

The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



GIVEN TO A DEITY? RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL REAPPRAISAL OF HUMAN CONSECRATIONS IN THE HELLENISTIC AND ROMAN EAST

Stefano G. Caneva and Aurian Delli Pizzi

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 65 / Issue 01 / May 2015, pp 167 - 191
DOI: 10.1017/S0009838814000676, Published online: 02 April 2015

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838814000676

How to cite this article:

Stefano G. Caneva and Aurian Delli Pizzi (2015). GIVEN TO A DEITY? RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL REAPPRAISAL OF HUMAN CONSECRATIONS IN THE HELLENISTIC AND ROMAN EAST. The Classical Quarterly, 65, pp 167-191 doi:10.1017/S0009838814000676

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

GIVEN TO A DEITY? RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL REAPPRAISAL OF HUMAN CONSECRATIONS IN THE HELLENISTIC AND ROMAN EAST*

INTRODUCTION: THE VARIETY OF IEPOI IN THE GREEK AND ROMAN EAST

The adjective *ιερός* is a central term in Greek religion and is used in various contexts. Generally translated ‘sacred’, it indicates that an object has been conceded to the gods and is now in relation with them (relation of belonging, protection, etc.).¹ It appears frequently in Greek inscriptions in the expression τὰ *ιερά*, to designate sacred objects or, in a more abstract meaning, sacred matters.

The last decades have seen several works on the question of ‘the sacred’ and consecration.² Without claiming comprehensiveness on such a wide topic, this article aims at discussing the question of human consecration in order to refine our knowledge of the general process of consecration in ancient Greek religion. The epigraphic evidence on the topic is so scattered, geographically and chronologically, that it should not be taken for granted that all the consecrated humans are identical and form a single category. However, this article proposes an attempt to compensate for the lack of any recent comprehensive approach.³

* The research which gave birth to this paper went through different stages and audiences. A.D.P. first gave a talk on the notion of *ιεροι* in the Oxford–Princeton graduate seminar at the University of Oxford in January 2011. Many thanks are due to Professor Robert Parker and Dr Beate Dignas for their support and advice in this preliminary step. S.C. and A.D.P. then gave a joint talk on the consecration of children in the *Unité de Recherche en Histoire et Anthropologie des Religions* of the University of Liège, Belgium, in November 2011. We would like to thank Professor Vinciane Pirenne-Delforge, Jan-Mathieu Carbon and the editors and anonymous reader of *Classical Quarterly* for their criticisms. Although we wrote different parts of the article, we both share responsibility for its whole content. Needless to say that, in spite of all the help from which we benefited, we are solely responsible for any remaining mistakes.

¹ J. Rudhardt, *Notions fondamentales de la pensée religieuse et actes constitutifs du culte dans la Grèce classique* (Paris, 1992²), 30. Unless otherwise specified, abbreviations are those used in the *Guide de l'épigraphiste*, 2010, and translations are ours. Other abbreviations used include: Akinci Öztürk and Tanriver (2008) = E. Akinci Öztürk and C. Tanriver, ‘New katagraphai and dedications from the sanctuary of Apollon Lairbenos’, *EA* 41 (2008), 91–111; Cabanes and Drini (2007) = P. Cabanes and F. Drini, *Corpus des inscriptions grecques d’Illyrie méridionale et d’Épire*, vol. 2: *Inscriptions de Buthrotum* (Athens, 2007); Darmezine (1999) = L. Darmezine, *Les affranchissements par consécration: en Béotie et dans le monde hellénistique* (Nancy, 1999); Hatzopoulos et al. (2000) = M.B. Hatzopoulos, F.M. Petsas, L. Gounaropoulou and P. Paschidis, *Inscriptions du sanctuaire de la Mère des Dieux Autochtone de Leukopetra (Macédoine)* (Athens, 2000); Ritti et al. (2000) = T. Ritti, C. Simsek and H. Yıldız, ‘Dedicatio e καταγραφαί dal santuario frigio di Apollo Lairbenos’, *EA* 32 (2000), 1–88.

² See the state of art in N. Papazarkadas, *Sacred and Public Land in Ancient Athens* (Oxford, 2011).

³ There are, to our knowledge, two general approaches of the phenomenon. F. Bömer, *Untersuchungen über die Religion der Sklaven in Griechenland und Rom*, vol. 2 (Hamburg, 1960), 149–89 is devoted to *ιεροι* from all over the Greek world. But his analysis relies on several misleading conceptions, such as an excessive emphasis on the question of ‘what is Greek and what is not’.

In our attempt better to understand the specific relation between human beings and deities through human dedications as well as changes of social status in these processes,⁴ it quickly appears necessary to investigate the term *ιερός* and some composite terms in which it appears.⁵ More precisely, three categories of persons are to be taken into account: the so-called *ιεροί*, *ιερόδουλοι* and *ιεροί παῖδες*. Does the common root *ιερός* justify an identity, or a relation, between these categories? And what is the connection of each of these persons with gods and human society in general? Etymologically, the terms *ιερόδουλοι* and *ιεροί παῖδες* hint at ‘sacred slavery’, which is not suggested by *ιεροί*. But if we go deeper into the contexts and practices into which these individuals are involved, it becomes obvious that the problem is much more complex than this analysis suggests at first sight.

The adjective *ιερός* is applied to a multitude of persons in various contexts throughout the Greek world and it is hard to perceive any unity between all of them. The issue of the *ιεροί* involved in the mysteries of Andania is well known, though not entirely unproblematic: as evident as their role in the mysteries of Andania may appear, their potential connection with other *ιεροί* attested in the Peloponnese and the date of their appearance in these mysteries are not clear.⁶ Other activities, cultic or not, are attested elsewhere in the Greek world.⁷ For instance, some *ιεροί* might have been involved in

P. Debord, *Aspects sociaux et économiques de la vie religieuse dans l’Anatolie gréco-romaine* (Leiden, 1982), 78–83 also provides a comprehensive commentary and bibliography, but several relevant epigraphic pieces of evidence have been published since then. Specific dossiers have also been treated subsequently without being compared to the ‘whole picture’ provided by the different pieces of evidence (see n. 6).

⁴ The notion of ‘social status’ will appear several times in our analysis, to designate the relationship between individuals and the community around them, in terms of freedom and obligations, as it is defined legally or through official texts. For a more developed reflection on ‘social status’ and its connection with the legal sphere, see e.g. V. Hunter and J. Edmondson, *Law and Social Status in Classical Athens* (Oxford, 2000), especially Chapters 1 and 8.

⁵ It should be stressed from this point that by ‘dedication’ or ‘consecration’, we are not considering curses which imply sanctions on a person. No divine *ἄγος* is at stake in the texts discussed here, though identical expressions may be used for both kinds of consecration: compare *ἄντιερούν* in Strabo 11.14.16 and in Cnidian curse tablets (*IK Knidos* 1.147, 148, 149, 151 and 158). *Ἀνατίθημι* is also attested in these tablets: cf. *IK Knidos* 1.150.

⁶ On *ιεροί* in the mysteries of Andania, see N. Deshours, *Les mystères d’Andania: étude d’épigraphie et d’histoire religieuse* (Paris, 2006), 77–82; V. Pirenne-Delforge, ‘Mnasistratos the “Hierophant” at Andania (*IG* 5.1.1390 and *Syll.*³ 735)’, in J. Dijkstra, J. Kroesen and Y. Kuiper (edd.), *Myths, Martyrs, and Modernity: Studies in the History of Religions in Honour of Jan N. Bremmer* (Leiden, 2010), 219–35, at 227–8; L. Gawlinksi, *The Sacred Law of Andania: A New Text with Commentary* (Boston, 2012), 22–7. In regard to the comparison with Peloponnesian epitaphs mentioning *ιεροί*, see P. Brulé and L. Piolot, ‘Women’s way of death: fatal childbirth or hierai? Commemorative stones at Sparta and Plutarch, *Lycurgus*, 27.3’, in T.J. Figueira (ed.), *Spartan Society* (Swansea, 2004), 151–78. Epitaphs mentioning *ιεροί* are not limited to the Peloponnese: see e.g. epitaphs from Samos in *IG* 12.6.2, 688, 756 and 803. See P. Themelis, ‘Ἀνασκαφή Μεσσήνης’, *ΠΑΑΗ* 156 (2001), 57–96, at 74: an inscription from Messene, dated to the beginning of the third century B.C., shows seven *ιεροί* dedicating a bronze statue to Apollo Karneios. On *ιερά* in the mysteries from Samothrace, see C. Karadima-Matsa and K. Clinton, ‘Korrane, a sacred woman in Samothrace’, *ZPE* 138 (2002), 688–92. See also A.D. Rizakis, *Achaïe*, vol. 3: *Les cités achéennes: épigraphie et histoire* (Paris, 2008), no. 63: an inscription from Achaia shows *συνιεροί* of a hero dedicating a statue to Thrason son of Xenophon.

⁷ We know of three *ιεροί* in Aizanoi, whose precise function is unclear, as discussed in C. Lehmler and M. Wörrle, ‘Neue Inschriftenfunde aus Aizanoi III. Aizanitica Minora’, *Chiron* 32 (2002), 571–646, at 576. According to an uncertain conjecture, a *ιερός* called Hermas was in charge of *δημόσια γράμματα* (see *MAMA* 9 P 28: *τοῖς πανηγυριάρχαις καὶ Ἐρμᾶ ἱερός τῷ πρὸς δημο[σίοις γράμμασι]*). If right, it would suggest that *ιεροί* were assistants also in non-religious matters.

oracular activities in Lydia,⁸ whereas a group of ἱεροὶ apparently had some financial responsibilities in a sanctuary in Pereudos, Phrygia, at an uncertain date.⁹ Alongside the matter of the activity of ἱεροὶ, the question of the status of some ἱεροὶ within a population is also a frustrating one: are they ἱεροὶ only through their activity, as a ἱερεὺς is not only a ἱερεὺς but primarily a citizen,¹⁰ or does the label ἱερός designate them as a distinct group within a community?¹¹ Moreover, are ἱερόδουλοι merely ‘sacred slaves’, that is slaves involved into cultic activities, or is the term δοῦλος misleading? And to what extent should they be contrasted to ἱεροὶ παῖδες?

It clearly appears from different epigraphic corpora that one could become ἱερός through ‘dedications’ to a god: a person was dedicated, offered, consecrated – a wide lexical variety is found here – and was thereby declared ἱερός. Several case studies will be adduced here in chronological order. ‘Sacral manumissions’ from different places of the Greek world in the Hellenistic period, collected mainly from Laurence Darmezin’s corpus, are an appropriate starting point.¹² After addressing general issues about the status of these freedmen, we will analyse more deeply the case of the city of Buthrotum, in Epirus. Two dossiers from the Imperial period will then be compared: registrations (καταγραφαί) into a god’s service from the sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos in Phrygia and dedications from Leucopetra (Macedonia) – a particularly complex case study as this corpus combines consecrations with slave manumissions, financial loans and votive dedications. The status of the freeborn Paramonos in Leucopetra will provide a case study. ἱερόδουλοι and ἱεροὶ παῖδες will also be discussed, before turning to the appropriateness of the notion of ‘rites of passage’ in the case of these dossiers.

Contextualization is the most important *desideratum* of a study encompassing different geographical and chronological settings. We will therefore try to make sense of the discontinuities between the corpora and of their internal inconsistencies by reading them against a well-delimited social and cultural background, in which the practice of consecrating human beings is attested. This not only prevents us from assuming an overly clear-cut picture of the practices related to human consecration, but it also allows us to appreciate the historical changes that progressively adapted consecration and its lexicon to new social needs and personal motivations.

⁸ P. Herrmann and H. Malay, *New Documents from Lydia* (Vienna, 2007), no. 54: τῶν ἱερῶν ὅτι ‘μὴ φοβῶ’· ἐπεζήτησεν | ἡ θεὸς καὶ ἦραν τρίφωνα | τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς | καὶ τὰ ἔγγονα αὐτῶν, | ἔτους σξ’, μη(νὸς) Ἀπελ|λαίου βι’ (‘from the holy servants (saying): “Have no fear!” The goddess made an inquiry and her [that is an aforementioned woman’s] children and their descendants took (the sin) away by means of three voiced animals, the year 260, month of Apellaios, the 12th’; the editors’ slightly revised translation). Yet the presence of ἱεροὶ is all but certain.

