

MARIJANA RICL

SOCIETY AND ECONOMY OF RURAL SANCTUARIES IN ROMAN LYDIA
AND PHRYGIA

aus: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 35 (2003) 77–101

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

SOCIETY AND ECONOMY OF RURAL SANCTUARIES IN ROMAN LYDIA AND PHRYGIA*

Dedicated to the Memory of Professor Peter Herrmann (1927–2002)

In his oration *Pro templis* (written c. 386) addressed to the Emperor Theodosius, amid vigorous protests against wanton destruction of pagan shrines by predatory monks, Libanius offers a vivid metaphor of shrines as the soul and the fountain of all hopes for the country people (9–11): *So they sweep across the countryside like rivers in spate, and by ravaging the temples, they ravage the estates, for wherever they tear out a temple from an estate, that estate is blinded and lies murdered. Temples, Sire, are the soul of the countryside: they mark the beginning of its settlement, and have been passed down through many generations to the men of today. In them the farming communities rest their hopes for husbands, wives, children, for their oxen and the soil they sow and plant. An estate that has suffered so has lost the inspiration of the peasantry together with their hopes, for they believe that their labour will be in vain once they are robbed of the gods who direct their labours to their due end.*¹

In rural Lydia and Phrygia during the Roman period the centre of the cult was the sanctuary with its temple and divine statue(s). The temple housed the cult statue in a central shrine and more often than not provided space for other deities. It also must have had rooms for storage and the activities of various personnel who worked there, both cultic and non-cultic functionaries. The sanctuary was not only a simple place of cult but a pre-state ethnological entity founded on a patrimonial base: in the beginning, the god was the ruler and master, his were the lands, his the people, animals, waters, harvest, etc. The sanctuary dominated the material life of neighbouring populations and the people of the sanctuary themselves were perhaps originally completely slave and parts of the patrimony (*hieroi douloi*); then they slowly developed into various statuses (*hieroi*, *hierodouloi* and sim.), remaining tied to the sanctuary in a kind of symbiosis. Many villages and some cities grew up as settlements around temples. It is thus no surprise that the god is frequently thought of as a supreme ruler (βασιλεύων) or possessor, occupier of a certain place (κατέχων).²

* Thanks are due to Professor Elizabeth A. Meyer (University of Virginia) for correcting my English and for offering many useful suggestions on the subject of this paper.

¹ Χωροῦσι τοίνυν διὰ τῶν ἀγρῶν ὥσπερ χεῖμαρροι κατασύροντες διὰ τῶν ἱερῶν τοὺς ἀγρούς, ὅτου γὰρ ἂν ἱερὸν ἐκκόψωσιν ἀγροῦ, ο τος τετύφλωταί τε καὶ κείται καὶ τέθηκε· ψυχὴ γάρ, ὃ βασιλεῦ, τοῖς ἀγροῖς τὰ ἱερά, προοίμια τῆς ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς κτίσεως γεγενημένα καὶ διὰ πολλῶν γενεῶν εἰς τοὺς νῦν ὄντας ἀφιγμένα καὶ τοῖς γεωργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτοῖς αἱ ἐλπίδες ὅσαι περὶ τε ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ τέκνων καὶ βοῶν καὶ τῆς σπειρομένης γῆς καὶ τῆς πεφυτευμένης. ὁ δὲ τοῦτο πεπονθῶς ἀγρὸς ἀπολώλεκε καὶ τῶν γεωργῶν μετὰ τῶν ἐλπίδων τὸ πρόθυμον μάτην γὰρ ἡγοῦνται πονήσειν τῶν εἰς δέον τοὺς πόνους ἀγόντων ἐστερημένοι θεῶν (Libanius, *Selected Works*, vol. II, translated by A. F. Norman, *The Loeb Classical Library*, Cambridge, Mass./London 1977).

² Cf. TAM V 1, nos. 159, 317, 460, 461, 499, 525; H. Malay, *EA* 12, 1988, pp. 148–149 no. 1 = *SEG* 38, no. 1233; E. Varinlioglu, *EA* 13, 1989, pp. 45–47 no. 4 = *SEG* 39, no. 1278; *ibid.*, pp. 47–50 no. 5 = *SEG* 39, no. 1279.

Even an unassuming rustic shrine was a community with its own personnel and its own economic resources, which were mainly in the form of land holdings. The architecture of these sanctuaries remains mostly unknown, as well as when they began to function and when they were abandoned.³ These rural shrines, frequented mostly by peasants, provide a welcome glimpse into their daily lives. Strong ties binding Lydian and Phrygian villagers to their predominantly agrarian divinities are reflected in the numerous vows made for the safety of the whole communities and for their harvests.⁴ Village-dwellers were conscious of the fact

³ Rural shrines of the following Lydian and Phrygian deities have been located with more or less precision: *Apollo Nisyreites* northeast of Saraçlar (H. Malay, *Researches in Lydia, Mysia and Aiolis*, *Denkschr. d. Österr. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.* 279, *ETAM* 23, Wien 1999, p. 108 = Malay, *Researches*, *Men Tiamou* and *Artemis/Meter/Thea Anaitis* at a place called Asar/Asarcık near the village of Esenyazı/Görnevit (Chr. Naour, *EA* 2, 1983, pp. 107–109; G. Petzl, *Chiron* 28, 1998, pp. 65–66), *Meter/Thea Larmene* on the Toma Mountain (Yeşiloba; Malay, *Researches* p. 89), *Meter Phileis* in Killik in the hilly part of Philadelphieia's territory (H. Malay, *EA* 6, 1985, pp. 111–125), an unknown divinity on top of Gökdere kalesi above Gökdere in the territory of Maionia (G. Petzl, *EA* 30, 1998, pp. 27–28), *Papas* at Dağdere, between Thyateira, Attaleia and Iulia Gordos (Malay, *Researches* pp. 48–50), *Zeus Antigon(e)ios* at İmrenler south of Demirci (H. Malay, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in the Manisa Museum*, *Denkschr. d. Österr. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.* 237, *ETAM* 19, Wien 1994, p. 52 = Malay, *Manisa Museum*), *Zeus Sabazios* near Küprüler southeast of Demirci (*ibid.*, p. 49), *Zeus Alsenos* and *Zeus Petarenos* at Kurudere-Yanal Mevkii, southwest of Amorion (Th. Drew-Bear – Chr. M. Thomas – M. Yıldızturan, *Phrygian Votive Steles*, Ankara 1999, pp. 13–16 = Drew-Bear – Thomas – Yıldızturan *Phrygian Votive Steles*), *Zeus Ampelites* and *Zeus Thallos* at Erikli Mevkii 6,5 km west of Akça, district of Altıntaş, near ancient Appia (*ibid.*, p. 16), *Zeus Andreas* in the same sanctuary at Erikli Mevkii (Th. Drew-Bear – Chr. Naour, *ANRW* II 18. 3, 1990, p. 1942, note 116), *Zeus Bennios* in Kırkpınar close to Eydemir, worshipped together with *Zeus Soter* (*ibid.*, p. 1980), *Zeus Bronton* in Avdan and Alpanos between Dorylaion and Nakoleia (*MAMA* V, nos. 124–131, 134–138 and pp. XXXIX–XL), *Zeus Kersoullos* northwest of Kotiaion (Drew-Bear – Naour, *ANRW* II 18. 3, p. 1911, note 3), *Zeus Megistos* in southeast Phrygia near Hadrianopolis [L. Jonnes, *IK* 62 (*The Inscriptions of the Sultan Dağı I*), nos. 376–377, 379], *Zeus Orkamaneites* in the territory of Akmoneia (Drew-Bear – Naour, *ANRW* II 18. 3, p. 1943), *Zeus Orochoreites* at Kurudere-Yanal Mevkii, *Agdistis* on the highest ridge of Türkmen Baba in the territory of Metropolis (E. Haspels, *The Highlands of Phrygia, Sites and Monuments*, Princeton 1971, pp. 194–195, 199–200, 202–203 = Haspels, *Highlands of Phrygia*), *Apollo Alsenos* at Ağzıkara in the territory of Dokimeion (Drew-Bear – Naour, *ANRW* II 18. 3, p. 1926–1929), *Hosios kai Dikaïos* at Yaylababa Köyü in the territory of Kotiaion (M. Riel, *ZA* 40, 1990, pp. 157–177), *Meter Andeirene* in southeast Phrygia near Ilgın [Jonnes, *IK* 62, nos. 381, 404] *Meter Steunene* 3.5 km southwest of the sanctuary of *Zeus* at Aizanoi (R. Naumann, *Ist. Mitt.* 17, 1967, pp. 218–247; *MAMA* IX, pp. XXXIII–XXXV; S. Mitchell, *Anatolia. Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor*, vol. II, Oxford 1993, pp. 18–19 = Mitchell, *Anatolia*), *Meter Tieioubudene* in the vicinity of Yazıdere, northwest of Nakoleia (Th. Drew-Bear *Nouvelles inscriptions de Phrygie*, Amsterdam 1978, ch III, pp. 43–47 = Drew-Bear, *Nouv. inscr. Phrygie*), *Papas* in a sanctuary close to Nakoleia and in another one in the middle Rhyndakos valley (Drew-Bear – Naour, *ANRW* II 18. 3, pp. 2019–2022).

⁴ Malay, *Manisa Museum* p. 75 no. 184; Malay, *Researches* p. 62 no. 53; M. Riel, *EA* 18, 1991, p. 16 no. 29; *ibid.*, pp. 19–20 no. 37; *ibid.* p. 21 no. 40; *ibid.*, p. 37 no. 80; *ibid.*, p. 37 no. 81; *ibid.*, p. 39 no. 85; Th. Corsten, *IK* 39 (Prusa ad Olympum), no. 49; E. Schwertheim, *IK* 33 (Hadrianoi u. Hadrianeia), no. 136; S. Mitchell, *R.E.C.A.M. II. The Ankara District. The Inscriptions of North Galatia*, *BAR Int. Series* 135, London 1982, pp. 81–82 no. 75 (= Mitchell, *R.E.C.A.M. II*); *MAMA* V, nos. 7, 87, 124, 125, 126, 150, 175, 210, 213, 217, 218; *MAMA* VI, no. 398; *MAMA* VII, no. 303; *MAMA* X, nos. 158, 443; Th. Drew-Bear, *GRBS* 17, 1976, p. 250 no. 4 = *SEG* 26, no. 1358; *ibid.*, pp. 251–252 no. 8 = *SEG* 26, no. 1326; W. H. Buckler – W. M. Calder, *JRS* 16, 1926, p. 88 no. 218; A. v. Domaszewski, *AEMÖ* 7, 1883, p. 177 no. 25; I. W. Macpherson, *ABSA* 49, 1954, p. 13 no. 4 = *SEG* 14, no. 782; P. Frei, *EA* 11, 1988, pp. 15–16 no. 5 = *SEG* 38, no. 1303; *ibid.*, pp. 22–24 no. 10 = *SEG* 38, no. 1308; Haspels, *Highlands of Phrygia* p. 335 no. 98; Drew-Bear, *Nouv. inscr. Phrygie*, ch. II, p. 30 no. 3 = *SEG* 28, no. 1109; *ibid.*, p. 46 no. 19 = *SEG* 28, no. 1196; S. Şahin, *IK* 10, 1 (Museum Iznik), no. 1083; *CIG* no. 4120; Drew-Bear – Naour, *ANRW* II 18. 3, p. 1934 no. 7 = *SEG* 40, no. 1190. Cf. T. Gnoli – J. Thornton, Σφῆζε τὴν κατοικίαν. Società e religione nella Frigia romana. Note introduttive, in: R. Gusmani – M. Salvini – P.

that they belonged to a unit larger than their nuclear families: this corporate identity and the resulting socio-economic and religious solidarity prompted them to include their fellow-villagers in prayers and vows.⁵ The family and communal worship were therefore very important in Roman Lydia and Phrygia: gods and goddesses are referred to as ancestral deities of a family or a community – *patrioi, patrikoi, papooi, syngenikoi*⁶ – and cults often assumed communal forms of worship with a sacrifice and a feast for the whole village, with wine, perfumes, and garlands for everyone.⁷

It is not always easy to distinguish urban from rural sanctuaries, especially since in many parts of Lydia and Phrygia the cities were so ill defined as to be hardly distinguishable from the larger village communities. On the other hand, many villages assumed the form, if not the substance of cities, organizing their own assemblies, electing magistrates, managing their public funds and regulating the use of common land, embellishing themselves with buildings emulating those of urban centers. Through all this, they managed to preserve their traditional position of basic units of economic and social life, maintaining their stable religious, economic, and social structures. In any event, wherever such a possibility exists, a distinction should be drawn between remote rural sanctuaries frequented by villagers and functioning with the help of a modest temple personnel, and the more important and better organized sanctuaries located in close proximity to urban centres. In both cases, the city on whose territory the sanctuary stood would assume control of it, but there would be a considerable difference in the architecture, size of the personnel, and economic activities of each case. When a sanctuary belongs to a village dependent on the city, its activity stands under the control of city officials and a part of the proceeds goes to the city, whereas a privately-owned village and its revenues, including the sacred ones, can be disposed of at will by its owner.⁸ In addition to villages situated on municipal territories, Imperial and private estates, we encoun-

Vannicelli (eds.), *Frigi e Frigio, Atti del I° Simposio Internazionale, Roma, 16–17 ottobre 1995*, Roma 1997, pp. 153–200.

⁵ Gnoli –Thornton [note 4] p. 157.

⁶ For the cults of *theoi syngenikoi*, cf. Şahin, *IK* 10,1 (Museum Iznik), no. 1130 (dedicated to Zeus Syngenikos) with bibliography.

⁷ Cf. note 26.

⁸ The village Palox/Paloka in the Aizanitis and its revenues were earmarked by its owner for cultic purposes involving the Emperors' cult (*CIG* 3381a¹⁴ = *MAMA* IX, no. 16). The village community of Arhillenoi [note 24] belonged to Asinius Rufus (Ἡ Ἀριλληνῶν κώμη προσήκουσά μοι ἐ' προγόνων), and its members consequently addressed themselves to him for help in their dealings with Sardis. A recently published bilingual inscription from Karia dated in AD 110/111 [R. Haensch, in: W. Eck (ed.), *Lokale Autonomie und römische Ordnungsmacht in den kaiserzeitlichen Provinzen vom 1. bis 3. Jahrhundert*, München 1999 (*Schriften des historischen Kollegs. Kolloquien* 42), pp. 115–139 = *Bull. épigr.* 2000, no. 553; *Année épigr.* 1999, no. 1592: [Iussu? Imper. Ca]esaris Nerva[e Traiani | Aug. Germ. Dac]içi vici Cosa et Anticosa | [dedicati? Di]anae Sbr̄yallidi et? ad[iudic]ati Heracl[eo]tis a [P]omponio B[asso]? Ἰ̄ te]r̄m[i]n̄atī s̄[u]n̄t a B[ae]bīo T̄ullō procosul. | Asiae per C. Valer̄ium Victorem | [p]raetorem designatum legatum | [pr]o pr. Ἐξ ἐπιταγῆς Αὐτοκράτορος Νέρβα Τραϊῶανου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ | Δακικοῦ κωμῶν Κοίρων καὶ Ἀντικοσῶν], | καθιερωμένων Ἀρτέμιδι Σβρυαλλίδι. | προσκριθεισῶν Ἡρακλεάταις ὑπὸ Πομπωνίου Βάσσου, ὅροι ἐτέθησαν ὑπὸ Βαβίου Τούλλου ἀνθυπάρχου Ἀσίας, | διὰ Γαίου Βαλερίου Βίκτορος στρατηγῶ ἀποδεξιγμένου πρεσβευτοῦ καὶ ἀντιστῆρα [τ]ηγῶν] has introduced us to two villages dedicated to Artemis Sbr̄yallis and attributed to the city of Herakleia Salbake by Pomponius Bassus.

ter autonomous villages grouped in regions lacking urban centres, all of them preserving their traditional religious institutions.⁹

The following general picture obtained from the sole source for the study of indigenous cults of Anatolia – inscriptions – can hopefully serve as a framework for a future in depth investigation into the same subject matter. This author hopes to write a comprehensive study on the “people of the sanctuary” in Anatolia from the Hittite to the Late Roman period.

