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Bibliographical Note

Bibliographical references occur in one of three places:

(1) Every entry has a “Publications” heading, where the first edition (*editio princeps*) of the Greek or Latin text and each significant, subsequent publication of the inscription are provided in chronological order (with dependent re–publications in brackets). These may be cited in the *notes or comments* sections using an author or author–date format. This bibliographical data is *not* repeated in the following two categories.

(2) Each entry concludes with a “Literature” section where any additional secondary sources discussed in the *notes or comments* of a specific entry are provided. These are also cited using an author–date format.

(3) There is a final “Bibliography” at the end of the work containing secondary literature which is cited *repeatedly* in connection with more than one inscription entry (e.g., Robert 1980; Dittmann–Schöne 2001). With these also, the author–date format is used in the *publication, notes or comments* sections.
Symbols / Sigla

Text editing symbols

τ[ῶ]ν Single square brackets with enclosed letters represent a lacuna (gap) restored by an editor. In the English translations, restored material is indicated by an ellipsis and a question mark at the end of the restored material: e.g. “The guild ... of dyers (?) ... honoured Athenodoros.”

[,]ς Single square brackets with no letters represent an unrestored lacuna.

[…] Dots within square brackets represent a specified number of missing letters.

[———] Long dashes in square brackets represent a lacuna with an uncertain number of missing letters.

δη(νάρις) Rounded brackets represent a resolution of an abbreviation or the correct spelling of a word.

κόρ<ν> Diamond brackets represent letters omitted by accident in antiquity and supplied by an epigraphic editor.

{καλ}καλέων Braces represent superfluous or erroneous letters or words.

[[ΔοΣετιανῷ]] Double square brackets represent a restored erasure.

Vacant is used to refer to an empty, uninscribed area.

| A small vertical line represents a line–break in the inscription with a double line break (||) used on every fifth line for inscriptions cited in the notes or comments sections.

Numerals and related symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>⋆</td>
<td>demarius, denarii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α’an</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β’an</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ’an</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ’an</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε’an</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζ’an</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η’an</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ’an</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ι’an</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ’an</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λ’an</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ’an</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ν’an</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζ’an</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ο’an</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π’an</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ’an</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ’</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ’an</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τ’an</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υ’an</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υ’</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χ’an</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ϒ’an</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ι’an</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ι’an</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ι’an</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ι’an</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviations

1. Periodicals, Series, Catalogues, Lexica, and Other Tools
(Note: Periodical and series abbreviations not listed here follow the standard outlined in the Society of Biblical Literature Handbook of Style.)

AJA  American Journal of Archaeology.
ANRW  Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung.
Athena  Athena. Syngramma periodikon tes en Athenais Epistemonikes Hetaireias.
BCH  Bulletin de correspondance hellénique.
BE  “Bullétin épigraphique” (printed int Revue des études grecques and cited by year and entry number).
EA  Epigraphica Anatolica.
EBGR  Epigraphic Bulletin for Greek Religion (in the periodical Kernos).
ÉPRO  Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain.
GRBS  Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies.
HSCP  Harvard Studies in Classical Philology
HTR  Harvard Theological Review.
IM  Istanbuler Mitteilungen.
JBL  Journal of Biblical Literature.
JHS  Journal of Hellenic Studies.
JÖAI  Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien.
JRS  Journal of Roman Studies.
JSJ  Journal for the Study of Judaism.
LCL  Loeb Classical Library
from the Magarid to Thessaly; vol. 4: Macedonia, Thrace, Northern Regions of the Black Sea; vol. 5A: Coastal Asia Minor: Pontos to Ionia.

LSJ

Mouseion
Μουσείον καὶ Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Εὐαγγελικῆς Σχολῆς (Smyrna).

PIR

RA
Revue archéologique.

REA
Revue des études anciennes.

RGRW
Religions in the Graeco–Roman World.

RhM
Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.

RPCO

ZPE
Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik.

2. Inscriptions and Papyri

AÉ
L’Année épigraphique

AGRW

BGU
Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen (later Staatlichen) Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden. Berlin: Weidmann, 1895–.

CCCA
→ ICybele

CCIS
→ ICybele

CIG

CIJ

CIL

CIRB
→ IBosp

CMRDM
→ IBMen

DFSJ
Abbreviations


Abbreviations


IG X/2.2 Papazoglou, Fanula, Milena Milin, Marijana Ricl, Klaus Hallof. Inscriptiones Graecae Epìri, Macedoniae, Thraciae, Scythiae. II:
Abbreviations


IGLSkythia → *Histrig, Pomis, Ikallatis.*

IGLSyria → *Byzia.*

Abbreviations


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILyciaHK</td>
<td>Heberdey, Rudolf, and Ernst Kalinka. “Bericht über zwei Reisen im südwestlichen Kleinasienn.” <em>Denkschriften des Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch–historische Klasse 45.1 (1897).</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviations


Abbreviations


IRhodM Maiuri, A. *Nuova silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos*. Firenze: Le Monnier, 1925.


*Jaccottet* → *Diōnyssos*


**Abbreviations**

**MAMA**

**MAMA XI**

**NewDocs I–IV**

**NewDocs VI–IX**

**NewDocs X**

**OGIS**

**OWilck**

**PHI or PH**
“Packard Humanities Institute: Greek Epigraphy.” http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/. To directly access a certain inscription on the PHI website, type the word “epigraphy” and the PHI number in quotation marks in Google search: e.g. “PH252192” epigraphy.

**Philippi II**

**P Athen**

**PCorn**

**P Flor**

**PGurob**

**PKöln**

**PLille**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td>Papiri greci e latini. Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la Ricerca dei Papiri Greci e Latini in Egitto. Firenze F. Le Monnier, 1912–.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG</td>
<td>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviations
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Introduction to Volume 2

This second volume was written with two main goals in mind, both of which may contribute to the overall objectives of this series on associations in the ancient world. On the one hand, I seek to provide a useful reference work which can be consulted—piecemeal—on this or that inscription or topic. For each entry, I provide publication information, a description of the monument, the Greek or Latin text, a translation, some epigraphic notes, a commentary, and a bibliography. In the comments section of each entry, I discuss various topics including the types of associations, their internal structures and membership, and their cultic, social, and funerary activities. In this respect, this second volume follows closely the format and aims of the first volume. My purpose here is to provide the necessary details that might help the reader to interpret the social and cultural contexts of particular monuments and to recognize the broader implications of certain inscriptions. In the process, cross-references to entries in this and the previous volume assist the reader in following leads on particular topics and issues.

With almost one thousand surviving inscriptions pertaining to associations in my assigned geographical regions, I have had to be carefully selective. I have generally limited myself to the Hellenistic and Roman imperial periods up to the time of Constantine (roughly covering 300 BCE–300 CE), although I wander back into the Persian period at some points, and a few inscriptions (e.g. place reservations) may date to the Byzantine era. The more official, age-based organizations connected with gymnasia (παῖδες, ἔφηβοι, νεανίσκοι, νέοι, γέροντες, γερουσία) are generally left out, although they are sometimes encountered alongside less formal associations in our inscriptions. Still, it is noteworthy that these age-based groups sometimes used similar self-designations and leadership titles to the groups we focus on in this volume. Also set aside are inscriptions that clearly deal with official boards of sanctuaries or of other institutions, although sometimes it is difficult to distinguish between an official board of cultic functionaries and a more or less voluntary association engaged in honouring the gods. My approach was to choose inscriptions that illustrate the different kinds of unofficial or voluntary associations and that instantiate the various kinds of monuments or documents encountered in each region (e.g. honorary inscriptions, dedications, epitaphs, membership lists, regulations, letters, imperial rescripts, oracles, graffiti). Simultaneously, I was careful to look for inscriptions
that might shed light on cultural characteristics of a particular region or locale. Because of the potential negative side–effects of selection, I briefly outline some inscriptions that were left out as I introduce each region or locale, which brings me to my other purpose.

My second main goal was to write this work in a way that you might choose to start at the beginning of the first comments section and continue reading each comments section throughout the work, looking back at relevant inscriptions as you proceed. In this sense, I have tried to create a coherent monograph arranged by geographical areas and, therefore, cultural regions, although this was not easy and some repetition was inevitable in order to meet the first goal. As a monograph, the book may serve as a social and cultural introduction to associations in areas both north and south of the Black Sea, particularly in Greek cities but also, in certain cases, in villages and the countryside. The formation of associations was not always merely an urban phenomenon, as material from Lydia and Phrygia shows. I have given special attention to local variations, investigating both recurring themes and distinctive characteristics of associative life in different parts of the Bosporan kingdom and Asia Minor. While much of the focus is on the Roman imperial era (in part because our evidence for associative life in this era is far more substantial), there are some important forays into social and cultural life in the Persian, Seleukid (312–188 BCE), and Attalid (188–133 BCE) eras.

As I progressed in my analysis of the materials, I began to develop certain key arguments that should be briefly outlined here. While there is value in scholars investigating unofficial groups together, there are simultaneously important features of associative life that vary from one group to the next and, importantly, from one cultural region to another. The concept of a more or less voluntary “association” is a useful scholarly or sociological category that allows us to consider, from a bird’s eye view of society, a range of small, primarily unofficial groupings that shared in common certain attributes (for a full discussion and definition of “association,” see Harland 2009, 25–47).

Nonetheless, there was significant diversity among these groups. Quite often, a useful way of understanding this diversity is to consider the sources from which members in a particular association were drawn, which is sometimes clearly reflected in the evidence. When surveying groups in a particular region, I pay close attention to the composition of membership and to the different types of groups that were formed, from those emerging from social contacts among fellow immigrants, or fellow–workers, or neighbours, to those emerging from social connections of the extended household. Although the constituency of membership is not always known, thankfully our historical subjects were sometimes concerned to express corporate identity precisely with regard to these origins within what a historian or sociologist might call “social networks” (on which see Harland 2013, 119–139 = Harland 2003c, 137–160). Our ability to see this
is due, in part, to the fact that our historical subjects in the Hellenistic and Roman eras sometimes (or often) found it important to express identities in terms of their original homeland, their occupation, their family, or the neighbourhood where they lived or worked.