⁹ P. Herrmann and E. Varinlioglu, ‘Theoi Pereudenoi: eine Gruppe von Weihungen und Stühnschriften aus der Katakekaumene’, *EA* 3 (1984), 1–18, no. 10: — ου Μηνὶ Λαβάνῃ καὶ Μηνὶ Πετραεῖτῃ ἐν Περειύδῳ Ἀμμία Ζηνᾶ Ἀκυρα|νῆ ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκίας τῆς | ἠγόρασεν παρὰ Ἀμμίας | Καλλιμάχου ἔδωκα (δηνάρια) οβ’ | καθὼς ἐπεσζήτησαν οἱ | θεοί, ἅτινα παρέλαβαν οἱ | εἱεροὶ Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀπολ|λωνίου, Ἀντίοχος Ἀντιόχου, | Γλύκων Ποπλίου (‘On the month of Labanas and of Petraeitis, in Pereudos, I, Ammia, daughter of Zenas, from Ankyra, had for the house bought from Ammia, daughter of Kallimakhos, 72 denarii, as the gods required. The sum was given to the ἱεροὶ Apollonios son of Apollonios, Antiokhos son of Antiokhos, Glykon son of Poplios’). The text is not completely clear as to why the house in question is connected to the gods.

¹⁰ Nevertheless, the priest is appointed to his office through specific processes and an analogy may be proposed between processes through which one became a ἱερός and the τελετή through which the priest had to go.

¹¹ The latter is suggested in a decree from Ephesus: *Syll.*³ 742.

¹² Darmezin (1999).

1. SACRAL MANUMISSIONS IN THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD

1.1 General remarks

General remarks about the so-called ‘sacral manumission’ in the Hellenistic period are needed. Sacral manumission was one of the processes through which a slave or servant could be granted freedom from his masters.¹³ In many cases, the expressions used by the master freeing his slave are typically appropriate for dedication, as shown by the verb ἀνατίθημι, and relied heavily on the personal preferences of the master or on local norms.¹⁴ In her corpus, in which most inscriptions are from Boeotia, Darmezín contrasts the expression ἀνατίθημι ἱερὸν with ἀφίημι ἐλεύθερον to stress that, in the second case, it was ‘un affranchissement “mixte”, où la divinité n’apparaît guère que comme protectrice dans la clause de sauvegarde’; she therefore distinguishes cases where terminology only refers to consecration and cases where the focus is on freedom.¹⁵ It must be noted, however, that, although terminological variations may emphasize different aspects, they should not be contrasted too strictly.¹⁶

The freedom of slaves manumitted through ‘sacral manumission’ has also been repeatedly debated.¹⁷ An argument supporting the view that a slave was merely transferred from a human to a divine master could rely on the fact that, in some cases, the quality of ἱερός came into force once the παραμονή, that is the obligation to stay by one’s master after being manumitted, reached an end.¹⁸ However, this question is partly a non-issue, because it is raised through our own perplexity and our need to establish well-defined categories. In this perspective, our analysis of sacred human beings also suffers from the comparison with sacred objects: one should not consider that, because sacred objects are the gods’ property, human beings who are ἱεροί share the same fate.

¹³ For an overview of modes of manumission, see R. Zelnick-Abramovitz, *Not Wholly Free: The Concept of Manumission and the Status of Manumitted Slaves in the Ancient Greek World* (Leiden, 2005), 69–99. ‘Sacral manumission’ implies two types of processes: the freedman was either *sold* or *consecrated* to a god. In this paper, our attention will bear on the latter. On sacral manumission, see J. Velissaropoulos-Karakostas, *Droit grec d’Alexandre à Auguste (323 av. J.-C. – 14 ap. J.-C.): personnes – biens – justice* (Athens, 2011), 379–86.

¹⁴ In Boeotia, for instance, deities to whom slaves are dedicated vary from place to place. Any attempt to establish a close relation between the identity of the deity and the process of consecration or the identity of the consecrated persons seems fruitless. Darmezín (1999), 184: ‘Il ne semble donc pas qu’il y ait eu des divinités “spécialisées” dans la protection des affranchis.’ Darmezín’s suggestion that only girls were consecrated to Artemis Eilithyia, a deity who had a ‘champ d’action spécifiquement féminin’, seems plausible (pp. 184–5).

¹⁵ Darmezín (1999), 180.

¹⁶ On this interchangeability, see P. Cabanes, ‘Epigraphie et affranchis du monde grec: acquis et problèmes’, in Y. Roman and Y. Le Bohec (edd.), *Epigraphie et histoire: acquis et problèmes. Actes du Congrès des Professeurs d’Histoire Ancienne, Lyon-Chambéry, 21–23 mai 1993* (Lyon, 1998), 53–60, at 59. Accordingly, for the sake of convenience, and since ἱερός is often – though not systematically – used to qualify the status of a new freedman, the term ἱεροί will here be used to designate persons who went through this process in the corpus of Darmezín.

¹⁷ The argument of M. Riel that, since no word in ἐλευθ- is attested in the Leucopetra dossier (see below), it should be inferred that slaves were donated to a divinity but not freed is unfounded: M. Riel, ‘Donation of slaves and freeborn children to deities in Roman Macedonia and Phrygia: a reconsideration’, *Tyche* 16 (2001), 127–60, at 130 and 134–5. Moreover, Zelnick-Abramovitz (n. 13) relied on the fact that freedmen had to render a service to the gods to prove that consecration involved a ‘moral link between slaves and gods; the latter could keep the slaves, give them back to the owners, or make them completely free’.

¹⁸ See e.g. Darmezín (1999), no. 29 = *IG* 7.3083.

The fact that *ἱεροί* enjoyed freedom – though not as citizens did – is suggested by several elements. Firstly, the process through which they could, in turn, consecrate their own children is remarkable.¹⁹ To do so, they required the assistance of a *ἱεράρχης*, ‘magistrat qui dirigeait l’ensemble de l’administration sacrée et gérait les biens appartenant aux dieux’.²⁰ It is understandable that freedmen did not enjoy the same political rights as citizens, which explains this assistance: after all, freedom does not suffice to grant access to the assembly either. But this specific status did not prevent *ἱεροί* from being occasionally more flexible in terms of dedicating their own children than some citizens were. For instance, some masters needed the agreement of members of their family – and more precisely of their heirs – to free and consecrate a slave, because heirs thereby lost a part of their legacy. Verbs used for this agreement are stronger than *(συμ)πάρειμι* and denote more than a mere assistance: *σύμφημι*, *συνεπαινέω*, *συνεπινεύω*, *συνευαρεστέω*, *συναρεστέω*, *εὐαρεστέω*, *συνευδοκέω*, *εὐδοκέω*.²¹ In the case of *ἱεροί*, however, assistance does not mean agreement: this becomes fairly obvious by looking at the terms in use. The typical verb used to denote this assistance is *παρεῖναι* or *συμπαρεῖναι*, ‘to be by someone’s side’. Moreover, the *ἱεράρχης* is never said to be *κύριος*, although Darmezín considers that the quality of a *κύριος* is inherent in the participle *παρόντος*.²² On this point, the freedom of the *ἱεροί* seems to be larger than, say, that of the *ἱεροὶ παῖδες* from Pergamum.²³

Secondly, although after the *παρομονή* (or, less often, during the *παρομονή*) some of these freedmen had to take part in rituals related to the deity to which they had been dedicated, this should not be interpreted as a sign of submission of the freedmen to the sanctuary or its deity. This indication is actually not so widespread.²⁴ Besides, such ritual acts are likely to have been performed by ‘non-consecrated’ persons as well, and nothing indicates that *ἱεροί* were the members of the cultic personnel specifically in charge of these acts. The necessity to accomplish sacrifices to specific deities does not mean that *ἱεροί* had to take part in *all* the sacrifices. Rather, they would be involved in the rituals performed by their masters.

Finally, nothing permits us to think that *ἱεροί* actually *belonged* to a sanctuary. It is more correct to speak of them as individuals with a specific relation to a specific sanctuary.²⁵ The reference to a sanctuary was part of a dissuasive strategy aimed at preventing other people from using as slaves these newly manumitted persons with a precarious status, which was a potential risk. The fact that any contraveners would be guilty of *ἱεροσυλία* or *ἱεροφορία* does not allow us to think, as Darmezín does, that ‘ces

¹⁹ Darmezín (1999), nos. 45, 72, 73.

²⁰ Darmezín (1999), 230. See also V. Petrakos, *Ὁ Ὁρωπὸς καὶ τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀμφιπόλου* (Athens, 1968), 48.

²¹ See the list in Darmezín (1999), 186, and inscriptions nos. 43, 45, 72, 73, 77. No. 79 shows that, if an agreement was needed in such a case, it was to come from members of the family of the *ἱεροί*, not from a magistrate: *παριόντος ἀπὲρ τῷ ἱεράρχῳ Νικίῳ Χαλάρωνδαο, συνευδοκίοντος | κὴ τῷ τοιῷ ἀπὲρ Εἰρώνος* (lines 3–6). See also parallels from the Buthrotum corpus in P. Cabanes, ‘La loi des *ateknoi* dans les affranchissements d’Épire’, in D. Liebs and J. Modrzejewski (edd.), *Symposium 1977* (Cologne, 1982), 215–22 and Cabanes and Drini (2007), 257–61.

²² Darmezín (1999), 196.

²³ Cf. n. 96 below.

²⁴ Darmezín (1999), 222.

²⁵ This was already suggested in A. Motte, *L’expression du sacré dans la religion grecque* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1996), 128, with regard to the general meaning of the adjective *ἱερός*: ‘Il signifie souvent la simple appartenance ou la réservation d’une chose à tel dieu, ou encore *la simple relation à un sanctuaire*’ (our emphasis).

afranchis sont donc devenus des biens sacrés, ils appartiennent au dieu'. It should be seen as a sanction against someone who would disrespect their new status rather than as a proof that such persons are devoid of freedom.²⁶ The priestess of Charops Heracles, a deity to which freedmen could be consecrated in Coroneia, is said to be *κουρία* in case someone would reduce the manumitted persons to slavery, and so is any Boeotian. The adjective *κύριος* does not mean 'owner' or 'master' here, but only implies that the priestess or any Boeotian is empowered to intervene to protect the freedmen.²⁷

Besides, the complexity of the relation between consecrated persons and a sanctuary is nicely illustrated by this clause, in one of the inscriptions: [ὄ]ς τῷ ἱερῷ ἰόντων ἐ|λευθέρων Διω[νουσίω κῆ Ὀ]|[ν]ασίμω κῆ ὦν κὰ [οὔτοι] | κτείσωνθη 'as Dionysios and Onasimos and their possessions will be free in relation to the sanctuary'.²⁸ The ambiguity is relevant to the interpretation of the genitive τῷ ἱερῷ and the verb κτείσωνθη. These men do have the right to acquire – and henceforth to own – things, to use the straightforward sense of κτήσθαι. Moreover they are said to be free (ἐλευθέρων). The genitive does not denote *stricto sensu* the possession of the freedmen by the sanctuary – why would they then be called ἐλευθέρων? – but rather a *relation* to the sanctuary. Similarly, the objects possessed by the freedmen do not belong to the sanctuary but are put in relation to it, be this relation as it is. On the same level, lists of freedmen kept by priests in their archives are not a list of goods *per se*, but rather come from the need to know who has been consecrated.²⁹ To quote a last example, another inscription envisages the possibility that the manumitted slave would leave (lines 14–15: ἐπὶ κ' ἀποτρέκε, ἐλεύθερος ἀποτρεχέτω): there would be no reason to raise this eventuality if the freedman was a property of the sanctuary.³⁰

1.2 The case of Buthrotum

Let us now examine a specific case study. The corpus of Buthrotum in Epirus provides a large set of human consecrations dating to the period 163–144 B.C., when the city was a member of the Epirotan *koinon* of the Prasaiboi.³¹ Dedications can be divided into three groups according to the authors and the type of slave manumission performed: individual acts of secular manumission; memorial lists of freedmen published on their own initiative and accompanied by the formula οἱ ἀφρωθέντες ἐλεύθεροι (cf. no. 20); individual acts of temple manumission accompanied by a consecration to Asclepius or Zeus Soter. It is the last type which is relevant to our study.

