

*The Place of Purity*Groups and Associations, Authority and Sanctuaries^{*}*Jan-Mathieu Carbon*

This chapter proposes to look in some detail at a few evocative cases, primarily from the Hellenistic and Roman periods, where associations or other groups, such as bands of worshippers, were especially concerned with purity or where they published inscribed rules of purity.¹ Limited in number partly due to the vicissitudes of epigraphic preservation, partly due to the geographic and chronological specificities of this material – post-Classical Asia Minor and the Aegean – other factors may also explain their scarcity and warrant further investigation.

Leading such an investigation entails probing the often-murky background and motivations for the publication of inscriptions regulating cult practice. These have traditionally been called ‘sacred laws’ – a questionable designation, since the documents are not always laws, nor ‘sacred’ in and of themselves. A newer proposal is to view such inscriptions as representative of ‘ritual norms’. These are a heterogeneous group of inscribed documents that defined, prescribed and/or codified norms for Greek ritual practices, such as purification.² The context for the passing of such rules is not often explicitly defined and, indeed, this is usually the case with rules of purity.

^{*} The writing of this chapter formed a part of my work as a member of the Copenhagen Associations Project (CAP) during 2015–16, an opportunity for which I continue to be deeply thankful. I am also grateful to the anonymous peer reviewers for their constructive remarks as well as to the editors for their diligence and extensive patience. Edward Harris kindly provided useful guidance and feedback. As always, Stella Skaltsa provided acute comments on my work, from which I greatly benefitted. The chapter was revised and partly updated in 2018 and 2019.

¹ A subject not discussed in the excellent recent survey and legal classification of ‘sacred laws’ in Harris 2015, but see esp. 70–1 on rules of associations (and cf. now the online appendices to this article by Harris with Carbon at <https://journals.openedition.org/kernos/2299>).

² On the question of the terminology and criteria for identifying cultic regulations, see recently Carbon and Pirenne-Delforge 2012; Zimmermann 2016; Petrovic 2017. Cf. also Harris 2015: esp. 58–60, who attractively distinguishes between laws or decrees *regarding* sacred matters and other more informal rules or summaries of formal rules, preferring to call the latter ‘signs’. After the volumes of Sokolowski (*LSAM*; *LSCG Suppl.*; *LSCG*) and Lupu (*NGSL*), for a new online collection of ‘sacred laws’, see now *CGRN*.

In confronting the difficult question of context, the relevant cases adduced here are particularly instructive for apprehending the identity and the authority of the groups in question. One can outline a relatively broad spectrum of groups and associations: those that were identified with a specific sanctuary but do not seem to have been fully in control of it (Section 1); others that expounded purity regulations for sanctuaries that they evidently controlled but where entry was open to other worshippers (Section 2); and finally, cults that were founded by private individuals, whether for their families or for a wider audience, which also enacted rules concerning purity (Section 3).

These case studies thus frame a wider investigation, aimed at addressing the question of why associations and other groups would promulgate rules of purity in the first place. Purity was a fundamental type of order, an indispensable aspect of the definition of any sacred space or cultic community. Proper religious conduct or piety included abstaining (cf. ἀγνεία, ‘purity’, and related concepts) from sources of pollution, a *sine qua non* for maintaining a successful relationship with the gods (being ἀγνός, ‘pure’, καθάρως, ‘clean’, ὅσιος, ‘pious, holy’ and the like).³ As this applied in society at large, so it did too in a smaller religious group or within an associational cult site. Many chapters in the present volume ably and amply underscore the importance of maintaining good order in assembled masses of people, such as associations. Concerns of this sort were administrative, logistical, even hygienic, but could also include ethical factors or those of religious decorum.

On fundamental level, then, it can be assumed that associations with direct ties to a cult or to a sanctuary would naturally wish to maintain it in a ‘well-ordered’ fashion, notably with regard to purity. Where sanctuaries are concerned, it is immediately apparent that associations sought in any eventuality to safeguard the sacrality of this space. For instance, associations in Attica regularly stipulated in lease agreements that a person renting their property treat it not just as normal land, but ‘as sacred’ (ὡς ἱερός).⁴

³ On ἀγνεία and the concepts of purity/impurity in the ancient Greek world, see Parker 1996b and cf. also now Parker 2018b, revisiting both old and new evidence. On the term ὅσιος and the framing of an adequate relationship with the gods, see Peels 2016: esp. 168–206 (ch. 6) with regard to ritual norms and purity.

⁴ Cf. *LSCG* 47 (*CAPInv.* 242; 306/5 BC), ll. 5–7, χρῆσθαι... ὡς ἱερῶν; *IG* II² 2501 (*CAPInv.* 243; late fourth cent. BC), ll. 4 (restored) and 15–16, ὡς ἱερ(ῶ)ν. On this, see Parker 1996b: 162, also adducing a later ‘law concerning precincts’ from Athens, which notably forbade birth and death, both dangerous sources of pollution.

Implicit in this requirement was also the essential preservation of the purity of the space.

But why did purity in particular matter to some groups? In what cases did this subject become an overt preoccupation? Beyond a general concern for maintaining pious conduct and the integrity of sacred space, such questions are normally difficult to answer fully in the absence of other evidence, though the rationale of the rules can occasionally become clear. Some progress can be made by looking at the circumstances of the development of such rules, where these can be identified, and at exactly how they were articulated. Did they precisely correspond with norms of purity at large or with ones in the local area of the community in question? Or were they different – for instance, more flexible or more stringent? In this regard, comparing purity rules in their local and wider context can be particularly illuminating (see Sections 2 and 3). Some rules articulated by groups can be recognised as inclusive or pragmatic, while others were apparently more strict or moralistic. Qualifying the rules of purity in this way can to some degree help evaluate their motivations. These can further be tied with the overall characteristics of the group, be it one generally welcoming outsiders in its sanctuary or one possessing more selective criteria of admission.

Making a sacred space accessible to worshippers, whether a select or a wider group, created a risk of impurity that needed to be carefully managed. In many if not most cases, associations and groups must have relied on existing, traditional rules of purity, whether recorded by the city and community or not. In other, more distinctive cases, regulations of purity became an intrinsic part of the definition of the cultic community and the organisation of its sacred space. The subject of purity rules therefore forms an interesting focus for apprehending how associations considered and managed sacred space as well as for illuminating the profile of the associations in their local and wider context.

The *Bacchoi* at Cnidus

Ensuring the purity of a sanctuary, if this was not a private cult site in any sense of the term, may be presumed to have been the remit either of the *polis* or of the sanctuary itself and its officials. In late Classical or early Hellenistic Cnidus, a group of *Bacchoi* made a petition to the city council and its *prostatai*, ‘leaders’. These worshippers of Dionysus formed a cultic group that was sufficiently well organised to make a collective action in front of the civic authorities, though whether they were formally an

association – with a charter, rules, fixed membership or the like – remains unclear. The concern of the *Bacchoi* was apparently that many other worshippers were camping in the sanctuary, thus rendering it not only insalubrious but, worse, impure. Indeed, it must be stressed that the concern of the *Bacchoi* was not merely a logistical or hygienic one, but rather, as the resulting decree of the city makes explicitly clear, ‘that the sanctuary remain pure’ (ὄπω[ς] | ἀγνεύηται τὸ [ἰαρὸς]ν, ll. 4–6). The petition of the *Bacchoi*, though now lost to us, will almost certainly have framed their complaint in religious terms, specifically pointing to the necessary purity (ἀγνεΐα) of the sanctuary of Dionysus.

The city acted on the recommendation of the *Bacchoi* and passed a decree forbidding camping altogether and very probably imposing penalties to that effect, which are now missing in the fragmentary lines concluding the stele (cf. ll. 12–13). The fragmentary inscription recording this decree is normally presented and restored as follows:⁵

ἔδοξε Κνιδιοῖς[ς, γν]ώμα προστατᾶ[ν]· | περὶ ὧν τοῖ Βάκ[χοι] | ἐπήλθον·
ὄπω[ς] | ἀγνεύηται τὸ [ἰαρὸς]ν τοῦ Διονύσου το]ῦ Βάκχου, μὴ ἐ[ξή]μ[εν]
καταλύε[ν ἐν | τῶ]ι ἰαρῶι τῶν [Βάκ|χων μ]ηδένα, μὴ[τε | ἄρσ]ενα μὴ[τε
θή|λειαν]· εἰ δέ [ἄ τ]ις | καταλ]ύηι – – – – –

It was decided by the Cnidians, on the proposal of the *prostatai*, regarding the matters for which the *Bacchoi* approached (the civic authorities): so that the sanctuary of Dionysus Bacchus remain pure, no one is to be allowed to camp in the sanctuary [of the *Bacchoi*], neither male nor [female]. If [anyone] should make camp [. . . (then) . . .]

A crux of the text occurs in lines 8–10: [ἐν | τῶ]ι ἰαρῶι τῶν [Βάκ|χων μ]ηδένα. This widely accepted restoration would either – highly paradoxically – restrict the prohibition of camping only to the *Bacchoi* themselves (‘none of the *Bacchoi* is to camp . . .’) or would – much more naturally, and

⁵ *I.Knidos* 160 (*CPIInv.* 838). Note that, from autopsy as well as the recently published photograph (*I.Knidos* II, p. 118), the stone clearly reads τῶν and not τῶμ in l. 9 (the latter being a possibility considered by its editor W. Blümel in *I.Knidos*, notably on the basis of a squeeze in the *IG* archives consulted by K. Hallof). The left hasta of the letter is straight and vertical; part of the right vertical hasta seems to be visible at the break; by contrast, mu has angular hastae in this inscription. Reading τῶν rather than τῶμ may lend further support to my suggestion below, because the dental nu, rather than an assimilated labial mu, would tend to anticipate a different word than [Βάκχων]. For a balanced discussion of the arguments for and against the associational character of the group in question, see Jaccottet 2003: II 257–8 no 154. Some other groups of *Bacchoi* included in the Inventory of Ancient Associations are similarly problematic: cf. e.g. *MDAI(A)* 27 (1902): 94 no 86, l. 3 (*CPIInv.* 913; 158 BC); but contrast the much more fully developed *Iobacchoi* of Athens (AD 164/5), who owned a *Bakcheion* and participated in both private and – apparently – civic rituals: *IG* II² 1368 / Jaccottet 2003: II 27–35 no 4 / *AGRW* 7 (*CPIInv.* 339).

as translated here – suggest ownership of the sanctuary by the *Bacchoi*. Yet the latter reading also begs the question: why, if they owned or controlled the sanctuary, did the *Bacchoi* either bother or need to ask the city to intervene in the matter of the purity of their sacred space? We could perhaps imagine that they attempted to pass rules regarding purity in the sanctuary and that these proved to be ineffective, possibly for want of tangible sanctions. The *Bacchoi* would then, in a surprising display of their lack of competence, have approached the city to lend its authority to the regulation of their sanctuary.⁶

While that reconstruction remains possible, there is an alternative: this is to view the completely uncertain restoration τῶν [Βάκ|χων] as inherently problematic. A fairly simple solution, for example, might be to restore the passage in question as τῶν [θυσόν|των μ]ηδένα. This reading would entail that ‘none of those offering a sacrifice’ – essentially any worshipper – ‘is to camp in the sanctuary’. While some inscribed rules granted those who offered sacrifices the right to feast and linger overnight, others restricted camping altogether.⁷ This seems to me to be the case here at Cnidus, where

⁶ An analogy might be sought in the case of the priests of Sarapis and Isis who obtained a decree from the council of elders in Seleucid Laodicea-by-the-Sea regarding the application of a civic law to their private sanctuary (*JGLS* IV 1261, 174 BC). That the concern of the priests was framed in terms of private property, is repeatedly made clear in the text (ιδιόκτητον, line 10; ἡ κτήσις αὐτῶν, ll. 16–17). On this document, see the detailed discussion of Sosin 2005. Yet this is essentially a different situation from the one at Cnidus: the private petition at Laodicea sought to make a pre-existing law concerning the dedication of statues apply to a privately owned sanctuary; any regulation made by the priests themselves in this regard would potentially have conflicted with the laws of the city. For a different emphasis on why the priests would not turn away dedicants, namely, because of their piety, see Sosin 2005: 139. In the case of the *Bacchoi*, piety certainly fuelled their anxiety about unclean campers, but would not explain why they would have permitted such visitors to set up camp in their own private sanctuary in the first place. On the possible legal precedents for the petition of the *Bacchoi*, see further below.

