



**Kernos**

Revue internationale et pluridisciplinaire de religion  
grecque antique

**28 | 2015**  
**Varia**

---

## The Documents in Sokolowski's *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure (LSAM)*

Edward Harris and Jan-Mathieu Carbon

---



**Electronic version**

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/kernos/2465>

DOI: 10.4000/kernos.2465

ISSN: 2034-7871

**Publisher**

Centre international d'étude de la religion grecque antique

**Printed version**

Date of publication: 1 October 2015

ISBN: 978-2-87562-055-2

ISSN: 0776-3824

**Electronic reference**

Edward Harris and Jan-Mathieu Carbon, « The Documents in Sokolowski's *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure (LSAM)* », *Kernos* [Online], 28 | 2015, Online since 01 October 2016, connection on 20 April 2019. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/kernos/2465> ; DOI : 10.4000/kernos.2465

---

## **The Documents in Sokolowski's** ***Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure (LSAM)***

This list of the documents found in *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure* attempts to classify them in terms of the categories formulated in Harris, "Towards a Typology" (2015).

### **1. Sinope. Law/decree about a priesthood (*polis*) – third century BCE (*I. Sinope* 8)**

This appears to be a law/decree of the *polis* for the priest of Poseidon Helikonios (line 2) and mentions public rites (lines 2-3), but there is no enactment formula. On the other hand, it may have been a contract between the *polis* and specific individual (*epi toisde* in line 1 implies a definitional verb or one of transaction, viz. a sale; cf. also the future forms in the document). The priest will receive perquisites from public sacrifices and be crowned during specific festivals in the months of Taureon and Poseideon (line 3-11). The priest is to be crowned like other magistrates ([*katho*] *ti kai tais timonxiais*, line 13) during the games, and he will also enjoy exemption from military service (lines 13-14); both of these clauses also indicate an enactment of the *polis*. There may be a penalty clause imposing fines for failure to carry out duties (lines 15-16). There may also be a penalty clause in a casuistic form (line 17-18).

### **2. Chalcedon. Hieron. By-laws of a private association – third century BCE (*I. Kalchedon* 13)**

This is a measure pertaining to a priesthood of the Twelve Gods. Sokolowski thought that this was a cult founded by a certain Nikomachos who is mentioned in the first line and also gives his name to the association (*koinoi toi Nikomacheioi*, line 7). The person who purchases the priesthood is given certain perquisites. There is the beginning of a clause in casuistic form where the stone breaks off (line 11).

### 3. Chalcedon. Law/decreed about priesthoods (*polis*) – third or second century BCE (*I. Kalchedon* 10)

The first lines are missing so that no prescript remains, but the Council and Assembly are mentioned (line 10; a fragmentary allusion to a public ritual may also be mentioned in line 1, [—]*tan damosio[rgan]*). The measure, according to Sokolowski, is a sort of cumulative sale of priesthoods: it will allow a buyer to purchase multiple privileges, with sums to be paid to different priests according/corresponding to the price paid (lines 1-10). There is an entrenchment clause threatening a penalty (lines 10-12). There is also a publication formula calling for inscribing the measure on a board in the Council and on a stele in front of the temple (lines 14-17). At the bottom of the stele, inscribed later, is the sum paid for the priesthood by Menemachus (lines 19-20) and other sums paid (lines 21-23). The first part of the document contains general rules about the priesthood while the final lines record payment for a single contract for a single priesthood.

### 4. Chalcedon. Law/decreed about a priesthood (*polis*) – third century BCE (*I. Kalchedon* 11)

The inscription is very fragmentary but appears to contain rules about contracts for the priesthood of a goddess (Sokolowski considered the cult to be that of Μήτηρ Ὀρέα; see lines 8 and 12, but the text is fragmentary). Lines 3-6 appear to contain an entrenchment clause like the one in no. 3, lines 10-12. Line 10 mentions *nomophylakes*, who are public officials – see Faraguna (2015). Lines 16-19 contain the amounts to be received by the priestess. Lines 21-25 contain provisions for payment. The final lines, 25-28, contain a record of the payment for a single contract by a woman called Aristonika.

### 5. Chalcedon. Law/decreed about a sale of priesthood (*polis*) – first century BCE (*I. Kalchedon* 12)

The prescript is not preserved, but the law/decreed provides regulations about the sale of a public priesthood of Asclepius (line 9, *polis*: lines 13-14 Council and Assembly). Lines 1-5 appear to deal with exemptions from civic duties. The person who purchases the contract can use the area around the temple (lines 7-9). The person who purchases must be *holokleros* and have the right to hold office (lines 9-10) and can purchase the priesthood for a son but not anyone else (lines 11-13). There is an entrenchment clause with a penalty of one

thousand drachmas to be dedicated to Asclepius (lines 13-17). There are rules for payment (lines 17-21). Whoever purchases will pay the expense for flowers (lines 21-23) and open the temple every day and make sure the stoa is clean (23-26). The contract will start in the month of Machaneios (line 27). The final lines record the price of the priesthood and the purchase of the contract by Matris, the son of Menius (lines 28-31).

**6. Kios. Fragment of metrical prescriptions (oracle?) – first century CE (*I. Kios* 19; *SGO* 09/01/01)**

This is a fragment of metrical prescriptions concerning sacred matters. Not much remains, making it difficult to exactly determine the authority that issued the rules, though the use of the verb προσαυδάω and an implied third person singular subject in lines 7-9 (i.e. the god), suggest an oracle (accepting this is an oracle, from Klaros, is Corsten in *I. Kios* 19). For further references, see A. and I. Petrovic (2006) 156-157 no. 6.

**7. Kyzikos. Law/decreed about priesthoods (*polis*?) – second century BCE (not in *I. Kyzikos*)**

The inscription apparently preserves a list of priesthoods to be sold and the remuneration that the priest or priestess in question is to receive for life from the treasurer (*tamias*; lines 4-5 and 10: one obol; lines 15, 22 and 27: four obols). The authority for the document cannot be determined, but the range of priesthoods apparently covered (though only [Aphrodi]te Agoraia's name is partially preserved in line 18) suggests that it was issued by the *polis*. If correct, the document would record that a range of civic priests and priestesses received small (and different) daily allowances.

**8. Lampsacus. Law/decreed about sacred matters (*polis*) – second century BCE (*I. Lampsakos* 9)**

Sokolowski prints only lines 16-30. The law/decreed contains regulations about festival of the Asklepieia. As Böckh explained, the regulations were enacted concerning a donation of money made by a private individual for the augmentation of the festival. The money was given to bankers who made loans at interest, and the revenue generated was given to the *epimenioi* for the festival (lines 4-16; on *epimenioi*, see Carbon – Pirenne-Delforge [2013]). There is to be a holiday for children from school and for slaves from work (lines 16-19). There

are duties for the priest (lines 19-21), for the *hierokeryx* (lines 21-23), for the heralds (lines 23-24). Creditors are not to seize the property of debtors during the festival; those who do are subject to the law about illegal seizures of property (lines 24-26). For a similar measure for the Dionysia at Athens see Dem. 21.11-12, 175-176 (the document at Dem. 21.10 is a forgery – see Harris in Canevaro [2013] 216-223). There are to be no trials during the festival (lines 26-28). The *epimenioi* are to sacrifice and not to spend money in another place (lines 28-35). The rest of the inscription is very damaged, but one section appears to provide privileges for priests (lines 35-36), another for the publication of a list of citizens eligible to participate (lines 36-51), another for the selection of bankers (lines 52-72), and another for lending the principal (line 72: *archaia*) at interest (lines 72-87).

### **9. Ilion. Law/decreed about sacred matters (*polis*) – second century BCE (*I. Ilion* 52)**

This is a law/decreed enacted by the city of Ilion about a donation made by Hermias, the son of Skamandrios, who has contributed (ἐπιδέδωκεν) and dedicated (ἱερουργοῖ) a sum of 15,000 drachmas of Alexander for a procession and sacrifice (lines 5-6). The people of Ilion have accepted the donation and pledged to use it to honor the gods (lines 7-9). There is an enactment formula (lines 10-12) and instructions to the *trapezitai* to lend the sum out at interest (lines 12-16). The revenue from the interest should be paid in the month of Panathenaios for the procession and sacrifice of the Iliaka to those elected by the tribes (lines 16-21). The *phylarchs* are to present an account of their expenditures (lines 24-25). Two (?) men are to be appointed to keep order and to beat the disorderly with a *rhabdos* (lines 27-29; cf. *LSCG* 65, Andania, lines 40-43). There appears to be a penalty of fifty drachmas for disobedience in a clause in casuistic form (lines 31-33). This measure is similar to other donations made to a city for religious ceremonies such as *LSCG* nos. 59, 80, 81, and no. 8 above. For discussion see Harris (2015) 72-75.

### **10. Ilion. Agreement of the Confederation of Ilion (federal sanctuary) – 77 BCE (*I. Ilion* 10)**

The document is called an “agreement” (*symphonon kai homologon*) made by cities of the confederacy of Ilion about the *panegyris* (line 1). On Face A is a dating formula with a mention of Lucius Julius Caesar (lines 2-6), followed by the names of representatives from Ilion, Dardanus, Scepsis, Assos, Alexandria,

Abydos, and Lampsakos (lines 6-13). The agreement releases the cities from overdue interest payments (lines 13-18) and contains the beginning of a penalty clause in the casuistic form (lines 18-19). These are financial provisions and do not pertain to religious matters. On Face B there are more financial measures. The first lines are missing; there are orders for cows to be purchased from revenues gained from the leases of the goddess' property (lines B3-4), for the sacrifice of an additional cow to [Athena Polias and all the gods] (lines B4-6), for the *agonothetai* and the *synedroi* to provide oil for rubbing from future revenues (lines B6-7) and for them to manage the theatrical and musical contests from future revenues (lines B8-9). There are to be gymnastic and equestrian games at the Great Panathenaea (lines B9-11), and money is to be taken from the revenue at the Lesser Panathenaea at the discretion of the *agonothetai* and the *synedroi* (lines B11-13). *Theoroi* are to be sent as before, and money is to be given for their expenses (lines B17-18). The *aparchai* are to be managed as before (lines B18-19). There is a provision about the payment of *theoroi* and envoys (lines B19-22). Most of these rules pertain to financial matters of the religious festivals of the confederation. The document is probably most closely paralleled by the laws/decrees of the Delphic amphictyony (see *LSCG* nos. 78-79 and Harris [2015] 61-65).

