

Author: ALEXANDRU AVRAM

CAPInv. 1326: U-BSR-011

I. LOCATION

i. Geographical area	Black Sea Region
ii. Region	North coast of the Black Sea
iii. Site	Pantikapaion

II. NAME

i. Association with unknown name	U-BSR-011
----------------------------------	-----------

III. DATE

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

V. SOURCES

i. Source(s)	SEG 46: 958 (f. ii AD)
Online Resources	SEG 46: 958 SEG 46: 958[1]
i.a. Source type(s)	Epigraphic source(s)
i.b. Document(s) typology & language/script	Fragmentary Greek inscription, possibly a tombstone put by the association for one of its members.
i.c. Physical format(s)	Five inscribed and one uninscribed fragment of a limestone stele.
ii. Source(s) provenance	Pantikapaion (necropolis)

VII. ORGANIZATION

iv. Officials	One γυμ[νασιάρχης], <i>gym[nasiarches]</i> (SEG 46: 958, l. 1), and one νεανισκάρχης, <i>neaniskarches</i> (SEG 46: 958, ll. 2-3), in this case association rather than city officials, as in Tanais (CAPInv. 1324). Their names were surely preceded by those of other officials (see XII.i).
---------------	--

IX. MEMBERSHIP

ii. Gender	Men
Note	The preserved names are male names.
iii. Age	Children Adults
Note	The presence of a νεανισκάρχης, <i>neaniskarches</i> , suggests membership of the youth.

X. ACTIVITIES

iv. Honours/Other activities	The association probably set up tombstones for its members.
------------------------------	---

XI. INTERACTION

i. Local interaction	The membership of a γυμ[νασιάρχης], <i>gym[nasiarches]</i> , and a νεανισκάρχης, <i>neaniskarches</i> , may suggest activities in the gymnasium.
----------------------	--

XII. NOTES

i. Comments

It is highly probable that the names of the γυμ[νασιάρχης], *gym[nasiarches]*, and of the νεανισκάρχης, *neaniskarches*, were preceded by those of other association officials. Best analogy seems to be CIRB 103 ([CAPIInv. 1296](#)), the only association record from Pantikapaion where both a γυμνασιάρχης, *gymnasiarches*, and a νεανισκάρχης, *neaniskarches*, are attested in the staff of an association. Therefore, we suggest restoring:

[Ἡ σύνοδος ἡ περὶ]
[ἱερέα - - - - -]
[καὶ πατέρα - - -]
[- - - καὶ συναγωγ]-
[γὸν - - - - - καὶ]
[φιλάγαθον - - -]
[καὶ παραφιλάγα]-
[θον - - - - - καὶ]
γυμ[νασιάρχη]-
ν Πύρρη[ν κ]αὶ νε-
ανισκάρχην Σω-
σίαν καὶ τῶν vac.
[λοιπῶν συνο]-
[δειτῶν ἀνέστησ]αν
[τὸν δεῖνα κτλ.],
[He synodos he peri]
[hierea - - - - -]
[kai patera - - -]
[- - - kai synago]-
[gon - - - - - kai]
[philagathon - - -]
[kai paraphilaga]-
[thon - - - - - kai]
gym[nasiarche]-
n Pyrre[n k]ai ne-
aniskarchen Zw-
sian kai ton vac.
[loipon syno]-
[deiton anestes]an
[ton deina ktl.]

(For the construction in the genitive, τῶν [λοιπῶν συνοδειτῶν], *ton [loipon synodeiton]*, see CIRB 97 and 98, Vinogradov, SEG).

Thus, our inscription could belong to the association described in [CAPIInv. 1296](#).

iii. Bibliography

Saprykin, S.Ju., and Chevelev, O.D. (1996), 'Fragment grecheskoj nadpisi iz Pantikapeja: k voprosy ob organizacii bosporskikh religioznykh sojuзов [A Fragment of a Greek Inscription from Pantikapaion: On the Question of the Organization of Bosporan Religious Associations]', *Rossijskaja Arkheologija* 2: 161-7.

XIII. EVALUATION

i. Private association

Probable

Note

See XII.i for the possible restoration of this fragmentary inscription.