I. TEMPLE COMMUNITY

Sanctuaries, big and small, possessed lands which were their territory and the essential base of their patrimony, but they also had animals and, above all else, power over the people who lived in dependency on the temple, in the cult of the god and in the security of his protection and communal defense.

Rustic sanctuaries scattered throughout Lydian and Phrygian countryside cannot have possessed an elaborate cult personnel. We have no inventories of temple personnel or instructions for the temple personnel comparable to the Hittite ones, which list “all the people of the temple, the kitchen personnel of the god, peasants of the god, shepherds of the god’s cattle” and the members of the cultic personnel: priests and priestesses, prophets, singers, and musicians.¹⁰ With one exception involving two urban sanctuaries,¹¹ Lydian and Phrygian texts of the Roman period never allude to anything comparable to the permanent communities (κατοικίαι or sim.) that existed around such important sanctuaries as those at Didyma,¹² Lagina,¹³ Ephesos,¹⁴ Nysa¹⁵ or Pergamon.¹⁶ Larger organized communities attached to sanc-

⁹ For the forms of village communities in Asia Minor, cf. Chr. Schuler, *Ländliche Siedlungen und Gemeinden im hellenistischen und römischen Kleinasien*, München 1996 (*Vestigia* 50), pp. 219–221 (= Schuler, *Ländliche Siedlungen*).

¹⁰ Cf. V. Souček, *Archív orientální* 47, 1979, p. 79, citing E. Laroche, *CTH* 264; P. Debord, *Aspects sociaux et économiques de la vie religieuse dans l’Anatolie gréco-romaine* (*ÉPRO* 88), Leiden 1982, pp. 76–77 = Debord, *Aspects*.

¹¹ *I. Sardis* VII 1, no. 8, XII ll. 132–139 (August–September 1 BC): οἱ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ τε Πολιέως Διὸς καὶ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος οἰκοῦντες. We should not forget the solitary occupant of a house belonging to the god Men [G. Petzl, *Die Beichtinschriften Westkleinasiens* (EA 22), Bonn 1994, p. 46 no. 37 (= Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*), second–third century AD: Ἀπολλώνιος οἰκῶν ἐν οἰκίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ], who possibly belonged to the lower personnel of an unknown rural shrine in the Hermos valley. The residents of the sacred precincts of Zeus and Artemis in Sardis, and Apollonios living in an unknown shrine (?) in northeast Lydia were most probably registered in the tax-rolls under the name of the deity/temple responsible for payment of their poll-tax [cf. notes 67–68].

¹² *I. Didyma* no. 396, ll. 3–5 (41/40 BC): [ὁ] προφήτης καὶ οἱ περὶ τὸ μαντεῖον [καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες] ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῶν πολιεῶν καὶ οἱ πρόσχωροι πάντες; *ibid.*, no. 395, ll. 5–7 (41/40 BC): [οἱ] περὶ τὸ μαντεῖον πάντες καὶ οἱ τὸ ἱερόν κ[ατοικ]οῦντες καὶ οἱ πρόσχωροι; *Str.* XIV 1, 5, p. 634 C.

¹³ A. Laumonier, *Les cultes indigènes en Carie*, Paris 1958, pp. 346–347, with attestations.

¹⁴ Laumonier, *op. cit.*, p. 346.

¹⁵ G. Radet, *BCH* 14, 1890, p. 232 no. 4 (Acharaka, second/third century AD): οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὰ ἱερά Ἀχάρα[κα].

¹⁶ *I. Perg.* III no. 55, ll. 4–5 (Roman Imperial period): οἱ κ[ατοικ]οῦντες τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Σωτήρος Ἀσκληπιοῦ; Aelius Aristides, *Hieroi logoi* p. 378, 11: οἱ ὑπῆρέται οἱ περὶ τὸ ἱερόν: the lower personnel under the direction of the *neokoros*.

tuaries were evidently exceptional,¹⁷ but even an unassuming countryside shrine could not function properly without a personnel catering to its needs and the needs of the local population. My aim is to examine the role of these local shrines in the daily life of Lydian and Phrygian villages during the Roman period and to study them as human communities, unities of persons and things and not simply places of cult.

As socio-economic organizations of great antiquity and conservatism, village shrines presumably preserved a structure based on that prevalent in Anatolia before Alexander. Most of them no longer possessed any “holy villages” peopled by “sacred slaves”, but the populations living in their vicinity still thought of themselves as distinct groups tied together and identified by the worship of their tutelary deity.¹⁸ We shall see that they also “inherited” from their ancestors many obligations introduced in an earlier age, when a sanctuary’s patrimony included both the lands in its possession and the people settled on them.

I.1. Senior Cult Officials

At the head of the senior cult personnel of village shrines were *priests* and *priestesses*. Priests outnumbered the priestesses, especially in Phrygia; in both regions, husbands and wives are found sharing office, while women occur as single priests usually but not exclusively in the cults of goddesses. As a rule, the care of a single sanctuary was entrusted to a single male priest or a group of priests.¹⁹

The majority of village priests, particularly those from more remote regions, were not Roman citizens before AD 212. Moreover, in northeast Lydia they often appear with a single name (less frequently in Phrygia). Since this mostly occurs in their private dedications and epitaphs,²⁰ whereas on the more official monuments (communal dedications, honorific

¹⁷ Perhaps one of these was ἡ Λαρείσηνῶν ἱερὰ κατοικία in the territory of Ephesos [R. Meriç – R. Merkelbach – J. Nollé – S. Şahin, *IK* 17,1 (Ephesos), nos. 3271–3272, 3274], mentioned by Strabo as an Ephesian village known for its cult of Apollo (XIII 3, 2, p. 620 C): τρίτη δ’ ἐστὶ Λάρισα κώμη τῆς Ἐφεσῖας ἐν τῷ Καῦστρίῳ πεδίῳ, ἣν φασι πόλιν ὑπάρχειν πρότερον, ἔχουσαν καὶ ἱερὸν Ἀπόλλωνος Λαρείσηνοῦ, πλησιάζουσαν τῷ Τμῶλι μᾶλλον ἢ τῇ Ἐφέσῳ· ταύτης γὰρ ἑκατὸν καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα διέχει σταδίους, ὥστε ὑπὸ τοῖς Μήσοις ἄν τις τάττοι ταύτην· Ἐφέσιοι δ’ αὐξηθέντες ὕστερον πολλὴν τῶν Μήνων, οὓς νῦν Λυδοὺς φασί, ἀπετέμοντο . . . Cf. Debord, *Aspects*, p. 91. Ἡ Διοσκωμ[ητ]ῶν κατοικία in the territory of Phrygian Sebaste, attested in an inscription from AD 246 (*IGR* IV, no. 635), could belong to the same category.

¹⁸ Mitchell, *R.E.C.A.M.* II, pp. 81–82 no. 75: ἀπὸ προγόνων [.]νοβατηνοὶ [θ]ρησκεύοντες ἐξ ἔ[θ]ους Διὶ Ἀκρεινηνῶ; Corsten, *IK* 40 (Prusa ad Olympum), no. 1022: οἱ θυσιάζοντες εἰς τὸ ἱερόν of the goddess Groustene; M. Riel, *EA* 29, 1997, p. 37 = *SEG* 47, no. 1751: (ὁ) συνερχόμενος λαός; cf. F. W. Hasluck, *JHS* 24, 1904, pp. 21–22 no. 4 = G. Mendel, *Catalogue des sculptures grecques, romaines et byzantines*, vol. III: *Musées impériaux othomanes*, Constantinople 1914, no. 837 (vicinity of Kyzikos): Θρακικοκωμηται τῷ θεῷ τὴν στήλην καθιέρωσαν ὑπὲρ εὐκαρπίας καὶ ἀβλαβίας τῶν καρπῶν καὶ ὑπὲρ ὑγείας καὶ σωτηρίας τῶν γεοκτειτῶν καὶ τῶν συνερχομένων ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν καὶ κατοικούντων Θρακίαν κώμην.

¹⁹ Sometimes linked by blood ties – father and son, brothers, uncle and nephew.

²⁰ *TAM* V 1, nos. 9, 247, 432, 433, 473c, 483a; Chr. Naour, *EA* 5, 1985, p. 69 no. 21 = *SEG* 35, no. 1261; Malay, *Manisa Museum* p. 54 no. 72; Malay, *Researches* p. 93 no. 95; *ibid.*, p. 141 no. 158; *MAMA* I, no. 14; *MAMA* V, nos. 79, R 4; *MAMA* IX, no. 154; *MAMA* X, no. 439; Şahin, *IK* 10,1 (Museum Iznik), no. 1090; M. Riel, *ŽA* 44, 1994, p. 157 no. 1 = *SEG* 44, no. 1034; Drew-Bear – Thomas – Yıldızıuran, *Phrygian Votive Steles* p. 251 no. 387; N. E. Akyürek Şahin, *EA* 33, 2001, p. 185, note 2, under ε.

inscriptions, dealings with state authorities) they tend to record their ancestry in full,²¹ I think that we should not invariably take single name as an indication of the priest's low legal and social status.²²

Family-members of officiating priests often shared the burden of costs for cult ceremonies and dedications. Some of these families obviously enjoyed prestige and economic ease, counting many dependants. Their members, old and young, shared cultic functions for generations, at times in more than one shrine. Hereditary lifelong priesthoods of rural cults were not uncommon in both municipal and village families, as shown by the appearance of οἱ διὰ γένους ἱερεῖς, ἱερεῖς ἐξ ἱερέων, ὁ ἐκ προγόνων ἱερέων among their members.²³ Naturally, these influential individuals and their families played an important part in their own cities and in the region as a whole, finding means of interceding even with the highest Roman government representatives on behalf of the village communities they served as priests.²⁴

In most cases of non-hereditary priesthoods, lasting a year or longer,²⁵ we cannot determine whether a priest of a rural cult was appointed by the city of his residence, or whether the

²¹ TAM V 1, nos. 449, 488, 490; Malay, *Manisa Museum* pp. 152–153 no. 523 = SEG 44, no. 977; Malay, *Researches* p. 62 no. 53. The priest Apollonides (Ἀπολλωνίδης [ἱ]ερεύς) appears with one name even in the formal dedication made by ἡ ἐταιρεία ἢ Ἀρζιμνέων ἢ περὶ Στρατόνεικον Ἀπολλωνίου Θεογᾶ καὶ Ζωτικὸν Ἀπολλωνίου Κλανδίωνος from Dağmarmara/Geveze in the territory of Hierapolis (L. Robert, *Journ. Sav.* 1983, pp. 45–63 = OMS VII, pp. 549–567 = SEG 34, no. 1298 = T. Ritti, *EA* 34, 2002, pp. 57–60).

²² So G. Petzl, in: S. Şahin – E. Schwertheim – J. Wagner (eds.), *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasiens. Festschrift für F. K. Dörner (ÉPRO 66)*, Leiden 1978, p. 750 (“unfreie Abstammung” of the priest Glykon in TAM V 1, 483a).

²³ TAM V 1, nos. 432–433, 449, 490; Malay, *Manisa Museum* pp. 152–153 no. 523 = SEG 44, no. 977; Malay, *Researches* p. 62 no. 53; MAMA IV, no. 302bis [the same person, a hereditary priest of Asklepios, features as an Ἀτυοχωρείτης in his dedication addressed to Apollo Lairbenos (W. M. Ramsay, *JHS* 4, 1883, p. 383 no. 5), while the community of Atyochoreitai itself has recently reappeared in possession of a *boule* and a *gerousia* (T. Ritti, *EA* 34, 2002, p. 67, A: ὁ δῆμος καὶ ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ἡ γερουσία Ἀτυοχωρειτῶν)]; MAMA VIII, no. 351 = Jonnes, *IK* 62, no. 506. In some of the cases of hereditary priesthoods we might be dealing with the communal cults that have developed out of personal or family cults [cf. Şahin *IK* 10.2, no. 1513 (Pazaryeri): [Ἀγαθῆ] τύχη· Διὶ Παππῶ κατὰ ἐπιταγὴν οἱ σὺνγενεῖς ἀνέστησαν, ἱερέων [. . .] ΤΩΝΩΖΥ [. . .] ὅς Ἀπολλ[. . .].

²⁴ Malay, *Manisa Museum* pp. 152–153 no. 523 = SEG 44, no. 977: the priest Metras son of Metrodoros, ἱερεὺς διὰ γένους Διὸς Δρικτου καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Θαμορειτῶν (territory of Daldis), intercedes with the proconsul (the future Emperor Antoninus Pius) on behalf of a village (*nom(ine) vicanorum Arhillon*) to secure market holding privileges for its inhabitants. Cf. L. De Ligt, *EA* 23, 1995, pp. 37–54; J. Nollé – W. Eck, *Chiron* 26, 1996, pp. 268–273.

²⁵ TAM V 1–2, nos. 484 (lifelong), 488 (two years), 1316 (yearly appointments in ἡ Τυαννωλειτῶν κατοικία, judging by the phrase αἱ κ[α]τ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἱέρ[ε]λαι in lines 13–14); Chr. Naour, *EA* 5, 1985, p. 69 no. 21 = SEG 35, no. 1261 (the priest had served for twenty-five years, until his death, so possibly he held a lifelong priesthood); M.-L. Cremer – J. Nollé, *Chiron* 18, 1988, pp. 207–208 no. 4 = SEG 38, no. 1232: Ἀρτέμων Ἀρτέμωνα τὸν πατέρα καθιέρωσεν ἱερῆ γένόμενον Ἀπόλλωνος Ταρσίου καὶ ἀναστραφέντος αὐτοῦ ἔτη πς' καὶ φιλοπονήσαντα παν[- -] (Artemon could hold the record with his eighty-six years of priestly service, if that is what the phrase ἀναστραφέντος αὐτοῦ ἔτη πς' really means); Malay, *Researches* p. 115 no. 127 (ἱερασάμενος, possibly for a year); J. Keil – A. v. Premerstein, *Bericht über eine Dritte Reise in Lydien und den angrenzenden Gebieten Ioniens, Denkschr. d. Österr. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.* 57,1, 1914, no. 37 (= Keil – v. Premerstein, *Dritte Reise*): - - - [ἀποδειχθεῖς? ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸς κ[αὶ αἰρε]θεῖς ὑπὸ τῆς πατρί[δος] μου τὴν ἱερατείαν [τοῦ] Διὸς; MAMA I, nos. 14 (ἱαρισσαμ[ένη], 373 (ὅτι ἐνιαυτοῦ καλοῦ ἱερεὺς ἐγένετο, “annual priesthood in the local temple of Zeus”, according to the editors of MAMA I), 417 (ἱερασάμενοι); MAMA VII, no. 432 (εἰαρασάμενος τὸ πρῶτ[ο]ν Διὶ Μεγίστῳ εὐχὴν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων, the first term of service, implying that a person could serve more than once); MAMA X, no. 521 (εἰε[ρ]εῦ[σ]α[ς]). In the following eight inscriptions dated

villagers were authorized to conduct elections on their own and even appoint a fellow-villager to the office. It is conceivable that shrines situated in villages dependent on urban centres were managed by city officials acting as priests, and several texts from the Kaystros valley show members of Ephesian and Hypaipan bourgeoisie assuming (actually, purchasing) priestly offices in rural cults and paying the villagers a *summa honoraria* for the office.²⁶ Some of these texts indicate that village assemblies had the last say on the amount and the ways of spending these *summae honorariae*,²⁷ and it is a reasonable assumption that on such occasions the villagers voted and made the final decision on the candidates and their proposals.²⁸ Along the same lines, the recently published dossier of texts from the rural sanctuary of the Indigenous Mother of the Gods in the territory of Macedonian Beroia (Lefkopetra)²⁹ shows that the priests and curators of this sacred place high in the Macedonian mountains were appointed by the city of Beroia from among its prominent members.