### **11. Pergamon. Letter of Attalid ruler or official about a priesthood – early or mid-third century BCE (*IvPI* 40)**

Sokolowski believed that the document, whose initial lines are lost, was a letter of Attalus I of Pergamum; by concluding with the word ἐρρωσο in line 22, it can certainly be inferred that the rules were issued in a letter by an Attalid official. There are rules about clothing to be worn by the priest and his perquisites, which include the revenues consecrated from workshops (*ergasteria*; lines 1-9). The person who obtains the priesthood is to make leases, probably of the sacred property, and to hand over to his successor the equipment (lines 9-14). If he does not, he must pay for the expense, but the clause does not indicate who enforces the penalty (lines 9-14). The priest is to enjoy exemption from liturgies during his term of office (lines 15-18) and to keep watch over silver and other dedications to the god, which he must hand over to his successor (lines 18-22). The regulations are similar to those for public priests in other communities.

## 12. Pergamon. Laws/decrees about sacred matters (sanctuary and *polis*) – after 133 BCE (*IvP* II 255)

The stele has three sections and the first two lines indicate that it was set up by Dionysius the son of Menophilus, who was *hieronomos* for the people. There follow rules about purification for those going into the temple (lines 2-9), which were set up on Dionysius' initiative and for the sanctuary (rather than by the city proper). Those who have had relations with their spouses are to purify themselves and enter on the same day, but those who have relations with "those belonging to others" are to wash and enter on the next day (lines 3-6). A man who has prepared a corpse for burial or been near a woman giving birth should also wash and wait until the day after (lines 6-7). Those who have participated in a funeral procession and burial should go through the gate where purifications are performed and become purified on the same day (lines 7-9).

There follow two decrees of the city, each of which begins with an enactment formula. The first orders that the right thighs and the skins of victims (i.e. proceeds from their sale) be placed in the treasury of Athena Nikephoros (lines 10-14). A tetrobol is to be paid for pigs, and two obols and a fraction are to be paid for other victims (lines 14-16). The final clause in this decree and in the next one states that the decree is to be valid forever unless another decision is made (lines 17-18, 28-29). The second decree starts with the statement that the traditional practice was for those sacrificing to Athena Nikephoros to give a triple portion to others in the sanctuary along with the perquisites of the goddess (lines 18-22). From now on, the *hieronomoi* will receive the skins from those sacrificing, sell them and give two obols for a pig to the *neokoros*, half an obol for cattle, and the same to the *aulos*-player and the *ololykttria* (lines 22-26). The following clause provides for payments from sacrificial animals to the *pyloros* and the rest to be given to the sacred revenues (lines 26-28).

The first section contains rules, probably formulated by Dionysius in his capacity as *hieronomos*, about purification before entering the sanctuary. Dionysius, the *hieronomos* for the people, also took the initiative to append two further official documents on the stele he erected. These two laws/decrees of the *polis* concern the financial administration of the public sanctuary. This would appear to indicate that the city entrusted the formulation of rules about purification to the religious personnel, but laid down rules for the sanctuary about financial matters.

### 13. Pergamon. Law/decreed about a priesthood (*polis*) – before 133 BCE (*IvP* II 251)

The law/decreed begins with a dating formula and an enactment formula (Council and Assembly) (lines 1-3) and expresses the intention that Asclepiades and his descendants hold the priesthood of Asclepius for all time (lines 4-6). This is followed by another enactment formula (lines 6-7) and the formal decision about Asclepiades and his descendants (lines 7-11 with the full title "priest of Asclepius and the other gods"). There follow rules about the priest's perquisites, including the right to the usufruct of the sanctuary, exemption from taxes, and *proedria* at contests (lines 12-22). Public officials will swear an oath in the *agora* at the altar of Zeus Soter that Asclepiades and his descendants will retain the priesthood will forever, and the generals will administer the oath (lines 25-34). The generals will place copies of the decree/law at the temple of Asclepius in Pergamon, in the temple of Athena on the acropolis, and in the temple of Asclepius at Mytilene (lines 35-40). The latter temple was a sanctuary that received *theoriai* and was held in high regard by the Attalids, and other inscriptions were set up by the dynasty in this location (for instance, *OGIS* 236, a treaty of Eumenes I; on this, see Robert (1925) 235-236 (= *OMS* I 29-30)). A copy of the decree (*psephisma*) will be placed among the laws (*nomous*) of the city of Pergamon (lines 40-42). For the absence of a strict distinction between the two terms in cities outside Athens see Rhodes with Lewis (1997), 555.

### 14. Pergamon. Law/decreed about sacred matters (*polis*?) – third century CE (*IvP* II 264)

This is a fragment of an inscription, which lacks the prescript and ending. There are rules about purity (lines 1-4) and the proper clothes to be worn (lines 7-11) for incubation in the shrine of Asclepius, which was a public shrine at Pergamon (see the previous entry; cp. also now Wörrle, *IvP* III 161, first half of the second century AD, a newer find of rules for the *egkoimeteria*, set up by [...] Klodios Glykon, the *hieronomos*; cf. no. 12). There are no officials named or penalties prescribed, but very little remains.

### 15. Pergamon (?). Law/decreed about a treaty and containing an order about sacred matters (*polis*) – 129 BCE (*SIG*<sup>3</sup> 694)

Sokolowski prints only lines 31-61. The first section contains a fragmentary prescript (lines 5-10). The name of the city has not been preserved, but



Sokolowski, following Wilhelm, thought that the shrines indicated Pergamon. The first clause recalls the city's loyalty to Rome during the war with Aristonicus, and Rome's support for the city (lines 11-22) and mentions a copy of the treaty with Rome inscribed on two bronze tablets with the decree of the Senate and the treaty kept in the Capitolium (lines 23-27). The decree calls for two bronze tablets with the treaty to be placed in the temple of Demeter and in the *bouleuterion* next to the statue of Democracy (lines 27-31). There follows another enactment formula (lines 31-32) with instructions for the *exetastai* to make the bronze plaques and place them on marble stelai (lines 32-37) with a copy of the decree (lines 37-39). When these are placed, the *stephanephoros*, the priests, the priestesses and the officials with the citizens are to open the temple of the gods, burn incense, and make a prayer (lines 39-44). The prayer is for the good fortune and safety of the people of the city, the Romans, and the Dionysiac artists and that the alliance remains forever (lines 44-48). This is to be accompanied by a sacrifice to Demeter and Kore, the goddesses of the city and to Rome and to all the gods and goddesses (lines 48-52). There is to be a holiday for students from school and slaves from work (lines 53-55). There will be a race or parade (*diadrome*) for the boys and young men supervised by the *paidonomos* and the gymnasiarch (lines 55-58). The expenses for all of this will be paid by the treasurers Eukles and Dionysios from the revenues they manage (lines 58-61).

The religious ceremonies form part of a series of one-off measures concerning the commemoration of a treaty between the city and Rome. The prayer and sacrifice are added to these measures to celebrate the city's relationship with Rome. This is not a law/decreed about sacred matters, but a decree about foreign relations, in which a prayer and sacrifice are included. For discussion of this kind of law/decreed combining non-sacred and sacred matters see Harris (2015), 66-67.

## **16. Gambreion near Pergamum. Law/decreed about sacred matters (*polis*) – third century BCE (CIG 3562)**

The first four lines contain a dating formula and a proposer. The measure is called a *nomos* for the people of Gambreion (line 4). There follow rules about what women in mourning are to wear (lines 5-6) and what men and boys are to wear (lines 6-9). Ceremonies for the dead are to be accomplished (at the latest) within three months, and mourning should end in the fourth month for men, in the fifth month for women (lines 9-14). Women are to leave the funeral by roads designated by law (lines 15-17). The *gynaikonomos* elected by law is to

make an imprecation during the purification ceremonies at the Thesmophoria calling for blessings on those who obey and "the opposite" for those who disobey (lines 17-25). Those women who commit impiety are forbidden to sacrifice for ten years (lines 25-26). The next *stephanephoros* is to publish the law on two stelai, one before the gates of the Thesmophorion, the other before the temple of Artemis Lochia (lines 27-33), two sanctuaries especially frequented by women. The treasurer is to provide payment for the stelai (lines 32-36). This is a law/decreed about sacred matters with general provisions and public officials named.

**17. Smyrna. Sign (private association or sanctuary) – first century BCE or CE (*I. Smyrna* 735 + vol. II 2, p. 377)**

The inscription is completely preserved and contains rules about a pond for sacred fish (*ikthuotrophion*) and its associated equipment, which are not to be removed or stolen (lines 1-5). Anyone who violates the rules is cursed with destruction and to be eaten by fish (lines 5-8). If any of the fish dies, it is to be burned and consumed on the altar on the same day (lines 8-10). The blessings of the goddess are invoked for those who protect and increase the honors of the goddess (lines 11-16). The absence of officials and penalties to be paid to the *polis* would seem to indicate a private association or a shrine.

**18. Maeonia. Sign (*polis* or private association?) – 147/6 BCE (*TAMV* 1, 530)**

The inscription is dated by thirteenth regnal year of Attalus II (so Sokolowski) and contains an invocation (lines 1-3). Regrettably, a group of individuals who "erected the stele" (*estesan ten stelen*), is now missing in the fragmentary lines 3-6. The remainder is a sign placed in the shrine of Meter and contains rules about purity for those entering the shrine. There is no prescript and no penalties are mentioned, so it remains unclear if this is a sign of the city, of a private association, or of the sanctuary itself.

**19. Maeonia. Sign (?) (private association) – 171/2 CE (*TAMV* 1, 536)**

The brief inscription concerns a *hieros doumos*, which is interpreted either as a Lydian word or (less probably) a transliteration of the Latin word *domus*; in any case, it is thought to be the equivalent of the Greek word *oikos* and to refer to a

cult group (for a precisely contemporary inscription apparently listing the members of the same group, there called ἱερὰ συνβίωσις καὶ νεωτέρα, see *TAM* V 1, 537). There is an order of the gods to make a prayer lasting nine days to Zeus Masphalatenios, to Men of Tiamos and Men Tyrannos (lines 1-6). If anyone disobeys, they will “learn” the powers of Zeus. The stele concludes with a genitive absolute clause indicating that Dionysius the son of Diodorus and Hermogenes the son of Valerius will supervise, but its grammatical connection to the preceding phrase is unclear. The stele is dated by the Sullan era (line 12).

