Classical Quarterly (2004) **54.2** 579–591
doi:10.1093/clquaj/bmh059

PRIESTLY PROCLAMATIONS AND SACRED LAWS

INTRODUCTION

In Julian's *Caesars* (Or. 10 Lacombrade), at a *Saturnalia* conducted by the Olympian deities to which some of the deified caesars and Alexander the Great have gained admission, Hermes supervises a competition in which the deceased rulers are asked what their guiding principle in life was.[1] The competitors are Alexander, Caesar, Octavian, Trajan, Marcus Aurelius, and Constantine. All of them with the exception of Constantine give suitably edifying answers (31–6, 329d–35b). Constantine, for his part, replies that his goal in life was to accumulate a large amount of wealth wherewith to gratify in generous measures his own desires and those of his friends (36, 335a–b). The gods now cast their votes; the majority of them go to Marcus Aurelius, but Zeus and Cronus confer and decide to ask Hermes to make an announcement that will keep winners and losers equally happy. What Hermes proclaims is that the kings should go to live under the leadership of whatever god they find pleasing and that they should henceforth use him as their patron and guide. At this, Alexander makes for Hercules, Octavian for Apollo, Marcus Aurelius for Zeus and Cronus; Ares and Aphrodite take pity on Caesar, who is at a loss, and call him to their side, while Trajan runs to sit beside Alexander (37, 335c–36a). Constantine, finding no tutelary deity amongst the gods for the form of life he preferred and seeing Luxury (*Τρυφή*) at hand, runs up to her; she embraces him warmly, clothes him in a tunic of many colours and leads him to Debauchery (*Ἀσωτία*); in the company of the latter he finds Jesus, who proclaims to all and sundry that by washing wrongdoers in water he will straightway make them pure and that if they are again found to be guilty of the same failings, he will grant them purity, if they strike their heads and beat their breasts:

> . . . ἵνα καὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν εὑρὼν ἀναστρεφόμενον καὶ προαγορεύοντα πᾶσιν· ὅστις φθορεύς, ὅστις μιαιφόνος, ὅστις ἐναγὴς καὶ βδελυρός, ἴτω θαρρῶν· ἀποφανῶ γὰρ αὐτὸν τουτῳὶ τῷ ὕδατι λούσας αὐτίκα καθαρόν, κἂν πάλιν ἔνοχος τοῖς αὐτοῖς γένηται, δώσω τὸ στῆθος πλήξαντι καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν πατάξαντι καθαρῷ γενέσθαι. (38, 336a–b)

> . . . where he found Jesus, who kept company with her and proclaimed to all: Whoever corrupts sexual morals, whoever is a murderer, whoever is impure and vile, let him proceed in full confidence, for I shall straightway make him pure with this water here and if they again succumb to the same failings, I shall grant that they will be pure, if they beat their breast and strike their heads.

[1] The arguments of C. Lacombrade, *L'empereur Julien: oeuvres complètes* II.2 (Paris, 1964), 27–30 seem to have persuaded the majority of scholars that the work was written for the *Saturnalia* of A.D. 462, when Julian was in Antioch preparing for his Persian campaign, and not for those of 461, when he had just arrived in Constantinople. I am much indebted to W. J. Slater for catching a number of errors in an earlier draft of this paper. I also owe a particular debt of gratitude to J. G. Howie for helping me with the interpretation of F. Sokolowski (ed.), *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplement* (Paris, 1962), no. 91.23–6 (henceforth *LSS*) and for remembering a pattern of speech in Pindar. David Jordan read the paper, pointed out errors, and drew my attention to an important parallel that I had overlooked.

Classical Quarterly 54.2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

If any one passage is the inspiration for the proclamation Jesus makes, 1 *Corinthians* 6.9–11 is the likeliest candidate; there Paul gives a list of the unrighteous who, when washed pure, will inherit the Kingdom of God.[2] Jesus' proclamation in Julian has with reason been compared with the invitation Celsus says Christians issue to wrongdoers to join them, an invitation that also looks back to 1 *Cor.* 6.9–11:[3]

ἐπακούσωμεν δὲ τίνας ποτὲ οὗτοι καλοῦσιν· ὅστις, φασίν, ἁμαρτωλός, ὅστις ἀσύνετος, ὅστις νήπιος, καὶ ὡς ἁπλῶς εἰπεῖν, ὅστις κακοδαίμων, τοῦτον ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ δέξεται. (Origen. *c. Cels.* 3.59)

Let us hear whom these men summon: Whoever, they say, is a sinner, whoever is without understanding, whoever is a fool, and, to put the matter simply, whoever is ill-starred, the Kingdom of God will receive that man.

Celsus has just declared that in marked contrast with the invitation that Christians issue to sinners, encouraging them to take part in their rites, are the proclamations issued by those who have charge of mystery-cults:

οἱ μὲν γὰρ εἰς τὰς ἄλλας τελετὰς καλοῦντες προκηρύττουσι τάδε· ὅστις χεῖρας καθαρὸς καὶ φωνὴν συνετός, καὶ αὖθις ἕτεροι· ὅστις ἁγνὸς ἀπὸ παντὸς μύσους καὶ ὅτῳ ἡ ψυχὴ οὐδὲν σύνοιδε κακόν, καὶ ὅτῳ εὖ καὶ δικαίως βεβίωται.[4]

Those who summon persons to participate in mystery-rites proclaim the following: Whoever has pure hands and who speaks intelligibly;[5] yet others utter this proclamation: Whoever is pure of all taint and whose mind is conscious of no ill and who has lived a good and righteous life.

What, accordingly, strikes both Celsus and Julian about Christianity is that it admits to its rites those who have serious moral faults. Julian, in particular, has difficulty with the ease with which Christians can be cleansed of their sins. Celsus explicitly compares the proclamations made by Christians with those pronounced by pagan priests; in the latter, wrongdoers are allowed no access to the gods and their rites. That Celsus and Julian can feign outrage at the willingness of Christians to welcome sinners into their midst throws an interesting light on the qualities that some educated pagans thought were called for in those wishing to worship the gods; it is a matter that merits further study. It is the form in which Julian and Celsus couch the Christian message, not its content, that is the subject of the present paper. I shall attempt to show that both authors present it in the shape of a pagan priestly proclamation directed at those seeking entry to a sanctuary. The verbs that Celsus and Julian use to refer to what Christians and Jesus proclaim, προκηρύττειν and προαγορεύειν respectively are in fact the terms employed in speaking of the proclamations of a pagan priest.[6] Celsus himself uses the verb προκηρύττειν of the proclamation made by the hierophant of mystery-rites (Origen *c. Cels.* 3.59), while Julian uses προαγορεύειν in another

[2] So R. Browning, *The Emperor Julian* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1976), 182. Lacombrade (n. 1), 70 n. 2 speaks of a sacrilegious parody of *Ev. Marc.* 16.16, *Ev. Luc.* 18.13, *Act .Ap.* 2.38, 22.16.

