

KENT J. RIGSBY

DIONYSIAKA

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 213 (2020) 53–61

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

DIONYSIACA

Tomis

In Hellenistic Tomis, a sculptor Hermagenes dedicated a statue of Dionysus and celebrated the gift with a poem:¹

ἀγνὸν ὑπὲρ θιάσοιο, πυρίβρομε, σοὶ τό[δ' ἄγαλμα]
 δῶρον ἀπὸ σφετέρας ὄπασεν ἐργ[ασίας]
 [μ]υστικὸν ἐμ βακχοῖσι λαχὼν στέφος [– ∪ – –]
 4 Πάρμιδος, ἀρχαίην δεικνύμενος τ[ελετήν].
 ἀλλὰ σύ, ταυρόκερως, Ἑρμαγένεος χε[ρὸς ἔργον]
 [δ]έξαι καὶ Πασοῦς σῶζε ἱερὸν θιάσ[ον].

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

The restorations are those of the first editors. Line 4 has from the start been taken to refer to the rite of initiation; as Reich explicated, the “τελεταὶ μυστηρίδες Βάκχου”.² This is disquieting: making public the rite of initiation was what initiates swore never to do. One thinks of the prosecution of Alcibiades and the stories about Aeschylus.³

The sculptor was proud of his art. Hermagenes who had obtained a Bacchic crown presented the statue, displaying – – what? Restore after δεικνύμενος not τ[ελετήν] but spondaic τ[έχνην]: displaying “ancient craft/skill”. By this he refers not to the rite of initiation but to his craft as a sculptor and to the statue itself.⁴ A good parallel is offered by a sculptor on Delos, who was similarly proud of his work: some honor Philetaerus with hymns, “but some by exhibiting the crafts of their hands” (οἱ δὲ χερῶν τέχνας δεικνύμενοι σφετέρων), hence this statue, and “Hephaestus himself would not find fault on seeing their craft” (οὐδέ κεν αὐτὸς Ἥφαιστος τέχνην τῶν γε ὀνόσαιτ' ἐσιδῶν).⁵ The verb is used of a statue in yet another verse dedication, πατρὶς ἰκόνα τὴν ἀρετῆς παρ Διὶ δικνυμένη (*I.Olympia* 445, Imperial date).

No doubt sculpture might be called one of the “ancient crafts”.⁶ But Hermagenes may be making a more specific claim, “exhibiting the ancient style” – that is, his Dionysus was what we call archaistic sculpture. So one distinguished an ἄγαλμα τῆς ἀρχαίας τέχνης (Themist. 34.7 [II 217 Downey–Norman]); cf. Strab. 14.1.5 κεκόσμηται δ' ἀναθήμασι τῶν ἀρχαίων τεχνῶν. A priestess at Sparta commissioned a statue with a face in “the style of our time rather than of antiquity”, ἕτερον τῶν ἀγαλμάτων ἱερασαμένη ... πρόσωπον ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀρχαίου ποιησαμένη τῆς ἐφ' ἡμῶν τέχνης (Paus. 3.16.1); cf. Ath. 676A ἀγαλμάτιον Ἀφροδίτης ... ἀρχαῖον τῆ τέχνη. Sparseness was the style of ancient sculptures: τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἀγάλματα, ὧν

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

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

³ To cite a contemporary: Chrysippus, *SVF* II 279 ὁ λέγων τοῖς ἀμύητοις τὰ μυστήρια ἀσεβεῖ.

⁴ So also Merkelbach–Stauber, *SGO* I 585, no. 06/02/05 = *SEG* XXXIX 1334 σοὶ ... ἄ τέχνα (I owe the comparison to G. Petzl).

⁵ *IG* XI.4 1105.4 (with F. Chamoux, *REG* 101 (1988), 498–499); cited by Reich for the form of δεικνύμενος but not for the substance.