## **20. Philadelphia. By-laws of a private cult / sanctuary – first century BCE (*TAM* V 3, 1539)**

The inscription contains the by-laws of an association founded by Dionysius in accordance with the orders he received in a dream (lines 2-6). There are altars to several gods starting with Zeus (lines 6-11). Zeus has given these orders (*parangelmata*) about purifications and mysteries *kata ta patria* (lines 12-14). The sanctuary appears to be open to anyone who wishes to participate, provided that they respect the rules. All those participating must swear an oath not to use potions or spells or philtres, etc., or to advise others to use them (lines 14-23). If anyone violates these rules, the prospective members should not allow them to do so and should not keep silent but should denounce and punish (*amunesthai*) them (lines 23-25). Men should not sleep with the wife of another man, either free or slave, or seduce a virgin or persuade another to do so. If he learns about such behavior, he should not remain silent (lines 23-33). The gods who have altars in the shrine will not tolerate anyone violating the rule (lines 33-35). Free women must remain chaste; if they do not, they are polluted and not worthy to honor the god or to attend sacrifices or purifications (lines 35-41). For a similar rule at Athens see [Dem.] 59.87 with Canevaro (2013) 190-196. Anyone who violates the rules will be cursed (lines 41-44). The god will give blessing to those who obey and punish those who disobey (lines 44-50). The orders are kept by the goddess Aggdistis, guardian and mistress of the house, who is responsible for seeing that they are enforced (lines 50-60). The final preserved lines contain a prayer (lines 60-64). There do not appear to be any officials to enforce the rules and Dionysius appears to rely mainly on the watchful eyes of the gods, such as Aggdistis, to police infractions. Sokolowski found here a “tendence universaliste et morale” which evinced an “esprit oriental,” but most of the rules find parallels in other laws/decrees or by-laws and do not appear especially “oriental”, except perhaps for some of the cults concerned (such as Aggdistis).

**21. Erythrai – Regulations about sacred matters (?) – end of fourth century BCE (*I. Erythrai* 203)**

The inscription contains fragments of nine lines, which concern portions to be given to a god or gods on an altar (line 2), and perhaps other provisions for the sacrifice such as breads (lines 7-8). Not enough remains to permit any firm conclusions.

**22. Erythrai. Law/decreed about a priesthood (?) (*polis*) – fourth century BCE (*I. Erythrai* 204)**

Only fragments of eleven lines are preserved, but appear to concern the perquisites (line 8: *dermata*; line 9: *glossas*) of priests in a public cult (line 10: *polis*). The two final lines (10-11) contain prescriptions about sacrificial tariffs, presumably to be deposited in the *thesauros*.

**23. Erythrai. Law/decreed or contract concerning the sale of a priesthood (*polis*) – end of the fourth century BCE (*I. Erythrai* 206; for a new fragment, see Himmelmann [1997] 117-121; *SEG* 47, 1648)**

Even though the document lacks a prescript, the regulations apply to those who have purchased priesthood from the city and are made "in accordance with the public decree" (line 6). The first part gives the duties of the man and the woman purchasing the priesthood of the Corybantes (lines 1-10). The second, fragmentary part contains the perquisites of the priest and priestess (lines 10-16). The new fragment confirms the public character of the rites (public sacrificial animals, line 4; altars, line 7; as well as a lengthy but fragmentary section on the administration of oaths on behalf of the city, lines 16-23ff.).

**24. Erythrai. Law/decreed about sacred matters (*polis*) — 380-360 BCE (*I. Erythrai* 205)**

The stele is inscribed on two sides. The top of the right side of Face A is not preserved, but the first thirteen lines concern sacrifices made to Apollo and Asclepius. Lines 13-25 provide regulations about the perquisites of the gods and priests. Lines 25-30 make a distinction between sacrifices performed for the *polis* and those performed by individuals for themselves, which do not take place during the festival. The final part of Face A contains the *paian* to be sung

in thank-offering to Asclepius for cures or in prayers to Apollo (lines 30-38). Face B contains further fragments of a *paian*. Wilamowitz thought that this *paian* had nothing to do with the *paian* mentioned on Face A and was sung at public festivals. On the *paian* in general, see Rutherford (2001) 3-137.

**25. Erythrai. Records of sales of priesthoods (*polis*) – ca. 274 BCE or shortly after (*I. Erythrai* 201)**

This document is not a law/decreed but a financial record of sales of priesthoods. Face A is fragmentary at the top, but Face B has a heading (lines 50-51: “the following are the priesthoods sold during the office of Metrodorus son of Apollodorus”, i.e. in one given year), and several other sections have similar headings with dates (lines 24-26, 107-108, 112-113, 149-151). Each entry records the name of the deity, the amount paid for the priesthood, the amount of the sales tax (*eponion*), the name of the purchaser, and the name of the surety.

**26. Erythrai. Records of expenses for sacred matters (*polis*) – after 189 BCE (*I. Erythrai* 207, with a new fragment in *SEG* 30, 1327)**

These are fragments of records of expenses paid for sacrifices to different deities, organized by different days of the months (line 1: fourth day; line 9: fifth; line 11: sixth; etc.). The precise organisation of the different fragments and their chronological order remains debated. Some expenses are listed as *koinon* or *koina*, particularly for the sacrifices to king Antiochos (III) or other monthly sacrifices (to the kings); the prevailing interpretation is that these represent expenses funded “in common” by the Ionian League. For the *terminus post quem*, note the mention of the cult of Rome, line 11.

**27. Near Erythrai. Fragment of a sacrificial calendar (?) – early fourth century BCE (*I. Erythrai* 208)**

Sokolowski restored several dates in this very fragmentary document and thought that it might be an earlier form of the records of expenses for sacrifices (see above, no. 26). It is perhaps likelier that it represents a fragment of a sacrificial calendar from the city or one of its subdivisions.

## 28. Teos. Law/decreree about sacred matters (*polis*) – reign of Tiberius (*SEG* 15, 718)

The first six lines are very fragmentary, but these are followed by a prescript (line 7) and orders for ephebes and the priest to sing hymns to Dionysus every day (probably of the festival; thus Robert and Sokolowski) when the temple is opened (lines 7-10). At the opening and closing of the temple the priest of Tiberius should make libations, spread incense and light lamps, rituals for which the sacred funds of Dionysos are to be used (lines 10-14). The officials of the city should perform sacrifices on the seventh day of each month, praying for the city (lines 14-16). The person who violates the rules is considered "impious" though it is not specified what legal steps are to be taken in this case (lines 17-18). The decree concludes with a publication formula: it is to be inscribed on the temple of Dionysos and to be classified as a law (*nomou taxin echon*, lines 18-19).

## 29. Metropolis in Ionia. Sign (*polis* or sanctuary?) – fourth century BCE (*I. Ephesos* 3401)

The regulation was placed in front of the temple of the Mother of the Gods called *Gallesia* (lines 14-15) and contains guidelines concerning purity. If this was a public temple, we could be dealing with a sign containing a rule enacted by the *polis*. However, there is no introductory prescript and the sanction of the regulation is an implicit religious curse (see below); this would tend to suggest that the *polis* was not directly involved in the drafting and publication of the regulation. The subject matter is rules for entry into the sanctuary after funerals and sexual relations (two days after sexual relations with one's wife, three days after a *hetaira*) (lines 2-7). There may be a rule against removing or harming suppliants if the restoration is correct (lines 8-12). On removing suppliants from altars and sanctuaries, see Naiden (2006) 18-27, etc. There is no penalty clause, and no officials are mentioned, but the final clause states that the goddess will not be well disposed to those who commit wrongs (lines 12-15).

## 30. Ephesus. Face A: Regulations (?) about omens. Face B: Law/decreree about judicial procedure (*polis*) – middle or end of sixth century BCE (*I. Ephesos* 1678A-B)

These are fragments of wall blocks inscribed on both sides, probably deriving from a larger code of laws at Archaic Ephesos. Face A contains rules about

observing the flight of birds as omens, which may be instructions to religious officials or advice to anyone in the community. The first seven lines are about the flight of birds from right to left, the next section about flight from left to right. Face B contains rules about witnesses giving oaths in court but is very fragmentary. This specifically concerns the use of a religious practice in judicial procedure, but may have originally been part of a larger set of laws about sacred and perhaps even other matters.

### **31. Ephesus. Law/decreed about sacred matters (*polis*) – around or after 160 CE (*I. Ephesos* 24)**

This statue-base contains a small dossier of three texts: 1 – a letter of G. Popilius Persicus confirming the decree of the city of Ephesos; 2 – the actual decree of the city itself, which is the only section included by Sokolowski; 3 – a decree in honour of the agonothete T. Aelius Persicus. Document no. 2 is the law/decreed about sacred matters, specifically a truce for the festival of Artemis. There is a long prescript (lines 1-7) and an even longer clause giving the reasons for the measure and describing Artemis' honors throughout the Greek world (lines 8-23). The city has decided that the entire month of Artemision should be dedicated as a sacred month (line 31: *hieromenia*) to Artemis (lines 23-32). The measure is designed to bring honor and prosperity to the city for all time (lines 32-34).

### **32. Magnesia. Law/decreed about sacred matters (*polis*) – 197/6 or 180's BCE (*I. Magnesia* 98 + p. 295)**

The document begins with a dating formula and a summary of its contents (lines 1-9) and an enactment formula (line 10). There is a long motivation clause about the purchase of a bull (lines 10-18) and the prayer of the sacred herald, boys and girls, and other officials for the city's safety (lines 18-31). After another enactment formula (lines 31-32), the *stephanephoros* is ordered to lead a procession in the month of Anthesterion and to sacrifice the bull to Zeus Sosipolis (lines 32-35). Those who are to march in the procession are listed (lines 36-40). The *stephanephoros* is ordered to carry wooden images of the gods in beautiful clothes and to make a *tholos* in the agora and to provide music (lines 41-46). There are orders to the *oikonomoi* to make sacrifices to various deities (lines 46-53), and the priests are to receive the normal perquisites (lines 53-54). The *oikonomoi* are to divide the meat for various officials (lines 54-59) and to ensure the feeding of the bull (lines 59-61). The *ergolabos* should lead the bull to

the agora and collect contributions from the grain-sellers and others in the agora (lines 61-64). The final lines contain a publication formula and the allocation of funds for the stele (lines 64-68). Even though many public officials are named, there are no penalties specified for non-compliance. For a discussion of the context of this new festival of Zeus Sosipolis ("Saviour of the City") at Magnesia, see Wiemer (2009), 123-127, preferring a date after the peace of Apamea (post 189 BCE).