While immigrant, occupational, and familial associations are sometimes easier for the social historian to identify, others are less so. In particular, with many groups, all we know is that numerous individuals joined together regularly to form a society, to honour a particular deity, or to be initiated into the mysteries of a deity. And in many of these cases no further information is available concerning how these individuals may have been connected before the formation of the association. This latter situation has often led to the rather unhelpful scholarly category of the “cultic association” or “religious association,” with, in some cases, scholars debating whether or not this or that group was “religious” enough to be called a “cultic association,” or whether a particular group was merely a “club,” or a “political association,” or what have you. Although it is true that a given group may have focussed more on honouring certain deities than some other group, these distinctions are, now, largely unrecoverable for the historian. We shall see that immigrant groups, occupational guilds, neighbourhood associations, and others were similarly concerned with honouring the gods, so virtually all groups discussed in this work had a cultic function and were, in some sense, “cultic associations.”

Another important argument that I develop concerning diversity relates to regional variations and to the role of what can be called indigenous or local cultures. Each of the specific regions enveloped within the geographical labels “Asia Minor” or “Anatolia” or “the Black Sea area”—let alone the larger “Greek East,” “Roman empire,” or “Greco–Roman world”—had its own individual history in interaction with other nearby peoples, and this process of cultural contact between local cultures (with each city, town, or village likewise having its own individual, developing way of life) played itself out differently in different places. So although many scholars have, recently, been attentive to studying associations on a regional basis, not enough attention has been given to the individual associative histories of particular geographical or cultural regions and locales. This is due, in part, to the fact that the sociohistorical study of such groups is a relatively new venture, and only the groundwork for a general history has begun, let alone the many local histories that remain to be written.

As I argue in this work, there are significant signs of the importance of local cultures in the development of associative life in particular times and places. Thus, for instance, certain group self-designations—perhaps reflective of structural or organizational differences as well—were more prevalent in one cultural area than another. And in some cases a self-designation is attested in only one area, suggestive of a particular local understanding of that social formation. Furthermore, the influence of indigenous cultural traditions can be seen in
the internal lives of associations in some cases, particularly though not solely relating to the choice of what deities to honour. The society (thiasos) that gathered to honour Mother Oreia at a mountainside shrine in rural Pisidia was, in some respects, quite a different phenomenon than the devotees of Mother Cybele in an urban setting such as Apameia in Bithynia or Kyzikos in Mysia. There is a similar need for caution and attention to details and variations when studying any number of other issues as well. My selection of inscriptions to include in (or exclude from) the volume began to be affected by this need to observe local cultures and associations within them.

Beyond the numbered entries, there are also many inscriptions cited within the comments of each entry. Many that I hoped to include also had to be left by the wayside in the service of creating a readable monograph with as little repetition as possible. Many of the excluded inscriptions, which are only mentioned in passing in this book, can still be read and studied online at the “Associations in the Greco–Roman World” companion website:


Acknowledgements: I would especially like to thank those who read the manuscript. Ilias Arnaoutoglou (Academy of Athens) provided extensive comments and corrections and pointed me to several recently published inscriptions. John S. Kloppenborg (University of Toronto), Richard S. Ascough (Queen’s University), and Thomas Corsten (Universität Wien) read the entire manuscript and provided very valuable feedback. Benedikt Eckhardt (Westfälische Wilhelms–Universität Münster) identified corrections for the inscriptions from Mysia, Lydia, and Phrygia. I also appreciated Yulia Ustinova’s (Ben Gurion University of the Negev) comments on the Olbian and Bosporan inscriptions and Sailakshmi Ramgopal’s feedback on entries that deal with associations of Romans (numbers 103, 108 and 115). Markus Öhler (Universität Wien) and Andreas Bendlin (University of Toronto) also made helpful suggestions. Matthew Clark (York University) was kind enough to provide me with translations of three inscriptions in verse that appear in the comments to entry number 102. Susan Dunning (University of Toronto), Liam O’Brien (York University), and Sarah Veale (York University) contributed by preparing the indices. Susan and Sarah also did some valuable proof–reading. The Ancient World Mapping Center <awmc.unc.edu> generously gave me permission to make use of two map bases for the three maps that I developed in preparation for this volume.
Special thanks are of course due to my wife, Cheryl, and to my sons, Justin and Nathaniel, who tolerated me only sometimes responding appropriately to “Daddy, do you want to play hockey in the hallway?” Nathaniel also helped out with the gladiators, as he was studying them in grade six.
NORTH COAST OF THE BLACK SEA
Graffito for Apollo by the Boreikian Society

Olbia (Scythia) ca. 300 BCE


Publication used: IOlbiaD 95.

Current location: Information unavailable.

Similar or related inscriptions: IOlbiaD 83a–b; SEG 53:788: Apollo Boreas in sixth century BCE dedications. IOlbiaD 96 (VI BCE); Stolba 2013, 293 = IOlbiaD 11 (ca. 300 BCE): Other associations at Olbia. IOlbiaD 94a–c: Fifth century BCE graffiti on bone tablets mentioning abstractions alongside Orphic matters and the god Dionysos. IPergamonSupp AM 27, 1902, no. 86 (~ IPergamon 485 [110] comments); SEG 46:1519 [121] (Sardis area); ISmyrna 765 [136]; OGIS 326 [141] (Teos): Associations in the Hellenistic era.

Circular inscription engraved on the outer and inner edge of a fifth century Attic vase–stand with black lacquer.

<inner circle>
Βίος Βίος, Ἀπόλλων Ἀπόλλων, Ἠλίος Ἠλίος, Κόσμος Κόσμος,
Φῶς Φῶς.

<outer circle 1>
Καλλίνικος Φιλονικου, [Ποσειδώνιος Σωκράτης] Ήρωος
Φιλοξένου, Δημήτριος Σωκράτου, Φιλόνιος Σωκράτου, Βορεικοὶ
θεοίται.

(inner circle 1) Bios Bios (“Life”), Apollo Apollo, Helios Helios (“Sun”), Cosmos Cosmos (“Universe”), Phos Phos (“Light”).
(outer circle 1) Kallinikos son of Philonikos, Poseidonios (?) son of Sokrates, Heroson son of Philoxenos, Demetrios son of Sokrates, and Philon son of Sokrates, the Boreikian (boreikoi) society–members (thiasitai).

Notes
Inner circle, line 1: B. Bravo (see SEG 58:772) proposes reading the text in the following order:

Ἀπόλλων Ἥλιο̣ς, Ἥλιος Κόσσος, Κόσσος Φῶς, Φῶς Βίος, Βίος Ἀπόλλων.
Apollo Helios, Helios Cosmos, Cosmos Phos, Phos Bios, Bios Apollo.

Comments
The majority of evidence for associations north of the Black Sea comes from Greek cities of the Bosporan kingdom, which occupy us in subsequent entries. But before turning to these, some attention should be given to the earlier materials from Olbia (near Parutino in the Ukraine), a Milesian colony founded in the seventh century BCE. It just so happens that our present inscription and some others from Olbia (dating about 300 BCE) are among the earliest evidence for associations in Greek cities both north (Bosporan kingdom) and south (Asia Minor) of the Black Sea. So it is worthwhile beginning with these earlier associations.

Our present entry is a circular inscription engraved on the outer and inner lip of the lower support of a fifth century Attic vase with black lacquer. The self–designation “Boreikians” (Βορεικοί) for members of this society probably relates to the personified North Wind (Βορέας) and, more importantly, may suggest that the patron deity of the society was Apollo Boreas (cf. Dubois in IOlbiaD). Herodotos claims that the Athenians had established a sanctuary for Boreas after a victory in battle due to the north wind (Histories 7.189), and the grammarian Hesychios of Alexandria’s entry (V CE) on βορειομοί or βορειασται (in some manuscripts) refers to the Athenians’ celebrations and banquets in honour of Boreas. Apollo Boreas specifically is (so far) only attested at Olbia, though, so this association likely has a local character with regard to its patron deity. There is further evidence for a cult of Apollo Boreas among Ionian settlers in Olbia dating back to the archaic period, including sixth–century dedications “to Apollo Boreas” (IOlbiaD 83a-b; see also Rusjaeva 2007, 100; Birzescu 2010, 101–102; cf. SEG 53:788).

In our main inscription, we are witnessing Apollo’s northern manifestation. It may be that the different titles or abstractions mentioned (Bios, Cosmos, and Phos) were considered attributes or epithets of Apollo Boreas. Apollo in his various forms seems to have been among the favourites of Olbians. It is important to remember here that Olbia was a foundation by Miletos, which was known for its sanctuary and oracle of Apollo at Didyma (→ IMiletos 935 [133]).
Beyond this, the two main sanctuaries excavated at Olbia show the presence of Apollo. Apollo Delphinios (“of Delphi”), who was also given attention at Didyma (cf. Fontenrose 1988, 121–122), was featured alongside Zeus and Athena in the Eastern sanctuary at Olbia. Apollo Ietros (“Healer”) and Apollo Boreas were honoured in the Western sanctuary, with other inscriptions indicating that the Mother of the Gods, the Dioskouroi, Hermes, Aphrodite and Athena were also given attention in this sacred space (see Rusjäeva 2008, 93; on Apollo Ietros / Iatros, see Ustinova 2009). Laurent Dubois (1996) refers to other graffiti from Olbia that may refer to associations, including several scrawled by members of a group of “Neomeniasts” (Νεομενιασταί), perhaps devotees of Apollo Neomenios (“of the first of the month”; IOlbiaD 96 and notes there). This graffito dates to the sixth century BCE, so Apollo was honoured within smaller groups at Olbia for quite some time before the existence of the society in our main entry.

A connection with Orphic ideas is also possible with our main inscription (cf. Dubois in IOlbiaD). Three tiny bone tablets with graffiti scratched on them were discovered at one of the sanctuaries at Olbia, and one of the tablets refers either to “Orphic matters” or to “Orphics” as a group of people (Ὀρφικοί). This is not the place to engage the whole problem of whether or not there were “Orphic communities,” which has been hotly debated for about a hundred years and cannot be solved here (on which see, most recently, the summary of scholarship by Graf and Johnston 2013, 50–65, 187–195). But something can be said about a possible connection between the ideas in our inscription and those on the bone tablets. These bone tablets have been dated to the fifth century BCE and contain themes that overlap with those in our present entry (IOlbiaD 94a–c = West 1982 = Graf and Johnston 2013, 214–216 [no. 1]; cf. SEG 28:659–661):

\[
\text{βίος θάνατος βίος Ζ(?) } | \text{ ἀλήθεια } | \text{Ζα(γρεύς?) Ζ(?) } | \text{Διό(νυσος)} \text{ (?) } \text{Ὀρφικοί.}
\]

Life, Death, Life, Truth. Dionysos. Orphic (matters) (or: Orphics; Orphikos)

\[
\text{εἰρήνη πόλες } | \text{ἀλήθεια ψεῦδος } | \text{Διό(υσος) } (\text{Διο(ύσῳ) ?}) \text{ Διό(νυσος)} \text{ (?) } \text{Α}
\]

Peace, War, Truth, Falsehood, Dionysos.

\[
\text{Διό(νυσος) (Διο(ύσῳ) ?) } | \text{ἀλήθεια } | \text{σῶς ψυχή } | \text{Α}
\]

Dionysos, Z. Truth, Body, Soul.

