

MARIJANA RICL

OBSERVATIONS ON A NEW CORPUS OF INSCRIPTIONS FROM LYDIA

aus: *Epigraphica Anatolica* 44 (2011) 143–152

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## OBSERVATIONS ON A NEW CORPUS OF INSCRIPTIONS FROM LYDIA

Four years ago, Austrian Academy of Sciences published a new corpus of Greek and Latin inscriptions from Lydia.<sup>1</sup> As explained in the Preface composed by one of its authors, this joint work was planned and started by Peter Herrmann and Hasan Malay in 1999, and by the time of his passing in 2002, Herrmann had already made his contribution, mainly on nos. 8 (dedication to Claudius or Nero), 32A–B (royal documents from the Attalid chancellery) and 58 (honorary decree for Kleandros, son of Mogetes). This exemplary volume embraces 101 unpublished inscriptions from the Hermos and Cayster valleys, mostly discovered by H. Malay during his yearly surveys. Inscriptions are arranged in chapters according to their find-spot. They come from the following ancient cities, village communities and regions: Hermokapeleia (nos. 1–2), Thyateira (3–6), Apollonis (7–11), Hierokaisareia (12–17), Moschakome (18), Tyanollos (19), Hyrkanis (20–21), Lamyana? (22), Ioulieis Maibozanoi? (23), Iulia Gordos (24–26), mountainous region between Thyateira, Attaleia and Iulia Gordos (27–30), Charakipolis (31), Daldis (32–38), area of Daldis-Charakipolis (39–42), Sardeis (43), Saittai (44–50), area of Hamidiye-Mağazadamları (51–52), Iaza (53–57), Maionia (58–65), Tarsi? (66), Silandos (67–74), Thermai Theseos (75–79), Tabala (80), Kollyda (81–85), Northeast Lydia (86–95), Cayster valley (96–101). Many important aspects of the region in question are highlighted by these inscriptions. It is my pleasure to offer comments and suggestions on the following ten items.

La pièce de résistance of the corpus is without doubt no. 32 brought to the Manisa Museum from Taşkuyucak west of Daldis, but probably concerning Sardeis and its territory (see below), an opisthographic stele with two inscriptions carved by different stone-cutters but at approximately the same period. On one side (A) we find royal regulations in favour of Mysian soldiers/colonists settled at a place called Kournoubudos who suffered during a war that took place “last year”. On the other side (B) is engraved the following inscription:

- [-----]PE[----- το]ύτων δὲ τῶν AN[-----]  
[.]δριαῖ ἐπιγράφεται ... ὑπάρχειν τὰ φιλόνηρωπ[α ..... ]  
ΝΑΣ τῶν συναναφερομένων λιποστρατήσαι ἐν τῷ β' καὶ λ' ἔτει περι-  
ελεῖν· ὑπάρχειν δὲ ταῦτὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις· τὴν ἀσυλίαν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ  
5 Στρατίου ὑπάρχειν – ἀντὶ τῶν προσυνκεχωρημένων σταδίων  
ἑπτὰ ἔσται ἐπὶ στάδια δέκα – καὶ ἵνα Βάκχιος ὁ ἱερεὺς ποιῆ στέφα-  
νον χρυσοῦν· τὰ ἀναφερομένα ὀφειλήματα τὰ ἐν ὑμῖν ἀργυρικὰ ἢ σι-  
τικὰ ἕως τοῦ τρίτου ἔτους ἀπολύσαι, εἰ μὴ τινες πράξαντές  
τινα αὐτοὶ κατεισχήκασιν· περὶ τῶν ἐνπεπυρισμένων καὶ κα-  
10 θειλκυσμένων οἰκιῶν ἐν τῷ προαστίῳ προνοηθῆναι, ἵν', ἐπεὶ  
δημόται ἐσμέν, μεταδοθῆ ἡ εἰς τὴν κατασκευὴν αὐτῶν· Σι-  
βλοην κώμην τὴν πρότερον οὔσαν ἡμετέραν, περὶ ἧς γέγρα-  
πται, ἵνα διορθωσαμένων ἡμῶν τὴν τιμὴν Μελεάργωι τῷ

<sup>1</sup> Peter Herrmann (†) – Hasan Malay, *New Documents from Lydia*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 340. Band, Ergänzungsbände zu den Tituli Asiae Minoris Nr. 24, Wien 2007.

- ἡγορακότη ἀυτὴν δραχμῶν<sup>vac</sup> ΥΜΗ - C ἀποδοθῆ, κομί-  
 15 σασθαι νῦν ἄνευ τιμῆς, ὅπως ὑπάρχωσιν αἱ ἐξ αὐτῆς  
 πρόσοδοι εἷς τε τὰς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Στρατίου καὶ τὰς ὑπὲρ ὑ-  
 μῶν συντελουμένας θυσίας καὶ διαμένη ἡμῖν ἱερὰ καὶ ἀτελής·  
 τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον δοθῆναι ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἐκ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ τῶι Μελεά-  
 γρωι· εἰς τὰ ἐλλείποντα τοῖς κλήροις καὶ προσδόμασιν δο-  
 20 θῆναι κώμας· ἐπ(ε)ὶ αἱ πρότερον ἀφαιρεθεῖσαι ἡμῶν οὐκ ἀ-  
 ποκατεστάθησαν ὄν τρόπον συνεκεχωρήκεις, παραδει-  
 ξαι Θιλευδον καὶ Πλαζειρα κατοικίας κυνηγῶν· τοὺς δ' ἐν  
 τούτοις μετάγειν εἰς ἃς ἂν κρίνη κατοικίας Λυκίνος ὁ γεωδό-  
 τής· συντετάχαμεν γὰρ τούτῳ ἐπιβλέψαντι παραδειξαι.