### **33. Magnesia. Laws/decrees about sacred matters (*polis*) – A: mid-second century BCE; B: after 85/4 BCE (*I. Magnesia* 100a-b)**

This is a small dossier consisting of two decrees relating to the new and augmented festival of Artemis Leukophryene. In the earlier decree (A), the first section contains a dating formula and a summary of the main topics of the document: the installation of a wooden statue in the Parthenon, the annual truce and sacrifice and the sacrifices of all inhabitants (lines A1-10). There is an enactment formula (lines A11 and A20) with a motivation clause about the city's desire to honor Artemis Leucophryene (lines A11-20). The *neokoros* and the priestess of Artemis are to set up the (statue of the) goddess in the Parthenon with a sacrifice, and the day is to be holy and called the *Isiteria* (lines A21-25). There is to be a sacred truce (lines A25-26), and the women are to go to the shrine and honor the goddess (lines A26-28). The *neokoros* is to lead choruses of virgins singing hymns to Artemis Leukophryene (lines A28-29). Children are released from school and slaves from work (lines A29-31). The priestesses and *stephanephoros* are to conduct a sacrifice and procession each year (lines A31-34). There is to be a release from taxes during the market organized for the festival (lines A34-36; cf. B61-62). The sacred herald now and in the future together with other officials will call for silence and make prayer and an appeal to the population (lines A36-43). Face B of the inscription contains another law/decreed relating to the same festival. The secretary of the Council and the under-secretary every year are to read and maintain the validity of the earlier decree (A) (lines B76-81). In case of infraction, there is a penalty clause inflicting on each a penalty of "T" drachmas (900 or 1000?) and denunciation to the *euthynoi* by any citizen who wishes (who will receive half of the penalty) (lines B31-34). The person who is elected to inscribe the decree is to present his accounts to the secretary of the Council and the under-secretary (lines B34-36). For a discussion of the date and context of the second decree, see Santangelo (2006).



**34. Magnesia. Law/decreed or contract for a priesthood (*polis*) – beginning of second century BCE (*I. Magnesia* 99; cf. also *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 554 and *SEG* 59, 1330)**

The prescript is missing, but the measure mentions fines paid to the *demos* (line 13), the power of the *demos* (lines 19-20) and public officials (lines 15-16: *euthynoi*; lines 5, 17: *oikonomoi*), and possibly the court (line 17). The main provisions of the measure concern the duties and perquisites of those who purchase the priesthood of Sarapis. There is a provision for volunteer prosecutors who receive one half of the penalty (lines 14-16). On the term *diagraphē* in contracts for priesthoods, see Lupu *NGSL*, p. 50.

**35. Priene. Sign (*polis* or private association) – 200-130 BCE (*IK. Priene* 205)**

This is a sign placed by Anaxidemus, son of Apollonius, who obtained the priesthood (lines 1-2). Like several signs, it was placed at the entrance to the sanctuary on the ante of the door (see Sokolowski). There is a brief order to enter the shrine in white clothes (lines 3-5).

**36. Priene. Law/decreed or contract for a priesthood (*polis*) – around 200 BCE (*IK. Priene* 196)**

This inscription is fragmentary and the prescript is missing, but there is a penalty to be paid to public officials (lines 23-25) and the *demos* appears to be mentioned (lines 28). The text contains rules about the priesthood of Sarapis and Isis, and it was thus perhaps a contract (*diagraphē*). Three will be a sacrifice to the gods on the twentieth of Apatourion (lines 7-9), and a sacrifice of birds to Isis (lines 9-11). The priest will also conduct a *lampadeia* to Sarapis, Isis and other gods and the priest will provide oil (lines 11-15). The next lines are fragmentary but assign a duty to the *neopoes* (lines 15-20). The priest must have an Egyptian helper to conduct the sacrifice, and no one who lacks such experience can help him. There is a fine of 1,000 drachmas and *phasis* to the *archontes* (lines 20-25). The following clause specifies perquisites for the priest (lines 25-33). For different opinions about the identity of the *κατεχομένοις* (line 29) see Sokolowski. Line 36 appears to concern purification, but the text is very fragmentary at this point.

### 37. Priene. Contract for the sale of a priesthood (*polis*) – second century BCE (*IK. Priene* 144)

This is a contract (*diagraphē*) of the *polis* for the sale of the priesthood of Dionysos Phleos. The buyer is to serve for life and enjoy *ateleia* (lines 3-6), have *sitesis* every day in the Prytaneion (lines 6-8), and perquisites from sacrifices (lines 8-10). He will provide items for sacrifices (lines 10-12) and enjoy *proedria* in the theater (lines 13-15). He will perform sacrifices in the theater, place incense, pour libations and make prayers (lines 15-19). There are rules about clothing and a crown (lines 19-24). If the person pays more than 6,000 drachmas, he will be exempt from several liturgies (lines 24-27); if more than 12,000 drachmas he will be exempt from the trierarchy, *oikonomia*, *neopoia*, and *proeisphora* (advance contribution to taxes). The person who purchases the priesthood will pay the *epidekaton* (a tax of 10%) immediately to the *neopoes*, half in Metageitnion, and half in Anthesterion (lines 30-35). The document concludes with a record of the purchase by Athenopolis for 12,000 drachmas with a payment of the *epidekaton* (lines 35-37).

### 38. Priene. Contracts for the sale of a priesthood (*polis*) – A: ca. 200 BCE; B: early second century BCE (*IK. Priene* 146-148)

Stele A contains the contract of the city for the priesthood of Poseidon Helikonios bought by Epameinon (lines 3-4) and begins with a dating formula (lines 1-2). The priest will serve for life and perform the sacrifice for Poseidon according to the laws of the Ionians, which demonstrates that this is a cult of the Panionion, which was in the territory of Priene (lines 6-7). The priest will receive *ateleia* and all other privileges granted by the Ionians (lines 8-10). He has the right to *sitesis* in the Prytaneion and in the Panionion during the sacrifices and *proedria* and the right to wear a gold crown during games, but a gold *strophiskos* during the rituals in the Panionion (lines 10-13). Lines 13-15 are fragmentary but appear to refer to things the priest will supply. The next clause provides legal guarantees for the exercise of the priesthood (lines 15-17). The contract concludes with an entrenchment clause with a curse as a penalty (lines 18-20) and a grant of *ateleia* for the priest's father (lines 20-21). Stele B appears to contain the clauses of the same contract, and also in the new edition of *IK. Priene* 147, starts with a dating formula and the name of a person who bought the contract (see that edition for a full discussion of the fragments of the text). For a further copy of this contract, prefaced by a record of the purchaser, the date and the price, see *IK. Priene* 148.

**39. Thebes of Mycale. Law/decreed about sacred matters or calendar (?) (*polis*) – mid-fourth century BCE (*IK. Priene* 416)**

This is partly a calendar with rituals to be performed by pastoralists on Mount Mykale on certain days (lines 1, 5-6, 7). The top of the inscription is missing so there is no prescript. There are public officials named (lines 4, 22 [*hieropoioi*]), and portions are to be given to all Thebans and to citizens, presumably those of the city that controlled Thebes, viz. Priene (lines 24-25). Orders are given to shepherds to make *aparchai* (lines 12-18), but there are no penalties mentioned, though oaths to be sworn by the pastoralists (probably concerning their flocks/herds) provided a means of making the regulations binding (lines 4, 11). For new discussions of this inscription, see Thonemann (2011) 196-197; Mack (2015) no. 2.

**40. Thebes of Mycale. Law/decreed about a priesthood (*polis*) – ca. 350-250 BCE (*IK. Priene* 417)**

There is a dating formula by *stephanephoros* (line 1). The rules concern the perquisites (lines 4-6, 14-16) and duties (lines 7-10) of a priest of Zeus and Poseidon. Because the priest is awarded *ateleia*, this would appear to be a civic priesthood. There is a publication formula ordering a copy to be inscribed on a stele in the temple of Athena next to the altar of Zeus Polieus (lines 10-14).

**41. Miletus. Calendar (*polis*) – before 500 BCE (*Milet* I 3, 31a-b; further fragments: *Milet* VI 3, 1215a-c)**

This is a sacrificial calendar with several dates (lines 3, 6, 9, 12), inscribed on a wall of the public building complex known as the Delphinion (sanctuary of Apollo Delphinios). In line 4, the *basileus* mentioned is a public official.

**42. Miletus. Fragmentary oracle – around 500 BCE (*Milet* I 3, 132a-b)**

Sokolowski identifies this as the response of an oracle (line 2: the god has said) and associates it with a cult of Heracles.

- 43. Miletus. Fragmentary law/decreree (?) about sacred matters (*polis*?) – fifth century BCE (*Milet VI 3, 1217a-c, with one new fragment, c*; note that LSS 122 is *Milet VI 3, 1217b*, part of this document)**

There appears to be a mention of kinds of cakes (line 2, *plakous*; line 3), along with perhaps other offerings. Not enough remains of the inscription to indicate which authority issued the rules, though the *polis* is a good probability.

- 44. Miletus. Law/decreree about contracts of priesthoods (*polis*) – around 400 BCE (*Milet VI 3, 1219*)**

This contains general rules about the perquisites of priests for priesthoods that are sold. Line 4, mentioning portions from civic sacrifices, shows that it was issued by the *polis*.

- 45. Miletus. Law/decreree concerning a priesthood (*polis*) – 380/379 BCE (*Milet VI 3, 1220*)**

This starts with a dating formula (lines 1-4) and an enactment formula (lines 4-5). There is a clause in the casuistic form allowing the *kyrios* of the priestess to denounce anyone who does not give the priestess her perquisites to the *praktores* (lines 7-14). This rule appears to supplement another measure written on a stele (lines 6-7), which indicated the fine (lines 13-14). If the person who is accused does not deny on oath the charge, the *praktores* are to collect the fine (lines 14-20). There is a publication formula (lines 20-22).

