

The Mysteries of the Goddess of Marmarini¹

Robert Parker and Scott Scullion

1. Introduction

The interest for students of Greek religion of the large opisthographic stele published by J.C. DECOURT and A. TZIAFALIAS, with commendable speed, in the last issue of *Kernos* can scarcely be over-estimated². It is datable on palaeographic grounds to the 2nd c. B.C., perhaps the first half rather than the second³, and records in detail the rituals and rules governing the sanctuary of a goddess whose name, we believe, is never given. This sanctuary was of some elaboration: a περίβολος, a ναός, a περίστυλον, a περιστύλιον (if distinct from the preceding), a πρόθυρον, a πρόπυλον, a great altar and other altars are mentioned⁴, though the size and precise character of these features is unknowable. The first twenty one lines of side A are lost. The legible portion begins with day-by-day regulations for a festival called here the Eloulaia (Aloulaia on side B), spread over the 12th to 19th of a month not here named. Side A continues with regulations for Τελετή τῆς θεοῦ, probably to be translated ‘The rite of initiation to the goddess’⁵. Subsequent lines certainly speak of an initiation, which involved (for males only?) shaving the head. There follows a badly damaged section of uncertain content.

The better preserved side B is no longer calendrical in form. It begins ‘An uninitiated person (ἀμύητος) shall not go into the temple of the goddess.’ Further restrictions on the uninitiated follow, and prescriptions for purifications in the event of violation. The central theme of what follows is that of varieties of sacrifice and other rituals required or permissible in the sanctuary – ten different possibilities are introduced with the formula ‘if anyone wishes

¹ Note the following abbreviations: *CIS*: *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*; *LSAM*: F. SOKOLOWSKI, *Lois sacrées de l’Asie Mineure*, Paris, 1955; *LSS*: id., *Lois sacrées des cites grecques. Supplément*, Paris, 1962; *LSCG*: id., *Lois sacrées des cites grecques*, Paris, 1969; *NGSL*: E. LUPU, *Greek Sacred Law: a Collection of New Documents*, Leiden, 2004; *RICIS*: L. BRICAULT, *Recueil des inscriptions concernant les cultes isiaques*, 2 vols., Paris, 2005; *I.Priene* (2014): W. BLÜMEL and R. MERKELBACH, *Die Inschriften von Priene, Inschriften von Kleinasien* 69, Bonn, 2014. For help and advice of various kinds we are very grateful to Jim Adams, Sebastian Brock, Mat Carbon, Jim Coulton, Emily Kearns, Sofia Kravaritou, Judith McKenzie, Philomen Probert, Maria Stamatoopoulou, and Andreas Willi, and for encouragement to publish in *Kernos* Vinciane Pirenne-Delforge.

² J.C. DECOURT and A. TZIAPHALIAS, “Un règlement religieux de la région de Larissa: cultes grecs et ‘orientaux’,” *Kernos* 28 (2015), p. 13-51.

³ See J.M. CARBON, “The Festival of the Aloulaia, and the Association of the Alouliastai: Notes Concerning the New Inscription from Larissa/Marmarini,” *Kernos* 29 (2016), p. xx-xx, at p. xx n. xx.

⁴ See p. 00 below.

⁵ A τελετή can be a rite of any kind, not necessarily an initiation: see F.L. SCHUDDEBOOM, *Greek Religious Terminology – Telete & Orgia. A Revised and Expanded English Edition of the Studies by Zijdeveld and Van der Burg*, Leiden, 2009. But what follows determines the sense here.

to' do X, or a variant – but other topics intrude without obvious coherence: regulations for 'collecting' before a festival (probably the E/Aloulaia of side A), purity regulations for women, rules for participation in the procession at two festivals, the E/Aloulaia and the Nisanaia. At the end come further rules for purifying the shrine in the event of various polluting acts.

The sequence of sides assumed above is the one cautiously assumed by the editors, and must be correct. B begins *in mediis rebus*, but a text of this importance cannot have lacked a preamble. Side B could only precede side A if a whole further stele had gone before, and that would imply, very implausibly, a text of more than 300 lines in all. Side A presumably began with a prescript identifying the issuing authority; it will also have named the, to us, anonymous 'goddess' of the text - unless her name was veiled in mystic silence, or just too obvious to need specification. B 7-10, 'An uninitiated person shall not go into the πρόθυρον, unless any wishes to perform a vow . . . and keeps pure for the three days from all the things specified above', must refer back either to side A or to nothing, since no such rule appears on B. Such a general introductory entry requirement to 'keep pure for three days' from certain things would be well in place there. What else was lost on side A is problematic. The editors suppose that, after the excursus on the 'Initiation of the Goddess', a day-by-day listing of rites within the same month resumed, but Carbon has questioned whether the traces of dates that they detect are reliable⁶; and certainly it would seem more likely that the other major festival mentioned later in the text, the Nisanaia, should be treated somewhere than that the rites of E/Aloulaia, already spread over eight to ten days⁷, should continue further. There is another back reference in B 79 to 'the purification of the peristyle prescribed before'. No purification identified as 'of the peristyle' occurs in the surviving text, but detailed regulations for purifications of particular places are found on B and such a rule would fit less well in A; perhaps then the reference is loosely to the purification of 'the altars' at B 29-35⁸.

Linguistically the text is a blend of the familiar jargon of Greek ritual prescriptions, fluently handled in a *koine* only slightly tinged with Thessalian⁹, with occasional bizarre

⁶ *o.c.* (n.* 3), p. 00.

⁷ Ten if we include those of the 19th. CARBON, *o.c.* (n.* 3), p. 00, supposes that the Nisanaia preceded the Aloulaia on side A, this being the order of the two months in question in the Mesopotamian calendar. But since Itonios (=Elul) was the first month of the Thessalian year, a reverse order is possible.

⁸ The reference cannot be to either of the other purifications, of the βάος and the πρόθυρον, that are prescribed in B 1-16, if we are right to argue below, p. 00, that the peristyle was not attached to the temple.

⁹ Cf. διακλαινέστω probably for διακλαινέσθω, A 21 and 22 (whether that unknown verb is itself a local variant is unknown); μετὰ τῆς ἱερείας A 6-7.

forms and constructions. Some incoherence in arrangement and inconsistency in phrasing cannot be denied, though one must always consider whether what looks careless or amateur may have a reason. Sections are divided by punctuation marks on side A, by *paragraphoi* (a strange variation) on side B. The sanctuary the text derives from is unknown, but the editors make a case for a location not far from the find spot, some 15 kilometres north east of Larisa¹⁰. The text itself confirms that the setting is rural: collections are to be made ‘at the threshing floors’ (B 17).

J.M. CARBON has already significantly advanced our understanding of the text¹¹. Building on the editors’ comparison of the festival names Eloulaia and Nisanaia with the month names Elul and Nisan found in the ‘standard Mesopotamian calendar’, and connecting passages in sides A and B which they left unassociated, he shows how the E/Aloulaia in all probability fell in the Thessalian month Itonios (September-October) which on independent grounds can be shown to correspond calendrically to the Semitic month Elul. Since that argument puts the Eloulaia in the Thessalian equivalent to Elul, it is a reasonable conjecture that the other festival mentioned, the Nisanaia¹², fell in the Thessalian equivalent to Nisan, Artemisios (April/May). A god Adara briefly mentioned (B 80) also bears a name connected with the Semitic month name Adar (March/April)¹³: some activity in that month too can perhaps be postulated. After this re-construction of the Thessalian cult’s ritual year, Carbon goes on to draw attention to a private society of Alouliastai on Cos, hitherto hidden from view by a ‘correction’ to Anoubiastai¹⁴; he also emphasizes, more firmly even than the first editors, the hybrid, multi-cultural character of the new Thessalian society (expressed, he suggests, by the use of *koine* at a date when most Thessalian inscriptions were still written in dialect).

A text as rich and important as this, as the editors and Carbon stress alike, requires further elucidation by many hands. We offer some here as students of Greek religion; with CARBON, we must hope for contributions by Semiticists, as also that technology may shed light on dark places in side A. As a preliminary we provide an English translation.

¹⁰ DECOURT and TZIAPHALIAS, *o.c.* (n. *2), p. 37, cf. 15.

¹¹ *o.c.* (n. *3).

¹² On the festivals celebrated in Nisan (first month of the year) throughout most of the Ancient Near East see D. SOURDEL, *Les Cultes du Hauran à l’ époque romaine*, Paris, 1952, p. 109-110 (who stresses the frequency of holocausts); M.E. COHEN, *Festivals and Calendars of the Ancient Near East*, Bethesda, 2015, p. 387-408.

¹³ On Adar see CARBON, *o.c.* (n. *3), n. *16.

¹⁴ To his single attestation, *o.c.* (n. *3), p. 40, for the possibly theophoric name Alulaios (*LGPN*, 1, Delos, 3rd c. B.C.) add Aloulaios, *IGLS*, II, 449 (Antioch), to which Sofia Kravaritou refers us.

2/ Translation

We translate the editors' text, as modified by Carbon¹⁵ in A 3 and in A 15. We print some letters in bold to indicate topics. Side A contains punctuation marks; the symbol : is used here to indicate them. Side B has *paragraphoi* in the left margin. Some follow a sense break at the end of the preceding line and are here marked //; others follow a sense break that occurs during the preceding line and are here marked /.

Side A

21 lines missing

(1) of the sacrifices first -----on the fifth

(3) (Sacrifice?) **of the Eloulaia: on the twelfth**, make preliminary sacrifice to Moira, not only collectively but also, any of the initiated who wishes to do so, privately:

(4) **on the thirteenth**, let the sacred places around/of the goddess be washed¹⁶, the temple and the peristyle and the door panels¹⁷ and the *propylon*, and (let) a sacrifice to Mogga (be performed), and let the impurities in the sanctuary be purified by, along with the priestess, the female purification officials (*phoibatriai*) and the temple warden (*neokoros*) and any other of the initiated who wishes:

(8) **on the fourteenth**, adorn the goddess and the altar, sacrifice finally to Helios:

(9) **on the fifteenth**, let anyone who wishes and wants to sacrifice to Pan whom Syrians call [. . .]PLEN and put on the table whatever he wishes except fish and doves, and let the one performing the sacrifice put on the table whatever he wants and take in return from what has been put on the table. Fill the *chytra* with water at the night ceremony (?) from a spring¹⁸:

(14) **on the sixteenth**, open the *chytra* and, anyone who wishes, sacrifice to Moira:

¹⁵ *o.c.* (n. *3), p. 00.

¹⁶ The Greek of this section is difficult. *πλύντηθι ... ναόν* : the form is probably the 2nd person passive imperative of *πλύνω* (Attic *πλύνθητι*), with the first rather than second aspirated consonant of underlying *πλύνθηθι* dissimilated, but the person is inappropriate, as is the following accusative object. *καθαρίσθω...τὰς φοιβατρίας*: *καθαρί(ζε)σθω* would be a 3rd person singular passive imperative, 'let the impurities be purified', but the construction continues as if this was an imperatival infinitive with *τὰς φοιβατρίας* as subject. On 'around/of the goddess' see p. 00.

¹⁷ CARBON, *o.c.* (n. *3), p. 00, prefers to translate 'kettle-drums'.

¹⁸ We follow the editors' rendering 'lors de la cérémonie nocturne' for the unparalleled *τῇ νυκτερινῇ ὕδρευεσθαι ..τὴν χύτραν τὸ ὕδωρ* is hard: the verb in active and middle commonly means 'draw water' with no object expressed. Here it seems to be constructed with two accusatives in the sense of 'fill'.

(15) **on the day after the procession**, sacrifice to Alaia and throw (deposit?)¹⁹:

(16) **on the nineteenth**, throw (deposit?) for Lillaias and Artemis Phylake and Apollo Pylaios (?) whatever you wish and eat everything and . . . a table . . . to the goddess whatever you have:

(18) **Initiation to the goddess.** [] is initiated, tend (the goddess) for three days, on the third be shaved. But if any of the unpurified wishes to be initiated, let him shave within three days, taking wine ... and let him *diaklainein* his mouth, the pure one of the goddess by means of the gold and the plant, but let the impure one being initiated *diaklainein* his mouth by the [body? blood?] ²⁰ of a bird and let the female purification officials (?) consume (?) it²¹ . . . (23) Let him who is being initiated not sacrifice (?) but let him bring an Attic *choinix* of *lagana* and two *kotylai* of wine from the . . . ²² collect on the third day . . . he will shave all round, and sacrifice to Moira a cock and . . . because of the collection, whatever he gets. And let him pay to the goddess for the *schoinos*²³ before shaving three obols. But if he does not shave, an obol for the propitiatory offering²⁴. Let him. . . in three . . . let him bring also . . . to the *schoinos*. (28) If also the person wishing to tend . . . by the goddess, let him tend . . . if he is well and . . . and the loaf:

(30) **As for the bowl**, if anyone lifts the first one . . . a sheep . . . male or female . . . *homorai*, four *choinikes* of *lagana*, two *choes* of wine, into the hands an Aiginetan [*mna* ?], chosen things (?) as at the table-filling, but take away the leg raw . . . for the priestess, and consume it there and of the others as many of the uninitiated . . . and charcoal for the priestess:

(35) **For the one who lifts the second bowl**, a *choinix* of *lagana*, (two?) *choinikes* of *homora*²⁵, a *kotyle* of olive oil into the hands, a *stater* into the collecting-box (?)²⁶, two *choes*.

¹⁹ So the editors: 'jeter (ou déposer?)'.

²⁰ On this problematic passage see p. 00.

²¹ Here and in A 34 LSJ sense III 'consume' of ἀναλίσκω is likely: cf. p. 00. 'Dépensent (?)' the editors.

²² The editors render 'de la vigne consacrée', which is not supported by the text they print. *Lagana*: a kind of unleavened flat bread (cf. n. *163).

²³ On σχοῖνος see n. *139 below.

²⁴ On this new form ἰλατηρία see DECOURT and TZIAFALIAS, *o.c.* (n. *2), p. 45, n. 114.

²⁵ *Homora*: a kind of sweet bread (cf. n. *163).

²⁶ The stone gives 'a *stater* for the mixing-bowl (*krater*)', which can only be explained by a complicated hypothesis (cash in lieu of the offering in kind); we suspect the cutter substituted one word much used in this text for another (e.g. B 67), misled also by the rhyme.

Increase these in the same way: as from the first (bowl) . . . wherever he wishes of those initiated. Sprinkle with salt

Thereafter scattered words only. The following notabilia are read by the editors: 44, ‘on the twentieth’, 47, ‘on the twenty sixth’ (but note the doubts of Carbon)²⁷; 41-2, ‘Aphrodite’; 42 and 47, ‘basket’; 44, ‘throw’; 45, ‘be slaughtered’; 48 and 53, ‘swear’ (‘after washing’ in the latter); 51-2, ‘if of the uninitiated ... the altar’; 52, ‘let him pay an Aiginetan drachma’.

Side B.

(1-6) **An uninitiated person (ἀμύητος) shall not go into the temple of the goddess.** If any goes in, purify with a hen and sacrifice in accompaniment another full-grown fowl on the altar of Moira, and the priestess or the *neokoros* or one of those who lift²⁸ the sacred objects shall do the purification, and (the offender) shall bring two *choinikes* of loaves, eight *kotylai* of wine for the mixing-bowl. //

(7-12) **An uninitiated person shall not go into the *prothyron*,** unless any wishes to perform a vow and to keep the sacred things pure (?)²⁹, and keeps pure for the three days from all the things specified above. He shall bring in accompaniment to the vows half a *kotyle* of oil for the lamp, an obol, torches, incense, a libation.//

(13-16) **If any of the uninitiated enters the *prothyron*,** purify with a cock or hen, sacrifice in accompaniment a leg of whatever he pleases, except of pork, and (bring?) three Attic *choinikes* of *lagana* and half a *chous* of wine.//

(17-21) **Collect** on the new moon of the month Itonios to the threshing floors, but do not collect (going) into a house nor take the sacred objects in, unless three days in advance [Interlinear addition Collect on the tenth until the twelfth of (the) month] one announces it³⁰. If any of the female purification officials does not do this, let her pay to the sanctuary a lamb and the accompaniments for this sacrifice³¹. //

²⁷ o.c. (n. *3), p. 00.

²⁸ αἰπούντων is printed by the editors but we read ΑΙΠΟΥΤΩΝ on the photo (certainly only 8 letters) and prefer the correction αἰπόντων.

²⁹ Sense unclear.

³⁰ Whether the interlinear addendum corrects the date or adds a new collecting period is unclear. The editors articulate differently, to give as a new sentence ‘unless one proclaims within three days in advance, collect on

(22-3) **Inscription for the peristyle.** Pre-sacrifice first to Phylake and to Men as offerings incense³². //

(24-26) **If anyone as an offering wishes to sacrifice white fowl**, let him sacrifice males to Men, female to Artemis, and if he wants (to sacrifice) lambs, similarly.

(26-35) **A woman shall enter** from childbirth on the thirtieth day, she who aborts on the fortieth day, from a man after washing from the head down, from the processes of nature (*i.e. menstruation*) on the seventh day. If anyone enters without having observed purity (*ἀγνεύσας, masculine*)³³ from the things aforementioned, let him purify the altars with a chicken, and let him sacrifice in accompaniment on the altar of Phylake a hen or a roasting fish, a *mna* of whatever meat he wishes except pork, and (bring?) a *choinix* of *lagana* and into the mixing-bowl four *kotylai* of wine. The *neokoros* shall perform this purification and any of the female purification officials who is present.

(35-43) **If anyone wishes to sacrifice to the goddess by the Greek rite**, it is permitted (to sacrifice) whatever he likes except pig To accompany the sacrifice, one must bring to the table as the deposited offerings a *choinix* of *lagana*, a *choinix* of *homora*, and three obols for the collecting-box and a *kotyle* of olive-oil for the lamp and for the mixing-bowl a *kotyle* of wine from the sanctuary³⁴, for the table the breast boiled and the leg raw. Bring the entrails to the priestess, the liver and lungs and diaphragm and left kidney and tongue. The right kidney and right *akrokolion*³⁵ and heart and omentum and the front leg (?)³⁶ and the portion of the tail customary for sacred offerings onto the fire³⁷.

(44-5) **After doing this and completing this sacrifice**, let him bring another victim of whatever species he pleases and let anyone who pleases eat of it. / (?)

the tenth until the twelfth of (the) month'. But the 'unless' clause lacks a connective and should look back; the 'collect on the tenth' clause has one and so should not be the apodosis of a conditional. 'Announce three days in advance' would normally require a dative; here we have the genitive *τριῶν ἡμερῶν*, but no other translation seems possible.

³¹ This is an attempt to interpret the ungrammatical *τὰ ἐπὶ τούτῳ τὴν θυσίαν*.

³² We are uncertain whether the 'inscription for the peristyle' ends here, as the marginal *paragraphos* may suggest, or continues down to 26 or even (but this would give a very long notice on the peristyle) 35.

³³ On this probably mistaken masculine see n. 207. It is possible that 'entry' in this section refers specifically to entry to the peristyle: cf. p. 00 above.

³⁴ Mysterious: sanctuary wines are not otherwise known.

³⁵ ἀκροκόλιον 'extremities of body...snout, ears, trotters', LSJ.

³⁶ Literally, 'the leg from the breast'.

³⁷ ἐπὶ τὸν πύρα, where one looks for either ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ or ἐπὶ τὴν πυράν.

(45-49) **If anyone wishes to make a complete ‘full table’ for the goddess**, (let him bring) a full grown sheep, male or female, and let it (*the full table*) extend to include (?) two *choinikes* of *homora*, four *choinikes* of *lagana*, two *choes* of wine, a drachma for the collecting-box, a *kotyle* of olive-oil for the lamp, and an uninitiated person does not taste of these. /

(49-51) **If anyone wishes to perform an all-day rite for the goddess**, (let him do so) bringing himself a lunch of whatever he wishes, except pork, and for the lamp a half-*kotyle* of olive-oil³⁸. //

(52-3) **To the ear of the goddess and her hair**, burn³⁹ incense, myrrh, aromatic plants, rose essence, (bring) three obols for the collecting-box. //

(54-57) **If anyone sacrifices a fowl or a goose**, (pay) for the fowl (female) into the collecting-box an obol, for the goose an obol and a half, (put) the legs and the innards onto the table, but let him carry away the rest wherever he wishes. Let him also bring four *kotylai* of wine, a *choinix* of *lagana*, half a *kotyle* of olive-oil. //

(58-61) **If anyone wishes to sacrifice a bovine**, bring to the table three *choinikes* of *lagana*, a *choinix* of *homora*, two *choes* of wine, two *kotylai* of olive-oil, sufficient wood, a gold piece for the collecting-box, and remove the sacred parts as from the sheep. /

(61-65) **All those who wish to sacrifice at the Nisanaia or the Aloulaia**, bring the animal to the procession. Let the procession occur at the Nisanaia on the next day if the goddess comes from the river, at the Aloulaia on the seventeenth in the morning. At night perform a torch-ritual. Anyone who wishes shall process, having washed from the head downwards on the day itself, and may go in as far as the sanctuary of Phylake.//

(66-70) **If anyone wishes to burn whole a full-grown ram, or, if not, a male lamb**, for the full-grown animal a *stater* into the collecting-box, for the lamb an Aeginetan (drachma), sufficient firewood in addition to this, a *chous* of wine into the mixing-bowl, on the table a *choinix* of *lagana*, a *choinix* of *homora*, ‘*basasirouta*’⁴⁰, incense, myrrh, a *kotyle* of olive-oil for the lamp. /

³⁸ We read from the photo ἐλαίου ἡμικοτύλιον.

³⁹ θυμῖαν as an adjective is unattested; we tentatively read θυμῖαν as an imperatival infinitive from θυμιάω; the odd word order can perhaps be explained if only the incense and myrrh are objects of this verb.

⁴⁰ DECOURT and TZIAPHALIAS, *o.c.* (n. *2), p. 42, take βασισαβαρουτα as a twice repeated misspelling for βασισὰ καὶ ῥοῦτα, which they interpret as combining transliterations of a Syrian botanical term (Dioscorides, *Materia Medica*, III, 46, 2, καλοῦσι δὲ τινες αὐτὸ ἀρμάλα, Σύροι δὲ βήσσαν) and a Latin, *ruta*,

(70-73) **If anyone wishes to burn whole a goose**, into the collecting-box two obols, sufficient firewood, a torch, four *kotylai* of wine into the mixing-bowl, a half *kotyle* of olive-oil for the lamp, ‘*basasirouta*’, incense, myrrh.

(73-4) **If anyone wishes to burn whole a *trubba*⁴¹ or a quail**, an obol and a half into the collecting-box, the rest the same as for the goose.

(74-80) **An uninitiated person may not approach the great altar**, nor sacrifice a hen on it⁴², nor bring the egg of another species (*literally*, ‘*another egg*’). If anyone⁴³ sacrifices a hen to the goddess, (let it be) at the altar of Moira, and let anyone who wishes go to the altar of Moira and Helios⁴⁴. If any uninitiated person goes to the great altar, let him purify it according to the purification described previously for the peristyle⁴⁵. Likewise let them keep away from the altar of Adara and Lilla.

(80-82) **If anyone kindles fire**, let him purify according to the notice on the *peribolos* wall⁴⁶. If anyone urinates or bleeds within the peristyle, let him purify with the purification previously described.

3. Gods

The gods of the law are well discussed by the editors. Of the non-Greek gods, only Men is attested elsewhere. Adara, as we have seen, bears a relation to a Semitic month name; Mogga (A 6), Alaia (A 15), and Lilla/Lillaias (A 16, B 80) are unknown⁴⁷. Noteworthy is ‘Pan whom the Syrians call [. . .] PLEN’, a perhaps unique instance in a Greek sacred law of an *interpretatio graeca* that announces itself as such. On one crucial point we differ from the

rue. A Syriac term *bashasha*, *bashosha* with an Aramaic equivalent is well attested (*Thesaurus Syriacus* s.v. □□□□□ or □□□□□□□: Paganum Harmala, not Ruta Graveolens, according to I. Löw, *Aramäische Pflanzennamen*, Leipzig/Berlin, 1881, p. 370-372, no. 317), but the postulated misspelling is hard to credit, and the Greek word ῥντή (Peloponnesian for πήγανον, according to Iolaos, *On Peloponnesian Cities*, cited in Σ Nicander, *Theriaka*, 523) is also relevant.

⁴¹ Unknown.

⁴² Unlike the editors, we take all these three prohibitions to apply to the uninitiated; they take the two latter to be general. See p. 00.

⁴³ i.e. on our interpretation ‘any uninitiated person’.

⁴⁴ The articulation of these clauses is problematic: the editors render ‘nor bring the egg of another species, if anyone sacrifices a hen to the goddess at the altar of Moira; and let anyone who wishes go to the altar of Moira and Helios.’

