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Abstract

Evaluations of the role of the goddess Hestia have varied widely over the past one hundred and fifty years. Some have seen her as the basis and origin of every Indo-European community from the family to the state. Others have dismissed her as never having been a real divinity but only a ‘pale personification.’ More current opinions have split between regarding her as a feminine goddess connected with domestic values, and those which draw attention to the fact that she was pre-eminently venerated in public contexts by male magistrates.

Eschewing an approach which tries to characterize Hestia on the basis of a selection of the literary testimony and inscriptions, this corpus assembles all the mentions of Hestia in the epigraphical record accompanied by translations and commentary. Behind this assemblage rests both the aim of refining our understanding of this goddess, in particular, and the desire to create a tool which may be used for the comparative study of divinities as they appear in epigraphy and literature.

As a result the corpus enables the researcher both to reconstruct broad trends in the history of Hestia worship across the Greek world from the fifth century B.C. to the third century A.D. It also furnishes a more detailed base of evidence to address questions about that worship raised in specific locales with relation to other practices such as the definition of territories, the exercise of sovereignty and the construction of archives.

Dissertation Advisor: Marcel Detienne.
Preface

The aim of this collection is to gather all the references to Hestia attested in the epigraphical record and present them with translations and commentary pertinent to the veneration of the goddess. The core of this collection was assembled by Georges Mavroudis in 1988. After his abandonment of the project, his preliminary work was handed to me by Marcel Detienne and from the outset certain practical questions made their appearance. The goddess Hestia cannot be compared with any of the other Olympians in that her name is shared, not as a half-forgotten legacy in the history of onomastics, but with the term by which the hearth was commonly designated. Some scholars of Greek religion would see every appearance of the word ἔστια as the invocation of a deity who never fully separated herself from an object and this method is not without substantial merit. Yet while the people who wrote and read these inscriptions may have intimately conjoined them, it is nonetheless possible to separate the mentions, albeit at the possible risk of forming a picture that would, in any case, be incomplete. Thus all epigraphical references to such things as, for example, the κοινή ἔστια, while not without their benefit for the study of Hestia, have been left by the wayside. Also omitted are those references to people, such as women given the title of ‘Hestia’ or things given the name Hestia, but which had little to do with her worship, such as ships. I have also neglected to include those documents which refer to the ‘Twelve Gods,’ even in places and periods where this is known to have included Hestia as well as such mentions as ‘all the other gods,’ where Hestia is certainly to be included, but not explicitly mentioned. In cases where there is some doubt whether the reference is to the goddess or
some other personage, I have included the inscription along with the reasons for the uncertainty.

The material is organized geographically, following the order of the *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Each inscription is presented with lemma, text, pertinent restorations, translation and commentary. The objective in this presentation of the inscriptions has always been to provide a practical reference to supplement the rather meager literary evidence pertaining to her cult. Pursuant to this goal, the lemmata are not those typically provided in epigraphical corpora as they are designed to be strongly relevant to the goddess Hestia. As customary, there is a brief description of the material used, and where possible, a notice as to where the stone was found and its current whereabouts. Every source which reproduces the text of the stone as a whole or the specific parts in question are included in the lemma with the aim of reducing the mentions which reproduce already existing editions or interpretations in the case of Hestia to a minimum. Many texts cite, for example, the “Constitution of Chios,” (134) in discussions of local and institutional history, but these are not necessarily treated as pertaining to her worship in particular. No dimensions of the stones are included, as this again does not necessarily relate to the cults of Hestia and is readily accessible through the sources cited. Stones of a size specific and important for the worship of Hestia, such as a horos, however, are mentioned and evaluated as such in the commentary. The abbreviations are those suggested in the *American Journal of Archaeology* 95 (1991) pp. 1-16, and those of the *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*.

The inscriptions include fragments, and in cases where the whole has largely been preserved, for purposes of brevity and relevance, only the portions significant to the cult
of Hestia and possible close associations of that cult to others are presented here. The
chosen texts of the stones are generally the most recent and accepted by the scholarly
community as I have been able to gauge it. Nonetheless, I was not able to reproduce the
dots which occur beneath letters where another reading is possible and the reader is
strongly urged to consult the sources included in the lemma before citing any text.
Pertinent disputes, variants and newly proposed emendations are mentioned in the
editorial notes and commentary which follow the text. I have seen virtually none of the
stones first hand and accordingly I have seldom deemed it possible to re-edit the texts on
the basis of knowledge of Hestia cult, as it is a common failing when searching for
something to see it everywhere. Bearing this in mind, I may have laid myself open to the
charge of being overly conservative, which I find preferable to sacrificing whatever
objectivity may be obtained in what is ultimately, a human science.

All translations are my own unless otherwise noted. At times it has happened that
I have translated a text and then found an already existing translation which has mirrored
my own almost exactly. In these cases, I have tried to mention the other translations and
the motivations for any disagreements. I have also found it worthwhile to refrain from
translating the names of governmental bodies, titles of magistrates and cult epithets,
preferring instead to present a transliteration of the Greek rather than translating them
into an English equivalent which summons up inappropriate images like ‘secretary,’ or
limits their function and association, irrespective of context, like ‘auditor,’ or ‘assembly.’
The transliteration of names has found no common standard in the scholarly community
and none is offered here other than that the majority have been latinized.
The commentary is designed to be germane to the subject of Hestia while at the same time providing what applicable information there exists for the conditions of production and publication. There are sometimes dedications made on behalf of magistrates or private individuals which form a more or less standard series differing only in the name of the dedicator. If prosopographical evidence exists, I have included this in the commentary over the alternative of letting it pass in silence, in the belief that behind the custom or the habit of dedication were lives, of which even the imperfectly known details might contribute to the understanding of the role of Hestia in those lives. Sometimes inscriptions were made annually, such as the inventories of Delos, which duplicate the previous year’s inscription in both form and substance almost exactly. In these cases, the majority of the commentary is reserved for the first of the series.

As mentioned previously, the corpus gathered here has striven for inclusiveness; any omissions are strictly the fault of the author and not that of the advisors or the committee.

Lastly, this work was completed only with the generous aid of the faculty of the Johns Hopkins University, most notably Marcel Detienne and H. A. Shapiro. I would also like to thank Matthew Roller for his counsel in matters unrelated to the topic of the dissertation per se, but without which the production would not have been achieved. I owe as well a debt of gratitude to my fellow graduate students, Marcello Carastro, Denise Demetriou, Kristina Giannotta, Andreas Weigelt, Claudia Zatta, and Wei Zhang. In France, I received the generous support of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs in the form of the Chateaubriand Fellowship, and I would like to thank François Lissarrague and Gerard Capdeville for their advice and support, as well as Pierre Petitmengin and
François Hartog for granting me access to the resources of the Ecole Normale Supérieure and the Centre Louis Gernet, respectively. My stay in France was made all the more pleasant by the generous assistance and hospitality of Geoffroy Simonetti and Agathe Sultan and their families. In closing, I would like also to thank my own parents and family as well as that of Oana Panaite without whose love and support none of this would have been possible.
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Introduction

No goddess in the Greek pantheon would seem more readily to lend herself to a broad investigation of the social and intellectual life of ancient Greece than Hestia. Her very name evokes a concrete situation in the private and public spaces of Greece. At the same time these spaces were, nonetheless, not devoid of other elements such as columns, walls, gates and stairs, which also served the practical needs of organizing and arranging space. The longevity of these features strikes the tourist and the archaeologist alike long after the paint has faded and the fire died. Yet one must likewise recall those other objects, like altars, tables and knives as connected and consecrated to the service of the divine as the hearth, which exist now alone in situ or alongside collections of similar objects in museums where their similarities and differences amid others of the same type serve to reinforce the specificity of the individual example and underline the broad category to which they belong.

From this assemblage the hearth alone emerged to become personified as a deity, and scholars ever since have been trying to figure out just why this should have been so. Compelled by the fundamental paradox of an Olympian goddess whose mundane, material presence combined with a near-absence from mythology, there emerged the necessity to interrogate the link between the place and the spirit, between the object and the divinity, if not exactly between the signifier and the signified. In other words it was the cultures themselves, the societies composed of individual men and women who conceived of and acted out their devotion to Hestia and the hearth, which required scrutiny, which demanded analysis, which wanted to be explained as much as she did.
The first important steps towards this end were taken in the year 1864, which saw the publication of two pivotal studies of Hestia namely, *Hestia-Vesta. Ein Cyclus religionsgeschichtlicher Forschungen* by August Preuner, and *La Cité Antique. Etude sur le culte, le droit, les institutions de la Grèce et de Rome* by Fustel de Coulanges. That the relative obscurity of the former stands in stark contrast to the longevity of the latter, originates from the fact that Fustel was not merely trying to forge an account of one divinity, but more or less of the whole of antiquity. It was, moreover, a project that he had been preparing for years.

In 1858 Fustel had received his doctorate with the submission of two theses. The first, *Quid Vestae cultus in institutis veterum privatis publicisque valuerit*, he had dedicated to his instructor J. D. Guigniaut who almost a quarter of a century earlier had translated and popularized the works of G. F. Creuzer in *Religions de l'Antiquité*. *Quid Vestae* marks the first time that Fustel extended beyond the rather dismissive treatment accorded to Hestia and Vesta in *Religions de l'Antiquité*, where Creuzer and Guigniaut had asserted that Hestia was the ‘inextinguishable principle of the fire lodged at the center of the Earth and sky.’¹ While at the same time admitting that, ‘Vesta had little or no mythological history, very few symbols, and the most simple of exterior cults.’² In *Quid Vestae*, Fustel saw a goddess venerated by the divine community no less than by the human community and by the Greeks and Romans no less than by the Persians and Scythians.³ Indeed her presence was the catalyst for the very creation of these

---

¹ “prinçipe inextinguible du feu caché au centre de la terre et de ciel.” Creuzer and Guigniaut (1825: 695)
³ Fustel de Coulanges (1858: 2-3).
communities as a vital element precipitated by humanity’s perception of its own natural partaking in the divine and its drive towards religion.⁴

*Quid Vestae*, and its companion thesis, *Polybe ou la Grèce conquise par les Romains*, present in reduced form many of the key themes and methods which Fustel will treat and expand upon six years later in *La Cité Antique*. Most striking for a study of the Greek goddess Hestia is the frequent resort made to Roman sources dealing with Vesta. That Fustel conceived of the two societies as inextricably entwined in their origins presages the attention he will give and the support for his conclusions that he will later draw from the study of texts such as the Rig-Veda and the construction then taking part of an Indo-European legacy.⁵ This comparative method will become one of the hallmarks of the style of Fustel, but so strong is the link between the two that no clear separation can be made between the goddesses Hestia and Vesta with the result that at times they seem almost to become one and the same, engendering similar institutional values, not the least of which is that of private property.

The motion by which Hestia-Vesta produced such an effect on the Indo-European peoples was fully elaborated in *La Cité Antique*. In this account, it is by the worship of Hestia-Vesta that the family was assigned roles, rights and duties. Laws were instated which sought not only to establish a proper code of behavior, but also to ensure that the actions which they enjoined were maintained, along with the family, in perpetuity. This first society, consisting of father, mother and children, expanded naturally to constitute

---

⁴ The account in *Quid Vestae* of this original impulse to religion was undoubtedly conditioned by his relationship to the historical and philosophical atmosphere of his time including his opposition to the notions of Rousseau on the origins of society and those of Montesquieu on the origin of religion. For a more thorough assessment of these influences, see the introduction to *La Cité Antique* by François Hartog in Fustel de Coulanges (1984), as well as Hartog (1988) and Momigliano (1982: 325-343).

⁵ For a brief commentary on the vagaries of Fustel’s reckoning of the relationship of the Greeks and Romans to the Indo-Europeans, see the introduction to *La Cité Antique* given by Georges Dumézil in Fustel de Coulanges (1982: 18-19) and also Fustel de Coulanges (1984: XIII-XIV).
other social forms, such as clans, *curiae*, *phratriai*, *poleis* and finally, in its ultimate expression, the Roman state.

This motion could only be accomplished after he had forged a more continuous tie between the hearth and those who commanded greater respect and who, by virtue of their organic link to the worshippers, could also claim priority over their religious sentiment, i.e. the dead. In 1864, Fustel had displaced the value of the hearth with respect to his earlier treatment and established an unbroken ladder of ascent from the Genii, the Lares, Penates and Manes to Hestia-Vesta. In this new account,

We may suppose therefore that the domestic fire was in the beginning only the symbol of the worship of the dead; that under the stone of the hearth an ancestor reposed; that the fire was lighted there to honor him, and that this fire seemed to preserve life in him, or represented his soul as always vigilant.\(^6\)

The evolutionary path of the domestic hearth, its associations and attributions, thus stem from its having been first merely a symbol of the dead, a representation of the life of the ancestors who had not ceased their activity, but had merely changed residence while continuing to oversee and lend structure to the life of their pious descendants.

The divine community formed by the hearth and the dead stood in contrast to those gods and goddesses who would come later to establish the Greek pantheon as it was traditionally represented among both the Greeks and the Romans. As conceived by Fustel, beings like Zeus, Poseidon, Hera and Athena sprang from a peculiar combination of general and specific aspects within the experience of the early Greeks, Romans and Aryas. For if the hearth and dead ancestors of these early worshippers represented and pertained “to the invisible principle, to the intelligence, to what he perceived of the soul,

to what of the sacred he felt within himself,” the Olympian gods were formed from all that was both external and physical to them.\(^7\) From such elements of nature as sun, earth and clouds the individual gods were born, particular and unique to each person, each family, and each village. Yet having been drawn from the common stock of perceptible phenomena, their number, although large, was limited. Mythology in part reflected the early history of these peoples, insomuch as it portrayed the struggle of these groups against one another as a clash or contest between gods. And when in the course of time these divinities were made to assume human form, Hestia-Vesta did likewise. Yet in whatever form she appeared, her essential nature remained constant. For as Fustel portrayed her,

She represented in the world neither fecundity nor power; she was order, but not rigorous, abstract, mathematical order, the imperious and unchangeable law, \(\alpha\nu\sigma\gamma\kappa\eta\), which was early perceived in physical nature. She was moral order. They imagined her as a sort of universal soul, which regulated the different movements of worlds, as the human soul keeps order in the human system.\(^8\)

Hestia-Vesta provided for Fustel the link between the human and the divine, between the dead and the gods. The special virtue of this link was on the level of the symbolic, where the fire and its associations with the liminal served as the conceptual bridge between individual, temporal, mundane existence and the social life of institutions which extended through human generations, living and dead, and mirrored the perpetuity and stability of the natural world.

\(^7\)“...l’attribut divin au principe invisible, à l’intelligence, à ce qu’il entrevoyait de l’âme, à ce qu’il sentait de sacré en lui.” Fustel de Coulanges (1982: 136).

\(^8\)“Elle fut l’ordre, mais non pas l’ordre rigoureux, abstrait, mathématique, la loi impérieuse et fatale, \(\alpha\nu\sigma\gamma\kappa\eta\) que l’on aperçut de bonne heure entre les phénomènes de la nature physique. Elle fut l’ordre moral. On se la figura comme une sorte d’âme universelle que réglait les mouvements divers des mondes, comme l’âme humaine met la règle parmi nos organes.” ibid (1982: 52). Translation from Fustel de Coulanges (1980: 24).
This conclusion will be echoed, albeit by different, yet related theoretical means by August Preuner in *Hestia-Vesta*. Although Preuner and Fustel came from different national traditions of scholarship, they shared some of the same opinions regarding mythology and the origins of the Greek gods. They agreed, for example, that the Greek gods, and the Olympians, in particular, had come from the reactions of primitive man to the forces of nature.\(^9\) They differed, however, on the status of Hestia with regard to these other divinities. For Preuner, akin to Fustel in *Quid Vestae*, Hestia was, quite simply, in her origin, a fire divinity, yet for him more specifically, and in contrast to other gods, such as Hephaistos, Prometheus and Phoroneus, a divinity of the sacrificial fire.\(^10\)

For Preuner, the chief problem began with the attitude of previous scholarship, principally if not exclusively coming from Germany, which presented the character and associations of Hestia and the hearth in largely uncritical lists or catalogues of pre-formed, static agglomerations of attributes. To summarize the difficulty engendered by these approaches and introduce his own methodology, Preuner states that

Thus the problem strikes the eye all the more vividly, to provide the evidence, how in the course of history from an originally indeed rather simple idea a richer more complex one built itself, how from it an abundance of tendencies sprouted forth, while some faded away, how finally others made contact with one another and conjoined.\(^11\)

In other words, what was required was a true history of the hearth and its goddess, yet that Hestia began as a simple concept was never really in doubt. Starting from this original simplicity, Preuner does what Fustel in his account of the ancient city cannot,

---

\(^9\) For a concise account of the origins of this idea as well as of the major debates and developments around the time of Preuner and Fustel, see F. Graf (1987: 15-38).

\(^10\) Preuner (1864: 202-203)

\(^11\) "Es springt die Aufgabe ihr gegenüber um so lebhauer in die Augen, den Nachweis zu liefern, wie aus einer ursprünglich gewiss einfacheren Idee im Fortgang der Geschichte eine reichere und mannigfaltigere sich bildete, wie daraus eine Fülle von Trieben hervorsprossen, während einzelne hinwiederum abstarben, wie damit endlich andere sich berührten und zusammenwuchsen." ibid. (1864: 36-37).
namely separate the study of Hestia from that of Vesta. Overlap occurs for the purposes of the comparison and clarification of certain aspects, but Preuner is very mindful of the differences of the historical and mythical traditions of both cultures, as well as of the differences in the scholarship regarding them. Preuner’s explication of the ‘historical-genetic development,’\textsuperscript{12} of Hestia, proceeding as it does by examining the various testimonia of ancient authors as well as epigraphical and archaeological evidence stands in stark contrast to the almost monological style of Fustel. Moreover, Preuner does not make the singular influence of Hestia extend to such lengths as Fustel does. She is not the font of the institution of private property and the dead are never mentioned in connection with her. Her worship and the development of her personality as a divinity rather work and react alongside the natural development of human society from primitive nomads to fixed individual settlements and eventually cities.\textsuperscript{13} Hestia begins to be worshipped as a fire divinity, later because that fire is located in houses, she takes on strong associations with those houses, but as social bodies larger than the family or tribe also possess their own hearths, her power becomes diffused and combined with other deities like Zeus and Apollo, instead of magnified or duplicated.

At times Preuner and Fustel seem to reproduce the conclusions of one another, as for example when Preuner refers to the father of the household as a priest and his wife as a priestess, Fustel agrees regarding the status of the former but not the latter.\textsuperscript{14} When Preuner discusses the origin of the gods in general, as mentioned above, he refers to the awakening of the primitive \textit{Geist} which venerated the ethical idea in mankind as it was

\textsuperscript{12}“historische-genetische Entwicklung.” Preuner (1864: 39).
\textsuperscript{13}ibid. (1864: 207-216).
\textsuperscript{14}“Sie wird durch die religiösen Gebräuche Hauspriesterin, wie ihr Gemahl Hauspriester ist.” Preuner (1864: 214). cf. Fustel (1984: 94) “il en est le pontife...mais elle n’est pas la maitresse du foyer.”
first perceived in natural phenomena as being ‘like the soul of the natural body,’\(^\text{15}\) a judgment and conclusory metaphor of the same stamp as Fustel’s “soul in the human system,” with all the benefits thereof, not the least of which is the convenience of blending the spiritual and the visceral in an immediately recognizable configuration. Additionally in both their approaches to Hestia lie certain Aristotelian notions about the origin of the Greek city-state and the means to understand the religious beliefs of ancient societies in general, which would be challenged most conspicuously by Gustave Glotz and Émile Durkheim, students strongly influenced by the work of Fustel during his time as director of the Ecole Normale, and to whom the latter even dedicated his Latin thesis on Montesquieu in 1892. If Fustel lent to them the motivating example of *La Cité Antique* and its thorough, comparative approach to all aspects, religious, moral, economic and political of ancient institutions, the contribution of August Preuner may be said to lay in the painstaking research methodology, which he brought to the collection of the data concerning Hestia. It was this meticulous character with regard to the ancient and modern sources which no doubt recommended him for the composition of the entry on Hestia in Roscher’s *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* some thirty years later in which he recapitulated the major points of his earlier study in the light of new theoretical developments and then recent archaeological discoveries.

In the period after the work of Fustel and Preuner, the study of Hestia receded into the background of schools of thought like that of Max Müller, James Frazer and the Cambridge Ritualists, whose aims and interests seldom brought them into any meaningful contact with either the goddess or the hearth as significant elements in Greek religion. Müller, for example, was content to range Hestia as a fire goddess alongside divinities

\[^{15}\text{15} \text{...gleichsam die Seele des natürlichen Körpers war.” Preuner (1864: 190).}\]
such as the Vedic Agni.\textsuperscript{16} Even though he grudgingly admitted that the origin of the names of Hestia and Vesta was unknown, the choice, he asserted, lay between the Sanskrit \textit{vas}, “to shine,” or \textit{vas}, “to build.”\textsuperscript{17} The controversy was an old one, and given Müller’s main preoccupation with the origins and development of religion and its relationship to language, the stakes were not terribly high.

James Frazer with his broad interests and encyclopedic tendencies devoted a little more attention to Hestia and Vesta, over and above his work on Pausanias. He based his theory of the origin of Hestia on the importance of fire, and the need for easy access to fire, which led to the establishment of the perpetual flame in the primitive communities of Greece and Rome. As the king was entrusted with the safety and welfare of the state, so was he entrusted with the custodianship of this precious resource. Later a religious meaning attached to this practical necessity, the content of which was inherited from the old kingship by the magistrates of Greece.\textsuperscript{18} The study is lavishly endowed with references to a number of other cultures, and represents his principal work on Hestia, who was to be left out of his larger study on the origin of fire.

In a similar vein, the Cambridge Ritualists also generally found Hestia unworthy of comment. If myth served as the explication of ritual, what could be made of goddess with hardly any myths and whose rituals, such as the \textit{amphidromia}, possessed no specific reference to her and none of the prepossessing grandeur such as was to be found in the Eleusinian mysteries? Jane Harrison in particular was antipathetic, viewing Hestia as

\textsuperscript{16} Müller (1897: 382 and 784).
\textsuperscript{17} For a summary and evaluation of the views of the origin of the word \textit{hestia} at the time, see Preuner in Roscher (1890: cols. 2606-2608).
\textsuperscript{18} Frazer (1885: 143-172).
merely a late assimilator of the attributes of Gaia and far too closely associated with that usurper of Delphi, Apollo.  

Whether considered late, vague or reducible into natural or etymological component elements, it is safe to say that the declining years of the nineteenth century were not distinguished by outstanding new studies of Hestia, and by 1901 Ernst Samter was capable in *Familienfeste der Griechen und Römer* to speak of rituals involving the hearth such as the *amphidromia* and the *katakhusmata* with scarcely any reference to Hestia at all. Yet the concerns of the new century, spurred by the archaeological discoveries of Schliemann, Evans and others along with the sociological approach of Durkheim began to shift the focus away from quests for origins and firsts to providing a more historical account of the development of Greek religion. Consequently the old debates on whether the worship of Hestia had developed from a feeling of reverence felt for fire or for earth gave way to attempts to discern from what strata of religious belief the elements of her character had descended. The introductory paragraph to the section entitled “Hestia-cults,” from Farnell’s *Cults of the Greek States* is a good example of the state of the question,

> Among the minor cults of Hellas that of Hestia specially arrests our attention for the light that it throws on a certain primitive phase of religious thought as well as on a special chapter in the history of primitive culture. Being the least anthropomorphic of Hellenic divinities, she appears to be the product of that period of animistic belief that may everywhere have preceded a more precise anthropomorphism.

Nonetheless, Farnell had articulated both the fundamental problem of Hestia,

> To explain this comparative insignificance of Hestia in ritual-ceremonies where she might be supposed to be chiefly concerned, as well as in the general religion, and to

---

19 Harrison (1899: 243).

20 Farnell (1909: V. 345).
reconcile it with the vague pre-eminence in ritual and in Prytaneia that is assigned to her on good authority, is the chief problem presented by the Hestia cult.\textsuperscript{21}

As well as isolating its source,

The career of a Hellenic divinity depended partly on the name; and the goddess Hestia has the name of a common and immobile thing. As the name ‘hearth’ clung to her, she could not emerge and develop into a free personality with an individual and complex character or history, like Artemis or Athena.\textsuperscript{22}

The lack of mythology thus stemmed from the inability of the ancient Greeks to completely divorce the word \textit{hestia} from the object used for heating and cooking which they encountered in their everyday lives. And if Hestia, the goddess, was not found in ritual where she might have been expected, at births, adoptions and weddings for example, the problem originated from the fact that the “hearth-spirit” was already felt as a powerful presence inherited from a previous phase of religious development. This idea hearkened back to some of the earlier work of Max Müller and Hermann Usener.\textsuperscript{23}

Unfortunately, at the same time that Farnell had inherited some of the ideas of the latter with respect to the importance of onomastics in the history of Greek religion, he had also inherited some of the weaknesses. Namely, that none of these theories could be proven.

In sum, what Farnell had succeeded in communicating was a synthesis of the previous work on Hestia with minor changes. Gone was the assertion of Preuner that Hestia was a deity of the sacrificial fire stemming from the reverence of the \textit{Geist}, instead she derived from “the pre-animistic feeling of religious awe that immemorially attached to fire.”\textsuperscript{24} The link between the hearth and the dead, which Farnell himself regarded as possible but improvable remained, as did the proposition that Hestia was older than the other Olympians. Yet the question of personification and its effects on the lack of

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid. (1909: V. 357).
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid. (1909: V. 364).
\textsuperscript{23} Usener (1896: 314).
\textsuperscript{24} Farnell (1909: V. 360 and 364).
mythology would become hallmarks of the treatment of Hestia for some time to come. The works of M. P. Nilsson, especially, return always to this same point. First in 1906, where he stated that, ‘Hestia has never acquired a full personality, hardly any myths at all were told about her,’25 Then again in 1925, “Hestia remained attached to the hearth; she was only incompletely anthropomorphized into a goddess.”26 And yet again in 1940, “Hestia herself was not a full-fledged personality but only a pale personification.”27 For Nilsson the fixed hearth was the Mycenaean invention par excellence, but that was all that it was, never having developed into a proper divinity and forever dwelling in the shadow of Zeus who, under a variety of epithets, was the true guardian of the house.28

In this atmosphere where the hearth was seen as an example of arrested religious development, the role of Hestia even in large state ceremonies such as that recorded in the sacrificial calendar of Cos, was bound to be underestimated. An aging Wilamowitz could rebel against the notion of the power of names with his famous criticism, ‘Feeling is everything, name is noise and smoke,’29 but even he granted that this ‘feeling,’ for Hestia in domestic cult had become extinct by the Hellenistic period.30

Another explanation for the new emphasis on the hestia as an object rather than on Hestia the divinity lay quite simply in the fact that archaeology had brought to light an

27 Nilsson (1940: 76).
28 Nilsson was not unopposed in his opinions on the Mycenaean hearth, for contemporary objections see Demargne (1932: 75-88), but nonetheless the view of Hestia as a goddess perpetually in embryo has prevailed over the majority of modern scholarship. Stephen Miller (1978: 15) for example, in his work devoted to the pyrteanion, with respect to Hestia, concludes, “This sparsity of visual representation is apparently due in part to the fact that Hestia was a relatively late, and never completely anthropomorphized, development in Greek religion.” And Walter Burkert (1985: 170) while according to Hestia pride of place in his section entitled “Lesser Gods,” claims, “The power worshipped in the hearth never fully developed into a person; since the hearth is immovable Hestia is unable to take part even in the procession of the gods let alone in the other antics of the Olympians.”
29 “Gefühl ist alles, Name ist Schall und Rauch.” Quoted in Briggs and Calder (1990: 471).
30 Wilamowitz (1931: II 157).
abundance of objects, including hearths, but still few new and sure representations in art and literature. The hymn to Hestia of Aristonoos found at Delphi, which described her as 'mistress both of Olympus and of earth,' was attributed more to the hyperbole of a mediocre poet than to any real significance of the goddess.\textsuperscript{31} The figure of Hestia on the François Vase was "without distinctive character."\textsuperscript{32} And inscriptions such as the so-called, "Chian constitution," whose orthography did not provide the surety now afforded by the use of capital and lower case for proper names, inevitably evoked confusion over just which hearth was meant. The common hearth of the pnytaneion? Or the goddess herself in some capacity?\textsuperscript{33}

The question of the name, or more properly, of the word had always been part of the discussions concerning Hestia, but the lines of inquiry had typically focused on possible roots and arguments over a connection to the Latin Vesta. Now more than ever there was need for a new approach, capable of bridging the gap between a "common immobile thing," and a goddess without mythology if the study of Hestia was to be break out of the stagnation which threatened to engulf it. Fortunately, however, the foundations for such an approach had already been laid in the early part of the century by Antoine Meillet and Michel Bréal, two members of the Durkheim school.\textsuperscript{34} Working contemporaneously with others who sought to break away from the atomistic treatment of semantics,\textsuperscript{35} they sketched a portrait of language and society, which drew more from \textit{Gestalt} psychology, and the influence of Ferdinand Saussure than Darwin or Humboldt.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{31} Audiat (1932: 305 and 310).
\textsuperscript{32} Farnell (1909: V. 365).
\textsuperscript{33} Wilamowitz (1909: 64).
\textsuperscript{34} See in particular Meillet (1921: 230-271) and Humphreys (1978: 76).
\textsuperscript{35} Òhman (1953: 123-134).
\textsuperscript{36} ibid.: 125.
Their attention to the ways that an original language changed in response to alterations originating from different linguistic strata or social institutions placed new emphasis on what would come to be known as the semantic ‘field.’ The argument revolved around the notion that all changes, in the form as well as the use of a word or group of words contributed indirectly to a change in meaning, and that these changes in meaning reflected the structure of the social groups who used those words. By 1952 this approach would find its application to the investigation of Hestia in the work of Louis Gernet, in his essay, “Le symbolisme politique: le foyer commun.”

Gernet accepted the proposition that language, and mythology as a form of language, were eminently social facts and that they preserved the history of institutions, taken in the broad sense to include not only law, government and religion, but also the arts, ways of living, social relations, processes of speech and thought. This synthesis of mythology and language combined in his work with a concern, influenced by the work of Marcel Mauss, for the system of objects and the way such objects circulated within Greek society. For Gernet, concepts such as “value,” which attached to these objects were as socially constructed as language and myth and likewise reflected historic notions which “other modes of expression no longer present.” The focus on objects, more specifically mythological objects, such as the tripod of the Seven Sages, the necklace of Eriphyle, the Golden Fleece and others led to his assertion that, “There was a mythology of the royal Hestia.” The force of this simple statement lies in the manner by which Gernet was

---

37 Meillet (1921: 243-245).
40 See Benveniste (1969: i. 9) and Detienne (1981: 213-216).
capable of resetting the boundaries between the goddess and object. Mythology no longer comprised solely the human actions performed by the goddess, but the human ideas and gestures articulated around her concrete counterpart as well. To understand the role of the hearth, moreover, for Gernet, was only possible by situating it historically in variety of systems, linguistic, mythological, social, economic and symbolic.

The idea that the hearth was a symbol was, indeed, not new. As far back as a century previously, Guigniault and Creuzer had seen it as such, but in a rather obscure fashion,

In effect, just as the great goddess of the fire acts by an invisible power from the heart of the earth where she resides; likewise, from the base of the house where they honor her, she showers her blessings on the whole house and family. She is the incomprehensible and marvelous condition of all which expresses and includes the words house, prosperity and domestic sanctuary. She is like a tutelary center, a sure and mysterious guarantor of the association, of the union and all ties domestic and civil.

Creuzer saw the hearth as a symbol of the power of fire later associated with the family. Fustel de Coulanges followed this conception in *Quid Vestae* but later confined it to a symbol of the dead. In either case, whether powers or spirits, presence or absence, the hearth was assumed to be a thing or an object, which could stand both by itself or for something else.

---

44 For an example of the previous mode of classification and the reasoning behind it, see the article by Süss on Hestia, *RE* 8, cols. 1266-1270.
45 “*En effet, de même que la grande déesse du feu agit par un pouvoir invisible du sein de la terre où elle reside; de même, du fond de la maison où on l’honore, elle répand ses bénédictions sur la maison et la famille entière. Elle est la condition incomprehensible et merveilleuse de tout ce qu’expriment et renferment les mots maison, prospérité et asile domestiques. Elle est comme un centre tutélaire, un garant sûr et mystérieux de l’association, de l’union et tous les liens domestiques et civils.*” Creuzer and Guigniault (1835: 695-696). For the contrast between Creuzer and Guigniault’s conception of the symbol and that formulated by Gernet and his school, see Vernant (1981: 227-232).
Gernet's treatment of the hearth saw it as a symbol, possibly originating from fire, which at one time had stood for life and perpetuity across the generations. The memory of this power attached to fire would be remembered in the city, in the maintenance of perpetual fires, apart from the hearth, at Athens and Argos. In the prehistoric time of the Mycenaean kings, the hearth shared the chthonian associations of the *omphalos*, which like the hero's tomb and the rock of the agora pertained to the same category of space as designators of the center. The hearth, however, was more intimately linked with the institution of the city than any of these other symbols, while it maintained an association with its royal counterpart. Each family, like each city, possessed their individual hearths, but the public hearth governed and organized this collection of similars. Every public hearth presupposed every other in the widespread institution of the prytany and the practice of hospitality, while simultaneously rejecting foreign bodies like Persia, and dominating the hearths of private individuals. Between these private hearths and the public one there could be no "social contract." The power of privileged families who preserved their hereditary cults, belonged to a time, preserved in myth, of distributions and classifications that were individual in character yet provided a balance of powers when taken together. The notion of the public hearth, by contrast, was that of command, subordination and more importantly, of collectivity. Its authority was domineering and impersonal by design. Having been removed from its previous royal and aristocratic contexts, the public hearth served to represent the new power of the city and its preoccupation with *homenoia*. In economic terms, the public hearth struck the difficult balance between public and private property through liturgy.

---

The emphasis that Gernet gave to the system of representations and institutions painted a picture of the hearth which reached back into Greece’s prehistoric past and participated in all the changes of Greek society. Pushed into the background was the question of personification, ‘the social age to which she (Hestia) corresponded did not ordinarily favor personification in the mythical sense,’49 foregrounded was the use made of the hearth by the city in a deliberate program to create a new kind of political space which made use of the symbol of the center. ‘Where the center is is an arbitrary – indeed a theoretical – matter,’50 Gernet claimed.

As a center then, like the omphalos, the hearth inherited selected religious associations. Unlike the omphalos, however, it retained political ties inherited from the age of kings, along with a certain flexibility of which the Greek city could make use. Gernet posited the hearth and its symbolism as a turning point for Greece and the outline of the hearth which he sketched would be further developed by his students, Jean-Pierre Vernant and Marcel Detienne. Both scholars have made contributions to the study of Hestia using methods inspired by Gernet, although the focus of their research on the hearth has diverged and should be addressed separately.

The fundamental work which has left its imprint on the majority of recent Hestia scholarship was produced by Vernant in his, “Hestia-Hermès: sur l’expression religieuse de l’espace et du mouvement chez les grecs.”51 Taking the representation of the twelve gods on the base of the statue of Zeus at Olympia as his starting point, Vernant confronted assertions like that of Farnell that, “in the matter of grouping, the art that dealt

with Hestia was capricious and without a plan."\textsuperscript{52} The pairing of Hestia and Hermes by Phidias was not, he argues, the result of a capricious whim, but 'revealed a properly religious signification,' and 'expressed a definite structure in the Greek pantheon.'\textsuperscript{53} Sharing the same field of deployment, the surface of the earth, each of them represented different aspects of the same field. Hermes represented the outside, the open, mobility, contact with the other. Hestia represented the inside, the closed, the fixed, the human group folded back upon itself. The opposition of the functions of Hermes and Hestia expressed the tension in the archaic representation of space, between the space which required a fixed point, a center which oriented and qualitatively defined different directions, and space represented as the place of movement that implied the possibility of transition from one point to another.\textsuperscript{54}

It is important to note, however, that Vernant does not say that the ancient Greeks themselves viewed Hestia and Hermes as symbols of space and movement. In his view, these concepts had not been detached as abstract notions from religious thought which carved out and ordered phenomena into agents and activities through its own logic. The expression of the concepts of "space" and "movement" were embedded in ancient praxis concerning the arrangement and organization of space, over different aspects of which Hestia and Hermes presided and which formed the frame in which the experience of spatiality was elaborated.\textsuperscript{55}

The mythology of Hestia provides to Vernant the two basic points around which the majority of his essay revolves, namely that Hestia is woman, and that she remains a

\textsuperscript{52} Farnell (1909: V 365). cf. also Kern (1935: ii. 13).
\textsuperscript{53} Vernant (1965: 98).
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid. (1965: 101).
\textsuperscript{55} Vernant (1963:101-102).
virgin. The relationship of Hermes and Hestia unfolds then along the divisions, social, spatial and economic between men and women. Hestia, then like Aphrodite and Hera is capable of incarnating specific aspects of feminine reality to the exclusion of others. This “purity” assumed by the goddesses is inaccessible to humans.\(^{56}\) As a hyper-expression of some of the values and activities attributed to women in Greek society, Hestia does not entirely reflect what that society is, but what it should be.

Hestia expresses then, taken to the extreme, the tendency of the oikos to isolate itself, to close itself, as if the ideal, for the family, should be a whole sufficient unto itself: complete autarchy on the economic level, strict endogamy in marriage. This ideal does not conform to Greek reality. Nevertheless, it is no less present in familial institutions and representations which ensure their function, as one of the poles around which domestic life is oriented in ancient Greece.\(^{57}\)

Through the institutions of marriage, the epiclerate, and the amphidromia, institutions which sometimes entail a reversal of the usual patterns of expectations and behavior, but which revolve around a core set of values, the function of Hestia becomes clear. As a virgin woman, she represents enclosed space, thesaurisation, possession, conservation, the perfect reduplication of the male line in perpetuity and religious solidarity. Outside of the house and “Hestia-Hermès,” Vernant accorded a role to Hestia and the public hearth with even broader associations.

In *Mythe et pensée chez les grecs*, of which “Hestia-Hermès,” forms but the first part of the larger chapter entitled “L’organisation de l’espace,” where Vernant proceeded to examine the hearth in its broader public and historical significance. In the two following sections, again originally published separately, he treats Hestia in the context

---

\(^{56}\) Vernant (1965: 112).

\(^{57}\) "Hestia traduit donc, en la poussant à la limite, la tendance de l’oikos à s’isoler, à se refermer, comme si l’ideal, pour la famille, devait être une entière suffisante à soi-même: autarcie complète sur le plan économique, stricte endogamie sur celui du mariage. Cet ideal n’est pas conforme à la réalité grecque. Il n’en est pas moins présent dans les institutions familiales et dans les représentations qui en assurent le jeu, comme un des pôles autour duquel s’oriente la vie domestique en Grèce ancienne.” ibid. (1965: 107).
of the rise and development of the polis, and tracks the changes in the way the city and its citizens conceived of their political and geographical situation.

For Vernant the sixth century B.C. was a pivotal period in the history of the Greek city-state when the social and political institutions of the city became the object of conscious reflection, when the division between domestic affairs, signified as the realm of oikonomía, and public affairs or ta koina, became a matter of deliberate research.\(^{58}\) In part a process of desacralization, the city thinking itself placed new emphasis on geometry as a way of articulating not only the relations of its component members, but also of space in a larger, cosmological sense. Correlative to the things ‘in common,’ ἐν κοινῷ were the things ‘in the middle,’ or ‘in the center,’ ἐν μέσῳ.\(^ {59}\) Politically it was a time when notions regarding the value of public debate, the open promulgation and publication of laws, and the relations of citizens as ‘equals,’ isoi, or ‘similars,’ homoioi, came to the fore. Intellectually it was the time of thinkers such as Anaximander and later Hippodamus of Miletus, who in the fields of astronomy and urban planning, respectively, utilized the notions of equilibrium, symmetry and reciprocity to construct a plan of the cosmos and of the city.

At the center, politically beside the agora, cosmologically in association with the earth, was the hearth, translated from a mythical image into a political and geometrical idea. Once used to differentiate individual houses from one another and to establish contact between different levels of the cosmos,\(^ {60}\) the public hearth now expressed the symmetry of relations between citizens gathered together as equals in a space defined by

---

\(^{58}\) Vernant (1981: 151 and 168-169).

\(^{59}\) See however Detienne (1965: 425-441) who finds the same notions in Homeric society.

reciprocal and reversible relations. The analogy between the physical and political, recovered by the use of the semantic approach, was conveyed by the use of the same vocabulary and concepts.

Beside Vernant in both this new examination of Hestia and the utilization of this approach was Marcel Detienne. Most conspicuous among his treatments of this topic is the chapter from *L'Écriture d'Orphée* entitled, “Hestia misogyne, la cité en son autonomie,” which sets the tone and establishes the program with regard to the study of Hestia in his subsequent treatments of the topic. In “Hestia-Hermès,” Vernant had seen the pairing of the two divinities and asked why they were associated with one another. The questions Detienne poses in “Hestia misogyne,” are more of the operative kind, namely asking, “How did the process of transcendence, the self-reflection on the principle of division, take place, and by what symbolic effort did the city, escaping from the fascination with an infinite similarity, construct a space where it could think itself?” Or later, “how was the autonomy of Hestia acquired? By what process was the Common Fire invested with an ideal quality, with an ideal quality which was that of the city?”

The focus of “Hestia misogyne,” as the title implies, deliberately shifts the emphasis from the Hestia of the domestic or enclosed space, the ideal domain of women, to a Hestia who was intimately involved with the public spaces of the city and the male magistrates who governed it. This Hestia, again originally a hearth and altar fire, became an idea, not just in Cleisthenic Athens, but throughout the Greek world. Detienne is at

---

62 “…comment s’opère le procès de transcendance, la réflexion sur soi du principe de partage, et par quel travail symbolique la cite, échappant à la fascination du semblable à l’infini, se ménage-t-elle un espace où se penser elle-même?” Detienne (1989: 89).
pains, moreover, to emphasize the variety of shapes into which this concept is molded and adapted as well as the multiplicity of other divine powers, not just Hermes, with which Hestia is associated. In each case the idea of Hestia, as a symbol of civic autonomy, is played out in a different configuration; in a state sacrifice on Cos where she appears with a civic manifestation of Zeus, in a procession of state singers from Miletus to Didyma where she is evoked in conjunction with Apollo Delphiniós, or in the dedications of the magistrates of Thasos found in the agora where she materializes besides Aphrodite as well as Hermes.  

64

In this sense, Detienne also follows Gernet in conceiving of the hearth as a symbol consciously taken and employed by the community precisely as a sign of their autonomy, of their conditions and ability, by deliberation and decision, to construct “the political.” This symbol recalls the collective process of the division of spoils and sacrifices, as well as the assemblies of the Homeric host outside the walls of Troy, rather than the reforms of Solon or of Cleisthenes, where the notion of ‘the common,’ arose.  

65

The creation of these spaces, enacted across the gestual, also entailed one gesture in particular, which Detienne has found to enjoy a special relationship with the gods, including Hestia, namely writing.

This writing found its place, not cloistered within the walls of a palace, the exclusive milieu of a body of trained scribes, but within public spaces, such as temples, council chambers and the agora, where it places before the eyes of all the citizens, laws, decrees, calendars, accounts and measures taken by sovereign bodies composed of the citizens themselves. These councils, assemblies and boards of magistrates represent,

---

64 Detienne (1989: 91-95).
together with the measures they enacted and fitted with entrenchments against erasures, alterations and counter-measures, institutions which ensured the autonomy of the city as an entity which could govern itself.\textsuperscript{66} Included within this program of self-government was also the management of relations with the gods, of the numerous pantheons of the Greek states, of which Hestia was but one member. Temporally in the domain of festivals and sacrifices, spatially in the location of temples, statues, and dedications, the world of the gods had also to be inscribed in the space of the city.

At this point then, the question of Hestia becomes a distinctly epigraphical one, but one which the epigraphy of Hestia is not sufficiently prepared to cope with. To link the worship of a particular deity, in this case, Hestia, with the evolution of the practice of writing as it was employed in the Greek city, is to implicitly ask how and to what degree the practices of the polis and its citizens as recorded in writing changed those institutions and worship. If the "Constitution of Chios," is an expression of the desire to record and publish the laws for the people there and that same inscription mentions Hestia, the publication was not simply a political or legal shift, but a religious one as well. And presumably, there would be some evidence from places besides Chios, which would show a similar development. The difficulty in evaluating this proposition and others remains the same as it always has for Hestia, namely that there has never been a systematic treatment of the epigraphical evidence.

In and by itself, this fact provokes no real surprise, the epigraphy of Greek divinities is generally not treated outside syntheses with the literary.\textsuperscript{67} In the case of Hestia, however, owing to the limited scope of the epigraphical evidence, there exists the

\textsuperscript{66} Delsenne (1992: 7-81).

\textsuperscript{67} One exception to this rule is the compilation made by Ladislav Vidman of the inscriptions relating to the cults of Isis and Serapis.
possibility of forming a corpus which is both substantial and manageable. The potential
benefit of this kind of examination works towards the solution of some of the key
problems of previous investigations of Hestia worship which have stemmed from
research methods more closely attuned to evaluating the mythologies and establishing the
personalities of the other Olympians to the detriment of other modes of assessment.
Walter Burkert, for example, has asserted that,

a polytheistic world is nevertheless potentially chaotic, and not only for the outsider. The
distinctive personality of a god is constituted and mediated by at least four different
factors: the established local cult...the divine name...the myths told about the named
being, and the iconography... All the same, this complex is easily dissolved, and this
makes it impossible to write the history of any single god.68

In the case of Hestia three of the four criteria, the name, the myths and the
iconography, have been examined in depth to the conclusion that Hestia is a goddess
without personality. The fourth criterion, “established local cult,” attested more
thoroughly in epigraphy than literature, has never formed more than a minor supplement
to these investigations. The result is a substantial breach between the synthetic analyses
of Hestia worship taken as a whole and based for the most part on literary evidence, and
the explications offered by epigraphical commentaries to account for the presence of the
goddess in her local manifestations. The substantial presence of Hestia on Delos, for
example, has been linked with literary testimonia of Delos as a center, but the inscriptions
themselves make no mention of this. Moreover, statements commonly found in
epigraphical commentaries such as ‘Hestia was the embodiment of the common hearth,’
or ‘Hestia was commonly associated with the prytaneion,’ are too vague to be of any real
value, as long as the principle terms remain undefined.

The definition of such terms has then frequently resorted back to the symbolic. Gernet took the first steps with his examination of the mythology of the hearth, as opposed to the mythology of Hestia, which revealed the importance of the hearth as a center, but this does not explain the subjective sentiment attested in the numerous votive dedications of individual worshippers to Hestia. The personal benefits received by these devotees of the goddess stemmed not from a symbol but from a divine power which listened to their entreaties, responded to their needs and commanded their fidelity. The important conception of a divine power strictly delimited among other divine powers found its first expressions for Hestia in Vernant, but as countered by Detienne, this power cannot be exclusively, or even primarily linked as Vernant portrays it, to the feminine sphere. Rather the potential of this insistence on Hestia as a member of a pantheon, of a polytheism, lies in the formation of a different question, not why does she appear, but why does she, and not some other divinity, appear? Returning to the case of Chios, for example, why was Hestia chosen to be present in this inscription and not Athena Poliouchos whose worship there was both ancient and prominent? And how would our interpretations change if this were so? The answer to these questions is not so easily arrived at for it requires that one try not only to understand the worship of Hestia, but also that of the other gods which made up the pantheon of a city; that one attempt to comprehend the choice not a priori, but rather in the circumstances of the historical moment when amid a variety of institutions and divine powers, this goddess was consciously selected for the purpose.

The defining characteristic of previous analyses of Hestia was the focus on her presence, and consequently they have not been able to construct a portrait of the goddess.

---

which could answer the problem posed by Farnell almost a century ago and still valid
today of accounting for her absence where she should be expected to be. If, for example,
Hestia was a goddess so closely connected with the feminine, then it is to be expected
that the epigraphy of Hestia should likewise be connected with dedications by women in
connection with domestic space or issues such as thesaurisation, rather than by private
individuals, magistrates and states in contexts which have little to do with these affairs.
In may be argued that the test of grand conclusions in small contexts is unfair, and that no
reconstruction of a divine power, however broad, could possibly account for every
manifestation. Nonetheless, by close examination of these local appearances important
patterns might emerge which could serve to define more sharply our notions not only of
Hestia, but of other divinities as well.

The return proposed by an epigraphical survey then is to a situation without
generalizations and without a model. The goal is principally first to observe how Hestia
was worshipped, as documented in the record of the individual city-states of Greece, and
then to proceed to an examination of where she fit into the polytheistic systems of these
locales. The eventual result of such a compilation cannot yet be foreseen, but there exists
the hope that by establishing a corpus, which gathers the evidence for one important deity
in the Greek pantheon, not only will our knowledge of this one goddess be made more
complete, but just as Hestia was the first born of the Olympians, many other divinities
will follow.
Attica


Not stoichedon around 34. 2nd century B.C.
Editorial Note: line 4. I have accepted the restitution proposed by Mavroudís of Βουλαία as the cult title of Hestia given her association with Zeus Boulaios and Athena Boulaia. The gap to him seemed sufficient to hold a word of seven letters. For the association of Hestia Boulaia with Zeus Boulaia in Athens cf. 11 and 12.

‘... to Zeus Boulaios and Athena Boulaia and Hestia Boulaia. To Good Fortune it seemed best to the demos to permit ... daughter of ... kios, of the deme Peiræus, to make the dedication of silver ... having the inscription as given above, so that when these things have been accomplished the good will of the city towards those well and favorably disposed might appear clearly, and (it seemed best to the demos) to write the decree on a stele and set it up in the bouleuterion inscribing by types the weights of the ... which were given over: Silver ... 3,200 drachmas, a pair of bowls... of the pair, 421 drachmas.’

Translation Note: The translation is largely that of Geagan (1971: 99).

The first lines of this inscription probably discussed the conditions of this decree including the text of the dedicatory inscription referred to in lines 7-8 (προγέγραπται). The restorations of the epithets for these divinities are based on their collective presence in the bouleuterion and in other dedications, and Geagan has

---

proposed that the bouleuterion was also the site of the objects inventoried.\(^2\) Additionally in his analysis, he identified four cults of Hestia, one in the pytaneion, one in the bouleuterion, another on the Acropolis, and a fourth of 'Εστίας Ῥωμαίων, ‘Hestia of the Romans.’ The list is somewhat misleading as the evidence for these last two derives from the same source, namely the inscribed seats of the Theater of Dionysus, dated to the period of the Roman Empire.\(^3\) Moreover, the cult of ‘Hestia on the Acropolis,’ is actually the cult of ‘Hestia on the Acropolis and Livia and Iulia.’ Whether Livia and Iulia are to be taken as the same person is a matter of dispute,\(^4\) but the late date, the association with a Roman noble woman, and the fact that it is a question of a priestess, seem to indicate that this was a Vesta cult just like that of the ‘Hestia of the Romans.’\(^5\)


Not stoichedon. Beginning of the 1st century B.C.

\[-----------------------------\\]

\[-----------------------------\varepsilon\pi\nu\varepsilon\ \varepsilon\nu\pi\varepsilon\iota\delta \\iota \ \omega\ \iota\nu\tau\varepsilon\acute{\alpha}\iota\varepsilon\varsigma \ \tau\acute{\iota} \varsigma \ ---\]


\(^3\) ‘Hestia of the Romans,’ *IG II*² 5102, 5145. ‘Hestia on the Acropolis’ *IG II*² 5096.

\(^4\) Dittenberger, *IG III* 316, argued that they were the same person, as Livia adopted the name Iulia Augusta in 14 A.D. For arguments against, see Wolters (1889: 321-322) and Graindor (1927: 155).

\(^5\) Miller (1978: 40-41). This was not unfortunately the last time that these seats would give rise to misconceptions. Rhodes (1972: 34) claimed “in the first century A.D. Zeus, Athena and Hestia shared a priest, who was given a front seat in the Theater of Dionysos.” His evidence consisted of two inscriptions, *IG II*² 3543 and 5054, which mentioned a joint priest of Zeus *Boulaios* and Athena *Boulaia,* but not Hestia. No further explanation is given.
[--ca. 6---καὶ] οἱ ἀείσιτοι ἐπαινέσαντες καὶ στεφανώσαντες ἀπό-
[φαίνουσιν τεὶ βουλεῖ καὶ τῶι δῆμωι τὸν ταμίαν ὅν ὁὶ πρυτάνεις]
[εἰς] [ο] [ν ές] [αυτών] [υ] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [ν] [nu...
... proposed ... Since the prytaneis of ... the aeisitoi display to the boule and the demos having praised and crowned the tamias whom the prytaneis chose from among themselves ... and the priest of Apollo Patroos ... to have performed all the sacrifices both on behalf of the boule and the demos, and to have taken care of everything else in a manner both right and honorable ... so that the boule and the demos might appear portioning out the praise which is due to those conducting liturgies both honorably and well.

To Good Fortune: it seemed best to the boule and the demos to approve the good things which they announced were in the sacrifices on behalf of the boule and of the demos and of the women and children and the friends and allies, and to praise the tamias of ... and the grammateus ... and the priest of Apollo Prostaterios ... and the priest of Apollo Patroos ... and the priest of Hestia, Marsyas ... and the priest of ... Agathocles ... and the priest of ... Semachides and the priest of ... and the priest of ... and to crown each of them with a laurel crown for piety towards the gods and eagerness to do well
towards the phyletai and (it seemed best to the boule and the demos) to praise the tamias of the boule ... and the grammateus of the boule and of the demos Oin ... and the hypogrammateus of the boule and of the demos Dion and the keryx of the boule and of the demos ... Erchiea and the priest of the eponymos ... and the copies ... ocles of the deme Pallene and the ... and according to the decrees Timocles ... and the copies and according to the unspeakable? Di ... and the aulettes ... and to crown each of them with a laurel crown.'

This decree of the boule and the demos follows a pattern set by similar decrees in which both the prytaneis and various officials associated with both the prytany and the boule were honored.6 The list of officials honored seems to have expanded continuously until the Roman era, and Peek has conjectured that the number included here reached fourteen.7 Notable among those incorporated here are the priests of Apollo Patroos, Apollo Prostaterios and Hestia, restored here because of the connection of these divinities with the bouleuterion.8

Although a small apsidal building in the agora was probably dedicated to Apollo Patroos by Peisistratus, this inscription, with the epithet restored, marks the first evidence for a priest of his cult.9 In the absence of evidence to support the assertion of Oliver that the archon basileus was in charge of presiding over the worship of Apollo Patroos during the archaic and classical eras, the only evidence regarding the direct relation of this

---

6 Dow (1937: 162-165).
7 Peek (1941: 6-7).
8 ibid. (1941: 8).
9 For the building, see Shapiro (1989: 51). For the cult in general, de Schutter (1987: 104-104 and 115-116) and Hedrick (1988: 185-210) whose account of the cult, while exhaustive in some respects, makes no mention of this priest.
divinity with the Athenian boule remains the account of the dokimasia of prospective archons provided by Aristotle.\textsuperscript{10} 

Apollo Prostaterios is frequently mentioned in the decrees honoring the prytaneis who appear to have sacrificed to him and Artemis Boulaia before meetings of the ekklesiai.\textsuperscript{11} Pausanias records that in the bouleuterion was a wooden xoanon of Zeus Boulaioi, Demos and Apollo, perhaps to be identified as Prostaterios.\textsuperscript{12} Yet the earliest evidence for his cult in Athens comes from a series of oracles mentioned in Demosthenes, Against Meidias (52-53). As Mikalson has proposed, it is possible that the worship of this deity extended farther back, and that both he and Artemis shared, with distinctive roles, a cult attached to the council and assembly. Or as he recommends, the worship of both Apollo Prostaterios and Artemis Boulaia rose to prominence in these civic cults only later in the third century.\textsuperscript{13} 

The identity and duties of the priest of Hestia are unknown.

3 Four fragments of a Pentelic marble stele published as a whole by U. Köhler, IG II 478; I. Kirchner, IG II\textsuperscript{2} 1042.

Not stoichiaden 41/40 B.C.

[------------------------ εἵπεν ὑπὲρ δῶν ἀπανγέλλει ὁ κοσμητ[ῆς τῶν ἔφηβων]}

\textsuperscript{10} Oliver (1950: 17). Arist. Ath. Pol. 55. 2-3; 45. 3. 
\textsuperscript{11} Mikalson (1998: 115-116).
\textsuperscript{12} Paus. 1, 3, 5. For the identification, see Wycherley (1978: 51). 
\textsuperscript{13} Mikalson (1998: 115-116).
[--------------- ενίδου Μαραθώνιος ὑπὲρ τῆς θυσίας ἦν ἔθυσεν μετὰ τῶν
ἔφη]-
[βων ἐν τοῖς προτανείωι τὰ εἰσιτητήρια τῇ τε Ἐστία καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις
[θεοῖς οἳς πάτριοι]
ἡν ὑπὲρ τε τῆς βουλῆς καὶ [τοῦ δῆμου καὶ παιδῶν καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ
τῶν φίλων καὶ συμμάχων]
καὶ γεγονέναι πάσι τοῖς θύμασιν τὰ ἱερὰ καλὰ καὶ σωτήρια. νν. 'Αγαθή
Τύχη καὶ δόξαι τῇ βουλῇ
tὰ μὲν ἁγαθὰ δέχεσθαι τὰ γεγονότα ὑπὲρ τοῖς ιεροῖς οἷς ἔθειν ἐφ' ὕπνῳ
cαὶ σωτηρία τῆς βουλῆς καὶ
[τοῦ δῆμου καὶ παιδῶν καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ τῶν φίλων. ἐπαινέσαι δὲ
τὸν κοσμητήν-----]
[...] ενίδου Μαραθώνιον καὶ τοὺς ἔφη[βους καὶ στεφανώσαι ἕκαστὸν
αὐτῶν τὰλλού τε στεφάνῳ-
[ων ἐπὶ] τῇ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐθείᾳ καὶ τῆς παρ' ὅλου τὸν ἐν-
αυτῶν σπουδῆς καὶ φιλοπονίας]
10 [ίνα] τοῦ[των] [συν]τελουμένων φαινήται ἡ βουλή [τιμῶσα τοὺς
ἀγαθούς τῆς ἐπιβαλλούσης τιμῆς]

‘... declared: for the sake of those whom the kosmetes of the ephes, ... enidos,
of the deme Marathon announced; for the sake of the sacrifice upon entry which he
performed with the ephes in the prytaneion both to Hestia and to the other gods whom
it was customary on behalf of the boule and of the demos and of the women and children and the friends and the allies and for all the offerings there were fine and salutary.

To Good Fortune: it seemed best to the boule to approve the good things that were in the sacrifices which he performed for the health and safety of the boule and of the demos and of the women and children and of the friends: to praise the kosmetes ... enidos of the deme Marathon, and the ephebes and to crown each of them with a laurel crown for their piety towards the gods and for their earnestness and industry throughout the whole year so that with these things being accomplished the boule might appear having honored the good with honor falling to …'

The present and the following inscription are part of a substantial group recording honors accorded by various civic groups to the ephebes and their trainers, either kosmetai, sophronistai or paideutai. Only these two inscriptions (3, 4) mention that the ceremony of the eisiteteria (var. eisiteria, iseteteria) entailed a sacrifice to Hestia. The other documents of this type and their variations,¹⁴ mention a sacrifice at the koine hestia in the Prytaneion at the engraphai of the ephebes in the presence of the kosmetes, the priest of the Demos and the Charites and the exegetai, but the divinity or divinities to whom it was intended are not mentioned.¹⁵

While these two inscriptions do not mention the presence of either the priest of the Demos and Charites or the exegetai, they do include the notice that the sacrifice made at this time was on behalf of the women, children, friends and allies of the Athenians, a fact which the other inscriptions do not contain. It is by no means unlikely that this

¹⁴ The assembly and typology of the group was developed by Reinmuth (1955: 220-239).
¹⁵ See IG II² 1006, 1008, 1028, 1029, 1030, 1042, 1043 and Decree I of Reinmuth (1955: 228).
sacrifice to Hestia at the hearth in the prytaneion was also a sacrifice to the Demos and the Charites,¹⁶ and two of the Charites, Auxo and Hegemone, are mentioned beside Hestia in the oath of the Athenian ephebes (7, lines 19-20). It is known that the kosmetes was elected by the demos but the length of his term of service, as well as his duties vis-à-vis the sophronistai and the strategoi remain unclear.¹⁷

4 Several fragments of a stele of Hymettian marble, now in the National Museum of Athens. Eds. U. Köhler, IG II 482; I. Kirchner, IG II² 1043.

Not Stoichedon 38/7 B.C.

Σώσις Σώσιδος ὁ ὑπὲρ τῶν οἰκεῖων ἀνέθηκεν.

'Αγαθης Τύχης τῆς Βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ Δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων ἐπὶ Καλλικράτιδος ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰαντίδου τρίτης πρωτανείας· Βοηθηρουμιώνος τετράδες ἑσταμένου,

τετάρτη τῆς πρωτανείας· Βουλή ἐν τῇ θεάτρῳ ἡ [μεταχείρισα ἐκ τοῦ Παναθηναίου]

ηδυσκοί σταδίου· τῶν προέδρων ἐπεμηφοίζεν Δίων ... εἰς [κ]αι συνπροεδροί Λύσις]

[Ἡ]σιλιππί[άδου Ἀλιμούσιος ε]πεν. ννν. Ὡπὲρ δῶν ἀπαγγέλλει· ὦ ὁ

¹⁶ This was, in all probability, what led to the assumption of a joint priesthood of Hestia, the Demos and the Charities by Martha (1882: 164).
¹⁷ Pélékidis (1962: 104).
κοσμητῆς τῶν ἐφήβων

[Ὁλυμπίοδωρος Ὁλύμπου Ἀγνώσιος ὑπὲρ τῆς θυσίας ἔθευεν μετὰ
tῶν ἐφήβων ἐν

[τῶι πρυτανεῖοι τῇ Ἑστία καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς οἷς πάτριοι ἦν τὰ

ἰστητηρία ὑπὲρ τε τῆς

[βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου καὶ παιδῶν καὶ γυναικῶν καὶ τῶν φίλων

καὶ συμμάχων καὶ γεγο[νέ]-

10 [ναι ἐν πᾶσιν τὰ ίερὰ καλὰ καὶ σωτηρία. ννν Τύχη Ἀγαθῆ διεδόχ-

θαί τῇ βουλῇ, τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ]

[δέχεσθαι τὰ γεγονότα ἐν τοῖς ίεροῖς ἀπὸσι ἐρ' ὑγείᾳ καὶ σωτηρίᾳ

τῆς βουλῆς καὶ]


νν. Ἐπαινέσαι δὲ καὶ

[τὸν κοσμητῆν Ὁλυμπίοδωρον Ὁλύμπου Ἀγνώσιον καὶ] τοὺς ἐφή-

βους καὶ στεφάνω-

[σαι ἕκαστον] αὐτῶν ἑκατόν ἑκατόν ἑκατόν ἑπὶ τῇ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσε-

βεῖαι καὶ τῇ παρ' ὀλον τῶν ἑνιαύ-

15 [τὸν σπουδῆι καὶ φιλότυπον[αι, ἵνα τούτων] ςυντελομενῶν φαίνεται

ἡ βουλῆ τειμῶνα

[τοὺς ἄγαθοὺς τῆς ἐπιβαλλούσης αὐτοῖς τιμῆς. κτλ.

'Sosis, son of Sosis, of the deme Oe, on behalf of the associated ephebes
dedicated (this). To the Good Fortune of the boule and of the Athenian demos in the

37
archonship of Kallikratides in the third Prytany of the tribe Aiantis: on the fourth of Boedromion, in the fourth Prytany: the boule being moved in the theater from the Panathenaic stadium: among the proedroi, Dion ... and his fellow proedroi: Lysis, son of Asclepiades, of the deme Halimous proposed; For the sake of the things which the kosmetes of the ephebes, Olympiodorus, son of Olympus, of the deme Hagnous announced, for the sake of the sacrifices upon entry which he performed with the ephebes in the Prytaneion to Hestia and the other gods to whom it was customary the sacrifices upon entry both on behalf of the boule and of the demos and on behalf of the women and children and the friends and allies and in everything there were fine and salutary sacrifices. To Good Fortune it seemed best to the boule and the demos and of the women and children and the friends and allies. Both to praise the kosmetes, Olympiodorus, son of Olympus, of the deme Hagnous and the ephebes and to crown each with a laurel crown for the sake of their piety towards the gods and for their earnestness and industry throughout the whole year, so that with these things having been accomplished the boule might appear honoring the good with honor falling to them ...’

5 White marble stele found in the Piraeus, now in the British Museum. Eds. E. L. Hicks, IBM I no. XI (IG II 589; SIG\(^2\) 430; Michel, Recueil 145); I. Kirchner, IG II\(^2\) 1214 (SIG\(^3\) 912).

Stoichedon 32 ca. 280 B.C.

Διόδωρος Πειραιεύς εἶπεν ἐπεὶδὴ Καλλ-
ιδάμας Καλλιμέδοντος Χολλείδης ἀνήρ
άγαθός ἐστι μερὶ τέ τοῦ δήμου τὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τὸν δήμου τοῦ Πειραιέων, καὶ πο-
εῖ ἀγαθὸν ὅτι δύναται καὶ τὴν εὐνοιαν ἑ-
υδέδεικται ἐπὶ τῶν καιρῶν, δεδοχθαὶ Πε-
ιραιεύσιν, ἐπαινέσας Καλλιδάμαντα κα-
ὶ στεφανώσαι θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι ἀρετῆς ἐ-
νεκα καὶ δικαιοσύνης τῆς εἰς τὸν δήμον

τὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ τὸν δήμου τοῦ Πειραιεύ-
ν. καὶ ὅταν θύσωι Πειραιεύς ἐν τοῖς κοιν-
οῖς ιεροῖς, νέμειν καὶ Καλλιδάμας με-
ρίδα, καθάπερ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Πειραιεύ-
σιν, καὶ συνεστίασαι Καλλιδάμαντα με-

τὰ Πειραιεύσον ἐν ἀπασί τοῖς ιεροῖς, πλὴν
eί ποὺ αὐτοῖς Πειραιεύσιν νόμιμον ἔστ-
ιν εἰσίεναι, ἄλλων δὲ μὴ κατανεῖμαι δὲ α-
ὐτὸν καὶ εἰς τριακάδα ἤν ἀν αὐτὸς βουλὴ-
ται. εἶναι δὲ αὐτῶι καὶ προεδρίαν ἐν τῷ

θέατρῳ ὅταμ ποίωσι Πειραιεύς τὰ Διον-
ύσια οὗ καὶ αὐτοῖς Πειραιεύσι κατανέμ-
εται, καὶ εἰαγέτῳ αὐτὸν ὁ δήμαρχος εἰς
tὸ θέατρον καθάπερ τούς ιερείς καὶ τού-
ς ἄλλους, οἷς δεδοται ἡ προεδρία παρὰ Πε-
25 ιραιέων. τελείν δὲ αὐτὸν τὰ αὐτὰ τέλη ἐν
tῶι δήμωι, ἀπερ ἀγ καὶ Πειραιεῖς, καὶ μὴ ἐ-
γλέγειμ παρ’ αὐτοῦ τὸν δήμαρχον τὸ ἐγκτ-
ητικὸν. ἀνειπεῖν δ’ ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ τὸν κή-
ρυκα τραγωδῶν τῶι ἄγωνι, ὅτι στεφανοῦ-
σι Πειραιεῖς Καλλιδάμαντα Καλλιμέδο-
ντος Χολλείδην ἀρετῆς ἑνεκα καὶ εὐνοι-
ας τῆς εἰς τὸν δήμον τὸν 'Αθηναῖων καὶ τὸ-
v δήμου τὸν Πειραιεῶν, ὅπως ἂν εἰδώσαι πά-
ντες, ὁτι ἐπίστανται Πειραιεῖς χάριτα-
35 ἂξιας ἀποδιδόναι τοῖς φιλοτιμουμέν-
οις εἰς αὐτοὺς. ἀναγράψαι δὲ τοδὲ τὸ ψή-
φισμα ἐν στήλη λιθίνη καὶ στήσαι ἐν τ-
ωὶ ἱερῶι τῆς 'Εστίας. vacat

'Diodorus, of the deme Peiraeus, declared: Since Callidamas, son of Callimedon, of the deme Cholleidai is a noble man with respect to the Athenian people and the people of the Peiraeus, and does what good he can and has displayed good will in difficult times, it seemed best to the people of the Peiraeus, to praise Callidamas and to award him a laurel crown for the sake of his justice and nobility towards both the Athenian people and those of the Peiraeus. And whenever the Peiraeans perform sacrifices in common, they are also to allot a portion to Callidamas, just like to the other Peiraeans and Callidamas is to be hosted with the Peiraeans in all the sacrifices, except where it is lawful for the
Peiraeans themselves to enter, but not for someone else. And they are to allot him to the *triakas* of his choice. And there is to be for him a front seat in the theater whenever the Peiraeans pay for the Dionysia which is allotted to the Peiraeans, and let the *demarchos* introduce him to the theater just like the priests and the rest to whom the *proedria* has been given by the Peiraeans. He is to perform the same sacrifices among the people, the very ones which the Peiraeans would, and the *demarchos* is to levy the land tax upon him. The *keryx* is to make a proclamation in the theater at the tragedy competition, that the Peiraeans can award Callidamas, son of Callimedon, of the deme Cholleidai with a crown for the sake of his nobility and good will towards the people of Athens and those of the Peiraeus, so that everyone may know, that the Peiraeans know how to return worthy favors to those who honor them. This decree is to be written on a stone stele and set up in the shrine of Hestia.’

Translation Note: I have accepted the translation of ἐπὶ τῶν καίρων (line 6) as ‘in difficult times,’ proposed by Gauthier (1979: 395 n. 99).

This decree of the deme Peiraeus was proposed by Diodorus, a member of that same deme who was included in a list of *bouleutai* from the year 281/0 B.C.\(^\text{18}\) His father has been identified by Whitehead as one of a board of ten officials honored by the city in ca. 325.\(^\text{19}\) The historical circumstances surrounding this inscription have been investigated in depth by Gauthier who has formed a picture of the city of Athens effectively separated from the Peiraeus by the presence there of a Macedonian garrison.

\(^{18}\) Meritt and Traill (1974: 72).
\(^{19}\) Whitehead (1986: 425).
This occupying force would have prevented the people of the Peiraeus from taking part in
the civic life of Athens including meetings of the boule and the demos or proposing
themselves as candidates for any of the various magistracies of the city.20 The separation
of the two may have lent additional political significance to the shrine of Hestia in the
Peiraeus for the people there beyond that generally attributed to such deme shrines.21

6  Plaque of Pentelic marble found near the stoa of Attalus. Ed. U. Köhler, IG II
596; J. Toepffer, Attische Genealogie (1889) p. 107. with restitutions by A. Wilhelm; I.
Kirchner, IG II2 1229.

Stoichedon 25  Second half of the 4th century B.C.

[Θ]  E  [O  I]

[*Ε]δοξεν Κροκέων[δαίς.........]

