



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

Robert Parker A Funerary Foundation from Hellenistic Lycia

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **40 • 2010**

Seite / Page **103–122**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/427/5035> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-2010-40-p103-122-v5035.0

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

ROBERT PARKER

A Funerary Foundation from Hellenistic Lycia¹

The ambition of one Symmasis, son of Sortias, to be remembered for ever, along with his wife, at annual banquets was first revealed to the modern world in 2007.² The long document that records his aspiration found its way, via illegal excavation, into a private collection in Fethiye, and lacks a provenance; but it can be assigned on internal grounds with high probability to either Tlos or, a weaker possibility, Xanthos. The community concerned contained groups of «Bellerephontians», «Iobateans», and «Sarpedonians», named after the Lycian heroes known from Homer; also of hitherto unknown «Araileisians». Bellerephontians, Iobateans, and Sarpedonians (and possibly some other civic sub-divisions) are all attested at Tlos, whereas Xanthos has Iobateans (once explicitly described as a «deme»), Sarpedonians and ἄστυκοί; none of the three «Homeric» groups appear elsewhere. It has been suggested that any further sub-division, if one existed at Xanthos, should have been represented in the isopolity agreement between the city and Myra; since none such appears, Xanthos will have had no Bellerephontians.³ If the argument, which only time can test, is sound, our document should belong to Tlos. In favour of Tlos is also the convincing connection suggested by DIETER SCHÜRR between the «Araileisians» and the apparent toponym *arailise* of an epichoric inscription found in Tlos, TL 26. 13.⁴ On the other side one can only adduce the prominent role in the document of Leto, who is the main divine fig-

¹ I discussed this text at the Oxford epigraphy workshop in November 2009 and am most grateful for suggestions then made, particularly by ANGELOS CHANIOTIS, EDOUARD CHIRICAT and SALLY HUMPHREYS; also for help through correspondence from CATHY DRAYCOTT, GUNNEL EKROTH, JOHN PENNEY, LENE RUBINSTEIN and MAREK WEŃOWSKI, and most particularly from CHRISTOF SCHULER and the anonymous referee of *Chiron*. I am very grateful also to ILIAS ARNAOΤOΓLOU for sharing his paper (n. 7 below) with me in advance of publication. He tells me that a re-publication by the first editors is promised.

² O. KÖSE – R. TEKOĞLU, Money Lending in Hellenistic Lycia: the Union of Copper Money, in: K. DORTLUK – T. KAHYA (ed.), *Adalya 10*, 2007, 63–76, with a small photo on p. 79.

³ P. GAUTHIER, REG 107, 1994, 326–328, on SEG 44, 1994, 1218, with the Xanthian attestations (on the ἄστυκοί cf. P. M. FRASER, *Greek Ethnic Terminology*, 2009, 28); for Tlos see TAM II, p. 204. For the Iobateans as a deme at Xanthos see P. BAKER – G. THÉRIAULT, REG 118, 2005, 335 n. 51 (SEG 55, 2005, 1502, note to line 1).

⁴ D. SCHÜRR, *Österreichische Namenforschung* 37, 2009, 107.

ure at Xanthos but apparently unattested so far in Tlos.⁵ The editors assign the inscription on the basis of orthography and letter forms to the second c. B.C.⁶ The orthographic arguments allow no more precision than «c. 200 – c. 1». The letters, in so far as they can be judged from the small published photos, would seem to fit the mid second c.: the alphas with broken cross-bar, and the sigmas with flat cross bars and middle strokes not reaching far to the right, argue against a much higher dating, the pis with short right vertical against a much lower. The predominance of Lycian over Greek names too might surprise at a later date.

I. ARNAOTOGLU has prepared a text, translation and interpretation of the inscription which makes notable progress in all three areas; he has also well discussed the onomastic mix.⁷ For the convenience of the reader I present here a text and translation which incorporate slight further adjustments; the text is, with only small divergences, one prepared on the basis of the first edition by C. SCHULER and A. V. WALSER and kindly put at my disposal. The inscription was recorded on three faces of a marble block the top part of which has been lost through re-cutting; at the bottom it is intact, though the text of column one breaks off in mid-line and mid-sentence.

A

<p>[..... το κοιν]- [. τ]ῶν χαλκίων, ἐὰν δέ τι πε- [ρ]ισὸν γένηται τῶν τόκων προσάξουσιν εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον. 5 παραθήσουσιν δὲ Συμμασει καὶ ἄλλην ἐπίκωλον μερίδα ὀπισθίαν καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς αὐ- τ[ο]ῦ Μαρμασῆ ἄλλην μερίδα ἐπ[ί]- κωλον ἐμπροσθίαν ὅσον ἂν χρό- 10 νον [ζ]ῆ Συμμασις πρὸς τῆ γεινο- μέ[ν]η μερίδι. ὡς ἂν δὲ μεταλλά- ξη Συμμασις τὸν βίον δώσου-</p>	<p>15 20</p>	<p>σιν τῆ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ Μαρμα ἀμφοτέρως, ὡς ἂν δὲ καὶ αὐ- τη μεταλλάξῃ τὸν βίον δώ- σουσιν τοῖς υἱοῖς μου, ὁμοίω(ς) δὲ καὶ αἱ τοῖς ἐπιγεινομένοις ἐκ τοῦ- των. παρέσονται δὲ ἐπὶ τὰς εὐωχίας οἱ υἱοὶ μου Σύμμα- χος καὶ Ἐρμάφιλος καὶ Κλεῖ- νος καὶ οἱ γαμβροὶ μοι Ερμα- κτυβελίς καὶ Ἐρμόλυκος οἱ Τινζασίος Βελλεροφόντει- οὶ καὶ οἱ (τοῦ)των ἐπιγεινόμενοι</p>
---	---------------------------	---

⁵ See P. FREI, *Die Götterkulte Lykiens in der Kaiserzeit*, ANRW 18.3, 1990, 1728–1864, at 1744–1753, 1812–1813.

⁶ KÖSE – ΤΕΚΟĞLU (n. 2) 67; on the orthographic criteria cf. N. MILNER, in: C. SCHULER (ed.), *Griechische Epigraphik in Lykien*, 2007, 158. I am grateful to CHARLES CROWTHER for advice on the letter-forms.

⁷ I. ARNAOTOGLU, *Cultural transfer and law in Hellenistic Lycia: the Case of Symmasis' foundation*, to appear in the Proceedings of the international conference: *Transferts culturels et droits dans le monde grec et hellénistique* (Reims, les 14, 15, 16 et 17 mai 2008). Onomastically, the translanguistic echoes in Symmachos son of Symmasis and Ermaktybelis brother of Hermolykos are particularly interesting (cf. S. COLVIN, *Names in Hellenistic and Roman Lycia*, in: id. [ed.], *The Greco-Roman East. Politics, Culture, Society*, 2004, 44–84, at 66).

- 25 οἱ πρῶτοι πρῶτοι ἕως ἄν γέ-
ωνται δέκα. ὅταν δέ τις τού-
των ἀποθάνῃ παρέσται ὁ πρε[σ]-
βύτατος ἐκ τούτων. ἔαν δέ τις
ἀνφιζβήτησις γείνηται κρινεῖ
30 τὸ κοινὸν τῶν χαλκίων ἐν τῷ τῆς
Λητοῦς ἱερῶι ὁποῖον δεῖ παρεῖναι κ[αῖ]
ὡς κρείνωσιν ἔσται κύρια{ι} ὥσ-
τε μὴ πλείονας παρεῖναι τῶν
ἀνχιστέων ἀν[δ]ρῶν δέκα. τὸ δὲ
35 ἀργύριον ὃ δέδωκεν Συμμασις ἐ-
κτοκιοῦσιν οἱ χιρισταὶ ὡς ὅτι ἀσ[φα]-
λέστα<τα> προσγράφοντες ἐν τοῖς
συναλλάγμασιν ὅτι ἐστὶν τοῦ-
το τὸ ἀργύριον τῆς Συμμασι-
- B

