges, the establishment and maintenance of which presuppose reacknowledgment of proximity, they are also partially irreducible to objective relations of proximity in physical (geographical) space or even in economic and social space.²⁴

Social capital, as Bourdieu understands it, is dually found as both a given feature of human relationships, but also as the formalized relationships of social groups which have constructed ways of living out their social capital through rituals, modes of being, rites of passage, and so on. His understanding of social capital in relation to other types of capital is primarily in the “multiplier effect” on the other cultural and economic capital someone has; one’s social capital amplifies their ability to leverage cultural and economic capital.²⁵ In the case studies below from Athens and Delos it is possible to see a close interplay of social and economic capital which, I will argue, is held together by the common language of ritual and worship. Nevertheless it is the social capital of the group which binds it together and, as I discuss below, Bourdieu’s work on


social capital already has a vital component for approaching immigrant groups: He recognizes
that social capital can be formalized into a trust group (such as a family), but that the structure of
this group’s social capital is not fixed but is subject to fluctuation and change.

In addition to Bourdieu’s work on social capital, Robert Putnam’s study provides a useful
addendum in clarifying how social capital can be invoked both internally and externally.
Putnam’s work on social capital, provocatively measuring the decline of American democratic
participation through a lowered involvement in bowling leagues, invokes declining social capital
in creating multifaceted deterioration of civic engagement: decreases in voting, individual
happiness, and economic ghettoization. Putnam’s work has been criticized generally for its
narrativization of social deterioration as well as limits of his study, but his observations on the
importance of social capital for a variety of social and civic institutions are sound. In particular,
Putnam’s work is useful for what follows because it articulates two types of social capital:
bonding and bridging. Bonding social capital is that which creates and reinforces close social
bonds of friends and family, even to the extent of forming cliquish behavior. This social capital
reinforces group boundaries and can be used to create exclusivist behaviour. On the other hand,
bridging social capital uses looser social ties to propel individuals within the group to strengthen
connections beyond its boundaries. Both of these concepts effectively convey a reality in social
groupings, that social capital is not strictly internal but rather it simultaneously orients the

members’ relationships to one another as well as the group’s outward relationship to society at large. This is a useful distinction for immigrant groups in particular, since groups must both construct themselves with social capital but relate to the outside world as well. Whether a group accepts new members or is closed, these two realities remain. Chapters four and five will juxtapose the Syrians and Phoenicians on Delos. The Phoenicians were a closed group, yet still used their rituals and worship as bridging trust to form relationships outside the group. The Syrian group would accept new members, and (as chapter five will show) ritualized giving, language, and worship bound newcomers to the group. In both cases, understanding the ways in which social capital creates group identity is vital.

It is useful to frame these bi-directional (internal and external) relationships as relationships of trust, understanding that social relations rely on trust just as (as will be discussed below) economic relationships do.\(^\text{29}\) Charles Tilly has usefully called the social capital of a group a *trust network*. He suggests that trust networks affect all parts of life: “cohabitation, procreation, provision for children, transmission of property, communication with supernatural forces, joint control of agricultural resources, long-distance trade, protection from predators, maintenance of health, and collective response to disaster.” These networks could be formed around “religious sects and solidarities, lineages, trade diasporas, patron-client chains, credit networks, mutual aid

\(^{29\text{M. Foddy and T. Yamagishi, “Group-Based Trust,” in Whom Can We Trust?: How Groups, Networks, and Institutions Make Trust Possible, ed. K.S. Cook, M. Levi, and R. Hardin, Russell Sage Foundation Series on Trust (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2009), 17. important here, trust is kept separate from “assurance”, in which we know individuals will act in our interests because they align ... but “trust is needed when another person has the potential to gain at our expense, but can choose not to do so;” we can identify two types of trust within this definition, cognitive and affective, Daniel J. McAllister, “Affect- and Cognition-Based Trust as Foundations for Interpersonal Cooperation in Organizations,” The Academy of Management Journal 38.1 (1995): 24–59. Cognitive trust is based on knowledge of a situation or person, while affective trust is based on feeling.\)}
societies, age grades, and local communities.” As Tilly further observes, in line with Bourdieu’s recognition of group social capital, these networks are fluid at the edges, they may be constantly shifted and reworked to include or exclude people and groups, a point which will become important in the next section.

These three theories provide an effective way of understanding group identity which does not flow from a common group trait such as its composition around the worship of a deity, an ethnic origin, or a trade collective, but is rather constructed from social capital and shared trust. As such, the identity of any given social group is not fixed, but can rather fluctuate and evolve over time, as indeed each of the groups profiled below does. It is both correct and useful, therefore, to understand associations as trust networks which operated on social capital. In them, as identified in chapter one, were forms of honour, prestige, belonging, and identity, as well as shared customs, languages, and gods in immigrant associations. Furthermore, the shared trust flowed beyond group identity and be used to articulate a group’s place within its host society. In some of the cases below, certainly for Syrians and Phoenicians, and possibly for Judaeans and Thracians, the trust networks in which they operated were equally business networks, and the shared worship of deities lent itself to the groups’ role in the Mediterranean economy. Trust networks can therefore cross-cut theoretical silos of diaspora and religion, as well as the social and economic. If we imagine, then, that immigrant associations are networks of trust which equally form bridging capital beyond the bounds of the group, we gain the ability to further relate social trust-creating mechanisms (common language, cult, deity, honour) with the economic.

2.3 The Economic Implications of Shared Gods (NIE)

The value of social capital and trust for immigrant associations involved in pan-Mediterranean business networks can be further connected to the theory of New Institutional Economics (NIE) which allows us to connect trust networks to economy, specifically through the formalization of trust into what we might call institutions of trust and the subsequent decrease of transaction costs. NIE emerged from the work of Ronald Coase (1937) and was officially named by Oliver Williamson in 1975.\(^{31}\) It redefined the place of economic institutions, those governing forces (either formal or informal) which in classical economics were thought to have no place in free market exchange such as laws, taxes, and social and cultural norms. The NIE movement, instead, understood these institutions to be either positive or negative for economic growth, social, legal, and political forces which influence the economy for better or for worse. Just as certain institutions can inhibit the economy (i.e., high taxes, complicated regulations) others can create much-needed stability for economic exchange (i.e., a criminal justice system or a reliable banking sector).\(^{32}\) One of the leading figures in the NIE movement, Douglass North, defines institutions as:

\[\ldots\] the humanly devised constraints that structure political, economic and social interaction. They consist of both informal constraints (sanctions, taboos, customs, traditions, and codes of conduct), and formal rules (constitutions, laws, property rights). \ldots institutions provide the incentive structure of an economy; as that structure evolves, it shapes the direction of economic change towards growth, stagnation, or decline.\(^{33}\)

---


Institutions, then, are social mechanisms which structure and affect, for our purposes, economic exchange. Studies of institutions are not yet ubiquitous among historians of antiquity, but are expanding rapidly.\footnote{J. K. Davies, “Ancient Economies,” in A Companion to Ancient History, ed. A. Erskine (Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2009), 436–46. On various modes of economy, J. K. Davies identifies three economic modes in antiquity: subsistence, command, and market. Subsistence is where the goal is only to maintain daily needs, command is where transfers of wealth and material is under the control of a monarch or power and, finally, market is where there is a relatively free transfer of wealth and goods; On power structures not being mutually exclusive to market economy, see V. Gabrielsen, “Profitable Partnerships: Monopolies, Traders, Kings, and Cities,” in The Economies of Hellenistic Societies, Third to First Centuries BC, ed. Z. H. Archibald, V. Gabrielsen, and J. K. Davies (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 216–50. He also criticizes Finley’s idea that ateleia had no economic benefits and was only about status (235-8); But cf. the critique of the influence of NIE on the study of antiquity in P. F. Bang, “The Ancient Economy and New Institutional Economics (Review Article),” JRS 99 (2009): 194–206. Bang developed his theory, rejecting the primitivist/modernist divide. He considers merchants to be the problematic factor in ancient trade, rejecting regional specialization, see The Roman Bazaar: A Comparative Study of Trade and Markets in a Tributary Empire (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011). For a challenge to Bang’s model, see, Temin, The Roman Market Economy, 50.}

North’s work on NIE also offers two important observations which are relevant to the study of antiquity. First, he argues that institutions emerged or evolved organically to govern exchange (he identifies religion as an institution\footnote{Further on the relationship between religion and institutions (religion as creating institutions), see Laurence R. Iannaccone, “Introduction to the Economics of Religion,” Journal of Economic Literature 36.3 (1998): 1465–95. Esp 1482-4.}). Secondly, he imagines that the problem of long distance trade and the subsequent need to resolve that principle-agent dilemma (below) was one of the drivers of ancient institutions. (He suggests that kin plays an especially important role in this trade, since they could be trusted, in theory, to act in someone’s interest overseas and to return with the merchandise.)

I would like to take these backwards, and begin with the problem of transaction costs. A transaction cost is the cost of participation in market exchange, usually incurred through
acquiring information on the market or the enforcement of contracts. But for the purposes of immigrant networks with a business component, as were the Syrians and Phoenicians on Delos and perhaps for the Judaeans in Corinth, there are two transaction costs which might give them an advantage in long-distance trade: asymmetrical information and agency costs. In 1970, George Akerlof developed his theory of the “lemon law,” drawing upon used car sales, in which the seller knows whether the car is a “lemon” or not and the buyer knows little about the car he/she is buying; in economics this creates a problem of “asymmetric information.” This puts the buyer at a disadvantage because of the things which the buyer doesn’t know about the seller and the product, a significant risk in long distance trade. Akerlof observed that asymmetric information, especially in the form of intentional dishonesty, is a drain on markets. On the other hand, agency cost, as mentioned above, is the cost of having someone else act in your interests with the challenge that their interests do not align directly with your interests. When you allow someone to act on our behalf, there is an agency cost.

If two of the transaction costs involved in long-distance exchange are agency costs and assymetrical information, is it possible to see associations as corrective for these problems? (NB My intention is not to argue that immigrant institutions intended to be corrections for these.) In

36 Giorgos Meramveliotakis and Dimitris Milonakis, “Surveying the Transaction Cost Foundations of New Institutional Economics: A Critical Inquiry,” Journal of Economic Issues 44.4 (2010): 1045–71. They challenge that transaction costs can be a driver behind the formation of economic institutions: “the transaction cost concept cannot provide a sufficient rationale for explaining either the emergence of institutions or the origins of organizations given its static, ahistorical and universalistic nature” (1046).


38 In the modern world, the problem of asymmetric information is solved by institutions which provide trust-creating mechanisms (things like recognizable chains, brand names which suggest a certain quality, and consumer protection laws). The problem of agency cost is usually addressed through attempts to align the self-interest of an individual with the organization, for example, by way of a raise or performance bonus.
the following chapters we will see how closely connected trade and communal worship were for the Phoenicians and Syrians. In these cases, I will suggest that common practices such as worshiping a shared deity or honorific giving (which nearly always involved reference to a deity) worked as economic institutions. However, it is important to note that attempts by economists to include religion as an institution have been generally incompatible with current trends in Religious Studies. On the one hand, the work in NIE helpfully suggests that shared deities and cultic practices can factor into stability in trade and business. Yet this work has been especially concerned with how religion, particularly belief, is either positive or detrimental to the economy: in the work of Robert Barro and Rachel McLeary, for example, which offers an explanation of how belief influences economic behavior. This is fundamentally flawed, based on the critiques of religion laid out in chapter one, since belief is first a protestant way of defining religion and, following, that belief is not necessarily a central tenet of other religions (especially not one which can serve cross-cultural economic comparison).

Yet once belief is set aside, whether as a protestant focus or simply because primary sources offer little to help us here, understanding shared language, culture, deities, and rituals as beneficial for economy allows a move towards an NIE interpretation of the spread of gods in antiquity and its possible relation to economy. Here NIE allows us properly to identify the way in which a shared deity, as chapter four will show with the Syrian goddess, could influence

economic channels of stability without attempting to interrogate the beliefs of ancients. Alain Bresson categorizes ancient institutions in the following way: 1. political, 2. symbolic (i.e., religion), 3. reproductive (“kinship and demography”) and 4. “the production of material goods (economics).” For our purposes, immigrant associations are especially related to symbolic and reproductive institutions. Shared language, gods, culture, and kinship were all social relationships which could naturally and positively affect economic exchange, and recognizing these things as institutions requires including them in a study of economic exchange.

Furthermore, one of the most obvious ancient institutions that could tie together economic relationships, which will be shown in the case studies below, is the set of honorific practices that associations nearly universally undertook. The old discussion about the absence of an ancient economy, drawing on the work of Moses Finley made honour the driving motivator in ancient actions rather than a desire for money or profit. But just as shared cult or ritual practices could establish trust within a group and between groups, so too honour and status operate under similar logic, as common practices which create an internal predictability for an immigrant association as well as natural external connections. Honour practices can be understood as a paradoxically reinforcing the possibility of economic exchange, even if at face value the group shows no interest in such exchange. Bresson argues that the discourses of money and apparent disdain for it upon which Finley focused were a deception to cover up the true interest in surplus and


41 But cf. P. Cartledge, “The Economy (Economies) of Ancient Greece,” in The Ancient Economy, ed. W. Scheidel and S. von Reden (New York: Routledge, 2002), 11–33. He calls 'presentism', the desire to somehow relate the past to the present, and he suggests that it is impossible to ultimately connect the economic structures of antiquity to modern economies, pointing to the interweaving of various other factors with monetary exchange, “war, civil war, politics . . ., and--centrally, not accidentally--religion” (31-2). However, Cartledges main objection here that economy was deeply embedded within political and religious structures, is answered by NIE (below).
growth, what he calls the “symbolic form of the system of reproduction.” Darel Tai Engen’s work on ancient Athens offers a similar approach to the disparity between economic interests and Athenian discourse, in which he suggests that the complicated moral code of Athens (the drive for honour) masked the economic pursuits at play in the city, especially by individuals who we can see “acting independently to fulfill their seemingly natural desire for profit for its own sake.” This is a critical point then, as we will see in the honorific practices of the Thracians, Syrians, and Phoenicians in the studies below, especially in the ritualized giving of money to associations. Honorific practices of associations do not preclude economic exchange, but can actually facilitate it and structure trust networks across which economic exchange can happen. This will become especially important in the discussion of the Syrian goddess, where the wealthy outsiders who worship at her temple seem to have a motivation other than simply devotion.

Herein lies a problem. Our evidence is primarily in the symbolic and ritualistic manifestations of honour and trust. However, for each of these groups it is a useful heuristic to posit economic activity behind their symbolic and honorific language. I will take these up in more detail in the following chapters, but they can be summarized as follows:

---


43 Darel Tai Engen, *Honor and Profit: Athenian Trade Policy and the Economy and Society of Greece, 415-307 B.C.E.* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2010), 28. Engen therefore presents a modified Polanyian thesis, imagining that the Greek economy was “socially constructed in accordance with ‘noneconomic’ values on the one hand while simultaneously allowing and even promoting profit-seeking ventures by individuals on the other,” which he calls a modified substantivist model, At Engen, *Honor and Profit*, 28–30. He presents, therefore, a modified substantivist model, especially drawing from the work of Mark Granovetter and Marshal Sahlins, which keeps the freedom of economic actors as individuals, but that these individuals, including their rational choices, are operating within a socially constructed economy.
1. The associations of Bendis created wealth for the Athenian economy through skin sales, offerings, and rentals of their space to other groups.

2. The Syrians on Delos were likely trading extensively with people from all over the Mediterranean (chapter four recreates this network from available evidence). Their symbolic practices mostly dictate the flow of money into the association for various capital projects and other expenditures. The speed at which the sanctuary evolves its membership and the rapid diversification of members suggest that shared trade lies behind rituals.

3. The Phoenicians on Delos show little evidence of newcomers to their group, yet their inclusion of several Roman benefactors (who gave generously) suggests that they were building strong relationships with Roman traders on Delos. This is shown further by their inclusion of the goddess Roma into their worship.

4. The Corinthian Christ group exists in a trans-Mediterranean trading network, brought together by more diverse bonds than a “Pauline mission” as chapter six will argue. It is useful to imagine that this network may have had a business component to it, which seems to be the most plausible explanation for a large and well-connected network of this sort. Furthermore, the Hellenistic Judaeans in the Corinthian group were actively forming bridging trust connections at the feasts of other deities; these are cross-ethnic relationships which may have had economic implications.

The shape of trade affected the fortunes and options of associations, particularly those made up of immigrants. In one example, a group of Tyrian immigrants which settled in the port of Puteoli slowly sank into financial difficulties in the mid second century CE, and in desperation they
reached out to their home-city of Tyre to request financial support. The members of the association were disappearing, probably due to the success of Ostia and the new Portus, and they could not afford to maintain the rent of 250 denarii on their building and the maintenance for the god. Furthermore, they seem to have been in competition with a group of stationarii in Rome, who were perhaps once required to pay dues to the Puteoli group but no longer wanted to. A certain Philokles, son of Diodoros, represented this Roman group to the Tyrian assembly, and requested that they not pay to support the Puteoli group, but rather allow it to dissolve, perhaps being rolled into the group in Rome. The Tyrian assembly agrees to support the Puteoli group for the time being. The inscription gives us a remarkable glimpse into how the fortunes of immigrant associations could be linked to the economy, governed by the rise and fall of a port, growth of other ports, and competition with a fellow group in the city. In addition to this, it provides us with a remarkable case of a home assembly having some form of control over immigrant groups far away.

What follows is that groups were could also be connected to the economy in often invisible ways. The concept of comparative advantage was developed by the English economist David Ricardo in a book published in 1817, On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation. In it, he explored the relationship between the value of commodities and the labour required to

44 IG XIV 830 (OGIS 595 = IGR I 421) [174 C.E.]


46 They could also be linked to military victories, such as the association of Roman sailors and merchants (emporoi and naukleroi) said that they had benefitted by the retaking of Alexandria by Ptolemy Euergetes, see ID 1526 (after 127 BCE); Théophile Homolle, “Les Romains à Délos,” BCH 8.1 (1884): 75–158.
produce them; Adam Smith had imagined this relationship as fixed. Ricardo argued that the relationship between labour and value fluctuate in different places. The value of a commodity or product rises and falls relative to the cost of production, but also relative to the cost of production elsewhere. He theorized, therefore, that international economies needed unhindered production and open markets: “wealth increases most rapidly in those countries where the disposable land is most fertile, where importation is least restricted, and where through agriculture improvements, productions can be multiplied without any increase in the proportional quantity of labour, and where consequently the progress of rent is slow.”

The underlying belief in Ricardo’s theory is that trade between two countries does not diminish the wealth and productivity of either country, but that each economy will naturally adapt to the things which it produces most efficiently, the foundation for modern free-trade. One of the most obvious examples for antiquity, and one which Peter Temin cites in his work on the Roman economy, is the comparative advantage behind the exchange of wheat and wine between Egypt and Italy, in which Egypt produces wheat much more efficiently than does Italy, but Italy produces wine more efficiently. While it is possible for Italy to produce wheat and Egypt to produce wine, it is much more efficient to trade them.

---


48 Ricardo, *On the Principles of Political Economy, and Taxation*, 147–85. This is often simply stated by a two-product comparison in a Production Possibility Frontier (PPF) curve.

49 If Country B can produce something more efficiently than Country A, and consequently (assuming trade barriers and taxation are low) people in Country A can buy that product at a reduced rate, labour and capital can be more efficiently spent producing what Country A does better and trading that product with Country B. Since countries have limited resources and labourers, they function most productively when they devote those to what they do best, see Temin, *The Roman Market Economy*, 22–24. See page 24 for his PPF model of these two commodities. It makes the most sense for these countries to trade these things, rather than for each to impose tariffs on the other and try to produce both wheat and wine; For a critique of the application of comparative advantage to antiquity, see George Grantham, “Contra Ricardo: On the Macroeconomics of Pre-Industrial Economies,” *European Review of Economic History* 3 (1999): 199–232.
The principle of comparative advantage offers an interesting way to think about the ways in which associations that traded were placed within the economy, and then economic forces that might have led to their growth and decline. Each of these four groups appear in cosmopolitan cities that sat at the nexus of Mediterranean trade, and the Phoenicians, Syrians, and Christ groups in Corinth appear in two port cities in times during which they exercised tremendous power. The networks of each of these groups, whether they are involved in trade or not, must to some extent emerge and thrive organically because it is more efficient to produce or acquire some product in another place (especially their home country), whether it be grain, perfume, or slaves. In the case of the Tyrians above, immigrants can be seen as the proverbial canary in the coal mine regarding the rise and fall of a specific trans-regional trade hub, and as such may show one of the ways in which regions were tied together economically. Not surprisingly, immigrants followed trade, congregating in major transit hubs, including cities like Dura-Europos and Palmyra, and the great harbours of the Mediterranean. These harbour communities grew to such an extent that they could destabilize the power center of the associated city; Sitta von Reden has argued that this was the case with the Piraeus and Athens. The trading foreigner or metic became a fixture in the harbours of many cities; the state’s treatment of those foreigners, says Johannes Hasebroek, was “in inverse proportion to the ability of its own citizens to run their...

50 Slaves are difficult, because they are obviously not produced as such. However, we can still consider the relative ease of acquiring slaves in one place rather than another.

51 In some cases the harbour could become the economic center of a city. This could be destabilizing, as Sitta von Reden’s work on the Piraeus has shown, especially where the strong harbour was geographically separated from the city as Piraeus is from Athens. This could, she says, challenge the ideal of the astu as the center, since the harbour was the first point of contact between the city and the rest of the world, and was also filled with foreign settlers who “weaken the concept of citizen status,” see “The Piraeus - A World Apart,” Greece & Rome 42.1 (1995): 25.
manufactures and their commerce for themselves.” The spread of the Syrian and Phoenician deities and Christ worship did not simply come because of the piety of missionary priests, but because of the economic growth and centrality of each of the hubs into which they entered.

2.4 How Trust Networks Drive Identity and Expansion

2.4.1 How Trust Drives Identity (Networks of Trust and Social Grouping)

The more important implication of flattening group relations (both social and economic) into trust-based relationships is that this can create a useful model for dealing with the expansion of group identity. Just as sociological constructions of identity such as those which are shared by immigrant associations can drive economic relationships by creating natural trading and trust networks, economic relationships (especially business connections for my purposes) can shape and change the group’s trust network both internally and externally. In chapters four and five, we will see that the group of Poseidon worshippers from Beirut (a Phoenician association) incorporated a goddess named Roma into their worship on Delos. This is not likely because of deep spiritual conviction or the convincing of an itinerant preacher but, as I will show, because of the important impact which this might have of their economic well-being. Yet in so doing Roma became part of their social identity, and a statue of her was built in one of the small chapels off of their central gathering place. In this case the shape of their economic trust network, which included trade with the Romans, shifted their cultic identity. Presumably, this expansion of their ritual life internally signals to those Romans with whom they traded the

_____________________________________

52 Hasebroek, *Trade and Politics in Ancient Greece*, 22–23. An important challenge to the connection of economy and trade is by Paul Cartledge, who imagines that the fact that trade was done by foreigners (with a good deal of non-market exchange), and often *xenoi* rather than *metoikoi*, which poses a challenge to an ancient economy model since citizens had little interest in trade, see Cartledge, “The Economy (Economies) of Ancient Greece,” 26–28. The fact that citizens were not always interested in trade, however, hardly negates the presence of a market economy, nor does the fact that status was connected with profession. Furthermore, citizens were often involved in financing trade.
Yet choosing Roma did not induce Romans to join, but rather created bridging social capital beyond the boundaries of the group; in Putnam’s words: “bridging social capital can generate broader identities and reciprocity.” Groups can organize themselves and direct their ritual practices in such a way that outsiders would notice, respect, and trust them, even if they did not join the group.

Yet other examples in the following chapters suggest that creating bridging social capital could bring outsiders into the group, as is the case with Syrians on Delos and perhaps Thracians and Judaeans in Corinth. We see this in our Athenian metic associations, some of which became a mixture of Athenian citizens and outsiders. Likewise on Delos, several of the cults had mixed membership. Perhaps the most obvious example is the Sarapeion, which attracted Italians to Egyptian worship. In Athens and Delos associations which seem to be made up of people from a common geographic origin, therefore, could attract outsiders, raising the question of whether it is ever appropriate to speak of ethnic associations. The examples of the Syrians and Judaeans below suggest that groups with a foreign deity in their midst could attract a variety of outsiders who were not from that ethnos, and unlike the earliest Athenian examples it does not seem that the Judaeans and Syrians responded to ethnic diversity through creating separate groups. This shifting of the boundaries of an immigrant group away from its common ethnos center creates a mixed group whose common identifying factor is no longer shared homeland, but shared deity.

The shared worship, focused on a sanctuary of some foreign god or goddess, created a network

---

53 Putnam, Bowling Alone, 23.
54 IG 1323 (GRA 31); IG II² 2859 (GRA I p. 158); et al. See list at index, GRA I p. 40.
55 Baslez, Recherches sur les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des religions orientales à Délos (IIe-Ier s. avant notre ère), 50–51.
of trust which facilitated economic exchange. The networks of trust of the groups under study below are not limited to social or economic relationships, nor are they limited to a certain *ethnos* or worship of a certain deity. Group identity is created in the confluence of the numerous streams of their trust network, and as identified above from both Bourdieu and Tilly’s work, trust networks can change over time; this change causes a substantive change in the group’s identity.

Into this relationship between a group’s identity self-awareness and shifts in a group’s trust network, we can place the question of newcomers entering a group or a god spreading outwards: occasionally called conversion. Conversion is already an especially Judeo-Christian word which would not be a useful heuristic tool in cross-cultural comparison in antiquity; it carries with it the universalizing undertones of monotheism and the occasional necessity for converts to one of these groups to renounce their previous gods, a practice which posed a unique challenge to the way in which identity was constructed in antiquity. One’s national gods were, after all, an extension of their *ethnos*, to deny these was not a simply theological decision, but a rejection of an essential element of the self. A considerable amount of work has been done on the spread of Christianity in relation to conversion. In contrast to conversion, the simple addition of a deity

---


into one’s pantheon was a much more common form of adopting a new god, and we must not forget that one dedication to a deity preserved in our sources does not necessarily indicate that the individual was a long-term worshipper of that deity. Also a practice of deity translation was common: to align a new god encountered in a host society with a counterpart from the home mythology and perhaps to meld their iconography. (The Phoenicians commonly did this, for example, changing Eshmun to Asclepius on Sardinia [II B.C.E.].) Therefore we are left with three possibilities for how people in antiquity navigated the worship of a new god: conversion (rejecting old gods), addition (including casual interest), or translation.

2.4.2 Framing Group Expansion as Network Bending

Yet these three possibilities give us no indication as to why religions could spread outwards beyond the bounds of their *ethnos* or why newcomers were brought in and how the new group identity was rationalized; they are merely descriptions of how different individuals and groups navigated these changes. If we focus on this *how*, converts who adopt the worship of the Jewish God or the Christian Christ appear to be relatively unique, although they were certainly not the

---


only monotheistic movements in antiquity. However, it is much more useful to shift the question to why individuals joined a group’s trust network and how the group navigated the inclusion of newcomers.

Above I introduced the idea that the expansion and evolution of trust networks, which can happen for various social and economic reasons, can change a group’s identity over time. I refer to these changes as network bending. Network bending, as I use it throughout this study, refers to the redrawing of a trust network, specifically of an immigrant association, to develop relations with someone formerly outside of the group. In Bourdieu’s thought, the social capital within groups is not given or fixed, but is rather constructed and enacted, strengthened through rituals of entry and everyday exchanges. This change at the borders of the network of trust in which social capital operates has a valuable application for understanding the spread of religion. While having rejected conversion as a useful cross-cultural label for the adoption of new gods in antiquity, the sociology of conversion can nevertheless provide some theoretical underpinning here, especially in its recognition of the importance of social networks. Such networks have been an important part of understanding the spread of religious ideas, even before the modern iteration of network theory, from the Lofland-Stark model of conversion which considered “cult affective bonds” (i.e., bonds with people who are in the group, and an extension of this as “intensive interaction”), everyday interaction with group members which were necessary conditions for

---


conversion to the Moonies. Rodney Stark’s later work, done with William Bainbridge, reflects an adapted paradigm of conversion that privileged social networks for conversion while minimizing the formerly-popular explanation of “deprivation” in conversion (the feeling of missing something in one’s life). This is especially valuable since “deprivation” makes little sense as a category in antiquity:

In the days of classical paganism, cults and sects were not regarded as especially deviant and it was not costly, in terms of social sanctions, to join one. At other times—in medieval Europe, for example—extreme costs were incurred by those detected in cult or sect activities. However, in periods when established faiths are organizationally weak and when little disapproval is directed toward novel religious movements, many people lacking any noticeably acute deprivations may well be attracted to cults and sects.

Using the example of proselytism among the Latter Day Saints, Stark and Bainbridge found that someone’s chance of converting to Mormonism increases from 0.1% if the person is unknown to the Mormon missionary to a 50% success rate if the personal being evangelized is in the social network (a friend or relative) of a Mormon. Furthermore, Stark and Bainbridge show that the

---

63 John Lofland and Rodney Stark, “Becoming a World-Saver: A Theory of Conversion to a Deviant Perspective,” *American Sociological Review* 30.6 (1965): 862–75. The Lofland-Stark conversion model has been challenged most fruitfully on the issue of a necessity of personal crisis for conversion. See, for example, David A. Snow and Cynthia L. Phillips, “The Lofland-Stark Conversion Model: A Critical Reassessment,” *Social Problems* 27.4 (1980): 430–47, who refocus the Lofland-Stark model on interpersonal connections and downplay the necessity of long-term tension on the part of the convert; in some cases the group creates the tension, rather than drawing upon previously held tensions: “the strains and problems alluded to by converts may indeed be a product of conversion itself” (435). Regardless of what prompted the conversion, it primarily occurs through social networks (see Table 2, p. 437).


Mormons intentionally facilitate *network bending* by encouraging members to form relationships with outsiders, seeing these as a means to an end of bringing someone into the church.\(^{66}\)

There are some studies of how networks can spread religion, and especially how trade networks spread Christianity.\(^{67}\) As these networks bend and evolve over time, the potential for the spread of a deity changes. The idea of *network bending* provides a useful supplement to these by articulating the actual process by which gods are spread and by challenging the simplistic understanding of conversion about being simply the adoption of new beliefs. Social and economic networks, therefore, become important sites for understanding the flow and transfers of cultural knowledge and practices, even if they exist for seemingly mundane reasons. A trade network is clearly implicated in the spread of the worship of the Syrian goddess, Atargatis (chapter four). On the other hand, modern anthropological work has highlighted the importance of religious belonging for certain trade networks, shown, for example, in research which indicates that conversion to Islam in parts of Africa gave access to trade networks and greatly


eased transaction costs.\textsuperscript{68} Therefore, \textit{network bending} moves us towards understanding the spread of gods as a type of socio-economic knowledge transfer which, in the study of immigrant groups, happens naturally as immigrants open up required new channels of exchange and as they innovate.\textsuperscript{69}

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, a networks of trust approach focused on \textit{network bending} should allow us to read beyond and through the stories which groups, especially those who worship a deity, tell about people coming to revere their deities. These comparisons will question the rhetoric which accompanies conversion or adoption of a new deity. For example, although inscriptions show honour practices, we know that most of the people on the Greek island of Delos moved there for economic reasons. Yet in one comprehensive inscription, one man tells the story of how his grandfather brought the god from Egypt.\textsuperscript{70} This man was now, he says, struggling against local opposition to build a new house for the god, and he recounts how the god miraculously defeated those opposed to him. We read similar stories in Acts about the spread of Christianity, for example, in which Luke imagines 3000 people converted in a single day.

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize


\textsuperscript{70} ID XI,4, 1299
\end{flushright}
day by the sheer conviction of the preaching of Peter (Acts 2:14–40). These accounts may be creative imaginings of group histories. But even if we accept on some level that some may have come to venerate different gods by the rhetorical skill of an itinerant preacher or witnessing the gods’ intervention on behalf of their followers, these should be underscored by understanding networks of trust behind such moments of conversion.71

Instead of simply accepting stories that groups tell about their own growth and the accommodation of outsiders, we can look to the ways in which rituals are used to create trust within the group and how trust rituals allow accommodation for former outsiders and bridge differences between ethnē. In the following chapters, we will see rituals of trust created in the Thracian parading and feasting rituals, the Syrian processions and ritual cleansing, the Phoenician worship of Roma (already discussed), and the institution of the communal meal and collective giving for Jerusalem by the Corinthian Christ group.

71 Stark and Bainbridge, “Networks of Faith.”
Chapter 3
The Thracian Bendis in Athens
3 The Thracian Bendis in Athens

This chapter begins the first of four case studies in which foreign deities entered cities in Greece, the Thracian goddess Bendis. While the entry of Bendis came at some point deep in the fifth century, the process by which she initially entered the city and the reasons for that entry are unknown. My focus in this chapter will be on the evolution of the associations which gathered to honour this goddess, the orgeōnes of Bendis. The work is limited by the fact that we have only a dozen inscriptions mentioning the goddess Bendis or her followers, which are separated by centuries and likely refer to at least two different groups. This is inadequate to allow a proper history of her worship in Athens.

My focus of this chapter will be threefold. I will not attempt to recreate the significant work that has been done on Bendis in Athens, which I identify throughout. First, I will survey some issues and scholarship of the initial entry of Bendis into Athens in the fifth century BCE. Next, I will consider the significant changes in Athenian associations in the fourth century BCE, especially those called orgeōnes, which began following the end of the Social War in 355 BCE and intensified with the so-called age of Lycurgus (336–23 BCE). This was a time of increased scrutiny on the finances of orgeōnes. I will study one of the most important inscriptions of the orgeōnes of Bendis in light of this, IG IP 1361 (330-24/3 BCE), and will argue that the cult went through significant ritual changes because of the city’s financial policies. Finally, I will identify a move towards increasingly mixed-ethnic groups in the third century BCE, which stands in contrast to an inscription by the Thracian orgeōnes which is intended to preserve the unity of their ethnos in IG IP 1283 (240/39 BCE).
The theoretical thrust of this chapter will be to identify the ways in which rituals were instrumentalized to create and enhance trust networks. I argue that the use of the main rituals of the group throughout its history—parading, feasting, and ritualized giving—were driven by the desires of the group at any given time. We see the same rituals used to create bridging trust with the city and to enhance trans-ethnic cooperation and then to create exclusivity and closed ethnic identity. We can determine, therefore, that group identity is not fixed, but is in constant flux and that rituals are used to simultaneously draw and cross boundaries for *orgeônes* of Bendis in Athens, thus following shifting group identity rather than dictating it.

### 3.1 Relations between Athens and Thrace and Bendis’ Entry

The entry of Bendis into Athens must be tied to the relationship between Athens and Thrace. However, the relationship between Athens and the regions of Thrace existed in complicated webs of political, military, and economic forces, which are not easily extricated. Thracians were well-known immigrants in classical Athens. At the time of Bendis’ entry into Athens (below), either before 429 or 411 BCE, both the community Thracians in Athens and political relations with regions in Thrace itself were numerous. It is the diplomatic relationship with parts of Thrace that provides two geopolitical and economic explanations for the entry of the cult of Bendis into Athens. The first, and most well-accepted interpretation, is that her entry facilitated positive relations with the Odrysian kingdom for the Peloponnesian War. Thucydides reports that the

---

1 D. Tsiafakis, “The Allure and Repulsion of Thracians in the Art of Classical Athens,” in *Not the Classical Ideal: Athens and the Construction of the Other in Greek Art*, ed. Beth Cohen (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 364–89. He argues that the Thracians were one of the best represented ethnic others in Greek art, but that this declined in the late fifth century.

Athenians made Nymphodora of Abdera, the brother-in-law of the Thracian king Sitacles, the Thracian proxenos in Athens and that he brought with him a group of Thracians to Athens. He also reports that Nymphodora engineered Athens’ gift of citizenship to Sitacles’ son, whose name was Sadocus, and the entry of Bendis may have been related to this. This was perhaps the defining moment for political and military relations with Thrace, but ties to Thrace were hardly limited to alliances with Sitacles. Dozens of prominent Athenian statesmen had political, military, and economic ties to Thrace, both on its own terms and as a strategic partner in protecting the Black Sea trade routes.

On the other hand, Thrace was recognized for its tremendous economic potential: its surplus of silver and timber which were at the ready for Greek colonists to exploit. Greeks developed strong trading relationships with regions of Thrace, as shown in a recently excavated emporion at Pistiros; an inscription from a nearby town reports that Greek merchants did not pay custom dues and were given rights of property. There is also perhaps a connection between Bendis and the

---


5 Her. 5.23.

Thracian tribes who lived near the Strymon River and the Athenians’ interest in founding a city (Amphipolis) in that area to exploit its resources. Ilias Arnaoutoglou has recently argued that this economic development goal, which led to two attempts to found Amphipolis, was the origin of Bendis’ worship in Athens, especially since she was popular with these scattered tribes but not with the Odrysian elite. He suggests, therefore, that the effects of the Athenian inclusion of Bendis on the alliance with Sitacles are questionable. Arnaoutoglou argues that, when the Athenians finally founded Amphipolis in 437/6 BCE, Artemis Tauropolis was the deity of the settlement, who was already venerated in two demes in Athens. By this argument, she must have had similarities with a local deity in Amphipolis, presumably Bendis, a reasonable assumption because of the close proximity of Bendis and Artemis in Athens itself. The Athenians’ reasons for settling and building connections in the region, he says, were to gain access to the various mines in the area.

The political climate in Athens itself that allowed for the entry of the goddess is ambiguous, especially since the precise date of her entry was not secure. In 429 BCE the valuables of Bendis are catalogued among the accounts of the other gods, where her skin sales are listed with city valuables.

---


8 Thucydides also records early attempts at settlement by 10,000 Athenians and allies, which he says the Thracians opposed vehemently and ultimately failed (1.100).

revenue. On the other hand, a set of regulations for her cult have been found which cannot be later than 411 BCE, the point at which a financial official called the kolakretes (κωλακρέτης), which appears in the inscription, was abolished. This inscription, highly fragmentary, also records that she had a cult statue (agalma), and a shrine, and a mention of Thracian women (Θράιττα) suggests that Thracians were involved in the cult from the beginning. In William Scott Ferguson’s extensive recreation of IG I³ 136 he discerned the traces of the word [ἱλά]σασθαι and so argued that Bendis’ entry came as a response to the plague which might require pacifying Bendis, at the instructions of the Oracle of Dodona, which he says was consulted twice: first in 431BCE. Ferguson’s reconstruction deals with a large amount of missing text and, as has been pointed out, it was not Bendis who was the healer but, rather, her consort Deloptes, and the reading of [τὲν Βενδῖν καὶ τὸν Δελόπτεν ἱλά]σασθαι . . . is not

10 IG I³ 383 (429/8 BCE).

11 Ferguson initially argued that the Thracian hieron was not the one that the citizens met in, which was, he says, probably not built until the official Bendidea by the state around 410-11. He initially imagined the entry of the unofficial Thracian cult in the 440’s, their acquisition of the right to a temple in 430s, then the state organized Bendideia with a sacrifice of a hecatomb provided by that state in 411/0 BCE, see William Scott Ferguson and Arthur Darby Nock, “The Attic Orgeones and the Cult of Heroes,” HTR 37.2 (1944): 102–3. However, after an extensive (and questionable) autopsy and reconstruction of IG I³ 136, the regulations, Ferguson changed his position to argue that there were Athenian orgeones in 429BCE, see “Orgeonika,” Hesperia Supplement 8 (1949): 142. He also argued here that Athenian orgeones were the ones in charge of the festival; Nilsson, “Bendis in Athen;” Robert Garland suggests that the cult was always public, Introducing New Gods: The Politics of Athenian Religion (Cornell University Press, 1992), 111; Christopher Planeaux suggests that Plato is correct on the details, but wrong about the date of the Bendideia, which he says was established earlier that 413 BCE. One of his primary reasons is the absence of any mention of foundation in IG I³ 136, see “The Date of Bendis’ Entry into Attica,” The Classical Journal 96.2 (2000): 165–92.

12 L. 36, this is Ferguson’s interpretation, Ferguson, “Orgeonika,” 133; Nicholas F. Jones, The Associations of Classical Athens: The Response to Democracy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 256; Xenophon, Hell. 2.4.10–11.

13 Ferguson, “Orgeonika.” For [ἱλά]σασθαι, see fr. C 2=l. 24; Planeaux, “The Date of Bendis’ Entry into Attica,” 179–82, who acknowledges that the origins may have been because of Bendis’ consort Deloptes, who was identified with Asklepius.
secure. However, it is a possibility. It is also not clear whether IG I² 136 is indeed the beginning of the public cult of Bendis, as Ferguson argues, or whether it was just a point of restructuring.

There was also a Thracian immigrant community in Athens which presumably facilitated the continuity and growth of the temple of the goddess. This certainly included a large number of metics and a high number of slaves. But perhaps there were also Thracians of high status and even citizenship in Athens. We know that Nymphodora of Abdera’s settlement in Athens was with a group of high-level Thracians. A group of Thracians also may have received some rights or even citizenship following the Battle of Phyle (404 BCE) which, although not the point of Bendis’ entry into Athens, may have increased the Thracians’ position in the newly rescued democracy. Indeed, Xenophon reports that the battle in the Piraeus took place in the road leading up to those two sanctuaries. IG II² 10 (401–0 B.C.E.) records the rewards of citizenship for those who helped defeat the thirty tyrants at the battle of Phyle:

14 Nilsson, “Bendis in Athens.”


16 This is a celebration and gifting of honours to metics, some of whom were Thracian, who joined Thrasyboulos in his attack on the Spartan garrison and subsequent expelling the thirty tyrants from Athens. Following their second victory at Piraeus, Thrasyboulos’ victory speech, with its appeal to a goddess may have even been intended to operate on two levels, as David Middleton argues, to signify Artemis to the Greeks and Bendis to the Thracian members of his battalion. David F. Middleton, “Thrasyboulos’ Thracian Support,” CQ 32.2 (1982): 298–303; Sears, Athens, Thrace, and the Shaping of Athenian Leadership, 90–94; On the question of whether metics were given citizenship after the thirty tyrants, see Geoff Bakewell, “Lysias 12 and Lysias 31: Metics and Athenian Citizenship in the Aftermath of the Thirty,” GRBS 40 (1999): 5–22.

17 Hell. 2.4.10-11.
In the list of participants on the B side of the inscription there is at least one Thracian mentioned, Bendiphanus the digger, and perhaps the name Gerus is also Thracian. We have already seen several sources relating to the granting of citizenship to Thracian residents in Athens, which begs the question of what type of Thracian immigrant population we might hope to find in ancient Athens, as well as its size in relation to other ethnic groups. Immigrants from Thrace would come at various times, such as the mid fourth century, when Thracians fleeing from Philip’s campaigns who are given refuge in Athens—an example is Dioskorides of Abdera and his family (IG II² 218 [346–5BCE]=IG II³ 302), who give a legitimate supplication (1.24–5: ἔννομα ἱκετεύειν), having been displaced when Philip of Macedon conquered.

We can imagine, therefore, that there were perhaps as many as three factors in the entry and perseverance of the goddess Bendis in Athens from the fifth century, the point when her gold and

---

18 Daphne Hereward, “New Fragments of IG II² 10,” BSA 47 (1952): 115 (Side II.1). Bendiphanes was probably in Athens to serve as a miner.

19 Middleton, “Thrasyboulos’ Thracian Support,” 300 (Side III.1.13); It is uncertain whether or not this grant of citizenship ever went forward. Aristotle reports that Thrasyboulos had tried to give citizenship to those who came to the Piraeus, of which some were clearly slaves (ὀν ἐνιοι φανερῶς ἦσαν δοῦλοι), and he continues to say that the citizenship grant was blocked. As a result, it may be that these metics were given isoteleia instead. Peter Krentz, “Foreigners against the Thirty: ‘IG’ 22 10 Again,” Phoenix 34.4 (1980): 298–306; Sitta Von Reden, “The Piraeus - A World Apart,” Greece & Rome 42.1 (1995): 30; see Deborah Kamen, Status in Classical Athens (Princeton University Press, 2013). 57 for a good modern overview of the issues, especially since there is yet no agreement as to whether these metics were actually given isoteleia or citizenship.

20 Garland, The Piraeus.

silver was collected, inventoried, and put to use by the city. First, political expedience with Sitacles, or more likely, the desire to found Amphipolis, created a foreign policy motivation for the inclusion of Bendis. Secondly, the Peloponnesian war and the response to the plague at home perhaps prompted the entry of both she and Deloptes. Finally, a contingence of Thracian immigrants across all levels of Athenian society perhaps created a base from which the worship of the goddess could come, although I agree with Zosia Archibald that the most likely candidates for inclusion of the goddess are elite Thracians who were given citizenship. While we do not know completely the number and role of Thracians in Athens, we can suggest that they were one of the more numerous ethnē. We can therefore imagine a relatively large and variegated immigrant group from Thrace who had different social statuses.

3.2 What Were Orgeōnes?

3.2.1 Overview

I have surveyed the reasons for the entry of Bendis into Athens rather quickly above. The focus of this chapter is not the reasons for her entry per se, but rather how her cult related to the city and how it evolved over time. In the first place, as introduced briefly in chapter one, the group
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22 Alec Blamire, “Athenian Finance, 454-404 B.C.,” Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens 70.1 (2001): 99–126. Lambert, “A Polis and Its Priests,” 25, the city took "direct responsibility" for the things which were owned by a god, including a list of the things owned by the other gods. The city treasury board oversaw these collections. This was presumably converted into loans which then entered circulation, since the drama of the treasurers of Athena and the other gods recorded by Demosthenes (24.136) tells the story of these treasurers who lent out the money with which they were entrusted, and then burnt the Oposthodomos in an attempt to cover their crime, see Edward Cohen, Athenian Economy and Society: A Banking Perspective (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 114.; also Jones, The Associations of Classical Athens, 256. He suggests that the collection may have been to fund war with Samos.

23 Archibald, “Thracian Cult-From Practice to Belief,” 458.

24 I would like to acknowledge gratitude to the creators of the texts and translations on www.philipharland.com, Philip Harland and John Kloppenborg, whose translations and comments on that website helped with the following chapters tremendously.
which we see gathered around the worship of Bendis calls themselves orgeōnes, by taking up this title the Bendis followers were identifying with a long-standing pattern of associative life in Athens. Participation in the polis was done through a web of numerous sub-groups, which defined the ways in which people could belong. At the highest level of these groups stood the tribe (the φυλή), within which were clans or families (the γένος) and brotherhoods or phratries (the φράτρα). After the Kleisthenes reforms of 506/7 BCE, the neighbourhood deme (δήμος) also emerged as a new way of belonging, delineated by geography. From within these major groupings came numerous subdivisions and sub-groups which created other ways of belonging, such as the banqueting fraternity (θίασος) which was a division of the phratry, the brotherhood (ἑταιρεία), and what are important for this chapter, orgeōnes. These groups in Athens must have sometimes formed organically, yet the polis would often mandate and control their processes, including membership and finances (this control seems to have decreased as the Hellenistic age wore on).

These associations allowed foreigners to forge their existence within the city. Some of the earliest studies of associations attributed their success to the demise of the classical polis in the Hellenistic age, creating a narrative of disintegration and divided loyalties, especially over the numerous new associations of foreign cults, but this has now been widely repudiated. Yet the reason for the success of associations is not clear. It may be, as Nicholas Jones suggests, that associations did come as a result of alienation which the average Athenian felt from their city,


26 Parker, Polytheism and Society at Athens, 9–36.

especially after the rise of the demes which privileged participation for certain areas rather than others. Whether this is the case or not, they created focal points for foreigners to belong in and assimilate to the city of Athens. This was especially true in their growth in the harbor, the Piraeus, which was perched on the edge of the great city and separated by a six kilometer march through the long walls to reach the asty (center). The Piraeus would pose a strange challenge to Athens, especially since it was cut off from the city for periods of time. When thriving, it allowed the easy entry of foreign goods into the city, and was composed of a variety of different residents from around the Mediterranean and it was here that most of the foreign associations formed and met around the cult of some foreign deity.

Orgeōnes were also initially subdivisions of the phratries, although it is possible that not every member belonged to the same phratry. They took the title from their orgiastic services to the gods, and it is notable that this title has no singular; it is not the title of the group, but of the individual members, the combining of which made orgeōnes. In the 1940s Ferguson classified Athenian orgeōnes into two groups. The first, Class A, were citizen associations which lived in the asty and gathered to venerate a hero, selecting a single officer to lead the orgies, a hesitator (host). The entry into these groups was on the basis of birth, membership was hereditary. Yet

28 Jones, The Associations of Classical Athens, 47, 100, 222–24.
29 Von Reden, “The Piraeus - A World Apart,” She says that there was enough distance between the asty and the harbor that it looked like a colony, even having its own bouletareion and strategon (27).
30 Aristotle, Nicomedian Ethics 8.9.46; Digest 47.22.4; Ferguson and Nock, “The Attic Orgeones and the Cult of Heroes,” 70.
32 So, the example from Isaeus in which an adopted son is enrolled into the father’s phratry, as well as his deme and group of orgeones: ποιησάμενος εἰσάγει μὲ εἰς τοὺς φράτορας παρόντων τούτων, καὶ εἰς τοὺς δημότας μὲ ἔγγραφει
Ferguson, drawing on the work of Adolf Wilhelm, identified a second type of *orgeōnes* in Athens, which he called Class B. These were *orgeōnes* which placed at their center some imported deity. Many of these groups had their sanctuaries at the Piraeus and some were not state-recognized cults, yet many also had slates of officers which borrowed from city functions.\(^{33}\) Even these groups were imitative of the *polis*. The prehistoric origins of the *orgeōnes* are difficult to assess, although Yulia Ustinova has argued that, from their inception somewhere in classical archaic Athens, they were always dedicated toward foreign gods and heroes. She claims that they arose from early immigration to Greece, in which foreigners could be enrolled in a phratry, but that *gennetai* were exclusive family groups which newcomers to Athens were not able to join. By this argument, the grouping of *orgeōnes* was meant to fill a gap of *genos* in the life of an immigrant, and that foreigners modelled them on these clans which were gathered around a common god or hero.\(^{34}\)

### 3.2.2 Two Associations of Bendis

This is the context in which we can identify *orgeōnes* of the Thracian goddess Bendis. These *orgeōnes* were presumably Class B, although they have some unusual features. In fact, the *orgeōnes* of Bendis seem an enigma of Athenian history, since they are perhaps the only non-citizen group to take this title and since there may have been two groups, a Thracian and an


Athenian (below). In the *Republic*, Plato records a description of a procession which, presumably, is the procession of Bendis. He describes two separate groups taking part in the parade: the Thracians (οἱ Θρᾷκες) and the natives (ἡ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων πομπὴ). From this, it has been common to envision two groups of orgeōnes in the Piraeus, Athenian and Thracian, down through the Hellenistic age, a hypothesis first developed by Adolf Wilhelm, with a foundation of a third group of Thracian orgeones in the asty following the end of the Macedonian occupation of the Piraeus (below). By this division, the Athenians met on the second day of the month, while the Thracians met on the eighth. He also thought that the Thracians gave oak crowns to their benefactors, while the Athenians gave olive crowns. (A group in Salamis also used olive wreaths.) It is also common to suggest that the Athenian orgeōnes had a more complex hierarchy, with officers such as priests, priestesses, hieropoioi, epimeletai, secretaries, and treasurers, while the Thracians usually had only epimelētai.

---

35 Plato, *Rep.* 327 A, B.; On the question of whether epichōrios means citizen or simply native born, see Plat. *Rep.* 6.497b: a foreign seed killed out by native growth (τὸ ἐπιχώριον); *Laws* 5.738c: no one with any sense would change native or imported cults that came in by the oracles (θυσίας τελεταίς συμμείκτους κατεστήσαντο εἴτε οὐτόθεν ἐπιχωρίους…); *Laws*, 8.846d: epichōrioi shall not engage in various crafts, used interchangeably with citizen; *Laws* 8.847a: an epichōrios is juxtaposed with a xenos; also Laws 9.879d-e; 6.764b.


37 *IG II² 1361=GRA 4 (330-324/3 BCE)* describes a ἀγορὰν δὲ καὶ ξύλλογον meeting of the hieropoioi and epimelētai on the second of the month, the unique circumstances of which I explore below; The assembly on the eighth day of the month is mentioned in *IG II² 1284.20 =GRA 22* and *IG II² 1283=GRA 23 (240/39 BCE)*.  

38 *IG IP 1284 (240/39 BCE).*

39 *IG IP 1324 (c. 190 BCE); IG IP 1283.19 (249/8 BCE)* has some type of crown given, but it is not clear exactly what this is.