The texts express the combination of manumission and consecration with a formalized vocabulary. The most extended formula follows a pattern exemplified by no. 67, ἀφίεντι ἐλευθέρων καὶ ἀνατίθεντι ἱερὸν τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ | ἀνέφαπτον Φιλουμέναν. Repetitiveness allows us to assume that even when abbreviated and rare formulae appear,

²⁶ For such sanctions, see Darmezin (1999), nos. 126 and 131. Quotation from p. 224.

²⁷ Darmezin (1999), no. 123. *Κουρία* is therefore not used in the same meaning as *κυριεύειν* in the inscription from Pergamum, see n. 96.

²⁸ Darmezin (1999), no. 133, lines 22–5.

²⁹ Cabanes and Drini (2007), no. 26.

³⁰ Darmezin (1999), no. 138.

³¹ For this *koinon*'s institutions, see Cabanes and Drini (2007), 242–8. The inscriptions were found in three locations: two in the city theatre and one in a Roman tower, whose blocks belonged to previous temples of Asclepius and Zeus. See the introductory remarks in Cabanes and Drini (2007), 63–5.

they have no influence on the act of manumission itself or on the status implied by it.³² Vocabulary and syntax also provide a consistent depiction of the relationship between the act of manumission and the god. The formula *ἱερόν* + dative is by far the most common, implying that the freed person is consecrated to the god, in whose temple the manumission took place. However, as Pierre Cabanes observed, even among those acts where no consecration is reported, reference to the manumission being performed in front of the god is often made explicit by mentioning the priest (at least for the date) and/or through the formula *παρὰ Ἀσκλαπιόν* (no. 20, 40, 46) or *παρὰ τὸν θεόν* (no. 23). Just as in the Boeotian corpus examined by Darnezin, the formulae of the inscriptions from Buthrotum hint at the complementary aspects of the manumission act and the role of the god as witness. Like the expression *ἐναντία | τῷ Ἀσκλαπιῶ* attested in Hellenistic Thespieae, the formula *παρὰ Ἀσκλαπιόν* makes it explicit that the manumission (even without implying formal consecration) has been performed in the sanctuary and has involved the local god as witness of the act. Similarly, those acts where manumission is combined with consecration suggest that religious authority was meant to strengthen the new status by submitting it to the care of the god, who became the protector of its inviolability.

2. IMPERIAL PERIOD: PHRYGIAN ΚΑΤΑΓΡΑΦΑΙ AND LEUCOPETRA

We shall now examine pieces of evidence from the Imperial period. It should be stressed that, although we are dealing with a period in which the studied areas were under Roman control, it is not the right place here to discuss at length connections with Roman forms of manumission. Specific problems arise from the study of Roman slavery and manumission itself.³³

2.1 *Phrygian καταγραφαί*

Καταγραφαί from the Phrygian sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos, in the Imperial period, require special discussion.³⁴ Although they display similar elements to the manumission inscriptions discussed so far (masters setting up inscriptions for their slaves, use of the adjective *ἱερός*), fundamental differences are to be noted. These texts are not manumission inscriptions *per se* and many persons who go through such *καταγραφαί* are

³² The order can change. In addition, *ἐλεύθερον*, *ἱερόν*, *ἀνέφορτον*, or even the whole sentence *ἀφίημι ἐλεύθερον*, can be omitted. These interchangeable variants seem to have no consequence for the meaning and must be consequently read as abbreviations, as proved by some awkward combinations such as no. 123, *ἀφίημι ἱερόν | καὶ ἀνατίθημι Φιλόστρατος Στίλπιονα παρὰ | Δία Σωτήρα, ἀνέφορτον* (cf. nos. 124, 125, 143); cf. Cabanes and Drini (2007), 273.

³³ For our purpose, it would be tempting to address the question of the Roman *manumissio sacrorum causa*, which is mentioned by the grammarian Festus (s.vv. *Puri, probi, profani, sui auri: dicitur in manumissione sacrorum causa*). W.W. Buckland, *The Roman Law of Slavery: The Condition of the Slave in Private Law from Augustus to Justinian* (Cambridge, 1970), 447–8 makes a brief comparison between this type of Roman manumission and Greek practices, but does not assimilate them. The role of *manumissio sacrorum causa* within the Roman system itself is unclear; for instance, the connection with the *manumissio vindicta* is problematic: see G. Fabre, *Libertus: recherches sur les rapports patron-affranchi à la fin de la république romaine* (Rome, 1981), 19 n. 147.

³⁴ The main publications of these texts are M. Riel, ‘Les ΚΑΤΑΓΡΑΦΑΙ du sanctuaire d’Apollon Lairbenos’, *Arkeoloji Dergisi* 3 (1995), 167–95 and Ritti et al. (2000), who present both edited and unedited texts, and Akinci Öztürk and Tanriver (2008), with only hitherto unedited texts.

actually not slaves, but free persons' children. Even in the case of people of servile status, *καταγραφαί* cannot be assimilated to manumission texts *stricto sensu*, as the act of *καταγραφή* in itself perhaps did not confer freedom to the slave.³⁵ Moreover, the verb *καταγράφω* has a different meaning from *ἀνατίθημι*: although it can have several meanings, it surely does not mean 'to dedicate' or 'to consecrate'. The translation retained here is 'to register'.³⁶ The reason for this choice is that *καταγράφω* is used in several inscriptions of the corpus to designate the assignment of tools to someone for the job that he will have to do.³⁷ Interestingly, there is a clear distinction in this sanctuary between objects, for which the verb *ἀνατίθημι* is used, and human beings, for which the verb *καταγράφω* is used. These texts have to be considered here precisely because they also occasionally use the adjective *ἱερός* – though at a lower rate than the manumission inscriptions discussed above.³⁸ How can *ἀνατίθημι* (*ἱερόν*) + an object and *καταγράφω* (*ἱερόν*) + a person be contrasted? We have to postulate that the motivations and implications of both processes largely differed.

Indeed, many inscriptions from the surrounding regions deal with acts of personal devotion to a god. Free – and sometimes wealthy – persons chose to 'consecrate' themselves or their children to a god. As is the case for slaves, the notion of 'devotion to a god' covers a wide range of Greek lexical expressions: the process of inscribing oneself at the god's service is often referred to as a *καταγραφή*, whereas different terms attest the submission to a god, such as *ὑποτακτικός θεῶν*³⁹ or the expression *καταγράψαι ἑμυαυτὴν ἰς ὑπηρεσίαν τοῖς θεοῖς* ('register myself to the god's service') in a confession inscription.⁴⁰ It is reasonable, however, to assume that this language is rather symbolic and attests a personal will to show one's piety. Even a woman writing that she is the concubine (*παλλακή*) of a god must be understood in this way and not as 'submitted' slavishly to a god.⁴¹ Similarly, owing to mentions such as *κατὰ τὴν ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ θεοῦ* or *ὡς ἐδήλωσε ὁ θεός* in our *καταγραφαί*, we are inclined to think of these

³⁵ When manumission is mentioned in a *καταγραφή*, it seems to be a separate process. See Akinci Öztürk and Tanriver (2008), no. 13: *Τίτος Φλάβιος Ἀχιλλεὺς καταγράφω τὸν ἑμυαυτοῦ δοῦλον ὀνόματι Ἐπίκτητον Ἡλίω Λαμνηῶ ὄν κὲ ἐπύησα ἐλευθέρων διὰ τῶν ἐν Μοτέλλοις ἀρχείων* ('I, Titus Flavi(u)s Achilleus, assign to Helios Larmentos my slave named Epiktetos whom I also made free through the archives in Motella'). We would also propose 'through the agency of the magistrates', but the meaning is not completely clear. No. 14 clearly states that a certain Zosimos will be *ἱερός* and free: the quality of *ἱερός* can be obtained from the *καταγραφή* while freedom comes from a procedure in Motella.

³⁶ For other meanings of the term, see LSJ s.v.: 'engrave', 'describe', 'enroll', 'register', and so on.

³⁷ Akinci Öztürk and Tanriver (2008), no. 2: *καταγράφω δὲ τῷ Ζήνωνι ἐργαστήριον κὲ τὸ δίστεγον κὲ ἄρμεν[α-]α σὺν εἰσόδοις κὲ ἐξόδοις*; Akinci Öztürk and Tanriver's translation, slightly modified ('I also assign to Zenon a workshop and a two-storied house and tools [for ...] together with (their) incomes and outgoings (?) ...'). See also no. 7.

³⁸ Cases of *καταγράφω ἱερόν*: Ritti et al. (2000), nos. 8, 11 and 49; Akinci Öztürk and Tanriver (2008), nos. 1, 5, 7, 8, possibly 9, 11, 15.

³⁹ SEG 42.1185, line 4.

⁴⁰ See M. Riçl, 'Society and economy of rural sanctuaries in Roman Lydia and Phrygia', *EA* 35 (2003), 77–101, at 91 n. 91.

⁴¹ See e.g. *I.Tralles* 6, lines 9–12: *παλλακεύσα|σα κατὰ χρῆ|σμον | Διῖ*. This has nothing to do with sacred prostitution, about which see Debord (n. 3), 78. According to S. Budin, *The Myth of Sacred Prostitution in Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2008), 193–6, the *παλλακή* in this inscription is a 'cult functionary'. The status of a *παλλακή* is not unproblematic. It may indicate a specific status that someone grants to herself in her own carrying out of a cult: being a *παλλακή* would therefore fall in the category of personal devotion rather than in official cultic organization. On the other hand, the hypothesis that it designates a specific sacerdotal function cannot be dismissed, as the term and its use seem more specific than *ὑποτακτικός*.

καταγραφαί as displaying the piety of families.⁴² Furthermore, there is no financial dimension in these texts whatsoever. The quality of *ιερός* – or of *καταγεγραμμένος Απόλλωνι*, to use a term of our own – would be part of someone's identity, even for well-off people or individuals with an important role on the scene.⁴³ Such a status could imply regular acts of piety towards the god.

On the other hand, as was the case with the manumission inscriptions, *καταγραφαί* usually have clauses of protection. The most usual risk is that some people might be tempted to dispute (*ἐπεγκαλεῖν*) the new status of a registered person. In this eventuality, the protester may have to pay fines to the god, to the city of Motella or to the Roman fiscus.⁴⁴ Protections against being brought back to slavery are also attested: in some cases, challenging the new status implies bringing back the individual to slavery.⁴⁵ It is important to highlight this point for our purpose: in the sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos as well as in the manumission inscriptions of the Hellenistic period, an external authority has a role to play to validate and protect a new status.

2.2 *Leucopetra*

Hellenistic Macedonia has not transmitted any large corpora of temple manumissions comparable to the ones from Boeotia and Buthrotum. However, some inscriptions show that similar manumissions performed through temple dedication were in use since the second century B.C.⁴⁶ Conversely, relevant documents are much more numerous in Imperial Macedonia, where, however, both the social framework and the practices of human consecrations are different from those shown by Hellenistic corpora.

The richest and more complex dossier comes from the sanctuary of the Mother of the Gods Autochthon of Leucopetra, situated about 13 km south from Beroea and active from the mid second to the early fourth century A.D.⁴⁷ Most inscriptions from

⁴² The dynamic of familial piety is patent in Akinci Öztürk and Tanriver (2008), no. 14: a *θρηπτός* goes through a *καταγραφή* on the altar of Artemis, which had been dedicated by the father of the author of the *καταγραφή*. For other examples of familial commemoration, see the entry of Akinci Öztürk and Tanriver's article in *EBGR 2008*, no. 1.

⁴³ An interesting case of someone qualified as *ιερός* in an honorific decree unfortunately had to be dismissed. First published in L. Robert, *Hellenica VI: Inscriptions de Lydie* (Limoges, 1948), 49–50, the inscription seemed to concern a certain Apellas the second Loukios, a *ιερός* who had been *δεκάπρωτος*, *στρατηγός* and *γραμματεὺς*. Robert subsequently assumed that the lacunary text was to be interpreted not as *ιερόν* but as *ιερόνομον*: see *BE 1973*, 413; L. and J. Robert, *La Carie: histoire et géographie historique avec le recueil des inscriptions antiques*, vol. 2: *Le plateau de Tabai et ses environs* (Paris, 1954), 295 n. 1, and *TAM 5.2.266*. Other inscriptions, however, show more clearly some *ιεροί*: see Robert (1948), 49–50.

