In Hellenistic Tomis, a sculptor Hermagenes dedicated a statue of Dionysus and celebrated the gift with a poem:

 trọng

This chaste statue, boisterous one, was donated to you in behalf of the thiasos, a gift from their workshop, by Parmis' – (son) – who has obtained the initiate's crown among the Bacchoi, displaying the ancient initiation rite. You, bull-horned, accept the work of Hermagenes' hand and protect the holy thiasos of Paso.

The restorations are those of the first editors. Line 4 has from the start been taken to refer to the rite of initiation; as Reich explicated, the "τελεταὶ μυστηρίδες Βάκχου." This is disquieting: making public the rite of initiation was what initiates swore never to do. One thinks of the prosecution of Alcibiades and the stories about Aeschylus.

The sculptor was proud of his art. Hermagenes who had obtained a Bacchic crown presented the statue, displaying – – what? Restore after δεικνύμενος not τελετήν but spondaic τέχνην: displaying "ancient craft/skill". By this he refers not to the rite of initiation but to his craft as a sculptor and to the statue itself.

A good parallel is offered by a sculptor on Delos, who was similarly proud of his work: some honor Philetairus with hymns, "but some by exhibiting the crafts of their hands" (οἱ δὲ χερῶν τέχνας δεικνύμενοι σφετέρων), hence this statue, and "Hephaestus himself would not find fault on seeing their craft" (οὐδὲ κεν αὐτὸς Ἡφαίστος τέχνην τῶν γε ὄνοσαιτ ἐσιδών). The verb is used of a statue in yet another verse dedication, πατρὶς ἱκόνα τὴν ἀρετῆς πὰρ Διὶ δικνυμένη (I.Olympia 445, Imperial date).

No doubt sculpture might be called one of the "ancient crafts". But Hermagenes may be making a more specific claim, "exhibiting the ancient style" – that is, his Dionysus was what we call archaistic sculpture. So one distinguished an ἄγαλμα τῆς ἀρχαίας τέχνης (Themist. 34.7 [II 217 Downey–Norman]); cf. Strab. 14.1.5 κεκόσμηται δ’ ἄνοδός μετά τῶν ἀρχαίων τεχνῶν. A priestess at Sparta commissioned a statue with a face in "the style of our time rather than of antiquity", ἔτερον τῶν ἀρχαίων ἱερασαμένη … πρόσωπον ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀρχαίου ποιησαμένη τῆς ἐφ’ ἡμῶν τέχνης (Paus. 3.16.1); cf. Ath. 676a ἀγαλμάτων Ἀφροδίτης … ἀρχαίου τῇ τέχνῃ. Spereness was the style of ancient sculptures: τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἀγάλματα, ὅν

---

1 G. G. Tosilescu and E. Reich, AEMÖ 11 (1887), 48–49, no. 60; I. Stoian, I.Tomis II 120, with photograph [A.-F. Jaccottet, Choisir Dionysos (Kilchberg, 2003) II, no. 62]; cf. D. Chiekova, in XII Congressus Internationalis Imperii Romani I (Barcelona, 2007), 278–280. Abbreviations used here are those of OED and SEG.

2 Cf. Jaccottet I p. 132, “on y pratiquait une ‘ancienne teleté’”.

3 To cite a contemporary: Chrysippus, SVF II 279 οἱ λέγουσι τῶν ἀμφότεροι τὰ μυστήρια ἁσεβείς.

4 So also Merkelbach–Stauber, SGO I 585, no. 06/02/05 = SEG XXXIX 1334 soi … ὃ τέχνη (I owe the comparison to G. Petzl).

5 IG XI 4.1105 (with F. Chamoux, REG 101 (1988), 498–499); cited by Reich for the form of δεικνύμενος but not for the substance.

6 Comedy was another: the playwrite Machon was "worthy of the ancient craft", τέχνης ἄντι τῆς ἀρχαῖας (Ath. 241F [T. Preger, Inscriptiones Graecae metricae (Leipzig, 1891), no. 37]). On the range of the noun see R. Löbl, TEXNH – Techne: Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung dieses Wortes (Würzburg, 1997–2003); E. H. Kozey, G&R 65 (2018), 205–217.
It is worth recalling the expulsion of another restored τελετή. On Hellenistic Delos a poem recites the victories of a herald; its lost right third has been restored by W. Peek. Three lines are devoted to the herald’s successes in Athens (14–16):

τρισαυδ’ Ἑρεμθείδαν ὄγνῳ ὀμαλικαί]

ἀγνὸν Ἐλευσίνοις πρὸς ἀνάκ[τορον ἀνίκ’] ἰδέσθαι]

πενταετὴ Δημοῦ ἥλθον [ἐγὼ τελετάν].

