The Annual of the British School at Athens

<http://journals.cambridge.org/ATH>

Additional services for *The Annual of the British School at Athens*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

A Statute of an Attic Thiasos

Marcus N. Tod

The Annual of the British School at Athens / Volume 13 / January 1907, pp 328 - 338

DOI: 10.1017/S0068245400002963, Published online: 18 October 2013

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0068245400002963

How to cite this article:

Marcus N. Tod (1907). A Statute of an Attic Thiasos. The Annual of the British School at Athens, 13, pp 328-338 doi:10.1017/S0068245400002963

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

A STATUTE OF AN ATTIC THIASOS.

THE following inscription,¹ which was found in the Peiraeus, was acquired by the British Museum in 1906. My warmest thanks are due to Dr. Cecil Smith, Head of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, for his kindness in giving me permission to publish it and supplying me with a copy and squeeze which have greatly facilitated the task.

----- δέ τις ΑΙ
 ----- ΝΑΙ κατασ-
 ----- \ΙΑΓΑ τῶν θιασ-
 [ωτῶν - - - εἰὰν δέ τι]ς αὐτῶν ἀπογίγνητ-
 [αι, φράσ]ει ἢ ὑδ[ς ἢ ἢ π]ατήρ ἢ (δ)ς ἂν οἰκειότατ- 5
 ος εἴ τοῦ θιάσου, τοῦ δ' ἀπογι(γ)νομένο(ν) ἰέναι ἐπ' ἐ-
 χφορὰν καὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ τοὺς φίλους ἅπαντας. καὶ ἄ-
 ν τις ἀδικῆται, (β)οηθεῖν καὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ τοὺς φί-
 (λ)ους ἅπαντας, ὅπως ἂν πάντες εἰδῶσιν ὅτι καὶ
 εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐ(σ)εβοῦμεν καὶ εἰς τοὺς φίλους · τα- 10
 (ῦ)τα δὲ ποιοῦσιν αὐτοῖς πολλὰ καὶ ἀγαθὰ καὶ ἐγγόν-
 οῖς καὶ προγόνοις. ἐπειδὰν δὲ κυρώσωσι τὸν νόμ-
 ον οἱ θιασῶται μηθὲν εἶναι τοῦ νόμου κυριώτερ-
 ον · εἰὰν δέ τις παρὰ τὸν νόμον ἢ εἴπει ἢ πράξει, κα-
 τηγορίαν αὐτοῦ εἶναι τῷ βουλομένῳ τῶν θιασωτῶ- 15
 ν, καὶ ἂν ἔλει αὐτὸν τιμάτωσαν αὐτὸν καθότι ἂν δο-
 κεῖ τῷ κοινῷ.

¹ Part of this paper was read in substance at a meeting of the Oxford Philological Society.

On the lower part of a stele of greyish marble, complete except at the top. Max. height '206 m.; breadth '36 m. at the top, increasing to '37 m. at the foot; thickness ca. '06 m. The back is left rough, and even the inscribed surface is very imperfectly smoothed, the marks of a coarse toothed chisel being plainly visible all over it.

I.

The letters are small, about '005 m. in height, but they are not crowded together: the average number in each line is thirty-eight. The writing is marked by the carelessness of its execution: no pains are taken to make the depth and thickness of the straight strokes uniform or to make the $\odot$ and $\circ$ real circles. In many cases strokes which should join fail to do so, so that, *e.g.*, a $\mathbf{N}$ consists of three separate strokes. Actual errors are common: $\odot \Sigma$ is written for $\delta \varsigma$ (l. 5), $\mathbf{A} \Pi \mathbf{O} \Gamma \mathbf{I} \mathbf{K} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{N} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{I}$ for $\alpha \pi \omicron \gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omicron \mu \epsilon \nu \omicron \nu$ (l. 6), $\mathbf{E} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{H} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{E} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{N}$ for $\beta \omicron \eta \theta \epsilon \acute{\iota} \nu$ (l. 8), etc.

It is not possible to determine the date precisely from the letter forms, but these seem to point to the half century from 325–275 B.C. The outer strokes of the Σ show no tendency to become horizontal, those of the $\mathbf{M}$ are not yet vertical, the $\mathbf{\Xi}$ still has the vertical stroke, and the horizontal bars of the $\mathbf{E}$ are, or at least are intended to be, of equal length.