⁷ Most clearly, cf. the interdictions of camping in all sacred areas stipulated by Antiochus III and Zeuxis to Seleucid troops (*I.Labraunda* 46, 203 BC, ll. 8–9: μήτε ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς | τόποις καταλύετε; cf. also *I.Amyzon* 10; for these texts, see also Ma 1999: 304–5 no 15 and 294–5 no 6, respectively). A similar rule may have been enacted at Olympia already ca. 500 BC concerning Epidamnian, Lybian and Cretan pilgrims to the sanctuary (*IED* 8, l. 6: αἱ δὲ τις σταθμεῖοι ἐν τῖαροῖ, EN[–] κτλ.). The immediately following lines, if directly connected with this lacunose passage, evoke fines not only for the pasturing of animals (ὁ νομε(ύ)ς) but also, it would seem, for lodging outside of the expected or prescribed guesthouse (τὸν] ξενεῶνα, δαρχμῶν κ’ ἀποτίνοι). For analogous rules concerning access to and purity in the sanctuary at Olympia (ca. 520–500 BC), see also *IED* 3 / *CGRN* 4 (case of a foreigner, ξένος), *IED* 4 / *CGRN* 5 (α θεαρός, ‘visitor’, having sex in the sanctuary). Conversely, other ritual norms grant the right to camp, but only to those who have performed a sacrifice: *SEG* 36:1221 (Xanthos), ll. 11–14: μηδ’ ἐν ταῖς | στοισις καταλύειν | μηθὲν ἀλλ’ ἢ τοὺς | θύοντας; or *SEG* 57:1674 / *CGRN* 129 (Patara, ca. 300–200 BC), ll. 7–8: μηδὲ καταλύειν | ἐν τῷ τεμένει πλὴν τῶν θυόντων. Camping in these cases was thus restricted to the specific category of worshippers who had sacrificed; these were allowed to stay and feast, others were not. To be distinguished from the above-mentioned cases are others that required camping and thus enforced consumption of meat on the spot (cf. e.g. *LSCG* 82 / *CGRN* 33, Elateia, fifth cent. BC, ll.

‘neither a male nor a [female]’ worshipper, not just the *Bacchoi*, is to be allowed to remain overnight in the sanctuary and potentially pollute it.

What might have been the source of impurity that so worried the *Bacchoi*? Urination and defecation were possible forms of pollution in the ancient Greek world, though they rarely if at all warrant any mention in the available evidence.⁸ It was perhaps simply expected that one did one’s business outside the sanctuary.⁹ Since the purpose of the Cnidian decree is framed in terms of necessary abstinence (ἀγνεΐα) and explicitly excludes both genders, the background of the petition of the *Bacchoi* suggests that campers were not just dirtying the sanctuary, but succumbing to that most natural of night-time proclivities: sex. Together with birth and death, as well as the shedding of blood and, much more rarely, the consumption of certain foods, intercourse was envisaged as one of the principal vectors of pollution in the ancient Greek world.

This new reading would also have the advantage of clearing up the question of the authority over the sanctuary at Cnidus: it belonged to the city and was controlled by it. Archaeological and epigraphical evidence for the sanctuary of Dionysus at Cnidus remains rather slim, but it is apparent that the city – as is also expected from other Greek cities – controlled the local festival of Dionysus, the Dionysia, from at least the early Hellenistic through the Roman periods.¹⁰ Nevertheless, the *Bacchoi* formed an important group: their name echoed the epithet of the god and they probably

3–4: θύοντα | σκανῆν; *IG XII.4 I 293 / LSCG 168*, Cos, late second cent. BC, with its repeated injunction θύόντωνι δὲ καὶ σκανοπαγεῖσθων).

⁸ For guidelines concerning urination and defecation, see already Hes. *Op.* 727–32. But these say nothing about religion or sanctuaries in particular, recommending instead the discretion of night-time and of a well-enclosed courtyard (ἔυεργκέος αὐλής). On this subject, see especially the comments of Parker 1996b: 293 and Parker 2018b: 26 (‘excrement is almost never mentioned in Greek religious laws, it is of no interest or concern’).

⁹ One of the only relevant inscribed rules is *SEG 56:890* (Nymphaeum, fifth cent. BC), which advises: μὴ χέσσε· ἱερόν, ‘do not defecate: sacred’. The irregular shape of the reused block in this case may suggest that it was affixed as a reminder (a sign) for a small or private sanctuary that was not otherwise immediately obvious (hence the need to include the word ἱερόν *in fine*). Note also that no notion of purity is invoked nor are any sanctions mentioned. The interdiction against urination in the peristyle of the sanctuary of the new inscription from Marmarini, Decourt and Tziafalias 2015 / Bouchon and Decourt 2017 (ca. 250–150 BC), face B (I), ll. 80–81, is remarkable but no doubt to be attributed in large part to the uniqueness of the document itself and the foreign cult it defines.

¹⁰ For the usual identification of the temple with the late Byzantine church ‘C’, see Blümel at *I.Knidos* 160, with refs. For the Dionysia, cf. *I.Knidos* 231, ll. 20–5 (decree of Smyrna from late third or second cent. BC, in which, pending authorisation – παραρ[α]λεῖν Κνιδίου[ς] – crowns are to be proclaimed in the theatre during the Dionysia at Cnidus, [πα]ρ’ αὐτοῖς ἐν τῶι θεάτρῳ Διονυσίων τῶι ἀγῶνι. . .; for direct parallels, cf. *I.Kaunos* 17, second cent. BC, ll. 38–40), *I.Knidos* 606 (first cent. BC), ll. 12–13 (proclamation by the herald of the council during the Dionysia), *I.Knidos* 74 (first–second cent. AD) and *IG XII.3 322 + Suppl. p. 282* (Thera, second cent. BC), ll. 1–18.

had a substantial degree of involvement in the sanctuary, taking it upon themselves, we might envision, to perform and maintain the cult in collaboration with the – probably civic – priest.¹¹ What is more, it should be noted that their petition to the polis worked: the city listened to their concerns and deemed them valid; the stele publicising the decree is the material manifestation of this. The sanctuary continued, as usual, to be allowed to receive visitors for sacrifices, but none of these – *Bacchoi* included – was allowed to stay overnight.

In other words, we seem to have here the case of a group that was closely connected with a sanctuary and had a role to play within it, but which did not properly control it. The *Bacchoi* were most probably not a fully formalised association.¹² As a recognised interest-group, they were generally concerned with maintaining the sanctuary as a ‘well-ordered’ space, but not fully empowered to do so. As a group with a manifestly religious vocation and cultic function, they notably focussed on preserving the indispensable purity (ἄγνεία) of the sanctuary, an emphasis which facilitated a successful appeal to the civic authorities.

Though the sanctions of the decree from Cnidus are not preserved after lines 12–13 and therefore remain unclear to us, the text nonetheless demonstrates that the city took matters in hand. These sanctions may have included concrete penalties or fines for those contravening the rule and illegally camping in the sanctuary of Dionysus. Reference may also have been made to general norms of purity, whether codified or not, which were espoused by the city. Transgressing such rules would have carried either a concrete penalty – for instance, requiring a ritual process purifying the sanctuary as a whole – or a seemingly less tangible, but nonetheless

¹¹ For a probable priest of Dionysus, see *I.Knidus* 113 (ca. 200–150 BC). Since this is a familial monument, it remains unclear whether he was a civic official or not, though given the civic importance of the cult (see n. 10, above), that he was a public priest is highly likely.

¹² A similar uncertainty hovers over other groups of Dionysiac worshippers, such as *mystai*. In the present study, a particularly intriguing case is the metrical and casuistic purity regulation consecrated by (...)tes the son of Menander who calls himself ὁ θεοφάντης: *I.Smyrna* 728 / *LSAM* 84 / *GRA* II 140 (*CAPInv.* 1337; second or third cent. AD). In this text, Dionysus is called Βρόμιος (l. 2) and we also find the mention of Bacchic festivals (ἐν Βακχείοις, l. 12). Though the initiative of the official in promulgating the rules is noteworthy, likely indicating an independent or private sanctuary where multiple gods might have been worshipped (τέμενος and ναοί, l. 2; cf. also plural altars in l. 10), we cannot ascertain any further information about the contextual framework of this cult. The provenance of the inscription is regrettably uncertain and, though a group of *mystai* are mentioned in l. 18, the formal character of the group as an association is far from evident. The purity rules present several standard and stringent delays of abstinence regarding impurity: forty days in the case of exposition of a child or an abortion/miscarriage, ca. ten days (a ‘third of the month’) from the death of a relative, etc. On these delays of ἄγνεία, see further below.

more oppressive one – for instance, being considered impious (ἀσεβής) and incurring the anger of the gods.¹³

A subcategory of the ‘sacred laws’ alluded to previously – texts that prescribe ritual norms or regulate religious behaviour in some way – consists of what might be called casuistic purity regulations. From the Archaic to the early Hellenistic periods especially, these regulations take the form of extensively detailed laws, enacted by the polis, which seek to define different cases of impurity and their recommended solutions.¹⁴ The formulary of these laws is organised on a case-by-case basis – ‘if such-and-such happens, then do the following’, hence the designation ‘casuistic’. For example, in the laws of the city of Cos concerning purity, codified in ca. 240 BC, but at least in part probably belonging to an earlier tradition or model, priestly personnel were explicitly prevented from entering a house in which a person had died. The period of abstention (ἀγνεία) in this regard was to last five days after the body was carried out for burial; if any priestesses or priests contravened the rules, then a purification with water poured from a golden vessel and a sprinkling of grain was required.¹⁵

The importance of civic authority in these kinds of regulations becomes less perceptible – if at all – in the epigraphic evidence from the late Hellenistic and Roman periods. This should not be taken to mean that the laws of the city that were already enacted did not remain in effect – they demonstrably did, in the case of Cos, for instance¹⁶ – only that the regulations published in later periods are generally of a different sort. The style of these later texts is also more practical and to the point. It now

¹³ For an example of both, see the law (νόμος, e.g. l. 19) concerning the purity of the sanctuary of Electryone, enacted by a decree of Ialysos, *IG XII.1 677 / CGRN 90* (ca. 350–300 BC), ll. 27–30: ὅ,τι δέ κά τις παρὰ τὸν νόμον | ποιήσῃ, τὸ τε ἱερὸν καὶ τὸ τέμενος | καθαιρέτω καὶ ἐπιρεζέτω, ἢ ἔνο|χος ἔστω τᾷ ἀσεβείᾳ. On impiety, see notably Delli Pizzi 2011.

¹⁴ For epigraphic purity regulations, see the still unsurpassed discussion of Parker 1996b: i.a. 144–6, 176–8, 332–56. For early, but regrettably more fragmentary cases, see e.g. *IG IV 1607 / LSCG 56 / CGRN 3* (Cleonae, ca. 525 BC; a civic context is nearly certain, see ll. 15–16). Two notable early Hellenistic examples include the famous ‘Cathartic Law’ of Cyrene, Dobias-Lalou 2000: 297–309 / *CGRN 99* (ca. 325–300 BC), and the inscription from Cos, *IG XII.4 1 332 / CGRN 148* (ca. 240 BC; see n. 15 below). Both sets of laws are notably interesting in their claims to a deeper form of religious authority or tradition: in the case of Cyrene, they are presented as an oracle of Apollo (cf. l. 1); in that of Cos, they are explicitly said to be sacred (ἱεροὶ νόμοι – here indeed ‘sacred laws’ properly speaking) and expounded by the official interpreters of religious matters (ἐξέγραψαι).

¹⁵ *IG XII.4 1 332 / CGRN 148* (Cos, ca. 250 BC), ll. 23–4 and 29–30: μηδὲ ἐς οἰκίαν [ἐσέρπεν ἐν ὀποία κα ἄνθρωπος ἀποθά|γη] ἀμερᾶν πέντε ὄφ’ ὅς κα ἀμ|[ρασ ὁ νεκρὸς ἐξενιχθῆ] . . . αὶ δέ τί κα τῶν] | ἄλλων συμβᾶι, ἀπὸ χρυσίου καὶ π[ροσπερμείας].