40 *IG IP 1317 (272/1 BCE).*

It is useful to lay out the evidence chronologically in order to envisage the separation between two associations that Wilhelm hypothesized (I have omitted IG I² 136). The evidence can be laid out as follows:

**Figure 1: Inscriptions Mentioning Bendis Associations in Athens**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>Meeting Dates</th>
<th>Cultic Practices Mentioned</th>
<th>Crowns</th>
<th>Other Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2³ⁿ Monthly</td>
<td>sacrifices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piraeus</td>
<td>IG I²</td>
<td>330–324/3 BCE</td>
<td>1. <em>Epimelêtai</em> 2. <em>Hieropoioi</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2³ⁿ Monthly</td>
<td>sacrifices</td>
<td>Dues by 16th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thargelion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piraeus</td>
<td>IG I²</td>
<td>329/8 BCE</td>
<td>1. <em>Epimelêtai</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gold- 100dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(and image)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bendis &amp; Deloptes Relief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salamis</td>
<td>IG I²</td>
<td>272–1 BCE</td>
<td>1. <em>Epimelêtai</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Olive branch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salamis</td>
<td>IG I²</td>
<td>274–3 BCE</td>
<td>1. <em>Epimelêtai</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1317b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salamis</td>
<td>SEG 2:9</td>
<td>243/2 BCE</td>
<td>1. <em>Epimelêtai</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>sacrifices</td>
<td>Olive branch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piraeus</td>
<td>IG I²</td>
<td>241/0 BCE</td>
<td>1. <em>Secretary</em> 8³ⁿ Skirophorion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oak leaves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>crown (2x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piraeus</td>
<td>IG I²</td>
<td>240/39 BCE</td>
<td>1. <em>Epimelêtai</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procession Refreshments in Nymphaeon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piraeus</td>
<td>IG I²</td>
<td>c. 190 BCE</td>
<td>1. <em>Epimelêtai</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>processions</td>
<td>Crowning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sacrifices</td>
<td>with an olive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leaf.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Repairs to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the temple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Bendis,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deloptes,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>other gods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1 (L=Lacuna)  ΑΚ/ΚΑ κυρίαι ἀγοράι**

The strength of Wilhelm’s argument for two separate groups diminishes when we consider the nearly century in between groups, and the fact that the *hieropoioi* were likely civic, as I argue below. Certainly a date may have been changed. Nevertheless, in the next section I will argue that Plato’s use of a dual association indicates either two groups of *orgeones* or one group which
uniquely had both Thracians and Athenians in it. While the appearance of periods may be a coincidence of preservation, they suggest that there are perhaps moments where, according to Nilsson’s observation, the cult rose and fell with the need to be friendly to Thrace. It is not clear how long the Athenian worship of Bendis continued. In the first period, we have the initiation of the cult in the fifth century, then a revitalization under Lycurgus in the mid fourth century, then a new dedication of a Bendis temple in the asty and a time of revitalized cult and parade in the mid third century to early second and, finally, the spread and growth of the cult organically to Salamis in the third century, as follows

3.3 The Problem with the Piraeus

While the problem of dual associations, citizens and Thracians, has received considerable attention, I would like to focus my discussion, not on the typology of the dual cults, but rather on the ways in which interaction between citizen and non-citizen are visible to us, paying particular attention to moments of cooperation and interaction as well as changes in ritual practices. To begin with, we can return to one of the primary written witnesses to a cult of Bendis in the Piraeus in the fifth century. The role of Plato in the reconstruction of the associations is interesting and deserves further comment here. After all, Plato does not merely relate details of a Thracian and Athenian group of Bendis-worshippers as history, but rather uses them to frame the introduction to the Republic; they are symbolic in the wider structure of the book.


44 Plato, *Rep.* 327 A, B.
I went down yesterday to the Peiraeus with Ariston’s son Glaucon to offer my prayers to the goddess and also because I wanted to watch the festival and see how they would perform it, seeing that this was the first time they were holding it. I must say that I thought that the procession of the local people was quite excellent, but the one put on by the Thracian contingent seemed no less impressive . . .

Are you telling us that you don’t know,” Adeimantus added, “that there’s to be a torch race on horseback this evening in honor of the goddess?

“On horseback?” I said; that really is something new! Do you mean they pass torches on to each other as they race their horses? Or something else?

“Exactly that,” said Polemarchus, “and besides, they’re going to hold an all-night festival, which will be worth watching . . . 45

I will discuss the role of parading as a ritual of trust between Thracians and Athenians below. But scholars working on Plato have observed an interesting literary function of the Piraeus and the Bendis associations here. Eric Voegelin identifies a symbolic use of the Piraeus within the Republic, and the role of Plato’s descent (kataben) to the harbor where he is symbolically restrained and forced into dialogue by his friends.46 The Piraeus, says Voegelin, is the mirror image of Hades in the Odyssey as well as in the Epilogue of the Republic, while Artemis-Bendis serves as the chthonic goddess bringing souls to the underworld—the fact mirrored in the reflections on old age and impending death by Cephalus—a wealthy metic.47 Voegelin writes:

46 Rep. 327c.
47 Eric Voegelin, The Collected Works of Eric Voegelin: Order and History III: Plato and Aristotle, ed. Dante Germino (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2000), 16:108. He compares it to the descent into Hades at the beginning of the Odyssey (Od. 23.252–3); Also T. K. Seung, Plato Rediscovered: Human Value and Social Order (Rowman & Littlefield, 1996), 98–99; Demetra Kasimis makes a similar argument about the use of the Piraeus to foreground the Republic, The Perpetual Immigrant and the Limits of Athenian Democracy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018)., 72-3; For disgust leveled at the Thracians and Bendis in other Athenian literature, see Claudia Montepaone, “Bendis tracia ad Atene: l’integrazione del ‘nuovo’ attraverso forme dell’ideologia,” Annales littéraires de l’Université de Besançon 463.1 (1992): esp. 216-7. She looks at the difference between portrayals of Bendis between various classical authors, most notably Plato and Aristophanes, and suggests that the treatment of Bendis ranges from interest to contempt. She concludes that there is a conscious ethnic difference, “consapevole distanza etnica,” which is maintained between Bendis and Artemis; Corrine Pache’s work,
The Piraeus of the Prologue becomes the Hades of the Epilogue, and they both blend into the subterranean Cave of the parable. The empty freedom of the Piraeus, with its celebration of the chotinian divinity, becomes the empty freedom of Arete in Hades, and they both blend into the play of the shadows in the Cave.  

Voegelin furthermore argues that the equality of all humans in the Piraeus—exemplified in the Bendis festival and its mixing of *epichoroi* and *xenoi*—exemplifies the “death of Athens.” He says that the parade of the Piraeus is therefore symbolic of the corrupt society and the narrative of the decline of the *polis* from which Socrates as a philosopher can rescue his listeners. Demetra Kasimis, in her recently published monograph, makes a similar case (although she rejects the “death of the *polis*” narrative. She argues that the construction of the Piraeus, with the parade of Bendis and Cephalus and Polemarchus’ house deliberately uses liminal space to frame Athenian democracy:

Piraeus is the literal and figurative space of democracy and empire’s interrelations, which means the opening confronts us with the continuity democracy posits between blood and inclusion, foreignness and exclusion, citizenship and power . . .

She continues:

In the *Republic*, Thracian metics are observed performing the tending of sacred rites, a citizen deed, just as well as Athenians. The metics possess a political capacity, in other words, that the city disavows at the same time that it helps them actualize it. Such a

---

as mentioned in chapter two, shows that the Thracians were often portrayed as murderous tyrants in classical literature, even as the Athenians had accepted and domesticated the cult of Bendis, “Barbarian Bond: Thracian Bendis among the Athenians,” in *Between Magic and Religion: Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and Society*, ed. Sulochana Ruth Asirvatham and John Watrous (Lanham; Boulder; New York; Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001), 3–11.


revelation is, if not the clearest indication that the membership lines of Athenian democracy are constructed and unstable, then a precursor of things to come . . .

Kasimis ends by arguing that the Bendideia is indicative of a problem with the *polis* that Socrates is addressing in the dialogue. In the parade the natives and Thracians perform equally well, their division only a product of their *ethnos*. Plato, she says, is advocating a city where merit rather than “blood” are the defining factors for participation.

While Voegelin presents the parade as an allegory of the death of the purity of the *polis* which Socrates abhors, Kasimis imagines the reference to the participants’ ethnicity and their division to be the fault which the ideal city will overcome. Both are diametrically opposed interpretations for Plato’s meaning by the allegory, but both recognize that the parade is foregrounding something symbolic, and that in the ideal of the ritualized relationship between the citizens and the metics, Plato is making political commentary. It is not a coincidence that the image of the metic and citizen parade foregrounds the discussion of Socrates, the citizen of Athens, and Cephalus, the wealthy metic from the Piraeus. However, leaving the literary function aside, the account serves as Plato’s recognition of one of the most unusual relationships in the sources from classical Athens, which saw the Thracians take up some sort of special relation to the city (below) and reaching across and forming partnerships with it. All this was done while retaining an ethnic independence within their associations that, as we shall see, stretched into the Hellenistic age. It is this observation which will frame what follows, since the ritual lives of the devotees of Bendis would frame their relations to one another and to the city for both citizens and non-citizens: a phenomenon that I will call rituals of trust. Whether the relationship between

---

51 Kasimis, *The Perpetual Immigrant and the Limits of Athenian Democracy*, 78.

52 *Rep.* 328c–330d.
the two was abhorrent to Plato or whether he saw them as equals, in either way it represents an irony about his Athens and the centuries that follows, in which difference can simultaneously be accentuated and overcome.

3.4 Expanding Membership by the City’s Power

3.4.1 The Lycurgan Era and Beyond (c. 336–323 BCE) and Economic Restructuring

After a space of over half a century, we again see a Bendis association in three inscriptions from the Piraeus: IG IP 1255 (337/6 BCE); IG IP 1361 (330–324/3 BCE); and IG IP 1256 (329/8 BCE). This section will focus on 1361, which deals with a new set of rules and income for what is possibly a Bendis cult made up of Athenian citizens based on the date of meeting: the second day of the month. The inscription gives us an insight into a pivotal moment of challenge and change in the Bendis cult, and it prescribes a system of income to make the cult profitable as well as some insight into the membership structures of the cult. It is indicative of the ways in which the cult was a part of the city structure, and it proves a vision of network bending being ordained by the city; in this case the city policies and concerns about financial viability lead to new forms of worship, a new structure, and the opening of membership. The example suggests that rituals and practice in this case, although adopted from an immigrant cult, could evolve and be rewritten by the city, and I will suggest that we likely see the cooperation between groups being mandated by the inscription.

In order to understand how the city could dictate the ritual practices of a cult, it is necessary to situate the inscription within the setting of cults and raising funds in Athens. Sometime in 333 or 332 BCE, the great Lycurgus son of Lykophron proposed a motion to close an issue that was open before the boulē. A group of Kitian merchants had earlier come before the council in order
to request that their group be given the permission to found a temple, presumably in the Piraeus, to Aphrodite (Astarte), which we see in the first half of the inscription. Now, Lycurgus proposes,

. . . περὶ ὧν οἱ ἐνπόροι οἱ Κ-ιτιεῖς ἐδοξαὶ ἐννομα ἐκ- ετεύειν αἰτοῦντες τὸν δ- ἡμον χωρίου ἔννομα, ἕν ὦι ἱδρύσονται ἱερόν Ἀφρ- οδίτης, δεδόχθαι τῷ δήμ- ων δοῦναι τοῖς ἐμπόροις
tὸν Κιτέων ἔνδεικτιν χ[ω]-ρίου, ἕν ὦι ἱδρύσονται τὸ ἱερόν τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, καθ- ἀπερ καὶ οἱ Ἐγυπτιοὶ τὸ τῆς Ἰσίδου ἱερὸν ἱδρυν- ται.

Since the Kitian merchants are making a legitimate request in asking the People’s assembly for (the right to) lease of land on which they propose to establish a temple of Aphrodite—be it resolved by the People (dēmos) to grant to the Kitian merchants the lease of the land to establish the temple of Aphrodite, in the same way that the Egyptians also established the temple of Isis (Trans. GRA I 3).\(^\text{53}\)

It is not clear whether this is the first introduction of the Kitian Aphrodite to the city or not,\(^\text{54}\) but the so-called “Age of Lycurgus” is an important moment for the orgeōnes of Bendis, as we shall see, and for groups of orgeōnes more generally. Lycurgus’ career and involvement in Athenian politics led to a restructuring of foreign and domestic cults, primarily to ensure stable revenue.

The Social War of 355 BCE left Athens destitute and so a great period of rebuilding and

\(^{53}\) Notably, this inscription omits the usual language which prescribes that the proclamation should be carved on a stele and set up in a public place.

\(^{54}\) See GRA I no. 3 for comments.
Restructuring began under Euboulos which would continue with Lycurgus.\textsuperscript{55} Rhonda Simms has shown that Lycurgus’ proposal to bring in Kitians and, presumably, his matching support for Egyptian cults did not come from his interest in either of those cults \textit{per se}, but rather from a shrewd strategy to rebuild the Athenian economy especially, in this case, through bolstering the remaining trade routes to Egypt and the Levant after a significant portion of territories under Athenian influence were lost from the Macedonian conquests.\textsuperscript{56} As Simms rightly notes, we can trace this strategy in Xenophon, who describes in \textit{Ways and Means} what is needed to rejuvenate the Athenian economy after the Social War. He points to Athens’ advantages as a trading port, her ability to produce silver locally and trade it in exchange for goods, and suggests that it was necessary to increase foreign merchants in the harbor (therefore increasing tax revenue and goods), to better control the production in local mines, and to increase the amounts of metics who are given grants of \textit{enktesis}.\textsuperscript{57} It was through employing precisely these strategies during his tenure as financial overseer that Lycurgus brought the annual revenues of Athens to 1200 talents. Part of his strategy was indeed the careful collection of Piraeus dues and restructuring of the mining production at Laurion, but a significant increase in the Athenian coffers under Lycurgus came from a careful counting of sacred properties, a more concerted effort to attract wealthy

\begin{flushright}


\textsuperscript{57} At 2.4 he says that the state should let metics fight in the army and gave them houses and land rights (ἐγκεκτήσαται).
benefactors, and the leasing of sacred properties.\textsuperscript{58} During and following the decades of Lycurgus, the amount of foreign gods began to increase in Athens, suggesting that the state goal of using foreign gods to bolster city revenue was being employed and was successful.\textsuperscript{59}

3.4.2 Shared Profits: IG II\textsuperscript{2} 1361 Opening Membership and Raising Money

The need for a cult to be profitable as well is likely the driving force behind an inscription, IG II\textsuperscript{2} 1361=GRA 4 (330–324/3 BCE), which outlines the revenues and an opening of membership for the orgeōnes of Bendis. In this case, we can see the membership and fortunes of an immigrant association dictated by the realities of the polis in which they found themselves. We further can see the groundwork laid at a policy level for network bending in the inclusion of new members, although it is not clear how this looked in practice. The inscription reads:

\begin{verbatim}
1 — — — — — εναικε — — — — — — — — — — ας ὁπόσοι ἐν τη[ι] στήλ-
η[ι] ε[γ]εραμμένοι εἰσίν ἢ το[ὺς τ]ούτων ἐκγόνους ννν· ἐὰν δὲ τις θυή
tῇ θεώδι τῶν ὀργεώνων οἷς μέτεστιν τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀτελεῖς αὐτοὺς θεύειν·
[ἐ]ὰν δὲ ἰδιώτης τις θύη τῇ θεώδι διδόναι τῇ ἱερέᾳ γαλαθθηνοῦ μὲν
2 [κ]αὶ τὸ δέρμα καὶ κωλῆν διανε[κ]ῆ δεξιάν, τοῦ δὲ τελέου
[ιΙ] καὶ δέρμα καὶ
[κ]ωλῆν κατά ταύτα, βοῦς δὲ δὲ :ΙΙΙ: καὶ τὸ δέρμα: διδόναι δὲ τὰ ἱερεόσυνα τῶ-

5 [ν μὲ]ν θηλ[ε]ν τῆι ἱερέᾳ, τὼν δὲ ἀρρένων τοίς ἱερεῖ: παραβόμια δὲ μὴ
[θῆ]εν τῷ θεῷ ὃς ἐπειδ[ή] ἔστιν ἡ ὀικία καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἐπίσκευ[
[κ]α], τὸ ἐν[οίκων τῇ]ς οἰ[κίας] καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ ὅσου ἂμ πραθῆι, ἐ-
[ἰς τὴν ἐπισκευὴν τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ τῆς] οἰκίας, εἰς ἄλλο δὲ μηδὲν ἀναλίσκειν, ἐ-
[ως] ἃν τὸ ἱερὸν ἐπίσκευ[ας]θῇ κ[αὶ τῇ οἰκίᾳ], ἐὰν μὴ τι ἄλλο ψηφίσωνται τοῖς

10 ὁ θηλικοῖς τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐπισκευῇ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐπισκευῇ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ

vv ὑπολιμπάνειν δὲ χρῆσθαι.

[ἐὰ]ν δ[ὲ τις εἰπὼν καὶ] ὁ ἐπιψηφίσας καὶ μὴ μετέστω αὐτῶι τῶι κοινῶι. ἀναγράφειν δ-
\end{verbatim}


\textsuperscript{59} Von Reden, “The Piraeus - A World Apart,” Fig. 1.
As prescribed here, the sacrifices to the goddess are free for all those who have a share in the sanctuary, (1. 3: ὅς μέτεστι τοῦ ἱεροῦ), but others are charged for sacrifices: 1 1/2 obols for a suckling pig; 3 obols for an adult; 1 1/2 obols for an ox. For some reason the oikia and the
sanctuary on the property were in disrepair, perhaps an outcome of the Athenian interest elsewhere to the Battle of Chaeronea (338 BCE). Therefore, the inscription states that the proceeds from the rental of the oikia\textsuperscript{60} and the water will be put towards repairs of the house (l. 8–10) and those who have a share in the sanctuary are required to pay 2 drachmae, yearly (l. 18, 20).

3.4.3 Orgeōnes and their Income

One of the most obvious effects of IG IP 1361 is that the ritual practices are intricately connected to the cult’s ability to raise income. We can situate the inscription within a wider body of association inscriptions, especially from groups of orgeōnes, which deal with leasing and taking income from property—indicating the ways in which economic relationships of trust could have ramifications for group identity. These leases formed important lines of contact across various social boundaries, as participants were drawn into financial networks of trust. Two of the features of this inscription fit within a general move towards increasing the profitability of sanctuaries after Lycurgus, the rental of unused portions of property and the act of tracking debts. The raising of income for groups of orgeōnes, done especially through the leasing of properties, was common. Associations were also involved in credit, such as the groups of eranistai who operated like associations in pooling their money and giving out loans, in some cases gaining control of the property that was pledged against the loan.\textsuperscript{61} The rental of

\textsuperscript{60} On whether this is a physical house or farmland, see Nicholas F. Jones, “Epigraphic Evidence for Farmstead Residence in Attica,” \textit{ZPE} 133 (2000): here 80.

sanctuaries was not novel; in fact, we have records of hundreds of such rentals from the mid fourth century, usually given on a ten-year lease. But we have several examples of other groups of domestic orgeōnes renting their spaces from the time of Lycurgus and in the decades following, which were also facing financial restructuring. In one case, a group of orgeōnes of a hero rent an orchard for 20 drachmae a year for thirty years. This is a relatively small sum, although we do not know how large the orchard was. We have two more examples of orgeōnes renting space from the decades following Lycurgus. A group of orgeōnes rented a temple of Egretēs to a certain Diognetos son of Archesilas, who was from the Melite deme. In this case the lease of a temple and surrounding buildings (houses) is for ten years at a rent of 200 drachma, yearly. Diognetos was required to care for the properties, but to vacate one oikos where there is a shrine and a shed and kitchen, and two triclinia worth of couches. A temple of Hypodektes is leased for 50 drachma yearly, by a group of orgeōnes to a citizen, Diopeithēs son of Diopeithēs of the Sphetto deme, perhaps the same well-known general who fought against Philip, which


62 SEG 24:203=Schwenk, Athens 32 (333/2 BCE) Schwenk, Athens in the Age of Alexander. 175 (no. 32). It could be that these are the orgeones of the Hero Iatros, of which other inscriptions have been found nearby (IG II² 839 and 840)

63 IG IP 2499=GRA 7 [306/5 BCE], commentary in GRA I no. 7.

64 IG IP 2501 (late IV BCE) 1.2–3: [Διοπείθει Διοπέθει Σφηττίωι Σφηττίωι]: If the reconstruction is correct, someone with the same name appears in a decree honouring Dioskorides of Abdera and his family, displaced from Abdera by Philip (IG IP 218 [346–5BCE]=IG IP 302); Gauthier, “Epigraphica IV,” 111. Diopeithēs adds a rider to the end of the decree (1.22ff) giving shelter to Dioskorides from Philip, which clearly limits his metic status only until the time he could return to Abdera, and they would pay the eisphora and stand for military service. John Atkinson suggests that this is Diopeithēs’ attempt, not to pacify Philip, but to placate members of the assembly who may have been hostile to Dioskorides and his family being offered these rights, see J. E. Atkinson, “Athenian Law and the Will of
carries similar instructions that the temple shall be vacated on the 14th of Boedromion, as well as at the crowning and anointing ceremonies for the statue of the god. All of these suggest that groups of orgeōnes were commonly renting their spaces, although these inscriptions deal with the logistics governing rentals unlike our inscription which is an overview of the sanctuary finances altogether. These ritual spaces were therefore not independent of economic and commercial ramifications but were important sites of financial exchange.

Presumably the rental of sacred properties was common, and became more so at the end of the fourth century BCE. It was also common to include regulations in such rentals about how the properties were to be treated. We have an inscription from Piraeus, IG II² 2498 (321/0 BCE), which does not deal directly with a group of orgeōnes, but nevertheless gives perspective on the general regulations around renting deme-based temenē and the surrounding pasture land (ennomia):  

1 ἐπὶ Ἀρχίππου ἄρχοντος, Φρυνίωνος δημαρχοῦ[ντος]. κατὰ τάδε μισθοῦσιν Πειραιαῖς Παραλίαιν καὶ Αλμυρί-[δ]α καὶ τὸ Θησεῖον καὶ τάλλα τεμένη ἄπαντα· τοὺς μισθο- 
καὶ τὸ Θησεῖον καὶ τάλλα τεμένη ἄπαντα· τοὺς μισθο-
[σ]αμένους ὑπὲρ :Δ: δραχμῖς καθιστάναι ἀποτίμημα τῆς μ-
[σ]αμένους ὑπὲρ :Δ: δραχμῖς καθιστάναι ἀποτίμημα τῆς μ-
5 [τ]ὸσδῶσεως ἄξιοχρεων, τοὺς δὲ ἐντὸς Δ δραχμ<ῶ>ν ἐγγ<η>τὴ
τὴ-

The People in the Fourth Century BC,” *Acta Classica* 46 (2003): 40–41. Diopeithēs also appears in a list of naval commissioners (IG II² 1620 [after 349–8BCE]) who serve in opposition to Philip in Thrace. Demosthenes tries to convince the Athenians to help Diopeithēs financially in his opposition to Philip, rather than prosecuting him for illegally detaining some merchants (8.19–28). His name also appears in a catalogue of silver bowls from 331–30BCE (IG II² 1575).

65 Diopeithēs agrees to treat the temenos of Hypodetis as sacred (l. 15–6: [τ]ῶι τεμέν[ει τοῦ][Ὑποδ]έκτου ὡς 
1<φ<ῶ>ι).  

During the archonship of Archippos, when Phrynion was demarch. The people of Piraeus rent out Paralia and Halmyris and the Theseion and every other temenos on the following conditions: the renters for above 10 drachmae must provide a deposit sufficient for the rent, and those who rent for under 10 drachmae shall pledge their own property for the value of the rent; by this they rent without estimate and tax free; but if some property tax (eisphora) should be levied of the valuation of the properties the members of the deme shall pay it . . . (My Translation)

The inscription goes on to prescribe the general requirements for the care of the land and buildings, giving the renters the rights to pasture animals, but prohibiting them from making significant alterations to the properties such as carrying away wood or mud.

The effect of renting properties, levying fines, and so on, was to generate operating expenses for the groups. The other groups of orgeoñes in Athens, from Lycurgus onward, seem to be quite interested in maintaining profits from their land. The all-important prosodos, or the “proceeds,” now would become the measure by which the group survived, and these proceeds could come from several directions. In the first place, this was from the rental of land, as we have seen, which was often used to underwrite the sacrifices. On the other hand, we also have a prosodos being drawn from a lump-sum deposit into the treasury of an association, whether this was to be lent with interest and grown or simply withdrawn from we do not know. Yet there is good

---

67 See also IG IP 1196 [326–5BCE]).
68 1.9: τήν ἔδε δὲ <λύν: could be ὑλήν (τὴν ὕλην in line 11). In IG I 84 they carry the mud from the ditch τὴν ὕλην ἐκκομίσασθαι ἐκ τῆς τάφρο, perhaps the prohibition is actually from damaging the water supply.
69 See also IG IP 1289; We see a similar statement in IG IP 1325=GRA 33 (185/4 BCE), a membership list of the orgoeones of Dionysos (ὅπως ἔχουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς προσόδου θέουν ταῖς θεοῖς καὶ τὰ μῆνα ἐκαστον κατὰ τὰ πάτρια).
70 In IG IP 1325 the prosodos comes from one thousand drachma which are deposited into the treasury, contributed by the treasurer himself, a certain Dionysios son of Agathokles from Marathon, JSK Notes in GRA 33 (p. 167) that
reason to suspect this may have been lent out, since, as mentioned above, we have instances of associations of *orgeōnes* listing their debtors.\(^71\) We also have one interesting inscription which records a dispute between groups of *orgeōnes* which is settled by a judge and the *prosodos* from rentals is to pay for the sacrifices: these are the properties (τὰ κτήματα) which cannot be alienated (if the lacunae at l. 5 is ἄποδόσθαι) or given as a deposit (l. 6: ὑποθεῖναι), and cannot be leased.\(^72\) The final stream of income which leads to the *prosodos* for our inscription here is the imposing of fines, which were common in Athens.\(^73\) (We could also mention benefactors, but these are not present in our inscription.\(^74\) All these things suggest that 1361 is a careful construction of a ritual life around economic realities, in which sacrifices cost money, bad behavior is punished through the use of fines, and members are rewarded with special treatment: rituals and finances in this association are inextricably would together as common trust.

---

\(^71\) In *Agora* 1:161[GRA 14] = *LSCGSup* 20.12–14 (Athens, 300–250 BCE), the debts which are owed to a group comprised of both *orgeones* and a neighbourhood *koinon* are inscribed and set up for all to see.

\(^72\) IG IP 1289 (mid IIIBCE); Sosin suggests that l. 11–12 [μή] δὲ μισθοῦσθαι prohibits a certain type of rental which would be qualified in the lacuna at l. 12, Joshua D. Sosin, “Two Attic Endowments,” *ZPE* 138 (2002): 127. He posits a recreation of [μή] δὲ μισθοῦσθαι [εἰς τὰς θυσίας], i.e. “not to lease for any purpose other than for the sacrifices.” It is also possible that the lacuna here does not contain an absolute prohibition from leasing, since the phrasing [κατὰ τάδε μισθοῦσιν] would also fit and is a common way of stipulating rental terms, although in these cases the verb appears in indicative forms rather than the infinitive, see IG IP 2493 (Sounion–339/8 BCE) which deals with the rental of a *temenos*; IG IP 2498 (Piraeus–321/0 BCE) in the rules governing the rental of *temenē* and *ennomia* in the Piraeus (κατὰ τάδε μισθοῦσιν). See list and comments, GRA I, p. 50, note. L.2:

\(^73\) For example, when a group of *orgeones* of Aphrodite honour a member for his faithfulness they crown him with an olive wreath and a woolen fillet, as is apparently their ancestral custom. They have to crown him or they are fined 50 drachma. AM 66:228 no. 4 (GRA 39)(138–7 BCE). This is the same amount given in IG IP 1263.45=GRA 11 (300-299 BCE).

\(^74\) Arnaoutoglou, “Associations and Patronage in Ancient Athens.”
One of the strongest examples of rituals and finance going hand in hand is the role of the *hieropoioi*, the “sacrifice makers,” who appear in our inscription. They are the second set of *hieropoioi* to appear in an association of *orgeones* of Bendis; the first instance is in an inscription which honors *hieropoioi* with gold crowns of 300 drachmae each. There is not agreement over whether these *hieropoioi* in IG II² 1255 were civic or members of the private association, and while the *hieropoioi* in IG II² 1361 are more involved in the cultic oversight (leading to general agreement that they are members) they could be civic as well. We are faced with two possibilities for IG II² 1361:

1. The *hieropoioi* may be civic officials who worked with the cult, since we have an expansion of that role under the financial reforms under Lycurgus.

2. The association may be imitating the *polis* by adopting a similar financial oversight role—an evolution which is visible in the cults of the second century when a cultic role that imitates the civic springs up.

I am more persuaded by the first of these interpretations, although it impossible to be certain. We have evidence from elsewhere that the *hieropoioi* became much more involved under Lycurgus, both with discharging the costs of sacrifice but also carefully collecting the revenues from

---

77 See note 83.
sanctuaries and planning the parade.\textsuperscript{78} In this way, they were to ensure efficiency financially, and our inscription deals with exactly this topic. Furthermore, they appear beside other leadership figures: the \textit{epimelētai}. The \textit{epimelētai} are clearly charged with the financial oversight of the property rental and the upkeep.\textsuperscript{79} Their appearance in IG IP\textsuperscript{2} 1361 is the first appearance in association with a Bendis cult, and they seem responsible in the following centuries for the non-sacrificial duties including the repair and building of properties, which they often did at their own expense\textsuperscript{80}, the furnishing of necessities for paraders,\textsuperscript{81} and they lead the parade. It is the appearance of the \textit{epimelētai} and \textit{hieropoioi} together in IG IP\textsuperscript{2} 1361 that suggests that these are civic \textit{hieropoioi}. While we do have \textit{epimelētai} and \textit{hieropoioi} together in some inscriptions, cults with both are rather rare. Most associations with both come several decades after our inscription following the Sophokles’ repeal of Sounion’s law, and primarily in foreign cults.\textsuperscript{82} In fact, a much closer comparison can be made with the appearance of both \textit{epimelētai} and \textit{hieropoioi} in


\textsuperscript{79} Perhaps these were Thracians, see comments at GRA I 25 (IG IP\textsuperscript{2} 1256).

\textsuperscript{80} IG IP\textsuperscript{2} 1324 (190 BCE); The furnishing of necessities by \textit{epimelētai} is common, while \textit{hieropoioi} almost never pay for things from their own funds, see Jon D. Mikalson, \textit{New Aspects of Religion in Ancient Athens: Honors, Authorities, Esthetics, and Society} (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 100–106.

\textsuperscript{81} IG IP\textsuperscript{2} 1283 (240/39 BCE).

\textsuperscript{82} In IG IP\textsuperscript{2} 1261=GRA I 9 (302, 301/0, 300/299 BCE) a certain Stephanos was first an \textit{epimeletēs} of an association of \textit{thiasotai} who worship Adonis, but is subsequently appointed as a \textit{hieropoios} in the following two; IG IP\textsuperscript{2} 1291 (mid III BCE) \textit{eranistai} honour \textit{epimeletai} and \textit{hieropoioi}, although it is not clear how either of these relate to the association; IG IP\textsuperscript{2} 1292 (215/4 BCE) The \textit{Sarapiastai} honour a treasurer, the have \textit{epimeletai}, along with a treasurer and secretary. The \textit{hieropoioi} are mentioned separately and are threatened with a fine if they do not announce the benefactor’s name and crown him; IG IP\textsuperscript{2} 1320 (late IIIBCE), a synod of artists; τὸ κοινὸν τῶν τεχνῶν. There is a possible reconstruction of \textit{epimeletēs} in the treasury account, IG IP\textsuperscript{2} 1496.75 (331/0 BCE), but this is highly uncertain.
an inscription of the accounts of the Eleusian mysteries, which was carved within a decade of 1361. This is an interesting similarity, since this was the other cult which required an extensive parade: from Athens to the Eleusis for the mysteries. Furthermore, Lycurgus’ name appears on this account too, suggesting that the *hieropoioi* may also be linked to his financial policies of keeping close tabs on cultic money. In this case, I think Ferguson is right when he observes the tight control the city maintained over the finances of the association: that *orgeōnes* were given charge of everything except sacrifices. In any case, whether civic or private the *hieropoioi* had a role which straddled ritual and financial, ensuring the delivery of the sacrifice as well as the collection of skin sales.

### 3.4.4 Rituals of Membership

In his *Hellenica* (2.4.10–11), while relating the story of Thrasyboulos’ expulsion of the thirty tyrants, Xenophon describes the stand of the men from the Phyle deme making a stand against the Spartan attackers. It is in this story we find the first mention of a sanctuary of Bendis, which he says sits on Mounichia hill with the sanctuary of Artemis Mounichia. This is our first introduction to the space occupied by the cult of Bendis.

83 IG IP 1672 (329/8 BCE).

84 Ferguson, “Orgeonika,” 156; Stephen Lambert suggested that groups of *orgeones* of Thracians and Athenians were used as selection pools for her civic priests, since, he says, priest couldn’t be taken from a *genos* or deme, because it would exclude the Thracians. He thinks that this development came from the effect of Pericles’ citizenship laws (451/0BCE) on Athenian citizenship and priesthood, making citizenship depend on both matrilineal and patrilineal descent, see “A Polis and Its Priests,” 143–44. He claims that Pericles’ law changed all the people of Athens into one *genos*, which democratized priesthoods to some extent, since anyone could then have one. He says that priests were not simply appointed “from all Athenians,” but rather that they were appointed in three ways. 1. urban cults, from the Athenians (maybe not Piraeus); 2. “priesthoods in new foreign cults of foreign gods, appointed from groups of *orgeones*”, and 3. outside of Athens appointment may have been made by deme. Therefore the *orgeones* provided a group within the *phratry* (161). For challenges to this view, see Arnaoutoglou, “Cult Associations and Politics. Worshipping Bendis in Classical and Hellenistic Athens,” 40–41. He rightly questions whether Thracian *orgeones* could be expected to offer sacrifices for Athenians, while if they were selected from the citizen Athenian *orgeones* alone it would challenge Lambert’s idea that *orgeones* were pools for priests.
That there was one sanctuary of Bendis in the Piraeus raises some interesting questions about the role of possible sharing. Plato imagines the relationship between the Athenians and the Thracians to be emblematic of a type of mixing. It is not particularly important whether he imagines it as the demise of the *polis* or its ideal, in either case this dual relationship between metics and citizens frames his work. This raises interesting, yet ultimately unanswerable questions about the nature of the relationship between these two *ethnē*. When we see that the main theme of IG II² 1361, beyond raising finances, is the mediation of various types of cooperation between parties which are unfortunately invisible to us, it suggests that participation in the cult was broad and, with the expansion of membership, widening. In the first place, this is demonstrated in the unusual reference to “those who have a share in the sanctuary” at lines 3 and 18–9 (οἷς μέτεστιν τοῦ ἱεροῦ). This language is rare in Athens, but we have examples of this type of phrasing from elsewhere, where it occasionally refers to groups sharing spaces. It is worthwhile considering the possibility, then, that this “share in the sanctuary” refers to different groups literally sharing the space, however this cannot be firmly established since the phrase can also be used to refer to the sum of the members. Another strange feature of the inscription, which may suggest

85 Many of these are from Kos. For example, from Halasarna, ASAA 41/42 (1963/64) 183,26 (early IIBCE), ἐδο[ξ]ε ταῖς φυλαῖς οἷς μέτεστι τῶν ἱερῶν λ’ 5 πόλλωνος καὶ Ἡρακλεῖς ἐν Ἀλασάρναι, these seem to be multiple tribes outlining their sharing of the sanctuary of Apollo and Herakles; Otherwise, see IG II 1204 (late IV BCE), in which someone is commended by a deme for the proper handling of sacrifices and τὰ κοινὰ ὧν μέτεστι αὐτῶι ἐν τῷ δήμῳ; Halasarna at the sanctuary of Apollo SEG 54:743 (250 BCE): ἀ ὑποθήκα ἄκυρος ἔστω καὶ ἐνθύμιον ἔστω τῶι δανεισάντης καὶ τῶι δανείσαντι 15 μένων ὡς ἀδικεύσητον τὸν θεόν, εἰ καὶ μὴ δανειζομένων οἷς μέτεστι τὸ ἱερὸν κατὰ ψάφισμα· relating to the collection of interest; other mentions of sharing in Athens: ϛ[ξ] τάς θυσίας καὶ τὰ κοινὰ ἐν τῷ δήμῳ, IG II 1204 (end IVBCE).

86 LSCG 177; Beate Dignas, “Benefitting Benefactors: Greek Priests and Euergetism,” *L’Antiquité Classique* 75 (2006): 79–80. In another example, a dedication of a temenos, guest houses, and a slave by someone named Diomedon by a group called οἱ τὸ ἱερὸν κοινωνεύοντες, the text prescribes how this group should sacrifice, and draws revenues for banquets, sacrifices, and festivals from the *prosodos* (C. III 74, 104, 150). Much like 1361, it records the proper allotment of sacrifices, skins, and legs, as well as the appropriate use of the *temenos* and its outbuildings and the prescription for the proceeds (l. 50 *pothodos* [*prosodos*]) and that a slave: “If anyone is in need of dwelling
multiple groups sharing the space, is that the *hieropoioi* and *epimelētai* are supposed to call an assembly and convocation (l. 17: ἀγο[ρὰν δὲ κ]αὶ [ξ]ύ [λλ]ογον) to discuss those things that relate to everyone (πε[ρὶ τῶν κοιν]ῶν). These two nouns do not occur together anywhere else and, if the reconstruction is correct, the repetition of *sullogos* and *agora* here is an interesting redundancy. Finally, it is also important to observe how frequently *orgeōnes* do share spaces. In IG II² 1289 (mid IIIBCE), for example, a judgment is made between two disagreeing parties of the *orgeōnes* of an unknown goddess. The judge ordered that the property became an endowment and couldn’t be alienated. In this case, the sacrifice is to be derived from the monthly income according to ancestral customs (l. 8: κατὰ τὰ πάτρια), perhaps an indication of an immigrant cult.

Yet citizen cults of *orgeōnes* often share spaces too and perhaps pooled finances for loans. This includes shared groups of *orgeōnes* by Type A groups, such as a decree

---


88. Only the most ancient were financed by leasehold.

of the orgeōnes of Amynos, Asklepios, and Dexion; in this case they adopt language in the decree signifying multiple groups: l. 8 & l. 20: περὶ τὰ κοινὰ τῶν ὄργεων. The groups are made up of a few people of high class, and numerous lower class individuals. We also have an example of a neighbourhood koinon who meet to honour Heroines and shared their space with those who met to honour the hero Echelos. They called their partnership a koinônia (l. 5–6), and pooled their resources and their lending, setting up lists of their debts in the temple, and they also share sacrifices. All of these things point to the possibility of Thracians and Athenians sharing a space, but it is impossible to say more than this.

The other issue in IG II² 1361 is the opening of up the membership. Although the financial stipulations are in line with other financial adaptations of orgeōnes during and after the Lycurgean era, we are seeing financial needs causing membership opening. This provides a useful addendum to what I argued above, that just as the finances are closely tied to ritual practice, they are also tied to membership; likely exacerbated by falling numbers and the need to raise a parade. (The collections from the skin sales for 331/0 BCE brought in a sum of 457 drachma according to the treasury list from that year.) The opening up of the membership raises the question of who would want to join? Perhaps membership opened to Thracian metics

90 IG II² 1252+999=GRA 6 (late IV BCE); Jones, The Associations of Classical Athens, 254–56.
91 Agora 16:161=GRA 14 (early IIBCE).
92 Jones, The Associations of Classical Athens, 260–61. He suggests that the move away from hereditary membership came in the absence of a cult endowment and the need to boost revenues; Kloppenborg, GRA I 5 (p. 39) suggests that it may have been to boost the parade numbers since we do not know the cost of renting the house.
93 IG II² 1496 l.86 & l. 117; Simms, “The Cult of the Thracian Goddess Bendis in Athens,” 71; Also Mikalson, Religion in Hellenistic Athens, 11–44.
at this point.\footnote{Arnaoutoglou, \textit{Thusias Heneka Kai Sunousias}, 96–101.} Perhaps it was Athenians who wanted to take advantage of connections to Thrace to attempt to join Bendis’ cult might join. And, finally, there is always the possibility that devotion increased for no pragmatic reason, but because of some surge of attention towards the Thracian goddess independently of connection to Thrace. In whatever case, whatever prompted the opening would considerably change the make-up of the association. The membership changes, the inscription tells us simply, are to increase numbers (l.20: \(\delta \pi \omega \zeta \delta^' \\tilde{\alpha} \nu \omega [\zeta \pi \lambda] \varepsilon \sigma \tau \iota \tilde{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu \tilde{\omega} \gamma \varepsilon \omega \nu e \varsigma \tau o \iota \iota \iota \iota [\tilde{\upsilon}] \)). As the orgeōnes dwindled in numbers and the buildings fell into disrepair, it is possible that Lycurgus’ reforms sought to capitalize on those offerands who were interested in Bendis but not formally part of the group by charging a yearly membership fee of 2 drachma. For the cost of 4–6 sacrifices (depending on what they are) one could become a member. Whether the revitalization was successful or not is unknown, however, the inscriptions below which deal only with the Thracian \textit{ethnos} might suggest that the Athenian cult eventually disappeared.

In short, the inscription about the accounts of the orgeōnes of Bendis raises more questions than it answers. While the finances are in line with other groups under Lycurgus, it is not obvious what social realities underlie the Bendis group at this time, especially the ambiguous hints at mixing and expansion of membership. It seems that the growth might have been to some extent organic, since opening of membership in absence of interested adherents (whether Thracian or Athenian) would have made little difference. In any case, we see the network of the cult bending from the formerly hereditary and (perhaps) ethnic ties which undergirded the logic of membership towards bringing outsiders in and thus shifting the membership profile of the group,
yet the logic behind this \textit{network bending} is not driven by the cult itself, but by the realities of its relation to the city.

3.5 Mixed Associations and (Re)Inventing the Thracian Ethnos

3.5.1 Mixed Associations

The next time we view an association of \textit{orgeōnes} of Bendis in the evidence from Athens is from nearly a hundred years later, and there is a marked change in the group structure. Unlike the opening and cooperation of the group that is hinted at from Plato to IG II² 1361, in the next evidence we view a Thracian group which, following the creation of a new Thracian group dedicated to Bendis within the \textit{asty} (city center), outlined a series of rituals to tie the separate groups together.

There was a marked evolution in the membership profiles of associations in the century following Lycurgus towards mixed membership. In 306 BCE, the law of Sophokles was repealed which affected the ability of non-citizens to own land. This led to the emergence of many new \textit{thiasoi} of foreigners from the late fourth century, perhaps indicators of a new type of \textit{thiasos}, a fact recognized first by Franz Poland and echoed by Ferguson, both of whom suggested that the majority of these foreign \textit{thiasoi} were formed between 302–278/7 BCE.\footnote{Ferguson and Nock, “The Attic Orgeones and the Cult of Heroes,” 67–68. He cites IG II 1261, 1263, 1271, 1273, 1277, 1278); Franz Poland, \textit{Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens}, ed. Leipzig. Fürstlich Jablonowskische Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften (Leipzig: Teubner, 1909), 20. Leiwo, “Religion, or Other Reasons? Private Associations in Athens,” 104.} The freedom for foreigners to own land would come alongside of one of the most significant developments in these groups, the move to mixed membership in terms of both \textit{ethnos} and citizenship. It is important to make the distinction that this was \textit{openly} mixed membership, since it is difficult to
say for certain that membership was never mixed before.\textsuperscript{96} I suggested above that the Thracians may have been a mixture of citizens and non-citizens after the reforms of Lycurgus. This is true, for example, of the orgeōnes of Amynos, Asklepios, and Dexion. Ferguson initially suggested that these were citizen orgeōnes of high standing in the polis, yet Jones correctly points out that there was only one man of any status, the chief benefactor.\textsuperscript{97} Furthermore, we do not know whether the members of associations which appear to be citizens were all citizens, since most associations occurred in “assimilative contexts” and were therefore a point of interaction for citizens and foreigners; they “may have provided a context of participation (or imagined participation) for the institutionally excluded element of the population.”\textsuperscript{98} But members become more obviously mixed from the third–second centuries BCE as various foreigners, metics, and even slaves enter into our material evidence for cultic practices as associations more and more frequently indicate in their inscriptions that they were crowing the all-important divide of citizenship.\textsuperscript{99} Ferguson argues that this slow and feeble inclusion of non-Athenians “indicates a certain weakening, attributable to the intermingling of citizens and aliens in a religious fraternity,

\textsuperscript{96} Jones, \textit{The Associations of Classical Athens}. For Jones the associations had long been tolerating difference in their membership. The sub-groups of the phratries provided the answer to the alienation felt in both the demes and the phylae. He argues that the subgroups tolerated a higher level of difference, including non-citizens and outsiders, and women, than the registration of the phratry itself. Thus phratry sub-groups created a type of “indirect membership” (218) in the phratry.

\textsuperscript{97} IG IP 1252+99 (GRA 6)(late IV BCE) and IG IP 1253 (c. 263 BCE); Jones, \textit{The Associations of Classical Athens}, 254–56.


\textsuperscript{99} Jones, \textit{The Associations of Classical Athens}, 264; evidence of mixing in associations evidence that the Athenians were softening their prejudices to non-citizens; see for example the Sabaziastai in IG IP 1335 (102/1 BCE) which had slave members.
of deep-rooted prejudices." He attributed this to the common allowance of foreigners into Class B orgeōnes, which had a different tolerance of outsiders, and that the orgeōnes (he uses the example of those dedicated to the Mother of the Gods) probably tried to balance enough members to pay for things and perform rites with the control: “wanted to widen the appeal of their patron deity for religious reasons, and to preserve their integrity for social and practical reasons.” Ferguson’s observation that the citizens’ snobbery was diminishing is an understatement of what was happening in these mixed groups; in fact, citizens were joining associations dedicated to metic deities!

This mixed membership also extended to the leadership of some associations. There is someone named Ergasion (worker) who appears as an epimelētēs in the Mother of the Gods cult, alongside two other citizen epimelētai. IG II² 1329 (175/4 BCE) has the interesting label of dēmotikoi for a segment of the association, suggesting perhaps that this identity marker for citizens was required because non-citizens were also involved in the cult. The phrase give in this inscription that outlines that the people (presumably of the lowest social registers) should share (τοὺς δημοτικοὺς μετέχειν) in the philanthropy of the association calls to mind those sharing in the things of Bendis above.

The associations, therefore, began to provide inter-status trust networks and the process of network bending between citizens and foreigners was reframed around shared group identity and

102 IG II² 1327 (178/7 BCE).
103 Comments GRA I 187–8.
a shared deity. For the citizen members of the group, it presumably offered a site into which one could pour their money and receive admiration and adoration in return. It may also have created access to non-citizen networks of capital.\(^{104}\) Non-citizen members of these groups gained access to city participation through the citizen members. The final effect of the changing landscapes of groups that is fairly well-recognized is that there was a shift in meanings in the titles: whatever structural differences may have existed between orgeōnes, thiasoi, eranistai, and so on appear to have become much less rigid over time.\(^{105}\)

### 3.5.2 A New Temple in Athens and Ritualized Ethnic Unity

Contrary to the general atmosphere of associations mixing in the third century, the next evidence of the Thracian Bendis associations shows us the exact opposite: a group priding themselves on ethnic unity. Presumably, the worshippers of Bendis grew at a slow and steady rate into the third century. This included the founding of a new thiasos of Bendis on the nearby island of Salamis, which we see shortly after the end of Macedonian control of the island around 280 BCE.\(^{106}\) Presumably the thiasōtai here were not citizens.\(^{107}\) But it is the inscription made upon the occasion of the founding of a new (private) sanctuary of Bendis in Athens that provides some interesting observations in light of the period of expansion in memberships and networks of trust just outlined. As mentioned above, this inscription outlines ritualized cooperation as a response

---

\(^{104}\) Martii Leiwo also argues that associations became places to hide money from the fourth century, “Religion, or Other Reasons? Private Associations in Athens,” 108–10.

\(^{105}\) Ziebarth, *Das griechische Vereinswesen*, 133–36. On the development of orgeōnes over time, Eranistai was a later development, first appearing in the early IIIBCE. The koinon was another later appearance, and Z. says that synodos was the latest.

\(^{106}\) IG II² 1317 (272/1 BCE), 1317b (249/8 BCE) and SEG 2.10 = GRA 21 (243/2 BCE).

\(^{107}\) Simms, “The Cult of the Thracian Goddess Bendis in Athens,” 70.
to a moment that could challenge the unity of the *ethnos*: the founding of a new sanctuary in the *asty*. In particular, it deals with the regulations around the parade, which obviously continued as between the groups as time elapsed, as is celebrated in IG II² 1283=GRA 23 (240–39 BCE), which outlines the specific responsibilities of the Thracians in the Piraeus to receive those parading from the *asty* and to provide them sponges and water, presumably for refreshing at the end of the parade.

\[\text{θεοί.} \]
\[\text{ἐπὶ Πολυστράτου ἄρχοντος μηνὸς Ἐκατουμβαϊδόνος ὑγδό}-\]
\[\text{i ἰσταμένου ἀγοραὶ κυρίαι.} \]
\[\text{Σοσίας Ἰπποκράτου εἶπεν: νῦ ἐπειδή τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων δεδωκότος τοῖς Ὀραιξὶ μ-}\]
\[\text{όνοις τῶν ἄλλων ἔθνων τὴν ἔκτην καὶ τὴν ἱδρυσιν τοῦ ἱεροῦ κατὰ τὴν μ[α]ντείαν τὴν ἐγ} \]
\[\text{Δωδώνης καὶ τὴν πονπὴν (SIC) π-}\]
\[\text{ένποι ὑπὸ τῆς ἔστιας τῆς ἐκ τοῦ πρυτανείου καὶ νῦν ὁ θ[η]μένοι ἐν τῶι ἄστει κατασκευάσασθαι ἱερὸν ὀργεών-}\]
\[\text{τες ὡς κελεύει τοὺς Ὀραιξὶς σφόγγους καὶ λεκάνας καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ στεφάνους καὶ ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι ἄριστον}} \]
\[\text{καθάπερ καὶ ἑαυτοῖς τῶι παρασκευάζουσιν· ὅτα} \]
\[\text{δὲ ὑσιν αἱ θυσίαι γίνωνται τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὅσα προσήκει κατὰ τέκνων καὶ τοὺς τῆς πόλεως νόμους καὶ ἔχει καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς παντὶ τῶι ἔθνει τὰς τοὺς} \]
\[\text{θεοῦ· εἶναι δ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐὰν περὶ ἄλλος βούλως πρὸς θεοὺς ἐνείπειν εἰς τοὺς ὀργεώνας εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς βούλως καὶ κατὰ ταὐτὰ τοῖς παρασκευαζομένως· ὅτας ῥοπὴν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ κατὰν} \]
\[\text{τὸν τάξιν· ὅπως ἂν ὁ θεὸς ἔχει καὶ ἐὰν} \]
\[\text{καὶ ἐὰν περὶ ἄλλος βούλως πρὸς θεοὺς ἐνείπειν ἐνείπειν· ὅπως ἂν ὁ θεὸς ἔχει καὶ ἐὰν} \]
\[\text{περὶ ἄλλος βούλως πρὸς θεοὺς ἐνείπειν· ὅπως ἂν ὁ θεὸς ἔχει καὶ ἐὰν} \]
\[\text{περὶ ἄλλος βούλως πρὸς θεοὺς ἐνείπειν· ὅπως ἂν ὁ θεὸς ἔχει καὶ ἐὰν}

Gods!
During the archonship of Polystratos, eighth of Hekatombaion, at the regular assembly, Sosias son of Hippokrates made the motion: Whereas, the people of Athens granted to the Thracians, alone of all of the immigrant groups (ethnē), the right to own property (enktēsis) and to build a temple, in accordance with the oracle of Dodona and (to have) a procession from the hearth of the Prytaneion; and now those who have been chosen to build a temple in the Asty think that both (groups) should be favorably disposed to each other; so that the orgeōnes also may be seen to be obedient to the law of the city, which orders the Thracians to have their procession continue to the Piraeus, and being favorably disposed towards the orgeōnes who are in the Asty; for good fortune, the orgeōnes resolve that the procession, when those in the Asty choose to arrange the procession, the (procession) shall therefore proceed from the Prytaneion to the Piraeus in the same (procession) with those (members) from the Piraeus. (Further, it is resolved) that the supervisors in the Piraeus shall promise to supply sponges in the Nymphaion and cups and water and wreaths and a breakfast in the temple, just as they prepare for themselves. When the sacrifices occur, the priest and the priestess shall pray, in addition to the prayers that they (normally) pray, also and in the same way for the orgeōnes who are in the Asty, so that when these things take place and the entire ethnōs lives in concord, the sacrifices and other rites shall be made to the gods, in accordance both with the ancestral customs of the Thracians and the laws of the city and so that it will go well and piously for the entire ethnōs in matters concerning the gods. (And further) it shall be (that), if one (of the orgeōnes of the Asty) should wish to have access to the orgeōnes (of the Piraeus) concerning some other matter, they shall always have priority following the sacred rites, and if one of the orgeōnes of the Asty should wish to join the orgeōnes, they may do so, and receive (sacrificial meat) without paying the fee, for life, the portion.... (Trans. GRA I 23).