Three prizes I carried off from the sons of Erechtheus, when I came to the chaste shrine of Eleusis to see the quadrennial initiation rite of Deo. It has twice been objected that the restoration in line 16 confuses two distinct festivals. Lest that objection be overlooked, it is useful to make the reason for it explicit: one could not win prizes at the (annual) Mysteries; the herald competed in the quadrennial Eleusinia. Therefore ἰδέσθαι and τελετάν do not belong; and ἐγὼ is filler. The Eleusinia must be signaled by the lost noun that πενταετὴ modifies. This might be something as pedestrian as ἀνάκ[τορον ὃς ἐς ἀγώνα] / πενταετή, then e.g. ἥλθον ἂμιλληθείς] (cf. Eur. Med. 1083 πρὸς ἂμιλλας ἥλθον, Tro. 621 εἰς ἂμιλλαν ἐρέσθα, Hec. 226 ἂμιλλαν ἐξέλθης). Whatever were the words, not τελετάν but some noun appropriate to the Eleusinia is required.

Chalcis

At Chalcis in Euboea in the second century B.C., the theatrical guild, the Technitai of Dionysus, honored a benefactor. They awarded him a statue, and also perpetual proclamation (lines 23–24):

τὸν δὲ ἀκέν ἄριστῇ ὄντα γραμματέ[λα τοῦ ποιήσει καὶ τῇ ἐνιαυτὸν ἀναγόρευσθαι, ἄνων]

24] ἱσθα[ν καὶ ἐκάστῃ ημ[έρᾳ, ὅτι “τὸ κοινὸν (κτλ.)”

the secretary then in office is to make proclamation annually, when they sacrifice to gods each day, that “the guild (etc.)”


First a pedantry: for a proclamation, the middle is normal, so in line 23 restore not ποιήσει but ποιεῖσθαι – the present tense reflecting the on-going requirement (e.g. SEG XXIX 771.21 ποιεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀναγόρευσιν εἰς τὸν ὄλευ ἀριστοῦν). But then: “they” are to sacrifice “to gods”. This is the first, the second is idle. One might at least expect the article, τοῖς θεοῖς. But rather, one expects nothing at all: “when (they) sacrifice each day” would be sufficient and unproblematic.

7 M. D. Fullerton, The Archaistic Style in Roman Statuary (Leiden, 1990), 127–162.
9 J. and L. Robert, BE 1942, 110, “une grave confusion entre les Eleusinia, dont il est question, et les mystères d’Eleusis”; K. Clinton, Myth and Cult: The Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries (Stockholm, 1992), 129 n. 6 [SEG XLI 739], “the Eleusinia … was not the same as the Mysteria”.
10 A. Manieri, Agoni poetico-musicali (Urbino, 2009), 155, no. Leb.10.
12 In Hellenistic times the magistracies of the theatrical guilds included secretaries but apparently not heralds; proclamation made by a secretary, e.g. IG IV 558.38 [Le Guen no. 36, Aneziri no. B9].
13 B. Le Guen made the best of a bad situation, translating “[tous] les jours où l’on sacrifice aux [die]ux”.

τέχνη ἑπικτή καὶ ἱσταμένη (Demetr. Eloq. 14 = Hecataeus FGrHist 1 τ 19). The opening word of Hermagenes’ poem, ἀγνὸν, may already hint at this style. Among the archaistic statues that are extant, Dionysus in fact looms largest.

It is indeed worth recalling the expulsion of another restored τελετή. On Hellenistic Delos a poem recites the victories of a herald; its lost right third has been restored by W. Peek. Three lines are devoted to the herald’s successes in Athens (14–16):

τρισαυδ’ Ἑρεμθείδαν ὄγνῳ ὀμαλικαί]

ἀγνὸν Ἐλευσίνοις πρὸς ἀνάκ[τορον ἀνίκ’] ἰδέσθαι]

πενταετὴ Δημοῦ ἥλθον [ἐγὼ τελετάν].