⁴⁵ On this problematic back reference see p. 00.

⁴⁶ The editors render ‘selon la prescription concernant le péribole’, i.e. another back reference to an unidentifiable earlier regulation. This is possible, but our rendering better suits the normal sense of προγραφή.

⁴⁷ But Edouard Chiricat has pointed out to us a plausible connection between this theonym and the several probably theophoric anthroponyms in Movy- attested in Rough Cilicia: *LGPN V B* (2013), p. 302.

editors⁴⁸. Whereas they identify the unnamed ‘goddess’ of the text with Artemis Phylake, we believe that Artemis Phylake is a distinct figure with a precinct of her own on the fringes of the main sanctuary; the goddess herself is always anonymous in the surviving text, but, honorand as she is of Nisanaia and Aloulaia, would surely not have borne a Greek name.

The full Greekness of one bearer of a Greek name can also be doubted. Moira is mentioned six times in the singular as recipient of various types of sacrifice; she shares an altar with Helios (only occasionally an object of cult in Greece) as well as having one of her own⁴⁹, unless these two altars are the same. She has a particularly close relation to ‘the goddess’: uninitiated persons wishing to sacrifice a fowl ‘to the goddess’ are, remarkably, diverted from her altar and directed instead to that of Moira (B 76-77). Outside this text, though the role of Moira as fate or death is familiar in poetry and thought, a singular Moira is not attested in cult at all, let alone with such prominence⁵⁰. The Moirai Patroiai known from Pherai⁵¹ provide another Thessalian instance of Moira, but still only in the familiar group form. To interpret the unique singular use, there seem to be two possibilities. One might postulate creative theology within the context of mysteries⁵², an attempt somehow to find a way of gaining control over Fate through ritual. But it is perhaps more likely that a non-Greek figure underlies her too, like ‘Pan whom the Syrians call [. . .] PLEN’. An obvious possibility would be Gad⁵³, even if the equivalent often found later for this power is not Moira but Tyche.

4. The Sanctuary

The many architectural features mentioned in the text invite an attempt at visualisation. It speaks of περίβολος, ναός, περίστυλον, περιστύλιον, πρόθυρον, πρόπυλον⁵⁴, τύμπανα, a great altar, the ἱερόν of Phylake (presumably containing her altar), the altar of Moira, the altar of Moira and Helios, the altar of Adara and Lilla; there are presumably also altars of Men, Pan,

⁴⁸ See R. PARKER, “The Unnamed Goddess of Marmarini”, *ZPE* 199 (2016), p. *00.

⁴⁹ A 3, 14, 25; B 3, 76, 77 (the altar is mentioned in the last three references).

⁵⁰ The altar to Zeus and Καλή Μοῖρα, *IG* XIV, 873, adduced by the editors, is different.

⁵¹ *SEG* XLII, 535; much later, an altar of Moirai at Metropolis, *IG* IX, 2, 282.

⁵² As suggested to us by Sofia Kravaritou.

⁵³ On whom see e.g. S. RIBICHINI, s.v. “Gad”, in K. VAN DER TOORN et al. (eds.), *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, Leiden, 1999² [1995], p. 339-341.

⁵⁴ On all these see the relevant entries in M.C. HELLMANN, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire de l'architecture grecque, d'après les inscriptions de Délos*, Athens, 1992. By her account, πρόπυλον is distinct from πρόθυρον (pace Hesychius s.v. προπύλαιον), περίστυλον from περίβολος. But she may be seeking too much precision; for imprecision Coulton refers us e.g. to J. C. MORETTI and C. MAUDUIT, “The Greek Vocabulary of Theatrical Architecture”, in R. FREDERIKSEN, E. GEBHARD, A. SOKOLICEK (eds.) *The Architecture of the Ancient Greek Theatre*, Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens, 17, 2015, p. 119 -129.

Helios and possibly other gods mentioned as recipients of sacrifice⁵⁵. Unfortunately, the imprecision with which Greeks used architectural expressions, which for them derived from words used in ordinary speech and were not technical terms, leaves crucial issues ambiguous. We cannot decide from vocabulary alone whether περίστυλον was distinct from περιστύλιον or πρόθυρον from πρόπυλον. As J.J. Coulton writes to us, ‘For contemporaries, the meaning would not depend on the vocabulary, but on what they saw.’

An important doubt concerns the phrase πλύντηθι [τ]ὰ τῷ περὶ τὴν θεὸν ἱερῶν, ναὸν καὶ περ[ι]στ[ύ]λιον καὶ τύμπανα καὶ πρόπυλον (A 4-6). If one takes τ]ὰ τῷ περὶ τὴν θεὸν ἱερῶν as indicating constructions in the immediate vicinity of the goddess’s cult statue, as the ναός at least certainly was, it will become likely that the other items mentioned were part of the temple: the ναός will be the cella, the πρόπυλον again the πρόναος, the περ[ι]στ[ύ]λιον the temple colonnade. But τ]ὰ τῷ περὶ τὴν θεὸν ἱερῶν might indicate more vaguely ‘the sacred places of the goddess’, since in the Koine ‘the use of bare case-forms yielded increasingly to prepositional phrases’, and in this instance the use of the preposition would have avoided a ‘nested genitive’⁵⁶. On that view the items listed for cleaning would be the architecturally finest elements most deserving this treatment; one notes the absence of the great altar, but ‘bloodying the altar’ was a ritual act and it is not clear that cleaning altars was normal.

Three points appear certain: the sanctuary of Phylake is at some remove from the ναός of the goddess, since at the great festivals of the cult anyone who wishes, i.e. the uninitiated, may process up to (but presumably not beyond) this landmark (B 65). Secondly, the πρόθυρον must be what we would term πρόναος, the temple vestibule: this emerges from the juxtaposition at B 1-16, where non-initiates are barred first, absolutely, from the ναός, then from the πρόθυρον unless they wish to make a vow. Thirdly, the περίστυλον is not the colonnade of a peripteral temple but surrounds a larger open area. B 81-2 prescribes a purification ‘if anyone urinates or bleeds within the peristyle’. While urination and indeed excretion within sacred space certainly occurred⁵⁷, the area most exposed to such desecration was surely the broader precinct, not the temple itself; and it would have been bizarre to impose a sanction on such behaviour merely within the temple, implicitly condoning it within the rest of the sacred area. One can perhaps go on to infer that a peristyle thus enclosing an appreciable area is unlikely to have been referred to by the diminutive περιστύλιον; the two

⁵⁵ See DECOURT and TZIAPHALIAS, *o.c.* (n.*2), p. 23-25.

⁵⁶ D. LANGSLOW, “The Language of Polybius since Foucault and Dubuisson”, in C. SMITH, L.M. YARROW (eds.), *Imperialism, Cultural Politics and Polybius*, Oxford, 2012, p. 85-110, at p. 93.

⁵⁷ See e.g. Aristophanes, *Wasps*, 394, *Wealth*, 1184.

things will therefore have been separate.

A possible model for the sanctuary thus becomes ‘a peripteral temple including a surrounding colonnade (*peristylon*) and a pronaos (*prothyron*), with a large altar of the goddess before it and a number of minor altars to other deities scattered around, all enclosed in a (probably rectangular) peristyle court (*peristylon*) with a formal entrance (*propylon*). The whole area would then be the *peribolos*’ (J.J. Coulton). But a περιστύλ(ι)ον is just a colonnade, not necessarily one attached to a temple. If περίστυλον and περ[ι]στ[ύ]λιον are distinct, one could envisage two colonnaded courts, either nested in Russian doll style or one leading into another. As a result of these various uncertainties it is impossible to determine to what extent the sanctuary was of familiar Greek form. Nothing contradicts that assumption; but, even if the arrangement differed from Greek norms as far, say, as that of some of the sanctuaries of non-Greek gods on Delos, the vocabulary used to describe it would not necessarily reveal the divergences. The question of how exotic a man from Larisa who had never left Thessaly might have found the sanctuary is therefore regrettably unanswerable.

What the bare text does give us, unusually, is some detail on the division between places open to all and those confined to initiates. Non-initiates are excluded from the ναός of the goddess (B 1-6), from the πρόθυρον except in order to make a vow (B 7-12), from the great altar (B 74-79), from the altars of Adara and Lilla (B 79-80). (It may not be coincidence that the ‘reserved’ altars [of ‘the goddess’, Adara and Lilla] belong to deities with non-Greek names.) The restrictions on non-initiates’ access to the ναός and πρόθυρον no doubt explain why they may not participate in the general cleansing of the sanctuary prior to the E/Aloulaia (A 4-8). Since non-initiates have to be explicitly excluded from particular buildings and altars, *prima facie* they may enter the rest of the sanctuary, in certain circumstances at least. Whether non-initiates could always enter most of the sanctuary, or only on particular occasions, is harder to determine. In B 61-5 it is specified that at the two great festivals ‘anyone who wishes’ (non-initiates presumably included) may process as far as the sanctuary of Phylake. In itself that rule might imply that for the rest of the year non-initiates could not come so far; it would be a relaxation on the occasion of the festivals. But this rule can equally well be interpreted as a tightening in a particular context: on this occasion of special sanctity (and perhaps unusual crowding) non-initiates are debarred further out than usual. At B 77 ‘anyone who wishes’ (who on our view is a non-initiate) is allowed to ‘proceed to the altar of Moira and Helios’ when a sacrifice is made there. Again, ‘to sacrifice, but not in other circumstances’ would be a possible understanding. But this rule has been immediately preceded by an explicit ban on non-initiates approaching the ‘great

altar', and the point may rather be to underline that access to the altar of Moira and Helios is, by contrast, free. What is clear at all events is that the arrangement is not one of inner and outer zones, with non-initiates permanently stopped at the transition between the two⁵⁸.

5/ Near Eastern Ritual Influences

Before looking in detail at the various ritual procedures in the inscription, it may be useful to consider against possible Near Eastern backgrounds some prominent ritual elements in it that are unexpected from a Greek point of view but may be explained on the basis of hybridity.

5.1 Bird Sacrifice

Sacrifice of birds and their use in purification are frequent in the inscription, and one regulation may suggest that a hen was a standard offering to the goddess on her "great altar". It runs Πρὸς δὲ τὸν βωμὸν τὸν μέγαν ἀτέλεστον μὴ προσεῖναι, μήδε ἀλεκτορίδα θύειν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, μήδ' ὠὶὸν προσφέρειν ἄλλο (B 74-7). Our reading of this passage differs from that of the editors, who think that on the one hand it bans uninitiated persons from the great altar and on the other forbids anyone from sacrificing hens on it. On that reading, however, the regulation prohibits everyone, including initiates, from sacrificing hens to the goddess on her own altar, and this despite the fact that pigs alone are prohibited as victims for her at B 36 and provision is made for sacrifice of a female bird, which very probably means a chicken, at B 54—not explicitly for the goddess, but it would be surprising if it were a suitable offering to any divinity but her. It is therefore preferable, and equally plausible linguistically, to take ἀτέλεστον as the subject of all three imperatival infinitives and render "An uninitiated person may not approach the great altar, nor sacrifice a hen on it, nor bring an egg of another species". This coheres well with the sequel, which we take as a new sentence⁵⁹: Ἐάν τις τῇ θεῶι ἀλεκτορίδα θύῃ ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς Μοίρας βωμὸν καὶ προπορευέσθω ὁ βουλόμενος ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς Μοίρας καὶ Ἡλίου βωμόν, "If anyone (i.e. anyone uninitiated) sacrifices a hen to the

⁵⁸ For such a possibility cf. *mutatis mutandis* the description of the four *porticus* of the Herodian temple, of which the inner three progressively excluded non-Jews, women, non-priests, in Josephus, *Against Apion*, II, 103-104. We have wondered whether the odd positioning of the rules on female impurities (B 26-29) straight after the requirement for preliminary sacrifices might imply that women could not proceed beyond the stage of preliminary sacrifice at altars not in the heart of the sanctuary. But so important a limitation ought to have been made explicit.

⁵⁹ Unlike DECOURT & TZIAPHALIAS, *o.c.* (n. *2), p. 23, who print a single sentence and take μήδ' ὠὶὸν προσφέρειν ἄλλο with what follows: see the notes to our translation *ad loc.* Ἐάν τις is normally sentence-initial in this text, usually with δέ but without it also at B 49, 73.

goddess, (let it be) on the altar of Moira⁶⁰, and anyone who wishes can proceed as far as the altar of Moira and Helios”. Such a formulation makes sense if initiates commonly sacrificed hens to the goddess on the great altar and the uninitiated are therefore permitted to make the same offering, but on Moira’s altar. An offering for one divinity on another’s altar—for which no parallel occurs to us—is very surprising. It can perhaps be understood as another reflection of the remarkable combination in these regulations of concern not only to exclude but also to include the uninitiated, or it may have to do with the nature of this remarkable, singular Moira (see above, p. 00). On the basis of this interpretation of the passage we include hen and egg offerings to the goddess in this summary of birds in the inscription:

Purification (?) in the context of initiation to the goddess: ὄρνις (A 22-3).

Purification: ἀλεκτορίς (B 2); ἀλέκτωρ, male or female⁶¹ (B 14); νοσσός ἀλέκτορος (B 30-31).

Sacrifice accompanying purification: ἀλέκτωρ τέλεος (B 2-3); female ὄρνις (B 31-2).

Sacrifice: ὄρνις to Moira (A 25); white ἀλέκτορες, male to Mên and female to Phylake (B 24-5); ὄρνις or χήν (B 54); ἀλεκτορίς and ὠϊόν to the goddess (B 75-6); ἀλεκτορίς on the altar of Moira (B 76-7).

Holocaust sacrifice: χήν (B 70); τρύββα or ὄρνυξ (B 73).

It seems probable, in accord with standard Greek usage⁶², that ὄρνις as well as ἀλέκτωρ refers in our text primarily to the domesticated chicken, which was available at sacrificial or purificatory need as game-birds were not. Beyond the famous cock which Socrates says “we owe to Asclepius” at the end of the *Phaedo*, we have further evidence for the offering of cocks to the god of healing and to other gods⁶³. Birds are however uncommon

⁶⁰ We assume that the verb in the protasis of this sentence is to be understood in the first clause of the apodosis, ἐάν τις . . . θύῃ, (sc. θυέτω) ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς Μοίρας βωμὸν κτλ. There are brachylogies of the same kind at B 45-6, Ἐάν δέ τις τραπεζοπλησίαν βούληται ποιεῖν τῇ θεῷ τελέαν, (sc. θυέτω/φερέτω) πρόβατον τέλεον κτλ., at B 49-51, Ἐάν τις πανημερῖσαι βούληται τῇ θεῷ, (sc. πανημερισάτω) ἄριστον φερόμενος ὅτι ἂν βούληται, πλὴν χοιρέων κρεῶν κτλ., and at B 55, Ἐάν δὲ ὄρνιθὰ τις θύ[σ]ῃ ἢ χῆνα, τῆς μὲν ὄρνιθος εἰς τὸν θησαυρὸν ὀβολόν (sc. φερέτω), τοῦ δὲ χηνὸς τριημιοβόλια κτλ.

⁶¹ Ath. IX, 373E-374D illustrates with many examples use of the cognate word ἀλεκτρούων of both male and female chickens; see also Ar. *Nub.* 660-67.

⁶² For ὄρνις clearly referring to a rooster or explicitly equivalent to ἀλέκτωρ/ἀλεκτρούων see Ar. *Vesp.* 815 ὄρνις = 934 ἀλεκτρούων (cf. 817); AP XII, 24, XII, 25 (ὄρνις 2 = ἀλέκτωρ 5), cf. XII, 27. Ath. IX, 373A-C notes post-classical application of ὄρνις to female chickens in particular.

⁶³ Asclepius: Pl. *Ph.* 118a.7-8; Artem. *Oneir.* V, 9; Herodas IV, 11-18. Suda β 457 (ed. ADLER) s.v. ἔβδομος βοῦς (and θ 617 s.v. θῦσαι) lists ὄρνις and χήν after sheep, pig, goat, and ox as sacrificial animals (ὄρνις presumably meaning “chicken” beside χήν, “goose”); cf. Diogenian. III, 50. Sacred to Apollo/Helios: Plut. *Pyth. orac.* 400C; Paus. V, 25, 9; Ael. fr. 186. Sacrificed to Apollo: AP VI, 155; XII, 24; to Moon and Sun: Iambl. *Protr.* 21, 17; to Ares: Plut. *Apoth. Lac.* 238F; to Anubis: Plut. *Is et Os.* 375E.

victims in Greek sacrifice and generally regarded as a poor person's substitute for a larger animal⁶⁴.

The relative valuation of victims in Semitic and Syrian tradition seems essentially the same as in Greek: bovines, ovines/caprines, and birds in that order of prestige, and usually listed in that order, as in the Hebrew Bible, the Punic "sacrificial tariffs" from Marseilles and Carthage, and Lucian's *Dea Syria*⁶⁵; the Marseilles tariff explicitly exempts those "poor in cattle or birds" from fees or perquisites. In the Hebrew Bible two turtledoves (or perhaps rather two fowl⁶⁶) or two pigeons (one as a purification sacrifice, the other as a burnt offering) are allowed as a substitute "if you cannot afford a sheep", and another passage requires that a woman at the end of her post-childbirth purity exclusion bring to the priest a yearling lamb for a burnt offering and a young pigeon or turtledove/fowl for a purification offering, but "if she

⁶⁴ D.S. REESE, "Faunal Remains from the Altar of Aphrodite Ourania, Athens", *Hesperia* 58 (1989), p. 63-70, at p. 69 observed that "burnt bird bones are very rarely found on altars or in sanctuaries", and this still holds; they occur only very occasionally, e.g., among the "documents archéozoologiques" assembled by A. HERMARY and M. LEGUILLOUX, "Les sacrifices dans le monde grec", in *ThesCRA* I, p. 59-134. On birds and e.g. incense as poorer offerings cf. Kynno's offering of a cock as "dessert course" (τάπιδορπα) at Herodas IV, 11-18, with the implication—confirmed by explicit contrast with "an ox or a piglet with plenty of crackling"—that the cock is not the sort of offering to constitute the main course. There is a useful compilation of parallel evidence in W. HEADLAM and A.D. KNOX, *Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments*, Cambridge, 1922, p. 179-80, at p. 180. Lucian's Zeus Tragôidos says that stingy Mnesitheus entertained sixteen gods by sacrificing "only an ἀλεκτρονών" and some incense (*JTr.*, 15), and in *On Sacrifices* Lucian says that, alongside the great goods which the gods sell at the price of greater offerings, εἰκάζειν δὲ χρὴ πολλὰ εἶναι ἀλεκτρονόου καὶ στεφάνου καὶ λιβανωτοῦ μόνου παρ' αὐτοῖς ὄνια (*Sacr.*, 2). See also Paus. X, 32, 16 (on cult of Isis in Tithorea in Phocis): θύουσι δὲ καὶ βοῦς καὶ ἐλάφους οἱ εὐδαιμονέστεροι, ὅσοι δὲ εἰσιν ἀποδέοντες πλούτῳ καὶ χῆνας καὶ ὄρνιθας τὰς μελεαγρίδας ("guinea-fowl"?); Plut. *Apoth. Lac.* 238F and *Marc.* 22, where the Spartans are said to encourage their leaders to be strategic by sacrificing a βοῦς if they have defeated an enemy by stratagem but merely an ἀλεκτρονών if by open conflict. Paus. II, 11, 7 reports that in the Asklepieion at Titane (southwest of Sicyon) they whole-burn (καθαγίζειν/καίειν) birds on the altar but larger animals on the ground. This presumably has to do with the sufficiency of an altar fire for the holocaust of a bird rather than with the comparative prestige of birds and larger animals as offerings; for a more venturesome interpretation of the distinction see V. PIRENNE-DELFORGE, *Retour à la source: Pausanias et la religion grecque*, Liège, 2008, p. 193-7.

⁶⁵ Leviticus chapters 1-2; Lucian, *Dea Syria* 54. The Punic sacrificial tariffs, both probably from Carthage (though the first was found in Marseilles), are late iv or early iii BC. The first, *CIS* I, 165 = H. DONNER, W. RÖLLIG (eds.), *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften*, Wiesbaden, 2002⁵, no. 69 = *NGSL*, Appendix A, p. 391-396 with English translation (also translated by D. PARDEE, "A Punic Sacrificial Tariff", in W.W. HALLO (ed.), *The Context of Scripture* I, Leiden, 1997, p. 305-9) deals in turn with offerings of a mature bovine (lines 3-4), an immature bovine or a mature deer (5-6); a mature sheep or goat (7-8); an immature sheep, goat, or deer (9-10); "a fowl or a free-flying bird" (11); other birds (12); there follow clauses regulating perquisites (13-21), including the exemption of the poor from fees and perquisites mentioned in the text (15). The second text, *CIS* I, 167 = H. DONNER, W. RÖLLIG, *o.c.* no. 74 (English translation by FR. ROSENTHAL in J.B. PRITCHARD (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, Princeton, 1969³, p. 657) deals in turn with offerings of ox (line 2); stag? (3); ram or goat (4); lamb, kid, or ?young stag? (5); offerings by the poor (6); offerings of birds (7); followed by further regulations. On the bird sacrifices in the Punic tariffs see M. DELCOR, "Le tarif dit de Marseille (*CIS* I, 165): Aspects du système sacrificiel punique", *Semitica* 38 (1990), p. 87-94, at p. 89-92.

⁶⁶ T. STAUBLI, "Hühneropfer im alten Israel: Zum Verständnis von Lev 1,14 im Kontext der antiken Kulturgeschichte", in T. RÖMER (ed.), *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers*, Leuven, 2008, p. 355-69, makes a strong case on a variety of grounds that Hebrew תור, *tor* means not "turtledove" but "fowl" (of the *phasianidae* family, partridge or pheasant) in every passage in which it occurs in the Hebrew Bible except (the later) Jeremiah 8:7.

cannot afford a lamb she shall take two turtledoves/fowl or two young pigeons”; Mary takes advantage of the latter clause in the case of Jesus⁶⁷. In his important recent study of Hebrew sacrifice, Naphtali Meshel suggests that a post-biblical “zoemic shift” to the use of immature animals as wholeburnt and purification offerings “may have originated from pragmatic considerations: the sacrifice of young animals is less of an economic burden, a particularly significant factor for laypersons”⁶⁸.

Birds are, nevertheless, much more prominent sacrificial victims in the Near Eastern traditions than they are in Greek. In the Hurrian realm of southeastern Anatolia and northern Syria birds (whose species is rarely indicated) are the most frequent burnt offerings (for underworld gods)⁶⁹. The Hebrew Bible provides for sacrifice of birds both as personal (rather than public) burnt offerings and as purification sacrifices in a variety of contexts⁷⁰, which normally involve one victim as purification offering and a second as burnt offering. Meshel notes that “the sacrifice of pairs of birds was apparently quite common in the Herodian temple”⁷¹, and a second-century-AD tractate in the Mishnah, *Kinnim*, deals entirely with “The Bird-Offerings”⁷². Many bones of birds are found at what have been identified as Hebrew cultic sites, where O. Borowski argues that a “large quantity of birds must have been required for sacrifice” and notes evidence for very large underground *columbaria* at and in the vicinity of Hellenistic Maresha⁷³. In Mesopotamia, whose ritual traditions provide a number of striking comparanda for our text, birds are standard offerings in the meals presented to the gods⁷⁴. So too are eggs, as in B 76 of our text: an inscription published in 1991, dated on palaeographical grounds to the time of Nebuchadnezzar II (who reigned ca. 605-562 BC) or one of his successors, attests eggs in meals presented to the gods in Babylon, confirming

⁶⁷ Lev. 5:7-11, 12:6-8; Luke 2:22-24. Cf. J. MILGROM, *Leviticus 1-16* (Anchor Bible 3), New York, 1991, p. 166-8 on the “bird pericope” at Lev. 1:14-17 as added “to provide the poor with the means to sacrifice the burnt offering”.

⁶⁸ N. S. MESHEL, *The “Grammar” of Sacrifice: A Generativist Study of the Israelite Sacrificial System in the Priestly Writings, with A “Grammar” of Σ*, Oxford, 2014, p. 46-8, quotation 47.

⁶⁹ As noted by B.J. COLLINS, “Animals in the Religions of Ancient Anatolia”, in B.J. COLLINS (ed.), *A History of the Animal World in the Ancient Near East*, Leiden, 2002, p. 309-34, at p. 321; see V. HAAS, *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, Leiden, 1994, p. 658-61: “Vogelopfer sind auf die syrischen und südanatolischen Rituale beschränkt” (658).

⁷⁰ Personal burnt offerings: Lev. 1:14-17. Purification sacrifices, the so-called “sin-offering” of English bibles, Hebrew חַטָּאת, *chattat*: Lev. 5:7-10 (private burnt-offering); 12:6, 8 (purification of women after childbirth); 14:22, 30 (purification of lepers); Lev. 15:14, 29 (purification from bodily discharges); Numbers 6:10 (purification of nazirites from contact with a corpse).