[3] H. N. Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum* (Cambridge, 1953), 168 n. 1.

[4] Cf. Julian *Or.* 7.25 (239c): ἢ γὰρ οὐ ταῦτα καὶ ὁ ἱεροφάντης προαγορεύει, ὅστις χεῖρα μὴ καθαρὸς καὶ ὄντινα χρή, τούτοις ἀπαγορεύων μὴ μυεῖσθαι.

[5] Chadwick (n. 2), 168 translates: 'whoever has pure hands and a wise tongue'. The parallel category in the Christian proclamation, ὅστις ἀσύνετος, ὅστις νήπιος, suggests that what is at issue is that the would-be initiate should be in possession of his wits and able to speak properly.

[6] For προαγορεύειν used of the proclamation made by the Eumolpidae and *Kerykes* at Athens, cf. Isoc. *Paneg.* 157.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

polemical work to refer to the proclamation made by a hierophant banning those with impure hands from taking part in the rite (*Or.* 7.25, 239b). The present paper seeks to illustrate some of the stylistic peculiarities to be observed in pagan priestly proclamations and in the regulations inscribed at the entrance to religious precincts governing the entry to the precinct, a form of prose that is closely related to the priestly proclamation and perhaps derives from it. I shall try to trace the history of these forms of expression back to their earliest known instances.

THE PARTICIPLE *ΘΑΡΡΩΝ* IN PRIESTLY PROCLAMATIONS AND SACRED LAWS

The form of the proclamation that Julian puts into the mouth of Jesus, *ὅστις φθορεύς, ὅστις μιαιφόνος, ὅστις ἐναγὴς καὶ βδελυρός, ἴτω θαρρῶν* (*Caes.* 38, 336a), is one that is attested in two sacred laws and in a number of priestly or quasi-priestly proclamations; its influence is furthermore to be detected in an epitaph written by Theocritus for Hipponax. It may consist of (i) a single indefinite relative clause or a series of indefinite relative clauses; (ii) the protasis of a present real conditional or conditionals; or (iii) a masculine nominative article and participle followed by an imperative, normally third person, qualified by the participle *ἀθαρρῶν* or its equivalent, the adverb *θαρραλέως*. These are all ways of specifying the conditions that must obtain, if a worshipper is to approach the gods fully confident that they will be receptive to him. So far as form goes, Jesus' proclamation follows a well-established pattern. It departs from the pattern, not in form, but in content; pagan sacred laws and priestly announcements bidding a worshipper enter a sanctuary in full confidence that his prayers will be heard demand good character on the part of the would-be worshipper.

The most straightforward and at the same time fullest instance of the form of announcement in question is the proclamation (*Ὀλυμπικὴ πρόρρησις*) that the Eleans are said to make to athletes wishing to take part in the Olympic Games:

εἰ πεπόνηται ὑμῖν ἐπαξίως τοῦ εἰς Ὄλυμπίαν ἐλθεῖν καὶ μηδὲν ῥᾳθυμον μηδὲ ἀγεννὲς εἴργασται, ἴτε θαρροῦντες, οἷς δὲ μὴ ὧδε ἤσκηται, χωρεῖτε οἷ βούλεσθε.

(Philostr. *VA* 5.43)

If you have trained so that you are worthy of coming to Olympia and have shown no slackness nor ignobility, you should proceed in full confidence, but if your preparation has not taken such a form, you should betake yourselves to wherever you wish.

Apollonius of Tyana quotes the proclamation to encourage those of his followers who are not up to it to leave his expedition to Upper Egypt. The unworthy followers take the hint and stay behind.

A sacred law of the third century A.D. inscribed on a column that stood at the entrance to the sanctuary of Athana Lindia at Lindos on Rhodes contains regulations governing entry to the sanctuary (*LSS* no. 91). The regulations prescribed not only physical but moral purity (*μὴ τὸ* [*σῶ*]*μα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν κεκαθαρμένους* 4–5) for those who would approach the goddess.[7] Below the regulations were inscribed

[7] Purity of soul necessary for proper worship of the divine: Plato *Leg.* 716e2–3: *ἀκάθαρτος γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν ὅ γε κακός, καθαρὸς δὲ ὁ ἐναντίος*; F. Sokolowski (ed.), *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Paris, 1969), 19.4–6 (Lindos, second century A.D.): *πρῶτον μὲν καὶ τὸ μέγιστον καὶ χείρας καὶ γνώμην καθαροὺς καὶ ὑγιε*[*ῖς*]; *LSS* 59.14–15 (Delos, Roman period): [*χε*]*ρσὶν καὶ ψυχῇ καθα*[*ρᾷ*] *LSS* 108.5 (Rhodes, first century A.D.): *οὐ λουτρῷ ἀλλὰ νόῳ καθαρόν*. Cic. *Nat.*

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

two elegiac couplets that take exactly the same form as the Olympic proclamation: a conditional sentence laying down the requirements for entering the sanctuary, preceded by an imperative bidding whoever fulfils the requirement to proceed on the path into the sanctuary in full confidence and then a further conditional sentence specifying what is unacceptable in the would-be worshipper followed by an imperative bidding the unwelcome visitor to take himself off wherever he may wish:

τάν ποτ' Ὄλυμπον ἔβας ἀρεταφόρον. εἴσιθι τοιγὰρ
εἰ καθαρὸς βαίνις, ὦ ξένε, θαρραλεώς.
εἰ δέ τι πᾶμα φέρις, τὸν ἀπάμονα κάλλιπε νάον,
στεῖχε δὲ ὅπα χρῄζις Παλλάδος ἐκ τεμένους. (*LSS* no. 91.23–6)[8]

You have set foot on a path filled with virtue leading to Olympus. Therefore enter the sanctuary confidently, stranger, if you are pure. But if you bring harm, leave this harmless temple and go off, wherever you wish, away from the sanctuary of Pallas.