These tablets and our main inscription both mention a deity or deities to whom the inscription was dedicated and both list qualities or sacred concepts. While these tablets seem to be focussed on Dionysos (abbreviated as Dion. or Dio.), our inscription is concerned with Apollo and Helios. The first of the bone tablets also shares in common with our inscription the reference to “Life,” but the tablet also offers its opposite, “Death.” The references to “Body” and “Soul” in another bone tablet might be compared with the abstraction of “Life” in our main inscription as well. Yet the bone tablets make no mention of the gods
Apollo and Helios or the other items in our main entry, namely Cosmos and Light.

If there is indeed an Orphic connection in the case of our main entry, the so-called Orphic hymns from a later era (II CE) may shed some light on these latter two abstractions and the connection with Apollo in particular, as Florina Panait Bărăcescu (2010, 103–104) points out. In the Hymn to Apollo (47), for instance, Apollo is designated the “light-bringing spirit” (φωσφόρε δαίμον) who “sees all and brings light to mortals,” and he is said to “hold the bounds of the entire cosmos” (ἔχεις δὲ τε πείρατα κόσμου παντός). Still, a caution is in order here. As I discuss further with regard to a sanctuary regulation at Smyrna (→ Smyrna 728 [140] comments), there has been a tendency for some scholars to eagerly seek out and apparently find supposed “Orphic” ideas or practices or communities where the evidence is quite slim or, sometimes, non-existent. So the possible Orphic connection of our main inscription should remain a tentative suggestion only.

Other inscriptions from Olbia attest to associations in the same era as our main entry. One base of white marble probably held the statue or statues of a Saviour deity or deities. The priests and society–members that dedicated the statue were gathered around a man named Heuresibios (or: Euresibios), and the society seems to consist almost entirely of members from two generations of two different families (Belzuki 1955 = SEG 18:304, with an alternative reading of line 1 in Robert, BE 1959, 270, and an alternative reading of line 2 in Ustina 1988, 156–159 = Knipovic, Nikolaeva, and Levi 1968, no. 71 = IOlbiaD 11 = Stolba 2013, 293, followed for column 2; ca. 325–300 BCE):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1, Line 3</th>
<th>Column 2, Line 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>θεοὺς Σωτῆρας (Robert)</td>
<td>Λεωκράτης ΠολυχάρΣος ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Υἱερεῖς Εὐρησιβίων (Ustinova)</td>
<td>Ἡραγόρης Πρα— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Καὶ θιασῖται· Εὐρησίβιος Λεωκράτεος,</td>
<td>Ἀρρενείδης Λεω— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πολυκράτης Λεωκράτεος,</td>
<td>Εὐμήνης Λεωπρέπεος ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πολύσήδης Λεωκράτεος,</td>
<td>Ἡραγόρης Πρα— —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πολύστρατος Λεωκράτεος,</td>
<td>Λεωπρέπης Εὐμήνεος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πολύχαρς Λεωκράτεος,</td>
<td>Συρίσκος Εὐμήνεος ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΠολυΣέδων Λεωκράτεος,</td>
<td>Ποσειδώνιος / –είδιππος — —</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

…but (This was dedicated to) the Saviour gods (?). Priests of the Heuresibian (column 1) and society–members (θιασῖται): Heuresibios son of Leokrates, Polykrates son of Leokrates, Polymedes son of Leokrates, Polyratros son of Leokrates, Polycharmos (?) son of Leokrates, Polydemos (?) son of Leokrates, Polycrates son of Leokrates, (10) Polymedon (?) son of Leokrates, (column 2) Leokrates son of Polycharmos (?) … Heragores son of Name …, Arrenides son of Name …, Eumenes son of Leoprepes (?), Heuresibios son of Eumenes (?) …, Leoprepes son of Eumenes (?) …, Syriskos son of Eumenes (?) …, (and) Poseidonios (?).
Eight of the seventeen members in the society were clearly sons of Leokrates, including the founder, Heuresibios, and a second generation is represented by Leokrates son of Polycharmos. The names of fathers in column two are heavily damaged, but the recent reconstruction by V. F. Stolba (2013)—which is followed above and is based, in part, on names in a contemporary inscription (IPontEux I² 201)—proposes that several are sons of Eumenes. And, in this case, the father was a member as well. So it seems that we are here dealing with an association drawn primarily from at least two generations of two different families (see Stolba 2013, 299, for possible family trees). It is noteworthy that five members of the Boreikian society in our main entry were brothers (sons of Sokrates).

[93] IBosp 1134

Dedication to the God Poseidon by a Society of Shippers

Gorgippia (Bosporan kingdom) 173–211 ce

Publications: Vasilii Latyshev, “Известия Археологической Комиссии” (Bulletin of the Archaeological Commission) 37 (1910) 38–43 (no. 2 and plate 2; first edition) (Minns 1913, 655 [no. 51]); Struve, IBosp 1134 (with photo now available at no. 1134 in the album by Gavrilov and others 2004); AGRW 84; PH183870.

Publication used: IBosp 1134.

Current location: State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg.

Similar or related inscriptions: SEG 36:700: Shippers at Gorgippia (?). ITomis 60, 132 (ca. 160 ce and II ce); TAM IV 22 (Nikomedia; 70/71 ce); Robert, BE 1974, 572 on TAM IV 33 (Nikomedia); Ehrhardt and Günther 2013 (Miletos; 131 ce); IErythrai 74 (Chios; time of Augustus); IG II 1012 [42] (Athens; 112/11 bce); SEG 1:282 [62] (27 bce–14 ce); SEG 42:625 [75] (90–91 ce); IDelos 1519, 1520; SEG 42:625 [75] (Thessalonike; 90–91 ce → IILydiaHM 85 [119] comments); IGUR 26 (Ephesians in Rome), IGRR I 392 (Alexandrians in Ostia): Groups of shippers. IBosp 1129, 1130, 1135, 1136: Synod membership–lists from Gorgippia. IBosp 1119A: Statue of Neokles son of Moirodoros.

Five fragments of a marble slab (letter height: 1.7 cm).

(fragments A–E)

[ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ].

[βιβλιστικῶν ὀνόματος] βασιλέως Τιμίου Ιουλίανος Σαῦρος Ἐρέσιου φιλοκαίσαρος καὶ φιλορωΣαίου, εὐσεβὴς — νας (?) ἔτους . . . . , Σηνὸς Δαισίου. θεῷ Ποσείδῶνος ἐπὶ βασιλέως Σαῦρος, υἱοῦ Σεγάλλου βασιλέως Ηλίου Σαῦρος, θέασον ναυκλήρων, οἱ καὶ ποιήσαντες τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ τὸν ναὸν ἐκ θεΣελίων ἀναστήσαντες, εἰς ὃ καὶ [ἑ]τείμησαν ὁ βασιλέως τὸν θεὸν καὶ τὴν θέασον [ἐξ]εξεγέτων ἄρταβάν χειλίων, θεασεῖται περί ἱερεῖαν Ἀθηνόδωρον Σελεύκου πρώτον ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας καὶ συναγω-γῶν Μοιρόδωρον Νεοκλέους ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς Γοργιπείας καὶ ἀφροντατών Κοσσυνὸν Ἀττα Κοσσυνοῦ καὶ Φαρνάκην Νου-μινίου ἱεροῖς οἰκονόμοις, θε[ε]τεῖται Πανταλέων

15 Φαρνάκου στρατηγὸν, Μοιρόδωρος Λαμπρού στρατηγός, Χριστίων Πέτα, Μακάριος Ἀθηνοδώρου (?) — — — — — — — — — —
To good fortune! During the reign of king Tiberius Julius Sauromates (?)…, friend of Caesar and friend of the Romans, pious one … in the xth year in the month (?) … of Daisios, the society (thiasos) of shippers (nauklēroi) dedicated this to the god Poseidon during the time of king Sauromates, descendant of the great king Rhometalkes. They also made the statues and built the temple, raising it up from the foundations, for which purpose also the king honoured the god and the society with funds worth one thousand artabas (Persian measures; or: with exemption from taxes on 1000 measures of imported or exported grain). (10) The society–members are gathered around the priest, Athenodoros son of Seleukos, foremost in the kingdom; the synagogue–leader (synagōgos), Moirodoros son of Neokles, who is also the governor of Gorgippia; the manager (phrontistas), Kossous Attas son of Kossous; and, Pharmakes son of Noumenios, administrator of sacred affairs (hierōn oikonomos).

The society–members are: Pantaleon son of Pharnakos, commander (stratēgos); Moirodoros son of … Atamazos (?)…, commander; Chrestion son of Papas, Makarios son of … Athenodoros (?) …; Name… administrator of the taxes (oikonomos enkykliōn); Gaganos …., administrator of the taxes; Aspourgos … administrator of the taxes; … (at least 33 other mem-
bers without any clear designation of roles are listed in the fragmentary lines that follow).

Notes
II. 2–3 and 5–6: Τιβερίου Ἰουλίου Σαυρόσατου… . υἱοῦ Σεγάλου βασιλέως Ῥομήντακου: The king here is Sauromates II, who reigned ca. 174–211 CE (Minns 1913, 606–607, based on coinage). He was the son of Tiberius Julius Eupator, whose father was Tiberius Julius Rhoimetalkes.

I. 10: περὶ ἱερέ[α]: This is standard phrasing for associations in the Bosporan kingdom (see other inscriptions below).
I. 11: ἐπὶ τῆς βα[σ]ιλείας → IBosp 36 (275–79 CE), 58 (249 CE), from Pantikapaion; IBosp 1051 (307 CE), from Hermonassa; IBosp 1237 (193 CE), 1249 (236 CE), from Tanais. Cf. ἐπὶ τῆς αὐλῆς → IBosp 78 (I CE), 98 (214 CE), from Pantikapaion; IBosp 897 (225 CE); IBosp 1005 (II CE), from Phanagoria; IBosp 1055 (II CE), from Hermonassa. See also the comments below regarding social status.