⁷¹ MESHEL, *o.c.* (n. 68), p. 49 n. 59.

⁷² See the English translation of H. DANBY, *The Mishnah*, Oxford, 1933, p. 598-602; the tractate consists of detailed rules for the various types of bird-offering mentioned in the Hebrew Bible.

⁷³ O. BOROWSKI, “Animals in the Religions of Syria-Palestine”, in COLLINS (ed.), *o.c.* (n. 69), p. 406-24, at p. 412-13.

⁷⁴ See J. SCURLOCK, “Animal Sacrifice in Ancient Mesopotamian Religion”, in COLLINS (ed.), *o.c.* (n. 69), p. 389-403, at p. 389-90.

earlier attestations in three inscriptions of similar date of eggs (in one case duck eggs), fish, and birds, collectively presented as “the pride of the marsh”, and there is also evidence from Seleucid Uruk for birds and ostrich and duck eggs presented as part of divine meals for Anu, Antu and other gods⁷⁵. Cultic texts from Ugarit too attest many offerings of birds⁷⁶. At Palmyra, a sarcophagus of the first half of the third century AD with a type-scene of sacrificial ritual depicts libations and fruit offerings and only two animal victims, a young bull and a plump fowl⁷⁷. The Punic sacrificial tariffs mentioned above include birds as victims, and Eudoxus of Cnidus attests Phoenician sacrifice of quail (mentioned at B 73 in our text) for Herakles of Tyre (Melqart)⁷⁸. Of the cultic practices of Seleucid Harran in upper Mesopotamia (Roman Carrhae) we hear that “Most of their sacrificial victims are cocks. The offering is not eaten but burned”⁷⁹. Birds were also used by the Hittites in purification rituals resembling the purifying of lepers in the Hebrew Bible⁸⁰.

Chickens, and in particular cocks, occur very frequently in the iconography—reliefs, statuary, and coins—of the Anatolian god Mên, who also receives cult in the goddess’s sanctuary at Marmarini⁸¹. Some literary sources apparently testify that the white cock was specially sacred to Mên, but this may merely be the result of confusion in the testimonia between the god’s name and the nouns μήν, “month” and μήνη, “moon”⁸².

No doubt the prominence of birds at Marmarini, both as sacrificial offerings and as purifying agents, reflects this Near Eastern background.

5.2 Holocaust Sacrifice

The elaborate set of provisions for elective holocaust sacrifice of various victims (ram or wether, goose, *trubba*-bird or quail) toward the end of the inscription (B 66-74) is without

⁷⁵ See P.A. BEAULIEU, “Egg Offerings for the Gods of Babylon”, *Nouvelles Assyriologiques Brèves et Utilitaires* 1991.3, no. 79, p. 50-52. For an English translation of the Seleucid evidence see PRITCHARD, *o.c.* (n. 65), p. 344.

⁷⁶ See e.g. D. PARDEE, *Ritual and Cult at Ugarit*, Leiden, 2002, index s.vv. “bird” and “goose”.

⁷⁷ See T. KAIZER, *The Religious Life of Palmyra*, Stuttgart, 2002, p. 179 with n. 45, and Plate IV.

⁷⁸ Eudoxus fr. 284b (ed. LASSERRE): Ath. IX, 392D-E; Diogenian. IV, 49; Zen. V, 56.

⁷⁹ See Ibn al-Nadīm, *Al-Fihrist* IX, 1 as translated in B. DODGE, *The Fihrist of al-Nadīm: A Tenth-Century Survey of Muslim Culture*, New York, 1970, vol. II, p. 748; cf. D. CHWOLSOHN, *Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus*, St Petersburg, 1856, vol. II, p. 8 (Arabic text and translation of Ibn al-Nadīm), p. 84-6 n. 53, p. 87-93 nn. 58-9. Al-Nadīm’s source here is the great Arab Muslim philosopher Abu Yūsuf Ya‘qūb ibn ‘Ishāq aṣ-Ṣabbāḥ al-Kindī of the ninth century AD. Much of our information about Harran in the Hellenistic and imperial periods comes from such late sources; see in general T. GREEN, *The City of the Moon God: Religious Traditions of Harran*, Leiden, 1992, especially Chapters 2 and 6.

⁸⁰ See HAAS, *o.c.* (n. 69), p. 665-6. Purification of lepers: Lev. 14:1-32.

⁸¹ E.N. LANE, *Corpus Monumentorum Religionis Dei Menis* I-IV, Leiden, 1971-1978, III, p. 101-2; G. LABARRE, *Le dieu Mên et son sanctuaire à Antioche de Pisidie*, Brussels, 2010, p. 35.

⁸² The testimonia have to do with the Pythagorean ban on touching or sacrificing white cocks: D.L. VIII, 34; Iamb. *VP* 84; cf. Iamb. *Protr.* 21. See LANE, *o.c.* (n. 81), III, p. 102; LABARRE, *o.c.* (n. 81), p. 25-7.

parallel in our evidence for Greek sacrifice, where holocausts tend to be prescribed on particular occasions and are relatively uncommon. Though the text says nothing about the grounds on which anyone might “wish to wholeburn” any of these victims, it suggests that such offerings were routine, and this too is probably best explained as a reflection of Near Eastern sacrificial practice.

There is considerable evidence for holocaust sacrifices at Near Eastern spring festivals such as the Babylonian New Year festival, the Hebrew Passover, and the spring festival in Harran with its holocaust of live animals⁸³ (all of these in the month Nisan), which resembles in this respect Lucian’s account of the spring festival for the Syrian Goddess⁸⁴. The holocausts at Marmarini are not connected (explicitly at any rate) with a particular ritual or festival occasion, but burnt offerings were also a routine, sometimes daily sacrificial procedure in various Near Eastern ritual traditions.

Of the five principal types of sacrifice described in Leviticus and elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, far the most common is עֹלָה, ‘olah or holocaust, generally translated “burnt offering” (but etymologically connected with “ascent”). It is sometimes called כָּלִיל, *kalil* or “whole offering”⁸⁵, which corresponds to the term כָּלֵל, *kll* used frequently of wholeburnt sacrifices in the Punic sacrificial tariffs⁸⁶. The central element of Hebrew temple worship was the public sacrifice every morning and evening of “the continual burnt offering”, הַתָּמִיד עֹלָה, ‘olat hatamid⁸⁷, and the phrase gives its name to the tractate *Tamid* in the Mishnah, which describes the ritual in detail⁸⁸. Public burnt offerings of various victims were also prescribed for the special sabbath and monthly sacrifices and those associated with the special festivals of the Israelite ritual year, Passover, Shavuoth (the Festival of Weeks), Rosh Hashanah (the New

⁸³ See Ibn al-Nadīm, *Al-Fihrist* IX, 1 translated DODGE, *o.c.* (n. 79), vol. II, p. 755-6; cf. CHWOLSOHN, *o.c.* (n. 79), vol. II, p. 23 (text and translation), p. 181-2 n. 162. Al-Nadīm attributes this information to Abu Sa’id Wahb ibn Ibrahim, whom he identifies as a Christian (probably of the ninth or tenth century AD). Cf. n. 79 above.

⁸⁴ Lucian, *Dea Syria* 49. For holocaust at spring festivals see e.g. H. SEYRIG, “Antiquités syriennes”, *Syria* 14 (1933), p. 238-82, at p. 277-9; D. SOURDEL, *o.c.* (n. 12), p. 109-10; J. LIGHTFOOT, *Lucian, On the Syrian Goddess*, Oxford, 2003, p. 503 with further references.

⁸⁵ Deut. 33:10, 1 Sam. 7:9, Psa. 51:19.

⁸⁶ See n. 65 above: *CIS* I, 165, l. 5, 7, 9; *CIS* I, 167, l. 2, 3, 4, 5. On the sacrificial practices of ancient Syria see e.g. H. GESE, M. HÖFNER, K. RUDOLPH, *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer*, Stuttgart, 1970, p. 174-5, 209. For interpretation of the term כָּלֵל, *kll* in the Punic tariffs see B.A. LEVINE, *In the Presence of the Lord: A Study of Cult and Some Cultic Terms in Ancient Israel*, Leiden, 1974, p. 120-22. On the shift in Hebrew terminology from *kalil* to ‘olah see e.g. MILGROM, *o.c.* (n. 67), p. 173-4.

⁸⁷ See Exodus 29:38-42, Numbers 28:1-8; for the phrase, Numbers chapters 28 and 29 *passim*, and in the Book of Daniel and the Mishnah simply הַתָּמִיד, “the continual one”. There is an excellent brief discussion with full citation of the sources and further references in E. SCHÜRER, revised and edited by G. VERMES, F. MILLAR, M. BLACK, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* II, Edinburgh, 1979, p. 295-308, esp. p. 299-301.

⁸⁸ DANBY, *o.c.* (n. 72), p. 582-9.

Year Festival or “Festival of Trumpets”), Yom Kippur (the Day of Atonement), and Sukkoth (the Festival of Booths)⁸⁹. Lambs were the victims in the daily public sacrifices, bulls, rams, and lambs on the monthly and festival occasions, but individuals could and did make elective burnt offerings of turtledoves/fowl and pigeons⁹⁰.

Hebrew tradition also provides a parallel for the prominent connection of incense with all three types of holocaust at Marmarini (B 69, 72-3, 74). The bible requires the construction of an altar of incense in the temple and alludes to the burning of incense which accompanied the morning and evening burnt offerings; extra-biblical sources specify that the incense was offered before the morning burnt offering and after that in the evening, as it were framing the daily holocausts⁹¹. The pseudepigraphical Book of Jubilees of the second century BC combines the elements of most interest to us in its imaginative vision of Noah’s offering on disembarking from the ark: “and he took a calf, a goat, a lamb, salt, a turtledove (fowl?), and a young dove, and he offered up a burnt offering on the altar. And he placed upon them an offering kneaded with oil. And he sprinkled wine, and placed frankincense upon everything. And he offered up a sweet aroma which was pleasing before the Lord”⁹².

Mesopotamian tradition offers no parallel for whole-burnt offerings⁹³; the focus of Mesopotamian sacrifice was “neither the slaughter of animals nor the process of consumption. Rather, they usually focus on presentation”⁹⁴, that is of meals to the gods. Holocaust is, however, a well-attested sacrificial mode in the Hittite/Hurrian realm, especially in north Syria and southern Anatolia, under the Hurrian term *ambašši* derived from the verb *am-* “burn (up)”; performed on a hearth, *ambašši*-sacrifices most often involved birds and lambs as victims⁹⁵. It was presumably this tradition in the north and/or common Semitic tradition from the south that affected sacrificial practice in the Syrian region, where we have, for example, burnt-offering (*šrp*, from the root “to burn”) in Ugarit and clear evidence for holocaust sacrifice in Palmyra, both under the Palmyrene term *mqlwt*’ and in texts composed in Greek⁹⁶. One Greek inscription, dated to 6 Nisan 163 AD, prescribes [όλό]κ[α]υστ[ο]ν θ[υσία]ν κατ’

⁸⁹ Sabbath and monthly: Numbers 28:9-15; Passover: Num. 28:16-25; Shavuoth: Num. 28:26-31; Rosh Hashanah: Num. 29:1-6; Yom Kippur: Num. 29:7-11; Sukkoth: Num. 29:12-39.

⁹⁰ See e.g. MESHEL, *o.c.* (n. 68) *ibid.*

⁹¹ Exodus 30:1-10; Mishnah tractate *Yoma* (“The Day of Atonement”) 3, 5; DANBY, *o.c.* (n. 72), p. 165; Philo Judaeus, *De spec. leg.* I, 35 (171); I, 51 (276).

⁹² Jubilees 6:3 in the English translation of the Ethiopic text by O.S. WINTERMUTE in J.H. CHARLESWORTH (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, New Haven, 1983, vol. 2, p. 66.

⁹³ See M.J.H. LINSSEN, *The Cults of Uruk and Babylon: The Temple Ritual Texts as Evidence for Hellenistic Cult Practice*, Leiden, 2004, p. 165-6 (citing isolated exceptions).

⁹⁴ T. ABUSCH, “Sacrifice in Mesopotamia”, in A.I. BAUMGARTEN (ed.), *Sacrifice in Religious Experience*, Leiden, 2002, p. 39-48, at p. 39.

⁹⁵ See HAAS, *o.c.* (n. 69), p. 661-2.

⁹⁶ See KAIZER, *o.c.* (n. 77), p. 194-5 with further references.

ἔτος τῇ ἀγαθῇ ἡμέρᾳ διαπαντός for an unknown recipient⁹⁷. At Palmyra as in the Hebrew evidence incense figures prominently in sacrificial ritual⁹⁸, and we also have the testimony of Herodotus that a thousand talents of incense a year is burnt for Baal in Babylon, and of Lucian that the “ambrosial odour” of incense strikes one from a distance as one approaches the sanctuary of the goddess and that one’s garments retain the scent of it when one leaves and one remembers it forever⁹⁹.

5.3 Table Offerings

We have mentioned that presentation of meals to the gods or “table offerings” are the commonest form of Mesopotamian sacrifice, and such offerings play a prominent role in cultic practice at Marmarini. We discuss below, for example, the previously unattested rite of *τραπεζοπλησία* or “table-filling”, which finds its closest parallel in the rite described by the phrase “to fill a table for the god” in the second-century AD cult of Mên Tyrannos at Sounion in Attica. The originally Anatolian Mên is a recipient of cult also at Marmarini, and tables of offering are prominent in both our visual and textual evidence for his cult, especially on reliefs (all of which also include depictions of cocks) from Athens and from Thorikos, which lies just north of Sounion on the east coast of Attica¹⁰⁰.

5.4 Tendence of Images

The new inscription involves a number of rites that seem to be focused on a statue of the goddess. At A 37 (cf. A 33) a *kotule* of oil is to be placed εἰς τὰς χεῖρας, which presumably means the hands of the statue of the goddess whose censuring we hear about at B 52-3: Πρὸς τὸ οὖας τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τὰς χα[ίτα]ς, λ[ι]βανωτόν, ζμύρναν θυμῖαν, ἀρώματα, μῦρον ρόδιον, κτλ.¹⁰¹. The prescription κοσμεῖν τὴν θεὸν on the 14th of the month during the festival Eloulaia (A 8) clearly refers to the goddess’s image, as may τὴν θεὸν in [τ]ὰ τῷ περὶ τὴν

⁹⁷ See J.-B. YON, *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie XVII, 1: Palmyre*, Beirut, 2012, no. 131. The lacunose previous line of the inscription quoted—also printed and discussed by KAIZER, *o.c.* (n. 77), p. 207-8—contains the letters καρπου, possibly a form of the verb καρποῦν, which indicates whole-burning: see LSJ *s.v.*, P. STENGEL, *Opferbräuche der Griechen*, Leipzig, 1910, p. 166-168; Sokolowski, *LSAM*, p. 49-50 for a collection of occurrences. The other Palmyrene inscription (YON no. 381)—also printed and discussed by KAIZER, *o.c.* (n. 77), p. 226-6—has line-initial ὁλόκανστο[. “The Good Day” seems to be a festival in the month Nisan; cf. the bilingual inscription of 132 AD, YON no. 130, with KAIZER, *o.c.* (n. 77), p. 160 with n. 479.

⁹⁸ KAIZER, *o.c.* (n. 77), p. 163-4, 177-8, 195-6.

⁹⁹ Hdt. I, 183; Lucian, *Dea Syria* 30: see LIGHTFOOT, *o.c.* (n. 84), p. 432-3 ad loc. with further references.

¹⁰⁰ See B. LEVICK, “The Table of Mên”, *JHS* 91 (1971), p. 80-84; LANE, *o.c.* (n. 81), III, p. 13-14; LABARRE, *o.c.* (n. 81), p. 57-8 with further references. Reliefs from Greece: LANE, *o.c.* (n. 81), I, p. 1-3 nos. 1-4, p. 6-7 no. 10.

¹⁰¹ We can make out the alpha of χα[ίτα]ς on the photograph of the inscription, so e.g. πρὸς τὸ οὖας τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τὰς χε[ῖρα]ς is not a plausible reading.

θεὸν ἱερῶν in A 4-6 (cf. p. 00 below). Cleansing and decoration of a divine image are well-attested in Greek cult, but we are unaware of any Greek parallel for the censuring of the ear(s) or hair of an image of a god or goddess, and it may be that Near Eastern influence is detectable here too. Especially in Mesopotamian tradition, statues of gods play a central role in ritual. Thorkild Jacobsen discusses the elaborate ritual process by which new statues have their materiality negated and are “brought to life”¹⁰². A neo-Babylonian text of 600-500 BC describes how a new statue is taken to the side of a river, “brought to life” there, and returned thence to its temple¹⁰³, which might (or might not) be relevant to the provision in our inscription that the procession of the Nisanaia festival be held “if the goddess comes from the river, on the next day” (B 62-3) and to the ἐς τὴν λίμνην καταβάσεις, “descends to the lake” of τὰ ἱερά, “the sacred images” which Lucian describes in the cult of the Syrian goddess¹⁰⁴. Caution is in order, but the tendance of the divine image at Marmarini may reflect such traditions.

5.5 The Mesopotamian “Washing of the Mouth” Ceremony (*mīs pī*)

The process by which Mesopotamian statues of gods are “brought to life” is the ritual of *mīs pī* or “mouth-washing”, a purification ritual that occurs in a wide variety of contexts and is attested from early Sumerian sources down through Seleucid Uruk¹⁰⁵. The earliest use of the ritual seems to be for the dedication of divine images, and the mouth-washing is performed on the statue; the whole dedication ritual seems in fact to be referred to as “the *mīs pī*”, and the mouth-washing (whatever form it took on a statue) is performed fourteen times in the course of it¹⁰⁶. The *mīs pī* is also used—again often repeatedly—in the initiation of priests (in combination with a shaving ritual, cf. A 19, 20, 27 in our text)¹⁰⁷ and on the Assyrian king¹⁰⁸.

¹⁰² T. JACOBSEN, “The Graven Image”, in P.D. MILLER, JR., P.D. HANSON, S.D. MCBRIDE (eds.), *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*, Philadelphia, 1987, p. 15-32. Cf. e.g. the Babylonian temple ritual for the new year translated in PRITCHARD, *o.c.* (n. 65), p. 331-4.

¹⁰³ Original publication, with English translation: S. SMITH, “The Babylonian Ritual for the Consecration and Induction of a Divine Statue”, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1925, p. 37-60 with plates II-IV; translation and discussion in E. EBELING, *Tod und Leben nach den Vorstellungen der Babylonier I Teil: Texte*, Berlin, 1931, no. 26, p. 100-108 (cf. no. 27, p. 108-14). More recently published texts of a later period with translation and commentary in W.R. MAYER, “Seleukidische Rituale aus Warka mit Emesal-Gebeten”, *Orientalia* N.S. 47 (1978), p. 431-58, at p. 443-58. For purification in a river in Mesopotamian ritual see too n. 232 below.

¹⁰⁴ *Dea Syria* 47.

¹⁰⁵ For a helpful discussion of the *mīs pī* and its various employments see V. HUROWITZ, “Isaiah’s Impure Lips and Their Purification in Light of Akkadian Sources”, *Hebrew Union College Annual* 60 (1989), p. 39-89, esp. p. 47-73; more briefly, with citation of texts and further references, LINSSEN, *o.c.* (n. 93), p. 153-4.

¹⁰⁶ EBELING, *o.c.* (n. 103), no. 26, lines 2, 11, 24, 26, 28-9, 30-1, 33-6, 47, 63.

¹⁰⁷ In Sumerian, Akkadian, and bilingual texts ca. 1000-700 BC: R. BORGER, “Die Weihe eines Enlil-Priesters”, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 30 (1973), p. 163-76; excerpts translated in W. FARBER, H.M. KÜMMEL, W.H.P. RÖMER, *Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments Band II: Religiöse Texte: Rituale und Beschwörungen I*, Gütersloh, 1987, p. 171-5.

In other contexts it is performed on animals and also on inanimate objects¹⁰⁹, e.g. on a bull that is sacrificed and its hide used to make the drum of a *kalu*-priest (who performs lamentation ritual) and then on the drum itself¹¹⁰, and also e.g. on a torch in the temple of Anu in Uruk: “The *mahhu*-priest, wearing a sash, shall use a *naphtha* fire to light a large torch in which aromatics have been inserted, and which has been sprinkled with sweet oil, and upon which “washing of the mouth” has been performed”¹¹¹.

If this kind of rite is in the background of the cult at Marmarini—which, as we have seen, certainly has elements in common with the neo-Babylonian material—it may be relevant to the difficult passage about initiation during “the Rite of the Goddess” (A 18-23), if the newly attested verb διακλαίνειν in the twice-repeated phrase διακλαινέστω τὸ στόμα means “cleanse”¹¹². If, to those who developed the rite at Marmarini, Babylonian “mouth-washing” was a familiar ritual which occurred in a variety of contexts (including initiations of priests which also involved shaving), then it could readily be transferred to non-priestly initiation and, to judge from the parallels, performed to purify an initiate himself, or a bird used in a rite of initiation. This is of course highly uncertain—in itself, the new verb could more readily be explained as a variant of διακλάω with the factitive/causative -αίνω suffix—but given other striking parallels between the new text and Mesopotamian traditions it seems possible that the equivalence between the plausible sense “cleanse the mouth” and Mesopotamian *mīs pī* is not coincidental.

6/ Initiation

Initiation has a central place in the text, and we need to try to locate the evidence from Marmarini in relation to what else is known about the phenomenon in the Hellenistic period. ‘Initiations’, in the sense of rites access to which is achieved by being subject to an act of τελεῖν, are broadly of two types, the second of which mutates into what should perhaps be recognised as a third¹¹³. (We disregard here the class of maturation rites often so described in

¹⁰⁸ G. MEIER, “Die Ritualtafel der Serie ‘Mundwaschung’”, *Archiv für Orientforschung* 12 (1937), p. 40-45.

¹⁰⁹ HUROWITZ, *o.c.* (n. 105), p. 52 with n. 34, p. 54 with n. 41.

¹¹⁰ PRITCHARD, *o.c.* (n. 65), p. 334-8: see p. 335 towards the bottom of the first column (bull) and of the second column (drum); this version of the ceremony was inscribed in Uruk in the Seleucid period.

¹¹¹ F. THUREAU-DANGIN, *Rituel accadien*, Paris, 1921, p. 119: no. IV, “Une cérémonie nocturne dans le temple d’Anu”, lines 28-30; translation in PRITCHARD, *o.c.* (n. 65), p. 338-9.

¹¹² As Andreas Willi has suggested to us it could, below n. 225.

¹¹³ Cf. J.N. BREMMER, *Initiation into the Mysteries of the Ancient World*, Berlin, 2014, p. xii-xiii.

modern, but not ancient, terminology; they are irrelevant here.) Some require travel to a particular sanctuary with which they are exclusively associated: such in the classical period were the Mysteries of Eleusis and Samothrace and of the Kabeirion at Thebes, and perhaps some others from the many that are attested later. With Eleusis and Samothrace the verb *μυεῖν* and the noun *μυστήρια* are particularly associated, but religious vocabulary could not be patented and the noun in particular came to be used more generally¹¹⁴. These mysteries were celebrated in a special ‘initiation-hall’, and typically at one fixed point in the year (though those of Samothrace are thought to have been more flexible). One went away from such an initiation with a permanent status as initiated (though two visits might be required to reach the highest grade), and having achieved (according to the promise of the cult) a permanent benefit: a better fate in the afterlife at Eleusis, security in sea-voyages on Samothrace. There would be no reason to re-visit the sanctuary, though some initiates may have done so for the pleasure of the experience.

Other initiations belong to a particular god rather than a particular sanctuary, and can be administered in multiple locations wherever a qualified minister of that god is present: of such a type are the initiations (found in many places) of Dionysos, Mother, the Korybantes, probably Demeter, and those performed by the Orpheotelestai¹¹⁵. The element of ‘revelation’ so important at Eleusis and Samothrace was not necessarily present; what mattered rather was participation in a dramatic ritual. Nor is it clear that such rites always offered lasting benefits to their initiates. Perfect passive participles implying a change of status are found in relation to the rites of Dionysus and the Korybantes (*βεβακχευμένος*, *κεκορυβαντισμένος*), the former in one case at least allowing access to a privileged burial plot¹¹⁶. The rites of the Orpheotelestai offered release from guilt, now and after death; the Korybantic rites release from mental disturbance. But other permanent benefits promised by these initiations are uncertain. It may be that the prime reason for being initiated to Dionysus or to the Mother was to be able to participate in certain rites not once but regularly; thus the main festival of Demeter on Mykonos was open to Mykonian women by right, but to women merely resident

¹¹⁴ See M. STAMATOPOULOU and R. PARKER, “A New Funerary Gold Leaf from Pherai”, *AEph*, 2004, p. 1-32, at p. 8-9, and note the application of *μεμνημένος* to the Samothracian Mysteries in Aristophanes, *Pax*, 278.

