

# ATTICA



[1] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2343*Cult Table with members of a *Koinon Thiasōtai*

Athens (Attica) ca. 400 BCE

Published: Koehler, *IG II* 986b; Roberts and Gardner 1887–1905, 2:417 (no. 165) (facsimile); Michel, *RIG* 1547; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2343 (facsimile); Lind 1985, 250–52 (facsimile; ph.); Gill 1991, 42–43 (no. 12; facsimile; ph.) (Poland A11).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2343 and a squeeze (Epigraphy room, Department of Classics, University of Cambridge).

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum, EM 10652.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 1017 (Piraeus, ca 500–480 BCE): A reference to a *thiasos* associated with Herakles?; *SEG* 24:208 (Athens [Kydathenaion]): A boundary stone of a sanctuary of Herakles (Travlos 1971, 274–77 = *SEG* 35:137).

Cult table of Pentelic marble, 140 cm. x 64 cm. x 30 cm., with the text inscribed around the edge of the table (ll. 1–4) and between three oval depressions (ll. 5–6). Letter height: 1.7–3.0 cm. The exact provenance is unknown but Lind (1985) speculates that it came from a sanctuary of Herakles in Kydathenaion. The stone is a *trapeza* used to distribute the roast meat to the worshipers and to deposit unburned food, cakes, and fruits for the gods (Dow and Gill 1965; Gill 1991, 23–25; Verbanck-Piérard 1992, 93).

## &lt;Around the edge&gt;

- 1 Σίμωνος Κυδαθ(ηρείως) · ιερέως Ἡρακλέος καὶ κοινῶ θιασωτῶν ·
- 2 Φιλωνίδης · Εὐθύνομος · Θεοφῶν
- 3 Πυθαῖος · Λυσανίας · Ἀντίθεος · Ἀμφίθεος · Ἡγέμων · Ἀρχέστρατος ·  
M-
- 4 [ελα]νωπίδης · Μελανωπίδης · Θεοφάνης

## &lt;Between the three depressions&gt;

- 5 Τελέστης Ἀπολλόδωρος
- 6 Ναυσίστρατος

## &lt;Around the edge&gt;

Belonging to Simon of Kydathenaion, priest of Herakles and the association of *thiasōtai*: Philonides · Euthynomos · Theophon · Pythaios · Lysanias · Antitheos · Amphitheos · Hegemon · Arcestratos · Melanopides · Melanopides · Theophanes

## &lt;Between the three depressions&gt;

Telestes · Apollodoros  
Nausistratos

## Notes

- l. 1: Σίμων → A hipparch named in Aristophanes, *Equites* 242 (*LGPN* 2:399[36]; *PA* 12702; *PAA* 822460) (Lind 1985, 250).
- l. 1: ἱερέως Ἡρακλέος καὶ κοινοῦ θιασσοῦ. An inscription from the early fifth century BCE may attest a *thiasos* connected with Herakles: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 1016 (*SEG* 10:330) (Piraeus): —ε— —μ— —ο [ἡερα]κλέο[ς] ἠίδρυε ὁ θιάσος [Ε]πιονιδῶν. There are three literary references to a θιάσος of Herakles. The first is in a speech of Isaeus (9.30) concerning Astyphilos, who was raised by his mother's second husband, Theophrastos. Theophrastos' son states: "My father took Astyphilos as a child with him to sacred rites (τὰ ἱερά) everywhere, as he did with me; and he introduced him to the Heraklean *thiasoi* (τοὺς θιάσους) so that he might participate in their activities (ἵνα μετέχοι τῆς κοινωνίας). The members (*thiasodotai*) themselves will bear witness to this for you."
- The second reference is in Diodoros Siculos (4.24.6), describing the Herakleia (a festival to Herakles) in Agyrion (Sicily): "Since the whole population, both free men and slaves, unite in approbation of the god, they have commanded their servants, as they do honor to him apart from the rest, to gather in bands (θιάσους τε συνάγειν) and when they come together to hold banquets and perform sacrifices to the god."
- Finally, Aristophanes' (lost) play *Daitales* (*The Banqueters*) is reported to have been named for a group "who dined in a shrine of Herakles and then got up and became a chorus" (Parker 1996, 333). *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1267 (Athens, late IV CE) appears to refer to this group: Λεοντε — — — | ἐψηφισ — — — | οἱ Δαιταλ[εῖς — — —] | ἐννέα ὄντ — — — || τοῦ νόμ[ου — — —] | [ἄ]ρχοντ — — —|.
- l. 1: Κυδαθ(ηείεως): Simon is designated as a demesman of Kydathenaion. The names Philonides (*PA* 14904; *PAA* 956765; *LGPN* 2:463[47]), Arcestratos (*PAA* 211130; *LGPN* 2:69[58]), and perhaps Apollodoros (*PA* 1425; *LGPN* 2:43[126–128]) are also attested as Kydathenaieis (see *PA* 2:564–567).
- l. 2: Φιλωνίδης. Dow (1969), Griffiths (1974, 367) and Lind (1985, 251) suggest that Philonides is Philonides of Kydathenaion (*PA* 14904), a comic poet who produced Aristophanes' *Vespae*, *Aves*, *Nubes* and *Ranae*. Like Philonides and Simon, Aristophanes also belonged to Kydathenaion (Gelzer 1971, 1398).
- l. 2: Εὐθόνομος; *PA* 5648a; *PAA* 433875; *LGPN* 2:172[1].
- l. 2: Θεοφῶν; *PA* 7180a; *PAA* 512775; *LGPN* 2:223[2].
- l. 3: Πυθαίος; *PAA* 793100; *LGPN* 2:385[2].
- l. 3: Λυσανίας; *PA* 9300a; *PAA* 612645; *LGPN* 2:289[7] → Aristophanes, *Nubes* 1162. Lysianos Sphettios (*PA* 9324; *PAA* 613020) son of Aischines was present at the death of Sokrates (Storey 1989).
- l. 3: Ἀντίθεος; *LGPN* 2:35[1]; *PA* 1040a; *PAA* 132995 → Aristophanes *Thesmophoriazousai* 898. Gill (1991, 43) suggests that Antitheos was the brother of Amphitheos.
- l. 3: Ἀμφίθεος; *LGPN* 2:27[2]; *PAA* 125420. The name is not common among Athenians but appears, as Dow (1969) and Lind (1985, 251) point out, as a character in Aristophanes, *Acharnenses* 46–47, 129, 175–76, where Aristophanes makes Amphitheos into an immortal, born of Demeter and Triptolemos (47–51) (*PAA* 125425). No other Athenian family is known to use the name Amphitheos. A rival theory argues that the Amphitheos of Aristophanes's play is to be identified with Hermogenes, son of Hipponicos (and brother of Callias), who claimed to have sprung from the gods on both sides. On this, see Starkie 1901, 21.

1. 3: Ἡγήμων: *PA* 6289a; *PAA* 480740; *LGPN* 2:200[3]. Dow conjectures that Hegemon is Amphitheos' son.
1. 3: Ἀρχέστρατος: *PA* 2405a; *PAA* 21130. A Kydathenaian demesman by this name is attested in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2336, but from a much later period (*PA* 2427; *PAA* 211555; *LGPN* 2:69[16]).
1. 4: Μελανωπίδης (*bis*): *PAA* 638614, 638615; *LGPN* 2:301[1].
1. 4: Θεοφάνης: *PA* 7074; *PAA* 510530; *LGPN* 2:221[2].
1. 5: Τελέστης: *PA* 13543a; *PAA* 879775; *LGPN* 02:426[5]. The name is also attested for a dedicator of a statue to Herakles ca. 440 BCE (*PAA* 879770).
1. 5: Ἀπολλόδωρος: *PA* 1981a; *PAA* 141905; *LGPN* 2:42[16]. The name is attested in Kydathenaian through much later: *PA* 1425; *PAA* 142790 (II/I BCE); *LGPN* 2:43[126–128].
1. 6: Ναυσίστρατος: *PA* 10587a; *PAA* 702290; *LGPN* 2:327[4].

### Comments

It is not certain, though probable, that this list is of Athenian citizens and that the *thiasos* is a subgroup of a “brotherhood” or phratry, although there is a small possibility that the members, apart from Simon, are noncitizens and the *thiasos* is composed of metics. If the former, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2343 is relevant to the study of the structure of the Athenian citizenry; if the latter, it is one of the earliest Attic attestations of an association of noncitizen devotees of the cult of Herakles.

Early in the fourth century BCE the terms θίασος and θιασῶται are attested in relation to subdivisions of Attic brotherhoods (phratries). The decree of the Demotionidai laid down rules for the introduction of new members into subdivision of phratries, called *thiasoi* (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1237.77, 82, 95 [Athens, 396–95 BCE], on which see Hedrick 1990; Lambert 1994, 285–93). Since membership in such *thiasoi* was strictly limited to legitimate male descendants of members (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1237.109–110), these associations were of a very different character than later noncitizen *thiasoi*, which included foreigners, slaves, freedmen and women. Another early fourth-century inscription (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2345) appears to be the membership list of a phratry<sup>1</sup> divided into at least six *thiasoi*, each designated by the name of a leading member. Patronyms and demotics are only irregularly present; but it is clear that many of the *thiasos* members were kinsmen.

Poland (1909, 18–19) took *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2343 to be a phratry list because, like *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2345, the *thiasōtai* are identified not by reference to a deity but to a demes-

---

<sup>1</sup> Thus Poland 1909, 18; Ferguson 1910, 270–71; Hedrick 1990, 57. As Lambert (1994, 83) points out, however, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2345 has some oddities. Someone is referred to as the *pais* of Euphronios (l. 73: Εὐφρονίου παῖς), that is, either a minor child, or unmarried female, or a slave. None of these was a phratry member, but slaves and women were members of *thiasoi* of foreigners. Second, Lambert notes that two of the members are known from another inscription to have belonged to a *genos* that did not belong to any phratry (1994, 64–65). Humphreys (1990) argues that the names without demotics (which form the majority) are from the city deme Alopeke. Lambert later (1999) argued that the list is a list of Herkleian *thiasoi*.

man.<sup>2</sup> By contrast, Lambert concludes that this and other Heraklean *thiasoi* “sound much more like the *thiasoi* of other cults which were clearly not phratry subdivisions in that foreigners and women were members” (1994, 89 n. 141). He adduced Isaeus 9.30 – “he introduced him to the Heraklean *thiasoi* (τὸς θιάσους) so that he might participate in their activities. The members (θιασῶται) themselves will bear witness to this for you” – which might suggest that membership in *thiasoi* was not identical with membership in Attic demes. However, both Isaeus 9.30 and 2.14 concern the introduction of an *adopted* son into the father’s association:

Isaeus 2.14: ποιησάμενος εισάγει με εἰς τοὺς φράτερας παρόντων τούτων, καὶ εἰς τοὺς δημότας με ἐγγράφει καὶ τοὺς ὀργεῶνας, “after my adoption, he introduced me to his phrateres in their presence (my opponents) and he registered me on the roll of the deme and on that of his *orgeōnes*.”

*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2343, moreover, lists no women and while some of the names (Amphitheos) are uncommon, none is obviously foreign. Dow (1969) first drew attention to the fact that a number of those named in the inscription appear to be persons named in Aristophanes’ plays, including Amphitheos (a very rare name) and Philonides. At least three of these are from Kydathenaion (Simon, Philonides, and Amphitheos), which suggests that all are demesmen. In that case, we have a list of a *thiasos* within a phratry.

Lind conjectures that the *thiasos* of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2343 was associated with a sanctuary of Herakles in Kydathenaion (→ *SEG* 24:208; *SEG* 35:137; Lind 1985, 256–57 [ph.]). This cannot be confirmed, but the stone resembles other cult tables (*trapezai*) used for offerings to the gods and for distribution of food to participants in a cult (Gill 1991).

**Literature:** Dow, et al. 1965; Dow, Sterling, “Some Athenians in Aristophanes.” *AJA* 73 (1969) 234–35 (*SEG* 33:161); Gelzer, T. “Aristophanes der Komiker.” *PW* Supplement 12 (1971) 1392–569; Gill, David H. *Greek Cult Tables*, New York: Garland, 1991, 42–42 (no. 12) (*SEG* 42:195, 1806); Golden, M. “Demosthenes and the Age of Majority in Athens.” *Phoenix* 33 (1979) 25–38; Griffiths, John G. “Amphitheos and Anthropros in Aristophanes.” *Hermes* 102 (1974) 367–69; Hedrick, Charles W. *The Decrees of the Demotionidai*. American Philological Association. American Classical Studies, no. 22. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1990; Humphreys, Sarah C. “Phrateres in Alopeke and the Salaminiotai.” *ZPE* 83 (1990) 243–48; Lambert 1999; Lind, Hermann “Neues aus Kydathen: Beobachtungen zum Hintergrund der ‘Daitales’ und der ‘Ritter’ des Aristophanes.” *Museum Helveticum* 42 (1985) 249–61 (*SEG* 35:131, 137); Starkie, W.J.M. *The Acharnians of Aristophanes*. London: Macmillan, 1901; Storey, Ian C. “Aristophanes Clouds 1158–60: A Prosopographical Notes.” *CQ* 39

<sup>2</sup> Similarly Dow 1969; Golden 1979, 38 n. 41. Ferguson’s comments are somewhat confusing. He suggests that the *thiasōtai* of *IG* II 986b (= *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2343) are “foreigners—as seems to me more likely from the presence among them of three woman and their designation as a *koinon*” (1910, 272). But it is the list of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2347 (= *IG* II 987) that has three women, not *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2343. Later, Ferguson (1911, 219 n. 5) treats *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2343 as a phratry list.

(1989) 549–50 (*SEG* 39:192); Verbanck-Piérard, Annie. “Herakles at Feast in Attic Art: A Mythical or Cultic Iconography?” In *The Iconography of Greek Cult in the Archaic and Classical Periods*, ed. Robin Hägg. Kernos Supplement 1. Athens and Liège: Centre d’étude de la religion grecque antique, 1992 (*SEG* 42:143); Welch, D. “IG II 2 2343, Philonides and Aristophanes’ Banqueters.” *CQ* 33(1) (1983) 51–55.

## [2] *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1255

### Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis honoring Athenian Citizens

Piraeus (Attica)

337/6 BCE

Published: Adolf Wilhelm, “Inscription aus dem Peiraieus,” *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien* 5 (1902) 127–39, here 132; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1255; Schwenk 1985, 63–67 (no. 13) (Poland A6e).

Publication used: *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1255, corrected by Schwenk on the basis of an examination of the stone in the Piraeus Museum.

Current Location: Museum in Piraeus.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 383.A.ii.V.143 = I<sup>2</sup> 310.208 (Athens, 429/8 BCE):

Treasury accounts of other gods mentioning Bendis; *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 136 (*LSCGSup* 6) (Athens, 432/1 or 411 BCE): A Council decree pertaining to the public worship of Bendis; *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 369.68 (426/5 BCE): A loan due to the association of Bendis; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1361 [4] (Piraeus, 330–324/3 BCE): Regulations concerning the cult of Bendis; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1496 (Piraeus, 334/3–331/0 BCE): treasury accounts; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1256 [5] (Piraeus, 329/8 BCE): Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1283 [23] (Piraeus, 240/39 BCE): Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1284A–B [22] (Piraeus, 241/0 BCE): Two honorary decrees of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1317 (Salamis, 272/1 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis honoring their treasurer and his *synepimeletai*; *SEG* 2:10 (Salamis, 251/0 BCE): Honorary decree for *epimelētai* of Bendis(?); *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1317b (Salamis, 249/8 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis, honoring their officials; *SEG* 44:60 (Salamis, 244/3 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis for their officers; *SEG* 2:9 [21] (Salamis, 243/2 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis(?) honoring *epimelētai*; *Agora* 16:245 = *SEG* 21:531 = Meritt 1961b, 227 [no. 25] (Athens, III BCE): “Probably a decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis” (Meritt); *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1324 [32] (Piraeus, ca. 190 BCE): Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis honoring Stephanos; *Agora* 16:329 = *SEG* 19:125 = Meritt 1960, 21 (Athens, II/I BCE): fragment of a decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis and Deloptes.

Stoichedon (26 letters). Discovered in the Piraeus. White marble, broken at the left and bottom. 41–31 cm. x 27 cm. x 7 cm; letter height: 0.7 cm (0.5–1.0 cm).

ἔδοξεν τοῖς ὀργεῶσι· Ὀλυμπιόδω-  
 [ρος · · · · ·] εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ οἱ ἱε-  
 [ροποιοὶ οἱ ἐπὶ] Φρυνίχου ἄρχοντ-  
 [ος καλῶς ἐπεμε]λήθησαν καὶ φιλ[ο]-  
 5 [τίμως τῆς τε πο]μπῆς καὶ τῆς κρεα-  
 [νομίας καὶ τῶν] ἄλλων πάντων· ἐψ[η]-  
 [φίσθαι τοῖς ὀργ]εῶσι ἐπαινέσα[ι α]-  
 [ὐτούς καὶ στεφ]ανῶσαι χρυσῶι [στ]-  
 [εφάνωι ἀπὸ τρι]ακοσίων δρα[χμῶν]  
 10 [Ἀντιφάνην Ἀντι]σθένους Κυ[θήρρ]-  
 [ιον, Ναυσίφιλον] Ναυσινίκο[υ Κεφ]-  
 [αλήθεν, Ἀριστομέ]νην Μοσχ · · 5 · ·  
 [· · 5 · · φιλοτιμία]ς ἔνεκα τ[ῆς εἰς]  
 [τούς ὀργεῶνας· ἀνα]γράφαι[ι δὲ τόδ]-  
 15 [ε τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν στή]λει λ[ιθίνει κ]-  
 [αὶ στήσαι ἐν τῷ ἱερ]ῶι τ[ῆς Βενδῖ]-  
 [δος τὸν γραμματέα Θ]άλλ[ον · · 5 · ·]

...the *orgeōnes* approved the motion which Olympiodoros son of ... made: Whereas the “sacrifice makers” (*hieropoioi*) who served when Phrynichos was archon have done so with honor and zeal, both in regard to the procession and the division of the sacrificial meat and all other matters; it was decided by the *orgeōnes* to commend the following and to crown them with a golden crown with the value of three hundred drachmae: Antiphanes son of Antisthenes of Kytherros, Nausiphilos son of Nausinikos of Kephale, and Aristomenes son of Mosch..... on account of the zeal that they have shown towards the *orgeōnes*; and that the secretary Thallos have this decree inscribed on a stele and set up in the sanctuary of Bendis.....

### Notes

1. 1: ὀργεῶνες: Almost all of the 140 references to *orgeōnes* (which lacks a singular form) come from Attica. Exceptions are *IG* VII 33.1 (Megara, I CE): [οὔ]δ'ε ὀργεῶνες κτῶν [θεῶν] (but see Sean Byrne, “The Dedication of the Orgeōnes of Prospalta, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2355,” in *Μικρὸς Ἱερομνήμων. Μελέτες εἰς μνήμην Michael H. Jameson*, ed. A. P. Matthaiou and I. Polinskaya. Athens: Elleniki epigrafiki etaireia, 2008, 117–32, who argues that this inscription is from Eleusis); *IG* XII/8 19.4–7, 12–16 (Lemnos, 314/3 BCE), describing a loan of land (χωρίον) and a house in successive years to ὀργεῶσι τοῦ Ἡρακλεί[ου]ς τοῦ ἐ[ν] Κόμει κατὰ τὸ γραμματεῖον τὸ ὀργεῶνικόν and ὀργεῶσι τοῦ Ἡρακλεί[ου]ς τοῦ ἐν Κόμει κατὰ τὸ γραμματεῖον τὸ ὀργεῶνικόν; similarly *IG* XII/8 21.1–6 (Lemnos, late IV BCE); *BCH* 4 (1880) 164–67, no. 21 (Teos, mid II BCE): ὁ θίασος ὁ [Σι]μαλ[ίων]ος· ὀργ[ε]ῶνες οἱ σὺν Ἀθηνοδότῳ Μητροδώρῳ. Teos had close relations to Athens, and Athenian



cleruchs lived on Lemnos, including in the village of Kome (Ferguson 1944, 92). Sokolowski restores *LSAM* 4.20–21 (Kalcedon, III BCE) as ἀποδόσθ[αι ᾧτινι τῶν ὀρ][γε]ῶν[ων κατ]ὰ τὰν συνγραφάν.

The term *orgeōnes*, rendered by Ferguson (1944, 62) as “sacrificing associates,” probably originally referred to those who performed sacred rites (ὄργια) on lands dedicated to the gods (ὄργα) (Arnaoutoglou 2003, 33), but later came to refer to membership in general. Some of those designated as *orgeōnes* were Athenian citizens (Isaeus, *Peri Menekleous klerou* 14; Philochoros in *FGrH* 328 f35a), but the relationship of *orgeōnes* to the phratries remains unclear. Moreover, the term is also used of persons who were clearly not citizens, such as the Thracian *orgeōnes* of Bendis (→ *comment*).

- II. 2–3: οἱ ἱε[ρο]ποιοί. According to Aristotle (*Athenian Constitution* 54.6), two sets of ten ἱεροποιοί (“sacrifice makers”), “called superintendents of expiation” (τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ἐκθύματα καλουμένους), were elected by lot each year in Athens. The first set performed sacrifices prescribed by oracle and for business requiring omens to be watched while the second set “perform[ed] certain sacrifices and administer[ed] all the four yearly festivals, except the Panathenaic festival.” *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361.16, 18 [4] indicates that the term *hieropoioi* was also used for officers of the (private) Bendis association, apparently in imitation of the Athenian institution. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1261.28, 36, 45–46 [9] uses the term in the context of an association dedicated (probably) to the Syrian Aphrodite.
- II. 3–4: Φρυνίχου ἄρχοντ[ι]ος, i.e., 337/6 BCE. See Dinsmoor 1931, 356; Meritt 1977, 168.
- II. 8–9: στεφ[αν]ῶσαι χρυσῶι [στ][εφ]ᾶνῶι ἀπὸ τρι[α]κοσίων δρα[χμῶν]. Compare *IG* II<sup>2</sup> frag. b.6–8 (403/2 BCE): the crowning of a secretary with a gold crown worth 200 dr.; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1252.9–10 [6]: ἐκ<ά>τερον χρυσῶι στεφᾶνῶι ἀπὸ δραχμῶν Ἑ; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1253.9–10 (Athens, second half of IV BCE): στεφανῶσαι αὐτῶν ἑκάτερον χρυσῶι στεφᾶνῶι; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1256.9–10 [5] (Piraeus, 329/8 BCE): χρυσῶι στεφᾶνῶι ἑκάτερον ἀπὸ Η δραχμῶν, two *orgeōnes* of Bendis, named without patronyms or demotics, are each voted gold crowns of 100 dr. each; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316.15–16 [16]: στεφ[αν][ῶ]σαι χρυσῶι στεφᾶνῶι ἑκάτερον αὐτῶν. In *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255.9 there is insufficient room on the line for ἑκάτερον, but presumably we are to understand that each is to receive a crown of 300 drachmae, rather than the two sharing one crown. Arnaoutoglou (2003, 60), however, thinks that each crown is worth only 100 drachmae.
- II. 10–11: [Αντιφάνην Ἄντι]σθένους Κυ[θήρρ][ι]ον (*PA* 1237; *PAA* 137490; *LGP*N 2:39[52]). Antiphanes Kytherrios son of Antisthenes is also named in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1554 [= *SEG* 18:38B]; 1627.204, 222.
- II. 11–12: Ναυσίφιλον Ναυσινίκο[υ Κεφ][αλήθεν] (*PA* 10601; *PAA* 702540; *LGP*N 2:327[1]). Nausiphilos is named in Demosthenes, *59 Against Neaera* 65, 71 as a guarantor of a loan of 30 minas. Nausiphilos’ father Nausinikos had been archon in 378–377 BCE.
- II. 12: Ἀριστομέ[νην] Μοσχ[ί]· · · 5 · · · (*PAA* 173115) either Μόσχου or Μοσχίονος, probably the former, if a deme name follows in l. 13. The name + patronym without a demotic is not otherwise attested.
- I. 13: φιλοτιμία]ς ἔνεκα: “on account of zeal.” *Philotimia* (lit. “love of honor”) is one of the most common virtues praised in Athenian public inscriptions and in association inscriptions and connotes actions in the interests of the polis or the association → Whitehead 1983 and Index s.v. Virtues and Vices.

- II. 16–17: T[ΗΣ ΒΕΝΔΙΔΙΟΣ] (Kirchner) is the only deity that will fit the space and number of letters available.
- I. 17: Θ[άλλ]ov: so Wilhelm. Ferguson (1944, 98 n. 43) opined that this Thallos might be the father of Stephanos (*PA* 12883; *LGPN* 2:209[1]) honored in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1324.1 [32] and mentioned by Lysias (19.46). The latter inscription, however, has now been redated to ca. 190 BCE. Schwenk (1985, 66), however, notes that the omicron presupposed by this reconstruction is missing, and in her 1973 examination of the stone, the second lambda could no longer be read.

### Comments

The cult of the Thracian deity Bendis was introduced into Athens in the fifth century BCE; by 429/8 Bendis had a public shrine (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 383.A.ii.V.143 = *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 310.208); in 426/5 BCE there is a record of loans being made by the cult to Athenians (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 369.68) (Meritt 1932, 128, 140) and by 413 BCE at the latest the *Bendideia* were part of the Athenian state cult. In 404 BCE Xenophon (*Hell.* 2.4.10–11) noted a temple to Bendis on the eastern side of the Piraeus on the road that led to the temple of Artemis Mounichia (ἡ φέρει πρὸς τε τὸ ἱερόν τῆς Μουνιχίας καὶ τὸ Βενδίδειον), where fragments of a stele which refers to Bendis have also been found (Nilsson 1942, 183–88). For a discussion of the history of the Bendis groups in Athens and the Piraeus and the *Bendideia* → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283 [23].

By the late fourth century two associations of Bendis existed, one Athenian and the other Thracian (in the Piraeus), a few decades later there was also a Thracian group in Athens. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283 (240/39 BCE) prescribes regulations for a procession from Athens to the Piraeus in which both Thracian groups participated. It is impossible to be certain which of the two associations, Athenian or Thracian, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255 represents. Wilhelm distinguished between the two groups on the basis of their meeting date and their crowns: the Athenian group met on the second day of the month and crowned their members with olive wreaths (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361 [4]), while the Thracian group met on the eighth and used oak wreaths (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283 [23], 1284 [22]; Wilhelm 1902, 132–34). This criterion is, however, of no help here. The citizen association had “sacrifice makers” (*hieropoioi*, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361 [4]), but it is not clear whether the *hieropoioi* honored in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255 were citizen members of the association or were three of the ten *hieropoioi* of the polis of Athens designated to officiate at state festivals (Aristotle, *Athenian Constitution* 54.6 → II. 2–3 note). If the honorees were members of the association, the likelihood is that *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255 is from the citizen association since *hieropoioi* are not attested for the Thracian association. If they were Athenian officials, however, the association could be the Athenian or the Thracian one, since non-citizen associations could honor Athenian officials for their benefactions in an effort to secure recognition by the *polis* and other favors.

Ferguson thought that the *hieropoioi* honored were Athenian officials, arguing that the golden crown (rather than oak or olive wreaths) points to civic

officials (1944, 99 n. 43) and noting that the *Bendideia* was an Athenian festival by this time (1949, 155). These features, in his view, point to a Bendis association comprised of citizens and located in the Piraeus (so Garland 1987, 119; Parker 1996, 171 n. 65; von Reden 1995, 37 n. 27; Jones 1999, 260; Arnaoutoglou 2003, 60, with hesitations). Arnaoutoglou (2003, 107), however, thinks it unlikely that the *hieropoioi* were civic officials, reasoning that,

it would be unusual if public officials were involved in the administration of an *orgeōnes* association forming, together with *epimelētai*, the executive board of this particular association. *Hieropoioi* as officials of the city had the task of helping in the organization of the four-year festivals; but in the *orgeōnes* of Bendis they seem to participate actively, not only in the organization of the *Bendideia*, but also in the administration of the association.

Schwenk (1985, 67) objects that 300 drachmae is a rather small amount for the crown and concludes that, since Lykourgos' program was friendly to foreign cults (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 337* [3]), it is possible that civic *hieropoioi* were honored by a Thracian association. If the figure of 300 drachmae in l. 9 is the total amount spent on *three* crowns (see the note above), the gold crowns of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255* would be comparable to those voted to two *epimelētai* of a Bendis association (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1256.9–10* [5] [Piraeus, 329/8 BCE]), who lack both patronyms and demotics and, hence, might be Thracian. I have argued, however, that l. 9 probably means “each having a value of 300 drachmae,” in which case we have the analogy of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2 frag. b.7–8* (403/2 BCE) where a civic official is honored with a golden crown of 300 drachmae. Whether Athenian officials or *hieropoioi* of the Bendis association, however, it would appear that one of the roles of these *hieropoioi* was to hand over to the civic treasury revenues obtained from the sale of the skins of animals sacrificed at the *Bendideia*, which was a civic festival. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1496.86* (331/0 BCE) records the delivery of 457 drachmae to the treasury ἐγ Βενδιδέων παρὰ ἱεροπο[ῶν] ΗΗΗΗΨΤΨ, “457 drachmae (delivered) by the *hieropoioi* from the *Bendideia*” (cf. l. 117: [ἐγ Βενδιδ]έων παρὰ ἱε[ροποιῶν · · · ·]).

Ferguson proposes that sometime between 429 and the time of Lykourgos the city transferred the responsibility for the *Bendideia* to the two Bendis associations, who then took charge of the procession, sacrifices and the torch race,

reserving perhaps its control of the *kreanomía* and a measure of control over the business and the business meetings of the Athenian branch by keeping in its own hands the appointment of the *hieropoioi*. The priest and the priestess of the Athenian association must, I think, have remained public officials, selected ἐξ Ἀθηναίων πάντων; but in the conduct of other than public sacrifices they came under the authority of the *orgeōnes*. (1949, 156)

**Literature:** Ferguson 1944, esp. 96–107; 1949, esp. 153–57; Garland 1987, esp. 232; Jones 1999, esp. 259–60; Pakkanen 1996; Planeaux 2000–2001; Schwenk 1985, esp. 63–67; Wilhelm 1902, esp. 132.

[3] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 337*

## A Kitian Temple for the Syrian Aphrodite

Piraeus (Attica)

333/2 BCE

Published: Stephanos A. Koumanoudes, *Παλιγγενεσία* (Sept. 10, 1870) (*ed. pr.*); Foucart 1873, 187–89 (no. 1); Koehler, *IG II* 168; Protz and Ziehen, *LGS II* 30; Roberts and Gardner 1887–1905, 2:115–17 (no. 43); Dittenberger, *Syll<sup>2</sup>* 551; Michel, *RIG* 104; Dittenberger–Hiller von Gaertringen, *Syll<sup>3</sup>* 280; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 337*; Tod, *GHI II* 189; Pečírka 1966, 59–61; Sokolowski, *LSCG*, 66–68 (no. 34); Vidman, *SIRIS* 3 (no. 10); *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 434; Schwenk 1985, 141–46 (no. 27); Le Guen-Pollet 1991, 216–19 (no. 81); Kai Brodersen, Wolfgang Günther, and Hatto H. Schmitt, eds. *Historische Griechische Inschriften in Übersetzung* (Texte zur Forschung, vols. 59; 68; 71; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992–99) 2: no. 262; Tracy 1995, 113 (squeeze of ll. 36–44); Peter John Rhodes, and Robin Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions 359–323 B.C.* (2nd ed. London Association of Classical Teachers, no. 9; Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2003) 462–66 (no. 91); Marguerite Yon, *Kition dans les textes: Testimonia littéraires et épigraphiques et Corpus des inscriptions*, Vol. 5 of *Kition-Bamboula* (Ed. Yves Calvet, Jean-François Salles, and Marguerite Yon; Editions Recherche sur les civilisations. Mémoires, 53; Paris: Éditions recherche sur les civilisations, 2004) 132–34 (no. 159) (ph.) = *IKition T* 159; Bricault, *RICIS* 1:3-4 (no. 101/0101) + Plate 101/0101.

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 337* and a squeeze (Cambridge University, Dept. of Classics, Box A.30 no. 56).

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum, EM 7173.

Similar Inscriptions → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4636* and *4637* (Piraeus, late IV BCE): Dedications to Aphrodite Ourania; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4586* (Piraeus, mid IV BCE): Dedication to Aphrodite; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4616* (Piraeus, late IV BCE): Dedication found in the same location as *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4596*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1261 [9]* (Piraeus, 302–299 BCE): Three decrees of the *thiasōtai* of Aphrodite; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1290* (Piraeus, mid. III BCE): A fragmentary decree of Salaminians of Cyprus concerning the worship of Aphrodite and the celebration of the Adoneia; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1337 [44]* (Piraeus, 97/6 BCE): Honors for a priestess of the Syrian Aphrodite.

Stoichedon (20 letters). Pentelic marble, 107.5 cm. x 27.9–32.5 cm. x 9.0–10.0 cm.; letter height: 0.7 (0.45–1.0 cm.). The inscription was discovered in the Piraeus in 1870, but no further details are available on the specific site of discovery. It is well preserved, with each line twenty characters wide. Tracy (1995, 112–13) has identified the cutter as active from 337–323 BCE. The cutter is inconsistent in spelling: ἔμποροι (l. 33) and ἐμπόρους (l. 39); τῆι βουλεῖ (ll. 6/7, 19) and τεῖ βουλεῖ (l. 12); Κιτιέων (l. 40) and Κιτιεῖων (l. 21). Ο = ου (l. 31) in Λύκοργος, unless the υ has been omitted accidentally.

[Θ] Ε Ο Ι

- Ἐπὶ Νικοκράτους ἄρχον-  
 τος, ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰγείδος πρώ-  
 τῆς πρυτανείας· τῶν προέδ-  
 ρων ἐπιψήφισεν Θεόφιλος  
 5 Φηγούσιος, ἔδοξεν τῆ βου-  
 λεῖ· Ἀντίδοτος Ἀπολλο-  
 δώρου Συπαλήττιος εἶπε-  
 ν· περὶ ὧν λέγουσιν οἱ Κιτι-  
 10 εῖς περὶ τῆς ἰδρύσειως  
 τῆ Ἀφροδίτῃ τοῦ ἱεροῦ,  
 ἐψηφίσθαι τεῖ βουλεῖ το-  
 ῦς προέδρους οἱ ἂν λάχωσ-  
 ι προεδρεύειν εἰς τὴν πρ-  
 15 ώτην ἐκκλησίαν προσαγα-  
 γεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ χρηματί-  
 σαι, γνώμην δὲ ξυνβάλλεσ-  
 θαι τῆς βουλῆς εἰς τὸν δῆ-  
 μον ὅτι δοκεῖ τῆ βουλεῖ  
 20 ἀκούσαντα τὸν δῆμον τῶν  
 Κιτιέων περὶ τῆς ἰδρύσ-  
 ειως τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ ἄλλου  
 Ἀθηναίων τοῦ βουλομένο-  
 υ βουλευέσασθαι ὅ τι ἂν αὐ-  
 25 τῷ δοκεῖ ἄριστον εἶναι.  
 Ἐπὶ Νικοκράτους ἄρχον-  
 τος, ἐπὶ τῆς Πανδιονίδος δε-  
 ευτέρας πρυτανείας· τῶν  
 προέδρων ἐπεψήφισεν Φα-  
 30 νόστρατος Φιλαΐδης· ἔδο-  
 ξεν τῷ δήμῳ· Λυκῶργος Λυ-  
 κόφρονος Βουτάδης εἶπ-  
 εν· περὶ ὧν οἱ ἔμποροι οἱ Κι-  
 τιεῖς ἔδοξαν ἔννομα ἰκ-  
 35 τεύειν αἰτοῦντες τὸν δῆ-  
 ῆμον χωρίου ἔνκτησιν ἐν  
 ὧ ἰδρύσονται ἱερὸν Ἀφρ-  
 οδίτης, δεδόχθαι τῷ δήμ-  
 ωι, δοῦναι τοῖς ἐμπόροις  
 40 τῶν Κιτιέων ἔνκτησι[ν] χ[ω]-  
 ρίου ἐν ὧ ἰδρύσονται τὸ  
 ἱερὸν τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, καθ-  
 ἄπερ καὶ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τὸ  
 τῆς Ἰσιδος ἱερὸν ἰδρυντ-  
 45 αι.

## G o d s !

In the year that Nikokrates was archon, in the first prytany of the (tribe of) Aigeis, Theophilos of Phegaea, (chair) of the presiders, put the following to a vote: resolved by the Council (*boulē*) (the motion that) Antidotos son of Apollodoros of Sypalettos made:

- 9 In regard to what the Kitians propose concerning the establishment of the temple to Aphrodite, it is resolved by the Council that the presiders, who are chosen by lot to preside in the first assembly (*ekklēsia*), shall bring them forward and deal with the business and put to the People (*dēmos*) the proposal of the Council: that it seems good to the Council that the People, having listened to the Kitians regarding the foundation of the temple and to any other Athenian who wishes (to speak), should decide whatever seems best.
- 26 In the year that Nikokrates was archon, during the second prytany, of (the tribe of) Pandionis, the question was put by Phanostratos of the deme of Philaidae, (chair) of the presiders; resolved by the Council (the motion that) Lykourgos son of Lykophron, of the deme of Boutadai, made:
- 33 Since the Kitian merchants are making a legitimate request in asking the People's assembly for (the right to) lease of the land on which they propose to establish a temple of Aphrodite: be it resolved by the People (*dēmos*) to grant to the Kitian merchants the lease of the land to establish the temple of Aphrodite, in the same way that the Egyptians also established the temple of Isis.

## Notes

- I. 1: Θ Ε Ο Ι, “gods!” frequently begins Athenian decrees and seems to indicate that “before the matter under discussion was considered and decided upon, the proper religious exercises had been performed or invocations made” (Woodhead 1967, 39; McLean 2002, 219).
- II. 1–2: Ἐπὶ Νικοκράτους ἄρχοντος. Nikokrates was archon 333/2 BCE (see Dinsmoor 1931, 357; Meritt 1977, 169). He is also named in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 338; 339; 340; 341; 391; 1496 A IV.93, 124; 1544; 1623; 1652; 1653; 2791; *SEG* 12:679; 680; 682; *SEG* 31:162; *SEG* 33:147; *AM* 76.143.
- II. 2–4: Ἐπὶ Νικοκράτους ἄρχοντος, ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰγείδος πρώτης πρυτανείας: on the form of dating by archon and prytany, see Alan S. Henry, *The Prescripts of Athenian Decrees* (Mnemosyne Supplement 49. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977) 38, 43.
- I. 3: πρυτανεία: The proposal of the Council is further dated by the prytany or executive council that held the presidency of the Council at the time. The presidency rotated monthly through the Athenian tribes on a pattern established by lot.
- II. 4–5: πρόεδροι: A board of *proedroi* presided in the council (βουλή) and the assembly (δῆμος) and was responsible for putting forth motions. They were selected by lot each day by that day's *epistatēs*, one from each tribe except that of the *epistatēs* and that of the incumbent prytany (Rhodes 1972, 25).
- II. 6–7: Decrees of the βουλή and δῆμος are normally introduced with the formula ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλεὶ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ. In Attic decrees, this formula is regularly followed

- by mention of the date, the magistrate or magistrates presiding, and the orator proposing the motion. The formula of proposing (ὁ δεῖνα εἶπε) governs the text of the main body of the decree, normally in a continuous accusative-infinitive construction. See Woodhead 1967, 38.
- II. 9–10, 21: Κιτιεῖς: Kition (→ Nicolaou 1976) in Cyprus was settled by Phoenician traders in the ninth century BCE and was under Phoenician control until the Hellenistic period. → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1261.9 [9] note*.
- I. 15: ἐκκλησία. Here *ekklesiā* is equivalent to ἀγορά (“meeting”) as it also is in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 336 frag. a.4 (334/3 BCE)*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 340.6–7 (333/2 BCE)* and many other Athenian decrees. Elsewhere ἐκκλησία is equivalent to δῆμος in the formula ἔδοξεν τῆ βουλῆ καὶ τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ: *IG VII 4256.5–6 (Boeotia, 322–13 BCE)*; *VII 4257.6–7 (Boeotia, 322–313 BCE)*; *Epigr. tou Oropou 6 (Boeotia, 322–313 BCE)*; *SEG 35:665.3–4 (Epeiros, 160 BCE)*; *SEG 30:990.3 (Delos, 325–275 BCE)*; *ICosED 18.1 (Cos, IV/III bce)*, etc.
- II. 31–32: Λυκῶργος Λυκόφρονος. Lykourgos was in charge of Athens’ finances from 338–326 BCE and is named as the proposer of decrees in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 328.8*; *333.14*; *345.9*; *414.2*; *1672.11*. He is known to have been interested in cultic matters, and in his extensive building program in Athens he had the temple of Dionysos reconstructed in marble. It was his grandfather who was probably the target of Aristophanes’ satire in *Aves* 1296. See further G.L. Cawkwell, “Lycurgus (3),”  *OCD 629*; M. Faraguna, *Atene nell’ età de Alessandro: Problemi Politici, Economici, Finanziari* (Atti dell’ accademia nazionale dei Lincei. Memorie. Classe di scienze morali, stoiche e filologiche 9.2.2. Rome: Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, 1992).
- II. 36, 40: ἔνκτησιν, “the right to own property.” See the *comment* below.

### Comments

The document is in two parts: The first records the motion of Antidotos, introduced in the Council by one of the presiders. Antidotos’s motion was only to place the matter before the entire Athenian Assembly. The motion seems to have come without a concrete recommendation of the Council. Sokolowski (1969, 68) took this to mean that the Council was not in favour of the Kitian request. Schwenk (1985, 144), however, points out that there are other instances of an open *probouleuma* which need not be taken to signal the Council’s opposition (see also Rhodes 1972, 59 n. 3). The second portion of the decree, dated later the same year, records a motion, introduced by the orator Lykourgos and formally moved by one of the πρόεδροι (Phanostratos), and the Assembly’s decision to lease land to the Kitian merchants.

The inscription lacks a formula ordering that the decree be recorded on a stele and erected near the proposed temple (e.g., *IG II<sup>2</sup> 237.31–38 [Athens, 337 BCE]*). This probably means that the inscription was erected by the Kitians themselves at their own expense (Roberts, et al. 1887–1905, 116; Tod 1933–1948, 2:251). Doubtless it was displayed in their temple, an action that served to establish their legal claim on the land.

As a port city the Piraeus was a natural point of entry for foreign cults. Non-citizens, however, were not normally permitted either to own land or to build

on it (Rhodes 1972, 97–98; Pečírka 1966). Though an expression of Plato’s ideals rather than any real enactment in Athens, Plato’s *Leges* expresses what was perhaps a more general sentiment that weighed against the establishing of private cultic centres:

For all these offenders one general law must be laid down, such as will cause the majority of them not only to offend less against the gods by word and deed, but also to become less foolish, through being forbidden to trade in religion illegally. To deal comprehensively with all such cases the following law shall be enacted: No one shall possess a shrine in his own house: when any one is moved in spirit to do sacrifice he shall go to the public places to sacrifice, and he shall hand over his oblations to the priests and priestesses to whom belongs the consecration thereof; and he himself, together with any associates he may choose, shall join in the prayers. (Plato, *Leges* 10.909DE)

Only three groups of metics are known to have obtained permission from the Council and People to own land: the cults of Bendis (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283 [23]), Isis, and the Syrian Aphrodite (Garland 1987, 108). The cult of the Thracian goddess Bendis had been established a century before *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 337 and was the first to receive a grant of ἔγκτησις, probably in the late fifth century BCE. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 337 indicates that the cult of Isis had been established in the Piraeus, probably shortly before the Kitian decree. The merchants of Kition, now resident in the Piraeus as μέτοικοι (*metics*), sought similar permission.

There is disagreement whether this decree amounted to approval and introduction of a new cult, as Foucart (1873, 127–28), Ziebarth (1896, 168), and Versnel (1990–1993, 1:122) think, or whether it merely concerned the right to acquire land (ἔγκτησις), as Poland (1909, 81), Radin (1910, 52), Jones (1999, 40), and Baslez (1988–1989, 14) hold. Versnel (1990–1993, 1:122–31) concludes that the Athenian law against the introduction of new gods under which Sokrates may have been prosecuted and mentioned in Demosthenes (*19 The False Legation* 281; Josephus, *Contra Apionem* 2.267; Servius *ad Vergil Aen.* 8.187) would have made new cults that were not specifically authorized subject to a charge of *asebeia*. Garland, however, points out that Josephus’ account is garbled – Ninos was executed not for introducing new gods but because her office as priestess forbade her from participating in the rites of foreign deities. Garland concludes: “the Athenians were certainly not backward in acknowledging that ‘the gods of other people were gods’.... The fact that they later acquired the reputation for being hostile to new gods was no doubt due in part to the notoriety surrounding the trial and condemnation of Sokrates” (1992, 150).

Nevertheless, as Arnaoutoglou (2003, 90) notes, the existence (and legitimacy) of the Kitian cult is tacitly acknowledged in the grant of ἔγκτησις. Parker (1996, 337–38) and Leiwo (1997, 115) suggest that both the Kitians and the Egyptians (Il. 43–45) had already formed cult associations. They may up to that point have been sharing cultic space in some other sanctuary (Arnaoutoglou 2003, 90 n. 5).



The patronal deity of these Cyprian merchants is called Aphrodite in this inscription and appears in other inscriptions as the Syrian Aphrodite or Aphrodite Ourania. A sanctuary of Aphrodite-Astarte has been excavated on the Acropolis of Kition, and another shrine to Astarte is located in the northern part of the town (Nicolaou 1976, 105–8), confirming Herodotos’ belief that Aphrodite Ourania originated in the East (1.105), apparently as a hellenized version of Astarte. Inscriptions honoring Aphrodite are plentiful in Cyprus. Temples to the goddess are now found in Athens, Elis, Megalopolis and Argos, and the cult is attested at numerous locations (Nilsson 1967, 1:521). Several fourth-century BCE dedications to Aphrodite are extant: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4586* (to Aphrodite) and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4616* (a dedication discovered in the same find spot in Piraeus); two fourth-century BCE dedications that name Aphrodite Ourania explicitly (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 4636*; *4637*), both discovered on the southern part of the Piraean peninsula. The first of the two and the more complete dedication is by a woman of Kition:

Ἄριστοκλέα Κιτιᾶς Ἀφροδίτῃ|ι Οὐρανίαι εὐξαμένη ἀνέθηκεν.|

Aristoklea of Kition dedicated this to Aphrodite Ourania, in fulfillment of a vow.

A slightly later inscription by the Salaminians (from Cyprus) mentions Aphrodite in connection with the celebration of the Adoneia or festival of Adonis (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1290*; mid III BCE). *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1337* [44] (Piraeus, 97/6 BCE), an inscription in honor of the priestess of the Syrian Aphrodite (Ἀφροδίτῃ Συρίαι), attests the existence of the temple two centuries later but the association of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1337* is a citizen, not a metic association. Unlike the Bendis associations (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255* [4]), there is nothing in these inscriptions to suggest that any Athenians became members of the group.

*IG II<sup>2</sup> 337* also attests to the establishing of a cult of Isis in Piraeus, apparently under similar terms to that granted to the Kitian merchants (Simms 1988–1989). Koehler (1871, 352) suggested that Lykourgos’ grandfather and namesake, nicknamed “Ibis” by Aristophanes (*Birds* 1296), was the first to propose a grant of *enktesis* to Egyptian metics and that in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 337*, Lykourgos was emulating his grandfather’s policy (so Dunand 1973, 2:5). There is no evidence to support this conjecture, however (Dow 1937, 185; Pečírka 1966, 61). It is just as likely that the precedent to which Lykourgos referred was his own (Schwenk 1985, 145).

Whether the cult of Isis was exclusively Egyptian or also patronized by Athenians is impossible to know. Nor is it clear when the cult was introduced. This is the earliest Attic reference to Isis, but the cult of Ammon is attested at the same time (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 338.15* [Athens, 333/2 BCE]; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 410.19* [Athens; ca. 330 BCE]; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1496 A IV.96* [Athens, 333/2 BCE]), the first a reference to the building of a fountain near the sanctuary of Ammon, the second an honorific decree commending the priest of Ammon, and the third a treasury account of skins from sacrifices. Dunand (1973, 2:5) points out that the name Ἰσιγένης (a

patronym) is attested ca. 325 BCE, which suggests that this Isigenes, probably a devotee of Isis, belonged to the early part of the IV BCE.

Although this is the only monument from Piraeus that mentions the cult of Isis, there is ample evidence from Attica indicating the presence of Isis and Sarapis (Dow 1937) and numerous monuments survive from Attica depicting women in the dress of Isis, a fringed shawl knotted between the breasts, and holding a *sistrum* (rattle) in one hand and a jar of Nile water in the other (Walters 1988).

Schwenk (1985, 145) points out the Lykourgos' program of openness to Kitan and Egyptian cults may have had to do with the importance of Egyptians and Cyprians in the Athenian economy for the importation of grain. In any event, this inscription attests to a toleration of foreign cults by the Athenians. Rudhardt (1992, 220) argues that this is in part due to the lack of a term for 'religion' in Greek: "Les Grecs n'avaient donc pas le moyen de désigner les religions d'une façon générale, comme nous le faisons. Il leur était difficile de situer toutes les religions étrangères dans une catégorie clairement définie et de s'interroger systématiquement à leur sujet." Opposition to foreign cults came down to concrete measures to obstruct particular proposals such as the building of new sanctuaries (Baslez 1996, 40).

**Literature:** Arnaoutoglou 2003, 89–90; Ascough 1997; Baslez 1996, esp. 42; Bonnet and Pirenne-Delforge 1999; Clerc 1893, 121–22; Dow 1937, 184–85; 1962, 363; Dunand 1973, 2:5–5; Ferguson 1911, 217–18; Foucart 1873, 127–28; Garland 1987, 108; Jones 1999, 40–42; Koehler 1871; Leiwo 1997; Radin 1910, esp. 52–54; Maass 1895, esp. 73; Mikalson 1998, 30–31, 146–47; Nock 1933, 20; Pakkanen 1996, 49–52; Parker 1996, 337–38; Pečírka 1966, 59–61; Poland 1909, 21, 81; Rhodes 1972, 59, 67–68; Rudhardt, Jean, "De l'attitude des Grecs à l'égard des religions étrangères." *RHR* 209 (1992) 219–38; Schwenk 1985, 141–46; Simms 1997–1998; Versnel 1990–1993, 1:122; Walters, Elizabeth J. *Attic Grave Reliefs That Represent Women in the Dress of Isis*. *Hesperia Supplement*, 22. Princeton, NJ: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1988; Ziebarth 1896, 28, 168 and mentioned in *SEG* 36:154; 42:229; 47:961.

[4] *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1361  
Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis

Piraeus (Attica) 330–324/3 BCE

Published: Stephanos A. Koumanoudes, “Ἀττικῆς Ἐπιγραφῶν ἀνεκδότοι,” *Athenaion* 1 (1872) 1–14, 14–16 (no. 4) (*ed. pr.*); Foucart 1873, 189–90 (no. 2) (facsimile, from a squeeze by Koumanoudes); Koehler, *IG II* 610; Protz and Ziehen, *LGS II* 41; Michel, *RIG* 979; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1361; Sokolowski, *LSCG* 81–83 (no. 45); Zaidman and Schmitt-Pantel 1992, 88–89 (translation only); Le Guen-Pollet 1991, 35–41 (no. 6) (Poland A2a).

Publication Used: *LSCG* 45.

Current Location: Epigraphical Museum, Athens.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 383.A.ii.V.143 = *I<sup>2</sup>* 310.208 (Athens, 429/8 BCE):

Treasury accounts of other gods mentioning Bendis; *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 136 (*LSCGSup* 6) (Athens, 432/1 or 411 BCE): A Council decree pertaining to the public worship of Bendis; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1255 [2] (Piraeus, 337/6 BCE): Decree honoring the *hieropoioi* of the year; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1496 (Piraeus, 334/3–331/0 BCE): treasury accounts; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1256 [5] (Piraeus, 329/8 BCE): Honorary decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1283 [23] (Piraeus, 240/39 BCE): Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1284A–B [22] (Piraeus, 241/0 BCE): Two honorary decrees of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1317 (Salamis, 272/1 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis honoring their treasurer and his *synepimelētai*; *SEG* 44:60 (Salamis, 244/3 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis for their officers; *SEG* 2:10 (Salamis, 251/0 BCE): Honorary decree for *epimelētai* of Bendis(?); *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1317b (Salamis, 249/8 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis, honoring their officials; *SEG* 2:9 [21] (Salamis, 243/2 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis(?) honoring *epimelētai*; *Agora* 16:245 = *SEG* 21:531 = Meritt 1961b, 227 [no. 25] (Athens, III BCE): “Probably a decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis” (Meritt); *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1324 [32] (Piraeus, ca. 190 BCE): Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis honoring Stephanos; *Agora* 16:329 = *SEG* 19:125 = Meritt 1960, 21 (Athens, II/I BCE): Fragment of a decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis and Deloptes.

Non-stoichedon (54–66 letters). Tablet of Pentelic marble, 23 x 28 x 10 cm. Letter height: 0.4 cm. The left hand side is slightly damaged and both the top and bottom are missing. Tracy is not able to relate the cutter of this inscription to other known Attic cutters (Tracy 1995, 129).

----- ]χεναικε . . . . . ιε . . . . . ας ὁπόσοι ἐν τῆ[ι στήλ-  
η[ι ἐ]γ[γεγραμμένοι εἰσὶν ἢ το[ὺς τ]ούτων ἐκγόνους *vacat* εἰάν δέ τις θύη  
τῆι θεῶι τῶν ὀργεῶνων οἷς μέτεστι τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀτελεῖς αὐτοῦς θυεῖν.

- [ἐ]ὰν δὲ ιδιώτης τις θύῃ τῆι θεῶι διδόναι τῆι ἱεραίᾳ γαλαθνοῦ μὲν :IC  
 5 [κ]αὶ τὸ δέρμα καὶ κωλῆν διανε[κ]ῆ δεξιάν, τοῦ δὲ τελέου, :III: καὶ δέρμα  
 καὶ  
 [κ]ωλῆν κατὰ ταυτά, βοὸς δὲ, :IC: καὶ τὸ δέρμα· διδόναι δὲ τὰ ἱερωῶσυνα  
 τῶ-  
 [ν μὲ]ν θηλ[ε]ῖων τῆι ἱεραίᾳ, τῶν δὲ ἀρρένων τῶι ἱερεῖ· παραβώμια δὲ μὴ  
 [θύ]ειν [μ]ηδέ[ν]α ἐν τῶι ἱερῶ[ι ἦ] ὀφείλει[ι]ν, :F: δραχμᾶς *vacat* ὅπως δ'  
 ἂν ἡ οἰκία καὶ  
 τὸ ἱερὸν ἐπισκε[υ]άζεται, τὸ ἐν[ο]ικίον τῆς οἰ[κ]ίας] καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ ὅσου ἄμ  
 πραθῆι ε-  
 10 [ἰς τὴν ἐ]πισκευὴν τοῦ ἱεροῦ [καὶ τῆς] οἰκίας, εἰς ἄλλο δὲ μηδὲν  
 ἀναλίσκειν, ἔ-  
 [ω]ς ἂν τ[ὸ ἱερὸν] ἐπισκευ[ασ]θῆι κ[αὶ ἡ οἰκία], ἐὰν μὴ τι ἄλλο ψηφίσωντι  
 οἱ ὀργεῶνε[ς]  
 ..ασε....ν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν *vacat* ὑπολι[μπά]ννειν δὲ ὕδωρ τῶι ἐνοικοῦντι ὥστε  
 χρῆσθ[αι].  
 [ἐ]ὰν δ[έ] τις [ε]ἴπῃ] ἢ ἐπιψηφίσῃ παρὰ τόνδε τὸν νόμον, ὀφειλέτω :F:  
 δραχμᾶς τῆι  
 θεῶι ὃ τ[ε] εἰπὼν καὶ] ὁ ἐπιψηφίσας καὶ μὴ μετέστω αὐτῶι τῶν κοινῶν·  
 ἀναγράφειν δὲ  
 15 [αὐτὸν ὀφείλο]ντα τῆι θεῶι τοῦτο τὸ ἀργύριον εἰς τὴν στήλην τοὺς  
 ἐπιμελητά[ς].  
 ἀγο[ρά]ν δὲ κ[αὶ] [ξ]ύ[λλ]ογον ποεῖν τοὺς ἐπιμελητάς καὶ τοὺς ἱεροποιούς  
 ἐν τῶι ἱερ-  
 [ῶ]ι πε[ρὶ] τῶν κοινῶν τῆι δευτέραι ἰσταμένου τοῦ μηνὸς ἐκάστου *vacat*  
 διδόναι δὲ  
 [τοῖς ἱ]εροποιοῖς εἰς τὴν θυσίαν :F: δραχμᾶς ἕκαστον τῶν ὀργεῶνων οἷς  
 μέτεστι  
 [το]ῦ [ἱ]εροῦ τοῦ Θαργηλιῶνος πρὸ τῆς ἕκτης ἐπὶ δέκα, ὅς δ' ἂν ἐπιδημῶν  
 Ἀθήνη-  
 20 [σ]ι καὶ ὑγαιῶν μὴ συμβάλληται, ὀφειλέτω :F: ἱεράς τῆι θε[ῶ]ι ὅπως  
 δ' ἂν ὦ-  
 [ς πλ]εῖστοι ὧσιν ὀργεῶνες τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ἐξεῖναι τῶι βουλομένῳ  
 εἰσενέγκαντι  
 [...δρ]αχμᾶς μετεῖναι αὐτῶι τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ εἰς τὴν στήλην ἐγγράφεσθαι·  
 τ[οὺς]  
 [δ' ἐγγραφο]μένους εἰς τὴν στήλην δο[κι]μ[ά]ζειν τοὺς ὀργεῶνας καὶ  
 παρα[διδό]-  
 [να] τῶν δοκιμασθέντων τὰ ὀνόματα τῶι γραμματεῖ το]ῦ Θαρ[γ]ηλι]-  
 25 [ῶ]νος - - - -

----- as many persons as are inscribed on the stele  
 and their descendants. *vacat*. If any of the *orgeōnes* who have a claim in

the sanctuary should sacrifice to the goddess, they shall be immune from charges (*atelēs*). However, if a private individual should sacrifice to the goddess, s/he shall pay the priestess, for a suckling pig: 1½ obols, along with the skin and the entire right thigh; for a mature animal: 3 obols, along with the skin and the thigh on the same conditions; for an ox: 1½ obols and the skin. They shall give the priestly portion of females to the priestess and of males to the priest. No one is permitted to sacrifice anything in the sanctuary beside the altar. If they do, they will owe (a fine) of 50 drachmae. *vacat*

- 8 In order that the house and the sanctuary be repaired, the income from the house and the (sale of) water is to be spent (on it and) not for any other reason, until the sanctuary and the house are repaired, unless the *orgeōnes* agree by a vote to do something different... for the sanctuary. *vacat* They should leave water for the occupant of the house so that he may use it. If someone should move or introduce a motion in violation of this law, they will owe 50 drachmae to the goddess – both the one who formulated the motion and the one who moved it – and let them not participate in the common activities, and the supervisors (*epimelētai*) are to inscribe on a stele the names of these persons who owe this money to the goddess.
- 16 The supervisors and the sacrifice makers (*hieropoiōi*) shall arrange an assembly and convocation in the sanctuary to (discuss) the association's affairs on the second day of each month. *vacat* Each of the *orgeōnes* who have a claim in the sanctuary shall give to the *hieropoiōi* 2 drachmae during Thargelian for the sacrifice, before the 16th day (of the month). Whoever is at home in Athens and in good health but does not contribute, owes 2 drachmae, sacred to the goddess.
- 20 So that there may be as many *orgeōnes* of the sanctuary as possible, it is permitted for anyone who wishes to contribute ... drachmae to become a member of the sanctuary and to be inscribed on the stele. Let the members approve those who are to be inscribed on the stele, and hand over the names of those approved to the secretary in the month of Thargelion.

### Notes

- I. 3, 11: ὀργεῶνες → IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255.2–3 [2] note.
- II. 3, 18–19: τῶν ὀργεῶνων οἷς μέτεστι τοῦ ἱεροῦ, “the *orgeōnes* who have a claim in the sanctuary.” The phrase is repeated in II. 3 and 18–19 and, according to Ferguson (1949, 154 n. 67), three interpretations are possible: (a) the phrase refers only to those who currently have a right to participate in the sanctuary, excluding those who have been expelled (I. 14); (b) both Athenian and Thracian association members are able to participate; or (c) the rights of Athenian members of the association to participate in a public shrine are affirmed. Ferguson prefers the third option.
- II. 4–5, 6: IC ... III, “one and one half obols...three obols.” The simple vertical stroke for obol is distinguished from F in II. 18, 20 for drachma. Zaidman and Schmitt Pantel (1991, 88) erroneously translate IC ... III, as “one drachma, one obol... three

- drachmae.” See also *IG I<sup>3</sup> 6 C.21–24*: λαμβάν[εν παρὰ] τὸ μύστ[ο ἡ]εκάστο πέν[τε ὀβολὸς τ]ῶν [ἄρρ]ένον, θελειδ[ὸν δὲ τρεῖς] [ἄτελέ μ]ύστ[ε]μ..., “They shall receive from each mystes 5 obols for a male, 3 for a female...” Sokolowski *LSCGSup* 3.C.17–21 restores this differently (see below on ll. 6–7).
- I. 6: τὰ ἱερεώσυνα probably refers not only to the parts of the animal sacrificed, but also to the payments indicated.
  - II. 6–7: The phrase is ambiguous, and grammatically could refer either to the sex of the victims or the sex of the worshipers. Sokolowski (1969, 83) points out that in associations having both a priest and a priestess, the priest assisted with the sacrifices of men, and the priestess with women’s sacrifices. He suggests that the same distinction is made here, referring to *LSCGSup* 3.C.17–21): λαμβάν[εν παρὰ] τὸ μύστ[ο ἡ]εκάστο π[ά]ν[τα τὰ ἀπὸ τῶ]ν [θουμ]ένον: θελειδ[ὸν δὲ καὶ ἄρ]ῃ[ρένομ μ]ύστ[ε]μ με ἐνέ[λ]ικα μ[ε]ῖ [ν μεδέ]να πλὴν τὸ ἀφ’ ἐ[στίας μ]υ[ο]μέν[ο], “shall receive from each *mystes* all parts (assigned to them) from the victims sacrificed. They shall not initiate a *mystes* from females and males who is not of the (prescribed) age save the child who is initiated ἀφ’ ἐστίας.” “The word θελειδ[ὸν] in line 23 seems to point out the persons who received initiation rather than to the victims (Sokolowski 1959, 2); see also *LSAM* 48.5–7; 23.9–10. However *IG I<sup>3</sup> 6.C.21–23* restores the lacunae differently: λαμβάν[εν παρὰ] τὸ μύστ[ο ἡ]εκάστο πέν[τε ὀβολὸς τ]ῶν [ἄρρ]ένον, θελειδ[ὸν δὲ τρεῖς] (see above on ll. 4–5, 6).
  - I. 7: παραβώμια: “beside the altar” (Ferguson 1949, 154 n. 69). Sacrifices on the altar required the priest or priestess to officiate.
  - I. 9: τὸ ἐν[οίκιον τῆ]ς οἰ[κίας]: Jones (2000, 80) observes that “if the occupant needs water on-site and if the sale of such water (to him) is of the magnitude to contribute significantly to the maintenance of the sanctuary, such occupancy will have been continuous, very possibly for the entire duration of the rental.”
  - I. 10: οἰκία. The house is distinct from the sanctuary. The association apparently derived income from rent on a house as well as a spring that it owned (or mortgaged). L. 12 seems to indicate that the spring and the house are connected, and that some water should be left for the occupant of the house. On mortgages → ll. 14–15 (*note*).
  - I. 12: ...ασε...ν : Sokolowski (1969, 83) suggests ἀν[α]λί[σκει]ν.
  - II. 13–15: [ἐά]ν δ[έ] τις [ε]ἴ[ρη]ν[η] ἢ ἐπιψηφίση παρὰ τόνδε τὸν νόμον, ὀφειλέτω ἑ δραχμὰς τῆι θεῷ ὃ τ[ε] εἰπὼν καὶ ὁ ἐπιψηφίσας καὶ μὴ μετέστω αὐτῷ τῶν κοινῶν: For similar prohibitions of motions contrary to association laws, see *IG XII/9 191A.56–57* (Eretria, IV BCE): ἐὰν δὲ τις λέγει ἢ γρά[φ]ει ἢ ἐπιψηφίζει παρὰ τοὺς ὄρκ[ους], ὡς ἀκυροῦν δεῖ τὰς συνθήκας, ἄτιμο[ι]ς ἔστω καὶ τὰ χρήματα αὐτοῦ ἱερά ἔστω τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Ἀμαρυσίας, “if anyone should introduce or write or propose a motion contrary to the oaths, that the agreements should be void, he shall lose his status as a citizen and his property shall become sacred to Artemis Amarysia” (i.e., his property shall be confiscated); *Iasos* 152.19–22 (Iasos, II BCE): ὃς δὲ τῶν νεμηθέντων ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους μὴ παραγένηται εἰς Ἰασὸν ἢ μὴ [ἐπιτε]-λ[έ]σῃ τοὺς ἀγῶνας, ἀποτεισάτω τῷ κοινῷ τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνιτῶν Ἀντιοχ[ε]ίας δραχμὰς χιλίας ἱεράς ἀπαρατήτους τοῦ θεοῦ, “whoever, approved by the assembly, is not present in Iasos or does not complete the games, let him pay to the association of the Dionysiac *technitai* 1000 drachmae sacred (to the god) which may not be remitted.” → Arnaoutoglou 2003, 135.
  - I. 14: ὃ τ[ε] εἰπὼν καὶ ὁ ἐπιψηφίσας. On the procedure for formulating and moving a motion in Athens, see *IG II<sup>2</sup> 337 [3]* (Piraeus, 333/2 BCE) and McLean 2002, 216–18.

- II. 14–15: ἀναγράφειν δὲ | [αὐτὸν ὀφείλο]ντα τῇ θεῷ τοῦτο τὸ ἀργύριον εἰς τὴν στήλην τοὺς ἐπιμελητά[ς]: The names of the debtors were sometimes inscribed on special stelai (e.g., the *orgeōnes* of Echelos, *Agora* 16:161.5–8 [14] (Athens, early III BCE): ἀναγράφαντας τοὺς ὀφειλοντά[ς] τι εἰς τὴν κοι|νωσίαν ἐν στήλει λιθίνει στήσαι παρὰ τ[ὸν βωμὸν] | ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὰ κεφάλαια καὶ τὸν τόκο[ν ὀπόσου] | ἂν ἔχει ἕκαστος, “(they are to) inscribe the names of those who owe anything to the association – both the principal and the interest. as much as each owes – and set it up by the altar in the temple.”
- I. 15: ἐπιμελητά[ς], “supervisors.” Ἐπιμελητής is one of the most common titles for one of the officials of Attic associations, appearing very frequently in fourth and third century BCE inscriptions. This office appears to be designed in imitation of civic structures in Athens, where ἐπιμεληταί were appointed to various roles, including supervision of the markets and supervision of Great Dionysia and Panathenaai. Originally, Athenian officials were expected to underwrite the expenses of the processions, but by the 330s the processions were paid from state funds. For Eleusinian Mysteries four *epimelētai* were appointed, two from all Athenians over age thirty, and two from the two priestly families who had hereditary prerogatives in the cult of Demeter and Persephone, the Eumolpidae and Kerykes.
- The use of *epimelētai* in associations is an instance of mimicry of Athenian offices. Although many inscriptions honor a single *epimelētēs*, it would appear that in many cases an association had more than one; the *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1327 [35] had at least three. The supervisors of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361 were charged with organization of meetings and financial administration; these roles are attested in other inscription: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1256.4–6; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1301.3–8 [25]; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1318.3–9; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1324.2–10 [32]. See Arnaoutoglou 2003, 108–9.
- II. 16, 18: ἱεροποιοῦς: On *hieropoioi* → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255.2–3 [2] note.
- I. 19: τῇ δευτέρῃ ἰσταμένον τοῦ μηνὸς ἐκάστου. Compare *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283 [23] (Piraeus, 240/39 BCE); 1284 [22], which come from Thracian devotees of Bendis, who meet on the 8th day of the month.
- II. 19–20: ὃς δ’ ἂν ἐπιδημῶν Ἀθήνη[[σ]ι, “whoever is at home in Athens.” Compare *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1339.13–15 [46]: ἔ]δοξεν μὴ μετέχειν αὐτο[ύς] | [τοῦ ἐράν]ου ἐὰν μὴ τινη συμβῆ διὰ πέ[ν]θου ἢ διὰ ἀ]σθένειαν ἀπολειφθῆναι, “it was resolved that [absentees] should not participate in the *eranos*, except if someone is absent because of mourning or illness”; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1368.50–51 [51]: χωρὶς ἢ ἀποδημίας | ἢ πένθους ἢ νόσου, which exempts from penalties those who are away from Athens or in mourning or ill.
- I. 21: Thargelion 16. The *Bendideia* was celebrated beginning on the 19th of Thargelion (Deubner 1932, 219).
- II. 23–24: δοκιμάζειν: For other instances of vetting of new members, see *IG* V/1 1390.71 (Andania [Messenia], 92/1 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1368.35 [51] (Athens, 164/65 CE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369.34 [49] (Lipsesi, Attica, Imperial period); *AM* 32 (1907) 295–97 (no. 18).7–9 (Pergamon): ὁμοίως δὲ εἰσέρχασθαι τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν μετεχόν]των, δοκιμασθέντας μὲν καὶ αὐτοὺς, διδόντας δὲ εἰση]λύσιον (δην.) ν’, “Likewise the sons of members (may) come, and after having been examined and paying the entrance fee of 50 drachmae”; *IG* VII 2808.b.9–12 (Hyettus [Boeotia], after 212 CE): [ἀ]ν δέ τις ἔξωθεν δοκιμα[[σθ]ῆ ὑπὸ τῆς γερουσίας, εἰ[[σ]φερέτω εὐθέως τῇ γερου]σίᾳ \* ἑκατὸν, “But if some outsider (i.e., not the relative of a member) is examined by the *gerousia*, let him pay forthwith to the *gerousia* 100 denarii.”

### Comments

While the inscription does not name any deity, the reference to the sacrifices occurring after the 16th of Thargelion connects this with the *Bendideia* (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283 [23] *commentary*). The date of the inscription is not certain but Ferguson (1949, 153) suggests the Lykourgan era (338–32 BCE) “a little before” *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1324 [32]. The date of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1324 [32], however, has now been adjusted significantly to ca. 190 BCE.

Wilhelm (1902, 132) and Ferguson (1949, 153 n. 65) invoke the dating of the meeting to the second of the month (l. 17) as an indication that *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361 was not an enactment of the Thracian group, which met on the eighth of each month (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283 [23]; 1284 [22]), but rather the Bendis association comprised of Athenian citizens (thus Sokolowski 1969, 83). Lines 16, 18, moreover, indicate that the association’s officers include *hieropoioi*, attested securely only in the citizen association.

The inscription appears to be not only an attempt to clarify certain matters pertaining to access and the right to offer sacrifices, the upkeep of the sanctuary, and membership in the association, but an effort to renew the association. There is no reorganization of the administrative structure: it still consists of supervisors (*epimelētai*), *hieropoioi*, a priest, a priestess, and a secretary. The “sacrifice makers” (*hieropoioi*), like their civic counterparts (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255.2–3 [2] *note*), were responsible for organizing sacrifices (rather than actually offering them), and hence were empowered to collect funds from the membership, presumably to purchase the animals and other materials. Ferguson (1949, 156) raises the (unanswerable) question of whether the fees collected were for a special sacrifice by the *orgeōnes*, or whether the sum raised was a contribution to the hecatomb (the sacrifice of one hundred cattle, which formed part of the *Bendideia*). He reasons that it would require 35 members to purchase one cow for a sacrifice. The underwriting of the hecatomb would be far beyond the means of an association, requiring the equivalent of 3500 members, but it may be that the association voluntarily contributed a small portion of the funds needed for the hecatomb.

This also means that if the state supplied the victims for the hecatomb, the *kreanomia* (distribution of meat) could not be restricted to the association members; on the contrary, “a *kreanomia* of national dimensions is alone thinkable” (Ferguson 1949, 155).

What is new in the ordinance are the mechanisms for the expansion of the membership, “so that there may be as many *orgeōnes* of the sanctuary as possible” (ll. 22–23). This seems to represent a deviation from older membership rules based on lineal descent (cf. ll. 3: ἐ]γ[γεγραμμένοι εἰσὶν ἢ το]ύς τ]ούτων ἐκγόνους) and the adoption of a new pattern that allowed access to the association “to those who wish” to join. This did not represent a completely open-door policy, since some form of vetting of new members was still



envisaged (ll. 25–26). Conversely, expulsion from the membership is possible (ll. 15–16), another deviation from a membership model based on lineal descent (rather than payment, good conduct, etc.). Ferguson (1944, 99–101) conjectures that these Athenian *orgeōnes* of Bendis were, like their Thracian counterparts (IG II<sup>2</sup> 1283), obliged by an Athenian law to hold the procession from the town to the sanctuary of Bendis in the Piraeus and, therefore, found it necessary to ensure that their members would be sufficient for such a procession.

Jones concludes that the revenues of the association appear to be rather meagre: “Taken together, these particulars suggest the absence of an endowment and, again, of wealthy benefactors by the earnings or generosity of whom the association might perpetuate itself. Rather, the impression is left of dependence upon a trickle of small dues and fines, with cash reserves so small that the association cannot finance its annual festival without first collecting a small fee (or equivalent fine) from its entire membership” (1999, 260–61). This conclusion is premature, however, because the inscription does not mention the sum to be obtained from the rental of the house (ll. 8–12), which in some cases could be substantial (see IG II<sup>2</sup> 2499 [7]). The desire to expand the membership likely had more to do with the obligation to mount an impressive yearly festival – and hence have the numbers sufficient for an impressive procession – and less to do with the association being impoverished.

**Literature:** Bingen, Jean. *Pages d'épigraphie grecque Attique-Égypte (1952–1982)*. Epigraphica Bruxellensia, 1. Bruxelles: Epigraphica Bruxellensia, 1991, esp. 17; Deubner 1932; Ferguson 1944, esp. 96–107; Foucart 1873, esp. 12, 20, 189–90; Foucart 1902, esp. 90; Garland 1992, esp. 111–14; Le Guen-Pollet 1991; Jones 1999, 259–61; Kern 1963, esp. 2:236–38; Nilsson 1942, esp. 173; 1967, esp. 1:833–834; Simms 1988; Sokolowski 1969, 81–83; Tracy 1995; Wilhelm 1911–1942, 220/5:157–159; Zaidman, et al. 1992; Ziebarth 1896, 36.

## [5] IG II<sup>2</sup> 1256

### Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis honoring *epimelētai*

Piraeus (Attica)

329/8 BCE

Published: Koehler, IG II 5 573b (from a photograph); Paul Hartwig, *Bendis: Eine archäologische Untersuchungen* (Leipzig and Berlin: Giesecke & Devrient, 1897) 4–7 (ph. fig. 1); Adolf Trendelenburg, *Das Bendis Relief in Kopenhagen* (Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Askanischen Gymnasium zu Berlin. 1898 Programm Nr. 50; Berlin: R. Gaertners Verlagsbuchhandlung H. Heyfelder, 1898); Michel, *RIG* 980; Paul Arndt, *La Glyptothèque Ny-Carlsberg. Les Monuments Antiques*

(Munich: F. Bruckmann, 1912) Plate 88 (ph. only); Dittenberger, *Syll*<sup>2</sup> 724; Kirchner, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1256; Dittenberger–Hiller von Gaertringen, *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 1095; Nilsson 1942, 171 (photo only); *LIMC* II/1 (1984) 881 (no. 211) and II/2 plate 651; Schwenk 1985, 252–59 (no. 52); Meyer, M. 1989, 296, Taf. 32,2 (photograph only); Güntner 1994, 160–61 (no. G4, ph.); Lawton 1995, A47 (ph.); Mette Moltesen, *Catalogue: Greece in the Classical Period. Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek* (Kobenhavn: Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, 1995) 138–41 (ph.) (Poland A3a).

Publication Used: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1256.

Current Location: Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek, Copenhagen inv. 1043a.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 383 = I<sup>2</sup> 310.208 (Athens, 429/8 BCE): Treasury accounts of other gods, mentioning Bendis; *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 136 (*LSCGSup* 6) (Athens, 432/1 or 411 BCE): A Council decree pertaining to the public worship of Bendis; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255 [2] (Piraeus, 337/6 BCE): Decree honoring the *hieropoioi* of the year; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361 [4] (Piraeus, 330–324/3 BCE): Regulations concerning the cult of Bendis; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1496 (Piraeus, 334/3–331/0 BCE): treasury accounts; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283 [23] (Piraeus, 240/39 BCE): Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1284A–B [22] (Piraeus, 241/0 BCE): Two honorary decrees of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317 (Salamis, 272/1 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis honoring their treasurer and his *synepimelētai*; *SEG* 2:10 (Salamis, 251/0 BCE): Honorary decree for *epimelētai* of Bendis(?); *SEG* 44:60 (Salamis, 244/3 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis for their officers; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317b (Salamis, 249/8 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis, honoring their officials; *SEG* 2:9 [21] (Salamis, 243/2 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis(?) honoring *epimelētai*; *Agora* 16:245 = *SEG* 21:531 = Meritt 1961b, 227 [no. 25] (Athens, III BCE): “Probably a decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis” (Meritt); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1324 [32] (Piraeus, ca. 190 BCE): Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis honoring Stephanos; *Agora* 16:329 = *SEG* 19:125 = Meritt 1960, 21 (Athens, II/I BCE): fragment of a decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis and Deloptes.

Stoichedon (31 letters), found in the Piraeus and acquired by the Ny Carlsberg Glyptothek in 1894. A stele of Pentelic marble 83 x 46 cm., with a rectangular pinax, 34 x 57 cm. at the top of a shaft, 34 x 20–49 cm. containing the inscription and broken at the bottom. Letter height: 0.7 cm. The relief on the pinax shows two divine figures. Bendis (right) wears a Phrygian cap and is dressed in an animal skin, spear in her left hand and a bowl or plate extended in the right hand. The other figure is identified as Deloptes, her consort (Foucart 1902, 98; Arnaoutoglou



- celui de leur père, sont de condition libre; les autres, sans patronymique, sont probablement des affanchis”; Garland 1987, 119, followed by von Reden 1995, 37 n. 27.
- II. 3, 7–8: Δέλιξιος: *PA* 3233; *PAA* 303690; *LGPN* 2:102[6]. Dexios, although not a very common name, is attested as the name of Athenian demesmen (*PAA* 303715, 303720, 303725), metics (*PAA* 303700, 303710) and as a patronym (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 8526: Δεξικράτης Δεξίου Ζελείτης), but also in a list of artisans, all without patronyms (*SEG* 12:84: [Δ]έλιξιος σ[– –]) and as the name of a freedman (Fragiadakis 1986, 49). See the previous note on Εύφους.
- I. 3: ἐπιμεληταί, “supervisor” → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361.15 [4] note.
- I. 4: ἐπὶ Κηφισοφώντος ἄρχοντος: On Kephisophon, see Dinsmoor 1931, 370; Meritt 1977, 169.
- I. 5: φιλοτίμως → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255.13 [2] note.
- I. 8: δικαιοσύνης ἔνεκα: “on account of their honesty”: Whitehead (1993, 67–68) notes: “Rendered ‘righteousness’ by Cynthia Schwenk [1985, 507] and others, *dikaiosynē* is better understood in an epigraphic context as something like ‘honesty’, the behavior – financial and otherwise – of someone who has been in a position to feather his own nest but has not (detectably) done so. It was thus a virtue which, unlike some of the ones we examined earlier (such as *eunoia*), was from the outset of its use regarded as at least as suitable for Athenian citizen honorees as for non-citizens, and it was a common choice for both the demos as a whole and its subdivisions to apply to the conduct of those who had discharged service in an official capacity.”
- II. 9–10: χρυσῶι στεφάνωι ἐκάτερον ἀπὸ : H : → See *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255.9–10 [2] note. In other decrees the crown is the more usual olive-wreath.

### Comments

As with *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255 [2] and 1361 [4], there is a difficulty in identifying whether this is an Athenian or Thracian association of Bendis. Dittenberger (*Syll*<sup>2</sup> 724) took the two honorees to be slaves because of the absence of demotics and Poland (1909, 307) concluded that they were Thracians and very probably slaves. Ferguson (1949, 152 n. 62), followed by Jones (1999, 260) and Arnaoutoglou (2003, 60), argues that gold crowns point to the citizen association rather than to the Thracian group. Arnaoutoglou (2008, 4) points out that the lack of a patronym does not necessarily imply that the person named is not a demesman, and notes “the overwhelming presence of citizens in *orgeōnes* associations and the preponderance of foreigners in *thiasōtai* associations....” While still uncertain, it seems most likely that the two honorees are demesmen, given the nature of the crown awarded.

The “supervisors” (*epimelētai*) are praised δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἐπιμελείας ἔνεκα. Since *epimelētai* in Athens were concerned with administration of the markets, festivals such as the Great Dionysia, and the Eleusinian mysteries, and their role in festivals was both administrative and to ensure that the festivals were carried out properly, we may surmise that the supervisors in the Bendis

association had analogous administrative roles. Δικαιοσύνη, “honesty,” probably includes the nuance of financial propriety (→ *note* on l. 8).

**Literature:** Ferguson 1944, esp. 96–107; 1949, esp. 153–57; Foucart 1902; Güntner 1994, 77–78; Hartwig 1897, 1–12; Jones 1999, 259–60; Lawton 1995, no. 47; Meyer, M. 1989, 296 (A 107); Nilsson 1942, esp. 173; Pečírka 1966, 122–30; Reilly 1978; Schwenk 1985, 252–59; 1900, 503–4 (no. 7); Wilhelm 1902, 131–33; Ziebarth 1896, 63. Also mentioned in *SEG* 35:73.

## [6] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252+999*

### Honorific decree by the *orgeōnes* of Amynos and Asklepios

Athens

late IV BCE

Published: A. Körte, “Die Ausgrabungen am Westabhänge der Akropolis. IV: Das Heiligtum des Amynos,” *AM* 21 (1896) 287–332 (facsimile) (*ed. pr.*); Kutsch 1913, no. 14; Michel, *RIG* 966; Dittenberger, *Syll<sup>2</sup>* 725; Larfeld 1902–1907, no. 157; Dittenberger–Hiller von Gaertringen, *Syll<sup>3</sup>* 1096; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252* (Poland A1c).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252+999*

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum, EM 12836 (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252*); EM 298 (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 999*).

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1253* (ca. 263 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1259* (313/2 BCE): Found in the same location and conjectured to be from the same group of *orgeōnes*; and votive inscriptions to Asklepios found in the vicinity of the Amyneion: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4365*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4385–87*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4422*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4424*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4435*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4457* (graffito in Kutsch 1913, 55 n. 9).

Non-stoichedon (32–36 letters). Table of Pentelic marble, 39 x 20–21 x 4 cm., with two crowns. Letter height: 0.6 cm. Discovered alongside *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1253* in the ruins of the shrine (Amyneion), at the western base of the Acropolis. There are a number of errors: Λ in place of Α in ll. 9 (*bis*) 12, 14; Ο instead of Θ in ll. 3, 8, 13, 15; Τ for Υ (l. 17); Ι for Ρ (l. 20); and the omission of Σ from ΤΗΣ in l. 7.

Κλειαινετος Κλεομένουσ Μελιτεύσ εἶπεν·  
 δεδόχθαι τοῖσ ὀργεῶσι· ἐπειδὴ εἰσιν ἄνδρες  
 ἀγαθοὶ περὶ τὰ κοινὰ τῶν ὀργεῶνων τοῦ Ἀμύ-  
 νου καὶ τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ τοῦ Δεξίουσ  
 5 Καλλιᾶδης Φιλίνου Πειραιεύσ, Λυσιμαχί-  
 δης Φιλίνου Πειραιεύσ, ἐπαινέσαι αὐτοῦσ  
 ἀρετῆσ ἔνεκα καὶ δικαιοσύνης τῆσ εἰσ τοῦσ  
 ἄθεοῦσ καὶ περὶ τὰ κοινὰ τῶν ὀργεῶνων καὶ

- στεφανῶσαι ἀντῶν ἐκἀτερων χρυσῶι στε-  
 10 φάνωι ἀπὸ δραχμῶν :F:· εἶναι δ' αὐτοῖς καὶ  
 ἀτέλειαν τοῦ χοῦ ἐν ἀμφοῖν τοῖν ἱεροῖν  
 καὶ ἀντοῖς καὶ ἐγγόνοις· δοῦναι δὲ καὶ εἰς  
 <θυσίαν καὶ ἀνάθημα αὐτοῖς ὅτι ἂν δόξει  
 15 τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν. ἀναγκάψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφι-  
 σμα ἐν στήλαις λιθίναις δυοῖν καὶ στήσαι  
 τὴν μὲν ἐν τῶι τοῦ Δεξιῶνος ἱερῶι, τὴν δὲ  
 [ἐ]ν τῶι τοῦ Ἀμύνου καὶ Ἀσκληπιοῦ· δοῦνα[ι]  
 δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰς στήλας αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ἂν δόξε[ι]  
 20 τοῖς ὀργεῶσι, ὅπως ἂν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι φιλοτι-  
 [μῶντα]ι περὶ τὰ κοινὰ τῶν ὀργεῶνων εἰδῶ-  
 [τες ὅτι χάριτας ἀποδ]ώσουσι τοῖς εὐεργετοῦ-  
 [σιν ἀξίας τῶν εὐεργετημάτων].

Kleiaiinetos son of Kleomenes of (the deme) Melete made the (following) motion: be it resolved by the *orgeōnes*: Whereas these men are generous in regard to the common affairs of the *orgeōnes* of Amynos and Asklepios and Dexion – Kalliades son of Philinos of Piraeus and Lysimachides son of Philinos of Piraeus –, (be it resolved) to commend them on account of the excellence and honesty that they have exhibited both with respect to the gods and to the associations of the *orgeōnes*, and to crown each of them with a golden crown with a value of 500 drachmae. They shall have immunity from “the heap” in both the temples, both they and their relatives. (It is resolved) also to give to them (funds) for sacrifice and for a votive offering, whatever (amount) seems good to the *orgeōnes*. (It is resolved) to inscribe this decree on two steles and to set one up in the sanctuary of Dexion, and the other in the sanctuary of Amynos and Asklepios, and to provide them (with funds) for the steles, whatever seems good to the *orgeōnes*, so that others who are ambitious towards the association of the *orgeōnes* might know that they (the *orgeōnes*) shall render thanks appropriate to the generosity of any who are benefactors (to the association).

### Notes

- I. 1: Κλειαινέτος Κλεομένους Μελιτεῦς; (PA 8462; PAA 574435; LGPN 2:262[14]), probably the same as that in a list of *διαίτηται*, IG II<sup>2</sup> 1926.122 (325/4 BCE) (PA 8462; PAA 574437) → Aleshire 1991, 236. The *diaitetai* according to Aristotle (*Athenian Constitution* 53) comprised a board of public arbitrators that formed a preliminary tribunal to hear civil suits with damages exceeding 10 drachmae, attempted to negotiate settlements and, failing that, issued verdicts. Appeals from the *diaitetai* went to the *dikasterion* or jury court.
- II. 3–4 τὰ κοινὰ τῶν ὀργεῶνων τοῦ Ἀμύ|νου: on Amynos, see Forsén 1996. Dedications to Amynos (sometimes appearing with Asklepios) continue into the first century

BCE: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4365*; 4385; 6835 (before the mid IV BCE); 4424 (IV BCE); 4435 (IV/III BCE); 4457 (II BCE); *SEG 39:234* (I CE): [Ἀμύνω καὶ Ἀσκληπιῷ καὶ][Υ]γεία ἀ[νέθηκεν Κόνων] | [Σ]οφοκλέους Σ[ουσιεύς χαριστήριον].

- I. 4: Δεξίων: Dexion, “the receiver,” according to the *Etymologicum Magnum s.v. Δεξίων*, is an honorific name for the poet Sophokles who was heroized for having “received” Asklepios into his house when the hero-physician arrived in Athens in 420 BCE → Foucart 1918, 121–25; Ferguson 1944, 86–92; Garland 1992, 125; Parker 1996, 184–85. Andrew Connolly (“Was Sophocles Heroised as Dexion?” *JHS* 118 [1998] 1–21 [*SEG 49:220*]), however, argues that the story of Sophokles reception of Asklepios is a Hellenistic fabrication and that Dexion was an entirely separate hero.
- I. 5: Καλλιάδης Φιλίνου Πειραιεύς: *PA 7797*; *PAA 553235*; *LGPN 2:245[47]* → Körte 1896, 200; Aleshire 1991, 236. He might be the same person named in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1176* (324/3 BCE), who proposed a motion honoring the contractors of a theatre at Piraeus (*PAA 553235*).
- II. 5–6: Λυσμαχίδης Φιλίνου Πειραιεύς: (*PA 9482*; *PAA 615815*; *LGPN 2:292[15]*), the brother of Kalliades (I. 5). He is also known from *IG III App. 95b.19–20*, a curse tablet; Aleshire 1991, 237.
- I. 7: ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ δικαιοσύνης, “excellence and honesty.” The translation “on account of virtue and justice” does not do justice to either term. Ἀρετή usually involves an element of performance and conveys the nuance of demonstrated potential for excellence. Δικαιοσύνη (uprightness, honesty) is common in honorific inscriptions, often having to do with the discharge of responsibilities in a position of trust often having to do with financial administration (e.g., *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1263 [11]*: in relation to a secretary with financial responsibilities; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1322*: applied to the administrators of an association).
- I. 11: τοῦ χοῦ ἐν ἀμφοῖν τοῖν ἱεροῖν, “the heap in both the temples”: Körte (1896, 302) draws attention to Athenaeus 8.365d: ἀργεῖοι δ’, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι φησιν Ἡγήσανδρος· γράφει δ’ οὕτως· «τὴν συμβολὴν τὴν εἰς τὰ συμπόσια ὑπὸ τῶν πινόντων εἰσφερομένην Ἀργεῖοι χῶν καλοῦσι, τὴν δὲ μερίδα αἰσαν», “But the Argives, as Hegesander says in his *Commentaries*, have other words [for contributions to *symposia*]: “The contribution brought in to the *symposia* by the drinkers is called by the Argives a ‘heap’, while the single share is called an ‘lot’.”
- II. 12–13: δοῦναι δὲ καὶ εἰς | θυσίαν καὶ ἀνάθημα αὐτοῖς → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1261.50 [9]* (302–299 BCE): δοῦναι αὐτῶι ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ ΔΔ δραχ(μάς).
- I. 16: ἐν τῶι τοῦ Δεξίονος ἱερῶι: Aleshire 1989, 9–11 points out that it is a *hieron* (a temple), rather than a *heroon*, distinct from the sanctuary of Aminos and Asklepios west of the Acropolis, and on the southern slope of the Areopagus. The location of the Dexion temple is unknown.
- II. 19–20: φιλοτι|[μῶντα]ι → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255.13 [2]* note.
- I. 21: χάριτας ἀποδ[ώ]σουσι, “they will render thanks”: Compare the use of χάρις in similar honorific inscriptions: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 222.11–14* (344/3 BCE): ὅπω[[ς ἀ]ν εἰδώσιν ἀπαντ[ε]ς ὅτι ὁ δῆμος [ὁ] | [Αθ]ηναίων ἀποδίδωσιν χάριτας μ[ε]|[γ]άλας τοῖς εὐεργετοῦσιν, “in order that all might see that the People of Athens gives great (expressions of) thanks to its benefactors...”; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 223.14* (343/2 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 269.11* (336/5 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 300.4* (336/5 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 391.10–11* (321–319 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1261.54–55 [9]*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1262.14 [10]*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1263.29–30 [11]* (300/299 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1277.32–33 [15]* (278/7 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1316.19 [16]* (272/1 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1284.10 [22]*;

*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1314.10 [28] (213/2 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1315.17 [29] (211/0 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1324.12–13, 25 [32] (ca. 190 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1327.22 [35] (178/7 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1329.21 [37] (175/4 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1337.9–10 [44] (97/6 BCE), *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1334.12 [45] (71/0 BCE); etc. → Harrison, J. R. 2003.

- l. 22: ἀξίας τῶν εὐεργετημάτων]. Dina Peppas-Delmouzou, “ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΙΚΗ ΣΥΛΛΟΓΗ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ,” *AD* 27 B.1 (1972) 10–13, no. 1 (p. 20) (*SEG* 26:135) has joined *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 999 to the bottom left of 1252 to obtain a new text of ll. 19–22:

τοῖς ὀργεῶσι, ὅπως καὶ ἄλλοι φιλοτιμῶνται περὶ τὰ κοινὰ τῶν ὀργεῶνων εἰδότες ὅτι χάριτας ἀποδώσουσι τοῖς εὐεργετοῦσιν τι αὐτούς.

### Comments

This inscription concerns an association of citizen (and therefore male) *orgeōnes* associated with two shrines, that of Amynos, a healing god, whose sanctuary was located on the southern slope of the Areopagus between the Areopagus and the Pnyx and consisting of an open-air shrine and a well (Kearns 1989, 147), and Dexiōn, the location of whose sanctuary is unknown, but presumably was in the vicinity of the shrine of Amynos. The Amyneion dates from at least the sixth century BCE, where Asklepios was also honored on his arrival in Athens in 420 BCE. Dexiōn (“the Receiver”) is a hero associated with Asklepios (Kearns 1989, 154). Sophokles was eventually identified as Dexiōn after his death. The association of *orgeōnes* of Amynos, Asklepios and Dexiōn is also known from other honorific decrees (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1253 [ca. 263 BCE]; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1259 [313/2 BCE; found in the same location as *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1252]; and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4487 [II BCE], Aleshire 1991, 223–30). *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1253 honors two demesmen, one from Melite, also with golden crowns:

Θ Ε Ο Ι

ἔδοξεν τοῖς [ὀργεῶσιν· ---]

Ἴππομάχου : Με[λιτεὺς εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ -]-

δώρος : καὶ Ἀντ[---- ἄν]-

- 5 ὄρες δίκαιοι γέγονασι περὶ τὰ κοινὰ  
τῶν ὀργεῶνων τοῦ Ἀμύνου καὶ τοῦ  
Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ τοῦ Δεξιόνοιο, ἐπαινεῖ-  
σαι αὐτούς : δικαιοσύνης ἕνεκα καὶ  
στεφανῶσαι αὐτῶν ἑκάτερον χρυσῶι

- 10 στεφάνωι. τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τότε ἀναγρά-  
ψαι ἐ[ν] τῶ[ι] ἱερῶι ἐν στήλει λιθίνει.

In *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1252, Kleiainetos, who proposed the motion, and the two honorees were all Athenian demesmen, as is also the mover of the motion of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1253. Körte (1896, 301) concluded that the honorees were persons of considerable standing (so Andrewes 1961; Parker 1996, 176; Mikalson 2010, 153), and Ferguson agreed, adding that “there is no trace of any non-citizen in [the association’s] records or in any of the orgeonic records thus far discussed [i.e., *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1252, 1253, 1259]” (1944, 87).



Jones disputes that the honorees were necessarily persons of status, observing that six of the nine mentioned in the three inscriptions (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1253*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1259*) are unknown from other sources, “at least no source suggesting wealth or prominence” (1999, 255). Kleainetos son of Kleomenes of Melite was one of the board of arbitrators (see the note above), Kalliades son of Philinos of Piraeus was the mover of a motion (see the note above), and Antikles son of Memnon (*PA 1069*), named in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1259*, was probably a grandson of the person named in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2383.19*. At least two others were demesmen but otherwise unknown: Lysimachides son of Philinos of Piraeus and the mover of the motion of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1253.2–3*. This leaves the two honorees of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1253* – there is insufficient space in l. 4 for a patronym and a demotic –, and two of those mentioned in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1259.1, 3/4* (312/1 BCE), who lack demotics and are not otherwise known. Jones concludes that this is not a group “of uniformly propertied members, but rather a more diverse membership dependent upon the largess of a few generous benefactors” (1999, 256).

Even though neither Kalliades nor Lysimachides is given a title, Ferguson has argued on the strength of the similar honorific inscription in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1259* that the honorees of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252* and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1253* were “hosts” (ἑστιάτορες) (1944, 87 → *Agora 16:161.12, 24* [14] note). Arnaoutoglou disputes this identification, pointing out that whereas *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1259.5* expressly mentions the successful execution of official duties connected with sacrifices, neither *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252* nor *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1253* intimates any official function on the part of the honorees (2003, 116). Moreover, the honorees of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252* and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1253* are voted golden crowns, in the case of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252* crowns worth 500 drachmae, a very substantial sum. By contrast the *hestiatores* of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1259* are given only olive wreaths. This perhaps suggests that Kalliades and Lysimachides were important benefactors of the associations and probably members, since they and their descendants are exempted from certain fees.

These groups of *orgeōnes* belong to Ferguson’s ‘A’ group of *orgeōnes*: groups that consist exclusively of citizens and who are devoted to the cult of a hero (rather than a god/goddess). They tend to be organized by single officer rather than a group of officers.

**Literature:** Andrewes, A. “Philochoros on Phratries.” *JHS* 81 (1961) 1–15; Clinton, Kevin. “The Epidauria and the Arrival of Asclepius in Athens. Ancient Greek Cult Practice.” In *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Archaeological Evidence. Proceedings of the Fourth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 22–24 October 1993*, ed. Robin Hägg. Stockholm: Paul Astöms Förlag, 1998 (*SEG* 47:194); Ferguson 1944, 86–91; Forsén, Björn. *Griechische Gliederweihungen: Eine Untersuchung zu ihrer Typologie und ihrer religions- und sozialgeschichtlichen Bedeutung*. Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 4. Helsinki: Finnish Institute at Athens, 1996; Kutsch 1913, 1–16, 54–59, 124–27; Jones 1999, 254–56; Mikalson 1998, 145–46; Pakkanen 1996, 52, 53.

[7] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2499*

## Lease of the temple of Egretēs

Athens (Attica)

306/5 BCE

Published: G.D. Lord, "An Attic Lease Inscription," *AJA* 3 (2nd series) (1899) 44–53 + Plate 1 (ph.); Michel, *RIG* 1356; Dittenberger, *Syll<sup>2</sup>* 937; Protz and Ziehen, *LGS* II/1:43; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2499*; Dittenberger–Hiller von Gaertringen, *Syll<sup>3</sup>* 1097; Sokolowski, *LSCG* 86–87 (no. 47); Behrend 1970, no. 39; Austin 1981, 225–25 (no. 130) (English translation only); Le Guen-Pollet 1991, 46–50 (no. 8); Marie-Christine Hellman, *Choix d'inscriptions architecturales grecques* (Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient, no. 30. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen, 1999) 103–4 (no. 8) (*SEG* 49:2401) (Poland A1A).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2499*.

Current Location: American School at Athens.

Similar or Similar Inscriptions: → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2501* (Athens, late IV BCE): Lease of a temple belonging to the *orgeōnes* of the "god" Hypodektes to a citizen; *SEG* 24:203 (333/32 BCE): Lease of a garden belonging to the *orgeōnes* of the Hero to a citizen for 20 drachmae yearly for thirty years; *Agora* 1:161 [14] = *LSCGSup* 20.12–14 (Athens, 300–250 BCE): Debts owed to the *orgeōnes* of Echelos inscribed on a stele; *Agora* 19 H84 (309/8 BCE): *Horos* on land mortgaged by *eranistai*; *IG XII/8 19* (Lemnos, 314/3 BCE): mortgages by *orgeōnes* of 1000 drachmae and 400 drachmae on two farms and houses; *IG XII/8 21* (Lemnos, 14/3 BCE): Mortgages by *orgeōnes* on a farm.

Stoichedon (28 letters), stele of white marble, 65 x 27.5–32 x 7 cm. Letter height: 0.4 cm. Discovered on the slope north of the Hill of the Nymphs "within the probable limits of the old deme Melite" (Lord 1899, 45). The inscription is carelessly cut; although stoichedon, lines 21, 31, 34, 36, 37, and 38 have one or two extra letters; in lines 10, 11, 15, 22, 28, 33, and 35 the cutter left the last space blank.

[Θ Ε] Ο Ι.

- [ο]ἱ ὀργεῶνες ἐμίσθωσαν τὸ ἱερὸν το-  
 [ὀ] Ἐγρέτου Διογνήτῳ Ἀρκεσίλου Με-  
 λιτεῖ εἰς δέκα ἔτη :ΗΗ: δραχμῶν τοῦ ἐ-  
 5 {ε}νιαυτοῦ ἐκάστου, χρῆ<sup>ν</sup>σθαι τῷ ἱ-  
 ἐρωῖ καὶ ταῖς οἰκίαις ταῖς ἐνοικοδο-  
 μιημέναις ὡς ἱερῷ. περιλαίψει δ-  
 ἐ Διόγνητος καὶ τῶν τοίχων τοὺς δε-  
 10 ομένους, ἐνοικοδομήσει δὲ καὶ κατ-  
 ασκευαὶ καὶ ἄλλ' ὅταν τι βούληται ὕ  
 Διόγνητος. ὅταν δὲ ὁ χρόνος ἐξίη ὕ

- αὐτῶι τῆς δεκαετίας, ἅπεισιν ἔχων  
 τὰ ξύλα καὶ τὸν κέραμον καὶ τὰ θυρώ-  
 [μ]ατα, τῶν δ' ἄλλων κινήσει οὐθέν. ἐπι-  
 15 [μ]ελήσεται δὲ καὶ τῶν δένδρων τῶν ὕ  
 ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι πεφυκότων, καὶ ἂν τι ἐγ-  
 λείπει, ἀντεμβαλεῖ καὶ παραδώσει  
 τὸν αὐτὸν ἀριθμόν. τὴν δὲ μίσθωσιν  
 ἀποδώσει Διόγνητος τῶι αἰεὶ ταμει-  
 20 ὕοντι τῶν ὀργεῶνων ἐκάστου τοῦ ἐν-  
 αὐτοῦ τῆμ μὲν ἡμίσεαν τὰς :H: δραχμὰ[ς]  
 τοῦ Βοηδρομιῶνος τῆι νομηναίαι, ὕ  
 τὴν δὲ λοιπὴν τὰς :H: δραχμὰς τοῦ Ἐλα-  
 φηβολιῶνος τῆι νομικηναίαι. ὅταν δὲ  
 25 θύωσιν οἱ ὀργεῶνες τῶι ἥρωι τοῦ Βο-  
 ηδρομιῶνος, παρέχειν Διόγνητον τ-  
 ῆν οἰκίαν, οὗ τὸ ἱερόν ἐστίν, ἀνεωιγ-  
 μένην καὶ στέγην καὶ τὸ ὀπτάνιον ὕ  
 καὶ κλίνας καὶ τραπέζας εἰς δύο τρ-  
 30 ἰκλίνας. ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀποδιδῶι τῆμ μίσθ-  
 ωσιν Διόγνητος ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις τοῖς  
 γεγραμμένοις ἢ τᾶλλα μὴ ποεῖ τὰ ἐν  
 τῆι μισθῶσει γεγραμμένα, ἄκυρος ὕ  
 ἔστω αὐτῶι ἢ μίσθωσις καὶ στερῆσθω  
 35 τῶν ξύλων καὶ τοῦ κεράμου καὶ τῶν ὕ  
 θυρωμάτων, καὶ ἐξέστω τοῖς ὀργεῶσι  
 μισθοῦν ὅτῳ ἂν βούλωνται. ἐὰν δὲ τις  
 εἰσφορὰ γίνηται, ἀπὸ τοῦ τιμήματος  
 τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν εἶναι. ἀναγράψαι δὲ  
 40 τῆμ μίσθωσιν τήνδε Διόγνητον εἰς  
 τὴν στήλην τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν ἐν τῶι ἱ-  
 ερῶι. χρόνος ἄρχει τῆς μισθώσεως ὕ  
 ἄρχων ὁ μετὰ Κόροιβον ἄρχοντα. ὕὕ

## G o d s!

The *orgeōnes* leased the temple of Egretēs to Diognetos son of Archesilas of Melite, for a period of ten years, at an annual rent of 200 drachmae. He may have use of the temple and the houses which are built there as a sanctuary. Diognetos shall whitewash the walls as they require it; he shall build and furnish it whenever he wishes. When the period of ten years elapses, he will depart, taking with him the wooden fixtures and the tiles and the doors, but he will remove nothing else.

- 15 He shall take care of the trees that have been planted in the sanctuary, and if any should die, he will replace it and return (to the lessors) the same

number (of trees). Diognetos shall pay the rent to whoever is the treasurer of the *orgeōnes*, each year, one half, or 100 drachmae, on the first of the month of Boedromion, and the remainder, being 100 drachmae, in the first of the month of Elaphebolion.

- 25 Now when the *orgeōnes* sacrifice to the hero in the month of Boedromion, Diognetos shall make available the house, where the shrine is, the open part and the shed and the kitchen, along with couches and tables for two *triclinia*. If Diognetos does not pay the rent at the times that have been indicated or if he does not carry out the other provisions that are recorded in this lease, the lease shall be void and after the wood and tiles and doors have been removed, the *orgeōnes* shall be entitled to re-lease (the sanctuary) to whomever they wish. If some special tax should be levied, it shall be (deducted) from the payment (due) to the *orgeōnes*. Diognetos shall inscribe this lease on the stele that belongs to the sanctuary. The lease shall be in effect beginning with the archonship of Koroibos.