¹⁶ On Cos, reference to the purity laws for priests and priestesses (*IG XII.4 1 332 / CGRN 148*, cf. n. 15 above) is clearly made some centuries later in a contract for the sale of the priesthood of Nike (*IG XII.4 1 330 / CGRN 163*, first cent. BC, ll. 12–14): καὶ ἀγνευέσθω | [δω]φω καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἱερεῦσι ποτιπέταται ἀ|[γν]εῦεσθαι.

involves inscribing a series of rules, for instance on a legible stele or a pillar, which should be observed by worshippers wishing to enter a sanctuary.¹⁷ As a representative example of this later form of casuistic purity regulation, we might take the following regulation inscribed on the entrance to the temple of Artemis Chitone near the agora at Miletus:¹⁸

[καθαροὺς εἰσι|έναι]ἰ εἰς τὸν νε|ώ] τῆς Ἀρτέμι|δος τῆς Κιθώνη[ς], | [ἄ]πὸ μὲν κήδε[ο]ς | [καί] γυναικός [τε]|[κούση]ς¹⁹ καὶ κυνός | [τε]το[κυ]ίας τ[ρ]ι|[τα]ίου[ς] λουσα|[μ]ένους, ἀπὸ [δέ] | τῶ]ν λοιπῶν [αὐ]θημ[ε]ρόν λουσα|[μ]έν[ους].

[Enter as pure individuals] into the temple of Artemis Chitone: from a funerary ritual [and] from a woman [having given birth] and from a bitch [having given birth], on the third day, having washed; and from the rest (that is to say other causes of impurity), on the same day, having washed.

Though the beginning is partly missing, the text is essentially preserved.²⁰ It is relatively clear that the regulation was simply addressed to worshippers and probably did not include any preamble concerning its source. In other words, the authority behind the regulation was left implicit. Moreover, no form of sanction for any contravention of the rules is stipulated at Miletus. In other rules, some form of sanction could occasionally be mentioned, but this usually took the form of a curse (or a blessing, which also implies its reverse: again, a curse).²¹ We never find fines or other tangible penalties associated with this later form of casuistic purity regulation.

Typically, these rules apply to any and all who wish to enter the sanctuary (εἰσιέναι, εἰσπορεύεσθαι, *vel sim.*). The form that they take is again set of cases, defining purity – the words καθαρός or ἀγνεία are often invoked, though they may also be left implicit – from (ἀπό) a specific

¹⁷ See now Petrovic and Petrovic 2018 for a helpful review of these inscriptions. For such texts as ‘signs’, cf. again Harris 2015: esp. 58–60.

¹⁸ *Milet* 1.7 202 / *LSAM* 51 / *CGRN* 214, ca. 75 BC to 1 BC.

¹⁹ The long-standing restoration may be maintained, though [τε][τοκυία]ς might alternatively be envisaged. To my knowledge, in the case of purity rules, the aorist participle is only used in *I.Pergamon* 255 / *LSAM* 12 / *CGRN* 212, l. 7: καὶ τεκούσης γυναικός δευτεραῖο(ι) (see below, Section 2, on this text from Pergamum). The perfect τετοκυία is somewhat more widely found: *I.Pergamon* 264 / *LSAM* 14, *IG XII Suppl.* 126 / *LSCG* 124 / *CGRN* 181, *LSCG Suppl.* 54 / *CGRN* 217, *LSCG Suppl.* 119 / *CGRN* 144.

²⁰ As the edition in *I.Milet* 1.7 202 informs us, the inscription was incised on a narrow anta-block, probably originally belonging to the temple itself. From the photograph, some erosion is perceptible above the extant text on the block, suggesting that only one or at most a few lines are now missing above. Unless we were to assume that further text was inscribed on another anta-block originally situated above this block, the inscription should be treated as essentially complete.

²¹ For an early example, see the conclusion of the rules concerning the sanctuary of Meter Galesia at Metropolis (*I.Ephesos* 3401 / *LSAM* 29 / *CGRN* 71, fourth cent. BC): θες δ' [ἔ]ν ἀδική[σ]η, μὴ εἴλωσ αὐ|[τῶ]ι ἢ Μήτηρ [ἢ] Γαλ[λ]ησί|α.

source of impurity, followed by a delay during which one must abstain from entry into the sanctuary and/or by a set of purificatory requirements, normally washing from the head down or other forms of ablution. Each scenario is either listed on a case-by-case basis or a group of cases may be treated under the same rubric in the regulation.

From the Hellenistic period onward, then, the inscribing of rules of purity, rather than emanating directly from the city or another form of political authority, was often left to the discretion and the initiative of sanctuaries and their officials, of private individuals or of other groups, notably associations. A related observation must be made. This type of evidence is more or less confined to the eastern Aegean and Asia Minor, with only a few cases from mainland Greece,²² and one example coming from Ptolemais in Egypt.²³ Prima facie, this geographical distribution need not be surprising or significant in and of itself, since a large proportion of the Hellenistic and Roman epigraphical sources comes from these areas of the ancient Greek world. A recent discussion, however, has sought to argue that these purity regulations all or nearly all pertain to foreign cults, more specifically Egyptian or Near Eastern forms of worship, whence they must have developed in Greek communities.²⁴ Without denying that several of these regulations do indeed relate to such cults, it should be said that the question of the ‘origins’ of specific purity rules remains difficult to answer. Particularly cautioning any hasty judgement is the fact that the norms underpinning these casuistic regulations match the aforementioned purity laws of the city and thus seem to derive from much the same traditional sources.²⁵ Moreover, as we shall see immediately below for the Attalid Kingdom, many of the cults that are concerned by such rules are far from straightforwardly explained as ‘Near Eastern’ or as having any connection

²² Apart from the inscription for a West-Semitic cult found at Marmarini near Larissa in Thessaly (Decourt and Tziaphalias 2015 / Bouchon and Decourt 2017 / *CGRN* 225, ca. 250–150 BC), two other cases are regulations for the sanctuary (of Despoina?) at Lycosura (*NGSL* 8 / *CGRN* 189, second cent. BC) and for the sanctuary of the Egyptian gods at Megalopolis (*NGSL* 7 / *CGRN* 155, ca. 200 BC).

²³ For the case from Ptolemais, written on a conical cone of basalt, see *LSCG Suppl.* 119 / *CGRN* 144 (first cent. BC); the context or authority of this regulation has not been clearly identified.

²⁴ Petrovic and Petrovic 2018.

²⁵ Note, for instance, the abstention (ἀγνεύεσθαι) from sex for the night preceding the sacrifice to Zeus Polieus on Cos, which the ἱεροποιός chosen as a sacrificer (σφαγεύς) must respect (*IG* XII.4 1 278, ca. 350 BC, ll. 41–43). This sort of abstention is typical of casuistic purity regulations and does not have any perceptibly ‘foreign’ aspect here. In fact, regulations concerning purity can usually be seen as striking some form of compromise between traditional norms and local trends, an assessment that is partially discussed below, but still warrants further study than is possible here.

to Egyptian practices.²⁶ For all of their diversity in terms of provenance, content and context, the regulations present a coherent picture of the need to avoid the spread of impurity in a community, by restricting the entry of impure individuals into sacred space.

Pergamum and the Attalid Kingdom

A particularly intriguing case study for examining the purity rules of associations in their local context is Pergamum and the wider area of the Attalid kingdom. Here, we find a series of conspicuous examples where the different sources of authority behind the promulgation of purity rules are particularly clear. One inscription, from the sanctuary of Athena Nikephoros on the Acropolis of the city of Pergamum, forms an apt starting point.²⁷ It has been thought to date to the period after 133 BC, but on the basis of its letterforms, could alternatively be dated to the late Attalid period.²⁸

Διονύσιος Μηνοφιλ[ου] | ιερονομήσα[[ντε]]ς τῶι δήμ[ωι]. | ἀγνεύετῶσαν δὲ καὶ εἰσίτῶσαν εἰς τὸν τῆς θεο[ῦ ἱερὸν] | οἱ τε πολῖται καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς ἰδίας γ[υναι]κός καὶ τοῦ ἰδίου ἀνδρὸς αὐθήμερον, ἀπὸ δὲ ἀλλοτρίας κ[αί] | ἀλλοτρίου δευτεραῖοι λουσάμενοι, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ | κήδους καὶ τεκούσης γυναικὸς δευτεραῖοι· ἀπὸ δὲ τάφου | καὶ ἐκφορᾶ[ς] περιρα(ν)άμενοι καὶ διελθόντες τὴν πύλην, κα|θ' ἦν τὰ ἀγιστήρια τίθεται, καθαροὶ ἔστῶσαν αὐθήμερον. κτλ.

Dionysios son of Menophilos, having served as *hieronomos* for the people. Let both citizens and all others abstain and enter into the [sanctuary] of the goddess, from (sex with) one's own wife and one's own husband, on the same day, from (sex with) another woman and another man, on the next day, having washed; and in the same way (that is to say having washed) from a death and from a woman having given birth, on the second day;

²⁶ It could instead be argued that, where Egyptian or Near Eastern cults implanted in Greek communities were concerned, rules of purity needed spelling out *in Greek terms* due to the novelty of the cults in question. Codification could be undertaken for a variety of reasons, the inauguration of the cult being one of them (see n. 25 above on the sacrifice to Zeus Polieus and below for other 'foundations').

²⁷ *I.Pergamon 255* / *LSAM 12* / *CGRN 212*. Given its findspot, the stele must originally have been erected close to the Nikephorion, which Kohl 2002 identifies with the known temple of Athena on the Acropolis of Pergamum, and near the gate leading to the upper city/citadel. At the end of l. 3, the common restoration is [νσόν], which certainly remains possible, as in the case of Artemis Chitone at Miletus, discussed above; [ἱερὸν] is the suggestion of *CGRN*, noting that a reference to the sanctuary in general also occurs in l. 21 of the text.

²⁸ For the earlier date, specifically in the reign of Eumenes II (197–159 BC) or shortly after, see Kohl 2002; Müller 2003.

from a tomb and from a funeral, having washed themselves all around and gone through the gate, where the vessels for lustration are placed, let them be pure on the same day. (Two decrees of Pergamum are also quoted)

The inscription is tripartite, forming a dossier of regulations on the sanctuary and the cult of Athena Nikephoros. A heading in larger letters (ll. 1–2) states that the stele was inscribed at the initiative of Dionysios, son of Menophilos, who served as an annual *hieronomos* or ‘sanctuary-warden’ for the city of Pergamum.²⁹ The first document inscribed on the stele (ll. 3–9) and quoted above, a list of purity regulations and entry requirements for the sanctuary, contrasts with the other two included below it, which are official documents, namely, decrees of the city of Pergamum. As presented on the stele, the rules of purity may represent an excerpt from a written document that was available to Dionysios: in this regard, note the beginning of the text in line 3, ἀγνευέτωσαν δὲ . . ., where the conjunction δὲ, presupposing an earlier clause, may thus imply a quotation. But, as far as we can tell, these rules derive from no other source of authority than that of recorded tradition, expounded by Dionysios in his role and his office as *hieronomos*.³⁰ It is without doubt in this capacity also that Dionysios undertook to reinscribe the two excerpts from decrees of the city of Pergamum below the purity rules. Both decrees seek to regulate the fees for those sacrificing in the sanctuary of Athena.