With this dating the orthography of the inscription is in accord. Four peculiarities deserve mention:

(1) $\mathbf{\epsilon} \chi \phi \omicron \rho \acute{\alpha} \nu$ (l. 7). In Attic inscriptions of the classical period the preposition $\epsilon \kappa$ before χ , ϕ or θ , whether alone or in a compound, may either remain unchanged or become χ (Meisterhans, *Gramm. d. attischen Inschriften*³, p. 106): *e.g.* in an inscription of 329 B.C. we find $\epsilon \chi \phi \omicron [\rho \eta \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \iota]$ and $\epsilon \kappa \phi \acute{\epsilon} \rho \omicron \nu \sigma \iota$ (*I.G.* ii. add. 834 *b.* i. 75 and ii. 5. 834 *b.* ii. 80). But no instance of the change from κ to χ is known to occur after 292 B.C. (Meisterhans³, *loc. cit.*).

(2) $\mathbf{M} \eta \theta \acute{\epsilon} \nu$ (l. 13). The forms $\omicron \theta \theta \epsilon \acute{\iota} \varsigma$, $\mu \eta \theta \epsilon \acute{\iota} \varsigma$ do not appear at all until 378 B.C., but they gradually gain ground, until by 330 they are the dominant forms. From 300–60 B.C. they are the only forms which occur, but in the Imperial period the old spelling reappears and the forms with δ are three or four times as numerous as those with θ (Meisterhans³, pp. 258 f.).

(3) $\mathbf{E} \acute{\iota} \acute{\alpha} \nu$ (l. 14). In the fourth and third centuries B.C., but especially between 350 and 300 B.C., $\epsilon \iota$ often takes the place of a simple ϵ before a vowel (Meisterhans³, pp. 45 ff.) $\mathbf{E} \acute{\iota} \acute{\alpha} \nu$ is not found before 387, but occurs several times after that date. The form $\acute{\alpha} \nu$ is very rare in Attic inscriptions, though common in the literary prose of the fifth century: Meisterhans (p. 256) quotes two instances from the fifth and three from the fourth century, the latter all in the same decree. Our present inscription adds two instances (ll. 7, 16).

(4) The substitution of *ει* for *η* in *εἶ* (l. 6), *εἴπει ἡ πράξει* (l. 14), *ἔλει, δοκεῖ* (l. 16). This spelling first occurs between 380 and 370 B.C., rapidly increases in frequency until by 300 it is the normal form, and gradually falls out of fashion from 200 B.C. (Meisterhans³, pp. 38 f.).

II.

§ 1 (ll. 4-7). '*[And if any] of them decease, [notice shall be given] either by his son [or his or] his father or whoever of the society is his nearest relation, and both themselves and all the friends shall attend the funeral of the deceased.*'

The first three lines are too mutilated to be capable of certain restoration. In l. 1 we have probably - - *εἰάν*] *δέ τις*, as in ll. [4,] 14: the last letter of the line is Γ, Ι, Π or Τ.

Lines 4-7 regulate the procedure to be followed on the death of a *θιασώτης*. Information is to be given¹ by the nearest relative of the deceased² both as to the fact of the death and as to the time of the funeral. Without such notice it would not be possible for the members of the society to attend the funeral, as the following clause directs them to do. We may note the use of the somewhat euphemistic *ἀπογίγνομαι* (ll. 4, 6), instead of *ἀποθνήσκω*: it occurs again in a decree of an Attic *θίασος* passed in 278-7 B.C. praising certain officials because *ἐπιμεμέληνται τῶν ἀπογενομένων καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως* (Ditt. *Syll.*² 727, 14) and in Thuc. ii. 34. In l. 5 the restorations *υῶ[ς]* and *[πα]τήρ* are certain: what came between them is doubtful, *ἀδελφός*, of which we most naturally think, being too long for the available space. I conjecture *υῶνός* 'grandson,' but Professor Wilhelm objects that '*υῶνός* would involve too great an age for the member of the *θίασος*: it is better to think of middle-aged or even young men as members and the rôle that a *μήτηρ* may play in the case is, as it seems to me, quite possible.' On the other hand, however, it may be argued: (1) that the

¹ The restoration *φράσ[ει]*, which I owe to Professor Wilhelm, exactly fills the required space and agrees with the extant letters; it may therefore be regarded as certain, though the use of the future indicative in place of the imperative is curious.

