

Adaptation and Tradition in Hellenistic Sacred Laws

by

Chad Erik Austino

Department of Classical Studies
Duke University

Date: _____

Approved:

Joshua D. Sosin, Supervisor

Carla M. Antonaccio

Mary T. Boatwright

Fred S. Naiden

Kent J. Rigsby

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of
Classical Studies in the Graduate School
of Duke University

2012

ABSTRACT

Adaptation and Tradition in Hellenistic Sacred Laws

by

Chad Erik Austino

Department of Classical Studies
Duke University

Date: _____

Approved:

Joshua D. Sosin, Supervisor

Carla M. Antonaccio

Mary T. Boatwright

Fred S. Naiden

Kent J. Rigsby

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of
Classical Studies in the Graduate School
of Duke University

2012

Copyright by
Chad Erik Austino
2012

Abstract

This dissertation examines the adaptability of civic cults during the Hellenistic period. Faced with shifting populations, increasing social tensions, economic changes, and political pressures, Hellenistic communities devised a number of strategies aimed at negotiating the tension between maintenance of traditional religious practices and adaptive, context-specific change. Through the lens of inscribed Greek sacred laws we see communities balancing the twin requirements of innovation and tradition. The epigraphic record shows significant changes to the choreography of religious experience in response to demographic change; experimentation in funding mechanisms, in what appear to be responses to economic and cultural changes; ambitious attempts to redefine the configuration of sacred space both inside the city and out; savvy rhetorical and ritual framing of innovation in the face of cults that had failed or else were on the brink of doing so.

Through a series of case studies I elucidate the legislative strategies with which communities dealt with these challenges. In chapter 1, I investigate legal strategies aimed at maintaining traditional oracular procedures as more visitors were coming to iatromantic shrines. I focus on the shrine of Apollo Coropeius in Thessaly where the civic authority at Demetrias passed a law reevaluating the administrative and ritual procedures for consultation. In chapter 2, I analyze the changing obligations of sacred personnel to perform rites in the city at large, i.e. before festivals, in the face of shifting socioeconomic norms. Communities frequently experimented with alternative mechanisms to fund religious activities. A sacred law from Halicarnassus forms the backbone of this analysis. I argue that cultural pressures may have helped shape these mechanisms. Chapter 3 concerns legislative

strategies for the reconfiguration of sacred space, particularly the moving or refactoring of sanctuaries. Here I analyze a third-century decree from Tanagra that regulates the transfer of a sanctuary of Demeter and Kore. Other laws, particularly from Anaphe and Peparethus, provide crucial details for the rearrangement of important cult structures. In these cases, we see the concerted efforts to provide for private and public and sacred and secular interests in order to ensure the perpetuation of traditional religious practices. The fourth chapter investigates the reinvention of cult caused by political and ideological interests. Communities employed rhetorical strategies to justify or mask the reinvention or renewal of traditional rites that had lapsed or were on the brink of doing so. I focus on two case studies that illustrate the complexities of legislating ritual reinvention. A second-century Athenian law details the rites for the revived Thargelia whereas a decree from Magnesia-on-the-Maeander details the expansion of the cult of Artemis Leukophryene with a new festival commemorating the goddess' new temple. In both cases, we can see rhetorical strategies of augmentation and renewal reflected in the writings of Anaximenes of Lampsacus. The concluding chapter provides a view of the other side of the coin: what happens when communities fail to adapt to the challenges that threatened their cults? Polybius, Pausanias, and Plutarch shed much light on our most pressing questions. For instance, what did failed cults look like? How did Greeks envisage dilapidated sanctuaries and defunct cults? Overall, the case studies based on sacred laws present a Greek view of religious change that finds strength in change, continuity in adaptation, commonality in variation, stability in the shifting sands of historical change. The portrait of Greek religion that emerges from this study is one in which tradition and innovation form two sides of the same coin, rather than opposing forces.

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Abstract..... | iv |
| Acknowledgements | x |
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Evidence..... | 2 |
| Methodology and Scope..... | 5 |
| Strategies, Networks, and Innovation..... | 7 |
| Chapters and Case Studies | 13 |
| 1. Adapting Ritual Procedures at Oracular and Healing Sanctuaries..... | 19 |
| 1.1. External Pressures: Population Movement and the Need to Adapt | 22 |
| 1.1.1. Access to the Shrines..... | 25 |
| 1.1.2. <i>Xenoi, Demotai</i> , and Access to the Shrines..... | 27 |
| 1.2. Written Rules and Visitors | 30 |
| 1.2.1. Written Rules and Visitors at Corope..... | 30 |
| 1.2.2. Sacrifices and Fees at Corope and Oropus..... | 32 |
| 1.3. Written Rules and Innovation..... | 38 |
| 1.3.1. Keeping Good Order..... | 39 |
| 1.3.2. <i>Eukosmia</i> : Appearances..... | 44 |
| 1.3.3. Violent and Nonviolent Sanctions..... | 47 |
| 1.4. Conclusion | 51 |
| 2. Innovations in Cult Finance..... | 53 |
| 2.1. Pledge Drives, Benefactors, and the Competition for Honor..... | 54 |
| 2.1.1. Pledge Drives and Benefactors: Testing Legislative Capacity..... | 56 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 2.1.2. Competition for Access: Sales of Priesthoods. | 63 |
| 2.1.3. Traditional Elites in the Changing Social Landscape. | 69 |
| 2.2. Adaptation or Innovation? Ritual Collections in the Hellenistic Period | 74 |
| 2.2.1. The Struggle Between Innovation and Tradition. | 75 |
| 2.2.2. The Social and Cultural Backdrop: Life in Hellenistic Cities. | 77 |
| 2.2.3. Tensions over Ritual Collections..... | 80 |
| 2.2.4. Alternative Funding and the Decline of Ritual Collections..... | 87 |
| 2.3. Conclusion | 93 |
| 3. Adapting and Reconfiguring Sacred Space | 94 |
| 3.1. The Case Studies: Tanagra, Anaphe, and Peparethus | 97 |
| 3.1.1. The Precedent for Transferring Sanctuaries | 97 |
| 3.1.2. Preliminary Case Studies: Ikaros, Colophon, and Athens | 101 |
| 3.2. Regulating Cult Transfer | 105 |
| 3.2.1. Choosing a Location..... | 106 |
| 3.2.2. Moving Structures, Disrupting Space..... | 109 |
| 3.3. Place, Ritual, and the Effects of Disruption | 113 |
| 3.3.1. Moving the Purification Basin..... | 116 |
| 3.3.2. Moving the Altar and Cult Statue | 119 |
| 3.3.3. Moving <i>Stelai</i> , Votives, and other Offerings | 122 |
| 3.3.4. Moving and Reconfiguring a Sanctuary at Peparethus | 127 |
| 3.3.5. Maintaining an Old Cult in New Sacred Space..... | 130 |
| 3.4. Conclusion: Strategies After Reconfiguration | 135 |
| 4. Tradition and the Reinvention of Cult..... | 137 |
| 4.1. Thargelia and Pythais: A Program of Revival..... | 138 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 4.1.1. History, Ideology, and the Intellectual Foundation for Cult Revival | 140 |
| 4.1.2. Reinventions and Strategies for Adaptation | 144 |
| 4.2. The Renewed Rites of the Thargelia..... | 145 |
| 4.2.1. The Procession..... | 145 |
| 4.2.2. Limiting Participation..... | 148 |
| 4.2.3. New Prayers, Defunct Rites..... | 152 |
| 4.3. The Rhetoric of Renewal and Enhancement..... | 154 |
| 4.3.1. Renewing Rites for the God..... | 155 |
| 4.3.2. Enhancing Rites for the God | 159 |
| 4.4. Reinvention Across the Aegean..... | 164 |
| 4.4.1. Renewal of the Temple and Divine Manifestation | 167 |
| 4.4.2. The People Appear Before the Goddess..... | 171 |
| 4.4.3. The Challenge of Maintaining Interest | 175 |
| 4.5. Conclusion | 177 |
| 5. Cult Demise and the Failure to Adapt..... | 181 |
| 5.1. Demographic Changes: Depopulation and Disruption..... | 183 |
| 5.1.1. Cessation and Change | 184 |
| 5.1.2. The Decline of Zeus's Oracle at Dodona..... | 187 |
| 5.1.1. Disruptions..... | 190 |
| 5.2. Decline through Intentional and Unintentional Violence | 194 |
| 5.2.1. Intentional Violence | 195 |
| 5.2.2. Accidental Destruction and the Monumentalization of Ruins | 198 |
| 5.3. Reimagining Cult: Neglect and Remembrance..... | 200 |
| 5.3.1. Broken Statues and Dilapidated Temples..... | 201 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 5.3.2. Neglect and the Reimagining of Cult | 207 |
| 5.4. Conclusion: Decline or Adaptation? | 211 |
| Appendix A: Sanctuary of Apollo Coropaius | 214 |
| Appendix B: Sanctuary of Amphiaraus at Oropus | 217 |
| Appendix C: Sale of the Priesthood of Artemis Pergaia at Halicarnassus | 220 |
| Appendix D: Renewal of the Thargelia at Athens | 222 |
| Appendix E: Foundation of the Eisiteria at Magnesia-on-the-Maeander | 225 |
| I.Magnesia 100A | 225 |
| I.Magnesia 100B | 227 |
| Bibliography. | 239 |
| Biography | 249 |

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been possible without the support of family, friends, colleagues, and teachers. I offer my sincerest thanks to Professor Joshua D. Sosin for his encouragement and supervision throughout the entire process. He truly went above and beyond with his generosity of time and energy. Deepest gratitude is also due to my supervisory committee, Professors Carla Antonaccio, Mary T. Boatwright, Fred S. Naiden, and Kent J. Rigsby for sharing their knowledge and helping me to develop a deeper understanding of material culture, history, religion, and epigraphy. I would also like to thank Professor Sheila Dillon for her advice at the beginning stages of this dissertation.

I offer additional thanks to the faculty, staff, and graduate students in the Department of Classical Studies for making my experience at Duke University rich and rewarding. Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for their enduring support: my parents, grandparents, and brother. I would also like to thank Puya Nili who has been a great and loyal friend over the years. Above all, I must thank my wife Jenny. I am grateful for your loving support and incredible patience.

Introduction

Plague and war struck Athens hard in the summer of 430 BC. It was a humanitarian crisis and one that had a serious effect on religious practices. Thucydides tells us that this crisis led to the neglect of religious rites and the defilement of temples.¹ Such was not, however, exclusive to the Classical period. According to Polybius, Hellenistic kings and federations often plundered sanctuaries and desecrated religious traditions during their wars against one another.² But neglect of rites and destruction of temples was not always due to major catastrophes. Gradual socioeconomic changes had profound effects on religious life as well. Populations moved, customs changed, and political and physical landscapes shifted. Such changes become increasingly well documented in the Hellenistic period. In the face of these changes, communities often altered religious practices rather than witness their cults wither. Inscribed laws tell this story. Although each law was tailored to the unique circumstance of its time and the particular customs of its provenance, we can see fundamental commonalities: traditional rites and the written and unwritten laws that governed them had to be flexible enough to adapt to ever-changing circumstances.

Throughout this work, I address a number of problems and questions concerning Hellenistic sacred laws and the religious practices they regulated. I explore the socioeconomic settings in which these laws were promulgated. I investigate the interplay between written laws and unwritten customs. Moreover, I aim to advance our understanding of fundamental questions about Greek religion: What did the adaptability of ancient Greek ritual practices look like? How were changes to traditional practices justified? In the end, many sacred laws represent attempts to impose logical and rational rules onto

¹ Thuc. 2.52.

² For instance, see Polyb. 4.9.10-11. See also Chapter Five below.

practices that had not developed according to rational principles. Those practices, often procedural and administrative, were also key components of the religious experience of cult.

Evidence

The majority of the evidence is epigraphic. Indeed, epigraphic evidence, particularly so-called sacred laws, provides the lens through which we can see legislative and religious changes taking place. Scholarship on sacred laws has centered upon the corpora of Prott and Ziehen,³ Sokolowski,⁴ and (recently) Lupu.⁵ These collections are based on a modern category of “*leges sacrae*” (sacred laws) that would have little meaning to an ancient Greek for whom religion was woven into nearly every facet of public and private life.⁶ The texts that comprise these corpora relate to one another only in that they are prescriptive and concern religious activity.⁷ In their uses and applicability, many of these inscriptions bear little similarities to one another. For instance, there is much difference in aim and scope between a sacrificial calendar and an ordinance forbidding grazing in a sanctuary. In making sense of such discrepancies, Parker has constructed useful categories. He identifies two types of sacred laws: “how to deal with a haunting” (exegetical laws) and “do not cut the sacred wood” (sanctuary protection laws).⁸ The former concern the appropriate way to perform rites whereas the latter are ordinances not unlike others issued by local authority.

³ L. Ziehen and H. T. von Prott 1896-1906, *Leges Graecorum Sacrae e Titulis Collectae (LGS)*.

⁴ F. Sokolowski 1955 *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure (LSAM)*, 1962 *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplément (LSS)*, 1969 *Lois sacrées des cités grecques (LSCG)*. Many laws include religious provisions along with secular ones. Thus, the compilers of these corpora often extract significant portions of the text. Anyone who wants to read an entire decree, as intended, should seek other editions.

⁵ Lupu 2005 (*NGSL*).

⁶ Burkert 1985, 216-218; Sourvinou-Inwood 2000, 13-37.

⁷ Lupu 2005, 8-9.

⁸ Parker 2004a, 65. As Parker notes, these categories are not hard and fast.

While this dissertation focuses on civic decrees (Parker's second category), many of them span these categories, especially where rules affect ritual performance directly. Naiden has refined Parker's categories, arguing that sanctions were issued even in exegetical texts whenever the community's wellbeing was concerned.⁹ These arguments have helped move us closer to understanding the principles and concepts that unite sacred laws as a useful category for heuristic purposes.

Only recently have scholars begun to examine the backdrop of these texts and the ways in which they reflect social and religious change. Rather than merely mining these texts for specific rules or nuggets of evidence, some have begun to approach them in a more systematic way.¹⁰ The authority behind these laws, their social and political setting, and their ideological underpinnings are coming under increasing scrutiny.¹¹ Laws that address extenuating circumstances (e.g. how to move this one temple) provide information about cultural and economic changes that we would otherwise not have. Thus, this type of law is the focus of this dissertation.

Literary evidence is invaluable for placing sacred laws within their cultural framework. The dearth of literary and historiographic evidence from the Hellenistic period presents a challenge; but what sources we have provide much-needed historical and cultural context for sacred laws. For instance, laws rarely provide the rationale behind their issue. So a law constraining a priestess' performance of a ritual collection should not be read in isolation from Hellenistic literary representations of women. A law on purity requirements is better understood alongside Theophrastus' *Superstitious Man* or passages

⁹ Naiden 2007, 126-127.

¹⁰ Notably S. Stavrianopoulou (ed.) 2006. *Ritual and Communication in the Graeco-Roman World*. *Kernos Supplement 16*. Liège. Also, Chaniotis 2009, 91-105.

¹¹ See Ma 1999, 19-20.

from tragedy dealing with pollution. From such tropes we learn that removing the *perirrhanteion* from a sanctuary could have an undesirable impact on ritual performance.

Socioeconomic pressures facing Hellenistic communities were not exclusive to that period. War, plague, demographic changes, and social change are evident in preceding and subsequent periods as well. In addition to the *Histories* of Polybius, literature from the Classical and Roman periods can shed much needed light on cultural phenomena in the Hellenistic period. For example, transferring sanctuaries, consulting oracles, and performing ritual collections are attested in Hellenistic sacred laws, but are also to be encountered in the literary harvest of antiquity.

Archaeological evidence is no less important for placing these laws in context. Almost every sacred law directly or indirectly relates to the physical landscape: where does the procession take place? To what spot should we move our sanctuary? Where should visitors stand when consulting an oracle? Where in the city may a priestess go or not go? Even seemingly mundane laws dealing with animal sacrifice usually have spatial implications: sacrifice an animal to the god *upon the altar*. Changes in religious practices often coincide with changes in the physical landscape, as we shall see in Chapter Three. Therefore, archaeological evidence provides the invaluable physical context in which these religious practices were taking place. We are, however, at the mercy of what we have. Many of the case studies in this dissertation involve cults for which the material evidence is scant or nonexistent. We may find a decree imbedded in the wall of a schoolhouse, but the sanctuary to which it refers may no longer be standing.¹² In these cases, comparative evidence is less than ideal but can nevertheless help fill the gaps in our knowledge.

¹² This is the case with the sanctuary of Aphrodite on Anaphe (*JG* XII 3, 248). See Chapter Three.

Methodology and Scope

This work, then, sets out to examine the adaptability of Hellenistic civic religions primarily through the lens of sacred laws, while placing them in their cultural and physical settings. I focus on the language employed in sacred laws in order to seek meanings, implications, and ideology.¹³ For instance, sacred laws and decrees usually state that actions are to be done “according to tradition”. Their lists of rules and procedures, however, may not be in accordance with tradition at all. That these laws are written suggests uncertainty about a particular practice, which may reflect concerns over communicating new rules to a familiar audience or old rules to a new audience. Sometimes, the texts are explicit about the tensions that prompted the legislation (e.g. more foreigners coming to a sanctuary), whereas others are more suggestive and require careful parsing. Thus I look to and behind the language of the laws to uncover the crucial underlying tensions.

The evidence for cult regulations during the Hellenistic period is abundant but diffuse. Employing evidence from across the Greek world is necessary in order to articulate a clear picture of the regulatory approaches to traditional religious practice. In other words, in order to evaluate and draw conclusions we must use what evidence we have. Sourvinou-Inwood articulated this methodological approach when discussing the evidence of Athenians and non-Athenian festivals:

I suggest that it is legitimate to deploy [comparative] material as culturally specific eye-openers... this allows the possibility of direct parallels, the possibility that the ritual under investigation may not be vastly different from the one about which more knowledge is available, because similar rituals belonging to the same culture are shaped by closely comparable parameters.¹⁴

¹³ On this approach, see J. Ma 1999, 19-20.

¹⁴ Sourvinou-Inwood 2011, 15. Also page 17: “if a reconstructed ritual schema corresponds to an attested schema structuring a ritual nexus that is comparable to the one investigated ... this would offer some support for that reconstruction – provided that the latter has not used material from that attested schema. In general, if the

Any attempt at a full sketch of any city's cults, except perhaps those of Athens, would be hindered by the lack of evidence required for the task.¹⁵ Thus, the approach here must be a thematic one in which complementing case studies are compared and contrasted.

An approach that selects case studies from disparate regions of the Greek world is rooted in ancient legal philosophy and practice. Ancient philosophers and legal theorists saw the merits of comparing different laws and customs to their own. In fact, the Athenian Solon and the Spartan Lycurgus were thought to have traveled to distant lands to investigate foreign customs and laws either before or after establishing constitutions in their home cities.¹⁶ In Plato's *Laws*, the lawgivers and elders of his fictional Magnesia traveled to learn different laws so that those of Magnesia did not become obsolete.¹⁷ Aristotle and his student Theophrastus were preoccupied with the practical applications of law.¹⁸ Theophrastus, in fact, compiled laws from all over the Greek world under categories like Constitutional Principles, Procedure, Homicide, and Commercial Law.¹⁹ Greeks not only thought about the laws and customs of their own *poleis*, but those of other communities. They exchanged ideas about law and religion frequently.²⁰ During the Hellenistic period procedural and substantive aspects of law, as well as language, became more standardized as populations fluctuated.²¹ Although Greeks shared a common language, and often a

reconstructed rites have close parallels in other Greek rituals (not implicated in the reconstructions), this would indicate that the reconstructed rites fit Greek ritual logic and modalities."

¹⁵ Parker 2005, 1-5.

¹⁶ Plut. *Lyc.* 3.5; *Hdt.* 1.29.

¹⁷ Pl. *Leg.* 950d-951a; However, Plato would prohibit anyone younger than forty from traveling abroad (950d-e). Elders should return from foreign embassies and tell the younger generation that the customs of the rest of the world are inferior.

¹⁸ Aristot. *Rhet*; Thphr. *Nomoi*.

¹⁹ See Szegedy-Maszak 1981, 82.

²⁰ Gagarin 2005, 29-40.

²¹ Modrzejewski 2005, 343-354.

common legal language, each community developed its own procedures to solve similar or identical problems.

Strategies, Networks, and Innovation

Sacred laws often prescribe behavior expected to be in force in perpetuity;²² others represent ad hoc strategies that communities used to deal with various financial or logistical hardships. Such are seen in Greek economic practice, which generally eschewed the theoretical. In *Oeconomicus* II, Ps.-Aristotle offers a list of clever, usually underhanded, means by which ambitious kings acquired money.²³ Sanctuaries and cults were often plundered because of their abundance of wealth; but these institutions were also particularly vulnerable to political and social change. Coercion was common, but so was manipulation and deception.²⁴ At Byzantium the community raised money by selling sacred land and forcing celebrants to gather elsewhere.²⁵ Dionysius of Syracuse devised several strategies. In order to raise money, he ordered all women to donate their gold to the goddess Demeter, declaring any refusal sacrilegious.²⁶ Another law he passed had unintended consequences and he eventually forbade the sacrifice of female victims.²⁷ He also confiscated property directly: while touring sanctuaries, the king had priests fill his vessels with treasure. Whenever they placed a piece into the vessel, Dionysius would say

²² For example: sacrificial and purity regulations.

²³ The work seems to date to the second half of the second century BC. See Zoepffel 2006, 215.

²⁴ For kings, economics, and chrematistics in Book II, see Zoepffel 2006, 218-219.

²⁵ Aristot. *Econ.* II 1346b.13-21.

²⁶ Aristot. *Econ.* II 1349a.14-20. See Pritchett 1991, 163.

²⁷ Aristot. *Econ.* II 1349b.11-14: ὁ δὲ ἀπέϊπε θῆλυ μὴ θύειν (13-14).

“for the honor of the good god” and “I accept it” (δέχομαι).²⁸ This rhetorical ploy obfuscated the fact that he was plundering the property of the gods.

Kings also threatened to alter the traditions of a cult or eliminate its independence. Chabrias the Athenian advised Taos of Egypt to combine a number of cults to streamline his finances. The priests of these cults, fearing that their posts would be eliminated, offered the king money to prevent consolidation.²⁹ Cleomenes of Alexandria threatened to kill sacred crocodiles in retaliation for the kidnapping of one of his slaves. Faced with this threat, local priests handed over their treasures.³⁰

A carrot sometimes worked better than a stick. At Ephesus, the community inscribed the names of donors who helped fund a new festival.³¹ This was a common incentive and is attested in sacred laws.³² After all, the desire for honor and notoriety had a long-standing and well-known place in ancient Greek society. Although the anecdotes in *Oeconomicus II* are likely apocryphal or contain apocryphal details,³³ they were not far-fetched given the ad hoc strategies of both kings and communities in solving assorted problems. In reality, both offered threats and incentives often simultaneously. Rewards are often placed alongside threats of punishment for noncompliance. Dealing with exigent circumstances often required one-time regulations aimed at solving a particular problem, but those regulations demonstrate very little foresight. Nevertheless, they could have lasting effects on a community. Refashioning or rearranging votives entailed altering the

²⁸ Aristot. *Econ.* II 1353b.20-24: Διονύσιος ... ἀγαθοῦ δαίμονος κελεύσας ἐγγεῖν ἐκέλευεν ἀφαιρῆν, ὅσα δὲ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων φιάλην εἶχε προτετακότα, εἶπας ἂν ὅτι δέχομαι, ἐξαιρῆν ἐκέλευε.

²⁹ Aristot. *Econ.* II 1350b.33-1351a.2.

³⁰ Aristot. *Econ.* II 1352a.23-28.

³¹ Aristot. *Econ.* II 1349a.11-13.

³² For example, see *IG II²* 1361; *Syll³* 736.70; Migeotte 1992, especially no. 28 (*LSCG* 72).

³³ Finley 1985, 20-21: “what is noteworthy about these half a dozen paragraphs is not only their crashing banality but also their isolation in the whole of surviving ancient writing.

physical qualities of a sanctuary,³⁴ but also meant changing the relationship between the dedicator and the divinity. Taxing dedications in one sanctuary could lead to an increase of dedications in others. Moving a sanctuary might alter a cult forever.

Although specific rules in these decrees reflect local concerns and strategies, they also share certain commonalities. After all, religious innovations did not take place in a vacuum.³⁵ Scholars have explained the introduction of new gods and even religious conversion by the interconnectedness and network establishment among communities.³⁶ Theoric networks attest to the complex inter-*polis* relationships that grew more extensive in the Hellenistic period.³⁷ Relationships fostered by *asylia* requests and festival revivals attest to vibrant inter-*polis* relations.³⁸ As Sourvinou-Inwood has noted: Greek festivals were not impermeable to influence from festivals of other cities.³⁹ Less obvious but no less important are the social and cultural changes taking place in and between Hellenistic communities such as the emergence of new rights and responsibilities for women in religious and civic life. Innovative approaches to solving practical problems, like moving and reorganizing sacred space, are evident in the ways communities deal with exigent and mundane challenges alike. Through the lens of sacred laws, we see an emerging picture of common problems but legislative approaches formed by local circumstances. It is through case studies that we can see this picture emerge.

Over the last few decades, scholars have come to view the Hellenistic period as an age of change rather than decline. In matters of religion we no longer see ruler cult and

³⁴ *IG VII 303 (LSCG 70)*: votives were removed and placed in a shed. See also *Syll³ 1016*

³⁵ See Collar 2009, 144-157.

³⁶ Collar 2009, 151-152.

³⁷ Rutherford 2009, 24-38.

³⁸ See Rigsby 1996, 22-25.

³⁹ Sourvinou-Inwood 2011, 17.

divine honors for exemplary mortals as religious decay, but rather a continuation of trends as well as the result of new ideas, perspectives, and experiences that had developed in a cosmopolitan age.⁴⁰ Much noteworthy scholarship has focused on the proliferation of new gods and cults (especially Serapis and Isis), ruler cult, and the influence of philosophical innovations.⁴¹ In essence, the focus has been on “what is new?” This work explores the question “how did the old become new?” In other words, what does “new” actually mean?

According to Plato, “As men’s beliefs about the gods change, so too should laws change.”⁴² Of course, Plato’s assertion comes from his late work the *Laws*, a philosophical text that aims at crafting the ideal state. The notion that laws should change to reflect changing religious beliefs appears, however, contrary to one that most Greeks held. Sacred laws in particular exhibit a language of preservation; the goal of many sacred laws is continuity of traditional religious practices. “According to tradition” is a phrase one is most likely to find in a regulation that touches on religious performances of any kind. But we know that religious customs did change over time, and we know that laws would be ineffective if they did not relate to contemporary concerns. It is my aim, then, to show that Plato’s assertion is closer to reality than it may appear. But the relationship between Greek law and religious practices was not always seamless; they did not join together like two rivers into one. Sacred laws responded to changes in religious practices or responded to socioeconomic pressures threatening to change them.

Customary and written laws had to be adaptable to meet changing times and circumstances. But the stated aim of sacred laws was almost always to maintain traditional

⁴⁰ See Price 1984, 23-52.

⁴¹ See Shipley 2000, 153-191; Habicht 1988, 4-22. See also the networks through which new ideas spread (Rutherford 2009 and Collar 2009).

⁴² Pl. *Leg.* 12.948d.1-2: μεταβεβληκειῶν οὖν τῶν περὶ θεοῦς δοξῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μεταβάλλειν δεῖ καὶ τοὺς νόμους.

religious practices. Such contradictions reflect the difficult deliberations that led to the promulgation of a law. Inscribed sacred laws were the culminations of negotiating parties coming to an agreement. Hence, the language of a decree may be vague in certain respects and overly precise in others, reflecting the specific concerns of potentially conflicting actors around larger issues.

We sometimes see in these decrees two layers of contention. The first is an external circumstance that threatens to undermine a cult. This need not involve war, plague, or any other exigent threat (although it could). Typically, tensions arose over finances and everyday logistical challenges that, left unresolved, could grow into greater problems. Social and cultural changes led cities to issue decrees aimed at solving or preventing greater problems. Gradual demographic changes, for example, might pose long-term threats to a cult's viability. Ideological changes might follow internal and/or external political pressures. This was especially acute in the Hellenistic period as Macedon, then Rome, altered the political landscape.

The second layer concerns how communities coped with such changes. Establishing a consensus for solving a particular problem was rarely easy. Emotions often ran high in the deliberation of religious issues. While some looked to benefit from changes to religious and administrative aspects of cult, others had an equal stake in preventing those changes. We see in the laws a careful rhetoric that appears aimed at resolving, defusing, or perhaps masking, conflicts that such competing interests could produce.

Philosophical works on rhetoric provide insights into the crafting of these laws. In his *Rhetoric*, Aristotle argues that good laws should be as narrowly defined as possible in

order to leave little discretion to judges.⁴³ Too much leeway, he argues, could weaken the authority of written laws, leading to dikasts ignoring the law itself and basing decisions on other considerations.⁴⁴ The overriding concern is over the mutability of law and thus citizens' behavior. In the *Politics*, he concedes:

In addition, it is not better that written laws remain unaltered. For just as in other arts, so in the political constitution, it is impossible that all things be written accurately: for it is necessary to write in general terms, but actions are concerned with the particular.⁴⁵

Laws must be flexible enough to accommodate unforeseen circumstances.⁴⁶ Although precision is the goal, Aristotle admits that it is impossible for the language of any law to account for endless possibilities.⁴⁷ Such is not confined to forensic oratory.⁴⁸ The desire to establish the appropriate scope of a particular law is seen in the measured language used in sacred laws. Religious considerations, however, add to the complexity of crafting laws that balance the general and the particular, written laws and unwritten customs. Compliance with administrative rules was not the only matter at stake; changes to religious practice could alter the relationship between a community and its gods. That relationship was buttressed by traditional ritual practices, the continuation of which depended on customary, i.e. unwritten, rules of behavior. Pericles expresses this balance of written and unwritten law in his funeral oration:

Conducting our private affairs without offense, we especially do not transgress our public laws, out of fear, in our obedience to those in office and to the laws, and especially those that

⁴³ Aristot. *Rhet.* 1354a.39-1354b.9: μάλιστα μὲν οὖν προσήκει τοὺς ὀρθῶς κειμένους νόμους, ὅσα ἐνδέχεται, πάντα διορίζειν αὐτούς, καὶ ὅτι ἐλάχιστα καταλείπειν ἐπὶ τοῖς κρίνουσι, πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι ἓνα λαβεῖν καὶ ὀλίγους ῥᾶον ἢ πολλοὺς εὖ φρονοῦντας καὶ δυναμένους νομοθετεῖν καὶ δικάζειν.

⁴⁴ Sickinger 2007, 289.

⁴⁵ Aristot. *Pol.* 1269a.7-14: πρὸς δὲ τούτοις οὐδὲ τοὺς γεγραμμένους εἶν ἀκινήτους βέλτιον. ὥσπερ γὰρ καὶ περὶ τὰς ἄλλας τέχνας, καὶ τὴν πολιτικὴν τᾶξιν ἀδύνατον ἀκριβῶς πάντα γραφῆναι: καθόλου γὰρ ἀναγκαῖον γράφειν, αἱ δὲ πράξεις περὶ τῶν καθ' ἕκαστόν εἰσιν.

⁴⁶ Hart 1994, 121-136; Harris 2000, 27-79.

⁴⁷ Aristot. *Rhet.* 1374a.11-14.

⁴⁸ See Carey 1994, 33-34.

are established for the benefit of the wronged, and those that, though unwritten, bring an acknowledged shame (to the transgressor).⁴⁹

Pericles' oration represents an idealized view of Athenian law, politics, and society.

Achieving harmony required striking a balance between unwritten and written laws; adhering to written laws, magistrates, and customs required constant negotiations in assembly and courts.⁵⁰ In reality, it sometimes required a reinvention of customs and law.

Athens has yielded the greatest amount of evidence about ancient Greek law. I return to Athens throughout this work as necessary and appropriate, but one of the aims of this study is to look beyond Athens and examine legislative strategies across the Hellenistic world. It is only through this approach that we can come to understand the significance of local customs for communities dealing with religious change, but also the proliferation of new customs and ideas from abroad. How did legislative strategies differ from place to place? Are there commonalities among the legislative approaches that communities adopted? In the case studies that comprise this work, we shall see how disparate communities crafted laws to address similar problems and challenges.

Chapters and Case Studies

Each chapter of this dissertation is built around case studies that illuminate a particular challenge that several communities faced that led to the promulgation of a sacred law. Studied together, they demonstrate how communities attempted to address a range of

⁴⁹ Thuc. 2.37.3: ἀνεπαχθῶς δὲ τὰ ἴδια προσομιλοῦντες τὰ δημόσια διὰ δέος μάλιστα οὐ παρανομοῦμεν, τῶν τε αἰεὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ ὄντων ἀκροάσει καὶ τῶν νόμων, καὶ μάλιστα αὐτῶν ὅσοι τε ἐπ' ὠφελίᾳ τῶν ἀδικουμένων κείνται καὶ ὅσοι ἄγραφοι ὄντες αἰσχύνην ὁμολογουμένην φέρουσιν.

⁵⁰ Cole 2008, 57: We can tell from the epigraphic record that practice was shaped by discussion, details were decided by legislative decisions, and disputes were subjected to the scrutiny of experts appointed to oversee public ritual.

issues: demographic change, evolving social norms, shifting physical landscapes, and external and internal political pressures. Faced with such challenges, cities had to find ways to accommodate necessary change and strict traditionalism.

The first chapter examines communities adapting their ritual procedures at iatromantic shrines. Laws from two local oracular and healing shrines show communities adapting to shifting populations and increased traffic. Faced with the pressures of more and more visitors coming to the sanctuary, accommodations had to be made to perpetuate the system of oracular consultation (Corope) and incubation (Oropus).⁵¹ Sacred laws from these communities reveal strategies framed to ensure continued access and honest consultation. The procedures outlined in these decrees were not merely administrative, but crucial components of the religious experience of consulting and incubating. Communities asked themselves: What are the proper procedures for consulting the god? What is the role of sacred personnel? What authority do we have? How are visitors and temple personnel to interact? The role of written procedures reinforced crucial traditional practices, but also introduced new ones to improve the ritual experience. Changes were permitted in order to preserve good order, *eukosmia*, which was necessary for successful communication with the god.

In the second chapter, I examine how changing social norms affected the rights and obligations of temple personnel, particularly priestesses, in cult finance. I trace the evolution of ritual collecting, an administrative and religious ritual performed in many parts of the Greek world mainly by women. I show that concerns over the practice coincide with

⁵¹ Corope: *IG IX 2*, 1109; *LSCG* 83 (ca. 100 BC) Oropus: *I.Oropos* 277; *LSCG* 69 (early fourth century BC). The decree from Oropus is certainly 4th century; Knoepfler (1986, 89-95) argues ca. 380 BC. Although this puts the decree in the late Classical period, it is helpful for our understanding of the Corope decree, as well as the shared challenges they represent.

social changes that were taking hold in the Hellenistic period. For instance, concerns for the safety and reputation of collectors led to reconsiderations of the practice. Over time, some communities experimented with alternative means of funding cults, namely a priestess' right of direct exaction (*praxis*). I place these changes within the wider scheme of socioeconomic changes during the Hellenistic period. We know that communities were often hard pressed to meet their religious obligations. Communities might rely on mechanisms such as ritual collecting, cultivation of benefactors, or pledge drives to address certain needs. Together, they helped ensure that civic cults did not fall through the cracks and into neglect. Social tensions, however, are evident. Many decrees for priesthood sales reflect factional tensions and conflicts, particularly between traditional elite families and an emerging wealthy class. I re-examine a well-known inscription from Heraclea-by-Latmus in which the community asks whether to fill an important priesthood by sale or election. It refers this question to an oracle. The oracle's measured response is suggestive of the internal social and economic tensions that prompted the question. Would sales weaken the city's control over the cult? Does the election of the priest preserve the dominance of one family or faction over competitors? Is religious policy following Hellenistic socioeconomic change? How did elite families respond to potential encroachment on their traditional privileges? These same concerns are attested in a decree from Halicarnassus.⁵² Here, the sale of a civic priesthood provides intriguing insight into ritual collecting, the roles of women in civic society, and the tensions that changing roles engendered.

Focusing on the transfer of a sanctuary at Tanagra,⁵³ the third chapter explores the complexities of transferring and reconfiguring sacred space. Here I show ways in which

⁵² *Syll*³ 1015; *LSAM* 73 (Halicarnassus, third century BC)

⁵³ Migeotte 1992, no. 28; *LSCG* 72 (Tanagra, third century BC)

communities balanced the need to adapt to changing circumstances while maintaining traditional practices; in a world in which communities were faced with maintaining a growing number of urban and suburban shrines, moving an entire sanctuary required more than simple manpower. Precise regulation and careful procedures were needed to preserve traditional ritual practices. What happens once a sanctuary is moved? How were cult structures then reconfigured? What impact did transfer have on the urban landscape? No one text provides all the answers. A regulation from Anaphe⁵⁴ and an honorific decree from Peparethus⁵⁵ provide details for how communities moved sacred objects within sacred space. In the case of Anaphe, an individual proposed to build a shrine to Aphrodite in an existing sanctuary. The decree shows the community's flexibility in accommodating private initiative, while clearly demarcating the limits of permissible changes. Too many structural changes to a sanctuary would alter ritual performances, even the very nature of the cult.

In the fourth chapter, I analyze two cases dealing with the reinvention and reimagining of cult. Two decrees from the second century BC show how neglected or faltering practices were reinvigorated. One records the rules for the revived Thargelia.⁵⁶ These rules reveal how ancestral customs were reevaluated to fit contemporary circumstances. Political pressures seem to have prompted the Athenians to revive this festival, but the form it took appears quite changed. How were these changes justified? How, in fact, did the Athenians explain the neglect of this cult? The decree reflects carefully crafted rhetorical strategies reminiscent of the advice given in Anaximenes' *Rhetoric to Alexander*. Rhetoric of enhancement (ἐπαύξησις) and renewal (ἀνανέωσις) helped excuse the community's neglect as well as the innovations that were being undertaken. Across the

⁵⁴ *IG XII 3*, 248; *LSCG* 129 (Anaphe, second century BC).

⁵⁵ *Syll³* 587; *IG XII 8*, 640 (Peparethos, 197 BC).

⁵⁶ *SEG* 21.469C; *LSS* 14 (Athens, 129/8 BC).

Aegean at Magnesia-on-the-Maeander, a decree was issued that established a new festival for Artemis Leukophryene called the Eisiteria.⁵⁷ Here too, the community claimed to “enhance” and “renew” the cult of the goddess; its strategy was to root the Eisiteria into the city’s mythical and historical past. This decree organized the administrative and ritual procedures for the festival that commemorated the goddess’ alleged manifestation; a second and later decree,⁵⁸ however, suggests that despite its best efforts the community had difficulty maintaining interest in this festival.

The fifth chapter concludes this study on adaptive measures and strategies with case studies of cults in decline: the outcome of failure to adapt. But what does “decline” mean? What happened to destroyed or neglected sanctuaries? Was sacred space decommissioned? How did Greeks reflect upon the demise of their cults? For instance, what did Greeks think when they saw dilapidated shrines and broken cult statues littering their landscape? Here I bring together evidence from earlier (Classical) and later (Roman) authors to show that the life of Greek cults was much more organic than often supposed. Cults were founded, flourished, and died. Some cults were revived, perhaps reinvented, whereas others were not. The purported decline of the oracles at Delphi and Dodona, the violent and non-violent destruction of sanctuaries, and reflections of ancient Greek cults among later Greeks (Plutarch and Pausanias) and Christian writers show how cults failed and how Greeks understood these failures.

While particular cults declined, such was a feature of organic changes that Hellenistic cults underwent. Indeed, the life cycle of cult is evident in every period of ancient Greek history. Familiar factors prompted the need to adapt: e.g. population movements,

⁵⁷ *I.Magn.* 100A; *LSAM* 33 (Magnesia-on-the-Maeander, second century BC).

⁵⁸ *I.Magn.* 100B (Magnesia-on-the-Maeander, early first century BC. On the date of this inscription, see Santangelo 2006, 133-138).

changes in social attitudes, and internal/external political pressures. Traditional cults, often viewed as static in their ritual formality, show a surprising amount of flexibility and adaptation in the face of mounting pressures. We can hardly find a place or time in Greek history in which “tradition” was stable and unchanging; the pressures we see through the lens of Hellenistic sacred laws were as characteristic as those we see in any other period. Although the ways in which communities adapted reflected strategies that were distinctly Hellenistic, they were no less Greek, no less normative, and no less important.

As desirous as it was to keep traditional cults the same, perhaps Greeks knew that failure to make necessary changes could doom a cult to failure. Cults tended to remain vibrant as long as their cities were. As Plutarch observed: cults lie idle and speechless like musical instruments when no one is around to play them.⁵⁹ But in a world in which sanctuaries competed for money and worshippers, the ability to adapt traditional practices paved the way for a continuation of the ancient Greek religious experience. What follows, then, is not a study of the changes that communities typically underwent, but rather a view of what change looked like through the eyes of Hellenistic Greeks.

⁵⁹ Plut. *De Defect.* 431b.1-3: τὸ γὰρ ἀφισταμένων καὶ ἀπολειπόντων τὰ χρηστήρια τῶν δαιμόνων ὥσπερ ὄργανα τεχνιτῶν ἀργὰ καὶ ἄναυδα κεῖσθαι λεχθέν.

1. Adapting Ritual Procedures at Oracular and Healing Sanctuaries

A second century BC decree of Demetrias from the oracular shrine of Apollo

Coropaius promulgates detailed procedures for consulting the god. It reads:

Since our city is piously disposed toward the other gods, and not least of all to Apollo Coropaius, and since it honors (him) with most conspicuous honors owing to the benefactions from the god, since he makes clear through his oracle, both in general and to each person individually concerning matters pertaining to health and safety; and since it is just and well, since the oracle is ancient and has been honored by our ancestors [15] and since more foreigners are coming to the oracle, that the city take more diligent care concerning good order throughout the shrine, it is resolved by the council and the people:

[18] Whenever consultation occurs, the priest of Apollo who is chosen by the people shall come forth, and of the generals and *nomophylakes* one from each office, one *prytanis* and one treasurer, and the secretary of the god and the *prophetes*. If anyone of the afore-written (officials) is sick or abroad, let him send another (in his place); [24] the generals and *nomophylakes* shall enroll also from among the citizens three men as *rhabdouchoi* who are older than thirty years old and who are to have the authority to hinder anyone acting in a disorderly fashion. Let a wage be given to the (each) *rhabdouchos* from the funds to be collected for two days at one drachma per day; if any of those enrolled is knowingly absent let him pay the city three drachmas with the generals and *nomophylakes* having recorded him.

[30] Whenever the aforementioned come to the oracle and perform the sacrifices and they turn out well, the secretary of the god shall receive at once the records of those wishing to consult the god, and having recorded all of their names onto a white board at once, straightaway he shall place the board in front of the temple and introduce (the consulters), summoning them from each record in succession, unless it has been granted for some to enter first. But if the one summoned is not present, let him introduce the next until the one summoned is present.

[38] The afore-written (individuals) shall be seated in the sanctuary in an orderly fashion in bright white garments, crowned with crowns of laurel, being pure and sober and having received the tablets from those consulting. Whenever a consultation takes place, having cast them into a jar they shall seal (it) with the seal of the generals and *nomophylakes* and likewise with that of the priest and allow them to remain in the sanctuary. At dawn, the secretary of the god, having brought out the jar and shown it to the aforementioned, shall open the seals and, calling (the names) from the record, shall hand over the ta[b]lets to each...]

[50] The *rhabdouchoi* shall give forethought for good order; and whenever the assembly is in session in the month of Aphrodision, first of all (business) the *exetastai* shall administer the appended oath before the people to the aforementioned men: "I swear by Zeus Acraius and Apollo Coropaius and Artemis Iolkia and all the other gods and goddesses, that I have done each thing as it is made clear in the decree concerning the oracle that was ratified when Chrinon son of Parmenion was priest." [60] And if they swear let them be guiltless, but if

anyone does not swear, he shall be liable to prosecution by the *exetastai* and anyone else of the citizens who wishes concerning this wrong, and if the *exetastai* do not do any of the afore-written, let them undergo scrutiny at the hands of the subsequent *exetastai* and he whoever else wishes.

[63] In order that the resolution may be fulfilled for all time, the generals and *nomophylakes* elected each year shall transfer this decree to the magistrates elected subsequently; and a copy of the decree shall be inscribed on a stone column, the contract being let by the *teichopoioi*, which shall then be erected in the sanctuary of Apollo Coropaius.¹

An increasing number of visitors to the shrine prompted the city of Demetrias to inscribe this decree containing the proper procedures for consultation. Were these rules new or merely a codification of existing guidelines? Did the influx of visitors force the city to change or reevaluate its traditional rites for consultation? Although these questions are not easy to answer, we shall come closer to understanding the adaptability of iatromantic rites by untangling the rules and rhetoric of this decree while setting it within the context of demographic shifts that were then taking place.² I analyze this decree alongside a decree from the Amphiareion at Oropus, an iatromantic cult along the Attic-Boiotian border,³ in order to show the legal and religious complexities communities grappled with in the face of external pressures that sometimes threatened to alter traditional ritual obligations.

Although the decree from Oropus dates from 386-371 BC,⁴ it reflects many of the same concerns evident in the decree from Corope. It offers valuable insight into the day-to-day operation of sanctuaries, but also shows a sanctuary in flux. Caught between Boiotia and Attica, the Amphiaraion came under Athenian and Boiotian dominance but also enjoyed

¹ *IG IX 2*, 1109; Robert 1948, 16-28; See Appendix A.

² Due to a lack of evidence demographics and population movements during the Hellenistic period are difficult to quantify. On these difficulties, see Morley 2011, 14-36; For a recent approach, see M. H. Hansen 2006. His "shotgun method" estimates the population of the late Classical and Hellenistic world by using ancient data and modern life tables.

³ Oropus: *I.Oropos 277*; Osborne and Rhodes 2003, no. 27. The history of more famous oracles has been the subject of much scholarly attention. See Fontenrose 1978 and 1988; Maurizio 1993; for the political history of Delphi, see Parke and Wormell 1956 chs. 7 and 11; Parker 1985, 298-326.

⁴ For the text, see Appendix B. For the date of the inscription, see Knoepfler 1986, 89-95; Sineux 2007, 82.

a brief period of independence. Here too, it seems, the increase of travel led to the reevaluation or reissuing of procedures.⁵ A fluctuating population began to leave a mark on mainland sanctuaries.

Polybius already saw the Hellenistic period as a time of population shifts and general decline: "I say this much is true: that in our time the whole of Greece is suffering childlessness and a general decrease of the population; because of this, cities have become deserted and infertility prevails."⁶ Polybius claims that war and pestilence were not the cause of population decline; instead, men had fallen into a state of pretentiousness, avarice, and indolence. As a result they chose not to marry and not to have children. Population decline, in Polybius' view, was due to social phenomena. This passage has been a cornerstone in the scholarly commonplace that Hellenistic cities in Greece declined in wealth and power. Despite Polybius' interpretation, war, pestilence, and various other socioeconomic factors affected the populations of Hellenistic Greece as well.⁷ Recent scholars have argued that Polybius was strictly referring to a geographical area and the wealthier members of society.⁸ The picture that emerges is one of demographic change, not decline.⁹

⁵ Traveling by land was strenuous, but often necessary (Casson 1974, 67); but this would have made iatromantic shrines attractive places for rest.

⁶ Polyb. 36.17.5-6: λέγω δὲ οἷον οὕτως, ἐπέσχευεν ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς καιροῖς τὴν Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν ἀπαιδία καὶ συλλήβδην ὀλιγανθρωπία, δι' ἣν αἱ τε πόλεις ἐξηρημώθησαν καὶ ἀφορίαν εἶναι συνέβαινε. He offers specific examples throughout: lawlessness and childlessness in Boiotia (20.6.1), bribery (18.34.7), and even murder and civil war (6.46.3).

⁷ A Delphic decree shows the possibilities of population mobility caused by war (*Syll*³ 644B); see also Chaniotis 2004a, 481-500; 2005, 143-165.

⁸ See Alcock 1993, 25-26.

⁹ For population growth and cities, see Billows 2005, 197-199. For population shifts, see Chaniotis 2004a, 481-500.

These changes affected Greek sanctuaries and the rituals that took place in them. Scholars (ancient and modern) have often focused on diminished traffic at certain sites,¹⁰ but some places experienced quite the opposite. Regional shrines like that of Apollo Coropaius experienced influxes of visitors. This put pressure on the traditional procedures for consultation that seem to have been struggling to accommodate the visitors.

The influx of visitors forced communities to ask who had access to the shrine, what was to be sacrificed, what the duties of officials were, what punishments were to be meted out for breaking rules and procedures. Through these sacred laws, we may identify three aspects of traditional rites that underwent reevaluation: access to the sanctuary, fees and sacrifices, and maintenance of good order (*eukosmia*). While Corope and Oropus both had to deal with a greater numbers of visitors coming to their sanctuaries, they devised different strategies to preserve their cults.¹¹

1.1. External Pressures: Population Movement and the Need to Adapt

Less-known oracles became increasingly popular during the Hellenistic period. Oracles at Clarus, Oropus, Acraephia, and Corope were within reach of local inhabitants who were attracted to their convenient locations;¹² but new avenues of travel and trade appear to have altered traditional routes. New festivals and theoric networks brought even distant communities into contact and reshaped the lines of religious communication.¹³ Oracular and

¹⁰ See Plutarch's *de Defectu Oracularum*; see also Chapter 5 of this dissertation.

¹¹ On legislative and ritual variety (regarding sanctions), see Naiden 2007, 133-134.

¹² Regional shrines were generally more accessible than famous, but distant, sanctuaries at Delphi, Delos, and Dodona. See Eidinow 2007, 63.

¹³ See Perlman 2000; Kowalzig 2007, 43; Rutherford 2009, 24-38. Concerning the role of *asylia* in inter-polis relations, see also Rigsby 1996, 22-25.

healing shrines benefited or suffered accordingly.¹⁴ It is generally held that over time oracular responses reflected the everyday concerns of individuals and communities. Frequently asked questions were: to which god should I pray? Where should I build a new sanctuary? Will we be victorious if we go to war?¹⁵ Regional shrines offered a service that better-known ones could not: easier access to a god's advice.¹⁶

Dodona, for instance, has been the subject of a recent study that argues that this regional shrine drew clients from all over Greece not unlike Delphi.¹⁷ In this study, Eidinow has also shown how important oracles were in the daily lives of Greek men and women. Oracles helped Greeks avoid unwanted risks in daily activities from business or marriages to sacrifices.¹⁸ This new approach calls for a focus on socioeconomic motivations that lay behind oracular consultations. It pushes against the scholarly perception that oracles had declined; in fact, many were thriving.¹⁹

Apollo's shrine at Corope, located in the Magnesian region of Thessaly, was such a thriving oracle by the end of the second century BC. The manner and place of consultation (ἀρχαῖον μαντεῖον) were passed down from the people's ancestors.²⁰ Emphasizing the ancient connection between the god and his worshippers was crucial in the light of any changes that the decree represents. The decree specifically notes the important role of the god's prophesies in the health and safety of individuals and the community.²¹ Whether the

¹⁴ For Delphi and Delos, see Malkin 2011, 112-117; Rutherford 2009, 24-38; Horden and Purcell 2000, 438-440; for Epidaurus, see Naiden 2005, 73-95.

¹⁵ See Eidinow 2007, 43-55, 63-66, and 133-138.

¹⁶ Seers provided even quicker access. See Flower 2008, 1-5.

¹⁷ Eidinow 2007, 57-63.

¹⁸ Eidinow 2007, 132-133.

¹⁹ See Fontenrose 1978, 5 and Lloyd-Jones 1976, 71-72.

²⁰ *IG IX 2*, 1109.13-15: ὄντος ἀρχαίου τοῦ μαν/τείου καὶ προτετιμημένου διὰ προγόνων.

²¹ *IG IX 2*, 1109.11-12: προδηλοῦντος διὰ τοῦ μαντείου.

ἀρχαῖον μαντεῖον refers to the process, the place of consultation, or both we do not know.²² In the eyes of Greek visitors, however, the two may not have been exclusive: space and the ritual that took place within it were inseparable.²³ The traditional process of consultation facilitated the oracle's initial success by conveying the prophesies of the god to as wide an audience as possible. In other words, the traditional procedures for consultation had served the oracle and community well. Why change anything?

By the first century BC the oracular shrine for Apollo at Corope experienced an influx of visitors seeking the god's advice. As a consequence, the decree gives detailed instructions for the process of consultation and the reason for promulgating them. Let us return to our opening passage: "since more foreigners are coming to the oracle, the city is to take more diligent care for good order throughout the shrine".²⁴ The term designating care, *pronoia*, may signify attention or reverence given by human reasoning or even divine providence.²⁵ In fact, Theseus tells Oedipus to have reverence for god and respect the supplication of his son: "See whether his (suppliant) seat compels you; beware, you must preserve *pronoia* for god."²⁶ At Corope, reverence for the god required precautions in the face of external pressures and ensuring that any precautions were acceptable to the god. Giving the god his due continued to be the main objective.

Precautions were needed because the oracle's apparent popularity threatened its ancient rites. Too many visitors resulted in problems of unstated dimension such as longer lines, confusion, disorder, and greater potential for tampering: the kinds of eventualities

²² Oracular response: *Od.* 12.272. Seat of an oracle: *Hdt.* 1.46, *Heraclit. Vorsokr.* 12 F 93. But also process of divination: *P.Mag.Lond.* 46.1.

²³ See Mylonopoulos 2006, 92-109.

²⁴ *IG IX 2*, 1109.15-17: παραγινόμενων δὲ καὶ ξένων πλειόνων ἐπὶ τὸ χρηστή/ριον, ποιήσασθαί τινα πρόνοιαν ἐπιμελεστέραν τὴν πόλιν / περι τῆς κατὰ τὸ μαντήιον εὐκοσμίας.

²⁵ Precaution (*Thuc.* 8.95) and divine providence (*Hdt.* 3.108). See also *Soph. OT* 978 and *Ant.* 283. *Pronoia* is prominent in philosophical works; see *Pl. Tim.* 30c.

²⁶ *Soph. OC* 1179-1180: ἀλλ' εἰ τὸ θάκημ' ἐξαναγκάζει σκόπει· / μή σοι πρόνοι' ἦ τοῦ θεοῦ φυλακτέα.

that written laws cannot always anticipate.²⁷ This could reduce access and convenience for locals whose forefathers had, as the decree notes, honored the oracle foremost. Thus a tension between tradition and innovation arose, prompting the city to take care and forethought for the oracular process.

1.1.1. Access to the Sanctuaries

Accessibility was an important issue for Greek sanctuaries, and is especially evident in the epigraphic evidence. Major oracles on the Greek mainland were located in remote areas difficult to reach. Although Delphi had a central location and was easily accessible by sea, it was nestled in the folds of Mount Parnassus²⁸ and was not an easy hike for land travelers. Moreover, the oracle was open for consultation for only a few days a year. The Pythia gave prophecies on the seventh of each month, but not at all during the winter. As Michael Flower notes, consulting the oracle would have taken a lot of advanced planning and very few Greeks would have been able to consult the oracle at all. Even if one appeared on the correct day and could afford the requisite sacrifices, there was no guarantee one would get a turn. Moreover, some privileged individuals (and states) had the honor known as *promanteia*, effectively allowing them to jump to the head of the line.²⁹

Visitors to other oracular sites faced similar problems. War and other political vicissitudes often closed off routes to many shrines.³⁰ The remote oracle of Zeus at Dodona was located in Epirus, and unlike Delphi it was not easily accessible by sea.³¹ The oracle of Apollo at Corope was located in Magnesia (Thessaly) along the path from Greece to

²⁷ Aristot. *Rhet.* 1374a.11-14.

²⁸ See McInerney 1999, 41-60, 111-112 and Pedley 2005, 135.

²⁹ Flower 2008, 1-2.

³⁰ For example, Athens could not consult Delphi during the Peloponnesian War.

³¹ See Eidinow 2007, 59-63 and Flower 2008, 2.

Macedonia. Since it was located thirty-five kilometers from Demetrias, however, the journey to and from the oracle required at least two days. Like the Amphiareion at Oropus, this sanctuary was positioned along a thoroughfare of intense political and military activity.³² Our inscription was issued around 100 BC, a generation after the Roman conquest of Greece and a generation before the Mithridatic Wars. At this point, the oracle was in the new province of Macedonia. It was nevertheless drawing larger crowds, which were putting a strain on the time and money of both the sanctuary and its visitors.³³ The physical integrity of the sanctuary was also strained.³⁴ A second fragment of the decree contains rules aimed to protect the Apollo's trees inside the precinct. Henceforth, citizens, locals, and foreigners were prohibited from lopping or cutting down the trees.³⁵ For whatever reason, people had unrestricted access and were helping themselves to the god's property.³⁶

Access to the Amphiareion at Oropus presented different challenges that reflect local developments. The sanctuary was situated in an accessible location between Attica and Boiotia. Access and accommodation were the main focuses of the decree: the priest could not be absent for more than three consecutive days from when the winter has passed until the season of plowing. He must also reside in the sanctuary no fewer than ten days per month.³⁷ In other words, the priest had to be present during the peak season of consultation. The *neokoros* had to be present in order to properly care and oversee the visitors. It was also important that the shrine be open to receive the visitors that were coming to the healing sanctuary in the fourth century. Who were these visitors?

³² See Graninger 2011, 8-39; G. Cohen 1995, 111-112.

³³ Robert 1948, 16-28.

³⁴ On excavations, see Papachadzes 1960, 3-24.

³⁵ *LSCG* 84 (Corope, ca. 100 BC).

³⁶ See Dillon 1997a, 118-119.

³⁷ *I.Oropos* 277.2-6: See Appendix B.

1.1.2. *Xenoi, Demotai, and Access to the Shrines*

Some sanctuaries were known to exclude certain groups.³⁸ Foreigners (*xenoi*) were obvious targets. A fifth-century decree from Paros states: “it is forbidden (οὐ θέμις) for a Dorian *xenos* or [a slave] or a citizen without a *kyrios* (to enter).”³⁹ Such prohibitions were still common in the Hellenistic period; the famous Myconus calendar records the new civic sacrifices following the *synoecism* of two communities. Women and foreigners were explicitly prohibited from certain rites.⁴⁰ Exclusion had well-known social and religious significance: the “identity of a group was confirmed by the exclusion of strictly defined outsiders, for nothing serves better to define a self-image than comparison with and exclusion of *xenoi*.”⁴¹ Prohibiting foreigners, however, would be uncharacteristic for an iatromantic shrine. In fact, healing and oracular cults took great pride in drawing visitors from afar.⁴² At Oropus, we learn that the *neokoros* had to record the names and cities of incubants and display them in the sanctuary for all to see.⁴³ Nevertheless, the influx of visitors put a strain on the traditional way of consultation; new restrictions had to be created or old ones reinforced.

How were foreigners expected to know local traditional customs? Sophocles tells us that ignorant foreigners could create serious trouble at local sanctuaries. In *Oedipus at Colonus*, the eponymous hero wanders into the Attic deme of Colonus in search of rest. He unknowingly enters the grove of the dread goddesses, the Eumenides. A stranger there tells

³⁸ See Naiden 2007, 134.

³⁹ *IG* XII, 5 225: ξε(ί)νωι Δωριῆι οὐ θέμι[ς] / οὐ[τ]ε δ[ο(ύ)λ]ωι· ἀκο(ύ)ρηι ἀστῶι ἔ[στι].

⁴⁰ *Syll*³ 1024.26: ξένωι οὐ θέμις. Line 9: γυναικι οὐ θέμις.

⁴¹ Mylonopoulos 2006, 84.

⁴² For example, see the Epidaurian Miracle Inscriptions (LiDonnici 1995).

⁴³ *Ioropos* 277.39-43. More evidence for this is the promulgation of miracle cures and oracular responses. Desire for patrons was not limited to iatromantic shrines. Especially by the Hellenistic period, cities participated in festival circuits. See Kowalzig 2007, 41-72; see also chapter 4 for the case of Magnesia-on-the-Maeander, which sought *asylia* and crown competition status for its festival, the *Leukophryeneia*.

him: “So you see, stranger, since you ask how it is: It’s a place made famous by no fine stories; only we live here and honor the presence of these divinities.”⁴⁴ Custom, formed by usage, established the accepted boundaries for the grove and its associated rites. The only warning was a local man who happened to be standing outside the boundaries of the *temenos*. The chorus arrives on the scene; struck by Oedipus’ presumptuousness,⁴⁵ it warns him:

You’ve gone too far now out of bounds – so go no farther in that grassy silent grove where bright water in the flowing bowl streams into a stream of honey. Move! Stand off! Step away from where you are! If it’s talk you want walk off the forbidden ground and speak your mind where it is lawful for all.⁴⁶

How would blind Oedipus know that he had trespassed into forbidden sacred space were the stranger not there to tell him? This was an issue for many travelers throughout Greece, even those who still had their eyes.

Approaching an oracle like Corope appropriately was certainly less dramatic, but no less serious. Foreigners had to be cautious not to transgress customs or violate local ordinances. Therefore, the city of Demetrias determined that ancestral custom, “habitual association” (ξυνουσία) according to the stranger who met Oedipus, was obviously no longer effective in ensuring that the many visitors now approaching the shrine knew what they were doing. After all, when Oedipus asks Antigone what they should do, she responds:

⁴⁴ Soph. *OC*. 62-63: τοιαῦτά σοι ταῦτ’ ἐστίν, ὃ ξέν’, οὐ λόγοις τιμῶμεν, / ἀλλὰ τῇ ξυνουσία πλέον. (Tr. Grennen and Kitzinger).

⁴⁵ Soph. *OC*. 120: ὁ πάντων ἀκορέστατος. Hogan 1991, 84: the single superlative translated by impious, blasphemous, shameless would suggest to the Greek ear the excess and outrageous behavior associated with *hybris*.

⁴⁶ Soph. *OC*. 151-169: ἄρα καὶ ἦσθα φυτάλιμος; δυσαιῶν μακραιῶν θ’, ὅσ’ ἐπεικάσαι. / ἀλλ’ οὐ μὰν ἐν γ’ ἐμοὶ / προσθήσεις τάσδ’ ἀράς. περᾶς γάρ, / περᾶς· ἀλλ’ ἵνα τῶδ’ ἐν / ἀφθέγκτω μὴ προπέσης νάπει / ποιάνεντι, κάθυδρος οὐ / κρατῆρ μελιχίων ποτῶν / ῥεύματι συντρέχει, / τῶν, ξένε πάμμορ’—εὐ φύλαξαι— / μετάσταθ’, ἀπόβαθι. πολλὰ κέλευθος ἐρατύοι· / κλύεις, ὦ πολύμοχθ’ ἀλάτα; / λόγον εἰ τιν’ οἴσεις / πρὸς ἐμὰν λέσχαν, ἀβάτων ἀποβάς, / ἵνα πᾶσι νόμος φώνει. (Tr. Grennen and Kitzinger).

“we should do what the citizens deem is right.”⁴⁷ Whereas the citizen outside the grove at Colonus served as a keeper of sacred law, the citizens of Demetrias promulgated written rules to safeguard proper procedure and ritual efficacy.

Of course increased traffic presented other kinds of logistical challenges for local sanctuaries. The charter of the shopkeepers from Samos regulated the commercial activity at the bustling Heraion, including the leasing of shops and the protection of the sanctuary from unwanted elements. That the extant decree is a revision of an older charter demonstrates the flexibility of the community to alter policies, as circumstances required.⁴⁸ As Lupu notes, the publication was directed not only at the lessor and lessees but also at the visitors to the sanctuary. Not all of these visitors were welcome.⁴⁹ Shopkeepers were not to lease to slaves, soldiers, or anyone unemployed. Nor were they to provide sanctuary for runaway slaves.⁵⁰ A sanctuary’s popularity did not always attract the most desirable elements. As a result, the community revised their *diagraphē* in order to adapt to the circumstances. In large sites like the Heraion and smaller extra-urban shrines like Corope, writing was the crucial medium through which authorities could communicate with foreigners and local officials alike, informing them of their rights, obligations, and local religious customs.

⁴⁷ Soph. *OC*.171-172: ὁ πάτερ, ἀστοῖς ἴσα χρῆ μελετᾶν, / εἴκοντας ἄ δεῖ κάκούοντας.

⁴⁸ *IG XII 6*, 169.4; *NGSL* 18; Habicht 1972, no. 9 (Samos, 245 BC).

⁴⁹ See *NGSL* 18, page 291.

⁵⁰ *IG XII 6*, 169.8-14: παρακαπηλ[ε]ύσει δὲ ἀ[ὐτοῖς] / οὔτε δούλος οὔτε σ]τρατιώτης οὔτε ἄπεργος οὔτε ἰκέτης ο[ὔτε ἄλ/λος κάπηλος οὐδεῖς] τρόπῳ οὐδὲ παρευρέσει οὐδεμίαι πλη[ν τῶν μι/[σθωσαμένων· ὁ δὲ] παρακαπηλεύων ἀποτεῖσει τοῖς μισθω[σα/μένοις δραχμῶν — ζη]μίαν. οἱ δὲ μισθωσάμενοι οὐ παραδώσου[σιν τὰ κα]/πηλεῖα οὔτε ἀπέρ]γωι οὔτε ἰκέτηι τρόπῳ οὐδὲ παρευρέσει[ι οὐδεμί]/αι. 16-17: οἱ δὲ μισθωσάμε]νοι οὐχ ὑποδέξονται παρὰ δούλου οὐθὲν [οὐδὲ παρ’ / ἰκέτου οὐδὲ παρὰ σ]τρατιώτου οὐδὲ παρὰ ἀπέργου.

1.2. Written Rules and Visitors

When new visitors entered the sanctuary of Apollo Coropaius they, like Oedipus entering the grove of the Eumenides, needed to know the customary local rules.

Purification, sacrifices, and fees were requirements that visitors had to know before entering sacred space or consulting a god. How did written rules relate to unwritten, traditional religious practices?

1.2.1. Written Rules for Visitors at Corope

According to Gagarin, the transition from unwritten customs to written laws produced significant changes for Greek society. Enacting written laws, lawgivers attempted to resolve ambiguity and inherent conflicts in traditional rules and customs.⁵¹ As a result, written laws tend to reflect the most contentious unwritten rules.⁵² Uncertainty about a particular *nomos* perhaps led some communities to publish, in imperishable stone, the definitive law on a given issue.⁵³ This may explain why some rules are elaborated and others are mentioned only with reference to usage or tradition (*nomos* or *patria*).

Determining whether written rules, like those from Corope, were newly introduced or the crystallization of existing convention is a very difficult task.⁵⁴ Laws dealing with religious practices have yet another wrinkle: in ritualized worship, such as oracular consultation, uncertainty over procedure could place the worshipper and community at risk

⁵¹ Gagarin 1986, 110.

⁵² See also Gagarin 2008, 109: "In law, writing standardizes rules and procedures, and helps make them uniform and stable over time and space. Second, writing depersonalizes information; that is, it divorces the written text from its personal source."

⁵³ See Thomas 2005, 54.

⁵⁴ Thomas 2005, 54: cites funerary legislation as evidence of change. Her example is *LSCG* 97.

of offending the gods or compromising the integrity of the question and answer.⁵⁵ Do written regulations, then, reflect contentious or unclear customary rules or do they reflect changes to those customs? In other words, did written sacred laws supplement or replace conventional norms? At Corope, the community's concern for diligence (*pronoia*), the elaborateness of the rules, and the very content of the rules suggest that changes were made to the traditional mechanisms of consultation.

Parker's category of "black tie laws" may be useful in understanding the religious issues at stake. This category of laws comprises regulations that are more suggestive than prescriptive: this is what you do if you want the god to answer your request. These rules usually do not have sanctions. Conversely, rules meant to protect sacred property are indistinguishable from civic laws regulating other, secular, matters.⁵⁶ But these categories overlap at Corope. It is true that in order to consult the god properly a visitor had to follow a certain protocol. The oracle was, according to the decree, well established by tradition and honored by ancestors.⁵⁷ At the same time, this is a civic decree reinforced by officials whose duties were legally sanctioned by the state and had the authority to enforce proper protocol, often through coercion. Certainly, the advisory notices in the law from Corope aided visitors in performing the rites properly; but as we shall see, there were real consequences for failure to perform rites properly.