Dionysios’ stele provides eloquent confirmation of the idea that, in the Hellenistic period, cities did not habitually inscribe casuistic purity regulations relating to specific sanctuaries: this was left to the occasional initiative of cult officials or other agents. General rules of the city remained

²⁹ The *hieronomoi* at Pergamum were apparently a board of civic officials responsible for administering sanctuaries and cult in the city. On these officials, see *I.Pergamon* 246 (ca. 138–133 BC), ll. 20–1: *hieronomoi* responsible for a sacrifice for Attalus III and the resulting feast. For the role of *hieronomoi* in Attalid territory, see *CIG* 3562 / *LSAM* 16 / *CGRN* 108 (Gambreion, third cent. BC); a law for the Gambreiotai passed under a probably identical *hieronomos* and *stephanephoros* and *TAM* V.2 1253 (155/4 BC, attributed to Hierocaesarea in Lydia; a dedication to Artemis by οἱ ἐγ Δοσφρήνης ἱερόδουλοῖσι] in honour of a beneficent *hieronomos*). For *hieronomoi* specifically attached to the cult of Athena in Pergamum, though only occurring in a later period, cf. *I.Pergamon* 161 (post-Attalid, probably first cent. BC on the basis of its letterforms), ll. B11–14 (τοὺς ἱε[ρο]νόμους τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς, paying for the setting up of a stele ‘from the funds’ of the goddess) and the restorations proposed at *I.Pergamon* 474 (ca. 88–86 BC). In the case of Dionysios son of Menophilos, it is interesting that the stone-cutter made a mistake in his title: ἱερονουμήσα[ν]τε]ς, erasing three letters (still visible), to correct this to the singular participle ἱερονουμήσας rather than the probably expected plural denoting a board of civic or sanctuary officials. At any rate, τῶι δῆμ[ω]ι makes it clear that Dionysios, acting alone in this case and apart from any other members of his board, did so in an official capacity for the city.

³⁰ Cf. also now Parker 2018a: 182, ‘we see here the distinction between (recorded) tradition and ψηφίσματα’.

in effect and would be consulted, but as in the case of the *Bacchoi* in Cnidus, groups or individuals needed to act in order to publicise or expand purity rules and encourage good behaviour. The need for such individual initiative remained current in Pergamum. One of the other major cults of the city, that of Asclepius, was also the recipient of two sets of cultic rules, which doubtless again derived from relatively long-standing tradition, but were only inscribed, as far as we know, in the second century AD. As the dedicatory formula concluding one of the texts makes clear, the rules were again inscribed at the behest of a *hieronomos*, one (. . .) Claudius Glykon.³¹

How do these rules erected by civic and religious officials compare with those set up by private groups? Two inscriptions from the Attalid kingdom, in the period ca. 250–150 BC, may be adduced. One particularly intriguing albeit only potential case comes from Maionia in Lydia. The text is officially dated to the reign of Attalus II (147/6 BC).³²

βασιλεύοντος Ἀττά[λου] | ἔτους τρεῖσκαὶδεκάτου. | ἀγαθῆι τύχη ἔστησαν | τὴν στήλην Ἄ[– – ca.8 – – | – – ca.9 – –] οἱ ΕΜΦΥΣΗ[. . .]ΧΗ[. . .], ἀγνεύειν δὲ | ἀπὸ μὲν κ[ῆ]δους ὀμαίμου πεμπταῖον, τοῦ δὲ ἄλλου τριταῖον, ἀπὸ δὲ γυναικὸς εἰς τὸν περιωρισμέ[νο]νον τόπον τοῦ

³¹ *AvP* VIII.3 161 (mid-second cent. AD; see also Lupu, *NGSL* p. 61, von Ehrenheim 2015: 224–7 no 7, Renberg 2017: 194–5), with ll. 35–6 for the concluding formula: [. ca.2. Κ]λώδιος Γλύκων | [ἱερ]σομῶν ἀνέθηκεν. The abbreviated *praenomen* of the full name is missing. Among various sacrificial and other ritual prescriptions, cf. ll. 11–14 for the rules concerning purity: ἀγνεύτω δὲ ὁ | [εἰσπορευ]όμενος εἰς τὸ ἐγκοιμητήριον ἀπὸ τε τῶν προειρημέ[νων πάν]των καὶ ἀφροδισίων καὶ αἰγείου κρέως καὶ τυροῦ καὶ | . . ca.7. .]ΙΑΜΙΔΟΣ τριταῖος; for the latter case, the photograph reveals that in ΙΑΜΙΔΟΣ only the bottom of the first supposed *iota* is visible: this is thus very likely to be read as [κ]υαμίδος, ‘from beans’ (cf. *LSJ* s.v. κυαμίδες and i.a. ἀ[πὸ] κυάμων in a regulation perhaps belonging to an Asklepieion in Rhodes, *LSCG Suppl.* 108, first cent. AD). Other rules would therefore have been mentioned earlier (ἀπὸ τε τῶν προειρημέ[νων πάν]των). See further ll. 18–19, where it is stated that the same purity rules applied to the ‘small’ incubation chamber: εἰς δὲ τὸ μικρὸν ἐγκοιμητήριον | [ὁ εἰσιῶν ἀγ]νεύειν ἀγνεύτω τὴν αὐτήν. Another, somewhat later and more fragmentary regulation concerning the Asklepieion and its ἐγκοιμητήρια is *I.Pergamon* 264 / *LSAM* 14 (late second cent. AD, with the discussion of Wörrle at *AvP* VIII.3 161, p. 180 n. 66), which specifies different rules for entry in an unclear context (perhaps for the sanctuary generally, ἱερόν, rather than the ἐγκοιμητήριον and its incubation-rituals, which are then mentioned from ll. 4ff.): [εἰσπορευέσ]θω εἰς [τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ ἀγνεύων ἀπὸ . . . ἡμέ]ρας δέκα, ἀπὸ δὲ (τ)ετοκ[ύιας (καὶ τρεφούσης?) ἡμέ]ρας . . ., ἀπὸ δ’ ἀφροδ[ισ]ειῶν λουσόμενος. The first scenario envisaged, entailing a delay of ten days, is perhaps a funerary ritual or abortion/miscarriage; the second, probably involving successful childbirth, would entail the same or a shorter delay. For a commendable effort to eliminate the restorations in this text, without yielding much progress, however, see now Renberg 2017: 196–7. On the specific practices and rules of abstinence and purification surrounding the rites of incubation, see now von Ehrenheim 2015: esp. 23–43; Renberg 2017: 242–4.

³² *TAM* V.1 530 / *LSAM* 18 / *CGRN* 211. For the *editio princeps*, with full details concerning the provenance (reused in a house) and with a facsimile, cf. Keil and von Premerstein 1911: 82–3 no 167.

Μητρῶιου | τῆι αὐτῆι λουσάμενον εἰσ|πορεύεσθαι· ἑταίρα τριτ|αία,
περιαγνισαμένη καθῶ|ς εἴθισται.

In the thirteenth year of King Attalus. With good fortune, they set up the stele [. . .] the men [. . .] and to keep pure from the death of a blood relative, (until) the fifth day, from that of another (that is to say a non-relative), the third day, from (sex with) a woman, into the place of the Metroion which is demarcated by boundaries, on the same day, having washed, one is to enter. A *hetaira* (can enter) on the third day, having purified herself all around as is customary.

Conforming to the expected pattern, the polis seems to be absent here. The first editors of the inscription, Keil and von Premerstein, already noted that while identifying the group responsible for erecting the stele containing these rules of purity represents a substantial problem, the traces following the lacuna in lines 4–5 are suggestive of a possible subject for the third-person plural verb ἔστησαν, ‘they set up’, in line 3. This intervening lacuna is rather large, however, and may perhaps have contained other names or nouns. Following it, we find what seems to be a definitive article, οἱ, and some other traces. Keil and von Premerstein tentatively suggested the restoration οἱ ἐμ Φυση [ὄρ]χη[σται], thinking of an association of dancers at an unknown place called Physa or Physe.³³ While this bold proposal has not been retained in most of the succeeding editions, we might suppose that Keil and von Premerstein were on the right track. An alternative restoration, for instance, could be οἱ ἐμφυση|[ται], involving a group of pipe-blowers.³⁴ The role of flute or brass musicians as performers in the cult of the Mother goddess, alongside players of percussion instruments such as tambourines and cymbals, is well known.³⁵ If this reasoning is correct, some or all of the musicians involved in the cult of Meter regulated by this stele may have temporarily joined forces or (less likely) formed a more permanent association, seeking to regulate the cult. If such a group could claim authority over the sanctuary, at least in matters of purity, it might suggest that this cult-site was not owned or controlled by the political community at Maionia. But we could just as easily be dealing

³³ An alternative proposal by Keil and von Premerstein would make this clause anticipate the one directly following it. This would seek to bar entry to individuals who were sick with emphysema: [μὴ εἰσῆλθαι] οἱ ἐμφύση|[μα ἔ]χ[οντες], ἀγνεύειν δὲ. . .

³⁴ Cf. *LSJ* s.v. ἐμφυσητής, φυσητήρ (II), φυσητήριον; note e.g. Ar. V. 1219: αὐλητρίς ἐνεφύσησε.

³⁵ See particularly, Roller 1999: 110 (‘The *tympanon*, the most common instrument of the Graeco-Roman Kybele, does not appear in Phrygian representations of the goddess’ but rather the lyre and especially the flute; for the *tympanon* appearing only in later depictions, as a Greek addition, see pp. 136–7, 148). The *Homeric Hymn to Meter* also mentions flutes (αὐλοῖ) alongside κράταλα, ‘castanets’, and *tympana* (see again Roller 1999: 122–3; cp. 149–55, 232 n. 278).

with the private initiative of a group of individuals involved in a civic cult, not a fixed group of authoritative officials.

We are on much more secure ground with another set of ritual norms, which were manifestly enacted by a small cultic association. These are the rules of the *Asklepiastai* at Yaylakale in Pergamene territory (the Yüntdağ, ca. 30 km southeast of Pergamum).³⁶ One stele found there testifies to the fact that a certain Demetrios, *phrouarchos* or commander of the Attalid garrison in this area, founded a sanctuary of Asclepius and gathered the first *Asklepiastai* at this relatively remote site in the first half of the second century BC.³⁷ Another stele discovered near the same site, though its beginning is missing, contains rules of purity for entering the sanctuary and, much more fragmentarily, the dormitory for incubation which was situated beside it.³⁸

[– – ὄγ]ν[εύεσ]|θαι τὸν εἰ]σπορευ|όμενον ὑγίας ἔν[ε]κ[ε]ν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν· |
ἀπὸ μὲν τῶν ἀφορ|δισιακῶν, κατὰ κε|φαλής λομσάμε|νον, ἀπὸ νεκροῦ δὲ |
καὶ ἀπὸ ἐκφορᾶς (?) | δευτεραῖον καὶ | ἀπὸ διαφορᾶς τὸ | αὐτό· ἐὰν δὲ τις |
ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τὸ παρὰ τὸ ἱερόν ἐνκοιμη|τήριον, [. . .]Α[.]ΟΥ – – – – –

. . . The one going into the sanctuary is to keep pure for the sake of good health: from sexual matters, washing from the head down (that is to say on the same day); from a corpse and from a funeral (?), (enter) on the second day and from an abortion/miscarriage, the same. If anyone visits the place of incubation beside the sanctuary, . . .

Though this inscription is much more difficult to decipher than the other stele, its editor, Müller, expressed no doubt that it constitutes a part of the same dossier for the cult that was created by the *phrouarchos* Demetrios and the ‘first *Asklepiastai*’.³⁹ This association will therefore have issued

³⁶ Müller 2010 (ca. 250–150 BC); see also von Ehrenheim 2015: 227–8 no 8, Renberg 2017: 242–3. For more details on the context of this find and the new sanctuary founded, see Skaltsa in Chapter 5.

³⁷ Müller 2010: 427–38 (SEG 60:1332), ll. 1–5: ἐπὶ Δημητρίου φρουράρχου, τοῦ κτίσαντος τὸ ἱερόν· ἀγοσθῆ | τύχη· συνήλθον οἱ πρόωτοι Ἀσκληπιασταί. A list of fifteen names follows. For a privately founded sanctuary of Asclepius at Thuburbo Maius in North Africa, which published purity rules in Latin, see Renberg 2017: 626–7.

³⁸ Müller 2010: 440–7 (SEG 60:1333). *In fine*, we might have expected the regulation to say that the same rules applied to the ἐνκοιμητήριον (cf. *AvP* VIII.3 161, ll. 18–19, cited above n. 31). But the apparent trace of a genitive at the end of l. 15 seems to introduce the consideration of other sources of impurity. Accordingly, then, a possible restoration at the end of l. 15 could be [ἀπὸ τ]ἀ[φ]ου | [καὶ ἐκφορᾶς. . .], as in *I.Pergamon* 255 cited above, though this variation from νεκροῦ in l. 8 of the text from Yaylakale might also be viewed as surprising. On incubation in sanctuaries of Asclepius, see again n. 31 above.