This inscription provides a reference to the soldiers registered as having deserted the army in the year 32 (τῶν συναναφερομένων λιποστρατήσαι ἐν τῶι β' καὶ λ' ἔτει), most probably referring to Eumenes' II reign and leading us to the year 166/5 BC. It contains a report on six decisions and *philanthropa* made by Eumenes II<sup>2</sup>. Decisions are couched in a series of infinitives (ὑπάρχειν, περιλεῖν, ἀπολύσαι, προνοηθῆναι, κομίσασθαι, δοθῆναι, παραδειξαι, μετάγειν)<sup>3</sup>. The type of decisions listed in this inscription is such that they could have been made only by a king (ll. 18–19: τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον δοθῆναι ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἐκ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ τῶι Μελεάγρωι; l. 24: συντετάχαμεν γὰρ τούτῳ ἐπιβλέψαντι παραδειξαι), but the wording and the changes from the first to the second person in the verbs and pronouns are more baffling than usually in this category of documents. Even more surprising, at least at first sight, is the phrase ἐπεὶ δημόται ἐσμέν in lines 10–11, where the person speaking seems to be referring to his appurtenance to “the same people/citizens”. The editors translate “since we are concerned about the people (?)”. I would venture another explanation: the “speaker” is not the King but a citizen of the city in question (Sardeis<sup>4</sup>) who is reporting to the community on the benefactions that possibly resulted from his intervention with the King (perhaps he is one of the ambassadors mentioned in the inscription on the other side of the stone?) or, less likely, a citizen of the same community employed by the King in some official capacity and reporting back to his πατρίς. If we accept this solution, then the phrase ἐν ἡμῖν in line 7 would stand for the members of the same community: *the debts in cash and grain reported among us are to be remitted until the third year*. The restoration of the burnt and demolished houses in the city's territory is left to the citizens themselves, who are urged to contribute the necessary funds, since the people living outside the city and affected by these demolitions are their *demotai*. If we continue in the same vein, we understand that the vil-

<sup>2</sup> The inviolable territory of the sanctuary of Zeus Stratios is extended from seven to ten stadia, the priest Bakchios is ordered to provide a golden crown, the debts in cash and kind (grain) registered in the community are remitted until the third year, the burnt and demolished houses in the territory are to be restored, the village of Sibloe is returned to the city without compensation, two villages are given over to the city for allotments and additional housing.

<sup>3</sup> Only once (l. 6) we have ἵνα with a subjunctive form (καὶ ἵνα Βάκχιος ὁ ἱερεὺς ποιῆι στέφανον χρυσοῦν). A. Chaniotis (*Kernos* 23, 2010, 302) suggests reading καὶ ἵνα Βάκχιος ὁ ἱερεὺς ποιῆι στέφανον χρυσοῦν τὰ ἀναφερομένα ὀφειλήματα τὰ ἐν ἡμῖν ἀργυρικὰ ἢ σιτικὰ ἕως τοῦ τρίτου ἔτους ἀπολύσαι, connecting the cost of the golden crown with the remittance of debts in cash and kind. I am not inclined to accept this suggestion because the mentioned debts were probably not due to the royal treasury at all (see below), and, moreover, a gold crown could hardly have been so expensive as to require a remittance of all debts in a community for its purchase. I think we can safely assume that the cost of the crown will be covered by the priest.

<sup>4</sup> C. Brixhe and Ph. Gauthier (*BE* 2007, 451) also attribute the inscriptions to Sardeis.

lage of Sibloe treated in lines 11–19 originally belonged to the city in question (Σιβλοην κώμην τὴν πρότερον οὔσαν ἡμετέραν) not the King; after some time, it was allowed by the (same?) King that the village be returned to the community upon payment of the purchase price to its current owner Meleagros, but now the King has graciously decided to pay the mentioned price from the royal treasury. Under these circumstance, it appears that the second person plural form ὑμῶν in lines 16–17 is needlessly emended by the editors to ἡμῶν. Not only would it be the only mistake committed by the stone-cutter, but there is actually no need for an emendation, as the pronoun refers to the King as referred to by the hypothetic local speaker. The sacrifices funded by the income from the village of Sibloe will be made both to Zeus Stratios and Eumenes II<sup>5</sup>. The concluding part of the inscription (ll. 19–24) refers to two villages of *kynegoi*, Thileudos and Plazeira: since some other villages belonging to the city and taken away from it were not restored ὄν τρόπον συνεκεχωρήκεις (sc. the King), the above-mentioned villages will be assigned to the city to cover the need for more allotments and additional housing<sup>6</sup>. The *geodotes* Lykinos who will find other *katoikiai* for settling the evacuated inhabitants of Thileudos and Plazeira, is the link between the two documents.<sup>7</sup>

Conclusion: the text of 32B is a decision made and written down originally in the first person by Eumenes II, addressed to the city of Sardeis (?) after the devastations it suffered during the Galatian war. It contains several *philanthropa* aimed at ameliorating the economic situation of the city and its citizens, particularly the ones from the surrounding territory whose houses were burnt and demolished in the war. The decision was read out in the civic assembly probably by one of the ambassadors who visited the King after his final victory over the Galatians. The original wording of the King's decision was modified in the following manner: all the second person plural pronouns referring to the citizens of Sardeis (?) were changed into first person plural ones (the original “you”, “your”, in lines 7, 12, 13, 17 and 20 was modified into “we/us”, “our”), and the same procedure was applied when the original ἐπεὶ δημόται ἐστέ in line 11 became ἐπεὶ δημόται ἐσμέν. With the same logic, two out of three instances in which the King referred to himself either in the plural or singular form (ll. 16–17: καὶ τὰς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν συντελουμένας θυσίας; l. 21: ὄν τρόπον συνεκεχώρηκα) were changed into the second person (καὶ τὰς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν συντελουμένας θυσίας; ὄν τρόπον συνεκεχωρήκεις). Only the last line of the inscription συντετάχαμεν γὰρ τούτῳ ἐπιβλέσαντι παραδείξαι remained in its original form, as a direct quotation of the King's words testifying that the formal order had been given to the official in charge.