ἐπέ[κρ]εινεν ἀνελέσθαι
καὶ χειρίζειν κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν
διὰ τῶν αἰρουμένων ἀεὶ
Ἑρμολύκῳ Κρεγδειτος Ἴοβα-
5 τείῳ, Ἰνονδει Ἑρμοκλέους Σαρ-
πηδονίῳ, Κλείῳ Συμμασιος καὶ
Συμμασει Σορτίου Αραιλεισευ-
σιν· οἱ καὶ παρόντες ἀνθωμολο-
γήσαντο ἀπέχειν τὸ ἀργύριον πᾶν,
10 ἐφ' ᾧ τὸ μὲν ἀρχαῖον διατηρήσου-
σιν σῶιον ἀεὶ τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον,
ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν προσ-
πειπόντων τόκων τῶν χω-
ρούντων θύσουσιν εἰς τὸν ἅπαν-
15 τα χρόνον ἀεὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἕμ-
μηνὶ Λώιῳ τῆι εἰκάδι καὶ πέμπτη
τομίαν τριέτην Ἑλίῳ ὃς εὐξήσεν
Συμμασιν καὶ Μαμμαν τὴν γυ-
ναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ εὐωχηθήσονται ἐν
20 τῇ τῆι ἡμέρᾳ ἄγοντες ἐπώνυ-
μον ἡμέραν Συμμασιος καὶ Μαμ-
μας τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν
εὐωχίαν παρέσονται ἀεὶ κα-
τ' ἐνιαυτὸν οἱ υἱοὶ μου Σύμμα-
- 40 ος δόσεως. ἔαν δὲ τὸ κοινὸν
[τ]ῶν χαλκίων μὴ ποιῆ ἢ ἄλ-
λος τις κατὰ τὰ γεγραμ-
μένα ἀποτ[ιν]έτωσαν οἱ ἀ[ῖ]τι]-
οὶ αὐτῶν <,α καθ' ἐκάστην
45 αἰτίαν ἱεράς Ἑλίου καὶ ἐξέ-
στω τοῖς Συμμασιος ἀν-
χιστεῦσιν ἐκδικάζεσ-
θαι καὶ ἄλλῳ τῷ βουλομέ-
νῳ ἐπὶ τῷ ἡμίσει. ἔαν
50 τὰς θυσίας ἢ εὐωχίας δι-
ὰ πόλεμον ἢ ἄλλο τι πολι-
τικὸν κώλυμα μὴ δύνηται ἐπι-
τελέσαι λυθέντος τοῦ κωλύ-
ματος [uninscribed space]
- 25 χος καὶ Ἑρμάφιλος καὶ Κλείνος
οἱ Συμμασιος καὶ οἱ γαμβροὶ μ[οι?]
Ερμακτυβελις καὶ Ἑρμόλυκος
οἱ Τινζασιος Βελλεροφόντειο[ι],
θύσουσιν δὲ ἀεὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ο[ἱ]
30 αἰρούμενοι ἄρχοντες τοῦ κοινοῦ
τῶν χαλκίων ἥρωι Συμμασιος
καὶ Μαμμας ἐπὶ τοῦ ἰδρυθησομέ-
νου ὑπ' αὐτοῦ βωμοῦ ἱερεῖον αἶ-
γεον <ἢ> προβάτεον· καὶ εὐωχηθή-
35 σονται καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
πρὸς τῷ τάφῳ οἱ χειρισταὶ καὶ
οἱ ἄλλοι ἄρχοντες <καὶ> οἱ προγ[ε]-
γραμμένοι ἀνχιστεῖς. δώσο[υ]-
[σι]ν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τῇ γεινομένη
40 [μ]ερίδι καὶ ἄλλην ἐπικώλον με-
ρίδα ὀπισθίαν Συμμασει Σο[ρ]-
τίου ὅσον ἄν χρόνον ζῆ, ὅ-
ταν δὲ μεταλλάξῃ προσ-
παρατιθέτωσαν τοῖς υἱοῖς μου.
45 ὅταν δὲ καὶ οὗτοι μεταλλάξ[ω]-
σιν διδότησαν τοῖς ἐγγό[νοις]
διὰ γένους ἀεὶ. τῆς δὲ θυσ[ίας]
καὶ εὐωχίας προσθήσονται

C

<p>-----</p> <p>[ἐπ]ιτελείτωσαν ἐν ἄλλαι[ς] [ῆ]μέραις τριάκοντα. ἀπὸ δὲ [τ]οῦ δεδομένου ἀργυρίου ὑπὸ Συμμασιος μηθὲν ἐξέστω ἀφε- 5 λείν ἢ μετενέγκαι <ῆ> εἰς ἄλ<λ>ο- ν καταχρήσασθαι. ἐὰν δέ τις ἀφέλη ἢ μετενέγκῃ ἢ ε- ἰς ἄλλον καταχρήσῃται ἀμα- [ρ]τωλὸς ἔστω Ἡλίου καὶ τῶν 10 ἄλλων θεῶν καὶ ἀποτινέτω- σαν οἱ αἴτιοι ὅσον ἂν ἀφέλω- σιν τοῦτο διπλοῦν καὶ ἔστω ἐγδικασία τῷ βουλομένῳ ἐ- πὶ τῷ ἡμίσει. εἰς δὲ τὸν τάφον</p>	<p>15 μηθὲν ἐξουσία ἔστω θάψαι οὗ ἔστιν τὸ πῶμα μονόλι- θον ἢ ὀφειλέτω τῷ κοινῶ τῷ προγεγραμμένῳ < ρ' > ὁ θάψας καθάπερ ἐγ δίκης, 20 καὶ κύριοι ἔστωσαν ἐνεχυρά- ζοντες ὡς ἂν προαιρῶνται [ο]ἱ κατ' ἐκείνων τὸν καιρὸν ὄντες χειρισταί. ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς προγεγραμ- μένοις πᾶσιν εὐδόκησεν τὸ κοινὸν 25 τῶν χαλκῶν· ἀναδοθείσης ψήφου, ἐ- κρίθη πᾶσαις. μάρτυρες Ἰδλαιμῖς Μίδου, Ἄττινας Ἐπίγονος οἱ Ερμαδε- [ι]ρου Βελλεροφόντειοι ἀρχόντων.</p>
---	---

A 24 or <ἐκ τού>των ἐπιγεινόμενοι. 25 πρώτοι πρώτοι: explained by WALSER (cf. n. 9 below). 32 κύρια{ι} neuter plural? κύριον was not inscribed. C 5–6 ἄλλον for ἄλλο: cf. E. SCHWYZER, *Griechische Grammatik I*, 1953, 609f., with references, and from 4th c. Lycia SEG 53, 2003, 1677.

A ... [the society] of metalworkers. If any surplus occurs from the interest, they shall add it to the principal. They shall serve Symmasis with a further portion, from the rear leg (?),⁸ and for his wife Mamma a further portion from the front leg (?), for as long as Symmasis lives, in addition to the regular portion. When Symmasis departs from life, they shall give both portions to his wife Mamma; when she too departs from life, they shall give them to my sons, and similarly for ever to those who are born from them.

⁸ I read ἐπίκωλον and understand it as accusative of an unattested compound adjective, even though the formation surprises. ANGELOS CHANIOΤIS compares Cretan ὑπερμηρίδιος (SEG 39, 1989, 954 = H. VAN EFFENTERRE – F. RUZÉ, *Nomima II*, 1995, no. 10; SEG 41, 1991, 743.4 = A. CHANIOΤIS, *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Poleis in der hellenistischen Zeit*, 1996, no. 6.4, with his comment p. 193). Ἐπίκωλος μερίς will be a variant of the (κωλῆν καὶ) τὰ ἐπὶ κωλῆν νεμόμενα of LSA 73 and SEG 29, 1979, 1088 (Theangela). I also take a distinction to be drawn between portions from the front and rear leg. It is a difficulty, however, that despite the belief found in some lexicographers that κωλῆ denotes τὰ ἐμπρόσθια μέρη τῶν ἱερείων (e.g. Suda κ 2236), I know no actual literary or epigraphic text that clearly applies κωλῆ, usually translated «thigh», to the front leg. (On the word see S. D. OLSON – A. SENS, *Matro of Pitane and the Tradition of Epic Parody*, 1999, 124–125; in Xen. *Cyneg.* 5.10 the ὑποκώλια of a dog are contrasted with τὰ πρόσθεν σκέλη.) But the alternative translation, whereby Symmasis would receive a «portion from the rear of the thigh» and Mamma from the front, is puzzling, given that the quality of the meat from these two parts of a small animal would not have differed (GUNNEL EKROTH, per litt.). In sacred laws, κωλῆ and σκέλος are alternative priestly portions, never combined (B. LE GUEN-POLLET, in: R. ÉTIENNE – M.-T. LE DINAHET [ed.], *L' espace sacrificiel*, 1991, 19), which suggests that they may sometimes have been treated as synonyms; that synonymy might have created the possibility of applying κωλῆ to the front leg.