[.]ς Ἄριστοδήμου [.........ἐπ]-

[ε]ν ἐπειδὴ οἱ αἰρ[εθέντες ὑπὸ τῶ]-

ν γεννητῶν οἰκο[δομῆσαι τὸ ἱερ]-

[ὁ]ν τῆς Ἑστίας ἐπε[μελήθησαν τῆς οἰ]-

notes that it is “one of only three – the others being Eleusis and Halimus – known to have possessed a
shrine dedicated to Hestia, the personified essence of the communal hearth whose foremost sanctuary was
in the prytaneion in the Asty.” At Eleusis there is known to have been a sacrifice to Hestia (9) but where
and by whom is unknown. Miller (1978: 228) has questioned the identification of the “prytaneion” at
Eleusis precisely because it “lacks...the all-important hearth room.” So where then was the shrine?
Additionally, the inscription from Halimus (8) makes no provision that it was specifically for the
demesmen. The information provided describes only the type of offering and for whom it was destined.
The scholia tell us that the ones who offered the ‘seventh ox,’ were oi πένθησει in Athens (Stengel (1910:
225-226)) but it is by no means possible to otherwise determine their identity. On the subject of what
'Gods. It seems best to the Krokonidai ... son of Aristodemus ... proposed: Since those selected by the gennetai to build a shrine to Hestia attended to the building honorably and well and donated the cost themselves for the construction, they are to be praised and awarded with a gold crown ...'

The occasion of this inscription from the Krokonidai is clearly established. The gennetai of that clan charged a commission to erect a shrine. When this was accomplished in a suitable fashion, those entrusted with the task were rewarded with golden crowns. As Toepffer noted, however, while there was a hearth in every house, and in every house, Hestia was honored, not every house had a temenos or a hieron, and this indicates a special cult and a special relationship to the goddess.22

The majority of our knowledge concerning the Krokonidai is now generally associated with a lost work attributed to Lycurgus known either as the "Κροκωνιδῶν διαδικασία πρὸς Κοιρωνίδας," or "περὶ ἱεροσύνης."23 The matter of the dispute is not known, but presumably the genealogy of the two clan founders was called into evidence. The lineage of Krokon, as it presently exists, is rather twisted. A

22 Toepffer (1889: 107).
23 The attribution itself is dubious, see Conomis (1961: 120).
version recorded by Pausanias (1. 38. 1) makes him the husband of Saisara, daughter of Keleos. The Lexicon Seguerianum holds both him and Koirom to be sons of Triptolemus (Bekker, Anec. 1. 275. 9). The athidographer Ister (FGrH 334 F15) added the information that Koirom was a bastard. Assuming that all the versions including that of Pausanias are derived from the speeches delivered during the legal proceedings, the story may be reconstructed as follows: A dispute arose between the clans regarding the prerogatives connected to the Eleusinian mysteries. The Krokonidai argued for a stronger tie to the principal characters at the origin of the mysteries, on the basis that Koirom was the illegitimate brother. The Koiromidai in turn argued that Krokon was only associated with these same characters by marriage.24

The privileges of this clan vis-à-vis Eleusis remain a mystery. Noted in connection with them, however, was the practice known as τὸ κροκοῦν. The description of this practice by Mylonas is as follows, “krokosis, from the legendary Krokos, the first dweller of the territory, whose descendents had the privilege of tying a woolen kroke, a ribbon of saffron color, around the right hand and left leg of each of the mystai. What the meaning of this rite was we do not know, but perhaps it protected the initiates against evil spirits.25 This passage is misleading in several respects. Firstly, there is no attestation of the word krokosis. Secondly, the name of this ancestor is manifestly Krokon, not Krokos (Paus. 1. 38.1). Thirdly, there is no indication that the Krokonidai performed any such rite personally.26 Fourthly, the kroke need not have been saffron in color; this definition

24 This is largely the reconstruction of Parker (1996: 303). For a slightly different account, see Kearns (1989: 67).
26 No duties of the other Eleusinian officials, such as they are known to us, resemble this one, save, perhaps, the hierophantids who may have crowned the initiates at the beginning of the telete, “but
instead wavers between the words κρόκη ‘thread,’ and κρόκος ‘saffron.’ Lastly, the initiates are only described as ‘purifying,’ themselves by this ritual, and the notion of protecting themselves from ‘evil spirits,’ does not convey precisely the same idea.\(^{27}\)


Stoichedon 4\(^{th}\) century B.C.

\[\Theta E O I\]

'Ιερεύς Ἄρεως καὶ Ἀθηνᾶς

'Αρείας Δίων Δίωνος Ἀχαρνεύς ἀνέθηκαν.

5 "Ὀρκός ἐφήβων πάτριος ὃν ὀμνύναι δεῖ τοὺς ἐφήβους. ννν. Ὄδε αἰσχυντα ἡ ἱερὰ ὁπλα ὀυδὲ λείψω τὸν παραστάτην ὅπου ἂν στοῖχος ἄμφω δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ ἱερῶν καὶ ὀσιων καὶ ὤκ ἐλάττω παραδώσῳ τὴν πατρίδα, πλείω δὲ καὶ ἄρείω κατὰ τε ἐμαυτὸν κα-

---

\(^{27}\) "οἱ δὲ ὃτι ἐνίοτε καθαίρονται." Photius 1109.
i meta aptantwv, kai euikoσo twν áei kρ-
ai nóntwv emfroλwv kai twν theσmuν twν
idrménwv kai oú̂s an to loipon idhmów-
ntai emfroλwv: éan dé tis anairei, oú̂ k é-

15 πitrepwv katá te emauton kai meta pánt-
wv, kai tmhsw ierá ta patria. "Isotores [[0]]
theoι "Aglauros, 'Eσtía, 'Enuw, 'Eνuλios, "Ar-
ns kai 'Aθná 'Areía, Zeus, Θeλλό, Aúξo, 
'Heμó̂n, 'Heraλῆs, órois tῆs patridos, πυροί,

20 kriβai, ἀμπελοι, ἐλάασι, συκαὶ.

'Gods. The priest of Ares and Athena Areia, Dion, son of Dion, of the deme, Acharnia dedicated (this). The traditional oath of the ephebes which it is necessary for the ephebes to take: I will not disgrace the sacred armament nor will I desert my companion wherever he may muster: I will fight in defense of the sacred and the profane and I will bequeath to posterity the fatherland no less than when I found it, but larger and better, both by myself and with the rest, and I will always conscientiously obey my superiors. And if someone attacks, I will not turn away by myself and with the others, and I will honor the ancestral rites. These gods are the witnesses; Aglauros, Hestia, Enyo, Enyalios, Ares and Athena Areia, Zeus, Thallo, Auxo, Hegemone, Herakles, the borders of the fatherland, the wheat, the barley, the vines, olive trees, and figs.'
Hestia is invoked here as one of the witnesses to the oath of the Athenian ephebes. The history of this institution is imperfectly understood, but the oath as it is preserved appears to contain elements which date to the archaic period.\textsuperscript{28} While the oath has found to be echoed in literary sources, the most direct parallel evidence comes in two versions preserved by Pollux (8. 9. 106) and Stobaeus (ed. Bethe, II, 134).\textsuperscript{29} Of the two, only the former contains a list of the witnessing divinities from which are missing, however, Hestia, Enyo, Athena \textit{Areia} and Herakles along with all the borders and vegetation. For his part, L. Robert saw Hestia and Enyo as belonging to the ancient oath, but Athena \textit{Areia} was a later addition as evidenced by the \kappa\alpha\iota.\textsuperscript{30} In general, the analysis of the deities has divided them into two broad categories, fertility and the raising of the young, and war. Hestia here has yielded her first place in the oath to Aglauros in whose shrine the oath was taken.\textsuperscript{31}


\'Εστίας.

\θύειν τρεῖς ἑβδόμους [β]ου[ς].

\'Of Hestia. To offer three ‘seventh oxen.’”

\textsuperscript{28} Siewert (1977: 109-111).
\textsuperscript{29} Daux (1971: 373-374).
\textsuperscript{30} Robert (1938: 305).
\textsuperscript{31} Kearns (1989: 139).
According to Sokolowski, this plaque was designed to be placed before the altar of Hestia. The ‘seventh ox,’ was a sort of pastry over which a bitter controversy ("acerrima illa controversia") seems to have taken place at the beginning of the last century between Wilhelm Roscher and Paul Stengel.\textsuperscript{32} The dispute centered over whether the ‘seventh ox,’ ought to signify one cake shaped like an ox (Stengel), or was so named due to the fact that it was offered in the seventh place after six other cakes (Roscher). Rather than stoke the flames of this debate, I shall content myself by noting that similar inscriptions exist for other deities, including Apollo \textit{Pythios}.

\textsuperscript{33} Pollux (6. 76), moreover, provides the testimony that, 'cakes (are) common for all the gods as also for the moon goddess; they have been named according to their shape, like the 'ox;' for there is a cake with horns attached, offered to Apollo, Artemis, Hecate and Selene.'\textsuperscript{34} In the state sacrifice to Hestia on Cos (\textbf{83}, line 30), there is mention of the offering of 'seven cakes,' (φθόης ἐπταὶ).


\textsuperscript{32} See Prout and Ziehe, \textit{LGS} II p. 77, esp. n. 1, for a history of the conflict. Prout and Ziehe sided with Roscher, but the most extensive argument against this position came a few years later in Stengel (1910: 222-233).

\textsuperscript{33} Peek (1941: 196 no.3). \textit{LSCG} p. 54 no. 25, A and B.

\textsuperscript{34} πελανω[k] δὲ κούνη πάσιν θεοῖς ὡς καὶ σελήνῃ τῇ θεῷ κέκλημεν δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ σχῆματος ὀφθεπέρ καὶ ὁ βοῦς: πέμμα γάρ ἔστιν κέρατα ἐχουτ πεπηγμένα, προσφερόμενον Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ Ἀρτέμιδι καὶ Εκάτη καὶ Σελήνῃ.
Τάδε τὸ ἑτέρον ἔτος θυεταὶ ἀ[---]

Col. III

ΔΠΙ  Θέμιδι οἶς

244  ΔΓ  Διὸ Ἐρκείωι ο[ῖς]

ΔΗΗ  Δὴμητρι οἶς

Φερρεφάττη[ι]

ΔΓΗΗ  κριός

248  ΔΓ  Εὐμόλπωι ο[ῖς]

ΔΓ  Δελίχωι ἡ[ρωὶ οῖς]

ΔΓ  Ἀρχηγέτη[ι οῖς]

ΔΓ  Πολυξέν[ωι οῖς]

252  Θρεπττῶι [κριός]

ΔΓΗΗ  κριτός

ΔΓ  Διόκλωι[ι οῖς]

ΔΓ  Κελεῶι [οῖς]

256  Εὐμολπ[ῖδαι]

ταῦτα [θύσιν]

ιερεᾷ[ι Δήμητρος]

Η  ἀπόμ[ετα]
260  ἐκ τῶν στηλῶν

<ΔΗΗΗ> χοίρος

ΔΗΗ  Ἐστί[αι οἴς]

ΔΗΗ  Ἀθην[αι οἴς]

264  Δ  Χά[ρισιν ----]

'Ἐρ[μή -----]

ΔΗΗ  Ἐν[αγωνίσω οἴς]

Δ  Ἐρμή---αίξ

268  Δ  Ἡρ[ακλεῖ οἴς]

ΔΗΗ  Διοσκούροις οίς

[-------------]

Editorial Note: The numbering of the lines is that given by Healey (1990). K. Clinton (1974: 70) has proposed the following emendation for lines 256-259.

256  Εὐμολπ[ιδαίς οἴ]

ταῦτα [θύσιν καὶ]

____________________

ἱερεά[ὶ Δῆμητρος]

Η  ἀπόμ[ετρα]

'These are sacrificed the other year.
12 drachmas To Themis, a ewe.
15 drachmas To Zeus Herkeios, a sheep.
12 drachmas To Demeter, a ewe,
To Persephone,
17 drachmas a ram.
15 drachmas To Eumolpos, a sheep.
15 drachmas To Melichos, the hero, a sheep.
15 drachmas To Archegetes, a sheep.
15 drachmas To Polyxenos, a sheep.
To Threptos, a ram
17 drachmas selected.
15 drachmas To Diocles, a sheep.
15 drachmas To Keleos, a sheep.
The Eumolpidai
sacrifice these things.
To the priestess of Demeter,
100 drachmas perquisites
from the stelai,
3 drachmas a pig.
12 drachmas To Hestia, a ewe.
12 drachmas To Athena, a ewe.
10 drachmas To the Charites ...
To Hermes

12 drachmas  *Enagonios*, a sheep.

10 drachmas  To Hermes ... a goat.

10 drachmas  To Herakles, a sheep...

Once called by Sterling Dow "the most precious and the most exciting," of all the Athenian inscriptions, this fragment represents the only mention of Hestia in the Nicomachean revision of the Athenian sacrificial calendar.\(^{35}\) Healey has linked these sacrifices with the *Eleusinia*, the games celebrated as both a trieteric and penteteric festival in the month of Metageitnion.\(^{36}\)

As it stands, the inscription has been divided in two by Healey, who saw lines 243-246 as forming a list of sacrifices to be performed by the Eumolpidai; lines 258-261 for the perquisites for the priestess of Demeter; lines 262-270 then form a separate set of sacrifices, to be performed on the same day, presumably on behalf of the people of Athens by agents whose designation has now been lost.

---

35 Dow (1959: 5) cited in Healey (1984: 136 n. 11). There exist two major treatments of this portion of the Athenian sacrificial calendar. The 1961 Harvard dissertation of Robert Healey, now republished as *Eleusinian Sacrifices in the Athenian Law Code* (1990) and that given by S. Dow, "The Athenian Law Codes," in the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*. I was unable to procure either of these works at the time of the writing of this commentary. Fortunately as it may be, the reproduction of the inscription in *Eleusinian Sacrifices* suffered some problems in the copying of Healey's type-written manuscript and the pertinent section had to be re-reproduced in *SEG* XL 146.

End of the 5th /Beginning of the 4th century B.C.

'Εστίαι, Κηφισώι, Ἀπόλλωνι
Πυθώι, Λητοῖ,
'Αρτέμιδι Λοχ-ίαι, Ἰλειθύαι, Ἀχ-ελώωι, Καλλ-ιρόηι, Γεραισ-
ταῖς Νύμφαι-
ς Γευεθλί-αῖς, Ἐστίαι.

'To Hestia, Kephisos, Apollo Pythios, Leto, Artemis Lochia, Eileithya, Acheloos, Kallirhoe, the Geraistan Genethlian Nymphs, Rhapso.'

This group of divinities, associated with the dedication of a shrine to Kephisos by Xenokrateia, daughter of Xeniades of the deme Cholleidai, has been interpreted in conjunction with a relief showing a meeting of both gods and humans of which Hestia
has been sometimes identified as a member, albeit not by the majority of scholars.\textsuperscript{37} As a consequence, the reasons provided for the presence of Hestia in the inscription have at times been tied with her inclusion in the relief. In cases where Hestia has not been recognized in the latter, her inclusion in the former has been attributed to the general practice of placing Hestia in the first position.\textsuperscript{38} Regardless of her presence or absence in the relief, given the place of Hestia in such rituals as the \textit{amphidromia}, she does not seem out of place in the present company of river gods and spring goddesses along with Apollo \textit{Pythios}, Leto, Artemis \textit{Lochia} and possibly Eileithyia.\textsuperscript{39} The assemblage in general appears convoked under the same idea as that found in Hesiod’s \textit{Theogony}, when speaking of the progeny of Ocean and Tethys, he says, ‘She (Tethys) bore the holy race of daughters, who on earth raise men to manhood with lord Apollo and with the rivers, this they have as their portion from Zeus.’\textsuperscript{40}

11 \hspace{1cm} Fragment of a Pentelic marble plaque found in 1939 in the Agora. (Agora inv. 5797). Ed. A. Raubitschek, \textit{Hesperia} 12 (1943) pp. 63-64 no.16, ph. ibid. p. 64.

ca. 24

\textsuperscript{37} See Linfert (1967: 149) but also Guarducci (1974: 64-65).
\textsuperscript{38} Linfert (1967: 154), Guarducci (1949-1951: 119).
\textsuperscript{39} Guarducci (1974: 60) prefers to read Artemis \textit{Lochia} \textit{Eileithyia}.
\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Τικτε δὲ θυγατέρων Ιέρων γένος, αἴ κατά γαῖαν / ἀνδρας κουρίζουσι σῶν Ἀπόλλωνι ἄνακτι / καὶ ποταμοῖς, ταύτην δὲ Δι ος πάρα μοίραν ἔχουσι. (Hes. Theog. 346-348).} Rhapso, the last deity, has given rise to some confusion based on her name, which evidently comes from \textit{ῥάπτειν}, most recently from Guarducci (1974: 60-61) “Questo verbo ha il valore di ‘mettere insieme’ quindi di ‘cucire’ si può facilmente passare a quello di ‘rabbriciare,’ poi a quello di ‘medicare,’ e infine a quello di ‘guarire’... In sostanza, Rhapsò potrebbe essere una Ninfa la cui prerogativa consisteva nel guarire, i suoi fedeli.” This seems needlessly complicated. In the catalog of springs from the \textit{Theogony}, there is mention of one spring named \textit{Ζευξώδ}. The names are similar enough in meaning, and Rhapso then becomes like the other divinities, a spring, albeit one whose location is unknown.
[name, patronymic, demotic]

ταμιεύσας πρυτά[νεων τῆς ..ca. 4..]
τίδος ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ Α[..ca. 6½... ἄρχου]-
τὸς ἐνιαυτῶι ὑπὲρ [τῆς φυλῆς]

5 Διὶ Βουλαίωι καὶ Ἐστία Βουλαίαι

‘So-and-so, son of so-and-so, of the deme X, having served as the tamias of the prytaneis of ... in the archonship of ... at the end of his tenure on behalf of the phyle to Zeus Boulaios and Hestia Boulaia.’

Two dedications made by the tamiai of the prytaneis. The names of the deities are restored on the basis of the literary evidence.


53/2 B.C.

Μηνόδωρος Αρ[-----ca. 14------τα]-
[μιεύ]σας πρυτ[άνεων τῆς Ἀκαμαντί]-
δος φυλῆς ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ Διοδώ[ρου ἄρχου]-
τὸς ἐνιαυτῶι ὑπὲρ τῆς φυλῆς Διὶ Βου-

5 [λαίωι καὶ Ἐστίαι Βου]λαίαι.
Menodorus, son of so-and-so, of the deme X, having served as tamias of the prytaneis of the tribe Akamantis in the archonship of Diodorus at the end of his tenure on behalf of the tribe to Zeus Boulaios and Hestia Boulaia.’

The name of the phyle, Akamantis, is restored on the basis of a prytany decree honoring the treasurer Menodorus.

Base of Hymettian marble. Ed. A. Böckh, CIG 480 after a copy of Fourmont (W. Dittenberger, IG III 68); Lolling, AD (1890) p. 41; I. Kirchner, IG I² 3185.

Middle of the 1st century A.D.

'Εστια καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ θεοῖς Σεβαστοῖς καὶ τῷ Βουλῇ
tῷ ἔς Ἀρείου Πάγου καὶ τῇ Βουλῇ τῶν ἔξακοσίων καὶ
τῷ Δήμῳ Φιλόξενος 'Αγαθοκλέους Φλυεύς
ἀνέθηκεν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ποιήσαντος τοῦ πατρὸς
'Αγαθοκλέους τοῦ Φιλόξενου Φλυεύς,
στρατηγοῦντος ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀπλείτας Τι. Κλ[αυδίου]
vac. Θεογένους Παιανεώς καὶ ἐπι-
μελητοῦ τῆς πόλε[ως --------------]
vac. Τρικορυ[σίου].

56
Editorial Note: The underlined letters are those which have disappeared since the time of Fourmont.

'To Hestia and Apollo and the theoi Sebastoi and to the boule from the Areopagus and the boule of the six hundred and the demos, Philoxenus son of Agathocles, of the deme Phlya dedicated (this statue) from his own means, with his father, Agathocles, son of Philoxenus, of the deme Phlya, having made it, when Titus Claudius, son of Theogenes, of the deme Paania, was strategos of the hoplites and epimeletes of the city ... of Tricorius ...'

Dittenberger dates this inscription from the name of Titus Claudius, who appears elsewhere in magisterial lists. As the inscription notes, Agathocles, the father of the dedicator Philoxenus, was a sculptor, likewise his father before him was presumably a sculptor and is known from a signature on a statue fragment discovered in Rome.41 Whether the Greek Hestia and Apollo, members of the Roman imperial family, or both are referred to here is a matter of dispute.

The epigraphical evidence from Athens is interesting in several respects, not the least of which is its relative scarcity. Of all the Greek city-states, Athens was distinguished by its fondness for publishing documents of all kinds, but only thirteen inscriptions which mention Hestia, as clearly distinguished from the Roman Vesta, are known to us. From the literary evidence, two episodes in the history of the Athenian

41 Graindor (1927: 236-238).
Hestia are salient. The first are the accounts from Thucydides and Plutarch which describe how the various prytaneia of Attica were united together at Athens in the synoikismos of Theseus. Secondly, is the scholiastic evidence which relates that the Athenian hearth was different from most other hearths of Greece as, owing to the autochthonous nature of the Athenians, it had remained unmoved. Conversely, however, the epigraphical evidence does not allude to either this event, or any alleged singular character of or relationship to Hestia at Athens deriving from their perceived autochthony.

The oldest epigraphical testimony of Hestia at Athens, given the arguments for an archaic date, remains the oath of the Athenian ephebes (7) which as a collective civic, if not entirely democratic, institution would then form a significant bridge between the Hestia worship maintained by private clans such as the Krokonidai (6), and rituals involving the goddess performed by the city, for the city, as a whole. Siewert has noted that the list of gods and goddesses in this oath avoids the Homeric deities,

worshipped particularly in the society of the Greek noble...either because they were not the principal deities of the oath taking hoplites, who were mainly middle class farmers...or because binding the hoplites to a deity whose cult was ministered by a single clan...would have given this family a political or social predominance intolerable to other clans.

In this context, the sacrificial calendar of Eleusis (9) illustrates the relationship which could result from such division. According to Healey, the first list of sacrifices, to be performed by the clan of the Eumolpidai,

is in fact the sacrificial list taken over and included in the general calendar of sacrifices of Athens, albeit somewhat modified, and extended and made more democratic by the addition of new sacrifices (the reason for the second series below) and with the victims

---

paid for by the state. Indeed, the whole list of the calendar could be read as a neat rubric: from their ancestral law (Themis) the genos (Zeus Herkeios) of the Eumolpidai (the final rubric) sacrifices to its special deities (Demeter and Persephone) and its hero kings and ancestors (the remaining figures).

While the dates of the implementation of these two practices, the ephebeia and the sacrifices at Eleusis, are unknown, taken together they illustrate two specific strategies employed by the city of Athens to control the influence of the gene and their cults utilizing Hestia worship. The first consciously avoided or excluded members of the traditional pantheon, which were perhaps largely controlled by individual clans. The second appended sacrifices to the important civic deities of Hestia, Athena and the Charites to those performed by the premier clan connected with the Eleusinian mysteries.

From this latter strategy, as attested now in the fragmentary remains of the sacred calendar, forms an interesting conjunction. In the Iliad (9. 63-64) Nestor rebukes Diomedes, with the warning that ‘Without phratry, without law, without a hearth is that man who loves the horror of war among his own people.’ If the figures at the head of the sacrifices by the Eumolpidai do indeed mark the beginning, there is a curious symmetry between the two lists. The ancient clan of the Eleusinian mysteries maintains as its prerogative an initial sacrifice to Themis, while the officials of the Athenian state whose identity is not preserved began their own sacrifice with Hestia. The sacrifice to Zeus Herkeios, sometimes associated to Zeus Phratrios, is paralleled by another to Athena, who under the epithet Phratria, also participated in that institution. The Homeric complex could thus be seen as resolved into its constituent parts and divided into two sets, one for the genos, another for the city. Consequently, without losing any of its original components, a distinction is established.

---

43 “ἄφρήτωρ ἀδέμιστος ἀνέστιος ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος / ὅς πολέμου ἔφαται ἐπιδήμιον ὁκρυόντος.”
This is not to say that the worship of Hestia was entirely completely appropriated from the clans. For reasons which remain unclear, another more obscure family with ties to the Eleusinian mysteries, the Krokonidai, built their own shrine to Hestia in the late fourth century B.C., and it was around this time that their relationship to the mysteries was challenged by another genos, the Koironidai. Pausanias, centuries later having visited their ancestral domain across the old border between Attica and Eleusis, reported that he could not find the tomb of Krokon. Is it mere coincidence that amid the sparse attestations of this genos there should be evidence for a clan shrine and a noted absence of the tomb of their clan founder? Another interpretation is possible. Krokon was reputedly the son-in-law of Keleos, who is described by Plutarch as the man ‘who first, according to the record, established a diurnal council of excellent and reputed citizens, which he called a prytaneion.’45 If Theseus united the prytaneia of Attica, then this prytaneion, which could also have served as the tomb of someone like Krokon would presumably at some point have been suppressed as well. The worship of Hestia continued, however, and a new building specifically for that purpose would have served nicely in the absence of both tomb and prytaneion to affirm the link of the Krokonidai with their eponymous ancestor, particularly in the context of a challenge to their historical claims.

The tension between the single prytaneion of Attica located within the city of Athens and those which formerly existed was evidently resolved at some point in the past, but the worship of Hestia could and did exist outside of the central prytaneion. In the circumstances of the third century B.C. when the deme Peiraeus was cut off from the

---

45 "ἀδιὰ δ’ ὦς ἐπεῖν τοῦ Κελεόν, ὃν πρῶτον ιστοροῦσιν εὐδοκίμου καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν κατασκευάσαντα σύνοδον καθημερινῆς ὑμνάσαι πρυτανεῖον." Plut. Symp. 667D.
prytaneion of Athens, the shrine of Hestia was used as an archive for the decrees of the
deme and perhaps even assumed the role of a functioning prytaneion for the inhabitants
there. Unsolved, however, is the mystery of the ‘priest of Hestia,’ (2, lines 16-17) who is
more attested via a restoration in modern accounts of Athenian religion than by the
ancient evidence and his relationship with either the prytanes or the boule. Unlike the
situation in her subject state Delos, the Athenians apparently never combined the worship
of their Hestia with that of the Demos and Roma (Delos 34), rather there existed two
distinct cults of Vesta.

In the Eleusinian sacrifices Hestia was included in a sacrifice to the Charites, but
this connection appears more prominently in the ephebeia, not only by their mutual
presence in the oath, but also by the attendance of the priest of the Demos and the
Charites at their enrollment within the prytaneion. The connection of Hestia so directly
with the young is virtually unparalleled elsewhere in the epigraphical record of Greece,
and the Xenokrateia stele provides an example of how this connection could be shaped
outside of large state contexts and institutions. For as a rule, Hestia is not commonly
associated with marine or water deities. One of the few myths of Hestia relates how she
spurned Poseidon, and instead chose to remain an eternal virgin. From the testimony of
this stele, however, she was one of group of deities, including the gods and goddesses of
at least three rivers and springs, to whom gifts could be offered in the shrine there. While
some researchers would see her placement at the head of the list of divinities as a form of
religious punctuation, noting that Hestia frequently occupies the first position in lists
where she appears, not every register of divinities, includes Hestia, or like the oath of the
Athenian ephebes, places her first when she does appear. In short, the fact that divinities
occur in lists or catalogs at all, forms neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for her
inclusion at the beginning of all such rolls. Her presence is not a marker that signifies
simply, “list,” but rather, given the other evidence stemming from Athens which places
her in the company of divinities associated with the young, is most probably the result of
a similar function. If the function is similar, however, it is still not the same, for the other
deities of the oath of the Athenian ephbe are not in this list. While there are the
Geraistan Genethlian Nymphs, there is no Aglauros, Auxo or Thallo. The presence of
Artemis _Lochia_, and Eileithyia seems to reflect a concern for the very moment of
childbirth, something which obviously would not be of concern for the ephbes. It is
tempting then to see this entire shrine as concerned on a local level with children from
birth through pre-adolescence.
Epidaurus


3rd century B.C.

'Αρισταρχο[ς]
'Εργίλου
['Ε]στία
[ἀν]έθηκε

Editorial Note: line 3 ['Εσ]τία Hiller; [Θέ]τι Blinkenberg.

'Aristarchus, son of Ergilus, dedicated (this) to Hestia.'

A stemma of this family has been constructed by Peek.¹ Aristarchus appears to have held several high-ranking priesthoods including that of Asclepius. Whether there was a priesthood of Hestia as well is unknown, but this remains a possibility.


Undated

ʻἈπαλλα[ξ]ικάκω
θεῷ ʻΑσκληπιῖῳ
ʻΕστίᾳ Δ[ι] ᾲπαλ-
λαξί[κ]άκω-------

ʻTo (the) god Asclepius Apallaxikakos, to Hestia, to Zeus Apallaxikakos...ʼ

The epithet *Apallaxikakos* was previously attested only on Delos as an epithet of Herakles.\(^2\) Both Asclepius and Herakles were heroic sons of Zeus concerned with the affairs of mankind, and the sharing of an epithet seems the natural inheritance of their father Zeus.\(^3\)

---

\(^2\) Roussel (1915-1916: 200 no. 208) attributed this to the assimilation of Herakles by an Egyptian deity such as Horus.

\(^3\) For connections between the deities see Edelstein (1975: *passim*).
Megalopolis


183 B.C.

[---------ca. 28--------δως]

[δέ] καὶ ἐν ταῖ πατρὶ [δι-----ca. 15------]

[...] ἔπαυξηται κατὰ πάντα, δεδοχθαι ταῖ]

[πολεί τιμῶσαι Φιλο[πο][μεν Κρανγίος]

[τ]ιμαῖς ἵσθείς ἄρετάς [ἐνεκεν καὶ εὐ]-

5 [ε]ρισεῖας· ἱδρύσαι[θαι δὲ εἰς τιμῶν αὐτοῦ]

[ἐ]ν ταῖ ἀγορᾶι τὸ με[νάμα καὶ μεταραι ἐκ Μεσσα]-

[νίς τάι ὁστέα εἰς τάν ἀμετέραν πόλιν],

καὶ βω[μὸν κατασκευάζαι λευκόλιθου ὡς]

[κ]άλλιστον, καὶ βオリστεῖν ταῖ ἀμέραι ταῖ]

10 [Δι]ός Σωτήρος, στεφα[νώσαι δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦν εἰ]

[κ]όσι χαλκέαι[ς τέσσαρι, καὶ στάσαι τάν]

[μὲ]ν μίαν ἔν τῷ θεάτ[ρῳ-----ca. 13------]

[π]εζικάν, τὰ[ν δὲ ἀλλαν------ca.15------]

[..]κον, τὰν δὲ ἁλ[λαν--------ca.17-------]

15 [τ]ὰν δὲ ἁλλ[αν------ca.14------καὶ ἀνακαθ]-
[ρ]ύζαι ἐν τῷ [ϊ ἁγώνι τῷ Σωτηρίων τὸν τε]

[στ]έφ[α]νον [ca. 24]

[τ]αῖς δὲ [ca. 26]

[--- lines 19-24 are too mutilated ---]

25 [π]όλιας γ[ca. 25]

[τά]ν πόλιν [ca. 24]

[.]ην τ[.]ν τε [ca. 25]

[.]όλεος καὶ [ca. 16]

[.]αις φ[.]ος καὶ ἄπιγ[ca. 10 πομπάν]

30 [πέ]ιμπνη ο[μ]φί ἀκρεσκό[μαν ca. 11]

[.]ς ταῖς ταῖς [τ]ς[μ]αι ἀν[ca. 15]

[.] Ἀρκάσι ἀξίαν, τ[θ]έναι δὲ καὶ ἁγώνα γνη-

[μ]υκόν καὶ ἰππικ[δν]

35 [τ]ον δὲ ταμίαν ἀνα[διδόναι εἰς τὰν θυσίαν]

τοῖς τᾶς πόλιοι [ιρο]θ[ύ]ταί[ς ἐκάστωι δύο]

μνᾶς, τὰ δὲ κρέα τ[ά] βρῶσιμα [καταχράοθαι, τὸ]

[δ]ὲ δέρμα καταδίδοσθαι τοῖς [.......]

μένοις: τοῖς δὲ Σωτηρίοις [ca. 9]

40 νοοίν τοῖς κτωμένοι[ις ca. 13]

τοῦ τοῦ Δία τοῦ Σωτήρ[ca. 14]

[.]ν τὸ τέμενος τὸ Φιλο[οίμενος, καὶ παρια]-

[τ]άτω ὁ ἱερόθυτον τὸν τ' οἶνον, καὶ ἀναγο]-
[πε]μέτω ἐπὶ ταῖς θυσίαις καὶ τ’ ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ]

45 [σ]τεφανώτω ὁ καὶ τὰ Ἑστία[η-----ca. 10-----]
[kα]λαμβανέτω καὶ [-----ca. 11-----]
[-----ca. 10-----καρ]υσ[ε]θ[ω----------]

Two lines too mutilated.


... and so that also in the fatherland ... may be proclaimed everywhere, that it seems best to the city to honor Philopoemen, son of Kraugis with honors equal to the gods because of (his) virtue and good works. And to build a memorial in his honor in the agora and to transport (his) bones from Messenia to our city, and to erect as fine an altar of white stone as possible, and to sacrifice an ox on the day of Zeus Soter, and to reward him with four bronze statues, and to erect one in the theater ... like a foot soldier, and the other ... and the other in ... and the other in ... and to announce both the crown and the other honors in the contest of the Soterioi ... and with the ... the cities ... the city ... and the ... of the city and ... procession ... and the honors ... worthy in Arcadia, and to establish also a gymnastic and equestrian contest ... and the tamias is to give at the sacrifice to the hierothytai of the city two minas each, and to use the edible meat, and to give the hide to the... And at the Soteria... to those who own ... Zeus Soter ... in the temenos of Philopoemen, and let him provide a hierothytos sheep and wine, and let him make a

67
proclamation at the annual sacrifices and let him crown and the man who is priest to Hestia let him also take portions and ... let him be proclaimed ...'

This decree of the Megalopolitans is largely restored on the basis of the testimonia of Diodorus Siculus (29. 18) and Livy (39. 50. 9).\textsuperscript{1} The sense is generally clear, and while Winand has compared these kind of honors to those made by the citizens of Cnidus to Artemidorus,\textsuperscript{2} it seems more relevant to an investigation of Hestia to point out the similarities to the honors decreed for Attalus III Philometor around 138-133 B.C. in Elaea/Pergamum (166). In both cases, the cult of these leaders was conjoined with that of Zeus Soter, in particular, but also that of other divinities Soterioi, in general. The other stipulations included statues placed in conspicuous locales and processions in their honor.

---

\textsuperscript{1} Winand (1990: 193 n. 1).

\textsuperscript{2} On the basis that the honors in both cases are characterized by the word λοιπόν, ibid. (1990: 193).
Tegea

17 Marble fragment broken on the right and left found in the small church just north of Ibrahim-Effendi. Eds. Milchhöfer, AM 4 (1879) p.139 c.; Bechtel, Bezzeng. Beitr. VIII (1884) 306 (SGDI 1223); Hiller von Gaertringen, IG V (2) 88.

4th century B.C.

[φι]στίαι · χα[ριστήριον]


'A thank-offering to Hestia.'

Very little regarding the worship of Hestia at Tegea can be gleaned from the stone as it is. Pausanias adds one other bit of evidence for her worship there, 'not far from the theater are famous tombs, one being called hestia koine, having a round shape where is said to be buried Antinoe, daughter of Cepheus.'

---

1 Paus. 8. 9. 5. "τοῦ θεάτρου δὲ οὐ πόρρω μνήματα προήκοπτα ἐστιν ἐς δόξαν, τὸ μὲν ἔστια κα-λουμένη κοινή, περιφερές σχῆμα ἔχουσα· 'Ἀντινόην δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐλέγετο κείσθαι τὴν Κεφέως.'
Delphi


Second half of the 4\° century B.C.

'Αριστονό[ο]υ  'Εστία[ι]
[ι]ηραν  ερόν  ἀνασαν  'Εστίαν  ύ-

μνήσομεν· ἄ καὶ 'Ολύμπου καὶ κυρ[ία]

γαῖας μεσόμφαλον ἀεὶ Πυθίαν ο[ὰν]

δάφναν κατέχουσα ναὸν ἀν' ύ[ψίπυ]-

[λ]ου Φοίβου χορεύεις τερπομένα [τρι]-
[π]όδων θεσπίσμασι[γ] καὶ χρυσέα[ι]

[φ]όρμιγγ' 'Απόλλωνος ἥνικ' ἀν ἐπτ[ά]-

τον κρέκων μετὰ σοῦ θαλιάζου-

τας θεοὺς ύκώνουσιν αὔξηι, χαῖρε

[K]ρόνου θύγατερ καὶ Ἡρας, μούνα πα[ν]-
Ἀριστονόος ὑπὸ Ἑστίας διδοῦ εἰς ἱδία  ἁμαρτάνειν ἐπὶ τοὺς νυκτερινοὺς ἱερὰς ἱερὰς ἡμέρας ἔσχατον

'Of Aristonoos to Hestia. We will sing of Hestia, holy queen of sacrifices. You, mistress of Olympus and of earth, holding always your Pythian laurel at the navel of the world, dance in the high-gated temple of Phoebus, delighting in the prophecies of the tripods and the golden lyre of Apollo when causing to resound the seven-chorded strings with you he praises in song the prospering gods. Hail daughter of Cronus and Rhea, alone making renowned the altars of the immortals teeming with portions, Hestia, grant us as a rich return for our piety, to dance forever around your altar teeming with fat.'

Aristonoos is known only by his two hymns, the first to Apollo, the second, presented here, to Hestia. These hymns were apparently well received by the people of Delphi who accorded a broad range of honors to him for his efforts. Modern critics, however, have not been so charitable. The commentaries furnished by these scholars and others are quite extensive and need not be reproduced here.

Inscription engraved on an orthostate on the western end of the long south side of the temple of Apollo. Ed. M. Wescher, MémAcInscr 1e série 8 (1868) p. 119; G. Colin,

1 The “méliore poète.” Audiat (1932: 305 and 310).
"Ορκος Ἀμφικτι[όνων. Πάν πι]ράγμα ἐν τῷ[ι κρίμα]τ[ι περὶ
χρημάτων καὶ ὀρῶν Ἀπόλλωνος δικάσω καθ’]
ὁ ἀν ἐγώ μάλιστα δό[ξω ἀληθὲς εἰναι, οὔτε φιλίας [οὔτε ἔχθ]ρας εἶνεκεν
ψεῦδε[α] κρινό [κατ’ οὐδένα τρόπον· καὶ τὰ καταδικασθέντα
ἀκολούθως]

τῶι κρίματι κατὰ τά[ν δύνα]μιν μάλιστα ἐκπράξω ὦ ἀν τάχιστα

δύ[ναμι], ἀποκαταστήσω τε τῶι θεῶι [δικαίως. Οὔδὲ δῶρα δέξομαι
οὔτε αὐτὸς ἐγώ, οὔτε]

ἄλλος ἐμοί, οὔτε [τῶι κοιν]όν χρημάτων οὐθενί μὴ δῶ, οὔτε ἐγώ [μετα

λήξομαι: ταῦτα ἐγώ οὔτως ποιήσω]. Καὶ εὔροκοντι μὲν μοι ἐιθ

πολλὰ καὶ ἀγαθά:]}

ἐφιοκοῦντι δὲ Ἐ[θέμις] καὶ Ἀπόλλων Πύθιος καὶ Λατῷ καὶ Ἀρτεμ[ις καὶ]

'Εστία καὶ Πύρ Ἀθάνατον καὶ θεοὶ πά[υτες καὶ πάσαι κακίσ-

τωι

ἐλέθρῳ τῆν]

σωτηρίαν μοι [ἀφέλωσι], μήτε τέκνων μήτε σπορῶν μήτε καρπῶ[ν μή]
te οὐσίας κατόνασθαι εάσωσι[ν] ἐμὲ [τε αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ γένος ἐμὸν, καὶ με]

ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχ[όντων] ἰδίων ζῶντα ἐγβάλωσι εἰ ἐφιορκῆσω.
'The Oath of the Amphictyons. Everything in judgment about the property and boundaries of Apollo I will judge according to what I consider the truth; in no way will I make a false judgment out of obligation, friendship or enmity; and I will execute the decisions to the best of my ability as quickly as I can, and I will justly abide by the god. I will not accept gifts, nor will another on my behalf, nor will I give to another any of the common property, nor will I share it; so will I do these things. And for me abiding by the oath may there be many good things; But should I be foresworn, may Themis and Apollo Pythios and Leto and Artemis and Hestia and the Undying Fire and all the gods and goddesses eradicate (my) well-being with destruction most vile, permitting neither me myself nor my family to enjoy children, seed, fruit (or) wealth and may they cast me alive out of existing private means, if I am foresworn.'

Following what Daux has called 'the scandal of 125,' in which certain properties belonging to Apollo were misappropriated, the Roman Senate ordered the governor of Macedonia to summon the Amphictyonic Council to evaluate and redress the situation.\(^2\) This action precipitated the taking of this oath, one of four which has come to us from the Delphic Amphictyony, and the only one to mention Hestia.\(^3\) Notable, of course, in this oath is the differentiation between Hestia and the 'Undying Fire.' It is likely that there was one flame in the Prytaneion of Delphi,\(^4\) and possibly another in the temple of Apollo itself, although as Roux has stated 'we have no information on the subject.'\(^5\) Colin, in his

---

\(^2\) Daux (1936: 372-386).
\(^3\) On these oaths in general, see Lefevre (1998: 147-151).
treatment, stated that 'Under two distinct names, it is a question of one and the same thing, the Pythian hearth whose flame is pure par excellence.' Aside from the question of which hearth is meant, that of the temple or that of the pryaneion, it seems to me that the Amphictyons would not have used two separate terms if they intended to invoke exactly the same thing. Moreover, the distinction between Hestia and the 'Undying Fire,' is made elsewhere in Ephesus in conjunction with the same flame in the pryaneion.7

---

7 See Ephesus 134, 137, 143, 144, 146-149 and the Conclusion to that chapter.
Metropolis


[-----------------------------]
[----------------] ΗΤ.Α.ΔΙΛΟ [-------]
[-----] ἐν τει λίμενι εἶναι ΤΡΙΠΛΑΙ [-------]
[-----] ΗΕΙ στάσει προύρρα [κ]οινά Σ[-----]
[-----] ΤΑΝΕ ἵνα Θαμιαέα ἔχει κασιέα [------]

5 [-----]ΝΟΔΙΑ [. Π]ολιά[δι] παρ' 'Εστίαι ΕΥΟ...ΩΝ--
[-----]ΙΕ. ευστες μίσγε[i]ν εἰς τὸ λίμενν
[-----]...Ξππε[σ]οι ἡ πέξδου πολεμου [-------]
[-----] τὰ αὐτὰ δικαιούματα Γομφείες [-------]
[-----] ΕΤΑΣ τὰς κοινὰς τὸ ἐννιαυτό[-------]

10 [-----] Ε.Α καὶ παρ πέτριτεν ἔτες Σ[--------]
[----τάν]εα μᾶ χοῦρα τὰ ποτ' ἐνλίμενα καθ[----]
[----εσ]του κοινὰ νόμοις καὶ δικαστείρρεις [-----]
[----]ΕΣ τείς αὐτείς κατὰ Γομφ[είες-------]
[---δικαστεί]ρρει δικαζδέτου τὰς δίκας καὶ ΤΕ----]
... in the agora is to be ... in stasis a common guard ... so as to have Ithomean brothers ... by Ennodia? Polias by Hestia ... to go to the agora ... with cavalry or of an infantry war ... the same judgments the Gomphoys ... annually the common ... every fourth year ... territory once in the agora ... common for the laws and jurors ... to them by the Gomphoys ... to judge? the case of the dikasdetes? and ... the Thamians (Ithomeans). And if among the Thamians (Ithomeans) ... towards them ... the things ... in the graphe ... should he? find to sell? ... then ... at the time ...

In an article which I was unfortunately unable to obtain, Bruno Helly has apparently translated this inscription into modern Greek with notes on geography and history. I therefore confine myself only to what is clearly evident from the text itself. Namely, that as Helly has asserted, it appears to be a sympoliteia agreement between Gomphoi and Ithome, involving common measures relating to both war and peace, the engraving of the stone, and certain actions to take place in the agora. (Thess. λιμήν =
ἀγορά; ἀγορά = ἐκκλησία). Hestia appears here in what perhaps was an oath, maybe in conjunction with the goddess Ennodia given here the epithet Polias.
Pharsalus


First half of the 4th century B.C.

['Εσ]τία· Σύμμαχος [ήρως.....11-13......... Θρασύδαιος· ἀνέθηκε].

Editorial Note: ['Εσ]τία suppl. Fougères and Miller; [...]eiα Kern.

‘Hestia. The hero Symmachus. So-and-so, son of Thrasydas, dedicated (this).’

Fougères remarked that the cult of Hestia linked to that of a hero was ‘very interesting,’ and left it at that. The hero Symmachus, attested nowhere else, fared better in his research through comparisons with the hero Epimachus whose cult was linked with that of Demeter, Kore and Pluto. Miller has recently confirmed Fougères’ initial reading of the stone, and on the basis of a relationship between heroes and Prytaneia, explains

---

1 Fougères (1888: 184).
their association "as a topographic connection between two immortals in the prytaneion, and Hestia is to be recognized as specifically Hestia *Prytaneia."²

² Miller (1973: 172).
22 Block of blue marble found in 1972 on the west slope of the acropolis of Pherai.


Middle of the 4th century B.C.

[Ἡστία Δημήτριη Ἑγόδια Ἀφροδίτη Ἀθήνα [Θέμις →

Ἡστία Δημήτριη Ἑγόδια Ἀθήνα [Αφροδιτίς Θέμις ←

Θέμις Ἀφροδίτη Ἀθήνα Ἑγόδια Δημήτριη Ἱστία.


This inscription, enumerating as it does, the "distaff side of the Twelve Gods in Thessaly, or at least in Pherai," has been explicated in detail by Miller, who paid particular attention to the inclusion of Enodia and Themis in this list. As a presentation of half of the Twelve Gods, the relationship between Hestia and the other female deities here can only be explained as one of simple association. In Thessaly in general, however, as has been seen by the relations of Hestia with Enodia Polias as restored (in an oath?) in the sympoliteia agreement between Gomphe and Ithome, and with the hero Symmachus (in the prytaneion?) at Pharsalus, Hestia was very much a political goddess. This view is further reinforced by the literary evidence in the form of a poem by Bacchylides for
Aristoteles, a member of the Agathokleidae clan of Larisa. Whether the occasion for the commissioning of the poem was a victory in wrestling, the chariot races or the entry of Aristoteles into public office remains in question, but what is most striking is the description of her 'sitting in the middle of the streets.'

As the evidence stands, no votives, sacred laws or other evidence found in situ reveals any clearer, or any earlier, the position of Hestia in Thessaly than this variant of the characterization of her sitting 'in the middle of the house.' Given the unusual composition of the Thessalian pantheon, which apparently had no problem accommodating deities such as Enodia and Themis for Artemis and Hera, a deeper understanding of the role of Hestia in this region is much to be desired.

---

Ambracia


Towards the middle of the 2nd century B.C.

'Ετη. Α[-------]
Φίλιππος [πρύτανις]
kai συνπρυτάνι[ς] 'Εστίαι Διί
Κάλλων Νικοσθένεος,

5 Σιλανός Παυσώνος,
Θράσων Κλεομήδεος,
Νίκαρχος Λεοντίσκου,
Λύκος μάντις.

'... Phillipus, *prytanis*, and the *synprytaneis*, (dedicated this) to Hestia, to Zeus, Kallon, son of Nicosthenes, Silanus, son of Pauson, Thrason, son of Cleomedes, Nicarchus, son of Leontiscus, (and) the *mantis* Lycus.'
Hammond originally interpreted this inscription as providing proof for the capture of Ambracia by Phillip V of Macedon between 209 and 207/6 B.C. His assumption that the Phillip of line 2 was identical with the king of Macedon has been strongly refuted first by J. and Louis Robert and later by Fanoula Papazoglou, who cogently remarked that if Phillip V of Macedon was meant, he would have been mentioned with the title Βασιλεύς Φιλίππος.\(^1\) Opinion ever since has sided in the majority against Hammond, and I see no pressing evidence to support him in his assertion.


\(^{3^{rd}/2^{nd}}\) century B.C.

Σωτὼν Σωτώνος π[ρύτανις--]

'Εστίαι Δι[ι----]

Εὐμήδης Πολυαν[-----]

Φιλόμηδος Λυσι[-----]

'Soton, son of Soton, the prytanis (dedicated this) to Hestia, to Zeus ... Eumedes, son of Polyan ... Philomedus, son of Lys ...'

---

Editorial Notes: line 2 Ἑστιά, Hammond. Ἑστιά, SEG XXIV 421.

The Zeus here is presumably the same Zeus Prytaneus mentioned in the following inscription.


End of the 3rd/beginning of the 2nd century B.C.

'Αγέλαος
Πυρρία
Πρύτανις
καὶ συμπρυτάνιε[ς]

5 Ἑστιαί
Διὶ Πρυτανεὶς
'Αρφοδίται
'Απόλλωνι
'Αρτέμιτι

10 Ἀγαθίων
Νικία
Μενέλαος
Χαίρετε

'Agelaus, son of Pyrrhias, the pryTanis, and the symprytaneis, (dedicated this) to Hestia, Zeus Prytaneus, Aphrodite, Apollo, Artemis. Agathion, son of Nicias, Menelaus, farewell.'

Editorial Note: Lines 10-13 are larger in height than lines 1-9. This, in addition, to the letter forms, shows that they were inscribed later after the stone was reused as a tombstone.²

This list of deities, in comparison with the other dedications by the prytanes of Ambracia seems to include all the major divinities of that state. Why this is so, remains unexplained. Unlike the dedications made by magistrates in places like Thasos, there is no evidence, either historically or in the form of the dedications themselves, which might give a clue as to the reasons for the difference between this and the other dedications to just Hestia and Zeus, or Hestia, Zeus and Aphrodite. Tzouvara-Souli has tried to trace the existence of all these cults back to the mother-city of Corinth by a study of the pantheons of all the Corinthian colonies in the area. Nonetheless, no direct evidence for Hestia cult at Corinth has come to light.

² Tzouvara-Souli (1979: 19).

Πρύτανις
cαὶ συνπρυτάνιες
'Εστίαι, Διί,
'Αφροδίται
Νίκαρχος
Σάμου
'Αριστόδαμος
Ζένωνος
Σώστρατος
[---------]

'Prytanis and symprytaneis (dedicated this) to Hestia, Zeus, Aphrodite.

Nicarchus, son of Samus, Aristodamus, son of Xeno, Sostratus, son of ...'
Epidamnus/Dyrrhachium


207/6 B.C.

Summary of lines 1-31.

Lines 1-24: After the formulas of use and date, it gives a summary of the subject. The citizens of Magnesia-on-Maeander sent ambassadors (θεωροὶ) to Epidamnus and they asked that the Epidamnians recognize the games in honor of Ἀρτέμις Λευκοφρυνία as equal to the Pythian games.


εράν καὶ ἄσυ-
[λον, καθότ]ι ὃ Ἀπόλλων ὁ ἐν [Δελφοῖς] ἔχρισεν ἐπαινέ[σαι δὲ τ]ὸν τε
ἀρχιθέωρου

87
[Σωσικλῆ] καὶ τοὺς [θιαροὺς Ἀριστόδαμον, Διότιμον ἐπὶ τῇ] τὰ ὑπὲρ
τὰς πατρί-
τὰν πο-
[λῖων, καὶ εἴμεν] δ[e ἀυτ]ῶν προξένους καὶ εὐεργεταὶ τὰς πόλις τῶν
[Ἐπιδαμνίων ὡς δὲ τὰ ἐνεμισμένα μετὰ τὰς τῶν θε[ῶν εὐνοίας νῦν]
τὸ καὶ εἰς

Ἐπιδαμνίων, τόμ

Ἐστίαι, καλέ-
40 σαντα δ' α[ὑτοὺς εἰς τὸ πρωταυ]ξίον ἐπὶ τὰν κοινὰν ἐστὶν[αν], ἱερεῖον
θύσαι ἐφέστιν-
ον κ[αὶ διὸ]σ[θαὶ αὐτοῖς τὰ σ]κληρακι καὶ τὸ νάκος καὶ ἔνεκ[έχηρον]

ἀργυρίου Κορινθίου
[ἡμιμναῖον, δόμεν δὲ καὶ ταί θεαὶ ἀργυρί]ν ἡμιμναῖον, [ὑπάρχειν] δὲ καὶ
τὰ κατάλοιπα
[ἔσπερ καὶ τοῖς θιαροῖς τοῖς ἄει ἡκόντεσσι]ν εἰς ἀ[μεί' δέκα καὶ] ἔς καὶ-
ρόν ἢ τὰν συν-

καὶ ὑπὸ δὲ καὶ ἕνοδοχὰ τῶν ἄει]
45 [ἀποστέλλομένων ἐγ]ν Μαγνησίας ἄξια γίνεται τα[μ] πολ][λίων ἀμφι]οτε-
ράν, θεωρ[οδόκουν]}
... the city and the territory of the Magnesians is to be sacred and inviolable, as Apollo at Delphi has bidden, and (they are) to praise both the architheoros, Sosicles, and the theoroi, Aristodemus, (and) Diotimus, for both the zeal and the behavior with which they have acted in a manner worthy of both cities; and they are to be representatives and benefactors of the city of the Epidamnians. So that the decrees may enjoy the goodwill of the gods now and forevermore for the benefit of the Magnesians and Epidamnians, the prytanis is to pray to Artemis Leukophryene and Hestia; inviting them to the common hearth in the prytaneum, (they are) to make a sacrifice at the hearth and to grant to them the leg and the fleece and (a) traveling allowance of a half mina of Corinthian silver, and to give a half mina of silver to the goddess, and the rest is to be just as for the theoroi who always come to us when there is (the) occasion of sacrifices and the contest being performed together, to appoint those who are to sacrifice with one another. And so that the repute of those appointed by Magnesia is worthy of both cities, a theorodokos is to be chosen by us. And the decree is to be written up in the bouleuterion.'

This is the only extent decree from the city of Epidamnus, preserved as a copy on the perimeter walls of the agora in Magnesia on Maeander in Asia Minor. Epidamnus was just one of the many cities, regents and confederacies whom the Magnesians approached with the purpose of receiving their acceptance for games and the inviolability
of their state.\textsuperscript{1} Artemis \textit{Leukophryene}, ‘of the white brow,’ whose name derives from the place Leukophrys, was the \textit{archegetis}, and chief deity, of Magnesia on Maeander.

Although Heracles was the legendary founder of the city, very little is known about the civic cults of Epidamnus. The accounts of Thucydides and Aristotle make it clear that traditionally, Epidamnus was notoriously oligarchic in constitution. Yet, even if at this time the city had already been under the protection of the Roman republic for more than twenty years, the \textit{prytanis} seems to have remained the principal magistrate of the city and the prytaneion, then, presumably his office.\textsuperscript{2}

While these same envoys are known also to have visited Ithaca, Corcyra and Apollonia, of the more than sixty responses to the Magnesian petition, some of which include mentions of invitations to either the prytaneion or the ‘common hearth,’ this inscription is the only one to explicitly specify a sacrifice to Hestia.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{1} The historical background is covered in depth by Rigsby (1996: 179-185).
\textsuperscript{2} Cabanes and Drini (1995: 24 and 39).
\textsuperscript{3} The corpus has been assembled by Rigsby (1996: 179-279).
Delos

28 Fragment of a marble stele, found in 1885, now in the museum of Delos. Eds. Th. Homolle, Archives (1887) 38 p. 127; F. Dürrbach, IG XI (2) 117.

Middle of the 3rd century B.C.

This is a list of vases which were found in the ptyaneion. Reproduced are the lines which mention the goddess.

A I

[------ἐπ' ἀρ]χόντων Μει[λιχίδου------]
[---Μειλιχίδου τοῦ Ἐ]χασσόγενο[-------------]
[-------------ο]ινοχόην ἐπὶ Π[-------------]

5 [---------------]Εὑστίας Πρυτα[νειάς------]
κτλ.

[-------------Μητρόδωρος] Κλαζομένιο[-------------]
[-------------'Εὑστίαι Πρυ]τανείαι ἐπὶ [ἀρχοντος---]

20 [-------------------]ιακῆ ἐπ' ἀπ[χοντος------]
[-------------------]ια[κῆ ἐπ'] [ἀρχοντος------]
κτλ.

'... In the archonship of Meilichides ... of Meilichides, son of Echesthenes, ... a wine pitcher in the archonship of ... of Hestia Prytaneia ...'
‘...Metrodorus of Clazomenae ... to Hestia Prytaneia ... in the archonship of...
in the archonship of ... in the archonship of ...’

This inscription forms part of an inventory of vases, found in the Prytaneion, dating from the period of Delian independence (344-166 B.C.). These vases were manufactured using the funds called first πρυτανικόν (ID 287, A 13-14) later either ἐστιατικόν or ἑστιατικόν (ID 320 B 77 and 82). These ‘prytanic,’ funds were actually the collective capital deposited in the Prytaneion by the different private foundations of the Micytheia, the Gorgieia and the Philonideia.¹ This money was originally deposited with the boule, which acted as the fiduciary of the donor. In practice, the hieropoioi watched over the deposit and were responsible for loaning it out and collecting the interest from it on a monthly basis. The role of the archon was to preside over the sacrifices mandated by the founders of these associations, and to dedicate a vase in the Prytaneion using the money obtained from the sacrifice.²

Melichides, son of Echesthenes, mentioned after the archon, Meilichides, cannot be the same person and must be ascribed to coincidence, as the archonship at this time, although eponymous, was chosen by lot. Moreover, the name Melichides is rather common on Delos, but not outside of it.³


---
¹ Bruneau (1970: 442).

29 = face A = *IG XI* (2) 122

225-223 B.C.

lines 1-18 are a catalogue of the *choregoi* of 224 B.C.

lines 19-67 are a catalogue of ἄργυρωμάτων

[-----------------------------]τὰ σκάφια δύο [Μαψιχίδων· ἄρν-
[Δηλίων ἀνάθεμια· σπονδοξοίδου [Ἐστίας Προτανείας?]

60 [σκάφια δύο φιλων]ίδος ἐπὶ 'Ἀναξιθέμιδος· [ἀλλο ἐπὶ Δε-
[ξικλέος· ἄλλο ἐπὶ Φιλοξένου· ἄλλο ἐπὶ Σκυλλίχου]

'two bowls of the Mapsichidai; a cup of Metrodorus; another of Heracleides; a censer, the offering of the Delians; a small libation vessel of Hestia *Prytaneia*; two bowls of Philonis from the archonship of Anaxithemis; another from the archonship of Dexicleus; another from the archonship of Philoxenus; another from the archonship of Skyllichus.'

30 = face B = *IG XI* (2) 124.
lines 1-21 are a catalogue of the *choregoi* of 221 B.C.

lines 22-78 are a catalogue of the ἀργυρωμάτων.

60 [ἀ]νάθημα· σκάφια δύο Μαψιχίδων ἐπὶ [----]
..ἀρυσάς Μητροδώρου· ἄλλος Ἡρακλείδ[ου];
[θυ]ματήριον Δηλίων ἀνάθημα· σπουδοχοῖδιο[ν]
[ἐ]πιγραφὴν ἔχον· ἱερόν Ἐστίας σκάφια δύο [ἐπὶ-
[λ]ωνίδος ἀνάθεμα ἐπὶ Ἐναξιθέμιδος κτλ.

‘... a dedication; two bowls of the Mapsichidai from the archonship of ... ; a cup of Metrodorus; another of Heracleides; a censer, the offering of the Delians; a small libation vessel with the inscription, ‘To Hestia *Prytaneia*’; two bowls of Philonis from the archonship of Anaxithemis ... ’

The two inscriptions, 29 and 30, refer to the same vessel dedicated to Hestia. The restoration of the title *Prytaneia* in 29 is presumably established on the analogy of the description of the vase in 28. In the order of the inventoried vessels, this vase forms one of a collection of six vessels, which were not included among the other offerings grouped according to the private foundations, such as the Philonidea, which dedicated them.₄

₄ Tréheux (1944-1945: 273).
The Mapsichidai were a *trittys* of Delos, and their offering of two bowls in the prytaneion is indicative of the veneration accorded to this goddess, not solely by the archons (such as Metrodorus and Heracleides) and private foundations, but also by civic divisions integral to the system of the polis as a whole.\(^5\)


This inscription concerns the accounts of the *hieropoioi*. Reproduced below is the text of lines B 142-143.

180 B.C.

142 Καὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῦ ἄρχοντος Τελεσαρχίδου παραδοθέντα υπὸ ἱεροποιῶν
Συνωνύμου καὶ Κρίττιος παρελάβομεν ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ Ἄπολλωνος;
ἀργυρίδα μικύθειν· λιβανωτίδα,

143 ἡς ἑπιγραφῆ· ὁ ἱερεὺς Πύθεος καὶ ὁ ἄρχων Φίλλις Ἐστίαι· φιάλας
gοργιείος ΔΠ ποτηρία, ἐπὶ Διογένου, Ἄπολλοδώρου, Χαιρέου, Ὄλυμ-
πιοδώρου, Πολυζένου, Ζένωνος, Μενεκράτου, Ἄριστάρχου, κτλ.

\(^5\) Vial (1984: 27). The exact relationship between the *trittyes* of Delos with other social groups such as the *phylae* in the selection of members for its civic institutions is not known, but it appears to have been similar to that of pre-Cleisthenic Athens, see Jones (1987: 211f.)
‘And these things which were handed over from the archonship of Telesarchides by the *hieropoioi*, Synonymus and Critsis, we received in the temple of Apollo: a piece of Micythian silverware, a censer with the inscription, ‘The priest Pytheus and the archon Phillis (dedicate this) to Hestia’; libation vessels of the Gorgieia, fifteen drinking cups, from the archonships of Diogenes, Apollodorus, Chaereas, Olympiodorus, Polyxenus, Xeno, Menecrates, Aristarchus…’

Recorded here is the presence of certain items which had been removed from the prytaneion and deposited in the temple of Apollo. Although the prytaneion regularly received dedications from private foundations and others, it was presumably not designed for the storage of the growing quantity of items accumulating there, and some had eventually to be transferred to the main treasury in the temple of Apollo. A similar situation existed with the vessels of the Stesileia, another private foundation, which sacrificed and offered vessels in the Aphrodision, the temple of Apollo, the *Oikos* of the Naxians and the prytaneion.

The vessel explicitly offered to Hestia in this case was dedicated by the archon and the priest Pytheus who also offered a *kyathos*, or ladle. Vial has ventured to identify him as the priest of Apollo, on the basis of the close relationship of this priesthood with the archon, who was a *stephanephoros* of Apollo and presided over the festival of the Apollonia. In the absence of an explicit declaration regarding Pytheus, however, this remains merely an enticing possibility.

---

'Εν τοί τρωτανείωι ξαλκὰ: Ἑστία[ν.....ἐπί βεω]-
[μίσκου λιθίνου καθήμενον καὶ ἐπὶ βάσεως λιθίνης: ἀπολλω[ίσκον ἀρχαικὸν
ώς]
[ποδιά[ί]ον καὶ θυμιατήριον πομπικόν ὡς πριημποδια[ι]ον: Ἐρμ[άς ἐπὶ βάσεως
λιθί]-
[νων] πέντε: σατυρίσκον ὡς τριπάλαιστον φέροντα κρα[τηρίσκον ἐπὶ βάλ]-
[σεω]ς λιθίνης: ὀμφαλὸν καὶ φύλακα (φύλακα) περὶ αὐτ[όν ··-------------------]
[ἀπο]λλω[ίσκον ἐν θυρίδι καθήμενον ἐπὶ ὀμφαλοῦ ὡς δί[που· ἄλλον?] -----]
[ἐν θυρίδι ἐπιβεβηκότα ἐπὶ ὀμφαλοῦ λιθίνου· στέφαν[ον·------- ἐν τοί]
[προ]δόμωι: Ἐρμήν ὡς δίπου ἐπὶ βάσεως λιθίνης ἕχ[ιον·-------- καὶ]
[προ]σανακεκλιμένον πρὸς δενδροφίῳ [------------- περιραντήριον ἔ]-
[χο]ν ὄστα δύο, ἔφ' οὗ ἐπιγραφῆ: ἱερὸν Ἀπόλλωνος, [ἐν τει αὐλεί: Ἐρμᾶς τέτ]-
[ταρας ἐπὶ βάσεως λιθίνου, ἐν τοί ἀρχείῳ: Ἑστίαν [ὡς δίπου ἐπὶ ὀμφα]-
λοῦ καθήμενην καὶ βάσεως λιθίνης, ἐν τοί [προδόμωι: Ἐρμᾶς δύο ἐπὶ βάσεως]
λιθίων, vacat κτλ.
‘In the prytaneion: bronze: a Hestia ... sitting on a little stone altar and on a stone base; an old-fashioned statuette of Apollo about a foot high and a processional censer about a foot and a half high; five Herms on stone bases; a little satyr about three hands broad holding a little mixing bowl on a stone base; an omphalos with a guard around it ... a statuette of Apollo in a niche sitting on an omphalos about two feet high; another ... in a niche setting foot on a stone omphalos; a crown ... In the prodomos: a Hermes about two feet high on a stone base having ... and leaning on a little tree ... a two-eared sprinkler of lustral water with the inscription, ‘Consecrated to Apollo.’ In the courtyard: four Herms on stone bases. In the archeion: a Hestia about two feet high sitting on an omphalos and on a stone base. In the prodomos: two Hermes on stone bases ...’

This inscription, as well as the one following, 33, are part of the inventory taken by the Athenian magistrates who took charge of the island of Delos after the year 166 B.C. when the native population was removed to make way for an Athenian clerouchy.

The concrete ties between Hestia and the omphalos are attested primarily through these two inventory lists from the Delian prytaneion and the notice of an important hearth at Delphi.9 I do not wish to engage here in a prolonged treatment of the relationship between Hestia and the omphalos, as such a discussion, deeply concerns the two locales of Delos and Delphi, as well as many deeper issues regarding the Greek conception and construction of space. Suffice it to say that at present the debate, as it is exists confined to the island of Delos, revolves around the issue of what might have been the predominant iconography of the goddess on the sacred isle. This question centers not on Hestia and the omphalos per se, but rather on the relationship of Hestia and the presumed lord of the

9 For Delphi, see Süss RE 8, col. 1288f.
omphalos, Apollo *Pythios*. More specifically, it is a matter of whether the representations of Apollo on the omphalos, Hestia on the omphalos and the omphalos alone, reflect some deep association between these two prominent sites of the worship of Apollo. The connection of the two has been most notoriously espoused by Roussel.\(^{10}\) Additionally, W. H. Roscher has contributed to these assertions by drawing attention to the similar conceptions of Delos and Delphi as centers,\(^{11}\) and an entirely different block of evidence has been assembled to assert the presence of an oracle on Delos.\(^{12}\) The similarity between the two sites has been further enhanced by the attested presence on Delos of a Python, which consumed large quantities of wood, presumably for the maintenance of a perpetual fire.\(^{13}\) According to Philostratus, it was this fire from the Python which was brought every year to Lemnos to purify the island in atonement for the crimes of the Lemnian women.\(^{14}\)

All this speculation on Hestia and Apollo *Pythios*, nonetheless, has notably lost sight of two facts from the records of Delos itself, firstly, that Hestia is depicted upon an altar as well as an omphalos, which demonstrates that the statue type with the omphalos was not a unique mode of representing the goddess on the island of Delos. Secondly, that there has yet to be unearthed any evidence of Hestia from the Python of Delos, itself.\(^{15}\)

In any case, the ‘old-fashioned statuette,’ of Apollo and the other two representations of Apollo on the omphalos have been attributed by Marcdé to a date no

\(^{10}\) Roussel (1911: 90) and Roussel (1987: 222).

\(^{11}\) Notably by citing the scholia to Euripides’ *Orestes* 331, Ἡ Δήλος ... μεσαίητη τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου ἡ τῶν Κυκλάδων νήσων, and Callimachus *Hymn to Delos* 4, 325 Ἰστη ὡς νῆσων εὑσθεῖε. *AbhLeip* 29 no. 9 (1913) pp. 129 and 132, and *AbhLeip* 31 no. 1 (1915) pp. 27-28.

\(^{12}\) This notion has been severely criticized by Bruneau (1970: 142-161).

\(^{13}\) ibid. (1970: 118-121).

\(^{14}\) Philostrat. *Heroic*. 233-234. Cf. the fire carried from Delphi after the Persian wars, Süss *RE* 8, cols. 1288-1289.

\(^{15}\) Bruneau (1970: 443).
earlier than the fourth century B.C. on the basis of the rise in popularity of this way of representing the god at that time.\textsuperscript{16} As for the representations of Hermes, one has been re-erected in the courtyard beside the low base of another, while the base of yet another still lies in the \textit{prodemos}. These were in all likelihood dedications made by former magistrates at the time of their discharge.\textsuperscript{17}

The omphalos noted here as standing alone save for the, ‘guard around it,’ has aroused some speculation, regarding the precise nature of this ‘guard.’ I agree with Marcadé that this was most probably some sort of animal guardian such as a snake as found depicted in the relief from the House of Dionysus.\textsuperscript{18}

The dedication of the satyr with the little mixing bowl appears to be the least obviously motivated of the dedications described. I would suggest the possibility that this is once again related to the duties of the archon of the city, who presided over the festival of the Dionysia.\textsuperscript{19}

33 Marble stele broken at the upper left corner. Eds. F. Dürrbach and P. Roussel. \textit{ID} 1417, after a copy revised and completed by Th. Homolle.

before 155/4 B.C.

\textbf{Annual Inventory}

Reproduced below is the text of lines B I 89-102

\textsuperscript{16} Marcadé (1969: 170 n. 7).
\textsuperscript{17} ibid. (1969: 146). For similar dedications made at Athens, see Harrison (1965: 118-119 and 126).
\textsuperscript{18} Marcadé (1969: 168 n. 3). See also \textit{BCH} 30 (1906) p. 561 fig. 24..
\textsuperscript{19} The same function is attested for the archons at Athens, Arist. \textit{Pol. Ath.} 56. 3. See also Bruneau (1970: 312-314) and Vial (1984: 207f.).
[-----'Εν τῷ πρυτανείῳ χαλκῇ 'Εστίαν ὡς δίπον

90 ἐπὶ βωμίσκον λιθίνου καθημένην καὶ(ε) ἐπὶ βάσεως λιθίνης· ἀπὸ[όλλωνϊς-

σκ]ον ἀρχαίον ὡς π[οδιαίον καὶ] θυμιατήριον πομπικόν ὡς τριημιποδίαιον

· 'Ερ:].