The inscription was first published by Blinkenberg in a simple transcription without diacritical signs or punctuation.[9] Sokolowski in *LSS* no. 91 (159–60) supplied these. Presumably because τοιγάρ almost invariably comes at the beginning of its clause, Sokolowski put a colon after εἴσιθι.[10] This means that εἴσιθι has to be understood again with θαρραλεώς.[11] Since in later Greek τοιγαροῦν is sometimes postponed (*LSJ*[9] s.v. τοιγάρ II.2; Denniston, *Gr. Part.* 567), the simpler form may also have been postponed. There is in an epitaph in elegiacs from Rome of the first or second century A.D. an instance of such postponement of τοιγάρ itself: κουφὴ τοιγὰρ ἐμοὶ πέλεται κόνις (*GVI* 647.3). A case can, accordingly, be made for placing the colon after ἀρεταφόρον. It is unclear whether ἀρεταφόρον is a two-termination compound adjective and whether it goes with τάν (ὁδόν understood) or Ὄλυμπον.[12] Although these issues cannot be settled, the run of thought is clear enough: as the sanctuary of Athena is a place in which virtue is practised or worshipped or the path to it is such, only those who are themselves virtuous should attempt to enter the sanctuary;[13] those

*D.*2.71: *cultus autem deorum est optumus idemque castissimus atque sanctissimus plenissimusque pietatis, ut eos semper pura, integra, incorrupta et mente et voce veneremur*; Sen. fr. 123 Haase, fr. 88 Vottero: *non immolationibus nec sanguine multo colendum . . . sed mente pura, bono honestoque proposito*; Pliny *Paneg.* 3.5: *animadverto enim etiam deos ipsos non tam accuratis adorantium precibus quam innocentia et sanctitate laetari, gratioremque existimari, qui delubris eorum puram castamque mentem quam qui meditatum carmen intulerit.* The formula καθαρὸς καὶ χεῖρα καὶ γνώμην continues to be used by Christians such as Synesius (*Ep.* 43 Garzya) and is found in a slightly modified form in a decree of excommunication from a convention of the bishops of the Cyrenaic Pentapolis of century A.D. 412, itself presumably composed by Synesius. Its exclusion of Andronicus and his offspring from all sanctuaries and holy places harks back to pagan proclamations banning the impure from entering the sanctuary (Synes. *Ep.* 42 Garzya): δεῖ δὲ εἶναι καὶ γνωμῇ καὶ σώματι καθαροὺς τῷ θεῷ . . . Ἀνδρονίκῳ καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῦ . . . μηδὲν ἀνοιγνύσθω τέμενος τοῦ θεοῦ· ἅπας αὐτοῖς ἱερὸς ἀποκεκλείσθω καὶ σηκὸς καὶ περίβολος.

[8] Cf. *Anth. Pal.* 14.74.1–3: ἱρὰ θεῶν ἀγαθοῖς ἀναπέπταται . . . ὅστις δ' οὐλοὸν ἦτορ, ἀπόστιχε.

[9] C. Blinkenberg, *Lindos: Fouilles de l'Acropole 1902–14: Inscriptions: Tome II nos. 282–710* (Berlin and Copenhagen, 1941), 871.

[10] In elegiacs it most commonly occurs at the beginning of a hexameter. I can find no parallel for its occupying the last foot in the line.

[11] For τοιγάρ with an imperative in elegiac verse, cf. *GVI* 681.5–8, 2060.3–4.

[12] ποτ' Ὄλυμπον expanded is the Doric ποτὶ Ὄλυμπον.

[13] Blinkenberg (n. 8), 877–8 takes the author of the couplet to mean that the steep climb up to

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

who harbour evil intentions should take themselves off elsewhere, wherever that may be.[14]

A variation on the pattern is to be seen in a series of inscriptions of the middle of the first century B.C. inscribed on the order of Antiochus I of Commagene to regulate entrance to cult-sites in his kingdom.[15] The variation is mainly attributable to the fulsome and grandiloquent style in which Antiochus' draftsman writes. In essence, all that is said is that the pure in mind may enter the sanctuary in full confidence and may entertain good hopes.[16] Instead of the protasis of a conditional followed by the imperative of a verb of motion, there is its equivalent, a relative clause followed by a series of commands:

the acropolis of Lindos on which Athana Lindia's temple stood was comparable to the ascent to Mt Olympus.

[14] For the banning of those with evil intentions from a shrine, cf. F. Sokolowski (ed.), *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1955), no. 20.17–25; Gratt. *Cyn.* 448–50: *manu ramum pallente sacerdos / termiteum quatiens: procul hinc extorribus ire / edico praesente deo, praesentibus aris, / quis scelus aut manibus sumptum aut in pectore motum est.* The formula of banishment, *στεῖχε δὲ ὅπα χρῄξις* or *χωρεῖτε οἷ βούλεσθε*, found in the Lindian sacred law and the proclamation of the Eleans, is of ancient origin. The tone of the formula in such contexts is far from friendly. The earliest known instance occurs in Eur. *Telephus*: *ἴθ' ὅποι χρῇξεις· οὐκ ἀπολοῦμαι τῆς σῆς Ἑλένης εἵνεκα* (fr. 722 N^2 = 8 P). The presumption must be that the lines come from an altercation between Agamemnon and Menelaus and that the speaker is Agamemnon. So Nauck ad loc. and now C. Preiser, *Euripides: Telephos*, Spudasmata 78 (Hildesheim, Zurich and New York, 2000), 280–8 with discussion of where in the play the quarrel occurred. Aristophanes alludes to the lines at *Nub.* 891–2 (*ἴθ' ὅποι χρῇξεις · πολὺ γὰρ μᾶλλόν σ' ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖσι λέγων ἀπολῶ*), the beginning of an altercation between the Better Argument and the Poorer Argument, and a response on the part of Poorer to Better's pompous and insulting order that he come forward and show himself, impudent though he is, to the spectators (888–9). The Lindian and Elean formula of dismissal also bears a resemblance in structure to another formula of banishment employed twice in Aristophanes, once for obscene effect: *ἴθ' ὀρθὴν ἥνπερ ἔρχει τὴν ὁδόν* (*Lys.* 834); *ἴθι ᾗπερ ἔρχῃ* (*Ran.* 301). The formula was detected by A. Sonny, whose account in Russian is reported by T. Zielinski ('Marginalien', *Philologus* 14 [1901], 5–6). See also H. Kleinknecht, *Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike*, Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 28 (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1937), 68–9; L. Radermacher, *Aristophanes' Frösche, Einleitung, Text und Kommentar*, Sitz. Wien. 198.4 (Vienna, 1954^2), 178; J. Henderson, *Aristophanes' Lysistrata* (Oxford, 1987), 174; K. Dover, *Aristophanes, Frogs* (Oxford, 1993), 231.

