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We publish here a Greek inscription, probably of the second half of the second century or the first half of the third, preserved in the museum of Manisa. It is reported to come from “the region of Kula." The corpus of inscriptions from this area was published in 1981 by P. Herrmann. Since then much new epigraphical evidence has been published, to which the following item is a further addition.

The inscription is a dedication, and the detailed story it tells shows that it is to be classified with the confession or propitiatory inscriptions. The great majority of these originate from the same area in which the new text is reported to have been found, Maeonia, the ‘Katakekaumene'; other confession-texts have been found elsewhere, especially in the Phrygian sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos (MAMA IV 279–90). Their chronological range extends from the early second century A.D. to the third quarter of the third.

Since there is great variety in the causes given for divine wrath, in how punishment came about, and in how the gods were placated, the following is only a rough outline of the usual pattern. A person is stricken with misfortune and somehow finds out, or is informed by the god or the god’s messenger, that the cause is a sin, some offense

1 TAM V.1, “Tituli Lydiae . . . regio septentrionalis ad orientem vergens." There is increasing evidence for the mixed Lydian, Phrygian, and Mysian character of the population in the northeastern area, covered by this corpus. We shall not address the appropriate nomenclature for this part of Asia Minor (northeast Lydia or southern Mysia Abbaitis); a bibliography on this problem is found in Herrmann, AnzWien 122 (1985) 249f.


3 According to the dated documents: TAM V.1 317 (A.D. 114/5); L. Robert, BCH 107 (1983) 516 (SEG XXXIII 1013: year 348 of the Sullan era = 263/4, erroneously put one year earlier by the editors).
which he or she has committed. To be released from his adversity, the
sinner must do away with the offense against the god, must propitiate
him; and the only way to do this is by erecting a stele inscribed with a
confession of the wrongdoing. Many of these stelae conclude by
calling on the reader to acknowledge the power of the god and not to
slight him.

A careful investigation of this category of inscriptions, with a con­sideration of their place in the history of religion, was published by F.
Steinleitner in 1913. Despite a remarkable increase of material and
of scholarly discussion since then, Steinleitner’s remains the basic
study. An up-to-date revision or replacement is desirable, but would
be premature before the appearance of some important texts still
awaiting publication. The present paper is meant as a contribution
towards that task.

Stele of white marble, height 1.03 m., width 0.51 (top) to 0.54 (bot­
tom), thickness 0.065; letter height 0.015 to 0.017. At top center,
representation of a crescent moon. Said to come from the area of
Kula; now in the Archaeological Museum at Manisa (inv. 5414).

PLATE

Μηνὶ Ἀρτεμιδώρῳ ᾿Αξιοτηνῷ
vacat of three lines

Συντύχη Θεογένοι εἰρόντος αὐ­
tῆς Θεογένου τοῦ ἄνδρος λιθάριον ὑα­
kίνθου, εἶτα κείμενον αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ οἶκῳ
αὐτῆς ἐκλάπη τὸ λιθάριον, καὶ ζητούσης
αὐτῆς καὶ βασανιζομένης ἐπευξάτο
Μηνὶ ᾿Αξιοτηνῷ περὶ αὐτοῦ ἵνα αὐτὴν
ἰκανοποησί, καὶ εἰρήθη κατακεκαμένου
καὶ ἡφανισμένου, ἐνδεμένου ἐν λυμο­
δίῳ ὑπὸ τοῦ κλέπτου τεθείμενον ἔπι
τοῦ τόπου, οὐ ἐκείτο ὀλόκληρον οὔτως

τε ἐπιφανεῖς ὁ θεός ἐν μιᾷ καὶ τριακο­
tῇ τὴν κλέψασα(ν) καὶ τούτο πνήσασα(ν) ᾿Απφίαν
Γλύκωνος οὐσαν παρθένου διερήξε·
περὶ<σ>υρούσης τε αὐτῆς τὴν ὑώμαν τοῦ

θεοῦ διὰ τὸ ἔρωτήσθαι ὑπὸ τῆς μητρός

4 Die Beicht im Zusammenhange mit der sakralen Rechtspflege in der Antike (Leip­
zig 1913).

5 See the references at Herrmann (supra n.1) 251 n.5; cf. 258, “mir sind einschliess­
lich der unedierten (sc. einschlägigen Texte) über 80 Exemplare bekannt, während
Steinleitner . . . über 21 verfügte.” Manganaro (supra n.2) and Malay/Petzl (supra n.2)
60–64 nos. 4–5, provide three more.
PETZL AND MALAY  

PLATE 1

Confession-Inscription from Maeonia
Syntyche, (wife) of Theogenes, (made this dedication) to Men Artemidorou Axiot(t)enos.
After her husband Theogenes had found a hyacinth stone, then (later) while it was lying in her house the stone was stolen, and when she was searching for it and being interrogated she prayed to Men Axiottenos to help her to satisfaction in regard to it; and it was found burned and disfigured, wrapped in a linen shirt, put by the thief in the place where it was lying when (still) undamaged. And so the god, having appeared [i.e. shown his power] on the thirty-first day, destroyed Glycon’s daughter Apphia, who was (still) a girl, who had committed the theft and done this. And because she [i.e. Syntyche] slighted (?) the god’s power, since she had been asked by the girl’s mother to keep silent, the god also became angry at this, (namely) because Syntyche did not make known and exalt the god. Therefore he made her set up the (report of the) punishment at his place at the time when (her) child Heracleides was thirteen years old, because she acted in men’s interest rather than in that of the god. It is Syntyche, the daughter of Apollonius and Meltine, who has brought to public knowledge the punishment.