The suggested original text of the royal rescript:

- [-----]PE[----- το]ύτων δὲ τῶν AN[-----]  
 [.]δριαι ἐπιγέγραπ[ται ... ὑ]πάρχειν τὰ φιλόανθρωπ[α ..... ]  
 ΝΑΣ τῶν συναναφερομένων (λι)ποστρατήσαι ἐν τῷ β' καὶ λ' ἔτει περι-  
 ελεῖν· ὑπάρχειν δὲ ταῦτά τοις ἄλλοις· τὴν ἀσυλίαν τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ  
 5 Στρατίου ὑπάρχειν – ἀντὶ τῶν προσυκεχωρημένων σταδίων  
 ἑπτὰ ἔσται ἐπὶ στάδια δέκα – καὶ ἵνα Βάκχιος ὁ ἱερεὺς ποιῆι στέφα-  
 νον χρυσῶν· τὰ ἀναφερομένα ὀφειλήματα τὰ ἐν ἡμῖν ἀργυρικὰ ἢ σι-

<sup>5</sup> It is not impossible that other members of the dynasty were included in the sacrifices as well.

<sup>6</sup> I think this is the meaning of πρόσδομα in line 19: more lots and houses are needed, and that is why the two villages are being evacuated of their original inhabitants.

<sup>7</sup> He appears in line 12 of 32A.

τικὰ ἕως τοῦ τρίτου ἔτους ἀπολύσαι, εἰ μή τινες πράξαντές  
 τινὰ αὐτοὶ κατεισχήκασιν· περὶ τῶν ἐνπεφυρισμένων καὶ κα-  
 10 θειλκυσμένων οἰκιῶν ἐν τῷ προαστίῳ προνοηθῆναι, ἴν', ἐπεὶ  
 δημόται ἐστέ, μεταδοθῆ τι εἰς τὴν κατασκευὴν αὐτῶν· Σι-  
 βλοην κώμην τὴν πρότερον οὔσαν ὑμετέραν, περὶ ἧς γέγρα-  
 πται, ἵνα διορθωσαμένων ὑμῶν τὴν τιμὴν Μελεάγραι τῷ  
 ἡγορακότῳ αὐτὴν δραχμῶν <sup>vac</sup> ΥΜΗ - C ἀποδοθῆ, κομί-  
 15 σασθαι νῦν ἄνευ τιμῆς, ὅπως ὑπάρχωσιν αἱ ἐξ αὐτῆς  
 πρόσοδοι εἷς τε τὰς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Στρατίου καὶ τὰς ὑπὲρ ἡ-  
 μῶν συντελουμένας θυσίας καὶ διαμένη ὑμῖν ἱερὰ καὶ ἀτελής·  
 τὸ δὲ ἀργύριον δοθῆναι ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἐκ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ τῷ Μελεά-  
 20 γρωι· εἰς τὰ ἐλλείποντα τοῖς κλήροις καὶ προσδόμασιν δο-  
 θῆναι κώμας· ἐπ(ε)ὶ αἱ πρότερον ἀφαιρεθεῖσαι ὑμῶν οὐκ ἀ-  
 ποκατεστάθησαν ὃν τρόπον συνεκεχώρηκα, παραδει-  
 ξαι Θιλευδον καὶ Πλαζειρα κατοικίας κυνηγῶν· τοὺς δ' ἐν  
 τούτοις μετάγειν εἰς ἃς ἂν κρίνη κατοικίας Λυκίνος ὁ γεωδό-  
 τῆς· συντετάχαμεν γὰρ τούτῳ ἐπιβλέψαντι παραδειξαι.

With the inscriptions from the city of Saittai begins the harvest of fourteen confession inscriptions, the second most important group of this corpus (nos. 46, 47, 51, 52, 54–56, 66, 70–72, 83–85).<sup>8</sup>

No. 51, a straightforward case of a theft, deserves special mention on account of the qualification κριτῆς ἀλάθητος ἐν οὐρανῷ applied to Meis Ouranios Artemidorou, since it settles once and for all the previously much discussed problem of actual trials taking place in Lydian temples<sup>9</sup>.

No. 52 starts off with an unusual theonym Μῆς Τιαμου Ἄρ(τε)μιδώρου combining, at least at first sight, two genitives of names of cult-founders, unparalleled in the previously published inscriptions. The form of the god Men, known as Men Tiamou<sup>10</sup>, remained for a long time mysterious and mostly misunderstood; this inscription reveals that Tiamou is not a genitive of a personal name, but an epithet expressing the god's nature. Fifty years ago G. Neumann drew attention to the Cuneiform Luwian form *tiyam-maššiš* "UTU-za (Tiyammaššiš Tiwat/Tiwaz) "Sun-Goddess of the Earth/Netherworld".<sup>11</sup> This name arises in the belief that the Sun retires into the underworld during the night. The deity dwelt within the earth and represented the Sun's course during

<sup>8</sup> See also the comments by C. Brixhe and Ph. Gauthier in *BE* 2007, 451, R. Parker in *ZPE* 163, 2007, 121–122, and A. Chaniotis in *Kernos* 23, 2010, 298–301.