Traces of a developed cultic hierarchy are preserved in two Lydian funerary inscriptions set up by the same extended family³⁰ whose two young deceased members are each honoured as ὁ εἰερεύς ὁ νεώτερος of an unnamed divinity. This priesthood was probably hereditary in

by priests [TAM V 1, nos. 193: ἐπὶ ἱερέων followed by seven names; *ibid.*, no. 241: ἱερατεύοντος Φιλίππου Γλύκωνος καὶ Μελτίνης Φιλίππου; Chr. Naour, *EA* 2, 1983, p. 136, note 122: ἐπὶ ἱερέως Ἀρτέμωνος; Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, p. 39 no. 33, lines 13–14: ἐπὶ Μητρῶ [ἱ]ερέως; *ibid.*, pp. 92–93 no. 71, lines 17–19: ἐπὶ ἱερέως Ἀλεξάνδρου Μούρκου; MAMA IX, no. 54 and Drew-Bear – Naour, *ANRW* II 18. 3, pp. 2023–2026 no. 28 = *SEG* 40, no. 1226, Tavşanlı: ἐπὶ Μηνογένουσι Μηνογένουσι Ῥόμου ἱερέως; Şahin, *IK* 10.2, no. 1513: ἐρήων [. . .]ΤΩΝΩΖΥ [. . .]ος Ἀπολλ[. . .]), the texts provide no data on the duration and the nature of the priesthoods themselves. Most of the documents relating to lifelong priests come from urban centres, not the countryside [TAM V 2, nos. 963, 996; MAMA IX, no. 34; M. J. Vermaseren, *Corpus Cultus Cybelae Attidisque*, vol. I: *Asia Minor* (ÉPRO 50), Leiden 1987, pp. 25–26 no. 59].

²⁶ H. W. Pleket, *Talanta* 2, 1970, pp. 61–62 no. 4 = E. N. Lane, *Corpus Monumentorum Religionis Dei Menis* (CMRDM), vol. I (ÉPRO 19.1), Leiden 1971, p. 49 no. 75 = Meriç – Merkelbach – Nollé – Şahin, *IK* 17.1, no. 3252, lines 11–15 (Eskioba/Darmara, ancient Almoura): διὰ τε τοῦτο καθιέρωσεν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἱερωσύνης εἰς τὰς ἐπιθυσίας τῆς Δήμητρος τὰ πρὸ τῆς οἰκίας ἐργαστήρια . . .; Malay, *Researches* p. 115 no. 127 (Dağmarmara/ Karaköy, northwest of Hypaipa, the community of Τεμψιανοί, AD 180–192): Ἀγαθῆ τύχη [- - -] καὶ τῆ πατρίδι Διονύσιος (ιος) γ' τοῦ Ἀρτεμῆ ἱερασάμενος τοῦ θεοῦ καθὰ καὶ ἡ πατρὶς ἠξίωσεν ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰς τὰ δεῖπνα ἀναλωμάτων τὸ ὕδωρ εἰσαγαγὼν καθιέρωσεν ἐπὶ ἀνθυπάτου Γεμινίου Μαρκιανοῦ (an inscription from the same site published by F. Gschnitzer – J. Keil in *Anz. Österr. Akad. d. Wiss.* 93, 1956, pp. 222–223 no. 3 = *SEG* 17, no. 533, mentions the construction of a κρήνη and a ὑδραγωγίον). For the attestations of the same practice from Iasos (*stephanephoria*) and Didyma (*stephanephoria, propheteia*), cf. L. Robert, *REG* 1957, pp. 362–363 = *OMS* III, pp. 1479–1480.

²⁷ Cf. H. W. Pleket, *Talanta* 2, 1970, p. 80.

²⁸ An inscription from the territory of Maionia or Philadelphiea registers the case of a priest of Zeus chosen by his πατρὶς, possibly the village of his residence (Keil – v. Premerstein, *Dritte Reise* no. 37, Hayalli, first century AD: - - - [ἀποδειχθεὶς? ὑπ]ὸ τοῦ Διὸς κ[αὶ αἰρε]θεὶς ὑπὸ τῆς πατρί[δος] μου τὴν ἱερατείαν [το]ῦ Διός, ἀνέγλυψα ἐμαυ[τ]ὸν καὶ ἀνέσστησα τοὺς [π]ρογεγραμμένους βωμούς). Cf. Schuler, *Ländliche Siedlungen* pp. 233, 251. Schuler considers all the ἱερεῖς τῆς κόμης/κωμητικοί (vel. sim.) [P. Frei, *EA* 11, 1988, pp. 19–21 no. 9 = *SEG* 38, no. 1307, area of Avdan: [. . .]ΙΩΣΟ(Θ)ΙΛΛΥΚΟΥ ἱερε(ὺς) [-]σοκομητῶν κὲ Ἀρσοκομητῶν; M. Riel, *ŽA* 44, 1994, 159 no. 4 = *SEG* 44, no. 1037, Süpren Köyü south of Dorylaion: Ἀὐρ. Ἀσκληπᾶς Μηνοφίλου, ἱερεὺς κωμητικός; Th. Corsten, *IK* 27 (Prusias ad Hyprium), no. 31: ἱερεὺς τῆς κόμης διὰ βίου; J. R. S. Sterrett, *Papers of the American School in Athens*, vol. 3: *The Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor*, Boston 1888, p. 57: ἱερεὺς Σεράπεος τῆς κόμης - Isaura Palaia] as elected by the village community in question.

²⁹ Ph. M. Petsas – M. B. Hatzopoulos – L. Gounaropoulou – P. Paschidis, *Inscriptions du sanctuaire de la Mère des Dieux Autochtone de Leukopetra (Macédoine)* (Μελετήματα 28), Athens 2000, pp. 23–24.

³⁰ TAM V 1, nos. 432 and 433 (AD 214 and 183 respectively).

their family, their fathers serving as chief priests. In another epitaph from the same region³¹ a priest honours a deceased friend as τὸν συνιερόδουλον, implying by the use of the latter term that the status/office of an ἱερόδουλος was a temporary one, and that a former ἱερόδουλος could advance to the position of a priest.³² Πρῶτοι ἱερεῖς/πρωτοιερεῖς are found in both the urban and rural environment of Lydia and Phrygia,³³ while village priests are mostly called simply ἱερεῖς/ἱερατεύοντες or ἱερεία/ἱερίσσαι; we have only one attestation of a ἱερεὺς κωμητικός.³⁴

Village priests were deeply attached to their small πατρίδες they represented before the gods, for whose safety they prayed and whose disputes they helped settle in their sanctuaries. This attachment was sometimes expressed by adding the name(s) of the village(s) to the priest's name.³⁵ Finally, some more populous village communities had more than one priest of the same cult.³⁶

Lydian and Phrygian priests performed many duties in their modest shrines: on the one hand, they went there to honour the gods and take care of their property, on the other, it was expected of them to secure the communication between the gods and their worshippers. They were more than simple cultic functionaries performing their daily rituals, making sacrifices, celebrating festivals and financing village feasts,³⁷ setting up altars, statues, and other gifts to the gods, issuing sacred ordinances,³⁸ or dealing with local cult associations; much of their time was spent on administrative duties involving the sanctuary's property and people, and probably as much on healing the bodies and souls of their fellow-villagers. We see them performing incantations, healing the sick,³⁹ and participating in all the stages of a complicated procedure designed to settle disputes among villagers: they witness the oaths uttered in the

³¹ TAM V 1, no. 483a.

³² As already noted [note 22], G. Petzl expressed the opinion that the priest in question was formerly an unfree *hierodoulos*, whereas M. Paz de Hoz in her book *Die lydischen Kulte im Lichte der griechischen Inschriften*, Bonn 1999 (*Asia Minor Studien* Bd. 36), p. 94 envisages the possibility that the term *hierodoulos* covered all the members of the cult personnel.

³³ TAM V 1, no. 449; MAMA V, no. 170; M. Riel, *EA* 18, 1991, pp. 10–11 no. 20 (Dorylaion); M. Riel, *ŽA* 44, 1994, p. 166 no. 18 (unknown provenance) = *SEG* 44, no. 1051. An atypical early fourth-century text from the Upper Tembris Valley (R. Merkelbach – J. Stauber, *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*, Bd. 3: *Der "Ferne Osten" und das Landesinnere bis zum Tauros*, Leipzig 2001, pp. 235–240, 16/31/10) records an ἀρχιέρεια δημοτική.

³⁴ M. Riel, *ŽA* 44, 1994, p. 159 no. 4 = *SEG* 44, no. 1037. Cf. also note 28.

³⁵ Malay, *Manisa Museum*, pp. 152–153 no. 523 = *SEG* 44, no. 977; P. Frei, *EA* 11, 1988, 19–21 no. 9 = *SEG* 38, no. 1307. Of course, a priest can make a dedication together with the inhabitants of a village other than his own (Haspels, *Highlands of Phrygia*, p. 304 no. 109, Söğüt Yaylası, northeast of Kütahya: Ἀγαθῆ τύχη Ἀσκληπιάδης Μηνοφῶνος ἱερεὺς Τρονβολιανὸς καὶ Εἰοκωμῆται Δεὶ Συρεανῶ εὐχήν).

³⁶ Seven in Κολονηῶν κατοικία serving Zeus Sabazios in AD 101 (TAM V 1, no. 193), an unknown number (οἱ εἰερίς) in a rural sanctuary of Men Axiot(t)enos somewhere in the Katakakaumene region (Malay, *Researches*, pp. 101–102 no. 111), three in the cult of Zeus Orochoreites in the territory of Dorylaion (Kızılcaören) (P. Frei, *Türk Arkeoloji Dergisi* 25, 2, 1981 [1982], pp. 77–78 no. 4 = *SEG* 32, no. 1271), two in a sanctuary of Zeus Bronton in the territory of Nakoleia (Alpanos) (I. W. Macpherson, *ABSA* 49, 1954, p. 14 no. 8 = *SEG* 14, no. 786) and the same number in the cult of Zeus Pappoos in Pazaryeri (Şahin, *IK* 10,2, no. 1513). Some of these priesthoods could be hereditary.

³⁷ Cf. notes 26 and 41.

³⁸ Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, p. 135 no. 115: [τῶν παρηγγελ]μένω[ν (?) ὑπὸ ἱε]ρέων ἔλαθέ [με].

³⁹ TAM V 1, no. 331; Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, p. 111 no. 94.

temple, they supervise the sceptre-ceremony, help edit confession texts, and take part in expiation ceremonies.⁴⁰ That some rural priests managed to leave more tangible traces of their activity is shown by an inscription set up by a former priest who registers his successfully completed efforts to bring water to his native village: his fellow-villagers demanded of him to direct the sum the priests usually contributed for communal repasts to this more lasting and beneficial design.⁴¹

For all their excellent deeds, the village priests, this most tangible and constant local authority, in addition to remunerations in kind and money, received praise from the gods,⁴² from their fellow-villagers,⁴³ from cultic and professional associations,⁴⁴ and from the members of the junior cult personnel.⁴⁵ The qualities emphasized in their honorary inscriptions, being a valuable indication of what was expected from them and what they actually offered, are piety, virtue, kindness to men, unselfishness, benevolence, industry, and wisdom (εὐσέβεια, θρησκεία, ἀρετή, καλοσύνη, ἀφιλοκερδία, φιλ(οκ)ἀγαθία, φιλοδοξία, φιλοπονία, φρόνησις).⁴⁶

Close assistants of priests were *neokoroi* (temple wardens), *epimeletai* (curators), *prophets*, *treasurers*, and others. *Neokoroi* are found only in two inscriptions from the Lydian country-

⁴⁰ Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, p. 11 no. 6: a penitent prepares a meal for the priests of Zeus Oreites and Men Axiottenos; on the steles no. 10–12 in Petzl's *corpus*, originating from the same rural sanctuary, a priest is depicted next to the penitent holding a crown in his outstretched right hand and leaning on a staff in his left. Cf. also Malay, *Researches* p. 101–102 no. 111.

⁴¹ Malay, *Researches* p. 115 no. 127 (Dağmarmara/Karaköy, AD 180–192): Ἀγαθῆ τύχη [- -] καὶ τῆ πατρίδι Διονύσιος {ιος} γ' τοῦ Ἀρτεμᾶ ἱερασάμενος τοῦ θεοῦ καθὰ καὶ ἡ πατρὶς ἠξίωσεν ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰς τὰ δεῖπνα ἀναλωμάτων τὸ ὕδωρ εἰσαγαγὼν καθιέρωσεν ἐπὶ ἀνθυπάτου Γεμινίου Μαρκιανοῦ. For the phrase ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰς τὰ δεῖπνα ἀναλωμάτων compare the parallel in the following inscription from the territory of Hyraipa [Meriz – Merkelbach – Nollé – Şahin, *IK* 17,2 (Ephesos), no. 3817]: [ἡ .]ζουληνῶν κατοικία ἐτείμησεν τὴν συνβίωσιν τῶν Εὐημερίων ἐπιγραφὴν; there follow the names of ten men, all with the *nomen* Aurelius, ὑπὲρ ὧν ἔθηκαν ὑπὲρ ἐπι[μ]ελείας μυριάδας δύο ἄτινα [παρ]εχώρησεν ὅπου ἠξίωσεν [ἡ] πατρὶς. Εὐτυχῶς. [Κ]αὶ τὰ ἐν β' * ,ε. The phrases ὑπὲρ τῶν τῆς στεφανοφορίας ἀναλωμάτων πάντων in the inscription from Iasos [note 26] and ὑπὲρ τῆς προφητείας ἀναλωμάτων in the text from Didyma [same note], when compared with the phrase ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰς τὰ δεῖπνα ἀναλωμάτων in the inscription from Dağmarmara/Karaköy, warrant the conclusion that the bulk of all the expenses incumbent on the prospective priest was earmarked for the communal repasts on the festival days of the divinity served by the priest (cf. Debord, *Aspects*, p. 74). The same situation can be observed in Pamphylia/Kibyra Minor in the second century AD, where an unpublished inscription states that a priest Διὸς Πισαρισσέων pays τῆ κόμη . . . τὸ ἐξ ἔθους ὀφειλόμενον δεῖπνον (Schuler, *Ländliche Siedlungen* p. 295 no. 81).

⁴² *TAM* V 1, no. 282 (the first editors of this inscription, J. Keil and A. v. Premerstein, think that the phrase Ὀνησίμην τὴν ἰέρειαν οἱ θεοὶ ἐτείμησαν simply means that the gods paid for the gravestone); Merkelbach – Stauber, *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*, Bd. 3, pp. 235–240, 16/31/10; *MAMA* VII, no. 257; W. H. Buckler – W. M. Calder – C. W. M. Cox, *JRS* 15, 1925, p. 154 no. 140 = Mitchell, *Anatolia*, vol. II, p. 26 and fig. 11. Cf. *IG* XI 4, no. 1299 = *Syll.*³ no. 663, ll. 9–10 (Delos, c. 200 BC, cult of Sarapis).

⁴³ *TAM* V 1, no. 488.

⁴⁴ *TAM* V 1, nos. 449, 483a, 490.

⁴⁵ Malay, *Manisa Museum* p. 85 no. 234 (Saittai?): οἱ ἱεροὶ join the relatives of the priestess Aphia in setting up her gravestone.

