Here Isis Soteira appears connected with the deities Astarte and Aphrodite who had similar characteristics with her, Eros is connected with Harpocrates,\(^{24}\) and in the group Apollo holds a place as an important god for Delos. Some of the inscriptions mention Isis together with her counterpart, some belong to the sanctuary of another goddess but are dedicated to Isis: a dedication to Isis, Mother of Gods, Astarte and Dionysus in Sarapieion C,\(^{25}\) for Artemis, specified with Hagia, and Isis in Sarapieion C (by an Athenian),\(^{26}\) for Isis and Nemesis (by the Bithynian king Nicomedes III) in Sarapieion C\(^{27}\) and for Isis–Aphrodite having Dikaiosynthesis an epithet (by Ἀσκληπιάδης Δικαίου Ἀθηναίος).\(^{28}\) Abstractions personified as deities were parallelized with Isis as well. Dedications given to these deities were: Isis–Dikaiosyne dedicated by a priest Γαῖος Γαῖου Ἀχάρνενς,\(^{29}\) Isis–Euphrosyne–Dikaiosyne by the priest Ἀριστέας Ἀριστέου Μαραθωνίου in Sarapieion C,\(^{30}\) Isis–Euploia by a certain Ἰσιδώρου Ἀθηναίος in Sarapieion C\(^{31}.\)\(^{32}\) Isis parallelized with Dikaiosyne is found in Athens, too, in the inscriptions from the beginning of the first century BC\(^{33}\) dedicated by an Athenian (the Athenian priests and a non-Athenian zakoros are mentioned as well). Plutarch (Mor. 5.352f) says that Isis had been called Justice already in Egypt, but here in Athens Dikaiosyne was a personification, a deity, and she was considered on par with Isis.

The Greeks knew Isis–Aphrodite and Isis–Demeter, the two commonest parallelizations of Isis.\(^{34}\) Aphrodite occurs in connection with Isis in Athens as well,\(^{35}\) and on Delos she was the closest counterpart of Isis\(^{36}\) perhaps because of their similarity in femininity and feminine beauty. Yet here the goddesses are not assimilated but kept separated so that their individual traits are still noticeable. On a lantern of the Hellenistic period from Egypt the face of Isis with her typical epithets, the Isiac crown with disc and horns is described. The decoration is surmounted with two ears of corn which is the most typical epithet of

\(^{24}\) For the sculptural presentation of Harpocrates–Eros see a statuette from the Roman period in which Harpocrates–Eros is shown with 'Isiac crown', little wings of Eros and cornucopia in his hand. Archaeological Museum of Florence, photo in Merkelbach 1995, Abb. 123, p. 596.

\(^{25}\) ID 2101 (130/29 BC).

\(^{26}\) ID 2068 (101/0 BC).

\(^{27}\) ID 2038 (110/9 BC); see also Dunand 1973, 82.

\(^{28}\) ID 2158 (94/3 BC) (also ID 2040, the same date, where the Isis’ epithet dikaiosynthesis is not so clear). This may be seen as an assimilation, too.

\(^{29}\) ID 2079 (115/4 BC). Dikaiosyne appears as well in ID 2103 (114/3 BC).

\(^{30}\) ID 2107 (before the year 88 BC).

\(^{31}\) ID 2153 (104/3 BC).

\(^{32}\) Dedicators who were not with certainty Athenians honouring the parallelized Isis were: Διονυσίου Δημοκλέους Σιδώνιος dedicating to Isis – Mother of Gods – Astarte in Sarapieion C (130/29 BC):

\(^{33}\) ID 2101.

\(^{34}\) IG Π/ΙΠ 4702 a dedication for Isis–Dikaiosyne; see Dunand 1973, 11–12, 82.

\(^{35}\) Isis paralleled with Aphrodite is the most frequent of the artistic representations of syncretized Isis; the next common is Isis–Demeter. See LIMC, s.v. Isis–Aphrodite, nos. 249–259 (pp. 779–781). See also Dunand 1973, 80.

\(^{36}\) IG Π/ΙΠ 4994 (middle of the 1st cent. BC). The names of the gods Hermes, Aphrodite and Pan in connection with Isis are clearly individuals; thus here it is question of parallelization, not assimilation. See e.g. IG XI 1305 (beginning of the 2nd cent. BC, Sarapieion A) which is a dedication to Aphrodite, but located in the sanctuary of the Egyptian gods and most probably connected with their cult as well.
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This type of syncretism considers the obvious equivalents of the goddesses side by side. The analogy that bound gods together but kept them as recognizable individuals was always quite abstract. Here beauty, the goddess's fertility-promoting and prosperity-evoking aspects (for which ears of corn and the cornucopia function as epithets) were analogies abstract enough to give rise to the same connotations but not to combine the goddesses. On Delos an Athenian Hephaistus, a man called Macedus and his wife, dedicated a votive relief in the first century BC which illustrates parallelizing syncretism. It is a marble relief of Sarapis and Isis symmetrically on both sides of Agathos Daimon, who is in a form of the snake, and Agathe Tyche. Together these four gods form a coherent unit, but each of them is easily recognizable. Isis' counterpart is Tyche and that of Sarapis is Agathos Daimon. The connecting link and analogy between them all is firstly their shared role as guardians, secondly the prosperity and fertility-promoting aspect as well as eschatological ones which all of these deities have. The dedicators wished to be protected in general and especially be under the protection of all these separate gods at the same time.

37 Egyptological Museum of Cairo, inv. no. CG 26939; Dunand 1976a, 71–72, figure in pl. I.1. See also Tran Tam Tinh 1986, 359. A comparable iconographical representation is also a relief from Hellenistic Egypt (Fayum) from the middle of the 1st cent. BC showing Isis with her head-dress (sun-disc surmounted with horns) holding in her right hand the ears of corn and lotus flower. The relief is in the Egyptological Museum of Cairo, inv. no. JE 47108; LIMC, s.v. Isis, no. 174 photo also in Merkelbach 1995, Abb. no. 88, p. 567.

38 F. Dunand 1973, 84–85 would call this “syncretisme juxtaposition”. P. Lévéque 1971, 181–182 used the same term contrasting it to “syncretisme emprunt” by which he meant that readily syncretistic elements construct a deity, who then moves from one place to another carrying this syncretism with him/her.

39 The relief was found in Sarapieion A, dedicated by a common formula to Agathos Daimon and Agathe Tyche. The dedicative inscription belonging to it is IG XI4 1273. In G.I.F. Kater-Sibbes' catalogue of Sarapis-monuments it is no. 356 and the inv. no. A 3195 of The Archaeological Museum of Delos; photograph also in Leclant 1983, 349 (fig. 9).

40 Compare this relief with the Roman one showing crowned Isis with a sceptre, Cerberus on her right side, seated Sarapis with crown in the middle, Harpocrates with cornucopia, and Demeter with torch standing on the right (Rome, Mus. Cap. 4371); see LIMC, s.v. Isis–Demeter, no. 262; photo also in Merkelbach 1995, Abb. no. 138. About Agathos Daimon associated with Sarapis and Agathe Tyche associated with Isis, see Pietrzykowski 1978, 959–966; also Vanderlip 1972, 4, 94.

41 Agathos Daimon occur often in form of snake on reliefs and terracotta figurines, and Egyptian Thermuthis (Renenutet), the old maternal goddess of cereal and grain, was sometimes illustrated as snake (cobra) with human head wearing 'Isiac' crown, a sun disc with horns; see LIMC, s.v. Isis–Thermuthis, nos. 332–364. Thus this pair became relatively early (in the middle Hellenistic period) associated with Sarapis and Isis; see e.g. a bronze statuette from the 1st cent. AD (Berlin, Staatl. Mus., Ägyptl. Mus. 20428; LIMC, s.v. Isis, no. 359) in which Isis–Thermuthis and Sarapis–Agathos Daimon are shown in the form of snakes with crowns, partly entangled together, and a small relief (Leiden, Rijksmus. F 1960/0.1.; LIMC, s.v. Isis, no. 354) on the same theme. Pietrzykowski 1978, 962–963; also Vanderlip 1972, 4. On the association of Agathos Daimon and Sarapis in Roman coins, see Bregman 1989, 70–71 and LIMC, s.v. Isis, nos. 330, 337, 344a, 349a.

42 The attributes of Agathos Daimon are often ears of corn and poppyheads, also known to symbolize Demeter's role in promoting fertility. Chthonic deities or the ones with chthonic aspects are often illustrated in the form of a snake and thence their attributes are torches and a caduceus which occur in the iconography of Agathos Daimon, Thermuthis, Sarapis and Isis as well. Pietrzykowski 1978, 963.
Syncretism that parallelizes religious elements presupposes interaction but not necessarily readiness to reform the religious system; old elements are kept alive. Reshaping was not done until the second stage of syncretism, namely with identification and assimilation.  

B.2. Identification

I regard identification as the second stage of syncretism, because it usually follows chronologically parallelization, but does not necessarily occur in all cases. Identification means that individual gods merge into each other to such a degree that it is no longer easy to distinguish the previously individual elements of the gods. Their epithets and attributes may still be seen, but even these usually amalgamate into a new unity. One of the best examples of this is the case of Demeter and Isis. On Delos in Sarapieion A, a statue of Isis has been found with a crown decorated with two ears of corn. Ears of corn are a symbol of Demeter, a diadem with ‘horns’ occurs in the iconography of Isis, but in this case they form a new individual symbol for the goddess Demeter–Isis who is a complete whole; ears of corn are now the horns of the crown of Isis, and their symbolism expresses the goddess’ fertility aspect and her role as the bearer of harvest. Some of the Athenian tetradrachms from the end of the first century BC were impressed with Isis’ head decorated by Demeter’s epithet, ears of corn, as well with the owl of Athena on the reverse. There are similar types of representations of Isis–Aphrodite as well.

B.3. Syncretistic Religion: Case of Sarapis

In the case of Sarapis the syncretizing process went even further. The consciously created god was a new whole, even his name completely amalgamated those of different

---

43 This is also connected with universal and cosmopolitan elements in religion. See Chapter V.4.
44 Compare V. Tran Tum Tiah 1986, 359 who quotes J. Vandier 1944, 14: “Syncretisme ... consiste à unir deux divinités ayant chaque une identité indépendante et à faire de cette dualité un être unique dans laqul se retrouvent les caractères, primitivement indépendants de ses deux éléments formateurs.”
45 Roussel 1916a, statue no. A 3181, p. 275; Baslez 1977, 57. A small statue of a similar sort has been found in Cretan Galene of Hellenistic times. The head-dress of the goddess is composed of a burst of ears of corn, a moon-shaped crescent and astral motifs including ‘Isiac cross’. Leclant 1964, 394; Leclant & Clerc 1985, fig. XII.
46 Thompson 1961, 382 and 606–607 catalogue nos. 1232–1233. Five of these coins of the year 107/6 BC were found. See also Dow 1937, 226–227; Dunand 1673, 12 and p. 63 above. These symbols must have had significance for the Athenians, since an individual magistrate could use them on his own coins.
47 E.g. a little statuette from Myrina carries epithets of both Isis and Aphrodite which together form a typical iconographical representation of the goddess Isis–Aphrodite. Mollard-Besques 1963, 87; fig. VIII in Leclant & Clerc 1985; photography also in Leclant 1986, 344, fig. 5 (text in p. 344). See p. 90, n. 34.
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48 When attempting to account for Sarapis and his nature, ancient writers tended to assert that he was essentially the same as any other god or gods: He is identified, for example, with Pluto, Osiris, Apis, and Zeus, but the most obvious identifications are Asclepius and Zeus. In the first century BC, Diodorus Siculus said that (1.25.2): “Some are of the opinion that Osiris is Sarapis, others that he is Dionysus, or Pluto, or Ammon; some that he is Zeus, many that he is Pan. And some say that Sarapis is the god who is called Pluto among the Greeks”. It is clear that Sarapis was connected, iconographically as well as in other ways with Zeus, Asclepius, Pluto, Osiris, Apis and Dionysus, within a hundred years of Alexander the Great’s death in 323 BC and that in the following years this syncretistic divinity was extended to include Helios well. Sarapis appears very frequently in the documents of the third century BC. He arrived in Athens at the beginning of the third century BC. The ‘creation story’ of Sarapis reveals some essential elements of syncretism. Ptolemy, who was visited in a dream by a god who was later identified as Sarapis, invited the Egyptian and Greek specialists to create together a new god, his cult and rituals. Manetho represented the Egyptians as a priest of Sebennyus, Timotheus was a member of the genos of the Eumolpidai and belonged to the priests of the Eleusinian Mysteries. It is claimed that these two priests were Ptolemy’s religious advisors and it was mostly they who prepared the cult scheme of Sarapis. Bryaxis is said to have cast the physical appearance of Sarapis, and Demetrius of Phalerum wrote hymns in honour of

49 The Egyptian god of the underworld, Osiris, and the Apis bull of Memphis are mixed in the name of Sarapis according to U. Wilckcn, P.M. Fraser and G. Mussies who explain the etymology of the name Sarapis as an equivalent (but not an exact transliteration) of the Egyptian Wsir–Hp (Osor–Hapis) which is Osiris–Apis. According to D.J. Thompson Apis was at Memphis Osor–Hapi, the defiled Apis bull, yet as Sarapis to the immigrants his chthonic aspect was that of Dionysus. G. Mussies 1978, 828–829 argues for the opinion that Sarapis was purely the Greek name of Osor–Hapi (Wsir–Hp), and that it was undoubtedly the Greeks who attributed the name to the Egyptian god. This deity was worshipped at the funerary temple of Apis bull at Memphis in which there were the statues of Apis and Sarapis and of the other deities together, but yet separate; the temples and statues were there for both the Greeks and the Egyptians. See Wilckcn 1927, 25–27; Fraser 1960, 1; Stambaugh 1972, 5; Mussies 1978, 825; Thompson 1988, 212; also Nilsson 1950, 156; Préaux 1978 (1987), 649–650; Tran Tam Tinh 1982, 101; Samuel 1983, 85.

50 E.g. Plutarch, Mor. 5.36.1.

51 Cf. Clemens of Alexandria, Protr. 4.48.5–6 (refers to Athenodorus of Tarsus, a writer from the 1st cent. BC).

52 Epigraphical document in SEG XV 426 from Thracia, (1st cent. BC). In the inscription Sarapis is identified with Zeus Aithrios (Zeug Aithrios, 1.3).

53 Fraser 1960, 3; Merkelbach 1995, 83.

54 Stambaugh 1972, 6; Tran Tam Tinh 1982, 101–102; Merkelbach 1995, 78, 82. POxy XI 1382 (= Pack 4 2480; Totti 1985, no. 13) is a dedicatory inscription to Zeus–Helios–Megalos Sarapis from the 2nd cent. AD.


56 See the discussion on whether Ptolemy was the I, II or III in Stambaugh 1972, 6–10 which concludes that: “... if we use the name Sarapis as a touchstone for the introduction, it cannot be later than fairly early in the reign of Ptolemy I ...” (p. 10).

