ASLAK ROSTAD

HUMAN TRANSGRESSION – DIVINE RETRIBUTION

A STUDY OF RELIGIOUS TRANSGRESSIONS AND PUNISHMENTS IN
GREEK CULTIC REGULATIONS AND LYDIAN-PHRYGIAN
RECONCILIATION INSCRIPTIONS

Doctorate thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of the Dr. Art. degree
Department of Classics, University of Bergen

Contents

Ch. 3. Prohibitions and punishments in Greek cultic regulations

Ch. 4. The reconciliation inscriptions and their religious context

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations of names and works of ancient authors follow *The Liddell and Scott Greek-English Lexicon.* As far as possible, abbreviations of periodicals follow the standard of *L'année philologique.*

ABSA	*The Annual of the British School at Athens.*
AMS	*Asia Minor Studien.*
AncW	*The Ancient World.*
Anz. Ak. Wien	*Anzeiger d. Österr. Akademie d. Wissensch.,* Wien.
Arch. Eph.	*Ἀρχαιολογικὴ ἐφημέρις.*
Ath. Mitt.	*Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Institutes: Athenische Abteilung.*
BCH	*Bulletin de correspondance hellénique.*
BICS	*Bulletin (University of London. Institute of Classical Studies).*
BWK	*Die Beichtinschriften Westkleinasiens* (= Petzl 1994/*EA* 22).
CCIS	*Corpus Cultus Iovis Sabazii* (= Lane 1985 & 1989).
CIG	*Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum* (= Boeckh 1828-1877)
CMRDM	*Corpus Monumentorum Religionis Dei Menis* (= Lane 1971, 1975 & 1976).
C. Th.	*Codex Theodosianus.*
DNP	*Der neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike.*
DT	*Defixionum Tabellae* (= Audollent 1904).
EA	*Epigraphica Anatolica.*
GRBM	*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine monograph,* Durham.
IC	*Inscriptiones Creticae* (= Guarducci 1950).
I.Delos	*Inscriptions de Délos* (= Roussel & Launey 1937).
I.Ephesos	*Die Inschriften von Ephesos* (= Wankel 1979).
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae.*
IGR	*Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas pertinentes.*
IGSK	*Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien.*

I.Lindos	*Lindos – Fouilles et recherches 1902-*1914 II, Inscriptions. (= Blinkenberg 1941).
I.Rhod.Per.	*Die Inschriften der rhodischen Peraia* (= Blümel 1991/*IGSK* 38).
I.Smyrna	*Die Inschriften von Smyrna* (= Petzl 1987/*IGSK* 24,1).
I.Tralleis	*Die Inschriften von Tralleis und Nysa* (= Poljakov 1989).
JbAC	*Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum.*
JHS	*Journal of Hellenic Studies.*
JÖAI	*Jahreshefte des österreichischen archäologischen Institutes in Wien.*
JRA	*Journal of Roman Archeology.*
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies.*
LGS	*Leges Graecorum Sacrae* (= von Prott and Ziehen 1896 & 1906).
LSCG	*Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques* (= Sokolowski 1969).
LSAM	*Lois Sacrées de l'Asie Mineure* (= Sokolowski 1955).
LSS	*Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques, supplément* (= Sokolowski 1962).
MAMA	*Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiquae.*
NGSL	*New Greek Sacred Laws* (= Lupu 2005).
RA	*Revue archéologique.*
RE	*Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft (Pauly-Wissowa).*
REG	*Revue des études grecques.*
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum.*
SGDI	*Sammlung de griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften* (= Collitz & Bechtel 1905).
SO	*Symbolae Osloenis: Norwegian Journal of Greek and Latin Studies.*
Syll.	*Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum.*
TAM	*Tituli Asiae Minoris.*

FOREWORD

This thesis is the continuation of my Master thesis, "Å falle i en levende guds hender – En språklig og religionshistorisk studie av de lydiske og frygiske 'bekjennelses-innskriftene'" submitted to the the University of Bergen in 2000.[1] There are several persons who deserve acknowledgements for help and support during my work on this thesis. First I would like to thank my tutors, professor Tomas Hägg and professor Ingvild Sælid Gilhus at Institute for Classics, Russian and Religion, University of Bergen. I am also grateful to assisting Professor Tor Hauken, now Dean of the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Stavanger, who first introduced me to the world epigraphy in general and the reconciliation inscriptions in particular.

I would also like to thank The Faculty of Arts at The University of Bergen for granting me a scholarship and a position as research fellow from 2002 to 2006. I am also grateful for scholarly support from the participants of PROAK research program at Institue for Classics, Russian and Religion. During the work on this study I have visited The University of Oxford twice. Professor Stephen J. Harrison has been of great help to me getting status as academic visitor at Corpus Christi College from March 1st to June 1st 2005, University of Oxford. Professor Robert Parker has kindly commented upon my views during my visits in Oxford. Richard Gordon read and commented on large parts of my study. This was of great value. I am also grateful to assisting professor at IKRR Mathilde Skoie has read and commented upon this thesis in the final stages of my work.

My colleges at Institute of Classics, Russian and Religion have been of great value both scholarly and socially: Matti Wiik, Liv Ingeborg Lied, Karl Johan Skeidsvoll, Thea Selliaas Thorsen, Lene Dåvøy, Gina Dahl, Martin Paulsen, Yngvar Steinholt, Sissel Undheim, Hugo Lundhaug, Jonas Bjørnebye, Gjert Vestrheim, Kåre Johan Mjør and Vebjørn Kirkesæther, and everybody working at the Institute for Classics, Russian and Religion, University of Bergen.

I would also like to thank my friends Morten Mongstand and Kristin Dancke, and my parents, my sister Maja, Rune A. Grimstad and Nora Louise.

---

[1] Rostad 2000.

Chapter 1

EARLIER RESEARCH ON THE RECONCILIATION INSCRIPTIONS AND AIMS OF THE STUDY

A. Introduction

The so-called 'confession inscriptions' of ancient Asia Minor have challenged scholars for nearly a century following Franz S. Steinleitner's famous thesis on confession and religious justice published in 1913. Since then the distinctiveness and peculiarity of these texts have been emphasised and they have been viewed as detached from other forms of ancient religiosity, especially traditional Greek religion. Instead these texts have been interpreted as expressions of Oriental beliefs and notions - based on the claim that the inscriptions record the confessions of sinners, a practice unknown to ancient Greek religion - but often without specifying what the terms 'Oriental' or 'Greek' imply.

There can be no doubt that these inscriptions represent a form of religious expression not found anywhere else than in certain parts of Asia Minor for a limited period of history (ca. AD 80 – 260).[1] But the fact that the texts are formulated in an unusual way does not prove that the beliefs and notions they express are completely alien to the ancient religious landscape and do not overlap with religious practices we find in cults which usually fall under the traditional category 'Greek religion'. After all, few if any religious and cultural expressions can be understood in isolation from a wider context of beliefs and rituals. In this study it is argued that what I shall henceforth call the 'reconciliation' inscriptions can be understood as part of a general religiosity, which may be referred to as Greek religion, or, since the inscriptions occurred only during Roman imperial times, Greco-Roman religion.

The reconciliation inscriptions tell stories of unacceptable actions. As a consequence, they refer to the fact that ancient societies, like any other society, defined certain beliefs and actions as unacceptable. Boundaries were thereby created which

---

[1] For an introduction to the genre, see Ch. 4, 142-153.

defined people who were accepted as members of the order of society and those who were not. A useful distinction in this respect is internal and external boundaries (see Ch. 2). External boundaries relate to 'the other'; i.e. those who *per se* were defined as outside the society and who could never become full members of it. Our concern is however the internal boundaries, which defined actions that were to be avoided by those who were members of the community. Those who transgressed these boundaries were placed outside the social order but often with some possibility of regaining their former status.

The cultic and religious sphere is an aspect of ancient society where the distinction between acceptable and unacceptable behaviour is especially evident. It is also an area where this distinction is often formally defined by laws and regulations. Areas specifically set aside for the gods were found in different forms, the most obvious being the sacred precinct of Greek temples. The common Greek word for this area was τέμενος, a word derived from the same stem as the verb τέμνω, meaning to 'cut' or 'divide'.[2] The ancient Greeks themselves accordingly understood the sacred precinct as 'cut off' from ordinary life in the everyday world which implies that a special code of conduct and behaviour was maintained there. Behaviour within sacred spaces was often regulated by laws that have been passed down to us through the epigraphic genre usually referred to as 'sacred laws', or 'cultic regulations' as they will be called in the present study (see Ch. 3). It is possible to follow the development of the Greek understanding of sacred space at least back to the 5th century BC.[3]

While the reconciliation inscriptions tell stories of people who have failed to observe the religious behavioural code and must face the consequences of their actions, the cultic regulations give insight in which actions were regarded as unacceptable in cultic contexts, why they were regarded as unacceptable and which sanctions a perpetrator would face. In the present study, these two epigraphic genres will be analysed and compared in order to establish which notions concerning acceptable and unacceptable behaviour they express.

The present study seeks to contribute to a further understanding of the reconciliation inscriptions as a Greco-Roman phenomenon and thereby to extend the

---

[2] *LSJ* s.v. τέμνω.

[3] E.g. *LSCG* 111; 150A; *LSS* 49; 128.

perspective beyond the one-sided claim of Oriental origin. It is therefore the conception of *religious transgression* found in the reconciliation inscriptions that is the object of this study and not their origin. The reasons for this will be clarified below. First, the questions asked about the ideology, cult and purpose of the genre will be presented, followed by a thesis proposal for the present comparative study of reconciliation inscriptions and Greek cultic regulations.

2. What are the reconciliation inscriptions?

The function of the reconciliation inscriptions was no doubt complex and they may be interpreted on several levels. Here three levels of interpretation are offered: a) The ideological level includes notions concerning the relationship between god and man; b) the cultic level concerns the kind of cult the reconciliation inscriptions were parts of; and c) the sociological level establishes the reasons why men and women in ancient Anatolia found it important to raise these inscriptions.

a. The ideological level

It is obvious that diseases and violent death could be interpreted as divine punishments in ancient Lydia and Phrygia. What does this idea tell us about the relationship between men and gods, and what were the dedicators of reconciliation inscriptions hoping to achieve?

b. The cultic level

The reconciliation inscriptions are mostly frustratingly silent concerning how the cult to which they belonged was conducted. Nowhere do we find a complete account of how the perpetrators approached their gods in order to regain their status, health or well-being. There are, however, a few hints in some of the inscriptions. First of all, these texts are dedicatory inscriptions. They are written as tokens of gratitude for fulfilled prayers of healing and propitiation. This means that in most cases they were raised after healing was achieved. The process that would end with a reconciliation inscription started with disease.

An important aspect of this process was therefore to praise the god and to make his power publicly known. The question we must ask is whether the Lydians and

Phrygians who raised these inscriptions believed that they were obliged to do so out of the mere idea of omnipotent and punishing deities, or whether raising a reconciliation inscription was done as a response to an extraordinary situation. If so, what was this situation?

Furthermore, what role did the ideas and practices of the reconciliation inscriptions play in Lydian-Phrygian religion? Is it correct to assume that the ideology behind these texts tell us something fundamental about how Lydian and Phrygian worshippers approached their gods, or did they have other means of communicating with them? If so, how do the reconciliation inscriptions relate to other religious expressions?

As will be shown below, it has long been discussed what part the priests played in the process of raising a reconciliation inscription: on the one hand Zingerle claimed that priests issued accusations, conducted trials and punished transgressors, whilst on the other hand E. N. Lane suggested that the priests only had a ceremonial role in the process.[4] If we assume that Lydian and Phrygian religion was marked by beliefs in divine supremacy, it is reasonable to assume that priests were considered intermediaries of the gods. But were they? Priests are after all rarely mentioned in the reconciliation inscriptions, and we would expect that if they had the prominent positions as assumed they would not hesitate to display their power and competence, above all in the reconciliation inscriptions, which allegedly were one of the most obvious signs of their authority. How was the cult of which the reconciliation inscriptions were a part conducted, and which role did the priests play in it?

c. The sociological level

It is not surprising that a society regarded some actions as unacceptable and that those who committed them had to face a response or punishment. Nor is it surprising that gods were imagined to punish those who violated the boundaries they were believed to have created; this is a notion attested in most religions. It is more interesting to ask why the reconciliation inscriptions were written and set up in public at all.

---

[4] Lane 1976 (*CMRDM* III), 38.

I have argued earlier that the syntactical structure of the reconciliation inscriptions places an emphasis on divine power and reconciliation while details of transgressions often are limited or left out entirely.[5] In only a few of the texts do we find expressions like ὁμολογέω[6] or ἐξομολογεομαι,[7] meaning 'admit', most of them from the temple of Apollo Lairbenos. These texts may indeed be called 'confessions' or 'admissions of guilt'. But in the corpus of the reconciliation inscriptions they are exceptions, and it is even more important to note that only three inscriptions actually contain the positive statement 'I confess that …' or 'I admit that …'.[8] The structure of most reconciliation inscriptions is based on three textual elements: an account of a) the transgression, b) divine intervention or punishment and c) reconciliation. My analysis showed that accounts of transgressions are introduced in the text either by dependent sentences marked with the conjunctions ἐπεί (often written ἐπί),[9] or by a participle construction,[10] or in a principal clause.[11] In addition, some inscriptions introduce the account of transgression by the prepositions διά[12] or ὑπέρ[13] followed by an infinitive or a noun. The dependent sentences, the participle constructions and the clauses introduced by the prepositions ἐπεί, διά and ὑπέρ must all be understood as causal clauses subordinated to principal clauses in which the subject is either the deity inflicting punishment or the transgressor performing propitiation. When the transgression is introduced in a principal clause hypotaxis is replaced by parataxis, with the transgression and the intervention of the deity or the attestation of reconciliation being given in coordinate sentences but with a shift of subject. The principal clause governing the subordinated clauses recording transgressions often describes the intervention of the deity using verbs like κολάζω or

---

[5] See Rostad 2002.

[6] *BWK* *68; *100; 106.

[7] *BWK* *3; 43; *109; *111; 112; 116.

[8] *BWK* *100; 106; 116.

[9] *BWK* *3; 4; 6; 7; 9; *13; *17; 19; *37;* 44; 50; 55; *57; *58; *60; *62; 64; *69; 72; 76; *79; *111; 112; 114.

[10] *BWK* *12; *15; *20; *27; *33; *35; 36; *45; *47; *49; *54; *59; *67; *68; *71; *78; *101; *103; *105; *119; 120,

[11] *BWK* *1; 5; *21; *34; *52; *65; *103; 115; 116; *117,

[12] *BWK* 10; *18; 22; 43; *95; 98; 107; *109; 112; *113.

[13] *BWK* *2.

κελεύω, or the acts performed by the transgressor in order to achieve reconciliation. This is often described by verbs like στηλλογραφέω, ἀποδίδωμι, εὐχαριστέω, ἱλάσκομαι, ἀνίστημι or ἀνατίθημι.[14] As we can see, some of these verbs are explicitly referring to the raising of the inscriptions and they often form the principal verb of the text. The dedicator is thus not telling us that he or she confesses his transgressions but that the stele was raised because a transgression was committed and propitiation has now been achieved. Consequently, the term 'confession inscription' should be replaced by a more appropriate one, such as 'reconciliation inscription'.[15]

If, as hinted above, reconciliation inscriptions were only used on special occasions, is there not reason to believe that the people who raised a reconciliation inscription wanted to communicate a special message to an audience? What was this message, apart from the fact that the deity was appeased, why was it so important to communicate it, and who was the audience?

B. Earlier research on the reconciliation inscriptions

1. Introduction

The research on reconciliation inscriptions has gained renewed interest following Georg Petzl's collection of 124 inscriptions published in 1994 (Petzl 1994 = *BWK*), and recent years have seen several new articles on the subject. This study is thus written in dialogue with earlier theories on the purpose and origin of the genre. Consequently, this chapter will first give an introduction to the most important perspectives of earlier research on reconciliation inscriptions and then introduce my own theories and the scope of my study.

Throughout the 20th century, these inscriptions turned up from time to time in articles and books, sometimes as curious examples of ancient religiosity and piety,[16] but

---

[14] See Rostad 2002, 158-159.

[15] C. E. Arnold has recently criticized my suggestion (Arnold 2005, 433, n. 11) arguing that 'reconciliation' implies that the god and the worshipper were reconciled as friends; the most accurate term, according to him, would be 'propitiatory' or 'appeasement inscriptions'. Whichever term is chosen (each has both its merits and its intended connotations), we agree that the purpose of these texts is to stop the god from punishing the dedicator.

[16] E.g. MacMullen 1981, 32.

basically they have been in isolation from Greek religion. However, there have been no systematic, contrastive studies which define the Greek and non-Greek elements of the genre. In my study of earlier research I will only refer to general studies of the reconciliation inscriptions, and not to editions of individual texts. On the basis of this criterion, we may establish the following bibliography: Steinleitner (1913), Zingerle (1926 & 1928), Pettazzoni (1936 & 1967), Varınlıoğlu (1983), Petzl (1988, 1991, 1994 & 1997), Versnel (1991, 1994, 1999 & 2002), Mitchell (1993), Chaniotis (1995, 1997 & 2004), Ricl (1995 & 1997), Klauck (1996), Schuler (1998), Sima (1999), Rostad (2002), Schnabel (2003), Graf (2004), Gordon (2004a & b), Arnold (2005).

2. Perspectives in research on the reconciliation inscriptions

The research on reconciliation inscriptions has been discontinuous, and has until recently followed the lines sketched out in Steinleitner's thesis. There are especially three closely related perspectives which can be traced back to him that have determined the understanding of the reconciliation inscriptions: a) they are confessions of sins; b) they are expressions of an Oriental religiosity that was characteristic of certain parts of Asia Minor and marked by divine interventions in human lives; and c) they are testimonies to a religious legal system alleged to have existed in Asia Minor with priests exercising considerable power over the population.

a. Confession of sin

With his thesis *Die Beicht im Zusammenhange mit der sakralen Rechtspflege in der Antike*, published in Munich in 1913, Franz Seraph Steinleitner was the first scholar to study the reconciliation inscriptions as a genre of their own. Notably, he introduced *Beicht*, 'confession', to describe the content of the texts. Steinleitner's introduction of this term and his claims that there is a coherence of vocabulary in the reconciliation inscriptions and curse tablets from Cnidos have had a decisive impact on later studies. He analysed all the 33 reconciliation inscriptions[17] known at that time, and compared

---

[17] Steinleitner's selection of reconciliation inscriptions corresponds to *BWK* *14; *34; *35; *39; *40; 43; *44; *53; *54; *60; *70; *73; 76; *77; 78; *95; *96; *97; *100; *109; 110; *111; 112; *113; *117; *118; *119; 120; *121; *122; 123. In addition, he lists two inscriptions (Steinleitner 2 & 17 = *TAM* V 1, *463 and *TAM* V 1, *329) which are not included in Petzl 1994.

them with 14 curse tablets from Cnidos. From these sources, Steinleitner developed the theory of a sacred judicial system, *die sakrale Rechtspflege* (see below).

There is no doubt that Steinleitner made many observations that are still relevant for the study of the reconciliation inscriptions. His most important contribution, in addition to establishing the crucial link between reconciliation inscriptions and judicial prayers (below), is his recognition of transgressions described in the inscriptions as primarily being violations against cultic rules and duties. Ἁμαρτία as it is expressed in the reconciliation inscriptions must according to Steinleitner be understood as violations of cultic regulations, and the conception of sin as it is expressed in the inscriptions cannot be detached from the action itself:

> Sie berichten demnach als Sünde Verfehlungen, die sich keineswegs gegen die leibliche oder geistige Wohlfahrt des Nächsten, sondern sämtlich gegen kultische Pflichten und Regeln richten, die ihre nächste Parallele in den Tabubestimmungen anderer kleinasiatischer oder doch von orientalischem Denken beeinflußter Kulte haben.[18]

At the same time it is important for Steinleitner to emphasise the difference between the conception of sin in the reconciliation inscriptions and the Christian notion of sin:

> Der Form nach gleicht dieser Gebrauch von ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμαρτία und ἁμαρτωλός gänzlich dem Gebrauch dieser Termini im Neuen Testamente, in ihrem inneren Sinne aber besteht ein wesentlicher Unterschied. […] Und nirgends tritt [der] Kontrast zwischen Heidentum und Christentum schärfer zutage, als in der Auffassung von ἁμαρτία.[19]

The demand for confession found in some of the Cnidian tablets made Steinleitner conclude that reconciliation inscriptions were products of a sacred legal system. According to Steinleitner, these tablets were the first step in the legal process that would end with the recording of a confession. Curse tablets such as those found at Cnidus are in Steinleitner's opinion impeachments directed at the transgressor. The ritual is described as πιττάκιον διδόναι[20] and its purpose is to force an offender to seek

---

[18] Steinleitner 1913, 91-92.

[19] Steinleitner 1913, 85:

[20] Steinleitner 1913, 100-104.

reconciliation.[21] According to Steinleitner a *pittakion* would be displayed in a shrine, and its mere presence would cause the offender to contact the priest who would sentence him or her to confess guilt and conduct propitiatory rituals.

Even though Steinleitner stresses the importance of confession it is interesting to note that he himself never uses the term *Beicht Inschriften*, 'confession inscriptions', preferring instead *'Sühne Inschriften'*, i.e. reconciliation or atonement inscriptions. Nevertheless, the term 'confession inscriptions' has determined the understanding of the purpose of this genre. The recognition of reconciliation inscriptions as confessions has rarely been questioned and has prevailed as the explanation of the purpose of these texts.[22] Petzl remarks however in the introduction to his collection of reconciliation inscriptions that the term 'confession inscriptions' is somewhat ambiguous and does not apply to all the texts.[23] He also remarks that if one assumes that the inscriptions are products of a tradition stretching over several centuries it is surprising that these inscriptions were only written at a rather late period in history.[24] E. J. Schnabel has also pointed out that some of the inscriptions do not contain any details of the transgressions because their main purpose was to prove the gods' power to punish transgressors. Despite these objections, the interpretation of these texts as confessions has prevailed and been the basis for the next main perspective associated with the reconciliation inscriptions, namely their presumed Oriental origin and nature.

b. Oriental religiosity

The main argument for claiming that the reconciliation inscriptions are expressions of Oriental religiosity has been that they are confessions, a form of religious expression which allegedly was not part of ancient Greek religion. The interpretation of the genre as confessions is probably primarily a result of the lack of comprehensive editions of

---

[21] Steinleitner 1923, 103: "[D]urch den Fluch soll ja der Missetäter zur Sühne gezwungen werden".

[22] Zingerle argues that Steinleitner is wrong in his assumption of ὁμολογεῖν as primarily a word with religious connotations, and claims that the word must be understood as a legal term; Zingerle 1926, 32. For other definitions of these inscriptions as confessions see Pettazzoni 1936, 54-162; 1967, 57; Varınlıoğlu 1983, 85; Frisch 1983, 41-42; Ricl 1995, 68; Schnabel 2003, 166.

[23] Petzl 1994, VII.

[24] Petzl 1994, XVII-XVIII.

the inscriptions, but we may also find some of the reason in a conventional conception of traditional Greek religion. There has always been a tendency to draw absolute dividing lines between Greek and other cultures in the Eastern Mediterranean because Western culture has regarded the former as its origin and ancestor. Greek culture and thought thus represented rationality and reason, while aspects regarded as irrational were explained as Oriental influences.

Among the first scholars who studied the genre there is a clear tendency to disparage the religious sentiments that these texts express. Steinleitner, for instance, describes the notions found in the reconciliation inscriptions as part of a slave mentality:

> In der Auffassung seiner Götter stand der schlichte lydische und phrygische Mann nicht höher wie seine orientalisch-semitischen oder halbsemitischen Nachbarn. Der Orientale übertrug von jeher seine Stellung zum Herrscher, die dem Verhältnis des Sklaven zu seinem Herrn nahe kam, auch in die Religion und das religiöse Leben. Diese Auffassung von der Gottheit als absolute Gebieterin über ihre Verehrer zieht sich durch alle alten orientalischen Religionen. Sie bildet die Grundstimmung der religiösen Vorstellung der Volksstämme vom Tigris bis zum Mittelmeere.[25]

Steinleitner shows clear antipathy towards Lydian religion and claims that the inscriptions must be products of a Lydian-Phrygian *Volksreligion*[26] where the relationship between gods and men is modelled on the relationship between master and slave. The gods are perceived as rulers, worshippers as subjects. Oriental religion, as Steinleitner understands it, is a religion of suppression and theocracy. This explains, according to Steinleitner, why the gods have epithets like βασιλεύς, τύραννος or κύριος. He emphasises that the epithets must have had real consequences and were not a purely conventional way of addressing the gods:

> Eine Folge dieser Anschauung von dem Verhältnisse des Menschen zur Gottheit als dem eines Sklaven oder Untertanen zu seinem Herrn und König war, daß das ganze private und öffentliche Leben unter dem religiösen Gesichtspunkte stand.[27]

---

[25] Steinleitner 1913, 76.

[26] Steinleitner 1913, 76.

[27] Steinleitner 1913, 77.

These notions, Steinleitner argues, are completely foreign to Greek religion.[28] It is quite clear that he creates a hierarchy where Greek notions and thought are ranked higher than Oriental, but nowhere does he define what he means by 'Greek' and 'Oriental', except the vague references to 'Semitic' religion.

Between 1929 and 1936 Raffaele Pettazzoni issued his work *La Confessione dei Peccati* in three volumes, in which he analyses confession of sin as a phenomenon and its history, based on material from various religions. He devoted an entire chapter to the confessional practice of Asia Minor.[29] In an article published in 1953, he summarises his results and traces the practice of confession as described by classical Greek and Latin authors. By referring to the reconciliation inscriptions and the myth of king Midas, he argues that the practice originates from Lydia and Phrygia. Confession, Pettazzoni claims, is particularly important in cults of Oriental goddesses such as Isis, Magna Mater and Dea Syria. He concludes that all evidence from classical authors shows that confession of sins cannot be an original Greek practice:

> To sum up, my detailed researches rather incline me to think that confession of sins, in the
> Greek world as well as among the other Indo-European peoples, did not belong originally
> to the Indo-European element.[30]

Recently, Marijana Ricl has argued that the practice of confession is a reminiscence of Hittite religion – thus Indo-European indeed, but still firmly non-Greek. According to Ricl, the entire temple culture of Lydia and Phrygia is a legacy of the Hittite period, when temples ruled larger areas and the people living there.[31] Ricl admits that her theory poses some problems, but maintains the perspectives of Steinleitner and Pettazzoni:

> […] I regard confessional practice in late-Hellenistic and Roman Anatolia as descended
> from the analogous beliefs and practices of Hittite Anatolia. […] It is true that we have to

---

[28] Steinleitner 1913, 80: "Diese orientalische Auffassung über das Verhältnis von Gott und Mensch, [ist] […] griechischem Denken und Empfinden ganz fremd […]".

[29] Pettazzoni 1936, 54-162.

[30] Pettazzoni 1967, 67.

[31] Ricl 2003.

wait almost 1000 years to get texts in Greek, but this fact does not compromise the theory of continuity […]. [I]t is conceivable that for a long period these rituals were performed orally, in the epichoric languages of Karia, Lydia and Phrygia, before they were finally consigned to stone when the epigraphic habit took root even in remote Anatolian villages. […] In any case, the whole complex has an undeniably Eastern, non-Greek character: Greek religion had no institutional framework for confessional rituals.[32]

Now, however, some scholars have questioned the definition of the reconciliation inscriptions as an isolated Oriental phenomenon. Stephen Mitchell, in his work on Anatolian history, shows that these texts were written in a larger religious context which does not differ significantly from religion performed elsewhere in Anatolia.[33] Angelos Chaniotis too points out that the issues and motives described in the reconciliation inscriptions, such as binding magic, divine punishment, honour and shame were typical beliefs in the ancient world. Chaniotis does not, however, overlook the fact that indigenous traditions must also have played a crucial role in the creation of this practice, for instance the institutional frameworks provided by the Lydian and Phrygian temples.[34] Fritz Graf offers new insights in his article "Confession, Secrecy, and Ancient Societies", arguing that the reconciliation inscriptions are part of a larger pagan complex of beliefs. He points out that divine intervention was commonly used as an explanation for misfortunes,[35] and draws a connection to the first book of the *Iliad* and the propitiation performed by Agamemnon. Recently, Richard Gordon has shown that reconciliation inscriptions follow a narrative pattern widely used in antiquity (below).

c. Theocracy and a religious legal system
The interpretation of the reconciliation inscriptions as confessions and Oriental expressions is closely related to the assumption that they were products of a theocracy

---

[32] Ricl 1999, 36, n. 16.

[33] Mitchell 1995, 194: "[T]he other inscriptions relating to cult activities in these areas […] are essentially identical to those found all over inland Anatolia […]. Given these important broad similarities it is implausible to imagine that the gods of northern Lydia or Apollo Lairbenos played a radically different part in men's life than the gods elsewhere".

[34] Chaniotis 2004, 39-40.

[35] Graf 2004, 262.

with extensive power over the population of Lydia and Phrygia. This view is not unjustifiable given the fact that these texts describe incidents which would be expected to be dealt with in a court and the extensive use of legal vocabulary. Steinleitner claimed that there existed a system of religiously administered courts of law possessing authority to pass sentences in cases of religious offence. Steinleitner assumed that the gods were regarded as judicial authorities passing sentences through their priesthoods, who functioned as intermediaries between gods and humans, and as judges. Steinleitner describes it as

> […] ein Rechtswesen, in dem die Trennung zwischen Recht und Religion sich noch nicht vollzogen hatte. Hier bei einem wenig entwickelten Gerichtswesen gewinnt die oben in kurzen Zügen dargelegte Auffassung des Verhältnisses zwischen Gott und Mensch, bei welchem die Gottheit noch ihre Geltung als oberste Rechtsinstanz und Herrin über Leben und Tod inne hat, durch Heranziehung der Götter in den Rechtsstreit ihre praktische Bedeutung. […] Die Gottheit bzw. ihre Priesterschaft war hier in Glaube und Praxis Trägerin der Rechtssatzungen und der Mittel, Hader und Streit schlichten und Genugtuung verschaffen zu können.[36]

This theory accordingly claims that the inscriptions are records of trials held at the local shrines, where priests acted as representatives of the gods, and passed verdicts in their name. According to Steinleitner, the extensive power of the priests was a consequence of the Oriental ideology expressed in the reconciliation inscriptions where men are portrayed as the gods' subjects or servants (see above, B 1b):

> Ist der Gott der einzige Gebieter und Herrscher auf jedem Lebensgebiete, so ist der Priester nicht mehr bloß der Hüter heiliger Überlieferungen, auch nicht bloß der berufsmäßige Mittler zwischen dem Menschen und der Gottheit, sondern er ist ihr Stellvertreter, der in ihrem Namen befiehlt und alle Lebensäußerungen der Gläubigen beherrscht […].[37]

Steinleitner's theories of a judicial system controlled by priests were supported by the Austrian archaeologist Josef Zingerle in his article "Heiliges Recht" published in 1926.

---

[36] Steinleitner 1913, 100.

[37] Steinleitner 1913, 82.

In this article Zingerle analyses eight of the inscriptions later included in Petzl (1994).[38] Zingerle claims that there are two types of reconciliation inscriptions:[39] The first type are those analysed by Steinleitner, i.e. inscriptions describing violations of cultic regulations. But Zingerle criticises Steinleitner for focusing only on the cultic aspects and claims that the second type of reconciliation inscriptions refers to civic conflicts.[40] In Zingerle's opinion these inscriptions are evidence of the existence of a real and formal legal system, often in opposition to the Roman legal system, controlled by priests who passed sentences not only in religious matters, but also in civil conflicts and criminal cases:

> […] nicht nur einen rein ideell wirksamen Ausfluß orientalischer Mentalität zu erblicken haben […], sondern vielmehr einen greifbaren Niederschlag höchst realer primitiver Rechtsbeziehungen von Gott zu Mensch. […] Als unmittelbare Auswirkung einer nicht nur fiktiven, sondern real betätigten und empfundenen Hoheitsgewalt der Gottheit über ihre Hörigen wird auch ihre Geltung als oberste Rechtsinstanz verständlich […].[41]

Zingerle denies that this judicial system in reality had a civil and profane organisation, and that the divine passing of sentences was only a formality. The divine judicial authority was regarded as real. This system, Zingerle claims, had deep historical roots:

> Kein Zweifel, daß sie in die Zeit zurückreicht, da die kleinasiatischen Tempel noch richtige Lehensherrschaften waren, in denen der Gott als unbeschränkter Eigner von Land und Leuten auch oberster Gerichtsherr war.[42]

By Roman times, this judicial system had become less important, but Zingerle claims that the Roman administration allowed local courts to have jurisdiction over their immediate vicinities. The emperor and his representatives in Asia Minor, meanwhile, were regarded as distant and unable to handle judicial issues.

---

[38] *BWK* *34; *35; *44; *54; *68;* 69; *70; 72; *74.

[39] Zingerle refers to the inscriptions as *Sühneinschriften.* See Zingerle 1926, 29-33.

[40] Zingerle 1926, 31: *irdische Rechtshändel.*

[41] Zingerle 1926, 9-10.

[42] Zingerle 1926, 47,

Like Steinleitner, Zingerle claims that the legal process was initiated by a formal indictment addressed to the deity. This was done by writing a *pittakion* with a curse formula. The opening of the legal process was marked by raising a sceptre (σκῆπτρον), which according to Zingerle was a symbol of the divine judicial power.[43] He finds the relation between sacred and civilian judicial system to be so close that the language used in the reconciliation inscriptions is drawn from civic court proceedings.[44] As an example Zingerle claims that the verb ὁμολογεῖν, which occurs frequently in legal protocols from Hellenistic and Roman times, is only used in a judicial and not in a religious sense.[45]

It is evident that Zingerle's main aim is to rationalise the stories of divine punishment found in the inscriptions. He regards the punishments attested in the reconciliation inscriptions as constructed stories intended to support the priests' right to pass sentences. Zingerle even goes so far as to claim that the stories of the deaths of transgressors can be explained as death penalties executed by these priests.[46]

Zingerle's theories have not gained much support among scholars,[47] while Steinleitner's perspectives still instruct much of the research on the reconciliation inscriptions. The research has therefore often concentrated on the relations between these inscriptions and judicial prayers and on the element of confession. Today this view has it most prominent defender in H. S. Versnel who in several articles has compared the reconciliation inscriptions to the special genre he categorises as 'judicial prayers'. In judicial prayers arguments as to why the gods should act and punish the offender are presented (see Ch. 4, 146-149). Versnel draws a distinction between these tablets and other ancient curse texts, because they do not instruct the deity what to do in a mechanical way, but ask for justice through a humble prayer.[48] This prayer asks the deity to punish an offender, and means that the plaintiff hands over the entire lawsuit to

---

[43] Zingerle 1926, 13.

[44] Zingerle 1926, 31-32.

[45] Zingerle 1926, 32.

[46] Zingerle 1926, 46.

[47] Versnel 1991, 80-81: "Zingerle has gone very far – certainly too far – in his views about a *Priestergericht*, in which priests not only had control of the lawsuit but also carried out punishment".

[48] Versnel 2002, 48-50.

the god, including not only the punishment, but also the reconciliation. The person who is being punished must therefore achieve reconciliation with the deity, and not the person who originally was wronged. This practice may be concentrated in the expression παραχωρέω τῇ θεῷ.[49] Versnel therefore agrees with Steinleitner's observation that the reconciliation inscriptions are responses to accusations or curses:

> We could say that the Cnidian tablets form the opening to a legal proceeding, just like the ἀραί, the πιττάκιον, and the πινακίδιον in the confession inscriptions, while the confession inscriptions themselves describe the course and the conclusion of the whole lawsuit.[50]

Nevertheless, Versnel rejects Steinleitner's and Zingerle's theories of a formally organised judicial system under the control of priests.

The first person to formulate a critique of Steinleitner's and Zingerle's theories was Otto Eger who published his article in 1939. Eger concentrates on the issues of perjury and curse magic, and the claims that every reconciliation inscription is a result of a formal accusation. Eger draws a distinction between the use of a *pittakion* and a *skēptron*, and claims that a *pittakion* was used only when the name of the offender was known, while a *skēptron* was used when the offender was unknown. In addition, Eger points out that the formula πιττάκιον διδόναι is only found in one of the reconciliation inscriptions (*BWK* *60),[51] and that there is no evidence that there were actual trials conducted by priests. Eger claims that if an offender or transgressor became ill or died, this was later interpreted as a divine punishment, maybe without any involvement of priests. Eger therefore draws the conclusion that there is no evidence for the existence of a sacred legal system:

> Soweit das geringe Material ein Urteil zuläßt, werden wir sonach nicht anzunehmen haben, daß ein formelles Verfahren vor dem – weder als ausschließliches noch neben dem ordentlichen, weltlichen Gericht fungierenden – Priestergericht stattgefunden hat. [52]

---

[49] Versnel 1991, 79.

[50] Versnel 1991, 77.

[51] Eger 1939, 290.

[52] Eger 1939, 239,

28

As a consequence of Eger's observations, the role of priests in the process of raising a reconciliation inscription has been one of the main areas of research. Between 1971 and 1978, Eugene N. Lane published all the known sources of the cult of Mēn in four volumes under the title *Corpus monumentorum religionis dei Menis* (*CMRDM*). 20 reconciliation inscriptions related to the cult of Mēn later found in Petzl (1994) are included in this work.[53] Like his predecessors, Lane emphasises the relationship between reconciliation inscriptions and judicial prayers, and focuses also on the ritual of raising the *skēptron*.[54] This ritual was, according to Lane, a sign of divine intervention in human conflicts, but he also stresses perjury as one of the most important reasons why secular issues are mentioned in the inscriptions. He claims that it is important to note how quickly the punishment occurs and how severe it can be.[55] Lane does not accept the theories of a sacred legal system because there are no sources to sustain this. On the contrary, he suggests there are reasons to believe that the punishment occurred more or less automatically:

> Nowhere […] do we find the slightest hint of the priest serving as a real intermediary between god and man. […] All […] seems to happen by itself, in a direct relationship between worshipper and deity. The priest's role still seems to be very restricted, and his functions, perhaps, purely ceremonial.[56]

There is, according to Lane, no evidence whatsoever in the reconciliation inscriptions or in any other source that this sacred legal system ever existed.[57]

The idea of a religious legal system is today rejected by most scholars. I have already mentioned Ricl's theory of a Hittite origin of the reconciliation inscriptions. Even though Ricl develops the theory put forward by Pettazzoni she rejects the idea that

---

[53] *BWK* *3; *35; *39; *40; *49; 50; *51; *53; *54; *57; *60; *61; *68; *69; *70; 76; *77; *80; *100; *101.

[54] *CMRDM* III, 27: ἐπεστάθη σκῆπτρον.

[55] *CMRDM* III, 29-30.

[56] *CMRDM* III, 38.

[57] For a similar view, see Mitchell 1995, 194: "Ἱερεῖς commonly appear in the village inscriptions of Anatolia but never as figures of great importance and their presence was by no means essential for regulating men's relations with the gods".

actual trials against transgressors took place in Maionian temples, suggesting that priests were only consulted after the punishment had occurred, and that the legal terminology found in some of these inscriptions[58] must be regarded as metaphorical. A similar position is taken by Chaniotis (below).

d. Trails in recent research

Following Georg Petzl's collection of reconciliation inscriptions issued in 1994 several scholars have taken an interest in the genre. Some of them have already been mentioned, such as M. Ricl. Many of the articles published after Petzl's collection seem to seek a key to explain the origin of these texts. This is a trail often followed by theologians who analyse the genre in relation to early Christianity. Hans-Josef Klauck, for instance, draws parallels between the reconciliation inscriptions and tales of miracles in the New Testament. He does not pretend to prove direct influence in any direction, but argues that there may have been a common understanding of penance. He rejects however the possibilities of Christian influence, even though possible Jewish elements may have led to some common terms in the two traditions.[59] Klauck analyses various motives in the reconciliation inscriptions such as transgression, punishment, confession and atonement, and compares them to corresponding motives in the New Testament. He concludes that the reconciliation inscriptions differ from the healing inscriptions found at Epidauros, while there are reasons to assume that the concept of δύναμις is used in a similar way in the reconciliation inscriptions and in the New Testament. Klauck thus suggests that further enquiries should focus on this concept, but argues that in the New Testament it is used metaphorically, while it is used in a concrete manner in the reconciliation inscriptions.

An example of a scholar who pursues a single explanation of the reconciliation inscriptions is Eckhard J. Schnabel who in his article "Divine tyranny and public humiliation: a suggestion for the interpretation of the Lydian and Phrygian confession inscriptions"[60] suggests a new approach to the relatively short history of the

---

[58] Ricl 1995, 72. Ricl is her referring to *BWK* 5. For her rejection of trials supervised by priests, see Ricl 2003, 101.

[59] Klauck 1996, 69.

[60] Schnabel 2003.

reconciliation inscriptions. Schnabel, who also assumes that the inscriptions must be read as confessions,[61] points out that the theory that these inscriptions are products of a long confessional practice is in conflict with the sudden appearance of written confessions. He suggests that they should rather be explained by the local priests' need to strengthen and reconsolidate their authority. Schnabel assumes that this authority was threatened by the rise of Christianity in Asia Minor which coincided historically with the reconciliation inscriptions.[62] By changing the perspective from continuity to historical processes and changes Schnabel represents a new turn in the research on reconciliation inscriptions which might prove fruitful and deserves recognition, even though he himself admits that his theory cannot be proven.[63]

An opposite view is taken by Clinton E. Arnold who uses the reconciliation inscriptions to explain why Paul so quickly was able to gain adherents in Galatia and why they so soon turned away from him and joined the Jewish-Christian movement. Arnold's answer is that the harsh religious ideology of Asia Minor provided an attentive audience to Paul's message of a merciful God and forgiveness of sin which would guarantee freedom from strict ritual requirements and propitiation.[64] When Jewish-Christian missionaries later came to Galatia and claimed that observation of the Torah was a requirement for salvation, this would have been quite comprehensible to the Galatians who were accustomed to similar ritual rules.[65] Arnold bases his hypothesis on the assumption that the reconciliation inscriptions represent a form of piety common to most of Anatolia,[66] but admits that no such inscriptions are located in Galatia.[67] Several objections may be made against Arnold's theories. For instance, he assumes, like many scholars before him, that the reconciliation inscriptions are at the core of Lydian and Phrygian religion, and thereby fails to see that they probably were used for a specific

---

[61] Schnabel 2003, 165-169.

[62] Schnabel 2003, 182-188.

[63] Schnabel 2003, 187.

[64] Arnold 2005, 444: "For all the people converted from a background in the central Anatolian cults, the Pauline gospel must have provided an exhilarating experience of freedom".

[65] Arnold 2005, 446.

[66] Arnold 2005, 430.

[67] Arnold 2005, 436.

purpose, namely desperate illness. There are also too many poorly based assumption to make his theories convincing.

Angelos Chaniotis has discussed the reconciliation inscriptions in several articles and has among other aspects analysed their extensive use of judicial vocabulary.[68] Chaniotis lists and analyses the more than 50 judicial terms found in the reconciliation inscriptions:

> Die Verwendung eines derartigen Vokabulars läßt keinen Zweifel, daß die Priester des Wortschatzes und der Institutionen des griechischen und z.T. des römischen Rechtes kundig waren, die Sühneinschriften mit Angelegenheiten des profanen Rechtes eng zusammenhängen und folglich die Heiligtümer eine gewisse Rolle in Rechtsgeschäften spielten.[69]

Chaniotis claims that this is not, however, evidence that actual court sessions were held in Lydian temples. Judicial vocabulary is, for instance, widely attested in curse texts where it is clearly to be taken in a metaphorical sense. Chaniotis also points out that the even though some of the references to negotiations and claims of ignorance from the transgressor bear resemblances to legal procedures, such as speeches of defence, there are no indication that these were given as part of a real trials.[70] Chaniotis admits that the Lydian temples played a significant part in the lives of the village citizens,[71] but rejects the belief held by many scholars that they replaced the profane judicial system altogether. According to him, this practice must have supplemented regular courts, and not replaced them. Chaniotis points out that the Roman administration was also present in remote areas of the Empire, and that serious crimes such as murder are never mentioned in the reconciliation inscriptions, probably because these would have been handled by Roman courts. The use of judicial and legal vocabulary, Chaniotis claims, indicates that profane authorities were taken very seriously.

---

[68] Chaniotis 1997.

[69] Chaniotis 1997, 357.

[70] Chaniotis 1997, 362.

[71] Chaniotis 1997, 370: "Die Tempel waren für sie Banken, Arbeitgeber, Krankenhäuser, ganz natürlich auch Ansprechpartner in Fragen des täglichen Rechtes".

In his article "Divine justice", Chaniotis points out that if there were formally indictments of religious transgressions, it is just as probable that these came from the community as from the priests.[72] Reconciliation inscriptions are, according to Chaniotis, a way of making the annulments of binding spells or appeasements of divine wrath publicly known. He gives a highly convincing picture of how and why this cult was conducted. In his view, even though it is correct that Lydian and Phrygian temples and priests played a role in legal disputes and that the vocabulary of the reconciliation inscriptions demonstrates knowledge of legal terms, this practice was not a competitor of or substitutes for the secular judicial system.[73] The entire complex of transgressions, judicial prayers, and reconciliation must, according to Chaniotis, be analysed within a larger context of ancient piety, in which worshippers were expected to address their gods in order to attain benefits.[74] Chaniotis shows how the process leading to the erection of a reconciliation inscription was very much a matter of financial transactions. Those who believed they were being punished by the gods could pay priests, who would then conduct rituals, give advice concerning propitiation, or annul oaths or judicial prayers.[75] This analysis is more sound and reasonable than some of those offered by other scholars, but Chaniotis probably overestimates the importance and frequency of the rites of propitiation when he claims that every misfortune of daily life was interpreted as divine punishment.[76]

In two recent articles, Richard Gordon rejects the notion of tracing the origins of reconciliation inscriptions,[77] and instead analyses their narrative structure and function in Lydian society. Due to the lack of sources, Gordon also rejects the idea of theocracy and explains the descriptions of gods as rulers or owners of villages as primarily

---

[72] Chaniotis 2004, 13.

[73] Chaniotis 2004, 40: "The relationship between secular and divine justice resembles the relationship between divine healing and secular medicine. That many sick persons made vows in the sanctuaries begging for divine cure does not mean that they did not visit medical doctors; in many cases we know for sure that they did both".

[74] Chaniotis 2004, 32.

[75] Chaniotis 2004, 34-38.

[76] Chaniotis 2004, 42. See Ch. 4 for other aspects of Lydian religion.

[77] Gordon 2004a, 198.

metaphorical.[78] According to Gordon, the reconciliation inscriptions offered a means of maintaining social and moral order, but also of ending conflicts and become reintegrated as a respectable member of society after committing wrongful acts. For Gordon, 'social control' is not necessarily a suppressive mechanism but "the totality of means, formal and informal, by which functional social norms are locally legitimated and instilled".[79] The reconciliation inscriptions must, Gordon argues, be seen as answers to a 'social script' where illness might be interpreted as a result of wrongdoing and where the *oikos* is seen as a 'socio-moral' unity.[80] As a consequence, one ran the risk of harming one's own family and household by committing wrongful acts.

Gordon's analysis of the narrative structure of the reconciliation inscriptions is in my view one of the most important contributions to the research on these texts. The stories of transgressions are, according to Gordon, multilayered and will in general contain the following elements: 1) the provocation; 2) the punishment; 3) the *anagnorisis*, i.e. realisation of why the punishment has been inflicted; and 4) the *lysis*, which is the re-establishment of the moral order.[81] Gordon draws the following conclusion on this narrative pattern:

> As my choice of the term *anagnorisis* acknowledges, the first three moments in this narrative pattern are widespread in religious contexts in antiquity, not merely in Greek tragedy but in patterns of divine anger in Homer and Hesiod; in Herodotus, and in the 'historical' narratives designed to reinforce notions of Greek piety. Its function is to integrate the natural and the moral orders in such a way that the latter appears not a social construction but as itself part of 'the fabric of things'.[82]

On the one hand, these narratives must be read as warnings against committing faults. This is what Gordon terms a 'social script'. When temples adopted the 'social script' and offered oracular services and rituals of propitiation they created a 'temple script'. By applying to the temple script the author could regain his or her position within the

---

[78] Gordon 2004a, 195.

[79] Gordon 2004a, 193.

[80] Gordon 2004a, 197.

[81] Gordon 2004b, 189-190.

[82] Gordon 2004b, 190.

34

moral order. On the other hand, they must also be seen, at least partly, as the transgressors own version of the incidents. The temple script was open to negotiation and alteration in order to serve the transgressor's interests. Gordon shows by using several examples that the reconciliation inscriptions do not merely express acceptances of the temple script but often create a balance between the temple script and the authors own self-justification. Accordingly, the transgressions may be presented as involuntary or the author shows that he or she was forced to commit them due to special circumstances:

> The institution of the confession-*stela* thus afforded a means of negotiation, not indeed with the god, who has only one grand thought: the re-equilibration of the moral order, but at least with the implied reader, and thus indirectly with the real community, where actual readers are to be found. The most obvious form of this negotiation is the suggestion that one was acting out of ignorance.[83]

Gordon argues that due to the epigraphic habit of Asia Minor in the first three centuries AD, a 'quasi-public realm' was created where gossip and conflicts between human beings, households or within households were transformed into a religious issue. By explaining incidents of illness as consequences of ritual transgressions the focus shifts from human controversies to "the level of ritual offence which affected no one directly (but perhaps everyone potentially)",[84] as well as identifying the cause of disease and a cure.

3. Conclusions

We have followed the research on the reconciliation inscriptions from Steinleitner's thesis to Gordon's narrative analysis. Following G. Petzl's edition there has been a marked shift in the approaches and aspects applied on the study of these texts. Whereas earlier scholars have emphasised the distinctiveness and peculiarity of the genre, modern research attempts to analyse it as part of ancient religiosity. Gradually, the focus has shifted from a question of origin to a question of function. As modern research has questioned or deconstructed categories like 'Greek', 'Oriental', 'pagan', 'Jewish' and

---

[83] Gordon 2004b, 193.

[84] Gordon 2004b, 194.

'Christian',[85] combined with a higher awareness of how religious traditions interact, it is today better equipped to understand *how* and *why* ancient religious practices were performed. Some modern scholars are still, however, searching for the origin of the reconciliation inscriptions. There are, as will be pointed out below, serious difficulties with this pursuit, in particular the lack of relevant sources. As a consequence, the present study seeks to analyse the notions expressed in these texts.

C. Aims of the study

1. General remarks

As we have seen from the survey in Ch. 1, research on the reconciliation inscriptions has only recently begun to focus on their relationship with broader patterns in ancient religious mentality or sought to establish the narrative patterns behind these texts. Reconciliation inscriptions provide an insight into a religious ideology in which actions had consequences. Most of the transgressions described in the reconciliation inscriptions are actions deemed unacceptable in a cultic context, or more precisely on cultic land or inside a shrine.[86] An explicit or implied code of behaviour within sanctuaries is a feature of most cultures, both ancient and modern. In Greek cults proper behaviour was regulated through laws which have come down to us in the form of inscriptions usually referred to by the somewhat imprecise term 'sacred laws' (see Ch. 3). Reconciliation inscriptions, on the other hand, contain stories of violations against a code of proper behaviour in cultic contexts. As a consequence of this, these epigraphic genres may be analysed as two aspects of an ancient code of proper cultic behaviour, which I have termed 'cultic morality' (see Ch. 2). The main question is therefore how the transgressions recorded in the reconciliation inscriptions relate to prohibitions found in Greek cultic regulations. Which acts were forbidden, and what were the consequences of breaking the rules of conduct within a shrine?

---

[85] See for instance Smith 1978, 1982, 1990.

[86] Chaniotis 2004, 4: "The offences recorded are primarily of a religious nature: disregard of purity regulations (e.g. consumption of forbidden food, entering the sanctuary with unclean clothes or unwashed, sexual intercourse), insult of the god by ignoring their commands, offences against sacred property and perjury".

36

A relatively large portion of the reconciliation inscriptions refer to so-called judicial prayers. In these texts the theme is human conflicts (see below). Why were both religious transgressions and human conflicts treated by the obviously same institutions and recorded in the same type of inscriptions? Below I will discuss two issues important in the approach to reconciliation inscriptions, namely the distinction between Greek and Oriental religiosity which is recurrent topic of the earlier debate and the question of judicial prayers and perjury which directly concerns the contents of the reconciliation inscriptions.

a. Greek or Oriental religiosity

In my study, the ideology of proper ritual conduct expressed by the reconciliation inscriptions will be compared to the corresponding attitude found in Greek cultic regulations in order to question the common notion that reconciliation inscriptions represent an Oriental kind of religiosity. Do for instance Greek cultic regulations claim that transgressions against the gods will invoke their wrath and cause the transgressor to suffer, and if they do, how are these notions expressed?

The entire concept of 'Oriental' cults has been proven to be misleading, in the sense that it is no longer possible to draw absolute demarcations between Greek and Oriental culture. Several gods and cults have been placed in the very broad and usually very vague category of 'Oriental religion', but scholars have recently challenged the notion of a clear distinction between cults of Greek and of 'Oriental' origin;[87] it is clear that the term must be used with caution. It is sufficient to mention the examples of Dionysos and the mystery cults, which both have been explained as results of Oriental influences. We now know that the name of Dionysos has been attested in the Linear B tablets from Pylos dated to ca. 1250 BC,[88] and mystery cults seem to have been integrated into mainstream religiosity to a larger extent than previously assumed. Another example with direct reference to the reconciliation inscriptions is the tendency to regard certain beliefs or practices, such as kneeling, portrayal of the believer as a

[87] Lane Fox 1988, 35: "[C]lear oppositions between "Eastern" and "traditional" cult are no longer convincing, and the very category of Oriental religion has been severely reduced in significance". See also Martin 2004, 38, n. 4.

[88] See Burkert 1985, 162; Faraone 1993, 1.

servant of the god, or prayers for mercy as late influences from Oriental cultures. H. W. Pleket has shown that such rituals and beliefs were part of Greek religion at a much earlier point in history than hitherto assumed.[89] He points out that humiliating acts became more widespread during Roman rule, partly due to political centralization. Such acts were used in classical Greek religion, but primarily in situations of crisis, such as serious disease. Yet Pleket makes an exception for the confession of sins, which he claims has no equivalent in Greek religion, and concludes that the reconciliation inscriptions must be a local Oriental phenomenon:

> Despite the increasing verticality in the relationship between deity and worshipper in the Greek religiosity of the votive inscriptions we hardly ever encounter references to a strong awareness of sin which leads the sinner to 'confession of sins' and thus to reconciliation with the wrathful, powerful deity. This last group of emotions (sin-divine wrath-punishment-confession-atonement) is to be found exclusively in the so-called Lydian-Phrygian 'confession-inscriptions' and can be regarded as a contribution of Oriental religiosity.[90]

I disagree with Pleket on this point. This quotation shows the influence that concepts like '*Beicht*' or 'confession' have had on the interpretation of the genre. As argued above, these texts are not primarily confessions, but rather recordings of achieved reconciliation and redefinition of the transgressor within the context of morality and piety. Consequently, this argument for the Oriental nature of the reconciliation inscriptions is no longer convincing.

The classification of phenomena as either 'Greek' or 'Oriental' mainly tells us, I suspect, about how scholars imagined, or how they wanted, ancient Greece to be. A common argument is that Greek authors, who are regarded as authorities, reject certain practices or cults.[91] This view implies that certain things are genuinely Greek, while others are not. But Oriental influences were not something that occurred only after the conquests of Alexander the Great; Greek culture had always been interacting with

---

[89] Pleket 1981.

[90] Pleket 1981, 156.

[91] On asceticism rejected by Plutarch and Epictetos, see Dodds 1965, 27-36. On confession, see Pettazzoni 1967.

neighbouring cultures. Some scholars even claim that Oriental influences were a decisive element in the creation of archaic Greek culture.[92] According to Dale Martin, in his article on *deisidaimonia,* the view that the ancient Greek world was marked by a scientific and rational rejection of superstitious irrationality must be understood as a defence of the scholars' own constructions.[93] We can view the classification of certain elements of ancient culture as 'Oriental' in the same way: it is an attempt to safeguard one's own picture and construction of ancient Greek culture; a construction that plays an important part in modern Western culture's conception of itself. In addition, a mere identification of the genre of reconciliation inscriptions as 'Oriental' does not provide a satisfactory explanation for the role of these texts in the culture in which they were written.

On the other hand, a rejection of the claim that reconciliation inscriptions are 'Oriental' must not lead us to the simplistic conclusion that they are 'Greek' without asking what this implies. If the demarcation between Greek and Oriental religion is questioned it means that neither of the categories can be regarded as absolute. As a consequence, it would be equally meaningless to shift the focus and claim that the reconciliation inscriptions must be 'Greek'. We should therefore avoid using the categories 'Oriental' and 'Greek'. My purpose is not to claim an identity in this respect between the reconciliation inscriptions and Greek cultic regulations, but rather to define both differences and similarities.

b. Judicial prayers and perjury

Curse magic and judicial prayers have been the point of departure for most scholars who have studied the reconciliation inscriptions. This is highly justified, because such practices are a major theme of the inscriptions.[94] As I have shown in my survey of research, the punishment as a result of curses or perjury has been comprehensively studied by scholars such as Steinleitner, Zingerle and Versnel.[95] In Petzl's collection of

---

[92] Burkert1992.

[93] Martin 1997, 124.

[94] See Ch. 4, 146-153 for an introduction to this theme.

[95] Versnel 1991, 1994, 1998, 1999.

reconciliation inscriptions, binding magic is the theme of 14 inscriptions,[96] almost exclusively related to what a modern person would identify as a secular conflict, such as theft or disputes over property.

Perjury is closely related to binding and curse magic. As ancient society was primarily based on oral communication, it was crucial to ensure the reliability of an agreement. An oath would precede most important transactions or decisions in order to ensure that promises were kept. It would usually contain invocations of one or several gods as witnesses and a prayer of punishment for those who did not fulfil the oath. As was the case with incidents of religious transgressions and binding magic, reconciliation inscriptions were used to record annulments of unfulfilled oaths. The theme of perjury in the reconciliation inscriptions has not been sufficiently looked at, and needs to be the object of further research. This topic is however only peripheral to the present study.

The issue of judicial prayers being used in cases of human conflicts as it appears in reconciliation inscriptions has proved to be a fruitful approach for many previous studies of the genre. Still, it is a fact that binding spells are only one of several reasons given for the punishment of the transgressor (see note 96) and in all these cases it is clear that the judicial prayer had human causes. How are we to explain the incidents where the transgression is of a religious nature and where there is no mention of any binding spell or *skēptron*? Why are these two categories of transgressions treated in the same genre? Were the gods thought to punish violators of purity rules automatically? This would imply that gods were envisaged as overseeing human beings and their behaviour. If not, how were the risks of being punished by the gods expressed and what does this tell us about the religious ideology of the reconciliation inscriptions.

2. Notes on method

a. The structure of the study

This study intends to compare notions of unacceptable behaviour in cultic contexts as they appear in Greek cultic regulations and Lydian-Phrygian reconciliation inscriptions. In order to establish a general framework for the interpretation and comparison, Ch. 2 will present the main motives, beliefs and notions of how worshippers were expected to

---

[96] *BWK* *3; *13; *17; *20; *21; *28; *35; *44; *47; *59; *60; *68; *69; *79.

behave when taking part in ritual activities, and propose the term 'cultic morality' to designate this behavioural code. The chapter will focus particularly on transgression of boundaries, ritual pollution and cleansing, and protection of sacred property as the main contents of cultic morality. Following this general introduction to the topic, Ch. 3 will trace these motives and notions in a selection of Greek cultic regulations. This chapter gives detailed accounts of prohibited acts or conditions in cults, how these are expressed and what reactions a violator of these rules could expect. Thereafter, the study turns to the reconciliation inscriptions by first introducing the genre, the structure and contents of the inscriptions, and then establishing the religious context in which they were written. This is done in Ch. 4, which studies other religious inscriptions from Catacecaumene, the central area for the production of reconciliation inscriptions. Ch. 5 picks up the thread from Ch. 3, seeking to establish how the religious transgressions accounted for in the reconciliation inscriptions are perceived and described. The final chapter will sum up the main similarities and differences between Greek cultic regulations and Lydian-Phrygian reconciliation inscriptions, and offer a possible explanation as to why the latter texts emphasise divine punishment as the main way of enforcing cultic morality.

b. Time, geography and context

As shown, scholars have tried to establish the origin of the reconciliation inscriptions. The latest contribution to this pursuit is M. Ricl's postulation of a Hittite origin.[97] But even if this genre had a Hittite origin, this would not have helped us to understand why Lydians and Phrygians of the first three centuries AD felt the need to raise these inscriptions. However, a comparison looking for both similarities and differences between the Hittite texts Ricl referrs to and the reconciliation inscriptions would have some merit. There are in some cases reasons to maintain a genealogical perspective, but there must be reasonable nearness in time and space if such claims are to be put forward. A comparison of reconciliation inscriptions and Greek cultic regulations is therefore more justifiable because many of them are nearer in time than the Hittite texts, they are written in the same language and because it is possible to trace a long

---

[97] See p. 23-24 (above).

continuity in Greek cultic regulations. Also the fact that both genres deal with religious transgressions, ritual purity and protection of sacred property makes a comparison justifiable. To establish direct continuity between Classical Greek and 2nd century AD Lydian religion is, as we will see, highly problematic, not at least due to a lack of relevant sources. The comparison conducted in this thesis will accordingly basically be analogous, leaving the possibility of cultural influences and borrowings on a formal level open.

The earliest dateable reconciliation inscription was written in 57/8 AD and the latest in 263/4 AD. To compare these inscriptions with cultic regulations from the 5th or 4th centuries BC is far from unproblematic, and cannot be done without reflecting on the gap of 600 years between these texts. It would also be unreasonable to claim a direct tradition between 5th century BC Athens and 3rd century AD Asia Minor, even though notions and practices found at different historical times and different geographical areas may have some similarities.

On the other hand, it is not unreasonable to suggest that something survives through the centuries. They were of course subject to changes and developments, but both the cultic regulations of classical Greece and the reconciliation inscriptions of Roman Asia Minor were responses to a fundamental question in ancient Greek religion irrespective of historical époque, namely the protection of sacred space and the definition of a code of behaviour accepted in ritual contexts. By comparing the reconciliation inscriptions with cultic regulations from various periods, I believe it is possible to show how this problem was met at different times.

c. Sources

This is not an epigraphic study; rather it is a study of ancient religious notions based on epigraphic sources found in various epigraphic editions. No new evidence or offer of any new readings or restorations of inscriptions already published will be presented in this study. The majority of reconciliation inscriptions selected come from the edition of Georg Petzl issued in 1994 (= *BWK*). The cultic regulations selected for this thesis are all, with one exception (*NGSL* 7), taken from the three volumes by Franciszek Sokolowski: *LSAM*, *LSS* and *LSCG* (see Ch. 3, 87-89). These are still the most

42

comprehensive editions of Greek cultic regulations. The selected texts with translations are are presented in two appendices.

In order to limit the perspective of my study it was necessary to choose a selection of both cultic regulations and reconciliation inscriptions based on three principles. Firstly, the texts must contain rules of proper behaviour in cultic contexts. I have therefore searched for texts which contain words for ritual purity or pollution and sacred property such as ἀγνός, καθαρός, ἄλσος etc. Secondly, the selected texts, in particular the cultic regulations, had to be as representative possible. This does not mean that I have only chosen texts which fit one perspective, but that texts which alone pose too many problems of interpretation have been left out. An example of this is the long (137 lines) and complicated regulation from Kyrene,[98] which differs radically from other Greek cultic regulations and contain regulations which are hard to interpret.[99] The selection is also intended to reflect historical and geographical diffusion and the texts are thus taken from a variety of places and historical periods. Thirdly, texts which are very fragmented have been avoided. As stated, I am looking at the inscriptions as sources for the understanding of religious notions. Consequently, the purpose is not to establish the most accurate text possible. This means that the texts must contain a sufficient amount of preserved and legible text to make them suitable as sources. There should not be too much doubt about the main contents of the text.[100] The following 40 cultic regulations have been selected:

LSAM: 12; 16; 17; 18; 19; 20; 29; 35; 74; 75; 83; 84.

LSS: 33 A; 49; 54; 59; 81; 82; 91; 108; 119; 128.

LSCG: 37; 53; 54; 55; 84; 91; 111; 116; 121; 124; 130; 136; 139; 148; 150 A & B; 152, 171.

NGSL: 7.

These inscriptions are presented with translations in Appendix A.

The reconciliation inscriptions analysed in this study have been selected on the basis of their contents. Basically, all reconciliation inscriptions are subject to analysis in this thesis, but the main focus will be on those texts which describe religious

---

[98] *LSS* 115 (4th century BC).

[99] For an analysis of *LSS* 115, see Parker 1983, 332-351.

[100] E.g. *LSS* *7; *18; *28; *31; *106; *114. *LSCG* *95; *154; *176. *SEG* XXXVI *376.

transgressions. Reconciliation inscriptions containing stories with explicit references to human conflicts, curse magic or judicial prayers have not been included in Appendix B. The same applies to those texts which do not contain any detailed account of the transgression. Apart from this, the same principles used for the selection of Greek cultic regulations apply here. Based on these principles the following 29 reconciliation inscriptions have been included in Appendix B:

> **BWK:** 4; 5; 6; 7; 9; 10; 19; 22; 25; 29; 36; 43; 50; 55; 64; 72; 76; 78; 98; 106; 107; 110; 112; 114; 115; 116; 120; 123; 124.

These inscriptions are presented in Appendix B.

Few inscriptions from Antiquity have come down to us unharmed. Consequently, these texts will in most cases contain lacunas or other damages impairing our understanding of their contents. In addition, there may be other severe obstacles for proper interpretation, such as orthography, omissions, or inaccurately carved letters. Lacunas filled out or passages corrected by epigraphers may be correct, but they may also be wrong. As a consequence, restorations cannot function as sources without critical consideration. If a cited passage from an inscription contains lacunas or restorations made by modern editors, references to these are provided in the footnotes. The texts included in the appendices do not come with an *apparatus criticus*. For further information the reader is referred to Sokolowski's and Petzl's editions.

If reference is given to texts not included in one of the appendices, they are marked with an asterisk (*). All the texts included in the appendices are provided with translations. They are, unless otherwise indicated, my own. For the formulas of legal terms I have consulted Rhodes and Osborne's *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404 – 323 BC*.[101]

3. Concluding remarks

The key to the understanding of the reconciliation inscriptions is not sought in this thesis. There is not one single element explaining why these inscriptions were written in a limited geographical area for a limited period of history. The genre is local, there can be no doubt about that, but if these texts are to be understood better we must compare

---

[101] Rhodes & Osborne 2003.

them to aspects of ancient religiosity which deal with the same issues. It is possible to analyse the reconciliation inscriptions within a wider context of ancient religion. Chaniotis has correctly remarked with reference to the reconciliation inscriptions and judicial prayers, the latter widely attested:

> Studies dedicated to a phenomenon in a particular region sometimes tend to overestimate its singularity; these texts remind us that, despite some particular features of the inscriptions of Asia Minor, the ideas concerning divine justice circulated widely in the ancient Mediterranean (and beyond).[102]

Here it will be argued that this also applies to the religious transgressions recorded in some reconciliation inscriptions.

The reconciliation inscriptions are pagan and thus belong to a large complex of notions, beliefs and practices that existed prior to and simultaneously with the Christian religion. 'Paganism' was never a homogeneous entity as the ancient Mediterranean world never was a homogenous cultural entity, but consisted of cultures with a wide range of different languages, political systems and religious beliefs. By focusing on the peculiarity of the reconciliation inscriptions and refusing any form of comparison with other pagan beliefs and cults scholars have failed to analyse these texts within the frameworks of ancient religiosity. On account of a strict distinction being drawn between 'Greek' and 'Oriental' religion and pervasive neglect of contextualization, the reconciliation inscriptions have become no more than a curious example of ancient beliefs. The present study intends to contribute to a broader understanding of these texts.

---

[102] Chaniotis 2004, 9.

Chapter 2

GREEK CULTIC MORALITY

A. Definition

1. Introduction

a. Definition

As Robin Lane Fox points out, pagan religion has been regarded as being marked by irrationality and anxiety,[1] especially in Hellenistic and Roman times. According to this view the post-classical era was characterized by superstition and magic, and a widespread fear of causing divine wrath. The most prominent spokesman for this view was E. R. Dodds, who introduced the term 'age of anxiety' for the period between the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161–180 AD) and the conversion of Constantine (312 AD).[2] Religious thought, Dodds claimd, emphasised the division between the mundane and the heavenly world. As a result, estrangement and salvation from the hardship, emptiness, and illusions of human life and the physical world became important issues in religions of this period. This explains, according to Dodds, the rise of philosophical schools like Neo-Platonism, the Pythagoreans and Stoicism, and cults like Orphism, Gnosticism, and ultimately Christianity. Dodds attributes these changes in religious thought to changes and uncertainties in the political and economical realities, but he also describes the most radical changes, such as the notion of a radical dualism between the human and the divine world, as being Oriental influences.[3]

Accordingly, research on Greek religion in Hellenistic and Roman time tends to focus on religious innovations and the introduction of new cults. This is entirely reasonable, but an exclusive focus on new aspects may lead us to neglect the fact that traditional rituals, values, and notions were still very much alive long after the fall of the classical Greek city-state, and that traditional cults represented the religiosity of the majority of the ancient population. These cults were basically centred on the sacrificial ritual; every religious event in the ancient world contained one or more sacrifices

---

[1] Lane Fox 1988, 66.

[2] Dodds 1965. See also Dodds 1951.

[3] Dodds 1965, 13.

regardless of what purpose the ritual was meant to fulfil.[4] The healing rituals of the shrines of Asclepius, the mysteries of Eleusis, and the Panathenian festival of Athens, just to mention a few examples, were all centred on a sacrifice. Sacrifice therefore remained at the core of pagan religions until and after Christianity was declared the only tolerated religion. In fact the decree issued by emperor Theodosius in 392 AD was a decree against sacrificial rites.[5] This ritual, first described by Homer,[6] was banned more than a thousand years later. We are therefore dealing with a high degree of continuity in these matters. The structure, meaning and purpose of sacrificial rituals have been comprehensively studied by several scholars. In this chapter I will not focus on the sacrifice itself, but rather on what kind of behaviour was allowed or prohibited within the cultic context in which the sacrificial ritual took place. By analysing vocabulary and motives of acceptable cultic behaviour this chapter seeks to establish an interpretative tool for religious transgressions in Greek religion.

To describe the mode of correct mode of behaviour in cultic contexts, and more specifically inside a sacred precinct, I propose the term 'cultic morality'. This term is intended as an interpretative tool, and not as a description or translation of an ancient

---

[4] See Burkert 1983 & 1985, 54-73. Detienne 1989.

[5] *C. Th.* 16.10.12. The law forbids the sacrifice of animals, wine and incense to idols or *lares* as a crime equal to high treason. The law also forbids the erection of altars, fortune telling and curse magic. The law was repeated and extended in the following years. In 395 Theodosius prohibited any kind of pagan rites and ordered a more severe enforcement of the law (*C. Th.* 16.10.13). The privileges of the pagan priests were abolished in 396 (*C. Th.* 16.10.14), and in 408 the emperor ordered the destruction of idols and altars, and prohibited banquets held at cemeteries. The law also ordered that pagan buildings should be claimed for public use (*C. Th.* 16.10.19). The income and property of pagan temples was confiscated to the benefit of the emperor and the church in 415 (*C. Th.* 16.10.21). In the following year, persons who still followed the pagan religion were denied access to imperial services (*C. Th.* 16.10.21). In 423, two laws were passed demanding that every pagan should be exiled or sentenced to death if they performed sacrificial rites (*C. Th.* 16.10.22-23). The emperor was for a long time reluctant to order the destruction of temples, and in fact issued a law in 399 (*C. Th.* 16.10.18) prohibiting this. In 435, the prohibition of sacrifice was repeated and the emperor ordered all temples to be destroyed and replaced by Christian buildings or monuments (*C. Th.* 16.10.25). See Pharr 1969. Cf. also Lane Fox 1986, 72 and Trombley 1993, 1-97.

[6] There are several descriptions of sacrifice in the Homeric poems. The most famous are *Il.* 1. 436-74 and *Od.* 3. 430-463.

concept. By 'cultic morality' I mean a code of accepted and unaccepted behaviour and conduct in a cultic context imposed on the individual worshipper in order to make him or her fit for participation in the cult, and to protect and mark cultic and ritual space as secluded from profane space. Acceptance of this moral code was a prerequisite for partaking in religious activity, something so vital to ancient societies that exclusion from this activity was synonymous with exclusion from society. Exclusion from sacred space meant that it was impossible to take part in the ritual that defined the unity of the society. The individual or group denied access to or voluntarily shunning the sacrificial ritual was also shut out of society. Examples of this are the Orphic and Pythagorean groups who, even if they did not shun sacrifice all together, at least made their own rules for how this ritual was to be performed. They rejected the common sacrificial meal of society, and created their own alternative communities, and therefore remained marginal phenomena.[7]

Cultic morality may be understood by using the distinction which Kenneth Dover draws in his book on Greek popular morality between 'morality' and 'moral philosophy' or 'ethics'.[8] By 'morality' Dover means a society's or a culture's unconscious system of values. 'Moral philosophy', on the other hand, is a rational and systematic reflection on the same issues. Values do not necessarily govern behaviour, but values are used to judge and evaluate behaviour.[9] We always have the possibility of acting contrary to the system of values, but we will then run the risk of being condemned as immoral, unless we are able to justify our actions within the same system of values. Cultic morality is a subcategory of this unconscious code of values. It creates rules of behaviour within cultic contexts which may or may not be observed.

Because of its unconscious character, cultic morality was never strictly uniform. Different cults emphasized different aspects and demanded different types of behaviour, and issued prohibitions against different forms of conduct. As Dover shows, the system of values provides an ideal pattern of behaviour. This means that cultic morality did not

---

[7] Burkert 1985, 301-304.

[8] Dover 1974, 1.

[9] Dover 1974, 3: "Favourable valuations are in large measure expressions of what we would like to see existing; they implicitly contrast a hypothetical world with the actual world, and wishes can easily accommodate contradiction".

48

describe what the ancient worshippers actually did, but regulated what they were expected to do and gave them a tool for evaluating piety. Even if cultic regulations required the participants of a cult to conduct a purification ritual before entering the sacred precinct, this is not evidence that they necessarily did so on every occasion. Indeed, the very existence of reconciliation inscriptions and cultic regulations and particularly the reactions to violations of the rules are indications that people sometimes did not do what was demanded of them. My final definition of cultic morality is therefore *an ideal code of behaviour that the worshipper was expected to submit to when he or she took part in ritual and cultic activities.*

b. Demarcations

Cultic morality was not the general morality or system of values of the society. For instance, even if sexual activity was prohibited within the cultic context, and temporary abstinence from sexual activity prior to a ritual was required in some cases,[10] this did not mean that the morality of everyday life recommended sexual abstinence. The same is true of diet regulations. A 2nd century AD cultic regulation from the temple of Mēn at Sounion[11] instructs those who enter the shrine to purify themselves if they have eaten pork. This does not, however, provide evidence that the participants of this cult were forbidden from eating pork outside the sacred precinct. The notion of cultic morality being something restricted to the cult is further strengthened by Versnel's observation that Greek and classical Athenian religion rarely made explicit moralistic demands.[12] Ancient Greek cultic morality was intended for special occasions, and marked a distance from everyday life. As Susan Guettel Cole points out: *Dirty hands are not themselves forbidden, but dirty hands in the service of a god are out of place.*[13]

A problem with the use of the term 'morality' is that it is often associated with our understanding of intentionality and conscience. These are motives that are crucial to Christian morality. Cultic morality as understood here is not a question of conscience; instead it is aimed at protecting certain limits and boundaries, and defining right and

---

[10] As Susan Guettel Cole points out, permanent celibacy was rare in the pagan cults; Cole 2004, 133.

[11] *LSCG* 55, 3.

[12] Versnel 2002, 42.

[13] Cole 2004, 34.

wrong actions. Cultic morality does not demand a change in attitude or repentance when a boundary is transgressed, but it may require a propitionary sacrifice to be performed or a certain amount of money to be paid. In the eyes of the modern Christian beholder, this appears to be a mechanistic view, and to some extent that is true. From an ancient pagan point of view however it is the valuation of acts which counts.

It is also necessary to distinguish between 'cultic morality' and 'piety', even though these concepts are intimately related. 'Piety' is too broad a concept and would include most aspects of ancient Greek religion. To be pious or εὐσεβής was for the ancient Greeks something that involved all parts of life, and was not just confined to behaviour inside a sacred precinct. Without doubt, the actions that we might call 'cultically immoral' would also have been 'impious', but as was the case with 'piety', 'impiety' covered more than what I mean by 'cultic immorality'. The major concern of ancient Greek religion at all stages of its history was to maintain and preserve what was claimed to be the ancestral tradition (τὰ πατρία), which primarily involved sacrificial rituals.[14] The observance of these duties was therefore regarded as a pious act, while the neglect of them was regarded as impiety. Jon D. Mikalson points out that in the classical Athenian society piety was to a large extent seen as the maintenance of ritual tradition, e.g. sacrifice and burial.[15] But the question of piety is broader than this. For instance, perjury or treason would have qualifyed as forms of impiety, but will not be classified as crimes against cultic morality because they did not necessarily take place in a cultic context. Although perjury was an impious crime, perjury does not fall within the concept of 'cultic morality'. Perjury was not accepted, but this was a universal demand that applied not only when rituals were performed. A traitor acted against his ancestral gods and was deemed impious, but conspiring with the enemy cannot be regarded as morally wrong in a strictly cultic meaning. It is therefore right to say that cultic morality is one aspect of ancient Greek piety. The issue of piety and impiety will be treated more thoroughly below.

It might be objected that 'cultic legislation' is a better term than 'cultic morality', since my sources are basically cultic regulations and laws. I can see this problem, but will argue that Greek cultic legislation is a very large and complex topic. Greek cultic

---

[14] Mikalson 1983, 96.

[15] Mikalson 1983, 98.

regulations contain rules for several aspects of cults and religion. We find regulations defining the duties and rights of the priests and priestesses, the conduct of the sacrificial rituals, and the distribution of the sacrificial meat. There are also regulations governing the celebration of large city festivals, or the *symposia* of small cultic associations. Often, a single regulation can contain several different rules concerning various aspect of the same cult, many of which are irrelevant to the study of accepted behaviour within a sacred precinct. At the same time, cultic morality would cover aspects that not necessarlily would fall under cultic legislation. Morality and legislation are not identical entities but exist in a dialectic relationship to each other. Moral values may be codified in laws but this is not necessarily the case. On the other hand, laws may create moral values. The opposite may also be true; a law can be in conflict with dominant moral values. In the ancient world too, this distinction between the illegal and the immoral was not clear. This was partly due to the fact that ancient legislation consisted of more or less related rules designed to meet particular ends, and was rarely a result of general programs of codification in law.[16] As we will see in the survey of Greek cultic regulations many of the inscriptions contain very specific rules, for instance for purification but no clear definition of what ritual impurity is and of what consequences it has.

c. The structure of this chapter

In this chapter the most important aspects of Greek cultic morality in general will be dealt with. My intention is to establish the basic language and function of Greek cultic morality, i.e. the more lasting structures of accepted cultic behaviour, ritual purity, and protection of ritual space. The survey is general and is not confined to any particular period of history. The perspective I hope to establish will serve as a generalisation that is neither normative nor identical with a particular expression of cultic morality, but that hopefully will provide a framework for the understanding of Greek cultic morality.

Cultic morality was formed part of the boundaries for human behaviour in ancient societies. But it was only one of several aspects of these boundaries, which covered political, legal and religious aspects of life. Section 2 presents an analysis of how cultic

---

[16] For the creation of archaic Greek law as answers to particular problems and cases, see Hölkeskamp 1992 and Thomas 1995.

morality should be understood in terms of the limitations of behaviour that ancient societies imposed on its members. The focus here is how these boundaries were defined religiously and how cultic morality, which is one aspect of the religious boundaries, fits into this picture. I will also consider to what extent these boundaries were means of social control.

In the following sections I will analyse the two most important aspects of cultic morality, namely the definition and protection of sacred land, and maintenance of the code of ritual purity. This aspect will be dealt with in section 3. The meaning and purpose of a purity code is analysed in section 4. Many of the scholars referred to in this chapter draw their conclusions using archaic and classical Greek sources, and the majority of these sources were written in the context of the Athenian *polis* state. Few scholars have actually studied the development of these notions in the Hellenistic and Roman eras comprehensively.[17] Research on Greek religion after 338 BC seems to focus on the introduction of new cults, while the continuation of the existing Greek religion is often regarded as a given fact.[18] Still, it is possible to discern certain common features and structures in the demands for acceptable conduct. Robert Parker argues that the Greek notion of cultic pollution and purity remained on the whole constant.[19] Cultic morality undoubtedly underwent changes, and was entwined with other cults and beliefs, but the central motives and structures remained throughout the centuries.

---

[17] The most comprehensive survey of the Greek notion of ritual purity and impurity is still Robert Parker's *Miasma* issued in 1983. Parker's sources are primarily from the archaic and classical period.

[18] For continuity and development in ancient religion in the Roman Empire, see MacMullen 1981 and Lane Fox 1988. Also see Trombley 1993, 3-10 for an account of the sacrificial ritual in late Antiquity. Scholars tend to base their conclusions concerning Greek religion in the Roman Empire on older sources. A good example of this is Klauck 2000, which is intended as an introduction to the religious context of Christianity, but bases many of its descriptions on older sources, such as Homer.

[19] Parker 1983, 322: "[T]he evidence for significant change in attitudes to pollution is too sparse. If we look forward briefly beyond the forth century, we still find more evidence for continuity than transformation".