⁶ Comedy was another: the playwright Machon was “worthy of the ancient craft”, τέχνης ἄξιον ἀρχαίης (Ath. 241F [T. Preger, *Inscriptiones Graecae metricae* (Leipzig, 1891), no. 37]). On the range of the noun see R. Löbl, *TEXNH – Technē: Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung dieses Wortes* (Würzburg, 1997–2003); E. H. Kozey, *G&R* 65 (2018), 205–217.

τέχνην ἔδδοκει ἢ συστολή καὶ ἰσχύότης (Demetr. *Eloq.* 14 = Hecataeus *FGrHist* 1 τ 19). The opening word of Hermagenes' poem, ἀγνόν, may already hint at this style. Among the archaistic statues that are extant, Dionysus in fact looms largest.⁷

It is worth recalling the expulsion of another restored τελετή. On Hellenistic Delos a poem recites the victories of a herald; its lost right third has been restored by W. Peek.⁸ Three lines are devoted to the herald's successes in Athens (14–16):

τρισαὶ δ' Ἐρεχθειδῶν ἀ[γαγόμαν ἄεθλα],
 ἀγνόν Ἐλευσίνος πρὸς ἀνάκ[τορον ἀνίκ' ἰδέσθαι]
 16 πενταετῆ Διοῦς ἦλθον [ἐγὼ τελετάν].

Three prizes I carried off from the sons of Erechtheus, when I came to the chaste shrine of Eleusis to see the quadrennial initiation rite of Deo.

It has twice been objected that the restoration in line 16 confuses two distinct festivals.⁹ Lest that objection be overlooked,¹⁰ it is useful to make the reason for it explicit: one could not win prizes at the (annual) Mysteries; the herald competed in the quadrennial Eleusinia. Therefore ἰδέσθαι and τελετάν do not belong; and ἐγὼ is filler. The Eleusinia must be signaled by the lost noun that πενταετῆ modifies. This might be something as pedestrian as ἀνάκ[τορον ὡς ἐς ἀγῶνα] / πενταετῆ, then e.g. ἦλθον [ἀμιλληθείς] (cf. Eur. *Med.* 1083 πρὸς ἀμίλλας ἦλθον, *Tro.* 621 εἰς ἄμιλλαν ἔρχεται, *Hec.* 226 ἄμιλλαν ἐξέλθης). Whatever were the words, not τελετάν but some noun appropriate to the Eleusinia is required.

Chalcis

At Chalcis in Euboea in the second century B.C., the theatrical guild, the Technitai of Dionysus, honored a benefactor.¹¹ They awarded him a statue, and also perpetual proclamation (lines 23–24):

τῶν δὲ ἀεὶ ἐν ἀρχῆ[ῃ] ὄντα γραμματέ[α ποιῆσαι κα]τ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἀναγόρευσι[ν, ὅταν]
 24 [θεο]ῖς ἀποθύωσιν κα[θ' ἐκάσ]την ἡμ[έραν, ὅτι “τὸ κοινὸν (κτλ.)”

the secretary then in office¹² is to make proclamation annually, when they sacrifice to gods each day, that “the guild (etc.)”

23 Ziebarth; γραμματέ[α τοῦ κοινοῦ κα]τ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἀναγορευ[σ]αι Joubin and Wilhelm. 24 init.: [. . .]ΕΙΣ but [θεο]ῖς Joubin and Wilhelm (“Nous proposons [θεο]ῖς, mais l'espace est un peu trop grand sur la pierre pour trois lettres seulement”); [. . .]ΙΣ and [θεο]ῖς Ziebarth.

First a pedantry: for a proclamation, the middle is normal, so in line 23 restore not ποιῆσαι but ποιεῖσθαι – the present tense reflecting the on-going requirement (e.g. *SEG* XXIX 771.21 ποιεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ τὰν ἀναγόρευσιν εἰς τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον).

But then: “they” are to sacrifice “to gods”. The first is vague, the second is idle. One might at least expect the article, τοῖς θεοῖς.¹³ But rather, one expects nothing at all: “when (they) sacrifice each day” would be sufficient and unproblematic.

⁷ M. D. Fullerton, *The Archaistic Style in Roman Statuary* (Leiden, 1990), 127–162.