The text consists of two main parts. The first (2–14) gives an account of how Men Axiottenos successfully brought about the solution of a case of theft; he was asked to do so by Syntyche, who found herself under suspicion of having stolen a precious stone. The god made the true thief, a girl, return the object and then probably put her to death as punishment. The second part (15–23) focusses on a religious wrong of which Syntyche made herself guilty: influenced by a request of the thief’s mother, she kept silent. The allusive description of events makes a full reconstruction impossible. The mother perhaps hoped that no one would notice the connection between Apphia’s death and the theft and therefore asked Syntyche not to reveal that the daughter had suffered for a crime. At any rate, the god, feeling deprived of his deserved glorification, became angry with Syntyche; in
order to placate him she had to set up not only a report of his
detection of the thief but also of his νέμεσις, that is, of how his wrath
was stirred up. We are not told how this was manifested, but the
unexpected mention of Syntyche’s thirteen-year-old son might suggest
that he was threatened.

The stele is dedicated to Μήν (or Μής)6 Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἀζιοττηνός. Set apart from the rest of the text, the name of the god is given as
a heading; it frames the representation of a crescent moon carved in
relief in the middle of this line. The letters are smaller than in the
following lines and less deeply cut; yet there seems to be no evidence
of an attempted deletion.

The testimonies for the worship of Men Axiottenos come from
‘northeast Lydia’, mainly the area around Gölda (Collyda). Herrmann
has demonstrated that the ethnic Ἀζιοττηνός derives from the topo-
nym Ἀζιώττα; Μήν Ἀζιοττηνός may have been the ruler and patron
of this place.7 The addition Ἀρτεμιδώρου may suggest that Men’s cult
in Axiotta went back to a foundation made by a certain Artemidorus.
This interpretation is not certain, however: most inscriptions offer
simply Men Axiottenos, without Ἀρτεμιδώρου;8 moreover, Μήν Ἀρ-
tεμιδώρου and Μήν (Ἀρτεμιδώρου) Ἀζιοττηνός are also mentioned as
holding other places than Axiotta.9 And we find Men Axiottenos fol-
lowed by ἐκ and persons other than Artemidorus;10 like the latter,
these persons may have been recognized as founders of local sanctu-
aries of Men or as initiators of cults maintained by families or associa-
tions.11

6 For instances of the nominative M(η)Σ rather than Μήν see J. Keil and A. von
Premerstein, Bericht über eine zweite Reise in Lydien (=DenkschrWien 54 [1911])
103. In inscriptions containing only oblique cases one cannot say which nominative
form is implied; for the sake of simplicity we shall use Μήν in such instances.

7 See P. Herrmann, “Men, Herr von Axiotta,” in Studien zur Religion und Kultur
Kleinasiens I (=EPRO 66.1 [1978]) 415–23, TAM V.1 525 with commentary, 526
(instances of Μήν/Μίς Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἀζιοττηνός quoted there as
unpublished has since been edited by H. W. Pleket, Talanta 10–11 [1978/9] 88–90
no. 13 [SEG XXIX 1174]).

8 Also simply Axiottenos, cf. TAM V.1 p.283 s.v.; new instances have since been published.

9 TAM V.1 460.9f, Μήν Ἀρτεμιδώρου Ἀζιοττηνός Κορεσα κατέχοντα; 461.1–5, Μήν Ἀρτεμιδώρου κώμην ἐνάθεντες. Without Ἀρτεμιδώρου: 159, Μίς Ἀζιοττήνου Ταρσαὶ βασιλεύουσα; in an unpublished
propitiatory inscription, Μήν Ἀζιοττηνός Περὶ κατέχοντα (sic; αΔ. 238/9).

10 TAM V.1 253, Μήν Ἀζιοττηνός Εἰς Ἀπολλωνίου; 344, Μήν Ἀζιοττήνῳ ἐπι-
κράτου, cf. 345; 343, Ἐπικράτου, cf. 254, Μήν Ἀζιοττηνός Εἰς Διοδόνου; cf. G.
Petzl, ZPE 30 (1978) 251 n.15 (the testimony for Ἀναπτήν ἐν Μηρῷ quoted there as
unpublished has since been edited by H. W. Pleket, Talanta 10–11 [1978/9] 88–90
no. 13 [SEG XXIX 1174]).

11 Keil/von Premerstein (supra n.6) p.104; see Herrmann (supra n.7) 421–23 for a
The new inscription can perhaps help to answer the question about the relation between the appellations Μὴν Ἀρτεμιδώρων Ἀξιοτητήνος and Μὴν Ἀξιοτητήνος. When Syntyche finds herself under suspicion of theft, she prays to Μὴν Ἀξιοτητήνος (7) that he prove her innocence. In what follows (12, 15f, 17, 19, 23) he is referred to as ὁ θεός, and it is said that he made Syntyche dedicate to him the present stele with the report of the punishment (20-22, cf. 17f, 24f). Since line 1 names Μὴν Ἀρτεμιδώρων Ἀξιοτητήνος as recipient of the dedication, it is clear that Μὴν Ἀρτεμιδώρων Ἀξιοτητήνος and Μὴν Ἀξιοτητήνος are designations for one and the same god, the latter being an abbreviated form. Therefore the shortened rendering of the god's title is a possibility to be reckoned with in inscriptions giving only Μὴν Ἀξιοτητήνος or Ἀξιοτητήνος. But it would certainly be rash to take this for granted in every instance.12

2–3: The usage Σωτρύχη Θεογένους, sc. γυνή rather than δυνάτης, is the less common.13 The names of Syntyche’s parents are given in lines 23f. Θεογένους: s-stem nouns in -ης often follow the first instead of the third declension.

2–14, the report of the theft and recovery of a valuable stone (λιθάριον βασιλέα): the thief—a girl—is convicted and punished by Men Axiottenos, to whom Syntyche had made appeal when suspected herself. A fair number of Maeonian propitiatory inscriptions attest to divine punishment for theft or illicit appropriation of property. In Tarsi, a place belonging to Saittai, the god Μεῖς Ἀξιοτητήνος Ταρσοῦ βασιλεύον was asked to prosecute any theft of clothes that might occur in a public bath (TAM V.1 159):14 “then a shirt was stolen, and the god punished15 the thief and made (him) bring the shirt after a detailed discussion of the material and of the problems connected with the nomenclature.