<sup>9</sup> The same observation is already found in the commentary offered by the first editors.

<sup>10</sup> E.g. G. Petzl, *Die Beichtinschriften Westkleinasiens*, EA 22, 1994, nos. 54, 67–71, 84.

<sup>11</sup> G. Neumann, *Untersuchungen zum Weiterleben hethitischen und luwischen Sprachgutes in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*, Wiesbaden 1961, 71–72. Cf. also M. Hutter, Aspects of Luwian Religion, in: H. Craig Melchert (ed.), *The Luwians*, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Erste Abteilung, Der Nahe und der Mittlere Osten, 68. Bd., Leiden 2003, 220. The goddess was identified with Sumerian Ereškigal, Akkadian Allatum, Hurrian Allani, and Hattic Eštan (I. Singer, *Hittite Prayers*, Leiden 2002, 22).

the hours of the night.<sup>12</sup> It is not unreasonable to look for the origin of the epithet Tiamou for the Moon-God in the same direction.<sup>13</sup>

No. 58 is a verbose honorary inscription from Maionia in honour of Kleandros son of Mogetes, set up in 17/6 BC.<sup>14</sup> Here is my translation of lines 10–34, differing in some points from the editors' one: *since Kleandros, son of Mogetes, a man having attained perfection in virtue, has with his generous soul surpassed the first prizes of his ancestors for all good (deeds), so that, though nobody will stand a comparison with their virtue, even their own achievements seem not comparable to his own – surpassing daily himself in attachment to his homeland, he always desires ardently abundance of things required for the common good, as a private person more eager than an official, as an official more zealous than himself, and he always proposes what is best for his homeland, so that it would not appear that the end proposed is not worth the toil: of course, he joins in bringing to fruition his proposals so that the effort achieves more than his (original) purpose; the illustrious deeds for the community are joined by the individual virtues of his soul, for he possesses honesty and righteousness and humanity and dignified mildness, to sum up, all the virtues that the nature lavishes on someone to make him perfect for doing the good deeds, so that, if we continue to produce evidence for his pre-eminence from the culmination of his deeds,<sup>15</sup> words would fail us, but the recent and still current favour of the joint sacrificial common festival in Athens and of - - -.*<sup>16</sup>

<sup>12</sup> B. J. Collins, *The Hittites and their World*, Atlanta 2007, 176–177.

<sup>13</sup> See already E. Lane, *Corpus Monumentorum Religions Dei Menis (CMRDM)*. Vol. III: *Interpretations and Testimonia (EPRO 19)*, Leiden 1976, 68–70 (Tiamou would be equivalent in meaning to the Greek (κατα)χθόνιος). From the same area of NE Lydia comes the theonym Μεις Ουράνιος Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἀξιότα κατέχων (Petzl op. cit. 66 no. 55; H. Malay, *EA* 36, 2003, 13–18; nos. 51 and 55 in the new corpus). An inscription from ancient Kollyda published in the new corpus (no. 83: Μεγάλη Μήτηρ Ἀναεΐτις καὶ Μεις Τιαμου καὶ Μεις Ουράνιος Κόλλυδα κατέχοντες καὶ ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν) shows that Meis Tiamou and Meis Ouranios were seen as two distinct divine entities.

<sup>14</sup> ἐπεὶ Κλέανδρος Μωγέτου, ἀνὴρ τετελεωμένος εἰς ἀρετὴν, τὰ τῶν προγόνων περὶ πάντων ἀγαθῶν πρωτῆα μεγάλῳ φρονι ψυχῇ νενίκηκεν, ὥστε πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνων ἀρετὴν μηθενὸς ἀνθρώπου συγκριθησομένου, πρὸς τοῦτον ἀσύνκριτα φαίνεσθαι καὶ τὰ ἐκείνοις πεπραγμένα· καθ' ἡμέραν δὲ νεικῶν ἑαυτὸν τῆι περὶ τῆς πατρίδος σπουδῆι περισ(σ)εύειν ἀεὶ προθυμῆται τῶν εἰς τάγαθὰ δεόντων, ἰδιοτεύων μὲν φιλοτειμότερον ἄρχοντος, ἄρχων δὲ σπουδαιότερον ἑαυτοῦ·<sup>vac</sup> καὶ προτίθεται μὲν ἀεὶ περὶ τῆς πατρίδος τὰ κράτιστα ὥστε ἂν μὴ δόξαι δύνασθαι τῷ πόνῳ τὴν πρόθεσιν· {E}<sup>vac</sup> συνδιοικεῖται μὲντοι γε τὰ προτ[ε]θέντα ὥστε πλήρον τῆς βουλήσεως αὐτοῦ τὸν πόνον πράσ(σ)ειν<sup>vac</sup>· τὰ δὲ λαμπρὰ τῶν εἰς τὸ κοινὸν ἔργων ἕτεραι διαδέχονται πρὸς τὸ καθ' ἓνα τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρεταί· πίστι τε γὰρ καὶ δικαιοσύνη καὶ φιλανθρωπία καὶ καταστολή πρᾶύτητος καὶ τὸ κεφάλαιον οἷς ἂν ἡ φύς(ις) φιλοτιμουμένη τελήωση τινα πρὸς τὰ τάγαθὰ ἄπασιν ἤρτισται<sup>vac</sup>· ὥστε κἂν πλήρῳ τῶν μαρτυρῶμεν αὐτῷ πρὸς τὴν ὑπεροχὴν τῶν ἔργων ἀκμήν, τοὺς λόγους ἐνλιπεῖν· τὴν δὲ πρόσφατον καὶ διὰ χερὸς ἔτι χάριν τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις συνθυσίας καὶ τῆς - - -. In line 30 the editors omitted ὥστε.