μᾶς ἐπὶ βάσεως λιθίνου πέντε· σατυρίσκου ὡς τριπάλα[α]τον [φέρον]-
tα κρατηρί[ου] απὸ τῇ βάσεως λιθίνης· ὡμφαλῶν καὶ φύλακα περὶ αὐτῶν·
τράχηλου· ἀπὸ[όλλων] ὡς ὑπερίδι καθήμενον ἐπὶ ὡμφαλοῦ

95 ὡς δίπον ᾗ ἄλλον?----] ἐν ὑπερίδι ἐπιβεβηκότα ἐπὶ ὡμφαλοῦ λιθίνου·

στέφανον ν[----] ἐν τοῖ προδόμῳ: 'Ερμήν ὡς δίπον ἐπὶ βάσεως λιθίνης

ἐχ[οντα.....η] βασιλεύσον καὶ προσανακεκλιμένον πρὸς δευτριφώς[.....]

[..... περὶ]ραντήριον ἔχον ὡς ἐν ἐφ' οὗ ἐπιγραφῇ [εἰ]ρον Ἀπ[όλλων]-

νος. ἐν τει αὐλὲς: 'Ερμᾶς τέτταρας ἐπὶ βάσεως λιθίνων. [ἐν τοῖς ἀρχ-

eίων]:

100 'Εστίαν ὡς δίπον ἐπὶ ὡμφαλοῦ καθημένην καὶ ἐπὶ β[άσεως λιθίνης].

[ἐν τοῖ προδόμῳ: 'Ερμᾶς δύο ἐπὶ βάσεως λιθίνων· ἄλλον ὡς

π[οδιαίον βάσιν ἐχον]· λεπίδ[ας ἀσπίδων] λημνίσκους

In the prytaneion: bronze: a Hestia about two feet high sitting on a little altar and

on a stone base; an old-fashioned statuette of Apollo about a foot high and a processional
censer about a foot and a half high; five Herms on stone bases; a little satyr about three
hands broad carrying a little mixing bowl on a stone base; an omphalos with a guard around it; a necklace; a statuette of Apollo in a niche, sitting on an omphalos...In the prodomos: a Herm about two feet high on a stone base having...and leaning on a little tree...a sprinkler of lustral water with an anse with the inscription, 'Consecrated to Apollo.' In the courtyard: four Herms on stone bases. In the archeion: a Hestia about two feet high sitting on an omphalos and on a stone base. In the prodomos: two Herms on stone bases; another about a foot high not having a base; shield plates; fillets.'

34 White marble plaque, found in 1906; Eds. P. Roussel, BCH 32 (1908) no. 64 p. 438, ph. ibid. pl. IV; P. Roussel and M. Launey, ID 2605.

158/7 B.C.

[--------------------------]

[-----τ]οῦ Ἀπόλλ[ωνος?]]

[------καὶ ἐπὶ τῆν [φυλακῆν]

[τῶν ἱερῶν χρημάτων[--------]

[-------τοῦ-----]ἵππου Ἐρικ[έως καὶ]

5 [-------------------]τοῦ Καλλικλ[έους]

[Προσπ]αλτίου.

[Ο]δε ἐγέν[οντο ἱερεῖς:

[-----]ς Φιλοξέν[ου ἔξ Ο]ιου.

[Ἐ]στίας [Δήμου Ὀ]ώμης,
10 [-----γ]όρας Νικοκλέους Κρασπίδη[ς].
  Διός Κυνθίου 'Αθηνᾶς Κυνθίας,
  Μικίων 'Ακρισίου Σημαχίδης.
  Διός Σωτήρος 'Αθηνᾶς Σωτείρας,
  Διός Πολιέως 'Αθηνᾶς Πολιάδος,
15 Ἐφορος Νικάνορος Πτελεάσιος.
  Ἀρτέμιδος ἐν νήσῳ,
  Μεγάλων Θεῶν Διοςκούρων Καβείρων,
  Σέλευκος Διοκλέους Περγασῆβεν.
20 Διονύσου Ἔρμοῦ Πανός,
  [Εὔμιλένης Εὔμενου Οἰναίος.
  Ἀσκληπιοῦ.
  Ἡχος Στράτων Σουλίεύς.
  Σαράπιδος,
25 [Φιλο]κράτης Φιλοκράτου 'Αμαξαντεύ[ς].
  Αὐίου,
  Νουμήνιος Εὐθίου Φυλάσιος.
  Ἰεροκῆρυς,
  Διονύσιος Δημαύθου Λαμπτρεύς.
  Μάντης.
30 Ὀλυμπίοδωρος Κρασάχου Παλληνεύς.
  Αὐλητής,
... of Apollo ... and the keeper of the sacred monies ... in the archonship of ...
son of ... ippus of the deme Erikeia and of ... tus son of Callices of the deme Prospalta.
These were the priests: ... , son of Philoxenus of the deme Oion. Priest of Hestia, the
Demos, and Roma: ... goras, son of Nicocles of the deme Kropidai. Priest of Zeus
Kynthios and Athena Kynthia. Micion, son of Acrisius, of the deme Semachidai. Priest
of Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira, Zeus Polieus and Athena Polias: Ephorus, son of
Nicanor, of the deme Ptelea. Priest of Artemis on the island: Athenagoras, son of
Athenagoras, of the deme Melite: Priest of the Great Gods, of the Dioscuri, of the
Cabeiri. Seleucus, son of Diocles, of the deme Pergase Priest of Dionysus, Hermes, and
Pan: Eumenes, son of Eumenes, of the deme Oinoe. Priest of Asclepius: Echus, son of
Straton, of the deme Sounion. Priest of Sarapis: Philocrates, son of Philocrates, of the
deme Hamaxanteia. Priest of Anios: Noumenius, son of Euthius, of the deme Phylasa.
Sacred Herald: Dionysius, son of Demanths, of the deme Lamptrai. Seer:
Olympodorus, son of Chromachus, of the deme Pallene. Flute-player: Perigenes, son of
Phocion, of the deme Eupyridai. Keeper of the Keys: Nymphodorus, son of
Nymphodorus, of the deme Marathon.'
This list of the priesthoods of Delos comes again from the time when the island
was under Athenian control. The name of the first priest, that of Apollo, has been lost.
His name was presumably mentioned in lines one and eight. That the priest of Apollo
should take pride of place before that of the priest of Hestia, the Athenian Demos, and
Roma on the island of Delos should come as no surprise. Here Hestia, who is mentioned
in the preponderance of the epigraphical evidence within a civic context on Delos, has
been associated with the two other sovereign powers then presiding over the island.20

...goras, son of Nicocles, of the deme Kropidai, who was the priest of Hestia, the
Demos and Rome (line 10), may have been the ancestor of the magistrate Nicocles, son
of Nicocles, of the deme Kropidai found in ID 2632.

35 White marble column, found in 1903. Eds. Th. Homolle, BCH 27 (1903) p. 61; P.
Roussel, IG XI (4) 1137.

287 B.C.

Τιμόθεμις μ’άνεθηκεν ὁ Δέξιδος Ἑστίαι ἄρξας
εὐξάμενος τότε ὅτ’ ἤρχετο ἀνέβλαστον δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι
tπλείους ἐκ γενεᾶς τῆς ἐπὶ τοῦτο γέρας.

‘Timothemis, son of Dexis, having been an archon dedicated me to Hestia, having
vowed to do so when he was in office. Many others from this family have attained to this
honor.’

This hexameter (cf. 37) inscription found near the altar of Zeus Polieus, northwest of the prytaneion mentions that both Timothemis and other members of his family have served as archons. The identity of these other archons remains unknown.

36 White marble base, found in 1902. Eds. F. Dürrbach, BCH 26 (1902) no.3 p. 510 (cf. P. Roussel, BCH 34 (1910) no. 5 p. 114.); P. Roussel, IG XI (4) 1138.

272 B.C.

[K]υρβηλ[ιων.....]νος
ἀρξας ['Εστία]ι


‘Cyrbelion, son of..., having been served as ..., to Hestia.’

37 Stone which was on the upper part of a base. Ed. F. Dürrbach, BCH 26 (1902) no.2 p. 509; P. Roussel, IG XI (4) 1139.

264 B.C.

'Εστία, ἵλαος τε καὶ εὐχαρις εἰς Πολύβοιο
'Hestia, both gracious and kind to the houses and family of Polybus arrange everything in the year. For when (the) stephanophoros of yourself and of Phoebus (Apollo) was appointed, he served as befits good men.'

A magistrate who is stephanophoros was always so of one or several deities. This hexameter dedication makes clear that the archons of Delos were stephanophoroi of Apollo, and as such, they were entitled to wear the laurel crown. Nonetheless, the divinity who watched over their time in office was Hestia.\footnote{Vial (1984: 203).}


249 B.C.

'Αρχίας Ζένωνος
άρξας τὴν στεφανηφόρον
άρχην [Ἐ]στίαι.
‘Archias, son of Xeno, having fulfilled the office of stephanophoros, (dedicated this) to Hestia.’

An Archias, son of Xeno, is mentioned as the choregos of comedy at the Dionysia of 261. His son, Xeno, son of Archias, is known as a hieropoios in the year 231. The formula, “ἀρξας τήν στεφανηφόρον,” in line 2, is found used also in the dedications of Mennis (39, line 2) and Soteles (40, line 2).


39 236 B.C.

Piece a

Μέννις Νικάρχου ἀρξας
tήν στεφανηφόρον ἀρχήν
 Ἔστια.

‘Mennis, son of Nicarchus, having fulfilled the office of stephanophoros, (dedicated this) to Hestia.’

---

22 ibid. (1984: 42 n. 98 and 363)
Mennis appears to have been devoted to public service. He was *grammateus* of the city in 240 B.C., archon in 236 B.C., and served as both *epimeletes* and *prodaneistes*.²³

40  217-211 B.C.

Piece b

Σωτέλης Τηλεμνήστου

ἀρξας τῆς στεφανηφόρου ἀρχῆν

'Eστία.

'Soteles, son of Telemnestus, having fulfilled the office of *stephanephoros*, (dedicated this) to Hestia.'

The life and career of Soteles is the most documented of those who dedicated to Hestia as numerous decrees bear his eponym. In the year 210 B.C. he appears in the accounts of the *hieropoioi* paying interest, he served as president of the assembly, *epistates* of the Paneia, and was eventually awarded honors by the people. He had a wife named Xenaino and a son named Telemnestus.²⁴

---

White marble base found in 1909, now in the museum of Delos. (inv. A 1579).


298 B.C.

Κλεόκριτος

'Ιφιάνακτος

'Εστίαι

'Cleocritus, son of Iphianax, (dedicated this) to Hestia.'

Cleocritus is not mentioned here as having been a magistrate. All that is otherwise know about him is that he once had a farm at Limnae on the island of Rhenaea.\(^{25}\)

White marble base found in 1885, now in the museum of Delos. (inv. A 1454).


2\(^{nd}\) century B.C.

Σωσίμα[χος--------]

'Ἀντίγον[ος--------]

'Εστ[ια].

‘Sosimachus, son of ..., Antigonus, son of ..., to Hestia.’

Roussel has speculated that Sosimachus and Antigonus may have been archons of the years 276 B.C. and 274 B.C.26 They may also have been related, which would have been the reason for their joint dedication, but the patronymics on the right side of the stone have been lost.


Κινέας Ἀγοράλλου[-------]
Εὐελθὸντος Ἐστίαι [π]ατρίαι.

Editorial Note: The text of line two, scarcely legible, is provided by Etienne.

‘Cineas, son of Agorallus, ... son of Euelthon, to the ancestral Hestia.’

Found in the House of Dionysus, this inscription made on behalf of Cineas and another person known here only by his patronymic were again probably not magistrates,

26 Roussel (1911: 431).
although Cineas was evidently a priest of Sarapis at the beginning of the second century B.C.\textsuperscript{27} This dedication attests to the worship of Hestia outside purely civic contexts on Delos. Also found in the House was a relief showing a serpent coiled around an omphalos.\textsuperscript{28}


End of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C.

\[
[...]\text{íov 'Agas[---------]}
\]

\[
[Σου]νιε(ύ)ς, \chiε[ροτυν]-
\]

\[
[θε]ίς \text{ιερεύς ['Estías],}
\]

\[
[Δή]μου, 'Ρώμη(ς \epsilonι τὸν]
\]

\[
[έπ]ί Λυκίσκο[υ ἀρχοντός]
\]

\[
[έ]νιαυτόν [--------]
\]

[...]ους [-------]

'... ion, son of Agas ... of the deme Sounion, elected priest of Hestia, \textit{Demos}, Rome, in the archonship of Lyciscus ... annual ...'

\textsuperscript{27} Etienne (1981: 180).
\textsuperscript{28} \textit{BCH} 30 (1906) p. 561 fig. 24.


\[\text{[Νί]κώδροιος Φίλων\textsuperscript{[ν]}ο[ς]}\]

\[\text{[ἀρ]ξας Ἐστίας.}\]

‘Nicodromus, son of Philo, having been archon, (dedicated this) to Hestia.’

Nothing else is known of Nicodromus. The inscription remains undated.


\[\text{Α' ΑΛΣ} \]

\[\text{ECTIAI}\]

Editorial Note: The first editors have qualified the text as ‘almost illegible.’ Etienne believes that one should ‘delete this graffito from the documents relative to the cult of Hestia on Delos.’\textsuperscript{29} It seems to me that it would be more prudent not to do so,

\textsuperscript{29} "rayer ce graffito des documents relatifs au culte d'Hestia à Délos." Etienne (1981: 181).
because I was able to distinguish very clearly, in the photo, the majority of the letters of the second line.

Perhaps nowhere save Delphi has the notion of the center, not merely of a territory, but of an entire region of the earth as perceived in Greece received as much attention as Delos. Yet, the impression of Delos being a center received rather little overt notice in the epigraphical record from the denizens of the island itself with respect to their veneration of the goddess Hestia. This is not to disparage or disregard the connections between the conception of the center and the concrete markers, such as either the omphalos or the hearth, which could be employed to mark it. It merely indicates that given the nature of the inventories themselves and the dedications on Delos which make reference to Hestia, the emphasis seems rather to fall on the difference between the local, individual institutions and larger interstate bodies such as the Delian League or the Athenian Empire. Most telling is the observation of Bruneau, ‘for the Athenian epoch – when Delos was no longer an autonomous city – we do not have a dedication to Hestia.’

Epigraphically, the period in-between the Athenian controls of the island marks the apogee of Hestia worship channeled primarily through the person of the archon and his installation in the prytaneion, and by extension, the hieropoioi and the boule. So deep had this sentiment surrounding Hestia run, that when in the course of time the Athenians did once again take control of the island, they could not help but notice the statues

---

dedicated to her in the prytaneion, and rather than cease her worship outright, they instead incorporated it into the priesthood of the Athenian *Demos* and Rome.\(^{31}\)

---

\(^{31}\) As was noted by Strabo 10.5.4. "And when the Athenians took possession of the island, they oversaw with due diligence both the sacrifices and the importers."
Rhodes

Marble plaque. Found in the church of St. Anna in the village of Kalavarda. Eds. Foucart, RA 14 (1886) no. 59 p. 336 after a copy of Biliottis; Hiller von Gaertringen, IG XII (1) no. 704; (SGDI 4125); M. Segre and G. Pugliese-Caratelli, TitCam no. 59a.

"Aristombrotidas, son of Nausippus, having served as demiourgos, to Hestia and Zeus Teleios."

The demiourgoi of Camirus were both eponymous and priests of Hestia and Zeus Teleios. They were the chief magistrates of the city and elected from each tribe in rotation, apparently regardless of whether they came from the island, the Peraea, or the dependent islands. The union of Hestia and Zeus Teleios, combined with the almost complete absence of Hera from the epigraphical record, has been interpreted as a sign that Hestia has here assumed the role of the protectress of marriage. Van Gelder, however, has reasonably raised doubts about whether this can be the case in inscriptions

---

1 The demiourgos is explicitly designated as a priesthood (hierosyne) in 53, line 12-13. cf. also 73.
2 See Van Gelder (1900: 236) and Jones (1987: 245).
3 For what epigraphical and literary evidence of Hera on Rhodes does exist, see Morelli (1959: 147).
that have nothing explicitly to do with either domestic life or marriage.\textsuperscript{4} Unfortunately, moreover, while the position of the demιourgοs is attested in a number of Greek cities, the current state of the evidence from Rhodes furnishes little testimony with regard to the everyday duties and functions of this magistrate which could either support or undermine this hypothesis.\textsuperscript{5}

Outside of the association of Zeus Teleios with marriage, there exists evidence of a connection between this aspect and that of Zeus Sотer most frequently in the context of the third libation at banquet.\textsuperscript{6} Both titles occur in the dedications of the epιstatai (62-64) of Camirus. If the relationship between the two is as close as may be supposed, it might be that the domestic aspect of Zeus Teleios or Zeus Sотer does indeed find some expression in the dedications of these public magistrates. In the \textit{Suppliant Women} of Aeschylus, Zeus Sотer is also referred to as the “household guardian of righteous men.”\textsuperscript{7} Also in his last speech in the \textit{Eumenides}, Orestes declares, “An Argive again among my ancestral possessions, by the will of Pallas and Loxias, and thirdly of the Savior who rules over all, he who feeling respect towards my inheritance, saved me, seeing these advocates of my mother.”\textsuperscript{8} It is possible that the priesthood of the demιourgοs of Hestia and Zeus Teleios, as well as the dedications made by them were products of a similar

\textsuperscript{4} Van Gelder (1900: 333).
\textsuperscript{5} E.g. one demιourgοs of Camirus has provided the only testimony to date in that place for the cult of Hermes \textit{Enaǥonis}, but whether this dedication was motivated by concerns arising from his public duties or his private concern for the gymnasium and the palaestra is unknown. \textit{TitCamSuppl} 4p, p. 212. For this cult on Rhodes, see Morelli (1959: 134). The evidence from another inscription of the first century A.D. is likewise equivocal, as it states that the demιourgοs Pythagoras had made repairs to the temple of Pan in Camirus, but also testifies that this was done with his wife Euboule and they themselves paid for it. \textit{TitCam} 57, p. 207.
\textsuperscript{6} Cook (1914-1940: II, 2, 1123-1125 n. 7).
\textsuperscript{8} “Ἀργεῖος ἄνὴρ ἀθῆς ἐν τε χρήμασιν/οἰκεῖ πατρέζου, Παλλάδος καὶ Λοξίου/ἐκατι, καὶ τού παν-ἀντα κραίνοντος τρίτου/σωτῆρος, ὡς πατρέζου αἰδευθείς μόρον/οὐ τι ω καὶ μητρὸς τάσις συν-δικοὺς ὀρῶν." Aesch. \textit{Eum.} 757-761.
concern for the preservation of the state and its possessions, both public and private. The best known example of which is perhaps the oath of the Athenian ephebes who swore to “bequeath to posterity the fatherland no less than when I found it.”


Δαμιουργός

Ἐστίας καὶ

Διὸς Τελείου

Εἰρηνίδας Ὄνα-

[σ]άνδρου Κυμισα-

[λεύς] τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ

[ἀρχαιοτά] ἱεροφαν-

[----------]ν ἐν Κα-

[μίρῳ ἱερῷ?]ὺς τῇ-

10 [ζ Ἀθάνας?]

‘Demiourgos of Hestia and Zeus Teleios, Eirenidas, son of Onasander, Kumasaleus, in the same election, Hieropha…priest of Athena in Camirus.’

---

9 See 101 lines 9-10. On the deities given the title Soter, in general, see also Nock (1972: 721f.).
If the restorations of ἀρχαιεσίς in line seven and Ἄθάνας in line ten were secure, it would indicate that the election of the demiourgos occurred at the same time as that of the priest of Athena.

49 Plaque of white marble decorated with a crown. In the museum of Rhodes. Eds. M. Segre and G. Pugliese-Carratelli, TitCam no. 41, p. 163, ph. ibid. fig. 15.

Δαμιουργὸς τὰς Ἑστίας καὶ
τοῦ Διὸς
τοῦ Τελείου
Λούκιος

5 Αὐρήλιος
Λεωνίδας
Ἐπινίκου

‘Demiourgos of Hestia and of Zeus Teleios, Lucius Aurelius Leonidas, son of Epinicus.’


50-70 A.D.

Θέωνα Μινωίωνος Κλασιου τὸν
κόρον καὶ ιεροθύταν οἱ ιερεῖς
τὰς Λινδίας Ἀθάνας καὶ τοῦ
Διὸς τοῦ Πολιέως καὶ οἱ ιερεῖς
5 οἱ ἐν Ἀχαίᾳ πόλει Ἰαλυσίων
καὶ οἱ δαμιουργοί τὰς ἐν Καμε[⟩
ρῶ 'Εστίας καὶ οἱ ιερεῖς
'Απόλλωνος τοῦ Ἐρεθειμίου
eis παραμυθίαν τοῦ πατρὸς
10 θεοῖς

'Theon, son of Minnion, Klasian. The priests of Athena Lindia and of Zeus Polieus and the priests in Achaia, city of the Ialysians, and the demiourgoi of Hestia in Camirus and the priests of Apollo Eretheimios, for the consolation of his father, (dedicate this) to the gods.'

This funerary monument presumably also supported a statue of the deceased, who is known from no other inscription of Rhodes. The priesthood of Athena Lindia and of Zeus Polieus in the imperial age was annual, eponymous and occupied by only one man as was the demiourgos of Hestia. The 'priests in Achaia, city of the Ialysians,' are the priests of Athena Ialysia Polias. The priest of Apollo Eretheimios was also an annual post and represented the most important public cult of Ialysus.¹⁰ Blinkenberg has supposed that these priests retained their title even after they had vacated their position

and formed associations, which nonetheless did not refer to themselves by the usual title of *koinon*.\textsuperscript{11}


> Καμιρεῖς ἔτειμασαν
> Μάρκον Αἰλίον Λυσίστρατον
> Ἄντιπάτρου Φαγαῖον τὰν ἄξιον ὀλογότατον δαμιουργὸν
> τὰς Ἑστίας καὶ τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ
> Τελείου φιλοτέιμως ἱερασάμενον καὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ
> σπονδᾶς τοῖς θεοῖς ὑπὲρ
> τῶν μεγίστων καὶ θειοτάτων αὐτοκρατόρων ἐπιτελέσαντα εὖνοιὰς ἐνεκα
> καὶ τειμᾶς τὰς ἕλις αὐτῶν.

'The Camirans honor Marcus Aelius Lysistratus, son of Antipater, Phagaeus, the most worthy *demiourgos* of Hestia and Zeus *Teleios* having worthily performed both the

\textsuperscript{11} Blinkenberg (1941: col. 815).
sacrifices and libations to the gods on behalf of the greatest and most solemn emperors having done so out of high regard and honor towards him."

A Lysistratus is also mentioned in a list of demiourgoi (TitCam 4, line 21). The emperors mentioned in line 10 are presumed by Segre and Pugliese-Carratelli to be Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus.

52 Incomplete rectangular base of Lartian marble. Ed. Blinkenberg, LindosInscr no. 482 (TitCam Ap. no. 36).

2nd century A.D.

[τ]ὰς Ἀθάνας τὰς ἐν Ἁχαίᾳ πόλι[ei δαμιουργήσαν]-
tα τὰ ἐν Καμίρῳ Ἑστίᾳ καὶ τῷ Διὶ τῷ Τελείῳ ιερατεύοντα]
tοῦ προπάτορος Ἀλίου κατὰ τὸ α[----------καὶ----------]
γοραν Δ γυμνασίαρχον νεώτερ[ον κατὰ τὸν ἔνιαυ]-
5 τὸν τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ιερωσύνας Ἀθάνας Πολι]-
άδος καὶ Διὸς Πολιέως καὶ Ἑρακ[λευς----------]
tα ἄγεμονεύοντα τὰς χώρας ἱεροταμιεύοντα]
χρεοφυλακήσαντα γυ(μ)νασίαρχή[ςαντα γραμμα]-
tεύσαντα βουλάς ταμιεύσαν[τα πρυτανεύ]-
10 σαντα ἀγωνοθετήσαντα Ρω[----------πρεσ]-
βεύσαντα ποτὶ τε τοὺς Αὐ[τοκράτορας καὶ ἐν]-
πρόσφορας μειζ(ο)溃 γενόμενον---------

‘...of the Athena in the city Achaia, having served as demiourgos in Camirus for Hestia and Zeus Teleios, (and) priest of the ancestral Helios according to ...and...goras gymnasarchos of the young annually? of the priesthood of his father of Athena Polias and of Zeus Polieus and Heracles...and hegemon of the island, hierotamias, chreophylax, gymnasiarch, grammateus of the Council, tamias, Prytanes, agonthetes...presbeutes both with the respect to the emperors and the better offerings being?…’


2nd century A.D.

Λίνδιοι καὶ οἱ μ[α]στρο[ί]
Εὐκράτην ’Αγλουδάμου
tὸν ἱερέα τῆς ’Αθήνας καὶ
tοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Πολιέως

5 καὶ ’Αρτέμιδος Κεκοίας καὶ
Διουσσός καὶ ἐν τῇ μεγα-
λῇ πόλι πρυτανεύσαντα
ταμιεύσαντα θεσμο-
φυλακήσαντα ἀντιτα-

123
[τα]μειύσαντα ἀγορανομη- σαντα σειτωνήσαντα ἱερα- σάμενον καὶ ἄλλας ἱερωσύ- νας καὶ τῆς ἐν Καμειρῷ Ἑσ- τίας καὶ τοῦ Διός τοῦ Τελείου

πολλὰς πρεσβείας καὶ συνδικίας κατορθώσαντα εὐσεβείας ἑύνεκα καὶ φιλοτειμίας.

θεοῖς.

The Lindians and the *mastroi* (honor) Euocrates, the son of Agloudamus, the priest of Athena and Zeus *Polieus* and Artemis *Kekoia* and Dionysus and in the great city having served as *prytanes, tamia, thesmophylax, antitamia, agoranomos, sitones*, priest of (the) other priesthoods of Hestia and Zeus *Teleios* in Camirus, having served correctly in several embassies and public advocacies out of piety and honor, to the gods.'

The heading of this inscription reinforces the local character of this dedication, as decrees made by the government of Lindos frequently contain the formula ἔδοξε μάστροις καὶ Λινδίοις, even though the honorand here is distinguished also for his services both in the ‘great city,’ i.e. Rhodes, and in Camirus.

Δαμόκριτου
Δαμοκρίτου

[σ]τρατευσάμενον ἐν τε
toῖς ἀφακτοῖς καὶ τοῖς κατ[α]-

5 φράκτοις ναυσίν καὶ στρακταλγήσαν-
tα ἐπὶ τάς ἐν ταί νάσσωι χώρας καὶ
στεφωθέντα [α] ὑπὸ τὰν συναρχι-
ἀν πασάν καὶ στραταγήσαντα ἐπὶ
tάς ἐν τῷ πέραν χώρας καὶ τιμα-

10 θέντα ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν συμ-
μάχων καὶ ταύν περικει-
μενὰν πολίων

'Εστία

'Democritus, son of Democritus, having served on both undocked and decked ships and having been strategos on the island and having been crowned by all his fellow magistrates and having been strategos of the Peraea and honored by all the allies and the outlying cities, (dedicates this) to Hestia.'

There were ten, and later twelve, strategoi on Rhodes elected by the assembly every year for a one-year term of which the most important were the strategos of the
island and the *strategos* of the Peraea. The duties of the other members of the board are not known, but Van Gelder has speculated that they may have involved state finances. The relationship of these presumed officers of the army with those of the navy is likewise uncertain. That the navy was the more prestigious branch of the armed services on Rhodes is generally assumed, and Democritus here, while he served in the most prestigious posts of the army command, nonetheless felt compelled to place his service in or with the navy first in his list of honors. That Hestia is the recipient of this dedication may be attributed to the prominence of her cult in conjunction with public service in Camirus, but not every *strategos* linked to Camirus felt such devotion.


1st century B.C.

[----]σκράτευς Πο-
[λ]υαινέτου Σιλυρίου
[στρα]ταγήσαντος ἐκ πάντων

5 [ἐπὶ τάς] χώρας τάς ἐν τά νάσσωι καὶ

---

14 ibid. (1900: 254).
15 See *TitCam* 76 p. 215.
[στρατευ]σαμένου ἐν τοῖς ἀφράκτοις καὶ
[δαμιουργή]σαντος ἐν Καμείρωι καὶ ἱεροποιή-
[σαντος κ]αὶ ἐξειριστεύσαντος καὶ γενομένου
[γραμματέως μ]αστρῶν καὶ στεφανωθέντος χρυσέ-
[ων στεφάνωι ύπό τε μαστ[ρῶν] δίς καὶ υπό Ἀσκλα-
10 πιαστάν καὶ Π]υθιαστάν καὶ Ἐρμαιστάν καὶ υπό Σεραπι-
[αστάν κοινοῦ τῶν ἐν Καμείρωι καὶ υπὸ Πυργαλίδαν κοι-
[νοῦ------] τῶν ἐν Λέλωι καὶ υπὸ Νακορείων
[κοινοῦ -------------κ]αὶ ἀποσταλέντος ἱεροποιοῦ εἰς
["Ιμβρον καὶ ε]ἰς Λῆμυνον καὶ Διδύμειον καὶ
15 [προσβεύσαν]τος εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν
[καὶ στεφανω]θέντος υπὸ τὰς βουλὰς
[χρυσέωι στεφάνωι
[��이να γραμματέως δαμόσιος
[τῶν αὐτ]οῦ ἄρχοντα
20 [Ἐστίαι καὶ] Δίω Τελείωι.

'...ocrates, son of Polyainetes, Silyrian, having served as strategos of the island from all and having served on the undecked ships, demiourgos at Camirus and hieropoios and exieristos and grammateus of the mastroi and awarded a golden crown both by the mastroi twice and by the Asklepiastai, Pythiastai and Hermaistai and by the association of Serapiastai at Camirus and by the association of the Pyrgalidai...at Lelos and by the association of the Nakoreians and while hieropoios he went to Imbros, Lemnos and the
Didymeion and served as ambassador to Alexandria and was awarded a golden crown by the council. With so-and-so being *grammateus* his archon? to Hestia and Zeus *Teleios*.

The dedicator of this inscription held both the posts of *demiourgos* and *strategos*.


![Greek inscription]

Κλεύθεμις
Χαριδάμου
στρα[ταγ]ήσας
ἐπὶ τ[ὰς] χώρας
5 Ἐστίαι

'Cleuthemis, son of Charidamus, having served as *strategos* of the island, to Hestia.'


![Greek inscription]

'Ιέρων Σωτ[η]σας
στραταγήσας
ἐκ πάντων

128
ἐπὶ τὰς χώρ[ας]

5 'Εστίαι

'Hieron, son of Sotimus, having served as strategos, of the island from all, to Hestia.'


[ὁ δεινα]
[στραταγήσας]
[ἐκ π]άντων
[ἐν] τῶν ἀστει

5 κατὰ μεγάλα

'Αλίεια

'Εστίαι

'So-and-so having been strategos, from all in the city after the great Halieia, to Hestia.'

59 White marble shield. In the museum of Rhodes (inv. 38). Ed. M. Segre and Pugliese-Carratelli, TitCam no. 77.
[Σ]ωκράτης
'
Απο[λλ]ωνίου
στρα[ταγ]ήσας
[ἐπὶ] τὰς χώρας

5 ['Εστίαι]

'Socrates, son of Apollonius, having served as strategos of the island, to Hestia.'

Fragment of a white marble shield. In the museum of Rhodes. Ed. M. Segre and Pugliese-Carratelli, TitCam no. 70, p. 213, ph. ibid. fig. 56.

[-----]Αι
[-----]είνου
[καθ' ὑσθε]σίαν δὲ
[-----]άχου

5 [στραταγ]ήσας
[ἐπὶ τὰς χώρας
['Εστίαι]

'So-and-so, son of ...einus, by adoption son of...achus, having served as strategos of the island, to Hestia.'
61 Fragment of a base which was seen by Hiller von Gaertringen at Syme in 1915. Eds. Durrbach and Radet, *BCH* 10 (1886) 4, p. 266; Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG XII* (1) no. 707 (*IGRR* 1139); M. Segre and Pugliese-Carratelli, *TitCam* no. 80.

Second half of the 1st century A.D.

[----------lepeus]

[Μουσάν καὶ Διονύσου, [τοῦ ?]

[Αὐτὸκράτος Τίτου Καίσαρος]

[γε]νόμενος ἐν ἑπαυγ[-------καὶ]

5 [ἀγ]ωνοθέτησας καὶ τίμιαθεὶς ὑπὸ]

[Καμειρέων ἔπι τούτ[οις ταῖς με]-

[γίᾳ] ταῖς τιμιᾶς μετὰ το[ῦ ὑιοῦ ?]--]

[...]ευς Β Κα. καὶ Καλλιστράτου---]

[...]Κα. 'Εστί[α καὶ] Δι[ς τελείω]

10 [...] ἐπὶ Σ[----------]

‘... being priest of the Muses and Dionysus, of the emperor Titus Caesar in ... and ... having served as _agonothetes_ and awarded by the Camirans the highest honors with his son? ...eus (Jr.) Ca. and Callistratus ... Ca. to Hestia and Zeus _Teleios_...’

Δεξ[-----]

'Αριστ[-----]

γενόμενος ἐπιστάτας]

τοῦ [περιπολίου]

5  'Ε[στίαι καὶ]

Δ[ιὶ Τελεῖω vel. Σωτήρι]

'Dex...son of Arist...being epistates of the suburbs, to Hestia and Zeus (Teleios or Soter.)'

The prime strategos who oversaw the security of the island of Rhodes was supported in his duties by three hegemones, one for each of the territories of Rhodes. Subordinate to each of the hegemones was an epistates, who also was stationed in that particular territory. Although the overall command structure pertained to military functions, the offices of the epistatai and possibly the hegemones in the subject Peraea, may also have entailed some civil authority as well.16

63  Fragment of an eared plaque made of white marble broken on the left. Ed. M. Segre and Pugliese-Carratelli, TitCam no. 68 (inv. 39).

[-----]όρας

'...oras...gora, being epistates of the suburbs to Hestia and Zeus Soter.'

64 White marble pillar found in 1929 at baths dating to the Roman era on the road to Salacum. Now in the museum of Rhodes. Ed. G. Jacopi, CILh II no 17 pp. 187-188, ph. ibid. p. 188; M. Segre and Pugliese-Carratelli, TitCam no. 62, ph. ibid. fig. 49.

Εὐάνορ Πραξίππου
καθ’ ύσθεσίαν δὲ
Εὐάνορος
ιεροποιήσας
5 ἀρχιεριστήσας
ἐπιστάτας γενόμενος
γραμματέως μαστρῶν
τιμαθεῖς
ὑπὸ Καμιρέων
10 θαλλοῦ [στε]φάνωι
'Εο[τι]αι
καὶ Διὶ Τελείωι

'Euanor, son of Praxippus, by adoption son of Euanor, having served as *hieropoios* and *archieristes*, being *epistates*, *grammateus* of the *mastrai*, being honored by the Camirans with a laurel crown, to Hestia and Zeus *Teleios*.

65  Sima decorated with a head of a lion. Ed. M. Segre and Pugliese-Carratelli, *TitCam* no. 64a, p. 211, ph. ibid. fig. 51.

άνεκάθαρε τὸ φρῆρ

(protome)  καὶ ἐπεσκέψασε

[--]ος  'Εστία καὶ Διὶ Τελείωι

'So-and-so? cleaned and fixed the well for Hestia and Zeus *Teleios*.'


'Εστίας

'Of Hestia.'

"Εστίας
cαι
Διός Τε-
λείου

"Of Hestia and Zeus Teleios."


"Εστίας
Σέραπις και
Εῖσις

"Of Hestia. Serapis and Isis."

Segre and Pugliese-Carratelli believe the names of Serapis and Isis were added later. The photo shows a clear difference in hands, and the grammar of the inscription with Hestia in the genitive and Serapis and Isis in the nominative adds to a suspicion of discontinuity.
Round altar. Ed. M. Segre and Pugliese-Carratelli, TitCam no. 133.

'Eστίας

'Of Hestia.'


3rd century B.C.

'Eστίας

'Of Hestia.'

This base formed one in a row of nine similar bases dedicated to Artemis Epimelidios, Zeus Machaneus, Poseidon Phytalmios, Zeus Droughtios, the hero Amphilochos, Presbytas, Dionysus Epikarpios, and Zeus Astrapaios in the near vicinity of a large altar consecrated to Helios. Segre has designated this whole area on the
acropolis of Camirus as the "agorà degli dei," dedicated not to one deity alone but "a
tutto l'Olimpo indigeno."\textsuperscript{17} This seems to be going a bit far considering the very specific
natures of the deities represented in the group of whom, aside from Hestia, only Poseidon
Phytalmios, is otherwise mentioned on Rhodes.\textsuperscript{18}

71 Small base of Lartian marble. Eds. M. Segre and G. Pugliese-Carratelli, \textit{TitCam}
Sup. no. 115d, p. 219, ph. ibid. fig. 20.

\[\text{[--------]}\]ioς
\[\text{][Μ]ιλήσιος} \text{'}Εστ[ια][ι]

'So-and-so of Miletus to Hestia.'

72 Fragment of a stone base. In the museum of Rhodes. Ed. I. Pugliese-Carratelli,

\[\text{'Αρισ[--------]}\]
\[\text{'Επικρ[--------]}\]
\[\text{'Εστ[ιαι]}\]

'Aris..., son of Epicr..., to Hestia.'

\[\text{\textsuperscript{17} Segre (1934:147).}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{18} Morelli (1959: 66).}\]
Small fragment of a marble plaque, decorated with two crowns. The inscription is cut into one of the two crowns. Eds. Blinkenberg, *LindosInscr* no. 480. I. Pugliese-Carratelli, *TitCam* Ap. no. 35.

2nd century A.D.

[ἰερεῦς]  
[Ἔστιας]  
[ἐν Κ]αμεῖ-  
[ρω]

‘Priest of Hestia in Camirus.’


[name][τιμ]αθ[ε]ντος ὑπὸ Ἀλίαστὰν Ἀθαναίσταν Ἐρμαίσταν Ἀ[ρ]ιστεί-  
[κοινοὶ χρυσέωι στεφάνωι] καὶ ὑπὸ Διὸς Σωτηριαστὰν  
Σαρατιαστὰν κοινοὶ θαλλίνωι στεφάνωι·  
καὶ ὑπὸ Σαρατιαστὰν χρυσέωι στεφάνωι· καὶ ὑπὸ [Μ]ηνιασ[τ]ὰν  
'Αφροδισιαστὰν κοινοὶ χρυσέωι στεφάνωι· καὶ ὑπὸ Σωτηριαστὰν
'Ἀσκλαπιαστάν Ποσειδανιαστάν Ἡρακλείαστάν Ἀθανάιαστάν Ἀφροδίσιαστάν

'Ερμαίαστάν Ματρός Θεῶν κοινοῦ χρυσέωι στεφάνωι [καὶ] ὑπὸ
'Εστιαστάν κοινοῦ θαλλίωι στεφάνωι.

'So-and-so is honored with a golden crown by the association for the worship of Helios, the association for the worship of Athena, and the association for the worship of Aristeides. And by the association for the worship of Zeus Soter and the association for the worship of Serapis with a laurel crown. And by the association for the worship of Men and the association for the worship of Aphrodite with a golden crown. And by the association for the worship of the Soterioi, the association for the worship of the Asclepius, the association for the worship of Poseidon, the association for the worship of Heracles, the association for the worship of Athena, the association for the worship of Hermes, and the association for the worship of the Mother of the Gods with a golden crown. And by the association for the worship of Hestia with a laurel crown.'

This inscription remains the only piece of evidence for the existence of a private association for the worship of Hestia on Rhodes.

Twenty-six inscriptions involving the public and private veneration of Hestia have come down to us from the island of Rhodes. These numbers are, nonetheless, deceptive. Of the twenty-six, almost a third are dedications made by or mentions of the *demiourgos* /priest of Hestia and Zeus Teleios in Camirus about whose origins and duties
virtually nothing is known. Likewise, another seven are dedications by strategoi whose reasons may have been tied to their local sentiment or their official duties, as far as they can be recognized, or both. Three come from the epistatai, officers subordinate to both the strategos and the hegemon, whose functioning on Rhodes can only be guessed at by analogy with magistrates bearing the same title in different quarters of the Greek world. Another seven leave little indication of either the dedicator or the circumstances which could aid to define the role of Hestia on the island.

The discordant combination of a relatively large number of inscriptions with a glaring poverty of background information to supplement them cannot, however, obscure the fact that when in 408-407 B.C. the peoples of Lindus, Ialysus, and Camirus decided to form the new city of Rhodes, they did not choose Hestia as the symbol of their united communities. In fact, it is likely that Hestia was consciously disqualified because of her prominent position in Camirus, as was Athena for Lindus and perhaps Apollo for Ialysus. The choice of Helios as the principal divinity of the new city and the unified island has typically been attributed more to political shrewdness than to a strong tradition of devotion. Yet for the synoikismos which resulted in the creation of the Rhodian state, a divinity with no strong prior political associations was ideal. Moreover, it is interesting that the people of the three cities of Rhodes should have chosen a deity who, like Hestia, was a personification and whose worship is as sparsely attested.

---

Thera


2nd century B.C.

'Εστίας

‘Of Hestia.’

The altars of Thera to Hestia have never, to my knowledge, spawned an inquiry into her status there. Rather at best the interpretation of them has called upon a comparison with other states in the Doric Aegean, such as Rhodes and Cos. The unfortunate result is that the only specific knowledge of Hestia from this locale is that in the first century A.D. the worship of Hestia was conjoined with that of Agrippina, the mother of Caligula.


'Εστ[ίας καὶ]

Διὸ[ς Τελείου vel. Σωτήρος]
'Of Hestia and Zeus (Teleios or Soter).'

Editorial Note: line 2 Διός [Τελειου] suppl. Hiller. One could also restore Διός [Σωτήρος]; for this association cf. 47.

77 Altar found on the west slope of the town. Ed. Hiller von Gaertringen, IG XII (3) Suppl. (1904) 1353.

'Εστίας

'Of Hestia.'

78 Altar of volcanic stone found on the way from the agora to the shrine of Artemidorus. Ed. Hiller von Gaertringen, IG XII (3) Suppl. (1904) 1354.

'Εστίας

'Of Hestia.'

79 Altar of porous stone, found on the west slope of the town; the left part is preserved. Ed. Hiller von Gaertringen, IG XII (3) Suppl. (1904) 1355.
80  Small altar of volcanic stone, found in the church of St. Stephanos. Ed. Hiller von Gaertringen, IG XII (3) suppl. (1904) 1356.


2nd century B.C.
τῆρος

‘Of Hestia and Zeus Soter.’
Cos


_Horos_ 13 (1999) ph. of lines 6-12, pl. 46, 1.

3rd century B.C.

[---------------------------]ω

-----------------------------'Ασ[κλαπιω[

[-------------- ταὶ αὐταὶ] ἀμέραι· 'Υγιε[ι]

[αι ------------------------ 'Ο]μονοίαι δι'ι

5 ------------------------ 'Εκ]άται ἐμ πόλει α[τ]-
[γα τελέαν καὶ δι'] ἐπίποκον τέλε-
[σαν. *dies*]· 'Ἀσκλαπιω[ι ἐν Ἱσθμω[ι]
[δι'] τέλεου. Πα]νάμου νευμηνίαι· Α
[---------------------] καὶ Ἰστίαι [Φ]αμίαι πλα-

10 [κοῦντα:, ἀλφ]των ἡμικεκτον κα[ι]

[--------------- θύε]ται ἐπὶ τὰς Ἰστίας.

[--------------- 'Αφροδί]ται Πανδάμωι ἔρι-
[φοι θήλειαν· ταῦταν θύει ἱέρε-
[ἰα καὶ ἱερὰ παρέχει]. δεκάται: Ποτει-

15 [δανὶ ἔριφον] ἄρσενα. ταῖς αὐ-
[ἀὶ ἀμέρας] ἔριφον ἄρσενα
[--------------------------]καὶδεκάται. Γ
[--------------------------] μὴ ἐλάχιστονος
[--------------------------] καὶδεκάται: Ἐκά-

20 [ταῖ]--------------------------]


'Ηστίας Newton. Sokolowski.

'... to Asclepius ... on the same day. To Hygieia ... to Homonoia, a sheep ... to Hecate in the city, a perfect goat and a perfect sheep with its fleece on ... to Asclepius in Isthmos, a perfect sheep on the first of the month of Panamus ... and to Hestia Phamia, a cake composed of a hemiektos of barley and ... is offered on the hearth ... to Aphrodite Pandemos, a she-goat. The priestess offers this and prepares the sacrifice. On the tenth: to Poseidon, a male goat. On the same day ... a male goat ... and on the tenth ... to Hecate ...

146
These remains of a sacrificial calendar contain provisions for the end of the month Hyacinthus and the beginning of the month Panamus.\(^1\) Hestia is here accompanied by another deity whose name has been lost, as has been the designation of the sacrifice intended for them. Newton restored the name of her companion as Asclepius presumably on the basis of his interpretation that the calendar as a whole concerned Asclepius and Hygieia. Bechtel, however, chose to restore the name of Apollo citing their close relationship in the Homeric hymns. This position has gained credibility recently, as Bosnakis has described a new sacred law from Halisarna, as yet unpublished, in which the priest of Apollo is enjoined to perform a sacrifice of a male sheep to Hestia \textit{Phamia}.\(^2\)

I have chosen to follow Bosnakis in his restitution of this epithet for Hestia in these two sacred laws of Cos for the following reasons. Firstly, the arguments regarding the reading of the stone itself seem valid from his publication of the first photos ever offered of these inscriptions or squeezes taken from them.\(^3\) Secondly, the epithet \textit{Tamia}, as has so often been noted, is attested nowhere else. The desire to accept the epithet \textit{Tamia} from two stones whose readings were dubious had already spawned some disagreement on the part of Herzog, who proposed \textit{Hetaireia} as the epithet for Hestia in the second instance and also by Sokolowski, who proposed either \textit{Damia} or \textit{Prytaneia} in accord with other manifestations of the goddess in the first. As the only clear epithet of Hestia on Cos, \textit{Phamia} now stands as the most probable reading.

\(^1\) Paton and Hicks (1891: 286).
\(^2\) The stone dates to the third century B.C. and was found in a second use in an early Christian settlement in the area of the shrine of Apollo at Καρδάμαινα, Bosnakis (1999: 194 n. 20).
\(^3\) This applies more to the sacred law from Isthmos than that of Cos. I freely admit I could not make any determination regarding the inscription from Cos which was published by Bosnakis as a photograph of a squeeze.
The part recording the sacrifice offered to Hestia has been damaged, but the remaining portion of the stone indicates that it clearly involved some portion of grain offered ‘on the hearth,’ (line 11). The phrase is common enough throughout Greece to exclude the need for capitalization and the awkwardness of a translation of ‘on the Hestia.’


ca. 300 B.C.

-------------------------καὶ εὐχο[νται] τοῖς ἑσαγμένοις ἐς ἄλλ[α]-
[v ἐνιαύτια ὄρ]αία (?) ἱερεύς καὶ ἱεροφύλακες καὶ ἄρχευο[ντ]-
[5] [τ]ὰ χ[α]λαστικὰς, βοῦς δὲ ἐννη[ᾶ] [β]λαντὶ, βοῦν ἔξ ἐνάτας ἐκάστ[ας],
[ἐ]ξ Ἀ...εὼν καὶ Πασθεμίδαν Πράτων καὶ Ν[ο]στίδαν· ἐς δὲ
[τ]άν ἀ[γο]ράν ἐλάντω Πάμφυλοι πράτοι ἐν ἀγοραὶ δὲ συμμίσ-
[y]νται· ὁ δὲ ἰερεὺς καθήσασθω [παρά] τ[ὰ]ν τράπεζαν ἔχουν τὰ[ν ὁ]-
tολάν τὰν ἰερὰν, τοι δὲ ἰερ[οποιοί ἀκατ]έρω τὰς τραπεζὰς· Π[άμ]-
tοῦτων κριθῆ τις· αἱ δὲ [μὴ 'Υλλεῖς τρ]εῖς ἔλαντω αἱ μέγ [κα τ]-
[ο]ὔτων κριθῆ τις· αἱ δὲ μ[ὴ Δυμάνες τρ]εῖς τοὺς λοιποὺς αἱ [μέ]-
γ κα τοῦτων κριθῆ τις· αἱ [δὲ μῆ, ἀτέρους] ἔλαντω ἐς τὰν ἀγ[ο]-
[ρ]άν καὶ ἐπελάντω κατὰ τα[ῦτα, αἱ μ]έγ κα τοῦτων κριθῆ τ[ις;]
15 αἱ δὲ μῆ, τρίτον ἐπελάντω κατὰ τα[ῦτα; αἱ δὲ κα τοῦτων κρι[θῆ]
ὶς, ἐπικρινόντω βοῦν ἐκ χι[λιασ]τύος ἐκάστας· ἐλά[σα]-
ντες δὲ τοῦτοι συμμίσγουν[ται τοῖ]ς ἄλλοις καὶ εὑθὺ κ[ρῖν]-
οντι καὶ εὑρόνται καὶ ἀποκαρύ[σιον]ντι· ἐπειτα ἐπελάντ[ι αὖ]-
tις κατὰ ταῦτα· θύεται δὲ αἱ μέγ κα ὑποκύψει, ταὶ 'Ιστίαι· θύ[ει]
20 δὲ γερεαφόρος βασιλέων καὶ ἱερά παρέχει καὶ ἐπιθύει ἱερὰ ἐς [Ἡ]-
μίκτου· γέρη δὲ λαμβάνει τὸ δέρμα καὶ τὸ σκέλος, ἱεροποι[οὶ]
δὲ σκέλος, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα κρέα τὰς πόλιος· τὸν δὲ κριθέντα τ[ῶι]
Ζηνὶ κάρυκες ἁγοντὶ ἐς ἀγορὰν· ἐπεὶ δὲ κα ἐν ταὶ ἀγοράι ἐω[ν]-
tι, ἁγορεῦει οὐ κα ἢ ό βοῦς ἢ ἄλλος υπὲρ κήνου ἐνδεξίο[ς].
25 [Κ]ω[ί]οις παρέχω τοῦ βοῦν, Κώοι δὲ τιμῶν ἀποδόντω (το) ταὶ 'Ιστία[ἰ]
tιμῶντω δὲ προστάται ὡμοσαντες παραχρήμα· ἐπεὶ δὲ κα τιμ[α]-
[θῆ], ἀναγορευέτω ὁ κάρυξ ὀπόσσου κα τιμαθῆ· τούτω δὲ ἐλάντ[ι πα]-
[ρ]ά ταὶ 'Ιστίαν τὰν [Φ]αμίαν καὶ θύοντι· ὁ δὲ ἰερεὺς στέπτει καὶ [ἐπι]-
στενδεὶ κύλικα οἶνου κεκραμένου πρὸ τοῦ βοῦς· ἐπειτα ἁγοντὶ το[μ β]-
τοῦ κάρυκα καὶ φθοιας ἔπτα καὶ μέλι καὶ στέμμα· ἐξάγοντες δὲ καρύσσοντες εὐφαμίαν· κηνεῖ δὲ ἐκδήσαντες τὸν βοῦν καὶ ἀρχονταὶ θαλλωὶ καὶ δάφναι· τοῦ δὲ [κάρυκας κ]αρπᾶντες τὸν μὲν χοῖρον καὶ τὰ σπλάγχνα ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ ἐπισπένδουνες μελίκρατον, ἐντοῦ τὸ[μ] βωμοῦ καὶ ἀρπῶντες· ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ καρπω-

[θῆι]

ἀποτελα, ἐπισπενδέτω μελίκρατον· ο ὅ [κάρ] ὃς καρυσσέτω ἑορτάζει·

Ζηνί-

ός Πολιεύς ἐνιαύτια σωραῖα ἑορτάν· [ιερεύς] δὲ τοῖς ἐντέροις ἐπιθυβ[τω]
[θ]ύκε καὶ τούς φθοιας καὶ σπονδάς [ἀκρατοῦ] ν καὶ κεκραμέναν καὶ στέ[μ]-

μα· τοῦτο δὲ ἱοντω πάρ τούς ιαρποιοὺς ἐς τὸ οἰκήμα τὸ δαμόσιον

ια[ρ]-

eῦς καὶ κάρυκα, ιαρποίοι δὲ ξενίζουντι τ[ῶν] ἱερή καὶ τῶς κάρυκας τα[ῦ]-

τεν τῶν νύκτα· ἐπεὶ δὲ κα ς πονδάς π[οιήσο] ω νται, αἱρέσθω ὁ ιαρεύς

[σ]-

[φ]αγῇ τῶν ιαρποιῶν βοῶς τοῦ θυσίμενον τῶι Ζηνὶ τῶι Πολιεύ καὶ

προα[γό]-

[ρ]ευτῶ αγνεύεσθαι γυναῖκος καὶ ἀνδρός ἀντί νυκτός· τοῦ δὲ κάρυκ[κε]-

[τῶι] αἱρεῖσθω σφαγῇ τοῦ βοῶς ὡγ καὶ χρήζωντι ηὐτῶν καὶ προαγωγεύ-

[τω] [λίκ]

καὶ δῆληται τῳ αἱρεθεῖντι κατὰ ταύτα· Ταὶ αὐταὶ ἀμέραι· Διονύσσωι

[Σκ]-

υλίται χοῖρος καὶ ἑρίφος· τοῦ χοίρου οὐκ ἀποφορά· θείε δὲ ἱερεὺς κ[α]
50 ἱερὰ ἱαρεύς παρέχει· γέρη φέρει δέρμα, σκέλος· ἵκαδι· βοῦς ὁ κριθεύς θύεται Ζηνί-
[Πο]λυήθι· ἐνδόρα ἐνδέρεται· ἐφ᾽ ἑστίαιν θύεται ἀλφίτων ἡμικτον, ἄρτο[ι]
[δ]ύο ἐξ ἡμικτου, ὁ ἀτερος τυρώδης, καὶ τὰ ἐνδόρα· καὶ ἐπισπένδει ὁ

55 [κέ]λος ἱερὰ ἱαρεύς παρέχει· ἵκαδι· βοῦς ἡμίου καὶ κοιλίας ἢμι[ι]-
[συ]· θυσαρώω δὲ τοῦ σκέλους τοῦ τῶν ἱεροποιῶν διδοται ἀκρίσχιον.
[kάρυ]-
[ξι] νότου δίκρας, ὑπόμαια, αἰματίου ὁμολος τρικώλιος, Νεστορίδαι[ς]
[δὲ] νότου δίκρας, ἰατρος κρέας, αὐληταί κρέας, χαλκῶν καὶ κερα[μέ]-
[ω]ν ἐκατέροις τὸ κεφάλαιον· τὰ δὲ ἄληλα κρέα τὰς πόλιος ταύτα πάν-

50 ἵος ἵκαδι· βοῦς ἡμίου καὶ κοιλίας θύεται· ἵκαδι· βοῦς ἡμίου καὶ κοιλίας θύεται. ἢμι-
[πι]-
[λι]-

ἀδι οἷς κυέσα· θύει δὲ ἱερεύς καὶ] ἱερὰ παρέχει· γέρη λαμβάνει δέ[ρ]-

μα καὶ σκέλος. κτλ.

'Let the priest and the hierophylakes and the archons make a proclamation; let the
hieropoioi and kerykes go by chiliastyes and drive nine oxen, an ox from each ninth, from
the A...eis and the Pasthemidae Pratoi and the Nostidae. Let first the Pamphylooi drive (the
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oxen) to the agora, and in the agora let them mix (the oxen) together. Let the priest sit at
the table with his sacred robe, and let the hieropoioi sit on each side of the table. Let the
Pamphyloi drive up the three finest oxen, if perhaps one of these might be chosen. But if
not, let the Hylleis drive three oxen, if perhaps one of these might be chosen. But if not,
let the Dymanes drive the last three, if perhaps one of these might be chosen. But if not,
let them drive others to the agora and let them drive them up in the same way, if perhaps
one of these might be chosen. But if none of these is chosen, let them choose in addition
an ox from each chiliastys. And having driven them, they mix (them) together with the
others and immediately make a selection and pray and make a proclamation.

Then they drive up again in the same way. And if (the ox) bows his head, he is to
be sacrificed to Hestia. And the gereaphoros of the basileis performs the sacrifice and
furnishes the hiera and offers in addition the hiera from a hemiektos. And he takes as his
share the hide and a leg, the hieropoioi (take as their share) a leg, but the rest of the meat
belongs to the city.

And the kerykes bring the (ox) selected for Zeus to the agora. When they are in
the agora, the man to whom the ox belongs, or another on his behalf, makes the following
announcement endexios. 'For the Coans I am providing an ox, let the Coans pay the price
to Hestia.' Let the prostatai having sworn an oath value the ox at once. And when the ox
is appraised, let the herald pronounce at how much it was valued. Then they drive this
(ox) to Hestia Phamia and perform the sacrifice. And the priest crowns and pours a bowl
of mixed wine as libation in front of the ox. Then they bring the ox, the burnt offering,
seven cakes, honey and a garland. Those who are doing the bringing proclaim a sacred
silence. Then having bound the ox, they begin with branch and laurel. The kerykes offer
the pig and the organs on the altar pouring wine mixed with honey over them, but having thoroughly washed the entrails, they offer them beside the altar. When the wineless offerings are presented, let wine mixed with honey be poured as a libation. Let the keryx make a proclamation to celebrate the annual seasonable things of Zeus Polieus. Let the priest with the entrails offer incense, the cakes, the libations, unmixed and mixed and the garland. Let the priest and the kerykes then go with the hieropoioi to the public house, and let the hieropoioi receive the priest and the kerykes that night. When they make libations, let the priest choose the sphageus of the ox being sacrificed to Zeus Polieus from among the hieropoioi and proclaim that he is to be kept pure from men and women that same night. Let the kerykes choose the sphageus of the ox whomever they desire from among themselves and let him, whoever may be willing, publicly order the one who has been chosen (to act) according to the same regulations.

On the same day: a pig and a ram to Dionysus Skyllites. There is to be no taking of the parts of the pig away from the sacrifice. Let the priest sacrifice and provide hiera. And let him take as his share the hide, the leg.

On the twentieth: the chosen ox is to be sacrificed to Zeus Polieus. The offerings are to be wrapped in hide. On the hearth is to be offered a hemiektos of barley, two loafs made from a hemiektos, one with cheese, and the offerings wrapped in hide. The priest pours a libation of three kraters of wine atop them. And the priest takes as his share of the ox, the hide and the leg – the priest is to provide hiera - ... and half of the chest cavity and half of the hollows. To the thyaphoros is given the end of the hip from the leg of the hieropoioi, to the keryx, a double portion of meat from the back, the part under the shoulder blade, black pudding weighing obelos trikolios, to the Nestoridai, a double
portion of meat from the back, to the physicians, meat, to the flute players, meat, the head is to go to each of the bronze-smiths and potters. The rest of the meat belongs to the city and all this is not to be taken away from the city. On the same day: to Athena Polias, a pregnant ewe. Let the priest perform the sacrifice and provide hiera. And let him take as his share the hide and a leg.'

Translation Note: The translation is largely my own, as I came across that of Deborah Kaestner only later in my research. Taking her interpretation into account, I nonetheless hold some reservations.

Firstly, while agreeing that ἀποκαρύσσω probably means 'proclaim for public sale,' I cannot agree with her translation of the initial lines of the text as 'Let the priest and the temple-keepers and chief magistrates proclaim for public sale the yearly seasonable things of the festival,' principally because of the uncertainty regarding the restorations of these lines. Her phrase 'A...os and Pasthemis first, and from Nostis,' I have discarded in favor of the reading of Sherwin-White, 'A...eis and the Pasthemidae Pratoi and the Nostidae,' as I follow her explanation of the social structure of Cos. 4

Kaestner's translation in line 26-27 of 'when payment has been made, let them publicly proclaim for how much the payment was made,' I have laid aside for a reading of the verb τιμᾶν which does not suddenly change from 'value,' to 'pay,' as if the Coan magistrates were constrained to transfer the sum right there and then.

I do not agree with the translation of ἐνδέξιος as 'favorably inclined.' In English, this is just hesitating between the literal sense of the word, which denotes a

---

motion from left to right, and the more general sense of ‘propitious.’ In this context, I admit that I cannot determine which is more appropriate, but it is appears to me as equally possible that the announcement should be made in a certain direction, as that it should be made in an auspicious manner.

This sacred law from the city of Cos comprises one of the most contested and speculated upon manifestations of the goddess Hestia. The nexus of all the disputes regarding it revolves around the particular cult epithet of the goddess. The conjectures have ranged broadly since the first discovery of the stone. Prytaneia, Damia, Tamia and Hetaireia have all been proposed as restorations and the evaluations of the role of Hestia have thus had to accommodate them.

Originally Martin P. Nilsson speaking on the basis of the restoration Tamia, derived the connection of Hestia with Zeus Polieus from the ‘political’ idea that the state hearth was intimately bound with the civic divinity. Louis Gernet followed this idea but stressed that

what is accentuated here is the idea of the unity of the civic body whose elements must for a time be lost in the whole (it's a theme of political as well of religious thought that the divisions, however artificial, of the city, which, alternatively, are represented either in their synthesis or in agonistic opposition). The choice of victim is determined by an ordeal-like procedure between the oxen which have been presented separately by each of the fractions of each of the tribes which are then mixed together in a common mass. The ox finally chosen will only be burned the next day, but it is first ‘brought before Hestia’ and this is the occasion for certain rites. Just before Hestia herself has received the honor of an animal sacrifice. Hearth and poliad divinity are closely associated: they remain so right up to the moment of immolation when the offerings are again placed on the hearth.

5 In this case the word is commonly used adverbially as ἐνδεξία, LSJ s.v. ἐνδεξίος.
6 "Die Verbindung leitet sich wohl aus einer politischen Idee her: die Göttin des Staatherdes und der Stadtgott berühren sich auf das engste." Nilsson (1906: 19).
7 "Ce qui est accentué ici, c'est l'idée de l'unité du groupe civique dont les éléments doivent se perdre momentanément dans le tout (c'est un thème de pensée politique comme de pensée religieuse que celui des divisions pourtant artificielles de la cité qui, alternativement, sont représentées dans leur synthèse ou en

155

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Jean-Pierre Vernant accepting the epithet as *Tamia*, paid close heed to this notion and offered little else by way of analysis save to bolster her connection to the economic life of the polis.\(^8\) The analysis of Marcel Detienne was more nuanced, accepting two different epithets, *Tamia* for Isthmos, and *Hetaireia* for Cos, yet once again the emphasis was placed on the method of the selection and division of the oxen to define the place of Hestia.\(^9\)

These repeated emphases on the assembly and selection of the victims for Hestia and *Zeus Polieus* have made two notable omissions; the first, that the methods for selecting the ox for Hestia and *Zeus Polieus* are different in that the ox for the latter is judged (κριθή), while the former is self-selected by the gesture of stooping. In addition, in analyses which emphasize the political character of this ritual as proven by the mustering and choice of the victim from among the various civic divisions, the fact that this same method was otherwise used also for a sacrifice to *Zeus Machaneus* is generally overlooked.\(^{10}\) More importantly, however, given the new epithet of Hestia, is the concern explicitly given in the inscription by the people of Cos for the control of their speech surrounding the sacrifice to Hestia.

---


\(^8\) Vernant (1965: 127-128).


\(^{10}\) Ἐνδεκάτις Ἡσίλι Μαχα/υν ὑπὸς κρίνεται τὸ ἀτερον ἔτος ἐφ’ οὗ καὶ ἔωντι Κ(α)ρνείαι, καὶ(θά)/περ τοῦ βατρομοῦ τῶν Ἡσίλι τῶν Πολιήν κρίνεται, κ(α)ὶ χοῖρος προ/κατευθεῖται, καὶ προκαρυ- σικαι καθάπερ τῶν Πολιήν. Sherwin-White (1978: 294 n. 24).

2nd/1st century B.C.

Ζωτυρίων Ἡρακλείτου νακορεύσας τὸ ἀφίδρυμα τῆς Ἑστίας καὶ τᾶν στάλαν

5 Ἑστία Φαμίς καὶ τῷ δάμῳ τῷ Ἰσθμιωτῶν.

‘Zopyrion, son of Heracleitus, having served as neokoros, (dedicated this) aphidruma and stele to Hestia Phamia and the demos of the Isthmiotae.’

The first publication and commentary of this inscription by Bosnakis has discussed the majority of issues connected with this find which I shall briefly summarize. The stone is a marble block with cuttings on the top that reveal the outline of what appears to have been the statue which was affixed there. Although there has been an ongoing debate with regard to the exact definition of the word aphidruma, on the basis of
these cuttings there can be no doubt that what was meant in this case was a statue. From the demarcation of the bottom of the statue, Hestia appears to have been advancing her right foot, leaving her left foot slack and a bit behind. A lead protuberance on the top of the stone probably served as the fixing for a scepter held in her left hand. The epithet \textit{Phamia} is attested from Cos in another inscription, as yet unpublished, from the region of Halisarna, in the environs of the temple of Apollo.\footnote{Bosnakis (1999: 191-192).} \footnote{ibid. (1999: 192 n. 2).}
Syros


138-161 A. D.

'Αγαθή Τύχη

'Ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος

Τι(του) Αιλίου 'Αδριανοῦ 'Αντωνείνονυ

Σεβαστοῦ Εὐσεβοῦς ύγείας καὶ α[ι]

5 ωνίου διαμονῆς ὅλου τοῦ οἴκου αὐ[τοῦ]

καὶ δῆμου 'Ρωμαίων καὶ ιερ[ά]ς συνκλήτου

καὶ τοῦ Συρίων δῆμου 'Αρισταγόρας 'Αρισταγό-

ρου ὁ στεφανηφόρος ἄρχων ἐπώνυμος σὺν

⟨ἀυ> ἄρχειν Πώλλη Σκύμη[νο]ν--------

10 νω ἐκαλλιέρησεν 'Ἐστία Πρυ[τανεί]α καὶ

τοῖς [ἄλλοις] [θ]εοῖς πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις καὶ[]

τῇ μὲν πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τοῖς τήν [γ]ε[ρο]-

σίαν μετέχουσιν ἄν[θρασι]ν ἀνά]

δηνάρια τρία καὶ οίνου [παρέα]χεν
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15 ταῖς δὲ γυναι[ξιν] καὶ τ[οῖς τέκνοις?]
ἀνὰ ἀσσάρια ὅκτῳ κ[α]ὶ οἶνον, [τῇ] δ[ὲ δευτέρᾳ]
ῥᾳ ἡμέρᾳ τοῖς στεφανηφόροις ἑπτὰ ἀνὰ δηνάρια ἑπτὰ,
καὶ τοῖς πολείταις πᾶσιν ἀνὰ δηνάρια ἑπτὰ ἐν,
καὶ τοῖς ἑλευθέροις παισίν καὶ
20 [τοῖς] κατοικοῦσιν καὶ οἶνον [παρέσχεν]
['Επὶ τούτων] ἦν ὑγεία.

'To Good Fortune. For the sake of the health of the emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius, and the everlasting perpetuity of his entire household, the Roman people, the holy Senate and the people of Syros. Aristagoras, son of Aristagoras, the eponymous archon stephanephoros with the archne, Polle, daughter of Skymnus ... sacrificed with good omens to Hestia Prytaneia and all the other gods and goddesses, and on the first day, he provided to the men who shared the gerousia three denarii each and wine, and to the women and children he provided eight asses each and wine. On the second day to the stephanephoroi he provided seven denarii each and to all the citizens one denarius each and to the free children and inhabitants, he provided wine. At this time there was health.'

The dating of this, and indeed all, of the inscriptions of Syros which mention Hestia is done solely by the names of the emperors which appear at the beginning. Moreover, the political and social conditions on Syros at this time are again largely known only from these inscriptions of the archons stephanephoroi. In this inscription,
Aristagoras acted as archon conjointly with the archine, Polle, who was evidently not his wife.1 Virtually nothing of the duties of the eponymous archons of Syros outside of these distributions of food, wine and money is known, save perhaps that they may have presided at certain games.2 The gerousia was probably a rotating subcommittee formed from members of the boule, as evidenced by the phrase, 'the men who shared the gerousia,' (lines 13-14) yet the precise composition and function of this body remain unknown.

The distributions overseen by the archon, Aristagoras, took place in the course of two days. The first day was specifically for the men who participated in the gerousia, and the women and children. The gifts of the second day were more general, being given to the stephanophoroi and all the citizens, children and inhabitants. It is noteworthy that the title of stephanophoros once assumed was not relinquished with the office or its duties.3

86 Marble stele found in the village 'Επιγραφαὶ τῆς νήσου Σύρου p. 475 and 'Ιστορία τῆς νήσου Σύρου (1874) p. 475 and 'Ιστορία τῆς νήσου Σύρου (1874) p. 246; Egger, CRAI 6 (1870) p. 194; K. Stephanos, 'Αθήναιον 3 (1874) no. 2 p. 530 (= 'Επιγραφαὶ τῆς νήσου Σύρου p. 18); Hiller von Gaertringen, IG XII (5) 660.

1 Stephanos (1874; 541-542) has noted in the forms of the inscriptions that the wives of the archons when they are archinae are designated as such by forms of the word γυνή and the lack thereafter of a patronymic or as in the case of L. Milionius Skymnus and Timas in 86 she is mentioned with a patronymic, but also especially asserted in line eleven to be, 'γυναῖκα ἰδίᾳ.'

2 See IG XII (5) 654, lines 14-15. Stephanos (1874: 540-541) has declared that these archons were without any political function.

3 Cf. the demourgoi and the priests of Apollo Eretheimios on Rhodes, 50.
Τύχη

Τού κυρίου ἡμῶν Αὐτοκράτο-

συν ἀρχεῖν Τεῖ-

κατοικοῦντα[ς] τὴν νῆσον ἑλευ-

τάς. Ἐπὶ τούτων ἦν ὑγεία.

'Αγαθή

Τύχη

Τού κυρίου ἡμῶν Αὐτοκράτο-

συν ἀρχεῖν Τεῖ-

κατοικοῦντα[ς] τὴν νῆσον ἑλευ-

τάς. Ἐπὶ τούτων ἦν ὑγεία.

'To Good Fortune. For the sake of the health and fortune of our lord, the emperor

Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius and that of the people of Rome
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and Syros, L. Milionius Scymnus, voluntary archon *stephanephoros* with the archine
Tima, daughter of Philargyros, his own wife, sacrificed with good omens to Hestia
*Prytaneia* and to all the gods and goddesses and held a public banquet for all the free
inhabitants, men and women, of the island, and their children and those having visited
from the neighboring islands. At this time there was health.’