### Notes

- I. 1: ΘΕ]ΟΙ → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 337.1 [3] (note)*.
- I. 2: ἐμίσθωσαν: The standard form of an Attic lease is κατὰ τὰδε ἐμίσθωσεν, “on the following condition, NN leased...” → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2492.1* (Athens, 345/4 BCE); 2493.2 (Sounion, 339/8 BCE); 2495.1 (Athens, 334/3 BCE); 2496.2 (Piraeus, late IV BCE); 2497.1 (Athens, mid IV BCE); *SEG 24:203* (Athens; 333/32 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2498.2* (Piraeus, 321/0 BCE). Ἐμίσθωσαν *simpliciter* appears in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2501.1* (Athens, late IV BCE): the life-long lease of a temple of Hypodektes by *orgeōnes* to a private citizen. Four of these leases are by a religious association: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2496* (lease of a workshop and house); 2499 (lease of a temple); 2501 (lease of a temple); and Pleket, *Epigraphica* 1 (1964) no. 43 (= *SEG 24:203*) (lease of a garden) (see Robin Osborne, “Social and Economic Implications of the Leasing of Land and Property in Classical and Hellenistic Greece.” *Chiron* 18 [1988] 318–23. (BE 1989, no. 261).
- II. 2, 20, 25, 36: [ο]ἰ ὀργεῶνες → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255.1 [2] note*.
- I. 3: Ἐγρέτου: On Egretēs → Ferguson 1944, 80–81; Kearns 1989, 157. Egretēs was worshipped on the slopes of the hill of the Nymphs, the site of the discovery of this inscription. The mythology of this hero is unknown.
- II. 3, 8, 11, 19, 26, 31, 40: Διογνήτῳ Ἀρκεσίλου Μελιτεῖ (*PAI 327870*). An Athenian demesman, probably the grandson of *PAI 327865* (IV BCE).
- I. 7: περιλείψει → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 659.23–26* (Eleusis): παρασκευάζειν εἰς κάθαρσι[ν] τοῦ ἱεροῦ περιστερὰν καὶ περιλαε[τῆ][ψα]ι τοὺς βωμοὺς καὶ πιττῶσαι τὰς [ὄ][ροφὰς] καὶ λούσαι τὰ ἔδη, “(resolved) that they shall prepare a pigeon for the purification of the temple and shall whitewash the altar and cover the roof with pitch and wash the statue (of the gods).”
- I. 27: τὸ ἱερόν: Literally “the sanctuary,” but Dittenberger, *Syll<sup>2</sup> 937* suggests that it here refers to the cult statue.
- I. 28: στέγην: Lord (1899, 53) notes that στέγην, which stands between τὴν οἰκίαν and τὸ ὀπτάνιον, lacks an article. If an article is to be presupposed, the phrase perhaps refers to a shed; or it may be connected with τὸ ὀπτάνιον and means “a shed with an oven.”

- II. 29–30: *τραπέζας εἰς δύο τρικλίνα*: “tables for two *triclinia*.” Hellman 1999, 104: “Il est probable que τρικλινον ne désigne pas, ici, une salle de repas pour trois lits seulement, car le terme était aussi employé d’une manière générale pour toute salle à manger, sept lits (à une, deux ou trois places) étant le chiffre plus courant.”
- II. 37–39: *ἐὰν δέ τις | εἰσφορὰ γίνηται, ἀπὸ τοῦ τιμήματος | τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν εἶναι* → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2496.26–29*: *ἐὰν δέ [τις] εἰσφορὰ γίνηται ἢ ἄλλο τι ἀπ[ό]τ[ε]ισμα τρό[π]οι ὁμοιοῦν, εἰσφέρειν Εὐκράτην κατὰ τὸ τίμημα κα[θ’] ἑπτὰ μῆνας*, “should a property-tax or some other payment in some other way be levied, Eukrates [the lessee] shall pay it in accordance with the assessment within seven months.” This provision in the lease is required by the fact that, in some cases, the payment of special taxes and levies fell to the lessor, and others, to the lessee.
- I. 44: *ὁ μετὰ Κόροιβον ἄρχοντα*, i.e., after 306/5 BCE → Meritt 1977, 171.

### Comments

The *orgeōnes* in this inscription are probably a citizen band who owned a temple, houses and a grove of fruit trees and who honored an otherwise unknown hero, Egretēs, once a year. The buildings were apparently roofless and not furnished with doors, which the lessee would provide and, at the expiration of the lease, remove. The lessors retained the right of access to the house for their sacred rites in the month of Boedromion (in September), and for these purposes the lessee was also obliged to give the *orgeōnes* access to the house, which contained a *cella* (I. 27: *οὗ τὸ ἱερόν ἐστίν*), and to the kitchen and to arrange two *triclinia*. Assuming that each *triclinium* could hold between 9–15 diners (i.e., 3–5 diners per couch), the latter detail suggests a membership of 18–30 persons (Ferguson 1944, 80).

The prohibition of the removal of trees from temple groves is attested in other laws: *LSCG 36* (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1177*); 37 (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1362*); 84 (*IG IX/2 1109*); 91; 111; 148; 150; *LSCGSup 36*; 53; 81 (*IG XII/6 1 171*); 91 (*IG XII/9 90*) and is probably a response to the appetite for timber in Greece, which by the fourth century BCE had already experienced severe deforestation (Jordan and Perlin 1984; Ragone 1998).

Austin (1981, 226) thinks that this lease is an indication that the *orgeōnes* lacked financial resources and were dependent upon the patronage of wealthy individuals. Thus, they were compelled to lease their temple. This conclusion does not necessarily follow: it may be, as Parker (1996, 110) speculates, that the lessee, Diognetos, was a member of the group and that this group, like at least two others, sacrificed to their hero only once a year.<sup>4</sup> Under such circumstances it would make sense to lease the sanctuary for the rest of the time, and derive income from it in order to support the yearly sacrifices. Lord (1899, 52) observes that a rent of 200 drachmae/year indicates an estate of considerable value.

<sup>4</sup> *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2501* (Athens; late IV BCE): the lease of a temple of Hypodektēs; *LSCGSup 20.12-14* (Athens; 300–250 BCE): *τὸν ἐστιάτορα θύειν τὴν [θυσί]αν μηνὸς ἑκατονβαϊῶνος ἐβδόμει καὶ ὀγδοεὶ ἐπ[ὶ] δέκα*.

**Literature:** Ferguson 1944, 80–81; Le Guen-Pollet 1991, 46–50; Jones 2000; Jordan, B., and John Perlin. “On the Protection of Sacred Groves.” In *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow*, ed. Alan L. Boegehold. Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies Monographs, no. 10. Durham, N.C.: Duke University, 1984 (*SEG* 34:1739); Poland 1909, 486; Ragone, Giuseppe. “Dentro l’alsos: economia e tutela del bosco sacro nell’antichità classica.” In *Il sistema uomo-ambiente tra passato e presente*, ed. Claude Albore Livadie and Franco Ortolani. Bari: Edipuglia, 1998 (*SEG* 49:2490); Sokolowski 1969, 86–87; Ziebarth 1900, 501–502

## [8] *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1275

### Obligations of members of a *thiasos*

Piraeus (Attica) 325–275 BCE  
 Published: Marcus N. Tod, “A Statute of an Attic Thiasos.” *ABSA* 13 (1906–7) 328–38 (facsimile) (*ed. pr.*); Kirchner, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1275; Michel, *RIG* 1549; Sokolowski, *LSCGSup* 126.  
 Publication Used: Tod 1906–1907.  
 Current Location: British Museum.

Non-stoichedon (35–40 letters). A stele of gray marble, 20.3 cm high x 36–37 cm. wide x 6 cm thick. Letter height: approximately 0.5 cm., with an average of 38 letters per line. The top portion of the inscription is missing, but except for the top left, both sides and the bottom are well preserved.

Tod (1906–1907, 330) describes the writing as careless: letters are not formed in a uniform way and there has been no effort to make Θ or O real circles. The cutter made a number of errors: ΘΣ for δς (L. 5), ΑΠΟΓΙΚΝΟΜΕΝΟΙ for ἀπογιγνομένου (L. 6), ΕΟΗΘΕΙΝ for βοηθεῖν (L. 8), ΦΙΠΠΟΥΣ for φίλους (ll. 8/9), ΕΥΙΕΒΟΥΜΕΝ for εὔσεβούμεν (l. 10) and ΤΑ|ΕΤΑ for ταῦτα (ll. 10–11).

Tod dated the inscription between 325–275 BCE, observing that the outer strokes on the Σ have not yet become horizontal, the Ξ still has a vertical stroke, the outer strokes on the Μ are not yet vertical and the horizontal bars on the Ε are the same length. This is confirmed by various spellings that are typical in late IV BCE Attic inscriptions (see the notes).

- 1 [-----] δέ τις αι  
 [-----] ναι κατασ-  
 [-----] αια τῶν θιασ-  
 [ωτῶν - - εἰὰν δέ τι]ς αὐτῶν ἀπογίγνητ-  
 5 [αι· ··]σει ἢ ὑδ[ς ἦ · · · · ἦ π]ατήρ ἢ <δ>ς ἂν οἰκειότα-  
 ος εἶ τοῦ θιάσου, τοῦ δ' ἀπογιγνομένου> ἰέναι ἐπ' ἐ-  
 χφοράν καὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ τοὺς φίλους ἅπαντες. καὶ ἄ-  
 ν τις ἀδικῆται <β>οηθεῖν καὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ τοὺς φί-  
 λους ἅπαντες, ὅπως ἂν πάντες εἰδῶσιν ὅτι καὶ

- 10 εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐ<σ>εβούμεν καὶ εἰς τοὺς φίλους· τα-  
 <ὄ>τα δὲ ποιοῦσιν αὐτοῖς πολλὰ κάγαθὰ καὶ ἐγγόν-  
 οῖς καὶ προγόνοις· ἐπειδὴν δὲ κυρώσωσι τὸν νόμ-  
 ον οἱ θιασῶται, μὴθὲν εἶναι τοῦ νόμου κυριώτερ-  
 ον· εἰάν δέ τις παρὰ τὸν νόμον ἢ εἶπει ἢ πράξει, κα-  
 15 τηγορίαν αὐτοῦ εἶναι τῷ βουλομένῳ τῶν θιασωτῶ-  
 ν καὶ ἂν ἔλει αὐτὸν τιμάτωσαν αὐτὸν καθότι ἂν δο-  
 κεῖ τῷ κοινῷ.

... and if a member ...

....

.... of the *thiasōtai* of the association

... and if any of them should die... or a son or a ... or a father or whoever is his closest relative in the association, and they shall attend the cortège—both the members and all the friends. And if a member should be wronged, they and all the friends shall come to his assistance, so that everyone might know that we show piety to the gods and to our friends. To those who do these things, (may) many blessings come upon them, their descendants and their ancestors. Whenever the *thiasōtai* have ratified this law, let there be nothing to take precedence over it. And if someone should either speak or act in contravention of the law, an accusation against him may be lodged by any of the *thiasōtai* who so wishes; and if he convicts him, let them assess the penalty, whatever seems appropriate to the association.

### Notes

- l. 4 : τ]ς; Tod; Sokolowski: οἰκεῖο]ς or ἐπιτήδειο]ς.  
 l. 5: ]σει. Tod: φράσ]ει; Sokolowski: καθὼ]ς εἰ.  
 l. 5: π]ατήρ; Kirchner, Sokolowski: [ἢ μήτηρ ἢ π]ατήρ. Tod: [ς ἢ · · · π]ατήρ. Tod notes that there is insufficient space for ἀδελφός (thus Michel). Wilhelm (*apud* Tod) also suggests μήτηρ, but Tod thinks that Greeks would not have written μήτηρ ἢ πατήρ but πατήρ ἢ μήτηρ. Moreover, if females appear, one would also expect θυγάτηρ alongside μήτηρ. Tod prefers ὕονός, “grandson.”  
 l. 5: Tod (1906–7, 331) suggests “[notice shall be given] either by his son [or his ... or] his father ....”  
 l. 6: The phrase εἶ τοῦ θιάσου is unclear. Tod suggests that it is either equivalent to θιασῶτης ὢν or a cutter’s error for θιασ<ώτ>ου. In the first case, the phrase would have been added because the association could only legislate regarding its own members; in the second, the phrase would mean “whoever is the nearest relative of the (deceased) member.” Sokolowski (*LSCGSup* 212): “Il me semble qu’il soit question d’une personne en relation avec l’association par la sympathie ou les bienfaits.”  
 l. 6: The euphemism ἀπογίγνομαι (for ἀποθνήσκω) also appears in the decree of a *thiasos* honoring their officials in IG II<sup>2</sup> 1277.14–15 [15] (Athens, 278/7 BCE):

ἐπιμετέλγηται δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀπογενομένων καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως, “they have taken care of those who died in a generous and honorable manner.” See also Lifshitz 1967, 259–60, commenting on *CIJ* I 89.

- I. 6: εἶ: εἰ for η (II. 6, 14, 16) appears 380–370 BCE and by 300 was the normal form. It was replaced by η after 200 BCE and by 30 BCE εἰ is rarely attested, η or η being the regular form. See Meisterhans 1900, 38–39.
- II. 6–7: ἐλχορᾶν: Attic inscriptions of the classical period use both ἐκ and ἐχ before χ, φ and Θ (e.g., *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672 [329/8 BCE].75: ἐλχορ[ρήσαντι]). No instance of χ for κ is attested after 292 BCE. See Meisterhans 1900, 106.
- I. 7: φίλοι: The “friends” seem to be distinguished from the association members. Tod (1906–1907, 332) considers three possibilities: (1) that “friends” is used in its ordinary sense and refers to friends of the members; (2) that they are friends of the deceased (L. 7) and the injured man (L. 10); or (3) that the term has a technical meaning, referring to persons who do not yet possess full membership. He rejects the first two possibilities on the grounds that the association would not be in a position to legislate the behavior of non-members and suggests that the φίλοι may be associates of the *thiasos*.

In other associations the members themselves were known as φίλοι. E.g., in Athens: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369.25–26 [49] (Athens, II CE?): ἔρανον σύναγον φίλοι ἄνδρες, καὶ κοινῇ βουλῇ θεσμὸν φιλήης ὑπέγραψαν; Boetia: Paul Perdrizet, “Inscriptions d’Acraephiae,” *BCH* 22 (1898) 241–60, 246: Παράμονον Ἀφροδισίου οἱ φίλοι τ[ὸν] | ἑαυτῶν εὐεργέ[τ]ην ἀνέστησαν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων, “the ‘friends’ set up (this statute of) Paramonon son of Aphrodisios, their benefactor, at their own expense”; Phrygia: *MAMA* X 458.2–3 (58/7 BCE): οἱ συνήθεις φίλοι ἐτίμησαν Διογένην | Ρούφου; Mysia: *IPerg* II 562, with a list of names, presumably association members; Cilicia (Canytelideis): E.L. Hicks, “Inscriptions from Western Cilicia,” *JHS* 12 (1891) 225–273, 229: Μαρκιανὸν | Μηνοδότου | οἱ φίλοι μνήμης χάριν τὸν αὐτ[ῶν] | εὐεργέτην, “The ‘friends’ (erected this monument to) Markianos son of Menodotos as a memorial to their benefactor”; Lydia: *ILydiaSaittai* 29 (Saittai, 170–71 CE) (*SEG* 29:1188): Ἔτ(ου)ς σνε΄ μη(νός) Ἀπ[ε]λλαίου ἡ Γλάφυρον Δ[ιο]γε[ν]οῦς οἱ συνβιω[τα]ί τὸν ἑαυτῶν φίλ[ον] ζήσαν[τα] ἔτη ἡ΄; *ILydiaSaittai* 31 (Saittai, 194–95 CE) (*SEG* 29:1195): Ἔτ(ου)ς σοθ΄ μη(νός) Ὑπερβε[ρ]ταίου β΄. ἡ συνεργ[ο]σία τῶν πιλοποιῶν τὸν φίλον Ἀττα|λιανὸν ἐτείμησαν ζή(σαντα) ἔτ(η) κζ΄; *ILydiaSaittai* III 19 (223–24 CE); *TAM* V/1 93 (Lydia, Saittai, 225–26 CE): ἔτους τί΄, μη(νός) Δύστρου σ΄ ἀ(πιούση) Αὐρ. Πρεῖμον ἐτείμησαν Χρυσάνθινοι οἱ φίλοι τὸν φίλον, ζή(σαντα) ἔτ(η) κε΄, “Year 310, Dystros 6. The Chrysanthinoi friends honored Aurelius Primus, their friend, who lived 25 years.”

- I. 10: εὐσεβοῦμεν: εὐσέβεια is normally rendered only to the gods. There are, however, a few puzzling instances: e.g. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1329.25 [37] (Piraeus, 175/4 BCE): ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν καὶ εὐσεβίης εἰς τε τὰς θεάς καὶ τοὺς ὀργεῶνας which, despite its grammar, probably means “on account of excellence towards the *orgeōnes* and piety towards the god.” Cf. also *Syl<sup>3</sup>* 1107.23–24 (Cos, 200 BCE): ἐπὶ τε τᾷ αἰρέσει καὶ εὐσεβείᾳ ἂν ἔχοντι ποτὶ τὸς θεός καὶ τὸς δαμότας.
- II. 12–17: The *nomos* comes into effect only with its ratification by the members, at which time violations may be prosecuted by the association. A late first century BCE inscription of Athenian Soteriastai concludes by giving the results of the vote: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1343.44 [48] (*Syl<sup>3</sup>* 955; *RIG* 973; Athens, 37/6 BCE): τῶ{τ}ν ψήφων, αἴς ἐδόκει τότε τὸ δόγμα κύριον εἶναι, ἐξήκον[τα], αἴς δὲ οὐκ ἐδόκει, οὐδεμία, “sixty votes in favour of the decree being ratified; those not in favour, zero.” According to Solonic



law, the regulations of private groups, once ratified, became binding provided that they did not violate civic laws:

ἐὰν δὲ δῆμος ἢ φρατέρες ἢ ἱερῶν ὀργεῶνες ἢ σύσσιτοι ἢ ὁμόταφοι ἢ θιασῶται ἢ ἐπὶ λείαν οἰχόμενοι ἢ εἰς ἐμπορίαν, ὅτι ἂν τούτων διαθῶνται τινες πρὸς ἀλλήλους, κύριον εἶναι, ἐὰν μὴ ἀπαγορευῆ δημοσία γράμματα.

If a deme or phratry or sacrificing associates or mess mates or those who are to be buried in the same tomb or *thiasōtai* or those who generally live together or those belonging to a merchant organization – if some of these form a joint agreement with each other, it is binding unless it violates any of the civic laws. (*Digest* 47.22.4)

1. 14: εἰάν: εἰάν for ἐάν is common especially between 350–300 BCE (Meisterhans 1900, 45–47).
1. 14: ἢ εἴπει ἢ πράξει: Woodhead (1997, 289 no. 202) compares a fragmentary decree from a religious group (Athens, mid III BCE) 1. 4: εἴπει ἢ γρά[φει], suggesting on the strength of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1275.14* that the preferred reading should be εἴπει ἢ πρά[ξει], “says or acts...”
1. 16: For τιμάω with the meaning, “fix the penalty due,” see Plato, *Leges* 8.843B: τιμάτω τὸ δικαστήριον ὃ τε ἂν δέη πάσχειν ἢ ἀποτίνειν τὸν ἡττηθέντα, “the court shall assess what the loser must suffer or pay as a fine.” The syntax is incorrect, however. Τιμᾶν should either take a dative or a construction such as περὶ αὐτοῦ (Demosthenes [21] *In Midiam*, 47).

It is common to find the imposition of fines and sometimes even temporary or permanent exclusion of members who violate the rules of an association. See, e.g., a IV BCE rule of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis, which imposed fines on members for acting or speaking in violation of the rule and for failing to attend meetings: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1361 [4]* (Piraeus, IV BCE). See further Ziebarth 1896, 170–79; Poland 1909, 446–52.

### Comments

The top portion of the tablet is missing where presumably the name of the association was given, perhaps along with the mention of a deity. Since the inscription three times refers to the regulations as constituting a *nomos* (ll. 12–13, 14), it is possible that the inscription began with an enactment formula and the designation νόμος θιασῶτων, similar to that found in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1369 [49]*: Ἄρχων μὲν Ταύρισκος, ἀτὰρ μὴν Μουνυχιῶν ἦν ὀκτ[ω]καιδεκάτη δ' ἔρανον σύναγον φίλοι ἄνδρες, καὶ κοινῇ βουλῇ θεσμὸν φιλίας ὑπέγραψαν. | Νόμος ἐρανοιστῶν, κτλ., “During the archonship of Tauriskos, in the month of Mounichion on the eighteenth day, the ‘friends’ convened a club and by common council established an ordinance of friendship. The law of the subscribers, etc.”

The dating of the inscription to the end of the fourth century BCE or beginning of the third places it at the time of the formation of other associations dedicated to Sabazius and Magna Mater, Asklepios, Isis (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 337 [3]*), the Syrian Aphrodite (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 337*) and association of metics (of Salaminians and Sidonians; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2946*; Athens, III/II BCE).

The inscription uses both the term *thiasos* (l. 6) and *thiasōtai* (ll. 13, 15–16). While the term *orgeōnes* is almost exclusively limited to Athens and a few other locales with strong links to Athens (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255.1 [2] note*), *thiasos* is

far more widely attested, appearing in Attica, the Peloponnese, Macedonia, Aegean Islands, Macedonia, North Pontus, Scythia Minor, Asia Minor, Thessaly, Crete, Cyprus, Egypt, and Sicily, and are found from classical period until the III or IV CE (Arnaoutoglou 2003, 60–61). *Thiasōtai* as a term for the members of an association is attested not only in Attica, but in the Peloponnese, the Black Sea region, Tenos, Thasos, Kalcedon, Cios, Smyrna, Teos, and Egypt.

In early Athenian and Spartan inscriptions θιάσος was generally restricted to gatherings of citizens and often, the subdivision of a phratry: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2343.1 [1] (Athens, ca. 400 BCE): κοινὸ θιασωτῶν; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2345 (Athens, mid IV BCE), a list of names of Athenians divided into several θιάσοι. Arnaoutoglou (2003, 62–63) points out that it is in the early IV BCE that *thiasos* and *thiasōtai* begin to appear, designating non-citizen groups. In literature, the term is often applied pejoratively. For example, in *De corona* and *De false legatione*, Demosthenes lampoons his opponent Aeschines for his associations with non-citizen cultic *thiasoi*:

ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις τοὺς καλοὺς θιάσους ἄγων διὰ τῶν ὁδῶν, τοὺς ἐστεφανωμένους τῷ μαράθῳ καὶ τῇ λεύκῃ, τοὺς ὄφεις τοὺς παρείας θλιβῶν καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς κεφαλῆς αἰωρῶν, καὶ βοῶν «εὐοὶ σαβοῦ», καὶ ἐπορχοῦμενος «ὕῃς ἄττης ἄττης ὕῃς», ἔξαρχος καὶ προηγεμὼν καὶ κίττοφόρος καὶ λικνοφόρος καὶ τοιαῶθ' ὑπὸ τῶν γραδίων προσαγορευόμενος, μισθὸν λαμβάνων τούτων ἔνθρυπτα καὶ στρεπτοὺς καὶ νεήλατα, ἐφ' οἷς τίς οὐκ ἂν ὡς ἀληθῶς αὐτὸν εὐδαιμονίσειε καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ τύχην ([18] *De corona* 260)

But by day you used to lead those noble companies (θιάσους) through the streets, men crowned with fennel and white poplar, throttling the puff-adders and waving them over your head, crying out “Euoe, Saboe,” and dancing to the tune of “Hyes Attes, Attes Hyes” – addressed by the old hags as leader, captain, ivy-bearer, fan-bearer, and so on; and as the reward of your services getting sops and twists and barley-bannocks! Who would not congratulate himself with good reason on such things, and bless his own fortune?

οὐκ ἴσασιν οὗτοι τὸ μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς τὰς βίβλους ἀναγιγνώσκοντά σε τῇ μητρὶ τελοῦση, καὶ παῖδ' ὄντ' ἐν θιάσοις καὶ μεθύουσιν ἀνθρώποις καλινδούμενον; ([19] *De falsa legatione* 199–200)

Did they (the jury) not know all about you? first the acolyte reading the books while your mother performed mysteries; and, child as you were, reeling and tumbling with *thiasoi* and drunken men.

In the mid-fourth to third century BCE, *thiasos* appears in three Attic inscriptions in addition to *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1275. In *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1177 (mid IV BCE) *thiasos* still seems to refer to a grouping within a deme (Poland 1909, 19) but as Arnaoutoglou notes, the apparent function of the *thiasos* in question is cultic (2003, 66). *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1297 [24] (236/5 BCE) is an association with both male and female members and therefore not a deme or phratry group, but dedicated to a deity, probably Artemis Kallistē. And *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4985 (mid III BCE: ὁμονοίας τοῦ

θείου) is a dedication to *Homonoia* by a *thiasos* (see Thériault 1996, 35–36). Arnaoutoglou concludes:

*Thiasos* as a technical term was used cautiously and sparingly [in mid-IV to III BCE Attic inscriptions] only when there was a religious function to be performed. (Arnaoutoglou 2003, 66)

The term *thiasōtai* is much more commonly attested in Attic inscriptions of the fourth and later centuries than is *thiasos*. Poland notes that associations of *thiasōtai* had a pronounced cultic orientation and,

from the names of the deities and from the nationalities of the majority of members, so far as it can be determined, one can conclude that...the foreign element predominated significantly in these collegia of *thiasōtai*. Perhaps it is a coincidence, but certainly a significant coincidence that among all these associations nothing purely Attic is attested. There is another coincidence to add which is no less remarkable: Most of the *thiasōtai*-inscriptions in question are found in a short span of time, from 302 to 278/7 BCE.<sup>5</sup> Hence, quite apart from the important question of the development of Greek associations in general, which must be discussed, the fact remains that in this period the name “*thiasos*” was the common one for newly-founded associations.... (Poland 1909, 20)

Dow and Gill, following Tod (1906–1907, 331 n. 2), hold that after the fourth century the terms *thiasos*, *thiasōtai* and *koinon* could be used interchangeably:

In the Hellenistic period it gradually assumed a more general significance, and came to mean simply “a religious association” ... In fact, the *thiasōtai* of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1275* (init. s. III a.) and 1297 (ca. 236/5) use both “*thiasos*” and “*koinon*” of themselves with no apparent difference in significance. (Dow, et al. 1965, 113)

Arnaoutoglou disputes this conflation, arguing that *thiasos* connotes the religious (or cultic) aspect of the association of *thiasōtai* and hence, *thiasoi* are said to be “convoked” (συναγαγεῖν) (e.g., *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297.4* [24]) (Arnaoutoglou 2003, 68). In any event, Poland’s observation, which still holds well, would incline us to conjecture that the *thiasōtai* of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1275* were partisans of a non-Attic deity.

The role that this *thiasos* assumed in the funeral of a member (or the relative of a member) seems to have been restricted to attendance. There is no reference to the payment of the ταφικόν (“funeral benefit”) by the treasurer, as there is in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1278.2* [17] (Athens, 272/1 BCE) and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1323.10–11* [31] (Athens, ca. 194/3), and no indication is given that the association owned a tomb in which members were buried. Instead, they probably participated in the ἐκφορά (II. 6/7), the rites at the grave, and the subsequent meal. Whether members would have had any role at the rites on the ninth day or in the annual commemoration is unknown. Nevertheless, the participation of the association

---

<sup>5</sup> Poland’s range must now be expanded to include the latter part of the third century BCE. See Index VI s.v. θιασῶται.

in funerary commemorations served as means to enhance the honor of deceased members (and their families), and to cement bonds within the association itself, since each member could presumably count on similar honors being conferred at death.

Although the inscription is fragmentary, it is clear that the role of this association was not restricted to providing burials for its members. Thus we have no analogy to the so-called *collegia funeraticia* of the Romans (→ *CIL* XIV 2112), whicher were supposedly *collegia* exclusively devoted to the burial of members, a category of very dubious merit in any case.

The members were obliged by the rule to assist fellow members. Neither the conditions under which assistance was required nor the nature and limits of such assistance is given. In *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1258 (Athens, 324/3 BCE) three members of a *koinon* were chosen to assist in the prosecution of a lawsuit against members who had given false testimony on some matter. In various Egyptian guilds, by contrast, there are attempts to stipulate both the nature and limits of assistance. *P.Mich.* V 243.9 (Tebtynis, I CE), for example, requires members to assist a member arrested for a private debt and to stand surety to a maximum of 100 silver drachmae for 30 days. Similarly *P.Cairo. dem.* 30606.23–24 (Tebtynis, 158/7 BCE) stipulates that members involved in an “unjust trial” are to be supported and their expenses paid (→ Boak 1937, 217–18).

In the Egyptian guilds, failure to render assistance or to participate in the funeral rites resulted in a fine. In Attic associations fines were imposed for various infractions: disorderly conduct, failure to attend meetings (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1368 *passim* [51]), failure of officials to implement decisions (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1292.10–11 [26]), but none for failing to participate in a funeral. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1275 suggests that service rendered to members, living and deceased, constitutes a display of piety (ll. 9–10) and that such acts will be rewarded. The motif of divine blessings as rewards for piety and cultic service appears in other inscriptions: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4547–4548 A 6–7 (Phaleron, 400 BCE); *LSCGSup* 72 B 2–5 (Thasos, I BCE); *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 985.60–62 (Philadelphia [Lydia], I BCE); *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 997.11–16 (Smyrna, I BCE).

**Literature:** Dow, et al. 1965; Sokolowski 1962, 210–212 (no. 126); Thériault, Gaétan. *Le culte d’Homonoia dans les cités grecques*. Collection de la Maison de l’Orient méditerranéen, 26; Série épigraphique et historique, 3; Lyon: Maison de l’Orient méditerranéen; Québec: Editions du Sphinx, 1996; Tod, Marcus N. “A Statute of an Attic Thiasos.” *ABSA* 13 (1906–7) 328–38.

[9] *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1261Three honorific decrees of *thiasōtai*

Piraeus (Attica)

A: 302/1 BCE; B: 301/0 BCE; C: 300/299 BCE

Published: Alexandre Meletopoulos, Κόσμος (10 Nov 1879); Stephanos A. Koumanoudes, *Athenaion* 8 (1879) 296 (*ed. pr.*); Paul Foucart, “Décret d’un thiasé d’Aphrodite,” *BCH* 3 (1879) 510–15 (facsimile from a squeeze); *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 611b; Michel, *RIG* 975–78; Dittenberger, *Syll<sup>1</sup>* 427; Dittenberger, *Syll<sup>2</sup>* 726; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1261; Dittenberger–Hiller von Gaertringen, *Syll<sup>3</sup>* 1098 (Poland A13a–b).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1261.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 4636 and 4637 (Piraeus, late IV BCE): Dedications to Aphrodite Ourania; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 4586 (Piraeus, mid IV BCE): Dedication to Aphrodite; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 4616 (Piraeus, late IV BCE): Dedication found in the same location as *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 4596; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 337 [3] (Piraeus, 333/2 BCE): Foundation of a temple to the Syrian Aphrodite; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1290 (Piraeus, mid. III BCE): A fragmentary decree of Salaminians of Cyprus concerning the worship of Aphrodite and the celebration of the Adoneia; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1337 [44] (Piraeus, 97/6 BCE): Honors for a priestess of the Syrian Aphrodite.

LI. 2–40: Stoichedon (25 letters); II. 44–55: non-stoichedon (29–32 letters). 125 x 33 x 24 cm. Marble tablet, discovered in the Piraeus. Three decrees in successive years by the *thiasōtai* of Adonis and Aphrodite.

- A ἐπὶ Νικοκλέους ἄρχοντος.  
 ἔδοξεν τοῖς θιασώταις· ἐπει[δὴ]  
 Στέφανος ὁ θωρακοποιὸς ἐπι[με]-  
 λητῆς γενόμενος τῶν κοινῶ[ν πά]-  
 5 [ν]των ἐπιμεμέληται τὴν ἐπιμ[έλ]-  
 εῖαν ἦν ἔδει αὐτὸν ἐπιμεληθ[ῆν]-  
 αι καὶ τᾶλλα φιλοτιμούμεν[ος δ]-  
 [ι]ετέλεσεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινού κ[αί]  
 [τ]ὴν πομπὴν τῶν Ἀδωνίων ἔπεμ[ψε]  
 10 [κ]ατὰ τὰ πάτρια· τύχει ἀγαθῆ[ι δ]-  
 εδόχθαι τοῖς θιασώταις ἐπα[ιν]-  
 [έ]σαι Στέφανον τὸν ἐπιμελητῆ[ν]  
 [φ]ιλοτιμίας ἔνεκεν καὶ ἀνδρα[γ]-  
 [α]θίας τῆς εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν θια-  
 15 [σ]ωτῶν καὶ στεφανῶσαι θαλλοῦ στ-  
 εφάνωι· δοῦναι δ’ αὐτῶι Δ δραχ[μάς].  
 στεφανῶ θεῖς ὑπὸ τ-  
 οῦ κοινῶ ἀνέθ-

ηκε τὴν <crown> Δήμητρα  
 20 ὁμόνοι ἀν τοῦ  
 κοινῶ.

Ἄφροδίτης  
 οἱ θιασῶται Στέ-  
 φανον Μυλωθροῦ.

## B

25 ἐπὶ Κλεάρχου ἄρχοντος ἔδο[ξε]-  
 [ν] τοῖς θιασῶταις· ἐπειδὴ Στέ[φα]-  
 νος πρότερόν τε ἐπιμελητῆς [γε]-  
 νόμενος καὶ νῦν ἱεροποιὸς λ[αχ]-  
 30 ὦν μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων συνιεροποι[ῶ]-  
 ν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γέγονεν καὶ τὰς [θ]-  
 υσίας ἔθυσσε τοῖς θεοῖς ἅς πά[ρ]-  
 ιον ἦν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τᾶλλα ἐπιμε[μ]-  
 ἔληται ὅσα προσήκε[ν] αὐτῶι πε[ρ]-  
 35 ἰ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν, τύχηι ἀγαθε[ῖ]  
 δεδόχθαι τοῖς θιασῶταις, ἐπα[ι]-  
 νέσαι Στέφανον τὸν ἱεροποιὸν  
 φιλοτιμίας ἕνεκεν καὶ ἀνδρα[γ]-  
 αθίας τῆς εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν θι[α]-  
 σωτῶν καὶ στεφανῶσαι θαλλοῦ σ-  
 40 τεφάνωι· δοῦναι [δὲ] αὐτῶι Δ δραχ[μάς].  
 Ἄ[φροδίτης]  
 οἱ [θιασῶτ]αι  
 [Στ]έ[φαν]ο[ν] Μυλωθροῦ.

## C

ἐφ' Ἡγεμάχου ἄρχοντος· ἀγαθεῖ τύχ[ει]  
 45 Σωκλῆς εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Στέφανος ἱερο-  
 ποιὸς γενόμενος εὖ ἐπεμελήθη τῆς θ[υ]-  
 σίας τῆς Ἄφροδίτης, δεδόχθαι τοῖς θι[α]-  
 σῶταις ἐπαινέσαι Στέφανον Μυλωθρ[οῦ]  
 καὶ στεφανῶσαι θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι καὶ  
 50 δοῦναι αὐτῶι ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ :ΔΔ: δραχ[μάς], τὸν  
 δὲ λαβόντα ἀναθεῖναι ἀνάθημα ἐν τοῖ  
 ἱερῶι ἐπιγράψαντα τότε τὸ ψήφισ-  
 μα ὅπως ἂν ὥσι πολλοὶ οἱ φιλοτιμούμε-  
 νοι, εἰδότες ὅτι ἐπίστανται χάριτας ἀ-  
 55 ποδιδόναι οἱ θιασῶται.

When Nikokles was archon, the *thiasōtai* approved (the following motion): Whereas Stephanos the breastplate maker, when he became the

supervisor (*epimelētes*) of all the association's affairs, administered them with the appropriate care and continued to be ambitious in other matters concerning the association (*koinon*); and (whereas) he conducted the procession in honor of Adonis in accordance with ancestral customs; – for good fortune, the *thiasōtai* resolved to commend Stephanos the supervisor on account of the zeal and the nobility of character that he has exhibited towards the association of *thiasōtai*, and to crown him with an olive wreath; (further) to give to him ten drachmae. Having been crowned by the association, he dedicated the statue of Demeter *Homonoia* of the association.

The association of *thiasōtai* of Aphrodite (honor)

Stephanos son of Mylothros

When Klearchos was archon, the *thiasōtai* approved (the following motion): Whereas Stephanos, formerly having become a supervisor and now has been chosen a “sacrifice maker” (*hieropoios*) with his fellow *hieropoioi*, has been a generous person and has offered to the gods the sacrifices which by ancestral custom are offered to them, and has exercised care over the other matters that are his to care for; – for good fortune, the *thiasōtai* resolved to commend Stephanos the *hieropoios* on account of the zeal and the nobility of character that he has exhibited towards the association of *thiasōtai*, and to crown him with an olive wreath; and (further) to give to him ten drachmae.

The association of *thiasōtai* of Aphrodite (honor)

Stephanos son of Mylothros

When Hegemachos was archon – for good fortune Sokles made the (following) motion: Whereas Stephanos, having become a *hieropoios*, has conducted faithfully the sacrifices to Aphrodite, the *thiasōtai* resolved to commend Stephanos son of Mylothros and to crown him with an olive wreath, and to give him from the treasury twenty drachmae; having received this money, he shall dedicate a statue in the temple, inscribing it with this decree, so that as many as are ambitious will see that the *thiasōtai* know how to recompense with due thanks (those who serve the association).

Notes

- I. 1: ἐπὶ Νικοκλέους ἄρχοντος: i.e., 302/1 BCE. See Meritt 1935, 545–547; 1977, 171.
- II. 3, 12, 23–24, 26, 36, 43, 45, 48: Στέφανος Μυλωθρ[οῦ] (*PAA* 833720; *LGPN* 2:405[99]). The patronym (*PAA* 661795) appears only here in Athenian inscriptions.
- I. 3: ὁ θωρακοποιός: The term appears only in Julius Pollux, *Onomasticon* 1.149 in a list of those who manufacture weapons: τεχνῖται τῶν ὀπλῶν ἀσπίδοπηγός, θωρακοποιός,

κρανοποιός, μαχαίροποιός, δορυξόος, πλοποιός, “The manufacturers of weapons: the shield maker, the breastplate maker, the helmet maker, the sword smith, the spear carver, the hatter.”

ll. 3–4, 12, 27: ἐπι[με]λλητής → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1361.15 [4] note.*

l. 9: πομπήν τῶν Ἀδωνίων, “the procession of the Adonis devotees.” Adonis is Semitic in origin (*Adon*, “Lord,” *Adonī*, “my lord”) although this is the title rather than the name of a Semitic deity. The rites associated with Adonis make clearer his identity: the rite of women weeping over the death of Adonis, the young lover of a love-goddess, associates him with Tammuz (the lover of Ishtar/Astarte) (→ Ezek 8:14). Kition (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 337 [3]*) in Cyprus, which was under Phoenician control until the Hellenistic period, is probably the one of the conduits of the cult to the Greek world. The association of Adonis with Aphrodite was natural.

In addition to the ritual of women’s lament (Simms 1997–1998), Adonis is associated with the practice of sowing “gardens of Adonis,” which germinate quickly and then die (Plato, *Phaedrus* 276B), and laying out of an effigy of the corpse of Adonis (Burkert 1979, 105–11). Plutarch, *Alcibiades* 18.3–4 refers to the *Adoneia* during the Peloponnesian War when “little images like dead folk carried forth to burial were in many places exposed to view by the women, who imitated burial rites, beat their breasts, and sang dirges (καὶ ταφὰς ἐμμοῦοντο κοπτόμεναι καὶ θρήνους ἦδον).” Aristophanes (*Lysistrata* 386–96) makes a derogatory reference to the cult of Adonis, and Diphilos (*Zoigraphos*, 40–42 [ed. J.M. Edmonds]) associates Adonis with brothels and courtesans.

l. 10: The qualification [κ]ατὰ τὰ πάτρια, “in accordance with the ancestral customs,” suggests that the version of the *Adoneia* observed by the devotees of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1261* (and 1290) was not identical with the rites as those observed by Athenian women, even though the dating of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1290* (on which see the comments of Meritt 1935, 573) suggest that the *Adoneia* of the Salaminians was also a spring or early summer festival.

l. 13, 54: [φ]ιλοτιμίας ἔνεκεν → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255.13 [2] note.*

ll. 13–14, 37–38: ἀνδρα[γ][α]θία: A virtue commonly praised in Attic inscriptions, e.g., *IG II<sup>2</sup> 25.3* (287/6 BCE); 103.30 (369/8 BCE); 138.7 (353/2 BCE); 145.4 (403/2 BCE), etc. The nuance of “bravery” or “manliness” is attested in Thucydides 2.42.3: τὴν ἐς τοὺς πολέμους ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος ἀνδραγαθίαν, “bravery in wars on behalf of one’s country.” However, it also has a more general sense of “honesty” or “nobility,” for example in Thucydides 3.57.1: προσκέψασθέ τε ὅτι νῦν μὲν παράδειγμα τοῖς πολλοῖς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀνδραγαθίας νομιζέσθε, “Consider also that at present the Hellenes generally regard you as a pattern of nobility”; Isocrates, *Nicoctes* 44.5: προειλόμην τῶν ἡδονῶν οὐ τὰς ἐπὶ ἔργοις τοῖς μηδεμίαν τιμὴν ἔχουσιν, ἀλλὰ τὰς ἐπὶ ταῖς δόξαις ταῖς δι’ ἀνδραγαθίαν γυνομένας, “I chose pleasures, not those which come from activities which hold no honor, but those which are from the honors that come from a noble character.” Demosthenes (59 *Against Neaira* 89) refers to a case in the 340s which cited a law according to which μὴ ἐξείναι ποιήσασθαι Ἀθηναῖον, ὃν ἂν μὴ δι’ ἀνδραγαθίαν εἰς τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων ἄξιον ἦ γενέσθαι πολίτην, “there is a law imposed upon the people forbidding them to bestow Athenian citizenship upon any man who does not deserve it because of distinguished services to the Athenian people.” Demosthenes himself was to be honored ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ ἀνδραγαθίας (Aeschines 3.49). Whitehead concludes: “[*Andragathia*] provided a way of conceptualizing the virtue of men who had proved themselves *agathos* to the Athenians by what they had done rather than who they were, and who were thus



suitable people to be praised and rewarded by an egalitarian society” (1993, 62, emphasis original). This is the only association inscription to praise this virtue in a benefactor.

- II. 19–20: Δήμητρα | ὁμόνοιαν του κοινῶ: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4985.1–2* (III BCE) attests a dedication to Ὀμονοίας | τοῦ θιάσου, “concord of the *thiasos*” but the inscription is only two lines long and so there is no context by which to interpret the dedication. A much later inscription, *SEG 36:266* (I–II CE), is a dedication to the concord of Athens: εὐχαριστήρ[ι]ον ὑπὲρ τῆς ὁ[μ]ο[ν]οίας τοῦ δήμ[ου] | τοῦ Ἀθηναίων | καὶ τοῦ πατρίου | ἐπ’ ἀγαθῶ, “a thanksgiving for the concord of the Athenian People and of the ancestral (things), for good (fortune).” A Greek dedication found in Kition (Cyprus) dating from the Augustan era contains a dedication to Zeus Keraunios, Aphrodite and Concord:
- SEG 30:1617*; *36:1251* (= *CIG II 2641*; Kition, Augustan era): Καίσαρ[ι] ἡ θεῶι | Διὶ ἡ Κεραυνίῳι, | Ἀφροδίτῃ, ἡ Πόλει | Δήμῳι, ἡ Ὀμονοίῃ | Ἀβιανίᾳ καὶ Ἀβιάνιῳι | τὰς στοάς καὶ τὰ | ἐν αὐταῖς πάντα | ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου, “to the deified Caesar, Zeus Keraunios, Aphrodite, the city, the People (and) Concord; Aviania and Avianios (dedicated) these stoas and everything in them, at their own expense.”
- II. 24, 43: Μυλωθρός (*LGPN 2:322[1]*): Mylothros means “the miller.” Although the word is attested in Attica, it appears only as an epithet → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 10995* (IV BCE): Γῆρυς μυλωθρός; *IG III App. 68.1a*: Φύλεαν τὸμ μυλωθρόν. This is the only attestation of the name in Attica.
- I. 25: ἐπὶ Κλεάρχου ἄρχοντος: i.e., 301/0 BCE. See Meritt 1935, 547; 1938, 132; 1977, 171.
- II. 28, 36, 45–46: ἱεροποιός, “Sacrifice maker”: *Hieropoioi* are found in groups of *orgeōnes* (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255.2–3 [2]* note) but also among *eranistai* (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1265*; 1291 [19]), *Sarapiastai* (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1292*) and *thiasōtai* (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1261*; 1263; 1297).
- I. 44: ἐφ’ Ἠγεμάχου ἄρχοντος: i.e., 300/299 BCE. See Meritt 1935, 547–48; 1977, 171; Osborne 2009, 84.

### Comments

The inscription records three successive honors voted to Stephanos, who served first as a supervisor (*epimelētēs*) and then as the *hieropoios* of an association dedicated to Aphrodite and Adonis. There is no clear indication whether this is an association of citizens or not (Arnautoglou 2003, 99). The name Stephanos, of course, is not uncommon as an Attic name, but Mylothros (“the miller”) is attested only here and might therefore be an indication of foreign origin, although there is no similar name attested elsewhere either.

Concluding that the *thiasōtai* in question were noncitizens, Ferguson proposed that noncitizen associations began to appear in significant numbers after 306 with the repeal of the law of Sophokles of Sounion, which had been directed against Theophrastos and the Peripatetics. This law had led to Theophrastos leaving Athens, for he had been associated with the dictatorship of Demetrios of Phaleron, who fled Athens in 307 BCE (Ferguson 1911, 104–7). With the repeal of Sophokles’ law, freer association was permitted and non-citizens found it easier to form associations (Ferguson 1944, 67). Hence,

Poland's observation (above, p. 57) that noncitizen associations are attested from 302 onward is substantially correct, though the lower limit of his span (278/7 BCE) should be put later.

There are several noteworthy aspects to this inscription. First is the way in which this honorific inscription imitates the form of honorific inscriptions by the Council or People of Athens. The decree begins with the standard archon-dating and follows in stereotypical fashion the form of civic honorific decrees. Even if it was easier for a noncitizen association to assemble and meet after the repeal of the law of Sophokles of Sounion, the mimicry of Athenian formulae attested in this and many later inscriptions served as a way to "fit in" with Athenian sensibilities.

Second, the commendation of Stephanos for ἀνδραγαθία (see the note on ll. 13–14) mimics commendations of Athenians for what was a civic virtue *par excellence* (Whitehead 1993, 62) and a *sine qua non* for Athenian citizenship. This, coupled with the commendation for φιλοτιμία constituted a tacit claim that the association and those associated with it emulated the values most prized by citizens (Whitehead 1983).

Third, the designation of Stephanos of *hieropoios* ("sacrifice maker") and in particular the commendation for having carried out sacrifices (ll. 31–33, 46–47) suggests that these *thiasōtai* owned a temple. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1261 may be related to *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1290 (Piraeus, 281/0 BCE), which attests a Salaminian group in the Piraeus from only shortly after *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1261, also dedicated to Aphrodite and Adonis and performing sacrifices:

[οις· ἐπειδὴ ··5··]ίδης Εὐβούλου Σα[λ]-  
 5 [αμίσιος ἐπιμελη]τῆς γενόμενος [ἐπι]-  
 [ὶ Οὐρίου ἀρχοντο]ς τάς τε θυσί[ας ἔθ]-  
 [υσε πάσας ὅσας προ]σήκεν αὐτῶι ὑπέ-  
 [ρ ······14·····] τεῖ Ἀφροδί[τ]ει κ-  
 [αὶ ····8····· τὸ γεν]όμενον εἰς [τ]ῆν τ-  
 10 [·····13····· καὶ] εἰς τὰ Ἀδῶ[ν]ια ε-

whereas? ...ides son of Euboulos a Salaminian, who became *epimelētēs* when Ourias was archon<sup>6</sup> offered all of the sacrifices that are appropriate, on behalf of... to Aphrodite and... which occurred for the ... for the Adonia...

Thus we might conclude that the *thiasōtai* of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1261 were also Salaminians of Cyprus (thus, Meritt 1935, 573) and perhaps in turn related to the Cypriot merchants of Kition (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 337 [3]), about 30 km. from Salamis (so Baslez 1986, 293; Mikalson 1998; Parker 1996, 160 n. 29). If they are not related to the Kitian merchants, it is unknown how they obtained a grant of ἔγκτησις to build a temple in Attica.

Fourth, the last lines of the inscription, ὅπως ἂν ᾧσι πολλοὶ οἱ φιλοτιμούμενοι, εἰδότες ὅτι ἐπίστανται χάριτας ἀποδιδόναι οἱ θιασῶται, "so that as

<sup>6</sup> On the dating and restoration of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1290, see Meritt 1935, 575 and now Osborne 2009.

many as are ambitious will see that the *thiasōtai* know how to recompense with due thanks (those who serve the association)” illustrate how the association’s public recognition of *philotimia* (zeal on behalf of the association) was deliberately and self-consciously calibrated to encourage additional acts of benefaction. Variations of this formula are regularly attested in civic inscriptions and in later decrees of associations.

The cult of Adonis was introduced into Athens from Phoenicia via Cyprus, perhaps in the fifth century BCE. But as Simms (1997–1998, 124) points out, Adonis never had an identity separate from Aphrodite. Adonis reflects the Semitic *ʾAdon*, “Lord,” a title rather than a name. In Phoenicia this figure was Tammuz, the young lover of Astarte; but in its *interpretatio Graeca* Adonis became the lover of Aphrodite. The Athenian *Adoneia* was neither an official state festival (as the *Bendideia* was) nor was it a private festival celebrated by metics. It was, on the contrary, a women’s festival observed by groups of women, Athenian and metics (Simms 1997–1998, 125) (→ note on 1.9 above).

The cult represented by *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1261* (and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1290*), by contrast, does not have any clear relationship to the Athenian *Adoneia*. The adherents of the group attested in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1290* were Salaminians from Cyprus and the same may be the case for some or all of the *thiasōtai* of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1261*. Baslez 1986, 293, 303 points out that the Phoenician cult of Adonis featured both sacrifice and a procession, like that presupposed by *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1261* but unlike the Athenian cult.

C’est un rituel oriental qui ne doit rien, là encore, à la forme grecque des Adonies. Celles-ci sont des fêtes privées, célébrées dans les maisons, et dont le moment essentiel était la lamentation des femmes sur les toits; au contraire, le décret des Salamiens met l’accent sur le sacrifice et la procession, ce qui évoque très directement le rituel de Byblos. Dans sa milieu, Déméter a sa place, associée à Concorde, pour signifier un culte parfaitement intégré. (Baslez 1986, 303)<sup>7</sup>

Temples to Aphrodite-Astarte were discovered in Kition, including one on the Acropolis of the town, indicating the prominence of Aphrodite-Astarte for Cypriots (Nicolaou 1976, 105–6). Thus, “in accordance with the ancestral customs” in l. 10 suggests that the *thiasōtai* of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1261* and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1290* sought to preserve the Phoenician-Cypriot form of the cult of Aphrodite and Adonis rather than embracing the Athenian observance of the *Adoneia*.

**Literature:** Baslez 1986; Deubner 1932, 220–222; Lambrechts and Noyen 1954; Nicolaou, Kyriakos, *The Historical Topography of Kition*. Studies in Mediterranean archaeology 43. Göteborg: P. Åström, 1976; Parker 1996, 160–61; Simms 1997–1998.

<sup>7</sup> Referring to Brigitte Servais-Soyez, *Byblos et la fête des Adonies*, EPRO 60 (Leiden : E.J. Brill, 1977).

[10] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1262*Honorific decree of the *thiasōtai* of Tynaros

Piraeus (Attica)

300/299 BCE

Published: D. Stauropoulos, "Thiasotendekret aus dem Piräus," *AM* 21 (1896) 93–94 (*ed. pr.*); Michel, *RIG* 1550; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1262*; Tracy 1995, 137 (ph. only) (Poland A14).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1262*.

Current Location: National Museum (Athens).

Stoichedon (22 letters). 85 x 46–48 x 12 cm. Letter height: 0.8 cm. Stele of Hymettian marble discovered in the Piraeus in 1894. The cutter has been identified by Tracy (1995, 136–47; 2000, 230–231; 2003, 38–48) as the cutter also of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 273a*; 394; 404; 418; 440; 455; 460; 464; 468; 496; 504; 505; 1194; 1230; 1241; 1260; 1264; 1265; 1487aA; 1491A,B; and *Agora* 16:107. He describes the lettering as "plain and somewhat sloppy in appearance, for the strokes often do not meet precisely, and horizontals tend to slant haphazardly. Round letters too are not round but are rendered, wholly or in part, by straight strokes. This cutter tends to leave ample space between letters" (1995, 136).

- ἐπὶ [Κλ]εάρχου ἄρχοντος, μη[νὸς Σκ]-  
 προ[φο]ριῶνος. Κανθαρίων [εἶπεν· δ]-  
 [εδόχ]θαι τοῖς θιασώ[τ]αις· [ἐπειδὴ]  
 [οἱ ἐπ]ιμεληταὶ καλῶς καὶ φ[ιλοτί]-  
 5 [μω]ς ἐπιμεμέληνται τῶν τε θ[υσιῶ]-  
 [ν κ]αὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων τῶν [κοιν]-  
 [ῶν], ἐπαιέσαι αὐτοὺς καὶ στ[εφαν]-  
 [ῶ]σαι θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι, δούν[αι δὲ]  
 10 αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰς ἀνάθημα ἐκ [τοῦ κο]-  
 [ιν]οῦ ὕ ΔΔ ὕ δραχμάς, ἐν ᾧ οἱ τε [στέ]-  
 φανοὶ καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα ἀναγραφῆ[σ]-  
 [ε]ται, ὅπως ἂν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι εἰδῶσι-  
 ν, ὅτι τὸ κοινὸν τοῖς φιλοτιμουμ-  
 15 ἐνοις εἰς αὐτοὺς ἀξίας χάριτας  
 ἀποδίδωσιν τῶν εὐεργετημάτων.  
 <in a crown> <in a crown>  
 οἱ θιασῶται οἱ θιασῶται  
 οἱ Τυνάρου οἱ Τυνάρου  
 Δράκοντα, Δράκοντα,  
 Κίττον Κίττον.

When Klearchos was archon, month of Skirophorion. Kantharion made the following motion: Be it resolved by the *thiasōtai*: Whereas the

supervisors have faithfully and ambitiously executed their responsibilities, both in regard to the sacrifices and all the other affairs of the association, (it is resolved) to commend them and to crown them with olive wreaths and to provide for them at the association's expense a votive plaque in the amount of twenty drachmae, on which both the crowns and the decree are inscribed, so that all the others might know that the association (*koinon*) renders appropriate thanks to those who are ambitious toward (the members) in acts of benefaction.

The *thiasōtai* of  
Tynaros (honor)  
Drakon (and)  
Kittos

The *thiasōtai* of  
Tynaros (honor)  
Drakon (and)  
Kittos

### Notes

1. 1: ἐπὶ Κλεάρχου ἄρχοντος: i.e., 301/0 BCE (Meritt 1977, 171) → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1261.25 [9] *note*. Since Klearchos is named, presumably the inscription itself is dated the year after his archonship, i.e., 300/299 BCE.
1. 2: Κανθαρίων: *PAA* 563805; *LGPN* 2:255[1]: according to Stauropoulos (1896, 94), the name is *in rasura*. The name appears nowhere else in Attica, but does appear on a II BCE tombstone from Oropos [Boeotia] (*Epigr. tou Oropou* 574): Δαμοζένα | Κανθαρίωνος | χρηστή; in a III BCE epitaph from Thrace (*IAegThrace* 229): Σωσιπάτρα | Κανθαρίωνος; an inscription from Stratonikeia in Caria: *IStratonikeia* II/1 647: ἱερεὺς κατὰ πενταετηρίδα [Φ]ανίας Ἐκαταίου τοῦ Φανίου Λο(βολδεύς) Κανθαρίων. M.C. Sahin, *Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia*, IGSK 21–22 (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1981–90) 2/1:57 suggests that the name is derived from κᾰνθαρος, “drinking goblet.”
11. 12–14: ὅπως ἂν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι εἰδῶσιν, ὅτι τὸ κοινὸν τοῖς φιλοτιμουμένοις εἰς αὐτοὺς ἀξίας χάριτας || ἀποδιδῶσιν τῶν εὐεργετημάτων. The formula is attested elsewhere in civic inscriptions: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 392 (322–319 BCE) ὅπως|| [ἂν φανερόν ἢ πᾶσι τοῖς] φιλο[τιμου]||[μένους ὅτι οὐ δῆμος ἀ]πο[δ]ιδῶσ[ιν] χάρ[ι]||[τας ἀξίας τῶν εὐε]ρ[γε]τη- μάτων; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 448.18 (323/2 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 577.1–3 (end IV BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1263.27–31 [11] (300/299 BCE), etc.
1. 14: ἀξίας χάριτας → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1252+999.21 [6] *note*.
1. 17: οἱ Τυνάρου: It is unknown whether Tynaros is a foreign deity or a hero and the name appears only here. For Kearns (1989, 201), the un-Greek name “suggest(s) that T. may have been a foreign god...” Parker (1996, 338) identifies Tynaros as a Phrygian hero. Tracy, however, argues that “the reading of this line in both instances is οἱ Τυνάβου, not Τυνάρου (*IG*). Τυνάβος is clearly a transliteration of a foreign word; it is not, so far as I can determine, attested elsewhere. The closest reflex I can discover is Θυναβουούβν, the name of a place on the west side of Thebes in Egypt that is known from papyri of the mid-second century BCE. According to Wilcken [1927–1957, 2:129–36 nos. 175a–c] the word transcribes an Egyptian phrase meaning “the grave of *Nbunn*” and may be a reference to the grave of the high priest *Nb-wnnf* of Rameses II (1290–1224 BCE). Given the existence in Attica before 333/2 of shrines of Isis (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 337 lines 43–45) and Ammon (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 338 line

14), it is not impossible that there was an association of devotees of an ancient Theban (Egyptian) cult in Piraeus in the late fourth century BCE.”

- l. 18: Δράκων (*LGPN* 2:135[13]), also an Athenian name attested in the demes Bate, Paiania, and Phlya.
- l. 19: Κίττον: *PAA* 570205; *LGPN* 2:261(15). Kittos is mainly attested in Attica (Kissos in Asia).

### Comments

This inscription honors two *epimelētai*, Drakon and Kittos. Traill (*PAA* 563805) suggests that Kantharion, the proposer of the motion, might be an Athenian, but since the name is not elsewhere attested in Athens and no demotic is present, the status of Kantharion remains unclear. The decree takes the form already seen in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1261, imitating the form of Athenian honorific decrees honoring those who perform acts of benefaction.

Paul Veyne (*Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism* [London: Allen Lane, 1990] 85–122) has argued that from the mid-fourth century onwards, governance in Greek cities such as Athens was less in the hands of citizens, and more a matter of wealthy families, who exercised power and influence through euergetism (as distinct from personal patronage). Veyne distinguishes three forms of euergetism: “voluntary euergetism” (“liberalité”) not occasioned by any particular event but functioning as a means for the élite to display social and moral superiority; funerary euergetism (the establishing of a funerary foundation through the donation of property); and gifts to the polis (or to associations) *ob honorem* – on the occasion of election to an office or honor.

The acts of generosity towards the association in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1262 are not specified, but evidently both supervisors displayed largesse toward the group, thus emulating the practices of wealthy Athenian citizens. On this topic, see Whitehead 1983.

The identity of Tynaros is unknown; I am unable to locate other instances of the name. Parker’s suggestion that Tynaros is a Phrygian hero is no more convincing than Tracy’s conjecture that “Tynaros” should be read “Tynabos” and is Egyptian. As Mikalson points out (1998, 1467 n. 28) the “tentative suggestion that the cult is Egyptian seems unlikely given the Cyprian origin of the devotees.” Mikalson’s own suggestion (1998, 147) is that the cult might be related to the cult of Aphrodite Ourania (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 337; 1337).

**Literature:** Kearns 1989, 201; Mikalson 1998, 103, 147, 151–53, 309; Parker 1996, 338; Tracy 1995, 146–47.

[11] *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1263Decree of *thiasōtai* honoring their secretary

Piraeus (Attica)

300/299 BCE

Published: Athansios Rhousopoulos, "Griechische Inscripten aus Athen," *Archäologische Zeitung (Archäologischer Anzeiger)* 23 (1865) 109–112 (facsimile) (*ed. pr.*); Foucart 1873, 212–14 (no. 30); Koehler, *IG II* 611; Michel, *RIG* 976; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1263 (Poland A15).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1263.

Current Location: Museum in Piraeus.

Stoichedon (28 letters). 78 x 25.5 x 11 cm. Letter height: 0.4 cm. A tablet of Pentelic marble, discovered in the Piraeus. Tracy (1995, 168) assigns this inscription to the cutter of *Agora* 1:4266 (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 379; 479; 571; 652; 653; 663; 684+752b; 704; 716+1226; 752a; 2390; *Agora* 1:4424; 5039) active between 304 and 271 BCE. He describes 1263 as follows: "This is a carefully inscribed complete text; nevertheless, three incorrect letters stand on the stone. Those in lines 8 and 38 are noted by Kirchner. In line 32, *pi* has been inscribed as the second letter of the archon's name. Presumably these incorrect letters were corrected with paint. The final line is spaced out slightly in a *rasura*. It is probable that the cutter first inscribed the patronymic and then erased it and put in the ethnic" (Tracy 1995, 168–69).

Ἐπι Ἡγεμάχου ἄρχοντος, μηνὸς Πυαν-  
 ομηώνος πέμπτει ἵσταμένου, ἀγορὰ  
 κυρία τῶν θιασωτῶν, ἔδοξεν τοῖς θια-  
 ασώταις· Κλέων Λεωκράτου Σαλαμίν-  
 5 ιος εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Δημήτριος γραμμα-  
 τεὺς αἰρεθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν θιασωτῶν ἐ-  
 πι Κλεάρχου ἄρχοντος, καλῶς καὶ δι-  
 καίως ἐπεμελήθη τῶν κοινῶν πάντων  
 καὶ τοὺς λογισμοὺς ἀπέδωκεν ὀρθ-  
 10 ῶ]ς καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐθύνας ἔδωκεν  
 ὧν τε αὐτὸς ἐκυρίευσεν καὶ τὰ πρὸς  
 τοὺς ἄλλους ἐξελογίσαστο, ὅσοι τε τ-  
 ῶν κοινῶν διεχείρισαν, καὶ νῦν δια-  
 15 τελεῖ τὰ συμφέροντα πράττων καὶ λ-  
 ἔγων ὑπὲρ τῶν θιασωτῶν καὶ κοινήι  
 καὶ ἴδιαι ὑπὲρ ἐκάστου, καὶ ψηφισα-  
 μένων τῶν θιασωτῶν μισθὸν αὐτῶι δ-  
 ἶδοσθαι ἐκ τοῦ κοινού καὶ τοῦτον ἐ-  
 20 πέδωκε τοῖς θιασώταις· ἀγαθῆι τύχ-  
 ηι, δεδόχθαι τοῖς θιασώταις ἐπαιν-  
 ἔσαι Δημήτριον Σωσάνδρου Ὀλύνθι-

- 25 ον ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἦ-  
 ς ἔχων διατελεῖ πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν  
 θιασωτῶν καὶ στεφανῶσαι αὐτὸν ἀν-  
 αθήματι ἀπὸ :F: δραχμῶν· τὸ δὲ ἀνάθ-  
 ημα ἀναθεῖναι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, οὐ ἂν βο-  
 ῦληται, αἰτήσας τοὺς θιασώτας, ὅπω-  
 30 ς ἂν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι φιλοτιμῶνται εἰς  
 τοὺς θιασώτας, εἰδόντας ὅτι χάριτα-  
 ς ἀπολήψονται παρὰ τῶν θιασωτῶν ἀ-  
 ξίας τῶν εὐεργετημάτων· τὸν δὲ ταμ-  
 ῖαν τὸν ἐπὶ Ἡγεμάχου ἄρχοντος δοῦ-  
 ναι τὸ ἀργύριον εἰς τὸ ἀνάθημα καὶ  
 ἐπιμεληθῆναι τοῦ ἀναθήματος ὅπω-  
 35 ς ἂν τὴν ταχίστην συντελεσθεῖ· στε-  
 φανῶσαι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ θαλλοῦ στεφά-  
 νωι ἤδη, ἀναγορεύειν δὲ τόνδε τὸν σ-  
 τέφανον τοὺς ἱεροποκοῦς τοὺς ἀεὶ  
 λανχάνοντας ἱεροποεῖν μετὰ τὰς σ-  
 40 πονδᾶς, ὅτι στεφανοῖ τὸ κοινὸν τῷ-  
 δε τῷ στεφάνωι Δημήτριον ἀρετῆς  
 ἔνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας, ἧς ἔχων διατελε  
 ἶ εἰς τοὺς θιασώτας· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀναγο-  
 ρεύσωσι, ἀποτινέτωσαν τῷ κοινῷ  
 45 :F: δραχμάς· ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψή-  
 φισμα πρὸς τῷ ἀναθήματι.

<in a crown>

οἱ θιασῶται

Δημήτριον

Ἰόλυνθον.

When Hegemachos was archon in the month of Pyanopsion on the fifth day of the present month in the regular assembly of the *thiasōtai*, the *thiasōtai* approved the motion that Kleon son of Leokrates from Salamis proposed: Whereas Demetrios, who was chosen secretary by the *thiasōtai* when Klearchos was archon, took care of all of the affairs of the association honorably and justly, and rendered the accounts in good order and justly and gave a public accounting both of what he had controlled himself and what he had delegated to the others – whatever he administered belonging to the *thiasōtai*—and now he continues to do what is helpful and speaks on behalf of the *thiasōtai*, both as a group and individually, and after the *thiasōtai* approved a motion to give him a reward from the treasury, he even returned this to the *thiasōtai*; for good fortune, it seemed good to the *thiasōtai* to commend Demetrios son of Sosandros



of Olynthos on account of the excellence and honesty which he continues to have in respect to the association of *thiasōtai* and to honor (“crown”) him with a votive plaque in the amount of 50 drachmae; and to set up the plaque in the temple, wherever he should wish it, after asking the *thiasōtai*. (This is) so that the others shall also be ambitious towards the *thiasōtai*, knowing that they shall receive thanks from the *thiasōtai* deserving of the benefactions. The treasurer, elected during the archonship of Hegemachos, shall provide the money for the plaque and he shall be responsible for the plaque so that it will be completed quickly. And (it is resolved) to crown him immediately with an olive wreath. The sacrifice makers (*hieropoioi*) who have been chosen at that time to serve as *hieropoioi* shall announce this crown(ing) publicly after the libations, «the association crowns Demetrios with this wreath on account of the excellence and good will that he continues to show towards the *thiasōtai*». And if they do not publicly announce this, let them pay a fine of 50 drachmae. (And it is resolved) to inscribe this decree next to the plaque.

<in a crown>

The *thiasōtai* (honored)

Demetrios of Olynthos

### Notes

- II. 1–2: μηνὸς Πυανοψηῶνος, “month of Pyanopsion,” September/October.
- II. 2–3: ἀγορὰ | κυρία, “regular assembly,” usually written ἀγορᾶ κυρίαί → *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1263.2–3 (300/299 BCE); 1277.2 (278/7 BCE); 1282.3 (262/1 BCE); 1283.3 (240/39 BCE); 1298.7 (248/7 BCE); 1284.20 (241/0 BCE); 1314.2 (213/2 BCE); 1315.3 (211/0 BCE); 1317.1 (272/1 BCE); 1317b.2 (249/8 BCE); 1323.3 (194/3 BCE); 1325.18, 34 (185/4 BCE); 1326.2 (176/5 BCE); 1327.2 (178/7 BCE); 1328.4, 21 (183/2 BCE); 1329.2 (175/4 BCE); 1334.1–2 (late II BCE); 1335.3 (102/1 BCE); 1337.2 (97/6 BCE); 1342.3 (mid I BCE); *SEG* 21:532.1 (227/26 BCE); 21:535.4 (112/1 BCE); 21:536.4 (111/0 BCE). This appears to be a variation on the much more common ἐκκλησία κυρία, e.g., *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 336 frag. a.4 (334/3 BCE); 340.6–7 (333/2 BCE), etc., and means “the regular assembly.” See McLean 2002, 304.
- II. 1, 32: ἐπὶ Ἡγεμάρχου ἄρχοντος, i.e., 300/299 BCE (thus Osborne 2009, 84) → *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1261.44 [9].
- I. 4: Κλέων Λεωκράτου Σαλαμίνιος; *PAA* 579310; *LGPN* 2:268[54]; *FRA* no. 6464. Kleon is from Salamis in Cyprus, not Salamis the island off the coast of Attica.
- II. 5, 21–22, 41, 48: Δημήτριος Σωσάνδρου Ὀλύνθιον; *PAA* 313287; *LGPN* 4:92[129]; *FRA* no. 5889. Demetrios is a Macedonian.
- II. 6/7: ἐπὶ Κλεάρχου ἄρχοντος; i.e., 301/0 BCE (Meritt 1977, 171) → *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1261.25 [9] note.
- I. 8: ΕΠΕΜΕΛΗΘΗ on the stone.
- II. 15–16: καὶ κοινῆ | καὶ ἰδία → *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1327.6 [35] note.
- I. 17: μισθόν, “reward, wages.” This seems extraordinary, since one expects distinguished members of the association to be rewarded with crowns, plaques and public

proclamations (as Demetrios is), but not with “wages.” It is not as surprising that Demetrios returned the *misthos* that he was offered it in the first place.

- l. 22: ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ δικαιοσύνης → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1252+999.7 [6] *note*.
- ll. 29–31: εἰδόμενος ὅτι χάριτα||ς ἀπολήψονται παρὰ τῶν θιασωτῶν ἀξίας τῶν εὐεργετημάτων → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1262.12–14 [10].
- ll. 29–30: χάριτα||ς ἀπολήψονται → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1252+999.21 [6] *note*.
- l. 32: ΗΠΙΕΜΑΧΟΥ on the stone.
- ll. 37–38: ἀναγορεύειν δὲ τόνδε τὸν στέφανον, “to announce publicly this crown(ing).” The public proclamation of the crowning of a member or benefactor is widely attested, both in associations (e.g., *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1277.24 [15]; 1297.14 [24]; 1292.14 [26]) and in the polis (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 212.29; 555.16, 21–22; 654.44, etc.).
- l. 38: ΙΕΡΟΠΟΙΟΥΣ on the stone.
- ll. 43–45: εἰδόμενος δὲ μὴ ἀναγορευέσθαι, ἀποτινέτωσαν τῷ κοινῷ || Ἔ δραχμάς: Unlike *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361.13–14 [4] (and the other inscriptions cited there) the fine is not paid to the deity (i.e., the temple), but to the association. Arnaoutoglou 2003, 136 also draws attention to *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1292.16–17 [26] and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328.11–14 [34], where likewise the fine is paid to the association directly.

### Comments

The deity honored by this association of *thiasōtai* is unknown, but l. 26 indicates that they possessed a temple. The only two persons named, Kleon and Demetrios, are noncitizens, the mover of the motion from Salamis (most likely from Salamis in Cyprus) and the honoree from Olynthos in Macedonia. Whether the association also included Athenians is unknown. What is clear is that the inscription mimics the structure and vocabulary of Athenian civic decrees, with an orator proposing the motion and the membership (equivalent to the *dēmos*) approving the motion and authorizing the recording of the motion on a stele. The structure of the club also mimics Athenian structures, with a *grammateus* and *tamias* selected yearly.<sup>8</sup>

The honoree had served as *grammateus* (secretary) of the association in 301/0 BCE and was to be honored the following year. He is praised for having rendered accounts fairly and honestly (ll. 9–10: τοὺς λογισμοὺς ἀπέδωκεν ὀρθῶ||ς καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐθύνας), which suggests that he was charged with aspects of financial management (there is also a *tamias* for the association). Demetrios was apparently a member of some means: he was not only charged with the financial management of the club, but is commended for continuing to act in a beneficial way on behalf of members, both corporately and individually (ll. 13–16), after his term of office had expired. His return to the association’s treasury of the μισθός (l. 17) voted to him also suggests a person of means.

While this inscription, like *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1261 [9] and 1262 [10], includes the explanation that honors are voted to members in order to encourage similar

<sup>8</sup> In 297 BCE the position of the Athenian *tamias* was abolished. → Ferguson 1911, 130, 136.

benefaction by others (ll. 28–31), it also includes a warning directed against the *hieropoioi* if they should interfere with or otherwise impede the honorific decree from being carried out:

ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀναγο|ρεύσωσι, ἀποτινέτωσαν τῶι κοινῶι || :Ϝ: δραχμῶς (ll. 43–45)  
And if they do not publicly announce this, let them pay a fine of 50 drachmae.

Similar warnings appear in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273.21–22* [18]; *1292.16–17* [26], *1297.17–18* [24] and *AM 66 228 no. 4* (138/7 BCE), which are all association inscriptions requiring the proclamation of honors or the crowning of benefactors. Assuming that these warnings are not purely formulaic, they suggest that other officers in the association might have reasons to withhold honors, presumably from potential rivals. This points to the fundamentally agonistic character of activities in associations: on the one hand, the club deliberately and intentionally cultivated benefactors by promising public recognition in the form of crowns, proclamations, and honorific plaques, and this naturally produced rivalry among potential benefactors; and on the other hand, the clubs had to devise methods to prevent rivalry from becoming counterproductive, as is seen here.

**Literature:** Arnaoutoglou 2003; Tracy 1995, 168–69.

## [12] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2347*

### A List of *thiasōtai* honored with crowns

Salamis (Attica)

ca. 300 BCE

Published: Abel Blouet, *Expédition scientifique de Morée: Architecture, sculptures, inscriptions et vues du Péloponèse, des Cyclades et de l'Attique* (Paris: Didot, 1831–38) vol. 3, plate 45 F III, IV (facsimile); Rangabes 1842–1855, 2 (no. 1247); Boeckh, *CIG I* 110; LeBas and Waddington 1847–1888 [Roma: “L’Erma” di Bretschneider 1968], no. 1634; Koehler, *IG II* 987; Foucart 1873, 221–22 (no. 39); Michel, *RIG* 989; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2347* (Poland A12).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2347*.

Current Location: Museum in Aegina.

Slab of bluish marble, 64 cm. x 70 cm. x 16 cm., with the inscription on the front and on the right hand side. The main face has ll. 1–2 along the top of the block, with two names, below, inscribed in a crown; ll. 5–6 are inscribed on a raised crossbar; ll. 7–12, 13–18 are in two columns (A, B) in the bottom panel. Column C is engraved on the right side of the table. Max Fränkel describes the lettering as a “sehr sorgfältige Schrift” with distinct apices (*Epigraphisches aus Aegina. Abhandlungen der königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 1897 no. 1* [Berlin: Verlag der königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Georg Reimer), 1897] 13).

τούσδε ἐστεφάνωσαν οἱ θια[σ]ῶται φιλοτιμί-  
 ας ἕνεκεν τῆς εἰς ἑαυτούς·  
 <in a crown> Φιλιστίδην  
 Σωσίβιον

- 5 τούσδε ἐστεφάνωσεν τὸ κοινὸν τῶν θιασωτῶν ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα  
 καὶ δικαιοσύνης τῆς εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν θιασωτῶν·

<A>

Ἄρχέστρατον  
 Σιλανίωνα

- 10 Ἐπικράτην  
 Σιλανίωνα  
 Ἀριστοτέλην  
 Ἀρχέστρατον

<B>

Ἀντιφῶντα  
 Κυχραῖον

- 15 Εὐεργέτην  
 Πυρρίνον  
 Ἐπικράτην  
 Ἐπικλῆν

<C><right face>

- Ἄρχέστρατος  
 20 Φιλιστίδης  
 Εὐκλέων  
 Πυθέας  
 Εὐεργέτης  
 Σιλανίων  
 25 Σωσίβιος  
 Πάμφιλος  
 Κλεοφῶν  
 Ἐπικράτης  
 Θράσων  
 30 Παρθενίων  
 Ἡσυχία  
 Ἐρωτίς  
 Αἰθέριον

On account of their zeal on behalf of the membership, the *thiasōtai*  
 (voted) crowns for (the following):

<in a crown> Philistides  
 Sosibios

- 5 On account of their excellence and honesty that they have shown to the  
 association of *thiasōtai*, the association of *thiasōtai* (voted) crowns for (the  
 following): <A list of names follows>

## Notes

- I. 1 φιλοτιμίας ἔνεκεν → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255.13 [2] note.*
- II. 3, 20: Φιλιστίδης: *PAA 931295; LGPN 2:452[78].*
- II. 4, 25: Σωσίβιος: *PAA 859850; LGPN 2:415[62].*
- II. 5–6: τὸ κοινὸν τῶν θιασωτῶν. Foucart (1873, 221) suggests “il y a une différence entre les θιασῶται et le κοινὸν τῶν θιασωτῶν.” However, the phrase occurs in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1261.14, 38*: [φ]ιλοτιμίας ἔνεκεν καὶ ἀνδρα[γ][α]θίας τῆς εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν θια[[σ]ωτῶν; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1263.23*: ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἧς ἔχων διατελεῖ πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν θιασωτῶν; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1298.8–9; 1317b.4, 6; IG II<sup>2</sup> 1318.9; IG II<sup>2</sup> 1323.14; IG II<sup>2</sup> 1361.14, 38; IG II<sup>2</sup> 1363.23*; Meritt 1961b, 227 (*SEG 21:532*), and in none of these instances does there appear to be a difference between τὸ κοινὸν τῶν θιασωτῶν and οἱ θιασῶται except that the former emphasizes the collective identity of the *thiasōtai*.
- II. 6–7: ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα | καὶ δικαιοσύνης → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252+999.7 [6] note.*
- II. 7 (12, 19), 13, 18, 22: Lambert observes that four of the names – Archestratos (II. 7, 12, 19), Pytheas (I. 22, father of Sosidemos in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2345.27*), Antiphon (I. 13), and Epikles (I. 18) – also appear in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2345* (II. 25, 27, 51, 68). He notes, however, that the names are not especially distinctive and that the *thiasoi* of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2345* and *2347* cannot be the same, since “the Salamis group included women and, to judge from the names, foreigners/slaves (or Salaminian ‘natives’)” (Lambert 1999, 101 n.5). Taylor (1997, 134–35, 137) points out that the names are obviously “Salaminian,” apart perhaps from Kychraios and perhaps Silanion.
- II. 7, 12, 19: Ἀρχέστρατος: *PAA 211145, 211150, 211155; LGPN 2:70(85–88)*. There are at least two Archestratoi in this club. Two persons with this name appear in the list in column A as honorees, and another Archestratos appears on the right face among the members proposing the motion. The latter may be identical with one of the honorees.
- II. 8, 10, 24: Σιλανίων: *PAA 819890; LGPN 2:397(4–6)*.
- II. 9, 17, 28: Ἐπικράτης: *PAA 393510–15; LGPN 2:149(122–124)*. As with Archestratos, two Epikrates are named among the honorees, and one is listed as a member.
- I. II: Ἀριστοτέλης: *PAA 174690; LGPN 2:60(69)*.
- I. 13: Ἀντιφῶν: *PAA 138250; LGPN 2:40(79)*.
- I. 14: Κυχραῖον: *PAA 588960; LGPN 2:277[1]*: The name, attested only here, is a variation of a name from Salaminian mythology, Κύχρεια, the name of one of the cities on Salamis. According to Pherekydes (apud Apollodoros, *Bibl.* 3.158) Kychreos was the grandfather of Telamon. See further Taylor 1997, 134.
- I. 15, 23: Εὐεργέτης: *PAA 430730–35; LGPN 2:167(12–13)*.
- I. 16: Πυρρίνος: *PAA 796350; LGPN 2:389(6)*.
- I. 18: Ἐπικλῆς: *PAA 393105; LGPN 2:148(29)*.
- I. 21: Εὐκλέων: *PAA 436335; LGPN 2:174(4)*.
- I. 22: Πυθέας: *PAA 793230; LGPN 2:385(36)*.
- I. 26: Πάμφιλος: *PAA 762105; LGPN 2:358(138)*.
- I. 27: Κλεοφῶν: *PAA 578195; LGPN 2:267(22)*.
- I. 29: Θράσων: *PAA 518285; LGPN 2:229(49)*.

- ll. 30–34: Παρθενίων: *PAA* 766830; *LGNP* 2:361[1]; Ἐρωτίς: *PAA* 423185; *LGNP* 2:160[1]; Αἰθήριον: *PAA* 112480; *LGNP* 2:14[2]. According to Taylor (1997, 137) these are likely slave names. Fragiadakis (1986, 348, 364) lists only Παρθενίων and Ἐρωτίς as slave names. Traill is uncertain about the status of Aitherion, but lists several women named Erotis, all either of uncertain status or non-Athenians. See also *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2358.51 [40].
- l. 31: Ἡσυχία: *PAA* 489175; *LGNP* 2:208(4).

### Comments

The main face of the table lists fourteen names in the accusative, of those to whom crowns have been voted, two in a crown and twelve in two parallel columns. The right hand face lists in the nominative the fifteen association members. Six names appear in both lists: Philistides (ll. 3, 20), Sosibios (ll. 4, 25), Archestratos (ll. 7–12, 19), Silanion (ll. 8–10, 24), Epikrates (ll. 9, 17, 28), and Euergetes (ll. 15, 23). The names Archestratos, Silanion, and Epikrates all appear twice in the list of honorees (and once in the membership list), suggesting that nonmembers by these names were honored. Since there are no other identifying features of the names, we must suppose that the association was very small and that each of the honorees (and members) were easily identifiable, at least by the membership.

None of the fifteen *thiasōtai* (ll. 19–33) is identified by a demotic and the list includes three women, Hesychia, Erotis and Aitherion (listed last). The association appears to be a club of metics resident in Salamis rather than citizens (thus Ferguson 1911, 219 n. 5). One might compare *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2354 [30], where none of the twenty-three members is identified with a demotic and (at least) thirteen of these are women, *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2357, a very fragmentary list of at least thirty-eight women's names, and *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2358 [40], a list of ninety-two names, including only three demesmen, but with thirty-two women's names.

The first two honorees, Philistides and Sosibios, are singled out for special attention and their names are enclosed in a wreath. They are praised for φιλοτιμία (ll. 1–2), which normally involves a strong element of competition for honors. These two likely had been either prominent officers or benefactors of the association. The second list of honorees (ll. 5–18) are praised ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα | καὶ δικαιοσύνης, “on account of excellence and honesty,” virtues often associated with financial propriety in administration of a club. Philistides and Sosibios evidently rank above the others in honors and may have been *epimelētai* or *orgeōnes* (if there were sacrificial officers), and the others may have served as secretaries and treasurers.

The three women's names on the inscription deserve attention. Commenting on *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2354 [30], which he took to be a list of twenty-three women's names, Ernst Maass argued:

I know of no example, not even from the Hellenistic period, of young women having bound themselves together into a private association for religious purposes.

Hence, I conclude that the ἐρανίσται in the inscription published by Foucart in *Les associations religieuses*, p. 222 [i.e., *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2354*] were *hetairai* (courtesans). Νεμεάς according to Athenaeus 13.587A was a well-known name for a courtesan.... The priestess Γλαῦκον, whose association voted honors in an inscription discovered in the Piraeus, in Foucart p. 195 [*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314 (28)*], also seems to have been a *hetaira*; the same applies to Αἰθέριον, who took part with two other women, Ἐρωτίς und Ἡσυχία, in an association otherwise comprised solely of men (Foucart p. 221; Salamis [*IG II<sup>2</sup> 2347*]). (Maass 1893, 24–25)

Two of the three female names as well as Parthenion are likely slave names, according to Taylor. There is no way to determine whether they had been manumitted and thus become metics.

Maass's view is put into question by two slightly later inscriptions, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1298 [20]* (248/7 BCE) and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297 [24]* (236/5 BCE). The latter concludes the decree by ordering the secretary to inscribe the names of *all the thiasōtai*, men (37) and women (21) separately:

ἀναγράψαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς θιασώτας πά-  
ντας χωρὶς τοὺς τε ἄνδρας καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας. (ll. 20–21)  
(That the secretary) inscribe the names of all the *thiasōtai*,  
the men and the women separately.

*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1298* orders the listing of the *thiasōtai* and, apparently separately, the *synthiasōtai* who are associated with the association. The inscription begins with two columns of names, the first column men and the second women, but since the inscription is broken at the top it is unclear whether one column represents the *thiasōtai* and the other the *synthiasōtai* or whether both columns are for *thiasōtai*. In any event, there is no reason to suppose that the women of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297 [24]* were other than members, and the association clearly had a “religious” function, possessing a temple, and having *hieropoioi* who offered sacrifices.

**Literature:** Ferguson 1910, 272–73; 1911, 219 n.5; Fränkel, Max, *Epigraphisches aus Aegina*. Abhandlungen der königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 1897/1. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1897; Lambert 1999; Maass 1893, 24–25; Taylor 1997, 134–37; Ziebarth 1896, 42.

[13] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1271*Decision of *thiasōtai* to honor their treasurer

Piraeus (apparently) (Attica)

299/8 BCE

Published: Paul Foucart, “Décret des thiasotes,” *RA* 10 (1864) 399–405 (fac-simile) (*ed. pr.*); Foucart 1873, 209 (no. 26); Koehler, *IG II* 613; Michel, *RIG* 977; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1271* (Poland A16).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1271*.

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum.

Non-stoichedon (39–45 letters). Marble tablet, broken at the top 62 x 30 x 8.0 cm.  
Letter height: 0.7 cm.

----- οκλῆς εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Μῆνις  
[Μνησιθέου διατελεῖ] εὖνους ὦν τοῖς θιασώταις καὶ φιλο-  
[τιμούμενος π]ερὶ τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ νῦν αἰρεθεὶς ταμίας ἐπ-  
5 [ἰ Εὐκτῆμ]ονος ἄρχοντος καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως πᾶσ-  
[ας τὰς] ἐπιμελείας ὑπέστη καὶ τό τε πρόσταιον καὶ  
[τ]ὸ [ἀ]έταμα τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Λαβραῦνδου ἐπε-  
[τέ]λεσεν ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ κοινὰ καλῶς καὶ δικαί-  
ως διεχειρίσεν ἀνένκλητον παρέχων ἑαυτὸν πᾶσ-  
10 ι τοῖς θιασώταις ἕκ τε τῶν πρότερον χρόνων καὶ ἀφ’ οὗ ε-  
[ἰς τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν τῆς ταμείας εἰσηλθὲν καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἰ-  
δίων τῶν ἑαυτοῦ προσανήλωσεν ἀργύριον ἀπροφασί-  
στος εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν φανεράν ποιούμενος τὴν εὖνοιαν ἦ-  
ν ἔχει εἰς τοὺς θιασώτας καὶ τὴν ἱερωσύνην ἀξίως ἱερε-  
15 ὤσατο τοῦ θεοῦ· ὑπὲρ οὖν τούτων ἀπάντων δεδόχθαι το-  
[ῖς θιασώταις, ἐπαινέσαι Μῆνιν Μνησιθέου Ἡρακλεώτην  
καὶ στεφανῶσαι αὐτὸν θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι· ἀναθεῖναι  
δ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰκόνα τοῦ ἱεροῦ οὗ ἂν εἴ κάλλιστον γράψαν-  
τας ἐν πίνακι κατὰ τὸν νόμον, ὅπως ἂν εἴ πᾶσιν φαν-  
ερὸν τοῖς βουλομένοις φιλοτιμεῖσθαι περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν  
20 ὅτι <τυ>μηθήσονται κατ’ ἀξίαν ἕκαστος ὦν ἂν εὐεργετή-  
σει τοὺς θιασώτας. ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ νῆφισμα ἐν  
στήλει λιθίνει ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ θεοῦ.

<crowns>

(the motion that was proposed by ...eles: Whereas Mēnis son of Mnēsitheos continues to be well-disposed towards the *thiasōtai* and is ambitious with respect to the temple, and now having been chosen treasurer in the year that Euktemon was archon, undertook all his



responsibilities honorably and ambitiously, and built both the portico and the pediment of the temple of Zeus Labraundos in a manner worthy of the god and managed the association's affairs honorably and fairly without reproach, performing his duty for all the *thiasōtai*, both before and during the time he assumed office as treasurer, and he expended funds from his own income for the temple unflinchingly, displaying the favorable disposition that he had towards the *thiasōtai*, and worthily enacting the priesthood of the god; therefore, on account of all these things it was resolved by the *thiasōtai* to commend Mēnis son of Mnēsitheos of Herakleia and to crown him with an olive wreath, and also to set up a votive image of him in the temple, wherever seems appropriate, writing it on a tablet according to the law, in order, so that it may be evident to all who desire to be ambitious in regard to the temple that they shall be honored fittingly, everyone who acts as a benefactor to the *thiasōtai*. Let them inscribe this decree on a stele and set it up in the temple of the god.

### Notes

- II. 1–2, 15: Μῆνις | [Μνησιθέου: PAA 648652; FRA no. 2068. Mēnis son of Mnēsitheos is non-Athenian, but either hails from Herakleia in Caria where the cult of Zeus Labraundos was popular or, more probably, from Herakleia Pontika. Fraser 2009, 186 points out that Ἡρακλεώτης by itself usually refers to Herakleia Pontika, while the ethnic form for the Carian Herakleia is Ἡρακλεωτῶν ἀπὸ Σαλβάκης.
- I. 4: Εὐκτήμι]ονος ἄρχοντος, i.e., 299/8 BCE → Meritt 1977, 171; Osborne 2009, 84.
- I. 7: τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Λαβραῦνδου: The principal deity of Mylasa in Caria, who gets his name from the village of Labraunda (Garland 1987, 135). Plutarch, *Parallela Graeca et Romana* (301F–302A) asks, “Why is it that the statue of the Labrandean Zeus in Caria is fashioned holding an axe but not a sceptre or a thunderbolt? Because when Herakles had slain Hippolyte, together with her other arms he took her axe and gave it as a present to Omphale. The Lydian kings who succeeded Omphale used to carry it as a part of the sacred regalia, handing it down one to the other until it came to Candaules. He deemed it of little worth and gave it to one of his fellow diners (*hetairos*) to carry. But when Gyges revolted and was at war with Candaules, Arselis came from Mylasa with an army as an ally for the Gyges and killed both Candaules and his *hetairos* and brought the axe to Caria together with other spoils. He therefore constructed a statue of Zeus and placed the axe in his hand and called the god Labraundeus, for the Lydians call the axe *labrys*” (translation, Babbit, LCL).

### Comments

This is the earliest attestation of the cult of the Carian Zeus Labraundos, the principal deity of Mylasa and the only attestation of the cult in Attica. Mēnis, the treasurer, is probably from Herakleia Pontika to the north. The inscription likely comes from a group of metics *thiasōtai* rather than Athenians.

The inscription indicates that its treasurer, Mēnis, saw to the construction of a temple or at least the modification of an existing temple. The funding of an

association depended on dues paid by members, rent of the association's lands (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2499 [7]) and extraordinary contributions such as those documented here. As the treasurer, Mēnis also paid for part of the construction of the association's temple.

**Literature:** Mikalson 1998, 103, 138, 147; Parker 1996, 338

## [14] *Agora* 16:161 Decree of the Combined *orgeōnes* of Echelos and the Heroines

Athens (Agora) early III BCE  
Published: Meritt 1942, 282–87 (ph.) (BE 1944 no. 67); Ferguson 1949, 131–32 (with a revised text of ll. 12, 16–20 by Meritt); Woodhead 1997, 229–231 (= *Agora* 16:161); Sokolowski, *LSCGSup*, 54–56 (no. 20); Smith 2003, 91 (translation only).

Publication Used: *Agora* 16:161.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4546 (ca. 400 BCE): A dedication to Echelos.

Inv. Agora I 1906. Non stoichedon. Stele of Hymettian marble, broken below and both upper corners, 29.3 x 31.5 x 8.2 cm. Letter height: 0.8 cm. Discovered in 1934 on the Areopagos. Since the hero Echelos is associated with the district of Echelidai, near Neon Phaleron (s.w. of Athens), this inscription must come from the precinct “of the heroines,” apparently near the Areopagos (Woodhead 1997, 230). While the inscription is dated to the early third century BCE on palaeographic grounds, Ferguson (1944, 76) argues that the archaism in l. 20 (see *notes*) and the reference to τὰ ψη[φίσματα] τὰ ἀρχαῖα (ll. 8–9) suggest an earlier date of origin for the group.

[Λυσίας Περι]άνδρου Πλωθεὺς εἰ[πεν· ἀγαθεὶ τύχει]  
[δεδόχθαι] τοῖς ὀ[ρ]γεῶσιν· ὅπως ἂν δι[ατηρῆται τῶν]  
[θυσίων ἢ κοινω]νία εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρό[νον τῶι κοι]-  
5 [ν]ῶι τῶι πρὸς τοῖς Καλλιφάνους καὶ τῶ[ι τοῦ ἥρωος Ἔ]-  
χέλου, ἀναγράψαντας τοὺς ὀφείλοντά[ς τι εἰς τὴν κοι]-  
νωνίαν ἐν στήλει λιθίνει στήσαι παρὰ τ[ὸν βωμόν]  
ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τὰ τε κεφάλαια καὶ τὸν τόκο[ν ὀπόσου]  
ἂν ἔχει ἕκαστος· ἀναγράψαι δὲ καὶ τὰ ψη[φίσματα]  
τὰ ἀρχαῖα εἰς τὴν στήλην· ἐπιμεληθῆναι δ[ὲ .....]  
10 να τῆς ἀναγραφῆς καὶ τῆς στάσεως τῆς στήλης κ[αὶ λο]-  
γίσ[α]σθαι ὅ τι ἂν εἰς ταῦτα ἀναλώσει τῶι κοινῶι.  
ἔδοξεν τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν· τὸν ἐστιάτορα θύειν τὴν [θυσί]-  
αν μνηὸς Ἑκατονβαιῶνος ἐβδόμει καὶ ὀγδοεὶ ἐπ[ὶ] δ-

- 15 ἕκα· θύειν δὲ τεῖ πρώτει ταῖς ἡρώιναις χοῖρον, τῶι δὲ [ἦ]-  
 [ρ]ῶι ἱερεῖον τέλεον καὶ τράπεζαν παρατιθέναι, τεῖ δ[ἐ]  
 [ύστερ]άαι τῶι ἥρωι ἱερεῖον τέλεον· λογίζεσθαι δὲ ὅ τι ἀν  
 [ἀναλ]ώσει· ἀναλίσκειν δὲ μὴ πλέον τῆς προσόδου· [ν]-  
 [εμέτω] δὲ τὰ κρέα τοῖς {οἰς} ὀργεῶσι τοῖς παρούσι καὶ τοῖ[ς]  
 20 [ύοῖς τὴν] εἰς ἡμίσεαν καὶ ταῖς γυναίξι ταῖς τῶν ὀργεῶ[ν]-  
 [ων διδ]οὺς ταῖς ἐλευθέραις τὴν ἰσαίαν καὶ ταῖς θυγ[α]-  
 [τράσι τὴν εἰς ἡμί]σεαν καὶ ἀκολούθῳι μιᾷ τὴν εἰς ἡμ[ί]-  
 [σεαν· παραδιδότω δὲ τ]ῶι ἀνδρὶ τῆς γυναικὸς τὴν με-  
 [ρίδα. <vacat> ] <vacat>  
 25 [ἔδοξεν τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν· τὸν ἐστιά]τορα τῶν ἐπιγενομέ-  
 [νων -----]  
 [-----]

[... the motion that] Lysias son of Periander of the Plotheian deme made: For good fortune. The *orgeōnes* approved. In order that the partnership (*koinōnia*) in the sacrifices be maintained for all time for the *koinon* that is near Kalliphanes' property and that of the hero Echelos, (it was decided) to inscribe (the names) of those who owe anything to the *koinōnia* – both the principal and the interest, as much as each owes – on a stele and set it up by the altar in the temple. (And further) to inscribe the ancient decrees on the stele. (And further) that... supervise the inscribing (of the stele) and its erection (in the temple) and render an account to the *koinon* of whatever has been spent for these purposes. This was approved by the *orgeōnes*.

(Further), that the “host” (*hestiator*) should offer the sacrifice in the month of Hekatombaion, on the 17th and 18th; that he should sacrifice first a porker to the Heroines and an adult animal to the Hero and to prepare an offering table; and on the last day (sacrifice) an adult animal to the Hero. He must render an account of whatever he has expended and must not spend more than the income. Let him distribute (shares of) the meat to the *orgeōnes* who are present – and up to a half-share to their sons – and to the women of *orgeōnes*, giving to free women the same share and up to a half share to their daughters and up to a half-share for one (♀) attendant. Let him hand over the woman's share to the man. <vacat>. It was approved by the *orgeōnes*.

Let the host ... of the following...

### Notes

- I. 1: Λυσίας Περι[άνδρου Πλωθεὺς (*PAA* 614107; *LGPN* 2:290[72]), otherwise unknown.
- II. 3–5: τῶι κοῖ||[ν]ῶι τῶι πρὸς τοῖς Καλλιφάνους καὶ τῶ[ι τοῦ ἥρωος Ἐ]||χέλου. Since τὸ κοινόν can also mean “common fund” (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1323.10–11, 29 [31] note), the

phrase might be translated “In order that the partnership (*koinōnia*) in the sacrifices be maintained for all time for the common fund that belongs to Kalliphanes and to the hero Echelos...”

- II. 4–5: Ἐ|χέλου: Echelos is the eponymous ancestor of the district Echelidai, near Neon Phaleron. A dedication to Echelos (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4546 [ca. 400 BCE]) was discovered near Neon Phaleron.
- II. 5–8: ἀναγράψαντας τοὺς ὀφείλοντά[ς τι εἰς τὴν κοι]νωνίαν ἐν στήλει λιθίνει στήσαι παρὰ τ[ὸν βωμόν] ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὰ τε κεφάλαια καὶ τὸν τόκο[ν ὀπόσου] ἂν ἔχει ἕκαστος: For a similar provision → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361.14–15 [4]: ἀναγράφειν δὲ | [αὐτὸν ὀφείλο]ντα τῇ θεῷ τοῦτο τὸ ἀργύριον εἰς τὴν στήλην τοὺς ἐπιμελητά[ς], “The supervisors are to inscribe on a stele the names of these persons who owe this money to the goddess.” See also *ISamos* 10 (D.F. McCabe, J.V. Brownson, and B.D. Ehrman, eds. *Samos Inscriptions: Texts and List*. Princeton: The Institute for Advanced Study, 1986) for a similar procedure in the case of non-payment of funds necessary for the conduct of sacrifices: ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀπ[οδι]||δῶσι τότε πάντα τὰ χρήμα[τα καὶ τοὺς τόκους, ἀναγ[ρά]||[ψαι αὐτοὺς ἀτίμους τοὺς ἐπ]ιμελητάς τῆς φυλῆς..., “if they do not pay all the money and the interest, let the supervisors of the *phylē* inscribe (the names of) those dishonorable persons.”
- II. 9–10: δ[ὲ] .....]||να: Sokolowski restores δ[ὲ μνήμο]||να, citing *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1247.17–20: ἐπαινέ[σαι δὲ καὶ τὸν ἱερέα τοῦ | Ἡρακλέους καὶ τὸν τοῦ Διόμου καὶ τοὺς μνήμον]ας καὶ τὸν πυρφόρον..., “to commend both the priest of Herakles and that of Diomos and the registrars and the fire-bearer...” For μνήμων see Aristotle, *Pol.* 1321b39; *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 45.8 (Halikarnassos, V BCE); *BGU* I 177.6 (I CE); *P.Lond.* II 299.20 (II CE).
- II. 12, 24: ἐστιάτορα: The *hestiator* or “host” was probably a liturgy or office fulfilled in rotation by members of the association (Woodhead 1997, 231). The term ἐστιάτωρ appears also in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1941 (106/5 BCE) in a list of 14 demesmen, and *FD* III/2 14, in a list of 15 freemen. Both inscriptions also mention a ἀρχεθέωρος (= ἀρχιθέωρος) ‘chief ambassador (to the sacred games)’. *IG* XII Sup. 646.11, 17 (III CE) mentions a [ἐστιά]τωρ τῆς πόλεως. See also Plato, *Resp.* 421B; *Timaeus* 17A; Demosthenes 20 *Adversus Leptinem* 21; 39 *Contra Boeotum* I 7.
- II. 18–19: καὶ τοι[ς] | [ύοις τὴν] εἰς ἡμίσεαν. Sokolowski: καὶ τοι[ς] | [παισὶ τὴν] εἰς ἡμίσεαν.
- I. 20: [ων, διδ]οὺς ταῖς ἐλευθέραις. Merritt restored this as [ων, μετ’ αὐτ]οὺς ταῖς ἐλευθέραις. But this restoration appears impossible on the basis of Dow’s (1944) analysis of the letter spacing of the inscription, which suggests that the lacuna could contain only 3–5 letters (including -ων, and Merritt’s suggestion includes a *mu*, which occupies 1½ spaces. Merritt later settled on [ων, διδ]οὺς (*apud* Ferguson 1949, 130–31). Likewise, Ferguson abandoned his restoration [ων, ἂν ἢ β]ροὺς ταῖς ἐλευθέραις, “and if (they sacrifice) an ox...” which would imply that the women would “get κρέα only when the animal sacrificed is an ox.” Ferguson’s reading is still presupposed by Larson 1995, 38, who suggests (following Detienne) that women received meat only when there was no shortage; in times of shortage, only *orgeōnes* and their sons participated. This is an unlikely reading.
- I. 20: ἐλευθέραις: *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 985.35: γυναῖκα ἐλευθέραν means “free woman” as contrasted with a servile woman (see I. 15: ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες] ἐλεύθεροι καὶ οἰκέται). Ferguson (1944, 75 n. 18): “The portions are then specified for the several classes of women, αἱ ἐλεύθεραι, αἱ θυγατέρες and αἱ ἀκόλουθοι. Excluding the second and third classes, αἱ ἐλεύθεραι comprise the wives, widows, and spinsters (possibly

aunts and unmarried daughters) of the orgeonic families. The choice of ἐλεύθεραι as the designation of this class was probably prescribed by the wish to distinguish it from the ἀκόλουθοι who were commonly, though not always, slaves.... It would exclude *hetairai*, as it does in Athenaeus XIII 571D. But in Theophrastos, *Characters* 11.2 γυναῖξιν ἐλευθέραις means simply “respectable women” as does γυναῖκας ἐλευθέρας in Theopompos (Jacoby, FGH II B 115, 143); and in Menandros (Frg. 546, Kock) ἐλευθέρα γυναίκι may be translated with propriety ‘lady’... in Plato, *Laws*, 937A, as often, ἐλευθέρα γυναίκι is contrasted with δούλη and δούλωφ.”

Ferguson 1949, 131 n. 2 argues: “The phrase, γυναῖκες ἐλεύθεραι, is a stereotyped expression. The list of examples given in [Ferguson 1944]... can be extended almost indefinitely. I have noticed two further instances in Theopompos (FGH IIIB 115; 121 and 227), two in Lysias (3.23; 13.66), one in Athenaeus, XIII 569A, and one in Aristophanes (*Ecclesiazusae*, 722; here, as in *Lysistratos*, 379, the substantive is omitted). The adjective means ‘free’, with what goes with freedom: civic status and hence respectability. Lysias, 13.66 suggests that the Athenian law used this phrase in defining the class of women, illicit sexual intercourse with whom constituted an offense punishable with death. The passages cited from Theopompos indicate that the rape of γυναῖκες ἐλεύθεραι, was recognized as an intolerable outrage.”

Sokolowski 1962, 56 rejects Ferguson’s proposal and Meritt’s (discussed below): “Le terme γυνή ἐλευθέρα, selon l’opinion vraisemblable de [Jacob] Rabinowitz [“Miscellanea Papyrologica,” *JJP* 11–12 (1957–58) 167–83], désigne la femme «légitime». Je serais tenté de restituer ἐκ γέν]ους. Seules les femmes épousées dans un mariage formel et d’une famille respectables sont autorisées à participer aux repas des orgéones.”

- l. 20: τὴν ἰσαίαν. According to Ferguson (1944, 76), an archaic form of ἴσος which “seems to have been in usage in the middle of the fifth century B.C. in texts dealing with the distribution of sacrificial meats.”
- l. 21: ἀκόλουθοι μιᾷ. Ferguson (1944, 78) takes this to imply that “one female attendant *per matron* was allowed to receive meat.”

### Comments

This inscription refers to two associations, a κοινόν identified by its neighborhood (near Kalliphanes’ property) and dedicated to the “Heroines,” and the other, an association devoted to the hero Echelos. This inscription likely comes from the shrine of the Heroines, since the association devoted to Echelos was probably located in the district of Echelidai, southwest of Athens near Neon Phaleron.

The first portion deals with the finances of the association, which like other associations had to devise methods to secure and ensure income. In this case, like that of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361.14–15 [4], the association resorted to naming publicly those who owed the group funds. It is impossible to determine with any certainty the financial status of the members. The limitation of one attendant per matron in l. 21 might mean that “some or all the members were capable of owning two or more ‘attendants’” (Jones 1999, 254).

The second portion of the regulation deals with sacrifices. To judge from the number of animals offered – one mature animal and one porker on one day and a mature animal on the other – the association cannot have been very large and probably only comprised a few families. Compare *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2499 [7]*, another association devoted to a hero, where the group could meet in a room with two *triclinia* (holding 12–18 diners).