2. Boundaries and social control

It is often assumed that ancient religions displayed a high level of tolerance.[20] This notion implies that ancient pagan religions were not 'ethical', both in the sense that they did not demand certain behaviour from the believers, and that they accepted other cults and beliefs. This is only partly true. There is not doubt that pagan culture defined certain behaviour as unacceptable. This created boundaries which separated those who could claim to be members of the proper order from those who could not. Boundaries of this kind existed on several levels and served various functions of exclusion and inclusion but in general it may be useful to distinguish between external and internal boundaries, although they to some extent overlap each other. These boundaries did not solely define cultic behaviour as acceptable or unacceptable but also the political system and general way of life. This study is however limited to the definition of εὐσέβεια, which we may translate as 'piety', and what is οὐ θέμις, or unlawful.

a. The external boundaries

The external boundaries are the definitions of 'the other', meaning the people who did not belong in the political, social and religious community and who never could. Ancient Greek societies could have several identities that overlapped and to some extent were contradictory to each other. On the one hand Greeks defined themselves in contrast to the barbarians; on the other hand they defined themselves in contrast to other Greeks. The Athenians of classical Athens saw themselves as different from the Spartans, and later on from the Macedonians.

Ancient religions did not accept everything. But the main difference from Christian thinking is that they lacked a concept of 'false religion'.[21] Gods were real as

---

[20] E.g. MacMullen 1982, 2: "Rome's Empire […] was complete, and completely tolerant, in heaven as on earth. Perhaps not quite completely: Jews off and on, Christians off and on, Druids for good and all, fell under ban, in the first century of the era. So did human sacrifice. […] But humanitarian views were the cause, not bigotry. For laws against soothsayers, the cause was fear of popular unrest, not any hostility to preaching in itself".

[21] The early Christian strategy of defining pagan gods as demons is in accordance with the ancient view of supernatural beings as real. The church did not claim these gods to be non-existant; on the contrary they represented a real danger. The difference between the pagan Greek and the Christian view lies in the

53

long as they were honoured in worship. The fact that the Greeks often identified foreign gods with their own ones indicates that the gods were respected; it was never a question of whether a god was a true god or not. On the other hand, how the gods were worshipped was a more important question. When the Greeks saw the Egyptians portray their gods with animal features, for example, they regarded it as silly and disgraceful. It is on this level we must seek the Greek concept of the religious 'other'.

Two concepts are important for the definition of the 'other' in religious term, namely the Greek δεισιδαιμονία and the Latin *superstitio*. The former of must be understood in opposition to *eusebeia*, the latter to *religio*, i.e. the officially accepted religion of the Roman elite. Although these two terms did not mean exactly the same thing, they were both crucial to the definition of 'the other'. It has for instance been argued that the reconciliation inscriptions are expressions of what authors like Theophrastus and Plutarch would call *deisidaimonia*.[22] I think this is a correct observation, but it is not unproblematic, because the term is often used in a pejorative sense; in Hellenistic and Roman times, no one would define themselves as δεισιδαίμων or an adherent of *superstitio*. *Superstitio* and *deisidaimonia* must consequently be seen as a means of setting the external borders of the cults that were acceptable in the eyes of the intellectual and political elite.

The Latin concept of *superstitio* defines better the external boundaries than the Greek *deisidaimonia* because the latter may also mean an excessive observance of religious duties. This means that *deisidaimonia* also defines internal boundaries, while *superstitio* primarily denotes those cults that do not belong in the officially accepted religion. *Deisidaimonia* is usually translated as 'superstition', but literally it means 'fear of the divine'. It is an old term, but the first authors to define the concept are Xenophon[23] and Aristotle.[24] Interestingly, neither of them regards the term as negative, but quite on the contrary as a positive virtue, and they use it more or less in the same sense as 'piety' or *eusebeia*. Aristotle even regards it as a requirement for a ruler to be

---

assignment of value given to the gods of the opponent. Defining gods or religious beliefs as illusions was, apart from in certain philosophical schools, in general unknown in antiquity. See Burkert 1985, 313-317.

[22] Versnel 2002, 65-66.

[23] *Cyr.* 3.3.58.6; *Ages.* 11.8.4.

[24] *Pol.* 1315a.1.

deisidaimōn, because people fear a pious ruler less. The negative definition of *deisidaimonia* goes back to Aristotle's pupil Theophrastus. In his book on Characters the *deisidaimōn* is described as a man who exaggerates his religious duties.[25] He is excessively concerned with ritual purity, and seeks to avoid any kind of contamination, and most importantly in our context, he fears divine punishment. He interprets every sign and omen, and never misses a chance to worship the gods.[26]

400 years later Plutarch wrote his essay on superstition,[27] where he compares the *deisidaimōn* to an atheist in order to assess who is worst. The atheist does not believe in the gods, and has therefore, according to Plutarch, no notion of what is good. The *deisidaimōn* fears the gods, and interprets every illness, misery and misfortune as the gods' punishment. The superstitious man thus becomes afraid of everything and cannot be free. Plutarch describes various rituals that the superstitious man performs, and they are all related to purification and atonement. In Plutarch's opinion *deisidaimonia* must be regarded as impiety because it identifies good as evil.[28] It is interesting to note that Plutarch mentions several peoples, Jews, Gauls, Scythians and Syrians, that he regards as superstitious, but he does not say that superstition is a purely foreign element. It also occurs among Greeks.

---

[25] Thphr. *Char.* 16. Theophratus' essay is primarily descriptive and not explicitly condemning or normative.

[26] Martin 1997, 114-115: "What does Theophrastus label as superstitious? Washing one's hands too often, sprinkling oneself with water from a shrine, walking around with a piece of laurel in one's mouth all day. If a weasel crosses the path, the superstitious man won't walk on until someone else goes by or he has thrown three stones across the road. Seeing a snake in his house, he invokes the god Sabazios; if it is a holy snake, he builds a hero-shrine on the spot, right there in his living room if necessary. It is superstitious to drench every pile of anointed stones one sees with more oil and prostrate oneself before them. If a mouse gnaws a hole in a sack of barley, the superstitious man performs an expiation instead of simply repairing the sack. He repeatedly purifies his house in case Hekate has possessed it. When he hears an owl hoot he invokes Athena. He is afraid of becoming polluted by stepping on a gravestone, viewing a corpse, or visiting a woman in childbirth. The list goes on: purifying houses with boiled wine and spices on prescribed days; consulting dream interpreters, manteis, or bird-omen readers; being initiated often in mysteries; sprinkling oneself with seawater; avoiding polluted persons; avoiding a madman (or epileptic), and spitting down one's chest for protection against catching the madness".

[27] Plu. *De Superstitione; Mor.* 164e-171f.

[28] *De sup.* 167e.

The negative attitude Greek intellectuals express towards *deisidaimonia* has led many scholars to the conclusion that it represented a religion and involved notions alien to 'proper' Greek culture. The problem is that neither superstition in general, nor *deisidaimonia* in particular, has been properly defined as an interpretative category. Often, *deisidaimonia* is identified as Oriental religion[29] and as an expression of irrational, religious fears as if this is an objective category.[30] Reiss's famous article on *Aberglaube* from 1894 illustrates this clearly.[31] Reiss first defines superstition as fear of higher beings, spirits or gods.[32] Later on, however, the author includes any kind of belief in divine or supernatural intervention, and gives a long range of example of what he regards as superstition. The list includes magic, curses, various forms of therapy, belief in the sympathy of elements, interpretations of omens and fortunetelling, healing by herbs and beliefs concerning the human body and processes of life. The result is not a definition of *Aberglaube,* but a long list of what Reiss regarded as examples of superstition.

Dale Martin provides a far better analysis of Greek superstition. He argues that the descriptions of *deisidaimonia* found in Greek authors are expressions of upper-class intellectuals' contempt for popular religion and beliefs.[33] *Deisidaimonia* as Theophrastus portrays it, Martin argues, is not something that he regards as alien to traditional Athenian cults, but is an exaggeration of the religious duties of a pious Athenian citizen.[34] The superstitious man's problem is not that he does not believe in the gods; quite on the contrary he takes the worship of gods seriously, too seriously. Theophrastus does not question the *deisidaimōn*'s beliefs or piety, but focuses on his exaggerated piety. The *deisidaimōn* is not a false believer. Theophrastus does not reject religion and cultic activities, but he recommends, or rather suggests, balance and modesty in the conduct of religion. Martin demonstrates that the views of Theophrastus tie in logicallt with an understanding of the universe as being in equilibrium between

---

[29] Pettazzoni 1967, 60-62; Versnel 2002, 68-69.

[30] See Martin 1997 for analysis and criticism of this view.

[31] *RE* I, 29-93.

[32] Reiss 1894, 29: "die Frucht vor höheren Wesen, Geistern oder Göttern".

[33] Martin 1997. Martin refers to Theophrastus and Diodorus Siculus. Cf. also Martin 2004.

[34] Martin 1997, 118-119.

opposites, with everything having its place and the balance needing to be maintained. Martin's analysis also explains why Plutarch claims that *deisidaimonia* exists among several ethnic groups, even Greeks. *Deisidaimonia* is not necessarily something alien or foreign, but out of balance with proper religious conduct. It is a mode of religiosity. What is important is that *deisidaimonia* is not something that existed in its own right, but was a label that someone gave to someone else. We cannot, therefore, say what *deisidaimonia* was, only what someone, e.g. Greek intellectuals, thought it was. Accordingly, *deisidaimonia* denoted both internal and external boundaries. The ancient Greek definition of ethnic groups was not necessarily based on religion, and certainly not on 'true' and 'false' religion. The Roman elites, however, gradually developed this notion. But the ancient Greek societies had other ways of excluding those who were not defined as Greek. Language, customs, political systems and general behaviour were aspects that Greeks authors described when they emphasised the difference between Greece and other countries.[35]

Like the Greek concept of *deisidaimonia,* the Latin term *superstitio* was not originally used exclusively about the religions of others, but was a way of describing a type of worship.[36] *Superstitio* had a wider meaning than the Greek *deisidaimonia*, in the sense that it not only included an exaggerated and perverted piety, but was a concept that gradually came to include false or vain religious beliefs, including the beliefs of other ethnic groups. According to Mary Beard, John North and Simon Price *religio* was part of the Roman elite's self-understanding; they represented a 'proper' religion, while *superstitio* was used to describe the religion of others.[37] During the late Republic and the subsequent centuries, Beard, North and Price argue, *superstitio* came to denote religious practices of ethnic groups in the Roman provinces. The term was nevertheless not necessarily applied to every foreign type of worship; Greek worship was for

---

[35] The most well known example is probably the second book of the *Histories* of Herodotus, where he describes the Egyptians as doing everything the opposite way, compared to the Greeks. The question of ancient racism is discussed in a recent book by Benjamin Isaac (Isaac 2004).

[36] Beard, North & Price 1998, 216-217.

[37] Beard, North & Price 1998, 215.

instance usually tolerated and respected by the Romans. Like the Greeks, the Romans focused on the way gods were worshipped, and not which gods were worshiped.[38]

We may conclude that the 'other' in the religious sense as it was understood by the Greco-Roman elite was not irreligious or a false believer, but a person who performed worship in an improper way. He or she was subject to irrational fears and failed to achieve the proper balance.

b. The internal boundaries

By 'internal boundaries' I mean strategies of defining acceptable conduct and behaviour among the members of a cultic context. We may classify the internal boundaries of ancient society according to their various functions. On the one hand there are the boundaries defined by physical means such as walls surrounding a city or a temple. On the other hand there are the culturally defined boundaries which determine how people were expected to behave; cultural boundaries include both ritual and legal boundaries. Physical and cultural defined boundaries were to a large extent overlapping. A city wall was of course a physical boundary but it was also a legal and a ritual boundary which marked the division between citizens and non-citizens and between the living and the dead since the *necropolis* was always located outside the city-walls. In addition, we may identify informal boundaries which also defined proper behaviour, such as boundaries between social classes, genders, or various out-groups. The boundaries of the society find their parallels in cultic contexts. There is a clear parallel between the walls surrounding the city and the walls surrounding a *temenos*, and as in the society at large there were limitation on behaviour. Different rules were imposed on different people, for instance on women who were required to follow other and often stricter rules of behaviour than men, or on slaves who would be punished differently from free men if they violated certain rules. One of the functions of these boundaries was to define εὐσέβεια and ἀσέβεια, piety and impiety. As I have pointed out above, my concept of cultic morality is not congruent with piety, but must be regarded as an important aspect of the Greek notion of piety. There remains, however, an important question: how should we define piety and impiety?

---

[38] Beard, North & Price 1998, 221-227.

Eusebeia is the ideal form of religious worship. Here, as in most aspects of Greek religion, piety meant participation in sacrificial rituals performed according to the supposed tradition of the ancestors. This form of worship, Walter Burkert points out, was expected to be reasonable and balanced;[39] humans were obliged to pay the gods due respect but not in an excessive manner. *Eusebeia* was never a fixed code of piety but it was the common term for describing what was regarded as the correct form of worship. As ancient societies were religious in a far more fundamental way than modern ones, to be a *eusebēs* was a sign of membership of society. *Eusebeia* is therefore the means by which humans could define themselves as members of the divine order of which the human society was a part.

Like *eusebeia*, *asebeia* is notoriously difficult to define. The word was used to describe a wide range of acts, in fact, any kind of wrongdoing. *Acts, notions, and thoughts considered contradictory to a supposed divine order* may serve as a preliminary and imprecise definition. This is a very vague definition, because it does not clarify what was regarded as 'the divine order'. But the definition is no vaguer than the ancient notion of *asebeia*. The only attempt to define impiety from Antiquity is made by Aristotle, who claims that impiety is *transgression with regard to gods and spirits, or even with regard to the departed and to parents and country*.[40] Aristotle's definition includes the gods, the *polis* and *oikos*, as well as the ancestors. In other words, it seeks to encompass acts which contradict the entire world order. But apart from this observation it is clear that a wide range of improper acts fall under the category of Asebeia. This is also indicated in David Cohen's examples of acts associated with impiety:

> [P]rofaning the mysteries, offences against cults or temples such as improper sacrifices, or violation of ritual prohibition; entering a temple or participating in a festival or ritual or holding a sacred office from which one is debarred; violating a temple by sacking it, murdering someone within its boundaries, or dragging a suppliant from its altar; and violating or destroying sacred objects like the Herms. Likewise clearly within the central

---

[39] Burkert 1985, 273.

[40] Arist. *VV*, ἀσέβεια μὲν ἡ περὶ θεοὺς πλημμέλεια καὶ περὶ δαίμονας ἤ καὶ περὶ τοὺς κατοιχομένους, καὶ περὶ γονεῖς καὶ περὶ πατρίδα·

conception of asebeia fall the more intangible offences of not honouring or believing in the gods of the polis, or introducing new gods […].[41]

In addition, Cohen shows that various violations of oath were regarded as *asebeia*.[42] According to Cohen, the vagueness of the term is related to the fact that the legal system of classical Athens, like most other pre-modern legal systems, lacked precise definitions of crimes. The definition was what Cohen calls *the unarticulated social norm*.[43] One of Cohen's most interesting observations in his survey of impiety in classical Athenian law is that it was not merely confined to ritual acts, even though this too was a central issue. *Asebeia* was also a matter of beliefs and opinions.[44] Cohen concludes his survey by saying that ancient societies were fundamentally intolerant when it came to religion: ideas, notions, and beliefs considered contradictory to the general consensus were met with suspicion, and in some case persecuted as impiety.[45]

Against this view, Robert Garland classifies behaviour regarded as unacceptable in classical Athens into two groups:

[F]irstly, offences against the gods, such as oath-breaking, blasphemy, sacrilege and other insults; and secondly, crimes against human beings or the state, such as murder, treason, tomb-violation and felonies of a sexual nature. Irreligiosity, in other words, was fundamentally a type of behaviour rather than an attitude of mind.[46]

Asebeia is, according to Garland, primarily a matter of offences against correct behaviour, and he claims that there is no evidence that beliefs were important constituents of Athenian piety.[47] It seems that Garland has misunderstood Cohen's observation, maybe because neither Cohen nor Garland defines 'belief'. If Garland

---

[41] Cohen 1991, 205-206. See also O' Sullivan 1997 and Parker 2005, 63-68.

[42] Cohen 1991, 206: "This includes various kinds of violations, such as perjury, or judges violating their oath of office by convicting a man innocent of homicide, or acquitting one guilty of homicide, or deliberately forswearing oneself".

[43] Cohen 1991, 208.

[44] Cohen 1991, 211f.

[45] Cohen's example is the trial of Socrates, where the issue of his beliefs was the central question.

[46] Garland 1996, 92.

[47] Garland 1996, 92 n. 7.

understands 'beliefs' as meaning 'dogma' then he is absolutely right. Dogmas, i.e. statements formulated by religious or political authorities and regarded as unquestionable, have always been part of the elite's religion, but it is improbable that every society possesses dogmas or that they play the decisive role we think they do. 'Belief', as understood here, is a much wider category covering both articulated and unarticulated notions. In other words, it may be described as the 'world view' of a given society. This is quite clear from Aristotle's definition of *asebeia*, which seeks to include every level of the divine order of the world. In my opinion, Cohen has shown that ancient societies regarded 'correct' beliefs as aspects of piety, but not in the sense complying with a set of dogmas.

B. Creating sacred space

1. Definition and protection of sacred space

a. Sacred space in ancient Greek religion

As cultic morality has been defined as an ideal code of proper conduct in cultic contexts, we must now ask how cultic contexts were created and how they were distinguished from profane contexts. Ancient Greeks themselves recognized a division between cult and everyday life, even though this division was often in practice rather unclear. But one strategy stands out as particularly important, namely the creation of sacred or ritual space. In her book *Landscapes, Gender, and Ritual Space: The Ancient Greek Experience,* Susan Guettel Cole analyses the ancient Greek system of ritual space. Even though Cole's sources are mainly taken from the archaic and classical periods, her views and theoretical framework are relevant to the understanding of both Greek cultic regulations and the reconciliation inscriptions of 2nd and 3rd century AD Asia Minor.

Cole lists three situations in which a ritual space was created: 1) when a new community was established,[48] 2) when a new ritual was introduced, and 3) when a secular space temporarily was converted into a ritual space.[49] According to Cole, the ancient landscape was divided between the land for agriculture on the one hand, and

---

[48] See also Parker 1983, 160.

[49] Cole 2004, 39.

land reserved for rituals on the other. The agricultural land is the land of humans; the ritual land is the land of the gods. When a new city was founded, it required a space with clearly defined borders that could be defended,[50] in order to protect cultivated land. Parallel to the definition of agricultural and human territory was the demarcation of ritual land. The importance of ritual space rested on the fact that ancient communities to a large extent based their identities on participation in and membership of cults and rituals. This principle existed on every level of society from the official cult of the city or the state to the private cults of *oikos* or various religious associations.

The world of the gods was seen as having qualities that the human world lacked such as immortality and absence of hardship, and the presence of these qualities in the divine world and the lack of them in the human world were the defining characteristics of these two levels of existence. The gods were immortal, humans were mortal; the gods were nurtured by the offerings of the humans, while the humans were forced to cultivate the earth or eat meat. The most famous expression of this ideology is to be found in the *Theogony* and *Works and Days* of Hesiod, where he tells the story of how Prometheus established the sacrificial ritual.[51] According to the French structuralist Jean-Pierre Vernant's interpretation, this is also a myth of the foundation of the human conditions of life. In the golden age, gods and men dined together at the same table after the victory over the titans. By establishing the distribution of the sacrificial animal, Prometheus also determines the division between gods and humans.[52] Prometheus cuts up an ox and divides it into two portions. To men he gives the meat and the entrails, but he covers them in an ox paunch. To Zeus he gives the bones covered in fat in order to make them appear tempting. Zeus becomes angry and denies men the use of fire, but Prometheus steals it back. Zeus then orders Hephaistos to create a woman who is sent to man and causes all the misfortunes that man must suffer. By establishing this distribution, the humans become mortal, while the gods remain immortal. Men and gods

---

[50] Cole 2004, 13 points out that the definition of external borders often was as important as a central town. See also de Polignac, 1995.

[51] Hes. *Th.* 535-616; *Op.* 45-105.

[52] Vernant 1981, 59: "All through the struggle between Titan's supple cunning and the unbending intelligence of Zeus what is ultimately at issue is this: the rules which define man's estate, the mode of life appropriate for men now".

cease to dine together and men become subject to the hardships of life.[53] According to Vernant, the sacrificial ritual has a dual meaning. On the one hand it was a way of holding the gods in honour by offering them food; on the other hand it confirmed the unbridgeable gulf between gods and men.[54] At the same time gods and men are dependent on each other: men need the benevolence of gods and gods need the sacrifices offered by men. Some form of communication must be maintained while avoiding the basic contradictions between divine and human life. Therefore, activities exclusively associated with human life, i.e. the activities that marked and defined the human way of existence, such as birth, death, sex, cattle herding and agriculture, were forbidden inside sacred areas in order to create the minimum of common conditions that made communication between gods and humans possible.

For these rules to be recognized and maintained the sacred space had to be identified with clear markers that left no doubt concerning the status of the land.[55] In the case of the larger sanctuaries, it was usually no problem to identify the sacred area, because of the *temenos* wall. If a human wanted admittance into the ritual space, he or she had to submit him- or herself to certain rules of behaviour and thereby gain the necessary qualities that were required for crossing the border between human and ritual space.[56]

We must, however, bear in mind the distinction between public and private cult. The maintenance of the code of accepted behaviour as we can reconstruct it is the code of cults addressed to a public audience, but not necessarily confined to the official cults of the state. We know much less about the cultic activity that took place inside private homes. We know that ancient houses contained private shrines dedicated to ancestors or gods, and that rituals were performed at these shrines. According to Béatrice Caseau, violation of private shrines did not qualify as sacrilege, but they had to be respected.[57]

---

[53] For an interpretation of the foundation-myth of sacrifice see Vernant 1981, 1989 & 1990b.

[54] Vernant 1981, 61: "In devouring what can be eaten, men simultaneously restore their failing strength and acknowledge the baseness of their human condition – confirming their absolute submission to those very Olympian gods whom the Titan Prometheus when he established the pattern in the first sacrifice once thought to trick with impunity".

[55] Burkert 1985, 85; Cole 2004, 40.

[56] For the institution of *asylia,* i.e. protection of persons who were prosecuted, see Sinn 1993.

[57] Caseau 1999, 24-25.

Private cults and cult places did not have the same protection as the official temples, indicating that the division between ritual and profane space was not as sharp as one may assume.

The dedication of space to deities remained crucial to pagan cults throughout their history and beyond. As Béatrice Caseau points out, cultic buildings and places were signs of a cult's vitality and a way of making the cult known to a wider audience.[58] As a consequence, the redefinition of pagan sacred space became an important aspect of the Christianization of the Roman Empire. By redefining or destroying ritual space belonging to pagan cults, the Church was able to gradually deprive pagan cults of their legitimacy.

b. Greek terminology of sacred space

The Greek language has several different terms for either the sacred land itself or particular aspects of the ritual space. Often, there is no obvious difference of meaning between the terms.

ἱερός

If an area was considered to be suitable for the gods, it was regarded as being ἱερός, which may be translated 'holy', i.e. the word denotes the status of the ritual space. As Walter Burkert points out, the term signifies whatever belongs to a god or a sanctuary, and is the opposite of profane, βέβηλος.[59] The word may also be used as a noun, τὸ ἱερόν, denoting the sacred space itself, or even the temple building.[60] This term is dealth with in greater detail in paragraph C 3 (below).

τέμενος

This term may be translated as 'sacred precinct'. It is derived from the verb τέμνειν, which means 'cut off'. More than any other term it stresses the seclusion of the ritual space from the profane space. Often, this seclusion was marked by boundary stones,

---

[58] Caseau 1999, 23.

[59] Burkert 1985, 269.

[60] Cole 2004, 40: "A *perirrhanterion* conveyed a warning that entry to a sacred area was impossible for anyone who could not demonstrate the necessary ritual purity".

ὄροι, and a wall, περίβολος. The *temenē* of the main sanctuaries could be rather large areas containing the temple and altar of the deity, in addition to buildings with various functions for the administration of the sanctuary. The surrounding wall usually had only one entrance where a water basin called a περιρραντήριον or ἁγιστήριον was placed.[61] The presence of a water basin was also the mark of a ritual space and a boundary that no one was allowed to overstep before undertaking the necessary purification rituals.[62] The earliest evidence of the use of *perirrantēria* dates from the 7th century, and in the 6th century they were found all over the Greek world.[63]

σηκός

This word denotes an enclosed and usually walled area.[64] It is less used than *temenos*, but they seem to be more or less synonymous. The most important difference between *sēkos* and *temenos* is probably that *sēkos* does not necessarily mean a sacred precinct, but may denote any enclosed area, while *temenos* is used exclusively in the religious sense. In Homer and Hesiod *sēkos* means a sheepfold, and has no religious connotation.[65] Althoug *sēkos* did not originally have a religious connotation, it is important to note that the use of the word in a religious context emphasizes the secluded character of the sacred precinct.

ἄβατον and ἄδυτον

These two terms literally mean 'not to be trodden on' and 'not to be entered'. In religious contexts they signify separate areas within a temple or a precinct that were subject to special rules of ritual purity and restrictions of access.[66] The terms were often used for the rooms inside the temple building where the deity's cult image was placed. *Adyta* were a special feature of sanctuaries where divination, initiation into mystery cults and incubation took place. *Adyton* is for instance the name the room inside the

---

[61] Burkert 1985, 86.

[62] Cole 2004, 44.

[63] Cole 2004, 43.

[64] Cole 2004, 40.

[65] *Il.* 18.589. *Od.* 9.219-20. Hes. *Op.* 785-7.

[66] Cole 2004, 40.

temple of Apollo in Delphi where the Pythia received the oracles of the god.[67] In this room, only the Pythia and the priest of Apollo were allowed access.[68] The most important characteristic of *abata* or *adyta* is that access was restricted to a narrowly defined group or no one was given access,[69] (see Ch. 3, 93-94 for cultic regulations prohibiting entry) unlike the *temenē* where anyone who fulfilled the minimum requirements of ritual purity was given access.

ἄλσος

The *alsē* or sacred groves are a special category of sacred space in Greek religion.[70] Trees, stands of trees and groves were by no means uncommon features of Greek religion, but sanctity was not associated with every tree or forest. This was a status granted to particular trees or stands of trees. As Darice E. Birge points out in her analysis of trees in Pausanias, he emphasises trees with a particular importance, for instance trees associated with hero shrines or temples.[71] Birge divides trees as they are described by Pausanias, into three categories: single trees, stands of trees in hero shrines, and groves (i.e. *alsē*) at the shrines of gods. Single trees were often associated with important events from the mythological past,[72] e.g. the olive tree growing on the Athenian Acropolis, which was Athena's gift to Athens in her contest with Poseidon. Pausanias also mentions other trees associated with the mythological past.[73] The sacred groves were part of several Greek shrines, they were dedicated to different deities, and they had different statuses. Birge concludes that the word *alsos* is almost exclusively

---

[67] Burkert 1985, 116.

[68] Diod. Sic. 16.26. Diodoros is referring to the foundation myth of the Delphian oracle. According to this myth, a goat discovered the chasm from which the divine inspiration came. This chasm was, according to Diodoros built into the 'forbidden' part of the sanctuary where Pythia was sitting on a tripod when she received the messages of Apollo. Cf. also Parker 1983, 167-168.

[69] Cole 2004, 200.

[70] For a full analysis of sacred grove in ancient Greek religion, see Birge 1982. For the role of groves in the cult of Apollo, see Birge 1994b.

[71] Birge 1994a, 233-234.

[72] Birge 1994, 235.

[73] Birge 1994, 234.

used in a religious context.[74] In Pausanias, she notes, it is evident that groves were an integrated part of Greek religion in the second century AD, regardless of which cult the groves belonged to.

A sacred grove in ancient Greece was generally a simple structure: a group of trees sometimes surrounded by a *peribolos*. Sometimes there was also an altar within the grove. The temple of Zeus at Olympia was for instance originally a sacred grove dedicated to the hero Pelops, which is indicated in the name given to the *temenos* of the shrine, ἄλτις.[75]

C. Proper cultic behaviour

1. Introduction

We have so far analysed the physical conditions that were necessary for establishing of cults. It remains to be considered what this code of proper cultic behaviour implied. Cultic morality marks seclusion from everyday activities and thus represents an analogy to the seclusion of ritual to sacred space (see above). It has several purposes. First, it is intended to protect sacred property from a legal point of view, which means that worshippers are expected not to harm objects or property belonging to a shrine. Secondly, it is meant to create the necessary conditions for communication with the gods. This requires that activities associated with the human way of life must be avoided. On the one hand, this means prohibition against agriculture. A notable feature of sacred land is that it is exempted from pasturage or cultivation, which is necessary to maintain human lives. One the other hand, the seclusion is marked by prohibitions against those aspects of life which are considered as characteristic for human beings, in particular sex, birth, and death. These incidents, considered potentially dangerous, are in Greek cultic regulations often regarded and described as 'impure'. A prominent aspect of cultic morality is thus the avoidance of ritual impurity.

---

[74] Birge 1994, 238.

[75] According to Paus. 5.10.1 *altis* is synonymous with *alsos,* and they may indeed have a common etymology. See Burkert 1985, 86.

2. Purity and impurity as an interpretative tool

Acts that are considered dangerous and even forbidden in a cultic context in Greek religion are often described in terms of impurity, pollution and defilement. In contrast, those who are fit to enter a sacred precinct and approach the divine are regarded as 'pure'. The study of purity notions has been an important field within social anthropology, and theories of purity and impurity are used as an interpretative tool in the study of many different cultures. The anthropological literature on the subject is vast, and it lies far beyond the scope of this thesis to offer a synthesis. However, the classic book *Purity and Danger* by Mary Douglas should be mentioned.[76] Her thesis is that defilement represents disorder, while purification is a way of structuring the world and creating order. This notion is universal and is thus not to be understood as a marginal activity in some religious traditions.

> In chasing dirt, in papering, decorating, tidying we are not governed by anxiety to escape disease, but are positively re-ordering our environment, making it conform to an idea. There is nothing fearful or unreasoning in our dirt-avoidance: it is a creative movement, an attempt to relate form to function, to make unity of experience. […] So far from being aberrations from the central project of religion, [rituals of purity and impurity] are positive contributions to atonement.[77]

Purity and impurity are not objective categories, but depend on how the viewer perceives his world. Impurity occurs at borders of the ordered world and human life. The great events of human life, such as births and deaths, always generate situations that are described in terms of impurity.

Mary Douglas claims that impurity occurs when something cannot be included in a culture's categories of definition. Objects, animals, and humans that do not fit into a particular category are regarded as impure. One of her most famous examples is taken from the diet regulations of Leviticus, which states that edible animals are ruminants and have hoofs. The animals that lack either or both of these characteristics cannot be used as human food. A pig is impure because while it has hoofs, it is not a ruminant. The hare, on the other hand, is a ruminant according to Leviticus, but has no hoofs, and

---

[76] Douglas 1966.

[77] Douglas 1966, 2.

is therefore impure. The same thing happens to humans who undergo some kind of change, for instance a rite of passage. In the liminal stage of these rites, when the candidate has lost his or her former status and not yet acquired a new one, i.e. no longer belongs to a particular category of definition, defilement and impurity often occur. The candidate must conduct purification rituals before gaining the new status and being reintegrated into society. Liminality is therefore, according to Douglas, characterized by impurity and impurity is liminality.

Robert Parker's book *Miasma* published in 1983 does not primarily set out to create a general theory of the notion of pollution, but to survey notions as they were expressed in ancient Greece. For Parker, the notion of purity and impurity is a 'science of division'.[78] It makes it possible to make distinctions between objects, places, people, occasions etc. by attributing the values of 'clean' and 'unclean' to them:

> Purification is one way in which the metaphysical can be made palpable. Although it can perhaps operate as a divider in a quite neutral sense, it more naturally separates higher from lower and better from worse. It's most obvious use of this kind in Greece is to mark off sacred areas from profane.[79]

For Parker, purification is not reserved for worship alone, but is characteristic of any kind of formalized behaviour. Although Parker agrees that rites of passage are often associated with impurity, it is not plausible to claim that every form of pollution is the result of a breach in the classificatory categories. Parker suggests a theory of impurity that differs slightly from that of Douglas. Purification is not necessarily a process of defining something into accepted categories, but simply a way of marking a special occasion. The group taking part in this occasion creates a community by sharing the same level of purity, and a distance from those who do not take part. Correspondingly, a spatial level was created where ritual land was separated from profane land.[80] Parker also argues that even though ritual impurity may be a sign of liminality, as Douglas claims, it may also be a way of treating the emotions surrounding a transition.[81]

---

[78] Parker 1983, 18.

[79] Parker 1983, 19.

[80] Parker 1983, 22-24.

[81] Parker 1983, 62.

Purification is not necessarily a classificatory process, but a part of the transition from the old to the new status. Transition, especially if associated with the processes of life, such as birth and death, is a breach of the normal order and, above all, it is uncontrollable. Those who undergo transitions are not, according to Parker, hard to classify, they are simply undergoing a change, and changes are always difficult processes. Pollution and subsequent purification are consequently in Parker's opinion a method of coping with this change and violation of order. For instance, it is often difficult to draw a clear distinction between death-pollution and grief. The purification of the family of the deceased according to this view brings the social group together again after a distortion.[82]

Cole adopts much of the same position as Parker, but her theories of ritual purity are related more specifically to the division of genders.[83] Like Parker, she claims that a certain level of purity was a requirement for participation in ritual activity.[84] But according to Cole, the different levels of purity associated with male and female correspond to the different levels of space, i.e. ritual and agricultural (see above). Women were associated with reproduction and natural processes that lay beyond human control and were excluded from ritual space:

> Maintaining boundaries between humans and gods required separating those activities that defined the human condition – birth, sexual intercourse, and death – from sacred spaces. Because males and females were assumed to differ in their ability to control body boundaries, and because some involuntary female conditions were treated as sources of contagious pollution, females were subjects to more restrictions.[85]

Thus, purity does not only create a division between those who partake in the ritual and those who do not, it also creates a division between males and females.

Ritual purity is not the same as physical cleanliness, even if we cannot separate ritual purification from the physical sphere completely; but physical purification is not necessarily a part of ritual cleansing rituals, and it is not justifiable to attribute a ritual

---

[82] Parker 1983, 64.

[83] Cole has treated the issue of gender in Greek religion in several articles. See e.g. Cole 1992 and 1995.

[84] Cole 2004, 93-94.

[85] Cole 2004, 113.

value to every form of physical washing. On the other hand, the removal of physical dirt often has a symbolic meaning, and is thus a part of ritual purification. But it is also important to note that ritual cleansing may be distinct from any form of removal of physical dirt. In fact, it may seem to be quite the opposite of purification. An example of this is purification rituals where the pollution was removed by blood or mud.[86] It is therefore better to analyse ritual and physical cleanliness and purification as two aspects of a general understanding of purity that neither exclude, nor necessarily depend on each other.

It follows from this that ritual impurity or pollution is not necessarily identical with physical dirt, but, of course, physical dirt may be a source of ritual pollution. It is in fact the most common source, while on other occasions things that are not dirty may cause ritual pollution. There is also a clear difference regarding the way physical dirt and ritual impurity are treated and how they affect people. Dirt may simply be removed by washing, while ritual impurity often cannot be removed before a certain period has passed.[87]

In relation to cultic morality, purification is primarily, as Parker points out, a way of creating a special occasion of worship. Even though the entering of a sacred precinct or a temple is a situation of transition, it is not a question of classifying the worshipper or granting him or her new status. Sex, birth, and death are impure because they are classified as unsuitable in cultic contexts, not necessarily because they are part of rites of passage. Purity and impurity in this sense are rather categories of classification of profane and cultic contexts.

---

[86] For a survey of the purificatory uses of substances like mud, blood, laurel, squill etc. see Parker 1983, 229-234. Parker interprets these as substances which have the ability to absorb the impurity and which were then washed away. In Parker's view there were no significant differences between these two methods of purification. According to Parker, the unclean materials became regarded as powerful because they were opposites to pure materials. Pollution acquires a positive sanctity. Susan Guettel Cole argues that pure and impure materials had different purposes, the first allopathic, the other homeopathic. An allopathic substance, e.g. water, creates an opposite to the pollution, while a homeopathic substance, e.g. blood, creates an effect by imitating the pollution, and thereby absorbs it. See Cole 2004, 139-140.

[87] Parker 1983, 56.

3. Greek terms relating to ritual pollution and purity

The basic Greek term for 'ritually pure' is ἀγνός. In addition the terms ὅσιος and ἱερός, both usually translated as 'holy', even though their meanings are not entirely overlapping, are important for the understanding of ritual purity in Greek religion.

<u>ἀγνός</u>

When a person has achieved the required level of ritual purity, he or she is described as ἀγνός. The word is never used in a secular context, and seems to have different meaning when used about gods and men. According to Parker, when the gods and their property are described as *hagnoi*, this does not mean 'pure' but 'demanding respect'.[88] When a worshipper is described as *hagnos* the word is used in the sense 'ritually pure' or 'fit to approach the sacred'.[89] The human ἀγνεία is the state that the worshipper must achieve if he or she is to take part in the cult. The words *hagnos/hagios* are etymological related to the verb ἄζεσθαι, which means 'to feel or display respect'.[90] It also has a parallel in the word σεμνός, 'reverend' or 'demanding respect', which is used about the gods in much the same way as *hagnos*.[91] Crucial to the understanding of *hagneia* is the fact that the concept usually is defined negatively. *Hagneia* means the absence of pollution and the method of achieving *hagneia* is defined through prohibitions, something my survey of Greek cultic regulations will show.[92] Thus, we cannot define *hagneia* as anything other than 'fitness to worship'. In the same way that the adjective *hagnos* is defined negatively, so is this verb, which more precisely can be translated as 'not displaying offence'.[93] *Hagios,* according to Benveniste, indicates that an object or a place is inviolable and protected.[94]

---

[88] Parker 1983, 147.

[89] Parker 1983, 148.

[90] Benveniste 1973, 465-469; Burkert 1985, 270f; Parker 1983, 147f.

[91] Parker 1983, 147-148.

[92] See chapter 3.

[93] Benveniste 1973, 465.

[94] Benveniste 1973, 467.

ἱερός

Hieros may be translated as 'belonging to the gods', but is not necessarily associated with something forbidden.[95] As noted above (p. 64) Walter Burkert argues that *hieros* means anything that belongs to the gods as opposite to what is βέβηλος, i.e. what belongs to the profane sphere.[96] This is the meaning *hieros* eventually acquired in the classical period, while it has a wider meaning in the Homeric epics. Here it means 'sacred', but not necessarily something secluded. Rather, it means anything influenced by the divine, whether it is a cultic act, a town, or an army.[97] During the archaic age *hieros* gradually came to designate the holy as something secluded and demarked,[98] and it is this meaning of the word we find in the cultic regulations and which is significant for the interpretation of the reconciliation inscriptions.

Parker emphasises that the term itself does not mean 'taboo' or 'forbidden', and like Burkert he defines *hieros* as a term used to designate that which is associated with the gods.[99] Burkert agrees that 'taboo' is not a suitable translation of *hieros* because Greek religion presumes contact and communication between humans and gods. But he also points out that what is regarded as *hieros* is defined by negative regulations and prohibition. Certain rules have to be observed for gaining access.[100] What is *hieros* is therefore not outside the reach of humans, even if it is secluded from the specific human characteristics of life; but contact requires those who approach the sacred sphere to take certain precautions. *Hieros* is not "forbidden", but it denotes something restrained and controlled, and this is done through *hagneia*.

ὅσιος

Another aspect of the Greek notion of what is sacred is ὅσιος, which is what Walter Burkert calls 'the recognition of the boundaries from the outside'.[101] A more precise definition is formulated by Emile Benveniste, who states that *hosios* denotes what is

---

[95] Parker 1983, 151.

[96] Burkert 1985, 269-271.

[97] Benveniste 1973, 456-461.

[98] Hooker 1980, 7.

[99] Parker 1983, 151.

[100] Burkert 1985, 269.

[101] Burkert 1985, 270.

prescribed or permitted to men by the gods.[102] Actions and objects regarded as *hosioi* are acceptable from a cultic point of view. To be *hosios* means to be given a religious security clearance, and involves no risk of divine reactions. A tree regarded as *hieros* belongs to the gods and no one can therefore cut it down without running the risk of some form of response. The cutting down of a tree regarded as *hosios*, on the other hand, does not result in any religious danger if it is cut down. *Hosios* is therefore the divine equivalent of the human δίκαιος, which designates the things that are permitted from a human point of view. What is δίκαιος καὶ ὅσιος is therefore something that, in Benveniste's words is *fixed as a rule in human relations by men and by gods,*[103] i.e. it is sanctioned by both human and divine law.

4. The notion of impurity and purification in ancient Greek religion

a. Miasma and agos

The fear of ritual impurity was deeply rooted in the ancient way of thinking, and could have powerful symbolic meanings. Accusations of impiety and violation of purity regulations were a constant source of conflicts, and in some cases impiety could serve as a justification for drastic actions. A military campaign could for instance be justified by the enemy's violation of a sacred precinct.[104] A common method of bringing a political opponent into discredit was to accuse him of sacrilege, thereby claiming that he was unfit to take on political responsibility. The most famous incident from Greek history is the exile of the Athenian commander Alcibiades in 415 BC for mutilating the *herms* and for allegedly parodying of the Eleusinian mysteries.[105] These examples show how strongly the concern for maintaining a proper ritual purity could be in ancient society. People who were accused of impiety and thereby risked loosing their social position had to find a way either to prove their innocence or to settle the conflict with the human antagonist or the divine avenger.

The Greek word for ritual impurity is μίασμα. Parker gives the following definition of Greek words starting with the syllable μια–:

---

[102] Benveniste 1973, 461-465.

[103] Benveniste 1973, 461.

[104] See Parker 1983, 165-166 for the use of sacred land in political conflicts and warfare.

[105] Th. 6.27-29.

> The basic sense of the mia- words is that of defilement, the impairment of a thing's form or integrity.[106]

The defilement of an object or a person must be understood as a threatening situation that brings this object or person 'out of place' or 'out of order'. In Greek, ritual defilement may be termed μίασμα, but Parker points out that the term is not very commonly used to denote ritual pollution.[107] He therefore uses the word as a theoretical means of establishing a definition of the Greek understanding of ritual impurity. The situations that may be described by *miasma* or the adjective μιαρός, Parker claims, have the following characteristics:

a) The person affected is subject to ritual impurity, and is therefore not allowed to enter a shrine.

b) It is contagious, and may affect other persons.

c) It is a threatening and dangerous situation that should be avoided.

d) This threat does not have an ordinary secular cause.[108]

Following Parker, we may therefore say that ritual impurity must be understood as 'religious danger', or, more precisely, impurity and pollution are metaphors used to denote situations, objects, and people that are to be avoided in religious and ritual contexts. It is not a very precise definition, but it is still useful due to the fact that Greek conceptions of pollution were very complex, and a too precise definition might exclude some aspects that ought to be taken into consideration.

Vernant gives a similar but clearer definition of impurity in ancient Greek thought. Against Louis Moulinier[109] he argues that defilement is not identical with physical dirt but must be understood in relation to its religious and symbolic value. A theory claiming that purification is identical with hygiene does not explain why cleanliness becomes significant in religion.[110] Vernant remarks that something regarded as impure in one context, such as blood, can be used for consecration in another. In

---

[106] Parker 1983, 3.

[107] Parker 1983, 12.

[108] Parker 1983, 4.

[109] Moulinier 1952.

[110] Vernant 1990a, 129.

Vernant's opinion defilement is an indication of a distortion or contradiction of the order that forbids contacts between things that must be kept at a distance from each other. Impurity occurs when something from the human sphere of life comes into contact with something from the divine sphere.[111] Defilement is therefore an indication of disorder; the balance between the human and the divine has been disturbed.[112]

The consequences of defilement and pollution are expressed through the concept of ἄγος. As was the case with the word *miasma*, this word must be treated as a theoretical instrument. *Agos* is a difficult word to define, as is its adjective ἐναγής, 'in *agos*'. It is closely associated with *miasma*, but their meanings are not identical. *Miasma* or ritual impurity was understood as unavoidable in certain situations, and every human being would inevitably be subjected to this condition from time to time. When a member of the household died, after the birth of a child, during women's menstrual period or after sexual activity, there followed a state of *miasma*. There are no moral aspects connected with *miasma*, it was simply a part of human life, and it could be removed by undertaking purification rituals. *Miasma* caused no problems or divine intervention as long as it was dealt with in a proper manner.[113]

Agos on the other hand, according to Parker, occurs when a limit is transgressed and impurity is brought into contact with the divine and the sacred:

> To create agos, the offence must probably be directed against the gods and their rules, as simple murder seems not to do so, while murder at an altar certainly does. It sometimes seems as if what causes agos is simply contact between miasma and the sacred.[114]

It is reasonable to say that *agos* is the moral aspect of impurity, because it occurs as a result of human actions that could have been avoided, even if there was no intention of bringing *miasma* into a sacred precinct. The intentions of the transgressor are irrelevant

---

[111] Vernant 1990, 131-132.

[112] Vernant 1990, 134-135.

[113] Parker 1983, 8: "To miasma gods seem irrelevant; it is a dangerous dirtiness that individuals rub off on one another like a physical taint".

[114] Parker 1983, 8.

in these cases. An exception, however, may be the case of murder where the intentions of the murderer can sometimes determine whether defilement occurs or not.[115]

A person who is affected by *agos* becomes *enagēs*. Parker claims that being *enagēs* must be understood as a kind of negative and dangerous consecration to a god. As he points out, the person who has been cursed or commits perjury becomes subject to *agos,* i.e. he or she becomes consecrated to the god they have offended in the sense that they will attract a divine reaction that may harm others than those who actually committed the transgression.[116] In fact, the word *enagēs* can be used in the sense 'to be cursed'.[117] Parker also points out that the verb ἐναγίζειν refers to a sacrifice where the sacrificial animal was burnt whole without any meal following the ritual.[118]

Scholars have debated whether there is an etymological connection between the words *agos* and ἁγνός/ἅγιος, i.e. the Greek concepts for 'ritually pure'. No clear conclusion has been drawn, but most scholars today seem to agree that these words may be traced back to a common origin. Vernant states that the semantic relation between *agos* and *hagnos/hagios* is essential to the understanding of these concepts. According to him these words express the dangerous aspects of the sacred.[119] Both *agos* and *hagnos/hagios* must be understood in connection with the notion of the sacred as something forbidden and dangerous. When a boundary that is not to be transgressed is created, it is often described in terms of *hagnos* and *hagios*. These concepts therefore suggest the distance humans must keep from the sacred and the divine. *Agos* on the other hand denotes the effect of these powers when the boundary between the human and the divine is transgressed. It overtakes the transgressor and makes him or her exposed to the wrath of the deity. Defilement is therefore, according to Vernant, 'the awful nature of the sacred'.[120] Thus it is not correct to say that to be *enagēs* is the same

---

[115] Vernant 1990, 125-126.

[116] Parker 1983, 7.

[117] *LSJ* s.v. ἐναγής, *under a curse.*

[118] Parker 1983, 8. *LSJ* s.v. ἐναγίζω, *offer sacrifice to the dead.* These sacrifices were normally performed for chthonic beings. See Burkert 1985, 63-64 on holocaust in the cult of the dead.

[119] Vernant 1990, 135-141.

[120] Vernant 1990, 137.

as to be defiled. A person who is *enagēs* is subject to the powers of a god, as a consequence of defilement.

Parker assumes a similar position, but draws no absolute conclusion concerning the etymology of *agos* and *hagnos/hagios*.[121] He does not deny the possibility of an etymological connection, but emphasises that irrespective of the nature of the actual relation between the concepts it is reasonable to assume that the ancient Greeks themselves acknowledged a relation. Parker suggests that the loss of the aspirate in *agos* may be a way of separating the positive and negative aspects of consecration,[122] and he accordingly approaches Vernant's conclusion.

At the other end of the discussion on the etymology of *agos* we find Walter Burkert. He denies the possibility of there being a common root for *agos* and *hagnos/hagios*, and explains the similarity as a phonetic coincidence. Nevertheless, he admits that it probably had consequences for how the ancient Greeks understood the sacred. There is definitely a dangerous side of the sacred, and the concepts cannot be totally separated.[123]

The discussion of the etymology of *agos* will, as Burkert points out, 'lead into pre-history'.[124] Etymology is a risky enterprise that may lead to quite irrelevant and erroneous conclusions, even if the alleged etymology of a word should prove to be correct. The origin of a word very often gives no indication of how the word was actually used and understood at a later stage in history. The only conclusion we can draw is that it is possible that these concepts were associated with each other because of their formal similarity, that they were both used to describe the sacred as something secluded, and that violation of this seclusion would result in a divine reaction.

b. Purification

Ritual purity could be gained through various rituals. In its simplest form this was achieved by sprinkling oneself with water from the *perrirhantērion,* which was placed

---

[121] Parker 1983, 6.

[122] Parker 1983, 12.

[123] Burkert 1985, 270-271.

[124] Burkert 1985, 81.

at the entrance of most temples and sacred precinct (see page 65).[125] Anyone entering a temple had to undergo a simple and primarily symbolic act of cleansing, not unlike the ritual performed when entering Catholic churches. Some incidents required longer periods of purification (see Ch. 3). Greek cultic regulations often relate various types of pollution to periods of exclusion during which the polluted person is debarred from entering the shrine. The length of these exclusions varies according to the type of pollution in question. Special occasions, such as initiation into a mystery cult, required special forms of purification.[126] Purification at the entrance of a temple or before an initiation was conducted by the worshipper him- or herself, while more elaborate rituals probably were performed by members of the priesthood.

In Greece, purification in most cases seems to have been the responsibility of the individual worshipper. We find, however, scraps of evidence for a practice highly relevant to the study of the reconciliation inscriptions, namely the so-called purifiers or μάντεις. The *mantis* remained a marginal character in Greek religion throughout its history and little is known about the activities of a *mantis*. Research on the *mantis*-tradition is further complicated by the fact that most of the stories about *manteis* are mythological or semi-mythological. Still, there is no doubt that there existed a subculture of purifiers and healers who claimed to have competence in purification. These figures are often associated with the archaic period of Greek history, and many of the names attached to this tradition must be regarded as mythical or literary figures. Still, there is no doubt that the tradition of the *mantis* reflects a historical fact. The *mantis* enters Greek literature at its very beginning, the 1st song of the *Iliad.* When Cryses curses the Greek army in revenge for the abduction of his daughter, and Apollo strikes the army with pestilence, the Achaeans seeks the advice of the prophet (οἰωνοπόλος) named Calchas (*Il.* 1.69).[127] The Achaeans are ignorant of the reason for the wrath of Apollo, but Calchas possesses the ability to explain everything in the past,

---

[125] *RE* XIX 856-857 s.v. περριραντήρια. *DNP* s.v. *Perirrhanterion.* For testimonies of the ritual of besprinkling see

[126] E.g. the θρόνωσις ritual at the Eleusinian mysteries. See Burkert 1983, 266-268. The ceremony is described by Pl. *Euthd,* 277d; *Lg. 790d-e.* D.Chr. *Or.* 12.33.

[127] On the story of Calchas see Borgeaud 1999, 290-291; Ronen 1999, 275-277.

the present, and the future.[128] He explains the reason for the pestilence and urges the Achaeans to return the girl to her father and give a sacrifice to Apollo in order to reconcile (*Il.* 1.100: ἱλασσάμενοι) him.[129]

The most famous of the *manteis* are Melampous and Epimenides. They are both shrouded in myths, but there seems to be some historical basis behind the stories. Epimenides was according to Plutarch called by Solon to Athens to propitiate the *agos* that occurred as a consequence of the murder of the coup leader Cylon and his adherents inside the temple of Athena. Thirty years later, Athens was struck by a crisis,[130] and Solon organized a trial in which the family of the archon responsible for the murders was convicted and exiled. Thereafter Epimenides was called to Athens to conduct the required propitiation (ἱλασμοί) and purification (καθαρμοί) rituals.[131] We also know that *manteis* were practising in Athens during the classical period, but clearly outside the official cult and apparently with bad reputation among intellectuals.[132] It is clear that a *mantis* was believed to have the ability to both predict the future and, more importantly, to explain past events[133] and thereby prescribe remedies to solve the crisis.

5. Sources of pollution in ancient Greek religion

As previously pointed out, birth, death, and sex were the main sources of ritual impurity. In addition we also find rules for which clothes were allowed inside a temple, which objects one might or might not bring into a sacred precinct, and in some cases, particularly in later cultic regulations, what kind of food one was to eat before entering the temple.

---

[128] *Il.* 1. 70: [...] ἤδη τά τ᾽ ἐόντα τὰ ἐσσόμενα πρό τ᾽ ἐόντα.

[129] *Il.* 1. 92-100.

[130] The sources disagree on the nature of the crisis. Plutarch (*Sol*. XII 3) claims that Athens was defeated by the Megarians and troubled by superstitious fears (φόβοι ἐκ δεισιδαιμονίας), while Diogenes Laertios (I, 110) describe the crisis as a plague (λοιμός).

[131] Plut. *Sol*. XII, 5.

[132] Pl. *Rep*. 364 B.

[133] Arist. *Rh*. III, xvii, 10. Cf. also Ronen 1999, 279.

a. Death-pollution

Like the way in which Greek societies divided space between the dead, the humans, and the gods, they also identified three corresponding levels of pollution.[134] One of the most important concerns of Greek cultic regulations is therefore the avoidance of death-pollution. The gods were immortal and therefore the dead had to be separated from them. Unlike Christian burial rituals, burials in Antiquity took place outside the cultic space regarded as the habitation of the gods, and even outside the human sphere of life. The burial ground or *necropolis* was usually located outside the city walls, at least from the classical period onwards.[135] To bring a corpse into a temple was unthinkable and a priest would never take part in a funeral.[136] Death and burial were primarily a concern of the household, and the purification rites that took place afterwards were directed at the family and the household of the diceased. Death-pollution was not only confined to the corpse, but would affect the entire household and anyone who came into contact with the corpse. The purification of mourners and attendants of funerals, and the subsequent period of exclusion from sacred places are important themes in Greek cultic regulations (see chapter 3).

b. Sexuality

Gender and sexuality are important issues with regard to ritual purity. As pointed out above, permanent sexual abstinence is rare in ancient pagan cult, but exclusion from sacred precincts and temples was required after sexual intercourse (see Ch. 3, 109-112). In later cultic regulations, menstruation becomes a reason for exclusion from cultic space, but in classical Greece menstruation was only discussed in medical texts.[137] This is surprising given that we know that menstruation is a widespread source of ritual pollution in many societies. Parker suggests that there were rituals surrounding the menstrual period, but that no evidence for this remains, possibly because it was regarded as unspeakable. Cole argues that it is reasonable to assume that menstruation

---

[134] Cole 2004, 35-36.

[135] Parker 1983, 42.

[136] Parker 1983, 36.

[137] Cole 2004, 108.

was a reason for exclusion from rituals before the Hellenistic period as well.[138] Here we do not need to speculate about the classical period; the important thing is that it was or became identified as a source of impurity in Hellenistic and Roman times.

c. Birth

Like many other societies, ancient Greek society secluded women who had recently given birth for a certain period of time. In fact, birth and death are often juxtaposed in cultic regulations.[139] The mother herself was excluded from temples and public places until the pollution was considered removed. Members of the household were also excluded from sacred places after a birth, but for a shorter period.

6. Protection of sacred property

Protection of sacred property is not directly related to ritual impurity, but is still an important theme in Greek cultic regulations. Regulations concerning the protection of sacred property contain prohibitions against offences such as logging wood or herding cattle in sacred groves, stealing or destroying votive offerings, removing sacrificial meat or insulting suppliants.[140] This aspect of cultic morality has both a religious and judicial purpose. From the religious point of view these rules are, like the purity code, intended to maintain the division between ritual and profane space, by prohibiting agricultural activities on sacred land, for instance. From a judicial point of view these prohibition serve to protect specific property belonging to a shrine. This makes these issues more concrete and tangible than the rather elusive categories of ritual purity. The legislation concerning sacred property is thus quite similar to legislation concerning any other form of property.

As ancient gods made their presence visible through temples, *temenē* and votive offerings, the protection of these belongings was vital for the prestige of their cults. The ability to preserve sacred land and valuables was therefore a sign of a cult's vitality. As

---

[138] Cole 2004, 111. Cole's argument is that Greek medical writers regarded menstruation as a process of purification.

[139] Parker 1983, 102. Cole 2004, 105.

[140] For the institution of *asylia*, see Sinn 1993.

we will see in the following chapter, regulations concerning the protection of sacred property tend to be more detailed than regulations setting out rules about ritual purity.

D. Conclusion

We may sum up the concept of cultic morality by saying that it is an aspect of the internal boundaries of ancient religions intended to create an occasion suitable for worship of the gods. Even though purity is a central issue in Greek cultic morality it would strech a point to claim that we are dealing with a fundamental classificatory process here. The cultic behavioural code was on the one hand intended to create an occasion possessing a particular significance, and on the other to provide possibilities for worshippers to participate in this occasion. Participation in the sacrificial ritual with others was a sign of membership of the community; a community marked by a shared 'fitness to worship'.

Consequently, there is a strong aspect of social control in cultic morality. Cultic morality is intended to create a notion of something important and necessary for participation in the community. The purpose is not necessarily to avoid actions and behaviour that are directly threatening to the community but to create a code for evaluation of behaviour. This does not mean that a particular set of actions is followed by all members of a community. The important issue is not what is done but how successfully behaviour is defined within the behavioural code.

PROHIBITIONS AND PUNISHMENTS IN GREEK CULTIC REGULATIONS

A. Greek cultic regulations

1. Introduction

We have now looked at the basic aspects and notions of what I call Greek cultic morality, and we will now analyse expressions and enforcements of the cultic behavioural code. An important feature of ancient pagan religions is the absence of canonised, authoritative texts intended for cultic purposes. The hymns of Pindar, Kallimachos and others, for instance, were written for special occasions and did not have the status of holy texts like the Christian bible, and were regarded as products of the authors' artistic talents and not of divine inspiration. In addition to hymns and other texts intended for ritual use, most of ancient Greek literature was religious in so far as it presented themes from mythology. But these texts are literature and were not used in ritual contexts. As pointed out in Ch. 2,[1] pagan religions were primarily focused on cult and ritual, in particular sacrifice, and not on dogmas. There was therefore no need to codify religious beliefs in the form of a fixed set of dogmas or myths. But as a consequence, the need to formulate rules for how the cult was to be performed was all the more evident. If there are any texts at all that we can identify as having authoritative status in ancient religions, it is the texts describing the external requirements and features of cult and ritual. These texts are usually referred to as ἱεροὶ νόμοι, *leges sacrae*, or 'sacred laws', and are primarily preserved as inscriptions.

There was not one general law for the performance of cult. The texts that survive were written for particular shrines, cults and festivals, but unlike the Greek hymns mentioned above, they had a more enduring significance in the cult. They were meant to establish a set of rules for how the cult was to be conducted, the organisation of the shrine and what behaviour could be tolerated inside a shrine. The term 'sacred law' may

---

[1] See Ch. 2, 46-47.

however be misleading, implying that these texts had a sacred status or were regarded as products of divine inspiration. Greek cultic regulations are often laws or decrees in the strictest sense of the word, passed by the Assembly of the city and containing the same formulae of authorisation as any other laws.[2] In other cases the texts are rules issued by the administrators of the cult, and therefore not laws passed by the Assembly or other responsible body. What is more important is that these texts were rarely regarded as sacred *per se*, like for instance the Jewish law. Eran Lupu has shown that the term 'sacred law' is in many ways a modern construct.[3] There are a few exceptions, to which I will return later, where the cultic regulation was regarded as divinely inspired, but in most cases the regulations did not have a special status distinguishing them from other public decrees. I have therefore chosen to call these texts 'cultic regulations', and avoid the term 'sacred laws', to avoid misconceptions about their formulation, content and significance.

The importance of cultic regulations is evident in the fact that they have a very long history and are preserved in rather large numbers.[4] The earliest evidence of the recording of religious rules goes back to the 6th century BC, and the practice lasts into the 3rd century AD.[5] Cultic regulations therefore had a more lasting significance in pagan religions than any other texts. We are not, however, very well informed about how long an individual regulation was in use. A contract between a priest and a shrine could only be valid as long as the priest remained in office, while a regulation of ritual purity might possibly be observed for centuries. Usually, it is impossible to draw any clear conclusions on these questions. There are also very few ancient sources that help clarify the function of these texts, even though there are scraps of evidence in some literary sources. The oldest literary reference to the practice of purification before entering a sacred precinct, for instance, is found in Hippocrates' *On the sacred disease:*

---

[2] Parker 2004, 58-59.

[3] Lupu 2005, 4.

[4] Sokolowski's collections contain 402 texts. *LSAM:* 88 inscriptions; *LSCG:* 181 inscriptions; *LSS:* 133 inscriptions.

[5] Lupu 2005, 4.

αὐτοί τε ὅρους τοῖσι θεοῖσι τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τῶν τεμενέων ἀποδείκνυμεν, ὡς ἂν μηδεὶς ὑπερβαίνῃ ἢν μὴ ἁγνεύῃ, ἐσιόντες τε ἡμεῖς περιρραινόμεθα οὐχ ὡς μιαινόμενοι, ἀλλ᾽ εἴ τι καὶ πρότερον ἔχομεν μύσος, τοῦτο ἀφαγνιούμενοι.

We ourselves mark out the precincts of the temples of the gods so that no-one should enter without purifying himself; as we go in, we sprinkle ourselves with holy water, not because we are thereby polluted, but to rid ourselves of any stain we may have contracted previously.[6]

Athēnaios in his *Deipnosophistai* refers to the following regulation in a discussion of the term 'parasite' which had a more positive connotation in the classical period. Even though the contents of this regulation are not directly relevant to this study, it shows that the genre and its style were well-known in ancient Greece:

ἐν Κυνοσάργει μὲν οὖν ἐν τῷ Ἡρακλείῳ στήλη τίς ἐστιν, ἐν ᾗ ψήφισμα μὲν Ἀλκιβιάδου, γραμματεὺς δὲ Στέφανος Θουκυδίδου, λέγεται δ᾽ ἐν αὐτῷ περὶ τῆς προσηγορίας οὕτως· τὰ δὲ ἐπιμήνια θυέτω ὁ ἱερεὺς μετὰ τῶν παρασίτων. οἱ δὲ παράσιτοι ἔστων ἐκ τῶν νόθων καὶ τῶν τούτων παίδων κατὰ ‹τὰ› πάτρια. ὃς δ᾽ ἂν μὴ θέλῃ παρασιτεῖν, εἰσαγέτω καὶ περὶ τούτων εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον.[7]

In the temple of Heracles in Cynosarges there is a tablet on which is a decree proposed by Alcibiades, the clerk being Stephanus, son of Thucydides. With regard to the use of the term (i.e. parasite) the words to be found on it are as follows: "The priest shall sacrifice the monthly offerings in company with the parasites. These parasites shall be drawn from men of mixed descent and their children, according to ancestral custom. And whosoever shall decline to serve as a parasite shall be cited before the court on precisely this charge.[8]

These sources primarily demonstrate that cultic regulations were texts which were very familiar to ancient worshippers. The large number of examples and wide geographical diffusion of the genre also indicates that they were regarded as a necessary and conventional part of a cult.

---

[6] Hp. *Morb.Sacr.* IV, translated by J. Chadwick and W. N. Mann, Penguin Classics 1950.

[7] 6.234 e-f. The text follows the Teubner edition of Georg Kaibel (Kaibel 1887).

[8] Translated by Charles Burton Gulick, Loeb Classical Library 1929.

It is also difficult to determine how and how strictly the cultic regulations were observed. The the very fact of the widespread need to formulate such rules suggests that the ideal conduct of the worshipper was not always observed. As pointed out in Chapter 2, cultic morality must be regarded as normative, and not a description of how Greek worshippers actually behaved.[9] An indication of the failure to observe cultic regulations may be found in a satiric essay by Lucian called *On sacrifice:*

> καὶ τὸ μὲν πρόγραμμά φησι μὴ παριέναι εἰς τὸ εἴσω τῶν περιρραντηρίων ὅστις μὴ καθαρός ἐστιν τὰς χεῖρας· ὁ δὲ ἱερεὺς αὐτὸς ἔστηκεν ἡμαγμένος καὶ ὥσπερ ὁ Κύκλωψ ἐκεῖνος ἀνατέμνων καὶ τὰ ἔγκατα ἐξαιρῶν καὶ καρδιουλκῶν καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῷ βωμῷ περιχέων καὶ τί γὰρ οὐκ εὐσεβὲς ἐπιτελῶν;[10]

> And although the notice says that no-one is to be allowed within the holy-water who has not clean hands, the priest himself stands there all bloody, just like the Cyclops of old, cutting up the victim, removing the entrails, plucking out the heart, pouring the blood about the altar, and doing everything possible in the way of piety.[11]

Even though Lucian's intention is to ridicule the practice of animal sacrifice, his observation indicates on the one hand that cultic regulations were familiar as late as the 2nd century AD, and that they contained, as we will see, very much the same purification requirements as the archaic and classical regulations.

2. Publications and classification of cultic regulations

The first collection of Greek cultic regulations, *Leges Graecorum Sacrae* (*LGS*), was published by Hans von Prott and Ludwig Ziehen in 1896. Ziehen also published a second volume in 1906. This publication was until the 1950s the most reliable compendium of Greek cultic regulations. Then the most comprehensive collections of cultic regulations to date were published by Franciszek Sokolowski in three volumes: *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure* (*LSAM*),[12] *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplément*

---

[9] See Ch. 2, 47-49.

[10] *De Sacr.* 13.

[11] Translated by A. M. Harmon, Loeb Classical Library 1921.

[12] Paris 1955.

(*LSS*)[13] and *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (*LSCG*).[14] *LSS* was originally intended to be a supplement to *LGS*, but this and the two other volumes eventually came to replace von Prott and Ziehen's editions. Sokolowski's editions have consequently to a large extent shaped scholars' views of cultic regulations and established the concept of 'sacred laws'.[15] In 2005 Eran Lupu published 27 new cultic regulations found after Sokolowski's collections.[16] I have here included only one of Lupu's inscriptions,[17] since the remaing texts are irrelevant to this study. Lupu points out that although Sokolowski has been criticized, especially for some of his restorations, his collections are still not out of date.[18] Consequently, there is a valid reason for most of the cultic regulations looked at in this thesis being taken from the collections of Sokolowski.

Neither von Prott and Ziehen nor Sokolowski offer a general classification of the cultic regulations,[19] but Sokolowski introduces the themes of the texts in the title of each inscription. These headings are not uniform. Sokolowski usually terms the texts 'règlement', and then gives a general characterisation of the content. If a text deals with several cultic themes, he terms it *Règlement de culte* or *Règlement cultuel*. In some case he is more specific, as in *Règlements relatifs au culte d'Apollon Pythios*[20] or *Règlement relatif à la pureté rituelle*. But these are merely descriptions, not classifications. A more

---

[13] Paris 1962.

[14] Paris 1969.

[15] Parker 2004, 57-58: "[W]e often continue to behave as if the texts assembled in Sokolowski are sacred laws, and sacred laws are the texts assembled in Sokolowski".

[16] Lupu 2005 (= *NGSL*) contains the following regulations: 1) *SEG* XXXIII 147, 2) *SEG* XXVIII 103/XXVI 134, 3) *SEG* XXXV 113, 4) *SEG* XXXVI 267, 5) *SEG* XXXI 122, 6) *SEG* XXX 380, 7) *SEG* XXVIII 421, 8) *SEG* XXXVI 376, 9) *I. Oropos* 278/*SEG* XLVII 488, 10) *I. Oropos* 279/*SEG* XLVII 497, 11) *SEG* XXXII 456, 12) *SEG* XXVI 524, 13) *SEG* XLIV 505, 14) *SEG* XXVII 261/*I. Beroia* 1, 15) *SEG* XLVI 923, 16) *SEG* XXXVIII 786, 17) *SEG* XXXIX 729, 18) *SEG* XXVII 545/*IG* XII 6, 169, 19) *IG* XII 6, 170, 20) *SEG* XXXV 923, 21) *SEG* XXXVIII 853, 22) *SEG* XLI 739, 23) *SEG* XLI 744, 24) *SEG* XXVIII 750, 25) *SEG* XXVI 1084, 26) *SEG* XXX 1119, 27) *SEG* XLIII 630. The collection does not include inscriptions from Cos or Asia Minor. Nos. 11 and 13 have been published earlier. See Lupu 2005, XI.

[17] *NGSL* 7.

[18] Lupu 2005, 3-4.

[19] Parker 2004, 57.

[20] *LSCG* 25.

useful category of classification is *Calendrier des cultes*, i.e. calendars for when certain rituals and festival were to be held. An even more specific category of cultic regulations is what Sokolowski calls *Règlement relatif à la prêtrise* or *Vente du sacerdoce*. These texts are rules for the office of priesthood, regulating aspects such as the duties of the priests, their payment, or which parts of the sacrificial animal the priest or priestess was entitled to receive, or how the sale of a priestly office was to be conducted. They are, so to speak, contracts for the office of priesthood, and we find a great number of them in Sokolowski's collections.

Sokolowski does not provide a satisfactory basis for the classification of cultic regulations, but it is obvious that this is a very difficult task due to the diverse content of the texts.[21] A preliminary classification of cultic regulations might be to distinguish between 'cultic regulations proper', 'contracts of priesthood' and 'cultic calendars'. But the fact is that the genres are very often mixed. For instance, we often find accounts of the duties of the priests side by side with rules for ritual purity. There are also other regulations aimed at specific situations and problems occurring within the sanctuary. An example is the regulations against destruction of sacred trees and groves, which were probably written as responses to actual problems. In this sense we may call any regulation of cultic activity a 'cultic regulation', but this is of course not very helpful for our purpose.

In Chapter 2 it was argued that cultic morality is not identical with cultic legislation because Greek cultic regulations contain rules for a great variety of cultic topics.[22] The reason for this diversity of content is probably that the regulations were written for specific occasions and not as a result of a codification programme.[23] In some cases it was necessary to write a general regulation regarding a cult, for instance when a new cult was founded. In other cases specific situations could provoke additional rules: when a priest or priestess was hired, it was necessary to formulate a contract. If the

---

[21] Lupu 2005, 5: "What links all of these documents together is neither a formal definition, let alone a formal definition of law – which in and of itself has little bearing upon the nature of the evidence – nor of genre. It is rather their subject matter – on the whole sacred – and the means – for the most part of a tangibly legal character – by which it is handled".

[22] See Ch. 2, 50-51.

[23] See Ch. 2, 51.

violation of sacred trees or groves was a problem, this might lead to the establishment of codified prohibitions against such acts. Accordingly, these texts cannot be classified individually; the classification must proceed according to the separate rules we find in the texts. First, we must make a distinction between 'regulations' and 'rules'. By 'regulation' I mean the entire text recorded in an inscription. Such texts contain various rules. Having made that distinction, we must turn to the specific rules that the texts contain, and classify them instead.

Few have attempted to define and describe Greek cultic regulations as a genre. In his recently published collection of cultic regulations, Lupu lists the following criteria for terming a text 'sacred law':

> 1) The documents must be prescriptive; they must set out rules and regulations, syntactically, by means of imperative forms, written or implied. In practice imperative infinitives and imperatives are normal; the future indicative may also be used as may the present. 2) Their subject matter, the object of their prescriptions, must be or pertain to religion and particularly to cult practice. When Greek sacred law is concerned, these must be Greek, and relevant documents such as the law from the Herodian temple of Jerusalem are to be left out.[24]

Lupu admits that these requirements are not sufficient,[25] and even though they may serve as basic descriptions of inscriptions containing religious rules, I would still claim that a classification of the single rules is more useful in this context than a classification of the entire texts. These rules may be classified in the following categories:

1) Rules concerning admission to the shrine.
2) Rules concerning the sacrificial rites.
3) Rules concerning the rights and duties of the priests.
4) Rules concerning the protection of sacred property.

---

[24] Lupu 2005, 5-6.

[25] Lupu 2005, 8: "Reality is, however, more complex and leaves some room for interpretation. Though many cases are sufficiently clear, the final decision as to whether or not to admit a given document into the corpus may at times depend on a variety of factors, including personal judgment".

This is a general classification. Lupu on the other hand classifies the issues dealt with by cultic regulations into four categories: sacred space, sacred officials, performance of cult, and religious events.[26] I would argue that performance of cult and religious events should fall under the single category of sacrificial rites, but I would retain a special category for the protection of sacred property or objects because it is more helpful in this context. Lupu's classifications are however undoubtedly useful if one is studying cultic regulations *per se.*

The first category, rules concerning admission to the shrine, includes the preconditions worshippers had to fulfil in order to be admitted to a shrine to participate in the cult. Very often these demands are expressed as purification requirements, but criteria of exclusion from a shrine may also be based on factors such as ethnicity, age, sex, etc. As I will show, there were also areas of the *temenos* that were absolutely out of bounds. Ritual purity is accordingly merely a sub-category of the criteria of exclusion.

Rules describing various aspects of the performance of sacrificial rites are included in the second category. Since almost every religious occasion in ancient societies involved some form of sacrifice, I find it unnecessary to create special categories such as 'cultic calendars', 'festivals' or 'division of sacrificial meat', because they all prescribe when and how a sacrificial ritual is to be performed. I therefore regard them as sub-categories.

It might be objected that the third category, rules concerning the rights and duties of the priests, might also be included in the second category. After all, the main duty of a priest is to perform sacrifices. But the regulations of the duties and rights of the priests also include rules that are not directly associated with the actual ritual, for instance the salary of the priest and the duration of his or her office. I have therefore kept it as an idependent category.

The final category, rules concerning the protection of sacred property or objects, includes any form of prohibition against the destruction of property associated with religious activity. Examples include the destruction or theft of votive offerings, cutting wood or herding cattle in a sacred grove, misuse of sacred land for agriculture etc.

---

[26] Lupu 2005, 9-110.

Since the present thesis aims to analyse the special variety of cultic morality found in the reconciliation inscriptions, the cultic regulations have been selected on the basis of containing transgressions analogous to those described in the reconciliation inscriptions. Since we hardly find any reference to them in the reconciliation inscriptions, the rules governing the conduct of the sacrifice and the rights and duties of the priests are irrelevant for my purposes. Neither do they fall within my concept of cultic morality. I will therefore focus on categories 1 and 4: admission to the shrine and rules concerning the protection of sacred property.

B. Prohibitions in cultic regulations

1. Introduction

As pointed out in the previous chapter, the cultic regulations very often define sacred space and ritual purity negatively, in the sense that they tell the reader what is not acceptable when one partakes in cultic activity.[27] This implies that the norm of correct behaviour within a sacred precinct is usually enforced through prohibitions. The majority of these prohibitions concern the conditions and demands a worshipper must fulfil in order to gain entrance to a shrine. There is much less focus on the behaviour expected of the worshipper inside the precinct than on unacceptable behaviour, while correct behaviour outside the sacred precinct is rarely mentioned. This indicates several things. On the one hand, it supports the observation that moralistic demands outside a specific ritual context were rarely made with reference to religion. Cultic morality was not identical with profane morality.[28] More importantly, it demonstrates that the main concern of Greek legislation regarding acceptable cultic behaviour was the transition between the profane and the ritual sphere. The rules function as markers for inclusion and exclusion in the ritual community. Whether there was an actual selection of worshippers at the entrance to temples is irrelevant as long as the prohibitions created a sense of exclusivity. They were not only intended to keep outsiders away, but were equally important in terms of strengthening the internal solidarity within the cultic community through a common code of behaviour.

---

[27] See Ch. 2, 72.

[28] See Ch. 2, 49.

2. Admission to the shrine

In pagan religion, participation in rituals was a sign of piety, and piety was crucial for social acceptance and membership of the community. Ancient communities were, to a much larger extent than those of the modern world, cultic communities in the sense that they were centred on the worship of one or more deities. The identity of the individual human being was to a large degree related to participation in a common cult. The household worshipped its house gods and ancestors; various cultic associations provided benefits for their members and the city usually gave special attention to one particular deity. The *polis* state of classical Greece recognised certain cults in which citizens were obliged to participate. In Roman times, the imperial cult provided a common identity for the Empire, at least formally.[29] On every level of ancient societies, the household, larger social networks, and the state, membership was expressed through participation in a cult. This cultic participation must have played a crucial role in people's self-perception, and created divisions between those who were members of the cults and those who were excluded. This chapter will analyse the various criteria for entrance to sacred precincts.

a. Prohibitions against entry

Some areas were deemed so sacred that no-one was allowed to enter.[30] There were probably quite few such areas, but they are attested.[31] Pausanias also mentions sacred precincts where no-one may enter, but all his examples are taken from Arcadia.[32] This indicates that such precincts were rather uncommon in Greek religion except in Arcadia where they continued to exist until the Roman period. In Sokolowski's collections of cultic regulations there are three inscriptions that record such prohibitions.

1) *LSS* 49, Delos, 5th century BC.
2) *LSS* 128, Kallion in Aetolia, 5th century BC.
3) *LSCG* 121, Chios, not dated.

---

[29] For the imperial cult, see Price 1984 and Gradel 2002.

[30] See Lupu 2005, 18-21.

[31] The most famous example is probably the grove of the Eumenides where Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* takes place.

[32] Paus. 8.30.2; 8.31.5; 8.36.3; 8.38.6.

LSS 49 is inscribed on what was probably a lintel from the entrance to an enclosed precinct or room,[33] and contains only one line. It was found in the temple of the ἀρχηγέται on Delos,[34] and was probably related to the cult of Apollo. It diverges from the other inscriptions of this group by being intended only to exclude persons who are not inhabitants of the island of Delos.[35] The word ὁσίη (Ionic for ὁσία) may be translated 'divine law' or 'lawful'[36] and the adjective ὅσιος denotes, as pointed out in chapter 2, something that is right and lawful according to divine law.[37] Since the inscription is so short, it is impossible to say anything about the nature of the cult that excluded foreigners from the precinct.

LSS 128[38] contains six short lines recording a prohibition against entering the shrine. There is no information about the cult or the god to whom it was dedicated. Nor is there anything to explain why no-one was allowed to enter. The word ἱερὸν indicates that the enclosed area in question is a shrine with temples and altars, and not for instance a grove. Possibly only a certain part of the shrine, e.g. an ἄβατον, was enclosed. But this must remain speculation.

The last and shortest of the cultic regulations prohibiting entrance to a temple is *LSCG* 121 from Chios.[39] The inscription contains only three words, and states that no-one may enter because it is a holy place.

These texts do not give us much information about what generates a general prohibition against entering a shrine. On the contrary, it is the fact that no reasons for the prohibitions are given that is most striking and significant in all three inscriptions. No reason is given because no reason is needed. These texts are intended to protect a sacred space that is inaccessible to humans or limited to a certain group. When a place or a temple is regarded as so holy that no one can approach its sacrosanctity no purification ritual will be sufficient.

---

[33] Sokolowski 1962, 102: "Le linteau surmontait, peut-être, la porte ou l'enclos de l'escharôn ou de l'abaton du temple".

[34] See *IDelos* 68.

[35] *LSS* 49: Ξένωι οὐχ ὁσίη ἐσι[έναι].

[36] *LSJ* s.v. ὁσία.

[37] See Ch. 2, 73-74.

[38] See Appendix A, p. 266.

[39] Sokolowski gives no date for this inscription.

b. Prohibitions against impurity

The prohibitions most widely found in Greek cultic regulations are those meant to prevent polluted persons,[40] animals, or objects[41] from entering the sacred precinct. Unlike cultic regulations that prohibit any form of access to the sacred area (above), these inscriptions are often very detailed. They contain long lists of situations that require purification before the worshipper may be admitted into the shrine. It is reasonable to assume that regulations of this kind were placed at the entrance to the shrine in order to make the visitors to the temple aware of the purification rituals.

Even though rules of purification give us valuable information about Greek beliefs regarding ritual impurity and purification, it is important to point out that they represent an official ideology and are not necessarily evidence that everyone who wanted access to the shrine followed the rules precisely. In addition, the sources are frustratingly silent when it comes to control mechanisms for the observance of these rules. Even though belief in the necessity of ritual purification probably was deeply embedded in ancient Greek thought, as the passage from the Hippocratic treatise 'On the sacred disease' cited above indicates (see page 86), we cannot say for certain to what extent these rules were observed.

In reality, the picture was probably quite complex, but here, as for so many other areas of everyday life in ancient Greece, the sources are frustratingly silent. The rules of purification, like any other laws, must therefore be regarded as indications of what was thought to be the norm, and not as statements of the realities. It should also be added that a cultic regulation is not necessarily focused exclusively on rules of purification. On the contrary, the prohibitions against ritual pollution may be mentioned in just a few lines of a text that covers various aspects of the cult[42] and may thus be no more than a conventional part of a cultic regulation.

The rules of purification have here been categorised into two main groups based on their contents, namely general and detailed regulations.

---

[40] See Lupu 2005, 14-16.

[41] See Lupu 2005, 16-17.

[42] E.g. *LSCG* 171. The rules of purification are only mentioned in the last three lines of the text (15-17).

c. General rules of purification

By general rules of purification I mean rules demanding that those who enter the shrine be ritually purified, but without specifying what situations require purification. The sources of pollution appear more or less to be taken for granted. Four inscriptions from the collections of Sokolowski belonging to this category have been chosen.

1) *LSCG* 130, 3rd century BC, Astypalaia, Cyclades.

2) *LSAM* 35, 3rd century BC, Priene.

3) *LSCG* 53, 2nd century AD, Attica.

4) *LSS* 82, not dated, Mytilene, Lesbos.

Apart from *LSCG* 53, all are quite short. Most of them probably had the same function as the inscriptions discussed above, i.e. as signs at the entrance to a shrine. The only exception is *LSCG* 53, which is a regulation for a religious guild. Here, the rule relating to purity occupies only a small part of the text.

LSCG 130 consists of only three lines and proclaims that no-one who is impure may enter the temple,[43] perform a ritual (2: τελεῖ) or be present in the shrine.[44] There is no information about the authority behind the inscription or to what god the temple was dedicated. Nor are we told what the ritual purity implies.

In the other inscription from the 3rd century BC, *LSAM* 35, we find the same demand for ritual purity, but with a specification added. The top of the text is damaged and we do not know how many lines are missing; only five lines remain. This fact means that we cannot say to what kind of cult the inscription belonged or to what deity it was dedicated. Sokolowski suggests that it might have belonged to a family group or φρατρία.[45] This cannot be confirmed but the two first remaining lines state that Anaxidemos son of Apollonios obtained the priesthood by lot.[46] This suggests that the inscription is not basically a regulation of cultic behaviour, but a contract of priesthood. The regulation itself is, however, missing.[47] At the end of the inscription there is a

---

[43] *LSCG* 130, 1-2: [Ἐ]ς τὸ ἱερὸν μὴ ἐσέρπεν ὅσ|τις μὴ ἁγνός ἐστι (...).

[44] *LSCG* 130, 3: αὐτῶι ἐν νῶι ἐσσεῖται.