Three prizes I carried off from the sons of Erechtheus, when I came to the chaste shrine of Eleusis to see the quadrennial initiation rite of Deo. It has twice been objected that the restoration in line 16 confuses two distinct festivals. Lest that objection be overlooked, it is useful to make the reason for it explicit: one could not win prizes at the (annual) Mysteries; the herald competed in the quadrennial Eleusinia. Therefore ἰδέσθαι and τελετάν do not belong; and ἐγὼ is filler. The Eleusinia must be signaled by the lost noun that πενταετὴ modifies. This might be something as pedestrian as ἀνάκ[τορον ὃς ἐς ἀγώνα] / πενταετή, then e.g. ἥλθον ἂμιλληθείς] (cf. Eur. Med. 1083 πρὸς ἂμιλλας ἥλθον, Tro. 621 εἰς ἂμιλλαν ἐρέσθα, Hec. 226 ἂμιλλαν ἐξέλθης). Whatever were the words, not τελετάν but some noun appropriate to the Eleusinia is required.
We can respect the reading of Joubin and Wilhelm, [. . . ]ΕΙΣ: restore [ὅταν/ οἱ ιερεῖς ἱππόθωσιν, “when the priests sacrifice”. The cities had their priests at theatrical festivals, and the theatrical guild had its priest of Dionysus.

The rest, “on each day”, might seem redundant with ὥστε. The phrase is emphatic: no sacrificial day is to be without this proclamation. Chalcis was the headquarters of the Technitai of Euboea, and this required proclamation was probably intended for their theatrical performances in all the cities of the island. In the work of the Technitai, both the occasions and the agents for sacrifice might vary in the several cities. Hence their care here to write the encompassing “the priests” and the insistent “on each day”.

Lindos

In the late second century B.C. a man of Lindos (his name is lost) was honored by a number of voluntary associations, one of them the Technitai of Dionysus. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the associations, one of them the Technitai of Dionysus. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some lines. Blind...
Line 7: Klaffenbach restored the phrase that is standard in acts composed by the Technitai. His restoration is perhaps long, and requires emending the copies. It may be that a Rhodian writer was indifferent to the guild’s formal title and wrote more simply: τεχνιτᾶν [Ἱονίων καὶ Ἑλλησπόντου].

Line 9: concerning ANA[ and ὀνο[ιρεύσει Pugliese Carratelli admitted that the absence of a genitive (τῶν τιμῶν vel sim.) is exceptional. He cited IG XII.1 937.5 χρυσέω στεφάνῳ καὶ ἀναγορεύσεσιν ἱσσον ἀεὶ χρόνον. But the plural weakens the parallel; unmodified ἀναγορεύσει seems in fact to be peculiar to Lycia. Moreover, any word here other than καί would be inconsistent with the other entries in the list, for there would then not be space for καί ἐπιονθείς καὶ στεφανοθείς to follow. Hence we can doubt Segre’s reading ANA, while Kinch’s KAI is unproblematic and what we expect. Perhaps Segre’s eye had strayed to line 11.


The crux, however, is at lines 8–9. Klaffenbach saw that Blinkenberg’s “Technitai in the temple” is impossible, and restored in line 8 ἀνδριάντι, credible Greek: crowned with a statue in the temple of Dionysus. The Roberts suggested instead that in line 9 Segre’s ANA[ can be Klaffenbach’s ὀνο[ιριάντι. But the word would be out of place in line 9, and again would leave insufficient space for the beginning of the next entry.

This statue, however, would be the only awarded item in the list that is not a crown. For the “proclamation” granted in line 11 may instead be restored στεφάνοις ἀναγορ[οφεύμονα: cf. on Rhodes the list of honors IG XII.1 155.87 τῶν στέφανων τῶν ἀναγορευόμενων ἐπὶ τάφος. Restoring the participle here would also eliminate the need to add (καί).

Moreover, a statue in “the temple of Dionysus”16 is unhelpfully unspecific – in Lindos, or where? Aneziri (86–87 and n. 366) reasonably guessed that these performers were a visiting troupe sent from the Ionian/Hellespontine area to Rhodes to take part in a festival. Were they to commission a statue and declare it, or perhaps instead the honorand visited a city in Ionia and did some favor for the Technitai, for which they honored him there. But a lone honorific statue would usually be placed in the honorand’s home city.17

Restore instead Καθηγεμ[όνα Διόνυσνο στεφάνοι[ / τῶι ιερῶι τοῦ Διονύσου: crowned “with the sacred crown of Dionysus”. This makes the item consistent with the rest of the awards listed, all crowns. The Roberts briefly envisaged this (“on pourrait penser”), but dismissed it in favor of ἀνδριάντι, whether in 8 or 9. But several arguments can be urged in support of restoring στεφάνοι[ in 8.