The peoples of Corope and Oropus determined, respectively, that pressures on traditional procedures could lead to disorder (*ataxia*), which would mean violations of traditional practice. Although many of our questions regarding motive cannot be answered with certainty, a close examination of detailed procedural rules show that increasing

⁵⁵ See Naiden 2007, 126.

⁵⁶ Parker 2004a, 65.

⁵⁷ IG IX 2, 1109.13-15.

tensions between innovation and tradition concerned the rights and obligations of visitors and personnel, respectively. The proper procedures for consultation began with knowing the appropriate preliminary sacrifices. Because of the influx of foreigners, these details needed to be written.

1.2.2. Sacrifices and Fees at Corope and Oropus

A preliminary offering was required before consulting an oracle.⁵⁸ According to the decree from Corope, whenever the prescribed officials come to the oracle and perform the sacrifice according to custom and it turns out well, the secretary of the god is to promptly receive the records of those wishing to consult the oracle.⁵⁹ Not the petitioners themselves, but the officials, namely the priest, generals, *nomophylakes*, *prytanis*, treasurer, secretary, prophet, and those charged with maintaining order, the *rhabdouchoi* were to perform the sacrifice.⁶⁰ The community preferred that these officials perform the sacrifice. Why?

The sacrifice had to turn out favorable (*καλλιερειν*). A favorable sacrifice is one that the god accepts. In order for the god to accept it, the sacrifice must be performed properly and turn out auspiciously; custom dictates the offering and experienced sacrificers or experts would interpret the outcome.⁶¹ The most detailed example comes from the

Andanian sacred law from 93/92 BC:

Supplying the sacrifices: Let the *hieroi*, after being appointed, grant the sale of the right to supply the victims that must be sacrificed and supplied for the mysteries, and the other things needed for purification... These are the victims that it is necessary to provide before the beginning of the mysteries: two white lambs, a nicely-colored ram for purification, and, when purifying oneself in the theater, three piglets, a hundred rams for the *protomystai*, in

⁵⁸ For sacrifice as establishing communication with a god, see Parker 2011, 132-133.

⁵⁹ *IG IX 2*, 1109.30-34.

⁶⁰ *IG IX 2*, 1109.18-25.

⁶¹ On the choice of offering see Burkert 1985, 56.

the procession a pregnant sow to Demeter, a young sow for the Great Gods, a ram for Hermes, a boar to Apollo Carneius, and a sheep to Hagna.⁶²

The law also exhibits a concern for the fitness of the animals. They had to be holy, clean, and unblemished.⁶³ The *hieroi* had to provide the appropriate victims should the contractor fail to do so.⁶⁴ The officials were permitted to contract out the task to the lowest bidder, but *they* were taking a risk. Failure to provide the necessary victims could jeopardize the efficacy of the entire festival.⁶⁵ Of course the offering for a god was not always an animal. Numerous sacred laws call for preliminary sacrifices of cakes or even just money.⁶⁶ Worshippers needed to know this information.

Preliminary sacrifice was usually the job of the worshippers, οἱ παραγινόμενοι, especially at iatromantic shrines.⁶⁷ That sacred officials at Corope performed the sacrifices may suggest some concern whether foreigners were performing the proper rites, or whether, in the light of demand, it was too much of a burden on the process. If so, κατὰ τὰ πάτρια could remain vague with no added fear of ritual deviation; the officials, especially the priest, knew what offering to make, how to make it pleasing to the god, and whether or not the sacrifice was ultimately accepted.⁶⁸ A passage from the *Iliad* clearly demonstrates the importance of making sacrifice pleasing to the god. The priest Chryses asks Apollo:

O god of the silver bow, you who protect Chryse and holy Cilla and rule Tenedus with your might, hear me O god of Sminthe. If I have ever decked your temple with garlands or burned

⁶² *Syll*³ 736.64-66; *LSCG* 65 (97 BC): θυμάτων παροχᾶς· οἱ ἱεροὶ μετὰ τὸ κα-/τασταθῆμεν προκαρῦξαντες ἐγδόντω τὴν παροχὴν τῶν θυμάτων ὧν / δεῖ θύεσθαι καὶ παρίστασθαι ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις καὶ τὰ εἰς τοὺς / καθαρμούς... (67-69): ἔστι δὲ ἅ δεῖ παρέχειν πρὸ τοῦ ἄρχεσθαι τῶν μυστηρίων, ἄρνας δύο λευκοὺς, ἐπὶ τοῦ καθαρμοῦ κριὸν εὐχρουν, καί, ὅταν / ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ καθαίρει, χοιρίσκους τρεῖς, ὑπὲρ τοὺς πρωτομύστας ἄρνας ἑκατόν, ἐν δὲ τῷ πομπᾷ Δάματρι σὺν ἐπίτοκα, τοῖς δὲ Μεγάλις / Θεοῖς δάμαλιν διετῆ σὺν, Ἐρμᾶνι κριόν, Ἀπόλλωνι Καρνεῖωι κάπρον, Ἄγναι σῖν.

⁶³ *Syll*³ 736.70; *LSCG* 65: παριστάτω τὰ θύματα εὐέρα καθαρὰ ὀλόκλαρα.

⁶⁴ See Petropoulou 2008, 66.

⁶⁵ Naiden 2007, 127-128.

⁶⁶ Kearns 1994, 65-70.

⁶⁷ Visitors could also give their offerings to an official like the *neokoros*. See Herod. *Miamb* 4.90.

⁶⁸ On priests as ritual experts, see Chaniotis 2008, 17-34.

for you thighbones in fat of bulls or goats, grant my prayer, and let your arrows avenge these my tears upon the Danaans.⁶⁹

Two aspects of this passage are important for our purposes. First, Chryses decorated (literally “did something pleasing for”) Apollo’s temple (εἰ ποτέ τοι χαρίεντ’ ἐπὶ νηὸν ἔρεψα). Second, Chryses sacrificed animals he knew were pleasing to the god. Since visitors coming to oracular shrines had to sacrifice correctly, the best way for visitors to ensure the desired outcome (καλλιερεῖν) was for the priest or another official to do it for them.

Even ritual expertise, however, was sometimes not enough to ensure proper rites. Although writing much later, Plutarch tells us what could happen if someone tries to consult the god without obtaining good omens. An embassy arrived to consult the god at Delphi. They sacrificed, but the innards of the victim were foreboding. Under pressure, the priests allowed the visitors to enter.⁷⁰ Unknowingly, the Pythia went into her chamber where a bad spirit overtook her and drove her into frenzy. She died a few days after.⁷¹ “For these reasons”, according to Plutarch, “they keep the Pythia free from intercourse and away from communication with strangers”. From then on, he assures us, they kept the Pythia away from crowds and took signs before proceeding to the oracle.⁷² Thus we should not ignore the religious rationale behind the procedural innovations at Corope and Oropus. Putting the sacrifices in the hands of personnel did not guarantee good omens, but it did limit the potential for bad ritual performance: a risk that increased along with the number of visitors.

⁶⁹ Hom. *Il.* 1.37-43: κλυθί μευ ἀργυρότοξ’, ὄς Χρῦσην ἀμφιβέβηκας / Κίλλάν τε ζαθέην Τενέδοιό τε Ἴφι ἀνάσσεις, / Σμινθεῦ εἰ ποτέ τοι χαρίεντ’ ἐπὶ νηὸν ἔρεψα, / ἢ εἰ δὴ ποτέ τοι κατὰ πῖονα μηρὶ ἔκηα / ταύρων ἠδ’ αἰγῶν, τὸ δέ μοι κρήνον ἐέλδωρ· / τίσειαν Δαναοὶ ἐμὰ δάκρυα σοῖσι βέλεσσιν.

⁷⁰ Plut. *de Defect.* 438a.9-438b.2: θεοπρόπων γὰρ ἀπὸ ξένης παραγενομένων λέγεται τὰς πρώτας κατασπείσεις ἀκίνητον ὑπομεῖναι καὶ ἀπαθεῖς τὸ ἱερεῖον, ὑπερβαλλομένων δὲ φιλοτιμίας τῶν ἱερέων καὶ προσλιπαρούντων μόλις ὑπομβρον γενόμενον καὶ κατακλυσθὲν ἐνδοῦναι.

⁷¹ See Hdt. 6.81: Cleomenes of Sparta attempted to sacrifice at Argos: he was refused and went mad.

⁷² Plut. *de defect.* 438c.2-5: τούτων ἔνεκα καὶ συνουσίας ἀγνὸν τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸν βίον ὅλως ἀνεπίμικτον ἄλλοδαπαῖς καὶ ἄθικτον ὁμιλίαις φυλάττουσι τῆς Πυθίας καὶ πρὸ τοῦ χρηστηρίου τὰ σημεῖα λαμβάνουσιν.

Under protection of strict new guidelines officiants might be less prone to the pressure of a crowd, or any one of its members. Moreover, the priest of Amphiaraus prayed over public sacrifices on behalf of the whole community.⁷³ This helped ensure that words were spoken auspiciously (*euphemia*).⁷⁴ It was better for someone who knows custom to perform the rites.⁷⁵

Economic circumstances at Oropus may have led the community to adopt peculiar policies regarding sacrificial rules. The decree includes numerous rules for sacrifices, including fees: “whoever comes to be cured by the god is to pay a fee of not less than nine obols of good silver and deposit them in the treasury in the presence of the *neokoros*.”⁷⁶ Such fees or tariffs were common in Greek sacred laws; worshippers had to pay a fee in addition to, or in lieu of, a sacrifice.⁷⁷ Under an earlier decree from Oropus:

It is resolved to record those coming to the sanctuary ... those being healing by the god... putting money into the treasury... putting no less than a Boiotian drachma into the *thesauros*... who happens to be in the sanctuary... the priest shall write the name and the city (of the one sacrificing).⁷⁸

The fees for sacrifice, then, increased from one drachma to one-and-a-half drachmas (nine obols). Although this increase could be due to any number of reasons, it may have helped pay for the building projects taking place in the sanctuary at that time.⁷⁹

⁷³ *I.Oropos* 277.28-29: κατεύχεσθαι... τῶν δὲ δη/μορίων τὸν ἱερέα.

⁷⁴ See Montiglio 2000, 15-16.

⁷⁵ Other factors were also at play. For instance, performing public sacrifice was a great honor.

⁷⁶ *I.Oropos* 277.20-24.

⁷⁷ See *NGSL*, pages 59-60. For other examples, see *LSCG* 125 and *LSS* 86.

⁷⁸ *I.Oropos* 276 (402-387 BC): δεδόχθα[ι / ἀναγράφειν μὲν τοὺς ἀφικνε]ομένους εἰς τὸ ἱερό[ν] / ... τοὺς θεραπευο[μ]ένους ὑπὸ τοῦ θε[οῦ] / ... ἐμβάλ[λ]οντα εἰς τὸ[ν] / θησαυρὸν μὴ ἔλαττον δρα[χμῆς] βοιωτῆς του / ... ἐν τοῖ ἱ[ερ]οῖ τύχει / ... τὸν ἱερέα ἀ[να]γρά[φ]ειν / [φειν ... τὸ τ]ε ὄνομα καὶ τὴν πό[λιν].

⁷⁹ *I.Oropos* 292 and 293 record the intricate regulations for constructing new water systems in the sanctuary. The drainage of water from the men’s bath had been impeded by the rise of the stream during rain. Such projects indicate that the community was concentrating its energy on renovating the sanctuary to fix structural problems and ensure that visitors had the most enjoyable experience possible.

A change in sacrificial requirements is evident. In Chryses' case, Apollo clearly prefers bulls and goats. Other gods preferred sheep, pigs, piglets, or rams.⁸⁰ According to many ritual theorists, the presentation of a prescribed offering, animal or non-animal, is necessary for other activities accompanying sacrifice to occur.⁸¹ In other words, deities received innumerable combinations of sacrifices, some of which did not include animals. Sacred laws dealing with sacrifices often state the recipient, type of animal, and (in the cases of animal sacrifice) the distribution of meat.⁸² In some instances, an incorrect sacrifice had to be cleansed from the sanctuary altogether.⁸³ Were healing cults more flexible? Of course, worshippers and incubants dedicated replicas of various body parts as *ex-votos* among many other variable types of offerings.⁸⁴ Nevertheless, a preliminary sacrifice was often required before approaching the god, typically cakes or poultry. At Epidaurus, a fifth-century sacred law was very specific: it called for a young ox to be sacrificed to Asclepius.⁸⁵

Other oracular shrines required the sacrifice of a goat to Apollo and would-be worshippers at the Asclepieum at Athens had to sacrifice a cock to the god.⁸⁶ Various offerings were permitted but a host of regulations, particularly sacrificial calendars, clearly demonstrate that there were limitations to what a worshipper could give. According to a fragment of Aristophanes' *Amphiarus*, "a cock kicked over the pot" just before it was to be sacrificed.⁸⁷ On the other hand, a fourth-century votive relief from Oropus shows a ram and

⁸⁰ See Bremmer 2007, 132-144.

⁸¹ McClymond 2008, 29.

⁸² Calendars, of course, also include the date of sacrifice and usually the cost. See Dow 1968, 170-186.

⁸³ The famous Cyrenean Cathartic Decree: Osborne and Rhodes 2003, no. 97.26-31 (*LSS* 115).

⁸⁴ Van Straten 1992, 247-284.

⁸⁵ *IG* IV² 1, 40.18-19: τῶι ἰ Ἀσσκλαπιῶι θύεν βῶ/ν ἔρσενα. See also *IG* XII 4, 280b (*LSCG* 169): worshippers are to sacrifice sheep and goats to Apollo and Asclepius.

⁸⁶ Pl. *Phd.* 118e.

⁸⁷ Arist. *Amphiarus* 17KA.

a pig being led to the altar,⁸⁸ suggesting that in the late fourth or early third centuries the sacrificial requirements were more lenient. Our fourth-century decree states that each man may sacrifice “whatever he wants”.⁸⁹ This suggests that a certain type of animal was not yet required.

Was the rule allowing a visitor to sacrifice whatever he wants a change in traditional practice? If so, was it a response to the influx of visitors to the sanctuary? The phrase does seem to suggest that specificity was yielding to practical necessity, but we cannot know for certain or under what precise pressure. Scarcity of a particular kind of animal would make that animal more expensive and thus less available for sacrifice.⁹⁰ In this sense, economics may have played a role; restrictions may have precluded would-be incubants from coming to the shrine.

The traditionally appropriate animal may not have been available for an increasing population of visitors to the site. In effect, the community decided to change the cult rather than turn away the influx of visitors (and their money) whose number may have made tradition a burden and traditional sacrifice untenable. Such flexibility seems to have been reconsidered at least by the second century AD. As Pausanias writes: “Purification consists of sacrificing to the god. They [worshippers] sacrifice to him [Amphiaraus] and to all those whose names are on the <altar>. After these preliminaries they sacrifice a ram, and spreading the skin under them go to sleep, awaiting a revelation in a dream.”⁹¹ By Pausanias’ time the matter appears settled. He does not mention a law requiring a ram, but

⁸⁸ Petrakos 1968, plate no. 41a. See also van Straten 1995, 72-74, plate no. 72.

⁸⁹ *I.Oropos* 277.30-31: θύειν δὲ ἐξ/εἶν ἅπαν ὃ τι ἂν βόληται ἕκαστος.

⁹⁰ See Rosivach 1994, 68-106 for supplying sacrificial animals at Athens and its demes; see 107-142 for issues relating to the acquisition of sacrificial animals.

⁹¹ Paus. 1.34.5: ἔστι δὲ καθάρσιον τῷ θεῷ θύειν, θύουσι δὲ καὶ αὐτῷ καὶ πᾶσιν ὅσοις ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τῷ <βωμῷ> τὰ ὀνόματα: προεξεργασμένων δὲ τούτων κριὸν θύσαντες καὶ τὸ δέρμα ὑποστρωσάμενοι καθεύδουσιν ἀναμένοντες δῆλωσιν ὀνειράτος. For the commonality of this kind of ritual, see Frazer’s commentary (1965 vol. 2, page 476).

simply states that it is what one does (κριὸν θύσαντες). Although the possibility remains that other offerings could have been made, a ram at least became the sacrifice that would best achieve the desired result as tested and shown by experience. Thus the flexibility of procedures and ritual performances extended to such crucial ritual acts as payments of fees and sacrifice.

While all Greek communities were concerned about proper rites, rules had to be flexible enough to meet unforeseeable circumstances. At these shrines, conditional rules won the day: one procedure applies when the official is here, another if he is not. Convenience and practicality certainly played a role; but so did concern for proper rites. The limits of adaptability were set foremost by appearances. What the god cared about most were *kallierein*, *euphemia*, and *eutaxia*. Everything had to be done “as beautifully as possible” to suit the god’s taste. How these objectives were met was to some degree negotiable.

1.3. Written Rules and Ritual Innovation

Maintaining good order, *eutaxia*, served two functions in iatromantic shrines: good order was pleasing to the god and facilitated efficient consultation and orderly incubation. The increasing number of visitors at Corope led to a reevaluation, if not change, of the rules for waiting in line and submitting a question. While queued, worshippers interacted with the personnel responsible for handling jars, recording names, and keeping general order. At this point in the process the responsibilities of worshippers and officials converged. Good

order (*eukosmia*)⁹² required both sides dutifully to perform their respective obligations. It depended on explicit rules for conduct and entailed punishment for disorderly behavior. Above all, written rules were required whenever one person's actions could affect another's ritual experience.

Visitors and personnel had respective obligations during consultation, but each needed the other to complete the ritual in an orderly fashion. Consultation cannot happen properly if an official appointed to bring a jar fails to do so. One focus of the revised procedures is on temple personnel whose behavior many rules specifically govern. In the light of elevated ritual traffic, written rules were more essential for keeping personnel on task. A mob would create disorder; cult personnel had to be the bastion against it.

1.3.1. Keeping Good Order

In his *Politics*, Aristotle addresses the importance of keeping order (*eukosmia*) in civil society; officials should know over which matters they are to have jurisdiction, and where authority should be centralized. He poses the question: should one official keep order in the market and another in some other place, or should the same official be responsible everywhere?⁹³ Jurisdiction was crucial. In sanctuaries, keeping good order meant officials knowing their responsibilities and the limits of their authority.

Eukosmia at Corope entailed following strict procedures. After the sacrifice, these procedures included sealing jars, conveying them to the appropriate personnel, and distributing replies. Others included stipulations enforcing orderly consultation. Louis

⁹² *Eukosmia* is the term used in *IG IX 2*, 1109.17, 51, and its antonym (26: ἀκοσμοῦντα). The meaning is indistinguishable from εὐταξία.

⁹³ Aristot. *Pol.* 1299b.14-18: ποίων δεῖ κατὰ τόπον ἀρχεῖα πολλὰ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι καὶ ποίων πανταχοῦ μίαν ἀρχὴν εἶναι κυρίαν, οἷον εὐκοσμίας πότερον ἐν ἀγορᾷ μὲν ἀγορανόμον, ἄλλον δὲ κατ' ἄλλον τόπον, ἢ πανταχοῦ τὸν αὐτόν.

Robert's excellent study of this inscription focuses primarily on the administrative aspect of this decree. In his words: "Ici, il n'est absolument pas question des rites; ils se dérouleront, comme auparavant, κατὰ τὰ πάτρια".⁹⁴ Moreover on the issue of rites: "il n'en faut point conclure que cette question était enveloppée d'un silence mystique"⁹⁵ Visitors to the shrine had to follow procedures that were established by tradition, as the decree states and Robert recognizes. Indeed acting "according to custom" entailed sacrifices and perhaps other religious rites, but the details of those rites were enshrouded in *silence mystique*. I suggest, however, that the manner of consultation (τὸ μαντεῖον) is both a vital administrative procedure *and* the ritual performed in the sanctuary. Thus certain rites are kept in silence, but not all.

Consulting an oracle was a ritualized event and so the procedures for consultation formed the religious experience in the sanctuary. In other words, the various components that made up consultation joined together to form the experience.⁹⁶ Successful consultation at Corope began to require rather precise stage directions for consulters and officials. Procedurally, the decree offers little room for flexibility and little scope for individual discretion. Of course, the goal of the rituals was receiving credible and convincing oracular responses. This required the competence of various religious officials and their precise execution of procedures laid out in either unwritten or written laws. Due to the influx of visitors, unwritten regulations were not getting the job done.

As Robert has noted, certain details are left out. Sacrificial requirements, for instance, may or may not be explicated, as the decree from Oropus demonstrates. But at

⁹⁴ Robert 1948, 19.

⁹⁵ Robert 1948, 20.

⁹⁶ Similarly, the various parts of a sacrifice (choosing an animal, procession, *euphemia*, dining, etc.) formed the religious experience. See McClymond 2008, 25-43.

Corope it was deemed unnecessary to outline such details about requirements. Consultation may commence whenever officials were present, made the customary sacrifices, and those sacrifices turned out well.⁹⁷ Hence, ritual authority over sacrifices at Corope was not a matter for dispute because officials took care of them.⁹⁸ Keeping good order was becoming the problem. What emerge in the decree are the main components of the procedures that led to ritual efficacy: a listing of actions that constitute religious requirements, which may or may not include explicit directives (often referring to “custom”), and the obligations of temple personnel and visitors to maintain the appropriate order (*eukosmia*), which led to the appropriate worship. Most importantly, what seem like mere administrative procedures for consulting the oracle of Apollo Coropaios in fact formed the ritual performance of the cult. As the ritual and legal authority of officials overseeing the ritual changed, so did the experience of oracular consultation.

During consultation, the city-appointed priest of Apollo would come forth with one *strategos*, *nomophylax*, *prytanis*, treasurer, secretary, and *prophetes*. Back-up provisions were needed: an official was permitted to send another in his place if he happened to be sick or out of the city. The *stratego*i and *nomophylakes* were to register three *rhabdouchoi* from among the citizens who were thirty years old or older. These three men were to have the authority to punish anyone acting in a disorderly fashion. Moreover, if any of these inscribed officials is knowingly absent, he must pay the city a fine of three drachmas.⁹⁹ These officials had circumscribed roles in the process of consulting the oracle (τὸ μαντεῖον): handing over jars, recording names, and maintaining order.

⁹⁷ *IG IX 2*, 1109.20-32.

⁹⁸ Precise details for sacrifice at Corope are not known. Other iatromantic cults required a preliminary sacrifice prior to consultation or incubation. See also *Syll*³ 144.3-6; *LSS* 11 (Athens, early fourth century BC).

⁹⁹ *IG IX 2*, 1109.18-30.

The incorporation of sealed jars may have been a crucial innovation in maintaining *eukosmia*. Lucian provides a humorous account of some of the problems and concerns related to the integrity of oracular consultation. Alexander of Abonouteichos had founded his own oracular shrine and a peculiar ritual for consulting it:

He [Alexander] ordered everyone to write down on a scroll whatever he would ask and what he especially wanted to learn, to tie it up, and to seal it with wax or clay... Then he himself, after taking the scrolls and entering the inner sanctuary ... proposed to summon in order, together with herald and *theologos*, those who had submitted them, and after the god had told him about each case, to give back the scroll with a seal on it, just as it was, and the reply written under it.¹⁰⁰

Alexander was, according to Lucian, a charlatan. He cheated hundreds, maybe even thousands, of “sniveling fools”¹⁰¹ out of their money with his false oracles.¹⁰² How did he do it? Elaborate procedures gave the impression of legitimacy. After consultants submitted their questions, in sealed jars, Alexander undid those seals, read the questions, and answered them.¹⁰³ Lucian describes how he did it:

He heated a needle, removed the seal by melting through the wax underneath it, and after reading (the contents) he warmed the wax once more with the needle, both what was under the thread and what was contained the seal, and so stuck it together easily.¹⁰⁴

As late as this satire may be (second century AD), it nevertheless gives us a vivid glimpse into the concerns that many probably had for the integrity of consulting an oracle like that

¹⁰⁰ Luc. *Alex.* 19: ἐκέλευσεν δὲ ἕκαστον, οὗ δέοιτο ἂν καὶ ὁ μάλιστα μαθεῖν ἐθέλοι, εἰς βιβλίον ἐγγράψαντα καταγράψαι τε καὶ κατασημῆνασθαι κηρῷ ἢ πηλῷ ἢ ἄλλῳ τοιούτῳ. αὐτὸς δὲ λαβὼν τὰ βιβλία καὶ εἰς τὸ ἄδυτον κατελθὼν — ἤδη γὰρ ὁ νεὸς ἐγήγερτο καὶ ἡ σκινη παρεσκευάστο — καλέσειν ἔμελλε κατὰ τάξιν τοὺς δεδωκότας ὑπὸ κήρυκι καὶ θεολόγῳ, καὶ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούων ἕκαστα τὸ μὲν βιβλίον ἀποδώσειν σεσημασμένον ὡς εἶχε, τὴν δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸ ἀπόκρισιν ὑπογεγραμμένην, πρὸς ἔπος ἀμειβομένου τοῦ θεοῦ περι ὄτου τις ἔροιτο.

¹⁰¹ Luc. *Alex.* 20: τοῖς δὲ ιδιώταις καὶ κορύζης μεστοῖς τὴν ρίνα τεράστιον καὶ πάνυ ἀπίστῳ ὅμοιον.

¹⁰² Lucian describes a genuine cult. Coins have been found depicting Alexander’s snake-like healing god, Glycon. See Robert 1980, 393-436; Stoneman 2011, 166-170.

¹⁰³ Luc. *Alex.* 20: ἐπινοήσας γὰρ ποικίλας τῶν σφραγίδων τὰς λύσεις ἀνεγίνωσκέν τε τὰς ἐρωτήσεις ἐκάστας καὶ τὰ δοκοῦντα πρὸς αὐτὰς ἀπεκρίνετο.

¹⁰⁴ Luc. *Alex.* 21: βελόνην πυρώσας τὸ ὑπὸ τὴν σφραγίδα μέρος τοῦ κηροῦ διατήκων ἐξήρει καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν τῆ βελόνη αὔθις ἐπιχλιάνας τὸν κηρόν, τὸν τε κάτω ὑπὸ τῷ λίνῳ καὶ τὸν αὐτὴν τὴν σφραγίδα ἔχοντα, ῥαδίως συνεκόλλα.

of Apollo Coropaius.¹⁰⁵ Alexander cheated in the oracular process because, according to Lucian, he knew his cult was a fraud. He was successful because he made it appear legitimate.

Although the story of *Alexander the False Prophet* informs us about the possibility of corrupted oracles, it also shows the extent to which oracular procedures had gone to ensure, or appear to ensure, uncorrupted questions and answers. Already in the fourth century BC, the Athenians consulted an oracle on the topic of cultivating the sacred *orgas*, a parcel of land sacred to Demeter. A famous decree records the procedure of consultation as well as the response: officials sealed two jars containing a 'yes' and a 'no', respectively.¹⁰⁶ The Pythia was asked to choose one of the two; everything was done as transparently as possible to minimize tampering. Having many eyes on the procedures was very important. One goal of inscribing the procedures was to emphasize the legitimacy of the oracle's response. Recording the details of the procedure was meant to show the legitimacy of the consultation.

Of course, oracles themselves were not the only source of oracular corruption. A passage from the *Theognidea* warns the consulter about altering oracles he receives from the god:

It is necessary for the man who is a *theoros*, Kyrnos,
to be straighter than a carpenter's pin, rule, or square,
for whom the prophesying priestess of the god at Pytho
pours forth her holy voice from the rich *adyton*.
For neither adding anything would you find a cure,
nor subtracting anything would you avoid erring in the eyes of the gods.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵ On Alexander of Abonouteichos, see Lane Fox 1989, 253-260.

¹⁰⁶ *IG II² 204 = Syll³ 204.*

¹⁰⁷ Theog. 805-810: Τόρνου καὶ στάθμης καὶ γνώμονος ἄνδρα θεωρόν / εὐθύτερον χρή (ἔ)μεν, Κύρνε, φυλασσόμενον, / ᾧτινι κεν Πυθῶνι θεοῦ χρήσασ' ἰέρεια / ὀμφὴν σημήνη πίονος ἐξ ἐδύτου· / οὔτε τι γὰρ προσθεῖς οὐδὲν κ' ἔτι φάρμακον εὖροισ, / οὐδ' ἀφελῶν πρὸς θεῶν ἀμπλακίην προφύγοις. Maurizio 1997, 315 (tr.).

In order to “avoid erring in the eyes of the gods” one had to return with an uncorrupted response. Receiving a straight answer from the god required that no tampering could possibly occur. Therefore, the process of consultation was a matter of religious as well as administrative consequence. As the Athenian decree concerning the sacred *orgas* attests, asking simple yes or no questions was one way for visitors to obviate confusing responses and limit the opportunity for corrupted ambassadors, like Theognis’ *theoroi*, to alter the response that they were conveying back to their cities. Conventional practices at Corope did not guarantee protection against tampering or manipulation, which is why the community had to “take precaution” and why they chose to write their rules.

Not surprisingly, new procedures for consulting the oracle at Corope involved sealing the questions in jars and submitting them to various officials. Answers were then recorded, sealed, and passed to the visitor.¹⁰⁸ These rules added integrity to the oracular process. Having as many eyes (and seals) on the jars as possible helped prevent the corrupted oracular responses and would have helped ensure that responses were given to the proper recipient; recording the names of consulters on a white board would have reinforced the proper succession.¹⁰⁹ The streamlined process was also aesthetically pleasing.

1.3.2. *Eukosmia*: Appearances

That the officials at Corope were to be clothed in white and crowned with laurel demonstrates the importance of appearances during the oracular process. Many regulations concern proper attire, which was often related to purification. Visitors to an Asclepieion, for

¹⁰⁸ *IG IX 2*, 1109.30-49.

¹⁰⁹ *IG IX 2*, 1109.32-36.

instance, were to enter “into the great sleeping chamber ... in white robes, crowned with pure shoots of olive, having no ring, nor belt, nor gold, nor tied hair, and barefoot.”¹¹⁰ This was not unlike certain requirements for festivals: “let it be possible to send along (children) younger than seven... and to send along cavalry in colorful clothes so that the sacrifice and procession be as beautiful as possible for Asclepius”.¹¹¹ Although concern for proper dress is apparent at Corope, we cannot discern whether there was any previous rule governing such matters. Was this previously a matter for conventional, i.e. unwritten, rules?

According to Mylonopoulos: “Greek religion represents a view of the interaction between the human and divine levels, which is oriented towards action and practice and not necessarily toward reflection.”¹¹² At Corope, human-to-human interaction was certainly a crucial part of the ritual. Performing rites as beautifully as possible was commensurate with making the oracle as authentic as possible and thus making the shrine an attractive destination for oracle-seekers. This is especially salient if we take the phrase “The afore-written (individuals) shall be seated in the sanctuary in an orderly fashion in bright white garments, crowned with crowns of laurel, being pure and sober and having received the tablets from those consulting” to apply to both officials and visitors.

But the gods too were concerned about appearances: “In order that the rites for the god be done according to custom” is a common phrase found in Greek sacred laws.¹¹³ This sometimes entailed, more specifically, that rites be “as beautiful as possible” (ὡς κάλλιστα)

¹¹⁰ *I.v.Perg.* 264.8-11; *LSAM* 14 (Pergamum, third century AD): [εἰς τὸ] μέγα ἐνκοιμητήριον ὁ ἐγκο[ιμᾶσθαι βουλόμενος / ἐν ἱμα]τίοις λευκοῖς, ἀγνοῖς ἐλάας ἔ[ρνεσιν ἐστεμμένους], / [ἔχων μῆτε δακτ]ύλιον, μῆτε ζώνην, μ[ῆτε χρυσίον, μῆτε τὰς / [τρίχας πεπλεγμένα]ς, [ἀν]υπόδητο[ς].

¹¹¹ *IG XII 9*, 194.5-8 (Eretria, fourth or third century BC): ἐξέστω δὲ πένπειν κα[ὶ ... / το]ὺς νεωτέρους τῶν ἐπτὰ ἐτῶν· συμπ[ένπειν δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἰ]/ππεῖς τὴν πομπὴν ἐν ἐσθῆτι ποικίλ[η]ι, ὅπ[ως ἂν ὡς καλλίστη] / ἢ θυσία καὶ ἡ πομπὴ γίνηται τῶι Ἀσκληπιῶ[ι].

¹¹² Mylonopoulos 2006, 92. The Andanian inscription of 93/92 BC gives the most detailed restrictions for dress (*Syll*³ 736.15-26; *LSCG* 65). See Chaniotis 2006, 236-237.

¹¹³ A few other examples: *IG XII 9*, 194 (*LSCG* 93); *IG XII 5*, 196 (*LSS* 112); *SEG* 21.469C (*LSS* 14); *IG II² 1242* (*LSS* 125).

After all, the Eretrian decree for the Asclepeia calls for sacrifices and a procession to be done as beautifully as possible *for Asclepius*.¹¹⁴ In fact, it is often used as the justification for new regulations and suggests that improvements, perhaps changes, were taking place. The preoccupation with appearances included sacrifice: sacrificial victims often had to be full-grown and without blemish.¹¹⁵ What we see at Corope is a complex interaction between human and human, human and divine.¹¹⁶ The significance of human-divine interaction should not be ignored when analyzing the role of appearances in the regulations of Greek religious performances.¹¹⁷

Of course, temple officials had other duties besides passing along jars while dressed in fine clothing. Their actions and their very presence contributed to the mood appropriate for the ritual occasion, which was pleasing to gods and mortals alike.¹¹⁸ This is perhaps one reason why the priest of Amphiaraus at Oropus had to be present for a certain number of days.¹¹⁹ The presence of the priest provided official recognition for a given ritual or at least gave the sacrificer peace of mind that the ritual would turn out favorably.¹²⁰ On the other hand, the responsibilities of sacred officials included keeping order through coercion and threats of sanctions. Some rules concerning this authority were quite explicit while others were implied. As we shall see, implied sanctions gave the community more flexibility to maintain good order during ritual performances.

¹¹⁴ *IG XII 9*, 194.5-8.

¹¹⁵ E.g. *LSCG* 35, 41, 92, and *Syll³* 589.42 (*LSAM* 32). On *teleios* (full-grown), see Rosivach 1994, 91-93.

¹¹⁶ On ritual as communication, see Lee 2012, 115-135.

¹¹⁷ See Versnel 2011, 312-319 for a recent discussion on the prominent scholarly interpretations.

¹¹⁸ Of course some rites were solemn (e.g. Eleusinian Mysteries) whereas others were jovial (e.g. Cronia).

¹¹⁹ *I.Oropos* 277.1-6.

¹²⁰ See Stavrianopoulou 2006, 138-139.

1.3.3. Violent and Nonviolent Sanctions

The priest of Amphiaraus was empowered to compel (ἐπαναγκάζειν) the *neokoros* to look after the sanctuary and visitors. This suggests that the *neokoros* may have shirked his duties from time to time. The following clause seems to reinforce this idea: “he is to care for the sanctuary *according to the law*, and also look after those coming to the sanctuary.”¹²¹ If the requirement that the priest be present is a new rule, then rules governing the *neokoros*’ responsibilities were perhaps meant to supplement the priest’s obligations. After all, the priest is to oversee the *neokoros*. It also means that the *neokoros* had much discretion in handling sacred affairs. Who was better suited to determine “custom” than the temple warden who was there each day?¹²²

Of course magistrates, priests, oracles, and experts (*manteis*, *chresmologoi*, and *exegetai*) had varying degrees of religious authority, but the city of Oropus ultimately handed most day-to-day authority over to the *neokoros*. The singular use of the noun in the phrase *kata ton nomon*,¹²³ however, suggests a legal enactment that at least some would have known. Does “according to *the law*” mean that these provisions were recorded elsewhere before the publication of the decree? Was this enactment ignored or simply reposted here at the temple.¹²⁴ Although the *neokoros* has wide discretion in “tending to the visitors”, more precise rules are needed should disorder arise. What we see emerging is a combination of violent and nonviolent sanctions, human and divine punishments.

The *neokoros* must tend to *all*, including the many foreigners, who were then visiting the sanctuary. Rules then stipulated the administrative duties of the priest, particularly his

¹²¹ *I.Oropus* 277.6-8.

¹²² Or any other temple servant, including temple slaves (see Eur. *Ion* 315: ἅπαν (τὸ) θεοῦ μοι δῶμ’, ἴν’ ἂν λάβῃ μ’ ὕπνος).

¹²³ A typical phrase is κατὰ τοὺς νόμους, which suggests a more general usage.

¹²⁴ Some regulations seem to be extracts from other laws. See *LSS* nos. 88-104.

authority to exact punishment for offenses committed in the sanctuary.¹²⁵ This explicitly applied to worshippers, foreign and local.¹²⁶ The distinction between ξένος and δημότης reveals that all visitors were not viewed as equal. Were there different punishments for foreigners and citizens, respectively?

Officials at the Amphiareion have a limited degree of authority to punish transgressors:

If anyone commits an offense in the sanctuary whether a foreigner or a member of the community, let the priest have the power to inflict a penalty of up to five drachmas and let him take guarantees from the one punished, and if he pays the money let him deposit it into the treasury when the priest is present.¹²⁷

It was not unusual for priests to exact fines.¹²⁸ When the priest is present he was usually the most respected figure of authority in a sanctuary. But what sort of crimes is he responsible for punishing? Priest and visitor alike would need to be aware of what crimes were actionable and to what degree:

The priest is to give judgment if anyone individually, either foreigner or member of the community, is wronged in the sanctuary, up to a limit of three drachmas, but in respect to larger (infractions) let the cases take place where it is stated in the laws for each.¹²⁹

The meaning of the phrase “where it is stated in the laws for each” is unclear. Does “for each” refer to the ξένοι and δημόται respectively or to each specific crime committed?

Petropoulou has suggested that it refers to a special court (or courts) for foreigners.¹³⁰

Others suggest that the phrase implies individual agreements between Oropus and the

¹²⁵ *I.Oropos* 277.9: ἂν δέ τις ἀδικεῖ ἐν τοῖ ἱεροῖ.

¹²⁶ *I.Oropos* 277.8-9: ὁ ξένος ἢ δημότης.

¹²⁷ *I.Oropos* 277.9-13.

¹²⁸ See Naiden 2007, 132.

¹²⁹ *I.Oropos* 277.13-17.

¹³⁰ Petropoulou 1981, 52.

home city of those involved.¹³¹ Oropus was located on the border of Attica and Boiotia. This decree was issued during Oropus' period of independence from Thebes, and before it fell into Athenian hands.¹³² Disputed borders and shifting legal jurisdiction probably made imposing its own judicial authority on foreigners cumbersome. Grammatically, it seems more likely that "for each" refers to individual offenses, particularly the larger infractions committed within the confines of the sanctuary.

Moreover, the phrase "wronged individually" suggests actionable offenses such as theft or assault. Committing such an offense in a healing sanctuary threatened the ritual efficacy of the cult. Curse tablets show that even petty crimes could become the business of a god, especially when committed in a sanctuary.¹³³ Punching Demosthenes in the face is assault; doing so during a religious procession is *hybris*, a crime with religious ramifications.¹³⁴ Crimes committed within a sanctuary or at a religious festival were particularly repugnant because they polluted sacred space or would displease the god. The Andanian mystery law calls for a greater fine for anyone caught thieving during the sacrifices and mysteries.¹³⁵ Parker notes: if purification from spectacular forms of sacrilege is not attested it is because such offenses are inexpiable.¹³⁶ Nevertheless, the temptation to steal in a healing shrine where worshippers were vulnerable or incapacitated was probably too great for some to resist.

¹³¹ Osborne and Rhodes 2003, page 132.

¹³² Oropus' independence dates from the King's Peace in 386 BC until it fell into Athenian hands in 374 BC. See Knoepfler 1986, 90.

¹³³ Watson 1991, 95: An unidentified thief cannot be prosecuted, but the offended party could curse him. See Eidinow 2007, 147-148.

¹³⁴ See Dem. 21.47-49. But *hybris* may not always entail violence. See Harrison 1998, 168-169.

¹³⁵ *Syll*³ 736.75-77 (96 BC). With different penalties for free and slave: ἂν δέ τις ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις, ἐν αἷς αἶ τε θυσία καὶ τὰ μυστήρια γίνονται, ἀλῶι εἴτε κεκλεβῶς εἴτε ἄλλο τι ἀδίκη/μα πεποιηκῶς, ἀγέσθω ἐπὶ τοὺς ἱερούς· καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐλεύθερος, ἂν κατακριθεῖ, ἀποτινέτω δι/πλοῦν, ὁ δὲ δοῦλος μαστιγούσθω καὶ ἀποτεισάτω διπλοῦν τὸ κλέμμα. And line 78: περὶ τῶν κοπτόντων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. μηδεὶς κοπτέτω ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τόπου.

¹³⁶ Parker 1983, 144.

Sanctions at Corope reflect similar concerns. Naiden has recently argued that communities imposed sanctions whenever a transgression of religious practice threatened the community's wellbeing (or even survival).¹³⁷ Administering records, handling jars, and conducting worshippers at oracular shrines were all part of a highly ritualized performance. Failure to keep good order put all worshippers, sacred officials, and the shrine, essentially everyone participating, at risk. The community chose not to issue explicit sanctions against visitors who were out of line. Instead, the decree empowers officials, the *rhabdouchoi*, with the authority "to hinder anyone acting in a disorderly fashion".¹³⁸ The use of force is explicit in their name and mandate. What about non-violent sanctions, namely fines? The decree stipulates one instance of an actionable offense for which the penalty is a fine: if a *rhabdouchos* is knowingly absent, he must pay the city three drachmas.¹³⁹ An oath is appended to the decree. Officials must swear that they will abide by the decree and act justly.¹⁴⁰ This decree, then, is as much about adapting personnel to the increasing number of visitors as it is about informing those visitors of the customary way to consult the oracle.

One fragment of a second century BC decree from Delos provides rules aimed at preventing disorderly conduct: "Resolved... so that no one may act disorderly in the sacred halls of Apollo, neither in the dining halls ... nor in the chambers..."¹⁴¹ Disorderly conduct during iatromantic rites threatened the efficacy of rites. Another fragment explicates the temple personnel's responsibilities for keeping order. Although a number of lines are missing, the legible portion begins with prohibitions against animals, the procedures and

¹³⁷ Naiden 2007, 127-128.

¹³⁸ *IG IX 2*, 1109: 25-26.

¹³⁹ *IG IX 2*, 1109.28-29: εὐάν δέ τις (τῶν) καταγραφέντων εἰδῶς μὴ / παραγένηται, ἀποτεισάτω τῆι πόλει δραχμᾶς γ'.

¹⁴⁰ *IG IX 2*, 1109.54-58.

¹⁴¹ *SEG 48.1037A*, 1-6; *LSS 51* (Delos, third or second century BC): Ἔδοξεν... ὅπως [μη]/θεῖς ἐν τοῖς [ιεροῖς οἰ]κοῖς τοῦ Ἀπ[όλλω]/νος ἀτάκτως [ἀναστραφ]εῖ μηδὲ εἰς τὰ / ἔστιατόρια [...]υρας μηδὲ [εἰς τοὺς θαλά/μους].

sanctions that follow seem to refer to acts of disorderly conduct mentioned in the first fragment:

Those (who do these things) shall be punishable by the curses, and they shall be fined by the *hieropoioi*, the *boule*, and the other magistrates with the fine that each office is empowered to exact, and they shall exact it immune from scrutiny. And it shall be permitted for anyone who wishes to impeach (an offender) to the magistrates and collect half of the fine.¹⁴²

Although the entire decree concerns actions that take place within sacred space, it is difficult to discern which of the provisions in this decree should be classified as religious or administrative obligations. Of course, one rule states that priests and priestesses also have obligations to uphold: “The priests and priestesses are to pray according to custom” (ἐπεύχονται ἱε[ρ]εῖς τε καὶ ἱέρειαι κατὰ τὰ πάτρ[ια]).¹⁴³ The aim is to achieve *euphemia*, which is needed for *eukosmia*. That offenders are punishable by curses (*arai*) demonstrates that offenses made in the sanctuary, including one with such a wide net as *ataxia*, are religious offenses actionable in the realms of both divine and human justice, a conventional sanction against those who commit impious acts.¹⁴⁴

1.4. Conclusion

Communities were willing to adapt traditional ritual procedures at their iatromantic shrines in order to keep their cults attractive and consultations accessible. This entailed either reevaluating rites that were outdated due to increased traffic or reaffirming old rites that were unclear to visitors and officials. Whether these communities were changing or

¹⁴² SEG 48.1037B, 4-11: ... ἐνόχους μὲν εἶναι καὶ ταῖς ἀραις, / ζημιοῦσθαι δὲ αὐτοὺς καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερο/ποιῶν καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν λοι/πῶν ἀρχόντων τῆι ζημίαι ἢ ἐκάστη κυ/ρία ἐστὶν ἢ ἀρχὴ ζημιοῦν, καὶ εἰσπράσσειν / ἀνευθύνοισ οὖσιν· ἐξεῖναι δὲ καὶ εἰσαν/γέλλ[ει]ν εἰς τὰ[ς ἀρ]χὰς τῶι βουλομένωι / καὶ λαμ[βά]νειν τὸ ἥμισυ.

¹⁴³ SEG 48.1037B.17-18.

¹⁴⁴ Rubenstein 2005, 273-279 has shown that these curses worked in combination with polis sanctions to ensure individuals complied with laws that protected the community.

reaffirming is not entirely clear to us. What is clear is that sociopolitical changes led to more visitors coming to the oracle of Apollo at Corope. As a result, the community had to rethink its religious and administrative procedures, which were one and the same. The very fact that these procedures were now written suggests that communities were rethinking how best to serve the visitors to the sanctuary, temple personnel, and the god. Whenever changes did occur, the pretext was *eukosmia*, which gave the god what he really wanted: aesthetically pleasing rites.

Political factors mattered as well. Were some of these *xenoi* coming to Corope Romans? The evidence does not provide any information to answer this question; but the impact of Roman rule on local religions elsewhere is well attested.¹⁴⁵ The end to the ongoing Macedonian Wars did, however, open central Greece to more secure trade, travel, and tourism.¹⁴⁶ Expanding networks also facilitated changes in socioeconomic and cultural norms. In the next chapter we shall offer an analysis of such changes and their impact on local religious practices.

¹⁴⁵ For example, prayers for the Romans at the renewed Thargelia at Athens (*SEG* 21.469C.57-58). See Chapter 4.

¹⁴⁶ See Alcock 1993, 224-225.

2. Innovations in Cult Finance

A third century sacred law from Halicarnassus outlines the rights and obligations that will go to the purchaser of the priesthood of Artemis Pergaia.¹ The priestess must collect money, i.e. conduct a ritual begging, three days before the festival of the goddess. The rationale behind this rule is unstated. Nor is it clear at first whether this rule was an extension or a contraction of the priestess' rights and obligations. In what follows, I shed light on these questions by putting this often-cited, but under-analyzed inscription within the context of socioeconomic changes taking place in Hellenistic cities. As we shall see, ritual begging represents one of the many strategies with which communities experimented in order to finance the growing number of religious obligations.

Ritual begging was both an administrative procedure and a religious performance. The reevaluation of this practice took place against a backdrop of social and legal change. For instance, as the role of women in the religious and civic life of the Hellenistic polis was expanding, communities began reassessing traditional practices like ritual collection. This parallels the concerns some communities had over this expanding role but also reflects a robust experimentation in cult finance taking place in Hellenistic cities. This spirit of experimentation coincided with the rise of alternative means of collecting revenue that culminated in the Roman period.

The reevaluation of ritual begging should be analyzed in the context of fiscal experimentations taking place around the Greek world. Because people were flocking to cities in large numbers communities had to devise new ways to fund civic cults and

¹*Syll*³ 1015; *LSAM* 73 (Halicarnassus, third century BC). See Appendix C.

festivals;² they had to adopt temporary and/or long-term strategies that would not only ensure needed funds and but also not conflict with growing social concerns.

Some new rules proliferated in an increasingly cosmopolitan age, but many of the practices that these rules regulated were old traditions. Wealthy benefactors and entrepreneurs were a fitting target for greater obligations when cities were hard pressed. When cities needed funds quickly, local elites were encouraged to donate sums of money or pay for festivals, warships, and building projects among other things.³ But festival financing could also be a path to profits; individuals sometimes bid for the rights to finance festivals and sacrifices. Thus, cities facilitated a range of such private initiatives in order to free public treasuries from the burden; meanwhile, these strategies provided useful outlets for elite competition over local honor and prestige. But in the end, communities, employing both carrot and stick, were not intending merely to make cult finance more efficient; civic cults needed money, lest they die.

2.1. Pledge Drives, Benefactors, and Competition for Honor

The first part of this chapter provides the socioeconomic context in which ritual begging flourished. I pay particular attention to alternative strategies for funding religious obligations and the conditions under which ritual begging became a questionable practice. In what directly follows, I shed light on the distinct strategies that communities employed to satisfy what were typically one-time or exigent needs. Such strategies formed one side of the revenue-collecting coin. That Hellenistic communities were hard pressed to fund an

² See Davies 1984, 267.

³ On the reciprocal relationship between benefactors and their cities, see Gygas 2009, 166.

accruing number of ritual obligations was not, however, a Hellenistic phenomenon.⁴ A

Lindian decree from AD 22, although from the Roman period, encapsulates many of the challenges that Hellenistic communities faced:

Decree of Hippias son of Hippias son of Hippias, from the deme Argos. Concerning the deposit for Athena: When Aristeidas was priest of Athena and of Pleistarchos was priest of Helios, on the 16th of Panamos. Resolved by the *mastroi* and Lindians; Hippias the third from the deme Argos proposed: *since it happens on the one hand that the revenues of the Lindians are late, and on the other that the expenditures for the sacrifices and festivals are pressing and that in this way the magistrates have fallen into a difficult position; and since it is beneficial for the Lindians that the honors for the gods and the propriety of the community be preserved from existing funds ready for the festivals and honors for the gods. With Good Fortune...*⁵

The decree honors individuals who contributed to a special fund that helped pay for the sacrifices and festivals.⁶ It is worth noting that the revenues of the Lindians were late (ὕστερεῖν), not necessarily non-existent. The phrase is unfortunately vague as to the cause and nature of the shortfall. Had collectors been remiss? Had revenues fallen short in general, or were specific earmarks at issue? Did a dearth of funds originate with the population or was this a narrow fiscal problem. We do not know, but the decree demonstrates the difficulties of financing cults and how a community devised an ad hoc strategy to ensure that its festival continued despite logistical difficulties. One way to obviate such difficulties was to offer honors and privileges to individuals who would pay for cults and festivals in advance.

⁴ The clearest example from the Classical period is Lysias 30.18-19 (early fourth century BC), in which we learn of the tensions that accumulating ritual obligations could engender. As for meeting these needs, Shipley 2000, 98-102: Hellenistic benefactions could be seen as a continuation of the use of liturgies in the Classical period.

⁵ *Lindos II* 419.1-10 (AD 22); Migeotte 1992, no. 41; *LSS* 90: ψάφισμα Ἰππία Ἰππία τοῦ Ἰππία Ἀργείου / περὶ τῶν παρακαταθήκων τῶν Ἀθάνων. ἐπ' ἱερέως τῶν Ἀθάνων / Ἀριστείδα, τοῦ δὲ Ἀλίου Πλε[ι]/στάρχου, Πα(νάμου) ις, ἔδοξε μασ[τ]ροῖς καὶ Λινδίοις· Ἰππίας γ' Ἀργ(εῖος) εἶπε· / ἐπειδὴ συνβαίνει τὰς μὲν ποθόδους τὰς Λινδίων ὕστερεῖν, τὰ δὲ εἰ[ς] / τὰς θυσίας καὶ πανηγύ[ρ]εις ἀναλ[ώ]ματα πολλάκις ἐπέγειν καὶ τοῦ/[τ]ῶ τρόπῳ τοὺς ἄρχοντας εἰς δυσ[σχρ]ηστίαν ἐνπιέπειν, συμφέ[ρ]ον δὲ ἐστὶ Λινδ[ί]οις κ[α]ὶ τὰ[ς] τῶ[ν] θεῶν τειμὰς καὶ τὸ τοῦ [κ]οινοῦ / πρέπον διαφυλά[σσει]σθαι, ὅ[ν]τος ἐξ ἐτοίμου ἀργυρίου εἰς τὰς / πανηγύρεις καὶ τ[ὰ]ς τῶν θεῶν τειμὰς, τύχῃ ἀγαθῇ...

⁶ See Migeotte 1992, 123.

2.1.1. Pledge Drives and Benefactors: Testing Legislative Capacity

A pledge drive was one way for communities to gather money for a particular cause. A third-century decree from Orchomenos notes the contributions for the temple of Asclepius, particularly for the restoration or adornment of statues.⁷ At Tanagra, funding to move the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore was partly undertaken by a group of individuals, all women, who were called upon to make contributions for the project.⁸ Such concerted fund-raising initiatives worked well for one-time projects,⁹ but were logistically difficult to organize for recurring needs. Officials like the priestess of Artemis Pergaia could canvas the town for donations, but such strategies were not always practical (or pleasant). Encouraging wealthy individuals to make large contributions was another way for communities to defray the cost of religious practices and avoid difficulties like the one that befell Lindos. Of course, individuals who took it upon themselves to perform a service to the community received honors and benefits in return for their services.¹⁰ In many cases civic benefactors are rewarded with *proedria*, prominent positions in civic processions, and elaborate funeral rites.¹¹ That Athenian ephebes performed sacrifices and rituals for “the gods and benefactors” shows that benefactors might aspire even to perpetual honors, favors, and gratitude.¹² There was much for both city and benefactor to gain.

⁷ Migeotte 1992, no. 27.2-3 (Orchomenos, 250-220 BC): τοῖ [σ]υνεβάλονθο ἐν τὸν ναὸν [τῶ] Ἀσχλαπιῶ. 37-39: τυῖ σ[υν]εβάλονθ[ο] ἐν τὸν ναὸν τῶ Ἀσχ]λαπιῶ, ἀρχόντων [ἐπι τὰν ἐπισκευὰν τῶν ἀ]γαλμάτων.

⁸ Migeotte 1992, no. 28 (Tanagra, ca. 200 BC); Roller 1989, no. 87.

⁹ A nice example is Archippe of Cyme whom the city honored for funding a new council house and distributions of wine and food to the people. See *SEG* 33.1035-1041 (end of the second-century BC); Gygax 2009, 163; van Bremen 1996, 13-19.

¹⁰ Honorary inscriptions (our best evidence for such behavior) record a wide array of rewards that were both honorific and monetary. See Zuiderhoek 2009, 6-7; Gauthier 1985, 24-38 and 103-111.

¹¹ See Zuiderhoek 2009, 7; Gauthier 1985, 60-63.

¹² *IG* II² 1006.15-16: συντέλεσαν δὲ καὶ τὰς ἄλλας θυσίας τὰς καθήκουσα[ς τοῖς θε]οῖς καὶ τοῖς εὐεργέταις. See also *IG* II² 1008.25-26 and 1009.36-37. Robert 1926, 499-500.

Certain individuals and families were well positioned to rescue cities in times of financial difficulty. By the Hellenistic period, “A few individuals were so rich that they could serve the public good on a scale never before seen.”¹³ Using private wealth for public good was expected and encouraged. In other words, a carrot often worked better than a stick. A case in point comes from a third-century BC inscription honoring a certain Cleopantus from Arcesine on Amorgus who donated a large sum of money to pay for the Itonia. He announced in the agora that all foreigners and citizens could attend the festival “without contributions” (ἄσυμβόλους).¹⁴

Cleopantus gave 2,500 drachmas to pay the sum of their contributions.¹⁵ His civic-mindedness freed everyone attending the festival from paying the required entrance fee (*symbola*).¹⁶ *Symbola* seem to have served a crucial logistical role for festival funding by allowing only individuals who contributed to partake in the festivities; anyone who wanted to attend the festival had to make the required *symbolon* “contribution”.

Symbola also had a deeply rooted socioeconomic and religious significance.¹⁷ A *symbolon* represented the relationship between guest friends (*xenia*). Although recognition of *xenia* took place whenever guest friendships were established and reestablished, the procedures were quite ritualized. Feasting, swearing oaths, gift exchange, and the

¹³ Shipley 2000, 98.

¹⁴ IG XII 7, 22.9 (Amorgus, third century BC): πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἴτωνία ἄσυμβόλους.

¹⁵ IG XII 7, 22.18-19: τὸ εἰς τὰς συμβολὰς γιγόμενον.

¹⁶ IG XII 7, 22.21-22: ἀφῆκεν ἀτελεῖς τοὺς ἰόντας τῶν συμβολῶν. Christopher Jones has shown that in such cases a *symbolon* refers to the contribution of money to finance a festival. Hence, *symbolaphoroi* are “bringers of contributions” rather than “carriers of sacred objects” as previously thought (Jones 2008, 202). Migeotte has argued that the verb συμβάλλεσθαι was an equivalent of ἐπιδίδωμι, “I hand over” (Migeotte 1992, 25-26 and 74-75).

¹⁷ *Symbolon* has a range of socioeconomic meanings. According to the LSJ, a *symbolon* could be any kind of tally, literally a symbol (Gauthier 1972, 65-66: et, comme dans un puzzle, seules les deux parties du même objet pourront coïncider). As Gabriel Herman has noted that any object marked by distinctive attributes could serve, i.e. two corresponding halves or pieces of an object that two *xenoi* or contracting parties broke between them. It is a token of goodwill, a seal, and a treaty. All that was needed to add significance was an exchange and the parties’ mutual consent to invest an object with its function (Herman 1987, 65).

widespread cult of Zeus *Xenios* distinguished the practice. Such a ritualized exchange is most famously described in *Iliad* Book 6 where Diomedes and Glaucus exchange armor on the battlefield at Troy.¹⁸ *Symbola* in guest-friendships are not altogether unlike those used for financing festivals. They were also tokens that conferred privileges on the holder. Concerning rites for Demeter, a second century AD oracle from Didyma pronounced: “it is especially necessary for the residents around spear-bearing Neleus (to give honors to the goddess); for there still belongs to these people the tokens (σύμβολα) of sacred birth that qualify them to perform here the rites of Deo and her daughter Deoīs.”¹⁹ Thus *symbola* referred to tokens of exchange or sacred objects that gave someone access to the divine. They formed an important sacred component of ritual procedure. At Amorgos, they were fees that granted access to the festival.

That Cleophantus made his announcement “in the agora” unfortunately does not tell us how far in advance attendees were typically required to make their contributions. Was the announcement made the morning of the festival or a week before? Maybe it was far enough in advance so that officials could plan accordingly. On the other hand, the system of using *symbola* at Amorgos does not necessarily preclude that an unofficial tally of prospective attendees did not take place beforehand. For administrative purposes, it was easier to plan a festival if certain details were known in advance, especially the number of attendees. After all, for how many people would the organizers have to plan? How much would sacrifices cost? Calendars helped regularize the expectation for a given sacrifice, but

¹⁸ *Il.* 6.199-235. Also, Telemachus and Mendes in *Od.* 1.115; see Herman 1987, 58-59.

¹⁹ *I. Didyma* 496B (second century AD). ἔξοχα δ' αὖ Νειλήος ἀκοντοδόκου ναετήρας· / τοῖσι γὰρ εὐγενίης ζαθέης ἔτι σύμβολα, ῥέζ[ειν] / Δημοῦς καὶ κούρης Δηωίδος ὄργια τῆδε. See Fontenrose 1988, no. 23 (page 197) and Cole 2008, 56.

logistical uncertainties persisted.²⁰ The intervention of a wealthy benefactor allowed the community to plan for the festival and avoid the possibility of a shortfall of available funds. Although it did little to regularize financing of festivals for the future, it at least made a large-scale pledge drive or ritual collection unnecessary. Through large outlays, festival finance thus became temporarily secured and was beneficial for all parties involved. In a way, consolidation and centralization of funding, not by the city but by an elite few private individuals, was crucial in maintaining a community's ever-growing number of ritual obligations. But this could not have been a permanent solution. Cities could not depend on private benefactors to pay for each religious obligation, could they? After all, benefactors had other non-religious obligations as well.²¹

Conversely, paying for a festival would be a boon for the city but could present unpleasant difficulties for the payer. The advanced payment of *symbola* was not a reoccurring activity. If the Itonia were held every year, then it follows that a collection or tally of *symbola* was made each year in advance. Who collected these contributions in normal years? Presumably civic and sacred officials would have to conduct the collection themselves. Although reprieves afforded by individuals like Cleophantus allowed the city to plan for the festival without worrying about performing the actual collection, it is conceivable that other benefactors might ask for reimbursement from some if not all attendees. But collecting from hundreds of individuals, some of whom were foreigners, would have been a major hassle. Cleophantus had no intention of being repaid, which is why he received an honorific decree. Others, hoping to profit, did expect repayment. Some

²⁰ Political circumstances could alter a community's sacrifices as in the case of the *synoecism* of Myconus (see *LSCG* 96). Calendars were sometimes the subject of disputes (*Lys.* 30.18-19)

²¹ Such as funding for war and public buildings.

learned how difficult it was to be reimbursed by both cities and individuals, and paid a steep price.

Funding a festival was a great opportunity to win honor, but also to make a profit. If not careful, however, it could have disastrous consequences. In 247 BC a certain Theopropus drafted a letter to Apollonius, the *dioiketes* of Egypt. In the letter, he charges that his city, Calynda in Caria, failed to repay him for the wine he supplied for a festival.²² Theopropus had purchased the right to furnish the wine at a price of 850 drachmas. He proceeded to borrow the money needed to purchase it. Because the pledges had not materialized,²³ the city was unable to reimburse Theopropus, thereby sticking him with the debt. This cautionary tale shows the risk and complexity of financing festivals. Ambitious individuals could imperil their fortunes when attempting to profit from these ventures. Cleophantus of Amorgus was evidently wealthy enough to pay the *symbola* outright without reimbursement. Theopropus could not absorb the cost. He was looking for a profit, not an honorific decree. He received neither.

Of course, festival financing did not always fall to one individual. A sliding scale of contributions is clear from other inscriptions. A certain Agathinus was honored for having expended five hundred drachmas for the Itonia at Arcesine,²⁴ far less than the 2,500 that Cleophantus expended a century before.²⁵ A Roman inscription from Dereköy, in western

²² *P. Cair. Zen.* III 59341a (Cypranda on Cyprus, 247 BC).

²³ Many received honorific decrees on the expectation that they would contribute the amount they pledged (see Gygax 2009, 163-192). Clearly, some never followed through on their pledges.

²⁴ *IG XII Suppl.* 330.10-14 (Amorgos, second century BC): παρήγγει[λ]εν ἐν τεῖ ἀ[γ]ορᾷ πρὸς / τῆ[ς ἐ]ορτῆς [μ]ετὰ κη[ρ]ύγματο[ς πορεύεσ]θαι εἰς τὰ / Ἴτόνια Ἀρκεσινεῖς πάν[τας] καὶ τοῦ[ς οἰκοῦ]ντας / [ἐν Ἀρκ]εσίνῃ καὶ ξένους τοὺς παρε[πιδημοῦντας / ἐπ'] ἀτελ[είαι] πασῶν τῶν συμβολῶν [καὶ] τῶν [ἄλλων ἀ/πάντων...]. Lines 20-23: πάντα καὶ γενομ[έ]νου το[ῦ] ἀ[ναλ]ώμ[α]τος εἰς μ[ὲν] τὰ ἰε/[ρ]εῖα δραχμῶν πεντ[ηκο]σίων / ... π[ε]ντηκοσία[ς] δραχμάς.

²⁵ *IG XII* 7, 22.16-22: ἀνάλωσεν εἰς τὰ / ἱερεῖα πρὸς τῶι ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἔλαβε δρα/χμάς πεντακοσίας καὶ τὸ εἰς τὰς συμβο/λάς γινόμενον δραχμάς δισχιλίας πεν/τακοσίας, καὶ τοῦτο ἅπαν ἐπέδωκεν καὶ / ἀφῆκεν ἀτελεῖς τοὺς ἰόντας τῶν συμβο/λῶν.

Lycia, lists numerous contributors to a local festival. The verb συνβολαφορεῖν is used in conjunction with the amount of contribution by each of the sixty-four individuals for the festival for Zeus on the Summit.²⁶ These individuals gave varied sums of money for the cause.

Cleophantus' contribution should be seen in the context of the various types of contributions, from *symbola* to *epidoseis*,²⁷ which helped communities finance religious obligations. In this case, Cleophantus was “contributing the whole sum” (ἅπαν ἐπέδωκεν). Many lists of contributors contain the names of women and even children.²⁸ A certain Nicareta of Thespiiai lent a significant sum of money (18,333 drachmas) to the neighboring town of Orchomenos. The city was evidently having great difficulties paying this sum back. Eventually, Orchomenos was able to persuade Nicareta to accept a contract guaranteeing the repayment of the principal of the loan.²⁹ Two other Boiotian women, Kleuedra and Olympicha, lent the small town of Kopai a large sum of money that it could not pay back. The two women agreed to remit the debt in exchange for grazing rights for their flocks.³⁰ In the Hellenistic period, women, individually and collectively, were becoming increasingly active in euergetism, especially in financing cults and festivals.³¹ For the transfer of their sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, the Tanagrans relied on contributions of money and materials from the town's women.³²

²⁶ Wörrle and Würster 1997, 399-461, especially 402-421. (Ca. AD 140). Text B.38-39 (page 405): εἰς ἅς ὀφείλλει συνβολαφορεῖν. Text C.5-6: Zeus on the Summit (ἐν ἄκρῳ Διός).

²⁷ Gygax 2009, 163: *epidoseis* were voluntary contributions made by citizens (sometimes foreign residents) in response to an appeal by the assembly, ratified by a decree.

²⁸ Migeotte 1992, 368-371. In the case of children, the donations were made by the families.

²⁹ An inscription (*IG VII 3172*), dated to 223 BC, records this contract. See Migeotte 1984, no. 13 and van Bremen 1996, 208-212.

³⁰ Migeotte 1984, no. 15 (ca. 200 BC).

³¹ See Migeotte 1992, 371-376, van Bremen 1996, 37-38.

³² Migeotte 1992, no. 28. Roller 1989, 102-103.

It is against this backdrop of socioeconomic developments that ritual begging took place. Any time that a wealthy benefactor or ambitious entrepreneur offered to pay some or all expenses was a tremendous boon for the community; but a community could not depend on this mode of financing alone. *Epidoseis* were sometimes even less reliable. Individuals who pledged money may not necessarily follow through.³³ As a result, some cults and festivals would inevitably slip through the cracks. Royal benefactions could run dry and local elites were not always reliable either, at least according to Aristotle.³⁴ Polybius claims that the kings of his day were far less generous than their predecessors.³⁵ A regularized means of collecting revenue still had valuable use. Many communities relied on other strategies such as ritual begging.

In some places, priestesses received new rights and privileges that aimed to facilitate the financing of cults. At the same time, specific provisions aimed to protect women from too many obligations that could be damaging to their reputations. These rights and obligations reflected changing socioeconomic norms and required written explication. While uncertainty over social propriety looms large behind these innovations, so too does the desire to make priesthoods as desirable as possible – especially where they were sold to the highest bidder.

³³ Gygax 2009, 163-191: communities issued proleptic honors to encourage contributions. Pledges were not always honored (168-170).

³⁴ Aristot. *Pol.* 1321a.36-41.

³⁵ Polyb. 5.90: Polybius details the generous gifts to Rhodes following the devastating earthquake in 224 BC in order to praise the Rhodians for their conduct and point out the insignificance of benefactions in his own day (δεύτερον δὲ τῆς τῶν νῦν βασιλέων μικροδοσίας καὶ τῆς τῶν ἔθνῶν καὶ πόλεων μικροληψίας). Polybius may be overstating for rhetorical effect (see Dmitriev 2005, 49-50), but it does seem as though there was an inconsistency of benefactions. Notable catastrophes provided kings with public relations opportunities. Needs of smaller communities were not always a priority. See Bringmann 1995, 93-102.