⁸ *I. Délos* 2552; W. Peek, *Hermes* 76 (1941), 415, and more fully *Wissensch. Zeit. Halle-Wittenberg* 9 (1960), 199–201 [*SEG* XIX 532].

⁹ J. and L. Robert, *BE* 1942, 110, “une grave confusion entre les Eleusinia, dont il est question, et les mystères d'Eleusis”; K. Clinton, *Myth and Cult: The Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Stockholm, 1992), 129 n. 6 [*SEG* XLII 739], “the Eleusinia . . . was not the same as the Mysteria”.

¹⁰ A. Manieri, *Agoni poetico-musicali* (Urbino, 2009), 155, no. Leb.10.

¹¹ A. Joubin and Ad. Wilhelm, *BCH* 16 (1892), 90–94 (= Ad. Wilhelm, *Kl. Schriften* II 4, 10–14); E. Ziebarth, *IG* XII.9 910 [B. Le Guen, *Les associations des Technites dionisiaques* (Nancy, 2001), no. 32; S. Aneziri, *Die Vereine der dionysischen Techniten* (Stuttgart, 2003), no. B10].

¹² In Hellenistic times the magistracies of the theatrical guilds included secretaries but apparently not heralds; proclamation made by a secretary, e.g. *IG* IV 558.38 [Le Guen no. 36, Aneziri no. B9].

¹³ B. Le Guen made the best of a bad situation, translating “[tous] les jours où l'on sacrifie aux [die]ux”.

We can respect the reading of Joubin and Wilhelm, [. . .]EΙΣ: restore [όταν/ οί ιερ]εῖς ἀποθύωσιν, “when the priests sacrifice”. The cities had their priests at theatrical festivals, and the theatrical guild had its priest of Dionysus.

The rest, “on each day”, might seem redundant with όταν.¹⁴ The phrase is emphatic: no sacrificial day is to be without this proclamation. Chalcis was the headquarters of the Technitai of Euboea,¹⁵ and this required proclamation was probably intended for their theatrical performances in all the cities of the island. In the work of the Technitai, both the occasions and the agents for sacrifice might vary in the several cities. Hence their care here to write the encompassing “the priests” and the insistent “on each day”.

Lindos

In the late second century B.C. a man of Lindos (his name is lost) was honored by a number of voluntary associations, one of them the Technitai of Dionysus. Blinkenberg did not see the stone but relied on a copy made by K. F. Kinch. My concern is line 8, but I give the inscription in full because the constitution of the text is complicated by an unpublished copy of Mario Segre from which G. Pugliese Carratelli quoted some readings. Segre measured the stone as 68 cm. × 29 × 84, letters 0.9. The list of honors, a favored genre on Rhodes, begins each entry with καὶ ἐπαινεθεῖς καὶ στεφανωθεῖς.

Chr. Blinkenberg, *I.Lindos* 264 (lines 1–18) [Aneziri no. D17 (lines 1–9)].

Cf. G. Pugliese Carratelli, *AASA* n.s. 1–2 (1939/40), 196 n. 1, and *PP* 1 (1946), 399 n. 3 (quoting from Segre’s copy); G. Klaffenbach, *MH* 6 (1949), 217–218; J. and L. Robert, *BE* 1951, 156.