³⁹ Müller 2010: 447: ‘(. . .) dass nicht nur der Stein, auf dem die Lex sacra aufgezeichnet ist, nach Material und ursprünglichen Dimensionen mit der Stele übereinstimmt, die die Liste der

rules concerning the purity expected of worshippers visiting the new sanctuary of Asclepius or seeking incubation there.

In terms of content and normative characteristics, the purity rules closely parallel those found in the city and the area of Pergamum that we looked at earlier. After sex, entry into the sanctuary is allowed on the same day, having washed from the head down: this is essentially the same prescription as one finds in the inscription from Maionia quoted above and in the sanctuary of Asclepius at Pergamum (*I.Pergamon* 264, n. 31 above), but also very widely elsewhere.⁴⁰ Sex between man and wife was similarly allowed on the same day as entry into the sanctuary of Athena Nikephoros in Pergamum (quoted above). Yet the cults in the city seem on occasion somewhat more restrictive: in the sanctuary of Athena, waiting until the next day (δευτεράῳι, counting inclusively it would seem) was necessary after sex with someone who was not one's spouse; until the third day (τριταῖος) after any form of sexual intercourse before visiting the incubation chambers of the Pergamene Asklepieion (*AvP III* 161, n. 31 above). Still, the match with the rules from Pergamum is particularly apparent when it comes to the other categories of impurity mentioned by the *Asklepiastai* at Yaylakale. From contact with a deceased individual, as well as with a woman who had aborted or miscarried, the delay was only until the next day (δευτεράῳν, still counting inclusively). These delays are nearly identical with those recorded for the cult of Athena Nikephoros. At the Nikephorion, entry was permitted on the next day following the death of an individual, whether a relative or not (ἀπὸ κήδους... δευτεράῳ(1)), and even on the same day from attendance at a funeral or at a tomb. At the Nikephorion again, abstaining the same amount of time was required after exposure to a woman who had given birth (ἀπὸ... τεκούσης γυναικός), while at Yaylakale, this delay applied to contact with an abortion or miscarriage.

In general, then, the regulations expounded by the association of the *Asklepiastai* at Yaylakale closely match those found in their immediate

Gründungsmitglieder des Asklepiastensvereins trägt, sondern auch die Beschriftung beider Monumente in Größe und formaler Gestaltung identisch ist.'

⁴⁰ For the widespread notion that one could enter on the same day after sexual intercourse, though often only after having washed from the head down: cf. Dobias-Lalou 2000: 297–309 / *CGRN* 99 (Cyrene, ca. 325–300 BC); *JG* XII.1 789 / *LSCG* 139 (Lindos, ca. AD 117–38); *I.Lindos* II 487 / *LSCG Suppl.* 91 / Petrovic and Petrovic 2018 (ca. AD 225); Decourt and Tziafalias 2015 / Bouchon and Decourt 2017 / *CGRN* 225 (Marmarini near Larisa, ca. 250–150 BC), face B (I), line 27; *NGSL* 7 / *CGRN* 155 (Megalopolis, ca. 200 BC); as well as in the recently published second cent. BC text from Thyateira, Malay and Petzl 2017: 25–30 no 1, with further commentary in Parker 2018a.

regional context. On the other stele, no ethnics are recorded for the names of the members of the ‘first *Asklepiastai*’. Though it is probable that some of the members were foreign soldiers, it is not impossible that at least a few of them were Pergamene or Mysian.⁴¹ At any rate, it is likely that these men will have had some occasion to visit the Attalid capital and its famous sanctuaries, such as the Nikephorion and the Asklepieion. In other words, the rules most probably derive from those that Demetrios the *phourachos* or other members of the group had commonly observed in practice at Pergamum. Though parallels with the Asklepieion of Pergamum might be thought the most suggestive,⁴² it is perhaps especially the sanctuary of Athena on the Acropolis, close to where the garrison was located in the upper city and its arsenal, which seems to have influenced the purity rules of the ‘first *Asklepiastai*’.⁴³ The *phourachos* and his garrison at Yaylakale wished to found a cult-group and new sanctuary and thus closely modelled it on these Pergamene structures and their cultic framework.

The periods of abstention known from Pergamum were considerably generous. Other cults, as we have already glimpsed and shall see further below, would often require an abstention of several days, usually around ten after the death of a relative, somewhat less, such as five, for that of another individual,⁴⁴ and typically of ten days in the case of contact with an abortion or miscarriage (forty days for the woman concerned). The rules articulated by the association at Yaylakale were of a similarly mild character, attributable to their Pergamene models but also with a view towards inclusivity. Indeed, the rules at Yaylakale expressly emphasised their function: not only was purity required ([ἀγ]υ[εύεσ]θα, ll. 1–2, if we accept this probable restoration), but the avowed purpose of the regulation

⁴¹ For a thorough and cautious discussion of the names of the leader and the members, see Müller 2010: 429–35.

⁴² For conscious modelling of the structures of the *Asklepiastai* on the Asklepieion located near the city, cf. the conclusions of Müller 2010 and also Renberg 2017: 243 (‘almost certainly was directly influenced by practices at the more prominent Asklepieion, instead of representing a separate tradition’). For this sanctuary, see also Radt 1999: 220–42.

⁴³ For the building of the arsenal, the upper city/citadel and its palaces, see Radt 1999: 63–78. Note also that the offerings to Athena Nikephoros could (but apparently not always) involve sacrifices ‘on the *akra*’, where tariffs would need to be paid to the gatekeeper of the citadel (*I.Pergamon* 255 / *LSAM* 12 / *CGRN* 212, ll. 26–7: τῶν δ’ ἐν τῇ ἀκρῶν θυομένων καὶ πωλωρῶν τῆς ἀκρας βοῶς κτλ.).

⁴⁴ For example, purity rules from neighbouring Lydia, to the south of Pergamum and Mysia, are different. The text from Maionia quoted above is relatively generous, but not as much: four full days of abstention are required for the death of a relative, two for that of another individual. The new text from Thyateira in Lydia (see n. 40 above) is even more strict: nine days were prescribed in the case of a relative, three or less in other cases.

was to foster good health (ὑγίαις ἐνεκεν, ll. 3–4). This was a particularly apt goal for an Asklepieion, of course, a cult site whose purpose was to serve as a place for the worship of the god of healing (and perhaps of Ὑγία/Hygieia herself, the personification of Good Health and one of the daughters of Asclepius, often found associated with the god). In the view of the ‘first *Asklepiastai*’, purity (ἀγνεῖα) was thus a precondition for good health (ὑγία). This helped to rationalise the need for rules of purity and served to advertise their beneficial function by publishing the stele containing them.⁴⁵

In their remote Attalid garrison, the ‘first *Asklepiastai*’ thus recreated elements of the Pergamene community, by founding a small local Asklepieion to honour the god, but also to consolidate their own identity, to invite worshippers from nearby villages and to host incubation rituals. The ‘well-ordered society’ developed in this case replicated on a smaller scale the civic and religious structures of Pergamum, being stimulated by an Attalid official and his soldiers for the inclusive benefit of a local community.⁴⁶ In particular, the rules of purity published by the group underscored all of these features: they were modelled on the rules of the major sanctuaries, maintained their short or ‘generous’ delays of ἀγνεῖα and at the same time advertised good health (ὑγία) to promote access to the sanctuary.

From Families to ‘Associations in the Making’

From the beginning of the Hellenistic period, familial associations become more conspicuous in the epigraphical evidence. By this designation, one may refer to cults that were privately established for the benefit of a restricted kinship group, normally the immediate family of the founder.⁴⁷ The membership of such groups was by definition exclusive: male relatives

⁴⁵ It should therefore be clear that, without denying that economic factors had a role to play in the development of this sanctuary by the *Asklepiastai*, I cannot readily agree with the view of Eckhardt 2017b: 417, who claims that ‘the sanctuary was modeled closely on the famous Asklepieion of Pergamum – a smaller copy of a major sanctuary could thus serve as a source of income’, citing (but also simplifying) Müller 2010: 446 in support of this view, ‘auf regelrechten Kurbetrieb ausgerichtet’. Yaylakale was primarily a sanctuary, providing a model for a cultic community, not merely a remote mountain spa.

⁴⁶ For the importance of the cult of Asclepius to the Attalid rulers, which the *phourarchos* Demetrios served as a minor official, see esp. *IG IV².1 60* (191 BC, reign of Eumenes II) or *I.Pergamon 246* (Attalus III).

⁴⁷ See Carbon and Pirenne-Delforge 2013 and now Campanelli 2016; on the misleading term ‘foundation’ often applied to these documents, see also Harris 2015: 71–7. On the construction and use of space by familial associations, see Skaltsa in Chapter 5.

by marriage were sometimes accepted; bastards might be included with some provisos; occasionally a wider familial circle might be defined.⁴⁸ Most of these groups constituted a completely different type of association from the *Asklepiastai* at Yaylakale, in that they sought less publicity or visibility, a fact reflected for instance in not having a well-defined name.⁴⁹

An interesting though unique case of a familial association which published rules of purity comes from the deme of Isthmus on Cos:⁵⁰

[ιερὸν ἔστω τόδε] τὸ τέ[μενος καὶ τὸ] | ιερὸν Ἀρτέμιτο[ς]ας καὶ Διὸς Ἰκ[ε]σίου καὶ Θεῶν Πατρῶιων· ἀνέθηκε δὲ | Πυθίων Στασίλα καὶ ἄ ἰέρεια [[. . . .]] παιδίον ὠ ἄνομα Μακαρίνος ἐλεύθερον ἰερὸν τὰς θεοῦ, ὅπως ἐπιτέλεται τοῦ ἱεροῦ | καὶ τῶν συνθυόντων πάντων, διακονῶν | καὶ ὑπηρετῶν ὁσσοῦ κα δὴ ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι· | ἐπιτελέσθω καὶ Μακαρίνος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων | ἱερῶν καὶ βεβάλων καθάπερ καὶ ἐν ταῖ ἱεραῖ δέλ|τωι γέγραπται, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ὧγ καταλεί|πει Πυθίων καὶ ἄ ἰέρεια· τοῖς δὲ ἐπιτελομέ|νοις καὶ συναύξουσι τὸ ἱερὸν, εὔ αὐτοῖς | ἔη καὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ τέκνοις εἰς τὸν αἰὶ χρόνον· | ἀγνὸν εἰσπορεύεσθαι – τὸ δὲ ἱερὸν ἔστω | τῶν υἰῶν πάντων κοινόν – ἀπὸ λεχοῦς καὶ | ἐγ δια(φθ)ορᾶς ἀμέρας δέκα, ἀπὸ γυναικὸς τρεῖ[ς].

[. . . this] precinct [and sanctuary] is to be sacred to Artemis [. . .] and Zeus Hikesios and the Ancestral Gods. Pythion son of Stasilas and the priestess [. . .] dedicated a slave, whose name is Makarinos, to be free (and) sacred to the goddess, so that he takes care of the sanctuary and of all those who make sacrifices together and provides services and also performs any other tasks that are necessary in the sanctuary. Makarinos is also to take care of other matters, whether sacred or secular, as is written on the sacred tablet, and of the other things that Pythion and the priestess bequeath. May good things happen to those who take good care of the sanctuary and augment it, both to themselves and to their children for all time. Enter pure – the temple is to be common to all the sons – from childbirth and after an abortion/miscarriage, ten days; from (sex with) a woman (or wife?), three.

This consecration of a cult by Pythion and a nameless priestess (perhaps his wife), albeit much briefer, shares many resemblances with the much

⁴⁸ Male in-laws and bastards: cf. Carbon and Pirenne-Delforge 2013: 80–3. For the familial circle of Epikteta, see n. 49 below.