[45] Sokolowski 1955, 101*: Il s'agit de culte de'un groupe familial ou d'une phratrie.*

[46] *LSAM* 35, 1-2 : ἔλαχε τὴν ἱερωσύν[ην] | Ἀναξίδημος Ἀπολλων[ίου].

[47] Sokolowski 1955, 101: "La partie abîmée de l'inscription contenait problablement des prescriptions relatives à la prêtrise d'une divinité".

statement that purity is a condition of admission. Like *LSCG* 130, this text states that whoever enters the shrine must be ritually pure. The demand is, in contrast to *LSCG* 130, formulated positively: enter in a pure state.[48] Interestingly, the inscription adds that apart from being in a state of purity, whoever enters the shrine must be dressed in a white robe (4-5:).[49] Even though the demand for a white robe is made in addition to the demand for ἁγνεία we cannot determine whether the robe is a sign of achieved purity or a sign of membership of the cult.

LSS 82 contains only two lines, and as with the two inscriptions discussed above, there is no information about the cult to which the inscription belonged. It is, however, quite probable that the inscription was placed at the entrance to a temple with the intention of informing those who partook in the cult of the rules of admission. As the previous inscriptions, this text too demands that the worshipper must be ritually pure before entering the shrine.[50] But this inscription adds an interesting detail: A person who enters the shrine must have a solemn attitude (2: ὅσια φρονέοντα).[51]

The last of the inscriptions in this group, *LSCG* 53, which is also the latest in date, is a regulation of a religious guild (ἔρανος).[52] The inscription provides no evidence of the guild's purpose, and does not mention any gods. Sokolowski believed that it was the regulation of a funerary guild, which provided the expenditures for the burial of its members.[53] This is not confirmed by the text itself. The parts of the text are: **1.** The archons of the guild and the date of the banquet at which the regulation was agreed upon (27-29). **2.** The rules of purification (31-36). **3.** The office of the magistrates, which is to last one year. It is also specified that the person appointed as *homleitōr* shall remain in his office throughout his life (36-39). **4.** A wish for the guild's prosperity (39-40). **5.** The punishment of troublemakers (40-44).[54]

---

[48] *LSAM* 35, 3-4: Εἰσίναι εἰς [τὸ] | ἱερὸν ἁγνὸν (...).

[49] *LSAM* 35, 4-5: ἐ[ν] | ἐσθῆτι λευκ[ῆι].

[50] *LSS* 82, 1: Ἁγνὸν πρὸς τέμενος στείχειν (...).

[51] *LSS* 82, 2: ὅσια φρονέοντα. See Lupu 2005, 18.

[52] The numbering of the lines following Boeckh (*CIG* I 126) is kept by *IG* III[1] 23, Sokolowski and the present study. The first 26 lines are severely damaged and left out by Foucart 1873 and Sokolowski.

[53] Sokolowski 1969, 104-105: "La collège porte le nom d'ἔρανος, probablement à cause de l'entraide pour couvrir les dépenses des funérailles".

[54] This is paralleled in *SEG* XXXI 122 (Attica, 2nd century AD).

There are two prohibitions expressed in this inscription: the prohibition against impurity, and the prohibition against internal strife. The prohibition against impurity is found in lines 31-36 and is positively expressed: A person who enters must be ritually cleansed. As in the inscriptions discussed above, this regulation requires that anyone entering the shrine must be ἀγνός (33).[55] In addition the regulation requires that members of the guild must be pious (33: εὐσεβὴς) and good (33-34: ἀγ|α[θ]ός). The regulation also demands that these moral state must be attested (32-33: δοκι|μασθῇ; 34: δοκιμα[ζέ]τω)[56] by the chairman (34: προστάτης),[57] the president of the guild (35: ἀρχ‹ι›ερανιστής),[58] the secretary (35: γ[ρ]αμματεύς), the treasurers (36: ταμίαι),[59] and the advocates (36: σύνδικοι).[60] This is a very interesting piece of information because it tells us that the guild took the question of ritual fitness so seriously that it had to be witnessed and proved by all the officials of the guild. There are, however, some difficulties in the interpretation of the passage. It could of course mean that the members of the guild had to undergo a purification ritual under the supervision of the officials every time they took part in a guild meeting. But it may also mean that whoever was to be granted membership of the guild had to undergo such a ritual. The inscription says ἰσι[έν]αι ἰς τὴν σεμνοτά[τη]ν | σύνοδον τῶν ἐρανιστῶν (32-33), not ἱερόν as in the other inscriptions discussed in this section. The noun σύνοδος means

---

[55] *LSCG* 53, 33: ἀ[γν]ός. The stone has A.OC which is transcribed ἄ[γι]ος by Boeckh (*CIG* I 126), but corrected ἀ[γν]ὸς by Dittenberg (*IG* III^1 23), by Foucart 1873, p. 202, nr. 20, and by Kirchner (*IG* II^2 1369). I think this conjecture is correct because the adjective ἄγιος is usually used to describe objects consecrated to the gods. It may be used to describe persons, but the meaning is basically the same as ἀγνός. The possibility of ἀγνός is further strengthened by the fact that this is most commonly used in inscriptions containing rules of admission to the shrine.

[56] *LSJ* s.v. δοκιμάζω: *approve, approve after scrutiny;* Pass., *to be approved as fit.*

[57] *LSJ* s.v. προστάτης: *leader, chief, ruler, administrator, president.*

[58] *LSJ* s.v. ἀρχερανιστής: *president of an* ἔρανος.

[59] *LSJ* s.v. ταμίης: *treasurer.*

[60] *LSJ* s.v. σύνδικος: *one who helps in a court of justice, advocate.* It is also pointed out, with reference to this inscription (*IG* II^2 1369), that it may be the title of certain officials of an ἔρανος, without any further explanation. Possibly then the term is used in a special way in this particular ἔρανος, without any actual relation to courts and trials. We know, however, that there existed clubs in Athens whose purpose was to provide aid to its members in trials (See Parker, 1983, 187). This may explain the use of σύνδικος in this case.

'assembly', 'meeting', or 'society for festal purposes'.[61] The demand for piety and goodness (33-34) seems to me to point to personal qualities, and not to something that could be achieved mechanically through a ritual. This indicates that we have to do with a regulation for membership of the guild.

Here we see clearly what is the meaning of the adjective ἀγνός, as I have pointed out in chapter 2, namely fitness to worship. Even though the inscriptions discussed in this section do not contain any specification of what ἀγνός implies, they nevertheless confirm that this was a prerequisite for admission to the shrine. The fact that 'purity' is never specified may indicate that this was regarded as so obvious to the participants of the cult that no specification was needed.

d. Detailed rules of purification

The majority of Greek purity regulations contain more details concerning the circumstances that required purification before one was allowed to enter a *temenos*. Detailed rules of purification sometimes fill an entire regulation, sometimes only a small section. There is a clear difference between *LSS* 91, which is exclusively devoted to rules of purification, and *LSCG* 171, where only three lines (15-17) contain such rules, while the rest of the text is devoted to the duties and rights of a priest. But they share one common feature, namely specification of conditions which require purification, as opposed to the general regulations of purification discussed above. Whereas the general regulations of purification lay down ἀγνεία as a condition for admission to the shrine, the detailed regulations serve to define the content and meaning of ἀγνεία. These demands are often formulated by an expressed or implied ἀγνεύειν, or another verb denoting purification, and the preposition ἀπὸ with the undesired condition in the genitive. In my selection of inscriptions taken from the collections of Sokolowski, 20 texts fall within this category:

1) *LSCG* 152, Cos, 4th century BC. Regulation of the cult of the nymphs.
2) *LSAM* 29, Metropolis, Ionia, 4th century BC. Regulation of the cult of Mētēr.
3) *LSAM* 83, Heracleia, Pontos, 4th century. Regulation of burials.
4) *LSS* 33 A, Patrai, 3rd century BC. Regulation of the cult of Demeter.

---

[61] *LSJ* s.v. σύνοδος. The last explanation of the word refers to this inscription (*IG* II² 1369).

5) *LSAM* 16, Gambreion, 3rd century BC. Regulation of funerary rites.

6) *LSCG* 136, Ialysos, Rhodes, ca. 300 BC. Regulation of the cult of Alektrōne.

7) *LSS* 54, Delos, 2nd century BC.

8) *LSCG* 124, Eresos, Lesbos, 2nd century BC.

9) *LSCG* 171, Isthmos, 2nd century BC. Regulation of the cult of Zeus Hikesios.

10) *NGSL* 7, Megalopolis, Arcadia, ca. 200 BC. Regulation of the cult of Isis, Sarapis and Anubis

11) *LSAM* 18, Maionia, 147/146 BC.

12) *LSAM* 12, Pergamon, before 133 BC. Regulation of the cult of Athena Nikephoros.

13) *LSS* 119, Ptolemaïs, Egypt, 1st century BC.

14) *LSAM* 20, Philadelphia, 1st century BC. Regulation of a private cult.

15) *LSS* 108, Rhodes, 1st century AD.

16) *LSCG* 139, Lindos, Rhodes, 2nd century AD.

17) *LSCG* 55, Sounion, Attica, 2nd century AD. Regulation of a Mēn-cult.

18) *LSAM* 84, Smyrna, 2nd century AD. Regulation of the cult of Dionysios Bromios.

19) *LSS* 59, Delos, Roman period. Regulation of the cult of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia.

20) *LSS* 91, Lindos, Rhodes, 3rd century AD. Regulation of a cult of Athena.

It was pointed out in Ch. 2 that conditions requiring purification were associated with transitory periods of life.[62] In this paragraph we will analyse a selection of rules concerning these occasions regarded as causing ritual pollution.

Death

Death and the purification after a funeral belong to the most frequently mentioned motivations for purification. As I have pointed out in chapter 2, the avoidance of death and corpses within a sacred precinct was regarded as very important. Burials within a sacred precinct were strictly prohibited, as shown in the short inscription *LSAM* 83.[63] 9 of the inscriptions in this selection mention death, corpses, or funerals as something that

---

[62] See. Ch. 2, 69-70; 80-82.

[63] *LSAM* 83, 1-4: Ὅρρος τô | ἱερô. τότο | ἐνδὸς μὴ | θάπτειν.

requires purification.[64] Even though death pollution was one of the most persistent and widespread notions in Greek religion, the specification of periods of exclusion from temples after encountering corpses or partaking in funerals is not attested in cultic regulations with certainty until the second century BC.[65] This is confirmed by Parker, who states that periods of exclusion after a mourning period are only attested in post-classical cultic regulations.[66] There are a few fragmented regulations, not included in my material, that may attest to periods of purification,[67] but these inscriptions are, besides being fragmentary, difficult to interpret, and we cannot say with certainty whether they refer to any kind of death pollution or specifically to murder. They will not be taken into consideration here. Parker concludes that if such rules existed in classical Athens, they belonged to the realm of unwritten laws.[68] We can, however, conclude that the prohibition against death pollution within sacred spaces is attested in Greek cultic regulations from the 2nd century BC to the 3rd century AD, indicating a very long period of continuity.

In the cultic regulations κῆδος is the most frequently used word for funerals. The basic meaning of the word is 'mourning', and it encompasses the entire funeral process.[69] In the selected material the word is found in 6 inscriptions.[70] The earliest occurrence of this word in a cultic regulation is found in *LSAM* 29, but the entire right-hand side of this text is missing, and *kēdos* is here reconstructed by Keil and von

---

[64] *LSCG* 55, 6; 124, 1-5; 139, 13. *LSS* 91, 13-15; 119, 4. *LSAM* 12, 6-9; 16; 18, 6-9; 29, 3; 84, 6-9.

[65] *LSCG* 124. *LSAM* 12; 18.

[66] Parker 1983, 37.

[67] *LSCG* *56, 11-13 (Cleonae, Peloponnese, early 6th century BC): κά|θαρσιν δὲ εἶμεν ⫶ h[ὸς ἄι] | [κα τις ἀ]ποθάνοι, καθαρά|μενον ⫶. *LSS* *31, 10-18 (Tegea, Arcadia, 4th century BC): [... εἰ δὲ θά]πτοι τις τῶν ὀρ[χηστρᾶ]ν τ[ῶν] | [...] μαι, τὸν δὲ ἰόντα [εἴργε]ιν Γ | [...] μέστ᾽ ἂν ἀέλιος ὀν[τέλλοι ?] | [... κα]θίξετοι ἄνθρωπον. . . ε[ἴ]τε | [...]α καθαρὸν ἦναι, εἴτ[ε κα]θαρο[.] | [...] τεθναότος επερο. . .ν. ει ||[15] [...] τὸν ἄνθρωπον διαΙΛ . . . ει, ἀπὺ | [...] καθαρὸν ἦναι τᾶ[ι ὑστέρ]αι, ὅτι | [... τά]τε ἵκαστα οἶσαι. *LSS* *106, 1-6 (Camiros, Rhodes, not dated – See Parker 1983, 37, n. 17): [...] πεμταῖον [...] | [.]A δ[ω]δεκαταῖον[...τὸν εἰσ]ελθόντα ἀπὸ | θανόντος [πατρὸς, μητρὸς, ἀδελφῆς, ἀδελ]φοῦ πεμπταῖ|ον ⱽ εἰ δέ κ[α ἀπὸ θανόντος ἄλλου οἰκο]υροῦ ἐπέλθη, | αὐταμερὸγ[...αὐτ]αμε[ρ]ὸν εἰσ|έλθη κα[θ]α[ρὸς...].

[68] Parker 1983, 37, n. 17.

[69] *LSJ* s.v. κῆδος.

[70] *LSCG* 124, 2; 139, 13. *LSS* 91, 13, 14. *LSAM* 12, 7; 18, 7; 29, [3].

Premerstein.[71] The restoration is not implausible, but neither is it certain. The earliest certain attestation of the word is therefore found in *LSCG* 124 from Eresos on Lesbos, dated to the 2nd century BC. In all the inscriptions the prohibition is expressed by the phrase ἀπὸ κήδους.[72]

Other inscriptions are more specific in their references to death. *LSCG* 55 demands that those who enter should be purified from corpses,[73] while *LSS* 119 refers to death as a 'departure'.[74] The only inscription in my material that refers to death as θάνατος is *LSAM* 84,[75] dated to the 2nd century AD. Based on this vocabulary we may draw some conclusions. Since most of the inscriptions refer to death as κῆδος, it is reasonable to assume that it was participation in the mourning process, not merely close contact with corpses, that was considered polluting. The ritual pollution that occurred was therefore probably regarded as an inevitable part of funeral and mourning rituals.

The periods of exclusion imposed upon those who have encountered death vary considerably from place to place, and from period to period. One interesting aspect is that it is often different periods of exclusion after deaths of relatives and deaths of others. Encountering death and corpses will always cause pollution, but relatives of the deceased will suffer more pollution than others. The earliest inscription requiring a period of purification is again *LSAM* 29, which according to Keil and von Premerstein[76] prescribes 12 days of exclusion from the temple. Sokolowski doubts this reconstruction,

---

[71] See note 76.

[72] *LSCG* 124, 2: ἀπὸ μὲν κάδεος (Aeolian dialect).

[73] *LSCG* 55, 6: ἀπὸ νεκροῦ.

[74] *LSS* 119, 4: ἀπ᾽ ἀπαλλ[αγῆς – – – –]. The word is restored by Wilhelm, *Archäologisch-epigraphische Mitteilungen aus Oesterreich Ungarn* 15 (1892), 8. I have not been able to locate this publication. This reading has been retained by *SEG* XLIII 1131.

[75] *LSAM* 84, 6.

[76] *LSAM* 29, 2-4: [ἀγνεύ]εται ἀπὸ | [κήδους] ἡμέρας | [δώδεκα]. The line is restored by Keil & von Premerstein (1914, nr. 154, p. 103-104). The inscription is broken at the top and the bottom, but the stone is preserved in its entire width. The letters on the left-hand side are however worn away. [ἀγνεύ]εται is restored by Sokolowski. Keil & von Premerstein 1914 read ἀγνιζ?]εται. [κήδους] is suggested by Keil & von Premerstein (1914) and must be regarded as hypothetical, and the word is marked with a question mark. [δώδεκα] is also restored by Keil & von Premerstein (1914). Their drawing of the inscription on page 103 suggests that it is possible to identify the letters ΔΕ and parts of an A in line 3, which may justify the restoration of [δώδεκα].

apparently because the word δώδεκα is too short for the lacuna in the text, and he also thinks a period of 12 days is too long.[77] More informative is *LSCG* 124 from 2nd century BC Eresos,[78] which differentiates between three types of funerary pollution: participation at the funeral of a relative, the funeral of others, and direct contact with corpses. A person participating in the funeral of a relative will, according to this regulation, have to go through a cleansing period of twenty days.[79] Other funerals, however, only require an exclusion from the shrine for three days.[80] If the reconstruction of the word [θν]ατῶ is correct[81] it would offer support for the theory that death pollution was to a large degree associated with the process of mourning, even

---

[77] Sokolowski 1955, 84: *La restitution* δώδεκα *est trop courte, d'ailleurs une période de 12 jours me paraît trop longue.*

[78] The upper right-hand side of *LSCG* 124 is severely damaged, and there are no complete lines until line 16; only 6 lines are complete (16-20, 22). The first publisher, Paton 1902, suggested several restorations that have been altered by later scholars.

[79] *LSCG* 124, 2-3: ἀπὸ μὲν κάδεος ἰδίω | [ἀγνεύσ]αντας ἀμέραις εἴκοσι· Paton 1902 does not restore line 3. Kretschmer (1902) also leaves the lacuna open, but suggests [ἀναμένν]αντας as a possible reading. Papageorgiou (1904) suggested περιμένν]αντας, which is kept by *LGS* II 117, *IG* XII Suppl. 126 and Schwyzer 1923, 633. [ἀγνεύσ]αντας is Sokolowski's own suggestion. An argument against Sokolowski's reading, however, could be that in the next line, the cleansing is referred to as λοεσσάμενον, which is used twice (4, 9). A change in vocabulary seems unlikely.

[80] *LSCG* 124, 3-4: ἀπὸ δὲ | [ἀλλοτρί]ω ἀμέραις τρεῖς λοεσσάμενον. The restoration was suggested by Papageorgiou 1904 and has been kept by most of the later editions. Paton 1902 suggested ἐκφορᾶ]ς, which is probably based on a misreading of the remaining letter. Kretschmer 1902 leaves the lacuna empty and does not transcribe the last letter of the missing word. *IG* XII Suppl. 126 transcribes the last letter as ω, but does not record any possible restorations. *LGS* II 117 accepts Papageorgiou's restoration. Given the fact that line 2 of this text emphasises deaths of relatives as a category of its own (see *LSCG* 139, 13), this seems to be a reasonable reconstruction.

[81] There are many other suggestions. Paton 1902 did not restore the line, but identified . . .]άτω, which is kept by Kretschmer (1902, 143, *IG* XII Suppl. 126) and *LGS* II 117. Papageorgiou 1904: ἀπὸ τοκ]άτω, 'childbirth'. Papabasileiou 1911: κυ]άτω, 'impregnate'. Papabasileiou's suggestion is rejected by Zingerle 1924, 188 as 'unbelegbar', and he suggests instead ἀπ' ἐκτρωμ]άτω, 'untimely birth'. These suggestions are as far as I can judge as good as any other, because we cannot determine whether this is the end of the rules concerning death pollution (lines 1-4) or the beginning of the rules concerning birth pollution. Sokolowski's reading is however reasonable if we assume that the word belongs to the rules concerning funerals.

though the corpse itself would also cause pollution, in this case to be purified by means of 10 days of exclusion.[82]

One of the longest periods of exclusion is stipulated in *LSCG* 139,[83] which demands forty days of purification after the funeral of a relative.[84] Interestingly, another cultic regulation from Lindos, *LSS* 91, which is dated to the 3rd century AD, requires the purification to last for forty-one days. This long period of exclusion may very well have been a local tradition. Like *LSCG* 124, this inscription differentiates between three levels of death pollution: in addition to participation in the mourning for a dead relative, which requires twenty days of purification, the bathing of a corpse require seven days of purification. Even though the meaning is somewhat unclear, it seems that entering a house where someone has died required three days of purification. It is not the corpse itself that causes the most severe form of pollution; it is one's relation to the deceased that determines the degree of pollution. [85]

There is great diversity in the demands for purification periods after a funeral, and exclusion from the *temenos* because of death pollution was apparently differently emphasised at different times and places. For example, *LSAM* 12 requires only two days after partaking in mourning,[86] presumably with direct contact with the corpse, while participation at a funeral may be purified by a simple ritual the same day.[87] *LSAM* 18 is probably one of the most interesting inscriptions in this category. It comes from Maionia, and is therefore geographically related to the reconciliation inscriptions, even though it is about one century older than the earliest of them. The dating of the inscription to 147/6 BC is certain, and is based on line 1-2: Βασιλεύοντος [Ἀ]ττ[άλου]

---

[82] *LSCG* 124, 5: [ἀπὸ δὲ θν]ατῶ᾽ ἀμέραις δέκα (see note 81).

[83] Lindos, 2nd century AD.

[84] *LSCG* 139, 13: ἀπὸ κήδους [οἰκ]είου ἡμε μ΄. The restoration was provided by Foucart, which I have not been able to locate. Sokolowski's reading is identical with *LGS* II 148 and *IG* XII[1] 789.

[85] *LSS* 91, 13: [ἀπ]ὸ κήδους οἰκίου μα΄; 14: [ἀπο λ]ούσεως κήδους ζ΄; 14: ἀπὸ ἰσόδου γ΄. These lines are restored by the *edito princeps* (Blinkenberg 1941 =*I.Lindos* 487). It is not clear what kind of admission the word ἰσόδου implies. Sokolowski 1962, 161: "L' ἰσόδου signifie probablement l'entrée dans un maison mortuaire ou un monument funéraire".

[86] *LSAM* 12, 6-7: ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ | κήδους καὶ τεκούσης γυναικὸς δευτεραῖος.

[87] *LSAM* 12, 7-9: ἀπὸ δὲ τάφου | καὶ ἐκφορᾶς περιρασάμενοι καὶ διελθόντες τὴν πύλην κα|θ᾽ ἣν τὰ ἀγιστήρια τίθεται, καθαροὶ ἔστωσαν αὐθημερόν.

| ἔτους τρεισκαιδεκάτου,[88] which must refer to Attalos II Philadelphos of Pergamon who reigned from 159 to 138 BC.[89] The text conforms to the general picture. The regulation states that funerals of relatives require five days of purification, while the funeral of another person requires only three days.[90] The real importance of this text is that it shows that the practice of purification periods was known in Maionia, and that the requirements of purity were not necessarily more severe than at other places, and even quite modest compared to *LSCG* 124, 139 and *LSS* 91 (above).

The three remaining inscriptions in this group (see note 64) are more uncertain. If the restorations are correct, they do not contribute considerably to our knowledge of the Greek notion of death pollution. *LSAM* 16 (Gambreion, 3rd century BC) is not a purity regulation in the real sense, but a regulation of funerary rites. According to this regulation, mourning should last for three months for men and four month for women.[91] The inscription mentions nothing about the purification of men, but states that women have to be purified under the supervision of the magistrate of the women before taking part in the Thesmophoria.[92] *LSAM* 84 (Smyrna, 2nd century AD, Dionysios Bromios) does not give any specific details as to how many days the purification is to last, but states that if someone conceals the death of a relative, he or she will be excluded for the third of a month.[93]

It is also worth mentioning that the fragmentary inscription *LSS* 119 also demands, in addition to the period of exclusion after encountering death, a period of

---

[88] Restored by Keil & Premerstein 1911, 167, pp. 82-83. The letters forming the name of the king are almost worn away, but the drawing of the inscription suggests reminiscences of the letters ATTA.

[89] Under Attalos I (241–197 BC) Lydia was not yet part of the kingdom of Pergamon, while Attalos III reigned only for five years (138-133 BC). See Sokolowski 1955, 51.

[90] *LSAM* 18, 7-9: ἀπὸ μὲν κ[ή]δους ὁμαίμ|ου πεμπταῖον, τοῦ δὲ ἄλ|λου τριταῖον.

[91] *LSAM* 16, 9-13: ἐπιτελεῖν δὲ τὰ νόμιμα τοῖς ἀποιχομέ||[10]νοις ἔσχατον ἐν τρισὶ μησίν, τῶι δὲ | τετάρτωι λύειν τὰ πένθη τοὺς ἄν|δρας, τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας τῶι πέμπτωι.

[92] *LSAM* 16, 17-25: τὸν δὲ γυ|ναικονόμον τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου αἱρούμενον τοῖς ἁγνισμοῖς τοῖς πρὸ ||[20] τῶν Θεσμοφορίων ἐπεύχεσθαι τοῖς ἐμμένουσιν καὶ ταῖς πειθομέναις τῶιδε τῶι νόμωι εὖ εἶναι καὶ τῶν ὑπαρχόν|των ἀγαθῶν ὄνησιν, τοῖς δὲ μὴ πειθο|μένοις μηδὲ ταῖς ἐμμενούσαις τὰ||[25]ναντία·

[93] *LSAM* 84, 6-7: ἢν δέ τιν' οἰκείων θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα καλύψη, | εἴργεσθαι μηνὸς τρίτατον μέρος ἐκ προπύλοιο.

purification after disease.[94] The inscription probably differentiates between the worshippers' own illness, and those of others. The right-hand side of the inscription is missing in its entirty, and it is not possible to say how many letters are missing.

Birth

Greek cultic regulations differentiate between three levels of birth pollution: a) pollution of the post-partum woman and the newborn child; b) pollution of the relatives; c) pollution caused by miscarriage. The pollution of the post-partum woman is usually the most severe form of pollution. In my selection of cultic regulations there are nine inscriptions with reference to one or more of these categories of birth pollution.[95]

The pollution that the post-partum woman encounters is in fact the form of birth pollution least frequently mentioned. In fact only two texts in Sokolowski's editions give rules for the purification of the mother.[96] *LSCG* 124 (Eresos, 2nd century BC) demands that the mother be excluded from the shrine for forty days.[97] *LSS* 119 is very severely damaged with the entire right-hand side missing and most of it is impossible to restore with any confidence. We can only observe that this regulation contained rules for women who had recently given birth and were breastfeeding.[98] The text is so corrupt that we cannot say anything about the length of the period of exclusion from the temple.

---

[94] *LSS* 119, 3-4: ἀπὸ πάθους ἰδίου καὶ [ἀλλοτρίου] | ἡμέρας ζ´ (...). The understanding of πάθους is sustained by *SEG* XLIII 1131. [ἀλλοτρίου] is restored by Sokolowski who justifies his restoration by referring to *LGS* II 117 2-4 (= *LSCG* 124) and *LSAM* 18, 7-8. The word is found in *LSCG* 124, but is also here restored (see note 80). The *edito princeps* (Maspero & Miller 1883, 181-2) leaves the lacuna open, while Zingerle 1924 suggested τόκου. *SEG* VIII 639 reads [τόκου] or [λεξοῦς]. Sokolowski's suggestion seems to be reasonable since the inscription emphasises one own disease as a special category. But it is not unreasonable to assume that more words may be missing from the text. Sokolowski's reading is retained by *SEG* XLIII 1131, but marked with a question mark.

[95] *LSCG* 55, 7; 124, 5-8; 139, 12. *LSS* 54, 5-7; 91, 11, 16; 119, 6, 11-12. *LSAM* 12, 7; 20, 20; 84, 3-5.

[96] *LSCG* 124; *LSS* 119.

[97] *LSCG* 124, 5-6: αὔταν δὲ [τὰν] ||[5] [τετό]κοισαν ἀμέραις τεσσαράκοντα. The reconstruction of the word [τετό]κοισαν is based on the occurrence of the word in line 7, which probably refers to an abortion.

[98] *LSS* 119, 11-12: τὴν δὲ τεκοῦσαν καὶ τρέ[φουσαν – –] | [ἐ]ὰν δὲ ἐχθῇ τὸ βρέφος[– – – – – – –]. The woman is referred to in the accusative case. The clause is governed by the infinitive construction ἀγνεύειν (line 2); this tells us that this is a demand given to the woman. *SEG* XLIII 1131 reads τρέ[φουσαν μ´]·.

The pollution passed on from a woman who has recently given birth to others seems to be much more important. The material analysed here contains five inscriptions with demands for purification after contact with a post-partum woman or a newborn child.[99] *LSS* 54 states that one may enter the sacred precinct on the seventh day after contact with a woman who has recently given birth.[100] *LSS* 91 is somewhat more uncertain. Line 15 says [ἀπ]ὸ λέχους γʹ, λεχώ καʹ. The word used is λεχώ which may be used to mean a woman in the marriage bed or one who has just given birth.[101] Λεχώ is distinguished from [ἀπ]ὸ λέχους in the same line, childbed. Sokolowski interprets it as a distinction between the pollution caused by sexual contact and the one caused by contact with a post-natal woman.[102] Parker on the other hand gives a somewhat different explanation. According to Parker the line should be read [ἀπ]ὸ λεχοῦς, i.e. in the genitive case, while λεχώ is given in the nominative case and is not governed by the preposition ἀπό. The meaning of the line is therefore 'enter purified from a post-partum woman after 3 days; the woman herself is excluded for 21 days'.[103]

As mentioned above, *LSS* 119 is a very fragmentary inscription which only allows us to say that there were prohibitions against post-partum pollution. In *LSS* 119 the phrase τετοκυίας καὶ τρεφούσης[104] tells us that those who entered had to be cleansed from the pollution of a post-partum and breastfeeding woman, but the number of days required is missing. *LSAM* 12 demands that those who enter the temple of Athena Nikēphoros must be cleansed for two days after contact with a woman in childbed. This demand is identical with the demand for purification after a funeral.[105] *LSAM* 84 is special because it demands the avoidance of pollution from the newborn child, and not the mother, as is usual in other cultic regulations. The period of exclusion from the

---

[99] *LSS* 54, 5; 91, 15; 119, 6-7. *LSAM* 12, 7; 84, 3-4. *NGSL* 7, 5-6.

[100] *LSS* 54, 5: ἀπὸ τετοκείας ἑβδομαίους.

[101] *LSJ* s.v. λεχώ.

[102] Sokolowski 1962, 161: "On distingue entre la souillure d'une femme en couches et celle qui se produit par un contact avec l'accouchée".

[103] See Parker 1983, 354.

[104] *LSS* 119, 6.

[105] *LSAM* 12, 6-7: ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ | κήδους καὶ τεκούσης γυναικὸς δευτεραῖος.

shrine of Dionysos Bromios is also very long, forty days.[106] The last inscription in this group, *NGSL* 7, requires a purification period of nine days.[107]

The pollution caused by a miscarriage is another frequent theme in Greek cultic regulations.[108] The word for spontaneous abortions is usually φθορά or διαφθορά, in some cases ἔκτρωσις or ἐκτρωσμός. In addition, some of the regulations contain rules concerning abortifacient drugs, referred to as φθορεῖον. The periods of exclusion from the sacred precinct following an abortion are often very long. This indicates that the pollution caused by an abortion or miscarriage was considered especially dangerous. Eight of the inscriptions in this group demand that the purification lasts for forty days, while *NGSL* 7 requires the longest period of purification: forty-four days.[109] *LSCG* 171 (Isthmos, 2nd century BC) on the other hand requires the shortest period of purification after a miscarriage: ten days.[110] In some cases this period of purification is much longer than what is demanded after a funeral, even though we also find regulations where death and abortion have equal status.

LSCG 124 (Eresos, 2nd century BC) is harder to interpret. The inscription is badly broken and lines 5-8 concerning birth and probably abortion have been restored. The text says αὔταν δὲ [τὰν] ‖[5] [τετό]κοισαν ἀμέραις τεσσαράκοντα | [ἀπὸ δὲ βιω]τῶ ἀμέραις τρεῖς [v] αὔταν δὲ [τὰν] | [τ]ετόκοισαν´ ἀμέραις δέκα. The meaning and restoration is far from clear. The restoration of [ἀπὸ δὲ βιω]τω is made by Sokolowski,[111] and he suggests that it is a rule concerning induced abortion.[112]

---

[106] *LSAM* 84, 3-4: τεσσαράκοντα μὲν ἤματα ἀπ᾽ ἐχθέσεως πεφύλαχθε | νηπιάχοιο βρέφους.

[107] *NGSL* 7, 5-6: ἀπὸ μὲν ‖[5] λέχ[ο]υς ἐγαταίαν (...).

[108] *LSCG* 55, 7; 124, 7; 139, 12; 171, 17. *LSS* 54, 6; 91, 11; 119, 10. *LSAM* 20, 20; 84, 5. *NGSL* 7, 6-8.

[109] *LSCG* 55, 7: καὶ ἀπὸ φθορᾶς ἡμερῶν τετταράκοντα. *LSCG* 139, 12: ἀπὸ φθορείων ἤμε μ᾽. *LSS* 54, 6-7: ἀπὸ διαφθορᾶς τετταρα|κοσταίους. *LSS* 91, 11: [ἀ]πὸ φθορᾶς γυναικὸς ἢ κυνὸς ἢ ὄνου ἤμε. μ᾽. *LSS* 119, 10: ἀπ᾽ ἐκτρωσμοῦ μ᾽ (...), see *SEG* XLIII 1131. *LSAM* 84, 5: ἔκτρωσίν τε γυναικὸς ὁμοίως ἤματα τόσσα. *NGSL* 7, 6-7: ἀπὸ δὲ δι|αφθέρματος [v] τεσσαράκοντα | καὶ τέσσαρας ἀμέρας (...).

[110] *LSCG* 171, 17: ἐγ δια(φθ)ορᾶς ἀμέρας δέκα (...).

[111] The first publisher, Paton 1902, interprets the beginning of line 7 Ἀπὸ τοκε]τῶ ?, which is maintained by Zingerle 1924, see note 81. Paton assumed this to be a question of differentiation between the birth of a living and a dead child (Paton 1902, 291). He remarks however that it is a surprisingly high period of exclusion. Kretschmer 1902 leaves the lacuna of line 7 open, but remarks correctly that the line 6 records the period of purification of the mother, while line 7 records the period of others. *LGS* II 117 also leaves

Sokolowski's restoration is probably based on the word βιατός, 'violent'. He does not, however, give any justification for this conjecture. Nevertheless, it is probably correct to assume that this is a rule of purification concerning an abortion, and that there is differentiation between the purification of the mother and of others. The mother is to be purified for forty days, and others for three days. It is also possible that the repetition of τετόκοισαν in lines 7-8 is a dittography.[113] The period of forty days is in accordance with the other inscriptions recording similar rules (see note 109).

Sexual activity

Pollution as a result of sexual activity is often mentioned in Greek cultic regulations. As is the case with other types of pollution, there is also a differentiation between various types of sexual pollution. The basic distinction is drawn between sexual intercourse between spouses and with prostitutes, but some regulations also mark the marriage bed, i.e. sexual debut, as a category of its own. There are also texts that make a distinction between the sexual pollution of men and women. Twelve inscriptions containing rules concerning sexual activity are included here.[114]

The most typical formulation of a prohibition against sexual impurity is (ἀγνεύεσθαι) ἀπὸ γυναικός. This means that such prohibitions are usually addressed to a male audience, and must be regarded as warnings against female sexuality. (ἀγνεύεσθαι) ἀπὸ γυναικός is found in nine of the inscriptions in my selection.[115] Only

---

the lacuna open, but suggests that this may have to do with an abortion. *IG* XII Suppl. makes no suggestion.

[112] Sokolowski 1969, 220: "Je crois qu'il s'agit d'une femme accouchée et de l'accouchement abortif ou normal".

[113] This has been suggested to me by Richard Gordon.

[114] *LSCG* 55, 4; 124, 9; 139, 14-18; 171, 17. *LSS* 54, 4; 59, 16; 91, 15-19; 119, 7-9. *LSAM* 12, 4-6; 18, 9-15; 20, 25-36; 29, 4-7.

[115] *LSCG* 55, 3-5: καθαριζέστω δὲ ἀπὸ σ[κ]όρδων κα[ὶ χοιρέων] | κα[ὶ γ]υναικός· For the restoration see note 130. *LSCG* 124, 9: [ἀπὸ δὲ γ]υναικὸς αὐταμερὸν λοεσσάμενον. *LSCG* 171, 17: ἀπὸ γυναικὸς τρεῖ[ς]. *LSS* 54, 4: ἀπὸ γυναικὸς τριταίου(ς). *LSS* 59, 15-16: ἀγνεύοντας ||15 [ἀπὸ γυν]αικός. (See note 133) *LSS* 119, 7-8: τοὺς δὲ ἄ[νδρας] | [ἀ]πὸ γυναικὸς βʹ. This reading is retained by *SEG* XLIII 1131. *LSAM* 12, 4-5: ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς ἰδίας γ[υναι] | κός (...). This inscription was published by Fränkel 1895, 255; the restorations of line 1-6 by Fränkel is maintained by Sokolowski. *LSAM* 18, 9-10: ἀπὸ δὲ γυναι|κὸς (...). *LSAM* 29, 4-5: ἀπὸ | [γυν]αικὸς τῆς ||5 [ἰδία]ς ἡμέρας δύ[ο].

in a few cases do we find regulations addressed to women requiring purification after sexual intercourse with a man.[116] This may indicate that women were regarded as more sexually impure than men, and may be the reason why we hardly ever find any reference to homosexuality in Greek cultic regulations. Was sex between men not regarded as polluting? Kenneth Dover does not address the question of ritual impurity at all in his survey of the legal status of Greek homosexuality and male prostitutes.[117] Parker remarks that the only cultic regulation that refers to homosexuality is *LSCG* *151 A,[118] but the text is uncertain. Male prostitutes in Athens were, however, excluded from shrines for life, and thereby fell out of the purity regulations as a category.[119]

A few cultic regulations refer to sexual intercourse as συνουσία.[120] The most interesting of these is *LSCG* 139 (Lindos, 2nd century AD), which specifies that the intercourse must be legitimate (νόμιμος). The lower part of the stele is missing, but the last expression is ἀπὸ παρθενείας,[121] 'from virginity'. A sexual debut was considered impure, and it may indicate that the inscription contained other rules as well concerning sexual impurity. As mentioned above, some cultic regulations define sexual contact with others than spouses as a special category of sexual pollution.[122] In addition, one

---

[116] *LSS* 119, 8-9: τὰς δὲ γ[υναῖκας] | ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἀνδρά[σιν]. Lines 7-8 are restored by the *edito princeps* Maspero & Miller, 1883, p. 181-4. *SEG* VIII 639 does not comment on these lines, but the reading is kept by *SEG* XLIII 1131. Given the context of the restoration, it does not seem unreasonable. *LSAM* 12, 4-5: ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς ἰδίας γ[υναι–] | κὸς καὶ τοῦ ἰδίου ἀνδρὸς αὐθημερόν. *LSS* 91, 16: [ἀ]πὸ [. .]ατ[. . . . .]ς γυνὴ σμησαμένη is more uncertain than the other examples. The first editor (Blinkenberg 1941 = *I.Lindos* 487) rejected the restoration κ]ατ[αμηνίας (menstruation) because this would be too long for the missing space and therefore leaves the lacuna open. Thus it is not possible to say with certainty whether this is a regulation demanding women to cleanse themselves after sexual intercourse, after menstruation, or after something else.

[117] Dover 1978, 19-39.

[118] *LSCG* *151 A, 42: ἁγνεύεσθαι γυναικὸς καὶ ἀγδ[ρὸ]ς (...).

[119] Parker 1983, 94.

[120] *LSJ* s.v. συνουσία, *sexual intercourse*. *LSCG* 139, 14: ἀπὸ συνουσίας νομίμου. *LSS* 91, 17: ἀπὸ [συ]νο[υ]σίας λουσάμενος ἢ ἁγνισάμ[ενος]. This line is restored by Blinkenberg 1941, *I.Lindos* 487.

[121] *LSCG* 139, 18.

[122] *LSS* 91, 18: ἀπὸ κο[ι]νῆ[ς] ἡμε. λ. Restored by Blinkenberg 1941, *I.Lindos* 487. Blinkenberg does however read the number Ᾱ, not Λ. This may be correct. 5-6: ἀπὸ δὲ ἀλλοτρίας κ[αὶ] ||⁵ ἀλλοτρίου δευτεραῖοι λουσάμενοι. *LSAM* 29, 7: [ἀπὸ ἑ]ταίρας τρεῖς.

inscription in the selection regulates the admission of prostitutes to temples.[123] *NGSL* 7 (Megalopolis, Arcadia, ca. 200 BC) diverges slightly from other regulations by referring to sexual intercourse as ἀφροδισία.[124]

The periods of exclusion after sexual intercourse are often quite short. Many cultic regulations only demand a purification ritual performed on the same day. Six of the selected inscriptions require no period of purification.[125] In other regulations the period of exclusion is usually no longer than two or three days.[126] If the regulation makes a distinction between marital and extra-marital sex, it usually requires a longer period of exclusion from the shrine for the latter, but the difference is in most cases not that great, with *LSS* 91 as a possible exception.[127] In general it seems reasonable to say that sexual pollution was regarded as one of the lesser problems of ritual purity and that pagan religion, unlike early Christianity, regarded sex as a necessary and enjoyable part of life.

An interesting aspect of ritual purity is the question of menstruation, which is regarded as polluting in most traditional societies. In relation to ancient Greek society,

---

[123] *LSAM* 18, 13-15: ἑταίρα τριτ|αία περιαγνισαμένη κα[θὼ]ς εἴ[θ]ισται.

[124] *NGSL* 7, 14.

[125] *LSCG* 55, 3-5: καθαριζέστω δὲ ἀπὸ σ[κ]όρδων κα[ὶ χοιρέων] | κα[ὶ γ]υναικός· λουσαμένους δὲ κατακέφαλα αὐθημερὸν εἰσ[πορευ]|εσθαι. For the restoration of this line, see note 130. *LSCG* 124, 9: See note 115. *LSCG* 139, 15-17: αὐθμερὸν περιρανάμενους ||[15] καὶ πρότερον χρεισαμένους | ἐλαίω. *LSAM* 12, 3-5: ἁγνευέτωσαν δὲ καὶ εἰσίτωσαν εἰς τὸν τῆς θεο[ῦ ναὸν] | οἵ τε πολῖται καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς ἰδίας γ[υναι]|κὸς καὶ τοῦ ἰδίου ἀνδρὸς αὐθημερόν (...). *LSAM* 18, 9-13: ἀπὸ δὲ γυναι|κὸς εἰς τὸν περιωρισμέ‹νο›||[10]νον τόπον τοῦ Μητρ[ω]ίου | τῆι αὐτῆι λουσά[μ]ενον εἰσ|πορεύεσθαι. *NGSL* 7, 13-15: ἀπὸ δὲ | ἀφροδισίων αὐθημερὶ [v] λουσά|μενον (...).

[126] *LSCG* 171, 17: ἀπὸ γυναικὸς τρεῖ[ς]. *LSS* 119, 7-8: See note 116. *LSAM* 29, 4-6: ἀπὸ | [γυν]αικὸς τῆς ||[5] [ἰδία]ς ἡμέρας δύ[ο] [...]. The lines in question are restored by J. Keil & A. von Premerstein, 1914, 154, p. 103-104. [γυν]αικὸς seems to be a reasonable restoration. According to the drawing of the inscriptions given in Keil & Premerstein 1914, there is a reminiscence of an O at the end of line 5. δύ[o] may therefore be justified.

[127] *LSAM* 12, 5-6: ἀπὸ δὲ ἀλλοτρίας κ[αὶ] ||[5] ἀλλοτρίου δευτεραῖοι λουσάμενοι. The same inscription demands that marital sex may be purified on the same day. See note 125. *LSAM* 29, 7: [ἀπὸ ἑ]ταίρας τρεῖς. The period of exclusion for marital sex is two days. See note 126. *LSS* 91, 18: ἀπὸ κο[ι]νῆ[ς] ἡμε. λ (see note 122). As pointed out in note 122, Sokolowski's reading of the number of days required for purification may be wrong.

however, the sources are frustratingly silent, as pointed out in Ch. 2. A few cultic regulations, most of them from Hellenistic or Roman periods, do regard menstruation as a cause of ritual impurity.

Other rules of purity

In addition to these three main areas of ritual pollution, which are found throughout the Greek world, there existed a large variety of objects and situations to be avoided in order to gain access to the shrine. The details of these rules are often distinctive to the individual cult, and can appear to have been chosen more or less at random. There are, however, also certain general characteristics associated with these rules.

Dietary rules are rare, but they occur in some post-classical regulations. Greek dietary regulations differ from, for instance, Semitic dietary regulations in that they rarely forbid special kinds of food entirely. It was not forbidden to eat food considered impure, but it was forbidden to enter a shrine or a sacred precinct before one had been purified after eating it. Five inscriptions containing dietary rules are included in this study,[128] three of which are rather late. *LSCG* 55 (Attica, 2nd century AD) and 139 (Lindos, 2nd century AD) are both from the 2nd century AD, and *LSS* 59 dates from the Roman period.[129] *LSS* 54 and *NGSL* 7 are dated to the later part of the 2nd century BC. None of the regulations are very detailed when it comes to food; they all mention one or two kinds that require purification. *LSCG* 55 lists garlic and pork as causing impurity.[130] These are mentioned in the same passage as sexual contact with women and require the

---

[128] *LSCG* 55, 3; *LSCG* 139, 9-11. *LSS* 54, 1-2; *LSS* 59, 16. *NGSL* 7, 10-13.

[129] *I.Delos* 2529. Sokolowski does not give a more precise dating for *LSS* 59, while the first editor of the inscription, Koumanoudis, claims that it may be from the early Roman period. Koumanoudis 1875, 457: "Σχῆμα γραμμάτων δεικνύει μοι τὸ ἔκτυπον τὸ τῶν παλαιοτέρων Ῥωμαϊκῶν χρόνων". Roussel 1913 restores lines 4-5 [ἐπὶ Ζή]νωνος ἄρ[χοντος] and dates the inscription to the archonship of Zēnōn 54/3 BC. (see Dinsmoor 1931, 280). Plassart 1928 suggests [Σαραπί]ωνος ἄρχον[ν|τος], which is accepted by Roussel & Launey 1937, 340-341. This dates the inscription to the archonship of Sarapiōn, 116/115 BC (see Dinsmoor 1931, 223). Both Roussel & Launey 1937 and Sokolowski 1962, 113 mark the restoration with a question mark.

[130] *LSCG* 55, 3-4: καθαριζέστω δὲ ἀπὸ σ[κ]όρδων κα[ὶ χοιρέων] | κα[ὶ γ]υναικός. The restoration of the word χοιρέων is based on *IG* II² 1365, which is a different version of the same regulation. *IG* II² 1365, 9-11 reads Κα|θαριζέστω δὲ ἀπὸ σκόρ||[10]δων καὶ καὶ χοιρέων.

same form of purification, which may be achieved on the same day.[131] *LSCG* 139 lists three kinds of food that cause pollution: lentil-soup, goat meat, and cheese.[132] Lentil-soup and goat meat require three days of purification, while cheese only requires one day. *LSS* 59 is not as detailed as the other inscriptions, and only requires purification from meat, but without any reference to a period of purification.[133] *LSS* 54 is more problematic because it demands that the worshippers are purified from ὀψαρίον;[134] this probably means fish.[135] The only regulation which seems to contain general rules concerning food is *NGSL* 7, which first requires a period of three days after eating goat meat and mutton, and then states that other kinds of food only require purification on the same day.[136] This requirement of purification after any kind of food is unique in Greek cultic regulations.

Parker argues that it is more or less impossible to discern a clear structure in Greek dietary rules, but goats, fish and pigs seem to be animals that cause ritual impurity.[137] It has been suggested that animals considered impure either lived close to (goat, pig) or far from (fish) human,[138] but Parker admits that this is insufficient due to the lack of conformity in Greek dietary rules. Parker is probably right when he suggests that purity requirement associated with food may also simply be a means of distinguishing everyday life from religious life.[139] Certain kinds of food should be

---

[131] *LSCG* 55, 4-5: λουσαμένους δὲ κατακέφαλα αὐθημερὸν εἰσ[πορευ]|εσθαι.

[132] *LSCG* 139, 9-11: ἀπὸ φακῆς ἡμερῶν γ´ | ἀπὸ αἰγείου ἡμε γ´ ‖[10] ἀπὸ τυροῦ ἡμε α´.

[133] *LSS* 59, 15-16: ἀγνεύοντας ‖[15] [ἀπὸ γυν]αικὸς καὶ κρέως (...). These lines are restored by Koumanoudis 1875, 456. The various editors do not agree on the precise division of lines in the inscription. Koumanoudis reads ἀγνεύον|[τας ἀπὸ γυν]αικὸς καὶ κρέως, while *I.Delos* 2529 reads ἀγνεύοντα[ς] | [ἀπὸ γυν]αικὸς καὶ κρέως (...) which is in accordance with Roussel 1913, 276. This reading is also accepted by Plassart 1928, 140.

[134] *LSS* 54, 1-3: ἀγνεύοντας | εἰσιέναι ἀπὸ ὀψαρίου τρι|ταίους (...).

[135] *LSJ* s.v. ὄψον: *cooked or otherwise prepared food; at Athens esp. fish.* Sokolowski 1962, 109: "Ὀψάριον est du poisson […]. L'ordonnance s'explique par le fait que les poisons étaient considérés comme consacrés à la désse […]".

[136] *NGSL* 7, 10-13: ἀπὸ δὲ αἰγέου καὶ ‖[10] προβατέου τριταῖον, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν | λοιπῶν βρωμάτων ἐκ κεφαλᾶς | λουσάμενον αὐθημερί (...).

[137] See Parker 1983, 357-365.

[138] Parker 1983, 364.

[139] Parker 1983, 365.

avoided because they were part of the everyday diet and therefore unsuitable for the cultic sphere. Since the periods of exclusion are rather short and diet regulations are so rarely found in Greek cultic regulations, it is reasonable to assume that food was not regarded as a serious threat to ritual purity.

The other category of purity regulations contains prohibitions against certain objects regarded as impure, and therefore not to be brought into a sacred precinct. This act may be denoted by the verb εἰσφερεῖν.[140] Clothing is included within this category because objects prohibited inside a temple are often parts of a garment. These rules are more frequent than diet regulations, and are attested earlier. Seven inscriptions containing prohibitions against certain objects will be analysed here.[141]

A prohibition against weapons inside the sacred precinct is a widespread rule. In three inscriptions included here it is stressed that the prohibition concerns martial weapons. Weapons are in all three cases denoted as ὅπλα.[142] A related prohibition found in several cultic regulations forbids certain metals and tools made of these metals, especially iron and copper.[143] One of the selected inscriptions also contains a prohibition against excessive use of golden jewellery among women.[144]

Some cultic regulations give instructions about how the worshippers are to be dressed. These are often prescriptions and not prohibitions, but there are also cases where certain kinds of clothes are forbidden. This particularly concerns shoes and clothes made of leather, and such rules usually demand that worshippers be

---

[140] *LSCG* 124, 13, 15; 136, 20, 26.

[141] *LSCG* 124, 13-17, 21-22; 136, 19-35. *LSS* 33 A; 59, 10-21; 91, 6-10. *LSAM* 35, 3-5; 85, 10.

[142] *LSCG* 124, 13: [μ]ὴ εἰσφέρην δὲ μηδὲ ὅπλα πολεμιστήρ[ια] (...). *LSS* 59, 20: μηδὲ ὅπλα πολέμια (...). *LSS* 91, 6: [ὅ]πλα ἀρήια μὴ φέροντας (...). Restored by Blinkenberg 1941, *I.Lindos* 487.

[143] *LSCG* 124, 15-16: [μη]δὲ εἰς τὸν ναυὸν εἰσφέρην ᵛ σίδαρον ||¹⁵ μηδὲ χαλκὸν πλὰν νομίσματος (...). *LSS* 59, 17-20: [καὶ μηθὲ]ν εἰσ[φ]έρειν [. . . .]ΛΙ | [. . . . . . . μη]δὲ κλειδίον, μηδὲ | δακτύλιον σιδηροῦν, μηδὲ | ζώνην, μηδὲ βαλλάντιον ||²⁰ (...). [καὶ μηθὲ]ν εἰσ[φ]έρειν is restored by Roussel 1913, 276. The inscription is broken in two parts at line at line 17 and the identification of the two fragments was done by Plassart 1928, 140.

[144] *LSS* 33 A, 2-5: (...) τὰς γ[υ]ν[αῖ]κες μήτε χρυσίον ἔχεν πλέον ὀδελοῦ ὁλκάν (...).

barefooted.[145] One of the selected inscriptions also forbids the wearing of goatskin.[146] This rule has a parallel in the requirement for purification after eating goat meat found in *LSCG* 139 (see note 132). *LSCG* 136 (Ialysos, ca. 300 BC, cult of Alektrōnē) forbids shoes and anything made from pigskin.[147] The prohibition against pigskin is also found in *LSS* 54.[148] If a regulation concerning dress or garment prohibits any kind of clothing, it is usually directed against coloured clothes, making the worshipper explicitly or implicitly obliged to wear a white garment.[149] In this context it is interesting to note that *LSAM* 16, which is a regulation of funerary rites, demands that female participants at mourning rituals must wear an undefiled, grey robe.[150] The male participants on the other hand may choose whether to wear a grey or white garment.[151] These regulations may indicate several things, and it is probably not merely a question of ritual purity. For instance, the prohibitions found in *LSS* 33 A (see notes 144 and 149) are, with their warnings against excessive jewellery, multicoloured or purple garments, and make-up, as much a means of limiting social competition, even though the inscription itself prescribes purification of the temple if the prohibitions are transgressed.[152] The explicit demands to wear white robes are probably intended to establish markers of cultic contexts. In the inscriptions in question (see note 149) the reference to a white robe is

---

[145] *LSCG* 124, 17: μηδὲ ὑποδεσιν μηδὲ ἄλλο δέρμα. *LSCG* 136, 25-26: See note 147. *LSS* 59, 15: [ἀνυ]ποδέτους (...). Restored by Koumanoudis 1875, 456. *LSS* 91, 8: ἀνυποδέτους ἢ ἐν λευκοῖς μὴ αἰγείοις ὑποδήμασι (...).

[146] *LSS* 91, 9: μηδέ τι αἴγιον ἔχοντας |.

[147] *LSCG* 136, 25-27: μηδὲ ὑποδή||²⁵ματα ἐσφερέτω μηδὲ ὕειον μη|θέν·

[148] *LSS* 54, 3-4: ἀπὸ ὑείου λουσάμε|νον (...).

[149] *LSS* 33 A, 5-6: μηδὲ λωπίον ποικί||⁵λον, μήτε πορφυρέαν (...). *LSS* 59, 14-15: [ἔ]χοντας ἐσθῆτα λευ[κήν] (...), restored by Koumanoudis 1875, 456. *LSAM* 35, 3-5: Εἰσίναι εἰς [τὸ] | ἱερὸν ἁγνὸν ἐ[ν] | ἐσθῆτι λευκ[ῆι]. *LSAM* 84, 10: μηδὲ μελανφάρους προσίναι βωμοῖσι ἄνακτ[ος] ||¹⁰ (...).

[150] *LSAM* 16, 5-6: νόμον εἶναι Γαμβρειώταις, | τὰς πενθούσας ἔχειν φαιὰν ἐσθῆ|⁵τα, μὴ κατερρυπωμένην.

[151] *LSAM* 16, 6-9: χρῆσθαι | δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας καὶ τοὺς παῖδας | τοὺς πενθοῦντας ἐσθῆτι φαιᾶι, | ἐὰμ μὴ βούλωνται λευκῆι.

[152] *LSS* 33 A, 8-11: εἰ δέ κα | παρβάλληται, τὸ ἱ||¹⁰ερὸν καθαράσθω | ὡς παρσεβέουσα. It should be noted that the missing upper part of the inscription may have contained other purity regulations. The last sentence may also be a reference to these regulations. This is, however, only my own speculation.

made in addition to other demands for ritual purity. The garment itself is not a means of achieving the proper state of ritual purity, but a part of the entire ritual framework.

The last category of objects forbidden inside a sacred precinct is domestic animals. This prohibition is usually found in cultic regulations concerning sacred groves where agricultural activity was forbidden. *LSCG* 136 is a law issued by the Assembly demanding that the *temenos* of Alektrōne is to be purified,[153] and seems to have been issued on a special occasion when the shrine of Alektrōne was in danger of becoming a pasture, since the law is issued in connection with a purification of the entire shrine.[154] In addition, the regulation lists objects which could not be brought into the *temenos*. These objects are, except shoes and anything made from pig (see note 145), solely domestic animals: horse, donkey, mule, hinny or cattle.[155] We find a similar rule in *LSCG* 124, which forbids cattle inside the *temenos*.[156] The detailed specifications of the various animals are probably an answer to a real problem: animals were grazing inside the *temenos*. This was obviously regarded as a threat to the state of purity of the shrine, and a violation of the law would make the transgressor responsible for a renewed purification of the area.

---

[153] According to a myth Ἀλεκτρῶνα or Ἠλεκτρυώνη was the daughter of the sun and the nymph Ῥόδος. Diodoros of Sicily claims that the true explanation is that she was among the first eight inhabitants of Rhodes, called the Ἡλιάδαι, who sprang from the earth when the sun dried up the island. Diodoros gives no details about the character called Ἠλεκτρυώνη other than that she died while still a virgin and then became worshipped by the Rhodians in a hero cult. Diod. Sic. V 56: εἶναι δὲ (...) θυγάτερα δὲ μίαν, Ἠλέκτρυώνην, ἣν ἔτι παρθένον οὖσαν μεταλλάξαι τὸν βίον καὶ τιμῶν τυχεῖν παρὰ Ῥοδίοις ἡρωικῶν. This suggests that the cult of Ἀλεκτρῶνα or Ἠλεκτρυώνη was centred on the alleged grave of the heroine, but it cannot be confirmed, since the inscription does not give any information about the nature of the cult apart from mentioning sacrifice in line 29: ἐπιρεζέτω. *LSJ*, s.v. ἐπιρρεζέτω, *sacrifice afterwards or besides.*

[154] *LSCG* 136, 3-5: ὅπως τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τὸ τέμενος | τᾶς Ἀλεκτρώνας εὐαγῆται κα|τὰ τὰ πάτρια (...).

[155] *LSCG* 136, 19-26: νόμος ἃ οὐχ ὅσιον ἐσίμειν οὐδὲ ||²⁰ ἐσφέρειν ἐς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τὸ τέ|μενος τᾶς Ἀλεκτρώνας· μὴ ἐσί|τω ἵππος, ὄνος, ἡμίονος, γῖνος, | μηδὲ ἄλλο λόφουρον μηθέν, μη|δὲ ἐσαγέτω ἐς τὸ τέμενος μη|θεὶς τούτων μηθέν, μηδὲ ὑποδή||²⁵ματα ἐσφερέτω μηδὲ ὕειον μη|θέν.

[156] *LSCG* 124, 21-22: [μὴ λω]τίζην δὲ μηδὲ κτήνεα μηδὲ βοσκήματα | ἐν τῷ τεμένει. The restoration is Sokolowski's own. Paton 1902 reads Πο]τίζην, *give to drink*, while Kretschmer 1902 suggests σι]τίζην, *feed*. *IG* XII Suppl. 126 and *LGS* II 117 reads [μὴ πο]τίζην. I doubt that Paton's restoration is correct, but I am also doubtful about Sokolowski's suggestion. Rules concerning domestic animals inside a sacred precinct are usually aimed against grazing. Kretschmer's restoration may therefore be the correct one.

3. Damage to sacred property

The majority of the prohibitions found in Greek cultic regulations concern the worshipper's state of ritual purity. But as pointed out in chapter 2, cultic morality is not confined to ritual purity, but includes any kind of correct behaviour in a cultic context. This means that prohibitions against damage done to sacred property may also be classified as an aspect of cultic morality. Ancient shrines often contained large amounts of goods. Votive offerings, statues, inscriptions and buildings are examples of objects regarded as belonging to the gods worshipped in the temples. One of the most important ways of showing piety was to donate some kind of object to the gods. This was either done in the hope of having a wish fulfilled or as a thanksgiving for a fulfilled request, for instance the healing of a disease. The majority of these donations were quite modest, especially those given by individuals. But city-states and also kings donated gifts to important shrines, for example after a military victory or as a display of power and wealth. The great pan-Hellenic shrines of Olympia and Delphi contained several monuments given by wealthy city-states or kings. Even cultic buildings were often built at the expense of wealthy donators.

Divine property was not, however, limited to votive donations, monuments and cultic buildings. The gods also owned large land properties in addition to their *temenē*. This could be land which was hired out for agricultural use or was kept uncultivated for religious reasons.[157] These properties could not under any circumstances be used without religious authorisation. In addition to the larger land properties, trees and groves were often regarded as the properties of a god, and therefore inviolable. Violation of sacred groves and cutting of sacred trees are oft-mentioned themes in Greek cultic regulations throughout the history of Greek religion.

---

[157] For cultivation of sacred land, see Parker 1983, 160-166. There are two most famous examples of conflicts over cultivation of sacred land. The first is the dispute between Athens and Megara over the Eleusinian *orgas* which took place in 432 BC and which became one of the initial cause of the Peloponnesian War; Thuc. 1.139. The second example is the accusations of cultivation of the Cirrhaean plain near Delphi which led to the third sacred war; Aesch. 3. 107-112. An interesting example of allotment of sacred land is the conflict which took place during the reign of Hadrian over the land belonging to the temple of Zeus at Aezani. In 125/6 AD Hadrian decreed that those who used the land had to pay rent to the temple. Magie 1981, 625. The source for our knowledge of this conflict is a letter to the proconsul of Asia, *IGR* IV 571.

a. Violations of sacred trees and groves

Cultic regulations prohibiting the violation of sacred groves and trees are more uniform than regulations for ritual purity. Unlike most cultic regulations, where prohibitions usually form a small part of the texts alongside other rules, these texts concentrate exclusively on the protection of sacred groves and trees, and they give more details concerning the punishment of those who transgress the rules. Regulations dealing with the treatment of sacred groves are usually responses to actual damage; the cutting of sacred trees seems to have been a serious problem.[158] This is, for instance stated in *LSCG* 84, written after the destruction of trees dedicated to Apollo Koropaios. The law was issued in an attempt to make the prohibition against the destruction of the sacred trees more widely known.[159]

It has been suggested that these prohibitions were results of the wide-ranging deforestation that escalated in the 5th and 4th centuries BC.[160] According to Jordan and Perlin the sanctuaries' own need for firewood for sacrificial rituals was one of the main reasons why trees and firewood were so rigorously protected. If there was a general shortage of firewood, it would also affect the temples and the conduct of sacrifices.[161] This explanation seems somewhat too rationalistic, as we should not overlook the religious background to such prohibitions: certain groves were regarded as holy space, and certain kinds of actions were therefore forbidden. But still I think that Jordan and Perlin are right when they point out that the destruction of sacred trees was a real problem.

---

[158] Lupu 2005, 26: "Sanctuary groves and vegetation seem to have been incessantly in danger of damage, probably being regarded as a readily available source for firewood and timber and evidently exploited for grazing".

[159] *LSCG* 84, 4-8: ἐπεὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα δένδρα ἐν τῶι ἱε|ρῶι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Κο(ρ)οπαίου εἰσὶν κατεφθαρμένα, ὑπολαμ||⁵βάνομεν δὲ ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι καὶ συμφέρον γενέσθαι τινὰ πε|ρὶ τούτων ἐπιστροφήν ὥ[στε] συναυξηθέντος τοῦ τεμένου(ς) ἐ|πιφανεστέραν γίν[εσθαι τὴν τοῦ] τ[ό]που μεγαλομέρειαν. Line 7: συναυξηθέντος has been read differently by various editors. The present reading is provided by *IG* IX² 1109 II (Kern), confirmed by the reproduced text. This reading is accepted by *LGS* and Hiller von Gaertringen *Syll*³ 1157. Lolling 1882, 74 reads [ὥστε καταφυτευ]θέντος. Hollaux 1897, 182 reads [ὥστε κατ]ασπ[αρ]τηθέντος. Line 8: γίνεσθαι is supplied by *IG* IX² 1109 II (Kern). Lolling and Hollaux read εἶναι. Wilhelm does not deal with this passage.

[160] Jordan & Perlin 1984.

[161] Jordan & Perlin 1984, 157.

9 cultic laws with regulations for the treatment of sacred groves from the collections of Sokolowski are included here:

1) *LSCG* 37, Attica, 4th century BC; Apollo Erithaseos.
2) *LSCG* 84, Korope (Magnesia, Thessaly), ca. 100 BC; Apollo Koropaios.
3) *LSCG* 91, Euboia, 4th century; Apollo.
4) *LSCG* 111, Paros, late 5th century BC; the name of the deity is damaged.
5) *LSCG* 116, Chios, 4th century BC; the name of the deity is not mentioned.
6) *LSCG* 148, Gortyn (Crete), 3rd century BC; the name of the deity is damaged.
7) *LSCG* 150 A, Kos, late 5th century BC; probably regulation of an Asklepieion.
8) *LSCG* 150 B, Kos, 4th century BC; Apollo Kyparissios and Asklepios (?).
9) *LSS* 81, Samos, 1st century AD; the name of the deity is damaged.

These inscriptions are geographically and chronologically diverse, but most of them are considerably earlier than the reconciliation inscriptions. There are no religious regulations from Asia Minor concerning the protection of sacred groves or trees, but we have other evidence for their existence, most importantly the *Geography* of Strabo.[162] Sacred groves were undoubtedly a well-known phenomenon all over the ancient Greek world, and it seems reasonable to regard cultic regulations from the Greek mainland and islands as containing analogous notions to what we would find in Asia Minor.

Prohibitions concerning sacred groves and trees may be divided into two main categories. The first category is the prohibition against the cutting of sacred trees, usually referred to as τὰ δένδρα κόπτειν. My selection of inscriptions includes 8

---

[162] Sacred groves in Asia Minor described by Strabo, with the location and the deity to whom the grove is dedicated, based on the occurrence of the word ἄλσος in Books XII – XIV: 13.1.16: Ophrynium (Mysia), Hector. 13.1.51: Astyra (Mysia), Artemis Astyrene. 13.1.65: Astyra (Mysia), Artemis Astyrene. 13.4.2: Pergamon, Nike. 14.1.5: Didyma (Caria), Apollon Didymeus. 14.1.20: Ortygia (Lydia), Leto. 14.1.27: Colophon (Lydia), Apollon Clarios. 14.1.31: Chalcideis (Lydia), Alexander the Great. 14.1.35: Chios, Apollon. 14.1.44: Acharaca (Caria), Pluton and Kore. 14.2.2: Artemision (Caria), Leto. 14.2.4: Physcos (Caria), Leto. 14.6.3: Arisnoe (Cyprus), Aphrodite. In most cases, Strabo just notes the occurrence of the groves; only in three cases does he refer to the mythical background of the grove (Str. 14.1.20; 14.1.27; 14.1.44). The most interesting one in our context is the grove in Acharaca, Caria, dedicated to Pluto and Kore (14.1.44). According to the myth, those who entered the grove unlawfully would die.

regulations containing this prohibition.[163] Apart from the general prohibition, some of the regulations contain more specific prohibitions which forbid the removal of wood, firewood, twigs and leaves, or curtailing and uprooting of sacred trees.[164] There is also

---

[163] *LSCG* 37, 5: μὴ κόπτειν τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος (...). *LSCG* 84, 10-13: μηθενὶ ‖[10] ἐξεῖναι τῶν πολ[ιτῶν μηδὲ τῶν ἐν]οικούντων μηδὲ τῶν ἐνδη|μούντων ξένων [δένδρα κόπτειν ἐν τ]ῶι διασαφουμένωι τόπωι μηδὲ κο|λούειν. Line 11: restored by Hollaux 1897, 182; accepted by *LGS* II 81 and Wilhelm 1909, 49. Lolling 1882, 74 does not suggest any restoration, while *IG* IX² 1109 II reads μετ?]οικούντων. Dittenberger *Syll.*² 790 II suggests παρ]οικούντων, μετ]οικούντων or συν]οικούντων. Line 12: restored by Hollaux 1897, 182. Lolling 1882, 74 leaves the lacuna open. Hollaux' reading is accepted by all other editors. *LSCG* 91, 9-11: ἀποτίνειν δὲ ἐὰμ μὲν κείρω[ν] | ἢ φέρων ἁλοῖ, ἑκατὸν δραχμ‖[10]άς. *LSCG* 111, 2-4: [...ἐξέ]ναι κόπτεν ὅτ[ο μὴ χρέα πρὸ]ς τὸ ἱερὸν οἰ[κοδό|μημα·...]. These lines, except [...ἐξέ]ναι which is found in all editons, are restored by Sokolowski. *LGS* II 107 does not attempt to reconstruct the lacunas of lines 3 and 4, while *IG* XII 5, 108 (Hiller von Gaertringen) reads lines 2-3 [...ἐξέ]ναι κόπτεν ὅτ[αν μὴ . . . . εἰ]ς τὸ ἱερὸν ο . . . . Szanto 1890, 75, n. 1 suggests a rather doubtful restoration: [...μὴ ἐξέ]ναι κόπτεν ὅτ[αν ὁ ἱερεὺς εἰ]ς τὸ ἱερὸν ὁρ[μᾶται· An accurate reconstruction is probably impossible in this case. The reading of *IG* XII 5, 108 seems in fact to be the best. *LSCG* 148, 1-2: – – – ῥά]χος καὶ φρύγανα, ἐσπρεμμίττεν δὲ τὰσχίνους | μὴ (...). ῥά]χος is restored by Ziehen (*LGS* II 153). The drawing of the inscriptions in *IC* IV, 186 makes it possible to identify the letters ΧΟΣ. The first publisher Haussoullier 1885, 9 does not restore the first word, but reads κ]αὶ φρύγανα κτλ. This is also the reading of *SGDI* 5027. *LSCG* 150 A, 1-6: Αἴ τίς κα τάμηνηι τὰς κυπαρίσσο|ς τὰς ἐν τῶι τεμένει ἢ τὰς ἔξω το|ῦ τεμένος ἢ φέρηι τὰ ξύλα ἐκ τ|οῦ τεμένεος τὰ κυπαρίσσινα, χι|λίας δραχμὰς ἀποτεισάτω καὶ τ‖[5]ὸ ἱαρὸν ἀσεβείτω (...). *LSCG* 150 B, 1-8: ὅπως | διαφυλάσσηται τὸ τέμενος | τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Κυπαρισ|σίου καὶ τ[οῦ Ἀσκλαπιοῦ] καὶ μη|δὲι[ς τάμνηι τὰς κυπ]αρίσσο[ς ‖[5] τὰς ἔντοσθε το]ῦ περιεχομέ|[νο]υ τόπου [ὑπ]ὸ τῶν ὅρων τοῦ | τεμένευς. The restoration is proposed by the first editor, Herzog 1928, 32. *LSS* 81, 2-3: [...μήτε ποιεῖν ἐκκοπὴν] | ἢ περικοπὴν δένδ[ρων δημοσίο]υς (...). Line 2: Restored by Sokolowski 1962, 142. Line 3: Restored by Robert 1958, 298, nr. 388.

[164] *LSCG* 37, 5-7: μηδὲ [φ]‖[5]έρει(ν) ξύλα μηδὲ κοῦρον μηδὲ φρύγανα μηδ[ὲ] | φυλλόβολα ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ. Apart from φυλλόβολα which is read φυλλο[β]ολα by *IG* II² 1362 and *IG* II 841, there are no differences between the various editors. *LSCG* 91, 9-11: See note 163. *LSCG* 148, 1-3: – – – ῥά]χος καὶ φρύγανα, ἐσπρεμμίττεν δὲ τὰσχίνους | μὴ, μηδ' ἐς ἀκάτιον ἐξῆμεν ξύλα παῖεν ἄλλ' ἢ ῥάχος κα[ὶ] | φρύγανα. *LSCG* 150 A, 3-4: See note 163. *LSS* 81 is a fragmented inscription, but it is quite evident that the text prohibits various violations of trees. Assuming the restorations are reliable, the inscription prohibits the cutting and mutilation of trees (4: ἐκκόψαι ἢ περικόψ[αι]. *LSJ*, s.v. περικόπτω, *cut all around, mutilate*), uprooting (4: ἐκγαΐζεσθαι, *hap. leg.* Sokolowski 1962, 143, *déraciner*. Probably interpreted as ἐκ + γαῖα), mowing (5: μήτε θε[ρίζειν. Restored by Buschnor 1953, 4), ploughing (6-7: καταρο|[.....]αι, dub. Maybe from καταρόω, *LSJ*, s.v., *plough up*), sowing (7: σπείρειν), taking up

one example of a prohibition against the purchase of sacred wood.[165] The other category of prohibition forbids the herding or grazing of herds or cattle inside sacred groves.[166] There are three inscriptions in my material containing this form of prohibition.[167] *LSCG* 116 is devoted entirely to this issue. The inscription forbids on the one hand the tending of herds, and on the other hand the spreading of manure, inside the grove.[168]

These specific prohibitions support the view that the protection of certain trees was not only caused by a shortage of wood, but was as much intended to stress the sacred inviolability of the grove. The reason why the cultic regulations were so specific was no doubt to prevent any kind of agricultural activity within a sacred grove. In the same way that there were specific rules for purity and prohibitions against sexual activity, for example, within a *temenos*, there were prohibitions against the logging of wood and grazing of herds in a sacred grove, these being the most likely activities

---

quarters inside the grove (7-8: καθ᾽ ὕλα[ν | τῶν δένδρ]ων ἐναυ[λίζεσθαι]. Lines 7-8 are restored by Sokolowski, 1962, 142. ἐναυ[λίζεσθαι] is restored by Buschnor 1953, 4), or feeding on the grove (8-9: ἐμβόσκειν εἰς | [αὐτό.]. αὐτό is restored by Sokolowski 1962, 142).

[165] *LSCG* 37, 7-9: ἂν δέ τις ληφθεῖ [κ]όπτων ἢ φέρων τι τῶν ἀ[π]ειρημένων ἐκ τοῦ [ἱ]εροῦ κτλ.

[166] Lupu 2005, 27-28.

[167] *LSCG* 84, 13-14: ὁμοίω[ς δὲ καὶ μὴ εἰσβάλλειν θ]ρέμματα νομῆς ἕνεκεν μηδὲ | στάσεως. The first editor of the text Lolling 1882, 74 reads lines 8-14: διὸ καὶ δε|δόχθαι τῆι βουλῆι κ[αὶ τῶι δήμωι τὸν ἀεὶ] καθεσταμένον νεωκορεῖν | ποιεῖν συμφανὲ[ς – – – – π]αραγενομένοις εἰς τὸ μηθενὶ | ἐξεῖναι τῶν – – – – οικούντων μηδὲ τῶν ἐνδημούντων ξένω[ν – – – – διασαφουμένωι τόπωι μηδὲ κο|λούειν ὁμοίω[ς – – – – θρέ]μματα νομῆς ἕνεκεν μηδὲ στάσε[ω]ς. δὲ καὶ μὴ εἰσβάλλειν is clearly supplied by Hollaux 1897, 184, with reference to *LSCG* 136, 31. Sokolowski's reading follows *LGS* on most points. Line 10: (ἱερὸν τὸ) is supplied by M. Holleaux 1897, 183: "D'autre part la phrase est inintelligible, si l'on ne se résout pas à rétablir après [π]αραγενομένοις εἰς τὸ le mot ἱερόν, probablement oublié par le lapicide; il est vraisemblable que l'article τὸ était répété devant μηθενὶ, et cette repetition a sans doute été cause de l'omission que nous signalons". Lines 11-13 are restored by Hollaux 1897, 183-184; accepted by Wilhelm 1909, 49. Line 14 is restored by Sokolowski. Lolling 1882, 73: εἰ [δέ τις παρανομεῖ, δώσει τῆ] πόλει; Hollaux 1897: εἰ [δέ τις κόπτει, ἀποτίνειν τῆ]ι πόλει; *IG* IX[2] 1109 II, *LGS* II 81: εἰ [δέ τις κόπτοι, ἀποτίνειν τῆ]ι πόλει. It is probably not possible to restore the text accurately, but given the context and the relative consensus among the editors, the passage in question was likely to have been a regulation of fines. *LSCG* 91, 11-12: ἐὰν δὲ βόσκων ἢ εἰρελῶν | στερέσθω τοῦ βοσκήματος.

[168] *LSCG* 116, 2-5: [ἐν τ]οῖς ἄλσεσιν μ[ὴ ποιμ]αίνεν μηδὲ κοπρε[ϝε]|ν. The restoration of the word ποιμαινειν is supported by the occurrence of the same word in line 5. κοπρόω is found in line 14. The restoration is supported by *LGS* II 111, *Syll*[3] 986, and Haussoullier 1890, 211.

associated with any grove. Sacred groves had the same status as a *temenos,* where agricultural or reproductive activities were also forbidden (see Ch. 2, 66-67).

b. Other prohibitions concerning sacred property

6 cultic regulations containing prohibitions intended to protect forms of sacred property other than the *temenos* and sacred groves are analysed in this study. *LSCG* 116 (Chios, 4th century BC) includes a prohibition against the removal of sacred belongings or equipment from the shrine, but without indicating specifically what kind of equipment this refers to.[169] The other 5 regulations are

1) *LSAM* 74, Loryma, 3rd century BC, regulation concerning votive offerings.
2) *LSAM* 19, Maionia, 173 BC, regulation of the cult of Zeus Masfalatenos, Mēn Tiamou and Mēn Tyrannos.
3) *LSAM* 17, Smyrna, 1st century BC; cultic regulation of an unnamed goddess.
4) *LSCG* 54, Attica, 1st century AD; regulation of the cult of Asclepios and Hygieia.
5) *LSAM* 75, Tralles, 1st century AD; regulation of suppliants.

LSAM 74 is a fragmentary inscription containing a prohibition against bringing out or damaging the votive offerings.[170] The restoration of the upper part of the text seems to be justifiable, but the lower part is so damaged that any restoration can only be purely hypothetical. *LSCG* 54 is directly related to the sacrificial rites. The inscription regulates who is to perform the sacrifice and states that the meat belongs to the priest and the founder of the cult. Only they have the right to this meat and nobody may

---

[169] *LSCG* 116, 22-23: σκεῦα ἐκ τô ἱε|ρ[ô μὴ] χφέρεν τὰ ἱερά. The text is not without problems, especially when it comes to the word χφέρεν in line 23. Both the χ and the ρ are marked as incomplete. The interpretation may be supported by the occurrence of the same word in line 24, [ἐχ]φέρηι, but this word too is partly restored and the φ is incomplete. Line 22 is restored by Sokolowski. *Syll*[3] 986 reads ΚΕΥΑ ἐκ τô ἱ[ε|ρô] μ[ὴχφ]έρεν τὰ ἱερ[α˙]. *LGS* II 111 reads σ . . ικευα ἐκ τοῦ ἱε[ρô] μ[ὴ ᾽χφ]έρεν. The reading of line 24 was suggested in *edito princes* by Zolōtas 1908, 188 and according to Sokolowski confirmed by a copy belonging to Professor W.G. Forrest.

[170] *LSAM* 74, 1-5: Ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ | μὴ ἐκφέρειν | τῶν ἀν[α]θ[ημά]των, | μηδὲ βλ[άπ]τε[ι]ν | μηθέν (...). Lines 3 and 4 are restored by the first publisher Chaviaras 1911, 54, nr. 18. It is retained by all later publishers. (Zingerle 1939, 156-157, nr. II; *I.Rhod.Per.* 5, nr. 3).

remove it from the shrine.[171] An interesting cultic regulation is *LSAM* 17 (Smyrna, 1st century BC) which concerns the protection of sacred fish and other property of the goddess.[172] *LSAM* 19 will be dealt with in detail in Ch. 6. *LSAM* 75 is admittedly not directly intended to protect sacred property, but rather suppliants of the temple. Persons seeking *asylia* in a temple were considered inviolable and could therefore not be removed from the *temenos*.

C. Punishments in cultic regulations

1. Introduction

Punishments are quite common in Greek cultic regulations. But as with most other aspects of cultic regulations, there are no uniform procedures for how offenders are to be punished. It is also important to note that many cultic regulations do not mention anything at all about the punishment of transgressors. Punishment, whether executed by civilian authorities or by a deity, was differently emphasised in different cultic regulations, in different places and at different times. We may to some extent see a historical development in the ways cultic regulations prescribe reactions towards those who commit religious transgressions. In classical regulations the general rule is that a free man must pay a fine, while a slave is to be flogged. In Roman imperial times there is a tendency to emphasise the danger of divine punishment, but it should be pointed out that the epigraphic material is quite limited. We must therefore be careful not to draw too wide-ranging conclusions.

Punishments for religious transgressions have here been divided into two categories: civil and divine punishments.

2. Civil punishments

By civil punishments I mean measure taken in response to transgressions that are inflicted upon the perpetrator by an identifiable human authority and agent, such as courts and officials. They may include fines or exclusion from shrines, or various

---

[171] *LSCG* 54, 4-11: θύειν τοὺς γεωργοὺς | καὶ τοὺς προσχώρους ||⁵ τοῖν θεοῖν ἧι θέμις | καὶ τὰς μοίρας νέμειν | τῶι τε εἰσαμένωι καὶ | τῶι θεηκολοῦντι· | τῶν δὲ κρεῶν μὴ ||¹⁰ φέρεσθαι.

[172] *LSAM* 17, 1-5: [Ἰ]χθῦς ἱεροὺς μὴ ἀδικεῖν, | μηδὲ σκεῦος τῶν τῆς | θεοῦ λυμαίνεσθαι, μηδὲ | [ἐ]κφέρειν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐπ[ὶ] | κλοπήν. For the protection of sacred animals, see Lupu 2005, 29-30.

corporal punishments such as flogging, imprisonment or the death-penalty. These are the forms of punishment we find most often in Greek cultic regulations. The most common civil punishment found in Greek cultic regulations is fining. In most cases the fines are associated with rules intended to protect sacred property. Nine cultic regulations where fines are the statutory punishment are included in this study.[173] Six of these texts are related to sacred trees and groves. The fines for violation of sacred trees and groves are as follows:

1) *LSCG* 37 (Attica, late 4th century BC): A free man is to be fined fifty drachmas for the removal of wood etc. from the shrine of Apollo Erithaseos, and his name is to be reported to the King archon.[174]

2) *LSCG* 84 (Korpoe, ca. 100 BC): Fifty drachmas for bringing herds into the grove of Apollo.[175] If the offender is a slave, one obol should be paid (presumably by the slave owner) for each animal (17-18).[176]

3) *LSCG* 91 (Euboia, 4th century; Apollo): The fine is one hundred drachmas for cutting trees. In addition, if someone tends cattle inside the sacred precinct, the herd is to be confiscated.[177]

4) *LSCG* 116 (Chios, 4th century BC): If someone tends cattle and pigs inside the grove, he is to pay half a *hekteus* (of grain?) for each animal. If manure is spread in the grove, the shepherd shall pay five gold coins to the god. If a witness neglects to report the incident, he is to pay five staters.[178]

---

[173] *LSCG* 37, 14-18; 53, 40-44; 84, 14; 91, 9-11; 116, 9-20, 26-30; 136, 30-33; 150 A, 1-6. *LSS* 81, [9-11], 128, 3-6.