[15] For a succinct and accessible account of the reign of Antiochus I, see Richard Sullivan, *Near Eastern Royalty and Rome* (Toronto, 1990), 193–7.

[16] Heinrich Dörrie, *Der Königskult des Antiochos von Kommagene im Licht neuer Inschriften*, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl. no. 60 (Göttingen, 1964), 121–22 takes this part of the sacred law to promise concrete blessings to the worshipper who enters the sanctuary in a state of pious expectation of seeing a wonder. In support of that contention, he cites Sen. *Ep.* 94.42: *Pythagoras ait alium animum fieri intrantibus templum deorumque simulacra ex vicino cernentibus et alicuius oraculi opperientibus vocem.* For Dörrie *καθαρὸς ἀδικοῦ ζωῆς* does not mean that the worshipper should have lived a morally upright life, but only refers to worshippers who enter the sanctuary and who have not wronged the sanctuary in any of the ways specified in the previous section of the law. Following Franz Cumont (*Syria* 18 [1937], 219), Dörrie takes this clause in the law to express Mazdaean ideas. That there is a persianizing tinge to the law is not to be denied, but the sentiments expressed in this section of the law have their parallels in other Greek sacred laws that demand purity of mind of those who would worship the god. In their case, purity of mind is fairly clearly moral probity, as it undoubtedly is in Antiochus' law. J. Duchesne-Guillemin, 'Iran and Greece in Commagene', *Acta Iranica* 17, *Études mithraiques* (Leiden, 1978), 190–91 suggests that the reference to Oromasdes-Zeus as a *συναγωνιστὴς ἀγαθῶν ἔργων* at lines 249–50 reflects the Mazdaean conception of the divine as a helper of men in their fight against evil and does not just mean that the worshipper who is to be helped has performed the requisite sacrifices in honour of Mithridates and Antiochus.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ὅσοις δὲ καθαρὸς μὲν νοῦς ἀδίκου [ζ]ωῆς, ἐπι-
θυμητὴς δὲ ὁσίων ἔργων, θαρροῦντες μὲν εἰς θε-
ῶν ἀποβλεπέτωσαν ὄψεις, ἱλαροῖς δὲ μακάρων
ἴχνεσιν ἐπιβαινέτωσαν, εὐδαίμοσιν δὲ [ἀτρα-]
ποῖς ἐξ ἡμετέρας τιμῆς βίον ἀγαθὸν εἰς ἐλπί-
δας ὁδηγείτωσαν ἰδίας. (A 237–42)[17]

Those whose minds are pure of unrighteous living and who eagerly pursue pious deeds, let them look confidently on the countenances of the gods, let them tread in the benign footsteps of the blessed immortals and let them by honouring us conduct a good life on a happy path to the fulfilment of their hopes.

The use of the pattern is not confined to sacred laws and priestly or quasi-priestly announcements; an author may put it into the mouth of a priestly functionary explaining who may confidently approach the gods and who may not; it may be used in prescriptions that have the character of a sacred law; and finally it may be employed in funerary epigrams encouraging the morally upright to rest on a tomb and bidding the wicked to stay away from it. The conclusion to be drawn from the use of the pattern for so very different ends is that it was a thoroughly familiar form of speech.

In Philostratus' *Vita Apollonii*, when the governor of Cilicia comes to the sanctuary of Asclepius at Aegae and asks the youthful Apollonius of Tyana, who had taken up residence in the sanctuary (1.9), as an intimate of Asclepius, to bring him into union with the god, Apollonius replies that if a person is of good moral character, there is no need to have someone else act as an intermediary, as the gods love those of good moral character. The governor persists and asks Apollonius as a *ξένος* of the god to act as his *πρόξενος*. Apollonius' response is that what had recommended him to the god and had established the warm ties that existed between himself and the deity was his nobility of character (*καλοκαγαθία*). He then tells the governor that if he too has made nobility of character his objective, he should approach the god in full confidence and pray to him for whatever he wishes:

εἰ δὲ καὶ σοὶ καλοκαγαθίας μέλει, χώρει θαρρῶν παρὰ τὸν θεὸν καὶ εὖχου ὅ τι ἐθέλεις. (1.12)

Apollonius, since he performs a priestlike rôle in the sanctuary, is made to speak in the manner of a priest.

There is one further instance of the pattern in Philostratus' *Vita Apollonii*; on the journey from Athens that will eventually take him to Egypt, Apollonius encounters in Rhodes a famous player on the pipes (*αὐλητής*)! with whom he has a discussion about playing the instrument; the discussion ends in his telling the piper that if he has certain qualities, he should play on his pipes in full confidence, since he will have Euterpe with him:

εἰ δὴ ταῦτα πάντα παρέχεις, θαρρῶν αὔλει, ὦ Κάνε, μετὰ σοῦ γὰρ ἡ Εὐτέρπη ἔσται. (5.21)

The register in which Apollonius speaks is that of a religious official telling a

[17] The line numbers are those of the inscription at Arsameia-on-the-Nymphaeus. It was first published by F. K. Dörner, 'Kultinschrift von Antiochos I. von Kommagene für das Hierotheseon des Mithridates Kallinikos in Arsameia am Nymphaios', *Istanbuler Forschungen* 23 (1963), 36–59. An improved text is printed by Helmut Waldmann, *Die kommagenischen Kultreformen unter König Mithidates I. Kallinikos und seinen Sohne Antiochos I.,* EPRO 34 (Leiden, 1974), 82–9.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

worshipper that he may approach the god in full confidence of winning his help if he fulfils the requirements imposed by the god. It is an appropriate register for Apollonius as religious authority to speak in and for the context, since the piper needs the help of a deity.

Philo Judaeus, in giving an allegorical explanation of *Numbers* 19.1–10, regulations for performing a sacrifice outside the precinct of the Temple in Jerusalem, provides an example of an author falling into the pattern of speech in citing a religious prescription:

ὁ μὲν οὖν τούτοις διακεκοσμημένος ἴτω θαρρῶν εἰς οἰκειότατον αὐτῷ τὸν νεών, ἐνδιαίτημα πάντων ἄριστον, ἱερεῖον ἐπιδειξόμενος αὐτόν· ὁτῷ δ' ἐγκάθηνται καὶ ἐλλοχῶσιν αἱ πλεονεξίαι καὶ ἐπιθυμίαι τῶν ἀδικιῶν, ἐγκαλυψάμενος ἠρεμείτω τὴν ἀναίσχυντον ἀπόνοιαν καὶ τὸ λίαν θράσος ἐν οἷς εὐλάβεια λυσιτελὲς ἐπισχών· τὸ γὰρ τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος ἱερὸν ἀνιέροις ἄβατον θυσίαις. (*Spec.* 1.270).