This second dedication from the time of Antoninus Pius draws attention to the
fact that L. Milionius Scymnus was the ‘voluntary,’ (αὐθαίρετος, line 9) archon
*stephanephoros*. This distinction stands in contrast to the explicit declaration of
Eleutherus in 87 that he was proclaimed eponymous archon *stephanephoros*, ‘by lot and
election,’ (κλήρῳ καὶ χειροτονίᾳ, line 7). No doubt the extensiveness of such
benefactions as recorded in these magisterial decrees required a considerable sum of
money, in cash no less than in produce, and the prominent citizens of Syros would at
times have been reluctant to assume the burdens of the office. During such times, one
might presumably forego the formal procedures of appointment to fill the post. 4 In this
case, L. Milionius Skymus is likely related in some way to the Polle, daughter of
Skymus, of 85 (line 9). As the dating of both inscriptions is dependent on the names of
the emperor, however, there is no precise way to determine what this relationship was. 5

Notable also in this inscription is the notice given to those inhabitants of the
neighboring islands, ‘having visited,’ (ἐπιδημοσαντος, lines 18f.). Stephanos has noted

---

4 Similarity irregularities are attested for the position of the *prophetes* of Apollo at Didyma, see in
particular the case of Claudius Damas (Fontenrose 1988: 48) and the *prytanis* at Ephesus (140) as well.
5 Stephanos (1874: 528f. n. 12) has hypothesized on the basis of the engraving at the top of 85 that this is
the earlier document. At the same time, he has asserted that Polle was the daughter of L. Milionius
Scymnus.
that this terminology indicates the singularity of the rites of Syros, in that citizens of other states would come on visit to partake of them.6

87 White marble stele found in the wall of the church of St. Georgios in the village Ἀνω Σύρος. Eds. K. S. Pittakis, ArchEph (1840) p. 511; Boeckh, CIG II add. 2347k, A΄ after a copy of Kokkonis given to Ross; LBW II no. 1889; K. Keil, RhM 20 (1865) p. 542; K. Stephanos, 'Αθήναιον 3 (1874) no. 4 p. 532 (= 'Επιγραφαὶ τῆς νήσου Σύρου p. 20 and tab. A΄); Hiller von Gaertringen, IG XII (5) 662.

166-169 A.D.

[Γ]πέρ τῆς τῶν Αὐτοκρατόρων Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου

[Γ]νωστονυ καὶ Λουκίου Αὐρηλίου 'Αρμενιακον

[Π]αρθικόν Μηδικῶν νείκης καὶ σωτηρίας

[κ]αι αἰωνίου διαμονής όλου τοῦ οἶκου αυ-

5 [τ]ῶν κ[αί] ίερᾶς συνκλήτου καὶ δήμου 'Ρωμαίων

[καὶ] δήμου Συρίων Με (?) 'Ελευθερος Β' στεφανηφό-

[ρ]ος καὶ ἐπώνυμος [ἀ]ρχων κλήρῳ καὶ χειροτονία προγραφῆς

[σ]υν γυναικὶ [ἀρχ]είνῃ 'Ουσιοφόρῳ φιλοτείμως τε καὶ ἐ[πί]-

[φ]ανῶς [δημοθοι]νίαιν παρασχόμενος τῇ Συρίων πόλει

10 [κ]αι τας [ἐξ ἑθος νομίζομενας θυσίας εκαλλιερήσειν

6 Stephanos (1874: 545).
δὲ ὁλοὺ ἐνιαυτοῦ Ἐστίς Πρυτανεῖα καὶ τοῖς ἀλλοις
θεοῖς πᾶσι καὶ πάσασι καὶ τοῖς μὲν τὴν γερουσίαν
μετέχουσιν παρέσχεν ἐκτενῶς πάντα τὰ δίκαια[α]
[τά]τος ἡθισμέναις ἡμέραις, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς τοῖς κατ[οι]-
15 [κ]ούσιν πᾶσιν ἀνδράσι τε καὶ γυναιξίν καὶ τέκνοις αὐ[τῶν]
[καὶ] τοῖς ἐπιδημήσασιν ἀστυγείτοσιν παρέσχεν τὰ κα-
[τὰ] τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ γενόμενον καὶ κυ[ρ]ωθὲν ύπὸ
[τῆς] βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ[ῦ] δήμου πάντα ἐκτενῶς, καὶ ἔξωθεν
[τῶν] ἐνεγεγραμμένων τῷ ψηφίσματι ἐκάστῳ τῷ
20 [συνεορ]τασάντων ἔδωκεν [σφυρίδα?] φιλοτείμως. Ἐπὶ
[τούτων] ἐγενέτο ὕγεια [ἐὐκαρπία εὐετηρία].

'For the sake of the victory and safety of the emperors Marcus Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Armeniacus Parthenicus Medicus and the everlasting perpetuity of their entire household, and that of the holy Senate and the people of Rome and Syros, Me(?) Eleutherus, son of Eleutherus, proclaimed stephanephoros and eponymous archon by lot and election with his wife, the archine, Onesiphoron, both honorably and with distinction provided a public banquet to the city of Syros and performed the sacrifices prescribed by custom throughout the whole year to Hestia Prytaneia and the other gods and goddesses. He also zealously provided to those sharing the gerousia all the right things on the customary days to all the rest of the inhabitants, the men, the women and their children and he zealously provided everything mandated by the existing decree and decided upon by the boule and the demos to those having
visited from the neighboring towns, and to each of the fellow diners enrolled by decree, he honorably provided gift-baskets. At this time there was health, fertility and a good season.'

The dating of this inscription is provided by the titles accorded to the co-emperor, Lucius Verus, for his victories in the east. The extensive description of the donations made at this time stands in contrast to that of the previous inscription, presumably due to the fact that the prosperity of the island lent itself once again to the resumption of the usual procedure for the choosing of the eponymous archon.

The decree mentioned in line 17 has either not survived or has yet to be discovered. Therefore it remains uncertain whether it was issued before, during the time of, or after, the inscriptions 85 and 86. This record of Eleutherus, nonetheless, seems at pains to express that everything had been done in conformity to tradition and the regulations. Such overdetermination may be the result of a less than satisfactory fulfillment of the post at some point in the past.

Finally, the mention of the 'gift-baskets,' ([σφυρίδα], restored in line 20) provided to 'each of the fellow diners enrolled by decree,' seems to indicate the presence of the practice on Syros of persons such as the aeisitoi, those who were invited to dine at public expense in the prytaneion at other sites in ancient Greece. These 'gift-baskets,'

---

7 Stephanos (1874: 544).
8 See in particular the references to the, 'the sacrifices prescribed by custom,' (τὰς [ἐξ ἔθους νομιζόμενας δυσίας, line 10), the 'all the right things on the customary days,' (πάντα τὰ δίκαια/ τοῖς ἰδιωμένοις ἠμέραις) and the 'everything mandated by the existing decree and decided upon by the boule and the demos.' (τὰ κα[,] τὸ ψήφisma τὸ γένομενον καὶ κυρ[ωθέν ὕπο τῆς] βουλῆς καὶ το(ἲ) δήμου πάντα, lines 16-18).
offered perhaps as a variation of the Roman *sportulae*, were intended according to Stephanos to be used at a communal banquet.⁹


183 A.D.

"Αγαθὴ [τύχη].

"Ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Αὐτοῦ-

κράτορος Καίσαρος Μ. Αὐρηλίου]

[K]ομμόδου Ἀντωνίου Σεβ(αστοῦ) [Εὔσε]-

5  [β]οὺς τύχης καὶ νίκης ἱερᾶς τε [συν]-

[κ]λήτου καὶ δῆμου Ῥωμαίων κ[αὶ δή]-

[μ]ου Συρίου Ἀνταίος Μοδέστου [στε]-

[φ]ανηφόρος ἐπώνυμος ἄρχων ἐ[καλ]-

[λ]εχθεὶς Ἐστία Πρυτανεία καὶ τοῖς [αλ]-

10  [λο]ίς θεοῖς πάσι καὶ παρέχει τῇ μὲν [συν]-

[ό]δῳ τῆς γερουσίας τῇ τετράδι τὰ ἔξ [θουσ]"
[αὗ]τοῖς πάντα, τῇ δὲ γενεισίῳ ἡμέρᾳ [τοῦ]

[kυ]ρίου Αὐτοκράτορος παρέσχεν τοῖς μ[έν]

[γερ]ουσιασταῖς δεῖπνον. καὶ ἔδωκεν ἐ-

15 [κάστῳ] ὁ σφυρίδος δηνάρια πέντε ἐλευ[θέ]-
[ραί]ς δὲ γυναιξὶν πάσαις καὶ θηλείαις[5]

[παισί]ν οἶνον. καὶ ἔδωκεν ταῖς μέν γυ-
[ναίξ]ι διανομῆς ἀνὰ ἀσσάρια ὅκ[τ]ιῳ,
[ταῖς δὲ] παισίν ἀνὰ ἀσσάρια τέσσαρα. τῇ]

20 [δὲ ἔξη]ς ἡμέρᾳ παρέσχεν τοῖς μέν [γε]-
[ρουσιασταῖς καὶ τοῖς ἀλλοις οἰς ἐθηλεὴθη
[δείπνῳ]ν καὶ ἔδωκεν ἐκάστῳ διανο[μῆς]

[ἀνὰ δημ]άριον ἐν τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς πολει-
[ταῖς καὶ πα]ἰσίν ἐλευθέροι[οι]ς καὶ παροικο[ύσι]

[τοῖς μέν π]ολείταις ἀνὰ δημάριον ἐν, [ἐλευ]-
[θέροις δὲ] παισίν ἀνὰ ἀσσάρια ὅκτω. [ἐκά-
[λεσε]ν δὲ] καὶ τοὺς παρεπιδημοῦντας [ἐκ]
[τῶν Κυκλά]δων νήσων, οῖς τὰ αὐτὰ παρ[έ]

30 [σχε]ν ἂ] καὶ τοῖς πολείταις [α]ὐν ἀρχεῖν
[.....]θοι Καλλίστοι τοῦ Θεογνώ[του]

[Ἐπί] τούτων ἦν ὑγεία εὔκαρπία

εὔκεντρία.
‘To Good Fortune. For the sake of the fortune and victory of our lord, the emperor Caesar M. Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Augustus Pius and of the holy Senate and the people of Rome and Syros, Antaeus Modestus, the eponymous archon stephanophoros sacrificed to Hestia Prytaneia and the other gods and provided to the meeting of the gerousia on the fourth day everything that was customary for them and on the birthday of the lord emperor (he provided) dinner to the gerousiastai. And he gave to each the five denarii of the gift-basket and to all the free women and girls he gave wine. And he gave by way of distribution to the women eight asses each, and to the children, four asses each. On the following day he provided to the gerousiastai and the others for whom it was decreed a dinner and gave to each by way of distribution one denarius each. And to the rest of the citizens and the free children and the resident aliens he provide wine and gave by way of distribution to the citizens one denarius each, and to the free children eight asses each. And he called the residents of foreign states from the Cycladic islands, for whom he provided the same things which were also for the citizens, with the archine ...tho, daughter of Callistus, son of Theognoutus.’

The dating of this inscription is more precise than that of the others and is based on the assertion of Keil that the emperor Commodus, although he received the title of Caesar in 166 A.D., did not use that title in his official nomenclature until 183 A.D.\textsuperscript{10} This year also marks \textit{terminus ante quem}, as the emperor assumed the title Britannicus in 184 A.D. The eponymous archon stephanophoros, Antaeus Modestus, can safely be

\textsuperscript{10} For the assumption of the title see Birley (1993: 232) for the claim that this title was not used before 183 A.D., see Keil (1865: 548).
assumed to be the father of the Modestus, son of Antaeus, who was the archon *stephanophoros* of 89.

Two celebrations are mentioned, the first took place ‘on the fourth,’ while the second commemorated the birthday of the emperor and ran into a second day. These two mentions are the earliest specific references as to when the festivals sponsored by the archon occurred thus far in the epigraphical record. Stephanos regards the dates of the public banquets recorded in 86 and 87 as uncertain, but the fourth, as he notes, was reserved for the celebrations of the gods Hermes and Heracles.11 This was, in his opinion, one of the ‘customary days;’ (ἡθισμέναις ἡμέραις, 87, line 14) for such distributions. The inscriptions 89 and 91, moreover, mention other distributions provided on the occasion of the new year and the days which followed. This can safely be assumed to date on which the new archon *stephanophoros* came into office.


193/4 B.C.

'Αγαθῆι Ἡ χινι

[*Ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Λ. Σεπτιμίου Σεουήρου*

11 Stephanos (1874: 543).
Περτίνακος Σεβ. τύχης καὶ νίκης ιερ[άς]
[τε] συγκλη[του καὶ δῆμου Ῥωμαίων καὶ [δή]-
μου Συρίων Μο[δέ]στος Ἀνταίου στε[φανη]-
[φί]όρος ἐπω[υμος] ἄρχων εὐκαλλιέρησεν
[δι'] ὅλου τοῦ ἔτους Ἑστίαι Πρυτανείαι καὶ τοι[ς]
ἀλλοις θεοῖς, καὶ παρέσχεν τῇ[ι] μὲν τετράδι
[τῇ] ἦ γερουσίαι πάντα τά ἐξ ἔθους τῶι δὲ νέωι
[ἐτει] τοῖς μὲν γερουσίαιν νέμουσιν δεῖ[π]-
[νον καὶ] ἔδωκεν ἐκάστῳ αὐτῶι σφυρίδος [.]
[----------] γυναιξίν δὲ ἐλευθέραις καὶ παι-
[σί θηλείαις πα]ρέσχεν οἶνον καὶ ἔδω-
[κεν ἐκάστηι διανομῆις ἀνὰ ἀσσάρια ὀκτ[ῶι],
[τῇ] δὲ ἐξής ἡμέραι παρέσχεν τοῖς [μὲν]
[-----------------κτλ.------------------------]

To Good Fortune. For the sake of the fortune and victory of our lord emperor
Caesar L. Septimius Severus Pertinax Aug. and of the holy Senate and the people of
Rome and Syros. Modestus, son of Antaeus, the eponymous archon stephanophoros
sacrificed throughout the whole year to Hestia Prytaneia and the other gods, and
provided on the fourth to the gerousia everything according to custom and in the new
year to those participating in the gerousia (he provided) a dinner and gave to each of
them ... of the gift-basket ... to the free women and the girls he provided wine and gave
to each by way of distribution eight asses each, and on the next day he provided to the
...

I have chosen to adjust the dating of this inscription from that given to it by
Stephanos, who ascribed it simply to the reign of Septimius Severus (193-211 A.D.). If
the primary criterion of dating these inscriptions is the emperor and his titles, then it
strikes me that this dedication should antedate the assumption by Severus of the titles of
Parthicus Arabicus and Parthicus Adiabenicus in the year 195 A.D. or at the very latest
antedate 198 A.D. when he raised Caracalla to the rank of Augustus.

90  ‘Facsimile of an inscription copied on the back of a will of 1534, found in the
archives of Naxia.’ Eds. A. de Ridder, BCH 21, (1897) no. 1 p. 18; Hiller von
Gaertringen, IG XII (5) 666.

238-244 A.D.

'Υπὲρ ύγειας καὶ σ[ω]τηρίας τού κ[υρίου ἦμ[ω]ν Αὐτοκράτορος Μ.
'Αυτ[ω]νίου Γορδιανοῦ Σεβ. ἱερᾶς τε σ[υνκλήτου καὶ δήμου Ρωμαίων καὶ
δ[ή]μου Συρίων Μ. Αύρ. Εὐνοικὸς Σ[-----] (ο) στεφανηφόρος καὶ ἐπ[ώ]νυμος
ἄρχων ἐκαλλιέρησεν τοῦ Ἑστία Πρωτανεία καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς πᾶσιν ---) κτλ.
‘For the sake of the health and safety of our lord emperor M. Antonius Gordanus Aug., and of the holy Senate and the people of Rome and Syros, M. Aur. Eunoecus S ... eponymous archon stephanephoros sacrificed to Hestia Prytaneia an to all the other gods...’

91 ‘Stele which was found in the antiquities collection of Panagia.’ (Tenos). Eds. LBW II p. 1850; K. Keil, RhM 20 (1865) p. 549; Hiller von Gaertringen, IG XII (5) 617; idem. SIG3 890.

249-251 A.D.

\[\text{Αγαθή} \quad \text{Σύχη} \]

\[\text{Υπὲρ ύγειας καὶ(ι) σωτηρίας τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν καὶ(ι) θει-} \]

\[\text{οτάτων Αὐτοκρατόρων Γάιων Μ[ε]σιών Κυντων Τραϊαν-} \]

\[\text{[ῶν Δεκίων] Σεββββ. καὶ(ι) Ἔρενν. Ἐτρουκ[ιλλ]α[ς] Σεβ. καὶ(ι) τοῦ} \]

\[\text{σύνπαντος αὐτῶν οἶκον καὶ(ι) τῆς ιερᾶς συνκλήτου καὶ(ι) δή}[ήμου] \]

\[\text{Ῥωμαίων καὶ(ι) δήμου Συρίων Ἱ[Ἀ]π[ο]λλωνίδης Ἰου[λιά]-} \]

\[\text{δου στεφα[ν]όφορος ἐπώνυμος ἀρχ[ι]ων ἑκαλλιέρησεν} \]

\[\text{Ἐστία Πρυτανείας καὶ(ι)} \]

\[\text{τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς πάσι καὶ(ι) παρέ-} \]

\[\text{σχεν τοῖς τὴν γερουσίαν νέμοις ὑπ[τ]ε[ρ]ά[δ]ι, τὰ ἐξ ἐξ-} \]

\[\text{θους πάντα ὑπ τοῖς τὴν γερουσίαν νέμοις ὑπ[τ]ε[ρ]ά[δ]ι, τὰ ἐξ ἐξ-} \]

\[\text{δὲ καὶ(ι) παρθένοις ἔλευθεραις πάσαις καὶ(ι) ταῖς τῶν στεφα-} \]

173
υηφόρων θεραπαινίσιν κα(i) τῶν ιερέων οίνου κα(i) ἄρτου λιτρ. α´
κα(i) κρέως χοιρείου (λιτρ.) α´ κα(i) νομής ἄνα [δην.] α´· τῇ δὲ δευτέρᾳ
ἡμέρα ὀμοίως τοῖς μὲν τὴν γερουσίαν νέμουσιν κα(i) ἄλλο[ι]
πολείταις πάνυ πολλοῖς κα(i) ἐτέροις οἷς ἐβουλήθη καλέσαι
dεῖπνον κα(i) ἐδωκεν νομῆς τοῖς μὲν τὴν γερουσίαν νέ-
μουσιν ἄνα (δην) β´ τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς πᾶσιν ἄνα (δην) α´ τοῖς
δὲ λοιποῖς πολείταις ἐνδήμοις τε κα(i) ἀποδῆμοις ἐδω-
[κε]ν ἐκάστῳ ἄρτου λ(ιτρ.) β´ κα(i) κρέως χοιρείου λ(ιτρ.) β´ κα(i) νομῆς
[ἐκάστῳ] ἔνα (δην) ἐν· τῇ δὲ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ταῖς ἀρχείναις
[κα(i) ἄλλας αῖς ἐβουλήθη καλέσαι] παρέσχεν δεῖπνον[ον]
[ταῖς δὲ λοιποῖς γυναιξίν ἐδωκεν] ἄρτου (λιτρ.) μ[i[a]в κα(i) кρέως]
[χοιρείου ----------------------------οις τ[-------]
[-----------------------------κτλ.-----------------------------]

'To Good Fortune. For the sake of the health and safety of our most holy lords,
the emperors Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Aug. and Erenn. Etruscilla Aug.
and their entire household and the holy Senate and people of Rome and Syros,
Apollonides, son of Julianides, eponymous archon stephanephoros sacrificed to Hestia
Prytaneia and to all the gods and provided to those sharing the gerousia on the fourth, all
the customary things. And in the new year to those partaking of the gerousia (he
provided) a dinner. And he gave by way of distribution ten denarii each, and to the
women and all the free maidens and the assistants of the stephanephoroi and priests wine
and one litra of grain and one litra of pork and by way of distribution one denarius.
Likewise on the second day to those sharing the *gerousia* and to all the numerous citizens and others for whom it was decreed (he provided) to call (them) to dinner, he also gave by way of distribution to those sharing the *gerousia* two denarii each and to all the rest one denarius each, and to the rest of the citizens at home and abroad he gave to each two *litrae* of grain and two *litrae* of pork and by way of distribution one denarius each. On the third day to the *archinae* and the others to whom it was decreed to call he provided dinner and to the rest of the women, he gave a single *litra* of grain and of pork …‘

Perhaps the most strongly specific with regards to its date of the inscriptions of Syros owing to the brevity of the reign of the emperor Decius, this dedication in the abbreviation, Σεβββ. with the triple beta (line 4), records not merely the emperor Decius himself but his sons Imp. Caesar Quintus Herenius Etruscus Messius Decius and Imp. Caesar Gaius Valens Hostilianus Messius Quintus, both of whom were proclaimed Augusti in 251 A.D.

The public feasts offered by the archons *stephanophoroi* of Syros, which as the previous dedications attest, appear to have grown in lavishness each year, and have here reached their apogee insofar as it is known to us. At this time it appears that not only *stephanophoroi* but their assistants, the *therapainai*, the priests (line 13), and the *archinae* (line 21) formed corporations which received particular honors in the donations provided by the archon. Stephanos, however, rejects the impression that women and men celebrated these occasions both equally and together.\(^\text{12}\)

\(^{12}\text{Stephanos (1874: 545-546).}\)
Depressingly little research has been done on the island of Syros. Historically, very little is known for certain, although the island is mentioned as far back as the *Odyssey* (15, 403-414).

There is an isle called Syria, if you have heard of it, above Ortygia, where are the turning places of the sun, rich in herds, rich in flocks full of wine, abounding in wheat. Famine never comes into the land, nor does any hateful sickness besides fall on wretched mortals; but when the tribes of men grow old throughout the city, Apollo of the silverbow, comes with Artemis, and assails them with his gentle shafts and slays them. In that isle are two cities, and all the land is divided between them, and over both ruled as king my father Ctesius, son of Orimenus, a man like to the immortals.\(^{13}\)

This, rather idealized, portrait of his homeland offered by the swineherd Eumaeus to Odysseus still stands of one of the most important testimonies regarding the early history of the island. Outside of the Homeric era, there exists some testimony which points to a time when the island might have fallen to Polycrates, the tyrant of Samos.\(^{14}\)

The island was part of the Delian League and appears in the tribute lists of the Athenians, but further information regarding either its cults or its administration is almost entirely lacking, as the ancient site of the city is the present location of the city of Hermoupolis.

To Hestia, the citizens of Syros proved extraordinarily devoted, preserving both sacrifices to her at the beginning of the political year, as well as her cult epithet *Pryianeia*, long after control of the island had passed to Rome.

\(^{13}\) Νησός τις Σύρη κικλήσακεται, εἰ ποῦ ἄκουεις / Ὄρτυγιῆς καθύπερθεν, δὲν τροπαὶ ἥλιοιο, / οὗ τι περιπλῆθης λήν τόσον, ἀλλ’ ἄγαθη μέν/ εὐβοτος, εὐμήλος, οἰνωπληθής, πολύτυρος, / πείη / δ’ οὗ ποτε δῆμον ἔσφερεται, οὐδὲ τις ἄλη/ νοῦς ὑπὶ στυγνῳ πέλτη πεῖλται δειλοῖς βροτοῖς/ ἀλλ’ ὅτε γηράσκως πόλιν κατὰ φύλ’ ἀνθρώπων, / ἔλθων ἄργυροτοξος Ἀπόλλων Ἄρτεμι/ ξύν/ ὅς ἄγανος βελέσων ἐποιχόμενος κατέπεφεν, / ἐνθα δωδὼ πόλεις, διχα δέ σφις πάντα/ δεδασται/ τοῖοι δ’ ἀμφοτέροι πατήρ ἐμὸς ἐμβασίλευε, / Κτήσιος Ὀρμενίδης, ἐπιείκελος σάλατας.

\(^{14}\) Stephanos (1874: 523-524 n.10).
Ceos


Stoichedon 5th century B.C.

Κλεογένης Κυδιγένεος

'Ιστίπι ἀνέθεκεν

'Cleogenes, son of Kudigenes, dedicated (this) to Hestia.'

No further reference to either of these names or the goddess Hestia has been found on Ceos.
Chios


Boustrophedon 575-550 B.C.

A

[-----]αις Ἰστίης δήμο

→

ρήτρας: φυλάσσω[ν -----]←

[-----]ον: ηρει: ἕμ μὲν δημαρ-

χών: ἡ βασιλεύων: δεκα[θῆ (?) ----]

5 [-----]ς Ἰστίης ἀποδότω δημα-

ρχέων: ἐξπρῆξαι: τὸν ἐξεταστήν (?)----]

[-----]εν δήμο κεκλημένο

ἀλοιαι τιμὴ διπλήσ[η----]

[-----]ν ὀσὴν παραλοιω[.]
B
[.ca. 3..]ην δ' ἤκκλητος δί[κη---] →
[-----] ἤν δὲ ἀδικήται: παρά ←
δημάρχωι: στατήρ[ας------]

C
ἐκκαλέσθω εἰς →
βολὴν τῆν δημ- ←
οσίην: τῇ τρίτηι
ἐξ Ἐβδομαιῶν

5 βολὴ ἀγερέωθ-
ω ἢ δημοσίη ἐ-
πιθώιος λεκτ-
ἡ πεντήρουτ' ἀπ-
ὸ φυλῆς: τὰ τ' ἀλ[λ]-

10 α προσεύμω τὰ δῆ-
μο καὶ δίκα[ς ό]-
[φό]σαι ἀν ἐκκλ-
ητοι γένων[τ]-
[αι] τὸ μηνὸς π-

15 ἀσάς ἐπ[...]
Editorial Notes: line 1. [...] ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ Βουλ/αῖς: Ἰστίνης Οἰκονιμίδες;
[Bουλαίνης ἐν]κα τῆς Ἰστίνης Hansen. line 15. [Βουλαίης τῆς Ἰστίνης Hansen. Van
Effenterre and Ruzé have altered the entire order of the reading of the stone placing side
D first.

'As for property sacred to Hestia, (the official) shall constantly observe the rhetras
of the demos and shall give an order that such and such be sacred by separately citing the
rhetra which will so declare. If a demarchos or basileus accepts a bribe, he shall hand
over, while in office, what Hestia gets. The exetastes shall exact it in the presence of a
convocation of the demos.

Convictions: poena dupli. After a case lost by default, always exact a penalty as
large as that which arises from convictions.

The boule which will judge appeals shall be a boule demosie. And in case one
claims that an unjust sentence has been given, he shall deposit so many staters with the
demarchos and shall appeal to the boule demosie. On the third day after the Hebdomaia
there shall regularly be a gathering of this boule demosie, has power to impose fines and
is to be empanelled by a selection of fifty men from each tribe. Let it conduct the other
business of the *demos*, and let it prepare (judge?) all those cases which have been appealed against during the month ... of the month Artemision ... let him take a solemn oath? and swear ... .’

Translation Note: The translation is for the most part that of Oliver minor exceptions. On face A, line 4 ‘accepts a bribe,’ I have accepted the reading of Jeffrey over that of ‘levies a tithe,’ an unattested sense suggested by Oliver. Likewise I drew with slight alterations the readings of the last lines of side D from Jeffrey rather than Oliver who let his own translation simply trail off.

In the reading as restored by Oikonomides of side A line 1, the translation would be ‘the priest of Hestia *Boulaia* guardian of the people.’

Wilamowitz-Moellendorf in the *editio princeps* of this inscription was the first to raise the question as to whether the word |ΣΤ|ΗΣ in the first line referred to the goddess, the prytaneion, or the ‘common hearth of the demos.’¹ The debate has continued until recently with Meiggs and Lewis having declared for the goddess,² while Detienne has advocated the ‘common hearth.’³ Barring the discovery of further evidence to settle the issue decisively either way, the matter must remain equivocal.

No further evidence regarding either the common hearth or Hestia has emerged from Chios. The suggestion of Forrest that the stone, made of red trachyte, a material not otherwise known for a Chian inscription, originated in nearby Erythrae is intriguing.⁴

---

¹ Wilamowitz (1909: 64).
³ "Foyer Commun."
⁴ Quoted in Meiggs and Lewis (1969: 17).
Two inscriptions from Erythrae, 152 and 153, attest to the presence of Hestia Boulaia and Hestia Temenia as early as the beginning of the fourth century B.C. Moreover, the upper half of 152 was found on Chios, evidencing the communicability of inscribed stones between the two locations.\textsuperscript{5} As a result, O. Hansen has used the material of the stone and the existence of the cult to reattribute the provenance of the stone to Erythrae, although this view has not found wide acceptance.\textsuperscript{6} As Robert has noted, the ties between Chios and Erythrae were always very close, with Chios having possessions on the mainland, and Erythrae maintaining the priesthoods of such deities as Apollo Kaukaseus and Artemis Kaukasis even though Kaukasa was on the island of Chios.\textsuperscript{7} Given the tangled relationship of the two locales the best way to determine provenance, however, remains the letterforms. Orthographically, the use of the sampi is still found in an Erythraean inscription dated to \textit{ante} 454 B.C. (IEK 2) and its absence in this inscription in \textit{φυλάσσω\nu} (A line 2) and \textit{πρησσέω\nu} (C line 10) as well as Chios in general should add to the reluctance to resituate the stone to the mainland.\textsuperscript{8}

The recording of this law (or oath)\textsuperscript{9} appears to have taken place after the formation of a council of the people comprised of fifty representatives from each of the tribes (C lines 6-9), which Jeffrey takes as being far more significative of a rupture between an old oligarchic structure and a newer more democratic one than the co-existence of a demarchos and basileus (A lines 3-4). Nonetheless, the corollary of such a move may have been the publishing of the law, of which this regulation forms part. The

\textsuperscript{5} L. Robert (1933: 483).
\textsuperscript{7} L. Robert (1933: 483).
\textsuperscript{8} Jeffrey (1956: 163).
\textsuperscript{9} Jeffrey (1956: 163) conjectured that the first lines 1-3 of side A might possibly belong to an oath, and this possibility has not been discounted. In the words of Effenterre and Ruzé (1994: 264) "Il est impossible de restituer une lecture cohérente de A."
role of the *demarchos* in this context remains a matter of speculation, and while Jeffrey has dismissed the exact correlation of the *demarchos* and the *demiourgos* suggested in one of the glosses of Hesychius as “too tidy,” it must be remembered that the eponymous *demiourgoi* of Camirus, at least, were also priests of Hestia. Similar doubts can be raised with regard to the restoration of the title *exestastes* in A line 6. No *exestastes* is known for Chios in this period, and the choice is derived from the titles of the magistrates with similar authority at Erythrae and Samos.

The presence and role of Hestia in this context is significant, in that she or her priest receives the penalty resulting from convictions for bribery (A line 5), but what part her worship played in the establishment of those earlier reforms can only be speculation. Effenterre and Ruzé, evading specific questions of the history of Chios, namely whether this was a first step towards democracy have instead laid the importance of this document on the fact that it marks ‘an important in the unification of the island thanks to a counsel representative of all the communities and the obligation to oversee laws valid for everyone.’

---

10 Jeffrey (1956: 164-165).
11 See Rhodes 47-53, infra.
Paros


2nd cent. B.C.

[--ca. 11----] Σ καλοκαγαθίαν, τῶ[ν] τε τ[οῦ β]ασιλε[ά]-
[ως πρ]αγμάτων[ν] Πτολεμαίου καὶ τῆς ἀδελ[φῆς αὐτ[οῦ]
[τὴν] διοίκησιν [ποι]ούμενος διατελεῖ ἀξίως τῶν
5 [τ]ις πιστευομ[ένων] αὐτ[ῶι] βασιλέως καὶ τῆς αὐ-
[τ]ιοῦ ἀναστροφῆς τίμια φυλάττων, πρὸς τε τοῦ-
[τ]ιοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἄλ]λοι[ς "Ελληνας ἀνέγκλητος
[ἐ]στιν, εὑ]σεβής τε ὑπάρχου εἰς τε τοὺς ἄλλους δὲ-
[ή]μους καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἑστίαν τοῦ δήμου τοῦ ἡμετέρου vac.

10 [σ]τεφάνην κατασκεύαζει χρυσῆν τῶι ἀγάλματι
[τ]ῆς Ἑστίας, ὅπως ἐπικοσμήσει τὸ ἱερὸν δαπάνην
[ὑ]πομένων ἐκ [τ]ῶν ἰδίων οὐ μικρὰν, ὑπόμνησα τῆς
[α]ύτοις εὑσεβείας θέλων καὶ παρ’ ἡμῖν καταλιπεῖν
[κ]αὶ τοῖς ἕξ ἡμῶν ἐπιγινομένοις. vac. ἀνθ’ ὧν ἀγαθεῖ

15 [τ]ύχῃ δεδόχθαι ἐπηνήθαι "Ἀγλαον Θεολκείους
[K]ώιον ἐπὶ τε τει εἰς τὸ θείον εὐσεβείας καὶ τει πρὸς
[τ]ῶν βασιλῆ Πτολεμαίου καὶ τὴν βασιλίσσαν Κλε[ο]-
[π]άτραν εὐνοίαι καὶ ἐπὶ τει εἰς τὸν ἡμετέρον δήμον
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[ύ]π’ αὐτοῦ γινομένει φιλαγαθία, ὡς μνημονεύ-

20 [ὅ]ν ὁ δήμος ὁ Παρίων καὶ νῦν αὐτὸν τιμᾷ πρὸς νας.
[tα]ῖς ὑπαρχοῦσαις τιμαῖς χρυσῶι στεφάνωι κα[ι]
[e]ικόνι τετραπήχει λυχνέως λίθου ὡς καλλίστει[ι],
[ὁ]πως πάσι φανερὰ ἐι ἡ ἱμερέταρα προαίρεσις καὶ [ἔ]
[k]τενεια εἰς τοὺς εὐργετοῦντας ἡμᾶς οὐ λει[πο]-

25 [μ]ένους ἐν χάριτος ἀποδόσει, ἢν στήσει ὁ δήμος ὁ Παρί-
[ων ἐν τῷ ιερῷ τῆς Ἑστίας, οὕπερ καὶ ἡ ΣΜ[--ca. 6-8--]
[.]δώ ἀνακειμένη ὑπάρξει. παραστῆσαι δὲ ταῦ]-
[τῆι καὶ στήλην λιθίην ἔχουσαν [τόδε τῷ ψήφισμα]
[....]ποιον τὴν [-----------------------------]

30 [-----------------------------]

'...generosity, and of the affairs of king Ptolemy (VI) and his sister queen Cleopatra (II) continually performing his duty in a fashion just and right...worthily both of the king's trust and preserving the privileges of his vocation, he is honored by both these and the other Greeks, being pious both towards the other peoples and the Hestia of our people ... he decorates the statue of Hestia with a golden crown, so that he may adorn the shrine paying no little expense from his own resources, wanting also to leave to us and our posterity a memorial of his piety ... in return for which it seems best to Good Fortune to praise Aglaos of Cos, son of Theocles, for his piety towards the divine, his goodwill towards king Ptolemy (VI) and queen Cleopatra (II), and for his benevolence to our people; mindful of these things the people of Paros honor him both now ... with lasting
honors, with a golden crown and with a statue four cubits high made of the finest red marble, so that our good will and affection to those who benefit us be made manifest as lacking nothing in the way of gratitude; this statue the people of Paros will erect in the shrine of Hestia, of which also the ... will be dedicated. And erect beside this, a stone stele having this decree…’

This stone records a decree honoring Aglaos, son of Theocles, who is mentioned in a decree on Delos dated to around 150 B.C. In the Delian decree,¹ he is honored by mercenaries of the Cretan confederacy for distinguished service rendered on behalf of Ptolemy VI Philometor and Cleopatra II, most recently during a campaign, presumably against Euergetes II, on Cyprus. Having already been appointed proxenos of the Cretans, he was honored with a golden crown and the erection of two bronze statues, one at Cos, the other at Delos, each one flanked by a stele recording the decree. Where the statues were to be placed was left to the discretion of the Coans for the one, and the Athenians for the other.


Middle of the 2nd cent. B.C.

Τάδε συνέγραψαν καὶ εἰσήνεγκαν οἱ αἱρεθέντες

¹ See Despinis (1965: 120 n. 2).
υπὸ τοῦ δήμου Κλεοβάρσης: Σιληνοῦ : Χάρης

Κρατιστόλεως: Εὐκράτης: Κρίτωνος: περὶ τῶν

4 γραμμάτων τῶν μνημονικῶν τῶν τε ἀνευνειγμένων εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ τῆς Ἁρτέμιδος καὶ τῆς Λητοῦς καὶ περὶ τῶν εἰς τὸν λόιπον χρόνον ἀνευνειχθεωμένων. Ὅσα μὲν υπὸ τι

8 νῶν ἡδίκηται: ἡ ἐξαλείπτηται ἡ ἐγγέγραπται τῶν γραμμάτων τῶν μνημονικῶν τῶν ἀνευνειγμένων εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν, περὶ μὲν τούτων τῶν γεγενημένων ἀδικημάτων ποιήσασθαι

12 τοὺς ἄρχοντας τοὺς περὶ Νικησιφώντα καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς τοὺς δημοτελεῖς ἀράν: εἰ τις τῶν γραμμάτων τῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῶν μνημονικῶν τῶν ἀνευνειγμένων ἡδικηκέ τι ἡ ἐξαλήλι

16 φε τι ἡ ἐγγέγραφε ἄρα ὅ ἀνευνείχθη εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν, ἔξωλη εἶναι αὐτόν, καὶ εἰ τις συνειδώς μὴ μηνύσειεν πρὸς τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ τὸν ἀποδεκτὴν τὸν ἐπιμελόμενον τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ὡσαύτως δὲ

20 [κ]αὶ εἰ τις εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ἀδικήσει εἰ τί ἡ ἐ-

[ξ]αλείψειεν ἡ ἐγγράφειεν τῶν μνημονικῶν

[γρ]αμμάτων τῶν ἀναφερομένων εἰς τὰ ἱερά, ἐξώ-

[λ]η εἶναι αὐτὸν καὶ εἰ τις συνειδώς μὴ μηνύ-

24 σειεν. Εἶναι δὲ καὶ ὑπεύθυνον εἰ τίς τί ἡδικη-
κεν τῶν γραμμάτων τῶν μνημονικῶν τῶν ἐν
τοῖς ἱερῶι τοῖς θουλομένωι Παρίων τὸν πάντα
χρόνου ἀτερ ἀντιγραφῆς, ἢ δὲ γραφόμενος περὶ

πάντων γραφέσθω δημοσίαιν δίκην κατὰ τὸν νό-
μου πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα τίμημα ἐπιγραφόμενος
tι χρῆ παθεῖν ἡ ἀποτείσαι, ὥσαυτῶς δὲ καὶ ἐὰν
ὕστερον αδικήσαντός τι περὶ τὰ γράμματα βοῦ-

ληται τινα γράφεσθαι. "Οπως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ δυνατὸν
μηθεὶν γίνεται αδίκημα εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνου,
eἰ δὲ μή, ἐλεγχος ἢ καὶ δι’ ἀντιγράφων, τοὺς μνη-
μονὰς τοὺς ἐπὶ Νικηφόρων ἄρχουντος ἀνα-

γράψαι εἰς βυβλία ἀντιγραφα πάντων τῶν μνημο-
νικῶν γραμμάτων ὅν ἀναφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ
Ἄπολλωνος καὶ τῆς Ἁρτέμιδος καὶ τῆς Λητοῦς
καὶ παραδίδοναι αὐτοὺς τοῖς ἄρχονσιν ὅταν καὶ

τὰ ἄλλα μνημονικὰ παραδὶδὼσιν τοῖς τε ἀποδέκτει
καὶ τοῖς μνήμονι καὶ τὸν ἄρχοντα ἀπογράφειν εἰς
τὸ δημοσίου παραδεδωκότα καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσιν καθα-
περ καὶ ἐκεῖνα, τοὺς δὲ ἄρχουντας παραδοῦνα τοῖς ἀ-

ποδέκτει τοῖς ἐπιμελομένωι τῶν κατὰ πόλει παρα-

λαβόντας παρὰ τῶν μνημόνων, τὸν δὲ ἀποδέκτην
θέσαι τὰ γράμματα εὐθέως παρόντων τῶν ἄρχον-
tῶν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Ἐστίας ἐμβαλόντα εἰς τὴν κι-
βωτόν τὴν οὖσαν ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι. Εἰς ἀνάλωμα δὲ
toúτων tois mnήμοσιν δοῦναι tois ἄρχοντας
tois peri Νικησιφώντα ἀπὸ τῶν πρυτανείων ἑ-
kάστωι δραχμάς: ΔΔΔ, τὸ μὲν ἡμισὺ ἐν τῶι Ὑαγη-
lιῶν, τὸ δὲ ἡμισὺ ἐν τῶι Ἀπατορίων. Εἰς δὲ τὸν λοι-
pὸν χρόνον τὸν μετὰ Νικησιφώντα ἄρχοντα tois
mnήμονας tois γινομένους τὰ μὲν ἄλλα γράμμα-
ta ὡς ἂν παραλάβωσιν παρὰ τῶν πρότερον μνημό-
νων ἀναγράψαντας παραδίδοναι τῶι ἀποδέκτει
eis τὸ Πῦθιον κατὰ τὸν νόμον. "Ὅσα δὲ ἄν ἐφ' αὐτῶν οἱ-
kονομιθεῖ πάντα καὶ τὰ δοθέντα αὐτοῖς γεγραμ-
mένα ἐν ὑπομνήμασιν, ταῦτα δὲ αὐτὰ καθ' αὐτὰ
ἀναγράψαντες ἔξης κατὰ μήνα παραδιδόντων
tοῖς τε ἀποδέκτει τοῖς ἐπιμελομένους τῶν τοῦ Πυθίου
καθάπερ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα γράμματα καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσιν
ὡς γέγραπται καὶ περὶ τοῦτων διοικεῖν καθὰ ἐπάνω
γέγραπται. Εἰς ἀνάλωμα δὲ τοῦτοι τοῖς mnήμοσι
δίδοοσιν ὀ τι ἀν ἐν τῇ διατάξει γραφεῖ. "Ὅπως δὲ καὶ ἐ-
ἀν τις βούληται τῶν γραμμάτων τῶν ἐν τῷ Ιερῶι
tῆς Ἐστίας ἐπισκοπεῖν ἐξεῖ αὐτοῖς, ἐὰν τις φη χῇ
ὥσαυτω τὰς ἀναγεγράφθαι τοῖς ἐν τοῖς Πυθίων γράμματί-
sιν τὰ ἐν τοῖς τῆς Ἐστίας, τοὺς ἀν φαμένους δηλοῦν
τοῖς ἄρχουσιν ἐγ γευμαί ἐκλησίαί ἀκούουσι τοῦ δή-
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μου δὲ ἀμὴ φηι εἶναι ὡςαύτως ἀναγεγραμμένον

72 τοῖς ἐν τῷ Πυθώι γράμμασιν, τὸν δὲ ἀποδέκτην τῇ
πέμπτῃ ἰσταμένου ἀνοίξαντα τὸ ἱερὸν ἐπιδεικνύ-
ειν παρόντων τῶν ἀρχόντων, ἐξω δὲ τοῦ ἱεροῦ μὴ ἐ-
ζεῖναι φέρειν τῶν βυβλίων μηθὲν μηδὲ οἱ ἀρχόντες

76 μηδὲ ὁ ἀποδέκτης ἐωντων, ἀλλὰ παρόντων αὐτῶν
τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν γίνεσθαι, ὑπευθὺνως δ᾽ εἰναι τοὺς
ἀρχόντας καὶ τὸν ἀποδέκτην, ἕαν τι ἀδικήσωσιν πε-
ρί τὰ γράμματα ἢ τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν τῶν γραμμάτων κα-

80 [τὰ τ]οὺς νόμους, εἰναι δὲ ὑπεύθυνον καὶ ἕαν τις ἀδι-
[k]ήσει τι περὶ τὰ γράμματα τὰ ἀναφέρομενα εἰς τὸ ἱε-
ρὸν τῆς Ἑστίας [καθὰ]περ γέγραπται ἕαν τις ἀδική-
σει περὶ τὰ γράμματα τὰ μην]μονικὰ τὰ ἐν τῷ Πυθώι.

84 "Οτιως δὲ καὶ, ἕαν δοξεῖ τῶι δῆμοι τ[ῶι]δὲ τῶι συγγράμ-
ματι χρᾶσθαι, φανερὸν ἢ πᾶσιν, τὸν ἀποδέκτην τὸν ἐ-
πιμελόμενον τῶν κατὰ πόλιν Σωκλείδην ἀναγρά-
ψαντα εἰς στήλην λιθίνην τὸ σύγγραμμα τοῦτο

88 θεῖναι παρὰ τὸ ἱερὸν τῆς Ἑστίας, τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα δοῦ-
ναι αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀναγραφὴν καὶ τὴν στήλην
ἀπὸ τῶν προσόδων οὖν ἐγλέγει.

"Those chosen by the demos, Cleotharses, son of Silenus, Chares, son of
Cratistoles, Eucrates, son of Crito, drafted and brought these things (to the demos). With
regard to the documents of the mnemones deposited in the shrine of Apollo, Artemis and Leto, and with regard to the ones that will be deposited there in the future. What things may be done for ill by anyone, either adaptation or erasure of the documents of the mnemones deposited in the shrine, concerning these infractions the archons around Nikesiphon and the public priests are to make a curse:

If someone contrives for ill either erasing or adapting the documents of the mnemones deposited in the shrine after they are delivered to the shrine he is to be cursed. Also if someone knowing of such activity should not report it to the archons and the presiding apodektes of the shrine. Likewise also if someone in the future contrive some ill or erase or alter one of the documents of the mnemones being brought to the shrines, he is to be cursed, as is someone knowing of such activity who does not report it.

To be held accountable is he who may contrive some harm upon the documents of the mnemones in the shrine, and there is to be legal prosecution by any of the Parians who wishes without possibility of counter-suit for all time. And according to the law the accuser should bring a public lawsuit about all the facts of the case to the basileus fixing the penalty, what it is necessary to endure or to pay. Likewise also if later someone contrives some harm with respect to the documents should someone wish to bring an indictment. Therefore also as much as possible let there be no tampering in the future. But if not, let demonstrability be given through copies, the mnemones in the year of the archon Nikesiphon are to write copies on papyrus rolls of all the documents of the mnemones which they are to bring to the shrine of Apollo, Artemis and Leto and to hand them over personally to the archons at the time when they hand over the other documents of the mnemones to the apodektes and to the mnemon. And the archon should mark in the
state archive that he has handed it over to the archons just like those (documents of the
mnemones), and the archons having received them should hand them over to the
apodektes in charge of the (archives) in the city, and the apodektes should immediately in
the presence of the archons deposit the documents in the shrine of Hestia in the container
which is there. As compensation for their expenses the archons around Nikesiphon are to
give to each of the mnemones the sum of 30 drachmas from the Prytanic funds; the first
half in Thargelion, the second in Apatourion.

And for the future after the archonship of Nikesiphon, the future mnemones, after
they have made copies, are to hand over the documents which they receive from the
previous mnemones to the apodektes in the Python according to the law. All the
documents administered by them and the ones given to them written in hypomnemata,
having made copies, they should deliver one by one in order every month to the
apodektes in charge of the Python and to the archons just like the other documents as
written and they are to act accordingly as described above. As compensation for this the
mnemones should be paid whatever is written in the budget. In that way, if ever someone
wants to see the documents in the shrine of Hestia, it is possible for them; if ever
someone says that the (copies) in the shrine of Hestia are not written conforming with the
documents in the Python those making such a claim are to present to the archons in a
regular assembly in the presence of the demos what is not written (in the copies) as in the
documents in the Python; and the apodektes should on the fifth of the month open and
grant inspection in the presence of the archons, but it is not permitted to take any of the
papyrus rolls outside of the shrine and neither the archons nor the apodektes should
permit that, but in their presence the consultation should take place; and the archons and
the apodektes are by law to be liable to prosecution if they somehow behave illegally with respect either to the documents or the examination of the documents; and the person who tampers with the documents brought to the shrine of Hestia is to be liable to prosecution just as it is written for the one who tampers with the documents of the mnemones in the Pythion.

That this resolution, if the demos decides to make use of it, should be visible to all, Socleides who is the present apodektes for the archive in the city, having written this resolution on a marble stele is to set it up beside the shrine of Hestia, and the costs for the inscribing and the stele he is to pay from the funds at his disposal.'

Translation Note: I have translated the inscription more or less literally, but for all that it occurs to me that there may be some points which remain less than clear. In the interim measures to be taken (lines 39-48) the mnemones are to hand over their documents to the apodektes of the shrine of Apollo, Artemis and Leto (i.e. the Pythion) and to the mnemon (line 41). Who this particular mnemon was and what was his role vis-à-vis the other mnemones is not certain but it indicates a certain specialization and hierarchy in that group of officials.\(^2\) The construction is paralleled by the following stipulation that the archon must hand it over to the other archons who in turn pass them over to the ‘apodektes of the (archives) in the city,’ (line 43-44). Again, precisely who this archon was is not known, but the structure of the whole process is more or less plain. The mnemones hand over their documents to the apodektes and copies to one of their own members, this one mnemon hands over the copies of the documents to one of the

archons, who in turn presents them to his own colleagues and the *apodektes* of the state archives in the prytaneion.

This inscription has been investigated and commented on at length by Lambrudakis and Wörle, whose explication I will briefly summarize.

The inscription mentions five different people in all; the archon Nikesiphon (lines 12, 35, 50, 53), the *apodektes* of the state archives, Socleides (line 86), and the members of the commission, Cleotharses, Charis and Eucrates (lines 2-3) whose purpose was to draft and present a *syngramma* (line 1) that was then to be published ‘if the demos decides to make use of it’ (lines 84-85). The subject with which this commission had to deal, related to the deposition of certain documents in the shrine of Apollo, Artemis and Leto, elsewhere called the Python (lines 57, 61, 68, 83), both those already in the shrine and those which were to be brought in the future. The resolution is divided into two parts. The first deals with procedures against those who render themselves culpable through illegal handling of these documents, while the second seeks to hamper or neutralize problems with these documents through preventative measures and future guarantees. There are transitory measures for the first year (lines 32-52), and immediately after, a definitive rule for the future (lines 52-84).

---

3 I have translated *συγγράφειν* (line 1) as ‘draft’ and *συγγραμμα* (lines 84-85, 87) as ‘resolution,’ where Lambrudakis and Wörle have read ‘verfassen’ and ‘Vorlage,’ respectively. Nonetheless, I feel it necessary to call to the reader’s attention that according to the stipulations at the end of the text, the fact that this stone was inscribed, and presumably set up beside the prytaneion, means that it was a functioning decree of the of the Parian *demos* even if it is not provided with the usual formula such as *ἐδοξέων τῇ θεολογίᾳ καὶ τῶι δήμῳ*, but only with ἔχαν δόξει τῶι δήμῳ (line 84). For similar practices elsewhere, see Lambrudakis and Wörle (1983: 297 esp. n. 55).
The shrine of Apollo Pythios has been discovered, and the text of this inscription confirms that it was used as an archive for private documents, as well as public ones. The archive in the ‘shrine of Hestia’ was used for copies of these private documents, and the public nature of this cult is attested in the horos stone (96) mentioning Hestia Demia as well as in the Aglaos decree (94). The archons of Paros were directly charged with the security of this shrine (lines 41-42; 75-77) and the cost for the fabrication of the copies to be preserved in it were to be paid by from the prytanic funds (lines 48-52). That the ‘shrine of Hestia,’ and the prytaneion were the same had been presumed and is now confirmed by the archeological evidence. Testimony for the presence of state archives in the prytaneion of Paros occur from the end of the third to around the middle of the second century B.C. The testimony of this stone leads to the conclusion that the prytaneion was the official archive of the Parian archons, while the Python served as the repository of private agreements and documents. There was however some overlap.

The circumstances, which provoked the assembling of the commission to deal with the issue of document tampering are unknown. Two means, one supernatural, the other legal, are used against those who have or will introduce alterations into the documents. The inscription charges the archons and the public priests with the solemn proclamation of a curse upon both those who falsify these private documents as well as their accomplices (13-24). There is also established the possibility of a demosia dike (line 28) which Lambrinudakis and Wörrle have explained as structured on the legal procedure established for cases of asebeia.

---

5 For the use of the Python as archive of public documents, see also the proxenia decree IG XII 5, line 110.
The documents described here as *mnemonika grammata*, obviously pertain to the functions of the *mnemones*. The alternative description of the *mnemonika grammata* (lines 57-58) as 'all the documents administered by them,' through a comparison with the functions of the *mnemones* of Thasos and notarial practice elsewhere indicates that it may have been a question of the legal affairs of private individuals such as the composition of dowries, contracts, sales and guarantees.\(^8\) The meaning of the description 'the ones given to them written in *hypomnemata*,' however, is of uncertain meaning in this context.

The *mnemones* of Paros were unknown until the publication of this inscription, yet the existence of *mnemones* in the Parian colony on Thasos, who may have had a similar function in connection with their own Python, makes their appearance here 'not surprising.'\(^9\) The number of *mnemones* is not known, but that they numbered more than the two attested on Thasos appears to be indicated.\(^10\) In both Paros and Thasos the role of the *mnemones* appears to be purely notarial, concerned with the documentation of private legal matters. Whether the Parian *mnemones* like their Thasian counterparts had a *grammateus* is not known.

96 Stele found in 1898 in the court of the small church of Prophetis Elias. Now in the museum of Paros. Ed. Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG XII* (5)\(^1\) 238 (*SGDI 5447*).

5\(^{th}\) century B.C.

[\'I]στίνης

---

\(^8\) ibid.: 320-322.
\(^9\) ibid.: 328-329.
\(^10\) ibid.: 330 n. 252.
Δημίους

‘Of Hestia *Demia.*’

An otherwise unattested epithet for Hestia, in light of the lack of further evidence, little can be said of how this epithet might differentiate this Hestia from other manifestations such as Hestia *Boulaia* or Hestia *Prytaneia.* However, it does rather obviously indicate the public nature of this cult on Paros.

The island of Paros presents a fine example of how the vagaries of preservation can influence the perception of the presence or absence of a divinity in any given locale. From only three pieces of epigraphical testimony is provided a strong base which when placed beside the evidence for Hestia worship from other locales gives a interesting vision of the goddess’ presence there.

The Aglaos decree tells us that within the shrine of Hestia there were both statues of Hestia and from the second century B.C. onward of Aglaos himself. Despinis has linked the testimony of two passages; one from Dio Cassius (55. 9. 6.) which relates how in 6 A.D. Tiberius forced the Parians to sell him a statue of Hestia which was then set up in the Temple of Concord; the other preserved in Pliny (Nat. Hist. 36. 25) saying that a seated figure of Hestia, made by Scopas, was set up in the Gardens of Servilius, to argue that in all three sources, the Aglaos decree, Dio Cassius and Pliny, one and the same statue is meant.\(^{11}\) The arguments for this unity are largely circumstantial, namely, that the homeland of Scopas was Paros and a statue for the Prytaneion there would have been a

\[^{11}\text{Despinis (1965: 131-132). See also Gruben (1982: 674 esp. n. 116).}\]
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logical and worthy commission for the sculptor. The fact that the Parians were forced to sell the statue indicates a strong reluctance to part with it and this is consonant with something which was deposited in their prytaneion hence presumably a source of civic pride. What is known from the Aglaos decree, however, is only that there was a statue of Hestia in the prytaneion, and that this sculpture was fitted with a golden crown. Whether this crown was a new feature or was meant to be a replacement for an earlier bronze one is not known.\(^\text{12}\) Consequently any attempt to see Scopas as responsible for establishing an iconographical "type" of Hestia on the basis of these testimonia cannot be ascertained.

To be sure, the fact that there was a statue of Hestia in the prytaneion comes as no surprise. The practice has parallels with both Delos (32, 33) and Athens, where as at Paros, certain prominent individuals also had their statues.\(^\text{13}\) More curious are the provisions made to utilize the prytaneion as an archive. S. G. Miller has collected the evidence for such a practice with the conclusion that "the prytaneion seems to have served also as a quasi archives, more for the interesting memorabilia of past events in the city's history than for historical or political documents."\(^\text{14}\) Yet this statement seems to be not entirely accurate in the case of Paros, where the documents deposed in the prytaneion were evidently important and relevant enough for certain individuals to risk tampering with them.

Lambrinudakis and Wörrle have noted these Parian archives were placed in the Python and not in the shrines of the chief state divinities, Demeter and Apollo Delios,

\(^\text{12}\) Despinis (1965: 132).
\(^\text{13}\) Paus. 1. 18. 3 tells us that there were statues of Miltiades, Themistocles, Demosthenes and the boxer Autolycus in the prytaneion as well as statues of Hestia and Eirene.
\(^\text{14}\) Miller (1978: 16-17).
and that this choice was not made arbitrarily.\textsuperscript{15} However, their account of the reasons for the choice of the Python as the repository of these documents rests heavily on their explication of the role of Apollo and leaves little room for Hestia. Nonetheless there is no reason to believe that the selection of the pryaneion, the 'shrine of Hestia,' was made with any less deliberation.

As access to these documents in the Parian pryaneion was closely restricted, it was not a question of publication, but rather of preservation. The documents in the Python were considered as perfectly legal. As there does not seem to have been made any provision for easy access to the copies in the shrine of Hestia, likewise there does not seem to have been a consideration that they were either the definitive copies or necessary to be consulted in every case. Moreover, the measures here do not order the placement of the 'container' (κιβωτός line 47-48) in the pryaneion, but speak of the one already there which indicates that this location was already in use as a public archive.

Can the function of the pryaneion, of the shrine of Hestia, as an archive be ascribed to this divinity as part of her association with thesaurisation as Vernant proposed? Possibly. But as Lambrinudakis and Wörrle have noted,\textsuperscript{16} archives are attested in the shrines or temples of many gods and goddess, and while there exists no systematic treatise which collects and examines the evidence for every ancient archive, a glance at the epigraphical testimony for Hestia alone demonstrates that she was not everywhere and for all times entrusted with this function. Thus rather than simply place a label on Hestia as a goddess concerned with thesaurisation or preservation, a more nuanced approach seems warranted.

\textsuperscript{15} Lambrinudakis and Wörrle (1983: 300).
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid. (1983: 303).
In the regulations for the deposition of documents in the shrine of Hestia it was the chief magistrates of Paros, the archons, who were accountable not only for their placement, but also for their fidelity to the ones deposited by the mnemones in the Python. This responsibility does not harmonize with the functions of those other magistrates, the apologoi of Thasos, the colony of Paros, whose function was to legally intervene on behalf of the state, and who also had close ties to Hestia.\(^{17}\) Or does it?

In \textit{IG XII} 348 which deals with the management of the port, should there be an infraction against the law, the epistatai, magistrates close to Aphrodite, are to exact a fine.\(^{18}\) If there is a dispute, the case is to be referred to the apologoi, for prosecution before the dikastai. In our Parian inscription concerning the documents of the mnemones, should someone have a dispute about the documents in the Python, this is to be sent to the archons and an ekklesia kyria who will see to the examination of the records, an examination not permitted to the plaintiff himself. In each case, a problem with the mnemones or with the epistatai, who are linked by Aristotle (\textit{Pol.} 6. 5. 4., 1321b) as officials connected with archives, is referred to magistrates, whether archons or apologoi, who are connected with Hestia and another large civic body. The duties of both these bodies of magistrates then, as Salviat has noted for the apologoi, are to represent the public interest in lieu of private initiative.

In addition, the apologoi of Thasos, for reasons which are unknown, were reduced in number from seven to three in the third century B.C., and afterwards made dedications to Hestia \textit{Boulaia}. The aim, effect or result may have been to bind them tighter to the Thasian \textit{boule} which conferred their authority, but the archons of Paros, as evidenced by

\(^{17}\) See the commentary on 98, infra.
\(^{18}\) On the \textit{epistatai}, see 99 infra.
our inscription, were already bound to another authority, the Parian *demos*, and Hestia *Demia*. Thus, while the shrine of Hestia may here have been employed by relation to her supervision of all things deposited, the question remains: With regard to the pantheon of Paros, and Hestia as goddess without mythology, is it so discordant that a goddess who refuses marriage with Apollo and who cannot be swayed by Aphrodite should be conjoined with magistrates, *apologoi* and archons, with similar independence, from the magistrates of Apollo, the *mnemones*, and those of Aphrodite, the *epistatai*?
Thasos

97 Base of Thasian marble broken on the right, found on the eastern part of the apse of the basilica. Ed. J. Pouilloux, Recherches I, no. 23 p.233, ph. ibid. pl. XX, 1.

Stoichedon First half of the 4th century B.C.

ΟΕΟΤ[ιςος --------]

'Ιστ[η-?--------]

'Theotimus … to Hestia …'

The breaks on the right side of this stone have caused the loss of the patronymic of the first name. It is possible that the ΙΣΤ of the second line was also a name such as 'Ιστ[ιςεῦς] also followed by a patronymic. If the reading of Hestia is justified, then that name would most probably be followed by the name of another divinity.¹ The Ionic form 'Ιστίη, attested also in 120, in contrast with the forms 'Εστίη in the majority of cases and 'Εστία once in 118 is likely the result of atticization.²

¹ Pouilloux 1 (1954: 233).
² cf. the inscriptions of Erythrae, 132 and 133.
Base of white marble, now in the Louvre. Ed. E. Miller, *RA* 12 (1865) no. 4 p. 140 (*SGDI* 5484); C. Friedrich, *IG* XII (8) 376; (cf. the remarks of J. Pouilloux, *Recherches* I, p. 232 ph. ibid. pl. XIX, 1)

Around 350 B.C.

'Α[π]ό[λογο]ι 'Εστί[η]
άνέθηκαν
Φανοφῶν
Ζεφυρίδεος

5 Δεινοκλῆς
Γλαύκωνος
'Αμφιμέδων
'Επικράτεος
Παῦσιππος

10 Φιλίσκου
'Αδείμαντος
Ποσείδίππου
Δεινόμαχος
Εὐηφένεος
'Αγλῶν Φίλωνος

'The *apologoi*, Phanophon, son of Zephyrides, Deinocrates, son of Glaucon, Amphimedon son of Epicrates, Pausippus, son of Philiscus, Adeimantus, son of Poseidipus, Deinomachus, son of Euephenes, Aglon, son of Philo dedicated (this) to Hestia.'
The *apologoi*, were a body, originally of seven, later three, magistrates, whose duties, broadly speaking, seem to have been to represent the legal interests of the city; politically in cases of the bestowal of rights\(^3\) or the title of *proxenos*\(^4\) and financially overseeing the laws concerning commerce and the administration of the port.\(^5\) They appear usually in the formula, "δικασσάσθων οἱ ἀπόλογοι." A secretary of the *apologoi* is known, and Pouilloux has hypothesized that this *grammateus* formed the seventh member added to the other six, corresponding in number to a three-fold division of the city.\(^6\) They are known from another inscription of Thasos to have been enjoined to hand over cases of maritime commerce on appeal to the *dikastai*.\(^7\)

The role of the *apologoi* as the public prosecutors in the cases specified on the stone is not without precedent in Greek law. At Athens for special circumstances, boards of *synegoroi* (also called *kategoroi*) were empowered by the *demos* or the *boule* to present certain cases. The number of prosecutors appointed for the trial of Demosthenes was ten based on the tribal divisions of the city.\(^8\) And while in Athens most cases would be brought by private individuals, as Salviat has noted, "The most constant trait of Thasian legislation in this area (bringing a case to trial) is an effort to replace this accusatory procedure, traditional in all Greek cities, by the repressive activity of magistrates."\(^9\) The special relationship between the *apologoi* and the *boule* hinted at in the fourth century and confirmed by the three dedications to Hestia *Boulaia* and Zeus

\(^3\) IG XII 8 suppl. 355.
\(^4\) IG XII 8 suppl. 267, 15.
\(^5\) IG XII 8 suppl. 348, 5.
\(^6\) Pouilloux I (1954: no. 150, 1. 15, 391 and 398-399)
\(^7\) Launey (1933: 406).
\(^8\) MacDowell (1978: 61-62).
\(^9\) "Le traité le plus constant de la législation thasienne dans ce domaine est un effort pour remplacer cette procédure accusatoire, traditionnelle dans toute les cités grecque, par l'activité répressive des magistrats." Salviat (1958: 203).
Boulaios (118, 119 and 120) could thus be attributed to their ties to the boule, which conferred their prosecutorial authority to them.

With respect to the dedications to Hestia, Aphrodite and Hermes by the apologoi and by the epistatai alone or in conjunction with the agoranomoi, Pouilloux has assigned Hestia the role of presiding over the 'national reconciliation,' which was accompanied by the reorganization of the Thasian archives in the early fourth century B.C.  

Base of white marble, broken on the right, found in 1956 in the region of the passage of the theoroi. Ed. F. Salviat, BCH 82 (1958) no.1 p.319 (SEG XVII 422); ph. ibid. p. 320 fig. 1

Second half of the 4th century B.C.

'Επιστάται Ε[στίη, Αφροδίτη, Ερμεί] Λυσίστρατος Ε[V-----name, patronymic----]
'Ισαγόρας Ηραγ[όρου, -name, patronymic]
'Απολλόδωρος Κ[----name, patronymic-----]
καὶ ἀγορανόμοι [------name, patronymic----]
Εὐθυκλῆς Τιμά[νδριδου].

'The epistatai, Lysistratus son of ... , Isagoras son of Heragorus, Apollodorus, son of ... , and the agoranomoi, Euthycles, son of Timandrides, to Hestia, Aphrodite, (and) Hermes.'

10 Pouilloux I (1954: 231-232 and 238-240)
This dedication was made on behalf of one board of six epistatai and another of two agoranomoi. Aristotle included the former beside the hieronmnomes and mnemones among the magistrates entrusted with the inscription of records,\(^{11}\) and Salviat attributed to them a function similar to the Thasian mnemones as registers of private contracts.\(^{12}\) Yet in the law cited previously concerning the apologoi,\(^{13}\) the epistatai oversaw the punishment of infractions against the law governing the docks of the port and in cases of a flagrant offence, they were enjoined to exact the fine directly. Charged with a judiciary and policing power which extended beyond the administration of the port,\(^{14}\) in the document published by Salviat the epistatai received denunciations by endeixis as well as having culpable parties remanded to them by apogōge. It appears that for admitted violations, they could take the initiative in exacting the penalty, but in all contested cases, they deferred to other judges or tribunals.\(^{15}\) There is evidence that they may have disposed of their own funds.\(^{16}\)

They enjoyed a privileged relationship with Aphrodite who was given the title Epistasiē,\(^{17}\) which would seem to establish a strong link between these magistrates and the goddess even where the epithet is lacking. The hypothesized tie between Aphrodite and the epistatai has grown even stronger in the light of an inscription, dated to the second quarter of the fifth century B.C. and brought to light by H. Duchêne. This inscription, generally regulating maintenance of the street which ran from the sea to the Heracleion, entrusts the epistatai with cleaning the street monthly, exacting fines from

---

\(^{11}\) Arist. Pol. 1321 b 34.  
\(^{12}\) Salviat (1958: 204-206).  
\(^{13}\) See above p. n.2  
\(^{14}\) Just how far beyond is indicated by the inscription published by Duchêne (1992).  
\(^{15}\) Salviat (1958: 205).  
\(^{17}\) Pouilloux I (1954: 233-235 no. 24 line 1).
offenders, and perhaps most relevant for the elaboration of their relationship to Aphrodite, penalizing women who lean out of their windows to look. Duchène links this to the strictness of regulations imposed on women in general on Thasos, and more specifically the prohibition of women from partaking in the cult of Heracles. ‘Just as women didn’t have the right to participate in the cult of Heracles, they could not appear at the windows which opened onto this ‘Sacred Way’ when it was used for processions and cortèges in honor of the god.’

Yet aside from one Thasian dedication on behalf of the *epistatai* and the *agoranomoi* jointly, the only dedications by magistrates found to Aphrodite alone have been made on behalf of the *gunaikonomoi*. This ‘manner police,’ consisting of three members at Thasos, existed at a number of Greek cities in the Hellenistic era, including Athens. Their presence on Thasos dates by their dedications to the fourth or third centuries B.C. at least, and the link now shown between their duties of overseeing the behavior of women in the Hellenistic period and those of the *epistatai* in the Classical period on Thasos strengthens and clarifies the tie to Aphrodite already presumed through their dedications.

---

18 μηδε γυνη εικ των θυριδων θησοντω, ‘Let no woman look out from the windows.’ lines 32-33 Duchène (1992: 52-54).
19 ‘Comme les femmes n’avaient pas le droit de participer au culte d’Héraclès, elles ne pouvaient pas se montrer aux fenêtres donnant sur cette <<voie sacrée>> quand elle était livrée aux processions et cortèges en l’honneur du dieu.’ Duchène (1992: 54).
20 *IG* XII 8 Suppl. 390.
21 Pouilloux I (1954: 407ff.)
22 Athen. *Deipn.* 245a.
23 For the relationship of Aphrodite to these and magistrates in general, see Pirenne-Delforge (1994: 403-408).
The *agoranomoi* as in other Greek cities controlled commercial transactions and verified weights and measures, as confirmed by two dedications of *sekomata* to Hermes by individual *agoranomoi*.  


End of the 4th century B.C.

[Ἐστίνι Ἀφρ]οδίτη[ι Ἐρ[μή]]
[---------------------]ἵππο[v]
[---------------------]νος
[Ἀντάνδρος ὁ Ἀντάνδρος]

5 [Τεισικράτης Λυσάδα[v]δρ[ου]
[Κρατιστόναξ Λυσιστρά[του]
[-------------------]ιαχρώνος
[-------------------]ανός[----------]

‘(Two names missing) Antandrus ?, son of Antandrus, Teisocrates, son of Lysander, Cratistonas, son of Lysistratus, … son of Aischron, …to Hestia, Aphrodite and Hermes.’

---

The seven names of the dedicants probably comprise the members of the board of apologetoi, and represent, providing the accuracy of the restoration of the first line, the only surviving dedication by that board to Hermes and Aphrodite in conjunction with Hestia. These same deities are named in a dedication by the epistatai and the agoranomoi, 116, from the second half of the fourth century B.C. and another by the epistatai alone from the third, 121. Above in 115, from around the middle of the fourth century, the apologetoi dedicated to Hestia alone.


Beginning of the 3rd century B.C.

'Απόλογοι 'Εστίαι Βουλαίαι καὶ Δίι Βουλαίωι
'Ηγησίπολις Λάμππωνος Λεώδικος Σατύρου
Τεισικράτης Βιτίωνος

'The apologetoi, Hegesipolis, son of Lampon, Leodicus, son of Satyrus, Teisicrates, son of Bition, to Hestia Boulaia and Zeus Boulaios.'

This dedication displays the shift from a board of seven apologetoi to a board of three. Characteristic of this shift apparently, is a change in the recipients of the dedications by the magistrates leaving office. Hestia Boulaia and Zeus Boulaios are only
dedicated to by the *apologoi*, and only after the reduction of their number from seven to three. The reasons for this shift are unknown, but it is not injudicious to speculate that the same reform, tentatively dated sometime between the end of the fourth and the middle of the third centuries B.C., which decreased the number of *apologoi* also introduced new regulations binding their office more closely with the council. The *apologoi* thus continued to dedicate to Hestia (see 115, 117 above) as they had done in the past, but now to Hestia with a special relationship with the council, and Zeus appearing in the same aspect, as an additional witness.


Middle of the 3rd century B.C.

‘Απόλογοι Ὑστίη
Βουλαίη καὶ Δί
Βουλαίωι

‘The *apologoi*, to Hestia *Boulaia* and Zeus *Boulaios*.’