There shall come to the banquets my sons Symmachos and Hermaphilos and Kleinos and my sons-in-law Ermaktybelis and Hermolykos the sons of Tinzasis, Bellerophon-teans, and the (male) children born from them, the first first, until the number of ten is reached. When one of these dies, the eldest (of those born?) from them shall attend. If any dispute occurs, the society of metalworkers shall adjudicate in the shrine of Leto who should attend and what they adjudicate shall prevail so that not more of the kin shall attend than ten men. The administrators shall lend at interest⁹ the money that Symmasis has given as securely as possible, specifying in the contract that this money comes from the gift of Symmasis. If the society of metalworkers or anyone else does not act in accordance with the specifications let those responsible among them pay 1000 drachmai sacred to the Sun for each offence (?)¹⁰ and let the kin of Symmasis and anyone else who wishes be allowed to prosecute for a half share (of the fine). If he is unable to perform the sacrifices or the feasts because of war or any other political obstacle, when the obstacle has been removed ...

B ... assigned (Symmasis' fund) to be received, and managed year by year, through those appointed on each occasion, by Hermolykos son of Kregdeis the Iobateian, Inondes son of Hermocles the Sarpedonian, Kleinos son of Symmasis and Symmasis son of Sortias, Araileisians. These men being present agreed that they were in receipt of all the money, on the condition that they would preserve the principal safe in perpetuity and from the interest payments coming in each year – the ones being spent (?)¹¹ – would sacrifice in perpetuity each year on the 25th of the month Loios a three year-old gelding to Sun, who raised up Symmasis and his wife, and would feast on this day, celebrating it as a day named for Symmasis and his wife, and there would always each year attend the feast my sons Symmachos and Hermaphilos and Kleinos the sons of Symmasis and my sons-in-law Ermaktybelis and Hermolykos the sons of Tinzasis, Bellerophon-teans, and always each year the elected archons of the society of metal-

⁹ Τοκίζειν stresses, in contrast to δαλείζειν, the charging of interest: A. V. WALSER, *Bauern und Zinsnehmer*, 2008, 118 n. 43. On συναλλάγματα applied to loan contracts see ib. 112 n. 24.

¹⁰ Καθ' ἐκάστην αἰτίαν is printed and from the photo seems secure. Fines charged per offence are common (κατ' ἕκαστον ἀδίκημα IG IX 1² 1. 138. 10–11, cf. IG V 1. 1390. 111; καθ' ἐκάστην ἀταξίαν SEG 40, 1990, 524 A (1) 6–7; καθ' ἕκαστον ἀτάκτημα SEG 13, 1956, 521. 69–70, 78–79; for similar expressions see e.g. Syll.³ 987. 33; IG IV 1² 68. 93; IPArk 3. 29; the law in [Dem.] 43. 71). But αἰτία in the sense of «offence» lacks parallels. LENE RUBINSTEIN suggests that the sense might be «for each (point of) accusation», in a situation where multiple charges are brought: cf. e.g. τὸ πλήθος τῶν αἰτίων πρὸς ἃς ἀπολογήσασθαι με δεῖ, Aeschin. 2. 1. But the parallel expressions cited earlier support the simpler, though linguistically problematic, interpretation.

¹¹ I do not understand τοκῶν τῶν χωροῦντων. Χωρέω εἰς «be spent on» is a recognised meaning (LSJ s.v. χωρέω II. 5), but I lack a parallel for the absolute sense; and though the possibility of unspent interest is envisaged at the start of the document the phrase here seems pointless. L. RUBINSTEIN adduces Ar.Nub. 18 οἱ γὰς τόκοι χωροῦσιν (interest accumulates? falls due?). But the phrase still seems redundant.

workers would sacrifice to the hero of Symmasis and Mamma on the altar that he would establish a goat or a sheep as a victim, and there would feast on this day also beside his tomb the administrators and also¹² the archons and the kinsmen specified above. In addition to the regular portion they will give a further portion, from the rear leg (?), to Symmasis son of Sortias for as long as he lives. When he departs let them serve it as an additional portion to my sons. When they too depart, let them give it to their descendants through the family in perpetuity, and the sacrifice and the feast shall be presided over by ...

C ... let them accomplish it within a further thirty days. From the money given by Symmasis let no one be permitted to remove any or transfer it or use it for another purpose. If anyone removes any or transfers it or uses it for another purpose let him be guilty before the Sun and the other gods, and let those responsible repay double the amount they remove and let anyone who wishes prosecute them for a half share. Let nobody have permission to bury (anyone else) in the tomb which has the cover made of a single stone, or let the one who performs the burial owe 100 drachmai to the aforementioned society as if a verdict had been delivered against him, and let whoever are the administrators at that time be authorized to make seizure from him in whatever way they please. The society of metalworkers approved all the aforementioned proposals; when a vote was taken, it was passed unanimously. Witnesses Idlaimis son of Midas, Attina and Epigonos the sons of Ermadeirou, Bellerophontians, from among the archons.¹³

Symmasis' foundation and the society of metalworkers

The character and structure of the document have been explained by ARNAOTOGLOU.¹⁴ Symmasis is setting aside a sum of money to endow a foundation, the annual interest from which is to be used to finance sacrifices in perpetuity in honour of himself and his wife. The witnesses named in C 26–27 are probably the witnesses regularly found in relation to donations and wills, even though they are not immediately juxtaposed to any mention of Symmasis' gift.¹⁵ The document deploys many formulae very familiar from other Hellenistic foundations, the ban for instance on misappro-

¹² Cf. LSJ s.v. ἄλλος II. 8.

¹³ This is how ARNAOTOGLOU takes the genitive ἀρχόντων. But the position surprises. Conceivably we have the beginning of a new phrase that was never completed: a dating formula in the genitive absolute, or a listing of further witnesses chosen from among the archons, additional to the ordinary witnesses just listed (cf. SEG 26, 1976/77, 720; IG V 2. 345, both cited by ARNAOTOGLOU [n. 7] n. 46, but perhaps working against his view).

¹⁴ It was already briefly noted by C. BRIXHE, BÉp 2008, no. 484.

¹⁵ ARNAOTOGLOU takes them to be witnessing the acceptance by the κοινόν of the donation. But the parallels that he quotes (IG XII 3. 330. 107–108; IG IX 1. 694. 37–38) are for witnessing a will/donation; cf. B. LAUM, *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike*, 1914, I, 178.

priation or misuse of the funds in C 2–14.¹⁶ Extensive responsibility in relation to the fund is given to a society of metalworkers, while the practical task of lending out the money year by year lies with «administrators» (χειρισταί A 36, B 36) doubtless appointed by, and from, that society. This arrangement too, whereby a foundation is entrusted to a collective body (whether the city or a smaller unit) which then runs it through administrators, finds ready parallels.¹⁷ There is much repetition, sometimes verbatim, between sides A and B (cf. A 5–28 and B 22–28, 38–47), which ARNAOTOGLOU is doubtless right to explain by supposing that A reproduces the offer of an endowment made by Symmasis and B the acceptance of the offer by the metalworkers. In just the same way, a well-known inscription of the 3rd c. from Thera records first the will of Epicteta in which she establishes a funerary foundation, and then the acceptance of the bequest by the city of Thera and various consequential decisions; a foundation text from 3rd c. Corcyra has the same structure.¹⁸ Familiar legal mechanisms are employed in defence of Symmasis' wishes. Offenders against his specifications, whether within or without the metalworkers, and those misusing the endowment funds, are threatened with fines enforceable by «volunteer prosecution» (A 40–49; C 6–14); the volunteer prosecutor (ὁ βουλόμενος) is, as often, offered the incentive of a half share of the fine.¹⁹ Anyone attempting to make an unauthorised burial in «the tomb which has the cover made of a single stone» (presumably the one destined for Symmasis himself) is made liable to a fine which the administrators of Symmasis' fund can enforce by seizure of his property «as if a verdict had been delivered against him», i.e. without going to court; such procedure is standard in defence of Lycian tombs.²⁰ «The first first» (A 35) is legal jargon too.²¹

In the light of all this, one would have said that the document had been drawn up by a lawyer, had such creatures existed in the Hellenistic world; it is something of a mystery how knowledge of appropriate formulae and mechanisms was diffused outside the

¹⁶ For many parallels see LAUM, *Stiftungen I*, 186–187.