57 Plutarch, Mor. 5.361f–362a; Tacitus, Hist. 4.83–84. Later Christian writers referred to the occasion, e.g. Clemens of Alexandria, Protr. 4.48.1–6. It has been suggested that the Eleusinian expert Timotheus was invited to Alexandria to advise the Egyptians on how to act correctly in the newly
the god as a response to being miraculously cured of blindness. Thus the very consciousness based on political motives makes Sarapis’ creation a representative of a ‘fully syncretistic’ religion with its own rites and cultic customs. Sarapis was the patron deity of the Ptolemaic dynasty, as well as of Alexandria. The Ptolemies thought of Sarapis as a kind of divine counterpart to their own benevolent rule, as a symbol, an ambassador for this policy, and at the same time as a mediator of their imperialistic expansion. Ptolemaios Soter I wanted even Memphis to become a central city of Sarapis worship already at the end of the fourth century BC. Thus the Greeks who wished to show their favour to the Ptolemies easily accepted Sarapis, whose very essence included their more traditional gods and who now had a complete cultic scheme of his own.

C. Syncretism of Demeter and Isis

Symbols are the instruments by which communication in religious life is made possible and concrete. To *homo symbolicus* (which as a concept includes *homo religiosus*) religious behaviour is symbolic in character. Thus by observing symbols we may study more closely how the syncretizing process was carried out in the case of Demeter and Isis. Attributes and epithets are symbols that characterize the roles, functions and identities of the goddesses.

“La confusion entre Isis et Demeter est totale”, says Y. Grandjean in his study concerning Isis of the first centuries BC and AD. As completely identified they are not met until the late first century BC. When Isis came to Athens she was clearly different from Demeter; her roles and sphere of activities were at least to some degree contrary to those of Demeter. The goddesses complemented each other because they had different functions. Demeter was the goddess of the old Greek pantheon, and represented the age-old religious traditions. Isis, on the other hand, was a newcomer and in her Greek form was closely connected with the pluralistic culture of Hellenism. In the beginning, when Isis arrived on Greek soil, there was no need for competition between these goddesses, especially when one takes into account the fact that in Greek culture it was possible for a person to belong to many cults and to be an adherent of many deities simultaneously. This way of acting was regarded as good, honourable and prestigious. The assimilation of Demeter and Isis was a necessary solution only in a situation where a competitive position emerged. This first caused the parallelization of the goddesses and finally led to their

---

established Demetrian mystery cult of Alexandrian Eleusis. Thus his duty would have been to observe that the rites were celebrated in accordance with those of the Attic Eleusis, the original location of the Mysteries. See Nilsson 1950, 94–95; Mylonas 1961, 203; Clinton 1974, 9; le Corsu 1977, 51; Préaux 1978 (1987), 651. Note, anyhow, that the existence of the mystery rites proper at Alexandrian Eleusis is a doubtful matter; see Bell 1952 (1975), 18; Fraser 1972, 200–201; Hopkinson 1984, 92–98 and p. 9, n. 1.

58 Artemidorus, Onirocr. 2.44.11–18.
59 Brady 1935, 7, 17–18; Stambaugh 1972, 94. See also 51 above and note rejection of the ‘imperialistic theory’.
60 Merkelbach 1995, 73–74.
61 Grandjean 1975, 93, also 103.
syncretism also on a cultic level as shown in the previous chapter. Now we shall follow the process of syncretism of the two goddesses.

C.1. Independent and Individual Goddesses

Demeter’s Identity:

Demeter was a chthonic goddess of corn and fertility. She awoke the land each spring to produce wheat and fruits so that people might enjoy them. Demeter’s connection with death came through the cycle of birth and death; it is only by death that a new birth is possible. She was the Mother and her beauty was worthy of honour. M.P. Nilsson said that the Mother god of the Greeks was not Ge, but Demeter. Demeter’s femininity is well-expressed in her epithets, and most of her functions and roles have some connection with it. The goddess Demeter occurs as a fruit- and gift-bearing goddess (ὣρηφόρος ἄγλαδδορος), who brings fruitful seasons to humans. Thus she is given epithets like fruit-bearing (καρποφόρος) and wheat-bearing (χλοόκαρπος), fruit-giving Mother (μήτηρ καρποδότειρα), rich of ears of corn (πολυτάστχος), nourishing ears of corn (σταχυτρόφος), nourisher (βοτιάνειρα, πολυτρόφος, κουροτρόφος), the one who brings many medimnoi, i.e. Attic corn-measures (πολυμεδίμνος). More generally she is the giver of life and nutrition; she is a fertility-giving Mother. Demeter’s fertility aspect is connected with the land and more narrowly with corn and fruit. It is remarkable that Demeter’s beauty is so much admired, her hair especially receiving attention; she is fair-haired; her hair is ambrosial and blonde or beautifully crowned, she is said to be fair-garlanded and mostly dark-clad; even her ankles are admired. As an important Olympian goddess Demeter was from the beginning σωτειρά, βασίλισσα, δέσποινα, αιδώη and σώτειρα. 70

62 Chthónia is a frequently-occurring epithet for this. See e.g. IG IV 679, II. 29, 13 (2nd cent. BC).
63 Nilsson 1950, 461.
64 Hymn Hom. Dem., 492, also 4, 54, 192.
65 See Aristophanes, Ran. 382; Orphic hymn 40. 2,3,5,13,18, 43.9; Theocritus, Id. 10.42; Callimachus, Hymn 6. 2,119,136. In these the epithets πολύφωρος, σταχυτρόφος, χλοόκαρπος and καρποῖς βρόθουσα also appear.
66 As Mother she appears twice in the Hymn Hom. Dem.: 35, 185 and 360 (dark-clad Mother). In the Orphic hymn she is called βότιον ἱερόθεντις (life-loving), κουροτρόφος (nourishing mother of boys) and even ὄλβιονδοτις (giver of happiness and wealth), Orphic hymn, 40. 2,9,13. Artemidorus, Onirocr. 2.39 says that Demeter is called ζείδωρος, βιόδωρος, φερεθώτος (life-giving), because she possessed the knowledge of cultivating the earth.
68 Ibid., 224, 307, 360, 374.
69 Ibid., 453.
70 In Hymn Hom. Dem. Demeter is the σεμνή Θεός; 1; πότνια μήτηρ: 39, 122, 185; πότνια: 54, 492; ἄνασσα: 75, 440, 492; αἰδώη: 343, 374, 486; in the Orphic hymn σεμνή (twice), πολυτάστχος and ἄνασσα: 40, 2,13,20; in Aristophanes, Thesm. 286 she appears as δέσποινα; in Ran. 378 as σώτειρα and 382 as καρποφόρος βασίλισσα. Callimachus called her πότνια and ἄνασσα in his hymn 6. 10,49,121. When describing gods σεμνοί is usually attested to goddesses, often to Demeter, in Athens it described also Erinyes (σεμνά Θεοί) and Athene, and ὄργα σεμνά when connected with the mystery-rites (Hymn Hom. Dem., 476–478). Of the gods it signifies revered, august, holy
Isis’ Identity:

Isis had a far-reaching background in Egyptian mythology before she arrived in Greece, where she became hellenized. When she first came to Greece, Isis reflected her original roles, of which many belonged to areas quite different from those of Demeter. In Egyptian mythology Isis was in the beginning, Oldest of the old, a sun-goddess. Thus she was more excellent than any other god; she was unique, Mistress of the House of Life, Mistress of the world of the gods. Egyptian Isis dealt with the courses of the sun, moon and stars because she was a primeval god who separated heaven from earth. These astral roles remained as Isis’ Egyptian characteristics. As a woman Isis was a Mother and sister, wife, smiling and gentle. Motherhood was an important characteristic of Isis from the beginning. She expressed perfect motherhood, because she was at first the female embodiment of the Nile’s annual reawakening and also the mother of Horus of whom every Pharaoh was the incarnation. Thus she was in control of all. This is seen in the Book of the Death in which she is described as having her feet on the prow of heaven and with her all-covering arms outstretched. Isis herself was the conqueror of death — which she never suffered — being concerned with resurrection. Family and daily welfare also depended on Isis, because she was the inventor of these, herself the ideal wife of Osiris and the one who invented cultivation, papyrus, linen, beer and bread. These aspects were still prominent in the role of Isis of the Hellenistic era, when she is described as a giver and organizer of civil life (Plutarch, Mor. 5.377a): “... (she was with Osiris) appointed over every allocation of good and whatever there is in nature that is fair and good ... Isis receives and distributes them.” Isis played her role in justice and law: she was lawless in the sense of being above human law and also a lawgiver and the best of advisors being a very skilful lover of wisdom. As such Isis showed people moral values, for example, she suppressed murders; she established the first maternity; in the social and civil sphere she protected cities and their institutions.

and of humans worthy of respect, majestic, stately and honourable (LSJ, s.v. οἰκειός).

71 Witt 1971, 14; Vanderlip 1972, 93; Merkelbach 1995, 4.
73 Vanderlip 1972, 94.
74 See e.g. Orphic hymn, 42.9.
75 Witt 1971, 15, 17.
77 Münster 1969, 71–76.
78 Witt 1971, 16–17; cf. The Pyramid Texts 655a and 474c.
79 Notice also Plutarch, Mor. 5.377a: ‘And if we revere and honour what is orderly and good and beneficial as the work of Isis ... we shall not be wrong.’ (translation F.C. Babbitt, The Loeb Classical Library 1936 (1962)). In the aretalogy of Thessalonica IG X2 254 (1st or 2nd cent. AD) Isis claims to be one who caused barbarians to be disposed (l. 21).
80 See Bruchman 1893, 161–162; aretalogy of Cyme IG XII Suppl. pp. 98–99 (1st cent. BC), ll. 34–35, 37, 52 and of Thessalonica IG X2 524 (1st or 2nd cent. AD), ll. 16–17: ἐγώ τὸ δίκαιον ἱσχύρθν ἐποίησα.
81 See e.g. Plutarch, Mor. 5.351f.
82 Diodorus Siculus, 1.15.1; 19.7. Osiris was also a protector of cities in the text. In the aretalogy of Cyme IG XII Suppl., pp. 98–99 (1st cent. BC) Isis speaks about herself: “I constructed walls of the cities (l. 51), I devised marriage contracts / I brought together man and woman (l. 17 and 30), I gave and ordained laws for men, which no one is able to change (l. 4), I brought an end to murders (l. 26),
To the Greeks, also, Isis became known as the goddess who could heal from illnesses; thus she was a salvatrix and magician. All in all, Isis who had transcendental aspects became to influence also every day human life and thus immanent qualities incorporated into her roles and identity. Isis’ feminine appearance is usually connected with her garments: Isis is clad in linen (λεινόστησας and λεινόστησος) probably referring to her original role as an Egyptian deity (Ἄιγυπτη). In addition to her vestments she was crowned and shown as holding a lotus flower. The knot in Isis’ garment is an epithet and identifier of the goddess at least in sculpture, especially in Graeco-Roman art. In addition to this she, as a hellenized goddess, had in art many attributes of other goddesses, such as the torches and poppy-heads of Demeter, crescent moon of Artemis–Selene, helm of Tyche, but the knot in her dress front is always the safe attribute which identifies Isis.

C.2. Parallelized Goddesses

Parallelization was possible by reason of analogies. People noticed analogous elements in the roles of deities in Hellenistic times. For example, the Eleusinian deities were connected with the Egyptian ones on Delos: the inscription IG XI4 1235 from the end of the third century BC or the beginning of the second is a dedication made by the people of Athymbrianus to Pluto & Kore, Demeter, Hermes and Anubis together (Πλούτωνι καὶ Κόρει, Δήμητρι, Ἑρμεί 'Ανοῦβι). Both of the two goddesses, Demeter and Isis, were Mothers, a role which became strongly underlined. In mythical thought being a mother is connected with the fertility of the land and through it with the fertility of the whole of and to the eating of men (I. 21)” (translation bases on the one of Grant 1950, 131–133). Similar themes occur in the aretalogies of Thessalonica IG X2 254 (1st or 2nd cent. AD) which concentrates on listing Isis’ values in ordering social and civilized life: “I am the constructor of the city of Bubastos (II. 11–12), I brought together man and woman (I. 17; also 27–28, 30), I brought an end to the eating of men with my brother Osiris (I. 22), I brought into being the right power of gold and silver (II. 28–29)”. According to B. Muller 1961, 87–88 these themes in the hymn reflect Egyptian ideas of Isis, the hymn being connected with the so called Isis-aretalogy of Memphis from the Memphis Sarapieion where also Isis was worshipped. According to D.J. Thompson in this Sarapieion the native hold was strong. Though it was Sarapis and Isis, not Apis and the Mother-of-Apis who became to be in the centre of worship in the Ptolemaic Memphis, Thompson 1988, 265.
human kind. In Greece, Demeter was always associated with corn, and this connection also played a role in her cult. Euripides wrote that, “divine Demeter - Earth is she, name by which name thou wilt; she upon dry food nurtureth mortal men” (Bacch. 274–277). Plutarch (Mor. 5.377b) notices that people had also associated Isis and Osiris with seasonal changes and with the growth of the crops, with sowing and ploughing. But still he associated Demeter specifically with the earth by saying (Mor. 5.367c): “That which pervades the earth and its products is Demeter and the Daughter”. Similarities of this kind were easily seen even in the parallel elements of the myths of the two goddesses. The myth of Demeter is best known in the Homeric Hymn’s version from the ca. 660–650 BC, and that of hellenized Isis from Plutarch’s De Iside et Osiride from the first century AD. Plutarch noticed also the parallelism between the mythical elements of the Egyptian and Greek myths. He was a Greek and sympathizer of Isis, but also a member of the priesthood of Delphi. Similar thematic elements in these mythical texts are: both goddesses lose a beloved member of their family, they seek desperately for the lost one all over the world, during their wanderings they meet an earthly queen with whom they become friends and whose child they take care of, making him immortal by fire (Demeter tries to do this, but is prohibited at the last moment by queen Metaneira); both goddesses are given back their beloved one and thus they symbolically achieve victory over death. Death is represented in personified form in the myths (Hades and Seth). It should be noted that this myth of Isis was already hellenized and many typically Greek traits had found their way into this story of the Egyptian gods. But this also represents parallelization by explaining the ease with which Demeter and Isis were considered similar on Greek soil. As explained above (Chapter III), the myth of Demeter was an aetiology for the cult thus explaining it. The aetiological function is seen also in the case of Isis: the hellenized myth explained Isis’ roles, her cult and the parallels with the myth of Demeter made her popularity and triumph in Greece understandable. The myth gave content and substance to the rites, and together they formed a whole in which the rite was a frame, and the myth completed it by giving meanings to it. This promoted the syncretism of the two goddesses.

gods, like Ge in Greece, who was displaced later by Demeter. Cf. Eliade 1963, 245–246.
90 Plutarch continues ibid. by telling of an offering of the first fruits to Osiris and says: “When they hear all this, people love it and believe it, deriving their conviction from things close at hand and familiar.”
91 For more about the hymn, see above, p. 31.
92 Plutarch, Mor. 5.360f. See the commentary on the text in Griffiths 1970, 57–58, 309. R. Merkelbach 1995, 51–52, 252–265 describes in length ‘Plutarch’s Platonic interpretation’ of Greek and Egyptian religion. He means the Plutarch’s tendency to describe and interpret Egyptian religion through the platonically orientated point of view, e.g. in De Iside et Osiride Plutarch explains that the role of Osiris is equivalent to the principle of good (ibid., 1995, 258–259), Isis–Psyche is the goddess of philosophical exercise (ibid., 259–260) and that Isis is a symbol or equivalent of knowledge (ibid., 261–262).
93 Cf. le Ccrsu 1977, 63–64; Martin 1987, 84; Merkelbach 1995, 5, 38.
94 Préaux i 1978 (1987), 658–659. V. Tran Tam Tinh 1982, 102, 104–105, 115 underlines that outside Egypt Isis became hellenized towards the beginning of the 3rd cent. BC.
C.3. Identified Goddesses

There are some aspects of Demeter and Isis which are so similar that the goddesses could become combined as persons as well. These aspects were noticed and utilized mainly in the second and the first centuries BC. Both deities were emphatically feminine and in the larger sense Mothers (Μητέρ); they made the cultivation of both the land and civil life possible. There are various features that connect Isis as a founder of culture with the nature of the Greek Demeter. Thus they both civilized humankind. Common epithets which characterize this are mother of ears of corn (σταχυμητέρ) and fruit-bearing (καρποφόρος and καρποτόκος) and θεομοφόρος. Designated like this Isis is put into the traditional roles of Demeter and becomes the same. The Greeks who identified Isis with Demeter saw in Isis’ rites their own Mysteries, and thus the ritualistic similarity has a place of importance in the identification. Being deities with similar functions Demeter and Isis were jointly honoured as powerful and mighty goddesses. Demeter is frequently specified as queen and majesty and Isis was given epithets that referred to her role as an omnipotent god who knew, saw and understood everything: she was all-seeing (πανθερκής); she had many forms (μυριόμορφος) and was many-named (πολυνύμφων). In the first century BC Diodorus Siculus said that (1.24.2): “the same goddess is called by some Isis, by others Demeter”. The same thought is found in Clemens of Alexandria (Strom. 1.221.106.3–4): “Isis belongs to the Egyptian gods and is called Demeter by the Greeks.”