The decree records that those in the asty have chosen/been chosen to build a temple. The epimelētai from Piraeus receive their urban counterparts and provide food for them, and they must include the asty priests at a sacrifice so that the “ethnos” is in harmony. The text “orders” (l.11) the Thracians that they must hold this procession, therefore an indication that the parade was mandated by the city and enshrined in city laws.108

---

In light of the climate of mixed membership in groups, the accenting of the *ethnos* of the Thracians three times in the inscription is curious. It almost seems to be a reaction to the climate of mixing and increased metic acceptance. The inscription states that the Thracians *alone* of all the other *ethnē* were given rights (τοῖς Θραῖς μόνοις τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν). Scholars have generally understood here that the Thracians are either copying an earlier decree or that this is a mistake, since we clearly have an example of Egyptians and Phoenicians being given *enkēsis* in IG II² 337 (333/2 BCE).\(^{109}\) Of course, since three things are mentioned here: *enkēsis*, building a temple, and holding a procession, the permission given in the decree may refer to the unique combination of these things. I see three ways to interpret the relationship between these two decrees which avoid seeing the Thracians’ boast as a mistake, although this may well be the case. In the first place, the legal process which follows the Kitians’ request for a temple of Aphrodite in IG II² 337=GRA 3 is strange. The initial motion to consider the cult is put forward by the *boulē* alone (l. 6–7) and then is ratified by the *demos* (l. 30–1).\(^{110}\) Perhaps the rather begrudging affirmation of the *demos* in 337 is not to be seen as equal to the apparent willingness of the Athenians to extend *enkēsis* to the Thracians: (l.4–5) ἐπειδὴ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων δεδωκότος τοῖς Θραιξὶ μόνοις. On the other hand, the grant to the Thracians *alone* might be a new grant to build a temple in the *asty*, since the former grants of *enkēsis* were made in the Piraeus.\(^{111}\) Finally, the statement may actually be a reference to the group’s status as the only group comprised of foreigners who were allowed to be considered *orgeōnes*. Yet the use of the

---

109 Nilsson, “Bendis in Athen,” 65-6 (176-7). He reads the *kai nun* as referring to a shift from the earlier decree to the present.


Thracians by Plato as an exemplary of the metic group that had a unique close bond with Athenian citizens does suggest that there may have been something special about the Thracians relationship with the city, whatever the reference to the “Thracians alone” means in our inscriptions. Furthermore, no matter which of these options is correct, what must be important is that the Thracians still understood themselves to have a unique and special relationship with the city—which it seems they did.

The inscription presents to us the creation of trust rituals, and articulates the precise anxiety that the group has over this foundation of a new cultic space: division. It is fairly obvious from the inscription that we are dealing with two Thracian groups which are concerned with a perceived unity of the whole *ethnos*. The new rituals of trust set in place and old ones re-emphasized are a response to this threat. In the first place, the parade is re-instated. Since the Piraeus was lost to the Macedonians until 262 BCE, the re-establishment of the parade between the two groups was perhaps ritually symbolic of the recovered unity between Athens and Piraeus; this may have been when it was re-established. At the end of the parade, the group in Piraeus is obligated to prepare and share breakfast, as well as sponges, water, and wreaths. In essence, we are seeing a type of mandated inclusion of the two groups. Furthermore, the inscription makes a proviso to include members of the *asty* group in the sacrificing rituals of the Piraeus group, including mandated prayers (l. 20 ἐὐχεσθαι) for the other group, and they are allowed to take part alongside the *orgeōnes* (ἐπεισέναι) in the sacrifices and associated meals. It seems that membership in one constituted membership in both, since the fee-for-sacrifice is waived for


those from the asty participating (l. 31. μὴ τελοῦντας τὴν φορὰν). But it is not clear if this privilege was extended in the opposite direction to those in Piraeus who came to the asty. In any case, these rituals of trust were intended to keep the two groups in harmony, and the unity of their ethnos was visually celebrated in the procession down the long walls.

3.6 Rituals and Trust

In attempting to understand the structure and nature of the sanctuary’s trust network, we get glimpses of some of the ways that those rituals we might consider “religious” served to enhance this network; I’ll call them “rituals of trust.” These rituals of trust could be used to cross lines of difference within the group and create internal and external social capital. This is perhaps what is happening in the inscriptions discussed above, binding together “those who share the sanctuary” and the disparate groups of Thracians and citizens who Plato imagines. In each of the other case studies to follow, the rituals of trust were constructed to bring together disparate groups and to cross ethnos lines, and in chapter five I will discuss how demarcating new rituals can lead to the solidification of a new network of trust. However, the rituals we see outlined by the Bendis group in IG II² 1283 are not to cross difference, but to reinforce the unity of the ethnos.

3.6.1 Ritualization and Community

In either case, group rituals are not sui generis processes to be followed, but are used to create, expand, and solidify group trust. Catherine Bell calls this demarcation of certain human activity as ritualistic a process of ritualization, by which some behaviors are set apart as unique or sacred while others remain mundane. 114 Throughout the scope of this chapter and those that follow, the

114 I use ritualized here in the way to mean the separation of a particular activity and the ways in which it is assigned meaning, as per Catherine Bell, Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 123
primary ritualized actions that we witness are those that support community formation: such as giving, eating, and parading. They are overwhelmingly rituals of “conviviality,” embodying and creating community cohesion—a type of visible embodiment of communal ideas, the apparent unification of the duality of belief and action into group solidarity that Bell identifies:

As a strategic embodiment of schemes for power relationships—schemes that hierarchize, integrate, define, or obscure—ritualization can promote social solidarity. It can promote solidarity particularly in a fairly homogeneous group with general recognition of key symbols, where a sense of unity can be achieved through consent to the forms, and where most subgroups benefit in some way from the simultaneous integration and differentiation of the social order.”

While Bell’s words here seem to embody the type of relationship between rituals of conviviality and group solidarity, there is a further historiographical challenge here for which account must be made: that both the records and descriptions of rituals are enshrined in textual mediums. From the inscriptions of the Thracians, Syrians, and Phoenicians to the epistles of Paul, any “real” rituals behind the texts are unseen and hypothetical; but for each of these groups the textual medium itself was ritualized. Catherine Bell’s work on ritual and text is again useful here, in this case her study of the Taoist master Lu Hsiu-ching’s editing of the Ling-Pao scriptures. She asks:

How does writing a text or depicting ritual in a text act upon the social relations involved in textual and ritual activities? Ultimately, how are the media of communication creating a situation rather than simply reflecting it; how are they restructuring social interactions rather than merely expressing them?  

88–107. The giving was a specific cultural form that was marked as a recognizable cultural form of piety and euergetism (Chapter 1).

115 Bell, Ritual Theory, 216.

In fact, the historiographical challenge at hand is that the ritual lives exist only in the text, the production of inscriptions and letters has produced rituals in and of itself.

Through inscriptions, rituals become a visual medium which can both celebrate past ritual acts as ideal (such as the giving by a wealthy benefactor) or prescribe future acts (such as a yearly parade). The inscription in itself was ritualized in a variety of ways between celebrating public benefactors and honoring sanctuary donors. Elsewhere, I have used Pierre Bourdieu’s work to argue that inscriptions could convey cultural capital through real or fictive connections between ancient rulers and sanctuaries which the inscriptions purported to record. Susan Sherwin-White accurately shows how the preservation of contact between Alexander the Great and the Prienians was not simply for a record, but was equally a visual manifestation of temple prestige and authenticity. Another example of inscriptions carrying cultural capital is the stele with hieroglyphs which was displayed at the Iseum of Pompeii—a visual representation of the social capital of the sanctuary, even though most visitors (presumably) could not read it. By the same token, while a full reconstruction of the social locations of the many inscriptions discussed below is not possible, the visual reconstruction of the ancient Delian dromos suggests the prominent civic landscape in which inscriptions could be placed while the ruins of the various sanctuaries,

such as the still standing statue of Roma in the Clubhouse of the Poseidoniasts (chapter four), further suggest the type of grandeur they could occupy within a place of worship.  

Paul’s use of the letter medium provides a two-part view into the complexity of ritual control in the Corinthian Christ group—a connection to the instrumentality of ritual which I will below identify as the power dynamic implicit in ritualization. As I argue in chapter six, Paul is undertaking a struggle for control of the ritual eating of the group (arguing for exclusivity). In this sense, the Corinthian eating practices convey a threatening duality in which eating is equivalent to belonging; he equates eating sacrificial meals at other altars with idolatrous worship of other gods. Yet the embodiment of Paul’s efforts at ritual control within the letter form itself creates a new type of textual ritual. Judith Newman argues that it is a process of ritualization which Paul cleverly invokes within the texts of 2 Corinthians which ultimately leads to his letters being read as scripture. Through these “weighty and strong” letters, he creates a type of ritualized performance of his own text which in fact supercedes his own weak physical presence in the community— as they are shared or “performed” they take on another status.  

Paul’s writing of rituals (eating) is performative too and an attempt to leverage his power (which I argue in chapter six is weak). He therefore takes us one step removed from the description or record of ritual to the struggle for control of its perceived meaning and, in so doing, controlling the community formation, just as his letters themselves become used to create communal formation.

3.6.2 Instrumental Rituals and Power

The power struggle which we see in Paul’s understanding of ritual eating and its connection to purity can be usefully understood further through Catherine Bell’s work on ritualization and power. She highlights the tendency of those who study ritual to see it as either limited to the symbolic, apragmatic sphere of human behavior, or else as universal—wound up in all action. The former provides a useful bridge into a discussion of rituals and power; the dichotomy between instrumental and symbolic (ritual), she says, is a dangerous extension of others like logical/illogical or rational/irrational.\textsuperscript{122} The danger in thinking that ritual is somehow neutral territory or merely symbolic, as opposed to the active non-ritual realm, hides the power dynamics at play in ritualization:

The ultimate purpose of ritualization is neither the immediate goals avowed by the community or the officiant nor the more abstract functions of social solidarity and conflict resolution: it is nothing other than the production of ritualized agents, persons who have an instinctive knowledge of these schemes embedded in their bodies, in their sense of reality.\textsuperscript{123}

For Bell, the exercise of power in the process of ritualization thus creates a way beyond seeing rituals as strictly symbolic or neutral. In fact, ritualization is a process of power struggle and delineation—it requires action upon ritualized agents. We see this struggle blatantly in Paul’s writing by which the epistle becomes the thing which tries to dictate the meaning of ritual acts. But the inscriptions too are an excersize of power in ritualization, as they are created and imposed on participants in both the city and its ritual worship. It is the dominant force of those

\textsuperscript{122} Bell, \textit{Ritual Theory}, 70–2.

\textsuperscript{123} Bell, \textit{Ritual Theory}, 221.
who control these mediums that acts upon ritual participants (or at least tries to), and thus signifies the instrumentality of ritual.

My contention is that, for each of the groups surveyed in this study, rituals can be used instrumentally for building and maintaining networks of trust. Instrumentality is, of course, a common trope used elsewhere in the understanding of ethnicity in the discussion of primordialism vs. instrumentalism.\textsuperscript{124} In the case of the ethnē discussed in the chapters here, an ethnos is primarily enacted through ritualization—carrying with it this intrinsic power struggle. The rituals remain instrumental in that they serve the purposes of the person or group who has power over them. In the community growth at the sanctuary of Atargatis in chapter five, we shall see that the Syrianness of the cult is not constructed in reference to ethnos, but rather in the ritualization of certain parts of Syrian identity: the Aramaic language, deities, and temple practices are incorporated into a Greek temple and context. In the same way above, Thracianness, that is to say, the unity of the Thracian ethnos, is not a product of blood or birth but of unique ritual practice. This is in part (re?)constructed through an appeal to a distinct cultic legitimacy, in which they maintain the narrative of their unique and divinely appointed status demarcates them from the other ethnē (IG II² 1283.4–5), a ritualized superiority that is rooted in antiquity, special connections to the city, and the fact that they were chosen by the oracle. It does not particularly matter if this boast is correct or not; it serves to delineate their ritual life as exceptional. The ethnos is furthermore held together in ritual unity by the commonly prescribed rituals of parading and meals (l. 23, 24), and its cultic legitimacy comes from a combination of Thracian ancestral laws and the civic decrees (l. 25–6). In this case the rituals are employed in a

\textsuperscript{124} Hall, \textit{Ethnic Identity}, ch. 2.
protectionist sense, to wall off outsiders and create a perception of difference between the Thracians and other civic cults. In other words, the ritualization is instrumentalized as an act of power through definition, and the same rituals end up justifying either ethnic mixing or isolation depending on the will of the ones wielding them. For Plato, the ritual parade is indicative of the type of mixing happening in the polis, for good or bad, the Thracians and the Athenians parading together symbolizes change to the underlying ideal of the city; in the ritual parade, people from different ethnē come together. The early parade, of which we also have mention in IG I³ 136.3–4 (διαμοιραὶ τὰς πόλεις πόλεως) was thus synonymous with mixing. The ritual crosses a line of ethnōs, although participation in the parade as groups of ethnē nevertheless suggests that they remain important. In IG II² 1283, by comparison, the ritual parade was used to promote group exclusivity and ethnōs unity. The parade was instrumentalized for different functions based on the needs of the group.

3.6.3 Ritual Innovation and Network Bending

Beyond being instrumentalized in discourses of power, recognizing ritualization as a process requires, by definition, seeing ritual as creative. This is the second implication for rituals and the trust networks that I introduced in the last chapter. If we understand human groups as networks of trust, in which initial constituting logic (shared ethnōs, culture, trade, etc.) can shift through a process of network bending, the process of ritualization can be seen as instrumental in adapting to this change and creating new group identities. As Bell says:

Since practice is situational and strategic, people engage in ritualization as a way of dealing with some specific circumstances. Ritual is never simply or solely a matter of routine, habit, or ‘the dead weight of tradition’.²

² Bell, Ritual Theory, 92.
Ritual is therefore reactionary and creative, and understanding the process of ritualization is a vital part of understanding liminal identity. Neither rituals nor identity are fixed in place and/or time, and as I will show in what follows, ritual innovation can often come as a response to changes of identity to unite disparate groups together. In antiquity, rituals were commonly used to cross difference through innovation. Angelos Chaniótis opens his discussion of rituals with the story of Prusias, who wore freedmen’s clothes and welcomed the Roman conquerors into Nikomedia and prostrated himself at the door of the senate when he arrived in Rome; this, Chaniotis says, enacted a Greek and Roman ritual. In this way, rituals may cross cultures and allow liminal identities to be performed in relation to more than one identity. In his study of ancient Athens, Ilias Arnaoutoglou argues that ritual eating was a place in which citizens and metics could cooperate and imitate the life of the city: “civil attitudes were apprehended and confirmed, and the social order was expressed,” in particular, this is seen in the koïna which mixed citizens and non-citizens: a type of initiation of non-citizens into civic life. Finally,

126 Newman, Before the Bible, 81–3, usefully theorizes how rituals can be used to cross kinship divides and form broader social groupings.


while I have rejected the category of *religion* for antiquity, modern anthropologists recognize the ways in which religious communities use ritual to create identities which are trans-ethnic: an extension of the type of cross-difference phenomenon we are seeing in antiquity.\textsuperscript{129} Rituals, therefore, are ritualized through innovative processes and as a response to real needs and changes in a community and, as I will show through what follows, ultimately create new ways to define community.

### 3.6.4 Rituals and Bendis

Returning to the use of rituals in the Bendis cult, they are both instrumental and innovative. The “division of the sacrificial meat” (κρεανομία) was one of the main ritual requirements that IG I² 1255 (336/7) mentions along with the parade.\textsuperscript{130} In 1361, the portion of the sacrifice is given to the priest. Presumably, to this point the eating rituals of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis were straightforward and in line with the common civic distributions of meat and eating of sacrifices. But in IG I² 1283, a new ritual of participation is prescribed to promote the ethnic unity of the cult—the extension of cups of water, wreaths, and breakfast to those paraders who had come from Athens. They are to do this as a symbol of inclusion “just as they prepare for themselves” (l. 19–20: καθάπερ [καὶ ἑαυτοῖς παρασκευάζουσιν]). These rituals of participation extend to the reception of the meat from the sacrifice without fee (καὶ λαμβάνειν καὶ μὴ τελοῦντας τὴν

---


\textsuperscript{130} IG I² 1255.5–6=GRA I 2 (337/6 BC)-translation from GRA.
φοράν), and are therefore used to create the type of unity of the *ethnos* which is imagined throughout the decree.

Too, the rituals around giving and celebration of donors are instrumentalized for several reasons, including to cross *ethnos* divides and to attract new donors. While I have focused in this chapter on the two inscriptions which give us some sense of the ritual and financial life of the *orgeōnes*, several of those inscriptions that I have not discussed at length provide another side of the cults’ interactions with one another and the city; these deal with ritual giving and celebration of donors (IG IP 1255 [336/7]; IG IP 1256 [329/8 BCE]; IG IP 1284 [241/0 BCE]; IG IP 1324 [190 BCE]). In the first of these, IG IP 1255, a group of citizen sacrifice makers are crowned with gold crowns with 300 drachmae (likely each).\(^{131}\) For these citizens, who I argued above are not members of the *orgeōnes* but rather civic overseers of the sacrifices, the giving of crowns works as bridging trust beyond the association, even if the relationship between the *orgeōnes* and the city was mandated. In another inscription from several years later, we have the honoring of two *epimelētai* who each receive 100 drachmae gold crowns. Their names bear no patronyms; at first glance they are metics or slaves: Euphyēs (*Εὐφύης*) and Dexios (*Δέξιος*).\(^{132}\) The gift of a 100 drachma gold crown is significant, especially considering a similar gift to citizen *hieropoioi* a decade before.\(^{133}\) Some attempt has been made to see them as citizens based on the quantity of

\(^{131}\) IG IP 1255=GRA I 2: see discussion ll.8–9.

\(^{132}\) IG IP 1256 (329/8 BCE) (GRA 5).

\(^{133}\) IG IP 1255 (337/6 BCE) (GRA 2). Here 300 drachma is given for crowns, either individually or separately.
the gift, but in the context of the evolving membership of the sanctuary this is not clear. In both of these inscriptions a reward is given in exchange for service to the association.

The situation in IG II² 1284 seems slightly different. This inscription, containing two separate motions, does include honors given to a secretary (l. γραμματεὺς), who they crown with an oak wreath in celebration. However, the top of the inscription contains the end of an honorific decree for a benefactor, Olympos son of Olympiodoros. As far as we can tell, his gift and a crown of an oak leaf do not come from any service to the cult, but rather from his financial largess. Moreover, the inscription records that its purpose in honoring him was to encourage other benefactors (l. 10: ἄν εὐεργετῆσο[ν]). The inscription is, therefore, concerned with attracting other benefactors and more income to the cult; and giving is further ritualized in line with the common discourse of generosity. Finally, we have a similar situation in IG II² 1324, in which an epimelētēs is honored for both his service to the cult, but also for his largess in giving from his own funds (l.8).

Each of these examples suggests that rituals are put in the service of whatever aim the cult desires—they are instrumental. Where cooperation between the Thracians and Athenians is at stake, the parade serves to unite them across difference. When two Thracian associations of Bendis desire to create a perceived unity of their ethnos, the parade serves to enhance this. Eating can likewise express cooperation and bridging trust between difference or to city officials, or it can create isolation. Giving can be used to express cooperation and appreciation to the officials overseeing the cult, or it can be ritualized as an act of benefaction and generosity. These examples show that the creation and enacting of rituals proceed from a desire to create trust and

---

134 For discussion, see GRA I p 42.
not the other way around. The rituals follow, rather than lead, the shape of the desired trust network. From this standpoint, these things we might consider religious: sacrificing, parading, ritual eating, and offerings, are not established as cultic absolutes, but are put to the service of the cults’ ends; this will hold true for the other associations studied below.

3.7 Conclusions

The Bendis worship in Athens fluctuated upon an invisible line that crossed citizen and metic, Thracian and Athenian. While little is certain about how these two related to one another, the ritual structure of Bendis worship in Athens was shaped by its relationship to the state and its need to be profitable. Secondly, we can see the rituals of trust in the sanctuary were not fixed entities but were rather employed tactfully towards the ends that the Bendis worshippers envisaged: both exclusivity and inclusivity. We have seen that rituals of trust are therefore highly flexible; they can form bridging trust beyond a group, bringing together disparate factions, and can simultaneously be used to delineate and protect a ceremonial ethnic unity. Yet the point where the Bendis cult formed intricate bonds between the city is not simply a matter of ethnic mixing or cultural accommodation, but this mixing between Thracians and Athenians is interwoven with the Athenian economy; the association held an important place within the broad financial trust network and the wealth generation of the city of Athens: a mutual financial relationship which also shaped the ritual practices of the cult towards profitability. This is an effective demonstration of why it is important to think about groups as “trust networks” rather than fixed upon ethnicity, trade, and so on. The question of ethnic composition of the group is not effectively disjointed from its economic position. In stating the situation through the use of the problematic terms: religion and economy are not discernable from one another; both are
wound up in relationships of trust. Network bending can therefore occur for a variety of reasons and, as the following chapters show, can also happen in multiple directions.
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4 Syrian and Phoenician Associations on Delos: Membership

The following two chapters are concerned with two case studies from independent Delos, the case of the Syrian goddess, Atargatis, and her growth on that island and the Phoenician groups who worship Poseidon, Heracles, and several other deities. These two studies are better attested than the Bendis associations, although the evidence is still imperfect.

The approach in this chapter and the next is first to map out the network of membership in both sanctuaries, and then to discuss changes in ritual practice and identity. This chapter presents a membership profile for two very different groups. The worshippers at the Syrian sanctuary are visible to us through dozens of inscriptions, the data is rich and informative, and we can see an association that became ethnically and geographically diverse over time. It would attract outsiders, including a large number of Romans. The evidence shows the process of network bending clearly, and the next chapter will take up how this network expansion was governed by rituals of trust. Less is known about the Phoenician associations on Delos, which are organized by their city of origin (Beirut and Tyre). Unlike the Syrian sanctuary, they kept their core groups over time and remained ethnically monolithic, building relationships with only two key Roman benefactors. Both associations’ membership profiles were shaped by divergent interaction with power. This chapter will demonstrate that the Syrian sanctuary, after being taken over by Athens, shows an increasingly ethnically and geographically diverse membership. The Phoenician group, on which I will focus, retained their Beirutian core through their time on Delos, but the next chapter will show that their ritual practices evolved to facilitate trust with the Romans.

Both of these groups undoubtedly owe their success on Delos to trade. The growth and success of the Syrian sanctuary, I will suggest, came from the Romans’ desire to trade with Hierapolis...
and beyond. The city of Hierapolis, that important Syrian center for the worship of Atargatis was not only a cultic center, but was also the last major city in Syria before crossing the Euphrates into Parthia. It is my hypothesis that powerful Hieropolitan families that we see on Delos held the monopoly on the ability to traverse the crumbling ruins of the Seleukid Empire to meet those traders bringing goods out of Parthia. The Beirutians were also traders who acquired great wealth. While we cannot reconstruct their trade network as we can for the Syrians, we can see in the following chapter the creation of institutions to facilitate long distance trade. Finally, it is important to note that this chapter will focus primarily on membership, while the next chapter contains a more full discussion of cultic practice.

4.1 Levantine Groups and the Marzēaḥ

The groups of Syrians and Phoenicians on Delos coming from the Levant had a great deal in common. Writing their histories is complicated, however, perhaps most of all by the common strategies that both groups employed for acculturation, translating the names of their deities as well as their personal names into a Greek context and thus often obscuring their origins.1 Yet as we shall see in the following chapter, they retained kernels of home practices which would define their ritual identities. Perhaps the greatest difference between the two in terms of strategies of acculturation were that Phoenicians faced acculturation with a variety of local gods for every occasion, which become rather obscure at times, while the Syrians put more and more focus on Atargatis, the Pure Aphrodite.2

---

1 Baslez, Rechérches sur les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des religions orientales à Délos (IIe-Ier s. avant notre ère), 71–73. She argues that Phoenicians evolved more than did Syrians (96–7); Also Harland, Dynamics of Identity in the World of the Early Christians: Associations, Judaeans, and Cultural Minorities, 120.

2 Baslez, Rechérches sur les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des religions orientales à Délos (IIe-Ier s. avant notre ère), 91–92.
In order to understand the ritual lives of both the Syrian and Phoenician settlers on Delos, it is important to recognize the common frame of associative practice across the Middle East that they drew from: the *marzēaḥ* (מרזח). While I will say little about the *marzēaḥ* in this chapter, it will become important in the next. These associations were undoubtedly similar to various forms of Graeco-Roman associations, especially the *thiasos* or *collegia*, since the *marzēaḥ* often included ritual banqueting. On the one hand, the *marzēaḥ* was a collective meeting for people drawn together by various ties like family and business and, as I have noted in chapter one, the lines of identity for them as for Graeco-Roman associations were varied. Yet they were also the center of cultic and ritual life for a group of immigrants, Baslez hypothesizes that “Oriental” cults were almost universally spread by immigrants from the east through the communal form of the *marzēaḥ*.3 We occasionally see the word *marzēaḥ* in translation with Greek words for associations; in a bilingual Greek and Phoenician inscription from the Piraeus, *koinon* and *marzēaḥ* are used interchangeably.4 Similarly, at Hierapolis we have evidence that the *marzēaḥ* was identified with the phratry, since an inscription honors an “archiphrator,”5 while at Dura-Europos the *marzēaḥ* was comparable to the *symposia*.6 Drinking, dining, and sacrificing were

---


4 The Phoenician text honours Shemʿabaʿal son of Magan (*KAI* 60).


the communal activities. In one marzēaḥ inscription published by Javier Teixidor, we have descriptions of practices in the marzēaḥ of Baalshamen (Baal), including a priest leading the sacrifice, assembling in the banquet hall, instructions about furnishing the food and how much each member would receive, as well as instructions on how to examine the members to check for ritual purity. The marzēaḥ was a uniquely portable institution that was the communal form of choice for Levantine immigrants abroad, outside of the Levant they appear predominantly in ports and other trade hubs, much like the Roman collegia around the Mediterranean.

4.2 Historical Background: Phoenician and Syrian deities

4.2.1 Atargatis at Home and Abroad

The goddess herself was known by several different names:

Her name is a compound of Ashtarte (Astarte) and ‘Anat and is spelled in various ways: in Aramaic ‘trʿh, ‘trʿt, ‘trʿth, ‘trʿt, ‘trʿt, and in Greek Αταργάτις, Ατάργατις, Ατταγάθη, Αταράτη, Αταράτη; the apocope form gave Derketo . . . The original name of the goddess is certainly ‘th, whereas the element ‘tr, derived from ‘št, has the meaning of

---


We have records of her devotees from around the Near East, including at Palmyra, Edessa, and Dura-Europos, and she is famously portrayed as a woman with a fish tail and often flanked by lions. But her home was Hierapolis, where her temple stood, and her image, along with her consort Hadad, is common to coins in the region. The most detailed account of her temple at Hierapolis is that attributed to Lucian of Samosata. In it, Lucian refers to Atargatis as Derceto,


13 Henri Seyrig, “Monnaies Hellénistiques,” Revue Numismatique 6.13 (1971): 11–16. Strabo calls the city Bambys, where he says they worship the Syrian goddess, Atargatis; Bambys, he says (wrongly) is also called Edessa or Hierapolis (Geo. 16.1.27: ύπέρκειται δε τοι ποταμοι τσχινους τετταρας διέχουσα η Βαμβύκη, ην και Έδεσσαν και Τεράν πόλιν καλως, ών η τιμώς την Συρίαν θεον την Αταργατην).

and reports various local legends about the founding of the temple.\textsuperscript{15} The ritual practices at the temple in Hierapolis were varied, but of note are the climbers who ascend to the top of giant phallai twice a year and spends days on top.\textsuperscript{16} Perhaps the other most famous ritual practice was self-castration which was performed by a group called the Galli, who were taken in fits of orgiastic passion, cutting off their testicles with ritual swords and flinging them into random houses. The inhabitants of those houses would then throw out women’s clothing for them to wear.\textsuperscript{17} The most important element of Lucian’s account for our purposes, which impacts the ritual practices on Delos, is the function of oracles in the worship of the goddess. Lucian presents the oracle at Hierapolis as genuinely speaking, unlike the other oracles of the Greeks (he says), this one moves around in his seat when he has an oracle, and the priests lift him. If they don’t, he sweats. When they suggest something, he either chases them or backs up, thus telling them his will.\textsuperscript{18}

On Delos she quickly took the epithet of the Pure Goddess (agnē thea) from the earliest point of the sanctuary and slowly also became identified with Aphrodite; outsiders occasionally called her this.\textsuperscript{19} Atargatis often appeared with her consort, Hadad, at Delos as elsewhere where he is

\textsuperscript{15} See also Pliny, \textit{Nat.} 5.14 (Ceto [Derceto]); \textit{Syr. D.} 12–3 one legend is that the temple of the Syrian goddess was built by Deukalion over the very spot where the earth opened to receive the flood waters. He claims to have seen the chasm, but that it was very small by his time; Lucian also cites another local legend that Derceto’s daughter, Semiramis, came from Babylon and built the temple (14), and yet another that Attes built the shrine for the goddess Rhea (15). He says that he is most convinced that Dionysus built it for Hera, especially since a pair of giant pillars/phalla have an inscription by Dionysus on them (16). The legend of Deukalion and the flood chasm is identical to a Rabbinic legend about the temple in Jerusalem, apparently build over the same chasm, see Benko, \textit{The Virgin Goddess}, 53–59.

\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Syr. D.} 16, 28.

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Syr. D.} 50–1 (also 26–7).

\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Syr. D.} 37

\textsuperscript{19} ID 2273; ID 2531.
sometimes identified with Zeus. However, Atargatis eclipsed him in the Greek and Roman world, often appearing alone at Delos, as elsewhere. Asklepius also appears alongside these two in several inscriptions from Delos, although it is not clear with which deity he is aligned; he may represent a third unknown deity who appears alongside Atargatis and Hadad in some Hierapolitain sources. She entered the Roman world slowly as the Syrian goddess.

4.2.2 Phoenician Deities and Acculturation

We find Phoenician cults all around Greece, and they bear evidence of the highly syncretic approach the Phoenicians took to their interaction with Hellenistic culture. The figure of

---

20 For a background to Hadad, see J.C. Greenfield, “Hadad,” in Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible, ed. Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter Willem van der Horst (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1999), 377–82. Zeus Hadad, ID 2262 (108/7 BCE); Also ID 2256+SEG 31:731; also Amédée Hauvette-Besnault, “Fouilles de Délos: Temple des dieux étrangers,” BCH 61 (1882): 488, who says that Hadad and Atargitis maintained their core features, even as rituals evolved, the descriptions given by Macrobius and Lucien remain accurate.

21 ID 2261 (113/2 BCE); ID 2248 (112/1 BCE); ID 2264 (c. 98 BCE); There is some discussion in Will, Le sanctuaire de la déesse Syrienne, 145–46. We do have evidence of some sort of triad along with Hadad and Atargatis at Hierapolis. Lucian reports that there is a third image standing between Atargatis and Hadad in the temple there, which he says that the Assyrians call a “sign”: καλέστε δὲ σημήνον και ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν Λασούμων. Henri Seyrig argues that this is Lucian’s incorporation of the goddess Simi into Greek, shown as a third figure on coins from Syria along with Atargatis and Hadad, who had the power to take sea water and put it into a well, see “Antiquités syriennes,” 242–43. Yet there is no clear reason to consider the male Asklepios aligning with the female Simi, and Seyrig rightly concludes that the presence of Asklepios on Delos is a “phénomène local” and is not the transplanted Hieropolitan triad (246–7). Baslez further argues that there is no obvious significance to the occurrence of the three deities together on Delos, Recherches sur les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des religions orientales à Délos (IIe-Ier s. avant notre ère), 76. See too the interesting inscription from Antioch, IGLSyr 2 376 (224 CE), which honors Σειμίῳ καὶ Συμβετύλῳ καὶ Λέοντι θεοῖς πατρῴοις, obviously imagery taken from the worship of Atargatis (see below on the lions), Dussaud, “Notes de mythologie syrienne IV. — Symboles et simulacres de la déesse parèdre,” 256–57.

22 EKM 1.Beroia 51 (240 CE); EKM 1. Beroia 52 (262CE); Soldiers also bring a sanctuary of the Syrian goddess to Phistyon, north of Lake Trichonida, in Aitolia; the records show manumission dedications made to the goddess (IG IX,1 1:95, 96, 98,et al. [III BCE-IIICCE].); for earlier appearances of the Syrian goddess in Egypt, see OGIS 733; P. Enteux. 13=Chr. Wilck. 101; SB 4 7351: Priestess of the Syrian Gods (inc. Atargatis); Syrian gods in Athens, see IG II² 1337 (96/7 BCE).

23 For example, on the changing of Eshmun to Asclepius on Sardinia (II B.C.E.); see Teixidor, “The Phoenician Inscriptions of the Cesnola Collection.” See Moatti, “Translation, Migration and Communication in the Roman Empire: Three Aspects of Movement in History.” She also calls translation a “strategy” of empire (110–2); see also,
Astarte is especially popular, who is often identified with Aphrodite. This is the case of the Phoenician group in Athens dedicated to the Cypriot Aphrodite.\textsuperscript{24} On Delos, the iconography of Astarte was aligned with the Aphrodite—sometimes a localized form such as the “Palestinian Aphrodite.”\textsuperscript{25} The most memorable example from the house of the Poseidoniasts is a remarkable statue of Aphrodite, is a nude of her in the bath fending off Pan with her sandal as Eros flutters overhead. This is no doubt an adaptation of some home legend perhaps with some preservation; Marie Baslez suggests that the images of Astarte in the house of the Poseidoniasts bear a specifically “indigenous” feel.\textsuperscript{26}

There are two mainly visible groups of Phoenicians on Delos: Tyrians and Beirutians. Both were private, and were never taken over by Athens like the sanctuary of Atargatis. I will focus primarily on the Beirutians throughout these chapters and mention the Tyrians only where necessary. The Poseidoniasts of Beirut (c. 150–90 BCE) are visible in the group’s dedications which refer to a \textit{koinon} of Berytian merchants, sailors, and \textit{egdochei}s (Βηρυτίων ἐμπόρων καὶ ναυκλήρων καὶ ἐγδοχέων), and from the archaeological remains of their clubhouse.\textsuperscript{27} The

\textsuperscript{24} IG IP 337; she is also identified with Isis on Delos, see ID 2132; 2101.

\textsuperscript{25} ID 1719 (c. 100 BCE).

\textsuperscript{26} Baslez, \textit{Rechérches sur les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des religions orientales à Délos (Ile-Ier s. avant notre ère)}, 79. See here and 89–90 for her discussion of the Phoenician syncretism, in which she suggests that core elements of the worship of the home cults were preserved, as with Judaeans, especially relating to the faithfulness of the god, as in the Aphrodite Peistche in ID 2396. For mentions of Astarte elsewhere, a temple in the Syron village: P.Flor. I 104= SB 22 15539; PSI V 531; UPZ I 5; 6; 7; 8; 13.

\textsuperscript{27} The inscriptions related to this group are published in a group from ID 1520 and 1772-1782.
Tyrians were a synod that we know of from just a single inscription from 153/2 BCE. The inscription records the story of a certain Patron, son of Dorotheos, who went to Athens to request permission to build a sanctuary of Herakles. Both cults could only meet because of grants of enktesis given from Athens, and imitated Athenian democratic institutions. I have maintained the title “Phoenicians,” for them, although like the Syrians they were fully Hellenized. The next chapter will discuss how these identities are constructed and performed, but Corrine Bonnet shows that “Phoenician” is actually a Greek invention, and both Tyre and Beirut cannot be taken as parts of the same entity—each had differing approaches to their own identity and the Greek conquerors.

Some Phoenician deities were so syncretized to a Greek environment that we cannot be sure of the originals, however, the Beirutian worship of Poseidon is probably the equivalent of the Phoenician Baal, who is adapted to his new environment, and given specifically marine power. The Tyrian immigrants, meanwhile, associated Melqart to Herakles, adapting the fertility god to have the power over nature, suitable to sailing. The Beirutians chose to align Greek gods with their home deities, worshipping the Greek gods in name but retaining a sense that Poseidon and Aphrodite were their own “ancestral gods” (theoi patrioi): who at least included Baal and Astarte.

28 ID 1519.


31 Ibid., 81–82; Herodotus also reports that Phoenicians had built a temple to Herakles on Thasos (Hist. 2.44).
and perhaps a third deity before Roma was introduced. The *theoi patrioi* ancestral gods are referred to half a dozen times in the inscriptions although it is notable that in every single one of these in which a dedicator is mentioned they could be from the same family. The Beirutians also took part in the worship of Apollo, including the yearly festivities in honour of the god, which seems to be an extension of their ongoing relationship with the city of Athens.

4.3 Network Bending: Syrians

4.3.1 The Three Phases of the Cult

The names witnessed in the Sanctuary of Atargatis create a remarkably complex portrait of the membership there. Of up to 217 people mentioned in the sanctuary, 55 are from Greece (25.34%), 2 are Phoenicians (.92%), 23 bear Roman names (of which 3 are from Athens)(10.6%), 45 are of Syrian origin (20.73%) (all with Greek names), and 93 are unknown origin (42.85%)—all Greek names too. We can discern three main stages of the worship of the Syrian Atargatis on Delos. At the first glimpse of the cult it is made up of a priest and his wife shortly before Delos became independent (166 BCE), a close-knit familial thiasos. In the second iteration of the cult, it has expanded to include worshippers from different cities in Syria, making up a *marzēah*. Finally, the cult was taken over by an Athenian-run priesthood, and it moved to a

---


33 ID 1774; 1776; 1778 (Mnaseos son of Dionysios); 1783 (Dionysios son of Zenon, grandson of Theodoros); 1789 (Zonen son of Dionysios); Baslez sees the presence of the ancestral gods and adaptation of Mārzeaḥ practices as evidence that the Phoenicians were eager to integrate, Baslez, “Les communautés d’orientaux dans la cité grecque: Formes de sociabilité et modèles associatifs,” 148.

34 ID 1777; ID 1520 (153/152, or 149/148 BCE); Dedications to Athens, see for example ID 1780 (); ID 1777 (110/9 BCE): For dating arguments see Wayne Moore, “Berytos-Laodicea Revisited,” *Schweizer Münzblätter* 42 (1992): 194.
membership of broad origins.\textsuperscript{35} I will explore these three phases below. The next section will profile all of the worshippers mentioned in the inscriptions, which I compiled into a database of an estimated 217 names (some may be duplicates, for example, if someone named Dionysios appears twice without a patronym it may be the same person). I suggest that we can make the following observations about trends of “membership” in the Syrian sanctuary (I will discuss my use of this word below):

1. Syrians and their families were involved in the life of the sanctuary of the Syrian goddess for its entirety, some for generations.

2. In the mid second century BCE, the sanctuary hosted a marzēah made up of mixed Syrians.

3. The temple attracted the attention of high-level business men and both freedmen and freeborn Romans, some of which were connected to senatorial families. These were instrumental in its success and growth down to the Mithraditic period.

4.3.2 Phase 1: Syrians and their Families

The first glimpse we get of the Syrian Goddess, Atargatis, on Delos comes around the time that independent Delos was founded in 166 BCE—probably slightly before.\textsuperscript{36} Here we see a Syrian,

\textsuperscript{35} Baslez, “Les associations à Delos: depuis les débuts de l’indépendance (fin du IVe siècle) à la période de la colonie athénienne (milieu du IIe siècle),” 229.

\textsuperscript{36} Dating based on the presence of “Delian Drachma” in the inscription.
Nikon the son of Apollonios along with his wife Onesako the daughter of Xenon, found a thiasos of the Syrian goddess from the land which was given for the Serapeion.\(^{37}\)

The priest Nikôn son of Apollonios and his wife the priestess, Onēsakō daughter of Xenōn (dedicated) the existing house, from which was set aside for the sanctuary (naos) of Sarapis, they furnished it fully on behalf of them and their children, an offering of thanksgiving to the Pure Goddess; and they have equally contributed for the restoration of the house; the association (koinon) of the members of the thiasos of the Syrian goddess which the goddess gathered on the 20th day. … 50 Delian drachmas.

Siebert understood this inscription to mean that Syrian groups gave money for the construction of the Sarapeion, and that the building near Sarapeion C was therefore dedicated for the sanctuary of Atargatis. The phrase εξ οὗ ἀφειρέθη εἰς can also be read as describing the limits of the property, as in “up to the Sarapeion.” They describe their organization as a koinon of thiasitai (common spelling of thiasōtai on Delos). This early instance is one of the few times we get any hint of the organization of the meeting in the roughly 80 dedications from the temple of the Syrian Goddess, and there is only one other use of the word thiasōtai in referring to the


\(^{38}\) The name is incredibly rare. There is a contemporary with the same name on Delos (LGPN I 79909), a daughter of Hermokrates. There is also Onesako who dedicates, κατὰ πρόσταγμα, to Artemis in 153/2 BCE (ID 2374 [LGPN I 80512]).
sanctuary—here too the equivalent of a group of worshippers in a *marzēaḥ*. The other inscription which references *thiasōtai*, unfortunately, cannot be dated, although it is before the Athenian priesthood; it records the goddess calling the association to convene, which is a unique feature of the association in draws from *marzēaḥ* practice.

1 Διονύσιος Ἑρμογένου Α[λεξανδρεὺς] ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ τὸ ἅγιον καὶ τὴν λιβανωτίδα, ἄ[πο τὸν? θι]-ασιτῶν Ἁγνῆς Ἐκου ὅς συνήγαγε.39

Dionysios son of Hermogenos from Alexandria, on behalf of himself, dedicated the statue and the censer and the frankincense, from the thiasōtai of the Pure Goddess which the goddess gathered.

Unfortunately we are able to say little about this Alexandrian.40 However, there are some similar family names from Alexandria in the nearby Sarapeion C.41 The connection to the Sarapeion may suggest that this was made during the close cooperation between the Sarapeion and the sanctuary of Atargatis; this cooperation is shown by the numerous Isiac names among the *therapeutai* of the goddess. Baslez suggests that these are evidence that the first generation of Syrian immigrants frequented the Sarapeion when they did not a sanctuary of their own.42 Like the Egyptian cults, the Syrian group led by Nikon and Onesako initially identified themselves by the day on which they were convened (τὸ κοινὸν τῶν θαισίτων [ν] τῶν Σύρων τῶν εἰκαδιστῶν . .

39 ID 2225 (n.d.); *BCH* 16, 1892, 161 n.22
41 ID 2137 (158/7 BCE). In 158/7 BCE, a Hermogenes son of Poseidon of Alexandria inscribes a prayer (euchê) to Sarapis and Isis.
150

., which is similar to an inscription of the Isiac group from the late third or early second century BCE (τὸ κοινὸν τῶν δεκαόιστῶν καὶ δεκαόιστριῶν). Even more interesting is the fact that this koinon for Egyptian gods honour the gods who share the temple (θεοὶς συννάοις), a common Egyptian phrase which mostly appears for Egyptians on Delos. Perhaps the Pure Goddess was one of these at this point.

4.3.3 Phase 2: What does Hierapolis have to do with Delos?

Phase two of the cult of the Syrian goddess appears to have been structured as a marzēah, which saw a majority of Syrians in the cult until the priesthood was taken over by the Athenians circa 112 BCE. Before turning directly to the membership structure and categories of the sanctuary, I would like to propose a hypothesis for the rapid growth of the Syrian cult on Delos at the end of the second century, and its attraction of outsiders, which I detail below. As it turns out, the timing of the growth of the temple of Atargatis on Delos runs parallel to seismic shifts at Hierapolis and the nature of its role as a trade center. Strabo describes it as follows:

Between the Tigris and the Euphrates flows a river, called Basileios (or the Royal river), and about Anthemusia another called the Aborrhas. The road for merchants going from

---

43 The dedication is to Serapis, Isis, and Anoubis (and those gods who shared the temple), IG XI,4 1227 (end III, beg II BCE); on the Sarapiastai, we perhaps have records of them convening under Menneas early IIBCE (IG XI,4 1307.7 : οὗ̣ς συνήγαγεν?)}; ID 1403.II.1.64; ID 1412.57 (166–576 BCE); ID 1417.88–9 (155/4 BCE); In the same vein there are not a lot of mentions of thiasōtai on Delos (but see IG XI,4 1228 [beg. II BCE], the same group from 1227) (On the sunagogetes see Baslez, “Entre traditions nationales et intégration: les associations sémitiques du monde grec,” 228.). The synod of Tyrian merchants have a thiasos attached (ID 1519 [153/2 BCE]) as do the Poseidonians of Beirut (ID 1520 [after 153/2 BCE]); Otherwise see ID 1798: [τὸ κοινὸν τῶν θ]ιασιτῶν Φα|ῖδρον τὸν ἑαυτῶν θ[ι]|ατήν. Therefore, both thiasōtai and their conveners are notably absent in most dedications to the Syrian goddess. This may simply be an accident of preservation, since we certainly expect that some of the marzēah practices from home carried over to Delos. Another possibility, however, especially with the Alexandrian convener, the only Alexandrian ever referred to among the followers of Atargatis, that this meeting occurred early in the IIBCE, when the groups were sharing space and perhaps also meetings.

44 At the settlement of Magdola in Egypt, we find a temple shared by Zeus Soter and the Syrian Goddess (OGIS 733 [186–2/1 BCE]); P.Giss 1.99, on gods sharing the same hearth: [τοῖς συνεστίοις θεοῖς] Examples of non-Egyptian gods in Egyptian sanctuaries as theoi sunnaoi are Apollo (ID 2119), Zeus Ourios (ID 2128 [105–3BCE]).
Syria to Seleuceia and Babylon lies through the country of the (Arabian) Scenitæ, [now called Malii, and through the desert belonging to their territory. The Euphrates is crossed in the latitude of Anthemusia, a place in Mesopotamia. Above the river, at the distance of four schœni, is Bambyce, which is called by the names of Edessa and Hierapolis, where the Syrian goddess Atargatis is worshipped. After crossing the river, the road lies through a desert country on the borders of Babylonia to Scenæ, a considerable city, situated on the banks of a canal. From the passage across the river to Scenæ is a journey of five and twenty days. There are (on the road) owners of camels, who keep resting-places, which are well supplied with water from cisterns, or transported from a distance. Strabo 16.1.27

It is interesting here that Strabo does not understand Hierapolis as a cultic center, but rather as a point on the trade route; Atargatis is an afterthought. This may be entirely appropriate for a geographer, but it also indicates that the city’s trade profile is vital to its place in the world and, consequently, to the place of the Syrian goddess. Those trade routes to the east underwent tremendous change in the second and first centuries BCE. First came the Seleukid loss of all of the territory east of the Euphrates to Mithridates I and the growth and consolidation of the Parthian Empire. Hierapolis, after this point, was no longer in the middle of an empire but at the new frontier with Parthia. Second, Syria itself was weakened and the Seleucid Empire declined under Antiochus VII Sidetes, who died in 129 BCE. His brother Demetrius II Nikator, who had lived in exile in Parthia for a time, returned and was briefly propped up by Kleopatra II, herself in exile, but he was killed in 126 BCE. Therefore, dynastic shifts and upheaval were common in second-century Syria. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the Silk Road opened in the latter half of the second century BCE, shortly after Parthia had expanded to the Euphrates. This was not one road, but many different trade routes which now enabled trade with China; Chinese silk

began filtering into the Roman market at this point. In addition to being a frontier city, Hierapolis was now the gateway to the Silk Road as well as the existing Persian Royal Road, as a number of eastern routes converged here. Hierapolis itself was not directly on the Euphrates. As we saw above, Strabo says that the distance of the river crossing to Hierapolis is 4 schoinoi, in this case the distance is just over thirty kilometers. There, to the north-west of Hierapolis, the great river narrows and a crossing was established at a small town called Seleukia (on the Euphrates)/Zeugma. Yet Hierapolis was, for all intents and purposes, the true border city, as described by the geography Ptolemy. It would enjoy several decades as the premier connection to the east, since the southern route through Palmyra would only become possible with the Palmyrene advances of protection for caravans later in the first century BCE. In the century from 150-50 BCE, Hierapolis therefore enjoyed a remarkable advantage, and traders from the city travelled east and west, presumably spreading the goddess as they went since we have other sanctuaries of her dotting this trade route including the later sanctuaries of Dura-Europos,

---


Edessa, and Palmyra. The rise of Palmyra would shift the routes, and much of the trade swung north through Commagene after the battle of Carrhae in 53 BCE soured relations between the Romans (and their client, Syria) and Parthians; around this time Seleukia/Zeugma was given to Commagene by Pompey. Yet it can be no coincidence that the temple of Atargatis on Delos flourished at exactly the point where its mother city did as well. Since the Red Sea trade route would not open to the east until the time of Augustus, this overland route was the primary way for silk to flow from China, and Roman glassware to return. I therefore approach the human connections at the sanctuary as networks of trust which spanned a lucrative trade route, which I think explains (as we shall see) the interest of some elites in the sanctuary.

If this hypothesis is correct, the role of Syrian traders on Delos would be access to the eastern trade routes, especially through their ability to speak local languages and knowing the Levantine terrain. In general, they would fit within a wider structure of long-distance Delian trade, in


51 Brijder, *Nemrud Dagi*, 174. On the southern route: “it split at Babylon and ran via Dura Europus, Palmyra and Apamea to the ports on the Mediterranean coast, Seleucia Pieria or Laodicea. The choice between the Tigris or the Euphrates routes depended on the political circumstances.”

52 Brijder, *Nemrud Dagi*, 172–73. He thinks that the enormous wealth of Antiochus I of Commagene came from taxing silk that flowed through after trade was forced north.

53 Manfred G. Raschke, “New Studies in Roman Commerce with the East,” *ANRW*, 2 2.9 (1978): 604–1361. see esp. 643 and note. 777 on Palmyra; John D. Grainger, *The Cities of Seleukid, Syria* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 181–82. “for Syrians there were two better routes (than Palmyra) . . . they were both in the north, beginning at Antioch and crossing the Euphrates at Zeugma.” The northern route, from Antioch to Zeugma through Hierapolis, was entirely through Greek cities. The southern route was through Arados, Emesa, and Palmyra were through cities which “had gained their power and importance in defiance of the Seleukid kings” (182). Also John D. Grainger,
which the settlers on the island represented access to both mundane and luxury things that came through the desert via hubs like Palmyra and Dura-Europos,\textsuperscript{54} or across the red sea, accelerated once the Greeks had learned to exploit the trade winds from Arabia to India,\textsuperscript{55} or through the Black Sea via the islands to Athens.\textsuperscript{56} When the Romans made Delos a free port in 166 BCE the island quickly grew into the center of pan-Mediterranean trade, especially for slaves, although other commodities were traded through the island as well.\textsuperscript{57}

4.3.4 Phase 2: Marzēah Membership

The second stage of the cult was primarily made up of Hierapolitains, of which I will identify several families below. Using 112/1 BCE as a cutoff date approximating the Athenian priesthood, the second phase of the cult—drawn from names that can be dated with certainty—would have: three from Antioch; four names from Athens; one from Damascus; sixteen from Hierapolis; one from Laodikea; and one Roman whose name is lost (See Appendix B). Two names from Athens are successive father and son priests after 118/7 BCE who come from the

\textit{Hellenistic Phoenicia} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), chap. 5. and Rauh, \textit{The Sacred Bonds of Commerce}, 53. R. argues that these traders received advances on purchases from Romans on Delos to serve as buyers in the east.


\textsuperscript{56} Ioan Glodariu, \textit{Dacian Trade with the Hellenistic and Roman World}, trans. Nubar Hampartumian, BARSupSer 8 (Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 1976).