⁴⁶ *TAM* V 1, nos. 449, 484, 488, 490; H. Malay – G. Petzl, *EA* 6, 1985, p. 57 no. 2 = *SEG* 35, no. 1233; E. Gibson, *ZPE* 28, 1978, pp. 20–21 no. 5 = *SEG* 28, no. 1091; M.-L. Cremer – J. Nollé, *Chiron* 18, 1988, p. 207 no. 4 = *SEG* 38, 1222; Malay, *Researches* p. 57 no. 51; Merkelbach – Stauber, *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*, Bd. 3, pp. 235–240, 16/31/10: ἐλντροῦσατο γὰρ πολλοὺς ἐκ κακῶν βαςάνων.

side,⁴⁷ but it is possible that in other texts they “hide” under the more common title of *epimeletai*. The post of *neokoros* is often defined in Late Antique and Byzantine *lexica* and *scholia*, at times in seemingly contradictory terms. *Suidas* first explains the phrase ἱερόν τι νεωκορήσας as equivalent to ἱερατεύσας,⁴⁸ then states that the *neokoros* is the one who adorns and keeps the temple ready for daily service (not the one who sweeps it),⁴⁹ and finally reverts to the idea of servant *neokoros* (ὑπηρέτης) sweeping the temple.⁵⁰ Herodianus (*Part.* p. 90. 4) defines the *neokoros* as the curator of the temple – ὁ τοῦ ναοῦ ἐπιμελητής, Pindar’s *scholia* (*Scholia et glossae in Olympia et Pythia, Scholia recentiora Triclinii, Thomae Magistri, Moschopuli, Germani*, Ode 13, sch. 69–77) put him in the general category of *propoloi* – κυρίως δὲ πρόπολος⁵¹ ὁ νεωκόρος, while Theocritus’ scholiast (*Scholia vetera*, Poem 1, v. 47 [a]) remains faithful to the idea that the duty of a *neokoros* is keeping the temple clean (κορεῖν γὰρ τὸ καθαίρειν, ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ νεωκόρος). These apparent contradictions actually mirror the differences in the situation and status of temple wardens in different periods and, within the same period, in different areas and shrines of the ancient world. The term *neokoros* is applied both to the modest servant charged with the task of keeping the temple clean and to the respectable administrative head of the lower temple personnel.⁵² Naturally, one must differentiate between *neokoroi* in renowned sanctuaries, who often formed a *collegium* with their own “office”, and those in modest countryside *hiera* who assumed many responsibilities shared by several officials in larger sanctuaries. Both Lydian *neokoroi* were female, and one served an unknown goddess in whose temple occurred an incident perpetrated by the author of a fragmentary confession inscription. The penitent expressed disbelief in the goddess’ powers to her virgin (priestesses?) and *neokoros*.

Lydian inscriptions coming from rural areas offer no information on the activities performed by local *neokoroi*. Fortunately, other literary and documentary sources, pagan and Christian alike, constitute an almost inexhaustible source of information on this subject. They show us that *neokoroi*, priest’s assistants, were instrumental for the smooth functioning of sanctuaries. Their duties fall into three groups: 1. Cult duties: *neokoroi* perform sacrifices and cathartic rituals;⁵³ 2. Financial and administrative duties: *neokoroi* control the temple treasury, depositing payments and purchasing whatever is needed in the sanctuary;⁵⁴ they also oversee

⁴⁷ TAM V 1, nos. 179, 269.

⁴⁸ S. v. ἱερόν τι νεωκορήσας· ἀντὶ τοῦ εὐφημότερον ἱερατεύσας.

⁴⁹ S. v. Νεωκόρος· ὁ τὸν ναὸν κοσμῶν καὶ εὐτρεπίζων, ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὁ σαρωῶν.

⁵⁰ S. v. Ζάκορος· νεωκόρος. Μένανδρος Δις ἐξαπατῶντι· οὐ Μεγάβυζος ἦν, ὅς τις γένοιτο ζάκορος. Καὶ ὑπηρέτης. Λευκαδία· ἐπίθετος τὸ πῦρ ἢ ζάκορος ἱερέως οὐτωςὶ καλῶς. ἢ ὁ ἱερεύς, ὁ τὸν ναὸν σαρωῶν. κορεῖν γὰρ τὸ σαίρειν παρὰ Ἀττικοῖς.

⁵¹ In an inscription from Davulga, southeast of Hisar Köy-Amorion (Cl. Brixhe – Th. Drew-Bear, in: R. Gusmani – M. Salvini – P. Vannicelli (eds.), *Frigi e Frigio, Atti del I° Simposio Internazionale, Roma, 16–17 ottobre 1995*, Roma 1997, p. 98 = *SEG* 47, no. 1723) we find this term in an unknown context: Σύμφωνος, Πρεῖμ[α τ’ Ἀ]βρύντιοι ἐνθάδε κείνται, οὐς κτερίσας μ[.....] τῆδε κόνει πέτασεν. Εὐτακτος υἱὸς ἄρι[στο]ς ε..στο νέας προπόλοιο τειμήσας τειμα[ῖς μ]νημοσύνης ἔνεκεν.

⁵² Cf. Debord, *Aspects*, pp. 259–260.

⁵³ Herodas, *Mime* IV; Athen. VIII 18, ll. 10–16 (ed. Kaibel); Orig., *Contra Celsum* VIII 73; Greg. Nyss. *De Vita Greg. Thaum.* p. 916; Theodoretus, *Hist. Eccl.* p. 194; *I. Magn.* no. 3.

⁵⁴ A recently published inscription from Sardis (Malay, *Researches* p. 119 no. 131, Çapaklı northeast of Sardis, AD 188/9 = *Année épigr.* 1999, no. 1534) shows us a *neokoros* of Men Askenos strongly protesting with

all building activities,⁵⁵ and witness the documents deposited in temple archives,⁵⁶ keeping the archives in order; 3. Caretaker's duties: they open and close the temple, keep discipline in and around the sanctuary, serve as guides and overnight guards, take care of sacred groves, etc.⁵⁷

Wherever there was a temple, its needs (the financial ones in particular) and the needs of its devotees had to be taken care of; therefore, the need for *curators/caretakers* (ἐπιμεληταί) arose in both urban and rural environments. Inscriptions from the rural sanctuary of the Indigenous Mother of the Gods in the territory of Macedonian Beroia⁵⁸ shows curators working side by side with priests to ensure the smooth functioning of this sacred place. They were appointed by the city of Beroia from among its prominent citizens, and some of them also appear as priests in the same sanctuary.

Curators of Lydian and Phrygian shrines administered sacred revenues, using them for construction and repairs around the sanctuary.⁵⁹ They were probably responsible for temple archives as well, approaching in this matter also the functions of *neokoroi*.

Male and female *prophets* are also attested in rural sanctuaries of Lydia and Phrygia.⁶⁰ The office is rare in the rural environment and its holders sometimes date inscriptions.

A dedication from Dorylaion⁶¹ may contain a reference to a *treasurer* of sacred moneys.

Two inscriptions from the Lydian countryside offer evidence of two kindred groups within the cultic personnel – *semeaphoroi*⁶² and *symbolaphoroi*.⁶³ Furthermore, a Lydian confession inscription⁶⁴ contains the only attestation of an enigmatic body called *council* (σύνκλητος, council of active priests?) functioning in a local sanctuary of Zeus and Men Artemidorou.⁶⁵

I.2. Junior Cult Personnel

Under this heading, I include the following categories: *diakonoi*, *douloi tôn theôn*, *hierodouloi*, *hieroi*, and *hypotaktikoi theôn*. Not only do they all have their place in Lydian and

the governor Arrius Antoninus against a civic official who refused to grant the god the customary annual sum of 600 *denarii* for sacrifices and libations: . . . ἔχοντος, κύριε, δίκαια τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ βασιλικῶν δωρεῶν καὶ ἐπικρίσεων ἐννόμων καὶ ἐπιτρόπων καὶ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου δίδοσθαι κατ' ἔτος ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων τῆς πόλεως ὀρισμένα κὲ κεκριμένα ἐξ ἔθους * χ' εἰς τε τὰς θυσίας κὲ σπονδὰς τοῦ θεοῦ . . .

⁵⁵ E. g. *IG* XII 9, no. 906; *MAMA* IX, no. 10.

⁵⁶ E. g. *FD* III, nos. 51, 263–264, etc.

⁵⁷ E. g. L. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cites grecques (LSCG)*, Paris 1969, nos. 69, 84, 101, 111, 112.

⁵⁸ Note 29.

⁵⁹ *TAM* V 1, no. 242.

⁶⁰ *TAM* V 1, nos. 185 (the monument was set up by [ἡ - -]νῶν κα[τ]οικία, and the prophet is the citizen of Saïtai (διὰ προφήτο[υ Ἀ]λεξάνδρου Σαιττηνο[ῦ]), 535; Malay, *Researches* p. 130 no. 139 (Saraçlar-Nisyra); *MAMA* IX, no. 60; Merkelbach – Stauber, *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*, Bd. 3, pp. 235–240, 16/31/10; W. H. Buckler – W. M. Calder, *JRS* 16, 1926, p. 88 no. 218 (territory of Sebaste: Ἐκάτης· ἡ κόμη κατὰ χρησμόν); E. Schwertheim, *IK* 33 (Hadrianoi u. Hadrianeia), nos. 6, 19, 23–26.

⁶¹ C. Armanet, *BCH* 28, 1904, pp. 192–193 no. 3: Αὐρ. Θάλλος Ἀσκληπᾶ αὐτῷ ζῶν καὶ Διὶ Βροντῶντι, ὁ ταμίης.

⁶² Malay, *Researches* p. 128 no. 136.

⁶³ *TAM* V 1, no. 576.

⁶⁴ Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, pp. 7–8 no. 5 (AD 235/6), from the territory of Silandos.

⁶⁵ G. Petzl [op. cit.] interprets it as a priestly tribunal.

Phrygian sanctuaries, but their legal and social status is similar. It is essential that one studies these groups in their specific environment and time, avoiding far-sweeping generalizations and keeping in mind the fact that the adduced terms sometimes denote a quality or a state, not a clearly defined legal status.

Although we have no documents to that effect, a census record was almost certainly kept of the sanctuary's dependants: in the eyes of the Romans the sanctuary was their *origo*, place of registration in the tax-rolls.⁶⁶ At least some of these dependants must have resided within the temple enclosure;⁶⁷ the names of all, including those having their domicile elsewhere, were entered in the tax-roll of the community under the name of the deity/temple responsible for the payment of their poll-tax.⁶⁸

In Lydian rural sanctuaries we find δίακονοι, δοῦλοι τῶν θεῶν, ιερόδουλοι, and ιεροί.⁶⁹ Their legal status and activities in the sanctuaries are still not completely understood. A confession inscription from southeast Mysia dedicated to the Phrygian deity Zeus Trosou⁷⁰ mentions a group of *diakonoi* who committed a transgression by eating the flesh of animals that had not been sacrificed. I am inclined to accept the interpretation of the first editors that these *diakonoi* belonged to the god, not to the dedicator of the inscription.⁷¹ Likewise, we know of only one δοῦλος τῶν θεῶν, a certain Theodoros who erected a confession inscription in AD 235/6.⁷² This difficult text suggests that his status/office was a temporary one, involving residence in the sanctuary and observance of strict rules of purity and sexual abstinence. Of the three *hierodouloi* attested in the Roman period,⁷³ two have patronymics and one of these was already mentioned as a *synierodoulos* of a priest. More common are *hieroi*, featuring in seven inscriptions⁷⁴ and sometimes employed on duties involving temple

⁶⁶ Cf. M. Mirković, *Mélanges d'histoire et d'épigraphie offerts à F. Papazoglou*, Belgrade 1997, pp. 17–19.

⁶⁷ Cf. Paus. X 32, 12: σταδίοις δὲ ἀπωτέρω Τιθορέας ἑβδομήκοντα ναός ἐστὶν Ἀσκληπιοῦ, καλεῖται δὲ Ἀρχαγέτας· τιμὰς δὲ παρὰ αὐτῶν ἔχει Τιθορέων καὶ ἐπ' ἴσης παρὰ Φωκέων τῶν ἄλλων. ἐντὸς μὲν δὴ τοῦ περιβόλου τοῖς τε ἰκέταις καὶ ὅσοι τοῦ θεοῦ δοῦλοι, τούτοις μὲν ἐνταῦθά εἰσι καὶ οἰκήσεις. Neo-Babylonian *shirkutu* – slaves consecrated to deities – were likewise registered in the temple register (A. G. Perihanjan, *VDI* 1957, 2, p. 52). Cf. also note 11.

⁶⁸ M. Mirković [note 66] p. 27 compares the position of consecrated slaves and children in Phrygia and Macedonia to that of *coloni adscripticii* featuring in tax-rolls under the name of the landowner on whose estate they worked, accepting D. Nörr's suggestion put forward in *Studi E. Volterra* II, Milano 1971, pp. 619–645.

⁶⁹ In the urban sanctuary of Anāhitā in Hierokaisareia private worshippers kept the custom of donating their slaves to supplement the lower personnel of the temple as σώματα ἱερά (S. Bakır-Barthel, *EA* 6, 1985, p. 17 = *SEG* 35, no. 1155 = *TAM* V 2, no. 1252. Cf. *Bull. épigr.* 1989, no. 607; Malay, *Researches* p. 61 no. 54).

⁷⁰ Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, p. 1 no. 1.

⁷¹ Ed. pr. P. Herrmann – K. Z. Polatkan, *Das Testament des Epikrates und andere neue Inschriften aus dem Museum von Manisa, Sitz.-ber. d. Österr. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.* 265,1, 1969, pp. 58–63 no. 15. In *TAM* V 1, no. 566, from Maionia, only the words δ]ιακόνων καὶ are preserved. For other *diakonoi* active in various pagan cults, cf. *IG* II 3², no. 3464; *IG* IX 1², 2, nos. 247–248, 250–252, 451; *IG* XII 2, no. 499; L. Gounaropoulou – M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Ἐπιγραφές Κάτω Μακεδονίας, I: Ἐπιγραφές Βεροίας*, Athens 1998, nos. 26 (= *SEG* 35, no. 714), 28 (Zeus Hysistos); *I. Magn.* nos. 176, 192.

⁷² Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, pp. 7–8 no. 5.

⁷³ *TAM* V 1, nos. 459, 483 a, 593.

⁷⁴ *TAM* V 1–2, nos. 182, 423, 681 (Charakipolis), 1348 (Magnesia ad Sipylum, cult of Sarapis and Isis); P. Herrmann – E. Varinlioglu, *EA* 3, 1984, 15 no. 10 = *SEG* 34, no. 1219; Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, pp. 7–8 no. 5; Malay, *Manisa Museum* p. 85 no. 234.

finances and temple archives. One of the shrines had at least three *hieroi* in its service,⁷⁵ and all the texts except two epitaphs⁷⁶ refer to them as a group active in a sanctuary, not individually. Last, but not least, some have a patronymic attached to their personal name. At this stage, it is difficult to say whether the terms *δοῦλος τῶν θεῶν*, *ιερόδουλος*, and *ιέρως* found in Lydian inscriptions define a status or an office (or both). The people of the sanctuary in general had a legal status that partly transgressed the schemes of classical law founded on the Roman legal science of classical and postclassical periods. In any event, *δοῦλοι τῶν θεῶν*, *ιερόδουλοι*, and *ιεροί* formed an important and ancient element in the permanent or temporary personnel of rustic shrines in Roman Lydia.

The Phrygian material contains only references to *hieroi*, mostly from the sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos near Hierapolis. They appear as authors of dedications, of *katagraphai* of their own children and slaves, and confession inscriptions.⁷⁷ These texts prove that one (the sole?) mode of their “recruitment” in this sanctuary was through the legal procedure of *katagraphē* of slave and freeborn dependants (children/grandchildren). Consecrated slaves became *ιεροὶ καὶ ἐλεύθεροι*, consecrated freeborn children *ιεροί*. Their actions prove beyond any doubt that both groups after consecration possessed the full private rights of free individuals concerning marriage and property, but not the citizen-rights of the urban community controlling the sanctuary.

We have no reliable information on their duties and activities in and around the sanctuary.⁷⁸ For at least some of the consecrated persons, serving the gods meant participating and helping in cult ceremonies, but many were probably employed in menial jobs in and around the sanctuary, on temple estates, or in workshops,⁷⁹ some perhaps even hired out to work outside the sanctuary for private people and earn wages. Unfortunately, many important details regarding the consecrated persons’ future remain vague. In any case, it seems to have been the deity’s prerogative to determine their ultimate fate by keeping them under its authority or liberating them from the obligations they undertook at the moment of their (self)consecration.