<sup>15</sup> Or if we adduce still more testimonies to the pre-eminence of his deeds.

<sup>16</sup> The translation of the first editors: *Kleandros, son of Mogetes, a man having attained perfection in virtue, has surpassed, by his high-minded soul, his ancestors' first-rate position in conferring all kind of benefits. Even though nobody can be compared to their especial virtue, nevertheless even their achievements seem incapable of being compared with this. Outdoing himself each day in his enthusiasm for his native city, he is eager to over-fulfil all requirements of welfare, being a private person in a more ambitious way than an official, being an official in a more zealous way than himself. And he always puts forward the most excellent proposals in the interest of his native city, in such a way that it does not appear that his proposition could (be thwarted, reduced?) by the trouble involved. But, in fact, he joins in carrying out his proposals so that his trouble achieves more than intended by him. His brilliant achievements for the community are complemented by the virtues of his soul directed with respect to individuals. For he is endowed with honesty and righteousness and benevolence and decency of gentleness and – to sum it all up – with all qualities by which the soul in its ambition contributes to welfare (?). And if we wished*

No. 66 is a confusing narrative about a case of a lost pig (ἐπεὶ ὕς ἀπόλετο Ἀπολλωνίου ἔτει σζι', περὶ τούτου σκήπτρον ἐφέστη Ἀπόλλωνος Ταρσίου, καὶ μηδενὸς ὁμολογήσαντος παρ' αὐτὸ ἐξ ὑστεροῦ εὐρεθεὶς παρὰ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ Τασιλα· πείσαντος τοῦ ἱερέως προσλαβέσθαι τὸν ὕν τὸν Ἀπολλώνιν, ἐπιγνοὺς ὅτι ἐντὸς τῆς προθεσμίας τῶν ἡμερῶν, ὧν ὑπεχειρημένων ἦσαν, ὑπέρχρονον ἦν, ἀπελάσαντος τὸν ὕν ὁ θεὸς ἐπεζήτησε στηλλογραφήσαι τὰς δυνάμεις τοῦ θεοῦ Τατίαν γυναῖκα τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου. Ἔτους σλθ'). Lines 1–6 are unambiguous: a pig belonging to one Apollonios<sup>17</sup> was lost in the year 217 (= 132/3 AD), the sceptre of Apollo Tarsios was set up but nobody came to the sanctuary to make a confession; later the pig turned up with one Alexander. Likewise, lines 10–14 demonstrate beyond doubt that it was Apollonios who committed a transgression by taking hold of the pig for himself; this transgression probably cost him his life,<sup>18</sup> since finally his wife was ordered by Apollo Tarsios to set up the stele in the year 239 (= 144/5 AD). Difficulties lie in lines 7–10, where it is not clear who the object of πείσαντος is – Alexander or Apollonios,<sup>19</sup> or the subject of προσλαβέσθαι – the priest,<sup>20</sup> Alexander or Apollonios. I would venture to propose the following story-line: the priest persuaded Apollonios to allow Alexander to keep the pig for himself,<sup>21</sup> realizing that the fixed number of days within which claims could be made (προθεσμία) expired and that consequently no further proceedings were allowed. Nevertheless, Apollonios drove the pig away and so committed a serious transgression of ignoring the will of the god as represented by his priest. In any event, it is interesting to see the priest (who remains anonymous!) doing his best to settle a dispute between two villagers by using πειθῶ, not βία: taking under consideration all the circumstances of the case as befits a meticulous judge, he notices that the prescribed προθεσμία (30 days?)<sup>22</sup> had expired, and that the former owner has lost his rights over the animal. Once more we see a priest in his role of intermediary in everyday disputes, relieving the villagers of the more costly and long-lasting option of finding justice in the city. Obviously, as the case of Apollonios abundantly shows, not everyone was content with the outcome of these priestly mediations, and it is mostly such cases of disgruntled litigants that we find eternalised on Lydian stelai.

No. 70 is a confession inscription from Silandos addressed to Men Axiottenos and dated in 180/1 AD. The inscription informs us about a family affair involving grandfather Attalos, his grandson Glykon and his grand-granddaughter Markia: Μηνὶ Ἀξιοττηνῶ· ἐπειδὴ ὁ Γλύκων ἐκολάσθη ὑπὲρ παππικῶν ἐνγαίων, ἅτινα Ἄτταλος, παρενχερίσας τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἔνγεα, ἐνεπορεύετο ἐξουθενήσας τοὺς θεοὺς τοὺς ἐν Νοννου, ἃ παραδίδει Γλύκων τῷ θεῷ χωρὶς δόλου πονηροῦ, δαπανήσ(ας) πυ(ρῶν) κύ(πρους) δ <', οἴνου πρ(όχους) δ <', ἐλαίου κοτύλην· συνεβάλετο Μαρκία Ἀφίας τῆς ἀδελφῆς μου· ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ ἡ προάπαρσις ἐξ ἐννεαφώνου. *To Men*

---

*to testify by him more than this, words would soon fail us in view of the very highest quality of his achievements. The recent and actual favour of (his participation in) the joint sacrifice in Athens and the - - .*

<sup>17</sup> The man seems well known in the village, not needing a patronymic to identify him among the numerous Apollonii who surely lived in the same place.