12 A survey of all dated texts mentioning this god does not enable us to trace any development in the nomenclature. If it were in fact correct in principle to recognize Μὴν Ἀρτεμιδώρων wherever the simple (Μὴν) Ἀξιοτητήνος occurs, we would be left with the problem of the personal names linked by ἐκ (see supra n.10). What would be the meaning, for instance, of Μὴν Ἀρτεμιδώρων Ἀξιοτητήνος Ἐκ Απολλώνιος? How did Apollonius' role (as cult-founder?) differ from that of Artemidorus?

13 Cf. Kühner/Gerth I 334 §414.2; Blass/Debrunner 107 §162.4.

14 The prosecution had been delegated to him by means of the "erection of the sceptre": for the procedure see most recently Chr. Naour, EpiqAnat 2 (1983) 119–22; Robert (supra n.3) 518–20. On the name of the god see supra n.9.

15 ἐνέμεσθεν, which in normal usage would mean ‘became angry with’. Since the anger of a divinity led inevitably to punishment, νεμεσάω is sometimes found for the more common κολάζω in these texts; cf. ἐνέμεσθεν, Malay/Petzl (supra n.2) 63ff no. 5.3 (Topuzdammari/Saittai), with nn.17f. It was a “Poetic Verb . . . rare in good Prose” (LSJ), but appears more frequently in later prose. In our text it occurs at 18, cf. νεμέσα in 21 and 25 and TAM V.1 460 (n.70 infra).
time to the god, and (the thief) made a confession.” Later, according to the god’s command conveyed by an “angel,” the shirt was sold, and the divine power manifested in these events was written on the stele.\(^\text{16}\) Neither the victim nor the thief is named; the thief apparently was a child.\(^\text{17}\) In the present inscription too, Apphia, punished for robbery, seems to have been a child.\(^\text{18}\)

Theft of money or the refusal to repay a loan are sometimes cited as occasioning the divinity’s intervention,\(^\text{19}\) or the disappearance of important documents.\(^\text{20}\) And it is not surprising in this largely agricultural area that we hear of the surreptitious appropriation of livestock: e.g. three pigs of Damaenetus and Papias had escaped and become mixed with the herd of Hermogenes and Apollonius, whose herdsman was a five-year-old child.\(^\text{21}\) While Damaenetus and Papias attempt to track down their pigs, Hermogenes and Apollonius claim to know nothing about them. Then the gods Anaitis and Men Tiamou are

\(^{16}\) κλαπέντος οὖν ἐματίων ὁ θεὸς ἐνεμῆση τὸν κλέπτην καὶ ἐπόρευε μετὰ χρόνον τὸ εἰμάτιον ἐνεκίων ἐπὶ τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ ἐξωμολογήσατο. ὁ θεὸς οὖν ἐκέλευε δι’ ἀγγέλου πρατήρια τὸ εἰματιάς καὶ στηλογράφησε τὰς δυνάμεις. In his commentary on the first edition P. Herrmann, Ergebnisse einer Reise in Nordostlydien (=DenkschrWien 80 [1962]) 31, wrote: “der Gott befiehlt dem Kleiderdieb διά ἄγγελον, das Kleidungsstück zu verkaufen und—offenbar doch von dem dabei erzielten Erlös—die Stele mit der Darstellung der δυνάμεις des Gottes zu errichten.” One might, however, suggest that the god ordered his clergy to sell the shirt and thus finance the stele for his glory. It is even possible that it was the victim himself to whom the god’s messenger gave the command. In TAM V.1 257 the wife of a certain Agathon from whom money had been stolen—and not the thief—dedicates a stele to Meter Aliane in return for its recovery. Usually, however, the sinner or his relatives see to the dedication.

\(^{17}\) This assumption is based on the smaller of the two reliefs: Herrmann (supra n.16) 30, “stehende Figur (Knabe?) mit erhobenen Händen” (photograph pl. VIII.2), cf. 31, “Sicher ist (der Täter) in dem kleineren Relief . . . dargestellt, und man kann danach annehmen, dass er noch ein Knabe gewesen ist.” The larger relief shows the god with his sceptre and the stolen μάτιον (cf. E. N. Lane, Corpus monumentorum religiosis dei Menis I [=EPRO 19.1 (1971)] no. 69 with pl. xxix; Robert [supra n.3] 519).

\(^{18}\) παρθένοι (14, 17); cf. TAM V.1 596, Μητρόδωρος Γλίκωνος παιδίον ὃν ἀκονιών κατατάξας στηλλάριον τῇ θεῷ ἐπέζησε ἀνασταθῆραι ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ ἄλλο (cf. n.21 infra).

\(^{19}\) TAM V.1 257, dedication to Meter Alanie ἐπὶ τοῦ κλαπέντος ἀργυρίου (δηναρίων) νιβ. . . καί ἐπιθέντος παρὰ Κρήσκεντι κτλ. (cf. in the present text 5 Κλάπη, 8 Κύρθη); further instances at 440, 443, 510, 525.

\(^{20}\) TAM V.1 231, two orphan children victims of ἐνιῶν ἀνθρώπων . . . ἀρότων ἐγγυαφά καὶ ἔτερα εἰδὴ ἐκ τῆς σκιάς αὐτῶν λαβραῖας. ἀιών is used similarly in 362, a curse against τὸν βεβληκότα τὸ π[ι]καίδιον καὶ ἰρκότα καὶ σύντορα (i.e. probably συνύτορα) τῇ ἀσπολία. Too little is preserved of the propitiatory inscription 180 to clarify the exact meaning of the words ἐπειδὴ ἄρθ[ἐν]των μον ὁπλαρίων νου ἔπο ’Ανθρωνίκου ε[ἰσ]τάκχον. See also n.29 infra.