Middle of the 3rd century B.C.
'Απόλογοι Ἡστίη Βουλαίη [καὶ Δί εΒουλαίω]
Στράτων Νεομάνδρου
Πολύτιμος Ὄρθομενους
Ἀριστείδης Ἀλκ[

'The apologoi, Straton, son of Neomandros, Polytimus, son of Orthomenes, Aristeides, son of Alc..., to Hestia Boulaia and Zeus Boulaios.'

104 Rectangular base of Thasian marble found in a gutter southwest of the Agora (?).
Ed. G. Daux, BCH 50 (1926) no. 23 pp. 244-245, ph. ibid p. 244 fig. 4; Hiller von Gaetringen, IG XII Suppl. (1939) 403.

Middle of the 3rd century B.C.

['Εστ]ή 'Αφροδίτη 'Ερμή[ί].
[Πύ?]ρων Φειδίππου
["Α]νθις Μελανωπίδου
Καλλιστρατος Καλλιστράτο[υ]
Πρηξίπολις Μεταγόνου
'Ηρακλείδης Φιλωνίδου
Πρηξαγόρας Φειδίππου.

'Pyrrhon, son of Pheidippus, Anthis, son of Melanopis, Callistratus, son of Callistratos, Prexipolis, son of Metagonos, Heraclides, son of Philonides, Prexagoras, son of Pheidippus to Hestia, Aphrodite, Hermes.'
The six names of this dedication indicate that it was made on behalf of the *epistatai*.


End of the 2nd century B.C.

[Ἀφροδίτῃ Ἐνιόια
cαὶ �太阳城
Πυθίων Διοσκουρίδευς
Καὶ τιστῶναζ Λυσιστράτ[ου].

Restorations of J. Pouilloux.

‘Pythion, son of Dioscurides, Cratistonax, son of Lysistratus, to Aphrodite Eunoia and Hestia.’

The restoration of the name of Aphrodite with an epithet otherwise unknown for Thasos is very uncertain and based upon other dedications which pair the two goddesses (99, 100, 104, 106).

1st century B.C.

[ʼΕπʼ ...ca.6...]φάνους, μυήμονες
[ʼΗρακλείδης Ἀρχέλεω
[...ca.7...]ος Κασάμβου
[καὶ ἔπιστάται
5
[Φιλίσ]κος Θεοδότου
[Κτησιφ]ῶν Ἀντιφώντος
[καὶ ἂ]γορανόμοι
[...ca.6...δ]ωρος Φιλώτου
[Μητροφά]νης Μητροφανου
10
[ἀγορανόμ]ων γραμματεύς
[.ca.5.] Στύρακος
[ʼʼΕστίη καὶ Ἔρμ]εὶ καὶ Ἀφροδίτη

Editorial Note: line 12 [ʼʼΕστίη καὶ Ἔρμ]εὶ καὶ Ἀφροδίτη suppl. Salviat;


ʼIn the tenure of ..., the mnemones, Heracleides, son of Archelaus, ..., son of Casambos and the epistatai, Philiscus, son of Theodotes, Ctesiphon, son of Antiphon, and
the _agoranomoi_, ..., son of Philotus, Metrophanes, son of Menophanes, the secretary of the _agoranomoi_, ..., son of Styrax to Hestia, Hermes and Aphrodite.'

Following the eponym appear two _mnemones_, two _epistatai_, and two _agoranomoi_ and their secretary. Pouilloux has speculated that the board of six _epistatai_ had by this time been split into three boards of two.\(^{25}\) Given, however, the new evidence from Paros \(^{65}\), and the known correlation of principal cults and officials between this metropolis and its colony, it is possible that the institution of the _mnemones_ dates back much earlier.\(^{26}\) In another dedication, this time to the Agathos Daimon, the _mnemones_ are also mentioned as having a secretary.\(^{27}\) Their function as notaries of private documents as on Paros, is evidenced by a later law from Thasos which regulates the fees that could be charged to register these documents.\(^{28}\) Daux has conjectured that this law acted perhaps as a supplement to another already existing law which was intended to curtail the _mnemones_ from profiting from excessive fees. As stipulated by this new law, the costs of entries into the records of the _mnemones_ were to be paid either by a special mnemonic fund, but more probably, given the evidence from Paros, a common public fund.\(^{29}\)

In general, on Thasos, the constellation of Hestia, Aphrodite and Hermes figures in dedications by a variety of magistrates sometimes dedicating alone, sometimes together. The grouping appears starting only in the fourth century contemporaneously with the Thasian reconciliation of which the reorganization of the archives was also

\(^{25}\) Pouilloux I (1954: 399).
\(^{26}\) Lambrinudakis and Whörle (1983: 328-331).
\(^{27}\) *IG* XII 8 suppl. 434, 11.
\(^{28}\) *IG* XII 8 suppl. 347, II.
programmatic. These new civic gods, in opposition to the older deities of Thasos such as Apollo Pythios, Athena Poliouchos and Heracles,\textsuperscript{30} sought to both symbolize and cement the concord of the city through their ties with such public spaces as the prytaneum, harbors, streets and the agora as well as the magistrates who administrated them. And while there appears to have been some tendencies to view specific associations of specific deities for specific magistracies, the apoloi, and perhaps the mnemones, with Hestia, the epistatai with Aphrodite, the agoranomoi with Hermes, the assemblage as a whole seems to have been rather stable, aided no doubt, by the fact that individual citizens both could and did hold several of these magistracies in their lifetime.\textsuperscript{31}

Moreover, the combination of the three deities displays new ligatures in their functions which could be exploited for the purpose of expressing public harmony. The power of Aphrodite is seen as complementary rather than antithetical to that of Hestia,\textsuperscript{32} for if Hestia is associated with the domestic duties of women, Aphrodite, through the epistatai and the gunaiikonomoi, keeps a close eye on their behavior in and around the streets. Likewise evocative are the citizenship decrees, which specify that the new citizens be enrolled in a patrai, ‘whichever one they can persuade.’\textsuperscript{33} The role of Peitho, the companion of Aphrodite, in the process of becoming a citizen is especially interesting as the efficacy of this persuasion, the actual enrollment in a patra, is guaranteed in the same decree by the apoloi, the magistrates who seem to have the strongest ties with Hestia.

\textsuperscript{30} See above n.9.
\textsuperscript{31} E.g. IG XII 8 608.
\textsuperscript{32} As alleged by Vernant (1965: 103).
\textsuperscript{33} IG XII 8 suppl. 355, l4 "\textit{πατραὶ ἔνας πειθωσιν.}" On the \textit{patrai} of Thasos in general, see Jones (1987: 184).
Chalcis


Undated

′Αρισταγόρη Ἰππάρη-
χοῦ ἡ ἱερεὶα Ῥστία
ἀπυρος.

Editorial Note: line 2 Ῥστίας suppl. Hiller. It could be a question of a dative Ῥστία with the omission of ἀνέθηκεν.

′Aristagore, daughter of Hipparchus, the priestess (of? to?) Hestia, unfired.'

Nothing further about Aristagore has come to light from Chalcis.


Late 3rd or early 4th century A.D.
Καρποκράτης, Σαράπιδι, ἀκοισὶς τῆς Ἰσίδος, Ὠσείριδι ἐπικόω, Ἑστία

Κουροτρό[φω--]

Καρποκράτης εἰμὶ ἔγὼ, Σαράπιδος καὶ Ἰσίδος ὅσο, Δήμητρος καὶ Κόρης καὶ Διονύσου καὶ Ἰάχ[χου—].

"Ὑπνού καὶ Ἡχοὺς ἀδελφός. Πᾶς καιρὸς εἰμὶ ἔγὼ, πάντων προμηθῆς ὅρων, εὐρετῆς ἀρχ[---, ---] κατεσκευασάμην ἐγὼ· ἄδυτα καὶ ἀνάκτορα θεοὶς πρῶτος εἰργασάμην· μέτρα καὶ ψήφο[νς---]

ἐπενόησα· σείστρον Ἰσίδι κατεσκευασάμην ἐγὼ· ξώων παντοδαπῶν θήρας ἐπενόησα ἐγ[ό---]

ἀεὶ πόλεων ἄρχοντας ἐγὼ κατεστησάμην· τοῖς ἀνατρεφομένοις παιδίοις ἐφέστηκα· ὑμνοὺς κ[αὶ ---]

χοροῦς ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν μετὰ Μουσῶν ἔστησα ἐγὼ· σίνου καὶ ὑδατος κράσιν εὗρον· αὐλῶν καὶ συρίγ[γων---]

τοῖς δικάξουσιν ἀεὶ πάρειμι, ἵνα μηδὲν ἄδικον γίγνεται· Βάχχοις καὶ Βάχχαις ἀεὶ συνθίασότης εἰμὶ· τῳ[---]

ἀνήκα· πᾶσαν ἐκάθηρα γῆν· ὄρεσσίδιατος θαλασσοδίαιτος ποταμόδιαιτος· βρονόμαντις ἀστρόμαντις ε[---]

κερατόμορφος, Ἀγαθεύς, Βασσαρεύς, Ἀκραῖος, Ἰνδοκτόνος, θυρσοκλόνος Ἀσσύριου κυναγέτης, ὄνειρόφοιτος, ὑπνοδ[ότης---]

ἀποδεχόμενος, τοῖς ἄδικως ἔρωσιν νεμεσῶν· ἐναγείς μεισῶ· πᾶσαν φαρμακεῖαν ιατροῖς εἰς σωτηρίαν [---].

217
Τειτάνιος Ἐπιδαύριος. ναε.Χαῖρε, Χάλκι, γενέτειρά ἐμή καὶ τροφή. ναε.
Λιγυρίς.

'To Carpocrates, to Serapis, to the ears of Isis, to Osiris the heedful, to Hestia Kourotrophos ... I am Carpocrates, son of Serapis and Isis, of Demeter and Kore and Dionysus and Iakchos ... brother of Hypnos and Echo. I am every season, foreseeing of every season, discoverer ... I equipped. I, first, built shrines and temples to the gods, I contrived measures and voting pebbles ... I provided the rattle to Isis. And I contrived beasts of every sort ... And I established leaders for cities for all time. And I established the songs ... and dances of men and women with the Muses. I discovered the mixture of wine and water. I provided to the just for all time ... of flutes and pipes, so that nothing would be unjust. I am always the fellow celebrant of Bacchoi and Bacchai ... I went up. I purified the entire earth. Searching the mountains, Searching the sea, searching the rivers. The seer of the herbs, the seer of the stars ... shaped of horn, Agueus, Bassareus, Akraios, Indoktonos, Thyrsklonos, the Assyrian hunter, dream ranger, giver of sleep ... receiver, wroth at those who love unjustly. You bring better things. Every drug for doctors for saving ... Titanios, Epidaurios. Farewell Chalcis, my progenitor and nurse. Liguris.

Carpocrates, found also in inscriptions from Egypt, is a form of Harpocrates, and results from the link between this god and Isis with the theme of fertility.¹ Otherwise identified with Horus, the son of Isis and Osiris, but present here as the son of Serapis

¹ Dunand II (1973: 153 n. 4).
and Isis, Carpocrates is provided with the parentage of Demeter and Dionysus and is the brother of Hypnos and Echo. J. and L. Robert have assumed that Hestia has been assimilated to Isis as in the Oxyrhynchus papyrus and the first hymn of Isidorus, and duly noted that this is the only attestation of Hestia with the epithet *Kourotrophos* outside of the *Etymologicum Magnum*.\(^2\)

\(^2\) *Etym. Magn.* 90.1 s. v. ἄμφιδρόμια.
Dheros

Stone stele inscribed on four faces, found in the ruins of Haghios Antonios near Neapolis. Now in the museum of Istanbul (inv. 691). Eds. Velonakis and Papasliotis, Αθηνα 14 Μαρτ. 1855; Dethier, SBWien 30 (1859) pp. 431-433; Halbherr, MusIt 3 (1890) pp. 657-659. (Michel, Recueil 23; SIG\(^2\) 463). Blass, SGDI 4952; SIG\(^3\) 527; Guarducci, ICret IX 1, ph. ibid. p. 84.

End of the 3rd century B.C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Θεός. Τύχα.</td>
<td>δικαίω δέ καί πρ(αξί)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>áγαθαι Τύχαι.</td>
<td>ων μηθέν ἐνορκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἔπι τῶν Αἰθαλέ-</td>
<td>ἡκόημ. Καί ἐνορκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ων κοσμιόντων</td>
<td>φιλοδρήριος καί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῶν σύν Κυίαί καί</td>
<td>φιλοκόσμιος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κεφάλωι, Πύρωι,</td>
<td>Καὶ μήτε τάμ πό-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πίωι, Βισίκωνος,</td>
<td>λιν προδιωσέιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γραμματέως</td>
<td>τάν τῶν Δρηρίων,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δὲ Φιλίππου,</td>
<td>μήτε οὐρεία τά</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τάδε ὁμοσαν</td>
<td>τῶν Δρηρίων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγέλαοι παν-</td>
<td>μηδὲ τά τῶγ Κν[ω]-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀξιωστοι ἐκα-</td>
<td>σίων, μηδὲ ἀν-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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τὸν ὅγδοη-κοντα· Ὅμων
τὰν Ἑστίαν τὰν
ἐμ πρυτανεῖωι
καὶ τὸν Δήνα τὸν
"Αγοραίου καὶ τὸν Δή-
να τὸν Ταλλαίου
καὶ τὸν "Απέλλωαν
τὸν Δελφίνιον καὶ
tὰν ᾽Αθανάιαν τὰν
Πολιούχον καὶ τὸν
"Απέλλωνα τὸν Ποίτιον
καὶ τὰν Λατοῦν καὶ τὰν
"Αρτεμίν καὶ τὸν "Ἀρεα
καὶ τὰν "Αφορδίταν καὶ
tὸν ᾽Ερμάν καὶ τὸν "Ἀλίον
καὶ τὰν Βριτόμαρτιν
καὶ τὸν Φοίνικα καὶ τὰν
"Αμφί[ώ]ναν καὶ τὰν Γαν
καὶ τὸν Οὐρανόν καὶ
"Ηρώς καὶ ἡρώασσας
καὶ κράνας καὶ ποτα-
μοὺς καὶ θεοὺς πάντας

dρας τοῖς πο-
λεμίοις προδω-
σεῖν μήτε Δρη-
ρίους μήτε Κυω-
σίους· Μηδὲ στά-
σίος ἄρειειν, καὶ
tῶι στασίζοντι
ἀντίος τέλοιαι,
μηδὲ συνωκώσι-
ας συναξεῖν
μήτε ἐμ πόλει
μήτε ἔξοι τὰς
πόλεως, μήτε
ἀλλωι συντέλε-
σθαι· εἰ δὲ τινὰς
κα πύθωμαι, συ-
νομνύοντας,
ἐξαγγελιῶ τοῦ
κόσμου τοῖς πλί-
σιν· εἰ δὲ τάδε
μὴ κατέχοιμι,
τοὺς ἵτε μοι θεοὺς
τοὺς ὀμοσα ἐμ-
καὶ πᾶσας· μὴ μὰν ἑγὼ
ποκα τοῖς Λυττίοις
καλὸς φρονησεῖν
μὴ τέχναι μὴ τε μα-
χανάι, μὴ τε ἐν νυκτί
μὴ τε πεδί ἀμέραν, καὶ
σπευσίῳ ὁ τι κα δύναμαι
κακὸν ταὶ πόλει ταὶ τῶν Λυττίων

C
[μὴ τε μοι γ]υναίκας
[tίκτειν] κατὰ φύ-
[σιν μήτε] πάματα·

90 [εὐορκίζουτι δὲ μοι
[τοὺς] θεοὺς τοὺς
[ζῆμος] ἱλέους ἤμεν
[καὶ πολλά] καγαθᾶ
δε[δόμην] ν. να. ὀμνῦ

95 τὸς αὐτὸς θεοὺς·
ἡ μὰν ἑγὼ τὸν κό-
σμον, αἳ καὶ μὴ ἔξορ-
κίζοντι τὰν ἄγε-
λαν τοὺς τόκα ἐ-
100 γυνομένους τὸν

D
αι δὲ μὴ πράξαι-
ἐν ἀ βωλὰ, αὐ[τοῖ]

130 τὰ διπλάσια ἀ[ποτεί-
σάντων, πραξάν]-
των δὲ οἱ ἐρευνάι
οἱ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων
καὶ δασσάσθωσαν

135 ταῖς ἐταρείασιν
κατά ταῦτα, να. τάδε ὑπομνάμα-
ta τας Δηρηγίας χώρας
tας ἀρχαιας τοις
140 ἐπιγιγνομένοις ἀξώ-
ствоις, τὸν τε ὄρ-
αὐτὸν ὁρκοῦ τὸν- κον ὄνυμου
περ ἀμὲς ὀμωμό καὶ κατέχειν.
καμες, ἐμβαλεῖν καὶ οἱ Μιλάτιοι
ἐς τὰν βωλάν, ἂi 145 ἐπεβώλευσαν
κα ἀποστάντι ἐν ταῖ νέαι νε-
tοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ Κο-
μυκαρίου ἢ τοῦ λει ταῖ τῶν Δρη-
᾿Αλιαίου· ἀ δὲ β[ω]λὰ
πραξάντων ἔκα-
150 χώρας τᾶς ἀ-
στον τὸν κοσμί-
οντα στατήρας μᾶς, τᾶς ἀμφι-
πεντακοσίονσι μαχόμεθα.
ἀφ’ ἂς κα ἐμβάλητι νικήτηρ
ἀμέρας ἐν τριμήνων· 
155 [---------]
αἱ δὲ λισσός εἰη[ι], καὶ ἐλαίαν ἕ-
ἀγγραψάντων καστον φυτεύ-
ἐς Δελφῖνον εἰν καὶ τεθραμ-
όσσα κα μὴ πρά-
μέναν ἀποδεῖ-
ξωντι χρήματα, 
160 ἕαι· ὃς δὲ κα μὴ [φ]υτευσεῖ, ἀπ-
τοῦνομα ἐπὶ πατρός [ὄ]τεισεῖ στα-
καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ ἄρ-
tηρας πεν-
γυρίου ἐξονομαίνον-
τες· ὃ τι δὲ κα πράξουν-
τήκουτα.
τι, ταῖς ἑταίρειαισιν

125 δασσάσθωσαν ταῖς

EMPL τολεὶ καὶ αἱ πεῖ

ΤΙΝΕΝ οὕρευσκτι ΔΡΗΡΙΟΙ.

A) 'God. Fortune. To Good Fortune: In the kosmoi-ship of the (tribe) Aithaleoi with Kuiaς and Cephalus, Pyros, Hippius, Bision, and with Philippus (acting as) grammateus. Each of the one hundred eighty unarmed agelaoi has sworn these things: I swear by Hestia in the ptytaneum and Zeus Agoraios and Zeus Tallaios and Apollo Delphinios and Athena Poliouchos and Apollo Pythios and Leto and Artemis and Ares and Aphrodite and Hermes and Helios and Britomarpis and Phoenix and Amphione and the earth and the sky and the heroes and the heroines and the springs and rivers and all the gods and goddesses:

Never will I favor the Lyttians, neither by skill nor contrivance, neither at night nor during the day, and I will do what harm I can to the city of the Lyttians. B) No legal proceedings and actions are to be valid under the oath. I am a friend of Dreros and a friend of Knossos. I will not betray the city of the Drerians, or the fortresses of the Drerians, or those of the Knossians, nor will I betray the men either of Dreros or Knossos. I will not initiate civil strife and I am opposed to the one engaged in civil strife, nor will I join with those who have sworn another oath, neither in the city nor outside the city, nor will I side with another. But if I discover those who share the oath (doing so) I will denounce them to the majority of the kosmos. But if I do not adhere to these things, which I swore, may the gods be angry with me, all the gods and goddesses, and may I
and my property perish in destruction most vile and may the land not bear fruit for me (C) neither the women nor the livestock bearing children for me as is natural. But for me upholding my oath well, I swear that the gods will be happy and give many good things ... And I swear by the same gods: I will hand over the kosmos to the boule, if they do not administer the same oath to the agela then being unarmed, which we have sworn at the end of the month of Komnokarios or of Heliaios: Let the boule fine each of those who have performed the function of the kosmos five hundred staters in the third month from the day it applies. And if he is poor let them write up in the Delphinion how much property they do not demand in the name of the father, naming the amount of money which they do demand; let them divide it among the hetaireiai, the ones in the city and the ones where the Drerians are on guard. (D) But if the boule does not do this, let they themselves pay double. Let the ereutai demand it and let them divide it in the same way among the hetaireiai. It is necessary for future azostoi to swear and uphold these records of the old Drerian territory.

And the Milasians laid an ambush on the first day of the new year for the city of the Drerians for the sake of our territory, on behalf of which we fight. The victor of the agela ... each is to grow an olive tree and when it is grown, to present it. And whoever does not grow it, let him pay five hundred staters...' 

The bulk of this alliance treaty between Knossos and Dreros consists of the oath to be administered to the agelaoi (line 11) by the kosmoi of Dreros at the time when the young men entered into full citizenship, probably during a festival. Unusually, no deities which can be specifically assigned to Knossos are included, but rather the list seems
composed of deities either particular to Dreros or commonly found in the other Cretan treaty oaths.\textsuperscript{1} As a consequence, for the first time in these oaths Hestia is qualified specifically as ‘in the prytaneum.’ This Drerian prytaneum has been identified, albeit provisionally as a building to the southwest of the agora. North of this building and on the western side of the agora is a Geometric building identified as the Delphinion in which the list of those under penalty was to be published (line 117).\textsuperscript{2} New also to the oaths of Crete are Phoinix and Amphione (lines 31-32), the heroes and heroines (line 33), Ge, Ouranos (lines 31-32) and the springs and the rivers (lines 34-35).

Phoinix was an ancestor of Minos and Rhadamanthys.\textsuperscript{3} Amphione is not otherwise known.\textsuperscript{4} The inclusion of Ge and Ouranos, along with Helios (line 28) recalls the invocation of traditional short lists of ‘cosmic’ deities who served as the constant witnesses to the fidelity of those who swore it. The addition of the springs and rivers seems also to operate within this context.\textsuperscript{5}

The various provisions of the oath have been linked with the historical circumstance surrounding its first performance. Dated roughly to the time of the Lyttian War (221-219 B.C.) the explicit hostility to Lyttos, in addition to the strong statements renouncing \textit{stasis} and the betrayal of Drerian or Knossian fortresses (lines 46-70) show the desire to prevent events like those then taking place in Gortyn from occurring in Dreros.\textsuperscript{6} This frame would also explain the number of \textit{agelaoi} who participated in the

\textsuperscript{1} Chaniotis (1996: 197).
\textsuperscript{2} The attribution of functions for both these buildings have been doubted by Miller (1978: 93-98).
\textsuperscript{3} \textit{RE} 20, 1, cols. 412-414, s.v. Phoinix.
\textsuperscript{4} \textit{RE} I, 2, cols. 1948-1949, s.v. Amphiona.
\textsuperscript{5} Cf. the oaths of Homer or the cases where Poseidon is sometimes substituted for Apollo, Rudhardt (1992: 205). If the connection between springs, rivers and the young in the oath were operative, one might then have reasonably expected to find it as more of a widespread phenomenon in the Cretan treaty oaths.
\textsuperscript{6} For a summary of the events, evidence and debates of the situation in Gortyn at this time, see Chaniotis (1996: 33-35).
first swearing of the oath, which as Chaniotis has rightly pointed out, is too round to have been the total number of young men in Dreros between the ages of eighteen and twenty.\textsuperscript{7} Rather these \textit{agelaoi} must have been only a portion, drawn as a representation either according to the tribes or the three years of ephebic service, while the others remained on active duty on the frontier. In contrast, the stipulations for future administrations of the oath require that it be taken by all at the end of their service (line 97-100).

The final lines of this inscription contain the curious mention of what has been interpreted by Detienne as a ritual and a duty attending ephebes not only in Dreros but also Sparta and Athens, to be performed on the first day of the new year which would also presumably mark the entrance of the new magistrates into office.\textsuperscript{8}

\textsuperscript{7} Chaniotis (1996: 199).
Eleutherna


3rd century B.C.

[-----------------------------]Α[-----------------------------]
[-----------------------------]ώΤώΝ[-----------------------------]
[-----------------------------]ταύρον καὶ κριόν καὶ κάπρον[-----------------------------]
[-----------------------------]τὰ ὑπερμηνεία[-----------------------------]

[-----------------------------]"Ορκος.] Ναὶ τὸν Ζη[να τὸν 'Αγο]-
[ραΐον· ναὶ τὸν Ζῆνα τὸν Βιδά]ταν· ναὶ [τὸν Ζῆνα τὸν]
["Οράτριον;· ναὶ τὸν Ζῆνα τὸν Θεβά[ταν· ναὶ τᾶν 'Ισ]-
[τίαν;· ναὶ τὰν "Ηραν· ναὶ τᾶν 'Αθαναίαν τὰν Πο]-
[λιάδα· ναὶ τὸμ] Ποτειδᾶ· ναὶ [τὸν 'Απέλλωνα τὸν]

[Δελφίνιον· ναὶ τὸν 'Απέλλ[ωνα τὸμ Πύτιον;· ναὶ]
[τὸν 'Απέλλων τὸμ Βιλκώ[νιον· ναὶ τὸν 'Απέλλ]-
[ωνα τὸν Σασθραίον· ναὶ [τὰν "Αρτεμῖν;· ναὶ τὸν]

"Αρεα· ναὶ τὰν 'Αφροδίτ[αν· ναὶ τὰν Λατών;· ναὶ τὸ]-
I quote the reading of Effenterre in full.

[ν Ἐρμᾶν· ναί τὸν Ἀλιον?]-----------------------------

[-------------------α-----------------------------]

[---------------]ωτων[-----------------------------]

[---------------]ν καὶ κάπρ[-----------------------------]

[---------τὰ ύ]περμηρίδια [-----------------------------]

5 [---------------] Ναί τὸν Ζήνα τὸν Κρηταγενία· ναί τὸν Ζήνα τὸν Ταλι-[
[λαιον· ναί τὸν Ζήνα τὸν Βιδᾶ]ταν· ναι [τὸν Ζήνα τὸν Δικτάιον· ναι τὸν Ζήνα τὸν]

[Σκυλλίον· ναί τὸν Ζήνα τὸν Θενά[ταν ναι τὸν Ζήνα τὸν Ἄγοραίον·

ναι τάν Ἡραν:] [ναι τάν Ἔλευθεριαν· ναι ταν Ἀθαν[αίαν τᾶν Σκυλλίαν· ναι τᾶν Ἁθαν-

αίαν τᾶν Ἁγο]-[
[ραίαν· ναι τὸμ] Ποτειδά· ναι [τὸν Ἀπέλλωνα τὸν Λυκῆιον· ναι τὸν]

ἀπέλλωνα τὸν]

10 [Δελ]φίνιον· ναί τὸν Ἀπέλλ[ωνα τὸμ Πύτιον· ναι τὸν Ἀπέλλωνα τὸν

Καρνητό· ναι] [τὸν Ἀπέλλωνα τὸμ Βιλκὼ[νιον· ναι τὸν Ἀπέλλωνα τὸν Στυρακίταν·

ναι τὸν Ἀπέλ]-[
[λωνα τὸν Σασθραῖον· ναι [τᾶν Λατῶν· ναι τᾶν Ἀρτεμιν τῶν Ἀγρο-

tέραν· ναι τὸν]
...a bull and a ram and (the) fruit ... the upper thighs ... Oath: By Zeus Agoraios and Zeus Idaios and Zeus Oratrios and Zeus Thenatas, by Hestia and by Hera, by Athena Polias, by Poseidon, by Apollo Delphinios, by Apollo Pythios, by Apollo Bilonios, by Apollo Sasthrais, by Artemis, by Ares, by Aphrodite, by Leto, by Hermes, by Helios...'

Evidently these are the last stipulations of a treaty and the beginning of an oath with a list of gods. The poor state of the text has given rise to two principal conjectures regarding the list of deities included in the oath. The version of van Effenterre, based on his assumption that this was an oath of the Cretan koinon, is composed largely of local gods including Zeus and Apollo with seven different epithets included for each. This brings the total number of gods and goddesses to twenty-eight which far exceeds that of any other extant Cretan oath. The more conservative restoration of Chaniotis, preferred here, eliminates the epithets of Skylia and Agoraia, which are not attested for Athena on Crete, and in particular the oaths of Crete. This same reason motivates his striking of the epithets Karneios, Lykeios and Styrikas for Apollo and Agrotora for Artemis.¹

Zeus Agoraios is invoked near the beginning of several Cretan oaths and it may easily be assumed that the word ‘agora,’ which was used on Crete as a general term

¹ For the discussion of the inscription as a whole, see Chaniotis (1996: 190-195).
meaning ‘assembly,’ had not entirely lost this sense even in the third century B.C.\textsuperscript{2} Chaniotis has grouped this divinity as well as Athena Polias (Poliouchos) under the general heading of “Schutzgottheiten.”\textsuperscript{3} Evidence for the worship of Zeus Thenatas has been discovered near Amnisos in Knossian territory, which lends support to the notion that it was this city which was involved in the oath.\textsuperscript{4} Apollo Delphinios could then be the god of Knossos whose temple served as the site of publication for a late third century decree concerning Teos.\textsuperscript{5} Apollo Bikonios and Apollo Sasthraios are both local divinities of Eleutherna about whose worship very little else is known.\textsuperscript{6} Ares and Aphrodite form a pair common in the Cretan oaths, while the rest of the gods and goddesses are restored on a similar basis.

\textsuperscript{2} Willetts (1962: 234).
\textsuperscript{3} Chaniotis (1996: 68-69).
\textsuperscript{5} ICret I, 8 lines 12-13.
\textsuperscript{6} Chaniotis (1996: 192-193).
Gortyn


3rd century B.C.

[Ἐ]πὶ τῶν Δεκ[-----ων τῶν σύν---------]
κορμιόντων, ια[ρογούντος δὲ---------]
Σόραχος Φείδ[------------------------]
'Ιπποκλείδας [--------------------------]

5 Πραξίας 'Αρισ[τ------------------------]
Φιλόσταρτος [--------------------------]
Μάγως Ευμά[στ------------------------]
Κόρμοι δεύτε[ρον παρ' Ἀρκάθη vac.?]
Κλέαρχος Νικο[λ------------------------]

10 Κάρτον Κλεω[ν------------------------]
τάδ' ὁμοσαν ο[i Ἀρκάδες Γορτυνίοις και οἱ Γορτύνιοι]
'Αρκάθη ναι τά[ν Ἰστίαν καὶ Τήνα Βιδάταν καὶ Τήν]-
n' Ἀγοραῖον καὶ [Τήν Ὀράτριαν κήραν καὶ Ἀθανάιαν]

232
Πολιούχον κατέλλογα Πύθιον καὶ Λατών κάρτεμιν]

κήνυάλιον κἀρ[εα κάφροδίταν----------]

Editorial Notes: line 12-13. [--Τῆ]ν' Ἀγοραῖον καὶ [*Ἀθαναίαν] Halbherr;
ναὶ τὰ[ν ἱστίαν καὶ Τῆ]ν' Ἀγοραῖον καὶ [*Ἠραν κάθαναίαν] Blass;
Τ[ὰ]ν' Δειτερα; [τὰν Ἀθαναίαν] Αλθ.


‘In the kosmoi-ship of the (tribe) Dec ... together with ... and with so-and-so
serving as hierourgos (the kosmoi were) Soarchus ... (son of ?) Pheid ... Hippocleides ...
Praxias, (son of ?) Arist ... Philostartus ... Magos, (son of ?) Eumnastus ... kosmoi for
the second time among the Arcadians? ... Clearchus, (son of ?) Nicol ... Carto, (son of ?)
Cleon ... The Arcadians to the Gortynians and the Gortynians to the Arcadians swore thus
... By Hestia and Zeus Idaios and Zeus Agoraios and Zeus Oratrios and Hera and Athena
Poliouchos and Apollo Pythios and Leto and Artemis and Enyalios and Ares and
Aphrodite ...’

This inscription records an oath between the Gortynians and the Arcadians. Given
the fragmentary state of the inscription, the conditions of the establishment and the taking
of this oath are not known. Furthermore, as the lengths of the lines of the original are
likewise unknown, it cannot be said with certainty how many names followed the
opening formula. Nonetheless, the list of the kosmoi is generally divided between those
of Gortyn (lines 1-7) and those of Arcadia (lines 8-10) based on the number of kosmoi and the prosopographical evidence from Arcadia itself.\(^1\) The restoration of ύλοργούντος δὲ (line 2) is based on the reading of Chaniotis.\(^2\) The hierourgos, of Gortyn was a member of the kosmoi who was charged with the performance of special sacral duties, including, presumably, the oath ceremony here.

Enyalios appears here for the first and only time in the Cretan treaty oaths as a result of the veneration afforded by either one or both the parties involved.\(^3\)


2\(^{nd}\) century B.C.

Treaty between the cities of Priansus, Gortyn and Hierapytna. Only the lines mentioning the goddess are reproduced below.

A

[Π]ριανσιέως Γόρτυνι (καὶ Ἱεραπύτναι). Ὡρκος Π[ριανσιέων Γορτύνιοις καὶ Ἱεραπύτνιοις]
[Ωμ]υώ τὰυ Ἰστίαυ καὶ Ττῆνα [Βιδάταυ καὶ Ττῆνα Ἀγοραίου καὶ Ττ-
ηνα]
[Σκ]ύλιον καὶ Ττῆνα Ὄρατριου κ[αί Ἡραν καὶ Ἀθαναίαν Πολιάδα καὶ
[Ἀθα]-
[ν]αίαν Ὄλεριαν καὶ Ἀπόλλων[a Πῦθιον καὶ Λατώ καρτεμιν κάρεα καὶ
[Ἀ]-
60 [φρο]δίταυ καὶ Ἐρμᾶν Δακύτιον καὶ Κωρήτας καὶ Νύμφαν καὶ Ἐλεύ]-
[θυιαν Βινατίαν καὶ θίσι πάντας καὶ πάνσας. κτλ.

Β
[αύτοι τε καὶ γενεά, οἱ δὲ θεοὶ μήτε εὔνοι μή]τε χίλεοι ἀμῖν εἰεν. Ἡ[ρ]κος
Γ[όρ]-
[τυνίων καὶ Ἰαραπυνίων τοῖς Πριανσεύσιν] ὀμνύω τὰυ Ἰστίαυ καὶ
Τ[τῆ]-
[να Βιδάταυ καὶ Ττῆνα Ἀγοραίου καὶ Τ]τῆνα Σκύλιον καὶ Ττῆνα Ἡ-[τριον καὶ Ἡραν καὶ Ἀθαναίαν Πολιάδα] καὶ Ἀθαναίαν Ὅλεριαν καὶ[
[Ἀ]-
75 [πόλλωνα Πῦθιον καὶ Λατώ καρτεμιν κάρεα]α κάφροδίταυ καὶ Ἐρμᾶν
Δα[κύ]-
[τιον καὶ Κωρήτας καὶ Νύμφαν καὶ Ἐλεύ]θυιαν Βινατίαν καὶ θίσι [πάν-
τας]
[καὶ πάνσας· συμμαχησὴν τοῖς Πριανσεύσι]ν τὸν ἀπαντὰ χρόνον [ἀπ-
λόως κάδολως]
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Editorial Notes:

line 57. [Μοννίτιον] Guarducci.

[βιδάταν καὶ Ττὴνα Δικταῖον καὶ Ττὴνα] Blass.


line 60. Δακύτ[ιων] or Δακύτ[ινον] Maiuri; Δακυτρ- Bergmann; [κ]αὶ Κύρβαντας καὶ Κωρήτας καὶ Νύμφας] Blass.

‘…The oath of the Prianseans to the Gortynians and the Hierapytnians: I swear by Hestia and Zeus Ιδαίος and Zeus Αγοράιος and Zeus Σκυλίως and Zeus Ορατρίος and Hera and Athena Πολιας and Athena Ολερία and Apollo Πυθίως and Leto and Artemis and Ares and Aphrodite and Hermes Δακύτιος and (the) Curetes and (the) Nymphs and Eileithyia Ινατία and all the gods and goddesses…’

‘…The oath of the Gortynians and the Hierapytnians to the Prianseans: I swear by Hestia and Zeus Ιδαίος and Zeus Αγοράιος and Zeus Σκυλίως and Zeus Ορατρίος and Hera and Athena Πολιας and Athena Ολερία and Apollo Πυθίως and Leto and Artemis and Ares and Aphrodite and Hermes Δακύτιος and (the) Curetes and (the) Nymphs and Eileithyia Ινατία and all the gods and goddesses…’

This treaty between the cities of Gortyn and Hierapytna on the one side, and Priansus on the other, enjoined Priansus to follow the foreign policy of Gortyn and Hierapytna both in war (even offensive wars) and peace. In return, Priansus was granted the aid of Gortyn and Hierapytna in defensive wars and received their guarantee to
maintain the present borders of the city (lines 7-16, 61-66, 77-81). A further clause, although fragmentary appears to have abolished taxes on goods brought overland while upholding the collection of duties on merchandise by sea (lines 32-37). A reference to a *thiasos* and a festival named the Pythia, perhaps at Gortyn, indicate that there was included as well some reciprocity in religious matters (line 37-39).

With relation to the gods presented her, *Zeus Idaios* is mentioned in no other treaty between these states, but is present in those of Lyttos, Olous, Eleutherna and Knossos. The shrine of *Zeus Idaios* mentioned in this agreement (lines 22-23) may have been on the border between Priansus and Gortyn, but the restoration of the cult title here is based its general importance for Crete as a whole. For *Zeus Agoraios*, Guarducci has preferred instead to supply *Monnitos* as *Zeus* was worshipped with this epithet as the chief deity of Malla on whose coinage he appears during the second century B.C. Although Malla lies closer to Hierapytna than Lyttos, Chaniotis has attributed a greater importance to the worship of this god by the Lyttians, whose ephebes annually attended a festival there.

Hera, Athena *Patrias*, Apollo, Leto, Artemis, Ares, Aphrodite and even the Curetes and the Nymphs are found generally in the treaties of Crete. Athena *Oleria* pertained to the city of Olerus, at this time subject of Hierapytna, as Eileithyia *Inatia* pertained to the city of Inatos, at this time subject to Priansus, and employed as the port of the latter city. *Apollo Pythios* was the chief divinity of Gortyn. The cult of *Zeus*

---

4 The borders are explained in detail in lines 16-32 of the inscription.
8 Willetts (1962: 171-172).
Skylios was located on the border between Priansus and Gortyn and may belong to either one or both of these parties. The etymology of this name has given rise to numerous hypotheses, none of which has proven sufficiently convincing. Hermes Dakytios appears also to have been a local deity but again the source of this epithet remains unknown.


c.a. 200/189 or 216/204

[-----------------------------------------------άναγιν]
[νωσκόντων δ]έ τάν συνθήκαν [κατ' ενιαυτόν Γόρτυνι μὲν τοίς-----]
[Συβριτίων π]αριόντων, Συβρίτ[i] δέ ἐν τοῖς ----------------οίς]
[Γορτυνίων] παριόντων: πρ[οπαραγγελλόντων δὲ ἀλλάλοις οἱ κόρμιοι]
[οι τόκ'] ἀεὶ κορμίοντες [προδέκανον? ἢ κα μέλλωντι ἀναγινώσκειν αἱ]
5 [δὲ μὴ προ]παραγγελαίειν ἢ τ[άν συνθήκαν μὴ ἀναγινοίειν ἢ]
[τάν στάλ]αν μὴ στῆσαιειν [ἡ ------------------------]
[-------------]ΕΣ τι τούτων ἑ[ρδοιε]ν, ἀποτεισάντων στατήρανς πεντάκα]
[τίος οἱ μὲ]ν Γορτύνιοι τοῖς Σ[υβριτίος ταῖ] πόλι οἱ δὲ Συβρίτιοι]
[Γορτυνίοι]ς τὰ πόλι. Αἱ δὲ τ[ί κα δώξη ταῖς πόλισι ἅμφοι]-

---

10 Willetts (1962: 246).
...Let them read the agreement annually at Gortyn at the ... in the presence of the Sybritans, in Sybrita at the ... in the presence of the Gortynians. Let the kosmoi in office announce to one another (the reading of the treaty) ten days? before they do the reading. And if they do not announce or read the agreement or erect the stele or ... if they do one of these things, let them pay five hundred staters, the Gortynians to the Sybritans, the Sybritans in the city to the Gortynians in the city. But if it seems best to both cities
wishing the common benefit to alter the agreement, whatever they might remove, let it be upheld neither by the gods nor by the oath, whatever they might add, let it be upheld by the gods and the oath. Let them also give ... the expense for ... unpunished ... of the citizens ... let them erect stelae ... before the first day of the month ... Oath: I swear by Hestia and Zeus Kretagenes and Zeus Agoraios and Zeus Oratrios? and Zeus Idaios and Apollo Pythios and Leto and Artemis and Hera and Athena Poliouchos and Ares and Aphrodite and Hermes and (the) Curetes and (the) Nymphs and the other gods and goddesses. I will break none of the compacts? ...’

The stipulations of this treaty are not preserved, only the oath and the requirements for its performance. The deities are those customarily invoked in the Cretan treaty oaths.
Hierapytna


2nd century B.C.

[-----------------------------------------------]

[-----------------------------------------------]ΩΝ

[-----------------------------------------------]ον. Ἀγγραψάντων

[δὲ τὰν ἵσωπολιτείαν ἐκάτεροι ἐς] στάλας λιθίνας τρεῖς κα[λ]

5 [ἀνθέντων τὰν μὲν ἐν ἱεραπύναι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὰς Ἀθανα[ι]-
[ας τὰς Πολιάδος, τὰν] δὲ ἄλλαν οἱ κατοικόντες ἱεραπύνιοι

[παρ’ Ἀρκάσιου?] ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῷ Ἀσκλαπιώ, τὰν δὲ τρίταν κοινάι

[’Ωλεροῖ] ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὰς Ἀθαναίας: αἱ δὲ τὶ κα δόξη βωλευμέ-
[νο]ις ἔπὶ τοῖς κοιναίι συμφέροντι ἐπιδιορθώσαι ἡ ἔξελεν ἢ ἐν-

10 βαλεν, ὡ τι μὲν ἐξέλοιμεν μὴ ἔνορκον ἔστω: ὡ τὶ δὲ ἐγγυράψαιμεν

ἔνορκόν τε ἔστω καὶ

ἐνθινον. vac."Ορκος. vac.'Ομνύω τὰν Ἐστίαν καὶ Τήνα ὁ Ὀράτριον καὶ

Τήνα
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Δικταίον καὶ Ἡραν καὶ Ἀθανάϊν ὑλερίαν καὶ Ἀθανάϊν Πολιάδα καὶ Ἀθανάϊν Σαμωνίαν καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα Πύτιον καὶ Λατώ καὶ Ἀρτε-
μίν καὶ Ἀρεα καὶ Ἀρρεδίταν καὶ Κωρήτας καὶ Νύμφας καὶ τὸς Κῦρβαν-
tας καὶ θεός πάντας καὶ πάσας· ἦ μᾶν ἐγὼ εὐνοησό ὁι ἐπι-
πασι ἱεραπυτύνιος τὸν ἄπαντα χρόνον ἀπλῶς καὶ ἀδόλως καὶ
tὸν αὐτὸν φίλον καὶ ἔχθρον ἔξω καὶ πολεμησό ἀπὸ χώρας παντὶ
σθένει, ὥσι καὶ οἱ ἐπίπαντες ἱεραπύτυνοι, καὶ τὸ δίκαιον δωσό καὶ
ἐμμενῶ ἐν τοῖς συγκεκιμένοις καὶ οὐ κακοτεχνησό ὦ θεῦ τῶν

ἐν ταῦτα ταῖς ἱσοπολιτείαις γεγραμένων οὕτε λόγῳ οὕτε ἔργῳ
οὐδὲ ἄλλῳ ἔπιπραγῷ ἐκῶν καὶ γινώσκων παρευρέσει οὐδεμία
οὐδὲ τρόπωι οὐθεν. Αἰ δὲ τι ἐπιορκήσασιμι τῶν ὁμοσά ἢ τῶν συνθε-
θέμαν, τῶς τε θεὸς τῶς ὁμοσά ἐμμάνιας ἦμεν καὶ ἐξολύσθαι
κακίστωι ὀλέθρῳ καὶ μήτε γὰν μήτε δεύνδρεα καρπός φέρεν μή-

τε γυναῖκας τίκτειν κατὰ φύσιν, τῶι τε πολέμωι νικήσθαι. εὐορ-
kώσι δὲ ἅμιν τῶς τε θεὸς ἱλέος ἦμεν καὶ γινέσθαι πάντα ἀγαθά.

Editorial Notes: line 11-12 Τάνα Βόεκχ, Καυέρ; Θήνα Δειτερς; Φράτριον
Βόεκχ; Ὄρατριον Καυέρ.

line 13 Σαμωνίαν Δειτερς, Γουάρδυκκι; Σαλμωνίαν Βόεκχ, Βλάσσ.
third in common in Olerus in the shrine of Athena. But if it should seem best to those who wish to make an amendment for some common advantage, either to annul or to make an addition, that which we annul let it not be protected by the oath. But that which we have amended let it be both protected by the oath and sacred. The Oath. I swear by Hestia and Zeus Oratrios and Zeus Diktaios and Hera and Athena Oleria and Athena Polias and Athena Samonia and Apollo Pythios and Leto and Artemis and Ares and Aphrodite and (the) Curetes and (the) Nymphs and the Corybantes and all the gods and goddesses; I will respect all the Hierapynans forever, simply and without guile, and I will hold the same friends and enemies (as they do) and I will fight with all (my) strength from (my) territory, where all the Hierapynans (fight), I will be held liable and I will abide by the existing compacts and I will contrive no harm against the provisions written in this isopoliteia either in word or deed. Nor by any pretense or in any manner will I willingly and knowingly turn against (it). But if in any way I may be foresworn of any of the things which I have sworn or agreed to, (let) the gods by whom I have sworn be enraged and destroy with the worst destruction and (let) neither the earth nor the trees bear fruit, nor the women give birth as is natural, nor (let me) be victorious in war. But to us faithfully observing the oath (let) the gods be propitious and (let) there be all good things."

Found in Hierapytna, this inscription forms the conclusion of a treaty establishing isopoliteia between the people of that city and another group of Hierapynans living elsewhere in a locale not preserved on the stone. The stone as it is, holds only the agreement concerning the isopoliteia, the publication of the treaty, the possibility of
future amendments and the oath of the Hierapytnan settlers. This oath bears certain similarities with that included in the treaty between Hierapytna and Lyttos (115). The primary difference lying in the use of the word συμμαχησο, 'I will fight with,' (115, line 15) and ευνοησο, 'I will respect,' (114, line 15). Chaniotis links the difference with the fact that the inscription above is between two populations of the same citizenship, although it is evident that Hierapytna is the mother city.

The places of publication were the shrine of Athena Polias in Hierapytna, the shrine of Asclepius in the place where the other Hierapytnans settled, and the shrine of Athena Oleria. Oerus was, in all probability the location of the old city center of the Hierapytnans, and thus held a special sacral significance for the inhabitants of both cities as their religious center, and Athena Oleria appears only in the treaty oaths of Hierapytna.

While the rest of the gods of the oath are familiar from other Cretan oaths of the time, the Corybantes, like Athena Oleria, may have shared in a special relationship with the Hierapytnans, as Stephanus of Byzantium records that the old name of Hierapytna was Kyrba, after their foundational hero, Kyrbas. The mentioning of other local gods venerated in eastern Crete, such as Zeus Diktaios and Athena Samonia, may also have served to cement the ties between the mother city and its wayward citizens. The inclusion

---

2 The sole firm indication of the location of these Hierapytnan settlers is this shrine of Aesclepius and on this basis, speculations regarding the possible sites has thus ranged widely. See Chaniotis (1996: 436-438) for a summary of these conjectures and his own arguments for the situation of the other Hierapytnans in the territory of Arcadia.
of these divinities also seems to date the inscription to the time after Hierapytna had destroyed its chief rival to the east, Praisos, in 145 B.C.\textsuperscript{4}

115 Blue-gray limestone stele in two fragments, the upper part is now lost. It was in Venice until the end of the nineteenth century. The lower part is in the museum of Venice (inv. 53). Eds. Tores y Ribera, \textit{Antiquitates cretenses} p. 76; Le Bas, \textit{RPh} 1 (1845) p. 268 no. 2; Naber, \textit{Mnemosyne} 1 (1852), 11 p. 105. (Michel, \textit{Recueil} 29; Blass, \textit{SGDI} 5041); Guarducci, \textit{ICret} III iii 3B ph. ibid.; A. Chaniotis \textit{Verträg} (1996) no. 26 pp. 241-245 with full bibliography.

\textit{post} 205 B.C.

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\ldots\ldots\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]

\[\text{\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots}\]
'Ιεραπυτνίοις ταῖ πόλει. Ὅ τι δὲ καὶ δόξη ταῖς πόλεσιν ἐξελευ ἢ ἐνθέμεν, ὡ τι μὲν ἐξέλοιμεν μὴ ἔνθινον μὴ—
tε ἐνορκοῦ ἡμεν, ὧ τι δὲ ἐγγράψαμεν ἐνθινόν τε ἡμεν καὶ ἐνορκοῦ. Εἰ δὲ
tὶ κα θεῶν ἤλεον ὄντων λάβω—
μεν ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων, λαγχανόντων κατὰ τὸ τέλος ἐκάτεροι: μὴ ἐξησ—
tω δὲ ἱδίαι μὴ ἐπολέμουν ἐ—
χφέρεσθαι χωρὶς μὴ ἔφηναν τίθεσθαι, αἱ κα μὴ ἀμφοτέροις δόξη. Αἱ δὲ
tινὲς κα ἱδίαι ἐξενέγκωνται,

αὐτοὶ καὶ διαπολεμόντως, καὶ μὴ ἐνορκοὶ ἐστῶν οἰ μὴ συμπολεμόντες.

Στασάντων δὲ τὰς στάλας ἐκά—
tεροι ἐν τοῖς ἴδιοις ἱεροῖς, οἱ μὲν 'Ιεραπύτνιοι Ὑλεροὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς, τὰν

δὲ ἐν Ἀπόλλωνι, οἱ δὲ Λυττίοι ἐν τοῖς ἱ—
εροὶ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνας καὶ ἐμ πόλει ἐν 'Ἀθαναίᾳ στασάντων δὲ καὶ κοι—

νὰν στάλαν ἐν Γόρτυν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς
tῶ[......]. Ὁρκος Λυκτίων οἱμυῶ τὰν Ἐστῖαν καὶ Ζηνα Ὀράτριον καὶ

'Ἀθαναίαν Ὑλερίαν καὶ Ζηνα
Μον[νίτιον καὶ Ἡ]ραν καὶ 'Ἀθαναῖν Πολιάδα καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα Πύτιον
καὶ Λατῶ καὶ ᾿Αρεα καὶ ᾿Αφροδίτα καὶ Κωρη—
tὰς [καὶ Νύμφα]ς καὶ θεῶς πάντας καὶ πάσας: ἣ μᾶν ἐγὼ συμμαχησῶ

tοίς Ἰεραπύτνιοις τὸν πάντα χρό—

νον ἄπλι]όως καὶ ἀδόλως καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν φίλον καὶ ἐχθρὸν ἔξω καὶ πο—

λεμησῶ ἀπὸ χώρας ψὲ καὶ καὶ ᾿Ιεραπύτνιος
καὶ τὸ δίκαιον δωσῶ καὶ ἐμμενῶ ἐν τοῖς συνκειμένοις, ἐμμενόντως καὶ
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τῶν ἱεραπτυνίων. Ἐπιορκόντι μὲν ἢμεν τὸς θεὸς ἐμμανίας καὶ γίνεσθαι πάντα τὰ ὑπεναντία, εὐορκώσι δὲ
tὸς θεὸς ἵλεος ἢμεν καὶ γίνεσθαι πολλά[[λ]]ὰ κἀγάθα. νας. Ὁρκος ἱεραπτυνίων ὁμισῶ τὰν Ἑστίαν καὶ Ζῆνα
Ὀράτριον καὶ Ἀθαναίαν Ὡλερίαν καὶ

Ζῆνα Μοννίτιον καὶ "Ἱραν καὶ Ἀθαναίαν Πολιάδα καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα
Πύτιον καὶ Λατώ καὶ "Ἀρεα καὶ Ἀφροδιταν καὶ Κωρήτας καὶ Νύμφας καὶ θεὸς πάντας καὶ πάσας· ἢ μᾶς ἐγὼ
συμμαχησῶ τοῖς Λυκτίοις τὸν
πάντα χρόνου ἀπλόως καὶ ἀδόλως καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν φίλον καὶ έχθρον
ἐξώ καὶ πολεμησῶ ἀπὸ χώρας νῦν
καὶ οὐ τὸ δίκαιον δωσῶ καὶ ἐμμενῶ ἐν τοῖς συνκειμένοις,
ἐμμενόντων καὶ τῶν Λυκτίων. Ἐπιορκόντι μὲν τὸς θεὸς ἐμμανίας ἢμεν καὶ γίνεσθαι πάντα τὰ ὑπεναντία,
eὐορκώσι δὲ τὸς θεо-

[ὁ]ς ἵλεος ἢμεν καὶ γίνεσθαι πολλὰ κἀγάθα.

... let the Hierapytnians go to the Lyttians to the ... and let the Lyttians (go) to the festival ... And let the kosmos of the Hierapytnians go to the archeion in Lytto. And accordingly let also the kosmos of the Lyttians go to the archeion in Hierapytna. And if the kosmoi neglect the sacrifice written, unless a war prevents it, let each kosmos pay by way of recompense one hundred silver staters, the Hierapytnians to the Lyttians in the city, and the Lyttians to the Hierapytnians in the city. But should it seem best to the cities
to do away with or make an addition, whatever we might do away with let it not be upheld by the oath, and whatever we additionally include, let it be upheld by the oath. And if, when the gods are propitious, we take something which belongs to the enemy, let them each obtain a share by lot according to cost. Let no one either declare war or make peace separately of their own accord, unless it seems best to both. But if some declare war of their own accord, let them fight alone, and let those who do not fight with them not be bound by oath. And let the steles stand for each in their own shrines, the Hierapytnians in the shrine at Olerus, and in the shrine of Apollo, and the Lyttians in the shrine of Apollo and, and in the city in the shrine of Athena. And let them set up a common stele at Gortyn in the shrine of ... The oath of the Lyttians: I swear by Hestia and Zeus Oratrios and Athena Oleria and Zeus Monnitiros and Hera and Athena Polias and Apollo Pythios and Leto and Ares and Aphrodite and (the) Curetes and (the) Nymphs and all the gods and goddesses. I will fight with the Hierapytnians forever, simply and without guile, and I will have the same friends and enemies, and I will fight offensively where the Hierapytnians do and I will submit to legal examination by the Hierapytnians and I will abide by the compacts, and at the man who is forsworn of the Hierapytnians may the gods be angered and may there be every adversity, to those who abide by the oath may the gods be propitious and may there be many good things. The oath of the Hierapytnians: I swear by Hestia and Zeus Oratrios and Athena Oleria and Zeus Monnitiros and Hera and Athena Polias and Apollo Pythios and Leto and Ares and Aphrodite and (the) Curetes and (the) Nymphs and all the gods and goddesses. I will fight with the Lyttians forever, simply and without guile, and I will have the same friends and enemies and I will fight offensively where the Lyttians do and I will submit to legal
examination and I will abide by the compacts, while the Lyttians abide by them. And at the man who is foresworn may the gods be angry and may there be every adversity for him, but to the man who abides by the oath may the gods be propitious and may there be many good things.’

This inscription was the concluding portion of a treaty between the cities of Hierapytna and Lyttos outlining the military and legal obligations to be met by both sides. In the preceding portion, alluded to in the first six lines of the stone as it is now, were most likely various religious provisions. In the second line there is mention of a festival (εὐδήμερον) and following it is the invitation of the kosmoi to the offices of the partner states.\textsuperscript{5} A sacrifice at a location not preserved, but certainly also included on the stone (ἡγραμμέναν, line 4) is attested by the enactment of a penalty attending its non-performance.

The oaths sworn here are flexible dependent upon the addition or the striking of clauses in the original compact (lines 6-7) and were not binding in campaigns that might be waged by private individuals or without the agreement of the partner state (lines 9-10). An additional stipulation regarding such privately conducted operations established the rule regarding the division of spoils by lot according to the cost incurred by the parties involved (lines 7-8).

\textsuperscript{5} The treaties of Hierapytna mention invitations to three festivals, the Heraia, the Theodaisia, and an unknown festival which began with “O,” see Chaniotis (1996: 243 n. 1386).
The oath was preserved in five copies, two by the Hierapytnians, one in the city shrine of Apollo⁶ and another in the shrine of Athena Polias at Olerus in the north of their territory. The Lyttians placed two as well, one in the city shrine of Athena Polias and another in the ‘extramural’ shrine of Apollo. The fifth copy was published jointly in the shrine of Apollo Pythios at Gortyn.⁷

---

⁶ Both Guarducci (1942: 41) and Chaniotis (1996: 244 n. 1390) link this shrine of Apollo with that of the Dodekathenon where the Twelve Gods, Apollo and Athena Polias were worshipped. ICret III, iii 9 (second century B.C.)

⁷ Guarducci (1942: 41) ascribes this publication to the preeminence of Gortyn as a regional power at the time, while Chaniotis (1996: 244) links the common publication to the fact that both Hierapytna and Lyttos had established treaties with Gortyn.
Lato


End of the 2nd/beginning of the 1st century B.C.

Treaty between the cities of Lato and Olous. Only the lines mentioning the goddess are reproduced below.

"Ὁρκὸς Λατίων· ὄμνυὼ τὰν Ἑστία[ν καὶ τὸν Ζῆνα τὸν Κρητογενεία καὶ τὰν Ἡραν καὶ τὸν Ζή]-
να τὸν Ταλλαΐον καὶ τὸν Ποσειδά[ν καὶ τὰν Ἀμφὶτρῖταν καὶ τὸν Ἀπέλ
λωνα τὸν Πύ]-
tiou καὶ Λατῶν κάρτεμιν καὶ Ἄρ[εα καὶ τὰν Ἀφροδίταν καὶ τὰν Ἑλευ-
θερίαν καὶ τὰν Βριτό]-
μαρτιν καὶ Ἑρμᾶν καὶ Κωρήτας καὶ [Νύμφας καὶ τὸς ἄλλος θίος πάντας
καὶ πάσας· ἢ
μὰν ἐγὼ τοῖς Ὀλοντίοις ἐμμε[νίω ἐν ταῖς φιλίαι καὶ συμμαχίαι καὶ ἰσοπο-
λιτείαι],
καὶ τοῖς ὄρκοις ἐμμενίῳ, κα[ὶ βοαθησίω ἀπλόως καὶ ἀδόλως καὶ κατά
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γὰν καὶ κατὰ]
[θά]λασσαν καὶ τίς κα πολε[μίων Ὄλοντίοις ἑφέρτη ἐπὶ πόλιν ἥ ἐπὶ
χώραν ἥ ἐπ' ὀρείᾳ ἥ
80 [λι]μένας τὸς τῶν Ὅλοντίων, [οῦ προλειψίῳ οὔτ' ἐν πτολέμῳ οὔτ' ἐν
eἰρήναι, ἀλλ' ἐμ]-
[με]νίω ἐν τοὺς ὀρκοὶς τοῖς σ[υγκειμένοις δίκας τε καὶ πράξεις διδωσίω
καθὼς]
[κα] συνθιώμεθα. εὐορκίο[ντι μὲν ἥμεν πολλὰ καὶ ἀγαθὰ, ἐφορκίοντι δὲ
τὰ]
[ἐν]αντία. Ὅρκος Βολοντί[ῶν ο ἀυτός].

‘...Oath of the Lattians: I swear by Hestia and Zeus Kretogenes and Hera and
Zeus Tallaios and Poseidon and Amphitrite and Apollo Pythios and Leto and Artemis
and Ares and Aphrodite and Eileithyia and Britomarpis and Hermes and (the) Curetes
and (the) Nymphs and all the other god and goddesses: I will remain beside the
Olountians in friendship, alliance and isopoliteia, and I will lend aid simply and without
guile both on land and sea; and if someone of the enemies attacks either the city or the
territory or the fortresses or the harbors of the Olountians, I will not abandon (them) in
war or in peace, but I will abide by the existing oaths; and I will submit to legal
examination and execute the judgment just as we agreed. And to him abiding by the oath
let there be many good things, and to him who is forsworn, the opposite. The Oath of the
Olountians: the same.’
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This extensive treaty between Lato and Olous is known from two copies. One, now lost, was found in western Crete near Kydonia, while the other was discovered in Venice where it was presumably brought from one of the cities involved. The treaty as a whole established isopoliteia between the two partners, set taxes, regulated trade and inter-marriage between the two, prohibited cattle rustling, outlined the division of spoils, and instituted a common foreign policy to be jointly decided.

The oath itself was to be administered for the first time by the kosmoi to the young men then in the agela at their departure when they assumed their full citizen rights.¹ In Lato, this ceremony was to be performed at the Theodaisia, but the occasion at Olous is not preserved. Non-compliance with this stipulation was punishable by a fine of one hundred silver staters. Visiting kosmoi were to be received at the prytaneion (line 31). The kosmoi of Lato were specifically invited to the festivals of the Theodaisia and the Britomarpeia at Olous, likewise the kosmoi of Olous were invited to the Theodaisia and a festival whose name has not survived at Lato. The copies of the oath were to be kept in the shrines of Eileithyia in Lato, in Olous in that of Zeus Tallaios, with additional copies at Knossos in the shrine of Apollo Delphinios and at Lyttos in the shrine of Athena. Chaniotis has linked the publication in these last two cities in the case of Knossos to the alliance of this city with Lato and their assistance in the negotiations which ended in this treaty, while Lyttos was allied both with Lato and Olous.²

¹ Ἐξορκιζόντων δὲ καὶ τὰν ἀγέλαν τὰν τόκ’ ἐσθομέναν; έν ἐκατέραι τὰί/πόλει [5] ἐπεί κ’ ἐγραφόμενοι οἱ κόσμοι ἐπ’ αὐτῶν κο[α]μίου[ον]. 'Let the kosmoi in charge of them administer the oath to the exiting agela in each city when they exit.' (lines 20-21) For other restorations, see Chaniotis (1996: 360).

Undated.

[\'Aγαθὴι τύχαι. Ἐπὶ τῶν [-----ων]

[kοσμιόντ]ων, Λίργω τῶ Πολ[--------]

[........]τῶ Κόρθυνος, Σωμυλ[-----]

[........]ὕχῳ τῶ Δαμοκάρτιος [-------]

5 [... τῶ Δαμ]ιοκάρτιος, Ἰογοράτω τῶ Ἰσ[---]

[.......τῶ] Δαμιοχάριος, Ἰστίαι ε[ύ]-

[χὰν καὶ] χα[ριστηία.

'To Agathe Tyche. In the *kosmoi*-ship of the ... Lirgos, son of Pol ... tos, son of Korthys, Somyl ... son of ... ychos, son of Damocartes ... son of Damocartes, Agoratos, son of Is ... son of Nemoneios, *grammateus* ... tos, son of Damocharis, a vow and a thank-offering to Hestia.'

This votive on behalf of the *kosmoi* of Lato lists the seven members who then held the post as well as that of their *grammateus*. While a number of similar lists exist, this one remains undated. The list includes what appear to be the name of two brothers, both sons of Damocartes (lines 5-6) which underlies the closed nature of these civic
magistracies. The Hellenistic prytaneion of Lato has been unearthed to the north of the agora, with remnants of what may have been a hearth. From the inscriptional evidence it is evident that this was the location used for the storage of certain documents. Whether this votive originally found its place there is unknown.

---

Lyttos

Three fragments of a Pentelic marble stele found in Athens on the Acropolis now in the Epigraphical Museum. Eds. frags. b and c Voretsch (1872) pp. 268 and 277; Ziebarth (1892) pp. 24-25; Deiters (1904) 51; Kirchner IG II 549 (SGDI 5147). Frag. a suppl. by A. Wilhelm; SBWien 180 (1917) Abh. II pp. 30-32. The whole in Kirchner, IG II² 1135 (Guarducci, ICrete I xviii 9); Kontorini (1983) pp. 36-37; Chaniotis, Verträge (1996) no. 60 pp. 352-358.

111/10 B.C.

Treaty between the Lyttians and the Olountians. Only the lines relevant to the goddess are reproduced below.

c

[-----]ΩΙΣ. vac. "Ορκος Λυπτίων [ὁμνύω τὰν ἱστίαν καὶ Τήνα Κρητα-γενία καὶ Τήνα Ὀρά]-

5 [τρισιν καὶ] [Τ]ήνα λιδάταν καὶ Τήνα [Ταλλαίον καὶ τὰν Ἦραν καὶ

'Αθαναίαν Πολιάδα]

[νύφας καὶ] τὰν ἴριδόμαρπιν καὶ τὸς ἀλλὸς θίος πάντας καὶ πάσας.

νν. Ἡ μὰν ἐγὼ ἐμμενίω

[ἐν ταῖς φιλίαι καὶ [συ]μμαχίαι καὶ ἰσοπο[λιτείαι καὶ ἐπιγαμίαι καὶ τοῖς

ἀλλοῖς πᾶσι τοῖς ἑν]

[ταῖς συνθήκαις γ[εγρ]αμμένοις ἐς τό[ν πάντα χρόνου ἀπλόως καὶ ἀδό-

λως, καὶ οὗ ποικα προ-]

10 [λειψὼ τὸς Βολοε[ν]τίος οὔτ’ ἐν πολέμῳ οὔτ’ ἐν εἰρήνα καὶ """

τοῖς Βολοεντίοις]

[ὡσπερ ἐμών αὐ[τῷ] ὑπὲρ τε θίων κ[αὶ ἀνθρωπίνων. Καθεξ[ῳ δὲ τάδε

πάντα καὶ οὐδέν κακό]-

[τεχνησίῳ, καθό[ς κα] συνθεώμεθα καὶ ο[ὔδε]ε[νίν ἄλλῳ εκών καὶ γινώ-

σκών """

[.ἐπὶ[τ]ραγίῳ π[αρευ]ρέσει οὐδὲμίᾶι καὶ ἐμμενίω ἐν τοῖς συνκειμένοις

ὁρκοίς, καθός κα]


θησίῳ. Εὐορκίοντι μὲν]

15 [ημεν πολλ[ὰ κάγαθα, ἐπιορ][κ[ίουτ[ι δὲ τὰ ἑναντία. να. ὁρκος Βολο]-

[ε]υτίον ὁ αὐ[τός]. vacat

Editorial Notes:

line 4 [ὁμιμόω τὰν Ἐστίαν τὰν ἐμ Πρυτα/νείκωι Voretsch; [ὁμιμόω τὰν Ἰστίαν

καὶ Τῆνα Κρηταγενεία καὶ Τῆνα] Deiters; [ὁμιμόω τὰν Ἐστίαν τὰν κ]αι Ziebarth;

[Κρηταγενεία καὶ Ἀθαναίαν/Πολίαδα] Kontorini; after Λυττίων vacat, Kirchner.
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The Oath of the Lytians: I swear by Hestia and Zeus Kretagenes and Zeus Oratrios and Zeus Idaios and Zeus Tallaios and Hera and Athena Polias and Apollo Pythios and Leto and Artemis and Ares and Aphrodite and Hermes and (the) Curetes and (the) Nymphs and Britomarpis and the other gods and goddesses. I will abide in friendship and alliance and isopoliteia and epigamia and all other things written in the agreement for all time, simply and without guile, and I will never desert the Olountians either in war or in peace and ... to the Olountians in the same manner as to myself in things both sacred and profane. I will uphold all these things and contrive no ill just as we will make an agreement with no other and willingly and knowingly... I will not betray by fraud and I will abide by the established oaths, just as the cities have agreed. And I will hold no other oath more binding than this one. Let there be many good things for the one who abides by his oath, but for he who is foresworn, the opposite. The Oath of the Olountians: the same.
This treaty establishing friendship, *isopoliteia, epigamia* and an alliance between Olous and Lyttos now exists in two copies, one erected in Athens, the other on Rhodes.\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) The reasons for the placement of these copies outside of Crete is not known. For speculations on the matter see Kontorini (1983: 40-42).

c. 201/200 B.C.

Treaty between Olous and Rhodes. Only the portions relevant to Hestia are reproduced below.

**fragment c**

μοι ὁ δὲ ὀρκὸς ἐστω [᾿Ολουντίοις· ὁμιλῶ τὴν Ἑστιάν καὶ]

[τὸν] Ζῆ[ν]α τὸν ἰδατη[ν] καὶ τὸν Ζῆνα τὸν Ταλλαίον; καὶ τὴν Ἤ]-

[ραν?] καὶ τὸν Ποσείδῳ καὶ τὸν Ἀρην καὶ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην?] καὶ τὸν Ἐρμήν καὶ τὸν Ἡλίον; καὶ τὴν Βρι]-

[τὸμαρτν?] καὶ θεοὺς παντάς καὶ πάσας· ἦ μὴν ἔγω Ῥοδίοις]

[συμμαχήσω] ἄδολως καὶ [ἀπροφασίστως εἰς τὸν ἄπαντα]

[χρόνον καὶ] ἐὰν τις ἐπὶ πόλιν ἢ χώραν στρατεύσῃ τ᾽ Ῥοδί]-

[ων ἢ τούς νόμιους ἢ τὰς προσόδους ἢ τὴν καθεστηκίαν]
‘...let the oath for the Olountians be thus: I swear by Hestia and Zeus Idaios and Zeus Tallaios and Hera and Poseidon and Ares and Aphrodite and Hermes Hegemon and Helios and Britomartis and all the gods and goddesses; I will fight with the Rhodians without guile and enthusiastically for all time, and if someone attacks either the city or the territory of the Rhodians, or if someone destroys the laws or the prosodoi or the established democracy, I will lend assistance to the Rhodians with all my strength. And if the demos of the Rhodians ... from the ...’

Dated to around the end of the first Cretan War (206-204 B.C.) this treaty was one of a series concluded by Rhodes with various Cretan cities, most likely in an attempt to neutralize them in future actions undertaken by Phillip V, Gortyn and its allies, against the island.¹ The list of deities contains two gods, Hermes Hegemon and Helios, commonly associated with Rhodes,² but which raise certain questions as to their choice here. Namely, that given the presence of Helios in other Cretan treaty oaths (109, line 28 and 110, line 14), this deity cannot be ascribed to the insistence of Rhodes alone. Hermes Hegemon, conversely, is attested not for Crete but only for Rhodes, and more

¹ Brule (1978: 54-56).
² See also however the epigraphical evidence for Hestia worship on Rhodes, 47-74.
specifically, Lindos.³ This marks only the second occasion in a Cretan treaty oath that Hermes is mentioned with a cult title⁴ The other deity with whom he is associated, Athena, is not found in this treaty nor does she occupy a place in the other treaties of Olous which could be definitively attributed to her presence in that city.

³ In an inscription dedicated to Athena Lindia and Hermes Hegemon, Morelli (1959: 44).
⁴ The other being Hermes Dakytios in the treaty between Gortyn, Hierapytna and Priansos, 112 lines 60 and 75-76.
Entella


Beginning of the 3rd century B.C.

vacat Ἐπὶ ιερομνάμονος

vacat Λευκίου τοῦ Πακκίου,

vacat Εὐμενιδείου ἐκταὶ ἐφ' ἱκάδα.