<sup>18</sup> The relief of a leg on the stele is a clear allusion to his illness attributed to this incident.

<sup>19</sup> Apollonios is the editors' choice, and I would have to agree with it.

<sup>20</sup> The editors' choice.

<sup>21</sup> If the pig simply strayed into Alexander's herd (cf. Petzl, op. cit. 86 no. 68) and he was not aware of it, he committed no transgression.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. M. Ricl, The Phrase *καταχθείσης τριακονθημέρου* in an Inscription from Macedonian Lefkopetra, *Tekmeria* 5, 2000, 155–160.



*Axiottenos. Since Glykon was punished on account of lands (inherited) from his grandfather that Attalos acquired by dishonest handling of the god's landed property, having shown contempt for the gods in Nonnou, Glykon hands over this land to the god without wilful deceit, along with the cost for 4.5 kyproi of wheat, 4.5 prochoi of wine and a kotyle of oil. Markia, daughter of my sister Apphia, made her contribution; the preventive removal of sin through an enneaphonon also took place.*<sup>23</sup> In my opinion, Attalos was Glykon's grandfather who acquired some lands by mishandling the property of the gods in Nonnou.<sup>24</sup> To do so, he had to have been a member of the temple personnel (a *neokoros*, *epimeletes*, *tamias*, *hieros* vel sim.). There are two possibilities: he either appropriated a part of the sacred property, the same land that Glykon and Markia, his descendants, are now giving back to the god, or he embezzled the god's money and bought property that was eventually inherited by Glykon and Apphia/Markia (I lean toward this possibility). This inscription provides excellent illustration of the reality behind another inscription from Silandos featuring a transgression committed by a group of people entrusted with the task of managing the property of Men ex Attalou.<sup>25</sup> This unspecified transgression caused the publication of a *lex sacra* forbidding the selling and mortgaging of the god's property without his explicit authorization.

No. 72, a fragmentary preserved inscription, contains the phrase λυτρούμεθα τοὺς θε[οῦς] (l. 3).<sup>26</sup> We can adduce as parallels the following phrases from other confession inscriptions: ἐλυτρώσαντο τὸν θεὸν ἐξ εἰδότην καὶ μὴ εἰδότην<sup>27</sup>, Μῆνα ἐγ Διοδότου Διογᾶς Διογένου ἔλοι-σα ἐξ ἐπιρκοσύνης<sup>28</sup>, and ἐλυτρώσαντο τὸν θεὸν Μῆνα Ἀξιοτηνόν.<sup>29</sup> Hitherto, these accusatives referring to the gods who were set free from “known and unknown (transgressions)”, from “perjury”, and other human faults, were a source of surprise to scholars studying the inscriptions in question. Parallels found in the corpus of Hittite cultic texts perhaps permit us to comprehend them as references to cathartic rituals performed on the gods “contaminated” by human impurities. The belief in contamination of gods and in the possibility of their catharsis is amply attested in Hittite texts. For instance, one text<sup>30</sup> prescribes a cathartic ritual for Ištar in the case of curses, because these curses were spoken out in front of her statue and she had to be cleaned from this miasma. Or, in a ritual bringing the god Tarhunt/Baal to life from a temporary state of deadly

<sup>23</sup> Editors' translation: *To Men Axiottenos, because Glykon was punished in respect to his grandfather's land of which Attalos, handling recklessly the god's land, made a trade, setting at naught the gods in Nonnou; Glykon delivers this (land) to the god without wilful deceit, having paid a fee amounting to 4.5 kyproi of wheat, 4.5 prochoi of wine (and) a kotyle of oil (Marcia, the daughter of my sister Apphia, made her contribution). Also the preceding removal (of the sin) by an enneaphonon took place.*

<sup>24</sup> The first editors consider the possibilities that Attalos was “a person who acted on behalf of [Glykon's] father (if he was not the father himself)”, or a relative of Glykon. The gods in Nonnou were already known; cf. the editors' note on p. 98 note 175.

<sup>25</sup> G. Petzl, *EA* 28, 1997, 70 no. 2 = *SEG* 47, 1654, and my comments in *EA* 35, 2003, 101–106.

<sup>26</sup> Translated by the editors as “we ... paid ransom to the gods”.

<sup>27</sup> Petzl, op. cit. 60 no. 51 (“merkwürdiger Akkusativ”; *ibid.*: “sich bei dem Gott loskaufen”).

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.* 61 no. 52.

<sup>29</sup> H. Malay, *Researches in Lydia, Mysia and Aiolis*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 279. Band, Ergänzungsbände zu den Tituli Asiae Minoris Nr. 23, Wien 1999, 101–102 no. 111.

<sup>30</sup> *Keilschrift-Urkunden aus Boğazköy (KUB)* 29.7.

sleep,<sup>31</sup> the god is cleaned by two priests from “oaths, curses, [sins, evil] words; (and) the body of Tarhunt/Ball became clean”. These transgressions he may have received from the world of humans and brought with him into the underworld. What these examples indicate is that, according to the Hittites, and not only the Hittites, human impurity can contaminate the gods who must be cleaned by elaborate rituals. In line 2 of the same inscription (... CAMENHOI τάχειον) we might have a reference to an earlier instance of cathartic rituals performed by the community on the gods in the same sanctuary.