Larson notes the disproportion involved in the types of animals sacrificed to the Hero and those to the Heroines (1995, 38). This, however, accords with the pattern seen in Attic sacrificial calendars. For example, the early fifth century calendar of the deme of Thorikos (Daux 1983) lists sacrifices to be made to various deities, heroes and heroines, Olympian gods typically receive animal victims worth more than those for the heroes, and heroines usually receive only an offering table:

- In Boedromion, on Prerosia: for Zeus Polieos a choice
- 15 sheep (and) a choice pig; women to cry aloud;  
a purchased pig to be burnt whole; the priest is to  
furnish lunch for the attendant; for Kephalos  
a choice sheep; for Prokris a table;  
for Thorikos a choice sheep; for the Heroines of Thorikos
- 20 a table: at Sounion for Poseidon a  
choice lamb; to Apollo a choice kid; to  
Korotrophos a choice pig; to Demeter an adult  
animal; to Zeus Herkeios an adult animal; to Korotrophos a porker;  
to Athena a market-sheep at the seashore; to Poseidon
- 25 an adult animal, to Apollo a pig. (*SEG* 33:147.14–25)

In this schedule of sacrifices the hero Kephalos receives a choice sheep but his wife Prokris only an offering table; the same pattern holds for Thorikos and the Heroines (l. 19). Only Alkeme and Helen receive adult victims (l. 38).

A major point of discussion concerns ll. 18–20 and the rule for the distribution of the sacrificial food. Meritt argued that the “free women” are “the women who were *orgeōnes* in their own right” and that ἐλεύθεραι here means “independent” (1942, 287 and n. 28). Ferguson (1944, 75 n. 18), however, argued, rightly it seems, that only adult males were *orgeōnes*. Meritt’s revised view was that “free” was meant to distinguish the women in question from minors and servants, but included “both wives and non-wives” (Meritt according to Ferguson 1949, 131).

Ferguson’s suggestion (1944, 75 n. 18) that γυναῖκες means “women” rather than “wives” in l. 19 helps. The inscription distinguishes, then, among several groups: the (male) *orgeōnes*; the (adult) women who are attached to the group by virtue of relationships with the *orgeōnes* (wives, widows, possibly aunts and married daughters); minor sons of the *orgeōnes* (who may eventually become *orgeōnes* in their own right); minor daughters (who may become “free women” at maturity); and attendant(s), probably slaves. Thus, while women,

minors and slaves participated in the orgeōnic feast, a hierarchy was strictly observed.

Despite the fact that the women of *Agora* 16:161 apparently receive the same amount of meat as the *orgeōnes*, Detienne observes:

As a general rule, by virtue of the homology between political power and sacrificial practice, the place reserved for women perfectly corresponds to the one they occupy—or rather, do not occupy—in the space of the city. Just as women are without the political rights reserved for male citizens, they are kept apart from the altars, meat, and blood. Within the sacrificial sphere itself, participation can occur on three levels, at least: within the broad community of those who are admitted to eat the portions of the victim; within the narrow circle of those who eat the viscera roasted on the spit; and finally, right at the center, the sacrificer-sacrifier, the one who wields the knife.... When women have access to meat, the rules of the cult are careful to specify the precise terms and conditions.... Thus a woman's equality with respect to meat is subject to two conditions that determine the limits of the hidden citizenship of free women who are lawfully wedded wives. They come third in the hierarchy, after the men, fathers and sons; and their husbands play the role of mediator between them and the shared pieces of the victim—where they are treated no differently from half-castes—they are admitted into the larger circle of commensals only by the intermediary of someone having the right to obtain for them this favored treatment. ” (1989, 131–32).

**Literature:** Detienne, Marcel. “The Violence of Wellborn Ladies: Women in the Thesmophoria.” In *The Cuisine of Sacrifice Among the Greeks*, Marcel Detienne and Jean Pierre Vernant, eds. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989; Dow 1944; Ferguson 1944, 73–79, 94–95; Ferguson 1949, 130–131; Jones 1999, 251–252; Larson, Jennifer. *Greek Heroine Cults*. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995; Sokolowski 1962, 54–56 (no. 20); Smith 2003, 90–93.

## [15] IG II<sup>2</sup> 1277

### Decree of a *thiasos* honoring its *epimelētai* and secretary

Athens (Attica)

278/7 BCE

Published: H. Lolling, *AD* (1892) 100; Koehler, *IG* II 5, 615b; Dittenberger, *Syll*<sup>2</sup> 727; Kirchner, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1277; Michel, *RIG* 969; Dittenberger–Hiller von Gaertringen, *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 1099 (Poland A18).

Publication Used: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1277

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum

Stoichedon (30 letters). 1.18m x 0.48m x 0.13m. Marble stele found east of the Pnyx.

ἐπὶ Δημοκλέους ἄρχοντος Μουνιχιῶν-  
ος [έ]β[δ]όμ[η]ι ἐ[π]ι δ[έ]κ[α]. ἀγοραὶ κυρίαι· Νο-  
υμη[ν]ία[ς] εἰ[π]ε[ν]· ἐπ[ειδὴ] οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ

καὶ ὁ γραμματεὺς οὐκ ἐπὶ Δ[η]μοκλέους ἀρ-  
 5 χ[ο]ν[το]ς κατασταθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινο-  
 ῦ τοῦ τε ἱεροῦ ἐπι[με]λ[η]ν[τα]ι καλῶς κ-  
 αὶ φιλοτίμως κα[ὶ] τ[ὰ]ς θυσ[ί]ας ἔθυσαν π-  
 ἄσα[ς] κ[α]τὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὰ νόμια, ἐπε-  
 10 κόσμησαν δὲ κα[ὶ] τ[ὴ]ν θεὸν καὶ τὸν βωμὸν  
 ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὠικοδόμησαν, καὶ εἰς ταῦτα  
 ἐπιδεδώκασιν παρ' ἑαυτῶν ἙΔΓ δραχμῶ-  
 ς, καὶ ποτήρ[ιο]ν ἀργυροῦν ποησάμενοι  
 παρ' ἑαυτῶν ἀνέθηκαν τῇ θεῷ ὀλκῆν Ἑ  
 ΔΗΠΙΙΙ δραχμῶν, ἐπιμετέλονται δὲ καὶ τ-  
 15 ῶν ἀπογενομένων καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμω-  
 ς, δεδώκασιν δὲ λόγον καὶ εὐθύνας πάν-  
 των ὧν διωκῆκασιν· ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ δεδ-  
 ὄχθαι τοῖς θιασώταις ἐπαινέσαι τού-  
 ς τε ἐπιμελητὰς Εὐκλῆν Θάλλον Ζήνων-  
 20 α καὶ τὸν γραμματέα Κτησίαν καὶ στεφ-  
 ανῶσαι ἕκαστον αὐτῶν θαλλοῦ στεφάν-  
 ωι ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας τῆς πρὸς  
 τὸ κοινὸν καὶ εὐσεβείας τῆς πρὸς  
 τὴν θεόν. ἀναγορεύεσθαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς σ-  
 25 τεφάνους αὐτοῖς καὶ τὸν ἔπαινον καθ'  
 ἑκάστην τὴν θυσίαν μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων εὐ-  
 εργατῶν· εἶναι δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἄλλο ἀγα-  
 θὸν εὐρέσθαι παρὰ τοῦ κοινοῦ οὐκ ἂν δο-  
 κῶσιν ἄξιοι εἶναι, ὅπως ἂν πάντες οἱ α-  
 30 ιεὶ καθιστάμενοι εἰς τῆς ἐπιμελεία-  
 ς φιλοτιμῶνται πρὸς τε τὴν θεὸν καὶ τ-  
 ὸ κοινὸν εἰδότες ὅτι χάριτας ἀξίας κ-  
 ομιοῦντ[α]ι. ἀναγράψαι δὲ τότε τὸ ψήφι-  
 σμα τοὺς ἐπιμελητὰς τοὺς μετὰ Δημοκ-  
 35 λέα ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ στήσαι ἐν τ-  
 ῶι ἱερῶι. *vacat*

Εὐκλῆν

Θάλλον

Ζήνωνα

Κτησίαν

During the year that Demokles was archon, 17th of Mounichion, at the regular assembly, Noumenias proposed the following motion: Whereas the supervisors and the secretary who were appointed by the *koinon* during the archonship of Demokles have managed the sanctuary honorably and ambitiously and performed all of the sacrifices in accordance with ancestral traditions and laws, and adorned the (statue of the) goddess and constructed the original altar; and for these things they have contributed



sixty-five drachmae from their own resources; and having had a silver vessel, valued at fifty-seven drachmae three obols, made at their own expense, they dedicated it to the goddess; and further, they took responsibility for those who had died, acting honorably and ambitiously; and they rendered accurate accounts of all the matters they had administered; – for good fortune, it was resolved by the *thiasōtai* to commend the supervisors, Eukles, Thallos and Zenon, and the secretary Ktesias and to crown each of them with an olive wreath, on account of the excellence and zeal that have shown to the *koinon*, and for their piety towards the goddess. Their crowns and commendations shall be announced at each of the sacrifices, along with the other benefactors. They shall also receive from the *koinon* the other honors, as they deserve, so that all who happen to be appointed to the role of supervisor might be ambitious towards the goddess and the *koinon*, knowing that they will receive appropriate thanks. The supervisors for the year following Demokles' archonship shall inscribe this decree on a stele and set it up in the sanctuary.

(The *koinon* honors)

Euklēs

Zeno

Thallos

Ktesias

### Notes

- I. 1: ἐπὶ Δημοκλέους ἄρχοντος → IG II<sup>2</sup> 673 for another inscription dated to the archonship of Demokles; on the dating, see Meritt 1977, 173; Osborne 2009, 87. Since the inscription is dated to Mounichion (i.e., late in the Athenian year), we are probably right in dating the inscription to late in Demokles' archonship (278/7 BCE) rather than the following year.
- I. 2: ἀγορᾶ κυρία, "regular assembly" → IG II<sup>2</sup> 1263.2–3 [11] note.
- II. 3–4: Νοῦμη[ν]ία[ς] → LGPN 2:342(1); PAA 721235 (listed as an Athenian). Noumenios is also attested as a slave name in Athens (Fragiadakis 1986, 362) and Reilly lists Noumenios as a slave name at Delphi (1978, 92).
- I. 15: ἀπογενομένων. The euphemism ἀπογίγνομαι is used for ἀποθνήσκω → IG II<sup>2</sup> 1275.6 [8] (note).
- II. 16–17: δεδώκασιν δὲ λόγον καὶ εὐθύνας πάντων ὧν διωικήκασιν. In Athens it was usual for public figures to submit their accounts for examination at the expiration of their term of office.
- I. 19: Εὐκλῆς → LGPN 2:175(102); PAA 436470. Euklēs is attested as a slave name in Athens: Reilly 1978, 48; Fragiadakis 1986, 349–50.
- I. 19: Θάλλος → LGPN 2:209(33); PAA 500640 (listed as an Athenian?). Thallos is also attested as a slave name in Athens: Reilly 1978, 64; Fragiadakis 1986, 38, 352.
- I. 19–20: Ζήνων → PA 6199; LGPN 2:194(114); PAA 460755.
- I. 20: Κτησίας → PA 8839; LGPN 2:275(43); PAA 586585. Κτησίας is attested as a slave name: Reilly 1978, 76.
- II. 24–25: ἀναγορεύεσθαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς σιτεφάνους → IG II<sup>2</sup> 1263.37–38 [11] note.
- II. 32–33: χάριτας ἀξίας κιομοῦν[α]ι → IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252+999.21 [6] note.

### Comments

The fact that none of those named has a patronym or a demotic is probably an indication that none is an Athenian citizen (so Mikalson 1998, 155). This suggestion is further supported by the fact that the inscription appears to presuppose that the *epimelētai* and secretary took responsibility for burial of members as a matter of course. When there were unclaimed and unburied dead, an Athenian law prescribed that the demarch take responsibility for the burial of the dead, a law that applied equally to demesmen, slaves and freedmen.<sup>9</sup> Metics, however, could not depend on such a provision.

This of course does not imply that the members were indigent or that they lacked families. The practice of this association takes us beyond what was recorded in *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1275 [8], which seems only to have required the association's attendance at the funeral of a member. While there is no reference to the payment of the ταφικόν ("funeral benefit") by the treasurer, as there is in *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1278.2 [17] and *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1323.10–11 [31] and no indication is given that the association owned a tomb in which members were buried, the inscription seems to imply that the *epimelētai* and secretary arranged and probably paid for at least part of the funeral expenses of deceased members as an act of benefaction. (On the cost of funerals in the IV BCE → *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1278 [17] *comment* and *SEG* 44:257).

The name of the goddess is not given in the inscription. The meeting date on Mounichion 17 is not much help. A number of associations record meetings in Mounichion, but not on the seventeenth: the Mother of the Gods (*IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1314 [28]; 1315 [29]; 1327 [35]; 1328 [34]; 1329 [37]), Sabaziastai (*IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1335 [43]), Herakliastai (*SEG* 31:122 [50]) and *orgeōnes* (*IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1334 [45]), and *eranistai* (*IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1345; 1369 [49]) whose cultic attachments are unknown. What is clear is that the association had a temple where they conducted ancestral rites (→ I. 8: κ[α]τὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὰ νόμιμα).

While many inscriptions mention *epimelētai*, indicating that there were often multiple supervisors each year, this inscription suggests that this association had three *epimelētai* per year and one secretary.

**Literature:** Ferguson 1944, 115; Mikalson 1998, 154–55.

---

<sup>9</sup> Ps-Demosthenes, *Against Makartatos* 53.57-58: "And when persons die in the demes and no one takes them up for burial, let the demarch give notice to the relatives to take them up and bury them, and to purify the deme on the day on which each of them dies. In the case of slaves he shall give notice to their masters, and in the case of freemen to those possessing their property; and if the deceased had no property, the demarch shall give notice to the relatives of the deceased. And if, after the demarch shall have given notice, the relatives do not take up the body, the demarch shall contract for the taking up and burial of the body, and for the purification of the deme on the same day at the lowest possible cost. And if he shall not so contract, he shall be bound to pay a thousand drachmae into the public treasury. And whatsoever he shall expend, he shall exact double the amount from those liable; and if he does not exact it he shall himself be under obligation to repay it to the demesmen."

[16] *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316The *thiasōtai/orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods

Piraeus (Attica) 272/1 BCE

Published: Paul Foucart, “Inscriptions du Pirée,” *BCH* 7 (1883) 68–77, 69–75 (no. 2) (facsimile) (*ed. pr.*); Ziebarth 1900, 504; Koehler, *IG* II,5 620b; Michel, *RIG* 983; Kirchner, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316; Vermaseren 1977–1989, 2:71–72 (no. 259) (Poland A2c).

Publication Used: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316.

Current Location: In a private collection of J. Melitopoulos.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4563 (Athens or Piraeus, IV BCE): A dedication to the Mother of the Gods; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4609 (Piraeus, late IV BCE): A dedication to the Mother of the Gods by two women; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 6288 (350–317 BCE): A grave inscription for a woman described as μητρὸς παντοτέκνου πρόπολος; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1273AB [18] (Piraeus, 265/4 BCE): A decree of the *thiasōtai* of the Mother of the Gods; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1314 [28] (Piraeus, 213/2 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1315 [29] (Piraeus, 211/0 BCE); *Agora* 16:235 (Meritt, Woodhead, and Stamires 1957, 209–10 (no. 57); *SEG* 17:36; 32:348; 39:195) (Athens, 202/1 BCE): Honorary decree of the *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods for a priestess; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328 [34] (Piraeus, 183/2, 175/4 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1327 [35] (Piraeus, 178/7 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1329 [37] (Piraeus, 175/4 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2950/1 (II BCE): A dedication of a treasurer to the Mother of the Gods; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1334 [45] 71/0 BCE (?); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4703 (mid I BCE): Dedication of the wife of a demesman; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4714 (Augustan period): Dedication of the daughter of a demesman to the Mother of the Gods and to Aphrodite, “gracious midwife” (εὐαντήτω ἰατρείνῃ); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4759–60 (I/II ce): Two dedications of the wives of two demesmen to the mother of the Gods (εὐαντήτω ἰατρείνῃ).

Stoichedon (40 letters). Tablet of Hymettian marble, preserved completely, but with no dimensions known. Foucart, who first published the inscription, made a squeeze but did not report the dimensions of the monument. ll 1–4. are above two crowns. The remainder of the inscription is below the crowns. Two other crowns at the bottom repeat the dedication.

οἱ θιασῶται  
Ἀγάθωνα  
καὶ τῆγ γυναῖκα  
αὐτοῦ Ζεῦξιον

<crowns>

οἱ θιασῶται  
Ἀγάθωνα  
καὶ τῆγ γυναῖκα  
αὐτοῦ Ζεῦξιον

<crowns>

- 5 ἐπὶ Λυσιθείδου ἄρχοντος μηνὸς Ἑκατομβαιῶνος· Σ-  
 ωκλῆς εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Ἀγάθων Ἀγαθοκλέους καὶ Ζεύξ-  
 ιον ἢ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ἢ ἱέρεια [κα]τ[α]σταθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ κ[ι]-  
 οינוῦ καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως ἐπεμελήθησαν [τῆς] ἰε[ρ]-  
 ει[ω]σ[ύ]νης καὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ἐπεμελήθησαν δὲ καὶ τῶν ὀ-  
 ργεῶνων ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀναλωμάτων, ἀπέφηναν [δὲ τῶι]  
 10 κοινῶι καὶ τὰ ἀναθήματα τὰ ἐφ' αὐτῶν ἀνατεθέντ[α ὀ]-  
 ρθῶς καὶ δικαίως, ἀπέδωκαν [δ]ὲ κα[ὶ τ]ῆν π[ρόσοδο]ν [τῆ]-  
 [ν γ]ε[ν]ομένην ἐφ' αὐτῶν [δικ]αίως· ἀγαθῆι τύχηι [δεδόχ]-  
 θαι το[ῖς] ὀργεῶσιν, ἐ[παι]ν[έ]σαι Ἀγάθω[να Φλυ]έ[α καὶ τ]-  
 15 [ῆ]ν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ Ζε[ύ]ξιον τ[ῆ]ν ἱέρειαν καὶ στεφ[αν]-  
 [ῶσαι] χρυσῶι στεφάνωι ἐκότερον αὐτῶν ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν κ[αὶ δ]-  
 [ικ]α[ῖ]οσύνης ἣν ἔχοντες διατελοῦσιν περὶ τε τὴν [θ]-  
 εὐν καὶ περὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ὀργεῶνων, ἵνα εἰδῶ[σιν π]-  
 [ά]ντες ὅτι χάριτας ἀποδιδόασι οἱ ὀργεῶνες τοῖς [ε]-  
 20 [ῖς αὐ]τοῦς φιλοτιμουμένοις. ἀναγρ[άψαι δ]ὲ τ[ὸ]δ[ε] [τὸ]  
 [ψη]φισμα[ι] εἰς στήλην λιθίνην καὶ στήσαι ἐν τῶι [ἱ]ε[ρ]-  
 [ῶι], τ[ῆς] δ[ὲ] [ἀνα]γραφῆς ἐπιμεληθῆναι τὸν ταμίαν κ[αὶ]  
 το[ῦς] ἐπιμ[ε]λ[η]τάς, μ[ε]ρί[σ]σαι [δ]ὲ τὸν ταμίαν ἀπὸ τ[οῦ] κο-  
 [ἱ]νοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀνα]γραφὴν τῆς στήλης δρ[αχ]μᾶ[ς -]  
 <crow> <crow>
- 25 οἱ θιασῶται οἱ θιασῶται  
 Ἀγάθωνα Ἀγάθωνα  
 καὶ τῆγ γυναῖκα καὶ τῆγ γυναῖκα  
 αὐτοῦ Ζεύξιον αὐτοῦ Ζεύξιον.
- The *thiasōtai* The *thiasōtai*  
 (honor) Agathon (honor) Agathon  
 and his wife and his wife  
 Zeuxion Zeuxion  
 <crow> <crow>

- 5 In the year that Lysitheides was archon, in the month of Hekatombaion, Sōkles proposed the (following) motion: Whereas Agathon son of Agathokles and his wife Zeuxion, priestess, having been appointed by the association (*koinon*), have executed their responsibilities with respect to the priesthood and the temple honorably and ambitiously, and have also cared for the *orgeōnes* at their own expense, and (further) have rendered to the association (*koinon*) accurately and fairly (an account of) the offerings that had been dedicated while they were in office and paid to the association (*koinon*) the income that accrued while they were in office; – for good fortune, it was resolved by the *orgeōnes* to commend Agathon of (the deme) Phlya and his wife Zeuxion the priestess and to crown each

with a golden crown on account of the excellence and the honesty that they have continually exhibited, both to the goddess and to the association of *orgeōnes*. In this way all will know that the *orgeōnes* shall give fitting thanks to anyone who acts ambitiously towards them. The treasurer and the supervisors shall inscribe this decree on a stele and place it in the temple, and shall take responsibility for the inscription, and the treasurer shall pay for the inscribing of the stele from the treasury in the amount of ... drachmae.

	<crowns>	<crowns>
25	The <i>thiasōtai</i> (honor) Agathon and his wife Zeuxion	The <i>thiasōtai</i> (honor) Agathon and his wife Zeuxion

### Notes

- ll. 2, 6, 14: Ἀγάθων Ἀγαθοκλέους Φλυέα: *PA* 84; *LGPN* 2:5(44); *PAA* 105460.  
 l. 4: Ζεύξιον: *PA* 6185; *LGPN* 2:192(1); *PAA* 460140.  
 l. 5: ἐπὶ Λυσιθειδῶν ἄρχοντος: Meritt 1977, 173 and Osborne 2009, 88 date Lysitheides to 272/1 BCE. See also *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317.1* (272/1 BCE): an honorific inscription to a treasurer and supervisors of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis, cut the same year.  
 l. 5: μῆνός Ἑκατομβαίωνος, “month of Hekatombaion.” Ferguson (1944, 137) points out that this assembly is not designated as ἀγορᾶ κυρία (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1263.2–3* [11] note). The regular assembly of these *orgeōnes* seems to have been in Mounichion (March/April) → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314* [28]; 1315 [29]; 1327 [35]; 1328 [34]; 1329 [37].  
 ll. 9–10, 14, 19: ὀργεῶνες → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255.1* [2] note.  
 ll. 15–16: στεφ[αν]||[ῶσαι] χρυσῶι στεφάνωι ἐκάτερον αὐτῶν → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255.9–10* [2] note.  
 ll. 16–17: ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν κ[αὶ δ]||[ικ]α[ι]οσύνης → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252+999.7* [6] note.  
 l. 19: χάριτας ἀποδιδόασι → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252+999.21* [6] note.

### Comments

The name of the deity honored is not given in this inscription, but the reference to the “goddess” in ll. 17–18 (τὴν [θ]||εόν) suggested to Foucart (1883, 72) that this was an association of the Great Mother, an identification that has been accepted by most. From a few years later *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273* [18] attests the existence of a non-citizen group of *thiasōtai* devoted to the Mother of the Gods; but the present inscription comes from an association that included Athenian demesmen. Whereas the metic group called themselves *thiasōtai*, the citizen association was known, at least in all later inscriptions, as *orgeōnes*. Epigraphical evidence of these *orgeōnes*, located in the Piraeus, extends from nearly a century after 272/1 BCE and includes *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314* [28] (Piraeus, 213/2 BCE); 1315 [29] (Piraeus, 211/0 BCE); *Agora* 16:235 (Athens, 202/1 BCE): honorary

decree of the *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods for a priestess; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1328 [34]* (Piraeus, 183/2, 175/4 BCE); 1327 [35] (Piraeus, 178/7 BCE); 1329 [37] (Piraeus, 175/4 BCE). *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1334 [45]* (post 71/0 BCE) may also come from this group.

The Mother of the Gods originated as a cult in Mesopotamia but arrived in Athens via Phrygia at the beginning of the fifth century BCE (Garland 1992, 45). In the late fifth century Alcibiades, a protégé of Pericles, returned from Asia and converted the old Bouleterion into a Metroon (Munn 2006, 319). Julian offers an account of the arrival of the Mother of the Gods:

The Athenians are said to have treated the Gallos [i.e., a priest of the Mother] contemptuously and expelled him since he was introducing new gods, because they did not appreciate the value of the goddess and how she was honored by them under the name of Deo, Rhea and Demeter. Then followed the wrath of the goddess and the appeasing of it. For the priestess of the Pythian Apollo ordered them to propitiate the wrath of the Mother of the Gods. The story goes that the Metroon was built as a consequence, this being where the Athenians used to keep all their official documents. (Julian, *Or.* 5.159a)

Munn states of the introduction:

[T]he Mother of the Gods at Athens symbolized harmony between the Athenian and Persian empires. Because she represented the highest priorities of the Athenian state, the Athenian Council House was an appropriate place for her seat. Her installation there was also significant for the reason indicated by Julian: it gave unambiguous proof that the Athenians had formally reversed the effects of the decision, taken in the very same Council House, to reject Darius' demand for obeisance and to put to death his heralds, among them the man... who had attempted to explain to the Athenians the nature and meaning of this great goddess. (Munn 2006, 329)

A private cult of the Mother of the Gods seems to have been founded sometime in the fourth century, probably by metics from Phrygia. Reliefs of the Mother of the Gods – forty-seven are now published from the Metroon in the Piraeus (Petrocheilos 1992) – depict her with lions and kettle-drums and her cult may have featured forms of ecstasy. By contrast, as Parker observes, the rites at the Metroon “seem to have been a tranquil and somewhat unimportant affair” (Parker 1996, 192). The earliest epigraphic evidence for the cult of the Mother of the Gods is from the late fourth century BCE – two dedications to the Mother of the Gods:

----- κράτος Μητρί θεῶν ἀνέθηκε.  
...kratos dedicated this to the Mother of the Gods (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 4563*)

Μάνης Μητρί | καὶ Μίκα Μητρί | θεῶν.  
Manēs (dedicated this) to the Mother and Mika (dedicated this) to the Mother of the Gods (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 4609* = Vermaseren 1977–1989, 2:82 (no. 267) plate 61 = Petrocheilos 1992, B5).

Since the latter two names are not typically Athenian names, the two devotees are likely metics.

In contrast to the metic group of IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273 [18] which had a priest, the *orgeōnes* of IG II<sup>2</sup> 1316 had a priestess, the wife of an Athenian demesman. This is also evidenced in *Agora* 16:235 (Athens, 212/1 BCE):

[----- εἶπεν]: ἐπ(ε)ιδὴ Ἱερό[κλεια]  
 [± 8· γυνὴ δὲ Ἄντ]ιγενεῖ[δ]ου Λαμ[πτρέως]  
 [ἰέρεια εἰς(?) τὸν ἐνιαυτὸ]ν τὸν ἐπὶ Εὐάνδ[ρου λα]-  
 [χοῦσα καλῶς καὶ εὖσ]εβῶς τὴν ἱερῶ[σύνην]  
 [ἐξήγαγεν καὶ τὰς θυσ]ίας τὰς καθηκού[σας ἔ]-  
 [θυσεν καὶ τὰ λοιπ]ὰ ἐφιλοτιμή[θη ἔ]π--  
 [----- ἐπεμ]ελήθη δὲ τῆς στ[ρώ]-  
 [σεως τῆς κλίνης τῶν θεῶ]ν μετὰ πάσης [σπου]-  
 [δῆς καὶ προθυμίας· ἐπεμ]ελήθη δὲ καὶ τῶν ὀργ[εῶ]-  
 [νων: ----- διεν]έμησε δὲ κ[αὶ ··]  
 [----- ἐπεμ]ελήθη δὲ καὶ ε· ± 5·  
 -----

... made the motion: whereas Hierokleia, wife of Antigeneides of (the deme) Lamptrai, who by lot was chosen the priestess for the year that Euandros was the archon, has carried out the office of priestess honorably and piously, and performed the customary sacrifices and was ambitious regarding the other things... she took responsibility for the bedding of the couch of the gods with all earnestness and willingness; and she took responsibility also for the *orgeōnes* ... she distributed... took responsibility also for... (*Agora* 16:235 = Meritt 1957, 209–10 [no. 57]; *SEG* 17:36)

There is a peculiarity to IG II<sup>2</sup> 1316. The only identifiable members are Agathon of Phlya and his wife, both Athenians. Like the later groups of *orgeōnes* of the Great Mother this association has a priestess. Yet the inscription has an odd mixture of designations, *thiasōtai* and *orgeōnes*. All of the later citizen groups use the term *orgeōnes*; only the metic group in IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273 [18] uses *thiasōtai* and had a priest. Wilhelm (1902, 132) opined that by the third century BCE the two terms were synonymous and therefore interchangeable. Ferguson (1944, 138–39) rejected this explanation, rightly no doubt, since no other inscription attests such interchangeability. Ferguson himself considered the possibility that the cutter, accustomed to cut numerous *thiasos* inscriptions simply confused the terms and the stele was never corrected. Although Ferguson was not inclined to this solution, it has been endorsed by Arnaoutoglou:

The existence of these two words in the same document implies confusion of the stone-cutter, as Ferguson pointed out, about the name of the group and that in the near past two such group co-existed. (Arnaoutoglou 2003, 106)

Against a hypothesis of a cutter's carelessness Jones objected that such a mistake might occur once, but in this case the cutter used the term *thiasōtai* four times (1999, 263 n.203). Moreover, as Arnaoutoglou has pointed out (*per litt.*) the term *thiasōtai* appears in the honorary crowns, the most prominent part of the inscriptions.

Jones himself drew attention to a palimpsest, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1246* published by Dow, et al. 1965). The top text inscribed on a cult table was dated by the editors to the beginning of the third century BCE and appears to be an honorific decree ordering the inscribing of a decree:

ἔδοξεν τοῖς [-----]  
 τῶν κοινῶν [----- ἀναγρά]-  
 ψαι δὲ τὸ δόγμα τόδε [-----] (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1246*)

Beneath this text and in somewhat smaller letters is an earlier text (not printed in *IG II<sup>2</sup>*) dated to the end of the fourth century BCE:

ἔδοξεν τοῖς ὀργεῶ[σιν -----]  
 ἐπεμελήθησαν κα[-----]  
 τῆς εἰς τὰ κοινὰ κα[-----]  
 ἐν τῷ θιάσῳ ὄπω[ς -----]  
 οἱ ὀργεῶνες τιμῶ[-----]  
*vacat* (Dow and Gill 1965, 104 = *SEG 22:122*).

Dow and Gill restored the lower text, *exempli gratia*, from familiar orgeonic decrees:

ἔδοξεν τοῖς ὀργεῶ[σιν ἐπειδὴ ± 25–30 -- και ± 25–30 – ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος ± 10]  
 ἐπεμελήθησαν κα[λῶς και φιλοτίμως τῶν κοινῶν· δεδόχθαι τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν  
 ἐπαινέσαι αὐτοὺς ἐπιμελείας ἔνεκα και φιλοτιμίας]  
 τῆς εἰς τὰ κοινὰ κα[ἰ εὐσεβείας τῆς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν (?) και στεφανῶσαι αὐτῶν  
 ἐκάτερον στεφάνῳ θαλλοῦ, ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸ δόγμα τόδε και στήσαι]  
 ἐν τῷ θιάσῳ ὄπω[ς ἂν και πάντες οἱ ἄλλοι ὀργεῶνες ὀρῶσιν τοῦτο και  
 φιλοτιμῶνται εἰς τοὺς ὀργεῶνας και εἰς τὰ κοινὰ, εἰδότες ὅτι]  
 οἱ ὀργεῶνες τιμῶ[σιν -----] (Dow, et al. 1965, 111)

Since the phrase ἐν τῷ θιάσῳ appears in the inscription at the point where one would normally expect ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, Dow and Gill concluded

the sense here must be “in the presence of” or “in the midst of the association.” (Cf. the expression ἐν τῷ δήμῳ, Plato, *Resp.* 565B.) The place for setting up the inscription was already determined by the position of the cult table, and the text simply points out that this was in the midst of the *orgeōnes*. (Dow, et al. 1965, 112)

This text, despite the curious use of θιάσος alongside ὀργεῶνες, does not assist much with the interpretation of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1316*, however, which uses θιασῶται rather than θιάσος.

Ferguson conjectured that the temple was once owned by *thiasōtai* but acquired by *orgeōnes* when the metic group fell on hard times. The result was that some or all of the *thiasōtai* were incorporated into the new group:

The *thiasōtai* must have been hard hit by the economic vicissitudes of the foreign traders and sea-merchants of the Piraeus during the critical epoch in which the association ceased to exist. Transfers of *hiera* from private to public control are so well attested as to be normal in Athens; but so far as I know there is no parallel to the transfer of a *hieron* from aliens to citizens. Yet this is what most probably



occurred with the Metroon in the Piraeus between 284/3 and 246/5 B.C. At some point between these dates, perhaps not long before 246/5 B.C., a group, undoubtedly a relatively large group, of citizens organized themselves as *orgeōnes* with an annual priestess instead of two semiannual priests, and a civil staff, modelled perhaps on that of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis, of *epimelētai*, treasurer, and secretary, and acquired control of the shrine and cult of the Mother of the Gods. It may have taken into its members the residue of the *thiasōtai* or its élite. (Ferguson 1944, 139–40)

Ferguson’s conjecture was based on dating *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273* to 284/3, which would place it *before IG II<sup>2</sup> 1316*, instead of the more recent dating, a few years after *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1316*. Ferguson’s scenario of an orgeonic group incorporating an earlier group of metic *thiasōtai* perhaps also accounted for the fact, pointed out by Jones (1999, 263–4), that a later inscription from the *orgeōnes*, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1327.31–33 [35]* (178/7 BCE) names as *epimelētai* two demesmen and an Ergasion (“Worker”), who might be a slave or freedman (or, more likely, a metic). If the *orgeōnes* incorporated the remnants of the older *thiasōtai* who included slaves and freedmen as well as non-Athenians, such non-Athenians would from time to time appear as *epimelētai* or other functionaries. Jones thus endorsed Ferguson’s general conclusion that such associations were responsible for “a certain weakening, attributable to the intermingling of citizens and aliens in a religious fraternity, of deep-rooted prejudices” of Athenians against foreigners (Ferguson 1944, 111; Jones 1999, 264).

Relying on the more recent dating of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273* to 265/4 BCE, Mikalson suggested that there were two separate groups, one metic and one Athenian:

In the earliest datable record of the cult, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1316* of 272/1, the goddess’ *orgeōnes* honored Agathon of Phlya (?) and his wife Zeuxion, the priestess, for their services and for contributing, as so many religious officials did in this period, their own funds for the maintenance of the cult.... *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273*, from 265/4, evidently is the record of a separate, entirely foreign *thiasos* of the Mother of the Gods, also in the Piraeus. (1998, 143)

If this is so, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273* is the only evidence of an exclusively metic group in the Piraeus, which left no trace of its existence after the mid-third century BCE. What complicates the picture is that *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273*, found in the ruins of the Metroon, honors a metic for his supervision of the temple of the Mother of the Gods (ἐπιμελέληται τοῦ τε ἱεροῦ τῆς | Μητρὸς τῶν θεῶν, ll. 31–32), while the present inscription, cut only a few years earlier, puts control of the temple in the hands of an Athenian and his wife (ἐπεμελήθησαν [τῆς] | ἐ[ρ] | ἐ[ωσ] | ὄνης καὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ll. 8–9).

The best solution may be to suppose, along with Arnaoutoglou, that the presence of *orgeōnes* alongside *thiasōtai* in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1316* is a cutter’s error, but to add that this error was occasioned by the fact that *two* groups were using the precincts of the Metroon in the late 270s. It remains difficult, nonetheless, to imagine how a group of citizen *orgeōnes* would have agreed to the erection of a stele that designated them as *thiasōtai*.

**Literature:** Arnaoutoglou 1994a; Ferguson 1944, 107–15, 137–40; Garland 1987, 236; Jones 1999, 262, 264–65; Roller 1999, 219–224; Wilhelm 1902, 132; Ziebarth 1896, 36; Ziebarth 1900.

[17] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1278*  
Decree of *thiasōtai*?

Athens(?) (Attica)

272/1 BCE

Published: Adolf Wilhelm, “Αττικά ψηφίσματα (Attika psephismata),” *AE* (1905) 215–52, 246–48 (no. 11) (ph.); repr. in Wilhelm 1984, 2:26–44; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1278* (Poland A22C).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1278*

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum.

Non stoichedon. 21 x 32.5 x 10 cm. Letter height 0.5 cm. Stele of Hymettian marble broken along the right.

----- O -----  
 [----- τὸν νόμον, ἔδωσαν [δὲ καὶ ταφικὸν τοῖς]  
 [μεταλλάξασιν τὸ γεγραμ]μένον ἐκάστωι κατ[ὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ πα]-  
 [ρα]δε[δ]ώκασιν[ν] ἀργυρ[ί]ου περιὸν ΧϞΗΗϞΔΔ ἐπε[μελήθησαν δὲ καὶ]  
 5 [τῶ]ν [ἄ]λλων ἀπάντων [μ]ετὰ τῶν ἡγεμόν[ω]ν κα[λῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως· ὅ]-  
 [πω]ς ἂν οὖν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες εἰδῶσιν οἱ ἀ[εὶ] καθιστάμενοι εἰς]  
 [τὰς ἐπιμελείας ὅτι [τ]ιμηθήσονται ὑπὸ τοῦ [κοινού] ἀξίως τῶν εὐ]-  
 [ερ]γητιμάτων· ἀγαθ[εῖ] τύχει, δεδόχθαι τοῖς θ[ιασώταις, ἐπαινέσαι]-  
 [τό]ν τε ταμίαν καὶ τὸν ἐπιμελητὴν καὶ τὸν γραμματέα καὶ τὸν ἀν]-  
 10 [τι]γραφέα καὶ τὸν γραμματοφύλακα καὶ σ[τεφανώσαι] ἕκαστον αὐ]-  
 [τῶ]ν [καὶ στεφανώσαι] ἕκαστον αὐ[τῶν] θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι δικαι]-  
 οσύνης ἔνεκα κα[ὶ] φ[ιλοτιμίας] [καὶ εὐσεβείας τῆς περὶ τοῦ]-  
 ς θεοῦς. ἀναγρά[ψαι] δὲ τὸδε τὸ ψη[φισμα ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνει]  
 καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα κ[αὶ] στήσαι ἐν τ[ῶ]ι ἱερῶι ----- ]  
 15 μερίσαι δὲ αὐτοῖ[ς] τὸν ταμίαν τ[ὸν] ταμιεύοντα τὸν  
 [ἐν]ιαυτὸν τὸν ἐ[πι] Γλαυκίππου [εἰς ἀνάθημα καὶ]  
 [θουσίαν] :ΔΔΔ: δρα[χμ]ᾶς ἐκ τῶν ὑ[πολοίπων?] -  
 . . . ον καὶ τὸ [προπ]έρυσι NEME -----

. . . the law, they also contributed the prescribed burial expenses for those who have died, to each in accordance with the law, and they have handed over the surplus funds in the amount of 1770 drachmae. They have also managed all of the other matters along with the leaders in an honorable and ambitious manner. Therefore, so that everyone who is ever appointed

to the role of supervision may know they will be honored by the *koinon* in a manner worthy of their benefactions, – for good fortune, it has been resolved by the *thiasōtai* to commend the treasurer, the supervisor, the secretary, the comptroller, and the record-keeper, and to crown each of them [and to crown each of them] with an olive wreath on account of the honesty and zeal and piety that they have exhibited towards to the gods. The (secretary?) shall inscribe this decree and their names on a stele and shall place it in the (temple?) and the treasurer who is serving during the year that Glaukippos is the archon shall pay them for the votive offering and the sacrifice to the amount of 30 drachmae from the reserves ... and ...

### Notes

1. 2: τὸν νόμον: Arnautoglou (2003, 126–29) notes that νόμος appears in 13 Attic association inscriptions, including seven honorary decrees (*SEG* 2:9; 44.60; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1282, 1284 [22], 1291 [19], 1298 [20], 1325 [33]), and six decrees on other subjects (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1275 [8], 1278 [17], 1283 [23], 1326 [36], 1361 [4], 1369 [49]). The *nomos* is never called a *psēphisma* (“decree”) though some decrees refer to an association’s *nomos* in the body of the decree. “In the latter cases... the word *nomos* refers to regulations concerning the activity of officers during their term of office, but it is not clear whether it refers to any particular decision of the group or simply to what is customary” (p. 128).
1. 2: ταφικόν, “burial expenses” → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1323.10–11 [31]: δέδωκεν δὲ καὶ τοῖς μετα[λ][λ]άξασιν τὸ ταφικὸν παραχρήμα, “he paid immediately the burial expenses for those who had died.” See also *P.Enteux.* 20.5, 7 (Magdola, 221 BCE): τὸ γινόμενον αὐτῶι ταφικὸν [ἀ]ποδεδώκ[ασιν... ἀποδοῦναι μοι τὸ ταφικόν; 21.6, 8 (218 BCE): τ[ὸ] τ[α]φικὸν οὐκ [ἀ]ποδιδόσ[ιν]... ἀποδοῦναι τὸ ταφικόν, *P.Ryl.* IV 580.ext.5 (I BCE): τὸ γινόμενον[ο] μοι ταφικόν; *O.Bodl.* I 134 (147–36 BCE): ἔχω παρ[ὰ σοῦ τοῦς] τόκους καὶ ταφικά; *BGU* VII 1668.14 (I CE): ταφικοῦ (δραχμᾶς) δ’.
1. 9–10: ἀν[τ]ιγραφεύς: a “checking-clerk” or a “comptroller,” who checked the accounts. In Athens there was an *antigraphus* for each deme. In lists the *antigraphus* is often named after the *grammateus*, e.g., *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 967.2–3; 1059.5–6; 1077.iii.47–51; 1758.5–6; 1774.ii.71–73; 1775.44–45; *Agora* 15:12.iii.64–66; 539.3, etc.
1. 10: γραμματοφύλαξ, “record keeper”: the term is rare in Athenian inscriptions, but more common in the Peloponnese, Thera, and Lydia.
11. 15–17: μερίσαι δὲ αὐτοῖς[ς] τὸν ταμίαν τ[ὸν] ταμειόοντα τὸν | [ἐν]ιαυτὸν τὸν ἐ[πι] Γλαυκίππου [εἰς ἀνάθημα καὶ] | [θυσί]αν :ΔΔΔ: δρα[χμ]ᾶς ἐκ τῶν ὑ[πο]λοίπων? –] → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317 (*SEG* 3:127): μερίσαι [δὲ] αὐ[τ]οῖς τὸν ταμ[ί]αν τὸ γινόμενον ἀνάλωμα ἀπὸ τοῦ κο[υ]νοῦ δραχ[μ]ᾶς : ἕξ : ἀν[α]θέτωσαν δὲ τοῦτο λαβόντες οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τῆς [B]ενδίδου[ς].
1. 16: τὸν | [ἐν]ιαυτὸν τὸν ἐ[πι] Γλαυκίππου. Glaukippos was archon 273/2 BCE (Meritt 1977, 173; Osborne 2009, 88), so this inscription must date from the following year.

### Comments

The top of the inscription is missing. This inscription, nonetheless, is clearly an honorific decree recognizing and commending the activities of the *tamias*

(treasurer), *epimelētēs* (supervisor), *grammateus* (secretary), *antigraphheus* (comptroller), and *grammatophylax* (record-keeper). This list of honorees points to a structure that is more complex than many associations, which typically only had a secretary, a treasurer and *epimelētai* (usually several). The structure of the association in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1278*, however, also mimics the structure of the civic government in Athens, which in the Hellenistic period included, in addition to a *tamias* and *grammateus*, a lesser functionary, the *antigraphheus* (comptroller) who served as an additional control on fiscal matters (Dow 1937, 19, 22).

This association took responsibility for the collecting funds to support the burial of its members. Even though no officials or others are named, we can probably assume that it was an association comprised mainly or exclusively of metics rather than Athenians, since the inscription seems to take for granted that the burial of members was a normal function of the group. Some metics of course might also have families and friends in the Piraeus who could oversee the burial—in which case, the association's participation added to the family's funerary honors—, but other merchants and traders might have an insufficient family network to underwrite the cost of a funeral.

The sum of money held by the treasurer and other officials – 1770 drachmae after some burial expenses were paid – is seemingly a large sum. In other associations, income might derive from membership dues, from rental of the property of the association (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2499* [7]), or income from fees charged to those who offered sacrifices (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1361* [4]). In this case the sum seems to be due to the benefaction of the five officials.

What is less clear is the sum that would have been paid out for funerals. Literary sources represent funerals as expensive: 3 mina (300 drachmae; Lysias 31.21); 1000 drachmae ([Ps-]Demosthenes, 40 *Against Boethus* 2 52); 1000 drachmae for the building of a tomb (Plato, *Letters* 13.361E); 2500–5000 drachmae for a tomb (Lysias 32, *Against Diogeiton* 21); 2 talents for a monument (Demosthenes, 45 *Against Stephanos* 1 79). In *Leges* 12.959D Plato advised that the cost of the funeral be limited to five minae (500 drachmae) for persons of the highest estate and declining to one mina for those of the fourth class.

At the lowest of Lysias' figures, 1770 drachmae would not cover more than five funerals. At Plato's lower figure – if this figure is not wholly idealistic – the association's fund might cover a dozen funerals at most, assuming that the association had other expenses as well. The literary sources, however, concern funerals of elite Athenians and in some case, the erection of spectacular monuments. There is very little direct evidence of the actual cost of non-elite funerals. Moreover, it is not certain that all of the 1770 drachmae represented monies collected for burials.

Nielsen *et al.* (1989) drew attention to *Agora* 19 P 5 1.25–29 (Crosby Young, 1914, no. 1; 367/6 BCE), a record of claims made against a house belonging to Theosebes of Xypete, who had been charged with sacrilege and who had fled Athens to avoid a trial. Another, Isarchos, had taken responsibility for burying Theosebes' parents, Theophilos and his wife, and filed a claim against the estate:

Ἰσαρχος Φίλωνος Ξυπέται: ἀμοισβητεῖ ἐνοφείλεισθαι ἑαυτῶι ἐν τῆι οἰκίαι τῆι Ἀλωπεκῆσι ἦν ἀπέγραψεν Θεόμνηστος Δεισιθέου Ἰωνίδης, θάψαντος ἐμὸ Θεόφιλον ὃ ἦν ἡ οἰκία καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν Θεοφίλο : ΔΔΔ : δραχμάς.

Isarchos son of Philon of Xypete argued that 30 drachmae were due to him on the house in Alopeke which Theomnestos son of Deisitheos of Ionidai registered, for I buried Theophilos, whose house this was, and the wife of Theophilos.

Davies (1971, xix n. 3) suggested that 30 drachmae did not represent the full cost of two burials but only an outstanding balance owing to Isarchos. Nielsen answered by pointing out that nothing in the inscription justifies Davies' conjecture, and argued that "this single piece of evidence is undoubtedly a much better source than the literary texts for the costs of an ordinary burial" (Nielsen *et al.* 1989, 414).

Oliver has objected to the use of *Agora* 19 P 5.1 to establish the minimum costs of a full burial (including the erection of a monument), pointing out that the inscription mentions only "burial" (θάψαντος), not the erecting of a monument. Theosebes' parents may have been buried as cheaply as possible (Oliver 2000, 63). Lambrecht even conjectured that Isarchos was the demarch of Xypete and had thus undertaken to bury unclaimed corpses under the terms of the ps-Demosthenic law (→ n. 9), which called for the demarch to bury such dead as cheaply as possible (Lambert 1994, 319). If this is so, the burials themselves may have been even cheaper, since the demarch was entitled to claim *twice* the burial expenses from the estate.

Although *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1278* does not indicate what expenses were included in the *taphikon*, it would seem likely that the cost of a monument would normally be part of a burial. Nolan's figures indicate that the cutting of a public inscription in the period from 298 to ca. 270 BCE should be put at about 10 drachmae (Nolan 1981, 74). Simple funerary inscriptions were likely cheaper, since they would not necessarily have been cut in professional shops, and in any case were only one or two lines in length. But the cost of the stele itself was not insubstantial: a Delian inscription records the cost of one (1.5 m. high) monument as including 25 drachmae for the stone, 5 drachmae for lead, 1 drachma for wood, 1½ drachmae for transportation, and 2½ for erecting the monument (*IG XI/2 161A.171*) (Nolan 1981, 57–59). Even if we figure on a much more modest grave marker such as *IG II<sup>2</sup> 10248 [55]*, a cost of 10–30 drachmae for the stone, its preparation and transport, and a few obols for a short inscription, does not seem unlikely.

**Literature:** Arnaoutoglou 2003; Crosby, Margaret and John Young, “Greek Inscriptions.” *Hesperia* 10/1 (1941) 14–19; Davies, J.K. *Athenian Propertied Families*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1971; Dow, Sterling. “Prytaneis: A Study of the Inscriptions Honoring the Athenian Councillors.” *Hesperia Supplements* 1 (1937) 1–215, 217–58; Nielsen, Thomas Heine, *et al.* “Athenian Grave Monuments and Social Class.” *GRBS* 30 (1989) 431–20; Nolan, B.T. “Inscribing Costs at Athens in the Fourth Century B.C.” Ph.D. diss. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, 1981 (*SEG* 44:257).

## [18] *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1273AB

### Decree of the *thiasōtai* of the Mother of the Gods

Piraeus (Attica) 265/4 BCE  
 Published: G. Paspaliotis, “Attische Inschriften vom Peiräus,” *Archäologische Zeitung (Archäologischer Anzeiger)* 13 (1885) 83\*–85\* (*ed. pr.*); Foucart 1873, 205 (nos. 22–23); Koehler, *IG* II 614; Michel, *RIG* 978; Kirchner, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1273AB; Vermaseren 1977–1989, 2:70–71 (no. 258) = *CCCA* II 258 (Poland A17).

Publication Used: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1273 with corrections by Arnaoutoglou (1994a).

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum, EM 7757.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4563 (Athens or Piraeus, IV BCE): A dedication to the Mother of the Gods; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4609 (Piraeus, late IV BCE): A dedication to the Mother of the Gods by two women; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 6288 (350–317 BCE): A grave inscription for a woman described as μητρός παντοτέκνου πρόπολος; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16] (Piraeus, 272/1 BCE): A decree of the *thiasōtai* of the Mother of the Gods; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1314 [28] (Piraeus, 213/2 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1315 [29] (Piraeus, 211/0 BCE); *Agora* 16:235 (Meritt, *et al.* 1957, 209–10 (no. 57); *SEG* 17:36; 32:348; 39:195) (Athens, 202/1 BCE): Honorary decree of the *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods for a priestess; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328 [34] (Piraeus, 183/2, 175/4 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1327 [35] (Piraeus, 178/7 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1329 [37] (Piraeus, 175/4 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2950/1 (II BCE): A dedication of a treasurer to the Mother of the Gods; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1334 [45] 71/0 BCE (?); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4703 (mid I BCE): Dedication of the wife of a demesman; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4714 (Augustan period): Dedication of the daughter of a demesman to the Mother of the Gods and to Aphrodite, “gracious midwife” (εὐαντήτω ιατρείνῃ); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4759–60 (I/II CE): Two dedications of the wives of two demesmen to the mother of the Gods (εὐαντήτω ιατρείνῃ).

Stoichedon (30 letters) after the first line. Stele, 39 x 22 x 9.2 cm.; letter height: 0.4 cm. The main body of the inscription is written stoichedon, but the first line, inscribed above the moulding, is slightly wider than the rest of the inscription

with slightly larger letters and with larger spaces between letters. According to Foucart (1873, 206), the stone was discovered in the ruins of the Metroon.

[ἐπ' Εὐβούλου ἄρχοντος [μη]νὸς Ἄνθεστηριῶν[ος]·  
 [Κεφ]αλίων Ἡρακλεώτης εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Σ-  
 [ωτ]ήριχος Τροζήνιος ἔν τε τῷ ἔμπροσ-  
 [θε]ν χρόνῳ διατελεῖ φιλοτιμούμενο-  
 5 [ς π]ρὸς τοὺς θιασώτας καὶ αἰρεθεῖς ὑπ-  
 [ὸ τ]ῶν θιασωτῶν ἐπὶ Νικίου ἄρχοντος κ-  
 [αλ]ῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως ὑπὲρ τοῦ οἴκου ἐπ-  
 [ι]μεμέληται τῆς οἰκοδομίας· ὕ ἀγαθεῖ  
 [τ]ύχει δεδόχθαι τοῖς θιασώταις, ἐπαι-  
 10 [ν]έσαι Σωτήριχον Τροζήνιον εὐνοίας  
 [ἔ]νεκα καὶ φιλοτιμίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς θι-  
 [α]σώτας καὶ στεφανῶσαι αὐτὸν θαλλοῦ  
 [σ]τεφάνῳ, καὶ τὸν ἱερέα τὸν ἀεὶ λαχόν-  
 [τ]α καὶ ὄντα ὅταν θύσωσιν οἱ θιασῶτα[ι]  
 15 [κ]αὶ σπονδὰς ποιήσωσιν, στεφανούτω  
 ὁ ἱερεὺς Σωτήριχον θαλλοῦ στεφάνῳ  
 καὶ ἀνειπάτω φιλοτιμίας ἔνεκα τῆς ε-  
 [ι]ς τοὺς θιασώτας, ὅπως ἂν φανερόν εἴ π-  
 ᾶσι τοῖς θιασώταις τοῖς βουλομένοι-  
 20 ς φιλοτιμεῖσθαι εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν θι-  
 ασω[ν]τῶν ὕ ἐάν δὲ ὁ ἱερεὺς μὴ στεφανώσ-  
 ει ἢ μὴ ἀνειπει καθάπερ γέγραπται, ἀπ-  
 οτινέτω Ἑ δραχμὰς παραχρῆμα ἱεράς τ-  
 25 [ο]ῖς θιασώταις καθάπερ καὶ ἄλλα ὀφε-  
 ἰλήματα. ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμ-  
 α εἰς στήλην. *vacat*  
 [Λ]εύκων εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Κεφαλίων Ἡρακλ-  
 εώτης ἱερεὺς λαχὼν ἐπὶ Νικίου ἄρχον-  
 30 τος μηνὸς Βοηδρομιῶνος καλῶς καὶ φι-  
 λοτίμως ἐπιμεμέληται τοῦ τε ἱεροῦ τῆς  
 Μητρὸς τῶν θεῶν [κ]αὶ τῶν θιασωτῶν, ἀγ-  
 αθεῖ τύχει δεδόχθαι τοῖς θιασώται[ς],  
 ἐπαινεῖσαι Κεφαλίωνα καὶ στ[εφανῶσαι α]-  
 35 ὑτὸν θαλλοῦ στεφ[άνῳ] -----]  
 . . . . . IQ -----

In the year that Euboulos was archon, in the month of Anthesterion, Kephalion of Herakleia proposed the following motion: Whereas Soterichos of Troizen has continued to be ambitious towards the *thiasōtai* in the

times past and was chosen by the *thiasōtai* in the year that Nikias was archon; (and whereas) he has managed honorably and ambitiously the building of the “house”; for good fortune, it is resolved by the *thiasōtai* to commend Soterichos of Troizen on account of the good will and zeal that he has shown towards the *thiasōtai* and to crown him with an olive wreath; and (that) whoever happens to have been chosen priest at that time when the *thiasōtai* sacrifice or make drink offerings shall crown Soterichos with an olive wreath and shall make an announcement because of the zeal he has shown towards the *thiasōtai*. (This is) so that it shall be apparent to all *thiasōtai* who might wish to be ambitious for the common good of the *thiasōtai*. If the priest does not crown him or make the announcement exactly as has been written, let him pay 50 drachmae immediately, sacred to the Mother of the Gods. This shall belong to the *thiasōtai* just as also the other monies that are owing. This decree shall be inscribed on a stele. *vacat*

- 28 Leukon proposed the following motion: Whereas Kephalion of Herakleia, who was chosen priest in the year that Nikias was archon, in the month of Boedromion, has supervised both the affairs of the temple of the Mother of the Gods and the *thiasōtai* honorably and ambitiously; for good fortune, resolved by the *thiasōtai* to commend Kephalion of Herakleia, and to crown with an olive wreath ....

### Notes

1. 1: The archon list from the middle portion of the third century BCE was uncertain up to discoveries in the 1970s; even so, several restorations of l. 1 seem possible. (a) Foucart: [ἐπὶ Γοργί]ου, i.e., 280/9 BCE. (b) The editors of *IG II<sup>2</sup>* argued for [ἐπ’ Ἀριστωνύμ]ου ἄρχοντος, now dated to 289/8 BCE (Meritt 1977, 172) on the basis that there were only two archons following Nikias with names that might fit the lacuna, Nikostratos, who succeeded Nikias I (296/5 BCE) and Aristonymos, who followed Νικίας Ὀτρυνεύς (281/0 but now dated to 266/5 BCE). They chose the latter because Aristonymos had only 13 letters. (c) Ferguson (“Polyeuktos and the Sotereia,” *AJP* 55 [1934] 318–36, here 330 n. 37) suggested Πειθίδημος (265/4 BCE). As Meritt (1938, 108) observed, the lacuna is too short to accommodate [ἐπ’ Ἀριστωνύμ]ου or Ferguson’s proposal. (d) On the strength of *P.Haun.* 6.22 (...νδὲ ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν Εὐξείνου), but without much argument Oikonomides (1978, 85–86) proposed [ἐπὶ Εὐξεί]νου ἄρχοντος, which would date the inscription to 222/1 BCE. (e) Osborne (1989, 230, 241), who placed Nikias III at 266/5 BCE, suggested Phanomachos as the name that best fits the size of the lacuna. (f) Arnaoutoglou (1994a) re-examined the squeeze and concluded that the spacing of l. 1 (non-stoichedon) would permit only six letters in the lacuna on the left. Of the three archons who followed Nikias (296/5, 282/1, 266/5), Nikostratos, Ourias, and Peithidemos, only Ourias fits the lacuna: [ἐπ’ Οὐρί]ου ἄρχοντος. This agrees with the suggestion of Meritt (1938, 108) who in 1938 dated Nikias (II) to 284/3 instead of his more recent dating to 282/1 BCE (Meritt 1977, 173; Osborne 2009, 87). This would date the inscription to 281/0 BCE. On the basis of a re-examination of the stone, Osborne later (2000, 519–20) argued that [ἐπ’ Οὐρί]ου ἄρχοντος is too short



- for the lacuna and that eight letters, not six, should precede ]ου. (g) He now proposes [ἐπ' Εὐβούλ]ου ἄρχοντος, in either 265/4 (see Osborne 2000; *SEG* 53:155; Osborne 2004; and Osborne 2009, 89). Since according to the most recent reconstruction of the archon list, Euboulos (265/4) follows Nikias (266/5), it seems best to reconstruct the lacuna with Osborne and to date the inscription to 265/4 BCE.
- II. 2–3: [Κεφ]αλίων Ἡρακλεώτης εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Σ[[οτ]ήριχος Τροζήνιος: Both the proposer of the motion and the honoree of II. 28–29 and the honoree of the first part of the inscription are resident aliens. Kephalaion is from Herakleia Pontika (*FRA* no. 1999); Soterichos is from Troizen (*FRA* no. 7169). See Fraser 2009, 186.
- I. 6: ἐπὶ Νικίου ἄρχοντος: Three archons with the name Nikias are known: Nikias [I] 296/5 BCE; Nikias [II] 282/1 BCE, and Nikias Otryneus, 266/5 BCE → Meritt 1977, 171–74; Osborne 2009, 89.
- II. 21–26: εἰδὲ δὲ ὁ ἱερεὺς μὴ στεφανώσῃ ἢ μὴ ἀνείπει καθάπερ γέγραπται, ἀποτινέτω Ἑ δραχμὰς παραχρημα ἱερὰς τ[ε]ῖ Μητρὶ τῶν θεῶν, ἢ δ' εἰσπραξίς ἔστω τ[ε]ῖ θιασώταις καθάπερ καὶ ἄλλα ὄφε|υλήματα → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1289.4–5*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297.17–18*; *AM* 66 1941 228 no. 4.18–19. → Arnaoutoglou 2003, 135 on fines paid to the deity.

### Comments

*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273* contains two decrees, one moved by Kephalion of Herakleia in January/February of 264 BCE honoring Soterichos and a second decree honoring Kephalion himself, who had been chosen priest in Boedromion (August/September) of 266 BCE.

Ferguson argued that in this association priests served only half the year, one beginning his term in Boedromion and the next in Elaphebolion (February/March) (1944, 107 n. 49). The inscription does not uniformly support this conclusion: Kephalion was chosen as priest in Boedromion of 266 BCE. The inscription, however, does not clearly indicate that Soterichos was a priest; in fact, the decree credits him with being responsible for the building (οἰκοδομία) of the “house,” which might imply that he was an *epimelētēs*. In any event, Soterichos had also assumed his office at the same time as Kephalion, in 266 BCE, probably also in Boedromion. Kephalion’s motion of Anthesterion (January/February 264 BCE) looks forward to the association’s sacrifices and election of a new priest later in 264 (in Boedromion). The text of the inscription is thus consistent with the supposition of yearly priesthoods.

Ferguson pointed out that while in this inscription the devotees are called *thiasōtai*, in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16]* (272/1 BCE), later inscriptions (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314 [28]*; 1315 [29], 1328 [34]; 1327 [35]; 1334 [45]) uniformly call the devotees of the Mother of the Gods *orgeōnes* (1944, 108–9). The devotees in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273* were metics, with the proposer of the motion from Herakleia Pontika and the honoree from Troizen in the Peloponnese, while the *orgeōnes* have Athenian citizens among their numbers. Thus Ferguson posits two groups of devotees to the Mother of the Gods, a metic group (called *thiasōtai*) of which *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273* is the sole testimony, and a group of *orgeōnes* that included citizens. The *thiasōtai* had a priest, the *orgeōnes* a priestess; and the *thiasōtai* met in

Anthesterion (January/February), the *orgeōnes* in Mounichion (March/April). Ferguson contended that the *orgeōnes* appeared sometime between 284/3 and 246/5 BCE (when *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16]* had first been dated). Now the archonship of Lysitheides has been dated to 272/1 BCE (Meritt 1977, 173), which means that less than a decade separates the first evidence of the citizen *orgeōnes* from the evidence of the *thiasōtai*.

According to *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16]* the *orgeōnes* appear to be in control of the Metroon in 272/1 BCE. Yet the temple mentioned in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273.31* a few years later was cared for by a metic, Kephalion of Herakleia. Ferguson (1944, 139) originally suggested that control of the temple had passed from the *thiasōtai* to the *orgeōnes* between 284/3 and 246/5; but with the re-dating of the archonship of Lysitheides and Osborne's redating of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273* to 265/4 BCE, we can no longer speak of a transfer of control of the temple, since *orgeōnes* controlled the temple both before and after *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273*. Ferguson rightly dismissed the possibility that two shrines to the Mother of the Gods existed in the same area, not in principle, but because after *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273* there is no trace of the *thiasōtai*:

The *thiasōtai* must have been hard hit by the economic vicissitudes of the foreign traders and sea-merchants of the Piraeus during the critical epoch in which the association ceased to exist. (Ferguson 1944, 139)

Ferguson suggests that the *thiasōtai* were in fact absorbed into the later association of *orgeōnes* (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16]*).

**Literature:** Arnaoutoglou 1994a; Habicht 1980; Jones 1999, 219, 262–63; Meritt 1938, 107–8; Mikalson 1998, 142–144; Munn 2006; Oikonomides 1978; Osborne 1989; Osborne 2000; Osborne, Michael J. “The Archons of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273*.” In *Ἀττικά Ἐπιγραφαί. Πρακτικά συμποσίου εἰς Μνήμην Adolf Wilhelm (1864–1950)*, ed. A.P. Matthaiou and G.E. Malochou. Athens: Ἑλληνική Ἐπιγραφική Ἑταιρεία [Greek Epigraphical Society] 2004, 199–211; Parker 1996, 159–60, 188–94, 197–98; Petrocheilos 1992; Vermaseren 1977–1989, vol. 2 (1982).

## [19] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1291*

### Honorific decree of *eranistai*

Piraeus? (Attica)

mid III BCE

Published: Carle Wescher, “Fragment de stèle trouvé à Athènes,” *RA* 11 (1865) 497–506 (*ed. pr.*); Foucart 1873, 210–11 (no. 27); Koehler, *IG II* 616; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1291* (Poland A33).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1291*.

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum

Non-stoichedon (25–28 letters), but “gravée régulièrement et presque στοιχηδόν” (Foucart 1873, 211). 23.5 x 15 x 10 cm., broken top and bottom. Letter height 0.5

cm. The provenance of the inscription is uncertain, but Wescher believed it to have come from the Piraeus. The top part of the inscription would have contained the name of the orator and the name of the archon for that year.

[· · · κ]αλῶς -----  
 [· τῶι] κοινῶ[ι ----- ὀ]-  
 [ρθῶ]ς καὶ δικαί[ως διεχείρισε τὸ ἀ]-  
 [ρ]γύριον τ[ὸ] κοινὸ[ν ὃ παρακατέθεν]-  
 5 το αὐτῶι οἱ ἔραριστ[αὶ κατὰ τοὺς νό]-  
 μους τοὺς κοινοὺς τ[ῶν ἔραριστῶ]-  
 ν καὶ τὸν ἔρανον καὶ τ[ --- Αἰσχυλ]-  
 εῖων ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ὢν καὶ [δίκαιο]-  
 10 ρανισταῖς· ἀγαθεὶ τύχει δεδ[όχθαι]  
 τοῖς ἔρανισταῖς, ἐπαινέσαι Ἀ[ἰσχυ]-  
 λίωνα Θεῶνος ἰσοτελῆ τὸν ταμία-  
 ν καὶ στεφανῶσαι αὐτὸν θαλλοῦ σ-  
 τεφάνωι φ[ι]λοτιμίας ἔνεκα καὶ ε-  
 15 [ὕ]νοίας τῆς εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἔρα-  
 νιστῶν· ἐπαινεῖσαι δὲ καὶ Διονύσιον  
 τὸν γραμματέα καὶ στεφανῶσαι  
 αὐτὸν θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι φιλοτι[μ]-  
 20 ἰας ἔνεκα κα[ὶ] ἐὺνοίας ἧς ἔχων δι-  
 ατελεῖ εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἔραριστῶν·  
 ἐπ[αι]νεῖσαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐπιμελητ-  
 ᾶς καὶ τοὺς ἱεροποιούς τῶι Διὶ τῶι  
 Σωτήρι καὶ τῶι Ἡρακλεῖ καὶ τοῖς Σω-  
 τήρσιν καὶ στεφανῶσαι ἕκαστον  
 25 αὐτῶν θα[λλ]οῦ [στ]εφάνωι ἀρετῆ-  
 ς ἔνεκα καὶ φι[λοτι]μ[ία]ς τῆς εἰς τὸ]  
 [κ]οινὸ[ν τῶν ἔραριστῶν· ἐπι ---

[· · · whereas] he (has acted with respect?) to the association in an honorable and... and managed accurately and fairly the common fund which the *eranistai* had entrusted to him in accordance with the common bylaws of the *eranistai* and the fund (*eranos*) and . . . being a generous and honest(?) man, (acting) in accordance with the oath that he swore to the *eranistai*; – For good fortune, be it resolved by the *eranistai* to commend Aischylion son of Theon, *isotelēs*, the treasurer and to crown him with an olive wreath on account of the zeal and goodwill that he has shown to the association of *eranistai*; (further) to commend Dionysios the secretary and to crown him with an olive wreath on account of the zeal and the goodwill that he continues to have for the association of *eranistai*; (further) to commend the supervisors and the sacrifice makers (*hieropoioi*)

*poiōi*) of Saviour Zeus and Herakles and the Saviors, and to crown each with an olive wreath on account of the excellence and zeal they have shown towards the association of *eranistai*. [. . . .]

### Notes

- I. 1: [· · · · κ]αλῶς -----; Foucart: [· · · · κ]αλῶς [καὶ εὐνοικῶς διετέλεσε]
- II. 1–2: [· τῶι] κοινῶ[ι - - - - - ὀ]||[ρθῶ]ς; Foucart: [· τῶι] κοινῶ[ι τὸν ἔραμιστῶν, εὐνό]||[μω]ς.
- II. 3–4: καὶ δικαί[ως διεχείρισε τὸ ἄ]||[ρ]γύριον; Foucart: καὶ δικαί[ως διαφυλάσσω τὸ ἄ]||[ρ]γύριον.
- II. 5–6, 9, 11, 15, 20, 27: οἱ ἔραμιστ[αί]: The term is attested in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1553.23 (ca. 330 BCE) and 1557–58, 1568–1572 (all *catalogi paterarum argentearum* [ → Glossary and Tod 1901–1902], ca. 330 BCE); in *horoi* inscriptions: *Agora* 19 84.4 (309/8 BCE): [ἐπὶ Δη]μητρίου ἄρχον[τος ὄρ]ος οἰκίας πεπραμ[ένης] ἐπὶ λύσει : 𐀡HH [ἔρα]μιστῶν, “boundary stone of the house ‘sold’ against redemption during the year that Demetrios was archon, for 700 drachmai to the *eranistai*” ( → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361.14–15 [4] note); *Agora* 19 89.4; 19 94.ii.5. It also appears in various association decrees: *SEG* 41:171 (300/99 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1265.1, 10, 12 (Athens, ca. 300 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1291.5, 6, 9, 11, 15, 20, 27 [19] (mid III BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2354.1 [30] (end of III BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1335.5, 14 [43] (102/1 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1343.26 [48] (37/6 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1345.2 (53/4 CE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369.30 [49] (ca. 100 CE); *SEG* 41:171; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1366.22, 25 [53] (II/III CE), etc.
- I. 7: τὸν ἔρανον → comment.
- I. 7–8 τ[– – Αἰσχυλ]εῖων. Suggestion of Arnaoutoglou (*per litt.*).
- II. 7–8: καὶ τὸν ἔρανον καὶ τ[– – – – –]εῖων; Foucart: καὶ τὸν ἔρανον καὶ τ[ὸν κύκλον δαν]εῖων. Foucart’s restoration is based upon a similar inscription from Eleusis: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1338 (Eleusis, after 86 BCE): καὶ τὸν κύκλον τῶν δανείων μεταπαρέδωκεν ἔκβα|ίνων ἐκ τῶν ἐπιμελειεῖων πολλοῖς ἐπευξημένον χρήμασιν.
- I. 8: ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός ὦν καὶ [δίκαιο]- (so Foucart): *IG* II<sup>2</sup> simply leaves the lines as ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός ὦν καὶ - - - - - . Since the line length is 24–28 letters, ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός ὦν καὶ [εὐνο]ς is one letter too short, even though the phrase is attested in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 808 and 1286.7. However, ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός καὶ δίκαιος ὦν is attested and fits the lacuna → *SEG* 37:102.4–5 (Piraeus, ca. 300 BCE): [ἀνὴρ ἀγαθ]ός καὶ δίκαιος ὦν [διατε]||[λεῖ περι τοῦς] Παράλους, [δεδο]χθαι...; *IG* VII 4257.7–8; *IC* 3.iv.3.7.
- I. 9: τὸν ὄρκον ὃν ὤμοσεν. Magistrates in Athens were required to swear an oath to act in accordance with the laws (Hansen 1991, 227). This appears to be another instance of associations mimicking the practices of the city.
- II. 11–12: Α[ἰσχυ]λίωνα Θεῶνος → *LGPN* 2:16[5]; *PAA* 115945, a metic.
- I. 12: ἰσοτελής: The *isoteleis* in Athens were a class of μέτοικοι (resident aliens) who were exempt from the alien tax (τὸ μετοίκιον) of twelve drachmae yearly. *Isoteleis* were not required to have a patron, as other metics were. Since the status represented an honor, such persons commonly identified themselves as *isoteleis*. (→ Glossary s.v. *isotelēs, metoikion, metoikos*).
- II. 16: Διονύσιον: *PAA* 337245; *LGPN* 2:127[915]. The lack of a patronym may indicate that Dionysios was a freedman. Foucart (1873, 9) argued that Dionysios was a slave: “Dionysios, sans ethnique et sans nom paternel, paraît bien n’avoir pas

- été un homme libre.” Poland (1090, 329 n.) objected: “Auf keinen Fall durfte [Foucart] bespielerweise einen harmlosen Dionysios um seine einfachen Namens willen ohne weiteres zum Sklaven stempeln.”
- II. 22–23: τῶι Διὶ τῶι | Σωτήρι, Zeus Sōtēr (“Savior): There was a temple to Zeus Sōtēr and Athena Sōteira in the Piraeus (Lykourgos, *Against Leocrates* 17, 136–37; Garland 1987, 104, 136–137 and Garland’s inscriptions, nos. 129–39, pp. 239–40). Successful voyagers were required to pay a tax of one drachma to the temple of Zeus Sōtēr (*IG I<sup>2</sup>* 128).
- II. 23–24: τοῖς Σωτήρσιν, “the saviors”: The “saviors” could refer to the Dioscuri (Parker 1996, 339 n.33), citing *IG XII/3* 422/1333 Suppl. p. 294 (Thera): βῶμόν ἔτευξε Διοσκουροῖς σωτήρσι θεοῖσιν | Περγαῖος Ἄρτεμίδωρος ἐπευχόμενοισι βοηθοῦς. See also Lucian *Alexander* 4: Διόσκουροι σωτήρες. Both Zeus and Athena bear the epithet *sōtēr/sōteira*, “savior,” but they are also associated with Asklepios and Hygieia by *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 783.6–8 (Athens, 162/3 BCE), honoring the priest of Zeus in Piraeus and the supervisors of the temples dedicated to various deities associated with Zeus Sōtēr: ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Σωτήρος τοῦ ἐμ Πειραιεὶ καὶ οἱ ἐπιμ[εληταὶ] | περὶ τῶν ἰερῶν ὧν ἔθουον [τ]ῶι τε Διὶ τῶι Σωτήρι καὶ τῆι Ἀθηνᾷ τε | Σω[τεῖραι καὶ] | τῶι Ἀσκληπιῶι καὶ τῆι Ὑγιείαι καὶ το[ῖς ἄλλοις] θεοῖς.

### Comments

This is a rather typical decree of an association honoring two of its officials, a treasurer and a secretary, for service. What makes this inscription of interest is the indication that Aischylion is a metic – his city of origin is not given – who had achieved the status of *isotelēs* in Athens, whereby he was exempt from paying the tax of 12 drachmae yearly imposed on all metics, and did not require a citizen as his patron (*prostatēs*). Although *isoteleis* did not enjoy the main benefits of citizenship, it was a status to be advertised. From the point of view of the association – probably comprised of other metics –, having an *isotelēs* as treasurer made clear the positive disposition of the association to Athens. The honoring of Zeus Sōtēr and Athena Sōteira, whom Garland describes as “foremost among all the deities worshipped in the Piraeus” (1987, 138), further underscored the loyalty of this group of metics to Athens at a time in the late third century when the Piraeus and Athens were not securely joined (the Long Walls were never rebuilt) and when Macedonian garrisons were stationed in the Piraeus (until 228 BCE when they abandoned Attica).

A second important aspect of this inscription concerns the use of the terms *eranistai* (II. 5–6, 9, 11, 15, 20, 27) and *eranos* (I. 7). Although both terms appear in this inscription, it is necessary to inquire how the two terms are related, if at all.

*Eranos* appears in Homer meaning a meal to which all contribute (*Od.* 1.226; 11.415). By the fifth century BCE it had come to mean “debt” (Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 615) or “fund” (Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 653) (Vondeling 1961, 15–27). The collective and financial aspect is stressed in Plato:

ἐράνων δὲ περὶ, τὸν βουλόμενον ἐρανίζειν φίλον παρὰ φίλοις· ἐὰν δὲ τις διαφορὰ γίγνηται περὶ τῆς ἐρανίσεως, οὕτω πράττειν ὡς δικῶν μηδενὶ περὶ τούτων μηδαμῶς ἐσομένων.

As far as friendly loans are concerned, whoever so wishes may collect as a friend among friends; but if any difference of opinion arises in respect to the collection, they must act on the understanding that in regard to these matters no legal actions are possible” (*Leges* 11.915E).

As Arnaoutoglou (2003, 74) points out, translators, influenced by a scholion to Plato, interpret *eranoi* as “club collections” (thus LCL). But it should be rendered “concerning friendly loans, let anyone who wishes to collect contributions as a friend from friends,” without any implication of the existence of a formal club structure or the practice of a communal meal. Only much later does *eranos* come to mean a club.

*Eranistai*, by contrast, means banqueters in Aristotle. In *EN* 4.2.20 (1123a 22) Aristotle lampoons the vulgar man who tastelessly gives a dinner for his *eranistai* on the scale of a wedding banquet (ἐρανιστᾶς γαμικῶς ἐστιῶν), and at *EN* 8.9.5 (1160a) he defines *thiasōtai* and *eranistai* as associations “which are unions for sacrifice and social intercourse” (αἴται γὰρ θυσίας ἔνεκα καὶ συνουσίας). Arnaoutoglou argues that from their beginnings as banqueters, *eranistai* “in the course of time crystallized and possibly institutionalized taking the form of an association, similar to other kinds of association[s] which already existed. The adoption of a religious pretext is already evident in the third century” (2003, 75).

Questions remain regarding whether and when *eranistai* constituted a real association as opposed to an ad hoc lending group. Finley (1952, 101–103) took the view that the *eranistai* mentioned in *horoi* inscriptions (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361.14–15 [4]) were not members of associations but ad hoc lending groups, and that “the earliest epigraphical documents of *eranos*-associations date in the middle of the 3rd century” (101; similarly Poland 1909, 29; Parker 1996, 337). Vondeling, by contrast, argued that the *eranistai* of the *horoi* inscriptions were already members of associations (1961, 138).

As Arnaoutoglou points out the evidence for *eranistai* as members of an association is well before the mid-third century: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2935 (324/3 BCE) is a dedication to Zeus Philios (of Friendship):

ἐρανισταὶ Διὶ | Φιλίῳ ἀνέθεσαν ἐφ’ Ἡγησίου ἄρχοντος

From the same period a dedication of eleven *eranistai* (including slaves) to Mēn Tyrannos might be mentioned (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2940; Laureion, IV BCE):

[Τυ]ράν[νοι Μηνι ἀν]έθ[ε]-  
[σα]ν ἐπ’ εὐτυχίας ἐρα-  
νισταὶ οἶδε Κάδους  
Μάνης Καλλίας  
Ἄττας Ἀρτεμίδω-

ρος Μάης Σωσίας  
 Σαγγάριος Ἐρμαί-  
 ος Τίβειος Ἴερμος.

Arnaoutoglou observes that “ad hoc groups would not proceed in such costly demonstrations of intimacy. Thus, it is not at all improbable that *eranistai* mentioned in *horoi* are actually associations and not simply lending groups” (2003, 78).

Two other association inscriptions from the late fourth century use the self-designation *eranistai*:

*SEG* 41:171 (300/299 BCE)

ὁ { } ταμίας καὶ οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ καὶ ὁ  
 γραμματεὺς, οἱ ἐπὶ Ἡγεμάχου ἄ[ρ]-  
 χοντος ἀνέθεσαν τῷ Πανκράτει  
 [στ]εφανωθέντες ὑπὸ τῶν ἐρανιστ-  
 [ῶ]ν ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ δικαιοσύνη-  
 [ς] τῆς περὶ τοὺς ἐρανιστάς.

<vacat>

<in a crown> ταμίας Μῦς

ἐπιμεληταὶ  
 Διονυσόδωρος Μιλήσιος {ς}  
 Εὐνοστος Θηβαῖος  
 Δημόφιλος Ἡρακλεώτης  
 Διονύσιος  
 γραμματεὺς  
 Κόνων Ἡρακλεώτης.

*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1265* (ca. 300 BCE)

[...8... εἶπεν· δεδόχθαι τοῖς ἐρανισταῖς, ἐπειδὴ  
 [Νίκων ταμίας τοῦ κοινοῦ γενό]μενος ἀφ’ οὗ χρόνου εἰ-  
 [σῆλθεν διατετέλεκεν φιλοτ]ιμούμενος καὶ ἐνδεικ-  
 [νύμενος τὴν αὐτοῦ εὐσέβειαν] καὶ τὴν εὐνοίαν εἰς τ-  
 5 [ὁ κοινόν· καὶ ἐπειδὴ Ἀγάθων ἐ]ροποῖός γενομένος π-  
 .....24.....αὶ ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ  
 [.....14..... ἐπαινέσαι μ]ὲν Νίκωνα καὶ Ἀγάθων-  
 [α .....20..... κ]αὶ στεφανῶσαι φιλοτιμ-  
 [ίας ἕνεκα· μερίσαι δ’ αὐτοῖς] τὸν ταμίαν εἰς στεφάνω-  
 10 [υς ... δραχμὰς καὶ λογίσασθα]ι τοῖς ἐρανισταῖς, ὅπ-  
 [ως πάντες εἰδώσιν ὅτι χάριτας ἀ]πολήγονται ὧν ἂν τ-  
 [ὁ κοινὸν εὐεργετώσι καὶ τοὺς ἐ]ρανιστάς.

vacat

Although *eranos* in Athenian inscriptions of the early Hellenistic period means “loan” or “fund,” by the first century CE *eranos* would come to mean “association” or “assembly” (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1369.40* [49]; *SEG* 31:122.38, 44 [50]; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1366.21* [53]). It is not clear, however, that *eranos* has yet made this terminological shift in either *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1291.7* or *1298.20* [20]. In *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1291.5–7* (κατὰ τοὺς νό]μους τοὺς κοινούς τ[ῶν ἐρανιστῶ]ν καὶ τὸν ἔρανον) it does not seem that οἱ ἐρανισταί and ὁ ἔρανος are intended as synonymous terms. On the

contrary, ὁ ἔρανος here probably means “the fund” (Arnaoutoglou, *per litt.*). The association in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1298 is called τὸ κοινὸν τῶν θιασωτῶν (ll. 8–9) and its members *thiasōtai* (ll. 12–13) or *synthiasōtai* (l. 17). The phrase in ll. 18–20, ἐπὶ ἀν καταβάλωσιν τὸ ἐπιβάλλο[ν] αὐτοῖς τοῦ ὑπάρχοντος ἀργυρίου κατὰ τὸ[ν ν]ό[μον] ἐν τῷ ἐράνωι, accordingly, should be rendered “when they contribute the (share) of the money that is their due in the ‘fund’, in accordance with the law.”

*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1291 and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1298 illustrate the complex functioning of these mid-third century associations. The financial aspect of the group represented by *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1291 is stressed in its honoring of its treasurer, Aischylion, for properly maintaining the common fund (compare *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1327 [35], where a treasurer underwrote association expenses when the common fund was depleted). The maintenance of a common fund is also stressed in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1298. Nevertheless, both associations were engaged in cultic activities. The *eranistai* of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1291 were involved in the cult of Zeus Soter and Herakles and had “sacrifice makers” (l. 22). Likewise, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1298 involves an association of *thiasōtai* devoted to Artemis Kallistē and, if they are the same group as that represented by *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1297, also had *hieropoioi* and conducted sacrifices. Whether the funds involved were for making of loans to members or whether they were for the conduct of the association’s activities remains unclear.

**Literature:** Arnaoutoglou 2003, 70–87; Leiwo 1997; Vondeling, Johannes. *Eranos*. Proefschrift University of Utrecht. Groningen: J.B. Wolters, 1961.

## [20] *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1298

### The *thiasōtai* of Artemis honor their secretary and treasurer

Athens (Attica) 248/7 BCE

Published: Stephanos A. Koumanoudes, *Athenaion* 8 (1879) 235 (*ed. pr.*); *IG* II, 5 618b; Kirchner, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1298; Michel, *RIG* 970; Dittenberger, *Syll*<sup>1</sup> 426 (Poland A19).

Publication Used: *RIG* 970, with Tracy 1988, 321.

Current Location: National Museum, Athens

Related Inscriptions: → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1297 [24] (236/5 BCE) (the same association); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1343 [48] (37/6 BCE).

Stoichedon (34 letters). 59 x 38 x 9.0 cm. Letter height: 0.5 cm. Marble tablet, broken at the top and bottom found near the Dipylon gate. Tracy (1988, 311–14; 2003, 129–49) identifies the cutter as that of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 788, responsible for at least fifty-seven inscriptions between 260 and 235/4 BCE, and the same cutter for *IG* II<sup>2</sup>



1297 [24]. Tracy (2003, 128) describes him as “one of the master cutters of his time.”

	[M]ενε[— — —]	— — —
	[Δ]ωρίων	Κα[λλίστιο]ν
	[Ν]ουμήνιος	Δόρκιον
	[Φ]ειδίας	Κόμψη
	[Σω]σιγένης	Σιμάλη
5	[Δίη]ς	Μηλίσ
	<i>vacat</i>	
	[ἀγα]θήη τύχη· ἐπὶ Διομέδοντος ἄρχοντος, Σ-	
	[κιρ]οφοριῶνος ἀγορᾷ κυρία· Διονύσιος Τ-	
	· · · · · ιος εἶπεν· δεδόχθαι τῷ κοινῷ τῶν θι-	
	[ασω]τῶν· ὅτι ἐπει τὰ τε ἄλλα πράττουσιν καλῶς	
10	[κ]αὶ εὐσεβῶς τὰ κατὰ τοὺς θεοὺς, ἀναθεῖναι	
	[α]ὐτοὺς καὶ στήλην ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμι-	
	[δο]ς καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα ἀναγράψαι τῶν θιασωτῶ-	
	[ν] πάντων, ἀναγράψαι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἱερειῶν τῶ-	
	[ν] ἅξι γενομένων κατ' [ἐ]νιαυτὸν ἀπὸ Διομέδο-	
15	[ν]τος ἄρχοντος ἐὰν δόξει τῷ κοινῷ ὀρθῶς ἐ-	
	[π]ιμεμελῆσθαι τῶν κατὰ τὴν θεόν· ὅτι ἀναγράψ-	
	αι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐπεισιόντων συνθιασωτῶν ὅτι	
	τὰ ὀνόματα ἐπὶ ἀναβαθμῶν τὸ ἐπιβάλλο-	
	[ν] αὐτοῖς τοῦ ὑπάρχοντος ἀργυρίου κατὰ τὸ-	
20	[ν] νόμον ἐν τῷ ἑράνῳ· ὅτι ἐνγραφέτω δὲ ἕκασ-	
	τος αὐτὸν τῷ αὐτοῦ ἀναλώματι μετὰ τοῦ ταμ-	
	[ί]ου καὶ τοῦ γραμματέως.	
	<i>vacat</i>	
23	τὸν ταμί-	τὸν γραμ-
	αν Διονύσιον	ματέα Θεόπροπον.
	· · · · ·	· · · · ·
	Mene —	— — —
	Dorion	Kallistion
	Noumenios	Dorkion
	Pheidias	Kompsē
	Sosigenēs	Simalē
	Diēs	Mēlis

For good fortune! In the year that Diomedon was archon, month of Skirophorion, at the regular meeting: Dionysios son of T . . . made the (following) motion: be it resolved by the association of *thiasōtai*: Whereas

(the aforementioned) have acted honorably and piously in all matters and in regard to the gods, let (the members) set up a stele in the temple of Artemis and inscribe the names of all of the *thiasōtai* on it and also inscribe (the names) of the priests who happened to serve in the year that Diomedon was archon, if it is agreed by the association that they properly administered the things pertaining to the gods. And (be it resolved) also to inscribe the names of the associates (*synthiasōtai*) who join, once they have contributed the (share) of the money that is their due in the “fund” (*eranos*), in accordance with the law. Each shall register himself and his dues with the treasurer and the secretary.

The treasurer

The secretary

Dionysios

Theopropos

### Notes

- l. 1: *IG* II<sup>2</sup>; *RIG*: ---; Tracy (1988, 321) reports traces of another name: [M]ενε[---].
- l. 2: [Δ]ωρίων: *PAA* 376690; *LGPN* 2:136[12]. Dow (1937, 196 n. 52) treats Dorion as a non-Athenian name, and observes that the first known citizen with this name is from 30 BCE. *FRA* 407 lists four persons by this name, two from Herakleia and two from Miletos.
- l. 5: [Δί]ης: *FRA* (nos. 7191, 7192) lists two Tyrians resident in Athens bearing this name, both from the second or first century BCE, one from Herakleia (*FRA* no. 1853) from the fourth century BCE and one from Melitos (*FRA* no. 4210) from the imperial period.
- l. 6: ἐπὶ Διομέδοντος ἄρχοντος. i.e., 245/4 BCE (Meritt 1981, 94–96; Osborne 2009, 91).
- l. 7: ἀγορᾶ κυρία → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1263.2–3 [11] note.
- ll. 8–9: τῶι κοινῶι τῶν θη[ασω]τῶν → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2347.5–6 [12] (note).
- ll. 11–12: ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τῆς Ἀρτέμι[δο]ς, “in the temple of Artemis.” Evidence for a temple of Artemis Ἀρίστη καὶ Καλλίστη comes from Pausanias (1.29.2), from excavations outside the Dipylon gate in 1890 and 1922 (Judeich 1931, 412), from a dedication of her priest, Antibios of Phrearrhioi (*SEG* 18.87; 246/5), and third century BCE dedications to Καλλίστη (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 788, 789) and a second century CE mention of a priest of [Ἀρτέμιδος] | Καλλίστης καὶ [Σωτείας... (Oliver 1941a, 242–43 [no. 42.5–6]). Even though *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1298 does not use Καλλίστη it seems that the temple in question is Pausanias’ temple to Artemis Kallistē. “Sotereia” is also attested as an epithet for Artemis. Since *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1343, honoring a ἱερεὺς τῆς Σωτείας and another inscription naming Ἀρτέμιδι Σωτεία[ι] (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4695), come from the same area as *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 788, 789 and 1298, Ferguson (1907, 213–14) argued that Artemis Soteira and Artemis Kallistē were “joined in a common cult administration by a single priest.” Three additional dedications to Kallistē were discovered, dating from the third century BCE (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4665, 4667, 4668) and two dedications to Artemis Soteira (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4631; Meritt 1941, 62–63). Edward H. Heffner (“Archaeological News,” *AJA* 32/3 [1928] 353–402, here 360) reports that most of the objects discovered at the site are ex-votos, mainly offered by or for women, since they represent female body parts. “The function of the goddess appears to have been as a protector of the virginity of maidens, a goddess to whom women desiring to become mothers prayed for help, and an attendant in the actual period of childbirth.”

- l. 17: συνθιασωτῶν occurs only here in Attic inscription, but συνθιασίτης, -ης appears in a few other inscriptions. See the *Index* s.v. συνθιασίτης, -ης.
- l. 19–20: κατὰ τὸ[ν] νό[μον]: on νόμος as the designation of a association's rule → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1278.2 [17] note*.
- l. 20: ἐν τῷ ἐράνῳ → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1291 [19] comment*.

### Comments

Since this inscription was discovered in proximity to the temple of Artemis Kallistē mentioned by Pausanias (1.29.2) and excavated near the Dipylon Gate, and since the temple is expressly mentioned (l. 11), it is likely that this association of men and women *thiasōtai* was connected with this temple. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297 [24]* was discovered in the same area and likely belongs to the same group, dating from only a few years later (Wilhelm 1905, 240). Tracy's conclusion that the cutter of 1298 is the same as that for 1297 and 788, a dedication to Kallistē, also suggests a common origin for the two inscriptions.

None of the names in 1298 or in 1297 has a demotic. For this reason, it has been usual to conclude that the members are non-citizens (Mikalson 1998, 148). Parker cautiously notes that demotics are added “to distinguish homonyms, not to mark status: those who lack them do so not necessarily because they lack citizenship, but because no other member of the group happens to share their name” (1996, 340). Perhaps more important is the fact, observed by Parker, that neither the *archeraniṣtēs* nor the proposer of the motion of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297* has a demotic, which likely indicates that both were non-citizens (*ibid.*). In the case of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1298*, however, the epithet following Dionysios in ll. 7–8 is uncertain. The ending suggests that it is not a patronym, and no Athenian demotic fits the space available. And Τύπιος is too short.

If Tracy (1988, 311–14) is correct that the cutter of the two inscriptions is also that for *IG II<sup>2</sup> 788* (235/4 BCE), it may be relevant that the city's decree commending the priest of Kallistē, Antidoros of the Pergase deme and hence a citizen, was cut at the same shop as the association's inscriptions of 245/4 and 236/5. However, as Mikalson points out (1998, 149), Antidoros of Pergase does not appear among the members in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297 [24]* nor are any of the citizens who made dedications to Kallistē (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 4665–68*) listed in the membership lists of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297* or 1298. This suggests that the association represented by *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297* or 1298 is a noncitizen association that used the temple of Artemis Kallistē, but was socially discontinuous with the citizens that worshipped there.

The list of members contains the names of six men (ll. 1–6 col. 1) and five women (ll. 2–6, col. 2) though presumably a woman's name is missing in the lacuna of l. 1). For separate listings of men and women, see *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297.21 [24]*. One is tempted to suppose that they represent families, but there is no way to prove or disprove this suggestion and in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297* it is not possible to coordinate the male names (col. 1–2) and female names (cols. 3–4) into

families. Since the inscription indicates that only those who have paid their dues are eligible to have their names inscribed, one should conclude that both sexes paid dues to the association. Artemis Kallistē was evidently popular among women (see the note on ll. 11–12). If this association is the same as that represented by *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1297 [24], the group’s activities involved sacrifices made by *hieropoioi* as well as the collection of dues (for banquets? → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1291 *comment*).

**Literature:** Dow 1937; Ferguson 1907, esp. 213–14; Masson 1997; Parker 1996, 340; Tracy 1988, 321; Wilhelm 1905, 234–44.

### [21] *SEG* 2:9

## Honorific decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis

Salamis

243/2 BCE

Published: Antonios D. Keramopoulos, *Ὁ Ἀποτυμπανισμός. Συμβολή ἀρχαιολογική εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τοῦ ποινικοῦ δικαίου καὶ τὴν λαογραφίαν* (Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθῆναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας no. 22; Athens: Typographeion “Hestia,” 1923) 113–15 (*ed. pr.*; ph.); *SEG* 2:9; Gaetano De Sanctis, “Gli arconti ateniesi del secolo III,” *RFil* 51 (1923) 167–186, here 170–71; Johannes Kirchner, “Zur Chronologie der attischen Archonten des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.,” *Philologisches Wochenschrift* 44 no. 36 (1924) 869–77; Dow 1936, Plate III (ph.), IV (facsimile); Tracy 2003, 118–24 (ph.); Osborne 2004–2009, 662–63 (no. 5).

Publication Used: *SEG* 2:9, with corrections from Tracy 2003 and Osborne 2004–2009.

Current Location: Piraeus, National Museum

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 383.A.ii.V.143 = I<sup>2</sup> 310.208 (Athens, 429/8 BCE): Treasury accounts of other gods, mentioning Bendis; *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 136 (*LSCGSup* 6) (Athens, 432/1 or 411 BCE): A Council decree pertaining to the public worship of Bendis; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255 [2] (Piraeus, 337/6 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1496 (Piraeus, 334/3–331/0 BCE): Treasury accounts; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361 [4] (Piraeus, 330–324/3 BCE): Regulations concerning the cult of Bendis; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1256 [5] (Piraeus, 329/8 BCE): Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317 (Salamis, 272/1 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis honoring their treasurer and his *synepimelētai*; *SEG* 2:10 (Salamis, 251/0 BCE): Honorary decree for *epimelētai* of Bendis(?); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1284 [22] (241/0 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283 [23] (Piraeus, 240/39 BCE); *SEG* 44:60 (Steinhauer 1993, 13–17 [ph.]) (Salamis, 244/3 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis for their officers; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317b (Salamis, 249/8 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis, honoring their officials; *Agora* 16:245 = *SEG* 21:531 = Meritt

1961b, 227 [no. 25] (Athens, III BCE): “Probably a decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis” (Meritt); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1324 [32] (Piraeus, ca. 190 BCE): Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis honoring Stephanos; *Agora* 16:329 = *SEG* 19:125 = Meritt 1960, 21 (Athens, II/I BCE): Fragment of a decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis and Deloptes.

A marble stele, 44 x 37–38.5 x 8.0–10.0 cm. thick, with a moulding at the top (rather than a pediment), discovered in the harbour area of Salamis. The stone is broken along the bottom on a diagonal, with the left side longer than the right. According to Dow (1936, 67–68) *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317b, *SEG* 2:9 and *SEG* 2:10 are all from the same workshop, and *SEG* 2:9 and *SEG* 2:10 were likely cut from the same block. He observes that the dimensions of the three stele were almost identical: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317b (87.5 x 37–40 x 10 cm.); *SEG* 2:10 (88 x 37–38.5 x 10 cm.); *SEG* 2:9 (44 [preserved] x 37–38.5 [preserved] x 8.0–10.0) and the letter height (+ one interspace) is identical at 1.18 cm. The wreaths are cut by the same hand. Tracy 2003, 118–27 identifies the cutter of *SEG* 2:9 to be also responsible for *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1284 [22]; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317b; *SEG* 2:10 and Piraeus Museum inv. 6657 (Steinhauer 1993). Tracy concludes: “This workman appears to have been localized on Salamis and in Piraeus, where he inscribed texts, so far as is known to us, only for various groups associated with the worship of Bendis” (Tracy 2003, 127).

- ἐπὶ Κυδήνορος ἄρχοντος, Ἀνθεστηριῶνος τρίτει ἰσταμένου,  
κυρίαί ἀγοραί, Βάτραχος εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ τῶν θιασωτῶν κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν  
οἱ καθιστάμενοι εἰς τὰς ἐπιμελείας καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως ἐπιμε-  
μέληνται τῶν τε θυσιῶν, ὡς αὐτοῖς πάτριόν ἐστιν, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων  
5 ὄσων αὐτοῖς ὁ νόμος προστάττει καὶ τοὺς λόγους ἀποδεδώκα-  
σι, δεδόχθαι τῷ κοινῷ ἐπαιέσαι αὐτοὺς καὶ στεφανῶσαι καὶ ἀ-  
ναγράψαι κατ’ ἐνιαυτὸν ἐκάστην τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ἀπὸ Πολυεύκτου  
ἄρχοντος μέχρι Θεοφήμου· ἐλέσθαι δὲ τρεῖς ἄνδρας, οἵτινες λα-  
βόντες τὸ ἐξαίρεθὲν ἀργύριον ἀναθήσουσι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν στήλη[v]  
10 καὶ ἀναγράψουσι τὸ τε ψήφισμα καὶ τοὺς ἐστεφανωμέν[ους]  
κατ’ ὄνομα ἕκαστον· οἱ δὲ αἰρεθέντες λόγον ἀποδότωσαν το[ῦ]  
ἐξαίρεθέντος ἀργυρίου εἰς τὸ ἀνάθημα. ὡ οἶδε εἰρέθησαν· ὡῶ  
Βάτραχος, Δόκιμος, Κράτης. *vacat*  
ἐπὶ Πολυεύκτου ἄρχοντος ἐπιμεληταί
- 15 ἐπὶ Κυδήνορος ἐπιμεληταί  
<olive branch> <olive branch>
- 15α Εὐτυχίδης, Θάλλος. Τίβειος, Ἀρτέμων, Θάλλος  
γραμματεὺς· Βάτραχος. γραμματεὺς· Ἀρχέπολις  
ταμίας· Κτήσιππος. ταμίας· Κράτης.  
<olive branch> *vacat*
- 20 ἐπὶ Ἰέρωνος ἐπιμεληταί· ἐπ’ Εὐρυκλείδου·  
Διότιμος, Δημήτριος, Πύρρος. γραμματεὺς· Β[άτραχος ?]  
γραμματεὺς· Ἀρχέπολις. ταμίας· Κρ[άτης].  
ὡῶ *vacat*

- ταμίας· Βάτραχος.  
 <olive branch>  
 ἐπὶ Διομέδοντος ἐ[πιμεληταί].  
 Ξένων, Ἀμφίπ[ολις],  
 25 Θάλλος, ΑΓ ---  
 γραμμα[τεύς: ---]  
 [ταμίας ---- ]  
 <olive branch>  
 [ἐπὶ Θεοφήμου ἐπιμεληταί]  
 30 [----- ]  
 γραμμα[τεύς: ---]  
 [ταμίας ---- ]  
 vacat

In the year that Kydenor was archon, third of Anthesterion in the regular assembly, Batrachos made the (following) motion: Whereas those members who have been appointed annually to roles of supervision have carried them out honorably and with zeal, both in respect to the sacrifices – as it is customary for them – and in respect to all the other matters which the law enjoins, and have rendered their accounts (in order), it was resolved by the association to commend and to crown them and to inscribe their roles, year by year, beginning from the archonship of Polyeuktos up to that of Theophemos; and that the association should choose three men who, after receiving the money that has been set aside for this purpose, shall set up a stele in the temple and shall inscribe it with this decree and with the names of each of those who have been thus crowned; and those chosen (to do this) shall render an account of the money that was set aside for the votive plaque. The following were chosen: Batrachos, Dokimos and Krates.

Supervisors when Polyeuktos was archon:

<olive branch>

Eutychides, Thallos.

Secretary: Batrachos

Treasurer: Ktēsippos

<olive branch>

Supervisors when

Hieron was archon:

Diotimos, Demetrios, Pyrrhos.

Secretary: Archepolis

Treasurer: Batrachos

Supervisors when Kydenor

(was archon):

<olive branch>

Tibeios, Artemon, Thallos

Secretary: Archepolis.

Treasurer: Krates

vacat

<Supervisors> when

Eurykleides (was archon)

Secretary: B[atrachos?].

Treasurer: Krates

vacat

<olive branch>

Supervisors when Diomedon was archon

Zenon, Amphipolis,

Thallos, AG...

Secretary: ...

[Treasurer: ...

<olive branch>

[Supervisors when Theophemos was archon]

[Secretary: ...]

[Treasurer: ...]

*vacat*

### Notes

- II.1, 15: ἐπὶ Κυδήνορος ἄρχοντος: i.e., 245/4 BCE. The dating of the archon cycle is debated, with varying dates proposed by Meritt (242/1 BCE; Meritt 1981, 95), Osborne (1989; 2000; 2003), and Habicht 1997. The most recent study by Osborne 2009, 92 proposes 245/4 BCE which I use here, but with the necessary caveats.
- I. 2: κυρίαὶ ἀγοραὶ → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1263.2–3 [11] *note*.
- II. 2, 13, 19: Βάτραχος: *PAA* 264115; *LGN* 2:87[12]. According to Bechtel (1917, 581) a Thracian name. However, FRA no. 7324 lists a Batrachos from Oreos (Euboea; V/IV BCE).
- I. 5: ὁ νόμος → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1278.2 [17] *note*.
- II. 7–8, 14: ἀπὸ Πολυεύκτου ἄρχοντος: i.e., 250/49 BCE (Osborne 2009, 91).
- I. 8: μέχρι Θεοφῆμου: i.e., 247/6 BCE (Osborne 2009, 92).
- I. 15: Τίβειος: *PAA* 882260; *LGN* 2:427[10]. According to Bechtel (1917, 543) a Paphlagonian name. Also attested as a slave name in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1951.69, 145; 2937.7; 2940.8; Theophrastos, *Characters* 9.3; Lucian, *Somn.* 29; *Philops.* 30 (Fragiadakis 1986, 17, 19, 20)
- I. 18: ἐπ’ Εὐρυκλείδου: i.e., 243/2 BCE (Osborne 2009, 92).
- I. 19: ἐπὶ Ἰέρωνος (ἄρχοντος)... ἐπ’ Εὐρυκλείδου: i.e., 249/8 and 243/2 BCE respectively (Osborne 2009, 91–92).
- I. 23: ἐπὶ Διομέδοντος (ἄρχοντος): i.e., 248/7 BCE (Osborne 2009, 91). Meritt dated Diomedon to 245/4 BCE (Meritt 1981, 94–96).

### Comments

The inscription calls for the names of the supervisors (*epimelētai*) from the archonship of Polyeuktos to those of Theophēmos to be inscribed, that is, from 250/49 to 247/6. Since the bottom portion of the stele has broken off, Dow (1936, 69) argued that “[t]he natural inference is that, like the other two [related inscriptions, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317b and *SEG* 2:10], its original height was 0.88 m., so that actually just one half of the stele is preserved.” He argues, further, that if each annual entry occupies 7.1 cm. vertically, the remaining space might allow for five additional years but, allowing for a bottom margin of 15–20 cm., more

likely only two or three additional entries (1936, 69). There are reasons, however, to think that the space below Theophēmos was not inscribed (→ below).

There are two peculiarities to the list of names. First, all of the names mandated by the decree itself (i.e., the *epimelētai* from 250/9 to 247/6) appear in the left hand column. This results in a highly asymmetrical arrangement. One might have expected five or six sets of names to have been distributed over two columns (Osborne 1989, 214). Second, the presence of two sets of names in the right hand column dating from a period *after* Theophēmos' archonship in 247/6 indicates that after the passing of the decree, it was decided to add the names for the years 245/4 and 243/2. Both Meritt (1981, 82) and Osborne (1989, 214) had suggested that the cutter for the names associated with Eurykleides is not the same as those for Polyeuktos to Kydenor; but Tracy now confirms that the cutter is the same. Tracy observes, however, that the name of Kydenor is not properly aligned with the names in col. 1. The cutter achieved an alignment

by crowding in the year-rubric for Kydenor and the olive branch into the vertical space between lines 14 and 15 of column I. When he came some months, perhaps as much as a year (or more!), later to add the officials of Eurykleides' year..., he was much less careful about the alignment of the columns." (Tracy 2003, 123)

Eurykleides also lacks an olive branch. Osborne suggests that the lower right hand column was deliberately left blank to accommodate the addition of names after the stele was erected (1989, 214).

With Osborne's dating of the archons the arrangement of the honorees is as follows:

<i>Archon</i>	<i>col. 1</i>	<i>Archon</i>	<i>col. 2</i>
Polyeuktos	250/49	Kydenor	245/4
Hieron	249/8	Eurykleides	243/2
Diomedon	248/7		
[Theophemos]	247/6		

No deity is named in the inscription. There are, however, good grounds to suppose that the temple in l. 9 refers to a temple of Bendis. The three other Salaminian inscriptions related to *SEG* 2:9 – *SEG* 2:10 (248/7 BCE), *SEG* 44:60 (244/3 BCE) and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317b (249/8 BCE) – and one Piraeian inscription (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1284) come from a Bendis association, and all five of these inscriptions are from the same workshop (*SEG* 2:9 and *SEG* 2:10 are likely from the same marble block). The Salaminian inscriptions have a very similar form:

*SEG* 2:10 (Salamis [acropolis], 251/0 BCE)

Θ Ε Ο [Ι].