The phrase “sacred crown” does not occur in the decrees of the Technitai,18 but it is well attested in other groups that were especially concerned with cult. Thus Delos votes to “crown with the sacred crown of laurel”, στεφανοῦσαι δάφνης τοῦ ιεροῦ στεφάνου (IG XI.4 697, cf. 706, 766, 784, etc.). At Delphi it is “the crown of laurel from the god”, δάφνους στεφάνου τῶι παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ (FD III.1 458, cf. III.2 18, 20, III.3 145 (δάφνας [ἰε]ρὰς στεφάνωι τῶις παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ), etc.) or “the crown of the god”, τῶι τοῦ θεοῦ στεφάνωι (III.2 47.33, 50.8, etc.). As to the Technitai, others said that they possessed “sacred crowns”, ἐχόντες καὶ τοὺς ἵοροις στεφάνους (the Roman Senate in 112 B.C.).19 The priests of the Athenian branch

16 Boeckh’s restoration of this phrase at CIG 3082.21 is most improbable. D. Morelli, I culti in Rodi (Pisa, 1959), 38, quotes ἐν τῶι ιερῶι τοῦ Διονύσου without brackets and comments that the Lindos temple of Dionysus is not otherwise on record.

17 The Ionian-Hellespontine guild, headquartered in Teos, honored a prominent member, the flutist Craton, with three statues, one “in Teos in the theater” (Le Guen no. 48, Aneziri no. D11a: line 23), the other two on Delos and wherever Craton wished. Their “fellow-competitors” voted him a painted image “in the Dionysion” (Le Guen no. 33, Aneziri no. D11b: line 27); in this context the location was unmistakable, the chief temple of Teos.

18 It may have been avoided by professional competitors, for “sacred crown” also signaled a tie in a contest, with no winner and the crown dedicated to the god (Polyb. 1.58.5, 29.8.9; IG VII 2727.24, IX.2 525.12; cf. LSJ s.v. ιερός IV.6).

19 R. Sherk, RDGE no. 15.44 (Le Guen no. 12, Aneziri no. C2).
of the Technitai were to wear “the ancestral crowns in every city”, \(\text{στεφανηφορεῖν το[ς] πατρίους στεφάνους EMPL πόλει:}\)20 perhaps these were what the Senate called the sacred crowns.

We now have an official emblem of the Technitai. Once in the history of the guild, in the second century B.C., the Ionian-Hellespontine branch commissioned an issue of coins: silver tetradrachms, in quite modest numbers, for only one has been found.\(^1\) The obverse shows Dionysus in profile; on the reverse, framing τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνίτων and a thyrsus, is a prominent crown of ivy (fig. 1). This might well have been called the sacred crown of Dionysus (cf. \(\text{κισσοφόρωι}\) in the guild poem \(\text{IG II2 12664}\)). Centuries later we hear of documents of the Technitai “sealed with the sacred seal of our leader Dionysus”, \(\text{σημανθέντα τῇ ιερᾷ τοῦ καθηγεμόνος ἡμῶν \(\text{Διονύσου σφραγῖδι}\)}\)\(^22\). Whatever that image was, they did call it “sacred”.

Megara

A decree of a Dionysiac association in Megara was seen by Ludwig Ross in 1835; his copy was published by Max Fränkel in 1903:\(^23\)

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ὀγῳθὴ τύχη}
\text{ἐτούς ὤρω, μηνὸς [– – – – – – ἔδω].}
\text{ξέν τῇ συνόδῳ τῶν θασσωτῶν Διο.}
\text{νῦσσου εἶναι Διονύσου θιάσῳ Ἀντίπαρα-}
\text{τρον τῶν ναοπ[οίων καὶ διὰ βίου [ἐ]-}
\text{ρεῖα: ἀποκλῆσθαι δὲ τῆς ἄλλης ὑπῆρ-}
\text{σείας καὶ ὁ[τελῆς ἔστω καὶ ἀλειτουρ-}
\text{γητος.}\)
\end{array}
\]

The restorations are Fränkel’s. Jaccottet saw that the group may have been called something other than θίασος as restored in lines 3 and 4. The date 172 is either Actian = A.D. 141/2 (so Fränkel) or (as I would prefer) provincial = 25/6.\(^25\)

“It was decreed by the \(\text{synodos} \) of the \(\text{thiasotai} \) of Dionysus that for Dionysus’ \(\text{thiasos} \) …”: the repetitions and the contorted word order are difficult to credit, so too the lack of an article before the god’s name in lines 3 and 4.