¹⁷ See e.g. IG IX 1. 694. 42ff. (LAUM, *Stiftungen*, no. 1); more in LAUM, *Stiftungen I*, 151 and II, 220, index s.v. χειρίζων.

¹⁸ Epicteta: IG XII 3. 330 (LAUM, *Stiftungen*, no. 43; MICHEL, *Recueil 1001*; GDI 4706; only an extract in LSCG 135), re-edited with photographs as T. RITTI, *Iscrizioni e rilievi greci del museo maffeiano di Verona*, 1981, no. 31, discussed by A. WITTENBURG, *Il testamento di Epikteta*, 1990. Corcyra: IG IX 1. 694 (LAUM, *Stiftungen*, no. 1). For other acceptance decrees see ARNAOTOGLOU, n. 32.

¹⁹ On volunteer prosecution in general see L. RUBINSTEIN, *Volunteer Prosecutors in the Greek World*, *Dike* 6, 2003, 87–113; in Lycia, P. FRÖHLICH, *Topoi* 12/13, 2005, 723.

²⁰ For the «as if a verdict» formula in Lycia see SEG 43, 1993, 980, with the note; C. SCHULER, *Chiron* 33, 2003, 498–499; P. FRÖHLICH, *Topoi* 12/13, 2005, 725–729; for an apparently related procedure (χωρίς απογραφής) found in Isthada in the territory of Myra C. SCHULER, *Chiron* 36, 2006, 421–423; on seizure FRÖHLICH loc. cit. and E. HARRIS, *ZPE* 167, 2008, 81–83.

²¹ See the Ephesian debt law (Syll.³ 364; I.Ephesos Ia 4; WALSER [n. 9] 26–36), lines 33–34, concerning creditors: εἶναι τήν κομιδὴν αὐτοῖς ... τοῖς πρώτοις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐπεξῆς, with WALSER, 137.

limited contexts (chancelleries; city administrations) where expertise existed. The «in the event of war» exclusion in A 49–54 is also very professional.²² A certain amateurism, by contrast, appears in the oscillations between third and first person in reference to Symmasis himself. One can also wonder whether the lack of complete agreement between the overlapping passages A 5–28 and B 22–28, 38–47 is a product of changes made to Symmasis' proposal by the metalworkers, or merely of careless drafting. A 5–28 deals with one sacrifice only, whereas in B there are two (14, 29); though we do not have the whole of Symmasis' original proposal, the sacrificial passage in A is framed by regulations on other matters, so that if, as is probable,²³ a second sacrifice was mentioned, the order of the whole in A was at the least unsystematic. Again, the portion reserved for Symmasis' wife Mamma in A 7–14 has vanished in B 38–44; deliberate adjustment, carelessness, or had she died in the interval between proposal and acceptance?²⁴ Elaborate arrangements are made in A 14–34 to assemble a group of ten descendants of Symmasis for the commemorative feasts, but such a group does not re-appear in B. Further unclarity perhaps owed to bad drafting will trouble us below when considering the ritual. Finally under this head, the obscurity of the first surviving section of side B is perhaps only in part²⁵ due to the loss of what precedes: ἐπέ[κρ]εινεν ἀνελέσθαι καὶ χειρίζειν κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν διὰ τῶν αἰρουμένων αἰεὶ Ἑρμολύκῳ Κρεγδεῖτος Ἰοβατείῳ, Ἰνονδεῖ Ἑρμοκλέους Σαρπηδονίῳ, Κλείνῳ Συμμασιος καὶ Συμμασει Σορτίου Αραιλειτουργιστῶν καὶ παρόντες ἀνθωμολογήσαντο ἀπέχειν τὸ ἀργύριον πᾶν κτλ., which I have rendered «assigned (Symmasis' fund) to be received, and managed year by year, through those appointed on each occasion, by Hermolykos son of Kregdeis the Iobatean, Inondes son of Hermocles the Sarpedonian, Kleinos son of Symmasis and Symmasis son of Sortias, Araileisians. These men being present agreed that they were in receipt of all the money». The four men named are evidently the administrators, who acknowledge «due receipt» of the money with the characteristic term ἀπέχειν;²⁶ apparently Symmasis himself and his son are initially chosen, along with two others. But what then is the role of «those appointed on each occasion»? Archons of the metalworkers were «appointed» (B 30), but administrators operating «through the archons» would be a bizarre arrangement. It would be rather strange too, though, for the four administrators to appoint a sub-group from their number to do the active work.

²² Prevention «through war» is also envisaged in the decree of Telmessus voting sacrifices on behalf of Ptolemy son of Lysimachus, TAM II 1. 33–35; for non-Lycian examples see E. HARRIS, ZPE 167, 2008, 81 n. 4.

²³ For the formulation in B 17–19 «Sun who raised up Symmasis and his wife» seems to reflect Symmasis' own piety.

²⁴ The presence of the administrators at this event (B 36) is also not mentioned in A 7–14.

²⁵ The problem of translating ἐπέκρεινεν is doubtless due to the loss of the preceding. ARNAOTOGLOU renders «decided», which leaves the following datives hanging. I owe my rendering to J. PENNEY, who (with LSJ) compares for the dative Syll.³ 1109. 7. On the verb cf. CHANIOTIS (n. 8) 263, with refs.

²⁶ Cf. C. SCHULER, Chiron 22, 2003, 494 n. 29.

A larger question, not this time a product of careless drafting, concerns the role of the society of metalworkers (κοινὸν τῶν χαλκῆων: literally, «bronzesmiths», but LSJ show that the word was used more generally). This society passed resolutions by vote (C 23–26), had several (annually?) elected archons (B 29–30),²⁷ and could receive fines (C 17–18). It is true that Lycian metalwork was famous in antiquity, probably already in Herodotus' time, and that societies of metalworkers of various types are quite common under the Roman empire.²⁸ But the appearance of a professional association of any type is unexpected, at the presumptive date of our document, anywhere in the Hellenistic world except Egypt;²⁹ nor are professional associations otherwise attested in Lycia at any date. Κοινά in general are little known in the region. The «κοινόν of Pernitai» (attested ? 350–300) is a local, not a professional group (from east Lycia);³⁰ the nature of the unnamed κοινόν that dedicated an undated grave monument to a member at Arykanda (τὸ κοινὸν Πανταινέτωι Τροκονδου ἥρωι) is unknown. Lycia was under Ptolemaic control for most of the third century, and professional associations, we have noted, are found early in Egypt; but it is not clear why political control should have led to the imitation of social forms without the presence of Egyptian craftsmen in good numbers in Lycia. ROSTOVITZEFF used to believe that the many professional associations of Anatolia of the Roman period might perpetuate an indigenous tradition.³¹ But for the moment all we can do is to note the κοινόν of the metalworkers as an important but isolated new datum.