⁴⁴ The recipients of these fines vary from one inscription to the other. Akinci Öztürk and Tanriver (2008), no. 3 mention these three recipients together.

⁴⁵ Riel (n. 34), no. 30 = Ritti et al. (2000), no. 29, lines 8–10: *μηδυνός ἔχοντος ἀν[θρ]ώπου ἔξουσίαν κατὰ τοῦ Ἀ[πο]λλ[ωνίου]*; Riel (n. 34), no. 32 = Ritti et al. (2000), no. 31, line 9: *ἐράψασθασι ὡς δούλης*. Akinci Öztürk and Tanriver (2008), no. 14, lines 7–9: *εἴ | τις δὲ ἐπενκαλέσει τοῦ Ζωσίμου ὡς εἰς δουλίαν ἀνθρώπου*.

⁴⁶ For cases of Hellenistic sacred manumissions from Macedonia, cf. *SEG 43.388* from Edessa: *Εὐρυόα Ἀριστοκλείδου ἀνατίθησιν τῆν αὐτῆς παιδίσικην Εὐτυχίδα, τὸ γένος Σύραν, Παρθένωι* (first half of the second century B.C.); *EAM 115* from Kelle (Eordaia): *ἔτους γ' [---] | στρατηγούνη[ος] Λ(ευκίου) Καλ[.]πορνίου Πείσω[νος] | Εὐδικος Ταυρίωνος | Βρυναῖος ἀφῆκεν ἔλειψθεραν Μέλισαν εὐχλῆν Ἡρακλῆ Κυναγίδα (57–55 B.C.)*. Cf. Hatzopoulos et al. (2000), 36, with reference at n. 6; M. Youni, 'Maîtres et esclaves en Macédoine hellénistique et romaine', in V.I. Anastasiadis and P.N. Doukellis (edd.), *Esclavage antique et discriminations socio-culturelles* (Bern, 2005), 183–95.

⁴⁷ For the topography of the area, see M.B. Hatzopoulos, 'Herodotos (8.137–8), the manumissions

Leucopetra differ from the stylized concision of other corpora, thus allowing a more detailed insight into the motivations – be they economic, religious, or both – that led people to dedicate slaves to a god. The most interesting aspect of the dossier is that the traditional vocabulary concerning human consecrations to a god, which here shows no differences from other corpora except the absence of the term ἱερός, discloses a much larger variety of motivations and social conditions related to the consecration.⁴⁸

A few documents from Leucopetra strikingly challenge the assumed connection between the dedication of human beings to a god and slave manumission. The sanctuary of the Mother of the Gods Autochthon operated in the surroundings of Roman Beroea like a pawnshop lending money in exchange for the temporary handing-over of slave property.⁴⁹ This procedure is clearly recognizable where things have gone wrong and the insolvent debtor lost his property over the slave.⁵⁰ We may assume that other cases of temple-loans have left no traces precisely because the borrower could honour his debt. Here the patent economic nature of the texts suggests that we are dealing with the reports of contracts, for which the dedication pattern provides suitable formal warranty. The absence of the verb ἀνατίθημι in these cases is perhaps of further support to this interpretation. *I.Leucopetra* 69 (A.D. 219) suggests that the operation of borrowing money from the sanctuary could be repeated more than once: the borrower, Klaudia Euboule, keeps up with the habits of her presumably deceased husband by handing over to the sanctuary the property rights of her slaves, who had already been pawned (and returned) more than once before.⁵¹ The traditional procedure of consecrating slaves to a god could therefore be reused to enact a (temporary or definitive) change of property of the dedicated good, namely the slave: this exchange can hardly be seen as an act of emancipation. However, ad hoc clauses could better define the status of the consecrated persons and actually improve their life conditions by reducing their duties in terms of time (usually the former owner's lifetime when the παραμονή clause is expressed) and occasions (service requested only on sacred days).⁵² Both the actor and the recipient of the consecration got advantages from this practice: consecrations

from Leukopetra, and the topography of the middle Haliakmon valley', in P. Derow and R. Parker (edd.), *Herodotus and His World: Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest* (Oxford, 2003), 203–18.

⁴⁸ Conversely, ἱερόδουλοι are present: cf. Section 3.

⁴⁹ See Ricl (n. 17) and (n. 40). For previous literature, see the references collected in Hatzopoulos et al. (2000), 33–5. The editors interpreted the inscriptions as a consistent corpus of slave manumissions, a view which has not met with general acceptance: see A. Chaniotis, 'From woman to woman: female voices and emotions in dedications to goddesses', in C. Prêtre (ed.), *Le donateur, l'offrande et la déesse: systèmes votifs dans les sanctuaires de déesses du monde grec* (Liège, 2009), 51–68, at 55.

⁵⁰ Cf. *I.Leucopetra* 134 (uncertain date).

⁵¹ *I.Leucopetra* 69, lines 3–12: σώματα ἃ ἡγόρασα παρὰ Αὐτρηλίου Φορτουνάτου καὶ Κλαυδίου | Σωτήρος, ὧν καὶ τὰς ὀνιάς παρέσχον σοι πολλάκις ἐπὶ εὐχαριστηρίαις οἷς παρέσχου | τῷ ἀνδρὶ μου Κλ(αυδίῳ) Ἀγάθωνι, ὅς καὶ | ἔδωκά σοι, χαρίζομαι σοι διὰ | ταύτης μου τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, ὧν | σωμάτων καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα ὑπέγραψα κτλ.

⁵² A particularly expressive case in this sense is provided by *I.Leucopetra* 12, lines 13–17: προσμενοῦσι | δέ μοι τὸν ζῶ χρόνον ὑπηρετοῦντα τῇ θεῷ | τὰς ἐθίμους ἡμέρας, μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐμὴν τε|λευτήν μηδένα εἶνε κύριον ἢ τὴν θεὸν μόνη|ν. Hatzopoulos et al. (2000), 90 state that 'apparemment Phlauios Eutrápelos avait emprunté 1.000 deniers pour acheter Phélix. Ne pouvant rembourser cette dette, il passa un accord avec le sanctuaire de la Mère des Dieux, selon lequel ce dernier assumait l'obligation du remboursement, recevant en contrepartie la totalité des biens de Phlauios Eutrápelos.' However, Ricl (n. 17), 147 proposes that the letters ICA at line 11 'should be read as ἴσα and understood as referring to χειρόγραφα τ[ὰ] | ὑπάρχοντα immediately preceding it. The donor is simply stating that he is depositing with the Goddess the number of documents equivalent to the number of the donated slaves ... I would then put a full stop or a semi-colon after ἴσα and

provided the sanctuary with new labour force whereas the παραμονή would allow the former master to enjoy the service of the consecrated person who had been under his property.

The ambiguous place of these transactions, between religious procedures and economic motivations, is paralleled by *I.Beroea* 49 (A.D. 181), where the record of the donation (line 4, δῶρον ἔδωκεν) of a slave to Artemis Agrotera by a woman, Ariagne, is followed by a letter from her brothers: they grant Ariagne their consent to dispose of her slaves for the present purpose of freeing them (lines 15–17: νῦν βουλομένης σοῦ τινὰς τῶν ἰδίων θρεπταρίων ἐλευθερῶσαι) and for possible future decisions to pawn them (at the sanctuary) as collateral to borrow money, so that she will be able to ensure herself a more comfortable life in her old age (lines 21–4: ἐὼν | καὶ ὡς πρεσβυτέρα γυνὴ βούλει δαίνισσασθαι καὶ ὑποθέσθαι τι τῶν σῶν ἰς | τὴν διεξαγωγὴν τοῦ γήρωσ). It is tempting to generalize from the data of this text and to infer that when the dedication of a slave is presented as a δῶρον to the divinity we are dealing with true manumissions (cf. line 17, ἐλευθερῶσαι), perhaps granting the slave the status of (ἀπ)ελεύθερος of the goddess, whereas cases of economic transactions with the sanctuary would involve the status of ἱερόδουλος and the compulsory task to serve the sanctuary on the festival days.

If some texts clearly imply an economic background for the consecration, others shed light on religious motivations. These vary from accomplished vows to confessions, from acts of thanksgiving to requests for the goddess' intervention. Consecrating a human being belongs here in the larger domain of offerings meant to establish a communication with the divine. As we will see below, a properly religious motivation can be detected in the cases of ἱερόδουλοι consecrating children to the goddess of Leucopetra and even purchasing newborns for this purpose. In other texts, the donor asks for or responds to divine help. In *I.Leucopetra* 41 a praetorian soldier consecrates gilded greaves to the goddess (lines 7–8: ἀνέθηκα δῶρον) and offers her (line 11, ἔχαρισάμην) a slave together with her two children. The dedicated objects seem to point at a thanksgiving offering, perhaps in return for safety during the military office. In any case, as already highlighted in Phrygia, the verb ἀνατίθημι is only used for votive objects whereas it is avoided, one could say on purpose, for human beings.⁵³

Other texts request the goddess' intervention by dedicating to her something that belongs to the donor but has been lost or is in danger. A man dedicates a lost slave to the Mother of the Gods, so that the goddess will look for her.⁵⁴ As Angelos Chaniotis pointed out, this text belongs to the widely spread type concerning 'the cession of lost or stolen property to a god or goddess making the deity a victim of the theft and forcing it to punish the culprit'.⁵⁵ Sometimes the dedication is meant to satisfy a god's request, which, if not fulfilled, may result in divine anger and punishment.⁵⁶

treat the following phrase as a separate clause dealing with the donor's debt of 1,000 denarii and its repayment by the Goddess.'

⁵³ On the other hand, while χαρίζομαι hints at an action pleasing the deity, its appearance in texts of the Leucopetra corpus with economic relevance suggests that one should not interpret this verb as necessarily indicating a gift to the goddess.

⁵⁴ *I.Leucopetra* 53, lines 2–6: ἔχαρισάμην κοράσιον ὀνόματι Συνφέρουσαν Μητρὶ Θεῶν Αὐτόχθονι τὸ κὲ ἀπούλ < ὠλ > ον | τὸ αὐτὴ ἀτῆ ἀναζητήσις.

⁵⁵ Chaniotis (n. 49), 57.

⁵⁶ Cf. the formula κατ' ἐπταγὴν (*I.Leucopetra* 9?, 34, 101, 151, 154, 164); κατὰ | κέλευσιν τῆς Θεοῦ (*I.Leucopetra* 131; cf. *JG* 10.2.2, line 34 = A.N. Oikonomides, *Sylloge inscriptionum Graecarum et Latinarum Macedoniae*, 2 vols. (Chicago, 1980²) = *SEG* 49.838; from Lynkestis, Vašarejca); see

This case is exemplified by *I.Leucopetra* 35 and 65, where the donors affirm that the consecration has occurred at the end of a period of persecution by the Mother of the Gods. Again, a fitting parallel is provided by propitiatory dedications known from contemporary Lydia and Phrygia.⁵⁷ Most remarkable is the verb ἀποδίδομεν used in no. 65, which represents the slave as something already belonging to the goddess. In consideration of this and of a similar expression in the fragmentary *I.Leucopetra* 9 (ἀποκατέστησα τῇ θεῷ), one can suggest that the property attributed to the goddess combined once more a religious and an economic aspect: the goddess' persecution could have originated from an illegitimate claim over the possession of the slave, an act which, as seen above, would result in an infraction of the clause recognizing the goddess as the only master of the dedicated slave.