- 46. Miletus. Law/decreree concerning a priesthood (*polis*) – around 300 BCE (*Milet VI 3, 1221*)**

This is a set of regulations about the perquisites of a civic priest (line 5: *polis*). The cult concerned was that of Apollo (lines 6, 8), perhaps that of Apollo Delphinios. Lines 7-8 concern sacrifices performed on behalf of foreigners. The text is very fragmentary, and the prescript is missing.

**47. Miletus. Law/decreed concerning a priesthood (*polis*) – before 234/3 BCE? (*Milet VI 3, 1225*)**

The prescript is missing but, this is a decree of the *polis* (line 1: *demos*; line 6: *ekklesian*, *demos*; line 6: *demos*). The people of Miletus ask the god about the *agerseis* (collections) for Artemis Boulophoros Skiris (lines 10-13). Four *theopropoi* were elected to consult the god (lines 8-10). For the term compare e.g. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 548 and *IG XII 5, 141*, line 9. The question posed is whether the community should conduct the collections as the Skiridai (exegetes of the cult) propose or in the traditional manner (lines 1-4). The measure is interesting because it reveals the relationship between the Skiridai, who are connected with the cult of Artemis, and the Assembly. The Skiridai make a proposal in the Assembly, which then appoints a committee to consult the oracle of the god at Dodona. For another example of a genticial group using the evidence of an oracle for their ritual role, see *LSCG 15* (Praxiergidai), with Harris (2015) 64.

**48. Miletus. Law/decreed or contract concerning a priesthood (*polis*) – 276/5 BCE (*Milet VI 3, 1222*)**

The beginning of the inscription is missing. The first preserved lines concern the *homophagion*, which cannot be performed before the priestess performs it (lines 1-3). No one can bring together a *thiasos* before the public *thiasos* (lines 3-5). Payment for the priesthood will be made over ten years, one tenth each year with the first payment on the fourth of Apatourion with the rest on the fourth of Artemision (lines 7-11). This section of the regulation may indicate that we are dealing with a contract for the sale of the priesthood rather than a more general regulation, though that is also possible. The following lines are fragmentary, but refer to *telestra*, which pertain to initiations (lines 12-15). If a woman wishes to sacrifice to Dionysus, she should give perquisites to the priestess (lines 15-18). If any woman in the city, in the countryside, or on the islands wishes to be initiated to Dionysus, she is to give to the priestess one stater for each *trieteris* (lines 18-20). During the rite of the Katagogeia, the priests and priestesses of Dionysus Bacchius are to lead down Dionysus starting at dawn (lines 21-24).

#### **49. Miletus. Contract for the sale of a priesthood (*polis*) – around 130 BCE (*Milet* I 7, 203)**

The document concerns the sale of priesthood of the People of Rome and Roma. The purchaser will register the name of a man not younger than twenty with the treasurers and the *basileis* (lines A1-6). The person registered with will serve three years, eight months starting in Metageitnion or provides another to serve in his place (lines A7-12). The priest will be an initiate of Zeus Teleisourgos and take from the treasurer each year on the first day of the month of Taureon 600 drachmas and sacrifice to the Roman People and Rome on that day (lines A12-19). On the eleventh of the same month, the gymnasiarchs entering office will sacrifice with the ephebes to the Roman People and Rome (lines A19-24). The gymnasiarchs leaving office will sacrifice with the ephebes and give to each priest their assigned perquisites (lines A24-28). Side B further concerns the organization of contests as part of the new cult and the giving of prizes (lines B1-22), as well as further mandatory sacrifices (lines B22-40).

#### **50. Miletus. Law/decreed about religious matters (association and *polis*) – principal original text dated to 447/6 BCE and inscribed as a dossier around 200 BCE (*Milet* I 3, 133)**

The measure was enacted by the Molpoi (line 4), a cult association of Apollo Delphinios, which held an important political position in Miletus (see Herda [2006] 31-37, 80-86, 178-179, 400-401, etc.; for another view, see Grieb [2008], 214-217). The prescript dates the measure to the year of Philtes as *aisymnetes* (line 1) and gives the names of five *proshetairoi* from three tribes (lines 1-4). The rules are to be published in the temple (lines 4-5) and all concern a public cult of Miletus. The first part of the law/decreed provides rules about the Hebdomaia and assigns duties and privileges to the *aisymnetes*, *proshetairoi*, and *stephanephoroi* (lines 6-18). The second section orders that the *polis* give victims to the two *aisymnetai-stephanephoroi* for the procession to Didyma (lines 18-20), but three additional clauses order the *polis* to give sacrificial victims to the Molpoi at different festivals (lines 20-22), specify the rights and duties of the *basileus* (lines 22-23), and order an *aparche* by the *aisymnetai-stephanephoroi* (lines 23-25). The third section contains regulations about the procession to Didyma: two *gylloi* are to be placed at the gates of Miletus and Didyma (lines 23-25), the procession is to follow a specified route (lines 25-31), and the *Onitadai* are given certain rights and duties (lines 31-40 with further details in lines 40-42). A later addition

specifies the rights and duties of the herald among the Molpoi (lines 43-44). A final addition concerns the rights of the *oidos* (*keitharodos*). There are no penalties mentioned. For the Greek text, German translation and detailed commentary see Herda (2006). For a Greek text with English translation and brief commentary, see Herda (2011).

### **51. Miletus. Sign (sanctuary?) – end of first century BCE (*Milet I 7, 202*)**

This is a sign containing purity rules, which was inscribed to be visible to worshippers, on the ante of the temple. Though its preamble is missing, it is now plausibly restored as only specifying rules for entry into the sanctuary of Artemis Kithone. No authority was probably mentioned and the sign may derive from the sanctuary itself or from private initiative rather than the *polis* proper.

### **52. Miletus. Law about the sale of a priesthood (*polis*) – first century CE (*Milet I 7, 204*)**

This is a law (line A9: *nomon*) about the sale of the priesthood of Asclepius enacted by a board of six generals (lines A1-9). The measure applies only if the priesthood had not already been sold by the people (lines A8-9). The person who purchases the priesthood will register immediately with the treasurers and *basileis*, and he and his successors will serve for fifty years (lines A11-13), will be initiates of Zeus Telesiourgos (lines A13-14), and wear any clothing they wish (lines A14-15). Side B appears to contain the duties of this priest and other officials. The *hydrophylax* and the *paraphylax* will each provide a male sheep (lines B-13). The *paidonomoi* on the same day will sacrifice a sheep for the health of the children and give to the priest certain parts of the victim (lines B3-8). The *agonothetai* and the *stephanephoros* will perform a similar sacrifice as well as women who have given birth and are *zonnymenai* (lines B8-11). The last provision is a clause in the casuistic form with a penalty of twelve drachmas paid to the priest for not sacrificing or not giving the specified items when sacrificing (lines B11-13).

### **53. Miletus. Law/decreed about sacred matters (*polis*) – first century CE (*Milet I 3, 134*)**

The measure is called a *psephisma* proposed by Tiberius Claudius Damas (lines 1-2). There is an enactment formula, and the motion was made by the *epistatai* (lines 3-4). There is a clause giving the reason for the measure: the people have

traditionally shown piety to the protector of the city, Apollo of Didyma and to the *Sebastoi* who are set up next to him, and have decided to increase the honors belonging to them (lines 4-13). The prophets and the *stephanephoroi* are to hold feasts (*enochias*) according to traditional custom as was previously legislated and voted (lines 13-14). No one, either an official or anyone else, is to exchange these duties for payment in any way (lines 18-21). There is an entrenchment clause in the casuistic form making the person who proposes changes subject to an accusation for impiety and injustice, and imposing a fine of 500 staters (lines 22-28). The same fine is imposed on the *prophetes* who does not perform the *kosmoi*, or any *stephanephoros* who does not perform the *molpoi* and feasts (lines 29-33). The purpose of these measures is to show piety to the gods and the *Sebastoi* and for the preservation of the city (lines 33-35). The inscription ends with a publication formula and orders that it be written on a white board and on two steles, one of which is placed in the temple of Apollo of Didyma and the other in the shrine of Apollo Delphinios (lines 35-40); a dating formula concludes the document (line 41).

#### **54. Didyma. Law/decreed about sacred matters (*polis* or sanctuary?) – first half of third century BCE (*I. Didyma* 482)**

The stone is missing its beginning and starts with the mention of a *skene*, which probably refers to camping for a banquet after a sacrifice (lines 1-2?). Another part of the regulation deals with the use of sacrificial meats and other parts. Everything must be sold after being weighed on a scale (line 3). For certain portions, including the snout and the extremities, one deducts a third (lines 4-6). The remaining lines concern the heads of sheep and permit the *mageiroi* to sell the heads after cleaning them and cutting off the horns (lines 7-9). This is probably an official regulation issued by the city of Miletus or by the sanctuary of Didyma itself.

#### **55. Cnidus. Law/decreed about sacred matters (*polis*) – around 350 BCE (*I. Knidos* 160)**

The inscription begins with an enactment formula, was proposed by the *prostatai* (lines 1-2) and concerns a petition of the Bacchoi concerning the sanctuary of Bacchus Dionysus (lines 3-7). The law/decreed forbids anyone to camp in the sanctuary, whether male or female (lines 7-12; for the meaning of *καταλύειν* see Pl. *Grg.* 447b, *Prt.* 311a; D. 18.82). There is a penalty clause in the casuistic form, but the penalty itself is not preserved.



**56. Hyllarima. Contract for the sale of a priesthood (*polis*) – ca. 197 BCE (see now Adiego, Debord and Varinlioglu 2005)**

This is a contract for the sale of a priesthood of the Theoi Pantēs by the people of Hyllarima, to Leon, the son of Theodorus (lines 5-9). There follows a list of gods with a final clause about any gods to whom the people of Hyllarima sacrifice except those for priesthoods already sold (lines 10-19). The perquisites of the priest (lines 20-22) and an exemption from liturgies follow (line 22). For a new edition of all the documents inscribed as part of the dossier on the stele, including this text and a new sale of priesthood, see now Adiego et al. (2005).

**57. Hyllarima. Fragmentary – Imperial period**

The inscription appears to be a cultic regulation, inscribed below another document, but is too fragmentary to allow for any firm conclusions.