Puzzling too is the role of the κοινόν. As the final lines indicate, our document is the endorsement by the κοινόν of a proposal put to it by Symmasis; the κοινόν is to adjudicate disputes among Symmasis' descendants about title to participate (A 28–34); the annual sacrifice to the hero of Symmasis and Mamma is to be performed by the archons of the κοινόν (B 29–34); it has a general responsibility for ensuring adherence to the terms of the endowment (A 40–41), and fines for intrusions into Symmasis' tomb are payable to it (C 14–19). (It is thus an addendum to the list of possible recipients of such fines.)³² There is, it is true, nothing surprising about a connection between κοινά and funerary sacrifices. In several parts of the Greek world, κοινά owned

²⁷ More than three if ARNAOTOGLOU's rendering of the end of C (see n. 7) is correct.

²⁸ F. POLAND, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, 1909, 118. Lycian metalwork: Ath. 11. 72. 486C–E, which argues persuasively for the reading προβόλους δύο Λυκιοεργέας in Hdt. 7. 76 against the transmitted Λυκιοεργέας (cf. Dem. 49. 31).

²⁹ O. M. VAN NIJF, *The Civic World of Professional Associations in the Roman East*, 1997, 8 (with bibl. on the Egyptian associations; on these see too M. ROSTOVITZEFF, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, 1941, 1388 n. 105, and for a κοινόν of knifemakers attested in Sidon in 47 B.C. 1591 n. 26).

³⁰ Pernitai: M. WÖRRLE, *Chiron* 21, 1991, 218–224, 236–237 (SEG 41, 1991, 1379–1380). Arykanda: I. Arykanda 114, no date: Hellenistic?

³¹ ROSTOVITZEFF (n. 29) 1066, with 1591 n. 27.

³² Cf. C. SCHULER, *Gottheiten und Grabbußen in Lykien*, *Lykia* 6, 2001–2, 261–275. For associations as recipients of grave fines in the Roman period (not however in Lycia) see VAN NIJF (n. 29) 56–57.

communal burial grounds at which collective commemorative ceremonies were held; κοινά centred on the cult of a god provided this service for their members in the Hellenistic period, professional κοινά did the same later.³³ But the point of such collective arrangements was that the commemoration too was collective. If a κοινόν is entrusted with supervision of an endowment, one would expect its members to be beneficiaries. Our text is incomplete, but in what survives there is no sign that any members of the κοινόν other than the archons are expected to attend the annual commemorative banquet; the trouble taken throughout the text to define exactly who was entitled to participate proves that a general invitation was not extended to all members of the κοινόν. Nor is there any hint that the κοινόν owned a burial area of its own. Perhaps Symmasis, no doubt an influential member of the κοινόν, turned to it as an established structure capable of supervising his endowment, even if not directly concerned with it. But one wonders why the κοινόν should have undertaken the responsibility with no direct benefit to itself. Possibly Symmasis was a benefactor of the κοινόν in some way not revealed by the text.³⁴

A different possibility has been tentatively raised by ARNAOTOGLOU. Numerous Lycian language funerary inscriptions of the 4th c. assign a role in connection with protection of the tomb to a group known as a *miñti*.³⁵ The body survives in two Greek texts: in TAM II 40 (Telmessos, «end of the 4th c.») the μενδίται fix a fine (?) of six Alexandrian drachmai for anyone opening a particular tomb, and in PETERSEN – v. LUSCHAN (n. 36) 22 no. 27 (Kyaneai, «III c. B.C.»: these dates are obviously very approximate) opening of a particular tomb is forbidden without permission of the μίνδης, which is also charged with preventing and punishing violations. As protector of «the tomb which has the cover made of a single stone» (C 14–23) the κοινόν has a function which could in the past have fallen to a *miñti*/μίνδης. It also, however, has a role of administering the foundation which no *miñti* is attested as having had; for though, as we shall see, Symmasis is not unique among Lycians in providing for post-mortem sacrifices at his grave, a *miñti* is never mentioned in that context (in our admittedly highly deficient evidence). How a *miñti* was constituted – whether based on the family, broader kinship, or locality³⁶ – is not known, but it will certainly not have been a professional association. On present evidence, therefore, the discrepancy between the character and function of *miñti* and κοινόν is greater than the continuity.

³³ P. M. FRASER, *Rhodian Funerary Monuments*, 1977, 58–70; VAN NIJF (n. 29) 31–69.

³⁴ So A. CHANIOTIS. Structurally the role of the κοινόν vis-à-vis the endowment seems to be comparable to that of the city of Thera vis-à-vis that of Epicteta (n. 18), of which it is not a beneficiary.

³⁵ See e.g. T. R. BRYCE, *The Lycians*, 1986, 121–122.

³⁶ Cf. M. ZIMMERMANN, *Untersuchungen zur historischen Landeskunde Zentrallykiens*, 1992, 146–151. The supposed attestation of a μίνδης in E. PETERSEN – E. v. LUSCHAN, *Reisen im südwestlichen Kleinasien II: Reisen in Lykien, Milyas und Kibyratien*, 1889, 47 no. 85 has yielded to a better reading: C. SCHULER, *Chiron* 36, 2006, 425 no. 19. 6–7, with M. WÖRRLE and others, *Chiron* 37, 2007, 275.

The ritual

Symmasis' bequest is to finance, first, the annual sacrifice of a «three year old gelding» (probably a castrated pig)³⁷ on the 25th of Loios to «Sun who raised up (εὔξησεν) Symmasis and his wife Mamma». The administrators apparently are to conduct the sacrifice, at an unspecified place, and Symmachus' three sons and two sons-in-law are to attend the feast; the day is thenceforth to bear the names of Symmasis and Mamma.³⁸ We cannot be sure whether Loios 25 was Symmasis' birthday, or was associated in some way with the cult of Helios, or was significant to Symmasis in some other way.³⁹ Symmasis' strong statement of indebtedness to Helios is striking, both for the form in which it is expressed and for the choice of deity. The idea of the gods as a source of growth is already commonplace in archaic Greek literature; it is most commonly found in relation to crops and herds,⁴⁰ but Odysseus in the *Odyssey* vows offerings to the Nymphs if Athena keeps him safe and «grows up» (ἀέξει) his son, and rings for children have been found inscribed αὔξε or αὔξησις.⁴¹ (In an epigram from Tripoli on the Maeander which begins εἰκῶν Ἑρμολάοιο, τὸν ἠέξεσε πάρος μὲν | Μαιονίη Τρίπολις, the nurturing role of the gods is transferred to the native land.)⁴² So we should perhaps suppose that the primary reference is to physical growth and well-being, particularly given the choice of Helios. But a more general sense of «making prosperous / causing to flourish» cannot be excluded. The idea that the gods make a person's βίος in a broader sense grow or fail is, again, already widespread in Greek literature, and appears in prayers (possibly suggesting a regular prayer formula) such as that of Demokydes and Telestodike to Artemis: τῶν γενεὴν βιοτόν τ' αὔχσ' ἐν ἀπημοσύνη (Paros, c. 500?), or of the tyrant Hieron at Delphi ἠὲν ἄεξ' εὐόνυμ'

³⁷ Cf. C. NAOUR, ZPE 8, 1977, 278 n. 45.

³⁸ On «eponymous days» cf. POLAND (Anm. 28) 250, 523; the new Lydian text n. 64 below provides another example. Commemorative days are found without explicit talk of «heroisation»: in IG XII 3. 329 (LAUM, Stiftungen, no. 44: 2nd c. B.C.?) a Theran lady gives a sum to an existing κοινόν so that a day may be celebrated for her and her daughter in perpetuity; in OGIS 326 (LAUM, Stiftungen, no. 91; Teos, «shortly after 152/1», LAUM), a κοινόν of Attalistsai votes «eponymous days» for its priest and benefactor Kraton. On the concern for «memory survival» see the index entry to C. SOURVINOU-INWOOD, «Readings» Greek Death, 1995.

³⁹ See W. SCHMIDT, Geburtstag im Altertum, 1908, 36–47.

⁴⁰ Hom. Od. 9. 111 and 358; Od. 14. 65–66 (where the reference may be rather more general); Hes. Theog. 444; Hym. Hom. Dem. 469. My remarks here are a paraphrase of most helpful advice from Dr MAREK WEÇOWSKI.