¹¹⁵ Dionysos Bacch(e)ios in Olbia (Hdt. IV, 79,1) and Miletus (*Milet* VI,3,1222 [*LSAM*, 48], l. 18-20); Dionysos Thylophoros on Cos (*IG* XII 4, 304, l. 18-21, ib. 326 [*LSCG*, 166], l. 23-26); Dionysos in Egypt (the edict of Ptolemy (?) IV Philopator: *SB* 3, 7266); Mother in Priene (*I.Priene* [2014], 145, l. 15-21), in Troizen (*IG* IV, 757 B, l. 10-11: cf. STAMATOPOULOU and PARKER, *o.c.* [n. *114], p. 14) and probably at Minoia on Amorgos (*LSCG*, 103 B, l. 11-12); the Korybantes in many places (BREMNER, *o.c.* [n. *113], p. 48-53); probably Demeter on Mykonos (*LSCG*, 96, l. 22) and perhaps in Athens (*LSCG*, 36, l. 3-4).

¹¹⁶ *LSS*, 120, *IG* XII 6, 1197.

on the island only if they had been ‘initiated to Demeter’¹¹⁷. On this view initiation meant entry into a cult society. But the truth is that we know very little of the initiators for (say) Dionysos and Mother attested in the inscriptions: where they initiated and how often, how permanent or otherwise were the groups of initiates they assembled.

Out of these ‘wandering initiator’ rites (though not from them alone) emerged cult associations with fixed membership and fixed locations; as the associations proliferate, the wandering initiators disappear¹¹⁸. Some cult associations use the language of initiation, others not. Where it was used, a specific and no doubt striking ritual was probably referred to, to which life-changing powers may have been ascribed, but even in that case the longer consequence was membership of a society: initiation was not a fulfilment but a beginning¹¹⁹. The members of some such societies came to be described as μύσται and their rites as μυστήρια, without it being clear that the change of vocabulary brought with it a change of ritual¹²⁰. An important and unexpected early instance is a society of μύσται based at a sanctuary of Apollo Pleurenos near Sardis, already attested in late Seleucid times. One does not normally associate Apollo with mysteries. It seems possible that an indigenous closed religious grouping of some kind has re-styled itself under the Greek title of μύσται¹²¹.

The initiations of the new inscription do not fit neatly into any of these categories. They are tied to a particular sanctuary. Non-initiates are spoken of as ἀμύητοι as well as as ἀτέλεστοι. On the other hand, the initiation offered is closer to entry into a cult society than a unique, life-changing experience: it is clearly envisaged that initiates will continue to frequent the shrine, and there is no mention of a revelation. In this sense our cult can be compared to the societies which, heirs to the ‘wandering initiator’ type of cult, have settled down in a fixed location. But what has emerged in this case is not a closed cult society. The

¹¹⁷ *LSCG*, 96, l. 20-22.

¹¹⁸ So W. BURKERT, *Ancient Mystery Cults*, Cambridge, Mass., 1987, p. 34.

¹¹⁹ A.F. JACCOTTET, *Choisir Dionysos: les associations dionysiaques, ou, La face cachée du dionysisme*, Lausanne, 2003, I, p. 143-4.

¹²⁰ On all this see JACCOTTET, *o.c.* (n. *119), I, p. 123-146, an excellent nuanced account; on the vocabulary of μύσται (‘phénomène plus lexical que religieux’) ib. p. 141; cf. p. 127 n. 26 ad fin.: ‘il y a de vrais mystères sans mystes, tout comme il y a des mystes sans véritables mystères’. On the weakened sense of mysteries see N. BELAYCHE, “L’évolution des formes rituelles: hymnes et mystéria”, in L. BRICAULT, C. BONNET (eds.), *Panthée: religious transformations in the Graeco-Roman Empire*, Leiden, 2013, p. 17-40, at p. 35-39.

¹²¹ *SEG* XLVI, 1519 (J. MA, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford, 1999, p. 371, no. 49); on the cult cf. ib. 1520, *SEG* XXXII, 1237, P. HERRMANN, “Mystenvereine in Sardeis”, *Chiron* 26 (1996), p. 315-348, at p. 318-21 (who refers to the Apollo Mystes of Daldi, Artemidorus, *Onirocritica*, II, 70, p. 203 Pack). L. CAPDETREY, *Le pouvoir séleucide: territoire, administration, finances d’un royaume hellénistique, 312-129 avant J.-C.*, Rennes, 2007, p. 171, supposes the cult to have been controlled by ‘une famille sacerdotale indigène’, which is not demonstrable: but the priest in question has a good Lydian name, Kadoas son of Pleri. Also probably late hellenistic, but unassignable to a cult, are a group of μύσται at Teos, *BCH* 4, 1880, p. 164, no. 21.

restrictions on access for the uninitiated to particular parts of the sanctuary show that other parts were open to them, at least on occasions. No secure parallel presents itself for a sanctuary thus serving both an initiated and a lay community¹²². One may think, however, of the later development in the cult of Isis, in which initiates apparently constituted an elite (of commitment and of wealth) amid a broader community of devotees.

An obvious question is whether initiations accompanied the goddess from wherever she came from, or were added to the cult in Greece. Clear evidence for such practices is hard to find from outside Greece or regions subject to Greek influence. Standard handbooks of the various ancient near eastern religions do not speak of them¹²³. It is generally accepted that Herodotus was misapplying a Greek concept when he claimed that the Egyptians described the Khoak festival of Osiris as Mysteries¹²⁴. A celebrated and complicated text from Sardis instructs νεωκόροι in the cult of ‘Zeus of Baradates’ (or Bagadates) μὴ μετέχειν μυστηρίων Σαβαζίου τῶν τὰ ἔνπυρα βασταζόντων καὶ Ἀνγδιστεως καὶ Μᾶς. But it is debated whether this portion of this perhaps composite text belongs in 366/5 (or even 426/5) B.C. or rather in the Roman period¹²⁵. Even if we accept an early date, all other evidence on the cult of Sabazius and Angdistis and Ma suggests that ‘mysteries’ here means ‘ecstatic rites’ (possibly preceded by some form of initiation)¹²⁶, certainly not Mysteries revealed at a fixed site in the style of Eleusis or Samothrace. At Thuria in Messenia in the 1st c. B.C., a benefactor who had promised to provide oil throughout his life for the ‘days of the Mysteries’ of what must, from the context, have been the Syrian goddess, was granted a front seat at those Mysteries and a place of honour in the procession. This text has been associated with the theatres found

¹²² The view that two ‘no entry to non initiates’ signs found in the excavations of the mystery sanctuary on Samothrace relate to particular buildings, not the whole precinct, has been strongly challenged: see most recently K. CLINTON, “Preliminary Initiation in the Eleusinian Mystera”, in A. MATTHAIOU and I. POLINSKAYA (eds.), *Mikros Hieromnemon. Meletes eis Mnemen Michael H. Jameson*, Athens, 2008, p. 25-34, at p. 26-7. Isis: see BURKERT, *o.c.*, (n. *118), p. 41.

¹²³ S. MAYASSIS, *Mystères et initiations dans la préhistoire et protohistoire, de l'Anté-Diluvien à Sumer-Babylone*, Athens, 1961, appears to be an isolated voice.

¹²⁴ II, 171, 1. See BREMMER, *o.c.* (n. *113), p. 110-114, with references. The origins of Isiac mysteries are obscure: P. MARTZAVOU, “Priests and Priestly Roles in the Isiac Cults”, in A. CHANIOTIS (ed.), *Ritual Dynamics in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Stuttgart, 2011, p. 61-84, at p. 73-6, tentatively looks to Delos in the second c. B.C.

¹²⁵ SEG XXIX, 1205 (P.A. HARLAND, *Greco-Roman Associations, II, North Coast of the Black Sea, Asia Minor*, Berlin, 2014, no. 120); cf. the overviews of debate in P. DEBORD, *L'Asie mineure au IV^e siècle*, Bordeaux, 1999, p. 367-374, and HARLAND, *o.c.*, p. 207.

¹²⁶ Sabazius: all evidence is problematic: on Demosthenes’ comic picture of Aeschines’ youth, 18, 259-60, see G. MARTIN, *Divine Talk*, Oxford, 2009, p. 104-112; on Christian authors E.N. LANE, *Corpus Cultus Iovis Sabazii*, III, *Conclusions*, Leiden, 1989, p. 59-60. In a late text from Ormeleis (E.N. LANE, *Corpus Cultus Iovis Sabazii*, II, *The Other Monuments and Literary Evidence*, Leiden, 1985, no. 4: probably 207-8 AD) μύσται probably = ‘association members’, as often in that period. Angdistis: see above on the rites of Mother, her Greek name. Ma: see e.g. A. HARTMANN, *RE* XIV.1 (1928) s.v. “Ma”, p. 86. Mysteries are not attested in the cult of Mên.

in other Syrian sanctuaries, most notably in that of Atargatis and Hadad on Delos¹²⁷. But there is no mention of initiation or mysteries in the quite numerous documents relating to that Delian cult; WILL in his publication of the sanctuary sees the theatre as intended for ‘festivals at which divine images were led in procession before the community of worshippers’, a community which the very size of the theatre requires us to envisage as open and non-exclusive¹²⁸. To revert to Thuria, it lies at one end of a valley at the other end of which is Andania, site of authentic Greek Mysteries, and rivalrous imitation by Thuria of the prestigious neighbour must be a serious possibility¹²⁹. Whether this would have meant mere re-naming of a ritual of display, such as that to be postulated for Delos, or actual re-shaping to involve an initiation, is not clear; but in neither case do we have reliable evidence for Mysteries brought from Syria. The probability is that it was within Greece that the rites of our cult received their initiatory/mystic shape. One might speculate that part of this process was the extension to ordinary initiates of ritual requirements such as ‘shaving’ (below)¹³⁰ hitherto forming part of the installation of cult functionaries in their office.

When did initiation happen? The day-by-day listing of the rituals of the month Itonios in side A breaks off in A 18 with an interpunct followed by Τελετὴ τῆς Θεοῦ. That juxtaposition may suggest that initiation typically occurred in the context of the E/Aloulaia in Itonios. But we cannot be sure that it was pinned to a fixed point; the priestess might have conducted it at various times, when there was demand. Another possible indication comes from the reference to an ἀγερμός, apparently imposed on the initiand as a requirement, in A 25-26. The ἀγερμοί on side B (17-21) fall in Itonios, in the run up to the Eloulaia. If that by initiands formed part of the same collecting operation, the τελετή is pinned to Itonios by a different argument. But this is far from certain.

A different uncertainty arises from variations in terminology. In A 3-4 and A 8 οἱ τετελεσμένοι appear; the process of initiation in A 18-24 is τελίσκεσθαι, and there are restrictions on ἀτέλεστοι in A 35, B 49, 75, 78. But in B 1, 7, 13 different restrictions are placed on ἀμύητοι. A logical possibility is that there were two grades of initiation, comparable (if differently named) to the distinction at Eleusis and Samothrace between *mystai* and *epoptai*. On that view, the difference between the restrictions apparently imposed

¹²⁷ So e.g. A.D. NOCK, *Conversion*, Oxford, 1933, p. 60; M.P. NILSSON, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, II, Munich, 1961² [1950], p. 640, on the inscription N. VALMIN, “Inscriptions de la Messénie”, *Bull. Soc. Royale des Lettres de Lund*, 1928-9, p. 123-4, no. 2, l. 19-24. Dea Syria’s sanctuary at Thuria is already a place for document display a century earlier: VALMIN, *l.c.*, 109-110, no. 1.

¹²⁸ *Le sanctuaire de la Déesse Syrienne* (Paris, 1985), p. 112 and 139.

¹²⁹ This is ‘widely acknowledged’ according to LIGHTFOOT, *o.c.* (n. 84), p. 76.

¹³⁰ And even perhaps ‘mouth-washing’ (p. 00 above).

on the two groups would arise because it did not need stating that the restrictions affecting those who had reached the higher grade of initiation also applied to the lesser: the ἀμύητοι, if they were the lower grade¹³¹, would be subject to all the restrictions placed on the ἀτέλεστοι, plus some of their own. But it is more plausible that the variation is due to careless drafting, particularly because it only occurs in negative expressions: for the two terms used synonymously cf. e.g. Plato, *Phaedo*, 69c ὃς ἂν ἀμύητος καὶ ἀτέλεστος εἰς Ἅϊδου ἀφίκηται ἐν βορβόρῳ κείσεται, ὁ δὲ κεκαθαρμένος τε καὶ τετελεσμένος ἐκεῖσε ἀφικόμενος μετὰ θεῶν οἰκήσει; Diodorus Siculus, III, 62, 8-9 τὰ παρεισαγόμενα κατὰ τὰς τελετάς, περὶ ὧν οὐ θέμις τοῖς ἀμυήτοις ἱστορεῖν τὰ κατὰ μέρος.

A harder complication arises from A 18-23. Two categories of person desiring initiation are apparently contrasted in two successive sentences; in the first sentence only one category is now identifiable, ‘any of the unpurified’ (τις τῶν ἀκαθάρτων), but in the second we have a clear opposition between ‘a pure one of the goddess’ (ἄγνός τοῦ θεοῦ) and ‘the impure one’. ἀκάθαρος might perhaps mean ‘uninitiated’, even though this usage lacks exact parallels¹³² and would introduce yet another variation from the vocabulary of ἀτέλεστος and ἀμύητος discussed above. On this view, however, the other category ought to be that of the initiated, and we are left to wonder why, if already initiated, they would need to be initiated again. If the opposition is not between initiated and non-initiated, but between two categories of potential initiate, we have no clue what it might refer to. ἄγνοί of a god(dess) and a recognisable class of ἀκαθαροί¹³³ are not otherwise attested.

The detailed description of the τελετὴ τῆς θεοῦ comes in the semi-decipherable middle portion of side A (whether it continues into the almost completely abraded lower part is unclear). Much survives, but not enough to allow a convincing picture of the whole. There are purifications (see below), sacrifices and their accompanying table offerings, collections, a mysterious ritual involving a σχοῖνος, ‘reed’ or ‘cord’ or possibly ‘reed basket’, something placed ‘in the hands’ (of the goddess’ statue?), a role (mysterious and unparallelled again) for individuals ‘lifting the first bowl’ and ‘the second bowl’: ‘the priestess’ is apparently

¹³¹ The opposite hierarchy would also be possible.

¹³² The effect of initiation could be spoken of as a purification, as in Plato, *Phaedo*, 69c quoted above (cf. Pl. *Phaedrus*, 250 C; A. BERNABÉ, *Poetae Epici Graeci II, Orphicorum...Fragmenta*, fasc. 2, Munich, 2005, fr. 488.1, with BERNABÉ’s note), but the strongly negative term ἀκάθαρος – which often means ‘dirty villain’ – was not normally applied to a non-initiate; note, however, μηθένα ἀκάθαρον προσάγειν in *LSCG* 55, 3, a text with some similarities to ours (p. 00 below).

¹³³ The term appears in a virulently anti-semitic account of the Jewish Exodus from Egypt in Lysimachus, *FGrH* 62, F 1, where the Jews are οἱ ἀκάθαροι; Strabo reports that elephant hunters in Arabia were called ἀκάθαροι by ‘the Nomads’, and that the same term was applied to their μάγιστροι by the Troglodytes (Strabo, XVI, 4, 10 and 17). These reports can have no direct connection with our text.

mentioned only as a receiver of perquisites, though one might have expected her to play a central part. The detail that shines amid the gloom is the requirement, unique among Greek sacred laws but several times repeated, ξυρεῖσθαι. The word is used for shaving very generally; often the part of the body affected is specified, but in our text it is assumed that every participant in the cult will know what is meant. In a religious context much the commonest requirement is for shaving of the head (even if, in Hierapolis/Bambyke, iconography shows priests with shaven chins, not heads¹³⁴); that, therefore, is probably the force here. As a rule for (male) participants, as opposed to priests¹³⁵, shaving of the head is most widely attested in Egyptian cults¹³⁶. But it also occurs elsewhere: according to Lucian, the first act of each male travelling to the goddess' *panegyris* at Hierapolis/Bambyke was to shave his head and eyebrows; Macrobius tells how the statue of Juppiter Heliopolitanus was carried during divinatory processions by *provinciae procures raso capite*¹³⁷.

There is, however, no trace of such requirements in the Egyptian or Syrian cults on Delos. Bremmer, discussing the requirement of a shaven head in the Isis mysteries of the high imperial period, has commented 'This has meant that many upper-class males will have refrained from this initiation, and it is noteworthy that Apuleius does not mention the shaving of Lucius' own head in his initiation into the Mysteries of Isis'¹³⁸. Very important here is the editors' reading of A 27 as ἔαν δὲ [μὴ] ξυρήσῃται, τῆς ἱλατηρίας ὀβολὸν IAM [...]. Without more context, this is a slippery foundation for an important claim. But it appears to state that one could exempt oneself from the shaving requirement by payment of an obol for a propitiatory offering. Indeed this option may even have been the cheaper if it exempted one from the three obols paid to the goddess for the σχοῖνος before shaving (A 26-7)¹³⁹.

¹³⁴ LIGHTFOOT, *o.c.* (n. 84), p. 517.

¹³⁵ For Egyptian priests see Hdt. 2, 36, 1; 2, 37, 2 (whole body, every three days); Lucian, *On Sacrifices*, 14; Artemidorus, *Onirocritica*, I, 22; for priests in Palmyra and Phoenicia H. SEYRIG, "Bas-reliefs monumentaux du temple de Bêl à Palmyre", *Syria* 15 (1934), p. 155-186, at p. 159; at Gades, Silius Italicus, III, 28.

¹³⁶ For Isis see Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, XI, 10, 1 (*tunc influunt turbae sacris divinis initiatae, viri feminaeque omnis dignitatis et omnis aetatis linteae vestis candore puro luminosi, illae limpido tegmine crines madidos obvolutae, hi capillum derasi funditus verticem praenitentes*), XI, 28, 5, XI, 30, 5; Martial, XII, 2, 19; Juvenal, VI, 533; Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, 3-4 (*Moralia* 352C-D), * Lactantius, *Divinae Institutiones*, I, 21, 20, *deglabrato corpore*; for a festival of Khnoum at Esna in the Ptolemaic period S. SAUNERON, *Les fêtes religieuses d' Esna*, Cairo, 1962, p. 344-5 (translation); idem, *Le temple d' Esna* III, Cairo, 1968, no. 197 (hieroglyphic text); for the Egyptian Adonia G. GLOTZ, "Les fêtes d' Adonis sous Ptolémée II", *REG* 33 (1920), p. 169-222, at p. 182-4 (on *P. Petr.* 3.142).

¹³⁷ Lucian, *Dea Syria*, 55; Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, I, 23, 13. For sacred barbers attached to Phoenician shrines see *CIS* I, 86A, l. 12 (Kition), ib. 257-9, 588 (Carthage), with O. MASSON, M. SZNYCER, *Recherches sur les Phéniciens à Chypre*, Geneva, 1972, p. 50-51; cf. T.S.F. JIM, "Seized by the Nymph?", *Kernos* 25 (2012), p. 9-26, at p.19.

¹³⁸ *o.c.* (n. * 113), p. 139.

¹³⁹ The editors render σχοῖνος 'basket' ('corbeille'), though admitting that the reference is unknown: *o.c.* (n. *2), p. 45. σχοῖνος means 'rush, reed' or (LSJ II.1) 'anything twisted or plaited of rushes, esp. rope, cord': basket

As a requirement for women as well as men, shaving the head is much less common; in the cult of Isis, for instance, where (some, at least) men shaved, women wore headscarves¹⁴⁰. Much earlier, in an Akkadian text of the 13th c B.C. from Emar, a high-priestess is shaved as part of her installation ritual¹⁴¹, and both male and female Nazirites in the Hebrew Bible allow their hair to grow during the period of their vow and, when it is complete, “shall shave the consecrated head at the entrance of the tent of meeting” and burn the hair on the altar fire¹⁴²; the biblical material is commonly attributed to the P(riestly) source, which most scholars date ca. 600-400 B.C. (though some regard it as earlier). But in the Greco-Roman period head-shaving by women appears to be attested only in the cult of Adonis at Byblos (and there only by Lucian), where it can be seen¹⁴³ as an expression of mourning. If we accept that in initiations it was probably not asked of women, the regulations in our text concern men only. But women entered the precinct (B 26-29) and performed numerous functions in the cult; it is hard to believe they were excluded from initiation.

A further word in this section deserves comment. In A 18 an initiand is required to ‘tend (the goddess) (θεραπεύειν) for three days’. θεραπεύειν recurs in A 29. Words from this root are standard for ‘pay cult to’ in a very general sense¹⁴⁴. In the hellenistic period there emerges the concept of the θεραπευταί of a particular god: it is first attested¹⁴⁵ in relation to the Egyptian and Syrian gods on Delos, but later can cover e.g. the devotees of Asclepius at Pergamum¹⁴⁶. On the most widely accepted view¹⁴⁷, it designates all persons particularly attached to the cult of the god in question, not an association or sub-group. This

would then seem a possible meaning, but no instance is quoted. If it is a basket as the editors suppose, one might speculate that it served for collection of the shaven hair for some ritual purpose: the Nazirites in the Bible burn theirs on the altar (n. * 142 below).

¹⁴⁰ Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, XI, 10,1, quoted in n. * 136.

¹⁴¹ D. ARNAUD, *Recherches au pays d’Aštata*, Paris, 1986 (Emar VI, 3), no. 369, lines 7-28; English translation in W.W. HALLO and K.L. YOUNGER, *The Context of Scripture*, Leiden, 1996, p. 427-8; see also D.E. FLEMING, *The Installation of Baal’s High Priestess at Emar*, Atlanta, 1992, p. 11 (text in transcription), 50 (translation), 181-2 (discussion of shaving).

¹⁴² Growing: Numbers 6:5, cf. Samson in Judges 13:5, 16:4-31; shaving: Numbers 6:18. For a discussion of ritual shaving in the bible, citing much comparative material, see S.M. OLYAN, *Social Inequality in the World of the Text: The Significance of Ritual and Social Distinctions in the Hebrew Bible*, Göttingen, 2011, p. 37-49.

¹⁴³ So LIGHTFOOT, *o.c.* (n. 84), note on Lucian, *Dea Syria*, 6.

¹⁴⁴ J. RUDHARDT, *Notions fondamentales de la pensée religieuse et actes constitutifs du culte dans la Grèce classique*, Paris, 1992² [1958], p. 141. It appears in Xanthos’ regulations for his cult of Mên (cf. p. 00 below), *LSCG*, 55, l. 12.

¹⁴⁵ Unless *SEG* XXIX, 1205 takes it back to Sardis in the 360s: on the dating of this text see n. *125.

¹⁴⁶ Aelius Aristides, XLVIII, 47.

¹⁴⁷ See references in HERRMANN, *o.c.* (n. *121), p. 322, who is sceptical; this view is re-stated by M.F. BASLEZ, “Les associations à Délos”, in P. FRÖHLICH, P. HAMON (eds.), *Groupes et associations dans les cités grecques*, Geneva, 2013, p. 227-249, at p. 244-7.

implication of a particular commitment seems relevant here, and the time limitation implies the performance of specific acts; what they were we do not know.

What could initiates do that non-initiates could not? As we saw above, they had access to areas of the sanctuary, and rights of sacrifice on altars, from which non-initiates were excluded. But beyond this the text is maddeningly imprecise. In A 3-4 a preliminary sacrifice to Moira is to be made by ‘any one who wishes (τὸν βουλόμενον) of the initiated’. In the many repetitions of the phrase ‘any who wishes’ (A 10, 15), or ‘if anyone wishes’ (B 24, 35, etc.) it is unclear whether the restriction of A 3-4 to ‘of the initiated’ still applies or not. In one case it clearly does: at B 45-9 the prescription for ‘anyone (who) wishes to make a complete “full table” for the goddess’, specifies the food offerings that are to be brought, and concludes ‘an uninitiated person does not taste of these’: thus the bringer of the full table must be an initiate. But, by contrast with ‘an uninitiated person does not taste of these’, one might naturally take ‘let anyone who pleases eat of it’ in the immediately preceding regulation (B 45) as completely open. Similarly, ‘anyone who wishes shall process’ (B 64-5) at the Nisanaia or the Aloulaia sounds like a general invitation, even if ‘all those who wish to sacrifice’ (B 61) on the same occasions may well have been a more restricted group. Thus ‘anyone who wishes’ apparently in some cases but not others requires the tacit addition ‘of the initiated’. A pervasive uncertainty is the consequence. It is arguable that the many sacrificial regulations of side B are addressed exclusively to initiates. But, on our interpretation, non-initiates are free to sacrifice fowl on the altar of Moira and Helios¹⁴⁸.