² The meaning of *τοῦ θιάσου* (l. 6) is not quite plain. I have taken it as equivalent to *θιασώτης* *ων*, and think that it was probably added because a statute of a *θίασος* was of course binding only upon members of the society. Or could *θιάσου* be an engraver's error for *θιασ(ώ)του*, 'whoever is the nearest relative of the (deceased) member'? Cf. Hdt. v. 5 *σφάζεται ὑπὸ τοῦ οἰκηιστάτου ἐωυτῆς*, iii. 65 *τετελεύτηκε ὑπὸ τῶν ἐωυτοῦ οἰκηιστάτων*.

Greeks would have written *πατὴρ ἢ μήτηρ*, not *μήτηρ ἢ πατήρ*: (2) that the words *τοῦ θιάσου*, if I have interpreted them rightly, point to the mention of male relatives as more probable: (3) that if females appear at all, we should expect *θυγάτηρ* side by side with *μήτηρ*: (4) that to be a grandfather does not necessarily imply a very advanced age,¹ and there is nothing improbable in supposing that *θιασῶται* continued their membership all through their lives.

We may note the curious phrase (l. 7) *καὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ τοὺς φίλους ἅπαντας*, which recurs in the following line. The *αὐτοὺς* can hardly have any other reference than to the members of the society, the *θιασῶται*: but who are the *φίλοι*? Three possible explanations suggest themselves:

(1) They are the friends (taking the word in its ordinary, non-technical sense) of the *θιασῶται*. But the society could hardly attempt to frame a rule binding upon so large and so vague a body, a body, moreover, which lay entirely outside its own boundaries. The use of the term *ἅπαντας* shows the reference of the word to be narrower and more specific.

(2) They are the friends of the deceased in the first case, of the injured man in the second. The same objections apply to this interpretation, though not to the same extent: statutes of a society are binding merely upon its own members, while once more the application of the word *φίλοι* is too vague and indefinite.

(3) The word *φίλοι* has a technical sense and denotes a specific number of definite persons who, though outside the full membership of the *θίασος*, possessed a qualified membership and were bound by its statutes. They would, if this interpretation is correct, correspond to our 'associates.' This explanation seems to me to meet the difficulties involved in the two which we have discussed, but it must be admitted that the hypothesis rests upon a very insecure foundation, and that if such an institution were at all widespread it might have been expected to leave very much clearer traces in the mass of extant inscriptions dealing with societies of every kind. The word does, indeed, frequently occur,² but apparently as the full and regular title of the members of certain clubs.

¹ In this case, however, we have to assume that the grandson was old enough to be a member of the society, which does, it is true, imply that the grandfather was an old rather than a middle-aged man.

² Boeotia, *B.C.H.* xxii. 246 (Acraephia): Macedonia, *Denkschr. Wien. Akad.* 1869, 167 ff. No. 42 (Deuriopus?): Thera, *I.G.* xii. 3, 1027: Bithynia, *C.I.G.* 3751 (Nicaea); *Arch. Anz.* 1903, 39 (Prusa): Ionia, *Μουσ. κ. Βιβλ.* ii. 40 (Smyrna): Lydia, Kontoleon, *Ἀνέκδ. ἐπιγρ.* i. 47 (Chasan

§ 2 (ll. 7-12). 'And if anyone is wronged, both they themselves and all the friends shall render aid, in order that all may know that we show piety both to the gods and to the friends : and if they do this let many blessings come upon them and their descendants and their ancestors.'

All the members and ' friends ' of the society are bound to render aid if one of their number is injured : the phrase recalls Thucydides' description of the oligarchical clubs αἵπερ ἐτύγχανον πρότερον ἐν τῇ πόλει οὔσαι ἐπὶ δίκαις καὶ ἀρχαῖς (viii. 54), save that here the object is purely defensive and there seems to be no political aim. What is most striking here is the absence of any practical directions as to how aid is to be rendered. For the phrase (l. 9) ὅπως ἂν πάντες εἰδῶσι κτλ. which is copied from similar expressions in state decrees see Ziebarth, *Griech. Vereinswesen*, p. 187, Wilhelm, *Ἐφ. ἀρχ.* 1905, pp. 235 ff., Nos. 9-13.