2.3 An unusual case: the consecration of Paramonos in Leucopetra

One document from Leucopetra (A.D. 203/4) can be considered as a limit case regarding the interaction between the religious motivations of consecrations and the social status that they bestow: it is the sole inscription from Beroea concerning the dedication of a freeborn and the unique extant document where a person consecrated on the initiative of another must express his consent for the achievement of the consecration. A certain Ladoma, daughter of Amyntas, promised to consecrate her son Paramonos when her child had fallen seriously ill in his childhood.⁵⁸ The verb χαρίζομαι used to indicate Ladoma's action fits the votive reason for her dedication. The exceptional character of this consecration emerges from the active role that Paramonos is called to play in the accomplishment of the dedication: he is said to have been present and to have agreed with the promise of his mother (παρῆν καὶ συνεπέδωκεν αὐτόν). Apart from the original status of Paramonos, however, nothing exceptional can be detected in the expression defining his new condition as a consecrated person: ὑπ<α>ρετοῦντα μηδενὶ ἐτέρῳ | ἢ μόνῃ τῇ θεῷ is a common clause of exclusivity in the corpus of Leucopetra. The adopted formula seems therefore to suggest that by being consecrated to the Mother of the Gods, Paramonos acquires an ambiguous status similar to the slaves dedicated to the goddess.⁵⁹

Faced with this unusual case, an approach exclusively internal to the text would fall short of a satisfactory explanation. The editors of the Leucopetra corpus aptly observe that we need to reconsider the existing gap between slaves, free and freed persons in the

also *I.Leucopetra* 78, where the dedication is the consequence of the goddess' order (lines 4–6: καθὼ [ς] ἐκέλευ[σας] ἀγοράσσε με σω[μ]άτι[α] accepted by the donor (lines 10–11: ὀμολογ[ῶ]).

⁵⁷ See A. Chaniotis, 'Ritual performances of divine justice: the epigraphy of confession, astonishment, and exaltation in Roman Asia Minor', in H.M. Cotton, R.G. Hoyland and J.J. Price (edd.), *From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East* (Cambridge, 2009), 115–53; cf. also Chaniotis (n. 49), 57–8, and *SEG* 50.597, p. 188.

⁵⁸ *I.Leucopetra* 47: ἔτους· εἰς Σεβαστοῦ | τοῦ καὶ αντ, Λαδόμα | Ἀμύντου ἐχαρίσαστο | τῇ θεῷ ὑόν ἴδιον ὀνόμα[ι] Π<α>ράμονον, ὃν ὑπέσχετο ὄντα ἐν νόσῳ, ὑπ<α>ρετοῦντα μηδενὶ ἐτέρῳ | ἢ μόνῃ τῇ θεῷ. ὁ προγεγραμμένος Παράμονος | παρῆν καὶ συνεπέδωκεν αὐτόν· | ἱερομένης Αἰλίας | Αὐρηλιανῆς, ἐπιμελουμένης Αὐρηλίας | Σαπφούς. Beside the editors' commentary, see for this text A.B. Tatakis, *Ancient Beroea: Prosopography and Society* (Athens, 1988), 487–8; M. Ricl, 'Legal and social status of *threptoi* and related categories in narrative and documentary sources', in H. M. Cotton, R. G. Hoyland, J. J. Price and D. J. Wasserstein (edd.), *From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East* (Cambridge, 2009), 93–114, at 109; Chaniotis (n. 49), 60.

⁵⁹ According to the editors, 'Paramonos demeure, bien entendu, libre': Hatzopoulos et al. (2000), 117. One must recall, however, that according to them, all the consecrations are manumissions.

provincial environment of Beroea.⁶⁰ Moreover, in this article we have argued that a short practical distance existed between different statuses, in relation to property and to other rights. If we assume that a case like Paramonos' implied a status-change, the only possible problem would concern the eligibility of the consecrated person for Roman citizenship. At least at the moment of the consecration, however, such issue was out of question for Paramonos, whose mother could not display a *nomen* stating her citizenship. In any case, reasons of a religious order like the accomplishment of a vow could be strong enough to submit the future of a person to a possibly life-long service to a sanctuary. This presumably happened in as much as the dedication would not have condemned the involved person to a worsening of his life conditions: Paramonos would probably not be requested to do much more than helping the temple staff on the occasion of the local festivals. Also, we are not told whether Paramonos would dwell in a facility of the sanctuary or remain in her mother's house: no certainty is possible, yet on the grounds of the cases discussed above we would argue that the second possibility was more likely. Similarly, the need for Paramonos' explicit consent for the accomplishment of the dedication may well have responded to a formal change of status; however, one can suggest that the consent was rather required because, as a freeborn, Paramonos was fully responsible for his own body and life and, as a consequence, he was expected to dedicate himself in order to accomplish his mother's promise. Finally, one cannot rule out the possibility that, in the provincial setting of Beroea, having been saved by a miracle of the Mother of the Gods could even give Paramonos some social prestige compensating for his service to the goddess.

All in all, Paramonos' case proves that the procedure of consecrating human beings to a god responded to a variety of purposes. Even if a diachronic investigation of the Hellenistic and Roman evidence shows that consecration commonly accompanied slave manumissions, the same practice would equally fit other forms of communication between the human community and the gods: prayers, requests for divine help and vows notably fall within this domain.

3. ΙΕΡΟΔΟΥΛΟΙ

3.1. *Hellenistic period*

A few references to *ιερόδουλοι* in Strabo provide a helpful starting point to warn against any generalization concerning the status and occupations of these figures.⁶¹ Strabo uses the term *ιερόδουλοι* to define women that he assumes to have been destined in the past to temple prostitution in Eryx (6.2.6; cf. Diod. Sic. 4.83) and Corinth (8.6.20). Modern scholarship has rightly criticized Strabo's assumption, based on a misunderstanding of the actual situation in Corinth.⁶² For our present purpose, however, it is interesting to

⁶⁰ Hatzopoulos et al. (2000), 37–8.

⁶¹ On Hellenistic *ιεροδουλία*, see W. Otto, *Beiträge zur Hierodulie im hellenistischen Ägypten* (Munich, 1949); L. Delekat, *Katoche, Hierodulie und Adoptionsfreilassung* (Munich, 1964); P. Debord, 'L'esclavage sacré: état de la question', in *Actes du colloque 1971 sur l'esclavage* (Paris, 1972), 135–50; R. Scholl, 'Ιερόδουλος im griechisch-römischen Ägypten', *Historia* 34 (1985), 466–92; B. Legras, *Les reclus grecs du Sarapieion de Memphis: une enquête sur l'hellénisme égyptien* (Leuven, 2011), 13–21, 162–5.

⁶² See Budin (n. 41), Chapter 7.

note that in the passage on Corinth, Strabo refers to *ιερόδουλοι* as possession of the sanctuary and interprets their status as the consequence of dedication by attenders of the sanctuary.⁶³ Strabo also identifies as *ιερόδουλοι* some figures associated with ecstatic prophecy and human sacrifice near Iberia, in Caucasian Albania (11.4.7). Finally, the historian mentions temple-slaves as being part of the large estate owned by sanctuaries of the Anatolian moon god Men (12.3.31; 12.8.14).⁶⁴ It is clear that in both cases the term *ιερόδουλοι* does not correspond to any Greek practice and simply provides lexical approximation to eastern costumes.

An interesting combination of Anatolian temple tradition and Hellenistic formulae of slave consecrations can be detected in the dossier of King Antiochos I Theos of Commagene (mid first century B.C.). In the relevant texts, whose number has considerably augmented after the archaeological rescue campaign of 2000,⁶⁵ the act of causing a person to become a *ιερόδουλος* stems from a consecration by the king to the gods and to his own cult, an act represented as responding to divine will (cf. *SEG* 53.1776, line 18: ἀφιέρωσα; *IGLS* 1.1, lines 174–7: ἐγὼ θε|οῖς τε καὶ τιμαῖς ἐμαῖς κατὰ δαμιό|νιον βούλη|σιν ἀνέθηκα). Whereas the verbs of consecration depict this act in a manner similar to the Hellenistic corpora of temple manumission, the condition of the consecrated persons appears quite different: as *ιερόδουλοι*, they will contribute to services in the sanctuary under the supervision of priests. Their status as property of the gods is made clear by clauses against the cancellation of the newly acquired status. These show, once again, only superficial similarities with Hellenistic temple manumissions: the formula μήτε αὐτοῖ καταδουλώσασθαι (cf. *IGLS* 1.1, line 182) cannot be appealed to as a sign that the consecrated persons are free, but simply that nobody will be allowed to take them and their descendants as his own slaves, thus alienating them from the sanctuary. A similar formula is attested in Roman Pisidia by *SEG* 19.827 (second century A.D.), a private dedication whose vocabulary (lines 8–11: ἐποίησιν ἱεροδούλην, ὅσ|τε ὑπηρετεῖν αὐτὴν τοῖς | θεοῖς) bears again no trace of manumission.⁶⁶

The dossier from Hellenistic and Roman Egypt further warns one against regarding the relationship between the consecration of a person to a deity and the change of status implied thereby as a homogeneous phenomenon.⁶⁷ Greek papyri from the mid-late third century B.C. to the Roman period show Egyptian *ιερόδουλοι* – most probably of free status because they are mentioned with their patronymic – serving local gods through a variety of temple activities, among which breeding and burying sacred animals is

⁶³ Strabo 8.6.20: 'The temple of Aphrodite was so rich that it owned more than a thousand temple-slaves (*ιεροδούλους*) serving as courtesans (*ἐταίρας*), whom both men and women dedicated (*ἀνετίθεσαν*) to the goddess.'

⁶⁴ On the cult of this god, which was typical of Southern Phrygia and central Pisidia, cf. G. Labarre, 'Les origines et la diffusion du culte de Men', in H. Bru, F. Kirbihler and S. Lebreton (edd.), *L'Asie mineure dans l'Antiquité: échanges, populations et territoires* (Rennes, 2009), 389–414.

⁶⁵ *IGLS* 1.1 (= *OGIS* 383; Nemrud Dağ); *IGLS* 1.47 (with corrigenda in *IGLS* 3, p. 681; Arsameia); *SEG* 12.554 (revised text of *IGLS* 1.51; Selik, near Samosata); *SEG* 53.1763, *And* (Ancoz); *SEG* 53.1770–1 (Zeugma); *SEG* 53.1776 (revised text of *SEG* 26.1623; Sofraz Köy). See discussion in H. Waldmann, *Die kommagenische Kultreformen unter König Mithridates I: Kallinikos und sein Sohn Antiochos I* (Leiden 1973); C. Crowther and M. Facella, 'New evidence for the ruler cult of Antiochus of Commagene from Zeugma', in G. Heedeman and E. Winter (edd.), *Neue Forschungen zur Religionsgeschichte Kleinasiens* (Bonn, 2003), 41–80; J. Wagner and G. Petzl, 'Relief- und Inschriftfragmente des kommagenischen Herreschkultes aus Ancoz', in G. Heedeman and E. Winter (edd.), *Neue Forschungen zur Religionsgeschichte Kleinasiens* (Bonn, 2003), 85–96.

⁶⁶ Cf. Scholl (n. 61), 468.

⁶⁷ See on this purpose the invitations to contextualizing *ιεροδουλία* within specific space and time contexts by Scholl (n. 61), 466, 468, 487.

attested.⁶⁸ Although no Greek document explains how one could become *ιερόδουλος* in Egyptian sanctuaries, it is probable, though not proved, that this Greek term corresponds to the Egyptian denomination *b3k*, ‘servant’ of a god, by which a rich corpus of Demotic self-dedications describe a person consecrating himself, occasionally together with his offspring, to a god.⁶⁹ While the young age of most consecrated persons, the extendibility of the contract to their descendants, and the protection asked to the god in exchange for sacred service, echo Greek human consecrations of the Hellenistic and Imperial periods, other details, such as the presence of a fixed sum to pay to the sanctuary for protection, warn against generalizations which are too clear-cut – all the more so in the light of contemporary Greek and Demotic evidence on temple *κατοχή*, which implied a period of seclusion within the precinct of a sanctuary, and whose existence suggests that in Greco-Roman Egypt several possible ways co-existed for people to be associated with sanctuaries and to provide their voluntary or forced service in exchange for protection.⁷⁰

3.2 Imperial period

The survey of Hellenistic documents concerning *ιεροδουλία* has shown how fluid the use of this term and the status implied thereby can be. We turn now to Imperial documentation from Macedonia and Phrygia to discuss what the status of *ιερόδουλοι* there was and what kind of religious and juridical proceeding would imply the acquisition of this condition. We first approach the dossier from Leucopetra, where six documents show *ιερόδουλοι* of the Mother of the Gods as the authors of dedications of slaves.⁷¹ This proves first of all that, in the Berean society of the Imperial period, *ιερόδουλοι* could acquire properties and dispose of them in a manner not different from free persons. Dedications where *ιερόδουλοι* act as donors show a strong religious intention since they often concern the purchase of newborns or small children, most probably with the purpose of dedicating them to the goddess. In addition, when they perform a human dedication, *ιερόδουλοι* often stress a personal tie with both the goddess and

⁶⁸ On whether *ιερόδουλοι* in Egyptian sanctuaries were charged with proper cult offices or simple administration (which seems more plausible), see the discussion by Scholl (n. 61) including previous bibliography.