No. 84 is without any doubt the “jewel in the crown” among the new confession inscriptions. It comes from Kollyda and the text is perfectly preserved: Μηνὸς Μοτυλλεΐτου ἰορτῆς γενομένης, ἐρχομένου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ἰορτῆς, συνήλθεν ὄχλος ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλικὴν ἔχοντες ξίφη καὶ ξύλα καὶ λίθους, συντρίψαντες τοὺς ἱεροδούλους καὶ τὰ ἀφυδρίσματα τῶν θεῶν, καὶ μηδενὶ χρώμα τηρηθῆναι μῆτε τῶ[ς] θεοῖς μῆτε τοῖς ἱεροδούλοις· εὐρεθεὶς δὲ Ὀνίσμος Λάθυρος ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ μὴ δυναθεὶς τὴν μάχην ἀνακροῦσαι, διαγενομένων ἐτῶν ἐκολάσθη<sup>32</sup> ἰς τῶν ὤμων καὶ δυσάπιστῶν τῷ θεῷ καὶ ὑπὸ μηδενὸς δυνάμενος θαραπευθῆναι ἐ(θ)αραπεύθη ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ· δευτέρῳ οὖν κολάσει ἐδράχθη κατὰ τῶν ἀπαλῶν ἐ(π)λ<sup>33</sup> ἡμέρας τρεῖς καὶ ὥρας τρεῖς· σωθεὶς οὖν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὸ ἐμὸν μέρος εὐλογῶν ἀνέθηκα. Ἔτους σπβ', μη(νὸς) Δαισίου κ'. *After the celebration of a festival of Men Motylleites, while he (sc. Onesimos Lathyros) was coming back from the festival, a mob gathered against the basilica, with swords and clubs and stones and beat the sacred slaves to a jelly and crushed the images of the gods – and nobody could save his skin, neither the gods nor the sacred slaves. He (sc. Onesimos Lathyros) found himself among them and since he was unable to stop the battle, after some years have gone by, he was punished in his shoulder and did not trust/obey the god, and when I could not be cured by anybody, I was cured by the god. As a second punishment, I was seized by the soft parts for three days and three hours. So, since I was saved by the god, for my own part, I set up (this stele) in praise (of the god). In the year 282 (= 197/8 AD), on the 20th day of the month of Daisios.*<sup>34</sup> This inscription brings a most surprising piece of information on a violent uprising and attack upon a sanctuary of Men Motylleites in Kollyda by an angry mob armed with swords, clubs and stones. Unfortunately, the dedicator breathes not a word about the reason for this aggression and all speculation is futile.

No. 85 is another confession originating from Kollyda, probably from the same sanctuary as the previous one and dated in 205/6 AD: Ἀμμιανὸς καὶ Ἑρμογένης Τρύφωνος πάρισιν ἐρωτῶντες τοὺς θεοὺς Μῆνα Μοτυλλίτην καὶ Δία Σαβάζιον καὶ Ἄρτεμιν Ἀναεῖτιν καὶ μεγάλην συνάτος καὶ σύνκλητον τῶν θεῶν, ἐρωτῶντες τὴν κατοικία[v] καὶ τὸν ἱερὸν δοῦμον, ἵνα ἐλέου τύχω-

<sup>31</sup> V. Haas, *Die hethitische Literatur: Texte, Stilistik, Motive*, Berlin/New York 2006, 216.

<sup>32</sup> The editors read διαγενομένων ἐτῶν ε' (ἐ)κολάσθη.

<sup>33</sup> Lap. EITI.

<sup>34</sup> The editors' translation: *After the celebration of a festival of Men Motylleites, when he came from the festival, a crowd gathered towards the basilica, the participants being armed with swords, sticks and stones and crushing the sacred slaves and the images of the gods, and for nobody (was it possible ?) to save his own skin (??), neither for the gods nor for the sacred slaves. Ones(i)mos the 'Chick-pea' was found amongst them and being unable to stop the fight he was punished in his shoulder after five (?) years had passed. And as I was disobedient towards the god and could not be cured by anybody, I was (eventually) cured by the god. As a second punishment I was gripped (by a disease) on the soft parts (of my body) for three days and three hours. After having been saved by the god, for my own part I set up this stele by praising. In the year 282, on the twentieth day of the month Daisios.*