Comments
Gorgippia (near modern Anapa, Russia) was one of several Greek colonies founded on the northern coast of the Euxine Sea (Black Sea) by Aiolians and Ionians in the sixth century BCE. Pantikapaion and Phanagoria, which are dealt with in subsequent entries, are other such colonies. Further north at the mouth of the Tanais (Don) river, the city of Emporion, or Tanais, was later founded by Bosporan Greeks in the early third century BCE. Beginning as early as the fourth century BCE, the Greek cities were included within kingdoms ruled by Thracian, Scythian, Sarmatian, and Pontic dynasties (Alekseyeva 1994, 47; Ustinova 1999, 2–6). For more than three centuries following the Roman emperor Tiberius, the Bosporan kingdom was ruled as a client kingdom of Rome by kings with Sarmatian, Thracian, and Pontic ancestry (hence the phrase “friend of Caesar and friend of the Romans”). The present inscription, like many others from Greek cities of the Bosporan area, is dated according to the current Bosporan client king, Julius Tiberius Sauromates, who reigned from 174 to 211 CE. Ties between associations and Bosporan royalty recur among associations in this region.

With its location on the eastern, Asiatic side of what was called the “Cimmerian Bosporos” (Strabo, Geography 11.2.5), the strait leading into the Maeotic Lake (now Sea of Azov), Gorgippia was a thriving city and an important trading base. Our inscription involving shippers happens to be among the more important mentions of traders at this port city. According to E. M. Alekseyeva (1994), the archeological record at Gorgippia indicates two main periods of
expansion. After a fire in the first quarter of the fourth century BCE, the city was rebuilt and there was an influx of newcomers, most likely Greeks from elsewhere in the Bosporos. The result was that the city had a thriving population in the subsequent period. The second main period of expansion was the second century CE—the period of our inscription—when there was a wave of domestic construction. The city was destroyed around the middle of the third century, likely by Gothic tribes.

All of our evidence (collected in \textit{IBosp = CIRB}) for associations at Gorgippia comes from the first to the early third centuries, and can be easily enumerated (setting aside extremely fragmentary inscriptions). There are two manumission inscriptions that definitely involve Judeans at Gorgippia in the first century (\textit{SEG} 43:510; \textit{IBosp} 1124). Two others which mention a “prayer–house” (προσευχῇ; \textit{IBosp} 1123, 1127) may or may not be Judean. A fourth manumission from the same era mentions neither Judeans, nor a prayer–house; this one is a dedication of a slave to Theos Hypsistos, but no association (Judean or otherwise) is directly mentioned. I will return to Judean and potentially Judean materials when dealing with a manumission from Pantikapaion (\textit{IBosp} 70 [95]). Then there are several fragmentary inscriptions that contain lists of leaders and members of specific synods “gathered around” a priest (ἡ σύνοδος ἡ περί etc.), all dating to the period 150–211 CE (\textit{IBosp} 1129, 1130, 1135, 1136). There is one other extremely fragmentary inscription that may involve shippers (\textit{SEG} 36:700).

Finally, there is our present inscription set up by a society of shippers or ship–owners. The monument was set up to dedicate a temple and statues to Poseidon, a deity associated with the sea. There is some debate surrounding the 1000 artabas (Persian measures) that are mentioned in lines 8–10 in connection with the king. Vasilii Latyshev originally read [ε ἰσ]αγώγιον in line 9. Those working with this reconstruction outline several options on how to interpret the term. Latyshev himself interprets this as a reference to the king’s gift to the society by remitting the “import–tax” on 1000 artabas of grain. Ellis H. Minns suggests that the king was paying an “entrance–fee” in order to become a member or honorary member of the society (cf. \textit{IKosS} ED 149 = \textit{IKosPH} 36, line 51 and \textit{IEph} 3329 \rightarrow \textit{IEph} 275 [130] comments). Michael Rostovtzeff (1957, 660n.15) cites both views but sees the former as more likely. Sergei Zebelev (notes to \textit{IBosp}) instead proposes reading [ἐξ]αγώγιον in line 9 (see Vinogradov 1993, 148 no. 41, who was responding to Rostovtzeff). Zebelev and J. G. Vinogradov then interpret this as the king exempting the shippers from an “export–tax” on 1000 artabai of grain. Finally, A. Kocevalov (1948) notes the absence of any mention of exemptions at all. He instead argues that the king was importing 1000 artabai of grain to offer as a gift or benefaction to the shippers. The nature of the evidence makes it difficult to decide which of these options is more likely.
The leadership of the group consists of a priest (ἱερέας), a synagogue–leader or convener (συναγωγός), a care–taker (φροντιστής), and an administrator of sacred affairs (ἱερῶν οἰκονόμος). The former two are widely attested in associations of the Bosporus, including groups at Pantikapaion and Tanais. The latter two positions—the administrator of sacred affairs (ἱερῶν οἰκονόμος in *Ibosp* 1129, 1130) and the care–taker (φροντιστής; *Ibosp* 1129, 1132, 1135, 1136)—seem specific to associations in Gorgippia, but it is not clear whether the administrator of sacred affairs is a position within the group or within the royal administration.

There are indicators of high social status in the case of the first two leaders. Both the priest and the synagogue–leader were also royal functionaries of the Bosporan kingdom. The priest of the shippers, Athenodoros son of Seleukos, is described as being “foremost over the kingdom” (πρῶτος ἐπὶ τῆς βα[σ]ιλείας). This complete phrase (with πρῶτος) is not attested anywhere else in inscriptions collected so far in the PHI database, for instance. But there are several inscriptions from the Bosporan kingdom where an individual refers to some special role within the royal court or kingdom using the phrase “over the kingdom” (ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας): see *Ibosp* 36 (275–79 CE), 58 (249 CE), from Pantikapaion; *Ibosp* 1051 (307 CE), from Hermonassa; and, *Ibosp* 1237 (193 CE), 1249 (236 CE), from Tanais. It is not clear how this role would relate to those who were identified as having a leadership role in the royal “court” or palace: see ἐπὶ τῆς αὐλῆς, “over the court,” in *Ibosp* 78 (I CE) and 98 (214 CE), from Pantikapaion; *Ibosp* 897 (225 CE) and 1005 (II CE), from Phanagoria; and, *Ibosp* 1055 (II CE), from Hermonassa. Again, in some cases these functionaries in the royal court were also members of associations (e.g., *Ibosp* 78 [I CE], 98 [214 CE]). In assessing functionaries of the Bosporan kingdom, Minns (1912, 612–613) suggests a division between the officers of the kingdom, with what he calls the “prefect of the kingdom” (ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας) as head, and the officers of the court, which included those described as “over the court” (ἐπὶ τῆς αὐλῆς). Yet these definitions are not certain. Regardless of the exact nature of these positions, what is clear is that there were connections between the royal power structure and certain associations.

The synagogue–leader of the shippers, Moirodoros son of Neokles, is described as being in a leadership role over the city of Gorgippia (ἐπὶ τῆς Γοργιπείας), likely a royal governor charged with overseeing the city. It seems that this same man set up a statue of his father, Neokles son of Moirodoros. Here too Moirodoros is described as being in a leadership role over Gorgippia and his father is described as formerly (πρίν) being in that same role: [Μοιρόδωρος Νεοκλέος ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς Γορ[γ]ιπείας (*Ibosp* 1119A, lines 5–6 [probably 186 CE], as read by Saprykin and accepted by Heinen 1996, 90–92 and Heinen 2001, 16–19, with photos of the statue of Neokles, now in the Puschkkin State Museum of Fine–Arts in Moscow). Two other members of the society are
designated “commanders” (στρατηγοί) and three others are called administra-
tors of taxes or payments, but it is hard to tell whether such roles are related to
the kingdom as a whole.

In terms of the ethnic identities of members in this group, it is worth men-
tioning that while there are a fair number of well–known Greek names on the list
(e.g. Athenodoros, Seleukos, Pharmakes, Pantaleon, Makarios, Noumenios, Her-
nodoros, Chrestos, Eumachos, Ariston), there are also many names specific to
the Bosporan region (e.g. Atamazos, Kossous, Zazzous, Kothinas, Myriskos,
Neokas, Dynaton), including some that are clearly Sarmatian or Iranian (Aspourg-
gos, Sarmatas; based on data collected so far in the PHI database). Attas and
Papas are common in Bosporan cities but also in central Asia Minor.
Moirodoros is primarily attested in Scythia, Thracia and the Bosporan kingdom.
Like associations in most Greek cities of the Bosporan kingdom, there is a mix-
ture of cultures and backgrounds—Greek, Thracian, Iranian (Scythian and Sar-
matian), and, infrequently, Roman. It is noteworthy that there was a significant
increase in Sarmatian forms of burial in the first century ce, which suggests a
new influx of Sarmatians into Gorgippia or an increased adoption of Sarmatian
(Iranian) cultural ways by the inhabitants that were already there (see Alekseyeva
1994, 54; cf. Ustinova 1999, 7). Moreover, indigenous cultural life in the
Bosporan cities of the Roman era was characterized by a fusion of Hellenistic
and Iranian (Sarmatian, Scythian) ways (Rostovtzeff 1922, 147–180), a situation
which will continue to be significant in the discussion of other associations in
this region, including a group dedicated to Aphrodite Ourania.

Northern Shore of the Black Sea.” In North Pontic Archaeology: Recent Discoveries
institutions maritimes en Grèce et dans l’Orient hellénisé. Geneva: Librairie Droz,
Jahrbuch der Philosophischen Fakultät der Julius–Maximilians–Universität zu
Würzburg (1948) 163–174; Rostovtzeff, M. Iranians and Greeks in South Russia.
of the Roman Empire. Translated by P.M. Fraser. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957,
esp. 660 n.15; Ustinova 1999, 1–17; Vinogradov, J.G. “Anmerkungen zu Kapitel
VI: Staat und Kultur des Bosporanischen Reiches.” In Skythien und der Bosporus,
Band II, edited by M. Rostovtzeff, translated by Heinz Heinen. Historia
Dedication to Heavenly Aphrodite by a Society

Pantikapaion (Bosporan region) ca. 150–125 BCE


Publication used: IBosp 75.

Current location: State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg.