⁶⁹ Scholl (n. 61), 488–92; M. Depaw, *A Companion to Demotic Studies* (Brussels, 1997), 136–7; Legras (n. 61), esp. 13–21, 162–5.

⁷⁰ On *κατοχή* in Ptolemaic Egypt, see Legras (n. 61). On the administrative charges of the *κάτοχος* Ptolemy of Glaucias in the Memphite Serapeum, in the mid second century B.C., see Legras (n. 61), esp. 180–2.

⁷¹ *I. Leucopetra* 39 mentions the dedication (line 4: ἀνατίθημι τῇ θεῷ) of a three-year-old child by the woman who bought her at her birth and brought her up, probably for the purpose of the consecration, as the name Theodote may suggest (cf. Chaniotis (n. 49), 59). No. 109 has a man offer a two-year-old baby he has brought up (lines 5–6: δωροῦμαι τῇ δεσποίνῃ | μου θρεπτόν μου). In no. 112 a woman offers a child (lines 1–2: δωροῦμε παῖδα τῇ δεσποίνῃ μου | [Παραμό]νον, <ὄν> ἀνέθη[κα]). The female donor of no. 113 offers a girl she has brought up so that she shall stay at the sanctuary on the customary festival days (lines 12–16: δωροῦμε | τῇ δεσποίνῃ μου θρεπτήν | μου Ἀλεξάνδραν, ἐτόν κε’ | προσμενούσης τῇ θεῷ τὰς ἐ<θί>μοις εὐρτάς). No. 117 has a lady, Theodote (chronology makes an identification with the homonymous consecrated baby of no. 39 impossible), offer a servant and her son (line 3: χαρίζομε), adding the *παραμονή* clause valid till her death (line 5: ἐφ’ ᾧ προσμίνωσίν μοι παρὰ τὸν τῆς ζοῆς χρόνον); no. 151 is of different nature, since here the offering of a child to the goddess is represented as a restitution ordered by Zeus Hypsistos (perhaps in a dream?), (lines 2–6: κατ’ ἐπιταγῆν Θεοῦ Ὑψίστου, | μετὰ υἱοῦ Παραμόνου τὴν ἐπιτ[αγ]ήν | ἀπέδωκεν τῷ θεῷ).

the consecrated person, often a *θρεπτός*, that is a child brought up by the future donor.⁷² With the exception of no. 117, none of the extant texts involves the *παρραμονή* clause keeping the dedicated slave attached to the donor during the latter's lifetime. If *I.Leucopetra* 117 did not exist, one could infer from the absence of the *παρραμονή* that *ιερόδουλοι* lived in temple facilities and consequently did not have a private place where their former slaves could be requested to dwell after the consecration. On the contrary, this text further equates the condition of *ιερόδουλοι* to that of free donors: they could enjoy a high degree of independency and a status close, in many respects, to that of free people.⁷³ On the other hand, *I.Leucopetra* 113 makes it explicit that the person offered to the goddess shall dwell at the sanctuary on the occasion of the customary festival days: while – here as almost always in Macedonian texts – the new status of the offered person is not expressed through a distinctive word, it is likely that this request fits the status of the *ιερόδουλοι* in general, who consequently would not be forced to stay at the sanctuary except on the days when they had to serve the goddess.⁷⁴

Besides the *Leucopetra* corpus, other contemporary documents from Macedonia show *ιερόδουλοι* dedicating human beings to a god.⁷⁵ An inscription from Heraklea Lynkestis (Suvodol, Republic of Macedonia), dated A.D. 286, has a *ιερόδουλος* of the goddess *Pasikrata* consecrate (*ἀνέ|θηκα*) to the goddess his child, a slave himself, purchased/ransomed by his father with the help of the goddess.⁷⁶ It is tempting to follow M. Riel in proposing that the father ransomed his son from a private owner with the economic help of the sanctuary and that, as a consequence, his son became a *ιερόδουλος* too, a condition that could imply a better quality of life and social status. The final clause *εἰς τὴν χρῆσιν αὐτοῦ* is particularly difficult to interpret. The possibility that it refers to a *παρραμονή* clause, where *αὐτοῦ* is the dedicating father, seems syntactically awkward and perhaps in contradiction with the father's attempt to ransom his son. We would rather opt for an interpretation of *αὐτοῦ* as an objective genitive: the goddess will take advantage of the consecrated person's service, that is the ransomed son will repay his freedom by being a servant of the goddess.

⁷² On *θρεπτοί*, see especially, for Phrygia, M. Riel 'Legal and social status of *threptoi* and related categories in the Greek world: the case of Phrygia in the Roman period', in *Νεοελληνική κληρονομία στους Σέρβους* 1 (Belgrade, 2005), 145–66; and, for Lydia, M. Riel, 'Legal and social status of *threptoi* and related categories in the Greek world: the case of Lydia in the Roman period', in *Sobria ebrietas: mélanges offerts à Miron Flašar*. Recueil de travaux de la Faculté de philosophie, série A: Les sciences historiques 20 (Belgrade, 2006), 293–321; Riel (n. 58) for a comprehensive survey.

⁷³ Hatzopoulos et al. (2000), 60 maintain that being a *ιερόδουλος* 'équivalait presque à un affranchissement'. As seen above, this statement can be accepted in many cases but there are acts in *Leucopetra* where a passage of the slave's property from a private owner to the sanctuary is a more suitable interpretation than manumission.

⁷⁴ Two texts contribute to the understanding of the tasks entrusted upon these low-rank cult personnel: the *ιερόδουλος* donor of *I.Leucopetra* 39 is a *λυχνιάπτρια*; *I.Leucopetra* 131 informs us that the offered person will serve as *αὐλητής*. On high and low-rank personnel of the cult in Macedonian, Phrygian and Lydian sanctuaries of the Imperial period, see Riel (n. 40).

⁷⁵ Dedications of human beings to local sanctuaries in Imperial Macedonia are attested from a few scattered locations beside the two major corpora, from *Leucopetra* and from the city of Beroea (*I.Beroea* 48–56: recipient gods are Artemis Agrotera, Artemis Eileithyia, Syria Parthenos, Dionysos Agrios (?) *Erikryptos/Kryptos Pseudanor*).

⁷⁶ *IG* 10.2.2.18c: *ἔτους δ'λυ' μηνός Δίου· ἐ|γὼ Διονυος [sic] ιερόδουλος) | θεᾶς Πασικράτας ἀνέ|θηκα υἱόν μου κέ δοῦ|λον ὀνόματι Φίλητον, | [ὄ]ν ἠγόρασα μετὰ κέ τῆς <θεᾶς> | εἰς τὴν χρῆσιν αὐτοῦ | ὡς τὸν ζωῆς χρόνον. See commentary in Riel, *ŽAnt* 32 (1982), 165–70, for the interpretation of *υἱόν μου κέ δοῦ|λον* being one person (cf. *SEG* 32.636), rather than an unnamed consecrated son accompanied by a manumitted slave.*

A puzzling text from the village of Episkopi (near Scydra in Bottiea) refers to the status acquired by the dedicated person in the accusative, within the unusual formula ἀφίημι⁷⁷ ... ιερόδουλον.⁷⁸ The dedication combines the typical verb of manumissions with a term formally implying slave-status. This could give the impression that, at least in Bottiea during the Imperial period, a formal act of manumission in a sanctuary did not grant the status of freedman. However, it seems more likely that becoming ιερόδουλος was something different from becoming (or remaining) a slave. If our interpretation of the inscription from Lynkestis is correct, both that text and this one could indicate a similar procedure implying a change of status, which would probably involve an improvement in the consecrated person's lifestyle.

It is interesting to compare this inscription with another one from the same area (Arseni; A.D. 232?), concerning the consecration of the eighteen-year-old slave Onesima to Artemis Gazoria. The girl will become δούλη τῆς θεᾶς, yet the text makes it explicit that Onesima will be free as regards matters outside the sanctuary.⁷⁹ The inscription seems therefore to foster the assumption that in Imperial Macedonia the special relationship with a sanctuary, which was bestowed upon slaves through dedication, implied an improvement of the slaves' life conditions and was in fact an intermediate position between slavery and freedom: for this reason, formal acts of manumissions could at the same time grant secular freedom and destine a person to a possibly life-long service in a sanctuary.⁸⁰

Another contemporary text warrants attention. If becoming (ἀπ)ελευθέρος marks the passage from slavery to freedom, an inscription from Kozani (north-west Macedonia) possibly adds further nuances to the status achieved through temple manumission (EAM 59). The source, which is badly preserved, collects fragments of three different acts, the last of which dates to A.D. 108. Apparently the person mentioned in the second text is attached to the sanctuary of a local hero; as a consequence she is ἐλευθέρα ναοῦ, a free(d?) person of the temple.⁸¹ A possible parallel case is *I.Leucopetra* 43, where the author of the offering, Crispina, is an ἀπελευθέρα of the goddess.⁸² The clauses

⁷⁷ For cases where ιερόδουλος appears in accusative, thus expressing the status acquired by the person through consecration, see the texts mentioned above from Commagene and Pisidia, in Section 3.1. In the inscription from Episkopi, however, the use of the verb ἀφίημι, which is usually related to manumissions, makes the interpretation of the formula much more complicated.

⁷⁸ SEG 2.396; Roman period: [Αὐ]ρηλία Φιλίππα [ἡ] | [π]ρὶν Εὐροδικῆς ἀφίημι παιδίσκην ὀ νόματι Ἀριάγνην | θεᾶ Ἀρτέμιδι Γαζωρίᾳ ιερόδουλον το[---]ΗΜ ΩΥΡΟ[---]. Cf. Scholl (n. 61), 468.

⁷⁹ A. Delacoulonche, 'Mémoire sur le berceau de la puissance macédonienne des bords de l'Haliacmon et ceux de l'Axius', *Archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires* 8 (1859), 67–288, no. 29; cf. Hatzopoulos (1987), 410–11: ἔτους CΓΕC [γξσ'(?)] Σεβαστοῦ, | μηνός Ὑπερβερεταίου λ' | Οὐλίπια Εὐπορία καὶ Αὐρήλιος Διονύσιος ἤξι|ασαν οἱ θρέψαντες καλῶς δουλευθέντες ὑπὸ | θρεπταρίου εἰδίου ὀνόματι Ὀνησίμαν περι ἔτη ιη' ἀνατιθή|μειν θεᾶ Ἀρτέμιδι Γαζωρίᾳ ταύτη|ν | εἶν<α> δούλην τῆς θεᾶς πρὸς τ[ἄ] | ἐκτὸς ἐλευθέραν, μέχρ[ι –].

⁸⁰ A good practical synthesis of the status of ιερόδουλοι and δούλοι of a god is given by Ricl (n. 40), 90: 'they legally became slaves of divinities protected by their divine patrons; yet with respect to the public authorities and private individuals they were considered personally free. They had property and personal rights, as well as legal capacity, but not complete freedom of movement or freedom to change their status.' A different interpretation of being δούλος of a god is proposed by Scholl (n. 61), 487, who thinks that the formula could simply point at the piety and devotion of a person towards a god. This reading, however, seems to fit better with cases where a person refers to himself as a servant of the god rather than with those where this definition is the effect of an act of consecration.

⁸¹ EAM 59b, lines 3–7: προσμ[ε]νεῖ τῷ ἥρω | καὶ εἶναι ἐλευθέραν ναοῦ etc. Cf. EAM 59a, line 2.