**58. Olymos. Law/decreed concerning sacred matters (*polis*) – second century BCE (*I. Mylasa* 861)**

The document begins with a dating formula and an enactment formula (lines 1-2; cf. line 14). The decree concerns the participation of the three former tribes, now called *syngeneiai*, of the deme of Olymos, in the common cult of the community for Artemis and Apollo. All citizens have the right to participate in the cult of Apollo and Artemis (both citizens by descent and those receiving citizenship by grant). The sacrifices and the allocation of funds are to be conducted in the traditional manner (lines 7-8). Disputes have arisen because some members of the former tribes have “dared” to appropriate funds and priesthoods belonging to the city (lines 8-13), which are considered to be impious acts. To avoid problems in the future, the assembly of Olymos orders the treasurers to draw up a list of all participants on the right *propylaion* of the *temenos* (this is found below the decree in the remainder of the document, but not reprised by Sokolowski). On the *polis* of Mylasa and its subdivisions including the deme of Olymos which was incorporated into it after a *sympoliteia*, see further Reger (2004).

**59. Iasos. Law/decreed about a priesthood (*polis*) – fourth century BCE (*I. Iasos* 220; Fabiani 2016)**

There is no enactment formula, but the rules concern perquisites for the priest of Zeus Megistos, a civic cult in which citizens, metics and foreigners participated. If the priest violates the rules, he is to be removed from the priesthood and barred from the sanctuary (lines 6-7). If anyone damages the stele, he is considered to be guilty of sacrilege (lines 7-8). Dedications consisting of silver coinage (according to Fabiani's new reading) are to belong to the priest; the remaining offerings belong to the god (lines 8-9). The *naopoiiai* are to administer sacrifices according to a law of the city (lines 9-10). For a new edition, also on the basis of a later copy of the same inscription, see now Fabiani; we follow this edition here.

**60. Iasos. Donations/dedications to the gymnasium and Elders for sacrifices (public group or *polis*?) – Imperial period (*I. Iasos* 245-246)**

There are two inscribed monuments, A and B, each containing similar provisions but pertaining to two different donations, one by Phaenippus, the other by Hierocles. Text A starts with a provision in the casuistic form imposing a fine of 3,000 drachmas to be paid to the donor Phaenippus by anyone responsible for not performing sacrifices, not awarding perquisites, diverting the money donated to another purpose or reducing the principal or the interest (lines A1-8). After the death of Phaenippus, the *dioiketai* must pay the heirs the same penalty if they do not do what is prescribed. The heirs have the right to collect the money as if there had been a court judgment (lines A8-12). After the death of Phaenippus, the *dioiketai* are to sell the priesthood on the condition that the buyer will receive the same perquisites for life as Phaenippus received (lines A12-16). Every year there will be an *epiphora* on the 12<sup>th</sup> of the month of Phyllion (lines A16-18). The *dioiketai* appointed by the Elders will take fifteen drachmas from the revenues and perform the sacrifice in front of the gymnasiarch and the ephebes (lines A18-22). The revenue will come from the money donated (lines A22-23), but it is unclear whether the donations were made to the city or to the gymnasium specifically (and the Elders themselves). For the idea that expenses should be paid out of income and not from principal, see Dem. 27.50. This clause was probably added to ensure that the money for an individual would come from the money he gave and not from the city or another body. The remaining lines are fragmentary but concern the

performance of sacrifices and distribution of perquisites (lines A23-31). Fragment B has only a few letters preserved on the left side, but appears to repeat verbatim these provisions for a donation made by Hierocles (lines B10-11, 13). Both donations are similar to wills insofar as they confer rights on the heirs, but they are not wills in and of themselves. For the combination of testamentary provisions and a donation/dedication, see Harris (2015) 71-77.

**61. Mylasa. Law/decreed about sacred matters (*polis*?) – late fourth or third century BCE (*I. Mylasa* 303)**

The text is very fragmentary and lacks a prescript so it is impossible to determine which authority issued the rules, though the *polis* is a good candidate. There is an oblique mention of a decision made by the women who participate in the cult (line 5). The regulations concern a festival involving primarily female participants, which may relate to the cult of Demeter, though men were also concerned by the rules. There appears to be a penalty of whipping for a slave, but the offence is not preserved (line 13); another “tenfold” fine is also mentioned in a fragmentary context (line 16).

**62. Mylasa. Law/decreed about cult (subdivision of the *polis*) – first century BCE (*I. Mylasa* 301)**

There is a dating formula (line 1), an enactment formula (lines 1-2), a proposal formula with the title of the proposer (lines 2-3). All those who are honored by the tribe after Antipater was *stephanephoros* are to dedicate a gold cup or *phiale* worth one hundred drachmas of Alexander and write on it the name of the person honored and that he dedicated it to Zeus of the tribe of Hyabesitytai, together with the weight (lines 4-7). The dedication is to be made within three months after the honor (line 7). If someone is honored by another tribe, he must dedicate either three cups or three *phialai* worth three hundred drachmas of Alexander and give them to the *tamiai* or *oikonomoi* of the tribe, according to the financial instruction (*chresmatismos*) of the judges and the *nomophylax* (lines 7-10). There is an entrenchment clause with a penalty of 3,000 drachmas to be dedicated to the Zeus of the tribe; the *tamiai* are to collect it after a trial (lines 11-13).

**63. Mylasa. Law/decree about sale of a priesthood (subdivision of *polis*) – first century BCE? (I. Mylasa 304)**

The inscription is very fragmentary but concerns the sale of a priesthood. It remains unclear which authority issued the rules, but Segre thought that it was a *syngeneia*, which seems a good hypothesis given that the priesthood belongs to a cult of a group ending in *-deis* (line 3).

**64. Mylasa. Fragmentary rules about the cult of Demeter and Hecate (*polis*?) – first century BCE (I. Mylasa 309)**

The inscription is very fragmentary. Since these were gods of the *polis*, this might be a law/decree of the *polis* or one of its subdivisions.

**65. Mylasa. Law/decree about the sale of a priesthood (*polis* or subdivision?) – second or first century BCE (I. Mylasa 305)**

The inscription is very fragmentary but has been plausibly restored as containing rules about the rights and duties of those who purchase a priesthood. Treasurers appear to be mentioned (line 7). A sale on the part of a subdivision of the city of Mylasa, such as a *syngeneia*, seems likely, see nos. 63 and 66 here.

**66. Mylasa. Decree of a *syngeneia* about the sale of a priesthood (subdivision of *polis*) – first century BCE (I. Mylasa 302)**

There is a dating formula (lines 1-2), the names of proposers (lines 2-5), and an enactment formula identifying the measure as a decree of the *syngeneia* of the Maunitai (line 2). The rules concern the sale of a priesthood and the duties and perquisites of the priest.

**67. Panamara. Laws/decrees or regulations about sacred matters (*polis* or sanctuary?) – A: first century BCE or AD? B: third century BCE (I. Stratonikeia 1 a-b)**

The document in Sokolowski actually consists of fragments of two different inscribed steles which do not belong together (so, rightly, van Bremen 2004), though both relate to the cults at Panamara near Stratonikeia. Fragment A repeatedly mentions hymns and sacrifices of oxen, perhaps as part of a

calendar. Fragment B lists animals to be sacrificed and mentions the Heraia as a *trieteris* (a biennial festival of Hera).

**68. Panamara. Sign (*polis* or sanctuary?) – date unclear (*I. Stratonikeia* 2)**

This is a sign because of its brevity and style. It lists prohibitions against bringing in weapons, grazing animals and possibly against the removal of objects from the sanctuary at Panamara.

**69. Stratonikeia. Law/decreed about sacred matters (*polis*) – end of second century CE (*I. Stratonikeia* 1101)**

The inscription begins with a dating formula (lines 1-2) and a clause about the city being rescued by the gods Zeus Panamaros and Hecate whose cult has been secured by the Roman rulers (lines 2-4). Statues of these gods have been set up in the Sebastos bouleterion (lines 5-6); the benefactions of these gods are said to deserve a procession and worship (lines 6-7). There is an enactment formula indicating a decree of the Council (line 7). Thirty children are to be chosen from good families, and every day the *paidonomos* and the public *paidophylakes* will lead them crowned with leaves, dressed in white, and holding branches (lines 7-9). Accompanied by a kithara player and a herald they will sing the hymn dictated by Sosander the secretary (lines 9-10). If some of the children chosen are enrolled as ephebes, others will be chosen for singing the hymn (lines 10-11). The children may be absent if they are ill or in mourning (lines 13-14). If these duties are not carried out, the officials and the *paidonomos* can be charged with impiety, the public *paidophylakes* placed in prison (lines 14-15). The reason for the different penalties is not clear. Every year the priest of Hecate will choose in the *peripolion* of the goddess (neighbourhood around the temple) the children to sing the hymn and have power over both the fathers and the children (lines 15-17). If the fathers do not provide children for singing the hymn and the children do not participate, they can be accused by *eisangelia* or any other procedure, with the priest and the eunuch *rhabdouchos* reporting the name to the Council in the same way as for those elected by the city (lines 18-20). If the priest or the eunuch does not do this, they can be charged with the same offences as the children (lines 21-22). There follows an order for the *paidonomos* to place the decree in *pronaos* of the Serapion and for the priest of the goddess to place a stele with the orders of the decree in the temple of the goddess (lines B2-6, after a number of missing lines). The decree is also to be

inscribed in the exedra of the Bouleuterion on the right to show piety for the gods, and the expense is to be paid by the *epistatai* of the Bouleuterion (lines B6-10; this is the extant copy of the inscription).

**70. Chalketor. Law/decreed about sacred matters (*polis* or subdivision) – second century BCE (*I. Mylasa* 914)**

This is a fragment containing rules about the duties and perquisites of cultic officials of a public cult because meat is distributed to the people (line 6; however, it is uncertain if *demos* here refers to Chalketor as a deme of Mylasa in this period or to the whole of the citizen community). Money is provided by treasurers (lines 1-2). A certain portion was customarily given to the priestess (lines 4-5), probably of a goddess like Artemis, while other portions are kept by officials, who were probably named in the missing part of the inscription (lines 6-8). Sokolowski thinks they were *hieropoioi*; *naopoioi* are also a good possibility in Caria. There is a penalty if they take more than their allotted share (lines 8-10).