The oldest of the aretalogies of Isis, (often personal) proclamations in which the goddess explains her majesty and power, belongs to approximately 100 BC. It was found in Maronea, but its importance is that it has been claimed to be the first explicit literal identification of Greek Demeter and Egyptian Isis. I would like to emphasize that in this

96 Demeter taught the men of Eleusis the art of agriculture according to her myth and thus elevated humans from the savage way of life to that of civilized humans: Hymn Hom. Dem. 452–458; Callimachus, Hymn 6.18–19. According to the myth Isis taught men all that is good and civilized them; Plutarch, Mor. 5.361d–f (Plutarch’s specification e.g. in 5.377a).
97 About Demeter’s and Isis’ roles see pp. 95–97. Demeter appears in Athens as καρποφόρος and καρποτόκος in IG II/II A 4587 (middle of the 4th cent. BC), and as καρποφόρος and θεομοφόρος still in SIG II 820 (AD 83/84), II. 3–5; see Bruchman 1893, 76, 161; Isis as καρπών εὐρέτρια occurs e.g. in the Isisidorus’ hymn to Isis from Madinat Maadi (SEG VIII 548–551) from the 1st cent. BC, I. II,3 (for more detail about the hymn, see below, p. 108–109), and in the aretalogy of Cyme (IG X2 254) she appears as πρώτη καρπών θεομοφόρα εὐρέτρια (I. 1).
98 Pausanias mentions that Demeter Thesmophoros had temples at Alimus, a small Attic town, 1.31.1; in Megara, 1.42.6; in Corinth, 2.32.8; at Leuctra (in Boeotia), 9.6.5; at Drymea (in Phocis), 10.33.12. Isis Thesmophoros occurs e.g. in the aretalogy of Cyme (IG XII Suppl., pp. 98–99), I. 50.
99 Heyob 1975, 11. This is discussed in Chapter IV.4.
100 See p. 95, n. 70.
101 See POxy XV 1803 (= Pack 2477), II. 94,97,101 (πολυνύμφως and πανθερκής), and Isisidorus Hymn to Isis SEG VIII 548, I. 1,26 (πολυνύμφως), also in Vanderlip 1972, 17–18, 34–35, 49–50. See also Collart 1919, 93–100 and Grant 1953, 128–130.
102 See p. 79 (n. 73).
103 The aretalogy and its commentary are in Grandjean 1975.
104 Versnel 1990, 42.
text the cults of Demeter and Isis are identified as well, since they have both become mystery cults.\textsuperscript{105} It is noteworthy that at the level of cultic practices identification did not occur until this time. Only from this time onwards we may talk about the Mysteries of Isis in the full sense. This has been discussed in connection with the problem of the mysteries, but the above-mentioned questions of the greatness and power of the goddesses now lead us to another very important concept that occurs in connection with the nature of Hellenistic religion; namely the monotheistic trend.

2. Monotheistic Trend

Monotheism as a concept is both categorical and abstract. It is an instrument of researchers, and its purpose is to help to classify religious phenomena; the word is not Greek, but invented from the Greek word \textit{θεῖος} (divine being, deity)\textsuperscript{106} with the prefix \textit{mono-} to denote religion which involves belief only in one god. Even though the idea of monotheism had been known to philosophers for a long time before the Hellenistic era. When studying cultic practice we must be cautious in using the term, because it is a strongly interpretative one. The problem is that the concept of monotheism is connected with our Christian-centred point of view, its theocentric forms and models for explaining the characteristics of religions. Old evolutionary theories about religious development must be assessed on this basis. These theories regarded monotheism as the final and complete form of the developing process of religions. This process was regarded as including stages that involved first, for example, animism and magic, then polytheism, and finally monotheism of which Christianity was ethnocentrically seen as the most ennobled representative.\textsuperscript{107} When studying the religions of antiquity it seems more suitable to speak about a 'monotheistic trend' rather than monotheism, because as a term monotheism excludes even the potential existence of other gods: "There is no other god at all except this god". The religions of Greek and Roman antiquity did not do this; they were fundamentally clearly polytheistic. Despite this there were monotheistic tendencies. The Greeks knew only synthesis of all or most of the gods, on the one hand, or philosophical or theological principle on the other.\textsuperscript{108} I shall comment on both of these in what follows.

It may well be appropriate to remember the term henotheism in this connection. It means an attitude which includes monotheistic content without involving rejection or

\textsuperscript{105} See Chapter IV.4 on this theme.
\textsuperscript{106} LSJ, s.v. \textit{θεῖος}. \textit{Τὸ \θεῖο} denotes to the acts or attributes of the gods and in general to the religious observances.
\textsuperscript{107} Older evolutionary theories of religion, which viewed the development of natural and social world as a movement from lower to higher forms, from the simple to the complex, were first postulated by E.B. Tylor ('animism') and R.R. Marett ('animatism' or 'dynamism'). In animism the origin of religion is in human belief in surrounding spirits and souls, and in animatism humans tend to spiritualize the surrounding world of objects, which habit is seen as the original religious thinking. About the emergence of these ideas see Sharpe 1975 (1986), 53–58, 65–71 and Bolle 1987, 296–302. Nilsson 1950, 569.
neglect of other gods. Evidence which reveals this kind of tendency does not always entail monotheistic notions in the strict sense. Thus henotheism may be regarded as a kind of *praeparatio* for monotheism in stressing the exceptional value of a certain god who is believed to be especially benevolent for the nation which believes in him/her. Prior to henotheistic concepts there may have been parallelizing or assimilating syncretism. A chronology may be constructed. In the process there is first syncretism which is followed by henotheism and finally a 'monotheistic trend' occurs.

The idea of monotheism belongs to many spheres: to the area of philosophy as a superior principle\(^{110}\), to political life as the hierarchical system of monarchy, and to religion as a process of syncretism leading to a monotheistic trend. It should be noted that this chronology is highly theoretical, and the chronological development does not always presuppose all of the stages. Its purpose here is to help in analyzing the central themes of Hellenistic religion, not to provide a universally applicable model for religious development.

All this was focused on the need to outline an ever-increasing and pluralistic gallery of gods, ordering them under one god who was regarded as more powerful than the others, but who could encompass in him/herself traits of the others at the same time. This strong god was not necessarily above good and evil in the universe, but was placed on the highest step of the hierarchy of the gods.

Absolute monotheism brings into mind the concept of transcendence. As a term 'transcendent' is technical.\(^{111}\) The transcendent indicates the idea of something 'beyond', first of all beyond the sphere of physical things and finite spirits as being prior to essential nature, to exalt above it. The transcendent idea of a god includes the idea that the god is absolute and infinite, wholly impassable and immune to influence of others, while an immanent god would be relative and finite (if we could comprehend such a god). Classical theism denies transcendence.\(^{112}\) From the beginning of Greek religious thought there had been immanent elements which belonged to the theological structure. There was an idea of a Supreme Being existing behind (or above) the theogony, that had an eye on the gods of the *pantheon* and affected their deeds. Activities of personal gods were subordinate to this power. This was denominated, for example, as Nemesis, who was fairly abstract and only rarely had an actual cult prior late Hellenistic or Roman times,\(^{113}\) or as Tyche. These

\(^{109}\) Versnel 1990, 35. He notes rightly that it also often denotes personal devotion to one god, for example, in the form "there is no other god like this god (for me)".

\(^{110}\) E.g. Bregman 1982, 58 speaks about 'Greek philosophical monotheism'.

\(^{111}\) Smart 1979, 29.

\(^{112}\) In religious thinking transcendence is a value term expressing the unique excellence of god, and immanence, the term important in connection with transcendence, is not obviously a value term because it includes a sense of *ubiquity*, being everywhere and thus merely expresses a unique property. Hartshorne 1987, 16, 18–19.

\(^{113}\) See e.g. Allëgre 1889, 38–39. Pausanias describes the cult places of these deities (personified abstractions), see pp. 27 and 43. Nemesis accompanied with Themis had a cult at Rhamnous already in Classical times. Rhamnous had two temples, the older and smaller of which was built in the 480s BC. There have been found two early 4th century BC thrones, originally placed in the porch, and dedicated to Themis and Nemesis by a priestess as well as the statue of Themis. The larger temple was built 50 years later to Nemesis alone. The cult statue of Nemesis and its base is known only from Pausanias 1.33.3–8 who tells that on the head of the goddess was a crown with deer and small images
deities represented the principle which was above or beyond in the same way as represented by transcendental deities, but they were immanent in belonging to the inner structure of the Greek theological setting of personal and usually anthropomorphic gods. When Isis was equated with these gods, as in the Isidorus’ hymn to Isis, she is clearly both immanent and transcendent, a helper on Earth and a divine judge, great Mother and creator-god.\textsuperscript{114} When studying Greek religion we are confronted with a search for order and meaning that required even the gods themselves to be subject to a predestined pattern.\textsuperscript{115} In the course of time, the transcendent element seems to gain ground at the expense of immanent principles. In Hellenistic times this idea of a Supreme Being was made more explicit and gained more prominence in theological structuring. This may have been the religious response to a situation in which people had to handle the coexistence of many different gods simultaneously and to deal with this plurality. Syncretism belonged implicitly to monotheistic tendencies, because they both tended to create order in religious pluralism. It should be remembered that the idea of monotheism does not necessarily imply turning away from polytheism, since monotheistic ideas may belong to a polytheistic system as such.\textsuperscript{116} Greek religion was to a certain extent a mixture of pantheism (the idea of the Supreme Being) and polysymbolism which means that none of the divine symbols excluded the divinity of the others. This was expressed vaguely among the people and more precisely among the philosophers.\textsuperscript{117}

\textbf{A. Ruler Gods}

The problem when studying a monotheistic tendency in the religion of the Hellenistic period is methodological: is it possible to handle religious thought and transcendental theories in the same way as the religious activities of every day life, i.e. will primary material be revealing enough about abstract modes of thought? We are attempting here to interpret the ‘monotheistic trend’ on the basis of the primary evidence, and trying to find

\textsuperscript{114} Cf. Vanderlip 1972, 4.

\textsuperscript{115} Humphrey 1978, 210. He refers to the suggestion made first by J.P. Vernant that it is important to make a distinction between transcendent power and transcendent order. In Greek thought the latter is predominant and means that it is not possible to find a contraposition of religion and the state. Humphrey 1978, 110–111.

\textsuperscript{116} Bianchi 1975, 95.

\textsuperscript{117} Festugière 1954, 255. The reason for this may be that the idea of transcendence is rather a sophisticated concept belonging mostly to the structuring of the philosophers and theologians. Smart 1979, 29. See also Bregman 1982, 59: “The universalist elements in Hellenistic religions reached their logical culmination when a transformed paganism systematically subordinated all the gods to a supreme transcendent One”.

of Nike, in her hand libation bowl and an apple branch. Based on Pausanias’ description A.N. Dinsmoor 1972, 15 states that the cult statue was not particularly attended to the character of the goddess but was instead the colossal image of a beautiful woman. In any case the inscriptions on the thrones show that at Rhamnous there was a cult of these goddesses in Classical times. H.J. Rose 1949, 601 argues that Nemesis may have appeared to have been there originally a deity of the type of Artemis who deals or distributes \( \nu\phi\mu\tau\sigma \)\( \alpha \)\( \iota \), appropriate gifts to her worshippers, and was afterwards made abstract. See Dinsmoor 1972, 14–15, 22–24; Eliot 1976, 753.

an answer to the question of what monotheistic tendency might really mean in a particular situation. There were some modes of civil orientation in social life which were determined by the movements towards new forms of religious thought, especially monotheistic thinking, so that the level of social structure comes into the picture, lessening the contradiction between the evidence and abstract constructions about the modes of thought. Transcendental visions in civilization can be recognized at least to some degree in the emerging institutions in which there appeared the concept of the accountability of the rulers and of the community to a higher authority such as a divine force, for example in the case of the ruler-gods. The cult of deified rulers was an important phenomenon in the religious and political life of the Hellenistic period. I will not treat this at length here, but it is necessary to take into account some notions connected with the ‘monotheistic trend’ and immanence of divine power in the persons of human rulers. Alexander the Great was the first deified ruler in the Hellenistic world and his successors wanted to follow his model, like the Macedonian king Antigonus and his son Demetrius Poliorcetes who were welcomed in Athens as Soteres, Euergetai and even as Theoi. The problem of the ruler-cult is whether it was motivated for administrative purposes in order to create, and present to the people, a powerful ruler whose role and deeds were justified by reasons taken from the divine sphere, and who could become venerated as a god belonging similarly to all people and all nations in the Hellenistic world at large, or was ruler-cult the spontaneous worship of men who were believed to be gods. From Alexander the Great onwards the first alternative seems reasonable; for example, in these cults the foremost object of worship was never a person or personality of a certain ruler, but an abstract characteristic of a benevolent ruler in general, like arete, dikaiosyne, philanthropia or sophia. Rulers wanted to strengthen their divine role by presenting themselves as identified with powerful gods known to the people and taking the epithets of these gods to characterize the ruler himself: Alexander the Great was known, for example, as Zeus and Heracles, and Demetrius Poliorcetes was presented in Athens as Zeus. It is

118 Eisenstadt 1982, 303.
119 See e.g. Cerfaux & Tondriau 1957, 148, 318; Habicht 1970, 225; Samuel 1983, 99: “The dynastic cult itself was a Greek institution, and it was completely separate from the traditional Egyptian worship of Pharaoh.”
120 Antigonus and Demetrius are both claimed to have had the cult of Soteres in Athens after the year 307 BC. Plutarch, Demetr. 10.3–4; see also ibid. 12.2–4; Diodorus Siculus, 20.46.23 and 20.93.6. Both authors speak of the golden statues of Antigonus and Demetrius, and the cult of the Saviour gods in honour of these Macedonian kings. The cult of Demetrius is known from the years 307, 304/3, 294 and 291/290 BC. This might have been said in the means of propaganda in order to defend the status of these rulers after their death. Habicht 1970, 44–45, 51, 166–167; see also Cerfaux & Tondriau 1957, 173–176.
122 Ibid., 222–223.
123 Plutarch, Mor. 4.2.338f says that Alexander was presented as Zeus; he was connected also with Heracles, the beloved hero of the legend and with whom he tended to identify himself and in the deeds of which people could see parallels with Alexander; see Cerfaux & Tondriau 1957, 148–151, 156–160, 162–166.
124 Plutarch, Mor. 4.2.338a; Clemens of Alexandria, Protr. 4.48; the latter adds that in Athens there was a temple of Demetrius designated as ‘Descending’ (Κατάβατς, a way down) while his altars were
evident that immanent divine power was incorporated in the person of a ruler, and this made him seem more potent when handling worldly matters. Divine justification from above, from the world of non-humans strengthened the authority of a ruler, because as a god he was exalted above the possibilities of ordinary people. For the Greeks (and Macedonians) the deified ruler was the one who had merited divine honours through his accomplishments, for example, victories. F.W. Walbank states that the ruler god in Greek fashion was identified with specific Greek gods while in Egypt, where different tradition prevailed regarding ruler gods; he was an incarnation of Horus, because he was Pharaoh. Godliness implies always the conception of power, often sovereignty as well. A ruler-god offered a worldly representative of these, of philanthropia and wisdom. His main role was probably to present himself as a benefactor to those he ruled. Thus in ruler-gods the transcendence of the gods above was made immanent in the world of humans. It is necessary, however, to deal next with the philosophical thought of Hellenistic Athens concerning abstract orientations and social structure.