\textsuperscript{57} Strabo \textit{Geo.} 10. 5. 4. & 14. 5. 2; see also on Delian trade Cicero \textit{Verr.} 5. 154; Pausanias 3. 23. 3–6; Pliny \textit{HN} 34. 4; Philip Kay, \textit{Rome’s Economic Revolution}, Oxford Studies on the Roman Economy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 200–207. As to the question of whether slaves were the primary commodity at Delos and the use of the agora of the Italians as a slave market, see Monika Trümper, \textit{Die “Agora des Italiens” in Delos: Abbildungen und Tafeln} (Rahden: Marie Leidorf, 2008), 407–10. who argues that it was really a quiet space.
deme Myrrhinoutta; the second connection to this deme after the name Onesako. The third name, Kleopatrides, I argue below, may have been from a Hierapolitain family. Finally, I have included Theodotos son of Diodoros of the deme Sounion here, although his name is listed the year before the certainty date for the Athenian takeover of the priesthood. He may belong in the third and final phase of the cult. As Appendix B shows, Hierapolitains make up the majority of Phase 2 members, and there are no Hierapolitains that can be placed with certainty within phase three. Moreover three of the Athenians mentioned were priests, who came after 118/7 BCE: Menodoros son of Menodoros, Alexandros son of Menodoros, and Theodotos son of Diodoros (See Appendix B). Therefore, in reality, Phase 2 of the cult was almost primarily Syrian families. I say families, because they can be plausibly reconstructed across generations in the cult. I have attempted to construct several family trees in what follows.

4.3.4.1 The Descendants of Apollonios of Hierapolis

One of the largest families of which we have record on Delos is the descendants of a Hierapolitain patriarch named Apollonios. Although a common name, it is also the patronym of the first priest of the cult, so it could be that he is a descendant of Nikon. In the first inscription of this family, carved in 128/7 BCE, the dedicant names his rather large household, including his children and his brothers. I believe that the following people can be linked to this family:

**Figure 2: Descendants of Apollonios of Hierapolis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Name AS</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

58 ID 2261 (113/2 BCE): For line numbers for each individual, see the appendicis.
59 ID 2226.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Αχαιός Άπωλλενίου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Ευβούλας (Αχαιού)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Eubola</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Άπωλλενίου (Αχαιού)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Διονυσίας (Αχαιού)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Dionysia</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Πρωτογενείας (Αχαιού)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Protageneia</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Αχαιού (Αχαιού)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Λυσιμάχου (Αχαιού)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lysimachos</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Άπωλλενίου (Απολλώνιου)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Hierapolis 128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Λυσιμάχου (Απολλώνιου)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lysimachos</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Hierapolis 128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Πρωτογενού (Απολλώνιου)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Protogenos</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Hierapolis 128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2258</td>
<td>Μαρίωνος τοῦ Άχαιού</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2258</td>
<td>Κλεοστράτιδης Άπωλλενίου Αθηναίος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kleopatrides</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Athens Pre 118/7, 108/7, 106/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.ii.18, 2250, ID 2251, ID 2252</td>
<td>Κλεοστράτι Άπωλλενίου Αθηναίος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kleopatrides</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Athens Pre 118/7, 108/7, 106/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.ii.21</td>
<td>Άπωλλενίου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Athens 108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.ii.22</td>
<td>Αμμία Κλεοστράτη δαυ</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ammía</td>
<td>Kleostratides</td>
<td>Athens 108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.ii.23</td>
<td>Διογένης Κλεοστράτη δαυ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Diogenes</td>
<td>Kleostratides</td>
<td>Athens 108/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We might construct a family tree as follows:

**Figure 3: Family Tree of Apollonios of Hierapolis**
I have posited one uncertain familial link here, for which I think there may be justification. This is Kleostratides, the son of Apollonios who appears several times as a remarkably generous benefactor in the sanctuary of Atargatis. He is listed along with his family members early on the list of *therapeutai* who dedicated to the construction of the enormous theater. He was a lavish donor throughout his career and his family followed in his footsteps; his children and even their *paidagogos* gave to Atargatis. Yet the reasons we might assign him to this family come

---

60 LGPN II 38806.

61 ID 2628.ii.18; see also Mikalson, *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*, 234.

62 In his career, Kleostratides son of Apollonios of Athens gave significant gifts to the sanctuary of the Syrian goddess, including two Eros statues (τοὺς Ἐρωτας) and pillars (τὰς παραστάδας) (ID 2251/2 [108/7 BCE]) as well as a throne of the Syrian goddess (ID 2250 [107/6 BCE]). Moreover, he was an early member, or at least benefactor, of Hadad and Atargatis sometime before 118/7 BCE, when there was still a priest from Hierapolis. Here, he dedicates 20 drachma to his family members, his mother and his brother, Apollonios, while his son and daughter follow with their own dedications of 4 drachma each (I.22–3). He appears again below (ID 2628.iii.36) where he gives 50
from his first gift, given before 118/7 BCE. At this point, the priest was still from Hierapolis, and he knows the deities as Hadad and Atargatis, the names used almost exclusively by those of Syrian origin, rather than the “Syrian Goddess” or “Pure Aphrodite”:

Kleostratides son of Apollonios, an Athenian, (dedicated) a thanksgiving on behalf of himself, to Hadad and Atargatis . . . During the priesthood of Marionos son of Achaios of Hierapolis.

Of course, Kleostratides identifies himself as an Athenian, although he is apparently not a member of a deme, perhaps suggesting that he is a first or second generation settler in Athens. If reconstruction is right, Kleostratides in fact made the dedication when his own cousin, Marion, was the priest. He is the only Athenian who makes a dedication in the cult before the Athenian priests, but he was also in the cult long-term. He (or perhaps his grandson) would later dedicate a throne in the sanctuary, this time calling the goddess the Pure Aphrodite Syrian Goddess.

drachma. His daughter Ammia and his son Diogenes also each give 4 dr. on their own (ID 2628.ii.18–19). Listed directly below them, their paidagôgos, Sunetos, also gives a donation of 4 dr., probably a slave of the family. See, Christian Laes, “Pedagogues in Greek Inscriptions in Hellenistic and Roman Antiquity,” ZPE 171 (2009): 113–22. Kleostratides himself appears again in ID 2628.iii.36, but it is not clear what the context of this is (the list is damaged).

63 ID 2258 (pre 118/7BCE)

64 Mikalson, Religion in Hellenistic Athens, 234. who just sees Kleostratides as a generous Athenian, and doesn’t make a connection to a Syrian family.
(Συρίαι θεῶι), one of the few times she is called that at Delos. Of course, the patronym Apollonios is far too common to be certain of any connection he may have had to the priestly family here. Otherwise, we can see two other potential families during this period:

**Figure 4: Potential Families in the Syrian Sanctuary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name (in case found)</th>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th>Date (BCE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2276</td>
<td>Διοκλῆς Διοκλέους (Διοκλέους)</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2247, ID 2280, 2282</td>
<td>Σελεύκου τοῦ Ζηνοδώρου Ἀνταῖο[υ τοῦ Σελεύκου Ἱερο]πολίτου</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In fact, as we will see in the following section, families from the Levant continued to be recognized in dedications; most people who identify their place of origin as some Syrian city in the inscriptions from Delos are in families. It also seems that most of them made their home on Delos. The connections offered in this section are only speculations, but we can see with certainty that several families had three generations visible on Delos. Undergirding the worship of Atargatis, therefore, were generations of devoted immigrants from Syria who no doubt thrive because of trade with the east, yet who wanted to experience the worship of their goddess (and god) on Delos.

### 4.3.5 Phase 3: Syrians after the Athenian Priesthood (Mostly From Antioch)

Phase three of the cult, after the Athenian priesthood took over leadership, still had a number of Syrians present in it, but there were none from Hierapolis (See Appendix C). Instead, this period...

---

65 Ἁγνῆι Ἀφροδίτῃ Συρίαι θεῶι; also ID 2250 (107/6 BCE) which presumably reads the same title for the goddess.
saw a majority during this period (likely sixteen) were from Antioch, with three from Laodikea one from Damascus, and one from Seleukia. Whether this is Seleukia/Zeugma at the Parthian frontier or Seleukeia Pieria, the harbor nearest Antioch, is not clear (probably the latter). The Laodikea is likely the other major Syrian port to the south of Seleukia. The role of Syrians in the sanctuary of Atargatis did not disappear with the Athenian priesthood, although their visibility decreases. Athens took over between 118 and 112 BCE, perhaps because of the rapid growth of the cult and the profits it therefore offered or, as I have already suggested, the advantageous connections the cult offered to a valuable trade route (this would be true of either Hierapolitains or Antiocheans. This late takeover is interesting; most of the cults on Delos were simply absorbed into the Athenian leadership structure when the Romans gave Delos to the Athenians in 167/6. Yet even after the Athenian priesthood, Syrians continued to play a part in the sanctuary of Atargatis. They were also involved in the assimilation of the deities into Greek forms, for example, in several places Hadad became mixed with Zeus often in dedications by Syrians, and

66 Mikalson, Religion in Hellenistic Athens, 311–12.

67 In 98 BCE, we have two datable inscriptions from Syrians. First, Agathes son of Glaukios of Antioch, who dedicated to his wife Rhoumatha and his son Glaukios, see ID 2263 (98 BCE); Secondly, Aristeas son of Apollonios of Laodikea, who dedicates to his wife and children on behalf of Hadad, Atargatis, and Asklepius according to divine command (kata prostagma), see ID 2264 (98 BCE); also ID 2261 (c. 113/2 BCE); Eisodoros son of Noumenios from Hierapolis; ID 2285 (113/2 BCE): Eukrates son of Protogenos of Antioch; ID 2283 (c. 113/2 BCE).

68 ID 2262 (108/7 BCE), by someone from Laodikea; ID 2256+SEG 31:731: someone from Antioch; ID 2291 and ID 2295 (both too damaged to identify the dedicators); ID 2286 and 2287 (107/6 BCE) Μάρθα Δαμασκήνη και Αντίοχος Καρπασιώτης; perhaps also in ID 2628.i.2 where there is also a Martha. We should perhaps read these as husband and wife, as Aliquot does J. Aliquot, “La diaspora damascène aux époques hellénistique et romaine,” AAAS 51/2 (2008): 77–92. There may also be a Damascene in ID 2283.1–2 (pre 118/7 BCE): Διόφαντος Αλεξάνδρου: Aliquot argues that this individual is from Damascus/Antioch based on the prevalence of other Damascene names on Delos and elsewhere, Aliquot, “La diaspora damascène aux époques hellénistique et romaine,” 75 no. 5.
they occasionally referred to the goddess as the “Pure Aphrodite,” as we have already seen from the earliest inscriptions of the sanctuary.  

We can identify several families among the inscriptions.

4.3.5.1 The Descendants of Isidoros of Antioch

The family of Isodoros of Antioch likely follows him; he was one of the Antiocheans that belonged to the marzēaḥ. My re-creation of this family is speculative here, since the first name Isodoros only appears once on Delos, where he is named as a zakoros. However, his four children are mentioned along with, frequently, their place of origin, Antioch. We can also see the “Semitic” style naming practices in which names are thematically translated from –ntn to the Greek doros or, later, dotos.

Figure 5: Aristarchos son of Isodoros Family Tree

---

69 Also ID 2262 (108/7 BCE).

70 ID 2253 (106/5 BCE).
We know little about this family. Aristarchos son of Isodoros was involved in some type of repair early in the cult (before 118/7: ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπισκευὴν Ἀριστάρχου τοῦ Ἰσιδώρου). This may suggest that the order I have suggested here is wrong, and that there are actually two generations of Isodoros, as grandfather and then the grandson is given at the head of Fig. 2 with Aristarchos in between.

4.3.5.2 Descendants of Glaukios of Antioch

Another Antiochene family that appears in the registry is that of Glaukios, this one much later:

Figure 6: Descendants of Glaukios of Antioch

---

71 ID 2247.
This family is not as well attested, but we do have mention of three generations in ID 2263 (98 BCE).

4.3.5.3 Dorotheos

We also have a family which seems to be Syrian from the names:

Figure 7: Family Tree of Dorotheos
The son Sosimenos served as a *bastageis*, a member of the paraders who carried the goddess, which I will deal with in the following chapter.\(^72\)

Finally, I can mention three more families with at least two generations mentioned in the inscriptions:

**Figure 8: Other Families in the Syrian Sanctuary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name (in case found)</th>
<th>Place of Origin</th>
<th>Date (BCE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2263</td>
<td>Ἀγαθοκλῆς Γλαυκίου Ῥουμάθα Ἀγαθοκλῆς Γλαυκίου (Ἀγαθοκλῆς)</td>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2256</td>
<td>Δημήτριος Δημητρίου Ἀντιοχέας Ἑρμιόνη Δημητρίου</td>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2276</td>
<td>Διοκλῆς Διοκλέους Ίέρωνος (Διοκλέους)</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2247</td>
<td>Σελεύκου τοῦ Ζηνονόθου</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^72\) ID 2628.iii.29: Σωσιμένης Δωροθέου. He also appears on a list of donors from 112/1BCE, ID 2248.
Throughout the second century BCE and into the first, the bonds of family would undergird the success of the worship of Atargatis on Delos, even as non-Syrians came to worship the goddess. Along with Athenians and Romans (below), there was one Phoenician settler from Athens who gave to the cult, Eirenaios son of Zenon. He makes a dedication to the Syrian Goddess on behalf of himself and his children. Rather than being unknown, he actually came from Beirut, and his son Zenon appears on an Athenian ephebic list from 107/6 BCE. These few cases suggest that settlers in Athens could have roots in the Levant, as I have suggested above with Kleostratides. The fact that Kleostratides and Theodotos, some of the earliest Athenians to honour the Syrian goddess, perhaps have connections to Syria raises interesting questions about the nature of the Athenian takeover of the cult and the ways in which Syrians in Athens mediated the cults relation to that city, but there are few conclusions that can be drawn. However, the evidence suggests that the role of Athenians in the cult may have been more complicated than a simple absorption of the sanctuary into Athenian temple structure.

4.3.6  Phase 3: The Athenians

But there were Athenians, including the yearly priests and their families, who presumably had little prior knowledge of the Syrian goddess, yet took up her worship. The cult certainly had a

73 ID 2275.
74 As per P. Roussel (ed. ID 2274), Baslez. Recherches sur les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des religions orientales à Délos (IIe-Ier s. avant notre ère), no. 464.
75 IG IP 1011 VI. 94; as argued in Eric Perrin-Saminadayar, “Notes d’épigraphie et de prosopographie attiques d’époque hellénistique,” La Lettre de Pallas 4 (1996): 4. He also points to a list of ephebes from Delos in 104/3, in which Εἰρηναίου Βηρύτιος is visible (ID 2599.13) (SEG 27:1222).
history in Athens for several decades, but Athenians in Athens were not as involved in the Athenian version of the cult as Athenians on Delos apparently were. As with the Syrians, Athenians took part in the cult as families. One example is the family of Nikostratos son of Demarets of the deme Lamptrai (Νικόστρατος Δημαρέτου Λαμπτρεύς), the priest who led the donations in the massive list of theater donors from the therapeuta of the Pure Aphrodite. He dedicates 100 drachma on behalf of his family, including his wife Dioklea, and his two sons: Euthudomos and Demaretos. His son Demaretos then proceeds to dedicate 50 drachma, followed by a dedication, likely of the grandson of Nikostratos, of another 50 drachma. The presence of daughters of priests as basket carriers I will discuss in the next chapter.

The Athenian priests, who took over the sanctuary officially by 112/1 BCE, also gave tremendous gifts upon the beginning of their tenure. This was a period of intense building activity. One of the highest ranking Athenians to venerate the goddess was Dionysios, the son of Nikonos of the deme Pallene, an epimelētēs of the island from 110/9 BCE; his interest may suggest the growing interest in the cult of Atargatis on Delos. His wife was named Artemisia,

76 IG IP 1337 (97/6 BCE).
77 ID 2628.4–5 (108/7 BCE)(LGPN II 49086; PAA 11040); We have evidence of Nikostratos senior making a proposal before the demos of Athens in IG IP 1028 (100–99 BCE) in a decree which honours epheses; See also SEG 35:887.
78 lines18–21.
79 line 22.
80 line 23.
81 Διονύσιος Νίκωνος Παλληνεύς, ID 2222 (110/9 BCE). He appears in numerous inscriptions from the islands, not surprisingly as an indicator of date during his time as epimelētēs in 110/9 BCE (ID 1911; ID 2038; ID 2220; ID 2228; ID 2342; In ID 1654 (110/9 BCE), the beginning of his tenure as epimelētēs is memorialized by the Athenians, Romans, and other Greeks who dwelt on the island (οἱ κατοικοῦντες), and a dedication is made to Apollo; His father, Nikon, may appear on a Delian ephetic list from 119/8 BCE (ID 2598.49).
the daughter of Diogenes from the deme Epieikidai in Athens, and his four children are Nikon, Diogenes, Hermaphilos, and Dionysios. Upon coming into his position, he made dedications to several deities on the island, including Aphrodite, Dionysus, Zeus Hikesios, Zeus Herkeios, and Apollo. So it may be that his devotion to Atargatis is only part of his overall strategy to endear himself to islanders, yet his interest in the sanctuary seems to run deep and she is the only Levantine deity which he honors. He is responsible for the dedication of the sanctuary and front hall (ID 2221) as well as a gilded throne.

Finally, there are several Athenians with Roman names who take part in the cult. In 96/5 BCE the priest of the Pure Aphrodite has a Roman name, Gaius son of Gaius from the deme Acharnae. He writes his name in the Greek form, and his daughter, Nikopolis, is also listed on

---

82 His wife, Artemisia daughter of Diogenes, likewise set up a dedication to celebrate her husband’s new position (ID 1815 [110/9 BCE]).

83 ID 2627 (110/9 BCE); In another dedication on the island from the same year, we see that only three of his children are named: Diogenes, Dionysia, and Nikon (ID 1969 [110/9 BCE]; also ID 2627 [110/9 BCE]). This omission of Hermaphilos is explained by a later dedication to Apollo since it names the two sons of Hermaphilos: Dionysios and Hermaphilos (ID 2000 [after 110/9 BCE]: 1 [Νίκων καὶ Διογένης οἱ Διονυσίου καὶ Ἑρμαφίλου οἱ Διονυσίου Νίκων, Σερούιος Κορνελίου Σερουίου ὑιός Λέντολος καὶ φίλος Ἀπόλλωνι]. This dedication is on a statue of Ser. Cornelius Ser, son of Lentulus, which stood in the agora of the Italians. The whole group is called the offspring of Dionysios son of Nikon. Hermaphilos was obviously an adult son with his own children when Dionysios became epilemētēs of the island.

84 He makes is own dedications to Aphrodite upon becoming epimeletēs, on behalf of the people of Athens (ID 1810 [110/9 BCE]; ID 1811), to Dionysus (ID 1812 [110/9 BCE]), Zeus Hikesios (ID 1813 [110/9 BCE]), Zeus Herkeios (ID 1814 [110/9]), to Apollo (ID 2011bes [110/9 BCE]).

85 ID 2240 (PAA 271520); Gaius’ name is perhaps also given in Athens on a list of the contributors to the pythais (IG 2336.234–5=SEG 32 :218: ἵερεφις ἱερεὺς Θεοῦ ἐν Δήλῳ Γαίος Γαίου Ἀχαρνέως; We have evidence of another man with the same name on Delos from thirty years earlier (127/8 BCE), perhaps the same Gaius but more likely his father, who was a priest of the Dioskourides (ID 1900 [PAA 271505]). There is a another priest of the Dioskourides with a similar name, perhaps a brother (ID 1905: Κόιντος Γαίου Ἀχαρνέως). Of course, all these arguments are highly speculative without the presence of nomina; Likewise, we have a Gaius who is from the deme Acharnae who is the priest of Isis in 115/4 BCE (ID 2073 : ἅπε ἱερεφὶς Γαίου Ἀχαρνέως; also ID 2091a.) That this is our Gaius is almost certain, as we have in ID 2079 (115/4 BCE ): Γαίος Γαίου Ἀχαρνέως, ἱερεφὶς γενόμενος ἐν τοῖς

167
the inscription with him as the kanēphoros.\textsuperscript{86} The dedication contains is of a NAMARAN (see chapter five).\textsuperscript{87} Another example is the Athenian priest, Publius son of Publius.\textsuperscript{88} We know that people with Roman names were registered in the Athenian demes in the first century BCE; however, it is difficult to know whether the naming practices were out of stylistic considerations or because the holders were actually Roman, especially with the phenomenon of using only a praenomen and then a father’s praenomen in the genitive.\textsuperscript{89}

One final Athenian is interesting to note. In an inscription of a group of eranistai from Athens, which records a large list of members and a priest from Antioch names Eirenaios, we see a certain Diodoros of the deme Sounion (Διόδωρος Σουνιε).\textsuperscript{90} In his forthcoming book, John Kloppenborg argues that this was probably an Atargatis association, due to Diodoros’ later tenure as priest of Atargatis on Delos.\textsuperscript{91} Theodoros son of Diodoros from the deme Sounion appears in the association on Delos; he was perhaps the second Athenian priest of the Syrian

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{86} We cannot know the origin of Gaius, Roman or not. See Sean G. Byrne, “Early Roman Athenians,” in Lettered Attica: a day of Attic epigraphy : actes du Symposium d’Athènes, 8 mars 2000 ; avec un mémoire, ed. Johannes. Kirchner, John S. Traill, and David R. Jordan (Athens: Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens, 2003), 7–8.
\textsuperscript{87} ID 2240.5 (96/5 BCE). Will thought that the NAMARA was the support for the semeion, Will, Le sanctuaire de la déesse Syrienne, 154 and note. 4.
\textsuperscript{88} ID 2255 (90/89 BCE).
\textsuperscript{89} Byrne, “Early Roman Athenians.” suggests, for the sake of moving with the study, to take those Roman names with Roman fathers as Roman or Italian in origin, and those with Greek fathers as not (5). He also observes that the names are concentrated in the Melite, Peiraeus, and Acharnai demes.
\textsuperscript{90} ID 2358=GRA 40 (135 BCE): See comments in Kloppenborg, Ascough, and Harland, Greco-Roman Associations, 196–97.
\textsuperscript{91} John S. Kloppenborg, Early Christians and Their Associations (Forthcoming) (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019), chapter 2.
\end{flushleft}
goddess in 113/2 BCE, perhaps dedicating a stoa. We also see Theodotos in Athens, making proposals relating to ephebes and honouring prytaneis from Erechtheis. When he becomes priest, his sons dedicate a high place? (τὰ χώματα) to him. The presence of this Athenian in the association whose father was in a possible association of Atargatis in Athens suggests that veneration of the goddess was a family affair. It also raises the question of whether there were connections between the Athenian and Delian associations, and whether the Athenian one played any role in taking over the Delian sanctuary, but evidence does not permit this.

4.3.7 Phase 3: Romans

The Roman naming practices among those in the temple of the Syrian goddess were standard for the second century: by the late second century the Greek simple genitive in a name functions to identify a freedman while the occasional use of υἱός marks a born son. However, this practice

92 ID 2261; ID 2285.
93 ID 2261 (LGPN II 31980), he is also a priest of a group in ID 1800, but it is not clear if this too is of the Syrian goddess: ἄρχει[············]καὶ οἱ συνε[············]ται? ἐφ’ ἱερέως Θεοδὸτο[············]ον Πολλανεύς, κατ’ εὐχές.
94 He makes two proposals related to the ephebes and his son Timokrates appears on the list IG II² 1011.5, 33, V.99 (his son Τιμοκράτης Θεοδώτου Σουνιεύς). Mikalson (and GRA I 40 n. 22) identify Theodotos as the proposer of a motion honouring John Hyrcanus (106/5 BCE) in Josephus (A.J. 14.152), but as far as I can see this is actually his son, Dionysios (δεδόχθαι δὲ καὶ νῖν Διονυσίων τοῦ Θεοδώτου Σουνιεύς). He also proposes a decree honouring prytaneis from Erechtheis (Agora XV, 254.7).
95 ID 2262 (113/2 BCE?).
96 IIIBCE praenomen + romaios was common, II BCE “praenomen, gentilicum, and title” become more standard, with occasional tria nomina, see J. N. Adams, Bilingualism and the Latin Language (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 670–86, esp. 673. Adams says that early bilingual inscriptions from Delos used the simple genitive for both filiation and freedman status, but that during the second century the inclusion of υἱός became the standard way to show filiation in Greek; often Romans only keep the praenomen as with a Greek foreigner, followed by the designation “Roman;” Marie Françoise Baslez, “La premiere presence Romaine a Delos (vers 250 - vers
was the result of a long evolution since both filiation and patron were marked with the simple
genitive for most of the second century. I have compiled the Roman names in the sanctuary in
Appendix D. Despite the great variety in the membership of the sanctuary of the Syrian goddess,
most Romans in the cult seem to have been freedmen, as we can deduce (not with complete
certainty) from their names. Moreover, the two certain freeborn names at the sanctuary were
children (C. Plotius and P. Aemilius son of Publius). Why would Romans be interested in the
Syrian goddess? It is possible that some had roots in the Levant. We can identify one man who
certainly did; this is Gaius Seius Aristomachos, a freedman who dedicates on behalf of his
mother:

1 Κλεοπάτραν Φιλοστράτου
Αραδίαν τῶν ἀπὸ Μαράθου
Γάιος Ζήσας Γιανίου Ῥωμαίος
Ἀριστόμαχος τῷ ἔσω τοῦ
5 μητέρα Αγνῆς Ἀφροδίτης
Συρία θεῶι,
ἔφὶ ἱερέως Διοφάντου τοῦ Ἀριστοκλέους
Μαραθωνίου. 99

C. Seius Aristomachos, (freedman) of Gnaius (Seius) a Roman, set up this statue of
Kleopatra, daughter of Philostratos from Aradus of those from Marathus (who is) his own
mother, (and dedicated it) to the Pure Aphrodite Syrian Goddess, in the priesthood of
Diophantos son of Aristokleos of Marathon.


97 Adams, Bilingualism and the Latin Language, 674. Adams attributes this to the desire of the earliest traders to
“get their Greek right.”

98 ID 2247 (pre 118/7 BCE): someone son of C.; A list, perhaps a dedication by therapeutai, ID 2248 (112/1 BCE) contains several Roman names.

99 ID 2245 (103/2 BCE).
The mother is Kleopatra of Aradus in Phoenicia; she also lives on Delos and honours the goddess in another inscription. We see Gaius honoring his patron upon his being freed elsewhere. For this Roman, the attraction to the goddess might not have been “conversion,” but rather his Levantine roots which lay behind his Roman name. (In some cases, the dedicants with Roman names might use the title Hadad or Atargatis for the deities, but this does not seem to be a stable way to identify origins in the Levant.)

The networks of some of the Romans in the sanctuary of Atargatis appears to have stretched into the Roman collegia on the island which, especially the Competaliastes, had mixed members and magistri. Some of the same people were active in both groups. One of the early dedications of Romans to the Syrian goddess comes in 112/1 BCE. It is a list of dedicators to the Pure Aphrodite, Hadad, and Asklepius, with several Roman names on it. Several are too damaged to recreate, but one of them was active in the collegium of the Hermaistai. The other is not

100 The author’s mother is from Aradus in Phoenicia, which was near Marathus. Adams, Bilingualism and the Latin Language, 644. We do find out from ID 2272 that Gaius’ mother is on Delos as well, and not back in Aradus. It is possible that Gaius’ name appears on the Mykonos curse tablet, in which a high-born Roman on Delos, T. Paconius, curses twenty people, including members of his own family (ID 2534 [130–71 BCE]: C(aium) Seium C(ai) f(ilium) Cheilonem / [---]ium Aristomachum . . . ), see Rauh, The Sacred Bonds of Commerce, 229–30; Adams, Bilingualism and the Latin Language, 680–82.

101 This freedman honours his Roman patron in ID 2013: Γαῖος Ὀλοσ-[ήι]ος Ῥωμαῖος Ρωμιῶν Χειλόνα Ἀριστόμαχος, Ἀπόλλωνι. In our inscription the relationship is expressed solely in the genitive. For the list of appearances of SEHII no. 4; Another freedman with the same nomen appears in the association of competaliastaei, in the bilingual ID 1753 (113 BCE): T. Seius M. l.; on the motivations of freedmen in making the more costly bilingual inscriptions, see J. Touloumakos, “Bilingue [Griechisch-Lateinische] Weihinschriften der römischen Zeit. A. Bilinguen aus dem griechischen Osten,” Tekmeria 1.0 (1995): 89–96. He suggests, in the case of ID 2013, that the liberation might have been promised but had not yet happened (89 n. 24).


103 The Italians in the inscription are, says Hatzfeld, Hermiastai. Gaius’ name appears on several other inscriptions on the island, but is spelt differently. It is on two donor lists for the round building of the bōmos of Hercules Rauh, The Sacred Bonds of 171
known to us, but those with a shared nomen appear among the Competaliastes, one of which is a slave.\textsuperscript{104} These examples suggest that networks of trust from the Syrian sanctuary could stretch into the wider Roman community on Delos. There are also a number of female Roman slaves who appear in the list of therapeutai from the theater.\textsuperscript{105}

But the most astonishing thing about the Roman names in the Syrian sanctuary is how well connected some of them apparently were; the dedications to Atargatis carry the nomina of some of the most powerful families on Delos. These are people like P. Aemilus, son or freedman of Lucius (Aemilus), a Roman.\textsuperscript{106} Although likely a freedman, he was connected to the Aemili
family. They were patricians, and had been celebrated on Delos for generations. A consul ancestor, L. Aemulius, was mentioned in the temple accounts of 179 BCE. Another Aemilius was honored by the Athenians and Romans who live on Delos, and the emporoi and nauklēroi who were settled there dedicated to the antitamias, M. Aemulius Lepidus, son of Manius (ID 1659 [85–78 BCE]). He would later become the consul. Another example of connections to a powerful family in the sanctuary is the presence of the name (though partially reconstructed) Q. Tullius in the list of therapeutai from the theater. Tullius (Cicero’s nomen) was an important Roman family from antiquity. We also have representatives of less well-known Roman families connected to the sanctuary, such as A. Pactumeius son or freedman of Marcus (Pactumeius), a Roman. In short, of the senatorial families on Delos, at least three are represented in the sanctuary of the Syrian goddess in various ways, including Aemilii, Egnatii, and Teulii. This demands the question of what the Lex Claudia (218) forbidding senators to be involved in trade

[before 112/1 BCE]). Finally, Hellas Aimulia dedicated to Isis, Sarapis and Anoubis on behalf of herself and και Σαπροφός και Σαπροφος (ID 2127 [106/5 BCE]).

107 ID 442.104; 43.B.39; also ID 468bis (175 BCE) (consuls seem to keep the title for life).

108 ID 2628. ii.2 Κύντος Τύλιος (Hatzfeld, IRD, 86: TULLII no. 2?).

109 ID 2255 (90/89 BCE): Πόπλιος Πλωτίος Λευκίου: “on behalf of himself and wife and children and grandson, Gaius Plotius . . . to the Pure Aphrodite and Hadad” (Hatzfeld, IRD, 68: PLOTII no. 5). The same Roman dedicates a Mosaic (ID 2302 [90/89 BCE]). For those with the same nomen, there was an A. Plotius M. l. in the bilingual dedications of the agora (ID 1732); There were magistri of the Hermaistes and Compitaliastes named Plotii.

110 ID 2269 (n.d.) Αὖλος Πακτομήιος Ρομαίος (Hatzfeld, IRD, 64: PACTUMII no. 1). There is a M. Pactumeius M. f. in a bilingual inscription as a magister of the Hermaistai, ID 1733 (c. 125 BCE) (on this same list is the father or patron of Gessius, above), likely the father of A. (Hatzfeld, IRD, 64–5). There is also an M. Pactumeius, either the father or (more probably) a brother of A., in a donor list from Serapeion C (ID 2619 [100–75 BCE]). The Pactumeia gens is relatively rare, but appears in several contemporary Greek inscriptions from Thessaly (IG IX² 258 [c. 168 BCE]: a proxeny decree for Romans); Euboia (IG XII,9 919 [late IIIBCE]); and a Latin inscription from Rome (Q PACTVMEIVS P F: AE 1983, 0038).
meant, or how it was interpreted. Ruah also suggests that members of several unknown nomina achieved senatorial rank “within a generation of their participation in the Delian slave trade;” his list includes Gessii, Seii, and Volusii, all of which were represented in the Syrian sanctuary. These six nomina therefore suggest that influential Roman families were connected within the sanctuary.

With a circle of wealthy Greeks and Romans in the sanctuary, we can take the study of their network of trust one step further and map every place of origin mentioned in the inscriptions.

Figure 9: Origins Map of Dedicants in the Syrian Sanctuary on Delos

111 For a chart of the Senatorial nomina at Delos, see Rauh, The Sacred Bonds of Commerce, 235–36, for discussion of these senators’ involvement with business, see 237–9.
112 Rauh, The Sacred Bonds of Commerce, 239.
113 This is a “heat map,” showing concentration as well as place of origin.
While most people from the sanctuary were from Athens, Rome, and Syria, there are a few outliers that show the reach of the sanctuary’s network (See Appendix A for all the names mentioned in the sanctuary by origin). The first is a dedication of a pillar in the sanctuary of a family from Ephesus, unfortunately undated. This may be evidence of connections evolving to Ephesus, to which some Romans would move following their time at Delos. The other dedicators of note, mapped above, are a Neapolitan family. This is Apollonios, a son of Dioskourides from Naples, who makes a dedication on behalf of his daughters, Artemis and Apollonia. I suggest that the presence of ever widening circles of influence at the sanctuary of Atargatis on Delos suggests expanding and perhaps bending trust networks and the extending reach of Syrian influence from the sanctuary, which had a phenomenal trans-Mediterranean network.

The next section will address the question of what “membership” in the sanctuary meant, and the following chapter will explore the ways in which ritual bound together disparate membership, but it should be clear that forging alliances with some of the most influential families on Delos suggests that the networks at the sanctuary of Atargatis were large-scale and long-distance. Although the timing of the opening of the Silk Road is coincidental, it seems to be one logical reason why, at the end of the sanctuary of Phoenicians and Egyptians dominating trade on Delos, the Syrian sanctuary should grow rapidly. This would mean that making a show of sharing gods was not incidental to trade; it was central to the trust required to put up capital and send traders

114 ID 2273.
115 Strabo reports that residents of Delos liked the access to Asia, Geo. 10.5.4.
116 ID 2265 (98-6 BCE): Ἀπολλώνιος Διοσκουρίδου Νεαπολείτης. Apollonios makes another dedication to Anubis on behalf of his (unnamed) wife and children in 110/9 BCE (ID 2126).
over long distances to the edge of Parthia. I therefore uphold Nicholas Ruah’s thesis, while rejecting his use of “religious” and “secular” as categories for studying antiquity. What we see at the sanctuary of the Syrian Goddess is an extension of his thesis that these “sacred bonds” undergirded business, trade, and trust: Ruah argues,

> Ancient commercial elements at Delos appear to have employed religious forms and institutions as the principal means to organize not only their private lives but their public dealings and all fundamental processes of trade.\(^{117}\)

The expanding of a Syrian goddess into the lives of some of the most influential Roman traders by way of the sanctuary is the closest thing that we have to evidence of “conversion,” and it obviously comes not from ideological motivations, but from the same trust networks that held together the trade routes.

### 4.4 Closed-Ethnic Trust Network: Phoenicians

The Phoenicians on Delos are not as well attested as the Syrians in the Syrian sanctuary, but they had a long history of dealings there. The city/kingdom of Beirut had a history as a vassal kingdom for the Ptolemies, who often used it as an entry point into the Eastern Mediterranean; many Egyptian coins have been found there and find of amphora, ceramics, reliefs, and lamps from the excavations there suggest that the city was thriving in the Hellenistic age.\(^{118}\) From the fourth century, it passed back and forth between the Ptolemies and the Seleukids until Antiochus III took it over completely in 198 BCE. It was destroyed in either 143 or 138 BCE by Diodotus Tryphon because of its support for Demetrius II Nicator and was rebuilt under the name

---


“Laodicea in Phoenicia” or “Laodicea in Canaan;” these were both names with which it had already been associated with by the time of the Seleucid civil war.119

The re-creation of the membership in the clubhouse of the Poseidoniasts is less extensive than the Syrian sanctuary, since there is less epigraphic evidence for this Phoenician sanctuary. Nevertheless, we can detect up to 92 names in the sanctuary (see Appendix E). As mentioned, these are not broken down geographically as in the Syrian sanctuary—perhaps an obvious choice if most of the members were from Beirut.120 Only one individual names the city of Beirut directly in his dedication, Dionysios son of Zenon and grandson of Theodoros of Beirut. This tracing two generations back to Beirut is interesting, perhaps evidence that the family had been removed from Beirut for a time. The Greek names on the list are mostly non-descript, although there is evidence of the type of adaptation of West-Semitic names that we see elsewhere. These strategies include the adoption of dynastic names (i.e. Πτολεμαῖος Ἀπολλοδώρου) as well as the use of names that commonly stood in for Phoenician divine names, such as the many Asklepi-rooted names which are the equivalent of Eshmoun.122 There is also significant innovation in the

119 Roger S. Bagnall, The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt: With 3 Maps (Leiden: Brill Archive, 1976), 11; Samir Kassir, Beirut (University of California Press, 2010), 38–40. Kassir argues that there was a quick recovery after being destroyed but, ironically, one of the strongest evidences of this which he uses is the Delian inscriptions; Moore, “Berytos-Laodicea Revisited.”

120 NB I have included ID 2611 as Roussel does, see Pierre Roussel, Exploration Archéologique de Délos, 30 vols. (Paris: Fontemoing et Cle, 1974), 77–78.

121 ID 2611.a.1.31

adoption of other Phoenician names: Ἡρακλείδης is the equivalent of ḫbdmlqrt or Διονύσιος is taken from ḫbdʾsr. Apollo-based names are also common, in line with the veneration of Apollo in honour of the city of Athens. The naming practices show the same cultural translation that is applied to the deities (discussed in the next chapter), a strategy of accommodation which requires aligning something from home practice with something in Greek culture and translating it.

4.4.1 Dionysios son of Zenon and grandson of Theodoros of Beirut

Dionysios son of Zenon and grandson of Theodoros of Beirut is a devoted patron of the sanctuary, whose name appears in connection to the building of a stoa. The name Zenon appears three other places as a patronym, suggesting that his sons were also active in the sanctuary; these include —κλῆς Ζήνωνος, —άσων Ζήνωνος. There is also a [Θ]εό[δ]ω[ρ]ος Ζήνωνος who also had a brother named Zenon on whose behalf he dedicates. Finally Zenon son of Dionysios, probably a son of this Dionysios, appears as a benefactor in two inscriptions. The patronym Dionysios is used five additional times for names in the inscriptions of the Poseidoniasts, but I will not try to connect these all since Dionysios is much too common a name in Greek. In short, we cannot reconstruct this family with specificity. But it does seem that the

124 ID 1780; 1796: Apollodoros son of Apollon, ID 1782; ID 2611.a.1.36: Dionysios son of Apollodoros
125 ID 1772; other dedications, see ID 1783; 1784; 1785.
126 ID 2611.a.1.42: he was a ἰατρὸς.
127 ID 2611.a.1.62.
129 ID 1788; 1789.
memory of their ancestry in Beirut stays alive for a long time: the names Zenon, Theodoros, and Dionysios and were involved in the clubhouse across several generations.

4.4.2 Other Families

The inscriptions also suggest more families in the sanctuary, but the connections are too tenuous to be certain. I list them here with minimal comments:

Figure 10: Other Families in the Beirutian Sanctuary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sons of Apollodoros:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611.a.1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 1782.7–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611.a.1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asklepiades and sons:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611.a.1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611.b.1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611.b.1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611.b.1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611.b.1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611.b.1.25 (perhaps connected)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sons of Demophontes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611.b.1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 1780.3, ID 1796.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In short, we cannot piece together with certainty all the familial relationships in the Beirutian sanctuary, and the fact that many only appear in a list (ID 2611) limits the possible interpretations of the evidence. But we can hypothesize that these bonds of family were important in the sanctuary and that key Phoenician benefactors remained active in the dedications of the sanctuary for some time, likely over multiple generations as we see with Dionysios and Zenon, which I will discuss in the following chapter. Finally, we note that there are two members of the sanctuary who were naturalized Athenians who would hold the roles of gymnasarch and agoranomos: Gorgias son of Asklepiades (Ionides? Deme) and Echedemos son of Echos of the deme Sounion respectively.

4.5 **Membership**

Having spent the bulk of this chapter identifying the make-up of the Beirutian and Syrian associations, I would like briefly to explore the problem of membership identified above. While identifying “membership” is an important task, it must be said that the term must be used loosely, since we know little about the attendance and participation of people in these

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID 2611</th>
<th>Γοργίου (Δημοφῶν[το]ς)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611</td>
<td>Ἡρακλέωνος (Δημοφῶν[το]ς)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611</td>
<td>Συμμάχου (Δημοφῶν[το]ς)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

130 ID 2611.b.1.13: Γοργίας Α[σ]κληπιάδου, whom Baslez mistakenly gives the patronym Alexander, Baslez, *Recherches sur les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des religions orientales à Délos (Ile-Ier s. avant notre ère)*, 158 n. 41.; For his role as gymnasarch: ID 1504.37 (147/6 or 146/5 BCE): Here he is praised by the Athenians; also ID 1979 (after 148/7 BCE); ID 1952 (148/7 or 147/6 BCE)

131 2611.b.1.25; ID 1834 (late II BCE): 1 Δημόνικος Εὐρήμων[ζ] Ἀναφλύστιος τὸν φύσει ἀδελφὸν Ἐχέδημον Ἡχοὺ Σουνιέα, 5. ἱερέα γενόμενον Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ ἀγορανομήσαντα Ἀπόλλωνι.
associations or the ways in which specific membership practices were constructed. We do have points at which we can see participation, for example, in the list of bastageis who had specific parading duties (see chapter five). However, other than these glimpses, a name carved in stone does not instantly demand a long-term relationship to the cult. We have the absence, at least in our evidence, of those clearly defined membership practices that we see in some other associations.

One of the first problems which must be addressed to define membership is the shape of a group of worshippers in the Syrian sanctuary called the therapeutai. We have two inscriptions that mention thiasitai, and therefore we know that there were some banqueting practices happening in the temple of the goddess. The title of therapeutai is always written as a plural noun (οἱ θεραπευταί). We likely have two lists of therapeutai. The first, ID 2248, does not actually have the word therapeutai in it, but it is heavily damaged and the list seems to allude to some body. The second, a dedication of the theater, likely had hundreds of names on it, but it raises questions about “membership.” The earliest glimpse of this body is in 118/7 BCE, perhaps before there was an Athenian priest. It is not clear who they were. Philo famously respects the therapeutai near Alexandria as healers and philosophers. Yet this cannot be what we are dealing with on Delos. From their list at ID 2628 we have a picture of at least 100 members, many of whom were active business people, and Philo’s picture of people who abhor slavery seems an unlikely fit

132 ID 2628.iii (107/6 BCE). See discussion in the following chapter.
134 ID 2227.
135 Philo, Cont. 2.
with the Delian center of the slave trade. The \textit{therapeutai} are more likely a general term for the devotees, perhaps borrowed from the Egyptian practices in the nearby Sarapion and, like Philo’s \textit{therapeutai}, were comprised of men and women. The \textit{therapeutai} of the Syrian goddess were also mixed nationalities. It seems that many of the names on the dedication lists were probably not regularly at the temple, and that financial contributions could make one a \textit{therapeutai} without necessitating regular contact with the cult. There are several indications of this. The theater donor list is suggestive here since some of the top donors were high-achieving and well-connected Delians whose financial dealings go well beyond Syrians and whose cultic dealings, likewise, extend across other diaspora groups. These included the Palestinian banker, Philostratos son of Philostratos (discussed above), who makes a dedication of 50 dr. on behalf of himself, his wife, and his children. They also included members of the elite Roman families, as mentioned, the \textit{Tullii}, and the \textit{Egnatii}. There were also representatives from other sanctuaries, including the priest of Zeus Kynthios from the nearby temple on the mountain, Lysandrus son of Demetrios. It seems possible that in this case these donors were assigned to the status of \textit{therapeutai} by virtue of their donation rather than their regular presence in the sanctuary. Another indicator of this is the physical size of the sanctuary, which could not hold half of all of the worshippers listed; Will estimates that there was space for around 60

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{136} Cont. 18. Nevertheless, the people on Delos fit within Philo’s general use of \textit{therapeutai} and \textit{therapeutō} as simply those who serve god, see Joan E. Taylor and Philip R. Davies, “The So Called Therapeutae of ‘De Vita Contemplativa’: Identity and Character,” \textit{HTR} 91.1 (1998): 3–24. They argue that Philo is working with a generalized image of devotees to a deity rather than a specific Jewish group.  
\textsuperscript{137} Taylor and Davies, “The So Called Therapeutae of ‘De Vita Contemplativa,'” 6.  
\textsuperscript{138} ID 2628.29–31: Φιλόστρατος Φιλοστράτου ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ τῶν τέκνων.  
\textsuperscript{139} ID 2628. ii.2; ID 2628.iii.17.  
\textsuperscript{140} ID 2628. 27–8
\end{flushright}
worshippers, yet he estimates between 600–700 people attached to the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{141} Therefore, it is necessary to theoretically separate the act of giving from an idea of “membership,” yet since our evidence does not allow us to make this distinction it is a moot point.

However, one part of this trend that can be identified is the possibility that several of the people listed among the \textit{therapeutai} may not have actually been present on Delos. One of these is one of the Romans: C. Egnatius Apollophanus. He was a freedman who, along with his two brothers, Gnaius and Publius, worked for Philostratos of Askalon. Their name appears on a statue base from the courtyard of the so-called “house of Philostratos,” which held a life-sized statue of Philostratos himself, who they call their \textit{euergetes}.\textsuperscript{142} This is the same inscription in which we discover that Philostratos is now a citizen of Naples rather than Ascalon. Yet it seems likely that this modest house of Philostratos was not, in fact, his house, but rather belonged to these three freed brothers who worked for him.\textsuperscript{143} Since Philostratos did not even live on Delos by 100 BCE, but had employees running his business, it is interesting that the employee (C. Egnatius Apollophanus) and employer (Philostratos) appear on the list of \textit{therapeutai}.\textsuperscript{144} Did they take part in the sanctuary together, or did Gaius dedicate on the behalf of Philostratos? Did Gaius forge business networks with Syrians, honouring the Syrian goddess, and then encourage Philostratos to make a donation to the theater? We do not know, and the other dedication made to Philostratos in the sanctuary, by his “friend” Midas, did not necessitate his being there either,

\textsuperscript{141} Will, \textit{Le sanctuaire de la déesse Syrienne}, 142.

\textsuperscript{142} ID 1724 (c. 100 BCE); Trümper, \textit{Die “Agora des Italiens” in Delos}, 176 n. 867.

\textsuperscript{143} Rauh, \textit{The Sacred Bonds of Commerce}, 200: The three brothers had a shared slave who appears among the \textit{magistri} of the Competiliastes in ID 1761 (98/7 BCE)(also ID 1765 [100 BCE] a similar but damaged inscription).

\textsuperscript{144} Rauh, \textit{The Sacred Bonds of Commerce}, chap. 5, esp. 195–205, 231–2.
although we might presume that he saw it. There is another name on the list of *therapeutai* that raises the same question: Q. Tullius (although damaged).\(^{145}\) A house appearing to belong to Q. Tullius likewise belonged to three of his freedmen, who decorated it with images relating to the Lares Compitales.\(^{146}\) Q. Tullius probably did not live on Delos, and there is a chance that his name on the list here is either indication of his freedmen acting on his behalf or an occasion of his visit to the sanctuary, rather than suggesting that he was a “member” in any ongoing way. However, it is certain that some Romans were involved in the regular ritual life of the cult, such as those Romans included among the *bastageis* who carried things in the procession, including L. Babullius son or freedman of Lucius\(^{147}\) and A. Gessius Fallaius.\(^{148}\) In the same way, the Poseidoniasts from Beirut have two slaves of Markus in their midst, presumably slaves of the same benefactor, Marcus Minatius, whose presence in the sanctuary may have been on behalf of

\(^{145}\) ID 2628. II.2 Κόιντος Τύλλιος. A similar Roman name appears in ID 1730 (c. 125 BCE) in a list of initiates into the Apolloniaci: Κόιντος Τύλλιος Κρήνα. Quintus here is a priest of Apollo. In ID 1802 (c. 100 BCE) we have three freedmen, Herakleon, Alexandros, and Aristarchos who are all in the patronage of Quintus Tullius and set up a bilingual inscription in his honour: (a.1) [Κόιντον Τύλλιον — — — —] Κόιντος Τύλλιος Κρήνα. (b.1) [Q. Tullium Q. f. — — — —um] Q. Tullius Q. l. Aristarchus, Q. Tullius Q. l. Alexander, Q. Tullius Q. l. Heracle [p]atr[onem] suom honoris et be[nef]ici cau[sa].

\(^{146}\) Rauh, *The Sacred Bonds of Commerce*, 198–202. Also, Philippe Bruneau, “Contribution à l’histoire urbaine de Délos,” *BCH* 92.2 (1968): 665 n. 3. He also suggested that the house belonged to the three brothers.

\(^{147}\) Rauh, *The Sacred Bonds of Commerce*, 229; ID 2628 III.20: Λεύκιος Βαβύλλιος Λευκίου? There are some similar names among Italian immigrants and a member of the Competaliastes carries the same *nomen* (It could be that Alexandros Babullius of Lucius is his slave, as well as perhaps another man ID 1760 [100–98 BCE]), see also ID 1842 [134BCE?], ID 2407 and perhaps ID 2616 [125–75 BCE].

\(^{148}\) Ibid., 31; ID 2628. iii.23: Αὐλός Γέσσιος Φαλλαίος: His freedman, D. Gessius D., was a magister of the Hermaistes (ID 1733).
I suggest that we might think of Roman participation in the sanctuary as ranging from occasional dedications to constant involvement in the ritual life.

### 4.6 Conclusions

This chapter has demonstrated, as much as the evidence allows, that the sanctuary of the Syrian goddess and the clubhouse of the Beirutians were focal points for networks of trust which permitted trade with the Romans. The activities in these sanctuaries show that, under the rubric of worship, friends and connections could be made and nurtured, the elite of the island could be brought into conversation, and the sanctuaries could expand their reach. The sanctuary of the Syrian goddess sat at the crux of a network of freedmen from senatorial and patrician families, consuls and bankers, Syrian trading families and Athenian priests, and slaves and freedmen. We wonder whether the Syrian goddess became a fixture in the psyche of some of the most powerful and influential Roman families, even if through freedmen, and there would be a contingent of Roman devotion to her up until Nero worshipped her briefly, before losing interest and urinating on her. Like Christianity, the mythology of the spread of the worship of Atargatis is a familiar tale, based on the wandering Gallii who functioned as missionary ascetics and spread her worship around. Yet on Delos the spread of the goddess seems more mundane; she spreads through the expanding networks (shifting for both political and economic reasons) of those Hierapolitains in the sanctuary.

---

149 ID 2628.a.151, 60.
150 Suet. Ner. 56; Piana, “Foreign Groups in Rome during the First Centuries of the Empire,” 316; Hörig, “Dea Syria-Atargatis,” 1572–75; Benko, The Virgin Goddess, 57. Little is known about the spread of the goddess into Italy.
In Marie Françoise Baslez’ study of the diffusion of “oriental” cults into Delos, she made an interesting observation: ethnicity in several of these cults, most noticeably the Syrians and Egyptians, is not a limiting factor for membership—rather shared deities become the bond that holds them together.\textsuperscript{152} We have seen that there is little if any invocation of \textit{ethnos} among these groups. However, the comparative evidence suggests an important question to ask of the outward spread of Christianity, which chapter six will ask of Corinth: If Levantine communities could move to highly mixed memberships naturally based on the diffusion and expansions of their trust networks, is it reasonable to suggest that Paul’s relating of Judaeans and Gentiles to one another was not driven by universalizing theology or even a “mission to the Gentiles,” but rather by the reality of cross-ethnos network bending? However, my argument in chapter six will reverse this narrative of outward spread, arguing instead that Paul founded an initially Gentile congregation in Corinth which then attracted Hellenistic Judaean worshippers. But in whatever direction the network bending occurs, it results in adapted rituals and practice that accommodates new vectors of identity.

To all this we must add the economic component of the shifting networks for both of these associations, and doing so further places the associations within their proper relationships to power.\textsuperscript{153} Here this must be primarily economic power, driven by the necessities of commerce and the movement of both associations further into Rome’s orbit. In this shift is the ultimate challenge which the next chapter will address: the worship of the deities hold together, at least

\textsuperscript{152} Baslez, \textit{Rechérches sur les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des religions orientales à Délos (IIe-Ier s. avant notre ère)}, 160.