ἐπι Θερσιλόχου ἄρχοντος, Σκιροφοριῶνος δευτέρα ἰσταμένον, κυρία ἀγορά· Νικίας εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ οἱ κατασταθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινού καλῶς καὶ φιλοτίμως ἐπεμελήθησαν τῶν τε θυσίων τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τῶν ἄλ-

5



- λων ἀπάντων τῶν περι τὸ κοινὸν καὶ τοὺς λόγους ἀπέδω-  
καν τῶν ἀνηλωμένων, ἀγαθῆι τύχηι· δεδόχθαι τοῖς θια-  
σώταις ἐπαινεῖσαι αὐτοὺς καὶ στεφανῶσαι ἕκαστον αὐ-  
τῶν θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ δικαιοσύνης·
- 10 Ῥύθμον ἐπιμελητὴν, Ὀνήσιμον ἐπιμελητὴν, Ὀφελίωνα ἐπι-  
μελητὴν, ταμίαν Δόκιμον, γραμματέα Στρατοκλήν, Ἐλευσί-  
νιον ἱερέα.  
in coronis :
- 13 Ῥύθμον Ὀνήσιμον Ὀφελίωνα  
Δόκιμον Στρατοκλήν

IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317b (Salamis [acropolis], 249/8 BCE)

- [Θ] Ε Ο [Γ].  
ἐπὶ Ἱερόνος ἄρχοντος καὶ ἱερέως Χαρίνου· μὴνός Σκιροφοριῶνος  
δευτέραι ἱσταμένου· κυρίαί ἀγοραί· ἔδοξεν τῷ κοινῷ· Ῥύθμος εἴ-  
πεν· ἐπειδὴ οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ οἱ κατασταθέντες ἐπεμελήθησαν τῶν  
5 τε θυσιῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων τῶν περι τὸ ἱερόν τῆς Βεν-  
δίδος, δεδόχθαι τῷ κοινῷ τῶν θιασωτῶν ἐπαινεῖσαι αὐτοὺς  
καὶ στεφανῶσαι ἕκαστον αὐτῶν, μερίσαι δὲ τὸν ταμίαν ΔΠ·  
δραχμάς· τοῦτο δὲ λαβόντες οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ ἀνατέθωσαν  
εἰς τὸ ἱερόν τῆς Βενδίδος.  
*in crowns*
- |                |             |             |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|
| 10 οἱ θιασῶται | οἱ θιασῶται | οἱ θιασῶται |
| Χαρίνον        | Μένωνα      | Νικίαν      |
| ἱερέα.         | ἐπιμελητὴν. | ἐπιμελητὴν. |
| οἱ θιασῶται    | οἱ θιασῶται | οἱ θιασῶται |
| Νίκαρχον       | Χαρίνον     | Στρατοκλήν  |
| 15 ἐπιμελητὴν. | ταμίαν.     | γραμματέα.  |

SEG 44:60 (Salamis [harbour area], 244/3 [Osborne 2009, 92])

- Θ Ε Ο Γ  
ἐπὶ Λυσιάδου ἄρχοντος, Σκιροφοριῶνος δευτέραι ἱσταμένου, ἀγοραί  
κυρίαί, Βάτραχος εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ καὶ ὁ γραμματεὺς ἐπε-  
μελήθησαν τῶν θυσιῶν τοῖς θεοῖς καθ' ἃ πάτριόν ἐστι, καὶ τῶν ἄλ-  
5 λων πάντων ὧν οἱ νόμοι προστάττουσιν, ἀγαθῆι τύχηι· δεδόχθαι  
τοῖς θιασώταις ἐπαινεῖσαι αὐτοὺς καὶ στεφανῶσαι ἕκαστον αὐ-  
τῶν θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν καὶ δικαιοσύνης, τὸν δὲ  
ταμίαν μερίσαι εἰς τὸν στέφανον Δ δραχμ[ά]ς· [αὐτοὺς δὲ λα]-  
βόντας τὸ ἀργύριον ἀναθεῖναι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν τῆς Βενδίδος].

As can be seen, the orator of SEG 2:10, Nikias, is also named as an honoree by IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317b (and IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317). Rythmos, the orator of IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317b, is an honoree of SEG 2:10, and Batrachos, the orator of SEG 44:60, is a multiple honoree of SEG 2:9. SEG 2:10 and IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317b (and IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317) share a reference to Stratokles the secretary. All come from an association that met on the second of the month. As Osborne has pointed out, however, the officers listed for the archonship of Hieron by SEG 2:9 differ from those listed for the same year in IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317b (Osborne 2004–2009, 665).

SEG 2:9

*epimelētai*: Diotimos, Demetrios, Pyrrhos

*grammateus*: Archepolis

*tamias*: Batrachos

*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317b*

*epimelētai*: Menon, Nikias, Nikarchos

*grammateus*: Stratokles

*tamias*: Charinos

*hierous*: Charinos

This implies that at least by 249/8 there were two groups of *thiasōtai* of Bendis in Salamis. The earliest Salaminian group attested in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317* (272/1 BCE) and *SEG 2:10* (251/0 BCE) was located on the acropolis (along with *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317b*). The group represented by *SEG 2:9* and *SEG 44:60* was from the harbour area. Since the acropolis group is unattested after *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317b*, Steinhauer (1993, 44) and Osborne (2004–2009, 667–68) conclude that the Antigonid general Herakleitos of Athmonon expelled the “acropolis group” from the city sometime after 249/8 BCE for reasons of security. The “harbour group,” founded about 250 BCE (archon: Polyuktos) decided in 245/4 BCE (archon: Kydenor) to begin recording the names of its officers. Osborne thinks that Batrachos, the founding member of the harbour group, initiated the cutting of a decree that would list the officers of the group from its foundation to Theophēmos’s archonship because, in contrast to the practice of the acropolis group, the harbour group had not been in the habit of honoring its officers annually. He conjectures that the officers of 246/5 BCE (archon: Philoneos) had already been honored with a stele and *SEG 44:60* (archon: Lysiades) from the year following Kydenor shows that these officers has received recognition; but those in the “missing years” of 250–246, which included Batrachos himself, had not been honored. At some later date, the officers for 245/4 and 243/2 were added, including Batrachos again, serving as secretary in 243/2 BCE (Osborne 2004–2009, 669).

None of the persons named in these four inscriptions is given a patronym or a demotic. Some of the names, moreover, are likely of servile origin and, as Taylor has argued, point to the presence of a substantial number of slaves on Salamis (1997, 137, referring also to *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2347 [12]*):

Amphipolis (*SEG 2:9*)

Archepolis (*SEG 2:9*)

Artemon (*SEG 2:9*)

Batrachos (*SEG 2:9; 44:60*)

Charinos (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317b*)

Demetrios (*SEG 2:9*): a common name, but also attested as a slave name (Fragiadakis 1986, 345).

Diotimos (*SEG 2:9*)

Dokimos (*SEG 2:10*): the name of a freedman in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1569.29–30* (Fragiadakis 1986, 346)

Eleusinius (*SEG 2:10*)

Eutychides (*SEG 2:9*): a slave name (Fragiadakis 1986, 350).  
 Krates (*SEG 2:9*)  
 Ktēsippos (*SEG 2:9*)  
 Mēnon (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317b*): attested as a slave name (Fragiadakis 1986, 360).  
 Nikarchos (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317b*)  
 Nikias (*SEG 2:10; IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317b*): Fragiadakis 1986, 362  
 Onēsimos (*SEG 2:10*): a common slave name (Fragiadakis 1986, 364)  
 Ophelion (*SEG 2:10*)  
 Pyrrhos (*SEG 2:9*): Πυρρίας and Πύρρος are both attested as slave names (Fragiadakis 1986, 367).  
 Rythmos (*SEG 2:10; IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317b*)  
 Stratokles (*SEG 2:10; IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317b*)  
 Thallos (*SEG 2:9*) is attested as a slave name in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2934.2* (Fragiadakis 1986, 352).  
 Tibeios (*SEG 2:9*): a slave name (see the note above on l. 15).  
 Zēnon (*SEG 2:9*)

There are other indications that the Bendis group involved was not a citizen association. The other citizen associations devoted to Bendis had *hieropoioi* as officers, but this functionary is not attested in any of the four inscriptions under discussion. On the contrary, the officials are the regular trio of *epimelētai*, *tamias*, and *grammateus* attested in other Thracian Bendis groups.

It is striking that the Salaminian Bendis group referred to itself as *thiasōtai*. The Athenian and Piraean Bendis groups, whether comprised of citizens (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255 [2]?*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1361 [4]*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1256 [5]*) or Thracians (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1283 [23]*; *1284 [22]*), referred to themselves as *orgeōnes*. The Salaminian groups represented by *SEG 2:9, 2:10; IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317b* and *SEG 44:60* are unanimous in calling themselves *thiasōtai* and avoiding *orgeōnes* entirely.

**Literature:** Dow 1936; Meritt 1981; Osborne 1989; 2000; 2003; 2004–2009; Taylor 1997.

## [22] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1284*

### Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis honoring two members

Piraeus (Attica)

241/0 BCE

Published: Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1284* (Poland A3d–e).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1284*.

Current Location: Museum in the Piraeus.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG I<sup>3</sup> 383.A.ii.V.143 = I<sup>2</sup> 310.208* (Athens, 429/8 BCE):

Treasury accounts of other gods, mentioning Bendis; *IG I<sup>3</sup> 136 (LSCGSup 6)* (Athens, 432/1 or 411 BCE): A Council decree pertaining to the public worship of Bendis; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255 [2]* (Piraeus, 337/6 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1496*

(Piraeus, 334/3–331/0 BCE): Treasury accounts; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361 [4] (Piraeus, 330–324/3 BCE): Regulations concerning the cult of Bendis; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1256 [5] (Piraeus, 329/8 BCE): Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317 (Salamis, 272/1 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis honoring their treasurer and his *synepimelētai*; *SEG* 2:10 (Salamis, 251/0 BCE): Honorary decree for *epimelētai* of Bendis(?); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317b (Salamis, 249/8 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis, honoring their officials; *SEG* 44:60 (Salamis, 244/3 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis for their officers; *SEG* 2:9 [21] (Salamis, 243/2 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis(?) honoring *epimelētai*; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283 [23] (Piraeus, 240/39 BCE); *Agora* 16:245 = *SEG* 21:531 = Meritt 1961b, 227 [no. 25] (Athens, III BCE): “Probably a decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis” (Meritt); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1324 [32] (Piraeus, ca. 190 BCE): Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis honoring Stephanos; *Agora* 16:329 = *SEG* 19:125 = Meritt 1960, 21 (Athens, II/I BCE): Fragment of a decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis and Deloptes.

Non-stoichedon (29–33 letters). 48 x 32 x 11 cm. Letter height: 0.5 cm. The cutter has made a few mistakes, e.g., in l. 9, he first wrote ὀργεῖωνας but then erased EI and substituted (incorrectly) Y. On l. 23 the cutter first wrote ὀργυῶνων and then inscribed an *epsilon* over the Y. Tracy 2003, 118–27 identifies the cutter of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1284 (241/0 BCE) as the one also responsible for *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1317b; *SEG* 2:9 [21] (243/2 BCE); *SEG* 2:10 (251/0 BCE) and *SEG* 44:60 (244/3 BCE; Steinhauer 1993). Tracy concludes: “This workman appears to have been localized on Salamis and in Piraeus, where he inscribed texts, so far as known to us, only for various groups associated with the worship of Bendis” (Tracy 2003, 127).

[----- ὀργ]εων-  
 ----- και τη  
 ----- ὅπως ὡς  
 [----- κ]αι ἐν τοῖς  
 5 [ἄλλοις εὐχρηστον αὐτὸν παρασ]κευάζων  
 [καὶ ἀποδεικνύμενος ἦ]ν ἔχει εὐνοια-  
 [ν πρὸς ἅπαντας τοὺς ὀργ]εῶνας. ὅπως ἂν  
 [εἰδῶσιν ἅπαντες οἱ β]ουλόμενοι φιλοτι-  
 [μείσθαι εἰς τοὺς] ὀργ[ε]ῖωνας ὅτι κομιοῦντ-  
 10 [αι χάριτας κα]ταξίας ὧν ἂν εὐεργετήσωσ-  
 [ι· ἀγαθεὶ τ]ύχει δεδῶσθαι τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν  
 [ἐπαινέ]σαι Ὀλυμπον Ὀλυμπιοδώρου καὶ  
 [στεφ]ανῶσαι δρυὸς στεφάνωι φιλοτιμ-  
 [ίας] ἔνεκεν καὶ εὐνοίας ἧς ἔχων διατε-  
 15 λεῖ περὶ τε τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τοὺς ὀργεῶνας· [ἀ]-  
 ναγράψαι δὲ τὸδε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γρα[μμ]-  
 ατέα ἐν στήλει λιθίνει καὶ στήσαι ἐν [τῶι]  
 ἱερῶι, τὸν δὲ ταμίαν μερίσαι δραχ[μ]άς ·· ]  
 <vacat>

- 20 ἐπὶ Λυκέου ἄρχοντος μηνὸς Σ[κιροφο]-  
ριῶνος ὀγδόει ἰσταμένου· ἀγο[ρά]ι κυρί]-  
αι· Σωσίας Ἴπποκράτου εἶπεν· ἐπ[ειδὴ Εὐ]-  
κλείδης γραμματεὺς αἰρεθεὶς [πλείω]  
ἔτη ὑπὸ τῶν ὀργ[υ]εῶνων διώ[ικηκεν τὰ πρ]-  
25 οσταττόμεν' αὐτῶι ὑ[πὸ τ]ῶν νόμων ὀρθ-  
ῶς καὶ δικαίως ἀν[έγκ]λητον αὐτὸν παρέ-  
χων καὶ [περὶ] ὧν οἰκονόμηκεν λόγον καὶ  
[εὐθύ]ν[α]ς δέδωκεν, ἀγαθεὶ τύχει δεδόχ-  
[θαι τ]οῖς ὀργεῶσιν ἐπαινεῖσαι Εὐκλείδην  
30 [Ἀ]ντιμάχου καὶ στεφανῶσαι δρυὸς στε-  
φάνωι φιλοτιμίας ἔνεκεν καὶ δικαιοσύ-  
νης τῆς εἰς τοὺς ὀργεῶνας· ἀναγράψαι  
δὲ τὸδε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γραμματέα ἐ-  
ν στήλει λιθίνει καὶ στήσαι ἐν τῶι ἱ[ερ]-  
ῶι, τὸν δὲ ταμίαν μερίσαι δραχμάς · · ·  
<two crowns>

. . . *orgeōnes*. . . so that. . . and in other matters he proved to be of service and displayed the good will which he held toward all of the *orgeōnes*. So that all who wish to be ambitious toward the *orgeōnes* might know that they shall receive thanks worthy of whoever should act as a benefactor: – for good fortune, it was resolved by the *orgeōnes* to commend Olympos son of Olympiodoros and to crown him with an oak wreath, on account of the zeal and good will that he continually exhibits toward both the temple and the *orgeōnes*. The secretary shall inscribe this decree on a stele and set it up in the temple, and the treasurer shall pay . . . drachmae. . .

*vacat*

- 19 In the year that Lykeas was archon, on the eighth of the month of Skirophorion, the regular assembly, Sosias son of Hippokrates made (the following) motion: Whereas Eukleides, who was chosen as secretary has for many years managed properly and in an upright manner those matters that were made his responsibility by the laws, showing himself to be blameless and gave an accurate account in regard to the things he managed; with good fortune, it was resolved by the *orgeōnes* to commend Eukleides son of Antimachos and to crown him with an oak wreath on account of the zeal and honesty that he has exhibited with respect to the *orgeōnes*. The secretary shall inscribe the decree on a stele and set it up in the temple, and the treasurer shall pay. . . drachmae. . .

### Notes

II. 9–10: κομιοῦντ[αι χάριτας κα]ταξίας → IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252+999.21 [6] *note*.

II. 11, 15, 28, 31: ὀργεῶνες → IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255.1 [2] *note*.

- l. 12: Ὀλυμπον Ὀλυμπιοδώρου: (*PAA* 743995; *LGPN* 2:351[28]). This person is not otherwise attested.
- l. 19: ἐπὶ Λυκέου ἄρχοντος. The exact date of Lykeas is not completely secure, but the most recent reconstruction of the archon list by Osborne (2009, 98) puts Lykeas at 241/0 BCE. Since l. 21 mentions an otherwise unknown orator, Sosias son of Hippokrates, also named in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283.2 (240/39 BCE), *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1284 should be placed close to the date of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283. Osborne's date for Lykeas fits well.
- ll. 20/1: ἀγο[ρᾶι κυρί]αι → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1263.2–3 [11] *note*.
- l. 21: Σωσίας Ἴπποκράτου (*PA* 1317b.6; *PAA* 859500; *LGPN* 2:415[40]) is also known from *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283.3 [23] (240/39 BCE).
- ll. 21–22, 28–29: Εὐκλείδην | [Α]ντιμάχου: *PAA* 435990; *LGPN* 2:174[74]. Not otherwise attested.
- ll. 22–23: [πλείω] | ἔτη → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1323.8 [31] *comment*.

### Comments

On the foundation of the cult of Bendis in Athens, see below *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283 [23]. The inscription comes from the Piraean (Thracian) Bendis group rather than the Athenian group and is a rather straightforward honorific inscription. Since the top of the inscription is missing and l. 19 begins with a new date, it seems likely that the top half of the inscription honoring Olympos comes from an earlier time.

Both of the honorees in this inscriptions and the mover of the motion in l. 21 are freeborn. Sosias son of Hippocrates is also known from the Thracian Bendis group (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283.3 [23]) and we should probably also assume that both Olympos and Eukleides were freeborn members of the Thracian association.

Like other groups, this association cultivated benefactors with the explicit promise that they would be honored in a manner commensurate with their benefactions.

**Literature:** Ferguson 1949; Foucart 1902; Garland 1992; Nilsson 1942; Pache 2001; Simms 1988.

[23] *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1283Decree of the Thracian *orgeōnes* of Bendis

Piraeus (Attica)

240/39 BCE

Published: Wilhelm 1902, 127–139 (ph.) (*ed. pr.*); Prott and Ziehen, *LGS II* 119–22 (no. 42); Michel, *RIG* 1551; Kirchner, *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1283; Sokolowski, *LSCG*, 84–85 (no. 46); Le Guen-Pollet 1991, 41–46 (no. 7) (Poland A3c).

Publication used: *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1283.

Current Location: Piraeus Museum.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG I*<sup>3</sup> 383.A.ii.V.143 = I<sup>2</sup> 310.208 (Athens, 429/8 BCE):

Treasury accounts of other gods, mentioning Bendis; *IG I*<sup>3</sup> 136 (*LSCGSup* 6) (Athens, 432/1 or 411 BCE): A Council decree pertaining to the public worship of Bendis; *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1255 [2] (Piraeus, 337/6 BCE); *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1361 [4] (Piraeus, 330–324/3 BCE): Regulations concerning the cult of Bendis; *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1496 (Piraeus, 334/3–331/0 BCE): treasury accounts; *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1256 [5] (Piraeus, 329/8 BCE): Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis; *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1317 (Salamis, 272/1 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis honoring their treasurer and his *synepimelētai*; *SEG* 2:10 (Salamis, 251/0 BCE): Honorary decree for *epimelētai* of Bendis(?); *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1317b (Salamis, 249/8 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis, honoring their officials; *SEG* 44:60 (Salamis, 244/3 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis for their officers; *SEG* 2:9 [21] (Salamis, 243/2 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis(?) honoring *epimelētai*; *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1284A–B [22] (Piraeus, 241/0 BCE): Two honorary decrees of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis; *Agora* 16:245 = *SEG* 21:531 = Meritt 1961b, 227 [no. 25] (Athens, III BCE): “Probably a decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis” (Meritt); *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1324 [32] (Piraeus, ca. 190 BCE): Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis honoring Stephanos; *Agora* 16:329 = *SEG* 19:125 = Meritt 1960, 21 (Athens, II/I BCE): Fragment of a decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis and Deloptes.

Stoichedon (45 letters). 41 x 42.2 x 65 cm.; letter height: 0.5 cm. Stele of white marble with a relief above, broken down and to the right. Tracy (1988, 305) identified the cutter of *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1283 as the same responsible for *Agora* 1:3238 and I 4169 (256/5 BCE) active from 286/5–245/4 BCE and responsible for seventy-five inscriptions.

Θ Ε Ο Ι.

ἐπὶ Πολυστράτου ἄρχοντος μηνὸς Ἑκατομβαιῶνος ὀγδόη-  
ι ἰσταμένου· ἀγοραὶ κυριαί· Σωσίας Ἴπποκράτου εἶπεν·  
ἐπειδὴ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων δεδωκότος τοῖς Θραιζὶ μ-  
5 ὄνοις τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν τὴν ἐγκτησιν καὶ τὴν ἴδρυσιν τοῦ  
ἱεροῦ κατὰ τὴν μ[α]ντείαν τὴν ἐγ Δωδώνης καὶ τὴν ποντὴν π-  
ένπειν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐστίας τῆς ἐκ τοῦ πρυτανείου καὶ νῦν οἱ

- ἡ[ρη]μένοι ἐν τῷ ἄστει κατασκευάσασθαι ἱερὸν οἶοντα-  
 ι δεῖν οἰκειῶς διακεῖ[σθ]αι πρὸς ἀλλήλους· ὅπως ἂν οὖν φα-  
 10 [ίν]ωνται καὶ οἱ ὀργεῶνες τῷ τε τῆς πόλεως νόμῳ πειθαρχοῦντες ὃς κελεύει τοὺς Θρᾷκας πέμπειν τὴν πομπὴν εἰ-  
 [ς Π]ε[ι]ραιᾶ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐν τῷ ἄστει ὀργεῶνας οἰκειῶς [δ]-  
 ιακειμένοι· ὕψιστος δὲ δεδόχθαι τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν ὕψιστον [τῆ-  
 ν μὲν] ποντῆ[ν ὡς] ἂν [ἐ]λθῶνται οἱ ἐν τῷ ἄστει συνκαθι[στάναν]-  
 15 ι τὴν πομπὴν καὶ τήνδε οὖν ἐκ τοῦ πρυτανείου εἰς Πει[ραιᾶ]  
 πορεύεσθαι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ Πειραιῶς· τ[οὺς δὲ ἐ]-  
 ν τῷ Πειραιεῖ ἐπιμελητὰς ὑποδέχεσθαι τοῦτου[ς παρέ]-  
 χοντας ἐν τε τῷ Νυμφαίῳ σφόγγους καὶ λεκάνας κ[αὶ ὕδωρ]  
 20 καὶ στεφάνους καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἄριστον καθάπερ [καὶ ἔαν]-  
 τοῖς παρασκευάζουσιν· ὅταν δὲ ὦσιν αἱ θυσῖαι εὐ[χεσθαι]  
 τὸν ἱερέα καὶ τὴν ἱερίαν πρὸς ταῖς εὐχαῖς ἃς εὐ[χονται]  
 καὶ τοῖς ὀργεῶσι τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἄστει κατὰ ταυτά, ὅ[πως ἂν τού]-  
 τῶν γινομένων καὶ ὁμονοῦντος παντὸς τοῦ ἔθ[νους αἰ τ]-  
 25 ε θυσῖαι γίνωνται τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὅσα πρ[οσηκεῖ]  
 κατὰ τε τὰ πάτρια τῶν Θρᾷκῶν καὶ τοὺς τῆς πόλ[εως νόμου]-  
 ς καὶ ἔχει καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς παντὶ τῷ ἔθ[νῳ] εἰ τὰ πρὸς τοῦ]-  
 ς θεοῦς· εἶναι δ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ἂν περὶ ἄλλο[ν τινὸς βούλωντ]-  
 αι προσιέναι πρὸς τοὺς ὀργεῶνας πρ[όσοδον αἰ] πρώτοις]  
 30 μετὰ τὰ ἱερά καὶ ἂν τινε[ς βούλωνται τῶν ἐν τῷ ἄστει]  
 ὀργεῶνων ἐπεισιέναι εἰς τοὺς ὀργεῶνας ἐξεῖναι αὐτοῖ]-  
 ς εἰσιέναι κ[αὶ λαμβάνειν καὶ μὴ τελούοντας τὴν φορὰν διὰ]  
 βίου τὸ μέρ[ος -----]

### G o d s!

During the archonship of Polystratos, eighth of Hekatombaion, at the regular assembly, Sosias son of Hippokrates made the motion: Whereas, the people of Athens granted to the Thracians, alone of all of the immigrant groups (*ethnē*), the right to own property (*enktēsis*) and to build a temple, in accordance with the oracle of Dodona and (to have) a procession from the hearth of the Prytaneion; and now those who have been chosen to build a temple in the Asty think that both (groups) should be favorably disposed to each other; so that the *orgeōnes* also may be seen to be obedient to the law of the city, which orders the Thracians to have their procession continue to the Piraeus, and being favorably disposed towards the *orgeōnes* who are in the Asty; for good fortune, the *orgeōnes* resolve that the procession, when those in the Asty choose to arrange the procession, the (procession) shall therefore proceed from the Prytaneion to the Piraeus in the same (procession) with those (members) from the Piraeus. (Further, it is resolved) that the supervisors in the Piraeus shall promise to supply sponges in the Nymphaion and cups and water and wreaths and a breakfast in the temple, just as they prepare for themselves.



- 20 When the sacrifices occur, the priest and the priestess shall pray, in addition to the prayers that they (normally) pray, also and in the same way for the *orgeōnes* who are in the Asty, so that when these things take place and the entire *ethnos* lives in concord, the sacrifices and other rites shall be made to the gods, in accordance both with the ancestral customs of the Thracians and the laws of the city and so that it will go well and piously for the entire *ethnos* in matters concerning the gods.
- 27 (And further) it shall be (that), if one (of the *orgeōnes* of the Asty) should wish to have access to the *orgeōnes* (of the Piraeus) concerning some other matter, they shall always have priority following the sacred rites, and if one of the *orgeōnes* of the Asty should wish to join the *orgeōnes*, they may do so, and receive (sacrificial meat) without paying the fee, for life, the portion....

### Notes

- I. 1: Θ Ε Ο Ι → *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 337.1 [3] (note).
- I. 2: Πολυστράτος, also the archon in *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 477. Osborne's new dating of Polystratos is based on a reconstruction of *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 670 which has Polystratos follow Lykeas. See Osborne 2009, 97–98.
- I. 2: 8th of Hekatombaion. According to Wilhelm (1902, 132–34) and Ferguson (1949, 153 n. 65), the Thracian groups of Bendis devotees met on the 8th of the month.
- I. 3: ἀγορᾶ κυρία, “regular assembly” → *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1263.2–3 [11] note.
- I. 3: Σωσίας Ἰπποκράτου (*PA* 1317b.6; *PAA* 859500; *LGPN* 2:415[40]) also named in *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1284.21 [22].
- I. 4: τοῖς Θραιζί. What the inscription means by “Thracian” has now been questioned by Arnaoutoglou 2003, 59–60: “...the Athenians were calling Thrace the area from the Thermaic gulf to Byzantium. The onomastic evidence of the “Thracian” *orgeōnes* is almost entirely Greek, an indication that the Thracian *orgeōnes* were not that Thracian after all.”
- II. 4–5: μόνους τῶν ἄλλων ἔθνῶν. The claim that the Thracians, alone among the nations, have been given permission to lease or buy land, while perhaps true in the late fifth century BCE, was no longer true in 269/8 BCE. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 337 [3] (Piraeus, 333/2 BCE) indicates that both Egyptians and Kitians (from Cyprus) had been given similar permission. Nilsson (1942, 177) suggests that the phrase is either copied from an earlier decree, or that it refers to all of the privileges, not just that of owning land and building a temple.
- I. 5: ἔγκτησιν, “right to own property” → *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 337 [3] comment and Pečírka 1966, 122–23.
- I. 6: κατὰ τὴν μ[α]ντεῖαν τὴν ἐγ Δωδώνης. There may be an allusion to this oracle in the extremely fragmentary *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 139.29 (413/2 BCE): εἶτε γρῆ.....
- I. 7: ἀπὸ τῆς ἐστίας: the shrine of Hestia, the symbolic centre of Athenian political life (Ferguson 1944, 103).
- I. 8: ἐν τῷ ἄστει, “in the Asty”: *Asty* is the classical designation for the city of Athens, to distinguish it from the city of Piraeus.

- ll. 10, 12, 13, 22, 28, 30: ὄργεῶνες → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255.1 [2] *note*.
- ll. 10–11, 25–26: “the laws of the city”. Jones (1999, 43, 258–59) suggests that the Athenian law in question specifically addressed the conduct of the procession from the Asty to the Piraeus.
- l. 11: ὃς κελεύει τοὺς Θρᾶκας πέμπειν. Garland (1987, 120 n.), following Dow (cited in a letter), argues that κελεύειν here means “invite” rather than “order.” Jones objects to the weakening of the sense of κελεύειν, noting that the use of πειθαρχοῦντες, “obey,” in ll. 10–11 is robbed of its meaning if κελεύειν only means to “invite” or “bid.” “The law... does seem to require the participation by all the *orgeōnes* of Bendis, both those in the port town and their co-nationals in the town” (1999, 258).
- l. 15: The stone has THNΔΕΥΝ, but read καὶ τήνδε οὐν (Wilhelm; Prott-Ziehen). The sense of οὐν is not entirely clear, but seems to imply that the Piraean procession from the Asty to the Piraeus is to join that of the Thracian *orgeōnes* from the Asty. Foucart (1902, 101) proposed καὶ τὴν ὄν, “and (their) pig,” suggesting that the *orgeōnes* reserve the right to bring their own sacrifices. Sokolowski (1969, 85, followed by Le Guen-Pollet 1991, 42) suggests from a photograph καὶ τὴν δρῶν: “Il s’agirait de l’arbre sacré, le chêne, porté dans la procession” referring to offices in associations similar to that of Bendis called δρυφόροι and πρινοφόροι (Bekker, *Anecd.* 242.9 δρῶν φέρειν διὰ τῆς ἀγοράς: τὸ τοὺς ἀπελευθέρους καὶ ἄλλους βαρβάρους κλάδον δρυὸς διὰ τῆς ἀγοράς... φέρειν.
- l. 30: Wilhelm; Kirchner: ἐπεισιέ[ναι εἰς τοὺς ὄργεῶνας ἐξεῖναι αὐτοῖ]-; Sokolowski: ἐπεισιέ[ναι εἰς τοὺς Πειραιεῖ ἐξεῖναι αὐτοῖ]-
- l. 31: Kirchner: εἰσιέναι κ[αὶ λαμβάνειν καὶ μὴ τελούντας τὴν φορὰν διὰ]; Wilhelm: κ[αὶ μὴ τελεῖν τὸ εἰσόδιον καὶ λαμβάνειν, or κ[αὶ λαμβάνειν καὶ μὴ τελούντας τὴν φορὰν διὰ]; Prott-Ziehen: εἰσιέναι κ[αὶ ... λαμβάνειν διὰ]; Sokolowski: εἰσιέναι κ[αὶ λαμβάνειν ἀπὸ τῆς θεᾶς θυομένων διὰ...].

### Comments

The cult of the Thracian deity Bendis was introduced into Athens in the fifth century BCE. By 429/8 BCE Bendis appears in a list of “other gods” whose gold and silver were removed to the Acropolis, which implies that Bendis already had a shrine (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 383.A.ii.V.143 = *IG* I<sup>2</sup> 310.208). In 426/5 BCE there is a record of loans being made by the cult to Athenians (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 369.68; Meritt 1932, 128, 140). In 404 BCE Xenophon noted a temple to Bendis on the eastern side of the Piraeus on the hill of Mounichia (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255 [2]) where fragments of a stele that refers to Bendis have also been found (Nilsson 1942, 183–88).

Two dates for the introduction of the *Bendideia* into Athens are discussed by Planeaux (2000–2001), 429 BCE and 413 BCE. In favour of the earlier date, *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 136 (432/1 or 411 BCE) refers to the appointment of a priest and priestess “from all the Athenians,” a statue, stele, procession, finances, an all-night festival (παννύχης), and hides, and the treasury account in *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 383.A.ii.V.143 (429/8 BCE) shows that Bendis had a public cult in Athens by 429/8 BCE. This means that Plato’s suggestion in *Resp.* 327AB (see below) that the *Bendideia* was a new introduction ca. 411 BCE is a mistake. In favour of the later date (ca. 413 BCE), the lettering of *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 136 allows for either the earlier or the later date.

Although *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 383 indicates that Bendis was known in Attica by 429 BCE, the regulating of the cult (in *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 136) may be later. In that case Plato's reference to a newly-established festival may be accurate. Planeaux points out that the debate hinges on accepting Plato as interested in historical accuracy, which is a view that is difficult to maintain. Planeaux therefore opts for the earlier date. Simms (1988, 62) also favors the earlier date, noting that the reference to Dodona in *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1283 rather than Delphi makes sense if the foundation had been during the Peloponnesian War, which began in 431 BCE, and which made Delphi inaccessible.

The *Bendideia* was an all-night celebration, including a torch relay on horseback and ending in a sacrifice. It involved independent processions, one of Athenian members and the other of Thracians. It is unclear how the various parts of the *Bendideia* were introduced – all at once, or in stages. Socrates, speaking through Plato, offers the earliest literary description of the *Bendideia*, supposedly describing events of about 410 BCE:

I walked down yesterday to the Piraeus with Glaucon son of Ariston to offer prayers to the goddess [Bendis] (τῇ θεῷ) and also because I wished to see how they would conduct the festival, since this was its inauguration (ἄτε νῦν πρῶτον ἄγοντες). I thought the procession of the citizens (ἡ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων πομπή) to be very impressive, but it was no better than the show made by the marching of the Thracian contingent. After we had said our prayers (προσευζόμενοι) and had seen the spectacles, we were starting for town (πρὸς τὸ ἄστυ) when Polemarchos son of Kephalos caught sight of us from a distance as we were hastening homeward and ordered his boy to run and have us wait for him.... “Do you mean to say,” said Adimantos, that you haven't heard that there is to be this evening a torchlight race on horseback in honor of the goddess?” “On horseback,” I said. “that is a new idea. Will they carry torches and pass them along to one another as they race with the horses, or how do you mean?” “That is the way,” said Polemarchos, “and besides, there is to be a night festival which will be worth seeing. For after dinner we will get up and go out and see the sights and meet a lot of the lads there and have a good talk. So stay and do as we ask” (Plato, *Resp.* 327AB, 328A).

Ferguson (1944, 103) argued that the Bendis was introduced in stages: first an unofficial Thracian cult in the 440s, eventually granted the right to build a temple in the 430s (from which treasures were then extracted in 429/8 BCE) (1949, 133). In or around 411/0 BCE the State organized the *Bendideia*, which involved a procession and a hecatomb (sacrifice of one hundred victims, “obviously” supplied by the state [1944, 101, 103]), and whose inauguration Socrates observed. Later (1949) Ferguson modified this view, arguing that the *Bendideia* was established in 429 BCE and remained a state festival until sometime between 429 BCE and the mid-fourth century when *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1361 (330–324/3 BCE) indicates that the Athenian *orgeōnes* of Bendis were responsible for the conduct of the festival (1949, 156).

Several circumstances have been proposed for the extraordinary grant of the right to own land to a Thracian cult in the 430s. Nilsson (1942, 178–79;

1951, 45–48) stressed political factors: during the Peloponnesian War it was imperative for Athens to maintain strong relations with Thrace. Athens wanted to protect its possessions and allies on the Thracian coast and their water route to the Black Sea, and sought friendly relations with the Thracians. In 431 the Athenians made Nymphodoros of Abdera their *proxenos* in Thrace (his sister was the wife of the Thracian king, Sitalkes). Nymphodoros obtained Athenian citizenship for Sadocos, son of Sitalkes (cf. Garland 1987, 119; Simms 1988, 63; von Reden 1995, 32). Garland (1987, 120) adds that Athenian interest in cooperation with Thracians continued in the 330s, when we have another set of Bendis inscriptions, and probably had much to do with their mutual hostility toward the Macedonians, now emerging as a powerful force.

While not discounting political considerations, Ferguson rightly asks whether Athens' need for political alliances could account for the more spectacular features of the *Bendideia*. He suggests that it was a plague that began in 430 BCE and claimed one-third of the population that induced the Athenians to agree not only to the grant of land, but, following the oracle's command, to sacrifice to Bendis as a way to alleviate the effects of the plague (1949, 160–62). Nilsson objected, pointing out that Bendis was not a healing goddess (1951, 46–47). Planeaux, however, pointed out that Bendis did not arrive in Athens alone, but with Deloptes (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1256 [5]), soon identified with Asklepios and eclipsed almost entirely by the latter upon his entry to Athens a few years later.

Thus, the appeal of Bendis during the great plague would not so much have been through Bendis herself but rather through her companion-hero: an Asklepios-like figure, a Thracian healing hero. (Planeaux 2000–2001, 182)

That *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283 is a decree of the Thracian association of Bendis of the Piraeus rather than the Athenian group (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255 [2]) is clear both from the meeting date (eighth of the month → note on l. 2) and from the reference in ll. 4–5 concerning the original decree of the Athenian Council granting the Thracians permission to build a temple and to hold a procession. The Thracians claim (ll. 4–5) that they “alone among the nations” (μόνοις τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν) obtained the privilege to own land and to build a temple (τὴν ἐγκτησιν καὶ τὴν ἴδρυσιν τοῦ | ἱεροῦ). While they were likely the *first* to have been granted this privilege, by 260 BCE they were not the only such group: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 337 [3] (333/2 BCE) attests similar grants to Egyptians and Kitian merchants.

The occasion of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1283 is the construction of a temple in Athens by the Thracian group (ll. 7–8: καὶ νῦν οἱ | ἡ[ῖ]ρ[η]μένοι ἐν τῷ ἄστει κατασκευάσασθαι ἱερὸν). This group had expressed a wish to join with the Piraean group of Thracians as they marched from the prytaneion in Athens to the Bendis shrine in the Piraeus, no doubt, within the security of the Long Walls that joined Athens to the port of Piraeus. The reason for the formation of the Thracian group in Athens may have been a function of the particular history of Athens

during the early third century BCE. Between 295 and 262 BCE Athens and the Piraeus were under separate and mutually hostile governments, Piraeus having been garrisoned by Macedonians (Habicht 1992, 71–72). Several efforts to expel the Macedonians failed and the two communities were reunited only after Athens was defeated in the Chremonidean War (268–62 BCE) and received a Macedonian garrison. Gauthier (1979, 396) notes that it is likely that throughout the period of 288 to 262 BCE the Bendis procession had been suppressed. The Thracians resident in Athens, having been cut off from the main cultic site of Bendis in the Piraeus, found it appropriate to form their own group in Athens and to construct a temple there (Ferguson 1911, 230).

After the reunification of Athens in 262 BCE it is unknown how the two Bendis groups related to each other, but *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1283, more than twenty years later, addresses that relationship, apparently for the first time. The group in the *Asty* wished to march with the Thracian group from the Piraeus and hence negotiated a place and privilege for their members along with the Piraean group. Accordingly, the supervisors of the Piraean (Thracian) group agreed to meet the Thracian group from Athens upon its arrival in the Piraeus with sponges, basins, water, and crowns and prepare a breakfast in the temple.

The *Bendideia* provides an important instance of a festival in which two ethnic groups participated *as distinct groups* (unlike the City Dionysia, where foreigners might participate but not as foreigners). The double procession of Thracians and citizens mentioned by Plato, and the Thracian procession itself, comprised of both *orgeōnes* from the *Asty* and the Piraeus were framed as deliberate expressions of harmony between the two Thracian groups (ll. 23–24: ὁμοιοῦντος παντός τοῦ ἔθ[νους]) and a demonstration that the piety of the Thracians was in no sense incompatible with Athenian sensibilities (ll. 24–26: αἱ τε θεσῖαι γίνονται τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὅσα πρ[οσήκει] || κατὰ τε τὰ πάτρια τῶν Θρακῶν καὶ τοὺς τῆς πόλ[εως νόμου]ς). These demonstrations, coupled with the appeal to Zeus’s oracle at Dodona, secured the position of Thracians within Attic society, where the introduction of new gods might otherwise bring about prosecution. An comparable joint procession demonstrating political unity is attested in Miletos (Herda 1996).

Graf argues that the procession, which began in the centre of Athens and proceeded to the Bendideion in the Piraeus, is an example of a bipolar centrifugal procession whose function, seen from the perspective of the state, stressed “the symbolic tie between the two poles” [i.e., the city and the port]. An analogy to this procession is one found ca. 160 BCE in two Cilician towns, Antiochia on the Cydnus and Antiochia on Pyramus:

We still have the *psēphisma* of the Antiocheans on Pyramus [*LSAM* 81]. It institutes a *pompē*, again from the political centre, ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑστίας τῆς Βουλαίας (l. 7) to the altar of Homonoia [concord] in the temple of Athena Magarsia, the patron goddess of the town, Magarsis being the earlier name of Antiochia. (Graf 1996, 61)

The express purpose of the procession in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1283.23* is in fact that the “entire *ethnos* live in concord” (ὁμονοοῦντος παντὸς τοῦ ἔθ[νους]), a purpose underscored by the requirement that the Piraean members show hospitality to the Athenian members upon their arrival.

**Literature:** Deubner 1932, 219–20; Ferguson 1944; Ferguson 1949; Foucart 1902; Gauthier, Philippe. “La réunification d’Athènes en 281 et les deux archontes Nicias.” *REG* 92 (1979) 348–99 (*SEG* 39:136); Graf, Fritz. “*Pompai* in Greece: Some Considerations About Space and Ritual in the Greek Polis.” In *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis: Proceedings of the Third International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, Organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 16–18 October 1992*, ed. R. Hägg. Skrifter utgivna av Svenska institutet i Athen, vol. 8. Athens: Svenska institutet i Athen, 1996 (*SEG* 46:2371); Habicht, Christian. “Athens and the Ptolemies.” *Classical Antiquity* 11/1 (1992) 68–90; Hartwig 1897; Herda, Alexander. “Von Milet nach Didyma: Eine griechische Prozessionsstraße archaischer Zeit.” In *Kult und Funktion griechischer Heiligtümer in archaischer und klassischer Zeit: 1. Archäologisches Studentenkolloquium, Heidelberg, 18–20. Februar 1995*, ed. Friederike Bubenheimer, et al. Schriften des Deutschen Archäologen-Verbandes, vol. 15. Mainz: Deutscher Archäologen-Verband, 1996 (*SEG* 46:1472); Jones 1999, 43–45, 257–59, 261–62; Nilsson 1942; Nilsson 1951; Pache 2001; Parke 1977, 149–52; Parker 1996, 170–75; Planeaux 2000–2001; Wilhelm 1902; Ziebarth 1900, 503–504.

## [24] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297*

### Decree and membership list of the *thiasōtai* of Artemis Kallistē

Athens (Attica) 236/5 BCE

Published: Adolf Wilhelm, “*Ἀττικὰ ψηφίσματα* (*Attika psēphismata*),” *AE* (1905) 215–52, 234–44 (no. 9) (facsimile); repr. Wilhelm 1984, 2:35–40; Michel, *RIG* 1554; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297* (Poland A22A).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297*.

Related Inscriptions: → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1298 [20]* (248/7 BCE) (the same association).

Stoichedon (36 letters), 82 x 33–38.5 x. 9.5–1.05 cm. Fifty-eight names (ll. 25–43) are arranged in four parallel columns, the first with nineteen names, the second with eighteen names, the third with eleven and the fourth, ten. Tracy (1988, 311–14; 2003, 129–49) identifies the cutter as that of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 788*, responsible for at least fifty-seven inscriptions between 260 and 235/4 BCE, and the same cutter for *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1298 [20]*. He describes him as “one of the master cutters of his time” (2003, 128).

Θ Ε Ο [I].

ἐπὶ Κίμωνος ἄρχοντος, Θαργηλιῶνος: ὕ [ἔδοξ]εν

- τῶι κοινῶι· ὕπειδῆ Σώφρων καλῶς καὶ φι[ιλ]οτί-  
 5 μως συνήγαγε τὸν θίασον, ἐπέδωκεν δὲ καὶ στή-  
 λην ὥστε ἀνατεθῆναι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν βουλόμενο-  
 ς αὔξειν τὸ κοινὸν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων· ὅπως ἂν οὖν ἐ-  
 φάμιλλον εἰ τοῖς βουλομένοις εὐεργετεῖν τ-  
 ὀ κοινὸν εἰδόσιν ὅτι κομοῦνται τὰς χάριτα-  
 10 ς· ἀγαθεὶ τύχει, δεδόχθ[α]ι τοῖς θιασώταις στεφ-  
 ανῶσαι τὸν ἀρχερα[ν]ιστὴν Σώφρονα θαλλοῦ στε-  
 φάνωι καὶ λημ[ν]ίσκωι· ὅπως ἂν καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπ-  
 ὸν οἱ γινόμε[ν]οι ἱεροποιοὶ εἰς τὰς θυσίας ἐπ-  
 15 εἰδὰν τὰ ἱερὰ ἀπαγγεῖλωσιν καὶ σπονδὰς ποιή-  
 [σ]ω[σ]ι[ν] σ]τεφανοῦτωσαν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀναγορευέτ-  
 [ω]σαν· ὅ[ο]ι θιασῶται στεφανοῦσι τὸν ἀρχερα-  
 νιστὴν Σώφρονα ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν καὶ εὐσεβείας τ-  
 ῆς εἰς τὴν θεόν· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀναγορεύσωσιν, ὀφει-  
 20 λέτωσαν τέτταρας δραχμὰς ἱερὰς τῆι θεῶι· ὅ-  
 ναγραψάτωσαν δὲ καὶ τὸν στέφανον ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀν-  
 αθήματος· ὅ ἀναγράψαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς θιασώτας πά-  
 ντας χωρὶς τοὺς τε ἀνδρας καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας· ὕ

<in a crown>

οἱ θιασῶται

τὸν ἀρχεραμιστὴν

Σώφρονα

<below the crown>

25	[Σ]ώφρων	Δίων	Ὀνούχιον	Ἡδίστη
	[Εὐ]κλήης	Σωτηρίδης	Ἀπολλωνίς	Φίλη
	[Εὐ]τυχίδης	Χάρης	Εὐπραξίς	Δορκάς
	[Σω]τηρίδης	Φιλόξενος	Εὐτυχίς	Σίμων
	[Κτ]ησίβιος	Ἀγάθων	Χοιρίνη	Ἴωνδόν
30	· · · θης	Μῦς	Ἀριστομάχη	Μέλιττα
	· · λων	Νίκων	Φίλικον	Λαμίδιον
	[Εὐτ]υχίδης	Φίλων	Ζωπύρα	Ἀφροδισία
	[Χα]ρίας	Μένων	Ἡδεῖα	Θεοδώρα
	[Ἰερ]ώνυμος	Ἔφεσος	Σίπη	Φιλώτιον
35	[Εὐ]ξενος	Κτήσων	Χάροπον	
	[Π]υθοκλήης	Δωριεύς		
	Λυσίστρατος	Δίων		
	Ἀρτέμων	Μενίσκος		
	Μενέχαρμος	Μενεκράτης		
40	Διονύσιος	Πόρος		
	Κτήσων	Δῶρος		
	Δημήτριος	Περιγένης		

- 44 Σύμμαχος  
ἐπὶ ἱερέως Διονυσοδώρου Σημαχίδου.

G o d s!

In the year that Kimon was archon, the month of Thargelion. *vacat*. The *koinon* approved the (following decree): Whereas Sophron generously and ambitiously convoked the *thiasos* and provided it with a stele to be set up in the temple, wishing to enlarge the treasury (*koinon*) at his own expense; *vacat* and in order that there might be a rivalry among those who wish to be benefactors to the *koinon* and that they might know that they shall receive thanks; for good fortune it has been resolved by the members of the *thiasos* to crown their *archerantistēs* Sophron with a wreath of olive leaves and a woolen fillet; so that also henceforth those who are sacrifice makers (*hieropoioi*) at the sacrifices, when they announce the rites and perform the libations, shall crown him and announce this publicly: «The *thiasōtai* crown their *archerantistēs* Sophron on account of his excellence and the piety he has shown to the Goddess.» If they do not announce this publicly, they will owe four drachmae sacred to the Goddess. And let them also inscribe the crown upon the monument. *vacat*. And they shall inscribe the names of all of members, the men and the women separately.

The *thiasōtai*

(honor) their *archerantistēs*

Sophon.

<A list of 58 names follows, men in columns 1–2, women in cols. 3–4>

During the priesthood of Dionysodoros of (the deme) Semachidai.

### Notes

- I. 2: ἐπὶ Κίμωνος ἄρχοντος, i.e., 236/5 (Osborne 2009, 93). Meritt 1981, 96 had earlier put Kimon at 237/6 BCE.
- I. 6: τὸ κοινόν: On κοινόν as “treasury” or “common fund” → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1323.10–11, 29 [31].
- II. 6–7: ὅπως ἂν οὖν ἐφράμιλλον εἶ, “that there may be a rivalry.” The formula appears mainly in Attic inscriptions dated from 335/4 BCE (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 330) until the late second: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 330.36; 558.11; 663.30; 667.10; 670. 13; 691.13; 697.15; 700 fr. b.16; 721.4; 786.15; 798 fr. a.23; 801.1; 808.21; 847.34; 859.11; 870.4; 884.27; 931.10; 984.6; 1008.64; 1011.45; 1027.27; 1045.2; 1227.20; 1281.12; 1292.18 [26]; 1293.8; 1297.6–7 [24]; 1301.8 [25]; 1319.7; 1324.20 [32]; 1327.20 [35]; 1329.20 [37]; 4841.1; *SEG* 15:113.16; *SEG* 18:33.8; *SEG* 19:90.4; *SEG* 21:419.5; *SEG* 21:451.20; *SEG* 26:98.27; *SEG* 28:52 col. i.29; *SEG* 33:96.4; *SEG* 33:117 fr. b.4; *SEG* 39:125.23; *SEG* 40:101.5; *SEG* 40:141.10; *SEG* 41:90.19; *Hesperia* 2 (1933) 156 no. 5.16; *Hesperia* 2 (1933) 503–4 no. 16.13; *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 160 no. 56.7–8.
- II. 8–9: κομιούνται τὰς χάριτα|ς → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1252+999.21 [6] note.
- II. 10, 15–16, 23: ἀρχερανιστής → Arnaoutoglou (1994b, 107), who notes that the title *archerantistēs* appears in associations of *thiasōtai* (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1297 [24]; 1319), in an



association of devotees of Amphiaros (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1322*), in associations of *Soteriastai* (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1343 [48]*), *Asklepiastai* (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 2960*) and *Heroistai* (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1339*), but curiously not in associations of *eranistai* until the imperial period, e.g., *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1345 (53/54 CE)*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1369.35 [49]* (where the *archeranistai* is named only after the προστάτης) and *SEG 31:122 [50]*. Even in the earlier period Arnaoutoglou argues that it is precarious to assume that this functionary took precedence in the association.

- II. 11: λημ[ν]ίσκωι: On the use of a woolen fillet, see also *AM 66:228.15 [39]* (138/7 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1366.26 [53]* (late II or early III CE).
- II. 14–15: ἀναγορευέτ[ω]σαν → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1263.37–38 [11] note*.
- I. 21: χωρὶς τούτ τε ἄνδρας καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας: a similar formula, distinguishing men from women, appears in *IG VII 235.a.44–45* (Sokolowski 1969, 130–41 no. 69.44–45) (Oropos, after 387 BCE): καθεύδειν χωρὶς μὲν τὸς ἄνδρας, χωρὶς | δὲ τὰς γυναῖκας;
- I. 29: Ἰνδόν (feminine) according to Bechtel 1917, 555 derives from the Indus river; Masson (1997, 75) thinks that it derives from the ethnic designation Ἰνδός (Indian, cf. Herodotos 3.94).
- I. 32: Ζωπύρα (*LGPN 2:195[9]*). The masculine form is attested as a slave name in the Roman period: Fragiadakis 1986, 35.
- I. 34: Σίπη: *PAA 823260*; *LGPN 2:399[1]*. Masson suggests a mistake for Σίγη (Masson 1997, 75): “il s’agit là d’un hapax absolu inexplicable comme tel par le grec, et l’on ne saurait alléguer un rapprochement avec σιπή, “huche à pain.” Le plus simple serait de supposer que le graveur a par erreur gravé une haste droite de trip après déjà gravé un *gamma*” (citing *IG XII/8 667.10* and 13 as examples of the name in the imperial period).

### Comments

As was suggested with regard to *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1298 [20]*, this inscription and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1298* come from the same association, dedicated to Artemis Kallistē. This association was comprised of non-citizens, distinct from the citizens who used the temple of Artemis (Mikalson 1998, 149; Parker 1996, 340). This inscription and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1298* were discovered near the ruins of the temple of Artemis outside the Dipylon gate (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1298.11–12 note*) and as Tracy has argued, were cut by the same cutter.

Although this inscription takes the form typical of many other honorific decrees, several features make this particularly interesting. First, Sophron is the *archeranistēs*. The inscription singles him out as instrumental in having “convened” the group and expanded it (αὔξειν τὸ κοινόν), even though from twelve years before *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1298*, which does not name Sophron, indicates that the *thiasos* had been in existence for some time. Presumably it was Sophron’s largess that was key in the expansion of the group and this growth is now recorded on the stele, bearing fifty-eight names.

Secondly, like *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1327 [35]* (Piraeus, 177/6 BCE), this inscription is quite intentional about its voting of honors: the granting of honors is to encourage

other high-minded persons to assist the club – indeed, to create a rivalry among benefactors –, confident in the knowledge that they too will be honored with the appropriate crowns.

Thirdly, the list of members makes it quite clear that the club was composed of women (21) as well as men (37). Arnaoutoglou (2008) observes that seventeen of the names are attested in relation to slaves, freedmen and foreigners, and that ten – Philoxenos, Kteson, Meniskos, Mekrates, Perigenes, Poros, Zopyra, Hedeia, Aphrodisia and Thedora – are borne “only by foreigners.” None but the priest is identified by means of a patronym, none has a demotic, and none of the women is identified with reference to their husbands or fathers. It is not clear that the priest is a member of the group; the public cult of Artemis had a priest and from *IG II<sup>2</sup> 788* we know the name of the priest of Kallistē for the year 235/4 BCE, Antidoros of Pergase. Dionysodoros of Semachidai (l. 44) may simply be the priest of the public cult from the previous year. It is worth noting that Antidoros is also not listed among the members of the association.

**Literature:** Arnaoutoglou 1994b; Ferguson 1907, 213–14; 1944, 71; Dow 1937, 191–97; Masson 1997; Mikalson 1998, 148–49; Parker 1996, 340.

## [25] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1301*

### Decree of *thiasōtai* or *orgeōnes*

Piraeus (Attica)

219/8 BCE

Published: K.S. Pittakes, *Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική*, no. 2661; Adolf Wilhelm, “Ἀττικά ψηφίσματα (Attika psēphismata),” *AE* (1905) 215–52, 247–49 (no. 12); Koehler, *IG II* 618; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1301*; Vermaseren 1977–1989, 2:72–73 (no. 260) = *CCCA II* 260 (Poland A21).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1301*.

Non-stoichedon (36–45 letters). Marble tablet, 27 x 16 x 10 cm. Letter height: unknown.

[ἐπὶ X]αιρεφῶντος? ἄρχ[οντος. Μ[ουνηγιῶνος ---]  
 [--- εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ] οἱ ἐπιμελητ[αῖ οἱ αἰρεθέντες εἰς]  
 [τὸν ἐπὶ Μενεκρ]άτου ἄρχον[τος ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπεμε]-  
 [λήθησαν ψηφι]σαμένων τῶ[ν θιασωτῶν? ὅπως ἂν ἐπι]-  
 5 [σκευασθεῖ τὸ μ]αγειρεῖον καὶ τ -----  
 [----- ἐπι]διδόντες μετὰ [πάσης φιλοτιμίας ---]  
 [δραχμάς? ἐκ] τῶν ἰδίων, τὴν π[άσαν σπουδὴν ποιούμενοι]  
 [ὅπως συντελε]σθεῖ τὰ ἐψηφισμέ[να· ὅπως ἂν οὖν ἐφά]-  
 [μιλλον εἰ τοῖς] φιλοτ[ι]μουμέν[οις εἰδόσιν ὅτι τῶν εὐ]-

- 10 [εργετημάτων]ν χάριτας ἀξίας κ[ομοιοῦνται πάντες]·  
 [ἀγαθεῖ τ]ύχει δεδόχθαι τοῖς [θιασώταις?, ἐπαι]-  
 [νέσαι τοὺς] ἐπὶ Μενεκράτου [ἄρχοντος ἐπιμελη]-  
 [τὰς καὶ στεφ]ανῶσαι θαλλοῦ σ[τεφάνωι εὐνοίας ἔνεκα]  
 [καὶ φιλοτι]μίας τῆς εἰς τὴν θ[εὸν καὶ εἰς ἑαυτοῦς. ἀναγρά]-  
 15 [ψαι δὲ τὸδ]ε τὸ ψήφισμα τοὺς [ἐπιμελητὰς εἰς τὴν στή]-  
 [λην ἐν εἰ το]ῦς ἐπιδεδωκότας.

In the year that Menekrates was archon, in the month of Mounichion . . . proposed the (following) motion: Whereas the supervisors who were appointed for the year that Menekrates was archon exercised their duties, after the *thiasōtai* (?) had voted to repair the kitchen and the . . . and, with all zeal they contributed . . . drachmae from their own resources and accomplished the things that had been voted upon with due haste; (and) therefore, in order that there might be a rivalry among those who are ambitious, knowing that everyone will receive fitting recognition who are benefactors (of the members); – for good fortune, it was resolved by the *thiasōtai* (?) to commend those who were supervisors during the archonship of Menekrates and to crown them with olive wreaths on account of the good will and zeal that they have exhibited towards the goddess and to all. The supervisors shall inscribe this decree on a stele, on which (are listed) those who have made contributions.

### Notes

- I. 1: ἐπὶ X]αιρεφώντος: i.e., 219/18 BCE (Meritt 1977, 178). See e.g., IG II<sup>2</sup> 1304.13; *Agora* 16:226.1; 16:227[1]; 16:227[2]. Since the decree honors the *epimelētai* from the archonship of Menekrates, the decree itself presumably dates from the following year.
- II. 1, 3, 12: ἐπὶ Μενεκράτου? ἄρχ]οντος: i.e., 220/19 BCE (Meritt 1977, 178).
- I. 5: μ]αγειρεῖον: Robert (“Hellenica,” *RPhil* 13 [1939] 97–217, here 194) points out that μάγειρος, “butcher” or “cook” appears frequently in inscriptions pertaining to cults. See also *SEG* 31:983 (between Magnesia on the Meander and Priene), recording the gifts to a Dionysiac cult association, including μαγε[ι]||ρικοὺς] ἐργάτας. A dedication from Delos (*ID* 2310; 96/95 BCE) records the dedication of καὶ τὸ] μαγειρεῖον [καὶ τὰς] τραπέζας καὶ τὴν ψαλίδα (“the kitchen and the tables and the vault”) to the θεοῖς πρώτοις. In Cilicia a priest of Hermes dedicated τὴν ἀνάκλισιν τε καὶ τὴν ἀποκλειμάκωσιν τοῦ [να]σοῦ καὶ τὸ μαγειρεῖον (“the bench and the steps from the sanctuary and the kitchen” (E.L. Hicks, “Inscriptions from Western Cilicia,” *JHS* 12 (1891) 225–273, here 232–33). Robert (BE 1950, no. 200) records from Iconium the dedication of a Roman veteran, Marcus Antonius Longus, to Διὶ Σωτήρι of a τράπεζαν, στοὰν, μαγειρεῖον ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων and in BE 1984, no. 480 the dedication of two *mageireia* τοῖς Μεγάλους Θεοῖς in Paphlagonia. Finally, *ISmyrna* II/1 737 (II/III CE): ἀγαθῆ [τύχη·] | ταμειούτος ΠΑ[-] τὸ ἱερὸν Ἀλέξανδρ[ος – ὑπὲρ τῆς] | τῶν τέκνων σωτη[ρίας καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς (αὐτοῦ) – ]|Νείκης τῆς ἱερείας [-εσ]|κεύασεν τῆ ἀμπελ[-]||νην μαγειρεῖον Γ[-] μολύβω Δ ρξε [-]||[·] ἑσχάραν Λ[-], “For good fortune: Pa... who serves as treasurer... the

temple... Alexander (constructed?) for the salvation of his children and his wife, Nike the priestess, in the ? this kitchen... with? lead? worth 165 *litra*... sacrificial hearth..." The Septuagint uses the term to translate מִבְשָׁלוֹת "cooking places" and בית המבשלה "place of boiling" (Ezek 46:23, 24). Ezek 46:24 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς με οὗτοι οἱ οἴκοι τῶν μαγειρείων, οὗ ἐψησοῦσιν ἐκεῖ οἱ λειτουργοῦντες τῷ οἴκῳ τὰ θύματα τοῦ λαοῦ "And he said to me, 'These are the kitchens where those who serve the house boil the sacrifices of the people'."

Excavations at Korinthos have revealed a series of kitchens adjacent the dining areas: Nancy Bookidis and Ronald S. Stroud, *The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: Topography and Architecture* (Corinth, XVIII/3. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens. 1997) 420–421 and *passim*.

ll. 8–9: ὅπως ἂν οὖν ἐρά[[μυλλον εἶ → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1297.6–7 [24] *note*.

### Comments

The identification of this association is unclear, except that it was devoted to a goddess (l. 14: εἰς τὴν θεόν). The two most obvious candidates are Bendis and the Mother of the Gods (thus, Ferguson 1944, 114; Vermaseren). Unfortunately, nothing in the inscription permits a clear decision. If the members referred to themselves as *orgeōnes*, this might be an association devoted to the Mother of the Gods since, as Ferguson observed (1944, 108–9), this association preferred *orgeōnes* to *thiasōtai* after the late third century BCE (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16]; 1314 [28]; 1315 [29], 1328 [34]; 1327 [35]; 1334 [45]). However, the name of the association is not extant, and either θιασῶται or ὀργεῶνες would fit in the lacunae in ll. 4, 11.

Neither does the meeting date in Mounichion assist in identification. Both associations are known to have issued decrees during that month. The Thracian Bendis group favored the eighth of the month, while the decrees of the association of the Mother of the Gods tend to come from Mounichion but with no indication of the exact date (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16]; 1314 [28]; 1315 [29]; 1327 [35]). Nor is the presentation of an olive wreath telling, since associations connected with Bendis (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1256 [5]; *SEG* 2:9 [21]; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1324 [32]), the Mother of the gods (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1273AB [18]), Aphrodite (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1261 [9]), and Artemis (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1297 [24]) used olive wreaths to commend their members.

The inscription honors the supervisors of this association, who effected the repairs to the *mageireion*, a kitchen frequently associated with the preparation of sacrificial animals (see the *note* above). Since the decree also calls for the inscription of other contributors to this project, we must assume that the lower part of the stele is broken and lost.

**Literature:** Ferguson 1944; Vermaseren 1977–1989, 2:260

[26] IG II<sup>2</sup> 1292Decree of the *Sarapiastai* honoring their treasurer

Athens? or the Piraeus? (Attica)

215/4 BCE

Published: F. Osann, *Sylloge inscriptionum antiquarum Graecarum et Latinarum* (Leipzig and Darmstadt: C.G. Leske, 1834) 1:169 (no. 61) from a squeeze (*ed. pr.*); Boeckh, *CIG* I 120; LeBas, et al. 1847–1888 [Roma: “L’Erma” di Bretschneider 1968], part 1, no. 381; Foucart 1873, 207–8 (no. 24); *IG* II 617; Michel, *RIG* 1553; Edward L. Hicks, Charles T. Newton, and Gustav Hirschfeld, eds. *The Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1874–1916 [1977–79]) 1:40–42 (no. XXI); Kirchner, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1292; Dow 1937, 188–97 (ph.); Vidman, *SIRIS*, 4–6 (no. 2); Danker 1982, 154–55 (no.21); Bri-cault, *RICIS* 1:5–6 (no. 101/0201) + Plate 101/0201 (Poland A34).

Publication Used: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1292 with Dow 1937.

Current Location: British Museum, from the Elgin collection, inv. 21.

Non-stoichedon (35–40 letters). A marble slab 35.5 x 29.2 cm., letter height: 0.4 cm., damaged on all but the left side. Dow estimates that the original stele was about 60 cm. in height. The remains of a third column at the bottom is attested in a single letter at the right. The cutter, according to Tracy (1978; 1990, 44–54), is responsible for a large number of inscriptions, including *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1706, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1292, 1314–1315, 1319–1320 and was active 229/8–ca. 203. The cutting is sloppy, with strokes that do not always meet precisely, vertical strokes that are not vertical, horizontal strokes not horizontal, and round letters cut with one or more straight strokes.

[ἐπι Διοκλέους ἄρχοντος -----]  
 · · · ±11 · · ος · · ια · · ±7 · · φια – [– – – εἶπεν]  
 [ἐπει]δὴ ὁ ταμίης τῶν Σαραπιαστῶ[ν Ζώπυρος]  
 [καὶ ὁ] γραμματεὺς Θεοφάνης καὶ ὁ ἐ[πιμελη]-  
 5 [τῆς] Ὀλύμπιχος [ἀ]νεγκλήτους ἑαυτο[ὺς παρε]-  
 [σκε]υάκασιν πλεονάκεις μὲν καὶ πρόσ[θεν κατασταθ]-  
 [έντες] ἐν ταῖς [ἐπ]ιμελείαις [τα]ύταις ἀγα[θοὶ τὰς] εὐ-  
 [θύνας] δεδώκα[σιν] περὶ [πάντ]ων παρὰ τὸν [νόμον],  
 [κατασ]ταθέντ[ες] δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ Ἀγνίου ἄρχον[τος κα]-  
 10 [λῶς κα]ὶ δικαίως καὶ ἐξ[ῆχ]α[ν τὸν] ἐνιαυτὸν ἀ[γαθεῖ]  
 [τύχει] δεδόχθαι τοῖς [Σαρα]πιασταῖς ἐ[παιν]-  
 [έσαι] αὐτοὺς καὶ [σ]τεφ[ανώσ]αι θαλλοῦ [στεφάνωι]  
 [σὺν τ]αινιδίω ὅταν πρ[ῶ]το[ν] θύωσιν ο[ἱ] Σαραπι]-  
 [αστ]αὶ καὶ ἀναγορεύειν [αὐ]τῶν τὰ ὀνόματα  
 15 [τ]οὺς ἱεροποιοὺς ἀεὶ κα[θ’] ἐ[κ]άστην θ[υσιάν με]-  
 [τ]ὰ τὰ ἱερά· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀναγορεύσωσ[ιν ἢ μὴ στε]-  
 [φα]νώσωσι, ἀποτεισάτω ἕκαστος αὐ[τῶν F]

- [δ]ραχμὰς ἱεράς τοῖς Σαραπιασταῖς, [ὅπως ἄν]  
 [ἐ]φάμυλλον ἤι τοῖς εἰς] αὐτοῦ[ς] φιλ[οτιμου]-  
 20 [μ]ένοις «εἰδόσιν» ὅτι τιμηθήσονται καταξίω[ς· εἶναι]  
 [δ]ὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰς τὸ λοιπὸν φιλοτιμ[οιμέ]-  
 [ν]οις εὐρέσθαι τι ἄλλο ἀγαθὸν π[αρ]ὰ το[ῦ κοινου]  
 [τ]ῶν Σαραπιαστῶν· ὅ ἐπαινέσαι δὲ κα[ὶ στεφα]-  
 [ν]ῶσαι καὶ τὴν [π]ροεραν[ίσ]τριαν Ν[ικί]ππην ὅτι  
 25 [ἔ]θυσσε τὰς θυσίας ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις τοῖς τεταγ]-  
 [μ]ένοις. ὅ ἀναγράψαι δὲ τότε τὸ ψή[φισ]μα ἐν στή]-  
 λει λιθίνῃ καὶ ἀναθεῖναι εἰς τὸ [Σαραπειῶν]  
 [τὸ] δὲ γενόμενον εἰς ταῦτα ἀνάλω[μα μερίσαι ἐκ]  
 [τ]οῦ κοινου τὸν ταμίαν Ζώπ[υ]ρον.  
 30 [π]ροερανίστρια Σέλευκος Πυ[---] [---]  
 Ν[ικί]ππη Δωρί[ω]ν [---] [---]  
 ταμία[ς] Εὐβουλίδ[ης] --- [---]  
 Ζώπυρος Ἄντ --- [---] [---]  
 [γ]ρα[μμα]τεὺς Ξε[ν ---] [---] [---]  
 35 [Θεοφάνης] ----- ἱε[ροποιοί] [---]  
 [ἐπιμελητῆς] [---] [---] [---]  
 [Ὀλύμπιχος] [---] [---] [---]

[In the year that Diokles was archon . . . . . made the motion: Whereas Zopyros the treasurer of the *Sarapiastai* and Theophanes the secretary and Olympichos the supervisor have frequently shown themselves to be irreproachable and in their management have rendered accounts honestly concerning all the things that they have administered in accordance with the law; and being appointed during the archonship of Hagnias they continued to act worthy of their own nobility; for good fortune the *Sarapiastai* resolved to commend them and to crown them with an olive wreath with a bandelette in the temple when the *Sarapiastai* should next sacrifice; and that the sacrifice makers (*hieropoioi*) are to announce publicly their names at each sacrifice after the ceremony; and that if they should not announce them or if they should not crown them, each shall pay fifty (?) drachmae sacred to the *Sarapiastai*, so that there might be rivalry among those who are ambitious in respect to them [the members], knowing that they will be honored in a way that is appropriate; and that those who are ambitious for honor with respect to the other members shall receive some other goodly recognition from the association of the *Sarapiastai*; and (it was resolved) to also commend and to crown the *proeranistria* Nikippē, because she offered the sacrifices at their appointed times. And (it was resolved) to inscribe this decree on a stele and to set it up at the Sarapeion; and let the treasurer Zopyros pay for the expenses that arise from the treasury.

<i>Proeranistria</i>	Seleukos	Py....	...
Nikippē	Dorion	...	...
treasurer	Euboulides	...	...
Zopyros	Ant---	...	...
secretary	Xen---	sacrifice makers	...
[Theophanes]	...	...	...
[supervisor]	...	...	...
[Olympichos]	...	...	...

### Notes

- I. 1: ἐπι Διοκλέους ἄρχοντος; i.e., 215/14 BCE (Meritt 1977, 178). This reconstruction is suggested by the mention of Hagnias in I. 9, the archon (presumably) from the year before the inscription was cut.
- I. 3: Ζώπυρος; *PA* 6255; *PAA* 464000; *LGPN* 2:196[135].
- I. 4: Θεοφάνης; *PA* 7075; *PAA* 510545; *LGPN* 2:221[35].
- I. 5: Ὀλύμπιος; *PA* 11419; *PAA* 743540; *LGPN* 2:351[40].
- I. 8: κατὰ τὸν [νόμον]; Dow; Vidman; Bricault. Kirchner: παρὰ τὸν [εὐθουν]
- I. 8: τὸν [νόμον] → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1278.2 [17] note.
- I. 9: ἐπι Ἀγνίου ἄρχοντος; i.e., 216/15 BCE (Meritt 1977, 178).
- I. 13: ταινιδίω. “a bandelette.” Robert (BE 1970, no. 260) draws attention to ταινιδίωσα in an inscription from Eleusis: Eugene Vanderpool, “Three Inscriptions from Eleusis,” *AD* 23 A (1968) 1–9, no. 1.13–15 (= *SEG* 25:156; 238/7 BCE; BE 1970, no. 260): ἀγαθεὶ τῷ[[χει δεδόχθαι τοῖς θια]σώταις ἐπαινέσαι Παιδικὸν [φι]][λοτιμίας ἔνεκα καὶ εὐ]νοίας, καὶ ταινιδίωσαι αὐτὸν..., “for good fortune, the *thiasōtai* resolved to commend Paidikos for his zeal and good will and to give him a bandelette....”
- I. 14: ἀναγορεύειν → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1263.37–38 [11] note.
- II. 16–17: ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀναγορεύσωσ[ιν ἢ μὴ στε]||[φα]νώσωσι → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1263.43–45 [11] note.
- II. 17–18: ἀποτεισάτω ἕκαστος αὐ[τῶν F] | [δ]ραχμᾶς ἱεράς τοῖς Σαραπιασταῖς. The numeral is restored from *AM* 66:228.19 [39]; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1263.45 [11]; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1273.23 [18]; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328.13 [34].
- II. 18–19: [ὄπως ἀν] | [ἐ]φάμυλλον ἦι → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1297.6–7 [24] note.
- I. 24: [π]ροεραν[ίσ]τρια. Compare the ἀρχερανίστρια of *SEG* 54:235.5 [47]. Leiwo (1997, 112), Dunand (1973, 2:7) and Heyob (1975, 105) cite *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1292 as evidence that a woman could have a position of authority in an *eranos* association. Dow (below) and Arnaoutoglou 1994b, 109, however, argues that her “supremacy may lie in her past, present and future financial help to the group of *Sarapiastai*. In reward the group decided to give to her this nominal headship.” The case for leadership is clearer in *SEG* 54:235 [47], where a woman bears the title of ἀρχερανίστρια and is named first in a list of members of an *eranistai* association: [ἀγα]θῆι τύχηι. ἐπὶ Λευκίου Ῥαμνουσίου νεω[τέρου ἄ]ρχοντος | ὁ{ι} ἱεροποιήσας καὶ κοσμητεύσας Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀντιόχου τούσδε ἀνέγραψεν ἐρανιστᾶς, ταμιεύοντος τὸ δεῦτερον Καλλίστρατον, γραμματεύοντος δὲ Δημητρίου τὸ δεῦτερον | ἀρχερανίστρια || Θάλεια. ἱερεὺς Ἡρακλέους Θεόδωρος | Μητροδώρου Παιανιεύς <the names of 125 men and women *eranistai* follow.>

### Comments

While the cult of Isis was introduced into the Piraeus by traders (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 337 [3]*), the introduction of Sarapis was likely due to political alliances between the Ptolemies and Athens. The Athenian Timotheos had been involved in Ptolemy I Soter's establishing of the cult of Sarapis in the first place, the Athenian ex-tyrant Demetrios of Phaleron reportedly composed hymns to Sarapis, and Athenian sculptor Bryaxis was responsible for the cult statue of Sarapis. The cult of Sarapis and Isis was popular on Delos, which had been under Athenian control from 478/7 until 315 (Bruneau 1970; Roussel 1987). Political alliances of Athens and Egypt under the later Ptolemies probably account for the introduction of the cult of Sarapis to Athens (Dow 1937; Mikalson 1998, 180–81). Pausanias describes a ἱερόν of Sarapis in Athens and asserts that Sarapis was “a god whom the Athenians received from Ptolemy” (1.18.4: ὄν Ἀθηναῖοι παρὰ Πτολεμαίου θεὸν ἐσηγάγοντο). It is not clear which Ptolemy Pausanias has in mind (Dow 1937, 187–88); Mikalson (1998, 276) thinks it was Ptolemy III Euergetes, who was a benefactor of Athens in the 220s BCE. This inscription and *IRhamnous II 59 [27]* from about the same time represent the only Athenian attestations of the *Sarapiastai*.

Dow describes the stele as small, with an original height of just 60 cm. and notes the relatively poor quality of the inscriptions. He infers that “from this it would appear that the *Sarapiastai* were not wealthy in the late third century” (Dow 1937, 190). Assuming that the association had an *epimelētēs*, a treasurer, a secretary, at least three *hieropoioi*, and Nikippē the *proeranastría* – seven officials in all –, he calculates that the club must have had between fifty and eighty members (i.e., one official for every 8–10 members; Dow 1937, 192). This would make it among the largest of Athenian societies. There is indeed sufficient space on the bottom portion of the stele to accommodate 50–80 names.

Since the find-spot of the stone is unknown, the location of the temple or shrine mentioned in this inscription is likewise unclear. Other finds related to the cult of Isis and Sarapis were discovered in the south-west part of Athens (→ *SEG 42:157 [42]*), and this is where Pausanias appears to locate the shrine (Dow 1937; Wycherley 1963). In that case, these *Sarapiastai* may have met in an existing Sarapis shrine, in contrast to the *Sarapiastai* of Rhamnous (*IRhamnous II 59 [27]*), who purchased land to build their own shrine.

The names at the bottom of the inscription are in the nominative rather than the accusative. Hence, this is not a list of honorees, whose names would normally appear in the accusative, but a list of members, headed by the names of the *proeranastría*, the treasurer, the secretary and, in all likelihood, the supervisor. Although Nikippē enjoys the first position in the list of members, implying a position of precedence, Dow observes that she is also the last to be commended in the decree itself and the praise is strikingly understated. All that



is stated is that she performed the sacrifices at the appropriate times. Other officials are praised with adverbs *πλεονάκις*, *καλῶς* and *δικαίως*. Hence, while Dow concedes that

Nikippe, the head of the society, performed the principal duty of a priest, yet the decree does not give her even an adverb. Her headship of the society had become, or always had been, merely nominal. (Dow 1937, 194).

Perhaps the best way to understand this combination of a position of precedence and strikingly understated praise is to suggest that Nikippē acquired the title of *proeranistria* either because she had founded the society or was a principal benefactor, at least in the past, and hence deserved an honorary title.

Like the albums of many other associations, this list lacks demotics or patronyms. Dow (1937, 196–97) is right to observe that this does not automatically indicate that the persons cited are metics or slaves, since lists of citizen members of some associations sometimes lacked demotics. Brady asserted, without any evidence, that “there were some Athenian citizens in the membership of the *Sarapiastai*,” singling out the supervisor, treasurer and secretary, but excluding Nikippē (Brady 1935, 21). He observed, moreover, that Nikippē is not a known Athenian name, and that Dorion (l. 31 → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1298.2 [20]*) appears as an Athenian name only in the late first century BCE. *IRhamnous II 59 [27]*, apparently representing related groups of *Sarapiastai*, did include demesmen; there is, however, no overlap between those named in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1292* and *IRhamnous II 59*. Dow argues that since after 300 BCE, care is usually taken to identify demesmen in such inscriptions, those named in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1292* are probably not citizens (Dow 1937, 197; similarly Parker 1996, 340). If that is the case, we should reckon on two groups of *Sarapiastai*, a largely metic group in Athens or the Piraeus, and a citizen group in Rhamnous.

**Literature:** Brady, Thomas A. *The Reception of the Egyptian Cults by the Greeks (330–30 B.C.)*. University of Missouri Studies 10/1. Columbia: University of Missouri, 1935, 20–21; Dow 1937, 188–97; Danker 1982, 154–55; Ferguson 1911, 171; Heyob 1975, 105; Leiwo 1997; Rusch 1906, 6–7; Tracy, et al. 1978; Tracy 1990, 44–54; Wycherley, R.E. “Pausanias at Athens, II.” *GRBS* 4 (1963) 157–175, esp. 161–62.

[27] *IRhamnous* II 59  
*Sarapiastai* honor a benefactor

Rhamnous (Attica) after 216/15 BCE  
 Published: Vasileios C. Petrakos, “ΑΝΑΣΚΑΦΗ ΠΑΜΝΟΥΝΤΟΣ,” *Πρακτικά τῆς ἐν Ἀθῆναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας* 1990 [1993] 1–39, pp. 31–32 (no. 15) (*SEG* 41:74) (ll. 1–17 only); Vasileios C. Petrakos, *Ὁ ΔΗΜΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΜΝΟΥΝΤΟΣ: Σννοπή τῶν ἀνασκαφῶν καὶ τῶν ἐρευνῶν (1813–1998), II. Οἱ ἐπιγραφές* (Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθῆναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας 181–182; Athens: Ἡ ἐν Ἀθῆναις Ἑταιρεία, 1999), 60–62 (no. 59) = *IRhamnous* II 59; Bricault, *RICIS* 1:31–32 (no. 101/0502).  
 Similar Inscriptions: → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1292 [26] (Athens or Piraeus; 215/14 BCE): Decree of the *Sarapiastai*.

Non-stoichedon. Stele of local white marble, 81 x 38–40 x 10 cm. Letter height: 0.7–0.9 cm. Discovered inside the east gate of the fort.

- [Αφθ]όνητο[ς Ἀφθονήτου Ῥαμνούσιος εἶπεν]·  
 [ἐπει]δὴ Ἀπολλ[λόδωρος χειροτονηθεὶς στρατηγός]  
 [δια]τετέλεκε[εν εὔνοους ὦν καὶ ἰδία καὶ κοι]-  
 [νε]ῖ τῷ δήμῳ ἐ[ν παντὶ καιρῷ, ἐστεφάνωσ]-  
 5 [ἐν] τε αὐτὸν ὁ δῆ[μος τὰς ἀξίας χάριτας το]-  
 [ῖς] κεχειροτονήμ[ενοις στρατηγοῖς ἀποδι]-  
 δούς, ἀνθ' ὧν αὐτὸν ἢ [τ]ε βο[υλῆ πολλὰκις ἐσ]-  
 [τ]εφάνωσεν χρυσοῖς στεφάν[οις, διατελεῖ]  
 [δὲ] καὶ ἰδία[ι] εἰς ὃ ἂν τις αὐτὸν [παρ]ακ[αλεῖ]  
 10 [τ]ῶν πολιτῶν εὐχρηστον ἑαυτὸν παρ[ασκευ]-  
 [ά]ζων· καὶ νῦν γραψάντων τῶν ἐν Ῥαμν[οῦν]-  
 τι ταττομένων πολιτῶν ὑπὲρ τόπου ὃς [ἦν]  
 ἴδιος αὐτοῦ καὶ βουλομένων πρίασθαι ὥστ[ε]  
 15 [Ἰ]σιδι, ἀποδ[ό]σσει μὲν οὐκ ἠβουλήθη, ἔδωκε δὲ ἄ-  
 νευ τιμῆς περὶ πλείστου ποιούμενος τήν  
 τε πρ[ὸς το]ῦς θεοῦς εὐσέβειαν καὶ τὴν πρὸς  
 τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ πολίτας εὔνοιάν τε καὶ φι-  
 20 λωτιμίαν· ὅπως ἂν φαίνωνται κ<α>ὶ οἱ Σαραπι-  
 ασταὶ χάριν ἀποδιδόντες τοῖς εἰς ἑαυ<sup>ν</sup>-  
 τοὺς φιλοτιμουμένοις, ἀγαθεῖ τύχει·  
 δεδόχθαι τῷ κοινῷ τῶν Σαραπιαστῶν  
 ἐπαιέσαι καὶ στεφανώσαι χρυσῷ στε<sup>ν</sup>-  
 25 φάνῳ Ἀπολλόδωρον Σωγένου Ὀτρυνέα εὐ-  
 σεβείας ἔνεκα τῆς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ φι-  
 λωτιμίας τῆς εἰς ἑαυτούς· καλεῖν δὲ αὐτὸν

- καὶ εἰς τὰς θυσίας τοὺς ἱεροποιούσας οἷς ἂν ἡ  
 λειτουργία καθήκει· τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τόδε ἀνα-  
 γράψαι εἰς στήλην λιθίνην καὶ στήσαι πρὸ τῆς  
 30 εἰσόδου τοῦ νεώ· ἐλέσθαι δὲ ἐξ ἑαυτῶν ἐξ ἄν<sup>ων</sup>-  
 δρας οἵτινες ἐπιμελήσονται τῆς τε ἀναγρα<sup>φης</sup>-  
 φῆς τοῦ ψηφίσματος καὶ τῆς ἀνα[θ]έσεως τῆς  
 στήλης· τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα τὸ γενόμενον λογισάσ<sup>ων</sup>-  
 θωσαν τῶι κοινῶι· οἶδε εἰρέθησαν <sup>ν</sup>
- 35 Δημοκλήης Εὐπυρίδης, Ἀντιφάνης ἐξ Οἴου, <sup>ν</sup>  
 Κλεοδώριδης Ῥαμνούσιος, Βίων Φρεάρριος, <sup>ν</sup>  
 Ἀφθόνητος Ῥαμνούσιος, Φιλοκλήης Ἐρχιεῦ<sup>ς</sup>.  
 τὸ κοινόν  
 τῶν Σαραπιαστῶν
- 40 Ἀπολλόδωρον  
 Σωγένου  
 Ὀτρυνέα

Aphthonētos son of Aphthonētos of (the deme) Rhamnous made the following motion: Whereas Apollodoros, who was elected as *stratēgos*, has continued to be well-intentioned towards the People (*dēmos*) — both to individuals and collectively — at all times and (whereas) the People crowned him when it accorded fitting recognition to all those who had been elected as *stratēgoi*, on account of which (things) the Council (*boulē*) has crowned him many times with gold crowns, (and whereas) he continues to be of service even individually in respect to whatever any of the citizens might ask him; and now, after the citizens of Rhamnous who had been appointed wrote in respect to a place that belonged to him, wishing to purchase it so that they could build a temple to Sarapis and Isis, not only did he not wish to be paid for it, but he even gave it to them without any charge, expressing to the highest degree piety towards the gods and good will and zeal with regard to his fellow citizens. So that the *Sarapiastai* might be seen as rendering appropriate thanks to those who are zealous in respect to them, for good fortune the *koinon* of the *Sarapiastai* have resolved to commend Apollodoros son of Sogenes of (the deme) Otrynē and to crown him with a crown of gold, for the piety that he has shown toward the gods and the zeal that he has displayed towards his fellows; and that the sacrifice makers who are responsible for the *leitourgia* should also invite him to the sacrifices; and that they should inscribe this decree on a stele and erect it in front of the entrance to the sanctuary; and that they shall choose men from among them who will take responsibility for inscribing the decree and for erecting the stele. Let them make an accounting to the association of the expenses that are incurred. They were chosen as follows:

Demokles of (the deme) Eupyridai; Antiphanes of Oioe;  
 Kleodorides of Rhamnous; Bion of Phrearrhioi;  
 Aphthonetos of Rhamnous; Philokles of Erchia  
 The association (*koinon*) of the *Sarapiastai* (honors) Apollodoros son of  
 Sogenes, of Otrynē.

### Notes

- Il. 1, 37: [Αφθ]όνητο[ς] Ἀφθονήτου Ῥαμνούσιος: Otherwise unknown.
- l. 2: Ἀπολλόδωρος χειροτονηθεὶς στρατηγός: On the basis of the first fragment discovered (Il. 1–16), Petrakos suggested that Apollodoros was Apollodoros son of Apollodoros of Otryne (*SEG* 3:122) (Rhamnous; 262/1–256/5 BCE). The discovery of the remainder of the inscription makes clear that the *stratēgos* in question is Ἀπολλόδωρος Σωγένου Ὀτρυνένυς (*PA* 1434; *PAA* 142960; *LGP*N 2:43[155]), also named in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 791d.i.26 (323/1 BCE) and in *Agora* 16:213.68–69 (Athens; 244/3 BCE) in a list of contributors to a defence fund (Woodhead 1997, 302–303 [no. 231]).
- Il. 3–4: ἰδίαί καὶ κοῖ||[νε]ῖ. → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1327.6 [34] *note*.
- Il. 8–11: διατελεῖ | [δὲ] καὶ ἰδία[ι] εἰς ὃ ἄν τις αὐτὸν [παρ]ακ[αλεῖ] || [τ]ῶν πολιτῶν εὐχρηστον ἑαυτὸν παρ[ασκευ]||[ά]ζων → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1327.6 [34] *note*.
- l. 35: Δημοκλᾶς Εὐπυρίδης (*PAA* 315820; *LGP*N 2:109[31]), named in *IRhamnous* II 26.33 (Rhamnous; after 229 BCE); *IRhamnous* II 26.6 naming Demokles as γραμμιατεὺς Δημοκλῆς Εὐπυρίδης; *IRhamnous* II 44.22 (after 216/5 BCE), as one chosen to supervise the awarding of a crown.
- l. 35: Ἀντιφάνης ἐξ Οἴου (*PAA* 137560; *LGP*N 2:39 [64]), also named in *IRhamnous* II 22.20 (Rhamnous; after 229 BCE); *IRhamnous* II 24.9 (Rhamnous; 216–206 BCE); *IRhamnous* II 44.22 (after 216/5 BCE), as one chosen to supervise the awarding of a crown.
- l. 36: Κλεοδωρίδης Ῥαμνούσιος: Otherwise unknown.
- l. 36: Βίων Φρεάρριος: Otherwise unknown.
- l. 37: Φιλοκλῆς Ἐρχιεύς: Otherwise unknown.

### Comments

On the introduction of the cult of Sarapis into Athens → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1292 [26] *comment*.

Although this inscription does not settle the issues of the membership of the *Sarapiastai* in the late-third century BCE raised a propos of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1292 [26], *IRhamnous* II 59 makes clear that demesmen were among its members at Rhamnous. Six demesmen are named in the inscription as the mover of the motion or as those chosen to supervise the inscribing of the honorific decree.

This inscription illustrates the donation of land by a wealthy Athenian, Apollodoros son of Sogenes, for the building of a temple to Sarapis and Isis. It is unclear how long the *Sarapiastai* existed as an association prior to their offer to buy land from Apollodoros and Apollodoros's donation of the land. That

they were in a position to purchase the land and build a temple on it indicates that the association collectively had substantial resources. Their patron, Apollodoros, is evidently also a person of considerable standing and wealth, since the inscription acknowledges his benefactions to Athens, the golden crowns he has received, and the fact that the association itself is prepared to award a golden crown rather than the more customary olive wreath (compare *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1292.12 [26]*).

**Literature:** Arnautoglou 2003, 85, 107, 116–117, 31, 137, 151, 154; Petrakos 1999, 60–62.

## [28] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314*

### The *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods honor a priestess

Piraeus (Attica)

213/2 BCE

Published: S. Rhousopoulos, “Ελληνικαὶ ἐπιγραφαί,” *AE* 1 (1862) 1–3 (no. 1) (facsimile, Πίναξ Α) (*ed. pr.*); Foucart 1873, 195 (no. 7); Koehler, *IG II* 619; Michel, *RIG* 981; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314*; Kirchner and Klaffenbach 1948, no. 95 (photo only); Vermaseren 1977–1989, 2:73–74 (no. 261) (Poland A2b).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314*.

Current Location: Piraeus archaeological museum.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4563* (Athens or Piraeus, IV BCE): A dedication to the Mother of the Gods; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4609* (Piraeus, late IV BCE): A dedication to the Mother of the Gods by two women; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 6288* (350–317 BCE): A grave inscription for a woman described as μητρὸς παντοτέκνου πρόπολος; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273AB [18]* (Piraeus, 265/4 BCE): A decree of the *thiasōtai* of the Mother of the Gods; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16]* (Piraeus, 272/1 BCE): A decree of the *thiasōtai* of the Mother of the Gods; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314 [28]* (Piraeus, 213/2 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1315 [29]* (Piraeus, 211/0 BCE); *Agora* 16:235 (Meritt, et al. 1957, 209–10 (no. 57); *SEG* 17:36; 32:348; 39:195) (Athens, 202/1 BCE): Honorary decree of the *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods for a priestess; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1328 [34]* (Piraeus, 183/2, 175/4 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1327 [35]* (Piraeus, 178/7 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1329 [37]* (Piraeus, 175/4 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2950/1* (II BCE): A dedication of a treasurer to the Mother of the Gods; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1334 [45]* 71/0 BCE (?); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4703* (mid I BCE): Dedication of the wife of a demesman; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4714* (Augustan period): Dedication of the daughter of a demesman to the Mother of the Gods and to Aphrodite, “gracious midwife” (εὐαντήτω ἰατρείῃ); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4759–60* (I/II ce): Two dedications of the wives of two demesmen to the mother of the Gods (εὐαντήτω ἰατρείῃ).

Stoichedon (28–34 letters). 110 x 44 x 12 cm. Letter height: 0.5 cm. A marble stele with a pediment, almost complete, with a slight breakage at the bottom. The cutter, according to Tracy (1978; 1990, 44–54), is responsible for a large number of inscriptions, including *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1706*, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1292* [26], *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1315* [29], and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1319–1320*, and was active 229/8–ca. 203. The cutting is sloppy, with strokes that do not always meet precisely, vertical strokes that are not vertical, horizontal strokes not horizontal, and round letters cut with one or more straight strokes..

## Θ Ε Ο Ι

- ἐπὶ Ἡρακλείτου ἄρχοντος· Μουνιχιῶνος  
 ἀγορᾷ κυρία· ὡ Παράμονος Παρμενίσκου  
 Ἐπεικίδης εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Γλαῦκον ἰε-  
 5 ρεῖα λαχοῦσα εἰς τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν ἐπὶ  
 Εὐφιλῆτου ἄρχοντος κ[α]λῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς  
 τὴν ἱερωσύνην ἐξήγαγεν καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ  
 ἐφιλοτιμήθη ὅσα προσήκεν τεῖ θεῷ,  
 ὅπως ἂν οὖν καὶ οἱ ὀργεῶνες φαίνονται  
 10 χάριν ἀποδιδόντες ταῖς φιλοτιμουμέ-  
 ναις τῶν λαγχανουσῶν ἱερειῶν εἰς τε  
 τὴν θεὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ὀργεῶνων,  
 ἀγαθεῖ τύχει δεδόχθαι τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν,  
 ἐπαινέσαι τὴν ἱερεῖαν Γλαῦκον καὶ  
 15 στεφανῶσαι θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι εὐσε-  
 βείας ἔνεκεν τῆς εἰς τὴν θεὸν καὶ φιλο-  
 τιμίας τῆς εἰς ἑαυτούς· ὡ ἀναθεῖναι δὲ  
 αὐτῆς καὶ εἰκόνα ἐν τῷ ναῷ· στεφανοῦν  
 20 τὸν καθ' ἐκάστην θυσίαν καὶ ἀναγορεύειν  
 τὸν στέφανον αὐτῆς τοὺς ἐπιμελητάς· ὡ ἀνα-  
 [γρ]άψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα τοὺς ὀργεῶνας  
 ἐν στήλει λιθίνει καὶ στήσαι ἐν τῷ τεμέ-  
 νει [τῆς θεο]ῦ.

<vacat>

- 25 οἱ ὀργεῶνες  
 τὴν ἱερεῖαν  
 Γλαῦκον.  
 <vacat>

## G o d s!

In the year that Herakleitos was archon, in the month of Mounichion, in the regular assembly, Paramonos son of Parmeniskos of Epieikidai, made the (following) motion: whereas Glaukon, allotted priestess for the year that Euphilētos was archon, carried out her priesthood honorably and in a

pious manner, and was ambitious in regard to the other matters that pertain to the goddess, (and) in order that the *orgeōnes* should be seen to render thanks to those (women) who are chosen as priestesses and who are ambitious in regard to the goddess and for the association of *orgeōnes*; – for good fortune, it has been resolved by the *orgeōnes* to commend Glaukon the priestess and to crown her with an olive wreath on account of the piety that she has shown toward the goddess and the zeal she has shown for (the members) themselves. (They shall) also to erect a statue of her in the temple; (and it is resolved) to wreath it yearly from that time on during each sacrifice; and (resolved) that the supervisors should announce (the awarding of) her wreath; and that the *orgeōnes* inscribe this decree on a stele and erect it in the sacred precinct of the goddess.

The members (honor)  
the priestess  
Glaukon.

### Notes

- I. 1: Θ Ε Ο Ι → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 337.1* [3] (note).
- I. 2: ἐπὶ Ἡρακλείτου ἄρχοντος: i.e., 213/12 BCE (Meritt 1977, 178).
- I. 2: Μουνιχιῶνος: The regular meeting of this society when officials were honored seems to have been in the month of Mounichion, late in the Athenian year (April/May): *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314* [28]; 1315 [29]; 1327 [35]; 1328 [34]; 1329 [37]. The meeting in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1316* [16] in Hekatombaion appears to have been exceptional.
- I. 3: ἀγορᾶ κυρία → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1263.2–3* [11] note.
- II. 4, 14, 27: Γλαῦκον: *PA* 2990; *PAA* 46879; *LGPN* 2:91[1]: L. Robert (“Inscription du Louvre,” *BCH* (1936) 206–7 + plate 25 [BE 1938, no. 104] = Lane 1971–1978, 1.no. 8) draws attention to *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4687<sup>a</sup>*, also discovered at the Metroon in the Piraeus, and which dates its dedication to the priesthood of Glaukon: Δημήτριος | καὶ ἡ γυνὴ | Ἐρώτιον | Μηνί, | ἐπὶ ἱερε[ι]ας | Γλαύκου, “Demetrios and his wife Erotion (dedicated this) to Mēn, during the priesthood of Glaukon.” Robert notes that the Metroon contained many other documents, including dedications to other deities: “décrets de l’association [*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314*], listes de membres, statuettes de la Mère des Dieux, dédicaces non seulement à la Mère des Dieux, mais à d’autres divinités telles qu’Hermes Hegemonios [*IG II<sup>2</sup> 4814*], et Artemis Nana [*IG II<sup>2</sup> 4696*]” (207).
- II. 4–5: ἰέρεια λαχοῦσα, “being allotted priestess.” Priestesses are attested in the *orgeōnes* of Bendis and the Mother of the Gods.
- II. 5–6: ἐπὶ | Εὐφιλῆτου ἄρχοντος: i.e., 214/13 BCE (Meritt 1977, 178).
- II. 9, 13, 22, 25: ὀργεῶνες → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255.1* [2] note.
- I. 10: χάριν ἀποδιδόντες → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252+999.21* [6] note.
- I. 20: ἀναγορεύειν → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1263.37–38* [11] note.

*Comments*

On the transformation of the cult of the Mother of the Gods from a non-citizen, metic group (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1273AB [18]) to a citizen association known as *orgeōnes*, see *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16]. Epigraphical evidence of these *orgeōnes*, located in the Piraeus, extends from nearly a century after 272/1 BCE and includes *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1314 [28] (Piraeus, 213/2 BCE); 1315 [29] (Piraeus, 211/0 BCE); *Agora* 16:235 (Athens, 202/1 BCE): honorary decree of the *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods for a priestess; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328 [34] (Piraeus, 183/2, 175/4 BCE); 1327 [35] (Piraeus, 178/7 BCE); 1329 [37] (Piraeus, 175/4 BCE).

Since this inscription comes from the citizen group, it is likely that the priestess Glaukon, like the priestess honored in *Agora* 16:235 (Athens, 202/1 BCE) (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16] *comment*) was the wife of an Athenian demesman. Arnaoutoglou observes that there are no clear references to women being *members* of associations of *orgeōnes* of heroes or foreign deities (Arnaoutoglou 2003, 100). In the case of the earlier *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316 it is possible, observes Arnaoutoglou, that Zeuxion the priestess had her office by virtue of the standing of her husband Agathon. In the present case there is no indication of the activities of Glaukon's husband and the formulae in ll. 9–12, ὅπως ἂν οὖν καὶ οἱ ὀργεῶνες φαίνωνται | χάριν ἀποδιδόντες ταῖς φιλοτιμουμέναις τῶν λαγχανουσῶν ἱερείων εἰς τε | τὴν θεὸν καὶ εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ὀργεῶνων suggests that priesthood now carried with it an aspect of benefaction. The fact that Glaukon has merited the erection of a statue (εἰκόν) which was to be placed in the sanctuary suggests that she played a much greater role than merely duly offering sacrifices (as is said of Nikippē in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1292.25 [26]).

**Literature:** Arnaoutoglou 1994a; 2003, 101–101; Roller 1999, 219–24; Tracy, et al. 1978; Tracy 1990, 47.

[29] *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1315Decree of the *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods

Piraeus (Attica) 211/0 BCE

Published: Foucart 1873, 196 (no. 8); Koehler, *IG* II 622; Michel, *RIG* 982; Kirchner, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1315; Kirchner, et al. 1948, no. 96 (photo only); Vermaseren 1977–1989, 2:75–76 (no. 262) = *CCCA* II 262. (Poland A2e).

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum, EM 7855.

Similar or Similar Inscriptions: → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4563 (Athens or Piraeus, IV BCE): A dedication to the Mother of the Gods; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4609 (Piraeus, late IV BCE): A dedication to the Mother of the Gods by two women; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 6288 (350–317 BCE): A grave inscription for a woman described as μητρὸς παντο-



τέκνον πρόπολος; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273AB [18]* (Piraeus, 265/4 BCE): A decree of the *thiasōtai* of the Mother of the Gods; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16]* (Piraeus, 272/1 BCE): A decree of the *thiasōtai* of the Mother of the Gods; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314 [28]* (Piraeus, 213/2 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1315 [29]* (Piraeus, 211/0 BCE); *Agora 16:235* (Meritt, et al. 1957, 209–10 (no. 57); *SEG 17:36*; 32:348; 39:195) (Athens, 202/1 BCE): Honorary decree of the *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods for a priestess; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1328 [34]* (Piraeus, 183/2, 175/4 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1327 [35]* (Piraeus, 178/7 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1329 [37]* (Piraeus, 175/4 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2950/1* (II BCE), a dedication of a treasurer to the Mother of the Gods; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1334 [45]* 71/0 BCE (?); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4703* (mid I BCE), dedication of the wife of a demesman; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4714* (Augustan period), dedication of the daughter of a demesman to the Mother of the Gods and to Aphrodite, “gracious midwife” (εὐαντήτω ἰατρείῃ); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4759–60* (I/II ce): two dedications of the wives of two demesmen to the mother of the Gods (εὐαντήτω ἰατρείῃ).

Non-stoichedon (28–33 letters). 85 x 29 x 9 cm. Letter height: 0.5 cm. The cutter according to Tracy (1978; 1990, 44–54) is responsible for a large number of inscriptions, including *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1706*, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1292 [26]*, and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314 [29]*, and was active 229/8–ca. 203. The cutting is sloppy, with strokes that do not always meet precisely, vertical strokes that are not vertical, horizontal strokes not horizontal, and round letters cut with one or more straight strokes.

## Θ Ε Ο Ι

- Ἄγαθει τύχει, ἐπὶ Αἰσχρωνος ἄρχον-  
τος, Μουνιχιῶνος, ἀγορᾶ κυρία, Διο-  
νυσόδωρος Ζωπύρου Ἄλωπεκῆθεν εἰ  
5 πεν· ἐπειδὴ Κράτεια, ἰέρεια λαχοῦσα  
εἰς τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν ἐπὶ Αἰσχρωνος, τὰ  
τε εἰσιτητήρια ἔθυσεν καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς  
θυσίας [τ]ᾶς καθῆκεν θύειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ  
κοινού, ἔστρωσεν δὲ καὶ κλίνην εἰς  
10 ἀμφοτέρα τὰ Ἀττίδεια, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πα-  
ρεσκεύασεν καλῶς καὶ ἱεροπρεπῶς, οὐ  
θὲν ἐνλείπουσα φιλοτιμίας, καὶ τὸν ἐ-  
νιαυτὸν καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς διετέλε-  
σεν θεραπεύουσα τὰς θεὰς καὶ ἀνοίγου-  
15 σα τὸ ἱερὸν ἐν ταῖς καθηκούσαις ἡμέ-  
ραις· ὅπως ἂν οὖν καὶ οἱ ὀργεῶνες φαί-  
νωνται χάριν ἀποδιδόντες τοῖς φ[ι]λοτι-  
μουμένοις εἰς τὰς θεὰς καὶ εἰς ἑαυτοὺς,  
ἀγαθεῖ τυχεῖ, δε]δόχθαι τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν  
20 ἐπαινέσαι Κράτειαν καὶ στεφανῶσαι  
θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι, εὐσεβείας ἕνεκεν

τῆς εἰς τὰς θεᾶς καὶ φιλοτιμίας τῆς  
εἰς ἑαυτοὺς, στεφανοῦν δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν ἔ-  
πειτα χρόνον ταῖς θυσίαις καὶ ἀγο-  
25 ρεῦειν τὸν στέφανον αὐτῆς· ἀναγρά-  
ψαι δὲ τὸδε τὸ ψήφισμα τοὺς ὀργεῶνας  
ἐν στήλει λιθίνει καὶ στήσαι πρὸ τοῦ  
ναοῦ.

<in crowns>

30	οἱ ὀργ- εῶνες τὴν ἰέρειαν Κράτειαν.	ἡ ἰέρεια Κράτεια Ἱερώνυμον.
----	--	-----------------------------------

G o d s!

For good luck, during the archonship of Aischron in the month of Mounichion, in regular assembly, Dionysodoros son of Zopyros, of the deme Alopekethe, proposed [the motion]: Whereas Krateia, having been allotted priestess for the year Aischron (was archon), offered both the sacrifices at the beginning of the year and offered the other appropriate sacrifices on behalf of the association (*koinon*); and [whereas] she also spread out the couch for both the festivals of Attis, and she prepared the other things correctly and reverently, neglecting nothing honorable, and she has continually acted correctly and dutifully throughout the year, serving the goddess and opening the temple on the proper days; therefore in order that the *orgeōnes* might be seen to render thanks to those who seek contribute liberally to the goddesses and to themselves [i.e., the *orgeōnes*]; for good fortune, the *orgeōnes* resolved to commend Krateia and to crown her with an olive crown, on account of (her) piety towards the goddesses and her zeal for them [the *orgeōnes*], and also to crown her during the sacrifices and to announce publicly her crowning. And the *orgeōnes* (resolved) to inscribe this decree on a stele and set it up in front of the sanctuary.

The *orgeōnes* (honor) the priestess Krateia.

Krateia the priestess (honors) Hieronymos.