A newly published *katagraphē*-inscription from the shrine of Apollo Lairbenos⁸⁰ has introduced us to freeborn Apollonios and his daughter Ammis, two *συνιεροί*⁸¹ who brought up and owned together a *θρεπτή* jointly offered by them to the god.

⁷⁵ P. Herrmann – E. Varinlioglu, *EA* 3, 1984, 15 no. 10 = *SEG* 34, no. 1219.

⁷⁶ *TAM* V 1, no. 681; Malay, *Manisa Museum* p. 85 no. 234.

⁷⁷ Cf. Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, pp. 126–127 no. 109; p. 136 no. 117; pp. 137–138 no. 118; p. 141 no. 123 (?); M. Riel, *Arkeoloji dergisi* 3, 1995, pp. 167–195 = *SEG* 45, nos. 1725–1740, 1748–1750 = *Année épigr.* 1995, nos. 1484–1496; Mirković [note 66] passim; T. Ritti – C. Şimşek – H. Yıldız, *EA* 32, 2000, pp. 1–88; M. Riel, *Tyche* 16, 2001 [2002], pp. 127–160.

⁷⁸ A damaged confession inscription (Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, 137–138 no. 118: ὅτι πενφθεὶς [- -]λογίαν ἡμά[ρτησεν] καὶ . . .) possibly refers to a transgression committed by a *hieros* in his “official capacity”.

⁷⁹ A workshop is given as a gift to Apollo Lairbenos in a newly published inscription from his sanctuary (Ritti – Şimşek – Yıldız, *EA* 32, 2000, pp. 32–33, K43).

⁸⁰ Note 79.

⁸¹ Cf. I. A. Papapostolou, *Ἀρχαιολογικὴ Ἐφημερίς* 1973, pp. 167–174 (cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigr.* 1974, no. 261): Οἱ συνιεροὶ τοῦ Ἡρώς Θράσωνα Ξενοφώντος (Pharai in Achaia). The same word appears only in Plutarch (*Amat.* 753E), but with a different meaning, “having joint sacrifices”. This is a close parallel to the term *συνιερόδουλος* found in *TAM* V 1, no. 483a.

Hieroi are found in other parts of Phrygia, as well (Dorylaion, Aizanoi, Tiberiopolis). In Aizanoi a *hieros* with the single name Hermas took care of δημόσια γράμματα.⁸²

Recently, an inscription from Phrygia has introduced us to yet another category of temple servants called ὑποτακτικοὶ θεῶν.⁸³ Judging by the meaning of the rare word ὑποτακτικός, “submissive, obedient”,⁸⁴ they could have been of servile or, at any rate, low extraction. Their vow was set up ὑπὲρ συνοίκων, most probably their fellow-servants living in the same shrine.⁸⁵

The legal and social status of slaves of gods in the Greek East varied considerably in accordance with local traditions and periods, so we cannot group under this same heading all the persons designated as δούλοι θεοῦ/θεᾶς, ἱερόδουλοι, and ἱεροί. What they all share, whether freeborn or (former) slaves, is their link with their divine patrons. The nature of this link is not always easy to define but a religious element can be discerned in several cases.⁸⁶

Some δούλοι θεοῦ/θεᾶς and ἱερόδουλοι in Roman Lydia and Macedonia, as well as contemporaneous ἱεροί in Lydia and Phrygia, were slaves and freeborn persons consecrated by their masters and blood relatives and transferred to gods by dedication. By virtue of this act, they legally became slaves of divinities⁸⁷ protected by their divine patrons; yet with respect to the public authorities and private individuals they were considered personally free. They had property and personal rights, as well as legal capacity, but not complete freedom of movement or freedom to change their status. Other individuals in the same category probably acquired their status by voluntary or divinely inspired self-consecration.

As yet, no freedmen of gods are attested either in Lydia or in Phrygia.⁸⁸

⁸² MAMA IX, P 28: a letter addressed τοῖς πανηγυριάρχαις καὶ Ἑρμᾶ ἱερῷ τῷ πρὸς δημο[σίοις γράμμασι]. The same seems to have been the duty of one Stratonikos, ἱερός Σμυρναίων ἐπὶ τοῦ Μο[υ]σείου, most probably a public slave ceded to the Mouseion, the seat of the state archives of Smyrna (Ç. Içten – H. Engelmann, *ZPE* 108, 1995, pp. 92–93 no. 7 = *SEG* 45, no. 1598; *Année épigr.* 1995, no. 1469). The origin and the status of Hermas of Aizanoi could have been identical.

⁸³ Bozan, area of Dorylaion (M. Riel, *EA* 20, 1992, 95 no. 1 = *SEG* 42, no. 1185: [Θε]οῦ Ἀπόλωνος κα[ὶ] ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ Ὁσίφ [καὶ Δ]ικέφ Μάντριος, Φονικός καὶ Ἀσκληπιός, ὑποτακτικοὶ θεῶν, ὑπὲρ συνοίκων εὐτυχῶς προ(σ)ευ[χί]ν).

⁸⁴ Cf. the meaning “unfree, slave” implied by Vettius Valens in the chapter of his book (*Anth. Lib.* IX, pp. 105–106) entitled Περὶ ἐλευθερικῶν καὶ δουλικῶν γενέσεων (e.g. ὑποτακτικοὶ γεννηθέντες ἐλεύθεροι τραφήσονται).

⁸⁵ Lucian (*Phalaris* I 1) calls Delphians ἱεροί . . . καὶ πάρεδροι τοῦ Πυθίου καὶ μόνον οὐ σύνοικοι καὶ ὁμορόφιοι τοῦ θεοῦ.

⁸⁶ Cf. Strabo’s information on the sanctuary of Selene in Caspian Albania and its *hierodouloi*, of whom many “are possessed and have the gift of prophecy” (XI 4, 7, p. 503 C): Θεοὺς δὲ τιμῶσιν Ἥλιον καὶ Δία καὶ Σελήνην, διαφερόντως δὲ τὴν Σελήνην, ἔστι δ’ αὐτῆς τὸ ἱερόν τῆς Ἰβηρίας πλησίον ἱεράται δ’ ἀνὴρ ἐντιμότητος μετὰ γε τὸν βασιλέα, προεστὼς τῆς ἱεράς χώρας, πολλῆς καὶ εὐάνδρου, καὶ αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν ἱεροδούλων, ὧν ἐνθουσιῶσι πολλοὶ καὶ προφητεύουσιν. Cf. also the following note.

⁸⁷ Cf. Firmicus Maternus (ed. W. Kroll – F. Skutsch II, 1913) p. 351, 1: *hieroduli servi templorum, in sacrorum caerimoniis hymnos dicentes*; p. 336, 8: *servus templorum vel sacrorum obsequiis deputatus*; vol. I, 1897, p. 276, 8: *in templis eos facit servilibus officiis deputari*; *ibid.*, p. 189, 11: *alios in templis facit ministeria exercere servilia* = Rhetorios (*Cat. Cod. Astr. Graec.* VIII, IV) p. 147, 22: ἐν ἱεροῖς δουλείας ἀδόξους ἢ δουλικὰς κεκτημένους; p. 148, 21: ἐν ἱεροῖς ἀδόξους ἢ δουλικὰς ἔχουσι πράξεις.

⁸⁸ In Lefkopetra we have one case (op. cit. in note 29, inscription no. 43, from AD 195/6: Κρισπίνα, Μητρὸς θεῶν ἀπελευθέρᾳ). Other cases of freedmen of divinities from the Graeco-Roman world known to me are the following ones: 1) *Agonis quaedam . . . Lilybitana, liberta Veneris Erycinae*, from Eryx (Cic. *Div. Caec.* XVII

The idea of serving the gods is usually expressed in Lydian and Phrygian inscriptions by the verb ὑπηρετέω. The same verb is present in many consecrations of slaves and family-members inscribed on the temple of the Indigenous Mother of Gods in Lefkopetra in Macedonia⁸⁹. The purpose for which the slaves and children are offered to the goddess of this shrine is one and the same in all cases: to serve her. The ambiguity of the verb ὑπηρετέω and of the corresponding noun ὑπηρετής (“attendant”) was stressed by W. Westermann.⁹⁰ A confession inscription from northeast Lydia⁹¹ informs us that a freeborn woman, Trophime, was called by the god (Apollo Tarsios or Men Artemidorou) to perform an unspecified service, but failed to present herself at the sanctuary at the proper time. She was then chastised with madness; turning for advice to the gods, she received instructions to set up a stele with a report on her chastisement *and to inscribe/enroll herself in the service of the gods* (καὶ καταγράψαι ἑμαυτὴν ἰς ὑπηρεσίαν τοῖς θεοῖς). This unique text suggests that each member of a village community in northeast Lydia could expect a summons to serve for a time in the local sanctuary; for this reason, temple officials kept lists with the names of these temporary(?) (self)consecrated ὑπηρεταί.⁹² The same conditions probably prevailed in the communities gravitating towards the sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos.⁹³ This custom suggests that the permanent personnel of rustic shrines was modest and needed to be supplemented by ordinary villagers during festivals and other major celebrations.

55); 2) *C. Iulius Optatus Veneris libertus* from Sicca Veneria, founded from Eryx and likewise renowned for its cult of Venus/Astarte (*CIL* VIII, no. 27580); 3) a freedwoman of Diana by the name of *Rufa* [Dessau, *ILS* ad no. 3523: *M. Orfio M. f. Fal. Rufa Dianaes l(iberta) sibi et coiuii (!) suuo (!) fecit*], member of the community around the sanctuary of Diana Tifatina in the vicinity of Capua; 4) *Septimius Asclepius Hermes*, a freedman of Asclepius from Apulum in Dacia [*CIL* III, no. 1079: *I.O.M. Iunoni Minervae et Aesculapio domino Septim(ius) Ascl(epius) Hermes, libertus numinis Aesculapi, habens ornamenta dec(urionalia) col(oniae) Apu(li) et aug(ustalis) col(oniae) e(iusdem) v(otum) p(osuit)*]; 5) a freedman (?) (his legal status is not stated) of a Histrian deity venerated under the name of Minerva Polensis, *Minervius Epaphroditus* from Pola, (*Inscr. It.* X 1, 592); 6) *Flavius Constantius, Matris Deae libertus* from Sirmium in Pannonia Inferior (M. Riel, *A Matris Deae libertus* at Sirmium, *ZPE* 141, 2001, pp. 287–296); 7) a slave-girl in an inscription from Macedonian Kozani (A. Rizakis – I. Touratzoglou, *Ἐπιγραφεὶς Ἄνω Μακεδονίας* I, Athens 1985, no. 59b, c. AD 108/9) consecrated to a local Heros, who προσμενεῖ τῷ Ἥρῳ καὶ εἶναι ἐλευθέραν ναοῦ . . . 8) *Dioskoros*, ἀπελ(εύθερος) τοῦ μελίστου/γάλου) θεοῦ] Σαράπιδος, a weaver working for the Roman army (*BGU* VII, no. 1564 = A. S. Hunt – C. C. Edgar, *Select Papyri* II no. 395, September 9, AD 138, Philadelphia in Fayum); 9) *liberti* from in an unknown sanctuary mentioned in *Dig.* XXXIII 1, 20, 1 as recipients of a *fideicommissum*: *Attia fideicommissum his verbis reliquit: “quisquis mihi heres erit, fidei eius committo, uti det ex reditu cenaculi mei et horrei post obitum sacerdoti et hierophylaco et libertis, qui in illo templo erunt, denaria decem die nundinarum, quas ibi posui”*. Of all these freedmen, C. Iulius Optatus, Septimius Asclepius Hermes and Flavius Constantius were former *servi publici* ceded to municipal sanctuaries: upon their manumission, they became freedmen of their divine masters, receiving simultaneously the *nomen* of the city that controlled the sanctuary where they served.

⁸⁹ Note 29.

⁹⁰ *PAPHilosS* 92, 1948, p. 58: “The Greek noun, *hyperetes*, with its corresponding verb, *hyperetein*, . . . express . . . the indefiniteness of ‘servant’ and ‘lowly services’ . . . non-slave services.” The noun and the verb appear in cult documents of diverse periods and regions, designating, as a rule, the activity of lower cult personnel or, in the cult of Mithras, initiates of the second rank.

⁹¹ Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, p. 68 no. 57 (AD 118/9).

⁹² It is unknown how (if at all) Trophime’s legal status changed during the period of her ὑπηρεσία in the sanctuary, and how long this period was.

⁹³ Cf. Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, p. 126 no. 108: Γ. Ἀντόνιος Ἀπελλάς Βλαυνδεύς, κολασθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πολλάκις καὶ πολλοῖς χρόνοις διὰ τὸ μ(ῆ) βούλεσθε ἑαυτὸν π(ρ)οσελθεῖν καὶ παρεστάναι τῷ μυστηρίῳ καλούμενον ἐκ[- -]; p. 134 no. 113: διὰ τὸ ὑστε[ρ]ηκέναι] καὶ μὴ παραγεγον[έναι].

I.3. Cult Associations

An impressive number of cult associations are on record in Roman Lydia and Phrygia.⁹⁴ All these associations occupied with the religious and material aspects of the sanctuary and composed mostly of individuals of a certain prestige and a certain level of economic ease, were involved in the economic and administrative functioning of the sanctuary, working closely with its personnel. In addition to functioning as social and funerary clubs,⁹⁵ cult associations voted honours for their own distinguished members and priests of their tutelary divinities,⁹⁶ set up altars and statues out of their own funds,⁹⁷ collected donations for the sanctuaries (?),⁹⁸ erected buildings for their use,⁹⁹ celebrated festivals,¹⁰⁰ and made contributions to cult practice by publishing cult rules.¹⁰¹ They had their own funds and officials.¹⁰² At times they themselves appear as objects of devotion and recipients of dedications.

The classic cult association of Lydia is the (ἱερὸς) δοῦμος (also found in Phrygia and

⁹⁴ TAM V 1, no. 144; MAMA VI, no. 239 (θίασος); TAM V 1, nos. 179, 449, 470a, 483, 536; Drew-Bear – Thomas – Yıldızıran, *Phrygian Votive Steles* p. 137 no. 167 (ἱερὸς) δοῦμος; TAM V 1, nos. 217 (?), 351, 490 (οἱ καταλουστικοί); *ibid.*, nos. 451, 470a, 806; Malay, *Researches* p. 128 no. 136; W. M. Ramsay, *JHS* 4, 1883, p. 417; *id.*, *CB I*, pp. 142–144 nos. 30 and 31 = T. Ritti, *EA* 34, 2002, pp. 48–51; MAMA IV, no. 230 (ἡ φράτρα); L. Robert, *Journ. Sav.* 1983, pp. 45–63 = *OMS VII*, pp. 549–567 = *SEG* 34, no. 1298 = T. Ritti, *EA* 34, 2002, pp. 57–60 (ἡ ἑταιρεία ἢ Ἀρζιμνέων); TAM V 1, no. 537 (ἱερὰ συμβίωσις καὶ νεώτερα); Meriç – Merkelbach – Nollé – Şahin, *IK* 17.2, no. 3818; G. Petzl, *EA* 26, 1996, p. 18 no. 14 = *SEG* 46, no. 1540; *CIG* 3865 ο; M. Riel, *EA* 18, 1991, pp. 24–5 no. 48; *ibid.*, p. 26 no. 53; Drew-Bear – Naour, *ANRW II* 18. 3, p. 1929 no. 4 = *SEG* 40, no. 1192 (συμβίωσις); TAM V 1, no. 225 (οἶκος); J. Keil – A. v. Premerstein, *Bericht über eine Zweite Reise in Lydien, Denkschr. d. Österr. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.* 54.2, 1911, no. 9; J. and L. Robert, *Hellenica IX*, Paris 1950, pp. 35–38; TAM V 1, nos. 806; 817, 822; S. Cole, *EA* 17, 1991, pp. 41–49 = *SEG* 41, 1171; W. M. Ramsay, *REA* 3, 1901, p. 276 [(ἱερὰ) σπεῖρα]; TAM V 2, no. 845 (κο[ινεῖ?]ον τὸ νεώτερον); Keil – v. Premerstein, *Dritte Reise* no. 14 (τὸ κοινόν); M. Riel, *ŽA* 44, 1994, p. 172 no. 30 = *SEG* 44, no. 1063 (συννοδία); Lane, *CMRDM I*, p. 118, no. 193; *id.*, *CMRDM IV (ÉPRO 19, 4)*, Leiden 1978, p. 44 no. 130 (σύννοδος); TAM V 1, nos. 151, 449, 824; MAMA VI, nos. 24, 48; MAMA VII, no. 515; Şahin, *IK* 10 (Museum Iznik), nos. 1034, 1035, 1512 (συνγενικόν/συνγένεια); MAMA V, KB 6; E. Haspels, *AJA* 66, 1962, pp. 285–287 nos. 1–2; Haspels, *Highlands of Phrygia* p. 352 no. 139; *ibid.*, p. 354 no. 144; Drew-Bear, *Nouv. inscr. Phrygie*, pp. 32–33 no. 1 = *SEG* 28, no. 1187 (μύστα); TAM V 2, no. 959 (Ἡρακληασταί).