\textsuperscript{153} Brah, “Diaspora, Border and Transnational Identities,” 186. She wants a diaspora theory which is "embedded within a multi-axial understanding of power; one that problematizes the notion of 'minority/majority."
for the Syrians, a disparate network of individuals (likely crossing *ethnē* although not always visibly to us). If we are to understand this as a trade diaspora, it cannot be based on a type of “ethnic collectivity” as John Armstrong puts it.\(^{154}\) Nor can we simplify the Phoenicians and Syrians into (respectively) “ethnic” or “universal” religions as Vertovec understand the place of religion in diaspora.\(^{155}\) For the Syrians sanctuary, the unifying role of the goddess looks more like what Paul Lovejoy identified in his seminal text in diaspora studies, in which Hausa traders of the Kola nut were not divided upon lines of ethnic difference, but rather the groups that had a shared religion of Islam were more successful at trading.\(^{156}\) This is something like we are witnessing in the Delian associations, where the deities facilitate trust and trade, but in turn the new connections in their network causes an evolution of worship and ritual in the sanctuary.

\(^{154}\) John A. Armstrong, “Mobilized and Proletarian Diasporas,” *The American Political Science Review* 70.2 (1976): 393; Otherwise on trade diasporas, see Curtin, *Cross-Cultural Trade in World History*, 2. He says that trade diasporas and communities are made up of people, usually those who live outside of the bounds of the normal community, who conduct trade between societies, as “an interrelated net of commercial communities forming a trade network, or trade diaspora;”


\(^{156}\) Lovejoy, *Caravans of Kola*. 
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5 Syrian and Phoenician Associations on Delos: Ritualizing Identities

The last chapter showed that the Poseidoniasts on Delos and the Syrian sanctuary were two very different immigrant groups. While the Syrian cult underwent three distinct stages, the final of which was a wholesale mixing of membership, the Phoenicians retained a relatively fixed ethnic membership. From this observation, it becomes possible to understand the ways in which the ritual lives of the cults interacted with their identities and the outside world. The third chapter argued that the worshippers of Bendis used the same rituals to justify whatever their communal identity and goals happened to be. Rituals were instrumentalized to create a trust network the community envisioned: both closed *ethnos* and mixed. This chapter will take a similar approach, arguing that for each of these immigrant-based cults, their construction of ritual cultic identities was driven by their community goals. In the case of the Syrians, the cult underwent a network bending that drastically reshaped the membership. As a result, the ritual expressions of the cult became a hybrid Graeco-Syrian form and we see mixed participation in the ritual practices. Yet beyond merely incorporation of these dual identities, the cult created new expressions of ritualized Syrianness, even as it became Athenian-led. The Phoenicians, by contrast, experienced little network bending. Yet their ritual expressions show their attempts to create bridging social capital with outsiders, and these relationships had a palpable impact on their practice.

Furthermore, for both cults, their relationship to the economy was paramount in shaping their rituals and worship. Whether they were fixed or mixed *ethnos*, these ritualized giving practices double as trust-creating economic benefits.
This chapter will serve as further evidence that group identity can be shaped and remade by network bending and bridging trust. Regardless of the ethnic character of an immigrant cult, rituals and worship flow from the trust network and changes within it.

5.1 The Syrian Sanctuary: Rituals and Ritualizing in a Mixed-Ethnic Group

5.1.1 Hybrid Rituals of Trust

There is an intrinsic connection between the trust networks of both groups and their ritual practices. Both evolved significantly in their worship while they were on Delos, as we shall see, invoking homeland practices and incorporating new ones. This type of ritual innovation can be understood as a type of hybridity: the melding of home and host and the creation of worship, rituals, and community that is something altogether different from its eastern counterpart.\(^1\) This hybridity was created in different ways, as each group responded differently to social prompts, while creating and recreating different-looking local manifestations of similar home cultures.

Marie François Baslez understands their key differences according to a theological divergence: the Phoenicians had a multiplicity of gods which were simply aligned with Greek equivalents, while Syrians put more focus on Atargatis over time, who retained a level of difference and exoticism as the Syrian goddess.\(^2\) This seems fundamentally correct. But the strategies of

\(^1\) Stuart Hall, “Cultural Identity and Diaspora,” in *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, ed. Jonathan Rutherford (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1990), 235: “Diaspora does not refer us to those scattered tribes whose identity is secured in relation to some sacred homeland to which they must at all costs return, even if it means pushing other people into the sea. This is the old, the imperialising, the hegemonising, form of ‘ethnicity’... the diaspora experience as I intend it here is defined, not by essence or purity, but by the recognition of a necessary heterogeneity and diversity; by a concept of ‘identity’ which lives with and through, not despite, difference; by hybridity.”

\(^2\) Baslez, *Rechérches sur les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des religions orientales à Délos (Ie-1er s. avant notre ère)*, 91–92.
preservation, accommodation, and recreation are also closely connected to the internal and external lines of trust each group constructed.

Since my goal here is to establish a link between rituals and trust networks, especially with expanding trust networks, it is important to observe first what the previous chapter highlighted: the large number of families from Syria in the sanctuary. This suggests that some of the bonds tying sanctuary members together were somewhat natural. This was true of Syrians, for example, we see a number of Syrian familial connections in the priesthood before the Athenian takeover. For example, there were two priestly descendants of the very large family of Apollonios of Hierapolis, in which one of his sons, Achaios, is priest, as well as one of his grandsons followed by either his son or grandson, Marionos. In another case, a certain Seleukos son of Zenodoros, from Hierapolis is a priest, who is followed by his son Antaios son of Seleukos, also of Hierapolis, before 118/7 BCE. Even the scattered remains from between 166 and 118 BCE suggest the importance of families. But families continued to be important even after the Greek takeover. The first Athenian priest, Menodoros son of Menodoros of the Myrrinoutta deme served alongside his son, Alexandros, who was zakoros. Likewise, the priest Theodoros son of Theodoros from the Aithalidai deme had his son or brother, Eukleon serving as the kleidouchos.

---

3. ID 2257 (pre 118/7 BCE); ID 2258 (pre 118/7 BCE).
4. ID 2247 (pre 118/7 BCE).
5. ID 2280; ID 2282: [Ἀγνὴ Θεοί, τοῦ Ανταίου τοῦ Σελεύκου Ἱεροπολίτου].
6. ID 2284 and ID 2260.7: Μηνοδ[ωροῦ τοῦ] Μην[ο]δ[ωροῦ Ἑ]γ Μυρρινού[τ]ης: We might suspect that this is a Greek priest. Names from this deme are always written ek Myrrinoutta for some reason, on Delos as in Athens (ID 1910 [c. 130 BCE]). Menodoros himself appears in ID 2630 (125-100 BCE), which is a list of some sort.
Therefore, behind any network of trust we can imagine, there are at least some family connections adding to that trust. But the focus of this section will be to explore the ways in which an ethnically varied cult supported trust across lines.

When the city of Athens took over administration of the cult of Atargatis on Delos (c. 112 BCE), numerous Greek cultic roles were incorporated into the cult. For example, the zakoros, which appeared frequently across the Greek world as a low level temple attendant or servant, begins to appear in Delian sanctuary of Atargatis at this point. This was a role that was adopted by many immigrant cults in Athens too, such as the zakoros for the orgeones of the mother of the gods in Athens who was a former priestess, and one was appointed for life. It seems probable that the position of zakoros came with a certain prestige, as it did at the nearby Sarapion. However, we have little information about the actual ritual practices and duties of the zakoroi in the sanctuary of the Syrian goddess. Generally, the name of the zakoros serves as a date holder in our

---

7 ID 2248 (112/1 BCE); ID 2229 (112/1 BCE); note that we have an Apollonia daughter of Eukleon in another inscription (ID 2293 [n.d.]).

8 The zakoros (like the kleidouchos), a temple attendant or servant (ID 2250 [107/6 BCE]; ID 2087-8 [c. 100BCE]; ID 2081 [94 BCE]; ID 2080 [115/4 BCE]). See comments at GRA I 41 (notes l.14) and p. 174; Dow, “The Egyptian Cults in Athens,” 201. In some cults, the zakoros would become more of a symbol of prestige over time, see Elena Muñiz Grijalvo, “Elites and Religious Change in Roman Athens,” Numen 52.2 (2005): 272–73; Also Susan Walker suggests that the Egyptian zakoroi were low level priests, while in Greece the zakoroi “acted as the guardian of the temple and was indispensable to the smooth functioning of the cult. In Hellenistic Athens the post was invariably held by a foreigner who was well acquainted [sic] with the ritual.” Susan Walker, “A Sanctuary of Isis on the South Slope of the Athenian Acropolis,” ABSA 74 (1979): 255–56, quote 256. This sanctuary of Isis had a female zakoros, who made dedications at the goddess’ instructions in a dream.


inscriptions (i.e. “when X was zakoros), although we do have one zakoros who was also a member of the bastageis and therefore also took part in the parading rituals (below).  

A second Athenian temple role that was adopted by the Syrian sanctuary was the kanēphoros. In a Greek temple, she was a young woman who was close to marriageable age. In Greek literature the purity and virginity of the kanēphoros was often fetishized. In addition to virginity, the kanēphoroi symbolized purity, especially in the cults dedicated to a goddess—perhaps an appropriate connection to the adaptation of Syrian purity expectations (below). They were certainly a part of the ritual processions, and were often connected with a deme. One of the kanēphoroi in the temple of the Syrian goddess from 100/99 BCE, Nymphes the daughter of Dionysios of Sphetto, was from the same deme as the priest that year, Philokles son of Zenon of the deme Sphetto. In 96/5 BCE, the kanēphoros was the daughter of the yearly priest. We also see the incorporation of the role of kleidouchos from the Greek temples, literally meaning someone who is in charge of the keys. The role of kleidouchos is mentioned from the beginning

11 ID 2628.iii.24 (108/7 BCE); We also have one dedication that was made by a zakoros, Dionysios. It is carved on a phallus, perhaps an imitation in some way of those phalloi in Hierapolis. ID 2224 (92/1 BCE), Photo, see Will, Le sanctuaire de la déesse Syrienne, PL. XXXIX.1.

12 In his Acharnians, dripping with innuendo, Aristophanes tells of Dicaeopolis and his wife, whose daughter the kanēphoros led the procession in the phallus ritual in which Xanthias took part. Ach. 241–262; also Lys. 1314-15.

13 Mikalson, Religion in Hellenistic Athens, 199; Matthew Dillon, Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion (New York: Routledge, 2003), 37–40. There were other similar roles, such as arrēphoroi.

14 ID 2628.iii.39 (108/7 BCE): Ζωίλα Διογένου: she is elsewhere mentioned as the kanēphoros (ID 2232.7 [107/6 BCE]: κανηφορούσης Ζωίλας τῆς Διογένους Κυδαθηναίως θυγατρός) her father is from the Kydathenaion deme in Attica. Zoila also appears in ID 2249 + SEG 36:740 (107/6 BCE).

15 ID 2238 and ID 2237.

16 ID 2240 (96/5 BCE): 1.4 : ἡ κανηφόρος Νικόπολις Γαίου Αχαρνέως θυγάτηρ.
of the Athenian priesthood, in 112/1 BCE. Finally, there was occasionally a public slave associated with the sanctuary: δημόσιος. Ultimately, the Greek takeover of the sanctuary brought with it a veneer of familiar Athenian forms. However, we see a number of emerging hybrid rituals which balance the old with the new.

While the sanctuary underwent an Athenianization in some of its structure, we can also identify several Syrian rituals that remained important in the sanctuary. Unfortunately, not all of these can be dated so that, while I include them here as a component of Syrian practice, it is not clear how the practice changed after the Athenian priesthood. Syrian iconography was widely adopted in the sanctuary and adapted into Delian worship. For example, the lions that often accompanied the goddess in the Levant may have also flanked the statue of Atargatis in Delos. (It is also possible that two winged Eros statues ordered for the sanctuary by Kleostratides of Athens, were also an adaptation of the lion tradition in the style of Aphrodite worship.) One of

17 ID 2248 (112/1 BCE): Eukleon son of Theodoros of the Aithalidai deme; also ID 2221, ID 2222, and ID 2228 (110/9 BCE); Heraios son of Apollodoros of the Souneion deme; ID 2232 and ID 2233 (107/6 BCE), Zenon son of Zenon of the Kephasia deme. This same fellow shows up in ID 2608 (early 1 BCE) in a dedication to Zeus Sotor and Athena Soter; ID 2234 (106/5 BCE): Diognetos son of Diognetos of the Melite deme.

18 ID 2232; ID 2249 + SEG 36:740 (107/6 BCE); ID 2250 (107/6 BCE); ID 2251 & ID 2252 (108/7 BCE & 106/5 BCE); ID 2234 (106/5 BCE); ID 2253 (106/5 BCE); ID 2255 (90/89?); ID 2256 + SEG 31:731; ID 2254 + SEG 35:884; ID 2292.

19 Will, Le sanctuaire de la déesse Syrienne, 147–48, points out the various images of the goddess from around, the couple, the goddess with lions on either side of her, the presence of a “sign.” There are hints of this imagery at the sanctuary, in the presence of an agalmata (ID 2227 and 2256) as well as the presence of a statue with some sort of perfume (ID 2225).

20 See images of a broken lion at Will, Le sanctuaire de la déesse Syrienne, P. XXXVII. 1-2. and perhaps reference in ID 2297; Will thinks the lions flanked the goddess, Will, Le sanctuaire de la déesse Syrienne, 152. The image on a coin from of the Venus from Gabala is flanked by winged lions or sphynxes, the iconography on the coins clearly influenced by Atargatis, see Dussaud, “Notes de mythologie syrienne IV. — Symboles et simulacres de la déesse parèdre,” 247 Fig. 26.

21 ID 2251 and 2252 (108 and 106 BCE). In this case, we can see the time elapsed between the ordering of the Erotes while Nikostratos was priest and their installation a year later while Aischronos was priest.
the most interesting examples of incorporation of Syrian practice at the sanctuary comes through the inclusion of purity rituals which identify the expectations directed at worshippers. These are preserved in an inscription (probably though not certainly) relating to the sanctuary:22

1 ἀγαθῇ τῷ χῃ ἀγνεύοντας εἰσίναι ἀπὸ ὀψαρίου τριτάιους ἀπὸ ὑείου λουσάμενον ἀπὸ γυναικὸς τριτάιους.<3>

5 ἀπὸ τετοκείας ἐβδομαίους ἀπὸ διαμορφής τεττάρακοσταίους ἀπὸ γυναικείων ἐναταίους.23

To good fortune; you shall enter abstaining from fish for three days; being purified from pork; refraining from (sex with) a woman for three days; after childbirth, seven days; after miscarriage, forty days; after menstruation, one day.

Here there are similar elements to the Hierapolitain practice. This might also include the prohibition of contact with dead bodies that Lucian reports from Hierapolis, which is perhaps unstated because of the general prohibitions around death and bodies on Delos.24 The abstention from fish is carried over, but we have an adaptation here from the total abstention required in Hierapolis to a three-day cleansing period on Delos.25 This probably reflects the simple realities around available food on an island as opposed to in the middle of the wilderness. So the construction of ritual purity seems to have been important still, yet the constraints can evolve

23 ID 2530 (n.d.).
24 Syr. D. 53. Lucian tells us that if one saw a dead body they had to be purified before returning to the temple, and if the dead person was a family member they had to wait thirty days. He also reports that the Galli would carry a dead man out, cover him with rocks, and wait seven days before re-entering the temple (51).
based on the situation and in relation to local realities.\footnote{Pierre Roussel, “Règlements rituels,” in Mélanges Holleaux: recueil de mémoires concernant l’antiquité grecque offert à Maurice Holleaux en souvenir de ses années de direction à l’École française d’Athènes (Paris: A. Picard, 1913), 265–79; Mikalson, Religion in Hellenistic Athens, 223–24, and perhaps influenced the purity expectations of the temple of Zeus and Athena Kynthios as well.} The adaptation of food laws to local realities, in particular, is reminiscent of the desire of some Corinthians to eat from the food offered to idols in Corinth, which the next chapter will discuss.

Another important preservation-yet-adaptation of the home practice in Delos, as at Hierapolis, was the ability to have some sort of perceived communication with the divine. This is exemplified by the presence of a small bronze ear on the side of the altar: the goddess hears.\footnote{See photo at Will, Le sanctuaire de la déesse Syrienne, PL. XXXIX.2. Atargatis and Hadad are invoked as hearing deities in an inscription from Ptolemais-accho, see Michael Avi-Yonah, “Syrian Gods at Ptolemais — Accho,” IEJ 9.1 (1959): 1–12; For the common invocation of deities who hear, see O Weinreich, Θεοὶ ἑπήκοοι, MDAI 37, 1912, 1-68; Javier Teixidor, The Pagan God: Popular Religion in the Greco-Roman Near East (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1977), 7–11.} For those who chose to give to the deities, the gifts were often marked with the Greek phrase κατὰ πρόσταγμα, indicating that the person was giving in response to a divine command.\footnote{ID 2280 (pre 118/7 BCE); ID 2248 (after 118/7 BCE); Baslez, Recherches sur les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des religions orientales à Délos (IIe-Ier s. avant notre ère), 289.} What this divine command may have looked like is, unfortunately, not clear. The communication of the oracle described by Lucian suggests that followers expected to know the will of the goddess, yet it seems unlikely that this elaborate ritual was behind the Delian dedications. After all, the whole city of Athens could fall under this divine command.\footnote{ID 2220 (110/9 BCE).} While this seems like a strict incorporation of the oracular functions from Syria, the divine command is interestingly blended with common Hellenistic benefaction practices discussed above and is closely tied to gifts given to the sanctuary. These rituals at the sanctuary give us a sense of how hybrid rituals could signal...
both Greek and Syrian identities, while even rituals imported from Syria underwent a natural evolution according to the realities of Delian life.

5.1.2 Inventing Syrianness in a Mixed-Ethnos Cult

The incorporation of these Syrian rituals raises an important question about the relationship of Syrianness to the cult. As the previous chapter showed, the sanctuary of the Syrian goddess underwent a wholesale shift from family, to immigrant cult, to a group or worshippers with widely-mixed cultural backgrounds—including some wealthy and well-connected residents of Delos. In the move from a private thiasos of a Syrian priest and his wife to honour Atargatis and Hadad to a cult based on an Athenian structure and calendar, the sanctuary underwent significant evolution in its practice. Yet the group still constructed a type of Syrian identity, even while most of the attendees in the sanctuary bore Greek names and, even those from Seleucid Syria, were thoroughly Hellenized. Nathaniel Andrade offers a useful lens for understanding the trifecta of Syrian identity (in Hellenistic Syria) in its intersection with a Greek aristocracy and an eventual Roman hegemony. He says:

> Syrians expressed Greekness and Syrianness by interweaving idioms of diverse origins within a vast spectrum of local or regional variation...They produced new, intersecting expressions of Greekness and Syrianness amid local and regional engagements with the “globalizing” tendencies of Roman imperialism.  

30 Andrade’s definition, appropriate for Hellenistic Syria, is equally valuable for understanding the invocation and evolution of the Syrian identity of members of the Atargatis cult on Delos. Those “Syrian” residents on Delos came from the cities of the Seleukid Empire and held Greek names. Yet the most active construction of a “Syrian” identity does not occur in naming practices, but

rather in the incorporations of motherland traditions into the cult, the worship of Syrian ancestral
gods, and even the preservation and ritualization of Aramaic cultic language. The adaptation of
purity practices for the Delian environment is an example of constructing Syrian identity, as is
the use of the *kata prostagma* formula to signify that the divine had ordered such or such a thing.
Furthermore, the practice of the goddess convening the cult rather than a *synagogos* was also a
common *marzēah* practice.\(^{31}\)

Ironically, even as Atargatis and her ritual worship was Hellenized on Delos, she became known
as the Syrian goddess—the epitome of *difference* at the exact point of her collision with Greek
identity.\(^{32}\) This difference is made up in exoticization as well, the most obvious example of this
is the presentation of the goddess and her followers in (Pseudo-)Lucian’s travelogue to the
sanctuary at Hierapolis. The incorporation of Aramaic at the sanctuary is an important
incorporation of Syrianness at the sanctuary on Delos, perhaps best explained through Andrade’s
explanation quoted above, that people created “new, intersecting expressions of Greekness and
Syrianness amid local and regional engagements with the “globalizing” tendencies of Roman
imperialism.”\(^{33}\) These Aramaic words at the sanctuary, transcribed into Greek to describe the
elements of communal worship. One of these refers to a ritual object, a NAMARA (τὸν
NAMAPAN), carved in a dedication by Gaius son of Gaius from the Acharnae deme. The

---

\(^{31}\) ID 2225 (n.d.); *BCH* 16, 1892, 161 n.22

\(^{32}\) Millar, *Rome, the Greek World, and the East*, 3–31. He argues that we can say little about the Hellenization of
Syria since we know so little of what Achaemenid Syria looked like; On the question of Hellenization of the
goddess, see Bilde, “Atargatis/Dea Syria: Hellenization of Her Cult in the Hellenistic-Roman Period?” who is
interested in the question, and Lightfoot’s appropriate critique of Hellenization as a useful lens in Lucian, *On the

dedication is on the side of a marble drum (53 cm high x 39 cm in diameter).  

It seems probable that the *namaran* refers to a candle base, although the root *nmr* in West Semitic languages, usually referring to a leopard, can also indicate something else that shines or gleams. René Dussaud argues that it is actually a crown or miter of the goddess, which is common on coins. Another possible Aramaic word to be adapted into Greek is Α[Δ]PANA. This is most likely the name of a deity Hadran, perhaps connected to the name Hadad. However it is also possible that it refers to a triclinium/banqueting hall, taken from the Aramaic *drwn*. The first interpretation seems more likely, since in the incorporation of other Aramaic nouns into Greek, an article is present. While this is a mosaic, and regular conventions may not apply, the name of a deity makes more sense here, especially since it was in a sanctuary and not a banquet hall.

34 ID 2240 (95/4 BCE), also ID 2241.
35 ID 2240.5 (96/5 BCE); Roussel, *Délos, colonie athénienne*, no. 35 (p. 424), speculates that it could be a town in Arabia.
37 S. Ronzevalle, “La Couronne d’Atargatis a Delos,” *MUSJ* 22.Fasc. 5 (1939): 111–21. He argues that the *NAMARA* is a crown-again, drawing from the sense of “brilliance” which I have already identified. He also argues that Lucian’s recognition of the *kestos* at Hierapolis is not a belt around her waist, but around her head. This suggests that perhaps she had some sort of jeweled head wrap resembling a crown on Delos; also René Dussaud, “S. Ronzevalle. — La couronne « Nemara » ? d’Atargatis à Délos,” *Syria* 25.1 (1946): 161–62.
38 ID 2244 (92/1 BCE).
39 Roussel, *Délos, colonie athénienne*, 261 n. 7. He cites several places where a deity with this name is mentioned, sometimes associated with Zoroaster; also J. T. Milik, “Les Papyrus Araméens d’Hermoupolis et Les Cultes Syro-Phéniciens En Égypte Perse,” *FR* 48.4 (1967): 573–74 n. 4. See here for an excellent summary of other places where HDRN is mentioned, including CIL III 14385; also cf. Baslez, *Recherches sur les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des religions orientales à Délos (He-lir s. avant notre ère)*, 85–86. who says that it is a hypostatic form of Hadad.
40 Alternatively, Will thought that it was the name of a deity, Hadran, see Will, *Le sanctuaire de la déesse Syrienne*, 146. He expresses doubt about whether this chapel of “Hadran” would have been used as a banquet hall, Will, *Le sanctuaire de la déesse Syrienne*, 146 n. 4. He sees it as evidence of some unknown deity and that Hadran means “glorious.” No evidence is given for this, but presumably he imagines *ḥdyr*, which appears in *Aḥiq* 207 or *hdr* at 108; by this logic, we should also consider *hdrh* and various compounds meaning “chamber” or “inner chamber,” see DSI 350.
However, we have another certain example of Aramaic adaptation for a cultic object in the dedication of TON ΕΙΓΑΝ, which is likely a term for the cistern near where it was found, a transliteration of the Aramaic ‘gn’ into Greek. This explanation is plausible in light of the inscription’s relation to the cistern as well as the common presence of sacred fish ponds at different temples of Atargatis, confirmed by archaeological remains elsewhere. It is not clear how this cistern was integrated into the ritual practices of the cult; if it did hold fish it was obviously in some way mimicking the sanctuary at Hierapolis, which Lucian reports had a lake with sacred fish that would respond to their name and had vibrant golden designs on them. In any case, for some reason the makers of the cistern thought that the Aramaic word was worth preserving. I would like to identify one further example of incorporation of an Aramaic word into the sanctuary; this is the role of archizappēs. This leadership position, an anomaly among the many roles adopted from Greek temples (above), only appears in reference to the Delian sanctuary. It is probably taken from the Syrian (Aramaic) rather than Greek context, indicated by several variant spellings (ἀρχιζάπφ-; ἀρχιζάφ; ἀρχιζάφφ). In the sanctuary of the Syrian goddess, we only have one person holding the position for nearly ten years: Phillipos. We never do find out his full name, he is simply indicated by his title, often in the genitive to indicate the time

41 ID 2234 (106/5 BCE); Will, Le sanctuaire de la déesse Syrienne, 154–55.
42 Franz Cumont, Études Syriennes (Paris: Auguste Picard, 1917), 36–37, who describes the sacred fish pond (with a drawing); Drijvers, Cults and Beliefs at Edessa, 79.
43 Lucian, Syr. D. 15, 45–7. It also seems like the water rituals are not limited to that place, since Lucian reports that they also happen at the sea (48).
44 ἀρχιζάφφου Φιλίππου: ID 2628.17 (108/7 BCE); ID 2253 (106/5 BCE); ID 2224 (105/4 BCE); ID 2274 (end II BCE) ID 2628.ΙΙΙ.33: Φιλίππος ἀρχιζά[πφης].
period (i.e. ἀρχιζάπφου Φιλίππου).\textsuperscript{45} Another person holding the title is witnessed in the funerary inscriptions of Rhenia from around the same time, another Syrian: Δημήτριος Ἀντιοχεῦ ἀρχιζάφφη χρηστὲ χαῖρε.\textsuperscript{46} There is probably a Syrian concept behind the title of archizapphēs, and it seems probable that the role is attested in the context of the marzēaḥ. One solution, which as far as I can tell has not yet been proposed, can be suggested in light of the marzēaḥ inscriptions from Palmyra, which make reference to two officers who are elected. The first is the rš marzēaḥ. This is the head of the marzēaḥ, which the Phoenicians on Delos refer to as the archithiasitēs. Yet there is another elected leader who is set over the treasury 1.9: דיהוא אחיד על ודהא ויהים.\textsuperscript{47} It is important that this word for the treasury or gold here in Aramaic דיהא appears with two interchangeable spellings in West-Semitic inscriptions: dhb and zhb.\textsuperscript{48} It seems probable that the prefix archi which so often stands in for rš or rb in leadership positions and appears at the Beirutian clubhouse as archithiasitos is here simply affixed to a Greek adaptation of the word zhb, the gold or the treasury, with the standard –ης ending so it could decline in Greek, the same strategy that is common for other Semitic words at the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{49} A comparable role of tamias (τάμιας) as a treasurer in the Beirutian sanctuary is simply an adoption

\begin{itemize}
  \item Example here from ID 2628.17 (108/7 BCE). The name Philippus who appears twice in the gymnasion records of 119/8 BCE, of which one is from Hierapolis (ID 2598.24).
  \item EAD 30.324 (125-100BCE).
  \item Teixidor, “Le thiase de Bêlastor et de Beelshâmên d’après une inscription récemment découverte à Palmyre,” 307; John L. McLaughlin, The Marzēaḥ in the Prophetic Literature: References and Allusions in Light of the Extra-Biblical Evidence, VTSup 86 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 51. In line 13. The דיהא refers to the treasurer or treasury to which/whom fines are paid.
  \item DSI, p. 306; Among the examples given here are A. E. Cowley, ed., Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), no. 10.9: silver and gold (כסף ודהב); no. 30.12: gold and silver (זהב וכסף); also no. 30.28; no. 31.11; Ahiq 193 (Cowley p. 219 & 225); also silver and gold: KAI 191.b; KAI 216.11; From Palmyra, CIS ii 3948.3 (on someone spending a denarius of gold).
  \item ID 2240- τὸν NAMAPAN. For possibilities see discussion below.
\end{itemize}
of the common Greek term. Thus, the variant spellings for the role (πφ, φφ, φ) represent the difficulty of adapting the Western Aramaic into Greek with the absence of any way in Greek to adapt the glottal ḫē into the middle of a Greek word. I suggest that this title is further evidence of the preservation of a role from the marzēah and, by extension, the use of Aramaic language for a cultic role.

I suggest that the inclusion of Aramaic at the sanctuary shows the Aramaic language becoming an “expression of Syrianness” at the sanctuary. These words could have fairly easily been assigned a Greek equivalent to match the Greek roles in the temple, but their preservation suggests both that translation would diminish the significance of the Aramaic words and that the ritualization of these words in a Greek linguistic context signalled Syrian ethos identity and rootedness for a mixed-ethnos cult. Even if some of the members spoke Aramaic, which seems likely, the incorporation of these few cultic words does not seem to be a functional bilingualism, but rather an invocation of the Syrianness of the cult for mixed members. Perhaps that language created authenticity for the attendees. In this case, the Syrianness of the cult is not expressed through the origin of the members, but rather the ritualization of a formerly mundane part of the Syrian ethos, the language itself. Ritual thus becomes an expression of a cult’s heritage regardless of the different ethnē that actually made up the membership. Therefore Syrianness in this case is not drawn upon from a shared ethnicity, but invented through ritualizing the Aramaic language.

---

50 ID 1519.46, 54 (153/2 BCE)
5.1.3 Cross-ethnos Participation

The last chapter identified the ways in which Thracians and Athenians participated in the parade, shown in Plato, in a way which created cooperation while retaining separation of ethnos. Later on, parading created unity among the ethnos of the Thracians. As the Syrian sanctuary moved to mixed membership on Delos, we have no sense that members from different ethnē or status contributed differently to the sanctuary. In fact, the little evidence we have of the application of ritual practice in the sanctuary suggests cross-ethnos involvement. This is one of the few examples we get of a ritual in which we can identify members involved, and it is informative.

The parading rituals, themselves a merging of Greek and Syrian cultures, are evidence of this cross-ethnos participation. The evidence records a group of people who carried something: the bastageis (βασταγεῖς). We have a list of people who worked under this title at ID 2628 col. iii; a diverse set of Greek and Roman names, as well as people who held other cultic roles, including the archizapphos, Philippos and the zakoros, Gorgias. The title and role of the bastageis elsewhere, but also can be from marzeah culture. Taken from the verb bastazō, this group was responsible for carrying the deity/ies on the throne in a procession; these were perhaps

51 Lucian describes two great feasts, the descent to the lake (Syr. D 47) and the pyre or flaming ritual with the procession of the divinities (Syr. D 49).

52 III.18; Syrians among the bastageis: ID 2628.III 28: Εὐκράτης Πρωτογένους, who is from Antioch, and had made a dedication to Hadad and Atargatis several years earlier (ID 2285 [113/2 BCE]); perhaps also III.30: Εὐήμερος Δημη[τρίου]: The name occurs a few times in the records, but someone with the same name from Antioch appears in IG II 8182 (II/I BCE: Εὐήμερος Δημητρίου Αντιοχεύς). There is also someone named Demetrios immediately below, which may be the father of this individual (l.32)

53 ID 2628. III 24, III.33

comparable to *pryphoroi* or *hydrophoroi* in Hierapolis, which Lucian talks about.\(^55\) They perhaps carried a throne or a cultic image of the goddess, something like happened in Hierapolis.\(^56\) By their names, we can see that it was a mixed-ethnic group, and that they participated in an *epidosis* (see discussion in chapter six):

**Figure 11: The list of the Bastageis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vac.</th>
<th>The carriers of the deity:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>col. III.18 βασταγεῖς·</td>
<td>Serapion son of Asklepiados 4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σαρεπίων Ἀσκληπιάδ(ου) δ’</td>
<td>L. Babylius Theophilus (slave or son of) Lucius 4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δεόκινος Βαβύλλιος Δεμάχην? δ’</td>
<td>Diogenes ? dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θεόφιλος δ’</td>
<td>A. Gessius Fallaius 4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διογένης δ’</td>
<td>Gorgias the zakoros 4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αύλος Γέσσιος δ’</td>
<td>Dionysios 4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀπολλοφάν(ης) Ἀντίοχ(ος) δ’</td>
<td>A. Gessius Apollophanes of Antioch 4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εὐκράτης Πρωτογένους δ’</td>
<td>Eukrates son of Protogenes 4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σω&lt;σι&gt;μένης Δωροθέου δ’</td>
<td>Sosimenes son of Dorotheos 4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διονύσιος δ’</td>
<td>Eueremos son of Demetrios 4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αὔλος Γέσσιος δ’</td>
<td>Diodotos son/slave of Manios 4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Καλλιστός Πρωτογένους δ’</td>
<td>Demetrios son of Aristeos 4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αὔλος Γέσσιος δ’</td>
<td>Philip archizaphes 4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αὐίλιος Σαραπίων δ’</td>
<td>Decimus Auilios ? dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αὔλος Γέσσιος</td>
<td>Serapion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διονύσιος</td>
<td>The carriers of the deity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αὔλος Γέσσιος</td>
<td>Serapion son of Asklepiados 4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διονύσιος</td>
<td>L. Babylius Theophilus (slave or son of) Lucius 4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diogenes</td>
<td>? dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Gessius Fallaius</td>
<td>4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorgias the zakoros</td>
<td>4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Gessius Apollophanes of Antioch</td>
<td>4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eukrates son of Protogenes</td>
<td>4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosimenes son of Dorotheos</td>
<td>4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eueremos son of Demetrios</td>
<td>4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diodotos son/slave of Manios</td>
<td>4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrios son of Aristeos</td>
<td>4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip archizaphes</td>
<td>4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decimus Auilios</td>
<td>? dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serapion</td>
<td>Serapion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^55\) Lucian mentions the priests who carry the fire and libations (*Syr. D.* 42). He also mentions people who carry water, but gives them no title (48: ἀγγήιον ἕκαστος ὕδατι σεσαγμένον φέρουσιν); Baslez, “Entre traditions nationales et intégration: les associations sémetiques du monde grec,” 241; For the practices of carrying the gods, see Louis Robert, “Le serpent Glycon d’Abônouteichos à Athènes et Artémis d’Éphèse à Rome,” *CRAI* 125.3 (1981): 530, the common practice, highlighted in the Acts of the Alexandrian/Pagan martyrs where each group carried their own god “ἐκατοκεφαλαίων θεόν θεοῦς.” He cites other papyrological and epigraphical examples; on water carrying in the Judaean tradition, see Benko, *The Virgin Goddess*, 60–61.

\(^56\) Lucian, *Syr. D.* 34. Likewise, a throne was included in some manner in the ritual space of the sanctuary, known from two dedications as well as the preserved throne base. An inscription on it refers to the generosity of the well-known Kleostratides (below) who provided it, see ID 2250 (107/6 BCE). However, there was an earlier reference to a benefactor setting up a gilded throne, which was gilded by the priest, Demonikos son of Heuremonos of the Anaphlystios deme, ID 2627 (110/9 BCE). We also have the dedication of various altars. One is from a certain Achaioi son of Apollonios of Hierapolis who was chosen priest and subsequently dedicated a small altar, indicated by the diminutive form (*τὸν βωμόν*), which was dedicated in 128/7 BCE, see ID 2232 (107/6 BCE); for the small altar ID 2226 (128/3 BCE). A later Athenian, Aischirion son of Aischion son of Dionysios of the Melite deme also dedicated an altar (*τὸν βωμὸν*), ID 2232 (107/6 BCE), and Will has argued that there is evidence for at least another altar from the presence of a staircase leading to a raised platform from the *exedra*. Will, *Le sanctuaire de la déesse Syrienne*, 150.
The diversity is interesting. They are all males (of course, we have at least one female participating in the parade as the *kanephore*), but they are a mixed group which includes slaves without patronyms. The list suggests that the parade was made up of people from different backgrounds who participated in a hybrid ritual. (Presumably the ritual eating was also a place where different *ethnē* mixed, but we know less about the banqueting life of the sanctuary with the exception of a relief of a banqueting scene and a possible [but unlikely] reference to the triclinium/drw. The list of *bastageis* gives us a brief glimpsed of a community that was mixed and participated equally in the ritual life.

### 5.1.4 Friends and Money

The ritual giving landscape in both the Syrian and Phoenician sanctuaries provides an indication of how important this benefaction was and, furthermore, the real influence it could have on practice. In chapter two, I made the case that trust networks could be closely tied to the economy. In particular, I argued that those things considered “religious” could be understood through the lens of New Institutional Economics (NIE) as helping associations construct themselves as “institutions of trust” which, because they were oriented towards rituals and deities, could work to reduce transaction costs, especially agency costs, and promote the trust required to trade, over long distances. Both the Syrian and Phoenician associations show the use of rituals and worship as an economic institution, primarily since the relationships between the sanctuaries and some of

57 Baslez, *Rechérches sur les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des religions orientales à Délos (IIe-Ier s. avant notre ère)*, 168–69.

the most powerful people on Delos were negotiated through “religious” acts: namely, shared worship and ritual practices. One of the clearest examples of this for both the Syrians and the Phoenicians is the question of ritualized giving. Again, it is not my intention to try to separate religious action from economic action here or below; NIE usefully suggests that the two may be interwoven. Although different in their makeup, both of the Syrian and Phoenician associations were remarkably similar in the ways in which ritual giving connected powerful individuals to the group.

One of the most obvious examples of ritual giving in the Syrian sanctuary is the three powerful friends whose gifts evoked reciprocity and the type of competition for valor which so many associationscoveted.  

Having argued that the rapid growth at the sanctuary of Atargatis on Delos came at the time when Hierapolis was at the front of Eastern trade, and having explored the possibility that Syrian families were involved in ferrying goods from Hierapolis to Delos, we are in a better position to understand the possible reasons for which high-level traders, including Romans connected to senatorial families, were involved in the sanctuary.

Ritualized giving and the inscriptions that accompanied it betray the integrated relationships of powerful people, although we remain mostly ignorant of what precisely these relationships

59 Ilias Arnaoutoglou, “Between Koinon and Idion: Legal and Social Dimensions of Religious Associations in Ancient Athens,” in Kosmos: Essays in Order, Conflict, and Community in Classical Athens, ed. Paul Cartledge, Paul Millett, and Sitta von Reden (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 80; See also chapter three, the example of IG IP 1284 which is supposed to inspire other benefactors to give.

accomplished in a business sense. We can detect a trust network of wealthy people forming social capital through the dedications at the sanctuary. One of the clearest examples of this comes in 106/5 BCE, when we see the invocation of friendship between an Athenian and a Syrian. Up until this point most dedications had been for an individual, for a family, or for a city. ID 2234 (106/5 BCE) marks the beginning of the career of the priest Zoilos son of Zoilos of the deme Phlya:

1 Ζωίλος Ζωίλου
Φλυεύς, ιερ<ε>υς γενό-
μενος Ἁγνής Αφροδίτης
ἐν τοί ἔπι Αγαθοκλέους
5 ἄρχοντος ἐνιαυτοῦ,
ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθη-
ναίων καὶ τοῦ δήμου
τοῦ Ῥώμαιων καὶ ὑπὲρ
τοῦ ἐαυτοῦ φίλου Μῖδου
10 τοῦ Ζήνωνος Ἡρακλείου
καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν θεραπευτῶν,
Αγνή Αφροδίτη ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων

Zoilos son of Zoilos from the deme Phlya, when he became priest of the Pure Aphrodite during the yearly archontship of Agathokles, dedicated this to the Pure Aphrodite at his own expense, on behalf of the people of Athens and the people of Rome, and on behalf of his friend, Midas son of Zenon from Herakleia and on behalf of the Therapeutai.

At first glance the dedication of the fish pond to his friend may seem like a simple progression in the evolution of the cult: the Greek priests giving gifts to the sanctuary and happening to mention a powerful friend. Midas was probably from Herakleia on the south coast of Anatolia and had connections within the Roman community, evidenced by his dedication of a bench to the Italians

---

61 LGPN 3 28911, PAA 6251; ID 2251; 2252; 2234; 2253; ID 2254 + SEG 35:884 (all 106/5 BCE).
in the Italian agora. But lest we think that Zoilos was merely Zoilos playing a sycophant to a powerful Delian trader, his friend Midas himself makes a dedication later that year in the sanctuary. It is not clear whether Zoilos’ inscription prompted Midas’ gift or it was in progress already. Yet he was remarkably generous towards the sanctuary of Atargatis; he dedicated the hall, the supplies for the roofed colonnade, and the house.

1 [Μίδας Ζήνων]ψως Ἡράκλειος [τί]ήν εξώδραν
[— — — — — —]ατην καὶ τα ὑ[π]ὲρ την στοὰν
[— — — καὶ τὸν] οἶκον ἐκ τῶν ν ἱδ]ίων ύπὲρ τοῦ δὴ-
[μου τοῦ Λαθηναίον καὶ τοῦ δή]μου τοῦ Ῥωμαι-
5 [ων καὶ — — — — — —]ΕΧΕΜ[— — — — — — —]οῦ Δημητρίου
[ethn.? καὶ τοῦ] ἐ[νυτὸς Φ]ιλοστράτου
[τοῦ Φιλοστράτου Ἀσκαλονιτίου καὶ τοῦ ἱερέως
[Ζωίλου τοῦ Ζωίλου Φ]ιλοστράτου κ]αὶ τῶν θεραπευ-
[τῶν, Ἀφροδίτη]ὶ Α[γνή] Θεόη χαριστήριον,
10 ἐφ’ ἱερέως Ζω[ίλου Φλ]υέως,

Midas son of Zenon of Herakleia dedicated the hall and the (supplies) for the roofed colonnade . . . and the house at his own expense, to the Pure Aphrodite Goddess, on behalf of the people of Athens and the people of Rome and . . . son of Demetrios and of his own friend Philostratos son of Philostratos of Askalon and of the priest Zoilos son of Zoilos of the deme Phlya and the therapeutai, a thanksgiving, in the priesthood of Zoilos of the Phlya deme, Eutuchidos was public slave, Philippoias was archizaphpos, Isidoros was zakoros.

63 ID 2253 (106/5 BCE); In terms of the progression, I have considered ID 2223 (ἱερ<ε>υς Ἁγνῆς Ἀφροδιτης) to mark the beginning of Zoilos’ term. In 2253 he is already priest (ἐφ’ ἱερέως Ζωίλου Φλυέως).
64 And perhaps something else that lies in the lacuna at line 3. For Midas, see LGPN 3a 28062.
Elsewhere he would dedicate a mosaic to the Syrian goddess. The construction of a hall, colonnade, and a house was presumably a huge expense. Zoilos’ ability to attract Midas as a benefactor paid huge dividends towards the group’s success. Yet the connections of “friendship” did not stop there, and in his own dedication we can see that Midas called out the wealthy Philostratos of Ascalon, the banker.

The question that arises from the bonds of “friendship” that hold together these three powerful men is what it means in this context. Elsewhere in Delian inscriptions, the language of friendship suggests a real connection between two people. However, in some cases they are of unequal social status, some dedications suggest that the dedicant is on a lower social level than the honouree. This does not mean that there were no bonds of friendship between them; Zoilos and Midas clearly have a reciprocal relationship. What’s more, Midas is no stranger to invoking the language of “friendship.” He also dedicated an enormous statue in the Antigonos Stoa in the Agora of the Italians to his “friend”, C. Billienus son of Gaius, the Roman strategos/consul.

---

65 The dedication of an exedra is further attested in ID 2288 (105/4 BCE) as with the building of a Mosaic, which Midas paid for (ἐψηφολόγησεν); on this word see Michael Donderer, Die Mosaizisten der Antike und ihre wirtschaftliche und soziale Stellung: eine Quellenstudie, Erlanger Forschungen 48 (Erlangen: Universitätsbibliothek, 1989), 4.

66 For Philostratos, see ID 1717 (c. 100 BCE); ID 1718 (c. 100 BCE); ID 1724 (c. 100 BCE), see also Martti Leiwo, “Philostratos of Ascalon, His Bank, His Connections and Naples in c. 130-90 B.C.,” Athenaeum (Pavia, Italy) 67 (1989): 575–84.

67 For example, ID 1534 (116–80 BCE), Simalos son of Timarchos of Salaminios dedicates something to “his friend”, Stolos son of Theonos of Athens, who also happens to be a kinsman of King Ptolemy Soter II, the archedeatros (dish taster??) and nauarchos and epistolographos. Also a dedication of one Roman to his friend the strategos (ID 1842 [134BCE]), another dedication by Dionysios son of Dionysios of the Sphetto deme to his friend, the Roman antistrategos (ID 1843 [125–100BCE]), Nikonos of Athens (the epimelētēs) to his xenos and friend, Servius Cornelius Servius, the Roman strategos anthypatos/proconsul (ID 1845 [110/9 BCE]).

68 ID 1854 (end I BCE). Here C. Billienus is called the strategos hypatos. This is the common way to express a proconsul, see Scipio Aemilianus Africanus (Africanus the Younger) who was consul and is described as a strategos hypatos (ID 1842.1–3 [134 BCE?]), also L. Caecilius Metellus son of Quintus (ID 1604bis [c. 85 BCE]: strategos hypatos); Monika Trümper, “The Honourific Practice of the ‘Agora of the Italians’ in Delos,” in Polis und...
The social capital being leveraged in the sanctuary, therefore, suggests that the priest was two steps removed from the Roman consul. Moreover, the inclusion of Philostratos in this network is also telling, and suggests that there may be financial relationships undergirding these “friendships,” although Philostratos also makes other dedications in the sanctuary of Atargatis and may be connected there.\footnote{ID 2628.I.29.} He was tremendously wealthy, and he used his money to endear himself to the Romans—dedicating an entire wing of the Italian sanctuary, for example. He famously became a citizen of Naples following his stay on Delos (it is suggestive here that there are Neapolitans who venerate the goddess several years later).\footnote{ID 2265 (98–6 BCE).} The only things that can possibly tie these three people together are the worship of a shared goddess and business (a financier, a trader, and a priest) and these are not mutually exclusive. Shared business and shared worship are likely the foundation of their trust network and their “friendship.”\footnote{We also have an example of oaths sworn to the goddess for financial matters, see ID 2531. It includes a curse and a requirement that the \textit{therapeuta}e curse the oath breaker.} But the gifting of enormous sums of money to the Syrian sanctuary suggests not only competition for benefaction, but the promise that the relationships mediated through the sanctuary held some tremendous value to these three men.

\begin{flushright}
The Syrian sanctuary therefore incorporated hybrid rituals of trust that bound together people from different *ethnē* who participated in the sanctuary. Furthermore, I have argued that the incorporation of the Aramaic language serves as a novel expression of Syrianness, exactly at the point where the association was quickly becoming mixed and Hellenized. Finally, the ritual life of the association held together an ethnically disparate group of people who attracted powerful benefactors, and served as an institution for some (unseen) trade.

5.2 The Phoenician Deities: Ethnic Exclusivism and Bridging Trust

5.2.1 Phoenician Worship

Where the Syrians on Delos entered a phase of a mixed-ethnic cult, bringing numerous outsiders into their midst, the Phoenicians remained—as far as we can tell—a monolithic group drawn from Beirutian trader families. Nevertheless, the rituals employed by the Poseidoniasts did not create isolation or boundaries, but were efforts to endear themselves to key outsiders. Therefore, even for this (relatively) fixed ethnic group, their cultic practice (here rituals and the worship of deities) did not create an inward focused diaspora group who preserved an expression of home, but rather the evidence suggests that rituals and worship were often invoked specifically to build trust with outsiders. The Poseidoniasts rapidly acculturated to their Delian environment (although this process of course may have begun at home). They quickly adapted to the Hellenistic building and ritual practices on Delos, and assimilated elements of their worship. Perhaps this is evidence of their previous relationship with Hellenistic culture at home, as Corinne Bonnet argues for the Tyrians, who saw the Greeks as liberators from the Persians and
therefore embraced Greek rule and culture. Their built environment, the clubhouse, was a massive “peristyle house,” funded by a Roman benefactor and banker, Marcus Minatius son of Sextus; it was, as Philippe Bruneau said, “un bâtiment complexe, un des plus originaux de Delos.” Monika Trümper argues that the exterior of the building did not follow residential norms, but was a building which “testified to the commercial power and high social standing of the association.” The activities that took place in the clubhouse seem to be mostly ritualistic and related to the meeting (as opposed to the interpretation that selling and merchandising was done inside; this interpretation imagined that the space was constructed around the housing of merchants and a type of office space for the associated business.) Instead, the activities in the clubhouse likely centered around the feasts and the cultic activity—perhaps more-so than in the Greek sanctuaries—although, as we shall see, these could be closely tied to business.

Like the Syrian sanctuary, there were certainly practices from home that were incorporated into the Poseidoniasts’ clubhouse. One of the roles that was adopted from homeland and mārzeaḥ practice was the archithiasitēs (ἀρχιθιασίτης). Above, I argued that the Syrian archizapphes was

---


75 Webb, Hellenistic Architectural Sculpture, 137; For the argument that the space was devoted to the cult and meeting, see Monika Trümper, “Where the Non-Delians Met in Delos: The Meeting-Places of Foreign Associations and Ethnic Communities in Late Hellenistic Delos,” in Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age, ed. O. van Nijf and R. Alston (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 55–59. She makes a similar argument of the Agora of the Italians, which was also, she says, not actually an agora in any sense, see Trümper, “The Honourific Practice of the ‘Agora of the Italians’ in Delos.”

a role which involved dealing with the finances of the association, also taken from mārzeah culture. The better-attested role of archithiasitēs in the Phoenician organizations is not common outside of Delos but appears numerous times on the island. The Tyrian immigrants who honoured Herakles (Melqart) had Dionysios son of Dionysios as an archithiasitēs. In the only inscription we have from the group, he made the proposal to honour a communal benefactor, Patron son of Dorotheos, and the archithiasitai are responsible for declaring honours for the benefactor at communal sacrifices. The section of text reads:

45 . . . ἐπιμελὲς δὲ ἔστω
toῖς καθισταμένοις ἀρχιθιασίταις καὶ ταμίαις
καὶ τοῖ γραμματεῖ ὅπως ἐν ταῖς γινομέναις θυ-
σίαις καὶ συνόδοις ἀναγορεύηται κατὰ ταύτην
tὴν ἀναγόρευσιν. . .

Let the archithiasitai who are appointed and the treasurers and the scribe take care that in the banquets and meetings this proclamation will be made. . .

The multiple archithiasitai witnessed in our inscription are unusual. They may be an indication that there were multiple subgroups within the Tyrian group, especially given the varying terms for the group koinon, synodos, thiasitai: the whole of which is called an ekklēsia. But there is as of yet not clear picture on how these possible terms refer to the group and, if there were multiple groups, how they relate to one another.

77 The enatistai (celebrators of the ninth day) use the title in inscriptions honouring Isis, Sarapis, and Anubis, see IG XI,4 1228 (early II BCE); IG XI,4 1229 (early II BCE); outside of Delos there is one inscription mentioning the title, from the Magna Mater cult in Pamphylia, SEG 6:718. I do not know how to reconcile this title to the common Phoenician usage on Delos.

78 ID 1519.2–3, 46, 54, 55 (153/2 BCE).

Otherwise, the *archithiasitēs* is the most common cultic title preserved in the inscriptions of the Poseidoniasts from Beirut, where we have the following people holding the office:

**Figure 12: People Holding the Office of Archithiasitēs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME τοῦ Ἱέρωνος</th>
<th>NAME son of Hieron</th>
<th>ID 1791</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mnaseōs τοῦ Διονυσίου</td>
<td>Mnaseos son of Dionysios</td>
<td>ID 1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διονυσίου τοῦ Σωσιάτρου</td>
<td>Dionysios son of Sosipater</td>
<td>ID 1779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γοργίου τοῦ Ἀπολλοδόρου</td>
<td>Gorgias son of Apollodoros</td>
<td>ID 1982 (c. 90 BCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δημοκλέους τοῦ Δημοφώντος</td>
<td>Demokles son of Demophantes</td>
<td>ID 1796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At a minimum, ID 1520 (after 153/2 BCE), an inscription recording the honours for the Roman benefactor Marcus Minatius, indicates that the *archithiasitēs* was responsible for leading meetings, dealing with punishments for members who had not properly honoured the benefactors, including the distribution of a voting pebble (l. 85 ψῆφον) to the members (θιασίταις), as well as the physical erecting of the decree honouring the benefactor on a stone stele (l.90). Like the priests of the Syrian cults, they occasionally dedicate upon taking the office (ID 1791). It is fairly clear that the title of *archithiasitēs* is adopted from mārzeaḥ practices, a stand-in for the typical chief of the banqueting clubs in West Semitic meetings, the prefix archi- (ἀρχι-) is likely a translation of rav/RB (master/head). The fact that this is the only title to participle (τοῖς καθισταμένοις) obviously apply to both nouns, and we might read this as singular (ie. the yearly *archithiasitēs* and treasurer), yet this is made difficult by the presence of the single scribe (τῶι γραμματεῖ).  

carry over seems like a testament to the importance of banqueting culture with the Poseidoniasts and that they were willing to differentiate themselves as a Levantine cult in some ways.