The phrase εὐσεβοῦμεν . . . πρὸς τοὺς φίλους is another example of the loose and inaccurate use of words which marks the document. Εὐσέβεια is very frequently commended in Attic honorary decrees, but it is always felt or exercised towards the gods or some specific god or sanctuary, and some other word—εὐνοια, ἀρετή, κτλ.—is introduced if merits towards men are mentioned. I know only two instances of εὐσέβεια used in reference to human beings,¹ both of which occur in decrees of corporations : in one (Ditt. *Syll.*² 730) a certain Chaereas is commended and crowned ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν καὶ εὐσεβίας εἰς τε τὰς θεὰς καὶ τοὺς ὀργεῶνας, while in the other, a decree of a Coan society, two men are praised ἐπὶ τε τῷ αἰρέσει καὶ εὐσεβείᾳ ἂν ἔχοντι ποτὶ τὸς θεὸς καὶ τὸς δαμότας (Ditt. *Syll.*² 735). In both these cases, however, a second word is linked with εὐσέβεια and makes the construction less harsh.

The absence of a verb in the next clause is noticeable, though the meaning is quite clear. The αὐτοῖς of l. 11 seems to include all those referred to in the previous phrase αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ φίλοι ἅπαντες. The invocation of blessings upon the πρόγονοι of zealous members of the society is curious, for the word can hardly refer merely to living

Karan) : Phrygia, *J.H.S.* xvii. 286 (Ancyra) : Mysia, *Inscr. v. Perg.* 562 (Pergamon) : Cilicia, *Μουσ. κ. Βιβλ.* i. 135, No. 55 (Seleucia) ; *J.H.S.* xii. 229 (Canytelideis) ; *ib.* xi. 249 (Castabala, Hieropolis) ; Humann and Puchstein, *Reisen in Kleinasien*, p. 398, note 2 (Nicopolis ad Issum). But in a number of these examples it is very doubtful whether the word refers at all to membership of a society.

¹ I exclude, of course, references to Roman Emperors.

ancestors but must surely include the dead. But perhaps it is not fair to analyse too closely a phrase of this sort.

§ 3 (ll. 12-17). 'And when the members have ratified the statute, nothing shall override the statute: and if anyone shall either speak or act contrary to the statute, he shall be liable to accusation by any of the members who wishes, and if he convict him let them punish him as seems good to the society.'

The statute did not come into force until passed at a formal meeting of the society: cf. Ditt. *Syll.*² 732. 44 τῷ<ι>ν ψήφων, αἷς ἐδόκει τόδε τὸ δόγμα κύριον εἶναι, ἐξήκον[τα], αἷς δὲ οὐκ ἐδόκει, οὐδεμία. With the phrase μηθὲν εἶναι τοῦ νόμου κυριώτερον we may compare the fuller statement in a financial bond from Arcesine (Amorgos), Ditt. *Syll.*² 517. 41 τῆς δὲ συγγραφῆς τῇσδε [ῶ]μολόγησαν Ἀρκ[εσιν]εῖς μηδὲν εἶναι κυριώτερον, μήτε νόμον μήτε ψή[φ]ισμα μήτε δ[όγμ]α [μή]τε στρατηγὸν μήτε ἀρχὴν ἄλλα κρίνου[σ]αν ἢ τὰ ἐν τῇ[ι] συγγ[ρα]φῇ γεγ[ρ]αμμένα μήτε ἄλλο μηθὲν κτλ. Cf. [Dem.] xxxv. 13, 39, and Dittenberger *O.G.I.* 326 (= *C.I.G.* 3069) 34 δεδόχθαι τοῖς Ἀτταλισταῖς κυρῶσαι μὲν τὸν ἱερὸν νόμον κτλ.

The word τιμάτωσαν in the final clause (l. 16) has an unusual meaning, to which I know no parallel. Τιμάω in Attic legal phraseology denotes 'to assess,' 'to award,' as for example in the phrases τιμᾶν τὴν βλάβην, τὴν δίκην, τὴν ἀξίαν τῆς βλάβης. Or again it may take a dative of the person and a genitive of the penalty, e.g. τιμᾶν τινι θανάτου or τιμᾶν τινι δέκα ταλάντων. But τιμᾶν αὐτόν, as here, is remarkable, not to say incorrect: αὐτόν might be omitted, as in Plato, *Laws*, 843 B τιμάτω τὸ δικαστήριον ὃ τι ἂν δέη πάσχειν . . . τὸν ἡττηθέντα, or it might be changed to περὶ αὐτοῦ as in the law quoted by Demosthenes xxi. 47 ἡ ἡλιαία τιμάτω περὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτου ἂν δοκῇ ἄξιος εἶναι παθεῖν ἢ ἀποτεῖσαι. Grammatically, of course, it is possible to take τιμάτωσαν in its usual sense, translating 'let the thiasotae honour him (i.e. the successful accuser) in whatever way the society determines,' but this rendering seems to me to be much less probable. The whole sentence is so carelessly constructed, especially in the frequent alteration of the grammatical subject, that the loose use of a single word need not surprise us.