2.1.2. Competition for Access: Sales of Priesthoods

The priesthood of Artemis Pergaia at Halicarnassus was sold. This fact has significant implications for the way in which the priestess was required to beg, as described in its sale decree. In fact, the sale of priesthoods had a significant bearing on the administration of a number of Greek cults. An examination of this practice will help explain why begging became such a concern in some communities and may help explain why others developed different strategies for filling temple treasuries.

That so many cities in Asia Minor sold their priesthoods prompts numerous questions. Why sell priesthoods?³⁶ What benefit did a community receive from selling its priesthoods?³⁷ How were sales of priesthoods religiously justified? In what follows, I examine the social tensions behind sales of priesthoods. While for some communities sales may have helped finance cults and relieve certain social tensions, it may have kindled a fire under others. Records and decrees for these sales always include important information about cults, namely the rights and obligations for the buyer: term of office, honors, duties and expectations, exemptions, and even legal privileges.

Concern over the sale of priesthoods is evident in a first-century BC decree from Heraclea-by-Latmus.³⁸ The people wondered: should the priesthood be determined by sale or annual election? While religious and administrative responsibilities varied from cult to cult,³⁹ such a decision would have a profound impact on the administration of the cult and its concomitant religious practices. It must be said that we do not know whether the traditional mode of acquisition at Heraclea was sale or inheritance. Explicit information on

³⁶ Rostovtzeff thought priesthood sale was a type of tax (1941, 895-896).

³⁷ See Dignas 2006, 71-84 on the mutual benefits for priests and communities.

³⁸ *SEG* 40.956 (100-75 BC).

³⁹ See Chaniotis 2008, 26-29.

such matters is frustratingly absent from the decree. Nevertheless, it is clear enough that religious, economic, and political considerations played no small role in the apparent reevaluation that was underway. After all, the priest or priestess was the symbolic, religious, and often administrative authority in a sanctuary. His or her mode of appointment may determine tenure, honor (including perquisites), obligations, and access to the treasury.

Uncertain whether or not it should change its traditional mode of acquisition, the city of Heraclea asked the god at Didyma for help.⁴⁰ He replied:

So that you may appoint a priest who carries out the rites of the well-armed Pallas and sacred Tritonis in a way pleasing to the goddess and the whole people, with good decisions and the best counsel, hear the all-truthful divine speech of Phoebus: him who is in birth and manner of life most excellent, you shall select from all citizens each year applying the care and zeal which are necessary for such matters, for it is right that only such men approach the *anaktoron* of the goddess.⁴¹

The oracle's response adumbrates the significance of the mode of priestly appointment for the priest's main obligation: doing whatever is pleasing to the gods. Here, the question pertaining to appointment revolves around the social standing of the priest. That the people were to choose him "who is in birth and manner of life most excellent" is a not-so-subtle hint that the god wants a particular faction to hold the priesthood. Such individuals were sometimes, but not always,⁴² thought to bring stability and expertise to the office.

Term of office was perhaps a major point of contention for priesthoods that were sold. A third-century decree from Tomi explicates the rights and obligations of the buyer: he

⁴⁰ Probably at Didyma, but the text does not say.

⁴¹ *SEG* 40.956.8-16 (Wörle 1990, 23-24): θεὸς ἔχρησεν. / ὡς ἂν Πάλλαδος εὐόπλου Τριτωνίδος ἀγνῆς / ἱερὰ δρώντα θεῶι τε φιλῶς σύμπαντι τε δήμῳ / θῆσθε σὺν ἐσθλαΐσιν γνώμαις βουλήι τε κρατίστη[ι] / κέκλυτε Φοιβείην παναληθέα θέσφατον αὐδὴν· / ὅς γένει ἠδὲ βίου τάξει προφερέστατος ἔστιν, / αἰρεῖσθε ἐκ πάντων ἀστῶν λυκάβαντος ἐκάστου / [φρ]οντίδα καὶ σπουδὴν ἣν χρῆ θέμενοι περὶ τῶνδε, / [το]ίους γὰρ θέμις ἐστὶ θεῆς πρὸς ἀνάκτορα βαίνειν.

⁴² See Chaniotis 2008, 17-30 and Cole 2008, 61-62.

is to be priest of the Samothracian gods for life and provide the wood for sacrifices on the 7th of the month of Apatoureon.⁴³ Lifetime tenure, however, could limit the amount of money a community could raise and also limit the number of participants. That is perhaps why the tenure for most sold priesthoods was for a shorter period of time, usually a year. Lifetime tenure would mean handing over permanent ritual authority to one person and his family, since he would serve for life (ἱερωσύνη διὰ βίου), as in the case of Lysimache at Athens.⁴⁴ How different would the cult of Athena Polias at Athens have been if the *Eteoboutidai* had not staked a hereditary claim to its priesthood? Lysimache was priestess of the cult for sixty-four years in the fifth and early fourth centuries; her brother, Lysicles, held the office of Secretary of the Treasurers in 416/5, which suggests that elite families had tremendous influence on civic finances.⁴⁵ Likewise a change in the mode of appointment would inevitably affect the cult's finances: "they would identify with the cult and handle the sacred revenues in an authoritative way, and their prestige would mainly be based on their function as priest."⁴⁶ Perhaps this was one priestly responsibility that the community wanted to regulate.

Priestly perquisites were a matter of contention as well. Sacrificers were required to know which portions of their kill went to the priest and which they could keep or eat. Would a priest who bought his office claim more or less than a hereditary one? It seems reasonable to suppose that increasing the perquisites would make the priesthood more attractive and thus more expensive; it was perhaps part of a community's strategy to coax participation and drive up the cost. The writing down of such provisions on sale decrees

⁴³ *LSCG* 87.1-5 (second or first century BC): ὁ πριάμενος τὴν ἱερω/σύνην τῶν μυστῶν θεῶν τῶν ἐν /Σαμοθράκη ἱερῆσεται διὰ βίου καὶ / Απατουρεῶνος ἐβδόμη παρέξ/ει εἰς τὰ ἱερά σχιζας.

⁴⁴ *IG* II² 3453; *Plin. NH.* 34.76; see Connelly 2007, 130-131.

⁴⁵ See Connelly 2007, 59-60.

⁴⁶ Dignas 2002a, 267; see also 2002c, 33.

suggests either change to traditional practice or uncertainty over particular features of the practice. Of course, such decrees also serve to hold the priest or priestess accountable.

Although sale decrees often bestowed shelter from obligations such as liturgies while enhancing privileges (thereby making the priesthood more attractive⁴⁷) they also set limits on their authority. The Heracleian decree shows that the community was unwilling to concede too much autonomy to its priest. This is made clear in the rule requiring the city to pick a new priest each year. But the community had a different concern: to have the most excellent and well-born individual serve as priest.⁴⁸ How did priestly appointment (sale, election, or allotment) factor in this determination?

The sale of priesthoods does not seem to have posed ethical or religious problems.⁴⁹ The community (and the god) seems less concerned about the way someone acquired the post than the person's competence in the discharge of duties. This is not to say, however, that there was no *perceived* connection between acquisition and piety among some in the community. In fact, Apollo's response to the Heracleians was rather elaborate and quite nuanced, ordering the people to select a priest who is most excellent with regard to ancestry and lifestyle.⁵⁰ Certain socio-political factions perhaps fit this description. As we shall see, some traditionally deemed themselves more fitting than others to guide the state and its cults. Sale of priesthoods to the highest bidder would not ensure that an individual with a suitable lineage fills the post.⁵¹ The oracle's decision puts the onus back onto the city

⁴⁷ Granting buyers tax or liturgy exemptions reflect the need on behalf of the community to fill the post and/or an attempt to drive the price of the auction up. The goal was to make the priesthood as attractive as possible. Honors as well as obligations attended the post. Certainly some cults were more attractive than others and therefore garnered more interest. See *LSAM* 25.

⁴⁸ See Dignas 2002c, 33.

⁴⁹ Wörrle 1990, 44.

⁵⁰ *SEG* 40.956.14-16. See note above.

⁵¹ Contra Dignas 2002a, 267-268 who claims that elite families bought priesthoods; therefore members would not have a record of misbehavior.

to *elect* those whom it determines to hold certain values.⁵² We may be seeing a latent or growing tension between factions of the city over the authority to manage civic cults. At Heraclea, the addition of written procedure for selecting the priest reflected the concerns for the most conventional of norms, descent and lifestyle, that according to the oracle were the requisite qualities for performing pious services to the god and city. Although sale was ruled out, the oracle left the method for filling the post to the city's discretion. In fact, the decree only states that the city must select the priest from among all the citizens (αἰρεῖσθε ἐκ πάντων ἀστῶν). It is unclear whether αἰρεῖσθε means election or choice by lot. Here, the oracle gives the city some flexibility. If election or lot was the conventional practice, then the oracle reaffirmed an existing norm. On the other hand, if sale was the custom, then the oracle overturned that norm.

Moreover, the selling of priesthoods might be seen as a symptom of corruption. In a Roman decree from AD 44, Paullus Fabius Persicus complained that the Ephesians filled their priesthoods "just as they make sales at an auction" and the Ephesians "convene men from every family to purchase them." Although the Fabius's consternation may be attributed to cultural differences,⁵³ his main concern is that the community is not selecting the most fitting candidates worthy of the priesthood.⁵⁴ Not every city that sold its priesthoods practiced such cronyism, but partisan interests and perceptions were nonetheless real. The oracle's choice of election over sale at Heraclea was a compromise

⁵² See Parker 1985, 298-326 (especially 298-304 and 314-315) who addresses the question "to what extent were Greek states prepared to cede to the god an important share in decisions that affected their own interests?"

⁵³ Yet Roman officials were usually aware of, even tolerant of, Greek religious customs that differed greatly from Roman. See Pliny 10.49 and 10.50: Pliny writes to Trajan about the rebuilding or transfer of a temple of Magna Mater. Trajan replies that Pliny should not worry about consecrating the temple since the Greeks have different customs (10.50: quod lex dedicationis nulla reperitur, cum solum peregrinae civitatis capax non sit dedicationis, quae fit nostro iure).

⁵⁴ *I Ephesos* Ia, 18b.14-19 (AD 44): ποιούμενοι τὰς ἱεροσύνας ὡσπερ ἐν ἀπαρτεία πιπράσκουσιν καὶ ἐκ παντὸς γένους ἐπὶ τὴν ὄνην αὐτῶν συνκ(α)λοῦσιν ἀνθρώπους, εἶτα οὐκ ἐγγέγονται τοὺς ἐπιτηδαιοτάτους, ὧν ταῖς κεφαλαῖς ὁ πρέπων ἐπιτεθῆσεται στέφανος. See Migeotte 1984, no. 90. Dignas 2002a, 150-153 and 180-193.

between various competing interests. It checked the growing ambitions of wealthy non-elites while maintaining the possibility that they had the opportunity to obtain the post through election or allotment. Moreover, that appointment was only for one year (λυκάβαντος ἐκάστου) may have prevented any one family from monopolizing the post. In the end, election or allotment allowed the cosmopolitan and traditional elites to compete, even if on an unequal level.

At Heraclea-by-Latmus the assembly and council referred their concerns to an outside authority, notably an oracle, over the legitimacy of proposed changes to method of priesthood acquisition; but they were not alone. Through extant regulations we can see communities deliberating: how should we select priests? How would that selection affect the priest's role in temple finance? Did it affect the ritual competence of the priest or priestess? One would suppose that hereditary priesthoods, or priesthoods reserved for "those who excel in ancestry and lifestyle" would have particular opportunities for training and long-term practice; but the evidence does not indicate anything of the sort.⁵⁵ Priesthoods afforded honors in exchange for money and obligations. Tensions over birth privilege and wealth in civic priesthoods boiled beneath the surface.

What about those who could not buy a priesthood? For some down-and-out elite families, priesthoods and other traditional positions allowed them to retain honor and civic notoriety. The increasing number of wealthy, non-traditional elite families led to more competition, which in turn put more pressure on cities to find ways to accommodate. Should they allow others to encroach on these traditional bastions of elite prestige? In the competition for honor the successful bidder could make enemies among those who were

⁵⁵ See Cole 2008, 61.

outbid. People accused priestesses of improprieties. Charges were often impiety and witchcraft, as in the case of Theoris who was accused of practicing magic and turning slaves against their owners. She and her family were put to death.⁵⁶ Moreover, in another speech against the often-prosecuted Aristogeiton, the prosecutor reminded the jury that this man was fined five talents for making false accusations against the priestess of Artemis Brauronia and her family.⁵⁷ Reputation was important in a litigious society in which family rivalries were rampant.

2.1.3. Traditional Elites in the Changing Social Landscape

Increasing tensions between the traditional elite families and their emerging wealthy competitors form the backdrop to these strategies of adaptation. According to Shipley, “there seems to have been a general polarization of wealth-classes, both generally and among the elite.”⁵⁸ In an increasingly cosmopolitan world, civic elites were striving to maintain their customary honors and privileges whereas a newly wealthy entrepreneurial class emerged hoping to gain a slice of those honors. Cities not only fostered competition for honors and offices, but they benefited from that competition financially.⁵⁹

While elections of priesthoods indicate that such offices were no longer inherited, sales suggest that a larger number of wealthy individuals and their families were allowed to be more active in the pursuit of the most prestigious offices. While elite “well born” families were losing their grip on some traditional civic honors and privileges, some took matters

⁵⁶ Dem. 25.79 (*Against Aristogeiton*): ἀλλ’ ἐφ’ οἷς ὑμεῖς τὴν μιὰν Θεωρίδα, τὴν Λημνίαν, τὴν φαρμακίδα, καὶ αὐτὴν καὶ τὸ γένος ἅπαν ἀπεκτείνετε.

⁵⁷ Din. 2.12 (*Against Aristogeiton*): οὐκ Ἀριστογεῖτων ἐστίν, ὧ Ἀθηναῖοι, ὁ κατὰ τῆς ἱερείας τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Βραυρωνίας καὶ τῶν οἰκείων αὐτῆς τοιαῦτα γράψας καὶ ψευδάμενος, ὥσθ’ ὑμᾶς, ἐπειδὴ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπύθεσθε παρὰ τῶν κατηγορῶν, πέντε ταλάντων τιμῆσαι τούτῳ.

⁵⁸ Shipley 2000, 98.

⁵⁹ Dignas 2006, 71-84; Whitehead 1983, 55-74.

into their own hands by appealing to the gods and even asserting themselves by public displays of “aristocratic” *ethos*. A third-century BC inscription from Epidaurus shows well-born elites reasserting their status in the community:

Isyllus the Epidaurian, son of Socrates, dedicated this to Apollo Maleatas and Asclepius: If the *demos* leads men toward aristocracy with success, the (*demos*) itself becomes stronger. For it is helped straight by manly excellence. But if someone who has been raised well should handle wickedness, pushing backward, the people becomes more secure by punishing him. I held that opinion then and used to say it and say it now. I vowed to inscribe it if the law, which I have shown, fell into accord with this opinion. This happened not without the gods.⁶⁰

Isyllus, a self-proclaimed aristocrat, was apparently dissatisfied with his community’s turn away from the aristocracy.⁶¹ For some reason, he believed it was imperative to reaffirm his socio-political faction’s influence in his community. Here, he appeals directly to the gods, in this case Apollo and Asclepius, focusing on the inherent manliness (ἀνδραγαθία) of like-minded individuals. Such a quality, he claims, strengthens the city by making it more secure and steady. A punishment (κολάζων) corrects any wickedness that arises within this class.

It is plausible that Isyllus was in fact the priest of Asclepius.⁶² His initiative may reflect a growing concern among his faction that their grip on certain privileges was slipping. Perhaps he feared losing his influence on public and religious policy more than losing his priesthood. After all, Epidaurus had undergone vast changes in the preceding years. Like most cities during the Archaic period, Epidaurus was ruled by a narrow

⁶⁰ IG IV² 1, 128A.1-9; see Furley and Bremmer 2001, vol. II no. 6.4 (pages 180-192): Ἴσυλλος Σωκράτους Ἐπιδαύριος ἀνέθηκε / Απόλλωνι Μαλεάται καὶ Ἀσκληπιῶι. / δῆμος εἰς ἀριστοκρατίαν ἄνδρας αἰ προάγοι καλῶς, / αὐτὸς ἰσχυρότερος· ὀρθοῦται γὰρ ἐξ ἀνδραγαθίας. / αἱ δὲ τις καλῶς προαχθεὶς θιγγάνοι πονηρίας / πάλιν ἐπαγκρούων, κολάζων δῆμος ἀσφαλέστερος. / τάνδε τὴν γνώμαν τόκ’ ἤχον καὶ ἔλεγον καὶ νῦν λέγω. / εὐξάμαν ἀνγράψεν, αἱ κ’ εἰς τάνδε τὴν γνώμαν πέτη / ὁ νόμος ἀμίν, ὃν ἐπέδειξα· ἔγεντο δ’ οὐκ ἄνευ θεῶν.

⁶¹ Asclepius supposedly told him to help Sparta and preserve the oracles received by Lycurgus (68-71: ἀλλὰ μὲν’ αὐτεῖ / τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις χαλεπὰς ἀπὸ κῆρας ἐρύξας, / οὐνεκα τοὺς Φοῖβου χρησμοὺς σώιζοντι δικαίως, / οὐς μαντευσάμενος παρέταξε πόλῃ Λυκοῦργος). See Kolde 2003, 223-225. On democracy in the Hellenistic world, see Gruen 1993, 339-354; Billows 2006, 209: “during the Hellenistic period the notion that democracy was the only appropriate form of constitution for an autonomous Greek city became part of Greek urban culture.”

⁶² Kolde 2003, 225-226.

oligarchy. According to the Aristotelian *Politeia*, the Epidaurians maintained 180 enfranchised citizens called *κοπίποδες* (dusty feet).⁶³ The city sided with the Peloponnesian League against rivals Argos and Athens in the fifth century. Thus, the city had a strong oligarchic tradition at least until the fourth century when numerous decrees were passed by the *boule* and the *demos*, suggesting a democratic constitution had emerged.⁶⁴ Isyllus' sentiments form a backdrop of social and political tension that was taking place in Hellenistic communities. The growth of the community contributed to the tensions. Well-known building projects and miracle inscriptions from Epidaurus testify to the growth of the town in the fifth and fourth centuries.⁶⁵ Epidaurus had become a "Panhellenic" site, drawing visitors from all over Greece. This influx of visitors and new residents surely contributed to the social tensions seen in Isyllus' inscription.⁶⁶

Isyllus' proposal, however, was not just the raving of one disgruntled individual. It was a sacred law (*ἱερὸν νόμον*) that established a festival or procession for the "best in the city". A crucial section of the inscription reads:

Isyllus devised this sacred law by divine fate as an imperishable, everlasting gift to the immortal gods. And the whole people imposed it as a law of our country, raising their hands to the wide heaven in honor of the Blessed Ones. Choose men who are the best of this city of Epidaurus and recite (their names) tribe by tribe, men who have city-protecting virtue and shame in their hearts, proclaim to these men that they are to march in a procession for lord Apollo and his son Asclepius the healer with their hair down (or long) and in white garments <and> wearing crowns of laurel march purified to the temple of Apollo, and to that of Asclepius with branches of cultivated olive, and that they pray (that the gods) always give all citizens and their children beloved health; and to ensure that gentlemanliness always prevails at Epidaurus, as well as harmony, peace, and blameless wealth; and that the Epidaurians always revere this law to seasons from seasons. Thus, may far-reaching Zeus spare us.⁶⁷

⁶³ Arist. fr. 498; Plut. *Mor.* 291E.

⁶⁴ See Rhodes, 1997 no. 74.

⁶⁵ Burford 1969, 16-18.

⁶⁶ A later (second or third century AD) inscription provides detailed information for the priest and attendants of Asclepius. *IG IV² 1, 742*. See Chaniotis 2008, 18.

⁶⁷ *IG IV² 1, 128.10-26*: τόνδ' ἱερὸν θεῖαι μοίραι νόμον ἤρην Ἴσυλλος / ἄφθιτον ἀέναον γέρας ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν, / καὶ νιν ἅπας δᾶμος θεθμὸν θέτο πατρίδος ἁμᾶς, / χεῖρας ἀνασχόντες μακάρεσσιν ἐς οὐρανὸν εὐρύ[ν]. / οἷ κεν ἀριστεύωσι πόληος τᾶσδ' Ἐπιδάουρου, / λέξασθαι τε ἄνδρας καὶ ἐπαγγεῖλαι κατὰ φυλάς, / οἷς πολιοῦχος ὑπὸ

This sacred law was clearly an assertion of elite influence on civic consciousness. The festival would be a new religious rite that, according to Isyllus' reasoning, was sanctioned by tradition, with an assist by the gods. The city passed this proposal and thus it became law. The law seems to have been a release valve that helped ease social tensions. The city was probably not concerned that a procession such as this would truly threaten the democratic constitution of the city. In fact, this episode demonstrates that traditional elites were looking to regain or reinvent, not retain their honors and privileges. He notes that this new festival had divine support:

Isyllus ordered Astypalaidas to consult the oracle at Delphi concerning the paian that he composed for Apollo and Asclepius: whether it would be better for him if he should inscribe the paian. The oracle said that it would be better for him if he should inscribe it both immediately and for all time.⁶⁸

Isyllus succeeded in grounding his new procession in divine authority and civic approval. Inscribing the paian solidified this authority and approval; the permanence of the inscription (εἰς τὸν ὕστερον χρόνον) will preserve his piety and reinforce this new ritual for all time, making this rite a lasting part of the procession and the civic consciousness. If Isyllus was indeed the priest of Asclepius, then this procession could have drawn attention to the cult in a way that was beneficial to the city.

Isyllus' tone, however, is suggestive of the tensions between traditional elites and the rest of their communities. Privileged families often maintained control over their

στέρνοις ἀρετὰ τε καὶ αἰδώς, / τοῖσιν ἐπαγγέλλεν καὶ πομπεύεν σφε κομῶντας / Φοῖβωι ἄνακτι υἰῶι τε
Ἀσκληπιῶι ἱατῆρι / εἵμασιν ἐν λευκοῖσι, δάφνας στεφάνοις ποτ' Ἀπόλλω, / ποι δ' Ἀσκληπιὸν ἔρνεσι ἐλαίας
ἡμεροφύλλου / ἀγνώσ πομπεύειν καὶ ἐπεύχεσθαι πολιάταις / πᾶσιν ἀεὶ διδόμεν τέκνοις τ' ἐρατὰν ὑγίαιαν, / τὰν
καλοκαγαθίαν τ' Ἐπιδαυροῖ ἀεὶ ῥέπεν ἀνδρῶν εὐνομίαν τε καὶ εἰρήναν καὶ πλοῦτον ἀμεμφῆ, / ὥραις ἐξ ὥρᾶν
νόμον ἀεὶ τόνδε σέβοντας· / οὕτω τοί κ' ἀμῶν περιφείδοιτ' εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς.

⁶⁸ *IG IV² 1, 128.32-36*: Ἴσυλλος Ἀστυλαΐδα ἐπέθηκε μαντεύσασθαί οἱ περὶ / τοῦ παιᾶνος ἐν Δελφοῖς, ὃν ἐπόησε
εἰς τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα / καὶ τὸν Ἀσκληπιόν, ἧ λῳίον οἷ κα εἶη ἀγγράφοντι / τὸν παῖα. ἐμάντευσε λῳίον οἷ κα εἶμεν
ἀγγράφοντι / καὶ αὐτίκα καὶ εἰς τὸν ὕστερον χρόνον.

communities' prestigious priesthoods; Isyllus may have been such a priest. His motive may have been simply to reinforce his faction's control over the city's most prominent priesthood. In the east, democratic and cosmopolitan forces began to assert pressure on these traditional bastions of elite privilege. Elites did not always acquiesce quietly. Elites like Isyllus at Epidaurus aimed to regain or reinvent their privileged social status, with divine approval, if not their religious privileges as well.

Against this backdrop of social tensions reevaluations of traditional religious practices were unfolding. Wealthy individuals had opportunities to sidestep traditional avenues of accruing honor such as serving in priesthoods. The accumulation of festivals and sacrifices meant both a growing need for funds and a growing number of priesthoods that needed filling. Reflecting Isyllus' sentiment, however, we see a greater emphasis on descent in honorific decrees by the second century BC. Offices, too, were increasingly "for all time" and "by descent" as even very young children began holding certain offices and priesthoods.⁶⁹ On Rhodes, a different practice emerged. The synoecism of the island's three cities in 408/7 BC triggered a number of changes to traditional priesthoods. By the Hellenistic period, priests were serving in annual posts in a fixed order and rotation.⁷⁰ An annual post was one stop in a priestly career that continued in another cult.⁷¹ Certain families appear to have kept their hold on these rotating priesthoods, as evidenced by the peculiarly high number of adoptions.⁷² A third-century honorific decree honors thirty "excellent men" who "protected" the selection of certain offices (priests, hierothytai, and

⁶⁹ Dmitriev 2005, 50-53.

⁷⁰ See *I.Lindos* II, no. 1.

⁷¹ A kind of religious cursus honorum according to Dignas (2003, 42).

⁷² See Rice 1988, 138-144; Dignas 2003, 46. See *I.Lindos* II 419.86-91

hieropoioi) from those who had no previous share in them.⁷³ Thus, access to priesthoods was a contentious issue in many Greek communities. Access to civic priesthoods varied according to time, place, and circumstance; access seems to be related to tenure and priestly obligations.

2.2. Adaptation or Innovation? Ritual Collections in the Hellenistic Period

Let us now take a closer look at the third-century sacred law from Halicarnassus that explains the duties for the buyer of the priesthood of Artemis Pergaia:

The buyer⁷⁴ of the priesthood of Artemis Pergaia shall provide a priestess who is a townswoman, born from parents who are both townspersons going back three generations on both her father's and mother's side. The buyer shall serve as priestess for her whole life, and shall make public and private sacrifices and shall receive from the public sacrifices a thigh from each victim and the customary parts in addition to the thigh and one-fourth portion of the innards and the skin in addition to the leg; from private sacrifices, she shall take a leg and the customary one-fourth portion of the skin in addition to the leg; the treasurers shall give thirty good drachmas to the *prytaneis* for the sacrifice to Artemis; the wives of the *prytaneis* who serve in the month of Heracleios shall prepare the sacrifice in the month of Heracleios, after having received what is given from the city, but let (the priestess) perform the sacrifice on the twelfth of Heracleios. The priestess shall have a portion of the public sacrifices equal to those of the wives of the *prytaneis*; and the priestess shall make a prayer on behalf of the city on the first of each month, receiving a drachma from the city.

[25] In the month in which public sacrifice is performed, let (the priestess) collect three days before the sacrifice, not going to *oikia*. The collection shall belong to the priestess. The priestess shall adorn the sanctuary, wherever she wishes; and she also shall adorn the treasury for the god, and those who sacrifice shall contribute two obols for the adult (victim), and one obol for young (victim); the *exetastai* shall open the treasury each year and give (money) to the priestess for her prayer and clothing.⁷⁵

⁷³ IG XII 1, 761.38-42: ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ ἐγένοντο συνδιαφυλάξαντες Λινδίοις ὅπως / ταὶ αἰρέσεις γίνωνται ἐν Λίνδῳ τῶν ἱερέων κ[αὶ] ἱεροθυτῶν κα[ὶ] / ἱεροποιῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἐπὶ τὰ κοινὰ τασσομέν[ω]ν ἐξ / αὐτῶν Λινδίων καθ' ἃ καὶ ἐν τοῖς νόμοις γέγραπται κα[ὶ] μὴ μετέ/χωντι τῶν ἐν Λίνδῳ ἱερώων οἱ μὴ καὶ πρότερον μετεῖχον.

⁷⁴ The buyer of the priesthood is explicitly male (4-5: ὁ πριάμε[νο]ς [τ]ὴν ἱερητείαν τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Περγαίας), but the gender changes in line 8: ἡ δὲ πριαμένη ἱεράσεται ἐπὶ <ζ>ωῆς τῆς αὐτῆς.

⁷⁵ Syll³ 1015 (LSAM 73). See Appendix C.

Among the many provisions, the priestess, whoever she will be, must perform the collection of funds (ἀγειρέτω) during the three days before the festival.⁷⁶ This sets limits on the priestess' obligations for what was perhaps a newly instituted cult.⁷⁷ Such a seemingly mundane rule had significant implications. Why would the community set limitations for collections? What other limitations are evident in this decree? And what exactly did ἀγειρέτω mean?

2.2.1. The Struggle between Innovation and Tradition

Usually performed by women, ritual collection was one of several means by which communities funded festivals and sacrifices and should be analyzed within the wider context of cult finance outlined above. Like other ways of acquiring sacred revenues, collection had a religious element that went beyond simple administrative procedure. Collecting is indicated by specific terms such as ἀγερμός, ἄγερσις, and λογεία, and is sometimes translated as 'begging'. The epigraphic evidence suggests that ritual collecting or begging was confined to the east, particularly Ionia and resulted from eastern influences; thus, some have argued that it was not a proper Greek tradition.⁷⁸ Most recorded instances of ritual collection in the epigraphic evidence are known from sales of priesthoods like the one from Halicarnassus. These decrees provide some of the most detailed evidence for the rights and responsibilities of Greek priests and priestesses. The literary evidence, however, suggests that the practice was widespread. Noel Robertson has demonstrated that regardless of origin, ritual begging was a tradition practiced in many cities of the Greek

⁷⁶ *Syll*³ 1015.26-27: ἀγειρέτω πρὸ τῆς θυ[σί]ας ἡμέρας τρεῖς.

⁷⁷ See Segre 1936, 827.

⁷⁸ Debord 1982, 196; Burkert 1985, 102.

mainland and islands, Athens, Argos, and Delos especially.⁷⁹ In fact, the priestess of Athena Polias at Athens is known to have traveled around the city asking for donations, particularly seeking out newly married women who owed gifts to the virgin goddess.⁸⁰ In a fragment of Aeschylus, we read that Hera appeared as a wandering priestess seeking gifts throughout Argos.⁸¹ Meanwhile, Ionian women collected gifts and sang hymns to the Delian maidens Opis and Arge.⁸² Thus, collections had longstanding social, economic, and religious significance for local communities.

Asia Minor is where ritual begging does indeed appear most prominent, at least from the fourth to first centuries BC. Nevertheless, procedures varied. A fragmentary decree from Antimacheia on Cos, for instance, perhaps states that the priestess of Demeter is to have a portion of the collection (*agermos*) and all the perquisites.⁸³ But more questions began to surface. A second-century Samian decree reads: “Concerning the matters about which the priest of Isis made a petition in the council, and was judged to be within the law, asking to collect for the goddess, as also (was done) before, resolved by the council and the people: the priest of Isis shall collect for the goddess [as before].”⁸⁴ Here the priest brought the question before the council: should I continue this traditional practice? While the city decided to continue it unchanged, other information regarding the practice was not deemed relevant enough to be inscribed. This is not the sort of detail that typically makes its way onto a stone. The clarity of the decision, as described in the inscription, covers over the

⁷⁹ Robertson 1983, 143-169. See Hdt. 4.34.2, 4.35.3, and 4.35.4.

⁸⁰ *Paroemiographai Suppl.* 1.65.

⁸¹ Aesch. fr. 355.

⁸² Hdt. 4.35.

⁸³ *LSCG* 175.12-14 (highly restored): τ[ο]ῦ δὲ ἀγερμού καὶ [τῶν θ]ησαυρ[ῶ]ν καὶ γερῶν πάντων [τὸ μὲν ἐν μέρος ἤμεν τὰν ἱερειῶν, τὰ δὲ δύο ἤ]μεν ἱερά· ταῖς δ[ὲ] ἱερείαις ἐξῆμεν ὑφιερειῶς ἀποδειξαι πολίτιδας...]. See Robertson 1983, 164-165.

⁸⁴ *LSCG* 123.4-14: Φωκύλος εἶπεν· ὑπὲρ ὧν ὁ ἱερεὺς τῆς Ἴσιδος ἔθετο τὴν ἱκετηρίαν ἐν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ ἐγνώσθη ἔννομος εἶναι ἀξιῶν τῇ θεῷ καθότι καὶ πρότερον ἀγείρειν, δεδόχθαι τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ· τὸν ἱερέα τῆς Ἴσιδος [ἀγείρειν] τῇ θεῷ καθότι καὶ πρότερον...].

deliberations that surely occurred. Such regulations appear to have a clear administrative intent, but there is more to the story.

2.2.2. The Social and Cultural Backdrop: Life in Hellenistic Cities

Confining the priestess of Artemis Pergaia to collecting three days before the festival may have served a rational administrative purpose: gathering funds in advance would allow the city to avoid last-minute difficulties in funding the festival. There is no reason, however, why such a rule cannot serve more than one purpose. Limiting the priestess' begging obligations may reflect social concerns. Literary evidence may give the reevaluation of this practice, as appears in the epigraphic evidence, an appropriate cultural context. Women's lives in cities became a prominent theme in Hellenistic literature. The normative boundaries between male and female, public and private, and domestic and political were undergoing reevaluation. It was an age of testing boundaries.⁸⁵ Moreover, Hellenistic literary tropes cover a range of social circumstances. Art and life often influence one another.

Theocritus sets his *Idyll* 15 in Alexandria. Two women, Praxinoa and Gorgo, venture into the city to attend a recital at the palace of King Ptolemy. The journey is one of danger and liminality, where representatives of various classes, nationalities, and ages converge.⁸⁶ Gorgo tells Praxinoa: "How distraught I am! I scarcely made it to you safely, Praxinoa. The crowd was so big, and there were so many chariots! Boots are everywhere, everywhere are men in cloaks. The road is unending, you live so far away!"⁸⁷ Burton argues that the text shows Gorgo's alienation from public space. Talk of boots and cloaks helps recreate Gorgo's

⁸⁵ Burton 1995, 41-42. The author prefers "fluid" to describe these boundaries.

⁸⁶ See Burton 1995, 10-11.

⁸⁷ Theoc. *Id.* 15.4-7: ὦ τᾶς ἀλεμάτω ψυχᾶς; μόλις ὑμῖν ἐσώθην / Πραξινοῖα πολλῶ μὲν ὄχλω, πολλῶν δὲ τεθρίπων. / παντᾶ κρηπίδες, παντᾶ χλαμυδηφόροι ἄνδρες: / ἅ δ' ὁδὸς ἄτροτος: τὸ δ' ἑκαστάτω ὄσσον ἀποκεῖς.

disorienting experience. She is clearly out of her comfort zone.⁸⁸ Then as the two venture out to attend a festival at the palace, Praxinoa exclaims: “Gods! What a mob. How and when can we get through this mob? Like ants, innumerable and immeasurable!”⁸⁹ The word used for mob here is τὸ κακόν, something evil, unseemly, dangerous, more than merely a nuisance.⁹⁰ Halicarnassus was no Alexandria; but it was a large cosmopolitan community nonetheless.⁹¹

Halicarnassus was built on a slope that depressed toward the sea. The famous Mausolus rebuilt the city,⁹² aggrandizing it as the new capital of his satrapy.⁹³ Rather than following the popular Hippodamian plan, the rebuilt city had a stepped arrangement that began from the agora near the harbor and culminated at the theater.⁹⁴ The monumental focal point of the city was the Mausoleum,⁹⁵ which anchored the city’s orientation;⁹⁶ but the city’s labyrinthine layout and idiosyncratic stepped-terraces might have had a disorienting effect on travelers. While the priestess, traveling around the city and collecting, may not have gotten lost in her own city, the closely-packed buildings and alleys may not have formed the safest setting for the practice. There were other risks as well.

⁸⁸ Burton 1995, 11.

⁸⁹ Theoc. *Id.* 15.44-45: ὦ θεοί, ὅσσοις ὄχλος. πῶς καὶ πόκα τοῦτο περᾶσαι / χρὴ τὸ κακόν; μύρμακες ἀνάριθμοι καὶ ἄμετροι.

⁹⁰ For instance, Ar. *Av.* 931: τουτὶ παρέξει τὸ κακὸν ἡμῖν πράγματα, / εἰ μή τι τούτῳ δόντες ἀποφευξοῦμεθα.

⁹¹ Diod. 17.23.4: Halicarnassus was the largest polis in Caria, endowed with several citadels. It was a πόλις μυρίανδρος that had an extremely dense population (Hornblower 1982, 8).

⁹² According to Arrian, Alexander razed the city (1.23.6). Although a siege did take place, it seems unlikely that the city suffered much damage (see Pedersen 2004, 145-147).

⁹³ Mausolus was satrap of Caria from 377/6-353/2 BC. For Mausolus’ synoecisms, see Hornblower 1982, 78-105. The synoecism would have made the rebuilt city especially dense (102).

⁹⁴ Vitr. *II* 8.10-11; see Owens 1991, 68-71, 89; Hornblower 1982, 299-301.

⁹⁵ For the central location of the Mausoleum, see Vitr. *II* 8.11: *per mediam autem altitudinis curvaturam praecinctionemque platea ampla latitudine facta, in qua media Mausoleum ita egregiis operibus est factum, ut in septem spectaculis nominetur.*

⁹⁶ Hornblower 1982, 301-302.

Evidence suggests that there were some very wealthy private homes in Hellenistic Halicarnassus.⁹⁷ Nevertheless, respectable women did not approach men's houses lightly. The injunction recalls literary tropes. Doors and thresholds played an important psychological role in Greek society. They marked the liminal space between public and private, sacred and profane. The door was also the place for illicit paramours in love poetry. Typically, the male suitor confronts his lover at her door: "Thus you sleep, Conopion, as you make me lay on your cold doorstep."⁹⁸ But women could also play the role of suitor.

Ismenodora is the object of desire in Plutarch's *Amatorius*. She is well born widow, rich, beautiful, and in the prime of her life. In some ways, she fits the bill for a priestess of Artemis Pergaia at Halicarnassus. Protogenes says:

If (Ismenodora) loves him and lusts for him, by Zeus, who is it who keeps her from knocking on his door, singing a *paraclausithyron*, and giving up her seemly (aristocratic) pretence, and decking her rivals?⁹⁹ For these are the affairs of love. Let her furrow her brow and quit her dainty living, and let her put on the clothes of passion. But if she feels shame and is σώφρων, let her sit decorously at home and await eager pursuers.¹⁰⁰

The chaste woman would give up her lifestyle or worse, her σωφροσύνη, if she ventures toward the liminal space of her lover's door. Although Plutarch is writing much later, such literary tropes were quite popular in the Hellenistic period.¹⁰¹ Such cultural concerns may have been in the minds of those who crafted the laws in Halicarnassus as well. Whether or not these concerns were warranted is beside the point. Perceptions mattered.

⁹⁷ See Poulsen 1994, 127.

⁹⁸ Call. *Epigr.* 64 (GP no. 63).1-2: Οὕτως ὑπώσασαις, Κωνώνιον, ὡς ἐμὲ ποιεῖς / κοιμᾶσθαι ψυχροῖς τοῖσδε παρὰ προθύροις.

⁹⁹ Literally, she is like a pankratiast.

¹⁰⁰ Plut. *Amat.* 753b: ἐρᾶται γὰρ αὐτοῦ νῆ Δία καὶ κάεται: τίς οὖν ὁ κωλύων ἐστὶ κωμάζειν ἐπὶ θύρας, ἄδειν τὸ παρακλαυσίθυρον, ἀναδεῖν τὰ εἰκόνια, παγκρατιάζειν πρὸς τοὺς ἀντεραστάς; ταῦτα γὰρ ἐρωτικά: καὶ καθεῖσθω τὰς ὀφρῦς καὶ παυσάσθω τρυφῶσα, σχῆμα λαβοῦσα τῶν τοῦ πάθους οἰκείων. εἰ δ' αἰσχύνεται καὶ σωφρονεῖ, κοσμίως οἴκοι καθήσθω περιμένουσα τοὺς μνωμένους καὶ σπουδάζοντας. See Rist 2001, 564.

¹⁰¹ See Gutzwiller 2007, 115-116.

2.2.3. Tensions over Ritual Collections

Often overlooked among the administrative provisions in sacred laws is the effect they had on the religious performances themselves.¹⁰² One well-known third-century decree from Miletus shows a community torn over between continuing and altering the practice. It referred the matter to the oracle of Apollo (Didymeius), asking:

Whether it will be pleasing to the goddess and beneficial to the people both now and in future time if [the people] conduct the collections for Artemis *Boulephoros Skiris* as the *Skiridai* expound and propose or as now occurs. Whatever the god pronounces let the sacred messengers report to the assembly, and let the people, having heard, deliberate, in order that everything be done in accordance with the god's advice.¹⁰³

The decree does not offer details about the current state of collection or about the changes that the *Skiridai* proposed. What is clear, however, is that either the community or its religious experts was uncertain about the practice. Why? A range of explanations exist of which I offer only a few most likely: one, the practice became administratively cumbersome and the *Skiridai* proposed to amend the procedures for collecting; two, the people were concerned about unscrupulous collectors and so the *Skiridai* proposed to make the practice more transparent; or three, there was debate over the safety and/or reputation of the collectors. Regardless of the reason, the people referred the matter to the god after it had failed to come to a decision.¹⁰⁴ This exemplifies how traditional religious practices could clash with practical needs. Frustratingly, the stone breaks off, leaving us to wonder how the traditional collection was performed, what changes the *Skiridai* proposed, or even what answer Apollo gave. Nevertheless, other oracular responses give us insight into this kind of

¹⁰² See Stavrianopoulou 2006, 19-20.

¹⁰³ *I.Milet.* 6.3.1225.1-8; *LSAM* 47 (228/7 BC): τ[ῆ]ι θεῶι κ[ε]χαρι[σ]μένω[ς] ἔξ[ε]ι κ[α]ι τῶι δήμωι συμφερό[ν]τως καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τὸν ἔπειτε χρόνον συντελοῦντ[ι] / τ[ῆ]ς ἀγέρσεις Ἀρτέμιδι Βουληφόρῳι Σκιρί/δι καθότι Σκιρί[ι]δαι ἐξηγούμενοι εἰσφέρουσι ἢ καθότι νῦν γίνεται· ἃ δὲ / [ἃ]ν ὁ θεὸς θεσπίσῃ οἱ μὲν θεοπρόποι εἰσαγγειλάτῳσαν / εἰς ἐκκλησίαν, ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἀκούσας βουλευσάσθω, ὅπως / πάντα πραχθήσεται ἀκολούθως τῆι τοῦ θεοῦ συμβουλ[ί]αι.

¹⁰⁴ On the religious authority of the *Skiridai*, see Parker 2011, 41 and 43-45.

consultation, suggesting what the response may have looked like and how communities balanced religious tradition and innovation. But there were limits to how much change an oracle would permit. Although oracles tended to preserve religious traditions, they did propose or accept changes so long as those changes did not alter the nature of the cult.

Chaniotis explains:

Some of the elements about which the oracle is silent did not need an explanation because they were dictated by tradition; others did not need instructions because they were variable. By contrast, the oracle does describe the ritual's innovative and distinctive features: the inflexible elements that made it work.¹⁰⁵

An oracle was the highest religious authority to which communities regularly referred questions of religious importance. Oracular responses strictly adhered to tradition whenever changes threatened to alter the nature of a cult. To use Chaniotis' example: an oracle would reject replacing a statue of a god in a position of mercy with one represented in a fighting stance.¹⁰⁶ In the same way, we can predict that the oracle at Didyma would protect aspects vital to the nature of ritual collecting in particular, or the entire cult in general. Yet it may have been sympathetic to the *Skiridai's* proposal. Whatever Apollo's answer to the Milesians, the decree demonstrates an uncertainty among the people of Miletus as to how the collection ought to be performed in the future.

A fragmentary decree from Phycus from around 100 BC states that the *mastroi* (financial officials) and the Lindians were to see to it that a collection (*logeia*) take place just as before, if the restorations are correct.¹⁰⁷ Unfortunately again, the decree breaks off. We are again left asking: What were the proposed changes? What prompted such changes?

¹⁰⁵ Chaniotis 2009, 94.

¹⁰⁶ Chaniotis 2009, 94: The example given is SEG 41.1411.

¹⁰⁷ LSCG 143.4-7: [ἔδοξε μάστροις καὶ Λινδίοις ἐπιστατῶν [γνώμα· πρεσβε]ίαν πρεσβεύσαντος [ποτι τ]ὸν δᾶμον ὅπως ἄ λογεί[α, καθὼς εἶθιστο πρό]τερον ἐν Φύσκωι...].

Although we cannot answer these questions from the decree itself, it is safe to conclude that the community found some aspect of a *logeia* questionable. At stake was the survival of an entire traditional cult or vital component of that cult. This was, after all, a practice administrative in form but charged with much religious significance. Why such uncertainty?

I propose two possible reasons for why these communities asked an oracle about collecting. First, communities were concerned for the safety and reputation of the collectors, regardless of whether they were male or female. If collecting was tantamount to begging, then we can gather from literary sources some reasons why communities would reevaluate the practice. In the *Republic*, Plato describes begging priests (*agurtai*) and seers traveling door-to-door trying to persuade the rich that they had divine power through sacrifices and incantations, and if they or their ancestors committed an offense they alone possessed the power to atone for it. These beggars also offered to harm their enemies, innocent and guilty alike, with a combination of spells and curses.¹⁰⁸ Although Plato is not an ideal historical source, we should not deny that many Greeks shared some of his views. In fact, Michael Flower notes: Greeks had different conceptual categories for seer, on the one hand, and for magician/sorcerer/begging priest, on the other. And whereas *mantis* (seer) was usually a positive term and one to which a high status could be attached, *magos*, *goês*, and *agurtês* were generally terms of reproach. In fact: “The harshest insult that one could pay a *mantis* was to call him or her a *magos* or *agurtês*”.¹⁰⁹ Oedipus calls Teiresias a “deceitful *agurtês*”.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ Pl. *Rep.* 364b.4-c.4: ἀγύρται δὲ καὶ μάντιες ἐπὶ πλουσίων θύρας ἰόντες πείθουσιν ὡς ἔστι παρὰ σφίσι δύναμις ἐκ θεῶν ποριζομένη θυσίαις τε καὶ ἐπφδαῖς, ἀδίκημά του γέγονεν αὐτοῦ ἢ προγόνων, ἀκείσθαι μεθ' ἡδονῶν τε καὶ ἐορτῶν, ἐάν τέ τινα ἐχθρὸν πημῆναι ἐθέλη, μετὰ σμικρῶν δαπανῶν ὁμοίως δίκαιον ἀδίκῳ βλάψει ἐπαγωγαῖς τισιν καὶ καταδέσμοις, τοὺς θεοὺς, ὧς φασιν, πείθοντές σφισιν ὑπηρετεῖν.

¹⁰⁹ Flower 2008, 66.

¹¹⁰ Soph. *OT* 389: δόλιον ἀγύρτην.

The term *agurtes* is also found in the Hippocratic corpus, where begging priests, *magoi*, and purifiers who even helped spread the diseases they promised to cure.¹¹¹ Hippocrates' beggars were also known as ἀγύρται who performed rites for clients and collected fees. This became a derogatory term for religious practitioners of suspect motives and dubious religious expertise.¹¹² It is not hard to imagine why the oracle of Apollo tells Peisthetairos in Aristophanes' *Birds* about imposters who, without invitation, bothered people while they sacrificed. Apollo advises the sacrificers to strike these annoying people in the ribs.¹¹³ Cassandra rhetorically asks the chorus in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*: "Am I some false prophet, a door knocker, an idle talker?"¹¹⁴ Given these literary anecdotes, taken from a variety of genres, it would not be surprising if some individuals viewed even authorized ritual beggars as nuisances, or if some priests refused to engage in the practice. Perhaps it was with such attitudes in mind that the Halicarnassians restricted priestess' begging.

Wherever priesthoods were sold to the highest bidder, communities would have wanted to make the duties of the priestess as attractive as possible. The thought of begging, and, so occupying a space in the public's value map alongside *magoi*, *agurtai*, *alazontes*, and *chresmologoi*, might have scared away promising candidates for the post or driven down the price. Even a priestess of a small and obscure cult might not have wanted to beg all alone, lumped in a category with such disreputable characters. Nor might her family be thrilled about the prospect.

¹¹¹ Hippoc. *Morb. sacr.* 1: ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκέουσιν οἱ πρῶτοι τοῦτο τὸ νόσημα ἀφιερῶσαντες τοιοῦτοι εἶναι ἄνθρωποι οἷοι καὶ νῦν εἰσι μάγοι τε καὶ καθάρται καὶ ἀγύρται καὶ ἀλαζόνες.

¹¹² *Agurtai* also had questionable medical expertise: see Flower 2008, 27-28.

¹¹³ Ar. *Av.* 981-985; see Shapiro 1990, 345.

¹¹⁴ Aesch. *Agam.* 1195: ἡ ψευδόμαντις εἰμι θυροκόπος φλέδων;

The phrasing of the Halicarnassian decree may reflect such anxiety. That the priestess is “to collect for three days before the public sacrifice”¹¹⁵ confines the ritual to a specific period before the festival. This stipulation can be interpreted in a few ways. Perhaps it aimed at giving people advance notice. In this way, the decree informs the public on what day the sacrifices were to take place.¹¹⁶ Now neighbors had forewarning that the priestess would be coming for three full days, indicated by the accusative of duration, leading up to the sacrifices.¹¹⁷ People would be able to distinguish her from unauthorized beggars and neighbors would prepare to be home (or perhaps not).

Another interpretation, however, is that the rule aimed to prevent the priestess from abusing her authority and pocketing donations.¹¹⁸ After all, a number of clauses in the decree relate to financial matters. Let us take a closer look at the decree:

In the month when the public sacrifice is performed, let the priestess collect for three days before the sacrifice, not going into the *oikia*. *Let the collection belong to the priestess*; let the priestess adorn the sanctuary where she wishes; she shall arrange the collection box for the goddess, and let those sacrificing contribute two obols for a full grown victim and one obol for a young one. Let the *exetastai* open the collection box each year and let them give to the priestess allowance and (money for) clothing.¹¹⁹

The phrase ὁ δὲ ἀγερμὸς ἔστω τῆς ἱερείας is ambiguous. Does ἀγερμὸς refer to the act of collecting or the money itself? Other occurrences of the word indicate that ἀγερμὸς was thought of as a practice (a gathering) rather than money collected;¹²⁰ although, its juxtaposition with sacrifices in one instance suggests that money and the practice of

¹¹⁵ *Syll*³ 101526-27: πρὸ τῆς θυ[σί]ας ἡμέρας τρεῖς.

¹¹⁶ *Syll*³ 1015.20-23: τὴν δὲ θυσιαν συντε<λ>εῖτω μηνὸς Ἡρακλείου δωδεκάτη.

¹¹⁷ *Syll*³ 1015.27: πρὸ τῆς θυ[σί]ας ἡμέρας τρεῖς.

¹¹⁸ Connelly 2007, 200.

¹¹⁹ *Syll*³ 1015. 25-35; line 29: ὁ δὲ ἀγερμὸς ἔστω τῆς ἱερείας.

¹²⁰ *IG* II² 1328.11 and 1329.15.

collecting it were not exclusive.¹²¹ Do we translate the phrase “the collection shall belong to the priestess” or “collecting belongs to the priestess”? It is most likely that collecting is her job and she also has authority over the money. The last clause limits the priestess’ access to sacred funds, or at least gives oversight authority to the *exetastai* in regard to the priestess’ expenses. The clause limits the time in which the priestess is to collect, but also limits the priestess’ authority. Each year, the *exetastai* were supposed to open the treasury and give the priestess recompense for her service to the cult. Here, the money collected was expected to go toward the festival, particularly the adornment of sanctuary. Rules restricting access are not uncommon in sacred laws.¹²² Sometimes only certain officials had access to the treasury box or the storeroom. Indeed whole committees were sometimes appointed to oversee cult finances. It was expected, then, that the priestess would spend the money for the festival and adornment of the sanctuary. Nothing is mentioned about money left over.

I suggest that these rules restrict the priestess’ obligations rather than her rights. The limit on collection gives the buyer forewarning of the priestess’ duties. In fact, detailed restrictions are common in Greek sacred laws whenever sacred money changes hands or when alterations are made to sacred property and space.¹²³ In this case, oversight is required when money is set aside for personal expenditure. There is little to suggest, however, that the decree aimed at limiting the priestess’ chances to take more money than

¹²¹ *IG XII 4*, 328.23-24 (Cos, first century BC): καὶ τὸς ἀγεροῦς καὶ τὰς ἄλλας θυσίας τὰς συντελευμένας τῶν θεῶν. Also, *LSCG* 175.12 (Antimacheia, third century BC): τ[ο]ῦ δὲ ἀγεροῦ καὶ [τῶν θ]ησαυρ[ῶ]ν καὶ γερώων πάντων.

¹²² Decrees from Oropus are particularly detailed. See *LSCG* 65.85 and *LSCG* 70. Forbidding access to parts of a sanctuary or entire sanctuaries was fairly common. For restrictions on women, see *NGSL* pp. 18-19. For forbidden rooms, see Hollinshead 1999, 189-218.

¹²³ Examples of overseers: see *LSAM* 78 and *LSCG* 155. Committees were often formed to oversee construction and the movement of objects within sanctuaries: see *LSCG* 72 and *IG II²* 840.2-17. For the charge of temple robbing and impiety, see Dem. 21.67-78.

she was due, i.e. pocket donations.¹²⁴ In fact, it is explicitly stated that she is to have some sort of contact with the collection box, although the verb κατασκευασάτω does not give us a precise meaning.¹²⁵ If the community were concerned about theft it would have sent overseers with her during the collection itself. Instead, the decree makes it clear: collecting belongs to the priestess.¹²⁶ No other official is named to oversee the collection. The *exetastai* are told to open the treasury to and give the priestess money each year; but this does not suggest that the priestess did not have access to it at other times. It appears more likely that these rules aimed to regularize the time when the community and the priestess expected the collection to occur and when she should expect official payment for her services.

This decree should also be viewed in the context of other sacred laws, particularly priesthood sales that clearly explicate the rights and responsibilities of the priest or priestess in order to avoid potential quarrels or confusion. It aimed to enhance her rights, limit obligations, and offer protection for the priest or priestess. An array of evidence from Hellenistic cities shows that communities aimed to enhance priestly privileges and limit duties.¹²⁷ The Halicarnassian regulation makes both the community and the priestess aware of her responsibilities to collect at a specific time and for a specific purpose in order to prevent or reduce the chance that any harm or ill repute could occur.

Nevertheless, her access to the outside world was restricted: she was not to go to *oikia* (ἐπ' οἰκίαν μὴ πορηυομένη).¹²⁸ This phrase too is not very clear. Presented among rules for collecting, adorning, and sacrificing, the clause seems to prohibit her either going to the treasury house, often called an *oikia*, or approaching a (private) house while

¹²⁴ See Connelly 2007, 200.

¹²⁵ *Syll*³ 1015.29-30: κατασκευασάτω δὲ καὶ θησαυρὸν τῆι θεῶι.

¹²⁶ *Syll*³ 1015.27-28: ὁ δὲ ἀγεμὸς ἔστω τῆς ἱερείας.

¹²⁷ See Dignas 2002c, 29-40 and 2006, 71-84.

¹²⁸ *Syll*³ 1015.27.

collecting.¹²⁹ Prohibiting the priestess from entering a treasury seems odd since so many of her other duties involve handling money and preparing the *θησαυρός*. If this was indeed the meaning, then perhaps the community wanted to temper her (and whoever bought the office for her) influence over the cult's finances. After all, she served for life. In this case, however, we would expect the definite article, *τὴν οἰκίαν*, and so this is perhaps unlikely. On the other hand, a rule forbidding her to approach a stranger's house makes sense given its syntactical proximity to rules concerning the collection itself. The preposition *ἐπί* with an accusative denotes reaching a goal.¹³⁰ Therefore, the sense must be "go to" or "approach". Was the priestess forbidden to approach, rather than enter, the treasury? Such phrasing seems too clumsy to be valid. Instead, the phrase may very well mean: "she may not approach a house (while collecting)". If so, then the decree reflects concerns that collecting threatened the priestess' reputation and wellbeing. While rules were clearly intended to protect the priestess and her reputation, they were also meant to rein in certain aspects of ritual collection that were becoming too questionable. Doing things "according to custom" was not good enough.

2.2.4. Alternative Funding and the Decline of Ritual Collections

But this was an age of increasing public engagement for women, and it may be that as other opportunities for priestesses emerged, the need for ritual collection diminished. Cultural and administrative rationales need not be exclusive. Both demonstrate the tensions between evolving social norms and the desire to maintain traditional cult practices. From

¹²⁹ Le Guen-Pollet translates "however, she is not to enter any house" (1991, no. 43 page 142). Likewise, Sokolowski LSAM 73, page 172: "Il était défendu à la prêtresse de visiter les maisons."

¹³⁰ See Smyth's *Greek Grammar* 1689, 3a. See the LSJ entry for *ἐπί* (C: with Accusative): up to; before, in the presence of; at the door (ld. 8.79).

the administrative standpoint, simply doing away with ritual collections could lead to a shortfall in a cult's treasury. In some places, however, new procedures may have come to supplant those conventional practices. Over time, new procedures for priestesses to acquire revenue emerged. Laws offered cult personnel alternatives to begging. For example, a second century BC Coan decree directs both merchants and brides to sacrifice to Aphrodite Pandamus.¹³¹ Here, the revenue was to underwrite sacrifices. The priestess is given right of *praxis* as if in execution of a legal judgment,¹³² which empowered her with legal authority, that is to say sanctioned use of compulsion, to collect money from certain individuals or groups.

A century later, the priestess for the cult of Artemis Pergaia at Cos was still conducting ritual collections. A decree concerning another priesthood declared: “the priestess shall collect each year on the first day of the month of Artemision and shall perform other (duties) about the collection just as is written for Artemis Pergaia.”¹³³ This decree bears a striking resemblance to the one for Pergaia at Halicarnassus, suggesting that the rites were perhaps as similar as the epithets. At Cos, the priestess is charged with providing the sacrifices each day that the sanctuary is open.¹³⁴ As we saw with the rules governing the priest of Amphiaraus discussed in the previous chapter,¹³⁵ this rule reflects some concern over obligations and the role of the priestess in conducting traditional

¹³¹ The epithet “for all the people” may indicate a relationship between the goddess and the synoecism of the city in 366/5 BC (Diod. 15.76.2). See Parker 2002, 154-155; Carlsson 2010, 202-208; and Cole 2008, 58.

¹³² *IG XII 4*, 302.26-31 (second century BC); *ICos ED 178*: ἡ δὲ πρᾶξις ἔστω αὐταὶ καθάπερ ἐγ δίκας. τοὺς δὲ ἀγερμούς τῶν σαλαῖδων καὶ τᾶλλα περὶ αὐτῶν γίνεσθα[ι] πάντα κατὰ τὰ προκεκυρωμέν<α> ἐπὶ μονάρχου Λευκίππου· ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἀ<γ>ερμῶν θυέτω ἕκαστος τῶν προεστακώτων ταῖ Ἀφροδίται ταῖ Πανδάμωι <τ>ᾶι ἐνάται τοῦ Πανάμου μηνὸς ἱερεῖον τέληον.

¹³³ *IG XII 4*, 346.5-8; *ICos ED 236.5-8*: ἡ ἱέρεια ἀγε[ιρ]έτω ἑκάστου ἐνιαυτοῦ τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ Ἀρταμιτίου τᾶ[ι] νομηνιαὶ καὶ τᾶλλα συντελείτω τὰ περὶ τὸν ἀγερμὸν [κ]αθότι [γ]έγραπται κα[ι] τ[ῆ]ι Ἀρτάμιτι ταῖ Περγαίαι.

¹³⁴ *IG XII 4*, 346.8-10: ἡ ἱέρεια ἑκάσ[τα]ς ἡμέρας ἅς ὄσιόν ἐστιν ἀνοίγειν τὰ ἱερὰ παρεχέτω τὸ[ν] [ι]ε[ρ]ὸ[ν] ἀνεωγμένον ἅμα ἁλίωι ἀντέλλοντι.

¹³⁵ *I.Oropos 277.1-2*.

practices such as collection and sacrifice. Over time, however, the religious obligations for some of the priesthoods at Cos began to change and procedures were redefined. New methods of gathering revenue emerged.

New rules called for groups who had associations with a certain god to pay a fee in lieu of sacrifice. One decree stipulates that all victors in crowned games must sacrifice a victim worth no less than forty drachmas to Hermes Enagonius.¹³⁶ Since Hermes had a close relationship to athletic competitions, it seems a reasonable and pious act for a victor to thank the god for his help. Later, the people of Cos devised a strategy for acquiring funds that did not entail sending a priestess or group of women begging from door to door. Here, another recently published decree records the responsibilities associated with the sale of the priesthood of Aphrodite Pandamus and Pontia.¹³⁷ This first century AD decree states:

The priestess may exact payment from those who do not perform what is prescribed as if in fulfillment of a legal verdict. In order that disputes may not arise between any two persons on any grounds about the value of sacrificial victims, any sacrificer who so wishes may pay the sum specified in lieu of perquisites for any of those victims which is permitted to sacrifice to the goddess.¹³⁸

As we have seen in the previous Coan decree for Aphrodite Pandamus, priestesses or other women performed a collection to pay for the sacrifices and maintenance of the cult. In this case the decree empowers the priestess with the right of exaction (*praxis*) to collect from those who do not comply with the law, i.e. fail to make the required sacrifice or payment. Again, only certain persons were required to contribute:

¹³⁶ *IG XII 4*, 298.74-75; Parker and Obbink 2001, 245-246: ὅσοι κα νικάσωντι στεφανίταν ἀγῶνα, θυόντω τῶι Ἐναγωνίωι ἱερεῖον μὴ ἐλάσσονος ἄξιον δραχμῶν ΔΔΔΔ.

¹³⁷ On this cult, which had one priestess for two deities, see Parker and Obbink 2000, 429-447 and Parker 2002, 143-160, especially 144.

¹³⁸ *IG XII 4*, 319.1-5; *SEG 50.766* (Parker and Obbink 2000, 416): ἃ δὲ πρᾶξις ἔστω τῆι ἱερείαι κατὰ τῶν μὴ ἐπιτελεσάντων [τὰ γεγραμμέ]να καθάπερ ἐγ δίκας· ὅπως δὲ μηδεμία ἀντιλογία γίνηται ὁ[ποθενοῦν μ]θενὶ ποτὶ μηδένα περὶ τᾶς ἀξίας τῶν ἱερείων, ἐξέστω τῶι θύ[οντι, αἴ] τίς κα δῆληται, ὧν ὅσιόν ἐστιν θύεν τῆι θεῶι καταβαλεῖν τῶν [γερῶν] τὸ διατεταγμένον.

On completion of the voyage those serving in warships shall sacrifice to Aphrodite Pontia on the altar specified previously, one full grown victim costing thirty drachmas for each *skênê*,¹³⁹ or pay fifteen drachmas in lieu of perquisites to the priestess for each *skênê*, and a drachma into the *thesaurus*.¹⁴⁰

That sacrificers may pay cash in lieu of perquisites (*gere*, or animal parts) to the priestess is quite revealing. The sailors had to pay a required amount in thanks for safe voyage. Of course, this method of financing cults is not new.¹⁴¹ Nonetheless, it gave sailors a choice to pay the cost in coin or provide an animal for sacrifice. Presumably sailors would choose the former since the value of the latter was twice as much. The strategy to collect more money was simple and ingenious: make it easier, and cheaper, to fulfill sacrificial obligations in cash than in kind. Expediency won out most of the time. It was easier and more cost effective for sailors to give cash than to buy and sacrifice a more costly victim although sailors would have the option of animal sacrifice if they happen to have a full-grown victim handy. The sacrificial suggestions that we find in many sacred laws declaring what is appropriate for people to sacrifice are in this case more than mere sacrificial suggestions; there is flexibility not altogether unlike the requirement at Oropus that a worshipper may sacrifice whatever he wants.¹⁴² At Cos we find real legal penalties for noncompliance.¹⁴³ We also find no more mention of ritual collecting in its traditional form.

As Parker and Obbink note, ἄ δὲ πρᾶξις ἔστω... καθάπερ ἐγ δίκας is a common formula in loan contracts. This formula was meant to ensure creditors a right of immediate

¹³⁹ σκηνή: for each tent. This seems to refer to a grouping of sailors.

¹⁴⁰ *IG XII 4*, 319.5-9: τοῖ στρατευόμενοι ἐν ταῖς μακραῖς ναυσὶν ἐ[πεῖ] κα καταλύωντι τὸν πλοῦν θυόντω τᾷ Ἀφροδίτῃ τᾷ Ποντία ἐπὶ τ[οῦ] προγεγραμμένου βωμοῦ ἱερεῖον τέλειον ἀφ' ἐκάστας σκανᾶς ἐπὶ δραχμῶν τριάκοντα ἢ καταβαλλόντω τῶν γερῶν καθ' ἐκάσταν σκανᾶν τᾷ ἱερεῖαι δραχμᾶς δεκαπέντε καὶ ἐς τὸν θησαυρὸν δραχμᾶν.

¹⁴¹ See *IG I³* 162, fifth century (soldiers at Athens); *LSS* 85, fourth century (soldiers and sailors at Lindos); see Sokolowski 1954, 161-162.

¹⁴² *I.Oropos* 277.31.

¹⁴³ For "black tie laws" see Parker 2004a, 65.

action against defaulting debtors.¹⁴⁴ The same formula is used in another Coan decree stating that whenever a *deme* finds a dead demesman it may exact the cost from his kin *καθάπερ ἐγ δίκας*.¹⁴⁵ In other instances we see that cult officials are extended the same rights; breaches of sacrificial rules attracted enforceable fines. Thus the same legal mechanisms apply in the failure to pay sacrificial dues as in the case of other unfulfilled obligations.

Was the priestess of Aphrodite expected to chase sailors around the city threatening legal action if they did not pay the required fee? According to Rubenstein:

When an enactment authorizes an official, including the personnel associated with sanctuaries, to seize *enechyra* in connection with the imposition of a penalty, there can be no doubt at all that he had the power – and often also a legal obligation – to participate actively in the process of *praxis*, and that his action in this respect did not depend on any initiative taken by a private individual.¹⁴⁶

How, then, did this right of exaction work in a way that did not compromise the priestess' reputation and safety? The vagueness of *praxis* in the evidence makes coming to any conclusion about procedure difficult.¹⁴⁷ Most likely, the priestess (more likely her *kyrios*) would have the authority to exact the money by whatever means necessary. To what ends one could go, however, is still uncertain.¹⁴⁸ What we see is a well-conceived carrot and stick strategy: whereas *praxis* awaits noncompliance, the discounted rate for sacrifice facilitates ease of compliance.

Sailors were thus contractually obligated to pay cult fees either in cash or in kind: a more efficient way for the community to ensure that the cult of Aphrodite remained

¹⁴⁴ Parker and Obbink 2000, 432 (see no. 64).

¹⁴⁵ *LSCG* 151 B 31.

¹⁴⁶ Rubenstein 2009, 194.

¹⁴⁷ On the use of force, see Rubenstein 2009, 194 no. 11: it is often difficult, if not impossible, to assess the extent to which the officials in question were authorized to exercise a measure of force against the debtor in order to recover the fine destined for the polis' treasury or its sanctuaries.

¹⁴⁸ Rubenstein 2009, 196 no. 14.

financially able to fulfill sacrificial obligations. Certainly, this seafaring community considered the propitiation of Aphrodite Pontia essential to the common good of the city's commerce.¹⁴⁹ Although it was far more practical for the sailors to go to the priestess, she did have the authority to go to them. The location of the sanctuary, however, may have made this a rare occurrence since the twin sanctuaries were in the agora facing the waterfront. Location, then, may have contributed to the development of this strategy.¹⁵⁰ Sailors could approach the sanctuary and fulfill their sacrificial obligations as soon as they docked at the port. It was also far more lucrative for the cult and far more attractive for a potential buyer of the priesthood.