ἐδοξε ταὶ ἀλίαι καθὰ καὶ ταὶ βουλαῖ·

5 ἐπειδὴ οἱ Ἐρβίταιοι ὁκα τὸ πρότερον τὰμ

πόλιν ταῦταν ὁικέομες πολέμου κα-

tασταθέντος ποτὶ Καρχαδονίους ἐ-

[β]ιασᾶν ταὶ πόλει ταὶ ἀμαὶ ἐνόρ-

κιοὶ τε ἐγέννωτο, ὀμοίως δὲ καὶ νῦν ἔξ ὦ

10 τὰν πόλιν οἰκέομες ἐς τὸ ἐμφανὲς

ποιοὺντι ὧτι μέμναν νας. ταὶ τὰς

φιλίας καὶ εὐνοίας τὰς ποτὶ ἀμέ,

δεδόχαι ἀναθέμειν εἰς χάλκωμα

grάφαντας εἰς τὸ ιερὸν τὰς ἱερὶς

15 τὰν εὐνοιαν καὶ συμμαχίαν τὰν ύ-
πάρχουσαν ἁμῖν ποτὶ τοὺς Ἐρβιταίους καὶ κατακαλεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς εἰς τοὺς ἀγώνας καὶ συνθέναι αὐτοῖς, ὡς εἰς τὸ ἐμφανὲς ποιῶμες τοῖς εἰπιγινομένοις ὡτι μνάμαν ἔχομεν τῶν ταῖ πόλει ταί ἀμαί ταῖ χρείας παρισχημένων.

Ἐρβιταίων.

'When Leukios, son of Pakkios, was hieronnemon, on the twenty-sixth day of (the month) Eumenideios. It seemed best to the helia and the boule; since the Herbitaeans, when we first lived in this city (and) when there was a war against the Carchadonians (Carthaginians), lent assistance and at the same time were faithful to their oath, and likewise now that we inhabit the city they show clearly that they remember their friendship and goodwill towards us; it has been decreed, that having inscribed on a bronze plaque our existing goodwill and alliance with the Herbitaeans, to set this up in the shrine of Hestia and to call them to games and to sacrifice with them so we may make evident to our posterity that we remember the support of the Herbitaeans. Regarding the Herbitaeans.'

264
Nine decrees inscribed on bronze connected with the city of Entella have recently come to light albeit in a rather left-handed fashion. Of these nine, one comes rather from the city of Nakone (III) and another has been proved a modern forgery (VII). The three inscriptions included here appear to have been issued on the same day, by the same *hieromnemon* and destined for the same shrine of Hestia. The uncertainty regarding their discovery has so far placed the location and character of this shrine almost beyond speculation. The plaques themselves, however, do furnish some clues regarding the historical circumstances regarding their publication.

The name of the *hieromnemon*, Leukios, is presumably Greek, while the name of his father, Pakkios, is Oscan. Aside from showing the multiethnic composition of the city, what is striking about the dating formulae of these three inscriptions is that they differ from the other inscriptions coming from Entella, which are dated by the eponymous archons. Furthermore, while these decrees dated by the *hieromnemon* were to be placed in the shrine of Hestia, those dated by the archons were slated for publication in the bouleuterion. This situation originally gave rise to three differing explanations of the discrepancy. The first, proposed by G. Nenci, before the discovery of Entella decree IX, saw the difference as arising from the nature of the documents themselves, i.e. decrees relating to internal affairs were dated by archons and deposited in the bouleuterion, while those dealing with foreign relations were dated by the *hieromnemon*.

---

1 The questions surrounding these documents, their discovery and publication, is long and need not be treated here. For a summary, see Loomis (1994: 127-160).
4 ‘In the archonship of Kipos, son of Soios and Theodorus, son of Mamos, on the thirtieth (of the month) Eumenideios,’ IV, lines 1-3. ‘In the archonship of Artemidorus, son of Eielos, and Gnaios, son of Oppios, on the first (of the month) of Panamus,’ V, VIII, IX, lines 1-6.
and placed in the shrine of Hestia. The discovery of document IX, in 1987, a grant of
isopoliteia by the Entellans to the Segestans, caused only a slight nuancing of this idea by
Nenci, who then saw the deposition of the documents in the shrine of Hestia, as the
motivation for the dating, without entirely renouncing the idea that different kinds of
documents were set in different places.

The second explanation, proposed by M. Giangiulio again asserted that the nature
of the documents gave rise to different dating systems, but rather than placing the
division between external and internal affairs, the distinction was drawn between old and
new decrees. Those documents dated by the hiermnemon were renewals and their
location in the shrine of Hestia was concordant with the use of that other notable place of
Hestia worship, the prytaneion, as a reliquary for the memorabilia of the polis.

The third hypothesis, which has since gained the majority of support, however,
postulated a change in the constitution of Entella, with a corresponding change in the
eponymous magistrate. Nonetheless, I find this unsatisfactory because of the
insufficiency of the argument; namely, the dating system changed because of a different
constitutional system, which is evidenced only by a change of dating system. In addition,
this supposition has been severely undercut by the new examination and re-editing of
document VI by W.T. Loomis, who has chosen instead to follow Giangiulio in asserting
that old decrees were dated by the hieromnemon and placed in the shrine of Hestia, while
new grants were dated by the archon and deposited in the bouleuterion.

---

6 Nenci (1987: 128 n. 22), the reference to Giangiulio there, however, is incorrect.
7 Giangiulio (1982: 968).
I agree with the position of Giangiulio and Loomis, on the difference between old and new decrees, but not for the reasons put forth by the former, that the prytaneion served as a 'reliquary,' or as "quasi-archives, more for interesting memorabilia of past events in the city’s history than for historical or political documents."\textsuperscript{10} Rather, it seems more logical to search for the rationale of date and deposition not in the place, the shrine of Hestia, but in the person of the hieromnemon.

The now recovered tablets of Entella describe their war against the Carthaginians and the flight of their citizens into the neighboring states. It is no stretch of the imagination to think that if the records of Entella were not utterly destroyed, they had suffered such substantial damage that the service and sanction of the hieromnemon were required in the process of their synoikismos, either to have direct memory of the original compact or to lend the authority of his office to what would have been obvious to all concerned, namely, that the cities allied with Entella had abided by their agreements. Notable, perhaps, in this context is that the Entellans, even after the destruction of their city, made provision for only one copy of their treaty. The reason for which may quite simply have been that human memory had proved, in the light of their recent experience, to be a far more durable stuff than stone or bronze.

\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{10} Miller (1978: 16) from whom Giangiulio (1982: 968 n. 70) drew the notion. The explication is undercut by the very examples used by Miller to support this claim.
vacat Ἐπὶ ιερομνάμονος

vacat Λευκίου τοῦ Πακκίου,

vacat Εὐμενιδείου ἐκταί ἐφ’ ἱκάδα.

ἐδοξὲ ταῖς ἀλίαις καθὰ καὶ ταῖς βου-

5 λαῖς ἐπειδὴ οἱ Γελώιοι ὁκα τὸν πρότερον τὰν πόλιν ταῦτα[ν ὤι]

κέομες πολέμου καταστάπθεν-

tος ποτὶ] Καρχαδονίους ἐβοαθό-

ησαν τὰί πόλει ταῖς ἀμαῖ ἤππεσο-

10 σι καὶ πέζοις ἐνώρκιοι τε ἐγένο[ν]το καὶ συνεβάλοντο συμμαχ[ίαν,

όμοιως δὲ καὶ νῦν ἐξ οὗ τὰμ πό-

λιν οικέομες ἐς τὸ ἐμφανὲς ποι-

οῦντι ὁτι μέμινανται τάσ φιλίας

15 καὶ εὐνοίας ταῖς ποτὶ ἀμέ, δεδό-

χθαι ἀναθέμειν εἰς χάλκωμα

γράψαντας εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τᾶς ἱστ-

ιας τῶν εὐνοιαν καὶ συμμαχ-

 iar τῶν ὑπάρχουσαν ἀμιὸν ποτὶ

20 τοὺς Γελώιους καὶ κατακαλεῖ-
σθαι αὐτοὺς εἰς τοὺς ἀγώνας καὶ
συνθέειν αὐτοῖς, ὡπως εἰς τὸ ἐμ-
φάνες ποιῶμες τοῖς ἐπιγινομέ-
νοις ὅτι μνάμαν ἔχομες τῶν ταῖ
πόλει ταῖ ἀμαί τὰς χρείας παρ-
ισχημένων.

Γελώιων.

'When Leucius, son of Paccius, was *hieromnemon*, on the twenty-sixth day of (the month) Eumenideios. It seemed best to the *helia* and the *boule*; since the Geloans, when we first founded this city (and) when there was a war against the Carchadonians (Carthaginians), lent assistance with cavalry and infantry and at the same time were bound by oath (and) entered into an alliance, and likewise now from the moment we inhabit the city they show that they remember their friendship and goodwill towards us it has been decreed that having inscribed on a bronze plaque our existing goodwill and alliance with the Geloans to set this up in the shrine of Hestia and to call them to games and to sacrifice with them so we may make evident to our posterity that we remember the support of the Geloans. Regarding the Geloans.'

vacat Ἐπὶ ἱερομνάμονος

vacat Λευκίου τοῦ Πακκίου

vacat Εὐμενίδειον ἔκται ἐφ' ἴκάδα.

[ἐδοξ]εῖ τ[ά]ι ἀλίαι καθα καὶ τά[𝑖 βο]ιλαί:

5 ἐ[πει]βή ἐν τε τοῖς ἐμπροσθον χρό-νο[ι]ς ὑπάρχει ἀμῖν ἱσοπολιτεία
ποτὶ τοὺς Ἀσσωρίνους, ὁμοίως δὲ
καὶ νῦν τὰμ πόλιν ἀμῖν συνοικι-
ξόντων χρείας παρέχονται κατὰ

10 δύναμιν, δεδόχθαι ὑπάρχειν πο-
τὶ τοὺς Ἀσσωρίνους τῶι δάμωι τῶν
Ἑντελλίνων τὰν τε ἱσοπολιτεί-
αν τὰν ἐξ ἄρχας ὑπάρχοναν
καὶ φιλίαν καὶ εὐνοιαν καὶ κατα-

15 καλεῖοθαι αὐτοὺς εἰς τοὺς ἁγῷ-
νας τὸ δὲ ἁλίσσαμα τοῦτο οἱ ἄρχο-
τες γράψαντες εἰς χάλκωμα
ἀναθέντω εἰς τὸ ιερὸν τὰς Ἰστίας,
ὡς ὑπόμνημα γίνηται τοῖς

20 ἐπιγινομένοις τὰς ὑπαρχούσας
εὔνοιας καὶ ἵσοπολιτείας ποτὶ
τοὺς Ἄσσωρίνους.

'Ἀσσωρίνων.

'When Leucius, son of Paccius, was hieromnemon, on the twenty-sixth day of (the month) Eumenideios. It seemed best to the helia and the boule; since in time past there was isopoliteia for us with the Assorans, likewise also now when we inhabit the city together they provide what means they are able, it seems best that there be with the Assorans for the people of Entella the isopoliteia which there was from the start and friendship and good will and to call them to the contests. The archons, having written up this decree on a bronze tablet, let them dedicate it in the shrine of Hestia, so that there might be a memorial for those to come of the existing good will and isopoliteia towards the Assorans. Of the Assorans.'
Heraclea


4th century B.C.

Ηιστίαιαὶ αὐτῆς καὶ τὰς Ἀφροδιτίας Δορκᾶς ἀνέθηκε

‘Dorcas dedicated (this) to Hestia on behalf of herself and Aphroditia.’

The odd spelling of Hestia in the first line is probably due, as Kaibel proposed, to the error of the engraver. Nothing further relating to the cult of Hestia has come to light from this locale.
Syracuse


271-216 B.C.

A

One line illegible.

[------]ν φροντίζειν
[------] βασιλέων καὶ τὰν
[πόλιν ύμῶν καὶ τὰν Σικελίαν; συν]ίδουν πάσαν πάρ

5 [πάντα τὸν χρόνον τηροῦσαν τὰ]ν εἰς ἀμε εὐνοιαν
[διὰ τὸ ύφ' ἀμών εἰράναν καὶ τάνομον παρακευ-
[άσθαί ταί τε νάσωι καὶ Σ]υρακοσίοις, φανερόν δή
[οὐχ ύμῖν μόνον γέγονεν ἐ]ν τοσοῦτοις ἔτεις, ὡς
[οὐδενὸς τῶν βασιλέων τῶν π]ρότερον ἀγημένων

10 [τὰς Σικελίας πράξεις τη]λικαύται ὑπάρχοντι,
[ἀ]λλὰ καὶ πάσαι ταῖ Ἐλλάδι τὸ τε κοινό[---]
...to consider ... of the kings your city and Sicily?, seeing the complete goodwill towards us enduring for all time because we have provided a permanent peace, both for the island and for the people of Syracuse, it was clear not only to us in these years that the deeds of none of the previous ruling kings of Sicily are so great, but also to all Greece both ... we ...

...no power ... grant to perform ... to perform also still ... your fathers and ... to preserve the things which ...

The Oath of the boule and the strategoi, the other citizens and ... I swear by the Hestia of the Syracusans and Zeus Olympios and ... Poseidon...’
The hopelessly mutilated condition of this inscription has given rise to numerous hypotheses regarding its date and content. Franz had originally interpreted it as a treaty between the Syracusans and an unknown state. Kaibel, on the basis of letter forms, dated it to after the time of Hieron II, and read it as two oaths, the first (col. B, lines 1 – 5) an oath of the king, the second (col. B, lines 6 – 10) an oath of the boule and perhaps some other officials. Wilhelm interpreted it as a letter sent by Hieron II probably at the appointment of his son, Gelon, as co-regent, and seeking a renewal of an oath taken previously. Most recently, Manganaro has re-edited substantial portions of the text to support a link with the Sicilian koinon.\footnote{This has generally met with little accord, see J. and L. Robert, BullEp 515, REG (1966).} While the context of the inscription remains obscure, the mention of Hestia in the oath is nonetheless clear, placed before Zeus Olympios, whose worship was of great political relevance for the city.\footnote{Giangiulio (1982: 973-975).}
Tauromenion

125 Altar of local limestone found at the church of S. Pancrazio. G.S. Gasparro, *I culti orientali in Sicilia* (1973) no. 191 pp. 223-224, with previous bibliography.

3rd/2nd century B.C.

'Αμφι παραστάσι ταίσδε Σαράπιδος 'Εστίαι ἄγνον
βωμόν Βαρκαῖος Καρνεάδης ἔθετο,
Εὐκρίτου υἱός, ξείνε, ὁ νεωκόρος ἰ γ' ὁμόλεκτρος
Πυθίας ἰ κεῖνου καὶ θυγάτηρ Ἐρασώ.

5 'Ανθ' ὅν, ὃ κραίνουσα Δίος μεγαλαυχέας οἰκους,
θυμαρίν βιοτάς ὀλβον ἔχοιεν ἀεὶ.

'At these gates of Serapis, traveller, Carneades of Barca, son of Eucrius, *neokoros* and husband of Pythia, his wife, with his daughter Eraso placed this pure altar to Hestia. In return, mistress of the vainglorious halls of Zeus, may he have the delightful blessedness of life.'

The ancient temple of Serapis at Tauromenion, of which this epigrammatic dedication once formed a part, appears to have been incorporated into the present church of S. Pancrazio. Carneades, aside from sharing an Academic name, was apparently a cult functionary, the *neokoros* of Serapis, a position widely attested in the service of Serapis
and Isis whose duties in this locale remain unknown. The relationship between Hestia and Serapis is complicated by the assimilation of Hestia to Isis elsewhere (108, 177, Oxy. Pap. XI.1380). If Hestia is to be understood as present as the result of this assimilation, then the connection between Serapis and Isis could be extended back into the Hellenistic period to which this dedication dates, but this does not seem warranted. Carneades hailed from Barca in Cyrenaica, and the presence of Hestia in Cyrene is documented (178). Furthermore, as Vidman has noted, there are traces in the cult of Serapis of other ties with the hearth. In a dedication from Portus are mentioned certain functionaries called καμενευται whose function he has connected with the care of the hearth. While at Side, a hearth was dedicated to Serapis and his synnaoi, another sign of this relationship.

The association of Hestia and Isis does in fact take place, but it is incorrect to think that “because she (Hestia) never acquired a husband nor...ever developed a personality, she is easily ousted by a divine newcomer who, in the process of expanding her sphere of power, naturally wishes to secure a place in the establishment.” There is no evidence that Hestia was connected with Isis either earlier or more easily than any other Greek divinity, and this inscription makes explicit the rationale of the dedicator. Hestia holds power over the house of Zeus and has the capacity to grant ‘the delightful blessedness of life,’ an aspect which is commonly found in the worship of Isis, but which need not be seen as her exclusive province.

---

1 SIRIS 556. Vidman (1970: 64). This inscription mentions the καμενευται as well as another class of attendants, the ιερόφωνοι, whom Vidman saw as “qui fatidica responsa deorum tradebant.” Again their precise duties are unknown, but the possibility of a relationship between Hestia and some form of oracular speech is tantalizing, see also the inscriptions from Cos 82-84.
3 Solmsen (1979: 47).
5 For διαβοσ in connection with Hestia, see also the hymn of Aristonoos, Delphi 18, line 14.
Rome

126 Cippus n the epigraphical museum of the Vatican. Eds. Franz, CIG 5952; Kaibel, IG XV 980; L. Moretti, IGUR 162, ph. p. 150.

2nd century A.D.

'Εστίαι Πατρώαι,
'Ιούλιος
Μάιορ
'Αντωνίνος

'To Hestia Patroa. Iulius Maior Antoninus.'

Iulius Maior Antoninus is held to be S. Iulius Maior Antoninus Pythodorus, who hailed from the city of Nysa in Caria, and was a member of a senatorial family. Around 140 A.D. he oversaw the dedications in that city of statues of Antoninus Pius and the imperial family. Likewise, in 163 A.D., he did the same for the city of Epidaurus.¹ While the cult of Hestia is not otherwise epigraphically attested for Nysa, the cult was widespread throughout Asia Minor. Moretti, furthermore, has proposed that this inscription may have belonged to one of the ancient stationes (στατίωνες), small buildings, dating from the beginning of the Empire, and employed by the inhabitants of

¹ He is known from one other dedication from Rome. See IG XIV 1013 and IGUR I 183.
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foreign cities for meetings when their business brought them to Rome. Such buildings were frequently dedicated to emperors or ancestral deities.
Velia


Undated.

'Ιστίη

'Hestia.'

The study of the Velian cults is still very much a work in progress.¹ This remains the only mention of Hestia.

¹ See, for example Guarducci (1966: 279-274) and Guarducci (1970: 252-261).
Cnidus


First half of the 2nd century B.C.

"Αγίας 'Εστιείου
γραμματεύων βουλαί
'Αθάνατ Νικαφόρωι
καὶ 'Εστιαὶ βουλαίαι
Ζηνόδοτος Μενίππου
Κνίδιος ἐποίησε.

'Agias, son of Hestieius, serving as the grammateus for the boule, (dedicated this) to Athena Nikephoros and Hestia Boulaia. Zenodotus, son of Menippus, from Knidos made (this).'

Both Zenodotus and Menippus are mentioned in another inscription of Cnidus, on the base of a statue of Sosibius, who was perhaps the "minister" of Ptolemy III Philopator (222-204 B.C.). Hirschfeld has hypothesized that Menippus, "may have been

---

1 "Ζηνόδοτος καὶ Μενίππος Χιόι ἐποίησαν." *IBM* IV, 1 no. 319, line 6.
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the brother or son of Zenodotus,\textsuperscript{2} which would place this inscription in the following generation. Although they are originally mentioned as Chians, it was not unusual for artists to have been granted the citizenship of the state in which they worked. The name Agias is found in other contexts in Cnidus.\textsuperscript{3} No other instances of either Hestia \textit{Boulaia} or Athena \textit{Nikephoros} have come to light from this location, yet the position of the dedicator as \textit{grammateus}, and the epithet of Hestia as \textit{Boulaia}, strongly suggest that these were deities of the Cnidian \textit{boule}.

\textsuperscript{2} Hirschfeld (1893: 26).
\textsuperscript{3} ibid. (1893: 26).
Halicarnassus


3rd century B.C.

[---υ]δής τής[---]

[---Φιλονόης? τής---]

[---α β τα πα[---]

[---ειον άπ[ό---]

5 [---άπ]ό τῶν [---]

[---άργου δρ[α(χμαί)---]

[---π]όλεως ἀπὸ τῶν [ἀπαργμά]-

[των---υ]δρίσκ[η] δρα(χμαί)[---]

10 [---Μαυ]σόλλου. Ἐπὶ ἱερέως Α[---]

[---]του Μ[---]

[---]ντου τοῦ Σίμων[ος] φιάλ[η λεία]·

[---]θοβου τοῦ Ἡρωίδου φιάλ[η λεία]

[---]σαι. Ἐπὶ Βασιλείδου τοῦ Ἀριστο[...]

15 [κατὰ ψήφισμα β]ουλής· Ἀπόλλωνος· Βασιλε[ίδης]

[---]ν ἱεροποιῶν φιάλη ἰτεόφυλλος[---]
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[----Βα]σιλείδου φιάλη λεία ἐπιπρόσωπος

[----Βασι]λείδου φιάλη λεία ἐπιπρόσωπος.

[Ἐπὶ ιερέως Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Ἀθηνίππου φι[ά]-

[Λῆ Μαυσ]όλλου. Ἐπὶ ιερέως Σωπόλ[ιος] τοῦ Ὀλύ-

[μιδίος? δρα(χμαί) ρο' ἀπό τῶν ἀπαργμάτων. Ἐπ[ι]

[ιερεώς] Ἀγαθοκλεύς. Δήμητρος ἐν δρόμω[ι]

[----Δήμ]ητρος Δημοσίας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπαργμά-

[τῶν. Θεσσα]λίας τῆς Μητροδότου κάθοπ(τ)ρον δρ[α(χμαί)])

[-----'Ασκ]ληπιοῦ. Ἐπὶ ιεροποιοῦ Ἀρτεμεύς το[ῦ]

[-------] δρα(χμαί) η´ [-----------]

[--------]ταί. Ἐπὶ Δηλιάδου τοῦ Γόρ-

[γου κατὰ ψήφισμα βουλῆς. Ἀπόλλωνος]

[--------]νος φιάλη ἱτεόφυλλος δρ[α(χμαί)])

[-------]νος τοῦ Ἀμύντου φιάλη [-----]

[-------'Απ]όλλωνος. Ἐπὶ Δηλιάδου τοῦ Γόργ[ο]ν

[φιάλη λεία ἐπιπρόσωπος δρα(χμαί) ρ[.]. Ἐστίας Βουλ[αίς]

[-------]τοῦ] Σκύμνου φιάλη λεία ἐπιπρόσ[].

[ωπος δρα(χμαί)----]Επὶ Δηλιάδου] τοῦ Γόργ[ο][----]

[---------------------------]

‘... of Philonoe, daughter of ... from the ... (weighing so-many) drachmas ... of Demeter in the course, golden ... of the city ... from the first-offerings ... a little water pitcher (weighing so-many) drachmas ... of Mausolus. In the priesthood of A ... tus, son of M ... ntus, son of Simon, a light phiale. ... sbus, son of Heroides, a light phiale. ... in the time of Basileides, son of Aristo ... according to a decree of the boule. Of Apollo: Basileides ... serving as hieropoios a phiale decorated with a pattern ... of Basileides of a light phiale with a face, of Basileides of a light phiale with a face. In the priesthood of Alexander, son of Athenippus. Phiale of Mausolus. In the priesthood of Sopolis, son of Olympus, weighing 170 drachmas from the first-offerings. In the priesthood of Agathocles. Of Demeter in the course ... of Demeter Demosia from the first-offerings. Thessalia, daughter of Metrodotus a mirror (weighing so-many) drachmas ... of Asclepius. In the hieropoios-ship of Artemes, son of ... weighing 18 drachmas ... In the time of Delias, son of Gorgus, according to a decree of the boule. Of Apollo ... a phiale with a pattern (weighing so-many) drachmas ... son of Amytus, a phiale ... of Apollo. In the time of Delias, son of Gorgus, a light phiale with a face weighing 100+ drachmas. Of Hestia Boulaia ... (in the priest-ship of so-and-so,) son of Skymnus, a light phiale with a face (weighing so-many) drachmas ... In the time of Delias, son of Gorgus ...’

Maiuri identified this as an inventory of the grand sanctuaries of the city which was then perhaps deposited in the sanctuary of Apollo on the acropolis now occupied by the “Castello dei Cavalieri.” The inventory as it stands now includes objects dedicated to Apollo, Demeter ἐν δρόμῳ[1], Demeter Demosia, and Asclepius.
Labraunda

130 Two fragments of a moulding found in 1951 at Labrauda at the "Oikoi" originally forming part of the building. Inv. nos. 119 A/NA and 119 B/NA. Ed. J. Crampa *Labrauda Swedish Excavations and Researches III*, 2 *The Greek Inscriptions II* (1972) no. 36 pp. 35-36 ph. pl. 10.

2nd century A.D.

[---Σεβαστ--καί Διό Λαβραύνδωρ (ἐν καὶ τῷ δήμῳ) ἱδρύσατο τῇν ὀφεὶλουσαν---] ἑστίνθεν θυμέλην ὁ δεῖνα τοῦ δείνος-----------------------------]ς τε Σεβ[αστοῦ vel.

--ὤν καὶ ιερεὺς] τοῦ Διός· ἢ δ' αὖ τοῦ[ vel. αὐτοῦ[

‘... to August ... and Zeus Labraundos (and to the people) he? built the owed ... altar of Hestia, so-and-so, son of so-and-so ... priest of Augustus? (or of the Augusti?) and of Zeus ...’

The restorations are those of Crampa, and while they are well reasoned, the inscription cannot offer much more in the way of information concerning the worship of Hestia there.
Mylasa


[τὴν εἰκόνα] Ἕκατόμμωο τοῦ
[-----------------]ομένου ἱπρέως
[-----------------]ναυ τοῦ Εκα-
[-----------------]καὶ Ἐστίας ἀνέ-

5 [θηκεν εὐνοίας ἑ]νεκα τῆς

[eis αὐτόν]

‘...the statue of Hecatomnus, son of ..., of the priest,...of (H?)eka...and of Hestia, dedicated because of the goodwill towards him.’

This presently undated inscription would seemingly attest to the presence of a priest of Hestia in the city of Mylasa and forms fully half of all extent evidence for her veneration by the people of that city. (see Miletus 156, yet also Labraunda 130). The name of Hecatomnus belonged to the entire line of dynasts of which Mausolus was one, and an inscription of Halicarnassus from the third century B.C. (129) attests to her presence in that city which he chose to replace Mylasa as his capital. In addition to moving his capital to Halicarnassus, however, Mausolus was also responsible for the re-
founding of the city of Mylasa in its current location on the site of what is today Milâs.¹

While the exact date at which the Hectomnid rule of Mylasa came to an end is unknown, a Hecatomnus, son of Ouliades, of the tribe Otorcondeis, who was also priest of Zeus Labraundos, is mentioned as one of the subscribers for the building of a stoa in the first century B.C. at Olympos.²

It is tempting to hypothesize that the worship of Hestia received either new or revived interest at the accession of the Hecatomnids as either a deity of foundation in the case of Mylasa, or as a symbol and instrument of the dynasts, or both. Yet the evidence, scattered as it is over two centuries, provides evidence for, at best, only two certainties. The first, that the people of Mylasa considered Hestia important enough in the context of their relations with Miletus to offer her a sacrifice at their consultation of the oracle of Apollo at Didyma. The second, that her worship existed at both the new capital of Caria, Halicarnassus, as well as the former center of Mylasa, where it was overseen by one of the presumably still prominent families of the town, who was associated with its principal cult of Zeus Labraundos,

---
¹ Bean (1989: 14-15)
² See Laumonier (1958: 58 n. 2)
Ephesus


92/93 A.D.

Κλαυδία Τροφίμη ἱερὴ ἣν πρύτανις Ἑστίη ἐπαίνον ἔγραψε·
Αὐτὰ καὶ μακάρεσσοι ἐπήρκεσθ᾿ ἐν εὐφροσύναισιν,
αὐτὴ καὶ θαλερὸν φῶς κατέχει πατρίδος
'Αδύτατα δαίμον, κόσμου θάλος, ἀέναον φῶς,
5 ἀ κατέχεις βωμοῖς δαλόν ἄπ’ οὐρανόθεν.
'Ἡ αὐτὴ δὲ πρύτανις ἔγραψε·
Κλεωπποτεῖ Πείων τὸν ὑπ᾿ ἥρος ὀμβρὸν ἐν αὐτῷ
χωρῶν εἰς λαγόνας πρὸς πελάγους μέγεθος.
Πῶς δὲ τις ἄν σε φράσειε, θεόκτιτον ἀ κατέχεις φῶς
10 σώζουσ’ ἐν σεαυτῇ λείψανον εὕμετρίης;

Editorial Note: line 1: ἱερὴ Knibbe. ἱερὴ Engelmann.
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'Claudia Trophime, the sacred prytanis, put her praise for Hestia in writing:

She both assists the blessed gods in festivities, and she possesses the shining light of the fatherland, most pleasant spirit, offspring of the universe, eternal light, she who possesses on the altars the fire-brand from heaven.

The prytanis herself wrote:

Pion thievishly drinks the rain from the air in himself stretching out to his flanks to the size of the sea. How could someone describe you, you who possess the god-created light, preserving in yourself the trace of good measure?'

The prytanis, Claudia Trophime, appears in two other inscriptions discovered at Ephesus. One lists the Curetes and other religious officials who held office during her eponymous year. The other records the dedication of a statue by her. The dedication here consists of two elegiac epigrams apparently composed by the prytanis herself. The first epigram calls attention to the goddess and her duties among the other divinities which were mirrored in Ephesus in the office of the prytanis, who preserved this flame and also oversaw its use to kindle the fires on all the altars of the city. Of special note at the end of these verses is the reference to the 'firebrand from heaven,' which recalls how the Greeks renewed the hearth at Delphi, not by simply rubbing two sticks together, but by the more difficult use of mirrors to focus sunlight upon the kindling.

---

2 Inschriften von Ephesos II, no. 508 p. 201.
3 Ibid. I, no. 10, lines 3-5, τὸν πρυτάνην αἰθέιν πῦρ ἐπὶ τῶν βουιῶν πάντων καὶ ἐπὶθυμίαν τὸν λιβανωτὸν καὶ ἐπὶ θυμίαν καὶ τὰ ιερατικὰ ἀρχώματα... cf. also the duties of Hestia as described in Homeric Hymn 29, lines 1-4, Ἐστὴν, ἢ πάντων ἐν δώμασιν ύψηλοισιν/ ἀθανάτων τε θεῶν/ χαμαι ἐρχομένων τ᾽ ἀνθρώπων/ ἐδρην ἀθινον ἐλαχε, προσβηθίσα τιμήν, καλὸν ἔχουσα γέρας καὶ τίμιον...
4 Plut. Num. 9. 6-8.
The second and more obscure epigram begins with the mention of Mt. Pion, even the location of which remains a matter of debate. Merkelbach has interpreted the contrast between Hestia and Pion as motivated in order to demonstrate a certain vision of the cosmos and a 'circulation of the elements,' conveyed by the spark on the hearth and the rain within the mountain. Without denying the possible validity of this interpretation, I would also call attention to the fact that the meaning of the verb κλεψιμοτείν as used by Claudia Trophime in this epigram is the opposite of how it is generally defined, namely, 'to deceive by causing others to drink, without drinking oneself.' In both cases it is a question of disproportionate consumption by Pion. The emphasis, rather than being solely on the natural elements involved, revolves around how these two behave in their different manners of consumption. Pion drinks and swells 'thievishly,' while Hestia holds and preserves, 'the trace of good measure.' This implied sophrosyne of Hestia, preserving the fire on the hearth, is apparently so much more impressive to Claudia Trophime than the enormous thirst of Pion that it is the source of her amazement in line 9, 'How could someone describe you...?'

Knibbe has linked the language of this dedication and also that of Tullia (134) with the Orphic hymns. Certainly, this might provide some of the thematic stock, but

---

5 The choice lies between Panayir Dağı to the north of the prytnaeion and Bülbül Dağı to the west. For arguments for the latter which in turn cite arguments for the former, see F. Brein (1976-1977: cols. 65-76). Cf. also the remarks of H. Engelmann (1979: 90) and G. Rogers (1991: p. 108).
7 Süid. 2116 B and Poll. 6, 20.
8 For this sophrosyne, see also 134, line 8.
10 e.g. θαλερόν and θάλας lines 3-4; cf. 134, line 2 óπθελάς and Orphic Hymn 84, line 4, ἀπεθελάς. It must be noted however that in the phrase, κόσμου θάλας, (line 4) for Hestia, Claudia Trophime has diverged from the use of the word θάλας as found in the Orphic Hymns, where it only appears with a noun in the genitive case when that noun is the proper name of the divinity who is the parent (e.g. Persephone is the Δημος θάλας, Orphic Hymn to Persephone 29, line 5). The present epigram has eschewed this construction, perhaps to maintain the focus on Hestia herself.
it cannot be established that there existed any formal connection between the state religion and cult practice of Ephesus and the Orphic movement.\textsuperscript{11}

133 White marble block found in a wall near the Theater. Eds. Heberdey, \textit{ÖJh} 3 (1900) Beiblatt col. 88; J. Keil, \textit{Anatolian Studies} (1939) no. 1 p. 119; D. Knibbe \textit{Forschungen in Ephesos} IX 1, no. F 3 p. 64; Engelmann, Knibbe and Merkelbach, \textit{Inschriften von Ephesos} IV no. 1064 p. 46.

c. 170 A.D.

\begin{verse}
\textit{ὐ} τῆς ἀρίστης Ἀνδροκλείου καὶ σοφῆς
dαϊμον πόλης, Ἐστί′ ἀειπάρθενε,
σὺ τ′, ὡς θεῶν μέγιστον οὐνομNearly\textsuperscript{5} ἀνθ′ οὖν προθύμως ἐπροστάνευον ὑμῶ̄ν ἁδην
tὸν πλούτον εἰς πᾶν πράγμαν ἀναλουσ′ ἀφθόνως.
\end{verse}

'O spirit of the noble and wise city of Androclus, Hestia the eternal virgin, and you Artemis, greatest name of the gods, were always the assistants of Tullia on whose behalf she willingly served as \textit{prytanis} generously lavishing wealth on every occasion to your satisfaction.'

\textsuperscript{11} There is, for example, no mention of a \textit{βωμός} in the Orphic hymns such as one finds in the epigram of Claudia Trophime.
Another metrical inscription, this time in iambics, makes mention of Hestia, ‘the eternal virgin,’ (ἄειπάρβευε, line 2) in conjunction with the legendary founder of Ephesus, Androclus,12 and the chief divinity of the state, Artemis Ephesia. Within the pryaneion itself were found three more or less intact statues of Artemis and parts of a fourth dating at the earliest to the first century A.D.13 Although all three, Androclus, Hestia and Artemis, are designated as ‘helpers,’ (ἄρωγοι, line 4) the presence of any particular site within the pryaneion which may have served as a special locale reserved for Androclus has not been found.14 Nonetheless, Pherocydes recorded that the descendents of Androclus retained the title of ‘king,’ and also some other privileges of which one was the superintendence of the sacrifices to Demeter Eleusinia.15 Demeter is not specifically attested epigraphically with the title Eleusinia at Ephesus, but rather was worshipped with the title Karpotrophos.16 This discrepancy may be due to the connection in this passage of Demeter with Androclus who was reputed to be the son of the Athenian king, Codrus. The son of an Athenian king, who led the Ionian colonization, would presumably then have brought the Athenian cult of Demeter to Ephesus. Both Demeter and Kore also have ties with the pryaneion of Ephesus, whose functionaries probably assisted in the celebration of their mysteries.17

---

12 Strabo 14. 1. 3. C 632.
13 For the discovery and dating, see Miltner, “Vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Ephesos.” ÖJh 44 (1959) Beiblatt cols. 305-312, ph. figs. 147-151.
14 Cf. however the list of evidence assembled by G. Rogers (1991: 107-108) for the very visible presence of Androclus in Ephesus.
16 But see Inschriften von Ephesus IV no. 1270 p. 153, dated sometime between the emperors Domitian and Trajan, where C. Licinius Maximus is mentioned as being the priest for life of the θεῶν Ἐλευσινῶν.
17 See 137.
The Tullia who made this dedication is no doubt the same as that of 134 and the final line draws attention to the amounts spent by Tullia during her time as prytanis indicate the strong financial component which pertained to this magistracy.


cia. 170 A.D.

'Ιστί, πρέβα θεών, πυρὸς ἀθανάτου μεθέουσα,
οὐ μέρος αἰθαλές δῶκε πόληι νέμειν.
Ζῆν ὑπατος, δωήτε θεοὶ προγενέστεροι ἄλλων
Τυλλίας, ὡς ἄχραντον ἐν ὑμετέροις δόμοισιν

5 ἤμως προστασιῶν, οὖτως δωήτε τέκνα αὐτῆ,
εἰκελα πάντα αὐτῆ καὶ νόου, οἴον ἔχει
αὐτῆ· ταῦτα ἰτω δομεναι χάριν ἄχραντοιο
σωφροσύνης σοφίης τε βροτούς, ὦτι καῖνυθ' ἀπαντας
τούτοις· τοὺς τε πάλαι, τοὺς ὁ' ἐγγεγαώτας ἀμ' ἥμειν.
Editorial Note: line 4 Τυλλιαν the stone, Τυλλιαφ{ν} Knibbe; my correction. 

lines 6-7, εἰκελα πάντ' αὐτῇ καὶ νόον, οἷον ἔχει' / αὐτῇ, ταύτ' αἴτω δόμεναι 

‘Hestia, eldest of the gods, guardian of the deathless flame, she of whose ever living portion granted the city to partake. Most high Zeus, may you gods older than the rest grant to Tullia, since in your houses she fulfilled perfectly the office, thus grant her children, exactly like her who also have a mind like the one she has; grant them the grace of pure moderation and wisdom to mortals, by which she (Tullia) surpasses them all: both those of old, and those born contemporaneously with us.’

Little is known of the life of Tullia outside of the fact attested here that she served as prytanis and can easily be assumed to have been a Roman citizen.\(^{18}\) Her description of Hestia and Zeus, deities ‘older than the rest,’ (προγενέστεροί ἄλλων, line 3) is somewhat enigmatic given the traditional theogony as given by Hesiod, but would nonetheless be justified if by ‘the rest’ is implied deities such as Artemis mentioned in her previous inscription.\(^{19}\) This prayer is in hexameters, save for lines one and five which are distichs, and Merkelbach has assumed that she was unmarried at the time of her office, presumably due to the fact that she had no children.\(^{20}\) He has also linked the cult of Hestia with prosperity and reproduction, for as the fire of Hestia was eternal, so should

\(^{18}\) Inschriften von Ephesos IV, no. 1063 p. 45.

\(^{19}\) Knibbe (1981: 39) has suggested that this characterization might simply be causa metri.

be the line of Tullia the prytanis who maintained it.\textsuperscript{21} The desire that a man’s children should resemble their father is almost a commonplace in Greek literature.\textsuperscript{22} In the prayer of Tullia, this standard has been supplanted with a notion more in accord with the conception of Hestia as virgin goddess who represents continuity without sexual reproduction, and thus it is the cycle of maiden, \textit{prytanis}, and mother which shall perpetuated through the granting of this prayer.


2\textsuperscript{nd}/3\textsuperscript{rd} century A.D.

\textit{Tib. Κλαύδιος} Αρτεμίδωρος φιλοσέβαστος εὐχαριστῶ Έστια Βουλαία καὶ πάσιν θεοῖς εὐτυχῶς τὴν πρωτανείαν ἐκτελέσας μετὰ καὶ τῆς εὐσέβειος ὑπηρεσίας.

‘I, Tiberius Claudius Artemidorus, loyal to the emperor, give thanks to Hestia \textit{Boulaia} and all the gods having fortunately completed the office of \textit{prytanis} with pious service.’

\textsuperscript{21} ibid. (1980: 87).
\textsuperscript{22} See for example Soph. \textit{Ajax} lines 550-551 and Aristoph. \textit{Thes}. lines 514-516.
This inscription forms the first in a catalog of provisory schemata formed by Knibbe which groups the dedications to Hestia according to the number of those who made an offering and the number of deities thanked after their time in office.²³ Here Tiberius Claudius Artemidorus offered this alone, as did the dedicants of inscriptions 143-145. That Hestia is mentioned with the specific cult title, Boulaia, is characteristic of all these offerings save for the exceptions of the previous inscriptions of Claudia Trophime (132) and Tullia (133-134) and that of Aurelia Juliane (145) where Hestia is described instead as despoina.

136 Block found reused in a small mosque in a small mosque on the hill of Ayasoluk. Eds. Le Bas-Waddington (1870) no. 171a, pp. 70-71; A. Böckh, CIG II 2986, after a copy of Pocorene; J. Keil, Anatolian Studies (1939) no. 2 p. 120 after a copy of O. Benndorf (D. Knibbe, Forschungen in Ephesos IX 1, no. F 5 p. 65; Engelmann, Knibbe and Merkelbach, Inschriften von Ephesos IV, no. 1068 pp. 47-48.

'Hestia Boulaia and Artemis Ephesia preserve Plutarch, the prytanis and gymnasiarchos, and his children, the priestesses of Artemis, both his companion, Nymphidia, daughter of Menander, and Nicopolis, her sister, wife of Nymphius, the brother of the prytanis and…’

Plutarch, who held a double magistracy, here made a joint dedication on behalf of his daughters, both of whom appear to have been priestesses of Artemis Ephesia, who by this time were the chief officers of that cult.


2nd/3rd century A.D.

[Ἐπὶ πρυτάνεως-----------]
[Αὑρ]ουνκή[ιος Μενάν-?]
δροι φιλοσέ[βαστος ὁ καὶ]
Πολυχρόνις [ἔστιοῦ]-
χος εὐχαρε[ιστῶ Ἔστια]

5 [Β]ουλαῖα καὶ Πυ[ρὶ ἀφθάρτῳ]
[καὶ] Δήμητρι κ[αὶ Δή]-
[μητρος Κόρη καὶ πᾶσι]
[θεοὶς ὅτι ὅλοκληροῦν]-
[τά με καὶ ἐκτελέσαντα]

10 [πάντα] τὰ μυστ[ήρια]
[οῦν καὶ τῇ] συνβίω μο[ῦ]
[καὶ τῷ ὕ]ιῳ μου Αὑρ[ουνκήῳ]
[εὐτυχῶς ἁ]πο[κατέστησαν].

‘In the prytany of ... Aurunceius, son of Menander, loyal to the emperor, and Polychronis, hestiouchos, I give thanks to Hestia Boulaia and the Undying Fire and Demeter and Kore, daughter of Demeter, and all the gods, that I in sound health performed all the mysteries successfully with my companion and with my son Aurunceius.’

Two differences separate this inscription from those cited previously in connection with the veneration of Hestia in Ephesus. Firstly, Aurunceius is not mentioned as having served as prytanis, although this fact may be due to the fragmentary
nature of the stone. The sole position mentioned rather, albeit as a restoration, is that of the *hestiouchos*, Polychronis. The exact duties of this position are not known, but in other inscriptions concerning Hestia, the *hestiouchos* is sometimes mentioned with the *kalathephoros* (138 and 148) and later sometimes with other officials (140) who were included among the list of Curetes, officials originally dedicated to the service of Artemis Ephesia (144).

Moreover as this inscription makes clear, to the service rendered by these functionaries to Hestia must be added that to Demeter and Kore. A sacred law of Ephesus dating from the third century A.D. outlines the duties of the *prytanis* with respect to Demeter *Karpotrophos* in the prytaneion which is described as her temple. In an inscription dating to the year 120 A.D. a P. Rutilius Bassus tells of building a ναὸς using his own money which may have been identical with some structure within the prytaneion. Thus while the position of the *kalathephoros* might summon up images relating to the mystery cults of Demeter, the apparent seat of this position in the prytaneion dedicated to Hestia *Boulaia*, and its later inclusion in the lists of the Curetes of Artemis, makes it likely that just as the *prytanis* was held accountable to both Hestia and Demeter, so the *kalathephoros* and the *hestiouchos* were not merely servants of Demeter or Hestia, but functionaries of all cults in the prytaneion.

Lastly, the mention of the ‘Undying Fire,’ (Πυ(?[π] ἄφθαρτως) line 5) is paralleled in a mention from an inscription of the second century B.C. unearthed at Delphi (Πῦρ Ἀθάνατος, 19, lines 14).

---

26 "δόξει τὸν πρύτανιν εἰς προκόκισμα τῆς/ ἐν τῷ πρυτανεῖῳ ἐστώσης Δημήτριος
Καρ/πυτρόφου, ἡς ἐστὶν νεός." Inschriften von Ephesos Ia no. 10, lines 28-29, pp. 65-67, see also Sokolowski, LSG Suppl. 121 pp.203-205.

2nd/3rd century A.D.

Lambdaνιανός [ἐστιοὐχος καὶ]
Κλαυδία Φ[----------]
καλαθί[φόρος εὐχαριστοῦσιν]
Ἔστια Βουλαία κ[αὶ Δ]ῆ[μη]-

5 τρι καὶ Δήμ[ητρ]ος Κ[όρη]-
κ[αὶ πᾶσι τοῖς θεῖς ὁ[τί]
[όλοκ]ληρός ἐτελείωσα[ν]
[όλον τὸ]ν ἐνιαυτόν.

'Libonianus, *hestiouchos*, and Claudia ... *kalathephoros*, give thanks to Hestia *Boulaia* and Demeter and Kore, daughter of Demeter and all the gods that he finished the whole year in good health.'

Another dedication by the *hestiouchos*, this time in explicit conjunction with the *kalathephoros*.

2\textsuperscript{nd} / 3\textsuperscript{rd} century A.D.

'Εστὶα Βουλαία καὶ τῇ γλυκυτ[άτῃ πατρίδι]

'To Hestia *Boulaia* and the fatherland most sweet.'

The phrase, 'to the fatherland most sweet,' (τῇ γλυκυτάτῃ πατρίδι) is not an uncommon one in the epigraphical record of Ephesus.\(^{29}\)


2\textsuperscript{nd}/3\textsuperscript{rd} century A.D.

'Άγαθή Τύχη

'Επὶ πρωτάνεως

τῆς κυρίας ᾑμῶν

---

\(^{29}\) See, for example, *Inschriften von Ephesos* II no. 431 p. 155.
'Αρτέμιδος Εὐτύ- χης Εὐφροσύνου
ιερὸς ἐστιοῦχος
ἐπὶ πρυτανείου
eὐχαριστῶ 'Εστία
Βουλαία καὶ τοῖς θε-
oῖς πᾶσιν ὅτι ὅλο-
κληρῶν τὴν ἐστι-
ουχίαν ἐτέλεσα
μετὰ καὶ Ζωῆς τῆς
ἀδελφῆς μου μαν-
tηλαρίας καὶ 'Απο-
λιναρίου ὑπεστι-
ούχου ἱεροφάντ[ου].

'To Good Fortune. In the prytany of our ladyship Artemis, I, Eutyches, son of Euphrosynus, the sacred hestiouchos in the prytaneion give thanks to Hestia Boulaia and all the gods that in good health I finished the hestiouchia with my sister Zoe, the mantelaria and Apolinarius, the hystiouchos and hierophantes.'

Most striking in this inscription is the fact that at this time, no person fulfilled the post of prytais, but instead the goddess Artemis herself assumed the responsibilities of that office. Irregularities and difficulties in the filling of magistracies, particularly those
which entailed the sizable expenditure of funds on the part of an individual or a family are certainly unsurprising, but the solution of nominating a goddess for the position must have been a last resort. No details exist of how this arrangement functioned in practice at Ephesus, but presumably the funds from the temple of Artemis would have been used to manage the financial side of the prytany. The absence of the name of any one person connected with the temple administration who might have been directly responsible for the supervision of the duties within the prytaneion may mean that this was instead taken up by a body of either the functionaries of the temple or perhaps even the civic administration of Ephesus itself.

Zoe, the sister of Eutyches, in her duties as mantelaria was a servant of the prytaneion who apparently oversaw the provisioning of napkins at the meals provided there. The mantelarioi are mentioned below in 143 (lines 14-15) in the list of Curetes as having been four in number. Not mentioned in that list of Curetes, but present in others is the hierophantes found here. The role of this functionary was seemingly more professional than that of the prytanis as it was for a long while passed from father to son and was at the same time publicly paid. Unfortunately, however, the other post occupied by Apolinarius, the hystiouchos, remains as enigmatic as that of the hestiouchos itself.

141 White marble stele now in the British Museum. Eds. E. L. Hicks, IBM III 596 a p. 219; D. Knibbe, Forschungen in Ephesos IX 1, no. F 9 p. 66; Engelmann, Knibbe and Merkelbach, Inschriften von Ephesos IV no. 1069 p. 48.

---

Beginning of the 3rd century A.D.

[-----name-------------]

[εὐχαριστοῦμεν Ἐστιά Βουλαίᾳ]

ἐπηκόω καὶ [πᾶσι θεοῖς]

καὶ τῇ Τύχῃ τῆς πόλισιν ὀ]-

τι ὁ θρέψας ἠμῶν Μ. Αὐρ. Ἄγα-

θόπους ὁ πρύτανις εὔτυχῶς κατα-

ἀρξάμενος ἐτελείωσε τὰ μυ-

στήρια σὺν καὶ τῇ συμβίῳ

αὐτοῦ Μαία Νηρηίδη καὶ τοῖς

téknois kai ékγόνois kai tῆς

10 εὐσεβοὺς ὑπηρεσίας.

‘... we give thanks to Hestia Boulaia the heedful and to all the gods and to the
Fortune of the city, that our prytanis M. Aur. Agathopus, having commenced
propitiously, celebrated the mysteries with both his companion Maia Nereides and their
children and grandchildren with pious service.’

The mysteries celebrated by the family of the prytanes M. Aur. Agathopus are
generally assumed to be those of Demeter even though a direct mention of them is
lacking. There were also mysteries of Artemis of which the Curetes were the
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administrants. The substance of these mysteries remains largely unknown, although Picard has hypothesized that they revolved around a reenactment of the events surrounding the birth of Artemis and Apollo.\textsuperscript{32}


\begin{quote}
Beginning of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century A.D.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
[-------------------------]
[πρύτανις εὐχαριστεῖ 'Εστία]
[Βουλαία καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς θεοῖς]
[τοῖς ἔν τῷ πρὺ[τανείῳ ὃτι]
[ἐντυχῶ]ς ἑπλήρωσ[εν τὴν πρυ]-
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
5 \[τανεία]ν μετὰ τῆς θρεψ[ας καὶ]
[τοῦ σ]υνείπου αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν]
[τέκνων] αὐτῶν
[......]ίνης τῆς καὶ Κοπ[η]-
[λίας..]καὶ Ἀντωνίας καὶ
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
10 [....Κα]τελλιανῆς
[καἰ..]ς Λαιλιά[ς] Κορ(υηλίας) Ἀντωνίας.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{32} Picard (1922: 278 and 296)
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‘... pry tanis gives thanks to Hestia Boulaia and all the gods in the prytaneion that he successfully fulfilled the prytany with his companion having fostered and their children ... ines of Cornelia and Antonia ... and ... Catelliana and ... of Laelia Cornelia Antonia.’

‘All the gods in the prytaneion,’ is presumably a reference to Demeter, Kore, and perhaps even Androclus and the Undying Fire.

143 Fragment of a marble block found to the west of the prytaneion. Eds. D. Knibbe, Forschungen in Ephesos IX 1, no. F 8 p. 66 after a copy by Miltner; Engelmann, Knibbe and Merkelbach, Inschriften von Ephesos IV no. 1067 p. 47.

Beginning of the 3rd century A.D.

[----'Αρίστων τοῦ Ἅρ[ιστων]
[eὐχαριστῶ Ἑστίᾳ Βουλαίᾳ καὶ Π]υρὶ ἀφθάρτῳ καὶ Δήμ[ητρί]
[kαὶ Κόρη καὶ πᾶσιν θεοῖς ὅτι μετὰ πᾶσαν ἄρχην [ἀποκατέστησάν]
[με ὑγιαίνουσαν μετὰ τῆς εὔσεβούς ὑπηρεσίας. Εὐτ[υχῶς].

‘I, ... son of Ariston, son of Ariston, give thanks to Hestia Boulaia and the Undying Fire and Demeter and Kore and all the gods that after every magistracy they restored me healthy after pious service. Farewell.’
Φαβωνία Φλακκίλλα πρύτανις καὶ γυμνασίαρχος ἢ
ἀρχιερεία εὐχαριστῶ Ἐστία Βουλακάρθα καὶ Δήμητρι
καὶ Δήμητρος Κόρη καὶ Πυρὶ ἀφθάρτω καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι
Κλαρίῳ καὶ Σωπολί καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς θεοῖς, ὅτι

ολοκληροῦσάν με μετὰ τοῦ συμβίου μου Ἀκακίου
καὶ τῶν τέκνων μου καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων μου
τῶν ἔνιαυτῶν ἐκτελέσασαν τὰ μυστήρια πάντα
εὐτυχῶς ἀποκατέστησαν.

οἴδε ἐκουρήτευσαν

Εὐάνδρις γερουσιαστής

Περιγένης φιλοσέβ(αστος) γραμματεύς

Ἀμυντιανὸς φιλοσέβ., Φάβ(ιος) Κυριακὸς ἐστιοῦχος
φαβ(ία) Ζωσίμη ᾗ καλαθηφόρος,
μαντηλάριοι Δαμώ, Πρεισκίλλα,

Νουνεχῖς, Λουκιανῆ. εὐτυχῶς.
‘I, Favonia Flaccilla, prytanis and gymnasiarchos, the archiereia give thanks to Hestia Boulai and Demeter and Kore, daughter of Demeter, and the Undying Fire and Apollo Klarios and Sopolis and all the gods, that they returned me in good health with my companion Acacius and my children and my people having performed all the annual mysteries successfully.

These were the Curetes: Euandris was the gerousiastes, Perigenes loyal to the emperor, was the grammateus, Amyntianus loyal to the emperor, Fabius Cyriacus was hestiouchos, Fabia Zosime was kalathephoros, the mantelarioi were Damo, Priscilla, Nunechis, Luciana. Farewell.

Favonia Flaccilla, having filled as many posts as she did,33 correspondingly had a great deal for which to be thankful and many to thank. The first on her list are known from other inscriptions of the prytaneion, but the addition of Apollo Klarios is new. The oracle of Apollo Klarios is generally regarded as being rather less important than those at Delphi or Didyma, but it may have experienced an upsurge in popularity in the second century A.D. due to the beneficence of the emperor Hadrian who contributed to the completion of the shrine.34 There was a mantic Apollo in the city of Ephesus within the prytaneion but this does not seem to bear any special connection either with Apollo Klarios or the other gods of the prytaneion.35 The reasons for the mention of Apollo

33 The archiereiai have generally been regarded as wives of the asiarchoi or the archiereis when those posts are presumed to be synonymous. This has been challenged by Kearsley (1985) who sees the possibility that the archiereiai may not have been dependent upon their husbands for their titles, but instead had their own duties outside of a connection with the asiarchoi and archiereis. On the office of the gymnasiarchos, see above n. 24.
Klarios here thus remain enigmatic. Otherwise, Sopolis, also known as Sosipolis, who appears in an inscription from Magnesia on the Maeander is quite evidently a guardian of the city.\textsuperscript{36}

The Curetes are here mentioned as being five in number, with four women having served as mantelarioi. Euandris, the first in the list, possesses none of the titles mentioned in the other lists of Curetes, but rather is known solely as a gerousiastes.\textsuperscript{37} The reduction in the number of Curetes in this list, as compared with earlier ones, and the fact that it appears not alone, but rather as part of a dedication by Favonia Flaccilla, indicates a deterioration in that body, the exact reasons for which are unknown, but which is generally connected to a long process of erosion with respect to the authority of the Curetes within Ephesus.\textsuperscript{38}

145 White marble column. Eds. J. Keil, Anatolian Studies (1939) no. 4 p. 121; D. Knibbe, Forschungen in Ephesos IX 1, no F 7 pp. 65-66; Engelmann, Knibbe and Merkelbach, Inschriften von Ephesos IV, no. 1066 p. 46.

Beginning of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century A.D.

\'Αγαθη

Τύχη

Αύρηλια Ιουλιανή Παπαρίωνος, ἀγνοτάτη καὶ εὐσεβεστάτη

πρύτανις, θυγάτηρ καὶ ἐκγόνη καὶ προεκγόνη καὶ ἀνεψιά

\textsuperscript{36} See SIG\textsuperscript{3} 589 and also the inscription recording an altar dedicated to this deity in Inschriften von Ephesos IV 1235 p. 137-138.
\textsuperscript{37} Oliver (1941: 21-27) asserts that the Ephesian gerousia by this date had virtually no political authority but rather acted solely in an economic capacity.
\textsuperscript{38} See, however, the speculations of Knibbe (1981: 91 and 96).
γραμματέων καὶ πρυτάνεων καὶ ἀσιαρχῶν εὐχαριστῶ

τῇ δεσποινῇ Ἑστίᾳ καὶ πάσιν τοῖς θεοῖς, ὅτι με ὑγιαίνουσαν
[τῷ]οῖς γονεῦσιν ἀπέδωκαν

'To Good Fortune. I, Aurelia Juliana, daughter of Paparion, most pure and pious prytanis, daughter and child and grandchild and cousin of the grammateis and the prytaneis and the asiarchoi give thanks to mistress Hestia and all the gods, that they returned me healthy to (my) parents.'

The grave of an Aurelia Juliana has been found at Ephesus.39

146 Fragment of a white marble plaque found in the prytaneion. Eds. D. Knibbe Forschungen in Ephesos IX 1, no. D 3 pp. 59-60; Engelmann, Knibbe and Merkelbach, Inschriften von Ephesos no. 1077 p. 53.

211/212 A.D.

[εἶπερ ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν προνοίᾳ] Ἑστίας Βοῦ[λαιας καὶ Δήμιυρος καὶ]
[Δήμιυρος Κόρης καὶ Σωπόλεως καὶ] τῆς Νείκης καὶ Ἀπ[όλλωνος]
[καὶ Πυρὸς Ἀρβάρτου καὶ τῶν] Αὐτοκρατόρων Μ. Αὐρη[λίου Σεουή-
ρου
[᾿Αντωνείνου Σεβαστο]ῦ Παρθικοῦ μεγίστου Βρεταν[νικοῦ μεγίστου]

39 Inschriften von Ephesos VI 2218a.
Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
'Αγαθῇ Τύχῃ.
πρυτανευούσῃ
Αιλίας Σεβήρας Βάσος
θυγατρός Αιλίου Πυθίωνος

5 φιλοσεβ(άστου) γραμματέως δήμου
Αιλ(ιος) ΄Ελπιδήφορος ἐστιοῦχος
καὶ Αιλ(ια) Πάνθεια καλαθη-
φόρος καὶ Αὐρ(ηλία) ΄Επίκτησις

υποκαλαθηφόρος

10 εὐχαριστούμεν ΄Εστίς Βουλαία
καὶ Πυρὶ ἀφθάρτω καὶ Δήμητρι
καὶ Δήμητρος Κόρη καὶ ΄Απόλ-
λωνι Κλαρίῳ καὶ Θεῷ Κυνναῖῳ
καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς θεοῖς ὅτι

15 εὐτυχῶς [συνετε]λέσαμεν
ὁλον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν μετὰ
τῆς θρεψάσθης ἡμῶν.
'To Good Fortune. When Aelia Severa Bassa, daughter of Aelius Python loyal to the emperor was prytanis, we, the grammateus of the demos, Aelius Elpidephorus, hestiouchos, and Aelia Pantheia kalathephoros and Aurelia Epictesis hypokalathephoros, gave thanks to Hestia Boulaiia and the Undying Fire and Demeter and Kore, daughter of Demeter, and Apollo Klarios and the god Kinnaios and to all the gods, that we successfully completed the whole year with her supporting us.'

The name Aelia Severa Bassa is preserved also on a fragmentary inscription from Ephesus. In addition to Apollo Klarios is the god Kinnaios, who has tentatively been identified with Apollo Kynnaios of Temnus in Aeolis. Like the hestiouchos and the hystiouchos, the duties of the kalathephoros and the hypokalathephoros remain unknown.

148 Column. Eds. J. Keil, Anatolian Studies, no. 5 p. 121; D. Knibbe, Forschungen in Ephesos IX 1, no. F 10; Engelmann, Knibbe and Merkelbach, Inschriften von Ephesos IV, no. 1070 pp. 48-49.

Beginning of the 3rd century A.D. (after 212?)

[Ἐπὶ πρυτάνεως Μ. Αὐ(ρηλίου)]

Φίλ[ου ?] βου(λάρχου) φιλοσεβ(άστου)

Αὐρ(ήλιος) Εὐπόριστος ἔστινω-

40 Inschriften von Ephesos II no. 488.
χος καὶ Λύρ(ηλία) Τειμοθέα

5 καλαθηφόρος
eὐχαριστοῦμεν Ἑστία
Βουλαῖα καὶ Πυρὶ ἀ-
φθάρτῳ καὶ πᾶσιν
θεοῖς. Εὐπυρίῳ.

In the prytany of M. Aurelius Philus(?) boularchos, loyal to the emperor, we, Aurelius Eupristus, hestiouchos, and Aurelia Timothea, kalathephoros, give thanks to Hestia Boulaia and the Undying Fire and all the gods. Farewell.'

149 White marble base found in the east part of the Agora. Eds. J. Keil, Anatolian Studies (1939) no. 6 pp. 121-122; D. Knibbe, Forschungen in Ephesos IX 1, no. F 11 p. 67; Engelmann, Knibbe and Merkelbach, Inschriften von Ephesos IV no. 1071, p. 49.

Beginning of the 3rd century A.D. (after 212?)

'Αγαθη[.] Τύχη
Πρωτανε[ύ]οντος Λύρ(ηλίου)
Τηλέφο[υ] φιλοσεβ(άστου)
βουλ[άρ]χου

5 'Ονη[σίμ]η καλαθηφόρος
eὐχαριστῶ Ἑστίᾳ Boulaia
κ[αί Πυρί ἀφθάρ]τω καὶ Δήμητρι
[καὶ Δήμητρος Κ]όρη καὶ
[΄Απόλλωνι Κλαρ[ω] καὶ Θεό]
[Σωπόλει σὺν τῷ πρωτ[οκουρη]
[-----------------------]ολοίς
[-----------------------συνβίς]φ ?

'To Good Fortune. In the prytany of Aurelius Telephus, loyal to the emperor, 
boularchos, Onesima, the kalathephoros, gives thanks to Hestia Boulaia and the Undying 
Fire and Demeter and Kore, daughter of Demeter, and Apollo Klarios and the divine 
Sopolis with the protokouretes... with his companion...?'

150 White marble block found in a wall near the Agora. Eds. D. Knibbe, ÖJh 47 
(1964-1965) Beiblatt col. 42, ph. fig. 19; Engelmann, Knibbe and Merkelbach, 
Inschriften von Ephesos IV, no. 1073 pp. 50-51.

Undated.

ʻΑγαθῆ Τύχη
Λαμπυρίς εὐχα-
ριστῶ ʻΕστια
Βουλαία καὶ τοῖς
θεμελίωις ὀλοκλη-
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‘To Good Fortune. Lampyris being in sound health gives thanks to Hestia Boulaiα and to the foundation (gods).’

The ‘foundation gods’ are mentioned in another new inscription from Ephesus.\textsuperscript{42} Their identity is partly revealed through an inscription from Miletus which names Zeus, Apollo and Poseidon and the theoi enthemelioi.\textsuperscript{43} In the commentary of the Inschriften, the editors say that these gods ‘guarantee the solidity of the foundation and the structure against earthquakes.’\textsuperscript{44} In literature these were the gods responsible for the destruction of the Greek wall outside Troy (Hom. II. 12. 1-23).


Undated.

Εστία Βουλαια, σω-
ζετε πολλοίς έτεσιν
τοὺς μαντηλαρίους
Φιλήμονα Τροφίμ(ης) άτπ-

\textsuperscript{42} SEG XXXIV 1127. In this inscription they are also designated as epekoι, cf. the characterization of Hestia Boulaiα as such in 141, line 2.
\textsuperscript{43} Rehm (1924: 352 no. 298).
\textsuperscript{44} “Die Götter θεμέλιοι garantieren die Festigkeit des Bodens und der Bauwerke gegen Erdbeben.” Inschriften von Ephesos IV, no. 1073 p. 51.
'Hestia Boulaiα, preserve these many years the mantelarioi Philemon, freedman of Trophime, Euangelus and Firmus, the hestiouchos.'

Knibbe has drawn attention to the fact that part of this inscription seems to be missing, as Hestia Boulaiα is the only divinity mentioned, and σωζετε is in the plural.

Although our knowledge of Hestia in Ephesus derives principally from dedications of the Roman period, the picture of her worship there is particularly vivid. In contrast to the inscriptions from Syros of roughly the same date, the evidence from Ephesus is remarkably varied, with poems and prayers as well as dedications to thank the goddess for her protection. The prytaneis of Ephesus appear to have felt the strongest affinity towards Hestia, whose duty seemed to have mirrored their own, as a keeper of the 'Undying Fire,' and an assistant at festivals. While Hestia retained the epithet Boulaiα at Ephesus in this period, there no longer seems to have been a strong and specifically political character attached to her, rather the reverence for Hestia seems at times to border on the mystical. This tendency no doubt strengthened due to the assistance lent by the prytaneis and presumably also the other functionaries of the prytaneion to the performance of certain mysteries.
From the dedications made by these officials and their assistants, it is apparent that the prytaneion, while the traditional residence of Hestia, virtually teemed with divinities. It possessed statues of Artemis Ephesia, an oracle of Apollo, and was an important site connected with the worship of Demeter Karpotrophos, but at the center of it all was a Hestia who not only oversaw the health and well being of her administrants but of their families as well.
Erythrae

152 Stone inscribed on three sides, broken into two fragments. The upper part was found on Chios by L. Robert in 1933 and the lower part at Erythrae by Fontrier and Earinos in 1875. Edited as a whole with changes in the faces and lines of the inscription by H. Engelmann and R. Merkelbach, Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai II (1973) no. 201 with previous bibliography.

Sale of priesthoods. Only the lines regarding the priesthoods of Hestia are reproduced following the text of Engelmann and Merkelbach.

Between 300 and 260 B.C.

a 26 [Μόοχου. 'Εστίας Τεμενίας' ΗΠ, ἐπώνιον Π' ἱερο-
[γένης ἱέρω]νος, ἐγγυητής Δημήτριος Ἀριστάρχου

a 32 [τῆς] Ζήνης Φιλίσκου. 'Εστίας Βουλαίης · ΠιμΗΗΔΔΔΔ
[ἐπώνιον Δ' Δημήτριος 'Απελλίου, ἐγγυητής 'Απολλώνι-
os] Ζωηπύρου. κτλ.

c 30 [τροδώρου, ήδε ἐπεπρέπθη · 'Εστίας Τεμενίας ·---]
[---, ἐπώνιον Δ' Ἀντίπατρος 'Απολλοδώρου, ἐγγυη-
[ητής] Πρηξάς Εύβούλου. κτλ.
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"... Of Hestia Temenia. 105 drachmas 5 drachmas on deposit. Hierogenes, son of Hieron, guarantor for Demetrius, son of Aristarchus."

"... Of Hestia Boulaiia. 830 drachmas 10 drachmas on deposit, Demetrius, son of Apellius, guarantor for Apollonius, son of Zopyrus..."

"... This was sold: of Hestia Temenia... 10 drachmas on deposit. Antipatrus, son of Apollodorus, guarantor for Preexas, son of Eubulus."

The sale of priesthoods could be a substantial source of revenue for any city, while for the buyer it could represent both a public honor and the equivalent of a modern day tax shelter. As Engelmann and Merkelbach have noted, the holding of a priesthood could sometimes be used as a means of evading other kinds of liturgy.¹ While it is not known for how long a priesthood, having been sold, was held, there appears frequently to have been a process of reselling the position with a price lower than the original indicated in the inscription. Engelmann and Merkelbach have speculated that this is due to the cost of the resale having been divided into two sums. Firstly, the person purchasing the priesthood must have paid an amount to the seller equal to or higher than the original sale price. Being a private matter and of no concern to the state, this sum is not recorded in the official documents. Secondly, it is possible that this resale incurred some penalty which was assessed on the buyer as a tax to be paid to the state and this is what is reflected on the stone.

¹ Engelmann and Merkelbach, IEK II (1973: 290 n.1).
The word ἐπικόνιον is translated here as ‘deposit,’ rather than its usual meaning of ‘duty on goods sold,’ on the suggestion of Engelmann and Merkelbach, who see the mention of the guarantor as significative of the role of this small sum.²

Antipatrus is known from a dedication made on behalf of either the strategoi or agoranomoi to Aphrodite (IEK II 215, line 7).

153 Marble stele inscribed on three sides, broken in three fragments. The whole in H. Engelmann and R. Merkelbach, Die Inschriften von Erythrae und Klazomenai II (Bonn 1973) no. 207 with previous bibliography.

Sacred expenditures. Only the lines pertaining to Hestia are reproduced following the text of Engelmann and Merkelbach.

post 189 B.C.

lines 68-93: sacrifices between the 1st (?) and 7th of a month.

[τοι γαλαθηνων δυο -----------------------]ι Κόρηι κρι-

80 [ου κδ'--------------------------------] και 'Εστίαι

[---------------------------------------γαλαθηνου η',

Editorial Note: Δι Βουλαίωι και 'Εστίαι [Βουλαίαι Sokolowski.

² See the table of costs and deposits in Engelmann and Merkelbach, IEK II (1973: 291).
‘two lambs...to Kore, a ram worth 24 drachmas...and to Hestia...a lamb worth 8 drachmas.’

The sacrifices recorded here may be assumed to have been made on either the second or third day of a month whose name has unfortunately been lost.³

Miletus

154 Marble block found in the Delphinion of Miletus in the autumn of 1904. Ed. A. Rehm, Das Delphinion (Milet 1, 3 Berlin 1914) no. 3, pp. 57-58.