For punitive powers exercised by similar societies we may compare the instances quoted by Ziebarth (*Das griech. Vereinswesen*, pp. 171 ff.):

the punishments imposed usually took the form of a fine, often accompanied by exclusion from the society. The amount of the fine might be left to the discretion of the members, as is done here, or a limit might be fixed. Cf. *I.G.* ii. 610 (a law of ὀργεῶνες in the Peiraeus) 13 εἰάν τις εἴπηι ἢ ἐπιψηφίσῃ παρὰ τόνδε τὸν νόμον, ὀφειλέτω [π] δραχμὰς τῇ θεῷ ὃ τε εἰπὼν καὶ ὁ ἐπιψηφίσας καὶ μὴ μετέστω αὐτῷ τῶν κοινῶν.

III.

We have before us the latter part of a law (νόμος, ll. 12, 13, 14) of a society¹ called a θίασος (l. 6: θιασῶται, ll. 3, 13, 15). How much of it is lost we cannot say, but the dimensions of the stone show that the document cannot originally have been a very long one. That the Peiraeus was the headquarters of a number of societies of ὀργεῶνες, θιασῶται, ἐρανισταί, etc. is proved by the numerous decrees and other inscriptions referring to them which have been found there.² As no mention is made of the deity in whose honour this society is named, it cannot be identified with any of the previously known Peiraic θίασοι; but it is worth noticing that these—to judge from the extant inscriptions—seem to have flourished especially at the very end of the fourth century B.C. and the beginning of the third, just at the period at which we have dated the present statute.

Though decrees of such societies are frequent, the number of their extant laws is small. Ziebarth gives the following list (*op. cit.* p. 145):

A. Those which have entirely survived :

1. Νόμος (in form a decree) of a Theran family association. *I.G.* xii. 3. 330.
2. Νόμος of the Iobacchi. Ditt. *Syll.*² 737.
3. Νόμος ἐρανιστῶν. *I.G.* iii. 23; re-edited with a greatly improved text and valuable commentary by A. Wilhelm, *Serta Harteliana*, pp. 231 ff.

¹ The *locus classicus* for the subject of the Greek societies is E. Ziebarth, *Das griech. Vereinswesen* (Preisschriften der fürstlich Jablonowski'schen Gesellschaft zu Leipzig, xxxiv.), Leipzig, 1896. The epigraphical materials are collected and arranged geographically by J. Oehler, *Zum griechischen Vereinswesen*, Vienna, 1905. Important additions have since been made by Wilhelm, *Ἀττικὰ ψηφίσματα* in *Ἐφημ. ἀρχαιολ.* 1905, 215 ff., Nos. 9–15.

² Ziebarth, *op. cit.* pp. 36 f.; Oehler, *op. cit.* pp. 7 f.; C. Schaefer, 'Die Privatkultgenossenschaften im Peiraieus' in *Jahrb. f. klass. Altertum*. cxxi. 417 f.

B. Those of which important fragments have survived :

4. *Ἱερὸς νόμος* (*I.G.* ii. 610) of *ὀργεῶνες* in the Peiraeus, and decrees partially altering its constitution (*ib.* 624).
5. Beginning of the *Ἱερὸς νόμος* of the *Νικομάχειον* at Chalcedon. Michel, *Recueil* 1008, Collitz-Bechtel 3051, Ditt. *Syll.*² 595.
6. Fragment of a law of *μύσται* at Tomi. *Μουσ. καὶ Βιβλ.* v. 47, *A.E.M.* vi. 8, No. 14.
7. Decree, equivalent to a law, of *Σαββατισταί*, found near Elaeussa Sebaste (Cilicia). *J.H.S.* xii. 233, Ditt. *O.G.I.* 573.