σιν, ἐπὶ ἐκολάσθη[σ]αν οὗτοι ὅτι τὸν πατέρα ἐκράτησαν ἐξομολογούμενον τὰς δυνάμεις τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἐλημοσύνην μὴ λαβόντος τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ ἀποτελεσθέντος αὐτοῦ «μὴ τις ποτε παρευτελίσι τοὺς θεοὺς» διὰ τὰς π[ρ]ώτας προγραφὰς αὐτοῦ ἔγρα[ψ]αν καὶ ἀνέθηκαν εὐλογοῦντε[ς] τοῖς θεοῖς. *Ammianos and Hermogenes, sons of Tryphon, have come to beg the gods Men Motyllites and Zeus Sabazios and Artemis Anaeitis and Great Senatus (?) and Council of the Gods, to beg the village and the Sacred Doumos to obtain mercy, because they were punished for preventing their father from acknowledging the power of the gods; when their father was not granted mercy but died, they wrote “let nobody ever disparage the gods” quoting his first preliminary declarations, and they dedicated (this stele) praising the gods.*<sup>35</sup> Above the inscription is carved an unusual relief representing a man (the father of two penitents?)<sup>36</sup> fallen on the ground, with a shield in his right hand, while an animal is attacking him on his left. The editors’ interpretation of the brothers’ transgression as preventing the father from making a confession of a sin, and the line «μὴ τις ποτε παρευτελίσι τοὺς θεοὺς» as a quote from the father’s intended confession is surely correct. Ammianos and Hermogenes appealed to the gods, the Great Senatus (?), the Council of the Gods,<sup>37</sup> the village and the Sacred Doumos to obtain mercy in a process resembling one before a human court. We know that judgment before gods is a well-known motive in Hittite literature. The king Hattušili III says to his nephew Urhi-Teššub: “Let us go in judgment before the Storm-God My Lord and Šaušga of Samuha, My Lady. If you prevail in the trial, they will raise you; but if I prevail in the trial, they will raise me.”<sup>38</sup> One is impressed by the fact that Hittite prayers often resemble a judicial process conducted before a court composed of gods, where the prosecutor is an angry deity. The defendant can use the “services” of a “divine lawyer” requested to act as an intercessor on his behalf; the court of justice is the assembly of gods.<sup>39</sup> For instance, the queen Puduhepa asked the goddess Lelwani to relay the good word on behalf of her husband Hattušili III to the gods, her peers.<sup>40</sup> We also have her prayers to the children of Tarhunt and to the Sun-Goddess of Arinna. A deity, usually the Sun-God (Ištanu) or the Sun-Goddess or a Storm-God, is invoked by the person suffering from some misfortune attributable to divine wrath to intercede with the angry deity, whose identity is often unknown to the petitioner. The same concepts of divine court and divine advocate are found in three Lydian confession inscriptions. In the first one<sup>41</sup> the sinner Theodoros relates his transgressions and divine retributions they caused, and finally says: ἔσχα παράκλητον<sup>42</sup> τὸν Δεῖαν. Zeus then, questioned by a divine “council” (ἡρωτημαίνος ὑπὸ τῆς συνκλήτου), states that he is satisfied with the sinner’s compliance to divine orders, so much so that he is finally ready to grant him

<sup>35</sup> The editors’ translation: *Ammianos and Hermogenes, sons of Tryphon, appear (at the temple) asking the gods Men Motyllites and Zeus Sabazios and Artemis Anaeitis and the great Senatus and the Council of the Gods, asking also the village and the Hieros Doumos in order that they will find mercy as they were punished because they overcame their father, while he was acknowledging the power of the gods; and their father did not obtain pity, but after his death, on account of his first (primary) written declarations they wrote ‘nobody at any time should disparage the gods’ on a stele and set it up praising the gods.*

<sup>36</sup> This is the editors’ interpretation as well (p. 116).

<sup>37</sup> There is no need to presume that the roles of the gods in the “Senate” and the “Council” were played by human beings (priests?) (p. 115).

<sup>38</sup> *Keilschrifttexte aus Boğazköy (KBo)* 6.29.

<sup>39</sup> Singer, op. cit. 5–14; Haas, op. cit. 254.

<sup>40</sup> *KUB* 21.27.

<sup>41</sup> Petzl, op. cit. 7–8 no. 5 (235/6 AD).

<sup>42</sup> In the New Testament, the Holy Spirit receives the same denomination (*Ev. Jo.* 14,16).

pardon. The second confession inscription, presently unpublished,<sup>43</sup> notifies us that (lines 5–6) παρεκλήτευσεν δὲ Κ[- - ]|τηνός [- - ] *tenos acted as advocate* on behalf of a sinner. Finally, no. 85 provides welcome details on the identity of those approached by transgressors in hope of obtaining mercy. The “Council of the Gods” can perhaps be compared to τὸ δωδεκάθεον τὸ παρὰ σοι κατεκτισμένον (σοι standing for Men Axiottenos) in two inscriptions, one from Ayazören,<sup>44</sup> the other from Saittai.<sup>45</sup>

No. 87 is a dedication to Meter Tazene by a woman, not a man, as the editors believe. The relief shows the veiled goddess on the left and a female worshipper on the right, holding her right hand up in the usual gesture of prayer. The name of the dedicant appears in line 2 probably as Εὐτυχίς.<sup>46</sup>

### Özet

Makalede, P. Herrmann ile Hasan Malay tarafından yayınlanan Lydia yazıtlarından (*New Documents from Lydia*, Wien 2007) 10 tanesi üzerinde bazı yorumlar yapılmaktadır. Bunlardan no. 32B’de yayınlanan ve İ.Ö. 165/4 yılına tarihlenen yazıt Bergama Krallığı ile ilişkili olup, Kral II. Eumenes’in, Galat savaşında uğradığı tahribattan sonra Sardeis kentine verdiği bazı ayrıcalıkları kaydetmektedir. Makalede esas olarak birkaç önemli confessio (no. 52, 72 ve 85) üzerinde durulmakta ve bunlarda görülen bazı sıradışı ifadeler Hitit metinlerine dayanılarak açıklanmaktadır. Yazar son olarak, Maionia’da ele geçen ve Mogetes oğlu Kleandros adındaki birini onurlandıran yazıt (no. 58) için yeni bir çeviri önerisinde bulunmaktadır.

University of Belgrade

Marijana Ricl

<sup>43</sup> I am grateful to G. Petzl for kindly forwarding me the text of this unpublished inscription dated in 192/3 AD.

<sup>44</sup> H. Malay, *EA* 36, 2003, 13–14.

<sup>45</sup> S. Bakır Barthel – H. Müller, *ZPE* 36, 1979, 182–183 no. 36.

<sup>46</sup> The editors suggest the reading Εὐτύχης.