7/ Sacrificial Terms and Procedures

7.1 Θύειν and Compounds

The new text is rich in sacrificial terminology, some of it difficult to interpret, some of it rare or novel. It contains a wider range of compounds of θύειν than any extant inscription: apart from the simplex itself and the common προθύειν (A 3, B 22) we find ἀποθύειν (A 9, B 44), ἐπιθύειν (B 31), and μεταθύειν (B 2-3, 14). The sequences in which these terms occur make their precise sense clear in every case.

The standard terms θυσία and θύειν occur frequently and require no special comment¹⁴⁹. In one case, θύειν is probably used as simplex for compound after προθύσαι: Προθύσαι πρώτη τῇ Φυλ[α]κῇ καὶ τῷ Μηνὶ θύματα λιβανωτόν. Ἐὰν δέ τις θυσίαν

¹⁴⁸ See p. 00.

¹⁴⁹ Noun θυσία A 1, 6, B 21, 24, 37; verb θύειν A 9, 11, 14, 15, 23-4, 25, B 24, 24-5, 35, 54, 58, 61, 75, 76.

βούλῃται θύειν ἀλεκτόρας λευκοῦς, θύειν τῷ μὲν Μηνὶ ἄρσενας, τῇ δὲ Φυλακῇ θηλείας κτλ. (B 22-5). As the object of προθύσαι is θύματα for προθύματα so θύειν probably stands for προθύειν and we have here alternative modes of preliminary sacrifice, the minimal (or standard) pre-offering of incense and the option of fowl sacrifice. Here the terms θύματα and θυσίαν presumably have respectively the general sense “offerings” and the specific sense “animal sacrifice”¹⁵⁰.

In texts known hitherto ἐπιθύειν is uncommon, μεταθύειν rare. In our text both are associated with purification rituals. Side B begins Εἰς τὸν ναὸν τῆς θεοῦ ἀμύητον μὴ εἰσπορεύεσθαι[ι]· ἔαν δὲ εἰσέλθῃ, καθαίρειν ἀλεκτορίδι καὶ μεταθύειν ἄλλον ἀλέκτορα τέλειον ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς Μοίρας βωμόν κτλ. The prepositional prefix μετα- links the sacrifice of the cock on the altar of Moira with the purification by means of a hen which precedes. The other occurrence of μεταθύειν is in precisely the same sort of context: Εἰς τὸ πρόθυρον ἔαν τις εἰσέλθῃ τῶν ἀμυήτ[ων], καθαίρειν ἀλέκτορι ἄρσενι ἢ θηλείαι, μεταθύειν δὲ σκέλος οὗ ἅμ βούλῃται πλὴν χοιρέου (B 13-15). Here purification by a male or female fowl is followed by a very surprising μετα-sacrifice (to which we will return), the leg of an animal of any species except pig, that is a portion of an animal that has already been butchered. The compound ἐπιθύειν is used in the same way: Ἐὰν δὲ τις εἰσέλθῃ μὴ ἀγνεύσας τῶν προγεγραμμένων, καθαρὰ τὸν βωμὸν νοσσοῖ ἀλέκτορος, καὶ ἐπιθύσατο ἐπὶ τοῦ τῆς Φυλακῆς βωμοῦ ὄρνιθα θήλειαν ἢ ἀποπυρίδα, μῶν κρεῶν ὁποῖων ἂν θέλῃ πλὴν χοιρέων κτλ. (B 29-35). Here again purification, in this case by a cockerel (young male chicken), is accompanied by a sacrifice, closely linked to it by the ἐπι-compound, of a female chicken or a small fish and of “a *mna* of meat of any kind the sacrificer wishes except pork”. In this case the prepositional prefix may be ἐπι- rather than μετα- because of the immediately following phrase ἐπὶ τοῦ τῆς Φυλακῆς βωμοῦ¹⁵¹, but in any case the parallels show that the compounds ἐπιθύειν and μεταθύειν are used in precisely the same way to connect a sacrifice closely with a preceding purification. We also have examples of ἐπιθύειν from Cos and Cyrene. In one inscription of the mid-4th century from Cos the “taker of the kings’ perquisites” sacrifices an animal, “provides offerings” (ιερά παρέχει), and “makes an accompanying sacrifice of (ἐπιθύει) a half *hekteus* of offerings”; at a later stage of the same ritual sequence, a priest making a

¹⁵⁰ For usage of θύμα both on its own and in contrast with θυσία see J. CASABONA, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en Grec*, Aix-en-Provence, 1966, p. 146-52, who rightly emphasises that both terms occur in a wide variety of senses which are determined by the context in given cases. In our passage, as often elsewhere, θύμα seems to mean ‘offering’ of any kind, animal or other, whereas θυσία has its common connotation of human participation or festivity (*ibid.* 131-4), which is appropriate here, in contradistinction to θύμα, because the fowl are presumably to be eaten.

¹⁵¹ Cf. *Pap. Gr. Mag.*² 4, 1497, ἐπιθύων ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπων.

preliminary holocaust of a pig cleans and burns its intestines and “is to make an accompanying sacrifice of offerings with the intestines” (τοῖς ἐντέροις ἐπιθυέτω [θ]ύη) of incense, cakes, libations, and a woolen fillet¹⁵². In another Coan inscription of roughly the same date a purification (restored by a plausible supplement) is followed by καὶ ἐπιθύει κτλ.¹⁵³. The best epigraphical comparanda for the use in our text, however, are three passages in the late-fourth-century cathartic law of Cyrene which require that a bride or pregnant woman who incurs various avoidable pollutions purify the sanctuary of Artemis and ἐπιθυσεῖ ζαμίαν βοτὸν τέλευν, “make an accompanying sacrifice of a full-grown animal as a penalty”¹⁵⁴. In all these cases the prepositional prefixes seem intended to make clear that the sacrifice is neither an independent ritual nor an elective option but a compulsory accompaniment to the preceding rite¹⁵⁵. In many cases what precedes is a purification, and in some cases, whether explicitly or implicitly, the accompanying sacrifice is a penalty or fine for the impurity in question.

One may compare a Cretan inscription of the mid-fifth to early fourth century BC from Gortyn: ἐπιβασίας κάθαρσις ἐπιναίων αἱ]τανς κατὰ νόμον τῷ ἐπ[ιναί]ω πεδεπιθ[ῦσαι]]ια καθαραιτάνς πεδεπιθῦσαι κτλ.¹⁵⁶. The text is difficult—some kind of purification at marine embarkation seems to be the context—but a purificatory rite in the one line and mention of “purifying officials” in the other are here too followed by a compound of θύειν which links the following sacrifice with the purificatory rite by means of the double prepositional prefix πεδεπι- (= μετεπι-). The new text and the Cretan inscription aid interpretation of what was until now the only attested occurrence of μεταθύειν, in a fifth-century BC inscription from Delphi which forbids the carrying of wine out of the stadium: Αἱ

¹⁵² IG XII.4 (1) 278 (LSCG, 151 A, RHODES & OSBORNE, 62 A) l. 21-22, 36-37. E. KEARNS, “Cakes in Greek Sacrifice Regulations”, in R. HÄGG (ed.), *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*, Stockholm, 1994 (*Skrifter utgivna av Svenska institutet i Athen*, 8^o, XIII), p. 65-70, at p. 67 with n. 9 points to the term ἐπιπεμμα, “additional cake” in *I.Priene* [2014], 146/147, l. 15 (LSAM, 38 B, l. 10) of c. 200 BC, and 416 (LSAM, 39), l. 14-15 (Thebes near Mykale, iv BC) and to references in the *Lex. Rhet. s.v. ἀρεστήρ* (*Anecd. Bekker* I, 210) and Polybius VI, 25, 7 to πόπανον/α as ἐπιτιθέμενον/α “onto the fire” or ἐπὶ τὰς θυσίας as indications that “accompanying offerings” of cake may have been standard procedure.

¹⁵³ IG XII.4 (1) 332 (LSCG, 157) A, l. 1-3.

¹⁵⁴ LSS, 115 (RHODES & OSBORNE, 97) B, l. 5-6 (87-8), 14 (96), 22-3 (104-5). In the earlier part of the same law concerning tithe-sacrifices the phrase προθυσεῖ ζαμίαν βοτὸν τέλευν *vel sim.* occurs six times (A, l. 36, 42, 45, 51, 59-60, 66), προθύειν here indicating that the penal sacrifice precedes rather than follows the tithe-sacrifice (or in one case purification, A, l. 40-42) with which it is closely associated.

¹⁵⁵ On ἐπιθύειν see CASABONA, *o.c.* (n. 150), p. 98. Eur. *Or.* 562 (τοῦτον [νῖζ Αἴγισθον] κατέκτειν’, ἐπὶ δ’ ἔθυσσά μητέρα) is a good literary parallel for the ‘associated sacrifice’ sense in our passage, and the usage is precisely parallel to that of ἐπιπρέζειν at LSCG, 136, l. 27-9 (Ialysos, ca. 300 BC): ὅτι δὲ κά τις παρὰ τὸν νόμον ποιήσῃ, τό τε ἱερὸν καὶ τὸ τέμενος καθαιρέτω καὶ ἐπιπρέξτω ἢ ἔνοχος ἔστω τῷ ἄσεβείῳ, cf. Theoc. XXIV, 96-9, where a purification is followed immediately by Ζηνὶ δ’ ἐπιπρέξαι καθυπέρτερῳ ἄρσενά χοῖρον, and see CASABONA, *o.c.* (n. 150), p. 64. This sense of the preposition is also illustrated by the first ἐπὶ in the sentence that begins at Marmarini B 36-7: Ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ[ι] θυσίᾳ, φέρειν δεῖ ἐπὶ τὴν τραπέζαν τὰ ἐπιτιθέμενα κτλ.

¹⁵⁶ IC IV, 146 (LSS, 114).

δὲ κα φάρει, ἡλαξάστο τὸν θεὸν ἡ□ι κα κεραίεται καὶ μεταθυσάτο κάποτεισάτο πέντε δραχμάς, “But if anyone carries it out, let him propitiate the god for whom it is mixed and make an associated sacrifice and pay a fine of five drachmas”¹⁵⁷. Translations of μεταθυσάτο here have been very various indeed—Buck’s “make an offering in its place” being the most plausible of those previously suggested¹⁵⁸—but the new parallels favour the conclusion that whatever act of propitiation ἡλαξάστο denoted had to be accompanied by a sacrifice. Perhaps the most telling exemplification of a close connection between purification and sacrifice, though it lacks the prepositional prefix, is a passage at the end of the inscribed lead tablet from Selinous published in 1993. A detailed set of instructions about ritual purification ends *ἡαρῆον τέλεον ἐπὶ τ□ι βομ□ι τ□ι δαμασίοι θύσας καθαρὸς ἔστω*.¹⁵⁹ Here the sacrifice marks the completion of or perhaps even gives ritual effect to the strictly purificatory rites that precede it, and it may well be that the compounds of θύειν in our text are expressing a similarly fundamental association between purification and sacrifice¹⁶⁰.

Casabona said of the compound ἀποθύειν, very reasonably given the limited evidence known hitherto, that “Il insiste sur la réalisation effective d’un sacrifice promis, dû, ou simplement dont l’accomplissement est attendu”, and most of the passages Casabona quotes refer to votive or first-fruit sacrifices which are appropriately said to be “duly sacrificed”¹⁶¹. In other kinds of context, however, such as those in our inscription, it is hard to see how ἀποθύειν in that sense would be significantly different from or more appropriate than θύειν itself, and its use would therefore seem arbitrary or ornamental. We suggest rather that in the new text the prepositional prefix gives the verb the sense “bring a sacrificial (or ritual) sequence to completion by sacrificing”, “sacrifice finally”, or “finish by sacrificing” (LSJ sense D.2 of ἀπό in composition). At A 3-15 we have a series of ritual acts on successive days: on the twelfth initiates make preliminary sacrifice to Moira; on the thirteenth the temple, peristyle, door-panels, and gateway of the goddess are cleansed, sacrifice is made to

¹⁵⁷ *LSCG*, 76 (G. ROUGEMONT, *Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes* I, Paris, 1977, no. 3) l. 2-5.

¹⁵⁸ See e.g. CASABONA, *o.c.* (n. 150), p. 101-2; ROUGEMONT (previous note) 14-15; C. D. BUCK, “The Delphian Stadium Inscription”, *CP* 7 (1912), p. 78-81, at p. 80; *idem*, *The Greek Dialects*, Chicago, 1955, p. 239; DECOURT and TZIAPHALIAS *o.c.* (n. *2), p. 38-9. DECOURT and TZIAPHALIAS, p. 39 n. 83, accept, and adopt for our passage, the interpretation of HOMOLLE, *BCH* 23 (1899), p. 611, ‘il recommencera son sacrifice’, i.e. replace a previous, invalid offering with a second victim, but neither at Delphi nor in any of the cases in our text is there a preceding *sacrifice* which the sacrifice associated with the purification might be putting right.

¹⁵⁹ M.H. JAMESON, D.R. JORDAN, R.D. KOTANSKY, *A Lex Sacra from Selinous*, Durham, 1993 (*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Monographs*, 11) = *SEG* XLIII, 630 = *NGSL*, 27 (Selinous, Sicily, ca. 470-450 BC?), B, l. 3-9, 10-11.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. R. PARKER, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, Oxford, 1983, p. 10: “In theory sacrifice and purification may seem to be distinct operations . . . In practice, what is spoken of as a purification often takes the form of a sacrifice”.

¹⁶¹ CASABONA, *o.c.* (n. 150), p. 95-6, at 95.

Mogga, and things in the sanctuary that have become impure are purified by various cultic functionaries and initiates; on the fourteenth the (image of the) goddess and her altar are adorned, with the prescription ἀποθύειν τῷ Ἡλίῳ (A 9); on the fifteenth sacrifice is made to Syrian Pan and during the night a pot is filled from a spring; and on the sixteenth the pot is opened and sacrifice is made to Moira. This ritual complex falls into two phases: first the sequence undertaken by the priestess and sanctuary personnel of preliminary sacrifice / cleansing and purification of the sanctuary / adornment of the goddess's image and altar on the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth, and then the sequence involving “anyone who wishes” of sacrifice to Pan and pot-filling / pot-opening and sacrifice to Moira on the fifteenth and sixteenth. We suggest that the sense of the clause ἀποθύειν τῷ Ἡλίῳ is “bring the (first, cleaning and adornment) sequence to completion by sacrificing to Helios”—an appropriate god before whom to display the freshly made-over image of the goddess. Similarly we suggest that the phrase ταῦτα ποιήσας καὶ ἀποθύσας at B 44 summarises the detailed prescriptions for sacrifice to the goddess “by the Greek rite” laid out at length in B 35-43 and means “having done these things and brought this sacrificial ritual to completion”¹⁶².

7.2 Sacrifice “By the Greek Rite”

If it is possible to be confident about the sense of the compounds of θύειν that are securely read in our text, the same cannot be said of the text's provision for sacrificing to the goddess “by the Greek rite”, θύειν . . . τῇ θεῷ Ἑλληνικῷ νόμῳ (B 35-6). The procedure is set out in great detail (B 35-45). The person wishing to sacrifice in this way is permitted to offer any victim he wishes except a pig (36); in connection with the sacrifice τὰ ἐπιτιθέμενα, “the offerings that are placed on the table”—two types of cake, λάγανον and ὄμορα¹⁶³—must be brought (36-8), a three-obol coin deposited in the collecting-box (38), oil provided for the

¹⁶² CARBON, *o.c.* (n. 3) suggests reading πα[ρ]έχειν τράπεζαν καὶ ἐν[θ]ύειν τῇ θεῷ ὅτι ἂν ἔχης at A 17-18, but ἐνθύειν, otherwise attested only in a late-3rd-c.-BC financial account from Delos (*IG* XI 2, 153, l. 11), seems to us an unlikely supplement here.

¹⁶³ These two forms of “cake”, neither hitherto known in a sacred law, appear repeatedly in the text. In B 37, 58 and 68 it is specified that they are for the offering table. A “choenix of λάγανα” presumably means “the quantity of λάγανα that can be made from a choenix of wheat”: cf. *I. Priene* (2014) 144 (*LSAM*, 37), l. 11-12 ἔλατρα βοὶ μὲν ἐκ τεταρτέως, προβάτῳ δὲ ἐξ ἡμιέκτου, γαλαθηνῶι δὲ ἐκ δύο χοινίκων and similarly *LSCG*, 135, l. 71-2 ἐλλύτας ἐκ πυρῶν χοινίκων πέντε; *SEG* LIV, 214 *passim*. λάγανα are a type of unleavened flat bread, made from wheat-flour probably mixed with olive-oil (cf. λάγανα ἄζυμα κεχρισμένα ἐν ἐλαίῳ, LXX Exod. 29:2 and often) and fried in a frying pan: see references in S.D. OLSON and A. SENS, *Matro of Pitane and the Tradition of Epic Parody in the Fourth Century BCE*, Atlanta, Georgia, 1999, p. 149, and for the type of cake E. KEARNS, “Ο λιβανωτὸς εὐσεβὲς καὶ τὸ πόπανον: The rationale of cakes and bloodless offerings in Greek sacrifice”, in V. PIRENNE-DELFORGE, F. PRESCENDI (eds.), *Nourrir les dieux*, Liège, 2011, p. 89-104, at p. 91; the plural suggests they may have been small. ὄμορα is new, but the editors adduce Hesych. ο 817 ὄ μ ο υ ρ α · σεμίδαλις ἐφθῆ, μέλι ἔχουσα καὶ σησάμην and Ath. XIV, 55 (646) ΑΜΟΡΑΙ. τὰ μελιτώματα Φιλητᾶς ἐν Ἀτάκτοις ἀμόρας φησὶν καλεῖσθαι. μελιτώματα δ' ἐστὶν πεπεμμένα.

lamp (38-9), a *chous* (six-pint measure) of wine “from the sanctuary” put “into the mixing-bowl” (39), and the boiled breast and one raw leg placed on the table (39-40). The priestess is to take the innards¹⁶⁴, liver, lungs, diaphragm, left kidney, and tongue (40-41); but the right kidney, right *akrokolion* (foot?), heart, and omentum, and the front leg (lit. “the leg that joins the breast”, presumably by implication the right front leg) and the part of the tail that is customary in rites should go onto the fire (41-3)¹⁶⁵. “Having done these things and brought this sacrificial ritual to completion”, the person offering sacrifice “is to bring another victim of whatever species he wishes, and anyone who wishes may eat of it” (44-5).

What is “Greek” about this method of sacrifice?¹⁶⁶ We favour one among various conceivable explanations as involving fewer oddities than the others. At first sight the “Greek rite” may appear to be one among different options available for the sacrifice of any animal, but we think it rather distinguishes between victims seen as typical of Greek sacrifice and those of a different culture, or at any rate of smaller size. On this view, we would schematise the context in which the specification occurs as follows:

1/ A section on preliminary sacrifices, either incense or “if anyone wishes to sacrifice white chickens, let him sacrifice males to Men, female to Artemis, and if he wants (to sacrifice) lambs, similarly” (B 22-26).

2/ The sentence speaking of the Greek rite: “but if anyone wishes to sacrifice to the goddess by the Greek rite, it is permitted (to sacrifice) whatever he likes except pig” (B 35-6).

¹⁶⁴ Innards are common priestly perquisites: *LSAM*, 129, l. 1-4 (Chios, v BC, priesthood of a god with the epithet Pelinaios): priest to receive σπλάγχνα; *LSCG*, 60, l. 15-17 (Epidauros, late v BC): τὸ δ’ ἄτερον σκέλος τοῖς φρουροῖς δόντο καὶ τ’ ἐνδοσθίδια; *LSAM*, 44, l. 4-5 (Miletus, ca. 400 BC): σπ[λά]γχνα among priestly perquisites; *LSS*, 77, l. 6 (Chios, early iv BC): priest to receive σπλάγχνα; *LSCG*, 119, l. 1-4, 6-8 (Chios, iv BC): priest of Heracles to receive σπλάγχνα; *LSCG*, 120 (Chios, iv BC), based entirely on (plausible) restorations; *LSAM*, 24 A, l. 13-25 (Erythrai, 380-360 BC, cult of Asclepius), table-offerings of σπλάγχνα: ταῦτα εἶναι γέρα τῷ ἱεῖ (24-5); *LSAM*, 59, l. 1-3 (Iasos, iv BC), perquisites of priest of Zeus Megistos include σπλ[άγχων] τέταρτον μέρος; *LSAM*, 72, l. 39 (Halicarnassus, iii BC, foundation of Posidonius), priest to receive τέταρτη[μο]ρίδα σπλάγχων; *LSAM*, 73, l. 11-12, 14 (Halicarnassus, iii BC, sale of priesthood of Artemis Pergaia), priestess to receive τέταρτημορίδα σπλάγχων; *LSS*, 78, l. 4-6 (Chios, ii BC): priest to receive σπλάγχνα; cf. *LSCG*, 125, l. 4 (Mytilene, ii BC): some portion of σπλάγχνα as a table-offering. Possibly, but very uncertainly, *SEG* XXXIII, 456 = *NGSL*, 11, l. 24, with LUPU’s note *ad loc.* (p. 236-7).

¹⁶⁵ The editors read ἐπὶ τὸν πῦρα at B 43, where ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ or ἐπὶ τὴν πυράν is needed.

¹⁶⁶ DECOURT and TZIAPHALIAS, *o.c.* (n. *2), p. 31 quote Paus. I, 24, 2, who describes a statue of Phrixus sacrificing the ram that carried him ashore in Colchis: θύσας δὲ αὐτὸν . . . τοὺς μηροὺς κατὰ νόμον ἐκτεμὼν τὸν Ἑλλήνων ἐξ αὐτοῦς καιομένους ὀρεῖ. Pausanias is contrasting what he knows to be standard Greek sacrificial procedure—the cutting out and burning of the thighbones (cf. Gunnell EKROTH, “Thighs or tails? The osteological evidence as a source for Greek ritual norms”, in P. BRULÉ (ed.), *La norme en matière religieuse en Grèce ancienne*, Liège, 2009 (*Kernos*, suppl. 21), p. 125-51, at 127 with n. 5)—with whatever he imagined to be Colchian practice, or at any rate with the barbarian setting of Phrixus’ sacrifice. The Ἑλληνικὸς νόμος at Marmarini has removal and burning in common with the norm reflected in Pausanias’ phrase “in accord with the custom of the Greeks”, but, in *contrast* to the commonest Greek practice, requires that very much more than the thighbones be removed and burnt.

3/ The long sentence specifying dues and offerings to be made “to accompany the sacrifice”; these include perquisites for the priestess and portions of the animal which are removed to be burnt on the fire (B 36-43).

4/ The final sentence concerning the additional victim (44-45).

It is not immediately clear whether 3/ specifies in detail how the Greek rite is to be conducted, or rather relates to any sacrifice whatsoever including that of birds mentioned in 1/. But a later section treating the sacrifice of bovines concludes τὰ ἱερὰ ἐξαίρειν καθάπερ τῶν προβάτων, “remove the sacred portions as in the case of the sheep” (B 60-61), and if this refers to another entry in our inscription it is probably a back reference to 3/, which would therefore refer primarily to the sacrifice not of any animals whatsoever but of sheep, and thus continue the thought not of 1/ but of 2/. “The Greek rite” therefore seems to refer to sacrifice of ovines (and doubtless caprines)—though we think the same rite is also used for bovines and so really applies to larger animals in general—with removal of certain portions for burning; it is contrasted with the sacrifice of birds, no portions of which appear to be burnt in this text except in the case of holocaust. Could then the larger victims be sacrificed either in the Greek way or in some other? There is no sign in the text that any alternative, non-Greek way of sacrificing such victims when full-grown was envisaged (but lambs appear with birds in 1/); if these were the victims, they were dealt with *Graeco ritu*. Conversely, there is no reason to think that the modes envisaged here of sacrificing birds were contrary to Greek custom. We know that Greeks did sacrifice birds, but the question of how they did so is one seldom posed, for lack of evidence; they cut out portions for the priest¹⁶⁷, as is also done here, but there is no sign that they burnt their thigh bones for the gods (nor, certainly, that they did not). It is then arguable that the distinction is not so much between modes of sacrifice as between small victims such as fowl (and lambs) and full-grown animals, the former being seen as the typical non-Greek, the latter the typical Greek victims (as indeed they were), and only the latter yielding portions which are taken out to be burnt. There is moreover clear evidence in the text that an ovine or caprine was the kind of victim normally used in the Greek rite. The cash payments specified as accompaniments to the various forms of sacrifice are one obol for a bird (B 54), one and a half obols for a goose (B 55), three obols for a Greek rite victim (B 38), and a gold piece for a bovine (B 60): that scale certainly suits and perhaps

¹⁶⁷ Herodas IV, 88-90: Κοκκάλη, καλῶς | τεμεῦσα μέμνεο τὸ σκελύδριον δοῦναι | τῷ νεοκόρῳ τοῦρνιθος.

requires the conclusion that the normal victim in the Greek rite is a sheep or goat¹⁶⁸. It is also relevant that ἱερεῖον, the term applied to the additional victim at the end of the prescriptions, commonly means “sheep” when used without further specification, particularly in the Hellenistic period¹⁶⁹.