### Notes

I. 1: ΘΕΟΙ → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 337.1 [3] (note).

II. 2–3: ἐπὶ Αἰσχρονος ἄρχοντος: i.e., 211/10 BCE (Meritt 1977, 178).

I. 3: ἀγορᾶ κυρία: → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1263.2–3 [11] note.

I. 9: ἔστρωσεν δὲ καὶ κλίνην: Compare *Agora* 16:235.7–9 (Athens, 202/1 BCE) where the *orgeōnes* commend their priestess, the wife of an Athenian demesman· [– – – ἐπεμ]ελήθη δὲ τῆς στ[ρώ][σεως τῆς κλίνης τῶν θεῶ]ν μετὰ πάσης [σπου][δῆς, “she took responsibility for the bedding of the couch of the gods with all earnestness....”

See also *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328.9–10 [34]: στ[ρω]ννύειν | θρόνους δὺ[ο ὧ]ς καλλίστους, “to furnish the two thrones as beautifully as possible”; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1329.14–16 [37]: διατετέλεκεν δὲ καὶ || συνλειτουργῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀγερμοῖς καὶ ταῖς στρώσεσιν ταῖς ἱερῆαις, “he has also continued to undertake service in the collection and with the sacred furnishings.”

- II. 16, 19, 26, 30/31: ὀργεῶνες → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255.1 [2] *note*.  
 I. 17: χάριν ἀποδιδόντες → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1252+999.21 [6] *note*.  
 I. 18: εἰς τὰς θεάς, “to the goddesses” → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328.10 [34].  
 II. 29–31: ἡ ἱέρεια | Κράτεια | Ἱερώνυμος: *PA* 8733; *PAA* 583655; *LGPN* 2:271[1]: “Krateia the priestess (honors) Hieronymos”: Foucart (1883, 72) understands Hieronymos to be the husband of Krateia, on the analogy of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16] where both Agathon (an Athenian citizen) and his wife, Zeuxion, a priestess, are honored. “Je pense que ce personnage, qui n’est désigné par aucun titre, est le mari de la prêtresse et que celle-ci l’associe à l’honneur que lui est décerné.”

### Comments

The proposer of the motion to honor Krateia is an Athenian demesman and in all likelihood, Krateia is the wife of an Athenian citizen (→ *note* on l. 31). Of the extant inscriptions from the association(s) of the Mother of the Gods in the Piraeus, Kephalion of Herakleia (Pontika) and Soterichos of Troizen of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1273 (265/4 BCE) are metics, as are Manēs and (presumably?) his wife Mika (of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4609; IV BCE). Ergasion of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1327 [28] (178/7 BCE) may be a freedman. Of the remaining sixteen names, seven are identified with demotics, two are the wives of men identified with demotics, and the remaining eight are likely citizens or the wives of citizens:

- Ἀγάθων Ἀγαθοκλέους Φλυέα (husband of honoree) (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316)
- Ζεύξιον (the wife of Agathon) (honoree) (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316)
- Ἱερόκλεια γυνὴ δὲ Ἀντιγενείδου Λαμπτρέως (priestess) (*Agora* 16:235)
- Παράμονος Παρμενίσκου Ἐπιεικίδης (mover of a motion) (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1314)
- Γλαῦκον (honoree and priestess) (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1314)
- Διονυσόδωρος Ζωπύρου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν (mover of a motion) (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1315)
- Κράτεια (honoree and priestess) (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1315)
- Κλείππος Αἰζωνεύς (mover of a motion) (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328)
- Μητροδόρα (priestess) (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328)
- Σιμάλη (priestess) (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328)
- Εὐαξίς (mother of Metrodora) (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328)
- Εὐκτῆμων Εὐμαρίδου Στεφριεύς (mover of a motion) (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1327)
- Ἑρμαῖος Ἑρμογένου Παιονίδης (honoree) (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1327)
- Νέων Χολαργεύς (*epimelētēs*) (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1327)
- Ἵνασῶ Θέωνος (priestess) (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1334)
- Ἱερώνυμος (honoree) (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1315)

Whether these *orgeōnes* included some metics in the late third century and early second century BCE is uncertain. The numerical preponderance of citizens after the middle of the third century BCE shows, however, that Athenians dominated.

One of the key parts of the ritual honoring the Mother of the Gods (Cybele) and Attis was the adorning of the Mother's couch (κλίνη) or throne (θρόνος). Indeed, depictions of the goddess normally represent her as seated on a couch or throne (Petrocheilos 1992, plates. 5–25). Pythagoras, according to Porphyry, when he was on Crete visited the Idaean cave, sacrificed to Zeus, and “saw the throne which every year is decorated for him” (τὸν τε στορνύμενον αὐτῷ κατ' ἔτος θρόνον ἐθεάσατο) (Porphyry, *Vita Pythagorica* 17). According to Robertson, this shrine was originally a shrine to the Mother, later taken over by Zeus (Robertson 1996, 252–53). In Piraean inscriptions, the priestess of the Mother of the Gods is routinely praised for “spreading” (στρωννύειν, αἱ στρώσεις) the couch or throne of the goddess, and there is an implication that two couches or a couch for two deities is meant: *Agora* 16:235.8–9 [ἐπεμ]ελήθη δὲ τῆς στ[ρώ][σεως τῆς κλίνης τῶν θεῶ]ν; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1328.9–10 [34]: στ[ρω]ννύειν | θρόνους δύο; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1329.14–16 [37]: διατετέλεκεν δὲ καὶ || συνλειτουργῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀγερμοῖς καὶ ταῖς στρώσε|σιν ταῖς ἱερῆαις. The preparation of the couches appears to have been the responsibility of women in the group, the priestess, the ζάκορος (attendant: *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1328.16 [34]) or πρόπολος (attendant: *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 6288.4; Piraeus, 350–317 BCE).

**Literature:** Arnaoutoglou 1994b; Jones 1999, 264–65; Parker 1996, 192–93; Petrocheilos 1992; Robertson 1996; Roller 1999, 219–24; Vermaseren 1977–1989, 2:75–76.

### [30] *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2354

#### Membership list of an association of *eranistai*

Athens (Attica) end of III BCE

Published: Fragment *a*: K.S. Pittakes, Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική (1859) 1828 (no. 3500) (facsimile of cols. 1–3 only); Foucart 1873, 222 (no. 40); Fragment *b*: Koehler, *IG II* 988; Lüders 1873, 6; Both fragments: Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2354 (Poland A35).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2354

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum, EM 8082.

Two fragments of a marble plaque (*a*, *b*), 11 x 34 x 8.0 cm., mutilated at the right and with a margin at the top and bottom. Tracy (1990, 240) assigns this inscription to the cutter of *IG I<sup>2</sup>* 787, also responsible for *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 837 (227/6 BCE).

[ τ ὸ κ ] ο ι ν ὸ ν ἔ ρ α [ ν ι ] σ τ ὶ ὦ ν ἄ ν ἔ [ θ η κ ε ν ].			
[Χά]ρις	Λεόντιον	Λαίς	Θεόξενο[ς]
[Ἡρ]αίς	Νικησώ	Σ[τ]ίμος	[Μ]νησίδημ[ος]
Κιλλώ	Σόφον	Παυσανίας	Σωτηρίδ[ης]

5	Νεμειάς Εὐκόλον [Γλ]άρα	Μέλιττα Αινήσιον Ἄριστώ	Διοσκο[υρί]δης Ὀλύμπιχος Δημήτριος	Σίμων Σύρος <i>vac.</i>
---	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	--	-------------------------------

### Notes

1. 1: ἐρανιστῶν → IG II<sup>2</sup> 1291 [19] *comment*.
1. 3: [Ἡρ]αίς (*PAA* 484140; *LGPN* 2:204[3]) Hiller von Gaertringen; Pittakes, Foucart: Ἐλπίς.
1. 4: Κῦλλώ (*PAA* 569655; *LGPN* 2:261[1]); Pittakes, Foucart: Φῦλλώ .
1. 6: Σύρος (*PAA* 853990; *LGPN* 2:411[4]). The name occurs frequently as a slave name (*PAA* 853505–32).
1. 7: [Γλ]άρα (*PAA* 534650; *LGPN* 2:235[8]) Koehler; Pittakes: Μη]λέα; Foucart: Εὐκ[λεα].

### Comments

Foucart treated this as an “*érane uniquement composé de femmes*” (1873, 222), but his edition did not print the final column or restore the endings of the third column. On the assumption that all the names on the list were feminine, Ernst Maass claimed:

I know of no example, not even from the Hellenistic period, of young women having bound themselves together into a private association for religious purposes. Hence, I conclude that the ἐρανίστιαι in the inscription published by Foucart in *Les associations religieuses*, p. 222 [i.e., IG II<sup>2</sup> 2354] were *hetairai* (courtesans). Νεμειάς according to Athenaeus 13.587A was a well-known name for a courtesan.... The priestess Γλαῦκον, whose association voted honors in an inscription discovered in the Piraeus, in Foucart p. 195 [IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314 (28)], also seems to have been a *hetaira*; the same applies to Αἰθέριον, who took part with two other women, Ἐρωτίς und Ἡσυχία, in an association otherwise comprised solely of men (Foucart p. 221; Salamis [IG II<sup>2</sup> 2347]). Finally, one can refer to an epigram of Callimachus [40] important for women’s θίασοι. It names a priestess of Demeter (later of the Cabeiroi and then of Rhea of Dindymon), and above all a married woman and mother, πολλῶν προστασίη νέων γυναικῶν. I can only understand this to be the leader of one (or more) associations of women which had religious purposes.... (Maass 1893, 24–25)

Poland, who understood that both male and female names were present, nonetheless treated this group of *eranistai* not as a genuine association, but as an ad hoc group comparable to those mentioned in IG II<sup>2</sup> 2935 (324/2 BCE) ἐρανισταὶ Διὶ | Φιλίῳι ἀνέ|θεσαν ἐφ’ Ἡγησιῶν ἄρχον|τος (“*eranistai* dedicated this [stone] to Zeus Philios, in the year that Hegesias was archon”) and IG II<sup>2</sup> 10248 (end of IV BCE) Ἀρτεμίδωρος | Σελευκεύς | ἐρανισταὶ (“Artemidoros of Seleucia: *eranistai* [dedicated this]”) (Poland 1909, 29). As noted above (→ IG II<sup>2</sup> 1291 [19] *comment*), however, Arnaoutoglou observes that it is unlikely that an ad hoc lending group would go to the expense of cutting an inscription such as IG II<sup>2</sup> 2935. In the case of IG II<sup>2</sup> 2354 it seems even less likely that this is

simply an ad hoc lending group; the listing of names suggests that it is in fact the membership list of an association.

Fine (1951, 20), commenting on *Hesperia Supplement* 9 (1951) 16–22 (no. 28.7–8) and the mention of a Δημώ, described as a female contributor (πληρώτρια) to an *eranos* loan, also notes the women membership in *eranos* associations is attested in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2354 and 2358. To this list Arnaoutoglou adds *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1292.24 [26] and *AJA* 64 (1960) 269 (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1292.24 [26] note) (Arnaoutoglou 2003, 100).

**Literature:** Fine 1951, 20; Parker 1996, 333–42; Poland 1909, 29.

### [31] *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1323

#### Decree of *thiasōtai* honoring their treasurer and secretary

Athens (Attica) 194/3 BCE  
 Published: Ulrich Koehler, “Attische Thiasotendekret,” *AM* 9 (1884) 388–389 (facsimile) (*ed. pr.*); Koehler, *IG* II,5 623b (pp. 167); Michel, *RIG* 971; Dittenberger, *Syll*<sup>2</sup> 731; Kirchner, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1323; Dittenberger–Hiller von Gaertringen, *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 1103 (Poland A21).

Current Location: no longer known.

Non-stoichedon (28–30 letters). Table of Pentelic marble, broken at the bottom.

Θ Ε Ο [I].

ἐπὶ Διονυσίου ἄρχοντος, Ἐλαφηβο-  
 λιῶνος ἀγοράι κυρίαι· ἔδοξεν τοῖς θι-  
 [α]σώταις· Ζήνων Ζηνοδότου Ἐρικεῦς  
 5 εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Θεῶν κατασταθεῖς τ[α]-  
 μία[ς εἰ]ς τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν ἐπὶ Νικ[ο]-  
 φῶντος ἄρχοντος λελειτούργηκ[εν]  
 ἔτη πλείω, μεμέρικεν δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰς θ[υ]-  
 σίας ἐν τοῖς καθήκουσι χρόνοις ἀπρ[ο]-  
 10 φασίστως, δέδωκεν δὲ καὶ τοῖς μετα[λ]-  
 [λ]άξασιν τὸ ταφικὸν παραχρήμα· ὁ[μ]ο[ί]-  
 ως δὲ καὶ ὁ γραμματεὺς λελειτούργ[η]-  
 [η]κεν ἔτη πλείω καὶ διατελοῦσ[ιν εὐ]-  
 [νους] ὄντες τῷ κοινῷ τῶν θια[σ]ωτῶν  
 15 [καὶ παρ]ασκευάζοντες ἕαυ[τοὺς εὐχρήσ]-  
 [το]υς καὶ ἴσο[υς] α -----  
 · · · · ομιλ -----

G o d s!

In the year that Dionyios was archon, in the month of Elaphebolion, during the regular assembly, the *thiasōtai* approved the motion that Zeno son of Zenodotos of Erike proposed: Whereas Theon, having been appointed as the treasurer for the year that Nikophon was the archon, has rendered this service for many years, and further, has allocated funds for the sacrifices at the appropriate times with honesty, and further, has paid immediately the burial expenses for those who have died; likewise also the secretary has rendered service for many years; and (whereas) these two continue to show goodwill towards the association of *thiasōtai* and to put themselves at its disposal, and . . . the same . . .

### Notes

- I. 2: ἐπὶ Διονυσίου ἄρχοντος; i.e., 194/3 BCE (Meritt 1977, 180; Habicht 1982, 167–68, 177).
- I. 4: Ζήνων Ζηνοδότου Ἐρικεεύς; *PAA* 461155; *LGPN* 2:193[43].
- I. 5: Θεών; *PAA* 513430; *LGPN* 2:225[25].
- II. 6–7: ἐπὶ Νικ[ο]φώντος ἄρχοντος, i.e., 200/199 BCE (Meritt 1977, 179) .
- I. 8: ἔτη πλείω → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1284.22–23* [22]; 1325.20 [33]; 1327.5 [35].
- II. 9–10: ἀπρ[ο]φασίστως, “without evasion,” “honestly,” “unhesitatingly,” commonly in commendations of financial officers. → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 558.12*; 666.16; 715.7; 1023.7; 1271.11; 1326.39, etc.
- I. 11: τὸ ταφικόν → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1278.2* [17] note.

### Comments

This decree, proposed by an Athenian demesman, honors a treasurer, Theon, and a secretary whose name is missing (presumably, both were named at the bottom of the decree). Although offices in associations were generally one year in duration – hence the common phrase “who was treasurer (secretary, supervisor) in the year that *x* was archon” (e.g., *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1271.3–4*; 1273AB.5–6, 29) – both Theon and the secretary in this case served at least seven years.

The association is evidently a cultic association, since regular sacrifices are mentioned, but the deity in question is unknown. Nor is the membership clear: at least one member is a citizen but, as Parker (1996, 338–39) suggests, this might be a mixed association, of citizens and metics (so Arnaoutoglou 2003, 99 n. 35).

The basis for this claim is the reference in l. 11 to the *taphikon*, or burial fee dispensed by Theon. The burials of citizens would normally be provided for by their families; metics and non-citizens, especially slaves and resident aliens, had to rely on associations of this sort for burial. In the case of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1323* it cannot be decided whether the association routinely reserved part of its fees for the burial of members, as is later the case with Ptolemaic and Roman

associations, or whether the funeral fees were due to the largesse of Theon (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1278.2–3 [17]* for a case where the honorees are said to have donated the *taphikon*).

Precedent for mixed citizen-noncitizen association is already furnished in the third century BCE by a dedication to Artemis by four *hieropoioi*, two of them citizens, one an *isoteles* and the other, a resident alien from Soli:

[ιε]ροποιοι οι επι Φιλιππίδου Ἀρτέμ[ιδι ἀνέθεσαν].  
 Πολύευκτος Ἀχαρ(νεύς), Βόηθος Ἀγκυ(λήθεν)  
 Χαβρίας ἰσοτε(λής) <*vacat*>  
 Παιδέας Σολεύς <*vacat*> (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 2859; 269/8 BCE*)

As has been pointed out earlier, the association's participation in a funeral (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1275 [8]*) or more dramatically, the supplying of funds for the funeral (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1278 [17]* and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1323*) and instances of the inscribing of the deceased members' name on a stone are acts that underscored the great benefits of membership. Oliver comments:

Erecting a burial marker implies a level of care among the living to commemorate the dead. Burial rites did not require the erection of a stone inscribed burial marker. The evidence for the attention of associations to the burial of members serves also as a reminder that not everyone would have afforded proper and full burial in antiquity. (Oliver 2000, 65)

**Literature:** Van Nijf 1997, 50–51; Oliver, G. J. 2000.

## [32] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1324*

### The *Orgeōnes* of Bendis and Deloptes honor an *epimelētēs*

Piraeus (Attica)

ca. 190 BCE

Published: J. Demargne, "Une nouvelle inscription du Pirée relative à Bendis," *BCH* 23 (1899) 370–73 (*ed. pr.*; facsimile); Michel, *RIG* 1558; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1324* (Poland A3b); T.A. Arvanitopoulos, "Σύμμεικτα," *Polemon* 3 (1948) ιζ'–λβ', here λα' (ph. of a squeeze) (BE 1950 no. 94).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1324*.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG I<sup>3</sup> 383.A.ii.V.143 = I<sup>2</sup> 310.208* (Athens, 429/8 BCE): Treasury accounts of other gods mentioning Bendis; *IG I<sup>3</sup> 136 (LSCGSup 6)* (Athens, 432/1 or 411 BCE): A Council decree pertaining to the public worship of Bendis; *IG I<sup>3</sup> 369.68* (426/5 BCE): A loan due to the association of Bendis; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255 [2]* (Piraeus, 337/6 BCE): Decree honoring the *hieropoioi* of the year; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1361 [4]* (Piraeus, 330–324/3 BCE):



Regulations concerning the cult of Bendis; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1496* (Piraeus, 334/3–331/0 BCE): Treasury accounts; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1256 [5]* (Piraeus, 329/8 BCE): Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1283 [23]* (Piraeus, 240/39 BCE): Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1284A–B [22]* (Piraeus, 241/0 BCE): Two honorary decrees of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317* (Salamis, 272/1 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis honoring their treasurer and his *synepimelētai*; *SEG 2:10* (Salamis, 251/0 BCE): Honorary decree for *epimelētai* of Bendis(?); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1317b* (Salamis, 249/8 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis, honoring their officials; *SEG 44:60* (Salamis, 244/3 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis for their officers; *SEG 2:9 [21]* (Salamis, 243/2 BCE): Decree of the *thiasōtai* of Bendis(?) honoring *epimelētai*; *Agora 16:245 = SEG 21:531 = Meritt 1961b, 227 [no. 25]* (Athens, III BCE): “Probably a decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis” (Meritt); *Agora 16:329 = SEG 19:125 = Meritt 1960, 21* (Athens, II/I BCE): Fragment of a decree of the *orgeōnes* of Bendis and Deloptes.

Non-stoichedon (23–28 letters). 84 x 28 x 12 cm. Once dated to the late fourth or early third century BCE (Ferguson 1944, 98 n. 43), this inscription now seems to be much later. Tracy (1990, 110) has identified the cutter as also responsible for a dedicatory poem for the Dionysiasts of Piraeus, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2948* (Piraeus, beginning of II BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4454* (Piraeus, late III or early II BCE); and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4459* (Piraeus, early II BCE), a dedication to Asklepios. Tracy describes the lettering as plain and amateurish: “[I]ndividual strokes of letters are not placed with precision and the letters themselves vary both in size and in placement in the letter-space. The cutter fails to align his letters either along a line [which most cutters probably drew on the stone] marking the top of his letters or along that [line] at the bottom” (1990, 110).

[ἐπειδὴ Στέφανος ἐπιμελητῆς]  
 [γενόμενος τὸν ἐν]ιαυτ[ὸν τὸν ἐπὶ]  
 [— — — ἀρχ]οντος [τῆς τοῦ]  
 [ἱερο]ῦ ἐπισκε[υῆς π]ροέσ[τηκε κα]-  
 5 [θάπε]ρ προσήκ[ο]ν ἦν, ἔπεμψε [δὲ]  
 [καὶ] τὴν πομπὴν ἀξίως τῆς θε[οῦ]  
 [φιλοτιμηθεὶς ἐμ πάσι τούτοις κ[αὶ]  
 προσαναλώσας ἐκ τῶν ιδίων, καὶ τ[ῶ]-  
 ν λοιπῶν δὲ ὧν καθῆκεν ἐν τῷ ἐν[ι]-  
 10 αυτῷ ἐπεμελήθη καλῶς καὶ εὐσχη-  
 μόνως· ὅπως ἂν οὖν καὶ οἱ ὄργεῶνες  
 φαίνωνται χάριτας ἀξίας ἀποδιδόν-  
 τες τοῖς ἀεὶ φιλοτιμουμένοις,  
 ἀγαθεὶ τύχει δεδόχθαι τοῖς ὄργε-  
 15 ῶσιν ἐπαινέσαι Στέφανον τῆς τε  
 πρὸς τὴν Βένδιν καὶ τὸν Δηλόπτη-

- ν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς εὐσεβείας  
 ἔνεκεν καὶ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς ὄργεω-  
 νας φιλοτιμίας στεφανῶσαι αὐ-  
 20 τὸν θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι, ἵνα καὶ τοῖς  
 λοιποῖς τῶν ὄργεῶνων ἅπασιν ἐ-  
 φάμιλλον εἰ τοῖς βουλομένοις πρ-  
 ὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβεῖν καὶ πρὸς  
 25 τοὺς ὄργεῶνας φιλοτιμείσθαι, εἰ-  
 δότας ὅτι καταξίας χάριτας κομι-  
 οῦνται παρὰ τῶν ὄργεῶνων· δεδόσ-  
 θαι δὲ αὐτῶι καὶ ἀνάθηματι τόπον  
 ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι οὗ ἂν εὐσχημον εἶναι  
 φαίνεται. ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸδε τὸ ψή-  
 30 φισμα εἰς στήλην λιθίνην τὸν γρα-  
 μματέα καὶ στήσαι παρὰ τὸ ἀνάθημα,  
 εἰς δὲ τὴν πόησιν καὶ τὴν ἀναγρα-  
 φὴν μερίσαι τὸν ταμίαν τὸ γενόμε-  
 νον ἀνάλωμα.  
 35 οἱ ὄργεῶνες  
 Στέφανον.

Whereas Stephanos became supervisor (*epimelētēs*) for one year during the archonship of ... and managed the repairs to the temple as were appropriate, and led a procession worthy of the goddess, being ambitious in all these things and making expenditures from his own funds, and (since) in the other matters that were his duty during the year he administered matters honorably and in a seemly fashion; in order, then, that the *orgeōnes* might be seen to have rendered thanks appropriate to those who, at any time, have been ambitious (towards the association); for good fortune, be it resolved by the *orgeōnes* of Bendis and Deloptes and the other gods to commend Stephanos for the zeal that he has shown towards the *orgeōnes* (and) to crown him with an olive wreath, so that there may be rivalry among all the other *orgeōnes* who wish to show piety towards the gods and zeal towards the *orgeōnes*, knowing that they will receive appropriate thanks from the *orgeōnes*; (further, it is resolved) that a place for a statue be given to him in the temple, wherever seems to be appropriate (and that) the secretary shall inscribe this decree on a stele and place it beside the statue, and that the treasurer pay for the expenses of making and inscribing it.

The *orgeōnes* (honor) Stephanos.

### Notes

- ll. 1, etc. Στέφανος: PAA 233490; FRA p. 426; LGPN 2:404[5]. Since Stephanos is not given a patronym or demotic, some have assumed that he is of servile origins

(Garland 1987, 119) *FRA* no. 8015 and Fragiadakis 1986, 360 no. 715 list a slave by that name (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 2397.9*; Sounion, IV BCE). Ferguson (1944, 98 n. 43) suggested that Stephanos is the son of Thallos honored in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255.17 [2]* and the Stephanos who mentioned by Lysias (19.46) (*PA* 12883) (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255.17 [2]* note). Jones (1999, 260) follows Ferguson in arguing that this inscription is from the citizen *orgeōnes* of Bendis, noting the large number of officers in the Athenian associations: priest, priestess, *hieropoioi* (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255*); *epimelētai* (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1256, 1361, 1324*), secretary (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1361, 1324*), and treasurer (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1324*). The latter point is inconclusive, since the Thracian group in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1283* and *1284* also had an *epimelētēs*, *grammateus* and *tamias*. Moreover, the redating of the inscription by Tracy to ca. 190 BCE makes the identification of Stephanos with a figure of the fourth century impossible.

II. 11, 35: ὀργεῶνες → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255.1 [2]* note.

II. 12–13, 25: χάριτας ἀξίας ἀποδιδόντες → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252+999.21 [6]* note.

II. 16–17: τὴν Βένδιν καὶ τὸν Δηλόπτην → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1256 [5]*. *Agora* 16:329 (Meritt 1960, 21 = *SEG* 19:125) (II/I BCE) is a fragment of a lease by (presumably) the same group: [----- εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς vacat | vacat | [-----] τῆς Βενδίδι καὶ τῷ Δηλόπτει [·3] | [-----] Θράκες ἐπειδὴ ἡ βουλὴ κ[αὶ ὁ δῆ]μος --- ἐμίσθωσαν Ἀθηναίους [·± 6·], “for the gods... to Bendis and Deloptes... Thracians. Whereas the Council and the People ... have leased to Athens....”

II. 20–22: ἴνα καὶ τοῖς | λοιποῖς τῶν ὀργεῶνων ἅπανιν ἐφάμυλλον εἶ → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297.6–7 [24]* note.

### Comments

Tracy (1990, 110–12) has connected the cutter to three other inscriptions (see above) from the Piraeus, all from the late third or early second century BCE. Tracy suggests that they are the work of “a local workman from Piraeus who had some special association with religious organizations” (1990, 112).

Like the group of *orgeōnes* of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1256 [5]* this group (perhaps a successor to *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1256* and a predecessor to the one mentioned in *Agora* 16:329) worshipped Bendis and her consort Deloptes. Bendis, however, appears still to be the focus of attention rather than the consort (→ l. 6: ἀξίως τῆς θε[οῦ]). Ferguson (1949, 98) took the group to be an association of citizens, invoking Wilhelm’s index that the Athenian group crowned their members with olive wreaths (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1361 [4]*), while the Thracian group used oak wreaths (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1283 [23]*, *1284 [22]*) (Wilhelm 1902, 133; Jones 1999, 257). This is no longer a very reliable index, since the Bendis group consisting of non-Athenians (including slaves) represented in *SEG* 2:9 [21] used olive branches as decorations on their list of honorees. The other index used by Wilhelm (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255 [2]* comment) concerning the meeting day is of no assistance here since the date of the meeting is not given. Hence, we do not know whether the procession (l. 6) mentioned is that of the Thracians (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1283 [23]* comment) or the Athenian Bendis group (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255 [2]*).

LI. 20–26 state frankly the benefits to benefaction. On the one hand, the benefactor receives public praise and, in this case, an inscription erected in the

temple; on the other hand, the association used this act of recognition to encourage similar acts by other members, relying on the agonistic nature of Athenian society and the tendency to compete for honors. Even those members less well endowed than Stephanos could expect recognition commensurate with their gifts to the club.

**Literature:** Foucart 1902, 98–99; Ferguson 1949, 98–99; Jones 1999, 256–262; Wilhelm 1902, 131–33.

### [33] *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1325

## Membership List and honorific decree of *orgeōnes* of Dionysos

Piraeus (Attica) 185/4 BCE  
 Published: E. Dragatsis, “Επιγραφή ἐκ Πειραιῶς,” *AE* (1884) 39–50, esp. 39–44 (facsimile); Ulrich Koehler, “Die Genossenschaft der Dionysiasten in Piraeus,” *AM* 9 (1884) 288–98, esp. 288–89; U. Koehler, *IG II* 5, 623d; Michel, *RIG* 987; Dittenberger *Syll<sup>2</sup>* 728; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1325; Dittenberger–Hiller von Gaertringen *Syll<sup>3</sup>* 1100; Jaccottet 2003, 2:20–22 (no. 1) (Poland A4a–b).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1325.

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum, EM 7844.

Related Inscriptions: → *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1326 [36] (same cutter, and the same association); *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2948 (Dionysios, the cult founder).

Non-stoichedon. A stele of Hymettus marble, 97.5 x 62 x 3 cm. (letter height 1.0 cm.), broken at the bottom. Discovered near Piraeus on the site of the ruins of a temple to Dionysos (Dörpfeld 1884, 286–87; Koehler 1884, 296–97). Tracy (1990, 92–95) assigns this to the cutter of *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1236; 1326 [36] 2858; *Agora* 1:432; 2965; 3988; 4966; 6100; 7191; *BCH* 90 (1966) 727; 731, active between 199/8–176/5 BCE, in two phases, cutting official documents from 200 to ca. 190, and then private documents after ca. 185. Tracy thinks that he worked in the same shop as the cutter of *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 897.

ἰ ε ρ ἄ Δ ι ο ν ὄ σ ο υ .  
 ἄ γ α θ ε ἰ τ ὺ χ ε ι ὄ ρ γ ε ῶ ν ε ς :

	Διονύσιος	Ἄγαθοκλέους	Μαραθώνιος
	Ἄγαθοκλῆς	Διονυσίου	Μαραθώνιος
5	Σόλων	Ἐρμογένου	Χολαργεὺς
	Ἐπιχάρης	Κράτωνος	Σκαμβωνίδης
	Ἴσοκράτης	Σατύρου	Κυδαθηναίου
	Ἄνδρων	Σωσάνδρου	Ἄμαξαντεὺς

- |    |  |            |            |
|----|--|------------|------------|
|    | Διονυσογένης   | Διονυσίου  | Παιανιεύς  |
| 10 | Σίμων  | Σίμωνος    | Πόριος     |
|    | Φιλόστρατος  | Διονυσίου  | Πόριος     |
|    | Λέων   | Σίμου      | Ἐλαιούσιος |
|    | Θεόδοτος   | Τιμησίωνος | Φλυεύς     |
|    | Δίων   | Ἀντιλόχου  | Λαμπτρέυς  |
| 15 | Ἡρακλείδης   | Θεοδώρου   | Παιονίδης  |
|    | Καλλικράτης  | Τιμησίωνος | Κηφισιεύς  |
|    | Ἀπολλόδωρος  | Ἀπολλωνίου | Λαμπτρέυς  |
|    | <i>vacat</i>   |            |            |
|    | ἀγαθεῖ τύχει· ἐ[πι] Εὐπολέμου ἄρχοντος, Ποσιδεῶνος ἀγοραὶ κυρίαι· ἔδοξεν τοῖς              |            |            |
|    | [Διον]υσιασταῖς· Σόλων Ἐρμογένου Χολαργεὺς εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Διονύσιος Ἀγαθοκλέους             |            |            |
| 20 | [Μαραθῶ]νιος κατασταθεὶς ταμίας ὑπὸ τῶν Διονυσιαστῶν πλείω ἔτη καὶ λαβὼν παρ' αὐτῶν        |            |            |
|    | [τὴν ἱερωσ]ύνην τοῦ Διονύσου τὸν τε νεῶ τοῦ θεοῦ κατεσκεύασεν καὶ ἐκόσμησεν πολλοῖς        |            |            |
|    | [καὶ καλοῖς ἀνα]θήμασιν καὶ εἰς ταῦτα ἀνήλωκεν οὐκ ὀλίγον πλῆθος ἀργυρίου, ἐπέδω-          |            |            |
|    | [κεν δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ κοινὸν δραχμὰς χιλίας ὅπως ἔχωσιν ἀπὸ τῆς προσόδου θύειν τῶι θεῶι κα-   |            |            |
|    | [τὰ μῆνα ἕκαστον κ]ατὰ τὰ πάτρια, παρεσκεύασεν δὲ τοῖς Διονυσιασταῖς ἵν' ἔχωσιν χρᾶ-       |            |            |
| 25 | [σθαι αὐτοῖς καὶ χρυσώ]ματα καὶ ἀργυρώματα καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν χορηγίαν πᾶσαν τὴν δέο-          |            |            |
|    | [υσαν εἰς τὰ ἱερά καὶ τόπον εἰ]ς ὃν συνιόντες καθ' ἕκαστον μῆνα μεθέξουσιν τῶν ἱερῶν·      |            |            |
|    | [δεδόχθαι τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν], ἐπαινέσαι Διονύσιον Ἀγαθοκλέους Μαραθῶνιον καὶ στεφα-            |            |            |
|    | [νώσαι κιττοῦ στεφάνωι κ]ατὰ τὸν νόμον ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν καὶ καλοκαγαθίας καὶ εὐ-              |            |            |
|    | [νοίας εἰς αὐτούς, καὶ ἀναγορεῦ]σαι τὸν στέφανον τοῦτον μετὰ τὸ τὰς σπονδὰς ποιῆ-          |            |            |
| 30 | [σασθαι ὅταν συντελεσθῆι τ]ὰ ἱερά τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν ἐν τει πρώτῃ συνόδωι ἀναγρά-               |            |            |
|    | [ψαι δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα τότε ἐν στήλει λιθί]νει καὶ στήσαι παρὰ τὸν νεῶ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀ- |            |            |
|    | [ναγραφὴν καὶ τὴν ἀνάθεσιν τῆς στήλης με]ρίσαι τὸ γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα τὸν ταμίαν· ταῦ-       |            |            |
|    | [τα Σόλων εἶπεν].  |            |            |
|    | -----ῶνος ἀγοραὶ κυρίαι· ἔδοξεν τοῖς Διονυσια-   |            |            |
| 35 | [σταῖς ----- εἶπεν· ἐ]πειδὴ Σόλων Ἐρμογέν[ου Χ]ολαργεὺς κατα-                              |            |            |

[σταθείς -----]ν ἐφρόντισεν ὅπως ἐπα[υξ]ηθῶσιν  
 ----- σ καὶ ἀόκνως οὐδεμίαν κα[κοπά]-  
 [θιαν ὑποστελλόμενος -----]οιμὸς τὸ ἱερὸν τ[οῦ θεοῦ --]  
 ----- ομενον αρ -----

The sacred rites of Dionysos

For Good Fortune, the *orgeōnes*:

Dionysos	son of Agathokles	of Marathon
Agathokles	son of Dionysios	of Marathon
Solon	son of Hermogenes	of Cholargos
Epichares	son of Kraton	of Skambonidai
Isokrates	son of Satyros	of Kydathenaion
Andron	son of Sosandros	of Hamaxanteia
Dionysogenes	son of Dionysios	of Paiania
Simon	son of Simon	of Poros
Philostratos	son of Dionysios	of Poros
Leon	son of Simon	of Elaious
Theodotos	son of Timesion	of Phlya
Dion	son of Antilochos	of Lamprai
Heracleides	son of Theodoros	of Paionidai
Kallikrates	son of Temesion	of Kephisia
Apollodoros	son of Apollonios	of Lamprai

*vacat*

- 18 For good fortune! In the year that Eupolemos was archon, month of Poseideon, at the regular assembly: The motion proposed by Solon son of Hermogenes of Cholargos was approved by the *Dionysistai*: Whereas Dionysios son of Agathokles of Marathon, who was appointed as treasurer by the *Dionysistai* for many years, and who accepted from them the priesthood of Dionysos, both constructed the sanctuary of the god and beautified it with many beautiful votive offerings and for this purposes expended no small sum of money, and also contributed one thousand drachmae to the treasury so that they might obtain from its income (the means) to sacrifice monthly to the god in accordance with ancestral traditions; and arranging that the *Dionysistai* should have the use of gold and silver objects and the other furnishing that are necessary for their sacred rites, and (that they might have) a place in which they gather each month to participate in the sacred rites.
- 27 It was resolved by the *orgeōnes* to commend Dionysios son of Agathokles of Marathon and to crown him with an ivy wreath in accordance with the law on account of his excellence and benefactions and the goodwill that he has shown to them, and to announce this wreath after the libations have been made when the sacred rites have been completed by the *orgeōnes* in their first meeting. (And it was resolved) to inscribe this decree on a stele

and to set it up beside the sanctuary of the god, and that the treasurer pay the costs of inscribing the stele and setting it up. Solon moved as follows: — — — — — at the regular assembly: The *Dionysiastai* approved (the motion) that was moved by . . . : Whereas Solon son of Hermogenes of Cholargos, who was appointed (treasurer?) . . . has taken care that (the revenues of the association) be increased ... and without hesitation, not shrinking before any distress ... the sanctuary of the god...

### Notes

- l. 3: Διονύσιος Ἀγαθοκλέους Μαραθώνιος (*PA* 4213; *PAA* 345460; *LGNP* 2:124[487]), the donor of the temple of the Dionysiasts, honored in this inscription; his death is recognized in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1326* [36]. He is also named as a contributor to a fund-raising effort in 183/2 BCE (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 2332.306–7*).
- l. 4: Ἀγαθοκλῆς Διονυσίου Μαραθώνιος (*PAA* 103835; *LGNP* 2:3[84]) the son of Dionysios son of Agathokles (l. 3), and also named in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2332.306–8* (183/2 BCE) and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2333.16–17* (ca. 180 BCE).
- l. 5, 19, 35: Σόλων Ἑρμογένου Χολαργεύς (*PA* 12816; *PAA* 828015; *LGNP* 2:402[15]), also named in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1326.3* [36] as the proposer of a motion commemorating the death of Dionysios son of Agathokles (l. 3 above).
- l. 6: Ἐπιχάρης Κράτωνος Σκαμβωνίδης: *PA* 5000; *PAA* 399595; *LGNP* 2:153[63].
- l. 7: Ἴσοκράτης Σατύρου Κυδαθηναεύς: *PA* 7717; *PAA* 542165; *LGNP* 2:242[16].
- l. 8: Ἄνδρων Σωσάνδρου Ἀμαξαντεύς (*PA* 920; *PAA* 1292560 *LGNP* 2:31[14]) was a *thesmothētēs* (assisting the yearly archon in judicial matters) in 214/3 (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1706.128*)
- l. 9: Διονυσογένης Διονυσίου Παιανιεύς (*PA* 4277; *PAA* 360320; *LGNP* 2:128[9]) is named as a contributor to a fundraising effort in 183/2 BCE (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 2332.133*). He also appears in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1326.4* [36]
- l. 10: Σίμων Σίμωνος Πόριος: *PA* 12705; *PAA* 822525; *LGNP* 2:399[42]: Simon is also mentioned in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1328.1* [34] and 1327.32 [35] as a member of the *orgeōnes* of the Great Mother.
- l. 11: Φιλόστρατος Διονυσίου Πόριος: *PA* 14744; *PAA* 943950; *LGNP* 2:459[77].
- l. 12: Λέων Σίμου Ἐλαιούσιος: *PA* 9113; *PAA* 605800; *LGNP* 2:283[36].
- l. 13: Θεόδοτος Τιμησίωνος Φλυεύς: *PA* 6807; *PAA* 505630; *LGNP* 2:215[83].
- l. 14: Δίων Ἀντιλόγου Λαμπρεύς: *PA* 4509; *PAA* 370520; *LGNP* 2:133[58]. Also named in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2443.26* (ca. 180 BCE) in a list of names (all demesmen).
- l. 15: Ἡρακλείδης Θεοδώρου Παιονίδης: *PA* 6477; *PAA* 485915; *LGNP* 2:205[129].
- l. 16: Καλλικράτης Τιμησίωνος Κηφισιεύς: *PA* 7965; *PAA* 556780; *LGNP* 2:248[56].
- l. 17: Ἀπολλόδορος Ἀπολλωνίου Λαμπρεύς (*PA* 1427–28; *PAA* 142815; *LGNP* 2:43[134]) was a *thesmothētēs* (assisting the yearly archon) in 214/3 (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1706.114*); he is listed with other donors in *SEG* 24:157 (222/1 BCE). Given the date of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1325* in the 180s, Apollodoros must be in his fifties or sixties.
- l. 17: ἀγορᾶ κυρία → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1263.2–3* [11] note.
- l. 18: ἐ[πι] Εὐπολέμου ἄρχοντος: i.e., 185/4 BCE (Meritt 1977, 181; Habicht 1982, 177).
- l. 20: πλείω ἔτη → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1323.8* [31] and comment.

- l. 23: εἰς τὸ κοινόν. For κοινόν as “treasury, common fund” → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1323.10–11, 29 [31].
- l. 28: κίττου στεφάνοι: One of the epithets of Dionysos was Kissos, “the Ivy.” Dionysos and his Maenads are usually pictured wearing the ivy crown. Cf. Euripides *Bacchae* 81–82: κισσῶι τε στεφανῶθεις Διόνυσον θεραπεύει.
- l. 28: κ]ατὰ τὸν νόμον → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1278.2 [17] note.
- l. 29: ἀναγορεῦ]σαι τὸν στέφανον τοῦτον → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1263.37–38 [11] note.

### Comments

This is the earliest attestation of the *orgeōnes* of Dionysos or *Dionysiastai* in the Piraeus, although there are dedications to Dionysos and references to the “Dionysia in the Piraeus” from a much earlier date (Garland 1987, 233–34). The honoree, Dionysios son of Agathokles of Marathon, who served both as the treasurer of the society and then as its priest, was evidently responsible for the building or repairing of the temple to Dionysos. The ruins of the temple are in fact still extant in the Piraeus. Garland describes the *hieron* of the *Dionysiastai*:

The *hieron* of the *Dionysiastai*, which lies a short distance due west of modern Plateia Korais, close to the intersection of two ancient roads, is one of the most impressive buildings to come to light in the Piraeus. It possessed a courtyard surrounded by a colonnaded hall over 21m in breadth with eight columns down one side and an unknown number down the other. On the eastern side of the courtyard lay a rectangular building (40m by 23m) which was divided into a large number of very small rooms.... The sanctuary, which was probably constructed at the beginning of the second century, remained in use until the sack of Sulla as is indicated by a hoard of bronze coins dated 87–86 found among its foundations. (Garland 1987, 146)

Several later inscriptions refer to this temple: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1008.13–14 (118/7 BCE); *Hesperia* 16 (1947) 170–72 (no. 67) (116/5 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1011.12–13 (107/6 BCE); 1028.16–17 (100/99 BCE); 1029.11–12 (94/93 BCE); 1039.53–54 (83–73 BCE), all referring to ephebes processing to or sacrificing in the temple of Dionysos in the Piraeus.

It is possible that Dionysios converted some of his house to cultic use. Mikalson (1998, 205 n. 102) reports that “excavations at the site where these inscriptions were found seem to reveal a large house (of Dionysios?) with a very large attached and colonnaded courtyard where Dionysos’ temple may have stood.” In the same area was discovered a poem, most likely commissioned by Dionysios, and affixed to the sanctuary:

- τόνδε νεώ σοι, ἄναξ, Διονύσιος εἴσατο τῆιδε  
καὶ τέμενος θυόεν καὶ ξόαν’ εἰκελά σοι  
καὶ πάντ’, οὐ πλοῦτον κρίνας πολυάργυρον αὔξειν  
ἐν δόμῳ ὡς τὸ σέβειν, Βάκχε, τὰ σοὶ νόμιμα.
- 5 [ἀ]νθ’ ὧν, ὦ Διόνυσ’, ὧν ἴλαος οἶκον ἄμ’ αὐτοῦ  
[καὶ] γενεὴν σώιζοις πάντα τε σὸν θίασον. (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2948)



This sanctuary, O Lord, Dionysios erected here for you,  
 and a fragrant *temenos*, and statues in your likeness,  
 and everything (else), not thinking that he might increase  
 his wealth in his home as much as  
 to revere your customs, O Bakchos.  
 In return, Dionysos, be appeased and may you grant safety  
 to his house and family, and to your entire *thiasos*.

The association is comprised exclusively of Athenian citizens and dominated by the family of the honoree (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1326* [36]). Parker (1996, 341) believes that “membership was apparently fixed at fifteen, with son in principle succeeding father (an unexpected reappearance of the hereditary principle),” but nothing in the decree indicates a limit of fifteen, and while *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1326* [36] (175/5 BCE) confirms the hereditary nature of the priesthood, it says nothing of a limit on membership.

That this was a cult association of well-to-do citizens is clear not only from what is said of the founder in this inscription and in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1326* [36], but also from the fact that a number of its members clearly come from the ranks of Athenians of means (see the *notes*). In *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1326* they are called οἱ τῆν σύνοδον φέροντες τῷ θεῷ (ll. 6–7), “those who are bringing the collection (of persons) to the god.” Mikalson observes that the Athenian Dionysiasts and devotees of the Mother of the Gods (e.g., *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314–15*) are

for the first time clear evidence of private religious associations of citizens – private clubs standing apart from state, local, and domestic cults....There were at this time quite probably several other such which left no records on stone. But it is first now, in the first half of the second century B.C., that one can claim to find some impact of such private cults on the religious lives of Athenian citizens, some indication that some Athenians were reaching beyond the traditional structures of state, local, and domestic cults to fulfil their religious needs. (Mikalson 1998, 206).

To be sure the cult of Bendis had citizen members much earlier (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1255* [2] 337/6 BCE), but Bendis had in some respects been absorbed into the Athenian pantheon, as had much earlier “imports” to Athens such as Amynos and Asklepios (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252 + 999* [6] late IV BCE).

This is an early instance of a cult group that was founded by an individual and subsequently controlled by his family (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1326*) even though nominally it is the group as a whole that made decisions. Later examples will be the cult of Mēn at Laurion, founded by a freedman, Xanthos the Lykian (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1365+1366* [53]), a Lydian cult group devoted to Zeus (*Syll<sup>3</sup> 985*) and founded by a certain Dionysios, and the Bacchic association controlled by Agrippinilla (*IGUR* 160).

This inscription is also of note for one other feature. It provides an example of one member belonging to two cult groups. Simon of Poros (l. 10) is also named as a member of the *orgeōnes* of the Great Mother (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1328.1* [34] and 1327.32 [35]). Simon is not an honoree in either association: he was a

member of the *Dionysiastai* and a supervisor (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1327.32) and proposer of a motion (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328.1) in the *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods. Arnaoutoglou thinks that “he was probably one of the few members of the *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods who could support the association financially and whose advice would be endorsed” (2003, 152–53).

**Literature:** Dörpfeld 1884; Garland 1987, 124, 146, 215–16; Koehler 1884; Mikalson 1998, 204–6; Parker 1996, 341; Poland 1909, 197; Traill 1978; Ziebarth 1896, 37, 39, 45–48.

### [34] *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328

#### Regulations of the *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods

Piraeus (Attica) A: 183/2 BCE; B: 175/4 BCE

Published: K.S. Pittakes, “Ελληνικαὶ Ἐπιγραφαί,” *AE* n.s. 1 (1862) 189–191 (no. 198) (facsimile, Πίναξ 28, KH') (ed. pr.); Foucart 1873, 191–93 (nos. 4–5); Koehler, *IG* II 624; cf. *IG* II 5 624 p. 170; Prott and Ziehen, *LGS* II 44; Michel, *RIG* 1559; Kirchner, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328; Sokolowski, *LSCG* 87–90 (no. 48); Vermaseren 1977–1989, 2:76–78 (no. 263) = *CCCA* II 263 (Poland A2g–h).

Publication Used: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328.

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum, EM 10550.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4563 (Athens or Piraeus, IV BCE): A dedication to the Mother of the Gods; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4609 (Piraeus, late IV BCE): A dedication to the Mother of the Gods by two women; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 6288 (350–317 BCE): A grave inscription for a woman described as μητρὸς παντοτέκνου πρόπολος; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1273AB [18] (Piraeus, 265/4 BCE): A decree of the *thiasōtai* of the Mother of the Gods; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16] (Piraeus, 272/1 BCE): A decree of the *thiasōtai* of the Mother of the Gods; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1314 [28] (Piraeus, 213/2 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1315 [29] (Piraeus, 211/0 BCE); *Agora* 16:235 (Meritt, et al. 1957, 209–10 (no. 57); *SEG* 17:36; 32:348; 39:195) (Athens, 202/1 BCE): Honorary decree of the *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods for a priestess; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328 [34] (Piraeus, 183/2, 175/4 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1327 [35] (Piraeus, 178/7 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1329 [37] (Piraeus, 175/4 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2950/1 (II BCE): A dedication of a treasurer to the Mother of the Gods; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1334 [45] 71/0 BCE (?); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4703 (mid I BCE): Dedication of the wife of a demesman; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4714 (Augustan period): Dedication of the daughter of a demesman to the Mother of the Gods and to Aphrodite, “gracious midwife” (εὐαντήτω ἰατρείῃ); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4759–60 (I/II ce): Two dedications of the wives of two demesmen to the mother of the Gods (εὐαντήτω ἰατρείῃ).

Non-stoichedon (A: 50–60 letters; B: 40–50 letters). Tablet of Pentelic marble, 106 x 64 x 9.5 cm. Letter height: 0.7 cm. Discovered by Pittakes in 1860 in Piraeus. Tracy (1990, 126) assigns: ll. 4–20 to the cutter of IG II<sup>2</sup> 1329 [37], active between 183/2–175/4 BCE.

<in a crown>

Οἱ ὀργεῶνες  
τοὺς ἐπίδε-  
δοκότας

- A [ἐπ]ι Ἐρ[μο]γέν[ο]υ ἄρχοντος· Μουνιχιῶνος ἀγορᾶι κυρίαι· Σίμων  
Σίμωνος Πόριος εἶπεν·
- 5 ἐπειδὴ συμβαίνει πλείω [ἀ]νηλώματα γείνεσθαι καὶ διὰ ταῦ[τα ἀξιοῦσιν]  
αἱ αἰεὶ λαγχάνουσαι ἱερεῖαι διάταξιν τινα ἐα[υταῖς] γενέσθαι [ε]ὐσχήμονα  
καθ' ἣν λει[το]υργήσουσιν μηδεμι[ᾶ]ς [α]ὐ[τ]α[ῖ]ς ἐπι[θ]έ[ε]του δαπάνης  
ἐπικειμένη[ς],  
ἀ[γαθ]εῖ τύχει δεδόχθαι τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν, τὴν λαχοῦσαν ἱερείαν εἰς [τὸν]  
μετὰ [Ἐρ]-  
μογένην ἄρχοντα ἐνιαυτόν, κατὰ ταῦτά δὲ καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς [σ]τ[ρω]νύειν
- 10 θρόνους δύο [ὡς] καλλίστους, περιτιθέναι δὲ ταῖς φιαληφόροις καὶ τ[α]ῖ[ς]  
πε]-  
ρὶ τὴν θεὸν οὔσαις ἐν τῷ ἀγερω[ῶ]ι κόσμον ἀρ[γυροῦ]ν· [ἐὰ]ν [δ]ὲ παρὰ  
ταῦ-  
τα ποιεῖ, κύριοι ἔ[σ]τωσαν οἱ ὀργεῶνες ζημιοῦντε[ς] τὴν [π]α[ρ]αβαίν-  
ουσά[ν]
- τι τῶν γεγραμμένων μέχρι δραχμῶν π[εν]τήκον[τα καὶ] εἰσπρατ[τό]ν-  
των τρόπῳ ὅτῳ ἂν [δύνωνται· μ]ὴ ἐξεῖναι δὲ μηθεὶ μηδ' ἐπιμηφίσαι
- 15 τὸν εἰθισμένον ἔπαινον αὐταῖς· κύριοι δ' ἔστωσαν καὶ τὸ φύλλον τᾶ[ξ]α[ι]  
ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀπειθούσης· καθιστάτω δὲ ἡ αἰεὶ λαγχάνουσα ἱερεῖα ζάκο]-  
ρον ἐκ τῶν ἱερείων [τ]ῶν γεγενευσῶν π[ρ]ότερον, δι[ί]ς δὲ τὴν αὐτὴν [μὴ  
ἐξεῖ]-  
ναι καταστήσαι ἕως ἂν ἅπασαι διέλθωσιν, εἰ δ[ὲ] μή, ἐν[οχ]ος ἔ[στω]  
ἡ ἱερεία τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐπιτιμίοις· ἀναγράψαι δὲ τότε τὸ ψήφισμα τ[ὸν]
- 20 γραμματέα εἰς στήλην λιθίνην καὶ στήσαι ἐν τῷ ἱερῶι.  
*vacat* 1.6 cm.
- B21 ἐπὶ Σωνίκου ἄρχοντος· Μουνιχιῶνος ἀγορᾶι κυρίαι·  
ἔδοξεν τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν· [Κλ]εῖππος Αἰξωνεὺς εἶπεν·  
ἐπειδὴ Μητροδώρα ἀ[ξί]ωθεῖσα ὑπὸ τῆς ἱερείας Ἀριστ[ο]-  
δίκης τῆς γενομένης ἐπὶ Ἰπ[κ]άκου ἄρχοντος ὥστε ζακο-
- 25 ρεῦσαι καὶ συνδιεξαγαγεῖν μετ' αὐτῆς τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπέ-  
δωκεν αὐτὴν καὶ συνδιεξήγαγεν καλῶς καὶ εὐσχημόνως  
καὶ εὐσεβῶς τὰ πρὸς τὴν θεὸν καὶ ἀνέγκλητον αὐτὴν παρε-  
σκεύασεν [τ]αῖς τε ἱερείαις καὶ τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν, κατὰ ταῦτά δὲ [κ]αὶ  
ἐπὶ Σωνίκου ἀ[ρχον]τ[ο]ς γενομένη[ς] ἱερείας Σιμάλης καὶ ἀξι-
- 30 ωσά[σης] ἐπιχωρήσαι ἑαυτῇ τοὺς ὀργεῶνας ὥστε καταστ[ῆ]-  
σαι ζάκορον Μητροδώραν καὶ ἐπιχωρησάντων αὐτῇ καὶ ταύ-

- τη συνδιεξήγαγεν τὴν ἱερωσύνην καλῶς καὶ εὐσχημό-  
 νως καὶ εὐσεβῶς τὰ τε πρὸς τὴν θεὸν καὶ τὰς ἱερέας καὶ τ[ο]ῦς  
 ἄργεῶνας·  
 δι' ὃ καὶ φιλοτειμοῦνται αἱ ἱερεῖαι τοῦ κατασταθῆναι αὐτῆ[ν]  
 35 διὰ βίου ζάκορον τεῖ θεῶι· ὅπως ἂν οὖν φαίνονται π[λ]είστ[η]ν  
 πρόνοιαν ποιούμενοι τῆς θεοῦ καὶ ἔχη αὐτ[οῖς] καλῶς καὶ εὐσ[ε]-  
 βῶς τὰ κατὰ τ[ὴ]ν θεόν, ἀγαθεῖ τύχει δεδόχθαι τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν,  
 τ[ᾶ] μὲν ἄλλα πάντα π[ράττ]ειν κατὰ τὸ ψήφισμα ὃ Σίμων Πόριος  
 40 εἶπεν, καταστήσαι [δ]ὲ τοὺς ὀργεῶνας ζάκορον τεῖ θεῶι διὰ [βίου]  
 Μητροδώραν καὶ λειτουργεῖν αὐτ[ὴ]ν] αἰετῆς γινομένης  
 ἱερείαις παρεχομένην τὴν χρεῖαν καλῶς καὶ εὐσχημόνως  
 καὶ φροντίζουσαν ὅπως εὐσεβῶς ἔχη τὰ κατὰ τὴν θεὸν κα[θ]ῶς  
 ἢ μήτηρ αὐτῆς Εὐα[ξ]ίς διετέλεσεν τοῦτο πράττουσα. ἀναγράψαι  
 δὲ τὸδε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γραμματέα εἰς τὴν στήλην τῶν ὀργεῶν[ων].

The *orgeōnes*

(honor) those who have contributed.

- A In the year that Hermogenes was archon, in the month of Mounichion, at a regular assembly, Simon son of Simon of Poros, made (the following) motion: Whereas there have been many expenses, and because of these (expenses) any woman who obtains the priesthood is expecting that there be a certain appropriate distribution (of funds) for them, so that they can perform their service with no additional service (*leitourgeō*) being imposed on them:
- 5 For good fortune, it has been agreed by the members that the one who happens to be chosen as priestess for the year following Hermogenes' archonship shall, in accord with these and the other things, furnish two thrones of the finest quality, and give an ornament of silver to the cupbearers and those who attend the goddess for the collection of the contributions. If someone acts in violation of these rules, the *orgeōnes* are empowered to fine the (priestess) who offends against any of these rules, up to fifty drachmae, and they will exact it in whatever manner seems best to them and it is unlawful for anyone to confer upon them the customary honors. They [the *orgeōnes*] shall also be empowered to set the leaf over the disobedient (priestess). Whichever priestess has obtained the priesthood shall appoint an attendant from among those who have already been priestesses. But it is not permitted to appoint the same person twice until all have had their turn. Otherwise, the priestess will be liable to the same fines. The secretary shall inscribe the decree on a stone stele and set it up in the temple.
- B In the year that Sonikos was archon, in the month of Mounichion, at the regular assembly, the *orgeōnes* approved the motion that Kleippos of

Aixone proposed: Whereas Metrodora, having been deemed worthy by the priestess Archedikē (who became priestess during the archonship of Hippakos), to serve as an attendant and to co-administer with her for a year, devoted herself (to this role) and co-administered the matters pertaining to the goddess honorably, appropriately, and piously and fulfilled her obligations both to the priestesses and to the *orgeōnes* without reproach; and (whereas) accordingly, when Simalē became priestess in the year that Sonikos was archon, and when she requested that the *orgeōnes* agree to appoint for her Metrodora as an attendant; and after (the *orgeōnes*) agreed with her, she co-administered the priesthood honorably and appropriately and in a pious manner – what pertained to the goddess, to the priestesses, and to the *orgeōnes* –, on account of which the priestesses also are eager to appoint her as attendant to the goddess for life. Therefore in order that they might be seen to be taking the best care of the goddess and that they might act honorably and piously in relation to the matters of the goddess; for good fortune it has been resolved by the *orgeōnes*, on the one hand to act in all matters that pertain to the decree that was proposed by Simon of Poros, and on the other, that the *orgeōnes* appoint Metrodora as an attendant to the goddess for life and that she serve indefinitely those who happen to be priestesses, and that she meet their needs honorably and appropriately; and that they take care that all things pertaining to the goddess occur piously, just as her mother, Euaxis, continued to do these things. And let the secretary inscribe this decree on the stele of the *orgeōnes*.

### Notes

- I. 4: ἐπὶ ἑρ[μο]γέν[ο]υ ἄρχοντος i.e., 183/2 BCE (Meritt 1961a, 236; Meritt 1977, 181; Habicht 1982, 177; Woodhead 1997, 381).
- II. 4, 21: ἀγορᾶ κυρία: → IG II<sup>2</sup> 1263.2–3 [11] note.
- I. 4: Σίμων Σίμωνος Πόριος: PA 12705; PAA 822525; LGPN 2:399[42] → IG II<sup>2</sup> 1327.32 [35] and IG II<sup>2</sup> 1325.10 [33] note and comment. Roller (1999, 220) wrongly treats Simon as a “metic from Poros.”
- I. 6: διάταξιν, “distribution [of funds],” “arrangement” → IG II<sup>2</sup> 844.27 (217 BCE); SEG 24.194.48 (164/3 BCE).
- II. 9–10: στ[ρω]νύειν | θρόνου: → IG II<sup>2</sup> 1315.9–10 [29] note and the comment. The spreading of a couch or throne, called *lectisternium* (Latin: *lectum sternere*, “to spread a couch”) consisted of a meal offered to the goddess, often represented by their statues covered with drapery. Livy (5.13.5–6) claims that the first *lectisternium* occurred in Rome in 399 BCE in response to a plague: “The duumvirs for the direction of religious matters, the *lectisternium* being then for the first time introduced into the city of Rome for eight days, implored the favor of Apollo and Latona, Diana and Hercules, Mercury and Neptune, three couches being laid out with the greatest magnificence that was then possible. The same solemn rite was observed also by private individuals.”

- l. 10: θρόνους δύο: The goddess is referred to in this inscription in the singular (ll. 11, 27, 33, 36, 39), unlike other inscriptions from this association, where the masculine plural (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1327.5, 19 [35]: τοὺς θεοὺς) or feminine plural (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1315.18 [29]; 1329.25 [37]: εἰς τὰς θεάς) are found. While the two thrones might be for Mater (Kybele) and Attis, Robertson 1996, 259 observes that it is only in Athens and nearby places that are found twin images of the goddess “sitting on adjacent thrones, mostly beneath a single pediment,” citing Vermaseren 1977–1989, 2: nos. 62, 172, 183, 193, 238–39, 241, 341, 454, 461, 478, 611 and 7: nos. 14, 21, 63, 142. On double representations, see Theodora Hadzisteliou Price, “Double and Multiple Representations in Greek Art and Religious Thought,” *JHS* 91 (1971) 48–69 and Giammarco Razzano 1984, 72–75. It has been argued by Lattimore (1980) and Vermaseren (1977–1989, 2:81), however, that the second deity is not a “doubled” Mater but Aphrodite Ourania or the Syrian Aphrodite, citing Foucart (1873, 98–100), who notes a close relationship between Mater and Aphrodite Ourania in the Piraeus: “Le singulier ou le pluriel *la déesse* ou *les déesses*, dans une formule presque identique, montre que les Orgéones regardaient leur divinité tantôt comme une déesse simple, tantôt comme une déesse multiple, dans laquelle les uns reconnaissaient la Mère des Dieux, les autres Aphrodite Syrienne” (99–100). Foucart (*ibid.*) notes that a dedication to Aphrodite Ourania was discovered in the ruins of the Metroon: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4636 (Piraeus, late IV BCE): Ἀριστοκλέα Κιτιᾶς Ἀφροδίτῃ| Οὐρανίαι εὐξαμένη ἀνέθηκεν. Much later *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4714 (Augustan period) records a dedication to both goddesses: ἐπὶ Ἐπικράτους ἄρχοντος Μεγίστη | Ἀρχιτίμου Σφητίου θυγάτηρ Μητρὶ | θεῶν εὐαντή(τω) ἰατρίνη Ἀφροδίτῃ | ἀνέθηκεν, “In the year that Epikrates was archon, Megistē the daughter of Architimos of Sphettos dedicated this to the Mother of the Gods (and) the gracious midwife Aphrodite.”
- l. 10: φιαληφόροι: Sokolowski 1969, 90: “Les φιαληφόροι portaient probablement des phiales pour recueillir les contributions.” Cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1006.23–24, 79 (122/1 BCE) *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1011.13 (106/5 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1028.40 (100/99 BCE), recording dedications of *phialai* to the Mother of the Gods.
- l. 11: ἐν τῷ ἀγεμ[ῶ]ι, “in the collection” refers to ritualized begging. → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1329.15 [37]; *GIBM* 895.27 (= *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 1015; *LSAM* 73; Halicarnassos): ὁ δὲ ἀγεμῶς ἔστω τῆς ἱερείας; *ICosED* 215.20–24 (Cos, I BCE): τὸν δὲ τόπον τὸν εἰσπορευόμενον ἐν | δεξιᾷ ἐκ τοῦ σταδίου μέχρι τῶν νακορείων καὶ τὰ[ς] | οἰκίας ἀνεῖσθαι ποτὶ τὰς σκανοπαγίας ταῖς καν[η]φόροις καὶ τὸς ἀγεμῶς καὶ τὰς ἄλλας θυσίας τὰς | συντελουμένα[ι]ς ταῖς θεαῖ; *ICosED* 178.26–28 (= *LSCG* 175) (Cos; 196/95 BCE): τοὺς δὲ | ἀγεμῶς τῶν σαλαῖδων καὶ τὰλλα περὶ αὐτῶν γίνεσθαι | πάντα κατὰ τὰ προκεκυρωμένα ἐπὶ μονάρχου Λευκίππου; *ICosED* 236.5–7 (Cos; I BCE): ἡ ἱερεία ἀγε[ι]|[ρ]λέτω ἐκάστου ἐνιαυτοῦ τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ Ἀρταμιτίου τὰ[ι] | [ν]ουμηνί[αι]. Dionysios of Halicarnassos describes the rites of the Mother of the Gods in Rome thus: 2.19.4: “Each year the praetors (*stratēgoi*) conduct the sacrifices and celebrate the games in her honor in accord with Roman customs, but her priest and priestess are Phrygian. These lead a procession throughout the city begging (μητραγυροῦντες), as is their custom, and wearing figures on their breasts, playing the flute in honor of the Mater for those who follow, and beating tympana.” Begging was in some instances limited by cities to a few days: *IG* XII/6 3.10–14 (= *LSCG* 123) (Samos; II BCE): δεδόχθαι τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ τὸν ἱερέα τῆς Ἴσῖδος | [ἀγείρειν] τῇ θεῷ κα[θότι] | [καὶ πρότερον –]; *IMagMai* 98.61–63 (= *LSAM* 32) (Magnesia; 197/96 BCE), a decree concerning the festival of Zeus Sospolis: ἀγέτω δὲ ὁ ἐργολαβήσας τὸν ταῦρον | εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν καὶ ἀγχιρέτω παρὰ τε τὸν σιτοπωλῶν

|καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀγοραίων ἃ ἀνήκει εἰς τὴν τροφήν; *LSAM* 48 (Miletos; 276/75 BCE): τ[ῆ]ι θεῶι κ[εχαρι]σμένω[ς ἕξ]ει κ[αὶ τῶι] δήμωι συμπερό[ν]τως καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τὸν ἔπειτε χρόνον συντελοῦντ[ι] | τ[ᾶ]ς ἀγέρσεις Ἄρτέμιδι Βουλευφόρῳ Σκιρίδι καθότι Σκιρ[ί]δα ἐξηγοῦμενοι εἰσφέρουσι ἢ καθότι νῦν γίνεται. *I.Smyrna* 753.26 (= *Syll<sup>3</sup>* 996.26) (Smyrna; I CE) uses *λογεία* (λογίᾳ) for “collection”: τὴν λογίαν καὶ πομπὴν τῶν θεῶν.

- I. 15: καὶ τὸ φύλλον τ[ᾶ]ξ[α]τ[ι]: the meaning is unclear. Koehler suggests that it concerns voting with leaves (citing *IG XII/5* 595 A.10–13: αἰρεῖσθαι δὲ .. ἄνδρας) τοὺς δοκιμοτάτους τῆι νέα[ι ἀρχ]ῆι, γράψαντας ἓνα ἐφ’ ἐκάστωι τῶι φύλλωι). Sokolowski (1969, 90) argued that the definite article suggests something more precise: “Dans les status des Iobacches [*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1368.137–38 (51)] figure une pénalité exprimée par la phrase τὸν θύρσον ἐπιφέρειν. De même dans les dédicaces de Lydie et Méonie relatives aux confessions figure l’expression τὸ σκήπτρον ἐπιστάναι. Je suppose que τὸ φύλλον était un symbole de la déesse, mais je ne peux pas trouver le verbe.”
- II. 16, 24–25, 31, 35, 39: ζακορεῦσαι, ζάκορος: Another inscription, uses the term πρόπολος: *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 6288 (350–317 BCE): [Χαιρεστράτη] | [Μεν]εκρ[άτου]ς | [Γ]καριέως [γυνή]. | <2 roses> μητρὸς παντοτέκνου πρόπολος | σεμνή τε γεραῖρά τῶιδε τάφωι κείται | Χαιρεστράτη, ἣν ὁ σύνευνος ἔστερξεν | μὲν ζῶσαν, ἐπένησεν δὲ θανούσαν· | φῶς δ’ ἔλιπ’ εὐδαιμων παῖδας παίδων ἐπιδοῦσα “Chairestratē wife of Menekrates of Ikaron. <two roses> An attendant of the Mother of All; pious and in old age, she lies in this tomb, Chairestratē, whom her husband loved while she was alive, and when she died, mourned; Blessed, she gave her children’s children light and hope.”
- I. 21: ἐπὶ Σωνίκου ἄρχοντος: i.e., 175/4 BCE (Meritt 1961a, 236; Meritt 1977, 181).
- I. 22: [Κλ]είππος Αἰξωνεύς: *PA* 8523; *PAA* 575515; *LGPN* 2:264[3].
- II. 23, 31, 40: Μητροδόρα: *PA* 10135; *PAA* 651005; *LGPN* 2:312[5].
- I. 23–24: Ἀριστ[ο]δίκη: *PA* 1826; *PAA* 169190; *LGPN* 2:55[7].
- I. 24: ἐπὶ Ἰππᾶκου ἄρχοντος: i.e., 176/5 BCE (Meritt 1961a, 236; Woodhead 1997, 393)
- II. 25–26: συνδιεξαγαγεῖν... συνδιεξήγαγεν: Compare *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1314.7 [28]: τὴν ἱερωσύνην ἐξήγαγεν; *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1334.7 [45]: τῆ]ν ἱερωσύνην διεξήγαγεν.
- I. 28: ταῖς τε ἱεραῖαις καὶ τοῖς ὄργεῶσιν. Jones (1999, 265) argues that the double phrase indicates that “women were not, strictly speaking, members of the association at all, but enjoyed such privileges as they did, including the offices of priestess and *zakoros*, by virtue of their male connections’ member status.”
- I. 29: Σιμάλη: *PA* 12659; *PAA* 820325; *LGPN* 2:398[2].
- I. 43: Εὐα[ξ]ίς: *PA* 5275; *PAA* 426565; *LGPN* 2:163[1].

### Comments

On the *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods in the Piraeus, see the comments on *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1314 [28] and 1315 [29]. As is the case with associations devoted to the Mother of the Gods after *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1316 [16] (Piraeus, 272/1 BCE), this decree comes from a citizen association. The proposers of both motions (II. 4, 22) are Athenian demesmen and it is likely that the women mentioned belong to citizen families. The fact that the priestess was expected to incur expenses in furnishing the thrones of the goddess suggests that they were drawn from

families with resources. Jones draws attention to the masculine participle in the corona—"the *orgeōnes* (honor) the contributors (τοὺς ἐπιδεδωκότας)"—and concludes that Metrodora's service was considered to belong "not entirely to the women themselves, but at least in part to the presumable ultimate sources of authority as well as of funds—their husbands or other male connections among the *orgeōnes*" (Jones 1999, 265).

The first of the two decrees concerns financial regulation of the association, and seems to reflect a complaint, probably lodged by priestesses, concerning heavy financial burdens placed on them by their *leitourgia*. The motion proposed by Simon of Poros thus limited the responsibilities of the priestesses to the outfitting of two thrones (for similar provisions, → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1315.9–10 [29] comment*) and gifts for those who assist in the collection of funds. The fact that the *orgeōnes* assume the power to fine and penalize a priestess who is in violation of these provisions might suggest that part of the problem was that previous priestesses were using community funds for these outlays rather than the resources of the priestess herself. The threat to withhold public honors for the priestess (ll. 14–15) was likely as powerful a disincentive as a fine.

The other provision of this decree is to allow each priestess to select an attendant from among her predecessors. The decree also requires a rotation of this position, such that no one attendant may monopolize this role.

The second decree, inscribed eight years later, is in conflict with the first provision, since it grants to Metrodora the permanent role of *zakeros*. Metrodora must have distinguished herself in some extraordinary way to merit this honor. She was first chosen as attendant in 176/5 BCE (l. 24) and the priestess for the following year, Simalē (175/4 BCE), who by the terms of the first decree should have chosen another former priestess as attendant, requested that the *orgeōnes* reappoint Metrodora, which they did for life, and obviously, without attaching the penalties prescribed in the first decree.

**Literature:** Dow 1937, 199–200; Ferguson 1944, 37–140; Jones 1999, 262–265; Robertson 1996; Roller 1999, 219–24; Sokolowski 1969, 87–90 (no. 48).



[35] IG II<sup>2</sup> 1327Decree of the *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods

Piraeus (Attica)

178/7 BCE

Published: G. Papanliotis, “Attische Inschriften vom Peiräus,” *Archäologische Zeitung (Archäologischer Anzeiger)* 13 (1885) 83\*–85\*; Foucart 1873, 193–94 (no. 6); Koehler, *IG II* 621; Michel, *RIG* 984; Kirchner, *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1327; Danker 1982, 152–53 (no. 20) (translation only); Vermaseren 1977–1989, 2:78–80 (no. 264) = *CCCA II* 264 (Poland A2d).

Publication Used: *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1327.

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum, EM 7854.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 4563 (Athens or Piraeus, IV BCE): A dedication to the Mother of the Gods; *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 4609 (Piraeus, late IV BCE): A dedication to the Mother of the Gods by two women; *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 6288 (350–317 BCE): A grave inscription for a woman described as μητρὸς παντοτέκνου πρόπολος; *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1273AB [18] (Piraeus, 265/4 BCE): A decree of the *thiasōtai* of the Mother of the Gods; *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16] (Piraeus, 272/1 BCE): A decree of the *thiasōtai* of the Mother of the Gods; *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1314 [28] (Piraeus, 213/2 BCE); *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1315 [29] (Piraeus, 211/0 BCE); *Agora* 16:235 (Meritt, et al. 1957, 209–10 (no. 57); *SEG* 17:36; 32:348; 39:195) (Athens, 202/1 BCE): Honorary decree of the *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods for a priestess; *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1328 [34] (Piraeus, 183/2, 175/4 BCE); *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1327 [35] (Piraeus, 178/7 BCE); *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1329 [37] (Piraeus, 175/4 BCE); *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 2950/1 (II BCE): A dedication of a treasurer to the Mother of the Gods; *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1334 [45] 71/0 BCE (?); *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 4703 (mid I BCE): Dedication of the wife of a demesman; *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 4714 (Augustan period): Dedication of the daughter of a demesman to the Mother of the Gods and to Aphrodite, “gracious midwife” (εὐαντήτω ἰατρείῃ); *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 4759–60 (I/II ce): Two dedications of the wives of two demesmen to the mother of the Gods (εὐαντήτω ἰατρείῃ).

Non-stoichedon. Tablet of Pentelic marble, 68 x 48 x 7.3 cm., with a pediment and *akroteria* (preserved only on the right side). Letter height: 0.5 cm. According to Tracy (1978; 1990, 71–79) the cutter of ll. 1–29 was also responsible for almost fifty other inscriptions. This cutter was active 210/09–171/0 BCE. Ll. 30–33 are from a different hand and were added after the cutting of the main part of the inscription. In contrast to the main body of the inscription, whose letters are neat, thin, well spaced and sharply cut, the letters of ll. 30–33 are larger, serifed, and awkwardly cut. Tracy (1990, 77) suggests that they were the work of “a local, less expert, cutter from Piraeus.”

Θ Ε Ο Ι

[ἐ]πι Φίλωνος ἄρχοντος· Μουνιχιῶνος ἀγορᾶ κυριαί·  
[ἀ]γαθεὶ τύχει· Εὐκτήμων Εὐμαρίδου Στειριεὺς εἶπεν·

5 [ἐ]πειδὴ Ἑρμαῖος Ἑρμογένου Παιονίδης ταμίαις γενόμενος πλείω ἔτη εἰς τε τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβῶς διατελε[ῖ] καὶ κοινεῖ τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν καὶ ἰδία ἐκάστωι εὐχρηστον αὐτὸν παρασκευάζων καὶ φιλοτιμούμενος τὰς τε θυσίας τοῖς θεοῖς θύεσθαι τὰς καθηκούσας καὶ εἰς ταῦτα προεισευπορῶν πλεονάκις ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων καὶ τισιν τῶν ἀπογεγονότων οὐχ ὑπάρχοντος ἀργυρίου τῷ κοινῷ προιέμενος εἰς τὴν ταφήν τοῦ εὐσχημονεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ τετελευτηκότας, καὶ εἰς τὰς ἐπισκευὰς δὲ προαναλίσκων καὶ τοῦ ἐράνου τοῦ ἀργυρηροῦ ἀρχηγὸς γενόμενος συναχθῆναι, καὶ τὰ ἄριστα συνβουλευῶν καὶ λέγων διατελεῖ καὶ ἐμὲ πᾶσιν εὐνοῦν ἑαυτὸν παρασκευάζων, ἀγαθεῖ τύχει δεδόχθαι τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν, ἐπαινέσαι Ἑρμαῖον Ἑρμογένου Παιονίδην καὶ στεφανῶσαι ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν καὶ εὐσεβείας τῆς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ κοινεῖ πρὸς τοὺς ὀργεῶνας, ὅπως ἂν ἐφάμιλλον εἶ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς βουλομένοις φιλοτιμεῖσθαι εἰδόμενος ὅτι χάριτας ἀξίας κομιῶνται vacat ὧν ἂν εὐεργετήσωσιν τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ὀργεῶνων. ἀναθεῖναι δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰκόνα ἐμὲ πίνακι ἐν τῷ ναῶι καὶ στεφανοῦν καθ' ἐκάστην θυσίαν αὐτόν.

29a

&lt;vacat 2.5&gt;

30

ἐπὶ ἐπιμελητῶν  
 Νέωνος Χολαργέως  
 Σίμωνος Πορίου  
 Ἐργασίου.  
 <vacat>

G o d s!

In the year that Philon was archon, in the month of Mounichion, at regular assembly, for good fortune, Euktemon son of Eumarides of Steiria, proposed the motion: Whereas Hermaios son of Hermogenes of the Paionidai, having been treasurer for many years has continually acted piously towards the gods; and has proved himself generous both to the *orgeōnes* collectively and privately to the individuals, putting himself at the disposal of each; and (being) both zealous that the customary sacrifices to the gods be made and generously paying for these, often from his own resources; and also for some who had died, when the treasury had

no money, he paid for the tomb so that they might be treated decently even in death; and (he) made expenditures for repairs and he was the one who organized the original collection of the common fund; and he continually talks about and advises what is best; and in all things shows himself to be well-intentioned. For good fortune, it was resolved by the *orgeōnes* members to commend Hermaios son of Hermogenes of Paionidai, and to crown him on account of the excellence that he has shown to the gods and, collectively to the *orgeōnes*, so that there might be a rivalry among the rest who aspire to honor, knowing that they will receive thanks benefitting those who are benefactors of the association of *orgeōnes*. And let there be set up an image of him with a plaque in the temple and let it be crowned at every sacrifice. And let the supervisors inscribe this decree on a stone stele and set it up in the Metroon. And the cost of both the plaque and the stele is to be paid from the treasury.

While the following were supervisors:

Neon of Cholorgos

Simon of Poros

Ergasion

<*vacat*>

### Notes

- I. 2: [ἐ]πι Φίλωνος ἄρχοντος; i.e., 178/7 BCE (Meritt 1977, 191; Habicht 1982, 177).
- I. 2: ἀγορᾶ κυρία → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1263.2–3* [11] note.
- I. 3, 17–18: Εὐκτήμων Εὐμαρίδου Στεριεὺς; *PA* 5808; *PAA* 438353; *LGPN* 2:176[46].
- I. 4: Ἑρμαῖος Ἑρμογένου Παιονίδης; *PA* 5089; *PAA* 402070; *LGPN* 2:156[10].
- I. 5: πλείω ἔτη → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1323.8* [31] and comment.
- II. 5, 8, 19: εἷς τε τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβῶς → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1328.10* [34]. One expects here εἷς τε τὴν θεὸν εὐσεβῶς rather than the masculine plural, unless the plural is also intended to include Attis (so Ferguson 1944, 138; Garland 1987, 129; Roller 1999, 224).
- I. 6: κοινεῖ τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν καὶ ἰδία ἐκάστωι: the formula κοινεῖ τοῖς *NN* καὶ ἰδία ἐκάστωι (*IG* 1263.15–16 [11]) is common in honorific decrees: e.g., *IG II<sup>2</sup> 252.5–6* (Athens; mid IV BCE): κοινεῖ [ἰ Ἀθηναίους εὐεργετοῦ] [v]τες καὶ ἰ[δία]; 339 fr. b.4–5 (Athens; 331 BCE): κοινεῖ [ἀπάντω] [v] καὶ ἰδία τοῦ δεομένου; 373.25–26; 398 fr. a.3–4; 399.13; 450.13–17; 560.10–11; 646.13–14; 740.6–7; 747.5; 850.5; 797 fr. a.13–14; *IRhannous* II 59–11 [27], etc. The PHI disk lists 320 matches in Attica, Central Greece, and the Aegean Islands.
- I. 11, 29: τῷ κοινῷ: Here “treasury” or “common fund.” See also *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1261.50*; 1262.18; 1292.29; 1297.6; 1316.23–24; 1343.18; *SEG* 18:33.20 and Poland 1909, 488–89.
- II. 13–14: τοῦ ἐράβου → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1291* [19] comment.
- I. 19: πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1328.10* [34] note.
- I. 20: ὅπως ἂν ἐφάμιλλον εἶ → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297.6–7* [24] note.
- II. 24–25: ἀναθεῖναι δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰκόνα ἐμὴ πίνακι ἐν τῷ | ναῷ. Compare B.C. Petrakos, “Ἀν ασκαφὴ Ῥα μνοῦντος,” *Πρακτικὰ τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς*

*Ἐταιρείας* (1989) (Athens 1992) 1–37, esp. 34–37 (no. 16) (= *SEG* 41:86), who cites an honorific inscription from Rhamnous (after 252/1 BCE) which mentions the installation of a portrait of the honoree in the temple: ἐλέσθαι δὲ τρεῖς ἄνδρας | ἐξ{ι}κ τῶν στρατιωτῶν οἵτινες ἐπιμελήσονται τῆς ἀ[να]||θέσεως τῆς στήλης καὶ τοῦ πίνακος· εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφήν καὶ τὴν στήλην καὶ τὸν πίνακα ὁ τι ἀνάλωμ[α] γέν[η]ται λογισάσθωσαν οἱ αἰρεθέντες τοῖς στρατιώταις.

- l. 27: ἐν τῷ Μητρόωι: The reference is confusing. The Metroon, or the temple to Kybele in Athens, was originally the place where the Council met, and after a new building was erected for the Council, the Metroon became the archives of the state [LSJ, s.v.] → Munn 2006. Since the association in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1327 is located in the Piraeus, however, the “Metroon” in question cannot be the Metroon in Athens but must be the temple to the Mother of the Gods in the Piraeus (Garland 1987, 146), as Ferguson (1944, 108) and Arnaoutoglou (2003, 49) have argued.
- l. 31: Νέωνος Χολαργέως: *PA* 10666; *PAA* 707180; *LGN* 2:329[10].
- l. 32: Σίμωνος Πορίου: *PA* 12705; *PAA* 822525; *LGN* 2:399[42] → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1325.10 [33] *note and comment*.
- l. 33: Ἐργασίων, “worker” (*PAA* 400820; *LGN* 2:154[8]) may be a metic, a slave or a freedman (Reilly 1978, 43; Jones 1999, 263). Fragiadakis 1986, 348 lists Ἐργάσιων as the name of a freedman in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1567.17 (ca. 330 BCE). Ferguson (1944, 111) treats Ergasion as an alien and conjectures (without any basis) that the association made a practice of putting an alien on the board of supervisors each year. The name also appears in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2943.7–8 (Athens; III BCE) as the name of a Samaritan metic: Ἐ[ρ]γασίων | Σαμαρίτης, “Ergasion the Samaritan.”

### Comments

The complexion of this group of *orgeōnes* conforms generally to that of the association of the Mother of the Gods at least since *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16] (Piraeus, 272/1 BCE), by which time this cult seems to have become a predominantly citizen rather than a metic association. What makes this inscription of interest is the name of the third supervisor, Ergasion (“Worker”). Although Ferguson thought that since the conversion of the metic group into a citizen band a practice had developed of appointing one non-Athenian as a supervisor, there is little evidence to support this conjecture. The name, however, is probably a metic name, although it is not impossible that Ergasion was a slave or freedman.

As we noted earlier (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1273AB [18]), in 265/4 BCE a group of metics calling themselves *thiasōtai* is attested in the Piraeus, existing alongside a citizen group of *orgeōnes* (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16]). Evidence for the exclusively metic group disappears after 265/4 BCE and hence it is reasonable to conjecture that the *thiasōtai* were eventually merged with the citizen *orgeōnes*. Ferguson suggests that the mingling of citizens and aliens led to “a certain weakening... of deep-rooted prejudices” (1944, 111) and Jones adds:

My suspicion is that it was the absorption of an earlier alien association by a larger dominant citizen association that had provided the mechanism enabling

such a profound, and perhaps otherwise unobtainable, development. (Jones 1999, 264)

The honoree in this inscription, Hermaios, is clearly a person of considerable wealth and influence, judging from the list of benefactions for which he was responsible. Important among those benefactions is the provision of burial for deceased members (ll. 10–12). *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1323 [31]* offers another instance of an association that was evidently mixed in its complexion, offering burial to some members. The phrase οὐχ ὑπάρχοντος | ἀργυρίου τῶι κοινῶι (ll. 10–11) seems to imply that the association normally provided burial out of its common fund but in some cases (l. 10 τισιν τῶν ἀπογεγονότων) lacked the funds to do so. In any event, the phrase τοῦ | εὐσχημονεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ τετελευτηκότας (ll. 11–12) underscores the association’s advertisement to treat its members in a “seemly” fashion (compare *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1275 [8]*; 1277 [15]; 1278 [17]; 1323 [31]).

**Literature:** Borgeaud, P. *Mother of the Gods: From Cybele to the Virgin Mary*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004; Ferguson 1944; Jones 1999, 263–264, 266–67; Munn 2006; Petrocheilos 1992; Roller 1999, 219–24.

## [36] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1326* Regulations of the *Dionysiastai*

Piraeus (Attica)

176/5 BCE

Published: E. Dragatsis, Ἐπιγραφή ἐκ Πειραιῶς, *AE* (1884) 39–50, esp. 45–47 (facsimile); Ulrich Koehler, “Die Genossenschaft der Dionysiasten in Piraeus,” *AM* 9 (1884) 288–298, esp. 290–91; Koehler, *IG II* 5,623e; Michel, *RIG* 986; Dittenberger, *Syll<sup>2</sup>* 729; Prott and Ziehen, *LGS II* 45; Bernhard, Laum, *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike: Ein Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1914) 2:20; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1326*; Dittenberger–Hiller von Gaertringen, *Syll<sup>3</sup>* 1101; Sokolowski, *LSCG* 91–93 (no. 49); Jaccottet 2003, 2:22–25 (no. 2) (Poland A4c).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1326*.

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum.

Related Inscriptions: → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1325 [33]* (Piraeus, 185/4 BCE): Same cutter and the same association; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2948* (Athens; early II BCE): Mention of Dionysos, the cult founder.

Non stoichedon (35–45 letters). Tablet of Pentelic marble, 91.5 x 34.5 x 8.0 cm. Letter height: 0.5 cm. Discovered near Piraeus on the site of the ruins of a temple

to Dionysos (Dörpfeld 1884, 286–87; Koehler 1884, 296–97). Tracy (1990, 92–95) describes the lettering as imprecise, tall, narrow and somewhat sloppy. He assigns this to the cutter of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1236 (ca. 180 BCE); 1325 (Piraeus, 185/4 BCE); 2858 (ca. 180 BCE); *Agora* 1:432; 2965; 3988; 4966; 6100 (199/8 BCE); 7191; and *BCH* 90 (1966) 727; 731). The style of lettering is similar to, but distinguishable from, that of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 897, indicating that the two cutters may have “worked in the same shop or trained under the same master” (1990, 92–95, 231). The cutter’s work (199/8–176/5 BCE) fell into two phases, an early phase consisting of official documents, and a later one (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1236; 1325; 1326; 2858) in which all the works are private decrees and dedications.

## Θ Ε Ο Ι

- ἀγαθεῖ τύχει· ἐπὶ Ἰπάκου ἄρχοντος, Ποσιδεῶ-  
 νος ἀγοραὶ κυρία· Σόλων Ἑρμογένου Χολαργεὺς  
 εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ συμβέβηκεν Διονυσίῳ μεταλλά-  
 5 ξαι τὸν βίον ἀποδεδειγμένῳ ἐμ πολλοῖς ἦν ἔ-  
 χων εὖνοιαν διετέλει πρὸς ἅπαντας τοὺς τὴν  
 σύνοδον φέροντας τῷ θεῷ, αἰεὶ τινος ἀγαθοῦ πει-  
 [ρ]ώμενος παραίτιος γίνεσθαι καὶ ἰδία καὶ κοινεῖ  
 [φ]ιλάγαθος ὦ[ν] ἐμ παντὶ καιρῷ· ὃς γοῶν προτι-  
 10 μηθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν Διονυσιαστῶν καὶ λαβὼν τὴν ἰε-  
 ρεωσύνην τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κατασταθεὶς ταμίης τὰς  
 τε κοινὰς προσόδους ἐπηύξησεν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων  
 ἐπιδούς αὐτοῖς ἀργυρίου χιλίας δραχμὰς καὶ τό-  
 15 πον μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης χορηγίας πάσης εἰς ὃν συν-  
 ἰόντες θύσο[υ]σιν κατὰ μῆνα ἕκαστον τῷ θεῷ κα-  
 τὰ τὰ πάτρια, ἐπέδωκεν δὲ καὶ ἄλλας ἀργυρίου  
 πεντακοσίας δραχμὰς ἀφ’ ὧν κατεσκευάσατο τὸ  
 ἄγαλμα τοῦ Διονύσου τοῖς ὄργεῶσιν καὶ προσιδρύ-  
 20 σατο κατὰ τὴν μαντείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ περὶ ἀπάντων  
 τούτων ὑπάρ[χ]ουσιν αἱ ἀποδείξεις ὑπὲρ τάνδρος σα-  
 φεῖς διὰ τῶν χρηματισμῶν εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον·  
 ἀνθ’ ὧν ἐπιγνόντες οἱ Διονυσιασταὶ ἐτίμησαν  
 αὐτὸν ἄξιον ὄντα καὶ ἐστεφάνωσαν κατὰ τὸν  
 νόμον· ἵνα ο[ὕ]ν φαίνωνται οἱ τὴν σύνοδον φέρον-  
 25 τες μεμνη[μ]ένοι αὐτοῦ καὶ ζῶντος καὶ μετηλλα-  
 χότος τὸν β[ί]ον τῆς πρὸς αὐτοὺς μεγαλοψηχίας  
 καὶ εὐ[νοίας κ]αὶ ἀντὶ τούτων φανεροὶ ὧσιν τιμῶν-  
 τες τοὺς ἐξ [ἐκ]είνου γεγονότας, ἐπειδὴ συμβαί-  
 νει διαδόχους αὐτὸν κ[α]ταλειοιπέναί πάντων  
 30 τῶν ἐν δόξ[ε]ι καὶ τιμῇ αὐτῷ ὑπ[α]ρχόντων, περὶ ὧν  
 καὶ ὁ νόμος τῶν ὄργεῶνων καλεῖ πρώτ[ον] ἐπὶ [ταῦ]-  
 τα τὸν πρεσβύτατον τῶν ὧν, καθὼς καὶ προεισ[ῆ]-  
 κται ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὰδελοφῶ Καλλικράτου ζῶν-

- 35 τος τοῦ πατρός· δεδόχθαι τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν, τὴν ἱερεω-  
 [σύ]νην τοῦ Δ[ι]ονύσου δεδόσθαι Ἀγαθοκλεῖ Διονυσίου  
 [Μα]ραθωνίῳ καὶ ὑπάρχειν αὐτῷ διὰ βίου ἐπὶ ταῖς  
 [τιμ]αῖς ταῖς αὐταῖς αἰς ἐτετίμητο καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐ-  
 [τοῦ], ἐπειδὴ ὑπομεμένηκεν τὴν ταμειαν εἰς τὸν  
 40 [με]τὰ ταῦτα χρόνον διεξάξειν καὶ ἐπαυ[ξ]ήσειν τὴν  
 [σύνο]δον διδοῦς εἰς ταῦτα ἑαυτὸν ἀπ[ροφ]ασίστως,  
 [βουλ]όμενος ἀποδείκνυσθαι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ εὐνοίαν  
 [καὶ] καλοκαγ[α]θίαν πρὸς ἅπαντας τοὺς Διονυσιαστά[ς],  
 [εἰσή]γαγεν [δ]ὲ καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ Διονύσιον Διο-  
 νυσίου Μαρα[θ]ώνιον εἰς τὴν σύνοδον ἐπὶ τὰ τοῦ πατρ[ός]  
 45 ὑπάρχοντα [μ]εθέξοντα τῶν κοινῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμο[ν]·  
 φροντίσαι δὲ τοὺς ὀργεῶνας ὅπως ἀφηρωῖσθεῖ Δι[ο]-  
 νύσιος καὶ ἀ[ν]ατεθεῖ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ παρὰ τὸν θεόν, ὅπου κα[ὶ]  
 ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ὑπάρχει κάλλιστον ὑπόμνημα αὐτοῦ  
 εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον. ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα ἐ[ν]  
 50 στήλει λιθίνῃ καὶ στήσαι παρὰ τὸν νεῶ τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ δὲ  
 γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα εἰς τὴν στήλην καὶ τὴν ἀνάθεσιν  
 μερίσαι τὸν [τ]αμίαν. ταῦτα Σόλων εἶπεν.

G o o d s!

For good fortune! In the year that Hippiakos was archon, in the month of Poseideon at the regular assembly, Solon son of Hermogenes of Cholargos proposed the following motion: Whereas it has happened that Dionysios has quit this life, who had displayed in many things the goodwill that he had (and) continued (to show it) to all who brought the association (*synodos*) to the god; and when he was asked he was always the cause of some good thing, both for individuals and for common good, being a benefactor (*philagathos*) at all times; who indeed having been already been honored by the *Dionysiastai* and having received the priesthood of the god and having been appointed treasurer, further increased the common revenues, contributing to them from his own resources one thousand silver drachmae; and after all of the other expenditures (he contributed) a place in which they could come and sacrifice each month to the god in accordance with their ancestral customs.

- 16 He contributed in addition another 500 silver drachmae, from which funds the statue of Dionysos was prepared for the *orgeōnes*, and it was installed in accordance with the oracle of the god. And concerning all of these matters, the plain demonstrations that exist concerning this man are registered in the archives for all time. On account of these things, the *Dionysiastai*, recognizing them, have honored him as being worthy and have crowned him in accordance with the law, so that (the members) who bring the association (*synodos*) (to the god) might be seen to remember

him, both while he was alive and after he died, his magnanimity (*megalopsychia*) to them and his goodwill; and because of these things, they have publicly honored his children, since it happened that he has left behind successors (*diadochoi*) to the things he possessed with glory and honor.

- 30 Concerning these (successors) the law of the *orgeōnes* also invites, first in this case, the eldest of the sons, just as also he had been introduced (into the association) in the place of his brother Kallikrates while his father was still alive; be it resolved by the *orgeōnes* that the priesthood of Dionysios be given to Agathokles son of Dionysios of Marathon, and that he hold it for life on account of all the honors with which his father has been honored, since he has continued to maintain the treasury for the period after (Dionysios' death), and has enhanced the association (*synodos*), devoting himself to these things without hesitation, wishing to demonstrate his own goodwill and nobility (*kalokagathia*) to all of the *Dionysiastai*; he also introduced his brother Dionysios son of Dionysios of Marathon into the association (*synodos*) in virtue of the possessions of his father which in accordance with the law he shares; (and further, resolved that) the *orgeōnes* recognize that Dionysios has been heroized and that (a statue of him) be set up in the temple beside the (statue of the) god, where (there is) also (a statue of) his father, so that he may have the most beautiful memory for all time. Let this decree be inscribed on a stone stele and erected beside the sanctuary of the god; and the cost of the stele and its erection shall be borne by the treasurer. These things were moved by Solon.

### Notes

- I. 2: ἐπὶ Ἰπάκου ἄρχοντος; i.e., 176/5 BCE (Meritt 1961a, 236; 1977, 181).
- I. 3: ἀγοραὶ κυρίαι: → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1263.2–3 [11] note.
- I. 3, 52: Σόλων Ἐρμογένου Χολαργεὺς: *PA* 12816; *PAA* 828015; *LGPN* 2:402[15] → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1325.5, 19, 35 [33].
- I. 4: Διονυσίωι: *PA* 4213; *PAA* 345460; *LGPN* 2:124[487]. This is the Dionysios who appears in the membership list of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1325.1 [33].
- II. 6–7: τοὺς τὴν | σύνοδον φέροντας τῷ θεῷ: Cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1012.13–15 [42]: ταμί|ας ναυκλήρων καὶ ἐμπόρων τῶν φε||ρόντων τὴν σύνοδον τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ | Ξενίου, “treasurer of the ship owners and merchants who bring together the *synodos* of Zeus Xenios.” Dittenberger (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 1101): “Hinc non solum ad ipsam sodalitatem transit vox, set etiam ad stipem, cuius nomen aliud, ἔρανος, eodem modo et pecuniam collatam et collegium significasse constat.”
- I. 8: καὶ ἴδια καὶ κοινεῖ → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1327.6 [35] note.
- I. 21: διὰ τῶν χρηματισμῶν, “in the archives.” Since it is unlikely that Dionysios' deeds were recorded in the civic archives, the association itself must have kept an archive.
- II. 23–24, 31, 46: κατὰ τὸν | νόμον: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1278.2 [17] note.
- II. 35–36: Ἀγαθοκλεῖ Διονυσίωι | [Μα]ραθωνίωι: *PA* 65; *PAA* 103835; *LGPN* 2:3[84] → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1325.4 [33]; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2332.306–7 (183/2 BCE) in a list of contributors:



[Διον]ύσιος [Ἀγαθ]οκλέους Μαραθῶ Δ | [καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ὕ]ων Ἀγαθοκλέους Δ |; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2333.16* (ca. 180 BCE): a list of contributors: [Διον]ύσιος Μαραθῶνιος ὑπὲρ [ἐαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν ὕων] | [Ἀγαθοκλέους καὶ] Διονυσίο[υ ??]

- I. 46: ἀφηρωίσθει: cf. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 10531a* (I/II CE): Φιλόξενος τὸν ἴδιον | θρεπτὸν Ἀβάσκαντον ἀφηρωίξει; *IG IV 799* (Troizen, II CE): [ἡ πόλις τὸν δεῖνα, υἱὸν] | [Ἐρ]μᾶ ἱερέως Τύχης Σ[ε]βαστής, ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν καὶ σωφροσύνης | ἀφηρωίσειν. The verb is particularly common in inscriptions from Thera (*IG XII/3* 281, 288, 864–86, 868–77, 896–902, 904 913–19, 921–30, etc.), some taking the form ἀβουλά καὶ ὁ δάμο[ς] | NN ἀρετᾶς ἔνεκεν ἀφηρωίξει, and others being private heroizations: Αὐρ(ήλιος) Τυχάσιος τὸν πατέρα | καὶ Ἐπιζούσα τὸν ἴδιον | σύμβιον Τυχάσιον | ἀφηρωίξαν. Koehler 1884, 298: “Es [*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1326*] ist dies das erste Beispiel einer Zuerkennung heroischer Ehren in den attischen Inschriften. Natürlich was es nicht das einzige. Dem Phrurarchen Diogenes z.B., welchem nach seinem Tode die Epheben an dem nach ihm benannten Feste in seinem τέμενος ein Stieropfer darbrachten, müssen vom Staate heroische Ehren decretirt worden sein.”

### Comments

For a discussion of the *Dionysiastai* in the Piraeus, see *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1325* [33] comments.

The current inscription, proposed by an Athenian citizen, not only recalls the founder Dionysios’ benefactions to the group and proposes that his son Agathokles be appointed priest for life in place of his father, but proposes that Dionysios be recognized as a “hero” (ἀφηρωίσθει) and his statue be erected in the temple beside the statue of Dionysos.

The phenomenon of the foundation of hero cults by individuals or associations is a striking development of the Hellenistic period. The best-known of these is the nearly two hundred-line testament of Epikteta of Thera (*IG XII/3* 330; ca. 200 BCE), which mandated the completion of the Mouseion started by Epikteta’s late husband, Phoinix, and the establishing of a yearly three-day festival, with sacrifices to the Muses on the first day, to the “heroes” Phoinix and Epikteta on the second (τοῖς ἥρωσι Φοίνικι καὶ [Ἐπικ]τήται), and on the third, to their other “hero” sons, Kratesilochos and Andragoras (τοῖς ἥρωσι Κρατ[ησ]ιλόχοι καὶ Ἀν[δρα]γόροι) (ll. 124–126). (Other examples of foundations of private hero cults are discussed by Hughes 1999). The decree in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1326* provides no indication of what, in addition to the erection of a status of Dionysios, might be involved in heroization but it is not unreasonable to assume at least a yearly commemoration.

Koehler (1884, 294–95) argued that the priesthood in question was hereditary in nature, pointing to ll. 30–31, ὁ νόμος τῶν ὀργεῶνων καλεῖ πρώτ[ον ἐ]πι[ταῦ]τα τὸν πρεσβύτατον τῶν ὕων, which suggests a formal prescription that Dionysios’ sons succeed him as the priest. The inscription also recalls that Agathokles had been introduced into the association to take the place of his (presumably deceased) brother Kallikrates while Dionysios was still living (on succession of priests within a family, see Volkmann 1942). Agathokles’ name

appears on the membership list nine years earlier in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1325.4 [33]*). He apparently assumed the role of treasurer of the society upon his induction (ll. 37–40) and thus followed in his father’s footsteps. Since we have no indication from either inscription that succession within a family applied not only to Dionysios and his successors but more broadly to all of the *orgeōnes*, one cannot concur with Parker (1996, 341) that membership in the group was limited to fifteen and operated by father-to-son succession. It is nonetheless appropriate to agree with Parker (*ibid.*) that the group was dominated by one great family.

**Literature:** Dörpfeld 1884; Ferguson 1944, 115–17; Garland 1987, 124, 147, 215–16; Hughes, Dennis D. “Hero Cult, Heroic Honors, Heroic Dead: Some Developments in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods.” In *Ancient Greek Hero Cult*. Proceedings of the Fifth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, ed. Robin Hägg. Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen and Paul Astöms Förlag, 1999, 167–175 (*SEG* 49:2477); Koehler 1884; Mikalson 1998, 204–6; Parker 1996, 341; Poland 1909, 197; Volkmann, Hans. “Die Bruderfolge griechischer Priestertümer im Licht der vergleichenden Rechtsgeschichte.” *Klio* 34 (1942) 62–17; Ziebarth 1896, 37, 39, 45–48.

### [37] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1329*

## The *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods honor their secretary

Piraeus (Attica) 175/4 BCE  
 Published: Stephanos A. Koumanoudes, *Athenaion* 8 (1879) 294; Koehler, *IG II 5* 624b; Michel, *RIG* 985; Dittenberger, *Syll<sup>2</sup>* 730; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1329* (Dittenberger–Hiller von Gaertringen, *Syll<sup>3</sup>* 1102); Kirchner, et al. 1948, no. 101 (photo only); Vermaseren 1977–1989, 2:80–81 (no. 265) = *CCCA II* 265 (Poland A2i).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1329* and a squeeze (University of Cambridge, Department of Classics).

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum, EM 7842.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4563* (Athens or Piraeus, IV BCE): A dedication to the Mother of the Gods; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4609* (Piraeus, late IV BCE): A dedication to the Mother of the Gods by two women; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 6288* (350–317 BCE): A grave inscription for a woman described as μητρὸς παντοτέκνου πρόπολος; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273AB [18]* (Piraeus, 265/4 BCE): A decree of the *thiasōtai* of the Mother of the Gods; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16]* (Piraeus, 272/1 BCE): A decree of the *thiasōtai* of the Mother of the Gods; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314 [28]*

(Piraeus, 213/2 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1315 [29]* (Piraeus, 211/0 BCE); *Agora 16:235* (Meritt, et al. 1957, 209–10 (no. 57); *SEG 17:36*; 32:348; 39:195) (Athens, 202/1 BCE): Honorary decree of the *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods for a priestess; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1328 [34]* (Piraeus, 183/2, 175/4 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1327 [35]* (Piraeus, 178/7 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1329 [37]* (Piraeus, 175/4 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2950/1* (II BCE): A dedication of a treasurer to the Mother of the Gods; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1334 [45]* 71/0 BCE (?); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4703* (mid I BCE): Dedication of the wife of a demesman; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4714* (Augustan period): Dedication of the daughter of a demesman to the Mother of the Gods and to Aphrodite, “gracious midwife” (εὐαντήτω ἰατρείῃ); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4759–60* (I/II ce): Two dedications of the wives of two demesmen to the mother of the Gods (εὐαντήτω ἰατρείῃ).

Non stoichedon (32–41 letters). Stele of Pentelic marble, 86 x 42 x 11.5 cm. Letter height: 0.9 cm. Tracy (1990, 125–27) assigns this to the cutter of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1328 [34]*. The letters vary in height and width. Round letters are made with multiple straight strokes.