While the right of exaction made securing revenue more efficient, priestesses gained more authority in the sphere of cult finance. The emergence of one practice coincides with, but may not relate to, the end of another. Nevertheless, it does appear that priestesses were no longer required to perform the undesirable task of begging. This shift should be seen within the larger context of cult changes taking place during the Hellenistic period. The increased number of cults can only have led to greater competition for resources, requiring cults to be more financially efficient in order to operate. The decree from Cos shows that while new options emerged for the priestess to have a role in the finance of her cult, certain ritual obligations may have diminished. These new options were backed by legal authority and enhanced the attractiveness of the office for potential priesthood buyers. The rules provided for the safety and reputation of the priestess and would-be collectors. Although the evidence does not reveal a direct connection, the rise of new strategies for reconfiguring or supplementing a cult's finances coincided with the decline of ritual collection.

¹⁴⁹ See Parker 2002, 150-152.

¹⁵⁰ See Parker 2002, 144-145: Two identical but separate temples have been identified with high probability that they are those of Aphrodite Pandamos and Pontia, respectively.

2.3. Conclusion

Ritual begging was both an important administrative means of collecting revenue and a traditional religious performance; like priesthood sales it was more popular in some places than in others. While this attests to the localized nature of Greek religious practices, it also reminds us that religious changes did not occur in a vacuum. Whatever the reason, it is clear that some communities began to think that there were better ways for women, especially priestesses, to help finance cults.

Ritual collection defrayed the cost of religious performances by relieving the city of the financial burden. In times of need, pledge drives no doubt helped pay for the cost of civic festivals as long as the people had money to contribute. But communities may have begun to reevaluate the practicality and/or appropriateness of repetitive ritualized collections, often seen as begging. At Cos, the community decided that day-to-day cult activities would benefit from a viable alternative to ritual begging. Thus, the community empowered the priestess with the right of exaction, *praxis*. Consequently, communities adapted the rights and obligations of their priestesses so that they could collect money with greater efficiency and less shame, with more legal autonomy and less social risk. One-time projects, however, still depended on the generosity of a few major benefactors or the numerous contributions of minor ones. The following chapter reveals the possibilities of such contributions, and the impact that these projects had on redefining the sacred landscape.

3. Adapting and Reconfiguring Sacred Space

In the third century BC, the people of Tanagra were faced with the decision whether to transfer their sanctuary of Demeter and Kore to another location. A decree records the details of the episode,¹ stating that the people had put the question to an oracle: should the sanctuary remain where it is, be moved to a spot called the *Euameria*, or be moved into the city? Apollo replied that the sanctuary should be moved into the city. This was not the end of the story. Moving a sanctuary would disrupt religious practices and posed logistical challenges that required careful legislation. In what follows, I examine the various legislative and ritual complexities that such disruptions to sacred space engendered, shedding light on the different strategies communities adopted when dealing with similarly profound changes.

Cult transfer required the alteration and often reinvention of sacred space. The concern for maintaining ritual and preserving sanctuaries is evident from nearly every corner of the Greek world. In many instances, communities issued detailed regulations backed by sanctions that were flexible in scope in order to protect sacred space.² Faced with circumstances threatening the continuity of their ritual performance, communities had to devise strategies to deal with foreseen and unforeseen outcomes, particularly the effects that a given project may have on nearby property.³ Laws concerning the transfer or disruption of sacred space attest that such rigid dichotomies as public/private and

¹ Migeotte 1992, no. 28 (lines 1-44); *SEG* 43.212; Roller 1989, no. 87 (pages 100-108) provides the most recent and most detailed analysis of *both* sides of the stone; See also Le Guen-Pollet 1991, no. 33.

² For the protection of sacred space, see Parker 2004a: 57-70, *NGSL* pp. 22-30, and Dillon 1997a, 115-127; For sanctions, see Naiden 2007, especially 123 and 132-133.

³ On public/private, see Humphreys 2004, 55-56. On the urban/extra-urban dichotomy, see Polinskaya 2006, 61-92.

urban/extra-urban do not always reflect the complexities of administering and protecting sacred space.

Laws governing spatial disruptions reveal efforts to balance innovation and tradition using written and unwritten laws. According to Aristotle, there are two kinds of laws: the universal and the particular. Particular law (*idios nomos*) is that which communities establish and apply to themselves. It is *both* written and unwritten. On the other hand, universal law (*koinos nomos*) is the law of nature (*physis*).⁴ Lawful movement or reconfiguration of sacred space would require a careful negotiation of particular law, i.e. written rules created to supplement and preserve what is unwritten (conventional religious practices). No law, however, can anticipate every possible outcome for any given decision. Although the laws discussed in this chapter were aimed at addressing specific problems directly, they also exhibit flexibility that allows for appropriate responses to unforeseen problems. Aristotle explains:

(Unwritten law) makes up for the deficiency of a community's written law. This balance seems just; it is a balance that is just even beyond the written law. It happens that this is a quality of both willing and unwilling legislators; of the unwilling, where it has escaped their notice; of the willing where they find themselves unable to make the distinction, and it is necessary to legislate generally, or not, as in most cases, and as much as it is not easy to make distinctions on account of endless possibilities, such as the kinds and sizes of weapons that may be used to harm someone. For a lifetime would pass anyone reckoning these distinctions. *Therefore, should there be uncertainty, but a need to legislate, then it is necessary to do so in general terms.*⁵

⁴ Aristot. *Rhet.* 1373b.4-7: λέγω δὲ νόμον τὸν μὲν ἴδιον, τὸν δὲ κοινόν, ἴδιον μὲν τὸν ἐκάστοις ὠρισμένον πρὸς αὐτούς, καὶ τοῦτον τὸν μὲν ἐγγραφον, τὸν δὲ γεγραμμένον, κοινὸν δὲ τὸν κατὰ φύσιν.

⁵ Aristot. *Rhet.* 1374a 25-34: τὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου νόμου καὶ γεγραμμένου ἔλλειμμα. τὸ γὰρ ἐπιεικὲς δοκεῖ δίκαιον εἶναι, ἔστιν δὲ ἐπιεικὲς τὸ παρὰ τὸν γεγραμμένον νόμον δίκαιον. συμβαίνει δὲ τοῦτο τὰ μὲν ἐκόντων τὰ δὲ ἀκόντων τῶν νομοθετῶν, ἀκόντων μὲν ὅταν λάθῃ, ἐκόντων δ' ὅταν μὴ δύνωνται διορίσαι, ἀλλ' ἀναγκαῖον μὲν ἢ καθόλου εἰπεῖν, μὴ ἢ δέ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, καὶ ὅσα μὴ ῥάδιον διορίσαι δι' ἀπειρίαν, οἷον τὸ τρωῶσαι σιδήρῳ πηλίκῳ καὶ ποίῳ τινί· ὑπολείπει γὰρ ἂν ὁ αἰὼν διαριθμοῦντα. ἂν οὖν ἢ ἀόριστον, δέη δὲ νομοθετῆσαι, ἀνάγκη ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν. See Hart 1994, 126-128. Laws depend on general agreements and open alternatives/textures since every possible combination of actions can neither be known nor legislated. See also Harris 2000, 29-30.

Appealing to unwritten laws was forbidden in Athenian courts;⁶ but unwritten laws, especially ones pertaining to religion, had to be considered when crafting written laws. Sanctuaries were home and host to ritual practices requiring precise repetition of specific conventional acts often dictated by *nomoi*, unwritten customs. Disruption to the physical integrity of the sanctuary endangered the efficacy of the ritual. Preserving religious space required a reasonable balance (ἐπιείκεια) of written and unwritten law.⁷ Written rules had to be flexible enough to permit a degree of renegotiation; striking this balance was not easy.

In the case studies that follow, I will show how specific rules for reconfiguration of sacred space were given wherever possible, but others had to be more open-ended to allow one to act according to one's best judgment. We are reminded of the Athenian Heliastic Oath: "I will cast my vote in consonance with the laws and with the decrees passed by the assembly and the council, but, if there is not law, in consonance with my sense of what is most just, without favor or enmity."⁸ One must follow the written law where possible, but follow one's sense of what is just where there is no written law. Moreover, if communities did not loosen the shackles of written law they would become slaves to it.⁹ They would fail to adapt to the sacred landscape that was changing around them. Such negotiation between law and religion, and tradition and innovation, is the subject of this chapter.

⁶ Andoc. 1.87: ἀγράφω δὲ νόμῳ τὰς ἀρχὰς μὴ χρῆσθαι μηδὲ περὶ ἐνός. See Harris 1994, 140.

⁷ Mirhady 1990, 396: A law governs 'the general', while fairness comes into play only when a specific situation does not conform to the general law. It ensures that despite deficiencies in the law, justice will be served (see Aristot. *Nic. Eth.* 1137b 13). For *epieikeia* as fairness in Athenian law, see Meyer-Laurin 1965.

⁸ The oath is reproduced by Fränkel (1878, 464) from its numerous quotations among the Attic orators: ψηφιοῦμαι κατὰ τοὺς νόμους καὶ τῆς βουλῆς τῶν πεντακοσίων, περὶ δ' ὃν ἂν νόμοι μὴ ὡσι γνώμη τῆ δικαιοσύνη, καὶ οὔτε χάριτος ἕνεκ' οὔτ' ἔχθρας. I follow the translation given by Hansen (1999, 182) with a few adjustments.

⁹ See Eur. *Hec.* 863-867: "Alas! There is no one among men who is free. Either he is a slave to money or fortune; or the people of the city or the written laws keep him from acting in ways according to his own judgment." φεῦ. / οὐκ ἔστι θνητῶν ὅστις ἔστ' ἐλεύθερος: / ἢ χρημάτων γὰρ δοῦλός ἐστιν ἢ τύχης, / ἢ πλῆθος αὐτὸν πόλεος ἢ νόμων γραφαὶ / εἴργουσι χρῆσθαι μὴ κατὰ γνώμην τρόποις.

3.1. The Case Studies: Tanagra, Anaphe, and Peparethus

Several case studies demonstrate different strategies under which communities modified their sanctuaries, either through transfer or reconfiguration. The case of the cult of Demeter and Kore at Tanagra details the planning process for the transfer of a sanctuary from one location to another. This episode, however, does not stand by itself. A late fourth-century decree from Colophon shows a different strategy. Here, the community brought its extra-urban shrine into the city by extending its city walls to enclose the sanctuary.¹⁰ A decree from the island of Anaphe details the ritual complexities of moving structures *within* sacred space that resulted from one man's own initiative to build a new sanctuary inside another.¹¹ Finally, a second-century honorific decree from Peparethus reveals the complexities of contracting the labor for moving a sanctuary.¹² In this case, the physical logistics of moving specific cult objects was the community's primary focus; but beneath the surface was a concern for replicating the sanctuary's layout and thus the cult's ritual practices. In the end, each case sheds light on the circumstances of the other. Together they demonstrate the strategies with which communities adapted to changing landscapes and competing interests.

3.1.1. The Precedent for Transferring Sanctuaries

Scholars identify various acts as cult transfers. Moving an entire sanctuary from one place to another and abandoning the old site is an obvious example. But transfer may also

¹⁰ Meritt 1935, 358-397, especially 361-371 (Colophon, late fourth century). Polinkaya 2006, 83: circuit wall embraces, not divides, land and deities.

¹¹ *IG XII 3*, 248; *Syll³* 977; *LSCG* 129 (Anaphe, second century BC); Bibliography, see *SEG* 25.909; see also Donohue 1988, no. 380 (pages 463-465).

¹² *Syll³* 587; *IG XII 8*, 640 (Peparethus, 197 BC).

entail transporting specific cult objects to a new land without decommissioning the existing site, i.e. a replication, cloning, or franchising of a cult. Replication of sacred space, and its accompanying ritual performances, is what unites the two under the category of transfer. Cult transfer is well attested in myth and history. Strabo recounts the Phocaeen foundation of Massalia (Marseille) that occurred around 600 BC:

They say that an oracle came to the Phocaeans as they were departing from their land (telling) them to use a guide for their voyage whom they were to take from Artemis at Ephesus. Indeed, on arriving at Ephesus they inquired as to how they might be able to obtain from the goddess what was commanded. The goddess came to Aristarcha, most esteemed among women, in a dream and ordered her to accompany the Phocaeans, taking with her a reproduction from among the sacred things. When this was done, and the colony was finally settled, the Phocaeans established a sanctuary, and honored Aristarcha exceedingly by appointing her priestess. Among all the colonies¹³ everywhere they worship this goddess foremost *and preserve the same placement of the xoanon and all other customs that are traditional in the mother city.*¹⁴

The *aphidruma* was a statue that was to be the cult statue (*xoanon*) in Massalia.¹⁵ This episode is an example of cult transfer in which certain cult objects are moved to a new location without decommissioning the old site. It is essentially the establishment of a branch cult. Replication of rites was the primary objective. The colonists were instructed to honor the goddess Artemis foremost (τιμᾶν ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις ταύτην τὴν θεὸν) and to preserve (φυλάττειν) the same διάθεσις of the statue. I suggest that the term διάθεσις means both shape and arrangement. Thus, in conjunction with the following phrase (καὶ τᾶλλα νόμιμα φυλάττειν τὰ αὐτὰ ἅπερ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει νενόμισται) the people maintain, at least ideally, an identical arrangement of objects in their sanctuaries, which permits the

¹³ It is unclear whether Strabo means all colonies of the Phocaeans, Massilians, or both.

¹⁴ Strabo 4.1.4: ἀπαίρουσι γὰρ τοῖς Φωκαιοῦσιν ἐκ τῆς οἰκείας λόγιον ἐκπεσεῖν φασιν ἡγεμόνι χρήσασθαι τοῦ πλοῦ παρὰ τῆς Ἐφεσίας Ἀρτέμιδος λαβοῦσι· τοὺς μὲν δὴ προσαχθέντας τῇ Ἐφέσῳ ζητεῖν ὄντινα τρόπον ἐκ τῆς θεοῦ πορίσαιντο τὸ προσταχθέν. Ἀριστάρχη δὲ τῶν ἐντίμων σφόδρα γυναικῶν παραστήναι κατ' ὄναρ τὴν θεὸν καὶ κελεύσαι συναπαίρειν τοῖς Φωκαιοῦσιν ἀφίδρυμά τι τῶν ἱερῶν λαβούση· γενομένου δὲ τούτου καὶ τῆς ἀποικίας λαβούσης τέλος, τό τε ἱερὸν ιδρύσασθαι καὶ τὴν Ἀριστάρχην τιμῆσαι διαφερόντως ἰέρειαν ἀποδείξαντας, ἐν τε ταῖς ἀποίκις πόλεσι πανταχοῦ τιμᾶν ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις ταύτην τὴν θεὸν καὶ τοῦ ξοάνου τὴν διάθεσιν τὴν αὐτὴν καὶ τᾶλλα νόμιμα φυλάττειν τὰ αὐτὰ ἅπερ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει νενόμισται.

¹⁵ See Malkin 2011, 182.

rites to be performed according to custom. In other words, the new sanctuaries had to replicate the one at Ephesus as closely as possible. Not every cult transfer, however, took place over such a distance.

At Tanagra, moving cult objects within the city walls was certainly less strenuous than shipping them across the Mediterranean. Nonetheless, this project required careful forethought to ensure the proper placement of the sanctuary and its reconfiguration. The scale of the project and the details differ, but the Tanagrans' concerns mirrored those of the Phocaeans. In both cases an oracle was involved, as one would expect. The Phocaeans may have received their oracular advice unexpectedly (λόγιον ἐκπεσεῖν), but the Tanagrans had sought it out.

Few would have been shocked when the oracle told the people of Tanagra to move their sanctuary into the city. While usually given a choice between two alternatives, the oracle in this instance had the choice of three: leave it where it is, move it to the *Euameria*, or move it into the city. Thus, the Tanagrans avoided the trap into which Xenophon fell when deciding whether or not to join Cyrus' ill-fated attack against his brother, the Persian king.¹⁶ In other words, the oracle had the choice of recommending inaction, leaving the sanctuary alone. By moving their sanctuary at all, the Tanagrans were risking disruption to the community's social and religious life. But the oracle's choice freed the community from apprehension and allowed a degree of flexibility. The oracle must have been confident that this transfer would not alter the rites of the cult. Questions over religious practices were commonly posed to oracles, but how common had cult transfer become?

¹⁶ Xen. *Anab.* 3.1.6-7: Xenophon asked: "to what god shall I pray and sacrifice I order that I ma best and most honorably go on the journey I have in mind, and return safe and successful?" For this, Socrates criticized Xenophon for not asking whether or not he should go in the first place.

We can only speculate as to why the people of Tanagra chose to transfer their sanctuary. Such transfer could be a logistically complex and emotionally taxing undertaking. As flexible as Greeks sometimes were, the location of a sanctuary was important for the development of local religion and helped shape civic identity. De Polignac famously argued that sanctuaries helped define the very territory of early Greek cities by signifying a sense of political and religious frontiers.¹⁷ Although his model has been much criticized, it is clear that the spatial relationship between a community and its sanctuaries provided a foundation for that community's self-identification.¹⁸ Of course, local historical developments cannot, and should not, be ignored. Parker has recently emphasized the difficulties posed by speaking of a 'Greek religion' or set of 'Greek religious practices'. Local cults were shaped by local historical circumstances and thus defy such an overarching model.¹⁹ Although local sanctuaries were crucial for the development of a community's religious and political identity, the relationship between Greeks and their gods does not always fit neatly into a structural paradigm.²⁰ When cities were founded, the placement of a sanctuary was usually determined by divine instruction or, in some cases the founder's careful planning.²¹ In other words, the development of a local Greek cult was in many ways determined by its relationship to its surroundings and the very spot on which it was founded. That communities issued ordinances protecting sacred space attests that these

¹⁷ de Polignac 1984, 30.

¹⁸ See Polinskaya 2006, 61-92; Antonaccio 1994, 79-86; Parker 2005, 387-395 provides a thoughtful critique of structuralist approach to Greek religion.

¹⁹ Parker 2005, 2: "Greeks bring out the individuality of a local pantheon, in their own way, by the connection that they often draw between gods and territory. Particular gods 'hold' or 'have' as their portion particular territories".

²⁰ See Parker 2005, especially 387-415.

²¹ Ferrari 2006, 231. However, even if a founder planned to build a sanctuary on a site it needed divine approval.

cults were also crucial for a community's continued sense of identity.²² Changes to that space were considered threatening.

Moving an extra-mural shrine into a city was one such change. The relationship between city and countryside has been the source of much scholarly attention. Many cults originated before state-formation took hold, i.e. before the *polis* arose as a political entity with its *asty-chora* dichotomy.²³ During this process, many gods were associated with rustic settings. Pan, Dionysus, and Demeter, began as rural deities that eventually had both urban and rural sanctuaries.²⁴ Was the setting of the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Tanagra crucial to how the goddesses were worshipped?

3.1.2. Preliminary Case Studies: Icarus, Colophon, and Athens

While moving sanctuaries was not a Hellenistic invention,²⁵ the evidence shows that transfers were becoming more complex amid expanding urban environments. Each case of sanctuary reconfiguration presented its own unique challenges particular to the circumstances, dictated by political and social developments as well as the physical terrain. Challenges were logistical (moving the actual sanctuary), but also required planning for less tangible consequences. Traditional honors, sacrifices, finances, and cult administration would have to be altered. This required a willingness to renegotiate tradition. A few preliminary case studies reveal how local circumstances affected transfer strategies, but

²² See Naiden 2007, 126.

²³ Polinskaya 2006, 72-75.

²⁴ On Dionysiac cults at Athens and Attica, see Henrichs 1990, 257-277. "As a god of the theater, he presided over dramatic performances both in the city and in the demes" (261).

²⁵ Chaniotis 2005, 149-163. War and population movements (not mutually exclusive) played a role in shifting the religious landscape. Demand 1990, 4-6: archaic and classical urban relocation was due in large part to external threats.

also demonstrate the difficulty of forming a complete picture based on the evidence we have.

A letter from an unknown Hellenistic king, perhaps Seleucus II (246-225 BC),²⁶ tells his subjects on the Persian Gulf island of Icarus (Failaka) that they must move their sanctuary of Soteira.²⁷ The destination of this transfer is not specified. The letter acted as a decree chastising negligent officials who were expected to have already completed this project:

Icadiion greetings to Anaxarchus. The King is concerned about the island of Icarus, both because his ancestors consecrated a cult (*aphidrysis*)²⁸ in this place and because they attempted to transfer the sanctuary of Soteira. And they wrote to the officials in charge (instructing them) to transfer; but they, either because something prevented them or for some other reason, did not carry out the transfer. But when King Seleucus wrote to us, we transferred it and we established a gymnastic contest for the gods.²⁹

The missive was inscribed and erected in front of the temple, *in antis*, at its new location. We know only that the temple was moved because the king or his predecessors simply preferred it elsewhere. The building of large fortification walls around the city suggests that security may have been a concern.³⁰ The enclosed city was founded to be a center for Mediterranean and Arabian trade.³¹ It seems then that the king mentioned in the letter either wanted to consolidate disparate structures into a centralized trading center or feared a growing local hostility to Greek presence on the island.³² A third possibility is that the cult

²⁶ *I. Estremo Oriente* 421/422. See Jeppesen 1989, 88.

²⁷ See Jeppesen 1989, 82-114. The identity of this deity is unclear, but was probably Artemis.

²⁸ For the reading of ἀφίδρυσις here, see Jeppesen 1989, 93.

²⁹ Jeppesen 1989, 102-103 lines 8-19 (Icarus (Failaka) third century BC): Ἰκαδίων Ἀναξάρχῳ χαίρειν· σπεύδει ὁ βασιλεὺς περὶ Ἰκάρου τῆς νήσου, διὰ τὸ [κ]αὶ τοὺς προγόνους αὐτοῦ ἀφίδ[ρυ]σι[ν] ἱερῶσαι καὶ τὸ τῆ Σω[τ]εῖρας ἱερὸν ἐ[π]ιβαλέ[σ]θαι μεταγαγεῖν κ[α]ὶ ἔγραψαν τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων τα[σσο]μένοις μεταγαγεῖν. ἐκεῖνοι δέ, εἴτ' [οὖν δ]ιὰ τὸ μὴ ἐκποιῆσαι αὐτοῖς, εἴτ[ε] δι' ἠνδρηποτοῦν αἰτίαν, [ο]ὐ μετήγαγο[ν]. ἡμῖν δὲ γράψ[α]ντος τοῦ βασιλέως Σε[λεύ]κου μετ[η]γάγομεν, καὶ κατεστήσαμεν [τοῖς θ]ε[ο]ῖς ἀγῶνα γυμνικόν.

³⁰ On the fortification walls and towers, see Jeppesen 1989, 13-23.

³¹ Piejko 1988, 97. As Jeppesen notes (1989, 75), the island did not serve any other strategic purpose.

³² Jeppesen 1989, 75. Piejko offers another possibility (1988, 99): "The relocation of the temple to a more convenient place may have provided a pretext to downgrade the native cult in favor of newcomers."

or cult objects were transferred from a site under Seleucid control in the Aegean.³³ In this way, the king was continuing a policy of cult transfer that began under Alexander the Great and Seleucus I Nicator.³⁴ The decree vaguely mentions that something initially prevented the people from compliance (εἴτ' [οὖν δ]ιὰ τὸ μὴ ἐκποιῆσαι αὐτοῖς, εἴτ[ε δι'] ἠνδηποτοῦν αἰτίαν). Logistical complications such as manpower shortage or disrupted trade routes may have hindered any attempt. On the other hand, the community may have been passively rebelling against the king(s), preferring to keep the sanctuary in its ancestral home.³⁵ Whatever the reason for the transfer, the evidence suggests that the people at Icarus built a new temple (B) joined to an older one (A)³⁶ that awaited the arrival of the *aphidrysis* (cult statue and accoutrements) from afar.

Distance between original and proposed locations affected how a community devised its strategy. At Colophon, the people decided to extend the walls of their city to incorporate their old city and temple that had been abandoned since the Persian Wars. Here, the community devised another way to bring their cults into the confines of the *asty* without moving the structures. A late fourth century decree reads:

In order that the people ... may show themselves in every way zealous of preserving the glory of their ancestors, it is resolved by the people with Good Fortune and for the safety of the entire people of Colophon, that the ancient city that according to all Greeks brought glory to our ancestors when they received it from the gods and established it and when they founded its temples and altars, be enclosed within a common system of walls together with the current city.³⁷

³³ Perhaps this transfer was part of Seleucid colonization projects. See Cohen 1978, 72-86.

³⁴ Jeppesen 1989, 77-79. Two conjoined temples have been identified at the site. Temple A seems to predate B and may have been dedicated to Apollo at the bequest of Didyma (Strab. 16.3.2). The smaller Temple B may have been dedicated to Soteira, but this cannot be proved.

³⁵ Greeks were often slow to act on the commands of the gods, especially when communicating with men through dreams. See van Straten 1976, 1-38. Moving a remote shrine at the behest of a king may have seemed less urgent.

³⁶ On these temples, see Jeppesen 1989, 53-79.

³⁷ Meritt 1935, 361-372 lines 6-12: ὅπως ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται / ... κατὰ πάντα τρόπον φιλοτιμούμενος δια/φυλάττειν τὴν τῶν προγόνων δόξαν, ἀγαθῆι τύχηι καὶ ἐπὶ σωτηρίαι παντὸς / τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Κολοφωνίων ἐρηφισθαι τῶι δήμωι τὴμ παλαιάμ πόλιν ἦν τῶν / θεῶν παραδόντων τοῖς προγόνοις ἡμῶν κτίσαντες ἐκεῖνοι καὶ

This case represents an alternative to the Tanagran strategy. The number of temples and other buildings to be included within the new circuit wall perhaps made transferring them impractical. Thus we may suppose that the Colophonians did not even consider moving so many structures. But large projects of moving numerous buildings are attested in the Hellenistic period, most famously in the *synoecism* of Lebedus and Teus.³⁸ At Colophon, the expansion of the walls may very well have also been a politically-driven attempt at territorial re-expansion,³⁹ but bringing the city to the cult was the best way to ensure the buildings and structures remained properly configured.

Establishing a new sanctuary within a city was another way to make a cult more accessible. Accessibility was not an issue with the establishment of the branch cult of Artemis Ephesus at Massalia since the original cult was so far away; but accessibility may have been a key factor in the development of branch cults elsewhere.⁴⁰ The City Eleusinion at Athens is a prime example. Establishing a new branch of a rural shrine within a city would not protect the rural shrine from incursions, but did allow worshippers to honor the gods and practice their rites with convenience. The temple identified as the Eleusinion, located southeast of the Agora at the north slope of the Acropolis, is attested as early as the 7th century BC; its relationship with the extra-urban sanctuary at Eleusis is attested as early as Solon.⁴¹ Both urban and extra-urban temples were used for celebrating the

ναοὺς καὶ / βωμοὺς ἰδρυσάμενοι παρὰ πᾶσι τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ἦσαν ἔνδοξοι / σ[υ]ντειχίσαι πρὸς τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν.
For the date of this decree, see Robert 1936, 158-166.

³⁸ Welles (*RC*) 1934, nos. 3 and 4 (Late fourth century BC).

³⁹ Demand 1990, 161-162.

⁴⁰ Moreover, these cults were at least partly responsible for the development of early poleis. See de Polignac 1995, 69-72 and 114-118.

⁴¹ Andoc. 1.111; Miles 1998, 8 and 21-23; De Polignac 1995, 85-88.

Thesmophoria.⁴² Although the Athenians essentially duplicated the cult, they did not duplicate the layout of the sanctuary at Eleusis exactly. The urban landscape and potential cost may have prohibited the Athenians from expanding the sanctuary in the city to match the one at Eleusis, which underwent periodic renovation and elaboration.⁴³ How the physical discrepancy between the two sanctuaries affected ritual performance remains a mystery.

From these preliminary cases we can see that whenever a community decided to transfer a sanctuary it devised legislative strategies that reflect local circumstances. Like the letter about Icarus, the Tanagran decree does not mention a reason for moving the sanctuary. Did war or brigandage pose an external threat? Did the sanctuary struggle financially and fall into neglect? Tanagra was not a densely populated site and seems never to have been; but did some degree of urbanizing pressure draw the sanctuary closer to the center of the community? What we know is that the option of “remaining where it is” given to the oracle may suggest that immediate external threats did not prompt the move, but even this cannot be said with certainty.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, moving it was a major priority for the community and required a strategy for acquiring resources and logistical planning. Let us now examine the city’s strategy more closely.

3.2. Regulating Cult Transfer

Large cult objects and administrative essentials had to be moved. But the first order of business was to choose a new location for the sanctuary. The Tanagran decree offers

⁴² Parker 1987, 142; Miles 1998, 22.

⁴³ See Mylonas 1961 for a detailed chronological study of the sanctuary of Demeter at Eleusis.

⁴⁴ The Tanagrans may have given the oracle the “remain where it is” option for religious reasons. Perhaps even with incursions or threats of violence, the god may want the temple to remain *in situ*. After all, gods were thought capable of defending their sanctuaries (Hdt. 9.65).

valuable insight into this process, the impact of transferring a sanctuary on other structures, and how communities sought to alleviate such complexities through regulation:

Since, after the city consulted the oracle concerning the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, namely whether it would be better for the Tanagrans to leave it where it is now or to transfer it to the *Euameria* or inside the city... in order that the sanctuary of Demeter might be built inside the city as beautifully as possible at the spot that seems good to the polemarchs, *syndikoi*, and elected commission...⁴⁵

The decree is concerned with the placement of the sanctuary, not the arrangement of specific structures and cult accoutrements.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, we learn how the city protected the space of other structures that might be affected during this project. This aspect of the project was one that the city predicted could lead to a great deal of complications. Finding a suitable place would not be easy.

3.2.1. Choosing a Location

Although cults for Demeter and Kore are known to be located in the countryside, in villages, and city centers (essentially anywhere), certain rustic qualities were nonetheless preferred.⁴⁷ Extra-urban sanctuaries, like the one at Tanagra, were situated close to areas of agricultural activity, e.g. outside the walls. Many of these sanctuaries were built on hillsides and near streams since pure water was used for religious practices. Votives associated with water were numerous in sanctuaries of Demeter, attesting to the importance of clean water

⁴⁵ Migeotte 1992, no. 28.3-6: ἐπιδή, / μαντευομένας τὰς πόλιος οὐπὲρ τῷ ἱερῷ τὰς Δάματρος κὴ τὰς Κόρας, πό/τερα κὴ αὐτῆ ἰαόντους Ταναγρήυς καθὰ κὴ νιοῦν ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον ἔσσειη / ἢ μεταφερόντους ἐν τὸν τόπον τὸν τᾶς Εὐαμερίας εἰ ἐν πόλιν... 8-10: ὅπως ὄν κατασκευ/ασθεῖη τὸ ἱερόν τὰς Δάματρος ἐν πόλι ὅτι κάλλιστον ἐν τῷ τόπῳ ἐν ᾧ κα / φήνητη τῆς πολεμάρχους κὴ τῆς συνδικύς κὴ τῆ ἀρχῆ τῆ ἡρεθείση.

⁴⁶ Also, the decree does not tell us details about which oracle was consulted. Most likely Apollo Ptoieus. On the oracle's popularity and access, see Schachter 1994, 291-306.

⁴⁷ See Cole 1994, 199-216.

in the cult.⁴⁸ The oracle's instructions concerning the cult performances for the new sanctuary comprise a crucial part of the decree. The oracle tells the Tanagrans "to receive the suburban goddesses into the circuit walls, celebrating (a festival) for your good, and do this while praying to the same goddesses".⁴⁹ What about the religious experience of those worshippers who would visit the shrine in the city? Since Demeter was the goddess of agriculture,⁵⁰ an extra-urban location was perhaps most desirable⁵¹ given that her rites required access to abundant fresh-water sources.⁵² Consequently, when the Tanagrans moved the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore from the countryside to the city they risked undermining the idyllic setting of the cult and the rites that depended upon that setting. Even if such an idyllic spot existed within the walls, something else was perhaps already there.

Greeks often tried to replicate an extra-urban experience within their urban sanctuaries. The sanctuaries to Demeter at Corinth, Iasos, and Eretria show that use of colonnades and natural formations (like hills) within the 'inner' space of the city helped form a remoteness within the urban setting.⁵³ Although choosing a spot for an urban sanctuary to Demeter had to be done with utmost care, the community had other ways to replicate a suitable idyllic setting, so long as it could provide certain essentials for the performance of ritual (e.g. fresh water). That the elected commission and certain magistrates were to build the new sanctuary as best as possible within the city in whatever

⁴⁸ Cole 1994, 203-204: miniature vessels, especially *hydriai*, were abundant in sanctuaries to Demeter. On the significance of water sources for urban development, see Crouch 1993, 100-120.

⁴⁹ Migeotte 1992, no. 28.8-9: θιάς προφαστίδας στεφάνου δέκεσθη ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ θάλλον/τας κῆ οὔτο ποιμεν εὐχομένως αὐτῆς τῆς θιῆς.

⁵⁰ See Burkert 1985, 159-161.

⁵¹ Pausanias mentions fifty-one cults of Demeter in mainland Greece. Twenty-one were located in cities, eighteen in villages, and twenty-four in the countryside. See Cole 1994, 199-216.

⁵² See Cole 1988, 161-165 for the uses of water in Greek sanctuaries.

⁵³ Cole 1994, 213.

spot they can (lines 8-10) allows these officials broader discretion in their choice for a new location. Why?

The oracle told the people to receive the goddesses “στεφάνυ” but the exact location cannot be discerned. This word has been interpreted in two ways: either στεφάνυ meant “on a summit” or “inside the crown” (i.e. within the circuit walls).⁵⁴ “On the summit” would fit with the idyllic requirements of the cult. “Within the walls”, however, is the probable meaning since it is consistent with the city’s question and the decree.⁵⁵ The city may have had an area in mind (perhaps it was the *Euameria*), but not yet an exact location. The subsequent rules gave the commission authority to find one.⁵⁶ Either the city had a place in mind that was occupied by another structure or it foresaw it might choose an occupied spot in the future. Further action would be needed to move the obstructing building or prepare a plot of land for the new sanctuary resulting in potentially numerous legal and financial entanglements: should someone’s land or house be useful for the project, the polemarchs had to convene a board of eleven men presumably to assess the situation.⁵⁷ The decree marks the beginning of what may have been a very long process had the commission chosen occupied space; further action would be required before shovels hit the ground. Perhaps this is why the city granted the commission three years to complete the project.⁵⁸

Dismantling the old sanctuary may be quick work, but finding a place to relocate it would

⁵⁴ For “on the summit”, see Roller 1989, 100-108. The terrain of Tanagra is hilly, suggesting that the oracle implied that any summit would suffice rather than suggesting a specific one. If this is indeed the case, then the sanctuary identified as that of Dionysus may in fact be that of Demeter and Kore.

⁵⁵ Migeotte 1992, no. 28.4-6: πότερα κῆ αὐτὶ ἰαόντης Ταναγρήως καθὰ κῆ νιοῦν ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον ἔσσειη ἢ μεταφερόντης ἐν τὸν τόπον τὸν τᾶς Εὐαμερίας εἰ ἐν πόλιν. Migeotte 1992, no. 28 translates: “Accueillez dans l’enceinte les déesses du faubourg en célébrant une fête florale pour votre bien et faites cela en invoquant les déesses elles-mêmes”. For στέφανος meaning walls, see Pi. *O.* 8.32, Anacr. 72, and *Il.* 13.736 (“encircling”).

⁵⁶ Migeotte 1992, no. 28.14-15.

⁵⁷ Migeotte 1992, no. 28.14-17: ἡ δὲ κά τινος τόπος ἢ φυκία χρῆ/σιμος ἔει πὸτ τὰν κατασκευὰν τῶ ἱερῶ, τὸ πολέμαρχυ σουγκαλέσ/σαντες τὸν δᾶμον στασάνθω τιματὰς ἔνδεκα ἄνδρας κὰτ τὸν νόμον / τὸν κυνὸν Βοιωτῶν.

⁵⁸ Migeotte 1992, no. 28.9-10.

take time. At that point, structures would have to be arranged within the new space. The decree does not provide explicit rules for this phase of the project; others do.

3.2.2. Moving Structures, Disrupting Space

Following the commission's decision on where to place the sanctuary, the objects and structures that comprise the sanctuary would have to be moved. The decree does not tell us what objects and structures these were, but evidence from elsewhere suggests that requisite cult structures like the altar, cult statue, and *stelai* were certainly among them. Also among the necessary cult structures was some combination of doors, roof tiles, and foundation stones. This evidence gives us logistical details for the disruption of space that the decree from Tanagra does not. Decrees from Anaphe and Peparethus reveal strategies for preserving sacred space, particularly when construction threatened to alter surrounding structures.

In the second century BC, a certain Timotheus of Anaphe proposed to build a new sanctuary to Aphrodite. He consulted the oracle of Apollo about whether he should build it in the precinct of the Asclepieion or that of Apollo Asgelates. A civic decree records the question to the oracle, its response, and the specific instructions for the building of the sanctuary.⁵⁹ The oracle told Timotheus to build it in the precinct of Apollo Asgelates rather than the Asclepieion and that it should be public. Regardless of what the oracle chooses, the new sanctuary to Aphrodite was going to be situated within an existing sacred space. That two divinities shared sacred space was not uncommon,⁶⁰ but the Anaphe decree represents

⁵⁹ *IG XII 3.248*; *LSCG 129* (Anaphe, second century BC).

⁶⁰ For instance, Aphrodite was worshipped at Apollo's famous sanctuary at Didyma and the two even shared an altar at Cyrene. Pironti 2007, 216, see no. 36; Fontenrose 1988, 149-151; Burkert 1988, 34.

a detailed view of the way a community reconfigured its sacred space and existing cults in order to accommodate one man's initiative.

The extra-urban sanctuary of Apollo is located three kilometers east of the ancient city, now called Casteli. Much of the material evidence from the sanctuary and other monuments has been incorporated into local farmhouses and the island's main monastery, which is located inside the *temenos* of Apollo.⁶¹ The *naos* of Apollo still stands, although it is in disrepair. Archaeological work has been difficult due to the poor preservation of the site and the fact that many statues, columns, inscriptions, and cult structures have been recycled into medieval and modern buildings.⁶² Ludwig Ross excavated the site in the 1830's and his findings were published in 1861; he provides a detailed epigraphic analysis of the inscriptions he found but only a few sketches of the terrain.⁶³ Hiller von Gaertringen provided the first known photographs of the site from 1899 to 1901 following his tour of the Cyclades.⁶⁴ Little work has been done since.

The sanctuary is located on the south coast of the island; the *naos* of Apollo, joined to the western wall inside the *temenos*, faces northeastward. It is a small temple approximately fifteen feet in length and width. It has a short stone perimeter wall. The large outer walls (*temenos*) appear to have an opening on the eastern side that may have been the main ancient entrance to the sanctuary. The modern entrance is on the western wall that leads the visitor past the *naos* of Apollo. Much ancient material, statue bases, and inscriptions, have been incorporated into the northwest portion of the *temenos*, perhaps at

⁶¹ Ross 1861, 494.

⁶² On these issues, see Kenna 2009, 490-491.

⁶³ Ross 1861, 486-527.

⁶⁴ Hiller von Gaertringen 1899, 351-357.

the time when the monastery was built in the 19th century.⁶⁵ Thus, the location of the new temple of Aphrodite is unknown, although Hiller von Gaertringen suggests that it was probably located where the monastery now stands. We must rely on our inscription that was once embedded in the wall of the island's schoolhouse⁶⁶ to make sense of Timotheus' project.

Although the sanctuary of Apollo Asgelates was extra-urban, erecting a new structure within established sacred space still engendered numerous challenges.⁶⁷

Timotheus needed a spot within the temple of Apollo:

Having asked that space be given to him in the sanctuary of Apollo Asgelates so that he might build a temple for Aphrodite using wood and stone and clay from the sanctuary, whatever he needs in the place, at the wall (ἐν τῷ αἰμασιᾷ) where the olive tree that faces the *Eudoreion oikos* and the *Meidileion* is; and so that he may make the place, where the altar and little statue of (Zeus?) *Ktesios* are,⁶⁸ into the passage to the temple there, having torn down the wall (τὸν τοῖχον).⁶⁹

To reconstruct precisely these complex operations would require visual information about the structures mentioned in the decree that we unfortunately do not have. Nevertheless, the decree provides enough information to formulate a probable, if partial, understanding of the project and will give us a better idea of how sacred space related to ritual practice and what this can tell us about cult transfer.

⁶⁵ I visited this site in August 2011. The incorporation of ancient materials into the monastery and rebuilt outer walls make an accurate and certain reconstruction of the Hellenistic sanctuary impossible. Ross 1861 provides some sketches of the terrain but no measurements. Hiller von Gaertringen provides photos. Neither works are particularly useful for any archaeological reconstruction of the site.

⁶⁶ Ross 1861, 494. The inscription is now in Epigraphical Museum at Athens (EM 10058).

⁶⁷ The site of the sanctuary is approximately three kilometers east of the ancient settlement now called Kastelli.

⁶⁸ *Ktesios* is a rather peculiar god worshipped within the *temenos* of Apollo. The decree only gives the epithet *Ktesios*; Zeus is implied. A shrine to the god is strange in a public setting such as this. See Parker 2005, 15-16: Zeus *Ktesios* was concerned both with the acquisition of property and with its preservation.

⁶⁹ *IG XII 3*, 248.7-15: ἀξιόσ<ας> αὐτῶι δοθῆ/μεν ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Ἀσγελάτα τό/πον, ὅσ[τε ναὸ]ν Ἀφροδίτας οἰκοδομησαι ὑλ[α]ι καὶ λί/θοις καὶ χοῖ [χ]ρώμενος ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ὅν κα χρείαν ἔχη / ἐν τῶι τόπωι ἐν τῷ αἰμασιᾷ ὅπεϊ ἅ ἐλαία ἅ ποτὶ τὸν / Εὐδώρειον οἶκον καὶ τὸν Μειδίλειον· τὸν δὲ τόπον, / [ὄ]πεϊ ὁ βωμὸς τοῦ Κτησίου καὶ τὸ ξοάνιον, τὸν τοῖχον / λύσαντα τὰν πάροδον ποιῆσαι ἐς τὸν ναὸν / [τ]αῦται.

First, we must determine the identity of the wall (or walls) to which the decree refers. The inscription offers two different words for wall, αἰμασιά and τοῖχος. Were these words used to describe the same wall? If so, the inconsistency would be difficult to explain. It is more likely that these are two different, but perhaps connected, walls. The αἰμασιά probably denotes a smaller wall that extended from the temple wall (τοῖχος). This is borne out logically from the fact that Timotheus would use materials from this αἰμασιά in order to build an entrance to his new temple *there* (at that spot), tearing down the wall (τοῖχος).

Moreover, he was required “once the wall was built to replace the altar and cult statue back against the wall.⁷⁰ Did Timotheus put the altar and cult statue back against the wall that he tore down to make the new entrance? Apparently, after Timotheus breaks the wall, along which is the shrine to Ktesios, in order to make a new entrance, he is to build a new wall or rebuild the one that he tore down. Rebuilding the same wall that he tore down would mean closing the entrance that he just created, which would make no sense. One possibility is that Timotheus had to build a new wall against which he would place the shrine to Ktesios. The verb used here (οικοδομέω) lacks a prefix to denote “re-build”.⁷¹ For building this new wall Timotheus could use the materials from the old.⁷² This new wall against which Ktesios would be settled was probably to parallel the torn down section that was to be the new entrance. It may have been the dividing wall between the shrine for Ktesios and the one for Aphrodite. It would also explain why certain objects were allowed to be replaced “wherever useful”, a phrase that I shall return to shortly.

⁷⁰ *IG XII 3*, 248.15-17: καὶ οἰκοδομηθέντος τοῦ τοίχου τὸν βωμὸν / καὶ τὸ ξοάνιον καταστᾶσαι πάλιν ἐς τὸν τοῖχ/ον.

⁷¹ The prefix ἐξ- would denote fortifying; but the prefix ἀνα- would have specified that Timotheus “rebuild” the wall. For instance, after the Persians abandoned Athens, the Athenians began to rebuild their city and its walls: καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἀνοικοδομεῖν παρασκευάζοντο καὶ τὰ τεῖχη. See Thuc. 1.89. Also an honorific decree, *IG II² 1225.11-12* (ca. 250 BC): καὶ τῶν τειχῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ πεπτωκότων συνεπεμε/[λ]ήθη ὅπως ἀνοικοδομηθεῖ.

⁷² *IG XII 3*, 248.9-11.

Creating a new wall, then, would compress the allotted space for the cult of Ktesios. Although the new sanctuary, like the one for Demeter and Kore at Tanagra was located away from the city-center,⁷³ there was a restriction of space within which the new sanctuary will be nestled. On the other hand, if the phrase *οικοδομηθέντος τοῦ τοίχου* means “build” in a general sense (i.e. carry out the work) then the arrangement of Ktesios’ shrine may have been severely altered when its structures were placed back against the wall. At this point we have two emerging possibilities: Timotheus had to “build a *new* wall” against which the shrine of Ktesios was to be placed or the shrine had to be replaced somewhere else along the *τοῖχος*. Rules for the second phase of the project, i.e. the replacement of cult structures, may help us understand these possibilities further.

3.3. Place, Ritual, and the Effects of Disruption

In order to build his new shrine, Timotheus had to disrupt the old sanctuary; in order to fulfill his obligations, he would have to reconfigure it. To achieve this goal, specific rules guided Timotheus in reconfiguring objects and structures within the old sanctuary:⁷⁴

After the wall has been made, he shall restore the *bomos* and *xoanion* back against the wall, and as to the *stelai* that are on the wall, and the purification reservoir (*aporranthron*), as many (*stelai*) as possible he shall restore there, but for as many (*stelai*) as there is no place, (he shall restore them) wherever it seems to be useful.⁷⁵

When the wall was built he had to replace the altar and cult statue (of Ktesios) “back against the wall”. In addition to giving permission to build the new sanctuary using materials from

⁷³ For the location of the sanctuary to Apollo at Anaphe, see Hiller von Gaertringen 1899-1909, 353; for the possible site of the sanctuary of Demeter at Tanagra, see Roller 1987, 213-232.

⁷⁴ The ritual significance of these structures will be discussed below.

⁷⁵ *IG XII 3*, 248.15-20: *καὶ οἰκοδομηθέντος τοῦ τοίχου τὸν βωμὸν / καὶ τὸ ξοάνιον καταστᾶσαι πάλιν ἐς τὸν τοῖχον· / τὰς δὲ στάλας τὰς οὔσας ἐν τῷ τοίχῳ / καὶ τὸν ἀπόρανθρον ὅσας μὲν καὶ δυνατὸν ἦι / αὐτεῖ καταστᾶσαι· ὅσας δὲ [κα] μὴ ἦι τόπος ὅπει κα / δοκῆι χρήσιμον ἦμεν.*

the existing one, the decree includes measures for dealing with problems that may result.⁷⁶ One such measure aimed to maintain the physical integrity of Apollo's sanctuary, particularly the shrine of Ktesios located therein. The altar, cult statue, *stelai*, and lustral basin were not ordinary objects; they were necessary for religious performance in the sanctuary. Failure to return them to their original place could have serious consequences for the integrity of sacred space. Timotheus has the power to use whatever resources he needs from the sanctuary of Apollo. Taking wood, stone (from the broken wall), and clay from the old sanctuary would drastically alter its layout.

Imagine that a typical visitor has just arrived at the entrance to the sacred *temenos*. Although each Greek sanctuary had its peculiarities, it tended to follow a plan familiar to most worshippers.⁷⁷ Before entering sacred space, all visitors were required to purify themselves so as not to bring pollution into the god's presence.⁷⁸ Therefore a basin of water⁷⁹ was typically located at the entrance. According to the decree, this structure goes back against the wall, presumably at the entranceway. After entering the *temenos*, the typical visitor would approach the central feature of the shrine: the altar.⁸⁰ Near the altar, especially at smaller shrines where space was limited, was the cult statue before which

⁷⁶ Precise instructions for the placement of structures and objects are not only in sacred laws. Building contracts, for instance, were legally binding documents that contain precise details regulating construction; they do not, however, have a primarily religious focus and are therefore not traditionally included in the corpus of laws. Although contracts are under the category of "law" they tend not to be included in "sacred laws". For the arguments and distinctions, see *NGSL* pp. 6-7.

⁷⁷ See Ferrari 2006, 234: "Despite a wide range of variations, the regularities... in the shape of the physical plant of worship in the polis add up to a coherent whole. The sanctuary is a compound, encompassing both natural features and built structures on a parcel of land. These include a circuit wall, accessible through a double gate giving access to the altar, the temple, or temples, and other shrines and temple-like structures". Evidence suggests that the early Greek sanctuary was modeled on Mycenaean monumental architecture, providing the basic layout of Greek sanctuaries (cf. Hanell 1932).

⁷⁸ Especially useful is the Cyrene Cathartic Law. See Parker 1983, 333-351.

⁷⁹ Greeks had various names for the lustral basin. It is called the *aporhanthron* in the Anaphe text, but is called the *hagisteria* or *perirrhantieron* elsewhere. See Burkert 1985, 77-78.

⁸⁰ See Ferguson 1989, 29, 32-36

worshippers prayed. A visitor would dedicate a hanging votive, statue, or another permanent dedication as close as possible to be the sacred property of the god.

In theory, successful ritual performances depended on a schematized set of actions conducted at a specific time and place.⁸¹ It follows that disruption of a sanctuary would threaten those actions and thus the traditional religious performances that took place there. Since disrupting objects within sacred space threatened to alter ritualized actions, replicating the layout of the old sanctuary, and using the same structures was the best a community could do, both at Tanagra and Anaphe. Following specific rules for the rearrangement of important structures helped ensure the most accurate replication desirable. The written prescriptions were meant to supplement the unwritten religious conventions. In other words, the written procedures for moving sacred structures tell us much about the traditional rites performed in these sanctuaries and what communities deemed most important to protect. Let us examine the replacement of structures at Anaphe, then Peparethus. We shall see how practical necessity matches up with the theoretical arrangement of sacred space.

Focusing on the interactions between objects and structures, recent scholarship has shown the potential for greater understanding of sacred space through analysis of the relationship between sanctuaries and their immediate surroundings in addition to the relationship between structures that comprise a given sanctuary.⁸² The Anaphe text provides an opportunity to explore this approach further by focusing on its specific rules governing the repositioning of structures within sacred space just as the Tanagra decree provides insight into the relationship between a sanctuary and its immediate surroundings.

⁸¹ See Kyriakidis 2007, 289-308; Rappaport 1999, 209-214.

⁸² For a recent focus on Delphi and Olympia, see Scott 2010; see also Cole 2004.

The relationship between the structures in the Anaphe text was crucial for the overall cult experience and the regulations preserved rituals performed in the *temenos* of Apollo.

3.3.1. Moving the Purification Basin

What would happen if the basin were not replaced? Pollution could cause distress to the sanctuary and the community.⁸³ This purification basin was a fixture in ritual, and few Greeks besides Theophrastus would question its use. In fact, many sacred laws from around the Greek world stipulate that ritual purity was required before entering a sanctuary.⁸⁴ Lucian sarcastically observes the accepted notion of entering sacred space “purified” as a priest himself stands nearby covered in gore and dripping blood upon the altar.⁸⁵ The satire would lack bite if purification were not a strictly observed requirement.

Bringing pollution into sacred space was believed to have profound consequences because it could contaminate the divine. We know from confession inscriptions in Asia Minor that the gods would punish individuals for committing offenses, including the seemingly minor infractions of entering a sanctuary with dirty clothes or without meeting other seemingly minor purity requirements.⁸⁶ This again demonstrates the importance of

⁸³ The Superstitious Man in Theophrastus' *Characters* (16) goes to great lengths to ensure his ritual purity: he washes himself in a spring and sprinkles himself with water from a basin in a sanctuary. Although this superstitious man is clearly a caricature, he testifies to the cautious behavior that any pious individual would (certainly to a lesser degree) emulate for ritual purity. See Bendlin 2007, 180-181; see *Il.* 6.266-268: Hector states that he cannot perform sacrifice with unwashed hands.

⁸⁴ For general requirements, see Parker 1983, 176-180; on lustration, see 226-227: water had to be pure and drawn from various flowing sources. Seawater was especially cathartic. Sanctions, however, were not always possible and it was often left to the god to punish transgressions. An inscription from Ephesus, marking the inviolable *temenos* of Artemis, offers the rather vague warning that he who transgresses will “have himself to blame” (*Syll*³ 989).

⁸⁵ Luc. *Sacr.* 1.2.12-13.

⁸⁶ On confession inscriptions see Chaniotis 2004b, 1-43.

placing the basin by an entrance or where one approaches the god.⁸⁷ Lustration remained an important custom for many centuries. A famous third century AD regulation from Lindos simply tells the visitor to be purified with the water from the *perirrhanterion* before entering the sanctuary with a pure body and soul.⁸⁸

These physical objects were reminders that any negotiation or interaction with a god required the ritual gesture of purification. Pure water was necessary because it was both a medium for interaction with the divine and, as an antidote to any pollution a visitor may have, a sign of important ritual boundaries and transitions.⁸⁹ This too, is why Oedipus ran into trouble at Colonus.⁹⁰ He not only transgressed local customs,⁹¹ but also universal requirements to enter sacred space purified.

As an indispensable component of many rituals, pure water had to be accessible to all entering a sanctuary. According to Horden and Purcell:

Water has indeed been indispensable in the ritual activities of most Mediterranean religious systems. No ingredient of the environment is given a higher status by inclusion in them, and if all springs are holy, in an important sense, all holiness is connected with water.⁹²

Placing the purification basin back in its original place following construction was crucial in providing visitors the necessary purification. Furthermore, as Walter Burkert notes: “Access to the divine is not free and simple, but regulated through steps and boundaries.”⁹³ The primary boundary, marked by a sanctuary’s *temenos*, defined the initial parameters of the

⁸⁷ In the case of sexual pollution one merely had to wash before entering a shrine or facing a divinity (Parker 1983, 76-79), but many later decrees contain stricter requirements depending on the nature of sexual encounter (e.g. *LSCG* 156; *LSAM* 12, 20, and 29 which specifies that one is polluted for two days after intercourse with his wife, but three days following intercourse with a prostitute).

⁸⁸ *LSS* 91.1-5; Also, Pl. *Crat.* 405a-b: *perirrhaneis*. Eur. *Ion* 435.

⁸⁹ Cole 2004, 34.

⁹⁰ Soph. *OC* 151-169.

⁹¹ See Chapter 1.

⁹² Horden and Purcell 2000, 412.

⁹³ Burkert 1988, 35.

ritual experience. A visitor would typically enter a sanctuary only through a specific spot where purification basins were located.⁹⁴ They marked the entrance to a sanctuary and were visible indicators of divine presence.⁹⁵

Thus, the basin was also as a means for controlling a visitor's movement *through* sacred space. It enforced the traditional ritual performances by eliminating the possibilities for ritual deviation. One could not enter sacred space through an entrance that did not have a purification basin or reservoir. At this moment, other structures and objects guided the visitor's movement through the sanctuary.⁹⁶ Thus, the purification basin marked the first step in the ritual experience. The Anaphe decree aimed to ensure that this fundamental structure would be returned to its original position as soon as possible to prevent the threat of pollution,⁹⁷ but also to limit the possibility of ritual deviation. Specifically, it is to be placed back against the wall with the other objects.

A Pergamene sacred law (133 BC) states that anyone who wished to do so may upon purification enter the sanctuary of Athena *Nicephoros* through the gate along which the basin (*hagisteria*) is located.⁹⁸ The gate flanked by the basin served as a funnel that

⁹⁴ Cole 1988, 162: the purification basin's appearance (in the seventh and sixth centuries) marks a refinement in the development of the marking off of the sacred *temenos* from secular life.

⁹⁵ Parker 1983, 19: without purification there is no access to the sacred. According to the Hippocratic corpus: "We ourselves build boundaries for the temples and sacred precincts of the gods in order that no one may cross them unless he purifies himself, and, upon entering besprinkle ourselves with water not because we are defiled but so that we have some impunity from any pollution that we have contracted in the past" (*Morb. Sacr.* 1).

⁹⁶ Pure water sources were common near sanctuaries to Apollo. See Cole 1988, 161. See also Parker 1983, 226-227: "Water had to be pure and drawn from a flowing source... this was a distinctively religious source of power."

⁹⁷ These structures are not preserved in what remains of the sanctuary of Apollo Asgelates (see Hiller von Gaertringen 1899-1909, 352-353; Reger 2004, 735). The building dates to the fourth or third-century BC (see Osborne 1999, 234). A glance at a nearby sanctuary may help illustrate the physical layout of the sanctuary, the placement of cult objects within it, and the significance of regulating spatial configuration. The foundation of the sanctuary dedicated to Apollo at Despotiko Mandra on nearby Naxos dates to the early archaic period and remained in use throughout the Hellenistic period. This sanctuary seems to share many of the physical features of the sanctuary on Anaphe. Recent excavation at Despotiko has yielded a fragment of a purification basin east of the entrance to room A1, which would have been used for lustration upon ingress. With the basin in place, the room served as the main entrance to the sanctuary. (See Kourayos 2006, 107).

⁹⁸ *IvPerg* II, 255.7-8; *LSAM* 12 (133 BC): διελθόντες τὴν πόλιν, καθ' ἣν τὰ ἀγιστήρια τίθεται, καθαροὶ

controlled movement into and out of sacred space. Likewise, a visitor entered the *temenos* of Apollo Asgелates through a portal near the basin, perhaps the very one that this decree states had to be moved for construction. Since sanctuaries of Apollo were almost always associated with a pure water source such as a spring or fountain (due to the oracular nature of the god and the oracular qualities of water)⁹⁹ this basin nominally associated with Ktesios may have been significant for various rituals that took place for the cult of Apollo as well.¹⁰⁰ But its placement against the wall, near the altar of Ktesios is puzzling. After all, if the purification basin marks the entrance to a sanctuary, how do we understand this in the light of Timotheus building a new entrance? Was there another entrance, perhaps a backdoor, to Ktesios? Or was the *aporranthron* originally not located near an actual entrance to the *temenos*, but rather situated next to the altar? Did it delineate an otherwise unmarked or unwalled division between the shrine for Ktesios and the sacred space of Apollo Asgелates? The location of the *aporranthron* is indeed an intriguing aspect of this logistical and topographical puzzle. Its relationship to other objects as described in the decree may help shed some light.

3.3.2. Moving The Altar and Cult Statue

After passing the purification basin and entering the *temenos*, a typical visitor proceeded toward the altar where he or she prayed and sacrificed. This was the spot where direct communication with the god occurred. Although an altar was usually placed in the

ἔστωσαν αὐθήμερον.

⁹⁹ Ritual bathing was common in healing sanctuaries and water was often associated with prophesy in oracular shrines. See Ginouvés 1962, 327-333.

¹⁰⁰ Ritual water may have been used in a variety of ways: lustration, bathing, and even drinking (see Cole 1988, 162).

open air opposite the entrance to a temple,¹⁰¹ the altar for Ktesios was explicitly “against the wall” reminiscent of the altar of Eileithyia within the *temenos* of Athena *Pronaos* at Delphi. An eastward orientation meant worshippers faced the rising sun while sacrificing or praying; but numerous exceptions weaken the rule.¹⁰² Local tradition dictated such arrangements. Failure to replace the altar of Ktesios would disrupt its relationship to other structures and hence ritual performances.¹⁰³ The altar was the culminating point of religious processions¹⁰⁴ and where suppliants headed when they entered a sanctuary.¹⁰⁵ In Euripides’ *Ion*, when Creusa tells her son Ion “I will leave this altar, even if I must die” Ion replies: “Seize her! For she has been driven mad by the god and has left the image at the altar (βωμοῦ λιποῦσα ξόανα); bind her hands”.¹⁰⁶ Suppliants like Creusa were under the god’s protection so long as they held fast to this structure, remaining under the watchful eye of the cult statue.¹⁰⁷ Thus the altar and cult statue had to be within view of one another. But this connection may have had its limits. Although Greeks were known to build new altars and refurbish old ones,¹⁰⁸ they tended to leave them at their customary locations even if it meant disrupting the relationship between the altar and other structures. The Argives built

¹⁰¹ See Burkert 1988, 37: “The temple, built as a façade, provides a magnificent background for the ritual, but no more.” Thus, the altar was a main focus during ritual.

¹⁰² Arcadian sanctuaries (e.g. Apollo at Bassai) tended to face north to south.

¹⁰³ See S. Lewis 1996, 52-55 and 170 for the significance of the herald’s role in the Greek *polis*.

¹⁰⁴ Mylonopoulos 2006 presents a great example (the two altars at the temple of Zeus at Olympia) of the important relationship between altar and procession for the perpetuation of ritual performance: “By means of the communicative connection of the most important cult facilities within the sanctuary with the aid of a sacrificial ritual at each individual altar, a ritual which remained identical in all its elements, the sacred topography of the sanctuary of Zeus was confirmed again and again...” (107-108).

¹⁰⁵ On supplication, see Naiden 2006, 36-41.

¹⁰⁶ Eur. *Ion* 1402-1403: λάζυσθε τήνδε: θεομανῆς γὰρ ἦλατο / βωμοῦ λιποῦσα ξόανα: δεῖτε δ’ ὠλένας.

¹⁰⁷ Chaniotis 2009, 96: if a suppliant loses physical contact with an altar he could lose his life or freedom.

¹⁰⁸ For example, the new temple to Hera at Perachora (fifth century BC) came with a new altar (see Whitley 2001, 295).

a new temple to Hera on a lower terrace after a fire consumed their old one in 423 BC. It does not appear, however, that they moved the altar to the lower terrace.¹⁰⁹

Timotheus had to place the altar and little statue (*xoanion*) back against the wall,¹¹⁰ which suggests that the two were physically and ritually related and that the community wanted to preserve that relationship.¹¹¹ We are reminded of the second-century BC Athenian sacred law that demonstrates the particular interest in the visibility of, and access to, the cult statue.¹¹² An accumulation of votives was not only threatening the physical integrity of sacred space, but may have also been interfering with the visitor's view of the statue, or the statue's (i.e. the god's) view of his cult.¹¹³ In other words, the abundance of votives became aesthetically displeasing and threatened to interfere with certain rituals that depended on visibility of the cult statue. Unless the problem was solved worshippers might not have been able to approach or perhaps even identify the statue.¹¹⁴ Therefore, the cult statue had to remain conspicuous and in a fixed place.¹¹⁵ At this point we can see why the people of Anaphe wanted the purification basin, altar, and cult statue put back into their proper places. But those proper places are difficult for us to discern. Perhaps Timotheus had a similar difficulty when trying to discern the proper place for *stelai* and votives.

¹⁰⁹ For the various arguments concerning the ash altar, see Antonaccio 1992, 97.

¹¹⁰ *IG XII 3*, 248.15-17: καὶ οἰκοδομηθέντος τοῦ τοίχου τὸν βωμὸν / καὶ τὸ ξοάνιον καταστᾶσαι πάλιν ἐς τὸν τοῖ/χον. For a brief discussion on the *xoanion* at Anaphe, see Donohue 1988, 66. The author offers two interpretations: that *xoanion* is a diminutive or that it the may have designated a place.

¹¹¹ So that the god could view the supplication or the sacrifice that took place See Romano 1988, 128.

¹¹² *IG II² 995* (*LSCG* 43).

¹¹³ *IG II² 995.5-8*: τυγχάνον [τῆς ὀφειλομένης ἀν/τῶι ἀπο]δοχῆς καὶ ἐπισημασ[ίας μηκέτι ἐπισκο/τῆται τ]ὸ ἄγαλμα τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὸ τῶ[ν ἀνακειμένων ἐν / τῶι ἱερ]ῶι εἰκονικῶν πινάκων.

¹¹⁴ This would have been a particularly acute problem at Anaphe, if we take *xoanion* to be the diminutive of *xoanon*.

¹¹⁵ See Burkert 1988, 32: some cult statues were called *hedras* "what is made to sit" indicating that it was not an object to be moved. Over time the cult statue became the focus of attention in many sanctuaries and the place where many offerings were made. For instance, in Herodas' *Fourth Mimiambus*, the woman who had come to the Asclepeion on Cos instructs her friend to place her offering close to the image of the goddess Hygieia (lines 19-20).

3.3.3. Moving *Stelai*, Votives, and Other Offerings

Timotheus had to replace as many *stelai* as possible back against the wall along with the *aporranthron*.¹¹⁶ Votives and other offerings were typically placed on or around these *stelai*. Movable and fixed benches, niches, *stelai*, offering tables, and even the altar itself are all known to have supported these objects. Votives were also hung from a wall or ceiling¹¹⁷ and were essentially lasting reminders of an individual's visit to the sanctuary, mementos of piety and symbols of social and political capital. Visitors dedicated either in hope of the god's assistance (*eparche*) or in thanks for a prayer fulfilled (*aparche*). Such offerings were certainly among the objects suggested in our inscription.¹¹⁸

Reconfiguring these objects was no simple matter since they were intricately bound to other structures and were the inviolable property of the god. Plutarch, speaking of both the quality and the significance of the dedications made at Delphi, declares: "there have been votive offerings sent here that have a high degree of moveability; they help the god's foreknowledge to signify things; none of them is empty or without aesthetic value, but all are full of divinity."¹¹⁹ Aesthetics, however, meant more than just the craftsmanship of the object; placement mattered.

By tying personal objects to monuments or sacred places, dedicators linked themselves to the divinity (or ancestor) and asserted political or social claims.¹²⁰

Dedications represented communication between mortal and divine and between mortals

¹¹⁶ *IG* XII 3, 248.17-19: τὰς δὲ στάλας τὰς οὐσας ἐν τῷ τοίχῳ / καὶ τὸν ἀπόρανθρον ὅσας μὲν καὶ δυνατόν ἦι / αὐτεῖ καταστᾶσαι.

¹¹⁷ See van Straten 1992, 252-254.

¹¹⁸ See Osborne 2004, 5 for the distinction between votives, dedications, and offerings.

¹¹⁹ Plut. *de Pyth.* 398A: ἐγὼ δὲ φαίην ἂν καὶ τῶν ἀναθημάτων τὰ ἐνταυθοῖ μάλιστα συγκινεῖσθαι καὶ συνεπισημαίνειν τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ προνοίᾳ, καὶ τούτων μέρος μηδὲν εἶναι κενὸν μηδ' ἀναίσθητον, ἀλλὰ πεπλησθαι πάντα θεϊότητος.

¹²⁰ Osborne 2004, 7.

too.¹²¹ Greek worshippers hoped to arrange their dedications in the “most conspicuous places” (*epiphanestatoi topoi*).¹²² Whatever the motivation, the result was often cluttered sanctuaries.¹²³ When the altar of Ktesios at Anaphe was relocated for the construction of the new sanctuary, the votives that were placed around the altar had to be moved with everything else.¹²⁴ By the second century BC, the sanctuary of Apollo at Anaphe may have accumulated a significant number of votives.¹²⁵ Here, however, piety gave way to practical necessity. Keeping these dedications in their original location, especially after the construction of the new sanctuary, would have been impossible. A useful parallel for the constriction of space in smaller sanctuaries is that of Orthia at Messene.¹²⁶ There, the modern visitor can see numerous votive *stelai* crammed into a tightly confined space.¹²⁷ Even at such a seemingly small shrine as Ktesios, the dedicators at Anaphe would have been displeased to learn that Timotheus moved their expensive and carefully placed offerings. Given the disruption to the temple, however, putting these dedications “wherever judged

¹²¹ Burkert 1988, 43-44: “The factual permanence of the *anathema* in the sacred precinct corresponds to the idea of permanence and local stability on which the polis is based, with established boundaries and the appeal to ‘ancestral custom.’”

¹²² See Haumesser and Montel 2006-2007, 147.

¹²³ See Dover 1974, 236-242 on the extent to which fear of shame permeated Greek society. Competition between wealthy and powerful Greeks was viewed positively but potentially dangerous. Too little moderation exposed elites to charges of *hybris*; the *graphe hybreos* was an early means of restraining and channeling the competitions between factions that the *demoi* deemed unhealthy to the community. See Fisher 1992, 494. Worshippers competed with one another to have their votive stand out among the others. Such competitions for honor were deeply rooted in Greek political and social life. Consequentially, the wealthy adorned temples with gifts as a show of their wealth, status, and piety. The wealthy were not alone, however, in their pursuit of honor and fear of shame. *Philotimia* was something to which all could aspire. For some, sacred space provided a place for rich and poor alike to exhibit their piety, and for others it provided a place to thank the gods for fulfilling prayers and cures.