Slab of Tauric limestone (100 x 44 x 20 cm). A relief within the gable at the top depicts Aphrodite Ourania (“Heavenly”) riding a swan and holding a sceptre with Eros to the right and two female figures of Victory (Nikai) above. The Nike on the right pours a libation while the Nike on the left holds an implement for burning incense (thymiaterion; see also the full discussion by Ustinova 1999, 46–51).
Of Pairisades. Of Kamasarye. Of Argotas. (crown under each name)

On behalf of the leader and king Pairisades, son of king Pairisades, mother–adoring, queen Kamasarye daughter of Spartokos, child–adoring, and Argotas son of Isanthos, husband of queen Kamasarye, the synagogue–leader (synagōgos) Theokritos son of Demetrios and (10) the society–members (thiasitai) dedicated the monument to Aphrodite Ourania (“Heavenly”) … of Apatouron (?), … guardian goddess. Theokritos son of Demetrios, Papias son of Papias (?) …, Straton son of Name …, Papias son of Name …, Papias son of Name …, Kallistratos (?) … Poseidonios (?) …

Notes
II. 2–5: βασιλέως | Παιρίσαδου … καὶ βασιλίσσης Κασάσαρύης → IDidyma 463 (in a list of donors); FD III/1 453 and 453[2] (honours by the city of Delphi).
Pairisades IV reigned 150–125 BCE and his father, Pairisades III, reigned 180–150 BCE.
II. 10–11: Ἀφροδίτῃ Οὐρανίᾳ Ἀπατούρου Σεδεού | Θεοκρίτου | Ναυτικοῦ | Ἀργοτᾶ | Βηθιστανοῦ | Καλλίστρατος | Ποσειδώνιο | → IBosp 31, 35, 971, 1045, 1111.

Comments
Pantikapaion (modern Kerch, Ukraine) was the capital of the Bosporan kingdom and home of the royal palace. The inscription above was dedicated on behalf of members of the royal family: king Pairisades (IV, reigned 150–125 BCE), queen Kamasarye (Pairisades’ mother), and Kamasarye’s then husband, Argotas son of Isanthos, whom she had married after the death of Pairisades III (ca. 150 BCE; Ustinova 1999, 48). In the mid–second century BCE, the Bosporan kingdom was not yet a client kingdom of Rome, and Pairisades IV and his father were part of the Spartokid dynasty (438 BCE–ca. 110 BCE), which was likely drawn from royals of Thracian ancestry. Connections between associations and Bosporan royalty would continue in subsequent eras, as the case of the society of shippers at Gorgippia shows (→ IBosp 1134 [93]).

The evidence for associations at Pantikapaion is considerable, with over thirty relevant monuments. Yet it is noteworthy that, to my knowledge, none of the associations clearly identifies itself in terms of common occupation. There are at least three slave manumission inscriptions that attest to an association of
Judeans at this locale in the first and second centuries (→ *IBosp* 70 = *IJO* 1 BS5 [95]; *IBosp* 71 = *IJO* 1 BS7; *IBosp* 73 = *IJO* 1 BS6). These manumissions seem to be our only surviving evidence for immigrant associations here.

The majority of evidence from this locale is funerary. There are more than twenty-nine graves set up in memory of the deceased by members of a synod or society. Quite typical here is the following grave (in this case, with a relief of a young man), which also illustrates the internal organization of the majority of these groups at Pantikapaion (*IBosp* 80 [80–150 CE]):

ἡ σύνοδος ἡ περὶ ἡρείου Παντάγαθον καὶ [συ]ναγωγὸς Μικαὶ φιλά[λαθος Εὐρ[ῆ]μον ἄν καὶ πραγματ[άς Φαρ][νάκην Μαστοῦν Μαστοῦ ǀǀ Σνή[Σης χάριν.

The synod (*synodos*) gathered around Pantagathos, the priest; Mikas, the synagogue-leader (*synagogos*); Euremon, the benevolent official (*philagathos*); Elis, the assistant benevolent official (*paraphilagathos*); and Pharmakes, the official in charge of affairs (*pragmatais*), (set this up) in memory of Mastous son of Mastous.

While group self-designations alternate between “synod” (*σύνοδος*) and “society” (*θίασος*), almost all of these memorials attest to similar internal group structures. The positions of synagogue-leader or convener, the benevolent official, and the assistant to the benevolent official are consistent fixtures, as also at Tanais, but the inscriptions reveal almost nothing concerning the responsibilities of these leaders. Nine groups at Pantikapaion also include a “father (πατήρ)” or “father of the synod” as a leader listed immediately following a “priest,” who comes first (*IBosp* 77 [173–211 CE], 95 [II CE], 96 [204 CE], 98 [214 CE]; 99 [221 CE], 100 [221 CE], 103 [late III CE], 104 [200–250 CE], 105 [200–250 CE]).

I return to the use of familial language within Bosporan associations in an entry below (→ *IBosp* 1283 [96]).

The presence of a priest (ἱερεύς) in ten inscriptions (nine of which also have a “father”) is indicative of rituals in honour of deities. Yet none of the twenty-nine graves happens to identify such deities. It is only in two known dedications by society-members to Zeus and Hera in connection with a vow. The functionaries within that group likewise include a synagogue-leader and a benevolent official, though no priest is mentioned and this particular group also had a “supervisor” (ἐπισεληνήτης; *IBosp* 76 [82 CE]).

Our main dedicatory monument from Pantikapaion is, so far, the earliest source attesting to any association in the cities of the Bosporan kingdom. The monument was dedicated to Aphrodite Ourania (“Heavenly”) of Apatouron (Apaturum) and is accompanied by a relief. The location of Apatouron remains uncertain, beyond that it was across from Pantikapaion on the Asiatic coast of the Cimmerian Bosporos (cf. Strabo, Geography 11.2.10; Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 6.6.18; Ustinova 1999, 29–32). The relief on the monument depicts
the goddess riding a swan or goose and holding a sceptre, with Eros to the right. Two female figures of victory (nikai) are on either side, with one pouring a libation and the other holding an implement for burning incense. Yulia Ustinova (1999, 47) suggests that the image of Aphrodite riding the swan may point toward her astral significance as the equivalent of Venus, the morning star, as well as her role as goddess of emerging spring.

Aphrodite Ourania’s importance in the Bosporan kingdom and her indigenous roots should be highlighted. Surveying the evidence for goddesses in the Bosporan cities, Ustinova (1999, 27–174) argues that Aphrodite Ourania was likely a synthesis of a particular indigenous transformation of the Greek Aphrodite and an Iranian goddess known as Argimpasa. Herodotos mentions Heavenly Aphrodite among the secondary deities worshipped by the Scythians themselves and clarifies that her native name was Argimpasa (Herodotos, Histories 4.59; cf. Celsus cited in Origen, Against Celsus 6.39). By the Roman period, at least, this goddess virtually dominated as guardian over almost all aspects of life and death in the Bosporan kingdom, according to Ustinova. Alongside the male deity Theos Hypsistos, to which I return below (→ Ibosp 70 [95], from Pantikapaion, and Ibosp 1283 [96], from Tanais), this Iranian deity identified with Aphrodite was one of the “supreme gods of the Bosporan kingdom” (the title of Ustinova’s work).

The nature of our evidence at Pantikapaion itself makes it difficult to assess the degree to which this Aphrodite was important within associations specifically. This is because most references to associations come from graves, and the epitaphs (many of them fragmentary) happen to say nothing about the deities honoured by the groups, even though all synods did have a priest as their principal functionary (Ibosp 77–108). There is just one other dedication by a synod that does name deities, in this case Zeus and Hera (Ibosp 78; 82 CE). So we know very little about the deities honoured by most synods at Pantikapaion and about rituals that were performed.

There was a synod devoted to Aphrodite (θεᾶς Ἀφροδείτης σύνοδος) across the strait at Hermonassa (Ibosp 1055; II CE). Yet this group’s devotion to an Aphrodite is almost all we know about the group, since only the opening of the inscription is preserved. Ustinova argues that a heavily damaged inscription from Phanagoria (north of Hermonassa), which involves “mysteries” (line 24) of a “goddess” (lines 11, 23), may entail Aphrodite Ourania as well (Ibosp 1005; II CE). The document, which seems to be the rules for the cult, mentions lamps and oil that may have been used in night–time ceremonies (lines 2, 13). It also refers to the use of incense (line 5) and to sacrifices (lines 8–9). Little else is known about rites performed in honour of the goddess. Further information regarding other deities honoured in the Bosporan kingdom comes from slave manumissions, to which I now turn.

[95] IBosp 70
Manumission of Heraklas in a Judean Prayer–House

Pantikapaion (Bosporan kingdom) 81 CE (Jan.–Feb.)


Publication used: IBosp 70.

Current location: State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg (inv. P. 1832.34).

Similar or related inscriptions: IBosp 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 1021: Manumissions from Pantikapaion and area. IBosp 1123, 1124, 1125, 1126, 1127: Manumissions from Gorgippia. IBosp 1123 (41 CE), 1125 (93–123 CE), 1126 (68 CE): Manumissions related to Theos Hypsistos at Gorgippia. SEG 43:510 and IBosp 895: Manumissions from Phanagoria.

Slab of white marble with a triangular gable at the top, broken in two and damaged on the right (64 x 29 x 9 cm; letter–height: 1.4 cm). There is a moulding above the inscription and there are guidelines for the mason above and below each line of letters. Found at Kerch (Ukraine) in 1832.
During the reign of king Tiberius Julius Rheskouporis, friend of Caesar and friend of the Romans, pious one, in the year 377 on the twelfth of the month Pereitios, I, Chreste, former wife of Drusus, permanently set free my house-bred slave, Heraklas, in the prayer-house in accordance with my vow. Not subject to control and undisturbed by any heir, he can go wherever he wants unhindered, just as I have vowed, apart from respect towards and service (or: attendance) at the prayer-house (proseuchē). My heirs, Herakleides and Helikonias, have agreed to this and the synagogue (synagōgē) of the Judeans has been designated joint guardian.