**71. Kasossos. Law/decreed or contract concerning the sale of a priesthood (*polis* or subdivision) – mid-to-late-Hellenistic (*I. Mylasa* 942)**

Though it is fragmentary and its beginning is missing, the inscription essentially contains a contract for the sale of a priesthood of Zeus at Kasossos, which seems to have been a public cult in the community. The first clauses pertain to the perquisites of the priest at Kasossos, such as when the Kasosseis sacrifice in common (*[kata] koinon*; lines 1-11). The exemption from taxation (*ateleia*) granted to the priest demonstrates that Kasossos was no longer a fully independent community at this time, but rather formed a civic subdivision of the city of Mylasa: exemption from taxation and liturgies is granted to the priest of Zeus only over those which the Kasosseis have authority (ὃν ἔν Κασωσ[σε]ῖς κύριοι ὄσιν, lines 11-13); i.e. not all of the taxes and liturgies in effect at Mylasa. The contract concludes with the modalities of payment for the office of priest, namely in three instalments to the treasurers (lines 13-20; a restored mention of the *stephanephoros* as a date in lines 19-20 almost certainly points to the eponymous official of Mylasa).

## 72. Halicarnassus. Oracle, donation and by-laws of private family cult /association – first half of third century BCE (Carbon 2013)

The inscription is a dossier consisting of three documents inscribed contemporaneously: first, an oracle of Apollo, sought by Poseidonios concerning his ancestral cults and that of the Agathos Daimon of himself and Gorgis (his wife) (lines 1-11); second, a pledge (*hypotheke*, cp. lines 25 and 49) by Poseidonios to his descendants, serving to fund the sacrifices recommended by the oracle (lines 12-22); third, a decree enacted by Poseidonios and his descendants concerning the appointment of *epimenioi* and the administration of the cult of the familial group. Male in-laws are also to be admitted into the group, as seems to be implied from the phrases “those who take (wives) from them” (lines 13 and 23). The second section, the pledge of Poseidonios, lists a series of landed properties, including a tomb (*mnemeion*, probably that of Poseidonios’ parents or his future memorial: line 17), as well as half the rights of tillage (*enerosion*) at a place called Taramptos (line 18). These are to be held in trust for the family and used for profit (*karpeneto*) by the eldest male descendant in succession, who is to serve as priest; specifically, the priest is to provide four *chrysoi* annually for the cult (lines 18-22). The third section, the decree of the family, adds some qualifications to this straightforward process: three temporary cult officials called *epimenioi* are to be appointed annually from the family members. Either they received the stipulated funds from the priest and put on the sacrifices (purchasing sacrificial animals and other necessities; lines 24-27) or, if the priest refused to pay or did not wish to use the pledged properties for profit, a different scenario was brought in effect (lines 27-31): all the pledged properties became commonly held by the group (*einai ta hypokeimena koina*; *to de temenos einai koinon*) and the *epimenioi* were tasked with renting them out. In this case, the *epimenioi* would use both the money derived from these rentals (*misthoma*) and the rights of tillage (*enerosion*) to directly fund the sacrifices. Further clauses of the decree describe the sacrifices of the group over the course of two days (lines 33-38); the perquisites of the priest (lines 38-40); the division of the remaining meat by the *epimenioi*, including their own prerogatives, and the sale of fleeces; an account of all the expenditures was presented by the *epimenioi* before the dinner presumably held on the second day of celebrations; any profits were to be used to fund dedications in the *temenos* (lines 40-48). The decree concludes with a clause concerning the inscribing of the tripartite dossier (lines 49-51). No penalty clauses are found on the stele, but the dossier does conclude with a wish that “it will be better both under god and man for those who preserve and enact these (commands/provisions)”: this is a blessing which

directly echoes the language of the oracle cited in the first part of the dossier (lines 10-11); the implicit obverse of the blessing was a curse against those who failed to do so. For a new edition with commentary, see Carbon (2013).

### **73. Halicarnassus. Law/decreed about the sale of a priesthood (*polis*) – second half of third century BCE (*GIBM* 895)**

There is a dating formula (lines 1-3) and an enactment formula (lines 3-4); the proposers are the *prytaneis* (line 4). The person who purchases the priesthood of Artemis Pergaia will provide a priestess who is a citizen with citizen parents for three generations on both father's and mother's side (lines 4-8). The woman will serve for life and make sacrifices for the community and for individuals and will receive perquisites from each (lines 8-14). The treasurers will give to the *prytaneis* for the sacrifice to Artemis thirty drachmas (lines 14-17). The wives of the *prytaneis* will prepare the sacrifice and receive money from the *polis* in the month of Herakleion, with the sacrifice will taking place on the 12<sup>th</sup> (lines 18-21). The priestess will receive an equal share with these other women (lines 21-23). The priestess on the first of each month will make a sacrifice for the city and receive a drachma for this purpose (lines 23-25). In the month Herakleion, the priestess will collect money three days before the civic sacrifice on the 12<sup>th</sup>, but she will not visit houses (lines 25-28). The shrine is to be built wherever the priestess wishes (lines 28-29). She is to prepare a treasury for the goddess, and those sacrificing are to contribute two obols for an adult victim, one for a suckling animal (lines 29-32). The *exastastai* are to open the treasury each year and give money for the prayers for the city and for her clothing and for other missing purposes (lines 32-35). The conclusion of the decree is missing but probably included a discussion of the modalities for purchasing the office.

### **74. Loryma. Sign (uncertain authority) – third century BCE (*I. Rhod. Peraia* 3; Bresson, *Pérée* 187)**

The inscription was inscribed on a wall at the foot of the acropolis of Loryma, and must relate to a sanctuary (*anathemata*, line 3). Because of its brevity and style this must be a sign, but it is unclear which authority issued the rules. The highly fragmentary rules prohibit taking dedications out of the shrine, damaging anything, putting [*pinakes*] in a different order (?), or removing/introducing anything without the permission of the priest (?).



**75. Tralles. Sign (*polis*) – first century CE (*I. Tralleis* 3; see also *I. Estremo Oriente* 240)**

This stele is a sign because of its brevity and style, and because it cites a boundary stone (*horos*) of Dionysus Bacchos (lines 8-12, a separate section of the document). It is dated by the year of Artaxerxes and the satrapy of Idrieus (lines 1-4; ca. 350 BC) and claims to record decisions of the people of Tralles (lines 4-5). This is either an ancient forgery or a copy erected in the first century CE to prove that a right of asylum existed earlier (for a nuanced discussion of this problematic inscription, see Rigsby [1996] 416-417). Sanctuary is given for a public shrine of Dionysus (5-7). There are two repeated prohibitions on harming suppliants or allowing suppliants to be harmed (lines 7, 9-10). Whoever does so is cursed with destruction, both himself and his family (lines 11-12).

**76. Isinda. Law/decree (about sacred matters?) (*polis*) – fourth century BCE (*TAMI* 65)**

The inscription is very damaged, but is a law/decree of the *polis* because it concerns citizens (line 10). There is a provision in the casuistic form for any priestess who does not obey, with the apparent result that the priesthood is given to someone else (lines 15-16). There also appears to be another penalty clause, probably for officials who do not enforce a provision, with a penalty of 1,000 drachmas (lines 27-28). Sacred matters are not especially prominent in the inscription, though there is a mention of the erection of tents, possibly during a festival (line 7; see Sokolowski).

**77. Tlos. Fragmentary regulation about sacred matters (uncertain authority) – date unclear**

Three very fragmentary lines contain a provision about wearing colored clothes and a prohibition against collecting contributions (line 1), a prohibition against men entering in women's clothes (line 2). A penalty for violations against the rules of entry into the sanctuary is then specified (amount not preserved) (lines 2-3).

**78. Tlos. Law/decrees concerning a priesthood (*polis*) – around 100 BCE (*TAM* II 548)**

This inscription is a dossier which contains a series of at least 4 laws/decrees concerning a public priesthood, specifically that of Zeus in Tlos (lines B3-4). The first calls for the appointment of a man to attend sacrifices with the *hierothytes* and other priests (lines A3-9). Lines A9-10 and B32-34 refer to enrolled citizens, who are entitled to cast a vote. The law/decreed in lines A14-27, concerning the selection of an expert official for this duty, appears to be the same as that in lines B12-25. The final lines of two of the decrees (lines B10-11 and B35-36) mention the appointment of Eirenaius, the son of Ajax, of the tribe of the Bellerophonteioi at Tlos.

**79. Pednelissos. Law/decreed concerning a priesthood and other (?) sacred matters (*polis*) – first century BCE (*SEG* 2, 710)**

The inscription has at least a few lines missing at the top and contains an enigmatic regulation relating to a priestess called Galato, her duties, and other ritual acts. As preserved, it begins with a clause about providing a witness and the person cursing paying a *siglos* (lines 1-2). This may be a way of initiating a charge. If there is no witness, the person places his hand on his head (as a form of oath), and sacrifices animals to all the public gods except Plouton; the judges and public slaves are to eat the meat of these sacrifices and give the fourth portion, which is customary to give to the god, to Galato (lines 2-6). Galato herself is to be pure and abstemious for life and a priestess as long as she lives, no one is to insult her or curse her (lines 6-8). After she dies, the city of the Galatians is to cast lots, and whoever is selected is to provide ritual supplies both for her confirmation/initiation (*telete*) and for offerings to the deceased former priestess (lines 8-12). Other fragmentary and elusive clauses appear to mention the purification held during the funeral of the former priestess (lines 12-14) as well as miscellaneous rules of purity (lines 14-21). The inscription thus seems to define the parameters of a public cult and its priestess, but both the identity of the cult in question and the genre of this regulation remain uncertain.

### 80. Around Elaioussa. By-laws (private association) – Augustan period (Harland [2014] 426-434 no. 152)

The inscription starts with an enactment formula by the *betairoi* and Sabbatistai of the god (lines 1-3). There is a prohibition against erasing the inscription or making its rule null and void (lines 3-5). The rules allow anyone to make a dedication (lines 7-8). There follows the interjected proposal of Protus to crown Aithibilios the *synagogos* (lines 9-11ff.). The rules of the by-laws then continue with a prohibition against erasing or making any of the dedications and the inscriptions on them useless or moving them (lines 11-17). There is a penalty clause for infractions in the casuistic form with penalties to be paid to the god, the Sabbatistai, the *polis* and the dynast respectively (lines 17-22). The stele is also said to be the record of an oath of each member equally that no one will entertain guests during the day (of the gathering?) (lines 22-23). The priest is to allocate the contributions (of members) to the god for the construction of the place of cult (*topos*, lines 24-26). For a detailed discussion of the controversy surrounding the interpretation of this group and its cult, and siding with a Cilician group rather than a Jewish one, see Harland, with further bibliography.