¹²⁴ Alroth 1988, 201-203: votives were often placed around or even on the altar. It was ideal to place the votive as close to the altar or cult statue as possible. See also Alroth 1989.

¹²⁵ The sanctuary is attested in dedications from the fourth-century (*IG XII 3*, 256 and 257).

¹²⁶ See Themelis 1994, 101-122. This shrine is approximately the same size as the temple of Apollo Asgелates.

¹²⁷ The value of the dedications did not match those at Delphi, but many of the statues currently on display in the museum at Anaphe attest that elites were erecting quality statues. See *LSCG* 43, *LSS* 107; Dignas 2007, 168. van Straten 1992, 247-290.

useful” (τόπος ὅπεϊ κα δοκῆι χρήσιμον ἦμεν)¹²⁸ may have been the best or only course of action and may have been a way to clean and reorganize the cluttered sanctuary.¹²⁹

The word χρήσιμον permits flexibility, designating ‘useful’ or ‘serviceable’ when referring to objects or people (in their relations with the state). The term could also mean frequented or available when used to describe structures. Placing these objects back in their original spot would not be possible since that spot was no longer known or available. Χρήσιμον downplays the exceptional circumstance under which these objects were moved, giving Timotheus significant leeway in the replacement of these objects. Was Timotheus free to place these objects wherever he wanted? Did another individual, such as the priest, oversee this process? Granting any individual such authority, as pious as he may be, was potentially hazardous.

A third-century regulation from Oropus explains the procedures by which sacred personnel were to assess and then reorganize ritual deposits that were unusable (ἀχρεῖα).¹³⁰ Three men were to be chosen from among the citizens to gather and evaluate the metal votives in the Amphiareion. The inscription instructs them to record the names and the value of the votives before melting them down and recasting them into votive bowls. Likewise, a third-century Athenian law stipulates that two officials be chosen from the Areopagites and three from the assembly to oversee the process of evaluating and then melting down metal offerings in the sanctuary of Hieros Iatros.¹³¹ In conjunction with the priest, *strategos*, and architects, the chosen individuals are instructed to evaluate old votives

¹²⁸ IG XII, 3 248.19-20.

¹²⁹ On the increase of votives over time see Pedley 2005, 30, 45, and 158; see 176 for the disposal (burying) of votives in sacred space.

¹³⁰ *I.Oropos* 324.5; IG VII 303; LSCG 70.

¹³¹ IG II² 839; LSCG 41 (Athens, 221/0 BC). On metal votives, see Aleshire 1992, 85-99.

and recast them into a new offering that will keep the people in good standing with the gods.

In these examples, we can see practical strategies to retain the property of the god (albeit not in its original form), record the name of the dedicator, and possibly free up sacred space.¹³² Other fragmentary Athenian decrees outline similar provisions for the reuse of metal deposits in the Asclepieion. The accumulation of votives in sanctuaries presented an acute problem by the Hellenistic period.¹³³ The second-century BC Athenian prohibition of hanging votives¹³⁴ demonstrates particular concern for the visibility of, and access to, the cult statue. Hanging dedications were forbidden since they blocked view of the statue. Another second-century inscription, from Laodicea-by-the-Sea, began charging a fee for dedications in public sanctuaries. The result: more dedications accrued in a privately owned sanctuary leading to complaints from the owners.¹³⁵

If part of the space within the *temenos* of Apollo, and Ktesios, was to be given to Aphrodite,¹³⁶ then the rearrangement of the *stelai* might have made this public sanctuary crammed. This could create problems over time. Reconfiguring dedications precisely would have been impossible for Timotheus, especially when the layout of the sanctuary changed. In the end, rather than a new wall being built, the shrine was moved to the side to make way for the new entrance but was then replaced along the same wall. That the decree gives Timotheus the leeway to replace some objects “wherever judged useful” suggests a

¹³² Bronze and terracotta votaries would have cluttered many sanctuaries. See van Straten 1992, 253.

¹³³ See *IG II² 1534b* (Athens, third century BC) and *IG II² 1019.17-35* (Athens, second century BC).

¹³⁴ *IG II² 995 (LSCG 43)*.

¹³⁵ *I GLS IV 1261*. See Sosin 2005, 130-139.

¹³⁶ Given the poor preservation of the sanctuary, now within the precinct of the Monastery of Panagia Kalamiotisa, it is difficult to imagine that this building project was ever carried out. It is possible, however, that the state of preservation and the incorporation of much *spolia* into the modern monastery hide what the sanctuary to Aphrodite would have looked like. Other cults attested in the epigraphic evidence have not been located. See Kenna 2009, 494.

compression of its space, perhaps against other structures not mentioned in the decree.¹³⁷ Timotheus would reconfigure the altar and cult statue to specificity with the purification basin in proximity, but most of the *stelai* had to be placed somewhere else.

At this point we can see that the decree ensured that the purification basin, altar, and cult statue were put back into their proper places where they interacted to guide the worshipper's ritual experience.¹³⁸ If we understand *πάλιν ἐς τὸν τοῖχον* to refer to the wall that is to be built, then all of these structures were situated along one line against the new or rebuilt wall. If the basin was placed along the wall and was moved during construction and subsequently placed beside the new entrance, then the *stelai* for Ktesios were moved, unless *τὸν τοῖχον* included the entire wall that was interrupted for the new entrance. In that case, the basin (if placed at the new entrance) would be farther from the altar and statue. The worshipper's progression through the sanctuary could be altered. Therefore, it seems that the shrine of Ktesios would not be accessible by the new entrance. Worshippers would approach Ktesios via the customary entrance, wherever that was. The creation of a new wall dividing Aphrodite and Ktesios would explain the apparent cramped space requiring some votives to be moved elsewhere, and would also preserve the layout of the most important cult structures. In the end, because none of the structures are now *in situ*, the logistical rules outlined in the decree may seem clumsily formulated and imprecise. But in the eyes of Timotheus and his contemporaries, the rules may have been as clear as day.

Across the Aegean, another community resolved to move their sanctuary of Athena. There, the community issued another kind of decree: honorific. This decree, however, contains valuable information on both cult transfer and the rearrangement of structures

¹³⁷ *IG XII 3*, 248.19-20.

¹³⁸ So that the god could view the supplication or the sacrifice that took place See Romano 1988, 128.

within new sacred space. It portrays yet another strategy for adapting to the changing landscape, in this case honoring as a benefactor an individual contracted to move specific parts of the sanctuary.

3.3.4. Moving and Reconfiguring a Sanctuary at Peparethus

The second century decree records the honors for a certain Philoxenus for having moved specific cult objects during the transfer of a sanctuary of Athena:

Having contracted to transfer and build the temple of Athena, [Philoxenus] conducted himself beneficially for the city in the bulk of the matters concerning the job, and completed the job according to the agreement (συγγραφή) pleasingly; and together with the architect he undertook to move both the base and the cult statue and restored them to the temple at his own expense, and having moved the altar, he restored it as the people requested of him.¹³⁹

The city gave Philoxenus the titles of *proxenos* and benefactor and awarded him the right of *enktesis* among a host of other honors. The foremost concern was the placement of certain structures important for traditional ritual performances; on this account, Philoxenus had gone above and beyond the terms of his contract by moving the statue and its base at his own expense. The phrase “as the people requested of him” (καθώς ὁ δῆμος παρεκάλεσεν αὐτόν) demonstrates this concern and confirms that Philoxenus fulfilled the community’s wishes, namely he put the altar back within the resettled temple where appropriate (either replicating the layout of the old sanctuary or, like Timotheus, replacing structures according to agreed specifications). We may imagine that officials either accompanied Philoxenus to

¹³⁹ *Syll*³ 587.8-15 (197BC): τόν / [τ]ε ναὸν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐργολαβήσας μεταγα/[γ]εῖν καὶ οἰκοδομήσαι ἐμ πλείοσιν τε τῶμ περ[ι] / τὸ ἔργον ἀνέστραπται συμφερόντως τεῖ / πόλει, τὸ τε ἔργον συνετέλεσεγ κατὰ τῆ[ν] / συγγραφὴν εὐαρέστως, ἐπεδέξατο δὲ / μετᾶξιμ μετὰ τοῦ [ἀ]ρχιτέκτονος τήν / [τ]ε βάσιγ καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα καὶ κατέστησεν εἰ/[ς] τὸν ναὸν ἰδίους δαπανήμασιν, καὶ τὸν βω/μὸμ μεταγαγὼν κατεσκεύασεν καθὼς ὁ δ[ῆ]/μος παρεκάλεσεν αὐτόν.

instruct him where to place the structures exactly, or details were kept in the *συγγραφή*, which is unfortunately non-extant.¹⁴⁰

Typical contracts, let to the lowest bidder, might contain various stipulations relating to the guarantor(s) of the contract, the amount of money, the timetable for completion, and specific instructions on the movement of objects.¹⁴¹ They also include details concerning oversight of the project. At Peparethus, Philoxenus carried out his task “with the architect”.¹⁴² The *συγγραφή* may have included important instructions, but the architect was surely at hand to make sure everything unfolded according to plan.¹⁴³

Taken together, the contract and the honorific decree tell only part of the story of the resettlement of the sanctuary. The contract certainly detailed which objects were to be moved and to where, and it also distinguished Philoxenus’ obligations from that of other contractors, but the possibilities for complications are endless. Whereas Philoxenus was honored for moving structures crucial for cult performances under extenuating circumstances, others may have been contracted for the movement of other items: e.g. administrative equipment, roof tiles, and doors. But what if something went wrong? What would happen to Philoxenus, Timotheus, and even the commission at Tanagra should they not fulfill by their respective obligations as agreed?

¹⁴⁰ Many contracts survive on stone and were placed in public; in these instances, communities deemed permanent materials more suitable to record longer contracts. See Burford 1969, 92.

¹⁴¹ See Burford 1969, 88-118; on the varying complexities and specificities found in building contracts: “not all were essential to every building contract. Their relevance depended on the particular circumstances of each case. A rigid contract-formula would have impeded, not assisted, the organization of temple building, for it would have paralyzed a mechanism which required the maximum flexibility if it was to work properly” (102). Philoxenus’ contract, however, must have contained considerations that were equally or more specific than those recorded in the honorific decree.

¹⁴² *Syll*³ 587.11.

¹⁴³ See Burford 1969, 91 n.1: the architect for building projects must have used drawings and models to aid with the project; an interesting parallel is a second-century BC contract for the construction of a wall for the Serapeum at Puteoli. See Du Plessis 2004, 291-295.

A second-century BC contract from Lebadeia outlines the responsibilities of the contractors, subcontractors, guarantors, and even workmen during construction in a sanctuary.¹⁴⁴ Anyone who does poor work, i.e. anything contrary to the contracted specifications, shall be dismissed from the project and perhaps fined.¹⁴⁵ More rules protected sacred space from mishaps and incompetent workers. If the contractor for setting the stones happens to ruin a good stone he is responsible for replacing it at his own expense “without hindering the project”. He has five days to remove the damaged stone from the precinct; otherwise, the stone was “to be sacred” (i.e. cannot be reused).¹⁴⁶ Apparently, there was a statute of limitations for the removal of an object before it becomes property of the god. Even a useless broken stone became sacred if it were left in the sanctuary too long. No matter how unsightly a broken stone could be the community would have to respect its owner, the god. It would not, however, let the guilt party off the hook.¹⁴⁷

We can see that these two communities adopted different strategies to ensure that important cult structures were reconfigured as precisely as possible. At Anaphe, the community detailed the specifics through direct regulation, which was inscribed as a record of the oracle. On the other hand, the honorary decree from Peparethus honored Philoxenus for the successful completion of the transfer. Although the decree from Anaphe does not confer honors on Timotheus, it does give him recognition. Altogether, these cases cover different pieces of the same process, but share the same goal: to ensure that important

¹⁴⁴ For the cost and distribution of labor at major sanctuaries (Eleusis, Epidauros, Delos, and Delphi) see Feyel 2006, 441-467.

¹⁴⁵ *IG VII 3073.19-22* (Lebadeia, second century BC): καὶ εἰάν τις ἄλλος τῶν συνεργαζομένων ἐξελέ/γχηταὶ τι κακοτεχνῶν, ἐξελαυνέσθω ἐκ τοῦ ἔργου καὶ / [μ]ηκέτι συνεργαζέσθω· εἰ δὲ μὴ πειθῆται, ζημιωθήσε/ται καὶ οὗτος μετὰ τοῦ ἐρ/γώνου.

¹⁴⁶ *IG VII 3073.32-37*: καὶ εἰάν τινα ὑγιῆ λίθον δια/φθείρηι κατὰ τὴν ἐργασίαν ὁ τῆς θέσεως ἐργώνης, ἔτε/ρον ἀποκαταστήσει δόκιμον τοῖς ἰδίους ἀνηλώμασιν οὐ/θὲν ἐπικωλύοντα τὸ ἔργον, τὸν δὲ διαφθαρέντα λίθον ἐξ /ἀξει ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐντὸς ἡμερῶν πέντε, εἰ δὲ μὴ, ἱερὸς ὁ λίθος / ἔσται. Compare the buried Corinthian capital at Epidauros (in Archaeological Museum at Epidauros) that may have served as a prototype for other columns.

¹⁴⁷ Thus lines 19-20: καὶ εἰάν τις ἄλλος τῶν συνεργαζομένων ἐξελέ/γχηταὶ τι κακοτεχνῶν.

religious structures are moved and reconfigured as seamlessly as possible. Let us now turn our focus back to the fate of the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Tanagra.

3.3.5. Maintaining an Old Cult in New Sacred Space

The extra-urban sanctuary to Demeter and Kore must have housed important cult objects and administrative paraphernalia. These objects had to be moved. Where were they housed while the sanctuary was moved? Whose responsibility was it to do the physical labor of replacing the structures? How were these structures supposed to be replaced? Unfortunately, the decree does not give us any information to answer any of these questions except the last one. The oracle's instructions, however, may provide a clue.

According to Eliade ritual establishes centers through which the divine enters the material world and from which that world is oriented.¹⁴⁸ Many rituals require that specific acts be performed in specific locations.¹⁴⁹ In rituals, the spatial often intersects with the temporal. In fact, many terms used to denote spatial and temporal relations overlap (before, in front of, etc.).¹⁵⁰ As we have seen, rituals performed within a sanctuary followed a sequence that was highly dependent on physical markers, like a purification basin, that guided the worshipper through sacred space.¹⁵¹ When these markers were moved the ritual would be performed out of sequence and thus not according to custom (*kata ta patria*). In other words, Greek ritual was largely one of "things done" (*drômena*) and the alteration of ritual space could alter how ritual was performed.

¹⁴⁸ Eliade 1957, 20-22.

¹⁴⁹ See Rappaport 1999, 209.

¹⁵⁰ Rappaport 1999, 210. In Greek, for instance, πρό may indicate "in front of" (spatial) or "beforehand" (temporal).

¹⁵¹ Stavrianopoulou 2006, 7: rituals are schematized actions described in a sequence that can be imitated and repeated.

When moving their sanctuary, the Tanagrans had to ensure that ritual traditions were maintained along those same lines or else the oracle would not have sanctioned the project. This may well have required replicating the sanctuary's layout. After all, the people were transferring a cult, not establishing a new one. In contrast to the Anaphe decree, however, the Tanagra text appears silent on the transmission of such important objects. Were the Tanagrans not concerned about the layout of the sanctuary? Were there detailed arrangements that are non-extant? In other words, did the city issue another regulation or public document that has not survived detailing the arrangement, like the *syngraphe* referenced in Philoxenus' honorific decree?¹⁵²

What exactly was the strategy for reconfiguring space at Tanagra? The oracle's instructions provide a clue. Apollo instructed the city "to receive the suburban goddesses into the circuit walls, celebrating (a festival) for your good, and do this while praying to the same goddesses".¹⁵³ Like many oracular responses, this one is poetical and rather vague. The phrase "while praying to the same goddesses" commands the people to be in constant communication with the goddesses to ensure that the ones transferred into the city retained the same identity. Moving them must not change them. Thereby the oracle instructs the community to honor not just any Demeter and Kore, but rather those specific goddesses as they were worshipped in their original extra-urban location. This would require specific prayer and therefore a specific placement of structures within the sanctuary.

¹⁵² The appointed commission was responsible for moving the sanctuary, but the decree does not mention the replacement of objects within it.

¹⁵³ Migeotte 1992, no. 28.7-8: θιάς προφαστίδας στεφάνυ δέκεσθη ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ θάλλοντας κῆ οὔτο ποιῖμεν εὐχομένως αὐτῆς τῆς θιῆς. Sokolowski: gods called προφαστίδας also sometimes called πρὸ πόλεως (*LSCG* 72, p. 147).

Place mattered. A first-century decree from Cos concerns the sale of the priesthood of Heracles Callinicus “the one in the agora and harbor”.¹⁵⁴ Scholars have asked whether this ought to be a single priesthood for two different gods or a single god worshipped in two places?¹⁵⁵ At first glance it seems most logical that Heracles “at the agora and at the harbor” is one god worshipped in two places and that he had a single priesthood. However, the list of rules and obligations in the decree were meant to ensure “that the sacrifices to *these gods* be performed most conspicuously”.¹⁵⁶ Whether the Greeks conceived of a god as many separate entities or a singular entity with multiple aspects is the subject of a debate as old as antiquity.¹⁵⁷ Anyway, the Coans knew. What was most important to the Tanagrans was what the oracle told them to do: pray to the same goddesses. Here too, there was no ambiguity.

Let us return to the fourth-century BC decree from Colophon, which captures the relationship between people, place, and prayer: “The people have decreed to enclose within the same wall with the existing (city) the ancient city which, when the gods handed it over to our ancestors, they, by founding it and establishing temples and altars, became esteemed in the eyes of all the Greeks.”¹⁵⁸ This is essentially an inversion of the project at Tanagra. Instead of bringing the sanctuaries within their walls, the inhabitants of Colophon decided to bring the walls to their sanctuaries. They needed help, and so consulted the gods.

According to the decree:

¹⁵⁴ *IG* XII 4, 320.8-9; *ICos* ED 180 (125-100 BC): περι τᾶς ἱερωσύνας τοῦ Ἡρακλεῦς τοῦ Καλλινίκου τοῦ ἐπὶ ἀγορᾷ καὶ ἐπὶ λιμένι.

¹⁵⁵ See Versnel 2011, 76: syntactically, they clearly qualify as one god.

¹⁵⁶ *IG* XII 4, 320.24-25: ὅπως δὲ καὶ αἱ θυσίαι τοῖς θε[οῖς] τοῦτοις ἐπιφανέστερον συντελῶνται.

¹⁵⁷ Most recently, see Versnel 2011, 75-102 and 269-280. Chaniotis 2010, 112-140. Of course, see Xenoph. fr. 23.

¹⁵⁸ Meritt 1935 lines 9-11: ἐφηφίσθαι τῷ δήμῳ τὴν παλαιὰν πόλιν ἢν τῶν θεῶν παραδόντων τοῖς προγόνοις ἡμῶν κτίσαντες ἐκεῖνοι καὶ ναοὺς καὶ βωμοὺς ἰδρυσάμενοι παρὰ πᾶσι τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ἦσαν ἔνδοξοι σ[υ]ντειχίσαι πρὸς τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν.

In order that it be done as quickly as possible, the priests of Apollo and other priests and priestesses and the *prytanis*, with the *boule* and those designated in this decree, having gone down to the old agora on the fourth of the coming month, shall pray at the altars of the gods that their ancestors left, to Zeus Soter, Poseidon Asphaleius, Apollo Clarius, Mother Antaia, Athena Polias, and to all the other gods and goddesses and heroes who dwell¹⁵⁹ in our city and territory.¹⁶⁰

Communities had their own gods that were part of local history. They called upon them in times of need. It was prayer that linked the worshipper to the god whose identity was above all determined by the place in which it dwelled. Prayer also forged a bond between a community and its deities and allowed for an alteration or reevaluation of the space between them.

Prayer (εὔξασθαι¹⁶¹ and εὐχομένως¹⁶²) was a crucial part of the formation of this bond and the overall Greek ritual experience. Worshipers needed to address a specific god or gods. Confused worshippers had to know: “which god did I offend?”¹⁶³ “To which god should I pray” was a common question asked of oracles.¹⁶⁴ “There is rarely a ritual without prayer, and no important prayer without ritual”, notes Burkert.¹⁶⁵ One began worship with an invocation “Hear!” followed by the name of the divinity, which is needed for directing the prayer to the proper recipient. Furthermore, the worshipper must also define the sphere of the god by naming spatially his or her favorite dwelling place.¹⁶⁶ As Parker notes, “each major god is active in many different spheres, and very often in a way that straddles all

¹⁵⁹ The verb κατέχουσιν means to hold, have power over, or dwell within. See Versnel 2011, 89 no. 239.

¹⁶⁰ Meritt 1935 lines 12-20: ἵνα δὲ συντελήται κατὰ τάχος τὸ μὲν ἱερέα τοῦ / Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἱερεῖς καὶ ἱερέας καὶ τὸ μὲν πρύτανιν [με]τὰ / τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τῶν ἀποδειχθέντων ἐν τῷδε τῷ ψηφίσματι καταβάντας / εἰς τὴν παλαιὰν ἀγορὰν τῆι τετράδι ἱσταμένου τοῦ εἰσιόντος μηνός [ἐπι] / τοὺς βωμοὺς τῶν θεῶν οὓς ἡμῖν οἱ πρόγονοι κατέλιπον εὔξασθαι τῷ Διὶ τῷ / Σωτῆρι καὶ τῷ Ποσειδῶνι τῷ Ἀσφαλείῳ καὶ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Κλαρίῳ καὶ / τῆι Μητρὶ τῆι Ἀνταίῃ καὶ τῆι Ἀθηνᾷ τῆι Πολιάδι τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς / πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις καὶ τοῖς ἥρωσιν οἱ κατέχουσιν ἡμῶν τὴν τε πόλιν καὶ τὴν / χώραν...

¹⁶¹ Meritt 1935, 361 line 16.

¹⁶² Migeotte 1992, no. 28.8.

¹⁶³ Hdt. 6.12.3: τίνα δαιμόνων παραβάντες τάδε ἀναπίμπλαμεν;

¹⁶⁴ Eidinow 2007, 63, 112, and 133. See also Versnel 2011, 43-60.

¹⁶⁵ Burkert 1985, 73.

¹⁶⁶ See Burkert 1985, 74.

divisions that we might like to set up.”¹⁶⁷ In other words, even gods who share the same name (e.g. Demeter, Ktesios, or Heracles) were worshipped differently in different places.¹⁶⁸ Thus, prayer and sacrifice were two distinct actions, but their performance was intimately associated, especially within the setting of a sanctuary.¹⁶⁹ A worshipper may either sacrifice to the god or make a vow in exchange for the fulfillment of a prayer.¹⁷⁰ In any event, prayer was intended to ensure that an offering or sacrifice was properly directed and understood by the god.¹⁷¹ At Tanagra, that the people were to bring the goddesses into the city while praying (εὐχομένως)¹⁷² suggests that the community was properly transferring the same goddesses linking the old sanctuary with the new.

The relationship between prayer and ritual and ritual and place established in this chapter regarding the transfer and disruption of sacred space has led us to conclude that the oracle’s instructions helped the Tanagrans transfer the traditional rituals along with the sanctuary. As we have seen, the profound relationship between ritual performance and the arrangement of cult objects within sacred space required that these objects be arranged in a certain order. At Tanagra, this responsibility of oversight fell to the commission. The commission was ultimately responsible for carrying out the oracle’s instructions and ensuring that the new sanctuary was built to accommodate “the same goddesses”. The city appointed this commission to be an extension of the city’s authority. Although the city

¹⁶⁷ Parker 2005, 389.

¹⁶⁸ In Parker’s words: the particularism of the religion of the Greek cities applies not just to festivals but also, if less obviously, to the gods honored; the names of the main gods may be largely the same from state to state, but the division of functions between the gods, the balances and combinations and emphases within the pantheon, differ from place to place (2). See also 394.

¹⁶⁹ Prayer need not always include a sacrifice, but a sacrifice always included a prayer.

¹⁷⁰ See Pulleyn 1997, 7-11. ‘Free’ prayers (prayers without sacrifice) occur in Greek literature, but these instances could be attributed to dramatic effect since such prayers hardly occur in prose. Nevertheless, Greeks certainly prayed without offering sacrifice in emergencies but free prayer was not the proper procedure of cult performance and cannot be what the oracle of Apollo intended for the Tanagrans.

¹⁷¹ Pulleyn 1997, 14.

¹⁷² Migeotte 1992, no. 28.7-8.

would not expect them to deviate from its plan, any commissioners who abused his authority could undergo a form of scrutiny (*euthynai*) and any infringement on private property was to be referred to the Boiotian League. These were the concerns that required written rules. Specific written rules were deemed unnecessary for the placement of the structures. Perhaps the city feared that too many written laws would keep them from acting in ways according to their own judgment.

3.4. Conclusion: Strategies after Reconfiguration

Who would have authority over these sanctuaries? Not surprisingly, the public sanctuaries at Anaphe and Tanagra were to remain public. The original extra-urban sanctuary to Demeter and Kore at Tanagra was clearly a public one from the beginning and would remain so. While moving the sanctuary demonstrates the community's concern for the cult's ability to operate outside of the city, maintaining the cult's public status perpetuated its important role in the civic life of the community. It also allowed the city to directly and closely regulate and administer the sanctuary, demonstrating the active role the city continued to play in its cults. At Anaphe, of course, the situation was a little more complicated. Here, a private individual was building a public sanctuary.

While the Hellenistic period is often seen as a time when private cults proliferated,¹⁷³ the case from Anaphe reminds us that public sanctuaries were still thriving. The city adopted a strategy to promote individual initiative while preserving control over its sanctuary. A fourth-century Athenian decree shows a different approach to a similar

¹⁷³ On public and private Hellenistic cults at Athens, see Mikalson 1998, especially 144 and 206; Purvis 2003.

situation. Here, however, the space under consideration was private property. Nevertheless, the Athenians consulted a god:

The god gave the answer to the people of the Athenians to dedicate the house of Demon and the garden adjacent to Asclepius and that Demon himself shall be the priest. The priest Demon, son of Demomeles of Paeania, dedicated the house and the garden after the god had given the instruction and the people of the Athenians granted that he be the priest of Asclepius according to the oracle.¹⁷⁴

This added space was originally private property. The clear, precise wording of the inscription masks the complex negotiations that surely took place behind the scenes between Demon and the city that resulted in his appointment to the priesthood.¹⁷⁵ The decree from Anaphe is reticent on the negotiations that took place between Timotheus and the city. Nevertheless, both instances show that the role of cities in expanding or maintaining civic cults remained strong.

While the city accommodated Timotheus' pious initiative for divine recognition, it held him directly accountable for the project.¹⁷⁶ By inscribing his name, the oracle's decision, and the rules for carrying out the project, the city may have sought to publicize its agreement with Timotheus; this could have subsequently been used against him should he fail to fulfill his obligations.¹⁷⁷ In the end, while communities tried to set limits on any individual's mark on the sacred landscape, some refashioning of that landscape was necessary from time to time in order to accommodate various interests and keep pace with a changing world. The failure to keep pace could result in the neglect or demise of traditional rites. Those are the subjects of the following chapters.

¹⁷⁴ *Syll*³ 1005; *IG* II² 4969: [ὁ] θεὸς ἔχρησεν τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθην[αίων ἀναθεῖναι / [τ]ὴν οἰκίαν τὴν Δήμωνος καὶ τὸν κή[πον τὸν προσόντα] / τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ καὶ αὐτὸν Δήμωνα [ιερέα εἶναι αὐτοῦ]. / ἱερεὺς Δήμων Δημομέλους Παιαν[ιεὺς ἀνέθηκε] / καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ τὸν κήπον προσ[τάξαντος τοῦ θεοῦ] / καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων δόν[τος ἱερέα εἶναι] / τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ κατὰ τὴν μαν[τεῖαν]. See Dignas 2006, 75-76.

¹⁷⁵ Dignas 2006, 76.

¹⁷⁶ On the positive effects of competition in Greek culture on civic life, see Whitehead 1983, 55-74.

¹⁷⁷ Perhaps this was not unlike the promulgation of honors in advance of benefactions (Gygax 2009, 165).

4. Tradition and the Reinvention of Cult

In the late second century BC, the Athenians decided to renew traditional rites for Apollo Pythios, Patroös, and Alexikakos. A decree records the details for the conduct of a festival called the Thargelia that was to take place in honor of these three manifestations of the god.¹ This festival appears to have been neglected for over a hundred years. The focus of the surviving portion of this decree is the procession that was to culminate in the Gardens (*Kepoi*) at the temple of Pythios.² Peculiarly, the decree does not mention a renewal of the other rites associated with the old Thargelia, namely the scapegoat ritual and the choral competition.³ These may have been omitted, reflecting a shift in cultural norms.⁴ Through the lens of this decree, we can see how the community adapted its traditional religious practices to fit the contemporary sociopolitical environment and how Athens re-imagined its relationship with the neglected deity. I shall suggest that the Athenians employed the rhetoric of renewal and enhancement in order to cloak their neglect of this festival and compare the Athenian legislative strategy to those of other cities that also reinvented religious practices and reimagined civic relationships with gods.

Reinventions of cult were complicated. Were all seen the same way? How did local circumstances affect a community's perceptions of cult renewal? Revivals were a part of a

¹ *SEG* 21.469C; *LSS* 15 (Athens, 129/8 BC). See Appendix D.

² *SEG* 21.469C.53-54.

³ For the rites of the old Thargelia, see Parker 2005, 481-483 and Bremmer 1983, 318-319.

⁴ We cannot be certain whether any given rite of the festival had any relationship to those of the old *Thargelia*, but we do know that the scapegoat ritual was not an official part of the renewed festival. Although there is a possibility that it took place unofficially, this not likely. By Aristophanes' time (and probably much earlier) the scapegoat ritual was regarded as rather antediluvian (*Ar. Ran.* 727-733). By the second century, the Athenians (and Romans) surely viewed it as too unseemly to revive, particularly in such an increasingly cosmopolitan setting as Hellenistic Athens. Here we have our first indication that the rites of the Thargelia were not as static as the second century decree would have us believe. We shall now take a closer look at the rationale for renewal and justification for ritual innovation of those rites that we know were part of the renewed program.

larger trend seen in many places around the Greek world.⁵ In what ways, however, do they reflect specific local pressures? Across the Aegean, a second-century BC decree from Magnesia-on-the-Maeander demonstrates the varied complexities of cult reinvention, namely the introduction of a new festival as an “enhancement” of its traditional civic cult for Artemis Leukophryene.⁶ This festival, however, fell into neglect prompting a second decree dated to the late second or first century.⁷ This second decree (B) offers a vivid glimpse of how one community aimed to stop a festival’s demise as it attempted to reinvigorate the cult in the face of domestic lack of interest and external pressures. Although the specific details of the decrees differ, their goals are strikingly similar: to enhance “ancestral” rites and downplay religious innovations. In both cases, the reinventions of cult were rooted in civic religious programs that were connected to a historical and mythological past.

4.1. Thargelia and Pythais: A Program of Revival

Xenophon son of Sopatris proposed to the Athenian *boule* that honors be restored to the god Apollo Patroös, known to most Greeks as Apollo Pythios. Throughout their history, the Athenians had a strained relationship with Pythios, the god of Delphi. At a time of immense political change and with the specter of external threats on the horizon, Xenophon and other seemingly like-minded Athenians thought it was time to revive Athens’ old religious traditions. In fact, another traditional religious performance, the Pythais, was reinstated just a few years before, which may have set the stage for other such revivals.⁸

⁵ Mikalson 1998, 5-6 and 242-247.

⁶ *I.Magn.* 100A and B (*LSAM* 33). See Appendix E.

⁷ See Santangelo 2006, 133-138. *NGSL* pages 107-108.

⁸ For the sending out of *Pythais* and first fruit offerings at the end of the second century BC, see *FD* III.2 no. 54 and *IG* II² 2336.

Although sacrifices for Apollo Patroös at his temple in the Agora probably continued for centuries, his full honors had not been given for almost a century. It was time to bring back the Thargelia.

A lengthy decree records the specific proposals and decisions regarding the revived festival.

Resolved by the council and the people. Xenophon, son of Sopatrides, of Sunium proposed: Since it is traditional and customary for the people of the Athenians, and handed down by their ancestors, to make piety toward the gods of greatest importance, and (since) because of this they have acquired a good reputation and fame for most glorious deeds on land and sea, in many infantry and naval expeditions, always beginning their piety toward the gods with Zeus Soter; and since Apollo Pythios exists as Patroös among the Athenians and as exegete of good things, and (since) the son of Zeus and Leto is also similarly common savior for all the Greeks, and since the god through his oracles has ordered them to pray to the god called Patroös, also making the ancestral sacrifices to Apollo on behalf of the people of the Athenians at the appropriate times of the year, sacrificing as it is traditional for the people to do; wherefore Timarchus of Sphettai, treasurer of the council, approached the *boule* and renewed the oracles and the honors that had been first assigned to the god through the laws; therefore, so that the council and people may be seen not only as preserving the traditional practices but also as increasing the sacrifices and honors well and piously, in order also that they may acquire worthy favors from the gods:

[20] With good fortune, that it be resolved by the *boule* that those allotted as *proedroi* for the next *ekklesia* raise these matters for consideration and report to the people the opinion of the council, that it is resolved by the *boule* to do the other things for Apollo according to the oracles from [...], and that the *basileus* and archon and the one who will be each year and the generals sacrifice at the (festival) previously decreed by it (the people), and that they perform the sacrifices and processions in the festival of the Thargelia in *Kepoi* each year, leading out the sacrificial victims as beautifully as possible [...]

[32] And the priests and priestesses shall ... and shall set ... on the altar and pray. And at the Thargelia, after they say their prayers, the priest of Apollo Pythios, the *exegetai*, the other priests, the nine archons, the *hierophantes*, the *dadouchos*, those going with them, the *agonothetai* of the contest performed near the Pythion, and whoever are *choregoi*, and the *hieropoioi* shall make procession... [46] And the maidens shall bring the sacred basket for the god... whenever according to custom the sacred days... the *kosmetes*... for Apollo Alexikakos. [50] And likewise the household slaves shall be released from their work and all public slaves from (all) their duties.

[51] And the *basileus*, the priest, the herald of the Areopagus Council, and the *thesmothetai* shall sacrifice as follows: the priest of Apollo Pythios shall take care of the appropriate sacrifices at *Kepoi* at the Pythion,⁹ presenting an adult sow to Apollo Alexikakos, and a cow to

⁹ I follow Mikalson's translation for this phrase (1998, 272-273). *Kepoi*, without an article, designates an unknown location. It was probably a neighborhood between the Acropolis and the Olympieion, near the Ilissos River. See Wycherley 1978, 166-167; Hedrick 1988, 185-210.

Patroös, [55] and a cow to Apollo Pythios, taking the same parts as before. And the treasurer of the Stratiotic Fund shall sacrifice a bull from the year's revenues on behalf of the Athenian people, their children and wives, and on behalf of the Roman people; they shall provide the sacrificial victim to the *hieropoioi*. The treasurers of the grain funds and the treasurer of the *boule* shall sacrifice also. And the *prytaneis* whoever happen to be *prytaneis* for the sixth-month period shall all sacrifice; the treasurer of the Stratiotic Fund shall give the money for the sacrifice and procession, and likewise all the *thesmothetai* and those who are about to be *thesmothetai*...¹⁰

Sacrifice, finances, obligations, and privileges are all intricately entwined in this decree. The particular rules work in tandem to form an organic whole. The final product was a renewed festival performed as splendidly and piously as possible for a traditional god of the city. We should view this renewed festival within the context of Athenian religious revival in the second century BC, a time when the Athenians were clearly looking back to the age of Lycurgus, who in turn had looked back to the remote age of Pericles.¹¹

4.1.1. History, Ideology, and the Intellectual Foundation for Cult Revival

A major festival during the classical period, the Thargelia was known as a “festival of the arts” second only to the City Dionysia.¹² For the most part, the old festival remains a mystery; we do know, however, that choral competitions were a major part of the rites as well as a ritualized driving out of bad elements (i.e. a scapegoat) and a “bringing in of the good” (i.e. first fruits of the harvest). The fairest of youth (καλοὶ κάγαθοί) whose physical beauty reflected desired Athenian values performed in the choruses, the opposites were driven out as scapegoats.

¹⁰ SEG 21.469C. See Appendix 1.

¹¹ Mikalson 1998, 272-273.

¹² See Parke 1977, 146-149; Wilson 2003; Parker 2005, 203-204 and 481-483.

The old Thargelia is last attested in 325/4 BC.¹³ Mikalson speculates that the cessation of choral performances may have been due to the abolishment of *choregiai* under Demetrius of Phalerum at the end of the fourth century.¹⁴ We do not know whether or not the procession continued for some time after this abolition, but the specific and detailed rules of the decree suggest that the Athenians were either reviving a lapsed practice or radically altering an existing one; the former seems likely. In other words, although we do not know whether or not the Thargelia fell into total abeyance from that time until the promulgation of the second-century decree, the decree marks a rejuvenation of the festival with a particular emphasis on the procession.

Other neglected festivals joined the Thargelia in the second century BC. The Pythais, a magnificent celebration that involved sending *theoroi* to Apollo at Delphi, is attested in 138/7 BC after a long period of abeyance.¹⁵ According to Parker, we have no reason to think that any Pythais had been sent from Athens between the 320s and 138 BC.¹⁶ This renewal roughly parallels the period of lapse for the Thargelia, and seems to reflect an initiative to rekindle old theoric networks that had gone cold. It is probably not a coincidence that the decree for the Thargelia also honors Zeus Soter who had cultic connections to Zeus Eleutherius.¹⁷ *Eleutheria* became a popular expression throughout the second century, reflecting contemporary political circumstances, i.e. the threat of Macedonian and then Roman hegemony. In 129/8 Athens had good relations with Rome who was the self-

¹³ *IG II²* 1629.196-199: "Let the herald of the *boule* announce the crowns (winners) in the contest of the Thargelia."

¹⁴ Mikalson 1998, 273.

¹⁵ For the sending out of Pythais and first fruit offerings at the end of the first century BC, see *FD III.2* no. 54 and *IG II²* 2336.

¹⁶ Parker 2005, 83

¹⁷ *SEG* 21.469C.5-7. See Rosivach 1987, 276.

proclaimed guarantor of freedom for the Greeks.¹⁸ Other cities were not so fortunate. Ideological changes and political necessity catalyzed the desire to renew old rites like the Pythais and Thargelia. This decree reflects ideological as well as political change. The language of the decree also demonstrates the manner in which the Athenians coped with such change. Various aspects of the decree reflect the Athenians' preoccupation with their past as well as their present. Scholars have noted that the language and tone of this decree echo sentiments of the Lycurgan age.¹⁹

After the defeat at Chaeronea in 338 BC until 324, Lycurgus son of Lycophon held almost complete control over the city's finances and used his power to reform social and religious policy.²⁰ His famous achievements included the restructuring of the state's finances and the refurbishing of its temples.²¹ All three aspects involved religious reforms.²² He established the famous *dermatikon* fund that raised money from the sale of sacrificial skins²³ and reinvigorated the ephebate, in which young citizens participated in military training and border defense. Ephebes participated and competed in religious festivals as well. By all accounts, festivals had once again become the centerpiece of Athenian political, religious, and social life.²⁴

Thus the age of Lycurgus is marked by an increased, if not renewed, focus on religious festivals. Dithyrambic and choral competitions were reintroduced and participation in international religious festivals became more common. In 326/5, for the first time in over twenty years, the Athenians sent delegations to Apollo Pythios at Delphi

¹⁸ See Morstein-Marx 1995, 164.

¹⁹ Mikalson 1998, 273. On the patriotic tone, see Chaniotis 1995, 154.

²⁰ Mikalson 1998, 11.

²¹ See Humphreys 2004, 86.

²² The religious significance of the ephebes is a matter of some debate. See Mikalson 1998, 41 and Humphreys 2004, 88-89.

²³ *IG II²* 1496 (334/3 to 331/0 BC).

²⁴ Humphreys 2004, 89.

offering first fruits to the god.²⁵ Lycurgus even prosecuted a certain *theoros* named Menesaechmus for improperly sacrificing during an embassy to Delos.²⁶ At home, most festivals that received attention were deeply rooted in tradition, or so it seemed. For instance, the Athenians showed renewed interest for the Theseia, a festival to honor the return of Theseus' bones to Attica,²⁷ as well as the Thargelia²⁸ for Apollo Patroös, the Apollo "of our fathers".

Private benefactors provided much of the funds for the building projects of the late fourth century. The Lycurgan building "program" was spearheaded by a number of wealthy private individuals. There is no clear evidence, however, that they worked together to fulfill a coordinated task of religious and state renewal. In fact, evidence points to the contrary. It is as likely that individuals like Cephisophon, Deinias, Demades, Glaucetes, Niceratus, Neoptolemus, and other wealthy benefactors²⁹ contributed resources out of competition with one another. Building projects did focus on one center area of the city: the Agora.³⁰ One new and important project that coincided with the renewed focus on traditional cults was the temple of Apollo Patroös, which is located on the west side of the Agora between the Stoa of Zeus and the Metroon.³¹ It was finished sometime in the second half of the third century.³² In front of this temple, according to Pausanias, was a statue to Apollo Alexikakos (Averter of Evil).³³ A cultic relationship between Apollo Patroös, Alexikakos, and Pythios is

²⁵ Other international, or Panhellenic cults were the Pythia, Zeus at Dodona, the Pythais, and the Olympic and the Nemean Games (see Mikalson 1998, 40).

²⁶ Lyc. fr. 14.1-11.

²⁷ See Plut. *Thes.* 36, *Cim.* 8.5, and Garland 1992, 82-98.

²⁸ *IG II²* 1629.196-199. και ἀναγορευσά[τω ὁ κῆ]ρυξ τῆς βουλῆς θαρ[γελίων] τῶι ἀγῶνι τοὺς στε[φάνους].

²⁹ On these wealthy benefactors and contemporaries of Lycurgus, see D. Lewis 1955, 27-36.

³⁰ Mikalson 1998, 29.

³¹ Paus. 1.3.4. See Wycherley 1978, 66-68.

³² Camp 1998, 159-161; Hedrick 1988, 185-210.

³³ Paus. 1.3.4.

evident long before the renewal of the Thargelia in 129/8.³⁴ Hedrick has convincingly argued that the god, in all three manifestations, had his original home in the Python near the Ilissos River.³⁵ This is where, evidently, the renewed Thargelia would culminate in sacrifices for all three.³⁶ Every few generations, it seems, the Athenians made an effort to reconnect with their past. These efforts typically were manifested in renewed interest in certain cults, building activity, and processions.

4.1.2. Reinventions and Strategies for Adaptation

External pressures may have helped provoke these renewed interests as well. The Macedonian Wars with Rome resulted in the upheaval of traditional balances of power. By the time of our decree (129/8 BC) the federations of Greek states were dissolved and the power of Macedon was broken. The characteristically Hellenistic, or even Lycurgan,³⁷ prayers “on behalf of the Demos, wives, and children” here includes Romans as well.³⁸ Through the lens of the decree we can see not only a reevaluation, but in fact a reinstitution, of religious practices prompted by a mix of external pressures (e.g. the specter of Roman authority) and internal competition for honor with renewed interest in the past. Although political motivations for cult innovation or reinvention were not unique to the Lycurgan and

³⁴ Patroos is the equivalent to Pythios (Dem. 18.141), which has origins in the archaic period; Alexikakos dates as far back as the plague during Peloponnesian War. Harpocration *Apollo Patroos Pythios* (A194).

³⁵ Hedrick 1988, 200-204.

³⁶ *SEG* 21.469C.52-55.

³⁷ See *IG* II² 410.12-16: ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ οἱ ἱεροποιοὶ ... ἔθυσον ... ἐφ' ὑγείαι καὶ σωτηρίαι τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων καὶ παίδων καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κτημάτων τῶν Ἀθηναίων. See Mikalson 1998, 43-45, who views such prayers as indicate of a new pessimism among Greek communities.

³⁸ *SEG* 21.469C.58.

Hellenistic periods,³⁹ the details of the revived Thargelia demonstrate how external pressures and internal ideological tensions affected religious performance.

4.2. The Renewed Rites of the Thargelia

The rites outlined in the decree lead us to conclude that the performance of the renewed Thargelia in 129/8 BC differed from the one in the fourth century. Moreover, the language of the decree reflects the religious, political, and legal complexities of reviving a traditional festival to a traditional god. Now that we have established the sociopolitical context and the organization of the renewed festival, what follows is an examination of how the component rites are presented in the phrasing and language of the decree. While the decree demonstrates concerns for the logistics of organizing a festival, it also suggests the ideological and rhetorical complexities of reviving a neglected rite. Analysis of this language can help us understand how the Athenians viewed their relationship with the gods and how they developed strategies to adapt to their shifting sociopolitical landscape. At the heart of the matter: what did ‘revival’ or ‘renewal’ actually mean?

4.2.1. Procession

The specific rites, or components, that make up the festival are fairly standard: procession, prayer, sacrifice, and feast.⁴⁰ Contests were a major component of the old *Thargelia* (and many other festivals), but there is no mention of them in this decree. One can

³⁹ D’Angour 2011, 96: “Even in the areas of religious and social institutions, where we might expect the old to be respected and the new abjured, the latter might be favored. Greek societies were constantly changing, and along with new social and intellectual conditions there inevitably evolved new forms of social and cultic interaction.” For the political significance of festivals, see Chaniotis 1995, 152.

⁴⁰ Chaniotis 1995, 154.

only surmise the presence of a contest through the decree's mention of the *agonothetai* and *choregoi* in lines 36 and 37. By this time, however, such offices were mainly honorary and seem to have had little or no responsibility or connection to actual contests.⁴¹ Moreover, no victory dedications from this time have been discovered.⁴² Although absolute certainty over the presence of contests cannot be established it is certain that the decree, fragmentary though it is, was entirely preoccupied with the procession and its related rites.

Lines 34-51 outline the rules for conducting the procession, including the order of processioners and the limits of participation, namely (in order) the priests and priestesses of Apollo Pythios, the *exegetai*, the other priests, the archons, *hierophantes*, the *dadouchos* and their attendants, the *agonothetai* and *choregoi*, and the *hieropoioi*. Basket-bearers were also included. The significance of organization and hierarchy in processions has been much discussed.⁴³ There were fixed rules for the sequence of participants in every Greek procession and each procession was arranged according to some inner logic.⁴⁴ Maintaining "good order" was crucial for the performance, which is exactly what rules in the Thargelia text aimed to do. But processions were not necessarily as orderly or as logical as scholars are inclined to imagine.

The rules governing the procession clearly aimed to provide order and paint a rather idealistic portrait of the ritual like that of the *Panathenaia* on the Acropolis Frieze.⁴⁵ That the decree lists the members of the procession, however, suggests that the community

⁴¹ Mikalson 1998, 117-119.

⁴² See Mikalson 1998, 273.

⁴³ Graf 1996, 55-65; Chaniotis 1995, 156. According to Jacobsen (2008, 9), processions are attempts to make a group visible and, as public ritual, are typically aimed at outside groups, i.e. those who are watching and not performing. On the political nature of processions see de Polignac 1995 (processions to extramural shrines), and Dougherty 1994 who shows how processional routes helped structure civic identity. See also Jameson 1999, 321-340.

⁴⁴ See Mylonopoulos 2006, 72-73.

⁴⁵ See Neils 1996, 177-197.

was reestablishing, perhaps reinventing, the roles and places of certain individuals and groups in the procession. Such reconfiguration is understandable considering that the festival was undergoing renewal, but may also reveal a degree of conflict within the community over the revived procession and the order of its participants.

Magistrates often performed sacrifices on behalf of the city and even accompanied the procession to the altar.⁴⁶ Decrees concerning processions, however, do not typically list civic officials marching in procession. This is not to say that civic officials did not usually take part, but that their participation was either an exception or was taken for granted. Of those inscriptions that do list officials in procession, two decrees from Delphi call for the local civic officials to march among other rules for the newly established and politically charged festival endowed by Attalus II and Eumenes II, respectively.⁴⁷ These distant kings gave generous gifts to Delphi. In the spirit of reciprocity, the Delphians established two festivals. During the Attaleia: “On the thirteenth (of Heracleion) the priests of Apollo and the other gods, the *prytaneis*, archons, and children shall make a procession while crowned.”⁴⁸ Nearly the same rules apply for the Eumeneia: “On the twelfth of Heracleion, the priests of Apollo and the other gods, the *prytaneis*, archons, other magistrates (τὰ ἄλλα ἀρχεῖα), *lampadistai*, and ten men from each tribe shall make a procession from the orchard.”⁴⁹ Sacred and civic officials were to guide these processions. This is not, however, the case for most festivals as seen in sacred laws.

⁴⁶ On the sacrificial duties of magistrates, see Parker 2005: 95-97.

⁴⁷ Attaleia (160/69 BC): *Syll*³ 672 and *LSCG* 80; Eumeneia (160/59 BC): *Syll*³ 671; *LSS* 44. Other foundation decrees listing civic officials as processioners: *LSCG* 81, *LSS* 85, *LSAM* 9, 33, and 81. See Shipley 2000, 85-86.

⁴⁸ *Syll*³ 672.56-58: τᾶι δὲ / τρεισκαιδεκάται πομπυόντω οἱ τε ἱερεῖς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος / καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν καὶ πρυτάνεις καὶ ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ / παῖδες ἐστεφανωμένοι.

⁴⁹ *Syll*³ 671a.8-11: τᾶι δωδεκάται π[ομ]/πευόντω ὥρας δευτέρας ἐκ τᾶς ἄλω[ς] οἱ τε ἱερεῖς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων / θεῶν καὶ οἱ πρυτάνεις καὶ ἄρχοντες καὶ [τ]ὰ ἄλλα ἀρχεῖα καὶ οἱ λαμπαδισταί, ἀφ’ ἐκάστας φυλᾶς ἄν/δρες δέκα.

A fourth-century Athenian decree suggests a separation of civic officials from the procession. It states that the sacrificial meat was to be distributed to the *prytaneis*, the archons, *hieropoioi*, and lastly to the processioners.⁵⁰ Likewise, a mid fourth century inscription concerning the Lesser Panathenaia focuses on the distribution of meat to various officials and the customary distribution to those Athenians “taking part in the procession”.⁵¹ A famous decree from Cos states the various duties that officials had to perform: sacred officials (*hieropoioi*) were responsible for driving the sacrificial oxen to the slaughter following an announcement by the archons, priest, and *hierophylakes*.⁵² Decrees explicitly list civic officials in the procession whenever a community needed to give new or renewed cults extra support and legitimize the innovations taking place.

4.2.2. Limiting Participation

Besides the list and order of the processioners, we are told that the household slaves shall be released from their work and all public slaves from their duties.⁵³ Such rules are not uncommon for festivals.⁵⁴ But they are in need of more scholarly explanation than they have so far received. Athenians certainly wanted to foster as much passive participation

⁵⁰ *IG II²* 47.35-39; *LSS* 11.13-17: νέμεν δὲ τὰ / [κρέ]α τῷ μὲν ἡγεμόνος βοῶς τοῖς πρυτάνεσιν / [καὶ τ]οῖς ἐννέ ἄρχουσιν κα[ὶ] τ[οῖς] ἱε[ρ]οποιοῖς [καὶ] / [τοῖς πο]μ[π]εῦσιν, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα [κρέα Ἀθηναίους μερίζειν].

⁵¹ Osborne and Rhodes 2003, no. 81B.10-16 (*LSCG* 33; *IG II²* 334): καθάπερ πρότερον καὶ νεῖμαντ/[ας τοῖς πρυτάν]εσιν πέντε μερίδας καὶ τοῖς ἐννέα ἄρ/[χουσιν τρεῖς] καὶ ταμίαις τῆς θεοῦ μίαν καὶ τοῖς ἱερ/[οποιοῖς μίαν] καὶ τοῖς στ[ρα]τηγοῖς καὶ τοῖς ταξιάρχ/[οις τρεῖς καὶ τ]οῖς πομπ[εῦσι]ν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις καὶ τα/[ῖς κανηφόροι]ς κατὰ <τὰ> εἰω[θότα], τὰ δὲ ἄλλα κρέα Ἀθηναίω/[ις μερίζειν].

⁵² Osborne and Rhodes, 2003 no. 62A.3-5 (*LSCG* 151A; *Syll³* 1025): ἱερεὺς καὶ ἀρχεῦο[ντ/ε]ς ἀποκαρυσσόντω, ἱεροποιοὶ δὲ καὶ τοὶ κάρυκες ἰόντω κ[α/τ]ὰ χ[ι]λ[ιασ]τύας· βοῶς δὲ ἐννῆ [ἐλάντι, βοῦν ἐξ ἐνάτας ἐκάστ[ας / ἐξ Α[—]έων καὶ Πασθεμιδᾶν πράτων καὶ Ν[οσ]τιδᾶν· ἐς δὲ / [τ]ὴν ἀ[γο]ρὰν ἐλάντω Πάμφυλοι πρᾶτοι, ἐν ἀγορᾶ...

⁵³ *SEG* 21.469C.50-51. For the restorations, see Wilhelm 1914, 45.

⁵⁴ Chaniotis 1995, 148.

(observers) as possible to supplement active (processioners). After all, a procession's effectiveness would be diminished if no one were around to watch it.⁵⁵

The focus on specific officials taking part in the procession overshadows the fact that Athens was full of individuals and families of various backgrounds. This was true in the Classical period and certainly the case in the Hellenistic. Although the decree does not mention metics or *xenoi*, we may safely admit that they took part in the festivities as spectators or even processioners.⁵⁶ Nevertheless, decrees usually focus on matters that are unclear; in this case, what were the roles of sacred and civic officials? Were slaves supposed to continue to work or could they have the day off? Rather than interpret this latter provision as a self-serving rule that put more eyes on the processioners, we are told that Athens' great successes "on land and sea" throughout its history were due to the community's relative stability and constancy.⁵⁷ That stability was coming under greater threat with the rise of permanent Roman power in Greece. Instability, however, would fester within Athenian walls, erupting under the guidance of Mithridates VI a generation later. In 129/8, however, it was crucial to re-establish and reaffirm political and ideological stability so shortly after the devastating Fourth Macedonian War that ended only two decades before. Reaffirmation required a joint effort of all *astoi* to reconstruct and re-imagine religious customs of old.

Scholars have noted that the famous Periclean funeral oration did not address Athenian *politai*, but *astoi*. His target audience was the broad and diverse (free) inhabitants

⁵⁵ Slaves never receive honors or prayers in Greek festivals with the exception of the Anthesteria and Cronia, two festivals celebrated within the household. See Parker 2005, 169.

⁵⁶ See Cartledge 2002, 105-132. Metics, for instance, had pronounced roles in the Panathenaic procession. See Parker 2005, 170. Sourvinou-Inwood 2011, 18-19: "In this procession, then, the polis articulated itself as an open system" (19).

⁵⁷ Also see Thuc. 2.37.3.

that comprised Athenian society.⁵⁸ Considering the foreign origins of some *astoi*, it should not be surprising that Pericles' depiction of Athenians as autochthonous has caused much scholarly debate.⁵⁹ Rosivach and Cohen each argue that autochthonous had a broad and elastic meaning and must have been applied to foreigners who assimilated. In comparison to other states that experienced massive invasions and underwent population transfer, Athens was relatively stable from a demographic point of view. Foreigners filtered into Attica from fairly early times and seem to have assimilated into Athenian society fairly well.⁶⁰ This interpretation of autochthony is quite useful for understanding the Athenians' strategy for renewing the Thargelia.

The myth of autochthony was deeply rooted in Athenian identity. Herzfeld states that such a "mythological notion of pure origins is often connected with social and cultural form; innovations are co-opted by being treated as the realization of an eternal essence."⁶¹ The incorporation of foreigners into Athenian society and their participation in Athenian festivals and wars were part of an innovative process. This process, however, had to be expressed in terms of traditional Athenian identity, i.e. autochthony. As Cohen puts it, accommodation was facilitated by the cultural phenomenon that 'truth' was multifaceted.⁶² When the Athenians revived the Thargelia they were introducing innovations to a traditional cult based on another multifaceted 'truth'. Stating that they were increasing rites meant that they were in fact renewing them, whereas renewing rites perhaps meant inventing new ones.

⁵⁸ E. Cohen 2000, 95-97 and Loraux 1986, 72-89.

⁵⁹ Pelling 2009, 471-483, E. Cohen 2000, 72 and 79-103, and Rosivach 1987, 294-306.

⁶⁰ E. Cohen 2000, 83 notes that Theseus is the prototypical assimilated foreigner.

⁶¹ Herzfeld 1997, 21 quoted by E. Cohen 2000, 82.

⁶² E. Cohen 2000, 83.

This revived festival needed support. Giving slaves the day off from their work served a practical purpose. Perhaps as owners were attending the festival no one would be able to supervise the slaves in their work. In fact, it would have been difficult if not naive to expect that slaves would remain at work and not attend the festival. After all, at least some slaves “lived apart” (χωρίς οικοῦντες) from their owners. Numerous sources tell us that identifying a slave in a crowd was not easy⁶³ and that citizens and slaves were often confused for one another.⁶⁴ The maltreatment of a free man and woman who were thought to be slaves was a major point of contention in Demosthenes’ *Against Evergus and Mnesibulus*.⁶⁵ Moreover, despite a city’s best efforts to keep order, festivals were often chaotic as emotions ran high. Personal enmities could erupt in violence, as attested by Demosthenes in his speech *Against Meidias* in which the prosecutor alleges that his adversary struck him in the face during a festival.⁶⁶ Using the ambiguity of slave and free, some even tried to bait enemies into attacking a free man in order to charge the attacker with *hybris*.⁶⁷ Rather than having celebrants suspicious of one another’s status during the festival, the Athenians probably decided that it was easier to give the slaves the day off. This way, everyone who shares in the cultic life of the city could enjoy the festivities without being under suspicion, falsely or justly, of shirking his or her duties. Since slaves often ran their owners’ businesses,⁶⁸ releasing slaves from their duties may have been part of a suspension of business during the festal day.⁶⁹ Perhaps, the community adopted this policy in part as a way to ensure that the crowd’s attention was on the religious rites and not

⁶³ E. Cohen 2000, 111-112: “Identification of individuals in Attica was so uncertain that both ownership of slaves and origins and status of even the most prominent leader of the polis were often unclear.”

⁶⁴ E. Cohen 2000, 133: no physical or other markers differentiated enslaved from free inhabitants.

⁶⁵ Dem. 47.58-61.

⁶⁶ Dem. 21.

⁶⁷ Dem. 53.16. See E. Cohen 2000, 146-148.

⁶⁸ See Dem. 36 for the famous example of Phormio who ran his owner’s banking business.

⁶⁹ Chaniotis 1995, 148.

business transactions. After all, Ps.-Xenophon tells us that slaves were known to be fearless businessmen who showed little respect for citizens.⁷⁰ Celebrants may not have wanted to be pestered by banker-slaves during a festival. That slaves were to have the day off during the Thargelia may demonstrate as much concern for practical necessity as it does for the desire to see and be seen.

4.2.3. New Prayers, Defunct Rites

On the other hand, the decree's strictest requirements deal with sacrifice. Specifically: who is to sacrifice, what is to be sacrificed, and where is the sacrifice supposed to occur? Predictably, only certain officials can perform the sacrifice and its accompanied prayers on behalf of the Athenian people. Each year the *basileus*, archon and generals were to perform other rites for Apollo⁷¹ according to the oracles and sacrifice on his behalf "in addition to what was previously decreed".⁷² This suggests that not all of the rites to Apollo had been neglected, or at least that these otherwise unknown decrees purported to know what was required. On the other hand, the phrase may imply that new (or renewed) rites must not supplant current ones. We cannot know for certain. The second clause states that these officials were to perform the sacrifices and processions in the festival of the Thargelia "in Kepoi each year", and do so as beautifully as possible.⁷³ The decree is redundant in restating the responsibilities of the *basileus* and priest (52-55), but does offer some elaboration regarding perquisites, λαμβάνων τὰς αὐτὰς μερίδας καθὰ καὶ πρότερον.⁷⁴ This

⁷⁰ Xen. *Ath. Pol.* 1.10-11.

⁷¹ To which Apollo is uncertain. It seems likely that the sacrifice was to all three epithets (Patroös, Pythios, and Alexikakos).

⁷² SEG 21.469C.24-25.

⁷³ SEG 21.469C.26-27.

⁷⁴ The beginning of the phrase (λαμβάνων τὰς) is heavily restored, but fits the context.

phrase, with the temporal adverb “before” conveys the notion that the sacrifices were according to tradition. These rules were either posted elsewhere or perquisites for the officials were to be the same as those from sacrifices to Apollo that were not associated with the procession. Lines 52-55 reinforce the obligations stated in lines 24-27 where the officials are told to sacrifice in addition to what is written in previous decrees. This elaboration, then, is a rhetorical strategy that promulgates new sacrificial obligations as the reinforcement of old ones.

Moreover, a civic official, the treasurer of the Stratiotic fund, is to sacrifice a bull on behalf of the Athenian *demos*, including children and wives, and on behalf of the Romans.⁷⁵ At this crucial time of sacrifice, the sacrificer had to be clear and precise, stating the name of the deity, appropriate epithet, and on whose behalf the sacrifice was being made.⁷⁶ Meanwhile, the audience had to remain in silence until the crucial moment of slaughter. Together, these customs ensured *euphemia*, an injunction of silence that was essential in making the sacrifice “as beautiful as possible”.⁷⁷ Sacrificing on behalf of individuals, groups, or the entire community was the culmination of the rites. Praying on behalf of the Romans marks an obvious change in the religious performance and reflects the tensions arising from changing political circumstances. Mikalson argues that prayers on behalf of the safety of the Athenian people were indicative of Hellenistic pessimism.⁷⁸ Prayers on behalf of the Romans (and kings before them) display homage by the community toward benefactors or acquiescence to powers beyond its control.⁷⁹

⁷⁵ SEG 21.469C.56-58.

⁷⁶ See Pulleyn 1997, 14.

⁷⁷ Montiglio 2000, 13-38; Göttsche 2011, 1-28.

⁷⁸ See Mikalson 1998, 43.

⁷⁹ Price 1984, 23-52.

4.3. Rhetoric of Renewal and Enhancement

Renewal of existing rites might be viewed as a kind of contradiction;⁸⁰ but such contradictions are not unknown among Greek thinkers. According to Plutarch, there was a great philosophical question surrounding the ship of Theseus:

The ship in which Theseus and the youth of Athens returned [from Crete] had thirty oars, and the Athenians guarded over it until the time of Demetrius of Phalerum, taking away the old planks as they decayed, but putting in new and stronger timber in their place; as a result, to the philosophers this ship became an example for the logical question of things that grow: one side arguing that the ship remained the same, and the other contending that it was not the same.⁸¹

The question was whether or not an object should retain its original identity even if its parts were replaced. Popular perception was that the object retains its identity even though it contains none of its original components. Hence, the ship was still known as that of Theseus. As we shall see, such logic was not relegated to philosophical pedantry, but made its mark on the crafting of laws. As with Theseus' ship, the Athenians had to decide whether their "renewed" festival was in fact the same as the old. Although Apollo Patroös may have continued to receive sacrifices, his old rites faded away like rotted planks. How, then, did the Athenians justify the innovations that they had made (eliminating the scapegoat) and others that they would ultimately make? The language in the Athenian decree adumbrates a smoothing over of the ideological incongruities with which the city was clearly grappling.

Language of civic decrees and ordinances are often formulaic and usually incorporate words and phrases meant to flatter an honoree or king, or promulgate a certain ideological message. In sacred laws, words and phrases have multiple meanings that are

⁸⁰ Unless one is referring to a renewal of a treaty or agreement.

⁸¹ Plut. *Thes.* 23.1: τὸ δὲ πλοῖον ἐν ᾧ μετὰ τῶν ἡϊθέων ἐπλευσε καὶ πάλιν ἐσώθη, τὴν τριακόντορον, ἄχρι τῶν Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως χρόνων διεφύλαττον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, τὰ μὲν παλαιὰ τῶν ξύλων ὑφαιρούντες, ἄλλα δὲ ἐμβάλλοντες ἰσχυρὰ καὶ συμπηγνύντες οὕτως ὥστε καὶ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις εἰς τὸν αὐξόμενον λόγον ἀμφιδοξούμενον παράδειγμα τὸ πλοῖον εἶναι, τῶν μὲν ὡς τὸ αὐτό, τῶν δὲ ὡς οὐ τὸ αὐτὸ διαμένει λεγόντων.

difficult to distinguish and require careful examination within their contexts. For instance, the decree claims that the Athenians were “renewing” (ἀνανεώσατο) existing honors for the god.⁸² The subsequent purpose clause states that the *boule* and the people are passing this decree in order to appear to be increasing in addition (προσεπ[αύ]ξοντες) the sacrifices and honors piously.⁸³ The literal meaning of the term ἀνανέομαι/ἀνανέωσις is “renew” whereas ἐπαυξάνω/ἐπαύξησις means “increase”. Neither of these terms suggests in any way that the festival was neglected. Any functioning cult may certainly undergo renewal or enhancement, i.e. be improved. Yet we know that the Athenians either stopped performing the *Thargelia* or it was significantly diminished in the fourth century.⁸⁴ Was such obfuscation intentional?

4.3.1. Renewing Rites for the God

According to Plato, Sophists like Gorgias and Tisias boasted of the ability to distort the meanings of words to suit the circumstances.⁸⁵ They could make the new become old and the old new:

Shall we allow Gorgias and Tisias to rest? They who saw that likelihoods are more to be esteemed than truths, and who in turn make small things appear great and great things small through the power of speech, and *new things old and old things new*, and who devised conciseness of speech and boundless length concerning all matters?⁸⁶

Such rhetorical skill could be highly useful in a society in which the traditional and the customary formed the standards by which all was measured. According to D’Argour, “the

⁸² *SEG* 21.469C.16-17.

⁸³ *SEG* 21.469C.17-20.

⁸⁴ See Mikalson 1998, 273.

⁸⁵ Poulakos 1995, 11-52.

⁸⁶ Pl. *Phdr.* 267a-b: Τεισίαν δὲ Γοργίαν τε ἐάσομεν εὔδειν, οἱ πρὸ τῶν ἀληθῶν τὰ εἰκότα εἶδον ὡς τιμητέα μᾶλλον, τὰ τε αὖ μικρὰ μεγάλα καὶ τὰ μεγάλα μικρὰ φαίνεσθαι ποιούσιν διὰ ῥώμην λόγου, καινὰ τε ἀρχαίως τὰ τ’ ἐναντία καινῶς, συντομίαν τε λόγων καὶ ἄπειρα μήκη περὶ πάντων ἀνηῦρον;

rhetorical and literary potential of creating the new by presenting a change in perspective was relished and exploited by the Greeks”.⁸⁷ We can see this rhetorical ploy in civic discourse, but we do not know much about the exact deliberation that took place before the Athenian decree concerning the Thargelia was issued. Was there a deliberate attempt to shroud neglect in terms of renewal, and innovation in a terms of enhancement?

The Athenians were to “renew the oracles and the long-standing honors first arranged for the god through laws”.⁸⁸ The verb they used, ἀνε νέωσατο, clearly means “make new” or “renew”. The meaning of “renew”, however, is not very precise. What constitutes “new” is a social and cultural construction rather than an objective reality.⁸⁹ After all, the English word “new” has a wide range of meanings and a variety of Greek words and cognates are used to express this same range, νέος and καινός most common among them.⁹⁰ Νέος usually denotes something as young and fresh, whereas καινός often means “newfangled” or “innovative” (καινοτομεῖν).⁹¹ The latter rarely has a positive connotation, especially in regard to religion.⁹² Therefore, we have ἀνανεώσατο rather than a form of καινοτομεῖν, seeing as the Athenians were “renewing” the festival in the sense of making it young again, i.e. refreshing the rites.