Comments
There are more than a dozen slave manumission inscriptions from Pantikapaion (seven inscriptions), Phanagoria (two) and Gorgippia (six) in the Bosporan kingdom. Six of these clearly involve an association or “synagogue” of Judeans, seven of them do not expressly mention Judeans but have been considered Judean by certain scholars, and two clearly involve dedications to other deities. At Pantikapaion, three manumissions including the one presented above mention both a “synagogue of Judeans” and a “prayer-house” (IBosp 70 = IJO I BS5, presented above; IBosp 71 = IJO I BS7; IBosp 73 = IJO I BS6). Another fragment from this locale may or may not be a manumission connected with a synagogue (IBosp 72 = IJO I BS9).
Two other manumissions from Pantikapaion are dedications to other gods that do not mention Judeans. One of these is only partially preserved (IBosp 69 = IOI BS8 [58 CE]). The other is a dedication of a manumitted slave to another deity, in this case to the goddess of Ma (?) who also seems to be described as a Maiden, a Parthenos (IBosp 74 [173–211 CE], with alternative reconstructions of lines 6–8 in SEG 19:501):

During the reign of king Sauromates, friend of Caesar and friend of the Romans, pious, in the … xth year during the month of Daeisios, Chrestos, son of Kossous and grandson of Menandros, and his wife, Chemata, priestess (?), have dedicated Thallousa, our house–bred slave who dwells with us (?) to the goddess of Ma (?) and of the Maiden on condition of an obligation to remain (paramonē) (in service). But after our life she herself is to be free—(10) by Zeus, Ge (“Earth”), and Helios (“Sun”)—and free of any seizure or injury by me or any heir, and to take … herself (?) …

Similarly, another manumission from Taman peninsula (across the strait from Pantikapaion) is a dedication to the deities Zeus and Hera (IBosp 1021 [105 CE]):

During the reign of king Tiberius Julius Sauromates, friend of Caesar and friend of the Romans, pious, in the 402nd year on the first of the month of Apellaios, Glykaria, wife of Apollonios, dedicated Philodespotos, her own house–bred slave, to Zeus and to Hera Kyleidon. My heirs, Dadas, the (10) elder son, Maisous, Tauriskos, and Apollonios have agreed to this.

So two of the known Bosporan manumissions clearly entail dedications to non–Judean gods.

Moving to Phanagoria, one inscription there is a manumission connected with a “synagogue of the Judeans,” and in this case there is reference to a “prayer–house” (SEG 43:510 = IOI BS18; ca. 53 CE):
During the reign of king Kotys in the 348th year on the first of the month of Xandikos, Psycharion and his sons, Sogos and Anos, set free Karsandanos, Karagos, and Metroteimos in the prayer–house (proseuchē), not subject to control and unhindered apart from service (or: attendance) at and respect towards the prayer–house, (10) and to establish their freedoms (?). The synagogue (synagōgē) of the Judeans has been designated joint guardian.

A second inscription from Phanagoria has been reconstructed with a reference to a “prayer–house,” but it is heavily damaged (IBosp 985 = IJO I BS17 [17 CE]).

One partially damaged manumission from Gorgippia does not mention a “prayer–house” or a “synagogue” but does conclude with reference to “Judeans” (IBosp 1124 = IJO I BS23 [59/60 CE]). There are two other first–century manumissions from Gorgippia which refer to a “prayer–house,” but Judeans are not mentioned in either case (IBosp 1127 = IJO I BS24 [I–II CE]; IBosp 1123 = IJO I BS20 [41 CE]). The better preserved of the two (IBosp 1123) is a dedication to Theos Hypsistos and reads as follows:

(This was dedicated) to Theos Hypsistos (“Highest god”), all–powerful, blessed. During the reign of king Mithridates (era sed), friend of Germanicus (?) and friend of the homeland, in the 338th year in the month of Deios, Pothos son of Strabon dedicated a house–bred slave, who is named Chrysa, to the prayer–house (proseuchē) in accordance with a vow, so that she will not be hindered or bothered by any heir, under Zeus, Ge (“Earth”), and Helios (“Sun”).

Finally, there are two other dedications to Theos Hypsistos which involve manumissions but without any reference to Judeans, a synagogue, or a prayer–house (IBosp 1125 = IJO I BS21 [93–123 CE]; IBosp 1126 = IJO I BS22 [68 CE]). It is noteworthy that no manumission inscriptions have been recovered at Tanais.

Space does not permit a full discussion of all issues surrounding these inscriptions, which have been discussed at length in many works (see literature section). But there are two issues of special concern that need some attention here: first, the identification of the manumitters as Judean or non–Judean and, second, the procedures and conditions of manumission. On the first point, five of the Bosporan inscriptions expressly involve Judeans, and this includes inscriptions from each of the three sites of Pantikapaion (three inscriptions), Phanagoria (one inscription) and Gorgippia (one inscription). The decision as to whether or not other inscriptions from these same sites entail Judeans or the Judean God centres on the interpretation of other vocabulary, particularly “prayer–house” (προσευχή). If this term can be considered a distinctly Judean designation for a
gathering place for prayer, as some argue (e.g. Levinskaya 1990), then other inscriptions that mention a “prayer–house” can also be categorized as likely Judean based on the presence of this word. It should be noted, however, that while the majority of references to a “prayer–house” in epigraphy generally happen to be Judean, there are also cases when non–Judeans employed the term, including a worshipper of the god Asbameus who set up an altar at Amastris in Pontus (Kalinka, JÖAI 28 [1933] 61, no. 8 [Beibl.] + L. Robert, RA [1936] 237, for line 4; cf. IG IV/2.1 106.27–29, from Epidaurus [IV BCE], IPontEux II 176 [II–III CE], from Olbia, and, potentially, IBosp 1123, if Theos Hypsistos is not identified with the Judean God):

θεῷ ἀνεικήτῳ ἈσβαΣεῖ καὶ τῇ κυρίᾳ προσευχῇ ἐγινόμην ἀνέθηκα Αὐρήλιος Πρωτόκτητος, εὐχαριστὴρ.

Having made a vow and attained success, I, Aurelius Protoktetos, have dedicated this as a thanksgiving to the unconquered god Asbameus and to the supreme prayer–house (proseuchē).

In the case of Pantikapaion, Phanagoria, and Gorgippia, however, Judeans are known to have lived at these locales and there were contemporary Judeans that manumitted their slaves, Judeans who also make reference to a “prayer–house.” Using this methodology, then, at least two other manumission inscriptions from Gorgippia might be considered to be likely Judean. (The reference to “prayer–house” in one candidate from Phanagoria is reconstructed).

A further complicating factor pertains to our understanding of the deity Theos Hypsistos, to whom the dedication is made in one of these same two manumissions from Gorgippia that mention a “prayer–house” (IBosp 1123, cited in the comments above). Yulia Ustinova’s study (1999) clearly demonstrates that the epithet “Most High” (Hypsistos) was by no means exclusively used by Judeans, even though the epithet was also adopted by Judeans (e.g. in the Septuagint). Ustinova critiques the views of Emil Schürer (1897) and those who follow him, such as Irina Levinskaya (1996), who too readily assume a Judean connection with many of the Theos Hypsistos inscriptions from Tanais, to which I return in subsequent entries below. Still, even Ustinova does suggest that it is “fairly certain” that the three instances of Theos Hypsistos in manumissions at Gorgippia (IBosp 1123, 1125, 1126) do refer to the Judean God, in part because of the conglomeration of other terms that are often associated with the Judean God, the descriptors “all powerful” (παντοκράτωρ) and “blessed” (εὐλογητός) in particular (Ustinova 1999, 228–231; Panayatov on JO I BS20–BS22). Still, Ross Kraemer (1991, 146–147) and Alice J. Bij de Vaate and Jan Willem van Henten (1996, 24–25), who are aware of the same issues, suggest that we should exercise more caution in identifying inscriptions as Judean. They cogently argue that, in cases such as these, we are better stating that the inscription in question (such as the Theos Hypsistos ones from Gorgippia) could be either Judean or
non–Judean. For further discussion of Hypsistos, see the comments on IBosp 1283 [96] further below.

One further complication should be noted, and that is the reference to an oath formula involving the gods “Zeus, Ge, and Helios” in two of the debated Theos Hypsistos inscriptions from Gorgippia (IBosp 1123, 1126). This is an oath formula also found in a manumission that was clearly a dedication of the slave to a non–Judean deity (IBosp 74). While the presence of pagan deities in an oath does not discount the possibility that Judeans were involved (see Panayatov’s comments on line 14 of IJO I BS20, for instance), this should nonetheless further suggest the need for hesitancy in identifying these Theos Hypsistos inscriptions as most likely Judean in light of other ambiguities discussed above.

Our main manumission of Heraklas at Pantikapaion illustrates common patterns and procedures that are observable in the other manumissions from the Bosporan cities, particularly in the Judean ones. Like our present inscription, most of these manumission inscriptions begin by dating the manumission with reference to Bosporan royalty, by year and by month. Something that is absent in our inscription but present in the three that involve Theos Hypsistos and in two others involving other gods (the Maiden goddess of Ma and Zeus and Hera) is an opening dedication to the deity or deities, which implies dedication of the slave to the deity or deities in question. Next comes a legal statement in which the stated owner sets free (a combination of ἀφίησι and ἐλεύθερος was common) the named house–bred slave (θρεπτός). The term θρεπτός combined with reference to manumission likely indicates the position of a slave that was raised (τρέφειν) within the household as opposed to purchased (see Riel 2005, 2006, 2009). This is the term used in all manumission inscriptions from the Bosporos (including those that are clearly non–Judean) when the status of the person is preserved in the texts (see Sivertsev 2002, 128–131). All those that are Judean also specify the location of the manumission, namely in “the prayer–house.” With the exception of reconstructed texts (e.g. IBosp 73), our main entry is the only definitely Judean manumission done “according to a vow” (κατὰ εὐχήν). However, two Theos Hypsistos dedications from Gorgippia, which may or may not refer to the Judean God, likewise clarify that the actions were completed “according to a vow” (IBosp 1123; IBosp 1125).

Further clarifications and conditions of the manumission then follow. Many, like our inscription, clarify that the freed slave will no longer be subject to control and/or will be unhindered. Yet several Judean manumissions also specify conditions of, or limitations on, freedom, particularly using variations on the phrase: “apart from respect towards and service (or: attendance) at the prayer–house” (χωρὶς ἰς τ[ὴ]ν προσευ[λ]ήθεας τε καὶ προσκα[τερείρ]ήσεω[ς], from IBosp 70; cf. IBosp 71, 73, from Pantikapaion; SEG 43:510, from Phanagoria). It is noteworthy that none of the Theos Hypsistos manumissions specifies
such conditions (see especially IBosp 1126, where we would expect such conditions to appear in the preserved portion).