B. Monotheistic Trend among Intellectuals

The role of intellectuals in contemporary thought is crucial. The importance of their role is often connected with a time of change as well. To S. Eisenstadt 'axial age' means a period which has to do with the emergence, crystallization and institutionalization of basic tension between the divinely justified and the mundane orders in society. During these periods the intellectual elite tends to become aware of the necessity to actively construct the world according to some visions with transcendental elements, i.e. so that it rests on something which gets justification from above the ordinary, every-day life and its institutions. These visions in turn ultimately become institutionalized. Intellectuals always have a two-fold role in society, because they have to distance themselves from what they analyze or criticize in order to be able to do so effectively, but at the same time they have to share the conditions analyzed, seeing it from inside in order to know what they are criticizing. Thus the philosophers of Hellenistic times also always had to everywhere. The word kataibates was used as a title for Zeus (see e.g. the Athenian inscriptions IG II/III 4964 from 400–350 BC: Διὸς Καταῖβατος. Διὸς Καταίβατος and IG II/III 4998 from the 1st cent. AD: Διὸς Καταίβατου) and it was probably used by the Athenians to flatter Demetrius as well; Clemens may have been willing to tell about this flattery in order to represent 'pagan' beliefs in negative light; about Demetrius entitled as Zeus, see also Bruchman 1893, 129.

125 Walbank 1993, 122.
126 By intellectuals I mean those people in a society to whom the role of an analyst and observer, and participation in political matters as well, is defined by the value of intelligence, i.e. comprehension as both a means and an end. Cf. Humphrey 1978, 212.
128 Of course the philosophers of the Classical times wrote texts which say a lot about this problem as well (see e.g. Korhonen, unpublished manuscript). Plato is surely the best example in his writings about the Demiurgos whom he identified with the Good and the Beautiful. The Demiurgos was a kind of personification of this highest idea of the Good or the Beautiful. The to theon of Plato is a divine force (idea), but as yet not highly personalized. Our ideas of personality are not equivalent to those of the ancients, and our idea of monotheism usually includes personal concepts of gods. See des Places
re-think their role in the city. The cynical and sceptical attitudes or self-control and superiority widened the distance between the intellectuals and every-day political activities in Hellenistic times. This separation obviously favoured the emergence of transcendental theories and a critique of religion by the philosophers. It is noticeable that the civilized public in particular had an important role in the change of religious attitudes, because through them new ideas slowly percolated through to a wider public.

Athens was occupied by the Macedonians, and a Macedonian garrison installed itself in the city after the Lamian war in 322 BC. Cassandrus instituted an oligarchy in the city in 317 BC and granted a controlling position to Demetrius of Phalerum. This ruler wrote about Tyche (Peri Tyches) in the same year and he placed Tyche above all humans and gods. He clearly regarded Tyche as a goddess who had qualities which placed her above theogony and which thus made her omnipotent. Later this was cited by Juvenal in his revealing verse on the same subject (Sat. 10.365–366; 14.315–316): *Nullum numen habes si sit prudentia, nos ie, nos factimus Fortuna, deam caeloque locamus.* The new governmental system reflected itself in the religious system, autocratic aspects becoming explicit in the nature of the Greek gods of Hellenistic times. M.P. Nilsson even stated that Tyche was the last stage in the secularization of religion in matters concerning human

---

129 E.g. the Cynics proclaimed that they were rootless and outsiders in the *polis*. Their aims were extreme self-sufficiency, attack against conventions and freeing oneself from the prevailing norms. Korhonen, unpublished manuscript.

130 Notice that C.S. Humphrey locates this to Classical times: "Study of the social position of the Greek intellectuals from Homer to Aristotle ... has suggested to me that there were factors both in the social structure of the Greek cities between the eighth and fourth centuries BC and in the conditions of communication experienced by Greek intellectuals that favoured the development of transcendental theories." Humphrey 1978, 212.

131 See e.g. the Athenian Theophrastus (372/369–288/285 BC), Char. 16, a famous characterization of a superstitious man, and Euhemerus' theory on the upsurge of religions in his *Hiera Anagraphe*, Jacoby (FGHist I), 63 (handed down in Diodorus Siculus' collection of fragments 6.1–10, cited also by Eusebius). Theophrastus expressed his ironical and scornful attitude towards religion, and Euhemerus expressed his rationalizing attitude in explaining that gods had originally been nothing but human kings who later became divinized. Theophrastus was a leader of the Peripatetic school after Aristotle and Euhemerus stayed for long periods in Athens in the service of Cassandrus between 311–298 BC. A.J. Festugière 1972, 123 claims with exaggeration (and without stating reasons) that "Évéhémère a été l'un des plus lus au IIIe et Ile siècles"; see also Henrichs 1984, 140–145: "Euhemerus' theory ... enjoyed such a wide circulation". A. Henrichs 1984, 140–145, 151 argues for the origin and base of Euhemerus' thinking in Prodicus, an Athenian sophist and Socrates' contemporary. Actually Euhemerus' theory, later known as 'Euhemerism', had more success in Latin after the publication of the *Euhemerus* by Ennius; see Brink & Rose 1949 (1950), 344 and Nilsson 1946 (1984), 86–92.

132 Festugière 1972, 40; Humphrey 1978, 203–204, Eisenstadt 1982, 289–299. This is mainly in connection with philosophical thinking. The religious devotion and the piety of lay people was not abstract in the same sense.

133 See commentary on this in Ferguson 1911, 87–99 and Murray 1925, 165–166. Compare this with the omnipotence attributed to Isis in Apuleius' statement about her in Met. 269.14–15: "*(Isis)... cuius numen unicium multiformi speciae, ritu vario, nomine multiugo totus veneratur orbis.*" See commentary in Griffiths 1975, 142–143.
destiny and the world. This also had a vice versa effect, as seen in the case of Demetrius of Phalerum. And it is worth remembering that Demetrius of Phalerum was involved in the history of Sarapis by writing hymns to the new and mighty god who reflected omnipotent qualities and taking personally part to the 'creating' of Sarapis in Egypt. Men who held ruling positions had an interest in maintaining and strengthening the social order and thus sought to integrate transcendent omnipotence into the prevailing system in order to legitimate their own power. The hierarchy of the gods organized below the Supreme Being or the principal god was reflected in the political hierarchy of the state. But intellectuals who criticized the system and used expressions reaching beyond the sphere of humans by constructing, for example, a theoretical cosmology, sought authority outside the institutionalized offices and structures of their society. This implies a transfer of authority and a challenge to it, perhaps even an expression of dissatisfaction with it. This took the form of a critique of religion.

C. Monotheistic Trend among More Concrete Religious Thought

Syncretism in the types and stages described above came first. The names of the gods were put one after another, and only later did the deities become identified. Abstract similarities, such as goodness and ruling power of a god, were incorporated into all of the gods. This included a 'monotheistic trend', but not monotheism proper. Here, too, the Delian material concerning Egyptian cults is revealing. The forms of invocation that people used to call the gods to whom they gave dedications are telling. In most of the Delian documents the gods are mentioned in the plural and called upon as a group of divinities. Convention required no separate mention of these gods; inscriptions were dedicated to the gods generally (Θεοί), this being the conventional topos at the opening of inscriptions on religious and related matters. Most of the inscriptions of the religious associations were dedicated to gods. Grouping the gods together and not particularizing them had connotations also for the mystery cults, because this habit occurs frequently in connection with them; the devotees did not have to particularize the god honoured; for example Demeter and Kore were often named together in a dual form as τῶ Θεώ in

136 About the 'preparation' of Sarapis see pp. 93–94.
139 In IG I (the volume of Attic inscriptions containing the oldest ones) the first inscriptions in Athens with the opening dedication to θεοί are IG I 34 (448/7 BC); 292 (434/3 BC); 130 (432/1 BC); 296 (430/9 BC); 82 (421/0 BC); 285 (421/0 BC). They deal with administrative matters of Athens, like collecting taxes (no. 34), naming the hellenotamiai (no. 285), organizing the administration of the city's cult for Athena Polias (nos. 292, 296) and Hephaistus (no. 82) and regulating the Athenian offerings for Delphian Apollo (no. 130). The oldest (333/2 BC) inscription IG II/III 337 referring to the Egyptian gods in Athens opens with the invocation Θεοί as well. According to A.G. Woodhead 1959 (1981), 39 the opening formula Θεοί occurs frequently in the decrees and, as it seems, rather cryptically indicates that, before matter under discussion was considered and decided, the proper religious exercises had been performed or invocations made.
connection with the Eleusinian cult. But a group of gods, such as the Egyptian ones, called upon as \( \text{Θεοί} \) receiving a specifying and abstract common epithet which underlines their shared power and might, shows perhaps a slight monotheistical trend. These groups could be named first as gods dwelling together or gods grouped together (\( \text{Θεοί σύνναιοι} \), \( \text{Θεοί σύνναιοι καὶ σύμβωμοι} \)). Then come invocations giving the gods epithets grouping them together without specifying their names, such as Great Gods (\( \text{Θεοί μεγάλοι} \)). Sarapis and Isis named as \( \text{Θεοί μέγιστοι} \), the greatest gods are also found.

As a curiosity, it is interesting to look at later Hellenistic Isis outside of Athens in order to observe the development. This is best done by examining aretalogies of Isis which were written during the first century BC and the first AD. They have been considered as cultic texts, largely Greek in conception with Egyptian references, and they express actual beliefs of ordinary worshippers of Isis. For the form of the aretalogies it is essential that they are proclamations in which the goddess proclaims her power, \textit{dynamis}. The Cyme aretalogy ends with the formula expressing Isis' omnipotence over other gods: “What pleases me, that shall came to an end. With me everything is reasonable” (lines 46–47). Final sentences make this more explicit: “I overcome faith. Faith harkens to me” (lines 55–56). The frequent epithets with the prefix \( \text{παν-} \), like \( \text{παντοκράτωρ, πανδερκέτης, πανυμήτηρ, παντρόφος, πάντων βασιλεία} \) underline the sentiment that she was seen as a powerful and mighty god in the hymns and aretalogies of this period. The same is true of the prefix \( \text{πολυ-} \), such as \textit{πολυπότνια}, \textit{πολυμόρφος}, \textit{πολυνύμφος}. The same occurs in the Orphic hymns to Demeter which were written over a long period of time between the fifth and the third centuries BC. In them Demeter is likewise \textit{πολυπότνια}, \textit{πολυομήτηρ}, \textit{πολυτεκνος, πολυπότνια and πολυνύμφος}. In addition to the hymns and aretalogies there are a number of Greek inscriptions denoting...

---

140 Nilsson, 1950, 463; e.g. IG I' 78, l. 13, 38–39, 50 (ca. 422 BC); IG II/III² 4588 (middle of the 3rd cent.); Aristophanes, Lys. 112; see des Places 1969, 50–51.

141 Delian inscriptions from the pre-Athenian era (before the year 167/6 BC) IG XI4 1223 (\( \text{Θεοί σύνναιοι καὶ σύμβωμοι} \): 1227; 1239; 1251; 1257; 1270; 2131. All these group together Sarapis, Isis and Anubis as \( \text{Θεοί σύνναιοι} \), also mentioning them separately. From the Athenian era ID 2119 (Apollo together with the Egyptian triad) and ID 2146 (the triad and Harpocrates as \( \text{Θεοί σύνναιοι καὶ σύμβωμοι} \). See also Tran Tam Tinh 1982, 106.

142 ID 2180 and 2181 (middle of the 2nd cent. BC); IG IV 854 (Methana, 162–146 BC); and SIRIS 41 (Argos, end of the 2nd cent. BC, of Sarapis and Isis), see Roussel 1916a, pp. 94–95; The Delian dedication ID 2105 (probably 98/97 BC). In these inscriptions \( \text{Θεοί μεγάλοι} \) designates the Egyptian divinities. Note also the thesis that \textit{theoi megálōi} designates mostly the Cabiri and Dioscuri, studied by B. Müller (1913), who states: “\( \text{Θεοί μεγάλοι ... in insulis Samothracea, Imbro, Paro suam vim atque naturam Cabiros semper servavisse puto, sed alis locis, utrum Cabiri an Dioscuri intellekundi sint, paucis absolvit nequit} \” (p. 289). B. Müller lists also the other Greek gods called \( \text{Θεοί μεγάλοι} \).

143 Of Sarapis and Isis as \( \text{Θεοί μέγιστοι} \): IG XII3 247, II. 5–7 from the island of Anaphe, close to Delos, the 1st cent. BC; see also Baslez 1977, 63, 124–125.


145 Keysner 1932, 45–46. He gives a complete list of the Greek hymns in which these epithets occur. Epithets mentioned here are to be found in the hymns to Demeter or Egyptian gods, most of which are mentioned in the notes to this study as well.