[174] *LSCG* 37, 14-18: ἂν δὲ ἐλεύθερος ἐι, θοάσει αὐτὸν ὁ ἱερεὺ[ς] | μετὰ τοῦ δημάρχου πεντήκοντα δραχμαῖς ||[15] καὶ παραδώσει τοὔνομα αὐτοῦ τῶι βασιλ[εῖ] | καὶ τῆι βουλέι κατὰ τὸ ψήφισμα τῆς βου[λ]|ῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων. *LSCG* 37, *IG* II 1362 (Kirchner) and *IG* II² 841 (Koehler) all have the same reading of these lines, except θοάσει which is read θῷάσει by *IG* II 1362.

[175] *LSCG* 84, 14: εἰ δ[ὲ μή, ἀποτίνειν τῆ]ι πόλει δραχμὰς [l?] (...). For the restoration see note 167.

[176] *LSCG* 84, 17-18: τοῦ δὲ θρέμματος ἀποτί|νειν ἑκά[στου ὀβολόν·...]. The line is the reading of *LGS* II 81 and *IG* IX² 1109. It is also accepted by Wilhelm 1909, 45. Lolling 1882, 74 reads ἑκα[στου...ἀναγραφῆν]αι. This was accepted by Hollaux 1897, 182.

[177] *LSCG* 91, 9-12: ἀποτίνειν δὲ ἐὰμ μὲν κείρω[ν] | ἢ φέρων ἁλοῖ, ἑκατὸν δραχμ||[10]άς· ἐὰν δὲ βόσκων ἢ εἰρελῶν | στερέσθω τοῦ βοσκήματος.

[178] *LSCG* 116, 9-20: τῶι δὲ π[ο]ιμαίνοντι ἢ ὑφορβέ||[10]οντι ἢ βοκολέοντι ἡ[μ]ίεκτον ἴθυνα ἔστω | κατὰ κτῆνος ἕκαστο|ν· ἢν δὲ κοπρεόων ἁλι|σκηται, πέντε στατ[ῆ]||[15]ρας ὀφειλέτω ἀγνῶ[ς] | πρὸς τὸ θεὸ· ἢν

5) *LSCG* 150A (Kos, late 5th century BC): This inscription demands a surprisingly high fine of one thousand drachmas and that the perpetrator is deemed impious if sacred cypress trees are cut down or brought out of the sacred precinct (4-6).[179]

6) *LSS* 81 (Samos, 1st century AD): This heavily damaged cultic regulation demands one hundred drachmas for each tree felled, but almost the entire passage is restored, and therefore very uncertain.[180]

Other religious transgressions are rarely punished by fines. Only two cultic regulations seem to be intended to punish violations of purity rules. The first is *LSS* 128 from 5th century Kallion in Aetolia. It simply states that whoever sneaks into the shrine is to be fined four staters.[181] The second cultic regulation containing demands of fines for transgressions associated with ritual impurity is *LSCG* 136. This inscription from Ialysos on Rhodes dated about 300 BC records the decision to purify the *temenos* of Alektrōne (see note 153) because it has probably been used for herding cattle, and it states explicitly that those who break the rules are to be punished.[182] The inscription forbids domestic animals inside the *temenos* (see note 155) and demands that anyone who breaks the rules is to purify the *temenos* and offer a sacrifice. In addition, he is to pay one obol for each animal brought into the *temenos*.[183] *LSCG* 53[184] prescribes that those who fight or make a noise within the guild are to be fined 25 tetradrakhmai.[185]

δὲ ὁ ἰ[δ]ὼν μὴ κατείπει, πέντ∣ε στατῆρας ὀφειλέτ∣ω ἱερ[ὸ]ς τῶι θεῶι. There are only minor discrepancies between the various editors. See note 168.

[179] *LSCG* 150 A, 1-6: See note 163.

[180] *LSS* 81, 9-11: ἐὰν δέ τις παραβαίνηι τὰ π]ερὶ τούτων προει∣[ρημένα, ἀποτείσει δραχμὰς ἑκα]τὸν κατὰ ἕκαστον ∥[10] [δένδρον?– – – – –] (...). Line 10: Restored by Buschnor 1953, 5. Line 11: Proposed by Sokolowski 1962, 142.

[181] *LSS* 128, 3-6: εἰ δὲ τίς κα ∣ παρέρπη, ζαλμία τέτορες ∥[5] στατῆρες.

[182] *LSCG* 136, 9-13: ἃ οὐχ ὅ∣σιόν ἐντι ἐκ τῶν νόμων ἐσφέ∥[10]ρειν οὐδὲ ἐσοδοιπορεῖν ἐς τὸ τέ∣μενος καὶ τὰ ἐπιτίμια τῶ[ι] πράσ∣σοντι παρὰ τὸν νόμον.

[183] *LSCG* 136, 27-33: ὅ, τι δέ κά τις παρὰ τὸν νόμον ∣ ποιήσηι, τό τε ἱερὸν καὶ τὸ τέμενος ∣ καθαιρέτω καὶ ἐπιρεζέτω, ἢ ἔνο∣χος ἔστω τᾶι ἀσεβείαι· εἰ δέ κα ∥[30] πρόβατα ἐσβάληι, ἀποτεισάτω ὑ∣πὲρ ἑκάστου προβάτου ὀβολὸν ∣ ὁ ἐσβαλών·

[184] See pp. 97-99 (above).

[185] *LSCG* 53, 40-44: εἰ δέ τις μά∣χας ἢ θορύβους κεινῶν φαίνοιτο ∣ ἐκβαλλέσθω τοῦ ἐράνου ζημιούμενος ‹ε› Ἀττ[ι]καῖς κε΄ (...).

This inscription represents a shift in focus from ritual concerns to the internal administration of the cult. As we will see, there are parallels to this in other late inscriptions. Apart from fines, there are also a few examples of confiscation of property. *LSCG* 91 states that those who let their animals into the shrine of Apollo are to be deprived of their herd.[186]

There are two types of corporal punishment described in Greek cultic regulations, flogging and exclusion from the ritual community. Flogging is the punishment for slaves and some of the cultic regulations state explicitly that only slaves are to be flogged. The only exception is *LSCG* 53 (see note 185) where fifty lashes is an alternative to paying 25 Attikai, probably if the convicted person was unable to pay his fine.[187] Fifty lashes is also the prescribed punishment for slaves in *LSCG* 37 (Attica, 4th century BC) (see notes 163, 164, 165 and 174);[188] while *LSCG* 84 (Korope (Magnesia, Thessaly), ca. 100 BC) prescribes one hundred lashes (if the restoration is correct).[189] The limitation of flogging to slaves is in accordance with the ancient custom that a free man was not to be flogged.[190] Exclusion from the ritual community is also mentioned in

---

[186] *LSCG* 91, 11-12: See note 167.

[187] *LSCG* 53, 43-44: ἢ πληγαῖς αἰκ‹αικ›ιζ[ό]|μενος ταῖς διπλαῖς πε‹τ›ρα κρίσεως.

[188] *LSCG* 37, 9-10: (...) ἂν μὲν δοῦλος ἐ̑ι ὁ λη[φ]θείς, μαστιγώ[σ]|εται πεντήκοντα πληγὰς (...). All editors (*IG* II² 1362 (Kirchner), *IG* II 841 (Koehler) and *Syll.*³ 984 (Hiller von Gaertringen) have the same reading of these lines.

[189] *LSCG* 84, 16-17: [(...) ἐὰν δὲ δοῦλος ἦι, μαστ]ιγοῦσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν στρατηγῶν καὶ νο|μοφυλάκ[ων ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς πλη]γὰς ἑκατόν, (...). Lines 16-17 as found in *LSCG* is restored by Wilhelm 1909, 49. Lolling 1882 does not suggest any restoration. Hollaux 1897, 182 reads [...εἰ δέ τις ἐννέμει, μαστ]ιγοῦσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν στρατηγῶν καὶ νομοφυλάκ[ων τὸν δοῦλον? πλη]γὰς ἑκατόν (...). This is also the reading of *LGS* II 81 and *IG* XII 2, 1109 II, with the exception of ἐννέμει which is read ἐννέμοι. I think Wilhelm is right to argue that corporal punishments are reserved for slaves and that the lashes amount to twice the sum that a free man must pay, rather than being a special punishment for letting cattle graze inside the grove. Wilhelm refers to Pl. *Leg.* 917 d-e which demands a similar punishment for fraud. The phrase ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς is also based on this passage from Plato. The differentiation of corporal punishment for slaves and financial sanctions for free men is also found in *LSCG* *65, 78-79; *115, 4-6.

[190] The threat of corporal punishment was an important distinction between free men and slaves. The distinction was not absolute, but flogging was usually a way of punishing slaves. See Finley 1980, 93-5. A famous example is story of Paul who avoids being flogged because he was a Roman citizen; *Act.Ap.* 22, 25-29.

some cultic regulations. As we saw, *LSCG* 53 requires that troublemakers must pay a fine or be flogged and be excluded from the guild.[191] This regulation represents the exclusion from a religious organisation, but we also find cases where transgressors are not allowed to sacrifice or the gods will not receive their sacrifice.[192]

A special form of civil punishment is the duty to perform various rituals in the case of a transgression. There are not many regulations that demand this, but the rituals usually take the form of a sacrifice or a purification of the shrine. This is maybe the closest parallel found in Greek cultic regulations to the practice described in the Lydian and Phrygian reconciliation inscriptions. According to *LSCG* 136, those who bring domestic animals (see notes 155 and 154) into the shrine must purify the temple and the *temenos,* and perform a sacrifice.[193] We also find the same punishment in *LSCG* 152 which forbids worshippers from throwing sacrificial cakes into the sacred spring, and anyone who does so must purify the shrine of the nymphs.[194] The last example is *LSS* 33 A from 3rd century BC Patrai. This regulation does not state explicitly that it refers to a transgression, but says that if someone brings in certain objects (see notes 141, 144, 149 and 152) the shrine is to be purified.[195] The requirement to undergo purification probably implies that the transgressor has to pay the cost of the necessary rituals.

The common feature of the punishment described in this section is that most of them are associated with identifiable acts, i.e. crimes that may be investigated and brought to trial. Instances of ritual pollution are rarely punished by economic or corporal means unless the act can be proven, for examples by witnesses.

---

[191] *LSCG* 53, 40-42: εἰ δέ τις μά||[40]χας ἢ θορύβους κεινῶν φαίνοιτο | ἐκβαλλέσθω τοῦ ἐράνου (...).

[192] *LSCG* 55, 7-9: καὶ μηθένα θυσιάζειν ἄνε[υ] | τοῦ καθειδρυσαμένου τὸ ἱερόν· ἐὰν δέ τις βιάσηται, ἀπρόσδεκτος | ἡ θυσία παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. *LSAM* 16, 23-27 (funerary regulation): τοῖς δὲ μὴ πειθο|μένοις μηδὲ ταῖς ἐμμενούσαις τἀ|ναντία· καὶ μὴ ὅσιον αὐταῖς εἶναι, ὡς ||[25] ἀσεβούσαις, θύειν μηθενὶ θεῶν ἐπὶ δέ|κα ἔτη.

[193] *LSCG* 136, 27-30: ὅ, τι δέ κά τις παρὰ τὸν νόμον | ποιήσηι, τό τε ἱερὸν καὶ τὸ τέμενος | καθαιρέτω καὶ ἐπιρεζέτω, ἢ ἔνο|χος ἔστω τᾶι ἀσεβείαι.

[194] *LSCG* 152, 7-8: εἰ δέ τις | κα ἐνβάληι, καθαράτω τὸ ἱερὸν | τᾶν Νυμφᾶν ὡς νομίζεται.

[195] *LSS* 33 A, 8-11: εἰ δέ κα | παρβάλληται, τὸ ἱ|ερὸν καθαράσθω ||[10] ὡς παρσεβέουσα.

3. Divine punishments

By 'divine punishment' I mean punishment inflicted upon human beings by a divine agent as a possible consequence of actions regarded as contrary to the code of correct cultic behaviour, i.e. cultic morality. This notion was not unknown to the ancient Greeks; on the contrary it provided themes for much of their literature, such as the tragedies. We also know this notion from the tradition of the *manteis* (see Ch. 2, 79-80), curse magic and judicial prayers. But evidence of direct threats of divine reactions in cultic regulations is sparse. When a threat of a reaction from a deity occurs, it usually takes the form of a curse. The reaction is usually not described in detail; we rarely hear of specific diseases or misfortunes that will harm those who transgress the rules. This unpredictability lies in the nature of divine punishment; you cannot really know how and when it will strike.

My material contains six cultic regulations with threats of divine punishment. They are dated to various periods, and only half of them are contemporary with the reconciliation inscriptions.[196] Except *LSCG* 55, all of the inscriptions come from Asia Minor. *LSCG* 55 is one of the most interesting texts in relation to the reconciliation inscriptions. It is a regulation from a sanctuary of Mēn in Sounion, Attica dated to the 2nd century AD. The regulation states that the cult was founded by an emancipated Lycian slave named Xanthos, and is probably written to ensure that he keeps control of the cult. No-one is for instance allowed to sacrifice unless he is present,[197] and no-one is allowed access to the temple if Xanthos becomes sick or dies, except the person who has been authorised by Xanthos himself.[198] The inscription starts with a conventional list of impure states, which does not differ significantly from similar lists in other cultic regulations.[199] Violation of these prohibitions involves no expressed form of punishment, but it is interesting to note that the threat of divine punishment is related to the role of Xanthos. The regulation states that interfering with the god's business is a transgression that cannot be made good by ritual means, but without giving any details

---

[196] *LSCG* 55, 14-16. *LSAM* 19, 6-9; 20, 33-35, 43-44, 48-50; 29, 12-15; 75, 11-12; 84, 2-4.

[197] *LSCG* 55, 7-8: καὶ μηθένα θυσιάζειν ἄνε[υ] | τοῦ καθειδρυσαμένου.

[198] *LSCG* 55, 12-14: ἐὰν δέ τινα | ἀνθρώπινα πάσῃ ἢ ἀσθενήσῃ ἢ ἀποδημήσῃ που, μηθένα ἄνθρώ|πων ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν, ἐὰν μὴ ὧι ἂν αὐτὸς παραδῶι·

[199] See notes 64, 73, 95, 108, 109, 114, 115, 125, 128, 130, 131.

of the implications.[200] The meaning of the phrase τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ is probably the administration and properties of the cult, in particular the performance of the sacrifice and votive donations.

LSAM 19 (Maionia, 2nd century AD), which will be discussed in detail in Ch. 6, refers to the divine punishment as encountering Zeus *dynamis*. Apart from this vague statement there are no details as to what this may imply, but as we will see, the inhabitants of Catacecaumene knew the meaning of this threat very well.

An important concept also found in the reconciliation inscriptions is found in *LSAM* 29 from 4th century BC Metropolis, Ionia, namely ἵλαος, meaning gracious or benevolent.[201] The regulation warns those who neglect purification rites and disrespect suppliants[202] that Mētēr will not show them benevolence.[203] A later occurrence of one of these threats is found in *LSAM* 75 from 1st century AD Tralles in Caria. This regulation deals with the protection of the suppliants of Dionysos Bakkhios. If they are interfered with, or anyone allows a suppliant to be assaulted, the regulation warns, the transgressor and his family are to be put to death.[204] The regulation does not give any details of how this is supposed to happen. One of the few cultic regulations where divine wrath is directly associated with ritual impurity is *LSAM* 84. The regulation opens with the conventional list of impure states, and focuses first on the pollution of a newborn child and a miscarriage. The pollution of the newborn child is to be purified for forty days in order to prevent the wrath of Dionysos Bromios.[205] Since the lower part of the regulation is severely damaged it is not possible to say whether this threat was repeated in relation to other purity demands. There is no threat of divine punishment involved

---

[200] *LSCG* 55, 14-16: ὃς ἂν δὲ πολυ|πραγμονήσῃ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ περιεργάσηται, ἁμαρτίαν ὀφιλέτω Μηνὶ ||[15] Τυράννωι, ἣν οὐ μὴ δύνηται ἐξειλάσασθαι·

[201] ἵλεος: *BWK* 5, 22. ἱλάσκομαι: *BWK* 5, 20; 6, 19; *33, 7; *45, 7; *47, 8; *54, 16; *60, 9; *68, 19; *70, 6; *73, 6; *74, 7; *80, 9; 112, 12.

[202] *LSAM* 29, 8: ἱκέτην is reconstructed with reference to *LSAM* 75, 7 = Ditt. *Syll*[2] 573. See Sokolowski, 1955, 84. The inscription is edited by Keil & von Premerstein, 1914, nr. 154, 103-104.

[203] *LSAM* 29, 12-15: ὃς δ᾽ [ἄν] ἀδικήῃ[σηι], μὴ εἵλως αὐ[τῶι ἡ] Μήτηρ [ἡ] Γαλ[λησ]ία. ||[15].

[204] *LSAM* 75, 11-12: εἰ δὲ μή, ἐξώλη εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸ[ν] | καὶ τὸ γένος αὐτοῦ.

[205] *LSAM* 84, 2-5: [πάν]τες ὅσοι τέμενος Βρομίου ναούς τε περᾶτε, | τεσσαράκοντα μὲν ἤματα ἀπ᾽ ἐχθέσεως πεφύλαχθε | νηπιάχοιο βρέφους, μὴ δὴ μήνειμα γένηται, | ἔκτρωσίν τε γυναικὸς ὁμοίως ἤματα τόσσα· ||[5].

when it comes to impurity from death; on the contrary, those who conceal that they are impure from a death are to be excluded from the shrine for one third of a month. This may imply that in this case the pollution of a birth was considered more dangerous than death pollution, but it is unclear whether the exclusion of a third of a month only applies when someone tries to conceal their impure state or a death within the family. The threat of divine reactions, as it appears in the preserved text, is rather detached from the context, and we are not able to say to what extent this was a conventional part of the reactions to religious transgressions.

As pointed out above, cultic regulations rarely specify how the transgressor will be punished. But *LSAM* 17 is an exception, even though the punishment is formulated as a curse and it is not explicitly stated that it is the deity itself that will execute the punishment. This regulation seeks to protect the sacred fish belonging to an unnamed goddess[206] and curses those who violate the rule; let them die and be eaten by fish.[207] The description of the punishment is formulated as a curse with the verb in the optative mood (lines 6-7: ἀπόλοιτο), and is clearly understood as analogous to the crime: if someone kills a sacred fish, let him himself be eaten by fish.

LSAM 20, which is a regulation of a private cult of 1st Century BC Philadelphia, deserves special attention. Unfortunately, the inscription is badly broken. The entire right-hand side of the stone is missing, so that there are no complete lines in the text. This means that great caution is needed in the consideration of this text, and the reconstructions must not be taken for granted. It is, for instance, impossible to know how long the lines of the inscription were; Barton and Horsley suggest that they probably consisted of 38 to 45 characters, while Keil & von Premerstein rightly point out that the heading in line 1 was probably placed in the middle of the inscription. This makes it possible to estimate the approximate width of the stele.[208] If they are correct,

---

[206] Commentators have suggested Atargatis, Artemis or Kybele. Dölger 1922, 183: "Der Atargatiskult auf den griechischen Inseln und der Fischkult im Dienste der namenlosen Göttin von Smyrna machen es recht verlockend, in der namenlosen Göttin Atargatis zu sehen". See Sokolowski 1955, 49.

[207] *LSAM* 17, 5-8: ὁ τούτων τι ποιῶν ‖^5 κακὸς κακῇ ἐχωλείᾳ ἀπόλοιτο, ἰχθυόβρωτος γενόμε|νος. Richard Gordon has pointed out to me that this is an allusion to a tombless grave at sea.

[208] Barton & Horsley 1981, 11. Keil & von Premerstein 1914, 19: "Der ursprüngliche Breite der Stele kann aus der sicher zu ergänzenden und doch wohl ungefähr in die Mitte gestellten Überschrift (Z. 1) ziemlich genau bestimmt werden".

we lack 10 to 15 letters on each line, which in most cases would represent two to four words.[209]

The cult is dedicated to several deities: Zeus, Eumenes, Hestia, Eudaimonia, Plutus, Arete, Hygieia, Agathe Tyche, Agathos Daimon, Mneme, the Charitae and Nike. The foundation of the cult is based on the revelation of a particular person, named Dionysios, and the inscription states that the regulation was given to him in his sleep, and that the cult takes place in his house.[210] Dionysios probably played a role similar to Xanthos described in *LSCG* 55. The regulation seems to be an ordinance for the performance of the purification rites and the mysteries. We cannot be sure whether this actually was a mystery cult or not, because the word μυστηρία does not occur in the preserved text,[211] but we can at least identify τούτ[ῳ] δέδωκεν ὁ Ζεὺς παραγγέλ[ματα τούς ἀ]|γνισμοὺς καὶ τοὺς καθαρμοὺς [... ἐπι]|τελεῖν (12-14) without too much uncertainty. The major part of the text is devoted to the question of purification, especially sexual purity, and the conduct of the participants.

The regulation states that Dionysios has been given a mandate from Zeus to perform the purification rites, and rules of purity are therefore the main issue of the text. The regulation gives at least three warnings of punishments, which are all related to

---

[209] Most of the restorations of *LSAM* 20 are done by Keil & von Premerstein 1914, nr. 18, 18-21. They make it clear that their suggestions are simply *exempli gratia*. Keil & von Premerstein 1914, 19: "Unsere Ergänzungen, welche vielfach nur etwas Mögliches bieten sollen, berücksichtigen den jeweils zur Verfügung stehenden Raum […]". It should be noted that the editors often give no reason for their suggestions.

[210] *LSAM* 20, 3-6: τὰ δοθέ[ντα παραγγέλμα]|τα Διονυσίωι καθ᾽ ὕπνον π[ρόσοδον διδόν]|τ᾽ εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οἶκον ἀνδρά[σι καὶ γυναιξὶν] ‖5 ἐλευθέροις καὶ οἰκέταις. The restoration of these lines is due to Keil & Premerstein ibid.; accepted by Weinreich 1919, 4.

[211] *LSAM* 20, 12-14: τούτ[ωι] δέδωκεν ὁ Ζεὺς παραγγέλ[ματα τούς τε ἀ]|γνισμοὺς καὶ τοὺς καθαρμοὺς κ[αὶ τὰ μυστήρια ἐπι]|τελεῖν κατά τε τὰ πάτρια καὶ ὡς νῦν [γέγραπται·]. Line 12 is restored by Keil & von Premerstein 1914, nr. 18. Line 13: Μυστηρία is suggested by Sokolowski. Keil & von Premerstein 1914, nr. 18, pp. 18-21 suggests κα[ὶ τὰς θυσίας ἐπί]|τελεῖν and this is kept by Weinreich 1919, 5. It is quite probable that it is participation in cultic acts that is the issue here; but it is indifferent whether the correct reading should be μυστηρία or θυσίας. The distinction is often not clear. Line 14: γέγραπται is suggested by Roussel 1920, 426. Keil & von Premerstein 1914, nr. 18 suggest εἴθισται instead of γέγραπται (line 14). This is also the reading of Weinreich 1919, 5.

transgressions of rules of purity. The first warning is found in lines 31-35.[212] The crucial words are reconstructed, but it is clear that it is a warning against transgressions of the rules. As we can see, the word εἰσπορευέσθω (32) is reconstructed (see note 212), but is made likely by the presence of the phrase εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦτον (32). It is therefore probable that this is a warning to men who have sexual intercourse with any other woman than their wives, that they will be denied access to the house of Dionysios, and thereby participation in the cult. In addition to the denial of access the transgressor is warned that the gods are keeping watch and will not tolerate this kind of behaviour. It is clear from the preserved words that the gods are regarded as μεγαλοί, great (line 33), which is an often used epithet in the reconciliation inscriptions.[213] It is also clear that these lines describe some form of divine reaction towards transgressors, since the subject is θεοί μεγαλοί and the object is τοὺς παραβαίνοντας (line 34). The reconstruction of the verb ἀνέξονται (lines 34-35) is suggested by Keil and von Premerstein (1914, nr. 18).[214]

The second warning is found in lines 41-44 and is directed towards women who have extramarital sex.[215] According to the restored text, the women who have sexual relations with other men will be polluted and unworthy of participating in rituals (lines 36-41) and will be cursed by the gods if they act contrary to this rule. ἀρὰς is here reconstructed, but the preserved text makes it clear that such women are to expect something evil (line 43: κακὰς) from the gods. The third warning (lines 48-50) has a more general contents and states that everyone who is disobedient will be punished

---

[212] *LSAM* 20, 31-35: γυνὴ καὶ ἀνήρ, ὅς ἂ[ν ποιῆι τι τῶν προ]|γεγραμμένων, εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦτον μ[ὴ εἰσπορευέσθω·] | θεοὶ γ[ὰ]ρ ἐν αὐτῶι ἵδρυνται μεγάλοι καὶ τ[αῦτα ἐπισκοποῦ]|σιν καὶ τοὺς παραβαίνοντας τὰ παραγ[γέλματα οὐκ ἀνέ]|ξονται· Line 31-32 are restored by Keil & von Premerstein 1914, nr. 18. Line 33 is restored by Weinreich 1919, 5. Keil & von Premerstein 1914, 18, p. 21 suggested ἐποπτεύουσιν (*LSJ* s.v. *overlook, watch,* but also *punish*) as a possible reading, but leave the lacuna open. Certainty is impossible. Lines 34-35 are restored by Keil & von Premerstein 1914, nr. 18.

[213] *BWK* 5, 4; 7, 8; 10, 9; *33, 11; *37, 1; *39, 1; *40, 1; 55, 1; *68, 1; *69, 2, 23; *73, 1; *74, 1; *79, 10; *109, 1.

[214] *LSJ* s.v. ἀνέχομαι, *be patient.* Barton and Horsley translate the word *tolerate.*

[215] *LSAM* 20, 41-44: ἐ]|ὰν δὲ ποιῆι τι τούτων, ἀφ᾽ οὗ τὰ παρα[γγέλματα εἰς τήν]δε τὴν ἀναγραφὴν ἥκουσιν, κακὰς [ἀρὰς παρὰ τῶν] | θεῶν ἔξει [τὰ πα]ραγγέλματα ταῦτα [παρορῶσα·

severely by the gods.[216] This passage is more certain than the previous warning as the word τιμωρίας is preserved. The text does not give many hints as to what these divine reactions may involve, but according to line 38 a woman committing fornication will be 'full of endemic pollution'.[217] This implies, as pointed out by Barton and Horsley, that she will be a source of ritual pollution for the other members of the cult.[218] Apart from this remark there is nothing indicating whether the gods will inflict diseases or other forms of misfortune upon those who disregard the rules.

The mystery-cult group at Philadelphia represents an exception; the initiates are instructed to remain faithful to their spouses. Here cultic and general moralities have merged, but in most Greek cultic regulations they remain distinct. *LSAM* 20 is a set of regulations drawn up for a rather small cult based in a private house and subject to the personal control of the cultic leader, and the regulation has been much discussed by theologians and historians of religion.[219] S. C. Barton and G. H. R. Horsley have analysed this text as a testimony to a foundation of a new cult taking place in a private house belonging to Dionysios and claim that the catalogue of forbidden acts may well be understood as an expression of popular Greek morality.[220] Membership of the cult was granted by following the moral code, but a clear hierarchy of priests seems to be absent. Matthew Dickie regards *LSAM* 20 as one of several testimonies to a development starting in the 5th century BC where worshippers' moral conduct was regarded as a precondition for gaining access to sacred areas.[221]

As shown in this section, divine punishment, which is a rare motive in Greek cultic regulations, usually occurs as vague threats without any details about the expected reaction. In most cases the regulations only state that transgressors will be punished. No human authority can sentence anyone to be punished by a god, only to corporal or economical punishments, but it may claim to be acting on behalf of a divine authority. If an incident is to be regarded as a divine punishment, on the other hand, it must be

---

[216] *LSAM* 20, 48-50: ἐὰν δέ τι]ῖνες παραβ[αί]νωσιν, τοὺς τοιούτους [μισήσουσι καὶ με]γάλας αὐτοῖς τιμωρίας περιθήσου[σιν.

[217] *LSAM* 20, 38: μύσο[υ]ς ἐμφυλίου πλή[ρ]η (...).

[218] Barton & Horsley 1981, 20

[219] See Barton & Horsley 1981 for a survey on the literature on this inscription.

[220] Barton & Horsley 1981, 19.

[221] See Dickie 2001.

interpreted as such. Divine punishment does not exist on an objective level; it is the justification for exercise of power or an explanation offered in retrospect by someone who had the competence to read certain signs.

D. Conclusions

1. Historical aspects

One of the few places where we can follow the development of purification regulations through the centuries is Rhodes. From Sokolowski's editions I have chosen four inscriptions containing rules for cultic purification, which date from the 3rd century BC to the 2nd century AD. These inscriptions are

1) *LSCG* 136, Ialysos, ca. 300 BC, cult of Alektrōne.
2) *LSS* 108, 1st century AD.
3) *LSCG* 139, Lindos 2nd century AD.
4) *LSS* 91, 3rd century AD.

Three of these inscriptions are relatively late, and there is a considerable gap in history between *LSCG* 136 and the other inscriptions. As pointed out above,[222] *LSCG* 136 seems to have been written in response to a violation against the *temenos* of Alektrōne. The other three inscriptions, however, seems to be have had a more permanent character. *LSCG* 136 primarily forbids domestic animals inside the *temenos*, and as such it diverges slightly from the other Rhodian texts which are general regulations of ritual purity. The only obvious link between the oldest and the latest inscriptions is the demand that worshippers be barefooted and the prohibition of special kinds of leather.[223] The continuity is far more evident in *LSS* 108, *LSCG* 139 and *LSS* 91. The most striking common feature is the demand that those who enter the shrine should not only be clean in a corporeal sense but also have a clean mind.[224] This seems to have been a conventional demand in Rhodian cultic regulations.

Without going too much into details we may say that *LSS* 108, *LSCG* 139 and *LSS* 91 are basically conventional regulations of purity. The regular impure conditions, such

---

[222] See p. 116 (above).

[223] *LSCG* 136, 25-26, see note 147. *LSS* 91, 8, see note 145. *LSCG* 136 forbids pigskin, *LSS* 91 goat.

[224] *LSS* 108, 6-7: οὐ λουτρôι | ἀλλὰ νόῳ καθαρόν. *LSCG* 139, 4-5: χεῖρας καὶ | γνώμην καθαροὺς (...). *LSS* 91, 4-5: μὴ τὸ [σῶ]|μα μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν κεκαθαρμένους·

as sex, birth and death are mentioned in all of them.[225] Both *LSCG* 139 and *LSS* 91 demand, for instance, a very long period of exclusion following the death of a relative.[226] There is also a clear similarity in the detailed demands for purification. In other respects, there are no significant differences between these regulations. These cultic regulations provide evidence in support of the theory that there was a high degree of continuity in requirements of participation in Greek cults; not only on Rhodes but in the entire ancient Greek world.[227] We may accordingly conclude that even though the texts chosen for the present study come from various periods and geographical areas, they all contribute to our understanding of the more lasting structure of Greek cultic morality.

2. Authority and punishments

a. Authority

As pointed out above, many cultic regulations are laws passed by the Assembly, and are not distinguishable from other laws in content and subject.[228] This means that the formulas of authorisation are the same as in other laws passed by an Assembly. If the texts identify the authority behind the text, it is usually the council and assembly, and they are formulated as public decrees.[229] *LSCG* 37, 84, 116 and 150 contain references to the Assembly and the Council. *LSCG* 84 is clearly a public decree from the Assembly of Korope, containing an account of who gave the proposal,[230] and the conventional formula ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.[231] *LSCG* 116 gives the name of the *prytaneus* and says βουλῆς γν[ώμη].[232] *LSCG* 150 also seems to be a public decree; both

---

[225] *LSS* 108 lacks demands for purification of death, but this is probably due to the fact that the first lines of the regulation are missing.

[226] *LSCG* 139, 13: 40 days; see note 84. *LSS* 91, 13: 41 days; see note 85.

[227] Parker 1983, 322: "[T]he evidence for significant change in attitudes to pollution is too sparse. If we look forward briefly beyond the fourth century, we still find more evidence for continuity than transformation".

[228] Parker 2004, 58.

[229] Woodhead 1967, 37-39.

[230] *LSCG* 84, 1-4.

[231] *LSCG* 84, 24-25.

[232] *LSCG* 116, 1-2.

A and B give references to the Assembly,[233] but only B gives the name of the person who proposed the law.[234] *LSCG* 91, 111, 148 and *LSS* 81 are damaged, and corresponding formulas are therefore missing in these texts. Most of them nevertheless contain references to public officials or give other indications of official status. In *LSCG* 91 and 111, the punishments are to be conducted by state officials.[235] *LSS* 81, which is heavily damaged, gives no clear references to a state official, but, if the reconstruction is correct, a court seems to be mentioned: [δικασ]τηρίου (13).

LSCG 37 comes from an Attic *dēmē*, and is raised by the priest of Apollo Erithaseos, probably on his own initiative. He states that he makes the announcement in his own name, ὑπέρ ἑαυ[τοῦ] (2), but also in the name of the *dēmē* and the Athenian people: τῶν δημ[ο]τῶν καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηνα[ί]ων (4-5). Later, the text states that the punishment for logging is to be imposed according to the terms of the decree of the Council and the Athenian people, κατὰ τὸ ψήφισμα τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων (12-13, 17-18). This indicates that the inscription itself is not a public decree, but refers to a decree issued by the Assembly.

Most of these texts are dated to the 5th or 4th centuries BC. They belong to the era of the Greek city-state. The authority behind these regulations is in most cases the *polis*. The priest who proclaims the prohibition against logging in the sacred grove in *LSCG* 37 refers to a law passed by the Athenian assembly (4-5, 17-18). He does not base his claims on divine authority. Unfortunately, the only inscription dated BC, *LSS* 81, is too damaged to give any indication of the authority behind the regulation but we may assume that regulations of this kind were issued by local assemblies also in Roman times. During the Roman period, however, there is some shift in the way authority is expressed in the cultic regulations. There is a tendency to focus more on the divine authority of the regulations, for example that the regulation has been given to the founder of the cult through a dream.[236] This may indicate that governing cults and behaviour of worshippers became an internal matter and to a less extent fell within the responsibilities of official authorities.

---

[233] *LSCG* 150 A, 6-7, 10; 150 B, 14, 16.

[234] *LSCG* 150 B, 1.

[235] *LSCG* 91, 2-3: δήμ[αρχος], 7: ἱεροπ[ο]οί. *LSCG* 111, 5-6, 7-8: θεορός, 6-7: ν[εωκ]όρος.

[236] See Lupu 2005, 12, with reference to *LSCG* 55.

b. Punishments

In a recent article, Parker confirms the observation[237] that punishments in cultic regulations are usually confined to actions such as the destruction of sacred property. Cutting down a sacred tree or stealing votive offerings are crimes of the same order as stealing from a private house. There may be witnesses, and a specific guilty individual may be identified and brought to trial. Transgressions of purity rules, on the other hand, cannot be treated in the same way. Mechanisms for checking ritual purity are impossible to devise; it is an elusive category that cannot be checked. There is no way to see that a person who comes to a shrine is ritually impure. Punishments related to violations of purification demands do exist, but, as Parker points out, they are of a special character:

> 'Penalties' for error or neglect are regularly stated. These invariably, however, take the form of a requirement to purify the shrine and/or to 'sacrifice an animal as a penalty'. That is to say, they are envisaged in relation to the shrine and the gods, and means of enforcement against worshippers who decline to sacrifice a penalty are not mentioned.[238]

Parker terms these regulations 'exegetic laws' and argues that they had a different function from laws prohibiting the destruction of sacred property:

> The primary aim of exegetical laws […] is to advise those who wish to be advised.[239]

Rules of purity are handbooks of cultic morality or piety. They tell those who want to show their piety and submit to the demands of proper cultic behaviour how to behave. They are not evidence that everybody actually followed these rules.

Ancient pagan religion lacked a central authority in the sense of a single institution that oversaw the worship of the pagan gods. This absence is of course reflected in the cultic regulations. Organisations such as the Amphictyonian league had a limited function.[240] There were, of course, official cults with their institutions, priests

---

[237] See p. 127 (above).

[238] Parker 2004, 63.

[239] Parker 2004, 65.

[240] An amphictyony was a group of states with responsibility for the administration of a particular cult and its temples. The most famous one was the Amphictyonic league of Delphi or the Pylaian Amphictyony,

and rituals, but they did not have a monopoly on the performance of religious rituals, nor did they codify dogmas. There were always private cults that existed side by side with the officially recognised cults, such hero or mystery-cults, and these were to a large extent beyond the control of central authorities who rarely interfered in the private sphere.

3. Conclusions

Greek cultic regulations contain rules intended to secure proper conduct and behaviour within the sacred sphere, i.e. cultic morality. The rules and demands vary over time and space, but the issues are basically the same: ritual purity and the protection of sacred property. Ritual purity usually relates to life processes: birth, death, sex and food. None of this is particularly surprising from a religious point of view; similar rules may be found in Jewish or Persian religion. But Greek rules differed from Semitic ones in that they primarily were markers of suitability for worship, not of a general mode of life. This is in accordance with the theory of Greek cultic morality proposed in Ch. 2 which sees it as a special code of behaviour that primarily had relevance in a cultic context, and was not intended to be a general mode of life, by contrast with the commandments and prohibitions of the Pentateuch. Adjustment to purity requirements was a means of displaying ones piety and a marker of the division between cultic and profane spheres. This is one of the important differences between Greek and Jewish religion.

How did these rules function in the actual conduct of the cult? The general lack of concrete punishments for the violation of purification rules points to the possibility that there was no real practice of punishment in these cases. It was, so to speak, a matter between the believer and his god(s). Impurity was certainly avoided because it was dangerous and would have consequences in some way. These consequences seem, however, to have been beyond the control of mortals, and therefore of less interest to

which usually refers to the council protecting the Delphic shrine of Apollo. Its origin was probably the sanctuary of Demeter at Anthela by Thermopylai (see Davis 1994, 204). After the 1st holy war in the first part of the 6th century BC, probably somewhere between 590 and 580 BC (see Davis 1994, 193), the league gained control of the sanctuary at Delphi and played an important role in Greek politics until the 4th Sacred War 340-338 when Phillip of Macedonia conquered Greece. The league consisted of 12 tribes (*ethnē*) who sent 2 envoys twice a year.

cultic regulations. Ritual purity was a serious matter but it was primarily the responsibility of the individual worshipper.

This is partly the explanation for why punishments for neglect of purity requirements and violation of sacred property are accentuated differently. When punishments are specified, it is usually in relation to sacred property, while consequences of ritual impurity are vague or not articulated at all. Rules of purity are conventional parts of cultic regulations and purification rituals are integrated elements of the cults. This is probably part of the explanation as to why rules of purification are so randomly distributed in Greek cultic regulations. Ritual impurity is also an elusive category which in most cases cannot be identified by visible features. Destruction of sacred objects on the other hand is to a much greater extent a crime that may be investigated and traced to a specific perpetrator, and thus treated in the same manner as a civil crime. Furthermore, cultic regulations seem to have been written in response to actual problems to a larger extent than purity requirements. But there is also a concrete and practical reason why ritual impurity seems to have been left unpunished, while crimes related to property were punished. The crime may have been observed, and some of the regulations do in fact require witnesses to come forward.[241] Ritual impurity cannot be punished in the same way, because it cannot be seen. No-one can check whether a person is in a state of impurity vis-à-vis the gods or not. Acceptable purity is therefore primarily the worshipper's own responsibility, and by applying to the code of proper behaviour and cultic morality he or she proves their piety, at least to themselves.

We may therefore, following Parker's classification (above), distinguish two levels of religious transgression, exegetical and criminal. These levels are perceived differently; they fill different functions, and are therefore treated differently. The exegetical level, which is to a large extent directed at the worshipper's eligibility to worship is in most cases a matter between the worshipper and the gods. The various rules of purification are derived from the norm of cultic morality which may or may not be articulated in details. As we have seen, some cultic regulations give only vague information about purity demands,[242] while others give detailed rules.[243] In some cases

---

[241] See *LSCG* 111, 7-8; 116, 6-7, 25-30. *LSCG* 116 even threatens witnesses who do not come forward with a fine of five staters.

[242] *LSCG* 53; 130. *LSS* 82. *LSAM* 35. See pp. 96-99 (above).

these rules seems to have been included in the regulation as a conventional element of cultic regulations.[244] In other cases impurity is regarded as a serious matter and may be given substantial attention in the regulation.[245] They are emphasised differently at various places and times and their observation is left to the worshipper. Explicit mention of punishment is therefore rare; it is not a matter for the civil authorities.

---

[243] *LSCG* 55; 124; 136; 139; 152; 171. *LSS* 33 A; 54; 59; 91; 108; 119. *LSAM* 12; 16; 18; 20; 29; 83; 84. *NGSL* 7, see pp. 99-116 (above).

[244] E.g. *LSCG* 53, 31-34; 55, 3-9; 171, 15-17. *LSAM* 12, 3-9.

[245] E. g. *LSCG* 124; 136; *LSS* 91; *NGSL* 7.

THE RECONCILIATION INSCRIPTIONS AND THEIR RELIGIOUS CONTEXT

A. Introduction

My survey of earlier research on reconciliation inscriptions (see Ch. 1) shows that scholars have assumed that these texts are isolated from other religious expressions written in Greek. There can be no doubt that the reconciliation inscriptions as an epigraphic genre are isolated with respect to their content and style, as well as their historical and geographical occurrence. Institutionalised recordings of religious transgressions, divine punishments and subsequent atonement are unparalleled in the ancient world. Scholars have therefore focused on the contents of the inscriptions, without relating them to other religious expressions in Lydia or Phrygia; the only exception is curse texts and judicial prayers (below). One of the few exceptions is Stephen Mitchell who remarks that other religious inscriptions found in Catacecaumene are primarily votive texts which share the same characteristics as most other inscriptions of inland Anatolia.[1]

This may explain why there seems to be a tendency among scholars to regard the reconciliation inscriptions as the core of religion in Catacecaumene and Phrygia. By focusing solely on the reconciliation inscriptions without relating them to other religious texts from the same area we might get the impression that religion in Catacecaumene was centred on a confessional practice which was based on the constant fear of being punished by the gods. In Ch. 1 it was argued that the reconciliation inscriptions were used for particular purposes, namely documentation of achieved propitiation in cases where any other means of healing had failed. This chapter will first present a survey of the geographical and historical context of the reconciliation inscriptions, then outline the basic structure and contents of the texts, and finally analyse the religious context in which the reconciliation inscriptions were written based on other religious texts from

---

[1] Mitchell 1995, 194; see Ch. 1, 24.

the same areas and period of history. Which notions of the relations between man and god existed in Lydia and Phrygia in the first three centuries AD and how do reconciliation inscriptions relate to other forms of ritual practice and religious expressions?

B. The reconciliation inscriptions

1. Geography

The reconciliation inscriptions all originate from inland Asia Minor, more specifically from Lydia and Phrygia. The majority of the inscriptions come from the Lydian region of Catacecaumene and the region of the upper part of the river Hermos. Some inscriptions have been found in the territories of Saittai and Philadelpia, and in Sardis and the region between Apollonos Hieron and Tripolis. In Phrygia the most important find spot for reconciliation inscriptions is the sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos and Akmonia. There are also a few texts known from Tiberiopolis in Mysia. Today about 140 inscriptions have been published.[2]

2. Time

51 of the inscriptions published by Georg Petzl are dated according to the so-called Sullan chronology which is based on the end of the campaign of Sulla against Mithradates VI, king of Pontos in 85/84 BC. Three of the inscriptions are possibly dated according to Actian chronology and we cannot say with certainty which year they were written.[3] *BWK* *39, *44 and *122 contain dates but are damaged and it is impossible to read the year. Based on the years given in these inscriptions we can give the following table:

BWK	Sull.	AD
56	142	57/8
41	166	81/2

---

[2] Chaniotis 2004, 3 claims that 142 reconciliation inscriptions have been published. Unfortunately, Chaniotis does not give a full bibliography for reconciliation inscriptions published after Petzl 1994. This thesis lists 8 inscriptions in addition to those of Petzl 1994 (See Ch. 5, 184-185).
[3] *BWK* *52; *95; *101.

68	199	114/5
39	2[ ]	115/6 – 214/5
54, 57, 67, 78	203	118/9
52	204	119/120
44	209	124/5
95	210	125/6
63	217	132/3
53	227	142/3
40	228	143/4
47	231	146/7
51	233	148/9
69	241	156/7
71	244	159/60
55, 101	245	160/1
72	247	162/3
3	249	164/5
23	250	165/6
58	251	166/7
80	257	172/3
24	258	173/4
64	262	177/8
66	273	188/9
9, 36	276	191/2
10, 16	279	194/5
19	283	198/9
18, 73, 74	284	199/200
4	285	200/1
20	294	209/10
35	295	210/11
22	300	215/6
46	307	222/3
44 (?)	309	224/5

5, 61, 76	320	235/6
70	321	236/7
6	323	238/9
77	335	250/1
12	338	253/4
11	348	263/4

The oldest inscription in Petzl's collection may be dated to AD 57/8 (142 sull.) but contains only the text Μηνὶ Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἀξιοττα and may thus be an ex-voto inscription. The oldest reconciliation inscription that can be dated with certainty is *BWK* *41 which was written in AD 81/2 (166 sull.). Most of the texts date from the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD, but with a concentration of texts written between AD 115 and 210. This coincides with the marked rise in the production of inscriptions in Asia Minor which occurred between AD 175 and 225, primarily of epitaphs.[4]

It should be noted that none of the inscriptions from the temple of Apollo Lairbenos are dated. The only exception is *BWK* *122 but this is very uncertain. Georg Petzl dates most of the texts from this temple to the 2nd or 3rd centuries AD. They were in other words written in the same period as the rest of the reconciliation inscriptions.

3. Content

Reconciliation inscriptions contain stories of human misfortunes interpreted in terms of religious transgressions. The purpose of these texts is on the one hand to explain why diseases or death have befallen certain people, on the other hand to testify that the angered deity now is reconciled and that the transgressor now has re-established his or her proper relationship with this deity. Their plots follow a rather rigid pattern of transgression, punishment, identification of the cause of divine wrath and propitiation of the enraged deity. The stories told evolve around religious transgressions, judicial prayers and perjury.[5] Usually, the transgressors and the victims of judicial prayers are punished by the gods through disease or death, and must thereafter seek reconciliation in order to obtain healing, and record this with an inscription. Most of these

---

[4] MacMullen 1982 & 1986. See also Meyer 1990.

[5] See Ch. 2.

transgressions are related to cultic activity, and a more detailed classification and analysis of the nature of the transgressions will be conducted in Ch. 5 of this thesis.

4. Structure

It is quite clear that the structure and style of these texts are influenced by the style and formulas of votive inscriptions. A reconciliation inscription usually starts with an appraisal of the deity involved in the process and its powers. A typical opening line is Μέγας Ζεὺς ἐγ Διδύμων Δρυῶν (*BWK* 10) or Μεγάλη Μήτηρ Αναειτις Αζιτα κατέχουσα καὶ Μεὶς Τιαμου καὶ αἱ δυνάμις αὐτῶν (*BWK* *68). In these opening lines the gods are often given epithets which describe them as kings and rulers (e.g. βασιλεύων, κατέχων, τύραννος). Often the name of the deity is given in the dative case, such as in *BWK* 64: Μηνὶ Ἀξιοττηνῷ.

The texts then often proceed with an account of the transgression. As shown in Ch. 1,[6] these accounts can be detailed and elaborate, but in most cases they are rather short containing just a few or no details of the transgression. Following this account the text might describe the disease which is interpreted as divine punishment but in many texts the punishment is only referred to in general terms such as κόλασις, κολασθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ etc. The texts often end with a short account of the propitiation, a thanksgiving to and an appraisal of the enraged deity. Some reconciliation inscriptions emphasise that the account should be taken as a warning to others against committing similar transgressions, such as παραγέλων μηδένα καταφρονεῖ[ν τοῦ θεοῦ] (*BWK* *117). This formula is in particular a distinctive feature of the inscriptions that come from the shrine of Apollo Lairbenos.

Particularly striking is the phrase στηλλογράφειν τὰς δύναμεις τοῦ θεοῦ/τῶν θεῶν which concludes several reconciliation inscriptions.[7] The phrase only occurs in reconciliation inscriptions and seems to express belief in divine intervention in human life.

---

[6] See Ch. 1, 17.

[7] *BWK* *3; *14; *33; *35; *37; *39; *47; 55; *69.

5. Curses, judicial prayers and oaths

14 of the inscriptions[8] in Petzl's edition explicitly attribute the punishment of the perpetrator to so-called judicial prayers. In every case these texts refer to conflicts between humans such as theft, fraud or insults. In the reconciliation inscriptions this ritual may be referred to as ἀρά.[9] Conducting the ritual is called ἐπικαταράσθαι,[10] ἐπαράσθαι,[11] ἀράσθαι,[12] πιττάκιον διδόναι,[13] and most prominently σκῆπτρον ἐπιστάναι.[14] These rituals belong to the category which Versnel has termed 'judicial prayers' or 'prayers for justice'.[15] Many texts, often written on lead tablets, intended to harm an opponent or rival have been discovered practically all over the ancient world. In these cases the punishment is initiated through a ritual in which someone who claims to have been wrongfully harmed asks a god to punish the wrongdoer. But unlike mere curses or binding spells, which usually are directed at rivals for the purpose of achieving financial gain or social prestige and where the harming of the opponent is expected to occur more or less automatically through the use of magic formulas,[16] judicial prayers are intended to harm someone who is guilty of an offence or crime. They are therefore not written with purely malevolent intentions. It is also important to note that the main purpose of writing a judicial prayer is not personal gain, as in most *defixiones*, but revenge.[17] The texts are formulated as prayers where the worshipper begs the gods to grant justice unlike binding spells which usually contain commands to the deities. In addition, judicial prayers often give the name of the author. There are also indications

---

[8] *BWK* *3; *13; *17; *20; *21; *28; *35; *44; *47; *59; *60; *68; *69; *79.

[9] *BWK* *69, 10.

[10] *BWK* *17, 3-4.

[11] *BWK* *20, 2.

[12] *BWK* *44, 3.

[13] *BWK* *60, 6-7.

[14] *BWK* *3, 2-3; *35, 12-13; *68, 15-16; *69, 9-10.

[15] Versnel 1991. R. Gordon argues that these texts should be termed 'vindicative texts' (Gordon 2004a, 198).

[16] Faraone 1991. For an introduction to ancient curse tablets and binding spells, see Gager 1992.

[17] Chaniotis 2004, 15: "What the authors of such prayers expected was not (or not primarily) material gain, but moral satisfaction and revenge".

that judicial prayers were put on public display,[18] whereas *defixiones* were normally folded and hidden in wells or buried in the ground, sometimes pierced with a nail. The author often presents him- or herself as a subject of the deity, who may be addressed as a ruler.

The most significant vindicative ritual described in the reconciliation inscriptions is the 'raising of the σκῆπτρον, i.e. an erection of a staff, presumably in a temple and accompanied by recitations of prayers in which the gods were asked to punish a wrongdoer. The staff thus indicates that divine power has been invoked and that a judicial prayer is active.[19] If the offender is punished, the sceptre has to be annulled at his or her expense. This was probably done by consulting a temple which could authorise the ransoming of *skēptra* and oaths.[20] Several scholars have noted the similarities between this practice and the practice of dedicating wrongdoers to the gods found in the thirteen lead tablets found at Cnidus dated to the 2nd and 1st century BC.[21] In the judicial prayers from Cnidus, Demeter is asked to let the perpetrator admit guilt and settle the injustice he or she has caused. The cursed person is then regarded as being under divine power and a potential threat to his or her surroundings. For this reason the deity is sometimes asked not to harm the author of the text if they should happen to meet the offender, as the latter was often unknown to the author. Often, the author makes it clear that stolen goods now are the property of the invoked deity as long as the thief is punished. This is done in cases of theft or fraud, and the culprit is often asked to admit guilt publicly or bring stolen goods to the temple.[22] This consecration of persons or even objects to the gods has a parallel in the Lydian practice of raising a *skēptron,* and means that the affair is handed over to the deity who is expected to track down the culprit and make him pay.[23] The Cnidian and Lydian appeals for divine justice diverge

---

[18] Versnel, 1991, 69.

[19] Versnel 1991, 76: "There is a ritual opening of the judicial process by the "drawing up of a scepter".

[20] See Ch. 5, 220-221.

[21] *DT* 1-13.

[22] E.g. *DT* 2 A, 22.

[23] This is most evident in *BWK* *3 where a *skēptron* is raised in order to prevent thefts of clothes in a bath. This text contributes to the impression of Lydian *skēptra* as primitive burglary alarms.

from judicial prayers elsewhere in that they often demand some form of compensation and not merely the punishment of wrongdoers.

Versnel assumes that the ritual of raising a *skēptron* was accompanied by the dedication of a written complain referred to as a πιττάκιον,[24] which probably was a lead tablet of the same type as to those found at Cnidus. Unfortunately, only one reconciliation inscription (*BWK* *60) mentions this practice and this can therefor not be confirmed. Chaniotis on the other hand argues that a *skēptron* primarily was raised when the wrongdoer was unknown[25] and that the *pittakion* was used when the offended person knew who the wrongdoer was.[26] In any case, it seems clear that the invocation of divine power was publicly announced, in contrast to binding spells which are usually hidden away.

Gordon has argued strongly for a wider interpretation of the use of *skēptra* in the reconciliation inscriptions. Gordon is certainly right in claiming that at least in cases of human conflicts and curses, the punished person had to ransom the *skēptron* raised by an opponent. He is, however, probably wrong about the presence of *skēptra* in the propitiating rituals. Gordon's claim is based on what he interprets as depictions of priests holding *skēptra* on some of the *stelae*.[27] After looking thoroughly at these depictions, I cannot draw any other conclusion than that these 'sceptres' are simply folds in the depicted persons' garments. The lines always start at the shoulders and end where the garments end, and the depicted persons, who all would be holding the sceptre in their left hand, are not holding anything, nor are the 'sceptres' clearly distinguishable in the same way as other sacred objects such as wreaths. If the *skēptron* is depicted, it is always held by the god and is much more clearly outlined than in the pictures Gordon is referring to.[28]

---

[24] Versnel 1991, 78.

[25] Chaniotis 1997, 366; 2004, 13.

[26] Chaniotis 2004, 14.

[27] *BWK* 6; 10; *11; *12; *37. G. Petzl 1994 supports the idea in his comments on these texts. It is sustained by Chaniotis 2004, 13.

[28] *BWK* *3; *51; *52; *58; *61; *68.

Oaths and perjury are assigned as reasons for punishment in 14 of the reconciliation inscriptions.[29] The practice of self-cursing was widely known in the Greek world. A person taking an oath would invoke divine punishment upon himself and his household as a guarantee that the oath would be kept.[30] Similar self-curses were probably found in Lydian and Phrygian oaths as well. As was the case with the practice of *skēptra* the perjurer or his relatives had to ransom the oath and thereby annul the curse. Curses were certainly taken in public and rumours of perjury would probably have spread quite quickly in the community.

All the 14 reconciliation inscriptions referring to judicial prayers are related to human conflicts. This fact indicates a belief in the gods as promoters of justice, but not without conditions. A god would not strike a wrongdoer without being invoked to do so through a judicial prayer. Texts in which a person claiming to have been wronged asks the gods to punish the wrongdoer are a widespread phenomenon in the Hellenistic and Roman world. Judicial prayers are accordingly one of the elements which relate the reconciliation inscriptions to a wider context of ancient religiosity, but as Chaniotis points out, there are significant differences as well. Most judicial prayers seem to have been conducted without the intervention of priests, while Lydian temples could offer an institutionalised practice for the annulment of curses.[31]

6. Gods in reconciliation inscriptions

The reconciliation inscriptions were not confined to one particular cult, even though the cult of Mēn held a prominent position. The strong presence of the cult of Mēn in the reconciliation inscriptions must be seen as a result of its wide diffusion in Roman Asia Minor and not as evidence for the origin of this practice. The fact that so many cults are represented in the reconciliation inscriptions is an indication that they were a widespread phenomenon in Lydia and Phrygia.

---

[29] *BWK* *2; *15; *27; *34; *52; *54; *58; *102; *103; *105; 106; 107; *119(?); 120.

[30] See Parker 1983, 186-188 for references.

[31] Chaniotis 1997, 366.

a. Μήν

Μήν or Μείς is the predominant deity of the reconciliation inscriptions. He is mentioned in 33 of the texts published by Petzl.[32] Mēn was probably a Persian god associated with the moon, which is his most characteristic attribute. In the iconography he is usually depicted as a beardless man dressed in trousers and a Phrygian cap. On his shoulders he carries a crescent. Usually he is depicted standing holding a sceptre, but there are also examples where he is riding a horse, and a few cases where he is sitting on a throne. Other frequently occurring attributes are bulls and roosters.[33]

The main centre for the worship of Mēn was Asia Minor, but the cult is also attested in Greece (*CMRDM* I, 1-19),[34] the Balkans (*CMRDM* I, 20-21), Ostia and Rome (*CMRDM* I, 22-27), and Pontos which according to E. N. Lane was heavily influenced by Persian culture.[35] In Asia Minor the cult was widespread, and held a dominant position in Maionia and in Antioch in Pisidia. In Antioch, where Mēn Askaenos was regarded as πάτριος θεός,[36] a great temple has been excavated. This shows that the cult must have held an important position, because we know that prominent Roman families were participants[37] and because a large amount of numismatic material has been found here.[38] The temple, which existed from the 2nd century BC to the 3rd century AD, is Ionian in style and shows strong Hellenic influences on the cult. In fact, the temple is a typical example of temples from Hellenistic Asia Minor.[39] The Mēn-cult of the Maionian region, from which the reconciliation inscriptions originate, had a different character with several local shrines. The largest portion of inscriptional material from the Mēn-cult comes from this area. The majority of the material consists of votive inscriptions and indicates cults with a

---

[32] *BWK* *3; 5; 6; *35; 36; *37; *38; *39; *40; *51; *52; *53; *54; 55; *56; *57; *58; *59; *60; *61; *62; *63; 64; *65; *67; *68; *69; *70; *71; *80; *84; *100; *101.

[33] For an account of the iconography of Mēn, see *CMRDM* III (Lane 1976), 99-108.

[34] The Attic material is the earliest evidence for the cult of Mēn.

[35] Lane 1990, 2170.

[36] Mitchell & Waelkens 1998, 37.

[37] E.g. *CMRDM* I, nr. 176. See also Lane 1990, 2165.

[38] *CMRDM* II.

[39] Mitchell & Waelkens, 1998, 68: "Far from being of unusual character, it is a classic Greek building of Hellenistic date".

heavy focus on communication between the deity and worshipper through oracular questions and answers. This is, however, a feature which is common to all cults in this area and not confined to the cult of Mēn.

Mēn has the following epithets in the reconciliation inscriptions: Ἀξιοττηνός,[40] Ἀρτεμιδώρου,[41] Λαβανας,[42] Οὐράνιος,[43] Πετραίτης,[44] Τιαμου[45] and Τύραννος.[46]

b. Ζεύς

There are in particular two cults of Zeus that stand out in the reconciliation inscriptions: Ζεύς ἐκ Διδύμων Δρυῶν[47] and Ζεύς Σαβάζιος.[48] The first of these is a local cult which was associated with oak trees with split trunks,[49] and probably a sacred grove, since some of the transgressions described are associated with the violation of sacred trees (*BWK* 9; 10). Apart from this there is little information about the performance of the cult.

The cult of Sabazios is widely attested in the ancient world, and is known from both Asia Minor and Europe. The earliest attestation of the cult is a decree from Artaxerxes II (404-359 BC).[50] Sabazios is also mentioned by several ancient writers, among them Aristophanes.[51] Sabazios is usually depicted as man with beard dressed in trousers and a Phrygian cap. The predominant signs of the cult are votive offerings made of bronze and shaped as hands with the index finger, middle finger and thumb raised and decorated with magic symbols such as snakes.[52] The cult seems to have

---

[40] *BWK* *3; 6; 36; *38; *57; *58; *59; *60; *61; *62; *63; 64; *65; *67; *71; *100.

[41] *BWK* 5; *40; 55; *56; *79; *101.

[42] *BWK* *35; 36; *37; *40.

[43] *BWK* 55.

[44] *BWK* *35; *37; *38; *39.

[45] *BWK* *54; *67; *68; *69; *70; *71; *84.

[46] *BWK* *53.

[47] *BWK* 9; 10; *11; *12.

[48] *BWK* *24; *49; 50; 76; *77.

[49] The tree may have been associated with Zeus because the trunk was split by lightning.

[50] *CCIS* II, 31. This inscription is a 2nd century copy.

[51] *CCIS* II, p. 46-52.

[52] See *CCIS* I.

originated in Asia Minor and was spread from Syria to Germania. However, most of the epigraphic material comes from Thracia, Asia Minor, and Italy.

Zeus is mentioned in 17 of the reconciliation inscriptions,[53] and he has 8 different epithets: Αἴθριος (*BWK* *47), ἐκ Διδύμων Δρυῶν (*BWK* 9; 10; *11; *12), Διδυμείτης (*BWK* 10), Ὀγμηνός (*BWK* *53), Ὀρείτης (*BWK* 6; 7), Ὀρκαμανίτης (*BWK* *102; *103), Πειζηνός (*BWK* *45), Σαβάζιος (*BWK* *24; *49; 50; 76; *77) and Τρωσου (*BWK* *1).

c. Ἀπόλλων

Apollo is mentioned in 14 reconciliation inscriptions,[54] 9 of which come from the Phrygian shrine of Apollo Lairbenos.[55] Apart from this deity, 3 other epithets are associated with Apollo: Αξυρος (*BWK* *21; 22), θεὸς Βοζηνός (*BWK* 43), Προπύλαιος (*BWK* *104 (?)), Τάρσιος (*BWK* *57).

We only know the cult of Apollo Lairbenos from Phrygia, where a temple has been located in the vicinity of the modern Turkish village of Orta Köy, approximately 30 kilometres north of Phrygian Hierapolis (modern Pamukkale). The cult is also located in Hierapolis, where it was probably introduced in 2nd century AD.[56] Apollo Lairbenos was associated with the sun. In *BWK* 107 he is named Ἥλιος Ἀπόλλων Λαβανός and he his portrayed on coins from Hierapolis with sun rays round his head.[57] His most important attribute is a double axe and he is sometimes depicted as a riding god.[58] There are few indications of the nature of the cult of Apollo Lairbenos; *BWK* *108 states that mysteries were celebrated in honour of this deity.

---

[53] *BWK* *1; 5; 6; 7; 9; 10; *11; *12; *24; *45; *49; 50; *53; 76; *77; *102; *103.

[54] *BWK* *21; 22; 43; *57; *104; 106; 107; *109; 112; *113; *118; *119; 120; 124.

[55] *BWK* 106; 107; *109; 112; *113; *118; *119; 120; 124.

[56] Miller 1985, 52.

[57] Miller 1985, 64.

[58] Miller 1985, 66.

d. Μήτηρ

The epithet Μήτηρ is found in 23 reconciliation inscriptions[59] and is associated with 8 goddesses: Αναειτις (*BWK* *68; *70; 72) Ατιμις (*BWK* *54) Ἱπτα or Εἱπτα (*BWK* *49; 50) Λητώ (*BWK* *122), Ταρσηνή, Τα(σ)ζηνη or Ταλ[...]ρδηνη (*BWK* *39; *41; *42; *57) Φιλεἱς (*BWK* *83; [*84?]; *86; [*88?]; [*89]; [*90]; *94; *95).

The most prominent among these goddesses is Αναειτις who is invoked in 9 reconciliation inscriptions (*BWK* *67; *69; *71; *73; *74; *75; 76; *96; *99). In three of the inscriptions she is associated with Artemis (*BWK* *69; 76; *99). Her cult originated in the cult of Aredvi-Sura-Arahita, the Persian river-goddess. The cult was introduced in Asia Minor in the 4th century BC where its most important cult centres were Nitalis in Cappadocia, Zela in Pontos and Akilisene in Armenia. The cult had a strong Persian character.[60]

The reconciliation inscriptions and the cults with which they are associated are usually devoid of references to myths or mythological themes. One of the few exceptions is the notion of the mother of gods, which is mentioned in *BWK* 55 where Μεγάλη Μήτηρ Μηνὸς Τεκοῦσα is invoked.

C. The religious context. Religion and cult in Lydia and Phrygia

1. General remarks

The reconciliation inscriptions were not written in a religious vacuum. They were part of a larger religious environment in which they only played a limited role; religious life in Lydia and Phrygia was not based on an eternal circle of transgression, punishment and propitiation. Which religious ideas did the inhabitants of Lydia and Phrygia possess? By 'idea' in this context I mean which purposes the worshippers intended, consciously or un-consciously, to fulfil. The word 'idea' should of course be used with caution; it assumes that religion is based on a set of dogmas to which the worshipper gives his or her consent. 'Ideas' are therefore not necessarily abstractions of

---

[59] *BWK* *39; *40; *41; *42; *49; 50; *54; 55; *57; *68; *70; 72; *83; [*84?]; *86; [*88?]; [*89]; [*90]; *94; *95; *97; *122.

[60] Gordon 1996.

worshippers' own accounts of their participation in religious and cultic activity but the result of scholarly analysis of the cult.

Our sources for the cults of Lydia and Phrygia are basically inscriptions. We have few substantial literary evidence from these areas. The epigraphic material, however, is quite extensive and provides a good picture of the cultic activity, even though its contents are primarily of a technical character. It focuses above all on the external aspects of the cult and does not give explicit statements about or explanations of notions and beliefs. The most comprehensive collection of religious inscriptions from Lydia so far is Maria Paz de Hoz's thesis *Die lydischen Kulte im Lichte der griechischen Inschriften* published in 1999. The thesis focuses primarily on the epigraphical and technical aspects of the religious material from Lydia and it is primarily a collection of religious sources. Based on de Hoz's study the following survey seeks to analyse which religious notions these sources express.

Roughly speaking,[61] the majority of reconciliation inscriptions originate from the vicinities of six Lydian cities: Saittai,[62] Tabala, Silandos,[63] Maionia,[64] Kula,[65] and Kollyda.[66] In addition, some inscriptions originate from the shrine of Artemis Anaitis and Mēn Tiamou,[67] and the area between the modern Turkish towns Gölde (Kollyda), Menye and the river Hermos. From these areas there are also a multitude of other religious inscriptions. In order to limit the study I have chosen to focus on inscriptions from the same geographical areas as the majority of the reconciliation inscriptions, namely the Catacecaumene and especially the four cities Saittai, Silandos, Tabala, and Maionia.

---

[61] This survey of origins of reconciliation inscriptions is not complete. Very often the actual original site of a reconciliation inscription is unclear or even unknown. This is therefore only an approximate survey of the most important sites, which does not include all reconciliation inscriptions published by Georg Petzl. For more specified information, see Petzl 1994.

[62] *BWK* *3 (?); 4 (?); 9; 10; *11; *12; *16; *17; *18; 19; *20; *21; 22; *23; *60 (?); * 66 (?).

[63] *BWK* 5; *47 (?); *48 (?); *60 (?).

[64] *BWK* 76; *77; 78; *81.

[65] *BWK* 25; *42; 43; *47 (?); *51 (?); *53; *59 (?); *68; *69; *70; 72; *73; *74; *75.

[66] *BWK* 6; 55 (?); *62 (?); *63 (?).

[67] *BWK* *68; *69; *70; *71; 72; *73; *74,

de Hoz divides religious inscriptions into two main categories. The first consists of private inscriptions, which include votive inscriptions, ex-votos, confession inscriptions and grave inscriptions.[68] The second category is official inscriptions, which include honorary inscriptions, votive inscriptions to a deity, cultic regulations[69] or other inscriptions, such as the decrees of a religious association. de Hoz draws the following conclusion about the nature of the epigraphic material:

> Private Inschriften an einheimische Götter erscheinen vorwiegend in der Kaiserzeit und dann vor allem im Ostlydien, währen offizielle Inschriften meistens als Zeugnisse für griechische oder stark hellenisierte Kulte in Westlydien belegt sind, und zwar gleichfalls meist in der Kaiserzeit. […] Die Ergebnisse, die sich aus der Klassifikation des Materials ergeben, zeigen, daß die Verwendung von Inschriften in hellenistischer Zeit wenig verbreitet war und daß die seleukidischen und attalidischen Könige sich keinesfalls für die Verbreitung einheimischer Kulte eingesetzt haben. […] In der Kaiserzeit scheint sich der Gebrauch von Inschriften in ganz Lydien verbreitet zu haben, wobei es eine deutliche Verteilung zwischen Inschriften offiziellen Charakters und privaten Inschriften gibt.[70]

According to de Hoz, the official inscriptions are primarily honorary inscriptions, while the private inscriptions focus on direct relations between gods and men. de Hoz claims that the official category is more frequent in western Lydia, while the private category dominates in the eastern part of Lydia, and that this is evidence for the profane character of the Hellenistic part of Lydia where religion was the responsibility of the city administration, and an indigenous eastern part where religion was marked by a more personal relationship between gods and worshippers.

The role of indigenous Lydian religion is much emphasised by de Hoz. de Hoz also points out that Persian influence on the religions of Lydia was rather limited. Lydia was never colonized by Persia and Persian rule (546-334 BC) did not challenge the Lydian culture and language.[71] Persian influence on religion was also minimal, and was

---

[68] de Hoz 1999, 9. de Hoz uses the German term *'Beichtinschriften'*.

[69] de Hoz claims that only five examples of cultic regulations from Lydia are known. See de Hoz 1999, 10. She does, however, not say which texts she is referring to.

[70] de Hoz 1999, 10.

[71] de Hoz 1999, 3-4.

according to de Hoz limited to a few names of deities.[72] On the other hand, the influence of Greek culture following the conquest by Alexander was very strong, and continued to play an important role in Lydia throughout the period of Roman rule. In Catacecaumene, however, it seems that there was less colonisation by Greeks than in other areas. Nevertheless, Greek influence on Lydian culture is evident in the names of deities, language, and epigraphic genres and habits. Lydian religion was thus neither 'Greek' nor 'Oriental', but was shaped by several intertwining traditions. I do not wish to exclude the indigenous Lydian cults as irrelevant, but I think it is wrong to draw a strict division between Greek and Lydian cults. Rather, I would claim that there was a continuum between Greek and Lydian cults; they were neither absolutely identical nor absolutely different. There is, for instance, no reason to claim that a more personal relationship between men and gods is a special characteristic of Lydian cults.

2. The Gods of Catacecaumene

de Hoz lists 63 different deities with various epithets. These include the most central Greek gods such as Zeus, Apollo, Artemis, Athena, Demeter, Asclepios, Hades, Hera, Heracles and Dionysos. Zeus and Apollo are the Greek gods most widely attested here. de Hoz divides the gods into Greek and Anatolian deities, but this is problematic: nowhere does de Hoz defined precisely what criteria she has uses for this division of the gods, apart from epithets associated with the gods, and her statistical survey[73] of Greek and Anatolian deities shows quite clearly that the picture is far more complicated. For example, de Hoz' inclusion of Artemis, Apollo, Demeter, Korē, Meter, Tychē and Zeus among the Anatolian deities is problematic. She lists 43 different epithets for Zeus,[74] 13 of which are Greek,[75] whilst the rest are Anatolian.[76] This proves only that Zeus had

---

[72] de Hoz 1999, 4: "[D]ie Analyse der kultischen Belege [zeigt], daß sich die Zeugnisse für einen starken religiösen Einfluß der Perser in Lydien, wie ihn Keil und andere ihm folgend angenommen hatten, auf die Annahme eines persischen Namens für eine anatolischen Gottheit beschränken".

[73] de Hoz 1999, 26-27.

[74] One of the epithets is damaged and illegible.

[75] Aerios, Agoraios, Aithrios, Antigoneios, Eumenes, Helios, Keraunios, Koryphaios, Kronides, Ktesios, Olympios, Seleukios, Soter.

[76] Ariu, Autheites, Baradateo, Batenos, Beudenos, Dareddenos, ek Didymon Dryon/Didymites, Digindenos, Driktes, Galaktios, Glaukas, Halonites, Killamenenos, Masphalatenos, Misyenos, Ogmenos,

both Greek and Anatolian epithets, and that Anatolian epithets were preferred to Greek ones. But it does not prove anything about the nature of the cults involved. As a result of this, it might be unnecessary to draw a clear division between Greek and Anatolian deities. Their cults existed side by side and they were obviously identified with each other. Neither are there any indications that Anatolian cults represented different sets of beliefs than Greek ones.

The following list based on de Hoz's survey shows the cults found in the selected Lydian towns. Various epithets are placed in brackets:

a. Saittai

Anaitis, Apollo, Asclepios, Dionysos, Heracles, Hermes, Hosios Dikaios, Hygieia, (Theos) Hypsistos, Larmene, Mēn (Axiottenos, Tarsi Basileuon, Tarsios (?), Uranios), Mētēr (Notene, Simidalene), Moira, Nikē, Pluton, Sabazios, Theion, Theoi Katachtonioi, Theoi en Tamasei, Theos Basileus, Tychē, Zeus (Agoraios, Antigoneios, Batenos, Beudenos, ek Didymon Dryon, Halonites).

b. Silandos

Anaitis, Attis, Dionysos, Hades, Herakles, (Theos) Hypsistos, Mēn (Artemidoru, ex Attalou, Labanas), Mētēr, Sabazios, Thea Tazene, Theoi ἐν Νόνου, Zeus (Aithrios, Keraunios), The twelve gods.

c. Tabala

Anaitis, Apollo (Tarsios), Asclepios, Hades, (Theos) Hypsistos, Mētēr Tarsene, Theoi Tabalenoi.

d. Maionia

Anaitis, Apollo (Nisyr(e)ites), Hades, Hekatē, Hosios Dikaios, Klotho, Korē, Mēn ((ex) Artemidoru Axiottenos, Axiottenos, Tiamu, Tyrannos), Mētēr (Akraia, Anatidos, Hipta), Moira, Nemesis, Persephone, Pluton, Sabazios, Thea Bryzi (Adytene), Theion,

Oreites, Peizenos, Perses, Petarenos, Phratrios, Polieus, Prottenos, Sabazios, Stratios, Taillenos, Tarigyenos, Timaios.

Theos Basileus, Theos Strapton kai Bronton, Zeus (Ariu, Masphalatenos, Sōtēr, Timaios).

e. Catacecaumene outside the territories of the four main cities

ΔΙΟΣ ἐκ ΛΗΤΟΙΣ (sic) ΚΟΥΡΗ, Mēn (Axiottenos, Labanas, Pereudo, Petraeites, Ploneates), Mētēr (Leto), Nemesis, Thea Urania, Theoi Pereudenoi, Theoi οἱ Perkenon, Tychē, Zeus (Oreites).

This survey shows that the cults of Anaitis and Mēn were highly popular. The cult of Anaitis is attested in all the four cities, and the cult of Mēn in all except Tabala, although it probably also existed there. The survey also shows that Greek and Anatolian deities were being worshipped side by side. The epithets are often derived from names of places and do not necessarily express differing aspects of the cult's or the deity's character.

3. Types of religious inscriptions

Following de Hoz's classification we can divide religious inscriptions other than reconciliation inscriptions from Lydia into the following categories:

  1) Ex-voto inscriptions.

  2) Dedication inscriptions.

  4) Grave inscriptions.

  5) Honorary inscriptions.

The ex-voto and the dedication inscriptions are the most numerous of the religious inscriptions found in Lydia. In de Hoz's thesis, I have counted 116 ex-voto inscriptions and 67 dedication inscriptions from the same areas as the reconciliation inscriptions.

a. Ex-voto inscriptions

Ex-voto inscriptions are raised as signs of gratitude to a deity for a fulfilled wish, and are therefore closely related to the reconciliation inscriptions. Ex-voto inscriptions and votive offerings are perhaps one of the most common religious expressions in the

ancient world and we can trace a long continuity in this form of cult.[77] When asking for a particular favour the worshipper made a vow to the deity to give some kind of votive offering if the wish was fulfilled. The vow is a typical part of votive inscriptions and is attested as early as the archaic period.[78] Sometimes these offerings could be large and elaborate, such as altars, but in most cases gifts presented to the gods in gratitude were modest, such as small figurines or inscriptions. Plato describes, and to some extent criticises, a similar form of cult as it was performed in classical Athens. Even though the quotation is 4-500 years older than the Lydian material Plato's observations are relevant to its interpretation:

ἱερὰ καὶ θεοὺς οὐ ῥᾴδιον ἱδρύεσθαι, μεγάλης δὲ διανοίας τινὸς ὀρθῶς δρᾶν τὸ τοιοῦτον, ἔθος τε γυναιξί τε δὴ διαφερόντως πάσαις καὶ τοῖς ἀσθενοῦσι πάντη καὶ κινδυνεύουσι καὶ ἀποροῦσιν, ὅτῃ τις ἂν ἀπορῇ, καὶ τοὐναντίον ὅταν εὐπορίας τινὸς λάβωνται, καθιεροῦν τε τὸ παρὸν ἀεὶ καὶ θυσίας εὔχεσθαι καὶ ἱδρύσεις ὑπισχνεῖσθαι θεοῖς καὶ δαίμοσι καὶ παισὶ θεῶν, ἔν τε φάσμασιν ἐγρηγορότας διὰ φόβους καὶ ἐν ὀνείροις, ὡς δ᾽ αὔτως ὄψεις πολλὰς ἀπομνημονεύοντας, ἑκάσταισί τε αὐτῶν ἄκη ποιουμένους, βωμοὺς καὶ ἱερὰ πάσας μὲν οἰκίας, πάσας δὲ κώμας ἔν τε καθαροῖς ἱδρυομένους ἐπιπλάναι καὶ ὅῃ τις ἔτυχε τῶν τοιούτων.

It is no easy task to found temples and gods, and to do this rightly needs much deliberation; yet it is customary for all women especially, and for sick folk everywhere, and those in peril or in distress (whatever the nature of the distress) and conversely for those who have had a slice of good fortune, to dedicate whatever happens to be at hand at the moment, and to vow sacrifices and promise the founding of shrines to gods and demi-gods and children of gods; and through terrors caused by waking visions or by dreams, and in like manner as they recall many visions and try to provide remedies for each of them, they are wont to found altars and shrines, and to fill with them every house and every village, and open places too, and every spot which was the scene of such experiences.[79]

Normally Lydian ex-voto inscriptions are very short and often they do not contain any particular information about the fulfilled wish. Their style is clearly marked by formulas

---

[77] For a general survey of the topic, see van Straten 1981. Burkert 1987, 12-29.

[78] van Straten 1981, 70: "The *euché* referred to in the inscriptions mentioned should usually be regarded as a prayer of supplication combined with a vow whose redemption is conditionally connected with the answering of the prayer".

[79] Pl. *Leg.* 909e-910a. Translated by R. G. Bury (Loeb Classical Library).

and fixed expression with few individual deviations. An ex-voto inscription will contain the name of the deity who is the object of the worshippers' gratitude in the dative case and the names of the dedicators in the nominative. The dedicators are sometimes described with a participle such as εὐχαριστῶν. The verb, if it is included in the text, will often be ἀνατίθημι or ἀποδίδωμι with εὐχή as the object. A typical example is *TAM* V1, 320[80] from the shrine of Artemis Anaitis and Mēn Tiamou:

> Θεᾷ Ἀναείτι καὶ
> Μηνὶ Τιαμου Σωκρά–
> τεια κὲ Βάσσιλλα
> 4 κε Ἀπολλώνις κε Πρό–
> κλος κὲ Τρόφιμος
> ἀπέδωκαν τὸ [ἱε–]
> ροπόημα εὐχαρισ–
> 8 ‹τ›οῦντες. Ἔτους σϞϛ΄,
> μη(νὸς) Λώου β΄.

Sōkrateia and Bassilla and Apollōnis and Proklos and Trophimos gave this sacrifice to Thea Anaitis and Mēn Tiamu in gratitude. In the year 296 on the second day of the month of Lōos.

Sometimes the inscription is even shorter, as shown by *TAM* V 1, 447 from the area between Gölde, Menye and the river Hermos:[81]

> Εὔτυχος Μωγέτου
> Ἀπόλλωνι Νισυρείτῃ
> καὶ Ἀσκληπιῷ εὐχήν.

Eutychos son of Mōgetos (gave this sign of) gratitude to Apollo Nisyreitēs and Asklēpios.

Sometimes an ex-voto inscription will contain a few details of the fulfilled wish, but usually in a vague and formulaic way. A frequent formula is the preposition ὑπέρ

---

[80] de Hoz nr. 3.29, p. 137.

[81] de Hoz 1999, nr. 5.18, p. 159.

introducing the reason for the gratitude in the genitive case. A good example of this is *TAM* V 1, 526 (Maionia):[82]

Δεσκυλὶς Δεσκύλου
Μηνὶ Ἀρτεμιδωρου Ἀξι–
οττα κατέχοντι ὑπὲρ τῶν
τέκνων εὐχήν.

Deskylis daughter of Deskylos gave this sign of gratitude to Mēn Artemiōru who rules Axiotta because of her children.

Deskylis here shows gratitude towards Mēn Artemiōru because she prayed to Mēn asking to have children. The inscription was then raised when the wish was fulfilled.

Some of the ex-voto inscriptions are raised in gratitude for the healing of a disease, but unlike reconciliation inscriptions they do not associate disease with transgressions. It is interesting to note that these inscriptions obviously existed side by side with, and were raised in the same shrines as the reconciliation inscriptions. One of these is the shrine of Artemis Anaitis and Mēn Tiamu. An inscription from this temple, *TAM* V 1, 323 reads:[83]

Ἀρτέμιδι Ἀναείτι καὶ
Μηνὶ Τιαμου Μελτίνη
[ὑ]πὲρ τῆς ὁλοκληρίας
4   [τῶν] ποδῶν εὐχὶν
         [ἀνέσ]τησεν.