⁴¹ Hom. Od. 13. 360. Rings: O. WALTER, ArchEph 1937, 108 n. 3. The verb was almost certainly used in a comparable sense in HANSEN CEG 743 (IG I³ 986) from the kourotrophic shrine of Cephisus at Phaleron.

⁴² MAMA VI 55; R. MERKELBACH – J. STAUBER, Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten I, 1998, 02/10/01. But the continuation of the epigram Ῥώμης δ' ἐνι κάθηετο βουλή may suggest a metaphorical sense of «increase» to be also present.

Ἄπολλ[ον].⁴³ We move closer to a social sense in two uses of the verb in a verse inscription from Kastolou Pedion in Lydia (late 1st c. B.C.?), in which a Jewish (?) dedicant thanks «the Sabathic god» for «raising him up» (εὔξησεν) (he has just mentioned acquisition of Roman citizenship) and prays for further «raising up» among the Romans (σὺ δὲ χαίρε καὶ αὐξοῖς | [εἰς αἰε]ἰ σῶζων πρῶτον ἐν Αἰνεάδαϊς.⁴⁴ All these connotations – physical, financial, social – may well be present in Symmasis' expression of gratitude. As for his god, the cult of Helios was famously prominent on Rhodes, and Rhodian influence is regularly invoked to explain the rather sparse attestations of honours paid to the god in Lycia.⁴⁵ But it is worth recalling LOUIS ROBERT's dictum that «Partout sans doute en Asie Mineure chacun adore, en plus de telles divinités, de tel panthéon, le Soleil et la Lune; on touché là au tuf religieux.»⁴⁶ Whatever the origin of Symmasis' devotion to Helios, its apparent intensity is impressive. It is not, however, a purely personal preference, because he makes a fine payable to the god (A 45); there must have existed an established cult.⁴⁷

There follows in the document a second sacrifice, apparently of a «goat or sheep», «on the altar that Symmasis would establish», to be followed by a banquet beside his tomb (near which the altar was doubtless to be established). This tomb was presumably the «tomb which has the cover made of a single stone» – a description enigmatically assumed to provide sufficient identification, though the feature is scarcely unique⁴⁸ – which is guarded against intruders in C 14–17. This second sacrifice lacks a date, as the first lacked a location, and all the participants in the first were to attend the second too (which however was to be conducted by the archons of the κοινόν of metalworkers, not mentioned in relation to the first). There is some temptation then to take the two sacrifices as constituting a single ceremony performed on Loios 25 beside Symmasis' tomb. If carefully expressed, however, the formulation «there shall feast on this day also (καὶ εὐωχηθήσονται καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ) beside his tomb the administrators and also the archons and the kinsmen specified above» must certainly set the event on an unspecified day other than the previously mentioned Loios 25;

⁴³ HANSEN, CEG 414. 4 and 397. 2. Literature: e.g. Hes. Op. 6; Soph. O.C. 1567; Eur. Med. 966; for such waxing and waning without explicit divine involvement Soph. O.C. 1453–1455; Eur. fr. 415. 4–5 and 916. 3 KANNICHT.

⁴⁴ TAM V 1. 225. 8 (cf. 15) (MERKELBACH – STAUBER, Steinepigramme I, 04/23/01).

⁴⁵ So most recently C. SCHULER – A. V. WALSER, in: F. KOLB (ed.), *Lykische Studien* 7, 2006, 180, republishing (173–175 no. 4) and dating to the 2nd/1st c. the attestation of a priest of «Zeus Eleutherios and Helios» from Trysa (PETERSEN – v. LUSCHAN [n. 36] 12 nr. 19). Best attested is the θρησκειτήριον of Helios near Arykanda (Σ Pind. Ol. 7. 35b, cf. I.Arykanda 88, 89). Cf. FREI (n. 5) 1796–1798.

⁴⁶ Documents d' Asie Mineure, 1987, 412.

⁴⁷ Cf. SCHULER (n. 32).

⁴⁸ I cannot provide the necessary archaeological commentary. A. CHANIOTIS suggests that what is meant is a cover that was sealed down after one use, not a multi-flap multi-use lid. But there were surely many such. How can Symmasis assume recognition of the right one? Was the inscription displayed in its vicinity?

as for location, it allows the possibility that both ceremonies happened beside the tomb, but does not make it a certainty.

We noted above a discrepancy between Sides A and B: Side A makes elaborate provision for the selection of a group of ten male kinsmen to attend the commemorative banquets, whereas Side B speaks explicitly only of Symmasis' three sons and two sons-in-law. Careless abbreviation is probably the explanation; at all events, the group of ten clearly represents Symmasis' original intention. It is to consist of his three sons and two sons-in-law and five representatives of the next generation (A 18–28). Whether these are to be the eldest sons of the first five (the obvious view – but in that case the restriction to a total of ten is redundant) or the first five males born to the original group of five is not clear; when deaths occur, the dead man is to be replaced, but the principle is again not quite clear, the phrase «the eldest from these» being vague (the dead man's eldest son? the eldest lineal descendant not yet included?). The details are not crucial; what is clear is the intention to create a self-renewing cell of male descendants who will continue the cult in perpetuity. Expressions of permanence tread on each other's heels on side B: ἀεί 11, 15, 29, 48, τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον 11, 14–15. It is noticeable that, though relations by marriage are only occasionally assigned the right to a place in Lycian family tombs,⁴⁹ Symmasis includes his two sons-in-law in the banqueting group, whom he twice speaks of as ἀνχιστεῖς;⁵⁰ the text adds a new complication to the already complicated issue of Lycian kinship structures. (Note too, incidentally, that Symmasis' two sons-in-law are brothers: two brothers marrying two sisters.) Women, however, are excluded, despite the prominent and it seems honourable place that they have in the «banqueting reliefs» on many Lycian tombs.⁵¹ It is not even clear that Symmasis intended his wife Mamma to attend the sacrifice from which she was to receive a portion of honour. The change of case in A 5–9 παραθήσουσιν δὲ Συμμασει καὶ ἄλλην ἐπίκωλον μερίδα ὀπισθίαν καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτ[ο]ῦ Μαρμας ἄλλην μερίδα ἐπ[ι]κωλον ἐμπροσθίαν may indicate that Symmasis is to be served directly with his own portion and also receives that «of» his wife to take away.

The uncertain relation between the first and second sacrifice is frustrating. But some striking features of the second sacrifice can be observed clearly. Though it is, as it seems (see below), primarily intended to be addressed to Symmasis and Mamma post mortem, it is to be initiated before their death, and they are to receive both ordinary

⁴⁹ A. V. SCHWEYER, *Les Lyciens et la mort*, 2002, 54–57, 194–195.

⁵⁰ A 34, B 38. Symmasis' language seems to differ from the semi-technical Attic usage (A. R. W. HARRISON, *The Law of Athens I*, 1968, 143–149), which included in the ἀγχιστεία collateral blood relatives but not normally «in-laws». The scope of the other Lycian attestation is obscure: HEBERDEY – KALINKA, *Bericht über zwei Reisen im südwestlichen Kleinasien* (Denkschr. Akad. Wien Phil.-Hist. Kl. 45.1, 1897) 28 no. 28. 15 (Kyaneai) [εἶναι δὲ τ]οῖς ἀγχιστεῦσιν [α]ὐτοῦ ἐπίτιμον καθάπερ ἐγ δι[χης].