146 Orphic hymn, 40. 1,3,16,17.
the might of Isis in her epithets μεγάλη,147 μεγίστη,148 παντοκράτωρ,149 σεμνή,150 πλούτοδέσποινα,151 ευπλοία,152 and even μήτηρ μεγάλη ἡ πάντων κρατοῦσα (the great mother having dominion over all)153. In the second century BC Isis was already the goddess whose important function was to save people; she was Σωτείρα even to the degree of becoming the means of salvation.154 In this role she was raised above other gods as the one who could rule the others. Omnipotence gives a god supremacy over life and death also, and Isis was the ruler over death par excellence. This and the monotheistic trend is to be seen in the Isidorus’155 Hymn to Isis, which is dated to the first decade of the first century BC, being the earliest of some dozen Greek hymns to Isis156 and belonging to the same genre as the aretalogies. It was found (in situ) at the south gate of a large Graeco-Egyptian temple in Madinat Maadi (Narmouthis in Fayum) in Egypt:157

I, lines 14–24:
“All mortals who live on the boundless Earth,
Thracians, Greeks, and Barbarians
Express Your fair Name, a Name greatly honoured among all,
Each speaks in his own language, in his own land.
The Syrians call You sovereign Astarte, Artemis, Nanaia,
The people of Lycia call You sovereign Leto, the Lady,
The Thracians also name You as Mother of the Gods,
And the Greeks Hera of the Great Throne, or Aphrodite,
Or Hestia the goodly, Rheia or Demeter.

147 IG IV 854, II, 4–5 (162–146 BC, Methana, the only Ptolemaic base on the Greek mainland which had a harbour); SIRIS 41 (Argos, end of the 2nd cent. or beginning of the 1st BC).
148 See above, n. 142.
149 IG V2 472, l. 6 (2nd cent. AD, Megalopolis).
150 Ibid., l. 1.
151 IG IV 244 (Cret.I), l. 1 (163 BC, Crete).
152 ID 2153 (Delos, Sarapieion A, 107/6 BC); ID 2132 (inscription cited above, p. 89).
153 IG XI4 1234, II, 3–4 (Sarapieion C, middle of the 2nd cent. BC); see also POxy XI 1380 (Pack2 2477; Totti 1985, no. 20), l. 20.
154 Versnel 1990, 45; see also Tran Tam Tinh 1982, 107 and Merkelbach 1995, 66–67. See inscriptions naming Isis as Soteira: SIRIS 179 (Rhodos or Kos, 1st cent. BC); SIRIS 247 (Kos, 3rd or 2nd cent. BC), and the Delian ones: IG XI4 1253 and 1254 (end of the 2nd cent. BC); ID 2132 and ID 2119 which is an (ex-voto) dedication from Sarapieion C to Sarapis, Isis and Anubis (theoi synnaoi) in a great danger craving for salvation from these gods. It is worth noting here that the names Soteira and Soter were largely a matter of royal policy and as such were connected to the ruler gods as well.
155 Isidorus was a priest who might have been brought to be a member of the Egyptian priesthood during the reign of Soter II who was interested in temple building and restoration. According to V.F. Vanderlip Isidorus was also a supporter of Soter II, and thus his hymn is a political as well as a religious statement of royalty. Vanderlip 1972, 14–15.
156 A more precise date (terminus post quem) 96 BC is proposed by Vogliano 1938, 274–276. See Bernand 1969, 631–632 with references. From the external and internal dating evidence V.F. Vanderlip 1972, 10–16 gives as terminus post quem the year 96 BC and as terminus ante quem absolutely latest the year 80 BC. This inscription is published in SEG VIII 548–551. Translation given above is based on Vanderlip’s translation in 1972, 18–51; the text, French translation and commentaries are also in Bernand 1969, 636–638; see also Dunand 1984, 79.
157 About the archaeological context see Vanderlip 1972, 9–12.
But the Egyptians call You 'Thiouis' because (they know) that You alone, You among all the other goddesses people are calling for."

I, lines 26–34:
"Deathless Saviour, many-named, mightiest Isis, Saving from war, cities and all their citizens; Men, their wives, possessions, and children. As many as are bound fast in prison, in the power of death, As many as are in pain through long, anguished, sleepless nights, All who are wanderers in a foreign land, And as many as sail on the great sea in winter When men may be destroyed and their ships wrecked and sunk All are saved if they pray that You be present to help."

II, lines 1–4:
"Hail, Agathe Tyche, greatly renowned Isis, mightiest Hermouthis, in you every city rejoices; O Discoverer of Life and Cereal food wherein all mortals delight because of your blessing."

The text indicates how the monotheistic tendency is bound to syncretism, which first parallelizes and then identifies gods of different areas and of similar roles. The intention was evidently to reduce the chaotically multiform world of the gods into order by finding the most suitable god to rule the others, one whose roles were sufficiently manifold to identify and later subordinate those of the others to her/him. This idea may also be interpreted from the point of view of change by looking at the concepts of power and potentiality of the gods of Classical times and of Hellenistic times, which were manifest in their dynamis and energeia. In Classical times, this power previously manifested itself in the gods, in the form of their persons, but in the Hellenistic period the gods themselves became merely manifestations of power.

3. Individualism

Individualism is deeply-rooted in our conception of man in today's world. It is also seen as the cardinal value of modern societies. Modern individualistic ideology is

158 Compare this Isidorus-Hymn with POxy XI 1380 (Pack 2 2477; Totti 1985, no. 20, early 2nd cent. AD) first published by B.P. Grenfell & A.S. Hunt 1915: "I invoke thee, who at Aphroditopolis art called fleet-commanding, many-shaped Aphrodite, ... at Pephremis Isis, ruler, Hestia, Lady of every country, ... at Delphoi best, fairest ... at Sidon Astarte ..." Almost everywhere Isis receives epithets like most great, almighty, ruler, many-shaped, many-named, all-seeing, one. This invocation is given and commented on by P. Collart 1919, 93–100. See the list of the Isis' epithets with expressions of omnipotency in POxy XI 1380 compiled by M. Malaise 1986, 31. See also Merkelbach 1995, 94–98.

159 F. Dumont 1986, 16, who criticizes a 'Durkheimian view' of individualism which regards it quite clearly as a value.
defined sociologically in relation to global values. As L. Dumont states, we are not dealing with one isolated feature, but with a configuration of features. The emergence of individualism in the history of ideas has been discussed quite a lot, and is variously placed in Hellenistic times, in our Judaeo-Christian background; sometimes the origin of the concept ‘individual’ is connected with Classical Athens where men lived seeing themselves as individuals in their consistent discourses, or with Renaissance, or with the rise of the bourgeoisie.

Menander, a representative of new comedy, living in Athens at the end of the fourth century, wrote at the end of his play Epitrepontes (1085–1090): “The world contains about a thousand towns each one with thirty thousand residents. Can every single man of them be damned or guarded by the gods? Absurd – you’d make their lives a drudgery.” Could this suggest one manifestation of individualism that has been claimed to have arisen in Hellenistic times? If we were to apply our understanding of today’s life and to regard the mood of this sentence as analogous to it, then perhaps so, but it might equally well have been a comic irony or scepticism by a playwright to wake up his audience, even though it has been common practice to speak of the Hellenistic period as an age of “the discovery of the individual” (S.C. Humphrey), and to quote Menander. Third century Athens has been said to have gone through the second great crisis of Greek religion. (The first was caused by the activities of the Sophists in the fifth century.) It has been claimed that these crises produced Hellenistic religion largely as a result of the conflict between official civil religion and individual religion. “L’élément principal consiste en la prédominance, de plus en plus assurée, de la religion individuelle” (A.-J. Festugière). “It is doubtful whether it is legitimate to speak of the emergence of the individual before the development in the late fourth century of the conception of society as a set of ego-centred networks” (S.C. Humphrey). Statements like this suggest that individualism has become a generalisation of Hellenistic religion. Still it is worth remembering that the gods of inner devotion were never objects of public worship in Greece; intellectual concepts of divinity,
as well as those of the lay public in the sense of personal devotion, had always been personal in character. Nymphs lived in every cave and fountain, Pan could be approached by devotion everywhere in the countryside, there were sacred stones and trees, houses had little shrines and enclosures, ancestors were worshipped in households. These kinds of religious practices were not the highest, but the most personal and probably the most persistent forms of the Hellenistic religion of unlettered peasants. This type of worship outlived the great gods and public religion as well as formal changes in religion. Thus it seems to me a little exaggerated to regard individualism as a completely new characteristic of Greek religion. Yet it is true that there were changes in political and social life, and those were reflected in religious life and vice versa.

Many reasons for this are given. The official state religion had become less important as a giver of meanings and answers to people's religious needs even though its practices continued to be performed. New institutions in religious life, such as the religious associations, fulfilled this function. In Athens the population had become more heterogeneous, the city still being one of the centres of Mediterranean trade and traffic. Borders were expanded, foreign religions came to Athenian soil, and travelling was widespread. Diffusion of foreign cults, especially those of Oriental and Egyptian origin and their identification with Greek ones, had an important role in the process of 'awakening an individual'. There were continuous wars and political instability. The results of all this for the religious life is expressed in the research literature as following, for example: "Hellenistic existence had been propelled into an individualism without instruction, an aimlessness motivated by a profound sense of alienation"; in short, into "a crisis of freedom" (L.H. Martin). There seems to prevail a tendency to regard Hellenistic 'alienation' and 'aimlessness' as an analogy with our own times when people tend to find answers to their existential problems in new religions.

Philosophical activity, the sustained exercise of rational inquiry, fostered individualism by stressing the capacities of a particular person who practices this individual thinking and which may take precedence, at least implicitly, over everything else. The Cynics especially expressed attitudes that favoured individualistic independence. The Cynic Teles wrote in the middle of the third century (De Ex. 64–65):

"Whether you manage to do well among the masses of people (οἱ πολλοὶ) or the private person (εἷς), whether you serve in public or work at home, whether you are in a foreign land or remain in your own land, it is equally possible with the same good planning to gain advantage from the political office and from one's private life."

In this connection L. Dumont's distinction between an inworldly individual and an outworldly individual is relevant. The 'inworldly individual' implies a man who lives in a

168 Festugière 1954, 5.
170 See e.g. Nilsson 1950, 20–21; Dodds 1951, 242; Festugière 1972, 36; Bregman 1982, 58; Simon 1983, 105.
171 Baslez 1977, 310 calls this "l'avènement de l'individu".
172 Martin 1987, 24. See also Dodds 1951, 242–244.
173 Translation from Betz & O'Neill 1977 (24 H). Teles was a native of Megara.
society and is defined by its presuppositions; he is social in fact. The latter is one who has
left the society proper; he is independent and autonomous, as, for example, an Indian
renunciant. Out worldly individualism encompasses recognition of and obedience to the
powers of this world. In a way these represent two concentric circles, the larger one
representing individualism in relation to god and the smaller one standing for acceptance
of worldly necessities, duties and thus is accommodating to a society. 174 Individualism in
antiquity may be interpreted as having been of the in worldly sort: Plato and Aristotle
regarded self sufficiency as an attribute of the polis, and analogically it becomes an
attribute of the individual. The Stoics and the Epicureans had already turned towards the
individual in their ethical principles by stressing the social spheres of pious life less than
had been done by Plato and Aristotle. Stoicism was cosmopolitan in stating that an
individual can be ethically good everywhere, and Epicureanism sought to reason the
nature of a good individual in terms of his personal happiness. 175 On the contrary, the first
Christians were merely representatives of out worldly individualism in rejecting the
surrounding society. 176 Thus, it seems that the Hellenistic times offered changes in the
contents and nature of individualism, so that Christianity, growing in the milieu of
Hellenism, would not have been able to succeed in the long run without a new type of
individualism. This was mainly imbedded also in the religious thinking and in the
religious life of the common people.

We must look at individualism in religious life more closely and try to rid ourselves of
the over generalisations which are to a large extent based on the parallelism seen between
Hellenistic times and our own. The reason for this may be our own emotional goallessness
and anxiety in today’s world, which produces a feeling of sympathy for the people of
Hellenistic age.

A. Individualism as the Possibility of Choice

There were several possible social frames of reference for an individual in early
Hellenistic times. The meaning of citizenship changed. The concept and context of
interaction as a basic unit of social structure was undergoing a transformation; namely, the
Classical kinship groupings phyle, phratria, demos (the official subdivisions of the state),
genos (the aristocratic colonial clan) and oikos (the household) were no longer the only
reference groups for an individual. 177 These had had their own rules, structure and patterns
of behaviour, because there was in each a central cluster of coherent structural principles
defined and upheld by law, or strong religious or moral beliefs. A common cult functioned
as a shared symbolic structure which defined group identity and formulated it to conform

---

176 Cf. Dunand 1986, 27, 32.
177 Membership of the tribe and phratry was always a prerequisite for citizenship and thus only through
that could a person be a political person. Genos organization was predominantly confined to the
nobility. The criteria for its membership were strictly defined, and when they possessed rights to
hereditary religious offices, as they did in Athens, the definition of membership also depended on
descent. See e.g. Humphrey 1978, 194–197.
to the outside world. Religious associations were open to all in the context of new social interaction which could offer a new kind of group identity, and oikoi maintained or even strengthened its value structure. The relation between religious groups and the oikos deserves mention, because the role of oikos as an arbiter of values seems to have been important even in Hellenistic times. But it seems likely that the changes occurred less in the structure of oikos and its relations to a wider kin group, and more in the changing significance of the household itself as a formulator of social roles.

It has often been said that the importance of individual religiosity increased at the expense of public religion in Hellenistic times. There arose the opportunity to choose one’s own religion; namely, the religious associations, in which a man could become a member by performing the required duties, opened the possibility of choice outside the boundaries of citizenship or kinship. A man could experience his individuality by uniting himself with others who had chosen similarly. This is sociologically determined individualism which Dumont calls inworldly individualism. Religious associations preserved their social character to quite a considerable degree. All this may have increased the motivation and intensity of the religious activities at the beginning of the Hellenistic era, when the cult associations generally increased in number in Athens. This produced the misleading but still prevalent illusion that people suddenly became much more ‘religious’ than they had been before. Only the contexts of religious activities and practices received new forms, and the intentions of religious life acquired new contents by being bound into social structures in a different way than before.

At the beginning the religious associations were religious in character, like the orgeones, and the individual’s interest in membership was centred around cultic and burial practices. Thus in the first associations the religious interest prevailed as it had had a role in religious institutions based on kinship, like phratriai. But in the course of time, from the beginning of the third century onwards, thiasoi and eranoi of foreign gods had many activities in social life in addition to their primarily religious functions. They were more developed in this sense than orgeones and thiasoi inside the phratriai; sometimes they tended to underline the ethnic roots of the adherents by forming ‘national religious clubs’ whose members were compatriots in a foreign land united primarily by worship of their national divinities. At the beginning of the second century BC, the resources of the associations grew, organizations developed, and the social as well as the economic basis

---

178 E. Salmenkivi has studied the meaning and role of the oikos in the comedies of Menander and draws an important picture of the Athenian oikos as a social and political unit in which even emotional relations played an important role. Salmenkivi, unpublished manuscript. I am thankful to E. Salmenkivi for many fruitful discussions.