5.2.2 Ritual Practice and Bridging Trust

The Beirutians were ethnically uniform, unlike the Syrian cult which underwent a widespread mixing—as we have seen above (although the comparison is limited by the fact that Syrian mixing happened later in the second century and most of the Poseidoniast evidence comes from the mid-second century). Yet what is clear from the limited evidence of the Phoenician practice on Delos is that new rituals were instrumentalized to create bridging trust with outsiders. One of the most obvious places we see this is in incorporation of the goddess Roma into their worship. A statue of this goddess is preserved in a small sanctuary room in their clubhouse, one of three or four rooms on the west side of the temple. Here the statue of the goddess still stands among the ruins of Delos, her flowing robes an indication of a once elegant statue, her head perhaps lopped off in the Mithridatic attack on all things Italian on the island. The inscription underneath reads:

Ῥώμην θεὰν εὐεργέτιν,
τὸ κοινὸν Βηρυτίων Ποσειδωνιαστῶν
ἐμπόρων καὶ ναυκλήρων καὶ ἐγδοχέων,
εὐνοίας ἕνεκεν τῆς εἰς τὸ κοινὸν καὶ τὴν πατρίδα.
5 ἀρχιθιασιτεύοντος τὸ δευτέρον


The Poseidoniast koinon of merchants and shippers and egocheis from Beirut, honour
goddess Roma, a benefactor, on account of the goodwill that she has shown to the koinon
and the fatherland. Mnaseos the son of benefactor Dionysias being the archithiasitēs
(ἀρχιθιασίτης) for the second time. Menandros Melanos the Athenian made (the statue).

The elegant statue was carved sometime in the second century BCE and placed into one of three
small naoi, likely dedicated to Poseidon, Astarte, and either a third unknown deity which Roma
replaced or the statue itself.83

The goddess did not originate in Rome, but rather emerged from Asia Minor in the second
century BCE, likely as a new manifestation of the former Hellenistic ruler cults.84 Tacitus
identifies Smyrna as the place of origin, with the consecration of a temple to her.85 Roma was
likely aligned with some unknown Phoenician goddess in the Poseidoniasts’ sanctuary, just as
Poseidon and Aphrodite were, yet her inclusion in the sanctuary is an example of
instrumentalizing worship to create between Phoenicians and Romans, a symbolic nod to the

82 ID 1778 (II BCE).
83 Charles Picard, having excavated the temple, thought that there were three Phoenician deities honoured and that Roma
came later, *L’etablissement des Poseidoniastes de Bérytos*, École française d’Athènes, Délos 6 (Paris: E. De
Bocard, 1921), 44–50; also Jean Marcadé, *Au Musée de Délos : étude sur la sculpture hellénistique en ronde bosse
découverte dans l’île*. (Paris: Éditions E. de Bocard, 1969); Philippe Bruneau argued instead that Roma was there
from the beginning, Philippe. Bruneau, “Les cultes de l’établissement des Poseidoniastes de Bérytos à Délos,” in
*Hommages a Maarten J. Vermaseren*, ed. Margreet B. de Boer and T. A. Eldridge, vol. 1, 3 vols. (Leiden: Brill,
argument that the statue of Roma was made following the Mithridatic invasion of 88 BCE, Hugo Meyer, “Zur
cronologie des Poseidoniastenhäuses in Delos,” *MDAI (A)* 103 (1988): 203–20, refuted by Bruneau, Bruneau,
“Deliaca (IX),” For an overview of the issues of dating this sculpture and inscription, see B. Hudson McLean, “The
Place of Cult in Voluntary Associations and Christian Churches on Delos,” in *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-
of Roma, Baslez considers her the equivalent of Tyche and some similar Phoenician goddess, Baslez, *Recherches
sur les conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des religions orientales à Délos (IIe-Ier s. avant notre ère)*, 71–72.

85 *Ann.* 4.56; for a summary of her creation and worship, see Mellor, “The Goddess Roma.”
power of Rome with her namesake deity who would eventually be seen as the consort of the
divine emperor.\footnote{She accompanies the deified emperor or the emperor’s family: \textit{Hypata-IG} IX.2 32 [Imperial]: \textit{θεοῖς Σεβαστοῖς}; TAM \textit{V.2} 903 [27BCE-14CE]: \textit{θεᾷ Ῥώμῃ καὶ Αὐτοκράτορι Καίσαρι θεοῦ υἱῷ θεῷ Σεβαστῷ καὶ τῷ Δήμῳ}). For more on Roma see comments at \textit{IAssos} 20 [103], \textit{IPergamon} 364 [111], in Philip A. Harland, \textit{Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society} (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 65–69, 112.\footnote{ID 1763 [94 BCE]; Mellor considers this inclusion to come from the non-Roman members of the cult rather than from Italians, \textit{Thea Rhome: The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World}, Hypomnemata: Untersuchungen zur Antike und zu ihrem Nachleben 42 (Göttingen: Vandehoecck and Ruprecht, 1975), 66, 151; Association of Hestia, Demos, and Roma, see Bruneau, \textit{Recherches sue les cultes de Délos à l’époque hellénistique et à l’époque impériale}, 444–46.\footnote{\textit{IAssos} 20 [GRA 103]; \textit{IStratonikeia} 507; \textit{et al}}

Roma was not common on Delos, although there was perhaps another statue of
her in the agora of the Competaliasts and there is another association of Hestia, Demos, and
Roma.\footnote{IAssos 20 [GRA 103]; IStratonikeia 507; \textit{et al}} The event behind her title of \textit{euergetis} is, unfortunately, not clear, although there are
other inscriptions to Roma which call her by the same title.\footnote{IAssos 20 [GRA 103]; IStratonikeia 507; \textit{et al}} Yet there can be no doubt of the
strategic cultural accommodation which her inclusion entails. Her inclusion no-doubt signified to
their Roman partners on Delos their respect and admiration, and perhaps even accommodation
and acquiescence. Its trust-bridging significance is fairly clear.

The second place where we can see concerted efforts to create bridging trust is in the honorific
practices of the group, specifically in their attempts to create bridging trust with wealthy and
powerful people. Although they only had visible relationships with a handful of people outside
of the association who appear in their ritual life, we can likewise suggest that these were the
relationships with and to the power structures that occupied their trade networks. In this sense,
we get glimpses of the types of social capital which the Beirutians were either trying to create or
exploit. This is clear from the earliest inscription from the group, which comes from before the
period of Delian independence in 166 BCE. Here they honour a benefactor, Heliodoros son of

\begin{footnotesize}
\textit{\footnote{She accompanies the deified emperor or the emperor’s family: \textit{Hypata-IG} IX.2 32 [Imperial]: \textit{θεοῖς Σεβαστοῖς}; TAM \textit{V.2} 903 [27BCE-14CE]: \textit{θεᾷ Ῥώμῃ καὶ Αὐτοκράτορι Καίσαρι θεοῦ υἱῷ θεῷ Σεβαστῷ καὶ τῷ Δήμῳ}). For more on Roma see comments at \textit{IAssos} 20 [103], \textit{IPergamon} 364 [111], in Philip A. Harland, \textit{Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society} (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 65–69, 112.\footnote{ID 1763 [94 BCE]; Mellor considers this inclusion to come from the non-Roman members of the cult rather than from Italians, \textit{Thea Rhome: The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World}, Hypomnemata: Untersuchungen zur Antike und zu ihrem Nachleben 42 (Göttingen: Vandehoecck and Ruprecht, 1975), 66, 151; Association of Hestia, Demos, and Roma, see Bruneau, \textit{Recherches sue les cultes de Délos à l’époque hellénistique et à l’époque impériale}, 444–46.\footnote{\textit{IAssos} 20 [GRA 103]; \textit{IStratonikeia} 507; \textit{et al}}}
\end{footnotesize}
Aischylos of Antioch, a close friend (τὸν σύντροφον) of Seleukos IV Philopator. Beirut is referred to by its Seleukid name, Laodicea: 89

Ἦλιόδωρον Αἰσχύλου Ἀντ[ιοχέα] τὸν σύντροφον τοῦ βασιλέως Σ[ελεύκου] Φιλοπάτορος καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πρα[γμάτων] τεταγμένον οἱ ἐν Λα[οδικείαι]

5 τῇ ἐν Φοινίκῃ ἐγδοχεῖς καὶ να[ύκληροι] εὐνοιάς ἔνεκεν καὶ φιλοστο̣[ργίας] [τ]ῆς εἰς τὸν βασιλέα καὶ εὐεργ[εσίας]
tῆς εἰς αὑτοὺς Ἀπόλλωνι. 90

To Apollo: The egdocheis and sailors in Laodikeia in Phoenicia honour Heliodoros son of Aischylos of Antioch, the kinsmen of King Seleukos Philopator and the one appointed over the affairs of state, on account of his goodwill and his affection for the king and benefaction to them.

Seleukus Philopater was the Seleukid King from 187–175 BCE, at which point he was murdered by the same Heliodoros who is mentioned in our inscription, then serving briefly as a guardian and regent for his son Antiochus. 91 Their honours for him are likely a reflection of the networks in which they moved and the reliance on a relationship with the powers in Hellenistic Syria to do their job. The egdocheis were likely commissioned buyers who moved long-distances as purchasers. 92 Of course, the merchants (emporoi) are notably absent from this early construction of the group. They were added at some later point, perhaps after 122/1 BCE. 93

89 the name here showing the brief resurgence of the name “Laodicea” in honour of King Antiochus VIII Moore, “Berytos-Laodicea Revisited.”

90 IG XI,4 1114 (187–75 BCE).

91 Erich S. Gruen, The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 1:646–47; In 2 Macc 3, Heliodorus plots to rob the widows and orphans fund at the temple in Jerusalem; Heliodorus was deposed quickly by Eumenes and Attalus who set up Antiochus IV Epiphanes as king in 175 BCE, see App. Syr. 45; For a list of the honourific statues for foreign rulers on Delos, see Christy Constantakopoulou, Aegean Interactions: Delos and Its Networks in the Third Century (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 114.

Another inscription dedicated to a powerful person comes nearly a century later by the Beirutians; this time they honour the virtue of Gnaius Octavius son of Gnaius (90 BCE) who was the Roman *strategos/praetor*.  

1 [τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐν Δήλῳ]
[B]ηρυτίων Ποσειδωνια[στῶν]
ἐμπόρων καὶ ναυκλήρων
[k]αι ἐγδοχέων Γναῖον Ὀκτα[ῖον]

5 Γναῖοι στρατηγὸν 'Ρομαίο[ν]
τὸν εὐεργέτην,
ἀρχιθιασιτεύοντος Γοργίου
tοῦ Απολλοδόρου.

Evidence from the papyri show that they travelled and made purchases with foreign currency (P.Cair.Zen. 59021 [258 BCE]: the director of the mint complains that *egdocheis* come into town with foreign currency which must be reminted.) They are also involved in guaranteeing purchases in the papyri, see P.Mich. I 23 (257 BCE): a complaint to Zenon from a certain Aisterides who has been made *egdocheus* of corn (προβεβλῆσθαι με σίτου ἐγδοχὲα) and is too young to fulfill the liturgy, likely underwriting the town’s grain supply from his own pocket (Κόστερ, *Der ΣΙΤΟΥ ΕΓΔΟΧΕΥΣ in P. Mich. Zen. 23,* 308); PSI VI 566 with BL 3 224 [Nov. 27, 254 BCE]: a request that Zenon provide a surety (ἐγδεξάμενος) for the contract on castor oil, perhaps because its purchase was above the yearly *sumbolon* (Henri Henne, “Sur l’interprétation de P.S.I. 349 et 566,” *JJP* 4 (1950): 89–99). His surety once given is called an ἐγδοχή; We get the same meaning of ἐκδέχομαι in LXX Genesis 43:8, in which Judah gives a guarantee that he will take care of Benjamin; for letters of guarantee, see P.Mich. I 28 [Mar. 29, 256 BCE]: ἐπιστολὴν σοι κομίζω ἐγδοχῆς; P.Lond. 2 227 Ra with BL 1 242 & 3 393 (Jul. 3- Aug. 1, 177BCE): παρανυσίου ἐγδοχῆς (guarantee of grain); In UPZ 1 100, l. 3.85-6 [164 BCE], correspondence from the archive of the *dioiketes*, Herodes writes that someone’s childishness precedes “the guarantee (εγδοχή) of the commands.” The word also appears in the Roman era: P.Oxy. XIV 1673 (IICE); 1669 (IIICE); 1748; P.Oslo III 144 with BL 3 127 (272-5CE); PSI VI 584[IIIBCE], Agesilaos promises an accompanying letter from Ammonius, in which he will make *egdochoi*, probably best translated as ‘guarantees’, from the payments or tributes; this is an agreement about the cut which Zenon will get; Similar to this, P.Köln XIII 521 is recently published in which an *egdochos* is a guarantee of payment which is given to hold the actual payment until some sort of judgement can be made by a superior; See also P.Petr. III 64. B6. *Ecedecato*. With this evidence, the interpretation of these people as guarantors or authorized buyers seems to most likely.

93 Roussel, *Délou, colonie athénienne*, 90.
94 ID 1782.
The koinon of Beirutian Poseidonast merchants, sailors, and middlemen on Delos, honour Gnaeus Octavius son of Gnaeus, strategos\(^95\) of the Romans and benefactor when Gorgios son of Apollodoros was archithiasitēs.

The title of *euergetēs* in relation to the *praetor* Gaius suggests that he has helped the group in some way, although this is not clear.\(^96\) This may refer to a direct gift or simply a policy or action that benefitted them indirectly, as we see from a group of Italian sailors and merchants who acknowledge that they benefitted when Ptolemy II Euergetes retook Alexandria.\(^97\) The fact remains that these types of dedications for rulers by groups including sailors, merchants, and buyers must be evidence of the need to perform appreciation for the people who had the power to stabilize their trade networks. Although we cannot map the network as we can for the Syrians, it seems likely that these powerful people created the institutions that required alignment to them and appreciation for them. We see the same phenomenon with a group of *egdocheis* in Alexandria who set up a statue in honour of Krokos the kinsman of King Ptolemy and Queen Kleopatra the sister and wife, which seems like a ploy to keep a shipping route open from Egypt to/through Cyprus at a difficult time politically.\(^98\) These examples suggest that the groups who relied on long-distance travel and stability of trade networks would honour the people who made

\(^{95}\) Otherwise the position of *strategos* on Delos seems to align with *praetor*. Brennan, *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic*, 2:376, 744, 876. For (pro)consul = *strategos hypatos*, see note 68 above; Servius Cornelius Lentulus son of Servius was also *proconsul* is called the *strategos anthypatos* in Greek (ID 1845 [c.110/9 BC]), see also C. Billenus son of Gaius (ID 1854 [end I BCE]: *strategos anthypatos*); C. Claudius son of Lucius (ID 1679 [c. I BCE]: *strategos anthypatos*); see E. Badian, “The Consuls, 179-49 BC,” *Chiron* 20 (1990): 403–5.

\(^{96}\) There are three generations of Cn. Octavii, the grandfather was praetor of the Roman fleet (168 BCE). He was later the *consul* (165 BCE). This is either his grandson or his son or grandson. If it is the grandson, it can be dated to c. 90; For a summary of the careers of all three, see Lawrence J. Bliquez, “Gnaeus Octavius and the Echinaioi,” *Hesperia* 44.4 (1975): 431–34; Also T. Robert S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, vol. 2 of *Philological Monographs* no. 15 (New York: American Philological Association, 1952), 596, who says he was *praetor* by 90BCE, and perhaps also the *promagister*. See p, 595 for his father and grandparents.

\(^{97}\) ID 1526 (after 127 BCE); Théophile Homolle, “Les Romains à Délos,” *BCH* 8.1 (1884): 107; for another regional association of foreign sailors on the Nile, see BGU VIII 1741; 1742; 1743 (63 BCE).

\(^{98}\) ID 1528 (127 BCE).
this possible, perhaps also in an attempt to endear themselves to these powerful figures and ensure future goodwill. This practice of honouring powerful people is obviously an attempt at bridging social capital—these figures were not likely to become members of the sanctuary. In the same way as the worship of Roma, we see the attempts of these groups to use ritual giving and worship to network with people whose goodwill benefitted their business.

5.2.3 Benefactors and Evolving Ritual Practice

The other example of benefaction from the Poseidoniast sanctuary provides an interesting balance to the evidence above, which shows the group honouring important people who were unlikely to join the sanctuary. In this case, one Roman benefactor, Marcus Minatius son of Sextus was closely connected to the sanctuary. He was a wealthy banker who gave 7000 drachma for the construction of their peristyle house (below), as well as fronting cash for the work and waiving the interest. The account of his help and the associated honours given him is preserved in ID 1520 (153/2 BCE or 149/8 BCE) and is quite detailed. Apart from the extensive rituals created to celebrate him, it appears that some association members may have chosen names for their children that honoured him. The name Μνασέας is used several times at the sanctuary. In the first place, Mnaseas son of Dionysios appears (perhaps connected to the same family of Dionysios son of Zenon above) as a generous benefactor and served as an archithiasitēs for the second time when the statue of Roma was set up.99 Another person’s name is lost, but he has the patronym Mnaseas (perhaps his son).100 Three other sons of Mnaseas are

99 ID 1773, ID 1775, ID 1778.
100 ID 2611.a.1.33.
Chares, Dionysios, and Sopatros.\textsuperscript{101} Mnaseas is witnessed elsewhere as a Phoenician name, where \textit{mnḥm} is adopted into the Greek, \textit{Μανάσης}.\textsuperscript{102} But it seems possible that the phonetic similarity of this name was the reason it was chosen for people in the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{103}

The inclusion of Marcus as a benefactor has a remarkable outcome for the Poseidoniasts: they incorporated his veneration into the rituals of their cult in a combination of financial and dining rituals—in effect reshaping their ritual practice. The account of his help and the associated honours given to him is preserved in ID 1520 (153/2 BCE or 149/8 BCE) and is quite detailed. It records that the building project of a house was in progress, but needed an influx of money to complete it (l. 3 \[\varepsilon \text{ις τ\'ην συντέλειαν το\'ν ο\'κου\]) and bolster the common funds. This is in response to some type of decree (l.4 \[\tau\'α ψηφισθέντα\]) to create this, but it is not clear what this means. M. Minatius’ response to this moment of need is remarkable, waiving the interest (l. 10 \[τόν τόκον\]) from the loan, offering an advance (l. 11 \[διαφόρου<υ>\]), and most impressively, 7000 drachmas (l. 13) of his own as a gift. He also hosted a special sacrifice and banquet in honour of the synod and promised to do more good in the future. Marcus’ gift is lavish in comparison, say, to the chunks of donations listed in the theater inscription at the sanctuary of Atargatis—here the highest gifts are several hundred drachma. And the response of the Poseidoniasts is proportional to the generosity of the gift. Marcus is permitted to choose the location for both a statue in the courtyard and a painted portrait inside. Beyond this, he is given the choice seats for both the festivities for Poseidon and the other meetings (l. 33–4). But above and beyond these gifts of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item ID 2611.b.1.7, 14, 15.
\item Bonnet and Guzzo, “Anthroponymes Phéniciens et Grecs: Remarques sur leurs correspondances,” 5.
\item Furthermore, we also have either slaves of Marcus himself or sons of someone with the same name present in the sanctuary: \textit{Ἀλέξανδρος Μαάρκου} and \textit{Ἀντίοχος Μαάρκου}. ID 2611.a.1.52, 60.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
thanksgiving, the association gives him a day of celebration each year (l. 34 ἡμέρα καθ’ ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ἐνιαυτὸν) after the parade for Apollo, a gold crown (l. 37) with accompanying proclamations, and the offering of a bull in his honour (l. 50) with a placard around its neck in his honour. This is interesting, because here we have the creation of new rituals in honour of a benefactor. While the gift and adoration exchange does seem to serve as bridging social capital, Marcus Minatius was also brought into the very ritual core of the sanctuary and the worshipping life is rewritten around his gift.

So far we have the elegant creation of a ritual of trust, a yearly memorial of the gift of M. Minatius. The inscription goes on to threaten penalties for those who violate the terms of the celebration of Marcus, a considerable 6000 drachma fine for anyone, including the archithiasitai who should cancel or interfere with the yearly celebrations (l. 65), and a 1000 drachma fine for herdsmen who do not appropriately treat the processional bull (l. 80). In addition to the monetary punishments, there is also the threat of a curse (l. 82 τῇ ἀρᾶι). Presumably the association wanted to preserve these ceremonies for a long time, but even more so they wanted to be seen preserving the memory of a generous benefactor, by their own account, so that many others might try to emulate his gift (l. 54 γίνωνται πολλοὶ ζηλωταὶ τοῦ φιλοδοξεῖν).

The incorporation of a benefactor into the community’s ritual life can be compared to the single source that we have from the other Phoenician group on Delos: the Tyrians. We have an account of them sending an ambassador to Athens for permission to build their temenos. The romanticized account of Patron son of Dorotheos and his trip to Athens to supplicate for a place

---

104 ID 1519.12 (154/3 BCE): Patron son of Dorotheos is a wealthy member of the association (l. 4 τῶν ἐκ τῆς συνόδου), and the inscription set up in his honour observes that he gives money without hesitating (l. 6-7 πολλὰς χρείας παρείσχεται ἄπροφασίστως).
for the Tyrians on Delos describes in detail how he went out of his way to do so, and how he
presented the association’s case over a two-day period. The only account we have of the
Herakleiates of Tyre is therefore this inscribed mythology of ritual giving, from a benefactor
who gave both his money and his relational ability to the cause of the Tyrians. The association
understands that they are creating a future climate which may encourage more benefactors, and
they crowned him in the yearly celebratory banquets for Poseidon, set up a statue of him,
declarations of his benefaction, and exemption from fees.

The giving practice of the Syrian Atargatis worshippers may display some connection to the
common marzēaḥ practice in which elected leaders were expected to offer a payment for the
position; this is especially the case in later Palmyrene inscriptions, where the leader furnished
either the position or the banquet. It may also be the adopted tradition of Athenian priests
giving lavish gifts of buildings and supplies to the sanctuary; it eventually coincided with the
start of their priesthood. The Poseidoniast giving, by contrast, seems to have come one

105 ID 1519.26-27.
106 Teixidor, “Le thiase de Bêlastor et de Beelshamên d’après une inscription récemment découverte à Palmyre,”
310. The member is required to pay money, either for the privilege of leading as Teixidor says (110), or perhaps
merely to fund the banquet, as suggested by McLaughlin, The Marzēaḥ in the Prophetic Literature, 51–53. He calls
the marzēaḥ here a “highly structured collective”
107 The cautions to this interpretation are ID 2242, a fragment “[— — ἱερεὺς γενόμενος — — — —] and ID 2279
which seems to refer to someone becoming a priest. Both are undated, and so could be from before 110/9 BCE.
This year Demonikos son of Heuremon from the Anaphlystos upon becoming priest dedicated something, perhaps a
stoa, to the goddess marking his new position; the dedication is at his own expense (ek tōn idiōn). ID 2230:
Δημόνικος Εὐρήμονος Ἀναφλύστης, ἱερεὺς γενόμενος. Here the thing dedicated is lost. However, ID 2228
(110/9 BCE) has someone dedicating a stoa upon becoming priest, which may be Demonikos rather than Theodotos
(below n. 129). He also dedicated a house and the victims for the oracle (τὴν οἴκησιν καὶ τὰ χρήστηρια), ID
2231 (110/9 BCE). We can see his dedications outside of his priesthood too (ID 2220.8–9) as well as outside of the
sanctuary (ID 1834 [end IIBCE]; Other dedications by priests when they take up the position, ID 2628 (108/7 BCE):
Nikostratos son of Demaretos from the Lamptrai deme, when he became priest, dedicated the theater to the pure
goddess along with the θεραπευταί who are named; ID 2232 (107/6 BCE), Aischrion son Aischrion son of
Dionysios of the Melite deme dedicates the altar when he becomes priest of the Pure Aphrodite (The inclusion of a
grandfather’s name is rather strange, but is most likely because there was a roughly contemporary man with the
225
benefactor who was remarkably generous. Yet both Syrian and Phoenician associations used giving to create economic advantage, and it is no coincidence that we have bankers connected to both: Philostratus and Marcus Minatius. It may be that these wealthy benefactors drew upon a sort of trust that is inherent to familial groups and even the broader *ethnē*. The necessity of trust for long distance trade is specifically implicated in the need to take risks when advancing capital or sending goods over long distances. Therefore, benefaction among these Delian associations might, in a real sense, purchase access to existing familial and ethnic networks and the economic opportunities that came with them. This could be an access to what Peter Temin calls customary behavior, in which transaction costs are reduced in exchanges through the benefit of predictable behavior created by social expectations, traditions, and customs, and presumably both parties benefitted from this relationship. We furthermore have hints of the level of wealth and influence the Beirutians may have had, and the cross-cultural connections

—


Foddy and Yamagishi, “Group-Based Trust,” 17–18.

worn by their trade, which stretched into Italy.\textsuperscript{111} Gary Reger, in a chapter on networks in the Hellenistic economy, uses New Institutional Economics as a point of entry for the ancient economy. He argues that the Poseidoniasts show how connections to Roman benefactors combined with the structures of Phoenician associations on Delos and their similarity to Roman \textit{collegia} could create space for Poseidoniasts to travel through the networks.\textsuperscript{112} Part of Reger’s argument hangs on what the relationship of the Poseidoniasts to these type of powerful figures really was, whether they were afforded special treatment by these high-level individuals or simply hoping that they would be noticed in their veneration. This can only be speculation, but what is clear are the ways in which the attempts to endear themselves to benefactors rewrote the cultic practice of the Phoenician associations.

But for our purposes, these examples show us not only the material value of benefactors to associations, but the ways in which these benefactors and their financial relationships could be used to create new rituals of celebration for their heroes—benefaction can prompt ritual change. Furthermore, the acts of benefaction shows how financial well-being and trade are closely connected to worship and ritual practice and offer an useful corollary to the suggestion in chapter two that, through trust networks, ritual practice and worship can be identical to economic activity. This is true both in bridging social capital creating economic possibility for trading, but also the reciprocal interaction which could exist between ritual celebration and financial gifts.


5.3 Conclusion

We have seen two diverging uses for ritual practices in the Syrian and Phoenician sanctuaries. Where the Phoenician groups remained relatively fixed in terms of membership, the Syrians have a wholesale network bending. Yet both groups use rituals and worship to navigate relationships across *ethnē* and to outsiders: the Syrians through bringing them in and the Phoenicians through creating bridging trust. The work of Paul Christopher Johnson offers a useful way to frame these evolutions. In his attempt to argue that *religion* can emerge from *diaspora*, he suggests four tenets\(^\text{113}\):

1. **Conscious Reworking of Identity**: “Formerly ‘natural’ [and] unspoken parts of the social environs and its quotidian routine, religious words and acts are now made objects of conscious selection. They must be planned, allotted space, deliberated, and settled upon.”

2. **Immigrant Innovation for Connection**: Immigrant groups are innovative as they perform their identity in an interaction with the host culture.

3. **Creation of Space**: Diasporas create and recreate a “spatial trail” within which they exist.

4. **Sacralizing**: Diasporas are involved in “catalyzing new forms, sources, sites, and brokers of the sacred.”\(^\text{114}\)


Johnson’s use of the terms *diaspora* and *religious* are both problematic here, which I rejected in chapter one as ways of partitioning history. Yet there remains some observable truth: that these Phoenician and Syrian immigrants on Delos do follow these four patterns of both creating their identity on Delos and using and creating rituals and worship to relate to the world around.

Johnson’s first point is that there is a conscious reworking of identity by immigrants. With replacing *religion* here, we can suggest that the rituals and worship that make up the life of the sanctuary take on a certain meaning that flows from being selected. This is true of the hybrid ritual forms discussed above, especially in the preservation of cultic titles from home; *archithisitēs* and *archizapphos* show the intentional incorporation of *marzēah* roles into the worship on Delos. Of course, it is also true of the use of the “formerly quotidian” Aramaic language, which is intentionally invoked in a new context. These roles must have carried weight for those who attended the associations and perhaps added a certain authenticity. They take on a certain significance in these two associations that they might not have at home, being products of intentional incorporation. The process of reworking identity in this way is what Rima Berns McGown calls “cultural weaving.” In her theoretical work, she identifies how this weaving takes place through a delicate balance of integration and how that integration is shaped by the political culture of the host.\(^{115}\) It is this type of “weaving” that we see in both associations as they integrate Levantine and Greek practices into Delian life.

The second of Johnson’s points suggests that as immigrants engage with new environments they are innovative. This is precisely what we have seen, and I have argued that the engagement with

\(^{115}\) Berns-McGown, *Muslims in the Diaspora*, 7. She suggests that it is the attitudes of governments (for our purposes powers) that dictate the shape of the immigration, comparing London and Toronto as sites for Somali migrants.
outsiders—bridging social capital—and with insiders—network bending, are both mediated through ritual. Common worship does not become a boundary marker to separate the association from the outside world. Rather, the very worship practices from home are put to use to cross the lines of difference in a new culture and to form connections with outsiders. Immigrant identity is not constructed strictly in boundaries, but is made through crossings, connections, and transversals, each of these pregnant with opportunities for hybridity and points of cultural translation. It can be useful to frame this use of ritual and worship for cross-boundary connection through contrast to the modern understanding of religion as bounded and privatized, existing in a separate sphere from public life. Whether this commonly accepted place for religion is an accurate portrayal of modern religion is debatable, but for the study of antiquity, in which religion cannot be a bounded or separated element of life, it becomes more helpful to see these rituals and worship as ethnos practices instead. For Frederik Barth, ethnic difference is never about complete otherness, but is full of comparisons and points where difference can be minimized instead of accentuated. And for these two associations, their gods were used to facilitate and ease relations with the outside world, in some ways marking off difference, but in others pushing into new forms of being and new lines of membership. This understanding of ritual or worship as capable of being instrumentalized to build either bridges or walls follows from the previous chapter as well where the Bendis associations use them to do both. Moreover, in the following chapter we will see a group of Judaeans in the Corinthian community who clearly feel that their acts of ritual eating at “idol” suppers are benign, to which Paul is opposed.

In this case too, for Judaeans, chapter six will show that it was those things we might consider *religious* that enabled engagement with the outside world, and Paul ascribes rituals of eating and giving to promote unity and exclusivism instead.

To the third point, the creation of space, I have devoted little attention here. However, the irony of studying ancient diasporas through archaeological remains is that the spatial trail is all that we have access to, what Manuel Vásquez calls the “material aspects of religion.” From this perspective, we see the innovation taking place as this type of creation, including the new cultic roles from the Athenian temple and the veneration of the goddess Roma. These new shapes of worship are prompted by the reality of the locality on Delos, and the subsequent sacred space that flows from this. Finally, Johnson points out that immigrants in their worship create “new forms, sources, sites, and brokers of the sacred.” This creation of sacrality or sacralising is what Manuel Vásquez uses to describe the *religious* in motion: that . . .

. . . within and through networks, actors carve out spaces to dwell, itineraries, and everyday routines, drawing from religious symbols and tropes to reflect on and orient their own practice and to ‘sacralize’ nature and build environments.

We do see a sort of sacralising; perhaps the most prominent example here too is the use of Aramaic. Yet we must be careful with this line of interpretation. Sacralising suggests marking

---

118 Vásquez, “Studying Religion in Motion,” 156.
things off as sacred, creating distance from the profane. In fact, the incorporation of these new forms of sacrality, say in the rituals of benefaction that bring new rituals into the sanctuary, are not marked off as a sacred which is disconnected to the mundane or profane, but rather they are closely connected to business and the economy, as I showed above. Since Vásquez work here is aimed at modernity, it may be a different process to imagine how actors can “carve out spaces . . . drawing from religious symbols and tropes” when we do not accept the existence of a home religion from which to draw. These immigrants do create new forms of sacrality, but as we have seen, sacralising is not strictly an act of carving some area of as such, but flows from a desire to create and maintain trust.

---

Chapter 6
Inventing Diaspora in Corinth
6 Inventing Diaspora in Corinth

6.1 Introduction

This chapter will use the lens of trust networks to explore the Corinthian ekklēsia. Rather than identify Corinth as a “diasporic community” into which Christianity entered, the initial Corinthian community as Paul founded it was likely Gentiles and that the entry of Judaeans into the community proved a challenge for Paul’s authority and expected community practice—in particular, this problem is most visible in the challenge of meat offered to idols which the Hellenized Judaeans were eating. His response is to advocate for a new imagined community which is based on the ideal of an exclusive koinōnia. The picture of Judaeans and Gentiles in Corinth, I argue, is quite different from the typical mythology of early Christianity emerging from a Judaean diaspora, a mythology which is invented by Luke.

The argument will proceed as follows:

1. The Shadow of Network Bending: In this section I argue that 1 Corinthians brings us into a mixed ethnic community that has recently faced network bending, namely, the entrance of Hellenistic Judaeans and related teaching figures. This change creates tension through issues of practice between the weak Gentiles and strong Judaeans that Paul refers to in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10 and leaves Paul’s authority and credentials in question. I suggest that a weakened Paul actually wants the strong Hellenistic Judaeans to avoid eating meat sacrificed to idols.

2. Luke—Inventing Jewish Diaspora and Gentile Mission: I then return to the question of diaspora in Corinth to argue that it is the Lukan understanding of the Gentile mission
that creates a Judaean diaspora from which Gentile Christianity moves (after the Judaean’s rejection). This likely has nothing to do with “what really happened” in Corinth, coming rather from Luke’s historiographical goals of tying the Christ movement closely with a Judaean heritage and diaspora and justifying the Gentile mission through Judaean opposition. I will conclude with observations on how Luke’s invention of the diaspora has dominated Christian origins and how Corinth challenges it.

6.2 In the Shadow of Network Bending

6.2.1 Network Bending

In chapter two, I outlined the relationship between the trust structure of a group and its identity. I suggested two ways that evolutions in the shape of a trust network, both internally and externally, could affect group identity.

1. As communities shifted and brought in new membership, the initial trust network of a community changed its theological and ritual makeup—as process I called “network bending.”

2. Even where there is not a change in membership itself, new bonds of trust formed with outsiders (bridging social capital) can also drive changes in rituals and theology.

3. As networks bend, rituals can create trust across former lines of difference, especially (for my purposes) across ethnē.

These types of network changes force changes in group theology and practice. As an example of network bending, we have seen from the Syrian sanctuary on Delos how a changing membership base, which expanded to include many non-Syrians, could unite around the worship of the Pure Goddess and the hybrid ritual structure that accompanied this. The Poseidonists give us an
example of a group that does not open up to accommodate new members—it does not “bend” as such. Yet the desire to forge new relations to Rome and Romans (likely through the two chief benefactors of the group) prompt the inclusion of a new goddess, Roma, in the Phoenician Pantheon. And for each of these groups, shared worship holds together a network that stretches beyond their geographical location. In the case of the Thracians, the worship is actually dictated by law that demands ritualized trust between groups in order to enhance a sense of common _ethnos_.

### 6.2.1.1 Gentiles Who Know Scripture?

The starting point for understanding the makeup of the Corinthian community is at the writing of 1 Corinthians. Since it is at least Paul’s second letter to the community (1 Cor 5:9), we are seeing a community which has a history of dealings with Paul, who considers himself their spiritual father (1 Cor 4:15). At this point in its history, the _ekklēsia_ in Corinth was obviously made up of both Judaeans and Gentiles: a mixed group (1 Cor 9:20–21) of people who were both formerly gentiles (1 Cor 12:2) and whose ancestors (1 Cor 10:1–5) wandered in the desert. Of course, the issue of _ethnos_ is only one of the many divisions in the Corinthian _ekklēsia_ which reflected some of the status divisions of the city while having both slaves and mixed genders. However, since my interest here is Paul’s work on Judaeans and Gentiles, I focus primarily on _ethnos_. By the

1. It is not clear that either of these community descriptors should be taken literally, but neither is it clear that they should be discarded as metaphorical.

2. Christine M. Thomas, “Greek Heritage in Roman Corinth and Ephesos,” in *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society*, ed. Steven J. Friesen, Daniel N. Schowalter, and James C. Walters, SNTS 134 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 117–47. We should imagine that the Corinthian _ekklēsia_ likewise reflected the high mélange of the broader Corinthian culture.
time of 1 Corinthians, I argue, there was a group of people in the Corinthian ekklēsia who understood themselves to be Judaean in some way.3

Yet this mixed community at Corinth presents us with an interesting conundrum: The people who Paul mentions by name in reference to the Corinthian Christ group bear names that are not typically Judaean, yet the writing of the Corinthian correspondence contains deep and complex Judaean themes and references—many of which would not be obvious to someone who was a recent convert to Christ worship. The names can be gathered from a compilation of those who send greetings (likely from Corinth) in Romans 16 and those Paul mentions in the Corinthian correspondence (I have omitted Acts here, for reasons which will be discussed below). The value of a list of names like this is limited, since it is incomplete and contains itinerants who may not have been based in Corinth (ie. Apollos, Timothy). Furthermore, onomastics are a notoriously problematic indicator of identity, useful primarily when a name is obviously an ethnic flag but

3 I remain cautious about what a relationship to this label meant. We can observe here John Barclay’s useful articulation of assimilation among Egyptian Jews (although I prefer acculturation to assimilation). While he imagines some Judaean communities and/or authors that had a particularist and isolationist view of Judaean identity, he identifies a range of situations which he says could bring about “high assimilation.” These are: 1. “Jews fully integrated into the political/religious affairs of state, 2. Social Climbers, 3. Jews who married Gentiles and failed to raise their children as Jews. 4. Jewish Critics and Opponents of Judaism, 5. Allegorists who abandoned key Jewish practices, 6. Isolated Jews.” John M. G. Barclay, Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander To Trajan (323 BCE To 117 CE) (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), 104–12. While this overemphasizes and essentializes the label of Judaean and, to an extent, makes “Jewishness” practice based, it nevertheless expresses quite well the range of meanings that Ioudaios could have for the person who held it. Furthermore, I leave unanswered the ratio of Judaeans to Gentiles in the Corinthian ekklēsia, as well as the question of “what type of Jews” they were. I absolutely reject the proposal that Corinth was a solely Judaean audience, for example, as proposed in J. M. Ford, “First Epistle to the Corinthians or the First Epistle to the Hebrews,” CBQ 28.4 (1966): 402–16. She makes this case based on the stringency of the observance of some community members and its midrashic feel.
limiting for most names. Nevertheless, the names associated with Corinth are as follows (I have marked which are attested as Judaean names):

Figure 13: Names of People Mentioned in Relation to Corinth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 13: Names of People Mentioned in Relation to Corinth</th>
<th>Figure 13: Names of People Mentioned in Relation to Corinth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 1:14; 16:17</td>
<td>Στεφανάνθ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 16:21</td>
<td>Τιμόθεος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 16:21</td>
<td>Τάσιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 16:21</td>
<td>Σωσίπατρος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 16:1</td>
<td>Φοίβην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 16:17</td>
<td>Φορτουνάτου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 16:17</td>
<td>Ἀχαϊκοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor 2:13; 7:6</td>
<td>Τίτον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 16:22</td>
<td>Τέρτιος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 16:23</td>
<td>Γάιος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 16:23</td>
<td>Ἐραστος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 16:23</td>
<td>Κούαρτος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 1:11</td>
<td>Χλόης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 1:12</td>
<td>Απολλών</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 1:14</td>
<td>Κρίσπον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor 1:14</td>
<td>Γάιον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom 16:21</td>
<td>Λούκιος</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


⁵ This name is rarely attested as Judaean. See, CIJ 642 (Pula: III-V CE): Sons honour their mother, Aurelia Soteria, who was Judaeicae metuenti; Stephanos: CIJ I. 405 (Monteverde: III-IV CE), who is a gerusiarcb.

⁶ Commonly a Judaean name. See for example, JIWE i. 149=CIJ 650d (Catania: IV-V CE); CIJ 32=JIWE ii. 474 (Villa Torlonia: III-IV CE): the name Jason with a menorah; JIWE ii. 538= CIJ 289 (West bank of Tiber: post II CE); C.Pap.Jud. 406.5 (I-II CE); 329.2 (105 CE); 328a.1. 104 CE); et al. See also comments at David Noy, Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe: Volume 1, Italy (Excluding the City of Rome), Spain and Gaul (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 197.

⁷ This name is also rarely attested as Judaean. See, JIWE i.14 (Ostia: I-II CE): Plotius Fortunatus the archisynagogos and his family; JIWE ii.118=CIJ 418: The epitaph of Fortunatus, a three year old who died in his sleep along with his brother. The inscription has amphora, menorah, and a shofar drawn on it.

⁸ Lucius is occasionally given to Judaeans, but the dearth of examples of what was such a popular Roman name suggests it was not common. See for example, JIWE ii.244=CIJ i.155: Vigna Randanini (III-IV CE); JIWE ii. 377=CIJ I 212.
From this list, Paul identifies Lucius, Jason, and Sosipater as Judaeans who are present at the writing of Romans (16:21)—but they are not mentioned in 1 Corinthians. According to Christian tradition, the figure of Apollos (1 Cor 1:12) is a Judaean from Alexandria who, Acts reports, adopted Paul’s teachings over time.\(^9\) I will argue below that he is a competing teacher of Judaean wisdom traditions.

What remains is a list of early Christ-followers in Corinth who are probably Gentile. Even Crispus, who Acts 18:8 reports is a synagogue leader, is not likely Judaean (the name is almost never attested as such).\(^10\) Yet this list of Gentile members is at odds with the way in which 1 and 2 Corinthians are constructed, namely, Paul’s constant use of and allusion to scripture within the Corinthian correspondence, indicating that his audience is familiar with them. In some cases, this includes an explicit introduction of a scriptural quotation, most commonly through using phrases like “it is written,” which might be useful for a non-Judaean audience.\(^11\) However, elsewhere in 1

\(^9\) Apollos is obviously a key figure. Acts 18:24–25 reports that he is a Judaean from Alexandria, a well-spoken man (ἀνὴρ λόγιος), who only knew of John’s baptism. He was corrected by Priscilla and Aquila (v. 26) and went to Achaia with letters of recommendation from the believers in Ephesus (Acts 18:27: οἱ ἄδελφοι ἐγραψαν τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἀποδέξασθαι αὐτόν). Apollos is also mentioned in Titus 3:13; seeCorin Mihaila, The Paul-Apollos Relationship and Paul’s Stance toward Greco-Roman Rhetoric: An Exegetical and Socio-Historical Study of 1 Corinthians 1-4, LNTS (London: T & T Clark, 2009), 181–212.


\(^11\) 1 Cor 1:19 (γέγραπται γάρ); 1 Cor 1:31 (καθὼς γέγραπται); 1 Cor 2:9 (καθὼς γέγραπται); 1 Cor 3:19 (γέγραπται γάρ); 1 Cor 9:9 (ἐν γάρ τῷ Μοϋσέως νόμῳ γέγραπται); 1 Cor 14:21 (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται); 1 Cor 15:45 (οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται); 1 Cor 15:54–5 (τότε γενήσεται ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος); For more and a complete list of citations, see F S Malan, “The Use of the Old Testament in 1 Corinthians,” NT 14 (1980): 134–70; See also John Paul Heil, The Rhetorical Role of Scripture in 1 Corinthians, SBL Monograph Series (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2005), 1–2.
Corinthians scripture quotations are only introduced with the conjunction γάρ\(^{12}\) while others are not framed at all.\(^{13}\) This level of rhetorical invocation of scriptures demands an audience familiar enough with them to recognize even references that are not obvious. Moreover, Paul draws heavily on the language and imagery of the Judaean scriptures.\(^{14}\) These same strategies are employed in 2 Corinthians.\(^{15}\) This interesting juxtaposition presents a valuable opportunity to revisit the story of the founding of a Christ group in Corinth and, as I argue in what follows, suggest that Paul’s primary trust network and the initial Christ group in Corinth consisted of Gentiles, but that a recent network bending which brought Judaean s into the community had created a situation in which Paul’s Judaean credentials were thrown into question and his opponents (Hellenistic Judaean s) had to be engaged through appeal to scripture.\(^{16}\)

---

\(^{12}\) 1 Cor 2:16; 10:26; 15:27.

\(^{13}\) 1 Cor 5:13; 1 Cor 14:25; 1 Cor 15:32.


\(^{15}\) Margaret Mitchell, “Paul’s Letters to Corinth: The Interpretive Intertwining of Literary and Historical Reconstruction,” in Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches, ed. Daniel N. Schowalter and Steven J. Friesen, HTS 53 (Boston: Harvard University Press, 2005), 307–38. In perhaps the earliest part of 2 Corinthians, Paul’s fundraising letter of chapter 8, he uses καθὼς γέγραπται (v. 15) to identify a quotation, and likewise his letter to Achaia (chapter 9) has καθὼς γέγραπται (9–10). The dating is unclear, although Mitchell places it last in succession of the compiled letters. cf. Hans Dieter Betz, 2 Corinthians 8 and 9: A Commentary on Two Administrative Letters of the Apostle Paul, ed. George W. MacRae, Hermeneia (Fortress Press, 1985). In a subsequent letter defending his own ministry (1 Cor 2:14–7:4), he once uses κατά τὸ γεγραμμένον to introduce a quotation of scripture (4:13) and once λέγει γάρ (6:1); although in the (probably inserted) material from 6:14–7:1 we have three times in succession καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ θεός (6:16); λέγει κύριος (6:17); λέγει κύριος (6:18). S. Hafemann, “Paul’s Use of the Old Testament in 2 Corinthians,” Interpretation 52.3 (1998): 246–57; See also Paul Han, Swimming in the Sea of Scripture: Paul’s Use of the Old Testament in 2 Corinthians 4:7–13:13, LNTS 519 (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2015). The final two quotations (2 Cor 10:17; 13:1) are not marked, and would once again require someone familiar with the scriptures to recognize them.

\(^{16}\) NB It is not appropriate to consider that these people to whom Paul quoted scripture were so-called “Godfearers.” I critique Luke’s use of Godfearers below as well as Acts’ historical reliability generally, and it is wrong to use Acts to construct a hypothetical Gentile audience in Corinth so steeped in Judaean scriptures that they could recognize the most obscure references to it. The evidence prima facie suggests Judaean s.
6.2.1.2 Teachers, Divisions, and Paul’s Leadership Crisis

While 1 Corinthians represents a group made of a mixture of both Judaeans and Gentiles, there is reason to believe that it was not always so. In fact, the Corinthian community was at a point of considerable challenge, where Paul’s own leadership is thrown into question. Given the initial Gentile makeup of the group with the depth of scriptural use and allusion in the Corinthian correspondence, it is clear that these are the after-effects of significant network bending, which saw an influx of new teachers and members who were better versed in Judaean ritual practice and philosophy than the initial Gentile members. In effect, I argue, we are witnessing juxtaposition between Paul’s personal trust network which is made up of Gentiles and the newcomers to the Corinthian fellowship, which are likely Judaeans with whom Paul does not enjoy a strong relationship. This network bending created disputes among diverse factions which were loyal to different teaching figures with which people were aligning themselves: ostensibly Paul, Apollos, Cephas, and (perhaps) Christ.\(^\text{17}\)

Now I appeal to you, brothers and sisters, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you be in agreement and that there be no divisions (σχίσματα) among you, but that you be united in the same mind and the same purpose. (1 Cor 1:10)

The problem of factions, ironically, came first from one of the rituals of entry into the community: baptism; perhaps because people perceived that the person who baptized them was

---

\(^\text{17}\) Helmut Koester, “The Silence of the Apostle,” in Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches, ed. Daniel N. Schowalter and Steven J. Friesen, Harvard Theological Studies 53 (Boston: Harvard University Press, 2005), 345–46. He suggests since listing Christ as one among other teachers, given his case for a sayings Gospel in Corinth. In this case, he says that Paul may actually be dismissing the teachings of Jesus in favour of the “mystery of the cross.” I will argue below, following Joop Smit, that the naming of these four figures is likely a rhetorical device.
their “mystagogue” (1 Cor 1:10–17). Yet it would continue, and we see Paul facing similar challenges to his leadership in 2 Corinthians, perhaps with different adversaries: the “Super Apostles” (2 Cor 11:5) (below).

The presence of new leaders, particularly Apollos in 1 Corinthians 1, challenged Paul’s position of trust and authority. In his writings, Paul is defensive on the issues of accepting financial support, his weak physical presence, and his dubious status as an apostle. In fact, his relationship to the Corinthians seems in peril throughout the entire Corinthian correspondence, although it may strengthen over time (depending on whether the Letter of Tears predates the rest of 2 Corinthians). He works to elevate his status in the group, which at times is so weak that he asks (perhaps sarcastically) whether he needs a letter of introduction to gain their trust. This is perhaps Paul’s fourth epistolary communication with the Corinthians, and he was either still trying to establish that he had enough social capital to forego a letter of introduction or (more likely) trying to affirm the fact that he does not need one. They are challenged by the

18 Koester, “The Silence of the Apostle,” 346. Paul’s own distancing from their baptism (1 Cor. 1:14-17) was a hesitancy to be considered as this mystagogue.

19 This network sees a multiplicity of teachers and self-proclaimed apostles. 2 Cor 11:22: “Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they descendants of Abraham? So am I” (NRSV). These are “super apostles” (2 Cor 11:5: τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων); also 2 Cor 11:12; He says that they are not like the many peddlers of God’s word (2 Cor 2:17: οὐ γάρ ἐσμεν ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ); also 2 Cor 10:12–17.


21 I am following Margaret Mitchell’s timeline of letters here, see “Paul’s Letters to Corinth: The Interpretive Intertwining of Literary and Historical Reconstruction,” in Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches, ed. Daniel N. Schowalter and Steven J. Friesen, HTS 53 (Boston: Harvard University Press, 2005), 324; cf. Francis Watson, “2 Cor. x-Xiii and Paul’s Painful Letter to the Corinthians,” JTS 35.2 (1984): 324–46, who argues that the Letter of Tears precedes chapters 1–7, and that 10–13 is the “painful letter” referenced in 2 Cor 2:4, 9; 7:8, 12. See here also for a survey of scholarship.
juxtaposition between his letters which are “weighty and strong” (βαρεῖαι καὶ ἰσχυραί) and his weak physical presence (2 Cor 10:10); the latter is unimpressive and diminishes Paul’s effectiveness among the Corinthians. In this case, it seems that some Corinthians perceived Paul as “socially inferior,” demonstrated in both his lacklustre presence as well as his inadequate oratorical skill in conveying his logos, especially in contrast to some of the other itinerant preachers who had entered their network.22 His credentials and credibility were also exposed to some serious examination (1 Cor 4:1–4; 1 Cor 9:3–6).23 While Paul clearly had some loyal supporters (those who would say “I am of Paul” [1 Cor 1:12]), they must have been embarrassed by his ongoing refusal to accept money for his ministry and his insistence on working with his hands to support himself (2 Cor 4:12). The situation is first hinted at in 1 Corinthians 9:6,24 but by the writing of 2 Cor 10–13, Paul is still defending his right to refuse money for ministry, which presented a serious blow to his credibility (2 Cor 11:7–8) and it becomes necessary for him to defend his Judaean credentials in 2 Corinthians.25


23 1 Cor 4:3: “To me it is a small thing if I should be interrogated by you” (ἐμοὶ δὲ εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν, ἵνα ὑμῖν ἀνακρίθω); 1 Cor 9:3–6: “The defense for those who interrogate me is this. . . (Ἡ ἐμὴ ἀπολογία τοῖς ἐμὲ ἀνακρίνουσίν ἐστιν αὐτή).

24 Where Paul defends his right to work for a living. He says that, while he had the right to gain material benefits (v. 11: τὰ σαρκικὰ) from his work among the Corinthians, he had not made use of this right (v. 12: οὐκ ἐχρησάμεθα τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ ταύτῃ) because it would put an obstacle (v. 12: ἐγκοπή) to the gospel.

