

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. <i>Ep.</i> 10.96.7)
i.b. Full reference (transliterated)	<i>hetaeriae</i>
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 <i>hetaeriai</i> (Plin. <i>Ep.</i> 10.96.7: <i>post edictum meum, quo secundum mandata tua hetaerias esse vetueram</i>). 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	ἡταιρείαι, <i>hetaireiai</i> in Greek

V. SOURCES

i. Source(s)	Plin. <i>Ep.</i> 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.

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).