223 B.C.

Some lines effaced

35 [-----------------------------] οἱ ἠρημένοι ἐπὶ [τῇ]
[φυλακῆι-----------------------------] οἱ Μιλησί... ἐλέσθαι
[θεσπρότους πέντε; ἐξ ἀρχήν τούτους δὲ παραγεν[σ]ένοις εἰς τὸ
[ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀπολλώνου τοῦ Διδυμέως ἔρωταν τὸν] θεόν εἰ τῶι δῆμωι
[τῶι Μιλησίωι λῷοι καὶ ἁμείνον ἔσται τοὺς ἀνδρα]ς προσγραψα-
40 [μένωι πρὸς τὸ πολὺτεμα-----------------------------]

lines effaced

61 εσθαι[...]μο[-----------------------------]
δέχεσθαι τοὺς [ἂ]νδρ[ας-----------------------------]
ἐργος τὰ ἁριστα τῷ πλ[ήθει.....8-10....]να δὲ ἐκαστα κατὰ τὰ προ-
δεδηλωμένα γένηται μ[ετὰ τῆς τῶν θεῶν εὐμενείας, θυσίας καὶ]
65 εὐχας ποιήσασθαι τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Διδυμῆι τὸν προφήτην καὶ
tὸν ταμίαν τοῦ παρεδρε[ύοι]ντα [ἐντῶι ιερῶι, τοὺς δὲ πρωτάνεις]
καὶ τοὺς ἠρημένους ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ τῇ Ἐστίας τῇ Βουλαίας πα]-
[r]ό[ν]των τῶν ἠρημένων ἐπὶ[.............................ca. 80.........................]
The elected guard ... to five *theopropoi* chosen from amongst everybody and that these go to the sanctuary of Apollo *Didymeus* to ask the god if, for the people of Miletus, it would be better and preferable to enroll the men into the state ... the men to be accepted ... in works the best for the majority ... so that everything according to the revelations may be with the favor of the gods, and the *prophetes* is to make prayers and sacrifices to Apollo *Didymeus*, and the *tamias* in attendance within the sanctuary, and the *prytanes* and the elected guard to Hestia *Boulaia* when the elected ... are present...'

Rehm has identified this inscription as the *probouleuma* to the decree 155, passed by the Milesian assembly in which the city of Miletus granted citizenship to a group of Cretan émigrés at the end of the third century B.C.

As restored, this proposal assumes the presence of both the *prytaneis* and the 'elected guard' to perform the sacrifice to Hestia *Boulaia* with no mention of the priest who appears in the actual decree (155, line 42). Whether his presence, as well as that of *Zeus Boulaios*, was here implied, but omitted due to the abbreviated form of the document, or was later specifically added by the assembly which passed the resolution is unknown.

The *prytaneis* of Miletus were generally charged in agreements of this kind with the enrollment of the new citizens into the tribes by lot and appear not to have been the
presiding body of the council or the assembly, this task falling instead to the epistatai.¹

The composition of the ‘elected guard,’ remains largely obscure, neither their number,
nor the exact nature of their power is known other than that it appears to have been
executive in character. Schehl has observed that the institution of ‘the elected guard,’
appeared concurrently with the disappearance of the strategoi from the evidence of
Miletus during the years 334 B.C. to 17/6 or 16/15 B.C.² The reason for this
disappearance is likewise unknown but may have been tied to the fall of the city to
Alexander, just as its reappearance may be tied to the restoration of the city’s liberty by
Marcus Antonius.³ In any case, they seem to have been primarily concerned with matters
of foreign policy.⁴

155 Marble block found in the Delphinion of Miletus in the autumn of 1904. Ed. A.
Rehm, Das Delphinion (Milet I, 3 Berlin 1914) no. 37, p. 59.

223 B.C.

[Mιλησίως μέτεστιν ἵνα δὲ πάντα προσούσης καὶ τῆς [ca.2] τῶν θεῶν

40 [εὐμεν]είας τάσσεται, τὸν προφήτην καὶ τὸν ταμίαν τὸν
Διδυμεὶ τὸν δὲ στεφανηφόρον τῶι Δε[λφινώι], τὸν [θ]ε[ρα]ς καὶ τοὺς

² Schehl (1951: 118). Müller (1976: 39) however prefers not to press the date and acknowledges the
existence of ‘the elected guard,’ only as far back as their first attestation in the epigraphical record dated to
the year 262 B.C.
³ Schehl (1951: 123 n. 56).
⁴ See however their involvement in the floating of an internal loan within the city of Miletus (Rehm 1914:
210-216 no. 147).
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πρυτάνεις καὶ τοὺς ἡρωμένους ἐπὶ τῇ φυλάκῃ τῇ τε Ἑστίαι τῇ
Βουλαίαι καὶ τῷ δί τοῖ βουλαίωι ἐπευχομένους τῇ μετάδοσιν
τῆς πολιτείας ἐπὶ σωτηρία καὶ ὁμονοίαι πάντων Μιλησίων γε-
γενέσθαι [ὀπτώς δὲ τὰ ἐνεπιμένα διαμείνων τὸν αἰ̂̈̂ον, γενομέ-
νησ [τῆς μεταδόσεως] μὴ ἐξέστω τοῖς μεταληφόσι τῆς πολιτείας
[δικάζεσθαι περὶ μηθενῶς μηθενὶ τῷ πολιτ[ῶν], ἀλλ' οἰκείοις καὶ
[φίλοις ὑπάρχειν τοῖς τε πολῖταις καὶ] τοῖς ἀρχουσίν, τοῖς δὲ δόγ-
[μασίν τοῦ δήμου ἐμμένειν-----------------------------------]

‘...And so that everything will be arranged with the goodwill and ... of the gods in attendance, the prophetes and the tamias in attendance in the sanctuary together are to perform the sacrifice to Apollo Didymeus and the stephanephoros to (Apollo) Delphinios and the priest and the prytaneis and the elected guard both to Hestia Boulaias and Zeus Boulaios saying a prayer for the sharing of citizenship and for the safety and concord of all the Milesians: so that the decrees remain for all time, when there is sharing let it not be possible for those sharing the polity to bring a lawsuit for any reason against any of the citizens, but rather (let them) remain friends and associates both with the citizens and with the magistrates...’

Although a great deal of scholarship has been devoted to ascertaining the procedural aspects of how legislation was proposed and passed either with or without the aid of the Milesian boule, the rituals which accompanied that legislation appear to have followed a more or less established pattern. Apollo Didymeus, who had first to bestow
his favor and sanction to the grant of citizenship, received sacrifice from his usual
ministrants, the *prophetes* and the *tamias*. Then the eponymous magistrate of Miletus,
the *stephanophoros* of Apollo *Delphinios*, the deity to whom would be commended the
record of this decree as well as the names of those who benefited from it, performed a
sacrifice. Thirdly, the priest, the prytaneis and the 'elected guard,' were enjoined to make
offerings and prayers to Hestia *Boulaia* and Zeus *Boulaios*. The priest mentioned in
connection with the sacrifice to them is again presumably the *prophetes* of Apollo
*Didymeus*, which accords well with the presence of Hestia in the rituals that accompany
the ratification of certain Milesian treaties in this period. For in the texts of the treaties
which came from the Delphinion, Hestia, as Zeus, Apollo *Didymeus*, Apollo *Delphinios*
and others, only received sacrifices in those in which the consultation of the oracle is
specifically mentioned or can be assumed. Müller has argued that,

"The duty of the state to sacrifice to Hestia *Boulaia*, once even in conjunction with Zeus
*Boulaios*, shows most meaningfully the concrete political preeminence of the combined
bodies of the prytaneis and the 'elected guard,' ever since the last third of the third century
B.C.: As they had to represent the Milesian state before foreign powers, they represented
it in its internal affairs with respect to the divinity of the state hearth, the divine
embodiment of the state as a political unity."

5

This may be so, but not every treaty which involved the participation of the
prytaneis and the 'elected guard' entailed a sacrifice to Hestia.6 Rather, the provisions
presented here appear to mark the apogee of solemnity and ceremony accorded by the
Milesians to agreements of this kind, with the inclusion of Apollo *Didymeus* entailing, by

5 "Die Verpflichtung, von Staats wegen der Hestia Bulaia, einmal zusätzlich noch dem Zeus Bulaios, zu
opfern, zeigt auf das Deutlichste die seit dem letzten Drittel des dritten Jh. faßbare eminenten politische
Vorrangstellung der vereinigten Kollegien der Prytane und Sicherheitsbeauftragten: Wie sie den
milesischen Staat gegenüber auswärtigen Mächten zu vertreten haben, so repräsentieren sie ihn im
innerstaatlichen Bereich gegenüber der Gottheit des staatlichen Herdes, der göttlichen Verkörperung des

6 See the accords with Kios, Phygela and Seleukeia-Tralleis. Rehm (1914: 188-200, nos. 141-143,
respectively).
necessity, the public acknowledgment of all the deities whose assistance would be required for the functioning of the decree.


209/8 B.C.

20 τοῦ Λαβραύνδου· συνετέλεσαν δὲ καὶ εὐχὰς καὶ θυσίας
toῖς τε προερημένοις θεοῖς καὶ τῇ Ἑστίαι καὶ Ἄπόλλωνι Δι-
dυμεῖ· ὡπώς οὖν καὶ ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται καταρχομένων Μυλα-
σέων εἰς πάντα τὰ φιλάνθρωπα μὴ λειτούργος ἐν χάρι-
tος ἀποδόσει, δεδόχθαι Μιλησίοις· δεδόσθαι Μυλασεῦ-
25 σι πολιτείαν τοῖς νέμουσι πατρίδα καὶ πόλιμ Μύλασα ἔως εἰς
στεφανηφόρον Ἀσκληπιάδην καὶ μῆνα Ἀρτεμισίωνα. εἰ δὲ τι-
νες κατὰ δόγμα τοῦ δήμου πολίται γεγένηται, μὴ ἐνεμον δὲ
tίμι Μυλασέωμ πόλιν, ἡ ἐὰν τισί μετὰ ταῦτα δοθῇ παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς
πολιτεία, ὑπάρχειν τούτοις καὶ τὴν παρ᾽ ἡμῖν πολιτείαν νεῖμαι πρό-
τερον πατρίδα καὶ πόλιμ Μύλασα ἔτη δέ-
30 κα ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸς τὸ πολίτευμα προσγραφῆς. ὅποσι δ᾽ ἀν αὐτῶν
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τοῖς ἱεροῖς τῷ τοῦ Διός τοῦ Ὅσσω καὶ τὸν τοῦ Διός τοῦ Λαβραύν-
δου. ἵνα δέ

ἐκαστα γίνηται μετὰ τῆς τῶν θεῶν εὐχάς ποιήσασθαι συνενεγκεῖν

μετὰ τοῦ ἱέρεω τῇ Ἑστία θύει καὶ τὸν ἱερέα τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ

Διδυμέ-

ως καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς τὸν τοῦ Διός τοῦ Ὅσσω καὶ τὸν τοῦ Διός τοῦ

Λαβραύν-

dοὺ προσαγαγεῖν θυσίαν τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ εὐχάς ποιήσασθαι συνενεγκεῖν

ταῖς πόλεις ἀμφοτέραις τὰ ἐγκεφαλομένα· τοὺς δὲ ταμίας τελέσαι τὸ ἀ-

νάλωμα εἰς ταῦτα ἐκ τῶν κοινῶ προσόδων· ἐλέσθαι δὲ καὶ πρέσβεις

οἴτινες ἀφικόμενοι εἰς Μιλητον καὶ ἐπελθόντες ἐπὶ τὴν βουλήν καὶ τὸν

δήμου τὴν τε οἰκείοτητα τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν ταῖς πόλεις ἀνιανεώσου-

ται καὶ τὴν παρὰ τοῦ πλῆθους εὗνοιν ἐμφασιούσιν Μιλησίοις, ἢν ἔχει

πρὸς αὐτούς, καὶ παρακαλέσουσιν φίλους καὶ οἰκείους ὑπάρχοντας

τοῦ δήμου διὰ προγόνων καὶ αὐτοὺς περιποιεῖν τῇ πόλει πάντα τὰ εἰς

τιμῆν καὶ δόξαν ἀνήκουσα δηλοῦντας, ὅτι καὶ οἱ δήμοι οὐθὲν ἐλλείψει[ι]

[σπο]υδῆς τε καὶ φιλοτιμίας περὶ τῶν συμφερόντων ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς πό

[λεο]ίν· προσαγαγέτωσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ πρέσβεις ἐμ Μιλήτωι μετὰ τοῦ στε-

[φα]νηφόρου θυσίαν τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ εὐχάς ποιησάσθωσαν ὑπὲρ ὁμο

[νο]ίας καὶ σωτηρίας τῷ πόλεων ἀμφοτέρων. πρέσβεις ἡρεθήσαν·

90 Διονύσιος Ἰάσσωνος τοῦ Διονύσιος, Ἀπόλλωνος Ἰεροκλείους,

'Αμύντωρ Ἀρηφίλου.
‘...And they accomplished the prayers and sacrifices both to the selected gods and to Hestia and to Apollo Didymeus. With the Mylasans performing a sacrifice for all the benevolence, so that the demos might show all kindness, neglecting nothing in the bestowal of gratitude, it seemed best to the Milesians: to grant citizenship to the those inhabiting the fatherland and the city up until the time of the stephanophoros Asclepiades and the month Artemision. And if some by ordinance of the demos have already become citizens, but don’t live in Mylasa, or if citizenship be granted to some there hereafter, to provide to them also our citizenship who lived in the fatherland and city of Mylasa ten years previous to the treaty...’

‘...they are to write this decree in the shrines both of Zeus Osogos and Zeus Labraundos. And so that each might be with the favor of the gods, the stephanophoros with the priest are to sacrifice to Hestia and the priest of Apollo Didymeus and the priests of Zeus Osogos and Zeus Labraundos are to bring a sacrifice to the gods and to take vows to bring the decrees to both cities; and the ambassadors are to be chosen who will come to Miletus and visit the boule and the demos to renew the existing relationship between the cities and to demonstrate the good will issuing from the majority to the Milesians, which it holds towards to them, and to exhort the present friends and relations of the demos inherited from their forefathers and to preserve for the city those displaying what is fit and proper with respect to honor and reputation, so that the demos is lacking nothing in the way of earnestness and ambition with regard to conditions for both cities; and let the ambassadors in Miletus with the stephanophoros bring a sacrifice to Apollo and let them take vows for the concord and safety of both cities. The ambassadors were
chosen; Dionysius, son of Jason, son of Dionysius, Apollonius, son of Hierocleus, Amyntor, son of Areophilus.’

The treaty between Mylasa and Miletus was established through a mandate given to the ambassadors above which was recorded in the Delphinion as a temporary notice on a whitewashed board as well as engraved on the stone presented here. The Mylasans, in this case, were the ones to take the first steps towards establishing a treaty. Before the Milesians made their decree, the Mylasans are mentioned as having made provisions to record their own decree in the temples of Zeus Osogos and Zeus Labraundos, who were presumably the ‘selected gods’ who received sacrifice in addition to Hestia and Apollo Didymeus. This and the actual decree of the Mylasans (lines 66-91) indicate that they had already undertaken to consult the oracle on their own initiative but with the participation of the stephanephoros of Miletus. A separate set of sacrifices referred to specifically as ‘customary,’ performed again by the prophetes and the tamias to Apollo Didymeus and by the stephanephoros and the proshetairoi to Apollo Delphinios on behalf of the city of Miletus alone, was nonetheless felt to be required and was presumably performed as a complement to those of the Mylasans.\(^7\)

The worship of Hestia is attested epigraphically in both Mylasa (131) and Labraunda. (130). The sacrifices accorded her here are performed in conjunction with the local Mylasan deities, Zeus Osogos and Zeus Labraundos, and it is known that the sanctuaries of both these deities were the depositories of the most important decrees of

---

\(^7\) While the treaty with Seleuceia-Tralleis, Rehm (1914: no. 143 pp. 194-200) includes many of the same provisions as the treaty with Mylasa, including mention of the ‘customary’ sacrifices, no provision is made for Hestia. Yet, this compact, which announces the institution of an annual procession and sacrifices to Didyma, also fails to mention the presence of a Milesian representative at any consultation of the oracle which may have ratified this decision.
the city. In addition, the sanctuary of Zeus Labraundos may have included an oracle revolving around the feeding of sacred fish. This would suggest that the Mylasans had, for their part, included the local referent of each of the components which the Milesians mention in connection with the enactment of significant legislation, namely, consultation of an oracle, ratification and enforcement by a sovereign political authority and the safeguarding of the records of both.


c. 180 B.C.

οις ὡσ ἔκαστα συντελεσθῇ μετὰ τῆς τῶν θεῶν εὐμενείας συμφερόν-
tως ἀμφοτέ-
ραις ταῖς πόλεις καθηγουμένης τῆς τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος συμβουλίας, τὸ μὲν προφή-
tὴν μετὰ τοῦ ταμίου τοῦ πα[ρε]βρεύοντος ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι θυσίας ποιήσα-
αθαί καὶ προσόδους ἱερῶν τῶι τε Ἀπόλλωνι τῶι Διδυμῆ καὶ Λητοῖ καὶ Ἀθηνᾶ(ι) καὶ τῶι Δι 
tῶι

Σωτήρι, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὸν στεφανηφόρον μετὰ τῶν προσεταίρων τῶι

8 Laumonier (1958: 104).
9 Bean (1989: 44f.)
'Απόλλωνι τώι Δελφηνίωι, τούς δὲ πρυτάνεις καὶ τοὺς ἡρμένους ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ μετὰ τοῦ ἑρμιοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἰεροκήρυκος τῇ 'Εστίαὶ τῇ Βουλαίᾳ ἐπευχομένους συνενεικέν τὰ δεδομένα τῶι τέ

tῇ δῆμῳ τῶι Μιλησίωι καὶ τῶι 'Ηρακλεωτῶν' κτλ.

καὶ παρὰ Μιλησίων λαμβάνουσιν. ὅπως δὲ ἔκαστα πραξῆθη(ι) συμφερό

υτῶς ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς πόλεισιν, ἔλεσθω μὲν ὁ δῆμος ὁ Μιλησίων ἄνδρας τρεῖς μετὰ τὸ

κυρωθῆναι τὸ ψήφισμα καὶ τὴν συνθήκην, οἱ δὲ ἀποδειχθέντες ὀρκισάτωσαν μετὰ τοῦ

ἰεροκήρυκος τοὺς πρεσβευτὰς τοὺς ἠκούωντας παρὰ 'Ηρακλεωτῶν καὶ εἰς 'Ηράκλειαν

παραγενόμενοι τὸν δῆμον· ὃ δὲ ὀρκοὶ ἔστω ὡδὲ ἐμισεῖν τοῖς ὑμολογουμένοις εἰς τὸν ἅει

χρόνον καὶ 110 οὐ παραβήσομαι τέχνη(ι) οὐδεμιαί οὐδὲ μηχανῆ οὐδὲ ἄλλωι παραβαίν

οντι τὴν συνθήκην ἐπιτρέψ(ω) καὶ ἐὰν τινα ἄλλου πυθάνωμαι παραβαίνοντα τὰς ὑμολο-

gίας, οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω
κατὰ δύναμιν τὴν ἐμὴν, ἀλλὰ διήλωσο τῇ βουληκίῳ καὶ τῶι δήμωι ταῦτα ἀληθῆ, ὑπ' τὸν

 продолονα τὸν Διδυμέα καὶ τὴν Ἐστίαν τὴν Βουλαίαν καὶ τὸν Δία καὶ τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν καὶ
toὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς. καὶ μοι εὐορκοῦντι μὲν εὖ ἐΙη, εἰ δὲ ἐφιορκοῖν, ἔξωλης
eἴην καὶ αὐτὸς
115 καὶ τάμα. οἶ δὲ Ἡρακλεωτῶν πρεσβευταὶ ὀρκισότωσαν τοὺς τε
πρωτάνεις καὶ
toὺς ἡρημένους ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ καὶ τοὺς συνέδρους τοὺς μετὰ τούτων
συνγρα-
ψαμένους τὴν συνθήκην καὶ τὸν δήμου τὸν Μιλησίων τὸν πρωτερήμενον
ὁρκον τὰ δὲ
συνεγραμμένα περὶ τούτων ἀναγράψαι ἐκάτερον τῶν δήμων εἰστήλ-
ὴν λιθίνην κα[1]
ἀναθεῖναι Μιλησίους μὲν ἐν τοῖς ἱερῶι τοῦ Ἡρακλεώνος τοῦ Δελφινίου,

120 τῷ ἱερῶι τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς. ἐὰν δὲ τῇ κοίνηκι φαίνηται ταῖς πόλεσιν
dιορθοῦσαι τῆς διὰ τὴς
πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς. ὀπότεροι δὲ ἐν μὴ ἐμμείνωσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ συνθήκῃ κατα-
κεχωρισμέ-
νοις, ἀδικοὶ δὲ ἐστῶσαν τῶν θεῶν, οὐς ὁμοσαν, καὶ ἀποτεισάτωσαν οἱ
μὴ ἐμμείναντες
τοῖς ἑμείναις τάλαντα πεντῆκοντα. ἤρεθησαν δὲ καὶ ἄνδρες οἱ ὀρκοῦντες

125 τοὺς πρεσβευτὰς τοὺς παρὰ Ὑρακλεωτῶν καὶ Ἀὐτοκλῆς
Ποσειδώνιον, Ὑθογένης Λεωδάμαντος, Πασίκλῆς Φιλίδου.

‘...so that everything may be accomplished with the good will of the gods profitably for both cities with the advice of Apollo acting as guide, the prophetes with the acting tamias are to make sacrifices in the shrine and processions of the sacrifices both to Apollo Didymaeus, Artemis, Leto, Athena and Zeus Soter and likewise the stephanephoros with the proshetairoi are to make sacrifices to Apollo Delphinios, and the prytaneis and the elected guard with the priest and hierokeryx are to make sacrifices to Hestia Boulaia praying that the decrees bring profit to both the people of Miletus and those of Heraclea...’

‘...And so that everything may be done profitably for both cities, let the demos of the Milesians choose three men after the ratification of the decree and agreement, and let those appointed who come to the demos, along with the hierokeryx, administer an oath to those ambassadors coming from the Heracleotes and to Heraclea. Let the oath be thus; I will abide by the agreements for all time and I will not betray them either by any means or in any manner nor will I allow someone else to betray the treaty, and if I learn about someone breaking the agreements, to the best of my ability I will not allow it, but I will reveal the truth to the boule and the demos, by Apollo Didymaeus and Hestia Boulaia and Zeus and Athena and the other gods. And may things go well for me obeying my oath,
but if I am forsworn, may I be accursed, both me and mine. And let the ambassadors of
the Heracleotes make the prytaneis, the elected guard and the synedroi with them who
agreed to the treaty and the demos of Milesians swear the chosen oath, and the demoi of
both cities are to inscribe the agreements about these things on a stone stele and the
Milesians are to dedicate it in the shrine of Apollo Delphinios, and the Heracleotes in the
shrine of Athena. But if something of this treaty appears for both these cities in common
to be amended, it is possible for them to make the amendment with the demoi exchanging
ambassadors between one another. And whoever might not abide by the positions set out
in the treaty, let them be unrighteous in the eyes of the gods by whom they swore and let
those who do not abide by the treaty pay to those who do the sum of five hundred talents.
And the men were chosen who administered the oath to the ambassadors of the
Heracleotes and the ones with the Heracleotes, Autocles, son of Poseidonius, Theogenes,
son of Leodamas, Pasicles, son of Philides.’

Forming what is perhaps the most lavish of state ceremonies yet attested in the
inscriptions from Miletus for an inter-state treaty, this accord provides for yet another
safeguard for the efficacy of the decree in the oath that is to be taken by the officials of
both Miletus and Heraclea. Here, the first part of the formal ceremonies where the
prophetes and the tamias are to lead and make sacrifices is expanded to include not only
Apollo Didymeus, but also Artemis, Leto, Zeus Soter and Athena as well. Each of these
deities, with the exception of Athena, the chief divinity of the Heracleotes, is attested at
Didyma and had smaller precincts (save, perhaps, Leto) within the temenos of Apollo there.  

In addition to the prytaneis and the ‘elected guard,’ moreover, is the inclusion of the hierokeryx in the sacrifice to Hestia Boulaia. This position is not otherwise attested for Miletus, or, to my knowledge, Heraclea.

Conversely, the oath is taken not by each of the deities to whom the sacrifices are led and performed but inclusively by Apollo Didymeus, Hestia Boulaia, Zeus, Athena and the other gods. The abbreviated nature of this catalog becomes even more extreme in the treaty between the city of Miletus with the people of Pidasa (158) where only Hestia Boulaia is mentioned by name. Presumably her inclusion in the oath is demanded for the same reasons as her inclusion within the set of sacrifices which accompanied the treaty itself, namely, that her favor was sought in both the ratification and enactment of the agreement.

158 White marble stele found in 1903 in the Delphinion, now in Berlin. Ed. A. Rehm, 

Das Delphinion (Milet I, 3 Berlin 1914) no. 149, pp. 226-233.

[ἐ]κ τούτων προσόδος. ὀρκισάτω δὲ ὁ στεφανηφόρος μετὰ τοῦ ἱεροκή-


ρυκος

[τ]ούς τε ἡκοντας ἐκ Πιδασέων προσβευτάς καὶ τοὺς πρωτάνεις καὶ

toū[σ] εἰρημένους ἐπὶ τῇ φυλακῇ καὶ τοὺς κεχειροτονημένους συν-

ἐδροὺς τὸν ὄρκον τόνυδε ἐμεμωνὶς τοῖς ὁμολογημένοις καὶ ἀναγεγραμ-
μένοις [εἰς] τὸν ἅει χρόνον καὶ οὐ παραβῆσομαι τέχηνι οὐδεμιᾷ οὐδὲ
μηχα-
νῇ οὐδὲ ἄλλως ἀλλοις εἰς παραβαίνωτι τὴν συνθήκην ἐπιτρέψω, καὶ ἐὰν τιν
ἀλλοι πυνθάνωμαι αἰροῦμενον παραβαίνειν τὰς ὁμολογίας, οὐκ ἐπι-
τρέψω κατὰ δύναμιν τὴν ἐμὴν, ἀλλὰ δηλώσω τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ
ταῦτα ἀληθῆ, νὴ τὴν Ἑστίαν τῇ Βουλαίαι καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους θεοὺς.
καὶ μοι εὐορκοῦντι μὲν εὖ εἶν, εἰ δὲ ἐφιορκοῖν, ἐξώλης εἴην καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ
tάμα. ὁμόσαι δὲ ἐμὶ Πιδάσοις καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Πιδασεῖς τοὺς ὄντας
ἐπιθήμους καὶ ἐν ἡλικία ὑπάρχοντας τὸν αὐτὸν ὄρκον προσομνύντας
καὶ τοὺς κατέχοντας αὐτῶν τὴν πόλιν θεοὺς. ὁπότεροι δὲ ἂν μὴ ἐμμ(ε)-
νω-
νδὶ τοῖς ἐν τῇ ἑ ἐν τῇ συνθήκη κατακεχωρισμένοις, ἄδικος τε εἶνα
αὐτοὺς τῶν θεῶν, οὐς ὁμωμόκασιν, καὶ ἀποτείσαι τοὺς μὴ ἐμείναν-
tας τοῖς ἐμείνασιν τάλαντα τριάκοντα.

‘…Let the stephanephoros along with the hierokeryx administer this oath both to
the ambassadors from Pidasa and the prytaneis and the elected guard and the elected
synedroi; I will abide by the agreements and the registers for all time, nor will I break
them by any means or in any manner, nor will I allow someone else to break this treaty,
and if I learn that someone else elected is breaking the agreements, to the best of my
ability, I shall not allow it, but I will reveal the truth to the boule and the demos, by
Hestia Boulaia and the other gods. And may things go well for me obeying my oath, but
if I am forsworn, may I be accursed, both me and mine. And among the Pidasans, both the Pidasans at home and those in service, they are also to swear the same oath adding the gods who maintain their city. And whichever of the two does not abide by the positions in this treaty, let them be unrighteous in the eyes of the gods by whom they swore, and let those who do not abide by the treaty pay to those who do the sum of three hundred talents.'

Relatively little is known for certain regarding the state of Pidasa at the time when this treaty was established. In the context of the other treaties recovered from the Delphinion of Miletus, this agreement shows the prominent involvement of Hestia even in contexts which do not specifically involve the oracle of Apollo at Didyma. Rather, her presence as the only deity mentioned distinctly reinforces what the Milesians considered most important about this treaty, namely its passage and enforcement by the prytaneis and the ‘elected guard,’ and the people of Pidasa, who are expressly granted permission to add whichever deity they wish in addition to her.

'Επὶ Φιλτέω το Διανυσίο μολπῶν αἰσυμνῶντος, προεταίροι ἦσαν Οἰ-
νω-
πῶν 'Αγαμήδης 'Αριστοκράτεως, Ὀπλῆθων Λύκος Κλέαντος,
Βίων 'Απολλοδώρο, Βωρέων Κρηθεύς 'Ερμώνακτος, Ὀράσων 'Αν-
τιλέοντος, ἔδοξε μολποίσιν τὰ ὀργία ἀναγράγαντας θεῖναι ἐς
τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ χρῆσθαι τούτοισιν. καὶ οὕτωι τάδε γραφθέντα ἐτέ-
θη. 'Εβδομαιοίσιν. ἤτιθι σγωί απολεί καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ ἢ σπλάγχα σπείσσοσι
μολπῶν
αἰσυμνήτης: ὃ δὲ αἰσυμνήτης καὶ ὅλ προεταίρος προσαιρεται, ὅταν οἱ
κρητῆρες πάντες σπεσθέωσι καὶ παισωνίσωσιν τῇ δὲ ἐνάτῃ καὶ ἀπὸ
tῆς ὀσφύος καὶ τῆς πεμπάδος, ἢν ἱσχοσιν στεφανηφόροι,
τούτων προλαγχάνει τὰ ἱερὰ ὁ νέος. ἄρχονται θύειν τὰ ἱερὰ

ταρχοῦ ἀπὸ τούτων Ὄπόλλωνι Δελφινίωι καὶ κρητῆρες κιννέαται
κατό-

περ ἐμολπῶ

καὶ παιῶν γίνεται, ὃ δὲ ἐξιὼν αἰσυμνήτης ἀπὸ τῶν ἡμί-

σε-

ων θύει Ἡστίη καὶ κρητῆρας σπενδέτω αὐτὸς καὶ παισωνίζετω· τῇ

δεκά-

τῃ ἀμιλλητήρια, καὶ διδοται ἀπὸ μολπῶν δύο ἱερήμα τοῖσι στεφανηφό-

ροισιν τέλη, καὶ ἐρθεται Ὄπόλλωνι Δελφινίωι, καὶ ἀμιλλώνται οἱ στε-
φανηφόροι οἱ τε νέοι καὶ ὁι ερεω̃τ καὶ οίνον πίνοσι τοῦ μολπῶν, καὶ κρητῆρες
σπένδονται κατόπερ ἐμμολπῶν· ὁ δὲ ἔξιων αἰσυμνήτης παρέχει ἀπερ

ὁ Ὀνιτάδης καὶ λαγχάνει ἀπερ ἔν Διδυμα, ἡ πόλις διδοὶ ἐκατόβην τρία ἱερήμα τέλειαι· τούτων ἐν δήλῳ, ἐν

20 δὲ ἐνορχῆς· ἐς μολπῶν ἡ πόλις διδοὶ Ταργηλίοισιν ἱερῷν τέλειου
καὶ Μεταγε[1]-

tύοισιν ἱερῷν τέλειου, Ὑβδομαιοῖσιν δὲ δύο τέλειαι καὶ χον τοῦ παλ-

τῆς ἐκάστης· τούτοις τοίς ἱεροῖσιν ὁ βασιλεὺς παρίσταται, λαγχάνει δὲ

οὐδὲν πλῆθον τῶν ἀλλῶν μολπῶν, καὶ ἄρχονται οἱ στεφανηφόροι

Ταυρεῶ-

νος θύειν Ἀπολλωνὶ Δελφινίωι ἀπὸ τῶν ἄριστερῶν ἀπαρξάμενοι, καὶ

τκρητη-

25 πίσας τέσσερας. καὶ γυλλοὶ φέρονται δύο, καὶ τίθεται παρ’ Ἐκάτην

τὴν πρόσθεν

πυλέων ἐστεμμένος καὶ ἀκρῆτω κατασπένδετε, ὁ δ’ ἐτερος ἐς Διδυμα ἐπὶ

θύρας τίθεται· ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσαντες ἔρχονται τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν πλατείαν

μέχρι

ἀκρο, ἀπ’ ἀκρο δὲ διά δρυμο· καὶ παιονίζεται πρῶτον παρ’ Ἐκατην

342
πρόσθεν πυ-
λέων, παρὰ Δυνάμει, εἶτεν ἐπὶ λειμών ἐπὶ ἄκρο παρὰ νύμφαισ' εἶτεν

κελάδο, παρὰ Φυλίωι, κατὰ Κεραιίτην, παρὰ Φυλίωι δὲ θύα θύetai

πάντες ἐτεα. Ὅνιτά-

δησι πάρεξις κεράμῳ σίδηρῳ χαλκῷ ξύλῳ οὐδατός κύκλῳ δαίδος ριπῶν

κρέα ἐπιδιαίρει φαλαγκτηρίων δεσμῶν τοῖς ἱερήσοις' παρὰ στεφανη-

φόρος

λύχνου καὶ ᾠλειφα' ὁπτήσις σπλάγχων, κρεῶν ἐψησίς, τῆς ὀσφύος καὶ

τῆς πεμπάδος, ἢν στεφανηφόροι ἱσχοσίν, ἐψησίς καὶ διαίρεσις,

καὶ μοῖρης λά-

ξις. ἐπιπέσαν τὰ ἑλατρά ἐξ ἱμεδίμῳ τωπόλλωνι πλακόντινα, τῇ

Ἤκα-

tη δὲ χώρις. γίνεται Ὅνιτάδησιν ἀπὸ μολπῶν ὀσφύες πᾶσαι ἐκτὸς

οἵν οἱ

στεφανηφόροι ἱσχοσίν, δέρματα πάντα, θυαλήματα τρία ἀπ' ἱερή ἐκά-

στο, θύ-

ων τὰ περιγινόμενα, οἴνων τὸν ἐν τοῖς κρητηρὶ περιγινόμενου, πεμπὰς

τῆς ἦ-

μέρης· ὁτι δὲ ἄν τούτων μὴ ποιῶσιν Ὅνιτάδαι, ἔαδε μολποῖσιν ἐπὶ

Χαροτίνῳ, στε-

φανηφόρος ἀπὸ τῶν ἱστηίσων παρέχεν. ὁτι δ' ἄν Ὅνιτάδαι χρηιζόσιν,

ἔαδε μολποῖ-
σι στεφανηροσιου επιτετράβαι.
τωι κηρυκι ατελει ἐμολπῶν πάντων καὶ λάξις σπλάγχνων ἀπὸ
θυών ἐκαστέων καὶ οἴνος φορη ἐς τὰ ψυκτήρια τέλεσι τοῖον ἐωυτο, ὁ δ' οἶνος ἀπὸ
μολπῶν γίνεται.
45 τωι ὑδώι δεῖπνου παρέχει ὁ ιέρεως, ἀριστον δὲ ωἰσυμνήτης.

Editorial Note: The stone and the editions of it are a wretched mess. Perhaps the most accessible text, that of Sokolowski, is imprecise. Our gratitude goes instead to Wilamowitz who, in addition to being the only commentator to date to dare attempt translate this document, also had the perspicacity to publish a remarkably clear photograph of it in its entirety. This has enabled me to clarify some gray areas in the text of Sokolowski created by his use of parentheses, and also to restore those letters in the text which he omitted as due to errors on the part of the scribe. Nonetheless, I do not feel qualified to pass a final judgment without a first-hand knowledge of the stone and the most disputed passages I have marked with cruces.

'When Philtes, son of Dionysius was *aisymnetes* of the *molpoi*, the *prohetairoi* were Agamedes, son of Aristocrates, from the tribe Oinopoi, Lycus, son of Cleas, from the tribe Hoplethoi, Bion, son of Apollodorus, from the tribe Boreas, Cretheus, son of Hermonax, Thrason, son of Antileon. It seems best to the *molpoi* having inscribed the rites, to put them in the shrine and to put them to use. And these writings were placed there. In the festival of the Hebdomaia: on the eighth, *apolei(?)* let the *aisymnetes* of the
molpoi pour a libation on the sacrifices or the entrails(?). Let the aisymnetes also choose the proshetairos, whenever all the mixing bowls are to be poured forth in libation and the paean sung. On the ninth day, both from the loin and from the fifth, which the stephanephoro hold, the new (aisymnetes) is additionally to be assigned equal portions of these. They start to perform the sacrifices from these things to Apollo Delphinios. And the mixing bowls are mixed just as among the molpoi and let there be a paean, and the departing aisymnetes from the halves let him sacrifice to Hestia and let he himself pour out the mixing bowls in libation and sing the paean. On the tenth day, contests, and two perfect sacrifices are given by the molpoi to the stephanephoro, and be accomplished to Apollo Delphinios, and let the stephanephoro, both the new and the ?? and they drink the wine of the molpoi, and let the mixing bowls be porn in libation as among the molpoi. And let the departing aisymnetes provide the same as the Onitades and get what the Onitades gets.

Whenever the stephanephoro go to Didyma, let the city give a hecatomb, three perfect sacrifices. One of these being female, and one uncastrated. Let the city grant to the molpoi a perfect sacrifice in the month of Thargelion and the month of Metageitnion, but at the festival of the Hebdomaia two sacrifices and the pouring out of an old chous at each festival. And the basileus is to be present at these sacrifices, and is to get no more than the molpoi.

And the stephanephoro in the month of Taureon they are to make first-fruit offerings to Apollo Delphinios starting from the left, and four mixing bowls.

And two gulloi are to be carried and (one) having been garlanded is to put before Hecate outside of the gates and let them pour a libation of unmixed wine upon it, and the
other is to be set down before the gates of Didyma. And when they have done this they are to travel the flat road up to the heights, and from the heights through the woods. And let them sing the paean first beside Hecate outside of the gates, at Dynamis, and let them go to the meadow on the height by the Nymphs and let them go to Hermes Enkelados, at Phylius, down to Keraiites, by the men of Chares, and in the all-sacrifice year a hide is to be offered at Keraiites, and at Phylius, incense is to be offered annually. And to the Onitadai is entrusted the responsibility for the provision of clay, iron, and bronze (vessels?), firewood, water, trays, pine-wood (for torches?), matting from which to distribute the meat, wooden shackles for the sacrifices. Beside the stephanephoros a lamp and oil. A roasting of the entrails, a boiling of the meat, of the loin and the fifth, which the stephanephoroi have, boiling and division, and allotment of a portion. And the flat cakes from the half-bushel go to Apollo, but separately for Hecate. From the molpoi are all the loins for the Onitadai with the exception of what the stephanephoroi have, all the skins, three cakes from each victim, the leftovers of the sacrifice, the leftover wine in the mixing bowl, the fifth of the day.

Whatever the Onitadai fail to do, it is decreed by the molpoi under Charopinus, that the stephanephoros make up from that which belongs to Hestia. Whatever the Onitadai should require, mandated to the molpoi, should be left to the stephanephoroi. For the keryx, there is to be an exemption from all payments in the house of the molpoi and a portion of the entrails from each of the sacrifices, and the transportation of the wine to all the wine-coolers at his own cost, except for the wine provided by the molpoi. For the musician the priest should provide dinner, and the aisymnetes, breakfast.'

346

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
As one of the most important documents to come from the city of Miletus, the regulations of the *molpoi* form a vital, if somewhat opaque, record of the duties revolving around this group of singers and the *stephanephoros* of Apollo *Delphinios*, who as leader of the *molpoi*, was also designated as *aisymnetes*. For the purposes of the present investigation, however, only the references to Hestia are of special import as they have received little attention since the initial translation and commentary by Wilamowitz. It was he who ventured the first opinion on the appearance of Hestia in this inscription,

He (the *aisymnetes*) performs the farewell offering to Hestia, i.e. the goddess of the hearth, which is not here (i.e. the Delphinion), but in the house of the singers. It is proper that he pay homage to the goddess of the house over which he has presided for a whole year. From the possessions of Hestia, the singers take the tools and other appurtenances for the sacrifice.

It is generally agreed that this portion of the regulations of the *molpoi* dates at the latest to the first half of the fifth century B.C., but no structure which could be definitively identified as the house of the *molpoi* has yet been identified. The festival of the Hebdomaea, nonetheless, seems to have been the time when both the incoming and outgoing *aisymnetes* and *proshetairoi* engaged in drinking and singing contests and sacrificed to Hestia at the transition of the office.

The second connection with Hestia comes near the end of the inscription in the provisions made for the *stephanephoroi* to accomplish whatever might have been left

---

11 As stated previously in the Editorial Note, Wilamowitz (1904) remains to this day the only complete translation of this document of which I am aware. Robertson (1987) while commenting at length and even translating portions of this document, nonetheless apparently sees the first mention of Hestia in line 13 as unworthy of consideration.

undone by the Onitadai using the funds named after Hestia or the hearth, "ἀπὸ τῶν ἱεροτῆτων," (line 41).¹³

While n the inter-state treaties preserved in the Milesian Delphinion, it generally seems prudent to uphold her association with the bodies of the prytaneis and the 'elected guard,' there appears to have been a more intimate connection with the molpoi and the stephanephoros or aisymnetes than the later documents show.

160 Cylindrical altar found in 1908. Ed. A. Rehm Der Südmarkt und die Benachbarten (Milet, I, 7 Berlin 1924) no. 299.

1st century B.C.

Θευδᾶς Ζωπύρου

'Απόλλωνι Διδυμί
καὶ Ἤστις Βουλαίᾳ
καὶ τῷ Δῆμῳ.

'Theudas, son of Zopyrus, to Apollo Didymos and Hestia Boulaiα and the Demos.'

¹³ Cf. the similarly named funds on Delos 28.
The deities mentioned here are the same as those mentioned on the architraves of the bouleuterion dedicated by Timarchus and Heracleides (161-162) so it is not unlikely that this dedication was made in some political context.


2nd century B.C.

καὶ τῷ Δῆμῳ.

'Timarchus and Heracleides the sons of Heracleides, on behalf of king Antiochus Epiphanes to Apollo *Didymeus* and Hestia *Boulaia* and the *Demos*.'

Knackfuss found the absence of Zeus *Boulaios* in an inscription so prominently displayed within the Miletan bouleuterion unusual, but noted that the first two divinities mentioned in this inscription were the same, and occupied the same positions as in the
oath included within the treaty with Heraclea. The Demos referred to here is that of the Milesians.

The dedicators belonged to the family of Timarchus, the tyrant of Miletus, removed by Antiochus II Theos (287-246 B.C.) who then raised his descendents at the Seleucid court. Under Antiochus IV Epiphanes (215-164 B.C.) Timarchus and Heracleides both occupied high positions at that same court, the former acting as satrap of Media and the latter apparently controlling the royal finances at the time of the death of the young Antiochus V Eupator (164-162 B.C.). Timarchus eventually revolted against the successor of Antiochus, Demetrius I Soter, but the insurrection ended with his death around 160 B.C.

The erection of the bouleuterion as it exists today has been dated to some time between 175 and 164 B.C.

162 Inscription on two blocks of marble which make up part of the south front of the architrave of the propylon of the bouleuterion. Ed. H. Knackfuss Das Rathaus von Milet (Milet I, 2 Berlin 1908) no. 2 and ph. p. 73 fig. 98.

2nd century B.C.

[Τίμαρχος καὶ Ἡρακλεῖδης οἱ Ἡρακλείδου ὑπὲρ βασ[ιλέως Ἀντιόχου Ἐπι-
φαν[οὺς]

---

14 Knackfuss (1908: 71).
15 The institution of the cult of the Roman demos and the goddess Roma occurs in Miletus around 130 B.C. Müller (1976: 16).
16 Will (1982 II: 367ff.)
17 Bean (1967: 228ff.).
Timarchus and Heracleides, the sons of Heracleides, on behalf of the king Antiochus Epiphanes to Apollo Didymeus and Hestia Boulaia and the Demos.'

The evidence for Hestia worship in Miletus attaches to three specific contexts. The first, following consultation of the oracle of Apollo at Didyma occur in state sacrifices to Apollo Didymeus, Hestia (Boulaia) and Apollo Delphinios on the occasion of interstate treaties. These three deities form the most basic group which may be expanded by the addition of Zeus (Soter), the other members of the Apollonian triad, Artemis and Leto as well as other divinities introduced by the state making the treaty with Miletus. The second attaches to the dedications made in the bouleuterion to Apollo Didymeus, Hestia Boulaia and the personified Demos of Miletus. Lastly and with the strongest claim to the ancient nature of Hestia worship are the regulations of the molpoi. When the aisymnetes was enjoined to perform a sacrifice at the hearth during the festival of the Hebdomaea, and the existence of certain hearth funds used in this case, to supplement the those of the Onitadai.
Priene


1st century B.C.

[Διονύσου?]  [Ποσείδώνος]  Ἑστία[ς]

[Ἡλικωνίου]  [Βουλαίας]

[ἐμ Παν]ιωνίωι

‘Of Dionysus? Of Poseidon *Helikonios* in the Panionion. Of Hestia *Boulaia.*’

Editorial Note: The restitution of Dionysus was suggested by Hiller.

The names of the divinities above are each surrounded by a crown, the first by ivy, the second by oak, the third by laurel. All of these deities have one explicit link in the inscriptions of Priene, namely, that each presides over one facet of the honors which the city traditionally bestowed on its benefactors, that is, privileged places in the theatrical contests, meals in the Panionion and meals in the ptytaneion.¹

¹ δεδόσθαι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ προεδριὰν ἐν τοῖς ἁγώναι καὶ ἐμ προεταλέω καὶ ἐμ Πανιωνίῳ σίτησιν. The phrase is found numerous times in the inscriptions of Priene. Hiller (1906: *passim*).
Philadelphia


2\(^{nd}\)/1\(^{st}\) century B.C.

Ἁγαθὴς Τ[ύχης].

ἀνεγράφησαν ἐφ’ ὑγιείας καὶ κοινῆς σωτηρίας
καὶ δόξην ἀρίστη τὰ δοθέ[ντα παραγγέλμα]-
tα Διονυσίωι καθ’ ὑπὸν π[ρόσοδον διδόν]·
5 τ’ εἰς τὸν ἑαυτὸν οἶκον ἀνδρά[σι καὶ γυναῖξιν]
ἐλευθέροις καὶ οἰκέταις. Διὸς [γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ]
tοῦ Εὔμενοῦς καὶ Ἑστίας τ[ῆς παρέδρου αὐ]-
tοῦ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν Σωτ[ήρων καὶ Εὐδαί]-
μοίας καὶ Πλούτου καὶ Ἄρετῆς [καὶ Ἡγείας]
καὶ Τύχης Ἀγαθῆς καὶ Ἀγαθοῦ [Δαίμονος καὶ Μνή]-
μῆς καὶ Χαρίτων καὶ Νίκης εἰς ὑ[ρμένοι βοῶμεν].

τούτ[ωι] δέδωκεν ὁ Ζεὺς παραγγέλ[ματα τοὺς τε ἁ]-
γυισμοὺς καὶ τοὺς καθαρμοὺς κ[αὶ τὰ μυστηρία ἐπι]-

353
τελείν κατά τε τά πάτρια καὶ ως νῦν [γεγραπται· poreu]-

15 ὁμενοι εἰς τὸν οἶκον τούτον ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικὲς
ἐλευθέροι καὶ οἰκέται τοὺς θεοὺς [πάντας ὅρκουσ]-
θωσαν δόλων μηθένα μήτε ἀνδρὶ μή[τε γυναικὶ εἰδό]-
tες μὴ φάρμακον πονηρὸν πρὸς ἄνθ[ρωποις, μὴ ἐπωι]-
δὰς πονηρὰς μήτε γινώσκειν μή[τε ἐπιτελείν, μή]

20 φίλτρον, μὴ φθορεῖον, μὴ [ἀτ]οκεῖον, μ[ὴ ἀλλο τι παιδο]-
φόνον μήτε αὐτοὺς ἐπιτελεῖν μήτε [ἐτέρωι συμβου]-
λεύειν μηδὲ συνιστορεῖν, ἀποστερ[ούντες δὲ μη]-
δὲν εὐνοεῖν τῷ οἶκῳ τῷ διδ, καὶ ἑάν τις τούτων τι ποιήν
tι ἢ ἐπιβο[υλε]ὐη, μήτε ἐπιτρέψειν μή[τε παρασιω]-

25 [πῆσα]ειν, [ἄλλ]α ἐμφανιεῖν καὶ ἀμυνεῖοθα[ι. ἀνδρα παρά]
[τὴν] ἐαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἀλλοτρίαν ἢ [ἐλευθέραν ἢ]
δούλην ἄνδρα ἔχουσαν μὴ φθερεῖ[ν μηδὲ παιδα μὴ].
[δὲ] παρθένον μηδὲ ἐτέρωι συμβουλ[εύσειν, ἄλλῳ ἂν τι]-
υι συνιστορήσῃ, τὸν τοιοῦτον φα[νερὸν ποιήσειν]

30 καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ μ[ὴ ἀποκρύψειν μὴ]-
δὲ παρασιωπήσειν γυνὴ καὶ ἀνὴρ, ὅς α[ν ποιήθε καὶ τῶν προ]-
γεγραμμένον, εἰς τὸν οἶκον τούτον μ[ὴ εἰσπορεύεσθω]
θεοὶ γ[ἀ]ρ ἐν αὐτῶι ἰδρυνται μεγάλοι καὶ τ[αῦτα ἐπισκοποῦ]-
σιν καὶ τοὺς παραβαίνοντας τὰ παραγ[γέλματα οὐκ ἀνέ]-

35 ξονται· γυναῖκα ἐλευθέραν ἄγνην εἰν[αι καὶ μὴ γινώσκε]-
eιν ἄ[λ]λου ἄνδρος πλὴν τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ εὐνη[ν ἢ συνούσιαν· ἐ]·
ἀν δὲ γνώι, τὴν τοιαύτην μὴ εἶναι ἂγ[ν]ήν, ἀλλὰ μεμισσαμένην καὶ μύσο[υ]ς ἐμφυλίου πλής[ρ]η καὶ σοβεσθαὶ ἀναξίαν
παρατυγχ[άνει]ν μηδὲ τ[οῖς] ἂγ[ν]ισμοῖς καὶ καθαρμοῖς
προσκόπτειν μηδὲ ὀρῶν ἐπιτελοῦμ[ενα τὰ μυστήρια· ἐ]-
ἀν δὲ ποθὶ τι τοῦτων, ἀφ’ οὔ τὰ παρα[γγέλματα εἰς τὴν]-
de τὴν ἀναγραφὴν ἥκουσιν, κακᾶς [ἀράς παρὰ τῶν]
θεῶν ἔξει [τὰ πα]ραγγέλματα ταῦτα [παρορῶσα· ὁ θεὸς γὰρ]45
tαῦτα οὔτε βούλεται γίνεσθαι μηθ[αμός, οὔτε θέλει, ἀλ]-
lά κατακολουθεῖν. οἱ θεοὶ τοῖς μὲ[ν ἀκολουθοῦσιν ἐ]-
σονται ἔλεως καὶ δώσοντι αὐτοῖς ἀεὶ πάντα τάγα]-
θὰ, ὡσα θεοὶ ἀνθρώποις, οὕς φιλοῦσιν, [διδόσαιν· ἐάν δὲ τι]-
νες παραβ[αι]υσαι. τοὺς τοιοῦτους [μισήσουι καὶ με]-
γάλας αὐτοῖς τιμωρίας περιθήσοւσιν. τὰ παραγγέλμα]-
tα ταῦτα ἐτέθησαν παρὰ Ἀγγελιστίν [τὴν ἀγιώτατην]
φύλακα καὶ οἰκοδέσποιναν τοῦδε τοῦ ὅ[ικου, ἡτίς ἀγαθάς]
dιανοίας ποιεῖτω ἀνδράσι καὶ γυναιξίν [ἐλευθέρω· καὶ]50
dούλοις, ἵνα κατακολουθῶσιν τοῖς ὅ[δε γ]εγραμμένοις, καὶ ἐν]
tαῖς θυσίαις ταῖς τε ἐμμένοις καὶ ταῖς κατὰ ἐνιαυτὸν ἅ]-
pτέσθωσαν, ὡσοὶ πιστεύουσιν ἐα[υτοῖς ἄνδρες τε καὶ]
[γυναικεῖς τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης, ἐν [ὁ] τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ παραγγέλ]-
[μα]τά είσιν γεγραμμένα ἵνα φανεροί γίνωνται οἱ κατα]-
[κολοῦ]θοῦντες τοῖς παραγγέλμασιν καὶ οἱ μὴ κατακολοῦ]-
'To Good Fortune. The precepts for health and the common safety and the best reputation, given to Dionysius in his sleep, were written down giving profit to his house, (and) to men and women, free and slave.

For in this place are built altars of Zeus Eumenes and his companion Hestia and the other gods Soteres and Eudaemonia and Plutus and Arete and Hygieia and Agathe Tyche and Agathos Daimon and Mneme and the Charites and Nike. To this man, Zeus gave precepts, expiations and purifications and mysteries to perform both in the traditional way and as has now been written.

To this man Zeus has given ordinances for the performance of purifications, the cleansings and the mysteries, in accordance with ancestral custom and as has now been written.

When coming into this oikos let men and women, free people and slaves, swear by all the gods neither to know nor make use wittingly of any deceit against a man or a woman, neither poison harmful to men nor harmful spells. They are not themselves to make use of a love potion, abortifacient, contraceptive, or any other thing fatal to children; nor are they to recommend it to, nor connive at it with, another. They are not to refrain in any respect from being well-intentioned towards this oikos. If anyone performs
or plots any of these things, they are neither to put up with it nor keep silent, but expose it and defend themselves.

Apart from his own wife, a man is not to have sexual relations with another married woman, whether free or slave, nor with a boy nor a virgin girl; nor shall he recommend it to another. Should he connive at it with someone, they shall expose such a person, both the man and the woman, and not conceal it or keep silent about it. Woman and man, whoever does any of the things written above, let him not enter this oikos. For great are the gods set up in it: they watch over these things, and will not tolerate those who transgress the ordinances.

A free woman is to be chaste and shall not know the bed of, nor have sexual intercourse with, another man except her own husband. But if she does have such knowledge, such a woman is not chaste, but defiled and full of endemic pollution, and unworthy to reverence this god whose holy things these are that have been set up. She is not to be present at the sacrifices, nor to strike against (?) the purifications and cleansings (?), nor to see the mysteries being performed. But if she does any of these things from the time the ordinances have come on to this inscription, she shall have evil curses from the gods for disregarding these ordinances. For the god does not desire these things to happen at all, nor does he wish it, but he wants obedience. The gods will be gracious to those who obey, and always give them all good things, whatever gods give to men whom they love. But should any transgress, they shall hate such people and inflict upon them great punishments.
These ordinances were placed with Agdistis, the very holy guardian and mistress of this *oikos*. May she create good thoughts in men and women, free people and slaves, in order that they may obey the things written here.

At the monthly and annual sacrifices may those men and women who have confidence in themselves touch this inscription on which the ordinances of the god have been written, in order that those who obey these ordinances and those who do not may be manifest.

*Zeus Soter*, accept the touch of Dionysius mercifully and kindly, and be well disposed towards him and his family. Provide good recompenses, health, salvation, peace, safety on land and sea --- likewise ---.’

Translation Note: Save for small alterations at the beginning and the end the translation is that of Barton and Horsley.

At first glance, nothing could seem more natural than to observe Hestia presiding over the *oikos* of Dionysius, were it not for the fact that here ‘*oikos,*’ refers not simply to the physical edifice where this association met, but also to the group of worshippers, itself.¹ An assembly of private individuals who united in an unusual form of mystic society, founded by Dionysius as the result of a divine revelation given to him in his sleep (καθ’ ὑπνοιν, line 4), this *oikos*, as a physical structure, at least, was previously the domain of Agdistis, a Phrygian manifestation of the Magna Mater.² While her worship

---

² Barton and Horsley (1981: 13 n. 23).
continued in this place, the new gods, the Greek gods, some of whom are attested nowhere else in this region of Asia Minor, receive here a privileged place.

Foremost among these gods is a rarely attested aspect of Zeus with the epithet *Eumenes*.³ Accompanying this Zeus is an assembly of personifications whose names rather concretely reflect the gifts that the worshippers expected them to bestow. The requirements for these blessings in this life entailed two general sets of prohibitions; the first demand a refraining from the use of various charms and drugs which could endanger human life at any stage, the second an abstinence from various sexual licenses.

Aeolian Aegae

165 Four fragments of an epistyle found on the acropolis which have been rejoined. Eds. frags. a and b Clerc, BCH 10 (1886) p. 290; The whole by Schuchhardt, Altertümer von Aegae pp. 33-34.

'Αντιφάνης Ἀπολλωνίδα Δία Βολλαίῳ καὶ Ἰστίᾳ Βολλαίᾳ καὶ τῷ δαμοῖ.

'Antiphanes, son of Apollonides, (dedicates this) to Zeus Boulaios and Hestia Boulaia and the demos.'

This inscription remains undated. No further reference to Hestia at Aegae has come to light.

138-133 B.C.


ψηφίζεσ-

[θαὶ τὰς πρεποῖσας αὐτῶι τιμᾶς, ὡπὼς ἐπὶ τοῖς γεγενημένοις ἀγαθοῖς
τῶι βασι-
λεῖ ἐκτενεῖς οἱ πολίται φαίνωνται καὶ ἀποδιδόντες αὐτῶι τὰς καταξίας
χα-

5 ριτὰς τῶν εὐημερημάτων καὶ τῶν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς εὐεργεσίων· ἀγαθῆι τύ-
χηι, δεδοχθαὶ τῇ βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δῆμῳ, στεφανῶσαι τὸν βασιλέα
χρυσῶι στε-

φάνωι ἀριστεῖωι, καθιερώσαι δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀγαλμα πεντάπτηχυ

τεθωρακισμέ-

νον καὶ βεβηκός ἐπὶ σκύλων ἐν τῶι ναῷ τοῦ Σωτῆρος Ἀσκληπιοῦ, ἵνα
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σύνναος τῷ θεῷ, στῆσαι δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰκόνα χρυσῆν ἐφιπποῦ ἐπὶ στυ-
λίδος μαρμαρίνης παρὰ τοῦ Δίος [τ]ου Σωτήρος βωμόν, ὅπως ὑπάρχη

η

eἰκῶν ἐν τῶι ἐπιφανεστάτωι τόπῳ τῆς ἀγορᾶς, ἐκάστης τε ἡμέρας ὁ

στε-

φανηφόρος καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ [ά]γωνοθέτης ἐπιθυμεῖτος

λιβανωτὸν

ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τ[ου] Δίος τοῦ Σωτήρος τῷ βασιλεῖ. τὴν δὲ ὄγδον, ἐν

ἡι παρεγένετο

eἰς Πέργαμον, ἱερὰν τε εἰναὶ [εἰς] ἀπαντα τὸν χρόνον καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ

ἐπιτελείοθαι κατ᾽ ἑνι-

αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἱερέως τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως

συμπομπευόντων τῶν εἰ-

θισμένων καὶ παρασταθείσης θυσίας καὶ καλλιεργείσης συναγέθωσαν

ἐν τῷ ίερῷ οἱ ἄρχοντες. δίδοοθαι δὲ εἰς τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ τῇ σύνοδον

αὐτῶν

ὑπὸ τοῦ ταμίου τῶν ἀμετοίστων προσόδων ἀπὸ τοῦ πόρου τοῦ

Ἀσκληπιείου ἀρ-

γυρίου δραχμάς πεντήκοντα, τὴν δὲ θυσίαν καὶ τῆς ύποδοχῆς

ἐπιμελεῖσθωσαν

οἱ ἱερονόμοι. γενέσθαι δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφάς, ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἀγάλματος. Ὁ

δῆμος βασιλεά
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"Ατταλοῦ Φιλομήτορα καὶ Εὐεργέτην θεοῦ βασιλέως Εὐμένου Σωτῆρος ἀρετῆς ἐνεκεν καὶ ἀνδραγαθίας τῆς κατὰ πόλεμον, κρατήσαντα τῶν ὑπεναντίων [ἐπὶ]

δὲ τῆς εἰκονος· Ὁ δῆμος βασιλέα "Ατταλοῦ Φιλομήτορα καὶ Εὐεργέτην θεοῦ βασιλέως Εὐμένου Σωτῆρος ἀρετῆς ἐνεκεν καὶ φρονίσεως τῆς συναυξάνσεσ τὰ πράγματα καὶ μεγαλομερείας τῆς εἰς ἑαυτὸν. ὅταν δὲ παραγίνεται εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν, [στε]-

φανηφόρησαι πάντα ἐκαστον στεφανηφόρον Δώδεκα Θεῶν καὶ θεοῦ βασιλέως Εὐμένου, καὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ τὰς ἱερεῖς ἀνοιξάντας τοὺς ναοὺς τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἐπιθύουντας τὸν λιβανωτὸν εὐχε[σ]θαίνειν τε καὶ εἰς τὴν ἁεὶ χρόνον
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ιερείας καὶ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἀρχοντας καὶ τὸν γυμνασίαρχου μετὰ τῶν

τας τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων ἁγίων στεφάνιους καὶ τὸν γυμνασίαρχον μετὰ τῶν

ἐφήβων καὶ τῶν νεῶν καὶ τὸν παιδίων καὶ τὸν παῖδα τοὺς πολίτας καὶ τὰς γυναίκας καὶ παρθένους πάντας καὶ τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐν ἐσθητογυμνασίας ἐστεφανωμένους. εἰναι δὲ καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν ἱεράν, ἐν ἤμι ἄμω παραγράφει ἡμῖν τεισ τὴν ποιμένα καὶ θυσάμοι τοὺς πολίτας πανε

δημεί κατὰ φυλὰς, παρασχομένων τῶν φυλάρχων θύματα. δοθήναι δὲ εἰς ἑκάστην φυλήν εἰς αὐτὰ ἔξ ἱερῶν καὶ τοὺς πολιτικῶς προσόδοους δραχμάς

eἰκοσιν. παραστὰ[θεὶση]ς δὲ κἀκε ἔμοι[σ]ας ὡς καλλίστης ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου ἔπι τοῦ βωμοῦ τοῦ Διός τοῦ Σωτηροῦ τοῦ βασιλεῖ, ποιήσας[θ]αι τὸν τὸν ἱεροκήρυκα τὴν ἀναγγελίαν τῆν ὁ. ὁ δὴμος ἐτύμησε βασιλεῖα Ἀτταλίον

Φιλομήτωρο καὶ Εύ-

εργεύ̣την τῷ εὐμένις Σωτηροῦ τοῦ χρυσῶι τοῦ στεφάνων ἀριστερῶι καὶ

ἀγάλματι πενταπήκαι καὶ εἰκόνι ἄρει ἢ [ἑ][ὲν] [κ]αι
μελετάμε στή
eις εαυτόν. πάντας άνευφημήσαι κελεύσει τα. θύλαι δε αυτώι καὶ
άλλας

θυσίας [ἐπὶ] στωιά[ι τῇ βασιλικῇ καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ βωμῷ] τῆς Βουλαί[ας]

'Εστίας

eις τὸ πρω-
τανείον [ἐπὶ] τ[ὴν κοινὴν ἐστίαν καὶ νεμέτωσαν αὐτῶι] με[ρίδας ἕν τοῖς
tῶν χαρισ-
τηρίων [ἱεροὶς τοὺς θυσμένοις ύφ᾽ ὑπέρ] τοῦ β[ασιλείως. ἦνα δὲ καὶ ὁ

βασιλεὺς εἰ-
δῆ[ι] τὰ ἑσπηρισμένα τῶι δήμῳ, πεμπάτωσαν αὐτῶι οἱ ἄρχον[τε]ς τὸ
ψήφισμα κ[αὶ] πα-
ρακάλει[το]ς[αν εὖνου] [δύνα] καὶ ε[ὑρ]γέτην τοῦ δήμου,

συντηροῦντα τήν

ὑπάρχουσαν διὰ προγόνων φιλανθρωπίαν πρὸς τὴν πόλιν [ἀ]εὶ τινὸς

[ἀ]γάθοι

παραίτ[ι]ον γίνεσθαι αὐτῶν [διὰ τὸν] δήμου, ὡς εἰς βελτίων καὶ

εὐδαιμο-
νεστέραν π[αραγίνηται κατά]στασιν τὰ κοινὰ τοῦ πολιτείματος.

'ιν[α] δὲ τὰ γε-


ἐκφανή
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προ[φανῶς] ὑπὸ πάντων θεω[ρηται], ἀναγράψαι τὸ ψήφισμα εἰς στήλην μαρμαρίνην καὶ
στῆσαι

πο[ν]όσαμένων
τῶν στρατηγῶν. τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τόδε [κ]ύριον εἶναι εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν
χρόνον
καὶ κατ[α]τε[θη]ναι αὐτὸ ἐν νόμοις ἵπποις.

'... hostile territory which he first ... since no one surpasses the king in goodwill, fitting honors are to be decree for him, so that the citizens may appear grateful to the king for the good things in the past and pay back to him thanks worthy of his successes and his good deeds to them.

To Good Fortune, it seems best to the boule and the demos, to award the king with the finest golden crown, and to dedicate a statue of him five cubits high wearing a cuirass and poised on spoils in the temple of Asclepius Soter, so that he may be the temple companion of the god. And on a marble column to erect a golden statue of him sitting on a horse next to the altar of Zeus Soter, so that the statue may be in the most conspicuous place in the agora. And each day let the stephanephoros and the priest of the king and the agonothetes offer frankincense to the king on the altar of Zeus Soter. And the eighth day of the month, when he came to Pergamum, is forevermore to be a holiday and each year on that day is to be held a parade, as fine as possible, of the customary processionists
from the prytaneum to the precinct of Asclepius and the king. And when the sacrifices are
provided and offered with good omens, let the archontes assemble in the shrine. And
fifty drachmas are to be provided for the sacrifice and the meeting by the tamias from
their inalienable funds of the cash reserves of the Asclepieion, and let the hieronomoi
oversee the sacrifice of the reception also. And there are to be inscriptions on the statue
(in the temple), ‘The people (honor) king Attalus Philometor and Euergetes, son of the
divine King Eumenes Soter for his virtue and nobility in war, having vanquished (his)
enemies,’ and on the statue (beside the altar), ‘The people (honor) King Attalus
Philometor and Euergetes, son of the divine King Eumenes Soter for his virtue and his
outstanding concern regarding the affairs and his own great merit.

And whenever he comes to our city, each stephanephoros is to crown every one
of the Twelve Gods and King Eumenes. And the priests and priestesses having opened
the temples of the gods and offering incense are to make a prayer: ‘Both now and
forevermore grant to King Attalus Philometor and Euergetes, health, safety, victory,
strength, both on land and sea, both attacking and defending, and may his queen remain
eternally blameless in complete security.’ And the prescribed priests and priestesses, the
strategoi, the archontes, the victors having crowns from the games, the gymnasiarchos
with the ephebes and the young men and the paidonomos with the children, the citizens,
all the women and maidens and the resident aliens wearing garlands are to give him his
due in white clothing. And the day is to be a holiday, on which he comes to the city, and
the citizens are to sacrifice as a whole by tribes, with the phylarchoi providing the
offerings. And for these things each tribe is to be given twenty drachmas from the
sacrifices and the monies of the city. And with as fine a sacrifice as possible being
offered by the *demos* on the altar of *Zeus Soter* to the King, the *hierokeryx* is to make the following pronouncement: ‘The people honor King Attalus Philometor and Euergetes, son of the divine King Eumenes Soter with the finest golden crown and with a statue (in the temple) five cubits high and with a statue (beside the altar) for his virtue and his own great merit.’ bidding all to proclaim with shouts. And they are to sacrifice to him also other sacrifices in the *stoa basilika* on the altar of Hestia *Boulaia* and *Zeus Boulaios*. And let the *strategoi* summon him to the Prytaneion, to the common hearth and let them serve to him portions among the sacrifices of the thank-offerings offered by us on behalf of the king. And so that the king may know the things decreed by the *demos*, let the *archontes* send to him the decree and proclaim him as generous and a benefactor of the *demos*, maintaining the benevolence which has existed for generations towards the city and always being responsible for something good for the city, so that the common affairs of the state come to a better and happier situation. And so that the things wrought by the king in his struggles in war may be known to all forever and his magnificence be attested clearly by all these things, the decree is to be written on a marble stele and set up in the shrine of Asclepius in front of the temple, with the *strategoi* in charge. And the decree is to be in effect for all time and set down in the sacred laws.’

The fragmentary nature of the beginning of this inscription makes unclear exactly who caused it to be written and erected. The date however is easily established by the short reign of Attalus III Philometor, the last Attalid king, to whom it pertains. The stone itself was found near Klisseköi, which is in the area of Elaea, the ancient harbor of
Pergamum, and the question as to whether the inscription refers to either Elaea or Pergamum has been in dispute since its publication.

The discussion has generally focused around the celebration of the holidays, the location of the monuments and the magistrates involved. Curtius was the first to draw attention to the distinction between the two locales within the inscription itself by the different provisions made for when the king came ‘to Pergamum,’ (εἰς Πέργαμον, line 14) and ‘to our city,’ (εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν, line 26). Conze, however, thought that the statues of Attalus, the shrine of Asclepius Soter, and the altar of Zeus Soter were to be associated with the buildings and monuments not at Elaea but at Pergamum, Fränkel equivocated on the location of the monuments, preferring to await archaeological confirmation, but stated that the officials in charge of this were certainly Elaean. Hopp claimed that the inscription was from Pergamum and only later carried off to Elaea in whose environs it was found, and the opinion that the decree is actually Pergamene appears currently to have won general acceptance. If this is the case, however, I find it very strange that this inscription includes no provision for the prytaneis of Pergamum, who were both its eponymous magistrates, and involved in the entertaining of guests at the ‘common hearth.’


---

1 Curtius (1872: 69).
2 Conze (1884: 12f.).
3 Fränkel (1890: 157).
6 IG Rom IV, 293, II.
letters from the imperial period

--] Ἑστία τεόν [---

'... to Hestia of the gods...'

Both the orthography and the find spot of this inscription place it in the period of the Roman empire. The signs revealed by the archeologists indicate a site of Hestia worship, but this is certainly not the Hestia of the prytaneion which is presumed to have been located elsewhere. Furthermore as Radt notes, 'To whatever extent here in the imperial period, in the building of the new shrine, Roman influence was involved, the Roman cult of Vesta moved to the forefront, while perhaps the veneration of Hestia had taken place in the prytaneion as in Ephesus and Miletus.'

Calchadon


2nd century B.C.

'Ανκριτήρες τοι ἐπὶ βασιλείος
'Αντιφίλου τοῦ Θεγείτου,
Διονύσιος Ἀμυνάδα,
Σωσιγένης Σωσιγένειος

5 Διότιμος Διονυσίου
'Εστία.

'The ankriteres in the basileus-ship of Antiphilus, son of Thegeitus, Dionysius, son of Amynades, Sosigenes, son of Sosigenes, Diotimus, son of Dionysius, (dedicated this) to Hestia.'

The function of these 'examiners' is not known, and the word remains a hapax. A prytaneion with a hearth is known to have existed in Megara, the mother-city of
Calchadon,¹ but of the major colonies of Megara, only Heraclea Pontica preserves a mention.²

¹ Miller (1978: 150 no. 79).
² Lloyd-Jones (1994: 3).
Sinope


End of the 4th/ Beginning of the 3rd century B.C.