Most scholarly debate centres on the precise meaning of two key terms here: θωπεία and προσκαρτέρησις. Although the term θωπεία is most often attested in its negative sense of “flattery” (see the LSJ entry), there are positive uses, as when Plato (Crito 50e–51c) outlines the attitude which a free citizen should have towards the city–state (see Levinskaya 2002, 515; cf. Panayatov in the notes to IIO I BS5). The verb can also connote serving others in a positive sense (see LSJ entry for θωπεύειν in reference to PSI V 525.16). So in our Bosporan inscriptions, the term likely refers to the “respect,” “honour” (Levinskaya), “subservience” (Harrill), or “submissiveness” (Gibson, Panayatov) which the manumitted slave was to have towards the prayer–house where the slave engaged in service.

Although some propose that the latter term (προσκαρτέρησις) of the conditions of manumission may be understood in terms of the manumitted slave’s mere “adherence” to or “participation” in the Judean community (cf. Overman 1999, 150–151), Benjamin Nadel’s work on the Bosporan manumissions suggests that it is more likely that concrete obligations of service are in mind (see Nadel 1975, 1976; cf. Levinskaya 2002). Nadel discusses the Bosporan manumissions in relation to Delphic manumissions (there are over 1200 dating from 200 BCE to 74 CE) that include the concept of παραΣονή, “conditional release” or “keeping” (παραΣονή) a slave in service for a specified period. In Delphic manumissions that refer to conditional release in dedicating or selling the slave to a god (Pythian Apollo), it was common to only fully manumit the slave upon the death of the master. We do find the concept of “keeping” (παραΣονή) a slave in service in Bosporan manumissions, as in the case of the dedication to the goddess of Ma (IBosp 74) and perhaps in one of the Judean manumissions (the term παραΣονή is reconstructed in line 11 of IBosp 73). In the former manumission (see the translation earlier in these comments), it is clarified that the house–bred slave, Tatlousa, will be kept in some sort of service until the death of the owners, and a similar stipulation seems to appear in the Judean case. Even in cases from the Bosporan region that do not directly refer to the legal concept of “keeping” (παραΣονή) the slave, it seems that the conditions emphasize that the manumitted slave would continue to fulfill obligations of concrete service in or for the prayer–house.

The practice of dedicating a slave to a god or goddess with conditions of service at a temple is also attested in Macedonia (in the late second century CE), for instance. Inscriptions from Leukopetra have slaves granted as gifts to the Mother of the gods with conditions including service in her sanctuary on certain holy days (ILeukopetra 16 [184/185 CE], cf. ILeukopetra 12, 17, 22; see Youni 2010, 319–323):
In some cases at Leukopetra, however, it becomes clear that conditional manumission entailed a slave continuing in service to the master until the master’s death, with the expectation that the dedicated slave would serve the goddess on the customary days only and the master on all other days. After the master’s death, the manumitted slave would be expected to serve the goddess on the customary days only (cf. *ILEukopetra* 12, 22, 56; see Youni 2010, 322–323). Still other manumissions do not specify any particular days for service in the sanctuary and instead dedicate the slave to the goddess upon the death of the master (cf. *ILEukopetra* 25). So although the custom of service to a sanctuary or holy place was common to both these Macedonian inscriptions and the Bosporan ones, there were other local variations in manumission practices.

Finally, the Bosporan manumission inscriptions tend to finish with reference to the agreement of heirs or other guardians, including a role for the group of Judeans in a few cases. In all but one that directly mention Judeans, there is a statement to the effect that that “the synagogue of the Judeans has been designated joint guardian (συνεπιτροπευούσης).” In these cases, it seems that the Judean group itself was thought to play a role in ensuring that the conditions of manumission, including service to the prayer–house, were fulfilled.


[96] IBosp 1283

Dedication to Theos Hypsistos by “Adopted Brothers”

Tanais (Bosporan kingdom) 228 CE

Publications: Ludolf Stephani, “Supplément: Erklärung einiger im südlichen Russland gefundener Kunstwerke,” Compte rendu de la Commission Impériale Archéologique (1874) [1870–1871] 249–250 (no. 9) (first edition); Latyshev, PontEux II 452 (IGRR I 920; Minns 1913, 656 [no. 58]); Struve, IBosp 1283 (with photo now available at no. 1283 in the album by Gavrilov and others 2004); Mitchell 1999, 134 (no. 98); AGRW 92.

Publication used: IBosp 1283.

Current location: National Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg (inv. no. Tn. 317).

Similar or related inscriptions: IBosp 1281 (210–227 CE), 1285 (210–234 CE), 1286 (220–240 CE); Associations of “adopted brothers who revere Theos Hypsistos.” IBosp 1260 (155 CE), 1260a (154–173 CE), 1277 (173–211 CE),

Slab of marble broken into 68 pieces (76 x 60 x 2 cm).

To good fortune! Vow for Theos Hypsistos (“Highest god”). During the reign of king … Tiberius (?) … Julius Kotys, friend of Caesar and friend of the Romans, pious one, the adopted brothers who revere (*eispoïetoi adelphoi sebomenoi*) Theos Hypsistos inscribed their names alongside the elder *Name* son of *Name*…, Nigosas son of Herakleides, Ariston son of Menestratos, Kalligenes (10) son of Myron, Alexion son of Patroklos, Eutychianos son of *Name*…, Eutyches son of Theagenes, Sozomenos son of Styrason, Maes son of Salas, Phadious son of Philemon, Dionysios son of Sogos, Eutychianos son of Gorgias, Dalosakos son of Symphoros, Kardious
son of Dadas, Phosakos son of Phosakos, Diophantos son of Dionysios, Eutyches son of Antimachos, Dadas son of Chodiakios, Sambion son of Elpidion, Myreinos son of Mastous, and Asklas son of Herakleides. Sambion son of Elpidion, Phourtas son of Agathos, and Agathemeros son of Publius gave this monument as a gift to the brothers. (20) In the 525th year on the first day of the month Gorpiaios.

Notes
ll. 8: πρεσβύτερον, “elder” → IBosp 1285, 1286.

Comments
Located on the Tanais river, Emporion or Tanais (30 km west of modern Rostov–on–Don, Russia) is second only to Pantikapaion in the quantity of inscriptions about associations for this region. There are a total of at least nineteen monuments that mention synods or societies in the second or third centuries of the common era. In contrast to the evidence from Pantikapaion, lacking here are funerary monuments erected by associations. There are five rather fragmentary inscriptions that list the members or donors of a synod or society, sometimes including mention of typical functionaries I discuss below: Ivantchik 2008, 94–95, no. 1 (200–50 BCE); IBosp 1262 (II CE), 1264 (100–150 CE), 1266 (100–150 CE), 1268 (II CE).

Yet the remainder of the evidence from Tanais is rather monochromatic. With two possible exceptions, all of the dedications (fourteen of the sixteen) that have been found are offered to the god Theos Hypsistos, “Highest God.” Another example will suffice (IBosp 1277 = AGRW 91; ca. 173–211 CE):

Θεός Τριστος ʼηγεῖθα τόχης, ἐνεκεῖνοι θεός Τιβερίου Ιουλίου Σεβόσενος καὶ φιλοτεχνόμενος Ἀγαθημέρος, Θεός ἐπὶ ἱερέως Ἰουλίου Σαυροσάτου, φίλος Κερδωνάκου, Θεός Ἀρδάρακου, Ἀπόλλωνος, Θεός Ἀταν Ἡρακλείδου, Θεός Ἐπιμεθίου, Θεός Θεομήτου, Θεός Εὐσεβοῦς ἄλλων ἥξι[α]ς

(This was dedicated) to Theos Hypsistos (“Highest God”). To good fortune! During the reign of king Tiberius Julius Sauromates, friend of Caesar and friend of the Romans, pious one, the synod (synodos) which is gathered around … the priest, Julius (?) … son of Rhalchados; the father (patēr) of the synod, Chorouathos …; the synagogue–leader (synagogos), Ardarakos son of Synegdemos; the benevolent official (philagathos), Dias son of Kerdonakos; the assistant to the benevolent official (paraphilagathos) … Name son of Phorgabakos; the head of the youths (neaniskarchēs), Demetrios son of Apollonios;
the head of the gymnasium, Basileides son of Theoneikos; the friend (?) of the (10) synod, Attas son of Herakleides; and the rest of the society members (thiasitai) were: (a fragmentary list of at least 29 names follows)…

A recent study in Russian by N.V. Zavoykina (see SEG 57:744) proposes that there were two main types of associations at Tanais: those with a head of the gymnasium and/or head of youths as functionaries (as in the inscription cited here), which were actually age–based organizations; and those groups with no such functionaries (as in our main entry). In both cases, Theos Hypsistos predominates, and there are only two association inscriptions from Tanais that may or may not involve a deity other than Theos Hypsistos (Ivantchik 2008, 96–100, no. 2 [200–50 BCE]; IBosp 1259 [104 CE]). So, at this point, Theos Hypsistos is virtually the only god certainly attested within associations at Tanais.

Much scholarly debate about these groups at Tanais, therefore, centres on the identification of Theos Hypsistos. So I begin with this subject before addressing internal structures and the use of familial language in the Bosporan region. Space does not permit a full engagement with all of the issues and theories surrounding Hypsistos here, but a few words are in order so that we can avoid possible misunderstandings of these Hypsistos associations at Tanais. While some scholars suggest that Theos Hypsistos was a Thracian (e.g. Sabazios) or a Sarmatian deity, the majority of interpreters until recently tends to identify Theos Hypsistos with the Israelite or Judean God, suggesting “Jewish influence” here at Tanais. In so doing, these scholars are following the theory first put forward by Emil Schürer (1897) in his study of our present inscription and three others from Tanais dealing with the group (or groups) designated “the adopted brothers revering (or: worshipping) Theos Hypsistos” (εἰσποιητοὶ ἀδελφοὶ σεβόντες Θεὸν Ὅψιστον; cf. IBosp 1281 [210–227 CE], 1285 [210–234 CE], 1286 [220–240 CE]). Schürer argues that these four associations, and likely others from Tanais honouring Theos Hypsistos, were, in fact, groups of non–Judeans that emerged under “Jewish influence.” They worshipped the Judean god as Theos Hypsistos, “God Most High.”