⁹⁵ TAM V 1, nos. 91, 92, 93, 470a, 483a, 817, 822.

⁹⁶ TAM V 1, nos. 144 (together with the village), 449, 490.

⁹⁷ TAM V 1, nos. 179, 351, 451; Malay, *Researches* p. 128 no. 136.

⁹⁸ TAM V 1, no. 217. This text is too fragmentary to warrant any secure conclusions regarding its content.

⁹⁹ MAMA VI, no. 239.

¹⁰⁰ *SEG* 6, no. 550; W. M. Ramsay, *CB I*, pp. 142–144, nos. 30 and 31 = T. Ritti, *EA* 34, 2002, pp. 48–51 (Thiounta in the territory of Hierapolis: καὶ ἤλιψαν ἡμέρας ἡ' ἐπειδὴ ἐποίησαν παννυχίδα τῷ Διὶ ἡμέρας ἡ' καὶ ἤλιψαν ἡμέρας ἡ').

¹⁰¹ TAM V 1, no. 536: κατὰ τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἐπιταγὴν ἱερὸς δοῦμος εὐχὴν Διὶ Μασφαλατηνῷ καὶ Μηνί Τιαμου καὶ Μηνί Τυράννῳ ἐκέλευσεν τηρεῖσθαι ἀπὸ ἡμερῶν θ'· εἴ τις δὲ τούτων ἀπειθήσι, ἀναγνώσεται τὰς δυνάμεις τοῦ Διός, ἐπιμελησαμένου Διονυσίου Διοδώρου καὶ Ἑρμογένους Βαλερίου. ἔτους σνς', μη(νὸς) Δύστρου.

¹⁰² TAM V 1, nos. 490 (γραμματεὺς), 817, 822 (ναρθηκοφόρος who is also a πρωτοκομήτης); S. Cole, *EA* 17, 1991, pp. 41–49 = *SEG* 41, no. 1171; W. M. Ramsay, *CB I*, pp. 142–144, nos. 30 and 31 (ἀγνονοθέτης); Drew-Bear, *Nouv. inscr. Phrygie*, pp. 32–33 no. 1 = *SEG* 28, no. 1187 (ἱερεὺς, ἱεροφάντης, σπειράρχης).

northern Pisidia)¹⁰³ and in Phrygia the βέννος.¹⁰⁴ The question of the true meaning of the last term has produced a lively controversy but, as Th. Drew-Bear and Chr. Naour have convincingly shown,¹⁰⁵ the word *bennos* means “cult association”. It is found in the cults of Zeus Bennios, Zeus Bronton, Zeus Kalagathios, and Men. At the head of a *bennos* stood a *bennarches*.¹⁰⁶

Another well-known Phrygian cult association is that of *Xenoi Tekmoreioi*. It had its centres at Sağır and Kumdanlı north of Antiocheia ad Pisidiam, and its members worshipped Artemis of Limnai and the Roman emperors.¹⁰⁷

II. TEMPLE ECONOMY

II.1. Patrimony

II.1.1. Land

The essential base of any sanctuary’s patrimony, forming its territory, was made up of the lands in its possession. Sacred land should not be imagined as a homogenous block in either extent or use; instead, this property was geographically fragmented and comprised several discrete sections. Lydian sanctuaries possessed arable land,¹⁰⁸ woods and groves,¹⁰⁹ vineyards,¹¹⁰ uncultivated plots,¹¹¹ and probably also meadows and gardens. Inscriptions supply

¹⁰³ A. S. Hall, *AS* 18, 1968, p. 75 no. 19 (cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigr.* 1969, no. 575): δο[ῦ]μος οἱ περὶ Ἐρδιν Κιῶδιου καὶ Κοῖντον Μαμᾶ εὐχὴν Μητρὶ Ουεγνα. Cf. Hesych. s.v. δοῦμος: ἡ οἰκία, ἣ τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσιν τῶν γυναικῶν. Two most recent studies of the term by O. Masson (*Le mot δοῦμος ‘confrérie’ dans les textes et les inscriptions, Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure* 41, 1987, pp. 145–152) and G. Neumann (*Δοῦμος, Belege, Bedeutungen, Herkunft, Etymologie*, in: *Florilegium linguisticum, Fs. W. P. Schmid*, Frankfurt–Berlin 1999, pp. 345–353) were not available to me. For the δοῦμος Ἀφροδείτης Ἐπιτευχιδίας in Thessalonike with officials called ἀρχισυναγωγῶν, γραμματεῶν and ἔξεταστής, cf. E. Voutiras, *ZPE* 90, 1992, pp. 87–96 = *SEG* 42, no. 625. In all the cases of *doumoi* found outside Asia Minor (including those from Novae, Serdica, and Tomis), their members were predominantly of Anatolian origin.

¹⁰⁴ *MAMA* V, nos. 176, 210; *MAMA* X, nos. 222, 304; *IGR* IV, no. 603; *SEG* 6, no. 550; S. Şahin, *EA* 7, 1986, p. 135, note 37 = *SEG* 36, no. 1150; Şahin, *IK* 10,1, no. 1206; Drew-Bear – Naour, *ANRW* II 18. 3, pp. 1998–2001 no. 20 = *SEG* 40, no. 1221.

¹⁰⁵ *ANRW* II 18. 3, pp. 1990–1991.

¹⁰⁶ I know of two attestations of this official, one in Şahin, *IK* 10,1, no. 1206 (βεννάρχην ἐκ προγόνων) and the other in an unpublished inscription from the hüyük by the village of Sülümenli southeast of Afyon (βεννάρχης θεοῦ Ἀντηνῶν).

¹⁰⁷ W. M. Ramsay, *The Tekmoreian Guest-Friends: an Antichristian Society on the Imperial Estates at Pisidian Antioch*, in: W. M. Ramsay (ed.), *Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, Aberdeen 1906, pp. 305–377; id., *BCH* 32, 1912, pp. 151–170; W. Ruge, *RE* 1934, s.v. *Tekmoreioi Xenoi*; Lane, *CMRDM* III (*ÉPRO* 19, 3), Leiden 1976, pp. 60–61, with bibliography.

¹⁰⁸ Chr. Naour, *Travaux et recherches en Turquie* II, 1984, pp. 59 no. 17 = G. Petzl, *EA* 6, 1985, pp. 72–73 = *SEG* 34, no. 1207; Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, p. 81 no. 63: sacred wheat of Men Axiottenos.

¹⁰⁹ *TAM* V 1, no. 590; P. Herrmann – E. Varinlioğlu, *EA* 3, 1984, pp. 4–5 no. 2 = *SEG* 34, no. 1211; Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, nos. 7, 9–10, 69, 76.

¹¹⁰ Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, nos. 18, 71; Naour, *Travaux et recherches en Turquie* II, p. 59 no. 17 = G. Petzl, *EA* 6, 1985, pp. 72–73 = *SEG* 34, no. 1207: . . . Δία εὐίλατον τῷ κληρονόμῳ, κὲ δωρηὰν χώραν κὲ ἀμπέλους τῷ Διεὶ ἀνάφερε τὰ πρὸς Τίλλῳ.

¹¹¹ *TAM* V 1, no. 538; P. Herrmann – E. Varinlioğlu, *EA* 3, 1984, pp. 4–5 no. 2 = *SEG* 34, no. 1211.

abundant evidence of the important part played by the rural population in the acquisition of these possessions, proving that sanctuaries and their upkeep were to a very high degree dependent on the private generosity of locals.¹¹² Moreover, gods often made open demands upon worshippers'/transgressors' landed property, addressing themselves even to the heirs of the deceased ones and coming into possession of tracts of land, woods, vineyards, houses, plots, etc. Although we do not have any information about the purchase of land by sanctuaries, it is a reasonable supposition that this also occurred.

A confession inscription¹¹³ represents a rural sanctuary of Men Axiottenos as the local granary and storehouse: people came to the temple to borrow corn – advances which they repaid with interest if they defaulted.¹¹⁴ A recently published sacred regulation from the territory of Silandos contains strict prohibitions issued by the god Men to οἱ ἴδιοι against selling or mortgaging any of his possessions.¹¹⁵ The new inscription is more a *lex sacra* than a confession inscription. A concrete transgression and punishment inflicted on a group of people guilty of mismanagement of his property induced the offended divinity to publicize new rules regulating the management and maintenance of his sacred property.¹¹⁶ Vaguely referred to as the gods ἴδιοι in line 3 (members of the senior temple personnel?), the transgressors suffered an unspecified punishment and then erected the stele as a part of the atonement process. The god forbade them to sell and mortgage any of his assets. It is not impossible that in this case Men had in mind not only the land and other immovable property, but also the people attached to the sanctuary.¹¹⁷

¹¹² The cult of the emperors seems to have been even more dependent on private generosity, at least in the countryside. We find individuals ceding the usufruct of their lands to their fellow-villagers to provide funds for the celebration of this cult [J. Keil – A. v. Premerstein, *Denkschr. d. Österr. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.* 53, 1910, p. 29 no. 43 = *IGR IV*, nos. 1615 (Philadelpheia); 1666 = Meriç – Merkelbach – Nollé – Şahin, *IK* 17,1, no. 3245 (Tire)].

¹¹³ Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, p. 81 no. 63.

¹¹⁴ A granary also appears in *TAM V* 1, no. 257, but it is not known whether it belonged to a temple, village or private individual: Ἔτους ρρη', μη(νός) Δαισίου. Ῥοδία Φλαουίας Μηνογενίδος δούλη Μη[τ]ρὶ Ἀλιανῆ εὐχὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κλαπέντος ἀργυρίου * υιβ' Ἀγάθωνος τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς ἐκ ΛΑΝΑΠΟΣΤΩΝ ἐκ τοῦ σειτοβολείου καὶ εὐρεθέντος παρὰ Κρήσκεντι τῷ Ἀλκίμου καὶ Ἐκλογῆς θρεπτῷ.

¹¹⁵ G. Petzl, *EA* 28, 1997, p. 70 no. 2 = *SEG* 47, no. 1654, January AD 99: Ἔτους ρργ', μη(νός) Περειτίου η'. Μεὶς ἐξ Ἀτάλου κολάσας [ΑΣ] τοὺς ἰδίους περὶ τῶν ἰδίων ὑπαρχόντων· ἵνα μηδεν[ι] ἐξὸν εἶναι μήτε πωλεῖν μήτε ὑποθήκην τίθειν, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων οἰκονομεῖσθαι, καὶ ὅσα ἐπιζητεῖ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων γείνεσθαι αὐτῷ. Ἐὰν δέ τις ἀπειθήσῃ χωρὶς τῆς ἐκείνου συνχωρήσεως, ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων δαπανήσας εἰλάσεται αὐτὸν μετὰ Μηνός Λαβανα. See also my article “Varia epigraphica” in this issue of *EA*.

¹¹⁶ A more developed parallel for the bipartite structure of the new text is found in a confession text from the sanctuary of Metere Tarsene (Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, p. 70 no. 58) which couples the concrete offence against the goddess with the general guidelines for expiating this and related transgressions.

¹¹⁷ In the sanctuary of the Indigenous Mother of the Gods in Lefkopetra [note 29] many consecration texts contain the clause ensuring the protection of donated slaves and his/her/their appurtenance to the goddess alone. The most explicit statement of this sort, found in inscription no. 13 (October 173: μηδενός ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντος πωλεῖν ἢ ἀποαλλοτριοῦν κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον) discloses that the essence of this prohibition-clause was that the slave was not to be alienated from the goddess, his sole master, and that no one would be empowered to sell or alienate him in the name of the goddess. This proviso, aimed more at protecting the rights of the goddess than those of the donated slave, brings to mind Strabo's description of the condition of numerous ἱερόδουλοι in the sanctuary of Ma in Pontic Komana (XII 3, 34, p. 558 C): the priest was their master, except that he was not empowered to sell them [τούτων (sc. τῶν ἐνοικούντων) μὲν οὖν ἡγεμὼν ἦν (sc. ὁ ἱερεύς) καὶ τῶν τὴν πόλιν οἰκούντων ἱεροδούλων κύριος πλὴν τοῦ πιπράσκειν].

An inscription from Dareioukōmē¹¹⁸ introduces us to a lessee of first proceeds (*naturalia*) (ὠνητήης πρώτων προσόδων)¹¹⁹ of a goddess, either Artemis Anaïtis or Demeter Karpophoros attested in TAM V 2, no. 1335 from the same site. We thus learn that the personnel of this sanctuary leased the collection of this category of sacred revenues to private individuals.

The situation in Phrygia is identical – we hear of *temene* (sacred domains) donated to gods¹²⁰ and of local populations living on sacred land.¹²¹ The latter case, pertaining to a group of people referred to as Κιμελιαεῖς ἐνχώριοι ἐπὶ ἱερῶν χώρων, is the only undisputable attestation of a Phrygian community situated on sacred land in the Roman period. Since the members of this community (either the entire village Kimelia situated on temple land or a group of people from the village settled on temple grounds as labourers, ed. pr.)¹²² set up their altar as an *ex-voto* to Zeus Saouadios for crops, depicting on one of its sides ploughing oxen, the sacred land in question (belonging to Zeus Saouadios?) was worked by them as tenants

¹¹⁸ TAM V 2, no. 1336: Ἐρμ[ο]γένης Ἐρμογένους, φύσει δὲ Ματρέου, ὠνητήης πρώτων προσόδω[ν] τῆς θεᾶς, τὸν θυμ[ια]τήρα βωμὸν καὶ τὸ[ν] ἐν δεξιούσι τοῦ ναοῦ[ν] λουτήρα καὶ τῆς θεᾶς τὸν AN...NA ἀπηρτισμένον ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἐποίησεν.

¹¹⁹ I was able to find only two doubtful attestations of πρώτοι πρόσδοι of Greek divinities: both are restored, one in an inscription from Athens (SEG 3, no. 100, ll. 12–14: τὸ δὲ ἀνά[λωμα τὸ εἰς ταῦτα γενόμενον δότωσαν οἱ] ταμίαι τῶν ὁσίων ἀπὸ τῶν [πρώτων προσόδων - -]), the other in a text from Magnesia on the Maiandros [I. Magn. 100.b = F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure (LSAM)*, Paris 1955, pp. 92–98 no. 33 B, lines 72–74: χορηγησά[ν]τω[ν] τὸ γινόμενον δαπάνημα χάριν τῆς ἀναγραφῆς τῶν (οἰκονόμων ἐκ τῶν) [πρώ]τω[ν] ἱερῶν π[ροσόδων] τῶν ἐν τῷ ἐνεστῶτι ἐνιαυτῶι; the restitution is due to A. Wilhelm (*Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde*, Wien 1909, p. 282, note 10)].