He who has such embellishments to his credit (sc. wisdom and moral purity), let him proceed in full confidence to the temple most akin to himself, the fairest dwelling place of all, presenting himself as the sacrificial victim; in whomsoever greed and desire for unjust deeds lurk, let that man cover up his shameless folly, check his over-great presumptuousness in matters in which caution is the best course and let him stay still, for the holy place of the truly real may not be trodden on by unholy sacrificial victims.

Inspiration for what Philo has to say about sacrifice is not to be found at *Numbers* 19.1–10. There is, in fact, little there that would account for the stance taken by Philo about the spirit in which God should be worshipped, nor can that section of *Numbers* be said to deal with the issue that Philo brings up when he expands on the idea of what kind of sacrifice is most pleasing to God: that God, since he is self-sufficient and possesses all things, does not particularly rejoice in large sacrifices, but in men whose minds are god-loving and pious, from whom he is happy to receive the least expensive of sacrifices; indeed those who bring nothing beyond nobility of character make the finest of sacrifices (271–2).[18] The sentiments Philo expresses about sacrifice are Greek in origin and are voiced in philosophical and non-philosophical texts.

The earliest datable expression of the idea that the gods are delighted with a sacrifice, however small, if it is given by a good man is in a fragment of Euripides in which someone declares that if a pious man sacrifices to the gods, even if his sacrifice is small, he can expect their protection (fr. 946 N^2).[19] The views that Euripides' characters voice about sacrifice are not at all eccentric; they are commonly held opinions. The same position is taken in Isocrates' *Ad Nicoclem*: its addressee, Nicocles, king of Salamis, is exhorted to follow the practice of his forebears in his dealings with the gods; he should take the view that the fairest sacrifice (*θῦμα κάλλιστον*) and the greatest worship (*θεραπεία μεγίστη*) that he can pay the gods is to be of the highest character and to be utterly upright (*ἂν ὡς βέλτιστον καὶ δικαιότατον σεαυτὸν παρέχῃς*); men who conform to that pattern can expect to fare better at the hands of the gods than those who make large sacrifices (20). Since the *Ad Nicoclem* is made up of what are demonstrably moral commonplaces, Isocrates is unlikely to have advanced

[18] *θυσίαις, εἴποιμ' ἄν, ὦ γενναῖε, ὁ θεὸς οὐ χαίρει, κἂν ἑκατόμβας ἀνάγῃ τις· κτήματα γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα κεκτημένος ὅμως οὐδενὸς δεῖται· χαίρει δὲ φιλοθέοις γνώμαις καὶ ἀνδράσιν ἀσκηταῖς ὁσιότητος, παρ' ὧν ψαιστὰ καὶ κριθὰς καὶ τὰ εὐτελέστατα ὡς τιμιώτατα πρὸ τῶν πολυτελεστάτων ἄσμενος δέχεται· κἂν μέντοι μηδὲν ἕτερον κομίζωσιν, αὐτοὺς φέροντες πλήρωμα καλοκἀγαθίας τελειότατον τὴν ἀρίστην ἀνάγουσι θυσίαν.*

[19] *εὖ ἴσθ', ὅταν τις εὐσεβὼν θύῃ θεοῖς, / κἂν μικρὰ θύῃ, τυγχάνει σωτηρίας.* Cf. Eur. fr. 327.6–7 N^2.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

views about the worship of the gods and about sacrifice that were not fairly widely shared. At any rate, there is no reason to think that they represent advanced philosophical speculation, although philosophers such as Plato certainly subscribed to them: he takes it for granted in the *Republic* that people will find outrageous the idea that wealth allows men to secure the good will of the gods.[20]

Since Philo in this section of his commentary on *Numbers* is demonstrably influenced by Greek views about sacrifice, there is every likelihood that he has couched his call to sacrifice in the form of a Greek sacred law or priestly pronouncement. Philo's model is a proclamation that took the form of an article and participle in the nominative case followed by a third person imperative: *ὁ καθαρὸς ὢν νοῦν, ἴτω θαρρῶν, ὅτῳ ἡ ψυχὴ σύνοιδε κακόν, ἀπίτω*. A clause of exactly that form is found in the proclamation that Lucian says was issued in Abonuteichos on the first day of the mysteries of Glycon; its model was the *πρόρρησις* at Athens:

εἴ τις ἄθεος ἢ Χριστιανὸς ἢ Ἐπικούρειος ἥκει κατάσκοπος τῶν ὀργίων, φευγέτω· οἱ δὲ πιστεύοντες τῷ θεῷ τελείσθωσαν τύχῃ τῇ ἀγαθῇ. (*Alex.* 38)

If any godless person, whether Christian or Epicurean, comes to spy on the rites, let him flee: let the initiation of those believing in the god be attended by good fortune.

The sentence prohibiting entry belongs to the pattern: *ὅτῳ* + verb, followed by a third person imperative. Instances of the pattern are to be seen in the proclamation made by the Eleans (*οἷς δὲ μὴ ὧδε ἤσκηται*, Philostr. *VA* 5.43) and the proclamation that Celsus says was made before certain ceremonies of initiation (*ὅτῳ ἡ ψυχὴ οὐδὲν σύνοιδε κακόν, καὶ ὅτῳ εὖ καὶ δικαίως βεβίωται* Origen, *c. Cels.* 3.59). What has suffered alteration in the second clause are the verbs: the intent of *σύνοιδε* is expanded upon and developed with *ἐγκάθηνται καὶ ἐλλοχῶσιν*; *ἀπίτω* has become *ἠρεμείτω*, an imperative that Philo uses elsewhere in lawlike statements to mean 'desist from'.[21]

The earliest instance of the pattern of a conditional sentence or its equivalent followed by an imperative qualified by the participle *θαρρῶν* is to be found in an epitaph composed by Theocritus, appropriately in choliambics, for Hipponax:

ὁ μουσοποιὸς ἐνθάδ' Ἱππώναξ κεῖται.
εἰ μὲν πονηρός, μὴ ποτέρχευ τῷ τύμβῳ·
εἰ δ' ἐσσι κρήγυός τε καὶ παρὰ χρηστῶν,
θαρσέων καθίζευ, κἢν θέλῃς, ἀπόβριξον. (Epigr. 19; *Anth. Pal.* 13.3)

[20] Socrates at Xen. *Mem.* 1.3.3 is said to have held that those who from their small resources made small sacrifices to the gods did not come off any worse than those who with large means made large sacrifices; his reason for taking the position was that it would create an intolerable situation, if the gods delighted in large sacrifices rather than small, since it would often mean that the sacrifices of the wicked were more pleasing to the gods than those of the good; his own view was that the gods rejoiced in honours paid them by those who were most pious (*εὐσεβέστατοι*); he particularly approved of the verse that said one should sacrifice to the gods as best one could (*καδδύναμιν δ' ἔρδειν ἱερ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι*). The same view of sacrifice is voiced by Apollonius of Tyana at *VA* 1.10–11.