⁵¹ J. M. DENTZER, *Le motif du banquet couché dans le proche-orient et le monde grec du VII^e au IV^e siècle avant J.-C.*, 1982, 394–428, esp. 425.

portions and special portions of honour from it,⁵² the latter to pass to their sons once they die; Symmasis gets a cut from the rear leg, Mamma from the (much less meaty) front leg (A 5–18).⁵³ (As noted above, Mamma's share disappears from the reprise of the topic in B 38–48, but Symmasis' ante mortem participation remains.) The recipient of the sacrifice is to be (B 31–32) «the hero of Symmasis and Mamma». Though in theory this could be «the hero to whom Symmasis and Mamma are especially devoted», it is hard to credit that they would have sought to perpetuate such a devotion for ever; the whole logic of the foundation indicates that the «hero of Symmasis and Mamma» was something closely associated with themselves, something on the lines of «that within Symmasis and Mamma which will allow them to survive as heroes after their death». The conception of a personal hero is unfamiliar; but in Lycia's neighbour Caria we frequently find references to the δαίμων or ἀγαθὸς δαίμων or ἀγαθοὶ δαίμονες of the dead.⁵⁴ Perhaps it was because the cult was initiated before the couple's death that it was directed not simply to «the heroes Symmasis and Mamma» but rather to their hero, a kind of potentiality within them. The sharing of one hero between man and wife probably reflects the man's concentration on himself rather than theology.⁵⁵

Greek and Lycian commemoration of the dead

Symmasis' foundation needs to be located in relation to two traditions. Several Lycian tomb inscriptions of the Hellenistic and Roman periods contain instructions for annual or biannual offerings to be brought (usually on specified days) to the tomb. Whereas the «customary offerings» brought to graves in mainland Greece in the clas-

⁵² Cf. I.Iasos 245 (LSA 60A; an extract in LAUM, *Stiftungen*, no. 120): Phainippos endows a priesthood which is to be held initially by himself; his successor is to make annual offerings on his tomb. For Roman commemorative rites beginning before the donor's death see SCHMIDT (n. 39) 37.

⁵³ Cf. G. ΕΚΡΟΤΗ, *Forelegs in Greek Cult*, to appear in a volume commemorating the 60th anniversary of the Swedish Institute at Athens.

⁵⁴ See I.Iasos 370, 397, 405, 408; I.Mylasa 428–429 with notes ad loc. (for many further instances see the index); J. M. CARBON, Δάρρων and δαίμων: A New Inscription from Mylasa, EA 38, 2005, 1–6, on SEG 52, 2002, 1064. 6; 54, 2004, 1117; Posidonius' foundation (below n. 68); LSA 56. 15–16 (now expanded as I. J. ADIEGO and others, *La stèle caro-grecque d' Hyllarima*, REG 167, 2005, 601–653, at 621–624).

⁵⁵ EDOUARD CHIRICAT refers me to a 2nd c. A.D. (?) funerary altar from Beroia inscribed Τι(βέριος) Κλαύδιος Φίλητος | έαυτοῦ και τῆς ιδίας γυναικός ♣ Κλαυδίας Κουάρτας | ♣ ἥρωι ♣ (L. ΓΟΥΝΑΡΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ – Μ. Β. ΗΑΤΖΟΡΟΥΛΟΣ, *Επιγραφες Βεροιας*, 1998, no. 353). Taken au pied de la lettre this is a dedication by Philetos to the hero of himself and his wife, and so exactly reproduces both singular features of our text, the hero of a person and the hero shared between husband and wife. But it is extraordinarily isolated in Beroia if so. It may be better if duller to suppose that the genitives reflect Roman usage (so A. B. ΤΑΤΑΚΙ, *Ancient Beroia. Prosopography and Society*, 1988, 509 n. 465) and (so the editors) that the dative singular is a slip for a genitive plural.

sical period are usually thought to have consisted of libations and vegetal substances only;⁵⁶ in Lycia animal sacrifice is sometimes required: a two year old kid, a «fine kid», a «cock and fine full-grown hen», a «gelding» (as in our text), a two-year old sheep, an undefined victim; only in two late texts is no more required than libations.⁵⁷ What is to be done with the victim is normally not specified, but one text says that «my heirs shall banquet and sacrifice» (εὐοχηθήσονται καὶ θυσιάσουσιν) annually; it is probably not rash to suppose that the animal was normally eaten.⁵⁸ In contrast then to the classical Greek commemorative offerings, deposited by relatives who then departed, the Lycian offerings could be occasion for a banquet at the tomb. The duty of bringing them falls to the dead person's wife, passing to «descendants» after her death, or children, or sons, or heirs, or slaves freed for the purpose, or, not very clearly, the «owner of the house», the «occupants of the house».⁵⁹ BRYCE has argued plausibly that these requirements to sacrifice in the Greek texts have at least one predecessor in a tomb inscription written in Lycian;⁶⁰ he suggests too that in the Lycian inscription a field was set aside to meet the cost of the offering. No such financial provision is normally made in the Greek texts, doubtless because performance of the rites is viewed as an obligation consequent on inheritance.⁶¹ Nor is much done in the Greek texts to ensure that the sacrifice continues to be performed: non-performance is threatened twice (not in early examples) with a fine,⁶² but more commonly just with divine anger.

Symmasis is evidently influenced by this indigenous tradition of feasting at the grave. But he goes beyond it in several ways: in scale; by establishing a source of revenue (though possibly here he had old Lycian precedent) and a mechanism designed to ensure that the sacrifice was in fact carried out; by inaugurating the commemorative feast in his own lifetime, and associating it with a sacrifice to a god, the Sun.

⁵⁶ See G. EKROTH, *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-Cults*, 2002, 278.

⁵⁷ Two year old kid: TAM II 636, Tlos, and 715, Çökek Asar; fine kid: SEG 54, 2004, 1458, no provenance; cock and hen: TAM II 245, Sidyma; gelding: SEG 27, 1977, 907, Arsada; two-year old sheep: SEG 27, 1977, 910, Arsada; an undefined victim: TAM II 458, Patara; JHS 68, 1948, 43 no. 3, Arsada; ZPE 8, 1977, 279 no. 7, Boubon; libations: I.Arykanda 136; TAM II 1037, Olympus. These last two texts are the only ones of the type from eastern Lycia. The requirement in TAM II 637 (Tlos) is too fragmentary for certainty.

⁵⁸ ZPE 8, 1977, 279 no. 7.

⁵⁹ Wife: TAM II 715; children: TAM II 458; sons: SEG 27, 1977, 907; heirs: ZPE 8, 1977, 279 no. 7; ? TAM II 637; slaves: I.Arykanda 136; owner/occupants of house: TAM II 636; SEG 54, 2004, 1458.

⁶⁰ T. R. BRYCE, *Sacrifices to the Dead in Lycia*, *Kadmos* 19, 1980, 41–49, on TAM I 84 (cf. BRYCE [n. 35] 69–70, 78); note too TAM I 150 (BRYCE [n. 35] 87); but on TAM I 149. 11–12 see the reservations of BRYCE, *Kadmos* 19, 1980, 49.

⁶¹ The reference to «three οἶκοι» in the late East Lycian text TAM II 1037 (Olympus) is puzzling; even if they are rooms, not houses, this seems a large endowment to finance the libations which are all the text goes on to call for.

⁶² TAM II 458; 636.

A second set of comparanda therefore become relevant, the various forms of «heroi- sation by private initiative» that were developing in this period in the broader Hellen- istic world. A private cult group devoted to the cult of a god could decide to recognise a prominent member as a hero on his death; possibly the prominent member had founded the group with that end in view.⁶³ A powerful family could assemble a group of ἡρωῖσται which was based on a nucleus drawn from itself but extended beyond it; a new example from the upper Cayster valley in Lydia numbers sixty four members.⁶⁴ Critolaus of Amorgus used the mechanism of endowment on a much broader scale: he established an annual banquet for all the citizens and residents of Amorgus, and an athletic competition, in honour of his dead son.⁶⁵ And there are many further relevant phenomena.⁶⁶ The form closest to Symmasis' is that found in a well-known though not large group of foundations that, like his, entrust the cult to a carefully-defined group of kin:

(1) Epicteta of Thera set aside a capital sum to be used after her death to endow what she called a «men's group of relatives» (ἀνδρείον τῶν συγγενῶν) which would meet annually for three days to make offerings: on day one to the Muses, on day two to «the heroes Phoinix, her husband, and Epicteta», and on day three to their two dead sons. This ἀνδρείον τῶν συγγενῶν was to consist of (a) twenty five named male συγγενεῖς, their wives, their children (daughters only until marriage) and children's children (b) «heiresses» (ἐπίκληροι) (from the family group) and their husbands and children (c) eight further named females (one a daughter of Epicteta, and the others no doubt related) and their husbands and their children. The society was to meet in a Mouseion which Epicteta's husband had already established for their dead son Kratesilochos.⁶⁷

(2) Posidonius of Halicarnassus established a society which was to consist of his children, his grandchildren born both of his sons and daughters, and apparently the husbands of his female descendants. Its purpose was to sacrifice annually (from the revenues from fields donated by him) on day one to the Good Fortune (Agathe Tyche) of Posidonius' mother and father and to the Good Daimon of Posidonius himself and

⁶³ For a society of ὄργεῶνες of Dionysus and the honours paid by it to Dionysius of Marathon and his father see IG II² 1325–1326 (Syll. ³ 1100–1101, 185/4 and 176/5 B.C.) with W. S. FERGUSON, *The Attic Orgeones*, HThR 37, 1944, 61–140, at 115–119.

