

Author: BENEDIKT ECKHARDT

CAPInv. 1790: Termesseon ton pros Oinoandois Pisidon to poleiteuma (l. politeuma)

I. LOCATION

i. Geographical area	The Near East and Beyond
ii. Region	Phoenicia
iii. Site	Sidon

II. NAME

i. Full name (original language)	Τερμησσέων τῶν πρὸς Οἰνοάνδοις Πισιδῶν τὸ πολείτευμα (l. πολίτευμα) (R <i>Bi</i> 13 (1904): 551, no. 2, ll. 3-5)
ii. Full name (transliterated)	<i>Termesseon ton pros Oinoandois Pisidon to poleiteuma (l. politeuma)</i>

III. DATE

i. Date(s)	250 (?) - 200 (?) BC
------------	----------------------

IV. NAME AND TERMINOLOGY

ii. Name elements	Ethnic:	<i>Termesseis, Pisidai</i>
	Geographical:	<i>pros Oinoandois</i>
iii. Descriptive terms	πολείτευμα, <i>poleiteuma</i>	
Note	<i>poleiteuma</i> : R <i>Bi</i> 13 (1904): 551, no. 2, l. 5	

V. SOURCES

i. Source(s)	R <i>Bi</i> 13 (1904): 551, no. 2 (250 (?) - 200 (?) BC)
Note	See also: AGRW 273
Online Resources	AGRW ID 1891

i.a. Source type(s)	Epigraphic source(s)
i.b. Document(s) typology & language/script	Commemorative inscription in Greek
i.c. Physical format(s)	Grave stele depicting a soldier
ii. Source(s) provenance	Sidon

XII. NOTES

iii. Bibliography	<p>Honigman, S. (2003), 'Politeumata and Ethnicity in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt', <i>AncSoc</i> 33: 61-102.</p> <p>Huß, W. (2011), <i>Die Verwaltung des ptolemäischen Reiches</i>. Munich.</p> <p>Sänger, P. (2014), 'The Politeuma in the Hellenistic World (Third to First Century B.C.): A Form of Organisation to Integrate Minorities', in J. Dahlvik, Chr. Reinprecht and W. Sievers (eds.), <i>Migration und Integration – wissenschaftliche Perspektiven aus Österreich. Jahrbuch 2/2013</i>, Göttingen: 51-68.</p>
-------------------	--

XIII. EVALUATION

i. Private association	Possible
Note	<p>The debate on the nature of ethnic <i>politeumata</i> has been long and inconclusive. It seems clear that they united Ptolemaic mercenaries from a given area, and that they had a certain judicial autonomy (Honigman 2003: 64-6; Sängner 2014: 59-60). According to Sängner 2014, this means that they could not have been private associations, but had "a public and institutional character" (62). It is nevertheless possible that the impulse to form a group was a private one, and we should remember that internal jurisdiction was characteristic of all ancient private associations.</p> <p>One important aspect of this debate is the old question whether or not privileges similar to citizenship were accorded to members of <i>politeumata</i> (on the debate, cf. Honigman 2003: 61-2). See also CAPInv. 1789.</p>