[21] There is in Philo at least one further instance of a prescriptive statement taking the form of a Greek priestly pronouncement of the same general pattern as *Spec.* 1.270: *ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τῷ μηδὲν ἐπεξεργάσασθαι κακὸν καὶ τὰ παλαιὰ ἐκνίψασθαι δικαίωσας γεγηθὼς προσίτω, ὁ δὲ ἄνευ τούτων δυσκάθαρτος ὢν ἀφιστάσθω* (*Quod sit immutabilis deus* 9). The pattern of article in the nominative with participle followed by a third person imperative is that found at Philo *Spec.* 1.270 and in the proclamation at Abonuteichos (Lucian *Alex.* 38). As for the phrase *γεγηθὼς προσίτω*, it looks as if it has been inspired by expressions of the form *θαρρῶν ἴτω*.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hipponax the poet lies here. If you are wicked, do not approach his tomb; if you are good and your parents were good people, sit down in full confidence, and if you wish, drop off in sleep.

Theocritus' epitaph for Hipponax is very different from those composed for Archilochus and Hipponax by other poets of the Hellenistic and Imperial periods, in that it presents him as a scourge of the wicked and a friend of the good; the other epitaphs warn the passer-by to avoid the tomb of the poet at all costs, lest they arouse his anger.[22] In portraying Hipponax as the enemy of the wicked and the friend of the good, Theocritus draws on a vision of what it is to be a poet that goes back to the Late Archaic Period: both Theognis and Pindar declare that they praise the praiseworthy and subject wrongdoers to criticism, no matter who they are;[23] the topic is then picked up by orators.[24] In Theocritus' poem, Hipponax as foe of wrongdoers and friend of the upright is combined with a Hipponax who is imagined inhabiting a tomb that constitutes a form of sacred space into which the wicked venture at their peril. Graves are characteristically called *ἱερά* and so presumably are not to be approached by unsuitable persons.[25] It is just possible that there were grave-monuments with just such warnings on them as Theocritus' tomb for Hipponax. But if there were, the balance of evidence would suggest that the formula did not have its origins in funerary monuments, but in priestly pronouncement and sacred laws.

A case can be made on the basis of Theocritus's epitaph for Hipponax for arguing that priestly proclamations or sacred laws in which an indefinite relative or the protasis of a conditional is followed by an expression of the form *θαρρῶν ἴτω* or some equivalent thereof go back at least to the early third century B.C. and almost certainly to a much earlier date. The form that the prescription takes in the regulations governing entry to the *ἱεροθεσία* of Antiochus I of Commagene looks as if it is a conscious reworking and elaboration on the part of Antiochus' draftsman of a simpler model. That means that the draftsman was well aware of the model and that already in the middle of the first century B.C. it enjoyed a certain established authority. Philo's use of it argues for its having been fairly widely disseminated. In what form Antiochus' draftsman and Philo encountered it can only be a matter for speculation. The most obvious candidate would seem to be in a *πρόγραμμα* governing entry to a sanctuary, but other possibilities cannot be excluded. The form and contents of the proclamations made by priests and other officials connected with sanctuaries were evidently fairly well known. It is unfortunately totally impossible to put a precise date on the proclamation that the Eleans made to athletes hoping to participate in the Olympic Games. The Eleans took control of the Olympic Games in the sixth century B.C. Although unlikely, the possibility cannot be entirely excluded that they took over an existing proclamation.

CONDITIONALS AND RELATIVE CLAUSES WITHOUT COPULA IN LAWLIKE UTTERANCES.

The pattern to be observed in the proclamation Julian puts into Christ's mouth, *ὅστις φθορεύς, ὅστις μιαιφόνος, ὅστις ἐναγὴς καὶ βδελυρός* (*Caes.* 38; 336b), and in the invitation that Celsus says Christians extend to all manner of sinners to be received

[22] Archilochus: *A.P.* 7.71, 674; Hipponax: *A.P.* 7.405, 408, 536.
[23] Thgn. 1079–80; Pi. *Pyth.* 9.93–6, *Nem.* 8.39.
[24] Gorg. DK 82 B 11.1.
[25] Cf. Posidippus Col. IX.33–4 Bastianini and Gallazzi: *γρηῢ φίλη, μετάδος λιπαροῦ μεγα[γήρως τοῖς ἱερὸν σῆμα παρερ[χομένοις*; *GVI* 2061.1–2.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

by God, *ὅστις, φάσιν, ἁμαρτωλός, ὅστις ἀσύνετος, ὅστις νήπιος, καὶ ὡς ἁπλῶς εἰπεῖν, ὅστις κακοδαίμων* (Origen. *c. Cels.* 3.59), which consists of a relative clause in which the copula is absent, is of great antiquity.[26] The draftsman who composed the regulations governing entry to the so-called *ἱεροθέσια* of Commagene for Antiochus of Commagene was following a well-established pattern when he set down a relative clause without copula (*ὅσοις δὲ καθαρὸς μὲν νοῦς ἀδίκου* [ζ]*ωῆς, ἐπιθυμητὴς δὲ ὁσίων ἔργων* A237–8), followed by a third person imperative. The same pattern or one that is its equivalent is to be found in some lines of Pindar in which an appeal is made to the teaching of the Old Man of the Sea to justify praising a man whose toils had culminated in achieving something fair for the common good; Nereus had prescribed praising even an enemy wholeheartedly and according to his due deserts, if he had performed noble deeds:[27] two conditional sentences, both of which lack copula and in which one follows the other asyndetically, are followed by a third person singular imperative:

> *. . . εἰ φίλος ἀστῶν, εἴ τις ἀντά-*
> *εις, τό γ' ἐν ξυνῷ πεπoναμένον εὖ*
> *μὴ λόγον βλάπτων ἁλίοιο γέροντος κρυπτέτω.*
>
> (*Pyth.* 9.93–4)

Let not fine achievements, whether they be those of one who is a friend amongst the citizens or a foe, be kept hidden, if they help the common good and have been won at the expense of toil, so that the teaching of the Old Man of the Sea is harmed.