ἱερατεύσας Ἀθά[νας Λινδίας καὶ Διὸς Πολιέως]
καὶ ἐπαινεθεῖς καὶ [στεφανωθεῖς χρυσέωι στε]-
φάνωι ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ἱεροθυτῶν καὶ ἀρχιερο]-
4 θύτα, καὶ ἐπαινεθεῖς [καὶ στεφανωθεῖς χρυσέωι στε]-
φάνωι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄρχοντο[ς τοῦ δεινός(?) καὶ ὑπὸ στρα]-
τευομένων Ἀθαναιστῶν κ[αὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν περὶ
8 τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνιτῶν τῶν ἐπ’ Ἰωνίας καὶ Ἑλλησπόντου]
καὶ τῶν περὶ τὸν Καθηγεμ[όνα Διόνυσον ἀνδριάντι ἐν]
τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Διονύσου, καὶ [ἐπαινεθεῖς καὶ στεφανω]-
θεῖς ὑπὸ Λητοδωρείων Πα[υσιστρατείων(?) κοινοῦ]
χρυσέωι στεφάνωι (καὶ) ἀναγορ[εύσει τᾶνδε τῶν τιμῶν ἀρε]-
12 τᾶς ἕνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας καὶ [εὐεργεσίας τᾶς ποτὶ]
τὸ κοινὸν τὸ Λητοδωρείων [Παυσιστρατείων(?), καὶ ἐπαινε]-
θεῖς καὶ στεφανωθεῖς χρυσ[έωι στεφάνωι ὑπὸ τῶν κατοικεῦν]-
των ἐν Λινδίαι πόλει καὶ ἱε[ρατεύσας Ἀρτάμιτος Κεκοίας]
16 καὶ Απόλλωνος Πυθίου καὶ [----- καὶ]
ἀρχιεροθυτήσας [-----]
[χο]ραγήσας καὶ νικάσας καὶ ἐπ[ιστάτας γενόμενος?]
τα Ἀλίεια μεγάλα, καὶ ἐπαιν[εθεῖς καὶ στεφανωθεῖς]
20 [ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ -----]

1–18 Klaffenbach. 6: κ[οινοῦ καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν περὶ] Blinkenberg. 7: I[---] Blinkenberg, Aneziri. 8: Διόνυσον τεχνιτῶν τῶν ἐν] Blinkenberg, Aneziri. 9 end Blinkenberg; Διονύσου ANA[Segre, possibly ἀναγορεύσει, καὶ στεφανωθεῖς (κτλ.) Pugliese Carratelli 1946. 12 end: καὶ Λ[Segre, perhaps δικαιοσύνας Pugliese Carratelli 1946. 19–20 read only by Segre; 18–19 perhaps γυμνασιαρχήσας κα]/τὰ Pugliese Carratelli 1946.

¹⁴ But e.g. *EKM* 1.B.11 καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν όταν οἱ παῖδες ἀλείφονται (the Beroea gymnasium law).

¹⁵ *IG* XII.9 910 (mid II B.C.), and 207.59 a century earlier; cf. Aneziri, *Die Vereine*, 55.

Line 7: Klaffenbach restored the phrase that is standard in acts composed by the Technitai. His restoration is perhaps long, and requires emending the copies. It may be that a Rhodian writer was indifferent to the guild's formal title and wrote more simply: τεχνιτῶν Ἰωνίας καὶ Ἑλλησπόντου].

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

Line 14: again the line seems long. Better ὑπὸ τῶν δάμων] / τῶν ἐν Λινδίαι πόλει as in *I.Lindos 347* and 349.

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

This statue, however, would be the only awarded item in the list that is not a crown. For the "proclamation" granted in line 11 may instead be restored στεφάνῳ ἀναγορ[ευομένῳ: cf. on Rhodes the list of honors *IG XII.1 155.87* τὸν στέφανον τὸν ἀναγορευόμενον ἐπὶ τάφοις. Restoring the participle here would also eliminate the need to add (καί).

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

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

The phrase "sacred crown" does not occur in the decrees of the Technitai,¹⁸ but it is well attested in other groups that were especially concerned with cult. Thus Delos votes to "crown with the sacred crown of laurel", στεφανῶσαι δάφνης τῷ ἱερῷ στεφάνῳ (*IG XI.4 697*, cf. 706, 766, 784, etc.). At Delphi it is "the crown of laurel from the god", δάφνας στεφάνῳ τῷ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ (*FD III.1 458*, cf. III.2 18, 20, III.3 145 (δάφνας [ἰε]ρῶ[ς] στεφάνῳ τῶ[ς] παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ), etc.) or "the crown of the god", τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ στεφάνῳ (III.2 47.33, 50.8, etc.). As to the Technitai, others said that they possessed "sacred crowns", ἔχοντες καὶ τοὺς ἱ(ε)ροὺς στεφάνους (the Roman Senate in 112 B.C.).¹⁹ The priests of the Athenian branch

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

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

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

¹⁹ R. Sherck, *RDGE* no. 15.44 (Le Guen no. 12, Aneziri no. C2).