The verb ἀνε νέωσατο takes as its the direct object τὰ ὑπάρχοντα... τ[ίμ]ια. Renewing something logically suggests that it had somehow lapsed or was in danger of lapsing (e.g. a treaty). Why would the community state that it is renewing honors that already exist? Wouldn't a continued performance of those honors and rites suffice? Let us

⁸⁷ D'Angour 2011, 88.

⁸⁸ *SEG* 21.469C.16-17.

⁸⁹ D'Angour 2011, 61.

⁹⁰ See D'Angour 2011, 24.

⁹¹ See Arist. *Pol.* 1305b.41 and 1316b.19.

⁹² D'Angour 2011, 38.

see if we can make sense of these contradictions. By renewing existing honors, the community accepts the cult back into its civic consciousness and expiates itself before the god for the lapse of honors that were clearly not as “current” as claimed. In a sense, the Athenians managed to announce their renewed attention to the festival without having to admit that they had been neglecting it.

The Greek preoccupation with decline and renewal is as old as Hesiod’s *Works and Days* in which the poet recounts the world’s descent from a golden age to one of iron. This does not imply that such descent and decay is permanent. Renewal was a predominant theme among many philosophers and historians.⁹³ Herodotus and Polybius note the decline of a ruling power in successive generations, which Polybius most famously theorized in his *anacyclosis* model.⁹⁴ In Plato’s *Laws*, the philosopher expounds the impermanency of the world: everything shifts and while one society grows another deteriorates.⁹⁵ Greeks would not use this intellectual framework, however, as an excuse to shirk commitments to the gods. Therefore, ἀνανέωσις forms the main strategy of propitiating Apollo (or Apollos) and explaining, perhaps rather than justifying, any innovations to both gods and men.

Ἀνανέωσις, the noun form of ἀνανεόμαι, may mean a “recalling to memory” (*LSJ*). Through this subjective “recall”, the community obviates the complexities of reinstating a religious performance for a god that had been discontinued. ἀνανεόμαι is often used for renewing agreements, relationships, and honors like *proxeny*, friendship, *asylia*, and *syngeneia*.⁹⁶ In such instances, agreements between individuals and communities had typically not yet expired. In fact, cities often use forms of ὑπάρχω to stress that the parties

⁹³ Dodds 1973, 13-25.

⁹⁴ Polyb. 6.9.10-15. Societies experience a cycle of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy (and their malignant counterparts). On Polybius’ model, see Podes 1991, 577-587.

⁹⁵ Pl. Leg. 676c. Herodotus 1.5.4 and Thucydides 1.19 express the same notion.

⁹⁶ For example, see *FD* III 4:225 (*proxeny*), *IG IX* 1² 582 (*philia*), and Rigsby 1996 (*Asylia*) 12.32-39.

were renewing current practices and agreements. Agreements with gods were similarly crafted, but were fundamentally different: a god was immortal. Once adopted into a pantheon the god was, in theory, a permanent fixture of the community. Even if rites were neglected, a people could renew them so long as they could claim a historical relationship. A number of *asylia* requests invoke ties old enough to be considered mythological.⁹⁷ Like *asylia* requests, “renewal” allowed communities to begin anew by refreshing rather than resurrecting their relationships. This is what the Athenian decree aims to do. It shows that the community viewed the festival and its honors for the god as a longstanding relationship couched in the language of a legal agreement between two negotiating parties. Although the Athenians had stopped practicing certain rites for Apollo Patroös, the god’s permanent residence in the Agora allowed the community to reinstitute these rites as the circumstances allowed, to claim renewal rather than resurrection.

The inclination to deny innovations, especially religious innovations, had much to do with conflicting Greek perspectives about their past. Although many of these conflicts are philosophical and may not have been shared or even known by the majority of Greeks,⁹⁸ we find in this decree a strong concern not to overstep certain boundaries of convention. In Euripides’ *Suppliants*, Theseus warns men not to think they know more than the gods.⁹⁹ In other words, man should not boast of his mental capacity and achievements. In man’s power, however, was the ability to build upon what the gods have bestowed.

⁹⁷ Sumi 2004, 80-87; Rigsby 1996, 1-29; Jones 1999, 33-34.

⁹⁸ The Platonic theory of forms, for example, prohibits progress of any kind that reaches beyond a pre-existing model. See Dodds 1973, 13-14.

⁹⁹ Eur. *Suppl.* 195-217, especially 216-218: ἀλλ’ ἡ φρόνησις τοῦ θεοῦ μείζον σθένειν / ζητεῖ, τὸ γαῦρον δ’ ἐν φρεσὶν κεκτημένοι / δοκοῦμεν εἶναι δαιμόνων σοφώτεροι. See Dodds 1973, 7.

4.3.2. Augmenting Rites for the God

The Athenian decree also calls for the “enhancement” of rites. The verb ἐπαύξειν is very common in sacred laws. It may refer specifically to improving the physical sanctuary or generally increasing the splendor of the rites for a god. Regulations were inscribed in order to notify the public of changes. Those changes were often explained as improvements. The fourth-century rhetorician Anaximenes of Lampsacus will help us put ἐπαύξεις in legal and rhetorical context. In his *Rhetoric to Alexander*, Anaximenes offers his readers a guide for crafting effective deliberative and forensic speeches. He gives the reader advice for arguing both sides of issues regarding religious rites.¹⁰⁰ He notes that it was commonly believed that the ancestral rites for the gods had to be maintained as prescribed by custom.

So on the matter of proposing religious legislation to maintain rites:

It is necessary to speak of sacred rites in three ways. We assert either that the existing form (of rites) should be maintained, or that they be changed to be more magnificent or humbler. Therefore, whenever we propose that it is necessary to preserve existing rites, we shall devise arguments from considerations of justice by saying that to transgress ancestral customs is unjust in the eyes of all men and since all oracles order men to make sacrifices according to ancestral customs it is especially necessary to maintain the rites for the gods prescribed by those who first founded our cities and established sanctuaries for the gods.¹⁰¹

Anaximenes offers other rhetorical strategies for arguing on behalf of the preservation of practices against diminishing their splendor:

From considerations of expediency, we shall say that, with regard to the contribution of funds, it will be beneficial for both private individuals and the community when sacrifices are offered according to ancestral custom, and that in terms of courage it will profit the citizens since, with hoplites, cavalry, and light-armed troops escorting them in the procession, they would become bolder citizens desirous for honor in such matters; and from

¹⁰⁰ See Chiron 2002, xvii-xviii; Sickinger 2007, 287-290.

¹⁰¹ Anax. *Rhet.* 1423a.21-39: Περὶ μὲν οὖν ἱερῶν τριττῶς ἀναγκαῖον λέγειν. ἢ γὰρ ἐροῦμεν ὡς τὰ καθεστῶτα διαφυλακτέον ἢ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ μεγαλοπρεπέστερον μεταστατέον ἢ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ ταπεινότερον. ὅταν μὲν οὖν λέγωμεν, ὡς δεῖ τὰ καθεστῶτα διαφυλάττειν, εὐρήσομεν ἀφορμὰς ἐκ μὲν τοῦ δικαίου λέγοντες. τὰ πάτρια ἔθνη παρὰ πᾶσι παραβαίνειν ἄδικόν ἐστι, καὶ διότι τὰ μαντεῖα πάντα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις προστάττει κατὰ τὰ πάτρια ποιεῖσθαι τὰς θυσίας, καὶ ὅτι τῶν πρώτων οἰκιστῶν τὰς πόλεις καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς ἰδρυσαμένων τὰ ἱερὰ μάλιστα δεῖ διαμένειν τὰς περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπιμελείας.

the (grounds) of the good if it has resulted in the festivals being exceedingly brilliant, and on the grounds of pleasure, if there is a certain elaboration introduced into the sacrifices of the gods with a view to spectacle; and on the grounds of practicability, if there has been neither lack nor excess in these sacrifices.¹⁰²

Reading how a grand spectacle induces patriotic sentiment reminds us of Thucydides' description of the ill-fated Athenian fleet setting out for Sicily.¹⁰³ But a civic procession may have had the same effect on the observer, albeit on a smaller scale. Anaximenes' advice would not apply to the Athenians for the renewal of the Thargelia, but nevertheless shows the way in which rhetoric can guide policy. An argument for keeping the rites the same would essentially be an argument for continued neglect. But the Athenians did adopt one aspect of this rhetorical strategy: renewed rites, they assert, were to be done *κατὰ τὰ πάτρια*.

Maintaining religious rites may be couched in terms of justice, benefit, the good (*kalon*), and splendor. Enhancing rites, however, could perhaps conflict with tradition, which Anaximenes tells us all pious men want to maintain. Therefore, he offers rhetorical advice for winning support for the enhancement (*ἐπαύξησις*) of rites:

But whenever we advise to change sacred rites for greater magnificence, we shall find suitable arguments for the altering of ancestral customs by saying that the proposal is *not for the destruction of existing rites, but for their enhancement*; that it is likely that the gods will be more favorably disposed to those who honor them more; and then that *not even our fathers always performed their sacrifices in the same way, but regulated their service to the gods, both as a community and as private households, according to the situation and their prosperity*.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² Anax. *Rhet.* 1423b.1-9: ἐκ δὲ τοῦ συμφέροντος, ὅτι πρὸς χρημάτων συντέλειαν ἢ τοῖς ιδιώταις ἢ τῷ κοινῷ τῆς πόλεως συμφέρον ἔσται κατὰ τὰ πάτρια τῶν ἱερῶν θυομένων, καὶ ὅτι πρὸς εὐτολμίαν λυσιτελεῖ τοῖς πολίταις, ἐπεὶ συμπορευόντων ὀπλιτῶν ἵππεῶν ψιλῶν εὐτολμότεροι γένοιντ' ἂν οἱ πολῖται φιλοτιμούμενοι περὶ ταῦτα. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ καλοῦ, εἰ οὕτω λαμπρὰς τὰς ἐορτὰς πρὸς τὸ θεωρεῖσθαι συμβέβηκεν. ἐκ δὲ τῆς ἡδονῆς, εἰ καὶ πρὸς τὸ θεωρεῖσθαι ποικιλία τις περὶ τὰς τῶν θεῶν θυσίας. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ δυνατοῦ, εἰ μήτε ἔνδεια γεγένηται μήτε ὑπερβολὴ περὶ ταύτας.

¹⁰³ Thuc. 6.31.

¹⁰⁴ Anax. *Rhet.* 1423b.10-20: ὅταν δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ μεγαλοπρεπέστερον συμβουλευόμεν μεθιστάναι τὰς ἱεροποιίας, περὶ μὲν τοῦ τὰ πάτρια κινεῖν ἀφορμὰς ἔξομεν εὐπρεπεῖς λέγοντες· τὸ προστιθέναι τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν οὐ καταλύειν ἔστιν, ἀλλ' αὖξιν τὰ καθεστῶτα· ἔπειθ' ὥς καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς εἰκὸς εὐνουστέρους εἶναι τοῖς μᾶλλον αὐτοὺς τιμῶσιν· ἔπειθ' ὥς οὐδὲ οἱ πατέρες ἀεὶ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ τὰς θυσίας ἤγον, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοὺς καιροὺς καὶ τὰς εὐπραγίας ὀρῶντες καὶ ἰδίᾳ καὶ κοινῇ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς θεραπείαν ἐνομοθέτουσιν.

That a proposed change to existing rites is conveyed as enhancement rather than destruction demonstrates a key rhetorical strategy seen in the Athenian decree for the Thargelia. But even more exemplary is that such changes can be justified by so candid an admission: that in reality ancestral rites often did change according to the circumstances. One can alter a religious tradition by citing another tradition: our fathers changed religious practices, so why can we now not do the same? This textbook taxonomy is not, however, found in the Athenian decree. Athens adopted a hybrid strategy: enhancement (and renewing) is what allowed the community to honor the gods according to tradition.

Anaximenes identifies ἐπαύξεις as an important rhetorical device in forensic speeches: the speaker should elaborate critical points on which he wants his audience to focus. In the spirit of philosophical argumentation Anaximenes offers advice on the opposite: when the objective is to scale down religious rites, the proposer should convince his audience that the city is less prosperous than it used to be.¹⁰⁵ Moreover, less ostentatious rites would be more pleasing to the gods. Although the diminishment of rites may be proposed in assembly, they would hardly make it into the epigraphical record. Renewal, conveyed in terms of enhancement, would fit into Anaximenes' rhetorical strategy. All told, the augmentation and renewal of traditional rites to Apollo is the pretext behind the Athenian decree throughout which we can detect echoes, and of course modifications, of Anaximenes' rhetorical advice.

¹⁰⁵ The objective of persuading the audience is the same whether the setting is forensic or deliberative. See Carey 1994, 33-34.

Along these lines Angelos Chaniotis elucidates the “stratigraphy” of norms contained in many Greek sacred laws. He identifies ἐπαύξησις as a third layer:¹⁰⁶ the stage directions and variable elements aimed at increasing a ritual’s efficacy.¹⁰⁷ These aimed at directing individuals or groups through the ritual process: e.g. the order of the procession and the distribution of meat. Whether or not the decree explicitly contains the word ἐπαύξησις, such rules were designed to make the performance “as beautiful as possible” for the god. According to Chaniotis texts were silent on other aspects of the performance because they were rigidly dictated by custom (νόμοι).¹⁰⁸ In other words, the stage directions in the ἐπαύξησις layer may be innovations whereas the νόμοι were not recorded because everyone presumably knew them.

The example Chaniotis offers is an early second-century BC decree from Magnesia-on-the-Maeander that outlines the procedures for an existing cult to Zeus Sosipolis. The *oikonomoi* were to purchase a bull that is “as beautiful as possible” for sacrifice, certain privileged individuals are told to pray on behalf of the city, others (magistrates, ephebes, priests and priestesses, etc.) are to make a procession, and statues of the Twelve Gods are to be conveyed in “the finest garments possible”.¹⁰⁹ Clearly, the concern is over improving the rites through innovative stage directions. But these stage directions formed an integral part

¹⁰⁶ The first layer consists of *patria* and *nomizomena* (the invariable hard core of ritual practices) and the second layer consists of *nomoi* (instructions concerning the performance of rituals and distinctive regulations). The third layer, *epauxesis*, consists of stage directions aimed at augmenting the ritual’s efficacy. See Chaniotis 2009, 102-103.

¹⁰⁷ Chaniotis 2009, 102-105.

¹⁰⁸ Popular expressions: κατὰ νόμους and κατὰ τὰ πατρία. See Chaniotis 2009, 104-105.

¹⁰⁹ I. *Magn.* 98.31-43; *LSAM* 32 (Magnesia-on-the-Maeander, 197/6 BC): δεδόχθαι τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ· τὸν στεφανηφόρον τὸν ἀεὶ γινόμενον μετὰ τοῦ ἱέρω καὶ τῆς ἱερείας τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Λευκοφρυην<ῆ>ς ἐξά[γ]ειν τῆμ πομπὴν τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ Ἀρτεμισιώνος τῆι δωδεκάτῃ καὶ θύειν τὸν ταῦρον τὸν ἀναδεικνύμενον, συμπομπεῦειν δὲ τὴν τε γερουσίαν καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας τοὺς τε χειροτονητοὺς καὶ [τ]οὺς κληρωτοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἐφήβους καὶ τοὺς νέους καὶ τοὺς παῖδας καὶ τοὺς τὰ Λευκοφρυηνὰ νικῶντας καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς νικῶντας τοὺς στεφανίτας ἀγῶνας, ὁ δὲ στεφανηφόρος ἄγων τὴν πομπὴν φερέτω ξόανα πάντων τῶν δώδεκα θεῶν ἐν ἐσθῆσιν ὡς καλλίσταις.

of the festival experience. They were complex and sophisticated components of the ritual and therefore needed to be recorded with precision and clarity.

In instances of cult renewal, communities cloak their rediscovered piety in similar language of ἐπαύξεις. Regarding the renewed Thargelia, the meaning of “pious enhancement of sacrifices and honors” is outlined in the closing lines of the decree. The procession is to take place according to certain specifications and specific officials are to conduct the sacrifices. That these “enhancements” of “existing honors” are explained in such detail suggests that a reevaluation of the festival performance was taking place. There are multiple interrelated uses of ἐπαύξεις in the decree: firstly, the rhetorical sense of “enhancement” as evident by the explicit use of ἐπαύξειν in the decree obscures the community’s neglect of the festival. Secondly, the rites were designed to emphasize the aesthetics of the performance.

The complex and contradictory language in these decrees demonstrates a nuanced relationship between these communities and their cults. Again, a significant development of this relationship is on display: a community would not outright admit that it neglected its gods. Instead it crafts its laws with rhetorical stratagems that sometimes resembled contradictory claims and statements. Ritual theorists have long argued over the logic and function of such religious language referred to by Rappaport as ultimate sacred postulates, which were contradictory or unintelligible assertions.¹¹⁰ Thus Greek perceptions of their cults were complex and entailed much legal maneuvering. Ἀνανέωσις and ἐπαύξεις are two terms that form the crux of cult innovations. As we shall see, renewal and/or enhancement also denote the spatial aspects of cult. In this sense, they should be seen in the

¹¹⁰ See Rappaport 1999, 264-265. The author offers as an example: “The Lord our God, the Lord is One” (*Deut.* 6:4).

context of concrete acts of ritual change: construction, the movement of sacred objects, and the passage of worshippers through religious space. The following case study represents a different strategy that was part renewal and part innovation. An extension of existing rites for a patron goddess was clearly an act of ἐπαύξησις, which above all had a predominately spatial focus.

4.4. Reinvention across the Aegean

A second century decree from Magnesia-on-the-Maeander explicates the rituals for the Eisiteria, a sacrifice and festival marking an annual event and may be seen as a celebration of a new year.¹¹¹ Here, the rites inaugurated a festival cycle that included the Leukophryeneia; it marked the arrival of the goddess in the city. The decree is in two parts. The first (A) concerns the establishment of an annual festival to commemorate the installation of the cult statue for the recently renovated Parthenon:

When Polykleides son of Pythodelus was *stephanephoros*, in the month of Hagneon; concerning the installation of the cult statue of Artemis Leukophryene in the Parthenon which has now been (re)built for her and concerning the performance of libations and sacrifices for her each year on the sixth of the month of Artemision, and the performance of sacrifices by each of the inhabitants, in front of their doors, according to the ability of each household, upon the altars to be prepared by them; [11] resolved by the council and the people; Diagoras son of Isagoras proposed: since, following divine inspiration and manifestation to all the people of the polity for the restoration of the temple, the Parthenon was finished, surpassing greatly in the particular enhancement of its features and in magnificence from the temple left to us formerly by our ancestors, and since it is ancestral custom for the people, inasmuch as it is piously disposed toward the divinity, always to render all the gods worthy sacrifices and honors, and especially to the founder of the city Artemis Leukophryene:

[19] With good fortune for the safety of our people and those who are well intentioned toward the people of the Magnesians, including their wives and children; resolved by the council and people:

¹¹¹ Wiemer 2009, 91. An *eisiteria* was also an inauguration of officials. See Dem. 19.190: ἡ βουλή ταῦτά ταῦτα, εἰσιτητήρι' ἔθυσσε...

[21] That the *neokoros* and priestess of Artemis on the sixth of the month of Artemision complete the restoration of the goddess into the Parthenon with most conspicuous sacrifice, and that this day be designated sacred for all time called the Eisiteria, and there shall be cessation of hostilities on this day against everyone, and there shall be procession of women into the sanctuary and they shall stand in attendance in the sanctuary performing the due honor and attendance on the goddess.

[28] The *neokoros* shall conduct also choruses of maidens singing hymns to Artemis Leukophryene, and children shall be released from their studies and male and female slaves from their work on the day in which these rites will be conducted. Those who are priestesses of Artemis after the stephanephorate of Polykleides and the *stephanephoroi* in their respective years shall conduct the sacrifice and procession. And there shall occur on this same day also a remission of the sales tax, which takes place also on the first day of the year, after the stephanephorate of Polykleides; and the *hierokeryx*, now and each year always on the designated sacred day of this month, in full assembly, in the presence of—in conspicuous dress and crowned with laurel—the polemarchs, *oikonomoi*, secretary of the *boule*, *strategos*, hipparchs, *stephanephoros*, and copy clerk, having called for silence in front of the *bouleuterion*, with the children, shall issue the following prayer and exhortation to the whole population:

[43] I exhort all inhabitants of the city and territory of Magnesia to perform at the beautiful Eisiteria, according to the ability of (one's) household, a pleasing sacrifice to Artemis Leukophryene on this day, and to pray that Artemis Leukophryene grant the Magnesians, both themselves and the women, health and wealth and that the existing generation be preserved and fortunate, and that their descendants be blessed.¹¹²

Diagoras, the proposer of the initial decree, refers at the outset to two connected events that provided the occasion for the construction of the temple. The Magnesians had consulted an oracle in 221/0 BC after the goddess Artemis had made an appearance.¹¹³ The Delphic oracle had told the Magnesians to enhance the honors for himself (Apollo) and his sister Artemis. The Magnesians decided to establish crowned games to honor the goddess and Apollo and have their city declared inviolable.¹¹⁴ For whatever reason, the Magnesians did not successfully canvas until 208/7.¹¹⁵ The games were first held in the first penteteric cycle

¹¹² *I.Magn.* 100A; *LSAM* 32A (Magnesia-on-the-Maeander, first half of the second century BC): see Appendix E.

¹¹³ Dedicating a shrine or altar to commemorate a god's manifestation, often on the battlefield, was common. See Platt 2011, 151-160. *Epiphaneia* inscriptions often lack details about the nature of the divine manifestation (Platt 2011, 150 and 155).

¹¹⁴ Rigsby 1996, no. 66.7-10 and 16-24 (*I.Magn.* 16). Political factors are much discussed. See Dunand 1978, 202-203.

¹¹⁵ See Sosin 2009, 369-410: the Magnesians did not actually begin canvassing until 208/7.

after 208/7, which seems to have coincided with the beginning of the construction for the new temple.¹¹⁶

The Eisiteria was founded to celebrate the completion of this grand temple that the famous Hermogenes designed.¹¹⁷ It introduces a new tradition and at the same time organizes the old.¹¹⁸ After a few decades, however, the Magnesians issued another decree (B) that may have served as a reminder to the people of their obligations to perform the Eisiteria.¹¹⁹ If this is so, then the festival failed to catch on or certain rites were not being performed as expected. Or, whatever the case, Magnesia felt the need to reinforce what had already been settled in law and on stone. Many have analyzed the sociopolitical agenda of the Eisiteria and especially the Leukophreyneia;¹²⁰ below I analyze the relationship between the two festivals, paying particular attention to rites of the Eisiteria meant to re-establish sacred space and the city's strategy of reinventing tradition through the rhetoric of augmentation and renewal. Whereas the Athenians were reinventing their Thargelia through renewal, the Magnesians were reinventing their cult to Artemis by creating an appendage festival to one that teetered on neglect.

¹¹⁶ Bingöl 2007, 67.

¹¹⁷ Vitr. 3.2.6,7 and Strab. 14.1.40; the exact meaning of Eisiteria is unclear and may vary from place to place (Parker 2005, 98 no. 31).

¹¹⁸ Stavrianopoulou 2006, 141.

¹¹⁹ See Dunand 1978, 201-215 (especially 203); *LSAM* 33, page 97. Inscription B was set up in the North Stoa near Inscription A. Reference (B: 20) to the ordinance passed during the stephanephorate of Polycleides (A: 1) clearly show that it was issued subsequent to Inscription A. See Bingöl 2007, 75-76.

¹²⁰ See Sumi 2004, 79-92.

4.4.1. Renewal of the Temple and Divine Manifestation

At Magnesia, the decree focuses on the installation (καθίδρυσις) of a cult statue for Artemis and the refurbishment (κατεσκευασμένον) of the Parthenon.¹²¹ Κατασκευή is an ambiguous term that could range from maintenance to renovation. Archaeological evidence shows that the term denotes the building of the temple to Artemis, perhaps over the original.¹²² The participle κατεσκευασμένον also conveys a religious renovation of the cult and sanctuary. Certain rules reveal a program that reflects religious innovations centered on new rites and the newly installed cult statue that marked the end of the renovation. This renovation took two forms: the completion of the “restored” (i.e. new) temple and the apparent reinstallation of the goddess in that temple each year.¹²³ Sacrifices, honors,¹²⁴ and reinstallation became the religious focus of the new festival. The goddess had shown herself to the people, prompting the enhancement (i.e. changes) to the traditional Leukophryeneia; she was now to appear in her newly renovated temple each year to symbolize her commitment to the community and vice versa.¹²⁵ An annual celebration reinforced the god’s acceptance of her restored temple, the new festival (i.e. the Eisiteria), and the larger programmatic initiative that had its roots in 221/0 BC.

The preamble to the decree mentions annual libations and sacrifices on the sixth of Artemision, that the sacrifices be performed by each of the inhabitants before the doors to

¹²¹ *I. Magn.* 100.3-5: ὑπὲρ τῆς καθιδρύσεως τοῦ ξοάνου τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος / τῆς Λευκοφρυηνῆς εἰς τὸν κατεσκευασμένον αὐ/τῆι νῦν Παρθενῶνα.

¹²² Winters 2006, 12.

¹²³ The reinstallation was to be performed by the *neokoros* and priestess “with the sacrifices” (*I. Magn.* 100A.21-24). It follows that if the sacrifices happen every year then the reinstallation does as well.

¹²⁴ Sacrifices and honors: *I. Magn.* 100A.16-18.

¹²⁵ Platt 2011, 150: “the epigraphic use of *epiphaneia* leaves anything beyond the manifestation to the imagination of the reader, allowing the text to concentrate on the epiphany’s immediate significance for the community – whether the safety and status of a city or sanctuary, or the vowing of appropriate honors for the deity.”

their houses according to the ability of each family (*oikos*).¹²⁶ Not surprisingly, the new ritual practices are related to the newly refurbished sacred space. The enactment clause (lines 11-18) emphasizes that the “restoration” of the temple would give the ability of the community to practice “age-old” rites. Subsequently, the purported aim of the decree, piety, is always evident: “it is customary for the city to be piously disposed toward the gods, especially Artemis Leukophryene, the *archegetes* of the city.” The restoration took place in response to the goddess’ manifestation in 221/0. Epiphanies had a prominent place in the relationship between individual Greeks and their gods,¹²⁷ and they played a significant role in civic religion as well: the appearance of a deity could enhance the sanctity of temples and festivals by confirming the power and immanence of local deities.¹²⁸

Restoration in conjunction with *epiphaneia* was the dominant theme of the decree. The word τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν appears again in line 23 linking the building of the Parthenon to the rites performed for the goddess: the *neokoros* and priestess of Artemis were to perform the reinstallation of the goddess in the Parthenon with most conspicuous sacrifices. That day was to be designated sacred for all time and called the Eisiteria.¹²⁹ Replacing the cult statue in the Parthenon is a symbolic “restoration” connected to, but not synonymous with, the κατασκευή of the temple itself mentioned in lines 5 and 10. Compare the uses of ἀποκατάστασις in lines 13 and 23: “for the restoration of the temple” (ἀποκατάστασιν τοῦ ναοῦ) refers to the construction of the temple whereas “the restoration of the goddess in the Parthenon” (ἀποκατάστασιν τῆς θεοῦ) signifies the ritual of setting up the cult statue in the Parthenon each year. Its vagueness is seen in Halicarnassian decree studied in Chapter Two:

¹²⁶ *I. Magn.* 100.5-10.

¹²⁷ Versnel 2011, 41-42 and 91-92. See Platt 2011, 145-147 on the Hymn to Demetrius Poliorcetes. His presence “in truth” (ἀληθινόν) gave him divine qualities.

¹²⁸ Platt 2011, 149.

¹²⁹ *I. Magn.* 100.21-25.

the priestess shall adorn the treasury for the goddess.¹³⁰ The evidence does not help us answer many of the logistical questions we would like to know. Where was the statue housed in the interval between statue's departure and its return? Where was the statue kept during the Parthenon's reconstruction? Many of the ritual components are similar to those performed for the statue of Athena during the Athenian Plynteria. A closer look at that festival may shed some light.

The Plynteria is long believed to have been part of the ritual nexus of the Panathenaia. Taking place in the month of Hecatombaion, the Athenian Panathenaia was the most significant administrative and organizational day of the year. Parker calls it "a demonstration of embedded religion in action".¹³¹ The term of office of Athena's treasurers ran from Panathenaia to Panathenaia. It marked a new year when Athena received her new *peplos*. Two months later on 25 Thargelion the lesser-known Plynteria began, which was the festival in which the goddess' garments were removed, washed, and returned.¹³² The first day of this festival was described as *apophras* (ill-omened), perhaps in reference to the removal of the statue's clothing.¹³³ On the second day, the goddess received a bathing rite when members of the Praxiergidai *genos* conveyed her statue to the sea.¹³⁴ The Plynteria, together with the Kallynteria, made up an "articulated nexus" around pollution and

¹³⁰ *Syll*³ 1015.30-31: κατασκευασάτω / δὲ καὶ θησαυρὸν τῆι θεῶ.

¹³¹ Parker 2005, 253.

¹³² The procession seems to have occurred on the second day, 26 Thargelion. See Sourvinou-Inwood 2011, 135-151.

¹³³ Sourvinou-Inwood 2011, 11-12.

¹³⁴ The ceremony continued after Pheidias crafted a new chryselephantine statue. The statue conveyed to the sea must have been the old wooden one (Parke 1977, 152-153). Mansfield 1985; Parker 2005, 478; Nagy 1991, 301. On the date 26 Thargelion, see Sourvinou-Inwood 2011, 135-151. The cult statue of Athena seems to have been housed overnight in the sanctuary of Athena Skiras at Phalerum. While we know of no similar bathing rite for Artemis Leukophryene at Magnesia, her cult statue must have been taken somewhere before her ritualized return (Sourvinou-Inwood 2011, 178).

purification. The festivals (Plynteria, Kallynteria, and Panathenaia) formed a ritual scheme of New Year and renewal.¹³⁵

The replacement of the cult statue and its concomitant rites served to renew the relationship between the Athenians and their goddess each year.¹³⁶ Likewise, the month of Artemision may have marked the beginning of a new year at Magnesia.¹³⁷ The annual advent of Artemis reassured the community that its new rites were aligned with conventional practices. Due to a lack of evidence, the cultic relationship between the Panathenaia and Plynteria is more difficult to reconstruct than the one between the Leukophryeneia and the Eisiteria as outlined in the Magnesian decrees. Nevertheless, they both indicate contrasting ways in which communities reconnected with their gods and each other.

In other instances, the installation of a new cult statue, altar, or *temenos* marked an important point in the human-divine relationship. A first-century decree issued by the Athenian *technitai* cites their increasing the honors and sacrifices to the gods by establishing an altar and adorning the *temenos* of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis.¹³⁸ Although local practices differed, to “increase the rites to the gods as much as possible” (συναύξουσα καθ’ ὅσον ἐστὶ δυνατὴ) was a common aim. In the case of the *technitai*, increasing rites entailed providing the goddess with new accoutrements: a new altar had to be installed and a *temenos* properly adorned (βωμὸν ἰδρυσ[αμένη καὶ] ἰέμενος κατασκευάσασα). In all cases,

¹³⁵ Sourvinou-Inwood 2011, 12-13.

¹³⁶ Sourvinou-Inwood 2011, 16: “In Greek advent festivals the deity’s statue was moved from its usual place in order to allow the enactment of its return to represent in a concrete way the arrival of the deity.” The author notes, however, that details about the deity’s departure are scarce. Where did the deity go? She never actually leaves the territory of the city.

¹³⁷ See Samuel 1972, 121-122: There were twelve months in the Magnesian calendar, but their order is uncertain.

¹³⁸ *IG II² 1338.7-10*: συναύξουσα καθ’ ὅσον ἐστὶ δυνατὴ τὰς τε θυσίας καὶ τᾶλλα πάντα τ[ᾶ] ἐψηφισμένα ὑ]π’ αὐτ[οῦ] τοῖς τε θεοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἐδεργέταις τίμια ἐψηφίσαστο καὶ αὐτὴ θύξ[ιν καὶ σπένδ]ειν τῆι Δήμητρι καὶ τῆι Κόρηι ταῖς μυστηριώτισιν ἡμέραις καὶ βωμὸν ἰδρυσ[αμένη καὶ] τέμενος κατασκευάσασα ἐν Ἐλευσίνοι...

the introduction of something new, whether a procession, sacrifice, or structure, is presented as enhancement rather than innovation. Enhancement and renovation, however, sometimes required more than a new temple. At Magnesia, the obligations of cult and civic personnel bore a striking resemblance to those outlined in the *technitai* decree. In both cases, reinventing tradition required fastidious participation among officials and non-officials alike. Here, however, the strategy appears to have differed from the one at Athens.

4.4.2. The People Appear before the Goddess

We may recall that at Corope consultants and temple officials maintained good order and wore special clothing in order to appear as beautiful as possible.¹³⁹ In that case, the rhetoric in the decree was one of reciprocation: “with most conspicuous honors owing to the benefactions from the god, since he makes clear through his oracle, both in general and to each person individually concerning matters pertaining to health and safety.”¹⁴⁰ Apollo had been steadfast in his presence and had provided for the community. An appearance by a god or goddess, as at Magnesia, had an amplifying effect. A decree from Bargylia records that the gratitude of the people has become “more conspicuous” (ἐκφανεστέρον γεγονέναι) on account of the manifestations of the goddess, Artemis Kindyas.¹⁴¹ Limiting or expanding the size of the festival was an important way for the community to achieve the desired appearances and appear to reciprocate the deity’s steadfastness. The goddess raised the stakes and the people should follow suit.

¹³⁹ *IG IX 2*, 1109. See Chapter 1 and Appendix A.

¹⁴⁰ *IG IX 2*, 1109.10-13: ταῖς ἐπιφανεστάταις τιμαῖς διὰ τὰς / εὐεργεσίας τὰς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ προδηλοῦντος διὰ τοῦ μάν/τείου καὶ κατὰ κοινὸν καὶ κατ’ ἰδίαν ἐκάστωι περὶ τῶν πρὸς ὑγίεια[ν] / καὶ σωτηρίαν ἀνηκόντων<ν>.

¹⁴¹ *SEG 50.1101.7-8*; also lines 1-4: διὰ τὰς γινομένας ἐπιφά/[νείας τὰς] ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀ[ρτέ]μιδος τῆς Κινδυ]άδος.

The Magnesian decree stipulates that on that sacred day when the assembly meets, the magistrates were to present themselves clothed in conspicuous garments with crowns of laurel.¹⁴² The space is formed outside of the traditional venue of a sanctuary. A procession strengthened the city's authority over religious matters and affirm Xenophon's famous claim that to please the gods, one must live in accordance with the city's laws.¹⁴³ Establishing the important bond between divine sanction and civic authority required both active participation for some groups and attendance for others.

The Magnesians had detailed instructions for conducting their procession and making sacrifices at the Eisiteria. In addition to the central role of women in the ritual celebration, children and slaves are given the day off: "let the children be released from their lessons and slaves from their work on the day when these rites are to be performed".¹⁴⁴ These rules remind us of those in the Athenian decree.¹⁴⁵ In both instances, we see an emphasis on the importance of participation or attendance in renewed or innovative festivals. What form did this procession take?

The procession at Magnesia began in the agora where the magistrates and others assembled in the morning.¹⁴⁶ As mentioned, the procession culminated in the sanctuary of Artemis where the women were to assemble in front of the newly installed statue. The

¹⁴² I. Magn. 100A.38-39: πληθυσούσης ἀγορᾶς συνπαρόντων ἐν ἐσθῆσι[ν] / ἐπισήμοις καὶ δάφνης στεφάνοις πολεμάρχων. The civic focus of the procession is explained by Dunand, 1978, 203: "Ce caractère officiel se révèle également à travers le rôle que jouent les magistrats pendant la fête. La prêtresse d'Artémis conduit la cérémonie, mais elle est assistée du stéphanéphore, qui est le plus haut magistrat de la cité, l'éponyme (1.1) (1.3, 1-34); d'autre part, un des épisodes de la fête consiste en une proclamation suivie d'une prière, faite parle héraut sacré en présence des magistrats, fonctionnaires civils et autorités militaires, revêtus d'un costume distinctif et couronnés de laurier (1.3642) ... Les habits distinctifs et les couronnes que portent les magistrats de Magnésie sont le symbole du caractère à la fois civique et religieux de la cérémonie sacrificielle."

¹⁴³ Xen. *Mem.* IV 3.16: ὁρᾶς γὰρ ὅτι ὁ ἐν Δελφοῖς θεός, ὅταν τις αὐτὸν ἐπερωτᾷ πῶς ἂν τοῖς θεοῖς χαρίζοιτο, ἀποκρίνεται: νόμος πόλεως: νόμος δὲ δήπου πανταχοῦ ἐστὶ κατὰ δύναμιν ἱεροῖς θεοῦ ἀρέσκεσθαι. πῶς οὖν ἂν τις κάλλιον καὶ εὐσεβέστερον τιμῶν θεοῦ ἢ, ὡς αὐτοὶ κελεύουσιν, οὕτω ποιῶν;

¹⁴⁴ I. Magn. 100A.29-31: ἀνιέ[σ]/θωσαν δὲ οἱ παῖδες ἐκ τῶν μαθημάτων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων δοῦλοι τε / καὶ δοῦλαι, ἐν ἧ ταῦτα ἡμέραι συντελεσθήσεται. Repeated in B.11-13.

¹⁴⁵ SEG 21.469c.50-51.

¹⁴⁶ I. Magn. 100A.38: πληθυσούσης ἀγορᾶς.

procession (*exodos*) and gathering of the women is prescribed: “there shall be procession of women into the sanctuary and they shall stand in attendance in the sanctuary performing the due honor and attendance on the goddess.”¹⁴⁷ By this time, however, the *neokoros* was to have reinstalled the cult statue of Artemis and made a “most conspicuous sacrifice” so that the women assembled could pray before her image.¹⁴⁸ Meanwhile, the *stephanephoros*, the priestesses, and the magistrates led worshippers who were assembled on their procession to the sanctuary, which parallels the Athenian civic and religious officials leading the procession at the Athenian Thargelia. The focus on obligations and honors in processions demonstrates a strategy for establishing wide acceptance for the reinvented festivals.

Processions exceed the bounds of identifiable sacred space, i.e. the *temenos*. As Fritz Graf has noted, processions are distinctly accompaniments. Processioners guide the animal to the altar for sacrifice, the statue of a god to the temple, or the deceased to a place of rest.¹⁴⁹ At the Eisiteria, the cult statue and attending women were already in place when the main procession began. Therefore, the officials and people may have been leading animals to be slaughtered for the goddess. The *neokoros*’ sacrifice commenced the festival. When the presence of the goddess was reestablished, she could receive further sacrifices and prayers from the processioners. As the renewal of the presence of the goddess herself was manifested in the reinstallation of the cult statue, the first sacrifice performed by the *neokoros* signaled the return of the goddess and reinvigoration of her cult. The decree does

¹⁴⁷ *I.Magn.* 100A.26-28. The *exodos* and *paredreia* are common features of processions in Asia Minor (see Dunand 1978, 204).

¹⁴⁸ *I.Magn.* 100A.21-24.

¹⁴⁹ See Graf 1996, 56-57.

not tell us the starting point of this procession, although it may have been at the *bouleterion* where prayer was held and *euphemia* was announced.¹⁵⁰

Similar procedures governed the festival for Zeus Sosipolis. According to the second-century regulation: the *stephanephoros* with the priest and priestess of Artemis Leukophryene are to lead out the procession on the twelfth of Artemision and sacrifice a bull; the *gerousia*, priests, archons (elected and allotted), ephebes, and victors in various contests are to make procession together.¹⁵¹ The *stephanephoros* leading the procession carried the *xoana* of all the Twelve Gods, which were to be dressed in their finest garments. Thereupon, processioners were to pitch a *tholos* in the agora in front of the altar of the Twelve Gods.¹⁵² That the agora is the site for this ritual is not insignificant.¹⁵³ The agora was spacious enough to accommodate large crowds; its proximity to the temple of Zeus at Magnesia made it an important nexus between the god and the city. A procession of so many important officials indicates the solemn function of the performance. Also, conveying the figures of the gods (*xoana*), dressed in their finest attire, to the place of sacrifice demonstrates an annual renewal of the relationship between the community and its gods. This served as a re-sacralization of the sanctuary, the marketplace, and marked the reconnection between the people and their gods. Conveying the statues of the gods and erecting a *thólos* (tent) before the temple of Zeus anticipates the rule directing the women

¹⁵⁰ *I.Magn.* 100A.40-43.

¹⁵¹ *I.Magn.* 98.31-40 (*Syll³* 589; *LSAM* 32): δεδόχθαι τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι / δήμωι· τὸν στεφανηφόρον τὸν ἀεὶ γινόμενον μετὰ τοῦ ἱέ/ρεω καὶ τῆς ἱερείας τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Λευκοφρυηνῆς ἐξά/[γ]ειν τῆμ πομπὴν τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ Ἀρτεμισιῶνος τῆι δω/δεκάτῃ καὶ θύειν τὸν ταῦρον τὸν ἀναδεικνύμενον, / συμπομπεύειν δὲ τὴν τε γερουσίαν καὶ τοὺς / ἱερεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας τοὺς τε χειροτονητοὺς καὶ / [τ]οὺς κληρωτοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἐφήβους καὶ τοὺς νέους καὶ / τοὺς παῖδας καὶ τοὺς τὰ Λευκοφρυηνὰ νικῶντας καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς νικῶντας τοὺς στεφανίτας ἄγῶνας.

¹⁵² *I. Magn.* 98.41-44: ὁ δὲ στεφανηφόρος ἄγων τὴν πομπὴν φερέτω ξόα/να πάντων τῶν δώδεκα θεῶν ἐν ἐσθῆσιν ὡς καλλίσ/ταις καὶ πηγνύτω θόλον ἐν τῆι ἀγορᾷ πρὸς τῶι βωμῶι / τῶν δώδεκα θεῶν.

The tholos is a temporary, circular, structure erected for chthonic rites. See Scullion 1994, 86-87 and 113 for the mixture of chthonic and Olympian aspects in this unique cult.

¹⁵³ The Twelve Gods are also at home in the Agora at Athens.

of the city to assemble before the goddess at the Eisiteria. The Magnesians were establishing new performances rooted in tradition.¹⁵⁴

4.4.3. The Challenge of Maintaining Interest

The Magnesian decree states that there was to be libations, perhaps indicating a cessation of hostilities, on the sixth of Artemision. A procession of women was to make its way into the sanctuary where they were to stand in attendance in the sanctuary and honor the goddess.¹⁵⁵ If *spondai* means truce, then between what groups is a cessation of hostilities to take place? Here, it seems that the Eisiteria was separate from the Leukophryeneia. There is no indication that the Eisiteria had an international/panhellenic audience like the Leukophryeneia. Therefore, the decree does not direct this truce at foreign participants. Although this was not a sacred truce like the ones during the Olympic games and Eleusinian Mysteries,¹⁵⁶ other cities and entities would (in theory) respect this truce couched in familiar terms of religious and political diplomacy. The intra-polis focus of this new festival, however, suggests that the aim was suppression of internal discord during the Eisiteria, but also the promotion of commerce. Inscription B makes this point clear: “permitting a market for sellers on that day for the sake of having the zeal of the people evident to all.”¹⁵⁷ It appears to be a provision designed to expand participation in the festival. Contrasting with rules in the Athenian Thargelia, in which the city seemed to limit attention to business and personal matters, at Magnesia the city tried to rekindle interest in the festival by offering economic incentives. Inscription A calls for children to be released

¹⁵⁴ *I.Magn.* 98 is from 197/6 BC.

¹⁵⁵ *I.Magn.* 100A.25-28.

¹⁵⁶ Thuc. 3.56.2 and Ar. *Lys.* 1131. See Dillon 1997b, 2-5 and Golden 2011, 1-13.

¹⁵⁷ *I.Magn.* 100B.13-15: συνεχωρήκοτος δὲ [οἰκονομί]/αν τῶν διαπωλουμένων ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρῃ χάριν τοῦ [τοῖς πολλοῖς μάλλ]/ον ἔκδηλον ὑπάρχειν τὴν τοῦ δήμου σπουδῆν.

from school and slaves from their duties as well as a favorable policy on sales;¹⁵⁸ inscription B restates that children shall be released from school and slaves from their duties,¹⁵⁹ and reinforces economic incentives for festival participation so that the zeal of the people may be apparent, *χάριν τοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ μᾶλλον ἔκδηλον ὑπάρχειν τὴν τοῦ δήμου σπουδὴν*.¹⁶⁰

The importance of “appearances” is clearly articulated in the Magnesian decree with references to the goddess’ manifestation and the community’s steadfast attendance on the goddess. But did the Magnesians celebrate this new festival as it was intended? The wording and tone of the second inscription (B) suggests that the *Eisiteria* was not practiced as expected. Why? Two possibilities suggest themselves. Perhaps this appendage festival failed to catch on with the populace. The threatening language and tone of the decree suggests as much: “It is befitting for the people to pay greater and more assiduous attention to matters regarding what has been written...”¹⁶¹ Furthermore, the clause “so that all may recognize that it is befitting to increase honors (*συνεπαύξειν τιμὰς*) to Artemis during the *Eisiteria*...”¹⁶² suggests that people were *not* recognizing these increased rites, at least not altogether (*συν-*). Second, officials were perhaps shirking their responsibilities: If the secretaries do not act in the prescribed manner, each of them shall pay a fine of 900 drachmas; any citizen who wishes shall receive half of this fine should they indict that official before the *euthynoi*.¹⁶³ The threatening language in this decree, which closes with “if

¹⁵⁸ *I.Magn.* 100A.29-31.

¹⁵⁹ *I.Magn.* 100B.10-11. The terms for slave, however, are different: *δοῦλος* and *δοῦλη* in inscription A, *οἰκετεία* in inscription B.

¹⁶⁰ *I.Magn.* 100B.12-13.

¹⁶¹ *I.Magn.* 100B.18-19: *καθηκον ἐστι τῶι δήμωι [πλεῖον καὶ ἐκτε]/νέστερον περὶ τῶν προγγεγραμμένων φροντίσαι*.

¹⁶² *I.Magn.* 100B: 26-28: *ἵνα δὲ πάντες γινώσκωσιν ὡ[ς] καθηκον ἐστι ἐν τοῖς Εἰσιτηρίοις τὰς τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος συνεπαύξει[ιν] τιμὰς...*

¹⁶³ *I.Magn.* 100B.31-36: *ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ποιήσωσιν τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν [αὐ]τοῦ καθότι προστέτακται, ὀφείλειν αὐτῶν ἑκάτερον ἱερὰς δραχ(μὰς) ἧ΄ καὶ εἶναι φάσιν τῶι βου[λ]ομένωι τῶν πολιτῶν, οἷς [ἔ]ξεστιν, ἐπὶ τῶ ἡμίσει πρὸς τοὺς εὐθύνοους.*

anyone does not comply, it is not to be good for him”,¹⁶⁴ may also denote failure of the officials to understand their obligations or comply. If the latter is the case, then inscription B aimed to reinforce inscription A with sanctions for noncompliance that the old inscription lacked.

In the end, it appears most likely that the Magnesians issued this follow-up decree because the people were not performing the Eisiteria with the expected zeal and that administrative officials were not holding them to task. Whatever the details, the language of the decree suggests that the first inscription (A) did not achieve the desired result of fostering enhanced honors for the goddess. Whether the failure was due to lack of interest, lack of specificity in its rules, lack of funding, or any other factor, we are left with the impression of a frustrated governing authority whose strategy for reinventing a traditional cult had at some point and for some reason failed.

4.5. Conclusion

The notion that “there is nothing new under the sun” persisted in Greek thought, particularly in regard to cult practices. As much as the rites of a civic cult may change, in the eyes of Greeks they always remained traditional. Disdain for the “new” is evident as early as Homer. The expression μέμνημαι τόδε ἔργον ἐγὼ πάλαι οὐ τι νέον γε ὡς ἦν emphasizes “not new at all”.¹⁶⁵ Greeks were notoriously suspicious of new ideas, which were often perceived to be indications of cleverness, even sophistry.¹⁶⁶ When circumstances required new rites, these new rites had to be packaged in a language of tradition.

¹⁶⁴ *I.Magn.* 100B.41-42: ἐὰν δέ τις μὴ ἐπι[τε]λέσῃ, μὴ ἄμεινον αὐτῶι εἶναι.

¹⁶⁵ *Il.* 9.527.

¹⁶⁶ See D’Angour 2011, 93-98.

Cult renewal, as seen through the lens of the Athenian decree, was bound within the seemingly binary opposition of old and new. The Greek syntactical construction of μέν ... δέ was of course a major factor in how Greeks made sense of their world.¹⁶⁷ Nevertheless, this mode of thinking does not fully explain the ideological contradictions seen in the Athenian and Magnesian decrees. Through the case studies analyzed in this chapter we can see that communities constructed strategies around a rhetoric of renewal and piety. To the Athenians and Magnesians, the difference between old and new/tradition and innovation was not as binary as μέν and δέ. Overall, the sometimes-strained relationship between a community and its gods required carefully crafted rhetoric of renewal and enhancement that in turn resulted in a strategy for coping with a shifting political landscape, competing interests, and changing ideologies.

Moreover, these decrees express prominently the competing interests and ideological changes pictured in the ritual performances they govern. In the words of Aristotle: he who is excluded from the honors of the state is no better than an alien.¹⁶⁸ The procession of honored officials who escorted the god's image was the centerpiece of the religious and ideological program, but everyone had to be on board for this to have worked: passive spectators (including women, slaves, and children), active participants (magistrates, honored guests, and sacred officials), and divine presence (the goddess' arrival each year). Pomp and imagery legitimized a new festival at Magnesia that took its place within the justified program established in 208/7 BC. A similar strategy was later employed across the Aegean in Athens for the reinvention of the Thargelia. There too the community was

¹⁶⁷ See Cartledge 2002, 2, 14, and 126.

¹⁶⁸ Aristot. *Pol.* 1278a.38: ὥσπερ μέτοικος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ τῶν τιμῶν μὴ μετέχων.

striving to legitimate religious innovations through a combination of civic and oracular authority. As Demosthenes reminds the jury during his prosecution of Meidias:

Surely, you know this: that you made all the choruses and hymns to the gods not only according to the laws about the Dionysia, but also according to the oracles among all of which, from both Delphi and Dodona, you find it ordained to set up the choruses according to custom, to fill the streets with the smell of sacrifice, and to wear crowns.¹⁶⁹

Having written ordinances sanctioning the establishment of rites and their particulars is necessary, but what gives these rites true legitimacy is approval from the gods.

In all, symbolic display was entwined with the appearance and/or steadfastness of the god's presence in the community. The Athenians were "renewing" and "enhancing" longstanding honors for the god. The preambles to these decrees cite the benefits that accrued from good relationships with the gods. The Athenians owe their victorious past to their cultivation of this relationship, particularly with Zeus Soter and Apollo Pythios (whom the Athenians call Patöos).¹⁷⁰ Conversely, the Athenians found it difficult to revere some of their other "traditional" gods to the same degree. Zeus and Athena Polias lost popularity during the Hellenistic period because these protecting gods failed to ward off disaster in war and humiliation.¹⁷¹ Along these same lines, the epiphany of Artemis Leukophryene at Magnesia-on-the-Maeander attested to the goddess' steadfastness on behalf of the community. Scholars have recently noted that the strategic use of religious phenomena such as epiphany by Hellenistic states evokes strong similarities to mythical genealogies in inter-

¹⁶⁹ Dem. 21.51: ἴστε γὰρ δὴπου τοῦθ' ὅτι τοὺς χοροὺς ὑμεῖς ἅπαντας τούτους καὶ τοὺς ὕμνους τῶ θεῷ ποιεῖτε, οὐ μόνον κατὰ τοὺς νόμους τοὺς περὶ τῶν Διονυσίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ τὰς μαντείας, ἐν αἷς ἀπάσαις ἀνηρημένον εὐρήσετε τῇ πόλει, ὁμοίως ἐκ Δελφῶν καὶ ἐκ Δωδώνης, χοροὺς ἰστάναι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ κνισᾶν ἀγνιᾶς καὶ στεφανηφορεῖν.

¹⁷⁰ Dem. 18.141: καλῶ ... καὶ τὸν Απόλλω τὸν Πύθειον, ὃς πατρῷός ἐστι τῇ πόλει See Meritt 1963, 420.

¹⁷¹ Mikalson 1998, 105-136. The years following Demetrius Poliorcetes' dominance over Athens (and her cults) and the military defeat in the Chremonidean War (260s BC) took its toll on Athenians' faith in these cults, but not in civic cults in general.

polis kinship diplomacy.¹⁷² Although this is sometimes referred to as “intentional” or “constructed” history that had political objectives,¹⁷³ it nonetheless shows that communities were reimagining, even reinventing, their local histories in order to reconnect their present to their past. As fictive as these constructs may have been, careful analysis of these decrees permits us to interpret them for what they were: attempts by communities to devise rational strategies to maintain their respective identities while coping with a changing social, political, and religious world.

¹⁷² Platt 2011, 153 and Jones 1999, 6-16 and 50-65.

¹⁷³ Gehrke 2001, 286-313 and Platt 2011, 153.

5. Cult Demise and the Failure to Adapt

Thucydides' vivid account of the plague that struck Athens in 430BC describes the conditions that led to the neglect or rites and defilement of temples:

In addition to the existing distress, the influx from the countryside into the city also bore down on them, and not least upon those who were just arriving. Because there were no houses for them as they spent the year in stifling quarters, death came upon them in no order, and the corpses of the dead lay upon one another, and in the streets the half-dead roamed around fountains in their desire for water. The sanctuaries in which they had made camp were full of corpses because people had died there; for since the evil was so violently compelling, the people, having no idea what was to become of them, turned to neglect of sacred and profane matters alike.¹

The exigencies of war and plague led to the lapse of all propriety of custom and attention to the gods. This was a swift and perfect storm for neglect of sacred *nomoi*. The Athenians could not ensure that people who entered their sanctuaries were purified, could no longer protect the physical integrity of their shrines, and could no longer pay for religious rites. They also, at the time, did not care. The city was in tatters and the cults with it.

We have seen an array of adaptive strategies, from topographical reconfiguration to revival. But sometimes cults could not or did not adapt. We have seen communities refactor sacred space; but what is the story of decommissioning? How did Greeks, living amidst dilapidated temples, re-envision the defunct cults that had been so important to their ancestors? While some recovered, other cults remained defunct. We shall see that among the reasons for failure, two reasons loom large: communities did not keep pace with with socioeconomic change or they experienced catastrophes against which no regulatory

¹ Thuc. 2.52.1-3: ἐπίεσε δ' αὐτοὺς μᾶλλον πρὸς τῷ ὑπάρχοντι πόνῳ καὶ ἡ ξυγκομιδὴ ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν ἐς τὸ ἄστυ, καὶ οὐχ ἦσσαν τοὺς ἐπελθόντας, οἰκιῶν γὰρ οὐχ ὑπαρχουσῶν, ἀλλ' ἐν καλύβαις πνιγηραῖς ὥρα ἔτους διαιωμένων ὁ φθόρος ἐγίγνετο οὐδενὶ κόσμῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ νεκροὶ ἐπ' ἀλλήλοις ἀποθνήσκοντες ἔκειντο καὶ ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς ἐκαλινδοῦντο καὶ περὶ τὰς κρήνας ἀπάσας ἡμιθνήτες τοῦ ὕδατος ἐπιθυμία. τὰ τε ἱερά ἐν οἷς ἐσκήνητο νεκρῶν πλέα ἦν, αὐτοῦ ἐναποθνησκόντων: ὑπερβιαζομένου γὰρ τοῦ κακοῦ οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὐκ ἔχοντες ὅτι γένωνται, ἐς ὀλιγωρίαν ἐτρέποντο καὶ ἱερῶν καὶ ὁσίων ὁμοίως.

strategy would have worked. But even then some communities were determined to revive their ancestral cults; communities that experienced invasion, natural disasters, and destruction had incredible tenacity. Many of their cults survived or were re-founded.

Plutarch offers an explanation for the failure, or decline, of prophetic shrines. The process he envisages was slow and not attributable to any one catastrophe. Sanctuaries, according to Plutarch, go quiet when the gods (or *daimones*) no longer frequent their halls:

It must be said what many before us have said, that when the *daimones* that stationed at oracles and centers of prophesy depart, such things cease altogether, and they lose their power whenever the *daimones* flee or move elsewhere, but after they return for some time, they speak *like instruments when those who use them are in charge and present*.²

Plutarch's explanation is based on a theory that both gods and men neglected oracles like Delphi. What did failed cults look like beyond Plutarch's interpretation? The picture, as one might expect, is rather muddled. We have little epigraphic evidence for failed cults because Greeks did not issue inscriptions regarding neglected sanctuaries. As the second century Thargelian inscription has shown,³ Hellenistic Greeks did not discuss their cults in such terms. The Athenian Thargelia is a known example of cult neglect chiefly because there was a concerted attempt at renewal; likewise, the Eisiteria at Magnesia-on-the-Maeander is visible as a cult on the brink of failure. Archaeological evidence is crucial.⁴ Otherwise, any argument about why a cult perished or was neglected would be from silence.

It was not until much later, in Roman times, that Greek writers like Plutarch began to address the physical and cultural remains of past cults in a reflective way. Although writing later than the Hellenistic period, Pausanias and Strabo are our best literary sources

² Plut. *de defect.* 418d.1-5: καὶ τετολμήσθω μετὰ πολλοὺς εἰρήσθαι καὶ ἡμῖν, ὅτι τοῖς περὶ τὰ μαντεῖα καὶ χρηστήρια τεταγμένοις δαίμονις ἐκλείπουσι τε κομιδῇ συνεκλείπει τὰ τοιαῦτα, καὶ φυγόντων ἢ μεταστάντων ἀποβάλλει τὴν δύναμιν, εἴτα παρόντων αὐτῶν διὰ χρόνου πολλοῦ καθάπερ ὄργανα φθέγγεται τῶν χρωμένων ἐπιστάντων καὶ παρόντων.

³ SEG 21.469C.

⁴ Alcock 1994, 257-261.

for the sacred landscape of Greece. They provide the view of dilapidated temples and unidentified statues through the eyes of Greeks living under the Roman Empire. On the other hand, Plutarch's Delphic dialogues give us a philosophical perspective that argues for neglect rather than change. One predominant reason for this neglect, as Plutarch suggests above, is demographic change.

5.1. Demographic Changes: Depopulation and Disruption

According to Thucydides, a major factor contributing to the increased misery of 430 was the influx of outsiders into the city, a reminder, from an extreme situation, of what effects population shifts could have on Greek religion.⁵ Although we lack precise data on demographic change during the Hellenistic period, the evidence provides impressions of its profound impact on the religious landscape of the Greek world, especially the continuity of oracular and healing shrines.⁶ These shrines were often at the geographical margins of society, located in remote areas that visitors traveled miles to reach. As discussed in chapter one, the oracle of Apollo Coropaius was situated nearly thirty kilometers from the city of Demetrias,⁷ which meant travel to the shrine would have taken more than a day. It is no surprise then that remote sanctuaries feature most prominently in literary accounts of so-called oracular decline. This decline, which authors declared prematurely,⁸ had more to do with changes in oracular practices and popular perceptions. Nonetheless, these changes to individual oracular and healing cults were seen as symptomatic of a larger trend.

⁵ See Demand 1990, 33-44 and 165-176; Parker 2004b, 9-22; Malkin 2011, 78-79; Horden and Purcell 2000, 423.

⁶ Chaniotis 2011, 125. On surface survey, see Alcock 1994, 248-252. See also Oliver 2007, 76-100.

⁷ Robert 1948, 16-28.

⁸ Oracular shrines remained in use and experienced resurgence in popularity in the late Roman Empire. See Lane Fox 1986 200-241 (especially 200-201) and 679-681.

5.1.1. Cessation and Change

Plutarch opens his dialogue *De Defectu Oraculorum* with a tale of the oracle of Ammon. The old reputation of the oracle's power there was great, but it seemed to be suffering,⁹ a slow and withering demise (ὕπομαραίνεσθαι). Although gods had been making frequent appearances, i.e. manifestations, the popularity and prestige of oracles appeared to be fading. This prompted a philosophical discussion on why mortals and gods alike were neglecting their ancient oracles. According to Plutarch, there may have been a divine explanation: gods and *daimones* were abandoning the shrines.¹⁰ This theory led to a discussion on the nature of *daimones*, gods, and their roles in managing the oracles. Without deities and worshippers there is no cult, no oracle.

The crisis seemed to speak of an endemic lack of religious devotion. Plutarch relates a famous story about a renowned orator named Aemilianus.¹¹ Once on a voyage to Italy he embarked upon a ship laden with passengers and cargo. It was evening and the breeze had died down. The ship drifted until it approached Paxi. Most on board were still awake, enjoying their after-dinner wine. Suddenly, a voice was heard from Paxi. Thamus, the Egyptian pilot of the vessel, heard it. Twice it called out to Thamus: “when you reach the Palodes, tell them that Great Pan is dead.” Upon hearing this request everyone on board was unsure whether they should do what was asked or to let it be. They decided that if there is a breeze Thamus should sail by quickly without saying a word but if the weather remained calm they should report this news. When he found neither wind nor wave off the Palodes,

⁹ Plu. *de defect.* 411e: παυσασμένου δὲ τοῦ Ἀμμωνίου ‘μᾶλλον’ ἔφην ἐγὼ ‘περὶ τοῦ μαντείου δῖελθ’ ἡμῖν, ὃ Κλεόμβροτε: μεγάλη γὰρ ἡ παλαιὰ δόξα τῆς ἐπεὶ θεϊότητος, τὰ δὲ νῦν ἔουκεν ὑπομαραίνεσθαι.

¹⁰ For *daimones* in Plutarch, see Brenk 1973, 1-11. For *daimones* in Greek religion and philosophy, see Mikalson 2010, 22-32 and Johnston 2008, 10-12.

¹¹ On the relationship between this episode and Plato's *Phaedrus*, see Dusanic 1996, 276-294.

Thamus at the helm looked to land and repeated: “Great Pan is dead.”¹² That a god could die (τέθνηκεν) posed a very serious religious and philosophical challenge, but not one that was wholly uncommon.

In order to make sense of this tale, one of Plutarch’s interlocutors turns to philosophy: the Stoics have long held that of the multitudes of gods, some are immortal and eternal whereas others come into being and perish (φθαρήσεσθαι).¹³ Conversely, the Epicureans maintain that there is nothing to fear since the notion of infinity is merely a myth.¹⁴ Even gods perish. Immortality is impossible. Philosophy is unable to provide a suitable answer to the question. It gives us only theories, which are tried often, “like foreign coins”.¹⁵

In a short time, however, Plutarch and his companions appear to be driving toward an explanation. The world has unity and structure with many dissimilar elements and the different parts of the world have various movements toward other objects. Elements, it may be surmised, change their places.¹⁶ The world is constantly experiencing changes and fluctuations. This is not anathema to the gods:

Divinity does not refrain from change, but rather takes much joy in it; if we must take as proof the changes and periods of those the bodies that appear in the heavens ... the care and forethought for the defined and limited multitude appears to me to involve nothing more

¹² Plut. *de defect.* 419c.9-d.5: παραπλεῖν ἡσυχίαν ἔχοντα, νημερίας δὲ καὶ γαλήνης περὶ τὸν τόπον γενομένης, ἀνειπεῖν ὃ ἤκουσεν. ὡς οὖν ἐγένετο κατὰ τὸ Παλῶδες, οὔτε πνεύματος ὄντος οὔτε κλύδωνος, ἐκ πρύμνης βλέποντα τὸν Θαμοῦν πρὸς τὴν γῆν εἰπεῖν, ὥσπερ ἤκουσεν, ὅτι “Πᾶν ὁ μέγας τέθνηκεν.” For the entirety of the tale, see 419a-e.

¹³ Plut. *de defect.* 420a.9-b.2: “καίτοι τοὺς Στωικούς” ἔφη “γινώσκωμεν οὐ μόνον κατὰ δαιμόνων ἦν λέγω δόξαν ἔχοντα, ἀλλὰ καὶ θεῶν ὄντων τοσοῦτων τὸ πλῆθος ἐνὶ χρωμένους αἰδίῳ καὶ ἀφθάρτῳ: τοὺς δ’ ἄλλους καὶ γεγόναι καὶ φθαρῆσεσθαι νομίζοντας.” On Plutarch’s Stoic identification of gods and nature, see Tarrant 2010, 82-83. See also Barut 1969, 460-461.

¹⁴ See Boulogne 2003, 113-116.

¹⁵ Plut. *de defect.* 421a.1-4: ἐπεὶ δὲ μύθων καὶ λόγων ἀναμεμιγμένων κρατῆρ ἐν μέσῳ πρόκειται καὶ ποῦ τις ἂν εὐμενεστέροις ἀκροαταῖς ἐπιτυχῶν ὥσπερ νομίσματα ξενικὰ τούτους δοκιμάσειε τοὺς λόγους;

¹⁶ Plut. *de defect.* 424e.9-10: δῆλον δὲ τῷ μετακοσμούμενα ταῖς οὐσίαις ἕκαστα καὶ τὰς χώρας ἅμα συμμεταβάλλειν.

undignified or toilsome than that which has entered into a single body, and attaching itself to this, refashions or reshapes it infinitely.¹⁷

That the gods accept changes of all kinds helps explain how oracles could fall into disuse. It perhaps explains how the god would accept changes to oracular procedures, as attested at Corope. Oracles, like everything else, undergo an organic process of birth and death, neglect and renewal: “For the sun kindles, advances, and encourages the mind just as the God (kindles) prophesy in the soul.”¹⁸ Nevertheless, the power of oracles and their prophetic currents are neither perennial nor ageless; such power is liable to constant change.¹⁹ Receiving currents from the gods can be exhausted but renewed.

The changes to oracles were not just philosophical. At times people were cut off from consulting oracles or preferred one oracle to another. Plutarch’s argument is that people stopped going to certain shrines and therefore the gods abandoned them as well. The gods of myth were ever on the move. But though Apollo may visit the Hyperboreans and Poseidon feast among the Ethiopians, gods were also fixed and localized and as eternal watchers and protectors over the community.²⁰ Oracular gods are typically the ones who are either home (*epidemia*) or away (*apodemia*).

Therefore, decline meant fewer worshippers, and therefore gods, were frequenting oracular shrines. For this, there may be geopolitical explanations. Oracles and cults that were less frequented by the end of the Hellenistic age were typically ones located on the

¹⁷ Plut. *de defect.* 426d.7-10: οὐ γὰρ ἀπεχθάνεται μεταβολαῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ πάνυ χαίρει τὸ θεῖον, εἰ δεῖ τῶν φαινομένων τεκμαίρεσθαι ταῖς κατ’ οὐρανὸν ἐξαμείψεσι καὶ περιόδοις. ... (426e.1-6): ἡ δ’ ἐν ὀρισμένῳ πλήθει καὶ ἀριθμῷ κόσμων ἐπιμέλεια καὶ πρόνοια τῆς εἰς ἐν δεδουκυίας σῶμα καὶ προσηρητημένης ἐνὶ καὶ τοῦτο μετασηματιζούσης καὶ ἀναπλαττούσης ἀπειράκις ἐμοιγε δοκεῖ μηδὲν ἔχειν ἀσεμνότερον μηδ’ ἐπιπονώτερον.

¹⁸ Plut. *de defect.* 433e.4-6: ἐξάπτει γὰρ καὶ προάγει καὶ συνεξορμᾷ τῆς αἰσθήσεως, τὴν ὀρατικὴν δύναμιν οὕτως ὡς τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν μαντικὴν ἐκεῖνος.

¹⁹ Plut. *de defect.* 434b.10-12: ταῦτά δὴ περὶ μαντικῶν πνευμάτων διανοητέον, ὡς οὐκ ἐχόντων αἴδιον οὐδ’ ἀγήρων τὴν δύναμιν ἀλλ’ ὑποκειμένην μεταβολαῖς.