It is to be suspected that Pindar adopts a pattern of speech that will give weight to the pronouncement he makes and that his model is a priestly proclamation. If that is correct, the inference to be drawn from his choice of register is that in lawlike statements and pronouncements the pattern is of considerable antiquity. The same pattern is visible in Aristophanes' *Ranae*, in the command issued by the Chorus of Initiates bidding those who fail to fulfil certain conditions to take themselves off:

> *εὐφημεῖν χρὴ κἀξίστασθαι τοῖς ἡμετέροις χοροῖσιν,*
> *ὅστις ἄπειρος τοιῶνδε λόγων ἢ γνώμην μὴ καθαρεύει.* (354–5)

The words with which the Chorus conclude their command (*τούτοις αὐδῶ καὖθις ἀπαυδῶ τὸ τρίτον μάλ' ἀπαυδῶ / ἐξίστασθαι μύσταισι χοροῖς* 369–70) a scholiast tells us were uttered by the hierophant and dadouch from the Stoa Poikile.[28] There is little room then for doubt that the inspiration for the whole announcement were priestly proclamations. The same pattern is to be seen in the parody of the execration-formula uttered at the beginning of meetings of the Athenian assembly at Ar. *Thesm.* 331–50, where we find:[29]

[26] The standard grammars offer no help here. On the ellipse of the copula in subordinate clauses in general and relative clauses in particular, see Kühner-Gerth II § 354 n. 1; Schwyzer, *Gr. Gr.* II 624; Cooper, *Attic Greek Prose Syntax* II § 62.1.4.

[27] *Pyth.* 9. 95–6: *κεῖνος αἰνεῖν καὶ τὸν ἐχθρόν / πάντι θυμῷ σύν τε δίκᾳ καλὰ ῥέζοντ' ἔννεπεν*. Similar sentiments are expressed at Thgn. 1079–80.

[28] *Σ in* Ar. *Ran.* 369: *τούτοις ἀπαυδῶ*: *παρὰ τὴν τοῦ ἱεροφάντου καὶ δᾳδούχου πρόρρησιν τὴν ἐν τῇ ποικίλῃ στοᾷ*.

[29] Our knowledge of the practice comes from Deinarch. 2.16; Isocr. *Paneg.* 157; Dem. 18.130. Parody discussed by Kleinknecht (n. 14), 34–6.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ἢ καὶ δέχεται προδιδοῦσ' ἑταίρα τὸν φίλον,
κεἴ τις κάπηλος ἢ καπηλὶς τοῦ χοῶς. (346–7)

There are indications, although no more than indications, that at least under the High Roman Empire the proclamation or proclamations made by the hierophant of the Eleusinian Mysteries and the Eumolpidae and *Kerykes* took the same form: in a *declamatio* of Libanius, the Corinthians, charging the Athenians with impiety, quote the proclamation made by the Eumolpidae and *Kerykes* to those wishing to be initiated at Eleusis:

ὅστις τὰς χεῖρας μὴ καθαρός. Ἀθηναίων λέγε. ὅστις Ἑλλήνων φωνῆς ἀξύνετος. (*Decl.* 13.52)[30]

Celsus' citation of what would seem to have been a proclamation made for the Eleusinian Mysteries has the same shape: ὅστις χεῖρας καθαρὸς καὶ φωνὴν συνετός (Origen. *c. Cels.* 3.59). Julian provides a further instance of the pattern: in discussing the refusal of Diogenes the Cynic to undergo initiation at Eleusis, he adduces as supporting testimony for the proposition that no advantage accrues to the wicked from entering a sanctuary the proclamation made by the hierophant forbidding those with impure hands and those who ought not to be initiated to seek initiation:

ἢ γὰρ οὐ ταῦτα καὶ ὁ ἱεροφάντης προαγορεύει, ὅστις χεῖρα μὴ καθαρὸς καὶ ὅντινα μὴ χρή, τούτοις ἀπαγορεύων μὴ μυεῖσθαι. (*Or.* 7.25, 239b)

Context makes it certain that Julian has the hierophant of the Eleusinian Mysteries in mind. He appears to give a syncopated version of the proclamation cited by Celsus and Libanius. That Celsus, Julian, and Libanius agree on this point is some indication that in the High Roman Empire the proclamation of the hierophant consisted in a series of indefinite relative clauses that lacked the copula.

It would be a mistake to suppose that the formulaic utterances of priests were confined to issuing commands and prohibitions. Priests or *mystagogoi* asked those who aspired to be initiated what the worst thing was that they had done or what the greatest ill was on their conscience.[31] The question was certainly asked at Samothrace.[32] That it had a set form cannot be doubted. It has long been suspected that behind the *makarismos* at *Hom. Hymn. Dem.* 481–3 lay what the hierophant at Eleusis said to those who had just been initiated, a suspicion that is reinforced by the presence in the second part of the *makarismos* of two relative clauses in which the copula is lacking:[33]

ὄλβιος ὃς τάδ' ὄπωπεν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων·
ὃς δ' ἀτελὴς ἱερῶν, ὅς τ' ἄμμορος, οὔ ποθ' ὁμοίων
αἶσαν ἔχει φθίμενός περ ὑπὸ ζόφῳ εὐρώεντι.

The absence of the copula in a relative clause in such a context suggests that clauses of the form were characteristic of priestly utterances in general and not just of commands and prohibitions.

[30] The text of the speech as a whole is corrupt and in this passage particularly so. What is not in doubt is that there is no copula in either indefinite relative clause.

[31] [Plut.] *Apophtegm. Lac.* 138c, 229c, 236d.

[32] [Plut.] *Apophthegm. Lac.* 217c, 229d. See further S. Cole, *Theoi Megaloi: The Cult of the Great Gods at Samothrace*, EPRO 96 (Leiden, 1984), 115 n. 252.

[33] G. L. Dirichlet, *De veterum macarismis*, RGVV 14.4 (Giessen, 1914), 63; N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford, 1974), 313.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The style of priestly pronouncements and sacred laws have a good deal in common. It is safe to say that they influenced each other; intuition suggests that proclamations were generally the model that sacred laws followed. As matters now stand, the Commagenian sacred law seems to be the only known instance of a sacred law in which a relative clause without copula occurs. There were no doubt other examples of the pattern. That there were is suggested by a sentence at Pl. *Leg.* 909d9–10 that conforms to the template:

καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσί τε καὶ ἱερείαις ἐγχειριζέτω τὰ θύματα, οἷς ἁγνεῖαι τούτων ἐπιμελεῖς.