Meltinē raised this sign of gratitude to Artemis Anaitis and Mēn Tiamou because of the complete healing of her feet.[84]

TAM V 1, 324[85] from the same temple contains a similar story:

---

[82] de Hoz 1999, nr. 39.12, p. 217.

[83] de Hoz 1999, nr. 3.32, p. 138.

[84] The stele contains a relief of two legs. Cf. also *TAM* V 1, 534.

Ἀρτέμιδι Ἀναε[ῖτι]
καὶ Μηνὶ Τιαμου Ἀ[λε–]
ξάνδρα ὑπὲρ τῶν
4   μαστῶν εὐχὴν
ἀνέστησ‹ε›ν.

Alexandra raised this sign of gratitude to Artemis Anaitis and Mēn Tiamou because of her breasts.[86]

Ex-voto inscriptions are so numerous and so uniform in their expression that it is sufficient to cite only a few of them, but their mere presence in Lydia is highly important to our understanding of the reconciliation inscriptions. For instance, *BWK* *101 shows the consequences of not fulfilling a promise made to a deity.[87]

[Μην]ὶ Ἀξιοτηνῷ Ἐ[πα]–
[φρόδ]ειτος οἰκο[νό–]
[μος Κλαυ]δίο[υ Στρα]–
4   [τ]ονείκου εὐξά[με]–
νος· ἐὰν λήψεται
γυναῖκαν ἣν θελω
καὶ λαβὼν καὶ μὴ ἀ–
8   ποδὼν τὴν εὐχήν·
κολασθεὶς ἀνέθη–
κεν καὶ ἀπὸ νῦν εὐλο–
γεῖ μετὰ τῶν ἰδίων
12   πάντων. Ἔτους σμε΄,
μη(νὸς) Δείου βι΄.

---

[85] de Hoz 1999, nr. 3.33, p. 138-139.

[86] This inscription shows a relief of two female breasts.

[87] This inscription consists of two fragments. The first contain lines 1-2, the other lines 3-13. Petzl 1994 does not include the first fragment. The identification of the two fragments was done by Robert 1964, 34 and retained by Horsley 1983, 27 and Lane 1971, 53 (*CMRDM* I 80). The identification is rejected by Petzl 1994, 118.

To Mēn Axiotenos Epaphrodeitos, steward of Claudius Stratonicus, having made a vow if he should get the wife which I want, and getting her but not paying his vow, after being punished he set up (the inscription), and from now on he blesses (the god) with all his family. In the year 245, month Deios, 12th (?).[88]

The votive cult is the most important link between Lydian and other ancient cults. F. T. van Straten points out that votive offerings are one of the most constant factors in ancient religiosity.[89] Unlike an animal sacrifice, which was eaten or sometimes even burnt completely, van Straten argues that votive offerings were enduring testimonies to the dedicators' piety[90] and thereby secured a lasting relationship between god and man.[91] It is not unreasonable to compare ex-voto inscriptions to a contract stating both the god's and the worshipper's obligations. Such offerings were often given to the gods in times of crisis; illness being one obvious condition that may require some kind of sacrifice.[92] But also other difficult or dangerous situations, such as seafaring or childbirths, were the reasons for votive offerings. Walter Burkert gives the following analysis of votive cult and religion:

The practice of vows can be seen as a major human strategy for coping with the future. It makes time manageable by contract. From crippling depression, man can rise to impress the structure of "if-then" upon the uncertainties of the future. If salvation from present anxiety and distress occurs, if the success or profit hoped for is attained, then a special and circumscribed renunciation will be made, a finite loss in the interest of larger gain. […] [V]otive religion did provide help by raising hopes, by socializing anxieties and sufferings: the individual is encouraged to try once more, and he encounters the interest and reinforcement offered by priests and fellow worshippers. The vow is made in public, and the fulfilment is demonstratively public, with many others profiting from the investment – craftsmen, shopkeepers, and all those sharing in the sacrificial banquets.[93]

---

[88] Translated by G.H.R. Horsley 1983, 27.

[89] van Straten 1981, 65-66.

[90] van Straten 1981, 69.

[91] van Straten 1981, 74.

[92] van Straten 1981, 97-102. For a survey of ex-votos dedicated to Asclepios see Edelstein 1945.

[93] Burkert 1987, 13.

The principle is simple: In order to gain you must give. The gods protect their worshippers, but not without getting something in return. Piety in this respect is bestowing proper compensation on benefactors. Still, votive cults offer one possible solution to difficult situations.

b. Dedication inscriptions

Dedication inscriptions are closely related to ex-voto inscriptions, but do not contain any reference to having been raised as a consequence of a vow. Like the ex-voto inscriptions, dedication inscriptions are usually rather short and contain a more or less fixed set of formulas without much room for individual differences and innovation. The inscriptions are often marked by the verb ἀνατίθημι and sometimes the phrase κατ᾽ ἐπιταγήν, 'at a command'. A typical example is an altar dedicated to Artemis and Mēn Tiamu found in the area between Gölde, Menye and the river Hermos (*TAM* V 1, 458):

> Μητρὶ Ἀρτίμιτι
> καὶ Μηνὶ Τιαμ–
> ου Γλύκων
> 4 Τρύφωνος καὶ
> Τρόφιμος Θεο–
> γένου κατ᾽ ἐπι–
> ταγὴν τὸν βωμ–
> 8 ον ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων
> ἀνέθηκαν.

> Glykōn son of Tryphōn and Trophimos son of Theogenēs raised this alter of their own means to Mētēr Artemis and Mēn Tiamu as commanded.

These texts may contain very few details, as this inscription (*I.Smyrna* 744)[94] which probably comes from Saittai and dates to imperial times shows:

---

[94] de Hoz 1999, nr. 40.8, p. 236.

Τύχη Ὑγιηνοῦ
γυνὴ Μητρὶ θεῶ–
γ κατ᾽ ἐπιταγὴν.

Tychē wife of Hygiēnos to the Mother of gods according as commanded.

Some of the dedications are clearly raised as thanksgivings, in this case (*TAM* V 1, 426)[95] because of a good harvest:

[Δ]ιὶ Σελευκίῳ καὶ Νύμφαις
Καρποδοτείραις ἡ Νισυρέωγ
κατοικία ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀλαβείας
τελεσφορίας τῶν καρπῶν
5   κατ᾽ ἐπιταγήν. Ἔτους τγι΄, μη(νὸς)
Πανήμου γι΄.

The *katoikia* of Nisurea (?) to Zeus Seleukios and the fruit-giving Nymphs as commanded because the harvest was unharmed and plentiful. In the year 313 (= 228/29 e.Kr.) on the 13th day of the month Panēmos.

In most cases the inscriptions will contain the name of the deities and the dedicators and a verb, usually ἀνατίθημι. These texts are primarily displays of the dedicators' piety. They show their confidence in the gods' assistance by raising a public inscription. Apart from indicating, as pointed out above, a religion based on reciprocity, these texts also point to another important aspect of ancient religions: piety and religious beliefs, in the broad sense of the word, were something the believers were expected to show publicly through certain actions such as performing sacrifices and dedicating votive offerings. Religion as it was performed in Lydia and Phrygia in the first three centuries AD was based on tangible actions and objects. 'Beliefs' in this case can therefore not be understood as pious and sincere confidence in God's mercy, but a confidence that certain actions would have certain consequences.

---

[95] de Hoz 1999, nr. 46.1, p. 261.

c. Grave inscriptions

Grave inscriptions, quite few of which are preserved from Lydia, may be divided into two groups. The first encompasses the regular epitaphs which record the name of the deceased and often the relatives who raised the inscription. de Hoz records 20 epitaphs in her collection. The other group consists of inscriptions containing a curse against those who seek to desecrate the tomb. de Hoz' collection contains 19 grave curses from the same areas as the reconciliation inscriptions; most of them come from the territory of Saittai.

Unlike the votive inscriptions, the epitaphs may contain individual elements intended to describe or honour the deceased. For instance, they often contain information about how old the person was when he or she died, and many of them are formulated as poems written in metric form. The most common feature of the epitaphs is the verb τιμάω, 'honour', which refers to the relatives honouring the dead. It is also important to note that the gods play a less important role in the grave inscriptions than in the votive inscriptions. As pointed out in Ch. 2, gods did not play a significant part in the cult of the dead because of the assumed pollution contact with corpses would cause and this is probably the explanation for their absence. A typical example of an epitaph is this inscription (*TAM* V 1, 591; *SEG* XXXIV 1202)[96] from Maionia:

> Ἔτους ρ΄ καὶ ια΄, μη(νὸς) Δίου
> ζ΄ ἀπιόντος. Ἕρμιππος
> Διοδώρου καὶ Ἀφιας ἡ γυ–
> νὴ αὐτοῦ ἐτείμησαν Ἀμ–
> 5   μίαν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ μητέρα
> καὶ Ἐμογένην τὸν ἑαυ–
> τῶν υἱὸν ἐτειμησαν, Ἕρμι–
> ππος, Ἀνδρόνικος, Ἀμμιας,
> Μελτίνη, Ἑρμῆς τὸν ἑαυ–
> 10   τῶν ἀδελφὸν ἐτίμησαν.
> Χαίροις, πᾶς πάροδε, τὰς
> Νεμέσις σοι, μή τίς μοι

---

[96] de Hoz 1999, nr. 43.1, p. 260.

τὴν στήλην ἀδι–
κήσεις.

In the year 211 (= AD 26/27) on the the 7th day of the month Dios. Hermippos son of Diodōros and Aphias, his wife, honour Ammia, his mother, and Hermogenēs, their son. Hermippos, Andronikos, Ammias, Meltinē, Hermēs honour their brother. May you rejoice all who pass by; I adjure you by the Nemeseis not to dishonour my stele.

As an example of an epitaph poem I have chosen *SEG* XXXV 1233[97] from Saittai. The inscription dates to AD 148/149. The poem is written in hexameter and is highly influenced by Homeric style:

Ἔτους σλγ΄, μη(νὸς) Δύστρου ε΄.
Θειογένην κατὰ τύμβος ἔχει γηραιόν, ὀδῖτα,
ἱερέα Λαρμηνῆς, εὐσεβίης κανόνα,
ῥώμῃ δ᾽ ἡμιθέοις ἐναλίνκιον ἡρώεσσιν,
5   τὸν πάσης ἀρετῆς κῦδος ἐννκάμενον.
          vacat
Υἱὸν ἔχει κατὰ γαῖα χυτὴ κλυτὸν Εὐβούλοιο
βαιὸν ὑπουράνιον Μοιρῶν πάρα νῆμα λαχόντα
Ἡφαιστίωνα, φυὴν ἀγαθὸν καὶ εἶδος ἄριστον,
τὸν πᾶς ἔξοχα τείμα ὅμως νέος ἠδὲ παλαιός,
10   νοῦς ὅτι οἱ πολιὸς τό τε μείλιχον ἦν ἐπὶ γλώσσῃ
ἠιθέῳ περ ἐόντι· καταστάξασα δὲ λήθην
παιδὸς ἀφ᾽ ἡλικίην ὑακίνθιον ὤλεσε Κλωθώ,
πρὶν γένυν ἀνθῆσαι μαλακὴν τρίχα· πᾶς δ᾽ ἄρα δῆμος
πένθος κοινώσαντο, ἐπεὶ θάνε σεμνὸς ἔφηβος·
15   ἀλλὰ γὰρ εὐσεβέων Κυλλήνιος οὐ τέκνα φωτῶν
ῥάβδῳ ἄγων Ἀχέροντι καταστυγίῳ πορθμεύει,
ἀλλ᾽ ὅ γ᾽ ἐς Ἠλύσιον πεδίον τρέπει, ἔνθα τε Πλουτεὺς
ὥρισεν ἡρώεσσιν ἐφέστιον ἀκροδίκοισιν.

---

[97] de Hoz 1999, nr. 23.1, p. 202-203.

In the year 233, on the 5th day of the month Dystros. The grave contains old Theogenēs, traveller, priest of Larmēnē, a model of piety, who in strength resembled the heroes, the demigods, and gained the glory of every virtue.

The mound of earth surrounds the renowned son of Euboulos, who by the Moiras was allotted just a short thread under the sky; Hēfaistiōn, by nature good and excellent by his appearance, whom everyone gave high honour, young as well as old, because he still young had the gentleness of an old man and had a pleasant manner of speaking. Klōthō who lets Oblivion (Lethe) flow destroyed the hyacinthine age of the boy before soft hair bloomed upon the cheek. The entire people shared the grief when the honourable ephēb died. But Kyllēnios does not carry the children of pious men to the abhorred Acherōn, but turn them towards the Elysian field where Plouteus has ordained (the deceased) as a guest of the most righteous heroes.

Unlike other religious inscriptions from this part of Lydia, grave inscriptions contain mythological themes and notions concerning the afterlife. The themes are usually taken from Greek mythology and the texts express the grief of those left behind, but also hope for a good life after death. The deceased is portrayed as a virtuous person and his or her death as a great loss. Unlike reconciliation inscriptions, epitaphs will often focus on the deceased's innocence and untimely death.

Grave curses are also epitaphs but contain some kind of formula intended to harm those who do not respect the grave or who try to destroy it. The inscription will usually inform the reader that a *skēptron* of a deity has been raised and that violation of the grave will cause divine wrath. The practice of raising a *skēptron* is, as we have seen, described in several reconciliation inscriptions as the reason for the punishment. This example (*TAM* V 1, 213)[98] comes from Tabala and is dated to AD 261/262:

> Ἔτους τμϛ΄, μη(νὸς) Δαισίου δεκάτῃ
> ἑσταμένῃ. Ἐτείμησαν τὸν
> πατέρα Στρατονεικιανὸν
> μνείας χάριν οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ Γλύ–
> 5 κων καὶ Στρατονεικιανὸς κα[ὶ]
> ἡ σύνβιος αὐτοῦ Μηνοφίλα
> μνείας χάριν. Εἴ τις θελήσει

---

[98] de Hoz 1999, nr. 3.17, p. 134.

σκυβαλίσαι τὸ μνῆμα τοῦτο, ἕ–
                    ξει τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα κεχολωμέ–
10   νον καὶ τὴν κυρίαν Ἀναεῖτιν διὰ
                    τέκνα τέκνων, ἔγονα ἐγόνων.

In the year 346, on the 10th day of the month Daisios. His sons Glykōn and Stratoneikianos and Mēnophila his wife honour the father Stratoneikianos with a monument. If someone wishes to look upon this epitaph with contempt he will have to reckon with the raging Apollo through his children's children and his grandchildren's grandchildren.

Another example (*TAM* V 1, 172), this time from Saittai, shows the clear parallel to the reconciliation inscriptions and the curse ritual of raising a *skēptron* as a guarantee against those who wish to destroy the monument:

                    Ἔτους ροη΄, μη(νὸς) Δείου δ΄.
                    Ἀμμιας ἡ γυνὴ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ
                    Ἀπολλώνιος καὶ Δημόφι-
                    λος ἐτείμησαν Πατερῇ
5   καὶ Τρύφαινα ἡ θρεπτή.
                    Ἵνα μή τις προσαμάρτῃ τῇ
                    στήλῃ ἢ τῷ μνημείῳ, σκῆ–
                    πτρα ἐπέστησαν τοῦ Ἀξ[ι–]
                    οττηνοῦ καὶ Ἀναείτιδος.

In the year 178 (= AD 93/94) on the 4th day of the month Deion. Ammias the wife and the sons Apollonios and Dēmophilos and Tryphaina the nurse honour their father. They raised a *skēptron* of Axiottēnos and Anaitis so that no one should disgrace the stele or the epitaph.

Grave curses are found all over Asia Minor[99] and were used by pagans as well as Jews and Christians.[100] J. H. M. Strubbe points out that there are no fundamental differences between Greek and Anatolian curses as claimed by Kurt Latte.[101] Strubbe sees the grave

---

[99] Strubbe 1997 contains 404 grave curses from Anatolia.

[100] Strubbe 1991, 33.

[101] Latte 1920, 77-80.

curses of Asia Minor as a product of both Greek and Oriental traditions of protecting things considered valuable.[102] Curse formulas used outside a funerary context were incorporated in the grave curses, which is a rare phenomenon apart from Asia Minor. In the ancient Near East, the protection of graves through curses had deep roots and the Anatolian grave curses must be seen as a result of the meeting between Greek and oriental traditions.[103] Greek tradition provided the formulas and vocabulary, which were applied to the funerary context of the Oriental tradition.

The oldest grave curse written in Greek dates to late 4th century BC Lycia,[104] but it is not until the 1st century BC that such curses are found in large quantities. In imperial times, however, their number increases considerably, and the majority dates to the 2nd and 3rd centuries.[105] This coincides to some extent with a general increase in inscriptions in Asia Minor, but not with the increase in epitaphs, whose numbers peaked in the second half of the 2nd century AD.[106] The emphasis on punishment relates these inscriptions to the reconciliation inscriptions, and both genres belong within the same realm of notions. They show that even though the reconciliation inscriptions constitute an epigraphic genre confined to a relative limited area, the notions they express were nevertheless well known throughout Asia Minor.

---

[102] Strubbe 1991, 37: "The objects that were safeguarded by non funerary imprecations in the Greek world belonged to the public, the religious, and the private spheres, for example property and property rights of individuals and temples, the constitution of a city-state, laws, treaties between cities, *asylia* of temples, private foundations. Some imprecations were directed against enemies of the city or against religious offenders. Many conditional imprecations were imbedded in the self-cursing oath".

[103] Strubbe 1991, 38.

[104] Strubbe 1997, nr. 371, pp. 245-246.

[105] Strubbe 1991, 39: "As far as I have been able to date the texts, the following results appear. Fifteen texts may date in the first century A.D., while twenty-three date in that century or later. Fifty-seven texts may date in the second century A.D., while thirty-two may date in that century or later. Another forty-five belong to the second or third century. Ninety-one texts seem to date in the third century or the early fourth century A.D. Only two or three texts certainly date in the (early) fourth century AD".

[106] Strubbe 1991, 40, notes 62 & 63.

e. Honorary inscriptions

There seem to be rather few honorary inscriptions from Catacecaumene; de Hoz only lists 7.[107] These texts fill more or less the same function as present day memorial plaques: they honour one or several persons for outstanding achievements, usually in the service of gods. This example (*TAM* V 1, 449)[108] comes from the area between Gölde, Menye and the river Hermos, and is dated to AD 223/224:

> Ἔτους τη΄, μηνὸς Πανήμου ιη΄.
> Ὁ ἱερὸς δοῦμος ἐτείμησαν Αὐρ.
> Γλύκωνα Διονυσίου τὸν ἐκ πρὸ–
> γόνων ἱερέων πρῶτον Ἀρτέμι–
> 5 δος Ἀναεῖτις τῆς συγγενικῆς
> θεοῦ σὺν καὶ Διονυσίῳ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ
> κε Χαμάσωνι τῷ ἐκγόνῳ αὐτοῦ διὰ
> τὴν ἰς τοὺς θεοὺς θρησκείαν καὶ
> τὰς ἰς τὸν δοῦμον πολλὰς εὐερ–
> 10 γεσίας καὶ τετελεκότα κε τελοῦντα.

In the year 308 on the 18th day of the month Panēmos. The holy house honoured Aurelius Glykōn son of Dionysios, first among the ancestral priests of Artemis Anaitis – the goddess of old – with Dionysios his son and Chamasōn his grandchild for his service to the gods and the great good work he has done and is doing for the house.

An inscription with particular interest for the study of reconciliation inscriptions is *TAM* V 1, 490[109] which is an honorary inscription of Tatia Bassa, priestess of Mēn Axiottēnos.

> Τατίαν Ἑρμοκράτους Βάσσαν ἱέρειαν Μηνὸ[ς Ἀξι–]
> οττηνοῦ οἱ καταλουστικοὶ ἐτείμησαν διά τε τὴν ἰς [τοὺς]
> θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν καὶ θρησκείαν καὶ τὴν πρὸς π[άντας]

---

[107] de Hoz 1999, nr. 3.47, 5.4, 15.8, 15.14, 39.35, 40.16, 63.30.

[108] de Hoz 1999, nr. 3.47, p. 143.

[109] de Hoz 1999, nr. 39.35, p. 223.

ἀνθρώπους φιλοκἀγαθίαν, ἀναστραφεῖσαν ἐπὶ τῷ θε–

5 ῷ ἀφιλοκέρδως παντὶ τῷ βίῳ διὰ γένους. Ἀνεστάθη

δὲ ἔτους σμδ´, μη(νὸς) Γορπιαίου βι´, ἐπιμελησαμένου

Φιλοξένου β´ γραμματέως, ζώσης ποιήσαν–

τες τὴν τειμὴν οἱ καταλουστικοὶ

ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων.

The guild of purifiers honoured Tatia Bassa daughter of Hermocratēs, priestess of Mēn Axiottēnos, because of her piety towards and service to the gods and kindness and goodness toward all people. She who is of a noble family retired unpretentiously toward the god all her life. (The stele) was raised in the year 244 on the 12th day of the month Gorpiaios under the supervision of Philoxenos the secretary. The guild of purifiers gave her the honour from their own means while she was still alive.

The inscription is given by a guild of καταλουστικοί. They are also mentioned in *TAM* V 1, 351, which testifies to the donation of an image of Dionysos by the καταλουστικοί. In that inscription from AD 161/162 Kollyda, the purifiers serve Mētēr, Mēn Tiamu and Mēn Petraeitēs.[110] We do not know for certain what this implied, but it seems that they were a group of priests and priestesses with special competence in ritual purification. Even though we do not have any evidence that the καταλουστικοί took part in the writing and erecting of reconciliation inscriptions, it is interesting to note that there existed groups of priests within the cult of Mēn who were specially trained for cleansing rituals. As will be pointed out in Ch. 5, καταλούω is one of the terms used for ritual cleansing in the reconciliation inscriptions.[111]

The honorary inscriptions provide us with information about priests and priestesses and their tasks, and about cultic vocabulary, such as the reference to religious service as θρησκεία which is the Greek term coming closest in meaning to our 'religion'. They do not, however, tell us much about ideas and mythology; their focus is

---

[110] *TAM* V 1, 351, 1-3: [Ἔτ]ους σμς´. Ἀνέθηκαν οἱ καταλουστικοὶ Μητρ[ὸς θεἶῶν ?] καὶ Μηνὸς Τιαμου καὶ Μηνὸς Πετραείτου τὸ [ἄγαλ]|μα τοῦ Διονύσου. The remaining 9 lines list the names of the dedicators.

[111] See Ch. 5, 189-190.

on the achievement of the person honoured. In that respect they provide insight into which virtues a priest or priestess was expected to hold.

4. Analysis

The epigraphic genres presented here tell us a great deal about religious life in and around Catacecaumene in the period during which the reconciliation inscriptions were written. The most important information is that even though reconciliation inscriptions are phenomena exclusively found in limited parts of Asia Minor, the rest of the religious inscriptions are not. The religion of Catacecaumene seems to fit into a general pattern found in most parts of Asia Minor. Ex-votos, dedications, epitaphs and honorary inscriptions are all well known genres in most of the ancient world in general and in all parts of Asia Minor in particular. Grave curses are widely attested in Asia Minor, and the presence of these inscriptions in Catacecaumene is therefore not surprising.

To what kind of religion do these sources testify? The inscriptions bear witness to two features that are crucial to our understanding of the religion of which the reconciliation inscriptions were only one part. The Lydian inscriptions are first of all testimonies that this was a religion of gods demanding cult. This might seem self-evident because there hardly exists any religion without some form of rituals or cult, but it is still important to emphasise this fundamental difference from modern Christian religion. The gods of ancient Lydia demand physical goods if they are to give something back to their worshippers. If the gods are treated in the correct manner, they will bestow benefits on their worshippers in return. If, on the other hand, the gods are treated with disrespect they will punish the transgressor. The principle is quite simple: it is a religion of giving and taking. Goods and benefits are exchanged between two parties, i.e. gods and men, with one of the parties, the gods, having higher status and more power than the other party, the men. The weaker party addresses the stronger party in order to gain certain benefits which are granted provided that the stronger party receives something in return. It is a religious system based on reciprocity, but where one party will always have the upper hand. It should consequently be no surprise that it is based on the system of patrons and clients which permeated the Roman Empire.[112]

---

[112] The terms patron and clients should be used with some caution. Gradel 2002, 36-44 points out that *cliens* used to denote anyone who was in a state of dependence on another person. A *cliens* in its strictest

The other important aspect testified through the sources is the publicity of the cult. By this I am not referring to the division between official and private or individual cult but to the fact that cult was at the same time individual and performed in public. Healing of a disease is on the one hand a personal affair, but it presupposes that the individual performs certain acts in public. Religion and piety were not solely matters between a man and his gods, but very much a matter between fellow human beings. Piety was something one put on display for everyone to see. Ancient society was a face-to-face society with close bonds between humans; one's dignity and status were very much a question of how one appeared in relation to other humans. The elite would show its status by erecting buildings and temples, while the less wealthy would try to contribute with small votive offerings etc. By erecting an inscription recording thanksgiving for a granted wish, the worshipper showed that he or she had the proper relations to the gods and as such with his cosmos. He or she was, so to speak, defined into the proper category of a pious man or woman. Grave and honorary inscriptions also fit into this pattern. Like the gods the dead were objects of cult. Relatives who were obliged to honour their dead would raise epitaphs to show that they complied with these obligations and that the deceased had lived a pious life. As a representative of the household, the dead would enhance the status of those left behind. An honorary inscription would be a further testimony to someone's status as a pious member of society.

These are the ideological aspects of Lydian religion in the 1st through the 3rd century AD. They were obvious to the worshippers of Lydia and needed no explanations or theological speculations. The cultic tradition was self-explanatory. We possess a great deal of information about the organisation of cults in Lydia, even though it can be rather hard to interpret and our information primarily comes from the cult that was performed in or near the temples. Presumably, there were cults performed in private homes, but there are no traces left of them. Temples played an important part in the religious life of Asia Minor and were probably centres of entire communities. When Christian monks started to ravage pagan temples in the 4th century AD, the orator

---

sense was a freedman with bonds of loyalty to his former master. *Patronus* on the other hand was a much wider term including the benefactors both of freedmen and of freeborn men. The freeborn man, however, was unlikely to call himself a *cliens*, even though he stood under the protection of a *patronus*.

Libanius wrote a speech addressed to the emperor Theodosius and asked him to prevent *this black robed tribe* from destroying temples.[113]

χωροῦσι τοίνυν διὰ τῶν ἀγρῶν ὥσπερ χείμαρροι κατασύροντες διὰ ἱερῶν τοὺς ἀγρούς. ὅτου γὰρ ἂν ἱερὸν ἐκκόψωσιν ἀγροῦ, οὗτος τετύφλωταί τε καὶ κεῖται καὶ τέθνηκε. ψυχὴ γάρ, ὦ βασιλεῦ, τοῖς ἀγροῖς τὰ ἱερὰ προοίμια τῆς ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς κτίσεως γεγενημένα καὶ διὰ πολλῶν γενεῶν εἰς τοὺς νῦν ὄντας ἀφιγμένα. καὶ τοῖς γεωργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτοῖς αἱ ἐλπίδες ὅσαι περί τε ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ τέκνων καὶ βοῶν καὶ τῆς σπειρομένης γῆς καὶ τῆς πεφυτευμένης. ὁ δὲ τοῦτο πεπονθὼς ἀγρὸς ἀπολώλεκε καὶ τῶν γεωργῶν μετὰ τῶν ἐλπίδων τὸ πρόθυμον· μάτην γὰρ ἡγοῦνται πονήσειν τῶν εἰς δέον τοὺς πόνους ἀγόντων ἐστερημένοι θεῶν.

Temples, Sire, are the soul of the countryside: they mark the beginning of its settlement, and have been passed down through many generations to the men of today. In them the farming communities rest their hopes for husbands, wives, children, for their oxen and the soil they sow and plant. An estate that has suffered so has lost the inspiration of the peasantry together with their hopes, for they believe that their labour will be in vain once they are robbed of the gods who direct their labour to their due end.[114]

It should be remarked that Libanius is referring to neither Lydia and Phrygia nor Asia Minor in particular, but to the Roman Empire in general.[115] The passage must therefore be regarded as a source for the role played by temples all over the ancient countryside. The majority of the ancient population lived in relatively small villages and their source of income was agriculture. Libanius here describes the agricultural countryside as a cultic community and indicates that local identities were associated with temples and cults. I have pointed out in Ch. 2 that participation in cult was a precondition for membership in most communities.[116] Almost every gathering of humans had some form of cultic element. The objects of cult were therefore, as Libanius shows, to secure the welfare of the household and family and income from *their oxen and the soil they plant.*

---

[113] Lib. *Or.* 30.8: οἱ δὲ μελανειμονοῦντες οὗτοι.

[114] Lib. *Or.* 30.9-11. Translated by A. F. Norman, *The Loeb Classical Library.*

[115] Libanius lived and worked most of his life in Antioch so his main information presumably came from the eastern parts of the Empire. M. Ricl 2003, 77 who also cites this passage does not discuss the universal perspective of Libanius' account of the destruction of temples.

[116] See Ch. 2, 48; see also Ch. 3, 93.

Libanius does not conceal the fact that the cult had practical ends, and this was also the main purpose of Lydian religion

D. Conclusions

Based on the evidence of other religious inscriptions from Catacecaumene, we may conclude that apart from the reconciliation inscriptions there were no basic differences between religion here and other places in Anatolia.[117] Lydians of the first three centuries AD worshipped their gods in order to gain those benefits which were necessary in order to maintain their well-being. Good crops, health and a long life were what these humans sought when addressing the gods. Ideas of salvation and life after death were, if not altogether absent, secondary. When life after death is referred to, as we have seen in grave inscriptions (above), this is done in conventional ways clearly influenced by Homeric literature. Lydian religion was primarily concerned with mundane issues, while metaphysical, philosophical and theological speculations are not mentioned at all. The concern for ones well-being and maintenance of good relations with the gods were features that Lydian religion shared with pre-Christian religions as they were practiced in most parts of the eastern Mediterranean. It is also quite clear that Lydian religion was highly influenced by the Greek habit of raising ex-voto and dedication inscriptions. The Greek influence is also seen in the Homeric allusions in grave inscriptions. The grave curses found in some of these inscriptions are also an important link to similar practices in Asia Minor. From this evidence it is thus reasonable to conclude that we can categorise religion in Catacecaumene as a part of Greco-Roman pagan religion, even though we can also identify local aspects.

The indigenous aspects of religion in Catacecaumene are the gods worshipped and the reconciliation inscriptions. Many of the gods obviously have a local origin even though they may be associated with Greek and Oriental deities. What this implies for the nature and content of these cults is difficult to say, but considering the inscriptions analysed above the name of the gods worshipped seem to have little importance in this respect. The reconciliation inscriptions are therefore a phenomenon that provides a special aspect to Lydian religion, but their style is also clearly influenced by other

---

[117] See Mitchell 1995, 194.

176

religious epigraphic genres which were widespread in Asia Minor, in particular votive inscriptions. This strengthens the postulation that reconciliation inscriptions fulfilled a specific function, namely the redefinition of a transgressor in cases of severe disease. The special form of language which emphasises divine power and human submission, which is far less prominent in votive inscriptions and epitaphs, can be explained by the function of these texts.

Chapter 5

TRANSGRESSIONS IN THE RECONCILIATION

INSCRIPTIONS

A. Transgressions

1. Introduction

The previous chapters have dealt with unacceptable religious acts as described in Greek sources. We have seen the categories to which these acts belong, and the areas of daily life with which they were associated. In addition, reactions to and punishments of unacceptable religious behaviour have been analysed. In this chapter I will categorise and analyse the transgressions described in the reconciliation inscriptions. The purpose of this is twofold. On the one hand I will analyse unacceptable acts in order to establish the contexts to which these acts belong, and on the other demonstrate parallels between transgressions in reconciliation inscriptions and in Greek cultic regulations. A valid comparison should take both similarities and differences into consideration in order to create as accurate an understanding of the individual phenomenon as possible. The parallels are therefore not intended to establish an absolute identity between the reconciliation inscriptions and Greek cultic regulations, but to point out similarities in some respects, and differences in others.

This chapter will focus on those transgressions committed in a cultic context. As shown in Ch. 1, earlier research on the reconciliation inscriptions has primarily focused on curse magic or judicial prayers as the instruments of punishment and related this to civil crimes. It is quite clear that the gods were not thought to punish ordinary crimes unless they were induced to do so through a judicial prayer.[1] In case of transgressions relating to the god's property, however, such as the sacred precinct, they seem to react without any intermediary. These stories will remain the central issue of this chapter. Strictly speaking, unacceptable religious acts are, as we will see, the only transgressions found in the reconciliation inscriptions, while crimes and conflicts between humans are

---

[1] See Ch. 4, 149.

not. At the end of the chapter I will give a short account of the civil conflicts and judicial prayers described in reconciliation inscriptions, but this will not be dealt with in such detail as religious transgressions.

3. Classifications of the transgressions

a. Earlier classifications of transgressions

It is a weakness of earlier research on the reconciliation inscriptions that there is often a lack of systematic classification of transgressions, with only a cursory observation that the transgressions are of a religious nature. Steinleitner (1913, 85-96) included a chapter called *'Wesen der Sünde'* in his thesis, where he gave a survey and analysis of the transgressions, but did not offer a systematic classification. He concluded in the following way:

> Was uns die Autoren der ersten Gruppe dieser Inschriften erzählen, wodurch sie die strafende Hand der Gottheit fühlen mußten, bezieht sich lediglich teils auf Übertretungen von allgemein geltenden Ritualgesetzen, teils auf Vergehungen im Kulte selber, teils auf Verletzung des Eigentumsrechtes der Gottheit oder ihrer Ehre, teils auf die Nichtdarbringung des ihr schuldigen Dankes. Sie berichten demnach als Sünde Verfehlungen, die sich keineswegs gegen die leibliche oder geistige Wohlfahrt des Nächsten, sondern sämtlich gegen kultische Pflichten und Regeln richten. [. . .] Da es sich in dieser Auffassung von Sünde und Schuld nur um kultische und rituelle Vergehen, nicht um Gesetze einer prinzipiellen Ethik handelt, bildet hier das objektive Faktum der sündigen Tat allein das Wesentliche der Sünde.[2]

This is undoubtedly one of Steinleitner's most important observations, even though his classifications do not give us a sufficient analytic tool. A more detailed attempt to classify the transgressions is found in Georg Petzl's corpus of reconciliation inscriptions.[3] According to Petzl, the transgressions described in the reconciliation inscriptions may be classified into 8 categories:[4]

---

[2] Steinleitner, 1913, 91-92.

[3] Petzl 1994, XII.

[4] The numbering of the categories is my own.

1) Unreiner, nicht angemessener Zustand (bei bestimmten Funktionen, beim Betreten einer heiligen Stätte usw.).

2) Nichteinhaltung bzw. Nichtbefolgung einer heiligen Frist oder Pflicht bzw. einer göttlichen Weisung, Ungehorsam gegenüber dem Gott.

3) Schädigung, nicht erfolgte Herausgabe, unrechtmäßige Aneignung bzw. Diebstahl.

  (a) von heiligem Besitz.

  (b) von sonstigem fremdem Eigentum.

4) Schmähung, Geringachtung gegenüber der Gottheit, einem Menschen usw.

  (a) der Gottheit.

  (b) einem Menschen.

  (c) Zusammenhang unklar.

5) Ausforschung bzw. Preisgabe heiliger arcana.

6) Nötigung der 'Geistlichkeit' durch Einschaltung ziviler Behörden.

7) Einbeziehung der Gottheit wider besseres Wissen durch Aufstellen eines Szepters, Leistung eines Eides oder mittels eines Fluches.

8) Gewalt gegen Menschen.

I find this classification too detailed, and in some cases confusing. For instance, Petzl classifies *BWK* 106 in five different categories (1, 3a & b, 4a, 7), and *BWK* *117 in four (1, 3, 4a, 8). This makes it difficult to use the classification in the study of the reconciliation genre.[5]

Hans-Josef Klauck divides the transgressions into four categories: *Rituelle Vergehen, Soziale Vergehen, Unwissentliche Sünden,* and *"Unverzeihliche" Sünden.*[6] By *rituelle Vergehen* he means transgressions associated with ritual practice, primarily related to the neglect of purity requirements. *Soziale Vergehen* include cases of perjury, while *unwissentliche Sünden* are occasions when the dedicator claims to have been ignorant of the fact that he or she was committing a transgression.[7] Klauck's last category, *"Unverzeihliche" Sünden,* 'sins impossible to reconcile', is somewhat more unclear. Klauck does not mention any particular examples from the reconciliation inscriptions, but refers to the cultic regulation of the cult of Mēn in Attica,[8] which states

---

[5] It should be remarked that *BWK* 106 records at least three different transgressions. This may be the reason why Petzl classifies this inscription in five categories.

[6] Klauck 1996, 72-75.

[7] Klauck's example is *BWK* *51.

[8] *LSCG* 55, 17.

that those who interfere with the god's property will commit a sin which cannot be undone. Klauck's classification is not unreasonable but his last two categories seem to serve no purpose. He also includes civil crimes as a category of its own, which confuses the picture.

One of the latest classifications of transgressions in the inscriptions is provided by Chaniotis[9], who distinguishes seven categories of offences: 1) ritual impurity, 2) damage to sanctuaries and their possessions, 3) the failure to fulfil a vow, 4) refusal to offer services to a god or to attend the mysteries, 5) perjury, 6) unjustified judicial prayers, and 7) theft or fraud. He concludes:

> It is quite clear that we are dealing almost exclusively with religious offences, i.e. with
> ritual impurity and sacrilege, which can also be associated with impurity.[10]

Chaniotis' conclusion is in my opinion correct, and confirms Steinleitner's definition of transgressions in reconciliation inscriptions. But even though Chaniotis' classification does contain important observations, it is still too detailed and includes mere crimes as a category of their own. Gordon has recently proposed narrowing down the categories of transgression to two: 'unneighbourly acts' and 'purely ritual faults'.[11] This classification might be too general to be used in this context, but is no doubt accurate.

b. Causes of punishment

While none of the earlier classifications is incorrect, they all suffer from two defects: 1) they are, with the exception of Gordon's classification, too detailed. As a consequence they constitute broad categories of examples rather than systematisations; 2) they include secular crimes, such as theft, as an independent category. This would correspond to what Klauck calls *Soziale Vergehen*, Petzl's categories # 3a, 4b and 8, and Chaniotis' category of theft and fraud. So long as the inscriptions are seen as confessions, it is quite reasonable to include such a category of transgressions. However, in my opinion it is a mistake to consider the theft of private property and

---

[9] Chaniotis 1995, 326-327.

[10] Chaniotis 1995, 327.

[11] Gordon 2004a, 196, n. 16.

other civil crimes as a transgression and a category of its own in this context. This may sound confusing, but as I will show, it is not the nature of the crime described that causes the punishment, but rather the judicial prayer performed by the victim of the crime. The inscriptions are in these cases attestations of binding spells that have been correctly resolved, and not confessions of guilt as previously assumed.

A classification of the 'causes of punishment', and not of transgressions in the strictest sense will be presented here. In most cases, a transgression is indeed the cause of the punishment, but this is not necessarily so. Being the object of a judicial prayer cannot be regarded as a transgression *per se*, and an offence against another person is not a transgression in the sense that it will cause punishment, unless the offended person performs a binding spell. It is consequently unnecessary to subdivide the different causes into too many categories, giving the impression that the ancient Lydians and Phrygians believed they might be punished by their gods for every transgression and error they committed. There were, as we have seen, other aspects to Lydian and Phrygian religious beliefs which were as important as the events recorded in the reconciliation inscriptions.[12] The reconciliation inscriptions represent a specific range of behaviour, primarily associated with religious and cultic activity, and are not expressions of the general morality of ancient Lydia and Phrygia. What the reconciliation inscriptions can above all tell us is what kind of behaviour was accepted within a cultic context, i.e. cultic morality. I am therefore narrowing down the categories of 'causes of punishments' into three main categories with a few subcategories:

I**.** Violations of cultic rules.

    a) Transgressions of purity rules.

    b) Violation of sacred property.

    c) Neglect of religious duty.

II**.** Judicial prayers.

III**.** Oaths.

Judicial prayers and oaths have been separated into two categories, even though they are closely related, and both involve civilian conflicts. This will be discussed later, but the

---

[12] See Ch. 4.

main focus of the thesis will be on the religious transgressions, i.e. category I a, transgressions of cultic rules.

4. Causes of punishment

Below is a list of all the causes of punishment found in the inscriptions, using to the numbering of Petzl's corpus:

a. Causes of punishment in BWK

1) Eating of meat which has not been sacrificed. **2)** Perjury. **3)** Theft of a garment from a public bath. **4)** Obstructing the cutting of wreaths for ritual purposes. **5)** Sexual transgressions of a *hierodoulos*. **6)** Crossing a border unlawfully. **7)** Herding cattle in a sacred grove. **8)** Fragmentary inscription – probably failure to record the power of the deities. **9)** Purchase of sacred wood. **10)** Cutting a sacred tree. **11)** No details. **12)** Failure to trust in Zeus ἐγ Διδύμων Δρυῶν. **13)** Fragmentary inscription – weapons are mentioned. **14)** Fragment – no details. **15)** Perjury. **16)** Unclear – possibly non-fulfilment of cultic duties. **17)** Attestations of resolved binding spell; no obvious reason for the spell is given, but it might have had something to do with vines. **18)** Unclear – possibly taking advantage of vines belonging to a temple. **19)** Neglect of period of purification. **20)** Illegitimate binding spell. **21)** Apollōnios has failed to show respect for his mother-in-law; the circumstances of the transgression are unclear. **22)** Theft from a shrine. **23)** Fragment. **24)** No details. **25)** Fragment – the transgression seems to have taken place in a temple. **26)** Fragment. **27)** Perjury. **28)** Fragment. **29)** Fragment – ritual impurity. **30)** Fragment. **31)** Fragment. **32)** Fragment. **33)** Unclear – the daughter of Apollōnios has been 'restricted' in the sanctuary. **34)** Perjury. **35)** Thefts of possessions belonging to orphans – the thieves have been made the object of a judicial prayer. **36)** Ritual impurity – Elpis has entered the podium of Mēn Labanas without being purified. **37)** Unclear – Apollōnios has been disobedient towards Meis Labanas and Meis Petraeites, possibly while being in their service. **38)** No details. **39)** Fragment. **40)** Fragment. **41)** No details. **42)** Fragment. **43)** Ritual impurity – Antonia has entered the sacred precinct in a dirty garment. **44)** Record of a resolved binding spell. **45)** Unfulfilled vow. **46)** Fragment. **47)** Record of a successful judicial prayer. **48)** Fragment. **49)** Fragment – letting a *hierodoulos* escape. **50)** Dioklēs has caught doves

belonging to Zeus Sabazios and Mētēr Hipta. **51)** No details. **52)** Perjury. **53)** No details. **54)** Perjury. **55)** Ritual impurity – Phosphoros has worn a dirty garment. **56)** No details. **57)** Neglect of cultic duties. **58)** Perjury. **59)** Failure to record the power of Mēn Axiottēnos. **60)** Record of resolved binding spell. **61)** Unfulfilled vow – the inscription is a substitute for the promised sacrifice of a bull. **62)** Unfulfilled vow. **63)** Theft from a shrine. **64)** Theft from a shrine. **65)** Unfulfilled vow. **66)** No details. **67)** Unclear. **68)** Thefts of pigs – the thieves have been punished by means of a judicial prayer. **69)** Illegitimate judicial prayer. **70)** No details. **71)** Apollōnios has shown contempt for the gods. **72)** Ritual impurity – Apollōnios has not respected the period of purification. **73)** No details. **74)** No details. **75)** No details. **76)** Cutting of wood in the grove of Zeus Sabazios and Artemis Anaitis. **77)** Fragment. **78)** Violation of a stele. **79)** Fragment. **80)** Fragment. **81)** Fragment. **82)** Fragment. **83)** No details. **84)** No details. **85)** No details. **86)** No details. **87)** Fragment. **88)** Fragment. **89)** No details. **90)** Fragment. **91)** Fragment. **92)** Fragment. **93)** Fragment. **94)** No details. **95)** Possibly perjury. **96)** No details. **97)** No details. **98)** Ritual impurity. **99)** Unclear – revenge is mentioned. **100)** Fragment. **101)** Unfulfilled vow. **102)** Perjury. **103)** Perjury. **104)** No details. **105)** Perjury. **106)** Perjury, ritual impurity and theft. **107)** Perjury and ritual impurity. **108)** Neglect of religious duties – Gaius Antonius Apellas did not attend the mysteries. **109)** Unclear – large part of the inscription is illegible. **110)** Ritual impurity – sexual intercourse inside the sacred precinct, and perjury. **111)** Unclear – perhaps neglect of religious duty. **112)** Ritual impurity – Eutykis has entered the sacred precinct and passed through the village. **113)** Unfulfilled vow. **114)** Unclear – a woman has brought soldiers into the shrine. **115)** Ritual impurity. **116)** Ritual impurity. **117)** No details. **118)** Fragment. **119)** Possible perjury. **120)** Perjury and ritual impurity. **121)** Contempt for the god; otherwise no details. **122)** No details. **123)** Eating meat which has not been sacrificed. **124)** Fragment – possibly ritual impurity

b. Reconciliation inscriptions published after BWK

SEG XLVII 1651: No details.

SEG XLVII 1654: Regulation concerning the use of the god's property.

SEG XLIX 1592: Record of paid ransom, no detail of the transgression or crime.

SEG XLIX 1636: No details.

SEG XLIX 1720: Record of priests paying ransom; no details of the transgression.

CIG 4142: Neglect of religious duty.

Malay (2003): Probably thanksgiving for a fulfilled judicial prayer

Malay & Sayar (2004): Failur to offer a votive tablet following a punishment.

This list shows that in 54 of the 130 inscriptions (42%) there is no mentioning of the cause of punishment at all.[13] 26 of these are so damaged that it is not possible to identify the transgression,[14] but in the remaining 25[15] (19.7% -a fifth- of the total number) the transgression is only referred to in a general way or not mentioned at all.[16] An account of the cause of punishment was thus not an unconditional requirement in the narrative structure of the genre.

5. The vocabulary of transgressions in the reconciliation inscriptions

Consequently, 76 of the inscriptions contain some form of narrative of the transgression. Before the specific transgressions are analysed, it is necessary to survey the more general terms for 'committing a transgression' in the reconciliation inscriptions. The most common word for 'transgression' as such is ἁμαρτία, found in 6 inscriptions.[17] In addition we find the equivalent word ἁμάρτημα in two inscriptions.[18] The verb ἁμαρτάνω occurs in 9 inscriptions,[19] the verb παραβαίνω in one inscription,[20] meaning 'commit a transgression'.

---

[13] *BWK* *8; *11; *17; *23; *24; 25; *26; *28; 29; *30; *31; *32; *38; *39; *40; *41; *42; *46; *48; *51; *53; *56; *66; *70; *73; *74; *75; *77; *80; *81; *82; *83; *84; *85; *86; *87; *88; *89; *90; *91; *92; *93; *94; *96; *97; *99; *100; *104; *118; *122; *SEG* XLVII *1651.

[14] *BWK* *8; 25; *26; *28; 29; *30; *31; *32; *40; *42; *46; *48; *80; *81; *82; *85; *86; *87; *88; *90; *91; *92; *93; *99; *100; *118.

[15] *BWK* *11; *17; *23; *24; *38; *39; *41; *51; *53; *56; *66; *70; *73; *74; *75; *77; *83; *84; *89; *94; *96; *97; *104; *122; *SEG* XLVII *1651. In addition, *BWK* *95, *121 and 124 contain no details of the transgression.

[16] See Ch. 1, 17-18.

[17] *BWK* 5, 6, 10, 12, 15, 21; *11, 4; *23, 8; *24, 7; *40, 9; *95, 5.

[18] *BWK* 4, 5; 22, 2.

[19] *BWK* *24, 8;* 66, 3; *73, 2; *74, 2; *100, 2 (?); *109, 4; 112, 2; *117, 3; *118, 7 (?). *BWK* *100 and *118 are both damaged, and it is not possible to determine whether this is the verb or not. Keil & von Premerstein (1907, 16) read *BWK* *100, 2-3 ἀμ[αρ|τήσας κατ]απίπτω. This reading is kept by Steinleitner

Some of the inscriptions characterise the transgression as a display of contempt for the deity. This is usually done by the word καταφρονέω, found in 11 inscriptions.[21] This verb is often used in a formula where the dedicator of the inscription warns others not to show contempt for the deity: παραγγέλλω μηδένα καταφρονεῖν τοῦ θεοῦ. It is found in 9 inscriptions.[22] In two inscriptions we also find the verb κατευτελίζω used in this sense.[23] In one inscription the cause of punishment is described as 'guilt' (αἰτία).[24]

B. Category I: Violations of cultic rules

The 35 inscriptions belonging to this category[25] are characterised by the fact that the transgressions recorded are actions forbidden in a religious context. The predominant transgression is neglect of rules for cultic purity, but in addition we find stories of other types of actions, such as the violation and destruction of sacred property.

1. Category I a: Violations of purity rules

18 of the inscriptions under scrutiny (12%) describe transgressions of the rules of ritual purity.[26] The accounts of transgression vary greatly in their specificity; some accounts simply state that there has been an incident of impurity, whilst others give vivid a description of the reason why the transgressor was regarded as impure. In this section I will first provide a survey of the vocabulary of impurity found in the reconciliation

---

(1913, nr. 20, p. 46), Buckler & Robinson (1932, nr. 96, p. 98) and Lane (*CMRDM* I, nr. 77, p. 51). Petzl (1994, 117) rejects this reading as uncertain and reads ἀμ[αρ|τ–]. In *BWK* *118 the letters ημα are reconstructed ἡμά[ρτησεν] by Steinleitner 1913, 57.

[20] *BWK* 106, 3.

[21] *BWK* 9, 10; 10, 10; 106, 14; 107, 10; *109, 13; 110, 5; *111, 5; 112, 7; *117, 7; 120, 5; *121, [2].

[22] *BWK* 9, 10-13; 106, 14-16; 107, 10-13; *109, 12-13; *111, 5-7; 112, 7-8; *117,7-9; 120, 5-7; *121, [2-4].

[23] *BWK* 10, 12: Παρανγέλλω δέ, αὐτοῦ τὰς δυνάμις μή τίς ποτε κατευτελήσι. 36, 1-2: ἡ Ἐλπὶς | κατευτελίσασα Μῆνα | Λαβανα (...).

[24] *BWK* 9, 7-10: ἐκέ|λευσε Μηνοφίλῳ τῷ υἱῷ αὐ|τοῦ ῥοισάμενον τὴν τοῦ πα|τρὸς αἰτίαν.

[25] *BWK* *1; 5(?); 6; 7; 9; 10; 19; 22; 25(?); 29; *33(?); 36; *37(?); 43; *49(?); 50; 55; *63; 64; *71; 72; 76; 78; *81(?); *95; 98; 106; 107; 110; 112; 114(?); 115; 116; *117(?); 120; 123; 124.

[26] *BWK* 5; 6; 19; 29; 36; 43; 55; 72; 98; 106; 107; 110; 112; 115; 116; 117; 120; 124 (?).

inscriptions and then analyse the details of the stories and relate them to prohibitions in Greek cultic regulations.

a. The vocabulary of ritual purity, impurity and purification

The vocabulary related to ritual pollution and purification found in the reconciliation inscriptions is rather diverse. Several terms are used to describe the undesired states which will cause divine wrath. We can divide them into the following categories:

1) Impurity: ἄναγνος,[27] ἀκατάλουστος,[28] καταμολύνω,[29] μολύνω,[30] μολυσμός,[31] ῥυπαρός.[32]

2) The state of purity and purification: καθαρμός,[33] καθαρός,[34] καταλούομαι.[35]

ἀγνός

ἄναγνος is the most commonly used single word for the state of impurity in reconciliation inscriptions. Only one of the selected cultic regulations contains this term,[36] but this is not surprising. The reconciliation inscriptions describe the negative state, while the regulations describe the positive requirements. The analysis of ἀγνός offered in Ch. 2[37] points out that the word specifically means 'ritual purity' or 'the purity of the worshipper',[38] and is not related etymologically to any word for physical

---

[27] *BWK* 110, 6; 112,5; 115, 3; 116, 3; 120, 3.

[28] *BWK* 36, 3.

[29] *BWK* 36, 12.

[30] *BWK* 98, 7-8.

[31] *BWK* 107, 9.

[32] *BWK* 43, 4.

[33] *BWK* 123, 1.

[34] *BWK* 5, 18.

[35] *BWK* 29, 3; 72, 5 (?). *BWK* 29 is a fragment with only a few legible words. ἐκολ[ασ– in line 4 identify the text as a reconciliation inscription. Its primary value as a source lies in the fact that ritual impurity is related to divine punishment.

[36] *LSS* 91, 4.

[37] Ch. 2, 72.

[38] Parker 1983, 147.

purity[39] and never means 'clean' in a secular sense. Like in Greek cultic regulations, ἄναγνος as used in the reconciliation inscriptions must mean 'unfit to worship'.

Parker's analysis of the concept of ἁγνός agrees with the use of the word in the cultic reconciliation inscriptions. Words deriving from ἁγνός are widely used to denote the state of purity required to obtain access to a shrine.[40] We also find the verb ἁγνεύω denoting the purification rites required in many religious regulations,[41] but it does not occur in the reconciliation inscriptions. As shown in Ch. 3, some regulations contain lists of actions or incidents that will cause impurity, thus rendering one unfit to enter the *temenos*. This observation fits in with how the word ἄναγνος is used in the reconciliation inscriptions. Even though it is only found in five inscriptions,[42] there is no doubt as to what it means. It is exclusively used to describe the state of the worshipper when he or she entered the shrine, and in all the inscriptions it is attached to a verb meaning 'to enter'.[43] The concepts of ἁγνός and ἄναγνος as used in reconciliation inscriptions are thus equivalent to the Greek usage of these words, namely 'fitness/unfitness to worship'.

καθαρός

The other group of purity words contains those derived from the adjective καθαρός. In cultic regulations καθαρός occurs frequently.[44] The word καθαρμός (*purification rite*)[45] is also found in religious regulations.[46] καθαρός is not a purely religious word, unlike ἁγνός, even though it is often applied to religious actions. As a result of a καθαρμός,

---

[39] Parker 1983, 12.

[40] *LSCG* 53, 33: ἁ[γν]ὸς; 130, 2: ἁγνός; 171, 15: ἁγνὸν. *LSS* 82, 1: ἁγνὸν. 91, 1: [ἁγνοὺς]. 108, 4: ἁγνὸν. *LSAM* 35, 4: ἁγνὸν. *NGSL* 7, 2: ἄγνον.

[41] *LSCG* 124, 3: [ἁγνεύσ]αντας. *LSS* 54, 1: ἁγνεύοντας; 91, 17: ἁγνισάμ[ενος]; 119, 2: ἁγνεύειν. *LSAM* 12, 3: ἁγνευέτωσαν; 18, 6: ἁγνεύειν; 29, 1: [ἁγνεύ]εται.

[42] *BWK* 110, 6; 112,5; 115, 3; 116, 3; 120, 3.

[43] *BWK* 110, 6: ἀναβαίνω; 112, 4: διέρχομαι; 115, 3: εἰσέρχομαι; 116, 3: ἀναβαίνω; 120, 3: εἰσέρχομαι.

[44] *LSCG* 58, 12; 97, A 17; B 12-13; 139, 4-5; 65, 70, 100; 97, A 31; B 6-7; 99, 3; 115, 3, 6-7. *LSS* 10, A 8; 31, 9, 14, 17, 20; 53, 4; 91, 7, 19, 21, 24; 106, 6; 115, A 29, 71. *LSAM* 12, 8.

[45] *LSJ* s.v. καθαρμός.

[46] *LSAM* 20, 13, 41; *79, 19. *LSCG* *36, 5; *65, 50, 66-67; *99, 4; *154, A 5-6, 10. *LSS* *115, A 2, 75; *118, 4.

the worshipper reaches the state of required purity. In the reconciliation inscriptions κπθπρός is found in *BWK* 5,[47] *18 and *BWK* 123, 1.[48] In both these cases it is obvious that the term describes a state which the transgressor achieves after the propitiatory rituals have been conducted and the proper relationship with the deity has been re-established.

λούω

The words ἀκατάλουστος and καταλούομαι are not found in the corpus of religious regulations, but the process of purification is often described as washing.[49] ἀκατάλουστος is only found in *BWK* 36. καταλούομαι is not a common word in classical Greek literature, but it is found in Aristophanes, where it means 'wash away'.[50] Even though the word is found in only one of the reconciliation inscriptions, it may have had special connotations in Lydia. As shown, two Lydian inscriptions[51] mention the καταλουστικοί which seem to have been 'a guild, which performed ceremonial ablutions'.[52] We do not have any clear information about the position and role of this guild, but it was obviously associated with the Lydian cult of Mēn,[53] and they might have had special competence in performing cleansing rituals and propitiation. This, however, is not attested in the inscriptions.

We do, however, find several regulations containing the verb λούω or λούομαι.[54] The word λούω simply means 'to bathe' or 'wash the body'.[55] As pointed out in Ch. 2, ritual impurity is not necessarily identical with physical dirt, but it is nevertheless not wholly unrelated to it. Physical dirt may often cause ritual impurity, and as the use of

---

[47] *BWK* 5, 17-18: κύ(προν) πυρῶν | καθαρὸς τοῖς εἰεροῖς, πρό(χον) αʹ.

[48] *BWK* 123, 1-2: καθαρμοῖς κὲ θυσίαις ἐ[ξ]|[ιλασάμην τὸν κ]ύριον (...). The restoration is done by Zingerle 1926, 21.

[49] *LSCG* 55, 4, 5; 124, 4, 9. *LSS* 54, 3; 91, 17; 108, 6. *LSAM* 12, 6; 18, 12. *NGSL* 7, 13, 14, 16.

[50] Ar. *Nu.* 838. Aristophanes does not use the word in a religious sense.

[51] *TAM* V 1 351, 490.

[52] *LSJ* s.v. καταλουστικοί.

[53] See Ch. 4, 171-172.

[54] See note 49.

[55] *LSJ* s.v. λούω.

λούω probably indicates, rituals surrounding religious cleansing often took the form of washing.

καταμολύνω, μολύνω and μολυσμός

BWK 36, 12 describes how Elpis has entered the sacred precinct and καταιμόλυνέ μου τὸ βῆμα. In *BWK* 98, however, it is the perpetrator who is described as μεμολυμένος (7-8), while *BWK* 107 states that the punishment was a result of a defilement, διὰ μολυ‹σ›μόν (8-9). Given the fact that *BWK* 36 associated καταμολύνω with entering a sacred area, there is no reason to assume that this word group has a different meaning from ἄναγνος.

καταμολύνω does not occur in classical Greek literature, and is not found in any cultic regulations. But there are several occurrences of the word in post-classical literature, for instance several Christian authors such as John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzen, Basil, Eusebius and Cyril. The meaning of the word is 'defile utterly'.[56] In the writings of Christian authors καταμολύνω is usually associated with the defilement of both body and soul. In the reconciliation inscriptions, the verb is used in the same sense of 'defile'.

ῥυπαρός

This word occurs only once in the reconciliation inscriptions, in *BWK* 43, where it describes a defiled robe (4: ἐν ῥυπαρῷ ἐπενδύτῃ). The word is found in the cultic regulation *LSAM* 79, (Pendelissos, 1st century BC) where it used in the phrase μηδὲν ἔτι νεκρῶι ἔστω ῥυπαρόν, i.e. "no one shall any longer be contaminated because of a corpse". This must mean that the word has the same connotations as ἄναγνος.

The vocabulary of purity and impurity found in the reconciliation inscriptions diverges slightly from that found in Greek cultic regulations. Despite this, the terms used apparently belong to the same conceptual context, namely 'fitness of worship'.

---

[56] *LSJ* s.v. καταμολύνω.

b. Violations of purity rules

Crossing the border

The analysis of Greek cultic regulations showned that adhering to a code of purification was regarded as a prerequisite for participation in a cult, and in this respect the notions of purity expressed in the reconciliation inscriptions do not differ fundamentally from other Greek notions. This has a parallel in the relatively large group of reconciliation inscriptions in which transgressions are associated with ritual impurity and cleansing.[57] Like in Greek cultic regulations the transgressions are associated with the entering of an area where rules of purity were to be observed.[58] 8 cases of impurity recorded in the reconciliation inscriptions have something to do with the entering of a *temenos* or other holy area without being in the proper state of ritual purity.[59]

The word *temenos* is not found in the reconciliation inscriptions. The secluded area is instead described as ὁ χορός[60] or τὸ χωρίον,[61] or the transgression is described as crossing a marked boundary, ὁ ὅρος. We do not know whether this refers to a *temenos* in the strictest sense of the word as it is know from the classical Greek shrines, i.e. a sacred area surrounding a temple. It may have been a piece of land belonging to a temple. It has been suggested that the temples of Lydia were large estates and that a *khoros* may refer to this.[62] Christof Schuler has shown that *khōrion* and *khōros* are used with a wide range of meanings in inscriptions from Asia Minor.[63] He points out that *khōrion* in Hellenistic times often referred to a small fortress or fortified area which may have contained some kind of settlement. It is not usually used in the same sense as

---

[57] See note 26.

[58] See Ch. 3, 93-116.

[59] *BWK* 6; 36; 43; 72(?); 106(?); 110; 115; 124(?).

[60] *BWK* 43, 2-4: διὰ τὸ ἀ|ναβεβηκέ̣νε με ἐπὶ τὸν χο|ρὸν ἐν ῥυπαρῷ ἐπενδύτῃ (...).

[61] *BWK* 106, 3-5: παραβε|[β]ῆχθαι καὶ 'πιεχειρηκέναι [ἐπὶ] | τὸ χωρίον (...). Petzl follows the reading of *MAMA* IV, 279. *BWK* 110, 6-7: ἄναγον ἀναβῆτ' ἐπὶ τὸ χ|ωρίον (...). 9-10: ἐγὼ Γέ|ᾳ ἐκηνησάμην ἐπὶ τὸ χ|ωρίον. ||¹⁰. *BWK* 112 , 3-4: ἐπεὶ τὼ χωρὶ 'πισέ|τυχει (...). *BWK* 116, 3-5: ἀνέβην ἄνα|γνος ἐπὶ τὸ [χ]|ωρίον (...). *BWK* 124, 4: χωρίον [|. This inscription is heavily damaged.

[62] Ricl 2003, 77: "The essential base of any sanctuary's patrimony, forming its territory, was made up of the lands in its possession. […] Lydian sanctuaries possessed arable land, woods and groves, vineyards, uncultivated plots, and probably also meadows and gardens".

[63] Schuler 1998, 49-55.

κώμη, but probably denotes a fixed area or hamlet without independent status.[64] *Khōros*, Schuler points out, is difficult to separate from κώμη, but may have been used as an equivalent to δήμη. It is difficult to draw any firm conclusions from the five inscriptions containing the word *khōrion* (see note 61), all of which come from the shrine of Apollōn Lairbenos and the one inscription containing *khōros* (see note 60). It is, however, reasonable to assume that the word for a fortified area, *khōrion*, eventually came to denote sacred precincts. As pointed out in Ch. 2, a *temenos* is characterised by the fact that it is conceptually separated from profane land, usually by a wall.[65] This is not very unlike the meaning *khōrion* eventually acquired in Catacecaumene. It is also interesting to note that *LSCG* 86 from 2nd century AD Ithaca reads: Ἱερὸς ὁ χῶρος | τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος,[66] which shows that there are parallels to this use of the word, even though this was not the common term. I therefore consider *khōros* and *khōrion* to be equivalent to *temenos*. In most instances, however, there is no mention of *khōros* or *khōrion*; in fact, most reconciliation inscriptions do not give us any clues about the term for a sacred precinct.

The transgressions which fall under this category are often described as 'overstepping' or 'crossing a border'. In Greek cultic regulations we often find words denoting this kind of entering in connection with requirements for ritual purity.[67] In *BWK* 36, 43, 110, and 116[68] the verb denoting the transgression is ἀναβαίνω. In *BWK* 6 we find the expression ὑπερβαίνω τὸν ὅρον (see note 72). Ὅρος is found in some cultic regulations[69] and is commonly known from Greek religion as a point of transition. In traditional Greek religion the inscribed stones marking the border of a *temenos* are

---

[64] Schuler 1998, 53.

[65] See Ch. 2, 64-65.

[66] *LSCG* 86, 1-2.

[67] (εἰσ)είμι: *LSCG* 53, 31; 136, 19; *LSS* 49; 54, 2; 59, 10; 108, 5; 119, 1; *LSAM* 12, 3; 35, 3. (εἰσ)πορεύομαι: *LSCG* 55, [4-5], 6; 171, 15; *LSAM* 18, 12-13; 20, [32], [14-15]; *NGSL* 7, 3-4, 18. εἰσέρπω: *LSCG* 130, 1. (εἰσ)στείχω: *LSCG* 124, 5, 10, 11, 18; *LSS* 82, 1. παρείμι: *LSCG* 139, [2]; *LSS* 128, 2. περάω: *LSAM* 84, 2.

[68] *BWK* 36, 3-7: ἀκατάλυστος | οὖσα ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμά του ἀ|νέβη καὶ ἠρεύνησεν τὸ ||⁵ βῆμα καὶ τὰς τάβλας αὐ|τοῦ· *BWK* 110, 6-7: see note 61. *BWK* 116, 3-5: see note 61.

[69] *LSCG* 150 B, 7; *LSAM* 83, 1; 75, 8.

referred to as ὅροι,[70] and it is likely that the transgression of Pōliōn described in *BWK* 6 was disregard for the boundary stone of a *temenos*. We also find transgression of a boundary described as εἰσέρχομαι, which is found in *BWK* 19, 115 and 120.[71] Neither *BWK* 19, nor *BWK* 115 state explicitly that a sacred boundary has been transgressed, but it is reasonable to assume so, given the fact that the verbs εἰσέρχομαι and ἀναβαίνω in every other case denote the entering of a sacred area.

Impure transgressions

In this section examples of impure transgressions will be analysed in order to establish which acts the religious environment of Lydia and Phrygia regarded as unacceptable. Explicit accounts of sources of ritual pollution are however often missing; usually the texts only state that pollution was the cause of punishment. A typical example is *BWK* 6 where Pōliōn claims that he has propitiated Zeus Oreites and Mēn Axiottenos following his unlawful transgression of a border which was unknown to him[72] by using 'a triad of a mole, a sparrow and a tuna'.[73] The text does not state explicitly that the transgression was associated with impurity, even though this is the probable explanation for why Pōliōn was punished. Here there is a clear parallel to *BWK* 5 and the story of Theodōros, and to sexual transgressions which are clearly associated with ritual impurity. Like Pōliōn, Theodōros uses various animals as remedies to remove the transgression (see note 108). In fact, both these inscriptions refer to the ritual as a removal,[74] and Theodōros states that he performed the final propitiation ritual in a pure state.[75] It is very reasonable to assume that the process of removal refers to ritual cleansing.

---

[70] E.g. *LSAM* 83.

[71] *BWK* 19, 4: εἰσῆλθα. *BWK* 115, 3-4: εἰσῆλθα ἄν|αγνος. *BWK* 120, 3-4: ἄναγνος ἰσῆλθα ἰς τὸ | σύνβωμον.

[72] *BWK* 6, 6-10: Ἐπί με ἔλαθεν | κὲ ὑπερέβην τὸν | ὅρον ἄθετος, ἐκο|λάσαντο αὐτὸν | οἱ θεοί·

[73] *BWK* 6, 11-13: τριφώνῳ ἀπῆρεν, | ἀσφάλακι κὲ στρουθῷ κὲ θι|νίῳ (...). Cf. *BWK* 5, 10-11, 14 and 16-17. In this inscription the three transgressions are annulled by means of three animals, with the exception of the second transgression for which only two animals are used. The mole, sparrow and tuna are all part of one of the three groups, even though they are never mentioned in the same group.

[74] ἀπαιρέω: *BWK* 5; 10; 14 and 16; *BWK* 6, 11.

[75] *BWK* 5, 17-18: See note 47.

The same rather limited clarification of the source of pollution is also found in *BWK* 106 which lists several transgressions of which one is entering a sacred precinct.[76] There are no explicit references to impurity, but as was the case with *BWK* 6 (above) it is highly likely that this was the cause of the divine wrath, because the transgression is associated with access to a sacred precinct. In *BWK* 107 the transgression is only referred to as διὰ μολυ‹σ›μόν (8-9).[77] In *BWK* 110 we find an obvious reference to a purity regulation. Here Aurelius Soterikhos proclaims that no one may enter the *khōrion* in an impure state.[78] This proclamation resembles the general demands for purity found in some Greek cultic regulations that do not specify the purity requirements.[79] It is therefore reasonable to suggest that this is a quotation or an allusion to a cultic regulation that may have been placed at the entrance of the shrine of Apollōn Lairbenos.

There are other examples that conform to this picture. *BWK* 115 is a fragmentary inscription which states that the transgressor entered what probably was the temple or a sacred precinct neglecting the purity requirements. The transgressor also states that he (the adjective is in the masculine gender) did this without knowledge and therefore unintentionally.[80] In the case of *BWK* 124 we must assume that it described an incident of this kind, although most of the text is illegible. From the verb παραγέλλ[ω] in line 2 it is clear that this is a reconciliation inscription, and the word *khōrion* may indicate that the transgression was related to overstepping a boundary. A special case described in greater detail is found in *BWK* 36, which tells the story of Elpis who has entered the *podium* (βῆμα) of Mēn Labana(s) without purification and desecrated his *rostrum* and his tablets.[81] The podium referred to was probably a stand where votive offerings and *ex voto* inscriptions were placed.

There are even more obvious parallels to Greek cultic regulations in *BWK* 19 and 72 which were erected after the narrators or subjects had ignored a period of

---

[76] *BWK* 106, 4-5: ᾀπικεχειρηκέναι [ἐπὶ] | τὸ χωρίον (...).

[77] *BWK* 107, 5-9: (...) ἐκολά‖⁵σετό με καὶ δι|ὰ ὅρκον καὶ συνί|δησιν καὶ διὰ | μολυ‹σ›μόν.

[78] *BWK* 110, 5-7: παραγέλων πᾶσι μηδ‖⁵ὲ ἄναγον ἀναβῆτ᾽ ἐπὶ τὸ χ|ωρίον (...).

[79] *LSCG* 53; 130; *LSS* 82; *LSAM* 35. See Ch. 3, 96-99.

[80] *BWK* 115, 1-4: MEN [ἱε]|ρέων ἔλαθέ [με] | καὶ εἰσῆλθα ἄν|αγνος· The reconstruction of [με] is done with reference to *BWK* 6, 6, see Petzl 1994, 135.

[81] *BWK* 36, 3-7: see note 68.

purification during which they were prohibited from entering a sacred area. As shown in Ch. 3,[82] many Greek cultic regulations contain specific demands as to how many days a defiled person was expected to keep away from a shrine.[83] *BWK* 19 tells the story of Marcia who 'entered when one day remained',[84] while *BWK* 72 is raised by Apollōnios on behalf of his brother Dionysios who was killed by the goddess Anaitis when he failed to adhere to the period of exclusion.[85] It is impossible to understand the inscriptions without keeping in mind the periods of purification described in Greek cultic regulations. Even though we do not have any clear evidence for cultic regulations from Lydia or Phrygia containing similar demands for exclusion, these two reconciliation inscriptions indicate that there must have been a similar practice.

Some of the more explicit texts attribute the undesired pollution to dirty clothes. *BWK* 43 tells the story of Antonia, who entered the sacred precinct dressed in filthy clothes.[86] *BWK* 55 is not so explicit, but states that divine wrath was caused by the dirty garment of a six-year-old boy.[87] This transgression presumably took place within a sacred precinct given the fact that the impurity was removed by a triad.[88] There is thus a clear parallel between this text and the triads of animals mentioned in *BWK* 5 and 6 (above). Given the fact that the transgressions of *BWK* 5 and 6 were related to cultic activity, it is reasonable to assume that the incident related to Phōsphoros' filthy garment was regarded as a transgression because he entered a sacred precinct. Clothes and dress code in cultic contexts are referred to in some cultic regulations, but as pointed out in Ch. 3 these rules are primarily meant to prevent excessive use of jewellery, coloured clothes, or clothes made of certain materials, such as goat skin.[89]

---

[82] See Ch. 3, 100-114.

[83] *LSCG* 55; 124; 139; 171; *LSS* 54; 91; *LSAM* 12; 18; 84; 119; *NGSL* 7.

[84] *BWK* 19, 3-4: ἐπὶ λειπούσης ἡμέ|ρας εἰσῆλθα (...).

[85] *BWK* 72, 4-7: Ἐπὶ | κατελούσετο καὶ οὐ||⁵κ ἐτήρησε τὴν προ|θεσμίαν τῆς θεοῦ (...). Gordon interprets the transgression as 'missing an appointment for purification'. προθεσμία may signify both a fixed time or a period. Both interpretations are therefore possible.

[86] *BWK* 43, 1-4: Ἀντωνία Ἀντωνίου Ἀπόλ|λωνι θεῷ Βοζηνῷ διὰ τὸ ἀ|ναβεβηκένε με ἐπὶ τὸν χο|ρὸν ἐν ῥυπαρῷ ἐπενδύτῃ (...).

[87] *BWK* 55, 6-9: Πωσφόρος Ἀρτεμᾶ | παιδίον ὢν ἐτῶν ἐξ | ἐπενδύτιον ἐνεδύσε|το σπίλους ἔχων (...).

[88] *BWK* 55, 10-11: ἦρε ||¹⁰ τρίφωνον (...). See notes 73 and 108.

[89] See Ch. 3, 114-116.

There is not, however, any explicit demand for clean clothes; the closest parallels are probably the regulations stating that worshippers have to wear white clothes[90] and the prohibition against wearing a black garment in *LSAM* 84.[91] Dress code was thus part of the requirements that made humans fit for worship and an aspect of cultic morality. But it is not stated that dress code was associated with ritual purity.[92]

The picture becomes more complicated in *BWK* 112.[93] Here, a woman possibly called Eutykhis has been punished because she entered the sacred precinct. Up to that point, the text fits into the same pattern as the other reconciliation inscriptions. It is therefore bewildering to read that Eutykhis also admits to having walked through the village twice in an impure state, if that is the correct interpretation.[94] Why was the impurity regarded as a threat outside the sacred area? The explanation may be that because Eutykhis had caused divine anger by entering the sacred area without performing the proper rituals of purification she remained a menace to other members of the village until purification and propitiation had been conducted. A possible parallel might be the curse tablets from Cnidus where the author asks the deity not to harm her if she happens to be in the same room as the cursed wrongdoer.[95]

As we have seen, ritual impurity related to sexuality and prescriptions for purification after sexual activity occur frequently in Greek cultic regulations.[96] Among the reconciliation inscriptions there are two texts that describe sexual impurity as the reason for punishment. The most prominent example is *BWK* 5, which is one of the longest and most peculiar texts of this genre. The inscription contains 26 lines written in skilfully carved letters. Since the stele is only slightly damaged, it gives detailed

---

[90] See Ch. 3, note 149.

[91] *LSAM* 84, 10: μηδὲ μελανφάρους προσίναι βωμοῖσι ἄνακτ[ος] (...).

[92] Richard Gordon has suggested to me that 'dirty clothes' in this case might have been a euphemism for menstruation.

[93] This text poses some severe problems. The interpretation offered here is based on Petzl's text, translation and commentaries. The words λημόνησα (5-6), ἐξοπάρειο[ν] (9) and ἐτόνμετον (10) have uncertain meanings and the entire text is difficult to understand. The suggestions given in the present study must accordingly be regarded as tentative. For a commentary on this text, see Petzl 1994, 132-133.

[94] *BWK* 112, 3-5: ἐπεὶ τὼ χωρὶ 'πισέ|τυχει καὶ διῆθα τὴν | κώμη β΄ ἄναγνα (...).

[95] See Ch. 4, 147-148.

[96] See Ch. 3, 109-112.

evidence as to how sexual transgressions might have been treated. There are, however, reasons to question how representative this text is, due to the fact that the transgressor seems to have had a special status, with obligations that an ordinary worshipper would not have been required to follow.[97]

In *BWK* 5, Theodōros gives a vivid and detailed account of his sexual transgressions with three women. As a consequence he was punished in his eyes.[98] It is unclear whether he committed these transgressions within the sanctuary,[99] but he states that he committed the second transgression despite the fact that he was a slave of the gods.[100] This shows that Theodōros was an ἱεροδοῦλος. It is uncertain what this term implies, but it may have been some sort of a temple servant or religious official still being a free man in a judicial sense, and not literally a slave.[101] It is however clear from this text that the status of *hierodoulos* in this case involved restriction of sexual activity, possibly because he had ritual duties which required observance of a special purity code. In Ch. 2 it was pointed out that celibacy was rare in Greco-Roman religion, and that sexual abstinence was only required on special occasions.[102] Two of the women with whom Theodōros had sexual intercourse are described as unmarried;[103] one of them is a slave.[104] We know that some Greek cultic regulations distinguish between sex with married and unmarried persons, and that extra-marital sex required longer periods of exclusion than marital sex.[105] I do not, however, believe that this is the reason why

---

[97] See Chaniotis 2004, 6.

[98] *BWK* 5, 5-6: ἐκολασόμην τὰ ὄματα τὸν | Θεόδωρον κατὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας (...).

[99] The phrase εἰς τὸ πλετώ|ριν in lines 9-10 may indicate this. It is however uncertain what this term implies. See Petzl 1994, 9.

[100] *BWK* 5, 12-13: ἀλλὰ δοῦλος ὢν τῶν θεῶν | ἐν Νονου συνεγενόμην τῇ Ἀριάγνῃ τῇ | μοναυλίᾳ.

[101] According to H. W. Pleket 1981, 166-171 ἱεροδοῦλοι were free men and women who served in temples. It is also worth mentioning that Theodōros is named without a patronymic, which is usually a sign of slave status. If *hierodouloi* were not slaves in the true sense of the word, this might have been a conventional way of recording their names.

[102] See Ch. 2, 49; 81.

[103] *BWK* 5, 13-14: συνεγενόμην τῇ Ἀριάγνῃ τῇ | μοναυλίᾳ. 15-16: συνεγενόμην Ἀρεθούσῃ ||[15] μοναυλίᾳ.

[104] *BWK* 5, 7-8: Συνεγενόμην τῇ πε|δίσχῃ τῶ Ἀπλοκόμα, τῇ Τροφίμῃ (...).

[105] See Ch. 3, note 127.

Theodōros stresses this point. The most probable explanation is that he wants to avoid being accused of having had sex with other men's wives.

   One of the most interesting features of this inscription is the constant alternation of speaker. There are several shifts between 3rd and 1st person narratives; there are even two 1st person narrators, Theodōros and the god, Mēn Artemidoros. At three points in the text the god proclaims the punishments he has inflicted on Theodōros.[106] Theodōros himself speaks *propria persona* when he describes his transgressions,[107] but the rituals and offerings he performs in order to remove the impurity are always described in the 3rd person without any identifiable narrator.[108] These shifts in the narrative voice are unparalleled in the reconciliation inscriptions. Presumably, the shifts were introduced in order to bestow authority to the text. Theodōros admits his transgressions, but the achieved propitiation is confirmed by the god's own proclamation,[109] and the rituals performed are attested by an impersonal speaker. This gives the text more credibility than an account given solely by Theodōros. He can no longer be accused of breaking the rules surrounding his status as a *hierodoulos*. This change of speaker and the remark that Theodōros has chosen Zeus as his intercessor may be interpreted as proceedings of a trial with a priest acting the role of Zeus.[110] Chaniotis has analysed *BWK* 5 and concluded that it cannot be taken as evidence for trials conducted in temples. The text, Chaniotis argues, must be read metaphorically.[111]

   Another example of a sexual transgression is found in *BWK* 110, which is one of the inscriptions from the Phrygian shrine of Apollōn Lairbenos. This is quite a short

---

[106] *BWK* 5, 5-6: see note 98; 19-21: εἴδαι, κατὰ τὰ πυήματα πεπηρώκιν, | νῦν δὲ εἰλαζομένου αὐτοῦ τοὺς θεοὺς κὲ στη||20λογραφοῦντος ἀνερύσετον τὰς ἁμαρτίας (...). 22-26: εἴλεος εἶμαι ἀναστανομένης τῆς στήλλην μου, | ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ ὥρισα· ἀνύξαις τὴν φυλακήν, ἐξαφίω | τὸν κατάδικον διὰ ἐνιαυτοῦ κὲ μηνῶν ι´ περι||25πατούντων.

[107] *BWK* 5, 7-10: Συνεγενόμην τῇ πε|δίσχῃ τῶ Ἀπλοκόμα, τῇ Τροφίμῃ, τῇ γυ|ναικὶ τῇ Εὐτύχηδος εἰς τὸ πλετώ|ριν. 12-14: ἀλλὰ δοῦλος ὢν τῶν θεῶν τῶν | ἐν Νονου συνεγενόμην τῇ Ἀριάγνῃ τῇ | μοναυλίᾳ. 14-16: Τῇ | τρίτῃ ἁμαρτίᾳ συνεγενόμην Ἀρεθούσῃ ||15 μοναυλίᾳ.

[108] *BWK* 5, 10-11: ἀπαίρι τὴν πρώτην ἁμαρτίαν προβά||10τω[[ν]], πέρδεικι, ἀσφάλακι. 14: ἀπαίρι χύρῳ, θείννῳ ἐχθύει. 16-18: ἀπαίρι ὄρνειθει, στρουθῷ, περισ|τερᾷ, κύ(πρῳ) κρειθοπύρων, πρό(χῳ) οἴνου· κύ(προν) πυρῶν | καθαρὸς τοῖς εἱεροῖς, πρό(χον) α´.

[109] See note 106.

[110] Petzl 1994, 10.