'Αριστ[α]ρχ[ο]ς 'Αρχίππου
Μήτρις [Κ]αλλικράτου[ς]
Διονύ[σ]ιος 'Αρχίππου
Λάμαρχ[ο]ς
[ca. 3-4]ος Καλλισθένο[υς]
Δημήτριος Φιότιος
Διόφαντος Εὐλαμπίχου
'Αγ[ε]λίδας Βαβύττου
Γληρίς Λεμβίου
'Αφροδίσιος 'Αφροδίσιον
'Ηφαίστιος 'Εξηκέστου
["Ασκληπιόδωρος 'Ολύμπου
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Δημόστρατος Προμηθίωνος
[β]ουλῆς ἐπιστ[α]τεύοντος Διονυσίου[ν]
[τ]ού 'Αρχίππου γραμματεύοντος
Λαμάχου τοῦ Χορηγίωνος.

Editorial Note: The restitutions are those of Robinson.

'When Epidemus, son of Epielpos, was nomophylax the prytaneis in the month Panemus dedicated this to Hestia Prytaneia; Aristarchus, son of Aristarchus, Metris, son of Callicrates, Dionysius, son of Archippus, Lamachus, ... son of Callisthenes, Demetrius, son of Phintis, Diophantus, son of Eulampichus, Agelidas, son of Babytus, Gleris, son of Lembius, Aphrodisius, son of Aphrodisius, Hephaestius, son of Execestus, Asclepiodorus, son of Olympus, Demostratus, son of Promethion, when Dionysius, son of Archippus was epistates of the boule, (and) Lamachus son of Choregion, was the grammateus.

D. H. French has recently reported having been unable to locate this stone, and that the mention of Hestia Prytaneia is "unique in the epigraphic corpus of pre-Roman Asia Minor."¹ Nothing further regarding her cult or the functions of any of these magistrates at Sinope exists.

Ankara


[’Απο]λλοφάνης
[’Ε]στίν θεός
εὐχήν

‘Apollophanes (dedicated this for a) vow to (the) goddess Hestia.’

Found near the modern village of Ameth, this inscription was one of two linked by Philippe Le Bas with the ‘local’ cults.\(^1\) As neither of the two inscriptions mentioned a specific location, their exact provenance in antiquity remains open. Regarding Hestia, ‘whose cult in a country where the thermal waters abound is nothing which should surprise us,’\(^2\) little more has been done by way of investigation in the area.

---

\(^1\) The inscription which formed the other half of this pair was a dedication to a god known only by the epithet *Terateios*, which Le Bas took to be an epithet of Asclepius. Le Bas (1845: 327).

\(^2\) “‘dont le culte dans un pays où les eaux thermales abondent n'a rien qui doive nous surprendre.” ibid. (1845: 327).
Laodikeia on the Lykos


136/137 A.D.

Τερέντιος Λούγεινος [θε]ίαν Ἐστιαν ὑλεών
τῇ πατρίδι σὺν τῇ βάσει καὶ τῷ βωμῷ ἀντὶ
ἀρχῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων, *vacat*.
πεπραβευκὼς *vac.* καὶ δίς προϊκα πρὸς τε

5 Λούκιον Καίσαρα εἰς Παννονίαν καὶ πρὸς
τὸν μέγιστον Αὐτοκράτορα Τί. Αἰλιον
'Αδριανὸν 'Αντωνείνον Σεβαστοῦ Εὐσεβῆ
εἰς Ῥώμην ἀντὶ στρατηγίας.

'Terentius Longinus (dedicated) the gracious goddess Hestia for the fatherland with the base and with the altar in return for the office in charge of the revenues ... having
served as *presbeutes* ... and twice at his own expense both to Lucius Caesar in Pannonia and to the emperor Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius in Rome as part of the office of the *strategia*.'

Corsten has interpreted the structure of this dedication as a base in the form of an altar and with the base as actually a small “Postament,” on this base.¹ The position of the *strategos* in Laodiceia is attested in this inscription and one other as having had control of the finances of the city.²

The inscription mentions two embassies of Terentius Longinus. For the first he travelled to Pannonia of whom the governor in 137 A.D. was L. Aelius, who was named L. Ceionius Commodus before his adoption by Hadrian in 136 A.D., at which time he took the name L. Aelius and the title of Caesar. Corsten has supposed that the motivation for this embassy to Pannonia was to congratulate him on this promotion. The second embassy may then have been for similar reasons, namely to congratulate Antoninus Pius for his ascension to the Principate after the death of Hadrian.³

---

² ibid. (1997: 158 no. 82, lines 4-5).
Phasilis

171 White marble found from a round edifice found in the ruins of the theater. Ed. E. Kalinka, TAM II, 3 (1944) no. 1185.

4th/3rd century B.C.

[']Αριστοκράτεια καὶ Νικάρης
ὑπὲρ Ἀθανίωνος τοῦ πατρὸς
δαμιουργήσαντος
‘Εστία καὶ ‘Ερμᾶι.

‘Aristocrateia and Nicares on behalf of their father, Athanion, the demiourgos, to Hestia and Hermes.’

The names of this dedication are otherwise unknown, as is the title of the demiourgos for the city of Phasilis, although its presence in this colony of Rhodes and the fact that it appears with Hestia is unsurprising.¹ Neither Hermes nor Hestia, however, is attested from any other epigraphical evidence there.

¹ See Rhodes 47-51.

Οἱ ἐνθάδε θεοὶ: Ἡστία Ἐρμῆς Δημήτηρ Ποσειδῶν Ζέυς Ἡρα Ἀρτέμις Ἀπόλλων Ἡφαίστος Ἀθηνᾶ Ἀρης Ἀφροδίτη Ἄν?

The gods here: Hestia, Hermes, Demeter, Poseidon, Zeus, Hera, Artemis, Apollo, Hephaistos, Athena, Ares, Aphrodite, written by Euelthon, son of ..., and the Sidymean, Eutyches, of son of Telesius.'

This is a list of the Twelve Gods of Sidyma.

1st century A.D.

'Εστι[ία]ς ?[-] ι Βουλαία[ίας;]

'Of Hestia ... *Boulaia*?'

Little is known of the city of Marion/Arsinoe during this period. Strabo (14. 6, 3, 683) recorded that there was a grove of Zeus, and a recent inscription from the time of Tiberius mentions a temple of Zeus and Aphrodite.¹

---

¹ Mitford (1990: 2193).
Palaipaphos


14 A.D.

[Νη την ἡμετέραν Ἀκραίαν Ἀφροδίτην και[ι]]

την ἡμετέραν Κόρην ν καὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον Ὕλα-

την Ἀπόλλων καὶ τὸν ἡμέτερον Κερύνητην

Ἀπόλλω ν καὶ τοὺς ἡμετέρους σωτηρὰς

5 Διοσκούρους ν καὶ τὴν κοινὴν τῆς νήσου

Βουλαίαν Ἐστίαν ν καὶ θεοὺς θεᾶς τε τοῦ[ς]

κοινοὺς τῆς νῆσου πατρώους νν καὶ τὸν

ἐκγονὸν τῆς Ἀφροδίτης Σεβαστῶν Θεῶν

Καίσαρα νν καὶ τὴν ἁέναον Ἑρώμην ν καὶ τοῦ[ς]

10 ἄλλους θεοὺς πάντας τε καὶ πάσας ν αὐτο[ι]

tε καὶ οἱ ἐκγονοὶ ἡμῶν ὑπακούσεθαι

πειθαρχῆσειν ν κατὰ τὴ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν

ἐυνοῆσειν ν σεβάσεσθαι vacat 12
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Τιβέριον Καίσαρα Σεβαστοῦ ὑὸν Σεβαστοῦ τὸν σὺν τῷ ἀπαντὶ αὐτοῦ οἶκῳ ὕπνας καὶ ὕπνας τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνος φίλον τε καὶ ἔχθρον τε ἔξειν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν μόνοις 'Ρώμη καὶ Τιβερίωι Καίσαρι ν Σεβαστοῦ ὑἰωὴ Σεβαστῶι νας. 12 ψοῖς τοῦ αἰ̑ματος αὐτοῦ λας καὶ οὐδενὶ ἄλλω τῶν πάντων ν εἰσηγήσεσθαι ψηφίσ[α]σ[θαι](?) [ιερά------------------------]

‘By our Aphrodite Akraia and our Kore and our Apollo Hylates and our Apollo Kerynetes and our Dioscuri Soteres and the common Hestia Boulaia of the island and the common ancestral gods and goddesses of the island and the offspring of Aphrodite, theos Caesar Augustus and eternal Rome and the other gods and goddesses, both ourselves and our offspring are to listen to them and obey both on land and sea, to regard favorably and to revere ... Tiberius Caesar Augustus, son of Augustus with his whole household and to have the same friends and enemies as they do and with the other gods to propose the decreeing (of divine honors) to Rome and Tiberius Caesar Augustus, son of Augustus and to the sons of his blood and to no others of the rest ...’
This unusual oath, which contains little of the usual formulae, was originally thought to have been sworn by deities which represented the different regions of Cyprus.\(^1\) Among this group, Hestia, designated both as \textit{Boulaia} and \textit{την κοινήν τής νήσου} (line 5), represented the union of these regions at Nea Paphos, the center of the Cypriot \textit{koinon} and customary seat of the Roman governor. Aphrodite \textit{Akraia} is known from another inscription from Cyprus and seems to have been identical with the Paphian Aphrodite.\(^2\) Kore appears in conjunction with Demeter at Curium Apollo \textit{Kerynetes}, the Dioscuri \textit{Soteres} and Hestia \textit{Boulaia} are found here for the first time.

---

\(^1\) i.e. Aphrodite \textit{Akraia} for the eastern portion of the island, Apollo \textit{Hylates} and \textit{Kerynetes} for the southern and northern coasts, the Dioscuri \textit{Soteres} for the west, and Kore for the center. Mitford (1960: 77).

\(^2\) See Mitford (1960), Mlynarczyk (1990: 145) and Strabo 14, 68, 2 who describes her temple on the tip of the Karpas peninsula as one which, ‘cannot be entered or seen by women,’ "\textit{αδυτον γυναιξι και αφρατον}"
Egypt


152-145 B.C.

Βασιλεῖ Πτολεμαίωι καὶ βασιλίσσῃ

Κλεοπάτραι τῇ ἀδελ[φῇ, θε]οῖσι Φιλομὴτορο[ί],

καὶ τοῖς τούτων τέκνοις καὶ "Ἀμωου

tῷ καὶ Χνο[ῦβει] καὶ ["Η]ραί [τῇ κ]αὶ Σάτει

καὶ Ἐστίαι [τῇ] καὶ Ἀνούκ[ε] καὶ Διουύσοι

tῳ καὶ Πετ[ε]μπα[ε]ντει κ[α]ὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις

θεοῖς ύπέρ Βοήθου τοῦ Νικοστράτου

Χρυσαρέως, τοῦ ἀ[ρ]χωματοφύλακος

καὶ στρατηγοῦ καὶ [κτίστῳ τῶν ἐν τῇ]

10 Τριακοντασχοῖνωι πόλεων Φιλομητορίδ[ος]

καὶ Κλεοπάτρας, εὖ[ν]οίας ἐν[κ]ε

ἡς ἔχουν διατελ[ε]ῖ πρ[ός τε τὸν βασιλέα]

καὶ τήν βασιλίσσαν κ[αὶ τά τέκνα α]ὔτῶν.

'Ἡρώιδης Δημοφώντος [Περγαμηνός
15 τῶν διαδό[χω]ν καὶ ἴγεμῶν ἐ[π'] ἀνδρῶν
καὶ φρούραρχος Συήνης [καὶ γερρ]οφύλαξ
καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνω τόπων [ταχθεῖσ] καὶ
προφήτης τοῦ Χυ[ούβεως] κ[αὶ ἀρχ]ιστολιστ[ῆς]
tῶν ἐν Ἐλεφαντίνη [καὶ Ἀβάτων] καὶ Φίλας

20 ἱερῶν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι [ἱερεῖς τῆς πεν]ταφυλίας
τοῦ Χύόμω [Ν]εβιῆσ [καὶ θεῶν Ἀδελφῶν καὶ]
θεῶν Εὐεργετῶν [καὶ θεῶν Φιλοπατόρων
καὶ θεῶν Ἐπιφανῶν καὶ θεοῦ Εὐπάτορος
καὶ θεῶν Φιλομητόρων, οἱ τῆ[ν] σύνοδον

25 συνεσταμένοι[ι εἰς τὸ ἐν Σήτει] ἱερ[ῶν],
ὁπῶς ἄγωσι[ν εἰς τιμὴν Πτολεμαίο] τ[ῃ τοῦ
βασιλέως καὶ[ι] τῆ[ς βασιλίσσ[ῆς καὶ τῶν
τέκνων αὐτῶ[ν] ἐ]ν Οὐασιᾶς ἐ]ο[ρῶ](κα[ί]
tῆν γενέθλιον ήμὲ[ραν τὴν Βο[ῆ]θου

30 κατὰ τῶν κείμενον [βασιλικ]ὸν νόμο[ν]
ὁν τὰ ὀνόματα ὑπ[ογέγραπται].

'To king Ptolemy (VI) and the queen Cleopatra (II), his sister, to the divine
Philometores and their children, to Ammon who is also called Chnoubis, and to Hera
who is also called Satis, and to Hestia who is also called Anoukis, and to Dionysus who
is also called Petempamentes, and to the other gods on behalf of Boethus, son of
Nicostratus, the Chrysaorean, archisomatophylax and strategos and founder of the cities
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Philometoris and Cleopatra in the Triaskontaschoinai for the goodwill he holds towards the king and queen and their children. Herodes, son of Demophon, of Pergamum, of the diadochoi, hegemon of the reserves and appointed phrouarchos of Syene and gerrophy lax of the places above it, prophetes of Chnoubis, archistolistes of the sacrifices in Elephantine and Abaton and Philae and the other priests ... of Chnoum Nebieb and of the divine Adelphoi and the divine Euergetai and the divine Philopatores and of the divine Epiphanaiai and of the divine Eupator and of the divine Philometores who held a session (of this association) in the shrine at Satis, so that they may celebrate in honor of the king and queen and their children, annual banquets and the birthday of Boethus according to royal law the names of whom are written below.'

The dating of this dedication comes from the reference to the divine Eupator (θεοῦ Εὐπάτορος, line 23) who received his cult title in 153/152 B.C. and the death of Ptolemy VI Philometor in 145 B.C.¹ After the deified members of the royal house, the first divinities mentioned here are the members of the so-called 'Cataract Triad.'² The Greek names are here given before the Egyptian ones, while in the second dedication by Herodes (176) the Egyptian ones take precedence, perhaps in a show of deference to local sensibilities.³ All three deities are associated with the flooding of the Nile, the source of which was symbolically presumed by the Egyptians to be the first cataract. Chnoubis is the hellenized version of Chnoum, the ram-headed god, who in Egypt was sometimes called upon to assist at childbirth, and consequently was later seen as deity who governed the destiny of certain mortals. In this syncretized form, Chnoubis was sometimes

¹ Bernand (1973: 126 n. 56).
² Attested as far back as the Middle Kingdom LÄ I 951 s.v. Chnum.
associated with the Agathos Daimon.\textsuperscript{4} That Chnoum was the premier deity of this region at the time is reinforced by his description in line 21 as 'Chnoum Nebieb,' or 'Chnoum the Great.'\textsuperscript{5} Satis (Eg. Satet) was the consort of Chnoum although her worship may actually have antedated his own,\textsuperscript{6} while Anoukis (Eg. Anuket) was alternatively her sister or daughter.\textsuperscript{7} King Ergamenes (reg. 270-260 B.C.) is described in one text as, 'son of Chnoum, born from Satet, nursed by Anuket.'\textsuperscript{8} These deities of the first cataract intimately connected as they were with the annual flooding of the Nile were taken in the main to be fertility gods. The last god, Dionysus or Petempamentes, was the lord of the island of Sehěl (Gr. Setis).\textsuperscript{9} The name Petempamentes has been alternately translated as, 'he who is in the hereafter,' or 'the god of the hereafter,' most likely an aspect of Osiris who was frequently conjoined with Dionysus.\textsuperscript{10} Further explanation of the association of Hestia with Anuket cannot in my estimation be grounded securely on any one attribute or set of functions ascribed to either the Greek or the Egyptian deity without a further study of the religious atmosphere prevailing around the first cataract at this time.

As for the dedicator, according to the titulature of Boethus and Herodes, the latter was at this time the subordinate of the former. Moreover, taking the titles, \textit{phrouarchos} and \textit{gerrophylax}, of Herodes as a guide, his duties on the southern frontier of the Ptolemaic kingdom seem to have been largely military and religious.\textsuperscript{11} As \textit{prophetes}, a term which held wide currency in Egyptian religion under the Ptolemies, Herodes would

\textsuperscript{4} LA I C 953 s.v. Chnum.
\textsuperscript{5} Bernard (1989: 265f.).
\textsuperscript{6} LA V 487 s.v. Satet.
\textsuperscript{7} As sister LA V 488 s.v. Satet and as daughter LA I 333 s.v. Anuket.
\textsuperscript{8} LA I 333 s.v. Anuket.
\textsuperscript{9} See below 176, lines 5-6.
\textsuperscript{10} LA IV 994. See also Bernard (1989: 271) who discusses the etymology of Petempamentes as 'he who belongs to Amenhes.' Amenhes signifying the underworld. Cf. Plut. \textit{De Iside, 29}.
\textsuperscript{11} For an in-depth discussion of these duties, see Mooren (1977: 127-130). For the explication of the phrase \textit{γυμενῷ ἐπὶ ἀνδρῶν}, see Holleaux (1942: 3-12).
still have been among the upper echelon of the priestly hierarchy. As archistolistes, moreover, he would most likely have been in command of those, ‘who, each day, had to see to the cleansing, clothing and ornament of the divine statues and keep in the halls of the temple the jewels, raiment and objects designated for this custom.’

Boethus, was the last strategos of the Thebaid to carry the title archisomatophylax. Later (between 149 and 135 B.C.) being promoted to the rank of the protoi philoi, and (post 135 B.C.) syngenes and epistrategos, his titles, far from placing him at the margins of Ptolemaic power, placed him as the equal of the epistrategos of the chora and the strategos of Cyprus. Together these three government functionaries controlled, militarily and administratively, almost all the territory of the kingdom. The two towns he founded, Philometoris and Cleopatra, have never been identified and may have been little more than military outposts.


---

12 Saunerion (1957: 58-60) and LÄ IV 1097 s.v. Priester(tum).
'Υπὲρ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου καὶ Βασιλίσσης
Κλεοπάτρας τῆς ὀδελφῆς, θεῶν Εὐεργετῶν
καὶ τῶν τέκνων Ἦρωδας Δημοφῶντος
Βερενικῆς ὁ ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ καὶ στρατηγὸς
καὶ οἱ συνάγοντες ἐν Σήτει, τῇ τοῦ Διονύσου
νήσῳ Βασιλισταί, ὃν τὰ ὄνοματα ὑπόνειται,
Χυνόβει τῷ καὶ Ἄμμωνι, Σάτει τῇ καὶ Ἡρᾷ
Ἀνούκει τῇ καὶ Ἔστία, Πετεμπαμέντει τῷ καὶ
Διονύσῳ, Πετενότει τῷ καὶ Κρόνῳ, Πετενόνη[1]
τῷ καὶ Ἑρμεῖ, θεῶι μεγάλοις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς
ἐπὶ τοῦ καταράκτου δαίμονοι τὴν στήλην καὶ τὰ
πρὸς τὰς θυσίας καὶ σπουδᾶς τὰς ἐσόμενας
ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ κατὰ τὰς πρῶτας ἐνάτας τοῦ
μηνὸς ἐκάστου εἰσενησθεγμένα χρήματα, ν. ἐπὶ ν.
Παπίου τοῦ Ἄμμωνίου προστάτου καὶ
Διονυσίου τοῦ Ἄπολλωνίου ἱερέως τῆς
συνόδου.

There follows a list of twenty-nine names.
‘On behalf of king Ptolemy and the queen, his sister, Cleopatra, of the divine Euergetai, and of their children. Herodes, son of Demophon, Bereniceus, the archisomatophylax and strategos and those who gather at Setis, the isle of Dionysus, the Basilistae, whose names are below, to Chnoubis who is also Ammon, to Satis who is also Hera, Anoukis who is also Hestia, to Petempamentes who is also Dionysus, to Petensetis who is also Cronus, to Petensenis who is also Hermes, to the great gods and the other daemons in the cataract, (have dedicated) the stele and the money brought by each member for the future sacrifices and libations in the meeting on the ninth of each month and the other eponymous days. In the prostates-ship of Papius, son of Ammonius and of Dionysius, son of Apollonius, priest of the meeting.’

Like the previous inscription, this stele is offered by the same Herodes, now having been promoted to archisomatophylax and strategos and carrying a demotic, ‘Bereniceus,’ (line 4) of the city Ptolemais, to the sovereigns and the deities of the first cataract.\[^{17}\] In addition to those mentioned previously are included here Cronus and Hermes. The Egyptian name of the former, Petensetis, may mean something like ‘he of Sehēl.’\[^{18}\] The name of the latter has been translated as ‘the god of Senis,’ or ‘pharaoh of Senis.’ Senis was the Greek name for the nearby island of Bigga and the connection of Hermes with this locale might be due to his association with Horus, the son of Osiris.\[^{19}\] Thus all three Egyptian names of those gods outside of the ‘Cataract Triad,’ are apparently derived from toponyms.

\[^{18}\] LÄ IV 993-994. s.v. Petensetis.
\[^{19}\] LÄ IV 994. s.v. Petensenis.

ca. 88 B.C.

Πλούτοδότι βασίλεια θεῶν, ἦμουθι ἄνασσα,
pantokrάτεα, Τύχη Ἀγαθή, μεγαλὼνυμε Ἰσι,
Δηοὶ ύψοτη, ζωῆς εὐετρία πάσης,
pantoiou ἐργῶν ἐμέλησε σοι, ὁφρ' ἀναδοῖν

5 ἀνδρώποιοι βίον τε καὶ εὐνομήν τε ἀπασι,
καὶ θειμοὺς κατέδειξας, ἵν' εὐδική τις ὑπάρχῃ,
καὶ τέχνας ἀνέδωκας, ἵν' εὐσχήμων βίος εἰη,
καὶ πάντων τε φύσιν εὐανθέα εὔρεο καρπῶν.
Σοῦ τε χάριν συνέστηκ' ὁ πόλος καὶ γαῖα ἀπασά

10 καὶ πνοαὶ ἀνέμων καὶ ἥλιος ὁ γλυκυφεγγής.
Σῆ δυνάμει Νείλου ποταμοὶ πληροῦντι ἄπαντες,
ὀρνη ὀπωρινὴ, καὶ λαβρότατον χεῖθ' ὑδωρ
gαῖαν πάσαν ἐπ', ἵν' ἀνέγλυπος καρπὸς ὑπάρχῃ.
"Ωςοι δὲ ζώουσι βροτοὶ ἐπ' ἀπείρουν γαίη,
15 Θράκες καὶ Ἐλληνες, καὶ οσσοι βάρβαροι εἰσι.
oυνομᾶ σου τὸ καλὸν, πολυτιμητὸν παρὰ πᾶσι,
φωναίσι φράζουσι ἰδίαις, ἰδίαι ἐνὶ πάτρῃ.

'Αστάρτην Ἀρτεμίν καὶ Σύροι κλῆσοι Ναναίον
καὶ Λυκίων ἔθνη (ἡ) Λητοῦν καλέουσιν ἄνασσαν,

20 Μητέρα δὴ κλήσουσι θεᾶν καὶ Θράκες ἄνδρες,
"Ελληνες δὲ "Ἡρην μεγαλόθρονυν ἢδ' Ἀφροδίτην.
καὶ Ἑστίαν ἀγαθῆν, καὶ Ἐρείαν, καὶ Δήμητρα,
Ἀγύπτιοι δὲ Θεοῦν, ὅτι μοῦνη εἰ σο ἀπασί
αἰ ὑπὸ τῶν ἔθνων ὄνομαζόμεναι θεαὶ ἄλλαι.

25 Δεσπότη, οὐ λήξω μεγάλην δύναμιν σου ἀείδων,
σώτειρ ἀθανάττη, πολυσώμεμε, Ἰση μεγίστη,
ἐκ πολέμου ρυμένη τε πόλεις πάντας τε πολίτας,
αὐτοὺς καὶ ἄλοχους καὶ κτήματα καὶ φίλα τέκνα.
"Οσσοὶ δὲ εἰ μοῖρας θανάτου συνέχονται ἐν εἰρκτῇ.

30 καὶ οσσοὶ ἀγρυπνίας μεγάλαις όχλοιντ' ὄδουντραῖς
καὶ ὁσσοὶ εἰ πελάγει μεγάλωι χειμῶνι πλέουσι.
ἀνδρῶν ὀλλυμίνων νηῶν κατὰ ἀγνυμενὰων,
σώζονθ' οὕτωι ἄπαντες, ἐπευξάμενοι σε παρεῖναι.
Κλυθὶ ἐμῶν ἑυχῶν, μεγαλοσθενῆς οὖνοι ἔχουσα,

35 εὐείλατος ἐμοὶ τε γείνου, λύπης μ' ἀνάπαυσον ἀπάσης.

'Iσιδωρος

ἔγραψε.
'Queen Hermouthis, Giver of Wealth, Queen of the Gods, Ruler of all, Good Fortune, great-named Isis, Deo most high, Deviser of all life, works of all sorts were thy concern, that thou mightest give life and good rule to all men, and ordinances thou laidest down that justice might exist, and skills thou gavest that life might be civilized, and thou didst find the flowery nature of all fruits, and the heavens were stablished through thee, and the whole earth and the breath of the winds, and the sweet-shining sun. Through thy strength all the courses of the Nile are filled in the autumn season, and fiercely flows the water over the whole land, that the fruits thereof may grow unceasing. And all mortals that live on the boundless earth, Thracians and Hellenes and all that are barbarians, call thy by thy lovely name, priceless among all, in their own tongue, each in his own land. The Syrians call thee Astarte-Artemis-Nanaia, and the tribes of Lycia call thee Queen Leto, and the Thracians call thee in truth Mother of the Gods, and the Hellenes Mighty-Enthroned Hera and Aphrodite and good Hestia and Rhea and Demeter, but the Egyptians call thee Thouis, for thou art alone of all the goddesses named by the tribes. Mistress, I shall not cease thy mighty power to sing, immortal saviour, of many names, Isis most great, thou that savest cities and citizens from war, yea, they and their wives, their chattels and children dear. And all they that are held in durance in the doom of death, and all that are distressed by great pains in sleeplessness, and all men that are wandering in a foreign land, and they that sail the sea in great storm when men perish and ships are broken up – all these are saved when they call upon thee. Hear my prayers, thou whose name is of great strength, be thou gracious unto me, and give me succour from all pain. Isidorus wrote this.'
Translation Note: The translation is that of P. M. Fraser. 20

One of four hymns written by Isidorus and discovered in the southern part of the Fayum at Medinet Madi, the first three of these hymns are dedicated to the goddess Isis while the last relates the history of the building of the temple. In addition to Isis, the names of no less than thirteen other goddesses are enumerated as being synonymous with her, among which is Hestia. Outside of the inscriptions which associate her with Anuket (175-176) Hestia is attested epigraphically in the company or in the place of Egyptian deities such as Isis and Serapis at Chalcis (108) Rhodes (68) and Tauromenion (125). Papyrological evidence also attests to the veneration of Isis under the name of Hestia in Egypt at Pephremis and Plinthine. 21

The inclusion of Hestia in this catalogue, however, is perhaps not best explained by the examination of the attributes of the goddesses mentioned here, as nearly the entire distaff side of the traditional Greek pantheon is present, but rather by an inquiry into which goddesses are omitted. The most conspicuous of these is Athena, typically, but not always associated with the Egyptian goddess, Neith. 22 In the light of what evidence exists for the conceptual associations between Athena and Isis, two come to the fore, victory and invention. 23 While Hestia is sometimes invoked in treatments of the latter, 24 she is seldom, if ever, explicitly invoked in connection with the former. Moreover, the aspects of discovery and invention here in the hymn are not those of the technical sort typically

20 Fraser (1972: 671-672).
21 Oxy. Pap. XI. 1380. Pephremis (line 23) and Plinthine (line 73).
22 LA IV 392-394 s. v. Neith.
23 See e.g. Oxy. Pap. XI. 1380. line 30, ἐν τῷ Σατῆ τῇ υἱοκήρυξιν ᾗ Αθήνην, νύμφην
24 Diod. Sic. V. 67. and also Cnidus 128 and Ephesus 149.
attributed to either Hestia or Athena. The emphasis of the hymn seems rather to be upon the generation of natural rhythms which foster an ordered life for humanity in the first part (lines 3-13) and salvation from danger (lines 25-35) in the second.

In the thematic absence then of her usual basis of identification with Isis, Athena makes no appearance in this hymn. In addition, while granting both goddesses their ties to the invention of skills useful to mortals, other goddesses of this catalog do not present the same tradition of invention (e.g. Agathe Tyche, Leto and Rhea). The focus of this hymn and the goddess whose names are included as aliases of Isis are to be traced instead as Vanderlip has noted to "the underlying theme...of the divine nurse-mother and her beneficent feelings for all her human children throughout their life-span."25 Hestia here would then seem to be included in consonance with her identification with Isis at Chalcis (108) as kourotrophos.

---

25 Vanderlip (1972: 4). Albeit Athena is not entirely divorced from this sphere, either. See Paus. 5. 3. 2. for the cult of Ἀθηνᾶ Μήτηρ.
Cyrene


5th – 3rd century B.C.

'lo[τ]aσ.

'Of Hestia.'

Initially the source of some enthusiasm on the part of Ferri, as it was found in a *temenos* with various *escharai, bomoi* and *stelai* dedicated among others to Zeus, Apollo and Aphrodite, this attestation of Hestia in Cyrene has, nonetheless, failed to be included in any of the major discussions of the religious activity there.
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Conclusions

The study of epigraphy, by itself, does not easily lend itself to the formation of grand assertions. The decisions to write, publish and read a decree, law, dedication or epitaph could be as ephemeral for those contemporary with them as for us today, who turn to them for our own purposes, forming and evaluating collections and compilations, the reasons for which would have seemed quite strange to the authors and audiences for whom they were originally intended. The discordance between the word and the ear has only amplified, as has the risk that by multiplying the voices in an effort better to hear them, only cacophony will be the result.

The assembly of references; a hymn from Delphi, a decree from Paros, an inventory from Delos, a dedication from Athens, creates a work en pointillé. To examine each closely and individually is to risk losing sight of the whole, while to encompass them at once in their totality is to hazard the loss of the specificity of each datum, of each moment. Unfortunately, moreover, much of our evidence is literally one of a kind. Dedications made by an individual or group, in a specific locale and a defined period, have generally preserved only the sentiment of the dedicators which, ironically enough, is what they were designed to do, albeit much to the consternation of scholars looking to build prosopographies, assemble constitutions, or reconstitute pantheons.

To begin to form conclusions, it is not enough then to assemble the evidence from where Hestia is found, or even when. The epigraphical evidence comes from times when certain circumstances or information were felt necessary to be recorded in writing and this is seldom if ever consonant with the origins of her worship in that place. The
locations where they are discovered, or not, as the case may be, are contingent not only
on the epigraphical habits of the population, but on the chances of discovery in places
which have suffered from such handicaps as continual occupation or the vagaries of
scholarly interest. Syros and Thera form two examples of such various fortunes. It
sometimes seems that more effort has been spent studying the geological history of Thera
than its cults. Syros furnishes several interesting epigraphic records of Hestia worship
from the period of the Roman empire, but this, for a large part, has been discovered in
second use in the walls of its houses and for the period when it paid tribute to Athens,
little can be said.

Assembling the epigraphical evidence for Hestia puts into relief the fact that no
such similar compilations exist for any other god or goddess. It is impossible to say
whether the cult of Hestia was more or less involved in the practice of writing than any
other divinity when that writing exists only in fragments of a civic discourse whose
history is unknown. It is impossible to say that Hestia was associated more with the
keeping of archives or with institutions such as treasuries than the other members of the
local pantheons when systematic treatments of such organizations and their deities are yet
to be written.

To accept that Hestia was not simply an object, situated somewhere in the
spectrum between *mobilier* and *immobilier*, or an element such as earth or fire, or a
practice of the *polis* inherited from the palace, is to accept that the Greeks, taken
cautiously as a generality, neither played by our rules nor abided by our classifications. It
is to recognize that Odysseus was capable of swearing by Zeus ‘first of the gods,’ or
‘highest and best,’ as well as by his guest-table and hearth with no contradiction. That in
the *Iliad*, Nestor could rightly caution a headstrong Diomedes with the words, 'Without phratry, without *themis* without *hestia* is that man who loves the horror of war among his own people,'¹ invoking them as an institutional unity connected with proper behavior. Yet sometime between the composition of these lines and two sets of sacrifices made at Eleusis on the same day at the end of the fifth century B.C. a separation occurs. At Athens, an ancient clan will have the privilege of sacrificing first to Themis and Zeus *Herkeios*, a deity linked with the institution of the phratry,² and the city of Athens will commence its own sacrifices with Hestia. The privileged position of first is shared between Themis and Hestia, but Hestia is no longer the possession of a king or clan, but of a city with new institutions and a new pantheon to supervise them.

What happened to Hestia in between the times of Homer and the classical polis is attested epigraphically in only three inscriptions for which a case has been made for a date in the archaic period, the oath of the ephesoi at Athens (7), the sacred regulations of the *molpoi* in Miletus (159) and the "constitution" of Chios (93). For the ephesoi, who take their oath in the shrine of Aglauros, she yields her customary place as first to the heroine whose place it is. In the hall of the *molpoi*, the *stephanephoros* of Apollo *Delphinios*, as he departs, performs a sacrifice to Hestia, this same Hestia whose name is given to a property dispensable by him. On Chios, in a document which remains very much a matter of speculation, possessions or perhaps a priest of Hestia are subjected to the 'rhetras of the *demos,*' in a law or oath designed to curb the abuse of power.

The contexts, dates and in the case of Chios, even the provenance of these documents are highly contested. The direct evidence for the existence of the Athenian

---

¹ ἀφρήτωρ ἀθέμιστος ἄνεστις ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνος/δς πολέμου ἔραται ἐπεθημίου ὁκρυόντος, Hom. II.9. 63-64.
ephebeia comes at the earliest from the fourth century B.C., and while they are known to have performed a sacrifice in the Prytaneion of Athens, whether the mention of Hestia is attributable to that fact alone is not certain. The names of the Milesian *stephanophoroi* first began to be recorded on the walls of the Delphinion in 525/4 B.C. and the amendment at the end of lines 40-42 added in 479/8 B.C. indicates that the institutions of the *molpoi* at least seem to date back into the late archaic period. Numerous speculations have circulated around the question of the political context surrounding the “constitution of Chios,” but most of them have argued on the basis of the stone itself in the near complete absence of any reliable testimony from Chios itself at the time. The argument made for reassigning this inscription to Erythrae has further complicated matters. Despite all these objections, however, is the question of whether these inscriptions present any common features with regard to Hestia.

Certainly, there is a temporal element. The Athenian ephesiot preschoolly started their service in the month of Boedromion, as did the *aisynnetes* in Miletus, and more specifically his term began after the festival of the Hebdomaea during which he was chosen. It was after this same festival at Chios that the *boule demosie* was summoned to inflict penalties on corrupt magistrates, and while the name of the month specified is unknown, several lines further the stone includes a provision for the month Artemision,

---

3 For the archaic character of the oath of the Athenian ephesiot, see Siewert (1977: 110-111).
4 See Robertson (1987: 359 and 367). Fontenrose (1988: 14) goes so far as to call this text “obviously archaic.”
5 Dumont (1876: 140).
7 By this I refer to the order of the text as it was read by Jeffrey (1956: 161). The placing of side D before side A as read by Effenterre and Ruzé (1994) has the effect of starting the stone with provisions (an oath?) for the month of Artemision. This would suggest that what were discussed here were provisions for the correction of magistrates and the conduct of business by the government of Chios at the end of the year. While this is an attractive hypothesis, Effenterre and Ruzé (1994: 264-265) have also noted its deficiencies.
which happened to be the last month of the Milesian calendar.\textsuperscript{8} An oath is taken by Hestia at the beginning of either the term or a period of service by the Athenian ephes. A sacrifice is performed to Hestia by the outgoing \textit{aisymnetes} of Miletus, but in which the incoming \textit{aisymnetes} partakes as well. A law or oath is enforced at the beginning or end of the tenure of the magistrates there. In the matter of Hestia, what is clear even through all the difficulties these documents present is the clear context of beginnings and endings, which at this early date is to be found for no other Greek divinity.

This by itself presents, however, no clear and sufficient reason for her inclusion, for we have many accounts of ingoing and outgoing magistrates which give no indication of Hestia. In addition, before concluding that Hestia was the goddess \textit{par excellence} of first or lasts as the \textit{Homeric Hymn to Hestia} tells us, ‘without you mortals hold no banquet, where one does not duly pour out sweet wine in offering to Hestia both first and last,’\textsuperscript{9} it is necessary to take note of certain discrepancies. The Athenian ephes did not invoke Hestia first of the various witnesses to their oath. This privilege was reserved instead for Aglauros. The \textit{aisymnetes} of Miletus was \textit{stephanophoros} of Apollo \textit{Delphinos}, and he sacrificed to him first and not to Hestia. The officials of Chios are not specifically stated as having a special relationship with Hestia, but it is at least clear that there were older and more prominent divinities in this state.\textsuperscript{10} The simplest explanation for placing Hestia second is that the locations where these rituals took place were the shrines or sanctuaries of other divinities whose \textit{τιμή} would be offended if they were not honored with the first mention. It must be admitted then that other factors could and did

\textsuperscript{8} Jeffrey (1956: 161).
\textsuperscript{9} οὐ γὰρ ἄτερ σοῦ εἰλαφίναι θνητοῖσιν πρῶτῳ πυμάτῳ τε / Ἐστὶν ἄρχόμενος σπένδει μεληδέα οἶνον: \textit{Hom. Hymn to Hestia}, lines 4-8. One thinks naturally also of the mythological \textit{aition}, that Hestia was the first swallowed and the last vomited from the belly of Cronus. \textit{Hom. Hymn to Aphr.} lines 22-23.
\textsuperscript{10} See for example the evidence of Athena \textit{Poliouchos}, Boardman (1967: 25).
come into play when assigning the position of first and last, and that the simple fact that some activity was either beginning or ending is not an adequate explanation.

For Hestia in the case of the Athenian ephebes, the arguments for her inclusion run both negatively and positively. The negative reasoning argues that she is present in the oath because certain other divinities are consciously excluded presumably on the basis that they were too gentilicidal in character.\footnote{This notion is discussed in greater depth in the conclusion to the section of Attica.} The positive reasoning generally refers back to Hestia as a reflection of the civic hearth in the prytaneion and the sacrifices upon entry which they offered there.\footnote{See Attica 3-4.} In the case of Miletus, Wilamowitz saw Hestia as the goddess of the house of the molpoi, and the divinity to whom belonged all the equipment used in the sacrifices, and the aisymnetes and his companions the proshetairoi sacrificed to her as the goddess of this house.\footnote{Wilamowitz (1904: 624).} For Chios, ‘the importance of Hestia, the common hearth of the city, evokes the one prytaneion which Theseus created at Athens,’ that is to say that on Chios the significance of Hestia cannot be linked to either an oligarchical or democratic constitution, but rather to the establishment of one council which oversaw the affairs of the whole island.\footnote{Effenterre and Ruzé (1994: 266).}

Taking this relationship of Hestia and the prytaneion, or in the case of Miletus, with a house as an explanation for her connection with the ephebeia, the molpoi, and the "constitution" of Chios, is a false model, for it passes on the explication of one institution onto another which then demands to be treated in turn. It is by no means self-evident in the archaic period what the relationship was between Hestia and the prytaneion. Given the only epigraphical evidence which could presumably date to this period, moreover, the
effect is also one of a deferring the investigator to later models and testimony. What should be noted in these three inscriptions is the discrepancy between what the inscriptions say and what is known to have been actually occurring.

One of the hallmarks of the period from 700-500 B.C. was the grand movement to establish colonies, and one of the practices of founding a colony was taking fire from the hearth of the mother city, presumably in the prytaneion, to establish fire on the hearth of the colony, again presumably in the prytaneion. The epigraphical record from this period makes no reference to the goddess Hestia in connection with this process. Given the reasons for the presence of Hestia in these archaic cities which cite her relationship with a house or the prytaneion, this cannot help but seem striking. Pliny once called Miletus the ‘mother of over ninety cities scattered throughout the sea,’ and while he may have been exaggerating, the colonial habit of Miletus stands in contrast to Athens which abstained from this movement almost entirely. Thus to assert that Hestia is mentioned in any particular place because of her connection with the prytaneion is to elide the fact that not all hearths were used in the same way, and the worship of Hestia might be expected to show different features in different places.

In Egypt at Naucratis, one of these colonies founded with the involvement of both Miletus and Chios around 650 B.C., there is a unique festival on the ‘birthday’ of the settlement where Hestia Prytanis finds herself playing hostess to the priests of Apollo Komaios and Dionysus, a divinity very seldom found directly mentioned epigraphically in the company of Hestia. Whether Apollo Komaios is ‘of the καὶμος,’ or ‘of the

---

15 I will not go into details of this process here as Malkin (1987) has treated this topic in depth.
16 “super XC urbium per cuncta maria genetrix.” Pliny *Nat. Hist.* 5. 112.
17 The celebration is related in *Athen. Deip.* 4. 32, 149d-150a. The name of Dionysus has been restored in *Priene* 163, where he appears as divinity associated with honors bestowed by the city. See also the ‘agora
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κῶμη,’ this day of music and wine drinking does bear some resemblance to the celebrations of the molpoi for Apollo Delphinios during the Hebdomaia. At Naukratis the music and carousing of the priests of Dionysus and Apollo in the shrine of Hestia appear directly related to the foundation of that settlement, but if the festivities at Miletus were similarly oriented around the foundation of that city it is not explicitly stated. Nonetheless, it seems clear that the recourse of Wilamowitz to an explanation which refers to the domestic aspects of Hestia does not seem sufficient. The hearth and the Hestia of the aisymnetes and the proshetairoi do not seem to be the public hearth of the prytaneion or the Hestia Boulaia which the Milesians were later very scrupulous to distinguish by her epithet. This is not then presumably the hearth which would be used to provide fire for the colonies of Miletus. Rather by its association with the aisymnetes and the proshetairoi, officials representative of the territory of Miletus, and the fact that it is these same representatives of Miletus who make the journey to Didyma and perform certain rites at small local stations along the way, their reverence for Hestia seems to be part of a celebration of Miletus itself and its territory. In the later inscriptions from Miletus, particularly the interstate treaties, the prytaneis and the ‘elected guard’ are the ones associated with sacrifices to Hestia Boulaia, while the stephanephoros represents

of the gods’ at Rhodes 70. At Athens, according to Arist. Ath. Pol. 51. 2-3, the archon who derives his power from the public hearth (Arist. Pol. 6. 5. 11. 1322b) immediately after the proclamation that ‘all men shall hold until the end of his office those possessions and powers that they held before his entry into office,’ appoints the officials for the Dionysia and also for the festival at Delos. The archons stephanephoroi at Delos, who frequently made dedications after their tenure to Hestia performed a similar function during the period of their independence from Athens, see Delos 32.

19 The sole occurrence where she appears without the epithet Boulaia at Miletus, other than in the regulations of the molpoi, is in the treaty with the Mysala 156, the religious stipulations of which concern that state more than Miletus. Likewise, in the one other inscription from Mysala 131 there is no epithet.

20 Naukratis was founded as a collaboration of several cities, so a slavish reproduction of the rituals connected with any one of them would be out of place. Thus while the rituals at the ‘birthday’ of Hestia there seem rather obviously to celebrate the foundation of that city, the form of these rituals takes those of a celebration of the possession of territory akin to, but not necessarily derived from, those of Miletus.
the god he serves, Apollo Delphinios. The two complement one another, for Hestia Boulaia is the aspect broadcast abroad to the stranger, but earlier within the state of Miletus, she is also found without an epithet in celebrations of that territory and lending her name to certain resources of that group.

At Athens as at Chios there is the contended context of a synoikismos, and even though this process is imperfectly understood,^21 the local character of this process is thought to lie at the heart of our earliest testimonies of Hestia in both places. The earliest epigraphical evidence from Miletus shows the character of this goddess as being intimately connected with the territory of that state, where it could very well have been expected to have pertained to the colonial activity of that state, yet no one has made the argument for synoikismos at Miletus. This union of all the prytaneia of Attica performed by Theseus colored thinking about the Athenian prytaneion and the hearth there for centuries. Later writers still insisted on the specific character of the Athenian hearth as being the only hearth which had remained unmoved.^22 That is, the Athenian hearth was not the product of colonization from elsewhere, it was founded and remained in its original situation among a population of autochthons. Like the Milesian officials then, the Athenian ephes are concerned with their territory and the religious observances in it, and like the aisynmetes and proshetairopoi of Miletus they are not entrusted with a specifically political power.^23 Like the Chians they are concerned with the restraint of "subverters and 'unreasonable' magistrates,"^24 and like the Chians this observance is placed under the sign of Hestia. The most glaring difference which separates this Hestia

---

^21 There exists, to my knowledge, no systematic treatment of this political phenomenon in ancient Greece. cf. also the role of Hestia in the synoikismos of Entella 120-122.
from that of the Chians who are assumed to have undergone a *synoikismos* or that of the
Milesian *aisymnetes* who seems to have been concerned with the territory of that city lies
precisely in the special emphasis on the age of the men concerned. From the earliest
mention, Hestia at Athens is concerned not with the prytaneion or the bouleuterion *per se*,
but most often with the young people in the process of assuming their citizenship. The
singularity of the Athenian Hestia in this context, is reinforced by her appearance in the
dedication of Xenokrateia (10). Hestia is involved with the magistrates, involved with
the territory of Attica, but for some reason, as nowhere else, she oversees young men in
their duties revolving around these matters.\(^\text{25}\) Is the autochthony of the Athenians the
cause? The matter remains open and will not be resolved here. Rather the differences and
similarities between Athens, Chios and Miletus form our only epigraphical evidence of
what happened in the worship of Hestia in between Homer and the Classical era, and this
can be summed up as follows.

Individual families no longer controlled Hestia as worshipped by these various
polities, but rather members of a class and the institutions surrounding them, which were
not necessarily democratic. These groups upheld two fundamental principles, the unity of
the state as expressed through representation of its territory and repression of magistrates
who might abuse their authority for personal aggrandizement. In effect then although
certain properties and funds belonged to Hestia, this property was not entirely at the
disposition of individuals acting for their own gain. Their primary duty was to the state

\(^{25}\) There is also the oath of the young men of Dreros 109 swearing eternal hostility to the city of Knossos,
but in the absence of any other information from that place, the role of Hestia there is only to be established
on basis of a comparison with the other Cretan treaty oaths and the ephes of Athens. At Ephesus 134, the
prytanis Tullia prays to her and Zeus to grant her children 'exactly like her who also have a mind like the
one she has,' but this is the only case of such a prayer made to Hestia there.
and its territory, although local concerns could, and often did play a role in the specific shape of her veneration.

Returning to our earliest literary evidence from the Classical period Hestia appears in two lyric poems, one by Pindar, the other by Bacchylides. In the first, *Nemean* 11, written for Aristogoras of Tenedos on the occasion of his entry into the office of the prytany, Hestia emerges with a ‘gleaming scepter’ (ἀγλασφοκάπτω line 4) in a constellation of deities similar to that found in Homer. In the *Iliad*, as mentioned previously, the hearth is invoked in the rebuke of Nestor beside themis (9. 63-64). In the *Odyssey*, she appears in the oath of Odysseus, ‘By Zeus first of the gods and the guest-table and the hearth of blameless Odysseus.’

Pindar combines the two and here Hestia appears in the prytaneion beside both Themis and Zeus Xenios. In the fragmentary poem of Bacchylides for Aristoteles of Larisa on an unknown occasion ‘golden-throned’ Hestia is described as ‘sitting in the middle of the streets.’ Elsewhere in Thessaly, at Pharsalus on a relief, this same Hestia is shown sitting with the hero receiving the hero Symmachus.

Again from Thessaly, in an altar of Pherai (22), which includes the premier female deities of that state, or half of the dodekatheon there, Hestia appears beside Demeter, Enodia, Aphrodite, Athena and Themis.

In the Classical period, in these poems and depictions, the image of Hestia is rather more concretely defined than in the Homeric Hymns or in the dedication of Claudia Trophime where she acts and is described in her attributes, but her physical

---

27 ἡμένα μέσας ἀγνάυας, Bacchylides frag. 14B, line 4.
28 The accompanying inscription is found in Pharsalus 21.
29 Ephesus 132.
characteristics remain vague. In the poems of Pindar and Bacchylides, two features of Hestia are salient, the first that she holds a scepter, the second that she is seated. The fact that she is seated holds import because this is not only the posture that she occupies in the Symmachus relief, but also later in the statues of the ptytaneia of Delos and Paros.

At Athens in the dedication of Xenokrateia, while Hestia is not commonly presumed to be present in the accompanying relief, when she is, she is standing. In the altar from Pherai, according the reconstruction of that structure made by Miller, only the heads were presented in sculpture above. At Cos, where Hestia appears in a new inscription, the marble base of the aphidruma which was placed above it has been interpreted as showing her advancing her right foot and holding a scepter. An epigraphical survey is not the right place to commence an investigation of the iconography of Hestia. If anything a glimpse at the inscriptionsal evidence, e.g. the Xenokrateia relief, shows the limits of this evidence in providing any sure indication of just where a divinity is not only mentioned, but also displayed. The statues of Hestia known to have existed in the ptytaneia at Athens and at Paros, like the relief at the base of the statue of Zeus at Olympia, are preserved in literature, but not epigraphically. Likewise, when a statue is described in the epigraphical record, the reference to it is just as likely to raise as many questions as it answers.

30 Save for Hom. Hymn 24, line 3 where her hair receives special attention, 'ever from your locks drips moist oil,' αἰαὶ σῶν πλοκάμων ἀπολειβέται ύγρὸν ἔλαιον.
31 Pharsalus 21.
32 Delos 32-33 and the conclusion to the chapter Paros.
33 Linfert (1967: 154).
34 Miller (1974: 231-244).
35 Cos 84.
36 For example what precisely was the Athenian magistrate seeing and describing when he included in his inventory of the Delian ptytaneion an ἄπολλωνισκόν ἄρχαικόν (Delos 32)?
The appearance of Hestia in Bacchylides and the statue of Hestia by Scopas on Paros, loosely connect the only two inscriptions of Hestia which have been dated to the fifth century B.C. The first is a dedication from Ceos the birthplace of Bacchylides, by Cleogenes, son of Kudigenes, which reveals very little of her worship on that island, and the second is a horos stone from Paros with the name of Hestia qualified by an otherwise unattested epithet, Demia.\textsuperscript{37} The character of the Parian Hestia, the forms of her worship and the magistrates and deities associated with her have been closely researched in the context of her colony Thasos, but the historical contexts of the epigraphical evidence of the two are not to be reconciled.

The earliest mention of Hestia for both Paros and Thasos lies in this horos from the mother city and the epithet is not found duplicated in her colony, where starting from the beginning of the third century B.C., the epithet is Boulaia. This epithet, moreover, is only applied in the context of dedications made on behalf of the board of apolgoi alone and only after a reform of their office.\textsuperscript{38} Just as there is no concordance between the pantheons of these states, there is no exact correlation in the duties of the magistrates placed under the patronage of the divinities found there. Nonetheless, both the archons of Paros and the apolgoi of Thasos seem to have been engaged in the movement to represent the public interest in lieu of private initiative. They did this in support of other magistrates, the mnemones of Paros and the epistatai of Thasos, whose patron deities were Apollo and Aphrodite, respectively, and also in conjunction with a larger public body, whether the demos or the dikastai. On Thasos, Pouilloux has interpreted Hestia as presiding over the ‘national reconciliation,’ which took place after a period of civil strife.

\textsuperscript{37} Paros 96.
\textsuperscript{38} Thasos 101-103.
and which resulted in the reorganizations of the Thasian archives in the early fourth century B.C. On Paros, the context of the decision to set the archons as supervisors of the copies made from the documents of the mnemones can only be reconstructed on the basis of the resolution which institutes the reform, and this most generally can only have occurred when the documents of the mnemones in the Python came under suspicion of having suffered from tampering. Strangely, the Parians themselves displayed a curious indifference to relating the legislative process of exactly how they enacted this resolution. The end of the Parian inscription states only, 'that this resolution, if the demos decides to make use of it, should be visible to all, Socleides who is the present apodektes for the archive in the city, should publish this resolution on a marble stele and set it up beside the shrine of Hestia.' Evidently the Parian demos did decide to enact the resolution of this panel, otherwise the stone would not exist.

The emphasis on publication over process stands in contrast to that other activity with which this resolution is involved, namely security for the copies of private documents placed in the Python. In the question of these documents, the prytaneion was a place not only of publication, but also of preservation. The stele was designed to publish the law with stipulations for ‘whoever wishes’ to bring a public lawsuit to the basileus if they knew of someone who had tampered with the documents in the Python and the prytaneion, but the publication of this law was to be beside the ‘shrine of Hestia,’ not the Python. The documents from Paros, on the other hand, were private documents, and the parties concerned presumably wanted those records preserved and upheld, but not made public, at least not outside the context of legal action in a public court. The original

---

39 Pouilloux I (1954: 231-232 and 238-240)
40 Paros 95, lines 84-88.
solution to the problem of illegal tampering was to have the Parian mnemones place those
documents in the Pythion, but when this proved inadequate, the prytaneion and the
archons were employed for the purpose of keeping and guarding copies of those
documents.

The religious dimension in all these matters is clear. The task of guarding the
documents is not only entrusted to the vigilance of the archons, but also to the curse that
is pronounced against those who tamper with the documents and anyone who knows
about it but does not report it. The prosecution of offenders is modeled, in the view of
Lambrinudakis and Wörre, on the procedure for cases of asebeia.\textsuperscript{41} The prytaneion was
not just a site of publication and preservation but also a sacred space whose contents were
placed in the possession and protection of Hestia. Her magistrates were the archons, but
they worked in conjunction with the Parian mnemones of Apollo Pythios. This
conjunction between the mnemones, or more specifically hieromnemones, is attested later
at the beginning of the third century B.C. in the Sicilian city of Entella, where the name
of the hieromnemon was used to date the decrees of the city destined for the prytaneion.
One of the central problems of the Entellan records is the existence of two different
dating systems. Some documents were to be dated by the hieromnemon and placed in the
'shrine of Hestia,' i.e. the prytaneion, while others were dated by the eponymous archons
and to be placed in the bouleuterion. Excavations around Entella have been ongoing, and
little has been discovered regarding the situation of either building, but the assumption
that the 'shrine of Hestia' and the prytaneion were one and the same remains. Yet given
the evidence from Paros, one sees something odd in this arrangement. On Paros, the
mnemones were associated with the Pythion, and the archons with the prytaneion. In

\textsuperscript{41} Lambrinudakis and Wörre (1983: 316).
Entella, the _hieromnemones_ were associated with the prytaneion and the archons with the bouleuterion.

Before resorting to the radical explanation that shortly after the _synoikismos_ of the city after its destruction by the Carthaginians there was a change in the constitution which entailed a change in the dating system and the placement of documents, it is important to note the difference in the roles of the archons and the _mnemones_ of Paros. On Paros, the archons were not charged with knowing the contents of the documents, but only with checking their fidelity to the originals and preserving them, and even this was an extraordinary measure. If the archives of the Parian prytaneion were destroyed or even altered, then there was no demonstrability of what was preserved in those records apart from the testimony of the parties involved and the _mnemones_ entrusted with the drafting of them. In Entella, presuming that the previous records actually had been destroyed when the Carthaginians sacked the city, the preserving of the documents, presumably in the bouleuterion, by the archons had failed. The only proof of what those documents were lay in the testimony of the _hieromnemon_, and while their relationship with legislation previous to the fall of that city is unknown, their very name implies the power of memory. In the re-inscription of decrees, the _hieromnemon_ then lent his name to the dating formula, for he was the one who remembered the original decree, and as at Paros the copy of the original decree was consigned to the prytaneion. The city placed its new decrees in the bouleuterion and dated them by the archons. No provision is included for the production of a copy which would be placed in the prytaneion, as it would have been the function of the _hieromnemon_ to remember it.
There is yet a third important example of storage in the prytaneion which includes references to Hestia and this is the evidence from Delos, where the prytaneion was used as a repository for dedications made by magistrates, civic institutions and private foundations.\textsuperscript{42} The duties of the archons of Delos were primarily religious, and like the \textit{stephanephoroi} of Miletus while they were devoted primarily to Apollo, the goddess who received their thanks after their time in office was Hestia. Like Paros, there is preserved in the inventories of Delos the mention of two statues of Hestia in the prytaneion, one sitting on an altar and another on an omphalos. Originally, the connection of Hestia and the omphalos was not considered at all significant.\textsuperscript{43} P. Roussel, treating these Delian statues, successfully argued that there was no reason that Hestia could not have been ‘ceded’ the omphalos by Apollo, when he had done so for so many other divinities such as Dionysus, Asclepius, Themis, Hygieia and Leto.\textsuperscript{44} Twenty years later, J. Audiat was able to ask the question, “Si depuis des siècles Hestia est comme une intendante sacrée du temple delphique (qu’on songe à l’\textit{ιερόν δόμον ἀμφιπολεύεις} homerique), qui s’étonnerait de la voir s’asseoir sur l’omphalos ou prendre en main le laurier du dieu?”\textsuperscript{45}

Despite the original resistance to the notion that Hestia was associated with the omphalos, the idea has taken firm root, but this stands in contrast to the elliptical references to it in both literature and epigraphy. The \textit{Homeric Hymn to Hestia} (24, lines 1-2) addresses Hestia as ‘you who tend the holy house of lord Apollo, the far-shooter, at goodly Pytho.’ The hymn of Aristonoos calls upon Hestia as ‘mistress of Olympus and of earth, holding always your Pythian laurel at the navel of the world, dance in the high-

\textsuperscript{42} See particularly Delos 28-31.
\textsuperscript{43} “Il paraît difficile de considérer ce dernier symbole (the Delphic omphalos) comme ayant un rapport quelconque avec le culte d’Hestia.” M. Bulard as quoted by Roussel (1911: 88 n. 2).
\textsuperscript{44} ibid. (1911: 89).
\textsuperscript{45} Audiat (1932: 413)
gated temple of Phoebus. In the brief overview of Hestia thus far, Apollo, whether Delphinios at Miletus or Pythios on Paros has shown himself to be an important companion of the goddess, yet the question of why there is not more evidence for their connection on Delos and at Delphi remains puzzling. Louis Gernet has differentiated the hearth and the omphalos as lying in the political connotations of the former as opposed to the primarily religious character of the latter. In this, from the evidence on Delos, he may not be wrong. The Delians dedicated to Hestia only in the period of their independence from Athens (344-166 B.C.), and while the archons of Delos appear to have been without any real political power, their fidelity to Hestia appears to have been the result of her being a symbol of the sovereignty of the island. Before their independence, there is no mention of Hestia, and after the Athenians regained control of the island, they combined her worship in the person of a priest of Hestia, the Athenian Demos, and Roma. The picture of her relationship with the omphalos is further clouded by the discovery in the house of Dionysus, of a dedication by Cineas, who was probably not a magistrate, and in the same location a separate relief showing an omphalos surrounded by a snake.

What the relationship between Hestia and the omphalos in both Delos and Delphi was, cannot be answered by epigraphy alone. On the basis of the evidence from Delos, the omphalos seems to have been primarily a religious symbol, while in the period of Delian independence Hestia had been raised to a political one. In the question of the relationship between Hestia and the omphalos at Delphi, and Hestia and the omphalos of

---

46 Delphi 18, lines 3-6.
48 Delos 34.
49 Delos 43.
Delos, there is a one parallel to be noted. Philostratus says that the fire from the Python of Delos was used to purify the island of Lemnos in atonement for the crimes of the Lemnian women, while Plutarch says that the hearths of Greece were re-lighted from the hearth at Delphi after the Persian wars. In the case of Delphi, the emphasis on the hearth, aside from the poetic examples cited, was on this practice of taking fire, whether from the hearth of the prytaneion or the hearth presumed to have been in the temple of Apollo. In the second century B.C. the oath of the Amphictyons made a distinction between Hestia and the Undying Fire, and while some have conjoined the two, it seems better not to assume that they were identical. For Delos, the fire in the prytaneion was distinct from that of the Python for purposes of purification, it was the fire of Apollo Pythios and not Hestia Prytaneia, which was used for this. Thus the practice most commonly associated with the pairing of Apollo and Hestia at Delphi, is performed apart from Hestia in the Delian prytaneion. The Hestia at Delos then seems to be entirely separate from the Hestia at Delphi, where the conjunction between Apollo Pythios and Hestia is at its closest, yet even there the people distinguished between Hestia and the Undying Fire. Whether this is the result of a similar separation between the premier deity of that state and deity which represented the sovereignty of that state, such as either Hestia or the Undying Fire cannot be ascertained. What is sure, however, is that even if the Hestia on the omphalos at Delos was recognized as being a center, she was not entrusted with the same attributes as the Hestia of Delphi, where Hestia was separated from the Undying Fire in a configuration which remains enigmatic.

---

50 Plut. Arist. 20.
51 See the commentary on Delphi 19.
The same distinction between Hestia and the Undying Fire is made at Ephesus in the first and second centuries A.D., where the *prytanis*, sometimes a woman, has the duties of maintaining a perpetual fire.\(^\text{52}\) Here as perhaps nowhere else the duties of a magistrate are concretely linked with the aspect of Hestia as divinity associated with fire. And this marks a dissimilarity in the worship of Hestia. Previously the connection of Hestia with the fire in the prytaneion had always been assumed, but not explicitly stated. It occurs only in these later inscriptions, which show the participation of women as officials in the rites of the prytaneion. This may be attributed to two factors which accompanied Roman rule of Greece. The first is undoubtedly social and concerns the liberation of wealthy women to fill magistracies which had either lost or had suffered a diminution of their political duties. The second was presumably the spreading influence of Roman Vesta worship whose most important functions were performed by women. In the majority of cases where there is doubt as to whether Hestia or Vesta is meant,\(^\text{53}\) it is a question of a priestess. These instances have been omitted from the present study, but clearly under the influence of the times Hestia worship changed. The picture of Hestia given by Claudia Trophime from Ephesus has been linked with the Orphic movement,\(^\text{54}\) another inscription from Asia Minor, this time from Philadelphia, places Hestia at the heart of private association of mystics,\(^\text{55}\) five other inscriptions, three from Egypt,\(^\text{56}\) one from Chalcis\(^\text{57}\) and another from Tauromenion\(^\text{58}\) show Hestia associated with different Egyptian deities, whether Serapis, Isis or Anoukis. The worship of Hestia was slowly

\(^{52}\) Ephesus 134.

\(^{53}\) Not all inscriptions are so specific as IG II\(^2\) 5145 from Athens which specifies that the priestess is 'of the Roman Hestia.'

\(^{54}\) Ephesus 132.

\(^{55}\) Philadelphia 164.

\(^{56}\) Egypt 175-177.

\(^{57}\) Chalcis 108.

\(^{58}\) Tauromenion 125.
incorporated into other less traditional pantheons and other forms of veneration outside of traditional polis religion. The twilight of Hestia comes from a motion very different from that which appears at her beginning. No longer is there a concern for the territory of the state or the governance of its magistrates. The statue of Hestia which once stood in the prytaneion of Paros is removed to Rome, and the Roman Vesta and other previously foreign deities make their appearance in the Greek states with priestesses, not priests, as servants.

Marie Delcourt once said that ‘Vesta in Rome is a goddess of the fire, who has a public cult. Hestia is a goddess of the hearth whose cult is above all familial.’\textsuperscript{59} Through an epigraphical survey, where the total of familial inscriptions remains scanty, this can be definitively said not to be the case. The resort to the domestic made by Vernant notably, but to Fustel de Coulanges ultimately, advances very little our understanding of any Greek inscription mentioning Hestia. There are to be sure certain records such as that of Timothemis, the archon of Delos, who in his dedication to Hestia proudly stated that ‘many others from this family have attained to this honor (γέρος),’ but this an expression of familial pride at having served as an archon rather than familial pride at having a hestia. In the sixth book of the Politics, Aristotle describes the archons, basileis and prytaneis as performing all the sacrifices which are not entrusted to a priesthood for they have ‘their honor (τιμή) from the common hearth.’\textsuperscript{60} Until now not much has been said about this ‘common hearth,’ yet a complete study of Hestia would include a far more detailed account of this hearth and how it relates to Hestia in different contexts. There is not a sure division between the two, but something happens when the adjective

\textsuperscript{59} “Vesta à Rome est une déesse du feu, qui a un culte public. Hestia est une déesse du foyer dont le culte est surtout familial.” Delcourt (1965: 94).

\textsuperscript{60} Arist. Pol. 6. 1322b.
'common,' (κοινή) is dropped and Hestia finds herself sitting with Apollo, Hermes, Aphrodite and Zeus. Even there, Hestia is always distinguished by her independence. The *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (5, lines 28-32) says that 'to her, father Zeus gave a splendid honor (γέρος) instead of marriage and she sits in the middle of the house receiving the richest portion. And in all the temples of the gods she has a share of the honors (τιμάοχος) and among all mortals she is chief among the gods.' When sacrifices are offered on behalf of an individual or community to a god, Hestia receives a separate portion. Whether this was true or not cannot be said. Yet to characterize this goddess, by either this separate portion or that it was she who received the honors first and last is to demarcate this independent goddess spatially and temporally. The symbolism of the middle and the first and last rarely plays out so neatly in the everyday life of the Greek polis where differing concerns, such as territorial claims, foreign policy, the keeping of records and the competing demands of clans, demes, and families could not be resolved by a simple and straightforward resort to the symbolic. But there are exceptions.

The epithets of Hestia have always been notable in that they are linked to a place and an institution, most often *Boulaia*, but also *Prytaneia* and even *Temenia*. Another epithet, *Demia*, might indicate the institution of the assembly, the *demos*, or simply mean 'public,' were it not also a question of a horos stone which has the effect of rendering this manifestation of Hestia as rooted in a specific locale as all the others. Thus, the epithets of Hestia prove that she is a goddess very much given to location, but only certain ones. There exists no attestation, for example, of a Hestia *Polias* or *Agoraia*. This does not mean, of course, that Hestia was not perceived as a poliad divinity. Plato makes it clear that she could be. Nor does it mean that Hestia was never to be found in the agora, this
occurs in at least two places Cos (83) and Pharae (Paus. 7. 22. 2-3). In the former, she was known by the epithet *Phamia*, which strikes us as strange for a goddess who does not have a speaking role in any of the myths told about her, save for the oath she utters in the Homeric Hymn when she takes hold of the head of Zeus, and pledges to remain a virgin forever. Yet preserved in Aristotle is the record of a Hestia who spoke in strange and sudden outbursts, with the crackling of the fire, via a process, which he explains as being akin to that by which lighting bolts cause thunder.\(^61\) This was the sound of ‘Hestia laughing,’ and the inarticulate voice of Hestia at strange and sudden moments around the fire was taken as a warning, as a *kledon*, and it was just such an oracle which was to be found at Pharae. Bouche-Leclercq explains this type of oracle thus,

Every speech, phrase, isolated word in an exclamation overheard by a man preoccupied with a notion foreign to the one who speaks, can become for the one who hears it, a *κλῆσις*; that is to say, that it can have there, between one person’s thought and a speech which does not follow from this thought, an unforeseen connection, a chance agreement which holds a providential notice. The supernatural intervention is even more evident as the speaking subject is less capable of reckoning and more estranged from the preoccupation of the one who hears it.\(^62\)

The question is then one of a communication which is diverted from the purpose for which it was originally intended, and the principle of this kind of oracle finds its parallel in two of the most puzzling features of the Coan sacrifice and the Pharaean oracle.

At both places Hestia appears with another deity, Zeus *Polieus* on Cos, Hermes *Agoraios* at Pharae. But something strange occurs in both places. In the agora of Cos, the traditional place of buying and selling, after the ox of Hestia *Phamia* spontaneously selects itself, it is evaluated and the owner of the ox must pronounce the formula, ‘For the
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\(^{61}\) Arist. *Met.* 368a 32.

\(^{62}\) Bouche-Leclercq I (1879: 156).
Coans I am providing an ox, let the Coans pay the price to Hestia.' A buyer who has chosen it does not purchase the ox, the ox offers itself up unexpectedly and of its own accord. The price of this ox goes not to the man who has raised it, but is diverted instead to Hestia in a strange statement which seems tailored to cause Hestia to appear as the one who herself has caused this ox to appear as the sacrifice. The ox is not the property of its owner, it is selected not by the choice of the magistrates, rather it suddenly presents itself and Hestia Phamia is both the source and the recipient of the sacrifice. After this, a sacred silence is proclaimed while the sacrifices are performed in this place so accustomed to the clamor of the market, and when these are done, the voice of the herald proclaims the festival of Zeus Polieus.

At Pharae, Pausanias describes in detail the process of the oracle. At dusk, the petitioner approaches the statue of Hermes Agoraios which stands in the center of the agora, but before asking his question he must first fill the lamps on the hearth and offer incense on the hearth in front of the statue. He whispers his question in the ear of the statue of Hermes and then stops up his ears and runs from the agora. Once outside, he unstops his ears and the first voice he hears is the response of the god. In both cases, an offering is made to Hestia in the agora, the unusual circumstance of which is mirrored by her involvement with the kledon. She is in the company of another deity whose involvement will mark the close of the ritual, but only after the imposition of silence in this place where voices are the rule and silence the exception.

As the first commentators on the inscription noted, the ritual of Cos seems strangely similar to that of the Dipolieia at Athens, a very ancient ritual whose prescriptions in general were a source of perplexity to ancient commentators, and whose
connections with the speech act, while marked in these same ancient commentators, have passed virtually unnoticed by their modern counterparts. Porphyrius (2. 30. 3) records that the ax of the Dipolieia was convicted precisely because of the fact that it was ‘without a voice,’ (ἄφωνον) in the presence of its accusers, but it is the act of accusing the ax which has received the most notice. The modern interpretations of this ritual have also neglected the information that it was the court of the prytaneion, the traditional seat of Hestia, which was responsible for the trying of this case. Lastly in Delphi, from the hymn of Aristonoos there is the description of Hestia pantompheousa (lines 11-12). A strange word used in connection with the voice of Zeus, as heard through a kledon.

All these topics remain to be explored in detail, but via epigraphy, it is now possible to say that Hestia has at last found her voice. Sharing the mind of Zeus and by his head swearing an oath to maintain her independence from Apollo, she walks at Olympia with Hermes, the herald. In her shrine, the prytaneion is a home for Themis, a form of law and justice, but also the basis for the state, which is represented in the form of magistrates who draw their honor from the exercise of a sovereign authority expressed in the maintenance of the common hearth. Here in its archives she holds the memories of the city’s past and in the ephebes receives the guardians of its future. These men, like Apollo and Poseidon will preserve her, but not possess her. She receives them there with warmth and hospitality and they inscribe their gratitude and fidelity in stone.
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