180 See e.g. Festugière 1972, 36; Avi-Yonah 1978, 32; Hicks 1989, 30.

181 Often this new kind of ‘religiosity’ is seen as a hopeless sense of dependence on some irrational ruling power, and thus people turned to Tyche, practised magic and astral cults. E.R. Dodds’ *The Greeks and the Irrational* (1951) is a good example; Dodds’ chapter dealing with the Hellenistic times characteristically speaks about “turning back to the irrational” and about “the intellectual period slowly vanished away”, pp. 244–255. See also Grant 1953, xxii. Contrary to this M.P. Nilsson 1946 (1984), 106 already stated that the level of religious piety had never been so low as at the beginning of the Hellenistic times.
increasingly displaced some spheres of the religious ones. Characteristic of this stage are the societies of *eranistai* and *koinoi*. They still bore the names of the gods in their titles and performed some cultic acts. Could religion legitimize the social and economic functions of *eranoi* and other *koinoi* by naming an association after a god? Finally the clubs called *synodoi* were secular.\(^{182}\) Thus we see that by choosing to become a member of a religious association an individual could find a new sphere of social life, too. His religion was not strictly individualistic, because it continued to be bound to group-institutions. The reason for its more individualistic character than the one of religion of the city-state was the opportunity and freedom of an individual person to choose outside the predetermined kinship and ethnic restrictions. This might be called ‘personal religion’,\(^{183}\) as distinct from ‘official religion’, depending on private decision and preference. In this sense there is a remarkable similarity between the associations and the function of the mysteries of Hellenistic times. W. Burkert distinguishes three major organizational forms of ancient mysteries, and as the last one he lists the association of worshippers in a form of a club, *thiasos*. In *thiasoi* the individuals remained independent, especially on the economic level and were still integrated into the structures of the *polis* and *oikos*, but they chose to contribute their time and part of their private property to the common cult which was of personal interest to them.\(^{184}\)

### B. Individualism as a Personal Faith

Conscious choice of this kind might also be, on the side of the social aspects and reasons, regarded as a personal religious trust, *pistis*, which is an essential element of religious individualism. The substantive *σέβας*\(^{185}\) means honour, respect, reverential awe (in front of divine majesty) which prevents someone from doing something disgraceful, and generally worship, honour and reverence, while the verb *σέβομαι* (*σέβαζομαι*) in Greek language meant at first to be reverenced and respect. *Εὐσέβεια* is to live or behave reverently, piously, and *εὐσέβης* designates a quality of one who is thus disposed, that is to say a person respecting a deity. *Εὐσέβεια* as a way of behaviour is connected to the feeling, *σέβας*, which means firstly reverence towards gods or parents, filial respect, or more generally piety.\(^{186}\) Thus *pistis* meant for an individual trust in persons, institutions, but also in gods. Later, in Christian times, this concept became to denote more clearly only religious experiences or feelings towards a deity and an act of faith. But already in Hellenistic times a new kind of a view of the goal of religious practices emerged; for example, soteriologically orientated goals of salvation as a final stage.\(^{187}\) Seeking liberation from daily troubles, among which, for example, a serious illness may be one of the

\(^{182}\) Tod 1932, 74–75; see p. 47.

\(^{183}\) The term was first postulated by A.-J. Festugière in 1954. W Burkert 1987, 12 observes that this has often prompted scholars to look for a deeper, ‘truly religious’, spiritual dimension in religion. He comments that “they cannot be said to be totally mistaken.”

\(^{184}\) Burkert 1987, 31–32.

\(^{185}\) *Sebas* could also be an object of reverential awe; LSJ, s.v. *σέβας*.

\(^{186}\) LSJ, s.v. *εὐσέβεια*; See also Motte 1986, 156–157 and 159–160.

\(^{187}\) Hicks 1989, 32–33 points out this soteriological aspect strongly.
most important, introduces a modest kind of soteriological desire. People needed to submit their worries to the gods whom they trusted thus expressing personal πίστις.188 This concept, as denoting trust in a deity, is frequently attested in connection with Isis,189 and more precisely when personal healing and salvation was needed. Isis was a healer and salvatrix,190 as was Demeter191. Thus giving votive offerings, i.e. the practice of making vows, as a form of religion which is personal and individual in character, is an important indicator when studying individualism in religion. The practice of making vows is closely connected with sacrifice and prayer: a vow may be regarded as a personal sacrifice to a
god and/or a prayer dedicated to him. We see that votive offerings, just like sacrifices, were often presented to redeem a vow previously made in a prayer.\(^\text{192}\) A votive could serve as thanksgiving (for curing an illness, for example), a memento, a request for taking care or curing and so on. It is in large measure a down-to-earth form of worship within the ancient religions and represents a humble aspect of them. For W. Burkert it formed the background for the practice of the mysteries.\(^\text{193}\) The main point is that salvation, even though not in the Christian sense, was understood to be addressed to the individual person. The quantity of votives must have been vast in the temples, especially in those of the healer-gods, such as Asclepius, Hygieia, Artemis (Brauronia), Apollo and in Hellenistic-Roman times Sarapis who had at that time risen to the status of a healer-god equal to Asclepius.\(^\text{194}\) Gods who in the Hellenistic period gained the status of ‘healer gods’ were usually of Egyptian, Oriental or Carthaginian origin; and Asclepius had this role among the Greek gods. The healing capacity of Isis and Sarapis were part of the identity of these gods.\(^\text{195}\) For example, Pausanias mentions in his description of Corinth, that in the temple of Asclepius at Titane the images of the gods (Asclepius and Hygieia) could hardly be seen because they were so surrounded with gifts given as votives.\(^\text{196}\)

Situations which concerned the ultimate questions, and were of deep importance to humans, could be treated as those which have a ‘religious’ character.\(^\text{197}\) In paying attention to individual religiosity, religious expressions in the case of serious illness may well be handled on such occasions as ultimate questions. Need teaches people to pray or induces them to give votive offerings personally to those gods who are of importance to them. When a man is ill he acquires a special awareness of mortality, which is why those gods whose roles touched upon the questions of life and death attracted a lot of votives of this sort. The sick sought cures foremost in the sanctuaries of Asclepius and of the gods venerated there, for example, in Epidaurus, the central cult place of Asclepius’ cult.\(^\text{198}\) The votives given to the gods are often models of the parts of the human body which had been

\(^{192}\) See Plato, Leg. 909e–910a–d; Theophrastus, Peri Euseb., frg. 12 (H. Pötscher 1964, about sacrifices); Juvenal, Sat. 12.28: antiquitus enim solebant qui naufragio liberati essent pro voto pingere tabellas et in templum Isidis ponere. See also van Straten 1981, 67–71.

\(^{193}\) Burkert 1987, 12–16.


\(^{195}\) Vanderlip 1972, 92; Préaux 1978 (1987), 652; Tran Tam Tinh 1982, 108, 111. E.g. in the aretalogy of Maronea (SEG XXVI 821) the healing capacity of Isis is referred to (ll. 6–11): “You came when I invoked you for my health” (English translation in Grandjean 1975, 25); see also Forsén, unpublished manuscript. B. Forsén kindly let me read the manuscript of his forthcoming dissertation on anatomic votives which will finally satisfy the need for a study on this important topic, and for which I am very grateful.

\(^{196}\) Pausanias 2.11.6. See the same theme also in Diodorus Siculus, 5.63. In the Asclepion of Rhodes in the 3rd cent. BC was an inscription, SEG XVI 456 (especially ll. 5–9), giving rules concerning votives: “No one is permitted to request that an image be raised or some other votive offering set up in the lower part of the sanctuary ... or in any other spot where votive offerings prevent people walking past.” (translation in van Straten 1981, 78); the text states that ex-votos have to be placed in a certain corner of the sanctuary (ll. 12–13) and that if someone behaves against these rules he will be expelled and his ex-votos will be transported (ll. 18–22).

\(^{197}\) See Chapter II.1.

\(^{198}\) F.T. van Straten 1981, 98 states that Epidaurus has its richest collection of votives from the 4th cent. BC.
cured and which were presented in gratitude to the deity, or as a prayer for a cure of this particular organ. It should be noted that votives of this sort have long been regarded in archaeological excavations as finds of minor importance and despite their number are not usually listed or studied properly. In Athens anatomical votives dedicated to gods are found from the fourth century BC onwards. The datable fourth and third century BC votives come from the Asclepieion, the sanctuary of Amynus, and from the sanctuary of Heros Iatros and from the sanctuary of Artemis Kalliste. Those dedicated to Aphrodite are often female organs, such as vulvas or breasts. From Delos we have a list of anatomical votives dedicated to the Egyptian gods which mention 3 human faces, 20 eyes, 3 ears, 1 male genital, 2 wombs and 1 arm. There are a number of votive dedications of human ears to Isis. The problem is whether their function was to commemorate the listening character of the goddess or to function as votives representing gratitude or prayer. One of these anatomical votives in the form of a human ear is a relief from the second century BC Delos depicting two bronze ears dedicated to the goddess Isis with an inscription stating: “Diogenes, son of Diogenes from Antioch to Isis the listening one as a vow”. The

199 IG IIII 4372 = van Straten 1981, no. 1.4 = Førsén 1995, no. 1.1.: eyes and a part of a nose to Asclepius; IG IIII 4407 = van Straten 1981, no. 1.8 = Førsén 1995, no. 1.5.: female breast to Asclepius; IG IIII 4429 = van Straten 1981, no. 1.22 = Førsén 1995, no. 1.47. B. Førsén 1995 lists 49 anatomical votive offerings from the Athenian Asclepieion of which the above mentioned are datable to the 4th cent. BC.

200 IG IIII 4422 = van Straten 1981, no. 2.3 = Førsén 1995, no. 2.2.: female breast dedicated to Asclepius (4th cent. BC); IG IIII 4435 = van Straten 1981, no. 2.4 = Førsén 1995, no. 2.4.: female leg (4th or 3rd cent. BC).

201 Van Straten 1981, no. 3.1 = Førsén 1995, no. 3.1.: eye(s) to Heros Iatros (3rd or 2nd cent. BC)

202 IG IIII 4667 = van Straten 1981, no. 5.1 = Førsén 1995, no. 5.1: female breasts to Artemis Kalliste (3rd cent. BC).

203 For example F.T. van Straten 1981 lists 8 ex-votos (nos. 11.1–11.8) and B. Førsén 1995 lists 9 ex-votos (nos. 11.1–11.9: no. 11.1 = IG IIII 4576, no. 11.2 = 4575, no. 11.4 = 4635) from the sanctuary of Aphrodite in Daphni depicting female vulvae; four of which are dated to the 4th cent. BC, others are of uncertain date. Van Straten also lists one ex voto depicting a female vulva, two male genitals, one female breast from the sanctuary of Eros and Aphrodite on the north slope of Acropolis in Athens (nos. 4.2–4.5). According to Førsén 1995, no. 1.6 van Straten’s no. 4.5 (=IG IIII 4729 from the 1st cent. AD), the ex-voto depicting female breasts does, however, probably originate from the Asklepieion on the south slope of the Acropolis.


205 SIRIS 28 (Athens); ID 2173 (Delos) dedication to Isis epekoor; SEG XVI 732 (Lydia); Thessalonian inscriptions: IG X2 98 (“Ἰωάννης ἐπίσκοπος”); 59 and 100 (“Ἰωάννης ἐπίσκοπος”); 101 (“Ἰωάννης ἐπίσκοπος”); 119 (to Isis). B. Førsén, unpublished manuscript states that of these anatomical offerings the ears and eyes obviously were to symbolize the (all-)seeing and listening character of the Egyptian gods; see also Bruneau 1970, 283–284.

206 B. Førsén suggests that votives of human ears with the epithet ἐπίσκοπος dedicated to the Egyptian and Oriental gods function as symbols for the listening role of the deity, while ears dedicated to Asclepius usually function as thanksgiving or prayer votives to the healer god; Førsén, unpublished manuscript; see also M.F. Baslez 1977, 294–295 who regards the votive of ears given to Isis in order to command the god’s attention to hear the prayers.

207 ID 2173 (the 1st cent. BC); Museum of Delos, inv. no. A 1858; van Straten 1981, 83, fig. 11.
ears of the goddess emphasize here that she is listening to the prayers. Thus Isis was clearly the goddess to whom prayers (εὐχαί) were addressed. A very telling marble plaque comes from Eleusis (van Straten 1981, no. 13), the only anatomical votive found on this site, which is decorated in relief and painting and is from the fourth century BC. Eyes and a nose are described on it, and underneath there is an inscription Δήμητρις Εὔκράτης. This may have been in order to commemorate Eucrates’ attainment of the final grade of initiation, epopteia, which indicates primarily a visual experience. The personal and individual experience of initiation, which required healthy eyes, justified giving a votive offering to the goddess as a mark of gratitude.

In Hellenistic Athens, Demeter could heal men on either side of the boundary of life and death; and Isis had ruling power over human life in this (social and personal) cosmos as the protector who could affect even Fate. This was one important factor in the process of the goddesses becoming identified with each other. They both had power (dynamis) in being Demeter/Isis βασίλισσα, ἀνάσσα, δέσποινα or σώτειρα in front of whom humans could express their personal faith (pistis). Individual element in religion and a person’s self-identity inherent in it is concerned with the way in which a person assigns himself in relation to the gods he worships. Those people were servants (Θεραπευτῆς) or slaves of the goddesses (δούλοι τοῦ Θεοῦ). A submissive, individual, attitude towards a deity who is approached as an omnipotent one becomes linked with the monotheistic trend dealt with in the chapter above. This power-concept was disseminated through the cultic reality of Greek religiosity in the Hellenistic-Roman periods. Gods even became manifestations of power. The worshippers often presented their gods as powerful absolute rulers who gave explicit commands (ἐμται), for example). In the aretalogies of Isis the dynamis of the goddess is expressed in honouring her arete, ‘miraculous power’ which is a post-Classical way of glorifying the divine

---

208 Isis’ epithet ἑπτάκος emphasize this role; see inscriptions presenting Isis in this role: SIRIS 47 (Peloponnesus, 3rd cent. BC); 88,11 (Euboea, Roman era); ID 2149 (“Ἰσίδη χρηστή ἑπτάκος, Delos, Sarapieion C, 122/1 BC); ID 2130 (dedicatory inscription for Sarapis, Isis and Anubis as theoi epekeoai, Delos 166–140 BC); ID 2116 and 2117 are dedicated to δεό ἑπτάκοι in Sarapieion A by a man and a woman (2116) and by a woman alone (2117); the last mentioned specifies Isis also as ἱπποτή (I. 7), both from slightly after 166 BC.

209 Malaise 1980, 83–116 shows this in his article concerning personal piety, especially prayers, in the cult of Isis. In the hymns to Isis the practice of praying is met frequently; see e.g. Isidorus’ hymn to Isis SEG VIII 548–551, ll. I, 35–36; II, 34–35 and III, 34 expressing the words of dedicating the prayer to Isis.


211 See the aretalogy of Cyme IG XII Suppl. pp. 98–99, ll. 55–56 and Apuleius, Met. 11.15.20: “absolutus Isisis magnae providentia gaudens Lucius de sua Fortuna triumphat”. See Burkert 1987, 27.