Fig. 1

of the Technitai were to wear “the ancestral crowns in every city”, [στεφανηφορεῖν το]ῦ[ς] πατρίους στεφάνους ἐμ πάσῃ πόλει:²⁰ perhaps these were what the Senate called the sacred crowns.

We now have an official emblem of the Technitai. Once in the history of the guild, in the second century B.C., the Ionian-Hellespontine branch commissioned an issue of coins: silver tetradrachms, in quite modest numbers, for only one has been found.²¹ The obverse shows Dionysus in profile; on the reverse, framing τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνιτῶν and a thyrus, is a prominent crown of ivy (fig. 1). This might well have been called the sacred crown of Dionysus (cf. κισσοφόρωι in the guild poem *IG II² 12664*). Centuries later we hear of documents of the Technitai “sealed with the sacred seal of our leader Dionysus”, σημανθέντα τῇ ἱερᾷ τοῦ καθηγεμόνος ἡμῶν Διονύσου σφραγίδι.²² Whatever that image was, they did call it “sacred”.

Megara

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

ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ
 ἔτους βορ, μηνὸς [----- ἔδο]-
 ξεν τῇ συνόδῳ τ[ῶν θιασωτῶν Διο]-
 4 νύσου εἶναι Διονύ[σου θιάσῳ Ἀντίπα]-
 τρον τὸν ναοπ[οιὸν καὶ διὰ βίου ἰε]-
 ρέα· ἀπολελύσ[θω δὲ τῆς ἄλλης ὑπη]-
 ρεσίας καὶ ἀ[τελής ἔστω καὶ ἀλειτούρ]-
 8 γητος.²⁴

The restorations are Fränkel’s. Jaccottet saw that the group may have been called something other than θιάσος as restored in lines 3 and 4. The date 172 is either Actian = A.D. 141/2 (so Fränkel) or (as I would prefer) provincial = 25/6.²⁵

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

²⁰ *IG II² 1134.37*. Cf. the Ionian-Hellespontine guild decree Le Guen no. 45, Aneziri no. D10 στεφάνωι τῶι ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ᾧ πατρίον ἔστι τοῖς τεχνίταις στεφανοῦν (line 29).

²¹ C. C. Lorber and O. D. Hoover, *NC* 163 (2003), 59–68.

²² P. Frisch, *Pap. Agon.* 4.34 and 3.36 (A.D. 264 and 288).

²³ M. Fränkel, *SitzBerlin* 1903, 91 [Jaccottet no. 7; J. S. Kloppenborg and R. S. Ascoug, *Greco-Roman Associations I* (Berlin, 2014), no. 60].

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

²⁵ For the provincial era at Megara see *CPh* 105 (2010), 308–313.

In line 3, rather than a phrase for the members, the god might have had an epithet, e.g. τ[οῦ Καθηγεμόνος Διο]γύσου; but omission of a plural that names the group would be unusual.²⁶ Jaccottet's caution is just; the word might be e.g. μυστῶν rather than θιασωτῶν.

In 4–5, the honorand is described in some detail: I suggest a double name, Διονύ[σιον τὸν καὶ Ἀντίπα]τρον or Σώπα]τρον. His name is followed by a descriptor (τόν) indicating his present office, ναοποιός. Typically this was a supervisor/manager of a sacred property and its needs.²⁷ This much is the subject of the infinitive εἶναι; “priest” (or high priest) in lines 5–6 is the predicate – unambiguously so marked if it has no article (but τόν in place of καί is possible, or καὶ τόν).