\(^{20}\) \(\text{IG II}^{\text{f}} 1134.37\). Cf. the Ionian-Hellespontine guild decree Le Guen no. 45, Aneziri no. D10 στεφάνων τῶι ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ὃι πατρίῳ ἔστι το[ῖς] τεχνιταῖς στεφάνονι (line 29).

\(^{21}\) C. C. Lorber and O. D. Hoover, \(\text{NC}^{\text{f}} 163\) (2003), 59–68.

\(^{22}\) P. Frisch, \(\text{Pap. Agon.}\) 4.34 and 3.36 (A.D. 264 and 288).

\(^{23}\) M. Fränkel, \(\text{Sitz},\text{Berlin}\) 1903, 91 [Jaccottet no. 7; J. S. Kloppenborg and R. S. Ascough, \(\text{Greco-Roman Associations I}\) (Berlin, 2014), no. 60].

\(^{24}\) Jaccottet: “Il a plu à l’assemblée des thiasotes de Dionysos qu’Antipatros, constructeur de temple et prêtre à vie fasse partie du thias de Dionysos; qu’il soit en outre exempté de tout autre service, exempté d’impôts et du charge publique.” Kloppenborg and Ascough: “The meeting of the \(\text{thiasotai}\) of Dionysos resolved that Antipatros, who built the temple of Dionysos for the association and was the priest for life, should be exempt from all services and exempt from dues and from \(\text{leitourgiai}\).”

\(^{25}\) For the provincial era at Megara see \(\text{CPh}\) 105 (2010), 308–313.
In line 3, rather than a phrase for the members, the god might have had an epithet, e.g. ΤΟῦ Καθηγεμόνος Διονύσου; but omission of a plural that names the group would be unusual. Jaccottet’s caution is just; the word might be e.g. μοντάιον rather than θυσιαστών.

In 4–5, the honorand is described in some detail: I suggest a double name, Διονύσιστον τὸν καὶ Ἀντίπατρον or Σόροπατρον. His name is followed by a descriptor (τὸν) indicating his present office, ναοποιός. Typically this was a supervisor/manager of a sacred property and its needs. This much is the subject of the infinitive εϊναι; “priest” (or high priest) in lines 5–6 is the predicate – unambiguously so marked if it has no article (but τὸν in place of καὶ is possible, or καὶ τὸν).

In 6, the article does not belong in this phrase; better would be a version of what is found e.g. in a decree of Aphrodiasis, ἀνείπθει σύντον πάσης ἀκουσίου ὑπηρεσίας (REG 19 (1906), 100–102, line 19). Associations expected to receive from their members both service and fees: exemption from these is here granted by the Bacchic group. This waiver does not imply some involvement of the association with the city government, for it does not refer to state obligations, exemption from which a private club could not dictate.

Thus what seems likely in lines 2–7: ξεν ἐν τη δυνατίῃ διὸ νοσοῦ εἰναι Διονύσιστον τὸν καὶ Σώπατρον τὸν ναοποιόν καὶ τὸν διὰ βίου ἀρχηγοῦ ἐπολεμισθῆσθαι πάσης ἀκουσίου ὑπηρεσίας (κτλ.)

It was decreed by the synod of the thiasotai(?) of Dionysus that Dionysius alias Sopater(?) their ναοποίος is [also?] to be the high(?) priest for life; let him be exempted from all involuntary service (etc.)

Thus the substance of the decree is to promote the association’s ναοποίος to be the god’s priest, with the attendant exemptions.

Rhodes

In the late second or early third century A.D., Rhodes honored one of its citizens, Marcus Aurelius Cyrus, who had completed a year of service as priest of Dionysus (τὸν ἱερέα τοῦ Βάκχου Διονύσου, line 2).