²⁰ For a discussion of this contradiction, see Versnel 2011, 88-102, especially 90-91.

Greek mainland. Alexander's conquests certainly contributed to the refocusing of the Greek world, its *omphalos*, eastward.²¹ This trend accelerated in the Imperial period. Trading routes, cosmopolitan centers, and new opportunities were to be found in Asia Minor and Egypt, not Delphi and Dodona.

5.1.2. The Decline of Zeus's Oracle at Dodona

Clement of Alexandria was certainly no friend of Greek oracles. He begins his second book of the *Protrepticus* with a warning:

Do not inquire about godless sanctuaries, mouths of caverns full of marvels, the Thesprotian cauldron, the Cirrhaean tripod, and the Dodonian bronze. Both the tree stump honored in the desert sands, and the oracle there has withered along with the oak itself, leave them both for legends of old.²²

Standing among Greece's most ancient oracles, Dodona underwent periods of prosperity and decline that often coincided with political vicissitudes.²³ A dearth of dedications indicates that the shrine was neglected for long periods of the fifth century, probably due to the Peloponnesian War.²⁴ When Philip II of Macedon captured the oracle at Delphi in 346 BC, the Athenians began establishing relations with Dodona instead.²⁵ The cutting off of the Athenians from Delphi, a rival sanctuary, marked a peak in Dodona's popularity and

²¹ Colonization was a major factor. See Davies 1984, 264-270 and Billows 1995, 56-106.

²² Clem. Alex. *Protr.* 2.1: ἄδυστα τοίνυν ἄθεα μὴ πολυπραγμονεῖτε μηδὲ βαράθρων στόματα τερατείας ἔμπλεα ἢ λέβητα θεσπρώτιον ἢ τρίποδα Κιρραῖον ἢ Δωδωναῖον χαλκεῖον ἢ γεράνδρουν δὲ ψάμμοις ἐρήμιας τετιμημένον καὶ τὸ αὐτόθι μαντεῖον αὐτῇ δρυὶ μεμαρασμένον μύθοις γεγηρακῶσι καταλείψατε.

²³ See Eidinow 2007, 56-63; Stoneman 2011, 56, 63-65.

²⁴ Hammond 1967, 488.

²⁵ In his speech *In Defense of Euxenippus*, Hyperides cites unjust charges by Philip's wife, Olympias (Hyp. 4.24): ὑμῖν Ὀλυμπιάς ἐγκλήματα πεποίηται περὶ τὰ ἐν Δωδώνῃ οὐ δίκαια, ὡς ἐγὼ δις ἤδη ἐν τῷ δήμῳ ἐναντίον ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἀθηναίων πρὸς τοὺς ἡκοντας παρ' αὐτῆς ἐξήλεγξα οὐ προσήκοντα αὐτὴν ἐγκλήματα τῇ πόλει ἐγκαλοῦσαν. And the oracle's command to Athenians to embellish the statue of Dione: ὑμῖν γὰρ ὁ Ζεὺς ὁ Δωδωναῖος προσέταξεν ἐν τῇ μαντείᾳ τὸ ἄγαλμα τῆς Διώνης.

influence.²⁶ In fact, the oracle had accumulated so many dedications that they were likened to great walls.²⁷ However, when the Athenians were about to adorn the oracle in fulfillment of Zeus's instructions, Philip's wife Olympias, a Molossian princess, warned them not to meddle in her sphere of influence. Dodona lost a generous client.

After moving from its original home in Thessaly,²⁸ the oracle at Dodona suffered a number of catastrophic attacks, but always managed to recover. It was rebuilt in splendor after the Aetolians sacked it in 219 BC. This splendor, however, was short-lived. Roman forces sacked the sanctuary again in retribution for the Epirotes' alliance with Macedonia in 167 BC.²⁹ According to Strabo, desolation overtook most parts and the oracle itself became essentially extinct.³⁰ This was a cult and oracle that undeniably underwent a long period of decline. Repeated incursions diminished the oracle's health; but unlike the cults of Athens that Thucydides describes, Dodona's remote location prevented any hope of long-term recovery. Unlike the Amphiareion at Oropus, it did not have populated surroundings and was not part of a strong network of interconnected *poleis*. The oracle of Apollo at Corope, far as it was from Demetrias, was still close enough for that city to administer effectively.

Aristotle writes that it was at Dodona where the Selloi (priests) and those who were then called *Graikoi* and now *Hellenes* used to live.³¹ Although he called it *δυσχεῖμερος* (stormy), Aristotle claimed that the region was the cradle of Greek identity.³² Herodotus tells us that Dodona was the oldest Greek sanctuary; there, he claims, he learned the origins

²⁶ See Stoneman 2011, 64.

²⁷ Eidinow 2007, 56.

²⁸ Strab. 7 fr. 1a.

²⁹ Polyb. 30.16; Strabo 7.7.3 (citing Polybius); Livy 45.34. Mithridates VI sacked it yet again in 88 BC (Cass. Dio 30-35, fr. 101.2). See Eidinow 2007, 62.

³⁰ Strab. 7.7.9-10: νῦν δὲ τὰ πολλὰ μὲν ἔρημία κατέχει, τὰ δ' οἰκούμενα κωμηδὸν καὶ ἐν ἐρειπίοις λείπεται. ἐκλέλοιπε δὲ πῶς καὶ τὸ μαντεῖον τὸ ἐν Δωδώνῃ, καθάπερ τᾶλλα.

³¹ Arist. *Mete.* 352a.33-34.

³² Hammond 1967, 39; Malkin 2011, 61. See Livy 43.21.

of the gods' epithets.³³ Set in a narrow valley below the Tomarus (Olytsika) Mountain, Dodona was much less accessible than other Greek oracles.³⁴ No continuous political authority ruled over the sanctuary,³⁵ and the local population is often characterized as nomadic and decentralized. In light of these factors, the shrine ultimately suffered because of a lack of planning and sufficient accommodations for visitors.

Among the numerous inscribed tablets the largest category of questions found at Dodona concern travel,³⁶ which was one of the more stressful activities in the ancient world. For instance, a fourth-century question by a certain Hexakon asks Zeus and Dione “whether it would be better (for him) to move to Pharos”.³⁷ As Eidinow notes, the abundance of extant questions pertaining to travel supports an emerging historical picture of the peoples of the Mediterranean always on the move.³⁸ Safe travel was not always easy, especially in Epirus. One could become lost, robbed, or even enslaved. After all, “There is nothing worse for mortals than wandering.”³⁹ For wandering equals suffering.⁴⁰ When a fragmentary tablet asks a question about traveling safely perhaps to Heraclea,⁴¹ the possible mention of “guards” is intriguing. As we shall see, even authorities were sources of concern. Threats, real or perceived, had a profound impact on the traffic to and from sanctuaries. This is perhaps why, in a changing urban and rural landscape, cities like Tanagra and Peparethus deemed it necessary to move their sanctuaries. Security may have also played a role in the

³³ Hdt. 2.52.

³⁴ For the location of Dodona and the topography of its town and sanctuary, see Hammond 1967, 168-173.

³⁵ The alliance of Epirotes and Molossoi, respectively, controlled the sanctuary at various times. But local control was lacking.

³⁶ Eidinow 2007, 72.

³⁷ *BE* 1969, 348.6: Ἐξακῶν ἐρωτᾷ τὸν Δία καὶ Διώναν εἰ λώιον αὐτῶι οἰκῶντι ἐμ Φάρωι. See Eidinow 2007, 78 no. 14.

³⁸ Eidinow 2007, 72.

³⁹ Hom. *Od.* 15.343: πλαγκτοσύνης δ' οὐκ ἔστι κακώτερον ἄλλο βροτοῖσιν.

⁴⁰ Montiglio 2005, 24.

⁴¹ *BE* 1996, 226.11; *SEG* 43.328 (330-320 BC): [--πε]ρι Ἡρακλέας [--]σα κομίζοντι [--ᾶ]σφαλέως καὶ οἱ φυ[-λακες--] Ἡρακλεωτᾶν. See Eidinow 2007, 77 no. 12.

Colophonians' decision to extend their city walls to incorporate their ancient sanctuaries. Security was in short supply and communities had to adapt to dangerous surroundings. Kings could, and often did, provide protection for sanctuaries that fell outside the purview of a major civic center. This was the protection afforded to the cult of Soteira at Icarus and that of Zeus Baetocaece in Syria. In the case of the latter, a king granted the god's sanctuary to the village of Baetocaece "from where the power of the god issues", which had previously been given to a certain Demetrius.⁴² The aim appears to have been to secure revenues for the sanctuary, seeing that it was handed over with all properties and possessions "so that the revenue from this may be spent for celebrating the monthly sacrifices and the other things that provide for the enhancement (αὔξησις) of the sanctuary by the priest chosen by the god as is customary".⁴³ Markets were to be held on the fifteenth and thirtieth days of each month, the sanctuary was to be inviolable, and the village free from billeting.⁴⁴ Here, the king worked with the local community to ensure the continuation of traditional religious practices and protect the sanctuary and community from the unpopular, often destructive, practice of billeting. Dodona, however, did not have such steady protection.

5.1.3. Disruptions

The remoteness of Dodona and the volatility of its environs may have added mystique to its reputation, but it also had a devastating long-term impact on its ability to attract visitors. When places become depopulated or whenever an area like Epirus becomes

⁴² Welles 1934, no. 70.5-6 (Baetocaece, perhaps late second century BC); *IGLS* VII 4028B and C: ὅθεν καὶ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ κατάρχεται.

⁴³ Welles 1934, no. 70.9-12: ὅπως ἢ ἀπὸ ταύτης πρόσοδος / ἀναλίσκηται εἰς τὰς κατὰ μῆνα(ς) συντελουμένας θυσίας καὶ τᾶλλα τὰ πρὸς αὔξη/σιν τοῦ ἱεροῦ συντείνοντα ὑπὸ τοῦ καθεσταμένου ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἱερέως ὡς εἴθισται.

⁴⁴ Welles 1934, no. 70.12-13: κατὰ μῆνα πανηγύρεις ἀτελεῖς τῇ πεντεκαιδεκάτῃ καὶ / τριακάδι, καὶ εἶναι τὸ μὲν ἱερὸν ἄσυλον τὴν δὲ κώμην ἀνεπίσταθμον.

too insecure for travel, then the finances of a cult are jeopardized. Accessible locations, however, also experienced disruptions. An early Hellenistic inscription from Sardis offers an intriguing glimpse into the dangers of travel even for sacred ambassadors:

The *proegoroi* on behalf of the goddess have condemned to death according to this proclamation of the verdict: that when *theoroi* had been sent by the city together with the garments for Artemis according to ancestral custom, and that when the sacred objects and the *theoroi* arrived at Sardis and the sanctuary of Artemis founded by the Ephesians, they (the condemned) committed sacrilege against the sacred objects and assaulted the *theoroi*. The penalty for the suit is death.⁴⁵

Crimes such as these posed a danger for travelers, especially ones on religious missions since they often carried money and valuable objects. One can imagine that priestesses carrying sacks of collection money would be easy targets for theft and abuse, especially in the bustling streets of the Hellenistic cities and villages of Asia Minor.⁴⁶ It is no wonder, then, why some would want to curb the practice of ritual begging, even if it meant altering or ending a traditional religious rite.

An attack against sacred personnel was especially heinous since the perpetrators even defiled the sacred objects (τὰ ἱερὰ ἡσέβησαν) they were carrying. This incident demonstrates that after making a long journey from Sardis to Ephesus even sacred ambassadors were not safe from assault. But the road itself could be treacherous. Greeks were anxious about highway crimes and banditry, as reflected in popular literary tropes.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ SEG 36.1011.1-11; *I. Eph.* 2: οἱ προήγοροι ὑπὲρ τῆς θεοῦ κατε[δι]/κάσαντο θάνατον κατὰ τὴν προγορ[α]/φήν τῆς δίκης ταύτην· ὅτι θεωρῶν / ἀποσταλέντων ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐπ[ι] / Χιτῶνας τῆι Ἀρτέμιδι κατὰ τὸν νό[μ]ον τὸμ πάτριον, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν κα[ι] / τῶν θεωρῶν παραγενομένων εἰς Σ[άρ]/δεις καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος / τὸ ἰδρυμένον ὑπὸ Ἐφεσίων τὰ τε ἱ[ερὰ] / ἡσέβησαν καὶ τοὺς θεωροὺς ὕβρι[σαν·] / τίμημα τῆς δίκης θάνατος. For background of the culprits, see Hanfmann, 1987, 1-8.

⁴⁶ On brigandage and sacrilege in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor, see Gregory 1997, 449-462.

⁴⁷ See Millar 1981, 63-75, especially 71-72 on the dangerous world of Apuleius' *Golden Ass*.

Three notorious criminals assaulted young Theseus near the Isthmus of Corinth;⁴⁸ it was on the road that Oedipus and King Laius came to blows.⁴⁹

Evidence for abuse against travelers, and travelling abusers, is more plentiful under the Roman Empire.⁵⁰ Much of this violence, according to letters of complaint, stemmed from abusive officials whose presence often deterred locals from traveling freely and visiting sacred sites.⁵¹ Of course, the breakdown of stability in the third century AD led to more violence in villages throughout the empire. A petition from Scaptopara to the governor in Thrace to the emperor Gordian III outlines the tendency for officers to abuse and burden local villagers.⁵² The location of the town had much to do with this problem: soldiers were drawn to the local hot springs.⁵³ But the soldiers became arrogant and even made markets and festivals an unpleasant experience for the local inhabitants:

Long ago, many inhabitants were left alone and not subject to extortion, they contributed faultlessly in full both in taxes and the other impositions. But when some persons now and then started to commit *hybris* and use force, thereafter the village also began to decline. A famous market (πανήγυρις) takes place two miles from our village. Those who stay there to attend the market do not however remain at the marketplace for all the fifteen days, they leave it and turn up in our village and compel us to provide them with *xenia* and most of the other things for their entertainment without offering payment.⁵⁴

⁴⁸ Plut. *Thes.* 8-9. Theseus himself was a bandit (see Walker 1995, 14-15).

⁴⁹ Soph. *OT* 112-115.

⁵⁰ See Shaw 2000, 361-404.

⁵¹ Turpin 1991, 101-118, especially 112-113.

⁵² Hauken 1998; Hallof 1994, 405-441; *IGBulg IV*, 2236. On abuse of official power in Asia Minor, see Gregory 1997, 465-472.

⁵³ Turpin 1991, 112.

⁵⁴ *IvBulg IV* 2236.26-44: καὶ ἐφ' οὗ μὲν τὸ / πάλλαι οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἀόχλητοι / καὶ ἀδειάσειστοι ἔμενον, ἀνευδῶς / [τούς τε φόρους καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ / ἐπιτάγ]ματα [συντελοῦν· ἐπεὶ δὲ κατὰ κ]α[ι]ρ[ο]ὺς εἰς / [(ὑβριν) προχωρεῖν τινες κ]αὶ βι[άζε]σθαι / [ἤρξαντο, τηνικαῦτ]α ἐλαττοῦσθαι / [καὶ ἡ κόμη ἤρξατο. ἀπ]ό γε μελιῶν / δύ[ο τῆς κόμης ἢ] μῶν πανηγύρεως / [ἐπιτελουμένης διαβοήτου οἱ ἐκεῖσε / [τῆς πανηγύρ]εως εἵνεκεν ἐπιδημοῦντ/[ε]ς ἡμέρ/[χον]ται εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν κόμη[η]ν [καὶ] ἀναγκάζουσιν ἡμᾶ[ς] ξ[ενί]ας / αὐ[τοῖς] παρέχειν καὶ ἕτερα πλείστα εἰς / ἀνάληψιν αὐτῶν ἀνευ ἀργυρίου χο/ρηγεῖν. I follow Hauken's translation, with a few changes.

The πανήγυρις was a periodic market (Latin *mercatus*) that may have coincided with a religious festival.⁵⁵ As a result of the various impositions the village began to decline (ἐλαττοῦσθαι καὶ ἡ κώμη ἥρξατο) and villagers decided to leave their ancestral homes.⁵⁶ Leaving a home meant abandoning ancestral gods. In Euripides' *Suppliants*, the playwright describes such deprivation: "No longer blessed with offspring, no longer blessed with children I have no share in happiness among the Argive women who bear sons. Nor would Artemis, who stands by childbirth, address the childless."⁵⁷ Leaving home would mean abandoning, and being abandoned by, ancestral gods.

Although shifting populations and demographic changes altered the religious landscape, many of the problems facing Hellenistic cults were familiar to earlier and later ones as well. Population shifts may have been a contributing factor to the rise of sanctuaries like that of Apollo Coropaius in Thessaly located along the road between Greece and Macedonia. Meanwhile, the Augustan period marked a last gasp for the oracle at Dodona and many other sites in mainland Greece;⁵⁸ while the intricate road systems of the empire, particularly the *cursus publicus*, facilitated travel east and west, Greece remained a detour along this path. In Greece, the province of Achaia (especially Corinth) became the central hub of the network in Greece,⁵⁹ bypassing sites like Dodona. Although a dearth of

⁵⁵ Hauken 1998, 115-116 offers one possibility: "A religious festival in the middle of October would easily explain the frequent and unaccounted presence of the leading men of the province." He notes, however, that the inexact use of πανήγυρις makes any conclusion difficult.

⁵⁶ Hauken 1998, 88 lines 59-63: ἐδηλώσαμεν γὰρ μηκέτ[ι ἡμ]ᾶς δύνασθαι ὑπομένειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ [νοῦ]ν [ἔχ]ειν συνλείπειν καὶ τοὺς πατ[ρ]ῶους θε[ε]μελίους διὰ τὴν τῶν ἐπερχομένων ἡμεῖν βίαν.

⁵⁷ Eur. *Suppl.* 955-959: οὐκέτ' εὔτεκνος, οὐκέτ' εὔ-/παις, οὐδ' εὐτυχίας μέτε-/στὶν μοι κουροτόκοις ἐν Ἀργείαις: / οὐδ' Ἄρτεμις λοχία / προσφθέγξαιτ' ἂν τὰς ἀτέκνουσ. Translated by Montiglio 2005, 33.

⁵⁸ Strabo 7.7.9; Eidinow 2007, 62-63.

⁵⁹ See Alcock 1993, 121-122.

dedications found at some sanctuaries may have led to a misleading impression of decline,⁶⁰ at remote sanctuaries like Dodona this impression seems to be right.

Sanctuaries like Dodona both fell into neglect and fell prey to incursions because they lacked the support network that a major nearby city offered. This meant, in the end, inefficient or nonexistent agents of strategies for coping with demographic, political, and social changes. In contrast, the city of Demetrias looked after Apollo Coropaius to ensure that proper procedures were enforced as more foreigners were coming to consult him. Adaptation was necessary. Violence was prevalent in city and country alike. Real and perceived threats of violence undermined safe passage to Dodona, but also undermined confidence in the traditional practices that priestesses of urban cults were accustomed to perform. Above all, Zeus at Dodona had already moved once; unlike Demeter and Kore at Tanagra, he had no other safe refuge.

5.2. Decline through Intentional and Unintentional Violence

On the other hand, even popular and wealthy sanctuaries faced the prospect of demise. Having an abundance of valuables could be either an advantage or disadvantage depending on the situation. A decreased number of valuable offerings need not suggest a decline in the public's interest in a cult. In many ways cult was a business. Financial trouble could doom a sanctuary to decline. Metal offerings were often melted down and reused in times of need. The many instances of temple plundering described in Polybius' *Histories*

⁶⁰ See Snodgrass 1989, 287-294. See also Dignas 2002b, 235-244.

suggest that many sanctuaries had enough valuables to make them targets for rapacious armies.⁶¹

When financially struggling cults are mentioned in the epigraphic evidence, it is usually in the context of a temple account or a law designed to alleviate that hardship. For instance, a governing body might appoint a commission to reevaluate sacred property and funds.⁶² Reevaluations, however, were not always beneficial for a sanctuary. The Roman general Sulla once sent evaluators to weigh the precious metals at Delphi because he wanted to know exactly how much wealth he was taking away.⁶³ Through the moralizing lens of literary and historiographical accounts, we can see how devastating the effects of war, natural disasters, and rapacious generals could be.⁶⁴

5.2.1. Intentional Violence

Diodorus relates how the Athenians, in financial straits, hijacked a sacred envoy traveling from Syracuse to Delphi and Olympia. A letter to the Athenians by Dionysius, tyrant of Syracuse, reads:

Dionysius to the *Boule* and Assembly of the Athenians: It is inappropriate to wish you well since you are committing sacrilege against the gods on land and sea, and, having stolen the statues that had been sent by us to be dedications to the gods, you have broken them⁶⁵ and have committed impiety toward the greatest of the gods, Apollo at Delphi and Olympian Zeus.⁶⁶

⁶¹ Polyb. 4.25.2, 4.62.2, 4.67.3-4, 5.9-13, 7.14.3, 9.33.4, 9.34.8-11, 11.7.2, and 31.9-11.

⁶² See Chankowski 2011, 145-149.

⁶³ Plut. *Sulla* 12.6-9. See Also Paus. 9.7.5.

⁶⁴ See Pritchett 1991, 160-168.

⁶⁵ κατεκόψατε may mean that the Athenians turned metal statues into coins.

⁶⁶ Diod. 16.57.3: Διονύσιος Ἀθηναίων τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ εὖ μὲν πράττειν οὐκ ἐπιτήδειόν ἐστι γράφειν, ἐπεὶ τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν ἱεροσυλεῖτε καὶ τὰ ἀγάλματα τὰ εἰς ἀνάθεσιν ὑφ' ἡμῶν τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπεσταλμένα παρελόμενοι κατεκόψατε καὶ περὶ τοὺς μεγίστους τῶν θεῶν ἠσεβήκατε, περὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖς καὶ τὸν Δία τὸν Ὀλύμπιον.

Violence and threats of violence had a disrupting effect on the continuity of local Greek religious practices by endangering a cult's financial security. The type of violence sometimes affected the manner in which a community coped, recovered, or failed to recover. Sacrilegious acts are numerous in Greek histories. Given the high moralizing tone of many historians from Herodotus to Polybius, it comes as no surprise that temple plundering and other offenses against the gods become common tropes to portray a licentious and immoral king or military commander.⁶⁷ After all, sanctuaries were well known to have stockpiles of precious metals that could be melted down and made into coinage.⁶⁸

After the Aetolians had defeated the Cynaethans in 221/0 BC, they occupied and plundered the city. Upon departure, they arrived at the temple of Artemis "regarded as inviolable among the Greeks".⁶⁹ Polybius tells us that the Aetolians intended to plunder the temple and steal away the sacred cattle in their never-ending search for loot. However, the locals (Lousiatai) persuaded them not to sack the temple by giving up some of the accoutrements belonging to the goddess.⁷⁰ Although the Lousiatai were able to stave off the marauders momentarily (the Aetolians still drove off the sacred cattle),⁷¹ they had to relinquish valuable property. Such property, however, is what made sanctuaries like that of Artemis such attractive targets during war. In fact, stratagems for acquiring easy funds, as seen in Ps.-Aristotle's *Oeconomicus* II, involved clever strategies for plundering temples and

⁶⁷ On the conflict between avarice and honor in Polybius, see Eckstein 1995, 70-82.

⁶⁸ See Pritchett 1991, 160-162 and 166-168.

⁶⁹ Polyb. 4.9.10: ἄσυλον δὲ νεμόμισται παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν.

⁷⁰ Polyb. 4.9.11 οἱ δὲ Λουσιᾶται νουνεχῶς δόντες τινὰ τῶν κατασκευασμάτων τῆς θεοῦ. See Scholten 2000, 205.

⁷¹ Polyb. 4.19.4. ... ὁμως τὰ θρέμματα τῆς θεοῦ περισύραντες ἀπήγαγον.

deceiving local populations.⁷² Those located in the countryside were merely the lowest hanging fruit.

According to Polybius, the Aetolians were by no means finished plundering cities and temples. In fact, upon being elected general Dorimachus invaded Epirus, and laid waste to the countryside. On reaching the temple of Zeus at Dodona, the Aetolians burned the porticoes, destroyed its votives, tore down the sacred *oikia*, and ravished everything that the people used during their festivals and rites.⁷³ But urban shrines were not completely protected either. In 219, Philip V marched on the deserted city of Dion where he burned the stoa around the *temenos* of a sanctuary and destroyed the offerings “as many as were for adornment and use for those who took part in festivals”.⁷⁴ In a speech to the Spartans, an Acarnanian envoy named Lyciscus lists a number of sacrilegious offenses that had recently been committed:

Who but you sent out such leaders, men who even dared to lay hands on inviolable sanctuaries, among whom Timaeus violated that of Poseidon on Taenarus and the sanctuary of Artemis at Lousoi, while Pharycus plundered the *temenos* of Hera at Argos and Polycritus that of Poseidon in Mantinea? And what about Lattabus and Nicostratus? Did they not violate the peace during the Pamboiotian festival, doing the work of Scythians or Galatians? No deeds of this sort were ever done by the successors (of Alexander)!⁷⁵

Lyciscus intended that the number of recounted instances and the brutality with which these crimes were perpetrated have a strong rhetorical effect. Moreover, comparing the

⁷² Ps.-Aristot. *Oec. II*.

⁷³ Polyb. 4.67.2-3 (217 BC): πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἐνέπρησε τὰς στοὰς τὰς περὶ τὸ τέμενος καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ διέφθειρε τῶν ἀναθημάτων, ὅσα πρὸς κόσμον ἢ χρεῖαν ὑπῆρχε τοῖς εἰς τὰς πανηγύρεις συμπορευομένοις. See also 4.25.2 (Boiotians accuse Aetolians of sacking temple of Athena Itonia in 220).

⁷⁴ Polyb. 4.62.2. See Philip’s sacrilegious treatment of Thermon (7.14.3 and 9.30) and the sack of Delphi by the Phocians (9.33.4).

⁷⁵ Polyb. 9.34.8-11: οὐχ ὑμεῖς; τίνες δὲ κατὰ κοινὸν τοιούτους ἡγεμόνας ἐξέπεμψαν οἴους ὑμεῖς; οἱ γὰρ καὶ τοῖς ἀσύλοις ἱεροῖς ἐτόλμησαν προσάγειν τὰς χεῖρας. ὧν Τίμαιος μὲν τὸ ἐπὶ Ταινάρῳ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐν Λούσοις ἱερὸν Ἀρτέμιδος ἐσύλησε, Φάρυκος δὲ καὶ Πολύκριτος, ὁ μὲν τὸ τῆς Ἥρας ἐν Ἄργει τέμενος, ὁ δὲ τὸ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος ἐν Μαντινείᾳ διήρπασε. τί δαὶ Λάτταβος καὶ Νικόστρατος; οὐ τὴν τῶν Παμβοιωτίων πανηγυρίαν εἰρήνης οὐσης παρεσπόνδησαν, Σκυθῶν ἔργα καὶ Γαλατῶν ἐπιτελοῦντες; ὧν οὐδὲν πέπρακται τοῖς διαδεξαμένοις.

rapaciousness (and impiety) of these commanders to non-Greeks aimed to stress their inherent lawlessness and incivility.⁷⁶ Above all, Polybius is conveying the notion, true or not, that such acts were becoming commonplace during his time. It is difficult to imagine what strategy if any would have protected these sanctuaries. What could even the most well managed and wealthiest rural sanctuary do to protect itself against a superior enemy? It seems the only strategy was one that required foresight and great effort: move the sanctuary within the walls of the city where it would stand a better chance. Its fate, then, would be tied to the city that surrounds it. Although the picture that emerges is one in which no Hellenistic sanctuary was safe from pillaging, accidental destruction was no less prevalent.

5.2.2. Accidental Destruction and the Monumentalization of Ruins

Strabo relates how Dodona came to be settled in Epirus: “Previously, the oracle was near Scotoussa, a city of the Pelasgians (in Thessaly). But after the tree was burned by certain people, it was transferred to Dodona in accordance with an oracle of Apollo to Dodona.”⁷⁷ It is not clear from this passage, however, exactly why the burning of the (presumably sacred) tree prompted a move of such distance. The devastating loss of the sacred tree may have prompted reconsiderations based on religious motives, e.g. no other tree like it could be found anywhere closer than Epirus.⁷⁸ On the other hand, the vague phrase “by certain people” may imply an intentional, violent, conflagration.

⁷⁶ See Champion 2004, 242: ὕβρις describes the insolence of kings as well as barbarians (9.34.2).

⁷⁷ Strab. 7 fr. 1a: ἦν δὲ πρότερον περὶ Σκοτοῦσσαν πόλιν τῆς Πελασγιώτιδος τὸ χρηστήριον: ἐμπρησθέντος δ' ὑπὸ τινῶν τοῦ δένδρου μετηνέχθη κατὰ χρησμὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἐν Δωδώνῃ.

⁷⁸ On the Pelasgian origins of Dodona, see Hammond 1967, 367-368; on Strabo's account of Dodona, see 443-480.

Pausanias and Thucydides both offer accounts of the accidental disaster that befell the Argive Heraion. This revered temple was burnt down in 423 BC when the lamp of the sleeping priestess caught fire.⁷⁹ According to Pausanias, the Argives did not take down the statue of the priestess; they allowed it to remain in front of the burnt temple “although it was so great an evil”.⁸⁰ This does not sound like the statue remained as a punitive reminder. It may have stood as a marker that the space remained sacred. Nevertheless, the cult not only survived, it flourished. The Argives transferred the site of their temple, rebuilding it around 400 BC on a lower terrace. This sanctuary, which meant so much to Argive religious tradition and self-identity,⁸¹ functioned for many more centuries.

Although many destroyed sanctuaries were not rebuilt, their demise did not necessarily signal the end of the cult. For instance, the Athenians refused to rebuild the sanctuary of Athena and other sacred buildings following the Persian sack of the Acropolis. The rubble from the sanctuary remained *in situ* as a reminder to the Athenians of the sacrilege.⁸² After a few decades, however, Pericles spearheaded his famous building project that included a new temple to Athena, the Parthenon. Like the Argive Heraion, the Parthenon was not built over the foundations of the destroyed temple, suggesting a continued effort to commemorate the enemy’s sacrilege in the hope that the people and the gods might some day exact revenge. These examples, however, are exceptions to the rule. Not all Greek communities had the resources or will to rebuild their sanctuaries and recover

⁷⁹ Thuc. 4.133.2-3: καὶ ὁ νεὸς τῆς Ἥρας τοῦ αὐτοῦ θέρους ἐν Ἄργει κατεκαύθη, Χρυσίδος τῆς ἱερείας λύχρον τινὰ θεΐσης ἡμμένον πρὸς τὰ στέμματα καὶ ἐπικαταδαρθούσης, ὥστε ἔλαθεν ἀφθέντα πάντα καὶ καταφλεχθέντα.

⁸⁰ Paus. 2.17.7. Ἀργεῖοι δὲ καίπερ κακοῦ τηλικούτου παρόντος σφίσι τὴν εἰκόνα οὐ καθεῖλον τῆς Χρυσηίδος, ἀνάκειται δὲ καὶ ἐς τὸδε τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ κατακαυθέντος ἔμπροσθεν.

⁸¹ de Polignac 1995, 52.

⁸² Hurwit 1999, 142-143.

from such devastation.⁸³ By Pausanias' time, the countryside of Greece was littered with abandoned sanctuaries, many of which must have been plundered. Indeed, the Greek countryside suffered the most from war,⁸⁴ whereas urban sanctuaries, although not completely secure, were more defensible and received more legislative attention. Accessibility was but one factor in how Greeks determined which sanctuaries to rebuild and which ones to leave in ruins. Ones that were too far outside city walls tended to remain in ruins.

5.3. Reimagining Cult: Neglect and Remembrance

In the *Protrepticus*, Clement of Alexandria aims to show how men created the statues of pagan gods. He offers an account of origins of the statue of Serapis at Alexandria:

Having received the image, the king (Ptolemy Philadelphus) set it up on the promontory that they now call Rhacotis where the sanctuary of Serapis is honored; this place neighbors the burial grounds. Ptolemy, upon bringing here his mistress Blistiche who had died at Canopus, buried her at the foot of the abovementioned shrine. Others say that Serapis was a statue from the Pontus and that it was brought to Alexandria with festival honors.⁸⁵

Clement uses the term *μετάγειν* (transfer) to refer to both the movement of Ptolemy's mistress and that of the statue of the god Serapis. According to Clement, the king had conveyed the god from elsewhere. This usage parallels the transfer of the oracle of Dodona from Thessaly to Epirus as well as the transfer of the temple of Athena at Peparethus.⁸⁶ As much as location mattered for traditional rites and honors, the gods seemed to move as

⁸³ Not many cities besides Athens had unfettered access to allied tribute that could be used for such rebuilding. For Athenian finance during the Peloponnesian War, see Blamire 2001, 99-126.

⁸⁴ Chaniotis 2011, 127.

⁸⁵ Clem.Al. *Protr.* 4: ὁ δὲ δεξάμενος τὸν ἀνδριάντα καθίδρυσεν ἐπὶ τῆς ἄκρας, ἣν νῦν Ῥακῶτιν καλοῦσιν, ἐνθα καὶ τὸ ἱερόν τετίμηται τοῦ Σαράπιδος, γεινιᾶ δὲ τοῖς τόποις τὸ χωρίον. Βλιστίχην δὲ τὴν παλλακίδα τελευτήσασαν ἐν Κανώβῳ μεταγαγὼν ὁ Πτολεμαῖος ἔθαψεν ὑπὸ τὸν προδηλωμένον σηκόν. ἄλλοι δὲ φασὶ Ποντικὸν εἶναι βρέτας τὸν Σάραπιν, μετήχθαι δὲ εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν μετὰ τιμῆς πανηγυρικῆς.

⁸⁶ *Syll*³ 587.8-15.

frequently as did the people who worshipped them. Boundaries were permeable; people, cults, and even tombs moved seemingly rather frequently. This was increasingly the case in the Hellenistic period when cults were transferred long distances from west to east (Icarus) rather than east to west (Massalia). Nonetheless, ones that suffered destruction or underwent neglect had become permanent fixtures on the landscape. These are the dilapidated sanctuaries that Pausanias writes about in his *Periegesis*.⁸⁷

5.3.1. Broken Statues and Dilapidated Temples

At Phalerum, Pausanias identifies altars of gods called “Unknown”.⁸⁸ As he makes his way from Phalerum to Athens he encounters another perplexing monument:

Along the road to Athens from Phalerum there is a temple of Hera that has neither doors nor a roof; they say that Mardonius, the son of Gobrias, himself set fire to it. The image that is there right now, according to what they say, is the work of Alcámenes; the Mede (Mardonius), then, could not have defiled it.⁸⁹

This dilapidated sanctuary, having neither roof nor doors, still had a cult statue of Hera. This cult statue, according to Pausanias’ reckoning, was either not the work of Alcámenes (who was active in the mid fifth century) or was not the original statue in the temple.⁹⁰ This passage attests to the incongruities of local stories concerning cult places; but also demonstrates that Greeks were willing to leave their gods in dilapidated temples.

⁸⁷ See Pirenne-Delforge 2008, 98-105.

⁸⁸ Paus. 1.1.4: ἐνταῦθα καὶ Σκιράδος Ἀθηνᾶς ναὸς ἐστὶ καὶ Διὸς ἀπωτέρω, βωμοὶ δὲ θεῶν τε ὀνομαζομένων Ἀγνώστων. See Frazer’s Commentary (volume 1, page 33); Diog. Laert 1.10.110: altars were founded across Attica when a plague hit Athens around 600 BC.

⁸⁹ Paus. 1.1.5: ἐστὶ δὲ κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν εἰς Ἀθήνας ἐκ Φαληροῦ ναὸς Ἥρας οὔτε θύρας ἔχων οὔτε ὄροφον: Μαρδόνιον φασὶν αὐτὸν ἐμπρῆσαι τὸν Γωβρύου. τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα τὸ νῦν δῦ, καθὰ λέγουσιν, Ἀλκαμένους ἐστὶν ἔργον: οὐκ ἂν τοῦτό γε ὁ Μῆδος εἶη λελωβημένος.

⁹⁰ If it was not the original statue, then the temple was burnt again or the people placed a new statue in a burnt temple without rebuilding the temple. See Frazer’s commentary (volume 2, page 37).

The physical remains of sanctuaries affected how Greeks understood their past and their religious traditions. Pausanias' depiction of Greek religious practices, history, and myth is diachronic⁹¹ and the landscape of Greece was a palimpsest of monuments and temples. Through his descriptions of dilapidated temples and broken statues, however, we can only see the sacred landscape through the author's eyes.⁹² This has, of course, frustrated many scholars who have attempted to reconstruct that landscape in the light of the archaeological evidence.⁹³ We do, however, get an impression of the organic cycle of cults and sanctuaries, many of which rose and fell since their earliest attestations. Some of the best-known sanctuaries, like the Argive Heraion, had fallen to ruins and were subsequently rebuilt; others like the temple of Hera in Attica remained in ruins. Prolonging the life of civic cults, and preventing sanctuaries from becoming ruins across the landscape, is what the sacred laws in the previous chapters were designed to achieve.

How did Greeks justify allowing their temples to fall apart? It is unclear whether Greeks had a mechanism for desacralizing space. Decommissioning, however, is distinct from desacralization and is known to occur (e.g. the old Argive Heraion). In other words, a sanctuary may become unused but remain "sacred". As discussed above, objects sacred to a deity were often refashioned or even decommissioned but not desacralized.⁹⁴ The terms 'sacralization' and 'desacralization' are usually limited to the time in which rites are performed; For instance, sacralization refers to preliminary rites that commence a ritual such as sacrifice, whereas desacralization refers to closing rites.⁹⁵ Such terms have thus applied to the temporary rites of sacrifice, when a religious rite began and when it ended.

⁹¹ Hutton 2005, 305.

⁹² See Rutherford 2001, 40-52.

⁹³ See Alcock 1994, 247-261, especially 257-261.

⁹⁴ See Pedley 2005, 45: dedications to a god could be buried within the *temenos*.

⁹⁵ See Parker 1983, 180 on purification rites and sacralization.

Reinstalling the statue of Artemis during the Eisiteria served to commemorate and perhaps reestablish the goddess' presence in temple and community. But was the temple decommissioned during the interval? This focus limits the term "sacred" to events that span a day or a week. Cult revival, particularly the Thargelia, suggest that another layer of sacredness spanned years, and even centuries.

Was there a solemn ceremony that marked a decommissioning of a sanctuary? Presumably, the Tanagrans would have placed a layer of dirt or clay over the foundations of their old sanctuary; but the evidence does not say.⁹⁶ We do not have enough evidence to suggest a ritual for this type of decommissioning of sacred space, which was intended to be more permanent than that which marked the beginning and end of sacrifice. Unlike Romans, Greeks did not have clearly defined and universal procedures for decommissioning sacred space.⁹⁷ The evidence we have shows that old space became an empty shell once the cult statue, altar, and other accoutrements that the local worshippers associated with cult practice were removed. But even this was not always the case. The dilapidated sanctuary to Hera that Pausanias describes still housed a statue. Remarkably, ruins besides the Attic temple of Hera contained cult statues in Pausanias' day: a sanctuary of Apollo and the Mother of the Gods had cult statues in front of the entrance to the dilapidated temple, but neither of these may have been the cult statue.⁹⁸ Whether or not these gods still received rites is unclear. Either the community continued rites for the god (perhaps nominally or sporadically) or those rites ceased. In the latter case, the community may have deemed it unfathomable to remove the statue given its prominent place in local identity, landscape

⁹⁶ Archaeological evidence for the site is inconclusive. A temple has been found that many identify as that of Demeter and Kore. Schachter 1981, 162-163 and Roller 1987, 213-232.

⁹⁷ Glinster 2000, 69-70.

⁹⁸ Paus. 8.24.6.

and lore. A community may not have had the funds to rebuild the sanctuary. On the other hand, perhaps it wanted to keep it in a dilapidated state as a reminder of Persian sacrilege.

An absence of doors and roofs is not altogether surprising. These were perishable materials (wood and clay) susceptible to rot or reuse. They were also valuable materials and obvious targets for plunderers. But for almost all of the dilapidated sanctuaries that Pausanias describes, the cult statues were missing; this indicates that worship at that site had completely ceased and the statue was lifted or the cult was transferred elsewhere.⁹⁹ If the setting (καθίδρυσις and ἀποκατάστασις) of the goddess' statue at the Magnesian Eisteria served to reestablish her presence in her sanctuary, then the opposite is surely the case. Removing the cult statue would generally mean removing the god. All that was left at many of the shrines that Pausanias describes were the pedestals on which the statues stood. This may indicate that the cult statue was moved to another location like those of Tanagra and Peperethus. On the other hand, Pausanias gives us the impression that many sanctuaries were simply abandoned. Why?

What did Greeks think when they saw such dilapidated sanctuaries or read decrees concerning festivals that no longer existed? That locals gave Pausanias an apocryphal story about the temple to Hera, either that it had been destroyed during the Persian Wars or that Alcamenes made its statue attests to the mutability of local religious traditions. Would locals knowingly promulgate a false story or was this a case of multiple or competing traditions? Regardless of what caused the destruction of the Heraion the people decided not to repair it. For the communities of antiquity recounting accurate cult history was not an easy matter; but it was not always the main objective either. The eclectic tendencies of

⁹⁹ Examples are numerous. See Paus. 1.1.5; 2.12.2; 2.36.2; 2.7.6; 2.24.3; and 9.33.3.

Greek polytheism meant communities were hard pressed to fund their cults. Naturally, some cults were more popular and therefore received more support than others. Finite resources, especially in a harsh economic climate, certainly contributed to neglected and dilapidated sanctuaries across the Greek landscape.¹⁰⁰ But ideology played a key role. A catastrophic event sometimes led to a conscious decision not to repair a sanctuary. This happened on the Athenian Acropolis after the Persian Wars. Likewise, the acropolis sanctuary in the city of Pheneus was mysteriously left in ruins.¹⁰¹

As Alcock has noted, amnesias play a part in creating a “correct past”.¹⁰² Although Pausanias’ contemporaries may not have known exactly what happened to the temple of Hera, their forefathers perhaps devised a story tied to heroics of the Persian Wars to obfuscate their decision to neglect a rural shrine that may have burned down accidentally. On the other hand, they may have wanted to tie their local shrine to a famous sculptor in order to enhance the sanctuary’s prestige. It seems that the local inhabitants used the Persian invasion as an excuse, true or not, to leave the temple unrepaired regardless of what caused the fire in the first place. In the end, the community decided that the shrine did not warrant the time and resources. Thus a frequented and visible location was no guarantee that a sanctuary would be maintained; but there was a precedent for such neglect.

Two of the most famous sanctuaries of antiquity left in ruins show the different ways in which their initial misfortunes were understood. By the Archaic period, the temple

¹⁰⁰ See Alcock 1993, 200-201. See Hotz 2006, 286-287: common causes were financial difficulties and war. See also Chaniotis 2005, 122, 162.

¹⁰¹ Paus. 8.14.4. He also mentions several other urban sanctuaries that were dilapidated by his time. This does not, of course, preclude that they were in poor condition in the Hellenistic period. See Paus. 2.7.6; 2.9.7; 2.24.3; 8.24.6; 9.33.3; and 10.38.13.

¹⁰² Alcock 2002, 17.

of Apollo Didymeius achieved great renown.¹⁰³ Its reputation, however, could not save it from destruction during the Ionian Revolt (499-494 BC). According to Herodotus, the Persians sacked the temple and carried off its treasures. The oracle was inactive for the next two centuries as its temple lay in ruins.¹⁰⁴ Alexander's conquest provided an opportunity to rebuild.¹⁰⁵ Persian domination over the site clearly had preempted any attempts to restart the oracle or rebuild the temple. In the meantime, however, legends began to circulate that the Branchidai family had betrayed the sanctuary to Xerxes. The revived Hellenistic oracle was not to be entrusted into the hands of this family, but governed by the city of Miletus.¹⁰⁶ Of course, alternate versions of mythical or historical events were often transmitted for political reasons or have political intentions. Such mutability of memory shaped how communities revised their traditional cults and religious practices.

Another famous sanctuary destroyed during the Persian invasion of Attica in 480 was old temple to Athena on the Acropolis. According to Herodotus, the Persians were able to breach the Acropolis:

It was necessary that all of Attica fall to the Persians according to an oracle... As the Athenians saw (the Persians) climbing the Acropolis, some threw themselves down from the wall and perished, while others fled into the temple. The Persians who had completed the ascent first turned toward the gates opened them and murdered the suppliants. When all were killed, they plundered the sanctuary and set the entire Acropolis on fire.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰³ Fontenrose 1988, 9.

¹⁰⁴ Hdt. 6.18-21; See Fontenrose 1988, 11-13.

¹⁰⁵ The temple was rebuilt under Seleucus I Nicator (Fontenrose 1988, 16); private initiatives were promoted: notably, *OGIS* 213; *I.Didyma* 479 (300/299 BC), in which a certain Demodamas of Miletus agreed to pay for a new stoa. See Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1993, 26.

¹⁰⁶ Strab. 17.1.43. See Dmitriev 2005, 64-76.

¹⁰⁷ Hdt. 8.53: ἔδεε γὰρ κατὰ τὸ θεοπρόπιον πᾶσαν τὴν Ἀττικὴν τὴν ἐν τῇ ἡπιέρῳ γενέσθαι ὑπὸ Πέρσησι... ὡς δὲ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ἀναβεβηκότας οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, οἱ μὲν ἐρρίπτεον ἑωυτοὺς κατὰ τοῦ τείχεος κάτω καὶ διεφθείροντο, οἱ δὲ εἰς τὸ μέγαρον κατέφευγον. τῶν δὲ Περσέων οἱ ἀναβεβηκότες πρῶτον μὲν ἐτράποντο πρὸς τὰς πύλας, ταύτας δὲ ἀνοίξαντες τοὺς ἰκέτας ἐφόνευσον: ἐπεὶ δὲ σφί πάντες κατέστρωντο, τὸ ἱρὸν συλήσαντες ἐνέπρησαν πᾶσαν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν.

The Athenians decided that a conspicuous display of the ruins of the old temple to Athena (*Archaïos Naos*) would offer a “looming reminder of the impiety of the Persians”.¹⁰⁸ Here, the ruins of the temple were embedded into the walls of the Acropolis overlooking the Agora. The Athenians did not rebuild on the Acropolis until a generation later. Dilapidated temples and/or neglected rites were justified as long as the community could provide a good reason. In this case, the community’s conscious decision not to rebuild was justified on the grounds of piety and vengeance.

5.3.2. Neglect and the Reimagining of Cult

Neglected temples thus became subjected to much local historical revision.

Pausanias states that the temple of Apollo Lykeios at Sicyon was built to thank the god for his help against a pack of wolves. Through an oracle, the god told the people about a certain place where they would find a dry log from which the bark, mixed with meat, would be poisonous for the wolves. Pausanias’ local sources were in disagreement over the details, like the type of tree.¹⁰⁹ Nearby were bronze statues of young girls that, according to Pausanias, locals said were the daughters of Proetus. The inscription he found referred to other women.¹¹⁰ Much uncertainty clouded the memories of places and their religious traditions even when accompanied by an inscription.¹¹¹ For this reason, Humphreys has argued, few family cemeteries in classical Athens continued for more than a few

¹⁰⁸ Hurwit 1999, 142-144; The Persians, however, may not have seen the sack of the Acropolis as impious in light of Hdt. 1.131.1: “The Persians establish no altars, supposing that their use is a sign of folly.”

¹⁰⁹ Paus. 2.9.7. His local guides could not recall the type of tree.

¹¹⁰ Paus. 2.9.8. See Foxhall 1995, 143: great monumental works do not need identification, but lesser works may call on the aid of writing to ensure what they do signify. Pausanias’ tale shows how written and unwritten accounts can vary, causing more confusion and uncertainty.

¹¹¹ On the conflicts and contradictions of oral and written sources, see Thomas 1992, 88-93.

generations.¹¹² The speaker in Demosthenes 55 owns a plot of land with tombs, but claims he has no idea whose tombs they were.¹¹³ Public and private recollection of the past was limited and susceptible to distortions, even with the aid of writing. Likewise, neglected cults were blank slates onto which a community could reinvent its past through the writing or retelling of myth. Here, genealogies are recounted, or recreated;¹¹⁴ ancient networks are reforged or reimagined. Second-century Athenians recreated the Thargelia festival the rites of which may have borne little resemblance to the ones they claimed to be renewing, resembling a palimpsest of cult. On the other hand, the Magnesians' reinvention of their cult to Artemis meant adding more and more obligations including a new festival. Writing, in the form of the Archive Monument,¹¹⁵ was an instrument with which the community reinvented its past in order to promote changes in the present. How do we organize our processions? Who has access to the shrine? What are the duties of the priestess? What is the correct way to approach the altar of Ktesios? After a while, the specific components of these rites were forgotten, altered and were then reinvented; but like the ship of Theseus, they retained the same name.

Pausanias confronts a number of different and contradictory myths and religious traditions. How does he come to accept or deny a particular story? He explains in Book 8 how incredible certain stories were on the surface: "In every age, (storytellers) who build lies on top of what is true have made deeds that happened long ago and even deeds that are still happening unbelievable in the eyes of most people."¹¹⁶ Tales contain a grain of truth but

¹¹² Humphreys 1980, 96-126.

¹¹³ Dem. *Orat.* 55.14; See Foxhall 1995, 138.

¹¹⁴ See Alcock 2002 and Jones 1999.

¹¹⁵ See Sumi 2004.

¹¹⁶ Paus. 8.2.6: ἐν δὲ τῷ παντὶ αἰῶνι πολλὰ μὲν πάλαι συμβάντα, τὰ δὲ καὶ ἔτι γινόμενα ἄπιστα εἶναι πεποιήκασιν ἐς τοὺς πολλοὺς οἱ τοῖς ἀληθέσιν ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἐψευσμένα.

become distorted over time. To Pausanias' dismay, written and unwritten stories make myth and cult mutable and organic; the changes they undergo become part of the fabric of cult. The Persians may or may not have destroyed the temple of Hera in Attica, but that does not mean it was not victim to violent attack at some point. In fact, it may have been occupied and plundered, but not destroyed, during the Persian invasion. Nevertheless, it lived on in memory if not in cult.

The antiquity of a particular story adds weight to its plausibility.¹¹⁷ Such a method of analysis is not peculiar to Pausanias; Herodotus, in fact, gives the most credence to stories told by Egyptian priests, guardians of the oldest of religions.¹¹⁸ The older the story, the more credible, despite the plethora of changes it had certainly undergone. This holds true for religious practices outlined in sacred laws. Phrases like *kata ta patria* and *kata nomous* attest, at least according to the locals who practiced them, to the relative antiquity of the rites in question. As we have seen, however, such phraseology often obscures innovation.

When cults are revived, their neglect had to be justified. Although population density helped urban sanctuaries survive, many urban religious performances like the Thargelia were nonetheless neglected. But neglect took other forms. The wide-ranging prices of priesthood sales suggest that some cults were more attractive than others.¹¹⁹ In fact, some communities were hard pressed to fill the posts and public interest waned from time to time. Funding sacrifices became burdensome and the upkeep of sanctuaries was expensive;¹²⁰ communities sometimes decided to spend their money in other ways or divert

¹¹⁷ See Hutton 2005, 306.

¹¹⁸ See Luraghi 2001, 138-16 (especially 144-147): Herodotus' source references usually obey the rule that any people is well informed about events which happened or continue to happen in its own country. Cultivated peoples will desire to obtain information and communicate with each other.

¹¹⁹ Parker and Obbink 2000, 426.

¹²⁰ See Dignas 2002c, 31. For repairs, see *I.Oropus* 290 (369/8 BC), *I.Iasos* 219 (*BE* 1973, no. 428), and *IG* II² 403 (*LSCG* 35) from 350-320 BC. See also *NGSL*, pages 38-39.

funds from one cult to another. As some cults rose to prominence, many others quietly fell into silence.

Lysias' speech against Nicomachus is one of our most illustrative examples of tensions arising over cult funding. Although dated to around 399 BC, the financial pressures it bespeaks would only become more acute during the Hellenistic period when the competition over funding (and attention) became more strenuous. Nicomachus was in fact accused of meeting cult obligations. Acting as scribe for the codification of the city's laws,¹²¹ he allegedly codified every one of the city's ritual obligations leading to the charge that old rites would necessarily yield to new ones.¹²² In other words, the city's resources would be spread too thin and traditional rites would suffer. In normal times, the accumulation of obligations would perhaps be ignored leading to the avoidance of certain rites. But under the circumstances, the Athenians had to face an essential fact: they had more ritual obligations than they could afford.

The Athenian deme cult of Artemis Aristoboule is another illustrative case. This politically charged cult, founded by Themistocles to commemorate (or worship) his strategic genius for helping to defeat the Persians, was neglected following his ostracism. An enigmatic honorific inscription, however, suggests that a certain Neoptolemus may have resurrected the cult around 330 BC:

Neoptolemus, son of Anticles, of Melite, when Chaerylle was priestess. Gods! Hegesippus son of Hegesius proposed. Resolved by the demesmen. Since Neoptolemus son of Anticles of Melite [declaring and] doing what is good as much as he is able and caring for the Athenian people, his demesmen, and all the sacrifices for Artemis at the present time... ¹²³

¹²¹ Much debate surrounds Nicomachus' role and his status. Some believe he was a public slave.

¹²² See Carawan 2010, 71-95.

¹²³ SEG 22.116.1-13: Νεοπτόλεμος / [Α]ντικλέ[ου]ς / Μελιτεὺς / Ἀρτέμιδι. / Ἐπι Χαϊρύλλης ἱερείας. / Θ ε ο ἰ. / [Η]γήσιππος Ἥγησιου εἶπεν· δεδόχθαι τοῖς / δη]μότ[α]ις· ἐπειδὴ Νεο[π]τό[λ]εμος Ἀντικλ[έ]ο]ς Μελιτεὺς [λέγων καὶ] ποῶν ἀγαθῶ[ν ὅ / τι δ]ύναται τόν τε δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναί[ων / καὶ] τοὺς δημότας καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐπιμελ[ού]μενος ἀπά]ντων [καὶ ν]ῦν τὰ τῆς [Α]ρτέμ[ι]δος...]. See Garland 1992, 76-78.

Its creation and demise both resulted from the vicissitudes of Athenian political life.

Neoptolemus and his fellow demesmen may have been resurrecting this cult as a means to reconnect to their past, i.e. their famous fellow demesman. Unfortunately we have no more details concerning the rites for this cult; but if the case of the Thargelia teaches us anything, it is that the Neoptolemus' demesmen were probably "renewing" and "enhancing" the rites for Artemis Aristoboule.

5.4. Conclusion: Decline or Adaptation?

Renewal of civic cults demonstrates a collective effort at remembrance even when an individual is responsible for the initiative. Regulations governing the renewed cult reflect a community's shared memory of a past religious tradition, if not the rites themselves. Accuracy of those memories may not be the goal of the exercise.¹²⁴ Certainly, decisions were made to exclude some rites that did not fit contemporary needs. Such decisions could arise from new historical circumstances: changes in the cultural, social, economic, and political environment in which the cult is reestablished. Moreover, as communities could neglect cults, they could also neglect particular rites practiced in cults.

In order to understand the regulation of cult revival, we must examine how communities conceived of their religious past. Extra-urban sanctuaries were particularly susceptible to neglect since they were often located far from settlements.¹²⁵ Settlement shifts during the Hellenistic period altered the ritual landscape of the Greek countryside.

¹²⁴ See Alcock 2002, 15-17.

¹²⁵ See Thuc. 2.16. Thucydides suggests that extra-urban sanctuaries were exposed to attacks.

This largely affected smaller shrines, places dear to limited local audiences.¹²⁶ Protected by city walls, urban sanctuaries were obviously more secure. After all, the Tanagrans moved their sanctuary of Demeter inside the walls of the city.¹²⁷ Therefore, an urban sanctuary was more visible to the inhabitants each day and would be less likely to lapse.

Religious practices performed in Greek cults, like Theseus' boat, changed over time yet the cult often retained its identity. So was a renewed cult viewed in the same way? Was a cult considered the same even if its religious practices were altered? When an inscription contains phrases like "according to tradition" scholars are rightly skeptical that the provisions in the decree are in fact traditional.¹²⁸ Phrases like *kata ta patria* should rather be interpreted in the context of a justification for the renewal or alteration of the cult's rites. The very promulgation of a decree attests to this notion. A decree may provide justification for changes or the introduction of new rites so long as it calls the cult by its traditional name.

The change of religious practices over time was perhaps a phenomenon to which few paid much attention. In his dialogue *De Pythiae Oracularis*, Plutarch bemoans the poor quality of oracular responses in his day: "What of the oracles? Some will tell us not that the oracles are quite beautiful because they are the god's, but that they are not the god's because they are bad."¹²⁹ Perhaps, notes the interlocutor Theon, the verses are not the god's because he only gives the Pythia the impulse and the inspiration.¹³⁰ In this sense, the details of ritual are left to human devices. In the end, however, the conclusion is reached that the

¹²⁶ Alcock 2002, 49: "Human and divine abandonment of the countryside intersect here, and together attest to a major upheaval in the religious landscape."

¹²⁷ See Migeotte 1992, no. 28.7-8.

¹²⁸ See Cole 2008, 57-59.

¹²⁹ Plut. *de Pyth.* 396e.11-f.1: διὸ καὶ τοὺς χρησμοὺς; ἔνιοι φήσουσιν εὖ καὶ καλῶς ἔχειν, ὅτι τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσιν: ἄλλοι τοῦ θεοῦ μὴ εἶναι, ὅτι φαύλως ἔχουσιν.

¹³⁰ Plut. *de Pyth.* 397b.

god should prophesy according to the style of the time.¹³¹ Of the ancient oracles, many were given in verse because such obscurity was considered dignified.¹³² In Plutarch's time, straight and concise answers were preferable for the simple questions of the day.¹³³

The adaptability of religious rites, seen through the dialogue of Plutarch, resembles the adaptability of traditional religious practice as through the lens of Hellenistic sacred laws. Cults had to be innovative to survive. In order for laws to be relevant, they have to pertain to the customs and practices of the times. The laws should change, suggests Plato, as man's beliefs about the gods change.¹³⁴ Greeks understood that religion and law should be rigid wherever possible; but at the same time, they they had to be flexible enough to accommodate social change, evolution, and the refactoring and movement through space. After all, law cannot provide for all particulars,¹³⁵ and ritual was comprised of particulars. Worshippers had to wear the particular clothing, sacrifice a particular animal, and pray to particular gods. Priestesses had to collect at particular times and places. Each sanctuary had to be configured in a particular way in order to guide a worshipper through the ritual process. And communities had to find innovative ways to maintain interest in traditional cults. "Tradition" in cult had to be innovative and had to be productive. In the end, even neglect and failure could be highly productive for the growth of new or revived cult activity.

¹³¹ Plut. *de Pyth.* 403f.1-3 and 405e.3-8.

¹³² Plut. *de Pyth.* 407c.1-5.

¹³³ Plut. *de Pyth.* 408c.3-12: it is pedantic to clothe answers to common questions (regarding loans, marriages, and travel) in poetic language.

¹³⁴ Pl. *Leg.* 12.948d.1-2: μεταβεβληκειῶν οὖν τῶν περὶ θεοῦς δοξῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μεταβάλλειν χρὴ καὶ τοὺς νόμους.

¹³⁵ Arist. *Rhet.* 1374a 25-34.

Appendix A: Sanctuary of Apollo Coropaius, ca. 100 BC.

IG IX 2, 1109.8-69; LSCG 83; Robert 1948, 16-28.

- 8 ἐπεὶ τῆς πόλεως ἡμῶν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους μὲν θεοὺς
εὐσεβῶς διακειμένης, οὐχ ἥκιστα δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα
- 10 τὸν Κοροπαῖον καὶ τιμῶσης ταῖς ἐπιφανεστάταις τιμαῖς διὰ τὰς
εὐεργεσίας τὰς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ προδηλοῦντος διὰ τοῦ μάν-
τειοῦ καὶ κατὰ κοινὸν καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν ἐκάστωι περὶ τῶν πρὸς ὑγίεια[ν]
καὶ σωτηρίαν ἀνηκόντων<ν>, δίκαιον δὲ ἐστὶν καὶ καλῶς ἔχον ὄν-
τος ἀρχαίου τοῦ μαντείου καὶ προτετιμημένου διὰ προγό-
15 νων, παραγινομένων δὲ καὶ ξένων πλειόνων ἐπὶ τὸ χρηστή-
ριον, ποιήσασθαί τινα πρόνοιαν ἐπιμελεστέραν τὴν πόλιν
περὶ τῆς κατὰ τὸ μαντήιον εὐκοσμίας· δεδόχθαι τῇ βουλῇ καὶ
τῶι δήμωι· ὅταν συντελῆται τὸ μαντήιον, πορεύεσθαι τὸν
τε ἱερέα τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τὸν εἰρημένον ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως
20 καὶ τῶν στρατηγῶν καὶ νομοφυλάκων ἀφ' ἑκατέρας ἀρχῆς
ἓνα καὶ πρύτανιν ἓνα καὶ ταμίαν καὶ τὸν γραμματέα τοῦ
θεοῦ καὶ τὸν προφήτην· ἐὰν δέ τις τῶν προγεγραμμένων ἀρρωσ-
στῆ ἢ ἐγδημῆ, ἕτερον πεμψάτω· καταγραψάτωσαν δὲ οἱ στρα-
τηγοὶ καὶ οἱ νομοφύλακες καὶ ῥαβδούχους ἐκ τῶν πολιτῶν ἄν-
25 δρας τρεῖς <μῆ> νεωτέρους ἐτῶν τριάκοντα οἳ καὶ ἐχέτωσαν ἐξου-
σίαν κωλύειν τὸν ἀκοσμοῦντα, διδόνθω δὲ τῷ ῥαβδούχωι ἐκ τῶν
λογευθησομένων χρημάτων ὀψώνιον ἡμερῶν δύο τῆς ἡμέρας
ἐκάστης δραχμῆ α'. ἐὰν δέ τις <τῶν> καταγραφέντων εἰδῶς μὴ

30 παραγένηται, ἀποτεισάτω τῇ πόλει δραχμὰς γ', παραγραφάν-
των αὐτὸν τῶν στρατηγῶν καὶ νομοφυλάκων· ὅταν δὲ παρα-
γένωνται οἱ προειρημένοι ἐπὶ τὸ μαντεῖον καὶ τὴν θυσίαν ἐπι-
τελέσωσι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ καλλιερήσωσιν, ὁ γραμματεὺς
τοῦ θεοῦ ἀποδεξάσθω ἑξαυτῆς τὰς ἀπογραφὰς τῶν βουλομένων
χρηστηριασθῆναι καὶ πάντα<ς> ἀναγράψας τὰ ὀνόματα εἰς λεύκωμα,
35 παραχρῆμα προθέτω τὸ λεύκωμα πρὸ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ εἰσαγέτω κατὰ
τὸ ἐξῆς ἐκάστης ἀναγραφῆς ἀνακαλούμενος, εἰ μὴ τιςιν συγ-
κεχώρηται πρότοις εἰσιέναι· ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ἀνακληθεὶς μὴ παρῆ, τὸν
ἐχόμενον εἰσαγέτω, ἕως ἂν παραγένηται ὁ ἀνακληθεὶς· καθήσθω-
σαν δὲ οἱ προγεγ<ρ>αμμένοι ἐν τῷ ἱερῶι κοσμίως ἐν ἐσθῆσιν λαμ-
40 πραῖς, ἐστεφανωμένοι στεφάνοις δαφνίοις, ἀγνεύοντες
καὶ νήφοντες καὶ ἀποδεχόμενοι τὰ πινάκια παρὰ τῶν μαν-
τευομένων· ὅταν δὲ συντελεσθῇ τὸ μαντεῖον, ἐμβάλόν-
τες εἰς ἄγγειον κατασφραγισάσθωσαν τῇ τε τῶν στρα-
τηγῶν καὶ νομοφυλάκων σφραγίδι, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τῇ
45 τοῦ ἱερέως καὶ ἐάτωσαν μένειν ἐν τῷ ἱερῶι· ἅμα δὲ τῇ ἡ-
μέρῃ ὁ γραμματεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ προσενέγκας τὸ ἄγγειον καὶ ἐ-
πιδείξας τοῖς προειρημένοις τὰς σφραγίδας ἀνοιξάτω καὶ ἐ-
κ τῆς ἀναγραφῆς ἀνακαλῶν ἐκάστοις ἀποδιδότω τὰ πινά-
[κια — — — — — 25 — — — — — — — τοῦ]ς χρησμοὺς [— —]
50 [— —]
[— — — — — — —]σε[— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — οἱ ῥαβδοῦ]-
χοι προνοεῖσθωσαν τῆς εὐκοσμίας· ὅταν δὲ ἦ ἐν[ν]ομ[ος ἐκκλη]-

σία ἐν τῷ Ἀφροδισιῶνι μηνί, πάντων πρῶτον οἱ ἐξετασται ὀρκιζ[έτω-]
 σαν ἐναντίον τοῦ δήμου τοὺς προειρημένους ἄνδρας τὸ[ν ὑπο-]
 γεγραμμένον ὄρκον· "ὄμνύω Δία Ἀκράϊον καὶ τὸν Απόλλω[να]
 55 τὸν Κοροπαῖον καὶ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν τὴν Ἴωλκίαν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλ[λου]ς θε-
 οὺς πάντας καὶ πάσας, ἐπιτετελεκένοι ἕκαστα καθά[περ] ἐν
 τῷ ψηφίσματι διασαφεῖται τῷ κεκυρωμένῳ περὶ τοῦ [μα]ντεί-
 ου ἐφ' ἱερέως Κρίνωνος τοῦ Παρμενίωνος·" καὶ ἐὰν ὁμόσ[ω]σιν, ἔστω-
 σαν ἀθῶιοι· ἐὰν δέ τις μὴ ὁμόσηι, ὑπόδικος ἔσ[τ]ω τοῖς ἐξε-
 60 <τας>ταῖς καὶ ἄλλῳ τῷ βουλομένῳ τῶν πολιτῶν [π]ερὶ τούτου <τοῦ> ἀ-
 δικήματος· καὶ ἐὰν οἱ ἐξετασται δὲ μὴ ποιήσ[ωσ]ιν τι τῶν προγε-
 γραμμένων, ὑπεύθυνοι ἔστωσαν τοῖς μετ[ὰ τ]αῦτα ἐξετασ-
 ταῖς καὶ ἄλλῳ τῷ βουλομένῳ· ἵνα δὲ ἐπιτελῆται διὰ παντὸς
 τὰ δεδογμένα, διαπαραδιδόναι τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα τοὺς <δὲ> κα-
 65 τ' ἐνιαυτὸν αἰρουμένους στρατηγούς καὶ νομοφύλακας τοῖς
 μετὰ ταῦτα κατασταθησομένοις ἄρχ[ο]υσιν, ἀναγραφῆναι δὲ
 καὶ τοῦ ψηφίσματος τὸ ἀντίγραφον εἰς [κί]ονα λιθίνην, γενομέ-
 νης τῆς ἐγδόσεως διὰ τῶν τειχοπ[οιῶ]ν, ἦν καὶ ἀνατεθῆναι
 ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ [Κ]οροπαίου.

Appendix B: Sanctuary of Amphariaus at Oropus, 387-371 BC.