The theory is based on several inter–related factors. Schürer does acknowledge that the descriptor Hypsistos was used of other deities. Yet quite important for Schürer (and those who follow him, such as Levinskaya, Diatrotov, and Mitchell) was the simultaneous use of σεβόμενοι language together with the reference to Theos Hypsistos. He took this as a technical term for non–Judean “god–fearers” with different degrees of interest in the God of the Judeans, as reflected in the Acts of the Apostles’ use of similar terminology. Schürer also points to what he considers seven Jewish names within the membership of societies at Tanais. Assuming a common theory that there was a tendency towards monotheism in the imperial period, Schürer proposes that these were syncretistic associations that combined Judaism and paganism (see also the summary and critique in Ustinova 1999, 179 and Bowersock 2002).
Irina Levinskaya (1996, 111, 244–45) attempts to revive Emil Schürer’s theory (1897). Levinskaya, whose aims include an attempt to establish the historicity of the Acts of the Apostles’ narrative concerning “god–fearers,” goes even further in arguing that the worship of the Judean God as Theos Hypsistos was the most popular form of cult in the Bosporan area and that the earliest Christian communities emerged in this context (Levinskaya 1996; cf. Diatroptov 1999, 217–222). Although more balanced in some respects, Stephen Mitchell (1999) studies what he labels a somewhat consistent “Hypsistarian cult” as part of an attempt to illustrate the tendency towards “pagan monotheism” in the imperial period. Regardless of how one assesses Mitchell’s arguments, he has made a very significant contribution in collecting together 375 epigraphic references to this god or these gods with the epithet Hypsistos, with 220 of them referring to “Theos Hypsistos” specifically (Mitchell 1999, with a supplement in Mitchell 2010).

Nicole Belayche’s ongoing work on the subject of Hypsistos demonstrates the precariousness of much work in this area (see Belayche 2005 or Belayche 2011; cf. Trebilco 1991, 127–144; Bowersock 2002; Ascough 2003, 198–201). Belayche shows how this epithet functions to highlight the greatness of a deity within the context of others and how the descriptor was readily applied to a whole range of deities (rather than any one), including Zeus, Poseidon, Isis, Apollo, Men, Attis, the Mother, Helios, the Phoenician Elioum, and the Israelite God. Zeus himself is described as Most High in other evidence from the island of Delos and from Odessos in Thrace, for instance. Yulia Ustinova’s exhaustive study of gods with the epithet Hypsistos and the Bosporan evidence for associations in particular convincingly demonstrates the weaknesses of Schürer’s and Levinskaya’s proposals. Ustinova points to the lack of any substantial evidence for Judeans in Tanais in the first three centuries and shows that these groups at Tanais, in particular, are best understood as associations devoted to a Hellenized, Iranian (Sarmatian) deity, with no Judean connection (see Ustinova 1999, 203–239; cf. Noy, Panayotov, and Bloedhorn, IJO I, p. 323). Similarly, G.W. Bowersock directly questions Mitchell’s claim that there was a unified, common cult of Hypsistos (but do see Mitchell’s [2010] response).

The dedicatory vow to Theos Hypsistos in our present entry also illustrates the use of familial terminology. The use of parental language in the Bosporan associations is characteristic, but there are also some instances of fictive sibling terminology as well. In our main inscription (and three others) sibling terminology has become part of the group self–designation or title, “adopted brothers” (ἐἰσποιητοὶ ἀδελφοί). There are some hints that sibling terminology was used in other groups without being adopted as a title, and so we rarely witness it in inscriptions. Together with evidence from associations elsewhere in the Mediterranean, this suggests that fictive sibling terminology may have been more common within such groups than many scholars have realized (see Harland
Another dedication to Theos Hypsistos from Tanais (IBosp 1284) has been reconstructed to refer to “the society... of brothers... gathered around Kopharinos the priest (?)... (ὁιμο[ος τον] ἄδελφ[ον τον] | [περὶ ιερέα Κ]όφαρνον?). Furthermore, two graves from Pantikapaion and nearby Ioura tôn (IBosp 104; IBosp 967 [100–150 CE]) both suggest that members in certain associations of this region referred to fellow-members as “brothers.” The less fragmentary one from Pantikapaion dates to the first half of the third century and reads as follows (IBosp 104):

ἀγαθῇ τύ[χῃ]. | τοῖς περὶ | ιερέαν Οὐ[λαέριν | Νεικο[στρά]του καὶ | πατέρα | συνοδεῖ | Καλλίστον βʹ | οἱ λοιποὶ | συνοδεῖται τὸν | ἄδελφον | Συμφορόν | Φιλίπ<π>ου.

To good fortune! Those gathered around the priest, Valeris son of Neikostratos, and the father (pατέρα) of the synod (synodos), Kallistos the second, and the rest of the members of the synod (synodeitai) (honoured) their own brother (αδελφος), Symphoros son of Philippos.

This use of sibling terminology among members is, in this case, also accompanied by the use of “father of the synod” for a functionary of the group.

This designation of a leader using parental language is well-attested not only at Pantikapaion, where nine instances are found (see related inscriptions), but also at Tanais itself. Three monuments referring to devotees of Theos Hypsistos at Tanais mention a “father of the synod” (IBosp 1277 [173–211 CE], 1278 [220 CE], 1282 [228 CE]). In at least two of these three groups at Tanais, it seems that the “father of the synod” is second in importance (as also at Pantikapaion). The father is mentioned immediately after the most important official, the priest, and just before the synagogue-leader, the benevolent official, the assistant benevolent official, the leader of the gymnasium, and the leader of the youths (IBosp 1277 and 1282). Since the inscriptions are vague on roles, any suggestion of their duties beyond what the name implies would be speculation. In the third inscription, the “father of the synod” does not occur at the head of the inscription along with other functionaries. Instead, the designation appears in the list of members as a designation for one of the members, which may suggest a role as benefactor (IBosp 1278). Still, in most cases “the consistency of the appearance of the ‘father’ position in various groups and the inclusion of the ‘fathers’ alongside others who are clearly functionaries who perform duties is suggestive of an active leadership role for the fathers here, rather than mere honorifics” (Harland 2009, 91).

There has also been some scholarly debate regarding the relationship between the association of “adopted brothers who revere Theos Hypsistos,” on the one hand, and the many other synods devoted to the same deity at Tanais. Ustinova (1999, 186–187) points out problems with Vasilii Latshev’s initial suggestion—followed by Franz Poland (1909, 284) and Schürer (1897, 207)—that the “adopted brothers” may have been the recently admitted members of the
There are clear cases when, in the same period, a person was described as a member of the “adopted brothers” while simultaneously being described as a “society-member” (θιαστῆς), as with Sozomenos son of Styranos and Phourtas son of Agathous who were called “society-members” in the month of Loos of 228 CE (IBosp 1282) and “adopted brothers” a month later (IBosp 1283). So it seems that people could be members of both the adopted brothers and a synod of society-members at the same time, on which see the numerous examples collected by Ustinova (1999, 186 n.10). Such dual memberships or multiple affiliations were not uncommon (→ IBosp 1283 [96] comments; IApamBith 103 [100] comments; IPergam 485 [110] comments; SEG 29:1205 [120] comments; see Harland 2009, 156–160 = Harland 2005a).

Before moving on from the Russian inscriptions, it is important to mention some associations from elsewhere that were devoted to a god labelled “Theos Hypsistos.” For those, such as Mitchell, who argue that there was a high degree of consistency in the worship of Hypsistos from one place to another, these associations might be considered to be worshipping the same god, with a similar understanding of that god and with some connection to the Judean God. For those who interpret the evidence for Hypsistos otherwise, such as Ustinova, Belayche, and myself, these other associations would be cases of some local deity being described as “the highest god” without any necessary connection with gods labelled such elsewhere. Beyond the Bosporan material, there are at least three associations that call their god “Theos Hypsistos” (cf. Mitchell 1999, nos. 56, 75). One altar from Serdica in Thrace was dedicated to the god by an association led by a priest (IThraceD, letter O, p. 316 = Isabazios II 6 = Mitchell 1999, no. 75; ca. 200 CE):

ἀγαθῇ θύχῃ. ǀ θεῷ ἐπηκόῳ ὑψίστῳ ǀ εὐχὴν ἀνέστησαν ǀ τὸ κοινὸν ἐκ ǀ τῶν ἰδίων, διὰ ἱερέως ǀ Ἑρςογένους καὶ προστάτου Αὐγουστιανοῦ ǀ Ἀχιλλεύς, Διός, Άλεξάνδρους, Μοκς, Μοκιανός, Ἀλέξανδρους, Μοκιανός, Αὐγουστιανοῦ ǀ [ — — — ] Θια[—  — — ] (θίατερος ?), Σεβαζιανὸς Ἐκ[—  — — ] Θ[—  — — ]

To good fortune! Using their own resources, the association dedicated this as a vow to the god who hears, Hypsistos (“Highest”), by the agency of the priest Hermogenes and the president (prostátoς) Augustianus: Achilleus, Aurelius, Dios, Alexandros, Mokas, Mokianos, (10) Domitis, Sapheinos, Paulinos, Pyros, Apolinarios, Mokianos, Selis (?), Alexandros son of Asklepiades, … Name (beginning with Thia…), Sabazianos (or, possibly: Sabazian society) … (remainder lost).

At Thessalonikē in Macedonia, forty members of a banqueting association led by a “tricliniarch” dedicated a monument to Theos Hypsistos in the mid-first century CE (Mitchell’s no. 56 = IG X/2.1 68; cf. SEG 47:963). Another Thessalonian dedication was made to Theos Hypsistos and the banqueters (συνκλίτης; Nigdelis 2006, 168–169 [no. 8]).
Richard S. Ascough discusses other associations in Macedonia at Edessa and at Pydna that were devoted to Zeus Hypsistos specifically (SEG 46:744 [65]; SEG 46:800 [72]). Devotion to Zeus Hypsistos had a significant history in Macedonia, with the earliest inscriptions coming from the early second century BCE in Edessa. It may well be that the cult of Zeus Hypsistos originated in Macedonia and spread elsewhere, as Ascough points out (Ascough 2003, 198–201; cf. Roberts, Skeat, and Nock 1936, 59). So it is a good possibility that the other references to “the highest god” (Theos Hypsistos) in Macedonia may in fact refer to Zeus as highest or supreme without expressly stating that this was the god in question. Although not involving associations, both Zeus Hypsistos and Theos Hypsistos are also well attested in northern Asia Minor, in the regions of Mysia (IMT 1552, 1917, 1918 1919, 2197, 2368; IPergamon 330, 331), Bithynia (TAM IV 62, 80, 81; IPrusaOlymp 1013), and Pontus (Binope 117, 118, 119), including the city of Amastris (Marek 1993, nos. 1b, 32, 79), to which we now turn.