The terminus post quem for the decree is not 212 (Reinach, Jaccottet, Pugliese Carratelli) but 161, Marcus

26 E.g. IG II 1012.15 τὴν συνόδον τοῦ Λέοντος τοῦ Ἡράκλειος, I.Philae 11.12 τὴν συνόδον τοῦ Ἡράκλειος.


29 Cf. in Rhodian territory W. Blümel, I.Rhod.Per. 12: an ἐπανομος club honors a member ἀτελείαι πάσας, with full exemption from fees, and makes him ἀπομομβολον, in no need of an entry token. In Britain a statuette was dedicated by a man in gratitude ob immunitat. colleg. (= collegii), for exemption granted to him by his collegium (ILLS 9302 = RIB 309).

30 Jaccottet II p. 40 (echoed by Kloppenborg and Ascough p. 291): “fortement empreint de rouages de la vie officielle de la cité; l’exemption de toutes les charges publiques que prévoit ce décret ne peut se concevoir que si cette association revêt un rôle quasi officiel.” She cites her no. 6 (IG VII 107, Megara), in which τὸ πάλαιον Βακχείον dedicats a statue of a high priest, under the heading ψβή. But these letters mean only that the city council authorized the placement of the statue, as in the Megarian statue bases 111 and 3476 for high priests of the imperial cult, likewise in the expressly private dedications of statues in the Peloponnesus tagged with ψβή (e.g. IG IV 715, 717, etc.) and in Boeotia with ψβδ (IG VII 1678, 3425, etc.).

31 Hiller, Ἀνωτερία 7 (1904), 92–94, from a copy by S. Saridakis; Th. Reinach, REG 17 (1904), 204–210, from autopsy and adding the short text that is inscribed on another face of the stone [Jaccottet, Choix des Dionysos no. 159 (both inscriptions)]. Of the decree, several words were quoted from Segre’s unpublished copy by G. Pugliese Carratelli, Annuario n.s. 1–2 (1939/40), 196 n. 7, together with a photograph, pl. VIII.

32 Bacchiiou! Reinach; cf. I.Lindos 449 (early II A.D.) honoring a man ἰερατεύσαντα τῶν μυστηρίων τοῦ Βάκχου Διονύσου.
Aurelius. The letter-forms are quite similar to those of I.Lindos 465, which Blinkenberg assigned to the late second century.

The decree lists Cyrus’ various benefactions during the year. The most endearing is that he paid an organist one denarius per day to come to the temple and “wake up the god”: δὸντα δὲ καὶ τῷ ὑδραύλῃ τῷ ἐπεγείροντι [τὸν θεόν * τ’] (lines 23–24). The water organ was the fanfare instrument of the time, familiar in the amphitheaters. Here is testimony that in Imperial times Dionysus enjoyed more diverse and more modern forms of music than the very traditional repertory offered by the Technitai.

The text is cast in the familiar way, using aorist participles to describe the priest’s various donations; but in lines 20–23 the grammar goes awry with a deviation, seemingly an independent sentence, which then ends unintelligibly, after which the decree reverts to its aorist participles. The text of Reinach:

20 καὶ εἰς πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα χρησάμου γεινομένου αὐτοῦ τὰ πόλει ἀ πατρίς [κλ] ἑ βακχεία οἰς καὶ ἐφιλοτειμήσατο ΑΝΔΡΟΣΙΝΗ [. .]ΟΣ * ρ’ δόντα δὲ καὶ τῷ ύδραύλῃ (κτλ.)

and because he made himself serviceable to the city in many and varied ways, the fatherland and Bacchic guilds to which he also donated 100 denarii; and having given to the organist (etc.)

21–22: At least a verb is lost here: Hiller suggested that after ἀ πατρίς a line has fallen out, (ἐτίμησεν αὐτόν -- καὶ εἰς Διονύσιον; or the loss is before ἀ πατρίς (Reinach). 22–23: ἀνδρόσινΗ. .ΙΟΣ Hiller (“hier könnte vielleicht Autopsie helfen”).

However the grammatical deviation is to be explained, the purpose of the donation of 100 denarii is stated in the string of letters in lines 22–23. The sum of 100 denarii, whatever its goal, would be insignificant, but he felt that even yet that sum seems insignificant: he guessed that the string of letters conceals some version of “per person”, κατ’ ἀνδρὰ.