This conclusion is open to objections which need to be addressed. An opening protasis Ἐὰν δέ τις θύειν βούληται τῇ θεῷ Ἑλληνικῷ νόμῳ followed immediately by the apodosis ἔξεστι ὃ ἅμ βούληται πλὴν χοίρου, “it is permitted (to sacrifice) whatever he likes except pig” may seem a strange way to begin the description of a form of sacrifice defined chiefly by its application to larger animals, and in the immediate context to sheep and goats. But we have argued that the Greekness of the ‘Greek rite’ refers primarily to the animals typically sacrificed by the Greeks. Greeks did often sacrifice pigs, if less often than sheep: whence perhaps the need to make the exclusion explicit. Permitting some Greek sacrificial preferences was not to be taken as permitting all.

There is no doubt that the sequence of entries is very odd if we are correct that the “Greek rite” refers to larger animals: a full description of the Greek rite referring in its immediate context to ovines and caprines is followed by an entry on *trapezoplesia*, another on the *panemerizein* ritual, and a third on censuring the goddess’s image, then by an entry on sacrifice of birds and geese that is not conducted according to the Greek rite, and only then by a section on sacrifice of bovines with a cross-reference back past all this non-Greek-rite material to the Greek rite, which on any sensible scheme it ought to follow immediately. We cannot account for this except as muddle, but there is a good deal of muddle elsewhere in the text. The regulation of collections at B 17-23 seems completely out of place between the end of the regulations restricting access of the uninitiated to temple and *prothyron* and the beginning of the regulations of sacrifice to the goddess, and the passage regulating women’s impurities (B 26-35) is out of place between the regulations of preliminary sacrifices to Phylake and Mên (B 22-6) and those of primary sacrifices to the goddess.

We conclude, then, that an ovine or caprine was—unsurprisingly—the usual victim in a “Greek Rite” sacrifice, and that the full description of that rite is therefore given when the composer deals with those victims. His readers will understand that he has in mind (without explicitly specifying) ovines and caprines, as the level of cash payment confirms. For

¹⁶⁸ As between “Greek Rite” victims and bovines there are also increases in most of the other accompanying offerings for the larger animal: for Greek rite victims one *choinix* of λάγανα, one *choinix* of ὄμορα, one *kotyle* of oil for the lamp, and one *chous* of wine are prescribed, but for bovines three *choinikes* of λάγανα, the same single *choinix* of ὄμορα, two *choes* of wine, and two *kotylai* of oil (not specified as “for the lamp”), as well as “sufficient wood”.

¹⁶⁹ CASABONA, *o.c.* (n. 150), p. 35-6.

unfathomable reasons he postponed the corresponding entry on bovines so that it follows a good deal of material that has nothing to do with the Greek rite, but readers with experience of sacrificial rites for the goddess will have understood his back-reference readily enough as there were only two modes of sacrificing larger animals to her, the Greek rite and holocaust.

The distinction between birds (and lambs) and larger animals is probably all there is to the “Greekness” of the Greek rite; birds, so prominent in this cult, are—as we have seen above—much more at home in Near Eastern cult than in Greek. There are, however, two other aspects of the rite that make it distinctive; neither of these can, we think, have been the criterion of Greekness, but both are remarkable features of it that call for attention.

The first of these distinctive features is burning of substantial portions of the victim—far more than the usual thigh-bones, fat, and tail—for which Scullion has coined the term “moirocaust”¹⁷⁰. The specific prescriptions in such rites vary, but a ninth is a typical proportion of the meat that is burnt¹⁷¹, and the portions to be put onto the fire at Marmarini seem roughly in line with that sort of amount. If we are right that Greek rite and holocaust are the only methods of sacrificing larger animals to the goddess, it is remarkable, even startling, that ‘standard’ Greek sacrifice with its modest portion for the divinity is not permitted, but only two modes of sacrifice involving very heavy burning. Perhaps more meat was burnt in this Greek cult than in any other known to us in comparable detail¹⁷², and we wish we could confidently explain why. Hybridity, however—in particular the much greater prominence of holocaust sacrifice in Near Eastern cults by contrast with its exceptional status in Greek, discussed above—probably provides at least a partial explanation. It is also notable that the Marmarini text offers no criterion by which “anyone who wishes” to sacrifice might choose between Greek-rite moirocaust and holocaust sacrifice. Knowledge of established criteria may have been assumed, but the phraseology of choice suggests that the sacrificer’s decision will depend on his or her own circumstances, aims, and sense of what is appropriate on a given occasion. Much of our evidence for Greek sacrifice attests obligatory offerings on particular, recurrent occasions, but elective sacrifices by private persons whose modality was determined by the kind of *ad hoc* judgements our text seems to allow for must have been far more common than the general run of our evidence suggests. In this regard as in others,

¹⁷⁰ See S. SCULLION, “Heroic and Chthonian Sacrifice: New Evidence from Selinous”, *ZPE* 132 (2000), p. 163-71, especially p. 165.

¹⁷¹ *LSCG*, 63, l. 4-5; *IG XII Suppl.*, 353, l. 10; *LSCG*, 96, l. 23-4; *SEG XLIII*, 630 = *NGSL*, 27, A, l. 11-12; SCULLION (previous note) discusses all these passages.

¹⁷² Leaving aside, that is, prescriptions of holocaust for particular recipients in sacrificial calendars, which may tell us no more than that a holocaust was the mode employed in the customary sacrifice offered by a public body or cultic group on that particular occasion.

however, we must reckon with the Near Eastern influences that make sacrificial practice at Marmarini distinctive.

The second distinctive aspect of the Greek rite has to do with the final clause of the regulation, Ταῦτα ποιήσας καὶ ἀποθύσας, φερέτω ἄλλο ἱερεῖον οὗ ἃμ βούληται καὶ ἐσθιέτω ὁ βουλόμενος, which provides for participation in the consumption of a supplementary victim—rather than the victim whose sacrifice to the goddess, doubtless on her altar, has been so painstakingly described—by “anyone who wishes”. It seems to us probable that this second animal is not obligatory. The sentence probably means “after doing this and completing this sacrifice, let him bring another victim of whatever species he pleases and let anyone who pleases eat of it”, but it might mean “Let anyone who pleases, after doing this and completing this sacrifice, bring and eat another victim of whatever species he pleases”. On either reading, however, what is intended is surely a ‘supplementary’ option rather than a prescribed obligation. Cooking and dining on the meat of Greek sacrificial victims normally took place not at the altar but in a “dining area” elsewhere in the sanctuary¹⁷³, and there is a very striking difference between the elaborate prescriptions for the ritual treatment of the first victim and the simple provision that a second victim may be ‘brought and eaten’. The meat of a second animal will not have come amiss once all of the prescribed table-offerings, priestly perquisites, and portions for the fire have been removed from the first, and the text suggests that the second animal’s role was primarily to load the banquet table. It is evidently not to be sacrificed in the same way as the first—the final clause can hardly mean “repeat the procedure with a second victim”—and this both sets a limit on table-offerings and perquisites and increases the meat available for the inclusive banqueting it explicitly provides for. It is remarkable that no ritual treatment of this second animal is prescribed. If some method of sacrifice other than the Greek rite is to be used—‘standard’ sacrifice, perhaps, with removal only of thigh-bones wrapped in fat, tail, and *splanchna*—this very detailed regulation oddly fails to specify what it is. One would also like to know whether “whoever wishes” merely means “anyone among those initiates present at the Greek-rite sacrifice at the goddess’s altar who wishes to stay on and dine” or envisages wider participation in the post-sacrificial banquet, perhaps even by uninitiated persons (cf. p. 00 above). In any case, the supplementary animal is both distinctive and remarkable.

¹⁷³ For “dining areas” see G. EKROTH, “Meat in Ancient Greece: Sacrificial, Sacred or Secular?”, *Food and History* 5 (2007), p. 249–272, at p. 260–63; *eadem*, “Meat, Man and God: On the Division of the Animal Victim at Greek Sacrifices”, in A. MATTHAIΟΥ, I. POLINSKAYA (eds.), *Μικρός Ιερομνήμων· Μελέτες εις μνήμην Michael H. Jameson*, Athens, 2008, p. 259–90, at p. 280–81; or *eadem*, “Bare Bones: Osteology and Greek Sacrificial Ritual”, forthcoming in I. RUTHERFORD (ed.), *Animal Sacrifice in the Ancient World*, Cambridge.

7.3 Sacrificial Novelties

The text's detailed prescriptions for sacrifice by the Greek rite are followed by less elaborate regulations of two previously unknown (or in the first case unrecognised) forms of ritual procedure, *τραπεζοπλησία* (B 45-9, also A 33) and *πανημερίζειν* (B 49-51). The first of these entries runs Ἐὰν δὲ τις τραπεζοπλησίαν βούληται ποιεῖν τῇ θεῷ τελέαν, πρόβατον τέλεον, ἄρσεν ἢ θῆλυ, (and cake offerings, wine, a drachma “into the sanctuary-chest”, oil for the lamp,) καὶ ἀτέλε[στ]ος τούτων οὐ γεύεται. Decourt notes that *τραπεζοπλησία* is a *hapax legomenon* and compares it with *τραπεζοποιεῖν*, “set out a table with meat” and *τραπεζοποιός*, “slave who sets the table”¹⁷⁴. There is however a much closer parallel in a second-century-AD inscription from Sounion in Attica recording a slave's foundation of a cult for the Anatolian god also attested in our inscription, *Mên Tyrannos*: ἐὰν δὲ τις τράπεζαν πληρῶι τῷ θεῷ, λαμβανέτω τὸ ἥμισυ, “if anyone fills a table for the god, let him take half (of the offerings on the table)”¹⁷⁵. The entry-initial ἐὰν δὲ τις here is close to the regular phraseology of the Marmarini inscription, and there can be little doubt that the ritual of “table-filling” also shares common ancestry, even if at Marmarini it honours the goddess rather than *Mên*. In standard Greek practice—and, as we have seen, elsewhere in our inscription—offerings on the sanctuary-table are an element of what is presented primarily as a ritual of sacrifice, normally involve vegetable offerings and often also portions of the meat of the sacrificial victim, and are offerings to the god, that is are made over to the sanctuary. In Marmarini, by contrast, sacrifice of a “fully grown male or female sheep” is an element of what is presented primarily as a “perfect” *τραπεζοπλησία*; it therefore seems probable that most or all of the meat goes onto the table, and, as we can infer from the prohibition on the uninitiated tasting the table-offerings, it does not all remain there to be taken by the sanctuary officials but is in part consumed by the initiates who attend. No inference is required in the case of the parallel “table-filling” for *Mên Tyrannos*, where the person sacrificing is explicitly allowed to take half of the offerings, and there is a parallel for this in another passage of our text. The entry governing sacrifice “by whoever desires and is willing” to “Pan whom the Syrians call - - - ΠΛΗΝ” requires that the person making this offering “deposit whatever he wishes on the table except fish or doves” and continues καὶ ὁ θύων ἐπιτιθέτω ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν ὃ τι ἂν θέλῃ καὶ ἀντιλαμβάνετω τῶν ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν ἐπικειμένων, “and let

¹⁷⁴ DECOURT and TZIAPHALIAS, *o.c.* (n. *2), p. 43.

¹⁷⁵ *LSCG*, 55, l. 20.

the sacrificer deposit whatever he wishes on the table, and take in exchange from the things deposited on the table” (A 9-14). Inscriptions often attest the taking of table-offerings as perquisites by priests, but what they are entitled to (whether specified parts or—as in the case of the person filling Mên Tyrannos’ table at Sounion—a specified proportion) is elsewhere strictly defined¹⁷⁶, and the normal assumption is that the rest becomes the property of the sanctuary. Athenaeus tells us that the Alexandrians dedicate wafer-bread cooked over coals to Cronus and also put it out in his temple for ὁ βουλόμενος to eat, but so far as our evidence goes this seems an unusual practice¹⁷⁷. We will return shortly to the question of quite what may be going on in all these ‘participatory’ table-offerings.

The entry immediately following that on *τραπεζοπλησία* is this: Ἐάν τις πανημερίσαι βούληται τῇ θεῷ, (sc. *πανημερισάτω*) ἄριστον φερόμενος ὅτι ἂν βούληται, πλὴν χοιρέων κρεῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ λύχνον ἐλ[αί]ου ἡμικοτύλιον, “If anyone wishes to undertake the ‘all-day ritual’ for the goddess, let him do so, bringing with him a lunch of whatever he wishes except pork meat and a *hemikotulion* of oil for the lamp” (B 49-50)¹⁷⁸. The verb *πανημερίζειν* is newly attested; the editors compare *πανημερεύειν* in Pseudo-Euripides, *Rhesus*¹⁷⁹, but the –*ίζειν* formation was doubtless coined to designate a *ritual* lasting all day. Even if the term is new, however, the surprising thing is what would be called in British English the “packed lunch”. A number of inscriptions mention provision of ἄριστον in a sanctuary, often naming the functionaries or officials who are to receive or provide the lunch¹⁸⁰, but whereas one

¹⁷⁶ *LSCG*, 29, l. 2-5 (Athens, second half iv BC): ἱερείωσυνα τάδε (2) . . . σκέλος ἐκάστου, δέρμα καὶ τὰ παρατιθέμενα ἐπὶ τράπεζαν; *LSAM*, 13, l. 12-16 (Pergamum, before 133 BC, priesthood of Asclepius): λαμβάνειν δὲ καὶ γέρα τῶν θυομένων ἱερίων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ πάντων σκέλος δεξιὸν καὶ τὰ δέρματα καὶ τᾶλλα *τραπεζώματα* πάντα τὰ παρατιθέμενα [τοῖς θ]ε[οῖς]; *IG XII.4* (1) 330 (*LSCG*, 163, Cos, i BC, cult of Nike), l. 14-17: γέρη δὲ λαμβανέτω τῶν θυομένων[ων] βοὸς μὲν ἢ οἶδς δέρμα καὶ σκέλος, τῶν δὲ [ἄλ]λων σκέλος: ἐπιτιθέντω δὲ τοῖ θυόντες [ἐπ]ὶ τὴν τράπεζαν τῶν ἱερῶν τῇ θεῷ, κτλ.; *LSAM*, 34, l. 10-12 (Magnesia, ii BC, cult of Sarapis): λήψεται δ[ὲ] τῶν θυομένων[ων] [ἐ]ν τῷ τεμένει ἀφ’ ἐκάστου ἱερείου σκέλος καὶ [τῶν τιθεμένων τ]ῷ θεῷ τὰ τρίτα μέρη; *I.Priene* (2014) 196 (*LSAM*, 36), l. 25-9 (c. 200 BC, cult of Sarapis), priest to take a portion (text uncertain) of table-offerings; *IG XII.4* (1) 326 (*LSCG*, 166, Cos, i BC, cult of Dionysus Thyllophorus), l. 62-6 relies on plausible restorations; *LSCG*, 103 B, l. 5-10 (Minoa on Amorgos, i BC, festival Μητρῶια): [. . . παρατιθέτω-] σαν δὲ καὶ ἐ[π]ὶ τὴν τρά[πεζαν] τοῦ μὲν θυομένου βοὸς] γλώσσαν καὶ σάρκας τρεῖς [καὶ - - - - - - -] ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων [πάντων τῶν παρατιθεμένων] τῇ θεῷ ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν ἔστ[ω τὸ μὲν τέταρτον μέρος τῆς ἱερείας; *LSAM*, 63, l. 7-8 (dubious restoration). A new inscription from late-iii-BC Iasos entitles the purchaser of the priestesshood of Mother of the Gods to take from the sanctuary table everything offered by private persons except gold, silver, and clothes: λήψεται δὲ καὶ τὰ παρατιθέμε[να] πάντα ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζα[ν] ἢ ἱερεία πλὴν χρυσοῦ ἢ ἀργυρ[ίου] ἢ [ἰ]ματισμοῦ (G. MADDOLI, “Vendita del sacerdozio della Madre degli Dei”, *SCO* 61.2 [2015], p. 101-18, at p. 103, l. 16-18).

¹⁷⁷ Ath. III, 110.

¹⁷⁸ The editors read ἐπὶ λύχνον ἐλ[αί]ον ἡμικότυλον, but the genitive ἐλαίου is needed as at A 36, B 11, 38, 48, 57, 59, 69-70, 72, and though we cannot read that word on the photograph we can clearly see the iota of the ending of ἡμικοτύλιον as in B 11 and 57.

¹⁷⁹ DECOURT and TZIAPHALIAS, *o.c.* (n. *2), p. 43; *Rhesus* 361-2. There is a good note *ad loc.* on *πανημερεύειν* and its cognates in A. FRIES, *Pseudo-Euripides, Rhesus*, Berlin, 2014, p. 252-3.

¹⁸⁰ Eleusis: *IG II²*, 1363 = *LSCG*, 7, l. 3-7; Piraeus: *IG II²* 1283 = *LSCG*, 46, l. 19; Thorikos: *SEG XXXIII*, 147 = *NGSL*, 1, l. 3-4, 16; Sparta: *IG V.1*, 363 = *LSCG*, 62, l. 7, 10; Miletus: *LSAM*, 50, l. 45.

assumed in those cases that the lunch consisted of food that was already in the sanctuary and that any meat in it would have come from victims that had been sacrificed there, it is clear here that the lunch is brought “packed” into the sanctuary, and that any meat in it might have been carried home from a previous sacrifice in the goddess’s sanctuary but might also have come from a victim sacrificed to another god or from an animal that was never sacrificed¹⁸¹. This is surprising, but the inscription contains still more surprising passages which may help us to understand this one.

The sacrifices accompanying purifications of a σκέλος οὗ ἃμ βούληται πλὴν χοιρέου, “leg of whatever (the sacrificer) pleases except pork” at B 15 and of a μνᾶν κρεῶν ὁποῖων ἂν θέλῃ πλὴν χοιρέων, “a *mna* of whatever meat he wishes except pork” at B 32-3 are very surprising indeed. In both cases, an animal must already have been slaughtered and butchered before these portions of its meat were “sacrificed”. This raises urgent questions: Where did the meat come from? From an animal previously sacrificed, and in this sanctuary? If so, it might seem odd that the portions sacrificed in our passage are as it were doing ‘double duty’.

One possible explanation would be that these portions are incinerated on the altar, and that by becoming unavailable for human use (as they would not be if they were portions of an animal sacrificed normally) they make an acceptable sacrificial offering. Another possibility is that “sacrifices” of a leg and a weight of meat are equivalent to the widely-attested placing of portions of meat “on the table” as perquisites for the sanctuary or its officials, but in that case the verb θύειν is used in a most unexpected way. It has generally been assumed that the verb θύειν and its compounds always implies that an animal of which it is used is brought alive to an altar and killed, and that some portion of it—as perhaps of any vegetable offering to which the verb is applied¹⁸²—is burnt¹⁸³. The first possible explanation therefore seems

¹⁸¹ For the eating of unsacrificed meat see R. PARKER, “Eating Unsacrificed Meat”, in P. CARLIER, C. LEROUGE-COHEN (eds.), *Paysage et religion: mélanges offerts à Madeleine Jost*, Paris, 2010 (*Travaux de la maison René-Ginouves*), p. 139–47 ; S. SCULLION, “Bones in Greek Sanctuaries : Answers and Questions”, in G. EKROTH, J. WALLENSTEN (eds.), *Bones, Behaviour and Belief*, Stockholm, 2013 (*Skrifter Utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen*, 4^o, 55), p. 243–55, at p. 246–53 ; F. S. NAIDEN, *Smoke Signals for the Gods: Ancient Greek Sacrifice from the Archaic through Roman Periods*, New York, 2013, p. 232–75.

¹⁸² The distinction is perhaps clearest and most explicit in one of our most careful and detailed descriptions of sacrificial procedures, the mid-fourth-century BC Coan sacrificial calendar, where at *IG* XII.4 (1) 278, l. 48–9 (*LSCG*, 151 A and RHODES & OSBORNE, 62 A, l. 47–8) food offerings that are burnt are said to be “sacrificed”, ἐφ’ ἐστίαν θύεται ἀλφίτων ἡμιάκτων, ἄρτοι δύο ἐξ ἡμιάκτων, ὁ ἄτερος τυρώδης κτλ., but at *IG* XII.4 (1) 274 (*LSCG*, 151 B, RHODES & OSBORNE, 62 B) l. 24–6 oil, wine, vessels, and cups are said to be “given to the goddess”, δίδεται τῷ θεῷ, at *IG* XII.4 (1) 276 (*LSCG*, 151 C, RHODES & OSBORNE, 62 C) l. 1–15 various animals are sacrificed (θύονται 2, θύει 10) but the unburnt offerings of grains, tableware, honey, cheese, a stove, wine and wood that accompany them are spoken of as ἱερά (5) or in the phrase ἐφ’ ἱερα δίδεται (11), and the phrase θύει ἱερὸς καὶ ἱερά παρέχει (*IG* XII.4 (1) 278, l. 59) *vel sim.* recurs constantly (A 46–7, 57, 62, 63–4, *ibid.* 274, l. 3, and *passim*).

safer than the second, but it is impossible to interpret this new and wholly unexpected phenomenon with any confidence.

It may be that these surprising requirements should be considered alongside some other unusual prescriptions in the new text. The passage about sacrifice of a *mna* of meat goes on καὶ χοίνικα λαγάνων καὶ εἰς τὸν κρατῆρα οἴνου κοτύλας τέσσαρας, and this requirement of “wine into the krater” occurs four times elsewhere¹⁸⁴. In one of these cases it is specified that the wine for the mixing-pot come “from the sanctuary stock”, φέρειν δεῖ . . . καὶ εἰς κρατῆρα οἴνου χοῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ (B 37-9); Decourt and Tziphalias suppose that that this is also the sense of the damaged line A 24, φερέτω δὲ λαγάνων χοίνικα ἀπτικὴν καὶ δύο κοτύλας οἴνου ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγ[2-3 l.], suggesting the supplement ἀγ[νοῦ, but this seems to us very unlikely¹⁸⁵. It is odd that those sacrificing should pour measures of wine into a—presumably common—mixing-pot, sometimes doing so with ‘sanctuary wine’ conveyed from a separate container.

One wonders whether wine put into the krater and thus made over to the sanctuary might later serve as the wine “from the sanctuary stock” which sacrificers were required to offer and presumably therefore to buy (B 39). If that were so, it might provide a parallel for the “leg” or “*mna* of meat” sacrificed at B 15 and B 32-3, which could conceivably have been purchased from the sanctuary’s stock of table-offerings or from priest(esse)s who had received it as perquisite-portions, which would not only increase the proportion of sanctuary and priestly income received in cash rather than kind but also make any given animal go further as a source of meat for sacrificial offerings. If so, there would be considerable exchange—re-use and selling-on of wine and portions of meat—happening in the sanctuary, and the sacrificer’s “taking in exchange” from the table offerings to Pan at A 12-13 (like the comparable taking of half of the table-filling offerings for Mên at Sounion) would fit into such a system of internal exchange. But, again, this is speculative—possibilities worth raising but no more than possibilities. An alternative explanation would be that these oddities are not curious if comprehensible developments of ordinary Greek ritual practice but foreign practices—or perhaps ‘foreignizing’ practices—explicable on the basis of the non-Greek origins of the cult. Dinner-offerings played a central role in Mesopotamian sacrifice¹⁸⁶, which

¹⁸³ See e.g. CASABONA, *o.c.* (n. 150), p. 72-5; J.-P. VERNANT in M. DETIENNE, J.-P. VERNANT, *La cuisine du sacrifice en pays grec*, Paris, 1979, p. 45 = P. WISSING, transl., *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks*, Chicago, 1989, p. 26; RUDHARDT, *o.c.* (n. *144), p. 263-4, 321.

¹⁸⁴ B 6, οἴνου κοτύλας ὀκτὼ εἰς τὸν κρατῆρα; B 37-9, quoted above; B 68, οἴνου χοῦν εἰς τὸν κρατῆρα; B 71-2, οἴνου εἰς τὸν κρατῆρα κοτύλας τέσσαρας.

¹⁸⁵ DECOURT and TZIAPHALIAS, *o.c.* (n. *2), p. 41.

¹⁸⁶ See ABUSCH, *o.c.* (n. 94).

perhaps, in this respect as in others, has influenced cultic practice at Marmarini.