\(^{21}\) TAM V.1 317. Here again (cf. supra nn.17f) a child—even if only indirectly—is involved in a crime; probably he is identical with τὸ τέκνον mentioned at the end of the inscription (line 21) as participating at the propitiation and eulogy of Anaitis. Cf. J. Zingerle, Jahrestheft 23 Beibl. (1926) 5–16 no. 1, with n.3.
entrusted with the investigation. As Hermogenes and Apollonius persist in their denial, the latter is put to death; finally his relatives arrange to placate the divinity.

3–4: The theft that occasioned the present affair had as object a λιθάριον ἴακίνθιον, probably a gem of hyacinth stone or else a small stone whose color was that of a hyacinth stone. According to Pliny this stone resembled the amethyst in some ways, though more watery in its violet color.22 Elsewhere its color is compared to the water of the sea as it appears near the coast in a shallow place.23 This is not what we now call the precious ‘hyacinth’; it has been supposed rather that in antiquity the term designated a subspecies of amethyst24 or a bluish aquamarine25 or else a blue corundum (sapphire).26

The λιθάριον of our text probably had this characteristic violet or bluish color, or was of the species of stone described by Pliny. The adjective ἴακίνθιος in this context is not elsewhere attested; its meaning here is ‘consisting of/belonging to the hyacinth-stone’.27 Apparently the words λίθοι ἴακίνθιοι in a papyrus of the fifth century are to be understood in a similar way.28

22 HN 37.125: multum ab hac (sc. amethysto) distat hyacinthos, ab vicino tamen colore descendens. differentia haec est, quod ille emicans in amethysto julgor violaceus diluitur hyacintho; cf. 37.122; Isid. Etym. 16.9.3, hic in Aethiopia invenitur, caeruleum colorem habens.

23 Heliod. Aeth. 2.30, ἵακινθοι ἀπεμμοῦντο χρόναν ἀκτῆς θαλαττίας ὡς ἀγχύβαθεν σκοτέλω μικρῶν ὑποφορτώσει καὶ τὸ ὑποκείμενον ἱαξάθει.

24 “Abart des Amethyst,” H. Blümmer, Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste III (Leipzig 1884) 252, with references to further testimonia.

25 A. Furtwängler, Die antiken Gemmen III (Leipzig/Berlin 1900) 393 with n.2, where he rejects the identification with the sapphire put forth by C. W. King, The Natural History (London 1865) 199.

26 D. E. Eichholz in the Loeb Pliny NH (X 266). On the magical effect of the λίθος ἴακινθος worn in a ring see Socrates and Dionysius Peri λίθων 27 (R. Halleux and J. Schamp, Les lapidaires grecs [Paris 1985] 166; we are indebted for this reference to E. Livrea, Florence), reporting that a ring-stone of this sort is usually engraved Ποσειδόνων ἓχων δελφίνα τῷ δεξίῳ ποδὶ καὶ τριάθαν τῇ δεξίᾷ χειρί. For gems of hyacinth-stone cf. Anthr Gr. 9.751; Dessau, ILS 4422; cf. n.28 infra.

27 For the ending, expressing belonging or relation to, see E. Schwzyzer, Gr. Gram. 13 (1959) 466. In our inscription ἴακίνθιος may well stand for an (unattested) ἴακινθιώς; for this ending, indicating ‘consisting of’, see Schwzyzer 467f. M. Leumann postulated a Greek ἴακινθιός on the basis of Latin hyacinthus, attested in Venant. Fort. (Carm. 8.3.270, 8.4.20); see TLL VI 3126 s.v.

28 PSI III 183.5, with Preisigke, Berichtigungsliste I 392 (‘hyazinthenfarbig’, Preisigke, Wörterbuch s.v.), At Candace’s court wine is offered to Alexander ἐν ποτηρίων σαμαραγδίων καὶ ἴακινθίων (Ps.-Callis. Hist. Alex. Magn. rec. λ, ed. H. van Thiel [Bonn 1959] 63.21, cf. 63.33; we owe this reference to an Ibycus word-search of the TLG records kindly made by David Packard). See also Aponius Comm. Cant. Cant. 8 (Bottino/Martini 159), ἀνίμαι... quas velut hyacinthinas gemmas Christus offert patris Passio Thomae p.142.2 Bonnet, tota fabrica (sc. palatii caelestis) ex lapidibus zmaragdinis et iacintinis (iacinctis Q, iacinctinis R) ... instructa est (cf. TLL VI 3126.25–29).

4–6: Syntyche's husband Theogenes had found the gem; later it was lying "in her house" and was stolen. She tried to recover it and found herself exposed to questioning. Although the verb βασανίζω does not necessarily refer to torture, Syntyche's appeal to the god seems to point to painful trials. The present participles ζητούσης and βασανιζομένης show that searching and interrogation occupied some length of time. Syntyche's house is mentioned explicitly (ἐν τῇ οίκιᾳ αὐτῆς). Therefore Theogenes' precious find was kept either in a house owned by his wife, or we must assume that οἰκία αὐτῆς is equivalent to γυναικώνυσι, Syntyche's own apartment.