⁴⁹ An exception is the dossier of Epikteta, where the association was named τὸ κοινὸν τοῦ ἀνδρείου τῶν συγγενῶν, 'the community of the male group of relatives': cf. *IG* XII.3 330 / *LSCG* 135 / *CGRN* 152 (ca. 210–195 BC; *CAPInv.* 1645); for the list of members of the familial group, which also includes women, see ll. 81–106. The designations occasionally given for the groups of Poseidonios at Halicarnassus (e.g. Ποσειδωνίος καὶ οἱ ἔκγονοι οἱ ἐκ Ποσειδωνίου καὶ οἱ εἰληφόντες ἐξ αὐτῶν: Carbon and Pirenne-Delforge 2013: Appendix; *CAPInv.* 830) and of Diomedon on Cos (τοῖ ἐγ Διομέδοντος καὶ αἰεῖ τοῖ ἐξ αὐτῶν γενόμενοι, see below with n. 51) are polymorphous and not formalised associational names.

⁵⁰ *IG* XII.4 1 349 / *LSCG* 171 / *CGRN* 162 (ca. 200–150 BC).

more detailed cultic dossier of Diomedon on the same island of Cos.⁵¹ In both cases, a sanctuary is consecrated to a group of deities – at least in part ancestral, though the epithet of Artemis in the case of Pythion remains mysterious⁵² – and a slave is associated with this consecration to take care of the sanctuary. Doubtless we would have further details about the cult if the ‘sacred tablet’ mentioned in lines 10–11 or details concerning the bequests, probably testamentary, of Pythion and the priestess (τῶν λοιπῶν ὄγ καταλείπει, ll. 11–12), were preserved.

The conclusion of the stele is particularly interesting for our purposes: it clearly begins to mention rules for entrance into the sanctuary in line 15 (ἀγνὸν εἰσπορεύεσθαι. . .), but these are interrupted by the interjected phrase τὸ δὲ ἱερόν ἔστω | τῶν υἱῶν πάντων κοινόν. This is to be taken to mean that the sanctuary (*to hieron*) is held in collective ownership by the sons of Pythion. A cultic community of *synthyontes pantes* is also vaguely alluded to in line 7 (τῶν συνθυόντων πάντων): this is most naturally interpreted as constituting the immediate family or the descendants of Pythion (and perhaps the priestess).⁵³ The question that can be raised, however, is whether the interjected clause in line 15 has a purpose: does it seek to define those who may enter (εἰσπορεύεσθαι) the sanctuary, is it simply misplaced or is there another reason for its placement? In the first view, the clause concerning the ownership of the sanctuary clarified that only the sons of Pythion had privileged access to it. But in fact, it cannot be just the sons of Pythion who were granted access to the sanctuary: the priestess and the slave Makarinos needed to enter it and we might presume that female family members, at least, could also do so.

A further alternative might be that access to the sanctuary was not strictly limited to the familial group of Pythion. As they are often expressed in inscriptions affixed to sanctuaries open to visitors, the purity rules published on Pythion’s stele could be taken to imply that the *hieron* inaugurated by him was in fact open to members of the general public: by agreeing to respect their prescriptions, access to the sanctuary would be permitted. Anyone could then become part of the *synthyontes pantes* during one of the celebrations envisaged. But the clause appended, presumably out of fear of the property becoming alienated, quickly clarified that ownership and control of the sanctuary remained in the hands of

⁵¹ Diomedon: *IG XII.4* 1 348 / *LSCG* 177 / *CGRN* 96 (*CAPInv.* 1919; ca. 325–275 BC). That dossier, however, does not include any rules concerning purity.

⁵² For a detailed discussion of the deities forming the focus of Pythion’s cult, see Campanelli 2016: 143–4.

⁵³ As stressed and further elucidated by Campanelli 2016: 154–6; 170.

Pythion's sons (in perpetuity, one assumes). Such an idea would also go some way towards explaining why this is the only case of a 'familial cult' which does not appear to have had strict rules of membership and also why, again uniquely among similar groups, it enacted purity regulations for entry into its sanctuary.

As we have seen, however, the evidence provided by this relatively brief stele is hardly complete. It seems to have served as a sign for worshippers and as a reminder of some essential aspects. Other documents, a 'sacred tablet' and likely a testament, would have provided a much fuller view of this familial group and the sanctuary that it consecrated. Any definitive conclusions should therefore be resisted, though it remains highly probable that the rules of purity were aimed at other worshippers coming to visit the sanctuary consecrated by Pythion.

Indeed, what we can affirm is that the purity rules defined by Pythion and his family readily match others known elsewhere in the epigraphic evidence from across the eastern Aegean and Asia Minor. A delay of ten days is specified before entry after childbirth or an abortion/miscarriage. This matches some of the delays stipulated in the regulation of an unknown cult at Eresos and also seems to agree with a regulation for the cult of Despoina at Lycosura, though that text is quite lacunose.⁵⁴ At Eresos, the delay of ten days was aimed at a man who entered into contact with a woman who had miscarried; but ten days was also the required *hagneia* for a woman who had given birth (only three days for a man). As a result, it remains somewhat unclear if women were also concerned by the purity rules enacted by Pythion. Apparently more demanding was the requirement to abstain three days from the sanctuary after sex with one's wife (ἀπὸ γυναικός; or does this mean 'any woman' here?). As we saw earlier, ablutions might be required after sex, but entry into the sanctuary would usually be permitted on the same day, after no delay. Yet the delay of three days in fact closely corresponds to other, stricter norms found elsewhere: in the *enkoimeterion*, 'dormitory', of the Asklepieion at

⁵⁴ Eresos: *IG XII Suppl.* 126 / *LSCG* 124 / *CGRN* 181 (second cent. BC). There, ten days is the delay for a person entering into contact with a woman who has aborted/miscarried (forty days for the woman concerned); ten days for a woman having given birth (three days for another individual entering into contact with her). Despoina at Lycosura: *NGSL* 8 / *CGRN* 189 (second cent. BC). Cf. also the delay of ten days after an unknown cause of impurity mentioned in the regulation of the Asklepieion at Pergamum, *I.Pergamon* 264 / *LSAM* 14, cited above n. 31.

Pergamum, as we have already seen, but also in the sanctuary of Syrian gods on Delos and in the sanctuary of Meter Galesia at Metropolis.⁵⁵

To broaden this understanding of Pythion's cult on Cos, instructive comparisons and contrasts may briefly be drawn with two famous epigraphic dossiers. The first is the cult of Men Tyrannos privately founded by Xanthos, probably a slave or a freedman, at Laurion, at a date that remains debated, but probably lies somewhere in the first century BC or AD.⁵⁶ The details of the cult, originating from Anatolia – Xanthos is notably called Λύκιος, 'Lycian' – are known from a pair of stelae. These are nearly identical in their formulary, though not entirely so. The narrower of the two (text B), functioning more as a sign, includes only a brief summary of the rules that were discussed more extensively in the lengthier document (text A). The cult elaborated by Xanthos following a command of the god (ἀίρετίσαντος τοῦ θεοῦ) does not explicitly aim at creating an association; rather, it confers pride of place on the founder as the principal participant or agent in the cult. Xanthos, while living, is to be present at all sacrifices (μηθένα θυσιάζειν ἄνε[υ] τοῦ καθειδρυσσάμενου τὸ ἱερόν, A, ll. 7–8; cf. B, ll. 11–13) and any violence, perhaps especially against him, is proscribed.⁵⁷ Upon anything undermining Xanthos' role as founder of the cult, such as his death, illness or emigration, no one is to have any right to the sanctuary, unless Xanthos himself confers it.⁵⁸ Therefore, by contrast with Pythion, the cult was not familial and Xanthos had apparently not yet thought of a precise successor.

Xanthos also enacted elaborate rules concerning sacrifices and purity. The cult was open to any participant who chose to follow these guidelines. In the context of the sacrifices, Xanthos in fact grants the opportunity for anyone to gather a temporary or ad hoc cult group (A, l. 21: τοὺς. . .

⁵⁵ Intercourse with one's own wife required a two-day ἄγνεια (or three days counting inclusively) at Pergamum: see above n. 31 on *AvP* VIII.3 161, ll. 11–14; Delos: *I.Délos* 2530 / *LSCG Suppl.* 54 / *CGRN* 217 (second cent. BC); and Metropolis: *I.Ephesos* 3401 / *LSAM* 29 / *CGRN* 71 (fourth cent. BC).

⁵⁶ Text A: *IG* II² 1366 / *LSCG* 55; Text B: *IG* II² 1365. This is a case that has already stimulated a large bibliography and ample commentary, to which little justice can be done in this short overview. For useful references and a summary of the evidence, see *GRA* I 53. Strangely, it is also only on the briefer stele B that we find the exclusion of murderers from the cult, ll. 21–2: ἀνδροφόνον μηδὲ περὶ τὸν τόπον. On the continued concern for pollution from homicide, see Harris 2018, with further refs.

⁵⁷ This appears to be the aim of the clause in Text A, ll. 8–9: ἐὰν δὲ τις βιάσῃται, ἀπρόσδεκτος ἢ θυσία παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ (cp. text B, ll. 13–15). When anyone acts violently – perhaps especially towards Xanthos/the founder as the implicit object of the verb – the sacrifice is de facto to be considered invalid.

⁵⁸ Text A, ll. 12–14 (cf. B, ll. 27–9): ἐὰν δὲ τινα | ἀνθρώπινα πάσχη ἢ ἀσθενήσῃ ἢ ἀποδημήσῃ που, μηθένα ἀνθρώπων ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν, ἐὰν μὴ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς παραδῶι.

βουλομένους ἔρανον συνάγειν) for the purposes of celebrating the god and holding a sacrificial feast; these groups might even wish to camp at the cult-site to continue their night-time feast (cf. also Il. 24–5: ἐὼν κατακλιθῶσιν οἱ ἔρανισταί. . .). There is little evidence that such groups would go on to form durative cult associations, though this of course remains possible.⁵⁹ In terms of rules concerning purity, we find some general precepts. On a basic level, Xanthos was concerned that nothing impure be brought forward to the cult-site and its altar: καὶ [μηθένα] ἀκάθαρτον προσάγειν (A, ll. 2–3; cf. B, 8–9). Such a rule was presumably designed to prevent the sacrificial offering of animals or foodstuffs viewed as impure in the cult (pork and garlic are specifically mentioned in the text; perhaps porcine products, such as leather, which might be brought into the sanctuary, would also be concerned by this interdiction). Another rule was presented as a blessing: that the god would be merciful to those who worshipped him with a simple soul. This is tantamount to the fundamental requirement that the worshipper's mind be pure, which is explicitly found in entry regulations for sanctuaries from the Hellenistic period onward.⁶⁰ The moral sense of these rules is further underlined in other clauses containing stringent sanctions, notably against any interference in the cult.⁶¹ All of this is coupled with practical cases of impurity such as we have looked at here. On both stelae, specific causes of impurity such as garlic, pork and sex are said to be remediable simply by washing from the head down. Impurity resulting from the eating of pork is found in one other purity regulation, appropriately from a sanctuary focussed on Near Eastern rituals.⁶² Other standard causes of impurity, but apparently only

⁵⁹ One intriguing possibility for such a group is the ἔρανισταί known from *IG* II² 2940 (second [rather than fourth] cent. BC) at Laurion, who apparently preceded Xanthos' cult and may have made a dedication to Men Tyrannos; the reading of the name of the deity has been questioned, however (for a helpful summary of the debate, see *CAPInv.* 311).

⁶⁰ Text A, ll. 11–12: καὶ εὐείλατος γένοιτο ὁ θεὸς τοῖς θεραπεύουσιν ἀπλή τῆ ψυχῆ (cf. B, ll. 25–6); repeated *in fine*, l. 26: καὶ εὐείλατος γένοιτο τοῖς ἀπλῶς προσπορευομένοι[s]. On this widespread concept of purity of the mind in Greek religious thought, see now Petrovic and Petrovic 2016.

⁶¹ Cf. the stipulation that those who enquired excessively into the affairs of the god or interfered with them would be guilty of an insurmountable offence to the god (Text A, ll. 14–16; cf. also B, 29–32): ὅς ἂν δὲ πολυπραγμονήσῃ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ περιεργάσῃται, ἀμαρτίαν ὀφειλέτω Μηνί | Τυράννωι, ἣν οὐ μὴ δύνηται ἐξελάσασθαι.