The stone is in the Archaeological Museum of Rhodes, a square slab h. 0.76 cm., w. 0.74, th. 0.26. The decree (fig. 2) is clearly and carefully inscribed, and confirms the published editions, with one exception: the second vowel in the doubtful string is not ο but Ω; and I find that Segre, as cited by Pugliese Carratelli, also read omega here. This offers us a noun that is real and pertinent, ἀνδρόσιν( literary); to Bacchic guilds the priest donated 100 denarii “for banquet halls”.36 Dedications of banquet halls are on good record, but this money could hardly pay for such a construction; the sum would be more appropriate for rent or for equipment of rooms for occasional use by the Bacchic guilds. In the second century B.C. we hear of a biennial reception/banquet for the Βακχείοι of Rhodes: ἐν ταῖς Βακχείοις ὑποδοχαῖς κατὰ τριετηρίδα.39 The word ἀνδρόν may be suggestive of the gender of the guild members, or at least of those who were invited to banquet.

But if this much text is gained, vindicating Mario Segre’s reading, there follow letters for which there seems no easy solution, (ν)η. .Οζ. Segre proposed ἀνδρόσιν Ἡ[ρώ]ος; but the plural does not join easily with a singular possessor. The erratic grammar and the obvious incompleteness of the passage recommend caution.

33 Note the careful distinction between Aurelius and Marci Aurelius in IG X.2 138.
34 Organ music welcoming an emperor’s advent (real or imagined): HA Gallienus 17.3. In I.Ephesos 1601a.8 (Hadrianic), an organist who was an initiate of Dionysus.
36 For the range of meanings of the term ἀνδρόν see R. Mouterde on IGLS II 584; M.-Chr. Hellmann, ZPE 80 (1990), 70.
37 SEG LVIII 1211; J. and L. Robert, BE 1966, 421 (τὸν ἀνδρόν καὶ τὴν κατασκευήν; I.Labraunda 14 (τὸν ἀνδρόν [καὶ] τὰ ἐνέστης) and 15: all in Caria, and two of these funded by great powers rather than an individual citizen. Privately-funded repair of an ἀνδρόν in Rhodian Caria: I.Rhod.Per. 110.
39 IG XII.1 155.49 [Jaccottet no. 156.10], with Pugliese Carratelli, AASA 196 n. 6.
Fig. 2

Fig. 3
On an adjoining face of the stone (the bottom from the point of view of the decree) is another text (fig. 3), inscribed in the opposite direction; it is a dedication, certainly of a statue. The script is earlier than that of the decree, finer and more elegant; it is close to *I.Lindos* 415 (prosopographical link to A.D. 7) and 418 (dated A.D. 20). The upper part of the stone has broken off, taking with it much of this inscription and leaving an irregular surface. When the stone came to be reused for the decree, it was rotated so that the original inscription, the front of the block, was turned to face the ground and the new text was cut on what had been the underside – a smooth and useful square.

Perhaps Saridakis did not see this text; when Reinach examined the stone it had just been extracted from the ruined church into which it had been built. He read:

```
... ΕΙΝΟΥ ΔΙΣ///Α//\Ο
?παραμυ\ThetaΙΑΣΣΤΑΣΣΕΝΠΑΤΕΡΑΞ
ΘΕΟΙΣ
```

In the first line I read, quite doubtfully: [*ca.* 5] ΕΙΝΟΥ ∆ΙΣ///Α//\Ο

The left edge is preserved, and the second line is flush left: as lines 1–2 restore probably [– – εὐνοίας ἕνεκα καὶ παραμυ\(\)ΘΙΑΣΣΕΝΠΑΤΕΡΑΞ 

The two inscriptions, separated by more than a century, are not related. This speaks against Jaccottet’s suggested emendation ΘΙΑΣΣΕΝΠΑΤΕΡΑΞ, with the πατήρ as an officer of a Bacchic guild. More likely he was the father of the person who was honored by the Rhodians with a statue. Compare the Rhodian bases Reinach, *REG* 16 (1903), 185 [ἔνεκα παραμυ\(\)ΘΙΑΣΣΕΝΠΑΤΕΡΑΞ ἐὰν \[τὸν αὐτοῦ\] ματέρα, and *IG* XII.1 92 εὐνοίας ἕνεκα καὶ παραμυ\(\)ΘΙΑΣΣΕΝΠΑΤΕΡΑΞ ἐὰν \[τὸν αὐτοῦ\] ματέρα.
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