215 Van Straten 1993, 259; van Straten deals primarily with the inscriptions connected with votive reliefs. The term ἑπτάκη is often used of oracles and more generally of divine commands and force; πρόσταγμα denotes generally ordinance and command, see LSJ, s.v. ἑπτάκη and πρόσταγμα.
omnipotence in general. An alteration in society’s organizations and social conditions (the rise of autocrats and a more heterogeneous population) is reflected in an autocratic image of the god coupled with submissive behaviour towards the deity. This submission could be expressed by an individual by kneeling before the god from whom he expected help. Even in his Deisidaimonia Theophrastus describes his caricature, the superstitious man in third century Athens, as the one who (Char. 16.5) “when passes one of the smooth stones set up at crossroads he anoints it with oil from his flask, and will not go his ways till he have knelt down and worshipped it”. Kneeling down (προσκύνησις) has been a constant feature over the centuries, but most of the evidence comes from the fourth century BC to the second AD. Both the Eleusinian gods and the Egyptian gods were knelt before. Often a deity to whom a person expressed this kind of supplication had at least some healing powers. Strikingly often the kneeling worshippers in the reliefs seem to be female. For example, three reliefs from the Athenian Agora (fourth century BC) show us human figures kneeling in front of Demeter and Kore accompanied by Iacchus and Plutos.
In the material collected by P. Roussel and M. Baslez from Delos in connection with the Egyptian gods of Hellenistic times we meet the terms *θεραπευτής* (one who serves the gods) and *λάτρης* (actually a one who works for a wage = δούλος ἐπὶ μισθῷ) characterizing the devotees.223 According to H.W. Pleket the term *therapeutes* becomes a structural one in Hellenistic times to denote an attitude of subservience in the cults of Sarapis, Isis, the Syrian goddesses and the Mother of the Gods.224 The individual’s role as *latris* or *therapeutes* of the god connotates complete devotion to the deity. It seems to me that the religiosity of this type was a phenomenon of later times, springing up during the Roman period and was typical of Christian piety.225 In Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* (Met. 277.21–278.2), the suggestion addressed to Lucius requires:

*Quo tamen tutor sis atque munitior, da nomen sanctae huic militia, cuius non olim sacramenta etiam rogabaris, teque iam nunc obsequio religionis nostrae dedica et ministerii iugum subire voluntarium. nam cum coeperis deae servire, tunc magis senties fructum tuae libertatis.*

Enroll your name into this holy military service whose solemn oath you were asked to take not long ago, and vow yourself from this moment to the ministry of our religion. Accept of your own free will the yoke of service. For when you have begun to serve the goddess, then you will better realize the result of your freedom.”

The requirement of a life-long devotion to the cults of Demeter and Isis is not met in Athens in the third and second centuries BC. It arose in the cult of Isis together with the development of its proper ‘mystery nature’ and belongs to the Roman era.227 In the Mysteries of Demeter it was sufficient to devote oneself to the goddess only during the

---

223 Baslez 1977, 304–305, 192–197 (on humility in personal devotion on Delos) with material references in the notes. In *Sarapieion A* the IG XI4 1299 the “Chronicle” uses the word *θεραπεῖς* (favouring gods) in l. 43; IG XI4 1215 from *Sarapieion C* (end of the 3rd cent. BC) is a dedication to Sarapis and Isis in the name of king and queen (’Τάρη βασιλέως καὶ βασιλίσσης) and Demetrius (II. 1–3) by *therapeutai* (l. 4). The first alpha and nu of the king’s name is preserved; on this ground P. Roussel suggests that this king was Antigonus Gonatas (died 240/239 BC). IG XI4 1216–1222 are inscriptions of the religious association the members of which called themselves οἱ θεραπεύοντες ἐν τῶι ἱερῷ τοῦ Τ. Abidius Trophimianus to Sarapis and Zeus Helios: *ἱεροδούλους Μενής* (11. 3-4), and SIRIS 556 (Ostia, 222–226) which is dedicated by four men to Zeus Helios, Sarapis and *synnaoi theoi* at the port: *ἱεροδούλους ἄνεθηκεν ἐπὶ ἀγαθῷ (II. 22–23).


227 See Chapter IV.4.
rituals; there was not even a need to return to the sanctuary. But if an individual was in personal need of healing and salvation, he expressed feelings which revealed his personal religion. This is seen in the inscription from the island of Amorgos the dating of which is uncertain; suggestions range from the second century BC to the second AD.228 The text tells how its dedicator wishes Demeter to punish a certain Epaphroditus who caused him misery. He uses words which are revealing: "Mistress (κυρία) Demeter, queen (βασίλισσα), I, your suppliant, your slave (δοῦλος σου) fall down before you (προσπίπτω) ... Demeter, I ... seek refuge in you, to participate in your mercy ... mistress Demeter, I beg you, hear me."229

4. Cosmopolitanism

As a concept cosmopolitanism is linked to the three other concepts studied above. Syncretism favoured and was a prerequisite of the monotheistic trend which was favourable to individual religion because it included the idea of a higher power before whom an individual could express his personal faith. Cosmopolitanism was a phenomenon implicit in all of these.

Cosmopolitanism was a prerequisite for this sort of thinking. There was a movement towards the internationalization of values and conceptualization of structures larger than the polis that continued from the fourth century into Hellenistic times.230 Late fourth and early third century Athens prospered culturally and economically especially during the reign of Demetrius of Phalerum. The next flourishing period was not until the middle of the first century BC.231 This caused an increase in migration, travelling, mixed marriages and economic, intellectual and religious relations between Athens and the other parts of Greece. Another reason for the population transfer was that it was the means by which the Hellenistic rulers maintained control and internal security over the conquered areas, and this may well be called colonization. Alexander himself had established colonies as part of his program mainly to the Eastern reaches of his empire. His successors the Ptolemies as well as Seleucids followed this policy of founding settlements, using soldiers to populate the colonies and recruiting mercenaries to them.232

In Hellenistic times Athens had famous philosophical schools which attracted intellectuals from abroad to move into the city. On the other hand, Athenian intellectuals searched for new opportunities; for example, Alexandria was popular among them.233 As a city Athens was relatively independent and could attract foreigners. This increased the status and prestige of the city. On the other hand, there was a pronounced nationalism in Athens

228 The text is given in Bömer 1990, 207; Zingerle 1926: 67-72. M. Gronewald and D. Hagedorn 1981, 290-291 mention the text as a parallel to the oracular text from the Ptolemaic age.
229 See comments of Pleket 1981, 189-191.
230 Humphrey 1978, 238.
231 Ferguson 1910, 3-4; Rostovtseff 1941 (1972), 626-632; Day 1942, 3. See e.g. the late 4th cent. traveller's description of Athens which belongs to the writings of Heracleides Criticus, written between 275–200 BC (Pfister 1951, 45).
in the middle of the fourth century (Isocrates). The ‘cosmopolitan attitude’ of the intellectuals especially considered the surrounding world as a borderless universe which was principally the same everywhere; this is expressed, for example, by the Cynic philosopher Teles who wrote in the middle of the third century BC (De ex. 81–85):

"Having considered that my homeland is insufficient for me, I move to another place and live abroad, and as far as I can. And just if changing from one ship to another I can have the same navigation, so I may pass from a city to another and be similarly happy."  

Migration was not due to an improvement in the status of foreigners, even though, the distinction between citizens and metics prevailed, but the opportunities available to them were more numerous from the late fourth century onwards. In the third century admission to citizenship both to individuals and to whole communities, increased. This might have been done as a diplomatic act; after all the Athenians wanted to show favour in front of their foreign protectors and thus gain a more powerful army as an awareness of the political situation and an opportunity to defend her interests against adversaries. Royal visits to the city, especially during great festivals such as Panathenaia or the Great Mysteries, should not be forgotten. Movement within the military service became more common during the Hellenistic era, though it had not been uncommon in Classical times. Guilds travelled as well, for example Dionysiac artists passed from one city to another spreading Athenian ideas and promoting uniformity of culture. All in all, Athens and the other important cities of the third and second centuries BC, Delos included, were centres of immigration, and demographic movements were a common phenomenon of the time. This trait of cosmopolitanism promoted fusion of peoples and cultures and favoured the amalgamation of religions.

236 See e.g. Baslez 1984, 210.
237 See, e.g. Giovannini 1993, 277–278 and Hakkarainen, unpublished manuscript (about the formulas in the inscriptions granting to foreigners the Athenian citizenship in the 4th and 3rd centuries).
238 Baslez 1984, 227–228.
239 Eadem, 235–236: "L’essaimage massif des soldats est relativement une nouveauté"; Festugière 1972, 125.
240 Baslez 1984, 236; Ferguson 1911, 296.
241 Delos has been handled as an example par excellence of the melting-pots of foreigners and foreign religious ideas. One example is the attitude towards the Egyptian gods and the increased number of the temples of the gods of foreign origin on the island especially in the 2nd cent. BC. Delos’ role as a centre of the Aegean trade (wheat, slaves, oriental products) and as a colony of Athens which wanted to support and strengthen those foreign contacts useful to economic and military support favoured this cosmopolitan development. See Préaux 1958, 176–184.
A. Cosmopolitanism as openness

As with the concepts studied above, also cosmopolitanism among them is an often used concept when rough lines have been drawn to describe changes in religious attitudes. A.-J. Festugière used it to distinguish three chronological periods of Greek religious thought: the period of general, shared public religion — the period of religious crises — the period of absolute universal religion which included the possibility to devote oneself totally to a religion. According to him the last period belongs mainly to the Hellenistic era and includes a religion which turns towards cosmic universals. According to Festugière’s view this kind of cosmic religion was much more all-embracing than earlier religions and included a strong element of escapism. People now sought a final release from an eternity of death, and found this, for example, in the mystery religions. This kind of periodizing is a typical view of religious change, and describes well how the Hellenistic period has been treated in the history of religions. Notions on fatalism, determinism and religious despair shadowed by a fear of release into a limitless cosmos usually characterize this view. It should be remembered, however, that there were some means by which the new ideas were handled, and the new structures developed around renewed religious life as well as around social and political life. It is better, therefore, to regard cosmopolitanism and universalism in Athens rather as an open attitude towards new forms of religious life. This openness affected social institutions, and thus it was quite a general phenomenon in urban life. Openness was expressed in the readiness to accept new cults, the new kind of religiosity which incorporated these cults into social and political contexts so that they were handled as part of the whole culture. “The association is the most efficient melting pot of the Hellenistic city, because the most outstanding feature of the different groups known is mixing (le mélange) ... First of all the mixing of citizens and foreigners really characterises the Hellenistic association”, states M.-F. Baslez. In his analysis of ‘axial age’, S. Eisenstadt underlines the society’s dynamics during these periods. According to him, different social groups constituted a basic component of these civilizations, generating their specific dynamics. One of the characteristics of this was the social interaction giving rise to new modes of institutional creativity. Its influence was two-fold: firstly towards growing symbolic articulation and ideologization of the meaning of social activities and collectivities; and secondly towards the growing diversification of the ranges of social activities and frameworks. An important factor was the possibility of making a free choice concerning one’s religious reference group. Religious life gave a good ground for expressing national coherence in both concrete and symbolic ways. It may be said that at the end of the third century and during the second, the religious associations

---

242 Festugière 1954, 98–99, 119. M.P. Nilsson 1946 (1984), 99 points out two crises in Greek religion: 1) disintegration of ancient piety at the beginning of the Athenian democracy and 2) the crisis that followed physical and mental enlargement of the world after the conquests of Alexander the Great.
244 Baslez 1984, 335. See e.g. IG II/II¹ 1335 (end of the 3rd cent.) which is the list of the Athenian thiasos of the god Sabazius listing 35 citizen-members and 13 foreigners (probably mostly soldiers from Syria and Macedonia) and 4 whose ethnic is not mentioned.
had a social appeal. In Athens it was still necessary for a new association to obtain a permit from the city-boule to build a sanctuary. This is also seen in the first inscription concerning the Egyptian cults in Athens (IG II/III² 333/2 BC) in 333/2 BC, when the merchants of Cition received permission from the boule to build a sanctuary for their goddess Aphrodite "in the same manner as the Egyptians built a sanctuary for Isis" (καθάπερ καὶ οἱ Ἀγύπτιοι τὸ τῆς Ἰσίδος ιερὸν ἱδρυναί, ll. 42–45). But it is evident that it was easy to acquire permission; the number of religious associations increased remarkably, especially during the third and the second centuries BC. Economic relations and broadened foreign policy made it necessary for the city to show a loyalty to those foreign religions which had initially been convinced to foreigners. The emergence of the religious associations was a concrete consequence of the cosmopolitanism in Athens at this period.

It has been speculated very abstractly that this also opened the individual's mental cosmos to such an extent that he could for the first time see universal perspectives around him, and act according to general universal laws that prevailed everywhere. Astral religions and mysticism have been treated as expressions of this kind of thinking. Philochorus (frg. 12) mentions that in Athens in the third century BC people regarded the morning sun, the sun and the moon as sacred. A.D. Nock even postulated three reasons which may have been behind the acceptance of the new religious cults, and which were at the same time consequences of this phenomenon: 1) new ways of outlining the universe, especially turning towards astrology, 2) interest in immortality, and 3) a habit of relying on supernatural solutions to religious questions. Applied to the situation of early Hellenistic Athens, this sounds a generalization. I would prefer to think that people were willing to solve their religious questions by becoming involved in the activities of the religious cult in which they were interested, and that turning towards cosmic universals was rather turning towards socially orientated religious activity. The primary material, the popularity of religious associations, supports this view. It must be remembered that in Hellenistic Athens the activities of the philosophical schools offered an opportunity for practising cosmic speculations outside the proper religious (cultic) life. How much philosophy was religion is another question which will not be touched upon here.

---

246 This refers to a law then recently promulgated by Lycurgus (390–325 BC) mentioned in the inscription IG II/III² 337, ll. 30–31 (333/2 BC).
247 See also Foucart 1873, 83, 129–131; Ferguson 1911, 88; Simms 1985, 197 and above p. 49.
249 FGrHist I11b, p. 101.
251 A.-J. Festugière 1972, 34–37 says that it was in fact Plato who was the one who actually started religious thought being orientated towards the cosmic god, something which was so common in Hellenistic times. It should be remembered, though, that philosophical abstraction, like Plato’s god, even though described by the forms of myth, is to be kept separated from actual religious life, like cults for the astral personifications, stars, sun, etc. Philosophy was not every man’s every-day life.
B. Openness versus *asebeia* legislation

When regarding cosmopolitanism as openness in early Hellenistic Athens, one should bear in mind that a tension between old conservative attitudes and the new ones still prevailed. It was a time of the old encountering the new. A.E. Samuel underlines the conservative element of Hellenistic thought, perhaps a bit too straightforwardly, in the following way: “In religion as in everything else Greek conservatism asserted itself. Although surrounded by new ideas and different concepts of deity, cult and religion, the Greeks managed to insulate themselves from novelty, for the most part.” The focus of the older conservatism was the still extant *asebeia* legislation. It is most probable that there had been *asebeia* legislation in Athens in the latter part of the fifth century BC, and it had not been explicitly abrogated. *Asebeia* legislation was a sanctioned Athenian law against foreign gods which were offences against the religion of the city-state. Aristotle (Virt et vit. 7.1–4) defined *asebeia* as “error (malpractice) concerning the gods and *daimones*, or dead people and the parents and the fatherland.” (ἀσέβεια μὲν ἡ περὶ θεῶν πλημμέλεια καὶ περὶ δαίμονας, ἡ περὶ τοῦ κατοικούμενου καὶ περὶ γονείς καὶ πατρίδα.) Hyperides (389–332 BC), an orator who shared the political views of his contemporary Lycurgus, takes the same line, saying (Eux. 6) that *asebeia* is “impiety against sacred institutions” (περὶ τὰ ιερὰ). Plato had postulated in his tenth book of *Leges* three kinds of impiousness concerning non-belief in the gods of the *polis*: 1) not to believe in the existence of the gods, 2) to believe that the gods do exist, but that they have no regard for men, and, finally, 3) to believe that the gods are easy to win over when bribed with offerings and prayers. According to him, all these were illegal and required official punishment imposed by law. An Athenian statesman and warm supporter of democratic ideals Andocides was accused of impiety in 415 BC on having taken part in two acts of sacrilege, the mutilation of the *hermae* and parody of the Eleusinian Mysteries together with Alcibiades; he expressed a disrespectful attitude towards the vow of secrecy. In 399 BC the accusation of impiety took place another time, now on two counts, the more serious being that he had taken part in the Mysteries when he was legally disqualified from doing so. The accused had to defend himself in front of the city-council. His defence is known as the speech *On the Mysteries* in which he says, for example (De myst. 10): “Concerning the Mysteries, I would show you (the Athenians) that I have not conducted impiety, neither have denounced, nor confessed” (περὶ τῶν μυστηρίων ὡς οὕτ’ ἐμὸ ἡσθήται οὐδὲν οὗτε μεμήνυται οὐθ’ ὁμολόγηται). On the ground of Plato’s texts, the law against impiety should include the prohibition of building private sanctuaries in private houses as well. Plato seems to identify a person who could be accused of *asebeia* and a person who could be called *atheos*; namely, the