⁶² The sanctuary of the Syrian gods on Delos: *I.Délos* 2530 / *LSCG Suppl.* 54 / *CGRN* 217 (second cent. BC). Similarly, after ingestion of pork (ἀπὸ ὑείου), only washing is required and entry is permitted on the same day. In the context of Near Eastern rituals and the interdiction to sacrifice swine, mention must be made of the new stele from Marmarini/Larisa (ca. 250–150 BC), which perhaps emanated from an association or a group of initiates: for the *editio princeps*, Decourt and Tziaphaliás 2015; see now Bouchon and Decourt 2017 / *CGRN* 225 for an improved text. For the hypothesis of an association, see Carbon 2016; against this view and with an extensive discussion of the purity rules, see Parker and Scullion 2016: 256–66.

for women, are treated with severe but normative periods of abstinence: menstruation (seven days and washing), contact with a corpse (ten days) and abortion or miscarriage (forty days).⁶³

The second interesting case for comparison is the much-discussed stele from Philadelphia in Lydia, which can only very briefly be treated here.⁶⁴ Debate continues to be sparked regarding the precise characteristics and background of the cult, as well as the interpretation of the text (about a third of the lines is missing to the right). The rules outlined in the text are presented as a written account of the divine commands ([παραγγέλμα]τα, ll. 3–4; παραγγέλ[ματα], l. 12) that were given to a certain Dionysios by Zeus, in a dream. On one view, the outcome of this divine inspiration was that Dionysios opened his own house (π[ρόσοδον διδόν]τ' εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οἶκον, l. 5), in which altars of large variety of gods have been constructed (ll. 6–12), to any worshipper, be they male or female, free or slave (ll. 5–6). Periodic sacrifices are also mentioned (l. 55), which would no doubt have served to gather together a community of worshippers. However, it has been questioned whether the stele actually reflects an attempt at inviting participants beyond the οἶκος, 'house', of Dionysios or whether it primarily concerns an existing cultic community (such as his kinship group and the slaves of his household).⁶⁵

At any rate, the injunctions that Zeus made to Dionysios involve the performance of 'abstentions, purifications and (probably) mysteries, according to the ancestral customs as well as to what is now written on the stele' (τούς τε ἀ|γνισμούς καὶ τούς καθαρμούς κ[αὶ τὰ μυστήρια

⁶³ See Text A, ll. 3–8; B, ll. 8–11 and 18–25. That women are primarily concerned by these three rules is made clear by the use of feminine ordinal adjectives on stele B: ἐβ(δ)ομαί(ν)α, δεκα(σ)ταίαν, τετταρακοσταίαν. The delays are conventional and, though often found of 'foreign' cults, these are spread across the ancient Greek world: for instance, menstruation requires seven days also in the text from Marmarini (n. above), face B (I), ll. 27–8, also in the sanctuary of the Egyptian gods at Megalopolis (*NGSL* 7 / *CGRN* 155, ca. 200 BC) and in the unknown cult at Ptolemais (*LSCG Suppl.* 119 / *CGRN* 144, first cent. BC).

⁶⁴ *TAM V.3* 1539 / *LSAM* 20 / *CGRN* 191 / *GRA* II 117 (ca. 125–75 BC; see also *CAPInv.* 348). For a recent and highly successful attempt at situating the cult in a local (Lydian) as well as a wider legal context, see now de Hoz 2017.

⁶⁵ Stowers 1998 makes a case for seeing Dionysios' rules as those of a household cult, though this still begs the question of why they were published in the first place (he himself comments 294: 'What is most peculiar about this cult is that rules of the *oikos* which were normally unwritten and more implicit than explicit have been set up in writing'). This view has been recently followed by Hurtado 2016: 174, who concludes that 'there is no indication that Dionysios even sought to recruit followers from beyond his own household'. Both of these views, however, would require questioning the restoration π[ρόσοδον διδόν]τ' εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οἶκον in ll. 4–5 as well as the purpose of the datives that follow ἀνδρά[σι καὶ γυναιξίν] | ἐλευθέροις καὶ οἰκέταις, since these imply that Dionysios granted access to his house as part of the cult that was being developed.

ἐπι]τελεῖν κατὰ τε τὰ πάτρια καὶ ὡς νῦν [γέγραπται], ll. 12–14).⁶⁶ Indeed, the bulk of the inscribed text (ὡς νῦν [γέγραπται]) contains precepts of purity that have a strong ethical dimension: for instance, worshippers entering the house are to swear an oath not to avail themselves of any magic or poison (ll. 14–19); instead of rules concerning the temporary impurity caused by an abortion or miscarriage, taking the oath required forsaking the use of any form of contraceptive (ll. 20–1); instead of lax rules concerning sexual intercourse, Dionysios promotes the virtue of marriage, strictly forbidding the ‘corruption’ of married women and of those who are not yet married by men (ll. 25–31) – while tacitly allowing for other, non-married partners or ἐταῖροι – and by recommending the exclusive company of one’s spouse for women (ll. 35–44).⁶⁷ Both men and women who fail in this regard are to be barred from entering (ll. 31–2). The guidelines and the outcomes of transgression are more severe for women, who are to be deemed impure and to spread this impurity to their kin (ll. 37–8: [μεμιασμέ]νῃν καὶ μύσο[υ]ς ἐμφυλίου πλή[ρ]ῃ), in addition to being barred from the cult.⁶⁸ Peer denunciation is to be the mechanism of enforcement (ll. 28–31), as well as the use of the stele itself as a touchstone (during prayers and the required oath-rituals, ll. 56–60), but in general the sanctions consists of threats of divine punishment (ll.

⁶⁶ The commonly accepted restoration κ[αὶ τὰ μυστήρια] in l. 13 is somewhat gratuitous, since no other aspect of the text explicitly mentions initiations; cf. however l. 41, which perhaps suggests this sense, though it could also refer to the contemplation of other rituals, such as sacrifices or those concerning the statues involved in the cult.

⁶⁷ Hurtado 2016: 174, wondering ‘why there is no mention of prostitutes or courtesans’, follows Stowers in thinking that ‘the particular concern is actually about disruptive sexual activities *among the members of the household*, and so the inscription does not address what sexual activities a man may engage in with other kinds of individuals outside the household’. But the rules have a strictly moral purpose: sex is not being regulated *per se*, but ‘corruption’ by a man is defined in the cases where the woman, whether free or slave, is already married or if a child or unmarried girl is concerned, ll. 25–8: ἄνδρα παρὰ | τήν] ἑαυτοῦ γυναικὰ ἀλλοτρίαν ἢ [ἐλευθέραν ἢ] | δοῦλην ἄνδρα ἔχουσαν μὴ φθερεῖν μηδὲ παῖδα μηδὲ] παρθένον μηδὲ ἐτέρωι συμβου[λεύσειν]. In other words, male sex with (by definition unmarried) prostitutes and courtesans was not mentioned because it was tacitly accepted; see also below.

⁶⁸ Stowers 1998: 299 affirms that he ‘see[s] no reason why normal practices of purification would not have taken care of an adulterous woman’s impurity, even if the stele treats such pollution as especially severe’. It depends what one means by ‘normal practices of purification’. For example, it is difficult to imagine that merely washing from the head down could have cleansed the woman or her kin, which would be contaminated as a result of her actions, from the severe pollution outlined by Dionysios. As elsewhere in Lydia, confession and the expectation of divine intervention might have been necessary; the oath required of participants in the cult, using the stele as a touchstone, could have served in this capacity; see de Hoz 2017: 101–2.

43–6, 48–50) while, conversely, blessings are formulated for those who respect and obey the commands (ll. 46–8, compare 50–4).

In other words, instead of a series of cases of impurity that could be readily resolved, whether through washing or delays in participation, the precepts outlined by Dionysios in this stele are detailed moral principles that hold dire consequences when contravened. This is not to say that some standard cases of abstention (ἀγνεία) and their correspondingly necessary purifications (καθαρμοί) would not have been covered implicitly by Dionysios' rules. This in fact seems to be what is alluded to by traditional practice in lines 12–14: ἀγνισμοί and καθαρμοί. . . κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.⁶⁹ To take the case of sexual relations, in addition to the ἀγνεία expected of men after sex with one's wife (ἀπὸ γυναικός) or after visiting a courtesan (ἐταίρα), Dionysios' stele makes explicit the parameters of these sexual relations: they are absolutely not to concern married women or those not yet married (children, maidens). It is probable that adultery was always implicitly proscribed, even by other purity regulations that seem to take a broader view of sexual relations, as ἀφοροδίσια 'sexual dealings', for instance.⁷⁰ But in the case of women, the stele is still more strict: some form of ἀγνεία would still be expected after relations with one's husband,⁷¹ but this was the only partner allowed for married women. This forms a marked contrast with some of the rules broaching the possibility of ἀφοροδίσια even for women,⁷² but it matches some other purity rules, for example, a text from Lindos that emphasises the licit character of sexual relations when discussing the necessary ἀγνεία in such a case; illicit sex is not mentioned at all, presumably because it was excluded and resulted in a more serious form of impurity.⁷³ In other words, Dionysios' rules supplement standard ritual practice and reshape existing ethical standards, by

⁶⁹ As perceptively remarked by Stowers 1998: 297–8 (such rules of purity 'are missing from the inscription').

⁷⁰ For ἀφοροδίσια *vel sim.*, see *AvP* VIII.3 161 (n. 31) and the text from Yaylakale quoted and discussed above (Section 2). See Parker 1996b: 94–100 on the connection between sexual morality and purity.

⁷¹ Purification after sex in the case of a woman is specifically mentioned in the text from Ptolemais (*LSCG Suppl.* 119 / *CGRN* 144, first cent. BC, l. 14: [ἀπ'] ἀνδρός, β', μυσσίνην δὲ [οἴσει (?)]).

⁷² Note especially the possibility of sex, both for men and women, with partners who were not one's own spouse, in text from the Nikephorion at Pergamum (*I.Pergamon* 255 / *LSAM* 12 / *CGRN* 212), quoted above: ἀπὸ . . . τῆς ἰδίας γ[υναι]κός. . . vs. ἀπὸ . . . ἀλλοτρίας; ἀπὸ . . . τοῦ ἰδίου ἀνδρός vs. ἀπὸ . . . ἀλλοτρίου.

⁷³ *IG* XII.1 789 / *LSCG* 139 (Lindos, ca. AD 117–138), l. 14: ἀπὸ συνουσίας νομ[ί]μου κτλ. For συνουσία vs. κοινή (any intercourse), see also the inscription from Lindos in Petrović and Petrović 2018 (ca. AD 225).

adding rigid and much weightier moral requirements for participants in the cult housed in his οἶκος.⁷⁴

In all of these cases, from Python to Xanthos and Dionysios, it is unclear if the intention of the founder of the cult was to create a group such as a durable association. None of the texts envisages the formal structure of an association, with a name and a well-defined membership, for instance. While these dossiers may potentially present primordial snapshots of associations in the making, what can clearly be discerned is that they represent private, individual efforts to inaugurate cults with doors at least partly open to the outside world. Python has founded a sanctuary that will belong to his sons, but which may well have accepted outsiders, who must respect some basic guidelines of purity. Xanthos instigates a cult where he is the founder but where anyone may freely gather, following some detailed guidelines for sacrifice and purification. Dionysios invites both genders, free individuals and slaves, but is more demanding, explicitly requiring that men, and women especially, abstain completely from deviant behaviour that is deemed impure. In these individual acts, then, the rules concerning purity play a fundamental role in regulating access to the sanctuary and the cult: the delays of ἀγνεία proposed by Python are relatively standard and strict, but are few in number and quite briefly presented at the conclusion of the stele, which seems to have functioned as a sign demarcating the sanctuary for worshippers; those expounded by Xanthos are of similar character, but are presented in a more detailed fashion and also include moral precepts, whether on the lengthier stele (text A) or on the sign for worshippers (text B). Finally, the case of Dionysios is different, since the strict rules he presented seem to have been aimed not just at safeguarding the purity of the sanctuary, but at shaping the moral character of worshippers in his οἶκος. All of these acts may represent attempts at a transition from private or familial worship to a cult that aimed to become more open to the public. The intended process is relatively clear given the *publication* of the inscribed documents for each cult, though it is not sure if this transformation became fully realised in each case.