[111] Chaniotis 2004, 27-30.

inscription of only ten lines. In this text Aurelius Sōtērkhos (or Sōtērikhos) gives an account of his transgressions. First he gives a warning against entering the holy area in an impure state, committing perjury or 'moving the testicles' as he expresses it.[112] This formula is not unproblematic because the text is slightly damaged. The sigma of the word κήνσ[?]ετε is hypothetical,[113] but it seems reasonable to assume that the word is a misspelling of κινήσεται, the future tense of κινέομαι. The same verb is found in line 9, but then in the aorist tense, ἐκηνησάμην. Strictly speaking this word means 'move' or 'set in motion'.[114] In the Attic comedies the verb is used in an obscene sense, i.e. 'to have sexual intercourse with'.[115] Accordingly, in the first case (lines 7-8) the expression κήνσ[?]|ετε τὸν ὄρχις probably means 'to masturbate'. Lines 8-10 are harder to interpret. Petzl writes ἐγὼ Γέ|ᾳ ἐκηνησάμην ἐπὶ τὸ χ|ωρίον, which can be translated 'I committed fornication with Gaia inside the holy precinct'. The letters are however difficult to read, and the actual meaning may have been different.[116] If this reading is correct it means that Sōtērikhos had sexual intercourse inside the *temenos*, which would be a major offence against the purity code. Sexual activity within a sacred precinct is never mentioned in Greek cultic regulations, probably because this was regarded as so obviously unacceptable.

c. The notion of ritual impurity in the reconciliation inscriptions

As we can see from this survey, the actual causes of impurity are often left out or only referred to in general terms. The texts simply state that ritual impurity was the cause of divine wrath and punishment without giving further details. The fact that the references to the transgressions are held in a general style, such as the failure to adhere to periods

---

[112] *BWK* 110, 5-8: παραγέλων πᾶσι μηδ||⁵ἐ ἄναγον ἀναβῆτ᾽ ἐπὶ τὸ χ|ωρίον, ἐπροκήσι ἢ κήνσ[?]|ετε τὸν ὄρχις· The reading of κήνσ[?]|ετε is uncertain. Hogarth (1887, 387) reads ΚΗΝΕ[Σ]ΕΤΕ, while MAMA IV, 283 reads κηνσετε. Reinach 1887, 355 reads κην[ή]σετε. For the spelling of ἐπροκήσι, see Petzl 1994, 130.

[113] Petzl 1994, 130: *κήνσ[?]ετε: von Sigma ist nur ein senkrechter Strich sichtbar; κηνή[σ]|ετε ist auch möglich [...]*.

[114] *LSJ*, s.v. κινέω.

[115] Ar. *Ach.* 1052, *Eq.* 364, *Nu.* 1102. According to Dover 1970, 164, κινέω is used in the comedies as slang for sexual intercourse.

[116] Petzl 1994, 130.

of exclusion in *BWK* 19 and 72, may indicate that the actual cause of punishment might have been unknown to the editors of the texts and that the general style reflects the fact that they are the results of retrospective interpretations. As pointed out in Ch. 2 and 3, ritual impurity is not identical with physical dirt, and as such is an elusive entity which cannot be immediately identified. The most important piece of information that these text give is the fact that there were areas in Lydia and Phrygia where ritual purity was required for access and that these areas probably were used for ritual purposes. In this respect the cultic morality expressed in the reconciliation inscriptions resembles closely the one found in Greek cultic regulations. When more details of the nature of the impurities are given these may find their parallels in Greek cultic regulations. It is true that no reconciliation inscriptions mention one of the most widespread notions concerning ritual impurity, namely death pollution. *LSAM* 18 shows however that this probably was a part of Lydian and Phrygian religion, even though this text was written much earlier than the reconciliation inscriptions.[117] The transgressions described in the reconciliation inscriptions clearly have parallels in the prohibitions against entering a *temenos* without conducting proper rituals of purification found in Greek cultic regulations.

The main religious transgression described in the Lydian and Phrygian reconciliation inscriptions is the bringing of ritual impurity into an area reserved for the gods. Like in Greek cultic regulations, there is no reason to assume that the mere fact of impurity was regarded as a transgression.[118] Ritual impurity is not a question of morality *per se,* but becomes one if the defilement is brought into a sacred precinct. Greek cultic regulations indicate that more or less everyone was likely to be exposed to some sort of impurity, since it resulted from everyday situations, such as deaths, sexual activity, menstruation and certain kinds of food. The probability of becoming impure must therefore have been quite high, and most people would encounter such situations quite often over the course of their lives. I have also pointed out that even though these events were regarded as a cause of impurity, we rarely find any explicit prohibition against them (see Ch. 3, 49), such as the demand for purification after eating pork found in *LSCG* 55. But even though the eating of pork meat required purification, there is no

---

[117] See Ch. 3, 104-105.

[118] See Ch. 2, 74-78.

actual prohibition against it. The transgression occurs when a person considered impure enters a precinct attached to a shrine or temple, and this also seems to be the case in the reconciliation inscriptions.

There is no evidence in the reconciliation inscriptions that Lydian and Phrygian notions of ritual purity and impurity differed considerably from those expressed in Greek cultic regulations generally. The material is limited but it bears no indications that the code of purity was imposed upon worshippers outside a cultic context. The only exception might be *BWK* 112 (see note 94), but it is uncertain, even though it is no doubt that the transgression described here was related to cultic activity. Neither do any of the proclamations against transgressions found in some reconciliation inscriptions contain any moralistic demands. Consequently, we may conclude that the notion of ritual purity expressed in the reconciliation inscriptions differs from Semitic or Jewish rules of purity which were intended to create a general mode of life and therefore imposed for instance dietary rules upon the worshippers outside a strictly ritual context. We may also conclude that the notions of purity and impurity expressed in the reconciliation inscriptions are more closely related to the notions found in Greek cultic regulations, with one significant exception: the emphasis on divine punishment.

2. Category I b: Violations of sacred property

In Ch. 3 we saw that apart from purity requirements, the protection of sacred property is one of the main themes in Greek cultic regulations. These rules were in most cases intended to protect either votive offerings or sacred groves and trees. In addition there are rules for the protection of the sanctity of suppliants. This section will analyse transgressions related to the same issues found in the reconciliation inscriptions and provide parallels to the prohibitions in Greek cultic regulations. Like in Ch. 3 the analysis will first look at violations of sacred groves and thereafter at the destruction or theft of other sacred objects, such as votive offerings.

a. Violations of sacred groves and trees

The transgression

Violations of sacred groves and trees provide an interesting parallel to Greek cultic regulations where their protection is an important issue.[119] The violation of sacred groves or trees is the theme of four reconciliation inscriptions.[120] These texts contain descriptions of three types of transgressions associated with sacred groves: a) cutting trees inside the grove, b) the purchase or sale of timber taken from a sacred grove, and c) letting herds graze in the grove. In other words, sacred groves in Lydia were meant to be exempted from agricultural activity as was the case in the concordant prohibitions of Greek cultic regulations.

The first type of transgression related to sacred groves and trees, the logging of wood, is described in *BWK* 10 and 76, and it is the person who actually cut down the trees who is punished. *BWK* 76 states clearly that the tree was cut down in a grove.[121] In *BWK* 10, the focus is on the punishment of the transgressor, stating that Stratoneikos cut down the trees belonging to Zeus,[122] but the text does not say that the tree that was cut down stood inside a sacred grove, but simply that the tree belonged to Zeus Didymeitēs.[123] Interestingly, both Stratoneikos of *BWK* 10 and Aurelios Stratoneikos of *BWK* 76 insist that they committed their transgressions in ignorance. This may simply rhetorical be a phrase thought to stress the unintentional character of the transgression, but perhaps also an indication that sacred groves were not necessarily marked by a wall or enclosure, and that correct conduct required knowledge of the sacred landscape.

An account of the second type of transgression related to sacred trees, the purchase of holy timber, is found in *BWK* 9. In this case, it is not stated that the timber was taken from a sacred grove, just that the timber was holy (*BWK* 9, 4-5: ἱερὰ ξύλα). Given the context of the transgression, however, it is highly likely that the timber came from a sacred grove. *BWK* 7 gives an example of the fourth type of violation of sacred

---

[119] See Ch. 3, 118-122.

[120] *BWK* 7; 9; 10; 76.

[121] *BWK* 76, 3: ἐκ τοῦ ἄλσου ἔκοψα.

[122] *BWK* 10, 3-5: (…) Διὸς Διδυμείτου ἔκκοψε δρῦ|ν κτλ.

[123] See Ch. 4, 151.

grove: grazing cattle inside the grove.[124] In this inscription it is also stated that the prohibition was given by the gods and Zeus Oreites himself. This formula may refer to a cultic regulation containing a divine command.

Only *BWK* 7 and 10 give an indication of the punishment. In *BWK* 10, 5-8 it is stated: κὲ ἀναζητήσας ὁ θεὸς τὴν | ἰδίαν δύναμιν διὰ τὸ ἀπιστῖν | αὐτὸν κατέθηκεν ΟΛΟΔΟΥΜΕ | ἰσοθανάτους - *And the god revealed his own power because he (i.e. Stratoneikos) did not believe in him, and placed him - - - in a deathlike condition.*[125] We do not know what this implies, but it must have been some kind of unconsciousness, and it is interesting to note that it is the same punishment as described in *BWK* 7.[126] Gordon has suggested that the 'deathlike' condition may refer to some kind of hysteria.[127] In *BWK* 9 the punishment is only indicated in the phrases ἐκολάσθη ὑπὸ | τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ πολλὰ παθόν|τος αὐτοῦ (5-7), while *BWK* 76 only states κολασθεὶς (5-6).

Violation of trees in the reconciliation inscriptions and in Greek cultic regulations

The reconciliation inscriptions use the Greek word for 'grove,' ἄλσος. This word is found in two reconciliation inscriptions, *BWK* 7 and 76, and in two of the religious regulations, *LSCG* 116 and *LSS* 81. In the other inscriptions the place is either described as τὸ ἱερόν, τὸ τέμενος, or not mentioned at all. The term τὸ ἱερόν is not found in these reconciliation inscriptions, but occurs in four of the regulations,[128] while the term τὸ τέμενος only occurs in *LSCG* 50.[129] It is also worth mentioning that in *LSCG* 50 B the

---

[124] *BWK* 7, 1-6: Ἐπὶ προήγγελαν οἱ θε|οὶ οἱ Περκηνῶν Ζεὺς Ὀρεί|της εἰς τὸ ἄλσος μὴ βόσχ|[ι]ν κτήνη, ἠπείθουσαν, ἐκο|λασαν Εὐμένην (δὶς) τὸν υἱὸν ‖[5] κὲ κατέθηκεν ἰσοθάνατον.

[125] Petzl 1994, 19: "ἀναζητήσας .. τὴν .. δύναμιν: die Wortverbindung nur hier, vermutlich im Sinn von (ἀνα)δεικνύναι τὴν δύναμιν, vgl. [*BWK*] *33, *34, *68". The phrase ΟΛΟΔΥΜΕ is written with capital letters in Petzl 1994 in order to mark it as incomprehensible. Petzl (Petzl 1994, 19) suggest that the phrase could be read κατέθηκεν ὅλο(ν) δ᾽ οὖ(ν) με ἰσοθάνατο‹ν›, but rejects this interpretation and concludes that there is no convincing explanation of this phrase. *TAM* V1 179b follows Petzl's transcribation.

[126] *BWK* 7, 1-6: see note 124.

[127] Gordon 2004b, 190.

[128] *LSCG* 37, [8]-9; 84, 4-5, (10); 116, 23-24; 150 A, 5-6.

[129] *LSCG* 150 A, 3, 9; 150 B, 2, 8, [17].

enclosed area is termed ὁ περιεχομένος τόπος ὑπὸ τῶν ὅρων τοῦ τεμένευς,[130] *the area surrounded by the borders of the* temenos. This indicates that in some cases, the violated trees were situated inside a territory with defined borders. In some cases, there are indications that sacred groves were not marked with borders.

As we have seen in Ch. 3, protection of sacred groves and trees is a frequent theme in Greek cultic regulations. Even though the comparative material is considerably older than the reconciliation inscriptions, there can be no doubt that the practice of regarding certain trees and groves as sacred and therefore inviolable was shared by Lydian-Phrygian and Greek religion. Strabo's account also shows that sacred groves and trees were well-known in Asia Minor.[131] Likewise, the transgressions associated with sacred groves described in the reconciliation inscriptions do not present a picture which diverges fundamentally from the prohibitions found in Greek cultic regulations, as the most frequently occurring prohibition in Greek cultic regulations against the violation of trees concerns the cutting of wood. *BWK* 10 and 76 are examples of violation of this prohibition. Even the phrase τὰ δένδρα κόπτειν which is the term for the transgression in Greek cultic regulations[132] is found in these two inscriptions.[133]

The two remaining reconciliation inscriptions in this category also describe transgressions attested in Greek cultic regulations. Ch. 3 has shown that several legal measures were employed in order to protect sacred trees, for instance attempts to specify the forbidden acts in detail.[134] One of these specifications is found in *LSCG* 37, namely the prohibition against the purchase of wood taken from a sacred grove.[135] This is a clear parallel to the story told in *BWK* 9. *BWK* 7 gives us an example of one of the most severe violations against sacred groves: herding of cattle.[136] These four texts in fact give us examples of violations of the most frequent prohibitions concerning the protection of sacred trees: cutting, purchase and the herding of cattle. This indicates that

---

[130] *LSCG* 50 B, 6-8.

[131] See Ch. 3, note 162.

[132] This prohibition is found in eight cultic regulations in my selection; see Ch. 3, note 163.

[133] *BWK* 10, 4-5: ἔκκοψε δρῦ|ν. *BWK* 76, 3-4: ἔκοψα | δένδρα.

[134] See Ch. 3, note 164.

[135] See Ch. 3, note 165.

[136] See Ch. 3, note 167.

Lydian and Greek legal approaches to this issue bore many similarities. Their ideas as to how sacred trees and groves should be protected are clearly related.

b. Destruction of sacred objects

The large amount of goods and food stored in ancient temples must have been a constant temptation for thieves, and as a consequence precautions were taken to protect these sacred objects. The ability to display valuable votive offerings was an important way of emphasising and enhancing the status of a shrine. Votive offerings showed that the shrine was held in reverence by worshippers and thereby contributed to the continuation of the cult. It was thus crucial to be able to protect and keep these offerings intact. Most of the inscriptions discussed in this paragraph record transgressions which would cause a threat to the shrine's status symbols. Transgressions of this kind were thus, in addition to the judicial aspects, a potential threat to the status of the cult.

Transgressions concerning sacred objects are described in four reconciliation inscriptions[137] and have clear parallels in Greek cultic regulations. Here, the protection of votive offerings is among the most important issues concerning sacred objects. The prohibition against the removal and destruction of votive offerings found in *LSAM* 74[138] is clearly paralleled in *BWK* 78, which attests that Metrodōros as a child broke one of the goddess's steles.[139] A similar story is told in *BWK* 22: two children have stolen objects belonging to the Apollōn Axyros.[140] Some of the prohibitions found in Greek cultic regulations concern the sacrificial ritual and the distribution of meat from the sacrificed animal. We find a few examples of crimes against the leftovers from sacrifices, in particular *BWK* 64, which is a dedication from Artemōn and Ateimētos as propitiation for their father having stolen hides from the temple.[141] The hides of sacrificed animals were often sold and were an important source of income for

---

[137] *BWK* 22; 50; 64; 78.

[138] See Ch. 3, note 170.

[139] *BWK* 78, 2-4: παιδίον ὢν ἀκου|σίως κατεάξας στηλλάριον τῆς | θεοῦ·

[140] *BWK* 22, 4-6: (...) καὶ ἔκλε|ψαν ΕΙΑΛΙΛΙΑ κὲ ἔτ||⁵ερά τινα τὰ κίμενα (...). The passage is partly unintelligible, see Petzl 1994, 32.

[141] *BWK* 64, 3-5: αὐ|τοῖς δορὰς ἦρειν βία | ἐκκ τοῦ ναοῦ (...).

sanctuaries.[142] It was probably one of these hides Artemōn's and Ateimētos' father had stolen. *BWK* 50 provides an interesting parallel to one of the cultic regulations, telling the story of Dioklēs, who is punished because he caught pigeons belonging to Zeus Sabazios and Mētēr Hipta.[143] We know that some temples possessed animals regarded as sacred. The closest parallel is in this case *LSAM* 17, which is aimed at the protection of sacred fish.[144]

3. Category I c: Neglect of religious duty[145]

In this category of transgression transgressors are being punished for something they have not done, but were obliged to do. In all of these inscriptions the neglected duty belongs in a religious context. We can identify two main types of transgressions in this category: 1) failure to pay the gods due honour, and 2) neglect of duties of a religious office.

a. Failure to pay the gods due honour

An important group is formed by inscriptions recording the failure to honour the god's powers by raising an inscription after having a wish fulfilled.[146] In Ch. 4 I pointed out that votive cults were one of the most widely found religious expressions in Asia Minor and that reconciliation inscriptions fall into a pattern of a religion based on a principle of reciprocity: when the gods granted a wish they had the right to receive something in return. The reconciliation inscriptions discussed in the present section tell the stories of those who neglected this important religious principle. Ancient Lydians and Phrygians worshipped their gods in order to receive the benefits they needed to maintain a good life. People wanted to secure the continuation of the household and their wishes were therefore related to crops, family and health. There is a direct parallel between the wishes found in Lydian ex-voto inscriptions[147] and the failure to return the service

---

[142] Burkert 1983, 7.

[143] *BWK* 50, 3-5: ἐπεὶ ἐπεί|ασα περιστερὰς τῶν | θεῶν (...).

[144] See Ch. 3, note 172.

[145] *BWK* 4; *8; *12(?); *16; *45; *57; *59; *"61"; *62; *63(?); *65; *101; *108; *111(?); *113.

[146] *BWK* *8; *59; *62; *65; *101.

[147] See Ch. 4, 158-164.

recorded in the reconciliation inscriptions. In these texts the transgressions in all cases concern the failure to raise an inscription which records the deeds and powers of the deity; in most cases an ex-voto inscription.

The Lydian gods could cause disease if they we disrespected, but they were also healers. Thanksgiving for healing is a frequent theme in ex-voto inscriptions.[148] *BWK* *62 gives an account of Prepousa who does not fulfil her promise to record the powers of Mēn after he has healed her son.[149] The story gives an almost programmatic introduction to the basic principles of votive cult. She has not paid her healer – Mēn - proper respect for the services he provided. Almost identical histories are found in *BWK* *65 and *101. In *BWK* *65 we find the story about Aphphias, who prays to Mēn in order to have a child, and then delays recording that the wish has been fulfilled.[150] This text is a clear parallel to *TAM* V 1, 526 which records the gratitude of a woman who was granted a similar wish.[151] In *BWK* *101, it is the longing for a wife that causes a man to make a promise he then does not fulfil.[152]

There are also a couple of inscriptions with related content, where a person has been unable to fulfil a promise. In *BWK* *45, Dogenēs was unable to repay his obligation to Zeus Peizenos after a prayer concerning his bull was fulfilled.[153] As a consequence, his daughter was punished with an eye disease. *BWK* *61 is a very revealing inscription, but it is doubtful whether it can be classified as a reconciliation inscription is the strictest sense. Unlike the other inscriptions, which record the reconciliation of a deity after a transgression with subsequent punishment, this inscription is raised in order to avert punishment. Tatianē promised to sacrifice a bull to Mēn Axiottenos regarding a request concerning her brother.[154] She has, however, been

---

[148] *TAM* V1 323; 324 and 534. See Ch. 4, 161-162.

[149] *BWK* *62, 4-8: εὔξετο ὑπὲρ υἱοῦ Φιλήμο|νος, εἰ ἔσται ὁλόκληρος καὶ ἰα||⁵τροῖς μὴ ποσδαπανήσι, στηλ|λογραφῆσαι, καὶ γενομένης | τῆς εὐχῆς οὐκ ἀπέδωκεν (...).

[150] *BWK* *65, 2-4: εὔξατο, εἰ | τεκνώσει· γεναμένη[ς] | τῆς εὐχῆς παρήλκυσε (...).

[151] See Ch. 4, 161.

[152] *BWK* *101, 2-6: εὐξά[με]|νος, ἐὰν λήψεται | γυναῖκαν, ἣν θέλω, | καὶ λαβὼν καὶ μὴ ἀ||⁵ποδὼν τὴν εὐχήν (...).

[153] *BWK* *45, 2-3: εὐξάμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ | βοὸς κὲ μὴ ἀποδούς (...).

[154] *BWK* *61, 2-4: εὐξαμένη ταῦρον ὑ|πὲρ ἀδελφῶν καὶ ἀκουσ|θεῖσα (...). Tatianē's request was probably related to the healing of disease.

unable to give the bull, and asks the god to accept the inscription as a compensation for the bull, and the god does so.[155]

As we know, curse magic and judicial prayers form a major theme in this genre. Judicial prayers are related to ex-voto cults, because the gods would be entitled to thanksgiving if the perpetrator was punished. The person raising a *skēptron* or writing a *defixio* was expected to raise an inscription recording the powers of the god invoked in the binding spell. *BWK* *59 is one of the most revealing and complicated of the reconciliation inscriptions. It appears to tell the story of a theft of a semi-precious stone, and how Mēn punished the thief after being invoked through a judicial prayer. But it was not the thief who raised the inscription recording the annulment of the binding spell. The woman who performed the binding ritual kept silent about the incident at the request of the thief's mother, and thereby neglected her duty to show the god gratitude for the fulfilment of her prayer by spreading the word of the god's powers.[156]

By committing the transgressions described above, the perpetrators violated both the gods' demand for cult and the principle of reciprocity which was a fundamental precondition for communication between gods and humans.[157] It is no wonder that this was regarded as a major offence in a culture where there was no clear division between public and private religion and piety. Paying proper honour to the gods was an obligation of the community as well as of the individual worshipper. There are, however, no obvious parallels between these accounts and Greek cultic regulations. The lack of analogous demands in most Greek cultic regulations may be explained by the fact that such demands were not regarded as necessary. Paying respect to the gods was after all a central aspect of most cults, and therefore regarded as self-evident. It is surprising to see that it was so strongly emphasised in Lydian religion, and in this respect it is reasonable to claim that there was a significant difference from similar rules found in Greek cultic regulations.

---

[155] *BWK* *61, 4-7: μὴ δυνασθεῖσα δὲ | ἀποδοῦναι ταῦρον ἠρώτη‖⁵σε τὸν θεόν, καὶ συνεχώρησε | ἀπολαβεῖν στήλλην.

[156] *BWK* *59, 15-19: περικρυβούσης τε αὐτῆς τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ‖¹⁵ θεοῦ διὰ τὸ ἠρωτῆσθαι ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς | τῆς παρθένου, ἵνα σειγήσι, καὶ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ|το ἐνεμέσησε, ὅτι οὐκ ἐξεφάντευ|σε οὐδὲ ὕψωσε τὸν θεὸν ἡ Συντύχη· See Gordon 2004b, 192.

[157] See Ch. 4, 173-174.

b. Neglect of religious offices

The other main transgression described in this group of reconciliation inscriptions is illegitimate absence from religious ceremonies or services.[158] These transgressions were probably committed by men and women with special religious obligations. We do not know much about how Lydian and Phrygian priests and other religious officials were elected, but there are indications that they were chosen from the community. One of the indications is found in *BWK* *57: Trophimē refuses to appear immediately at a service (*hyperēsia*) she was called to by the god.[159] We find a similar story in *BWK* *108, where Gaius Antonius Apellas refuses to be present at the celebration or the mysteries he is called to partake in.[160] Admittedly there are no indication of the nature of the institutions or authorities that called on Trophimē and Gaius Antonius Apellas, but we must assume that it was a local body of priests.

Two of the inscriptions in this group, *BWK* *16 and *111, are more dubious, but the vocabulary and phrases in these texts make it likely that they too describe illegitimate absence from religious duties. In *BWK* *16 the transgression is described as διὰ τὸ ἐνλιπέσθε ἡ|μέρας, and viewed in the light of the texts analysed above, it is reasonable to believe that the transgressor Agathopus had been absent from a religious duty.[161] The final inscription in this group, *BWK* *111, is even more uncertain, and it is not possible to establish with certainty whether the transgression in question is absence from a religious ceremony. The text says ἐπεὶ ἠθέλησα μεῖνε μετὰ ||[4] γυνεκός· (4-5). There is a possibility that this inscription describes an incident of ritual impurity, but the meaning may also be that the transgressor preferred to stay with his wife than perform his religious duties.

---

[158] *BWK* *16; *57; *108; *111(?); *113.

[159] *BWK* *57, 2-6: (...) Τροφίμη Ἀρτεμιδώρου Κι|κιννᾶδος κληθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ | θεοῦ ἰς ὑπηρεσίας χάριν μὴ | βουληθοῦσα ταχέος προσελ||[5]θεῖν, ἐκολάσετο αὐτὴν καὶ μα|νῆναι ἐποίησεν· It is not clear which god called Trophime to the service. When she has been punished she asked three deities, Μήτηρ Ταρσηνή, Ἀπόλλων Τάρσιος and Μήν Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἀξιοττηνός, about how to perform the reconciliation.

[160] *BWK* *108, 3-5: (...) διὰ τὸ μ‹η› βούλεσθε | [α]ὐτὸν προσελθεῖν καὶ παρεστάναι | τῷ μυστηρίῳ καλούμενον (...).

[161] Petzl 1994, 24.

Transgressions of this kind are not obviously paralleled in Greek cultic regulations, but the relationship to the idea of gods demanding cult is quite clear. The closest parallel is probably the category of cultic regulations that give terms for the office of priesthood.[162] Here we find rules regulating when priests are supposed to be present in temples. On the other hand, there are no examples of reactions against or punishments of priests who violate these rules.

c. Other transgressions

One inscription is difficult to fit into any of the categories mentioned above. *BWK* 4 tells the story of Severus who tried to prevent the cutting of wreaths, probably intended for cultic purposes.[163] It is uncertain whether it describes a neglect of cultic law, or neglect of religious duty. But I am inclined to classify it under the last category, or rather to interpret the transgression as an attempt to hinder someone in their performance of a religious duty. This does not, however, explain why Severus tried to stop someone from cutting wreaths. The explanation is probably that they were cut from trees belonging to Severus and that he was simply trying to protect his own property. We may assume that the actual background to this text was a dispute over property and ownership of the trees. Seen in retrospect, the death of Severus[164] was probably interpreted as a result of impiety. It is not stated who tried to cut wreaths from Severus' trees, and although it is likely that it was officals from a temple,[165] we cannot rule out the possibility that it might have been representatives of the other part to the conflict, who claimed ownership to the trees.[166]

---

[162] E.g. *LSAM* *4; *11; *13; *23. *LSS* *77; *130. *LSCG* *69; *117; *157. *LSCG* *69, 1-5 contains rules for the priest's presence in the shrine, see Hauken 1989.

[163] *BWK* 4, 2-4: ἐπεὶ | ἐκώλυσεν ὁ Σεβῆρος τὸ | στεφάνωμα κοπῆναι (...). BWK 4 is one of the few reconciliation inscriptions where the transgression is depicted.

[164] It is not stated explicitly that Severus was punished by death, but we may assume so due to the fact that the inscription is raised by his foster daughters.

[165] Petzl 1994, 6: "Severus wollte, wie es das Relief zeigt, seine Bäume vor Verstümmelung durch das Tempelpersonal bewahren".

[166] Gordon 2004b, 187: "We must assume that these were his own trees, and that in this area, probably near Saittai, the temple claimed the right within customary limits to cut branches for festivals at will, a

4. Reconciliation inscriptions with uncertain content

A number of transgressions are not directly associated with notions of impurity, but still constituting violations of cultic laws, i.e. stealing or damaging the property of the temple. Two of these records are probably related to rules for the proper conduct of sacrifice, namely *BWK* *1 and 123. They both tell stories of meat that was eaten without being sacrificed. In *BWK* *1 Meidōn has been made dumb because his servants ate meat that had not been sacrificed,[167] while *BWK* 123 may contain a command to priests or officials of the temple not to eat this kind of meat.[168] The last quotation may have been taken from a cultic law. The point is that these people have eaten meat that was intended for the deity or was a leftover from the sacrificial ritual. Cultic laws often contain detailed rules for the distribution of the sacrificial meat and specify which parts of the victim that are to be given to the deity and which parts may be given to the priests or the participants in the rituals.[169] These transgressions were probably related to such rules. On the other hand, there is no evidence that Lydians and Phrygians were prohibited from eating certain kinds of food in the way that Jewish dietary rules prohibited this. As pointed out in Ch. 3, Greek cultic regulations do not impose general dietary rules upon worshippers, instead demanding abstinence and purification from some kinds of food prior to participation in religious rituals due to the need for ritual purity.[170] The reconciliation inscriptions do not, however, contain any accounts of breaches of dietary rules, except the prohibition against eating un-sacrificed meat.

---

right that owners of lessees of timber resented, since such rights could easily be exploited in pursuit of private enmities, or simply in the endless conflict of interests between rich and poor".

[167] *BWK* *1, 3: οἱ διάκονοι ἄθυτα ἐφάγοσαν (...).

[168] *BWK* 123, 4-6: διὸ παρανγέλλω μηθ|ένα ἱερὸν ἄθυτον αἰγοτόμιον ἔσθε||⁵ιν (...). G. Petzl translates ἱερόν as 'heiliger Funktionär' interpreting the accusative case as subject for ἔσθειν. This may be justified by word order and μηθένα. Possibly, the word could be taken as an attribute of αἰγοτόμιον. See Ch. 6, 238, n. 62.

[169] *E.g. LSCG* *12 A, 8-13; 55, 9-11; *69, 25-30; *90, 4-7; *119, 1-9; *125, 1-5; *151 B, 18-21; *163, 14-15. *LSS* *19, 31-33; *77, 5-10; *78, 4-8. *LSAM* 12, 13-14; *48, 15-18; *52, 3-8; .

[170] See Ch. 3, 112-114.

The remaining inscriptions[171] in this group have more uncertain contents, or are fragmentary. *BWK* *33 is quite hard to interpret, partly because the upper part of the inscription is missing, but also because it is not clear whether the ἐνποδισθ[ῖ]|σα ἐν τῷ| ναῷ| ἐκο|λάσθη (2-3) describes the reason for the punishment, or the punishment itself. The word ἐμποδίζω means 'put the feet in bonds', 'hinder' or 'to be a hindrance to, interfere with'.[172] The last meaning of the word should take the dative case, but this is not found here. But if we still assume that this is the meaning of the expression, there is a possibility that the transgressor interfered in the matters of the temple, in which he or she was regarded as an intruder. Petzl suggests in his commentary to this text that this refers to an actual imprisonment of the transgressor,[173] but Chaniotis points out that as in *BWK* 5 is a metaphor for the punishment.[174] Due to the missing lines it is impossible to determine whether ἐνποδισθ[ῖ]|σα is part of the transgression or the punishment.

BWK *37 is also hard to interpret. The inscription tells the story of Apollōnios who was living in the house of the god, as the god ordered him to.[175] The account of the transgression is very limited (5: ἐπὶ ἠπίθησεν), and contains no details. Apollōnios may have been a priest or a temple servant, and failed to conduct his duties.[176] The syntax is

---

[171] *BWK* 25; *33; *37; *71; 78; *81; *95; 114. *BWK* 25 is heavily damaged, and only the right-hand side of the inscription is preserved. This makes it difficult to establish what the transgression was, but line 5 contains the word ἐλοιδόρη[σ, i.e. 'ridicule'. Line 6 contains the phrase ἐ]ν τῷ ναῷ, which indicates that the transgression took place inside the temple. *BWK* *81 is also severely damaged, and the only reason for classifying it in this category is the βω[μ–] (2), which probably is a fragment of the word βωμός. This may mean that the transgression was committed within the *temenos*.

[172] *LSJ* s.v. ἐμποδίζω. Varinlioğlu 1991 reads ἐνποδισθ[εῖ]|σα but this is rejected by *SEG* XLI 1038 arguing that there is only room for one letter.

[173] Petzl 1994, 39. *Editio princeps* E. Varinlioğlu 1991, 92 argues for a metaphorical interpretation, while H.W. Pleket comments in *SEG* XLI 1038: "it is hard to see why the woman should not have been 'thwarted in the temple', i.e. imprisoned temporarily until she confessed her sins".

[174] Chaniotis 2004, 22-30.

[175] *BWK* *37, 2-5: Ἐπὶ Ἀπολλώνιος | οἰκῶν ἐν οἰκίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ παραν|γελλομένῳ αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ θε|οῦ (...).

[176] Petzl 1994, 46-47. Gordon 2004, 196 translates this text: "Whereas Apollōnios, resident in the God's house – seeing that he had been given a command by the God – when he disobeyed (the God) caused etc". Gordon also suggests that Apollōnios might have been a temple slave with special responsibility for guarding the temple.

rather incoherent with an embedded absolute dative[177] which might refer to an order to attend a religious service, but this can only remain speculation.

BWK *71 should perhaps rather be classified as 'Neglect of religious duty', because the transgression that causes the divine punishment is a failure to raise an inscription within a time limit.[178] The god ordered this inscription, because Apollōnios had ridiculed the god Mēn and was punished.[179] We are here dealing with two transgressions that both cause divine punishment, but the transgressions are different in nature. The abuse of the deity is clearly a reference to neglect of cultic law, while the postponement of the dedication of the inscription is neglect of religious duty.

The transgression described in *BWK* *95 is a wrongly uttered word,[180] but it is not specified what was said and in what context. Petzl suggests that Ammias may have failed to comply with a cultic prohibition or a command of silence.[181] The bottom part of the inscription is missing, and several words are illegible. This makes it impossible to give a reliable interpretation of the text.

BWK 114 contains the interesting story of how a woman, whose name is erased from the inscription, brought soldiers into a shrine because she wanted to fight against an enemy.[182] Georg Petzl classifies this inscription in the category *Nötigung der 'Geistlichkeit' durch Einschaltung ziviler Behörden*.[183] Stephen Mitchell also comments on this text that:

> The item provides evidence from an unexpected quarter for the presence of Roman soldiers
> in secular Asian communities during the later second or third century.[184]

---

[177] *BWK* *37, 3-5: παραν|γελλομένῳ αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ θε|οῦ (...).

[178] *BWK* *71, 8-11: Παρελκύ|σαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ χρόνον | καὶ μὴ ἀποδιδόντος αὐτοῦ ||[10] τὰ μέρη (...).

[179] *BWK* *71, 2-5: Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀπολλω|νίου μεγαλορημονήσα|ς Μῆνα Ἀξιεττηνὸν καὶ | ἐκολάσθη.

[180] *BWK* *95, 4-5: δι᾿ ἁ|μαρτίαν λόγον λαλήσασ[α] (...).

[181] Petzl 1994, 113: *[M]öglicherweise gab sie ein heiliges ἀπόρρητον preis oder hielt ein vorgeschriebenes Redeverbot nicht ein* (Pettazzoni, Confessione III 68f.).

[182] *BWK* 114, 2-5: ἐπεὶ ἀνήγαγα σ|τρατιώτας ἐπὶ τὸ ἱε|ρὸν ἐχθρὸν θέλου|σα ἀμύνασθαι (...).

[183] Petzl 1994, XII, 135.

[184] Mitchell 1995, 194.

I am not convinced by Petzl's idea that this has something to do with interference in the matters of the priests; there is no mention of this in the text. I rather think it is an account of failure to comly with the prohibition against bringing weapons into a temple.[185] Chaniotis assumes that the enemy whom the woman sought might have been a suppliant.[186] In that case, the transgression may well have been both a violation of a prohibition against weapons inside the temenos and a threat to the sanctity of those who sought *asylia*.[187]

C. Categories II & III: Judicial prayers and perjury

1. Civil conflicts

I will only give a brief introduction to the topic of judicial prayers and perjury in the reconciliation inscriptions here, because this issue has been comprehensively studied by other scholars.[188] Only some instances will therefore be looked at in detail. Reconciliation inscriptions describing civil conflicts, judicial prayers and perjury are nevertheless important for the study of religious transgression and form an important contrast to the latter.

By civil conflicts I mean conflicts between human beings. These conflicts are the issues of 25 inscriptions included in *BWK*[189] and involve financial and personal irregularities, such as the thefts of private possessions, incidents of fraud or problematic personal relations. As stated earlier, civil conflicts are not transgressions in the strictest sense. Even if a person had committed some kind of offence against another person the gods only seem to have punished wrongdoers on certain conditions. One example is *BWK* *44:

> Ἔτους [.]θ΄, μη(νὸς) Πε[ρειτίου Day ?].
> Θεοδότη Γλύκω[νι ἐπηράσατο]

---

[185] *LSCG* 124, 13; *LSS* 59, 21; *LSS* 91, 6. This interpretation is supported by Chaniotis 1997, 361, n. 42.

[186] See note 185.

[187] For the protection of suppliants see *LSAM* 29, 8 (?) and 75, 7.

[188] See Ch. 1, 24-30.

[189] *BWK* *2; *3; *15; *18; *21; *27; *28; *34; *35; *44; *47; *52; *54; *58; *60; *68; *69; *79; *102; *103; *105; 106; 107; *119; 120.

θρεπτῷ, ἐπιδὴ ἀράμ[ενος]

τὰ χῖρας αὐτῇ ἐκα[κώσα]–

5 το, κὲ ἀποθανούση[ς αὐτῆς]

κὲ τοῦ Γλύκωνος ὁ [θεὸς]

ἐπεζήτησεν παρὰ [Name]

τοῦ ἐκγόνου αὐτῆς, [καὶ ἀπέ]–

δωκε καὶ ἀπὸ νῦν ε[ὐλογεῖ].

This inscription poses some problems because the entire right side of the stele is missing and attempts at reconstructions have given no certain results.[190] But it is reasonable to assume that the text records a personal conflict between a woman and her apprentice or foster son (θρεπτός), and it seems as if the conflict is of a private nature. The exact meaning of the text eludes us, and it is impossible to establish with certainty what took place between the two people. But it seems clear that their death can hardly be seen as a result of the transgression or crime. It is therefore better understood as a 'conflict'. Gordon interprets this text as an attempt to settle a conflict between two families, Theodotē's and Glykōn's. By raising the inscription, Gordon claims, they tried to reconcile two versions of the same story and the question of who was actually punished by the gods.[191]

Perjury on the other hand is clearly a transgression, both judicially and religiously, for reasons I will comment upon below. The main difference between incidents involving judicial prayers and incidents of perjury is that the element of oath is missing in the first group.

2. Judicial prayers

11 of the reconciliation inscriptions describe a judicial prayer as the cause of the punishment.[192] As pointed out in Ch. 4, the term 'judicial prayers' was introduced by Versnel and denotes a special category of ancient curse magic. Unlike mere curses, judicial prayers contain arguments and justifications as to why someone should be

---

[190] Petzl (1994), "Die Ergänzungen und damit die Interpretation der Zeilen 3 und 4 sind unsicher".

[191] Gordon 2004b, 195-196.

[192] *BWK* *3; *18; *21; *28; *35; *44; *47; *60; *68; *69; *79.

punished; persons who claim to be wronged ask the gods to give justice by punishing the wrongdoers. The lawsuit is then handed over to the gods who may both punish the guilty party and demand compensation.[193]

We can differentiate between two types of reconciliation inscriptions concerning binding spells and judicial prayers: a) inscriptions recording the punished person's or his relatives' lifting of the spell, and b) inscriptions involving judicial prayers and binding spells recording the fulfilment of obligation to the god that the person who performs the prayer makes. This means that these inscriptions are attestations of fulfilled prayers and not reconciliation inscriptions in the strictest sense.

A good example of the first group is *BWK* *68, which gives a vivid account of a quarrel over livestock that by mistake were intermingled with another herd. This is a long inscription (25 lines), and gives several details of the conflict, in which one of the parties refused to deliver the animals back to their owners.[194] The wronged party raised a *skēptron* and thereby caused the death of Hermogenēs, who had refused to deliver the pigs back. The inscription has been raised by his wife, his children and his brother and attests that the goddess is properly propitiated.

The personal conflicts give interesting glimpses into the private sphere of ancient society and in particular the code of honour. These conflicts are mainly centred on questions of insults and violence. *BWK* *47, for instance, tells how a mother was insulted by her son.[195] *BWK* *69 is more problematic, and shows how a civil conflict develops into a religious transgression. Tatias had been accuesed (rightfully the text claims) by public opinion of witchcraft against her son-in-law.[196] When Tatias raised a *skēptron* in the temple, probably with the purpose of clearing her name,[197] the binding spell struck her and her son because she was guilty of what she had been accused of.

---

[193] See Ch. 4, 146-149.

[194] Petzl translate χοίρος (l. 6) as 'piglets'. Gordon argues that the presence of πρόβατα in line 9 must mean that the animals must have been sheep or goat; see Gordon 2004a, 199, n. 33.

[195] *BWK* *47, 2-4: Μηνοφίλα | ὑπὸ Πολυχρονίου τοῦ υἱοῦ χολιασθεῖσα (...).

[196] *BWK* *69, 3-9: Ἐπὶ | Ἰουκοῦνδος ἐγένετο ἐν | διαθέσι μανικῇ καὶ ὑπὸ πάν||⁵των διεφημίσθη ὡς ὑπὸ Τατιας τῆς πενθερᾶς αὐ|τοῦ φάρμακον αὐτῷ δεδόσ|θαι, (...).

[197] *BWK* *69, 9-13: ἡ δὲ Τατιας ἐπέστησεν | σκῆπτρον καὶ ἀρὰς ἔθηκεν ||¹⁰ ἐν τῷ ναῷ ὡς ἱκανοποιοῦ|σα περὶ τοῦ πεφημίσθαι αὐ|τὴν (...). For the discussion of the expression ὡς ἱκανοποιοῦσα (*BWK* *69, 11-12), see Petzl 1994, 90.

The binding spell was illegitimate and might have contained some form of self-cursing formulas. The inscription was raised by Tatias' family and states that they have ransomed the *skēptron* raised by Tatias, whereby she had performed an illegitimate judicial prayer that eventually rebounded on her.[198] This text also indicates why reconciliation inscriptions were regarded as important; Tatias had clearly become the victim of gossip. She failed, however, when she tried to take revenge on the campaign against her.

BWK *3 is very interesting because it gives a revealing picture of how a secular crime could be handled religiously. The binding spell was initiated in case something would be stolen from the public bath,[199] i.e. before anything was stolen. When a *himation* was stolen, the god, in this case Μεὶς Ἀξιοττηνός, punished the thief. The thief then brought the *himation* back, but interestingly it was not given back to the owner, and was at the demand of the god instead sold to provide money for the inscription.[200] The purpose was therefore not to provided justice to the man, from whom the *himation* hade been stolen, but to lift the binding spell and honour the power of the god. We find the same pattern in the other inscriptions describing a judicial prayer. *BWK* *3, *60, *68, *69 belong to this group.

The second group of inscriptions in this category is related to ex-voto cult as it is described in Ch. 4. When someone had successfully caused a wrongdoer to suffer by casting a binding spell, he or she was obliged to record the incident and give praise to the deity who had carried out the punishment. It is here a matter of reciprocating the services provided by the deity. These inscriptions are therefore, strictly speaking, not reconciliation inscriptions, and they are certainly not confessions of transgressions. They are fulfilments of promises made to the gods.

---

[198] *BWK* *69, 24-34: ἐπεζήτησαν | λυθῆναι τὸ σκῆπτρον καὶ τὰς ||²⁵ ἀρὰς τὰς γενομένας ἐν τῷ | ναῷ· ἃ ἔλυσαν τὰ Ἰοκούνδου | καὶ Μοσχίου, ἔγγονοι δὲ τῆς | Τατιας, Σωκράτεια καὶ Μοσχᾶς | καὶ Ἰουκοῦνδος καὶ Μενεκρά||³⁰της κατὰ πάντα ἐξειλασάμενοι | τοὺς θεούς, καὶ ἀπὸ νοῖν εὐλογοῦ|μεν στηλλογραφήσαντες τὰς δυ|νάμις τῶν θεῶν.

[199] *BWK* *3, 2-4: Ἐπεὶ ἐπεστάθη σκῆ|πτρον, εἴ τις ἐκ τοῦ βαλανείου τι | κλέψι (...).

[200] *BWK* *3, 8-11: Ὁ θεὸς οὖν ἐκέλέ|σε δι᾽ ἀνγέλου πραθῆναι τὸ εἰμά|τιν καὶ στηλλογραφῆσαι τὰς δυ||¹⁰νάμεις.

As an example of this category we can look at *BWK* *35, where the *katoikia,* probably a village or local community,[201] of the Tazenians asks the gods to punish the thieves who stole the documents from some orphans. The bottom of the stele is missing, but there are reasons to believe that the text is a thanksgiving for the accomplishment of the prayer,[202] since it is stated that the thieves are dead.[203] *BWK* *47 tells how a mother curses her son, and is required to record the incident in an inscription.[204] A recently published inscription[205] contains Glykōn's and Myrtion's praise of Mēn and Mētēr for their assistance in a conflict with Glykōn's nephew Dēmainetos concerning property and possibly blackmail.[206] Glykōn thanks the gods for helping him. It is not explicitly stated that Dēmainetos died, but it is reasonable to assume that he was punished in some way.

3. Perjury

A transgression closely connected to the category of judicial prayers is unfulfilled oaths, the recorded transgression in 14 inscriptions.[207] The stories told in these inscriptions basically revolve around the same issues as the other inscriptions describing secular conflicts, but with one crucial difference, namely the element of unfulfilled oath. In ancient societies, the oath was a strong means of securing the validation of statements or agreements,[208] and was consequently regarded as sacrosanct. When an oath was taken, gods were invoked as witnesses. In order to ensure that the oath was fulfilled, it would often contain a self-curse in which those who took the oath asked the gods to punish

---

[201] *LSJ*, s.v. κατοικία: *habitation, farm, village, settlement.*

[202] *BWK* *35, 16-19: Ὁ θεὸς [οὖν] | [ἐπεζήτ]ησε (?) στηλλογραφῆσα[ι εὐ|λογοῦντας τὰ]ς δυνάμις, ὅτι [ ] | [ ]. ΤΗΣ[ ].

[203] *BWK* *35, 14-16: καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐξεζήτησεν [καὶ] | ἐκολάσετο καὶ διέφθειρε τοὺς [ἐπι]||¹⁵βουλεύσαντας αὐτοῖς.

[204] *BWK* *47, 9-11: ἐκέλευσεν αὐτην | στηλλογραφῆσαι τὰς δυνά||¹⁰μεις τῶν θεῶν.

[205] Malay 2003.

[206] The text states that the nephew has imprisoned his uncle. Malay interprets this as an attempt to get more money out of Glykōn.

[207] *BWK* *2; *15; *27; *34; *52; *54; *58; *102; *103; *105; 106; 107; *119(?); 120.

[208] Burkert 1985, 250-254.

them if they were to commit perjury.[209] These formulas would often ask the gods not only to destroy the oath-breaker but also his family and household. In this sense, the notions expressed in the reconciliation inscriptions concerning perjury are in accordance with the common ancient view. The punishment for perjury described in the reconciliation inscriptions is often harsh, and it not unusual that the perjurer or members of his household die.

The perjurer is not expected to fulfil the original terms of the oath when he or she is being punished. Reconciliation inscriptions recording incidents of perjury are rather meant to attest the annulment of the oath, not the fulfilment of the obligation toward the other party to the conflict. As was the case with judicial prayers, the lawsuit was entirely handed over to the gods. In addition, the ransoming or annulment of binding spells often takes place after the death of the perjurer. As pointed out above, the unfulfilled oath remains a threat to those left behind, and it is therefore necessary to perform rituals for the gods and pay the required sum of money to the temple in order to resolve the oath. When the oath was no longer considered active, the inscription was raised as evidence.

An example of how relatives become involved when an oath is not fulfilled is found in *BWK* *15, which tells the story of a man who stubbornly refused to annul an oath.[210] It is eventually his wife who annuls the oath and gives an account of their fate; an indication that the perjurer himself is dead. *BWK* *34 tells the shocking story of how Hermogenēs swore an oath related to cattle trade, and shows how severe the punishments for false oaths were thought to be. The god, who is not named in the inscription, punishes Hermogenes first by killing his bull and donkey, and when he still refuses to annul the oath, his daughter dies. Then he annuls the oath,[211] but it is Aphias and her children who raise the inscription. It is not stated what relations they have to

---

[209] One of the most famous examples is the oath from Plataiai taken by the Greek forces in 479 BC prior to the battle against the Persian army.

[210] *BWK* *15, 1-2: ἀ|τενῶς ὀμόσας (...).

[211] *BWK* *34, 13-14: τότε ἔλυσεν τὸ|ν ὅρκον.

Hermogenēs, but they were probably his relatives[212] given what we know of the ancient understanding of oath and perjury. In this case, we may assume that the family wanted to clear itself from the accusation of perjury by stating that the oath of Hermogenēs was already annulled.

BWK *58 gives a more puzzling picture, because the story of how Eudoxos annuls an oath taken by his wife only forms the eight first lines of a total of twentyone.[213] The remaining thirteen lines give a price list for annulling oaths and binding spells (*skēptron*). This part of the text does probably not refer to the case of Eudoxos and his wife, but seems to come from a cultic regulation, maybe from a temple that could offer the appropriate rituals for resolving binding spells and oaths. The style of this passage differs from the account of Eudoxos and the price he pays (nine obols) is not the price demanded by the regulation. The subjects of the passage are the impersonal ὁ λύων ὅρκους (10-11) and ὁ λύων σκῆπτρον (16), which also indicates that this is a quotation from a cultic regulations. This text is thus an important source for the practice of the reconciliation inscriptions and gives further understanding of the role of priests in the cult.[214] The text states that annulling an oath or a *skēptron* will cost 175 *denarii*[215] and that this has to be documented by raising an inscription.[216]

Based on the fact that 6 of the inscriptions in this group state clearly that the oath has been resolved and the spell has been lifted[217] we can conclude that the inscriptions do not record the confession of sin, but are attestations of the resolution of oaths. The passage of *BWK* *58, 9-21 gives evidence that this was to a great extent a question of

---

[212] *BWK* *34, 14-18: Ἀφιας καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς Ἀλέ|ξανδρος, Ἄτταλος, Ἀπολ‹ώ›νιος, Ἀμιο||[15]ν ἐστήσομεν τὴν στήλην καὶ ἐγράψομε|ν τὰς δυνάμις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ νῦν εὐλ|ογοῦμεν. See also Petzl 1994, 42.

[213] *BWK* *58, 4-8: ἐπεὶ | ὤμοσεν Σάρδιον καὶ παρώρκησεν, διὰ τοῦ||[5]το – μήπω οὖσα ἐνῆλιξ {ουσα} – δαπανή|σας ὁ Εὔδοξος ἐννέα ὀβολοὺς ἔλυσε τοὺς ὅρκους καὶ ἐστηλογ{γ}ράφησε̣ | καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ.

[214] See Ch. 1, 16; 25; 26-29.

[215] *BWK* *58, 9-12: Ἵνα λύονται οἱ ὅρκοι τῷ | ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἀξιοττηνοῦ, ὥστε ὁ ||[10] λύων ὅρκους δαπανήσει δηνάρια ἑ|κατὸν ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε. 16-18: ὁ λύων σκῆπτρον θήσ|ει ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν δηνάρια ἑκατὸν ἑβδο|μήκοντα πέντε{ι} (...).

[216] *BWK* *58, 12-16: τειμὴ|ν δὲ λήμψεται ἀφ᾽ αὐτῶν, ἣν ἂν ἐ|περωτήσι, εἰ ταῦτα δικαίως γ{ι}εγρ|αμμένα εἰσί, ἵν᾽ ἀνέσστησεν ||[15] στήλλην·

[217] *BWK* *15; *34; *52; *54; *58; *103.

money and payment. As the curse remains a threat to the perjurer or even to the family of the perjurer until the oath has been resolved according to specific rules and rituals. Accordingly, in several inscriptions it is the family or a member of the family who resolve the oath after the death of the perjurer.[218] Why it was important to confirm that an oath had been resolved must of course remain speculation, but I think the answer lies in the social exclusion that an accusation of perjury probably entailed. By raising an inscription, the family may have had the opportunity to clear itself of this accusation, and thereby try to regain its social status.

Even though perjury cannot be directly associated with cultic morality, there are indications that a perjurer was regarded as unfit to worship and as ritually polluted. The best example of this is *BWK* 120, which tells how Sōsandros walked up to the 'common altar' when he was impure after swearing falsely.[219] This is not, however, a notion found in Greek cultic regulations.

4. Civil transgressions in the reconciliation inscriptions – concluding remarks

Transgressions or crimes that cannot immediately be attached to the religious sphere turn out to be closely associated with religion. In the case of secular conflicts it is questionable whether we can speak of 'transgressions' at all. Perjury is definitively a transgression, but as I have shown, in most cases of secular conflict the punishment is not caused by the crime, but by a judicial prayer or binding spell. This must imply that a civil crime in itself is of no concern to the gods, unless the gods are asked to intervene. The act of perjury is a crime against the gods, because the oath is taken in their name, but the perjury also activates the curse that is embedded in the oath. The inscriptions recording secular crimes are therefore not confessions of guilt in these matters, but attestations of properly resolved binding spells and oaths.

These stories can easily give the impression that the gods were thought to punish even crimes of the kind mentioned above, especially financial conflicts. This

---

[218] *BWK* *15; *34; *54; *58; *102. In *BWK* *102 it is not explicitly stated that the oath has been annulled. The inscription consists only of three lines, but the perjury was committed by the wife of the dedicator: Θάλαμος Διὶ Ορκαμαν[ί]τῃ χάριν ἐφορκίας γυναικ[ί]ας.

[219] *BWK* 120, 1-5: Σώσανδρος Ἱεραπολέ|της ἐπιορκήσας καὶ | ἄναγνος ἰσῆλθα ἰς τὸ | σύνβωμον· ἐκολάσ||⁴θην·

interpretation was also part of the theories of a sacred judicial system put forward by Steinleitner and Zingerle. This is an oversimplification. The crimes or the conflicts are not the actual reasons for the punishment inflicted upon the perpetrators. Of the eleven inscriptions containing an account of a secular conflict, nine are related to judicial prayers.[220] The conclusion must be that the gods were not perceived as guardians of secular law in the way that Zingerle and Steinleitner understood it. In most of the inscriptions describing a secular conflict or crime, it is quite clearly stated that it is a judicial prayer that causes the punishment, and not the crime committed itself. There is no reason to believe that the inscriptions affirm the notion of the gods interfering in human affairs unless through a judicial prayer.[221] Still, it is evident that these texts testify to a clear notion of justice: a wrongdoer should be punished and a prayer for justice must be legitimate. It is also interesting to note that binding spells or judicial prayers have to be justifiable. The person who casts the spell has to justify his or her act and the accused person has to be guilty. If the opposite is the true, the spell will make the person who performed the binding ritual suffer.[222]

Even though civil crimes did not strictly speaking fall within the jurisdiction of the temples, the judicial prayers did, and the temples had the authority to annul them. It would therefore be wrong to separate the inscriptions belonging to this group from the inscriptions recording religious transgression; they belong to the same context of beliefs and rituals. We must not focus exclusively on the transgressions, however, because we will then lose the crucial point of these texts, namely the reconciliation of the deity through the annulment of the judicial prayers or oaths. The inscriptions attesting the annulment of binding spells and oath will therefore provide a useful model for this genre as a whole.

D. Conclusions

The reconciliation inscriptions represent a small amount of material and do not allow us to draw very far-reaching conclusions. Their contents are often limited and their style

---

[220] *BWK* *3; *28(?); *35; *44; *47; *60; *68; *69; *79.

[221] See also *CMRDM* III, 27.

[222] See *BWK* *69.

tends to be formulaic; what they present is only a glimpse of the entire stories behind the texts. As a result of this, it is not possible to postulate a direct relationship or continuity between notions of cultic morality as they are expressed on the one hand in Greek cultic regulations and on the other in reconciliation inscriptions.

Some transgressions described in the reconciliation inscriptions have parallels in the prohibitions of Greek cultic regulations. There is most common ground between them with regard to ritual impurity or damage to sacred property. Prohibitions against entering a sacred precinct when ritually polluted and periods of exclusion from sacred places are attested in both genres. The protection of sacred trees and groves in addition to other forms of sacred property is also an issue with several similarities in both Greek cultic regulations and in the reconciliation inscriptions. The two genres thus define certain limits of behaviour in a cultic context. Certain actions are not tolerated within the cultic sphere. We may conclude that Greek religion, with its high degree of continuity, and Lydian and Phrygian religion of the first three centuries AD, shared a concept of cultic morality.

I have argued that Greek cultic morality was not identical with general morality or a general mode of life. The rules of proper behaviour in ritual contexts were often not applied outside these contexts,[223] and this is one of the main differences between rules in Greek cultic regulations and the Jewish Pentateuch.[224] Observance of the rules of cultic morality was for the ancient Greeks a way of showing one's piety but it was not an aspect of Greek ethnic identity to the same degree as the Jewish rules were. I would also argue that there is no evidence that cultic morality as it was practiced in Lydia and Phrygia had a more far-reaching range or meaning than Greek cultic morality. The transgressions associated with ritual impurity are in most cases acts taking place inside a sacred precinct; a fact that is often explicitly stated in the texts. There is nothing in the reconciliation inscriptions to indicate that Lydian and Phrygian temples imposed purity or dietary rules or demands of sexual abstinence upon worshippers outside cultic contexts. There are a few texts which may give a divergent picture, such as the punishment of Theodōros described in *BWK* 5 and the account found in *BWK* 112 of a woman walking impure through the village. But in both cases it seems to be justifiable

---

[223] See Ch. 2, 49.

[224] See Ch. 3, 138.

to claim that the transgressions were related to cultic activity. Also in this respect we can conclude that Greek and Lydian-Phrygian cultic morality of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd centuries AD coincided to a large extent.

The most striking feature of the transgressions described in reconciliation inscriptions is therefore not their mere character and contents, but the reactions with which they were met. What is most surprising is the fact that the reconciliation inscriptions do not distinguish between an exegetical and a criminal level of religious transgressions in the way that we find in Greek cultic regulations.[225] As pointed out in Ch. 3 there is a clear tendency in Greek cultic regulations not to stipulate punishments for failure to comply with purity rules, i.e. the exegetical level, while identifiable transgressions such as stealing or damaging religious objects, i.e. the criminal level, are regarded as equal to other criminal acts and punished in the same way. In the reconciliation inscriptions the criminal level is simply missing. Criminal acts, such as theft or violations of sacred property, are not punished by civil authorities but by divine ones. At least there is no record of criminal acts being punished by fines or flogging. Why were these transgressions not punished in that way? If the priests of Lydia and Phrygia possessed the far-reaching power that some scholars have claimed they had, they should have been able to impose such punishments upon transgressors. But nowhere is there any mention of this. It is no surprise that wrongdoers are thought to be punished by gods when judicial prayers or perjury are involved. The practices described in the reconciliation inscriptions do not, however, diverge fundamentally from similar practices elsewhere in the ancient world. Judicial prayers are after all not an exclusively Lydian genre. Elsewhere, however, they belonged more to the realm of magic and did not represent an institutionalised practice. What the reconciliation inscriptions appear to demonstrate is that the notion of divine punishment found in curses and judicial prayers had been transferred to the realm of cultic morality as well.

---

[225] See Ch. 3, 137-140.

Chapter 6

CONCLUSIONS

A. Introduction

This study has sought to analyse legislation and practice concerning violations of the moral code of piety expressed in Greek cultic regulations in general and Lydian and Phrygian reconciliation inscriptions in particular. This final chapter will sum up the similarities and differences of the notion and practice of cultic morality as found in the two epigraphic genres analysed in the previous chapters. It will also offer a possible explanation as to why the consequences of both religious transgressions and judicial prayers were obviously handled by the same institutions and recorded in the same epigraphic genre. By analysing two texts not previously discussed in detail in this study, it will be shown that there is reason to assume that there was a close connection between judicial prayers and curses used to punish wrongdoers and the way in which violators of religious prohibitions were treated. Finally, answers will be presented to the questions asked in Ch. 1 about the ideology and function of the reconciliation inscriptions, and some reflections will be added on the question of the origin of the reconciliation inscriptions.

My survey of earlier research has shown that most scholars have rejected the possibility of a relationship between Greco-Roman religion and the religion to which the reconciliation inscriptions belonged. The reason for this has mainly been the definition of the reconciliation inscriptions as confessions, of which there is no evidence in classical Greek religion. As demonstrated in Ch. 1, however, reconciliation inscriptions were not primarily *confessions* of sins, but rather records of having achieved the propitiation and appeasement of a deity. This means that the argument of these scholars is no longer valid. My survey of other religious inscriptions from Catacecaumene also shows that religious practices and notions here did not differ fundamentally from religious notions elsewhere in Asia Minor. On the other hand, it is also true that reconciliation inscriptions as a genre are almost unparalleled in the ancient world. Do these perspectives change the way we should understand these texts and their place within the ancient religious landscape?

B. Cultic morality in reconciliation inscriptions and Greek cultic regulations

1. Transgressions

The aspect of the two genres that shares most similarities is the nature of the acts which are presented as unacceptable in cultic contexts. There is a high level of correspondence between the presentation of religious transgressions in the Lydian-Phrygian texts and the prohibitions of Greek cultic regulations. The transgressions are both associated with definition and protection of the borders between ritual and non-ritual spheres and with the protection of property belonging to the gods. Both genres obviously served mundane purposes, while aspects such as salvation, religious opinions or life after death are, in both cases, at best secondary.[1]

Furthermore, I would claim that neither Greek cultic regulations nor reconciliation inscriptions in general are concerned with the intentions of the transgressors. It is not a matter of acting in good faith or not, it is a matter of acting rightly or wrongly.[2] We have seen that some of the reconciliation inscriptions insist on the ignorance of the transgressors,[3] but nevertheless they were punished. Most of the cultic regulations, with just a few exceptions only demand that those who enter the shrine are fit for worship, in the sense that they are ritually pure.[4] In a few cases, it is true, cultic regulations demand

---

[1] A possible exception might be *BWK* *12. Lines 1-3 state: Κ. Βάσσα κο|λασθεῖσα ἔτη δ΄ καὶ μὴ πιστεύουσ|α τῷ θεῷ (...). The word 'belief' in this context should however not be taken in sense 'belief in the existence of' but rather 'acceptance of the cause of the suffering'. This is indicated in lines 4-5: ἐπ‹ι›τυχοῦσα δὲ περὶ ὧ|ν ἔπαθα (...).

[2] Gordon 2004b, 189: "Thoughts do not count in this world as 'events' in the required sense, and at least to that extent the texts are dissimilar to Christian notions of sin and confession". Ibid. 193: "[…] a fault was objectively a fault, just as a false oath was a false oath, whatever the person's intention".

[3] E.g. *BWK* 6, 6-10: Ἐπί με ἔλαθεν | κὲ ὑπερέβην τὸν | ὅρον ἄθετος, ἐκολάσαντο αὐτὸν | οἱ θεοί·; *BWK* *11, 2-5: Ἀθήναιος κολασ|θεὶς ὑπὸ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ | ἁμαρτείας κατὰ ἄγνοι|αν (...); *BWK* 76, 2-5: ἐπειδὴ κατὰ | ἄγνοιαν ἐκ τοῦ ἄλσου ἔκοψα | δένδρα θεῶν Διὸς Σαβαζίου καὶ | Ἀρτέμιδος Αναειτις (...).

[4] See Ch. 2, 72.

worshippers to be of a pure mind or similar,[5] but this is not a widespread demand in Greek cultic regulations, nor is this a theme in any reconciliation inscriptions. I have also pointed out that we rarely find moral or ethical claims in Greek cultic regulations, nor are there any demands for general moral behaviour. With the exception of a few regulations from Asia Minor,[6] sexual activity for instance is not regarded as wrong, provided the pollution is properly dealt with before one enters a shrine. There are no indications that religious institutions in Catacecaumene imposed moralistic demands upon worshippers; practically all transgressions of impurity are associated with entering the sacred precinct. This is reflected in Greek cultic regulations, with a possible exception in *LSAM* 20, which in most cases make no demands outside ritual contexts.

It is also significant that the reconciliation texts never deal with criminal acts which would fall under the jurisdiction of Roman courts. It is striking, for instance, that murder is never mentioned in any of the texts. We know that in the 1st century AD most of the Lydian villages were part of the *conventus* or διοικήσις of Sardis. This is attested by an inscription published by Christian Habicht in 1975.[7] Consequently, the inhabitants of Catacecaumene had access to the Roman legal system in cases of serious crimes. The human conflicts described in the reconciliation inscriptions,[8] in contrast, lie primarily on a very personal level and can only be lifted to a religious level through judicial prayers. This indicates that raising a *skēptron* in order to harm a culprit was one of several options anyone claiming to have been wronged disposed of as a means of gaining justice, although judicial prayers and reconciliation inscriptions cannot have excluded the possibility of addressing the official Roman legal system.

As Otto Eger concluded,[9] there is no evidence that there ever existed religious courts of law in Lydia or Phrygia passing sentences and imposing punishments upon perpetrators and transgressors. None of the reconciliation inscriptions published after

---

[5] E.g. *LSS* 82, 2: ὅσια φρονέοντα; *LSS* 108, 6-7: οὐ λουτρôι | ἀλλὰ νόῳ καθαρόν; *LSCG* 139, 4-8: χεῖρας καὶ | γνώμην καθαροὺς καὶ ὑγιε[ῖς] ||5 ὑπάρχοντας καὶ μηδὲν αὐτοῖς | δεινὸν συνειδότας | καὶ τὰ ἐκτός.

[6] E.g. *LSAM* 20.

[7] Habicht 1975; see *I.Ephesos* 13 = *SEG* XXXVII 884. For a survey of the Roman legal system, see Burton 1975.

[8] See Ch. 5, 214-222.

[9] See Ch. 1, 28-29.

Eger's article has provided information supporting the theories of a religious legal system put forward by Steinleitner and Zingerle. On the other hand, there is still some confusion and disagreement among scholars regarding how the cult was practiced. But one thing remains certain: the reconciliation inscriptions represent a cultic practice intended to offer remedies for diseases. A court may impose punishments like fines or prison upon a perpetrator, but it cannot make a person sick.

2. Divine punishments and curses

a. Divine punishment in Greek cultic regulations and reconciliation inscriptions

Divine punishment is not unknown to ancient Greek religion but is rarely mentioned in cultic regulations. In most cultic regulations, acts that are punishable in religious terms are also criminal acts, in contrast to the reconciliation inscriptions where all wrong behaviour is subject to divine punishment. Most Greek cultic regulations presented, as Parker points out,[10] instructions for pious conduct to those who wanted to act piously. These were not laws in the proper sense of the word and contain few indications as to what consequences a violator of the rules might face. In Greek literary sources, on the other hand, divine punishment is a frequent motif. It is sufficient to mention the first song of the *Iliad* describing the plague sent to the Greek army by Apollo, or to point out that the entire genre of tragedy is to a large extent based on the idea that the gods did punish those who transgressed certain limits.[11] But most of the incidents of divine punishment found in Greek literature belong to the realm of the mythic past and can therefore not be regarded as evidence of everyday religiosity as is the case with the reconciliation inscriptions. There are scraps of evidence indicating that the idea of divine punishment played a more important part in popular religion. This is most evident in the phenomenon of *deisidaimonia* or superstition[12] and in the tradition of the *manteis*;[13] but neither of these belonged to an institutionalised practice in the way that the reconciliation inscriptions did. Nor is there any evidence linking these traditions

---

[10] See Ch. 3, 137.

[11] Gordon 2004, 190. An interesting insight into the conception of divine retribution in Herodotos is provided by Harrison 1997 & 2000.

[12] See Ch. 2, 54-58.

[13] See Ch. 2, 79-80.

historically to Lydian and Phrygian religion. Accordingly, *deisidaimonia* and *manteis* can at best be understood analogous to the practice of reconciliation inscriptions.

To Lydians and Phrygians of the first three centuries AD, divine punishment was very much a reality. The question is whether they imagined that their gods oversaw all their actions and punished every incident of misbehaviour. There are good reasons to believe they did not; it is in this respect fundamental to the interpretation of the reconciliation inscriptions to understand how transgressions, divine punishment and cultic regulations are linked. In the following section we will see that there are good reasons to assume that threats of divine punishment were an integral part of Lydian cultic regulations.

b. Divine punishment in Lydian cultic regulations

We know that in cases of civil conflict the gods were not thought to interfere unless they were invoked through a judicial prayer.[14] In contrast, in incidents of religious transgression the gods seem to punish perpetrators without any apparent intermediate cause other than the transgression itself. It is therefore striking that both judicial prayers/perjury and religious transgressions were dealt with within the same cultic practice and recorded in the same epigraphic genre, in spite of the fact that these two forms of incidents were initiated for quite different reasons. This was also observed by Steinleitner when he claimed that the reconciliation inscriptions represented a culture without a clear division between judicial and religious proceedings,[15] and he was right in his observation that all transgression, observable and non-observable alike, is punished by divine and not human authorities. He did not, however, give a satisfactory explanation as to why this was the case. The answer probably lies in how divine punishment is described in Lydian and Phrygian cultic regulations.

In so far as notions of divine punishment occur in cultic regulations it is in the form of vague threats and curses.[16] These threats rarely contain any details regarding how they are supposed to be fulfilled. They are often formulated as wishes or plain statements that divine wrath will occur if a wrongful act is committed. This is not unlike

---

[14] See Ch. 5, 221-222.

[15] See Ch. 1, 25.

[16] See Ch. 3, 128-134.

the practice of making civil conflicts the concerns of gods by raising a *skēptron* or offering a judicial prayer to the gods. It is hence possible to suggest that in the case of both religious transgressions and civil conflicts the threat of punishment was given in the form of curses, and that in the case of the former, the curses were formulated in cultic regulations.

Can this assumption be verified by relevant sources? Not unconditionally, unfortunately. The material which makes a comparison possible is limited, which should warn us against coming to too far-reaching conclusions. The following analysis must accordingly be regarded as a hypothesis. There are very few cultic regulations preserved from Lydia and Phrygia; yet two deriving from Mainoia are highly relevant to our understanding of the reconciliation inscriptions. *LSAM* 19 (*TAM* V1, 536) is a regulation from the cult of Zeus Masfalatēnos, Mēn Tiamou and Mēn Tyrannos, dated to the year 257 of the Sullan era, i.e. 172/3 AD. Both Mēn Tiamou and Mēn Tyrannos are deities mentioned in the reconciliation inscriptions.[17] The regulation is therefore linked to the reconciliation inscriptions in terms of geography, time and cult. It seems to be a decree from a guild of priests, referred to as ἱερὸς δοῦμος, in charge of a temple. The same term is used in *TAM* V1, 449 where Aurelius Glykōn is honoured for his achievements as a priest.[18] The regulation states that people who are disobedient will know the powers of Zeus: εἴ τις δὲ τού|των ἀπειθήσι ἀναγνώ|σεται τὰς δυνάμις τοῦ Δι|ός.[19] τούτων here presumably refers to the members of the *doumos* and the regulation might have something to do with their conduct. The most important thing about this text is the fact that the punishment is described as a manifestation of divine *dynamis*. As we know, the reconciliation inscriptions are very often presented as testimonies to the powers of the gods, and to their ability to control the life and death of human beings. This is particularly evident in the phrase στηλλογράφειν τὰς δύναμεις τοῦ θεοῦ/τῶν θεῶν[20] which is a genre marker of the reconciliation inscriptions.[21] *LSAM* 19 indicates

---

[17] Mēn Tiamou: *BWK* *54; *67; *68; *69; *70; *71; *84. Mēn Tyrannos: *BWK* *53.

[18] See Ch. 4, 171.

[19] *LSAM* 19, 6-9.

[20] *BWK* *3; *14; *33; *35; *37; *39; *47; 55; *69.

[21] See Ch. 4, 145.

that the concept of *dynamis* has been incorporated into curse formulas and that rules of proper cultic behaviour were linked to threats of divine punishment.

The inscription poses some problems which should not be overlooked. First of all it is difficult to say what the regulation demands. It could be assumed that it demands that thanksgiving to the gods should be observed. However, the verb τηρέω is not paralleled in relation to εὐχή. The verb means 'to observe, take care of, preserve' etc,[22] but εὐχή is never the object of this verb. τηρέω might, for instance, be taken in the meaning 'to observe an oath'.[23] A possible solution is to put a full stop after line 4 which might then be read: Κατὰ τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἐπιτα|γὴν ἱερὸς δοῦμος εὐχὴν | Διὶ Μασφαλατηνῷ καὶ Μηνὶ | Τιάμου καὶ Μηνὶ Τυράννῳ: "According to the command of the gods the holy house conveys its gratitude to Zeus Masphalatēnos, Mēn Tiamou and Mēn Tyrannos".[24] This may mean that the regulation itself was given to the gods as a votive gift.[25] There are parallels to the practice of dedicating cultic regulations as votive gifts, for instance *SEG* XXXVI *267,[26] which is a dedication made by three ephebes,[27] but also contains a prohibition against bringing something coloured or dyed, presumably clothes, into the shrine.[28] Another parallel is *LSS* *17 A which states that an altar was dedicated by Xenokrateia and that everyone who wishes to do so may sacrifice at the altar.[29] A similar combination of votive offering and cultic regulation is also found in *SEG* XXVIII 750.[30]

---

[22] *LSJ* s.v.

[23] C.f. E. N. Lane, *CMRDM* III: "a vow to be observed after nine days".

[24] This reading has been suggested to me by Robert Parker.

[25] κατ᾽ ἐπιταγὴν (...) εὐχήν is also found in *TAM* V1 *537, which is dedicated to the same gods as *LSAM* 19 and dated to the same year (but not the same month as claimed by E. N. Lane, *CMRDM* III, 23).

[26] Marathon, 61/60 BC.

[27] *SEG* XXXVI *267, 1-6: Ἀγαθῆ τύχῃ· (...) Πυθαγόρας καὶ Σωσιᵛ|κράτης καὶ Λύσανδρος | οἱ συνέφηβοι Πανὶ καὶ ||⁵ Νύμφαις ἀνέθηκαν.

[28] *SEG* XXXVI *267, 7-9: ἀπαγορεύει ὁ θεός· μὴ | [ε]ἰσφέρειν χρωμάτιν[ον] | [μ]ηδὲ βαπτὸν μηδὲ Λ...

[29] *LSS* *17 A, 1-7: Ξενοκράτεια Κηφισô ἱερ|ὸν ἱδρύσατο καὶ ἀνέθηκεν | ξυνβώμοις τε θεοῖς διδασκαλίας τόδε δῶρον, (...) | (...) ||⁵ θύεν τῶι βουλομένοι ἐπὶ | τελεστῶν ἀγαθῶν.

[30] For a discussion of these texts, see Parker 2004, 62-63.

If this reading is correct, *LSAM* 19 still poses severe problems. Who is to be taken as the subject for ἐκέλευσεν (5) and what does τηρεῖσθαι ἀ‖⁵πὸ ἡμερῶν θ´ (5-6)[31] imply? The subject might be ἱερὸς δοῦμος[32] but provided we accept the suggestion of a full stop after line 4, it may also be an implied ὁ θεός; for when κελεύω is used in the reconciliation inscriptions it always introduces divine commands and the actual subject is often left out.[33] The subject of the verb may therefore be Zeus who is mentioned in lines 8-9. τηρεῖσθαι is used in *BWK* *54 in the sense 'observe an oath; keep an agreement',[34] but more important in this context is the use of the word in *BWK* 72 where the transgression described is the neglect of a period of exclusion from the temple due to ritual impurity.[35] Consequently, *LSAM* 19 may very well have been intended to contain a demand for exclusion lasting nine days following ritual pollution which was to be ended by performing a cleansing. There is, however, nothing to indicate what this pollution might have been and the regulation seems to end quite abruptly. A tentative solution would be that the text is corrupt and that the carver has omitted parts of the original manuscript. This would not, however, explain the use of ἀπό governing in ἡμερῶν. Another solution would be that the undesired condition or the contents of the vow – if that is the meaning of τηρεῖσθαι - was known to the audience to which the regulation was addressed.

One of the new reconciliation inscriptions published by Petzl gives further indication of this state of affairs. *SEG* XLVII 1654,[36] which presumably comes from Silandos, is not strictly speaking a reconciliation inscription; the names of the

---

[31] The *editio princeps* (*CIG* 3439) reads τηρεῖσθαι αὐτῶν but the reproduction of the inscription in Le Bas 1870, nr. 668 shows that this is wrong. This reading is retained by Herrmann (*TAM* V1, 536). With some minor corrections, Herrmann's reading is identical with Sokolowski's.

[32] This is the reading of Lane, *CMRDM* III, 23. Lane here claims that *TAM* V1 *537 is the fulfilment of the oath. This is probably wrong and is also rejected by Herrmann in his commentary (*TAM* V1, p. 176). The religious guild is here called ἱερὰ συνβίωσις καὶ νεωτέρα and the persons in charge are named Ioulianos and Hermogenes. This suggests that *TAM* V1 *537 was written by a different guild of priests.

[33] *BWK* *3, 8-9: Ὁ θεὸς οὖν ἐκέλευ|σε (...). In *BWK* 9, 7-8; *8, 9; *57, 11 and *71 the actual divine subject is tacitly understood or refer to the name of the deity in a previous line.

[34] *BWK* *54, 9-11: μὴ τηρήσαντος | αὐτοῦ τὴν πίστιν παρεχώρησεν ‖¹⁰ τῇ θεῷ ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος·

[35] *BWK* 72, 4-8: Ἐπὶ | κατελούσετο καὶ οὐ‖⁵κ ἐτήρησε τὴν προ|θεσμίαν τῆς θεοῦ, | ἀπετελέσετο αὐτόν.

[36] Published by G. Petzl, *EA* 28, 70-75.

transgressors are not mentioned and there is only a brief reference to the punishment. The remaining 8 lines are clearly a quotation from a cultic regulation.[37] The theme of this regulation is the use of sacred property. It states that Meis ex Attalou has punished some of his own people, villagers or priests, because of misuse of the god's property (see note 37), and that no one is to sell or mortgage what belongs to the god unless authorised to do so.[38] The inscription ends with an account of what awaits those who break this rule: those who are disobedient will have to propitiate Mēn Labanas at their own expense.[39] The text does not mention punishment explicitly but this is implicit in the verb εἰλάσαιται (11-12). We know that the reconciliation inscriptions follow a rather strict *sujet* of transgression – punishment – propitiation. Without any punishment, there was no need for propitiation. This text also shows that there was only a fine line between reconciliation inscriptions and cultic regulations: the text contains both an account of punishment and a divine command. As shown, many reconciliation inscriptions contain similar warnings against wrongful acts.

The introduction to the punishment in *LSAM* 19 and *SEG* XLVII 1654 resembles analogous passages in Greek cultic regulations. In both cases the punishment is presented in a conditional clause containing a reference to the transgression and the punishment, which are described in a principal clause. The subject is in both cases the indefinite τις. This type of formula is the conventional way of introducing punishments or reactions in Greek cultic regulations, whether civil punishment or threats of divine punishment.[40] As pointed out by both Chaniotis and Gordon, there seems to have been considerable knowledge of Greek legal terminology among the Lydian priests.[41] As is

---

[37] *SEG* XLVII 1654, 2-4: Μεὶς ἐξ Ἀττάλου κολάσας [[ΑΣ]] τοὺς ἰδίους περὶ τῶν ἰ|δίων ὑπαρχόντων· Petzl 1997, 71: "Die inschrift erwähnt Z. 2-4 göttliche Strafe auf Grund einer Verfehlung; damit reiht sie sich in die Beichtinschriften ein. Ab Zeile 4 handelt es sich freilich um eine Art von lex sacra mit abschließender Strafbestimmung".

[38] *SEG* XLVII 1654, 2, 4-7: ἵνα μηδεν[ὶ] | ἐξὸν εἶναι μήτε πωλεῖν μή||⁵τε ὑποθήκην τίθειν, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ | τῶν ἰδίων οἰκονομεῖσθαι (...).

[39] *SEG* XLVII 1654, 9-12: Ἐὰν δέ τις ἀπειθήσῃ χωρὶς τῆς ἐκείνου συνχωρήσεος, ||¹⁰ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων δαπανήσας εἰλάσαι|ται αὐτὸν μετὰ Μηνὸς Λαβανα.

[40] Civil punishment: *LSS* 81, 9; 128, 3; *LSCG* 37, 7; 53, 40; 84, 16; 91, 11; 111, 4; 116, 5, 14, 17, 24; 136, 30. Divine punishment: *LSCG* 55, 8; *LSAM* 17, 8; 20, 41-42.

[41] See Ch. 1, 32-35.

the case in similar threats in other cultic regulations, no details are given as to what the punishment may involve. They are statements, issued by religious authorities, that disobedience will cause divine wrath; they are by no means verdicts passed by a court, but rather rhetorical phrases which can be used to interpret subsequent events.

LSAM 19 and *SEG* XLVII 1654 indicate that even though not all reconciliation inscriptions mention judicial prayers explicitly, it is highly likely that most of them were raised in response to curses. In cases of religious transgression these spells were found in cultic regulations. Curses and judicial prayers were, as we know, regularly used for settling conflicts between humans and to prevent something from being stolen[42] or to protect places subject to special reverence. The most widespread use of such texts in Asia Minor was the inclusion of curse formulas in epitaphs intended to protect graves from violation.[43] This practice is by no means confined to Catacecaumene: it is found all over Asia Minor and is, as pointed out by J. H. M. Strubbe, a result of the merging of Greek and Oriental traditions.[44] As shown, grave curses in Catacecaumene were undoubtedly linked to the raising of *skēptra*,[45] a fact that gives further evidence to the link between reconciliation inscriptions and the use of judicial prayers. Likewise, we that curses were employed to protect wills in Asia Minor.[46] It is therefore no surprise that binding spells were also used for the protection of sacred precincts. The Lydian cultic regulations may be evidence for the fact that curses were also used to protect the ritual sphere. It is tempting to suggest that there were *skēptra* placed at the entrance to Lydian shrines, but as no source can confirm this, this must remain speculation.

Despite *LSAM* 19 and *SEG* XLVII 1654 being the only cultic regulations from Catacecaumene, it is probable that similar spells were conventional parts of cultic regulations in this area, as spells of this kind are found in other cultic regulations from Asia Minor.[47] This indicates that cultic morality as it was practiced in the areas from

---

[42] *BWK* *3. See Ch. 4, 147-148.

[43] See Ch. 4, 168-170.

[44] See Ch. 4, 169-170.

[45] See Ch. 4, 169: *TAM* V1, 172.

[46] See Jones 2004. Jones' example comes from Cappadocia.

[47] See Ch. 3, 128-134.