A further, remarkable feature of the text is the frequency with which phrases such as ὅτι/οὗ ἄν βούληται, ὅ τι ἄν θέληις, and ὅτι ἄν ἔχηις allow those sacrificing a free choice as to the victim's species. The phraseology "the person wishing to do X", e.g. ὁ βουλόμενος θύειν, is common enough in sacrificial inscriptions¹⁸⁷, but such regulations normally specify victims by species and often by gender, age, colour, and so on; explicit examples of free (or wide) choice of victim as in our text are few. A fifth-century BC regulation from Thasos allows choice of gender and (with qualifications) species for Apollo Nymphegetês and the Nymphs: θῆλυ καὶ ἄρσεν ἅμ βόλῃ προσέρδεν, οἷν οὐ θέμις οὐδὲ χοῖρον, and a second-century inscription from Mytilene gives wide scope (θυέτω ἰρήιον ὅτι κε θέλη) of male or female victim except pig for Aphrodite Peitho and Hermes¹⁸⁸. The freest choice previously attested epigraphically is in a regulation of the cult of Amphiaraos at Oropos in Boeotia of the fourth century BC: θύειν δὲ ἐξεῖν ἅπαν ὅτι βόληται ἕκαστος¹⁸⁹. Among literary sources, Pausanias tells us that when the Greeks finally got a favouring wind at Aulis they sacrificed to Artemis ὅτι ἕκαστος εἶχε, θήλεά τε ἱερεῖα καὶ ἄρσενα ὁμοίως, καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου διαμεμένηκεν ἐν Αὐλίδι πάντα τὰ ἱερεῖα εἶναι δόκιμα¹⁹⁰. The aetiological story is here accounting for an abnormally non-prescriptive approach to sacrifice. Wide choice as to victim, then, is very common in our text (generally with the qualification that pork is forbidden¹⁹¹) but would seem to be uncommon elsewhere. It is however possible that the epigraphical record is misleading, that public bodies specify victims in their regulations because they have to control the budget and to follow certain inherited traditions for public rites, but that individuals were free—subject only to cult-specific prohibitions such as that on pigs—to offer any victim they pleased. One cannot be confident that this was so—our own text, for example, explicitly provides that among larger animals only a full-grown ram or male lamb may be holocaust-sacrificed (B 66)—but it is perfectly plausible. Whether or not our cult is exceptionally permissive in reality, it is certainly exceptional in the verbal stress that it lays on the point, perhaps because in a hybrid cult worshippers need to be told explicitly what is allowed.

¹⁸⁷ E.g. *SEG* XXVIII, 421 = *NGSL*, 7, l. 4-5 (Megalopolis, ca. 200 BC); *SEG* XXVIII, 750 = *NGSL*, 24, l. 3 (Lissos in Crete, Hellenistic or Roman).

¹⁸⁸ *LSCG* 114 A, l. 1-2; *LSCG*, 126. There is more restricted "supplementary" choice at *SEG* XXXV, 113, l. 14 = *NGSL*, 3, l. 14 (Phrearrhioi in Attica, ca. 300-250 BC), which apparently allows those wishing to do so to add an unspecified sacrificial victim (καὶ ἐάν τι ἄλλο βούλωνται) to a male bovine and another victim (lost in a lacuna) prescribed for Kore.

¹⁸⁹ *LSCG* 69, l. 30-31.

¹⁹⁰ Paus. IX, 19, 7.

¹⁹¹ See p. 00 below.

7.4 Holocausts

The final set of sacrificial regulations on side B of the inscription (B 66-74) is devoted to holocaust sacrifice of various classes of victim: ram or male lamb (66-70), goose (70-73), and *trubba*¹⁹² or quail (73-4). It is notable that in the cases of holocausts of sheep and goose the text requires ξύλα τὰ ἱκανά (B 67-8, 71), as it does, among the many varieties of non-holocaustic sacrifices dealt with earlier, only in the case of the largest victims, bovines (B 59-60). The extra wood required for whole burning of sheep and goose is implicitly required also in the case of the smaller birds by the clause τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ταῦτάπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ χηνός (B 74).

These prescriptions of the extra wood needed for holocaust find a parallel in (and provide a parallel for) the recently published sacrificial regulations of the Attic deme of Aixone, where what must be holocaust sacrifices for Hagnê Theos require three-obols-worth of “larger wood” in addition to the two-obols-worth of firewood prescribed for other sacrifices¹⁹³. We also note that the holocaust prescriptions in our text require—as, among the earlier entries, only the prescription for the censuring of the goddess’s image does (B 52-3)—a good deal of incense and other aromatic material¹⁹⁴; presumably they were added to the fire, but in any case holocaust at Marmarini was meant to be a sweet-smelling thing, and we have seen that this too may owe something to Near Eastern tradition.

None of these holocaust sacrifices is said to be “for the goddess”, but it seems most likely that whoever drafted or cut the text, having kept up regular reference to the goddess as the divinity honoured throughout the prescriptions of Greek mode sacrifice, τραπεζοπλήσια, πανημερίζειν, and censuring of the image at B 35 to B 53, then flagged or omitted reference to her as self-evident in the remainder of the ‘standard’ sacrificial entries at B 54-61, mentioned her in the festival regulations at B 61-65, and again omitted reference to her in the holocaust regulations at B 66-74, finally mentioning her again with reference to fowl sacrifice in the ‘further rules’ at the end of side B. This may seem a bold assumption, but it would be strange to conclude that those among these entries not explicitly connected with the goddess were in fact for other, unspecified recipients rather than for her. It is also possible, however, that the sacrificial procedures without a specified recipient are suitable for offerings either to the goddess or to any of the other divinities with altars who are named in the inscription but for whom no (or very few) dedicated sacrifices are prescribed.

¹⁹² *Trubba* is a previously unattested type of bird: see DECOURT and TZIAPHALIAS, *o.c.* (n. *2), p. 40.

¹⁹³ SEG XLVI, 173, 1.26: φρ[υγ]άνων : II., ξύλων : III. . See S. SCULLION, “Sacrificial Norms, Greek and Semitic: Holocausts and Hides in a Sacred Law of Aixone”, in P. BRULÉ (ed.), *La norme en matière religieuse en Grèce ancienne*, Liège, 2009 (*Kernos*, suppl. 21), p. 153-69.

¹⁹⁴ See DECOURT & TZIAPHALIAS, *o.c.* (n. *2), p. 41-2.

An intriguing question about these holocausts is why among ovines only a male, whether ram or lamb, is to be holocaust-sacrificed. We have no explanation to suggest, but note that the pattern of sacrifices in the inscription distinguishes Phylake, who seems only to receive female victims (B 24-5, B 31-2), from “the goddess” who explicitly receives “male or female” victims at B 46 (cf. A 31-32), apparently a female chicken or a male goose at B 54-5, implicitly either a male or female in most of the other prescriptions, the ram or lamb holocaust, and finally sacrifice of female fowl either on the “great altar” or (if offered by an uninitiated person) on Moira’s altar (B 76-7). This pattern of offerings coheres with the terminological distinction between (Artemis) Phylake and “the goddess”, and it seems to us perfectly clear that the one is not to be identified with the other.

7.5 Other Sacrificial Terms

Three terms connected with consumption of the meat from sacrifices occur in the inscription: ἐσθίειν (A 17, B 45), ἀναλίσκειν (αὐτοῦ) (A 23, A 34), and ἀποφέρειν (B 56). These mean respectively “eat”, “consume (on the spot)”, and “carry away”, but it is unusual to encounter all three together, which raises interesting questions about how they are related, and in particular about how the first relates to the other two.

At A 21-3 ἀναλίσκειν occurs in a very difficult sentence: ὁ μὲν ἀγνὸς τῆς θεοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ χρυσίου καὶ τῆς βοτάνης, ὁ δὲ ἀκάθαρτος τελισκόμενος σώματι, διακλαινέστω τὸ στόμα ὄρνιθος καὶ ἀναλίσκόντωσαν αἱ φοιβατρίαι κτλ. “And let the female purification officials consume it” (*viz* the bird that has been killed), seems the likeliest rendering for the last four words. The context is also difficult at A 34-5: τὸ δὲ σκέλος ὄμῳ ἀφαιρεῖν καὶ --- Ο --- Η τῇ ἱερείᾳ καὶ ἀναλίσκειν αὐτοῦ (?) καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσοι τῶν ἀτελέστων ---- καὶ ἄνθρακα τῇ ἱερείᾳ. Too much is missing for one to be confident about the general sense, but it seems probable that we have here a new example of the requirement to “eat on the spot”, expressed in the well-established phrase ἀναλίσκειν αὐτοῦ¹⁹⁵. This requirement is designed to prevent the common practice of carrying portions of the meat of the sacrificial victim away from the sanctuary, a practice mentioned in the inscription at B 55-6, where among the prescriptions for sacrifice of bird or goose we find τὰ σκέλη ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν καὶ τὰ ἔνδον, τὰ δ’ ἄλλα ἀποφερέτω ὅπου ἂν βούληται, “(let him place) the legs and giblets onto the sanctuary-table, but carry away the rest of the meat wherever he wishes”. So far so neat and clear, but if

¹⁹⁵ On the requirement see S. SCULLION, “Olympian and Chthonian”, *Classical Antiquity* 13 (1994), p. 75-119, at p. 98-112. For the phrase, *SEG* XXXV, 923, l. 4-12 = *NGSL*, 20, l. 6-10; *LSS*, 94, l. 12-14; *LSAM*, 34, l. 7; Paus. VIII, 38, 8; for the verb in the same sense see Paus. II, 27, 1.

ἀναλίσκειν αὐτοῦ means “(compulsorily) eat on the spot” and ἀποφέρειν means “carry away from the sanctuary”, then what precisely does ἐσθίειν, “eat” imply? We find the word in two passages, A 15-17 (quoted on the following page) and B 44-5:

Ταῦτα ποήσας καὶ ἀποθύσας, φερέτω ἄλλο ἱερεῖον οὗ ἂμ βούληται καὶ ἐσθιέτω ὁ βουλόμενος. Are ἐσθίειν and ἀναλίσκειν equivalent variants, both requiring consumption in the sanctuary—as ἀμύητος and ἀτέλεστος (and perhaps ἀκάθαρτος) are probably indifferently used terms for “uninitiated person”—or are they distinct in meaning? If they are distinct, is ἐσθίειν equivalent to ἀποφέρειν? The simplest explanation is that ἐσθίειν is an equivalent of ἀναλίσκειν used in passages (such as the second) where ὁ βουλόμενος is the subject because no individual could consume a whole animal. This would not explain the use of ἐσθίειν rather than ἀναλίσκειν at A 17, but if the two terms are essentially equivalent it would not be surprising if they were used interchangeably.

7.6 Other Rituals and Ritual Terms

Three intriguing passages involve acts expressed by the verb βάλλειν:

τῇ μετὰ τὴν πομπήν, θύειν Ἀλαιαὶ καὶ βάλλειν : τῇ δε[κά]τῃ ἐνάτῃ Λιλλαιαδι βάλλειν καὶ Ἀρτέμιδι Φυλακῇ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι Πυλ[α]ίῳ ὅ τι ἂν θέλῃς καὶ ἐσθίειν πάντα (A 15-17)

ὥσπερ τῆς πρώτης [ca 5 l.] δὲ ὅπου ἂν βούλη[τα]ι τῶν τετελεσμένων ἄλι δὲ βάλλειν +ΚΑΙ. ΣΤΑΤΑ θύειν H[.]N (A 37-9)

ΕΙΟΥΛΗΝ. εἰκαδι ΙΟ τὰν θεὰν βάλλειν δὲ ΕΙΑΑΣ (A 44)

The context in all three passages is difficult, and in the third insufficient to determine the sense of the verb. The editors suggest that βάλλειν means “jeter (ou déposer?)”¹⁹⁶. We suggest that in the first passage the verb means “put” (LSJ II.6) or “cast” onto an offering-table and in the second either “pour”¹⁹⁷ or “sprinkle” with saltwater or “sprinkle” with dry salt.

¹⁹⁶ DECOURT and TZIAPHALIAS, *o.c.* (n. *2), p. 20, cf. p. 31 n. 50.

¹⁹⁷ LSJ sense II.6, as most famously at NT Matthew 9:17: οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς, “nor pour new wine into old wineskins”.

The second passage is most easily dealt with. The word ἄλς, like θάλασσα, can mean “saltwater”, which is a well-known agent of purification¹⁹⁸, and though dry salt could be used for purificatory purposes, the only evidence of it being “thrown” or “cast” of which we are aware is a passage of Menander where salt (and lentils) are “cast into” springs from which purificatory water is to be taken¹⁹⁹. Ritual aspersion with saltwater is, by contrast, well attested²⁰⁰.

In the first passage (A 15-17) βάλλειν is used in a new sense. The compound ἐμβάλλειν in the sense “throw into a sacrificial pit (or other receptacle)” is common enough, and the simplex might conceivably have that sense, but so far as we are aware there is no parallel for such an offering being retrieved and eaten. In A 16-7 βάλλειν stands alone, and the sequel ὅτι ἂν θέλῃς καὶ ἐσθίειν πάντα requires that it be closely equivalent to θύειν rather than ἐμβάλλειν, but on the other hand it cannot be precisely equivalent to θύειν, with which it is paired in the previous line. It might describe some type of sacrificial presentation preceding a meal, perhaps the “casting” of an offering onto the sanctuary table before it is eaten, in the case of Alaia along with (portions of) a sacrificed animal. This would perhaps cohere with the evidence discussed above²⁰¹ for table-offerings going back into the hands of the sacrificer both in this text (A 11-13) and in the cult of Mên at Sounion, but it is no more than a plausible guess at the sense of yet another new and surprising usage.

8/ Purity, purifications and abstentions

¹⁹⁸ For pure water and saltwater as purifying agents see especially PARKER, *o.c.* (n. 160), p. 226-7; for seawater in particular, D. WACHSMUTH, *Πόμπιμος ὁ δαίμων: Untersuchungen zu den antiken Sakralhandlungen bei Seereisen*, diss. Berlin, 1967, p. 219-23.

¹⁹⁹ Sophron fr. 4, 2-4 in R. KASSEL, C. AUSTIN, *Poetae Comici Graeci I*, Berlin, 2001, p. 194 and in J. HORDERN, *Sophron's Mimes*, Oxford, 2004, p. 42: a lump of salt is taken in the hand and laurel put by the ears; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* VII, 4, 26, 2-3 (vol. III, p. 19 STÄHLIN-FRÜCHTEL): lumps of salt are listed alongside red wool, torches, squill, and sulphur; Σ Aristoph. *Nub.* 1237: the mentally disturbed soaked with salt and oil; see PARKER, *o.c.* (n. 160), p. 227 n. 109; Menander *Phasma* 54-6 (ed. SANDBACH) = 29-31 (ed. ARNOTT), περιμαζάτωσάν σ' αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν κύκλῳ | καὶ περιθεωστάτωσαν· ἀπὸ κρουνῶν τριῶν | ὕδατι περίρραν' ἐμβάλων ἄλας, φακούς, which apparently plays on the making of soup.

²⁰⁰ As e.g. at *LSCG*, 97 A, l. 14-16, διαραίνειν τὴν οἰκίην ἐλεύθερον θαλά[σση] πρῶτον (Ceos, v BC, funerary); *IG* XII.4 (1) 274 (*LSCG*, 151 B, RHODES & OSBORNE, 62 B), l. 23-4, θύει ἱερῆς καὶ ἀπορραίνεται θαλάσσαι (Cos, iv BC), where the middle perhaps indicates self-purification; Menander *Theophor.* fr. dub. 1-2 (ed. SANDBACH), [καὶ τὸ χρυσίον |]θάλατταν ἐκχέον; Theocritus XXIV, 97-8, ἔπειτα δ' ἄλεσσι μεμιγμένον, ὥς νενόμισται, | θαλλῶ ἐπιρραίνειν ἐστεμμένῳ ἀβλαβὲς ὕδωρ, “and then, as the custom is, sprinkle pure water mixed with salt, using a twig wound with wool”; and Iambl. *Vit. Pyth.* 153, ἢ χρυσῶ [i.e. “with (water from) a golden bowl”] ἢ θαλάττη περιρραίνεσθαι; cf. *LSCG*, 156, l. 16 (ἀπορρανάσθω θαλάσσαι καὶ] καθαρὸς ἔστω *per conj.*). For aspersion see esp. JAMESON, JORDAN, KOTANSKY, *o.c.* (n. 159), on lines B 11 (p. 45) and A 12f. (p. 33).

²⁰¹ See p. 00-00.

Concern for purity arises in the text at four and perhaps five levels: (a) general cleansing of the shrine (b) periods of exclusion for those in impure conditions (c) purification in preparation for initiation (d) purifications after specific pollutions and perhaps (e) abstentions prior to access to the shrine.

(a) General cleansing of the shrine. The run up to the Eloulaia begins on the twelfth with a preliminary sacrifice to Moira; on the thirteenth a general cleansing of the sanctuary is performed, and on the fourteenth the goddess and her altar are ‘adorned’;²⁰² the purificatory sequence ends with a sacrifice, apparently marked as a conclusion by the prefix ἀπό in ἀποθύειν²⁰³, to Helios as overseer of purity. The general cleansing on the thirteenth is to be performed ‘along with the priestess by the φοιβατρίαι and the νεωκόρος and any other of the initiated who wishes’. The word φοιβατρίαι, cleansers, makes its first appearance outside ancient lexicography here²⁰⁴, though cf. LSJ s.v. ἀφοίβαντος, φοιβαίνω, φοιβάω, φοῖβος. Washing of statues and other items before a rite was commonplace²⁰⁵; at Eleusis and Olympia special officials were charged with the task, while the statue of Athena Polias at Athens was tended by the λουτρίδες/πλυντρίδες doubtless drawn from the *genos* of the Praxiergidai²⁰⁶. The function is nowhere assigned to special officials in a private society; in *LSCG*, 58, l. 12-14 it is merely one of the responsibilities of a foundation’s ἐπιμεληταί. The most interesting parallel is perhaps Pausanias, X, 32, 14: before the biannual festival of Isis at Tithorea, the *adyton* is purified ‘in a secret fashion’ by individuals picked out for the task by the goddess herself through dreams.

In the cleansing on Itonios 13 (A 4-8) the φοιβατρίαι are or may be dealing with physical dirt, and the words listed above usually refer to cleansing with liquids; but in B 34-5 the φοιβατρίαι share in the purification of the altars approached by an impure person. In A 23, if they are correctly read there, they either eat, or dispose of, a victim; in B 20-21 they are charged with collecting for the goddess. They seem to have assisted the priestess in a broad range of ways.

²⁰² On providing *kosmos* for cult statues see e.g. Hyperides, *Euxenippos*, 24-26; *IG* II³, 445.

²⁰³ See p. 00.

²⁰⁴ Hesychius φ 681 (ed. HANSEN-CUNNINGHAM), φοιβήτρια· καθάρτρια; cf. DECOURT and TZIAPHALIAS, *o.c.* (n. *2), p. 34.

²⁰⁵ *LSCG*, 39, l. 24-6; 58, l. 12-14.

²⁰⁶ For the φοιδυντής at Eleusis see *IG* I³, 231, A, l. 14 (Eleusis), with K. CLINTON, *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Philadelphia, 1974, p. 95. Olympia: Pausanias, V, 14, 5; λουτρίδες/πλυντρίδες: Hesychius, Photius, s.v. λουτρίδες.

(b) periods of exclusion for those in impure conditions. B 26-35 treats the topic. It prescribes ‘A woman shall enter from childbirth on the thirtieth day, she who miscarries/aborts on the fortieth day, from a man after washing from the head down, from the processes of nature (*i.e. menstruation*) on the seventh day. If anyone enters without having observed purity (ἀγνεύσας, masculine) from the things aforementioned ... ’ (a ritual of purification is then prescribed). The section appears to intrude within rules for sacrifice. Comparable restrictions for men do not survive, though they must have existed; on the three day rule of B 9-10 see (e) below. Had such preceded, ἀγνεύσας covering both genders would have been normal; as the text stands it is bizarre, and one may suspect that ἀγνεύσασα should have been written²⁰⁷. The pollutions listed are specifically feminine; it is surprising that there is no reference to contact with death, but this pollution may have been omitted because common to both genders.

Though regulations of this kind are familiar, the details would surprise at this date in a traditional Greek cult. An exclusion for 30 days after childbirth is the longest so far attested; 10 days was probably the norm²⁰⁸, and even the late *LSS*, 91, l. 15 (3rd c. A.D. ?) only goes up to 21 days. 44 days ἀπὸ διαφθέρματος (miscarriage, abortion) is attested in a cult of Egyptian gods at Megalopolis c. 200 B.C.²⁰⁹, 40 days in the sanctuary of the Syrian gods on Delos in the 2nd/ early 1st c. B.C.²¹⁰ and in unidentified sanctuaries at Ptolemais in Egypt in (?) the 1st c. B.C.²¹¹ and perhaps at Eresos on Lesbos²¹². But the securely identifiable cults in this list are non-Greek; in the earlier evidence from Greek cults miscarriage pollutes like either death or birth, thus in neither case for as long as 40 days²¹³. Particularly clear is the rule on menstruation, which pollutes in the cults of the Egyptian gods at Megalopolis, the Syrian gods on Delos, and the unknown cult at Ptolemais mentioned above²¹⁴, and much later in Xanthos’ foundation for Mén in Attica²¹⁵, but is a surprising

²⁰⁷ Conceivably the masculine is broadening the regulation to include men who have not been purified from contact with women in the preceding conditions as well the women themselves. But, unclarity aside, no Greek sacred law speaks of men being contaminated by contact with a menstruating woman.

²⁰⁸ PARKER, *o.c.* (n. * 160), p. 52, n. 74.

²⁰⁹ *NGSL*, 7, l. 6-9.

²¹⁰ *LSS*, 54, l. 6-7, ἀπὸ διαφθορᾶς.

²¹¹ *LSS*, 11, l. 10, ἀπ’ ἐκτρωσμοῦ.

²¹² *LSCG*, 124, l. 5-6, ? 2nd c. B.C.

²¹³ See PARKER, *o.c.* (n. * 160), p. 50, n. 67 and p. 355-6 (with some later evidence), where it is argued that these regulations do not distinguish natural from procured abortion.

²¹⁴ *NGSL*, 7, l. 8-9 (7 days); *LSS*, 54, l. 7-8 (9 days); *LSS*, 119, l. 13 (7 days).

²¹⁵ *LSS*, 55, l. 5 (7 days).

absentee from cults honouring old Greek gods²¹⁶. The relaxed attitude to sexual pollution – immediate access after washing - is perhaps more typical of Greek than non-Greek cults, but not unknown in the latter: the Megalopolis law has the same modest requirement as here²¹⁷.

(c) purification in preparation for initiation. Lines A 18-23 appear as follows in the first edition: Τελετή τῆς θεοῦ. ἄμ.ΕΠ.ΙΛΕΝ τελίσκῃται τρεῖς ἡμέρας θεραπεύειν, τῇ τρίτῃ ξυρεῖσθαι. ἐὰν δέ τις τῶν ἀκαθάρτων β[ούλ]ῃται τελεσθῆναι, ξυρησάσθω ἐν τρίσιν ἡμέραις, οἶνον λαβὼν ΟΥΚ..ΛΟ καὶ διακλαινέστω τὸ στόμα, ὁ μὲν ἀγνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ χρυσίου καὶ τῆς βοτάνης, ὁ δὲ ἀκάθαρτος τελισκόμενος σῶματι, διακλαινέστω τὸ στόμα ὄρνιθος καὶ ἀναλίσκόντωνσαν αἱ φοιβατρίαι

Only one point is clear in this difficult passage. ἀπὸ τοῦ χρυσίου καὶ τῆς βοτάνης is a variant of the purification ἀπὸ χρυσίου καὶ προσπερμείας, where ἀπό means not ‘from’ but ‘by’ means of²¹⁸, attested on Cos²¹⁹; this is the clearest trace in the text of a possible connection between Thessaly and Cos²²⁰. Insoluble problems surround it:

1/ A 20, ἐν τρίσιν ἡμέραις, οἶνον λαβὼν, is rendered by the editors ‘dans un délai de trois jours après avoir pris du vin’. If this means ‘after three days abstinence from wine’ it is paralleled by occasional requirements to approach Egyptian gods ‘pure from wine’²²¹ but strains the Greek, which should mean ‘within three days, having taken wine’²²². Wine had ritual uses in Egypt²²³, and it is not certain that abstention from it is what is here being enjoined. But we need to be told ‘within three days’ from what starting point.

2/ The verb διακλαίνειν is unknown, and a guess at its meaning is made very difficult by the change between τὸ στόμα and (apparently) τὸ στόμα ὄρνιθος as object in its two occurrences.