- ἀγαθεὶ τύχει· ἐπὶ Σωνίκου ἄρχοντος, Μουνι-  
 χίωνος ἀγορᾶ κυρία· Ὀνησίκριτος Διοκλέ-  
 ους Πειραιεὺς εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ Χαιρέας εὔνου ὦν  
 διατελεῖ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν, κατα-  
 σταθεὶς δὲ καὶ γραμματεὺς ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ  
 5 Θεοξένου ἄρχοντος οὐθὲν ἐνλέλοιπεν φιλο-  
 τιμίας συναύξων τε διατετέλεκεν τοῖς ὀρ-  
 γεῶσιν τὴν σύνοδον, πεφρόντικεν δὲ καὶ θερα-  
 πείας τοῦ ἱεροῦ πλεονάκις, οὐκ ἀπολέλιπται δὲ  
 10 οὐδ’ ἐν ἐπιδόσει οὐδεμίᾳ, εἰσήνεγκεν δὲ καὶ  
 ψηφίσματα ἐπὶ τῷ συμφέροντι ἵνα συνσταλῶ-  
 σιν αἱ λίαν ἄκαιροι δαπάναι, ἐφρόντισεν δὲ τοῦ καὶ  
 τοὺς δημοτικὸς μετέχειν τῶν δεδομένων ὑπὸ  
 τῶν ὀργεῶνων φιλανθρώπων, διατετέλεκεν δὲ καὶ  
 15 συνλειουργῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀγερμοῖς καὶ ταῖς στρώσε-  
 σιν ταῖς ἱερῆαις, προευχρήστηκεν δὲ καὶ διάφορον  
 πλεονάκις ἄτοκον ἀποδημοῦντος τοῦ ταμίου, ἐπαγ-  
 γέλλεται δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον συμφρονη-  
 εῖν εἰς ὃ ἂν αὐτὸν παρακαλῶσιν οἱ ὀργεῶνες· ἵνα οὖν  
 20 ἐφάμιλλον ἢ τοῖς αἰεὶ φιλοτιμουμένοις, εἰδότες ὅ-  
 τι χάριτας ἀξίας κομιοῦνται ὧν ἂν εὐεργετήσω-  
 σιν, ἀγαθεὶ τύχει, δεδόχθαι τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν, ἐπαι-  
 νέσαι Χαιρέαν Διονυσίου Ἀθμονέα καὶ στεφανῶ-  
 σαι αὐτὸν θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν καὶ  
 25 εὐσεβῆας εἰς τε τὰς θεὰς καὶ τοὺς ὀργεῶνας καὶ  
 ἀναγορεῦειν τὸν στέφανον τῇ θυσίαι τοῦ Μουνιχι-

ὄνος ὅταν καὶ τὰς ἱερείας, δοῦναι δὲ αὐτῶι καὶ ἰκό-  
 νος ἀνάθεσιν ἐν τῶι ναῶι. ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸδε τὸ ψήφι-  
 σμα εἰς στήλην λιθίνην καὶ στήσαι ἐν τεῖ αὐλεῖ  
 30 τοῦ ἱεροῦ.

<in a crown>

οἱ ὄργεῶνες

Χαιρέαν

Διονυσίου

Ἄθμονεα.

For good fortune! In the year that Sonikos was archon, month of Mounichion, at the regular assembly. Onēsikritos son of Diokles of Piraeus, proposed the (following) motion: Whereas Chaireas has continually been well-intentioned to the *orgeōnes* on every occasion, having also been appointed as secretary by them beginning with the year that Theoxenos was archon, and has in no way neglected his honorable ambitions and has continued (to be well intentioned) to the *orgeōnes* assisting (them) to enhance the association (*synodos*); and many times he has been concerned about servicing the temple and has not failed in any contribution at all, but has introduced decrees for the benefit (of the association), so that the extremely inopportune expenses were cut down; and he also arranged that ordinary people (*tous dēmotikous*) should share in the benefactions given by the *orgeōnes*, and he has also continued to undertake service for the collection and for the sacred furnishings, and he has frequently advanced money for payments without charging interest when the treasurer happened to be absent, and has promised that in the future he will be ready to consider whatever matter the *orgeōnes* ask of him; therefore, so that there may be a rivalry among those who are zealous at any time, knowing that those who act as benefactors shall receive fitting recognition; for good fortune, the *orgeōnes* have resolved to commend Chaireas son of Dionysios of Athmonon and to crown him with a wreath of olive, on account of the excellence and piety that he has shown to the gods and to the *orgeōnes*, and to announce publicly the crown at the sacrifice in the month of Mounichion, when they also (perform) the sacrifices, and to give to him a fitting stele in the temple. They shall inscribe this decree on a stele and erect it in the courtyard of the temple.

The *orgeōnes* (crown) Chaireas  
 son of Dionysios  
 of Athmonos.

### Notes

- I. 1: ἐπὶ Σωνίκου ἄρχοντος; i.e., 175/4 BCE (Meritt 1961a, 236; 1977, 181).
- I. 2: ἀγορᾶ κυρία → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1263.2–3 [11] note*.
- II. 2–3: Ὀνησίκριτος Διοκλέ|ου|ς Πειραιεὺς; *PA 11451; PAA 746035; LGPN 2:352[4]*.

- II. 3, 23: Χαίρεάν Διονυσίου Ἀθμονέα: *PA* 15097; *PAA* 971535; *LGPN* 2:469[18].
- II. 5–6: ἀπὸ Θεοξένου ἄρχοντος: i.e., 187/6 BCE (Meritt 1961a, 236; 1977, 181; Habicht 1982, 177)
- II. 11–12: συνσταλω|σιν αἱ λίαν ἄκαιροι δαπάναι → Thucydides 8.4 (of the Athenians reducing expenses), ζυστελλόμενοι ἐς εὐτέλειαν, “cutting down any expenses which seemed unnecessary.”
- I. 13: τοὺς δημοτικούς μετέχειν, “the ordinary people should share...” Compare *IG IV* 1.15–17 (Aigina, mid II BCE): [ὄ]πῳς καὶ τῷ ἀσθενεστάτῳ [πρὸς] | τὸν δυνατώτατον [καὶ] τῷ δημοτικώτατῳ πρὸς τὸν εὐπορ[ώ]τατον ἢ ἴση ὑπάρχ[η] δικ[α]ιοδοσ[ί]α, “so that an equal administration of justice might exist for the weakest as for the most powerful, and for the ordinary person as for richest person.”
- II. 13–14: μετέχειν τῶν δεδομένων ὑπὸ | τῶν ὀργεῶνων φιλανθρώπων, cf. *IG IX/2* 1107b.20–22 (II BCE; Demetrias [Thessaly]): μετέχειν τ[ε καὶ διὰ] | βίου πάντων <τῶν> τοῖς ὑποστόλοις διδομέν[ων φιλαν]θρώπων.
- I. 15: ἐν τοῖς ἀγερμοῖς → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1328.11* [34] note.
- II. 15–16: ταῖς στρώσει|σιν ταῖς ἱεράϊαις, “the sacred furnishings” → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1315.9–10* [29] note.
- I. 16: προευχρήστηκεν → προδανείζειν, “to advance money.”
- II. 17: ἐπαγγέλλεται → Arnaoutoglou 2003, 149 draws attention to *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1318.3–5*, a fragmentary honorific decree, which describes the “promise” of the honoree “to give a share from his income to everything suitable to the *koinon*” ([· αὐ]τὸς δὲ ἐπηγγείλα[το ἐκ τῶν] | [ιδ]ῶν εἰς ἅπαντα τὰ [προσή]||[κ]οντα τῷ κοινῷ μερ[εῖν]).
- II. 19–20: ἴνα οὖν | ἐφάμιλλον ἦ → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297.6–7* [24] note.
- I. 25: εἰς τε τὰς θεάς: The plural “goddesses” is curious here, but may reflect the fact that this association apparently used a double-throne for Mater → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1328.10* [34]. Lattimore 1980 and Vermaseren 1977–1989, 2:81, however, think that the second goddess is Aphrodite Ourania or “Venus Syria.” Referring to *CCCA* 2:141–42 (no. 454) (Isthmia; Hellenistic period), a double *naiskos* with a dedication to [Μ]ήτηρ θεῶν *vac* οὐρανία, Giannmarco Razzano (1984, 72–75) suggests that the blank space between “Mother of the gods” and *Ourania* might indicate that the latter refers to the deity in the right niche. Nevertheless, his general conclusion is that the double figure does not represent a divine couple, but rather to one deity doubled.
- I. 26: ἀναγορεύειν τὸν στέφανον → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1263.37–38* [11] note.

### Comments

The association is undoubtedly the same as the Piraean *orgeōnes* responsible for *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314* [28] (213/2 BCE), 1315 [29] (211/0 BCE), *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1328* [34] (183/2, 175/4 BCE) and 1327 [35] (178/7 BCE), comprised dominantly of citizens. Both the proposer of the motion and the honoree are demesmen. Nevertheless, the appearance of τοὺς δημοτικούς in I. 13 is curious (see the note above). Jones (1999, 267) rejects the possible translation “citizens” on the grounds that Chaireas, a citizen, would hardly refer to Athenian citizens as δημοτικοί. Nor would the term refer to the demesmen of Piraeus. This leaves only “people” “in its politically colored sense and especially with an intimation

of poverty or at least low-class orientation.” It should be recalled that *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1327.10 [35], from the same association, commended an honoree for paying for the funerals of those who lacked the resources for proper burial, pointing to either the presence in the association of metics whose families were not available to pay for funerals or indigent Athenians. Whichever the case, this inscription provides evidence of membership from a range of social registers. Mikalson (1998, 205) is probably right to conclude:

From the activities and concerns of the Piraeic cult of the Mother of the Gods in the second century one might imagine that its members, all citizens, were of the lower economic and social classes. But of the eleven individuals identifiable in these texts, three belonged to families that at least later had some prominence. A descendant of Dionysodoros of Alopeke (*PA* 4290) of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1315 served as the chief presiding officer of the *Ekklesia* in 118/7 (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1008.3). Descendants of Chaireas of Athmonon (*PA* 15097), the secretary honored in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1329, served as a gymnasiarch in 55/4 (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2993) and as a *prytanis* late in the Roman period (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1794.50). Also about that time a descendant of Paramonos of Epieikidai (*PA* 11619) of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1314 was an *ephebe* (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2052.91).

The mention in this inscription and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328.11 [34] of ἀγερμός provides the first references ritualized begging in an Athenian association, although the practice is attested in various settings in Halicarnassos, Cos, Magnesia, and Samos during the same period (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328.11 [34] *note*) and Dionysios of Halicarnassos describes ritualized begging (μητραγυρτοῦντες) as a yearly Roman ritual performed by the Phrygian priest and priestess of the Great Mother (2.19.4). It seems doubtful, however, that this Piraeic association also required the practice of using a Phrygian priestess. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1314 [28] and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328 [34] name five priestesses and former priestesses, Glaukon, Archidikē, Metrodora, Simalē and (probably) Euaxis, all presumably members of citizen families. In *Agora* 16:235 frag. 2 (Athens; 212/11 BCE) the restoration suggests also that the priestess is the wife of a demesman:

[— — — εἶπεν]· ἐπ(ε)ιδὴ Ἱερὸ[κλεια(?)]

[· ± 8 ··· γυνὴ δὲ Ἀντι[γγενει[δ]ου Λαμ[πτρέως]

[ἱέρεια εἰς(?) τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν ἐπὶ Εὐάνδ[ρου λα]-

[χούσα καλῶς καὶ εὐσ[εβῶς τὴν ἱερῶ[σύνην]

— — — proposed the motion: Whereas Hierokleia... wife of Antigeneides of Lamptraí, who by lot was chosen the priestess for the year that Euandros was the archon, has carried out the office of priestess honorably and piously...

This inscription also illustrates the practice of long term appointments as a secretary, although there is no support for Garland’s suggestion that the treasurer and the secretary were “permanent appointments” (1987, 130). At the time of the honorary decree Chaireas had been secretary for twelve years, presumably because of his distinguished benefactions to the *orgeōnes*, and perhaps being re-elected successively. The role of the secretary clearly extended well beyond the recording of decrees but, like *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1263 [11], 1284 [22], 1291 [19], 1292 [26], and 1323 [31] included financial management, and in some

cases also included the opportunity for significant benefaction to the group and its members (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1277 [15]).

**Literature:** Arnaoutoglou 2003, 109–11, 116–17, 149; Baslez 2001; Mikalson 1998, 204–5; Giammarco Razzano, M. Carla. “Il culto di Cibele e il problema dei doppi naiskoi.” *Miscellanea Greca e Romana* 9 (1984) 63–88 (*SEG* 36:327); Robertson 1996.

### [38] *SEG* 36:228

#### New Members for a *synodos* of Herakles

Attica (uncertain location)

159/8 BCE

Published: Peter C. Bol, “Liebieghaus,” *Städel-Jahrbuch* N.F. 8 (1981) 359–378, here 361–62 (ph.); Peter C. Bol, ed., *Liebieghaus-Museum alter Plastik: Antike Bildwerke I: Bildwerke aus Stein und aus Stuck von archaischer Zeit bis zur Spätantike* (3 vols.; Melsungen: Verlag Gutenberg, 1983–1985) 1:216–17 (ph.); *SEG* 36:228.

Current Location: Liebieghaus Museum (Frankfurt a.M.) inv. 1570.

White marble pedimental stele, broken at the bottom, 78 x 36 x 9.5 cm., acquired from a private collection. The text of the inscription is complete in twelve lines. The space below the inscription is blank.

ἐπὶ Ἀρισταιχμοῦ ἄρχοντος καὶ ἱερέως  
 Σωσάνδρου τοῦ Φιλίνου Κυδαθηναίως,  
 οἶδε ἐνέβησαν [εἰ]ς τὴν σύνοδον τοῦ Ἡρα-  
 κλέους, ἐπιδόντος τὴν στήλην Σωσάν-  
 5 δρου Κυδαθηναίως, <vac.>  
 Δημήτριος Παιανιεύς, Τιμαγόρας Ῥαμνούσι<sup>ος</sup>,  
 Σωτήριχος Ἀντιοχεύς, <vac.>  
 Πέτρων οἰκογενής, <vac.>  
 Σώδας Ποτάμιος, Γλαυκίας Ἀντ-  
 10 ιοχεύς, Ζώπυρος Ἀφιδναῖος,  
 Σπερχειός, Μελέαγρος, Σίνδης,  
 Σωσίβιος, Ἴπποδρόμος, Ἄττας.

In the year that Aristaichmos was archon and Sosandros son of Philinos of Kydathenaion was priest, the following entered the *synodos* of Herakles, Sosandros of Kydathenaion having paid for the stele:

Demetrios of Paiania, Timagoras of Rhamnous, Soterichos of Antioch, Petrōn a house-bred slave, Sōdas of Potamos, Glaukias of Antioch, Zopyros of Aphidnai, Spercheios, Meleagros, Sindēs, Sosibios, Hippodromos, Attas.

## Notes

- l. 1: ἐπὶ Ἀρισταΐχμου ἄρχοντος, i.e., 159/8 BCE (Habicht 1988, 241, 246).
- l. 2: Σωσάνδρου τοῦ Φιλίνου Κυδαθηναϊῶς: *PAA* 858740; *LGNP* 2:414[9].
- l. 6: Δημήτριος Παιανεύς: *PAA* 311535; *LGNP* 2:106[412].
- l. 6: Τιμαγόρας Ῥαμιούσιος: *PAA* 883280; *LGNP* 2:428[6].
- l. 7: Σωτήριχος Ἄντιοχεύς: *PAA* 869690; *LGNP* 2:421[37]; *FRA* no. 1052. Bol (1983, 1:216) thinks that Sotērichos is also an Athenian, identified by his tribe rather than his deme. But Ἄντιοχεύς is extremely common in Athenian inscriptions, often paired with epithets such as Λαοδικεύς, Σολεύς, Ῥωμαῖος, Ἡρακλεώτης, Μιλήσιος, and Καρθαϊεύς (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1009–1011) which clearly refer to cities outside of Athens. Moreover the tribal name of Ἄντιοχίς would have been Ἄντιοχίδης.
- l. 8: Πέτρων οἰκογενής: *PAA* 772975; *LGNP* 2:367[1]. The original publication treated these as two names, but Parker (1996, 341 n. 46) suggests that οἰκογένης (“homebred slave”) is a description of Petrōn rather than a proper name. As a name Oikogenēs is otherwise unattested in Athens, but the epithet appears frequently in Delphic manumission inscriptions. Petrōn is also otherwise unattested as a proper name in Attic inscriptions but is attested in Locris. (Petronios of course is very common in Northern Greece, the Aegean Islands, and Asia in the Roman period).
- l. 9: Σώδας Ποτάμιος: *PAA* 854655; *LGNP* 2:411[2].
- ll. 9–10: Γλαυκίας Ἄντιοχεύς: *PAA* 275500; *FRA* no. 671.
- l. 10: Ζώπυρος Ἀφιδναῖος: *PAA* 464680; *LGNP* 2:195[30].
- l. 11: Σπερχειός: *PAA* 830100; *LGNP* 2:403[1].
- l. 11: Μελέαγρος: *PAA* 638960; *LGNP* 2:302[3]. *FRA* no. 915 lists a Meleagros from Antioch from I BCE/CE.
- l. 11: Σίνδης: *PAA* 823105; *LGNP* 2:399[1]. *FRA* no. 7086 lists a Sindēs from Tarsus in the I CE.
- l. 12: Σωσίβιος: *PAA* 859865; *LGNP* 2:415[64]. According to *FRA* 464 Sosibios is a name commonly borne by foreign residents of Athens.
- l. 12: Ἴπποδρόμος: *PAA* 538052; *LGNP* 2:237[1]. *FRA* no. 1979 lists a first century CE resident of Athens hailing from Herakleia (Pontika).
- l. 12: Ἀττάς: *PAA* 226202; *LGNP* 2:78[3]; *FRA* p. 392.

## Comments

In contrast to *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2343 [1], a *thiasos* dedicated to Herakles comprised only of Athenian demesmen, this *synodos* included four demesmen, two metics and even one slave. Arnaoutoglou (2008) thinks that Attas and Sindēs were freedmen or slaves, and that Sosibios, Spercheios, Meleagros, and Hippodromos are likely foreigners. It is worth noting, however, that like *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2343 the priesthood was held, at least in this year, by a demesman from Kydathenaion where the sanctuary of Herakles was located (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2343 [1] *comment*). Since this is the record of the entrance of fourteen new members into this *synodos* rather than a full membership list, it is impossible to guess the size of the association. The priesthood was annually assigned to a demesman.



**Literature:** Arnaoutoglou 2008; Bol, Peter C., ed. *Liebieghaus-Museum alter Plastik: Antike Bildwerke I: Bildwerke aus Stein und aus Stuck von archaischer Zeit bis zur Spätantike*. 3 vols.; Melsungen: Verlag Gutenberg, 1983–1985.

## [39] AM 66:228 no. 4

Honorary Decree of the *orgeōnes* of Aphrodite

Athens (Attica)

138/7 BCE

Published: Nikolaos Kyparissis and Werner Peek, “Attische Urkunden,” *AM* 66 (1941) 218–239, p. 228 no. 4 + Plates 75, 76; Robert, *BE* 1942, 329; Lawton 1995, 110–111 (no. 61) and Plate 61; Meyer, M. 1989, 316 C 3.

Current Location: Athens, National Museum, 3876.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4636 and 4637 (Piraeus, late IV BCE): Dedications to Aphrodite Ourania; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4586 (Piraeus, mid IV BCE): Dedication to Aphrodite; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4616 (Piraeus, late IV BCE): Dedication found in the same location as *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4596; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1261 [9] (Piraeus, 302–299 BCE): Three decrees of the *thiasōtai* of Aphrodite; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1290 (Piraeus, mid-III BCE): A fragmentary decree of Salaminians of Cyprus concerning the worship of Aphrodite and the celebration of the Adoneia; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1337 [44] (Piraeus, 97/6 BCE): Honors for a priestess of the Syrian Aphrodite.

Three fragments of a marble stele, restored as 82 x 54–52.5 x 12–13 cm. Letter height: 0.5–0.7 cm. Discovered in the church of Hagios Sostos on Leoforos Syngrou (Athens) in 1933. A large figure on the right, partially preserved, is probably Aphrodite, with a sceptre resting on her shoulder. Two smaller figures face her to the left, probably Sarapion and either his wife or a priestess. Between the two figures on the left and Aphrodite is an altar. Sarapion, according to Lawton 1995, no. 61, is “a middle aged man with a round face, large nose, and short, curly hair.” The female figure wears a peplos or chiton and a mantle, pulled over her head like a veil. Behind the altar is a pillar with a small figure, probably Athena, holding a spear in the left hand and a phiale or a crown in the right.

[ἀγ]αθεὶ τύχει. ἐπὶ Τιμάρχου ἄρχοντος, Θαργηλιῶνος ἀγορᾶ κυρ[ίαι].  
 [ἔ]δοξεν τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν· ἐπειδὴ Σεραπίων Ποσειδωνίου Ἡρακλεώτ[ης]  
 ἐπιμελητῆς κατασταθεὶς εἰς τὸν ἐπὶ Διοκλέους ἄρχοντος ἐνιαυτ[ὸν]  
 5 τὰς τε θυσίας ἔθυσεν τοῖς θεοῖς τὰς καθηκούσας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ [ἔ]-  
 καλλιέρησεν ὑπὲρ τε τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ὀργεῶνων καὶ παίδων καὶ γ[υναι]-  
 κῶν καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων, ἐπεμελήθη δὲ καὶ ὀργε[ῶνων]  
 καλῶς καὶ εὐσημῶνως ἐν ὄλωι τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ, ἐθεράπευσεν [δὲ καὶ τοὺς]  
 θεοὺς ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων, ἐκονίασεν δὲ καὶ τὰ βάρηρα τὰ ἐν τῷ ἱε[ρῷ] σταθέντα  
 καὶ τὸν λουτρῶνα τὸν ἀνδρείον, ὑπομείνας δὲ καὶ πᾶσα[ν τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν]

- 10 ἐπέδωκεν τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν καλῶς καὶ εὐσχημόνω[ς περὶ πλείστου ποι]-  
 ούμενος τὴν εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν καὶ τῆ[ν πρὸς τοὺς ὀργεῶνας]  
 φιλοτιμίαν· ἵνα οὖν καὶ οἱ ὀργεῶνες φαίνωντ[αι τιμώντες τοὺς πρὸς τε]  
 θεοὺς φιλοτιμουμένους καὶ εἰς ἑαυτοὺς· [δεδοχθαι τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν  
 ἐπαινέσαι Σαραπίωνα]  
 Ποσειδωνίου Ἡρακλεώτην καὶ στεφανῶ[σαι αὐτὸν θαλλοῦ στεφά]-  
 15 νωὶ καὶ λημνίσκωι ὧ πάτριόν ἐστιν εὐσε[βείας ἔνεκεν τῆς πρὸς τοὺς]  
 θεοὺς καὶ ἀναγορεύειν καὶ τοῦτον τ[ὸν στέφανον τὸν γραμμα]-  
 τέα καὶ τὸν ἐπιμελητὴν καθάπερ καὶ [τοὺς ἄλλους μετὰ τὰς σπονδὰς]  
 ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀναγορεύσω[σιν ἢ μὴ στεφανώσωσιν, ἀποτεῖσαι]  
 [δρ]α[χμ]ῶς Ἑ : ἱεράς τῆι Ἀφροδίτε[ι, ἀναγράψαι δὲ τότε τὸ ψήφισμα]  
 20 [εἰς στήλη]ν λιθίνην κα[ὶ] στ[ῆσαι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ].

For good fortune! In the year that Timarchos was archon, the month of Thargelion at the regular assembly, the following was approved by the *orgeōnes*. Whereas Sarapion son of Poseidonion of Herakleia, who was appointed as supervisor in the year that Diokles was archon, has both sacrificed the customary sacrifices to the gods in the temple and has obtained good omens on behalf of the association of *orgeōnes* and the children and women and the *dēmos* of the Athenians, and he took care of the *orgeōnes* in a generous and honorable fashion throughout the entire year, and performed services for the gods at his own expense, and he plastered both the pedestals which stand in the temple and the men's bathhouse; and persevering in his oversight, he contributed to the *orgeōnes* in a generous and honorable fashion, considering most important piety towards the gods and zeal towards the *orgeōnes*. In order that the *orgeōnes* be seen to be honoring those who benefact the gods and themselves, the *orgeōnes* have agreed to commend Sarapion son of Poseidonios of Herakleia, and to crown him with an olive wreath and a woolen fillet, which is in accord with ancestral custom, on account of the piety that he has shown to the gods; and further, that the secretary and the supervisor shall announce the crowning along with the other (honors) following the libations in the temple. If they should fail to make the announcement or to crown him, they will be fined fifty drachmae, sacred to Aphrodite. This decree shall be inscribed on a stele and erected in the temple.

### Notes

1. 1: ἐπὶ Τιμάρχου ἄρχοντος: i.e., 138/7 BCE (Meritt 1947).
1. 2: Ἡρακλεώτης: PAA 817980. For another resident alien from Herakleia (Pontika) see IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273.2 [18] [Κεφ]αλίων Ἡρακλεώτης. On citizens of Herakleia in Athens → FRA, 72–98 (641 names). On Ἡρακλεώτης as an ethnic designator, see Fraser 2009, 186.
1. 3: ἐπὶ Διοκλέους ἄρχοντος, i.e., 139/8 BCE (Meritt 1947, 196; Daux 1947).

- II. 4–5: [ἐ]καλλιέρησεν, ‘obtained good omens’: Kyparissis and Peek (229) point out the θύειν and καλλιερῆειν are connected in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1028.18–19 (Athens; 100/99 BCE) ὄν καὶ ἔθυσαν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις ἅπασιν | ἐκαλλιέρησαν, “who also sacrificed in the temple and has obtained good omens in all of these [sacrifices]”; in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1343.25 [48] (Athens; 37/6 or 36/5 BCE) ἐκαλλιέρησεν appears in the commendation of a priest.
- II. 5–6: ὑπέρ... παίδων καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων. This is a standard formula in Athenian honorific inscriptions, e.g., *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 410.13–16 (Athens; ca 330 BCE): οἷς ἔθυσον τῷ Διονύσῳ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς ἐφ’ ὑγείαι καὶ σωτηρίαι τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ παίδων καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κτημάτων τῶν Ἀθηναίων, “who have sacrificed to Dionysos and the other gods for the Council and the People of Athens and their children and wives and the other possessions of Athens.”
- I. 8: ἔκονίασεν, κονιάν, “to plaster” (with lime or stucco), Demosthenes 3.29, 23.208, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.107, 140, 179.
- II. 12–13: ἵνα οὖν καὶ οἱ ὄργεῶνες φαίνωνται τιμώντες τοὺς πρὸς τε] θεοὺς φιλοτιμουμένους καὶ εἰς ἑαυτοῦς → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1252+999.21 [6] *note*.
- I. 15: λημισκῶι → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1297.11 [24] (236/5 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1366.26 [53] (late II or early III CE).
- I.19: [δρ]α[χμ]ᾶς Ϝ, “50 drachmae.” See also *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1263.45 [11]; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1273.23 [18]; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328.13 [34] and Poland 1909, 449.

### Comments

Although only one member is named in this inscription – Sarapion, a metec from Herakleia Pontika –, some details of the inscription suggest that this group, whether mixed in composition or exclusively metec, cultivated strong links with Athens. The figure standing behind the altar (see the description of the stone above) is probably Athena. The formula in II. 5–6 mentioning sacrifices and omens on behalf of “the children and women and the *dēmos* of the Athenians” suggests strong affinities with the Athenian *polis*. Mikalson (1998, 278) thinks that this implies that Athenian citizens were involved in the cult; that is possible, but equally possible that the group assumed standard honorific formulae (→ II. 5–6 *note*) as a way of signalling loyalty to Athens.

Another cult association devoted to Aphrodite is attested in the Piraeus (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1261 [9] [302–299 BCE]) from at least a century earlier. There is, however, no strong reason to assume that the Piraeian *thiasōtai* and the Athenian *orgeōnes* were connected. Kyparissis and Peek (1941, 229–31) suggest that in the Athenian *orgeōnes* Athena likely played a significant role alongside Aphrodite.

**Literature:** Arnaoutoglou 2003, 108, 109, 116, 135–136, 154; Daux 1947; Ferguson 1949, 163; Kyparissis, Nikolaos and Werner Peek. 1941. “Attische Urkunden,” *AM* 66 (1941) 218–239; Lawton 1995, no. 61; Mikalson 1998, 278.

[40] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2358*

## Membership List of a cultic association

Athens (Attica) ca. 135 BCE

Published: Adolf Wilhelm, "Inscripfen aus Attika," *AM* 21 (1896) 434–439, esp. 438–439 (no. 4) (facsimile) (from a squeeze); Michel, *RIG* 1560; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2358* (Poland A45).Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2358* and Wilhelm's facsimile.

White marble stele, broken at the top and the bottom, 58 cm. x 49 cm. x 9 cm., discovered in a house in Chalandri (10 km. NW from the center of Athens). The stone was first seen by A. Conze and P. Hartwig in 1895, who made a squeeze.

Wilhelm reports that the entire first column and the second up to l. 51 (Erōtis) belong to the same hand that cut the superscription; Diodora and Philainis (ll. 52–53) can be distinguished from the next four names (ll. 54–57), and again from the final names in col. 2. In column 3, ll. 63–75 are in the same hand (except l. 65), and can be distinguished from ll. 76–81, and again from the smaller lettering of ll. 82–97.

[— — Εἰρηναῖος]

[Εἰρην]αίου Ἀντιοχεύς

[ἀνέθη]κεν τὴν στήλην

[ἀ]ρχεραμιστῆς Εἰρηναῖος

5 [ἰ]ερεὺς Εἰρηναῖος νεώτερος

Βίθυς

Δημόκλεια

Ἄρτεμίδωρος

Μητροφάνης

Στρατονίκη

Μένανδρος

Θεοκλῆς

35 Ἀμμωνία

65 Φιλωνίδης

Νέων

Θηβαγένεια

Δωρόθεος

10

Λαμέδων

Διονυσία

Μύστα

Ἀντίγονος

Διονυσία

Μνάσων

Εὐμένης

Διοδότη

Ἑρακλείδης Φίλω

Βαγχίδης

40 Μητρίχη

70 Μοσχίων

Ὀνήσιμος

Γνώμη

Σαραπίων

15

Χρήσιμος

Ἀπολλωνία

Γλαυκίας

Διοκλῆς

Εὐτυχίς

Φιλωνίδης Ἴφισ

Ζήνων

Μητροδώρα

Γλαῦκος

Ἀπολλώνιος

45 Ἥδεῖα

75 Ἀρσάκης

Ἑρμών

Εὐπορία Φιλωνί

Μάαρκος

20

Δάμων

Διονυσία Ἀμμω

Ὀνήσιμος

Νουμήνιος

Κλεοπάτρα

Βότρυς

Διόδωρος Σουνιε

Ἀμμία

Ἑράκλειτος

Ξένων

50 Ἰσιάς

80 Ἰέρων

Ὀνήσιμος νεώ

Ἑρωτίς

Φίλων Ἀλαιεύς

25	Εὐφράνωρ	Διοδώρα	Ἡρακλείδης Μαραθῷ
	Ἀσκληπιάδης	Φιλαίνης	Ἀθηνόδωρος
	Παρνασός	Περσίς	Εἰρηναῖος Μενάνδρου
	Στρύμων	55 Δωρίς	85 Χαλῖνος
	Σ[α]ραπίων	Ἀντιοχίς	Λαμέδων νεώ
30	Διονυσόδωρος	Διοδότη	Λυσανίας
	[Δ]ᾶος	Σάρδιον	Ἀρτεμιδώρα
	[Μη]γύδοτος	Εὐπορία	Λυσανίας Ἰωνίδης
	---	60 Ἐπικαρπία	90 Ἀσκληπιάς
		[Ἀρ]ῆτη	Διόδοτος
		· · · υγ	Στρατονίκη
		---	Δημόκριτος
			Ἀλεξίων
			95 Νικόστρατος
			Βίотτος
			[Ἀ]ρτεμισία
			---

### Notes

- I. 1–2: Εἰρηναῖος] | [Εἰρη]αῖου Ἀντιοχεύς; *PAA* 381375. A grave inscription from a woman, possibly related, was found *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 8166 = *Agora* 17:420 (I BCE): [Ε]ἰρήνη | [Εἰ]ρηναίου | Ἀντιοχίς. Athens had a large population of citizens of Antioch. *FRA* 25–45 list 558 Antiochenes who were resident in Athens.
- I. 4: [ἀ]ρχεραμιστής → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1297.10 [24] *note* and Arnaoutoglou 1994b. In contrast to earlier inscriptions using *archeranistēs*, this inscription and *SEG* 31:122.3 [50] may signal the emergence of the *archeranistēs* as a prominent rather than subservient official in associations.
- I. 6: Βίθυς; *PAA* 265620; *LGPN* 2:88[4]; *FRA* p. 394. The name appears six times in Attica, once as the name of an Athenian demesman (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2263.6), but in Delphi and Thessaly in manumission inscriptions (Reilly 1978, 24): *GDI* II 2009 (Delphi, 182 BCE); 2169 (140–100 BCE); Y. Béquignon, “Sur des inscriptions de la Thessalie du Nord,” *Mélanges helléniques offerts à Georges Daux* (Paris: Éditions de Boccard, 1974) 1–11, esp. 6–9 (no. 5.9) (Thessaly; Augustan period); *IG* IX/2 555.23 (Thessaly; time of Claudius). It is also attested in Macedonia (*CIL* III 703 → *Philippi* II 133/G441.20 [69] *comment*), Thrace (*IGBulg* III/2 1626.15 [85]), Delos, the north Aegean, and Syria. Without a demotic, one might reasonably conclude that Bithys is a slave or freeman.
- II. 14, 24: Ὀνήσιμος (*PAA* 746340; *LGPN* 2:353[102]), a common slave name: (Reilly 1978, 96–97; Fragiadakis 1986, 364), since Onesimos in I. 24 is apparently the son of that named in I. 14, we should presume that both are freedmen.
- I. 15: Χρήσιμος (*PAA* 991740; *LGPN* 2:479[10]), a common slave name: Reilly 1978, 143; Fragiadakis 1986, 379.
- I. 21: Νουμήνιος (*PAA* 721365; *LGPN* 2:342[64]), attested as a slave name: Fragiadakis 1986, 362.
- I. 22: Διόδωρος Σουνιε (*PAA* 331145; *LGPN* 2:119[155]), a citizen. Diodoros’ son Theodotos (*PA* 6803; *PAA* 5055985; *LGPN* 2:215[87]) appears in several datable

- inscriptions. He was a priest of Aphrodite Hagnē on Delos in 110/9 BCE (*ID* 2228 and undated inscriptions *ID* 1800, 2261, 2626) and the *epimelētēs* of Delos in 103/2 BCE (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2336.65). He proposed motions in the Athenian assembly (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1011.5, 33, 99 [106/5 BCE]; *Agora* 15:254.7 [104/3 BCE]) and Josephus (*Ant.* 14.153) mentions him as the mover of a decree honoring Jonathan Hyrcanus. Since Theodotos was a evidently person of wealth and so, in all likelihood, was Diodoros his father. See Mikalson 1998, 239.
- l. 27: Παρνασός (*PAA* 767440; *LGPN* 2:361[3]; *FRA* no. 6479) appears only here and in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 10215 (imperial period) in Attic inscriptions, but the name is attested in Delphic manumissions (*FD* III 2:245; 3:1.4–5, 6; 161 BCE; *GDI* 2163; 2251; Reilly 1978, 101), Thessaly (*SEG* 34:568; III CE) and Egypt (*IGSyringes* 408; 419).
  - l. 43: Εὐτυχίς; *PAA* 448265; *LGPN* 2:186[11]: a common slave name (Reilly 1978, 52–53), though the name is also attested of freeborn women (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 8535; 8661; 9131; 11488; *Agora* 17:527).
  - l. 51 Ἐρωτίς; *PAA* 423190; *LGPN* 2:160[1]. See also *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2347 [12] for the name in a much earlier list of members. Traill lists several women named Erotis, all uncertain or non-Athenians. Reilly (1978, 45) lists four slaves bearing this name, three from Delphi.
  - l. 55: Δωρίς (*PAA* 376560; *LGPN* 2:136[8]), attested as a slave name: Fragiadakis 1986, 347.
  - l. 69: Ἡρακλείδης Φίλω (*LGPN* 2:205[230]), probably Ἡρακλείδης Φίλωνος/Φιλωνίδου, Herakleides son of Philo/Philonides.
  - l. 73: Φιλωνίδης Ἴρις (Ἴρισιτιάδης) (*PAA* 957330 = 956890; 956895?; *LGPN* 2:463[39]), a citizen. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1009.103 mentions a Φιλωνίδης – οἰγένου Ἴρισιτιάδης in a list of ephebes and honorees from the archonship of Menoitēs (117/16 BCE).
  - l. 75: Ἀρσάκης; *PAA* 204275; *LGPN* 2:65[1]. The name is attested only here in Attica, but appears in Lykaonia (*AM* 1888:265,107), Thessaly (*IG* IX/2 1158), Olbia (*IOlbia* 128), and Babylonia (*SEG* 37:1403 and *IKEO* 218).
  - l. 81: Φίλων Ἀλαιεύς (*PAA* 954975; *LGPN* 2:462[107]), either of Halai Aixonidai (Kekropis) or Halai Araphenidai (Aigeies), a citizen. Isidoros son of Philo, of Halai, who may be Philo's grandfather, is known from *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 5484 (early II BCE) and Philo himself might be known from a list of demesmen: *SEG* 32:216 (Athens; 150–140 BCE) [Φί]λων Φίλων[ος] Ἀλααιεύς[ς].
  - l. 82: Ἡρακλείδης Μαραθώνιος (*PAA* 485850; *LGPN* 2:204[13]), a citizen.
  - l. 84: Εἰρηναῖος Μενάνδρου; *PAA* 381465; *LGPN* 2:139[83]. The patronym is perhaps given to distinguish him from Eirenaios (l. 1) and Eirenaios the younger (l. 5).
  - l. 85: Χαλῖνος (*PAA* 978565; *LGPN* 2:472[1]) is also attested in two funerary monuments from the first century BCE or CE, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 8312 = *Agora* 17:432 (I BCE/I CE) Χαλῖνο[ς] | Ἄρταξιῶ | Ἄντιοχεύς and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 9844 (I BCE): Περδίκαι | Ἀπολλωνίου | Μιλήσια, | Χαλῖνου || γυνή; and from Sparta: *IG* V/1 97.20 (Sparta; I CE): Χαλῖνος Χαλῖνοιο Ἐνυμαντιάδα.
  - l. 89: Λυσανίας Ἴωνίδης (*PAA* 612830; *LGPN* 2:289[28]), a citizen.

### Comments

Although no archon is mentioned, Wilhelm (1896b, 439) reasoned that Theodotos son of Diodoros of Sounion (→ l. 22 *note*), whose political activities fall

between 110/9–103/2 BCE, must either be the father or the son of Diodoros. He noted further that Philonides (l. 73) appears in an inscription datable to the archonship of Menoites (→ l. 73 *note*). Wilhelm, following Homolle, dated Menoites to 103/2 BCE, and suggested that the Philonides of l. 73 was either identical with that named in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1009.103* or his uncle, preferring the latter solution. The consensus, however, now puts Menoites at 117/6 (Meritt 1977, 186), with the consequence that the Philonides of the two inscriptions are likely one and the same. Wilhelm's dating of the inscription to ca. 135 BCE is plausible, but it should be noted that this applies only to the superscription and col. 1 (where Diodoros' name appears) and col. 2 up to l. 51. Philonides belongs to the third column, in a different hand and may well have been added sometime after the initial inscription was cut. This would also suggest that Lamedon the younger (l. 86) became a member some time after his father (l. 10).

This is a large association in comparison to the other discussed above, with ninety-four members. Column 1 has twenty-seven male names including one demesman; column 2 has thirty women's names; and the final column has thirty-five names, including four demesmen and two women. The epigraphical observations concerning different cutters (above) suggests that the association may never have been as large as ninety-four members at any given time, since it seems likely that the membership list was updated several times. But if we consider only the names given at the time that the superscription was cut, we are left with 46, still much larger than the associations of *orgeōnes* discussed in previous inscriptions.

The membership is heterogeneous, not only including women and men, but persons of varying social ranks. At least one demesman belonged to the original list, and to judge from the accomplishments of his son (→ l. 22 *note*), Diodoros was likely a man of some social and political influence. Four more demesmen are included in the later extensions of the list. The *archeranistēs*, however, is a metic from Antioch, as is his son (l. 5). Neither Arsakes (l. 75) nor Chalinios (l. 85) is a common Attic name, which may indicate that both are metics. While the list contains many common Attic names, some are typically servile names: Bithys (l. 6), Dōris (l. 55), Erōtis (l. 51), Noumēnios (l. 21), Onēsimos (l. 14, 24), Parnassos (l. 27), and Chrēsimos (l. 15), suggesting the presence of either slaves or (probably) freedmen (Arnaoutoglou 2008). At least three father-son members are present, with the son designated “the younger” (Eiranaios [ll. 1–2, 5], Onēsimos [ll. 14, 24], Lamedon [ll. 10, 86]).

That this was a cultic association is suggested by the fact that Eiranaios' son is designated “priest.” The deity or deities revered remain unclear, perhaps named in the missing top of the inscription. While Wilhelm (1896b, 438) originally designated this an *eranos* (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1291 [19] comment*), Arnaoutoglou's observation should be heeded, that rather ironically, the title *archeranistēs* appears in associations of *thiasōtai* (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297 [24]*; 1319), in an associa-

tion of devotees of Amphiaraos (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1322), in associations of *Soteriastai* (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1343 [48]), *Asklepiastai* (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2960) and *Heroistai* (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1339), but curiously *not* in associations of *eranistai* until the imperial period. Moreover, as we have observed above (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1291 [19] *comment*) *eranos* makes its appearance as the name of an association rather late (during the imperial period). Hence, it does not seem likely that this association was known as an *eranos* or even that its principal function was to provide loans. The presence of a priest suggests that it was a group of *thiasōtai* or a group named for the deity it honored.

**Literature:** Arnaoutoglou 1994b; 2008; Dow 1937, 192; Parker 1996, 340.

### [41] *SEG* 42:157

## Dedication to the Egyptian gods

Athens (Attica)

ca. 116/5 – ca. 95/4 BCE

Published: A. Boeckh, “Bermerkungen zu einigen Rossischen Inschriften von Athen,” *Archäologischen Intelligenzblatt der Hallischen Allgemeinen Lit. Zeitg.* (1835) 25 (no. 4); repr. *August Boeckh’s Gesammelte kleine Schriften* (6 vols.; Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1871–72) 6:430–448, here 434–35 (no. 4); Karl Keil, “Zum Corpus Inscriptionum Graecum,” *RhM* 19 (1864) 255–60, here 255–56; Adolf Rusch, *De Serapide et Iside in Graecia cultis* (Berlin: Hermann, 1906), 52; Konstantinos Kourouniotes, “Εξ Ἀττικῆς,” *AE* (1913) 193–209, 197–99 (ph.); Dow 1937, 208–212 (no. VIII); Roussel 1915–1916, 268 (no. 2); Vidman, *SIRIS*, 7–8 (no. 5); Tracy and Dow 1975, 72–73 (no. 13); Bricault, *RICIS* 1:9 (no. 101/0206) and Plate 101/0206.

Publication Used: Dow 1937, 208.

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum, EM 649.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 337 [3] (Piraeus, 333/2 BCE): Mention of a temple of Isis; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1292 [26] (Athens or the Piraeus; 215/14 BCE): Decree of the *Sarapiastai*; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4692 (Athens; II BCE): Dedication to Sarapis, Isis and Anubis; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4702 (I BCE): Dedication to Isis Dikaiosynē; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4994 (I BCE): Dedication to Hermes, Aphrodite, Pan, the Nymphs, and Isis; *Hesperia* 32 (1963) 47 (no. 68) (I BCE): Dedication to Sarapis; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4697 (Augustan period): Dedication to Isis; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4732 (Augustan period): Dedication to Isis; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 6311 (I CE): statue of a woman dressed as a priestess of Isis, with a sistrum and situla; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4733 (time of Hadrian): Dedication to Isis and the Egyptian gods.

Non stoichedon. A monument base of Hymettian marble, 37 x 18 x 21 cm., broken at both the top and bottom. The monument may have been a herm. Letter height:



1.1 cm. The letters on the stone that could once be read but now missing are underlined.

The provenance of this inscription was once in doubt, and although likely Athenian, it was not included in *IG II<sup>2</sup>* due to its similarities to Delian inscriptions. Dow, however, noted that it was found in Athens in a house at 11a Philothea Street, which is about 45 m. from the square in which the Metropolitan Church now stands. The Sarapeion was somewhere in this neighborhood. (Dow 1937, 208–9). Dow assigned this inscription to the cutter of *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1228, 989, 2336 and 1028, active between 116/5 BCE and 100/99 BCE. The subsequent study of Tracy and Dow (1975, 73) concluded that “no fragment by this cutter appears among the inscriptions extant on Delos. The Athenian place of discovery and letter-cutter make it certain, therefore, that the inscription is Attic and not Delian.”

Ἴσιδι ὕ Σαράπιδι  
 Ἀνούβιδι Ἄρποκράτη[ι]  
 Μεγαλλίς Μάγα  
 Μαραθωνίου θυγά-  
 5 τηρ ὑπὲρ τῆς θυγα-  
 τρὸς Δημαρίου καὶ  
 τῶν υἱῶν<sup>ων</sup> κατὰ  
 πρόσταγμα, ὕ ἐπὶ ἱε-  
 10 ρέως Μενάνδρου  
 τοῦ Ἀρτέμωνος  
 Ἄλωπεκῆθεν, κλε[ι]-  
 δουχοῦντος Ἄσω-  
 15 ποκλέους Φλυέως,  
 ζακορευόντος Σω-  
 σικράτου Λαοδικέ-  
 ως, κρίνοντος τὰ ὀ-  
 [ρ]άματα Διονυσίου  
 Ἀντιοχέως.

To Isis, Sarapis Anubis, and Harpokrates.

Megallis daughter of Maga of Marathon (set this up) on behalf of her daughter Dēmarion and [[her sons]], in accordance with a command, during the priesthood of Menandros son of Artemon of (the deme) Alopekē, when Asopoklē̄s of Phlya was temple guardian (*kleidouchos*), Sosikrates of Laodicea was the attendant, (and) when Dionysios of Antioch (was) interpreting (?) of the spectacles (or dreams?).

### Notes

1. 1: Ἴσιδι Σαράπιδι: An indication that this is not a Delian inscription is the fact that in contrast to Delian dedications the dedicator is not named first (Dow 1937, 209–10).

Moreover, in Delian inscriptions, Sarapis is normally the first named (except for Zeus).

*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4702 (*SIRIS* 6) (Athens), from the beginning of I BCE, takes the same form: "Ἴσιδ[ι] Δικαιοσύνη[ι] | Κτησικλῆς Ἀπολλοδ[ώρου] | Ἀλμουσίου ἀνέθηκ[εν] | ἐπὶ ἱερέως Σώσου [τοῦ] || Χαρμίδου Αἰθαλίδο[υ], | *vac.* | ζακορέοντος | Ζωπύρου Μιλησίου[υ], "To Isis *Dikaiosynē*. Ktēsikles son of Apollodoros of (the deme) Halimous dedicated (this) when Sosos son of Charmides of (the deme) Aithalidai was priest, and Zōpnyos of Miletos was attendant." (→ I. 14 note).

- I. 3: Μεγαλλίς: *PAA* 636600. The name is known only from this inscription and two manumission inscriptions from Bouthrotos (Epirus): *IBouthrotos* 25.11; 31.89–90, both from after 163 BCE.
- I. 3: Μάγα Μαραθωνίου: *PAA* 630925; *LGNP* 2:295[3]. This is the only attestation of the name Magas in an Attic inscription. The name is attested outside Attica in a Delphic manumission (*GDI* II 2174), in Macedonia (*IMaked* 186.II.48), Pisidia (*Isinda* 21.1), Lykia (*TAM* II 212.1; *ILykiaBean* 1; *IAsMinLyk* II 192, no. 260), Lykaonia (*SEG* 6:405), and Egypt (*IG.Syringes* 660). Magas, governor of Cyrene was the half-brother of Ptolemy II Philadelphos. Roussel (*Roussel* 1915–1916, 268 [no. 2]), however, identified this Magas with an Athenian mint magistrate ca. 150 BCE (*PA* 9650; *PAA* 630920).
- I. 6: Δημαρίου: *PAA* 306445; *LGNP* 2:103[1]? Dow (1937, 211) suggests that the absence of a husband's name means that Demarion's husband was deceased.
- I. 7: [τῶν ὑῶν <sup>ν</sup>]: It is unclear whether these are the sons of Megallis or Demarion. These letters are inscribed *in rasura* and do not fill the full space of the erased letter. Dow (1937, 211) reports that the space should hold 9½ to 10 letters and the reading of the erasure appears to be ....ο...γα, which might suggest [τοῦ ὑ]ο[ῦ Μά]γα. "Evidently it was decided at some time after the monument had been inscribed that a brother (or brothers) of the younger Magas should be included" (1937, 211). Dow notes, however, that the inscribing of τῶν ὑῶν is by the original cutter.
- II. 7–8: κατὰ | πρόσταγμα. Dow (1937, 211), following Graindor 1934, 162 n. 3, suggests that the command was given in a dream. The phrase is common in dedications: e.g., *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4671 (IV/III bce): Ἀνγδίστει | καὶ Ἄττιδι | Τιμοθέα | ὑπὲρ τῶν παίδων || κατὰ πρόσταγμα; *SEG* 14:481 (Macedonia; 300–250 BCE): [Α]ρτέμυδι Ὀπιταῖδι | [Φ]ιλίνος Στρατοκλέους | [Ζ]ακύνθιος κατὰ πρόστ[ι]γμα; *IAegThrace* 203 (Thrace; II/III CE): ἀγωνοθέτης Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀπολλωνίου Σεράπιδι, | Ἴσ ἰδι, Ἀνούβιδι, Ἀρφογράτη κατὰ πρόσταγμα; *IBosp* 27 (Pantikapaion; II BCE): Πλουσία ὑπὲρ τῶν θυγατέρων κατὰ πρόσταγμα | Ἀγγίσκει ἀνέθηκε; *ID* 1450.198 (Delos; 140/39 BCE): τραπέζας δρυίνας δύο, ὧν ἡ μία ἀνάθεμα Ἰέρωνος, ἡ δὲ μία κατὰ πρόσταγμα τοῦ θεοῦ]; *ID* 1901 (Delos; 114/13 BCE): Μόσχος Μανίου Πειραιεύς, | ἱερεὺς γενόμενος | Θεῶν Μεγάλων Διοσκουίων | Καβείρων, κατὰ πρόσταγμα ἰδρύ[σ]ατο, ἐπὶ ἐπιμελητοῦ Ἰπάρχου τοῦ Τιμοκλέους | Πειραιέως; *ID* 2047 (Delos; 126/5 BCE): ὁ ἱερεὺς | Ἀθην[α]γόρας | Ἀθηναγόρου | Μελιτεὺς || Σαράπιδι, Ἴσιδι, Ἀνούβιδι, τὸ μέγαρον | κατὰ πρόσταγμα; *ID* 2080 (Delos; 105–103 BCE): [Ἴσ]ιδι Ἀφρ[οδ]ίτη[ι] <τὸ βῆμα κατὰ | πρόστ[ι]γμα ἀνέθηκαν | [οἱ] μελανφόροι κ[α]ὶ οἱ θεραπευταὶ | ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου [τ]οῦ Ἀθ[η]ναίων || [καὶ] τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥω[μ]αίων; *ID* 2098 (Delos; after 158/7 BCE): κατὰ πρόσταγμα Σαράπιος, | Ἴσιος, Ἀνούβιος, Ἀφροδίτης, | Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀσκληπιοδώρου | ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς || Ἀφροδισίας καὶ τῶν τέκνων Ἀσκληπιοδώρου καὶ Ἀπολλωνίου | καὶ Προτ[ί]μου τὴν ἀνάβασιν | καὶ τοὺς τοίχους ἕως τοῦ νηαοῦ, ἐπὶ ἱερέως Ζήν[ωνος τοῦ] || Διοσκουρίδου Λα[μπ]τρέως and frequently in Delian inscriptions.

- II. 9–11: Μενάνδρου τοῦ Ἀρτέμωνος Ἀλωπεκῆθεν: *PAA* 6416050; *LGPV* 2:304[34]?
- II. 11–12: κλει[τ]ιδουχοῦντος; Lit. “having the keys”; this functionary is known only in Athens, Elis (Peloponnese), and Delos; Athens: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 974.23 (137/6 BCE); 1944.16, 21 (IV BCE); 1950.15 (after III BCE); 3564 (I/II CE); [ἡ βουλή και ὁ δῆ]μιος Φίλιον | [----- κλειδουχῆσαντα Εἴ[σιδος και Σαράπιδος ἐπὶ ἰε]ρέως Πρωτογένου[ς] | [-----, ζακορεῦ]οντος Φιλῆμονο[ς] || [-----, κληφοροῦσης Π]αραμόνας τῆς Τρύφων[ος -----]; 3644.2 (II CE); 3704.13 (III CE); 3728.6 (?); 3798.8 (119/20 CE); Peloponnese (Elis [Olympia]): *InvO* 61.1 (36 BCE); 62.10 (36–24 BCE); 64.14 (28–24 BCE); 65.16 (20–16 BCE); 66.2 (51–50 BCE); 69.19 (5 CE); Delos: *ID* 1403.B.b.90 (165–157 BCE); 1426.9 (156–145 BCE); 1443.B.i.163 (145–42 BCE); 1444.47 (141/0 BCE); 1830.7 (150–100 BCE); 1875.4 (ca. 150 BCE); 1875.4 (I BCE). Dow (1937, 211) notes that the κλειδοῦχος never appears alone and is never the first official to be named. Roussel (1915–1916, 268) states “le cleidouque est toujours Athénien et de sonne famille.” He thinks that this official was responsible for opening the temple doors at dawn.
- I. 14: ζακορεῦοντος → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1328.16 [34]. Dow (1937, 201) and Roussel (1915–1916, 269) note that in Delian inscriptions the ζάκορος normally does not have a patronym or an ethnic designation, and often appears last in a list of officials (as it does here): “The post of *zakeros* was therefore honorable, but hardly exalted – a place which metics were doubtless pleased to hold” (Dow 1937, 201). The attendant is normally not an Athenian and as in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4702 (→ I. 1 note) is a metic.
- II. 14–16: Σω[σικράτου Λαοδικέ]ως (*PAA* 862440; *FRA* no. 3299): on Laodiceans in Athens → *FRA* 139–43 who lists 97 Laodiceans.
- II. 16–17: τὰ ὀ[ρ]άματα: Boeckh (435) rejects ὀ[ν]είρατα as a reading for this line, but adduced *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4771 = *CIG* I 481 (Athens, after 120 BCE): [τά] κίονια και τὸ αἶτωμα | [κ]αὶ τὰς κινκλίδας και τὴν | [Α]φροδείτην τῆ θεῶ ἐκ | τῶν ἰδίων ἀνέθηκεν, ἐ[πι]σκευάσασα και αὐτὴν | τὴν θεὸν και τὰ περὶ αὐτὴν, | οὐσα και λυχνάπτρια αὐ[τῆς] και ὄνειροκρίτης *folium* | στολίζοντος Αἰμυλίου [Ατ]||[τ]ικου Μελιτώως, ἱερατε[ύ]οντος ἱακχαγωγού Διονυσίου Μαραθωνίου, ζακορεῦοντος ἀγιαφόρου Εὐκάρπου. In Delian inscriptions the ὄνειροκρίτης does not appear to be a major official. Dow (1937, 212): notes, “in fact he never appears in a list of functionaries. His position in the present list, at the end, is therefore what one would expect.”
- II. 17–18: Διονυσίου | Ἀγτιοχέως; *PAA* 348575; *FRA* no. 743: on Antiochenes in Athens → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2358.1–2 [40] note.

### Comments

The cult of Isis was introduced into the Piraeus sometime around 333/2 BCE (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 337 [3]), perhaps by Egyptian traders. Although it was originally a metic cult (since the cult required Athenian permission to acquire land on which to build a temple), the cult must have acquired Athenian members by the time of this inscription, since the dedicator was a spouse of a demesman and the priest and the temple guardian were Athenians.

The relation of this cult group to that of the *Sarapiastai* (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1292 [26]) from 215/14 BCE is unclear. As was noted a propos of the *Sarapiastai*'s inscription, the monument was small and the lettering of poor quality, perhaps indicating a metic group with few resources. This group, however, had the

conventional array of officials – ἐπιμελητής, ταμίας, γραμματεὺς, ἱεροποιοί and a προερανίστρια as well, while *SEG* 42:157, a century later, mentions only a priest, temple guardian, attendant and dream-interpreter, and clearly included Athenians.

A dedication to Sarapis, Isis and Anubis from the beginning of the second century BCE, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4692, mentions both a priest (probably an Athenian) and a *zakoros*:

Σαράπιδι Ἴσιδι[ι --- ἀνέθηκε].  
*vac.*  
 ἐπὶ ἱε[ρ]έως Στ[η]σικράτου τοῦ Σ -----,  
 ζακορέυοντος Ἡ[ρακ]λ -----].

In the first centuries BCE and CE the cult of Egyptian gods is strongly attested.

The strong similarities between this inscription and Delian inscriptions is due no doubt to the fact that Athens controlled Delos through much of its history, and after 167 BCE Rome entrusted its control to Athens, which supplied a number of its priesthoods. Roussel noted the parallelism of cult organization in Delos and Athens, but argued for an Athenian provenance for this inscription, since “*aucun* de ces personnages n’est connu à Délos” (1915–1916, 268 n.2).

The differences in style between Athenian and Delian inscriptions (→ I. 1 *note*) and the site of discovery (see above) ensure an Athenian provenance. Nevertheless, the deities are listed in the same order as in Delian inscriptions (except that Isis is named first); the array of officials is the same; they are listed in the same order; and that the attendant (*zakoros*) and interpreter of dreams are not Athenians (so Dow 1937, 212).

Unlike the associations studied thus far, there is no indication that this association had an ἐπιμελήτης, ταμίας, and γραμματεὺς but it did have various priestly offices: ἱερεὺς, ζάκορος, and κλειδοῦχος, and probably a dream-interpreter (ὄνειροκρίτης), assuming that κρίνειν τὰ ὄραματα in ll. 16–17 refers to dream-interpretation. The *oneirokritēs* played a major role in the cult of the Egyptian deities on Delos:

il expliquait aux fidèles les songes, souvent obscurs, que la divinité leur envoyait.... Sans nul doute, il avait un titre officiel et un mandat régulier. (Roussel 1915–1916, 269)

The reference in the inscription to a command (ll. 7–8: κατὰ | πρόσταγμα) may in fact be a command to erect a dedication conveyed in a dream and interpreted by the dream interpreter.

The association is clearly mixed, with Athenians serving as the priest and the temple guardian, but the attendant and dream interpreter being resident aliens.

**Literature:** Dow 1937; Dunand 1973, 2:4–12; Roussel 1915–1916, 268–269; Tracy, et al. 1975; Williams, Ellen Reeder. “Isis Pelagia and a Roman Marble Matrix from the Athenian Agora.” *Hesperia* 54/2 (1985) 109–19.

[42] *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1012

## Society of ship owners and merchants

Athens (Attica)

112/11 BCE

Published: Boeckh, *CIG* I 124; *IG* II 475; Michel, *RIG* 1502; Dittenberger, *Syll<sup>3</sup>* 706; Kirchner, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1012.

Publication Used: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1012.

Current Location: Museo Naniiano di Venezia (Venice).

Non-stoichedon (27–31 letters).

ἐπὶ Διονυσίου ἄρχοντος τοῦ μετὰ  
 Παράμονον ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰαντίδος ἐ-  
 βδόμης πρυτανείας, ἧ Λάμιος Τιμού-  
 χου Ῥαμνούσιος ἐγραμμάτευεν· Γα-  
 5 μηλιῶνος ὀγδόῃ ἰσταμένου, ὀγδό-  
 ῃ τῆς πρυτανείας· βουλὴ ἐμ βουλευ-  
 τηρίῳ· τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφισεν  
 Στρατοφῶν Στρατοκλέους Σουნი-  
 εὺς καὶ συνπρόεδροι·  
 10 ἔδοξεν τεῖ βουλεῖ·  
 Ῥῆσος Ἀρτέμωνος Ἀλαιεὺς εἶπεν·  
 ἐπειδὴ πρόσοδον ποιησάμενος πρὸς  
 τὴν βουλὴν Διόγνητος ἐξ Οἴου ταμί-  
 15 ας ναυκλήρων καὶ ἐμπόρων τῶν φε-  
 ρόντων τὴν σύνοδον τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ  
 Ξενίου ἐμφανίζει τεῖ βουλεῖ βούλεσ-  
 θαι τὴν σύνοδον ἀναθεῖναι εἰκόνα γρα-  
 πτὴν ἐν ὄπλῳ τοῦ ἑαυτῶν προξέ-  
 20 [λ]ητοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν λιμένα Διοδώρου τοῦ  
 Θεοφίλου Ἀλαιεὺς ἐν τῷ ἀρχεῖῳ αὐ-  
 τοῦ καὶ διὰ ταῦτα παρακαλεῖ τὴν βου-  
 λὴν ἐπικυρῶσαι ἑαυτῷ ψήφισμα·  
 25 ἀγαθε[ῖ] τύχει δεδόχθαι τεῖ βουλεῖ ἐπι-  
 κεχω[ρ]ῆσθαι[ι] Διογνήτῳ καὶ τῇ συνόδῳ  
 [π]ο[ι]ήσα[σθ]αι τ[ῆν] ἀνάθεσιν τῆ[ς] γρα-

πτῆς εἰκόνοσ ἐν ὄπλῳ Διοδώρου τοῦ  
Θεοφίλου Ἀλαιέωσ ἐν τῷ ἀρχεῖῳ αὐ-  
τοῦ καθάπερ παρακαλεῖ τὴν βουλῆν.

In the year that Dionysios, who followed Paramonos, was archon, during the seventh prytany of Aiantis, when Lamios son of Timouchos of Rhamnous was the secretary, eighth day of Gamelion, eight day of the (above) prytany, with the Council (*boulē*) in the council chamber: Stratophon son of Stratokles of Sounion, one of the presidents with his fellow presidents put to a vote – and the Boulē approved – the motion that Rhēsos son of Artemon of (the deme) Halai proposed: Whereas Diognetos of (the deme) Oe, the treasurer of the ship owners and merchants who bring together the *synodos* of Zeus Xenios, has made an overture to the Council, (and) explained to the Council that the *synodos* wishes to set up in his (Dionysios’) record office a shield with an image of their *proxenos*, Diodoros son of Theophilos of (the deme) Halai, who has also been appointed the supervisor over the harbour; therefore they petitioned the Council to ratify the motion for itself.

For good fortune, the Boulē has resolved to permit Diognetos and the *synodos* to erect a shield with an image of Diodoros son of Theophilos of Halai in his record office, as they have petitioned the Council.

### Notes

- I. 1: ἐπὶ Διονυσίου ἄρχοντοσ: i.e., 112/11 BCE (Meritt 1977, 186; Woodhead 1997, 452).
- I. 2: Παράμονον: Archon for the year 113/12 BCE (Meritt 1977, 186). He is mentioned again in a decree of an association devoted to the Great Gods (*SEG* 21:535).
- I. 3: πρυτανείασ → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 337.3 [3] *note*.
- II. 3–4: Λάμιος Τιμούλχου Ῥαμνούσιοσ: *PAA* 6014700; *LGPN* 2:279[3].
- II. 8–9: Στρατοφῶν Στρατοκλέουσ Σουνιεύσ: *PAA* 8391050; *LGPN* 2:407[7].
- II. 11: Ῥήσοσ Ἀρτέμωνοσ Ἀλαιεύσ: *PAA* 8004100; *LGPN* 2:390[1].
- I. 13: Διόγνητοσ ἐξ Οἴου: *PAA* 3278950; *LGPN* 2:117[37].
- I. 14: ναυκλήρων καὶ ἐμπόρων, “ship owners and merchants.” References to these groups (normally named together) appear in Athens in *SEG* 26:72 (375/4 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 343 (332/1 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 409 (ca. 330 BCE); 416 (ca. 330 BCE) (all proxeny decrees); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2952 (97/6 BCE): dedication to a non-Athenian Ἀργεῖον Ἀργείου Τρικоруσίο[ν στρατηγήσαντα ἐπὶ τὸν Πειραιᾶ] by the shippers and merchants; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2993 (50/49 BCE): dedication to a non-Athenian by the shippers and merchants. In a mid-second century dedication, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3607 (mid II CE), there is reference to οἱ ἐν Πειραιᾷ πραγματευταί, perhaps a similar group. These groups appear very frequently in Delian inscriptions and Thasos (more than 40 times). Reed (2003, 81–83, 93–132) provides a useful catalogue of known *emporoi kai nauklēroi* and a list of their states of origin, which include most commonly Athens, Byzantium, Chios, Herakleia, Megara, Miletos, Phaselis, Phonicia (Tyre), and Salamis.
- II. 14–15: τῶν φελλόντων τὴν σύνοδοσ, “bring together a *synodos*” → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1326.6–7 [36] *note*.

- II. 15–16: σύνοδος τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Ξενίου. Cf. *Kaunos 23* (found near Küçükkale; no date): ἱερὸν | Διὸς Ξενίου | ἴδρυται· | ἀγαθη· ···· ΑΙ[—]|| θιασίτα[ι? ·±4·]Σ·ΑΤΩ· | ΟΙΣΠΟ·ΟΥ·Ι[· κ]αθ’ ὄραιμα[ι], “the *thiasōtai* set up this temple of Zeus Xenios... in accordance with a dream.”
- II. 18–19: προξένου. In Athens a *proxenos* was “a person who for some time has assisted visitors from a *polis* [other than Athens] and has shown himself as a friend of that *polis* in general, [who] is now appointed *proxenos* by the *polis* in question” (Hansen and Nielsen 2004, 98).
- II. 19–20: ἐπιμε[ι]||[λ]ητοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν λιμένα, “supervisor of the harbor.” See Aristotle, *Constitution of Athens* 51.4: “They elect by lot ten harbor supervisors (ἐπιμελητὰς δέκα κληροῦσιν), whose duty is to supervise the harbor markets and to compel the merchants (τοὺς ἐμπόρους) to bring to the city two-thirds of the sea-borne wheat that reaches the wheat market (εἰς τὸ σιτικὸν ἐμπόριον).”
- II. 20–21: Διοδώρου τοῦ | Θεοφίλου Ἀλαιέως; *PAA* 330355; *LGPN* 2:118[73]. Diodoros is named in the list of prominent Athenians (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 2452.56*; 125/4 BCE). On the family of Diodoros, see Geagan 1983, 158–61.

### Comments

Associations of “ship owners and merchants” are common on Delos and Thasos but are also well known in Athens. They engaged in inter-regional trade in grain, timber, slaves and war materials, selling their goods to retailers (Reed 2003, 12). Most of the evidence indicates that the shippers and merchants in Athens were non-citizens as were, for example, the Kitian *emporoi* given permission to build a temple of the Syrian Aphrodite (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 337 [3]*) (Reed 2003, 27–33).

Reed argues that from the mid-fourth century BCE onward, Athens deliberately attracted *emporoi* by promising them speedier legal resolutions, should they become involved in legal disputes, exempted *emporoi* from some of the obligations imposed on metics, allowed them to acquire land for temples, and extended honors to *emporoi* who donated grain or sold it at low prices (Reed 2003, 44–46). Burke has drawn attention to the fact that from “the late fifth and fourth centuries there are a number of instances where Athens and other states did designate as *proxenoi* men actively involved in maritime trade” (Burke 1992, 207). An example of both the granting of honors, and the designation of a foreigner as a *proxenos* is found in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 343* (332/1 BCE):

[----- τὸν προέδρων ἐπεμήφιζ]||[ε]ν Ἐπαμειβων ····13·····]ησι····9····| Ἄναγυράσιο[ς εἶπ]ε[ν· ἐπειδὴ οἱ ἔμποροι καὶ να]ύκληροι ἀπ[οφαίνου]σι[ν Ἀπολλωνίδην Δημητρί]ου Σιδώνιο[ν εἰ]ῖ[ναι] ἄ[νδρα ἢ ἀγαθὸν ἢ κ]αὶ εὖνο[ι]||[υ]ν τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναί[ων, δε]δόχθαι τῷ[ι δήμῳ]||[ἐ]παινεσαι Ἀπολλωνίδην [Δημητρί]ου Σιδώνιο[ν] || [κ]αὶ στεφανῶσαι αὐτὸν ἢ χρυ[σ]ῶι στεφάνω[ι ἀπό] || [χ]ιλίων δραχμῶν ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ εὖνοια[ς τῆ]||[ς] εἰς τὸν δήμον τὸν Ἀθηναίω[ν]· καὶ εἶναι αὐ[τὸν] || [π]ρόξενον καὶ εὐεργέτην τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθ[ηναίω]||[ων] αὐτὸν καὶ ἐγγόνους· εἶναι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ [γῆς] || [κ]αὶ οἰκίας ἐγκτησιν κατὰ τὸν νόμον. ἀναγ[ράψαι] δὲ τότε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γ[ρ]αμματέα τῆς βου[λής] || ἐν στήλει [λιθί]νει καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἀκροπό[λει], | εἰς δὲ τῆ[ν ἀναγραφὴν] τῆς στήλης δοῦν[αι τὸν]

ταμίαν τ[οῦ δήμου ...] δραχμὰ[ς ἐκ] τῶν [εἰς τὰ κα][τ]ὰ ψηφίσμα[τα ἀνα-  
λυσκ]ομένων τῶι [δήμωι]. (Schwenk 1985, 84; Pečírka 1966)

... of the presidents, Epameinon has put to a vote (the motion) that NN son of NN of the deme Anagyrous proposed: Whereas the shippers and merchants have declared Apollonides son of Demetrios of Sidon to be a good man and well-intentioned toward the people of Athens, the People (*dēmos*) resolved to commend Apollonides son of Demetrios of Sidon and to crown him with a golden crown of the value of 1000 drachmae, on account of the excellence and good will that he shows to the people of Athens; and he and his children shall be (designated as) *proxenoi* and benefactors (*euergētēs*) of the people of Athens; and in accordance with the law he shall have possession (*enktēsis*) of property and a house. Let the secretary of the Council inscribe this decree on a stele and set it up on the Acropolis and let the treasurer of the People pay for the inscribing of the stele (up to?) x drachmae, from the expenses designated for (the inscribing) of decrees.

In the case of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1012, an Athenian citizen, Dionysios son of Theophilos, a demesman of Halai and also the harbor supervisor, was appointed as the *proxenos* for these ship owners and merchants. The association evidently had the assistance of two other demesman, Rhēsos son of Artemon, who proposed the motion on behalf of the association, and Diognetos, a demesman and treasurer of the association. This inscription evidences the close cooperative relationship between an association comprised largely of foreigners and influential persons in the Athenian *boulē*.

The question is, why did the association bother to ask of the *Boulē* the permission to set up a statue of its *proxenos*? Radin (1910, 55) argues that since the venue was a public building, the permission of the *Boulē* was necessary, adding, against Ziebarth 1896, 27, that this does not mean that the association did not have a temple of its own: “The choice of a place is determined by reason of policy.” Jones (1999, 43–45) adds that the decree indicates that the Athenian *Boulē* exercised control over associations, even foreign associations (cf. Solon’s law concerning associations in *Digesta* 47.22.4 → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1275.10 [8] (325–275 BCE). The latter suggestion seems unlikely.

**Literature:** Burke, Edmund M. “The Economy of Athens in the Classical Era: Some Adjustments to the Primitivist Model.” *TAPA* 122 (1992): 199–226; Hansen, Mogens Herman, and Thomas Heine Nielsen. *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004; Jones 1999, 43–45; Radin 1910; Reed, Charles M. *Maritime Traders in the Ancient Greek World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003; Vélissaropoulos, Julie. *Les naoclères grecs: recherches sur les institutions maritimes en Grèce et dans l’Orient hellénisé*. Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 9. Genève: Droz; Paris: Minard, 1980.



[43] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1335*  
List of contributing *Sabaziastai*

Piraeus (Attica)

101/0 BCE

Published: Stephanos A. Koumanoudes, “Ψήφισμα καὶ ἀναθέσεις Σαβαζιασ-  
τῶν,” *AE* (1883) 245–50; Koehler, *IG II,5* 626b (pp. 170); Michel, *RIG*  
972; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1335*; Vermaseren and Lane 1983–1989, 2:24–26  
(no. 51) (ph.) = *CCIS II* 24–26 (no. 51) (incorrectly labelled as *IG II<sup>2</sup>*  
1325) (Poland A48a).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1335*.

Current Location: Archaeological Museum in Piraeus.

Non-stoichedon. Tablet of Pentelic marble, broken at the bottom, 139 x 37 x 3.0  
cm. with a pediment and akroteria, and broken at the bottom. Letter height: 0.8  
cm. According to Tracy (1990, 207) ll. 1–24 are the work of the cutter of *IG II<sup>2</sup>*  
2336 (100/99–98/7 BCE), 2983 (Piraeus, 111/0 BCE). He describes the lettering as  
sloppy, probably done in haste.

Θ Ε Ο [I].

- ἀγαθεὶ τύχει· ἐπὶ Θεοκλέους ἄρχον-  
τος· Μουνιχιῶνος ἀγορᾷ κυρίαι·  
ἔδοξεν τοῖς Σαβαζιασταῖς, ἀνα-  
5 γράψαι τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἔρανι-  
στῶν ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ στήσαι  
ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ.  
ἱερεὺς  
Ζήνων Ἄντιοχεύς·  
10 ταμίας καὶ  
γραμματεὺς  
καὶ ἐπιμελητῆς  
Δωρόθεος ἽΟαθεν.  
Ἑρανισταί·  
15 Εὐβουλος Σημαχίδης  
Βάκχιος Μιλῆσιος  
Ξενοκλείδης Σουνιεύς  
Διοκλῆς Κολωνήθεν  
Ἑπαινος Φαληρεὺς νε(ώτερος)  
20 Σωμένης Οἰναίος  
Ἑπαινος Φαληρεὺς πρεσ(βύτερος)  
Διογένης Μακεδῶν  
Φαῖδρος Μιλῆσιος  
Διογένης Ἄμφιτροπήθεν  
25 Ἀπελλῆς Κολωνήθεν

- Ἀπολλόδωρος Τρικορῦσιος  
 Φιλοκράτης Ἐυπειταίων  
 Θεοδόσιος Ἀχαρνεύς  
 Κόϊντος Προβαλίσιος  
 30 Ἀρτέμων Λαοδικεύς  
 Διονύσιος Λαοδικεύς  
 Δημήτριος Ἀντιοχεύς  
 Διόδοτος Ἀλιμούσιος  
 Διονύσιος Ἀλιμούσιος  
 35 Ἀθηνόδοτος Οἰναῖος νε(ώτερος)  
 Μενέδημος Μακεδόν  
 Σήραμβος Αἰθαλίδης  
 Θεοδόσιος Ἀγνούσιος  
 Ζώβιος Ἡρακλεώτης  
 40 Διονύσιος Φλυεύς  
 Εὐφρόνιος Φαληρεύς  
 Εὐρύστρατος Κικυννεύς  
 Ἀθηνόδοτος Οἰναῖος πρε(σβύτερος)  
 Διονύσιος Ἔρμειος  
 45 Σῶσος Μαρωνίτης  
 Φίλων  
 Λύσις Παλληνεύς  
 Πλούταρχος Αἰγινήτης  
 Ἀριστοτέλης Παιανιεύς  
 50 Ὠκυμένης Προβαλίσιος  
 Πύθων  
 Πολέμαρχος Φαληρεύς  
 Σωσιγένης Προβαλίσιος  
 Ῥόδιππος Ῥαμνούσιος  
 55 Σωσιγένης Ἀπαμεύς  
 Φιλόστρατος Κολωνήθεν  
 Μενέμαχος Παιανιεύς  
 Ἀγαθοκλῆς δημόσιος  
 Ἀριστόνικος Ὀήθεν  
 60 Δημήτριος Ἀλωπεκῆθεν  
 Λήναιος Μιλήσιος  
 Θέων Ὀήθεν  
 Σωτᾶς Ἀναγυράσιος  
 Εὐβουλίδης  
 65 Δημήτριος Ἀμαξαντεύς  
*vacat*  
 [ἀνεγρά]φη ἐπὶ Μηδείου Μουνιχιῶνος.

## G o d s!

For good fortune. In the year that Theoklēs was archon, month of Mounichion, in the regular assembly. The *Sabaziastai* resolved to inscribe the names of the *eranistai* on a stele and to erect it in the temple.

Priest: Zenon of Antioch

Treasurer, secretary and supervisor: Dorotheos of (the deme) Oa.

*Eranistai* <then follow fifty-one names>

## Notes

- II. 2–3: ἐπὶ Θεοκλέους ἄρχοντος; i.e., 103/2 BCE (Meritt 1977, 187).
- II. 9, 32: Athens had a large population of residents who came from Antioch. *FRA* 25–45 lists 558 Antiochenes resident in Athens.
- II. 16, 23, 61: Μιλήσιος; Milesians are the most numerous foreign residents of Athens. *FRA* lists 2012 Milesians in Athens.
- II. 22, 36: Μακεδών; on Macedonian residents in Athens → *FRA* 150–51 lists 43 Macedonians resident in Athens.
- II. 30–31: Λαοδικεύς; on Laodicean residents in Athens → *FRA* 139–43 (97 names).
- I. 39: Ἡρακλεώτης; on citizens of Herakleia (Pontika) in Athens → *FRA* 72–98 (641 names).
- I. 45: Μαρωνίτης; on citizens of Maroneia in Athens → *FRA* 9–10 (27 names).
- I. 48: Αἰγινήτης; on citizens of Aegina in Athens → *FRA* 153–54 (49 names).
- I. 55: Ἀπαμεύς; on citizens of Apameia in Athens → *FRA* 45–47 (59 names).
- I. 58: Ἀγαθοκλῆς δημόσιος; *PAA* 103165: Agathokles is a public slave.
- I. 59: Ἀριστόνικος Ὀθήθεν (*PA* 2029; *PAA* 174095; *LGPN* 2:59[20]) is known from a list of ephebes in 106 BCE (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1011*.iii.99). A third century BCE gravestone (Agora 17:243) records the name of a woman, Θεοφίλη Ἀριστονικοῦ Οἰθήθεν (*PAA* 511015; *LGPN* 2:221[8]), probably the wife of Aristonikos son of Meniskos of Oa (*PA* 2030; *PAA* 174105; *LGPN* 2:59[18]), an ancestor of Aristonikos.
- I. 66: ἐπὶ Μηδείου (ἄρχοντος), i.e., 101/0 BCE (Meritt 1977, 187).

## Comments

The origins of the cult of Sabazios are disputed, but most of the evidence suggests that it arrived in Attica from Phrygia. The cult was known at least from the fifth century BCE, when it was mentioned by Aristophanes and connected with Bacchic-like frenzy (*Vespae*, 9–10), flutes (*Horae*, frag. 566), the mother of the gods (*Aves*, 876), and Adonis (*Lysistrata*, 387–90). The latter text seems to associate Sabazios with women:

390 ἄρ' ἐξέλαμψε τῶν γυναικῶν ἡ τρυφή  
 χῶ τυμπανισμὸς χοὶ πυκνοὶ Σαβάζιοι,  
 ὃ τ' Ἀδωνιασμὸς οὗτος οὐπὶ τῶν τεγῶν  
 οὗ ἴγ' ὅτ' ὦν ἤκουον ἐν τῆκκλησίᾳ;

Has then the wantonness of the women blazed out, their continuous beating on drums and frequent cries, “Sabazios,” and that Adonis-like dirge up on the roofs, which I once heard in full Assembly-time?

Demosthenes’ attack on Aeschines in [18] *De Corona* 259–60 also suggests the participation of women in the cult:

When you became a man you organized things for your mother while she performed her rites, reading the books (τὰς βίβλους ἀνεγίγνωσκες). At night, wearing a fawn skin and mixing the libations and washing the initiates and wiping them clean with the loam and the bran, and raising them up once their purification was finished, commanding them to say, “I am fleeing evil, I have found the better way”... In day you led the good *thiasoi* through the streets, their heads crowned with fennel and white poplar; and squeezing the fat-cheeked snakes, or holding them above your head, now shouting out “Euoi Saboi!” and dancing (to the chant) “Hyes Attes! Attes Hyes,” being greeted by old hags as “master of the ceremonies” (ἔξαρχος), instructor (προηγεμῶν), Ivy-bearer (κιττοφόρος), Fan-carrier (λυκνοφόρος)...

The comments of Aristophanes and Demosthenes, which implicitly or explicitly associate Sabazios with Dionysos, present problems since, as Johnson observes, it is *only* in literary sources, usually hostile ones, that this equation is made. “Almost without exception when inscriptions make an equation it is with Zeus-Jupiter” (Johnson 1984, 1586). This conflation of Dionysos with Sabazios might also account for the fact that whereas women played important parts in the cult of Dionysos, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1335 reflects a membership that is exclusively male, including a male priest.

The membership included at least one, and perhaps two, father-son pairs Athenodotos (ll. 35, 43) and Epainos (ll. 19, 21). Even more noteworthy is the mix of Athenian citizens, metics from Antioch (ll. 9, 32), Miletos (ll. 16, 23, 61), Laodicea (ll. 30–31), Macedonia (ll. 22, 36), Herakleia (Pontika) (l. 39), Maroneia (in Thrace, l. 45), Aigina (l. 48), and Apameia (l. 55), one public slave (l. 58), and a number of names without demotics, presumably slaves or freedmen. Lane observes, “We have evidence of the catholic nature of these organizations, where Athenians rubbed elbows with metics, free men with slaves” (Vermaseren, et al. 1983–1989, 3:8).

This inscription raises acutely the issue of the relationship between the *eranistai* and the name of the association, *Sabaziastai*. Poland (1909, 30) seems to have thought that associations with an *archeraniḥtēs* would be called *eraniḥstai*, but as Arnaoutoglou (1994b) has shown, *archeraniḥtēs* typically appears in associations of *thiasōtai*, not among *eranistai*, at least until the first century BCE (e.g., SEG 54:235 [47]; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1343 [48]). He suggests that *eranistai* in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1335 means “contributors to an *eranos* loan” (2003, 86).

**Literature:** Johnson, Sherman E. “The Present State of Sabazios Research.” *ANRW* II.17.3 (1984): 1583–1613; Vermaseren, et al. 1983–1989, 3:7–8.

[44] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1337*

## Honors for the Priestess of the Syrian Aphrodite

Piraeus (Attica)

97/6 BCE

Published: Rangabes 1842–1855, 2:429–431 (no. 809); Foucart 1873, 197–98 (no. 10); Koehler, *IG II* 627; Michel, *RIG* 1561; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1337* (Poland A2k).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1337*.

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4636* and *4637* (Piraeus, late IV BCE): Dedications to Aphrodite Ourania; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4586* (Piraeus, mid IV BCE): Dedication to Aphrodite; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4616* (Piraeus, late IV BCE): Dedication found in the same location as *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4596*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 337 [3]* (Piraeus, 333/2 BCE): Foundation of a temple to the Syrian Aphrodite; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1261 [9]* (Piraeus, 302–299 BCE): Honorific decree of an association dedicated to Aphrodite and Adonis; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1290* (Piraeus, mid-III BCE): A fragmentary decree of Salaminians of Cyprus concerning the worship of Aphrodite and the celebration of the Adoneia; *AM 66:228 no. 4 [39]* (138/7 BCE): Honorary decree of the *orgeōnes* of Aphrodite.

Non-stoichedon (42–50 letters). Stele of Pentelic marble, 47 x 52 x 10.5 cm., broken at the base. Letter height: 1.0 cm. Tracy 1990, 244 could not relate the cutter to any other known Attic cutter.

Θ Ε Ο Ι.

- Ἐπὶ ἡρακλείτου ἄρχοντος· Σκιροφοριῶνος ἀγορᾷ κυρίαι·  
 ἔδοξεν τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν· Ὡς Σάτυρος Μενίσκου Αἰξῶ[νεύς]  
 εἶπεν· περὶ ὧν ἀπαγγέλλει ἡ ἰκέτρια τῆς Συρίας θεοῦ]  
 5 Νικασίς Φιλίσκου Κορινθία περὶ τῶν θυσ[ιῶν ὧν ἔθυσεν]  
 τεῖ τε Ἀφροδίτῃ τε Συρία καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θε[οῖς οἷς πάτρι]-  
 ον ἦν, ὡς ἀγαθὴ τύχει τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ δέ[χεσθαι τὰ γεγονότα]  
 ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς ὑπὲρ τε τῶν ὀργεῶ[νων καὶ ----]-  
 ὅπως [ἄ]ν οὖν καὶ οἱ ὀργεῶν[ες φαίνονται --- χά]-  
 10 ριτας ἀπονέμοντες [καὶ τιμῶντες καταξίως τοὺς φιλο]-  
 τιμουμένους [εἰς τε τὴν θεὸν καὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ὀργεῶνων, ἐπα]-  
 νέσαι τὴν ἰκέτριαν -----]

G o d s!

In the year that Herakleitos was archon, in the month of Skirophorion, in regular assembly, the *orgeōnes* approved the motion made by Satyros son of Meniskos of (the deme) Aixone: Concerning the things which the priestess of Syrian Aphrodite, Nikasis daughter of Philiskos of Korinthos reports about the sacrifices that she sacrificed both to Syrian Aphrodite

and to the others gods, which is ordained by ancestral custom: – for good fortune (the *orgeōnes* resolved) to acknowledge the benefactions that have occurred in the temples on behalf of the *orgeōnes* and ... in order that also the *orgeōnes* shall be seen imparting worthy thanks and honoring in a worthy manner those who are ambitious, towards both the goddess and the association of *orgeōnes*, (and) to commend the priestess....

### Notes

- l. 1: Θ Ε Ο Ι, “Gods!” → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 337.1 [3] note*.
- l. 2: ἐπι Ἡρακλείτου ἄρχοντος: Dinsmoor (1931, 33, 245) had dated Herakleitos III to 96/5 but this is now revised to 97/6 BCE (Meritt 1977, 187, so Ferguson 1944, 119; Mikalson 1998, 277). 95/4 BCE appeared frequently in other treatments of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1337* and its related items (see Ferguson 1911, 423; Garland 1987, 228; Parker 1996, 342).
- l. 2: ἀγοράι κυρίαι → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1263.2–3 [11] note*.
- l. 3: Σάτυρος Μενίσκου Αἰξω[νεύς]: *PA 12588; PAA 813375; LGPN 2:394[27]*.
- l. 5: Νικασίς Φιλίσκου Κορινθία: (Pope 1947, 89; *PAA 710065; FRA* no. 2983). For other Korinthians in Athens → *FRA 127–30* (67 names). Even though Korinthos had been completely razed by Rome in 146 BCE, the ethnic designation “Korinthian” continued to be used.
- l. 6: Ἀφροδίτη τῆ Συρία → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 337* (333/2 BCE) and the *comment* below. Foucart (1873, 98) suggested that the Syrian Aphrodite had been identified with the Mother of the Gods (Cybele), but it is usually pointed out that on Delos the cult of the Syrian Aphrodite existed alongside a separate cult of Cybele (Roussel 1987, 256; Lambrechts, et al. 1954, 273). The cult of Atargatis/Aphrodite Hagnē is widely attested on Delos: *ID 2245* (103/2 BCE); *2250* (107/6 BCE); *2251* (108/7 and 106/5 BCE); *2252* (108/7 and 106/5 BCE); *2275* (n.d.).
- ll. 6–7: τοῖς ἄλλοις θε[οῖς οἷς πάτρι]ον ἦν, “to the other gods, which is ordained by ancestral custom”: cf. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1261.31–32 [9]*: ἔθυσσε τοῖς θεοῖς ἃς πάτρ]ιον ἦν αὐτοῖς. The phrase θε[οῖς οἷς πάτρι]ον ἦν is extremely common in Attic inscriptions. The “ancestral gods” in this case may include Hadad, Atargatis’ consort in Hierapolis (Ferguson 1944, 121).
- l. 7–8: ἀγαθεῖ τύχει τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ δέ[χεσθαι τὰ γεγονότα] | ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς. The formula ἀγαθῆι τύχει δεδόχθαι τῶι δήμῳ, τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ δέχεσθαι τὰ γεγονότα ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς οἷς ἔθυσεν ἐφ’ ὑγίαια καὶ σωτηρία τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων... ἐπαινέσαι δέ ... is extremely common in Attic inscriptions. E.g., *IG II<sup>2</sup> 410.13–14; 661.17; 668.7–8; 775.12–13; 780.8–10; 790.13–14; 848.12–13; 890.10; 902.9; 910.10–11; 929.7–8; 949.15*, etc. Even though the formula seems always to use the plural τὰ γεγονότα ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς, it should not be taken to mean that this association possesses multiple temples in Athens.
- ll. 9–10: χά]ριτας ἀπονέμοντες → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1252+999.21 [6] note*. The formula ὅπως [ἄ]ν οὖν καὶ οἱ ὀργεάν[ε]ς φαίνονται is usually followed by variations of χά]ριτας ἀπονέμοντες τοὺς φιλο[τ]ιμουμένους χάριν] ἀποδιδόντες ταῖς φιλοτιμουμέναις (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314.9–10 [28]*); τοῖς φιλοτ[ι]μουμένοις (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1315 [29]*); χάριτας ἀξίας ἀποδιδόντες τοῖς ἀει φιλοτιμουμένοις (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1324 [32]*); τὴν ἀξίαν χάριν] ἀποδιδόντες ταῖς φιλοτ[ιμουμένοις] (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1334 [45]*).

### Comments

The Syrian Aphrodite arrived in Athens by the late fourth century BCE (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 337 [3]*), but there is very little other evidence of her cult between the end of the fourth century and the mid-second century BCE when there is also evidence of the cult on Delos (→ I. 6 note). The key difference between the fourth century cult and that represented by *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1337* two and a half centuries later is that citizens are now involved. This is signalled not only by the fact that the proposer of the motion is a demesman, but that the association members are called *orgeōnes*, which normally appears in citizen associations. The priestess, nonetheless, is from Korinthos.

The “Syrian Aphrodite,” also known as Aphrodite Ourania and Aphrodite Hagnē, is to be identified with Atargatis, a Syrian deity from Hierapolis, also known as the Syrian Goddess (*Dea syria*) (Lambrechts, et al. 1954). Her cult was brought west by Syrian merchants and was well established on Delos while it was under Athenian control (Mikalson 1998, 277, 312). Once embraced by the Athenians, however, the goddess was no longer referred to as Atargatis; by 112 BCE, she had become the “Atticized” Aphrodite Hagnē (Mikalson 1998, 312).

The Delian cult of Atargatis first had a priest from Hierapolis (*ID 2228*; 128/7 BCE) but by 112/1 BCE an Athenian was the priest:

Θεόδωρος Θεοδώ|ρου Αἰθαλίδης, ὁ | ἱερεὺς ὢν ἐν τῶι | ἐπὶ Διονυσίου ἄρ||χοντος ἐνιαυτῶι, | καὶ οἱ θεραπευταί, | ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου | τοῦ Ἀθηναίων, | Ἀφροδίτῃ Ἄγγει, || τὰς ψαλίδας ἀνέ|θηκαν, ἐπὶ ἐπιμελ[η]||τοῦ Δράκοντος Βα|τήθεν καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ [τὰ] | ἱερά Ἀρκέτου Κυ[δα]||[θ]ηναίως καὶ Ἐστιά[ι]ου | [Ἀλ]αίως. (*ID 2229*; 112/1 BCE)

Theodoros son of Theodoros of (the deme) Aithalidai, who was priest in the year that Dionysios was archon, and the devotees (*therapeutai*) dedicated the vaults to the pure Aphrodite on behalf of the People of Athens, when Drakon of (the deme) Bate was supervisor and when Arketes of Kydathenaion and Hestaios of Halai were in charge of the sacred things.

On Delos, Aphrodite Hagnē appears to have been associated with rites that required purity. A Delian cultic relation, probably connected with Atargatis required:

ἀγαθῆ τύχῃ· ἀγνεύοντας | εἰσιέναι ἀπὸ ὄψαριου τρι|ταίους· ἀπὸ ὑείου λουσά-  
με|νον· ἀπὸ γυναικὸς τρι|ταίους· || ἀπὸ τετοκειας ἐβδομαίους· | ἀπὸ διαφθοράς  
τετταρα|κοστῆ· ἀπὸ γυναικε|ῶν ἑναταίους. (*ID 2530 = LSCGSup 54*)

For good fortune. Let (only) those enter who are purified from fish for three days; from pork, after having bathed; after intercourse (?), three days; after childbirth, seven days; after a miscarriage, 40 days; after a period, nine days.

It is unknown whether the same kinds of regulations were part of the Athenian cult.

It is also unknown whether the cult of the Syrian Aphrodite evolved from a metic club composed of and for foreign merchants (cf. the Kitians in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 337 [3]*) to one consisting of Athenians (Satyros) and non-Athenians (Nikasis) alike. The more common view is that the association of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1337* is not the direct successor of the fourth century BCE metic association but is a new introduction from Delos (Parker 1996, 342; Mikalson 1998, 312). In order to account for the presence of a Korinthian priestess in the cult, Ferguson (1944, 120–21) adduces the importation of ritual specialists in other cults. Since Korinthos had been razed in 146 BCE, Ferguson suggests Philiskos, Nikasis' father, may have been a resident on Delos and that Nikasis "may have learned the technique of her job at Delos" (1944, 120–21 n. 64).

**Literature:** Clerc 1893, 135; Ferguson 1911, 423; Ferguson 1944, 119–20; Lambrechts, et al. 1954; Parker 1996; Mikalson 2006, 277, 311–12.

*John S. Kloppenborg and Michelle Christian*

## [45] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1334*

### Decree of the *orgeōnes* honoring a priestess

Piraeus (Attica) after 71/70 BCE

Published: Stephanos Koumanoudes, *Ἐπιγραφαὶ ἐλληνικαὶ* 1860, no. 6 (*ed. pr.*); Foucart 1873, 197 (no. 9); Koehler, *IG II* 623; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1334*; Vermaseren 1977–1989, 2:81–82 (no. 266) (Poland A2f).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1334*.

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum, EM 7764.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4563* (Athens or Piraeus, IV BCE): A dedication to the Mother of the Gods; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4609* (Piraeus, late IV BCE): A dedication to the Mother of the Gods by two women; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 6288* (350–317 BCE): A grave inscription for a woman described as μητρὸς παντοτέκνου πρόπολος; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1273AB [18]* (Piraeus, 265/4 BCE): A decree of the *thiasōtai* of the Mother of the Gods; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16]* (Piraeus, 272/1 BCE): A decree of the *thiasōtai* of the Mother of the Gods; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1314 [28]* (Piraeus, 213/2 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1315 [29]* (Piraeus, 211/0 BCE); *Agora* 16:235 (Meritt, et al. 1957, 209–10 [no. 57]); *SEG* 17:36; 32:348; 39:195) (Athens, 202/1 BCE): Honorary decree of the *orgeōnes* of the Mother of the Gods for a priestess; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1328 [34]* (Piraeus, 183/2, 175/4 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1327 [35]* (Piraeus, 178/7 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1329 [37]* (Piraeus, 175/4 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2950/1* (II BCE): A dedication of a treasurer to the Mother of the Gods; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1334 [45]* 71/0 BCE (?); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4703* (mid I BCE): Dedication of the wife of a demesman; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4714* (Augustan



period), dedication of the daughter of a demesman to the Mother of the Gods and to Aphrodite, “gracious midwife” (εὐαντήτω ἱατρείη); IG II<sup>2</sup> 4759–60 (I/II ce): Two dedications of the wives of two demesmen to the mother of the Gods (εὐαντήτω ἱατρείη).

Non-stoichedon. Stele of Pentelic marble, 18 x 14 x 5.4 cm. Letter height: 0.5 cm. found on Melos but carved in Piraeic stone (Garland 1987, 237).

- [ἐπὶ --- ἄρχον]τος· Μου[νιχίωνος ἀγορᾶι]  
 [κυρία· ἔδοξεν τοῖς ὀργεῶσιν· ἐ-----  
 [----- εἶπεν]· ἐπειδὴ Ὀν[α]σ[ῶ] Θέ[ωνος? πρό]-  
 [τερον μὲν ἱέρεια λα]χοῦσα εἰς τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν τὸν  
 5 [ἐπὶ --- ἄρχον]τος ὁμοίως δὲ κ[αὶ] πάλιν  
 [λαχοῦσα εἰς τὸν ἐπὶ] Ζηνίωνος ἄρχοντος ἐνιαυτὸν  
 [καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς τῆ]ν ἱερωσύνην διεξήγαγεν προ-  
 [νοουμένη τῆς περὶ τὸ ἱε]ρὸν εὐκοσμίας καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐ-  
 [φιλοτιμήθη ὅσα καθῆ]κον ἦν τεῖ θεῶι, ἔθυσεν δὲ καὶ  
 10 [τὰς καθηκούσας θυσίας] ἀλύπως τε πρὸς πάντας ἀν-  
 [εστράφη τοὺς ὀργεῶνας]· ἵνα οὖν καὶ οἱ ὀργεῶνες φα-  
 [ίνονται τὴν ἀξίαν χάριν] ἀποδιδόντες ταῖς φιλο-  
 [τιμομέναις τῶν λαγχανο]υσῶν ἱερειῶν εἰς τὴν  
 [θεόν, δεδόχθαι τῶι κοινῶι τῶν ὀρ]γεῶνων, ἐπαίνεσαι τὴν  
 15 [ἱέρειαν Ὀναςῶ καὶ στεφα]νῶσαι θαλλοῦ στεφά-  
 [νωι ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ εὐσεβείας] <τῆς> εἰς τὴν θεὸν καὶ φιλο-  
 [τιμίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ὀργεῶνας· ἀ]ναθεῖναι δὲ αὐτῆς καὶ ε-  
 [ἰκόνα ἐν τῶι ναῶι, στεφαν]οῦν δὲ αὐτὴν καθ’ [ἐκάστ]-  
 [ῆν θυσίαν --- καὶ] εἰς τὸν ἔπ[εῖτα χρόνον -]  
 20 -----

In the year that ... was archon, in the month of Mounichion, at the regular assembly: the *orgeōnes* approved (the motion that NN) proposed: Whereas Onaso, daughter of Theon, who had earlier been chosen as priestess in the year that ... was archon, and likewise was chosen again in the year that Zenion was archon, carried out her priesthood in an honorable and pious manner, providing for decorous behaviour around the temple and being ambitious in regard to the other things that pertained to the goddess, and performed the appropriate sacrifices, conducting herself towards all the *orgeōnes* without causing offense; therefore, in order that the *orgeōnes* should also be seen as rendering appropriate thanks to any who are ambitious by being chosen priestesses for the goddess; – it seemed good to the association (*koinon*) of *orgeōnes* to commend the priestess Onaso and to crown her with an olive wreath on account of the excellence and piety that she has shown the goddess and the zeal she has towards the *orgeōnes*; and (resolved) that they also set up an image of her in the sanctuary, and crowned it at each sacrifice; and subsequently. . . .

## Notes

- II. 1/2: ἀγοράι | [κυρίαί → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1263.2–3 [11] note.
- I. 3: Ὀν[α]σ[ῶ] Θέ[ωνος?]: *PAA* 745435; *LGPV* 2:352[3].
- I. 6: εἰς τὸν ἐπιὶ Ζηνίωνος ἄρχοντος: i.e., post 71/70 BCE (Meritt 1977, 189).
- I. 8: εὐκοσμία (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1368.16 [51]). Compare *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 950.10 (*SEG* 18:22) (165/4 BCE): ἐπιμεμέληται δὲ καὶ τῆς τοῦ ἱε[ρ]οῦ εὐκοσμίας καὶ τὰς θυσίας ἀπάσας τέθεικεν κατὰ [τὰ] ψηφίσματα, “[the priest] has supervised the orderly conduct of the temple and has performed all the sacrifices in accordance with the decrees...”; 996.10–11 (*SEG* 18:21): πρόεστη δὲ [καὶ τῆς εὐκοσμίας τῆς] | [ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀκολούθως τ]οῖς νόμοις, “he also presided over the good conduct in the temple, in accordance with the laws”; *IPerg* 251.24–25 (II BCE): ἐπιμελεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ τῆς εὐκοσμίας τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἱε[ρ]ὸν | πάσης τὸν ἱερέα ὡς ἂν αὐτῷ δοκῆ[ι] | καλῶς ἔχειν καὶ ὁσίως, “the priest shall supervise all the conduct around the temple, in whatever way it seems to him to be honorable and holy.”
- I. 12: τὴν ἀξίαν χάριν ἀποδιδόντες → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1252+999.21 [6] note and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1337.9–10 [44] note.
- I. 14: δεδόχθαι τῷ κοινῷ τῶν ὄργεῶνων. This replaces the earlier formula, δεδόχθαι τοῖς ὄργεῶσιν. Arnaoutoglou (2003, 131) observes that τὸ κοινόν appears only in inscriptions from the second half of the third century onwards (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1297; 1298; 1317b; 1334; 1339; 1343; 1345; *SEG* 2:9; *Agora* 16:223). See further Arnaoutoglou 2003, 132–33.

## Comments

Although the (female) deity is not named, it seems likely that this is an association honoring the Mother of the Gods, which regularly met in the month of Mounichion and which regularly had a priestess (Ferguson 1944, 137; Arnaoutoglou 2003, 113). As in other inscriptions from the association of the Mother of the Gods (→ *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1316 [16] comment) the priestess was the wife of a demesman and the members were called *orgeōnes*. Noteworthy here is the renewal of Onaso’s terms as priestess.

**Literature:** Ferguson 1944, 108, 137; Sfameni Gasparro, Giulia. *Soteriology and Mystic Aspects in the Cult of Cybele and Attis*. EPRO 103. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985, esp. pp. 49–50; Vermaseren 1977–1989, 2:81–82 (no. 266).

[46] IG II<sup>2</sup> 1339  
Regulations of the *Heroistai*

Athens (Attica)

57/6 BCE

Published: K.S. Pittakes, 'Εφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική (1842) 520–21 (no. 861) (facsimile) (*ed. pr.*); Rangabes 1842–1855, 2:432–33 (no. 811); Keil 1855, 37; Foucart (1873) 203, no. 21; Michel, *RIG* 1562; Koehler, *IG II* 630; Kirchner, *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1339.

Publication Used: *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1339.

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum.

Non-Stoichedon (30–35 letters). Stele of Hymettian marble, broken on the left top, and right near the base, 27 x 22 x 8.0 cm. Letter height: 0.7 cm. Discovered not far from the temple of the Dioskuroi on the slope of the Acropolis.

[ἀγαθῆι τύχηι· ἐ]πι Διοκλέους τοῦ Διοκλέ[ο]-  
[υς ἄρχοντος], ταμειύοντος Ἀρόπου τοῦ Σε-  
[λεύκου ---]ως Ἡροϊστῶν τῶν Διοτίμου  
[καὶ Ζήνωνος? κ]αὶ Παμμένου, ὧν ἀρχεραμιστῆς  
5 [Ζηνίων? Διοτί]μου Μαραθώνιος· ἔδοξεν τῶ[ι κοί]-  
[νῶι τῶν Ἡρ]οϊστῶν, προνοηθῆναι τῆς [προσ]-  
[όδου ὅπω]ς οἱ ἀποδημοῦντες τῶν Ἡ[ροϊσ]-  
[τῶν καθ' ὄν]δηποτεοῦν τρόπον διδῶ[σι εἰς]  
[τὴν θυσίαν?] δραχμὰς τρεῖς, οἱ δὲ ἐπιδη[μοῦν]-  
10 [τες καὶ] μὴ παραγινόμενοι ἐπάναγκ[ε]ς  
[ἀποδιδῶ]σι τὴν φορὰν τὰς ἑξ δραχμ[ὰς ἐ]-  
[ὰν καὶ μῆ? λάβ]ωσιν τὰ μέρη· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ διδ[ῶσι]  
[τὴν φορὰν, ἔ]δοξεν μὴ μετέχειν αὐτο[ῦς]  
[τοῦ ἐράν]ου ἐὰν μὴ τι συμβῆ διὰ πέ[ν]-  
15 [θος ἢ διὰ ἀ]σθένειαν ἀπολειφθῆναι· ὁμ[οί]-  
[ως δὲ ἔδοξ]ε ἐμβιβάζειν ἐξεῖναι τοῖς [τε]-  
[λοῦσιν ἔραν]ον δραχμῶν τριάκοντα κα[ὶ]  
----- ὦν ἑξ δραχμῶν καὶ μὴ π· · ·  
· · · 9 · · ·, ὑπὲρ τούτων δὲ ἀναδιδ[όν]-  
20 [αι τὴν ψήφον -----]

For Good Fortune. In the year that Diokles son of Diokles was archon, when Aropos son of Seleukos was treasurer... of the *Heroistai* of Diotimos, Zenon, and Pammenes, whose *archeranistes* was Zenion son of Diotimos of (the deme) Marathon; the association (*koinon*) of the *Heroistai* resolved to make provision for the income (of the association), so that those of the *Heroistai* who are away from home for whatever reason shall

pay three drachmae for the sacrifices, and those living at home but not in attendance shall be required to pay six drachmae as the contribution, and they shall not receive the portion (of the sacrifice). And if they do not make a contribution, it was resolved that they should not participate in the *eranos*, except if one should be absent because of mourning or because of sickness. Likewise it was resolved to allow those who have contributed thirty drachmae to introduce (new members) to the association (*eranos*) and — — of six drachmae and not ..... let them cast their ballot regarding the things....

### Notes

- II. 1–2: ἐπι Διοκλέους τοῦ Διοκλέ[ο]||[υς ἄρχοντος]: i.e., 57/6 BCE (Meritt 1977, 190).
- I. 3: Διοτίμου: Diotimos: *PAI* 365970.
- I. 4: Ζήνωνος? → Geagan 1992, 34.
- I. 4: Παμμένου was archon in 83/2 BCE and mint magistrate in 70/69 BCE and 66/65 BCE (Geagan 1992, 34, 38–39).
- I. 4: ἀρχεραμιστής → Arnaoutoglou 1994b.
- II. 14–15: ἐὰν μὴ τινη συμβῆτι διὰ πέ[ν]||[θος ἢ διὰ ἀ]σθένειαν ἀπολειφθῆναι; cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361.19–20 [4]: ὅς δ' ἂν ἐπιδημῶν Ἀθήνη||[σι], “whoever is at home in Athens”; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1368.50–51 [51]: χωρὶς ἢ ἀποδημίας | ἢ πένθους ἢ νόσου, which exempts from penalties those who are away from Athens or in mourning or ill. Likewise, *P.Mich.* V 243.4 (Tebtinis; I CE) imposes a fine on those who do not attend a club meeting: ἐὰν δέ τινη ||[ς] σύλλο[γ]ος παραγγελη καὶ μὴ παραγένηται, ζημιούσθω ἐπι μὲν τῆς κόμης δραχ(μῆν) μίαν, ἐπι δὲ τῆς πόλεω(ς) δραχ(μάς) τέσσαρας.