### 81. Antioch-ad-Pyramum. Law/decree about sacred matters (*polis*) – around 160 BCE (*SEG* 12, 511)

This is a law/decree establishing sacrifices and a festival to celebrate the reconciliation of Antioch-ad-Pyramum and Kydna (lines 2-4). There is an enactment formula (line 4). The *prytaneis* are to look after the construction of the altar (lines 5-6). On the day the altar is set up, a procession is to go from the hearth of the Council to the shrine of Athena Magarsia and the *demiourgos* of the *prytaneis* is to ensure that it is as beautiful and conspicuous as possible (lines 6-9). A young cow with gilded horns is to be sacrificed to Athena and Homonoia (lines 9-10), and the priests, and the officials, and those who have won at the games and the gymnasiarch, with the ephebes and the *paidonomos* with the children are to participate in the procession (lines 10-13). The officials, the *stephanitai* and the citizens organized by tribes are to meet in the shrine of Athena Magarsia (lines 15-16). The *hieromnemon* and the *phylarchoi* are responsible for keeping order at the *panegyris* (lines 17-18). In the future, a sacrifice is to be made on the altar of Homonoia on the first of every month (lines 18-19), and every year the procession, the sacrifices and everything else are to take place according to the

rules stated above (lines 19-21). The provisions are prepared (published?) by the public slaves with public money from the treasurers (lines 21-23).

## **82. Near Amasia. Dedication and sign (private cult) – Imperial period (*St. Pont.* III 96)**

The inscription is a small dossier: it combines a dedication by L. Iulius Cornelius Celer to the Great Goddesses and Nymphs, which is placed on the lintel of the entry to a cave, with a later regulation. On the sides of the entry are placed this later sign enjoining all who enter "this place" to do so in a pure fashion.

## **83. Heraclea on the Pontus. Sign (*polis* or sanctuary?) – ca. 400 BCE (*I. Heraclea Pont.* 70)**

This is a sign because it is placed on a *horos* for a sanctuary and contains a simple prohibition against burial "inside this place". For this use of the demonstrative pronoun/adjective in signs, see no. 82 immediately above and Harris (2015) esp. 59.

## **84. Smyrna. Metrical by-laws (private cult or association) – second or third century CE (*I. Smyrna* 728 + *I. Smyrna* II<sup>2</sup> p. 377)**

The inscription lacks a prescript or introduction which would indicate any authority that might have issued the rules; however, we immediately learn that the inscription was dedicated by someone (name missing), the son of Menander, who was the *hierophant* of Bromios (Dionysus) (line 1). The rules are given in the second person plural and notably concern purity requirements for entry into the shrine: entry is allowed only forty days after exposing a child (lines 3-5), one third of a month after the death of a relative (lines 6-7), three days after the death of someone from another's house (lines 8-9). One should not approach the altars in black clothes, or after an improperly conducted sacrifice (lines 10-11). Eggs are banned from the feast at the *Baccheia* (line 12) and so are beans (line 15). The rest of the lines are fragmentary, but initiates (*mystai*) are mentioned at line 18. Previous scholars have thought that the prohibitions are Pythagorean or Orphic in nature, but they may simply reflect a particular private or associational cult of Dionysus at Smyrna.

### 85. Ephesus. Sign (*polis*) – second century BCE (*I. Ephesos* 1520)

The inscription on a block probably derives from the wall of the *peribolos* of the civic sanctuary of Artemis at Ephesos (so Sokolowski, Rigsby). The sign announces that the shrine of Artemis is completely a place of [asylum] (or refuge) and invokes a curse on transgressors. The last line is restored notably on the basis of a parallel found in inscriptions from the Herodian temple in Jerusalem (see Lupu, *NGSL*, p. 19-20, for these texts). On the *asylia* of the Artemision at Ephesos, see Rigsby (1996) 385-393 with no. 182.

### 86. Aphrodisias. Order of Roman proconsul and law/decreed about sacred matters (*polis*) – 77 CE (Reynolds, *Aphrodisias & Rome* no. 46; *I Aph.* 13.609<sup>1</sup>)

This is an edict made by Silius Italicus as proconsul (lines 1-3), though it also mentions existing decrees of the city on the matter at hand (lines 3-6). The order prohibits capturing, feeding, frightening, catching (?) pigeons, in connection with the cult of the goddess Aphrodite (lines 5-10). Though the bottom part is now missing, the document may have been intended as a sign because of its brevity. The monument on which it was originally inscribed, a “white marble statue base shaft” (so *I Aph.*) may also indicate that it was affixed as a brief record of the edict on the statue of the proconsul himself.

### 87. Caunus. Dossier of oracles (*polis*) – mid-Hellenistic (*I. Kaunos* 31)

The inscription is very fragmentary dossier containing several Delphic oracles sought and received by the city of Caunus; see already Lupu, *NGSL*, p. 35 with n. 162, for a tentative identification of the character of the document. A new edition, confirming this identification, is in preparation by Carbon.

### 88. Laodicea in Phrygia. Sign (?) (private cult or association?) – Imperial period (*I. Laodikeia am Lykos* 64)

This appears to be a sign because it is inscribed on a marble altar. For similar signs on altars, see Harris (2015) 59-60. The first two lines indicate a dedication made for at least a pair of gods, including Zeus (cult epithet lacunose) and Hermes, perhaps

---

1. <http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/iaph2007/iAph130609.html#edition>.

on the part of an individual named [Epaph]ras; this would suggest that we are dealing with some sort of private (or perhaps associational) cult. The sign contains an instruction about sacrificing an animal for making an oath.

Edward HARRIS

University of Durham

edward.harris@durham.ac.uk

assisted by Jan-Mathieu CARBON

University of Liège

Center for Hellenic Studies, Harvard University

jmcarbon@ulg.ac.be

## Bibliography

- Adiego, I.-J., Debord, P. and Varinlioğlu, E. (2005) “La stèle caro-grecque d’Hyllarima (Carie)”, *REA* 107: 601-653.
- Canevaro, M., with Harris, E.M. (2013) *The Documents in the Attic Orators: Laws and Decrees in the Public Speeches of the Demosthenic Corpus*, Oxford.
- Carbon, J.-M. (2013) “Appendix: The Stele of Poseidonios”, in Carbon and Pirenne-Delforge 2013.
- Carbon, J.-M. and Pirenne-Delforge, V. (2013) “Priests and Cult Personnel in Three Hellenistic Families”, in Horster, M. and Klöckner, A. eds. *Cities and Priests: Cult Personnel in Asia Minor and the Aegean Islands from the Hellenistic to the Imperial Period*, Berlin / Boston: 65-119.
- Fabiani, R. (2016) “*I.Iasos* 220 and the regulations about the priest of Zeus Megistos: a new edition”, *Kernos* 29: 159-184.
- Faraguna, M. (2015) “I *nomophylakes* tra utopia e realtà istituzionale delle città greche,” *Politica Antica: Rivista di prassi e cultura politica nel mondo greco e romano* 5: 141-59.
- Grieb, V. (2008) *Hellenistische Demokratie: Politische Organisation und Struktur in freien griechischen Poleis nach Alexander dem Grossen* (Historia Einzelschriften 199), Stuttgart.
- Harland, P. (2014) *Greco-Roman Associations*, vol. II: *North Coast of the Black Sea, Asia Minor*, Berlin / Boston.
- Harris, E.M. (2015) “Towards a Typology of Greek Regulations about Religious Matters: A Legal Approach”, *Kernos* 28: 53-83.
- Herda, A. (2006) *Der Apollon-Delphinios-Kult in Milet und Neujahrsprozession nach Didyma. Ein neuer Kommentar de sog. Molpoi-Satzung*, Mainz.

- Herda, A. (2011) "How to Run a State Cult : The Organization of the Cult of Apollo Dephinius in Miletos" in Haysom, M. and Wallensten, J. eds. *Current Approaches to Religion in Ancient Greece*, Stockholm: 57-93.
- Himmelman, N. (1997) "Die Priesterschaft der Kyrbantes in Erythrai", *EA* 29: 117-121.
- Mack, W. (2015) "Shepherds beating the bounds? Territorial identity at a dependent community (IPriene 361-63)", *JHS* 135: 51-77.
- Naiden, F.S. (2006) *Ancient Supplication*, Oxford.
- Petrovic, A. and I. (2006) "'Look who is talking now!': Speaker and Communication in Greek Metrical Sacred Regulations", in Stavrianopoulou, E. ed. *Ritual and Communication in the Graeco-Roman World* (Kernos Suppl. 16), Liège: 151-179.
- Reger, G. (2004) "*Sympoliteiai* in Hellenistic Asia Minor", in Colvin, S. ed. *The Greco-Roman East, Politics, Culture, Society*, Cambridge: 145-181.
- Rhodes, P.J., with Lewis, D.M. (1997) *The Decree of the Greek States*, Oxford.
- Rigsby, K.J. (1996) *Asylia, Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley / Los Angeles / London.
- Robert, L. (1925) "Notes d'épigraphie hellénistique", *BCH*: 219-238 (= *OMS* I 13-32).
- Rutherford, I. (2001) *Pindar's Paean: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*, Oxford.
- Santangelo, F. (2006) "Magnesia sul Meandro alla vigilia della prima guerra mitridatica. Nota sulla cronologia di *I.Magn.* 100b", *EA* 36: 133-138.
- Thonemann, P.J. (2011) *The Maeander Valley: A Historical Geography from Antiquity to Byzantium*, Cambridge.
- van Bremen, R. (2004) "Leon son of Chrysaor and the religious identity of Stratonikeia in Caria", in Colvin, S. ed. *The Greco-Roman East, Politics, Culture, Society*, Cambridge: 207-244.
- Wiemer, H.-U. (2009) "Bild der Polis oder Bild des Königs? Zur Repräsentationsfunktion städtischer Feste im Hellenismus", in Matthaei, A. and Zimmermann, M. eds. *Stadtbilder im Hellenismus*, Berlin: 116-131.