Let them hand over the sacrifices to the priests and priestesses, whose concern is with matters of purity.

It is reasonable to suppose that the clause takes the form it does, because Plato was imitating the style of a sacred law.

DATIVE OF AGENT WITH THIRD PERSON PERFECT PASSIVES

There is a mannerism used in two of the proclamations studied that must also have been characteristic of priestly announcements. It consists in a relative in a masculine dative signifying agency, either plural or singular, followed by a third person singular perfect passive verb or in the protasis of a conditional with a third person perfect passive singular verb and a dative of agent. Thus Celsus says that in some mystery-cults the announcement takes the form: ὅστις ἁγνὸς ἀπὸ παντὸς μύσους καὶ ὅτῳ ἡ ψυχὴ οὐδὲν σύνοιδε κακόν, καὶ ὅτῳ εὖ καὶ δικαίως βεβίωται (Origen. *c. Cels.* 3.59); the Eleans, on the other hand, in the announcement they make to those who wish to compete in the Olympics, have both the protasis of a conditional with a perfect passive verb and a dative of agent and a relative in the dative with a perfect passive verb: εἰ πεπόνηται ὑμῖν ἐπαξίως τοῦ εἰς Ὀλυμπίαν ἐλθεῖν καὶ μηδὲν ῥᾴθυμον μηδὲ ἀγεννὲς εἴργασται, ἴτε θαρροῦντες, οἷς δὲ μὴ ὧδε ἤσκηται, χωρεῖτε οἷ βούλεσθε (Philostr. *VA* 5.43). A further instance of the pattern is to be seen in the explanation Julian gives of Diogenes the Cynic's refusal to undergo initiation at Eleusis, which was that Diogenes wished to remind the man who wanted him to be initiated, because of the high stock the man set on initiation, that the gods did not give a reward that was in any way lesser to those who had lived in a manner worthy of being initiated (οἷς ἀξίως τοῦ μυηθῆναι βεβίωται), even though they had not been initiated, while there was no advantage gained by the wicked by being admitted to the sacred precinct (*Or.* 7.25). Context makes it likely that Julian is echoing the form of a priestly pronouncement; in the next sentence to strengthen his point, he adduces the proclamation of the hierophant, presumably of the Eleusinian Mysteries, forbidding the initiation of whoever had impure hands and whoever ought not to be initiated: ὅστις χεῖρα μὴ καθαρὸς καὶ ὅντινα μὴ χρή.[34]

[34] Julian in the *consolatio* that he addresses to himself on the departure from this life of the philosopher Sallustius (*Or.* 4.5) speaks of those able by consorting with mind and with the divine to see and to love that which escapes the senses and is not rooted in place, a sight that they are worthy to see by the quality of the life they have lived (ὅσοις ἀξίως βεβίωται τῆς τοιαύτης θεᾶς). Julian would seem to be following Platonic tradition of describing the entities that can be grasped only by a process of intellection in the terminology associated with the mysteries, on which in general, see C. Riedweg, *Mysterienterminologie bei Platon, Philon und Klemens von Alexandrien* (Berlin and New York, 1987). The locution τοιούτων ἐπιτηδευμάτων οἷα τούτῳ βεβίωται is a favourite of Demosthenes (21.151, 22.78, 24.186). He uses it in particular of

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh059 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ASYNDETA IN PRIESTLY PROCLAMATIONS

Asyndeton seems to have been a feature of priestly pronouncements that prescribed what categories of person might or might not enter a sanctuary. The most straightforward instance of the pattern is to be seen in the proclamation that Plutarch says the man in charge of the sanctuary of Leucothea in Chaeroneia made, while standing in front of the precinct with a whip in his hand:

μὴ δοῦλον εἰσιέναι μὴ δούλαν, μὴ Αἰτωλὸν, μὴ Αἰτωλάν. (*Quaest. Rom.* 267d)

No male slave is to enter, nor female slave, nor Aetolian male, nor Aetolian female.

In *oratio recta* what the man said will have been:

μὴ δοῦλος εἰσίτω, μὴ δούλα, μὴ Αἰτωλός, μὴ Αἰτωλά.

That very simple form can be expanded into a series of indefinite relative clauses or a series of conditional clauses set one after the other without connectives. Instances of the indefinite relative clause pattern are to be found at: Ar. *Thesm.* 347, Julian *Caes.* 38, 336a–b, and Origen. *c. Cels.* 3.59; I know of only one example of the conditional pattern: Pind. *Pyth.* 9.93–4. Pindar's use of the pattern suggests that it was of some antiquity.

CONCLUSION

That Julian and Celsus in putting a law-like pronouncement into the mouths of Jesus and Christians in general should copy a pattern of speech employed in pagan priestly pronouncements and should echo the register of such speech is not surprising. Both writers will have been thoroughly familiar with such patterns of speech and will have couched the words they put into the mouth of Jesus and the imagined spokesman for Christianity in the only form they knew such pronouncements to be made. It is very much to be doubted whether any deeper significance is to be read into their setting in Christian mouths forms of speech primarily employed in pagan cult.

The patterns of speech of which Julian and Celsus make use are of some considerable antiquity and evidently survived in a stereotyped form down into the fourth century A.D. and perhaps beyond. Just why priestly prouncements and sacred laws favoured series of asyndetic relative clauses and conditional sentences in which the copula is missing can only be a matter for speculation. It seems unlikely that it was a practice adopted spontaneously and independently throughout the Greek-speaking world. It would be better to hypothesize the existence of an authoritative model that was widely followed. The proclamations made by those who ran the Eleusinian Mysteries are a possible model. The procedures of the Eleusinian Mysteries were widely copied, while the proclamations made by the officials of the cult were evidently well known.

Glenfarg, Perthshire M. K. DICKIE
theurgy@uic.edu

persons who have rendered themselves unfit for contact with the sacred because of the manner of their lives. It is closely related to such expressions as τὰ βεβιωμένα and ὁ βεβιωμένος βίος, which are used by the orators of the way in which men have lived their lives (Lys. 16.1; Isoc. *Antid.* 7.168; Dem. 18.265, 19.199, 200, 22.23, 53, 25.63; cf. Pl. *Resp.* 498c3–4, *Epinom.* 974a6; Xen. *Apol.* 5).

https://doi.org/10.1093/clquaj/bmh059 Published online by Cambridge University Press