Conclusion

Groups that were particularly concerned with purity form a disparate array. We have looked at one, the *Bacchoi* at Cnidus, which was concerned

⁷⁴ *Contra*, see Stowers 1998: 293 criticising the idea of ‘supposedly elevated moral rules’ and Harland in *GRA* II 117, pp. 190–2, who asserts that these rules are ‘not unusual’, except perhaps in their emphatic character.

to maintain standards of purity in a sanctuary but which did not have the authority or power to do so (Section 1). It is likely that many other cult groups and even associations, which partook in civic sanctuaries rather than possessing their own cult sites, were faced with similar problems. More clearly an association, the *Asklepiastai* at Yaylakale recreated the rules of the major sanctuaries of Pergamum for the use and benefit of worshippers in the countryside (Section 2). Finally, we analysed a series of private cults that expounded rules of purity, probably as part of a process of opening their doors to a wider community (Section 3). In the case of the *Asklepiastai* and the private cults of Pythion and Xanthos, it is no coincidence that we are dealing with the act of inaugurating a cult. One of the main strategies employed for addressing new and potential worshippers and for defining the sacred space used by the cult was the publication of casuistic rules of purity. Enacting rules of purity of this sort can thus be seen as a mechanism for fostering participation beyond the core group of the association or the family, while at the same time maintaining religious (and moral) standards expected of a sanctuary.

More distinctive is the case of Dionysios at Philadelphia, which in fact required that worshippers abstain *permanently* from certain acts, such as adultery, and, in the case of women, from sex outside of marriage. This was not just the casuistic type of ἀγνεία necessitating a temporary absence from the sanctuary, therefore, but a sort of ‘categorical imperative’ that was imposed on potential worshippers. Yet even such ideas were far from new. We might, for instance, recall a similar view aired as part of the accusations made against Androtion, in the speech written by Demosthenes in 356/5 BC.

ἔγώ μὲν γὰρ οἶομαι δεῖν τὸν εἰς ἱερὸν εἰσιόντα καὶ χερνίβων καὶ κανῶν ἀφόμενον, καὶ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπιμελείας προστάτην ἔσομενον οὐχὶ προειρημένον ἡμερῶν ἀριθμὸν ἀγνεύειν, ἀλλὰ τὸν βίον ἡγνευκέναι τοιούτων ἐπιτηδευμάτων οἷα τοῦτω βεβίωται.

In my opinion, the man who enters temples, touches lustral water and sacred baskets and intends to take responsibility for looking after the gods, should not only keep himself pure for a prescribed number of days, but keep his entire life pure from the kind of activities that this man has practiced during his life.⁷⁵

Some impure deeds were severe enough that they could be viewed as beyond the remedy of time or mere purification by washing. In fact,

⁷⁵ Dem. 22 (*Against Androtion*) 78, as translated by Harris 2008.

casuistic purity rules could also include clauses that issued similar moral pronouncements. A prime example is a much later text from Lindos, recently reedited, which concluded a list of ἀγνείαι with the statement: ‘from illicit acts one is never pure’ (ἀπὸ τῶν παρανόμων οὐδέποτε καθαρὸς).⁷⁶ Xanthos in his rules also emphasised the moral dimension of purity, advising worshippers to approach or perform the cult ‘with a simple soul’.⁷⁷

While moral commands could thus be part of the entry rules for all worshippers, some of the difference between the casuistic rules of the *Asklepiastai*, Pythion and Xanthos, on the one hand, and the strict purity rules of Dionysios, on the other, can be explained in terms of whom these rules addressed.⁷⁸ The casuistic rules applied to any and all worshippers in sanctuaries that were open to a wide participation. In such cases, there could be a core group or association, but the cultic community was potentially much wider. The rules of Dionysios, by contrast, were more demanding and find closer analogies in rules for membership in an association. One celebrated Athenian inscription, containing the foundational rules (literally, ‘a law of friendship’, θεσμὸν φιλίης, l. 28) for a community calling itself an *eranos*, provides an evocative parallel.⁷⁹ The rules begin immediately with a stipulation of what an ideal member would be: no one is to be admitted to the group without a formal examination or *dokimasia* performed by the officials of the group.⁸⁰ This, of course, imitates some structures of the Athenian state, where the *dokimasia* was held to scrutinise the legitimacy of officials, whether they possessed citizenship and met all the requirements to hold a specific office.⁸¹ But there is

⁷⁶ See now Petrovic and Petrovic 2018 (ca. AD 225), l. 20. But these παράνομα ‘acts against the norms’ do not seem to have concerned the distinction between sexual relations with one’s spouse and those with another partner (see n. 73).

⁷⁷ Cf. n. 60 above. See again Petrovic and Petrovic 2016 on the long-standing moral aspects of purity, as well as several of the essays in Carbon and Peels 2018.

⁷⁸ Cf. e.g. Eckhardt 2017b: 417: ‘While internal activities of associations were normally exclusive, their sanctuaries (qua being sanctuaries) were not’.

⁷⁹ *IG* II² 1369 / *GRA* I 49 (*CAPInv.* 308; end of second cent. AD), from the Mesogea, probably the deme of Paiania. On this text, see also Arnaoutoglou in Chapter 6. This group has been related to *SEG* 31:122, the σύννοδος τῶν Ἡρακλίστων ἐν Λίμναις found in the same area one century earlier (ca. AD 90), though unconvincingly as Arnaoutoglou 2003: 83–4 rightly argues.

⁸⁰ Ll. 31–6: [μη]δενὶ ἐξέστω ἰσι[έν]αι ἕξ τὴν σεμνοτάτην | σύννοδον τῶν ἐρανοιστῶν πρὶν ἂν δοκιμασθῆ | εἴ ἐστι ἀ[γν]ὸς καὶ εὐσεβῆς καὶ ἀγ[α]θ[ὸ]ς· δοκιμα[ζέ]τω δὲ ὁ προστάτης [καὶ | ὁ] ἀρχιεραριστῆς καὶ ὁ γ[ρ]αμματεὺς κα[ὶ | οἱ] ταμίαι καὶ σύνδικοι.

⁸¹ Other examples of a process of *dokimasia* for admission to associations are known, though the particulars of the examination remain murky: cf. already the *orgeones* of Bendis, *IG* II² 1361 / *GRA* I 4 (*CAPInv.* 230; ca. 350–300 BC), who allude to a *dokimasia* for new members, when they clearly sought to increase their membership (ll. 20–3); cf. also *I.Smyrna* 218 + vol. II 2 p. 371 (*CAPInv.* 1138; first–second cent. AD), apparently requiring *dokimasia* to obtain a resting place in the burial

a fundamental difference in the case of this *eranos*: the *dokimasia* is not one of the legitimacy, but instead concerns the character of the prospective new member into an assembly that presents itself as ‘most revered’ or ‘holy’ (ἰς τὴν σεμνοτάτην | σύνοδον τῶν ἔραμιστῶν) and that was probably focussed on the cult of a hero.⁸² The prospective member must first and foremost be ἀ[γν]ός, that is to say, chaste and abstemious with regard to known sources of impurity; the other criteria listed are piety (εὐσεβής) and general goodness of character (ἀγα[θ]ός; this adjective might also refer to ‘good birth’).⁸³ The rules then went on to discuss further, but related, practicalities: if anyone caused fights or disturbances, they would be expelled from the *eranos* and subject to a fine.⁸⁴ Only one who was not *hagnos*, *eusebes* and *agathos* would be at the source of such chaos in the sanctuary or risk shedding blood in the ‘most holy assembly’.

Purity, piety and good morality were the requirements for membership in this Athenian association, as they were for participation in the cult of Dionysios at Philadelphia. A process of *dokimasia* was undertaken to test for these characteristics in the Athenian *eranos*, just as, in the *oikos* of Dionysios, oaths would be required of participants in good, ethical standing. The purity rules of Dionysios, though they do not explicitly claim this purpose, should therefore be thought of as analogous to membership rules for admission into an association. A recent study by Kloppenborg concluded that the moral principles that constituted criteria of admission in

plot; see also the commentary at *GRA* I 49. For a *krisis* of familial legitimacy, see the procedure by which bastards (*nothoi*) could become members of the cultic family of Diomedon, *IG* XII.4 I 348 / *LSCG* 177 / *CGRN* 96 (*CAPInv.* 1919), ll. 146–9; cf. also *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907): 293 no 18 for the *dokimasia* of fathers and their sons to enter into the membership of a *systema* at Pergamum, though the associational character of the group is unclear and it may be the *gerousia* (*CAPInv.* 1659; second cent. AD); similar rules concerning the replacement of members in *IG* VII 2808 (Hyettos, ca. AD 212–250), probably relating to the sacred and political *gerousia* of the community rather than a private association *stricto sensu* (pace Marchand in *CAPInv.* 984). On admission procedures codified by associations, see Giannakopoulos in Chapter 2.

⁸² For the superlative σεμνοτάτη, see the commentary at *GRA* I 49. A heroic cult is implied by ll. 38–9, where the official called ὁμολείτωρ is appointed as responsible for the *heroon* for life: ὁμολείτωρ δὲ ἔ[ι]στω δ[ι]ὰ βίου αὐτοῦ | ὁ ἐπὶ ἡρώου καταλιφθεῖς. That this was the tomb of the founder of the group (Sokolowski, *LSCG* 53) is possible, but far from clear.

⁸³ The closest analogy is perhaps provided by the *dokimasia* in the cult of the *Tobacchoi*, *IG* II² 1368 / Jaccottet 2003: II 27–35 no 4 / *AGRW* 7 (*CAPInv.* 339), ll. 35–7: δοκιμασθῆ ὑπὸ τῶν ἰοβάκκων ψή[φω], εἰ ἀξιός φαίνοιτο καὶ ἐπιτήδειος | τῷ Βακχείῳ. This suggests that new members were assessed only for their worthiness or goodness (ἀξιός cf. perhaps ἀγαθός) and their suitability to the *Bakcheion* (ἐπιτήδειος; and perhaps their serviceable or friendly disposition as potential benefactors). Yet this is also different: there were no overt criteria of religious rectitude, no connotations of purity or piety, in this case; though these may have been implicit to the constitution of the *Tobacchoi*, they were not explicitly expressed.

⁸⁴ Ll. 40–4: εἰ δὲ τις μά[χας] ἢ θορύβους κεινῶν φαίνοιτο, | ἐκβαλλέσθω τοῦ ἔρανου ζημιού[μενος] [ἐ] Ἄττ[ι]καῖς κέ ἢ πηληγάς αἰκ[αικ]ιζόμενος ταῖς διπλάσις πέ[τ]ρα κρίσεως.

associations 'not only served as a public advertisement of the propriety of the members, but functioned internally to create an ethos of trust and solidarity that no doubt served as an instrument of recruitment'.⁸⁵ What we have witnessed here, however, are quite varying strategies of advertising and potential recruitment: for instance, the *Asklepiastai* at Yaylakale promoted good health and simply recommended washing after *any* sexual activity; the precepts of Dionysios at Philadelphia on the same subject were, to say the least, much more strict and elaborately codified.

Rules of purity, though only occasionally apparent in the available evidence, constitute an interesting case study for evaluating how a cultic community chose to present and define itself. Such rules could be modelled on local practice or developed according to more widespread ethical and religious principles in the Greek world. The norms of purity functioned not only as a necessary precondition for the maintenance of good order, but could shape participation in the cultic community, whether this was formalised as an association or not. Purity regulations could be published to open and regulate access to a sanctuary for a wider group of worshippers, as well as to define admission and participation in a limited cultic group, like an association. Much like for sanctuaries generally, the rules of purity enabled groups to establish a difficult equilibrium between expanding their networks of worshippers and maintaining appropriate control over the cults themselves.

⁸⁵ Kloppenborg 2014: 226, speaking in particular of 'The Moralizing of Discourse' or 'the moralizing of association rules'. Given that morality was such a long-standing preoccupation in Greek society in general, I am not sure that to speak of a 'moralising' tendency is a good historical approach, however.