

Author: PASCHALIS PASCHIDIS

CAPInv. 497: **hoi synthiasitai**

I. LOCATION

i. Geographical area	Macedonia
ii. Region	Northern Paionia
iii. Site	Resava (modern)

II. NAME

i. Full name (original language)	οἱ συνθιασίται (Düll 1977: 340 no 131)
ii. Full name (transliterated)	<i>hoi synthiasitai</i>

III. DATE

i. Date(s)	ii - iii AD
------------	-------------

IV. NAME AND TERMINOLOGY

ii. Name elements	Cultic:	<i>synthiasitai</i> : The members of the association refer to themselves merely as members of the same <i>thiasos</i> .
-------------------	---------	---

V. SOURCES

i. Source(s)	Düll 1977: 340 no 131 (ii/iii AD)
Note	The text presented by Vulić 1931 (who is followed by Düll 1971) is slightly defective in ll. 2, 3, 8-10 (see XII.i: Comments, below).
Online Resources	Vulić 1931: no. 176 and AGRW ID 15381
i.a. Source type(s)	Epigraphic source(s)
i.b. Document(s) typology & language/script	Greek dedication

i.c. Physical format(s)	Simple marble stele without decoration.
ii. Source(s) provenance	The stele was discovered by L. Heuzey and then by N. Vulić at Čakovec, near modern Resava, on the left bank of Erigon (mod. Crna Reka). The site abounds in archaeological finds (see TIR K34: 108-109); a large Roman settlement was located there, as well as Roman villas. The area has been tentatively ascribed to the territory of Audaristos (see however Papazoglou 1988: 327-8 n. 139).

VII. ORGANIZATION

ii. Leadership	There is no reason to assume a priori that the dedicant is the leader of the <i>thiasos</i> .
iii. Members	The dedicant calls the other members συνθιασῖται, <i>synthiasitai</i> (fellow members of the <i>thiasos</i>).

IX. MEMBERSHIP

i. Number	There are at least eight members in this association, including the dedicant.
ii. Gender	Men
Note	All named members are men.
v. Relations	The first two members listed after the dedicant (Düll 1977: 340 no 131, ll. 5-6), Makedon son of Makedon and Hermogenes son of Makedon, are clearly brothers. Gaios son of Meleagros (l. 7) may well be a son of the dedicant, Meleagros son of Menadros (l. 3). Three of the four members mentioned in ll. 8-10 are also related, or, more probably, freedmen of the same individual.

X. ACTIVITIES

iii. Worship	The dedication to Herakles <i>theos megistos</i> (ll. 1-2) suggests worship by the group.
Deities worshipped	Herakles

XII. NOTES

i. Comments	<p>The text presented by Vulić 1931: 75 no 176 (and followed by Düll 1977: 340 no 131) is slightly defective in ll. 2, 3, 8-10. A new photograph allows the following changes:</p> <p>L. 2: μεγίστω, <i>megisstoi</i>, not μεγίστω, <i>megistoi</i> (see already Heuzey 1876: 329 no. 133, followed by Demitsas 1896: no 284).</p> <p>L. 3: The correction Μενά<n>δρο[υ], <i>Mena<n>dro[u]</i>, by all editors is unwarranted.</p> <p>Ll. 8-10: despite the loss of some letters in the beginning of the lines, in comparison to Vulić's age, and minor differences in the reading of other letters, the three mentions of the <i>nomen</i> Mamercius is very probable; however, the abbreviated conjunction κ(αί), <i>k(ai)</i> in ll. 8 and 9 in Vulić's text is certainly the abbreviated <i>praenomen</i> Κ(όντος), <i>K(ointos)</i> (see already Papazoglou 1982: 44 n. 16).</p>
ii. Poland concordance	Poland B 65

<p>iii. Bibliography</p>	<p>Demitsas, M.G. (1896), <i>Ἡ Μακεδονία ἐν λίθοις φθεγγομένοις και μνημείοις σωζομένοις</i>. Athens: no. 284.</p> <p>Düll, S. (1977), <i>Die Götterkulte Nordmakedoniens in römischer Zeit: eine kultische und typologische Untersuchung anhand epigraphischer, numismatischer und archäologischer Denkmäler</i>. Munich: 340 no 131.</p> <p>Heuzey, L. (1876), <i>Mission archéologique de Macédoine</i>. Paris: 329 no. 133.</p> <p>Papazoglou, F. (1982), ‘Notes épigraphiques de Macédoine’, <i>ZAnt</i> 32: 39-52, esp. 44 n. 16.</p> <p>Vulić, N. (1931), ‘□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ <i>Spomenik</i> 71: 1-259, esp. 75 no 176.</p> <p>Papazoglou, F. (1988), <i>Les villes de Macédoine à l’époque romaine</i>, Paris.</p>
--------------------------	---

Demitsas, M.G. (1896), *Η Μακεδονία ἐν λίθοις φεγγομένοις καὶ μνημείοις σωζομένοις*. Athens: no. 284.

Düll, S. (1977), *Die Götterkulte Nordmakedoniens in römischer Zeit: eine kultische und typologische Untersuchung anhand epigraphischer, numismatischer und archäologischer Denkmäler*. Munich: 340 no 131.

Heuzey, L. (1876), *Mission archéologique de Macédoine*. Paris: 329 no. 133.

Papazoglou, F. (1982), 'Notes épigraphiques de Macédoine', *ZAnt* 32: 39-52, esp. 44 n. 16.

Vulić, N. (1931), '□ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □', *Spoimenik* 71: 1-259, esp. 75 no 176.

Papazoglou, F. (1988), *Les villes de Macédoine à l'époque romaine*, Paris.

XIII. EVALUATION	
i. Private association	Probable
Note	As is often the case in mystery cults, it is difficult to distinguish between a 'normal' mystery cult and a 'private' associative structure. The fact that Herakles (popular throughout Upper Macedonia and Northern Paionia) is nowhere else termed Theos Megistos favours perhaps the assumption that this is a private cult association.

i. Private association	Probable
Note	As is often the case in mystery cults, it is difficult to distinguish between a 'normal' mystery cult and a 'private' associative structure. The fact that Herakles (popular throughout Upper Macedonia and Northern Paionia) is nowhere else termed Theos Megistos favours perhaps the assumption that this is a private cult association.

Probable

As is often the case in mystery cults, it is difficult to distinguish between a 'normal' mystery cult and a 'private' associative structure. The fact that Herakles (popular throughout Upper Macedonia and Northern Paionia) is nowhere else termed Theos Megistos favours perhaps the assumption that this is a private cult association.