### Comments

This association honored three Athenian citizens as heroes, Diotimos, Zenon, and Pammenes. They belonged to a distinguished Athenian family which had come from Athens to Delos in the mid-second century BCE, and which was involved in the civic life of Athens in the first century. Many of the members of this family are known from other sources, and many bore the names Zenon and Pammenes. The particular Zenon and Pammenes named here are known from Delphic inscriptions listing *πυθαῖσται* (those who participated in the Pythian processions to Delphi) (*FD* III 2:15; 106 BCE), and numerous Delian inscriptions attest the involvement of the family in civic life on Delos.

From 130 BCE onwards, members of the family were also involved in civic life in Athens: Pammenes was archon in 83/2 BCE and mint magistrate in 70/69 BCE and 66/65 BCE (Geagan 1992, 34, 38–39). Both Zenon (II) and Pammenes (I) and the otherwise unknown Diotimos must have died before 57/6 BCE, the date of the attestation of their hero cult. While the family was not among the most distinguished of Athenians in the late second and early first century BCE, it achieved greater influence later in the first century BCE when Zenon (IV) and Pammenes (II), both son of Zenon (III) of Marathon, were among those

“selected by the hierophant to make up Pluto’s couch and decorate the table according to the oracle of the god” (Geagan 1992, 40).

Like other associations, this group of *Heroistai* needed both to police attendance at meetings, and hence imposed penalties on those who did not attend, and to recruit new members.

The very existence of this association in 57/6 BCE is noteworthy, in view of the facts that Attica was under Roman control by this time and that by 64 BCE the Roman Senate had banned associations that were deemed to be inimical to the public interest of Rome (Asconius, *In Pisonem*, 7: *Cicero supra memoravit senatus consulto collegia sublata sunt quae adversus rem publicam videbantur esse <constituta>* [Clark 1907, 7 and De Robertis 1973, 83–108]. Although Clodius had this legislation rescinded in 58 BCE (Tatum 1990), bans against political clubs were reintroduced in the wake of the Catiline conspiracy in 55 BCE (Cicero, *Ad Quint. Fratr.* 2.3.2, 4–5) and later Caesar is said to have dissolved *collegia* that did not have an ancient foundation (Suetonius, *Divus Iulius* 42.3: *cuncta collegia praeter antiquitus constituta distraxit*; cf. *Divus Augustus* 32: *collegia praeter antiqua et legitima dissolvit*) (Ligt 2000, 244).

At virtually the same time that these suppressions in Rome were occurring, however, there is good evidence of the continued flourishing of associations in Attica and the Peloponnese – not only *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1339* (dated to the year after the *Lex Clodii de collegiis*), but also *SEG* 37:103 (Attica; 52/51 BCE); *AJA* 64 (1960) 269 = *SEG* 54:235 (Athens; ca. 50 BCE); *IG V/2* 266 (Mantineia; 46–44 BCE); *SEG* 43:59 (Rhamnous; 41/40 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1343* [48] (Athens; 37/36 or 36/36 BCE); and *IG V/1* 210–212 (Sparta; 30–20 BCE; an association of *Ταινάριοι* with approximately 50 members). Although Ligt (2000, 244) believes that the Roman laws resulted in the abolition of some eastern *collegia*, Arnaoutoglou points precisely to these Attic associations as an indication that the Roman laws had little or no effect in the east (2002, 32).

**Literature:** Arnaoutoglou 1994b; 2002; Clark, Albert C., ed. *Q. Asconii Pediani Orationum Ciceronis quinque enarratio*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1907; Geagan 1992; Ligt 2000; Parker 1996, 342; Tatum, W. Jeffrey. “Cicero’s Opposition to the *Lex Clodia de Collegiis*.” *CQ* 40/1 (1990) 187–94.

[47] *SEG* 54:235List of *eranistai*

Epano Liosia (Attica)

mid I BCE

Published: Eugene Vanderpool, "News Letter from Greece," *AJA* 64, no. 3 (1960), pp. 265–271, p. 269 (ll. 1–9 only); G. Daux, "Chronique des fouilles," *BCH* 84 (1960) 617–874, 655; Athanasios A. Themos, "Κατάλογος έρανιστῶν," in A.P. Matthaiou and G.E. Malochou (eds.), *Ἀττικάί Ἐπιγραφαί. Πρακτικά συμποσίου εις Μνήμην Adolf Wilhelm (1864–1950)* (Athens: Ἑλληνική Ἐπιγραφική Ἑταιρεία [Greek Epigraphical Society], 2004), 253–269 (ph., facsimile) (*SEG* 54:235).

Current Location: Piraeus Museum, inv. 3508.

Similar or related inscriptions → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2343 [1]: Cult table from a *thiasos* of Herakles; *SEG* 36:228 [38]: A *synodos* of Herakles.

Limestone stele, 84.5 x 47 x 8.0 cm., with a pediment and a disk within the tympanum. Letter height: 1.2–0.5 cm. (ll. 1–104; 1.5–0.8 cm. (ll. 105–117); 2.0–0.8 cm. (ll. 118–135). The find site is a sanctuary of Herakles which was frequented by the members of an *eranos*. The stele, broken only on the left side, was found along with four fragments of a sculpture of Herakles. Themos notes that three different cutters inscribed the names, presumably at different times: Cutter 1 is responsible for the heading and cols. I–II and III.1–18 (ll. 1–104); Cutter 2 is responsible for the remaining names in col. III (ll. 105–117) and dates from the first century CE; and Cutter 3 cut the last five names in col. III and the names in col. IV (ll. 118–135), in the late first century CE. Cutter 3 used larger and cruder lettering than Cutter 1. Cutter 3 used abbreviations, all arranged as monograms: *rho* attached to a *pi* enclosing a broken-bar *alpha* (ΠΑΡ = πάρεδρος), *pi* enclosing a broken-bar *alpha* (ΠΑ or ΑΠ = πάρεδρος or ἀπελεύθερος) and a *upsilon* superimposed on a *pi* (ΥΠ = ὑπηρέτης), according to Themos.

<in the margin below the pediment>

[ἀγα]θῆι τύχηι. ἐπὶ Λευκίου Ῥαμνουσίου νεω[τέρου ἄ]ρχοντος,

<on the face of the stele>

ὁ{ι} ἱεροποιήσας καὶ κοσμητεῦσας Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀντιόχου τούσ-  
δε ἀνέγραψεν έρανιστὰς, ταμιεύοντος τὸ δεύτερον Καλ-  
λιστράτου, γραμματεῦνοντος δὲ Δημητρίου τὸ δεύτερον.

<Column I>

5 ἀρχερανίστρια  
Θάλεια.  
ἱερεὺς Ἡρακλέους  
Θεόδωρος Μητρο-  
δώρου Παιανιεύς.  
10 έρανισταί  
Θεόδωρος

<Column II>

Νικάνωρ  
Δημητρία  
Κρίτος  
50 [. . .]ις  
Ἰσίας  
Εὐπορος  
Ἐπαφρόδιτος

	Λ[υσί]μαχος		Νικηφόρος
	Θ[αλή]ς	55	ὼνήσιμος
	Σ[. .]ιχος		Δημήτρι[ος] Ἄχαρ(νεύς)
15	Διονύσιος Φυλάσι(ος)		Λήναιος Δημητρ[ρίου]
	Καλλίστρατος		Σατύρα
	[. .]έρων		Μικίων
	Ἴσιγένης	60	Σέλευκος
	Ἐπιτυγχάνων		Ἀγάθανδρος
20	[Τρ]ύφων		Ζωίμη
	Δίφιλος		Διονύσιος
	Εὐφαντος		Παπίας
	Ἀφροδίσιος	65	Πάμφιλος
	Ἴσίδοτος		Διο[νύ]σιος Θεο
25	Ὀλυμπος		Ἀγαθόδωρος
	[---]ιμος		Ἀσώπιος
	Διονυσ[όδ]ωρ[ο]ς		Ἀχιλλεύς
	Παράμονος	70	Διόδοτος
	Λήναιος		Ζωσάριον
30	Θεόπομπος		Κροῖσος Νε
	Αλ[---]ς		Καιλία
	Δα[---]		Ἀγαθοκλῆς
	Α[---]ς	75	Στρατονίκη
	Θεόδοτος		Γραφίς
35	Διονυσόδωρος		Διονύσιος
	Ἴσιγένεια		Σώστρατος
	[---]νιον		Βαρναῖος
	Ἀντιοχίς	80	Λεύκιος
	Ἴσιδώρα		Ἀπελλάς
40	Ἀρτεμισία		Ἴσίδοτος
	Χρωτάριον		Ἀπολλ[ώ]νιος
	Ἀγαθημερίς		Ἀπολλώνιος
	Ἐπίκτησις	85	Ἀρτεμισία
	Ἴσία		Γ[---]ας
45	Πόπλιος Γρά(νιος)		
	Γρανία		
	<Column III>		<Column IV>
	Ζωσίμη		Στράτων
	Ζηνίων		Εἰσιδότη ΑΠ
	Μηνάς	125	Λύδη
90	Ἀλέξανδρος		Αἰσιξίνης
	Ζωπυρίων		Ἀπολώνιος ΥΠ
	Φιλόκαλον		Δεκμίων
	Λαυδίκη		Ἐπαφρόδιτος

- |     |                  |     |                |
|-----|------------------|-----|----------------|
|     | Πάμφιλος         | 130 | Βοδ[.]α        |
| 95  | Ἐρώτιον          |     | Ἐπ{ι}αφρόδιτος |
|     | Ἐπ[ι]γόνη        |     | Ἄφροδισία ΥΠ   |
|     | Πῶλλα Σερ[ο]υλία |     | Εὔβουλος       |
|     | Ἄντιοχίς         |     | Ἄπελλᾶ[ς]      |
|     | Εἰρήνη           | 135 | ΕΙΣ[- -]ΕΡ[.]  |
| 100 | Ἐπαφρόδιτος      |     |                |
|     | Ἄρτεμάς          |     |                |
|     | Ἐπίκτησις        |     |                |
|     | Λήναι[ος]        |     |                |
|     | <i>vacat</i>     |     |                |
|     | [. . . . .]ς ΠΑ  |     |                |
| 105 | Δεΐφιλος         |     |                |
|     | Ζώσιμος          |     |                |
|     | Μύστα Θεο        |     |                |
|     | Μελιτίνη         |     |                |
|     | Ἱεροκλῆς         |     |                |
| 110 | Ἀπολλωνία        |     |                |
|     | Εὔπορος          |     |                |
|     | Καλλισθένης      |     |                |
|     | Ἐλένη            |     |                |
|     | Σύμφορον         |     |                |
| 115 | Ἡραΐς            |     |                |
|     | Ἄντιοχος         |     |                |
|     | Φιλέ[ρω]ς        |     |                |
|     | Ἡρακλείδης       |     |                |
|     | Ἀριστόκληα ΠΑΡ   |     |                |
| 120 | Διονύσιος ΠΑΡ    |     |                |
|     | Θεοφίλη ΠΑΡ      |     |                |
|     | Διονυσόδωρος     |     |                |

For good fortune: in the year that Leukios the younger of Rhamnous was archon, the former sacrifice-maker and former supervisor (*kosmētēs*) Apollonios son of Antiochos inscribed the (names) of these *eranistai*, when Kallistratos was the treasurer for the second time, and Demetrios was secretary for the second time.

The *archeranistra* (was) Thaleia.

The priest of Herakles (was) Theodoros son of Metrodoros of (the deme) Paiania

*Eranistai*

<125 names follow>.



## Notes

- I. 1: ἐπὶ Λευκίου Ῥαμνουσίου νεω[τέρου ἄ]ρχοντος. Themis does not think that this is the archon Leukios of Rhamnous named in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 5172 and *SEG* 21:685 (59/8 BCE) (*PAA* 604545; Meritt 1977, 190) but a later archon.
- I. 2: ἱεροποιήσας; on *hieropoioi* → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1255.2–3 [2] note.
- I. 2: κοσμητεύσας. In Athens the κοσμητής was a supervisor in charge of the ephebate. In this inscription the *kosmētēs* appears instead to be a cultic official charged with care of the temple and its statues (Themis 2004, 259).
- I. 5: ἀρχερανίστρια. Compare the προερανίστρια of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1292.24, 30 [26] (215/4 BCE). Arnaoutoglou (1994b) observes that in the earliest Attic inscriptions *archeranistēs* appears in associations of *thiasōtai*, but not in *eranistai* associations. *Archeranistai* first appear in *eranistai* associations in the first century BCE (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1343 [48]).
- I. 7: ἱερεὺς Ἡρακλέους → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2343.1 [1]; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1247.17–20: ἐπαινέ|σαι δὲ καὶ τὸν ἱερέα τοῦ | Ἡρακλέ|ου καὶ τὸν τοῦ Διόμου καὶ τοὺς μνήμο|νας καὶ τὸν πυρφόρον..., “to commend both the priest of Herakles and that of Diomos and the registrars and the fire-bearer...”; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3717: [ὁ δῆμος — — —] | τὸν ἀρχοντα | καὶ ἱερέα | Ἡρακλέους || ἐπὶ Ἀριστείδου ἀρχοντος ἀνέθηκεν.
- II. 8-9: Θεόδωρος Μητροιδόρου Παιανιεύς (*LGPN* 2:217[192]) may be also named in a list of demesmen from Paiania in *Agora* 15:294.34 (ca. 20 BCE): Θεόδωρος [— — —].
- II. 66, 107: Διο[νύσ]ιος Θεο, Μύστα Θεο, i.e. Διο[νύσ]ιος/Μύστα Θεοδώρου/Θεοδότου.
- II. 119–121: ΠΑΡ (πάρεδρος). In Athens *paredros* (literally, “one who sits beside”) has a range of meanings, from “assistant” to “advisor” to “assessor” (assigned to a magistrate) (Kapparis 1998). It is unclear in this inscription what the sense is (assuming that Themis’ resolution of the monogram is correct). The three *paredroi*, two women and one man, appear as the second–fourth members of the third list and might therefore be assistants to Herakleides (I. 118), who is named first.

## Comments

This list represents at least three generations of *eranistai*. The superscription and the main part of the list (II. 1–104) were cut sometime in the late first century BCE and indicate a membership of ninety-eight men and women (assuming that Theodotos [I. 11], Kallistratos [I. 16] and Demetrios [I. 56] are not the same persons named in II. 2–8). The list was extended in the early first century CE by a second cutter, who added thirteen names (II. 105–117), and still later, in the late first century CE a third cutter added in a rather crude hand the final eighteen names. The third cutter also added monograms ΠΑΡ (πάρεδρος), ΠΑ or ΑΠ (πάρεδρος or ἀπελευθέρος/ἀπελευθέρα) and ΥΠ (ὕπηρέτης), apparently to identify the roles played in the association.

The morphology of this inscription is similar to that of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1335 [43]: the record of a decision to record the names of members, followed by the naming of a cultic official, the supervisor, the treasurer and the secretary, and then the list of *eranistai*. The *eranistai*, as Arnaoutoglou had suggested a propos of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1335, are “contributors to an (eranos)-loan” (2003, 86). It is nevertheless clear

that the association engaged in cultic activities, because the inscription lists both a “sacrifice-maker” (*hieropoios*, l. 2) and a priest of Herakles (l. 7). One might also compare *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1291 [19]*, an association of *eranistai* devoted to Zeus Sotēr, Herakles, and the Savior Gods, which also had both *hieropoioi* and *epimelētai* as well as a treasurer and a secretary.

Only one member is expressly designated as a citizen and only five have patronyms. This does not necessarily mean that others are not citizens, but it is curious that in the work of the first cutter, for example, there are four persons named Dionysios, three persons named Lenaios, and two each named Theodoros, Demetrios, Epiktesis, Artemesia, Antiochis and Apollonios, with no attempt to distinguish among these (contrast *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1335 [43]* in which persons with the same name can be distinguished by their demotics and cities of origin).

The *eranistai* included both women and men in all three stages and perhaps remarkably, a woman, Thaleia, is named first in the list of members and is designated as the *archeranistria*.

**Literature:** Themis, A. A., “Κατάλογος έρανιστών,” in A.P. Matthaiou and G.E. Malochou (eds.), *Ἀττικά Ἐπιγραφαί. Πρακτικά συμποσίου εἰς Μνήμην Adolf Wilhelm (1864–1950)*. Athens: Ἑλληνική Ἐπιγραφική Ἑταιρεία (Greek Epigraphical Society, 2004, 253–269 (*SEG* 54:235); Kapparis, K.A. “Assessors of Magistrates (Paredroi) in Classical Athens,” *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 47, no. 4 (1998) 383–393;

## [48] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1343*

### Honorary decree of the *Soteriastai* for their Founder

Athens (Attica)

37/6 or 36/5 BCE

Published: K.D. Mylonas, “Ψήφισμα Ἀττικόν,” *AE* (1893) 49–60 (facsimile) (*ed. pr.*); Koehler, *IG II* 5, 630b; Dittenberger, *Syll<sup>2</sup>* 732; Michel, *RIG* 973; Dittenberger–Hiller von Gaertringen, *Syll<sup>3</sup>* 1104; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1343* (Poland A47a).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1343*

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum.

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4695*: Dedication to Ἀρτέμιδι Σωτεῖρα[ι]; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4631* (IV BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1298 [20]* (248/7 BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1297 [24]* (236/5 BCE): The same association as in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1298*, but probably not the same association as that in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1343*; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2942* (III bce): οἱ Ἀρτεμισιασταὶ | Μουσαίων | Κυρηναίων. | *vac.*; Meritt, *Hesperia* 10 (1941) 62–63 (no. 28): Ἀριστονίκη | Ἀρτέμιδι | Σωτεῖρα.

Non stoichedon 62 x 32 x 10 cm. Letter height: 0.8 cm. The stone was from the *temenos* of Artemis Soteira, outside the Dipylon Gate.

- <in a crown>
- 1 Διόδω-  
ρον Σω-  
κράτους  
Ἀφιδναϊ-
- 5 ον  
<vacat>
- 6 ἐπὶ Θεοπίθου ἄρχοντος, Μουνιχιῶνος  
ἔκτη· ἐπ[ε]ιδῆ [Δι]όδωρος Σωκράτου Ἀφ[ι]-  
δναῖος εὐνους ὦν δι[ια]τελεῖ τῶι [κοινῶι] τῶι  
10 Σωτηριαστῶν καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ πράττω[v] τ[ᾶ]  
συνφέροντα τῆ συνόδῳι, γενηθεῖς δ[ἐ]  
καὶ παραίτιος τῆς ἄνωθεν συλλογῆς καὶ  
τὴν σύνοδον αὐτὸς κτίσας ἀρχερανισ[τ]-  
ῆς ὑπέμεινεν, καὶ ταμιεύσας ἐν τῶι ἐπὶ  
Εὐθυδόμου ἄρχοντος ἐνιαυτῶι προεστά-  
15 τησεν τοῦ θεμελιωθῆναι τὴν σύνοδον· ἀ-  
διαλίπτως δὲ ἐπαγωνιζόμενος καὶ ἐν  
τῶι ἐπὶ Νικάνδρου ἄρχοντος ἐνιαυτῶ ταμιεύ-  
σας ὡσαύτως εὗξησεν τὰ κοινά· ἀκοπίατον δὲ  
ἑατὸν παρεχόμενος καὶ ἐν τῶ ἐπὶ Διοκλέους  
20 Μελιτέως ἄρχοντος ἐνιαυτῶι ταμιεύσας ἐποί-  
ησεν ἐκ πλήρους τὰ δίκαια καὶ τὰ νῦν ἐν τῶι  
ἐπὶ Καλλικρατίδου ἄρχοντος ἐνιαυτῶ ταμιεύσας π[ᾶ]-  
σαν εἰσητέγκατο σπουδὴν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν περὶ τῶν κοι-  
νῶν· κατασταθεῖς δὲ καὶ ἱερεὺς τῆς Σωτείας ἐν τῶι ἐ-  
25 πι Μενάνδρου ἄρχοντος ἐνιαυτῶι ἐκαλλιέρησεν καὶ ἀφιλαργύρως  
ἰστανόμενος ἡστίασεν τοὺς ἐρανιστὰς ἐκ τῶ[[ι]]ν ἰδίων  
ἀναλώσας οὐκ ὀλίγον χρήμα· ἐφ' οἷς ἅπασιν ἡ σύνοδος ἀποδε-  
ξαμένη τὴν ἐκτένειαν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν αὐτοῦ ὁμοθυμα-  
δὸν προεβάλετο τοὺς εἰσοίσοντας αὐτοῖς τὰς καθηκού-  
30 σας τιμὰς Λεύκιον Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἀζηνιέα, Δημήτριον Ἀρτε-  
μιδώρου Λαμπτρέα, Διότιμον Δημητρίου Κηφισιέα, Φίλιππον  
Φιλίππου Ἰκαριέα· τύχη ἀγαθῆι, δεδόχθαι τῶ κοινῶι τῶν Σωτηρι-  
αστῶν, ὦν ἀρχερανιστῆς Διόδωρος Σωκράτους Ἀφιδναῖος, <ἐπαινεῖσαι  
Διόδωρον Σωκράτους Ἀφιδναῖον> καὶ  
στεφανῶσαι θαλλοῦ στεφάνῳι ἐφ' ἧ ἔσχηκεν πρὸς τὴν σύνοδον  
35 ἀδιαλίπτῳι φιλοτιμίᾳ· στεφανοῦσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν καθ' ἕκα[σ]-  
τον ἐνιαυτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀεὶ ἐσομένου ταμίου καθὼς καὶ οἱ  
ἱερεῖς καὶ ὁ ἀρχερανιστῆς· ἀναγορεύεσθαι δὲ ὅτι τὸ κοι-  
νὸν τῶν Σωτηριαστῶν στεφανοῖ Διόδωρον κατὰ τὸ δό-  
γμα· ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ δόγμα εἰς στήλην λιθίνην  
40 καὶ ἀναθῆναι ἐν τῶι τεμένει τῆς Σωτείας, ἵνα τούτων

- συντελουμένων πολλοὶ ζηλωταὶ γίνονται τὴν  
 [τὴν] σύνοδον ἐπαύξειν, βλέποντες τὸν κτίσαντα τυγ-  
 χάνοντα τῆς προποῦσης εὐνοίας τε καὶ μνήμης.  
 Λεύκιος Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἀζηγιεὺς εἶπεν· ἴν τῶ[ι]ν ψή-  
 45 φων αἶς ἐδόκει τόδε τὸ δόγμα κύριον εἶναι, ἐξήκον[τα].  
 αἶς δὲ οὐκ ἐδόκει οὐδεμία.

*In a crown*

(The *koinon* has honored)

Diodoros son of Sokrates

of (the deme) Aphidnai.

- 6 In the year that Theopeithes was archon, Mounichion six: Whereas Diodoros son of Sokrates of Aphidnai has continued to be well-disposed to the *koinon* of *Soteriastai*, doing in both word and deed what is beneficial for the *synodos*; and (whereas) he shared responsibility for the initial gathering (*sylogē*) and, having also created the *synodos*, he remained as its *archeranistēs*; and having served as treasurer in the year that Euthydomos was archon, he presided over the foundation of the *synodos*. During the year that Nikander was archon he continually exerted himself as treasurer and similarly he enhanced the common funds. Tirelessly he made himself available and in the year that Diokles of Melite was archon, as he served as treasurer, he did what is right to the fullest; and as to the present, in the year that Kallikratides was archon, serving as treasurer, he has showed earnestness and zeal in respect to the association. And when he was appointed as priest of (Artemis) Soteira during the year that Menandros was archon, he sacrificed with favorable omens and, not being addicted to money, he hosted the *eranistai* members at his own expense, spending not a little money. On account of all these things, the *synodos*, having been the beneficiaries of his assiduousness and zeal, proposed unanimously that those who are to introduce (motions) on their behalf – Lucios son of Artemidoros of (the deme) Azenia, Demetrios son of Artemidoros of Lamprai, Diotimos son of Demetrios of Kephisia, and Philippos son of Philippos of Ikarion – (to bestow) the appropriate honors.
- 32 For good fortune, it was resolved by the *koinon* of the *Soteriastai*, whose *archeranistes* is Diodoros son of Sokrates of Aphidna, «to commend Diodoros son of Sokrates of Aphidna» and to crown him with an olive wreath on account of the zeal that he has continually shown for the *synodos*. He is to be crowned yearly by whoever happens to be the treasurer in the same way that the priests and the *archeranistes* (are crowned). There shall be a proclamation, that “the *koinon* of the *Soterastai* crowns Diodoros in accordance with this decision (*dogma*).” This decision shall be inscribed on a stele and set up in the sacred enclosure of Soteira, so that when these

things have been completed, all members might be zealous to enhance the *synodos*, seeing that its founder obtained a fitting token of good will and memorial. Leukios son of Artemidoros of Azenia proposed the motion: Those in favour of enacting the decision: sixty. Those opposed: none.

### Notes

- I. 6: ἐπὶ Θεοπείθου ἄρχοντος: i.e., 37/6 BCE or 36/5 BCE (Dinsmoor 1931, 280). Theopeithes is also known from *Hesperia* 36 (1967) 94–95 (no. 23) and *Hesperia* 9 (1940) 86–96 (no. 17). The dating of this period of the Athenian archon list is somewhat uncertain. A list from Delos (*ID* 2632) gives the following sequence of archons:

Demetrios, Demochares, Diokles (τοῦ μετὰ Φι[λοκρά]τη[ν]), Eukles, Diokles, Nikandros, Philostratos – – –, Menandros, Kallikratides – – –, Apollogenes, Kleidamos.

*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1043*, a list of ephebes, confirms that Kallikratides followed Menandros, contrary to the impression left by *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1343*, which seems to put Menandros after Kallikratides. According to Dinsmoor (1931, 284) the proper sequence of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1343* should be Euthydomos, Nikandros, Diokles of Melite, Kallikratides, Menandros and Theopeithes. The dating of Euthydomos to 42/41 BCE and Menandros at 38/37 BCE is secure from other inscriptions (Dinsmoor 1931, 284). This yields the following chronology:

42/41: Diodoros as treasurer (archon: Euthydomos); foundation of the *synodos*

41/40: treasurer (archon: Nikandros)

40/39: nothing reported (archon: Philostratos)

39/38 treasurer (archon: Diokles of Melite)

38/37 priest (archon: Menandros)

37/36 treasurer (archon: Kallikratides)

36/35 decree (archon: Theopeithes, 37/6 or 36/5)

- II. 7–8, 33, 47–48: [Δι]όδωρος Σωκράτου Ἀφ[ι]δναῖος; *PAI* 3304900; *LGPV* 2:118[59].
- I. 11: συλλογῆς: The formula ἐπεμελήθησαν δὲ καὶ τῆς συλλογῆς τῆς τε βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου is extremely common in civic inscriptions from Athens.
- I. 12: τὴν σύνοδον αὐτὸς κτίσας. See other statements that seem to imply the founding of an association, normally with συνάγειν or φέρειν: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1012.13–15* [42]: ταμίῃας ναυκλήρων καὶ ἐμπόρων τῶν φε||ρόντων τὴν σύνοδον τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ | Ξενίου; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1326. 6–7* [36]: τοὺς τὴν | σύνοδον φέροντας τῷ θεῷ; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1366.21*: τοὺς δὲ βουλομένους ἔρανον συνάγειν Μηνί Τυράννοι ἐπ' ἀγαθῆι τύ[χη]; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1369.26–27*: ἔρανον σύναγον φίλοι ἄνδρες; *IG VII 3376* (Boeotia, II BCE): ἐξενεγκάτω δὲ Σώσων τὸν | ἔρανον, ὃν συνάγαγε Θεῶν ἐμ Φανατεῖ; *IG XI/4 1227* (Delos, III/II BCE): τὸ κοινὸν τῶν δεκαδιστῶν καὶ | δεκαδιστριῶν ὧν συνήγαγεν | Ἀρίστων Σαράπιδι, Ἴσιδι, Ἀνούβιδι, | θεοῖς συννάοις; *ID 2225* (Delos, II BCE): Διονύσιος Ἐρμογένου Ἀ[λεξάνδρου]ς | ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ τὸ ἄγαλμα [καὶ τὸ θυμ]ιατήριον καὶ τὴν λιβανωτίδα, ἀ[πὸ τῶν? θι]ασιτῶν Ἀγνῆς Θεοῦ οὖς συνήγα[γε]. With other verbs: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1322.1–2* (Rhamnous, III/II BCE): Διοκλῆς συνήχε τῷ Ἀμφιαράωι σύνοδον.
- II. 12–13: ἀρχεραμιστής → Arnaoutoglou 1994b.
- II. 13–14: ἐπὶ Εὐθυδόμου ἄρχοντος: i.e., 42/41 BCE (Dinsmoor 1931, 280, 285).

- l. 17: ἐπὶ Νικάνδρου ἄρχοντος: i.e., 41/40 BCE (Dinsmoor 1931, 280, 284).
- l. 18: εὐξήσεν τὰ κοινά, apparently a mistake for αὐξήσεν τὰ κοινά. See *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1326.11 [36] ἐπιύξήσεν.
- ll. 19–20: ἐπὶ Διοκλέους | Μελιτέως ἄρχοντος: i.e., 39/38 BCE (Dinsmoor 1931, 280, 284).
- l. 22: ἐπὶ Καλλικρατίδου ἄρχοντος: i.e., 37/36 BCE (Dinsmoor 1931, 280).
- l. 25: ἐπὶ Μενάνδρου ἄρχοντος: i.e., 38/37 BCE (Dinsmoor 1931, 286).
- l. 25: ἐκαλλιέρησεν, “obtained good omens” → *AM* 66:228.4–5 [40] *note*.
- ll. 28–29: ὁμοθυμαδόν, “unanimously.” See the other instances of this cited in Thomas Drew–Bear, “Deux décrets hellénistiques d’Asie Mineure,” *BCH* 96/1 (1972): 435–71, here 452.
- l. 30, 44: Λεύκιον Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἀζηνιέα: *PAA* 604110; *LGPN* 2:281[27].
- l. 30–31: Δημήτριον Ἀρτεμιδώρου Λαμπτρέα: *PAA* 311220; *LGPN* 2:106[341].
- l. 31: Διότιμον Δημητρίου Κηφισιέα: *PAA* 365930; *LGPN* 2:131[51].
- l. 32: Φίλιππον | Φιλίππου Ἰκαριέα: *PAA* 930010; *LGPN* 2:450[77–78].
- l. 37: ἀναγορεύεσθαι → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1263.37–38 [11] *note*.
- ll. 38–39, 45: τὸ δόγμα: Arnaoutoglou 2003, 126 notes that from the first century BCE δόγμα appears in Athenian cult inscriptions and “means, almost always, decision.”
- ll. 45–46: On voting, see also *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369.20–24 [49].

### Comments

Although the find spot of this inscription, near the temple of Artemis Sotereia outside the Dipylon Gate, was also the site where *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1298 [20] and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1297 [24] were discovered, the latter association was a non-citizen group which designated its members as *thiasōtai*. The group reflected in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1343, by contrast, is a citizen group which referred its members as Σωτηριασταί and ἐρανισταί. As the inscription makes clear, moreover, this is a *new* foundation attributed to the initiative of the honoree, Diodoros son of Sokrates, an Athenian demesman.

The inscription details the contributions of the honoree over a lengthy period, from the foundation of the association in or around 42/41 BCE at which time he was the treasurer until his appointment as priest in 38/7 BCE and the decree one or two years later. The sequence implied by the inscription is puzzling, since it appears to put Diodoros’ appointment as priest (during the year Menandros was archon) at the end of the sequence even though in fact Kallikratides’ archonship, during which the inscription lists Diodoros again as a treasurer, followed the archonship of Menandros. One wonders whether the dates of Diodoros’ priesthood have been confused.

The inscription illustrates some of the internal dynamics of an association. It is evident that Diodoros was a person of means and influence, having initially been involved in the founding of the association and from its foundation served as treasurer during which time the association’s funds were in-

creased. He is honored for having hosted (at their monthly banquets?) the association for an entire year at his own expense (l. 26: ἡστίασεν τοὺς ἔρανιστάς ἐκ τῶ[ι]ν ἰδίων).

The claims that Diodoros had “created the *synodos*” (l. 12: τὴν σύνοδον αὐτὸς κτίσας) and that he “presided over the founding of the *synodos*” (ll. 14–15: προεστάτησεν τοῦ θεμελιωθῆναι τὴν σύνοδον), in spite of the possibility of some exaggeration, should perhaps be taken more seriously than statements such as *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1322.1–2* (Rhamnous, III/II BCE) concerning the convocation of a *synodos* (Διοκλήης συνῆ|χε τῶι Ἀμφιαράωι σύνοδον) since, as Arnaoutoglou has rightly observed, the latter seems more a case of “preventing [an association] from falling apart and disappearing” (2003, 95). In other such statements (→ l. 12 *note*) συνάγειν with ἔρανον or θίασον might also mean simply to “assemble” rather than to “found”; in the case of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1343*, however, the combination of κτίσας and θεμελιωθῆναι τὴν σύνοδον suggests a stronger role for Diodoros.

Finally, the size of the association is to be noted: a membership of sixty does not make this association equal with the largest associations (→ *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2358* [40]: 94 members; *AJA* 64:269 = *SEG* 54:235: 130 members), but it appears to be comparable in size to many Attic associations.

**Literature:** Arnaoutoglou 1994b; Ferguson 1907; Parker 1996, 342.

## [49] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1369* A *Nomos* of *eranistai* regulating admission and discipline

Liopesi (modern Painia) (Attica)

II CE

Published: Boeckh, *CIG* I 126; Foucart 1873, 202 (no. 20); Wilhelm 1896a, 231–235 (facsimile); Dittenberger, *IG III* 23; Michel, *RIG* 1563; Prott and Ziehen, *LGS* II 47; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1369*; Sokolowski, *LSCG* 104–5 (no. 53) (Poland A50).

Publication Used: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1369* assimilated to *LSCG* 53.

Current Location: no longer extant.

Similar Inscriptions: → *SEG* 31:122 [50]?

A text copied by Abbe Michel Fourmont (1690–1746) during his trip to Greece (1729–30). The stone was found at Liopesi at the eastern base of Mount Hymettus, 16 km. east of Athens. No other description of the stone is available in the secondary literature, except to point out that, for the most part, the first twenty-two lines are fragmentary and it is not possible to restore them with any certainty. It seems to have contained a poem (cf. Georg Kaibel, *Epigrammata graeca ex lapidibus colecta* [Berlin: G. Reimer, 1878] 507–8 no. 1128).

18 [εἰς?] μνήμην φθιμένοις καὶ ἀλλήλους ἀν-  
[έθηκ]αν

20 -----  
-----  
-----  
-----

ἄρχων μὲν Ταύρισκος, ἀτὰρ μὴν Μου-  
25 νιχιῶν ἦν,

ὄκτ[ω]καιδεκάτῃ δ' ἔρανον σύναγον  
φίλοι ἄνδρες

καὶ κοινῇ βουλῇ θεσμὸν φιλίης ὑπέ-  
γραψαν.

30 νόμος ἔρανιστῶν.

[μη]δενὶ ἐξέστω ἰσι[έν]αι ἰς τὴν σεμνοτάτην  
σύνοδον τῶν ἔρανιστῶν πρὶν ἂν δοκι-

μασθῆ εἴ ἐστι ἀ[γν]ὸς καὶ εὐσεβῆς καὶ ἀγ-  
α[θ]ός· δοκιμα[ζέ]τω δὲ ὁ προστάτης [καὶ]

35 [ὁ] ἀρχιεραγιστῆς καὶ ὁ γ[ρ]αμματεὺς κα[ὶ]

[οἱ] ταμίαι καὶ σύνδικοι· ἔστωσαν δὲ ο[ὗ]-

[τ]οι κληρωτοὶ κατὰ ἔ[το]ς χωρὶς πρ[ο]σπρ[ο]στάτ[ου].

ὁμολείτωρ δὲ ἔ[[ι]στω δ[ι]ὰ βίου αὐτο[ῦ]

ὁ ἐπὶ ἡρώου καταλιφθεὶς· ἀύξανέτω δ[ὲ]

40 ὁ ἔρανος ἐπὶ φιλοτειμίαις· εἰ δὲ τις μά-

χας ἢ θορύβους κεινῶν φαίνοιτο,

ἐκβαλλέσθω τοῦ ἔρανου ζημιού-

μενος [[ε]] Ἄττ[ι]καῖς κέ ἢ πλῆγαῖς αἰκ[[αικ]]ιζό-

μενος ταῖς διπλαῖς πέ[[τ]ρα κρίσεως.

18 ... set up this in memory of the dead and the others.

<the next lines are too damaged to translate>

24 In the year that Tauriskos was archon, in the month of Mounichion on the eighteenth day, the male friends convened a club (*eranos*) and by common council subscribed to an ordinance of friendship.

30 The law (*nomos*) of the *eranistai*.

It is not lawful for anyone to enter this most holy assembly of *eranistai* without being first examined as to whether he is pure and pious and good. Let the president (*prostatēs*) and the *archeranistēs*, and the secretary, and the treasurers and the syndics examine (the candidate). And except for the president, let these be chosen by lot each year. The one who has been entrusted with (the tomb of) the hero shall be the liturgist for his lifetime. May the club increase because of the zealousness (of its members). But if anyone of those should be seen where fighting or disturbances occur, he



shall be expelled from the club (*eranos*), being fined twenty-five Attic drachmae or being punished with double the blows in addition to judgment (?).

### Notes

1. 18: φθιμένοις, “the dead”: cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 5552a: νυνὶ δὲ <φ>θιμένοι κείμεθα γῆς ἀφανεῖς; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 6214.7–8: τὴν πάντων κοινὴν μοῖραν [ἔχει] | φθιμενος, etc.
1. 24: ἄρχων μὲν Ταύρισκος: The date of the archon Tauriskos (*PAA* 875910) is unknown but the inscription has been dated to the imperial period (Foucart 1873, 202), and the “fin du II<sup>e</sup> siècle” (Sokolowski 1969, 104; which Robert 1979, 154 describes as “sans justification”). The name is also attested on a gravestone *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 12762–63 (imperial period) (*PAA* 875915) but as Graindor 1922b, 275 notes, “on ne peut... songer à identifier l’archonte ave le père d’Apollônis cité dans [CIA] III, 1483 [= *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 5290], ni avec le Tauri[sk]os de 3380 [*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 12762–63]: ces deux personnages, connue seulement par deux modestes colonnettes funéraires, n’ont sans doute rien de commun ave l’archonte.” A list of donors, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2776.106 (ca. 117–138 CE) names Ἀσκληπίας Ταυρίσκου. If the Tauriskos is the same as that in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369, Tauriskos would belong to the early II CE. But as Graindor 1922b, 274–75 notes, nothing is known of this person.
1. 27: φίλοι ἄνδρες → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1275.7 [8] note.
1. 30: νόμος ἐρανιστῶν → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1278.2 [17] note.
1. 31: σεμνοτάτη is commonly attested in Athenian inscriptions of the Imperial period, “used of the Panhellenes (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1088 [restored], 1090, 3626, 3627 [restored]), of the synod of the *eranistai* (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369), of the Council of the five hundred (or of the 750) (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1817; 3579; 3638; 3680; 3735; 3962), the Council of the Areopagos (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2773; 3571; 3637; 3656; 3667; 3817). It is also applied to the People (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3625), to individuals or individual magistrates (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3198; 3802; 4067), and to the city itself (*Hesperia* 10 [1941] no. 37, p. 87)” (Geagan 1967, 171). It is also attested in the titles of some associations in Asia: e.g., *IMiletos* 358 (Miletos, imperial period) τὸ οἰκουμενικὸν καὶ σεμνοτάτον συνέδριον τῶν λινοῦργῶν, “the world-wide and most holy *synedrion* of wool-workers”; *Alt.v.Hierapolis* 40.1-3 (Hierapolis, imperial period): ἡ σεμνοτάτη | ἐργασία τῶν | ἐριοπλῦτῶν, “the most holy association of wool dealers”; 42.5-7 (Hierapolis, imperial period): ἡ σεμνοτάτη ἐργασία τῶν πορφυραβάρων, “the most holy association of purple-dyers”; *BCH* 2 (1878) 593,1A.5-7 (Lycia): ἡ σεμνοτάτη | συνεργασία τῶν σκυτοβυρσείων, “the most holy association of leather-workers.”
- II. 31–34: [μη]δενὶ ἐξέστω ἰσι[έν]αι ἰς τὴν σεμνοτάτην | σύνοδον τῶν ἐρανιστῶν πρὶν ἂν δοκιμασθῆ ἔϊ ἐστι ἀ[γν]ῶς καὶ εὐσεβῆς καὶ ἀγ[α]θ[ῆ]ός. On the requirements for exhibiting moral as well as cultic purity → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1365/1366 [53] *Comment*.
1. 34: δοκιμα[ζέ]τω: On the vetting and approval of new members → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361.23, 24 [4] (Piraeus, 330–324/3 BCE); *SEG* 31:122.5 [50] (Liopesi, ca. 100 ce); *IG* V/1 1390.71 (Andania [Messenia], 92/1 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1368.35–38 [51] (Athens, 164/65 CE): δοκιμασθῆ ὑπὸ τῶν ἰοβάκων ψή[φ]ω, εἰ ἄξιος φαίνοιτο καὶ ἐπιτήδειος | τῷ Βακχεῖω; *IG* VII 2808.b.9–12 (Hyettus [Boeotia], after 212 CE). Robert (1979, 155) cites as an example of an examination *AM* 32 (1907) 295–97 (no. 18).4–11 (Pergamon: εἰάν δοκιμασθῶσι[ν ὑπὸ τῶν συμφώ(?)]|νων, οὕτως μετέχειν τοῦ συνεδρίου.... ὁμοίως δὲ εἰσέρχεσθαι τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν μετεχόντων, δοκιμασθέντας μὲν καὶ αὐτοῦς, διδόντας δὲ εἰση|λύσιον (δην.) ν’, εἴ γε αὐτῶν οἱ πατέρες πρὸ πενταετίας

- με||τεῖχον τοῦ συστήματος, “If they have been examined by the *sumphonoι*, they may join the association (*synedrion*).... Likewise the sons of members (may) come, after having been examined and paying the entrance fee of 50 drachmae, if their fathers were members of the association (*systema*) for five years.”
1. 34: ὁ προστάτης → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1368.13 [51] (Athens, 164/65 CE) *note*. San Nicolò 1972, 1:219: “Daraus läßt sich entnehmen, daß der προστάτης an der Spitze des Vereins steht und sein Amt διὰ βίου innehält, während der ἀρχεραμιστής wie die anderen Beamten jährlich gewählt werden.” San Nicolò rejects the suggestion that the προστάτης was merely an honorary president while the ἀρχεραμιστής was the effective president. He cites *IG* XII/1 155.II.4–43 (Rhodes, II BCE) where an ἀρχεραμιστής is also recognized as εὐεργέτης.
1. 35: ἀρχ||τι]εραμιστής → Arnaoutoglou 1994b.
1. 36: σύνδικοι: In the government of Athens the syndics were originally a body of five public advocates appointed to defend traditional laws when new laws to supplant them were proposed. The function of the *syndikoi* in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369 is unclear.
1. 38: ὁμολείτωρ: “liturgist.” Wilhelm (1896a, 234) and Sokolowski (1969, 105) suggest that the term means the same as συλλειτουργός. Masson (1963, 217) suggests some Boeotian influence: “La forme la plus ancienne paraît être λίτωρ avec un ἔ ancien confirmé par ἀλήτωρ, etc.; c’est elle qui apparaît en Arcadie – appellatif ou non propre – comme on vient de le rappeler. En Thessalie, \*λείτωρ ou \*λείτωρ est attesté par le verbe λειτορεύω, dont on possède de nombreux exemples, *IG* IX/2 1228 (Phalanna, III<sup>e</sup> siècle), etc. En Béotie, on a des traces convergentes pour l’existence de ce groupe, grâce au témoignage de la glose d’Hésychius λείπειραι-ίρειαι, qui est d’aspect béotien, et peut-être avec l’emploi en attique récent de λείτωρ, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4817.25 (II<sup>e</sup>/III<sup>e</sup> siècle de notre ère), et ὁμολείτωρ, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369.38 (même époque).” *AM* 69, 9,9 (= *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4817) (II/III CE) records a list of officials, including priests: οἱ περὶ τὸν ἐπόνυμον Ἀριστόβουλον | Κολαινίδι τὰ – – – – – | ἀγαθὴ τύχη || ἐπόνυμος ὡς Ἀριστόβουλος | Ἀριστόβουλος ὡς νεκ(ώτερος) | ἱερεὺς ὡς Πρεῖμιος | Γλαύκη ὡς εἰρία | πατήρ ὡς Ἰππαρχος | μήτηρ ὡς Ἐρβία || Ἐπαφροδίτειος Ο – – – ΦΙ? – | γραμματεὺς Ἀττικὸς | Εἰρηναῖος | ⋯ δότης Κόβ[ι]ωνος | [ ]τεια || Πειρεὺς | Μάτρων | Ἀγαθήμερος ὡς – – – – Ο? | Εὐφράντα | Θεόφραστος || Εὐτύχη Ε – – – | Εὐπόρος Ἀνδροκλέως | Φαυστεῖν[α] | *vac.* | Συμφέρων | *vac.* | εὐτυχεῖτω ὁ χαράξας. | <on the lower moulding> | Ἄρωγος λείτωρ(γος). The facts that this figure appears low on the list, after the προστάτης, ἀρχεραμιστής, γραμματεὺς, ταμίαι and σύνδικοι, and that he is likely a slave or freedman probably means that this is a minor figure.
1. 39: ὁ ἐπὶ ἡρώου καταλιφθείς: Sokolowski (1969, 105) suggests that ἡρῶον may be the tomb of the founder. Ὁ ἐπὶ ἡρώου καταλιφθείς must be the appointed guardian, probably a slave or freedman. In Diogenes Laertius 5.54 Theophrastos’ will made provision for the maintenance of his tomb by two emancipated slaves, Pampilos and Threpta. *ICosED* 149 (Cos, late IV– ca. 280 BCE), the foundation of Diomedon, also includes a manumission for the purpose of caring for a tomb and sacred buildings: [Διομέδων ἀνέθηκ]ε τὸ τέμενος [τόδε] | Ἡρακλεῖ Δ[ιομε]δοντειῶι, ἀνέθηκε δ[ε] | καὶ τοὺς ξενώνας τοὺς ἐν τῷ κάπῳ | καὶ τὰ οἰκημάτια καὶ Λίβυν καὶ τὰ ἔγγονα αὐτοῦ· ἐόντων δὲ ἐλευθέροι[ι] ποιοῦντες τὰ συντεταγμένα· ἐπιμελέσθων δὲ αὐτῶν τοῖ τῶν ἱερῶν κοινωνεῦντες ὅπως | ἐλευθέροι ὄντες διατελέωνται καὶ μηθε[ι]||ς αὐτοὺς ἀδικῆι. θυόντων δὲ τὰ ἱερά τοῖ ἐγ [Δι]||[ο]μέδων{δον}τος καὶ αἰε τοῖ ἐξ αὐτῶν γε[ν]||[ό]μενοι· ἐχέτω δὲ Λίβυς καὶ τοῖ ἐγ Λίβυος μισθοῦ τὸν κάπον...”, “Diomedon dedicated this sacred enclosure to Herakles Diomedonteios, and he also dedicated the guest

chambers that are in the garden and the chambers and Libys and his offspring. Let them be free doing what has been commanded. Let those who share in the sacred rites look after them so that they will be free to continue (to do this) and no one should harm them. Let the descendants of Diomedon make the sacrifices and those descended from these. Let Libys and those of Libys have the garden a rent of...". Wilhelm (1896a, 233) cites a testamentary manumission: Petersen-Luschan, *Reisen II* 36 (no. 56.4–14; Myra [Lykia]): οὐδὲ || ἀλλαγῆ οἰκῆσαι, | μένειν δὲ ἐν τῷ ἡρώ|ω καὶ αὐτοὺς ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν | αὐτοῦ πάσαν· οἱ καὶ || ἐχέτωσαν τὴν χρῆ|σιν τοῦ περιτετε|χισμένου κηπίου | καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ οἰ|κημάτων, “nor shall they change where they live, but shall remain at the *heroon* and take care of everything pertaining to it; and they shall also have the use of the enclosed garden and the buildings in it.” Bömer 1958–1963, 2:78–79 also cites *MAMA VIII* 413e.20–23 (Aphrodisias [Caria], 117–38 CE): τὴν δὲ ὑπηρεσίαν καὶ ἐπιμέλει|[ι]αν τῶν ἐν τῷ θυηπολείῳ βού|λο|[μ]αι ποιεῖσθαι εἰς τὸ δηνεκέες [Ἵ]νῆσιμον τὸν ἀπελευθερόν μο|υ,], “I wish that Onesimos my freedman undertake the service and care of what is on the altar in perpetuity.”

- I. 40: ἐπὶ φιλοτιμίαις (Boeckh; Dittenberger; Wilhelm; Ziehen; Sokolowski). Kirchner and Michel read ἐπιφιλοτιμίαις, and LSJ treated this as a *hapax* with the possible meaning “endowment” but the Supplement now has deleted the entry. Robert (1979, 159) also cites *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2361.60–61 [52]*: ἱερασαμένη τὸ β' | ἐπὶ ταῖς αὐταῖς φιλοτιμι(αῖς) in a list of priestesses, where he comments “Elle a assumé la prêtrise en faisant la même promesse de libéralités comme *summa honoraria*.” He concludes: Ainsi chez les éranistes à Liopesi... il était prescrit que dorénavant le nombre des éranistes serait augmenté par l'admission de postulants qui auraient fait la promesse de générosités pour leur entrée dans l'association, αὐξασάντω δὲ ὁ ἔρανος ἐπὶ φιλοτιμίαις; c'était une condition. Il faut renoncer à l'*hapax* ἐπιφιλοτιμία, *endowment*, et revenir à l'ancienne lecture maintenant expliquée.”

I. 41: κεινῶν, i.e., ἐκεινῶν.

- II. 43–44: Ἄττ[ι]καῖς κε? ἢ πληγαῖς αἰκ[αυ]ζόμενος ταῖς διπλαῖς πέ[τ]ρα κρίσεως. A fine of 25 Attic drachmae for fighting is also mentioned in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1368.82 [51]* and in *SEG 31:122 [50]* the fine is 10 drachmae. The distinction between a monetary fine and physical punishment points to the presence in the association of slaves, who are subject to physical punishment. Freeborn members pay a fine.

### Comments

The relationship of this inscription to *SEG 31:122 [50]*, found at the same site, is controverted. Raubitschek (1981, 95–96) thinks that the two are related but Arnaoutoglou (2003, 83) points out that *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1369* is a decision of the φίλοι ἄνδρες (I. 27) while *SEG 31:122* is a decision of the *archeranistēs*; whereas the latter is deeply concerned with the regulation of financial life, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1369* “is brief and regulates essential parameters of the associative life”; and there are important differences between the two associations: *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1369* mentions multiple treasurers and entrance to the association involves only an examination (I. 34: δοκιμα[ζέ]τω) by a board consisting of the *prostatēs*, *archeranistēs*, secretary, treasurers (pl.), and syndics, while *SEG 31:122* has a single treasurer and levies an entrance fee for new members, but fails to mention an

examination. The only common denominator is the mention of an *arch-eranistēs*, which of course is common to many societies.

That this is the foundational document of an association is demonstrated by its reference to the establishing of an “ordinance of friendship” (L. 27), that is, the law of the *eranistai* (cf. ll. 27–28). Wilhelm (1896a, 232) thought this to be an *eranos* of ἡρωϊσταί (cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1339 [46]). Sokolowski (1969, 104) suggested that the inscription was the rule of a funerary association (cf. l. 39). At the very least, one of its functions seems to have been to maintain the tomb of the “hero” (founder?). Nevertheless, this does not seem to be the only function. On the contrary, the club has a fairly complicated hierarchy, with a president, *archeranistēs*, secretary, treasurers (plural!) and syndics as well as the slave (?) appointed to care for the hero’s tomb. The reference to fighting and fines suggests that a banquet was held at regular intervals. Since the association was called an *eranos* it may have functioned to defray the costs of the funerals of its members.

While recruitment to clubs from earlier periods seems to have involved only the payment of a fee (e.g., *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1361.20–23 [4]), *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369 implies a moral examination of candidates for membership and in this respect resembles *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1368.35–38 [51] from the same era, which stipulates that a new member must be “approved by a vote of the Iobakchoi if he appears to be worthy and suitable for the Bakcheion” (δοκιμασθῆν ὑπὸ τῶν ἰοβάκχων ψή|φω, εἰ ἄξιος φαίνοιτο καὶ ἐπιτήδειος |τῷ Βακχείῳ). The initiation process for entrance into this club is based on an examination of the life of the initiate, whether he has evidenced piety (ἀγνός and εὐσεβής) and goodness (ἀγαθός). A council of members, selected yearly by lot, oversaw this examination process.

Two of the club officials, the president/patron and “liturgist,” enjoyed a lifetime appointment. But this honor was likely for different reasons. The “liturgist” was in all probability a slave or freedman who had been freed on the condition that he maintained the tomb of the owner (→ above l. 39 *note*). The “president/patron” by contrast enjoyed this lifetime appointment because of the benefactions and largess that he had shown, or because he was a near relative of the deceased “hero.”

**Literature:** Arnaoutoglou 1994b; 2003, 83–84, 96–97, 125–127; Bömer 1958–1963, 2:79–80; Masson 1963, 217; Raubitschek 1981; Robert 1979; San Nicolò 1972, 1:218; Ziebarth 1896, 37.

[50] SEG 31:122  
 A *Nomos* of *eranistai*  
 regulating sacrifice and discipline

Liopesi (modern Paiania) (Attica)

early II CE

Published: A.E. Raubitschek, "A New Attic Club (ERANOS)," *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 9 (1981) 93–98 (SEG 31:122); Lupu, *NGSL* 177–190 (no. 5) (ph.).

Current Location: Getty Museum (Malibu, Calif.) inv. 78.AA.377

Similar inscriptions: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369 [49] (Liopesi, II CE)?

Two fragments of Pentelic marble, 74.5 x 43–44.7 x 4.7–7.5 cm. Letter height: ca. 1.0 cm. The plaque has a pediment with three akroteria, one centered and the other two on the outer angles. There is a shield in the pediment. The inscription is reported to have been found at Liopesi (the site of the deme Paiania). The base is a roughly cut tenon that could be inserted into a socket base. The first 36 lines are cut by one cutter, ll. 37–46 by a second, who has also corrected ll. 3, 13, 21, 24, 32 and 35. The second cutter used Σ instead of Λ and as punctuation, the *diple* (´) instead of anti-sigma + sigma (´). The second cutter also used I in place of EI. (Raubitschek 1981, 93).

- ἀγαθῆ τύχη· ἐπὶ Τίτου Φλαβίου Κόνωνος ἄρχοντο-  
 σ καὶ ἱερέως Δρούσου ὑπάτου, Μουνιχιῶνος ὀκτώ  
 καὶ δεκάτη· ἔδοξεν τῷ ἀρχεραμιστῆ [[Μάρκῳ]] Αἰμιλίῳ  
 Εὐχαρίστῳ Παιανιεῖ συνόδου τῆς τῶν Ἑρακλιαστῶν τῶν  
 5 ἐν Λίμναις ὅτι τάδε δοκματίσαι· ἐὰν τις ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ  
 μάχην ποιήσῃ, τῇ ἐχομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀποτινέτω προστείμ-  
 ου ὁ μὲν ἀρξάμενος δραχμὰς δέκα ὁ δὲ ἐξακολουθ-  
 ῆσας δραχμὰς πέντε καὶ ἐξάνανκα πραττέσθω τῶν σ-  
 [υ]νεραμιστῶν ψήφον λαβόντων ἐκβιβάσαι τῆς δὲ ἐνθήκ-  
 10 ης τῆς τεθείσης ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχεραμιστοῦ καὶ ὅση ἂν ἄλλη ἐν-  
 θήκη ἐπισυναχθῆ, ταύτης μηθεὶς κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον ἀπ-  
 [έ]σθω πλείω τοῦ τόκου τοῦ πεσομένου ὅτι μὴ πλέω δὲ δαπανάτ-  
 [ω] ὁ ταμίας δραχμῶν [[Τ· ἔδοξε]] ἐκ τοῦ τόκου ὅτι ἐὰν δέ τι πλείων-  
 [ο]ς ἄνηται ἢ ἐκ τῆς ἐνθήκης ἢ ἐκ τοῦ τόκου ἀποτινέτω προσ-  
 15 [τ]είμου τὸ τριπλοῦν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἂν ταμιεύσας τις ἐπιδειχθῆ  
 [ν]ενοσφισμένος ἀποτινέτω τὸ τριπλοῦν· περὶ δὲ ἱερωσυν-  
 [ῶ]ν ὧν ἂν τις ἀγοράσῃ παραχρήμα κατατιθέσθω ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἐχ-  
 [ο]μένῳ ἐνιαυτῷ αὐτῷ τῷ ἀρχεραμιστῆ, καὶ λαμβανέτω πρόσ-  
 [γ]ραφον παρὰ τοῦ ἀρχεραμιστοῦ, λαμβάνων δὲ ἐξ ἔθους τὰ διπλά  
 20 [μ]έρη ἐκτὸς τοῦ οἴνου· οἱ δὲ ἐργολαβήσαντες οὐκὸν ἢ οἰνικὸν μ-  
 ἢ ἀποκαταστήσαντες ἐν ᾧ δειπν[οῦ]σιν ἐνιαυτῷ ἀποτινέτω-  
 σαν τὸ διπλοῦν· οἱ δὲ ἐργολαβοῦντες ἐγγυητὰς εὐαρέστους

- παρατιθέτωσαν τῷ ταμίᾳ καὶ τῷ ἀρχεραμιστῇ· καταστάνεσθαι δὲ γ' ἄνθρωποις γ'. διδότησαν δὲ τὴν σιμίδαλιν πάντες τῇ δημοσίᾳ χροίνικι [·?]. ἐγδιδόσθαι δὲ καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ ταμ[ιο]υ θύμα τῷ θεῷ, κάπρον Μ<sup>N</sup> κ' ἔαν δέ τις τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἐράνου τέκνον [Τ].Σ. θέλη ἰσάγην διδότην ὑικοῦ Μ<sup>N</sup> ις', ἔαν δέ τις ἐμβῆναι θέλη διδότην ὑικοῦ Μ<sup>N</sup> λγ'
- 25 ὡν κληρούσθωσαν καὶ ὁ λαχὼν ὑπομένετω· ἔαν δὲ μὴ ὑπομένη ἢ μὴ θέλῃ παννυχιστῆς εἶναι λαχὼν ἀποτινέτω δραχμὰς ἑκατὸν ἔαν δὲ τινες μὴ θέλωσιν πράκτορες ὑπομένειν κληρούσθωσαν ἐκ τοῦ πλήθους δέκα ἔαν δὲ τινες μὴ θέλωσιν πράκτορες ὑπομένειν κληρούσθωσαν ἐκ τοῦ πλήθους δέκα ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἔαν ὁ ταμίᾳς ἀποδιδῶι λόγον ἀγορᾶς γενομένης καταστάνεσθαι ἐγλογιστὰς τρεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἐγλογιστὰς ὁμνύειν αὐτὸν τε τὸν Ἡρακλῆν καὶ Δήμητρα κα[ὶ] Κόρην ἔαν κληρούσθαι δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκάστης ἐπὶ τὰ κρέα ἀνθρώπους δύο ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς σ[τρε]πτούς ἀνθρώπους δύο ἔαν δέ τις τῶν πεπιστευμένων εὐρεθῆ ῥυπαρὸν τ[ῆ] πεποιηκῶς ἀποτινέτω δραχμὰς εἴκοσι αἰρείσθω δὲ ὁ ἀρχεραμιστῆς οὗς ἂν βούληται ἐκ τῆς συνόδου [εἰς τὸ συνεγ]δανίσαι τὴν ἐνθήκην μετ' αὐτοῦ
- 30 ἀνθρώπους γ'. διδότησαν δὲ τὴν σιμίδαλιν πάντες τῇ δημοσίᾳ χροίνικι [·?]. ἐγδιδόσθαι δὲ καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ ταμ[ιο]υ θύμα τῷ θεῷ, κάπρον Μ<sup>N</sup> κ' ἔαν δέ τις τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἐράνου τέκνον [Τ].Σ. θέλη ἰσάγην διδότην ὑικοῦ Μ<sup>N</sup> ις', ἔαν δέ τις ἐμβῆναι θέλη διδότην ὑικοῦ Μ<sup>N</sup> λγ'
- 40 καταβάλλεσθαι δὲ τὸν λόγον ὅταν οἱ ἐγλογισταὶ ὁμόσαντε[ς] ἀποδώσι τῷ ἀρχεραμιστῇ τὸν λόγον καὶ ἐπιδίξωσι εἴ τι ὀφίλι ὁ ταμίᾳς· ξύλα δὲ ἐγδιδόσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ καθ' ἔτος ταμίου ἔαν τὰς δὲ φορὰς καταφέρῃν τῷ ταμίᾳ ἐπάναγκες ἰς τὰς ἐγδόσεις· ὁ δὲ μὴ κατενέγκας ἀποτινέτω τὸ διπλοῦν ἔαν δὲ μὴ δούῃ τὸ κάθολον ἐξέρανος
- 45 ἔστω / μὴ ἐξέστω δὲ τῶν ἐν τῷ ἄλσι ξύλων ἄπτεσθαι ἔαν στέφα- [νο]ν δὲ φέριν τῷ θεῷ ἕκαστον.

For good fortune. In the year that Titus Flavius Conon was archon and the priest of the consul Drusus, on the eighteenth of Mounouchion: It seemed good to [[Marcus]] Aemilius Eucharistos of (the deme) Paiania, the *archeranistēs* of the *synod* of Herakleiaiastai in the Marshes to approve the following (regulations): if someone in the *synod* should cause a fight, on the following day let him pay a fine, the one who initiated the fight, ten drachmae, and whoever joined in, five drachmae. And after his fellow *eranistai* have taken a vote to expel him, let him without fail pay (the fine).

- 9 Concerning the endowment that has been deposited by the *archeranistēs* and whatever other endowment has been collected, let no one in any way whatsoever touch it, beyond the interest that accrues. The treasurer shall not expend more than three hundred drachmae from the interest. If he should lay hold of more or (take) from the endowment, or (more) of the interest, he shall pay a fine of three times (what was taken). Likewise, if a former treasurer has been proved to have put money away for himself let him be fined three times (the value of the misappropriation).

- 16 Concerning the priesthoods: if someone should (agree to) purchase one, let him make the payment straightaway to the *archeranistēs* in the following year and let him receive a receipt from the *archeranistēs*, and receiving in accordance with custom, a double portion, except for the wine. Those who contract for the pork and the wine who do not hand them over during the year that they are providing the dinners shall be fined a double portion. Those who contract (to supply provisions) must present acceptable sureties to the treasurer and the *archeranistēs*. (It is decided that) they shall appoint three able-bodied night watchmen. If any of them should refuse, then let them be selected by lot and whoever is chosen shall accept. If he should not accept or if he does not want to be a night watchman after having been chosen, he shall pay a fine of one hundred drachmae. It is necessary to appoint from the *synodos* ten bailiffs (*praktōres*). If they do not wish to be bailiffs, let ten be chosen by lot from the general membership. Likewise, when the treasurer provides an accounting, after a meeting has been called, they shall appoint three auditors and the auditors shall swear by Herakles and Demeter and Korē.
- 31 They shall choose by lot two men every day (to be) in charge of the meat. Likewise, two men in charge of the rolls. If anyone who is entrusted (with this task) is found to have done something sordid, he shall be fined twenty drachmae. Let the *archeranistēs* choose three people – whoever he wants – from the *synod* to assist him in paying out the endowment. But let all of them give *x choinikes* of fine wheat flour, by the public measure. And each year, the treasurer shall take care that a sacrifice to the god is performed consisting of a boar weighing twenty minas.
- 38 If a member of the *eranos* wishes to initiate his child [– –], let him provide sixteen and one half (?) minas of pork. If someone wants to enter himself, let him provide thirty-three minas (of pork). And let the account be closed when the auditors, having taken an oath, return the accounts to the *archeranistēs*, and indicate whether the treasurer owes anything. Firewood should be supplied by the treasurer each year. The dues must be brought to the treasurer (so that) loans can be made. Whoever does not pay shall be fined a double amount. Whoever does not pay at all shall be expelled from the association (*exeranos*). It shall not be lawful to touch the firewood in the grove. Everyone is to wear a wreath (in honor of) the god.

### Notes

1. 1–2: ἐπὶ Τίτου Φλαβίου Κόνωνος ἄρχοντος καὶ ἱερέως Δρούσου ὑπάτου: see the family tree of Titus Flavius Conon as constructed by Raubitschek (1948). Raubitschek thinks that he was a brother to T. Flavius Sophokles of Sounion, archon for 121/2 CE. T. Flavius Conon (II), the father of T. Flavius Sophokles, is named in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 3952–3953* and probably in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1992.3, 28*, and was archon in 56/7 CE. Follet (1976, 180 n.5), however, suggests that a sixty year interval between Conon II

- and his grandson, T. Flavius Sophokles, is “excessif” and proposes on the basis of *ID* 2535A a date of 100–105 CE for T. Flavius Sophokles. Aleshire 1991, 228–30 notes that *SEG* 31:122 cannot be any later than 121/2 CE, the date of the last known priesthood of Drusus (see I. 2 *note*), but observes that the archonship of T. Flavius Conon (III) might be “before the beginning of *ID* 2535 in A.D. 87/8 or in one of the years missing from *ID* 2535 in the last decade of the first century or the first decade of the second.” Lupu (2005, 183) agrees that Raubitschek’s date is too late but suggests that if Conon is the younger brother or cousin of T. Flavius Sophokles, a date early in the second century is probable. See also Follet 1989.
- I. 2: ἱερέως Δρούσου ὑπάτου, the priest of the consul Drusus. See Geagan 1967, 8, who points out that the “archon eponymos was also the priest of the consul Drusus from the time of the death of Drusus [in 9 BCE] until the reign of Hadrian. The priestly title appeared always in the archon lists, but in other documents it seems not to have been used as regularly during the first century after Christ.” This priesthood is first attested in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1722 (?) and according to Raubitschek (1981, 95) the last attested archon to bear the priesthood of Drusus was T. Flavius Alcibiades (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3589) (122/23 CE).
  - I. 2: Μουνιχιῶν 18 → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369.30 (Liopesi) the νόμος ἐρανιστῶν, also dated to Mounichion 18. Mounichion was, however, a popular month for annual meetings.
  - II. 3–4: [[Μάρκῳ]] Αἰμύλιῳ | Εὐχαρίστῳ Παιανεῖ: *PAA* 634900.
  - II. 3, 10, 18, 34, 41: ἀρχερανιστῆ → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1297.10 [24] *note* and Arnaoutoglou 1994b.
  - I. 3: [[Μάρκῳ]]. The name has been supplied in the erasure by the second cutter. Marcus Aemilius Eucharistos is otherwise unknown. Raubitschek 1981, 95–96: “the fact that this inscription and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369 [49] were both found in [Aemilius’] home deme [Paiania] is significant. One would like to assume that the association, founded or at least controlled by Eucharistos, was located in Paiania, were it not for the fact that it is expressly stated that its location was ἐν Λίμναις (line 5). Under these circumstances it may be best to assume that the two inscriptions were set up in Paiania because Eucharistos was at home there. This would mean that *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369 should also be connected, if not with him, then at least with his son or grandson.” But see the comment on *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369 [49].
  - I. 5: ἐν Λίμναις, “in the marshes.” Raubitschek (1981, 96): “I have not been able to find any place by that name except the famous one with the sanctuary of Dionysos, the location of which ‘still remains an insoluble riddle’” (citing Wycherley 1978, 172). According to Dörpfeld the find spot of the Iobakchoi inscription (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1368 [51]) was a Dionysos sanctuary ἐν Λίμναις, but this site is in Athens, not near Liopesi.
  - I. 5: δογματίσαι: i.e., δογματίσαι.
  - II. 5–9: Provisions to control fighting and other disturbances are not uncommon as is illustrated by *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1368.72–102 [51]; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369.40–43 [49]; *P.Lond.* VII 2183 (Philadelphia, Egypt, I BCE); *P.Mich.* V 243.3 (Tebtunis, I CE); and *CIL* XIV 2112.24–27 (Lanuvium, 136 CE). A fine of 25 Attic drachmae for fighting is levied in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1368.82 and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369.43–44 and in *SEG* 31:122 [50] the fine is 10 drachmae. The distinction in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369 between a monetary fine and physical punishment points to the presence in the association of slaves, who are subject to physical punishment. Freeborn members pay a fine; slaves are beaten.
  - I. 8: ἐξάνανκα for ἐξανάκαια (LSJ 100b). Raubitschek translates this “and without fail let him be (made to be) expelled after his fellow eranistai have cast a vote” which leaves παρατέσθω untranslated. On the adverb, see Threatte 1980–, 2:64.0667.



- II. 8–9: σ[υ]νεραμιστῶν. While the rule is framed as the decision of the *archeranistēs*, it prescribes that decisions to expel members who misconduct themselves be approved by the membership. The term συνεραμιστής is also attested in *IG* Π<sup>2</sup> 2721.4 (Athens, in *horos* inscriptions); *ID* 1800.2–3 (in a dedication); *IG* XII/1 155.46–47 (Rhodes, II BCE).
- I. 9: ψῆφον. On voting by a show of hands, see also *IG* X/2.1 192 (Thessalonikē, III CE).
- II. 9–10, 10–11, 14, 35: ἐνθήκη, “endowment.” This is the only Attic inscription attesting the term but it appears, e.g., in *IBeroia* I 7.38 (Beroia, 100–150 CE); *IGBulg* III/1 1519.4; *ICosED* 200.10 (Cos, I BCE); *IC* IV 285.14 (Crete, 385 CE); *SEG* 16.754 (Phrygia, 200–237 CE); *TAM* II 905 (Rhodiapolis, 152/153 CE).
- I. 13: [T̄· ἔδοξε] The significance of ἔδοξε is unknown. Raubitschek thinks it is an afterthought on the sum of the fine.
- I. 16: [ν]ενοσφισμένος. In biblical literature, νοσφίζω refers to pilfering or holding back what belongs to God: Josh 7:1: ἐνοσφίσαντο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναθέματος; Acts 5:2: καὶ ἐνοσφίσαιτο ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς, συνειδυίης καὶ τῆς γυναικός; Titus 2:10. μὴ νοσφισομένους, ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν πίστιν ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγαθὴν. See also the oath taken by *epimelētai* in *IG* XII/7 515.91–95 (Amorgos, II BCE): ὀμνύομεν Δία Ποσειδῶ Δῆμητρα· | ἔδαπανήσαμεν τὸ ἀργύριον πᾶν τὸ ἀπ[ο]τεταγμέ[ν]ον [ε]ἰς τ[ε] τὴν δημό[θ]οινίαν καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα... καὶ | [ο]ὐ νοσφισόμεθα οὐθέν...., “we swear by Zeus, Poseidon and Demeter: we have spent all the funds that have been assigned both for the public feast and for the games... and we have not pilfered anything....”
- II. 18–19: πρόσ[γ]ραφον. See *P.Oxy.* XVI 1997, 1998 for receipts labelled πρόσγραφον.
- I. 24: παννυχιστάς. Raubitschek (1981, 97) thinks that these are night watchmen but who served only during meetings; Pritchett (1987, 188 n. 25) suggests that they were bouncers, charged with maintaining order in an all-night festival.
- I. 28: πράκτορες, “bailiffs.” The role of these figures is not articulated. In Athens, the Council handed over the names of public debtors to the *praktōres* who were empowered to try to collect the debts and to inscribe the names of defaulters on lists on the Acropolis (Hunter 2000, 26–27).
- I. 31: Ἡρακλῆν καὶ Δήμητρα κα[ὶ] Κόρην. On swearing by Herakles see e.g., Plato, *Charmides* 154D and [Lucian] *Amores* 14. It is unclear why Demeter and Korē are included.
- I. 33: σ[τρε]πτούς: TPE is written *in rasura* by the second hand. Στρεπτός is a twisted pastry roll: Demosthenes, [18] *De corona* 260; Athenaeus 4.130d; Julian, *Ep.* 180.
- I. 35: [εἰς τὸ συνεγ]δανίσαι. The letters in the erasure are supplied by the second hand.
- I. 36: σμιδάλιν, i.e., σμιδάλιν: a type of wheat flour, mentioned by Hippocrates *Vict.* 2.42.20; Athenaeus 3.115d; 109b, 112b; 2 Macc 1:8; Sir 35:2; 38:11; 39:26; Bel 1:3. 1 choenix is approx. 0.75 kg.
- I. 36: [·]. Raubitschek indicates that traces are visible, perhaps of γ.
- I. 38: κάπρον, “wild boar.” According to Pausanias (1.32.1) boars were hunted on Mount Parnes. The weight – 11.3 kgs. – indicates that this must be an immature animal. Raubitschek 1981, 97 thinks that it must mean a domestic pig, but Lupu 2005, 188 sees no reason to doubt that a wild boar could be obtained. On the appropriateness of a boar as an offering to Herakles, see Burkert 1985, 209.
- I. 38: M<sup>N</sup>: μνᾶ, mina.
- I. 38: Raubitschek restores this as ἐὰν δὲ τις τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἐράνου τέκνον [τ]ῖσι θέλη ἰσάγν, with τίσι (for τίσει), “by making a payment.” But in this case the size of the

payment is not given, which would have to be in addition to the providing of the swine meat. Compare also *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1369.31–33 [49]: [μη]δενὶ ἐξέστω ἰσι[έν]αι ἰς τὴν σεμνοτάτην | σύνοδον τῶν ἑρανιστῶν πρὶν ἂν δοκιμασθῆ..., “It is not lawful for anyone to enter this most holy assembly without being first examined....”

l. 39: τρι, i.e. 16½. See Threatte 1980-, 1:5.0124; Lupu 2005, 189.

l. 43: ἐγδόσις, i.e., ἐκδόσεις, “loans.” Lupu 2005, 189 thinks that it refers to letting out of contracts rather than making loans.

### Comments

A striking feature of this association is the role assumed by the *archeranistēs*. Whereas in most other associations, decrees affecting honors and internal policy are approved by the members as a whole, in this association the *archeranistēs* is depicted as approving the regulations (ll. 3–5: ἔδοξεν τῷ ἀρχεραμιστῆ ... τὰδε δοκματίσαι). This is perhaps because of a foundational role that Marcus Aemilius Eucharistos played in the association or, because he was its principal benefactor. The former is perhaps more likely, since *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1368, which honors Herodes Attikos as its chief priest (and no doubt, most distinguished member) is still framed as an approval by the membership as a whole. *SEG* 31:122 in this respect is more like *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1365–66 [53] where the founder of the sanctuary also defines the rules of access.

As Raubitschek (1981, 96–96) observes *SEG* 31:122 provides some of the most detailed regulations regarding the management of an endowment (ἐνθήκη). The capital for the association appears to have come from the initial endowment (from M. Aemilius Eucharistos?) and additional sums that were contributed and this was invested in such a way as to produce income. Raubitschek suggests that the capital was invested in real estate, which would have produced a yearly income. The sale of priesthoods and membership dues and perhaps the lease of a wood lot (l. 45) netted additional revenue. The rule shows great concern over expenditures: a limit of 300 drachmae from the interest is set, and audit procedures were put in place to ensure that the treasurer did not expend more than the allotted 300 drachmae. Expenses consisted of the banquets and sacrifices (paid out of the endowment by the treasurer) and loans (ἐκδόσεις) made to members. The *archeranistēs* seems to have been in charge of the disbursement of loans and was assisted in this by three other members (ll. 34–36). It is not clear whether loans to members produced interest.

**Literature:** Aleshire 1991, 228–29; Arnaoutoglou 1994b; Follet 1976; Follet 1989; Hunter, Virginia J. “Policing Public Debtors in Classical Athens.” *Phoenix* 54(1/2) (2000) 21–38; Lupu 2005, 177–190; Pritchett, W. Kendrick. “The Παννυχίς of the Panathenaia.” In *Φίλια ἔπη εἰς Φεώργιον Ε. Μυλωνᾶν διὰ τὰ 60 ἔτη τοῦ ἀνασκαφικοῦ τοῦ ἔργου*. Athens, 1987, 2:179–188 (*SEG* 36:198); Raubitschek 1981; Wycherley, Richard E. *The Stones of Athens*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1978.

[51] IG II<sup>2</sup> 1368  
The Rule of the *Iobakchoi*

Athens (Attica)

164/65 CE

Published: Sam Wide, “Inscription der Iobakchen,” *AM* 19 (1894) 248–82 (*ed. pr.* with commentary) (Maass 1895, 14–71 [text and German trans.]; Dittenberger, *Syll*<sup>2</sup> 737; Protz and Ziehen, *LGS* II 46; Michel, *RIG* 1564); Engelbert Drerup, “Ein antikes Vereinsstatut,” *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur* 2 (1899) 356–70; Roberts, et al. 1887–1905, 2:236–243 (no. 91); Kirchner, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1368 (Dittenberger–Hiller von Gaertringen, *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 1109; Sokolowski, *LSCG*, 95–101 [no. 51]); Graindor 1922a, 47–49 (no. 73) and Plate LVII; Tod 1932, 71–96 (trans.); Walter Ameling, *Herodes Atticus* (Hildesheim and New York: Georg Olms, 1983) 2:113–116 (no. 94) (ll. 1–31) (*SEG* 33:254); Thomas Schmeller, *Hierarchie und Egalität: Eine sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchung paulinischer Gemeinden und griechisch-römischer Vereine* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, vol. 162; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995) 110–115 (no. 4) (text and German trans.); Jaccottet 2003, 2:27–35 (no. 4) (text and French trans.); Pilhofer, Ebel, and Börstinghaus 2002, 46–57 (with German translation) (Poland A59); Ebel 2004, 87–92 (text), 94–101 (German translation).

Translations: Ramsay MacMullen, and Eugene N. Lane, eds. *Paganism and Christianity, 100–425 C.E. A Sourcebook* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press., 1992) 69–72 (no. 5.4); Danker 1982, 156–166 (no. 22); Meyer 1987, 95–99 (reprinting Tod’s translation); Smith 2003, 129–131 (adapting Tod).

Photograph: Kern 1913, plate 48; Kirchner, et al. 1948, 137–38.

Publication Used: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1368.

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum.

Inscription on a column, 99.5 cm high, 31 cm in diameter. Letter height 0.7 cm. This inscription was discovered in a Roman building 11 m. x 18 m., between the Pnyx and the Areopagos in Athens near the western slopes of the Acropolis (Dörpfeld 1895, 176–180; Harrison, 1906, 88–91; Judeich 1931, 262; Hill 1953, 192–93). The building is described as having two rows of columns, with a quadrangular apse on the eastern end and an altar. The altar was decorated with Dionysiac scenes (a goat being dragged to the altar, a Satyr, and a Maenad) (Harrison 1906, 90; Schäfer 2002). The inscription was found inside the apse. Thucydides (2.15.4) mentions a Dionyseion “in the marshes” which may coincide with the area in which the Roman-era building (Bakcheion) stood (Parke 1977, 107–108). Schäfer (2002, 189–202) provides a catalogue of individual finds in the building in which the column was found.

Wide (1894) observes the presence of diacritics on the iota on *ιερεύς* (ll. 67, 71, 85, 88, 92, 104, 111, 137, 140), *ιόβακχος*, (ll. 60, 68, 77, 87, 96, 135, 147, 160), *ιερασάμενος* (l. 116–117), *ιερονείκου* (l. 134), and *ισηλύσιον* (ll. 61, 103) and on the epsilon in *ὕβρις* (l. 79). These and the complete absence of the iota

adscript, according to Wide (1894, 261–62), point to a date after the middle of the second century CE. ✱ is used as a siglum for “denarius” in ll. 38, 40, 55, 90, and 161; drachma is abbreviated as δρ. in ll. 80, 82, 99, and 110. Lajtar (1987) observes that a dedication to Zeus Hypsistos found near the Phyx has lettering that strongly resembles that of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1368*.

- ἀγαθῇ Ϝ τύχη.  
 ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀρ(ρίου) Ἐπαφροδείτου, μηνὸς  
 Ἐλαφβολιῶνος ἡ ἔσταμένου, ἀγορὰν  
 5 συνήγαγεν πρῶτως ὁ ἀποδειχθεὶς  
 ἱερεὺς ὑπὸ Αὐρ(ηλίου) Νεικομάχου τοῦ ἀνθι-  
 ερασαμένου ἔτη ιζ' καὶ ἱερασαμένου  
 ἔτη κγ' καὶ παραχωρήσαντος ζῶντος  
 εἰς κόσμον καὶ δόξαν τοῦ Βακχείου  
 10 τῷ κρατίστῳ Κλα(υδίῳ) Ἡρώδῃ, ὕφ' οὗ ἀνθιερεὺς  
 ἀποδειχθεὶς [ἀν]έγνω δόγματα τῶν  
 ἱερασαμένων Χρυσίππου καὶ Διονυσίου,  
 καὶ ἐπαινέσαντος τοῦ ἱερέως καὶ τοῦ ἀρ-  
 χιβάρχου καὶ τοῦ προστάτου ἐξ(εβόησαν)· «τούτοις  
 15 αἰεὶ χρώμεθα», «καλῶς ὁ ἱερεὺς», «ἀνάκτησαι  
 [τ]ὰ δόγματα»· «σοὶ πρέπει», «εὐστάθειαν τῷ  
 Βακχείῳ καὶ εὐκοσμίαν», «ἐν στήλῃ τὰ δό-  
 γματα» «ἐπερώτα». ὁ ἱερεὺς εἶπεν· ἐπεὶ καὶ  
 20 ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς συνιερεῦσί μοι[υ] καὶ ὑ-  
 μεῖν πᾶσιν ἀρέσκει, ὡς ἀξιούτε ἐπε-  
 ρωτήσομεν. καὶ ἐπερώτησεν ὁ πρό-  
 εδρος Ῥούφος Ἀφροδεΐσιου· ὅτῳ δοκεῖ  
 κύρια εἶναι τὰ ἀνεγνωσμένα δόγμα-  
 τα καὶ ἐν στήλῃ ἀναγραφῆναι, ἀράτω  
 25 ἔτεσι τὸν κράτιστον ἱερέα Ἡρώδην»  
 «νῦν εὐτυχεῖς, νῦν πάντων πρῶτοι  
 τῶν Βακχείων», «καλῶς ὁ ἀνθιερεὺς», «ἢ στή-  
 λῃ γενέστω». ὁ ἀνθιερεὺς εἶπε· ἔσται ἢ  
 30 στήλῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ κείνου, καὶ ἀναγραφῆ-  
 σονται· εὐτονήσουσι γὰρ οἱ προεστῶ-  
 τες τοῦ μηδὲν αὐτῶν λυθῆναι.  
 <vacat>  
 μηδενὶ ἐξέστω ἰόβακχον εἶναι, ἐὰν μὴ  
 πρῶτον ἀπογράψῃται παρὰ τῷ ἱερεῖ  
 35 τὴν νενομισμένην ἀπογραφὴν καὶ  
 δοκιμασθῇ ὑπὸ τῶν ἰοβάκχων ψή-  
 φῳ, εἰ ἀξίος φαίνοιτο καὶ ἐπιτήδειος  
 τῷ Βακχείῳ. ἔστω δὲ τὸ ἰσηλύσιον

- τῷ μὴ ἀπὸ πατρὸς \* ν' καὶ σπονδῆ.  
 ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἀπογραφέ-  
 40 σθωσαν ἐπὶ \* κε' διδόντες ἡμιφόριον  
 μέχρις οὗτος πρὸς γυναῖκας ὄσιν.  
 συνίτωσαν δὲ οἱ ἰόβακχοι τὰς τε ἐνά-  
 τας καὶ τὰς ἀμφιετηρίδας καὶ Βακχεί-  
 α καὶ εἴ τις πρόσκαιρος ἑορτῆ τοῦ θεοῦ,  
 45 ἕκαστος ἢ λέγων ἢ ποιῶν ἢ φιλοτει-  
 μούμενος, καταβάλλων μηνιαίαν  
 τὴν ὀρισθεῖσαν εἰς τὸν οἶνον φορὰν·  
 ἐὰν δὲ μὴ πληροῖ, εἰργέσθω τῆς στιβά-  
 δος, καὶ εὐτονεῖτωσαν οἱ τῷ ψηφίσμα  
 50 τι ἐνγεγραμμένοι, χωρὶς ἢ ἀποδημίας  
 ἢ πένθους ἢ νόσου ἢ «εἰ» σφόδρα ἀνανκαῖός  
 τις ἦν ὁ προσδεχθησόμενος εἰς τὴν στιβά-  
 δα, κρεινάντων τῶν ἱερέων. ἐὰν δὲ ἰοβάκ-  
 χου ἀδελφὸς ἰσέρχηται ψήφῳ δοκιμασθεῖς,  
 55 διδῶτα \* ν': ἐὰν δὲ ἱερὸς παῖς ἐξωτικὸς καθεσ-  
 θεῖς ἀναλώσῃ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ τὸ Βακχεῖον,  
 ἔστω μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἰοβάκχος ἐπὶ μιᾷ  
 σπονδῇ τοῦ πατρὸς. <sup>v</sup> τῷ δὲ ἀπογραψαμένῳ  
 καὶ ψηφοφορηθέντι διδῶτα ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπισ-  
 60 τολῆν ὅτι ἐστὶν ἰοβάκχος, ἐὰν πρῶτον  
 δοῖ τῷ ἱερεῖ τὸ ἰσηλύσιον, ἐνγεγραφομένου  
 τῇ ἐπιστολῇ τὰ χωρήσαντα εἰς τόδε τι.  
 οὐδενὶ δὲ ἐξέσται ἐν τῇ στιβάδι οὔτε ἄσαι  
 οὔτε θορυβῆσαι οὔτε κροτῆσαι, μετὰ δὲ  
 65 πάσης εὐκοσμίας καὶ ἡσυχίας τοὺς μερισ-  
 μούς λέγειν καὶ ποιεῖν, προστάσσοντος  
 τοῦ ἰερέως ἢ τοῦ ἀρχιβάκχου. <sup>vvv</sup> μηδενὶ  
 ἐξέστω τῶν ἰοβάκχων τῶν μὴ συντελε-  
 σάντων εἰς τε τὰς ἐνάτας καὶ ἀμφιετηρί-  
 70 δας εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὴν στιβάδα μέχρις ἂν  
 ἐπικριθῇ αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τῶν ἰερέων ἢ ἀπο-  
 δοῦναι αὐτὸν ἢ ἰσέρχεσθαι. <sup>vvv</sup> μάχης δὲ  
 ἐὰν τις ἄρξηται ἢ εὐρεθῇ τις ἀκοσμών ἢ  
 ἐπ' ἄλλοτριαν κλισίαν ἐρχόμενος ἢ ὑβρί-  
 75 ζων ἢ λοιδορῶν τινα, ὁ μὲν λοιδορη-  
 θεῖς ἢ ὑβρισθεῖς παραστανέτω δύο ἐκ  
 τῶν ἰοβάκχων ἐνόρκους, ὅτι ἤκου-  
 σαν ὑβριζόμενον ἢ λοιδορούμενον,  
 καὶ ὁ ὑβρίσας ἢ λοιδορήσας ἀποτιν[νύ]-  
 80 τω τῷ κοινῷ λεπτοῦ δρ(αχμάς) κε', ἢ ὁ αἴτιος

- γενόμενος τῆς μάχης ἀποτινύτω  
 τὰς αὐτὰς δρ(αχμάς) κε', ἢ μὴ συνίτωσαν ἰς τοὺς  
 ἰοβάκχους μέχρις ἂν ἀποδώσιν.  
 ἐὰν δέ τις ἄχρι πληγῶν ἔλθῃ, ἀπογραφέστω  
 85 ὁ πληγεὶς πρὸς τὸν ἰ·ερέα ἢ τὸν ἀνθιερέα,  
 ὁ δὲ ἐπάνανκες ἀγορὰν ἀγέτω, καὶ ψή-  
 φω οἱ ἰ·όβακχοι κρεινέτωσαν προηγου-  
 μένου τοῦ ἰ·ερέως, καὶ προστειμάσθω  
 πρὸς χρόνον μὴ εἰσελθεῖν ὅσον ἂν δό-  
 90 ξη καὶ ἀργυρίου μέχρι X κε'. ὕἑστω δὲ  
 τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπιτείμια καὶ τῷ δαρέντι καὶ  
 μὴ ἐπεξελθόντι παρὰ τῷ ἰ·ερεὶ ἢ τῷ  
 ἀρχιβάκχῳ, ἀλλὰ δημοσίᾳ ἐγκαλέσαν-  
 τι. ὕἑπιτείμια δὲ ἕστω τὰ αὐτὰ τῷ εὐκόσ-  
 95 μῳ μὴ ἐκβαλόντι τοὺς μαχομένους.  
 εἰ δέ τις τῶν ἰ·οβάκχων εἰδὼς ἐπὶ τοῦ-  
 το ἀγορὰν ὀφείλουσαν ἀχθῆναι μὴ ἀ-  
 παντήσῃ, ἀποτεισάτω τῷ κοινῷ λε-  
 πτοῦ δρ(αχμάς) ὕ'. ἐὰν δὲ ἀπειθῆι πρασσόμε-  
 100 νος, ἐξέστω τῷ ταμία κωλύσαι αὐτὸν  
 τῆς εἰσόδου τῆς εἰς τὸ Βακχεῖον μέ-  
 χρις ἂν ἀποδοῖ. ὕἕἄν δὲ τις τῶν  
 εἰσερχομένων τὸ ἰ·σηλύσιον μὴ  
 105 διδοῖ τῷ ἰ·ερεὶ ἢ τῷ ἀνθιερεὶ, εἰργέσ-  
 θω τῆς ἐστιάσεως μέχρις ἂν ἀπο-  
 δοῖ, καὶ πρασσέσθω ὅτω ἂν τρόπῳ  
 ὁ ἱερεὺς κελεύσῃ. ὕἕμηδεῖς δ' ἔπος  
 φωνεῖτω μὴ ἐπιτρέψαντος τοῦ ἱε-  
 ρέως ἢ τοῦ ἀνθιερέως ἢ ὑπεύθυνος  
 110 ἕστω τῷ κοινῷ λεπτοῦ δρ(αχμῶν) λ'.  
 ὁ ἰ·ερεὺς δὲ ἐπιτελείτω τὰς ἐθίμους  
 λειτουργίας στιβάδος καὶ ἀμφιετη-  
 ρίδος εὐπρεπῶς καὶ τιθέτω τὴν  
 τῶν καταγωγῶν σπονδὴν στι-  
 115 βάδι μίαν καὶ θεολογίαν, ἣν ἤρ-  
 ζατο ἐκ φιλοτειμίας ποιεῖν ὁ ἰ·ε-  
 ρασάμενος Νεικόμαχος. ὕἕὁ δὲ ἀρχί-  
 βακχος θυέτω τὴν θυσίαν τῷ  
 θεῷ καὶ τὴν σπονδὴν τιθέτω  
 120 κατὰ δεκάτην τοῦ Ἐλαφηβολι-  
 ῶνος μηνός. ὕἕμερῶν δὲ γεινομέ-  
 νων αἰρέτω ἱερεὺς, ἀνθιερεὺς,  
 ἀρχίβακχος, ταμίας, βουκολικός,

- Διόνυσος, Κόρη, Παλαίμων, Ἄφρο-  
 125 δείτη, Πρωτεύρρυθμος. τὰ δὲ ὀνό-  
 ματα αὐτῶν συνκληρούσθω  
 πᾶσι. <sup>vv</sup> ὅς δ' ἂν τῶν ἰοβάκχων λάξη κλη-  
 ρον ἢ τειμῆν ἢ τάξιν, τιθέτω τοῖς ἰο-  
 βάκχοις σπονδῆν ἄξιαν τῆς τάξεως,  
 130 γάμων, γεννήσεως, Χοῶν, ἐφηβείας,  
 πολειτείας, ῥαβδοφορίας, βουλείας, ἀ-  
 θλοθεσίας, Πανέλληνος, γερουσίας,  
 θεσμοθεσίας, ἀρχῆς ἡσδηποτεοῦν,  
 συνθυσίας, εἰρηναρχίας, ἰερονείκου,  
 135 καὶ εἴ τις τι ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖσσον ἰοβάκχος ὢν  
 τύχοιτο. <sup>v</sup> εὐκοσμος δὲ κληρούσθω ἢ καθισ-  
 τάσθω ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰερέως, ἐπιφέρων τῷ ἄκοσ-  
 μοῦντι ἢ θορυβοῦντι τὸν θύρσον τοῦ θε-  
 οῦ. <sup>vv</sup> ᾧ δὲ ἂν παρατεθῆ ὁ θύρσος, ἐπικρεί-  
 140 ναντος τοῦ ἰερέως ἢ τοῦ ἀρχιβάκχου  
 ἐξεργέσθω τοῦ ἐστιατορείου. <sup>v</sup> ἂν δὲ ἀ-  
 πειθῆ, αἰρέτωσαν αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ πυλῶ-  
 νος οἱ κατασταθησόμενοι ὑπὸ τῶν  
 ἱερέων ἵπποι, καὶ ἔστω ὑπεύθυνος  
 145 τοῖς περὶ τῶν μαχομένων προστεί-  
 μοις. <sup>vv</sup> ταμίαν δὲ αἰρέισθωσαν  
 οἱ ἰοβάκχοι ψήφῳ εἰς διετίαν, καὶ παραλαμβα-  
 νέτω πρὸς ἀναγραφὴν τὰ τοῦ Βακχεί-  
 ου πάντα, καὶ παραδώσει ὁμοίως τῷ  
 150 μετ' αὐτὸν ἔσομένῳ ταμίᾳ. παρεχέτω  
 δὲ οἴκοθεν τὸ θερμόλυχνον τὰς τε ἐ-  
 νάτας καὶ ἀμφιετηρίδα καὶ στιβάδα,  
 καὶ ὅσαι ἔθιμοι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμέραι καὶ  
 τὰς ἀπὸ κλήρων ἢ τειμῶν ἢ τάξε-  
 155 ων ἡμέρας. <sup>vv</sup> αἰρέισθω δὲ γραμμα-  
 τέα, ἂν βούληται, τῷ ἰδίῳ κινδύνῳ,  
 συνκεχωρήσθω δὲ αὐτῷ ἢ ταμειυ-  
 τικῆ σπονδῆ καὶ ἔστω ἀνείσφορος  
 τὴν διετίαν. <sup>vv</sup> ἂν δὲ τις τελευτή-  
 160 σῃ ἰοβάκχος, γεινέσθω στέφανος αὐ-  
 τῷ μέχρι X ε', καὶ τοῖς ἐπιταφήσασι τι  
 θέσθω οἴνου κεράμιον ἓν, ὃ δὲ μὴ  
 ἐπιταφήσας εἰργέσθω τοῦ οἴνου.

For good fortune!

In the year that Ar(rios) [A(u)r(elios)?] Epaphroditos was archon, on the eighth of Elaphebolion, an assembly was first convened by the priest who was nominated by Aurelius Nikomachos, who had served as vice-priest for seventeen years and as priest for twenty-three years and had, for the order and glory of the Bakcheion, resigned while still living in favor of his excellency Claudius Herodes, by whom he was nominated as vice-priest.

- 10 He (the vice priest) read the statutes (drawn up by) the former priests, Chrysippos and Dionysios, and after the priest and *archibakchos* and the president had approved, they (all) shouted: “We will use these forever!” “Bravo for the priest!” “Revive the statutes!” “It is fitting for you (to do so)!” “Health and good order to the Bakcheion!” “(Inscribe) the statutes on a stele!” “Put the question!”
- 17 The priest said: “Since it is pleasing to me and to my fellow priests and to all of you, as you ask, we shall put the question.” And the president (*pro-edros*) Rufus son of Aphrodisios, put the question: “To whomever it seems good that the statutes that have been read out should be ratified and inscribed on a stele, raise your hand.” Everyone raised (their hand). They shouted: “Long life to his excellency, the priest Herodes!” “Now you have good fortune.” “Now (we) are the best of all Bacchic societies.” “Bravo to the vice-priest!” “Let the stele be made!” The vice-priest said, “The stele will be set on the column and inscribed. For the presiding officers shall be empowered to prevent any of those decrees from being violated.”
- 33 It is not allowed for anyone to become an Iobakchos unless he first register with the priest the customary notice and is approved by a vote of the Iobakchoi if he appears to be worthy and suitable for the Bakcheion.
- 37 The entrance fee shall be fifty denarii and a libation for one whose father was not a member. Similarly, those whose fathers were members should be enlisted, giving an additional twenty-five denarii—half the usual rate—until puberty.
- 42 The Iobakchoi shall meet together on the ninth of each month, on the annual festival, and on the Bacchic days (*Bakcheia*), and if there is any occasional feast of the god.
- 45 Each (member) shall speak and act and be zealous (for the association), contributing to the fixed monthly dues for wine. If he does not fulfil (these obligations), he shall be shut out of the gathering (*stibas*) and those named in the decree shall be empowered (to enforce this), except (in the cases of persons who are) out of town, in mourning, ill, or if someone to be admitted to the gathering (*stibas*) is completely indispensable—the priests shall judge these cases.
- 53 If a brother of an Iobakchos should enter, having been approved by a vote, he shall pay fifty denarii. If an uninitiated boy (active in) sacred (services) has paid the fee to the gods and the Bakcheion, he shall be an Iobakchos



- with his father, on the basis of one libation by his father. To everyone who has been submitted a notice and has been approved by vote the priest shall give a letter indicating that he is an *Iobakchos*—(after the member) gives the entrance fee to the priest. The (priest) shall indicate the payments made, and for which purpose, in the letter.
- 63 In the meeting (*stibas*) no one is allowed to sing, cause a disturbance or applaud; but with all order and decorum members shall speak and do their parts, as the priest or the *archibakchos* directs. None of the *Iobakchoi* who has not paid (the contributions) for either the meetings on the ninth (of the month) or the annual festival is permitted to enter into the gathering (*stibas*), until it has been decided by the priests whether he should pay the fee or be allowed to enter (anyway).
- 73 Now if anyone begins a fight or is disorderly or sits in someone else's seat or insults or abuses someone else, the person abused or insulted shall produce two of the *Iobakchoi* as sworn witnesses, (testifying) that they heard the insult or abuse. The one who committed the insult or the abuse shall pay to the treasury (*koinon*) twenty-five light drachmae, or the one who was the cause of the fight shall either pay the same twenty-five drachmae or not come to any more meetings of the *Iobakchoi* until he pays.
- 84 If someone comes to blows, the one who was struck shall file a report with the priest or the vice priest, who shall without fail convene a meeting and the *Iobakchoi* shall judge by a vote with the priest presiding. The offender shall be penalized by not being permitted to enter for a time—as long as it seems appropriate—and (by paying) a fine up to twenty-five silver denarii.
- 90 The same penalty shall also be applied to the one who is beaten and does not go to the priest or the *archibakchos* but (instead) brings a charge with the public courts. The penalty shall be the same for the officer in charge of order (*eukosmos*) if he does not expel those who fight.
- 96 If one of the *Iobakchoi*, knowing that a meeting ought to be convened for this purpose, does not attend, he shall pay a fine of fifty light drachmae to the treasury (*koinon*). If he fails to pay, the treasurer shall be permitted to prevent him from entering the meetings of the *Bakcheion* until he pays.
- 102 If one of those who enters does not pay the entrance fee to the priest or the vice-priest, he shall be expelled from the banquet (*hestiasis*) until he pays and he shall pay in whatever way the priest orders.
- 107 No one is permitted to recite a speech (or hymn?) unless the priest or the vice-priest gives permission; (otherwise) he is liable to pay a fine of thirty light drachmae to the treasury (*koinon*).
- 111 The priest shall perform the customary services (*litourgia*) of the *stibas* and of the yearly festival in a fitting manner; he shall set before the gathering (*stibas*) one libation of the Festival of Return (*Katagogia*), and shall give the discourse about the god (*theologia*), which the former priest *Nikomachos* inaugurated out of his zeal.

- 117 The *archibakchos* shall sacrifice the victim to the god and make a libation on the tenth day of Elaphebolion. When the parts (of the sacrificial victims) are distributed, let them go to the priest, the vice-priest, the *archibakchos*, the treasurer, the one playing the cowherd (*boukolikos*), “Dionysos,” “Kore,” “Palaimon,” “Aphrodite,” “Proteurythmos.” Let these roles be apportioned among all by lot.
- 125 Whoever of the Iobakchoi receives a legacy, honor, or appointment shall make a libation for the Iobakchoi commensurate with the appointment—a marriage, birth, pitcher-festival (*Choai*), coming of age (*ephebeia*), (a grant of) citizenship, (being honored as) a rod-bearer, Council member, (being chosen as) president of the games, Panhellene, (being) a member of the elders’ council (*gerousia*), *thesmothesia*, or any magistracy whatsoever, an appointment as a fellow sacrificer, *eirenarch*, or sacred-victor (*hieroneikos*), and if any who is an Iobakchos should obtain any promotion.
- 136 The officer in charge of order shall be chosen by lot or be appointed by the priest, bearing the thyrsus of the god for anyone who is disorderly or creates a disturbance. And if the thyrsus be laid on anyone—and the priest or the *archibakchos* approves—he shall leave the banquet hall (*hestiatoreion*). If he refuses, those who have been appointed by the priests as bouncers (*hippoi*) shall take him outside of the door. And he shall be liable to the punishment that applies to those who fight.
- 146 The Iobakchoi shall choose a treasurer by vote every two years. He shall receive for registration all of the property of the Bakcheion; he shall likewise hand over everything to his successor. He shall provide at his own expense the lamp-oil for the meetings on the ninth of the month, the annual festival, and the gathering (*stibas*), as well as all the usual days of the god and the days on which legacies, honors and appointments (are celebrated). If he so wishes, he shall choose a secretary—but at his own risk—and the treasurer’s libation shall be given to him and he shall be exempt from membership fees for two years.
- 159 If an Iobakchos dies, let there be a wreath up to the cost of five denarii and a single jar of wine shall be provided for those who attend the funeral. But no one who is absent from the funeral (itself) shall have any wine.

### Notes

1. 2: ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀρ(ρίου) Ἐπαφροδείτου: Although the dates of Epaphrodeitos’ archonship are not known, the inscription (and therefore Epaphrodeitos) is usually dated on the basis of Herodes Attikos’ life. Hence Oliver (1941b, 106–7) dates Epaphrodeitos to “shortly before 178 CE, the year of Herodes’s death.” Rotroff 1975, 407 puts Epaphrodeitos at 175/6 CE; Follet 1976, 138, 141, 171, 509 dated him to either 175/6 or 177/8 CE, Moretti (1986, 252) to 176 or 177 CE. Ameling, however, points out that the inscription presupposes that Herodes was in Athens at the time of the inscription and so concludes that dates after 173/4 are impossible,

since by Elaphebolion (summer 174) Herodes Attikos was not in Athens but in Sirmium (in Pannonia) at the famous trial before Marcus Aurelius. 172/3 CE is thus the last possible year that Epaphrodeitos could be archon and Herodes Attikos still in Athens. In his reconstruction of the archon list from 160–189 CE, Ameling finds only three possible gaps into which Epaphrodeitos could fit: 164/65, 173/74, or 174/75. Given the fact that Herodes Attikos was not in Athens for the latter two dates, 164/65 CE is the only possible date. This is the date that we have accepted.

Some date the inscription (and therefore Epaphrodeitos) much later. Wide (1894, 266) argues that the naming of an Aurelii in l. 5 points to a date after the *Constitutio Antoniniana* (212 CE) after which Aurelius became a common praenomen. Similarly Nilsson 1957, 46. See also below on ll. 9, 25. This, however, is a dubious line of argument since if the inscription is dated after 212, one would expect more Aurelii to be named.

Kapetanopoulos 1984, 185–86 argues that while the inscription refers to Herodes Atticus, the inscription “must have been set up at a later time even though it speaks of events shortly before 177–78.” He argues that the priest mentioned in ll. 4–5 is not the priest of ll. 12 and 17 (Herodes Atticus) and, further, that παραχωρήσαντος ζώντος in l. 7 indicates that Nikomachos was not alive when the inscription was cut and that the name Aurelius suggests a date after 212 CE.