25 NB In Philippians 3:1–8 he again opens the discussion of his Judaean credentials, yet to a Gentile audience. Here he concludes that they are not only loss (3:7–8: ζημία) but excrement (3:9: σκύβαλον). It’s hard to believe that his Hellenistic Judaean opponents in Corinth would be won by this strategy of rejecting his Judaean identity. Based on the defense finally produced in 2 Corinthians 1:22, it seems likely that his Judaean credentials are less impressive than his opponents and he is forced to revert to rhetorical argument instead (below); On the question of constructing legitimacy through persecution narratives and its connection to Paul as a freelance ritual expert in Philippians, see Heidi Wendt, At the Temple Gates:
Paul’s refusal of the gift may indicate just how perilous his status in the Corinthian ekklēsia had become. Bengt Holmberg and David Briones both argue that it is part of Paul’s strategy in church planting by which established churches carry the financial burden for new ones until they reach a point of self-sufficiency. This may be true, but does not explain why Paul did not accept any gift throughout his relationship to the Corinthians. It has further been suggested that Paul was hesitant to enter into a patronage relationship with some of the Corinthians, in order to preserve his ability to preach the gospel freely and without hindrance—but since the koinōnia with the Philippians was based on mutual share in the work (below), it seems the Corinthians might do this too. The refusal of funding is especially strange because the rejection of the gift

---

26 Bengt Holmberg argues that Paul preferred to first establish a church to the point where it was self-sufficient and then to accept money, see Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 91–92; Also David Briones argues that there is a cycle that Paul enters into with his churches, developing them into financial supporters then moving on to the next place and enjoying their support, see Paul’s Financial Policy: A Socio-Theological Approach, LNTS (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014), 217–21.


apparently came at great expense to Paul’s reputation and was tantamount to a refusal of friendship (2 Cor 11:7–12) and leads to the accusation that Paul is crafty (2 Cor 12:16: πανοῦργος).²⁸ It would have made things easier had he accepted it. In fact, the ongoing refusal of financial support may indicate precisely how carefully Paul is treading with his relationship with the Corinthians—a position of weakness that demanded both tactical agility and theological concessions. Since Paul did not enjoy unanimous support among the Corinthians, his position and leadership challenged by network bending, it is reasonable to suggest that those who said “I am of Paul” accepted Paul’s primary authority, while others did not. This interpretation offers a reasonable explanation for Paul’s continued refusal of funds, while illustrating his weak position as a whole which will become important below. Paul attempts to bolster and maintain his shaky trust network with those Corinthians who are loyal to him through making the refusal of support an ethical and spiritual issue (2 Cor 11:12), when it may simply come from a desire to avoid escalating divisions, as well as the embarrassment that might come from only a few people being willing to support him. In any case, the evidence points to Paul in a weak and compromised position in response to network bending, walking a tenuous line to maintain his authority and trust.

---

²⁸ L. L. Welborn, An End to Enmity: Paul and the “Wrongdoer” of Second Corinthians (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 132–49, argues that Paul tries to mend an uncomfortable situation by offering real love in comparison to the false friendship of the false apostles, which he elaborately denounces in 2 Cor 11.
The Challenge of the Trust Network

The reasons for the network bending which challenged Paul’s authority seem to come from both the entry of new teaching figures into the Corinthian church and these teachers either attracting new members or drawing the support of those who were already there. Their entrance seems to be a product of a simple reality: that the Corinthian ekklēsia was somehow connected to a much larger Mediterranean network across which people, including itinerant missionaries, moved; Apollos, (perhaps) Cephas, and the “Super Apostles,” presumably came into Corinth the same way Paul did and were certainly not his disciples who moved on so-called “Pauline missionary journeys.” At least one of these new teachers, I will argue below, reoriented the Corinthian Christ group to the city leading a group of strong Hellenistic Judaeans who were more comfortable negotiating trust relationships outside of the ekklēsia.

In glimpsing the network through which Paul moved and in which the Corinthian ekklēsia operated, we have a sense that it was a vast and well-connected network of some type which was, no doubt, an effective channel through which Christianity could spread. It was a trans-Mediterranean network, and its members enjoyed considerable mobility. They apparently move from Ephesus to Cenchrae and Corinth, to Rome, and back to Jerusalem. This includes Chloe, whose “people” travel on her behalf (1 Cor 1:11), Timothy (1 Cor 16:10), Apollos (Acts 18:27), and Stephanus, Fortunatas, and Achaicus (1 Cor 16:17). As a network of trust, it was large enough to require letters of introduction, indicating that the members did not all know each other, yet presumably accepted these letters as extended social capital. This is the case for Phoebe in her travels to Rome (Rom 16:1). Furthermore, they extended hospitality to one another, as we learn in Romans 16:23 when a guest (ξένος) named Gaius came from Rome to Corinth and was hosted by the entire church there, indicating that there were both long distance
bonds that connected the groups as well as social expectations of hospitality.\textsuperscript{29} It seems likely that the network was not constructed solely for the purpose of sharing the gospel (even the fictive account of Acts 18 imagines Paul utilizing his ethnic and trade connections with Aquila and Priscilla [18:3]), but we can discern little more about it from Paul’s letters.\textsuperscript{30}

The Syrian sanctuary in chapter four involved a trans-Mediterranean network comparable to this network in which Paul and his associates moved, although the comparison is clearly limited by the nearly two-century gap between the two communities (see map in chapter four). Nevertheless, like the Corinthian Christ group, the Syrian sanctuary on Delos sat at the nexus of a long-distance network that was trans-local and likely had a business component to it. However, as with the Corinthian \textit{ekklēsia}, this is almost completely hidden in the language of mutual worship and ritual practice. Like the network in which the Corinthians operated, it was certainly multi-ethnic. Furthermore, it was undergirded by common worship (which it seems the Corinthians’ network also may have been, since everyone moving into their local trust network shares a connection to either Christ-worshipping or Judaean identity).

The network map from the Syrian sanctuary in chapter four gives us a sense of what the trust network of an association with long-distance ties could look like. Here Delos operates as a hub, just as Corinth presumably does for the network Paul entered. The sanctuary of Atargatis had connections with major trading centers including Athens, Ephesus, Naples, and Rome. Many of


\textsuperscript{30} Julien M. Ogereau, \textit{Paul’s Koinonia with the Philippians: A Socio-Historical Investigation of a Pauline Economic Partnership}, WUNT 2 Reihe 3 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), argues that the long-distance network was formed around a partnership (\textit{koinōnia}) which functioned as a \textit{societas} for sharing the gospel (see below).
the sanctuary attendees are from Antioch and Damascus, and the center of the movement, Hierapolis in Syria, was the point of origin for many of its priests and members (including its founders). As connections to Hierapolis were important for the early stages of the Delian cult, we can see that connections to Jerusalem and Judaean identity were likewise important to the Corinthian group, perhaps increasingly over time (below).

As stated above, for both the Delian sanctuary and the Corinthian church it is a red herring to discuss whether this was a business, ethnic, or religious network. I have already made the case in chapter two that such distinctions are problematic and that thinking of it as a trust network moves us beyond such divisions. While I will not attempt an extensive overview of commerce in Roman Corinth, it was clearly a node of an important trade network between Rome and the east that brought great wealth to the city. It cannot be a coincidence that many of the Corinthian trade routes align with the spread of early Christ groups, including its connections to key places like Ephesus and Pergamum: that goods flowed east-west between the major cities that would also be hubs for Paul’s journeys. The connections stretched to the east, perhaps even to Palestine (there

31 See chapter four for further discussion.


have been some “amphoras with sandy fabrics” found which may be from as far south as Palestine, and it is possible that Jerusalem may have played a role in this, perhaps through the balsam trade. Nevertheless, the fundamental point of understanding the long-distance network in which the Corinthian Christ group sat is that it would both create the opportunity for Paul to found a group there, but would simultaneously allow for network bending through the influx of opponents who challenged Paul’s legitimacy and identity.

6.2.1.4 Strong Judaeans and Weak Gentiles

6.2.1.4.1 The Strong Judaeans

Since I am hypothesizing a point of network bending in the influx of new teachers and, presumably, some new members/followers of these, it is important to address the issue of what the Corinthian community looked like before this intrusion. Can we discern what type of community the Corinthian ekklēsia was before the entry of divisive teachers and different factions into their trust network? One of the most promising areas for such an investigation is the issue of food offered to idols (εἰδωλόθυτα). Paul’s discussion of this issue stretches between 1 Cor 8:11 and 10:33 (it has raised the issue of partitions within the work, especially Paul’s

34 Spawforth, “East-West Trade in Fine Wares and Commodities: The View from Corinth,” 301.

35 Strabo 16.2.41- Strabo describes the groves around Jericho, noting especially the presence of the Balsam park (ὁ τοῦ βαλσάμου παράδεισος). He describes the sap as milky-white, and describes its healing properties and says it is only produced here. He also notes that it has the caryotic palm, and that Xylobalsam is used as a spice (καὶ τὸ ξυλοβαλσάμῳ δὲ ὡς ἀρώματι χρῶνται); Dioscorides (MM 1.19) reports that Balsam is only produced in Judea and in Egypt; Josephus (AJ 14.54) describes the Balsam trees at Jericho when Pompey camped there. Also he mentions the value of Balsam (BJ 4.8.3); Pliny (NH 12.54) says that the Balsam only grows in Judea, and that Vespasian and Titus had it shown in Rome. Describes how the Romans had come to use it, and he says that the cuttings from Balsam sold for 800 000 sesterces; Tacitus (5.6) describes Balsam in Judea and says that it is used by physicians; Justin (Epitome of Trogus, 36.3.1–4) says that the wealth of Judea came from Balm and the taxes on it, again describes Jericho and the growth of balm there.
apparent contradictions on the subject, but I reject the partition theories here.\(^{36}\) Also, while there are certainly class divisions at stake in Corinth, such as those which challenge the lordly meal, I maintain that there are ethnic elements to the divisions of weak and strong that cannot be explained as class distinctions. This is not to say that class does not also factor.\(^{37}\) Richard Horsley argues, convincingly, that Paul’s approach to the issue reveals that the challenge to his Corinthian vision was actually groups of Hellenistic Judaeans and their teachers; these are the “strong” who are taking idol food. He does this in several ways. In the first place, he argues \(^{(1977)}\) that one faction of the Corinthians was made up of Judaeans who idealized the idea of the heavenly Sophia (as present in Wisdom and Philo) and, subsequently, were overly impressed with the wisdom-\textit{logos} of teachers (especially Apollos).\(^{38}\) This led to a division in communal


\(^{37}\) Gerd Theissen, \textit{The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth}, trans. J.H. Schultz, SNTW (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), 121–43, argues that the conflict caused by meat sacrificed to idols hangs on the social division of Corinthian Christians. Some of a higher social register would have numerous opportunities to partake in the sacrificial meals, while those of a lower social register would not. I accept that social register seems to have been the clearly visible division in the lordly meal, but does erase the ethnic language around meat sacrificed to idols; For a critique of Theissen’s view, see Cheung, \textit{Idol Food in Corinth}, 311–13; I’m uncomfortable with the dichotomy between social class and ethnicity that is often imposed on this discussion. I’m not so clear that these are easily divided. Reading Corinth as a trust network allows multifarious identity-factors and, consequently, challenges simplistic explanations of divisions. This does not seem at odds with also accepting in part Dale Martin’s argument that the Corinthians were dealing with different constructs of the body, even if he suggests “there is no need to seek a particularly Jewish source for the asceticism of the strong,” \textit{The Corinthian Body} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 207.

\(^{38}\) Richard A. Horsley, “Wisdom of Words and Words of Wisdom in Corinth,” \textit{CBQ} 39.2 (1977): 224–39. This is following his earlier argument that the \textit{pneumatikos/psychikos} that runs through 1 Corinthians is a continuation and evolution of certain Neo-Platonic dualities that are found in both Philo and Wisdom,
status between those enlightened community members who considered themselves wise, although Paul rejects their wisdom (1 Cor 2:6–3:4). This, Horsley argues (1978), becomes the rationale for approaching the issues laid out in 1 Cor 8–10. Here, Paul’s understanding that other gods do not actually exist (1 Cor 8:4: οἴδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἴδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ) echoes arguments made about the gnōsis of God in Philo and Wisdom—that true knowledge creates recognition that idols are not real. Subsequently, having gnōsis leads to freedom and the understanding that eating meat offered to idols is acceptable for the strong, since idols do not exist.

I will argue below that Paul creates 1 Corinthians in a large part to convince the strong to see things his way, especially on issues of idolatry. This is not because he has real authority over them, in fact, his position is rather weak, and he resorts to trying to persuade them. We can find the words of the strong at points throughout the letter. Presumably someone has written to Paul questioning their teachings of celibacy (7:1), and he quotes their beliefs in a set of rhetorical partitions in 1 Cor 8: they value knowledge (8:1), they don’t believe in the existence of idols (8:4), and they are monotheistic (8:5). They celebrate σοφία (1:19–30, et al.) and γνῶσις (8:1, 7). In order to argue with them, Paul uses extensive reference and allusion to scripture, combined with rhetorical composition. At times, he almost identifies them directly, most notably at the

specifically the heavenly and earthly anthropos, the type of which are seen in other couplets in 1 Cor 2:6–3:4 (perfect/children) and 15:44–50 (person of heaven/person of earth), see Richard A. Horsley, “Pneumatikos vs. Psychikos Distinctions of Spiritual Status among the Corinthians,” HTR 69.3/4 (1976): 269–88.

39 Richard A. Horsley, “Consciousness and Freedom among the Corinthians: 1 Corinthians 8–10,” CBQ 40.4 (1978): 574–89; See also, Richard A. Horsley, “The Background of the Confessional Formula in 1 Kor 86,” ZNW 69.1 (1978): 130–135. Here he argues that the formula of 1 Cor. 8:6 is drawn from a Platonic/Hellenistic wisdom tradition: “from whom are all things and for whom we exist . . . through whom are all things and through whom we exist.”
beginning of chapter 10. Here he calls upon the example of “our ancestors” (οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν) who were under the cloud and walked through the sea (10:1–2), who were “an example for us” not to engage in idolatry (v. 7). He urges them to therefore flee idolatry (v. 14) which he identifies as eating idol food (below). In short, it is reasonable to see the strong as Hellenistic Judeans.

6.2.1.4.2 The Weak (ἀσθενής) Gentiles?

The evidence for the weak is less clear, since they are offstage in 1 Corinthians (although presumably reading it along with the strong). In fact, they really only enter the discussion in chapter eight, where Paul tries to persuade the Hellenistic Judeans not to injure the consciences of the weak. From the evidence, it seems probably that the weak were Gentiles, and so the divisions between “strong” and “weak” reflect an ethnic divide. Jerome Murphy O’Connor likewise upholds the traditional argument that there were two factions to the Corinthian church, typically reflected in the terms “weak” and “strong,” arguing that the strong considered the body to be “morally irrelevant,” and also that they considered the weak to be “too easily defiled” or “too easily wounded.” The weak, he argues, were Gentile Christians for whom the idol meals were a regular occurrence and whose friends and relatives still maintained idol feasts; they were put in a difficult position by the strong who gladly ate from the very meals they repudiated.

Paul’s answer, Murphy-O’Connor says, is to appease the conscience of the weak through his

40 He seems to reframe entry point into Judean, not by birth but by being baptized into Moses (10:2: εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο), combined with eating and drinking (v. 4).

own assurance that the law had been fulfilled in Christ—"superseded," while convincing the strong to have sympathy for them.\textsuperscript{42} He concludes,

Through fear the Weak would have forced the community into a self-imposed ghetto. Through a destructive use of freedom the Strong would have committed the church to a pattern of behavior indistinguishable from that of its environment. If either group had prevailed, the identity and mission of the church would have been gravely compromised. Paul's response was to focus the vision of the Corinthians on their roots in Christ and on their responsibility to each other and to a wider world. His passionate prudence is a perfect illustration of \textit{hê agapê oikodomei} (8:1).\textsuperscript{43}

I agree with Murphy O'Connor in his view that the weak are Gentiles for the following reasons. (However, it is not as certain that Paul is speaking his mind on the issue of idol meat; in fact, he only begrudgingly allows it.) The brief references to them in the letter show them in dialectical position with the strong. Paul outlines the position of the Hellenistic Judaeans who know that idols are nothing and that God is one through quoting a series of commonly-accepted slogans:

\begin{align*}
8:1 & \text{oîdámēn dê piántes γνώσιν ἔχομεν} \\
8:4 & \text{oîdámēn dê oúdên eîðōlōn ēn kósμῳ} \\
8:5 & \text{(oîdámēn) dê oúdēiç théōç ēi μῆ εἶç.} \textsuperscript{44}
\end{align*}

It is this knowledge which Paul says the strong are using to destroy the weak: \textit{ἀπόλλυται γάρ ὁ ἀσθενῶν ἐν τῇ γνώσει} (8:11). The logical inference from this statement is that the weak do not share the knowledge that God is one or that idols are nothing. Since it is this knowledge which leads the Hellenistic Judaeans to engage in idol feasts, the people who do not share this knowledge (8:7) can only be Gentiles. If the weak were other Judaeans they might also refrain

\textsuperscript{42} Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, “Freedom or the Ghetto,” 99.

\textsuperscript{43} Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, “Freedom or the Ghetto,” 112.

\textsuperscript{44} Charles Kingsley Barrett, \textit{The First Epistle to the Corinthians} (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1968), 42–51, 146–47, 195–96, on the use and challenging of Corinthian slogans by Paul (also 8:8, 10:23).
from idol feasts, but would likely share this “knowledge”, rendering the whole force of 1 Corinthians 8 ineffective.) \(^{45}\)

This argument is strengthened by Paul’s emphasis of this exact fact, that it is the people who do not have this knowledge who are the weak:

\[\text{Ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γνῶσις· τινὲς δὲ τῇ συνηθείᾳ ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ἄσθενής οὖσα μολύνεται. 1 Cor 8:7.}\]

But the \textit{gnōsis} is not in everyone. Until now, some, by habit, eat from the idol as meat sacrificed to an idol, and their conscience, being weak, is defiled. \(^{46}\)

It is here that the concept of weakness (ἀσθενής) is first mentioned, and it is repeated in 8:9 (where it becomes substantive), 10, 11, and 12. Here Paul goes further than simply identifying the weak as those-without-knowledge. In fact, he provides another hint to their identity: they eat from idols as if the meat were sacrificed to an idol (ie. with a conviction that the idol is a real thing), and that this practice is done by custom (τῇ συνηθείᾳ). This is once again clearly referring to Gentiles. \(^{47}\)

---

\(^{45}\) John Coolidge Hurd, \textit{The Origin of I Corinthians} (London: SPCK, 1965), 115–49, argues that the weak are actually an invention to justify Paul’s walking back of his initial lenience towards idol meat after the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15:19–21) and the use of slogans with which he actually agrees. Hurd’s argument makes Paul the source of the slogans used by the strong, and suggests that his challenge to these slogans is essentially damage control to mollify the Jerusalem council. It is a compelling argument; however, I disagree with it here on the grounds that the weak seem to be Gentiles. Furthermore, if Paul had the authority of the Jerusalem church, in a community that respected Judaean credentials and challenged Paul’s own connection to Jerusalem as well as his apostleship and authority, why would he resort to rhetorical arguments to make his case? Finally, since Acts is of questionable historicity, and the Jerusalem council fits within Luke’s historiographical mandate of tying the Gentile mission to a Jerusalem core, I am not inclined to take this as a trustworthy lens for reading 1 Corinthians.

\(^{46}\) Adaptation of the NRSV.

\(^{47}\) An objection can be anticipated here, that perhaps the τινὲς refers to a wide section of the community, of which only part are Gentiles. While this is possible, the simplest reading is that τινὲς is the culmination of its anteceding statement: a. Not all have \textit{gnōsis}; B. τινὲς are these people.
If we reach beyond the section on food offered to idols, 1 Corinthians 12:2 provides an instructive addendum to the identity of the weak. Here Paul writes:

Οἶδατε ὅτι ὅτε ἔθνη ἦτε πρὸς τὰ εἰδώλα τὰ ἄφωνα ὡς ἂν ἤγεσθε ἀπαγόμενοι.

Cavan Concannon has recently made much of reading this through the lens of ethnic malleability; indeed Gentiles is in the past tense here, which suggests that Paul imagines a switch of identity or perhaps even ethnos.\(^{48}\) For now, I leave aside the past tense of “you were Gentiles” to focus instead on the clue to the weak’s identity.\(^{49}\) It is the mark of ethnē that they are led

\(^{48}\) Cavan W. Concannon, “When You Were Gentiles”: Specters of Ethnicity in Roman Corinth and Paul’s Corinthian Correspondence, Synkrisis: Comparative Approaches to Early Christianity in Greco-Roman Culture (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2014), xi–xii, argues that a change of identity has happened here that we risk missing because of our ingrained Protestant reading of the text; he imagines how shocking it would seem to Christ-group members to think that they were no longer ethnē. While the observation of ethnic malleability and performativity as prized virtues in the Corinthian society (Favorinus) is useful, to imagine that Gentile converts were relieved to find out they were no longer ethnē (a Judaean category to begin with which they had likely never applied to themselves) seems strange. Saying “when you were Gentiles” is not the same ethnic repudiation that saying “when you were Judaeans” or, for that matter, “when you were Egyptians” would be and would have very different connotations (“to keep a literal rendering of the text, the ἔθνη, constructed in Paul's rhetoric as people characterized by idolatry, have become not-ἔθνη by changing cultic practice. Paul's reasoning assumes a connection between cultic practice and ethnic identity: to change one's cultic practices and allegiances is also a means of changing one's ethnicity, becoming no longer ἔθνη but now something else.”[xi]). Furthermore, becoming “all things to all people” doesn’t seem to represent malleable identity or Paul as an ethnically ambiguous political figure (27), but “pleasing everyone in everything I do;” an ethic in which Paul sets himself up as an ideal to be imitated (10:33: καθὼς κἀγὼ πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω). If he is telling them to do what he does, while simultaneously telling them to keep the position in which they were called (7:17–20), it seems unlikely that he is talking about shape-shifting identities in “all things to all people”, but rather sensitivity to others (10:24); cf Gordon D. Fee, The First Epistle to the Corinthians, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 3–4, who agrees that it is a Gentile community, but who also sees the influence of Hellenistic thought to be from the Gentiles, which it cannot be.

\(^{49}\) Contrary to Concannon, who reads ethnic malleability as a sign that Gentiles could change to a liminal not-Judaean, not-Hellenic position (77–9), it seems that Paul reads people as ethnē before they join the group and hellenes after. Every time (except for 9:20) Judaeans are mentioned in 2 Corinthians, they are either in couplets with ethnē or hellenes, based on whether they are called or not. Judaeans do not become Judaeans, they become Hellenes: “Jews seek a sign and Greeks seek wisdom” (1:22) implies community members (Gentiles are converted by signs—tongues, and Judaeans have wisdom) “1:23 Judaeans and Gentiles (Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον ἔθνευν δὲ μωρίαν,) but, once they are called (1:24: αὐτοῖς τοῖς κλητοῖς) both Judaeans and Greeks (Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλησιν). Judaeans stay Judaeans, upholding Mason’s ethnicity theory in chapter 1, but the Gentiles become Greeks. Paul is using Gentiles as a
astray to weak idols, with the result that Paul gives them the tools to discern which spirits are benevolent (further evidence that Paul doesn’t really believe that an idol is nothing). This is a continuation of the logic of people who had contact with idols in the past from 8:7; unsurprisingly, they are Gentiles. We can make the following statements:

a. The weak are accustomed to eating idol food as if idols were real.

b. Gentiles were led astray to weak idols before their conversion.

To this argument, we can add two supplemental points, both of which strengthen the case that the weak were Gentiles. When we work backwards from the controversy to infer some things about the community before the point of network bending, a Gentile community makes sense of the evidence. While we might hypothesize that the Paul-following contingent of the Corinthian church were comprised of people who rejected meat offered to idols, and that they were an even more observant Judaean community, this is unlikely. In the first place, as the Corinthian correspondence progresses, Paul is increasingly called upon to defend his own Judaean credentials (2 Cor 11:21–24). This increase in people’s interest in his identity does not seem to fit a strictly observant Judaean community who were challenged by the enlightened Hellenistic Judaean. If there were a more conservative community at the core of Paul’s following, and the encounters with the meat market and meat offered to idols at the hands of the Hellenistic Judaean were forced upon this community, this “liberal Judaism” (if we could call it that) would

pejorative term for people who are not called. This is the same use at 5:1: that even the ethnē do not tolerate the sexual immorality of sleeping with a father’s wife (NRSV translates it as “pagans”, which is problematic but does get to the heart of what is implied). This same dualism is repeated in 10:32, and then in 12:13: that all community members were baptized into one body by one Spirit: εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἑλληνες, εἴτε δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλευθεροί.

hardly be the catalyst for Paul needing to tout his Judaean credentials. Surely they would have been relevant before this.

Finally, Paul himself claims that the church in Achaia began in the house of Stephanas; they are the “firstfruits” (1 Cor 16:15: ἀπαρχη). They are also the few that Paul baptized (which include Crispus and Gaius)(1 Cor 1:13–4).\(^{51}\) While I identified the challenges with the use of onomastics above, it is worth observing that the names appear Gentile (there is one record of a Stephanus who may be a Judaean\(^{52}\)). This has limited application, but these people are clearly those who would say “I am of Paul,” and those who he baptized (1:12, 14, 16) appear to be Gentiles. Also, it is Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus who come to visit Paul in Ephesus, suggesting that they have some loyalty to him (16:17). He furthermore sets them up as exemplars for the community, telling the Corinthians to approve (16:18: ἐπιγιγνώσκω) people like this. So, in these five names, we have represented Paul’s first converts, people loyal to him, and his exemplars (presumably also the “weak”). We therefore have only evidence that the Corinthian community was Gentile before the arrival of Apollos and some Hellenistic Judaeans and no evidence for Judaean present before this. Without further evidence, it makes the most sense to understand the community of the weak as exclusively Gentiles.\(^{53}\) While I disagree with Fee that the source of the Hellenistic wisdom was from Gentile Corinth, he is right to observe:

---

\(^{51}\) For Crispus, and Hurd’s argument that Acts makes him Judaean, see note 6. Gaius is such a common praenomen it is impossible to guess at an ethnicity behind it.

\(^{52}\) Ţal Ilan, *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity: Palestine 200-650*, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 148 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 458, 426. The example is from the Hinnom Valley. I remain cautious about this identification as Judaean, made here on the basis that his father’s name is Ἰονα (CIIP 1.2 991); the dating is uncertain, as is the context. It may be Christian.

It is striking that the self-confessed ‘apostle to the Gentiles,’ when writing to the most thoroughly Hellenistic city in the NT, should be thought to be writing to a Diaspora Jewish congregation. All the evidence suggests otherwise.\textsuperscript{54}

In fact, the idea that Corinth was tied to a Judaean diaspora seems to emerge from Acts’ narrativization of the Pauline mission (below). The evidence suggests that the weak are Gentiles and that the strong are Hellenistic Judaeans, although it is important to observe that the crisis which this prompted was not rooted in identity, but in differing practices.\textsuperscript{55} Therefore, the evidence in 1 Corinthians suggests that Paul founded an initially-Gentile community who, for some reason, attracted Hellenistic Judaean teachers and perhaps also Hellenistic Judaeans into their network whose presence was a challenge to the initial community. These are the Gentiles who would say “I am of Paul” in the face of what amounts to a Hellenistic Judaean intrusion via network bending on the Corinthian community.

If I have understood the evolution of the Corinthian Christ group properly, that is, if an initially Gentile group led by Paul faced the network bending of outside Judaean teachers and perhaps new members, it begins to explain the conundrum I laid out above: that Paul’s trust network is nearly exclusively Gentiles but the Corinthian correspondence seems aimed at Judaeans. In effect, the letters are not authoritative pastorals, but rather the weak expressions of a challenged leader who wants to retain his hold on and importance to the community. It is this weakness that

---

\textsuperscript{54} Fee, \textit{The First Epistle to the Corinthians}, 4.

\textsuperscript{55} As an objection to this interpretation, 1 Cor 3:6–7 might suggest that Paul’s planting and Apollos’ watering indicate the same followers for both leaders. But the metaphor warrants caution in this interpretation, considering Paul’s use of metaphors of unity (a field, a building [3:9], a body [12:12–31]). Furthermore, the mention of Cephas (1:12; 3:22) might suggest an alternate component, but the mention is infrequent enough to generate a working hypothesis here.
justifies many of the studies of Paul’s use of rhetorical argument in 1 and 2 Corinthians to spar with his opponents, in which rhetorical argument (especially deliberative) becomes a tool for Paul to both undermine his challengers (particularly Apollos) as well as to demonstrate his own rhetorical skill.\textsuperscript{56} The two places where Paul makes interventions on idol meat, 1 Corinthians 8 and 10, both seem to betray Paul’s true feelings on the subject. In chapter 8, he seems to be agreeing with the two theses identified about (8:4 and 8:5), but as I suggested above, he distorts these. He does not agree on the ontological non-existence of idols, and while he does minimize the position of those who believe in these so-called gods (\textit{λεγόμενοι}), he instantly repeats that there are many gods and lords (8:5).\textsuperscript{57} He then suggests with the use of the dative modifier (\textit{ημῖν εἶς θεὸς . . . καὶ εἴς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός}), that “one God” and “one Lord” relative terms rather than universal statements about the existence or non-existence of gods (8:6). Even in his

---

\textsuperscript{56} One of the most important contributions on Paul’s use of rhetoric in response to community divisions is Margaret Mitchell’s work, in which she argues that the discussions of factionalism laid out in 1 Cor 1–4 are rhetorical interventions which flow into and frame the rest of the letter, Margaret M. Mitchell, \textit{Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians} (Westminster John Knox Press, 1993), 111; See also A. Duane Litfin, \textit{St. Paul’s Theology of Proclamation: An Investigation of 1 Cor. 1-4 in the Light of Greco-Roman Rhetoric} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), who argues that the central argument Paul makes in 1 Cor 1:17–2:5 and 2:6–4:21 is in defense of his lack of rhetorical skill that the Corinthians were used to. He suggests that Paul’s opponents are not quoting Hellenistic Judaean philosophy, but rather public philosophy from Corinth (chs. 9–10); Also Charles A. Wanamaker, “A Rhetoric of Power: Ideology and 1 Corinthians 1-4,” in \textit{Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict : Essays in Honour of Margaret Thrall}, ed. Trevor J. Burke and James Keith Elliott, NovTSup 109 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 115–37; Oh-Young Kwon, \textit{1 Corinthians 1-4: Reconstructing Its Social and Rhetorical Situation and Re-Reading It Cross-Culturally for Korean-Confucian Christians Today} (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2010); Joop F. M. Smit’s (2002) article elegantly frames Paul’s use of rhetoric in line with his own weakness against those who follow Apollos. (Smit argues that by naming four teaching figures, Paul is using \textit{insinuatio}, thus avoiding direct conflict with his intended target, Apollos, see Joop F. M. Smit, “‘What Is Apollos? What Is Paul?’ In Search for the Coherence of First Corinthians 1:10-4:21,” \textit{NT} 44.3 (2002): 248–49; On Paul naming his enemies, see also Peter Marshall, “Inventive: Paul and His Enemies at Corinth,” in \textit{Perspectives on Language and Text: Essays and Poems in Honor of Francis I. Andersen’s Sixtieth Birthday, July 28, 1985}, ed. Edgar Conrad and Edward Newing (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 359–74.

\textsuperscript{57} This may be a position he is forced into, since to deny this would perhaps justify the Gentiles’ participation in idol feasts, which is exactly what he wants to avoid.
restating of the knowledge of the strong, he has subverted it, and concludes that abstinence is better than offense (8:13). In chapter 10 he reaches the same conclusion from a different direction, in this case drawing on the ideal of the dangerous *koinōnia* with idols, which precludes *koinōnia* with Christ.\(^{58}\)

While pretending to hold the position of the strong, Paul’s conclusions betray that he actually thinks like the weak.\(^{59}\) In particular, his fear that they would create partnership with demons (1 Cor 10:21) belies his professed acceptance that idols are nothing—he is willing to attribute real spiritual power to them.\(^{60}\) These suggest that Paul did not really want to condone eating meat offered to idols, but was rather forced to it. I am inclined to agree with Alex Cheung’s proposal:

> Given Paul’s strong disdain for idolatry, one is hard put to find a motive for his condoning the consumption of idol food. Nothing in his encounter with the risen Christ or in his calling as an apostle to the Gentiles leads us to believe otherwise.\(^{61}\)

### 6.2.1.4.3 Instrumentalizing Rituals for *Ethnos* Unity

The preceding chapters identified points at which rituals could become instrumentalized to create and preserve unity across the lines of *ethnos* for the Syrian, Phoenician, and Thracian groups.

The ritual in Corinth that best fits this description is the offering for Jerusalem (or for the saints) which is referenced in Gal 2:10, 1 Cor 16:1–2, Rom 15:25–31, throughout 2 Cor 8 (which


\(^{60}\) Contra Hurd, see note 44 above.

\(^{61}\) Cheung, *Idol Food in Corinth*, 81.
probably stands alone as a fundraising letter).² 2 Cor 9, and Acts 30:1–5. This offering makes up a small part of 1 Corinthians, but becomes much more important in the letters within 2 Corinthians, evidently because of the problem Paul faces with fundraising. The logeia for the saints is first introduced near the end of 1 Corinthians (16:1: Περὶ δὲ τῆς λογείας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους . . .). Here Paul requests that they put a little money aside each week, and assures them the offering will be delivered by people who they approve (16:3: οὓς ἐὰν δοκιμάσητε) and that he will even go himself if necessary (1 Cor 16:1–4). The issue is taken up in much greater detail in the later letters to Corinth, suggesting that the call for funds was not initially successful. As a stand-alone fundraising letter, 2 Corinthians 8 contains Paul’s attempts to cajole the Corinthians into giving, entreating them to take part with the churches of Macedonia in the partnership of the service to the saints (2 Cor 8:4: τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους). (It is interesting in this case that he downplays the Jerusalem connection.) Here, Paul has reframed the logeia as much wider trust network of koinōnia. He discusses what the participation by the Corinthians in this trust network looks like and entreats them to give over and above this gift (8:8: ἵνα καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χάριτι περισσεύητε); the sense of περισσεύω here refers to outdoing the Macedonians in their donations to the koinōnia, since they begged for the chance to give (8:4). This is not a financial partnership, as the Philippians koinōnia may be, but is rather framed as a competition for virtue. The gift, charis, enables the Macedonians to participate in a wider koinōnia which binds together Christ groups in multiple cities. Paul pushes the Corinthians to likewise excel at this giving, advising them that they must finish what they began the year before and give from their abundance (vv. 8–14). The language is interesting in this letter. Paul no

---

² Mitchell, “Paul’s Letters to Corinth: The Interpretive Intertwining of Literary and Historical Reconstruction,” 324.
longer uses the word logeia, but rather refers to the offering several times as a charis instead (8:7, 19), using the same word for the offering here as for the charis which God or Christ has given, to which he also refers several times (8:1, 9, 16). Furthermore, the koinōnia that the Macedonians have is referred to as a charis (8:4), as is the work that Titus, Paul’s koinōnos, is doing in the group (8:6). We have a glimpse here of an ideal of a trans-geographic koinōnia which extends beyond the Corinthians, which is held together by charis.

The language of the charis seems like a softening of the expectation of giving from the logeia of 1 Corinthians, but this is an interesting shift, since there is still an implied obligation in Paul’s language.  

The language becomes even stronger in 2 Corinthians 9, a similar fundraising letter for Achaia. In this case Paul takes the liberty of sending somebody to prepare the afore-promised gift (τὴν προεπηγγελμένην εὐλογίαν) so that Paul can collect it when he comes (9:5). He insists that the written reminder of the letter is so the finances will be arranged as a positive gift and not as a presumptuous one (9:5: ὡς εὐλογίαν καὶ μὴ ὡς πλεονεξίαν). In this letter, the gift is not called a charis but a eulogia, with the promise that in giving a eulogia the givers will also receive eulogia (9:6). (However, it is interesting that God’s gift is still called a charis [9:8, 14–5].) Furthermore, an interesting new dynamic enters Paul’s writing at 2 Corinthians 9: the offering now described as a liturgy (v. 12: ἡ διακονία τῆς λειτουργίας ταύτης). Here the language of expectation is even stronger, and the offering becomes a service (λειτουργία). Furthermore, it


64 It seems likely too that this offering is for Jerusalem, but 2 Cor 9:12 implies that it could be used for other things: that it overflows (περισσεύω) to God with many thanksgivings (περισσεύουσα διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστιῶν τῷ θεῷ).
demands “subordination to our agreement in the gospel of Christ” (13. ἐπὶ τῇ ὑποταγῇ τῆς ὁμολογίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ), implying that a part of the euangellion is understood as assenting to some type of practice which could include financial obligation. After all of the language of obligation, Paul identifies the theme of mutual agreement which ties trans-geographical communities together: “in the sincerity of the koinōnia to them and to all” (9:13: ἀπλότητι τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτούς καὶ εἰς πάντας). These examples suggest that Paul’s ideal of community is extended across Christ groups in this case, traversing a geographic network which is described above. Contrary to the koinōnia of the feast which drew together local believers, the koinōnia of the offering brings the Corinthian Christ groups into a wider trust network, within which they were expected to perform a certain way. John Kloppenborg examines Paul’s collection for Jerusalem in the context of the ἐπιδόσεις taken both by cities and private associations. In these cases, the special offerings had similarities to their Graeco-Roman counterparts, which included opportunities for donors to build their own social capital, to compete to show their generosity, and for their donations to be tracked and the donors to be honoured; this seems to be what is happening with the Corinthian gifts. Where the gift for Jerusalem was strange, Kloppenborg observes, is as a trans-ethnos offering that was non-local.65

65 John S. Kloppenborg, “Fiscal Aspects of Paul’s Collection for Jerusalem,” EC 8 (2017): 153–98; The language of finance is notably absent from Paul’s discussion of the gift. However, Paul does use financial language elsewhere in his letters. For example, he wishes that people would consider him as an underling (ὑπηρέτης) of Christ and a steward (οἰκόνομος) of God’s mysteries; and he assures them that he trustworthy (πιστός) in this service (1 Cor 4:1–2) and is therefore worthy to receive a payment (1 Cor 9:12: μισθός), John Goodrich, Paul as an Administrator of God in 1 Corinthians (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 105–7; He also compares the giving of the spirit of God to earnest money, or a first installment (2 Cor 1:22: ἀρραβών; also 2 Cor 5:5). Here the sense of σφραγίζω is to “accredit” but even more so, the word ἀρραβὼν (from ἀρραβών) refers to a partial sum of money given up front before a full amount is given (the earnest), of which we have several examples in papyri, see Peter Arzt-Grabner, 2. Korinther, Papyrologische Kommentare zum Neuen Testament 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 227–29. In this case, Paul uses business language to refer to God’s promise of salvation, and the language of commerce seems to underscore the certainty of spiritual matters. The offering for the saints,
Paul’s collection of the gift relies on a trifecta of rhetorical persuasion, leveraging his own position (whatever that was), and referring to the Corinthians’ own position in a wider trust network.\(^{66}\) I am inclined to agree with Stephan Joubert’s interpretation that the collection is an act of benefaction, in which a response is expected. He argues that Paul always had reciprocity in mind to tie his communities together with the Jerusalem church: “The bestowal of gifts initiated the establishment of long-term relationships that involved mutual obligations and clear status differentials between the transactors.”\(^{67}\) At this point, it seems to function similar to the widespread ritualized giving practices in associations, including my examples given in the last chapter, in which we can clearly see that ritualized giving is not simply done in a vacuum, but to cement the interrelationship of a trust network through an act of devotion or even duty.\(^{68}\) The reciprocal relationship, however, has a theological element for Joubert, and is actually initiated by the Jerusalem church who offered the benefaction of the gospel to the Gentiles. He argues that by contrast, relies on the language of gift with components of duty, both of exert considerable social pressure on the part of the receivers to give. See also, Peter Arzt-Grabner, “Gott als verlässlicher Käufer: Einige Papyrologische Anmerkungen und bibeltheologische Schlussfolgerungen zum Gottesbild der Paulusbriefe,” *NTS* 57.3 (2011): 392–414.


\(^{68}\) Richard Ascough’s study compares the use of ἐπιτελέω in 2 Cor 8 :1-15 with the data from such collections in associative life, and he argues that it commonly refers to enacting a “religious duty;” in fact, this is the same word that describes Marcus Minatius (ID 1520.15) (I am not sure if the translation “duty” has the appropriate connotation since it connotes obligation and Ascough is clear that it’s not obligatory). See, Richard S. Ascough, “The Completion of a Religious Duty: The Background of 2 Cor 8.1-15,” *NTS* 42.4 (1996): 584.
Paul uses various strategies and theologies to justify the collection, but that his thought finalized in Romans 15:25–32.69

The two key points here are that Paul’s rhetoric surrounding the collection is often pragmatic, as a way to convince people to give, and that a gift serves as an entry point into a koinonia that extends beyond the boundaries of society. We have a somewhat similar example of a gift serving as an entry point into a long-distance Egyptian trust network from Delos, in which an individual donor to the Egyptian koinon on Delos uses giving as a point of access. In this case, his (unknown) gift serves as a magnanimous example to other foreigners (l. 6–8: μεγαλόψυχον ὑπόδειγμα καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς ἐπ’ ἄλλοις ἀλληλοδήμιας), and serves as his entry point to the rites of the association.70 This might be a similar phenomenon to what is happening in the Jerusalem gift. Moreover, the account goes on to show the interconnected nature of the koinon of the Egyptians in different cities, since the copy of the decree is sent to the homeland (24–6: πεμφθῆναι δὲ τοῦ ψήφισμα]τος τούτου τὸ ἀντί γραφὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν πατρίδα) and to the “koinon … of our citizens” (26. τῶι κοινῶι τῶι ἐν τῶι κοινῶι τῶι ἡμετέρων πολιτῶι). Frustratingly, this text breaks right at the place where we expect them to name another immigrant community with which the koinon on Delos is connected. In sum, the relationship of benefaction as Paul understands it may be

69 Joubert, Paul as Benefactor, 129–31. He thinks that the collection throughout Macedonia and Achaea was not mandatory, but rather was seen as benefaction in which they were pleased (v. 26 εὐδόκησαν) to give to the poor saints in Jerusalem (εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ). In verse 27 he emphasizes again that they were pleased: εὐδόκησαν γάρ, καὶ ὀφειλέται εἰσὶν αὐτῶι.

70 ID 1521 (II BCE). The inscription goes on to prescribe the benefits given to this donor and another person, the account of whom is lost. They are given a gold crown and a bronze statue (l. 14–5: χρυσῶι στεφάνωι καὶ εἰκόνι χαλκῆι) as well as entry into the synod (l. 16: προσλάβεσθαι τε αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν σύνοδον) except for the regular meetings.
theologized (as David Downs has argued\textsuperscript{71}), but its function remains to create trust across lines of geography and difference.

We can offer a hypothesis of several reasons why Paul would wish to collect such a gift. Since Paul’s efforts to promote giving among his ekklesiai seem to have been only moderately successful we can rule out that they wished it.\textsuperscript{72} From Paul’s perspective the offering could have been motivated by the following things:

1. A desire to give legitimacy to his own followers and especially the non-Judaean portion of the Corinthian Christ group. This would especially be the case if Paul only enjoyed a partial support of the community (above).

2. Paul’s desire to build his own social capital and apostolic credibility through linking to Jerusalem.

3. To create or enhance a trust-network between Paul’s movements and the Jerusalem church for some reason, or to enhance Paul’s own position on this existing network over which other teachers (ie. Apollos) could move.

4. An attempt to build solidarity and koinōnia between communities.\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{71} Downs, \textit{The Offering of the Gentiles}, 155, 159–60.


These reasons are not, of course, mutually exclusive, and I must leave aside number three for a lack of any evidence. It is obvious that Paul had difficulty fundraising, and it is remarkable that Gentiles with no former connection to Jerusalem might choose to give to the Jerusalem church. As to why people would give to such an offering, we can first submit that members of Paul’s communities gave to increase their visibility and notoriety as benefactors. Secondly, it is possible that the giving would provide a bridge of some sort between different factions in the group: either those hostile to Paul would gain trust for him, or Judaeans would be more likely to take part in this offering than to support Paul (above), or perhaps even Gentile members might use it to show goodwill and to create trust with Judaeans.

Regardless of why people gave or of how successful the collection was, the gift at the end of 1 Corinthians, which is obviously intended to be delivered to Jerusalem (16:3), does seem to be an effort to create a cross-ethnos epidosis in a mixed community, in which presumably at least some of those giving would not be familiar with the Judaean home-city. In this case, the ritual would serve to hold together the shape of the group trust and its place within the broader network. In the same way as the practices among the Thracians in Athens and the Syrians and Phoenicians in Delos, the giving practice of the Corinthian Christ group may be a ritualized way to bridge ethnic and geographic difference and distance rather than to create ethnic walls or boundaries.

6.3 Luke—Inventing Jewish Diaspora and Gentile Mission

6.3.1 Inventing a Corinthian Diaspora

From my work above, the Corinthians are a challenge to assumptions about diaspora studies: the Judaeans reach outwards, creating bridging capital by eating at “idol” feasts, while the

---

74 Ascough, “Translocal Relationships among Voluntary Associations and Early Christianity,” 237.
isolationism is not driven by ethnic particularism but rather Paul’s isolative philosophy, which he refers to as *koinōnia*. In fact, the situation in Corinth is decidedly un-diasporic by theoretical standards. As a case study in the relationship between the Judaean diaspora and the spread of Christianity, the material in the Corinthian correspondence is disappointing. In fact, to read the Corinthian *ekklēsia* as a diasporic story in the conventional narrative, in which a universalizing Gentile mission goes out from a particularistic Judaean diaspora community, we must return to Acts.

When Silas and Timothy arrived from Macedonia, Paul was occupied with proclaiming the word, testifying to the Jews that the Messiah was Jesus. When they opposed and reviled him, in protest he shook the dust from his clothes and said to them, “Your blood be on your own heads! I am innocent. From now on I will go to the Gentiles.” Then he left the synagogue and went to the house of a man named Titius Justus, a worshiper of God; his house was next door to the synagogue. Crispus, the official of the synagogue, became a believer in the Lord, together with all his household; and many of the Corinthians who heard Paul became believers and were baptized. Acts 18:5–8

This Lukan account is central to the creation of a Corinthian narrative in which Judaeans were offered the gospel first and, upon their rejection, the offer spread to the Gentiles. Here Paul is networked with Aquila and Priscilla because of their common trade (18:3), he enters the Judaean *synagōgē* (made up of Judaeans and Greeks—Ἰουδαίους καὶ Ἕλληνας) where he is quickly rejected (18:4–7), and he goes next door to the house of Titus Justus, a so-called “Godfearer” who accepts him (18:7: τινὸς ὄνοματι Τιτίου Ἰούστου σεβομένου τὸν θεόν). But in the next verse we see Crispus, the *archisynagōgos* (Κρίσπος δὲ ὁ ἀρχισυνάγωγος) converted to Christianity (18:8), and later Sosthenes (another *archisynagōgos*) is beaten by the Judaeans (18:17). It is Acts, then, which creates a Corinthian church that begins with a connection to a Judaean diaspora, even if for a short time, before moving outwards in concentric circles to “Godfearers” who are networked with the synagogue; even as some synagogue leaders later convert.
But this narrative of the Corinthian diaspora is suspect, particularly when we place the Corinthian narrative within Luke’s wider historiographic goals. Studies of Luke-Acts are in relative agreement that one of Acts’ primary functions is to form a solid narrative connection between the Gentile mission, the Judaean diaspora, the Apostles, the Jerusalem church, and the Judaean ancestral law. Todd Penner’s work is particularly helpful here. He argues that Stephen’s speech in Acts 6:1-8:3 is a piece of epideictic rhetoric intended to show continuity between Judaean history and the Christian movement, that Luke draws upon Judaean uses of epideictic rhetoric. His mission is to tie the church to Judaean history:

Luke takes great pains as a historian to demonstrate the constant interrelationship of the new community with its broader Jewish context. This feature is a consistent aspect of Luke’s narration. Not only do the apostolic or other community leaders sanction each successive stage of the progression of the message, but also, and more importantly, at every stage Jews are both positively and negatively involved.

75 Stephen G. Wilson argues that Luke has no developed theology of the Gentiles, The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts, SNTSMS 23 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 239. He ties in Jerusalem as the central unifying place of Luke’s narrative and the twelve apostles as its core; all this is done while solidifying the gentile mission at this ostensible heart of Christianity: “It is not so much a theology of the Church of a theory of apostolic succession which inspires Luke’s account, rather it is a desire to trace the Gentile mission back to the primary witnesses of Jesus’ life, death and resurrection, namely the Apostles, and ultimately therefore to Jesus himself. . . . an attempt to reconstruct and make intelligible the experience of the early Church” (240-1); Elizabeth V. Dowling, “‘To the Ends of the Earth’: Attitudes to Gentiles in Luke-Acts,” in Attitudes to Gentiles in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity, ed. David C. Sim and James S. McLaren, LNTS (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014), 191–208, argues that Luke actually downplays references to Gentiles in his Gospel, for example through omitting the Markan account of the Syro-Phoenician woman (Mark 7:24–30) and replacing it with the Samaritan leper (Luke 17:11-19). She therefore argues that Luke uses the Samaritans as liminal Judaean/Gentile crossovers, which set the stage for the complete transition to a Gentile mission in the great commission (Luke 24:37);


77 Penner, In Praise of Christian Origins, 278.
Furthermore, Paul “embodies the meeting place of Diaspora and Palestinian Jew” and, Penner argues, Luke is sure to include Judaean rejection at “each successive stage in Paul’s ministry to the Gentiles.” Luke’s invention, therefore, is first of all of a diaspora which had a myriad of witnesses in Jerusalem to watch the birth of the church: resident Jews (2:5: κατοικοῦντες Ἰουδαῖοι) from every nation under heaven from all nations (ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους)—a connection to the Great commission and the diaspora. These diaspora characters in Palestine continue with Greek speaking widows (presumably from the diaspora [6:2]), Joseph, a Levite from Cyprus who becomes Barnabas (4:36), and the Ethiopian eunuch (8:27) whose ignorance and desire to understand serves as a typology of Luke’s imagines diaspora who are connected by ethos but missing practice. Luke continues by creating a Pauline mission that flows outwards from diaspora synagogues, which are at the heart of Paul’s proclamation (Acts 9:20; 13:5, 14–15; 14:1, 17:1–2, 10, 17; 18:4, 9, 19; 19:8; 28:17 [no synagogue mentioned, but local leaders in Rome]). Some of these respond favourably. Luke builds a common rejection tropes that we see at Corinth—ie. Philippi (16:19–24) and Thessalonica (17:5–9)—which echo Stephen’s indictment and persecution (Acts 6:8–15), thus using Paul’s rejection by synagogues to invent a Pauline mission that is a continuation of the earliest Jerusalem church.

---


79 Roland Deines, *Acts of God in History: Studies Towards Recovering a Theological Historiography* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 163–64, he argues that the diaspora is constructed on the ethos of Judaean custom held by diaspora Judaeans which was differentiated from the practice in the land (temple and the laws of Moses); at key points they form the chief opposition in Judea (Acts 6:14; 15:21; 21:27).

80 In Pisidian Antioch there is an open turning point in which the Judaeans in the synagogue reject the message, and Paul and Barnabas announce that they will now go to the Gentiles (13:46–48); also in Iconium 14:1–2; in Thessalonica (17:4); Beroea (17:11-12).

Along with a Judaean diaspora, Acts also invents a Gentile mission. This begins with Gentiles who are hangers-on in both Jerusalem (Acts 2:10—προσήλυτοι) as well as in the diaspora (i.e. Acts 13:43—τῶν σεβομένων προσηλύτων [Pisidian Antioch]; 16:14—σεβομένη τὸν θεόν [Lydia]). The Gentile mission comes first to Peter, who has his own series of visions and an interaction with the Gentile family of Cornelius (Acts 10; 11:1–18). Yet overwhelmingly the Gentile mission becomes the prerogative of Paul (Acts 9:15; 22:21; 28:28), whose call and mission is upheld and blessed by the Council of Jerusalem in Acts 15.83

In short, Acts presents a triumphalist narrative, mirrored in the narratives of Graeco-Roman cult foundations, which solidifies the mythology of a Pauline gospel message which was first offered to Judaeans and then, upon their rejection, taken to the Gentiles who gladly accepted.84 There can be little doubt of its ahistorical nature, especially as it relates to the relationship of the Judaean diaspora to the spread of the Christ message, given Luke’s obvious objective of cementing a progression from Judaean practice and Jerusalem church to Paul’s mission. Furthermore, with more recent arguments for a much later dating of Acts (110-20 CE), we are forced to acknowledge that there can be no solid connection between Acts’ account of origins and

82 For comments on the hellēnistai, which also play an important part in Luke’s diaspora construction, see Jonathan Bernier, The Quest for the Historical Jesus after the Demise of Authenticity: Toward a Critical Realist Philosophy of History in Jesus Studies (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), 106–8.