⁶⁴ P. HERRMANN – H. MALAY, *New Documents from Lydia*, 2007, nos. 96 and 97 (2nd c. B.C.?), with C. P. JONES, *A Hellenistic Cult-Association*, Chiron 38, 2008, 195–204; cf. IG II² 1339, of 57/6.

⁶⁵ IG XII 7. 515 (LAUM, *Stiftungen*, no. 50; an extract in LSS 61). Very different is the foundation established (in the early 1st c. A.D.?) by Epikrates in memory of his son: he provided not for a crowd of relatives feasting together, but for two freedmen to tend the tomb and perform the Rosalia (P. HERRMANN – K. Z. POLATKAN, *Das Testament des Epikrates und andere neue Inschriften aus dem Museum von Manisa*, SBWien 265.1, 1969, 8–17, no. 1, lines 43–51).

⁶⁶ J. FABRICIUS, *Die hellenistischen Totenmahlreliefs*, 1999, is important, and for a valuable overview see now C. P. JONES, *New Heroes in Antiquity: From Achilles to Antinoos*, 2010.

⁶⁷ See n. 18.

his wife, and on day two to a range of gods: Zeus Patroios, Apollo who rules Telemessos, the Moirai and the Mother of the Gods.⁶⁸

(3) On Cos, Diomedon established a shrine of «Diomedontean Heracles» for the use of what are described as «Diomedon's descendants and their descendants»; but twice (86–87, 154) there is a reference to «those in the male line», οἱ κατ' ἀνδρογένειαν, which seems to exclude daughters' children. Though it is not made explicit that part of the point of the foundation was to pay cult to Diomedon himself after death, a two day festival was to be held each year (funded from property donated by Diomedon), at which on the first day Heracles was honoured, and on the second an offering of fish was made to an unspecified recipient: since fish were often offered to the dead, the general and plausible presumption is that the recipient was Diomedon.⁶⁹

There are differences in scale among these various foundations. Epicteta's used a shrine established by her husband, and envisaged well over fifty relatives participating, in contrast to Symmasis' maximum of ten; Diomedon too established a shrine, Posidonius a τέμενος, Symmasis merely an altar. There are important differences too of local religious tradition: Epicteta and her husband are to become heroes; at Halicarnassus sacrifice is to be made to the Good Fortune of Posidonius' mother and father, and to the Good Daimon of Posidonius himself and his wife; in our text, as we have seen, the recipients are to be «the hero of Symmasis and Mamma». But the central aim of founding a society of συγγενεῖς to pay continuing cult to self and other family members is common to all; and, while the composition of the societies varies, that set up by Posidonius resembles Symmasis' quite closely. In each case, the cult paid to family members is parcelled up with divine cult:⁷⁰ on Thera, Cos and at Halicarnassus the «heroes» have a day or days within a longer event within which gods also have a day, while in our text the sacrifice to «the hero of Symmasis and Mamma» is preceded by that to «Sun who raised up Symmasis and his wife».

One reads in an old but still-cited book by E. F. BRUCK, and again in M. NILSSON'S great history of Greek religion, that the point of the funerary foundations was to ensure performance of funerary cult in the new conditions of the Hellenistic world: in the classical period one could rely on a kin group to pay one cult out of piety; later it

⁶⁸ BMus.Inscr. IV 896 (Syll.³ 1044; LAUM, Stiftungen, no. 117; LSA 72). The involvement of Posidonius' sons-in-law and grandsons-in-law depends on understanding the unexpressed object of the last part of the phrase «his offspring and their offspring both from males and females and those who receive from them» (οἱ λαμβάνοντες ἐξ αὐτῶν) as «brides»: see note 8 ad loc. in Syll.³.

⁶⁹ I.Cos 36 (Syll.³ 1106; LAUM, Stiftungen, no. 45; LSCG 177). I.Cos 349 (re-edited by S. M. SHERWIN-WHITE, ZPE 24, 1977, 207–217, no. 3) is very likely a similar foundation by the family of Charmylos, as SHERWIN-WHITE argues.

⁷⁰ In two third century foundations from Kalaureia, money was left for sacrifices to be performed on specially established altars of Poseidon and Zeus beside the statues of the donor or kin of the donor: IG IV 840–841 (LAUM, Stiftungen, nos. 57–58).

was necessary to establish a foundation to press them to do so.⁷¹ But, whether or not the general argument about loosened kinship ties has validity, what the family funerary foundations sought to achieve was commemoration on a grander scale than that received by ordinary individuals in the classical period. What precisely children had been expected to do for their parents each year at the *Genesia* under the title of «the customary rites» (τὰ νομιζόμενα) is a tantalisingly unanswerable question,⁷² but it was surely not on the scale of the annual banquet costing 200 drachmai for many more than 50 persons established by the will of Epicteta; since an animal was not normally sacrificed, there can scarcely have been a banquet. Symmasis too aspires to be commemorated by ten relatives, plus officials, not just during the life of his children, but in perpetuity. He thus goes beyond the Lycian tradition to which we have seen that he is indebted. This is not simply a continuation of funerary cult in changed circumstances, but an augmentation that blurs the boundary between it and the permanent cult of gods and heroes. How long this particular form of augmentation lasts is a question worth posing. Though none of the relevant inscriptions is precisely dated, the consensus puts Diomedon's foundation on Cos c. 300, Posidonius' at Halicarnassus in the third century, Epicteta's on Thera in the last quarter of that century. Our new example perhaps belongs in the mid second century. The family foundations tend to be seen as emblematic of new Hellenistic tendencies in relation to the dead, but that may be to treat them as more typical and symptomatic of the future than they really were: they may vanish before the late Hellenistic period, just one current amid that Euripus of conflicting currents which makes Hellenistic attitudes to the dead so hard to grasp.

The influences to which Symmasis was most exposed cannot be traced with precision. Some features of the document (in addition to the names and demotics) are characteristically Lycian: the role of Leto; the formula «let him be guilty before» (ἀμαρτωλὸς ἔστω)⁷³ the Sun and other gods; the anxiety about re-use of the tomb. Feasting at the tomb was a Lycian tradition, but Symmasis' foundation is drafted according to a panhellenic template, and the parallels available to us for a kinship-based commemorative group also come from outside Lycia. The role and indeed the existence of the κοινόν of metalworkers is a novelty at this date whether within Lycia or outside it. The conception of a «hero of Symmasis and Mamma» available to be honoured both before and after their death, and shared between them, is an unparalleled variation on the possibility for an individual of being treated after death as a hero.

⁷¹ E. F. BRUCK, *Totenteil und Seelgerät im griechischen Recht*, 1926, 231–270; M. P. NILSSON, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion II*², 1961, 116. For a different view see P. VEYNE, *Le pain et le cirque*, 1976, 245–251; P. SCHMITT PANTEL, *Évergétisme et mémoire du mort*, in: G. GNOLI – J. P. VERNANT (ed.), *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*, 1982, 177–188; VAN NIJF (n. 29) 65.

⁷² Cf. n. 56 above.

⁷³ See M. WÖRRLE, *Chiron* 8, 1978, 234–235; SCHWEYER (n. 49) 68.

Symmasis' strong devotion to Helios is a perhaps personal trait not demonstrably owed to any particular tradition. Much in the new text satisfyingly refuses to be pigeonholed within the rubrics of existing knowledge.

New College
Oxford – OX1-3BN