- I. 2: Ἄρ(ρίου) (Kirchner; Dittenberger; Sokolowski); Ἄρ(ίστονος) (Wide; Maass). Ameling (1985) notes that the abbreviation Ἄρ can be resolved either as Ἄρ(ρίου) or Ἄ(υ)ρ(ηλίου).
- I. 3: Ἐλαφηβολιώνος ἡ': See line 120: The assembly was held two days prior to the special festival of Dionysos.
- II. 4–5: ὁ ἀποδειχθεὶς || ἱερεὺς ὑπὸ Αὐρ(ηλίου) Νεικομάχου. Kapetanopoulos 1984, 185 believes that “the priest (l. 5) may not be the Cl(audius) Herodes of line 9,” but that would leave the curious situation of interposing an unnamed priest between Nikomachos and Herodes, whereas the inscription implies that it was Nikomachos *as priest* who stepped aside in favour of Herodes. The inscription makes better sense if one assumes that the priest of l. 5 is identical with that of ll. 12 and 17.
- I. 5: Αὐρ(ηλίου) Νεικομάχου (*LGPN* 2:337[25]).
- I. 7: παραχωρήσαντος, “to surrender [a claim, right].” See e.g., *P.Grenf.* II 33.1, 3 (ca. 100 BCE): ὁμολ[ογ]ε[ῖ] NN... | παρακεχωρηκέναι αὐτῶι Ἄρσιῆσει τὸ ἐπιβάλλον αὐτῶ μέρος ἧς ἔμισθώσατο σὺν Πακοῖβι Σχώτου καὶ τοῖς μετόχοις γῆς σιτοφόρου...; *P.Mich.* V 258 (32–33 CE): Ἀπολλώνιος Μάρωνος ὁμολογῶ παρακεχ[ωρ]ηκέναι Παπνεβτύνι Ἄμεν[έ]ως τὴν ὑπάρχουσάν μοι περὶ Θυγονίδα γῆς ἀμπελίτιδος ἄρουρα(ν) μία(ν) ἧμισυ..., etc. For the use of παραχώρησις in legal contracts, see Taubenschlag 1944, 172.
- I. 8: εἰς κόσμον καὶ δόξαν τοῦ Βακχείου. Compare *P.Lond.* I 137 V = *SB* I 4224.22–23 (unknown location in Egypt, time of Marcus Aurelius): εἰς τε τὸν κόσμον τῆς | συνόδου καὶ τὴν αὔξησιν αὐτῆς, “for the good order of the *synodos* and for its growth...”
- II. 8, 16, 27, 37, 43, 56, 101, 148: τοῦ Βακχείου: i.e., the association of Dionysos devotees and/or their meeting place. The term appears in Attic inscriptions only here (eight times), but is attested in *IG* VII 107 (Megara, II CE); *Spomenik* 75 (1933) 25 (no. 55) (Paionia [Macedonia], I CE); *IGBulg* III/2 1865.4–5 (Malko Tarnovo); *IGBulg* 5579.2 (Augusta Traiana); *IPerinthos* 56.12 = *IGRR* I 787.12 (Perinthos-Herakleia, 196–198 CE); *IGLScythia* 79.2 (Kallatis [Scythia Minor], I BCE);

- IGLScythia* 80.2 (Kallatis [Scythia Minor], 50–100 CE); *IG XII/1* 155.49 (Rhodes, I BCE); *REG* 17 (1904) 203 (no. 1b) (Rhodes, after 212 CE); *ISmyrna* 733.12 (Smyrna?, II–III CE); *IKyme* 30.4 (Kyme, II BCE); *IMT Skam/NebTaeler* 267.5 (Ilion).
- II. 9, 25: κρατίστω Κλα(υδίω) Ἡρώδη: The inscription is too late for it to refer to T. Claudius Attikos Herodes (I), the Athenian millionaire, born ca. 40 CE, and governor of Judaea in 107 CE. His son, T. Claudius Atticus Herodes (II) (ca. 101–177 CE) was the famous Athenian benefactor, orator and sophist, teacher of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus and consul in 143 CE. It is Herodes II with whom *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1368.9, 25 is usually identified (Kroll 1916, 1829 and others). An inscription from virtually the same time as *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1368 names T. Claudius Herodes Marathonios as the civic high priest (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2090.6–7 [165/66 CE]: διὰ τῆς λαμπροτάτης εὐεργεσίας | τοῦ κρατίστου ἀρχιερέως · Τιβ · Κλ · Ἡρώ[δου] Μαραθωνίου). Now, a recently discovered inscription on a statue base, found in Olympia, identifies Herodes Attikos as Διονύσου ἱερέα, “priest of Dionysos,” which supports the identification of the priest of *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1368 with Herodes (II) (Schumacher 1999, 422). It is also worth noting that Marcus Aurelius’ letter to the Athenians (James H. Oliver, *Marcus Aurelius: Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East* [Hesperia Supplements, 13; Princeton, NJ: American School of Classical Studies in Athens, 1970] 3) three times refers to Herodes as κράτιστος ἀνὴρ (A 3; C 12, 17).
- Wide (1894, 267–68) identified Claudius Herodes with an ephebe, Claudius Herodes, named in *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2199 (ca. 200 CE) which, if this Herodes became a priest of the association of Iobakchoi, would place the inscription in the mid-third century. Nilsson (1957, 46) rejected the identification of the Herodes of the inscription with Claudius Atticus Herodes (II) the orator, suggesting that Herodes was probably the son or grandson of the orator.
- II. 10, 15, 16–17, 22–23: δόγματα: see also *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1343.38–39 [48].
- I. 13: τοῦ προστάτου, “president”: A προστάτης is also attested in *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1369.37 [49]. Given the juxtaposition with the ἱερεὺς and ἀρχιβακχος in II. 12–13, the προστάτης must be a functionary of some authority and prominence. The term also commonly appears ephebic inscriptions listing functionaries connected with the education and supervision of ephebes, where it seems to mean “president [of the gymnasium]”: e.g., *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2101.44 (Athens, 169/70 CE); 2113.34 (Athens, 183/4–191/2 CE); 2130.23 (Athens, 192/3 CE); 2201.9 (Athens, after 200 CE); 2208.26 (Athens, after 212 CE), etc. The term also seems to mean either “guardian” or “president” in *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 4747 = *SEG* 42:118 (Athens, I/II CE): [θεᾶ]ι Νεμέσει | [Ἰφ]ιάδης Σα[λω]νέως Βη[[σ]α[ι]εὺς ὁ προ[[στ]άτης τοῦ | ἱεροῦ. In *ICorinth* III 265 (Korinthos, mid II CE), προστάτης is the equivalent of the Latin *patron*: Μ. Ἀντ[ών]ου | Πρόμα[χ]ος | τὸν φίλο[v] καὶ || π[ρο]στάτην | ἀ[ρετ]ῆς ἔνεκ[α] | κ[αί] πίστεως, “M. Antonius Pro-machus (dedicated this to) his friend and patron, on account of his excellence and loyalty.” Προστάτης is paired with εὐεργέτης in *Spomenik* 71 (1931) 39 (no. 88) (Paionia, Macedonia, after 212 CE).
- I. 21: Ποῦφος Ἀφροδεισίου: *PAA* 801885; *LGPN* 2:391[7].
- I. 32: Ἰόβακχος. A Dionysiac festival called the *Iobakcheia* is already mentioned in [Ps-]Demosthenes (59 *In Neaeram* 78), who records the oath of the priestesses: “I live a holy life and am pure and unstained by all else that pollutes and by commerce with man, and I will celebrate the feast of the wine god (τὰ θεοίνια) and the Iobakchic feast (τὰ ἰοβάκχεια) in honor of Dionysos in accordance with custom and at the appointed times.”
- I. 35: δοκιμασθῆ. On moral examination upon entrance to a club → *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1369 [49].

- II. 37–38: ἔστω δὲ τὸ ἰσηλύσιον | τῷ μὴ ἀπὸ πατρὸς ✕ ὕ' καὶ σπονδῆ → *AM* 32 (1907) 295–97 (no. 18).4–11 (Pergamon): ἐὰν δοκιμασθῶσι[ν ὑπὸ τῶν .....]ῶν, οὕτως μετέχῃν τοῦ συνεδρίου.... ὁμοίως δὲ εἰσέρχεσθαι τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν μετεχόντων, δοκιμασθέντας μὲν καὶ αὐτοὺς, διδόντας δὲ εἰσηλύσιον (δην.) ὕ', εἴ γε αὐτῶν οἱ πατέρες πρὸ πενταετίας με||τεῖχον τοῦ συστήματος, “If they have been examined by the ..., they may join the association (*synedrion*).... Likewise the sons of members (may) come, and after having been examined and paying the entrance fee of 50 denarii, if their fathers were members of the association (*systema*) for five years.”
- The εισόδιον, εἰσηλύσιον or ἀπογραφή, “entrance fee,” for an association varied considerably. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1361.18 [4]* levied a yearly (?) charge of 2 drachmae on all members; *ID 1521.17–18* (Delos, II BCE) simply refers to the τοῦ καθήκοντος εισοδίου, from which certain prospective members are exempt entirely. *ISmyrna 731.14–15* (Smyrna, 80–131 CE) refers to οἱ πεπληρωκότες τὰ ἰσηλύσια, “those who have paid the entrance fees in full”; *AM* 32 (1907) 295–97 (no. 18).7–14 (Pergamon): 50 dr. for family members; ? for non-family members; *IG VII 2808.b.2–12* (Hyettos [Boeotia], after 212 CE): 50 dr. for family members; 100 dr. for non-family members. On entrance fees, see Sokolowski 1954, 160.
- II. 39–40: οἱ ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἀπογραφέ|σθωσαν ἐπὶ ✕ κε' διδόντες ἡμιφόριον: A reduction in the membership dues for sons of members of a society is attested in other associations → *AM* 32 (1907) 295–97 (no. 18).7–14 (Pergamon): ὁμοίως δὲ εἰσέρχεσθαι τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν μετεχόντων, δοκιμασθέντας μὲν καὶ αὐτοὺς, διδόντας δὲ εἰσηλύσιον (δην.) ὕ', εἴ γε αὐτῶν οἱ πατέρες πρὸ πενταετίας με||τεῖχον τοῦ συστήματος. ἐὰν δὲ ἡ συνεισὴ παῖς πατρὶ, ἢ πρὶν πενταετίαν διελεθῆν τῷ πατρὶ τοῦ καταλεχθῆναι, αὐτὸς ἐπείσέρχεται, καὶ αὐτὸν διδόναι | [ἐξ ἴσου] τὸ ἰσηλύσιον ὡς οὐκ ὄντα πατρὸς μετέχον[τος], “Likewise the sons of members (may) come, and after having been examined and paying the entrance fee of 50 denarii, if their fathers were members of the association (*systema*) for five years. But if the son should enter at the same time as his father, or before five years has elapsed from the father’s enrollment, he shall enter and pay the same entrance fee as if his father had not been a member.” *IG VII 2808.b.2–12* (Hyettos [Boeotia], after 212 CE): εἴ τις τῶν ἄνδρῶν | [τούτων] ἀποθάνοι {[ε]ν}, τοῦτου | [τῶν] {H} υἱὸν αὐτοῦ γείνεσθαι, || [δὲ] ἢ γερουσία ἐληται· ἐὰν | δὲ μὴ ἔχη παιδί[α], τῶν ἐγγύτατα συγγενῶν ὅς εἰσίων | [δῶ]σει τῇ γερουσίᾳ ✕ ὕ'. | [ἄ]ν δὲ τις ἐξῶθεν δοκιμα|[σθ]ῆ ὑπὸ τῆς γερουσίας, εἰ|[σ]φερέτω εὐθέως τῇ γερουσίᾳ ✕ ἑκατόν, “if one of the members dies and if he has sons the *gerousia* may choose him; but if he did not have children, (they can choose) the nearest relative, and whoever enters will pay to the *gerousia* 50 denarii. But if some outsider is examined by the *gerousia*, let him pay forthwith to the *gerousia* 100 denarii.” See also Ziebarth 1896, 156. On club fees in general see Poland 1909, 488–498; Sokolowski 1954.
- I. 41: μέχρις οὗτο πρὸς γυναῖκας ὄσιν: Lit. “until they are (able to be) with women.”
- I. 43: τὰς ἀμφιητηρίδας, a yearly (?) festival of Dionysos. Merkelbach 1988, 86 treats ἀμφιητηρίς as synonymous with τριητηρίς, both referring to a biennial festival (since counting of years likely included the current year as the first). However, *OGIS* 51.27–30 (Ptolemais Hermaiou, 285–246 BCE), in a list of honorees, distinguishes the two: Ζώπυρος ὁ πρὸς τοῖς ἱεροῖς τῆς τριητηρίδος καὶ | ἀμφιητηρίδος καὶ τούτου ἀδελφοί· | Διονύσιος || Ταυρίνος, “Zopyros, who is with the priests (in charge of) the triennial feast and the yearly feast, and his brothers, Dionysios and Taurinos.”
- II. 43–44: Βακχεῖα: An otherwise unknown which is also mentioned in a Rhodian inscription, *IG XII/1 155.49–50* (Rhodes, II BCE): ἐν ταῖ τῶν Βακχείων ὑποδο||χῆα κατὰ τριητηρίδα, “at the reception of the Bakcheia at the triennial festival.”

- I. 45: λέγων ἢ ποιῶν: Cf. lines 65–66, 121–27.
- II. 46–47: καταβάλλων μηνιαίαν | τὴν ὀρισθεῖσαν εἰς τὸν οἶνον φοράν, “contributing to the fixed monthly dues for wine.” On monthly dues → Sokolowski 1954, 160.
- II. 48–49, 52, 63, 70, 112, 114–15, 152: στιβάς, “gathering”: The term στιβάς, literally meaning “a straw-spread floor” or “straw bed or couch,” is used here in reference to a particular gathering of the Iobakchoi originally involving use of a straw bed (see also lines 111–113). By the Roman period it had probably come to refer to purpose-built couches or the place or room in which their activities took place, as an inscription from Pergamon seems to indicate (*IPerg* 222: Διογύσωι Καθηγεμόνι | και τοῖς [— — —] | Ἀρ[ί]σταρχοῖς {τοῦ δεῖνος}) | τ[ὸ] σ[τ]ιβάδε[ιον ἀνέθηκεν]) (cf. Nilsson 1957, 63–64). This “gathering” is perhaps identical with one of the meetings mentioned in lines 42–44 (see I. 112, where the *stibas* is connected with the yearly festival). The term appears in Dionysiac inscriptions in *IGLScythia* I 167.8 (Scythia minor, 150–200 CE). See Smith 2003, 113–15; Wide 1894, 271–273.
- II. 50–51: χωρὶς ἢ ἀποδημίας | ἢ πένθους ἢ νόσου. Compare *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1339.13–15 [46]: ἐ]δοξεν μὴ μετέχειν αὐτο[ῦς] | [τοῦ ἐράν]ου ἐάν μὴ τι συμβῆι διὰ πέ[ν]||[θος ἢ διὰ ἀ]σθενείαν ἀπολειφθῆναι, “... it was resolved that they should not participate in the *eranos*, except if one should be absent because of mourning or because of sickness.”
- II. 51–53: «ἐν σφόδρα ἀνανκαῖός | τις ἦν ὁ προσδεχθῆσόμενος ἰς τὴν στιβάδα. The meaning of ἀνανκαῖός | τις is not clear. According to Wide (1894, 264) it concerns a member who has something very urgent (“wenn [er]... sonst etwas sehr Dringendes vorhatte”). Others think it refers to someone who is indispensable to the association (Protz and Ziehen 1896–1906, 143; Sokolowski 1969, 100).
- I. 55: ἱερός παῖς. Wide (1894, 273): “Ein ἱερός παῖς ist ein Knabe, der bei den Chorgesängen und sonstigen religiösen Gebräuchen mitwirkt. Wenn dieser ἐξωτικός καθεσθῆις, nach aussen versetzt wird, d.h. aufhört ein ἱερός παῖς zu sein (was z.B. mit einem ἐφηβος geschieht, der nicht mehr ein παῖς ist, so hat er das Recht ein ordentliches Mitgleid der Iobakchengesellschaft zu werden ohne Eintrittsgeld zu zahlen.”
- II. 65–66: τοὺς μερισμοὺς λέγειν και ποιεῖν: These activities evidently included some sort of theatrical play involving impersonation of the gods by members of the association (see lines 121–25; cf. Nilsson 1957, 60–61).
- II. 80, 98, 110: On κοινόν as “treasury” or “common fund,” → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1323.10–11, 29 [31].
- I. 80: λεπτοῦ δρ(αχμάς): Kroll 1993, 84: “Since the denarius was by weight the effective equivalent of an Attic silver drachma, it is apparent that the Roman-era hemidrachm and drachm, called a ‘light’ drachma, λεπτοῦ δραχμή in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1368... represented the traditional silver values of the hemiobol and obol and that at some point the bronze coins that would have ordinarily represented the hemiobol and obol were renamed hemidrachm and drachm.” The term is widely attested in Carian inscriptions.
- II. 82–83: On fighting → *SEG* 31:122.5–9 [47] note.
- II. 94/95, 136: τῷ εὐκόσμῳ: While the term εὐκοσμία (“good order”) is common in inscriptions often commending the actions of *epimelētai*, the title εὐκοσμος appears only here and in *IPerg* 374.b.3, 13 (Pergamon, 129–138 CE), where it is used of one of the leaders of the association of *hymnods* at Pergamon. See Robert 1937, 58.
- II. 96–99: on fines for absences from meetings → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1339.14–15 [46] note.

- II. 107–8: μηδεὶς δ' ἔπος | φωνεῖτω. On the translation of ἔπος in an orgiastic context, see Peppas Delmoussou 1996, 110–111.
- I. 114: καταγωγίον: “festival of the return” → Sokolowski, *LSAM* 48.21–24 (Ephesos, 276/5 BCE): τοῖς δὲ Καταγωγίοις κατάγειν τὸν Διόνυσον τοὺς ἱερεῖ[ς] | καὶ τὰς ἱερείας τοῦ [Διονύ]σου τοῦ Βακχίου μετὰ τοῦ [ιερέως] | [κ]αὶ τῆς ἱερείας πρ[ὸ] τῆ[ς] ἡμέρας μέχρι τῆς ἡλίου δύσεως | [··6···] τῆς πόλεως; *IPriene* 174.5, 21 = *LSAM* 37 (Priene); *IEph* 661.20 (Ephesos, II CE).
- I. 115: θεολογία: Poland 1909, 268: “die Festpredigt zu Ehren des Gottes”; Sokolowski 1969, 101: “un panégyrique ou sermon en l’honneur des dieux.”
- I. 125: Πρωτεύρυθμος: Nilsson 1957, 60–61: “it may be guessed that he was Orphic or a god of the dance; we know nothing for certain.”
- I. 126: συνκληρούσθω: This is probably a further reference to a sacred play in which members of the Iobakchoi were assigned certain roles (cf. lines 64–66). Provisions for cultic activities are evidenced in the statutes of other associations (cf. *Syll<sup>3</sup>* 985 [Philadelphia, Asia, I BCE]; *P.Lond.* VII 2193 [Philadelphia, Egypt, 69–58 BCE]).
- II. 127–136: Other associations also made special levies upon members who had received honors or whose status had been enhanced in some way. *P.Mich.* V 243 (Tebtunis, Fayûm; time of Tiberius) requires: “If a member gets married, he shall contribute two drachmae, two drachmae for the birth of a male child, one for a female, four drachmae if property is purchased, four drachmae for a flock of sheep, one drachma for cattle.”
- I. 130: Χοῶν, “festival of the jugs”: See Deubner 1932, 115–16. According to Nilsson (1961, 33–34) “At Athens the wine was brought to the sanctuary of Dionysos in the Marshes, mixed by the priestesses, and blessed before the god. Everyone took his portion in a small jug, and hence this day is called ‘the Festival of the Jugs’ (Choes). Even the small children got their share and received small gifts, particularly little painted jugs. The schools had a vacation, and the teachers received their meager fee. The admission to this festival at the age of about four years was a token that a child was no longer a mere baby.”
- I. 131: ῥαβδοφορίας: This was a position associated with management of the ceremonies (Sokolowski 1969:101).
- I. 138: τὸν θύρσον: The thyrsos, or sacred wand tipped with a pine cone, was used in cultic settings, particularly associated with Dionysos (cf. Burkert 1985, 162–63).
- I. 141: ἐστιατορείον, “banquet hall.” See also *IG XI/2* 139.12 (Delos, ca. 300 BCE): [τὴν ὀρ]οφὴν τοῦ [ἐ]στιατορί[ου], “the roof of the banquet hall”; *XI/2* 144.68, 70 (Delos, before 301 BCE); *XI/2* 154.4 (Delos, 296 BCE); etc., and *IDelta* I 1036.6–7 (Egypt, 209–204 BCE): οἱ λοιποὶ θιασῖται | τὸ ἐστιατόριον, “the other members (dedicate) this banquet hall”; *IFayum* II 106.3 (Fayûm, 140 BCE): τὸ ἐστ[ι]α[τ]ό[ρ]ι[ο]ν κα[ὶ] τὸν βωμ[ὸ]ν....
- I. 144: ἵπποι, “bouncer” (lit. “horses”); cf. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2361.16 [52], where a member of the *orgeōnes* of Belela is designated as a *hippos*.
- II. 162–3: ὁ δὲ μὴ | ἐπιταφίσσας εἰργέσθω τοῦ οἴνου: For more elaborate provisions regarding burial of members of an association see the by-laws of the association at Lanuvium in Italy (136 CE; *CIL* XIV 2112).

### Comments

Associations dedicated to Dionysos are found in many locations throughout the Roman empire—Athens, Boeotia, Ephesos, Smyrna, Philadelphia (Lydia), Magnesia, Campania (Italy), Madaura (Numidia), and other sites. Many of these were led by wealthy patrons, although in some cases the membership also included many of lesser status, including freedmen and slaves (Merkelbach 1988, 15–30; Jaccottet 2003). The élite patronage of the patron of the Iobakchoi is clear from the fact that he is addressed as “excellency” (κράτιστον, l. 25). Elite patronage is also evidenced in the Dionysiac associations led by Pompeia Agrippinilla, the spouse of Gavius Squilla Gallicanus (*IGUR* 160; Terre Nova, Campania, ca. 150 CE) and by the group patronized by T. Aelius Glykon Papias Antonianus in Philadelphia (Lydia, *ILydiaKP* I 42). Since it was a household association, the Agrippinilla group included various nonelite persons. It is not so clear that the Iobakchoi did: The honors for which a member was required to provide wine are all offices open only to citizens (ll. 127–36): the ephebate; (a grant of) citizenship; rod-bearer, Council member, president of the games, member of the elders’ council (*gerousia*), *thesmothesia*, peace officer, and other magistracies. This perhaps means that membership in the group was limited to (male) citizens.

The Bacchic association described in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1368 was already of long-standing at the time of the inscription (164/65 CE). The chronology implied in the first paragraph is somewhat unclear, but the reference to the regulations (δόγματα) of two former priests, Chrysippos and Dionysios, implies that the association had been founded sometime early in the second century. Nikomachos, a priest (l. 117) responsible for the inauguration of the practice of a “theological” discourse (*theologia*), presumably followed Chrysippos and Dionysios. Prior to the appointment of Claudius Herodes, Nikomachos had served in the capacity of vice-priest and then as priest, for a total of 40 years. Whether during the last 23 years he had a vice priest is possible, but if so, he is unnamed. Nikomachos is described as having stepped aside (παραχωρήσαντος) “while still living” (ζῶντος) – a phrase which suggests that Nikomachos had been appointed as priest διὰ βίου and had been persuaded to relinquish this right in favour of Claudius Herodes. Lines 9–10, ὑφ’ οὗ ἀνθερεῦς || ἀποδειχθεῖς, implies that upon Herodes’ appointment as priest, Nikomachos again became vice priest. The sequence of appointments implied in ll. 1–10 is somewhat unclear, but seems to be:

?	Priest: Chrysippos?	Vice Priest: Dionysios?
124/5	Priest: Dionysios?	Vice Priest: Nikomachos?
141/2	Priest: Nikomachos	Vice Priest: ?
164/5	Priest: Claudius Herodes	Vice Priest: Nikomachos

It is not clear what impelled the Iobakchoi to take the extraordinary decision to have Nikomachos relinquish his office in favor of Claudius Herodes.



Sokolowski (1969, 99–100) believes that the club had suffered a decline – hence ἀνάκτησαι || [τ]ὰ δόγματα in ll. 14–15 – and that this was an act of renewal.

Like the Agrippinilla inscription, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1368* has an impressive list of functionaries: ἱερεὺς, ἀνθιερεὺς (συνιερεῖς), ἀρχίβακχος, προστάτης, προεστῶτες, πρόεδρος, βουκολικός, ταμίας, γραμματεὺς, εὐκοσμος, and ἵπποι in addition to the various roles assumed in the sacred performance. Other Dionysiac societies display a similar complex array of roles and officers: *IPerg 485* (Pergamon, early I CE) lists a “chief cowherd (ἀρχιβουκόλος), eighteen cowherds (βουκόλοι) two hymn teachers (ὕμνοδιδάσκαλοι), two *Seilenoi* (σειληνοί) and one chorus leader (χορηγός); *AM 24* (1899) 179 (no. 31) = *IGRR IV 386* (Pergamon, 109–10 CE) lists twelve dancing cowherds (χορεύσαντες βουκόλοι), one assignment officer (διαταξίαρχος), one chief cowherd (ἀρχιβουκόλος) and thirteen cowherds (βουκόλοι). See also *IGBulg 1517* (KalugERICA, Bulgaria, III CE).

The club met monthly, on the ninth of each month (l. 42), but also for a series of special events: a yearly festival (ἀμφιετηρίς, l. 43), the “Bacchic days” (*Bakcheia*), a festival about which little is known, and “any other appropriate festivals of the god” (ll. 43–44). The club also met on the 10th of Elaphebolion (l. 120), the day of the public festival of Dionysos, “the Great Dionysia” (Kroll 1916; Deubner 1932, 138–142). It is on this day that the association apparently sponsored a theatrical performance in which its members took various assigned parts (ll. 123–24).

There appear to have been two types of meetings: business meetings to conduct business such as that which the inscription records in ll. 1–31 and the disciplinary meetings mentioned in ll. 86–88, and banquets, called *stibas* or perhaps the “banquet of the god” (l. 44) or *hestiasis* (l. 105, cf. l. 141). Members were expected to contribute monthly dues for the purchase of wine and could be ejected upon failure to pay. These banquets were held in a banquet hall (l. 141: *hestiatoreion*).

The amount of space devoted to the maintenance of order (*eukosmia*) is striking. The regulations anticipate not only uproarious behavior, but fighting, taking another member’s seat, insults and abuse. That the Iobakchoi took these matters seriously is shown by the fact that an officer in charge of maintaining order (*eukosmos*) was appointed and he was assisted by *hippoi*, literally ‘horses’, who served as marshals or bouncers. Offenders were fined, and fines could be imposed on members who did not report abuse, and even on the officer should he refuse to carry out his duties.

The rules are concerned with payments of various kinds. Entrance fees are set at 50 denarii for one whose father is not a member and 25 denarii for the son of a member. The monthly fees (ll. 46–47) are not given, which might mean that they varied depending on the activities that were anticipated. Since l. 161 stipulates that the society provide a wreath for a deceased member of not

more than 5 denarii, we might presume that the combination of entrance fees and monthly fees could underwrite this expense. There is no indication, however, that the society provided burial expenses (contrast *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1277* [15]; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1278* [17]; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1323* [31]).

The club was keen to specify the fines for certain forms of misbehavior: 25 “light drachmae” for abuse and insults, and 25 drachmae and a temporary exclusion for physical violence. Such fines are modest, especially when it is recognized that by the second century, a “light drachma” was equivalent to the old obol (see note on l. 80); hence the fines amount to four and one-sixth denarii – not an insignificant fine were the society to be comprise of non-elite persons, but given the list of possible political achievements for its members (see above), probably not a serious penalty.

The rules are, however, careful to enforce the penalty structure, imposing fines on members who take their conflicts outside the society (ll. 90–94; compare 1 Cor 6:1–7) and even on the officer charged with the maintaining of order, should he fail to perform his duties. Attendance at meetings was also enforced by the imposition of a fine, in this case even more than the fine for fighting (30 drachmae).

**Literature:** Ameling, Walter. *Herodes Atticus*. Hildesheim and New York: Georg Olms, 1983 (*SEG* 33:254); Ameling, Walter. “Der Archon Epaphrodeitos.” *ZPE* 61 (1985) 133–47 (*SEG* 35:111); Dörpfeld, Wilhelm. “Die Ausgrabungen an der Enneakrunos.” *AM* 17 (1892) 439–45; Dörpfeld, Wilhelm. “Die Ausgrabungen an der Enneakrunos.” *AM* 19 (1894) 143–51; Dörpfeld, Wilhelm. “Die Ausgrabungen am Westabhange der Akropolis: II. Das Lenaion oder Dionysion in den Limnai.” *AM* 20 (1895) 161–206 + plate IV; Ebel, Eva. “Der Stein und die Steine: Methodische Erwägungen zur Benutzung von epigraphischen Quellen am Beispiel *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1368*.” In *Die frühen Christen und ihre Welt: Greifswalder Aufsätze 1996–2001*, ed. Peter Pilhofer. WUNT 2. Reihe, vol. 145. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2002, pp. 11–22, 46–57; Follet 1976, 138, 141, 171, 509; Hamilton 1992; Hill 1953, 192–93 (and fig. 30); Judge 2003; Kapetanopoulos, Elias. “Athenian Archons of A.D. 170/1–179/80.” *Rivista Di Filologia* 112 (1984) 177–91 (*SEG* 34:113, 269); Kroll, John H. *The Greek Coins*. Vol. 26 of *The Athenian Agora*. Athens: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1993 (= *Agora* 26; *SEG* 45:232); Kroll, Wilhelm. “Iobakchoi.” *PW* 9 (1916) 1828–1832; Maass 1895; Merkelbach 1988, 25–26; Meyer, M. W. 1987; Moretti 1986, 247–259; Nilsson 1953, esp. 188–89; Nilsson 1957, esp. 46, 52, 58–61, 64, 145; Oliver, J. H. 1941b, 106–107; Oliver and Palmer 1955, esp. 323; Pilhofer, et al. 2002; Pilhofer 2002; Poland 1909, 266, 276, 282, 417; Reicke 1951, 332–333; Rotroff 1975; Schäfer 2002; Tod 1932; Schumacher, Leonhard. 1999. “Eine neue Inschrift für den Sophisten Herodes Atticus.” In *XI. Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia*, ed. Alfred Mallwitz. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter (*SEG* 49:483); Smith, Dennis E. *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003, 111–125; Weinfeld, Moshe. *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect: A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. NTOA 2. Fribourg: Editions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht., 1986; Wide, Sam. “Inschrift der Iobakchen.” *AM* 19

(1894) 248–282; Wilken, Robert Louis. *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984, 41–44; Zingerle, Josef. “Zur Iobakchen-Inschrift.” *JÖAI Beiblatt* 24 (1929) 125–28.

John S Kloppenborg and Philip Harland

## [52] IG II<sup>2</sup> 2361

### Membership list of the *orgeōnes* of Belela

Piraeus (Attica) 200–211 CE

Published: Stephanos Koumanoudes, *Athenaion* 5 (1876) 428 (*ed. pr.*); Koehler, *CIA* 1280a p. 519; Dittenberger, *Syll*<sup>2</sup> 739; Dittenberger–Hiller von Gaertringen, *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 1111; Graindor 1922a, 63 (no. 93); Kirchner, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2361 (Poland A7).

Publication Used: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2361

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum EM 1629.

A herm of Pentelic marble, 138 x 20 x 17 cm., with the head of a beardless youth. Letter height: 1.0 cm. The phallus (marked with |) appears between the words of ll. 27–30 on face A. The siglum ∩ is used in ll. 6, 15, 18, 26, 28, 30, 33, and 36, as in other Attic inscriptions after 100 CE, when a man’s father’s name is identical with his own (Threatte 1980-, 1:105–6).

<face A>

ἀγαθῆ ∩ τύχη  
 ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Κλαυδίου  
 Φωκᾶ Μαραθωνίου · ὁ · ὑ-  
 μνητῆς τῆς Εὐπορίας θε-  
 5 ᾶς Βελήλας καὶ τῶν περὶ  
 αὐτὴν θεῶν Πόπλιος ∩  
 Φυλάσιος τειμήσας τοῦ[ς]  
 ὀργεῶνας καὶ ἀγκωνο-  
 φόρους καὶ τὰς ἱερείας ἀν[έ]-  
 10 γραψεν ∩ ἱερεὺς διὰ βίου  
 Ἔρωσ Σμαράγδου Ἀραφήνιο[ς]  
 ἰέρεια ἢ περιρ[ά]πτρια Νεικο-  
 στράτη Ἐπικτήτου ἐξ Ἀχ[αρ]-  
 νέων ∩ πατήρ ὀργεω[νι]-  
 15 κῆς συνόδου Εὐπορο[ς ∩]  
 Πειραιεύς ∩ ἵππος Χρυσ[έ]-  
 ρως, ἐπιθέτης Μηνόφι-  
 λος ∩ Μελιτεύς. ὀργεῶναι

- Ἑρμέρωσ Ἄσμενου Γαργή(ττιος)  
 20 Ἀγήσανδρος Φίλωνος Δαιδα(λίδαι)  
 Νεικηφόρος Μηνοδώρου Σουნი(εύς)  
 Κάλλιστος Εὐπόρου Τρινε(μεεύς)  
 Δαμιανός Δαμά Ἀχαρνεύς  
 Εὐφρόσυνος Φίλωνος Δαιδαλ(ίδαι)  
 25 Παιδέρωσ Ἐρωτος Ἀραφήνιο[ς]  
 Πρεμιγένης Ϝ Γαργήττιος  
 Ὑάκινθος | Εὐτυχίδου νε(ώτερος)  
 Μηνόφιλ | ος Ϝ Μελιτε(ύς)  
 Πρεῖμος | Καλλίστου  
 30 Διονύσιο | Ϝ Ϝ Εὐπυρίδη[ς]  
 Βάκχις Εὐτυχίδου  
 Ἐπαφρόδειτος Μειλήσιος  
 Ζώσιμος Ϝ  
 Εὐφραντάς Ϝ Εὐτυχίδου  
 35 Διονύσιος, Θεόκοσμος  
 Εὐτυχᾶς Ϝ  
*vac.*

<face B>

- ἰέρειαι αἱ πρὸς ἐνι-  
 αυτὸν ἀναλώματα  
 ποιήσασαι μεγάλα·  
 40 Ἀπολλωνία Ζωσίμου  
 ἐκ Βησαιέων  
 Εὐφροσύνη Φίλωνος  
 ἐκ Δαιδαλιδῶν  
 Μαρθεῖνη Κορηλιανο[ῦ]  
 45 ἐξ Οἴου  
 Ἀρέσκουσα Κίττου  
 ἐξ Αἰθαλιδῶν  
 Νείκη Ἀττικοῦ ἐκ Παι-  
 ανιέων  
 50 Γλύκη Ἑρμέρωτος  
 ἐκ Γαργηττίων  
 Κορηλία Κλεονεΐκη  
 ἐκ Μαραθωνίων  
 Νεικομῶ Μαρκιανοῦ  
 55 ἐκ Παιανιέων  
 Ὑψίστη Φίλωνος  
 ἐκ Δαιδαλιδῶν  
 Γλυκέρα Ἀθηναίου

- ἐκ Λαμπρέων  
 60 ἱερασαμένη τὸ · β´ ·  
 ἐπὶ ταῖς αὐταῖς φιλοτειμ(ίαις)  
 Εὐπλοια Εὐπορίστου  
 ἐξ Ἀθμονέων  
 Ζωσάριον Ῥόδωνος  
 65 ἐξ Στειριέων  
 Μεσσία Δημητρία Κογνί-  
 του ἐκ Πρασιέων  
 ἰέρεια Ὀραίας διὰ βίου  
 Τυχαρῶ Φίλωνος  
 70 ἐκ Δαιδαλιδῶν  
 στεφανηφόρος  
 Ματρώνα  
 ἰέρεια Ἀφροδείτης  
 Νείκη Μηνοφίλου  
 75 ἐκ Μελιτέων ς  
 ἰέρεια Συρίας θεοῦ  
 Ἑρμαῖς Εὐτύχους  
*vac.*

## &lt;Face A&gt;

For good fortune!

In the year that Claudius Phocas of Marathon was archon: The *hymnētēs* of the goddess of plenty, Belela and the gods associated with her, Publius (son of Publius) of (the deme) Phlya, who has honored the *orgeōnes* and the vase-bearers and the priestesses, has inscribed this. *Priest for life*: Erōs son of Smaragdos of (the deme) Araphenas. The priestess in charge of dressing (the goddess) is Neikostratē daughter of Epiktētōs of (the deme) Acharnai. The Father of the association of *orgeōnes* is Euporos (son of Euporos) of Piraeus; the Bouncer is Chryseros; the *epithetēs* is Menophilos (son of Menophilos) of (the deme) Melite. The *orgeōnes* are: <there follows a list of 20 names: ten demesmen, five freeborn men (with patronyms), a freeborn woman, a man from Miletos, and two men without demotics or patronyms, perhaps freedmen or slaves>.

## &lt;Face B&gt;

Priestesses who have made great expenditures: Apollonia daughter of Zosimos of (the deme) Besa; Euphrosynē daughter of Philo of Daidalidai; Martheinē daughter of Cornelianos of Oion; Areskousa daughter of Kittos of Aithalidai; Nikē daughter of Attikos of Paiania; Glykē daughter of Hermeros of Gargettos; Cornelia Kleoneikē of Marathon; Neikomō daughter of Marcianos of Paiania; Hysistē daughter of Philo of Daidalidai; Glykera daughter of Athenaeos of Lamprai, who was priestess

for a second time; for the same liberality: Euploia daughter of Euporistos of Athmonon; Zosarion daughter of Rhodon of Steiria; Messia Demetria daughter of Cognitos of Prasiai; the priestess of Oraia for life: Tycharo daughter of Philo of Daidalidai; crown-bearer: Matrona; priestess of Aphrodite: Nikē daughter of Menophilos of Melite; priestess of the Syrian Goddess: Hermais daughter of Eutychēs.

### Notes

- ll. 2–3: ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Κλαυδίου | Φωκᾶ Μαραθωνίου: Graindor 1922b, 221–225 (no. 165): “début du III<sup>e</sup> siècle, au plus tôt, et avant 212.”
- ll. 3/4: ὕμνητής: “Hymn singer,” is attested only here. The more common term is ὕμνωδός: e.g., *I Eph* 18.D.4–5, 10 (Ephesos, 44 CE); 27B.146 (Ephesos, 104 CE); 1004.5 (Ephesos), 1061.4 (Ephesos, I CE); 1600.5 (Ephesos, 180–192 CE), and frequently in Ephesian inscriptions; *ISmyrna* 594.3 (Smyrna, 124 CE); 595.16–17 (Smyrna, ca. 200 CE); συνῦμνωδοῖς | θεοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ; 644.17 (Smyrna, 117 CE); 697.5 (Smyrna, 124–38 CE); 798.6 (Smyrna, imperial period), dedication to Dionysos Breiseus, etc.; *IPerg* II 374.4–5 (Pergamon, 129–38 CE) ὕμνωδοὶ θεοῦ | Σεβαστοῦ καὶ θεᾶς Ῥώμης; 523.10 (Pergamon, after 176 CE): [ὕμ]νωδοῦ θεοῦ Αὐγούστου; etc.
- l. 4: ἡ Εὐπορία: Euporia is a proper name, but is also attested as the epithet of a goddess: Agora I 224 = *SEG* 19:224 (Attica, ca. 200 bce): Λεύκιος | Εὐπορία(ι) | εὐχὴν, “Lucius dedicated this to Euporia, in fulfilment of a vow.” Robert (BE 1961 no. 264): “Il nous semble qu’il faut rappeler l’inscription, au Pirée (début du III<sup>e</sup> siècle), des orgéons τῆς Εὐπορίας θεᾶς Βελήλας καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὴν θεῶν.”
- l. 5: Βελήλα: Belela is otherwise unknown although according to Nilsson (1967, 2:334 n. 3) *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1351 (Athens, after 170 CE), which does not mention the name of the deity, may be related. Belela is evidently of Semitic origin. Buckler and Robinson connect Belela with Beleus, king of Assyria, Belesys ruler of Syria and Assyria (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 1.4.10; 7.8.25), Beltra near Ecbatana, Belte in Phrygia, all of which “may have the same root” (William H. Buckler and David M. Robinson, “Greek Inscriptions from Sardis I,” *AJA* 16/1 [1912] 11–82, here 32).
- ll. 8, 18: ὀργεῶναι. The usual spelling is ὀργεῶνες. This is the only Attic inscription to attest this spelling.
- ll. 8/9: ἀγκωνοφόρους, read ἀγκωνοφόρους, “bearers of the ἀγών.” The ἀγκών is a kind of vase → Pouilloux, *La Forteresse de Rhamnonte* no. 24 (Athens, 83/2 BCE) = *IRhamnontis* II 179: θεοῖς. λιτουργοί: ὑποστά[της Ἀγδίστεως] Ζήνωνος Ἀντιοχεύς: ἐπιτιθ[ή]νος... Νικίας Στρατονίκης: ἀγκωνοφόρ- Χρότοι καὶ Στρατονίκη: δαμματονυσίου Μιλησία ἀγκωνοφόρος, “To the Gods. The *leitourgoi* (dedicated this): the *hypostatēs* of Agdistis, Zenon of Antioch; *epitithēnos*... Nikias of Karustos; the *ankon*-bearers, Chroto and Stratonikē; *damm*-? of Dionysios of Miletos, *ankon*-bearer.”
- l. 12: ἱέρεια ἢ περιφ[ά]πτρια: “The priestess who sews or stitches” or “the priestess who takes care of the dress”.
- l. 16: ἵππος: “bouncer” (lit. “horse”) → *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1368.144 [51].
- ll. 16–17: Χρυσ[έ]ρως: *PAA* 992920; *LGPN* 480[2]. Chryseros is a commonly attested Attic name. Neither Reilly 1978 nor Fragiadakis 1986 lists it as a known slave name.

- I. 17: ἐπιθέτης, an otherwise unattested title for an official of an association. Epithetēs appears as a proper name in some Athenian inscriptions.
- I. 30: Διονύσιος; *PAA* 338269; *LGN* 2:127[981]. A common name, including as a servile name: Reilly 1978, 33–34; Fragiadakis 1986, 345–46.
- I. 35: Θεόκοσμος; *PAA* 508285; *LGN* 2:218[1]. The name appears only here in Attic inscriptions.
- I. 60–61: ἱερασαμένη τὸ β' ἐπὶ ταῖς αὐταῖς φιλοτειμ(ίαις) → Robert 1979, 159: “A quoi s'applique l'expression ‘les mêmes libéralités’? Je suppose qu'il ne s'agit pas proprement des mêmes libéralités que les autres prêtresses ont faites; mais prêtresse, elle seule, pour la seconde fois, elle a fait la même générosité que lors de sa première prêtrise, sans en abaisser le taux sous prétexte que c'était la seconde fois, et alors qu'on n'avait peut-être pas trouvé une postulante nouvelle.”
- I. 68: ἰέρεια Ὀραίας (more commonly spelled Ὀραία). Oraia is an epithet of Artemis. For dedications, see *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1537.21* (Athens, III BCE); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 4632* (Athens, IV BCE): Ἰέρων Ἀρτέμ[ιδί] | Ὀραία.

### Comments

Belela is a Semitic deity otherwise unattested. This inscription is the only indication of her cult in Attica (or elsewhere), and while it was discovered in the Piraeus, the site of many metic cults, these *orgeōnes* were mainly citizens of Athens.

Fourteen demesmen are named, including the person responsible for the inscription, the priest for life, the “father” of the association and an otherwise unattested functionary called an *epithetēs*. Fifteen of the priestesses of the goddess, including one responsible for the dressing of the cult statue and the priestess of Aphrodite, were from Athenian families. The priestess of the Syrian Goddess (Hermis) is identified only as the daughter of Eutykhēs, which, because no demotic is given, probably means that her father is not a demesman. The family of one demesman, Philo of Daidalidai, was represented by a son (Euphrosynos, l. 24) and three daughters who became priestesses in the cult: Euphrosynē (l. 42), Hypsistē (l. 56) and Tycharo (l. 69), who was the life-long priestess of the goddess Oraia. Two of the members are identified as the daughter (Bakchis, l. 31) and son (Euphrantas, l. 34) of Eutychidēs.

It is unclear whether the bouncer (*hippos*) Chryseros is a citizen: there is no demotic, but the name is not a known slave name. Five members are listed with patronyms but no demotic, one member is identified as a Milesian, and two appear without demotics or patronyms, which might signal freedmen or slaves.

The fact that Glykera daughter of Athenaeos of Lamprai is identified as “priestess for a second time” probably implies that the normal term for priestess was one year and the phrase αἱ πρὸς ἐνιαυτὸν ἀναλώματα | ποιήσασαι μεγάλα (ll. 37–39) implies that assuming this honor also entailed financial benefaction.

**Literature:** Ferguson 1944; Nilsson 1945, 66.

[53] *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1365+1366  
The Cult of Mēn Tyrannos

Laurion (n. of Cape Sounion, Attica) late II or early III CE

Published: *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1365: Stephanos Koumanoudes, *Παλιγγενεσία* (Sept–Oct 1868); Anonymous, “Épigraphie,” *Bulletin de l’Ecole française d’Athènes* 3–4 (1868) 55–57, esp. 56–57; W. Gurlitt, “Inscripfen aus Athen,” *Philologus* 27 (1868) 729–36, here 733–34; Foucart 1873, 119–27; Lüders, *IG III* 73; Michel, *RIG* 988; Kirchner, *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1365; Lane 1964, p. (no. 13); Lane, *CMRDM* 1:7–8 (no. 12) and plate 12 (Poland 51b).

*IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1366: Stephanos Koumanoudes, *Παλιγγενεσία* (Sept–Oct 1868); Anonymous, “Épigraphie,” *Bulletin de l’Ecole française d’Athènes* 3–4 (1868) 55–57, esp. 55–56; W. Gurlitt, “Inscripfen aus Athen,” *Philologus* 27 (1868) 729–36, here 730; Foucart 1873, 219–21 (no. 38); Lüders, *IG III* 74; Dittenberger, *Syll*<sup>1</sup> 379; *Syll*<sup>2</sup> 633; (Wide 1909, 225–30; Michel, *RIG* 988; Prott and Ziehen, *LGS II* 49; Dittenberger–Hiller von Gaertringen, *Syll*<sup>3</sup> 1042); Kirchner, *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1366; Sokolowski, *LSCG* 106–108 (no. 55); Lane 1964, 9 (no. 14); Lane, *CMRDM* 1:9–10 (no. 13) and plate 13; Horsley 1983a (with translation) (Poland A51a).

Publication Used: *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1365: Sokolowski, *LSCG* 55 and a squeeze by B.H. McLean; *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1366 and a squeeze by B.H. McLean.

Current Location: Athens, Epigraphical Museum (both inscriptions).

Similar Inscriptions: → *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 2940 (IV BCE); *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 4684 (Thorikos, III BCE); *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 4856 (Laurion): Ξά[ν]θος Μ[ηνί] Τυράννω; *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 4876 (Athens, imperial period): ὁ Πᾶν ὁ Μήν, χαίρετε νύμφαι καλά. ὕε κῦε ὑπέρχυε; *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 4818 (Athens, II/III CE): ἱερεὺς στολιστῆς Ἴσιδος | καὶ Σεράπιδος Ἀὐρ Ἐπαφρόδειτος τῶι Οὐρανίω Μηνί εὐχα[ρ]ιστήριον ἀνέθηκα; *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 4687a (Piraeus, III CE): Δημήτριος | καὶ ἡ γυνή | Ἐρώτιον | Μηνί, | ἐπὶ ἱερε[ί]ας | Γλαύκου.

Both stones (and *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 4856) were discovered “südlich von Ergastiria [Laurion] auf dem Schornsteinhügel” and north of Cape Sounion (A. Milchhöfer, “Antikenbericht aus Attika,” *AM* 12 (1887) 277–330, here 300, no. 279).

*IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1365: Tablet 68 x 27 x 7 cm. Letter height: 2.4 cm. (first six lines); 0.8 cm. (the remainder). At the top of the stone there is a roughly inscribed crescent which may have been painted (Lane, 1971–78, 1:7). The lettering is erratic throughout. The last four words of the inscription are written on the right side of the stone.

*IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1366: 89 x 73 x 9.5 cm. Letter height: 0.9 cm. In the center at the top of the stone is a large, deeply incised, U-shaped crescent, which resembles a horse-shoe. The letters are more regular than those of 1365 but not entirely even or well-formed. At the base is a large lug used to secure the stone in place. The stone is badly damaged on the right hand side; both the top right corner and the bottom right corner are missing. There is slight damage at the left side of the base.

It is widely held that 1366 is a later and expanded version of 1365 (Gurlitt 1868, 734; Dittenberger, *Syll*<sup>3</sup> p. 195; Lane 1971–1978, 3:8; Horsley 1983a).



Dittenberger argued that Xanthos had inscribed *1365*, which accounts for its various solecisms and barbarisms, and that a professional cutter inscribed *1366*. Lane (1971–1978, 3:8) rejects this, observing simply that the stone of *1365* was too small to accommodate all of the regulations, “but hardly more careful in grammar and spelling, and, if anything, with even more carelessly formed letters.”

	<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 1365</i>		<i>IG II<sup>2</sup> 1366</i>
	Ξάνθος		Ξάνθος Λύκιος Γαῖου
	Λύκιος		Ἵορβίου καθειδρύσατο
	καθειδρούσατο		ἱερὸν τοῦ Μηνῶς
	ἱερὸν τοῦ	5	Τυράννου, αἰρετίσαντος
	Μηνῶς		τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐπ’ ἀγαθῇ τύχη·
	Τυράννου		καὶ [μηθένα]
	αἰρετίσαντος τοῦ θε-		ἀκάθαρτον προσάγειν·
	οῦ, ἐπ’ ἀγαθῇ τύχη καὶ μη-		καθαρίζεστω δὲ ἀπὸ
	θένα ἀκάθαρτον προσάγειν· κα-		σκόρδων κα[ῖ] χοιρέων
10	θαρίζεστω δὲ ἀπὸ σκόρ-		κα[ῖ] γ]υναικός· λουσα-
	δων καὶ χοιρέων· καὶ μηθένα		μένους δὲ κατακέφαλα
	θυσιάσκειν ἄνευ τοῦ καθι-		αὐθημερὸν εἰσ[πορεύ]  -
	δρουσαμένου· ἐὰν δὲ τις βιάση-	5	εσθα[ν]· καὶ ἐκ τῶν γυναι-
	ται, ἀπρόσδεκτος ἢ θυσία παρὰ		κέων διὰ ἑπτὰ ἡμερῶν
15	τοῦ θεοῦ. παρέχειν δὲ καὶ τῶι		λουσαμένην κ[ατα]
	θεῶι τὸ καθήκον, δεξιὸν σκέ-		κέφαλα εἰσπορεύεσθαι
	λος καὶ δορὰν καὶ ἔλαιον ἐπὶ βω-		αὐθημερόν· καὶ ἀπὸ νεκ-
	μὸν καὶ λύχ[ν]ον καὶ σπονδήν.		ροῦ διὰ ἡμερῶν δ[έκα]
	καὶ		καὶ ἀπὸ φθορᾶς ἡμερῶν
	ἀπὸ νεκροῦ καθαρίζεσται δεκα-		τετταράκοντα, καὶ μηθένα
20	ταί[αν], ἀπὸ γυναικέων ἐβ[δ]ο-		θυσιάσειν ἄνε[υ]
	μαία[ν],		τοῦ καθειδρυσμένου τὸ
	ἀνδροφόνον μηδὲ περὶ τὸν τό-		ἱερὸν· ἐὰν δὲ τις βιάσῃται,
	πον, ἀπὸ δὲ φθορᾶς τετταρα-		ἀπρόσδεκτος
	κοσταίαν, ἀπὸ δὲ γυναικὸς λου-		ἢ θυσία παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ·
25	σάμενοι κατακέφαλα αὐθειμε-		παρέχειν δὲ καὶ τῶι θεῶι
	ρί. εὐίλατος γένοιτο ὁ θεὸς τοῖς		τὸ καθήκον, δεξιὸν
	θεραπεύουσιν ἀπλή τῇ ψυχῇ.	10	σκέλος καὶ δορὰν καὶ
	ἐὰν δὲ τινα ἀνθρώπινα πάσχη ἢ		κεφαλὴν καὶ πόδας καὶ
	ἀσθενήσῃ ἢ ἀποδημήσῃ, θερα-		στηθύνιον καὶ ἔλαιον
	πευέ[τω]		ἐπὶ βωμὸν καὶ λύχνον καὶ
	τὸν θεὸν ὧι ἂν αὐτὸς παραδῶι·		σχίζας καὶ σπονδήν, καὶ
	ὄς ἂν δ[έ]		εὐείλατος
30	πολυπραγμονήσῃ ἢ περιεργάσῃ-		γένεῖτο ὁ θεὸς τοῖς θερα-

- τα[ι],  
 ἄμαρτίαν ὀφ[ει]λέτω Μηνὶ Τυ-  
 ράννῳ,  
 ἦν οὐκ ἐξειλάσεται. διδότη κε-  
  
 <right face>  
 φαλή(ν)  
 καὶ  
 πόδας <καὶ  
 15 στηθύ-  
 νιον.
- πεύουσιν ἀπλή τῆ ψυχῆ·  
 ἐὰν δέ τινα |  
 ἀνθρώπινα πάσχη ἢ ἄσθε-  
 νήση ἢ ἀποδημήση που,  
 μηθένα ἀνθρώ-  
 πων ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν, ἐὰν  
 μὴ ὦ ἂν αὐτὸς παραδῶι.  
 ὃς ἂν δέ πολυ||-  
 15 πραγμονήση τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ  
 ἢ περιεργάσηται, ἄμαρ-  
 τίαν ὀφειλέτω Μηνὶ |  
 Τυράννῳ, ἦν οὐ μὴ δύνη-  
 ται ἐξειλάσασθαι. ὁ δὲ  
 θυσιάζων τῆ ἐβδόμη |  
 τὰ καθήκοντα πάντα ποι-  
 εῖτωι τῷ θεῷ· λαμ-  
 βανέτωι δὲ τῆς θυσίας ἧς |  
 ἂν φέρῃ σκέλος καὶ ὦμον,  
 τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ κατακοπτέτω  
 <ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ· εἰ δέ τις |  
 [[εἰ δέ τις]] προσφέρει  
 θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ, ἐγ νου-  
 μηνίας μέχρι πεντεκαι||-  
 20 δεκάτης· ἐὰν δέ τις τρά-  
 πεζαν πληρῶι τῷ θεῷ,  
 λαμβανέτω τὸ ἥμισ[υ]· |  
 τοὺς δὲ βουλομένους ἔρα-  
 νον συνάγειν Μηνὶ Τυ-  
 ράννῳ ἐπ' ἀγαθῆι  
 τύ[χηι].|  
 ὁμοίως δὲ παρέξουσιν οἱ  
 ἔρανισταὶ τὰ καθήκοντα  
 τῷ θεῷ, δε[ξιὸν] |  
 σκέλος καὶ δορὰν καὶ  
 κοτύλην ἐλαίου καὶ χοῦν  
 οἴνου καὶ να[στὸν χοινι]||-  
 κιαῖον καὶ ἐφίερα τρία καὶ  
 κολλύβων χοίνικες δύο  
 καὶ ἀκροά[ματα, ἐ]||-  
 25 ἂν κατακλιθῶσιν οἱ ἔρα-  
 νισταὶ καὶ στέφανον καὶ  
 λημνίσ[κον]· |

καὶ εὐεΐλατος γένοιτο τοῖς  
 ἀπλῶς προσπορευομέ-  
 νοι[ς].  
*vacat*

*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1365*

Xanthos the Lykian consecrated the temple of Mēn – the god having chosen him.

For good fortune: No one shall enter while impure, but let him be purified after (eating) garlic and pork.

And no one shall offer sacrifice without the (permission of the) founder. If anyone does this by force, the sacrifice will be unacceptable to the god.

(The sacrifice) shall provide what is prescribed for the god, a right leg, the skin, olive oil for the altar, a lamp, and a libation. And let him be purified from (contact with) a corpse on the tenth day; from menstruation on the seventh day; but (do) not (let) a murderer around the place; from a miscarriage (abortion) on the fortieth day, from (intercourse with) a woman on the same day, having washed themselves from head to foot. May the god be merciful to those who serve

*IG II<sup>2</sup> 1366*

Xanthos the Lykian (slave) of Gaius Orbius, consecrated the temple of Mēn Tyrannos – the god having chosen him. For good fortune. No one shall enter while impure, but let them be purified after (eating) garlic or pork and (intercourse with) women.

When members have washed from head to foot on the same day, they may enter. And (a woman), having washed from head to foot for seven days after menstruation, may enter on the same [i.e., seventh] day. And (likewise) for ten days after (contact) with a corpse, and forty days after a miscarriage (abortion). No one shall offer sacrifice without (the permission of) the founder of the temple. If anyone does this by force, the sacrifice will be unacceptable to the god.

(The sacrificer) shall provide what is prescribed for the god, a right leg, the skin, head, feet, breast, olive oil for the altar, a lamp, kindling, and a libation.

May the god be merciful to those who serve (the god) with

(the god) with a simple soul.

If he (the founder) dies or is sick or out of town, let people serve the god with the approval of the one to whom (the founder) hands over (authority).

Anyone who is a busybody or meddles will incur sin against Mēn Tyrannos that cannot be expiated. Let him give (to the priest) a head and feet and a breast.

a simple soul.

If he (the founder) dies or is sick or out of town, let no one have authority except the one to whom he hands it over.

Anyone who is a busybody or is interferes with the property of the god will incur sin against Mēn Tyrannos which he certainly cannot expiate.

And the one who offers sacrifices on the seventh (day of the month) should perform all that is appropriate for the god; let him receive a leg and shoulder from the sacrifice which is brought; let the remainder be cut up at the temple. And if anyone offers a sacrifice to the god from new moon till the fifteenth (and?) if someone fills a table for the god, let him receive a half-portion (of its contents). Those who wish may convene a club (*eranos*) for Mēn Tyrannos (may do so) for good fortune. Likewise, the club members shall provide what is appropriate for the god, a right leg, hide, a *kotylē* of oil, a *chous* of wine, a *choinix* worth of cake, three sacred cakes, two *choinikes* of small cakes, and fruit. If the club members hold banquet (they shall provide) a wreath and a woolen fillet. And may [the god] be very merciful to those who approach with simplicity.

### Notes

1365.1; 1366.1: Ξάνθος: PAA 730670; LGPN 2:344[?]. A common slave name (Fragiadakis 1986, 363). Gurlitt 1868, 731 thought that Xanthos was the son of Gaius Orbius, but Dittenberger (*Syll*<sup>3</sup> 1042) is surely right that Ξάνθος Λύκιος Γαῖου Ὀρβίου in IG II<sup>2</sup> 1366.1 denotes “servus non filius.”

1366.1: Γαῖου Ὀρβίου, “Gaius Orbius”: The double name suggests that Xanthos’ owner was a Roman citizen. J.H. Oliver, “The Athenian Archon Thisbianus,” *Hesperia* 32, no. 3 (1963) 318 (BE 1964 no. 138) cites an Athenian herm honoring [Γ.] Ὀλβιον Θισβια[νόν] Μαραθώνιον (*SEG* 18:83 = *SEG* 21:760, 186/7 CE) which, he argues, must be a mistake for G. Orbios Thisbianos (of Marathon) (see also Meritt 1963, 49). Oliver conjectures that this is the same person as that named in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1366* and the archon named in the inscription published by A. E. Raubitschek (“Commodus and Athens,” *Commemorative Studies in Honor of Theodore Leslie Shear* [Hesperia Supplements 8, 1949] 279–290, here 279), which Raubitschek restored as ἐπὶ ἀρχοντος Γ. [Ιου]λίου Θισβιαν[ου Μα]ραθωνίου, but which now should be restored ἐπὶ ἀρχοντος Γ. [Ορ]βίου Θισβιαν[ου Μα]ραθωνίου. If Oliver is right, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1365/66* would probably be dated within about twenty years of Orbius’ archonship in 186/7 CE.

1365.5; 1366.1–2: Μηνὸς Τυράννου → *Comment*.

1365.10; 1366.3: ἀπό σκόροδον. → *Comment*. Garlic (σκόροδον) is a perennial vegetable that has grown in Egypt and the Near East since early times (Crawford 1973). It was consumed in a variety of ways: fresh, dried, and powdered.

On the use of ἀπό in prohibitions see Lupu, *NGSL* 7.3–15; *ID* 2530 = *LSCGSup* 54 (Delos) and the purity regulations cited below (→ *Comment*).

1365.21–22: ἀνδροφόνον μηδὲ περὶ τὸν τόπον, “but (do) not (let) a murderer around the place.” Gurlitt (1868, 734) argued that the absence of a counterpart to this prohibition in 1366 indicated that Xanthos later “jedem den eintritt gestattetete.” This seems most unlikely. Lane (1971–78, 3:9n.49), citing Protz, et al. 1896–1906, 2:151, thinks that the exclusion of murderers is obvious and for that reason was omitted in 1366. Murderers are also prohibited from entry into a temple in *IG XII Suppl.* 126 = *LSCG* 124.10 (Eresos, II BCE): [φονέας] δὲ μὴ εἰστέιχιν ἢ μηδὲ προδοτάς.

1365.23; 1366.4: ἀπό δὲ γυναικός, “after (intercourse with) a woman.” The same formula appears in numerous purity regulations: e.g., *ID* 2367.5–6 (Delos): [παριναίαι ἀγν]ὸν ἀπό γυναικός; *ID* 2529.16–17 (Delos, 116/5 BCE): ἀγνεύοντα[ς] | [ἀπό γυν]αικός και κρέως; *ID* 2530.4 (Delos, II BCE): ἀπό γυναικός τριταίου[ς]; *SEG* 14:529.16–17 (Cos, II BCE): ἀπό λεχοῦς και | ἐγ διαφθοράς ἀμέρας δέκα, ἀπό γυναικός τρεῖ[ς]; *IG XII Suppl.* 126.9 (Eresos, II BCE): [ἀπό δὲ γ]ύναικος αὐτάμερον λοεσσάμενον; *I Eph* 3401.3–4 = *LSAM* 29 (Ephesos): [ἀγνεύ]εται ἀπό | [κῆ]δους | ἡμέρας | [δώδεκα,] ἀπό | [γυν]αικός τῆς || ἰδία[ς] ἡμέρας δύο[ς]; *IPerg* II 264.1–3: [εἰσπορευέ]σθω εἰς [τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ ἀγνεύων ἀπό γυ][ναικός ἡμέ]ρας δέκα; *TAM* V/1 530.6–12 (Maionia, 147/6 BCE): ἀγνεύειν δὲ | ἀπό μὲν κ[ῆ]δους ὁμαίμου πεμπταῖον, τοῦ δὲ ἄλλου τριταῖον, ἀπό δὲ γυναι[κός] εἰς τὸν περιωρισμέ[νο]νον τόπον τοῦ Μητροῦ; *LSCGSup* 91.7–8 (Alexandria, I BCE): τοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας | [ἀ]πό γυναικός β’.

Interestingly, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1365.23* treats the *miasma* that comes from intercourse along with the much more serious pollutions (corpses; menstruation; miscarriage) while *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1366.4* groups it with more minor contaminants (garlic and swine) requiring only washing on the same day.

1365.20; 1366.5: ἀπό γυναικῶν → *ID* 2530.3, 7–8 (Delos, II BCE): λουσάμε|νον...ἀπό γυναικει|ων ἐναταίους. Several other terms are used for menstruation (→ *Comment*): Lupu, *NGSL* 7 (ca. 200 BCE): τὰ φυσικά; *LSCGSup* 119 (I BCE): τὰ καταμήνια. Philo, *Leg. All.* 1.13: αἱ τε ἀποκρίσεις ἐπὶ δάκρυα, μύζαι, σέλος, σπέρμα, διττοὶ περιτωμάτων ὄχετοί, και ὁ δι’ ὄλου τοῦ σώματος ἰδρώς. ἐν γε μὴν ταῖς νόσοις κριτικωτάτη ἐβδομάς. και γυναιξὶ δὲ αἱ καταμήνιοι καθάρσεις ἄχρ

ἑβδομάδος παρατείνουσιν, “There are seven secretions: tears, mucus, saliva, semen, the two excremental discharges, and sweat which comes from every part of the body. Moreover, in diseases the seventh day is the most critical period and in women the monthly purification extends to the seventh day.”

1365.22; 1366.7: ἀπό δὲ φθορᾶς, “after a miscarriage/abortion”: Commenting on *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1366 and *IG* XII/1 789.12 (Lindos, Rhodes, II CE = *LSCG* 139): ἀπό φθορείω[ν] ἡμ<sup>ε</sup>(ρῶν) μ’, Johannes Ilberg (“Zur gynäkologischen Ethik der Griechen,” *ARW* 13 [1910] 1–19, 2–3) shows, citing Soranos *Gynaeciorum libri iv* 1.28.59, that φθόρα can mean either abortion or miscarriage. In *Didache* 2.2 οὐ φονεύσεις τέκνον ἐν φθορᾷ the term appears to refer to an abortion. In *ILindos* II 487.11 (Lindos, ca 225 CE), however, φθορά clearly mean ‘miscarriage’: [ἀ]πό φθορᾶς γυναικὸς ἢ κυνὸς ἢ ὄνου ἡμε(ρῶν) μ[α’], “after a miscarriage of a woman or a dog or a donkey, 41 days.” Wide (1909, 227) concluded from the prohibition of abortion that the Mēn inscription betrayed Jewish influence; but it should be noted that this inscription does not prohibit abortion (if that is what φθορά means in this case) but restricts entry into the temple for forty days after an abortion. See also Parker 1983, 353–56.

1365.24; 1366.5–6: κατακέφαλα, “from head [to foot]” → Lupu, *NGSL* 7.12–13 (Arcadia, ca. 200 BCE): ἐκ κεφαλᾶς | λουσάμενον, “having washed from head [to foot].” See also *LSCG*Sup 65.8 (Thasos, IV BCE): [καὶ λούσασθαι] | κατὰ κεφαλῆς..., “and having washed from head [to food].” Theophrastus, *Characters* 16 lampoons those who engage in repeated or ‘superstitious’ ablutions.

1365.25; 1366.11: εὐ(ε)ίλατος, “merciful” → *IGBulg* III/1 930.1–2 (Philippopolis): Ο Ἡρακλῆς | Π[· ε]ὐεἰλάτος γένου|το; *IGRR* 1/5 1237.4–6 (Wadi Hammamat, 20 CE): θεῶ Πανί, || ὅτι εὐεἰλατος ὑμεῖν | γέγονε; *PSI* IV 392.6 (242/41 BCE): ὥστε συν[β]ῆναι τοῦ βασιλέως εὐλάτου γενομένου καὶ ἐπιγράψαντος τὴν ἄφρασιν; *UPZ* 109.6 (98 BCE): αἰρετίζω αὐτοὺς ὡς [ποι]ῶσι [μο]ι [τ]ὸ πρ[ο]σκύνημα αὐτῶν ἐν ···[·] ·····[·6]··· εὐλάτου τετεύχασι τοῦ βασιλέως ··· αὐτοῦ εἰ[σ]αγγελία γεγονέναι ἐν Ἀλεξαν[δ]ρ[ε]ία ···]. Wide 1909, 228 draws attention to 1 Esdras 8:53: ἐδεήθημεν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν κατὰ ταῦτα καὶ εὐλάτου ἐτύχομεν, “We prayed to our Lord about these things and we found him to be merciful; Ps 99(98):8: κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν σὺ ἐπήκουες αὐτῶν ὁ θεὸς σὺ εὐίλατος ἐγένου αὐτοῖς, “Lord our God, you answered them, you, O God, were merciful to them.”

1365.26; 1366.12: ἀπλη τῆ ψυχῆ → *Comment*.

1365.27; 1366.13: τινα ἀνθρώπινα πάσχη, “die” → *IG* V/2 266.20 (Mantineia, Arkadia, 46–43 bce): ἐάν τι ἀνθρώπινον πάθη; *FD* III 1:303.8–9 (Delphi, I ce): ἐπεὶ δὲ κά τι | πάθη ἀνθρώπινον Μνασίμαχος; *FD* III 2:172.46–47 (Delphi): ἐπεὶ δὲ κά τι πάθων[τ]ι ἀνθρώπινον Φιλῶ ἢ Νικόστρατος; *TAM* II 261.b.7–9 (Lykia, before 43 CE): [ῥτα]ν δὲ τ[ι π]ᾶθαι ἀνθρώπ[ι]ν[ων κ]αὶ μεταλλ[ά]ξ[ω]ι τὸν βίω[ν], etc.

1365.30; 1366.11–15: πολυπραγμονήση (τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ) ἢ περιεργάσεται. While the version in 1365 might be rendered “anyone who is a busybody or meddles” (intended in some general sense), 1366 adds τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. Horsley (1983b, 26) cites *P.Princ.* III 119.2.2–4 (325 CE) (= *SB* XII 10989), τοὺς περιεργαζομένους τὰς ἀλλοτριὰς κτήσεις καὶ ἔνδειξιν ἐπιχειροῦντας μισοῦσιν μὲν οἱ νόμοι, μισεῖ δὲ καὶ ἡ σὴ μισοπονηρία, “both the laws and your own hatred of evil-doing hate those who interfere with the property of others and who try to make an indictment...” where περιεργάζομαι with a direct object means to “interfere with.”

1365.31; 1366.15: ἁμαρτία. Lane (1971–1978, 3:19–23) notes several Mēn inscriptions that mention sin (ἁμαρτία) requiring propitiation (*CMRDM* 42; 70, 71, 77). Confession of sins is attested in *CMRDM* 77 (= *ILydia*KP 1:25; *ISard*BR 96)

(Sardis): [····ω]ν Ἀριστ[οει][κου(?) ἐλεη]θεὶς καὶ ἀμ[αρ][τήσας κα]ταπίπτω εἰς ἀ[σ][θ][ένειαν] καὶ ὁμολογῶ τ[ὸ] || [ἀμάρτημ]α Μηγνὶ Ἀξίω[τ][τηνῶ] καὶ στη]λλογρ[αφῶ], “I, NN son of Aristoneikos, who was shown mercy and who sinned, fell ill. I confess the sin to Mēn Axiottenos and inscribed this stele.” On confessions of sins to the gods, see Fridoff Kudlien, “Beichte und Heilung.” *Medizin-Historisches Journal* 13 (1978) 1–14.

A number of other Asian Mēn inscriptions convey the notion that the god punishes failures to keep vows. *CMRDM* 50 (Lydia, 235–6 CE) is a dedication by a woman who, when she was unable to keep her vow to sacrifice a bull, was accommodated by Mēn who accepted the stele instead. But *CMRDM* 80 (Sardis, 160–61 CE) reports that a man who failed to keep a vow was punished (κολασθεὶς) by the god. In *CMRDM* 47 = *TAM* V/1 460 (Lydia, 118–19 CE) a woman who failed to respond to Mēn’s “call to service” (κληθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἰς ὑπηρεσίας χάριν) was punished by being driven mad (ἐκολάσето αὐτήν καὶ μανῆναι ἐποίησεν), but was subsequently “ordered” to inscribe a stele (στηλλογραφῆναι) and enroll (καταγράψαι) in the service of the gods.

1365.32; 1366.16: ἐξειλάσεται. For a similar use of this word but to opposite effect, see Heb 2:17: ὅθεν ὤφειλεν κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι, ἵνα ἐλεῆμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εἰς τὸ ἰλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἀμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ, “Therefore he had to be made like his brethren in every respect, so that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God, to make expiation for the sins of the people” (RSV). The verb also appears in *CMRDM* 35 = *TAM* V/1 322 (Lydia, 236/7 CE): Θεῆ Ἀναεῖτι καὶ Μηγνὶ Τιαμου | Τύχη καὶ Σωκράτης καὶ Ἀμμιανὸς καὶ Τρόφιμος οἱ Ἀμμίου καὶ Φιλῆτη καὶ Σωκρατία || αἱ Ἀμμιάδος ποιήσαντες τὸ ἱεροπώμημα εἰλασάμενοι Μητέραν Ἀναεῖτιν ὑπὲρ τέκνων καὶ | θρεμμάτων ἔνγραφον ἔστησαν, “To the Goddess Anaetis and Mēn Tiamou: Tychē and Socrates and Ammianos and Trophimos, the sons of Ammios, and Philētē and Socratia, the daughters of Ammias, having made a sacrifice to propitiate Mater Anaetis for the sake of their children and nurslings, inscribed and set up (this stele).”

1366.16: τῆ ἑβδόμη, “the seventh day.” Sokolowski (1969, 108) suggests that the seventh day is related to the phases of the moon.

1366.19–20: εἰ δέ τις | [εἰ δέ τις] προσφέρει θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ, ἐγ νομηνίας μέχρι πεντεκαὶ| δεκάτης. The phrase is incomplete.

1366.20: τράπεζα, “table.” Gill (1991, 67–68 [no. 52]) described a fragment of a cult table (EM 4014) bearing the inscription ΞΑΘΟΣ N– – and made from the same stone as *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1366*. Since l. 20 refers to the τράπεζα of the group, Gill argues: “The stone of which the fragment and the stele are made is sufficiently rare and sufficiently like that in the theater of Thorikos to make it probable that the fragment came from the same area. He notes, further, that the letters of the two inscriptions are similar (careless, irregular) even though they are not made by the same cutter, and that the names, Xanthos, Xathos, though not the same, are “similar and also foreign, no doubt.”

1366.23–24: να[στὸν χοινι]κταῖον, “a choinix worth of cake.” A choinix represented about 1 litre of wheat, equivalent to the daily caloric needs of an active male. → M.M. Markle, “Jury Pay and Assembly Pay at Athens,” in *Athenian Democracy*, ed. P.J. Rhodes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) 95–131, here 126; Lin Foxhall and H.A. Forbes, “*Sitomētria*: The Role of Grain as a Staple Food in Classical Antiquity,” *Chiron* 12 (1982) 41–90.

1366.24: κολλύβων χοϊνικες δύο, “two *choinikes* of small cakes.” On κόλλυβον see B. Schmidt, “Totengebräuche und Gräberkultus im heutigen Griechenland,” *ARW* 25 (1927) 52–82, esp. 52–53.

1366.24: ἐπίερα, “sacrificial cake” → *ICosED* 140.10–11 (Cos, IV BCE): τῷ δὲ | [θεῶι ἐφ]ίερα δίδοται κριθᾶν τρία ἡμέδιμνα, “to the god is offered three sacrificial cakes made of one half medimnos of barley.”

1366.24: ἀκρό[δρνα, “fruit”: Sokolowski; Horsley. The restoration is uncertain: ἀκρό[ματα, “songs [during a meal]” (Robert and Robert 1989, 47); ἀκρο[κόλια, “extremities [of the sacrificed animals]” (Foucart); ἀκρό[αμα, “song” (Ziehen; Lane); ἀκρο[θίνιον; “first fruits” (Dittenberger).

1366.26: λημνίσ[κον] → *AM* 66:228.15 [39] (138/7 BCE); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1297.11 [24] (236/5 BCE).

### Comments

Mēn is a Phrygian moon god often associated with Attis. The cult of Mēn is widely attested in Asia and was transported to Attica as early as the third century BCE (Perdrizet 1896; Sokolowski 1969, 107). Mēn is usually depicted as a handsome young man wearing a Phrygian cap, with the crescent of the moon behind his shoulders (Lane 1990; Perdrizet 1896). Both *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1365 and 1366 bear the typical crescent associated with Mēn though neither depicts the god himself (Lane 1971–1978, 1:plates VIII, IX, X). Other symbols associated with Mēn include the peacock, the pine cone, and the pomegranate.

The site of the discovery of these two inscriptions, Laurion (rather than Sounion as is often reported: see Lauffer 1956–1957, 180 n. 3), was the location of silver mines that supplied Athens with silver for coinage. Since the mines were worked by slaves, Sokolowski is perhaps right to suggest that Xanthos was or had been a slave attached to the Laurion mines (1969, 107). Nilsson describes the cult of Mēn as “ein ausgesprochener Sklavenkult” (Nilsson 1967, 2:121). Indeed, the oldest attestation of the cult of Mēn in Attica are two fourth century BCE dedications from slaves at Laurion who had formed an *eranos*:

[Τυ]ράν[νοι Μηνι ἀν]έθ[ε]||[σα]ν ἐπ’ εὐτυχίας ἐρα[νισ]ταὶ : οἶδε : Κάδους | Μάνης : Καλλίας : || Ἄττας : Ἀρτεμίδω[ρος] : Μάης : Σωσίας : | Σαγγάριος Ἑρμαῖος : Τίβειος : Ἑρμος (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2940; compare *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2937, without the god’s name, but the same dedicators; but see W. Peek, *AM* 67 [1942] 44 n. 57, who suggests restoring the lacuna as [Ἡ]ρακ[λεῖ θεῶι· or [Ἡ]ρακ[λεῖ Τυρτίωι].

By the third century the cult was also practiced by the freeborn: two Piraean inscriptions, a III BCE altar from the Piraeus (found in the excavations of the Metroon; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4687a) and a statue base from the same era (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4685), bear dedications to Mēn. A relief from Thorikos (just north of Laurion) shows two free adherents before a cult table and Mēn seated (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4684):

Δημήτριος | καὶ ἡ γυνὴ | Ἐρώτιον | Μηνί, | ἐπὶ ἱερε[ῖ]ας || Γλαύκου (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4687a; Piraeus, III BCE)



Μιτραδάτης καὶ ἡ γυνὴ Μηνί (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 4684; Thorikos, III BCE*)

Διονύσιος καὶ Βαβυλία τῷ Μηνί τὸ ἱερὸν ἀνέθεσαν (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 4685; Piraeus, III BCE*)

Lane has collected a total of thirteen references to the cult in Attica (1971–1978, 1:1–10 [nos. 1–13]).

Three inscriptions set up by Xanthos have been found. The shortest (now lost) is a simple dedication which reads  $\Xi\acute{\alpha}[\nu]\theta\omicron\varsigma$   $M[\eta\nu\acute{\iota}$   $\tau\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\nu\omega]$  and is restored by analogy (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 4856; Lane, CMRDM 1: no. 11; Horsley 1983, 22*). The second and third are *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1365* and *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1366*, the former an earlier draft of the latter. In 1366 the language has been clarified and strengthened in places and some prescriptions have been added.

Xanthos was evidently not only the founder of the temple but also its first priest (Lauffer 1956–1957, 183). The regulations allow access to the temple only with the permission of Xanthos or his designate, should he be ill or away. Xanthos also provided for an authorized successor in the role of guardian and priest of the cult. Xanthos claims divine authorization founding the cult; similar authorization can be found in the Zeus/Agdistis cult in Philadelphia (*Syll3 985*) and a Sarapis cult in Opus (*IG X/2.1 255 [77]*), the latter authorized through a dream. Horsley points out that only one Mēn dedication is explicitly authorized through a dream (Μηνί εὐχαραστήριον | [κα]τὰ ὄναρ, *CMRDM 4:137* [Pisidian Antioch]), but several Mēn inscriptions use the formula κατ' ἐπιταγὴν ('by a command'), which might imply revelation in a dream (Horsley 1983a, 23; Lane 1971–1978, 4:46).

Although it is common to suppose that the cult association associated with the temple appealed largely to non-citizens (Lauffer 1956–1957, 184), Horsley observes (rightly) that the first few lines grant access to both men and women and that nothing in the regulations implies an exclusively slave association. Other Attic inscriptions represent a family approaching the cult table of Mēn (see above).

*Purifications.* Of particular interest are the emphases both on purifications before entry into the temple, and on the moralizing requirements. Rather than the simple prescription to cleanse oneself, this inscription twice stipulates that the one participating in worship must have bathed from head to foot (λουσαμένους κατακέφαλα; λουσαμένην κατὰ κέφαλα). In this case admission to the temple requires purification, sometimes after an elapse of time, from certain acts and substances: after contact with garlic, (eating?) pork, and intercourse after having washed; seven days after menstruation, ten days after (contact) with a corpse, and forty days after a miscarriage or abortion. Similar restrictions are attested for other sanctuaries. For example:

Megalopolis, Arcadia (a temple of Isis, Sarapis, and Anubis): Lupu, *NGSL 7.3–15* (ca. 200 BCE): after childbirth (ἀπὸ λέχ[ο]υς), 9 days; miscarriage/abortion (ἀπὸ διαφθέρματος), 44 days; menstruation (ἀπὸ τῶ[v] | φυσικῶν), 7 days; bloodshed (?) (ἀπὸ φό[v]ου), 7 days; after eating goat or mutton, 3 days; after

eating other food, after washing on the same day; sexual intercourse, after washing on the same day.

Delos (temple of Atargatis?): *ID 2530 = LSCGSup 54* (II BCE): after eating fish, 3 days; pork (ἀπό υἱείου), having bathed (on the same day?); after intercourse, 3 days; after childbirth (ἀπό τετοκείας), 7 days; after a miscarriage/abortion (ἀπό διαφορᾶς); 40 days; after menstruation (ἀπό γυναικείων), 9 days.

Eresos (unknown goddess): *IG XII Supp. 126 = LSCG 124* (II BCE): after the funeral of a relative, after twenty days; the funeral of someone else, after three days; after a stillbirth ([ἀπό δὲ θν]άτω), 10 days; after childbirth (αὐταν δὲ | [τὰν τετό]κοισαν), 40 days; (for the man) after a live birth ([ἀπό δὲ βιω]τῶ) (?), 3 days; for the woman who has given birth (αὐταν δὲ τ[άν] [τε]τόκοισαν), 10 days(?); after (intercourse) with one's wife, on the same day; but a murder ([φονέας]) cannot enter, nor a traitor (προδόταις), nor Galloi (γάλλοις), nor women devotee of Cybele ([γύ]ναικες γαλλάζην). Also prohibited from the *temenos* are weapons of war, carcasses (θνσιδίων), iron, bronze, nor shoes, nor anything else made of skin; nor shall a woman enter the sanctuary (ναῦον) except the priestess and the prophetess.

Lindos, Rhodes (unknown deity): *ILindos II 487 = LSCGSup 91* (ca. 225 BCE): after a miscarriage of a woman, a dog or a donkey, 41 days; after deflowering (a virgin), 41 days; after contact with the corpse (of one's family), 41 days; after bathing a corpse, 7 days; after entrance (???), 3 days; after the marriage bed, 3 days; after childbirth, 21 days; after ... woman... after she has washed; after intercourse, having washed or purified himself; after sex with a courtesan, 30 days; but after illegal deeds, one is never cleansed.

Lindos, Rhodes (oriental deity?): *IG XII/1 789 = LSCG 139* (II ce): having one's hands and thoughts purified and being healthy, and with no terrible thoughts; after eating lentils, 3 days; after (eating) goat, 3 days; after eating cheese, 3 days; after a miscarriage (ἀπό φορειῶ[ν]), 40 days; after contact with a corpse of one's own dead (ἀπό κήδους [οικ]είου), 40 days; after lawful intercourse (ἀπό συνουσίας νομ[ί]μου), on the same day, having purified oneself by sprinkling, and first using oil; after (loss of?) virginity....

Cyrene (Apollo?): *LSCGSup 115* (IV BCE): after intercourse: after having washed (but the code distinguishes between intercourse at night and during the day); (a man) after his wife has given birth, 3 days.

Ptolemais, Egypt (unknown temple): *LSCGSup 119* (I BCE): after the death (ἀπό πάθους) of a family member or someone else, 7 days; after a miscarriage (ἀπ' ἀπαλλ[α]γῆς), ...? days; after an abortion (ἀπ' ἐκτρωσμοῦ), with... ? days; after childbirth (τετοκείας) and nursing, ...? days; and if the child should be exposed (ἐὰν ἐχθῆ), 14 days; men may enter after intercourse ([ἀ]πό γυναικός) after 2 days, and women following their husbands (ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἀνδρά[σιν]); after an abortion (ἀπ' ἐκτρωσμοῦ), 40 days;... but after she gives birth and nurses, ...? days; and if the child is exposed, ...? days; after menstruation (ἀπό καταμηνίων), 7 days, but for the husband, 2 days.

A few items in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1365/66* stand out as peculiar. The reason for the prohibition of garlic here is unclear. Antaphrodisiac plants such as garlic were consumed by women during the Thesmophoria (see Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 66–

68); *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1184.15* (IV BCE) requires, among several other ritual substances, σκόρδων δύο στατήρας. Tzanetou observes that during the fasting portion of the Thesmophoria (*Nesteia*) the use of antaphrodisiac plants “symbolized women’s chastity during the festival, because women reverted symbolically to their prior status as virgins” (2002, 333; also Versnel 1976, 35). It is unclear whether the antaphrodisiac qualities of garlic were at issue in the prohibition of *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1365/66*.

The prohibition of consumption of pork (χοίρειος) is also interesting precisely because swine were common as sacrificial animals. The cult of Atargatis(?) on Delos also prohibited pork (*ID 2530 = LSCGSup 54* [II BCE]). But no other Mēn inscriptions suggest that consumption of pork was forbidden. This highlights Horsley’s point that “cultural factors, and the personalities of individual founders of localized groups, will be elements contributing to the diversity” of local expression of a cult (1983, 22).

Despite the purity rituals and the expressions of the god’s mercy, tampering with the possessions of the gods is treated as an “unpardonable sin” which cannot be expiated (ἰλάσκομαι). Distinctive of the cult of Mēn are repeated claims that the god inflicts punishments – illness, madness and other ailments – for disobedience or for other “sins” (Lane 1971–1978, 3:18–23).

*Morality and Cult.* A second noteworthy feature of the two inscriptions is their focus on interior purity, expressed as “simplicity of soul” (ἀπλῆ τῆ ψυχῆ, 1365.26; 1366.12, 26). R. Turcan, in his review of *CMRDM III* in *Gnomon* (51 [1979] 280–87, here 282), draws attention to the increased scrutiny in the Hellenistic period of interior purity, citing Cicero’s comments in *De legibus* 2.24 and Theophrastos, *Περὶ Εὐσεβείας* frags. 8–9 (ed. Walter Pötscher, *Theophrastos ΠΕΡΙ ΕΥΣΕΒΕΙΑΣ. Griechischer Text* [Philosophia Antiqua 11; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964]):

The law commands us to approach the gods in purity (*caste*)—that is, purity of soul (*animo*), in which are included all things. This does not remove the necessity for purity of the body, but it should be understood that since the soul is much superior to the body and that one must observe the requirement of bodily purity, we ought to be much more careful about the soul. For in the former case impurity is removed by the sprinkling of water or the passage of a certain number of days, but a blemish on the soul can neither be blotted out by the passage of time nor washed away by any river. (Cicero, *De legibus* 2.24)

Believing that the gods have no need of [sacrifices], but rather see the character (τὸ ἦθος) of those who approach them, since they take as the greatest sacrifice having the correct opinion concerning them [the gods] and their deeds, how is this not prudent, and holy, and righteous (σώφρων καὶ ὅσιος καὶ δίκαιος)? For the gods, the best offering of first fruits is a pure mind and a soul free of passions (νοῦς καθαρὸς καὶ ψυχὴ ἀπαθής). (Theophrastos, *Περὶ Εὐσεβείας* frag. 8 = Porphyry, *De abstentia* 2.60–61)

One must thus purify one’s character (τὸ ἦθος) and thus come to sacrifice to the gods, loving the gods, offer these sacrifices, but not costly ones. Now people

suppose that it is not enough for the purity of sacrifices to have an unclean body clothed with distinguished clothing; but when they come to the sacrifices having a soul not purified of evils but having dressed the body with splendid clothing, they think that it doesn't matter, as if God does not especially rejoice over the most divine part of us being pure, see that it is related to what he had planted (in us). (Theophrastus, Περὶ Εὐσεβείας frag. 9 = Porphyry, *De abstentia* 2.19–20)

As Chaniotis (1997) has observed, even though the distinction between the outer and inner parts of the human being appears in literature and philosophy in the fifth century BCE, it is not until considerably later that one finds an emphasis on inner purity in cultic rules. Chaniotis argues that the earliest attestation of the requirement for inner purity is from the late classical period, from the temple of Asklepios at Epidaurus:

ἀγνὸν χρῆ ναιοῖο θυώδεος ἐντὸς ἰόντα  
ἔμμεναι· ἀγνεῖα δ' ἐστὶ φρονεῖν ὅσια.  
One must be pure if one comes into the temple  
purity means to think pious thoughts.

The attestation of this is not epigraphical but literary, from a section of Porphyry's *De abstentia* that is sometimes treated as a quotation from Theophrastus, Περὶ Εὐσεβείας (frag. 9 = Porphyry, *De abstentia* 2.19–20). Recently, however, Bremmer has argued that the attribution of *De abstentia* 19.4–20.1 to Theophrastus is not secure (2002, 106–8; so Bouffartigue and Patillon 1977–79, 2:29). Bremmer observes, moreover, that the conjunction of ἀγνός and ὅσιος is otherwise unattested until the common era and represents a new development. Accordingly he argues that the Asklepios inscription belongs to the Hellenistic period, not to the late classical period. Two other first-century Asklepieia, in Mytilene and on Rhodes, attest to the emphasis on moral purity as a requirement to enter a temple:

*IG XII Supp.* 23 (Mytilene; Imperial Period) = *LSCGSup* 82: Enter this precinct pure (ἀγνὸν), with holy thoughts (ὅσια φρονέοντα).

*LSCGSup* 108: (Rhodes; mid I CE): To enter this fragrant temple and remain there, one must be pure (ἀγνὸν) from intercourse, from beans, and from the heart (ἀπὸ καρδίας), not by bathing, but by a pure mind... (οὐ λουτροῖ | ἀλλὰ νόφ καθαρὸν).

Even if the Epidaurian inscription is dated well into the Hellenistic or early Roman period, Chaniotis helpfully chronicles the introduction of notions of moral purity into cultic regulations, beginning with the second century BCE. An inscription from Phaistos (Crete; temple of the Great Mother) requires both piety and good speech to enter the temple and a regulation from Eresos (Aegean Islands; II BCE) excludes not only those with physical impurities but those who have committed moral transgressions:

*IC I xxiii* 3.6–11 (Phaistos, Crete; II BCE): All the pious (εὐσεβίης) and those of sweet speech (εὐγλωθ|{1}οι) come as pure into the temple of the Great Mother, which is full of the divine (ἐνθεον); you will recognize divine-filled deeds of the immortals worthy of this temple.

*IG XII Supp. 126 = LSCG 124 (Eresos; II BCE):* But a murder cannot enter, nor a traitor.

Even more striking is a metrical inscription from the temple of Zeus Lepsynos in the Carian city of Euromos (II BCE):

M. Errington, “Inscripfen von Euromos,” *EA* 21 (1993) 15–31, here 29–30, no. 8 (Euromos; II BCE): εἰ καθαρὰν, ᾧ ξεῖνε φέρεις φρένα, καὶ τὸ δίκαι[ι]ὸν ἠσκήκεις ψυχῆ(ι), βαί|νε κατ’ εὐ|ρόν· εἰ δ’ ἀ|δίκων ψαύεις, καὶ σὺ νόος οὐ καθαρεύει, | πόρρω ἀπ’ ἀθανάτων | [ἔ]ργεο καὶ τεμένους | οὐ στέργει φαύλους || ἱερὸς δόμος, ἀλλὰ κολλάζει, τοῖς δ’ ὀσίοις | [δεξ]ίους ἀντιέμε[ι] ὁ θεός[.]

If you, friend, have a pure heart and practice righteousness in your soul, then you can enter this holy place; but if you gain by doing injustice and your mind is not pure, take yourself far from this precinct of the immortals. This house does not love evil men but punishes them, but God bestows his gifts on the holy.

Chaniotis observes, “Die besondere Bedeutung des neuen Texte von Euromos liegt jedoch darin, daß er nicht bloß gerechte Taten verlangt, sondern von einer gerechten Seele spricht (τὸ δίκαιον ἠσκησες ψυχῆ). Der Verfasser dieses Textes ist ausschliesslich an den inneren Menschen interessiert” (Chaniotis 1997, 158).

*Syll<sup>3</sup> 985 (Philadelphia [Lydia]; I BCE),* a Zeus cult association from the late Hellenistic period, also emphasizes the role of will and intention in contracting and avoiding pollution rather than involuntary forms of *miasma*:

When entering this house let men and women, free people and house-slaves, swear by all the gods that they neither know nor make use wittingly of any deceit against a man or a woman, nor a poison harmful to people, nor harmful spells; or that they practice the use of a love potion, abortifacient, contraceptive, or any other thing fatal to children; or that they would recommend it to, nor connive at it with, another (ἐτέρωι συμβου|λεῦεν μηδὲ συνιστορεῖν). On the contrary, they are not to hesitate to be well-intentioned (εὐνοεῖν) toward this *oikos*, and if anyone should do any of these things or plot them, they are neither to put up with it nor to keep silent, but shall expose it and defend themselves.

By the early imperial period it was common to require moral purity as well as purity from physical contaminants:

*LSCGSup 59 (Delos; temple of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia, imperial period):* One should enter the temple of Zeus Kynthios and Athena Kynthia with hands and soul pure (ψυχῆ καθα[ρᾱ]), wearing white clothing, without sandals, having been purified after intercourse and eating meat and carrying neither.... nor a key, nor a ring made of iron, nor a belt, nor a purse, nor weapons of war, nor can one do anything that is prohibited.

*IG XII/1 789 = LSCG 139 (Lindos, Rhodes, II–III CE):* One may enter the temple being pure from the following (contaminants): First of all, and most important: having one’s hands and thoughts pure (γνώμην καθαρὸς) and being healthy, and with no terrible thoughts (μηδὲν αὐτοῖς δεινὸν συνειδότας). And as far as externals are concerned: after eating lentils: 3 days; after (eating) goat: 3 days; after eating cheese: 3 days; after a miscarriage/abortion: 40 days; after contact with a corpse of one’s own dead: 40 days; after lawful intercourse: on the same

day, having purified oneself by sprinkling, and first using oil; after (loss of?) virginity....

*ILindos* II 487.4–5 = *LSCGSup* 91 (Lindos, Rhodes, ca. 225 CE): ... having been purified not only as far as the body is concerned, but also the soul.

*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1369.31–34 [49] = *LSCG* 53 (Liopesi, Attica, II CE): It is not lawful for anyone to enter this most holy assembly (σύνοδον τῶν ἐρανιστῶν) without being first examined as to whether he is pure and pious and good (ἀ[γν]ός καὶ εὐσεβής καὶ ἀγ[α]θ[ος]).

*ILindos* II 484 = *LSCGSup* 86 (Lindos, Rhodes, ca. 200 CE): ... they may sacrifice, only those who have a good conscience (τὸ συνειδὸς ἄριστον).

Ἄπλοδος and ἀπλῶς, often with καρδιά, appear prominently in the Septuagint and in the writings of the early Jesus movement as a term connected to piety:

Prov 10:9: ὃς πορεύεται ἀπλῶς πορεύεται πεποιθῶς ὁ δὲ διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ γνωσθήσεται, whoever walks in simplicity goes with confidence, but the one who is depraved does not know his own way.

Prov 11:25: ψυχὴ εὐλογουμένη πάντα ἀπλή ἀνὴρ δὲ θυμώδης οὐκ εὐσχήμων, every simple soul is blessed, but the hot-tempered man is not seemly.

1 Chr 29:17: καὶ ἔγνω κύριε ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐτάζων καρδίας καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἀγαπᾷς ἐν ἀπλότητι καρδίας προεθυμήθην πάντα ταῦτα καὶ νῦν τὸν λαόν σου τὸν εὐρεθέντα ὡδε εἶδον ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ προθυμηθέντα σοι, and knowing, Lord, that you are the one who examines hearts and loves justice; with simplicity of heart I have been zealous to do all these things and now I see your people who are here joyfully offering (these things) to you.

1 Macc 2:60: Δανιηλ ἐν τῇ ἀπλότητι αὐτοῦ ἐρρύσθη ἐκ στόματος λεόντων, Daniel was delivered from the mouth of the lion through his simplicity.

Wis 1:1: Ἀγαπήσατε δικαιοσύνην οἱ κρίνοντες τὴν γῆν φρονήσατε περὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἐν ἀγαθότητι καὶ ἐν ἀπλότητι καρδίας ζητήσατε αὐτόν, Love justice, you who judge the earth, and know the goodness of the Lord, and seek him with a simple heart.

Rom 12:8: ὁ μεταδιδοὺς ἐν ἀπλότητι, ὁ προϊστάμενος ἐν σπουδῇ, ὁ ἐλεῶν ἐν ἰλαρότητι, The one who shares (should do so) with simplicity, the one who presides (should do) with diligence, the one who shows mercy (should do this) cheerfully.

2 Cor 1:12: ὅτι ἐν ἀπλότητι καὶ εἰλικρινείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, [καὶ] οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ σαρκικῇ ἀλλ' ἐν χάριτι θεοῦ, ἀνεστράφημεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, περισσοτέρως δὲ πρὸς ὑμᾶς,... For we have conducted ourselves in the world with simplicity and sincerity and not with fleshly wisdom, but with the grace of God (cf. 2 Cor 9:11; 11:3).

Eph 6:5: Οἱ δοῦλοι, ὑπακούετε τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου ἐν ἀπλότητι τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν ὡς τῷ Χριστῷ, Slaves, obey those who are your owners according to human reckoning, with deep fear and simplicity of heart, as you are obedient to Christ (similarly Col 3:22).

Jas 1:5: εἰ δὲ τις ὑμῶν λείπεται σοφίας, αἰτείτω παρὰ τοῦ δίδόντος θεοῦ πᾶσιν ἀπλῶς καὶ μὴ ὀνειδίζοντος καὶ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ, If someone lacks wisdom, let them ask of the God who gives to all simply and without reproach, and it shall be given to him.

Hermas *Mand.*, 2.4: πᾶσιν ὑστερουμένοις δίδου ἀπλῶς, μὴ διστάζων τίνι δῶς ἢ τίνι μὴ δῶς, To everyone that is in want, give simply, without hesitating to whom you should give or to whom you should not give.

The term also appears frequently in the writings of Marcus Aurelius, e.g., 3.6.3; 16.2; 4.26.1; 5.7.1 (ἦτοι οὐ δεῖ εὐχεσθαι ἢ οὕτως ἀπλῶς καὶ ἐλευθέρως); 8.51.1; 10.8.3; 11.15.1. Rather than supposing that the appearance of ἀπλῶς in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1366* is an indication of Jewish influence, as Wide (1909) supposed, it is more plausible to think that *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1366* reflects a broader tendency to conceive of purity as including moral aspects as well as physical aspects.

*Eranos.* Finally, the founder permits the formation of an *eranos* associated with the temple on the condition that the members provide the appropriate portions to the priest: a right leg, the hide, a *kotylē* of oil, a *chous* of wine, a *choinix* worth of cake, three sacred cakes, two *choinikes* of small cakes, and fruit. Remarkably, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2940* from the fourth century BCE also designates the members of a Mēn association as *eranistai*. Lane (1971–1978, 3:14–15) believes that the *eranos* in question was not a permanent organization but nonetheless concedes that “we are still in the framework of communal worship that is familiar from the *δοῦμος* and the *καταλουστικοί* of the Lydian material, the *Μηνιασταί* of the Rhodian inscriptions, and perhaps the *Ξένοι Τεκμόρειοι* of the area of Antioch.” There is little basis, however, to decide whether the *eranos* envisaged by the inscriptions was permanent or not.

**Literature:** Bömer 1958–1963, 438–448; Bouffartigue, Jean and Michel Patillon, eds. *Porphyre, De l’abstinence*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1977–79; Bremmer, Jan N. “How Old is the Ideal of Holiness (of Mind) in the Epidaurian Temple Inscription and the Hippocratic Oath?” *ZPE* 141 (2002) 106–8; Chaniotis 1997; Goette, Hans Rupprecht. *Ἄξιόλογος δῆμος Σούνιον: Landeskundliche Studien in Südost-Attika*. Internationale Archäologie 59. Rahden, Westfalia: Verlag Marie Leidorf, 2000, 107–108 (*SEG* 50:17); Gurlitt, W. “Inchriften aus Athen.” *Philologus* 27 (1868) 729–36; Kern 1963, 59–61; Lane 1964; 1971–1978, esp. 3:7–16; 1990; Lauffer, Siegfried. *Die Bergwerkssklaven von Laureion*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrg. 1955, no. 11. Wiesbaden: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz in Kommission bei F. Steiner, 1956–57 (*SEG* 29:138); Lesky, Albin. “Men.” *PW* 15(1) (1931) 689–697; Nilsson 1967, 2:41, 121–23, 334, 374, 655, 657; Perdrizet, Paul. “Mên.” *BCH* 20 (1896) 55–106; Petzl, Georg. “Men.” *New Pauly* 8 (2006) 656–658; Sartori, Franco. “Appunti di storia siceliota: La costituzione de Tauromenio.” *Athenaeum* 32 (1954) 356–83 (*SEG* 15:116); Sokolowski 1969, 106–8 (no. 55); Tzanetou, Angeliki. “Something to Do with Demeter: Ritual and Performance in Aristophanes’ Women at the Thesmophoria.” *AJP* 123 (2002) 329–67; Wide, Sam. “ΑΩΠΟΙ ΒΙΑΙΟΘΑΝΑΤΟΙ.” *ARW* 12 (1909) 224–33; Wolters, P. “Votive an

Men.” In *Festschrift für Otto Benndorf zu Seinem 60. Geburtstage gewidmet von Schülern, Freunden und Fachgenossen*. Wien: A. Hölder, 1898.

[54] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2960*  
Dedication of the *Asklepiastai*

Acharnai (Menidi) (Attica)

mid II CE

Published: A. Milchhofer, “Antikenbericht aus Attika,” *AM* 13 (1888) 337–363, 339–40 (no. 516); Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2960*; Kirchner, et al. 1948, no. 1907 (facsimile).

Current Location: Built into the wall of a house east of the agora in Menidi.

Tablet of Pentelic marble, broken on both sides, 46 x 32.5 x 24.5 cm. Letter height: 1.7 cm., discovered at Menidi (Archarnai), n. of Athens.

[A]ντίοχον Μενάν[δρου]  
Μελιτέα  
[τὸ]ν ἀρ[χ]εραμιστῆ[ν]  
[τῶν Ἀ]σκλη[πι]αστ[ῶν]  
5 ὁ π[ατ]ήρ αὐ[τ]οῦ κα[ὶ]  
[ἡ] μήτηρ] Ἄγγ[η] Νεῖκ[ω]-  
[νο]ς Μαραθωνίου θ[υ]-  
[γά]τηρ σὺν τῶι κοινῶ[ι]  
[τῶν] Ἀσκληπιαστῶ[ν].  
10 <vac>

His father and mother, Hagnē daughter of Neikon of (the deme) Marathon, along with the association (*koinon*) of *Asklepiastai* honor Antiochos son of Menandros, of (the deme) Melite, the *archeranistēs* of the *Asklepiastai*.

*Notes*

- I. 1: [A]ντίοχον Μενάν[δρου] | Μελιτέα. Antiochus is also named as a gymnasiarch in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2037.A.12* (125/6 CE).
- II. 6–7: Νεῖκ[ω][νο]ς Μαραθωνίου. Nikon of Marathon is named as a gymnasiarch in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2037.A.13* (125/6 CE).
- I. 9: Ἀσκληπιαστῶ[ν]. *Asklepiastai* are also attested in *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1293 = SEG 18:33* (Athens, III BCE), a decree of an association dedicated to Asklepios and Hygieia honoring a demesman; *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2353* (Athens, III BCE), a dedication to Asklepios by at least nine demesmen.



*Comments*

Numerous dedications are extant honoring the officers of various associations. In some cases the grammar suggests that it was the honorees who also dedicated the tablet or monument as a response to receiving an honor. E.g., *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2941* (276/5 BCE):

ἐπὶ Φιλοκράτου ἄρχοντος [οἶδε ἀνέθεσαν στεφανωθέντες] | ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ἐργαζ[ομένων — — —] |

<col. 1> ταμίαι | Ἡδύφιλος || Σώστρατος | Σάτυρος

<col. 2> γραμματεῖς | Ἐπίστρατος || Αἰσχυλίδης | ἐπιμεληταί | Φιλόμηλος | <vac>

<col. 3> Δημ — — | Φα — — || Μο — — | Σ — —

In the year that Philokrates was archon, those who had been crowned by the association of workers dedicated (this monument): treasurers: Hedyphlos, Sostatros, Satyros; secretaries: Epistratos, Aischylides; supervisors: Philomelos ... Cf. *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2939, 2949, etc.*

In most other cases, however, it was the association that honored one of its members, e.g., *IG II<sup>2</sup> 2943, 2946; 2947; 2960.*

Arnautoglou (2003, 101) observes that while many associations of later periods include a mixture citizen, metics and foreigners, and slaves, the associations of *Asklepiastai* seem predominantly to have attracted citizens.

[55] *IG II<sup>2</sup> 10248**A Koinon tomb*

Athens (Attica)

III CE

Published: K.S. Pittakes, “Ἐπιγραφαὶ Ἑλληνικαί,” *AE* n.s. 1 (1862) 123–124 no. 114 (facsimile) (*ed. pr.*); Koumanoudes 1871, 283 (no. 2362); Foucart 1873, 218 (no. 35); Koehler, *IG II* 3308; Michel, *RIG* 1851; Kirchner, *IG II<sup>2</sup> 10248* (Poland A44).

Current Location: Pittakes reported that the stone was in the house of Mr. Rebellakes of Athens.

Column of Hymettian marble, discovered in 1862, 65 high x 20 cm. in diameter.

Ἄρτεμίδωρος

Σελευκεύς

ἐρανισταί

Artemidoros of Seleucia. The *eranistai* (erected this for him).

*Notes*

1. 2: Σελευκεύς (*FRA* no. 6608). Other metics from Seleucia (probably Seleucia in Cilicia) are named in Attic inscriptions, including an Aristokreon son of Nausikratos (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 785.10 [Athens, 239/8 BCE]; 786.22 [Athens, 229/8 BCE]), honored by the Athenian assembly for his benefactions. For other Seleucians in Attica, see Pope 1947, 143, *FRA* 281-282 (19 names) and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 10249–10257.

*Comments*

Several inscriptions discussed above indicate that associations either attended or provided funerals for members. This inscription represents the memorial for a deceased member of an otherwise unknown group of *eranistai*. The form of the inscription is similar to that of II BCE *koinon* burials from Tanagra (Boeotia) (see below [57]). Since the inscription itself does not identify the ἐρανισταί by reference to a deity, it is likely that this monument belonged to the associations' burial plot; its location would make clear which association had buried the deceased. As a foreigner, Artemidoros may have had no family—at least no extended family—to attend to his burial and so membership in an association was crucial to the provision of a proper burial.

**Literature:** Koumanoudes 1871; Poland 1909, esp. 509; Pope 1947; Ziebarth 1896, 18, 39.