6–8: In her distress Syntyche has recourse to Men Axiottenos and asks him to prove her innocence and to rehabilitate her: ἕπευξατο . . . πέρι αὐτοῦ (sc. τοῦ λιβαρίου) ίνα αὐτὴν ἰκανοποιήσῃ (i.e. -σῃ). Some inscriptions of this sort mention the transfer of the investigation to the gods. So for instance in the "sombre histoire villageoise" in which a certain Tatias, suspected by all of having given her son-in-law Lucundus a φάρμακον that drove him out of his mind, set up a sceptre and deposited curses in the temple in order to clear herself: ἣ δὲ Τατιάς ἐπέστρεψεν σκήπτρον καὶ ἀράς ἐθηκεν ἐν τῷ ναῷ ὡς ἰκανοποιοῦσα περὶ τοῦ πεφημίσθαι αὐτῆς. One could also entrust the god with the investigation of a case by 'giving the πιττάκιον' or by ceding a claim to the god. To call down a curse upon someone likewise meant to transfer him to the jurisdic-

29 This is the most common use of βασανίζω, to 'examine to find out the truth', e.g. Thuc. 7.86.4, 8.92.2; cf. Preisigke s.v. In P.Oxy. VI 903 (c. IV) a man is accused by his wife of having tried by means of torture (μαστιγούμενοι) to learn from the slaves τὴν ἄρας (sc. the wife) ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας μου . . . βασανιζομένους οὖν ἐπιτή διὸ οὖν τῶν σών ἔρχεται κτλ.

30 Cf. Lys. 1.9, οἰκίαν ἐςτὶ μοι διπλόν, ἵνα ἔχων τὰ ἄνω ταύτης κατὰ τὴν γυναικωμίνιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀνδρωμίνιν.

31 For ἐπεύξεσθαι with ίνα instead of the infinitive see Blass/Debrunner 240 §392.1c.

32 So Robert (supra n.3) 518.

33 See supra n.14.

34 ὡς ἰκανοποιοῦσα, rendered by Zingerle (supra n.21) 17 "um . . . sich Genugtuung zu verschaffen," adding (23) "mit vulgarer Genusvermengung das Aktivum statt des vom Sinne geforderten Mediums"; by LSJ Suppl. "defend oneself against an imputation"; see Herrmann ad TAM V.1 318.11. As in our inscription Men Axiottenos helps Syntyche, God occurs in a Christian context as ἰκανοδότης: in his will the testator Fl. Phoebammon promises the person who is to care for his orphaned sons, καὶ τὸν ἰκανοδότητας θεὸς ἄντι τῶν πόλων [τούτων] ἀμείβηται αὐτῷ πλούσια χερι (P.Cair.Masp. II 6715.255, A.D. 570). An unpublished confession inscription contains: Μηνοφίλα . . . τοῖς θεοῖς ἐνευξαμένη ἢ ἔκανος ἰκανοποιηθήσαι αὐτήν.

35 TAM V.1 318; in this instance, Tatias happened to turn the divine wrath upon herself and her son.

36 πιττάκιον ἐδώκεν, TAM V.1 251.6f with Herrmann's commentary; cf. Steinleitner (supra n.4) 100–05.

37 παρεχώρησεν τῇ θεῷ, TAM V.1 440.10f with Herrmann's commentary.
tion of the god. Thus Rhodia made a dedication to Meter Aliane because money stolen from her husband was recovered. She presumably had acted just as Syntyche does here: she had handed over the investigation to the goddess, who proved successful and therefore received the stele.

8–11: The inscription goes on to report that the gem was found wrapped in a linen shirt, put back by the thief in the same place it had been before. Yet it proved to be no longer ‘whole, undamaged’ (ολόκληρον, 11), but disfigured by fire. ἕφαυσμένον (9) probably means that it had lost its colour and had become in appearance inconspicuous and ordinary. According to mediaeval tradition, which presumably goes back to ancient mineralogy, the blue hyacinth-stone, unlike the red, suffers upon exposure to fire.

A modern reader might wonder whether in fact a thief returned the damaged gem: the burnt, scarcely recognizable object could have been a different stone. The claim in the inscription, that the thief had wrapped up and returned the stone, would have been hard to prove.

11–14: The god’s appearance “on the thirty-first day” is ambiguous: reckoned from the theft or—if this happened on a different day—from the god’s taking up the investigation? The chronological indication seems to be related apo koinou to ἐπιφανεῖς as well as to διέρηξε: Apphia’s violent death was an immediate consequence of the god’s appearance. We are not told however whether this event coincided with the rediscovery of the gem. Men Axiottenos both freed Syntyche from her difficult situation and punished Apphia, daughter of Glycon, τὴν κλέψασα(ν) καὶ τοῦτο πνήσασα(ν); this last phrase refers to

---

38 For δραῖ in propitiatory inscriptions see supra n.35 (lines 10, 25f), and TAM V.1 525.9f, 492.2 (?); Herrmann/Varinlioglu (supra n.7) 6f no. 3.3 with n.20, 13 no. 9.2; cf. Steinleitner (supra n.4) 100–08.
39 TAM V.1 257, cf. supra n.19.
40 For ἐ νθέμενον instead of ἐ νθημενον compare συνθεμένον in a Sethianic curse-tablet: Audollent, Defixionum tabellae 155.a.36, b.6; K. Dieterich, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache (Leipzig 1898) 215f.
41 οπδ τοι κλέτνων is to be related apo koinou to both ἐ νθεμένον and τεθεμένον.
42 Compare the report (quoted supra n.16) in which the thief is compelled by the god to bring the stolen shirt to the temple.
43 Deductions and propitiatory inscriptions of this region normally use ὀλόκληρον/ ὀλοκληρία in the sense of ‘healthy/health’, cf. L. Robert, Hellenica X (Paris 1955) 97–103; TAM V.1 238.7, 323.3; H. Malay, EpigrAnat 6 (1985) 121 no. 38.2.
44 H. Lüschen, Die Namen der Steine2 (Thun 1979) 241f.
45 For children as sinners in such texts see supra nn.17, 18, 21; cf. the fragmentary TAM V.1 269.4 (with Buckler’s supplements) [τὴν] παρένων καὶ ναυ[κών] (the context is obscure).
46 For the omission of final nū see Dieterich (supra n.40) 88–91; F. Gignac, Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (Milan 1976–81) I 111f.
the damage to the stone, as distinct from the theft. Both actions are instances of the god’s manifestation, his epiphany. Compare a dedication from Saittai, offered to θεός ὡς Υψιστος and μέγα Θείον ἐπιφανείας;47 an altar from Saraçlar (A.D. 20/1) was set up to Ἀπόλλωνι Νυσυρεΐτη ἐπιφανεί (TAM V.1 427). The attribute ἐπιφανής seems to be attested also in a very fragmentary confession inscription from Ayazviran.48