⁸² *I.Leucopetra* 43: ἔτους ζκσ' Σεβ<α>στοῦ τοῦ | καὶ γμτ', εἰρωμένης | Αἰλίας Μητρῶς κὲ | ἐπιμελουμένου Αὐρηλίου Ἀσκληπιάδου | Κρισπίνα Μητρῶς | Θεῶν ἀπελευθέρα | ἐχαριστήσασθαι Μητρὶ Θεῶν Αὐτόχοιτι δούλην ὀνόματι Ἐλπιδιαν π<ρ>ο|<σ>μένουςαν τὰς ἐθίμους ἡμέρας,

accompanying the consecration do not differ from the common formulae of the corpus: the dedicated person is required to dwell in the sanctuary for the customary days whereas she remains in the master's house for the rest of the time, until Crispina's death.

It is hard to understand what difference existed between being the sacred δούλος of a god – yet considered free outside the sanctuary – and being attached to a sanctuary as a free(d) person. Ricl has collected the scanty parallel cases of people mentioned as freedmen of a god or of a sanctuary in Greek and Latin sources.⁸³ They are only eight and this exiguity proves that such a definition was quite infrequent. Similarly, the kind of social path to which it refers is for the largest part obscure. By reacting against the opinion of the editors of the Leucopetra corpus, who considered ιερόδουλος and (ἀπ)ελεύθερος θεοῦ as interchangeable variants respectively stressing the viewpoint of the sanctuary and of the former owner,⁸⁴ Chaniotis first stressed that 'one should also consider the possibility that the donated slaves could at some later point be released from service in the sanctuary, that is, become ἀπελεύθεροι of the goddess'.⁸⁵ M. Ricl developed this hypothesis by proposing a sequence of status changes that can be summarized in the following scheme:

- A: (1) δούλος → consecration implying duties towards the god → (2) ιερόδουλος → following exemption from these duties → (3) (ἀπ)ελεύθερος θεοῦ
 B: (1) δούλος → consecration without duties towards the god → (2) ἀπελεύθερος

In Marijana Ricl's words, then, 'Ἀπελεύθεροι Θεᾶς can be viewed as (ιερό)δουλοι who owed this status to their consecration by the original masters ... and who were subsequently released by the Goddess from the obligations imposed on them at the moment of the consecration. Even if we take the obligation of staying in the sanctuary on all the "customary days" and serving the Goddess to be a life-long bond uniting the slave to the deity, it is at least conceivable that some (ιερό)δουλοι were granted exemption from this customary service (perhaps after the former master's death and in return for a payment to the sanctuary?), thus joining the ranks of ἀπελεύθεροι Θεᾶς and let free to worship their patroness without having the obligation to present themselves in the sanctuary on all the "customary days".'⁸⁶ This explanation is ingenious but cannot rely on any documentary evidence proving that stage A(3) was necessarily preceded by A(2). Moreover, we lack any knowledge of how this change could occur.⁸⁷ Finally, the rarity of the relevant formulae in ancient sources warns against inferring a high level of coherence for the procedures concerning temple manumission within such a large historical framework. As a consequence, Ricl's interpretation remains a likely hypothesis but one cannot rule out other explanations: it is also possible that, in Imperial Macedonia, definitions such as ιερόδουλος and (ἀπ)ελεύθερος τοῦ θεοῦ constituted, together with practical clauses like the παρομονή and the service on sacred days, a flexible system open to fluctuations from case to case. Be that as it may, sources allow us to

τὸν | δὲ | κατὰλοιπον | χρόνον | προ<σ>μ>ενί | ἐμοί | καὶ | Διονυσίῳ | τὸν | ζώομεν | χρόνον, | μετὰ | δὲ | τὴν | ἡμε|τέραν | τελευτήν | μηδένα | εἶνε | κυριώτερον | ἢ | τὴν | θεόν.

⁸³ Ricl (n. 40), 90–1 n. 88.

⁸⁴ Hatzopoulos et al. (2000), 111.

⁸⁵ SEG 50, p. 189.

⁸⁶ Ricl (n. 17), 142.

⁸⁷ Ricl (n. 17), 143 with n. 61 tentatively pointed to a second-century B.C. inscription from Lycian Oenoanda (SEG 27.932). In addition to coming from a very different context, however, the text is highly mutilated and the relevant passage is entirely in lacuna; for the uncertainty of the restoration, see L. Robert, *Bull. Épig.* 1978, 462.

conclude that, despite the formal distinction implied by the language used, little or hardly any practical difference with regard to status existed between a *ιερόδουλος* whose service was restricted to a sanctuary and a freedman who had to serve therein.

Tullia Ritti suggests a parallel in terms of freedom between the *ιερόδουλοι* from Macedonia and *ιεροί* of the sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos in Phrygia.⁸⁸ As far as the *ιερόδουλοι* from Asia Minor are concerned, it seems that it was also possible for them to take some initiatives and be responsible for cultic acts. For instance, two altars are dedicated by *ιερόδουλοι* respectively to Artemis Epekoos and Thea Hera Epekoos.⁸⁹ In another inscription, a priest honours a friend qualified as *συνιερόδουλος* with a gold-en crown: this suggests that someone could become a priest after being a *ιερόδουλος*, but nothing precludes him from being a *ιερόδουλος* at the same time as being a priest.⁹⁰ Besides, in a confession inscription from Lydia, *ιερόδουλοι* are mentioned as being the targets of an attack in a procession alongside images of gods.⁹¹ Both images of gods and *ιερόδουλοι* must have been the core of the procession, which suggests that, in some cultic contexts at least, these 'sacred slaves' were not negligible and had an active role to play.

4. BACK TO THE ΙΕΡΟΙ: A COMPARISON OF ΙΕΡΟΔΟΥΛΟΙ, ΙΕΡΟΙ AND ΙΕΡΟΙ ΠΑΙΔΕΣ

After adducing the relevant evidence and highlighting the features of each category of persons, it is necessary to make a brief comparison. A cautious postulate must be adopted: *ιερόδουλοι* and *ιεροί* should not be assimilated too hastily, since differences are evident on several levels. Riel has written that some *ιεροί* from Lydia and Phrygia 'were slaves and freeborn persons consecrated by their masters and blood relatives and transferred to gods by dedication. By virtue of this they legally became slaves of divinities.'⁹² We did not find any *ιερός* who had become slave of divinities, at least not at a legal level. If the vocabulary suggests devotion or servile service, it is at a symbolic level, as emphasized above. On the other hand, slaves could be consecrated to a deity and keep their servile status, which, as suggested by a passage from Strabo,⁹³ was a common practice: *ιερόδουλοι* seem to be placed at this level, with all the different possibilities that were implied in each case. It is probably no coincidence that, although the corpus of Darnezin displays plenty of cases in which people become *ιερός*, only one instance shows a man leaving his two female servants as *ιερόδουλοι* to Meter Oreia, in Lycia.⁹⁴ These two categories are therefore intrinsically different.

⁸⁸ Ritti et al. (2000), 51.

⁸⁹ G.H.R. Horsley, *The Greek and Latin Inscriptions in the Burdur Archaeological Museum* (London, 2007), nos. 20 and 50.

⁹⁰ TAM 5.1.483a, lines 15–17.

⁹¹ Herrmann and Malay (n. 8), no. 84. The *ἀφιδρύματα τῶν θεῶν* and *θεοί* are, in our opinion, images of the gods and not persons playing the role of gods. It could be that *ιερόδουλοι* actually were in charge of carrying the images of the gods. On *ἀφιδρύματα*, see V. Pirenne-Delforge, 'Des marmites pour un méchant petit hermès! ou comment consacrer une statue', in S. Estienne, D. Jaillard, N. Lubchansky and Cl. Pouzadoux (edd.), *Image et religion dans l'antiquité gréco-romaine: actes du colloque de Rome, 11–13 décembre 2003* (Naples, 2008), 109–10.

⁹² Riel (n. 40), 90. Riel is more careful in other passages. A similar confusion is evident in Bömer (n. 3), 151–2.

⁹³ Strabo (11.14.16) considers dedicating slaves to a god to be *οὐ θαυμαστόν*.

⁹⁴ Darnezin (1999), no. 198: *Κλοινιζόας (...)* 'Ερμαίου 'Ονοβ[ά]ρου Μνανδρασέως ἀπέλυσεν

A last category that will be discussed briefly here are the *ἱεροὶ παῖδες*. These are attested in inscriptions from different parts of the Greek world in the Hellenistic period.⁹⁵ The term suggests at first sight a connection with *ἱερόδουλοι*, as it is tempting to interpret *παῖς* as ‘slave’. Indeed, *ἱεροὶ παῖδες* seem to have benefited from a restricted freedom. In an inscription from the sanctuary of Asclepius in Pergamum (second century B.C.) the priest is to care for the good order of the sanctuary and be the master (*κυριεύειν*) of the *ἱεροὶ παῖδες*.⁹⁶ As indicated by the verb *κυριεύειν*, it seems likely that the priest was the legal *κύριος* of the *ἱεροὶ παῖδες*. In any case it clearly indicates a hierarchy between these different persons. An inscription from Samos (245/244 B.C.) forbids the *ἱεροὶ παῖδες* from taking part in commercial transactions in the surroundings of the sanctuary.⁹⁷ Interestingly, slaves are also mentioned in this same inscription (line 16: *παρὰ δούλου*), which shows that the *ἱεροὶ παῖδες* should not be assimilated to them. It is likely that the mentioned *δούλος* is a generic term for any slave external to the sanctuary, whereas the *ἱεροὶ παῖδες* are part of the internal personnel.

The action of the *ἱεροὶ παῖδες* apparently only fell within the organizational matters of a sanctuary. In Didyma, for instance (probably in the second century B.C.), the role of *ἱεροὶ παῖδες* is mentioned alongside mules in the description of building works, which is instructive of the low status that must have been shared by these *παῖδες*.⁹⁸ In a list of offerings from Delos (middle of the second century B.C.), a *ἱερός παῖς* called Stephanos is said to have brought back a lost amount of gold.⁹⁹ The verb for this action, *ἀναφέρω*, does not designate a cultic act, such as *ἀνατίθημι*, but merely an action related to the internal organization of the sanctuary. The absence of patronymic in the name may lead us to think that this Stephanos was of servile status, or a freedman. The mere fact that his name is mentioned, however, should also be taken into account, as he was worthy enough to be mentioned in spite of his low status.¹⁰⁰ To sum up, there seems to be less variety in the status of *ἱεροὶ παῖδες* than *ἱερόδουλοι*, but there is also much less evidence.

5. DISTINGUISHING SLAVE CONSECRATIONS FROM RITES OF PASSAGE

Tracing the possible evidence for archaic rites of passage in northern Greek societies (especially in Thessaly and Macedonia), Miltiades Hatzopoulos has proposed that the process enacting the acquisition of freedom by a slave through consecration in a sanctuary originated from ‘rites of segregation → integration’, as described by the famous model proposed by Arnold Van Gennep.¹⁰¹ The weakness of this explanation emerges

τῆι Μητρὶ Ὀρειᾷ ἱεροδούλας Ἀκιερούν καὶ Ἀπιονιθεῖν | τὰς ἑαυτοῦ παιδίσκας ... (‘Kloinozas [...] freed to Mater Oreia, as sacred slaves, his own servants Akieros and Apionitheids’). We disagree with Darmezis’s translation of *ἀπέλυσεν*, as we see no reason to translate it by ‘he abandoned’ rather than ‘he freed’.

⁹⁵ We will not discuss the *ἱερός παῖς* mentioned in the inscription of the Iobacchoi (*IG* 2².1368), which is a specific case.

⁹⁶ *IvP* 2.251, lines 24–6: ‘The priest shall take care of the good order in the sanctuary as seems good and right to him, having authority over the *hieroi paides* (*κυριεύοντα τῶν ἱερῶν παίδων*).’

⁹⁷ *IG* 12.6.169, line 38: *μη̄ ἐξουσία δὲ ἔστω τῶν ἱερῶν παίδων κατηλεῦειν*.

⁹⁸ A. Rehm, *Didyma*, vol. 2: *Die Inschriften* (Berlin, 1958), no. 40.

⁹⁹ *ID* 1409, line 107.

¹⁰⁰ See also *ID* 372: *μισθωτοῖς τοῖς θάψασι τὸν ἱερὸν παῖδα Χρήσιμον*.