83 Paul and Barnabas lead the charge so that the Gentiles do not have to be circumcised (15:3) and the Jerusalem council compromises that the Gentiles must only abstain from food sacrificed to idols and from blood, from strangled food, and from fornication (15:29; 21:25). Ironically, Paul makes sure Timothy is circumcised in 16:3.

anything that really happened, in particular, between Paul and the Corinthians. Luke’s mandate is to show continuity in all things, from the Israelite practice to Jesus’ followers to the Apostles to Paul’s mission to the Gentiles, and inventing a diaspora is a part of this.

6.3.2 Diaspora and the Invention of Christian Origins

In Luke’s narrative of the spread of Christianity into Corinth, we can see the roots of diaspora myths that have dominated discussions of Christian origins for centuries. Acts’ invention of the Corinthian diaspora in chapter eighteen follows many of the typically Lukan conventions, ratifying Corinthian Judaeans’ rejection of the gospel message so it can go out to the Gentiles. Here Luke repeats a phrase from Ezekiel, that for those who neglect a warning: “his blood will be on his own head.” In the Judaean rejection of the message, Luke draws once again on a theme that he uses elsewhere, in making Gentiles with some sort of close connection to Judaean law and custom “the next step” as it were for the gospel. As in Acts 13:43, where the sebomenoi are those who show interest in Paul’s teaching as the Jews reject, and 16:13, where Lydia the sebomenē has a connection to a liminal (but not synagogue) group which prays on the Sabbath, the sebomenos in the Corinthian account is a liminal figure that lives next door to the synagogue and fears God: Titius Justus. Just as with Luke’s other uses of sebomenoi, Titius’s house creates a mythology of proximity to the Judaean diaspora in order to justify the message going out even


after being rejected. However, there is a triumphalist addendum to this rejection, that two leaders of synagogues: Crispus (18:8) and Sosthenes (18:17) are eventually converted.87

While the Acts account creates a Judaean diaspora, Paul’s own Corinthian letters suggest no failed initial Judaean push and, as I have argued above, the Judaeans in Corinth appear to be an intrusion onto Paul’s group with which he had to reckon. The Acts narrative has two outcomes. First, it reinforces the idea of Jewish particularism and Christian universalism. Second, a mythological diasporic community of Judaeans simultaneously serve as the launching point and foil for Paul’s mission even while imagined liminal figures, Godfearers, accept it. Any inward focus, isolationism, and self-protectionism of the Judaeans in Corinth comes not from Paul’s letters, but from Luke’s historiography.

Yet Luke’s work has had the primarily role in shaping understandings of Christian origins, especially through the role of the Godfearers.88 While Luke says little about these people, they have been adopted in historiography as a group of willing Gentiles who were familiar with Judaean scriptures and practice that eventually became a way to explain the spread of Christianity.89 It was Kirsopp Lake, who suggested in the 1930s that the synagogues of the

87 On whether Crispus and Sosthenes are the same person, see above n. 6. and Pervo, Acts, 448–49.
88 John Paul Heil, The Rhetorical Role of Scripture in 1 Corinthians, SBL Monograph Series (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2005), 261. Heil thinks that Paul’s audience is Gentiles who are familiar with the Jewish scriptures (9–10).
diaspora attracted “the attention of non-Jews who were not wholly satisfied with heathenism.”

He also thought that these were the prime Christian converts:

Greek Christians came from this class, and this illuminates two of their characteristics which are otherwise difficult to explain. On the one hand they were not Jews the existence of any large body of Jews converted to Christianity is doubtful and improbable, but on the other hand they were all acquainted with the LXX.

While removing Jews from the history of Christianity was, of course, a politicized project in the early 20th Century, more recent studies have maintained the importance of Godfearers for understanding Christian expansion.

These Godfearers have fit within a much larger dialogue about the relationships of Judaeans and Gentiles to one another, in which Acts has again been a guiding force. The narrative of particularist Jews and universalizing Christians was a logical part of the so-called “parting of the ways” model, which was first articulated by the French historian of religion, Marcel Simon.

---


91 Lake, “Proselytes and God-Fearers,” 77.

92 Stephen Mitchell suggests that it is these parallel organizations that evolved from Theos Hypsistos cults which became the main site for the growth of Christ associations, see Mitchell, “The Cult of Theos Hypsistos between Pagans, Jews, and Christians;” Paula Fredriksen’s work has also retains a place for the Godfearers, suggesting that Paul sets his sights on a Gentile audience who are familiar with Judaean scriptures, even beyond the walls of the synagogue, see “What ‘Parting of the Ways’? Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City,” in The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, ed. Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 52. n.54; On the Godfearers and related history, see Joshua Burns, “God-Fearers,” in The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism, ed. John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 681–82.

imagined early Judaism and Christianity in conflict with one another, a dialectical production of two separate religious movements. His ideas were meant to be a correction to the supersessionism of the (especially German) New Testament tradition, and his work laid the foundation for attempts to treat Judaism on its own terms as a real force alongside of Christianity. This would lead to new foci on early Judaism, answering the call of George Foot Moore two decades before: “Christian interest in Jewish literature has always been apologetic or polemic rather than historical.” So was born the idea of a competition between Christianity and Judaism for followers, resources, and legitimacy, and a new model began to emerge through which to understand the parting of Judaism and Christianity in which the fledgling Rabbinic movement and the Christian church were born quickly following the life and death of Jesus and solidified by the fall of Jerusalem. The “parting of the ways” model has now rightly come

---


94 Simon, *Verus Israel*, 369. “The two religions did confront each other, in a conflict whose principal aspects I have attempted to delineate. From beginning to end of the period which we have been considering, Judaism did not cease to trouble the church.”


96 Klein shows that the condescension in the form of supersessionism and assumptions about the inferiority of Judaism would remain in biblical studies for much of the twentieth century, *Anti-Judaism in Christian Theology*, 7–9.

under criticism, since our sources portray various moments of parting alongside moments of contact and convergence long after the second century BCE. So began the dissolution of the parting model as seen, for example, in a volume edited by Adam Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, joining other important works which challenged this idea. (This is not to dismiss the idea of parting altogether. Certainly there were moments of parting, seen best in attempts of many figures to create separation between the two groups. There is also considerable evidence

---

98 There is also an ethical aspect of this, as Miriam Taylor argues, “if anti-Judaism is described as emerging out of a social conflict, then it can be characterized as the by-product of an historical rivalry in which both parties might be said to be equally involved, and equally responsible,” see Taylor, Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity, 194–96, here 195.


101 In second-century Alexandria, Origen could warn his readers against bringing the teachings that they learned in the synagogue the day before into the church, a practice which he says is equivalent to eating stale meat. Yet whatever parting this justifies, it also suggests that there was still a great deal of contact and intermingling between groups, or perhaps better, that these groups were not disparate, members of the synagogue were also members of Origen’s church. Hom. Lev. 5.8. Also, Sel. Exod. 12.46; Likewise, in Antioch, John Chrysostom in his sermon against the Judaizers preaches against the Judaizing of his community members, which suggests contact rather than dissimilation, Adv. Jud. 1.1.5; Wolfram Kinzig, “‘Non-Separation’: Closeness and Co-Operation between Jews and Christians in the Fourth Century,” VC 45.1 (1991): 36–37. Movements to define and alienate a nascent Christian other are also visible from the Jewish side, indicated in the birkhat-ha-minim: the so-called, ‘blessing on the heretics’ (b. Ber. 28b-29a), from which a recension found in the Genizah also curses בְּיָמִינוֹ וְהֶנְצָרִים וְהַמִּינֵי: These nṣrym are probably the Nazarenes, the description used of Christ-followers in the book of Acts by Tertullus, who calls them “a sect of the Nazarenes” (τῆς τῶν Ὡσσωράτων αἱρέσεως [24:5]), also Tertullian, Marc. 4:8; On parting
that Judaeans and Christ-followers (which are not mutually exclusive categories) remained intertwined in various ways in their every-day lives.\(^\text{102}\)

In removing the Lukan account, and thus challenging both the role of the Godfearers in the spread of Christianity and the parting of the ways, we can begin to rewrite Christian origins, particularly the role of diaspora in the emergence of a Christian religion. The situation at Corinth is at odds with several points, as I identified above:

1. There is no evidence that there was a diasporic community there at the beginning. This is part of the narrative that Jews rejected the gospel and it was then offered to Gentiles.

2. Reaching outward and mixing—forming bridging capital with the world around—does not come from Paul or at his behest (that we can see), but rather it is done by Hellenistic Judaeans.

from the Jewish perspective, see also, Philip S. Alexander, “‘The Parting of the Ways’ from the Perspective of Rabbinic Judaism,” in The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity, ed. James D. G. Dunn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 1–26; On the Genizah recension of the birkhat-ha-minim, see S. Schechter and I. Abrahams, “Genizah Specimens,” JQR 10, no. 4 (1898): 657 l. 13; Jacob Mann, “Genizah Fragments of the Palestinian Order of Service,” HUCA 2 (1925): 269–338; William Horbury, “The Benediction of the ‘Minim’ and Early Jewish-Christian Controversy,” JTS 33, no. 1 (1982): 19–61; Various Rabbinic texts condemn various elements of Christianity, such as whether and when their books should be saved from fire (t. Šabb. 13:5); or whether or not handling gospels (glymm) or heretical books (sfr mnm) risk defiling one’s hands (t. Yad. 2:13, also b. Sanh. 107b).

3. In our Corinthian evidence, it is probably the Gentiles led by Paul who are particularist, driven by a philosophy of an isolating koinōnia, while the Judaeans are ironically universalizing.

4. Paul’s theology of the Gentiles’ place seems reactive rather than prescriptive, increasing and being sharpened over time with challenges to his mission.

I have argued the first of these points above. The second and third come primarily from the issue of eating meat offered to idols, and Paul’s begrudging acceptance of the practice. The remarkable implication of Horsley and Murphy O’Connor’s work taken together is that they completely turn the narrative of isolationist Jews and universalizing Paul on its head. We are hard pressed to see that Paul’s strand of Gentile Christianity pushed beyond the communal boundaries with a permissiveness and inclusiveness with which Judaeans were uncomfortable. The network bending within the city of Corinth itself came not by outsiders coming in, but by those with Judaean ancestry going out—establishing ties with the city cults and civic institutions. But we can take this further. As chapter one argued, the notion of particularist Jews and universalizing Gentiles has also become a central tenet of diaspora studies, which read modern nationalist anxiety into antiquity to create an ideal type: an inward focused diaspora ever longing for return to Palestine and keeping the faith with Judaism. The Corinthian example, while only a small part of the much broader study of Judaean diasporas in antiquity—some of which might be much closer to the diaspora studies ideal—simultaneously challenges both the parting of the ways model and the diaspora studies model of the ancient Judaeans.103

103 Boyarin and Boyarin, “Diaspora.”
But one final point deserves equal attention. It seems likely that Paul is being reactive rather than prescriptive in his theology of Judaeans and Gentiles, and his community and the outside world. Of course, the significance of Paul’s mission to the Gentiles is usually understood as being theologically rather than practically driven, since it assumes that Paul is in a position of power and chooses to reach out to Gentiles, driven by his theological understanding of their place in Christ. The network bending in Corinth instead suggests that Paul’s rationalizing of Gentiles’ place in relation to Judaeans one of necessity. So, in interpreting Paul’s mission to the Gentiles as bringing them into an eschatological framework of universalist Judaean identity, for example, we can choose to make Paul’s eschatology of a Gentile entry into the tradition either a vision which drove Paul’s mission to former outsiders or a reaction which was demanded once Judaeans entered his Gentile communities. The latter seems to be true of Corinth. Rather than having some grand theological vision of the mode of engagement with the outside world, in which Paul drives contact with Gentiles and helps inward-focused Jews overcome their conscience about eating meat sacrificed to idols, his theology seems driven by a need to navigate his own weak position, a desire to maintain followers, and to accommodate the outward-reaching that was already happening by the new Hellenistic Judaeans in his community. (This is perhaps a similar challenge to the Gentile congregation at Galatia, who were likewise at risk of teachers


105 Johannes Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, trans. Frank Clarke (London: SCM, 1959). Munck’s view also influenced the idea of the Gentiles’ return to Jerusalem in Paul’s collection (below). Also Paula Fredriksen, “Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul’s Gospel,” NTS 56.2 (2010): 232–52. She argues that Paul’s understanding of requirements for Gentile inclusion were rejecting their home gods rather than circumcision, which she says is in line with eschatological expectations about participation of gentiles.
entering their network and preaching some adherence to Judaean customs [Gal 2:15–16; 3:1–14]). This might indicate that Paul came to terms with the relationship between Judaeans and Gentiles over time, which he eventually approaches theologically by Romans. Paul does not embark on extensive theologizing of the relations between Judaeans and Gentiles in the Corinthian correspondence; rather the focus is on how to create harmony in communal practice and unity in the face of factions.

Chapter 7
Thesis Conclusions
7  Thesis Conclusions

So what observations can be made about diaspora and religion from the four case studies above? Indeed, each of them is unique enough to warrant caution in even making the comparison. The Thracians brought the worship of Bendis into Athens which was then either duplicated by associations with Greek members, or perhaps they joined. In any case, in IG II² 1283=GRA 23 (240–39 BCE) we have a vision of an ethnos who celebrated their unity, while at the same time establishing rituals to enhance the connections to a nearby group of the same ethnos. In the Syrian sanctuary from Delos, we have a community that moved from a small Syrian family group, to a thiasos/marzēah, to a mixed association which had Greeks, Syrians, and Romans (not mutually exclusive categories). This group celebrated with a hybrid ritual practice which drew from Syrian and Greek practice. Ironically, the development of the Syrian sanctuary is closer to the traditional narrative about the spread of Christianity than the Corinthians were. The Phoenicians on Delos retain their ethnic identity, admitting few to no outsiders, yet establishing close connections to two Roman benefactors. Finally, the Corinthians likely began as a Pauline-founded association (I argued primarily Gentiles), for which the intrusion of Hellenistic Judaeans served as a challenge to Paul’s leadership and vision.

In Kim Butler’s work on defining diaspora studies in 2001, nearly 20 years ago, she identified the problematic nature of diaspora as an interpretive lens which was being nearly-universally applied. She suggested that the field was in agreement with several things. A diaspora group must be scattered to at least two locations, they must maintain (either actually or fictively) a relationship to a homeland, they must have a common self-awareness of their own identity, they must be “consciously part of an ethnonational group,” and they should maintain these
connections for longer than two generations.\(^1\) While the normal limitations of ancient evidence apply, it seems that the Thracians, Syrians (who had several generations of Syrian meetings), and Phoenicians are closer to this definition than the Corinthian church, although none of these associations fit the profile completely. We likewise do not see initial discomfort in the new space until they create their own forms of sacred space and practice, another common trope of diaspora, although perhaps the Syrians who begin as a closed family group fit this description.\(^2\)

The other trope that has little bearing in our “diasporas” is the idea of return, which has been a common theme in modern diasporas. As Stéphane Dufoix observes with the African diaspora and the question of return to Liberia: “. . . the return (to Africa) is only a fiction, a way of keeping alive and reinventing an Africa whose territory is the memory of dispersion itself, more vibrantly alive in the scattering than it would be in reunion.”\(^3\) Yet we do not see any longing for a return to home from these four groups and, as was the case with the Babylonian captivity, presumably people in each of them could have chosen to return and did not.\(^4\) This is not to say that longings for home did not exist, but at the very least it did not occupy their material space or the literature of Paul in any identifiable way, although these four communities invoked both real and fictive connections to another place.

Instead of comparing the above communities as diasporas, it is more profitable to compare them as networks of trust: each of which had an ethnic component. I maintain what I articulated in the

\(^{1}\) Butler, “Defining Diaspora, Refining a Discourse,” 192.


first two chapters, that studies of associations flummox fixed categories of identity for ancient communities like ethnic, religious, or trade. We have encountered four communities which crossed all of these lines. Each of these communities is in motion, recreating and directing their ritual practices to connect to one another and to the outside world. The Thracians must negotiate their right to maintain their worship in relation to their own social capital within Athens, and they have decisions made for them in relation to their income and profitability. The Beirutian group maintains a type of ethnic core, or at least a core of people from a common city, but they rapidly adopt their practice (perhaps even more so than the Syrians) to endear themselves to their Roman society with a new goddess and translated rituals. The Syrians’ membership expands beyond their original ethnic core, prompted to a large extent by the Athenian takeover of the priesthood, and rituals such as giving and the parade serve to promote unity across difference. Finally, the ethnic component of the Corinthian ekklēsia creates a challenge to identity, and it is the Judaeans who seek to create bridging trust at idol feasts, challenging Paul’s isolationist ideals.

Group identities are not fixed (diaspora, ethnicity), but are rather driven and evolve, particularly as a reaction to evolving trust networks. To understand this requires reversing the narrative of identity driving practice, rather in Chapter Two I made the case that changes in practice can drive group identity. The nature of each of the four groups studied above is not made up in displacement or longing, but rather re-creation, accommodation, hybridity, and contact. Where communal boundaries exist, we see them constantly being transversed. The rituals and worship devoted to Bendis, Atargatis, the Phoenicians’ deities, and Christ and God (for the Hellenistic Judaeans) end up becoming bridges across difference, first within the group and secondly outside. Furthermore, reaching across difference recreates these groups. Cultural identity,
according to Stuart Hall, is constantly emerging: “becoming” as well as “being”; beyond cultural identity as essentialist kernels hidden within the individuals in a given culture, Hall prefers cultural identity which is in “constant transformation.” Diasporic experience, as Hall presents it, is not based in some rooted ethnicity, but rather the “recognition of a necessary heterogeneity and diversity; by a concept of ‘identity’ which lives with and through, not despite, difference; by hybridity.” Using Hall’s lens, we can see new group identities created through the invocation of rituals, which in the case of the Syrians and Corinthian Christ group provides a method for redefining a group beyond ethnic lines. But hybridity is also sparked by contact with the outside world which does not incur network bending, in the case of the Phoenicians the adoption of Roma is a hybrid ritual that arises from the creation of bridging trust, even without allowing new members in. In either case, the ritual practice of the group is closely connected to relationships across difference and evolves according to the need to maintain the trust network.

I have argued above that the Corinthian diaspora as Luke invents it is a trope: a group of unnamed and faceless Judaeans who reject Christ and, in turn, who miss out on the opportunity to be Christians. What we see in Corinth is precisely the opposite: first of all a Gentile group who attract Judaeans and whose inward-focus is challenged by the out-pushing of the Hellenistic Judaeans. Here we may perhaps implicate *ethnos*; As I discussed in Chapter One, Judaean ethnicity required no rituals or separation to keep one a Judaean—especially by the Hellenizers model. In other words, the Hellenistic Judaeans in Corinth are at odds with the major tenets of diaspora studies, precisely because of their ethnicity. The *ethnos* required no ghetto to be

---

maintained; it needed no retreat into confined and particularistic communities. (However, as the rising challenges to Paul’s not-Judaean-enough identity and the collection for Jerusalem suggest, connections to home could still be important.) The larger implications for diaspora studies is that at least a part of the ideal type underlying the discipline is not only a product of modern historicizing, but that caution is required in making the ancient diaspora an image for the modern; since diaspora was weaponized by Christian historiographers.

Finally, I affirm what I presented in the opening: that religion and diaspora are both ways of partitioning history; real groups don’t fit into either of these neatly, but are constantly pushing up against our theoretical boundaries and crossing them. Yet the creation of new sacred space and ritual identities, and the network bending that brings former outsiders deeper into relationships of trust with the group, serves as a catalyst for new ritual and cultic forms, as does the desire to forge social capital even with people who would never take part in a worshipping community. We have seen multiple ways in which people could come to worship a god/dess who is not part of their original ethnē identity. Both the Syrians and Phoenicians do this in different ways but the end result, former outsiders worshipping a non-native deity, is the same. Therefore, despite my critique of problematic category lines, each of these communities gives us a glimpse of people coming to worship a deity that was formerly not their own, crossing boundaries between ethnē and forming new communities that might be more accurately described as religions than diasporas, although neither quite fits.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Greek Names Mentioned in the Sanctuary by City of Origin (With Line Numbers)\(^7\)

Alexandria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Name AS FOUND</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2225.1</td>
<td>Διονύσιος Ερμογένου Α[λεξανδρέως]</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>Hermogenos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Antioch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Name AS FOUND</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2247.14–15</td>
<td>Αριστάρχου τοῦ Ἱσιδόρου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Aristarchos</td>
<td>Isodoros</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2280.1, ID 2281</td>
<td>Σαραπίων Ἐρμαφίλου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sarapion</td>
<td>Hermaphilos</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2285.1–4, ID 2628.iii.28</td>
<td>Εὐκράτης Προτογένου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Eukrates</td>
<td>Protogenos</td>
<td>113/2, 108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.iii.27</td>
<td>Απολλοφάν(ης)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Apollophanes</td>
<td></td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.b.i.23</td>
<td>Ζωίλα Ἰσιδώρου</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Zoila</td>
<td>Isodoros</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.b.i.25</td>
<td>Ἀσία Ἰσιδώρου</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Isidoros</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.ii.13</td>
<td>Αρτεμιδόρου Ἱσιδώρου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Artemidoros</td>
<td>Isodoros</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.ii.16</td>
<td>Νίκων [Ἀ]ρτεμιδόρου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nikon</td>
<td>Artemidoros</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2253.12</td>
<td>Ἱσιδόρου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Isodoros</td>
<td></td>
<td>106/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2224.1–2</td>
<td>[—5–6—0] Αρτεμιδόρου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>Artemidoros</td>
<td>105-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2264.1–3</td>
<td>Ἀγαθοκλῆς Γλαυκίου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Agathokles</td>
<td>Glaukios</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2263.6–7</td>
<td>Ῥημάθα</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Rhoumetha</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2263.8</td>
<td>Γλαυκίου (Ἀγαθοκλῆς)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Glaukios</td>
<td>Agathokles</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^7\) NB This list does not include Roman names, with the exception of three who were citizens of Athens. The Romans are listed at Appendix D.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2256.1</td>
<td>Δημήτριος Δημητρίου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Demetrios</td>
<td>Demetrios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2256.2–3</td>
<td>Εμιώνη Δημητρίου</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Hermione</td>
<td>Demetrios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2268.1</td>
<td>Αρτέμων — ου Αντιοχείς</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Artemon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2268.2–3</td>
<td>Σελε[υ]κίδος</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Seleukides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2277.1</td>
<td>[Τλι]κίας? Νίκωνος</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Glaukias??</td>
<td>Nikon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2224.2–4</td>
<td>Αρτεμίδωρος Ισιδόρου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Artemidoros</td>
<td>Isidoros</td>
<td>105-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Askalon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Name AS FOUND</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.29, ID 2253.6–7, ID 2254.2–3</td>
<td>Φιλόστρατος Φιλοστράτου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Philostratos</td>
<td>Philostratos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Athens**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Name AS FOUND</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2258.1, ID 2628.II.18, I-III.36, ID 2250.1, ID 2251.1–2, ID 2252.1–2</td>
<td>Κλεοστρατίδης Απολλωνίου Αθηναίος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kleopatrides</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Pre 118/7, 108/7, 106/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2260.5-6, ID 2284.2–3</td>
<td>Μηνοδ[ώρου τοῦ] Μηνοδώρου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Menodoros</td>
<td>Menodoros</td>
<td>Post 118/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2260.9–10, ID 2284.3–4</td>
<td>Αλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μη[νοδώρου]</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Alexandros</td>
<td>Menodoros</td>
<td>Post 118/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2299.1–2, ID 2248.6–7</td>
<td>Θεοδώρου Θεοδώρου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Theodoros</td>
<td>Theodoros</td>
<td>112/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2299.14–5</td>
<td>Αρκέτου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Arketos</td>
<td></td>
<td>112/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2299.15–6, ID 2248.10–11</td>
<td>Εστη[ου]</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hestaios</td>
<td></td>
<td>112/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2248.12–13</td>
<td>Ε[υκ]λέωνος τοῦ Θεοδώρου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Eukleon</td>
<td>Theodoros</td>
<td>112/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2221.1, ID 2222.1, ID 2228.5, ID 2627.5</td>
<td>Διονύσιος Νίκωνος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>Niko</td>
<td>110/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2221.2–3, ID 2627.5</td>
<td>Αρτεμίσια Διογέν[ου]</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Artemisia</td>
<td>Diogenes</td>
<td>110/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Birth/Death Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2220.5–6</td>
<td>Δημητρίου του Ροδίπου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Demetrios</td>
<td>Rhodippos</td>
<td>110/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2220.6–7</td>
<td>Ναυσιστράτου του Ναυκράτου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nausistratos</td>
<td>Naukratos</td>
<td>110/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2220.8–10</td>
<td>Δημονίκου του Εύρήμονος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Demonikos</td>
<td>Heuremonos</td>
<td>110/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2221.9</td>
<td>Ηραίου του Ναυκράτου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Heraios</td>
<td>Apollodoros</td>
<td>110/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2230.3</td>
<td>Κλευλίδος</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kleulides</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>110/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2262.5–7</td>
<td>Νικοστράτου του Δημαρέτου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nikostratos</td>
<td>Demaretos</td>
<td>108/7, 106/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2262.i.21</td>
<td>Εὐθυδόμου (Νικοστράτου)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Euthodemos</td>
<td>Nikostratos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2262.i.22</td>
<td>Δημάρετος Νικοστράτου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Demaretos</td>
<td>Nikostratos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2262.i.23</td>
<td>Εὐθυδόμου Εὐθυδόμου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Euthodemos</td>
<td>Euthodemos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2262.ii.20</td>
<td>Απολλωνίου (son of Apollonios)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2262.ii.21</td>
<td>Αμμία Κλεοστράτιδου</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ammia</td>
<td>Kleosтратides</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2262.ii.22</td>
<td>Διογένης Κλεοστράτιδου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Diogenes</td>
<td>Kleosтратides</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2262.iii.38</td>
<td>Εὐνους Αἰσχρίωνος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Euonous</td>
<td>Aischrion</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2262.iii.39</td>
<td>Ζωίλα Διογένου</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Zoila</td>
<td>Diogenes</td>
<td>108/7, 107/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2232.2–3</td>
<td>Λισχρίων Λισχρίωνος του Διονυσίου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Aischrion</td>
<td>Aischrion</td>
<td>107/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2232.6–7</td>
<td>Ζήνωνος τοῦ Ζήνωνος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Zenon</td>
<td>Zenon</td>
<td>107/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2251.10–11</td>
<td>Ζωίλοι τοῦ Ζωίλου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Zoilos</td>
<td>Zoilos</td>
<td>106/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2234.1–2, ID 2253. 7–8, 10, 2254.3</td>
<td>ID 2254.3 (2x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2224.13-15, ID 2288.5–6</td>
<td>ID 2241.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2235.1–2, ID 2236.1–4, ID 2245.6–7</td>
<td>ID 2246.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2274.1–2</td>
<td>ID 2240.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2237.1, ID 2238.1–2, ID 2239.2–3</td>
<td>ID 2246.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2237.5–6, ID 2238.3–4</td>
<td>ID 2246.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2263.11–12, ID 2264.4–5</td>
<td>ID 2246.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2265.4–5</td>
<td>ID 2246.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2240.3–4</td>
<td>ID 2246.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2243.3–6</td>
<td>ID 2246.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2266.4–5</td>
<td>ID 2246.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2255.8–9, ID 2302.1–2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2255.10–11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2255.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2241.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2241.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2246.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2246.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2256.8–9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2627.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2627.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2627.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2627.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2627.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2627.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2627.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2261.6–8, ID 2285.5–8, ID 2228.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2234.1–2, ID 2253. 7–8, 10, 2254.3</td>
<td>ID 2254.3 (2x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2224.13-15, ID 2288.5–6</td>
<td>ID 2241.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2235.1–2, ID 2236.1–4, ID 2245.6–7</td>
<td>ID 2246.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2274.1–2</td>
<td>ID 2240.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2237.1, ID 2238.1–2, ID 2239.2–3</td>
<td>ID 2246.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2237.5–6, ID 2238.3–4</td>
<td>ID 2246.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2263.11–12, ID 2264.4–5</td>
<td>ID 2246.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2265.4–5</td>
<td>ID 2246.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2240.3–4</td>
<td>ID 2246.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2243.3–6</td>
<td>ID 2246.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2266.4–5</td>
<td>ID 2246.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2255.8–9, ID 2302.1–2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2255.10–11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2255.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2241.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2241.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2246.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2246.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2256.8–9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2627.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2627.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2627.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2627.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2627.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2627.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2261.6–8, ID 2285.5–8, ID 2228.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ID 2234.1–2, ID 2253. 7–8, 10, ID 2254.3 | ID 2254.3 (2x) | | | |
| ID 2224.13-15, ID 2288.5–6 | ID 2241.2 | | | |
| ID 2235.1–2, ID 2236.1–4, ID 2245.6–7 | ID 2246.1 | | | |
| ID 2274.1–2 | ID 2240.2 | | | |
| ID 2237.1, ID 2238.1–2, ID 2239.2–3 | ID 2246.2 | | | |
| ID 2237.5–6, ID 2238.3–4 | ID 2246.3 | | | |
| ID 2263.11–12, ID 2264.4–5 | ID 2246.4 | | | |
| ID 2265.4–5 | ID 2246.5 | | | |
| ID 2240.3–4 | ID 2246.6 | | | |
| ID 2243.3–6 | ID 2246.7 | | | |
| ID 2266.4–5 | ID 2246.8 | | | |
| ID 2255.8–9, ID 2302.1–2 | | | | |
| ID 2255.10–11 | | | | |
| ID 2255.11 | | | | |
| ID 2241.2 | | | | |
| ID 2241.4 | | | | |
| ID 2246.1 | | | | |
| ID 2246.2 | | | | |
| ID 2256.8–9 | | | | |
| ID 2627.6 | | | | |
| ID 2627.6 | | | | |
| ID 2627.6 | | | | |
| ID 2627.6 | | | | |
| ID 2627.6 | | | | |
| ID 2261.6–8, ID 2285.5–8, ID 2228.1 | | | | |
### Damascus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Name AS FOUND</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2283.1–2</td>
<td>Διόφαντος Ἀλεξάνδρου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Diophantos</td>
<td>Alexandros</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2286.1, ID 2287.1</td>
<td>Μάρθα</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td></td>
<td>107/6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ephesus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Name AS FOUND</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2273.1</td>
<td>[Ἡρ]ακλείδης</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Herakleides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2273.1</td>
<td>Ἀλεξάνδρα</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2273.2–3</td>
<td>[Ἀλε]ξάνδρας (Ὠρ[Ηρ]ακλείδης)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>Herakleides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Herakleia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Name AS FOUND</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2234.9–10, ID 2253.1, ID 2288.1–2, ID 2254.1</td>
<td>Μίδου τοῦ Ζήνωνος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Midas</td>
<td>Zenon</td>
<td>106/5, 105/4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hierapolis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Name AS FOUND</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2247.10–11</td>
<td>Σελεύκου τοῦ Ζηνοδώρου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Seleukos</td>
<td>Zenodoros</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2257.7–8, ID 2258.4–5</td>
<td>Μαρίωνος τοῦ Ἀχαιοῦ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2259.4</td>
<td>ΝΑΜΕ τοῦ Ἀποβληταίου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>Apollonidos</td>
<td>Post 118/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2280.3, ID 2282</td>
<td>Ανταῖος τοῦ Σελεύκου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Antaios</td>
<td>Seleukos</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2276.1</td>
<td>Διοκλῆς Διοκλέους</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Diokles</td>
<td>Diokles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2276.3</td>
<td>Τέρωνος (Διοκλέους)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hieron</td>
<td>Diokles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2226.1–2</td>
<td>Ἀχαιός Ἀπολλωνία</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2226.7–8</td>
<td>Εὐβούλας (Ἀχαιοῦ)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Eubola</td>
<td></td>
<td>128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2226.9, 12–13</td>
<td>Απολλωνίου (Ἀχαιοῦ)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2226.9–10</td>
<td>Διονυσίας (Ἀχαιοῦ)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Dionysia</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2226.10</td>
<td>Προτογενείας (Ἀχαιοῦ)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Protageneia daughter of Achaios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2226.11</td>
<td>Αχαιοῦ (Ἀχαιοῦ)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2226.11</td>
<td>Λυσιμάχου (Αχαιοῦ)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lysimachos</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2226.11–12</td>
<td>Απολλωνίου (Ἀπολλωνίου)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2226.12</td>
<td>Λυσιμάχου (Ἀπολλωνίου)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lysimachos</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2226.12</td>
<td>Προτογένου (Ἀπολλωνίου)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Protogenos</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>128-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2283.6–7</td>
<td>Σαραπιώνος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sarapion</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2261.6–8</td>
<td>Εἰσιδόρος Νουμηνίου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Eisdoros</td>
<td>Noumenios</td>
<td>113/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Karpasia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Name AS FOUND</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2286.1–2, ID 2287.2</td>
<td>Αντίοχος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Antiochos</td>
<td></td>
<td>107/6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Laodikea**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Name AS FOUND</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2259.1</td>
<td>Unknown name</td>
<td>Unknown Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2262.2–3, ID 2270.1</td>
<td>Σωσίβιος Αρισ[τέ]ου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sosibios</td>
<td>Aristeos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.iii.19, ID 2267.1–2</td>
<td>Σαρπιίων Ασκληπιάδ(ου)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sarapion</td>
<td>Asklepiados</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2264.1</td>
<td>Αριστεάς [Ἀπ]ολλωνίου</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Aristeas</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marathus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Name AS FOUND</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2245.1–2, ID 2272.1</td>
<td>Κλεοπάτραν Φιλοστράτου</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kleopatra</td>
<td>Philostratos</td>
<td>103/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2245.3-4, ID 2272.1</td>
<td>Γάιος Σήμος Γναίου Αριστόμαχος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C. Seius Aristomachos</td>
<td>Cn. Seius</td>
<td>103/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Neapolis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Name AS FOUND</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2265.1–2</td>
<td>Απολλώνιος Διοσκουρίδου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Dioskouridos</td>
<td>98-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2265.3</td>
<td>Ἀρτεμιῶς (of Απολλώνιος)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Artemis</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>98-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2265.3–4</td>
<td>Απολλωνίας (of Απολλώνιος)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Apollonia</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>98-96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unknown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Name AS FOUND</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.ii.2</td>
<td>[Μάρ]θα Σαραπ[ι — — —]</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Martha ?</td>
<td>Sarapi(on)</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2248.ii.15–16</td>
<td>Πρῶτος Δωροθέου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Protos</td>
<td>Dorotheos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2248.ii17</td>
<td>Αφροδίσιος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Aphrodisios</td>
<td></td>
<td>112/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2248.18</td>
<td>NAME Διονυσίου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>112/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2248.24–5</td>
<td>Διονύσιος PATRONYM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>112/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2268.iii..25</td>
<td>Διονύσιος PATRONYM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dionysios son of NAME</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>112/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2248.28–9</td>
<td>Ερήμιας Σωτηρίχου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Hermias</td>
<td>Soterichos</td>
<td>112/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2248.30, ID 2628.iii.29</td>
<td>Σωσιμένης Δωροθέου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sosimenes</td>
<td>Dorotheos</td>
<td>112/2, 108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2228.3</td>
<td>Απολλωνίου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td></td>
<td>110/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.16</td>
<td>Διοκλέους</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Diokles</td>
<td></td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2232.8, ID 2249.15–16, ID 2250.6, ID 2251.12, ID 2234.18, ID 2253.11, ID 2628.17</td>
<td>Εὐτυχίδου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Eutuchidos</td>
<td></td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.17, III.33, ID 2253.12, ID 2224.10, ID 2274.6</td>
<td>Φιλίππου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Philippos</td>
<td></td>
<td>108/7, 106/5, 105/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.24</td>
<td>Σώστρατος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sostratos</td>
<td>Hermios</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.26</td>
<td>Nikasous (mother of Sostratos)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Nikasous</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.27-8</td>
<td>Lysandros Demetrios</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lysandros</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.39</td>
<td>Archelaos Dionysios</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Archelaos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.ii.27</td>
<td>Sunetos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sunetos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.ii.21</td>
<td>Theophilos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Theophilos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.ii.22</td>
<td>Diogenes</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Diogenes</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.ii.24</td>
<td>Gorgias</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Gorgias</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2243.1, ID 2244.1</td>
<td>Diogonis</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.30</td>
<td>Euemerous Demetrios</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Euemeros</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.31</td>
<td>Diodotos Manios</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Diodotos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.32</td>
<td>Demetrios Aristos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Demetrios</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.34</td>
<td>Dekmos Aui[io]</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dekmos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.35</td>
<td>Saraption</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sarapion</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.37</td>
<td>Menodotos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Menodotos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.39</td>
<td>Zenon Pamphilos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Zenon</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.40</td>
<td>Diogenes son of K...Sios</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Diogenes son</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.41</td>
<td>Atalante Zeuxid</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Atalante</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.42</td>
<td>Zosime Zoi[lo]</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Zosime</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.46</td>
<td>Dionysios son of Herakle(S?)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.b.i.21</td>
<td>Hedeia Philo daughter of Philo...</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Hedeia</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.b.i.22</td>
<td>Nikon Herakleides</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nikon</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.b.i.24</td>
<td>NAME Dioskouridós</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.b.i.26</td>
<td>NAME Nei[lo]</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.b.i.28</td>
<td>NAME Aulos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.b.i.3</td>
<td>Herai[is] Ptolemaios</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Herai[is]</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.b.i.4</td>
<td>Berenike Nikios</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Berenike</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.b.i.5</td>
<td>NAME el[to] Diokleidos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.b.i.7</td>
<td>Xanthias Sarapion</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Xanthias</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.b.i.8</td>
<td>NAME Hieronike Basileidos</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Hieronike</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.ii.9</td>
<td>Asklepiades</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.ii.12</td>
<td>M. OΣAGENOY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.ii.14</td>
<td>Apollonia Eirenia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Eireniaios</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.ii.15</td>
<td>Laodike Heliodoros</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Heliodoros</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.ii.17</td>
<td>Chaireas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.7</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.8</td>
<td>Demetrios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.10</td>
<td>Elpis Imeros</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Imeros</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.11</td>
<td>Hermias Protos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Protos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.12</td>
<td>Hieronis Hermios</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Hermios</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.13</td>
<td>Sophia Eudamos</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Eudamos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.14</td>
<td>Philot...ke Apollonanos</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Apollonanos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.15</td>
<td>Theophila Herakleon</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Herakleon</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.16</td>
<td>Laodike Xanthippos</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Xanthippos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.18</td>
<td>Herakleia Nikia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Nikia</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.19</td>
<td>Andromachos Andromachos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Andromachos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.20</td>
<td>Kerdon Maikion</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Maikion</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.21</td>
<td>Eireniaios Dorotheos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dorotheos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.22</td>
<td>Markos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.23</td>
<td>Dorotheos Dorotheos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dorotheos</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.25</td>
<td>NAME of Demetrios</td>
<td>NAME of Demetrios</td>
<td>Demetrios</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2628.iii.26</td>
<td>Theophilos Theophilos son of X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Metlius of X</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2232.6, ID 2249.9–10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2241.5</td>
<td>Iasonos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>107/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2232.8, ID 2249.14–5, ID</td>
<td>Demetrios?</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>107/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B: Phase 2 Membership (By Date)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Name AS FOUND</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2247</td>
<td>Αριστάρχου τοῦ Ἰσιδώρου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Aristarchos</td>
<td>Isodoros</td>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2280, ID 2247</td>
<td>Σαραπίων</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sarapion</td>
<td>Hermaphilos</td>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inscription | Name AS FOUND | Sex | Name | Patronym | Origin | Date (if known) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2281</td>
<td>Hermaphilus</td>
<td>Eukrates</td>
<td>Protogenos</td>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>113/2, 108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2285</td>
<td>Kleopratides</td>
<td>Kleopatrides</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Pre 118/7, 108/7, 106/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2260</td>
<td>Mennodos</td>
<td>Menodorus</td>
<td>Menodorus</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Post 118/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2261</td>
<td>Theodotos</td>
<td>Diodoros</td>
<td></td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>113/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2283</td>
<td>Diophone</td>
<td>Alexandros</td>
<td>Damascu</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2247</td>
<td>Seleukos</td>
<td>Zenodorus</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2257</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2260</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>Apollonidos</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2280</td>
<td>Antaios</td>
<td>Seleukos</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>128-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Eubola</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>128-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>128-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Dionysia</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>128-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Protogeneita</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>128-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>128-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Lysimachos</td>
<td>Achaios</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>128-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>128-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Lysimachos</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>128-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2226</td>
<td>Protogenos</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>128-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2283</td>
<td>Sarapion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2261</td>
<td>Eisdoros</td>
<td>Nomenios</td>
<td>Hierapolis</td>
<td>113/2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2259</td>
<td>Unknown name</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Laodoke</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix C: Phase 3 Syrians (By Date)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Name AS FOUND</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2262</td>
<td>Σωσίβιος Λροστέου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sosibios</td>
<td>Aristeos</td>
<td>Laodikea</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2262, ID 2267</td>
<td>Σαρπισιόν Λσκληνάδου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Sarapion</td>
<td>Asklepiados</td>
<td>Laodikea</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2268</td>
<td>Απολλοφάνης</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Apollophon</td>
<td>Antioc</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2268</td>
<td>Ζοῖλα Ισιδώρου</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Zoila</td>
<td>Isodorus</td>
<td>Antioc</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2268</td>
<td>Άσία Ισιδώρου</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Asia daughter of Isodorus</td>
<td>Antioc</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2268</td>
<td>Μάρθα</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Martha?</td>
<td>Sarapi(on)</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2268</td>
<td>Άρτεμιδόρος Άντιοχεύς</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Artemidoros</td>
<td>Antioc</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2268</td>
<td>Νίκον Άρτεμιδόρου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nikon</td>
<td>Artemidoros</td>
<td>Antioc</td>
<td>108/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2286, ID 2287</td>
<td>Μάρθα</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>107/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2253</td>
<td>Ισιδώρου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Isodorus</td>
<td>Antioc</td>
<td>106/5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2224</td>
<td>[—5-6—ο] Άρτεμιδόρου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>Artemidoros</td>
<td>Antioc</td>
<td>105-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2224</td>
<td>Άρτεμιδόρος Ισιδώρου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Artemidoros</td>
<td>Isodorus</td>
<td>Antioc</td>
<td>105-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2263</td>
<td>Άγαθοκλῆς Γλαυκίου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Agathokles</td>
<td>Glaukios</td>
<td>Antioc</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2263</td>
<td>Ρούμαθα (Άγαθοκλῆς)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Rhoumatha</td>
<td>Agathokles</td>
<td>Antioc</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2263</td>
<td>Γλαυκίου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Glaukio</td>
<td>Agathokles</td>
<td>Antioc</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription</td>
<td>Name AS FOUND</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2257.2</td>
<td>NAME Γαίου Ρωμαίος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NAME son of Gaius a Roman??</td>
<td>Pre 118/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.ii.20–1</td>
<td>Γάιος Όλοσσηίος Ποπλίου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C. Volosseius</td>
<td>112/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.ii.27</td>
<td>Πόπλιος Γαίου Πομπώνιος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P. Pomponius</td>
<td>112/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.iii.20</td>
<td>Λεύκιος Βαβύλλιος Λευκίου</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L. Babyllius</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.iii.23</td>
<td>Αὖλος Γέσσιος Φαλλάιος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A. Gessius Fallaius</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.iii.26</td>
<td>Αὖλος Γέσσιος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A. Gessius</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.iii.36</td>
<td>Γαίος Όλοκιος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C. Olokios</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.iii.43</td>
<td>NAME Λικινία Λευκίου</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NAME Licinius</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.iii.44</td>
<td>NAME Στλακκία Κοίν(του)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NAME Stlakkia</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2628.ii.6</td>
<td>Κόιντος Τύλλιος</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Q. Tullius</td>
<td>108/7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix D: Romans (With Line Numbers by Date)

*NB There are several Roman names from Athens. These are listed with the Athenians.
Appendix E: Names of the Poseidoniasts (With Line Numbers)

I have alphabetized these by the Anglicization of their name, since very few have known dates. I have omitted the many references to family members and identified only proper names. Some of these appear to be the same person, but it is not possible to be certain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Name AS FOUND</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Patronym</th>
<th>Date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611.a1.52</td>
<td>Αλέξανδρος Μαάρκου</td>
<td>Alexandros</td>
<td>Maarkos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611.a1.60</td>
<td>Αντίοχος Μαάρκου</td>
<td>Antiochos</td>
<td>Maarkos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 1780, 13</td>
<td>Απολλοδόρου τοῦ Απολλοφάνου</td>
<td>Apollodoros</td>
<td>Apollophanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611.b1.18</td>
<td>Απολλοδόρος (Δημοφόνου)</td>
<td>Apollodoros</td>
<td>Demophontes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611.a1.21</td>
<td>Απολλόδορος Διόνυσιος</td>
<td>Apollodoros</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611.b1.23</td>
<td>(probably same as #76)</td>
<td>[Α]πολλόδορος Γοργίου</td>
<td>Apollodoros</td>
<td>Gorgias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611.b1.16</td>
<td>Απολλόδορος Γοργίου</td>
<td>Apollodoros</td>
<td>Gorgias</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611.a1.53</td>
<td>Απολλόδορος Γοργίου Φείδουν</td>
<td>Apollodoros</td>
<td>Pheidon</td>
<td>Gorgias PHEIDON??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID 2611.a1.34</td>
<td>Απολλοφάνης</td>
<td>Apollophanes</td>
<td>Pistas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father/Surname</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.17</td>
<td>Ἀρ[ιστ][έας] T[. . . . . .]ν</td>
<td>Aristas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b1.4</td>
<td>Ἀρίστων Ἡ[ρα]κλείδου</td>
<td>Ariston Herakleides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1781.r.3</td>
<td>Ἀρτ... Δ[ι]ο[ϕάν]του</td>
<td>Art. . . Diophantos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.61</td>
<td>[Ἀσκ]ληπιάδης Ἀσκληπιάδου</td>
<td>Asklepiades Asklepiades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b1.30</td>
<td>[Ἀσκ]ληπ[ιά]δης . . .</td>
<td>Asklepiades NAME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b1.26</td>
<td>[Ἀσ]κληπι[ά]δης Νίκονος</td>
<td>Asklepiades Nikon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.44</td>
<td>[Βα]σιλείδης . . .</td>
<td>Basileides NAME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b1.15</td>
<td>Χάρης Μνασέου</td>
<td>Chares Mnaseos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786.1</td>
<td>Δημήτριος Ἀπολλονί[δου]</td>
<td>Demetrios Apollonidos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b1.12</td>
<td>Δημήτρι[ος] Νίδος</td>
<td>Demetrios . . . NIDOS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.45</td>
<td>[Δ]ημήτριος [Σοπάτρου]</td>
<td>Demetrios Sopatros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780.3, ID 1796.2–3</td>
<td>Δημοκλήν Δημοφόντος</td>
<td>Demokles Demophontes 150-110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b1.17</td>
<td>Δημοκλής Δημοφο[ν]το]ς</td>
<td>Demokles Demophontes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.59</td>
<td>Δημοστράτος [Δημοστράτ]ου</td>
<td>Demostratos Demostratos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.24</td>
<td>Δημοστράτος Εὐδώρου</td>
<td>Demostratos Eudoros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.50</td>
<td>[Δ]ημόστρατος . . .</td>
<td>Demostratos NAME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.58</td>
<td>Δημόστρατος Περσαίου</td>
<td>Demostratos Perseios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.30</td>
<td>Δίκαιος Διονυσίου</td>
<td>Dikaios Dionysios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.38</td>
<td>Διοκλῆς Νυμφοδώρου</td>
<td>Diokles Nymphodoros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.35</td>
<td>Διονύσιος Ἀπολλοδώρου</td>
<td>Dionysios Apollodoros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.41</td>
<td>[Διο]νύσιος Ἀπολλονίου</td>
<td>Dionysios Apollonios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b1.28</td>
<td>[Διο]νύσιος Ἀσκληπιάδου</td>
<td>Dionysios Asklepiades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.27</td>
<td>Διονύσιος Διονυσίου</td>
<td>Dionysios Dionysios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b1.20</td>
<td>Διονύσιος Δόνακος</td>
<td>Dionysios Donakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.39</td>
<td>Διονύσιος Ἡλιοδώρου</td>
<td>Dionysios Heliodoros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.12</td>
<td>[Διο]νύσιος Κρατίνος</td>
<td>Dionysios Kration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b1.5</td>
<td>Διονύσιος Μέντορος</td>
<td>Dionysios Mentres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b1.14</td>
<td>Διονύσιος Μνασέου</td>
<td>Dionysios Mnaseos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Son/Mother</td>
<td>Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b.12</td>
<td>Διονύσιος . . .</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a.15</td>
<td>Διονύσιος Πίστου</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>Pistos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779, 7, 2611.28</td>
<td>Διονυσίου τοῦ Σωσιπάτρου</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>Sosipatros</td>
<td>150-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1790.1</td>
<td>Διονύσιος Ζηνοδόρου</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>Zenodoros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b.16</td>
<td>Διονύσιος Θεοδώρου Μαγαββών</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>Theodoros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772.1, 1783.1, 1784.1, 1785.1–2</td>
<td>Διονύσιος Ζήνωνος τοῦ Θεοδώρου</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>Zenon (son of Theodoros)</td>
<td>150-110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b.24</td>
<td>Διονύσιος Ζήνωνος τοῦ Θεοδώρου</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>Zenon (son of Theodoros)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b.25</td>
<td>Διονύσιος Ζήνωνος τοῦ Θεοδώρου</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>Zenon (son of Theodoros)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a.57</td>
<td>Εὐδοκίμης . . .</td>
<td>Euedokimos</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a.46</td>
<td>Εὐπολύνης . . .</td>
<td>Eupolynos</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a.40</td>
<td>Γερμήνας τοῦ Ἀριστοκράτου</td>
<td>Gerasimos</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a.54</td>
<td>Γερμήνας Διονυσίου</td>
<td>Gerasimos</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1793.2</td>
<td>Γερμήνας</td>
<td>Gerasimos</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>153-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a.29</td>
<td>Γερμήνας Διονυσίου</td>
<td>Gerasimos</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a.56</td>
<td>Γερμήνας Διονυσίου</td>
<td>Gerasimos</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a.48</td>
<td>Γερμήνας Διονυσίου</td>
<td>Gerasimos</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>153-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a.31</td>
<td>Γερμήνας Διονυσίου</td>
<td>Gerasimos</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a.48</td>
<td>Γερμήνας Διονυσίου</td>
<td>Gerasimos</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Roman Name</td>
<td>Greek Name</td>
<td>Patronym or Patron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.19</td>
<td>Διονυσοδώρου</td>
<td>Dionysodorus</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.63</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.62</td>
<td>Ζήνωνος</td>
<td>Zenon</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.3</td>
<td>Hagesandros</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b1.8</td>
<td>NASIDES</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b1.27</td>
<td>Nikon</td>
<td>Herakleides</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.18</td>
<td>Agathon</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b1.23</td>
<td>Patron</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b1.10</td>
<td>Peithagoras</td>
<td>Kleon</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b1.11</td>
<td>Philokles</td>
<td>Zoilos</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1786.3</td>
<td>Posidoni</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.55</td>
<td>Prothomos</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.31</td>
<td>Ptolemaios</td>
<td>Apollodorus</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.43</td>
<td>Sarapion</td>
<td>Apollonios</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.22</td>
<td>Sokrates</td>
<td>Sosipatrois</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b1.7</td>
<td>Sopatros</td>
<td>Mnaseos</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.47</td>
<td>Sosipatrois</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.b1.19</td>
<td>Summachos</td>
<td>Demephontes</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.14</td>
<td>Theodoros</td>
<td>Zenon</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1791.1, 1792.a1.1</td>
<td>X son of Hieron</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>Hieron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2611.a1.15</td>
<td>Zenon</td>
<td>(Zenon)</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788.1, 1789.1</td>
<td>Zenon</td>
<td>Dionysios</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMANS</td>
<td>Patronym or Patron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782.2</td>
<td>Cn. Octavius</td>
<td>Gnaius</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520.6</td>
<td>M. Minatius?</td>
<td>Sextus</td>
<td>153/2 OR 149/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520.6</td>
<td>M. Minatius?</td>
<td>Sextus</td>
<td>153/2 OR 149/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>