Apphia seems to have atoned for the wrongdoing with her life: the god smashed her, διέρηξε.49 Describing how Heracles killed Busiris, Dio Chrysostom writes τὸν δὲ Βούσιριν . . . διέρηξεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καταβαλὼν (8.32). The death penalty inflicted by the god is not at all extraordinary in the reports of the propitiatory inscriptions; it can strike the sinner himself, his relatives, or his livestock.50 Strabo (12.8.9 [574f]) tells the story of the ‘gangster’ Cleon, who a month51 after being ordained a priest at Comana in Pontus died of a disease; those who belonged to the sanctuary interpreted this as a punitive reaction of the goddess,52 since Cleon had blatantly disregarded the taboo against pork.

The remainder of the inscription focusses upon Syntyche, who apparently had become guilty, probably after the god’s investigation of the theft, of a wrongdoing.

15–16: She acted in a way that was interpreted by the god as showing disrespect to his power. So too the sinner Stratonicus, at the end of his confession inscription, urges the reader “not to slight the god’s

49 For the single rho cf. Gignac (supra n.46) II 246.
50 The sinner(s): TAM V.1 231.15 (ὁ θεὸς . . . διέφθειρε), 317 (τελευτήσαντος; cf. supra 465), 326 (ἀπετέλεστο, for which see infra), 440 (κολασθέντος . . . ἐς βαπτόν λόγον), cf. 492.5, 527.8, Herrmann/Varinioğlu (supra n.7) 9. The sinner and her son: supra n.35. Relatives: Herrmann (supra n.1) 255–58 no. 2, ἀπετέλεσε ἀυτοῦ Ἑλεύθερον τῶν νόμον καὶ Μαρκίαν τὴν ἐκγονὸν αὐτοῦ ("brachte der Gott seinen Sohn Iulius und seine Enkelin Marcia zu Tode"). A relative and livestock: TAM V.1 464.10ff, ζημίας αὐτῷ ἑπόσφερε ἀποκτινός αὐτῷ τὰ κτήνη βοῶν καὶ ὄνοι ἀποθανόντως δὲ τοῦ Ἐρμογένου ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτοῦ τὴν θυγατέραν.
51 ἐντὸς μηναίου χρόνου: cf. here 12f, ἐν μακαρικοτη.
52 ὡς ἔφασαν οἱ περὶ τὸ ἱερόν, κατὰ μήνιν τῆς θεοῦ; cf. Zingerle (supra n.21) 45ff.
power."53 A number of texts of this category show how sensitive the gods were about persons who did not believe in their might or were even contemptuous of it. In principle, any deliberate transgression of divine order is a sign of contempt of the divinity; but sometimes the inscriptions stress explicitly that the god has not been respected.54 If we correct the meaningless ΠΕΡΙΚΙΝΟΥΣΗΣ to περὶ<ν>υρώνης, Syntyche "ridiculed" the power of the god. In the Odyssey (17.217ff) the goatherd Melantheus addresses mocking and provocative words to Eumaeus and Odysseus; in his commentary, Eustathius (1816.46) points out that Odysseus' anger is stirred up διὰ τὸ τοῦ λόγου . . . ψυγερὸν καὶ περισύρων ἐπεὶ τῷ τὴν κωμῳδίαν ψόγον καὶ περισύρμα ὀρίζων οἱ παλαιοὶ.55

16–19: The consequence of Syntyche's fault is divine punishment: "the god also was wroth at this."56 Although the preceding genitive absolute gave the reason for the god's nemesis, it is explained again in a following ὅτι-clause, "because Syntyche did not show the god (sc. in his eminence) or praise him." ἐκφαντεύω is not attested elsewhere; Ps.-Dionysius has ἐκφαντεία,57 and other formations on ἐκφαντ- show that its meaning here is 'reveal, make known'.58 It is perhaps relevant to

53 TAM V.1 179b.11f [SEG XXVIII 914]: αὐτοῦ (sc. τοῦ Δίως τοῦ Ἐγ Διδώμων Δροῦν) τὰς δυνάμεις μή τίς ποτε κατέτευχ(ή) (i.e. κατετελήσῃ); κατετελέσασα Μύρα Λαβαδα is said to have been the sin of one Elpis, see Herrmann (supra n.1) 251 no. 1.2f, with 253 and n.9 on the verb.

54 Cf. Malay/Petzl (supra n.2) 60 no. 4.2–5, μεγαλορημονησας Μύρα Ἀξιεττρήν (Kalburcu, a.D. 159/160); cf. the preceding note, and the urging at TAM V.1 179a.11–13 [SEG XXVIII 913], ὅτι οἱ δεὶ καταδεονεὶς τοῦ θεοῦ (similarly the Phrygian inscriptions MAMA IV 279, 280, 282–285). Disbelief or disobedience is also taken as a punishable sin: TAM V.1 464.11 ἀπίσθανοντος, Herrmann (supra n.1) 255 no. 2.5 ἐπικεφαλήσας, Robert (supra n.3) 520 [SEG XXXIII 1012.2f] μὴ πιστεύοντα τῷ θεῷ.

