Author: NIKOLAOS GIANNAKOPOULOS

CAPInv. GR-42: **hetaeriae**

I. LOCATION

i. **Geographical area**	Eastern Asia Minor
ii. **Region**	Pontus

II. GENERAL REFERENCE

i.a. **Full reference (original language)**	hetaeriae (Plin. *Ep.* 10.96.7)
i.b. **Full reference (transliterated)**	*hetaeriae*
ii. **Reference context**	In his well-know correspondence with Trajan regarding the proper handling of Christians, Pliny mentions an edict of his own which in accordance with the emperor's instructions prohibited the function of *hetaeriai* (Plin. *Ep.* 10.96.7: *post edictum meum, quo secundum mandata tua hetaerias esse vetueram*). See Sherwin-White 1966: 608-9 and 709 (with further bibliography) and Cotter 1996: 83.

III. DATE

i. **Date(s)**	109 - 111 AD

IV. TERMINOLOGY

i. **Descriptive terms**	hetaeriae
Note	ἑταιρείαι, *hetaireiai* in Greek

V. SOURCES

i. **Source(s)**	Plin. *Ep.* 10.96.7 (109-111 AD)
i.a. **Source type(s)**	Literary source(s)
i.b. **Document(s) typology & language/script**	Letter in Latin addressed by Pliny to Trajan.

ISSN 2446-2500
CC BY NC SA

VIII. NOTES

i. Comments	On the date see Sherwin-White 1966: 80-81. The term *hetaeriai* used by Pliny does not necessarily concern purely political clubs, since on this specific occasion it obviously applies to the Christians as well. Trajan refused to authorize the creation of a *collegium fabrorum* in Nikomedeia fearing that it might evolve into a dangerous *hetaeria* (Plin. *Ep.* 10.34). The same word in Plin. *Ep.* 10.96.7 is apparently a generic term covering various kinds of associations which were perceived as potentially dangerous, i.e. keen to turn into *hetairiai*, in the literary sense of political clubs involved in civil strife. Trajan's policy regarding prohibitions and/or restrictions on associations in the province of Pontus-Bithynia is also mentioned in Plin. *Ep.* 10.33-34 and 92-93. Internal strife potentially provoked by such associations constituted the grounds for Pliny's edict. However, this measure, which recalls a more general, but sporadically and conditionally enforced, imperial policy with respect to associations (cf. Sherwin-White 1966: 608-609; Cotter 1996: 78-88; Liu 2008: 55-56), was rather short-lived, at least as far as Bithynia and Pontus is concerned (see Van Nijf 1997: 21 note 84 and 180; de Ligt 2000: 245; Arnaoutoglou 2002). Cf. cf. CAPInv 975, GR-41 and GR-66.
iii. Bibliography	Arnaoutoglou, I. (2002), 'Roman Law and Collegia in Asia Minor', *RIDA* 49: 27-44. Cotter, W. (1996), 'The Collegia and Roman Law: State Restrictions on Voluntary Associations', in J.S. Kloppenborg and S.G. Wilson (eds.), *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*. London, New York: 74-89. de Ligt, L. (2000) 'Governmental Attitudes towards Markets and Collegia' in E. Lo Cascio (ed.), *Mercati permanenti e mercati periodici nel Mondo Romano*, Bari: 237–252. Liu, J. (2008), 'Pompeii and collegia: a new appraisal of the evidence', *AHB* 22: 53-69. Sherwin-White, A.N. (1966), *The Letters of Pliny. A Historical and Social Commentary*. Oxford. Van Nijf, O. (1997), *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*. Amsterdam.

IX. EVALUATION

i. Private associations	Certain
Note	The term *hetaeriae* refers to private associations (see above under field VIII.i: Comments).

CC BY NC SA