234

which the reconciliation inscriptions derive fall into a pattern familiar to worshippers in Asia Minor.

c. Literacy and oral tradition

One crucial question arises following these observations: was this only a matter of writing down curses, or did also oral distribution play an important role? Oral announcements or proclamations of curses were quite common in the Greek world. A closely related example is the funerary law from Gambreion (*LSAM* 16), which states that the supervisor of women at the festival of Thesmophoria should publicly ask the gods to reward those who obey the law but grant the opposite to those who are disobedient.[48] Public curses date at least back to the 5th century BC. At Athens the meeting of the *boulē* and the *ekklesia* was opened with the recital of curses against those who would commit treachery.[49] Parker argues, however, that public curses of this kind cannot be taken as an indication that the gods were expected to punish those who were affected by these curses. On the contrary, he argues, public curses were primarily expressions of society's willingness to react against certain types of crime.[50]

As we have seen in the discussion on the relationship between reconciliation inscriptions and judicial prayers, there are indications that the rituals described were conducted in public. It is obvious that raising a *skēptron* was very much a public act; it was clearly not something intended to be hidden away like *defixiones*. In the grave curses of Catacecaumene it is evident that the mere recording of the curse was thought to have an effect. We do not know for certain whether judicial prayers were meant to be read in public or perhaps recited by priests.[51] According to Chaniotis it was precisely the public character of the cult that made its institutions possible. The public announcement of a judicial prayer was, he claims, sufficient to bring the wrongdoer to the temple where the priests would identify his or her crimes and prescribe the

---

[48] *LSAM* 16, 17-25: τὸν δὲ γυ|ναικονόμον τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου αἱ|ρούμενον τοῖς ἁγνισμοῖς τοῖς πρὸ | τῶν Θεσμοφορίων ἐπεύχεσθαι τοῖς ἐμ‖[20]μένουσιν καὶ ταῖς πειθομέναις τῶι|δε τῶι νόμωι εὖ εἶναι καὶ τῶν ὑπαρχόν|των ἀγαθῶν ὄνησιν, τοῖς δὲ μὴ πειθο|μένοις μηδὲ ταῖς ἐμμενούσαις τἀ|ναντία·

[49] Rhodes 1972, 36-37.

[50] Parker 1983, 194.

[51] Versnel 1991, 80-81.

remedies.[52] Furthermore, grave curses were more than mere texts: they attest the performance of a particular ritual.[53]

The small number of cultic regulations from Lydia and Phrygia may be accounted for if we assume that curses intended to protect the ritual sphere and sacred property were publicly announced, but also the evidently vague division between cultic regulations and reconciliation inscriptions should be taken into account here. Several reconciliation inscriptions contain warnings against wrongful acts and these may accordingly have filled the function similar to cultic regulations.

3. The ideology and function of the reconciliation inscriptions

If we assume that worshippers in Catacecaumene believed they were in constant danger of being punished by the gods this would indicate that the reconciliation inscriptions were the products of a rather harsh religious ideology. We now know that this was probably not the case: divine punishment was associated with quite extraordinary occasions. There were apparently specific scenarios for how and when gods were expected to punish people. It would therefore be wrong to claim that the gods were believed automatically to punished anyone who entered a sacred precinct in an impure state, etc.[54] They punished transgressors and wrongdoers because they were actively invoked to do so, and this had to be done through a binding spell, as was the case with civil conflicts and crimes.

We may then ask for the ideology and function of these texts and the institutions that created them. In Ch. 1,[55] three levels of interpretation of the function and purpose of the reconciliation inscriptions were proposed. In the present section answers will be offered to the questions asked.

---

[52] Chaniotis 1997, 366: "Die feierliche, öffentliche Verfluchung des Straftäters führte ihn früher oder später zum Tempel und veranlaßte somit eine Untersuchung des Falles".

[53] Chaniotis 2004, 36.

[54] See Ch. 1, 29.

[55] See Ch. 1, 15-17.

a. The ideological level

The reconciliation inscriptions are testimonies of acts considered wrong from a religious point of view and imagined to cause the wrath of divine beings. Committing these acts would cause a reaction from the gods which in most cases was either disease or death. If the perpetrator is to experience healing and redemption from the divine wrath, he or she must perform certain rituals in order to make the enraged deity benevolent.

By raising a reconciliation inscription the person who was believed to have been punished showed that he or she now had re-established the proper relationship with the god who had inflicted the punishment. The dedicator thereby re-defined him- or herself within the moral order as it was laid down by the gods; the dedicator was no longer a transgressor of divinely constituted boundaries, but a pious human being who paid the gods their due respect.[56] The depiction of the gods as rulers and the worshippers as their servants must be understood as a consequence of this ideology.

b. The cultic level

Reconciliation inscriptions were probably erected only in desperate situations when other means had failed.[57] A person unable to regain his or her health would address a temple with special competence at identifying the alleged reason for the disease. I am, howeve, sceptical to the view that the reconciliation inscriptions reflect an extensive power possessed by Lydian and Phrygian priests. Still, it would be incorrect to assume that they only played a minor role, as claimed by Lane.[58] An intermediate position seems preferable, admitting that the priests indeed played an active role, but largely through cooperation and negotiation with persons claiming to have been subjected to divine punishment.[59] We must assume that there was a two-way communication during which the dedicator probably had considerable influence over the result. By interpreting

---

[56] I owe much of this perspective to Richard Gordon.

[57] As shown in Ch. 4, 161-162 ex-voto inscriptions dedicated to some of the same deities as those mentioned in the reconciliation inscriptions were raised in gratitude for healing without any mention of transgressions causing the disease. *BWK* *96, 2-4 indicates that other cures were used before one started to seek for possible religious transgressions or conflicts as causes of one's sufferings: (...) κολασθεῖσα [π]ονηρῶς | [κ]αὶ ἀφελπισθοῦσα ὑπὸ ἀν|θρώπων ἐσστηλογράφησε κτλ.

[58] Ch. 1, 29.

[59] Chaniotis 2004, 39.

oracles, for instance dreams received by the transgressor through incubation,[60] and probably consulting and negotiating with the transgressor, the priests could identify the transgression, the offended deity or the binding spell and thereby prescribe the necessary remedies in order to propitiate the deity. The Lydian and Phrygian priests who possessed this competence did indeed exercise power, but not in the way Steinleitner and Zingerle assumed. These priests had interpretative power to make believers understand their past actions and the consequences of these within a religious ideology. This would of course have had a great impact on how people perceived themselves and their relationship to the gods. In addition, we should not overlook the financial aspects of this type of cult (below); identifying transgressions and providing remedies against divine wrath must have generated considerable income. On the other hand, there is no reason to assume that priests in Catacecaumene were members of some sort of Brahmanic class. Presumably, the priests and priestesses came from the body of citizens of Lydian and Phrygian villages. It is also clear that priest and religious personnel were not immune to the moral demands laid down by these cults. The transgressions categorized under 'Neglect of religious office'[61] shows that those who conducted religious rituals were subject to similar demands to anyone else. Particularly revealing is *BWK* 123 which may state that no priest must eat un-sacrificed meat.[62] The priests seem to have exercised a religious morality accepted by the entire community.

The dedicator did not confess the transgression as previously assumed, but admitted having performed the forbidden act or taking part in the events preceding a binding spell, and then probably made some kind of sacrifice, performed cleansing rites[63] or paid money for the services provided by the temple. The financial aspect of the cult is clearly shown in *BWK* *33 where it is stated that a woman has paid money and

---

[60] *BWK* *11, 5-8: ὑπὸ ὀνείρου πολλὰς ||^5 κολάσεις λαβὼν ἀπητή|θην στήλλην καὶ ἀνέγρα|ψα τὰς δυνάμις τοῦ θεοῦ. Observe that the god addresses the transgressor (Athēnaios) personally; the command of raising an inscription is not given by a priest acting as an intermediary. This is also the case in *BWK* 106, 9-12: ἐκο|λ[ά]σθην ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πολλὰ ||^{10} [κ]αὶ ὀνείριοις μοι παρεστάθη καὶ | [εἶ]πεν κτλ.

[61] See Ch. 5, 209-210.

[62] *BWK* 123, 4-6: διὸ παραγγέλλω μηθ|ένα ἱερὸν ἄθυτον αἰγοτόμιον ἔσθε||^{5}ιν (...). As pointed out in Ch. 5, this interpretation is not certain. See Ch. 5, n. 168.

[63] E.g. *BWK* 5 & 6.

thereby made the gods benevolent.[64] Even more revealing is *BWK* *58, which quotes a cultic regulation containing prices for the annulment of binding spells and oaths.[65] This inscription does not mention confession; the important thing is to make the annulment of the oath, not the transgression, publicly known.[66] If there was some sort of confession, or preferably 'admission of guilt', it was part of the process of propitiation and not the function of the inscription *per se*. The dedicators' primary intention was to point out that the conflict with the deity was settled.

c. The sociological level

There are two levels to the messages expressed by the reconciliation inscriptions. The first level corresponds to the ideological level of the function of reconciliation inscriptions: if certain boundaries of behaviour are transgressed, the perpetrator will face divine punishment. This explains why some reconciliation inscriptions contain warnings against committing forbidden acts.[67] It is also a rhetorical device that the author uses to show that he or she acts in accordance with a general view of pious conduct. But the author also wants to say 'I did something wrong, but I have now conducted the required rituals and am now no longer subject to divine wrath'. This is the second level of the message.

Ancient society was based on face-to-face communication; power and politics were performed on a personal level. Accordingly, social prestige and honour were crucial for gaining influence in society. A prominent aspect of social prestige was to be pious and fulfil the obligations that humans had towards the gods. To be regarded as impious, on the other hand, might lead to prosecution and a loss of social position. Even though we know very little about Lydian and Phrygian society, it is clear that it was dominated by small villages where people probably lived in close contact with one another. Consequently, one's position in society would to a large extent depend on other

---

[64] *BWK* *33, 7-13.

[65] See Ch. 5, 220-221.

[66] *BWK* *58, 9-21.

[67] E.g. *BWK* 9, 10-13; 10, 10-13. This aspect is particularly evident in the reconciliation inscriptions from the temple of Apollo Lairbenos, e.g. *BWK* 106, 14-18; *109, 12-15; *117, 7-9.

people's evaluation of one's conduct, as in most rural and traditional societies, past and present.

It is therefore no wonder that disease and death would lead to social stigmatisation and exclusion, given that these incidents were in certain cases thought to be the result of binding spells and religiously prohibited and impious acts. The reconciliation inscriptions, in which binding spells and judicial prayers are presented as the cause of punishment show clearly that human conflicts were the original cause of the process. In *BWK* *69, for instance, Tatias is accused by the community of poisoning or enchanting her son-in-law.[68] The text shows that Tatias and her family were victims of local gossip and had to regain their status and honour by resolving the spell. In inscriptions in which the transgression is identified as a religious offence, there is no clear evidence for human conflicts playing a role in the process, but they were probably significant here too. We must assume that many of the reconciliation inscriptions do not tell the full story as to why people felt the need to raise the inscriptions. Gossip and allegations of impiety were probably important reasons for the process of raising a reconciliation inscription being initiated in these cases as well.

Reconciliation inscriptions thus offered an opportunity for a person stigmatised by the allegation of impious behaviour to regain his or her former position. Interestingly, this was not achieved by claiming and proving one's innocence, as may be seen in trials of impiety in classical Athens[69] - even if this may have been one of the options tried before raising the reconciliation inscription - but by admitting the transgression and performing rituals of propitiation. Thereby, the transgressor could be redefined within the moral order and claim to be a pious person who was free of the binding spell. Despite the fact that the transgressor admits guilt he or she can no longer be accused of being subjected to divine wrath. The analysis of religion in Catacecaumene offered in Ch. 4 shows that piety was based on a reciprocal relationship between gods and worshippers where one service demanded another in return, and that this was something one was obliged to show in public. The reconciliation inscriptions fit well into this pattern: an impious act is annulled by the performance of a pious act, i.e. paying the gods homage by recording and praising their powers. We can only speculate about how

---

[68] *BWK* *69, 3-9. See Ch. 5, 216-217.

[69] See Garland 1996.

successful this was; but the inscription would at least provide a strong argument against accusation of impiety.

d. The function of reconciliation inscriptions in Lydian and Phrygian cults

These insights enable us to shift focus from the interpretation of the texts as expressions of a harsh religious ideology in which the worshippers were regarded as slaves and the gods as rulers, to a culture where binding spells and judicial prayers played a significant role in the interaction between fellow human beings and between man and god. Or to be more precise, through the practice of judicial prayers interactions and conflicts between fellow human beings were transformed into to matters between man and god. Accordingly, the ideology and purpose of reconciliation inscriptions are primarily to be sought in the realm of human conflicts and not in an alleged judicial system ruled by priests.

This model assumes that reconciliation inscriptions had a specific purpose and must not be understood as the core of religious life in Lydia and Phrygia. As shown in Ch. 4, there were many other aspects to religious life in ancient Lydia and Phrygia than those found in the reconciliation inscriptions. Overemphasising the importance of reconciliation inscriptions has, in my opinion, been one of the main deficiencies of earlier research on this genre, and should probably be ascribed to the definition of the genre as confessions. The fact that confession is an important element in Christian belief and practice may have led scholars to draw an analogy and assume that it was equally central in ancient Anatolia. Based on this assumption, many scholars have concluded that Lydian and Phrygian religion imposed a rigid morality on its followers which governed every aspect of daily life.[70] This is undoubtedly to stretch the argument too far. The language of submission and divine power found in the reconciliation inscriptions must be understood in the light of the extraordinary and desperate situation of the dedicators.

If my conclusion is correct, the notions of religious danger expressed through reconciliation inscriptions do not diverge radically from the Greek concept of *agos* which is used to denote the consequences of religious transgressions. As pointed out in

---

[70] Chaniotis 2004, 42.

Ch. 2, *enagēs* may be used in the sense 'cursed'. A person entering a sacred precinct in an impure state was exposed to dangerous powers which were embedded in the curse formulas of the cultic regulations. It is not the pollution *per se* that creates the dangerous situation, but rather the fact that the polluted person has been cursed by entering the sacred precinct in an impure state. I would thus claim that the phrase τὰς δυνάμεις τοῦ θεοῦ found in the reconciliation inscriptions may be understood as analogous to the Greek concept *agos*.

We can therefore conclude that the notion of unacceptable behaviour in cultic contexts is something that reconciliation inscriptions share with most Greco-Roman religion. Binding spells and judicial prayers are also widespread ancient phenomena, and the inclusion of these in cultic regulations may be explained as a tradition from Asia Minor. The institutionalised procedure of annulling binding spells and judicial prayers and recording this by an inscription is however unparalleled in Asia Minor and elsewhere in the ancient world. Still, there is no reason to claim that the elevation of human conflicts to a religious level took the form of formal trials, as claimed by Steinleitner and Zingerle. Instead, it can reasonably be claimed that these institutions were influenced by ancient healing cults. Chaniotis also indicates that this was the case.[71] The practice to record thanksgivings on account of healing and the depiction of body parts on some of the *stelae* provide further support. In Greek healing cults, on the other hand, the close connection between diseases and transgressions is not a theme.

C. Concluding remarks – The origin of the reconciliation inscriptions

If the reconciliation inscriptions are responses to binding spells they cannot any longer be regarded as totally isolated phenomena, and should instead be understood in the wider religious context of Roman Asia Minor. The notions and beliefs they express and the cultic practices they represent are well-known. This would lead us to expect similar texts to have been written elsewhere too. They were not. This is still the great mystery regarding the reconciliation inscriptions. I have no adequate answer as to why

---

[71] Chaniotis 2004, 40: "The relationship between secular and divine justice resembles the relationship between divine healing and secular medice".

reconciliation inscriptions were only written in Catacecaumene and some other areas and not all over Asia Minor. The traditional answer, 'Oriental influence', creates more questions than answers and is unsustainable. On the other hand, we have no evidence that enables us to claim continuity with the Greek tradition of *manteis,*[72] for example, or the cults of Asklepios, but we can claim that they represented analogous practices.

Several scholars have sought to explain the origin of the reconciliation inscriptions. A common feature of these theories has been that they have been difficult to prove. The classic theories of Steinleitner and Zingerle are today rejected as improvable as well as improbable by most scholars. The latest theories provided by Marijana Ricl, E. J. Schnabel and C. E. Arnold are all based on suppositions without empirical basis in our material: M. Ricl's theory of the Hittite origin of the genre is based on a claim of 1000 years of continuity,[73] which would be quite extraordinary. The theories presented by Schnabel[74] and Arnold[75] are, in addition to being mutually exclusive, based on assumptions which are not supported by any sources. Even though Schnabel's theory is interesting, it illustrates the general problem in searching for the origin of the reconciliation inscriptions and the religious practice they represent: we simply lack the relevant sources, so theories of this kind must remain speculation.

Since there are few traces of similar texts elsewhere in the ancient world, it is likely that the genre had a local origin, probably in Catacecaumene, where the highest concentration of reconciliation inscriptions has been found. This assumption is also be supported by the fact that the texts are not limited to one particular cult but were incorporated into cults of Greek and indigenous gods alike. Even though Mēn is the dominating deity of the genre, there is no reason to assume that the practice originated here. The cult of Mēn was widespread in Asia Minor and beyond, but the practice of reconciliation inscriptions is nevertheless only found in Lydia and Phrygia. If we thus assume the genre to be a local invention, it might support Ricl's theory of a Hittite origin,[76] but here the question of continuity poses severe problems.

---

[72] See Ch. 2, 79-80.

[73] See Ch. 1, 23-24.

[74] See 1, 30-31.

[75] See Ch. 1, 31-32.

[76] See note 73.

We can conclude that it is impossible to prove a historical link between traditional Greek religion and the practice of reconciliation inscriptions. Still, there are strong reasons to suggest that the genre of reconciliation inscriptions originated in a meeting of Greek and indigenous practices. It is admittedly difficult to attempt to postulate genuinely Greek and Anatolian elements. Ch. 1 pointed out that the entire concept of 'Greek' and 'Oriental' religion is highly problematic,[77] and as a result it would seem contradictory to claim that it is nevertheless possible to draw a line between these two entities. This is not, however, my intention. On the contrary, it would be more accurate to claim that the reconciliation inscriptions are examples of how intertwined the cultures of the ancient eastern Mediterranean were. If we are to identify the 'Greek' elements of the genre of reconciliation inscriptions, the epigraphic habit and epigraphic genres would seem to be the most obvious candidates. This involves the general habit of raising inscriptions, the characteristics of the ex-voto genre and the tradition of cultic regulations. The reconciliation inscriptions contain many characteristics and much of the vocabulary of Greek ex-voto inscriptions. This might be attributed to Greek influence. The indigenous elements are obviously the inclusion of curse formulas in cultic regulations and the enforcement of a cultic code of behaviour through explicit threats of divine punishment. It important to emphasise the word 'explicit' here, because the idea of divine punishment, while not unknown to Greek thought, clearly did not play a central role in official religion and cult.

Asia Minor was a melting pot of several religious traditions and in most cases it is impossible to separate Greek elements from 'Oriental' ones. The origin of the reconciliation inscriptions may be sought in the meeting and intermingling of several religious traditions which were by no means mutually exclusive. This does not, admittedly, provide a satisfying explanation, but the analysis offered in this study at least brings new testimonies to the understanding of Greco-Roman pagan religion as a complex pattern of beliefs and rituals. Whether this practice was influenced by Greek, Jewish, Christian or 'Oriental' trends is irrelevant to our understanding of them. Writing and raising reconciliation inscriptions was undoubtedly a local Lydian and Phrygian practice, and the only explanation I can offer for the origin of these texts is that they

---

[77] See Ch. 1, 37-39.

were part of a local trend. Why this became a trend only in Catacecaumene and a few other parts of Asia Minor is beyond the scope of our knowledge, but a successful analysis of the actual function and context of the reconciliation inscriptions does not depend on an answer to this question.

Appendix A

CULTIC REGULATIONS

The cultic regulations found in this appendix are mainly found in the publications of Franciszek Sokolowski, *Lois Sacrées de l'Asie Mineure* (*LSAM*), *Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques – Supplément* (*LSS*), and *Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques* (*LSCG*). I have provided parallel editions of the cultic regulations, based upon the concordances found in Lupu 2005, 405-422. For a full bibliography of the single inscriptions, see *LSS*, *LSCG* and *LSAM*.

A. LSAM

1. <u>LSAM</u> 12 (*I.Perg* 255)

Regulation of the cult of Athena, Pergamon, before 133 BC.

<div align="center">

Διονύσιος Μηνοφί[λου]

ἱερονομήσα‹ντε›ς τῶι δήμ[ωι].
</div>

ἀγνευέτωσαν δὲ καὶ εἰσίτωσαν εἰς τὸν τῆς θεο[ῦ ναὸν]

οἵ τε πολῖται καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς ἰδίας γ[υναι–]

5   κὸς καὶ τοῦ ἰδίου ἀνδρὸς αὐθημερόν, ἀπὸ δὲ ἀλλοτρίας κ[αὶ]

ἀλλοτρίου δευτεραῖοι λουσάμενοι· ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ

κήδους καὶ τεκούσης γυναικὸς δευτεραῖος· ἀπὸ δὲ τάφου

καὶ ἐκφορᾶς περιρασάμενοι καὶ διελθόντες τὴν πύλην κα–

θ᾽ ἣν τὰ ἁγιστήρια τίθεται, καθαροὶ ἔστωσαν αὐθημερόν.

10   Ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι, γνώμη στρατηγῶν· τὰ μὲ[ν]

ἄλλα περὶ τῶν θυόν[των τ]ῆι Νι[κηφόρωι Ἀθηνᾶι γίνεσθαι κατὰ]

[τὸν νόμον, τιθέναι δὲ μετὰ τῶν πρ]ουπ[αρ]χ[όντων τῆι θεᾶι γε–]

[ρῶν κ]αὶ τῶν εἰς τὸν [θ]ησαυρὸν ἐμβαλλομένων ἑκ[άστου ἱερεῖ–]

[ου σ]κέλος δεξιὸν καὶ τὸ δέρμα· τὸ δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν ὑῶν ἐκκ[είμε–]

15   [ν]ον τετρώβολον καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἱερείων = **Ο** ἐμβ[άλ–]

λειν εἰς τὸν θησαυρόν, καθάπερ διατέτακται. εἶναι δ[ὲ τὸ]

ψήφισμα κύριον διὰ παντός, ἐὰ μή τι ἄλλο δόξηι.

Ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμωι, γνώμῃ στρατηγῶ[ν· ἐπει–]

δὴ πρότερον ἦν εἰθισμένον τοὺς θύοντας τῆι Νικηφόρ[ωι Ἀ–]
20 θηνᾶι μετὰ τῶν διατεταγμένων τῆι θεᾶι γερῶν διδ[όναι]
κα[ὶ] ἄλλοις τισὶν τῶν περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν διατριβόντων πλέο–
να τρίπλευρα, δεδόχθαι· ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν τοὺς κατ᾽ ἐνιαυτὸν τασ–
σομένους ἱερον[ό]μους παραλαμβάνοντας τὰ τιθέμενα δέρ–
[μ]ατα ὑπὸ τῶν θυόντων καὶ πωλοῦντας διδόναι νεωκόρωι
25 [ὑ]ὸς μὲν =, προβάτου δὲ ἡμιωβέλιον, αὐλητρίδι καὶ ὀλο–
λυκτρίαι κοινῆι τὸ ἴσον· τῶν δ᾽ ἐν τῆι ἄκραι θυομένων καὶ πυλω–
ρῶι τῆς ἄκρας βοὸς μὲν Σ, προβάτου δὲ Σ, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν
τῆς τιμῆς κατατάσσειν εἰς τὰς ἱερὰς προσόδους. εἶναι δὲ τὸ
ψήφισμα κύριον διὰ παντός, ἐὰν μή τι ἄλλο δόξηι.

Translation:

Dionysios son of Menophilos, temple warden of the people. The citizens and everybody else are to be purified and enter the temple of the goddess (purified) from intercourse with one's own wife and own husband on the same day, from another woman and another man on the second day after being cleansed, likewise, also to from deaths and a woman who has given birth, on the second day. From a grave and funeral they are to enter clean on the same day, having been besprinkled and having walked through the gate where the vessel for lustral water is placed. The council and the people on the advice of the *strategoi*. Other things concerning those sacrificing to Athena Nikephoros are to be conducted according to the law, and the right thighbone and the skin of every sacrificed animal are to be placed together with the formerly received gifts to the goddess that are placed in the treasury. The *tetrobolon*, which has been publicly announced for the pigs and the other sacrificial animals, is to be placed in the treasury, as it has been ordered. This decree shall be valid for ever, unless something else is decided. The council and the people on the proposal of the *strategoi*: Because it was earlier the custom that those who sacrificed to Athena Nikephoros also gave, together with the prescribed gift to the goddess, several parts of the sacrifice to others staying around the shrine it was decided: From now on, on the contrary, the wardens of the temple appointed for the year shall receive the skins dedicated by those who sacrifice, and sell them and give (an amount of money) equivalent to a pig to the sacristan, half an obol for a sheep, and the same to share for the flute-girl and the sacrificial crier. The gatekeeper of the citadel shall also have a ?? part of bull of those sacrificed in the citadel, a ?? part of a sheep. The rest of the price they shall pay to the holy incomes. This decree shall be valid for ever, unless something else is decided.

2. *LSAM* 16 (*Syll*[3] 1219)

Regulation of funerary rites, Gambreion, 3rd century BC.

Ἀγαθῆι Τύχηι. ἱερονομοῦντος
Δημητρίου, μηνὸς Θαργηλιῶνος
δευτέραι, Ἀλέξων Δάμωνος εἶ–
πεν· νόμον εἶναι Γαμβρειώταις,
5   τὰς πενθούσας ἔχειν φαιὰν ἐσθῆ–
τα, μὴ κατερρυπωμένην· χρῆσθαι
δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας καὶ τοὺς παῖδας
τοὺς πενθοῦντας ἐσθῆτι φαιᾶι,
ἐὰμ μὴ βούλωνται λευκῆι· ἐπιτε–
10   λεῖν δὲ τὰ νόμιμα τοῖς ἀποιχομέ–
νοις ἔσχατον ἐν τρισὶ μησίν, τῶι δὲ
τετάρτωι λύειν τὰ πένθη τοὺς ἄν–
δρας, τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας τῶι πέμπτωι,
καὶ ἐξανίστασθαι ἐκ τῆς κηδείας
15   καὶ ἐκπορεύεσθαι τὰς γυναῖκας
τὰς ἐξόδους τὰς ἐν τῶι νόμωι γε–
γραμμένας ἐπάναγκον· τὸν δὲ γυ–
ναικονόμον τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου αἱ–
ρούμενον τοῖς ἁγνισμοῖς τοῖς πρὸ
20   τῶν Θεσμοφορίων ἐπεύχεσθαι τοῖς ἐμ–
μένουσιν καὶ ταῖς πειθομέναις τῶι–
δε τῶι νόμωι εὖ εἶναι καὶ τῶν ὑπαρχόν–
των ἀγαθῶν ὄνησιν, τοῖς δὲ μὴ πειθο–
μένοις μηδὲ ταῖς ἐμμενούσαις τἀ–
25   ναντία· καὶ μὴ ὅσιον αὐταῖς εἶναι, ὡς
ἀσεβούσαις, θύειν μηθενὶ θεῶν ἐπὶ δέ–
κα ἔτη. τὸν δὲ μετὰ Δημήτριον
στεφανηφόρον ταμίαν αἱρεθέντα
ἀναγράψαι τόνδε τὸν νόμον εἰς δύο
30   στήλας καὶ ἀναθεῖναι τὴμ μὲν
μίαν πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν τοῦ Θεσμοφο–

ρίου, τὴν δὲ πρὸ τοῦ νεὼ τῆς Ἀρτέμ–
ιδος τῆς Λοχίας. ἀνενεγκάτω
δὲ ὁ ταμίας τὸ ἀνάλωμα τὸ γε–
35   νόμενον εἰς τὰστήλας {τὰς στήλας} τῶι
πρώτωι λογιστηρίωι.

Translation:

May Good Fortune prevail. When Demterios was temple-warden, on the 2nd day of the month Thargelion, Alexon son of Damon proposed: It is the law of the Gambreiotians that those women who mourn must wear a grey robe, which is not defiled. Also men and boys who mourn must wear a grey robe; if they do not want (to wear a grey one, they must wear) a white. The customs for the dead must be fulfilled to the end for three month, but in the fourth month the men must end the mourning, and the women must do so in the fifth month, and depart from the mourning, and the women must go out in procession as it is written in the law. The supervisor of women, chosen by the people, shall through the purifications before the *Thesmophoria* pray that those who abide and obey this law shall be well and have benefit of the existing good and the opposite for those who do not obey or abide. It shall not be permitted by religion for them, as being guilty of impiety, to sacrifice to any of the gods for ten years. The person elected treasurer carrying the wreath after Demetrios shall write this law on two steles and place one of them in front of the door of the *Thesmophorion*, and the other in front of the temple of Artemis Lokhia. Let the treasurer give an account of the expenses of the making of the steles at the first meeting of the auditors.

3. *LSAM* 17 (*I.Smyrna* II, 1 735)

Cultic regulation, Smyrna, 1st century BC.

[Ἰ]χθῦς ἱεροὺς μὴ ἀδικεῖν,
μηδὲ σκεῦος τῶν τῆς
θεοῦ λυμαίνεσθαι, μηδὲ
[ἐ]κφέρειν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐπ[ὶ]
5   κλοπήν· ὁ τούτων τι ποιῶν
κακὸς κακῇ ἐξωλείᾳ ἀπό–
λοιτο, ἰχθυόβρωτος γενόμε–
νος. ἐὰν δέ τις τῶν ἰχθύ–
ων ἀποθάνῃ, καρπούσθω
10   αὐθημερὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ.
τοῖς δὲ συμφυλάσσουσιν

250

καὶ ἐπαύξουσιν τὰ τῆς
θεοῦ τίμια καὶ τὸ ἰχθυο–
τρόφιον αὐτῆς βίου καὶ
15 ἐργασίας καλῆς γένοιτο
παρὰ τῆς θεοῦ ὄνησις.

Translation:

It is not allowed to harm the holy fishes, damage any possession of the goddess, or bring anything out of the temple as theft. May the wretch who does any of this perish in terrible and utter destruction, eaten by fish. If any of the fish dies, let it be sacrificed the same day on the altar. May those who guard and increase the wealth of the goddess and her fishpond receive profit from the goddess for their good life and work.

4. *LSAM* 18 (*TAM* V1, 530)

Purity regulation, Maionia, 147/146 BC.

Βασιλεύοντος [᾿Α]ττ[άλου]
ἔτους τρεισκαιδεκάτου.
᾿Αγαθῆι Τύχηι· ἔστησαν
τὴν στήλην [. . . . .]
5 [. . . . .]οι ἐμ φυση
[. .] χη [. . . .] ἀγνεύειν δὲ
ἀπὸ μὲν κ[ή]δους ὁμαίμ–
ου πεμπταῖον, τοῦ δὲ ἄλ–
λου τριταῖον, ἀπὸ δὲ γυναι–
10 κὸς εἰς τὸν περιωρισμέ‹νο›
νον τόπον τοῦ Μητρ[ω]ίου
τῆι αὐτῆι λουσά[μ]ενον εἰσ–
πορεύεσθαι· ἑταίρα τριτ–
αία περιαγνισαμένη κα[θὼ]–
15 [ς] εἴ[θ]ισται.

Translation:

In the thirteenth year in the rule of king Attalos. May Good Faith prevail. They set up the stele [………] in the body (?) […] be pure from mourning over relatives on the fifth day, over another on the third day,

from intercourse with a woman on the same day, enter the enclosed area of the Metrōon having washed. A prostitute (may enter) purified all round on the third day as it is customary.

5. *LSAM* 19 (*TAM* V1, 536)

Cultic regulation, Maionia, 173 BC.

<div style="text-align:center">

Κατὰ τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἐπιτα–
γὴν ἱερὸς δοῦμος εὐχὴν
Διὶ Μασφαλατηνῷ καὶ Μηνὶ
Τιάμου καὶ Μηνὶ Τυράννῳ.
5 ἐκέλευσεν τηρεῖσθαι ἀ–
πὸ ἡμερῶν θ´. εἴ τις δὲ τού–
των ἀπειθήσι ἀναγνώ-
σεται τὰς δυνάμις τοῦ Δι–
ός. ἐπιμελησαμένου
10 Διονυσίου Διοδώρου
καὶ Ἑρμογένους Βαλερίου
ἔτους σνζ´, μ(ηνὸς) Δύστρου.

</div>

Translation:

In accordance with the commandment of the gods the holy house conveys an ex-voto to Zeus Masfalatēnos, Mēn Tiamou, and Mēn Tyrannos. (The god ?) has ordered that (??) is observed for nine days (?). If one of them disobey this, he shall know the powers of Zeus. When Dionysios son of Diodoros, and Hermogenes son of Valerius were in charge, in the year 257, in the month of Dystros.[1]

6. *LSAM* 20 (*Syll*³ 985)

Regulation for participation of a private cult, Philadelphia, 1ˢᵗ century BC.

<div style="text-align:center">

Ἀγαθῆι Τ[ύχηι].
ἀνεγράφησαν ἐφ᾽ ὑγιείαι κα[ὶ κοινῆι σωτηρίαι]
καὶ δόξηι τῆι ἀρίστηι τὰ δοθέ[ντα παραγγέλμα–]
τα Διονυσίῳ καθ᾽ ὕπνον π[ρόσοδον διδόν–]

</div>

---

[1] For the reading of line 1-5, see Ch. 6, 231.

5   τ᾽ εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οἶκον ἀνδρά[σι καὶ γυναιξὶν]
      ἐλευθέροις καὶ οἰκέταις. Διὸς [γὰρ ἐν τούτωι]
      τοῦ Εὐμενοῦς καὶ Ἑστίας τ[ῆς παρέδρου αὐ–]
      τοῦ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν Σωτ[ήρων καὶ Εὐδαι–]
      μονίας καὶ Πλούτου καὶ Ἀρετῆς [καὶ Ὑγιείας]
10   καὶ Τύχης Ἀγαθῆς καὶ Ἀγαθοῦ [Δαίμονος καὶ Μνή–]
      μης καὶ Χαρίτων καὶ Νίκης εἰσὶν ἱδ[ρυμένοι βωμοί.]
      τούτ[ωι] δέδωκεν ὁ Ζεὺς παραγγέλ[ματα τούς τε ἁ–]
      γνισμοὺς καὶ τοὺς καθαρμοὺς κ[αὶ τὰ μυστήρια ἐπι–]
      τελεῖν κατά τε τὰ πάτρια καὶ ὡς νῦν [γέγραπται· πορευ–]
15   όμενοι εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦτον ἄνδρε[ς καὶ γυναῖκες]
      ἐλεύθεροι καὶ οἰκέται τοὺς θεοὺς [πάντας ὁρκούσ–]
      θωσαν δόλον μηθένα μήτε ἀνδρὶ μή[τε γυναικὶ εἰδό–]
      τες μὴ φάρμακον πονηρὸν πρὸς ἀνθ[ρώπους, μὴ ἐπωι–]
      δὰς πονηρὰς μήτε γινώσκειν μή[τε ἐπιτελεῖν, μὴ]
20   φίλτρον, μὴ φθορεῖον, μὴ [ἀτ]οκεῖον, μ[ὴ ἄλλο τι παιδο–]
      φόνον μήτε αὐτους ἐπιτελεῖν μήτε [ἑτέρωι συμβου–]
      λεύειν μηδὲ συνιστορεῖν, ἀποστερ[οῦντες δὲ μη–]
      δὲν εὐνοεῖν τῶι οἴκωι τῶιδε, καὶ ἐάν τ[ις τούτων τι ποι–]
      ῆι ἢ ἐπιβο[υλε]ύῃ, μήτε ἐπιτρέψειν μή[τε παρασιω–]
25   [πήσ]ειν, [ἀλ]λ᾽ ἐμφανιεῖν καὶ ἀμυνεῖσ[θαι. ἄνδρα παρὰ]
      [τὴν] ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἀλλοτρίαν ἢ [ἐλευθέραν ἢ]
      δούλην ἄνδρα ἔχουσαν μὴ φθερε[ῖν μηδὲ παῖδα μη–]
      [δὲ] παρθένον μηδὲ ἑτέρωι συμβουλ[εύσειν, ἄλλ᾽ ἄν τι–]
      νι συνιστορήσηι, τὸν τοιοῦτον φα[νερὸν ποιήσειν]
30   καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ μ[ὴ ἀποκρύψειν μη–]
      δὲ παρασιωπήσειν· γυνὴ καὶ ἀνήρ, ὅς ἂ[ν ποιῆι τι τῶν προ–]
      γεγραμμένων, εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦτον μ[ὴ εἰσπορευέσθω·]
      θεοὶ γ[ὰ]ρ ἐν αὐτῶι ἵδρυνται μεγάλοι καὶ τ[αῦτα ἐπισκοποῦ–]
      σιν καὶ τοὺς παραβαίνοντας τὰ παραγ[γέλματα οὐκ ἀνέ–]
35   ξονται· γυναῖκα ἐλευθέραν ἁγνὴν εἶν[αι καὶ μὴ γινώσκ–]
      ειν ἄ[λ]λου ἀνδρὸς πλὴν τοῦ ἰδίου εὐνὴ[ν ἢ συνουσίαν· ἐ–]
      ὰν δὲ γνῶι, τὴν τοιαύτην μὴ εἶναι ἁγ[ν]ή[ν, ἀλλὰ μεμιασμέ–]
      νην καὶ μύσο[υ]ς ἐμφυλίου πλή[ρ]η καὶ σ[έβεσθαι ἀναξίαν]

τὸν θεὸν τοῦ[το]ν [ο]ὗ ταῦτα τὰ ἱερὰ ἴδρυ[ται, μηδὲ θυσίαις]
40 παρατυγχ[άνει]ν μηδὲ τ[οῖς] ἀγ[νι]σμοῖ[ς καὶ καθαρμοῖς]
προσκόπτειν μηδὲ ὁρᾶν ἐπιτελούμ[ενα τὰ μυστήρια· ἐ–]
ἂν δὲ ποιῆι τι τούτων, ἀφ᾿ οὗ τὰ παρα[γγέλματα εἰς τήν–]
δε τὴν ἀναγραφὴν ἥκουσιν, κακὰς [ἀρὰς παρὰ τῶν]
θεῶν ἕξει [τὰ πα]ραγγέλματα ταῦτα [παρορῶσα· ὁ θεὸς γὰρ]
45 ταῦτα οὔτε βούλεται γίνεσθαι μηθ[αμῶς, οὔτε θέλει, ἀλ–]
λὰ κατακολουθεῖν. οἱ θεοὶ τοῖς μὲ[ν ἀκολουθοῦσιν ἔ–]
σονται ἵλεως καὶ δώσουσιν αὐτο[ῖς ἀεὶ πάντα τἀγα–]
θά, ὅσα θεοὶ ἀνθρώποις, οὓς φιλοῦσιν, [διδόασιν· ἐὰν δέ τι–]
νες παραβ[αί]νωσιν, τοὺς τοιούτους [μισήσουσι καὶ με–]
50 γάλας αὐτοῖς τιμωρίας περιθήσου[σιν. τὰ παραγγέλμα–]
τα ταῦτα ἐτέθησαν παρὰ Ἄγγδιστιν [τὴν ἁγιωτάτην]
φύλακα καὶ οἰκοδέσποιναν τοῦδε τοῦ ο[ἴκου ἥτις ἀγαθὰς]
διανοίας ποιείτω ἀνδράσι καὶ γυναιξὶν [ἐλευθέροις καὶ]
δούλοις, ἵνα κατακολουθῶσιν τοῖς ὧδε γ[εγραμμένοις, καὶ ἐν]
55 ταῖς θυσίαις ταῖς τε ἐμμήνοις καὶ ται[ς κατὰ ἐνιαυτὸν ἁ–]
πτέσθωσαν, ὅσοι πιστεύουσιν ἑα[υτοῖς ἄνδρες τε καὶ]
[γυ]ναῖκες τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης, ἐν [ἧι τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ παραγγέλ–]
[μα]τά εἰσιν γεγραμμένα ἵνα φαν[εροὶ γίνωνται οἱ κατα–]
[κολου]θοῦ[ντ]ες τοῖς παραγγέλ[μασιν καὶ οἱ μὴ κατακολου–]
60 [θοῦν]τες. [Ζεῦ] Σωτή[ρ], τὴν ἀφὴ[ν τοῦ Διονυσίου ἵλεως καὶ]
[εὐμεν]ῶς προσδέχου καὶ προ[σηνὴς αὐτῶι καὶ τῶι γένει]
[πάρεχ]ε ἀγαθὰς ἀμοιβάς, [ὑγίειαν, σωτηρίαν, εἰρήνην,]
[ἀσφάλεια]ν ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ ἐπὶ θα[λάσσης [– – – χ. 13 – – –]
[. . . . .]μένοις ὁμοίως– – – – –

Translation:

May Good Fortune Prevail. For health and common salvation and the fines reputation the ordinances given to Dionysius in his sleep were written up, (5) giving access into his *oikos* to men and women, free people and slaves.

For in this place have been set up altars of Zeus, Eumenes, and of Hestia his coadjutor, and of the other saviour gods, and Eudaimonia, Plutus, Arete, Hygieia, (10) Agathe Tyche, Agathos Daimon, Mneme, the Charitae and Nike.

To this man Zeus has given ordinances for the performance of the purifications, the cleansings and the mysteries, in accordance with ancestral custom and as has now been written.

When coming (15) into his *oikos* let men and women, free people and slaves, swear by all the gods neither to know nor make use wittingly of any deceit against a man or a woman, neither poison harmful to men nor harmful spells. They are not (20) themselves to make use of a love potion, abortifacient, contraceptive, or any other thing fatal to children; nor are they to recommend it to, nor connive at it with, another. They are not to refrain in any respect from being well-intentioned towards this *oikos*. If anyone performs or plots any of these things, they are neither to put up with is nor keep silent, (25) but expose it and defend themselves.

Apart from his own wife, a man is not to have sexual relations with another married woman, whether free or slave, nor with a boy nor a virgin girl; nor shall he recommend it to another. Should he connive at it with someone, they shall expose such a person, (30) both the man and the woman, and not conceal at it or keep silent about it. Woman and man, whoever does any of these things written above, let him not enter this *oikos*. For great are the gods set up in it: they watch over these things, and will not tolerate those who transgress the ordinances.

(35) A free woman is to be chaste and shall not know the bed of, nor have sexual intercourse with, another man except her own husband. But if she does have such knowledge, such a woman is not chaste, but defiled and full of endemic pollution, and unworthy to reverence this god whose holy things these are that have been set up. She is not (40) to be present at the sacrifices, nor to strike against (?) the purifications and cleansings (?), not to see the mysteries being performed. But if she does any of these things from the time the ordinances have come on to this inscription, she shall have evil curses from the gods for disregarding these ordinances. For the god (45) does not desire these things to happen at all, not does he wish it, but he wants obedience. The gods will be gracious to those who obey, and always give them all good things, whatever gods give to men whom they love. But should any transgress, they shall hate such people and (50) inflict upon them great punishments.

These ordinances were placed with Agdistis, the very holy guardian and mistress of this oikos. May she create good thoughts in men and women, free people and slaves, in order that they may obey the things written here.

(55) At the monthly and annual sacrifices may those men and women who have confidence in themselves touch this inscription on which the ordinances of the god have been written, in order that those who obey these ordinances and those who do not may be manifest.

(60) Saviour Zeus, accept the touch of Dionysius mercifully and kindly, and be well disposed towards him and his family. Provide good recompenses, health, salvation, peace, safety on land and sea - - - likewise - - .[2]

---

[2] Translation: Barton & Horsley 1981, 9-10.

7. *LSAM* 29 (*I.Ephesos* 3401)

Purity regulation, Metropolis in Jonia, 4th century BC.

<div style="margin-left:10em">

– – – – – – – – –

[ἀγνεύ]εται ἀπὸ

[κήδους] ἡμέρας

[δώδεκα], ἀπὸ

5   [γυν]αικὸς τῆς

[ἰδία]ς ἡμέρας δύ[ο],

[ἀπὸ ἑ]ταίρας τρεῖς.

[ἱκέτην] μὴ ἀπέλκειν

[. . . . . .] ἐπιστα

10 [. . . .]ν μηδὲ

[δρᾶν] μ[η]θὲν ἄδι–

[κον.] ὃς δ᾽ [ἄν] ἀδική–

[σηι], μὴ εἴλως αὐ–

[τῶι ἡ] Μήτηρ [ἡ] Γαλ–

15 [λησ]ία.

</div>

Translation:

- - - - - - - - is purified from a funeral for twelve days, from intercourse with one's own wife for two days, and from a prostitute for three days. Do not drag away a suppliant […] know (?) […], nor do anything unrighteous. Whoever does something unrighteous, the Gallesian Mother will not be merciful towards him.

8. *LSAM* 35 (*I.Priene* 205)

Inscription at the entrance of a sacred οἶκος, Priene, 3rd century BC.

<div style="margin-left:10em">

Several lines missing.

ἔλαχε τὴν ἱερωσύν[ην]

Ἀναξίδημος Ἀπολλων[ίου].

Εἰσίναι εἰς [τὸ]

ἱερὸν ἁγνὸν ἐ[ν]

5   ἐσθῆτι λευκ[ῆι].

</div>

Translation:

Anaxidemos son of Apollonios obtained the priesthood by lot. Enter the shrine in a pure state dressed in a white robe.

9. *LSAM* 74 (*I.Rhod.Per.* 3; *SEG* XV 634)

Regulation concerning votive offerings, Loryma, 3rd century BC.

<div style="padding-left: 3em;">

Ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ
μὴ ἐκφέρειν
τῶν ἀν[α]θ[ημά]των,
μηδὲ βλ[άπ]τε[ι]ν
5   μηθέν, [μη]δὲ πα–
ρὰ τ[άξιν] τασ–
σόν[των πίνακα]ς,
μήτ[ε ἄλλους ἐσ–]
φε[ρόντων ἄνευ]
10   τ[οῦ ἱερέως.]

</div>

Translation:

It is not allowed to carry out any of the votive offerings from the temple, or to damage any of them, nor are they to place the tablets in disorder, or bring others in, without (permission of) the priest.

10. *LSAM* 75 (*I.Tralleis* 3)

Regulation of suppliants, Tralles, 1st century AD.

<div style="padding-left: 3em;">

Ἔτεος ||||||||, μηνὸς ἐββδόμω·
βασιλέοντος Ἀρταξέσσε–
ω· ἐξσατραπεύοντος Ἰδριέ–
ως· ὅσα ἐψηφίσαντο Τραλ–
5   δεῖς· ἱκετηρίην εἶναι Διο–
νύσωι Βακχίωι τῶι δημοσί–
ωι· ἱκέτην μὴ ἀδικεῖν.
Ὅρος ἱερὸς ἄσυλος Διονύσου
Βάκχου· τὸν ἱκέτην μὴ ἀδικεῖν

</div>

10 μηδὲ ἀδικούμενον περιορᾶν,

   εἰ δὲ μή, ἐξώλη εἶναι καὶ αὐτὸ[ν]

   καὶ τὸ γένος αὐτοῦ.

Translation:

In the year |||||||, in the 8th month. When Artaxerxes was king, and Idrieus was satrap, the Traldeians decided this: The branch of the suppliant belongs to the public (cult of) Dionysos Bakchios. Do not harm a suppliant. The holy border of Dionysos Bakchios is inviolable. Do not insult a suppliant and do not overlook anyone being harmed. If not, both he and his family shall be destroyed.

11. *LSAM* 83 (*I.Heraclea Pontica* 70)

Heracleia, Pontos. Regulation of burial, 4th century BC.

   Ὅρρος τô

   ἱερô. τότο

   ἐνδὸς μὴ

   θάπτειν.

Translation:

The border of the shrine. Inside this no funeral must be conducted.

12. *LSAM* 84 (*I.Smyrna* II, 1 728)

Regulation of the cult of Dionysios Bromios, 2nd century AD.

  . . . .–της Μενάνδρου ὁ θεοφάντης ἀνέθηκεν.

  [πάν]τες ὅσοι τέμενος Βρομίου ναούς τε περᾶτε,

  τεσσαράκοντα μὲν ἤματα ἀπ᾽ ἐχθέσεως πεφύλαχθε

  νηπιάχοιο βρέφους, μὴ δὴ μήνειμα γένηται,

5 ἔκτρωσίν τε γυναικὸς ὁμοίως ἤματα τόσσα·

  ἢν δέ τιν᾽ οἰκείων θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα καλύψῃ,

  εἴργεσθαι μηνὸς τρίτατον μέρος ἐκ προπύλοιο·

  ἢν δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἀπ᾽ ἀλλοτρίων οἴκων τι μίασμα γένηται,

  ἡελίους τρισσοὺς μεῖναι νέκυος φθιμένοιο·

10 μηδὲ μελανφάρους προσίναι βωμοῖσι ἄνακτ[ος],

μηθ' ἀθύτοις θυσίαις ἱερῶν ἐπὶ χῖρας ἰάλ[λειν],
μηδ' ἐν Βακχείοις ὠὸν ποτὶ δαῖτα τ[ίθεσθαι],
καὶ κραδίην καρπο͂ν ἱεροῖς βωμοῖς [– – – –]
ἠδὲ ὀσμο͂ τ' ἀπέχεσθαι, ὃν δη[– – – – –]
15 ἐχθροτάτην ῥίζαν κυάμων ἐκ σπέ[ρματος– –]
Τειτάνων προλέγειν μύσταις [– – – – – –]
καὶ καλάμοισι κροτεῖν οὐ θέσ[μιόν ἐστιν– –]
ἤμασιν οἷς μύσται θυσί[ας – – – – –]
[μηδ]ὲ φορεῖν συ[– – – – – – – – – – –]
[– – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –]

Translation:

The *theophantes* … son of Menandros dedicated (this stele). All who enter the *temenos* and temples of Bromios: avoid for forty days after the exposure of a newborn child, so that (divine) wrath does not occur; after the miscarriage of a woman for the same amount of days. If he conceals the death and fate of a relative relative, keep away from the *propylon* for the third of a month. If impurity occurs from other houses, remain for three days after the departure of the dead. No one wearing black clothes may approach the altar of the king, nor lay hands on things not sacrificed from sacrificial animals, nor place an egg as food at the Bacchic feast, nor sacrifice a heart on the holy altars […] keep away from the smell, which […] the most hateful root of beans from seed (?) […] proclaim to the *mystai* of the Titans […] and it is improper to rattle with reeds […] on the days when the *mystai* sacri[fice……], nor bring […..].

B. LSS

1. LSS 33 A (*DGE* 429)

Regulation of the cult of Demeter, Patrai, 3rd century BC.

. . . . [Δα]–
ματρίοις τὰς γ[υ]ν[αῖ]–
κες μήτε χρυσίον ἔ–
χεν πλέον ὀδελο͂ ὀλ–
5 κάν, μηδὲ λωπίον ποικί–
λον, μήτε πορφυρέαν,
μήτε ψημυθιοῦσθαι,
μήτε αὐλῆν. εἰ δέ κα
παρβάλληται, τὸ ἱ–

| 10 | ερὸν καθαράσθω |
| | ὡς παρσεβέουσα. |

Translation:

…………for the Demetrians (?) the women must not have gold weighing more than an obol, nor a many-coloured robe, nor a purple one, nor be painted white with lead, nor play the flute. If someone transgresses with regard to the shrine she is to purify herself since she is impious.

2. *LSS* 49 (*I.Delos* 68)

Cultic regulation, Delos, 5th century BC.

Ξένωι οὐχ ὁσίη ἐσι[έναι].

Translation:

It is not permitted for a stranger to enter.

3. *LSS* 54 (*I.Delos* 2305)

Purity regulation, Delos, late 2nd century BC.

Ἀγαθῆ Τύχῃ. ἁγνεύοντας
εἰσιέναι ἀπὸ ὀψαρίου τρι–
ταίους, ἀπὸ ὑείου λουσάμε–
νον, ἀπὸ γυναικὸς τριταίου(ς),
5 ἀπὸ τετοκείας ἑβδομαίους,
ἀπὸ διαφθορᾶς τετταρα–
κοσταίους, ἀπὸ γυναικεί–
ων ἐναταίους.

Translation:

May Good Fortune prevail! One may enter purified from fish on the third day, cleansed from things made of pig, from intercourse with a woman on the third, from women, who have given birth on the seventh day, from a miscarriage on the fortieth day, and from menstruation on the ninth day.

4. *LSS* 59 (*I.Delos* 2529)

Regulation of the cult of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthis, Delos, Roman period.

[ἱερεὺς γενόμενος] Δ[ιὸς]
[Κυνθίου καὶ ᾽Α]θηνᾶς
[Κυνθίας] ἐν τῶι ἐπ[ὶ]
[Σαραπί ?]ωνος ἄρχο[ν]–
5   [τος] ἐνιαυτῶι ν
[ζακορεύον]τος Νικηφόρου
[. . . . ἀ]ντὶ τῆς καταγεί–
[σης στ]ήλης κατὰ πρόστα–
[γμα ἀν]έγραψεν τὴν προγ–
10   [ραφήν] ν ἰέναι εἰς τὸ ἱερ–
[ὸν τοῦ] Διὸς τοῦ Κυνθίου
[καὶ τῆ]ς ᾽Αθηνᾶς τῆς Κυνθί–
[ας χε]ρσὶν καὶ ψυχῇ καθα–
[ρᾷ, ἔ]χοντας ἐσθῆτα λευ–
15   [κήν, ἀνυ]ποδέτους, ἁγνεύοντας
[ἀπὸ γυν]αικὸς καὶ κρέως
[καὶ μηθὲ]ν εἰσ[φ]έρειν [. . . .]ΛΙ
[. . . . . . . μη]δὲ κλειδίον, μηδὲ
δακτύλιον σιδηροῦν, μηδὲ
20   ζώνην, μηδὲ βαλλάντιον,
μηδὲ ὅπλα πολέμια, μηδ᾽
ἄλλο πράττειν τῶν ἀπηγο–
ρευμένων μηδέν ν τὰς δὲ
θυσίας ἐπιτελεῖν καὶ καλ–
25   λιερεῖν κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.

Translation:

?? having become priest of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia in the year when [Sarapi?]ōn was archon, when Nikephoros was attendant of the temple …,instead of the damaged stele he wrote down the edict according to the command: Enter the sanctuary of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia with pure hands and soul, wearing a white garment, barefooted, pure from women and meat, and do not carry anything

….. nor a key, nor a ring of iron, nor a belt, nor a purse, nor weapons of war, and do not do anything else that is forbidden, but perform the sacrifices and sacrifice with good omens according to ancient traditions.

5. *LSS* 81 (*IG* XII 6, 171)

Fragmented stele. From Samos, 1ˢᵗ century AD.

<div style="text-align:center">

‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ εξει ‒ ‒ ‒

ια τὰ πρὸς χρῆμα [μηδὲν ‒ ‒ ‒ μήτε ποιεῖν ἐκκοπὴν]

ἢ περικοπὴν δένδ[ρων δημοσίο]υς, μήτε ἰδιωτ[ικοὺς]

ἐκκόψαι ἢ περικόψ[αι, μήτε ἀθ]ετεῖν ἢ ἐκγαΐζεσθαι

5   [ἐ]ξ αὐτοῦ, μήτε θε[ρίζειν τόπους τ]οὺς παραθαλασσί-

[ους] ἢ ἐκ τοῦ Ἰμβράσ[ου ὕδωρ ἀ]ναιρεῖσθαι ἢ καταρο‒

[. . . . .]αι τὸ ἄλσος ἢ μ[. . . . . . ἢ] σπείρειν ἢ καθ᾽ ὕλα[ν]

[τῶν δένδρ]ων ἐναυ[λίζεσθαι ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒] ἢ ἐμβόσκειν εἰς

[αὐτό. ἐὰν δέ τις παραβαίνηι τὰ π]ερὶ τούτων προει‒

10   [ρημένα, ἀποτείσει δραχμὰς ἑκα]τὸν κατὰ ἕκαστον

[δένδρον? ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ἐκπρ]άξαντα καὶ ΄ εἰ

‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ νομένης κα ‒ ‒

‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ δικασ]τηρίου ρ. . . .

‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒

</div>

Translation:

- - - - - - - -absolutely not……allowed to perform felling or cutting of the trees in public ?, nor to fell or cut trees for private purposes, nor uproot (?) from it, nor mow the area along the sea or take away water from Imbrasos or plough up (?) - - - - the grove - - - - sow or dwell in the wood of trees - - - - or feed in it. If anyone transgresses what has been prescribed about these things, he shall pay a hundred drachmas for every [tree (?) - - - - - - - - exact punishment and if - - - - - - of the court of justice - - - - - - - - - - - - -.

6. *LSS* 82 (*IG* XII Suppl. 23)

Purity regulation, Mytilene.

<div style="text-align:center">

Ἁγνὸν πρὸς τέμενος στείχειν

ὅσια φρονέοντα.

</div>

Translation:

Approach the temenos in a pure state and purely minded.

7. *LSS 91* (*I.Lindos* 487)

Cultic regulation, Lindos, 3ʳᵈ century AD.

[Κα]θαρο[ὺ]ς [καὶ ἁγνοὺς]
[π]εριραντηρίων εἴσω καὶ τῶν τοῦ ναοῦ [πυλῶν]
[ἴ]ναι ὅσιον, φειδομένους ὁράσεως, τέκνων βδ[– –],
[ἀ]πὸ παντὸς ἐναγοῦς, ἀνάγνου, ἀθέσμου, μὴ τὸ [σῶ]–
5   μα μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν κεκαθαρμένους·
[ὅ]πλα ἀρήια μὴ φέροντας
αἰσθῆτας καθαρὰς ἔχοντας, χωρὶς ἐπικρανίων,
ἀνυποδέτους ἢ ἐν λευκοῖς μὴ αἰγείοις ὑποδήμασι
μηδέ τι αἴγιον ἔχοντας
10   μηδὲ ἐν ζώναις ἄμματα
[ἀ]πὸ φθορᾶς γυναικὸς ἢ κυνὸς ἢ ὄνου ἡμε. μʹ
[ἀ]πὸ διακορεύσεως μαʹ
[απ]ὸ κήδους οἰκίου μαʹ
[ἀπο λ]ούσεως κήδους ζʹ, ἀπὸ ἰσόδου γʹ
15   [ἀπ]ὸ λέχους γʹ, λεχώ καʹ
[ἀ]πὸ [. .]ατ[. . . . .]ς γυνὴ σμησαμένη
ἀπὸ [συ]νο[υ]σίας λουσάμενος ἢ ἁγνισάμ[ενος]
ἀπὸ κο[ι]νῆ[ς] ἡμε. λʹ
ἀπὸ τῶν παρανόμων οὐδέποτε καθαρός.
20   ἱερεῖς, μολποί, μουσικοί, ὑμνῳδοί, ὑπηρέται ἀπὸ
τῶν ἀκουσίων πάντοτε καθαροὶ τῷ ἱερῷ καθαρσίῳ
      χρώμενοι.
τάν ποτ᾽ Ὄλυμπον ἔβας ἀρεταφόρον εἴσιθι. τοιγὰρ
εἰ καθαρὸς βαίνις, ὦ ξένε, θαρραλέως,
25   εἰ δέ τι πᾶμα φέρις, τὸν ἀπάμονα κάλλιπε ναόν,
στεῖχε δ᾽ ὅπα χρήζις Πάλλαδος ἐκ τεμένους.

Translation:

It is religiously permitted to enter cleansed and purified inside the lustral basin and the [gates] of the temple, refraining from looking (?), children - -, purified not only with regard to the body, but also to the soul from everything that is polluted, impure and unlawful, without carrying martial weapons, with pure senses, without headdress, barefooted or wearing white shoes not made of goatskin, carrying nothing of goatskin, nor knots in the belts. From the miscarriage of a woman, a dog or a donkey (one is to be purified) for forty days, from deflowering for forty-one days, from death in the family forty-one days, from the washing of corpses seven days, from entering (a house where someone has died?) three days, from childbed three days. A woman who has given birth must be purified for twenty-one days. A woman cleansed from […], while a man is to be cleansed or purified from sexual intercourse, from a prostitute for thirty (or: one) day(s). From unlawful things one will never be pure. Priests, dancers, musicians, choral singers and servants must always be pure from involuntary matters using the purification sacrifice. When you have come to the virtuous Olympian goddess, enter. For if you come purified, stranger, have no fear. But if you bring something harmful, leave the unharmed temple and go wherever you want from the *temenos* of Pallas.

8. *LSS* 108

Purity regulation, Rhodes, 1st century AD.

                    – – – – – –
                    [ἀπὸ ἀφρ]οδισίω[ν]
                    ἀ[πὸ] κυάμων
                    ἀπὸ καρδίας.
                    ἀγνὸν χρὴ ναοῖο θ[υ]–
          5   ώδεος ἐντὸς ἰόντ[α]
                    ἔνμεναι· οὐ λουτρôι
                    ἀλλὰ νόῳ καθαρόν.
                    καθ᾽ ἀδίτους θύοντα
                    ἐνβάλλειν εἰς τὸν θη–
          10   σαυρὸν βοὸς ‹α´, τῶ[ν]
                    ἄλλων τετραπόδων [.´],
                    ἀλέκτορος ε´.

Translation:

……[from sexu]al intercourse, from beans, from a heart. One must be in a pure state to enter and be in the fragrant temple. Not clean by bathing, but by mind. At the shrine (?) the performer of the sacrifice shall pay one drachma to the treasury for a bull, for other animals ??, and for a cock five drachmas.

9. *LSS* 119 (*SEG* VIII 639; *SEG* XLIII 1131)[3]

Purity regulation, Ptolemaïs in Egypt, 1st century BC.

> Τοὺς εἰσιόντας εἰς τὸ [ἱερὸν]
> ἀγνεύειν κατὰ ὑποκε[ίμενα]·
> ἀπὸ πάθους ἰδίου καὶ [ἀλλοτρίου]
> ἡμέρας ζ´, ἀπ᾽ ἀπαλλ[αγῆς – – – –]
>
> 5   ἀπ᾽ ἐκτρωσμοῦ συν[– – –· ἀπὸ]
> τετοκυίας καὶ τρεφούσης.´
> καὶ ἐὰν ἐχθῇ ιδ´· τοὺς δὲ ἄ[νδρας]
> [ἀ]πὸ γυναικὸς β´, τὰς δὲ γ[υναῖκας]
> ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἀνδρά[σιν·´αχατ´].
>
> 10 ἀπ᾽ ἐκτρωσμοῦ μ´·´αχατ
> τὴν δὲ τεκοῦσαν καὶ τρέ[φουσαν μ´]
> [ἐ]ὰν δὲ ἐχθῇ τὸ βρέφος [– – – – – – –]·
> ἀπὸ καταμηνίων ζ´·´αχατ
> ἀνδρὸς β´, μυρσίνην δὲ [οἴσει ?]
> – – – –

Translation:

Those who enter the shrine are to purify themselves according to the following: from the disease of one's own or someone else seven (days), from [death…], from miscarriage […….] (woman) giving birth and breastfeeding […] and if she exposes it (?) fourteen (days). The m[en] from (intercourse) with women, two days, and the women in accordance with the men. (A woman?) from a miscarriage, forty days […….] (a woman) giving birth and brea[stfeeding, forty days?]. If she exposes the baby […….], from menstruation, seven (days) […….] (from intercourse with?) a men, two days, myrtle (?) […….].

---

[3] The text follows *SEG* XLIII 1131.

265

10. *LSS* 128 (*SEG* XVI 368)

Regulation of entrance to a sanctuary, Kallion in Aetolia, 5th century BC.

        Ἐν τὸ ἱερὸν
        μὴ παρίμεν
        εἰ δὲ τίς κα
        παρέρπῃ, ζα–
5   μία τέτορες
        στατῆρες.

Translation:

Do not enter the shrine. If someone sneaks in, he will be fined four staters.

C. LSCG

1. *LSCG* 37 (*LGS* II 34; *IG* II^2 1362)

Regulation for protection of the trees at the sanctuary of Apollon Erithaseos. Stele of white marble. From Attica, late 4th century BC. Written in *stoichedon*.

        Θεοί.
        ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Ἐριθασέου π[ρ]–
        οαγορεύει καὶ ἀπαγορεύει ὑπέρ τε ἑαυτ[οῦ]
        καὶ τῶν δημ[ο]τῶν καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηνα[ί]–
5   ων μὴ κόπτειν τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος μηδὲ [φ]–
        έρει(ν) ξύλα μηδὲ κοῦρον μηδὲ φρύγανα μηδ[ὲ]
        φυλλόβολα ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ· ἂν δέ τις ληφθεῖ [κ]–
        όπτων ἢ φέρων τι τῶν ἀ[π]ειρημένων ἐκ τοῦ [ἱ]–
        εροῦ, ἂν μὲν δοῦλος ἖ι ὁ λη[φ]θείς, μαστιγώ[σ]–
10   εται πεντήκοντα πληγὰς καὶ παραδώσει [α]–
        ὑτοῦ καὶ τοῦ δεσπότου τοὔνομα ὁ ἱερεὺς [τ]–
        ῵ι βασιλεῖ καὶ τῆι βουλῆι κατὰ τὸ ψήφισ[μ]–
        α τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων·
        ἂν δὲ ἐλεύθερος ἖ι, θοάσει αὐτὸν ὁ ἱερεὺ[ς]
15   μετὰ τοῦ δημάρχου πεντήκοντα δραχμαῖς

καὶ παραδώσει τοὔνομα αὐτοῦ τῶι βασιλ[εῖ]
καὶ τῆι βουλῆι κατὰ τὸ ψήφισμα τῆς βου[λ]–
ῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων.

Translation:

Gods. The priest of Apollo Erithaseos declares and forbids on behalf of himself and the other members of the *dēmē* and the Athenian people anyone to cut down trees in the sanctuary of Apollo, and to bring wood, twigs, firewood or fallen leaves out of the sanctuary. If anyone receives what is illegally cut or brought out of the sanctuary, he shall, if he is a slave, be whipped with fifty lashes and the priest shall give his and his master's name to the king archon and the council in accordance with the decision of the council and the Athenian people. If he is a free man the priest shall, together with the *dēmarch* fine him fifty drachmas and give his name to the king and the council in accordance with the decision of the council and the Athenian people.

2. *LSCG* 53 (*LGS* II 47; *IG* II² 1369)

Regulation of a guild from Attica, late 2nd century AD.

Ἄρχων μὲν Ταυρίσκος, ἀτὰρ μὴν Μουνιχιὼν ἦν,
ὀκτ[ω]καιδεκάτη δ᾽ ἔρανον σύναγον φίλοι ἄνδρες
καὶ κοινῆ βουλῆ θεσμὸν φιλίης ὑπέγραψαν.
30   νόμος ἐρανιστῶν
[μη]δενὶ ἐξέστω ἰσι[έν]αι ἰς τὴν σεμνοτά[τη]ν
σύνοδον τῶν ἐρανιστῶν πρὶν ἂν δοκι–
μασθῆ εἴ ἔστι ἁ[γν]ὸς καὶ εὐσεβὴς καὶ ἀγ–
α[θ]ός· δοκιμα[ζέ]τω δὲ ὁ προστάτης [καὶ]
35   [ὁ] ἀρχ‹ι›εραγιστὴς καὶ ὁ γ[ρ]αμματεὺς καὶ
[οἱ] ταμίαι καὶ σύνδικοι· ἔστωσαν δὲ ο[ὗ]–
[τ]οι κληρωτοὶ κατὰ ἔ[το]ς χωρὶς π‹ρισπ›ροστάτ[ου]·
ὁμολείτωρ δὲ ἔ‹ι›στω δ[ιὰ] βίου αὐτο[ῦ]
ὁ ἐπὶ ἡρῴου καταλιφθείς· αὐξανέτω δ[ὲ]
40   ὁ ἔρανος ἐπὶ φιλοτειμίαις· εἰ δέ τις μά–
χας ἢ θορύβους κεινῶν φαίνοιτο
ἐκβαλλέσθω τοῦ ἐράνου ζημιού–
μενος ‹ε› Ἀττ[ι]καῖς κε΄ ἢ πληγαῖς αἰκ‹αικ›ιζ[ό]–
μενος ταῖς διπλαῖς πε‹τ›ρα κρίσεως.

Translation:

Taruriskos was archon and the month was Mounikhion. On the 18th day friendly men convened a guild and signed by common decision an ordinance of friendship. THE LAW OF THE GUILD MEMBERS: It is not allowed for anyone to enter the holy assembly of the guild members before proven to be in a pure state, pious, and good. The chairman, the president of the guild, the secretary, the treasurers, and the advocates (?) must approve them. These (magistrates), except the chairman, are to be elected by lot every year. He who is left in the *herōon* shall be *homoleitōr* for life. Let the guild increase in honour. If someone displays strife or clamour, he is to be thrown out of the guild and be fined 25 Attic drachmas or be tortured with the double amount of lashes beyond the verdict.

3. <u>*LSCG* 54</u> (*LGS* II 48; *IG* II² 1364)

Regulation of the cult of Asclepios and Hygieia, Attica, 1st century AD.

      Ἱερὸν τὸ τέμενο[ς]
      τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ
         τῆς Ὑγιείας.
      θύειν τοὺς γεωργοὺς
5   καὶ τοὺς προσχώρους
      τοῖν θεοῖν ἧι θέμις
      καὶ τὰς μοίρας νέμειν
      τῶι τε εἰσαμένωι καὶ
      τῶι θεηκολοῦντι·
10   τῶν δὲ κρεῶν μὴ
      φέρεσθαι.

Translation:

The *temenos* of Asclepios and Hygieia is holy. The peasants and the neighbours shall sacrifice to the two gods according to the custom and distribute the portions to the founder and the priest. Do not take (away) of the meat.

4. <u>*LSCG* 55</u> (*LGS* II 49; *IG* II² 1366)

Regulation of the cult of Mēn, Sounion, Attica, 2nd century AD.

      Ξάνθος Λύκιος Γαίου Ὀρβίου καθειδρύσατο ἱερ[ὸν τοῦ Μηνὸς]
      Τυράννου, αἱρετίσαντος [το]ῦ θεοῦ, ἐπ᾽ ἀγαθῆ τύχη· καὶ [μηθένα]

ἀκάθαρτον προσάγειν· καθαριζέστω δὲ ἀπὸ σ[κ]όρδων κα[ὶ χοιρέων]
κα[ὶ γ]υναικός· λουσαμένους δὲ κατακέφαλα αὐθημερὸν εἰσ[πορευ]–
5   εσθαι· καὶ ἐκ τῶν γυναικέων διὰ ἑπτὰ ἡμερῶν λουσαμένην κ[ατα]–
κέφαλα εἰσπορεύεσθαι αὐθημερόν, καὶ ἀπὸ νεκροῦ διὰ ἡμερῶν
δ[έκα]
καὶ ἀπὸ φθορᾶς ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα· καὶ μηθένα θυσιάζειν ἄνε[υ]
τοῦ καθειδρυσαμένου τὸ ἱερόν· ἐὰν δέ τις βιάσηται, ἀπρόσδεκτος
ἡ θυσία παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ· παρέχειν δὲ καὶ τῶι θεῶι τὸ καθῆκον, δεξιὸν
10   σκέλος καὶ δορὰν καὶ κεφαλὴν καὶ πόδας καὶ στηθύνιον καὶ ἔλαιον
ἐπὶ βωμὸν καὶ λύχνον καὶ σχίζας καὶ σπονδήν· καὶ εὐείλατος
γένοιτο ὁ θεὸς τοῖς θεραπεύουσιν ἁπλῇ τῇ ψυχῇ· ἐὰν δέ τινα
ἀνθρώπινα πάσχῃ ἢ ἀσθενήσῃ ἢ ἀποδημήσῃ που, μηθένα ἄνθρώ–
πων ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν, ἐὰν μὴ ὧι ἂν αὐτὸς παραδῶι· ὃς ἂν δὲ πολυ–
15   πραγμονήσῃ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ περιεργάσηται, ἁμαρτίαν ὀφιλέτω Μηνὶ
Τυράννωι, ἣν οὐ μὴ δύνηται ἐξειλάσασθαι· ὁ δὲ θυσιάζων τῇ ἑβδόμῃ
τὰ καθήκοντα πάντα ποιείτωι τῶι θεῶι· λαμβανέτωι δὲ τῆς θυσίας ἧς
ἂν φέρῃ σκέλος καὶ ὦμον· τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ κατακοπτέτω ⟨ἐν τῶι⟩ ἱερῶι· εἰ
δέ τις
⟨ει δε τις⟩ προσφέρει θυσίαν τῶι θεῶι, ἐγ νουμηνίας μέχρι πεντεκαι–
20   δεκάτης· ἐὰν δέ τις τράπεζαν πληρῶι τῶι θεῶι, λαμβανέτωι τὸ
ἥμισ[υ]·
τοὺς δὲ βουλομένους ἔρανον συνάγειν Μηνὶ Τυράννωι ἐπ᾽ ἀγαθῆι
τύ[χηι]·
ὁμοίως δὲ παρέξουσιν οἱ ἐρανισταὶ τὰ καθήκοντα τῶι θεῶι, δε[ξιὸν]
σκέλος καὶ δορὰν καὶ κοτύλην ἐλαίου καὶ χοῦν οἴνου καὶ να[στὸν
χοινι]–
κιαῖον καὶ ἐφίερα τρία καὶ κολλύβων χοίνικες δύο καὶ ἀκρό[δρυα,
ἐ]–
25   ὰν κατακλιθῶσιν οἱ ἐρανισταί, καὶ στέφανον καὶ λημνίσ[κον]·
καὶ εὐείλατος γένοιτο τοῖς ἁπλῶς προσπορευομένοις.

Translation:

Xanthos Lykios, slave of Gaius Orbius, founded the temple of Men Tyrannos, when the god had chosen him, with good luck. No one is to approach in an unclean state. A man is to purify himself from garlic,

pork and intercourse with women, and having washed himself from head to foot on the same day he may enter. Seven days after her menstruation, having washed herself from head to foot on the same day a woman may enter. After a death, ten days, and after abortion forty days. No one is to sacrifice unless the man who founded the temple is present. If someone violates this rule, the sacrifice will not be received by the god. One is to give to the god what is due to him: the right thighbone, the skin, the head, the feet, the chest, olive oil on the altar, and a torch, firewood and a drink-offering. May the god be benevolent to those who serve him with a sincere heart. If (Xanthos) dies or is sick, or is absent, nobody is to have the authority, except the one he himself gives it to. Anyone who interferes in the business of the god without having anything to with it, is to be guilty of a transgression against Mēn Tyrannos, which it is impossible to reconcile. He who sacrifices on the seventh day is to do everything due to the god. From the sacrifice he brings, he is to take a thighbone and a shoulder, while the rest he is to cut up in the temple. If someone brings sacrifices to the god, it is (to take place) from the first day of the month to the fifteenth. If someone fills the table for the god, he is to take half. Those who want to call a feast for Men Tyrannos shall do so with a good luck. Likewise, the participants of the feast are to give what is due to the god: right thighbone, the skin, a cup of olive oil, a jug of wine, a cake of one *khoinix* of grain, three sacrificial cakes, two *khoinix* of small cakes and fruit. If the participants lie down at the table, they are also to give a wreath and a woollen band. May the god be benevolent to those who him sincerely approach.

5. *LSCG* 84 (*LGS* II 81; *IG* IX 2 1109 II)
Stele of white marble. From Korope (Magnesia), about 100 BC.

Ἱερέως Κρίνωνος τοῦ Παρμενίωνος, μηνὸς Ἀρτεμισιῶνος δεκάτηι.
Κρίνων Παρμενίωνος Ὁμολιεὺς ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ἀκραίου καὶ
Διονυσόδωρος Εὐφραίου Αἰολεὺς ὁ κοινὸς στρατηγὸς καὶ οἱ στρατη-
γοὶ καὶ οἱ νομοφύλακες εἶπαν· ἐπεὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα δένδρα ἐν τῶι ἱε-
5   ρῶι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Κο(ρ)οπαίου εἰσὶν κατεφθαρμένα, ὑπολαμ-
βάνομεν δὲ ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι καὶ συμφέρον γενέσθαι τινὰ πε-
ρὶ τούτων ἐπιστροφήν ὥ[στε] συναυξηθέντος τοῦ τεμένου(ς) ἐ-
πιφανεστέραν γίν[εσθαι τὴν τοῦ] τ[ό]που μεγαλομέρειαν· διὸ καὶ δε-
δόχθαι τῆι βουλῆι κα[ὶ τῶι δήμωι, τὸν] καθεσταμένον νεωκορεῖν
10   ποιεῖν συμφανὲς [πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀεὶ π]αραγινομένοις εἰς τὸ (ἱερὸν τὸ)
                                  μηθενὶ
ἐξεῖναι τῶν πολ[ιτῶν μηδὲ τῶν ἐν]οικούντων μηδὲ τῶν ἐνδη-
μούντων ξένων [δένδρα κόπτειν ἐν τ]ῶι διασαφουμένωι τόπωι μηδὲ
                                  κο-
λούειν· ὁμοίω[ς δὲ καὶ μὴ εἰσβάλλειν θ]ρέμματα νομῆς ἕνεκεν μηδὲ

στάσεως· εἰ δ[ὲ μή, ἀποτίνειν τῆ]ι πόλει δραχμὰς [Ι'], τῷ δὲ προ–

15 σαγγείλα[ντι δίδοσθαι τοῦ εἰσπραχθέ]ντος τὸ ἥμισυ παραχρῆμα παρὰ

τῶν ταμι[ῶν· ἐὰν δὲ δοῦλος ἦι, μαστ]ιγοῦσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν στρατηγῶν καὶ

νο–

μοφυλάκ[ων ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς πλη]γὰς ἑκατόν, τοῦ δὲ θρέμματος ἀποτί–

νειν ἑκά[στου ὀβολόν· ποιεῖσθ]αι δὲ τὰς προσαγγελίας τούτων πρὸς

τοὺς

διασαφο[υμένους ἄρχοντας· ἀν]αγραφῆναι δὲ καὶ τοῦ ψηφίσματος τὸ

ἀν–

20 τίγραφ[ον – – – – – Ἀπό]λλωνος, ὃ καὶ προτεθῆναι πρὸ τῆς εἰσόδου

τοῦ νεω[κορίου, γενομένης ἐγ]δόσεως ὑπὸ τῶν τειχοποιῶν, ὅπως πα–

[ρα]κολ[ουθῶσι οἱ παραγινόμενο]ι πάντες τὰ δεδογμένα·

διαπαραδιδόσ–

[θ]ω [δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα τόδε καὶ τοῖς] αἱρεθησομένοις μετὰ ταῦτα

στρατηγοῖς

[‹στρατηγοῖς› καὶ νομοφύ]λαξιν νομοθεσίας τάξιν ἔχον· ἔδοξεν

25 τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῆι ἐκκλησίαι.

Translation:

When Krinōn son of Parmenion was priest, on the 10th day of the month Artemision. Krinon from Homolion son of Parmenion, priest of Zeus Akraios, and Dionysodoros the Aeolian son of Euphraios, the *koinos stratēgos*, the magistrates and the guardians of the law made the proposal. Because the trees in the sanctuary of Apollon Koropaios have been destroyed, we consider it necessary and useful that attention be paid to this, so that when the *temenos* is extended the great size of this area becomes most evident. Therefore the people and the council have decreed that the person appointed warden of the temple shall make clear to all present at any time in the shrine that none of the citizens, residents or foreigners staying in the country be allowed to cut or curtail the trees in the marked area, likewise that nobody be allowed to bring in herds for grazing or keeping. If not, the transgressor shall be fined 50 drachmas to the city, but half the exacted money shall immediately be given to the informer by the treasurers. If he is a slave he shall be whipped with a hundred lashes by the magistrates and the guardians of the laws at the marketplace, and pay a fine of one obol for each animal. Informing about this shall be made to the specified officials. A copy of the decision shall be written down . . . . of Apollon, which shall also be raised in front of the entrance of the sacristy, the publication procured by of the wall builders, so that everyone present shall follow the decision accurately. This decision shall also be handed over to the magistrates and guardians of the laws to be elected in the future, as having the status of legislation. This is the decision of the council and the assembly.

6. _LSCG 91_ (_LGS_ II 87; _IG_ XII 9, 90)

From Euboia. 4th century BC.

<div align="center">

– – – –

[πεντήκ]οντα δραχμὰς [ἱερὰ]–
[ς τῖ Ἀπ]όλλωνος· ὁ δὲ δήμ[αρχ]–
[ος εἰ]ὰμ μὴ ὁρκῶρει ἢ μὴ ἐ[νε]–
[χ]υράρει τοὺς [μ]ὴ ὁμόρα[ν]–
[τα]ς, πεντα[κο]ρ[ί]ας δ[ρ]αχμὰς
[ἀ]ποτινέτω· ἐκπρηττόντων
δὲ οἱ ἱεροπ[ο]οὶ ἢ αὐτο[ὶ] ὀφε-
λόντων διπλεῖ.
ἀποτίνειν δὲ ἐὰμ μὲν κείρω[ν]
ἢ φέρων ἁλοῖ, ἑκατὸν δραχμ-
άς· ἐὰν δὲ βόσκων ἢ εἰρελῶν
στερέσθω τοῦ βοσκήματος.

</div>

5

10

Translation:

………fifty drachmas consecrated to Apollo. The _demarchos_ shall pay five hundred drachmas if he does not make those who have not taken the oath swear or take the pledge from them. The overseers of the temple shall exact the punishment or themselves owe the double. A person shall be fined one hundred drachmas if caught cutting down trees or carrying (wood). If caught letting (cattle) grass or driving them in, one shall have the herd confiscated.

7. _LSCG_ 111 (_LGS_ II 107; _IG_ XII 5, 108)

From Paros. Late 5th century BC.

<div align="center">

– – –

– – – – – – –]ος ἐχ[φ]έρ[εν]
[μηδὲ . . . . . ἐξῆ]γαι κόπτεν ὅτ–
[ο μὴ χρέα πρὸ]ς τὸ ἱερὸν οἰ[κοδό]–
[μημα· ἢν δέ τ]ίς τι τούτων παρίη[ι]
[φηνάτ]ω ὁ θέλων πρὸς θεορ–
[ὸς καὶ] σχέτω τὸ ἥμισυ· τὸν δὲ ν–

</div>

5

[εωκ]όρον ἐξορκ(ό)ντων θεορ–

[οὶ ἤ]ν τινα ἴδηι κόπτοντα πὰρ τ–

[ὰ] ἐκγινόμενα κατερῆν πρὸς τ–

10   [ὸ]ς θεορός.

Translation:

. . . . [not] bring out . . . nor is anyone allowed to cut what he does not need for the holy building. If someone disregards anything of this, whoever wishes shall denounce him to the *theoros* and receive the half. The *theoroi* shall make the temple warden swear that if he sees anyone cutting against what is legal, he shall denounce him to the *theoroi*.

8. <u>LSCG</u> 116 (*LGS* II 111; *Syll*³ 986)

From Chios. 4th century BC.