Our present inscription unfortunately fails to give us much fresh information. Of its two enactments which have survived, that which enjoins mutual assistance is too vague to be illuminating, while that which refers to the burial of members covers familiar ground.¹ There do not appear to have existed in the Greek world burial societies similar to the *collegia funeraticia* of the Romans, societies, that is, whose sole aim was to secure members a tomb and a becoming funeral, for which purpose regular subscriptions were levied.² Yet the majority of Greek societies apparently undertook certain duties connected with burial amongst their other duties, and this certainly did not rank among the least important of their functions. Some possessed their own burying places,³ but much more frequently the tombstone only was furnished from the funds of the *κοινόν*,⁴ or again, as in the present case, the association rendered honour to the dead by taking part in the funeral and in its attendant religious ceremonies.⁵ Further, in some cases the society procured the recognition of its deceased members as 'heroes,' and we meet with associations, the

¹ The clause, however, requiring that notice be given of a member's decease is, so far as I know, unique. The question of the honours paid by Greek societies to their dead members is best treated by Wilhelm, *Serta Harteliana*, 231 ff., and Ziebarth, *op. cit.* 17 f.

² Ziebarth, *loc. cit.*

³ E.g. the *κοινὰ ἐπανιστῶν* of Alopeke (Wilhelm, *loc. cit.*), Kamiros (*I.G.* xii. 1. 736 = Ditt. *Syll.*² 746), and five *θλασοί* of Cos (Paton-Hicks, *Inscr. of Cos*, Nos. 155-9).

⁴ Instances might be cited from all parts of the Greek world, referring not only to religious or semi-religious *θλασοί* and *σύνοδοι*, but also to trade-gilds, etc.

⁵ E.g. Kaibel, *Epigr. graec.* No 153, l. 11; Ditt. *Syll.*² 737. 159 ff., 729. 46 ff.; *Inscriften von Pergamon*, 374 B, 24.

main object of which was the proper performance of the heroic cult of the deceased.¹

In many of these points apt parallels may be drawn between the ancient Greek *κοινά* and the mediaeval English gilds.² In the latter too we have in most cases the same religious background, and in almost all of them provision is made for succour being given to those who needed it, and certain rites performed at the funeral of a member. Thus, for example, it is enacted in the statutes of the Gild of St. Leonard, Lynn (Toulmin Smith, p. 50):

‘There shal no brothir ne sistir sene othir in prison, th^t he shal comyn and vesityen hym, and comfordyn hym in his powere.’

The Gild of Berwick-upon-Tweed orders that (Toulmin Smith, p. 340):

‘If a brother is charged, on a matter of life or limb, outside the borough, two or three gildmen shall help him, at the cost of the gild, for two days;’ etc.

while the Gild of Garlekhith, London, makes provision for a weekly payment if ‘any of the forsaide bretherhede be enpresoned falslich by enme, other by fals conspiracie, and haue noght for to fynd hym with, etc.’ (Toulmin Smith, p. 5).

Of the many enactments of English Gilds dealing with the burial of deceased members, that which comes nearest to the terms of our present inscription is one of the Tailors’ Gild, Norwich (Toulmin Smith, p. 35):

‘And also it ys ordeyned, be alle the bretheren and sisteren, that what brother or sister deye, the ferndes of the dede body sshullon whet the Alderman to seyn; and he ssal sende forthe the bedel to alle the bretheren and the systeren, that they bien at the derge of the body and also at messe and offeren etc.’

Very similar is the statute of the Gild of St. Leonard, Lynn (Toulmin Smith, p. 50), already referred to:

‘Alle-so, if any brothir or sistir deye, th^e aldirman shal comand th^e Oficere to warnyn alle th^e bretheryn and sisteryn to bryng th^e Cors

¹ *E.g.* *I.G.* iii. 23 (= Wilhelm, *Serta Harteliana*, 231); *I.G.* ii. 630; Ditt. *Syll.*² 893.

² Toulmin Smith, *English Gilds: The Original Ordinances of more than one hundred Early English Gilds*. London, 1870 (Early English Text Society, 40). My attention was drawn to these parallels by Mr. C. T. Onions.

to th^e chirche, w^t waxe brennend, and th^e waxe for to brenne in th^e tyme of seruice.'

So also it is ordered by the Gild of the Palmers, Ludlow (Toulmin Smith, p. 194), that

'Services for the dead shall be duly attended by all the bretheren and sisteren.'

The actual cost of the funeral, however, is usually borne by the gild only in cases of poverty: thus in the statutes of the Gild of Berwick-upon-Tweed (Toulmin Smith, p. 340 § 11) we find it enacted:

'Whoever dies without leaving means enough to pay for becoming burial rites, shall be buried at the cost of the gild.'

MARCUS N. TOD.