I.Oropos 277; LSCG 69; Osborne and Rhodes 2003, no. 27:

θεοί.
τὸν ἱερέα τοῦ Ἀμφιαράου φοιτᾶν εἰς τὸ ἱερό-
ν, ἐπειδὴν χειμῶν παρέλθει μέχρι ἀρότου ὥρ-
ης, μὴ πλέον διαλείποντα ἢ τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ
5 μένειν ἐν τοῖ ἱεροῖ μὴ ἔλαττον ἢ δέκα ἡμέρα-
ς τοῦ μηνὸς ἐκ(ά)στο : καὶ ἐπαναγκάζειν τὸν ν-
εωκόρον τοῦ τε ἱεροῦ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι κατὰ τὸ-
ν νόμον καὶ τῶν ἀφικνεμένων εἰς τὸ ἱερόν· νν
ἂν δέ τις ἀδικεῖ ἐν τοῖ ἱεροῖ ἢ ξένος ἢ δημότ-
10 ης, ζημιούτω ὁ ἱερεὺς μέχρι πέντε δραχμῶν
κυρίως καὶ ἐνέχυρα λαμβανέτω τοῦ ἐζημιωμ-
ένου, ἂν δ' ἐκτίνει τὸ ἀργύριον, παρεόντος το
ἱερέος ἐμβαλέτω εἰς τὸν θησαυρόν : δικάζει-
ν δὲ τὸν ἱερέα, ἂν τις ἰδίει ἀδικηθεῖ ἢ τῶν ξέ-
15 νων ἢ τῶν δημοτέων ἐν τοῖ ἱεροῖ μέχρι τριῶν
δραχμῶν, τὰ δὲ μέζονα, ἦχοι ἐκάστοις αἱ δίκ-
αι ἐν τοῖς νόμοις εἰρηῆται ἐντῶθα γινέσθων·
προσκαλεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ αὐθημερὸν περὶ τῶν ἐ-
ν τοῖ ἱεροῖ ἀδικιῶν, ἂν δὲ ὁ ἀντίδικος μὴ συνχ-
20 ωρεῖ εἰς τὴν ὑστέρην ἢ δίκη τελείσθω : ἐπαρ-

χὴν δὲ διδοῦν τὸν μέλλοντα θεραπεύεσθαι ὑ-
πὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μὴ ἔλ(α)ττον ἐννέ' ὀβολοὺς δοκίμου ἀργ-
υρίου καὶ ἐμβάλλειν εἰς τὸν θησαυρὸν παρε-
όντος τοῦ νεωκόρου [...19...]

- 25 [... 9 ...] κατεύχεσθαι δὲ τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ ἐπι-
τὸν βωμὸν ἐπιτιθεῖν, ὅταν παρεῖ, τὸν ἱερέα,
ὅταν δὲ μὴ παρεῖ, τὸν θύοντα καὶ τεῖ θυσίει ἀ-
ὕτὸν ἑαυτοῖ κατεύχεσθαι ἕκαστον, τῶν δὲ δη-
μορίων τὸν ἱερέα· ν τῶν δὲ θυομένων ἐν τοῖ ἱε-
30 ροῖ πάντων τὸ δέρμα ἱερ[ὸν εἶναι], θύειν δὲ ἐξ-
εἶν ἅπαν ὃ τι ἂν βόληται ἕκαστος, τῶν δὲ κρεῶ-
ν μὴ εἶναι ἐκφορὴν ἔξω τοῦ τεμένεος· ν τοῖ δὲ
ἱερεῖ διδοῦν τὸς θύοντας ἀπο τοῦ ἱερέου ἐκ-
ἄστο τὸν ὄμιον πλην ὅταν ἡ ἑορτὴ εἶ, τότε δὲ ἀπ-
35 ὸ τῶν δημορίων λαμβανέτω ὄμιον ἀφ' ἑκάστου
ν τοῦ ἱερέου· ν ἐγκαθεύδειν δὲ τὸν δειόμενο-
μ[έ]χρι [... 23]ς ἐπὶ το-
ῦ αὐ[το]ῦ [... 23] πειθόμε-
νον τοῖς νόμοις· ν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἐγκαθεύδον-
40 τος, ὅταν ἐμβάλλει τὸ ἀργύριον, γράφεσθαι τ-
ὸν νεωκόρον καὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς πόλεος καὶ ἐκ-
τιθεῖν ἐν τοῖ ἱεροῖ γράφοντα ἐν πετεῦροι σ-
κοπεῖν (τ)οῖ βολομένοι· ἐν δὲ τοῖ κοιμητηρίο-
ι καθεύδειν χωρὶς μὲν τὸς ἄνδρας, χωρὶς ννν

45 δὲ τὰς γυναῖκας, τοὺς μὲν ἄνδρας ἐν τοῖ πρὸ ἡ-
[δ]ς τοῦ β[ω]μοῦ, τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας ἐν τοῖ πρὸ ἡσπέ-
ρης ο[..... 12 τὸ κοι]μητήριον τοὺς ἐν-
κα<θ>[εὐδοντας ... 15 ... τὸν δ]ὲ θεὸν
ἐγκ[..... 32]

Appendix C: Sale of the Priesthood of Artemis Pergaia at Halicarnassus, third century BC

*Syll*³ 1015; *LSAM* 73:

[ἐπι ν]εωποίου Χαρμύλου τοῦ Διαγόρου μηνὸς Ἡρακλείου
πρυτανείας τῆς μετὰ Μενεκλεῦς τοῦ Φορμίωνος
[γρ]αμματεύοντος Διοδότου τοῦ Φιλονίκου ἔδοξεν
[τῆ βουλ]ῆ καὶ τῶι δήμῳ, γνώμη πρυτάνεων· [ὁ] πριάμε-
5 [νο]ς [τῆ]ν ἱερητείαν τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Περγαίας πα-
[ρέ]ξεται ἱέρειαν ἀσπὴν ἐξ ἀστῶν ἀμφοτέρων ἐπὶ
[τρε]ῖς γενεὰς γεγενημένην κ[αί] πρὸς πατρὸς καὶ πρὸς
[μη]τρὸς, ἢ δὲ πριαμένη ἱεράσεται ἐπὶ ζωῆς τῆς αὐτῆς
καὶ θύσει τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ δημό[σ]ια καὶ τὰ ἰδιωτικὰ καὶ λήψε-
10 ται τῶν θυομένων δημοσίου ἀφ' ἐκάστου ἱερείου κω-
λῆν καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ κωλῆι νεμόμενα καὶ τεταρτημορί-
δα σπλάγχνων καὶ τὰ δέρματα, τῶν δὲ ἰδιωτι-
κῶν λήψεται κωλῆν καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ κωλῆι νεμόμενα
καὶ τεταρτημορίδα σπλάγχνων· τοῖς δὲ ταμ-
15 ίας διδόναι τοῖς πρυτάνεσιν εἰς τὴν θυσίαν
τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἐντελε(ῖ)ς δραχμὰς τριάκον-
τα, παρασκευάζειν δὲ τὴν θυσίαν τὰς γυναῖκας
τὰς τῶν πρυτάνεων λαβούσας τὸ ἐκ τῆς πό[λ]εως
διδόμενον τῶν πρυτανευόντων τὸμ μῆνα τὸν
20 Ἡράκλειον, τὴν δὲ θυσίαν συντελείτω μηνὸς Ἡρα-
κλείου δωδεκάτη. ἔστω δὲ ἡ ἱέρεια ἰσόμοιρος ἐ[ν]

- ταῖς γυναίξιν τῶν πρυτάνεων τῶν θυομένων
δημοσίαι· ποιείσθω δὲ ἡ ἱέρεια καθ' ἑκάστην νο-
μηγίαν ἐπικουρίαν ὑπὲρ πόλεως λαμβάνουσα
- 25 δρακμὴν παρὰ τῆς πόλεως· ἐν ᾧ [δ]ὲ μηνὶ ἡ θυσία
[σ]υντελεῖται ἡ δημοτελὴς ἀγειρέτω πρὸ τῆς θυ[σί]-
ας ἡμέρας τρεῖς ἐπ' οἰκίαν μὴ πορηυομένη, ὃ δὲ ἀ-
γερμὸς ἔστω τῆς ἱερείας· κατ[α]σκευᾶται δὲ ἡ ἱέ-
ρεια [κ]αὶ τὸ ἱερόν, οὔ ἂν βούληται, κατασκευασάτω
- 30 δὲ καὶ θησαυρὸν τῆι θεῶι, ἐνβαλλέτωσαν δὲ οἱ
θύοντες ἐπὶ μὲν τῶι τελείῳ ὀβολοὺς δύο, ἐπὶ
δὲ γαλαθεινῶι ὀβολόν, ἀνοιγόντων δὲ οἱ ἐξε-
τασταὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτ[ὸ]ν τὸν θησαυρὸν καὶ δι[δ]ό[ν]-
των τῆι ἱερείαι εἷς τε τὴν ἐπικουρίαν {κ[α]ὶ εἰς
35 [ἰ]ματισμὸν} καὶ εἰς ἰματισμὸν καὶ εἰς [...]

Appendix D: Renewal of the Thargelia at Athens, 129/8 BC.

SEG 21.469C; LSS 14

έδοξεν τεῖ βουλευῖ καὶ τῶι δήμωι·

Ξε[ν]ο[...] Σωπατρίδου Σουνιεὺς εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ πάτριόν

[έ]στ[ιν καὶ ἔ]θος τῶι δήμωι τῶι Ἀθηναίων καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν προγόνων

π[α]ραδε[δ]ομένον περὶ πλείστου ποεῖσθαι τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς

5 [εὐσέβειαν] καὶ διὰ ταῦτα πολλὰ<ι>ς <πεζαῖς> καὶ ἐπὶ ναυσὶ στρατεῖ<αι>ς τὴν

κλε[ιν]οτάτων ἔργων καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν εὐδοξία[ν]

καὶ [εὐλογίαν κέκτ]ηνται ἀρχόμενοι διὰ παντὸς ἀπὸ <τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ> Σωτήρος

[τῆς π]ρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ὁσιότητος, ὑπάρχει δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἀπόλλων ὁ Πύθιος

ὦν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις Πατρῶιος καὶ ἐξηγητὴς τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ὁμοίως δὲ

10 καὶ κοινῆι σωτῆρ πάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὁ τῆς Λητοῦς καὶ τοῦ Διὸς

[υῖός, τούτ]ο[υ] δὲ διὰ τῶν χρησμῶν προσ[τ]ε[ταχ]ότος αὐτοῖς λ[ι]ταν[εῦσ]α[ι τὸν]

θεὸν τὸν ἐπικαλούμενο{υ}ν {ἐπικαλούμενον} Πατρῶιον καὶ ποιουμένους τὰς

[πατρί]ου[ς θυσί]ας ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων τοῖς τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ

[καιροῖς τῶι Ἀπ]ό[λ]λωνι [θ]ύοντας ὡς πάτριόν ἐστι τῶι δήμωι : δι' ὧν

15 πρ[όσοδ]ον ποιησάμενος πρὸς τὴν βουλήν Τιμαρχος Σφήττιος ταμίας

βουλῆ[ς τούς τε] χρ[ησμ]οὺς κατὰ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἀνεπέσαστο τ[ίμ]ια

πρ[ῶ]τον διὰ νόμων τεταγμέν[α] τῶι θεῶι· ὅπως οὖν ἢ τε βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος

φαίνωνται οὐ μόνον διοτηροῦντες τὰ πάτρια, ἀλλὰ καὶ προσεπ[αύ]ξον<τες>

τάς τε θυσίας καὶ τὰς τιμὰς καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς, ἵνα καὶ παρὰ τῶν θεῶ[ν]

20 κτήσωνται τὰς καταξίας χάριτας, ἀγαθεῖ τύχει δεδόχθαι τεῖ βουλευ[ῖ]

τοὺς λαχόντας προέδρους εἰς τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἐκκλησίαν χρηματίσαι περὶ

τούτ[ων], γνώμην δὲ ξυμβάλλεσθαι τῆς βουλῆς εἰς τὸν δῆμον ὅτι δοκεῖ

τεῖ βουλευ[ῖ] τὰ [μὲ]ν [ἄλλα π]ρ[ά]τ[τε]ιν τῶι Απόλλωνι κατὰ τοῦ<ς> ἀπὸ τ. του

χρησμού<ς>, θῦσαί τ' ἐπὶ τοῖς προεψηφισμένοις ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τόν [τ]ε βασιλέα

25 τόν τε ἄρχοντα καὶ τὸν [κα]θ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ἐσόμενον καὶ τοὺς <στρ>ατηγούς,
{καὶ τοὺς στρατηγούς}, ἐ[πιτελ]έσαι τὰς τε θυσίας καὶ τὰς πομπὰς τὰς ἐν τῇ Θαργη-
λίῳ ἐορ[τῆ]ι ἐν Κήποις καθ' ἕ[τος] ἀγομένου<ς> ἱε[ρεῖ]α ὅτι κάλ[λ]ι[σ]τ[α] καὶ ἐπὶ
τὸ ἐξ[ῆ]ς πέμ-

π<ε>ιν ΛΥ... ΚΡΑΤΟΝΔΕΟ ... ΝΕΙΝΤΕΚΑΙΗΕΠΙΤΩΝ — — — — —

Ἑλλήνω[ν] ΟΛΙΝΥΕΙΠΑΝΤΑΣΤΟΙΣ — — — — —

30 ΤΑΜΕΙ αν ταῦτα σύμπαντα ὁ μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ [τ]α[μει]-
ου γενόμε[ν]ος ΤΗ . . . ΟΙΗ . ΙΤΟΥ — — — — —
— — — — — ΘΕΝΤΑΣΕΗ — — —

ΕΧ τοντα θυσάν[τω]ν τε οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ αἱ ἱέρειαι <κ>αὶ
δ[όν]των ΟΙ-

ΚΗ . ΑΤΙ ΑΓΑΙΣ τ[ι]θέτωσαν ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν καὶ εὐχέ[σθ]ωσαν· Θαργη-

λίῳις τε εἶπαντες τὰς εὐχὰς πομπευέτωσαν ὁ μ[ε]ν ἱερεὺς τοῦ Απόλλωνος

35 τοῦ Πυθίου[ν κα]ὶ οἱ ἐξηγηταὶ καὶ οἱ ἄλ[λ]ο[ι] ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ ἐ[ν]νέα ἄρχοντες καὶ ὁ
ἱερο[φάν]-

της καὶ ὁ [δαιδ]ο[ῦ]χος καὶ οἱ μετὰ τούτων ἤκοντες καὶ οἱ ἀγνοθέται [τοῦ]

[ἀγ]ῶν[ος τοῦ πρ]ὸς τοῦ Πυθίου τε<λουμέν>ου καὶ οἱ ἄν χο[ρ]η[γ]οὶ [ῶ]σιν καὶ οἱ
ἱεροποιο[ὶ καὶ]

... vvs. sex non legendi ...

45 τη. βου — — — — — ατων ἐπὶ
τῶν ε [— — — — — αὶ δὲ παρθένοι φερέτω]σ[α]ν τὸ ἱερὸν κα-
νοῦν [τῶι θεῶι — — — — —] ὄ[τ]αν κατὰ τὰ πάτρια ἀφέσι-
μοι ἡμ[έραι — — — — —] καὶ τὸν κοσμη-

- τὴν καὶ π[— — — — — τῶι] Ἀπόλλωνι τῶι Ἀλεξικάκωι·
- 50 ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ [ἀνίσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων τοὺς οἰκέτας] καὶ τοὺς δημοσίους πάν-
 τας {καὶ} λειτουργείας ἀπ[ὸ πάσης· ν] θυέ[τωσαν ὁ βασιλ]εὺς καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ ὁ
 κῆρυξ
 τῆς ἐξ Ἀρείου Πάγου βουλῆς καὶ οἱ θεσμοθέται] κατὰ τάδε· ὁ μὲν ἱερεὺς
 τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Πυθίου ἐπιμελέσθω [τῆς καθηκ]ούσης θυσίας ἐν [Κήπ]οις
 ἐπὶ τοῦ Πυθίου τ<έλ>ειαν σὺν <παραστήσας> καὶ τῶι τε Ἀ[πόλλωνι τῶι Ἀ]λεξικάκωι,
 καὶ τῶι Πατρώωι
- 55 βοῦν, καὶ τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι τῶι Πυθίωι <βοῦν, λαμ>[βάνων τὰς] αὐτὰς μερίδας καθὰ καὶ
 πρότερον·
 καὶ ὁ ταμίης δὲ τῶν στρατιωτικῶν ἀπὸ τῶν τοῦ ἔτ[ου]ς προσόδων θυέτω βοῦν
 ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων [καὶ παί]δων καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ
 Ῥωμαίων καὶ διδότη τὸ θῦμα τοῖς ἱεροπο[ιοῖς· θυέ]τω<σαν> δὲ καὶ οἱ ταμίαι τῶν
 σιτω-
 νικῶν καὶ ὁ ταμίης τῆς βουλῆς, θυέτω[σαν δὲ κ]αὶ οἱ πρυτάνεις οἱ ἂν τυγχάνωσιν
 60 πρυτανεύοντες τὸ ἑξαμηνιαῖον [πάν]τες, [ἀ]ποδότη δὲ ὁ ταμίης τῶν στρατιωτικῶν
 εἷς τε τὴν θυσίαν καὶ τὴν πομπήν· ὁμοίως [δ]ὲ καὶ οἱ θεσμοθέται π[άν]τες καὶ οἱ ἂν
 μέλ-
 <λ>[ωσιν θ]ε[σμ]οθέτα[ι] εἶ[ναι πάντες] καὶ οἱ — — — — —

Appendix E: Eisteria at Magnesia-on-the-Maeander

I.Magn. 100A and B; *LSAM* 33

A: Early Second Century BC

στεφανηφοροῦντος Πολυκλείδου τοῦ
Πυθοδήλου μηνὸς Ἀγνεῶνος
ὑπὲρ τῆς καθιδρύσεως τοῦ ξοάνου τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος
τῆς Λευκοφρυηνῆς εἰς τὸν κατεσκευασμένον αὐ-
5 τῆι νῦν Παρθενῶνα καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἐπιτελεῖσθαι αὐτῆι
καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν μηνὶ Ἀρτεμισιῶνι τῆι
ἕκτηι ἰσταμένου σπονδὰς καὶ θυσίας, συντε-
λειῖσθαι δὲ καὶ ὑφ' ἑκάστου τῶν κατοικούντων
θυσίας πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν κατ' οἴκου δύναμιν ἐπὶ
10 τῶν κατασκευασθησομένων ὑπ' αὐτῶν βωμῶν.
ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ· Διαγόρας Ἰσαγόρου εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ
θείας ἐπιπνοίας καὶ παραστάσεως γενομένης τῶι σύνπαντι πλήθει
τοῦ πολιτεύματος εἰς τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν τοῦ ναοῦ συντέλειαν εἴλη-
φεν ὁ [Π]αρθενῶν τῆι [κ]ατὰ μέρος ἐπαυξήσει τῶν ἔργων καὶ μεγαλοπρε-
15 πείαι πλεῖστον διαφέρων τοῦ ἀπολειφθέντος ἡμῖν τὸ παλαιὸν ὑπὸ τῶν
προγόνων, πάτριον δ' ἐστὶν τῶι δήμῳ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβῶς διακει-
μένῳ πᾶσιν μὲν τοῖς θεοῖς ἀεὶ ποτε τὰς καταξίας θυσίας τε καὶ τιμὰς
ἀπονέμειν, μάλιστα δὲ τῆι ἀρχηγέτιδι τῆς πόλεως Ἀρτέμιδι Λευκο-
φρυηνῆι, τύχηι ἀγαθῆι καὶ ἐπὶ σωτηρίαι τοῦ τε δήμου καὶ τῶν εὐνοοῦν-
20 τῶν τῶι πλήθει τῶι Μαγνήτων σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις τοῖς τούτων,

δεδόχθαι τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ· τὸν μὲν νεωκόρον καὶ τὴν ἰέρειαν τῆς
 Ἀρτέμιδος τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ Ἀρτεμισιῶνος τῆι ἕκτῃ ἰσταμένου συντε-
 λέσαι τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν τῆς θεοῦ εἰς τὸν Παρθενῶνα μετὰ θυσίας
 τῆς ἐπιφανεστάτης, τὴν δὲ ἡμέραν τήνδε ἀναδεδειχθαι εἰς τὸν ἀε[ι]
 25 χρόνον ἱερὰν προσαγορευομένην Ἰσιτήρια, καὶ ἔστωσαν ἐν αὐτῇ ἐκε-
 χειρίαι πᾶσι πρὸς πάντων, γινέσθω δὲ καὶ γυναικῶν ἔξοδος εἰς τὸ
 ἱερόν καὶ παρεδρευέτωσαν ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τὴν ἐπιβάλλουσαν τιμὴν καὶ
 παρεδρείαν ποιούμεναι τῆς θεοῦ· συντελείτω δὲ ὁ νεωκόρος καὶ χο-
 ροὺς παρθένων αἰδουσῶν ὕμνους εἰς Ἄρτεμιν Λευκοφρυηνήν, ἀνιέ[σ]-
 30 θωσαν δὲ οἱ παῖδες ἐκ τῶν μαθημάτων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων δοῦλοί τε
 καὶ δοῦλαι, ἐν ἧι ταῦτα ἡμέραι συντελεσθήσεται· τὰς δὲ γινομένας
 ἱερείας τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος μετὰ στεφανηφόρον Πολυκλείδην καὶ τοὺς
 στεφανηφόρους ἐν τῶι καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἐνιαυτῶι θυσίαν καὶ πομπὴν συν-
 τελεῖν· ὑπάρχειν δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ ταύτῃ τῆι ἡμέρῃ καὶ τὴν περὶ τῶν
 35 ὠνίων οἰκονομίαν μετὰ στεφανηφόρον Πολυκλείδην ἥτις γίνε-
 ται καὶ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρῃ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ· τὸν δὲ ἱεροκῆρυκα [τὸν]
 νῦν καὶ τὸν κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἀεὶ τοῦδε τοῦ μηνὸς ἐν τῇ ἀποδεδειγ[μέ]-
 νῃ ἱερᾷ ἡμέρῃ πληθούσης ἀγορᾶς συνπαρόντων ἐν ἐσθῆ[σιν]
 ἐπισήμοις καὶ δάφνης στεφάνοις πολεμάρχων, οἰκονόμω[ν, γραμ]-
 40 ματέως βουλῆς, στρατηγοῦ, ἱππάρχων, στεφανηφόρου, ἀν[τιγρα]-
 φέως εὐφημίαν καταναγείλαντα πρὸ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου μετὰ [τῶν παί]-
 δων κατευχὴν καὶ παράκλησιν παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους ποιεῖσ[θαι τήν]-
 δε· παρακαλῶ πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας πόλιν καὶ χώρ[αν τὴν Μα]-
 γνήτων ἐπὶ καλοῖς Ἰσιτηρίοις κατὰ δύναμιν οἴκου κεχ[αρισμένην θυ]-

45 σίαν συντελεῖν Ἀρτέμιδι Λευκοφρυηνῆι τῆιδε τῆ ἡμέ[ραι— — —]
καὶ Μάγνησιν αὐτοῖς τε διδόναι καὶ γυναῖξιν ὕγ[ι]ει[— — Ἄρ]-
τεμιν Λευκοφρυηνὴν καὶ γενεὰν τὴν τε ὑπά[ρχουσαν σὴ]ζεσθαι
καὶ εὐτυχεῖν καὶ τὴν ἐπιγονὴν μακαρίαν — — — — — — — —
[. . .]ον δε . χεθ 13 ειο[— — — — — — — — — —

B: Early First Century BC

5 [. . 5 . .] π . ὅτος τὴν θε[ἄν? — καθι]-
δρῦεσθαι προστάξαν[τος ὅπως]ντ . . οἱ πάντ[ες οἱ κατοι]-
κοῦντες τὴν τε πόλιν καὶ [τὴν χώραν κα]τὰ δύναμιν τὴν ἰδίαν [τὰς πρε]-
πούσας ἀπονέμωσιν τῆι θεῶι τιμὰς κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν τῆι ἕκτῃ ἰ[σταμέ]-
νου τοῦ Ἀρτεμισιῶνος μηνὸς ἐν τοῖς προσαγορευομένοις [Εἰσιτηρί]-
10 οἰς καταξίως τῶν ὑπ' αὐτῆς γεγενημένων τε καὶ γινο[μένων δια]
παντὸς εἰς τὸ πλῆθος ἡμῶν εὐεργεσιῶν, οἰομένου σ<υ>ν[οίσειν ἀνί]-
εσθαι μὲν τοὺς παῖδας ἐκ τῶν μαθημάτων κατὰ τὸ πά[τριον ἔθος]
[κ]αὶ τὴν οἰκετεῖαν ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου, συνεχωρηκός τε δὲ [οἰκονομί]-
αν τῶν διαπωλουμένων ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῆι ἡμέραι χάριν τοῦ [ἐπι? μᾶλ]-
15 [λ]ον ἔκδηλον ὑπάρχειν τὴν τοῦ δήμου σπουδὴν, τὰ τε ἄ[λλα κατα]-
χωρίσαντος ἐν τῷ ψηφίσματι τὰ διατείνοντα πρὸ[ς] τὴν τ[ῆς θεοῦ λατ]-
[ρ]είαν, ἐπιτάξαντος δὲ καὶ σπονδὰς καὶ κατευχὰς ὑπὸ τῆς συν[αρχίας, ἔτι]
δὲ καὶ θυσίας συντελεῖσθαι, καθῆκόν ἐστιν τῷ δήμῳ [πλεῖον καὶ ἐκτε]-
νέστερον περὶ τῶν προγεγραμμένων φροντίσαι καὶ ἀ[ναγράψαι]
20 μὲν τὸ κεκυρωμένον ἐπὶ στεφανηφόρου Πολυκλείδου [μηνὸς Ἀ]-

γνεῶνος ψήφισμα, περιέχον δὲ τὰς προγεγραμμένας τι[μὰς]
 εἰς τὴν παραστάδα τὴν ἀπὸ δυσμῆς τῆς στοᾶς τῆς βορεί[ας ἐφ' ἧς ἔ]-
 πεστιν τὸ βουκεφάλιον χειροτονηθέντος ἐπὶ τῆς ἀναγ[ραφῆς ἀν]-
 δρὸς ὃς ἐγδῶσει μετὰ τοῦ ἀρχιτέκτονος χορηγη[σάντ]ω[ν τὸ] γινό]-
 25 μενον δαπάνημα χάριν τῆς ἀναγραφῆς τῶν ἐπὶ τῶν [παν]τῶ[ν] ἐ(κ τ)ῶν προ[οσό]-
 δων τῶν ἐν τῷ ἐνεστῶτι ἐνιαυτῷ· ἵνα δὲ πάντες γινώσκωσιν ὡ[ς]
 καθήκόν ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς Εἰσιτηρίοις τὰς τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος συνεπαύξε[ιν]
 τιμὰς, τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς τὸν ἀεὶ κατασταθησόμενον
 καὶ τὸν ἀντιγραφέα καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ Ἀρτεμισιῶ-
 30 νος τῆι δευτέραι μετὰ τὸ τὴν αἴρεσιν γενέσθαι τῆς τε ἱερείας
 καὶ τοῦ στεφανηφόρου παραναγινώσκειν ἐπάναγ[κ]ες τὸ [ψ]ήφισ-
 μα τὸ εἰσενεχθὲν ὑπὸ Διαγόρου τοῦ Ἰσαγόρου τὸ περὶ τῆ[ς τῶν Εἰ]-
 σιτηρίων διοικήσεως· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ποιήσωνται τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν [αὐ]-
 τοῦ καθότι προστέτακται, ὀφείλειν αὐτῶν ἐκάτερον ἱεράς
 35 δραχ[μὰς] Τ' καὶ εἶναι φάσιν τῷ βου[λ]ομένω τῶν πολιτῶν, οἷς [ἔ]-
 ξεστιν, ἐπὶ τῷ ἡμίσει πρὸς τοὺς εὐθύνοους, θέσθω δὲ ὁ αἶρε[θ]ησ[ό]-
 μενος ἀνὴρ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀναγραφῆς περὶ ὧν ἂν χειρίση λόγον πρὸς τε
 τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τὸν ἀντιγραφέα, ἄμεινον δὲ εἶ-
 ναι καὶ τοῖς κεκτημένοις οἰκίας ἢ ἐργαστήρια κατασκευάσασιν [κα]-
 40 τὰ δύναμιν βωμοὺς πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν καὶ κονιάσασιν, ποιήσασιν δὲ [ἐ]-
 πιγραφὴν Ἀρτέμιδος Λευκοφρυηνῆς Νικηφόρου· ἐὰν δὲ τις μὴ ἐπι[τε]-
 λέση, μὴ ἄμεινον αὐτῷ εἶναι· ἀναγραφῆναι δὲ εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν παρασ[τά]-
 δα καὶ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα. ἡ<ι>ρέθη ἐπὶ τῆς ἀναγραφῆς
 τῶν ψηφισμάτων Μαιάνδριος Ἀρτεμιδώρου.

Bibliography

- Alcock, S. E. (1993) *Graecia Capta: The Landscapes of Roman Greece*. Cambridge.
- . (1994) "Minding the Gap in Hellenistic and Roman Greece" in *Placing the Gods: Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece*. Oxford. 247-261.
- . (2002) *Archaeologies of the Past: Landscape, Monuments, and Memories*. Cambridge.
- Aleshire, S. B. (1992) "The Economics of Dedication at the Athenian Asclepieion" in *Economics of Cult in the Ancient Greek World*. Uppsala. 85-99.
- Alroth, B. (1988) "The Positioning of Greek Votive Figurines" in *Early Greek Cult Practice*. Stockholm. 195-203.
- . (1989) *Greek Gods and Figurines: Aspects of Anthropomorphic Dedications*. Uppsala.
- Amandry, P. (1950) *La mantique Apollinienne à Delphes: Essai sur le fonctionnement de l'Oracle*. Paris.
- Antonaccio, C. M. (1992) "Terraces, Tombs, and the Early Argive Heraion" *Hesperia* 61: 85-105.
- . (1994) "Placing the Past: the Bronze Age in the Cultic Topography of Early Greece" in *Placing the Gods*. 79-104.
- Barut, D. (1969) *Plutarque et le Stoïcisme*. Paris.
- Bendlin, A. (2007) "Purity and Pollution" *A Companion to Greek Religion*. Malden, MA. 178-189.
- Billows, R. (1995) *Kings and Colonists: Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism*. New York.
- . (2005) "Cities" *Blackwell Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Malden, MA. 196-215.
- Bingöl, O. (2007) *Magnesia on the Maeander: An Archaeological Guide*. Istanbul.
- Blamire, A. (2001) "Athenian Finance: 454 to 404 B.C." *Hesperia* 70: 99-126.
- Boulogne, J. (2003) *Plutarque dans le miroir d'épicure: analyse d'une critique systématique de l'épicurisme*. Villeneuve-d'Ascq.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990) *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford.
- Bremmer, J. (1983) "Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece" *HSCP* 87: 299-320

- . (1998) "'Religion', Ritual, and the Opposition of 'Sacred' vs. 'Profane'" in *Ansichten griechischer Rituale*. Stuttgart and Leipzig. 9-33.
- . (2007) "Greek Normative Animal Sacrifice" *A Companion to Greek Religion*. Malden, MA. 132-144.
- Brenk, F. E. (1973) "A Strange Doctrine: *Daimon* in Plutarch" *CJ* 69.1: 1-11.
- Bringmann, K. (1995) "Die Ehre des Königs und der Ruhm der Stadt. Bemerkungen zu königlichen Bau- und Feststiftungen" in *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus. Kolloquium München 24-26*. Munich 93-102.
- Burford, A. (1969) *The Greek Temple Builders at Epidaurus*. Liverpool.
- Burkert, W. (1985) *Greek Religion*. Cambridge, MA.
- . (1988) "The Meaning and Function of the Temple in Classical Greece" in *Temple in Society*. Winona Lake, IN. 27-48.
- Burton, J. B. (1995) *Theocritus's Urban Mimes*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Camp, J. K. (1998) *The Athenian Agora: Excavations in the Heart of Classical Athens* (updated version). London.
- Carawan, E. (2010) "The Case against Nikomachos" *TAPA* 140: 71-95.
- Carey, C. (1994) "Rhetorical Means of Persuasion" *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. London and New York. 26-45.
- Carlsson, S. (2010) *Hellenistic Democracies: Freedom, Independence, and Political Procedure in Some East Greek City-States*. Stuttgart.
- Cartledge, P. (2002) *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Casson, L. (1974) *Travel in the Ancient World*. London.
- Champion, C. B. (2004) *Cultural Politics in Polybius' Histories*. Berkeley.
- Chaniotis, A. (1995) "Sich selbst feiern? Städtische Feste des Hellenismus im Spannungsfeld von Religion und Politik" in *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus*. Munich. 147-172.
- . (2004a) "Mobility of Persons during the Hellenistic Wars: State Control and Personal Relations" in *La mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée, de l'antiquité à l'époque moderne. II La mobilité négociée. Procédures de contrôle et documents d'identification*. Rome. 481-500.

- (2004b) “Under the Watchful Eyes of the Gods: Divine Justice in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor” in *The Greco-Roman East: Politics, Culture, Society*. *YClS* 31: 1-43.
 - (2005) *War in the Hellenistic Period*. Malden, MA.
 - (2006) “Rituals between Norms and Emotions” in *Ritual and Communication in the Graeco-Roman World*. *Kernos Suppl.* 16. Liège. 211-238.
 - (2008) “Priests as Ritual Experts” in *Practitioners of the Divine*. Cambridge, MA. 17-34.
 - (2009) “The Dynamics of Ritual Norms in Greek Cult” in *La norme en matière religieuse*. *Kernos Suppl.* 21: 91-105.
 - (2010) “Megatheism: The Search for the Almighty God and the Competition for Cults” in *One God: Pagan Monotheism in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge. 112-140.
 - (2011) “The Impact of War on the Economy of the Hellenistic Polis: Demand Creation, Short-Term Influences, Long-Term Impacts” in *The Economies of Hellenistic Societies, Third to First Centuries BC*. Oxford. 122-141.
- Chankowski, V. (2011) “Divine Financiers: Cults as Consumers and Generators of Value” in *The Economies of Hellenistic Societies, Third to First Centuries BC*. Oxford. 142-165.
- Chiron, P. (2002) *Pseudo-Aristotle: rhétoric à Alexandre*. Paris.
- Christensen, L. B. (2009) “‘Cult’ in the Study of Religion and Archaeology” in *Aspects of Ancient Greek Cult*. Aarhus. 13-28.
- Cohen, D. (1991) *Law, Society, and Sexuality: the Enforcement of Morals in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.
- Cohen, E. E. (2000) *The Athenian Nation*. Princeton.
- Cohen, G. M. (1978) *The Seleucid Colonies: Studies in Founding, Administration and Organization*. Wiesbaden.
- (1995) *Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*. Berkeley.
- Cole, S. G. (1988) “The uses of water in Greek sanctuaries” in *Early Greek Cult Practices*. 161-165.
- (1994) “Demeter in the Ancient Greek city and its Countryside” in *Placing the Gods: Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece*. Oxford. 199-216
 - (2004) *Landscapes, Genders, and Ritual Space: The Ancient Greek Experience*. Berkeley.

- . (2008) "Professionals, Volunteers, and Amateurs: Serving the Gods *Kata Ta Patria*" in *Practitioners of the Divine*. Cambridge, MA. 55-72.
- Collar (2009) "Network Theory and Religious Innovation" in *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean*. London and New York. 144-157.
- Connelly, J. (2007) *Portrait of a Priestess*. Princeton.
- Crouch, D. P. (1993) *Water Management in Ancient Greek Cities*. Oxford.
- Culley, G. R. (1975) "The Restoration of Sanctuaries in Attica: I.G. II² 1035" *Hesperia* 44.2: 207-223.
- D'Angour, A. (2011) *The Greeks and the New: Novelty in Ancient Greek Imagination and Experience*. Cambridge.
- Davies, J. K. (1984) "Cultural, Social, and Economic Features of the Hellenistic World" in *Cambridge Ancient History (2nd ed.): Volume VII: The Hellenistic World*. Cambridge. 257-320.
- Debord, P. (1982) *Aspects sociaux et économiques de la vie religieuse dans l'Anatolie gréco-romain*. Leiden.
- Demand, N. H. (1990) *Urban Relocation in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Norman and London.
- de Polignac, F. (1995) *Cults, Territories, and the Origins of the Greek City-State*. Chicago.
- Dignas, B. (2002a) *The Economy of the Sacred*. Oxford.
- . (2002b) "'Inventories or Offering Lists: Assessing the Wealth of Apollo Dydimeus" *ZPE* 138: 235-244.
- . (2002c) "Priestly Authorities in the Cult of the Corybantes at Erythrae" *EA* 34: 29-40.
- . (2005) "Rhodian Priests after Synoecism" *Ancient Society* 33: 35-51.
- . (2006) "Benefitting Benefactors: Greek Priests and Euergetism" *L'Antiquité Classique* 75: 71-84.
- . (2007) "A Day in the Life of a Greek Sanctuary" in *A Companion to Greek Religion*. Malden, MA. 163-178.
- Dillon, M. (1997a) "The Ecology of a Greek Sanctuary" *ZPE* 118: 112-127.
- . (1997b) *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece*. New York and London.
- . (2002) *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion*. London and New York.

- Dmitriev, S. (2005) *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. Oxford.
- Dodds, E. R. (1973) *The Ancient Concept of Progress*. Oxford.
- Donohue, A. A. (1988) *Xoana and the Origins of Greek Sculpture*. Atlanta.
- Dover, J. K. (1974) *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*. Berkeley.
- Dow, S. (1968) "Six Athenian Sacrificial Calendars" *BCH* 92.1: 170-186.
- Dunand, F. (1978) "Sens et Fonction de la fête dans la Grèce Hellénistique. Les ceremonies en honneur d'Artemis Leukophyène" *Dialogues d'Histoire Ancienne* 4: 201-215.
- Du Plessis, P. (2004) "The Protection of the Contractor in Public Works Contracts in the Roman Republic and Early Empire" *Journal of Legal History* 25.3: 287-314.
- Dusanic, S. (1996) "Plato and Plutarch's Fictional Techniques: The Death of Great Pan" *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 139: 276-294.
- Eidinow, E. (2007) *Oracles, Curses, and Risk among the Ancient Greeks*. Oxford.
- Eliade, M. (1957) *Sacred and Profane: The Nature of Religion*. New York.
- Ferguson, J. (1989) *Among the Gods: An Archaeological Exploration of Greek Religion*. London and New York.
- Ferrari, G. (2006) "Architectural Space as Metaphor in the Greek Sanctuary" in *The Artful Mind*. 225-240.
- Feuchtwang, S. (2010) "Ritual and memory" in *Memory: Histories, Theories, and Debates*. New York. 281-298.
- Feyel, C. (2006) *Les artisans dans les sanctuaires grecs aux époques classique et hellénistique: à travers la documentation financière en Grèce*. Athens.
- Finley, M. I. (1985). *The Ancient Economy*. Berkeley.
- Fisher, N. (1992) *Hybris: A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece*. Warminster.
- Flower, M. A. (2008) *The Seer in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley.
- Fontenrose, J. (1978) *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations with a Catalogue of Responses* Berkeley.
- . (1988) *Didyma: Apollo's Oracle, Cult, and Companions*. Berkeley.

- Foxhall, L. (1995) "Monumental Ambitions: The Significance of Posterity in Greece" in *Time, Tradition, and Society in Greek Archaeology: Bridging the 'Great Divide.'* 132-149.
- Fränkel, M. (1878) "Der attische Heliasteneid" *Hermes* 13: 452-466.
- Frazer, J. G. (1965) *Pausanias' Description of Greece*. 6 vols. New York.
- Furley, W. D. and Bremer, J. M. (2001) *Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period*. 2 Vols. Tübingen.
- Gagarin, M. (1986) *Early Greek Law*. Berkeley.
- . (2005) "The Unity of Greek Law" in *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law*. Cambridge. 29-40.
- . (2008) *Writing Greek Law*. Cambridge/New York.
- Garland, R. S. J. (1984) "Religious authority in Archaic and Classical Athens" *Hesperia* 79: 75-123.
- . (1990) "Priests and Power in Classical Athens" in *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*. Ithaca, NY. 73-91.
- . (1992) *Introducing New Gods: The Politics of Athenian Religion*. Ithaca, NY.
- Gauthier, P. (1972) *Symbola: Les étrangers et la justice dans les cites grecques*. Nancy.
- . (1985) *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*. BCH Suppl. 12. Paris.
- Gehrke, H. J. (2001) "Myth, History and Collective Identity. Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond" in *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*. Oxford. 286-313.
- Ginouvés, R. (1962) *Balaneutikè: recherches sur le bain dans l'antiquité grecque*. Paris.
- Glinster, F. (2000) "Sacred Rubbish" in *Religion in Archaic and Republican Rome and Italy: Evidence and Experience*. Edinburgh. 54-70.
- Gödde, S. (2011) *Euphêmia: die gute Rede in Kult und Literatur der griechischen Antike*. Heidelberg.
- Golden, M. (2011) "War and Peace in the Ancient and Modern Olympics" *G&R* 58.1: 1-13.
- Graf, F. (1996) "Pompai in Greece: Some Considerations about the Space and Ritual in the Greek Polis. in *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis*. Stockholm. 55-65.

- Graninger, D. (2011) *Cult and Koinon in Hellenistic Thessaly*. Leiden.
- Gregory, A. P. (1997) *Village Society in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. Dissertation, Columbia University. New York.
- Gregory, C. A. (1980) "Gifts to Men and Gifts to Gods" *Man* 15: 626-652.
- Grennan E. and Kitlinger R. (tr.) (2011) *The Complete Sophocles Volume I: The Theban Plays*. Edited by P. Burian and A. Shapiro. Oxford.
- Gruen, E. (1993) "The Polis in the Hellenistic World" in *Nomodeiktēs: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*. Ann Arbor. 339-354.
- Gutzwiller, K. (2007) *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature*. London and New York.
- Gygax, M. D. (2009) "Proleptic Honours in Greek Euergetism" *Chiron* 39: 163-192.
- Habicht, C. (1972) "Hellenistische Inschriften aus dem Heraion von Samos" *Ath Mitt* 87: 191-228.
- . (1987) "The role of Athens in the Reorganization of the Delphic Amphictiony after 189 B.C." *Hesperia* 56.1: 59-71.
- . (1988) *Hellenistic Athens and Her Philosophers*. Princeton.
- Hallof, K. (1994) "Die Inschrift von Skaptopara. Neue Dokumente und neue Lesungen" *Chiron* 24: 405-441.
- Hanell, K. (1932) "Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des griechischen Tempelhofes" in *Corolla Archaeologica*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup. 228-237.
- Hammond, N. (1967) *Epirus: The Geography, Ancient Remains, the History, and the Topography of Epirus and Adjacent Areas*. Oxford.
- Hanfmann, G. M. A. (1987) "The Sacrilege Inscription: The Ethnic, Linguistic, Social and Religious Situation at Sardis at the End of the Persian Era" *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 1: 1-8.
- Hansen, M. H. (1999) *Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structures, Principles, and Ideology*. Oklahoma.
- . (2006) *The Shotgun Method: The Demography of the Ancient Greek City-State Culture*. Columbia, MO.
- Harris, E. M. (1994) "Law and Oratory" in *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in Action*. London and New York. 130-152.

- . (2000) "Open-Texture in Athenian Law" *Dike* 3: 27-79.
- Harrison, A. R. W. (1998) *The Law of Athens* (2 Vols.). Oxford.
- Hart, H. L. A. (1994) *The Concept of Law*. Oxford.
- Hauken, T. (1998) *Petition and Response: An Epigraphic Study of Petitions to Roman Emperors 181-249*. Bergen.
- Havelock, C. M. (1999) *The Aphrodite of Knidos and Her Successors: A Historical Review of the Female Nude in Greek Art*. Ann Arbor.
- Haumesser, L. and Montel, S. (2006-2007) "Les images caches" in *Cahier des thèmes transversaux ArScAn (vol. VIII) Thème IV: Images, textes et sociétés*. 147-153.
- Hedrick, C. W. (1988) "The temple and cult of Apollo Patroos in Athens" *AJA* 92.2: 185-210.
- Henrichs, A. (1990) "Between Country and City: Cultic Dimensions of Dionysus in Athens and Attica" in *Cabinet of the Muses*. 257-277.
- Herman, G. (1987) *Ritualized Friendship and the Greek City*. Cambridge.
- Herzfeld, M. (1997) *Social Intimacy: Social Poetics in the Nation-State*. London.
- Hiller von Gaetringen, F. F. (1899-1909) *Thera; Untersuchungen, Vermessungen und Ausgrabungen in den Jahren*. Bd 1. Berlin.
- Hogan, J. C. (1991) *A Commentary on the Plays of Sophocles*. Carbondale and Edwardsville.
- Hollinshead, M. B. (1999) "'Adyton,' 'Opisthodomos,' and the Inner Room of the Greek Temple" *Hesperia* 68.2: 189-218.
- Horden, P. (2004) "Regimen and travel in the Mediterranean" in *Mobility and Travel in the Mediterranean from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*. R. Schlesier and U. Zellmann (eds.). New Brunswick, NJ. 117-131.
- Horden, P. and Purcell, N. (2000) *The Corrupting Sea: A Study of Mediterranean History*. Malden, MA.
- Hornblower, S. (1982) *Mausolus*. Oxford.
- Humphreys, S. C. (1980) "Family Tombs and Tomb Cult in Ancient Athens – Tradition or Traditionalism" *JHS* 100: 96-126.
- . (1988) "The Discourse of law in Archaic and Classical Greece" *Law and History Review* 6.2: 465-493.

- . (2004) *The Strangeness of the Gods: Historical Perspectives on the Interpretation of Athenian Religion*. Oxford.
- Hurwitt, J. M. (1999) *The Athenian Acropolis: History, Mythology, and Archaeology from the Neolithic to the Present*. Cambridge.
- Hutton, W. (2005) *Describing Greece: Landscape and Literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias*. Cambridge.
- Jacobsen, K. A. (2008) "Religion on Display" in *South Asian Religions on Display: Religious Processions in South Asia and in the Diaspora*. New York. 1-12.
- Jameson, M. H. (1999) "The Spectacular and the Obscure in Athenian Religion" in *Performance and Culture in Athenian Democracy*. Edited by R. Osborne and S. Goldhill. Cambridge. 321-340.
- Jeppesen, K. (1989) *Ikaros: The Hellenistic Settlements. Vol. 3. The Sacred Enclosure in the Early Hellenistic Period*. Aarhus.
- Johnston, S. I. (2008) *Ancient Greek Divination*. Malden, MA.
- Jones, C. P. (1999) *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, MA.
- . (2008) "A Hellenistic Cult-Association" *Chiron* 38: 195-204.
- Jones, H. L. (1976) "The Delphic Oracle" *G&R* 23.1: 60-73.
- Kearns, E. (1994) "Cakes in Greek sacrifice regulations" in *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*. Stockholm. 65-70.
- Kenna, M. E. (2009) "Apollo and the Virgin: The Changing Meaning of a Sacred Site on Anafi" *History and Anthropology* 20.4: 487-509.
- Knoepfler, D. (1986) "Un document attique a reconsiderer: Le decret de Pandios sur l'Amphiareion d'Oropos," *Chiron* 16: 71-98.
- Knott, K. (2005) *The Location of Religion: A Spatial Analysis*. London.
- Kolde, A. (2003) *Politique et religion chez Isyllos d'Epidaure*. Basel.
- Kourayos, Y. (2006) "Despotiko Mandra: A Sanctuary Dedicated to Apollo" in *Architecture and Archaeology in the Cyclades. Papers from a Colloquium Held at London College, University of Oxford, 17 April 2004*. Oxford. 105-133.
- Kowalzig, B. (2005) "Mapping out Communitas: Performances of *Theoria* in their Sacred and Political Contexts" in *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman & Early Christian Antiquity*. Oxford. 41-72.

- Kyriakidis, E. (2007) "Archaeologies of Ritual" in *The Archaeology of Ritual*. Los Angeles. 289-308.
- Lane Fox, R. (1989) *Pagans and Christians*. San Francisco.
- Le Guen-Pollet, B. (1991) *La vie religieuse dans le monde grec du Ve au III^e siècle avant notre ère: choix de documents épigraphiques traduits et commentés*. Toulouse.
- Lee, D. B. (2012) "Making It Look Right: Ritual As a Form of Communication" *Understanding Religious Ritual: Theoretical Approaches and Innovations*. London and New York. 115-135.
- Lewis, D. (1955) "Notes on Attic Inscriptions (II)" *ABSA* 50: 1-36.
- . (1990) "Public Property in the City" in *The Greek City*. Oxford. 245-264.
- Lewis, S. (1996) *News and Society in the Greek Polis*. Chapel Hill.
- LiDonnici, L. R. (1995) *The Epidaurian Miracle Inscriptions*. Atlanta.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1976) "The Delphic Oracle" *G&R* 23.1: 60-73.
- Loraux, N. (1986) *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*. Cambridge, MA.
- Lupu, E. (2003) "Sacrifice at the Amphiareion and a Fragmentary Sacred Law from Oropos" *Hesperia* 72.3: 321-340.
- . (2005) *Greek Sacred Law: A Collection of New Documents (NGSL)*. Leiden.
- Luraghi, N. (2001) "Local Knowledge in Herodotus' Histories" in *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*. Oxford. 138-160.
- Ma, J. (1999) *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*. Oxford.
- Malkin, I. (1991) "What is an 'Aphidruma?'" *ClAnt* 10.1: 77-96.
- . (1987) *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*. Leiden and New York.
- . (2011) *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford.
- Mansfield, J. M. (1985) *The Robe of Athena and the Panathenaic Peplos*. Berkeley.
- Martin, R. (1951) *Recherches sur l'agora grecque*. Paris.
- Marmor, A. (2011) *The Philosophy of Law*. Princeton.

- Maurizio, L. (1993) "Delphic narratives: recontextualizing the Pythia and her Prophecies" Dissertation, Princeton University. Princeton.
- . (1997) "Delphic Oracles as Oral Performance: Authenticity and Historical evidence" *ClAnt* 16.2: 308-334.
- McClymond, K. (2008) *Beyond Sacred Violence: A Comparative Study of Sacrifice*. Baltimore.
- McDowell, D. M. (1995) *The Law in Classical Athens*. Ithaca, NY.
- McInerney, J. (1999) *The Folds of Parnassos: Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis*. Austin.
- McNeal, R. A. (1967), "Anaphe: Home of the Strangford Apollo" *Archaeology* 20: 254-263.
- Meritt, B. D. (1935) "Inscriptions of Colophon" *AJPh* 56.4: 358-397.
- . (1963) "Apollo Pythios or Patroios" *AJPh* 84.4: 419-420.
- Meyer-Laurin, H. (1965) *Gesetz und Billigkeit im attischen Prozess. Graezistische Abhandlungen*. Bd 1. Weimar.
- Migeotte, L. (1984) *L'emprunt public dans les cités grecques*. Quebec/Paris.
- . (1992) *Les souscriptions publiques dans les cites grecques*. Geneva and Quebec.
- Mikalson, J. D. (1998) *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*. Berkeley.
- . (2010) *Greek Popular Religion in Greek Philosophy*. Oxford.
- Miles, M. M. (1998) *The City Eleusinion. The Athenian Agora: Results of the Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. 31*. Princeton.
- Millar, F. (1981) "The World of the Golden Ass" *JRS* 71: 63-75.
- Mills, H. (1984) "Greek Clothing Regulations: Sacred and Profane?" *ZPE* 55: 255-265.
- Mirhady, D. C. (1990) "Aristotle on the Rhetoric of Law" *GRBS* 31.4: 393-410.
- Modrzejewski, J. M. (2005) "Greek Law in the Hellenistic Period: Family and Marriage" in *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law*. Cambridge. 343-354
- Montiglio, S. (2000) *Silence in the Land of Logos*. Princeton.
- . (2005) *Wandering in Ancient Greek Culture*. Chicago.
- Morley, N. (2011) "Demography and Development in Classical Antiquity" in *Demography and the Graeco-Roman World: New Insights and Approaches*. Cambridge. 14-36.

- Morstein-Marx, R. (1995) *Hegemony to Empire: The Development of Roman Imperium in the East from 148-62 B.C.* Berkeley.
- Mylonas, G. E. (1961) *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Princeton.
- Mylonopoulos, J. (2006) "Greek Sanctuaries as Places of Communication through Rituals: An Archaeological Perspective" in *Ritual and Communication in the Graeco-Roman World. Kernos Suppl. 16*. Liège. 69-110.
- Naiden, F. S. (2005) "Hiketai and Theoroi at Epidauros" in *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman World & Early Christian Antiquity*. Oxford. 73-91.
- . (2006) *Ancient Supplication*. Oxford.
- . (2007) "Sanctions in Sacred Laws" *Symposion 16*: 125-138.
- Neils, J. (1996) "Pride, Pomp, and Circumstance: The Iconography of Procession" in *Worshipping Athena: Panathenaia and Parthenon*. Madison. 177-197.
- Niku, M. (2007) *The Official Status of the Foreign Residents in Athens 322-120 B.C.* Helsinki.
- Oliver, J. G. (2007) *War, Food, and Politics in Early Hellenistic Athens*. Oxford.
- Osborne, R. (1999) "Archaeology of the Athenian Empire" *TAPA 129*: 319-332.
- . (2004) "Hoards, Votives, Offerings: the Archaeology of the Dedicated Object" *World Archaeology 36.1*: 1-10.
- Osborne, R. and Rhodes P. J. (2003) *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404-323 BC*. Oxford.
- Owens, E. J. (1991) *The City in the Greek and Roman World*. New York.
- Papachadzes, N. D. (1960) "Η Κοροπή και το ιερό του Απόλλωνα" *Thessalika 3*: 2-34.
- Parke, H. W. (1977) *Festivals of the Athenians*. Ithaca, NY.
- Parke, H. W. and Wormell, D. E. W. (1956) *The Delphic Oracle*. Oxford.
- Parker, R. (1983) *Miasma*. Oxford.
- . (1985) "Greek states & Greek Oracles" in *Crux: Essays in Greek History Presented to G. E. M. de Ste Croix on His 75th Birthday*. London. 298-326.
- . (1987) "Festivals of the Attic Demes" in *Gifts to the Gods: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium*. Uppsala. 137-147.

- (2002) “The Cult of Aphrodite Pandamos and Pontia on Cos” in *Kykeion: Studies in Honour of H. S. Versnel*. Leiden. 143-160.
- (2004a) “What are Sacred Laws?” in *The Law and the Courts in Ancient Athens*. London. 57-70.
- (2004b) “New ‘Panhellenic’ Festivals in Hellenistic Greece” in *Mobility and Travel in the Mediterranean from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*. New Brunswick. 9-22.
- (2005) *Polytheism and Society at Athens*. Oxford.
- (2011) *On Greek Religion*. Ithaca, NY.
- Parker, R. and Obbink D. (2000) “Sales of Priesthoods on Cos I” *Chiron* 30: 415-449.
- (2001) “Sales of Priesthoods on Cos II” *Chiron* 31: 229-252.
- Pedersen, P. (2004) “Halikarnassos and the Ptolemies II. Architecture of Hellenistic Halikarnassos” in *The Samalkis Inscription and Hellenistic Halikarnassos. Halicarnassian Studies IV*. Odense. 145-164.
- Pedley, J. G. (2005) *Sanctuaries and the Sacred in the Ancient Greek World*. New York.
- Pelling, C. (2009) “Bringing Autochthony Up-to-Date” *CW* 102.4: 471-483.
- Perlman, P. (2000) *City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece: The Theorodokia in the Peloponnese*. Göttingen.
- Petrakos, V. (1968) *Ho Ōrōpos kai to hieron tou Amphiaraou*. Athens.
- Petropoulou, A. (1981) “The ‘Eparche’ Documents and the Early Oracle at Oropus” *GRBS* 22.1: 39-63.
- Petropoulou, M. Z. (2008) *Animal Sacrifice in Ancient Greek Religion, Judaism, and Christianity, 100 BC-AD 200*. Oxford.
- Piejko F. (1988) “The Inscriptions of Icarus-Failaka” *Classica Mediaevalia* 39: 89-116.
- Pirenne-Delforge, V. (2008) *Retour à la source: Pausanias et la religion grecque. Kernos Suppl. 20*. Liège.
- Pironti, G. (2007) *Entre ciel et guerre: figures d’Aphrodite en Grece Ancienne. Kernos Suppl. 18*. Liege.
- Platt, V. (2011) *Facing the Gods: Epiphany and Representation in Graeco-Roman Art, Literature, and Religion*. Cambridge.

- Podes, S. (1991) "Polybius and his Theory of *Anacyclosis*: Problems of Not Just Ancient Political Theory" *HPTH* 12.4: 577-587.
- Polinskaya, I. (2006) "Lack of Boundaries, Absence of Oppositions" in *City, Countryside, and Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden. 61-92.
- Potter, D. (2006) "Hellenistic Religion" *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Blackwell. 408-419.
- Poulakos, J. (1995) *Sophistical Rhetoric in Classical Greece*. Columbia, SC.
- Poulsen, B. (1994) "The New Excavations in Halicarnassos" in *Hekatomnid Caria and the Ionian Renaissance. Halicarnassian Studies I*. Odense. 115-133.
- Price, S. R. F. (1984) *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge.
- Pritchett, W. K. (1991) *The Greek State at War. Part V*. Berkeley.
- Pulleyn, S. (1997) *Prayer in Greek Religion*. Oxford.
- Purvis, A. (2003) *Singular Dedications: Founders and Innovators of Private Cults in Classical Greece*. New York and London.
- Quass, F. (1993) *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Staten des griechischen Ostens. Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und romischer Zeit*. Stuttgart.
- Rappaport, R. (1999) *Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity*. Cambridge.
- Reger, G. (2001) "The Mykonian Synoikismos" *Revue des etudes anciennes* 103.1: 157-182.
- . (2004) "The Aegean" *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. Oxford. 732-793.
- Rhodes, P. J. with Lewis, D. M. (1997) *Decrees of the Greek States*. Oxford.
- Rice, E. (1988) "Adoption in Rhodian Society" in *Archaeology in the Dodecanse*. Copenhagen. 138-144.
- Rigsby, K. J. (1996) *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*. Berkeley.
- Rist, J. M. (2001) "Plutarch's 'Amatorius': A Commentary on Plato's Theories of Love?" *CQ* 51.2: 557-575.
- Robert, L. (1926) "Notes d'epigraphie hellenistique" *BCH* 50: 469-522.
- . (1936) "D'crets de Kolophon" *RPh 3rd Series*, 10: 158-660.

- . (1948) "Sur l'oracle d'Apollon Koropaios" *Hellenica V*. Paris. 16-28.
- . (1980) "Lucien en son temps" in *A travers l'Asie mineure poètes et prosateurs, monnaies grecques, voyageurs et géographie*. 293-436.
- Robertson, N. (1983) "Greek Ritual Begging in Aid of Woman's Fertility and Childbirth" *TAPA* 113: 143-169.
- Roller, D. W. (1987) "Tanagra Survey Project 1985: The Site of Grimadha" *ABSA* 82: 213-232.
- . (1989) *Tanagran Studies I: Sources and Documents on Tanagra in Boiotia*. Amsterdam.
- Romano, I. B. (1988) "Early Greek Cult Images and Cult Practices" *Early Greek Cult Practices*. Stockholm. 127-134.
- Rosivach, V. T. (1987) "Autochthony and the Athenians" *CQ* 37.2: 294-306.
- . (1994) *The System of Public Sacrifice in Fourth-Century Athens*. Oxford.
- Ross, L. (1861) "Über Anaphe und Anaphaische Inschriften" *Archäologische Aufsätze*. Vol. 2. Leipzig. 486-527.
- Rostovtzeff, M. (1941) *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. Oxford.
- Rouse, W. H. D. (1975) *Greek Votive Offerings*. New York.
- Rubenstein, L. (2005) "Arai in Greek laws in the Classical and Hellenistic periods: Deterrence or Concession to Tradition?" *Symposion* 15: 269-286.
- . (2009) "Praxis: The Enforcement of Penalties in the Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Periods" *Symposion* 17: 193-213.
- Rutherford, I. (2001) "Tourism and the Sacred: Pausanias and the Traditions of Greek Pilgrimage" *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*. Oxford. 40-52.
- . (2009) "Network Theory and Theoric Networks" in *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean*. London and New York. 24-38.
- Seaford, R. (1994) *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City State*. Oxford.
- Samuel, A. E. (1972) *Greek and Roman Chronology: Calendars and Years in Classical Antiquity*. Munich.
- Santangelo, F. (2006) "Magnesia sul Meandro alla Vigilia della Prima Guerra Mitridatica. Nota sulla Cronologia di *I.Magn.* 100B" *EA* 39: 133-138.

- Schachter, A. (1981) *Cults of Boiotia*. London.
- . (1994) "The Politics of Dedication: Two Athenian Dedications at the Sanctuary of Apollo Ptoieus in Boeotia" in *Ritual, Finance, and Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*. Oxford. 291-306.
- Scholten, J. B. (2000) *The Politics of Plunder: Aitolians and Their Koinon in the Early Hellenistic Era, 279-217 B.C.* Berkeley.
- Scott, M. (2010) *Delphi and Olympia: The Spatial Politics of Panhellenism in the Archaic and Classical Periods*. Cambridge.
- Scullion, S. (1994) "Olympian and Chthonian" *ClAnt* 13.1: 74-119.
- Segre, M. (1936) "Osservazioni epigrafiche sulla vendita di sacerdozio" *RIL* 69: 811-830.
- Shapiro, H. A. (1990) "Oracle-Mongers in Peisistratid Athens" *Kernos* 3: 335-345.
- Shaw, B. (2000) "Rebels and Outsiders" in *Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. XI: The High Empire A.D. 70-192*. Cambridge. 361-404.
- Sherwin-White, S. and Kuhrt, A. (1993) *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*. London.
- Shipley, G. (2000) *The Greek World after Alexander: 323-30 BC*. London and New York.
- Sickingler, J. P. (2007) "Rhetoric and the Law" in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. Malden, MA. 286-302.
- Sineux, P. (2007) *Amphiaraos: guerrir, devin et guérisseur*. Paris.
- Slater, W. J. and Summa, D. (2006) "Crowns at Magnesia" *GRBS* 46: 275-299.
- Smith, J. Z. (1987) *To Take Place: Toward a Theory of Ritual*. Chicago and London.
- Smith, J. Z. (1998) "Religion, Religions, Religious" in *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*. London. 269-284.
- Snodgrass, A. (1989) "The Economics of Dedication at Sanctuaries" in *Anathema: Regime delle offerte e vita dei santuari nel Mediterraneo antico, Scienze dell'Antichità, Storia, Archaeologia, Antropoligia* 3-4: 287-294.
- Sokolowski, F. (1954) "Fees and Taxes in Greek Cults" *HThR* 47.3: 153-164.
- . (1955) *Lois Sacrées de l'Asie Mineure (LSAM)*. Paris.

- . (1962) *Lois Sacrées Cités Grecques, Supplément (LSS)*. Paris.
- . (1969) *Lois Sacrées Cités Grecques (LSCG)*. Paris.
- Sosin, J. D. (2005) "Unwelcome Dedications: Public Law and Private Religion in Hellenistic Laodicea by the Sea" *CQ* 55:130-139.
- . (2009) "Magnesian Inviolability" *TAPA* 139.2: 369-410.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (2000) "What is Polis Religion?" in *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*. Oxford. 13-37.
- . (2011) *Athenian Myths and Festivals: Aglauros, Erechtheus, Plynteria, Panathenaia, Dionysia*. Edited by R. Parker. Oxford.
- Stoneman, R. (2011) *The Ancient Oracles: Making the Gods Speak*. New Haven and London.
- Stavrianopoulou, E. (2006) "Normative Interventions in Greek Rituals" in *Ritual and Communication in the Graeco-Roman World. Kernos Suppl. 16*. Liège. 131-148.
- Steinbach, M. and Wagman, R. (1994) "Votive *Perirrhanteria* from Epidauros: Anecdota and Revisions" *ZPE* 103: 106-108.
- Sumi, G. (2004) "Civic Self-Representation in the Hellenistic World: The Festival of Artemis Leukophryene in Magnesia-on-the-Maeander" in *Games and Festivals in Classical Antiquity: Proceedings of the Conference Held in Edinburgh 10-12 July 2000*. Oxford. 79-92.
- Szegedy-Maszak, A. (1981) *The Nomoi of Theophrastus*. New York.
- Tarrant, H. (2010) "Platonism before Plotinus" in *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*. 2 Vols. Cambridge. 63-99.
- Themelis, P. G. (1994) "Artemis Ortheia at Messene: the Epigraphical and Archaeological Evidence" in *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*. Stockholm. 101-122.
- Thomas, R. (1992) *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- . (1995) "Written in Stone? Liberty, equality, orality and the codification of law" *BICS* 40: 59-74.
- . (2005) "Writing, Law, and Written Law" in *Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law*. Cambridge. 41-60.

- Turpin, W. (1991) "Imperial Subscriptions and the Administration of Justice" *JRS* 81: 101-118.
- van Bremen, R. (1996) *The Limits of Participation: Women and Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Amsterdam.
- van Straten, F. T. (1976) "Daikrates' Dream: A Votive Relief from Kos, and Some Other Kat'onar Dedications" *Babesch* 51:1-38.
- . (1992) "Votives and Votaries" in *le Sanctuaire Grec: huit exposés suivis discussions*. Geneva. 247-290.
- . (1995) *Hiera Kala: Images of Animal Sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World*. Vol. 127. Leiden.
- . (1996) *The Limits of Participation: Women and Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Amsterdam.
- Versnel, H. S. (2011) *Coping with the Gods: Wayward Readings in Greek Theology. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, vol. 173*. Leiden and Boston.
- Walker, H. J. (1995) *Theseus and Athens*. Oxford.
- Watson, L. (1991) *Arae: The Curse Poetry of Antiquity*. Leeds.
- Welles, C. B. (1934) *Royal Correspondences in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy (RC)*. New Haven.
- Whitehead, D. (1983) "Competitive Outlay and Community Profit: φιλοτιμία in Democratic Athens" *Classica et Medievalia* 34: 55-74.
- . (1985) *The Demes of Attica*. Princeton.
- Whitley, J. (2001) *The Archaeology of Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- Wiemer, Hans-Ulrich (2009) "Neue Feste – neue Geschichtsbilder? Zur Erinnerungsfunktion städtischer Feste im Hellenismus" in *Feiern und Erinnern: Geschichtsbilder im Spiegel antiker Feste*. 83-108.
- Wilhelm, A. (1914) *Neue Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde Sitzber III*. Vienna.
- . (1947) *Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Sitzungsberichte* 224 (4). Vienna.
- Wilson, P. (2003) *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia: The Chorus, the City and the Stage*. Cambridge.

- . (2007) "Performance in the Pythion: the Athenian Thargelia" in *The Greek Theatre and Festivals*. 150-182.
- Winters, F. (2006) *Studies in Hellenistic Architecture*. Toronto.
- Wörrle, M. (1990) "Inschriften von Herakleia am Latmos II. Das Priestertum der Athena Latmia" *Chiron* 20: 19-58.
- Wörrle, M. and Würster, W. W. (1997) "Dereköy: Eine besfestigte Siedlung im nordwestlichen Lykien und die Reform ihres dörflichen Zeuskultes" *Chiron* 27: 393-467.
- Wycherley, R. E. (1978) *The Stones of Athens*. Princeton.
- Zoepffel, R. (2006) *Aristoteles Oikonomika: Schriften zu Hauswirtschaft und Finanzwesen. Aristoteles Werke in Deutscher Übersetzung*. Bd 10. T. 2. Berlin.
- Zuiderhoek, A. (2009) *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire: Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor*. Cambridge.

Biography

Chad Austino was born in Woodbury, NJ on May 22, 1980. He graduated *summa cum laude* from Rutgers University-New Brunswick as a Henry Rutgers Scholar in 2004 with a BA in History and Classics (double major). After graduation, Chad taught Latin at South Brunswick High School in Monmouth Junction, NJ before enrolling at Duke University in 2006. During his time at Duke, Chad has pursued his interests in Greek and Roman history, religion, material culture, and philology. He is a 2008 graduate of the American Academy in Rome Summer School Program and a 2011 graduate of the American School at Athens Summer School Program for which he received the Lawler II Scholarship. Chad was awarded the Anne T. and Robert M. Bass Instructorship for 2011-12 through which he is teaching a course based on his dissertation.