¹²⁰ A. Körte, *AM* 25, 1900, p. 419 no. 32 (Inönü): Διὶ ἐξ ἀύλης ἐπηκόφ θεῶ οἱ Παπᾶ καὶ Γαίου κληρονόμοι ὑπὲρ Ἀσκληπιάδου τοῦ Δαμᾶ υἱοῦ εὐχὴν τήνδε ἀνέστησαν, δόντες καὶ τεμένους ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῇ κόμῃ ἀπτικᾶ, β καὶ ἴ εἵνεκα εἴλωα ἔχιν τὸν θεόν; Corsten, *IK* 40 (Prusa ad Olymrum), no. 1012: ΕΠΙΛΕΙ[- -]Ν[- -]ου καὶ ΚΑΛΛΕΙΑΙΔΙΣ, Θεόδοτος, Τιμόθεος Εὐτυχᾶ, Καρπιανός, Εὐτυχός, τέμενος ἐχαρίσατο Δικαίφ.

¹²¹ P. Frei, *EA* 11, 1988, p. 22 no. 10N = SEG 38, no. 1308, from Avdan about half way between Dorylaion and Nakoleia: Κιμελιαεῖς ἐνχώριοι ἐπὶ ἱερῶν χώρων περὶ καρπῶν Διὶ Σαουαδίφ εὐχὴν.

¹²² Nearly all other instances of people referred to as ἐγχώριοι in Phrygia come from the territory of Nakoleia [A. Kirchhoff, *Ann. dell'Inst.* 33, 1861, p. 188 no. 40, Ayvali, northwest of Nakoleia (non vidi); *MAMA* V, no. 208, Nakoleia: Ἀεζηνοὶ ἐγχώριοι Μηνὶ Τουιτη[ν]ῶ εὐχὴν; *ibid.*, no. 218, Nakoleia: [.....ω]ν ἐγχώριοι περὶ ἐαυτῶν καὶ [τῶν ἰδίων] πάντων καὶ τῶν καρπῶν [καὶ τῆς] Νακολέων σωτηρίας Δεὶ Βροντῶντι, ἐπιμελουμέ]νου Ἀσκ(λ)ηπιδοδору Ἀπολλᾶ; Drew-Bear, *Nouv. inscr. Phrygie*, p. 46 no. 19 = SEG 28, no. 1196, the sanctuary of Meter Tieioubendene in Yazidere/Köle Deresi northwest of Nakoleia: Ἀπελλοκωμῆται ἐνχώ[ριοι - - -]. As Ph. Gauthier (*Bull. épigr.* 1999, no. 509, p. 681) and Chr. Schuler (*ZPE* 128, 1999, pp. 127–129) have rightly noticed, the same word is present in line 27 of the first letter of Eumenes II to the inhabitants of Toriaion (L. Jonnes – M. Riçl, *EA* 29, 1997, p. 3 = Jonnes, *IK* 62, no. 393: καὶ τοῖς μεθ' ὑμῶν συνοικοῦσιν ἐγχωρίοις). This example shows that the word has a long history as a designation of local populations, both urban and rural (Hesych., s.v. ἐγχώριοι: ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τόπου ὄντες). Cf. L. and J. Robert, *La Carie. Histoire et géographie historique avec le recueil des inscriptions antiques*. Tome II: *Le plateau de Tabai et ses environs*, Paris 1954, p. 307, note 3; L. Robert, *Gnomon* 35, 1963, p. 79. In their book on Karia, L. and J. Robert adduce other examples of the same adjective in inscriptions from Selymbria, Delphi and Apollonia Salbake. In an inscription from the last named city, published by them on p. 303 under no. 167 (after 188 BC), the word in question appears in line 11: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα πεμφθεις εἰς Ῥόδον καὶ διαγωνισάμενος μετὰ τῶν [10] συμπρεσβευτῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἀντικειμένους τῶν ἐγχωρίων, ὡς ἐνεδέχετο μάλιστα συμφέρειν οὕτως ἐποιήσατο τὰς συνθήκας πρὸς Ῥοδίους. In their opinion, the phrase οἱ ἀντικείμενοι τῶν ἐγχωρίων refers to the indigenous population of Apollonia Salbake, but I would rather put it in relation with the Rhodians who received Karia from the Romans in 188 BC. Chr. Schuler has independently arrived to the same conclusion (*ZPE* 128, 1999, p. 129, note 21).

owing dues payable to the temple/the controlling city.¹²³ In addition to working the god's lands, these peasants could have owned and tilled their own plots situated outside the ἱερὰ χώρα. This case proves that sanctuaries did not possess labour force capable of cultivating all the lands in their possession; instead, they had recourse to free tenants from their own and neighbouring villages.

The temple in Lydian and Phrygian villages occupied a most important position in local economy. Involving a substantial part of local populations in its economic activities, it received from its estates, from tithes and other fixed dues, as well as from the sacrifices and other offerings of the faithful, large amounts of all sorts of *naturalia* besides money and permanent gifts. The temples became granaries and storehouses.

II.1.2. Other Immovable Property

In addition to cultivated and uncultivated land, local sanctuaries in Lydia and Phrygia owned houses or parts of houses (within and outside their sacred precincts) and workshops.¹²⁴ "Ordinary" villagers and members of the temple personnel occupied these houses on unknown terms. Nothing specific is known about the contribution of a sanctuary's workshops to its prosperity, but analogous cases from the territory of Ephesos¹²⁵ and elsewhere suggest that the rent or revenues of donated workshops were used for sacrifices and other needs of the sanctuary; alternatively, some temple workshops could have worked partly for the needs of the sanctuary, partly for the local market. A recently attested weaving/fuller's workshop donated to Apollo Lairbenos (possibly together with three skilled workers attached to it),¹²⁶ and situated in the donor's house, must have been rather small.

Among the buildings other than temples themselves and parts thereof (together with cult statues and other cult apparel paid from private generosity and donated to the gods),¹²⁷ we

¹²³ Comparable is the case of κληροί (*particulae*) on the sacred land of Zeus of Aizanoi, whose τέλος (*vectigal*) was paid to the city of Aizanoi controlling the temple (U. Laffi, *Athenaeum* 49, 1971, p. 9; *MAMA IX*, no. 8).

¹²⁴ *TAM V* 1, no. 538; P. Herrmann – E. Varinlioğlu, *EA* 3, 1984, pp. 4–5 no. 2 = *SEG* 34, no. 1211; Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, 46 no. 37: οἰκῶν ἐν οἰκίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ; W. H. Buckler – W. M. Calder, *JRS* 16, 1926, p. 94 no. 228, AD 119: Μητρὶ Τυραζηνῆ Μένανδρος Μένανδρου Οὐαλέριος ἐποίησεν τὸν οἶκον (perhaps "place of worship", cf. Sokolowski [note 119], pp. 53–58 no. 20, *passim*) ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων, ἔτους σγ', μη(νὸς) θ' Σε(βαστῆ); Ritti – Şimşek – Yıldız, *EA* 32, 2000, pp. 32–33, K43: κ[αὶ ἐν τῆ] | οἰκίᾳ ἐργαστήρι[ον κατεσ]κευασμένον γ[ερδιακόν] (this is my correction of the editors' reading κ[αὶ ἐν] | οἰκίᾳ? ἐργαστήρι[ον κατεσ?]κευασμένον γ[- - -]; cf. *Tyche* 16, 2001 [2002], p. 159).

¹²⁵ H. W. Pleket, *Talanta* 2, 1970, pp. 61–62 no. 4 = Lane, *CMRDM I*, p. 49 no. 75 = Meriç – Merkelbach – Nollé – Şahin, *IK* 17,1, no. 3252 (Eskioba/Darmara, ancient Almoura): Πό. Αἴλιον Μενεκράτην τῆ ἱερατεία τῆς Δήμητρος ἀνεένκαντα καὶ καθιέρωσαντα κάλαθον περιάργυρον τὸν λείποντα τοῖς τῆς Δήμητρος μυστηρίοις καὶ τῷ προκαθημένῳ τῆς κόμης Μηνὶ σημήαν περιάργυρον τὴν προπονπεύσασαν τῶν μυστηρίων αὐτοῦ. Διὰ δὲ τοῦτο καθιέρωσεν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἱερωσύνης εἰς τὰς ἐπιθυσίας τῆς Δήμητρος τὰ πρὸ τῆς οἰκίας ἐργαστήρια εἰς τὸ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἕκαστον τῆ τοῦ καλάθου ἀναφορᾷ τοὺς κληρωθέντας εἰς τὴν πομπὴν ἄνδρας μετὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων προθύοντας εὐωχεῖσθαι ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ διὰ παντὸς τοῦ βίου. Ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος τῆς κατοικίας Λ. Βερίου Βάσσου φιλοσεβάστου καὶ τῶν συναρχόντων αὐτοῦ.

¹²⁶ Note 124.

¹²⁷ Cf. Meriç – Merkelbach – Nollé – Şahin, *IK* 17,2, no. 3757 = *SEG* 31, no. 993 (Dios Hieron, south of Hyraipa): Διὶ καὶ Διονύσῳ [καὶ τοῖς Σε]βαστοῖς καὶ τῇ Κε[.].[α[-]ηνῶν κατοικία "Ατταλος [- - -]ο[υ] τοῦ Ἄρτεμιδώρου ...σ.τος καὶ Τρύφαινα Κλε[.].[ν]. .]ουν. ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ Τρύφαινα ἡ θυγάτηρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ναὸν

find porticos¹²⁸ which either served the needs of worshippers frequenting the sanctuaries or whose rents were ceded to the sanctuary.¹²⁹ In the other direction, we find a Lydian priest paying for the water supply of his village,¹³⁰ and the gods' own *prosodoi/hiera chremata* being used to finance constructions and other needs of his sanctuary.¹³¹

Each village possessed one or more *hiera* set apart from the surrounding territory and having a temple as its central part.¹³² The courtyards of these sanctuaries were full of votive steles and other private and communal dedications. Private individuals acting as priests founded numerous small rural sanctuaries in Lydia and Phrygia. Divine epithets derived from personal names (Ζεὺς Ἀρίου, Ζεὺς Μήδου, Ζεὺς Πόττεως, Ζεὺς Τρωσου, Μῆν (Ἀξιοττηνός) ἐξ Ἀπολλωνίου, Μῆν Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἀξιοττηνός, Μῆν (Ἀξιοττηνός) ἐξ Ἐπικράτου, Μείς ἐξ Ἀττάλου, Μῆν ἐκ Διοδότου, Μῆν Τιαμου (?), Θεὰ Ἀνδρονίκου, Μήτηρ Ἀδιασπούλου (?), Μήτηρ Καλλίπου, Μήτηρ Νουννου, and others) provide abundant testimony to this effect.¹³³ Such acts imply the creation of funds for the celebration of the cult, as well as

καὶ τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ κόσμον καὶ [τὰ] θ[υρ]ώματα πάντα καὶ χαλκίον χαλκῆον ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἀνέθηκαν; Th. Drew-Bear, *GRBS* 17, 1976, p. 257 no. 13 = *SEG* 26, no. 1362 (territory of Amorion, on a statue of Asklepios): Ἀὐρ. Οὐαναξος Μάνου ἐποίησε τὸν ναὸν σὺν τοῖς ἀγάλμασι; Drew-Bear, *Nouv. inscr. Phrygie*, p. 50 no. 26 = *SEG* 28, no. 1176 (territory of Nakoleia): Ἀλέξανδρος λατύπος τὸ ἱερὸν κὲ τῶν κωμῶν τὴν Ὀμό[νοϊαν - - -]; *MAMA* VII, no. 486 (Beşkavak, towards Lake Tatta): Λούκιος Σέργι[ος] Κόρινθος Μην[ῖ] .]πυκηνῶ εὐχὴν τό[ν] τε ναὸν καὶ περὶ τὸ[ν] ναὸν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἐποίησεν. ἔτους ριδ' (AD 89/90).

¹²⁸ Malay, *Researches* p. 40 no. 24 (*stoa* for Apollo, Artemis and Herakles Kallinikos, north of Thyateira); *ibid.*, p. 140 no. 156 (*stoa* and *bomos* for Zeus Olympios in Maionia); Malay, *Manisa Museum* p. 148 no. 517 (stoas for Apollo in Tabala); Ritti – Şimşek – Yıldız, *EA* 32, 2000, p. 8, D5 (Apollo Lairbenos).

¹²⁹ A confession inscription from the territory of Silandos (Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, pp. 7–8 no. 5) informs us of the existence of a building called the *πλετώριον* that possibly belonged to the local sanctuary of Zeus and Men Artemidorou. From Arrian and Hesychius we see that this word can be used for a private house or a place of assembly (Arr. *Diss. Epict.* III 22; Hesychius, s.v. *πραϊτώριον τόπος, ἔνθα συνάγεται ὁ λαός*).

¹³⁰ Cf. note 26.

¹³¹ *TAM* V 1, no. 242: ἐκ τῶν προσόδων τῆς θεοῦ; Th. Homolle, *BCH* 18, 1894, p. 542 = *IGR* IV, no. 1349; T. Ritti, *EA* 34, 2002, p. 64 no. 7: the text - - - ὁ αὐτὸς ἐκ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ χρημάτων is carved on a marble box which probably served as a *thesauros* for god's valuables and cash.

¹³² *TAM* V 1, nos. 148; 179; 242; 269; 318; 502; Mitchell, *R.E.C.A.M.* II, pp. 54–55 no. 34. For a detailed description of a sanctuary of Men in the area of Burdur, cf. J. and L. Robert, *Hellenica* IX, Paris 1950, pp. 41–42 = Lane, *CMRDM* III no. 121: the offering made by a *paredros* of Men consists of two beds with their equipment, two tables, four chairs (ἀνακλιτήρια), a window with a grill ([θυ]ρίδα κανκελλωτήν) opening to the ταμίον, a garden with τῷ πεπηγμένῳ ξυλικῷ, θεσσαυρός, ξυλοθ[ήκη], τοὺς βωμοὺς - - -; Th. Drew-Bear, *GRBS* 17, 1976, p. 257 no. 13 = *SEG* 26, no. 1362; Drew-Bear – Naour, *ANRW* II 18. 3, pp. 2041–2043 no. 35 = *SEG* 40, no. 1251; Ritti – Şimşek – Yıldız, *EA* 32, 2000, p. 7, D1 (Apollo Lairbenos).

¹³³ Compare the dedication of an ἀνδριάς to Βαραδάτεω Δίῃ by the satrap of Sardis Droaphernes [L. Robert, *CRAI* 1975, pp. 306–330 = *SEG* 29, no. 1205; cf. P. Frei, in: P. Frei – K. Koch (eds.), *Reichsidee und Reichsorganisation im Perserreich*, Freiburg/Göttingen 1984, pp. 19–21 = *SEG* 35, no. 1253; J. Wiesehöfer, *Gnomon* 57, 1985, pp. 565–566; F. Gschnitzer, in: W. Meid – H. Trenkwalder (eds.), *In Bannkreis des Alten Orients*. *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft* 24, 1986, pp. 45–54; P. Briant, *Histoire de l'empire perse de Cyrus à Alexandre*, Vols. I–II, Leiden 1996 (*Achaemenid History* X), p. 697; *id.*, in: T. Bakır (ed.), *Achaemenid Anatolia. Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Anatolia in the Achaemenid Period, Bandırma, 15–18 August 1997*, Leiden 2001, pp. 16–17], Ζεὺς Βροντῶν Ἀπελλιναρίου [Şahin, *IK* 10, 2 (Museum Iznik), no. 1509], Ζεὺς Βροντῶν Μειλησίου ἱερέος (*ibid.*, no. 1510), and Ζεὺς Βροντῶν Μάρκου κ' Ἐπικ[ράτου] [Corsten, *IK* 40 (Prusa ad Olympum), no. 1015] in neighbouring Bithynia, Μῆν Φαρνάκου in Pontos (Str. XII. 3. 31, p. 557 C), and the newly attested cult of Ζεὺς Φαρνάουα on the south shore of Lake Tatta (M. Aydaş, *EA* 34, 2002, p. 24).

dedication of the land, buildings, and persons necessary for the same purpose.¹³⁴ If a private cult became public, its financing was assumed by the controlling community.