²¹⁶ See PARKER, *o.c.* (n. * 160), p. 102, n. 112. For menstrual pollution in a confession inscription from Lydia see R. PARKER, “τὰ φύσικα in a Confession Inscription from Saittai”, *ZPE* 163 (2007), p. 121-2.

²¹⁷ *NGSL*, 7, l. 12-13.

²¹⁸ *LSJ* s.v. ἀπό, III 6.

²¹⁹ *IG* XII 4, 72 (*LSCG*, 154) passim. Cf. n. * 226 below.

²²⁰ But note that the Alouliastai discovered by Carbon (p. 00 above) are on Cos.

²²¹ *LSCG*, 94, from Delos; Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, XI, 23, 2; Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride*, 6 (*Moralia* 353 A-C).

²²² Cf. Plutarch, *Eumenes*, 8, 9, τοῖς δὲ στρατιώταις ὑποσχόμενος ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις τὸν μισθὸν ἀποδώσειν; id., *Coriolanus*, 31, 7, παρακαλεῖν μετρίωτερα φρονήσαντας . . . ἥκειν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν ἡμέραις τρισὶν; Aristophon, fr. 8 K/A, ἐν ἡμέραις τρισὶν / ἰσχυρότερον αὐτὸν ἀποφανῶ Φιλίππιδου; *LSJ* s.v. ἐν, IV 2.

²²³ Plutarch, l.c. (n. * 221), with the commentary of J. GWYN GRIFFITHS, University of Wales Press, 1970, ad loc.

The editors show their perplexity by offering different tentative translations in the two cases. For the first they offer ‘garde bouche close (?)’, probably assuming a variant form of διακλείω, but this gives bad sense; one cannot keep the mouth closed indefinitely. The second they render ‘qu’il brise le cou d’un oiseau (?)’, probably thinking of διακλάω. That interpretation gives possible sense there, since birds were often killed through the mouth²²⁴, but is impossible in the first occurrence; and the middle form is not justified. The obvious meaning required by context in the first instance is ‘cleanse’, and Andreas Willi has tentatively suggested a route by which διακλαίνομαι could have emerged as a by-form of διακλύζω/ομαι, which is specifically used of the mouth in Hippocrates and Aristotle (see LSJ s.v.)²²⁵. To give it that sense in the second occurrence we must remove the comma before the second διακλαινέστω, detaching τὸ στόμα from ὄρνιθος and making the latter depend on a preceding dative of instrument, whether the editors’ σώματι (all letters dotted) or our very tentative [αἷματι]. But this solution introduces not just a bold hyperbaton uncharacteristic of this text, [αἷματι] ... ὄρνιθος, but also a ritual of purificatory mouth-washing with blood that is unattested and not readily believable.

3/ The sentence that starts ἐὰν δέ τις τῶν ἀκαθάρτων begins and ends with the requirement for an ‘impure initiand’ to διακλαίνεσθαι τὸ στόμα (ὄρνιθος), but is interrupted by a clause concerning the ‘pure one of the god’. This is inconsequential on any view. The inconsequentiality is lessened if ‘the pure one’ is also required διακλαίνεσθαι τὸ στόμα: having entered on that theme via the impure initiand, the writer would then have digressed to specify the different method by which the pure one was required to ‘cleanse his mouth’ (if that is indeed what the phrase means). The probably fatal difficulty with that view is that the purification ‘by gold and plant’ is normally, and surely rightly, taken to entail sprinkling, not drinking²²⁶; it does not then involve the mouth. We must then suppose that the writer has

²²⁴ Artemidorus, Ὀψαρτυτικά Γλῶσσαι, in Athenaeus, XIV, 663d: ἐσφάχθω μὲν διὰ τοῦ στόματος εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν.

²²⁵ ‘διακλύζω belongs to a rare formal group of verbs alongside βλύζω and φλύζω, but the latter too mean “bubble up, gush forth” and “boil over, bubble up”, respectively: so they are clearly intransitive (though active in form). With such “parallels” in place, transitive διακλύζω “wash out” could seem the odd one out and hence in need of clearer marking of its factitive-causative (transitive) value. For that purpose, the productive factitive-causative suffix -αίνω was quite suitable, all the more, perhaps, because -αίνω did occur with u-stem-based adjectives, among others: cf. γλυκαίνω “sweeten” to γλυκυ- – so if the (synchronic only!) basis was taken to be διακλυ-, then διακλαίνω would seem a reasonably straightforward neo-formation.’ But he stresses that this interpretation is primarily sense-driven and a link with διακλάω might be easier formally.

²²⁶ See JAMESON, JORDAN, KOTANSKY, *o.c.* (n. 159), p. 33 on the Coan ἀπὸ χρυσίου καὶ προσπερμείας: ‘water from a golden vessel and seeds’. In our passage the βοτάνη could be either a branch used for sprinkling, or some leaves that are thrown.

veered to the quite different means by which the pure one purified himself. Such inconsequentiality is common in speech, strange in writing.

The difficulties noted under 2/ and 3/ could be alleviated by the hypothesis – but we are now piling speculation on speculation! – that the phrase ‘purify the mouth’ had become fossilized to mean simply ‘purify oneself’ without any reference to the mouth²²⁷; this would dispense with the blood drinking of 2/ and allow the purification ‘by gold and plant’ of 3/ to work normally; there would remain the hard hyperbaton of (e.g.) [αἵματι] ... ὀρνιθοῦς noted under 2/.

(d) On the ritual aspects of the three purifications, and the sacrifices that must follow them, after pollution of parts of the sanctuary see p. 00. By contrast, a *phoibatria* who neglects a duty must pay for a sacrifice, but has not polluted the sanctuary (B 20-21), and an initiand who prefers not to shave can apparently buy himself free of the obligation (A 27). In B 2-6 and in B 29-35 it is specified that the purification is performed by members of the temple staff (just as they are charged with purifying ‘impurities in the sanctuary’ in A 6-8); thus ‘let him purify’ in B 30 must be imprecise for ‘let him pay for the purificatory offering’. The same is likely to have applied in B 13-16 too. Whether the offender performed his own sacrifice, or whether this was seen as part of the purification performed by the temple staff, is unclear, though one might think that the offender against time-based purity rules of B 29-35 should not have been allowed to sacrifice until the required time had passed.

(e) B 7-10 prescribes ‘An uninitiated person shall not go into the *prothyron*, unless any wishes to perform a vow . . . and keeps pure for the three days from all the things specified above.’ No such ‘three day’ rule is found in the surviving portion of the text. Among the conditions or activities purity from which is commonly required in sacred laws, several are treated later in the text ((b) above), where the ‘quarantine’ period tends to be much longer than three days. It is likely then that the reference here is to something different; very probably what was required was abstention from particular foods for a period before approaching the sanctuary, as in the Egyptian cult at Megalopolis and the Syrian cult on Delos from which parallels to our text were quoted above²²⁸.

9/ General character of the text

²²⁷ For possible Mesopotamian antecedents that might help to explain this development see p. 00 above.

²²⁸ *NGSL*, 7, l. 10-11; *LSS*, 54, l. 2-3; cf. PARKER, *o.c.* (n. * 160), p. 359, n. 12, LUPU’s note on *NGSL*, 7, l. 10-12.

That the cult performed at the unknown sanctuary for the unknown goddess is a hybrid has been obvious from the start. On the Greek side, there is nothing un-Greek about the titles of the cult personnel; the φοιβατρίαι are new, but they bear a Greek name and perform functions familiar from Greek cult. ‘Collecting’ is already attested in the cult of Greek goddesses in the fifth century²²⁹. The physical features of the sanctuary bear familiar Greek names, though this does not prove that they had familiar Greek forms²³⁰. On the other hand, the two festivals, thus the central activity with which the text is concerned, bear names derived from ‘the standard Mesopotamian calendar’; the long duration of the Eloulaia (7 days, preceded by collecting) finds many parallels in the ancient Near East²³¹, though not unheard of in the Greek world. It is unfortunate that we learn no more about the Nisanaia than that the procession occurs ‘if the goddess comes from the river’. Nisan, at the time of the spring equinox, was the first month of the year in the standard Mesopotamian calendar, and a time of major cultic activity throughout the ancient Near East; often (so for instance at Seleucid Uruk) it hosted an ‘akitu’ festival, enacted over many days and centring on the withdrawal and triumphant return of a deity. It is tempting to imagine the ‘coming of the goddess from the river’ within such a scenario; but we know too little to press the comparison²³². It is tempting too to wonder whether the festivals at Marmarini retain a calendrical/astronomical connection: the Nisanaia is close to the spring equinox, and the first month of the Thessalian new year is Itonios, which in our calendar begins with collections at the new moon (B 17-18), which are soon followed by the Eloulaia itself. The Eloulaia, however, cannot be tied to the autumn equinox; Elul is the fifth month after Elul, i.e. one too soon.

The gods named are a mixture of Greek and non-Greek, but ‘the goddess’ herself, we believe, is not the Greek Artemis Phylake. The entry requirements after pollutions find their detailed parallels at this date in the cults of Egyptian or Syrian gods practised on Greek soil.

²²⁹ Aeschylus, fr. 168, 16-17 (ed. RADT); Herodotus, IV, 35, 3; cf. P. DEBORD, *Aspects sociaux et économiques de la vie religieuse dans l’Anatolie gréco-romaine*, Leiden, 1982, p. 196; H.U. WIEMER, D. KAH, “Die Phrygische Mutter im hellenistischen Priene”, *EA* 44 (2011), p. 1-54, at p. 9.

²³⁰ Above, p. 00. But for parallels to many of them in Greco-Egyptian cults see the index to *RICIS*, II, s.v. ναός, περίστυλον, πρόναος, πρόπυλον; on sanctuaries of oriental gods on Delos see P. BRUNEAU, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l’époque hellénistique et à l’époque impériale*, Paris, 1970, p. 457-480.

²³¹ See CARBON, *o.c.* (n. * 3), p. 00.

²³² See COHEN, *o.c.* (n. *12), p. 104, 389-407. Akitu rituals were celebrated for various gods and goddesses. For Assyrian Astrolabe B’s characterisation of the month Elulu as that when ‘the goddesses purify themselves in the sacred river’ see *ibid.*, p. 422. Note too n. 103 above. But on washing of statues in rivers or the sea in Greek cult see e.g. PARKER, *o.c.* (n. * 160), p. 27-8. On rites in Nisan see n. *12 above. It has been suggested to us that the unpredictable ‘coming of the goddess from the river’ might refer to the unpredictable appearance of the first new moon of the new year. But we struggle to understand ‘from the river’ on this view.

Central aspects of the cult's sacrificial regime such as the frequency of bird victims and of holocaust sacrifices, and many of its salient anomalies by the standard of Greek norms, are very probably to be explained by hybridity. The non-Greek components have themselves multiple origins: Semitic and Anatolian²³³ elements are certain, and it is at least possible that Egyptian cults have also contributed. What one is to make of 'initiation' is the most tantalising question: as a form of cultic action it is unquestionably Greek, but is it exclusively so? At all events candidates for it are now invited to submit to the drastically non-Greek requirement to shave the head – but may be able to avoid it.

A completely clear picture does not emerge from the various restrictions on offering particular victims to particular gods. The rule that one may bring anything except fish and doves to 'Pan whom the Syrians call [. . .] PLEN' (A 9-11) recalls the Syrian reverence for fish and doves already mentioned by Xenophon²³⁴. Doves are not mentioned again, whether positively (amid the many bird species that appear as permitted victims) or negatively. Small roasted fish (ἀποπυρίς)²³⁵ can be offered to Phylake (B 32). One should not then stress too much the Syrian character of the text, since the familiar restriction on fish is limited to one case, and even there the ban is on offering, not eating, the species. Pork is the offering most regularly forbidden in the text (through strangely not in relation to 'Pan whom the Syrians call [. . .] PLEN'): it is never permitted and repeatedly banned (B 15, 32-3, 51), even in the prescription for 'sacrifice by the Greek rite' (B 36); purifications are performed with birds, not, as normally in Greece (except for Aphrodite)²³⁶, with piglets. But twice the worshipper is permitted to sacrifice 'anything he pleases' (A 16-17, to Lillaias and Artemis Phylake and Apollo ? Pylaios; B 44, a rather mysterious context); one may wonder whether the complete freedom implied by that formula was really intended. The editors write²³⁷ that the ban on pork does not in itself allow one to speak of a cult as oriental; but in Greece it is confined to Aphrodite and (this only so far on Thasos) figures from her entourage²³⁸.

²³³ Semitic: the festival names; 'Pan whom the Syrians call [. . .] PLEN'. Anatolian: Mên. Mên is unattested in Syria with the single exception of his appearance on coins of Laodicea ad Libanum from the time of Hadrian onwards: see E. LANE, *Corpus Monumentorum Religionis Dei Menis*, vol. 2, Leiden, 1975, p. 162-3; the map at the end of the volume shows the extreme isolation of this attestation.

²³⁴ *Anabasis*, I, 4, 9. Cf. for fish LIGHTFOOT, *o.c.* (n. *84), p. 65-72, beginning: 'if there was one thing that characterized the Syrian goddess in Greek eyes, it was her association with fish'; for doves, where the evidence relates predominantly though not exclusively to Syria, see *ibid.*, p. 513.

²³⁵ R. STRÖMBERG, *Studien zur Etymologie und Bildung der griechischen Fischnamen*, Göteborg, 1943, p. 89.

²³⁶ *LSCG*, 39, l. 24.

²³⁷ *o.c.* (n. 2), p. 34.

²³⁸ V. PIRENNE-DELFORGE, *L' Aphrodite grecque*, Liège, 1994, p. 396-392; Thasos: *LSCG*, 114, *LSS*, 73. On the widespread ban among Near Eastern peoples see references in LIGHTFOOT, *o.c.* (n. *84), p. 512, n. 1.

It is not easy to contextualize in Thessaly the immigrants (or returning soldiers?) who introduced the cult. Demetrias was a cosmopolitan city, but the easterners whose specific origin is attested by the famous painted gravestones are, almost without exception, Phoenicians, and Phoenicia was one region of the Near East where the standard Mesopotamian calendar, from which come the festival names Eloulaia and Nisanaia, was not in use²³⁹. Philip V in 217 B.C. famously exhorted the citizens of Larisa to share their citizenship more generously, like the Romans²⁴⁰, but there is no knowing the origin of the beneficiaries he envisaged; they may well have been primarily metics from other Thessalian cities. Much the most suggestive document for our purposes is a base from Krannon, tentatively dated to the late 2nd c B.C., which bears a dedication plausibly supplemented by the editor Παρθ[ένωι?]/ Βαμβυκί[αι?]/ Ἀσύλο[ς?]/ Ἐργ[]/ εὐ[]²⁴¹. The ‘Virgin of Bambyke’ would inescapably be the Syrian goddess, Atargatis of Hierapolis/Bambyke, even if that precise periphrasis for her is not found elsewhere; and it would become arguable that a Parthenos who receives a dedication at Pherai in the third century was the same goddess (though she may rather be a quite distinct Parthenos widely attested in Northern Greece)²⁴². The Syrian goddess already had public cult at Beroia in Macedonia in the third c. B.C.²⁴³. ‘The goddess’ of our inscription might indeed be Atargatis – but one misses any reference to her well-known consort Hadad.

The great absentees from our picture of the cult are the worshippers. Since no single individual is named, we have no information about their ethnicity; the Eloulaia and Nisanaia were surely brought to Thessaly by immigrants, but numerous examples show how imported cults could be swiftly domesticated. Carbon has stressed the permissive character of the text, with its openness to sacrifice in many forms, whether Greek or an unidentified other. Against this must be set the requirement for male initiates to join what Juvenal was later to call a

²³⁹ As acutely observed by CARBON, *o.c.* (n. *3), p. 00. Painted gravestones: A.S. ARVANITOPOULLOS, *Θεσσαλικά μνημεῖα* (τόμ. 1.). Περιγραφή τῶν ἐν τῷ Ἀθανασακείῳ μουσεῖῳ Βόλου γραπτῶν στηλῶν τῶν Παγασῶν, Athens, 1909; idem, *Graptai stēlai Dēmētríados-Pagason*, Athens, 1928; cf. O. MASSON, ‘Épigraphes de Phéniciens à Démétrias de Thessalie’, *BCH* 93 (1969), p. 687-700. Among the many slave names attested in Thessaly by manumission inscriptions (R. ZELNICK-ABRAMOWITZ, *Taxing Freedom in Thessalian Manumission Inscriptions*, Leiden, 2013, p. 151-6), names such as Σύρα/ος occur (e.g. *IG* IX 2, 287 b, l. 7; 474, l. 34-5), but not with significant frequency. For a stray ‘Chaldaian astronomer’ from Hierapolis who had acquired citizenship in Homolion see *SEG* XXXI, 576.

²⁴⁰ *Syll.*³, 543.

²⁴¹ D.P. THEOCHARIS, *AD* 17 B (1961/62), p. 179, no. 4b, drawn to our attention by Sofia Kravaritou.

²⁴² Y. BÉQUIGNON, *Recherches archéologiques à Phères de Thessalie*, Paris, 1937, p. 91, no. 64. Parthenos: cf. R. PARKER, ‘Some Theonyms of Northern Greece’, forthcoming.

²⁴³ See n. *253 below.

‘grex calvus’²⁴⁴; but we saw above that even this may have been avoidable for a small fee. There may also have been a recommendation (unenforceable) of abstention from certain foods for three days before entry²⁴⁵.

The editors and Carbon have discussed the body responsible for publishing the rules and thus in charge of the sanctuary; both, with due caution, have inclined towards a private body rather than the city. Parallels can certainly be drawn with the activities of some of the associations of the Hellenistic period²⁴⁶. Associations could have ‘temples’ and other elaborate architectural features²⁴⁷, celebrate named festivals²⁴⁸, and organise processions and collections²⁴⁹. Yet our text is very unlike any surviving decree of an association. The difference is not just that such decrees relate almost exclusively to honours and membership and not to the actual rituals that are to be performed. More important is the complete absence from our text of the characteristic officials of such associations (ταμίαι, ἐπιμεληταί, γραμματεῖς), and, still more, of any trace of a concept of association or membership. Even if we suppose that the concept of member has been replaced by that of ‘initiate’, the openness of the sanctuary to non-members/initiates is very unusual. The shrine of the ὀργεῶνες of Bendis at Athens, a classical precursor of the later associations, was open to non-members²⁵⁰, but these ὀργεῶνες were a most unusual case, since both they and their sanctuary had a role in a civic festival. And even the Bendis ὀργεῶνες charged special fees to non-members who sacrificed in the shrine: our text, preoccupied though it is with perquisites and fees, makes no such distinction. It is true that we do not know how the cult of some non-Greek gods was organised in the early years after their introduction: the cults introduced to Athens by the merchants of Kition (Aphrodite) and ‘the Egyptians’ (Isis) are cases in point, as is that of Sarapis brought to Delos by Apollonios²⁵¹. But a contribution-paying association is the most likely answer. Until a sanctuary of some importance (minor rustic shrines are a different case)

²⁴⁴ VI, 533.

²⁴⁵ p. 00 above.

²⁴⁶ For useful selections see *Greco-Roman Associations: Texts, Translations and Commentary*, I, J.S. KLOPPENBORG, R.S. ASCOUGH, *Attica, Central Greece, Macedonia, Thrace*, Berlin, 2011; II, P.A. HARLAND, *North Coast of the Black Sea, Asia Minor*, Berlin, 2014.

²⁴⁷ See KLOPPENBORG and ASCOUGH, *o.c.* (n. *246), General Index, s.v. ναός; note e.g. the πρόστωιον and ἄετώμα of IG II², 1271 (their no. 13).

²⁴⁸ e.g. Adonia, IG II², 1261 (KLOPPENBORG and ASCOUGH, *o.c.* [n. *246], no. 9), l. 9; ‘both the Attideia’, IG II², 1315 (KLOPPENBORG and ASCOUGH, no. 29), l. 10.

²⁴⁹ See KLOPPENBORG and ASCOUGH, *o.c.* (n. *246), General Index, s.v. πομπή and ἀγερμός.

²⁵⁰ IG II², 1361 (KLOPPENBORG and ASCOUGH, *o.c.* [n. *246], no. 4), l. 4-5; cf. R. PARKER, *Athenian Religion*, Oxford, 1996, p. 170-1. KLOPPENBORG and ASCOUGH, p. 166, are wrong to identify the sanctuary of Dionysus in the Piraeus at which ephebes sacrificed with that of the Dionysiasts; the cult of Dionysus in the Piraeus long antedated the association (e.g. IG II², 1496, l. 70, 144).

²⁵¹ IG II³, 337 (KLOPPENBORG and ASCOUGH, *o.c.* [n. *246], no. 3); IG XI 4, 1299.

has been identified that is both private and open to ‘anyone who wishes’, the Marmarini precinct will be isolated if so understood.

The alternative is that it was controlled by a city. It may be objected that no set of rules issued in the name of a city resembles our text any more than did decrees of private associations. But it is at least possible to imagine situations in which a city might have created such a text. Gods initially worshipped by associations of foreigners were adopted into the civic pantheon of cities; or perhaps cities decided of their own accord to introduce such cults. We know no study devoted specifically to the take up by cities of foreign gods, but it was certainly commonplace: in regard to Egyptian gods we can mention public priesthoods attested by the end of the second c. B.C. in Thessalonike, Delos, Athens, Demetrias, Magnesia on the Maeander, and Priene, and, if we accept the evidence of manumissions by consecration, public cult in numerous cities of central and northern Greece²⁵²; in regard to the Syrian goddess, public cults in the hellenistic period on Delos, at Thuria in Messenia, Beroia in Macedonia, and probably Phystion in Aetolia²⁵³. A civic sanctuary might be established alongside and to some extent in rivalry with one belonging to an association or associations, as happened when Sarapieion C joined the private Sarapieia A and B on Delos; or an association’s sanctuary might simply be taken over, as with that of the Syrian goddess on Delos. The documents that attest these cults reveal little about the ritual activities that took place in them, but numerous dedications show the popularity of both Sarapieion C and the Syrian sanctuary; festivals have certainly to be supposed²⁵⁴. We have already noted the theatre in the Syrian sanctuary, the ‘mysteries’ of the same cult at Thuria in Messenia. Different religious traditions came together in Sarapieion C as in the Marmarini sanctuary; Roussel, observing the range of deities who received dedications, famously described it as a pandemonium²⁵⁵. Rural Thessaly is a very different environment from multi-cultural Delos, but the hybridity of the Marmarini cult is a fact.

²⁵² Thessalonike: *RICIS*, 113/0501-2; Delos: BRUNEAU, *o.c.* (*n. 230), p. 462; Athens: *IG* II², 4692 (*RICIS*, 101/0202), as interpreted by S. DOW, “The Egyptian Cults in Athens”, *HTHR* 30 (1937), p. 184-232, at p. 198-201 (dating it c. 200; the new dedication *SEG* LIX, 274 may still relate to a private cult); Demetrias: *RICIS*, 112/0702-4; Priene: *IPriene* (2014), 196 (*RICIS*, 304/0802; *LSAM*, 36); Magnesia: *RICIS*, 304/0701 (*LSAM*, 34). Manumissions: *RICIS*, 105/0602 with note; cf. e.g. *RICIS*, 105/0201 (Sarapieia in Tanagra, c. 90-85 B.C.); *RICIS*, 112/0503 (a dedication by the polis of Larisa to Harpocrates, ? 1st BC).

²⁵³ Delos: BRUNEAU, *o.c.* (*n. 230), p. 468; Thuria: note *127 above; Beroia: L. GOUNAROPOULOU, M. HATZOPOULOS, *Ἐπιγραφὲς Κάτω Μακεδονίας*, I, Athens, 1998, 19; Phystion *IG* IX I², I, 96.

²⁵⁴ On all this see BRUNEAU, *o.c.* (*n. 230), p. 457-473; on the Sarapieia now I. Moyer, *Egypt and the Limits of Hellenism*, Cambridge, 2011, p. 142-207.

²⁵⁵ P. ROUSSEL, *Délos, Colonie Athénienne*, Paris, 1916, p. 251.

It has been objected to us that an imported cult taken over by a city would not bear the aspect that this one does: the city would have replaced the libertarian approach of the text with sacrificial norms, and would not have cared to accommodate the worship of obscure gods with unadjusted barbarian names such as Mogga and Lilla(ias)²⁵⁶. These points have force, but are not decisive when we know so little in detail of the processes and stages by which cities incorporated imported cults. Any confident statement about so unusual a text is hazardous, but we tentatively assign it to a city, thus presumably Larisa. On any view, the new document is a bombshell that has transformed our sense of the possibilities of middle/late Hellenistic religion.

Robert Parker
New College, University of Oxford

Scott Scullion
Worcester College, University of Oxford

²⁵⁶ These points were made to one of us by, respectively, Sylvie Honigman and Miltiades Hatzopoulos.