In 6, the article does not belong in this phrase; better would be a version of what is found e.g. in a decree of Aphrodisias, ἀνεῖσθαι ἀπὸ τὸν πάσης ἀκουσίου ὑπη[ρεσίας] (REG 19 (1906), 100–102, line 19). Associations expected to receive from their members both service and fees;²⁸ exemption from these is here granted by the Bacchic group.²⁹ This waiver does not imply some involvement of the association with the city government,³⁰ for it does not refer to state obligations, exemption from which a private club could not dictate.

Thus what seems likely in lines 2–7:

ἔδο]-

ξεν τῇ συνόδῳ τ[ῶν θιασωτῶν τοῦ Διο]-
 4 νύσου εἶναι Διονύ[σιον τὸν καὶ Σώπα]-
 τρον τὸν ναοπ[οιὸν καὶ τὸν διὰ βίου ἄρχι]-
 ρέα ἀπολελύσ[θω πάσης ἀκουσίου ὑπη]-
 ρεσίας (κτλ.)

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

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

Rhodes

In the late second or early third century A.D., Rhodes honored one of its citizens, Marcus Aurelius Cyrus,³¹ who had completed a year of service as priest of Dionysus (τὸν ἱερέα τοῦ Βάκχ[ου] Διονύσου, line 2).³² The terminus post quem for the decree is not 212 (Reinach, Jaccottet, Pugliese Carratelli) but 161, Marcus

²⁶ E.g. IG II² 1012.15 τὴν συνοδὸν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ξενίου, *I.Philae* 11.2 τῆι συνόδῳ τοῦ Ἡρακλείου.

²⁷ P. Stengel, *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer* (Munich, 1920), 51; O. Schulthess, *RE* 16 (1935), 2433–2439; S. Georgoudi, *Thesaurus Cultus et Rituum* V (2005), 56.

²⁸ F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens* (Leipzig, 1909), 493–498; Aneziri, *Die Vereine*, 181–186.

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

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

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

³² Βακχ[ίτου?] Reinach; cf. *I.Lindos* 449 (early II A.D.) honoring a man ἱερατεύσαντα τῶν μυστηρίων τοῦ Βάκχου Διονύσου.

Aurelius.³³ The letter-forms are quite similar to those of *I.Lindos* 465, which Blinkenberg assigned to the late second century.

The decree lists Cyrus' various benefactions during the year. The most endearing is that he paid an organist one denarius per day to come to the temple and "wake up the god": δόντα δὲ καὶ τῷ ὑδραύλῃ τῷ ἐπεγείροντι [τὸ]ν θεὸν * τξ' (lines 23–24). The water organ was the fanfare instrument of the time,³⁴ familiar in the amphitheaters. Here is testimony that in Imperial times Dionysus enjoyed more diverse and more modern forms of music than the very traditional repertory offered by the Technitai.

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

20 καὶ εἰς πολλὰ δὲ καὶ
 ἄλλα χρησίμου γεινομένου αὐτοῦ τῆ πόλει ἅ πατρις
 [κ]αὶ βακχεῖα οἷς καὶ ἐφιλοτειμήσατο ΑΝΔΡΟΣΙΝΗ
 [.]ΟΣ * ρ· δόντα δὲ καὶ τῷ ὑδραύλῃ (κτλ.)

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

21–22: At least a verb is lost here: Hiller suggested that after ἅ πατρις a line has fallen out, (ἐτίμησεν αὐτὸν -- καὶ εἰς Διονύσια); or the loss is before ἅ πατρις (Reinach). 22–23: ἀνδρΟΣΙΝΗ/ . ΙΟΣ Hiller ("hier könnte vielleicht Autopsie helfen").

However the grammatical deviation is to be explained, the purpose of the donation of 100 denarii is stated in the string of letters in lines 22–23. The sum of 100 denarii, whatever its goal, would be insignificant if given to the whole city and its Bacchic guilds. Reinach saw that only βακχεῖα can be the referent of οἷς, but he felt that even yet that sum seems insignificant: he guessed that the string of letters conceals some version of "per person", κατ' ἄνδρα.