II.2. Cash Revenues

A substantial part of the revenues collected by Lydian and Phrygian rural sanctuaries originated from fines and fees charged for the performance of certain acts and rituals in the sanctuary. Several recently published inscriptions have shown that most of these acts were part of the expiation process.

Sums charged for the annulment of certain cult acts are quite elevated: 175 *denarii* for the annulment of oaths taken in the name of Men Axiottenos (minus the price of the stele reporting on the transgression), and the same sum for the annulment of the sceptre-ceremony.¹³⁵ A group of confession inscriptions addressed to Θεοὶ Περευδηνοί¹³⁶ attest the existence of inheritance and sales taxes payable to the local temple, again as part of the expiation process. Moreover, the term λύτρον and the verb (ἐκ)λυτρόομαι present in several confession inscriptions¹³⁷ may likewise refer to cash fines paid during in the same process, as “ransom”. In one case it is ordered by the god that τὰ λύτρα be divided in three parts – one for the gods, one for the village, and one for the priests who performed the whole ceremony (perhaps called εὐιλασία).¹³⁸

On the other hand, two inscriptions from the sanctuary of Θεοὶ Περευδηνοί¹³⁹ seem to imply that the gods asked for money and other property of the faithful even when no transgression had occurred, as a regular tax designed to fill the “sacred coffers”.¹⁴⁰ Obviously, the controlling city in this case relinquished a part of its income for the benefit of local sanctuaries in need of financial assistance. The amount of cash collected in this manner was

¹³⁴ Cf. Debord, *Aspects*, pp. 202–207. The whole process is well illustrated by the foundation of Diomedon from Kos (*Syll.*³ no. 1106 = Sokolowski, *LSCG*, pp. 307–313 no. 177 = M. Segre, *Iscrizioni di Cos*. Vol. I, Athens 1993, ED 149, c. 300 BC: [Διομέδων ἀνέθηκε]ε τὸ τέμενος [τόδε] Ἡρακλεῖ Δ[ιομε]δοντείω, ἀνέθηκε δ[ὲ] καὶ τοὺς ξενῶνας τοὺς ἐν τῷ κάπῳ καὶ τὰ οἰκημάτια καὶ Λίβρον καὶ τὰ ἔγγονα αὐτοῦ.

¹³⁵ Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, p. 70 no. 58 (AD 166/7).

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 25 no. 17; p. 27 no. 18 (southwest of Saittai).

¹³⁷ *TAM* V 1, no. 576; Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, p. 60 no. 51; p. 62 no. 53; Malay, *Researches* pp. 101–102 no. 111; *ibid.*, p. 102 no. 112.

¹³⁸ Malay, *Researches* pp. 101–102 no. 111: Ἔτους σπγ', μη. Δαισίου βι' (AD 169): ἔξ εὐειλασίας· ἐλυτρώσαντο τὸν θεὸν Μῆνα Ἀξιοτηνὸν οἱ εἰερίς καιλεύσαντος τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐφ' ᾧ γίνεται τὰ λύτρα μέρη τρία: ἐν τῶν θεῶν, ἐν τῆ κώμῃ, ἐν τοῖς εἰερίσι τῶν λυόντων κατὰ δύναμιν.

¹³⁹ P. Herrmann – E. Varinlioğlu, *EA* 3, 1984, p. 15 no. 10 = *SEG* 34, no. 1219: Ammia pays seventy-two *denarii* for a house she bought from another woman; the sum was received by three *hieroi* active in the sanctuary. Inscription no. 2 of the same edition (= *SEG* 34, no. 1211) shows Glykon, a brother of the deceased Gaius, ceding the whole of Gaius' inheritance to the gods; no transgression is mentioned: Θεοῖς Περευδηνοῖς καθότι ἐπεζήτησαν τὴν τοῦ Γαίου Ἰουνεῖτου κληρονομίαν, ἣν ἀποδίδει Γλύκων ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ· τόπον, ἐνόνα δρῦν καὶ τὰ σὺν αὐτῷ δένδρα καὶ τὴν ἀπόμοιραν τῆς οἰκίας, ὡς * οε'. ἔτους σπγ', μη. Δεῖου (AD 198/9).

¹⁴⁰ A distant parallel is found in Thebes on Mycale [*I. Priene* 364 = Sokolowski, *LSAM*, pp. 112–113 no. 40 (third/second century BC) where a priest received the proceeds of ἡ στρυπτηρία, the tax on alum, and in Ephesos (H. Wankel, *IK* 11,1, no. 14, end of first century BC), where the collection of certain taxes is ceded by the city to Artemis (lines 12–15: τὰ δο[θ]ησόμενα ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν τῷ ἀντιγραφίῳ γεινομένων τελεσμάτων).

by no means negligible and contributed substantially to the normal functioning of modest rural shrines.

A steady source of income for oracular shrines was the price paid for their consultation, while participation in mystery cults involved payment of a sum of money for initiation; gods of healing likewise expected cash in return for their help.¹⁴¹ An important part of sacred revenues came from sacrifices, particularly the profits made by sale of hides of victims.¹⁴² Furthermore, the cults of Meter and Men were known for their mendicant priests called Μητραγύρται and Μηναγύρται.¹⁴³ In a damaged inscription from the sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos,¹⁴⁴ we might have a reference to a *hieros* of Apollo sent out by the sanctuary for this purpose.

A confession inscription from northeastern Phrygia¹⁴⁵ shows that worshippers could also be asked by the gods to supply sacrificial animals for the sanctuary and help the temple budget in this way. Any disobedience was regarded as a transgression against the god.

As far as fines are concerned, they also represented an important source of revenue for local temples. Nearly all the *katagraphai* of slaves and children from the temple of Apollo Lairbenos contain a fine clause directed against those willing to contest the validity of the act and reduce the consecrated person into slavery. The amounts reserved for the god and his treasury range from 1,000 (?)¹⁴⁶ to 2,500 *denarii*.¹⁴⁷

Consecration of an income or a part of it to the gods by private individuals, although not yet attested, is to be expected, in view of similar cases from the rest of the Greek world.¹⁴⁸

A very instructive text on the question of sacred finances and relations between cities and sanctuaries in the Roman period has recently been edited by H. Malay.¹⁴⁹ In it we see a *neokoros* of Men Askenos strongly protesting with the governor Arrius Antoninus against the *archon* of Sardis who refused to transfer to the god the customary annual sum of 600 *denarii* for sacrifices and libations to the god and (for sacrifices) on behalf of the Emperor's victory and eternal permanence and the abundant crops: Τῷ σωτῆρι τῆς ἐπαρχείας ἀνθ(υπάτω) Ἀρρίῳ Ἀντωνείῳ παρὰ Ἑρμογένους τοῦ Δη(μη)τρίου Σαρδιανοῦ, νεωκόρου θεοῦ Μηνὸς Ἀσκηνοῦ προπάτορος τοῦ ὄντος ἐν Σάρδεσιν ἔχοντος, κύριε, δίκαια τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ βασιλικῶν δωρεῶν καὶ ἐπικρίσεων ἐννόμων καὶ ἐπιτρόπων καὶ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου δίδοσθαι κατ' ἔτος ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων τῆς πόλεως ὠρισμένα κὲ κεκριμένα ἐξ ἔθους * χ'

¹⁴¹ Cf. Debord, *Aspects*, p. 195; *ibid.*, pp. 406–407, note 93, adducing Luc. *Alex.* 19, 23 for Mallos in Cilicia (two, then eight *oboloi* per consultation, amounting to 70–80,000 *drachmai* a year).

¹⁴² A case of forcible seizure of hides from a temple appears in a confession inscription (Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, p. 82 no. 64, AD 177/8): Μηνὶ Ἀξιοττηνῷ Ἀ[ρ]τέμων καὶ Ἀτείμητος, ἐπεὶ ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῖς δωρὰς ἦρεν βίᾳ ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ, κολασθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ νῦν εὐλογοῦσιν).

¹⁴³ Debord, *Aspects*, pp. 196 and 408, with references.

¹⁴⁴ Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, p. 137–138 no. 118: [Ἀσκλ]ητιάδης Ἀττά[λου] ἱερός κολασ[θεῖς] ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπιφ[ανεστ]άτου θεοῦ [Ἀπόλ]λωνος Λαρ[μηνοῦ], ὅτι πενφθεῖς [.....]λογίαν ἡμά[ρτησεν] καὶ ὅτι - - -.

¹⁴⁵ *CIG* no. 4142 (facs.) = M. Riel, *EA* 29, 1997, p. 37 = *SEG* 47, no. 1751.

¹⁴⁶ Ritti – Şimşek – Yıldız *EA* 32, 2000, p. 43, K 55 (the sum is supplied by the editors on the analogy of the sum earmarked for the controlling city of Motella).

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, *passim*.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. an example from the sanctuary of Lefkopetra [note 29], p. 105 no. 35 (AD 192/3): ἀ]νεθόμην - - - ἐ]στηλογράφη[σα τὸ]ON τῆς προδόσου τα[ύτης], ὀχλούμενος ὑπὸ τῆς θε[ο]ῦ.

¹⁴⁹ *Recherches* p. 119 no. 131 = *Année épigr.* 1999, no. 1534 (Çapakli, NE of Sardeis, AD 188/9).

εἷς τε τὰς θυσίας κὲ σπονδὰς τοῦ θεοῦ κὲ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος [v]είκης τε καὶ αἰωνίου διαμονῆς κὲ τῶν ἀφθόνων καρπῶν . . .¹⁵⁰ Judging by the wording of the inscription, this privilege dated back to the royal period, but at the end of the petition only a letter of Vespasian's procurator Venuleius Valens to the *archon* of Sardians and an intervention by the proconsul P. Nonius Asprenas are adduced in proof of this claim.¹⁵¹ It is not difficult to understand how heavily this obligation weighed on the budget of Sardis where the cult of Men Askenos was just of one of many needing assistance from the city. In a difficult year civic officials could try to withhold the sums earmarked for some deities. It seems that the letter of Venuleius Valens quoted at the end of inscription was sent to put an end to another similar confrontation between the city and the sanctuary. The sanctuary of Men Askenos was an urban one dedicated to a θεὸς προπάτωρ at that,¹⁵² and its personnel still had to face similar difficulties and turn to Romans for help. Compared with them, people in charge of modest rural sanctuaries had much slimmer prospects of securing financial support from the controlling city. Instead, they had to rely on the local population, as abundantly evidenced by epigraphic monuments.

III. THE TEMPLE AND JUSTICE: THE SO-CALLED “TEMPLE JURISDICTION”

Lydian confession inscriptions throw light on a very significant part played by local sanctuaries in adjudicating disputes between humans. They register about twenty cases of conflicts between villagers (theft, failure to return a loan or a deposit, family altercations, slander) settled by the gods. Other confession texts show that the gods automatically punished offences against their sacred rules, their property, and their personnel. On the other hand, unjust or illegal human actions seem to have attracted their attention only after one of the following procedures was used by the injured party: setting up/placing of divine sceptre (on the altar?: ἐπεστάθη τὸ σκῆπτρον, ἐπέστησε τὸ σκῆπτρον), uttering an oath or a curse, submitting a written complaint. The person suffering an injustice and unable (or unwilling) to find other means of asserting his right could resort to divine aid by lodging a complaint with the local gods. At that moment, the village temple assumed some traits of a law-court, but without earthly judges and lawyers. We see villagers with their feeling of cohesion reluctant to address themselves to the city and state administration; instead, they prefer to settle their conflicts without interference from the state authorities, in a manner inherited from their forefathers, that was probably considered more effective than secular justice.

The “judicial process” in Lydian sanctuaries was opened by the sceptre-ceremony devised to open a “trial” and cede the case to the god, who thereby became involved in the lawsuit. In front of this divine symbol, the disputing parties proceeded to a quasi-judicial process, which

¹⁵⁰ In *I. Sardis* VII 1, no. 15, from the middle of the second century AD, we might have another mention of subsidies granted to local cults, this time in a letter from a proconsul (?): [.....]ο[.]α[κο]σίας καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος δηνάρια διακόσια πενήκοντα καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος, δικαιοτάτων αὐτῶν τὴν γνώμην ἀξιούσθαι τέλους εἰς τὴν εὐσέβειαν τῶν Σεβαστῶν ἐρρῶσθαι ὑμᾶς βούλομαι.

¹⁵¹ Lines 25–30: Οὐνεουλήτιος Βάλης ἐπίτροπος Αὐτοκράτορος Οὐεσπασιανοῦ Σαρδιανῶν ἄρχοντι χαίρειν· τὰ ἐξ ἔθους εἰς τὰ τοῦ Μηνὸς μυστήρια χορηγούμενα εὐλογόν ἐστιν δίδοσθαι ἐκάστου ἔτους· κὲ Ἀσπ[ρήν]ας ἀνθύπατος οὐτ[ω]ς.

¹⁵² In Thyateira the same epithet is borne by Helios Pythios Apollo Tyrimnaios (*TAM* V 2, nos. 926, 935, 946, 956, 976, 984, 997, 1000, 1025).

ended with a confession or a preliminary examination including giving an oath of innocence with a conditional self-curse. Taking an oath/depositing a curse meant giving the last word to the gods, who were expected to open an inquiry, prosecute and chastise the guilty and, in cases of theft, claim (a part of) the stolen property for themselves.¹⁵³

Tablets reporting on the details of a specific case and invoking divine aid are referred to in Lydian inscriptions as *πιττάκια*, *πινακίδια*, *τάβλαι*.¹⁵⁴ They must have been commonplace in every temple, hanging on the walls or deposited next to cult statues or on platforms (*βήματα*).¹⁵⁵ In their wording, they reflected the form and terminology of petitions and complaints in secular courts of law, while the expected divine judgment was a substitute for inadequate human justice.

Although Lydian village priests did not possess autonomous judicial authority, their role in the whole process was not negligible. They were probably present at all the stages of the procedure taking place in their temple: they witnessed the lodging of the complaint, the setting up of the divine sceptre, and the taking of an oath. Moreover, as intermediaries between gods and their worshippers, they consulted the gods on the transgressor and communicated back divine answers and commandments. Fines in money or natural products were delivered to them or to their assistants – *hieroi* – and they took care that the transgressor erected a stele informing everyone of his sin, sometimes, perhaps, even taking part in formulating the text of the inscription. For the villagers, divine justice was not something abstract. They firmly believed that the gods would punish the transgressor and help the injured party, so that human intervention was needed only on some “technical points” during the process of establishing connection with the divine world. After that, it was just of question of time and patience until the punished transgressor confessed his guilt and redressed the wrong he had done.

University of Belgrade

Marijana Riel

¹⁵³ H. Versnel [in: C. A. Faraone – D. Obbink (eds.), *Magika Hiera. Ancient Greek Magic and Religion*, Oxford 1991, pp. 60–106] has admirably shown that similar practices are not confined to the Greek-speaking parts of the Roman Empire (including Macedonia, as shown by inscription no. 53 from the corpus of Lefkopetra [note 29]), but are also attested in some western provinces (especially Britain and Spain) and Rome itself. However, he does not exclude the possibility that borrowing and transmission has taken place, facilitated by migration of soldiers from East to West.

¹⁵⁴ Petzl, *Beichtinschriften*, p. 44 no. 36; *ibid.*, pp. 76–77 no. 60: Ἀρτεμίδωρος πιττάκιον ἔδωκεν; *TAM V* 1, no. 362.

¹⁵⁵ Such texts are termed by H. S. Versnel [note 153] “prayers for justice”, “judicial prayers”, “prayers for legal help”.