['Ἐπὶ Τ]έλλεος π[ρυτάν]–

εος, βολῆς γν[ώμη· ἐν τ]–

οῖς ἄλσεσιν μ[ὴ ποιμ]–

αίνεν μηδὲ κοπρε[*bε*]–

5   ν· ἢν δὲ ποιμαίνηι [ἢ ὑ]–

φορβῆι ἢ βοκολῆι, [ὁ ἰ]–

δὼν κατειπάτω πρ[ὸς]

τὸς βασιλέας ἀγν[ῶς]

πρὸς τὸ θεὸ· τῶι δὲ π[ο]–

10   ιμαίνοντι ἢ ὑφορβέ–

οντι ἢ βοκολέοντι ἡ–

[μ]ίεκτον ἴθυνα ἔστω

κατὰ κτῆνος ἕκαστο–

ν· ἢν δὲ κοπρεόων ἁλι–

15   σκηται, πέντε στατ[ῆ]–

ρας ὀφειλέτω ἀγνῶ[ς]

πρὸς τὸ θεὸ· ἢν δὲ ὁ ἰ[δ]–

ὼν μὴ κατείπει, πέντ–

ε στατῆρας ὀφειλέτ–

20   ω ἱερ[ὸ]ς τῶι θεῶι· τ[αῦ]–

τα̣ γράψαι ἐν τοῖς ἄλ–
σεσιν· σκεῦα ἐκ τῶ ἱε–
ρ[ῶ μὴ̓] χφέρεν τὰ ἱερά·
[ἢν δ᾿ ἐχ]φέρηι ἀρεστή–
25   [ριον ὀφεί]λ[ε]ν· [τ]ὸν δὲ
[ἰδ]όντα πρὸς τὸς βα[σ]–
[ι]λέας κατειπεῖν· ἢν [δ]–
[ὲ] μὴ κατείπει, πέντε
στατῆρας ὀφείλεν ἱ–
30   ερὸς τῶι θεῶι.

Translation:

When Tellis was *prutaneus*. The decision of the council: It is not allowed to herd cattle or spread manure in the groves. If someone tends a flock or herds pigs or cattle, the witness shall report this to the kings pure before the god. The person who tends a flock or herds pigs or cattle shall pay a penalty of half a *hekteus* (of grain?) for each animal. If anyone is caught spreading manure, he shall owe five gold coins pure before the god. If the witness does not report this, he should owe five staters to be consecrated to the god. This is to be written in the groves. One shall not bring out sacred goods from the temple. If someone brings out anything, he shall owe a propitiatory offering. The witness should report this to the kings. If he does not report this, he shall owe five staters to be consecrated to the god.

9. *LSCG* 121 (*SEG* XVII 394)

Boundary stone, Chios.

Ἱρόν. οὐκ ἔ–
σοδος.

Translation:

Holy! No entrance!

10. *LSCG* 124 (*LGS* II 117; *IG* XII Suppl. 126)

Purity regulation, Eresos, 2nd century BC.

– – –

. . . . . .   ς εἰσ̣τείχην εὐσεβέας
ἀπὸ μὲν κάδεος ἰδίω

[ἀγνεύσ]αντας ἀμέραις εἴκοσι· ἀπὸ δὲ

[ἀλλοτρί]ω ἀμέραις τρεῖς λοεσσάμενον

5 [ἀπὸ δὲ θν]ατῶ ^ꓦ ἀμέραις δέκα ^ꓦ αὗταν δὲ [τὰν]

[τετό]κοισαν ἀμέραις τεσσαράκοντα

[ἀπὸ δὲ βιω]τῶ ἀμέραις τρεῖς ^ꓦ αὗταν δὲ [τὰν]

[τ]ετόκοισαν ^ꓦ ἀμέραις δέκα

[ἀπὸ δὲ γ]υναικὸς αὐταμερὸν λοεσσάμενον

10 [φονέας] δὲ μὴ εἰστείχην ^ꓦ μηδὲ προδόταις

[μὴ εἰσ]τείχην δὲ μηδὲ γάλλοις ^ꓦ μηδὲ

[γυ]ναῖκες γαλλάζην ἐν τῶι τεμένει

[μ]ὴ εἰσφέρην δὲ μηδὲ ὅπλα πολεμιστήρ[ια]

[μ]ηδὲ θνασίδιον

15 [μη]δὲ εἰς τὸν ναυὸν εἰσφέρην ^ꓦ σίδαρον

μηδὲ χαλκὸν πλὰν νομίσματος

μηδὲ ὑποδεσιν μηδὲ ἄλλο δέρμα

μηδὲν ^{ꓦꓦ} μὴ εἰστείχην δὲ μηδὲ γυν[αῖκ]α

εἰς τὸν ναυὸν πλὰν τᾶς ἱερέας

20 καὶ τᾶς προφητίδος.

[μὴ λω]τίζην δὲ μηδὲ κτήνεα μηδὲ βοσκήματα

ἐν τῷ τεμένει.

Translation:

…………enter pious from the funeral rites of relatives purified for twenty days, from (the funeral) of others cleansed for three days, from death purified for ten days, the woman who has given birth herself purified for forty days, from provoked abortion (?) purified for three days, the woman who has given birth herself for ten days, from intercourse with a woman cleansed on the same day. Murderers must not enter, nor must traitors enter, nor *galloi*, nor must women who practice the cult of Cybele enter the temenos. One must not bring in weapons of war, nor the carcass of an animal. Nor is one to bring iron into the temple, nor copper except money, nor shoes, nor any other skin. No one is to enter the temple, not even a woman, except the priestess and the prophetess. One must not water (?) herds or cattle inside the temenos.

11. *LSCG* 130 (*LGS* 123; *IG* XII 3, 183)

Purity regulation, Astypalaia, 3rd century BC.

[Ἐ]ς τὸ ἱερὸν μὴ ἐσέρπεν ὅσ–

τις μὴ ἁγνός ἐστι, ἢ τελεῖ

ἢ αὐτῶι ἐν νῶι ἐσσεῖται.

Translation:

Whoever is not pure, must not enter the shrine, nor perform the rites nor be present in the temple itself.

12. *LSCG* 136 (*LGS* II 145; *IG* XII 1, 677)

Cultic regulation, Ialysos, ca. 300 BC.

Ἔδοξε τοῖς μαστροῖς καὶ Ἰαλυσίοις·

Στρατῆς Ἀλκιμέδοντος εἶπε·

ὅπως τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τὸ τέμενος

τᾶς Ἀλεκτρώνας εὐαγῆται κα-

5   τὰ τὰ πάτρια, ἐπιμεληθήμειν

τοὺς ἱεροταμίας, ὅπως στᾶλαι

ἐργασθέωντι τρεῖς λίθου Λαρτ[ί]-

ου καὶ ἀναγραφῆι ἐς τὰς στάλα-

ς τό τε ψάφισμα τόδε καὶ ἃ οὐχ ὅ-

10   σιόν ἐντι ἐκ τῶν νόμων ἐσφέ-

ρειν οὐδὲ ἐσοδοιπορεῖν ἐς τὸ τέ-

μενος καὶ τὰ ἐπιτίμια τῶ[ι] πράσ-

σοντι παρὰ τὸν νόμον· θέμειν δὲ

τὰς στάλας μίαμ μὲν ἐπὶ τᾶς ἐσό-

15   δου τᾶς ἐκ πόλιος ποτιπορευομένο-

ις, μίαν δὲ ὑπὲρ τὸ ἱστιατόριον,

ἄλλαν δὲ ἐπὶ τᾶς καταβάσιος τᾶ[ς]

ἐξ Ἀχαΐας πόλιος.

νόμος ἃ οὐχ ὅσιον ἐσίμειν οὐδὲ

20   ἐσφέρειν ἐς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τὸ τέ-

μενος τᾶς Ἀλεκτρώνας· μὴ ἐσί-

τω ἵππος, ὄνος, ἡμίονος, γῖνος,

μηδὲ ἄλλο λόφουρον μηθέν, μη-

δὲ ἐσαγέτω ἐς τὸ τέμενος μη-

25   θεὶς τούτων μηθέν, μηδὲ ὑποδή-

ματα ἐσφερέτω μηδὲ ὕειον μη–
θέν· ὅ, τι δέ κά τις παρὰ τὸν νόμον
ποιήσηι, τό τε ἱερὸν καὶ τὸ τέμενος
καθαιρέτω καὶ ἐπιρεζέτω, ἢ ἔνο–
30 χος ἔστω τᾶι ἀσεβείαι· εἰ δέ κα
πρόβατα ἐσβάληι, ἀποτεισάτω ὑ–
πὲρ ἑκάστου προβάτου ὀβολὸν
ὁ ἐσβαλών· ποταγγελλέτω δὲ
τὸν τούτων τι ποιεῦντα ὁ χρήι–
35 ζων ἐς τοὺς μαστρούς.

Translation:

Resolved by the treasurers and the Ialysians. Strates son of Alkimendon proposed that the temple and the temenos of the Alektrone is to be purified according to the ancestral customs, under the charge of the temple-treasurers, and that three steles are to be made of Lartian stone and on these steles is to be written this decision, and what is not permitted according to the laws to be bring in, nor to enter the *temenos,* and the punishment for acting contrary to the law. One of the steles is to be placed at the entrance for those who approach from the city; one is to be placed above the banquet hall and another at the road down from the city of Achaia. Law regarding what is not permitted to enter or bring into the shrine and *temenos* of Alektrone: A horse, donkey, mule, hinny, or any other pack animal must not enter. Nor is anyone to bring any of these into the *temenos*. No one is to bring in shoes or anything made from pig. The person, who does anything contrary to the law, is to purify the shrine and the *temenos*, and offer a sacrifice afterwards, or be liable to impiety. If someone brings in cattle, he who brings them in, is to pay an obol for each animal. Let the one who so desires rapport him who does any of these things to the treasurers.

13. *LSCG* 139 (*LGS* 148; *IG* XII 1, 789)

Purity regulation, Lindos, 2nd century AD.

[Ἀγ]αθᾶι τύχ[α]ι.
ἀφ᾽ ὧν χρ[ὴ] πα[ρ]ίν[α]ι αἰσίως
ε[ἰ]ς τὸ ἱε[ρ]όν· πρῶτον μὲν
καὶ τὸ μέγιστον, χεῖρας καὶ
5 γνώμην καθαροὺς καὶ ὑγιε[ῖς]
ὑπάρχοντας καὶ μηδὲν αὐτοῖς
δεινὸν συνειδότας

καὶ τὰ ἐκτός·
ἀπὸ φακῆς ἡμερῶν γ΄
10   ἀπὸ αἰγείου ἡμε γ΄
ἀπὸ τυροῦ ἡμε α΄
ἀπὸ φθορείων ἡμε μ΄
ἀπὸ κήδους [οἰκ]είου ἡμε μ΄
ἀπὸ συνουσίας νομίμου
15   αὐθμερὸν περιραναμένους
καὶ πρότερον χρεισαμένους
ἐλαίῳ
       ἀπὸ παρθενείας – –
    – – –

Translation:

May Good Fortune prevail! Those who are to enter the temple in an auspicious state must first and most importantly have clean hands and mind, be of good health, and they must not be aware of anything dangerous to them. And with regard to external things: From lentil-soup, three days; from goat meat, three days; from cheese, one day; from abortion drugs, forty days; from the funeral of a relative, forty days; from legitimate sexual intercourse on the same day after having been besprinkled and first used olive oil. From virginity - - -

14. <u>*LSCG* 148</u> (*LGS* II 153; *IC* IV 186 A)

From Gortyne. 3rd century BC.

      – – – ῥά]χος καὶ φρύγανα, ἐσπρεμμίττεν δὲ τὰσχίνους
μὴ, μηδ᾽ ἐς ἀκάτιον ἐξῆμεν ξύλα παῖεν ἄλλ᾽ ἢ ῥάχος κα[ὶ]
φρύγανα· αἱ δὲ μή, κύριος ἔστω ὁ παρτυχὼν ἀφελόμε–
νος κατὸ ἀρχαῖον.

Translation:

- - - brushwood and firewood, and not root out the mastics, nor is it allowed to bring out wood for a light boat (?), other than brushwood and firewood. If not, whoever is present shall have the authority to hinder it according to ancient custom.

15. *LSCG* 150 (A: Herzog, *Heilige Gesetze von Kos* 11; B: ibid. 12)

From Cos. Two marble stelae. A: Late 5th century BC (NB: See Parker 2004, n. 10), B: 4th century BC.

A

Αἴ τίς κα τάμηνηι τὰς κυπαρίσσο-
ς τὰς ἐν τῶι τεμένει ἢ τὰς ἔξω το-
ῦ τεμένεος ἢ φέρηι τὰ ξύλα ἐκ τ-
οῦ τεμένεος τὰ κυπαρίσσινα, χι-
5   λίας δραχμὰς ἀποτεισάτω καὶ τ-
ὸ ἱαρὸν ἀσεβείτω, αἴ κα μὴ ἐκκλη-
σίαι δόξει ἐς δαμόσιον ἔργον· φ-
αινόντω δὲ τοὶ ἐπιμεληταὶ τọ[ῦ]
τεμένεος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὁ χ[ρηίζ]-
10   ων ἐς τὰν ἐκ̣[κ]λησίαν κατ[ὰ τὸν ἱα]-
[ρὸν νόμον καὶ τ]ὸν μασ[τρικόν].

B

Φίλιστος Αἰσχίνα εἶπε· ὅπως
διαφυλάσσηται τὸ τέμενος
τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Κυπαρισ-
σίου καὶ τ̣[οῦ Ἀσκλαπιοῦ] καὶ μη-
5   δεὶ[ς τάμνηι τὰς κυπ]αρίσσο[ς]
[τὰς ἔντοσθε το]ῦ περιεχομέ-
[νο]υ τόπọυ [ὑπ]ὸ τῶν ὅρων τοῦ
τ̣εμένευς· [π]ροστάτας μη-
δεὶς προτιθέτω μηδὲ ἐπιψαφ[ι]-
10   ζέτω μηδὲ γνώμαν μηδεὶς
ἀγορ[ευ]έτ̣[ω ὡ]ς δεῖ καταχρῆ[σθαι]
τọῦ [κυπαρισσίνο]υ ξύ[λου· μηδὲ]
ἐξέστω [– – – – – – αἴ κα μὴ]
ἐκκλησίαι [δόξηι καταχρῆσθαι]
15   εἴς τι τῶν ἱε[ρῶν ἔργων καὶ ὅσσον]
ἐπὶ τᾶι ἐκκλη[σίαι ἐπικυρωθῆι]
ἀνακαθαίρεν [τὸ τέμενος καὶ κυ]-

παρίσσος εἰς ὕ[λαν ἐμφυτεύεν κα]–
τὰ δένδρος· μ[ηδὲ – – – αἰ κά τις]
20   προθῆι[– – –

Translation:

a

If anyone cuts down the cypresses inside the temenos or those outside the temenos or takes cypress wood out from the temenos, he shall pay one thousand drachmas and be deemed impious in respect of the temple; unless the Assembly decides (that the work was carried out) for public work. The superintendents of the *temenos* and whoever of the others who wishes are to denounce (violators) to the Assembly according to the sacred law and the law of the public examiners.

b

Philistos son of Aischinas proposed: In order to protect the temenos of Apollo Kyparissios and Asclepios and prevent anyone from cutting the cypresses inside the area surrounded by the borders of the *temenos*, no president is to propose or put to the vote anything, nor is anyone to make a proposition that implies the use of cypress wood. Nor shall it be allowed - - - - - - unless the Assembly decides to use (cypress wood) for any holy work and in so far as it is ratified in the Assembly to clear out the temenos and plant thick woods of cypresses to be used as timber. Nor - - - - - - - -if someone prop[oses………..

16. *LSCG* 152

Regulation of the cult of the Nymphs, Cos, 4th century BC.

Φίλιστος Αἰσχίνα εἶπε· ὅσσα
κα θύωντι ἐν τῶι ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀσ–
κλαπιοῦ ταῖς Νύμφαις θυόν–
τω ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν, εἰς δὲ τὰς
5   κράνας τὰς ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι μὴ ἐξε–
στω μηθενὶ πέμμα μηθέν· ἐνβάλ–
λειν μηδὲ ἄλλο μηθέν· εἰ δέ τις
κα ἐνβάληι, καθαράτω τὸ ἱερὸν
τᾶν Νυμφᾶν ὡς νομίζεται.

Translation:

Philistos son of Aiskhinas proposed: Everything they sacrifice in the shrine of Asklepios is to be sacrificed to the Nymphs on the altars, but it is not allowed for anyone to throw any sacrificial cake into the springs in the shrine, nor anything else. If someone throws something into it, the shrine of the Nymphs must be purified as is customary.

17. *LSCG* 171 (*SEG* XIV 529)

Foundation of the cult of Artemis and Zeus Ikesios, Isthmos, 2nd century BC.

[Πυθίων ἀνέθηκε] τὸ τέ[μενος τόδε]
ἱερὸν Ἀρτέμιτο[ς . . . .]ας καὶ Διὸς Ἱκ[ε]–
σίου καὶ θεῶν πατρώιων· ἀνέθηκε δὲ [καὶ]
Πυθίων Σιρασίλα καὶ ἁ ἱέρεια [. . . .] παιδ–
5   ίον ὧι ὄνομα Μακαρῖνος ἐλεύθερον ἱε–
ρὸν τᾶς θεοῦ, ὅπως ἐπιμέληται τοῦ ἱερο[ῦ]
καὶ τῶν συνθυόντων πάντων διακονῶν
καὶ ὑπηρετῶν ὅσσωγ κα δῆ ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι·
ἐπιμελέσθω καὶ Μακαρῖνος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων
10   ἱερῶν καὶ βεβάλων καθάπερ καὶ ἐν τᾶι ἱερᾶι δέλ–
τωι γέγραπται, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ὧγ καταλεί–
πει Πυθίων καὶ ἁ ἱέρεια· τοῖς δὲ ἐπιμελομέ–
νοις καὶ συναύξουσι τὸ ἱερόν, εὖ αὐτοῖς
ἔη καὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ τέκνοις εἰς τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον·
15   ἁγνὸν εἰσπορεύεσθαι – τὸ δὲ ἱερὸν ἔστω
τῶν υἱῶν πάντων κοινόν – ἀπὸ λεχοῦς καὶ
ἐγ δια(φθ)ορᾶς ἀμέρας δέκα, ἀπὸ γυναικὸς τρεῖ[ς].

Translation:

[Pythiōn dedicated] this sa[cred precinct] of Artemis […] and Zeus Hikesios and the ancestral gods. Pythiōn son of Sirasilas and the priestess have also dedicated a free child named Makarinos as sacred to the goddess, so that he will be in charge of the shrine and all the servants and assistants taking part in the sacrifice that are needed in the shrine. Makarinos must also take charge of the other members of the guild and uninitiated, as it is written on the holy tablet, and the others left behind by Pythiōn and the priestess. May those who are in charge of the shrine and contribute to its growth be blessed, both themselves and

their children forever. Enter in a pure state - but let the shrine be common to all the sons - from childbed and miscarriage after ten days, from a woman three days.

D. NGSL

1. *NGSL* 7 (*SEG* XXVIII 421)

Regulation of the cult of Isis, Serapis and Anubis, Megalopolis, Arcadia, ca. 200 BC.

       Στάλα Ἴσιος Σαράπιος.

      Θεός· τύχα ἀγαθά. Ἱερὸν ἅγνον Ἴσιος

      Σαράπιος Ἀνούβιος. ν Εἰσπορεύεσ–

      θαι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τὸν βουλόμενον

5   θύειν καθαρίζοντα ἀπὸ μὲν

      λέχ[ο]υς ἐγαταίαν, ἀπὸ δὲ δι–

      αφθέρματος ν τεσσαράκοντα

      καὶ τέσσαρας ἀμέρας, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶ[ν]

      φνυσικῶν ἑβδομαίαν, ἀπὸ φό[ν]ου (?)

10   ἑπτὰ ἀμέρας, ἀπὸ δὲ αἰγέου καὶ

      προβατέου τριταῖον, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν

      λοιπῶν βρωμάτων ἐκ κεφαλᾶς

      λουσάμενον αὐθημερί, ἀπὸ δὲ

      ἀφροδισίων αὐθημερὶ ν λουσά–

15   μενον, ἀπὸ ΠΑΘΙΝ[.]ΙΑΜΕΙΙΓΑΝ

      ΜΟΑΝ αὐθημερὶ λουσάμε[ν]ον.

      [-----]υεσθαι μηδεγ[------]

      [------] εἰσπορεύεσθα[ι----]

      [-------] . ΕΩΝΠΟ[------]

      [---------]ΣΘΕ[-------]

20   --------------------

Translation:

Stele of Isis and Sarapis. God! Good luck. A sanctuary sacred to Isis, Sarapis, Anoubis. Whoever wishes to sacrifice shall enter the sanctuary, being pure: From childbirth on the ninth day; from an abortion, for forty-four days; from menstruation, on the seventh day; from bloodshed (?), for seven days; from (eating) goat meat and mutton, on the third (day); from other foods, having washed oneself from the head down,

on the same day, from sexual intercourse, on the same day, having washed oneself; from [- - -] on the same day, having washed oneself [- - -] no one shall enter (?) [- - -] enter [- - -].[4]

E. SEG

1. *SEG* XLVII 1654

Proclamation of Meis ex Attalou, the territory of Silandos (?), sull. 183 = 98/99 AD.

Ἔτους ρπγʹ, μη(νος) Περειτίου
ιηʹ. Μεὶς ἐξ Ἀττάλου κολά–
σας ⟦ΑΣ⟧ τοὺς ἰδίους περὶ τῶν ἰ–
δίων ὑπαρχόντων· ἵνα μηδεγ[ὶ]
5 ἐξὸν εἶναι μήτε πωλεῖν μή–
τε ὑποθήκην τίθειν, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ
τῶν ἰδίων οἰκονομεῖσθαι, καὶ ὅσα
ἐπιζητεῖ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων γείνεσ–
θαι αὐτῷ. Ἐὰν δέ τις ἀπειθήσῃ χω–
10 ρὶς τῆς ἐκείνου συνχωρήσεος,
ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων δαπανήσας εἰλάσαι–
ται αὐτὸν μετὰ Μηνὸς Λαβανα.

Translation:

In the year 183, on the 18th of the month Peritios. Meis ex Attalou has punished his own people on account of his own property. It is not permitted for anyone either to sell or mortage (the property), but (it) should be administered by (the God's) own people; and as much as he demands, he shall receive from his own people. If someone is disobedient without his (i.e. the god's) consent, he shall propitiate him together with Mēn Labana paying the expences from his own means.

---

[4] Translated by E. Lupu. See Lupu 2005, 206-207.

Appendix B

RECONCILIATION INSCRIPTIONS

1. *BWK* 4 (*SEG* XXXVIII, 1229)

First publication: M. L. Cremer & J. Nollé, *Chiron* 18 (1988).

285 sull. = 200/201 AD.

Ἔτους σπεʹ, μη(νὸς) Πανήμου ιʹ ἀ(πιόντος)·
Θεῷ Ταρσίῳ ἀλύτῳ· ἐπεὶ
ἐκώλυσεν ὁ Σεβῆρος τὸ
στεφάνωμα κοπῆναι, ἐ-
5   πεζήτησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ ἁ-
μάρτημα. Ἀνέστησαν αἱ
αὐτοῦ τεθραμμέναι Ἀσια-
τεικὴ καὶ Ἰουλιανὴ εὐχα-
ριστοῦσαι.

In the year 285 on the 30th of the month Panēmos. For Theos Tarsios from whom no one may escape. Because Severus hindered cutting of wreaths the god examined the transgression. His foster daughters Asiateikē and Joulianē raised (this stele) in gratitude.

2. *BWK* 5 (*SEG* XXXVIII, 1237)

First publication: Chr. Naour, EA 2 (1983), 137, 123.

320 sull. = 235/6 AD.

Ἔτους τκʹ, μη(νὸς) Πανήμου βιʹ ·
κατὰ τὸ ἐφρενωθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν
Crescent   Pair of eyes
                                    θεῶν, ὑπὸ τοῦ
Διὸς κὲ τοῦ (Μηνὸς) μεγάλου Ἀρτεμι–
5   δώρου· ἐκολασόμην τὰ ὄματα τὸν
Θεόδωρον κατὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἃς
ἐπύησεν. Συνεγενόμην τῇ πε–

δίσχῃ τῷ Ἁπλοκόμα, τῇ Τροφίμῃ, τῇ γυ-
ναικὶ τῇ Εὐτύχηδος εἰς τὸ πλετώ–

10 ριν· ἀπαίρι τὴν πρώτην ἁμαρτίαν προβᾳ-
τῳ⟦ν⟧, πέρδεικι, ἀσφάλακι. Δευτέρα
ἁμαρτία· ἀλλὰ δοῦλος ὢν τῶν θεῶν τῶν
ἐν Νονου συνεγενόμην τῇ Ἀριάγνῃ τῇ
μοναυλίᾳ· 'παίρι χύρῳ, θείννῳ ἐχθύει. Τῇ

15 τρίτῃ ἁμαρτίᾳ συνεγενόμην Ἀρεθούσῃ
μοναυλίᾳ· 'παίρι ὄρνειθει, στρουθῷ, περισ-
τερᾷ, κύ(πρῳ) κρειθοπύρων, πρό(χῳ) οἴνου· κύ(προν) πυρῶν
καθαρὸς τοῖς εἰεροῖς, πρό(χον) α΄. Ἔσχα παράκλητον
τὸν Δείαν· εἴδαι, κατὰ τὰ πυήματα πεπηρώκιν,

20 νῦν δὲ εἰλαζομένου αὐτοῦ τοὺς θεοὺς κὲ στη-
λογραφοῦντος ἀνερύσετον τὰς ἁμαρτίας.
Ἠρωτημαίνος ὑπὸ τῆς συνκλήτου· εἴλεος εἶ-
μαι ἀναστανομένης τῆς στήλλην μου,
ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ ὥρισα· ἀνύξαις τὴν φυλακήν, ἐξαφίω

25 τὸν κατάδικον διὰ ἐνιαυτοῦ κὲ μηνῶν ι΄ περι–
πατούντων.

Translation:

In the year 320, on the 12th of the month Panemos. In accordance with the fact that I was instructed by the gods, by Zeus and the great Mēn Artemidoros: 'I have punished Theodoros on his eyes according to the transgressions he committed'. I had intercourse with Trophime, the slave of Haplokomas, wife of Eutykhes, in the *praetorium* (?). He removed the first transgression with a sheep, a partridge and a mole. The second transgression: Even though I was a slave of the gods in Nonu, I had intercourse with Ariagne, who was unmarried. He removed the transgression with a piglet and a tuna. At the third transgression I had intercourse with Arethusa, who was unmarried. He removed the transgression with a hen (or cock), a sparrow and a pigeon; with a *kypros* of a blend of wheat and barley and one *prokhos* of wine. Being pure he gave a *kypros* of wheat to the priests and one *prokhos*. As intercessor, I took Zeus. (He said): Behold! I hurt his sight because of his deeds, but now he has reconciled the gods and written down (the events) on a stele and paid for his transgressions. Asked by the council (the god proclaimed): I will be merciful, because my stele is raised on the day I appointed. You can open the prison; I will release the convict when one year and ten months has passed.

3. *BWK* 6 (*SEG* XXXIX 1279)

First publication: E. Varinloğlu, EA 13 (1989), 47 – 49.

323 sull. = 238/9 AD.

           Διεὶ Ὀρείτη μεγά–
           λῳ κὲ Μηνὶ Ἀ–
           ξιοττηνῷ
           Περκον βασιλεύ–
5   οντα Πωλίων.
           Ἐπί με ἔλαθεν
           κὲ ὑπερέβην τὸν
           ὅρον ἄθετος, ἐκο–
           λάσαντο αὐτὸν
10   οἱ θεοί· ἔτους τκγ΄, μη(νὸς) Δύσ–
           στρου λ΄· τριφώνῳ ἀπῆρεν,
           ἀσφάλακι κὲ στρουθῷ κὲ θι–
           νίῳ, κὲ τὴν θυμολυσίαν, τὴν
           εἶχαν οἱ θεοὶ ἐν ἔθι ἀναστα–
15   νομένης τῆς στήλης· μόδιος
           πυρῶν. οἴνου πρόχος α΄· ἄρισ–
           τον τοῖς εἰερεῖσιν πυρῶν κύ–
           προν αΓ΄, οἴνου πρόχον αΓ΄,
           ἐρέβινθοι κὲ ἁλειά· κὲ ἱλα–
20   σάμην τοὺς θεοὺς διὰ τέκνα τέ–
           κνων, ἔγγον᾽ ἐγόνων.

Translation:

Polion (dedicates this stele) to Zeus Oreites and Mēn Axiottenos, who rules Perkos (or: Perkon) as a king. When (the circumstances) were hidden for me, and I overstepped the border without permission, the gods punished him (= me). In the year 323, on the 30th of the month Dystros. He removed (the transgression) with a triad consisting of a mole, a sparrow and a tuna. He also gave the means of atonement that by habit is due to the gods when the stele was raised: a modius of wheat and one *prokhos* of wine. As a meal to the priests he gave 1½ (?) kypros of wheat, 1½ (?) prokhos of wine, peas and salt. And I have reconciled the gods for the sake of my grand-children and the descendants of my descendants.

4. *BWK* 7 (*SEG* XXXVIII, 1236)

First publication: H. Malay *EA* 12 (1988), 150f.

2nd or early 3rd century AD.

> Ἐπὶ προήγελαν οἱ θε–
> οὶ οἱ Περκηνῶν, Ζεὺς Ὀρεί–
> της εἰς τὸ ἄλσος μὴ βόσχ–
> [ι]ν κτήνη, ἠπείθουσαν, ἐκο–
>
> 5 λασαν Εὐμένην (δὶς) τὸν υἱὸν
> κὲ κατέθηκεν ἰσοθάνατον.
> Ἡ δὲ ἐμὴ Τύχη ἐλπίδαν
> ἔδωκε. Μεγάλαι Νεμέσις
> ἐν Περκῳ.

Translation:

When the Perkenian gods (and?) Zeus Oreites had warned not to let the herd graze in the grove and they (i.e. the people) did not obey, they (i.e. the gods) punished Eumenes the younger and he (i.e. Zeus Oreites?) put him in a deathlike condition. But my Fortune gave hope. Great are the Nemeseis in Perkos (or: Perkon).

5. *BWK* 9 (*SEG* XXVIII, 913; *TAM* V 1, 179a)

First publication: G. Petzl *ZPE* 30 (1978), 255f.

276 sull. = 191/2 AD.

> Μέγας Ζεὺς ἐκ Διδύμων
> Δρυῶν κατεκτισμένος καὶ
> αἱ δυνάμις αὐτοῦ. Ἐπεὶ
> Μηνόφιλος ἠγόρασε ἱερὰ ξύ–
>
> 5 λα, διὰ τοῦτο ἐκολάσθη ὑπὸ
> τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ πολλὰ παθόν–
> τος αὐτοῦ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐκέ–
> λευσε Μηνοφίλῳ τῷ υἱῷ αὐ–
> τοῦ ῥοισάμενον τὴν τοῦ πα–
>
> 10 τρὸς αἰτίαν. Παρανγέλλει

πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, ὅτι οὐ
δεῖ καταφρονεῖν το[ῦ θε]–
οῦ. Ἀνέστησε δὲ τὸ μαρτ[ύ]–
ριον ἔτους σος´, μη(νὸς) Δαισίου λ´.

Translation:

Great is Zeus founded at the Twin Oaks and his powers. Because Menophilos bought holy timber, he was for this reason punished by the god. And when he had suffered a lot, (the god) afterwards commanded his son Menophilos to propitiate his father' guilt. He proclaims to all people not to show contempt for the god. He raised the testimony in the year 276, on the 30th of the month Daisos.

6. *BWK 10* (*SEG* XXVIII, 914; *TAM* V 1, 179b)
First publication: G. Petzl, *ZPE* 30 (1978), 253.
279 sull. era = 194/5 AD.

Μέγας Ζεὺς ἐγ Διδύμων Δρυ–
ῶν. Στρατόνεικος Εὐανγέ–
λου διὰ τὸ ἀγνοεῖν αὐτὸν Δι–
ὸς Διδυμείτου ἔκκοψε δρῦ–
5   ν, κὲ ἀναζητήσας ὁ θεὸς τὴν
ἰδίαν δύναμιν διὰ τὸ ἀπιστῖν
αὐτὸν κατέθηκεν ΟΛΟΔΟΥΜΕ
ἰσοθανάτους, καὶ σωθεὶς ἐγ
μεγάλου κινδύνου εὐχαρισ–
10   τῶν ἀνέθηκεν. Παρανγέλ–
λω δέ, αὐτοῦ τὰς δυνάμις μή
τίς ποτε κατευτελήσι καὶ
κόψει δρῦν. Ἔτους σοθ´, μη(νὸς) Πα–
νήμου ηι´.

Translation:

Great is Zeus of the Twin Oaks. Stratoneikos son of Euangelos because of ignorance cut down one of the oaks belonging to Zeus Didymeites. And the god mobilized his own power because he (i.e. Stratoneikos) did not believe in him, and placed him - - - in a deathlike condition. He was saved from great danger and

288

raised the stele in gratitude. I declare that no one shall ever show contempt for his powers and cut down an oak. In the year 279, on the 18th of the month Panemos.

7. *BWK* 19 (*SEG* XXXIV, 1217)

First publication: E. Varinlioğlu, *EA* 3 (1984) 13.

283 sull. = 198/9 AD.

<div style="margin-left: 2em;">

Ἔτους σπγ΄, μη(νὸς) Ξαν–
δικοῦ. Μαρκία Αριου
ἐπὶ λειπούσης ἡμέ–
ρας εἰσῆλθα, ἐπεζή–
5   τησαν οἱ θεοί, καὶ ἐσ–
στηλλογράφησα ^v
καὶ εὐχαριστῶ.

</div>

Translation:

In the year 283, in the month of Xandikos. Because I, Markia daughter of Arios (or -es) went in when one day remained, the gods demanded (it), and I wrote down (the events) on a stele and convey my thanks.

8. *BWK* 22 (*SEG* XXXVII, 1737)

First publication: J. Nollé, *EA* 10 (1987), 102-104.

300 sull. = 215/6 AD.

<div style="margin-left: 2em;">

Ἔτους τ΄, μη(νὸς) Ξανδικο-
ῦ δωδεκάτη. Διὰ τὸ ἁ-
μάρτημα, τὸ ἐποίη-
σαν ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ - καὶ ἔκ-
5   λεψαν ΕΙΑΛΙΛΙΑ κὲ ἕτ-
ερά τινα τὰ κίμενα-, κο-
λασθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ θ-
εοῦ ἡ Μελίτη καὶ ὁ Μακ-
εδών, ἠρώτησαν οἱ γονῖς
10   ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν Ἀπόλλωνα Α-
ξυρον· ἠρώτησαν, εὐχαρι-

</div>

στοῦντες ἀνέθηκαν.

Translation:

In the year 300, on the 12th day of the month Xandikos. Because of the transgression which they committed towards the god – and they stole ?? as well as other property – Melitē and Makedōn were punished by the god and their parents asked Apollo Axyros on their behalf. Having asked they raised (the ex-voto) in gratitude.

9. *BWK* 25 (*TAM* V 1, 269)

First publication: A. E. Kontoleon, *REG* 14 (1901), 301, nr. 4.

Not dated.

```
        [        ἀ]πιθίας τ[
        [          Ἀσκλ]ηπιάδου κατα[
        [            ]ιϲ θεοῦ (?) εἶπεν [
        [        ] παρθένον καὶ ναυ[
   5    [            ]ου καὶ ἐλοιδόρη[σ–
        [          ἐ]ν τῷ ναῷ ποϲτα[
        [        σ]τίλλην ϲτανθ[–
        [          ]ν ὑπὸ Βάϲϲης [
        [          ]τος καὶ συνεβου[λευ–
  10    [          ]ατων κατα[
        [            ]ηναιϲτιχορ[
        [              ]ακον
```

Translation:

- - - disobedience - - - of Asklēpiadēs - - - of the god (?) said - - - virgin and - - - abused - - - in the temple - - - raised a stele - - - by Bassa - - - and advised - - -.

10. *BWK* 29 (*TAM* V 1, 467)

Not dated.

```
        ] . . ἐχεσθ[
        ]ΧΑΜΕΝ[
```

]. ΟΥ καταλο[υ–

]ΘΙΑΛΜΑ ἐκολ[ασ–

5   ] Ι Ι ἰς τὴν ὅρασ[ιν

Translation:

- - - ritual cleansing - - - punished - - - in the eyesight - - -.

11. <u>BWK</u> 36 (*SEG* XXXV, 1157)

First publication: P. Hermann, *Anz. Ak. Wien* 122 (1985), 251-4.

276 sull. = 191/2 AD.

Μηνὶ Λαβανα· ἡ Ἐλπὶς
κατευτελίσασα Μῆνα
Λαβανα ἀκατάλουστος
οὖσα ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμά του ἀ–

5   νέβη καὶ ἠρεύνησεν τὸ
βῆμα καὶ τὰς τάβλας αὐ–
τοῦ· ἐπιζητήσαντος τοῦ
θεοῦ οἱ κληρονόμοι εὐ–
λογοῦντες ἀπέδωκαν.

10   Ἔτους σος΄, μη(νὸς) Περειτίου.
Καὶ Μηνεὶ Ἀξειτηνῷ
–"καταιμόλυνέ μου τὸ βῆμα"–
εὐλογοῦντες ἀποδείδο–
μεν.

Translation:

For Mēn Labana(s). Elpis showed contempt for Mēn Labana(s) and being in an impure state she entered his podium and examined the podium and his tablets. When the god made his demand, the heirs made atonement praising (the god). In the year 276, in the month of Peritios. To Mēn Axeitēnos - "She defiled my podium" - praising we make atonement.

12. _BWK_ 43 (_TAM_ V 1, 238)

First publication: A. Conze, _Archäologische Zeitung_ 1880 (1881), 37.

Not dated.

      Ἀντωνία Ἀντωνίου Ἀπόλ–
      λωνι θεῷ Βοζηνῷ διὰ τὸ ἀ–
      ναβεβηκένε με ἐπὶ τὸν χο-
      ρὸν ἐν ῥυπαρῷ ἐπενδύτῃ,
5   κολασθῖσα δὲ ἐξωμολο–
      γησάμην κὲ ἀνέθηκα εὐλο–
      γίαν, ὅτι ἐγενόμην ὁλόκ[λ]–
      ηρος.

Translation:

Antōnia, daughter of Antōnios, to the god Apollon Bozenos, because I entered the (holy) land in filthy clothes. Having been punished I admitted (my guilt) and raised the praise, that I recovered completely.

13. _BWK_ 50 (_TAM_ V 1, 264)

First publication: W. H. Buckler, BSA 21 (1914-16), 169, nr. 1.

Not dated.

      Διεὶ Σαβαζίῳ καὶ Μη-
      τρεὶ Εἴπτα. Διοκλῆς
      Τροφίμου· ἐπεὶ ἐπεί-
      ασα περιστερὰς τῶν
5   θεῶν, ἐκολάσθην ἰς
      τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ
      ἐνέγραψα τὴν ἀρετήν.

Translation:

For Zeus Sabazios and Mētēr Hipta. Dioklēs son of Trophimos. Because I had caught the pigeons belonging to the gods I was punished in my eyes and recorded the (divine) power.

14. *BWK* 55 (*SEG* XXXIX, 1278)

First publication: E. Varinlioğlu, *EA* 13 (1989), 45-47, nr. 4.

245 sull. = 160/1 AD.

Μεγάλη Μήτηρ Μηνὸς
Τεκοῦσα, μέγας Μεὶς
Οὐράνιος, Μεὶς Ἀρτεμι–
δώρου Ἀξιοττα κατέ–
5   χων καὶ ἡ δύναμις αὐτοῦ·
ἐπεὶ Πωσφόρος Ἀρτεμᾶ
παιδίον ὢν ἐτῶν ἓξ
ἐπενδύτιον ἐνεδύσε–
το σπίλους ἔχων, ὁ θε–
10   ὸ‹ς› ἐπεζήτησεν, καὶ ἦρε
τρίφωνον, καὶ ἐστηλ–
λογράφησεν τὰς δυ–
νάμις τοῦ θεοῦ· ἔτους
σμε΄, μη(νὸς) Πανήμου βι΄.

Translation:

Great is Mētēr who gave birth to Mēn, great is Meis Uranios, Meis Artemidorou who rules Axiotta and his power. When P(h)osphoros, son of Artemas, a child six years old, was dressed in a garment stained with impurity, the god investigated. A triad took (the transgression) away, and he (i.e. Phosphoros) wrote down the powers of the god on a stele. In the year 245 on the 12th of the month Panēmos.

15. *BWK* 64 (*SEG* XXXVIII, 1234)

First publication: H. Malay, *EA* 12 (1988), 149, nr. 2.

262 sull. = 177/8 AD.

Μηνὶ Ἀξιοττηνῷ· Ἀ[ρ]–
τέμων καὶ Ἀτείμη–
τος, ἐπεὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐ–
τοῖς δορὰς ἦρεν βίᾳ
5   ἐκκ τοῦ ναοῦ, κολασ–

293

θέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ θε-
οῦ ἀπὸ νῦν εὐλογοῦ-
σιν· ἔτους σξβ΄, μη(νὸς) Αὐ-
δναίου βι΄.

Translation:

For Mēn Axiottēnos. Artemōn and Atimētos who were punished by the god after their father had by force taken hides from the shrine from now on give their praise. In the year 262 on the 12th day of the month Audnaios.

16. *BWK 72* (*SEG* IV, 649; *TAM* V 1, 326)

First publication: J. Zingerle, *ÖJh* 23 (1926) Bbl. 23-27.

247 sull. = 162/3 AD.

        Μεγάλη Μήτηρ Αναει–
        τις. Ἀπολλώνιος Μηνο–
        δώρου ὑπὲρ Διονυσί–
        ου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ. Ἐπὶ
5   κατελούσετο καὶ οὐ–
        κ ἐτήρησε τὴν προ–
        θεσμίαν τῆς θεοῦ,
        ἀπετελέσετο αὐτόν.
        Ἔτους σμζ΄, μη(νὸς) Λώου λ΄.

Translation:

Great is Mētēr Anaitis. Apollonios son of Mēnodoros on behalf of his brother Dionysios. When he was ritually purified, and did not observe the goddess' appointed time, she killed him. In the year 247, on the 30th of the month Lōos.

17. *BWK 76* (*TAM* V 1, 592)

First publication: M. Çakıroğlu, *Museion* III 1-2 (1878/80).

Dated 320 sull. = 235/6 AD.

        Ἔτους τκ΄, μη(νὸς) Περειτίου βι΄. Αὐρ.

Στρατόνεικος β΄, ἐπειδὴ κατὰ

ἄγνοιαν ἐκ τοῦ ἄλσου ἔκοψα

δένδρα θεῶν Διὸς Σαβαζίου καὶ

5 Ἀρτέμιδος Αναειτις, κολασ–

θεὶς εὐξάμενος εὐχαριστή–

ριον ἀνέστησα.

Translation:

In the year 320, on the 12th of the month Peritos. Because I, Aurelius Stratonikos son of Stratonikos, in ignorance cut down trees belonging to the gods Zeus Sabazios and Artemis Anaitis in the grove, I was punished and raised the sign of gratitude after having promised to do so.

18. <u>*BWK* 78</u> (*TAM* V 1, 596)

First publication: Keil & von Premerstein, *Bericht über eine zweite Reise in Lydien ausgeführt 1908,* 99f, nr. 197.

203 sull. = 118/9 AD.

Ἔτους σγ΄, μ(ηνὸς) Πανήμου. Μητρόδω-

ρος Γλύκωνος παιδίον ὢν ἀκου-

σίως κατεάξας στηλλάριον τῆς

θεοῦ· ἐπεζήτησε ἀνασταθῆ-

5 ναι ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ ἄλλο.

Translation:

In the year 203 in the month of Panemos. Mētrodōros son Glykōn who is a child (or: as a child) unintentionally broke a small stele belonging to the goddess. She demanded that he raised a new one.

19. <u>*BWK* 98</u> (*SEG* XXIX, 1155)

First publication: H. Malay, *Gr. Lat. Inschr. Mansia Mus.* Nr. 185.

2nd century AD.

‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ‒

ΑΠΟ [. .] Φ [. . . .]–

ηνοῦ κολασθ–

εἰς, διὰ τό με ἔτ–

5   οιμον εἶνε κὲ κ–
εκληδονίσθε
με ὅτι "Μεμολυ–
μένος εἶ" εὐξάμε–
νος ἀνέθηκα.

Translation:

Having been punished, I [- - - son of - - -]ēnos, because I was prepared and had received an omen that "You are defiled", raised the stele after having promised (to do so).

20. *BWK* 106

First publication: W. H. Buckler, W. M. Calder & W. K. C. Guthrie, *MAMA* IV (1933) 103f., nr. 279.

2nd or 3rd century AD.

Νεικ[   ] ὁμολογῶ
[περὶ] τῶ[ν] περιστερῶγ
ἐπιωρκηκέναι με καὶ παραβε–
[β]ῆχθαι καὶ ᾿πικεχειρηκέναι [ἐπὶ]

5   τὸ χωρίον καὶ ἠρκέναι πρόβατον
τῶν Δημητρίου, καὶ παρανγ[είλ]–
[α]ντός μοι τοῦ θεοῦ μὴ δίδιν
[τὴ]ν ἐλευθερίαν τῷ κυρίῳ μου
[πε]ριδιωκόμενος ἔδωκα. ἐκο–

10   λ[ά]σθην ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πολλὰ,
[κ]αὶ ὀνείροις μοι παρεστάθη καὶ
[εἶ]πεν ποδῶν ΤΙÇ λαβὼν ἐμὸ[ν]
δοῦλον καὶ ΑΝΠΙ[?]ΛΑ[. .]ΖΟΜΕΝ
καὶ κεῖθεν ἀνάξιν. παραν–

15   γέλλω μηδένα καταφρο–
[νεῖν τῶ θ]εῶ Ἡλίῳ ᾿Απ–
[όλλωνος, ἐπεὶ ἕξει] τὴν στήλ–
[ην ἐξεμπλάρι]ον.

Translation:

I, Nik[   ], admit that I committed perjury concerning the pigeons, that I committed a transgression, that I made an attempt on (?) the (holy) area, and that I took a sheep from the herd of Demetrios; and even thought the god had instructed me not to give the freedom to my lord, I gave it when I was pursued. I was much punished by the gods, and in my dreams he stood before me and said that he (?) would take my slave ?? by the feet and take him away. I proclaim that no one shall show contempt for the god Helios Apollon, because he will have the stele as an example.

21. *BWK* 107

First publication: W. H. Buckler, W. M. Calder & W. K. C Guthrie, *MAMA* IV (1933) 104, Nr. 280.

2nd or 3rd century AD.

<blockquote>

Ε̣λιον[?]μος κολαθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ
[θ]ε̣οῦ Ἡλίῳ Ἀπόλωνι
    Λαβηνῷ στη–
    λην ἀνέθηκα
5   καθὼς ἐκολά–
    σετό με καὶ δι–
    ὰ ὅρκον καὶ συνί–
    δησιν καὶ διὰ
    μολυ‹σ›μόν.
10   Παραγέλω πᾶσις
    μηδίνα καταφρο–
    νεῖ τῶν θε–
    ῶν.

</blockquote>

Translation:

I, - - - mos, having been punished by the god, raised a stele to Apollōn Labēnos (with an account) of how he punished me because of an oath, my awareness (of my guilt), and a defilement. I proclaim to all that nobody shall show contempt for the gods.

22. *BWK* 110 (*MAMA* IV (1933) 106, nr. 283; *SEG* VI, 251)

First publication: D. G. Hogarth, *JHS* 8 (1887), 387, nr. 16.

3rd century AD.

Ἀὐρήλιος
Σωτήρχος
Δμοστράτου Μοτελ–
ηνὸς κολάθιν ἐπὸ τὸ θε–

5   οῦ· παραγέλων πᾶσι μηδ–
ὲ ἄναγον ἀναβῆτ᾽ ἐπὶ τὸ χ–
ωρίον, ἐπροκήσι ἢ κήνσ[?]–
ετε τὸν ὄρχις· ἐγὼ Γέ–
ᾳ ἐκηνησάμην ἐπὶ τὸ χ–

10   ωρίον.

Translation:

I, Aurelius Soter(i)khos from Motella, son of Demostratos, was punished by the god. I proclaim to all that no one may enter the (holy) area in an impure state, commit perjury or have sexual intercourse/masturbate. I had sexual intercourse with Gaia inside the (holy) area.

23. <u>BWK 112</u> (*MAMA* IV (1933) 107, nr. 285; *SEG* VI, 250)

First publication: D. G. Hogarth, *JHS* 8 (1887), 383 –5, nr. 14.

3rd century AD.

[. . . . . .] λίου Ἀπολλ–
[ωνί]ου δι τὸ ἡμαρτηκ–
έγε, ἐπεὶ τὼ χωρὶ ᾽πισέ–
τυχει καὶ διῆθα τὴν

5   κώμη β᾽ ἄναγνα· λημόν–
ησα· παρήμη εἰς τὴν κώμη·
παραγέλω μηδεὶς καταφ–
ρεινήσει τῶ θεῶν, ἐπεὶ ἕξ–
ει τὴν σείλην ἐξοπάρειο[ν].

10   Ἐπόισ᾽ ἐτόνμετον ἡ προγεμένε
[Εὐτ]υχεὶς καὶ ἐξομολογήσα–
[το] καὶ ϝἰλάθη.

298

Translation:

- - - daughter of Apoll[oni]os through a transgression because she (= I) was accidentally in the (holy) area and I have twice walked through the village in an impure state; unmindful (?) I was in the village. I proclaim that no one shall show contempt for the gods, because he will have the stele as an example. [Eut]ykhis (?), whom this story is about (?), has made this stele (?), admitted her guilt and reconciled (the god).

24. *BWK* 114

First publication: W. H. Buckler, W. M. Calder & W. K. C. Guthrie, *MAMA* IV (1933) 108, nr. 287.

2nd or 3rd century AD.

0   [Ἡ δεῖνα]
Τιμοθέου Μοτελλ–
ην ⟦τ⟧ὴ ἐπεὶ ἀνήγαγα σ–
τρατιώτας ἐπὶ τὸ ἱε–
ρὸν ἐχθρὸν θέλου–

5   σα ἀμύνασθαι, δι–
ὰ τοῦτο κολασθ–
εῖσα καὶ σωθεῖσα ὑ–
πὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐχ⟨α⟩ρι–
στοῦσα ἀνέθηκα.

Translation:

Because I, [Name] from Motella, daughter of Timotheos, brought soldiers into the shrine wanting to defend myself against an enemy, I was for this reason punished and saved by the god, and I raised (the stele) conveying my thanks.

25. *BWK* 115

First publication: W. H. Buckler, W. M. Calder & W. K. C. Guthrie, *MAMA* IV (1933) 108, nr. 288.

2nd or 3rd century AD.

MEN̦ [ιε]–

ρέων ἔλαθέ [με]
καὶ εἰσῆλθα ἄν–
αγνος· ἐστηλλο–
γράφσα ΕΞΕΥ ^{vac?}
5   [. . . .]ΤΩΝ. ^{vac}.

Translation:

[I, - - -, was punished, because the orders of (?)] the priests were unknown to me, and I entered in an impure state. I wrote down (these events) on a stele [   ].

26. *BWK* 116

First publication: W. H. Buckler, W. M. Calder & W. K. C. Guthrie, *MAMA* IV (1933) 108, nr. 289.

2nd or 3rd century AD.

– – – – –
[.] Κλάρου ἐξομ–
[ο]λογοῦμαι, ὅτι
ἀνέβην ἄνα–
γνος ἐπὶ τὸ [χ]–
5   ωρίον καὶ ὑπ[ ]
[Fragments of letters]

Translation:

I, [Name] son of Klaros, admit that I entered the (holy) area in an impure state and [   ].

27. *BWK* 120

First publication: W. M Ramsay, *JHS* 10 (1889), 217, nr. 1.

Not dated.

Σώσανδρος Ἱεραπολέ–
της ἐπιορκήσας καὶ
ἄναγνος ἰσῆλθα ἰς τὸ
σύνβωμον· ἐκολάσ–

5   θην· παραγγέλλω μη–
δένα καταφρονεῖν
τῶ Λαιρμηνῶ ἐπεὶ ἕξει
τὴν ἐμὴν στήλλην ἔξενπλον.

Translation:

I, Sosandros from Hierapolis, went in to the common altar (?) in an impure state after committing perjury. I was punished. I proclaim that no one shall show contempt for Lairmēnos, because he will have my stele as an example.

28. *BWK* 123

First publication: D. G. Hogarth, *JHS* 8 (1887), 387-9, nr. 17.

Not dated.

[   ] καθαρμοῖς κὲ θυσίαις ἐ[ξ]–
[ιλασάμην τὸν κ]ύριον, ἵνα μυ τὸ ἐμὸν σῶ–
[μα σώ]σι, κὲ μόγις με ἀποκαθέστησε
[τῷ ἐμ]ῷ σώματι· διὸ παραγγέλλω μηθ–
5   ένα ἱερὸν ἄθυτον αἰγοτόμιον ἔσθε–
ιν, ἐπεὶ παθῖτε τὰς ἐμὰς {εμας} κολ–
άσεις.

Translation:

[- - - I reconciled the] Lord with purifications and sacrifices that he should save my body, and with toil he restored me in my body. Therefore, I proclaim that no holy (official) must eat unsacrificed goat meat (or: no one must eat consecrated unsacrificed goat meat), because he will then suffer my punishments.

29. *BWK* 124 (*SEG* XXXI, 1119)

First publication: A. Strobel, *Das heilige Land der Montanisten* (1980).

Not dated.

[.] Γάιος ΑΠΟ[
παραγγέλλ[ω
ΙΝΑΠΑΡΟ[

χωρίου [

5   ΟΥΠ[

[..]Λ[

Translation:

[- - I,] Gaius [   ] proclaim [   ] (holy) area [   ].

BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography lists the works cited in the thesis. Titles of books, journals and periodicals are given in italics, while titles of articles are given in quotation marks.

Arnold, C. E. 2005: "'I Am Astonished That You Are So Quickly Turning Away!' (Gal 1.6): Paul and Anatolian Folk Belief", *New Testament Studies* 51, 429-449.

Audollent, A. 1904: *Defixionum Tabellae quotquot innotuerunt tam in graecis orientis quam in totius occidentis partibus praetor Atticas,* Paris.

Barton, S. C. & G. H. R. Hosley 1981: "A Hellenistic cult group and the new testament churches", *JbAC* 24, 7 – 41.

Beard, M., J. North & S. Price, 1998: *Religions of Rome, vol. 1 – A History*, Cambridge.

Benveniste, E. 1973: *Indo-European Language and Society* (First published in French under the title *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes,* translated by Elizabeth Palmer), London.

Birge, D. 1982: *Sacred groves in the ancient Greek world,* Berkeley.
    - 1994a: "Trees in the Landscape of Pausanias' *Perigesis*", in: S. E. Alcock & R. Osborne (eds.), *Placing the Gods. Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece,* Oxford, 231-245.
    - 1994b: "Sacred Groves and the Nature of Apollo", in: J. Solomon (eds.), *Apollo. Origins and Influences,* Tucson & London, 9-19.

Blinkenberg, C. 1941: *Lindos: Fouilles de l'Acropole 1902-1914. II: Inscriptions* (= *I.Lindos*), Paris & Copenhagen.

Blümel, W. 1991: *Die Inschriften von der rhodischen Peraia, IGSK* 38, Bonn.

Boeckh, A. 1828-1877: *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum* (*CIG*), Berlin.

Borgeaud, P. 1999: "Melampous and Epimenides: Two Greek paradigms of the treatment of mistake", in: J. Assmann & G. G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Transformation of the inner self in ancient religions,* Leiden, Boston & Köln, 287-300.

Buckler, W. H. 1914-16: "Some Lydian propitiatory inscriptions", *ABSA* XXI, 169-183.
    - & D. M. Robinson 1932: *Sardis: Publications of the American society for the excavation of Sardis,* Vol. VII 1, Leyden.

Burkert, W. 1983, *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth* (Originally published 1972 in German under the title *Homo Necans.* Translated by Peter Bing), Berkeley, Los Angeles & London.
    - 1985: *Greek Religion.* Harvard.
    - 1987: *Ancient Mystery Cults,* Cambridge, Massachusetts & London.
    - 1992: *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age,* (Originally published in German under the title *Die orientalisierende Epoche in der griechischen Religion und Literatur.* Translated by Margaret E. Pinder and Walter Burkert), Harvard.

Burton, G. P. 1975: "Proconsuls, assizes and the administration of justice under the Empire", *JRS* 65, 92-106.

Caseau, B., 1999: "Sacred Landscapes", in: G. W. Bowersock, P. Brown, Oleg Grabar (eds.), *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World,* 21-59, Cambridge, Massachusetts & London.

Chaniotis, A. 1995: "Illness and cures in the Greek propitiatory inscriptions and dedications of Lydia and Phrygia", in: Ph. J. van der Eijk, H. F. J. Horstmanshoff, P. H. Schrijvers (eds.), *Ancient Medicine in its Socio-Cultural Context vol. II,* Amsterdam & Atlanta, 323-344.

- 1997: "'Tempeljustiz' im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien: Rechtliche Aspekte der Sühne-Inschriften Lydiens und Phrygiens," in: G. Thür & J. Vélissaropoulos-Karakostas (eds.), *Symposion 1995. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Korfu, 1.-5. September 1995),* Köln, Weimar & Wien, 353-84.
- 2004: "Under the watchful eyes of the gods: divine justice in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor", in: S. Colvin (ed.), *The Greco-Roman East: Politics, Culture, Society,* Vol. XXXI, Cambridge, 1-43.

Chaviaras, M. & N. 1911: "Ἐπιγραφαὶ Περαίας τῶν Ῥοδίων", *Arch. Eph.* 1911, 52-69.

Cohen, D. 1991: *Law, Sexuality, and Society: The enforcement of morals in classical Athens,* Cambridge.

Collitz, H. & F. Bechtel 1905: *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften,* Göttingen.

Cole, S. G. 1992: "Gynaiki ou themis: Gender difference in the Greek *leges sacrae*", *Helios* 19, 104-122.
- 1995: "Women, Dogs, and Flies", *AncW* XXVI 2, 182-191.
- 2004: *Landscapes, gender, and ritual space: The Ancient Greek experience,* Berkeley, Los Angeles & London.

Davis, J. 1994: "The Tradition about the First Sacred War", in: S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography,* Oxford, 193-212.

Detienne, M. 1989: "Culinary Practices and the Spirit of Sacrifice", in: M. Detienne & J.-P. Vernant (eds.), *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks* (Originally published 1979 in French under the title *La cuisine du sacrifice en pays grec.* Translated by Paula Wissing), Chicago, 1-20.

Dickie, M. 2001: "Exclusion from the Catechumnate: Continuity or discontinuity with pagan cult?", *Numen* 48, 418-443.

Dinsmoor, W. B. 1931: *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age,* Cambridge & Massachusetts.

Dodds, E. R. 1965, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety,* Cambridge.

Dölger, F. J. 1922, *Der heilige Fisch in den antiken Religionen und im Christentum,* Münster.

Douglas, M. 1966: *Purity and Danger: An analysis of concepts of pollution and taboo,* London.

Dover, K. J. 1970: *Aristophanes: Clouds.* Oxford.
　　- 1974: *Greek popular morality in the time of Plato and Aristotle,* Oxford.
　　- 1978: *Greek homosexuality,* London.

Edelstein, E. & L. 1945: *Asclepius: A collection and interpretation of the testimonies,* Baltimore.

Eger, O. 1939: "Eid und Fluch in den maionischen und phrygischen Sühneinschriften", in: *Festschrift Paul Koschaker,* III. Band, Weimar, 281-293.

Faraone, C. A. 1991: "The Agonistic Context of Early Greek Binding Spells", in: C. A. Faraone & D. Obbink (eds.), *Ancient Greek Magic and Religion,* New York/Oxford, 3-32.
　　- 1993: "Introduction", in: T. H. Carpenter & C.A. Faraone (eds.), *Masks of Dionysus,* Ithaca/London, 1-10.
　　- 2002: "Curses and Social Control in the Law Courts of Classical Athens", in: D. Cohen (ed.), *Demokratie, Recht und sozial Kontrolle im Klassischen Athen,* München, 77-92.

Finley, M. I. 1980: *Ancient Slavery and Modern Ideology,* London.

Foucart, P. 1873: *Associations religieuses chez les grecs: thiases, éranes, orgéons avec le texte des inscriptions relatives à ces associations.* Paris.

Fränkel, M. 1895, *Die Inschriften von Pergamon: 2. Römische Zeit,* Berlin.

Frisch, P. 1983: "Über die lydisch-phrygischen Sühneinschriften und die "Confessiones" des Augustinus, *EA* 2, 41- 45.

Gager, J. G. (ed.) 1992: *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World,* New York & Oxford.

Garland, R. 1996: "Strategies of Religious Intimidation and Coercion in Classical Athens", in: P. Hellström & B. Alroth (eds.), *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World. Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1993,* 91-99.

Gordon, R. 1996: "Anaitis", *DNP.*
  - 2004a: "Social Control in the Lydian and Phrygian 'Confession' Texts", in: L. H. Guerra & J. A. Ezquerra (eds.), *Actas Del XXVII Congreso Internacional Girea-Arys IX: "Jerarquías religiosas y control social en el mundo antiguo"*, Valladolid, 193-203.
  - 2004b: "Raising a sceptre: confession-narratives from Lydia and Phrygia", *JRA* 17, 177-196.

Gradel, I. 2002: *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion,* Oxford.

Graf, F. 2004: "Confession, Secrecy, and Ancient Societies", in: B. Luchesi & K. von Stuckrad (eds.), *Religion in Cultural Discourse, Essays in Honor of Hans G. Kippenberg on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday,* Berlin/New York.

Guarducci, M. 1950: *Inscriptiones Creticae,* Roma.

Habicht, C. 1975: "New evidence on the province of Asia", *JRS* 65, 63-91.

Harrison, T. 1997: "Herodotos and the certainty of divine retribution", in: A. B. Lloyd (ed.), *What is a God?,* London, 101-122.
- 2000, *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus.* Oxford.

Hauken, T. 1989: "Loven for Amfiareion. Mirakelkurer i greske helligdommer", in: T. Eide & T. Hägg (eds.), *Dionysos og Apollon,* Bergen, 181-194.

Haussoullier, B. 1885: "Inscriptions de Crète", *BCH* IX, 1-28.
- 1890: "Cronique – Boulletin épigraphique", *REG* III, 205-213.

Herzog, R. 1928: *Heilige Gesetze von Kos,* Berlin.

Hogarth, D. G. 1887: "Apollo Lermenus", *JHS* VIII, 376-400.

Holleaux, M. 1897: "Note sur deux inscriptions de la confederation des magnètes", *Revue de philologie* XXI, 181-188.

Hölkeskamp, K.-J. 1992: "Written law in archaic Greece", *PCPS* 38, 87-117.

Hooker, J.T. 1980: "ΙΕΡΟΣ in Early Greek", in: *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprach-Wissenschaft, Vorträge und Kleinere Schriften* 22, Innsbruck.

Horsley, G. H. R. 1983: *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1978,* Macquarie University.

de Hoz, M. P. 1999: *Die lydischen Kulte im Lichte der griechischen Inschriften*, *AMS* 36, Bonn.

Isaac, B. 2004: *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity,* Princeton & Oxford.

Jordan, B. & J. Perlin 1984: "On the Protection of Sacred Groves", in: A. L. Boegehold *et al.* (eds.), *Papers Presented to Sterling Dow on his Eightieth Birthday, GRBM* 10, Durham 1984, 153-159.

Kaibel, G. 1887: *Athenaei Naucratitae Deipnosophistarum, Libri XV,* Vol. II, Leipzig.

Keil, J. & A. von Premerstein 1907: *Bericht über eine Reise in Lydien und der südliche Aiolis, ausgeführt 1906 im Auftrage der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften,* Wien.
- 1911: *Bericht über eine zweite Reise in Lydien ausgeführt 1908 im Auftrage des K. K. österreichischen archäologischen Instituts,* in: *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien,* 54.
- 1914: *Bericht über eine dritte Reise in Lydien und den angrenzenden Gebieten Ioniens, ausgeführt 1911 im Auftrage der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften,* in: *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, philosophisch-historische Klasse,* 57.

Klauck, H.-J. 1996: "Die kleinasiatischen Beichtinschriften und das Neue Testament", in: H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger & P. Schäfer (eds.), *Gesichte – Tradition – Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag,* III, Tübingen, 63-87.
- 2000: *The Religious Context of Early Christianity: A Guide to Graeco-Roman Religions* (Originally published in two volumes as *Die religiöse Umwelt des Urchristentums,* Stuttgart 1995 & 1996 (Translated by Brian McNeil), London & New York 2000).

Koumanoudis, S. A. 1875: "Ἐπιγράφαι ἀνέκδοτοι Δήλου, ῥηνείας καὶ κυθήρων," in: *Ἀθηναίον. Σύγγραμμα περιόδικον κατὰ διμήνιαν ἐκδιδόμενον σύμπραξει πόλλων λογίων* 4.

Kretschmer, P. 1902: "Lesbische Inschriften", *Jahreshefte des österreichischen archäologischen Institutes in Wien* 5, 139-147.

Lane, E. N. 1971: *Corpus Monumentorum Religionis Dei Menis* (*CMRDM*). Leiden.

    - 1985: *Corpus Cultus Iovis Sabazii* (*CCIS*), volume II: *The other monuments and literary evidence,* Leiden

    - 1989: *Corpus Cultus Iovis Sabazii* (*CCIS*), volume III: *Conclusions,* Leiden.

    - 1990: "Men: A neglected cult of Roman Asia Minor", *ANRW* II 18.3, 2161-2174.

Lane Fox, R. 1988: *Pagans and Christians.* San Francisco.

Latte, K. 1920: *Heiliges Recht: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der sakralen Rechtsformen in Griechenland,* Tübingen.

Le Bas, Philippe, 1870: *Voyage archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure,* Paris.

Lolling, H. G. 1882: "Mittheilungen aus Thessalien", *Ath. Mitt.* 1882, 61-76.

Lupu, E. 2005: *Greek Sacred Law: A Collection of New Documents (NGSL),* Leiden & Boston.

MacMullen, R. 1981: *Paganism in the Roman Empire,* New Haven & London.

    -1982: "The epigraphic habit in the Roman empire", *AJP* 103, 233-246.

    -1986: "Frequency of inscriptions in Roman Lydia", *ZPE* 65, 237-238.

Magie, D. 1975: *Roman rule in Asia Minor to the end of the third century after Christ* (originally published 1950), New York.

Malay, H. 2003: "A praise on Men Artemidorou Axiottenos", *EA* 36, 13-18.

    - & Sayar, M. H. 2004: "A new confession to Zeus "from twin oaks", *EA* 37, 83-84.

Martin, D. 1997: "Hellenistic Superstition: The Problems of Defining a Vice", in: P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad & J. Zahle (eds.), *Conventional Values of the Hellenstic Greeks,* Aarhus.

- 2004: *Inventing superstition: from the Hippocratics to the Christians,* Cambridge, Massachusetts & London.

Maspero, G & E. Miller 1883: "Inscriptions grecques découvertes en Égypte", *RA* 1883 II, 172-184.

Mayhew, R. 1996, "Impiety and Political Unity: Aristotle, Politics 1262a25-32", *Classical Philology,* Vol. 91, No. 1, 54-59.

Meyer, E. A. 1990: "Explaining the epigraphic habit in the Roman Empire: The evidence of epitaphs", *JRS* LXXX, 74-96.

Mikalson, J. D. 1983: *Athenian Popular Religion,* Chapel Hill & London.

Miller, K. M. 1985: "Apollo Lairbenos", *Numen* 32, 46-70.

Mitchell, S. 1995: *Anatolia - Land, Men, and Gods in Asia Minor. Vol. I. The Celts and the Impact of Roman Rule* (first published 1993), Oxford.

- & M. Waelkens, 1998: *Pisidian Antioch: The Site and its Monuments.* London.

Moulinier, L. 1952: *Le pur et l'impure dans la pensée des Grecs d'Homère a Aristote,* Paris.

O'Sullivan, L. L. 1997: "Athenian Impiety Trials in the Fourth Century B. C.", *The Classical Quarterly,* Vol. 47, No. 1, 136-152.

Parker, R. 1983: *Miasma - Pollution and Purification in early Greek Religion.* Oxford.

- 2004: "What are Sacred Laws", in: E. M. Harris & L. Rubinstein (eds.), *The Law and Courts in Ancient Greece*, London.

- 2005: "Law and Religion", in: M. Gagarin & David Cohen (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law,* Cambridge, 61-81.

Paton, W. R. 1902: "An inscription from Eresos", *The Classical Review* 16 (1902), 290-291.

Patterson, J. R. 2000: "On the margins of the city of Rome", in: V. M. Hope & E. Marshall, *Death and Disease in the Ancient City,* London & New York, 85-103.

Pettazzoni, R. 1936: *La confessione dei peccati, parte seconda, volume terzo, Siria, Hittiti, Asia Minore, Grecia,* Bologna.
- 1967: "Confession of sins and the Classics", in: *Essays on the history of religion* (Originally published in *Harvard Theological Review* XXX, 1937), Leiden, 55-67.

Petzl, G. 1987: *Die Inschriften von Smyrna, Teil II, 1,* Bonn.
- 1988: "Sünde, Strafe und Wiedergutmachung", *EA* 12, 155-166.
- 1991: "Lukians Podagra und die Beichtinschriften Kleinasiens", *Metis* VI, 131-145.
- 1994: "Die Beichtinschriften Westkleinasiens", *EA* 22.
- 1995: "Ländliche Religiosität in Lydien", in: E. Schwertheim (ed.), *Forschung in Lydien, AMS* 17, Bonn, 37-48.
- 1997: "Neue Inschriften aus Lydien (II). Addenda und Corrigenda zu „Die Beicht-Inschriften Westkleinasiens (Epigr. Anatol. 22, 1994)", *EA* 28.

Pharr, C, 1969: *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions: A translation with commentary, glossary, and bibliography,* New York.

Plassart, A. 1928: *Les sanctuaires et les cultes du mont Cynthe,* in: *Exploration archéologique de Délos* XI, Paris.

Pleket, H. W. 1981: "Religious history as the history of mentality: 'The believer' as servant of the deity in the Greek world", in: H. S. Versnel (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of religious mentality in the ancient world,* Leiden, 152-192.

de Polignac, F. 1995: *Cults, Territory, and the Origins of the Greek City-State,* (Originally published in French as *La Naissance de la cite grecque*, 1984), Chicago& London.

Poljakov, F. B. 1989: *Die Inschriften von Tralleis und Nysa. Teil I: Die Inschriften von Tralleis,* Bonn.

Price, S. R. F. 1990 (originally published 1984): *Rituals and power: The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor.* Cambridge.

von Prott, H. & L. Ziehen, 1896 & 1906: *Leges Graecorum Sacrae* (*LGS*) 1-2, Leipzig.

Reinach, S. 1887: "Cronique d'Orient", *RA* 1887 II, 350-358.

Reiss, 1994, "Aberglaube", *RE* I, 29-93.

Rhodes, P. J. 1972: *The Athenian Boule,* Oxford.
    - & R. Osborne 2003: *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404 – 323 BC,* Oxford.

Ricl, M. 1995: "The appeal to divine justice in the Lydian confession-inscriptions", in: E. Schwertheim (ed.), *Forschung in Lydien, AMS* 17, Bonn, 67-76.
    - 1999: "*CIG* 4142 – A forgotten confession-inscription from north-west Phrygia", *EA* 29, 35-43.
    - 2003, "Society and economy of rural sanctuaries in Roman Lydia and Phrygia", *EA* 35, 77-101.

Robert, J. & L. 1958: "Bulletin épigraphique", *REG* LXXI, 169-363.
    - L. 1964: *Nouvelles inscriptions de Sardes I,* Paris.

Ronen, N. 1999: "Who practiced purification in archaic Greece? A cultural profile", in: J. Assmann & G. G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Transformation of the inner self in ancient religions,* Leiden, Boston & Köln, 273-286.

Rostad, A. 2000: *Å falle i en levende guds hender: En språklig og religionshistorisk studie av de lydiske og frygiske 'bekjennelsesinnskriftene'*, (*To fall into the hands of a living god. A study language and religion in the Lydian and Phrygian 'confession inscriptions')*, Unpublished Mater's Thesis, Bergen.
-2002: "Confession or Reconciliation? The Narrative Structure of the Lydian and Phrygian 'Confession Inscriptions', *SO* 77, 145-164.

Roussel, P. 1913: "Réglements riuels" in: A. Picard (ed.), *Mélanges Hollaux: Recueil de mémoires concernant l'antiquité grecque,* Paris, 265-279.
- 1920: "Bulletin épigraphique", *REG* XXXIII, 403-432.
- & M. Launey 1937: *Inscriptions de Délos,* Paris.

Schnabel, E. J. 2003: "Divine Tyranny and Public Humiliation: A Suggestion for the Interpretation of the Lydian and Phrygian Confession Inscriptions," *Novum Testamentum* XLV 2, 160-188.

Schuler, Ch. 1998: *Ländliche Siedlungen und Gemeinden im hellenistischen und römischen Kleinasien,* München.

Schwyzer, E. 1923: *Dialectorum Graecarum exempla ephigraphica potiora,* Leipzig.

Sima, A. 1999: "Kleinasiatische Parallelen zu den altsüdarabischen Buß- und Sühne-Inschriften", *Altorientalische Forschung* 26, 140-153.

Sinn, U. 1993: "Greek sanctuaries as places of refuge", in: N. Marinatos & R. Hägg (eds.), *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches,* London & New York, 88-109.

Smith, J. Z. 1978: "Adde parvum parvo magnus acervus erit", in: *Map is Not Territory. Studies in the History of Religions*, Leiden, 240-264.

- 1982, "In Comparison a Magic Dwells", in: *Imagining Religion – From Babylon to Jonestown,* Chicago & London, 19-35.

- 1990: *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity,* Chicago.

Sokolowski, F. 1955: *Lois Sacrées de l'Asie Mineur* (*LSAM*), Paris.

- 1962: *Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques. Supplément* (*LSS*), Paris.

- 1969: *Lois Sacrées des Cités Grecques* (*LSCG*), Paris.

Steinleitner, F. S. 1913: *Die Beicht im Zusammenhange mit der sakralen Rechtpflege in der Antike.* München.

van Straten, F.T. 1981, "Gifts for the gods", in: H. S. Versnel (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of religious mentality in the ancient world,* Leiden, 65-151.

Strubbe, J. H. M. 1991: "Cursed be he that moves my bones", in: C. A. Faraone & D. Obbink (eds.), *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion,* 33-59.

- 1997: *Ἀραί ἐπιτύμβιοι: Imprecations against Desecrators of the Grave in the Greek Epitaphs of Asia Minor: A Catalogue* (*IGSK* 52), Bonn.

Szanto, E. 1890: "Zur Geschichte von Thasos", *Att. Mitt.* 15, 72-83.

Thomas, R. 1995: "Written in stone? Liberty, equality, orality and the codification of law", *BICS* 40, 59-74.

Trombley, F.R. 1993: *Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370-529,* Volume 1, Leiden/New York/Köln.

Varınlıoğlu, E. 1983: "Zeus Orkamaneites and the expiatory inscriptions", *EA* 1, 75-86.

- 1991: "Vier Inschriften aus Lydien", *EA* 18, 91-94.

Vernant, J.-P. 1981: "Sacrificial and alimentary codes in Hesiod's myth of Prometheus", in: R. L. Gordon (ed.), *Myth, religion and society: Structural essays by M. Detienne, L. Gernet, J.-P. Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet,* Cambridge, 57-79.

- 1989: "At Man's Table: Hesiod's Foundation Myth of Sacrifice, in: M. Detienne & J.-P. Vernant (eds.), *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks* (Originally published 1979 in French under the title *La cuisine du sacrifice en pays grec*. Translated by Paula Wissing), Chicago & London, 21-86.

- 1990a: "The Pure and The Impure", in: *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece* (Originally published in French as *Mythe et société en Grèce ancienne,* 1974), New York, 121-142.

- 1990b: "The Myth of Prometheus in Hesiod", in: *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece* (Originally published in French as *Mythe et société en Grèce ancienne,* 1974), New York, 183-201.

Versnel, H. S. 1991: "Beyond Cursing: The Appeal to Justice in Judicial Prayers", in: C. A. Faraone & D. Obbink (eds.), *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek magic and religion,* Oxford, 60-106.

- 1994: "Πεπρημένος: The Cnidian curse tablets and ordeal by fire", in: R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence,* Stockholm, 145–154.

- 1998: "An Essay on Anatomical Curses", in: F. Graf (ed.), *Ansichten grichischer Rituale,* Stuttgart & Leipzig, 217–267.

- 1999: "Κόλασαι τοὺς ἡμᾶς τοιούτους ἡδέως βλέποντες. 'Punish those who rejoice in our misery': On curse texts and *Schadenfreude*", in: D. R. Jordan, H. Montgomery & E. Thomassen (eds.), *The world of ancient magic: Papers from the first International Samson Eitrem Seminar at the Norwegian Institute at Athens 4-8 May 1997,* Bergen, 125-162.

- 2002: "Writing Mortals and Reading Gods: Appeal to the Gods as a Dual Strategy in Social Control, in: D. Cohen (ed.), *Demokratie, Recht und soziale Kontrolle im klassischen Athen,* München, 37-76.

Wankel, H. 1979: *Die Inschriften von Ephesos, Teil 1a, Nr. 1-47* (= *I.Ephesos*), Bonn.

Weinreich, O. 1919: "Stiftung und Kultsatzung eines Privatheiligtums in Philadelpheia in Lydien", in: *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse,* Heidelberg.

Wilhelm, A. 1909: "Zu den Inschriften des Bundes der Magneten", *Hermes* XLIV, 41-59.

Woodhead, A. G. 1967: *The Study of Greek Inscriptions,* Oxford.

Zingerle, J. 1924: "Zu griechischen Reinheitsvorschriften", *Strena Buliciana: Commentat-iones gratulatoriae Francisco Bulić ob XV vitae lvstra feliciter peracta oblatae a discipvlis et amicis,* Zagreb/Split, 171-192.
    - 1926: "Heiliges Recht", *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts (Beiblatt)* 23, 5-72.
    - 1939: "Kleinasiatische Kultsatzungen", *JÖAI* XXXI (Beiblatt), 151-160.

Zolōtas, G. 1908: "Ἐπιγράφαι Χίου καὶ Ἐρυθῶν ἀνεκδότοι," in: *Ἀθήνα: Συγγράμμα περιόδικον τῆς ἐν Ἀθηναῖς ἐπιστημόνικῆς ἑταίρειας* 20, 119-381.

Index of citation

n. 125; 112, n. 128; 113, n. 132; 115; 134, n. 224; 135, n. 226; 140, n. 243; 188, n. 44; 192, n. 67; 195, n. 83; 227, n. 5.

148: 43; 119; 120, n. 163, 164; 136.

150 A: 14, n. 3; 43; 119; 120, n. 163, 164; 124, n. 173; 125, n. 179; 135; 136, n. 233; 203, n. 128, 129.

150 B: 43; 119; 120, n. 163; 125; 135; 136, n. 233, 234; 192, n. 69; 203, n. 129.

152: 43; 99; 127, n. 194; 140, n. 243.

171: 43; 95, n. 42; 99; 100; 108, n. 108, 110; 109, n. 114, 115; 111, n. 126; 140, n. 243, 244; 188, n. 40; 192, n. 67; 195, n. 83.

NGSL

7: 43; 44; 88, n. 17; 100; 107, n. 99; 108, n. 107, 108, 109; 111, n. 124, 125; 112, n. 128; 113, n. 136; 140, n. 243, 245; 188, n. 40; 189, n. 49; 192, n. 67; 195, n. 83.

SEG

XLVII 1654: 184; 232-234, n. 37, 38, 39.

BWK

4: 17, n. 9; 44; 185, n. 18; 206, n. 145; 206, n. 145; 210, n. 163.

5: 17, n. 11; 30, n. 58; 129, n. 201; 132, n. 213; 150, n. 32; 151, n. 41; 152, n. 53; 154, n. 63; 185, n. 17; 186, n. 26; 187, n. 34; 189, n. 47; 193, n. 73, 74, 75; 195;

196-198, n. 98, 100, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108; 212; 223; 238, n. 63.

6: 17, n. 9; 44; 129, n. 201; 148, n. 27; 150, n. 32; 151, n. 40; 152, n. 53; 154, n. 66; 186, n. 25, 26; 191, n. 59; 192; 193, n. 72, 73, 74; 194, n. 80; 226, n. 3.

7: 17, n. 9; 44; 132, n. 213; 152, n. 53; 186, n. 25; 202, n. 120; 203, n. 124, 126; 204.

9: 17, n. 9; 44; 151, n. 47; 152, n. 53; 154, n. 62; 186, n. 21, 22, 24, 25; 202, n. 120; 203; 204; 232, n. 33; 239, n. 67.

10: 17, n. 12; 44; 132, n. 213; 145; 148, n. 27; 151, n. 47; 152, n. 53; 154, n. 62; 186, n. 21, 23, 25; 193, n. 74; 202, n. 120, 122; 203; 204, n. 133; 239, n. 67.

19: 17, n. 9; 44; 154, n. 62; 186, n. 25, 26; 193, n. 71; 194; 195, n. 84; 200.

22: 17, n. 12; 44; 152, n. 54; 154, n. 62; 185, n. 18; 186, n. 25; 205, n. 137; 140.

25: 44; 154, n. 65; 185, n. 13, 14; 212, n. 171.

29: 44; 185, n. 13, 14; 186, n. 25, 26.

36: 44; 186, n. 23; 187, n. 28, 29; 189; 190; 192, n. 68; 194, n. 81.

43: 17, n. 7, 12; 19, n. 17; 44; 152, n. 54; 154, n. 65; 186, n. 25, 26; 187, n. 32; 190; 191, n. 59, 60; 192; 195, n. 86;

50: 17, n. 9; 29, n. 53; 44; 151, n. 48; 152, n. 53; 153, n. 59; 186, n. 25; 205, n. 137; 206, n. 143.