The stone is in the Archaeological Museum of Rhodes,³⁵ a square slab h. 0.76 cm., w. 0.74, th. 0.26. The decree (fig. 2) is clearly and carefully inscribed, and confirms the published editions, with one exception: the second vowel in the doubtful string is not O but Ω; and I find that Segre, as cited by Pugliese Carratelli, also read omega here. This offers us a noun that is real and pertinent, ἀνδρῶσι(v): to Bacchic guilds the priest donated 100 denarii "for banquet halls".³⁶ Dedications of banquet halls are on good record,³⁷ but this money could hardly pay for such a construction; the sum would be more appropriate for rent³⁸ or for equipping of rooms for occasional use by the Bacchic guilds. In the second century B.C. we hear of a biennial reception/banquet for the Βακχεῖοι of Rhodes: ἐν ταῖς τῶν Βακχείων ὑποδοχαῖ κατὰ τριετηρίδα.³⁹ The word ἀνδρῶν may be suggestive of the gender of the guild members, or at least of those who were invited to banquet.

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

³³ Note the careful distinction between Aurelii and Marci Aurelii in *IG* X.2 138.

³⁴ Organ music welcoming an emperor's advent (real or imagined): *HA Gallienus* 17.3. In *I.Ephesos* 1601a.8 (Hadrianic), an organist who was an initiate of Dionysus.

³⁵ Inv. E 5483, studied and photographed (2019) courtesy of the Ephoreia of the Dodecanese.

³⁶ For the range of meanings of the term ἀνδρῶν see R. Mouterde on *IGLS* II 584; M.-Chr. Hellmann, *ZPE* 80 (1990), 70.

³⁷ *SEG* LVIII 1211; J. and L. Robert, *BE* 1966, 421 (τὸν ἀνδρῶνα καὶ τὴν κατασκευήν); *I.Labraunda* 14 (τὸν ἀνδρῶνα [κα]ὶ τὰ ἐνεόντα) and 15: all in Caria, and two of these funded by great powers rather than an individual citizen. Privately-funded repair of an ἀνδρῶν in Rhodian Caria: *I.Rhod.Per.* 110.

³⁸ Cf. *I.Delos* 403.53 ἀνεμισθῶσα[μεν δὲ καὶ τοῦς] ἀνδρῶνας (163 drachmas, in 189 B.C.).

³⁹ *IG* XII.1 155.49 [Jaccottet no. 156.10], with Pugliese Carratelli, *AASA* 196 n. 6.



Fig. 2



Fig. 3

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

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

... ΕΙΝΟΥ ΔΙΣ///Α//\Ο
 ?παραμυ]ΘΙΑΣΤΑΣΙΣΤΟΝΠΑΤΕΡΑ
 ΘΕΟΙΣ

In the first line I read, quite doubtfully: [^{ca.5}] εινουδισ[.]ΕΙ / \Ι. The first letters might be the end of a personal name in *-inos*; but δίς for a duplicate patronym is not a Rhodian usage. What follows could be -εται- / -ειαι- / -ειμι-. But I am not confident that this reading is better-founded than Reinach's.

The left edge is preserved, and the second line is flush left: as lines 1–2 restore probably [– – εἰς τὸν πατέρα. The two inscriptions, separated by more than a century, are not related. This speaks against Jaccottet's suggested emendation θιασ(ί)τας, with the πατήρ as an officer of a Bacchic guild. More likely he was the father of the person who was honored by the Rhodians with a statue. Compare the Rhodian bases Reinach, *REG* 16 (1903), 185 [ἔνεκα παρα]μυθίας τᾶς εἰς [τὰν αὐτοῦ] ματέρα, and *IG* XII.1 92 εἰς τὸν πατέρα. Compare also *IG* XII.1 92 εἰς τὸν πατέρα. Compare also *IG* XII.1 92 εἰς τὸν πατέρα. Compare also *IG* XII.1 92 εἰς τὸν πατέρα.

Kent J. Rigsby, 15 Estrella Ave., Piedmont, CA 94611, USA
 krigsby@duke.edu