55 LSJ s.v. περιφυτόω 1.2. The verb occurs in a different context in the confession inscription TAM V.1 231.10: περισυρομένων αὐτῶν (two orphans) ἵπποι δακτυλῶν. There the precise meaning is not clear: had the creditors maltreated them (so Zingerle [supra n.21] 42, "hart zugesetzt")? Or had they even confiscated their property? Cf. Herrmann (supra n.16) 51 no.201. By letter Herrmann suggests that the letters might be a corruption of περιφωνούσης. The meaning would then probably be, "because she put the god's power to the test"; for περιφωροῦω meaning 'strike all round' (a vessel to test if it is cracked) cf. Pl. Phlb. 55c, Iamb. Myst. 8.5; see LSJ s.v. 2. In Lucian's Podagra the deified disease emphasizes how angrily she reacts if someone tests her strength (176–81): τοῖς . . . περιφορεὶ μὲ εἰσὶν ἅπασταν μᾶλλον ὅργιλωτέρα. . . . ὁ γὰρ μεταλαβὼν τῶν ἐμῶν νυμφηρίων πρῶτον μὲν εἰόθεν εὐστομεία διδάσκεται. By εὐστομεία one is reminded of εὐλογεῖν, a verb often used in proprietary inscriptions (see n.60 infra).

56 νεμεσάω is here construed with the accusative of respect τοῦτο; on its meaning see supra n.15.

57 De cael. hier. 2.1 (Migne, PG 3.136d); "elucidation, explanation," Lampe, Patristic Greek Lexicon s.v.

58 See LSJ and Lampe s.vv. ἐκφαναίος, ἐκφαντικός, ἐκφαντορία (=ἐκφανὸς φανερώσαι, Suda), ἐκφαντορικός, ἐκφαντος, ἐκφάντωρ.
recall the θεοφάνης mentioned in a Smyrnaean inscription. The epexegetic υψώσε makes clear how the god expected Syntyche to ‘reveal’ him: by praise. The eulogy of the god’s dynamis is a central theme in confession inscriptions. The present text is the first of this category to express this exaltation or praise with the verb υψώ. In the Septuagint υψώ is often nearly synonymous with υμιν and δοξάζω, whereas in non-biblical contexts it occurs only rarely and in late texts. It is tempting to take υψώ in the Maeonian inscription as testimony for the influence of Jewish vocabulary. Of εὐλογεῖω/εὐλογία, whose meaning is close to that of υψώ, it has already been suggested that they were chosen under such influence.

Syntyche made herself guilty of slighting (περισύρειν) the god’s power by failing to reveal him with an act of praise. The text indicates the reason: the mother of the thief asked her to keep silent (16f). Probably after the theft was resolved and Syntyche was obliged to reward the god for his resourcefulness, Apphia’s mother undertook to keep the affair concealed. Presumably she was concerned for the reputation of her dead daughter; perhaps no one would have known

59 Petzl, I.Smyrna 728.1 with commentary.
60 εὐλογοῦμεν στηλλογοράφησαντες τὰς δυνάμες τῶν θεῶν (TAM V.1 318.32–34), and similarly many other instances; for εὐλογεῖω/εὐλογία as supposedly reflecting Jewish influence see infra; (to Meter Anaitis) μαρτυροῦμεν καί εὐλογοῦμεν (TAM V.1 317.23f); μαρτυροῦμεν τὰς δυνάμες τῶν θεῶν (319.5f); ἀνέστησε τὸ μαρτύριον (179α [SEG XXVIII 913]); θεοῖ τοῖς ἐν Περέσσῳ μαρτύριοι (presumably = μαρτύριον; Herrmann/Varinlioğlu [supra n.7] 6f no. 3.1f with n.19); ἀνέγραψα τὴν ἄρτην (TAM V.1 264); ἐνέγραψαν τὰς δυνάμες τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ νῦν εὐλογοῦμεν (464); ἀνέγραψα τὰς δυνάμες τοῦ θεοῦ (Robert [supra n.3] 516 [SEG XXXIII 1013.7f]).
61 Steinleitner (supra n.4) 112f n.2 compares Babylonian usage, in which the sinner at the end of his expiation praises and extols the divinity.
63 L. Robert, CRAI 1978, 249 n.47: “Quant aux nombreux exemples de la Ménie . . . je n’exclus pas . . . une influence du vocabulaire juif, tant les Juifs ont été nombreux et influents en Asie Mineure à l’époque impériale.” H. W. Pleket, in Faith, Hope and Worship (Leiden 1981) 184–89, on the other hand assumes that εὐλογεῖω/εὐλογία in Maeonia had no direct connection with Jewish usage; rather the LXX and the Maenians chose εὐλογεί- independently because “it was the non-secularized Greek word for ‘praise’ and, moreover, a term which had been used in situations of great awe and respect for the god” (187). For the borrowing of terms in western Anatolian cults from Hellenistic Jewish communities of the area see also A. R. R. Sheppard, “Pagan Cults of Angels in Roman Asia,” Talanta 11–12 (1980/1) 77–101.
64 For the ὑα construction see Blass-Debrunner §392.1c.
about the connection between the reappearance of the gem and Ap­
phia’s death if Syntyche did not reveal it in an ex-voto. This was what
the mother tried to prevent, and Syntyche yielded to the request, acting “in men’s interest rather than the god’s” (22f). The diction here
becomes solemn,65 and one might deduce that these words are quoted
from the temple authorities’ characterization of Syntyche’s wrongdo­
ing.

The human sphere is strongly contrasted with the divine by the op­
position το των ἀνθρώπων/τοῦ θεοῦ.66 A fragmentary propitiatory text
from Philadelphia reflects the idea of the powerless inferiority of
human beings: a woman set up a declaration, presumably of the
salvation brought about by the god, “after she had been severely
punished (by the god) and given up by mankind” (κολασθείσα [π]ονη­
ρώς [κ]αὶ ἀφελπισθούσα ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων).67

19–22: “Therefore68 he made her set up the (report of his) anger.”
As in many similar inscriptions, we read that the god forced69 the
sinner to erect a stele narrating the whole affair, νέμεσις (cf. line 25)
here meaning the report itself. We are not told, however, exactly what
the punishment consisted of. In the only other instance found of νέμεσις in confession inscriptions, the word means the report of sin, divine punishment, and relief from it.70