¹⁰¹ Hatzopoulos et al. (2000), 30. The existence of such initiation rites in archaic Thessaly and Macedonia remains, however, far from being proved. The applicability of the formal pattern proposed

from the fact that the assumed equation between the status of slaves and young citizens going through initiatory rites is ultimately founded only on the fact that both enjoy, for different reasons and to a different extent, incomplete rights in comparison with adult citizens.¹⁰² Their rights are increased, remarkably again to a different extent, by passing through a ritualized change of status: respectively manumission and access to adult society. Allegedly, an equation between the status of free under-age people and slaves is somehow implied by a passage of the Hellenistic gymnasiarchal law of Beroea (*I. Beroea* 1B, lines 21–3), which allows the gymnasiarch to whip both disorderly boys and *paidotribai* who are not free, whereas the free ones will be punished with a fine.¹⁰³ Nevertheless, this kind of association is in fact hardly of any significance with regard to a religious domain: free-born children can receive corporal punishment simply because they have not yet become citizens, yet becoming adults changes their status in a way that has no analogy with manumission whatsoever. Another passage of the gymnasiarchal law (1B, lines 27–8) is more interesting for the present purpose as it informs us about the social classes that were prohibited from stripping off to exercise in the gymnasium: slaves, freedmen and their children are mentioned among members of other social categories.¹⁰⁴ The fact that two generations were required before the social stigma of slavery disappeared in relation to the gymnasium must arise from the importance of this place for civic identity. This reminds us of the insufficiency of conceiving ancient Greek societies in terms of a mere dichotomy between citizens' freedom and slavery. A variety of social statuses and life conditions existed in between these extremes, varying through space and time.¹⁰⁵ It is exactly within this setting that religious authority operated in slave manumissions: rather than the succession 'segregation (through consecration in a sanctuary) → integration' suggested by Hatzopoulos, the process at stake here was intimately related to the freedmen's risk of losing the freedom that they had newly acquired. Putting freed persons under the god's supervision was

by A. Van Gennepe, *Les rites de passage* (Paris, 1909), to the study of initiation rites in ancient Greek religion has been recently questioned in the collective volume D. Dodd and C.A. Faraone, *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives* (London, 2003): see in particular F. Graf, 'Initiation: a concept with a troubled history', 3–24; D. Dodd, 'Adolescent initiation in myth and tragedy: rethinking the Black Hunter', 71–84; and B. Lincoln, 'The initiatory paradigm in anthropology, folklore and history of religions', 241–54. A review of the debate and a more favourable position towards the utility of A. Van Gennepe's paradigm are available in K. Dowden, 'Van Gennepe et l'initiation dans la mythologie grecque: mort prématurée d'un paradigme?', *Gaia* 14 (2011), 171–9.

¹⁰² For a brief reflection on rites of passage in connection with Roman *manumissio*, see Fabre (n. 33), 20–1.

¹⁰³ *I. Beroea* 1 = *SEG* 27.261 = *NGSL* 14; c. 180 B.C. Cf. the commentary in Ph. Gauthier and M.B. Hatzopoulos, *La loi gymnasiarchique de Béroïa* (Athens, 1993), 65–8; E. Lupu, *Greek Sacred Law: A Collection of New Documents (NGSL)* (Leiden, 2005), 260–8.

¹⁰⁴ For the social classes excluded from the gymnasium, see Tatakis (n. 58), 424–7; Gauthier and Hatzopoulos (n. 103), 78–87, esp. 79–81 for slaves and freedmen.

¹⁰⁵ Commenting on the gymnasiarchic law of Beroea, Tatakis (n. 58), 425–6 (with references) suggested that 'the regulation probably indicates the existence in Macedonia of a social rank with restricted political rights, similar to that attested in neighbouring Thessaly, at Sparta and at Gortyn'. More cases of this in-between condition, which one could not reduce to either freedom or slavery, are discussed by D. Lotze, *Metaxu Eleutheron kai Doulon: Studien zur Rechtsstellung unfreien Landbevölkerung in Griechenland bis zum 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Berlin, 1959) and *Bürger und Unfreie im vorhellenistischen Griechenland: Ausgewählte Aufsätze* (Stuttgart, 2000); J. Ducat, *Les Pénestes de Thessalie* (Paris, 1994); N. Luraghi and S.E. Alcock, ed., *Helots and their Masters in Laconia and Messenia: Histories, Ideologies, and Structures* (Washington DC, 2003); and P. Cartledge, 'The Helots: a contemporary review', in K. Bradley and P. Cartledge (ed.), *The Cambridge World History of Slavery*, vol. 1: *The Ancient Mediterranean World* (Cambridge, 2009), 74–90.

therefore a suitable religious instrument for safeguarding them against any future claims over their property. Because freed people were sacred to a god, their new status was expected to become stronger and possibly untouchable.

Because the inheritance of rites of passage must be rejected, one should look for other explanations for the young age of most consecrated persons. A motivation of religious order is patent in the dedication from Leucopetra mentioned above where a person decides to purchase a newborn to offer her to the god (*I.Leucopetra* 39).¹⁰⁶ Moreover, as the grant of divine protection seems to be a common expectation related to temple consecration, we may assume that the early age of the people given to a deity corresponded to the purpose of placing them under divine care as soon as possible. However, other explanations may be also possible, and given that consecrations must have had, at least in some social contexts, economic ramifications as well, we should not underestimate the possibility that the age of slaves given to sanctuaries also bears a more practical meaning in relation to social conventions and to their economic value for the household.

The corpus of Leucopetra offers once again a helpful case study as many of the extant inscriptions provide detailed information about the age of the consecrated persons (Table 1).¹⁰⁷ Male slaves are usually consecrated from their birth up to ten years old, while only three cases of consecration being performed at the end of the adolescence or in adulthood are known.¹⁰⁸ As for female slaves, a conspicuous gap between thirteen and seventeen years corresponds to a particularly sensitive moment in the life of women, that is puberty, marriage and motherhood.¹⁰⁹ The absence of consecrated women of this age most probably had a religious connotation too in the light of impurity being associated with pregnancy and giving birth.¹¹⁰ For men too, the beginning of puberty seems to be a critical moment for consecrations, perhaps again for religious reasons. Nevertheless, the Leucopetra corpus also shows that slaves could be consecrated throughout their childhood, thus disproving a specific ritual connection with the approximation of puberty. A link with the upcoming beginning of adolescence can

¹⁰⁶ Cf. above, n. 71.

¹⁰⁷ As regards denominations in relation to gender and age, it appears from the dossier that *παῖδιον* refers to slaves consecrated in their childhood, regardless of their gender; *παῖδριον* is used for male slaves, while *κορόσιον* and *παῖδιση* are attested for female slaves respectively up to twenty years and from eighteen years on. The overlap between eighteen and twenty years is to be interpreted in relation to motherhood: cf. Hatzopoulos et al. (2000), 42–3. This is proven by the fact that, with the exception of the generic terms *σώματα*, *σωμάτια*, *δούλοι*, inscriptions from Leucopetra only mention *παῖδισσαι* consecrated together with their offspring. Other evidence from contemporary Macedonia confirms this assumption. A twenty-two-year old *κοράσιον* is consecrated to Dionysus Pseudanor in Beroea together with her two younger brothers, aged twelve and sixteen, which suggests that she was not yet associated with a man (*I.Beroea* 55). Conversely, the only eighteen-year-old *παῖδιση* from Leucopetra (no. 84; A.D. 234) may well be a married woman: cf. no. 92 (A.D. 239), where the consecrated 25-year-old *παῖδιση* is mother of two children of ten and eight years; or no. 95 (A.D. 241), where another *παῖδιση* aged 23 is mother of six and two-year-old daughters.

¹⁰⁸ The 50-year-old slave of no. 93 is an aberrant case unless we think of a mistake.

¹⁰⁹ Inscriptions from Leucopetra suggest that women could have their first child when they were between fifteen (or perhaps earlier) and twenty years old. A slightly larger generation gap is suggested by no. 69 (A.D. 219), attesting the consecration of a whole family: the grandmother Neike (60 years), the mother Alexandra (40 years) and the children Paranomos (twenty), Helene (eighteen) and Alexandra (twelve).

¹¹⁰ R. Parker, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford, 1983), 48–53; see p. 49 for cases whereby pregnant and breastfeeding women are temporarily excluded from a specific cult. One cannot rule out the possibility that such an interdiction also existed in relation to the cult of the Mother of the Gods in Leucopetra.

TABLE 1 Age and consecration in Leucopetra.

Years	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	
παιδίον	20M		39M		33M			42F		92M													
								106F															
Years	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22			50	(?)	
παιδάριον	27					91		107								81		107				93	
M	32																						
Years	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	
κοράσιον			3			98	30	20		83		85						100				37	
F			76					82		128		103										68	
												116										87	
												118										98	
Years	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30										
παιδίσκη	84					95		92															
F																							101

Notes:

Numbers under the line correspond to the references in Hatzopoulos et al. (2000).

M and F refer to the gender of the consecrated slave.

Bold numbers refer to the age gap discussed in the text.

explain why the rate of consecrated girls reaches its peak at twelve years, at a limit age before the menarche. Rather than drawing on the heritage of hypothetical rites of temple seclusion and passage, the link between adolescence and the temporary interruption of consecrations should therefore be understood as the consequence of the exclusion from sanctuaries of persons in risk of polluting them. As a transition period, the entrance in fertile age was very critical in both a social and religious way and it seems that for this reason slaves *were not consecrated* during puberty – exactly the opposite of the ‘rites of passage theory’. Finally, the rarity of dedications of young adult men in comparison with women of the same age is plausible to interpret in an economic sense, that is, in relation to the high value of adult male slaves in terms of labour force, a resource which owners would predictably not want to lose.

CONCLUSION

The ambiguous category of ‘sacred’ persons comprises multiple groups – ἱεροί, ἱερόδουλοι, ἱεροὶ παῖδες – whose place in relation to the gods and to human society cannot be framed within a single coherent interpretative paradigm, beyond the mere fact that they all shared in a special relationship with a sanctuary. Other groups like (ἀπ)ελεύθεροι and δοῦλοι of a god contribute to the difficulty of disentangling the issue of the social and religious status of these people. This may partly depend on the fact that evidence is often too scanty and scattered, but even when sources are sufficiently informative, the impression is that being sacred to a god was just one element of a much richer set of variables, which would define the condition of a person within a certain social context. In practice, this warns against assuming that people labelled as ἱεροὶ *necessarily* passed through a consecration comparable to the one customary for manumitting slaves. In addition, the relationship between ἱερόδουλοι, (ἀπ)ελεύθεροι charged with temple service, δοῦλοι of a god and ἱεροὶ παῖδες leaves an ambiguous zone where case-by-case negotiations and local traditions could play a role in defining the condition of the consecrated person.

This draws attention to a third point: the inefficacy of an interpretative approach based on the dichotomy freedom vs slavery, whereas it is clear that a varied in-between class of people having reduced civil rights existed throughout antiquity in the Greek world. It is in relation to these social groups, whose condition was somehow fluid and weak enough to be exposed to the abuses of stronger people within society, that the appeal to the protection of a god played a helpful role by strengthening the inviolability granted by law. Consecrating a person to a god is therefore a device deeply rooted in the religious instruments that support social stability. This aspect ultimately makes any interpretation drawing on rites of passage through segregation unnecessary.

A final point that warrants attention concerns the vocabulary used in the inscriptions, particularly from the Imperial period. We have highlighted that some word-families, such as those related to the concept of giving (δῶρον, δωροῦμαι, δίδωμι), can shed more light on the type of consecration involved when different possible motivations can co-exist in the same corpus. However, we would like to finish with a warning against any univocal interpretation of the vocabulary, in particular as regards the concepts of servitude (ὑπηρεσία, δοῦλος): these words hint in some cases at the legal condition of the consecrated persons, but in other texts they may convey a more symbolic

meaning indicating actual religious devotion. Failing to take prudent consideration of the nuances of these difficult texts can at the same time expose us to the risks of forcing the interpretation of the social status granted to consecrated persons and of neglecting the religious significance of their being in a sacred relationship with the god.

University of Liège (Belgium)

STEFANO G. CANEVA
ste.caneva@gmail.com

AURIAN DELLI PIZZI
aurian.dellipizzi@gmail.com