A precise statement is made concerning when the νέμεσις, i.e. the
present stele, was set up: when Syntyche’s son Heracleides was thir­
teen years old. This way of specifying the date is strange; the
τέκνων Heracleides had not been mentioned before. That the deadline for

65 Some of the propitiatory inscriptions tend to a somewhat hieratic, elevated style. So for instance TAM V.1 318.14–23, οἱ θεοὶ αὐτὴν ἐποίησαν ἐν κολάσει, ἦν οἱ διεγένεις όμοιοι καὶ . . . οὗτος αὐτῆς παράγων τὴν ἱσοδον . . . δρέπανον κρατῶν ἀμπελοτόμω, ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς ἐπέσεν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὸν πόδαν, καὶ οὕτως μονημέρῳ κολάσει ἀπελλάγη (cf. Zingerle [supra n.21] 21, “geschraubte Wendungen und Worte”); 440.11–13, κολασθεῖτοι . . . ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν ἰς θεατὴν λόγον. These words on the base of a statue of Men have the air of quoting a divine answer (Manganaro [supra n.2]): ’Αμύνταν πεποιχότα . . . κε­
χαρισμένον εἶναι Μην ’Ἄξιτηρῷ καθίσε (probably=kathisma; κάθιε, “ha innalzato,” ed.) ἀφίδρομα (A.D. 118/9). Unpublished inscriptions supply further instances of this
tendency.

66 One is reminded of Ev.Luk. 20.25, ἀπόδοτε τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ
θεῷ.

67 A.-E. Kontoleon, REG 12 (1899) 385 no. 8 (Steinleitner [supra n.4] 46 no. 19); cf. IGUrbRom I 148.8, 11, ’Ἰουλιανῷ ἀφθισμεμένῳ ὑπὸ παντὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐχρημάτισεν ὁ
θεὸς (Asclepius) κτλ. (early III A.D.).

68 For this meaning of δι’ ὅτι see Schwzyzer, Gr.Gram. II 3 (1950) 661, “‘weshalb’, auch mit ‘relat. Anschluss’ . . . ’deshalb’.”

69 With ἐποίησαν here compare the text quote supra n.16, ἐποίησε κτλ.

70 TAM V.1 460: ἵπτε(ς) Ἰροφήμ . . . κληθείσα ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἱς ὑπηρεσίας χάριν μὴ
βουληθήσατα ταχεῖος προσελθεῖν, ἐκολάσετο αὐτὴν καὶ μανήσε ἐποίησεν ἤρωται σὺν
Μητέρα Ταρσηνὶ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα Τάρμοι καὶ Μήνα ’Αρτεμιδώρων ’Αξιστηρῶν Κορεσα
κατέχοντα, καὶ ἐκέλευσεν στηλογραφθῆναι νέμεσιν καὶ καταγάψει ἐμαυτήν ἵς ὑπηρεσίαν
τοῦ θεοῦ. For νεμέαι see supra n.15.
completing the expiation is defined by his age may suggest that he was somehow involved in the events, perhaps affected in some way by Men’s νέμεσις. It is natural that when a god ordained the erection of a stele, he wanted it executed as quickly as possible; delay roused his anger. Yet for the indication of an exact date by which the work was to be completed, the only parallel seems to be in an unpublished text from Selendi, where apparently the god says: εἶλεος εἰμαι ἀναστανομένης τῆς στήλης (for -λης) μου ἡ ἡμέρα ὁρίσα. Presumably all confession stelae were set up in the sanctuaries of the respective gods; it is a peculiarity of this text that it specifies that the νέμεσις must be erected “at his (surely the god’s) place.”

23–25: The closing remark states that it was Syntyche who “set forth as a public notice” the record of the divine punishment. Her name stands in a worn part of the stone; but it is sufficiently legible and shows no sign of intentional deletion. Lines 24 and 25 are written—probably by a different hand—in larger and less elaborate letters. Here her parents are named, but it seems that the persons mentioned in this affair, whose names have little or nothing to distinguish them, cannot be securely identified with homonyms occurring in other texts; TAM V.1 656 is an undated tombstone from Daldis erected by a Meltine for her husband Apollo.75
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71 In the inscription from Kalburcu (supra n.54), the god demands a relief or sculpture of Men Tiamou and Anaitis, and postponement caused punishment (see Herrmann’s commentary on lines 8f).
72 Compare TAM V.1 536 (Maeonia, a.d. 171/2): κατὰ τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἐπισταγῆν ἵερος δοῦμοι εἰς Ὕδωρ Διὸς Μασφαλατσμῷ καὶ Μηνὶ Τιαμοὺ καὶ Μηνὶ Τυράνῳ ἐκείνους τῇρείθαι ἀπὸ ἡμῶν θ’ (“votum intra nundinum solvendum esse” J. Keil, quoted by Herrmann ad loc.): εἰ τις δὲ τούτων ἄπειθη, ἀναγράφεται τὰς δυνάμεις τοῦ Διός.
73 Cf. TAM V.1 465.2f, [ἀνεύστησεν] τὴν στήλην ἕ τοις θεοῖς. The god’s place presumably corresponds to what is elsewhere called ὁ χορὸς (TAM V.1 238.3f); cf. the χορίον in the confession inscriptions of the sanctuary of Apollo Lairbenos in Phrygia, ΜΑΜΑ IV 279–289.
74 Cf. LSJ s.v. προγράφω II; for -οίςα rather than -ύα in a perfect participle see Dieterich (supra n.40) 207.
75 We should like to express our deep gratitude to Zeph Stewart (Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington), who both helped improve our English and also aided our understanding of the inscription in several points. We also wish to thank several institutions. G. Petzl had the pleasure to work on this article in the Center for Hellenic Studies and use its excellent facilities as well as those of Dumbarton Oaks. Financial support from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (Bonn) enabled H. Malay and Petzl to work together in the Manisa museum in 1983.