---

253 Versnel 1990, 128; Derenne 1930, 185–190.
254 Aristotle distinguishes three kinds of offence (δικαίωσις) of which *asebeia* is the first. Cf. the concept with Latin *impietas* (the opposite of *pietas*).
255 Plato, Leg. 10.885a–c; 907d–909d. In 907d (and 909d) the Athenian orders: “All the impious to quit their ways of life for those of piety (προσαγορευόντων ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀδεσφοι τρόπων τῶν ἀτόνων εἰς τοὺς ἐπίστας). For those who disobey let us prescribe the law concerning impiety (*asebeia*).” (Translation P. Shorey, The Loeb Classical Library 1935 (1968)).
one who does not believe in the gods, an impious person. For Plato there seems to be only one correct way of believing, namely to believe in the existence of the gods. His intention was to reason for the existence of the gods and for the superior nature of the soul, because in the gods there is a trace of the Beauty; even though it is doubtful whether Plato himself was so dogmatic in theological matters. Socrates was accused of corrupting youth and not acknowledging the gods recognized by the polis, but different, new daimonia. The concept nomizein theous (νομίζειν θεοὺς) has been taken to explain the Greek attitude towards religion as practical and act-oriented: Greek religion was centred mainly on honouring the gods by worshipping them according to the cultic tradition, taking part in the rituals and thus observing the gods by practical deeds. Plato considered it unwise to think that one is wise and that the other is not (Ap. 29a). Actually this kind of thinking was for him equivalent to thinking that one is divine. Such unwise manner of thought de facto is ‘not acknowledging the existence of the gods’. According to this view Socrates refused to do what was expected of him. But as E. Derenne and M.L. Morgan convincingly showed, Socrates refused to believe in the existence of gods in the way that was traditionally held by the polis. Plato wanted to argue for belief which was not reducible to deeds or to a set of moral values of right, and just in distinction to traditional, honour and prestige orientated values. The same tendency characterizes in a more general manner the new way the people of Hellenistic times interpreted the contents of νομίζειν θεοὺς. New gods, Plato's daimonia, meant that things could become deified as gods, and new deities who had been denied before could now be believed in, in the same way as the traditional gods of the polis. Thus the belief, not the deeds, held the place of foremost importance for Plato. For him these objects of belief were mainly celestial objects and foreign deities.
In a similar way, there were also changes in the contents and interpretations of the term *asebeia* in early Hellenistic times. At that time *asebeia* legislation was primarily the law concerned with the introduction of foreign gods and their cults into Athens. IG II/III² 337 tells us that permission for building the *hieron* of Isis had been given regardless of the *asebeia* legislation. A little earlier the famous courtesan Phryne had been condemned to death for establishing a *thiasos* for the Thracian goddess Isodaites.²⁶³ In the name of *asebeia* the same sentence of death was passed on the priestess of Sabazius called Ninos.²⁶⁴ In Hellenistic times, philosophers were still accused of *asebeia* the meaning of which varied from case to case. Probably the most important of them was Theophrastus, who as a result of a successful accusation presented before the Areiopagus by Demochares, a bitter anti-Macedonian, had to pay fines.²⁶⁵ Other philosophers worth mentioning in this connection are the Cynic Stilpon, exiled after the year 230 BC,²⁶⁶ and Theodorus of Cyrene, who was exiled between the years 317–303 BC because he denied all the gods and thus got the nickname *Atheos*, the godless.²⁶⁷ Thus during this period *asebeia* was used for political purposes, and its use was only occasional, not systematic.²⁶⁸ These *asebeia* accusations were linked to politics; for example, in the case of Theodorus *asebeia* was used because the Macedonian ruler Demetrius Poliorcetes wished to show himself as a liberator of Athens, and, thus, it was useful for him to express favour to some traditional practices of the city, but, at the same time, to support intellectuals who were favourable to the Macedonians and supporters of the monarchy. Furthermore, Demetrius Poliorcetes' predecessor Demetrius of Phalerum, who had ties and was sympathetic to Peripatetics, had protected also the other philosophers acting in Athens.²⁶⁹ This makes Demetrius Poliorcetes' *asebeia* accusation against Theodorus, representative of 'the old ideas', more understandable.²⁷⁰

By these means *asebeia* legislation was also a symbol of the older conservatism, in practice its use was not systematic at all. There was a political and economic need for loyalty towards the ever-increasing number of foreigners and their religions at the beginning of the Hellenistic era.²⁷¹ The existence of *asebeia* legislation was forgotten in

---

263 Harpocration I, 163, II. 3–4. See also Foucart 1873, 81; Ferguson 1911, 88; Nilsson 1946 (1984), 98; Simms 1985, 282; Versnel 1990, 126.
264 Demosthenes, Con. Boeot. I 1.1.2. Plutarch says that Demosthenes himself sentenced the unknown priestess Theoris; Plut., Dem. 14.4 for the same. According to Plutarch Theoris was accused of exiling slaves for fraudulent among other things.
265 This happened during the reign of Demetrius of Phalerum (317–315 BC); see Derenne 1930, 201. Diogenes Laertius, Stilpon 101. E. Derenne 1930, 198–199 calls Demochares “the new Demosthenes”; see also Korhonen, unpublished manuscript.
266 Diogenes Laertius, Stilpon 116–117. Stilpon is said to have denied the divinity of the goddess Athena.
268 Derenne 1930, 267; Korhonen, unpublished manuscript.
271 Day 1942, 16–20. Trade brought foreigners to the city. Their increased number is seen in inscriptions 1) bearing foreign names, 2) concerning foreign religious cults, 3) of foreign funerary-type, and 4) concerning the laws limiting proprietary rights (for land, for example) of the foreigners.
practice, but not forgotten in principle. Many cult associations of foreign gods were established, but very few official permits for their establishment have been found.\textsuperscript{272}

Later, during the early Roman era \textit{asebeia} legislation was still remembered; we have, for example, a decree of the Athenian \textit{boule} from the last half of the first century BC concerning the regulation of the cult of the Egyptian gods in the Attic village Pikermi (SEG XXII 167)\textsuperscript{273} dedicated to Isis and Sarapis (1.1). The first section of the inscription deals with the punishment to be imposed upon those who violate the sacral regulations which are, unfortunately, mutilated in the text, but the words \textit{\varepsilon\nuo\chi\omicron\iota\ \varepsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\omega\alpha\nu\ \tau\eta\ \varepsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\eta\iota\omicron\varepsilon} in line 6 are clear. We could conclude that conservatism in Athens was nominal, and an open attitude was a political and economic necessity behind which lay the cosmopolitanism of the time. The acceptance of foreigners and support of their new cults had economically positive effects. This evolved into a new attitude towards religious matters.\textsuperscript{274}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{272} Simms 1985, 282–285; Clerk 1969, 126–135. About the appearance of the foreign cults in Athens see Chapter III.3.
\item \textsuperscript{273} SEG XXII 167 = SIRIS 33a. J.J. Pollitt first published it in Hesperia 34 (1965), 125–130.
\item \textsuperscript{274} Simms 1985, 198–205 stresses highly secular motives in the acceptance of the foreign religious cults in Athens. Her example is the cult of Isis. Compare Festugière 1972, 134–135.
\end{itemize}
Table 3.

In the following table the studied concepts are presented as a summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCEPT</th>
<th>CONTENTS AND INTERPRETATION</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYNCRETISM</td>
<td>- theoretical term</td>
<td>- Greek Demeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Separate religious systems adapted functionally into surrounding culture</td>
<td>- Egyptian Isis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Parallelization</td>
<td>- Isis connected with Astarte–Aphrodite and Eros–Harpocrates–Apollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- traits of separate deities recognizable but deities are parallelized because of their analogical elements</td>
<td>- Sarapis and Isis with Agathos Daimon and Agathe Tyche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Identification</td>
<td>- Demeter–Isis/ Isis–Demeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- deities amalgamated into a new unity, but their attributes may still be seen</td>
<td>- the cult of Sarapis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Syncretistic religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONOTHEISTIC TREND</td>
<td>- theoretical concept</td>
<td>- Demetrius of Phalerum: <em>Peri Tyches</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- presupposes syncretism which may lead to henotheism</td>
<td>- Isidorus’ hymn to Isis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- rulers and intellectuals used in order to support autocracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- omnipotence seen in certain deities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUALISM</td>
<td>COSMOPOLITANISM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- in Hellenistic Athens “inworldly individualism”</td>
<td>- philosophical attitude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- possibility of choice</td>
<td>- openness towards new cults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- personal faith: submissive attitude towards deity</td>
<td>- caused pragmatic oblivion of the asebeia legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the Cynics: Teles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- emergence of religious associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- religious associations: thiasoi and eranoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- anatomical votives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- devotee as therapeutes and latris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Conclusion

Two religious cults of Hellenistic Greece, and especially of Athens and Delos, as related to the city of Athens from the third till the first centuries BC, have been examined in this study on the basis of inscriptions, ancient literature, archaeological material and research literature. These cults are the Great Mysteries of Demeter, and the cult of Isis. They function as examples characterizing the features of the religious life of early Hellenistic Athens. The third and second centuries BC saw a change in religious life of the city. The first cult mentioned, the cult of Demeter, represents the old religion of the city-state also incorporating new elements typical of the Hellenistic era, and the latter, the cult of Isis, the new ways of religious life. They were both very popular cults, both holding places of significance among the inhabitants of Athens and, thus, illustrate how the old and the new came together.

1. Method

The methodological point of view departs from combining the methods used in the history of religions and in the phenomenology of religion. Thus certain phenomena of Hellenistic religion have been examined on the premises of the historical study of religion. The description of the cults is given on the first level in order to function as a basis for interpretation on the second level. The religions have been studied within their locally and temporally defined context and their important aspects are analysed. In this procedure there is no a priori definition of religion. Human religiosity functions as a basis for
approaching religions of antiquity relying on the so-called relative a priori, which means that religion is, in a Wittgensteinian sense, a family-resembling concept: there is a network of similarities overlapping and criss-crossing in all of the religions, and one characteristic that they all share is religiosity, which is to be understood as something having deep importance for those to whom it counts as ‘ultimate concern’. The method is hermeneutical because the subject and the whole method of research function reciprocally, in the sense that the method progressively shapes and collates its evidence, which in turn refines the method. This culminates mainly in an interest in terminology: four scientifically important terms and concepts in current use are interpreted by relating them to the life and contexts from which they have been derived. The difference between their original use and content and the scientific terminological use has been explained. In studying religious change, an important theme in Hellenistic religion, the meaning of different groups has been considered, since moving from one group to another means not only change in social structure, but also in the individual’s life; it presupposes choice. Openness and conscious choice were one of the important new aspects of religious life in Hellenistic times, observable in the cults studied.

2. The Cult of Demeter

There was a remarkable continuity in the cult of the Eleusinian Great Mysteries of Demeter from early Classical times throughout the Hellenistic era. The cult of Eleusis had been absorbed into the official cults of Athens for political reasons. Thus it was a symbol for the city and as a Panhellenic festival it marked the importance of the polis. As such it stressed Athenian identity and gave the rulers and civil servants an opportunity to make a public appearance. The Great Mysteries were also a popular cult because of their individualistic appeal through the ritual’s emotional aspect. This accounts for its mystery character; it was different from every-day life, giving the possibility of being individually purified, and being in touch with the ultimate questions concerning life and death.

The priesthoods of the gentile-type had faded away by the third century BC and the democratic system of appointing officials spread to the sacred institutions of Athens including the cult of Demeter. It was open to all with “clean hands and intelligible speech”. Thus all cities were invited to take part in the festival, women and slaves were not excluded. This openness gave Athens an opportunity to show its grace, and also to acknowledge the city’s power which was important to it during its periods of political and economic difficulties.

The Great Mysteries were financed in various ways, starting from offerings devoted to the deities and by individual, as well as public sacrifices. Eleusinian functionaries, mainly hierophantai, dadouchoi and hieropoioi, took care of the handling these charges. The cities invited to take part in the festival paid so-called aparchai, the offering of the first fruits of the harvest, as official taxes paid to Athens for the festival. Private financing seems to have been an important practice as well, because there are inscriptions honouring individual supporters, the philotimoi, for the financial support intended for the benefit of the cult.
3. The Cult of Isis

Isis was a newcomer to Athens arriving in the late fourth century BC, first to Piraeus and thence to Athens. She was worshipped by one of the religious associations, a new phenomenon in the religious life of the early third century BC. During the Macedonian period the number of religious associations grew considerably. Thiasoi were clearly ‘religious’ in character being dedicated to a particular god and practising religious activities alongside eranoi; finally came the more secular synodoi which were mainly trade guilds. These associations gave individuals an opportunity to choose their religious affiliation, and create a group identity free from the existing supra-individual distinctions which had previously been given to everyone, together with the name and social status of one’s oikos, phratra, phyle, demos. Associations now grouped them in a new way according to their own choices.

The goddess Isis was brought to Piraeus before the year 333/2 BC by foreigners, and at the beginning she was worshipped by foreigners and metics in an unofficial thiasos. In Athens she was worshipped in the thiasos of Sarapiastai which was established in the first part of the third century BC. The cult gained official status at the end of the same century. Isis was the most popular of the Egyptian gods, and even claimed as the most popular of the foreign gods of Athens in Hellenistic times. It is obvious that Athenian citizens behaved in a politically and economically sound way by accepting the new cult; the attitude to the Ptolemies was favourable during the third century BC and there was pressure to accept a foreign cult because of the increased number of metics in the city.

The thiasos of Sarapiastai was organized administratively according to the practices of the city-state’s organizations. These formed a new life inside the associations on a smaller scale, thereby providing a nominal openness for individuals to find new ways for constructing their group-identity. In the inscriptions of the associations, the same formulas are frequently used as in the polis: they, like the Sarapiastai, honoured their benefactors, mostly economic supporters as philotimoi, giving them honorary crowns and inscribing their names on stelai.

In the official cult of Isis the members and the officials were mainly citizens. Even the priest, the hierus chosen yearly by lot, came from the upper classes. The tamias, who took care of the finances, was an important official of the association. The grammateus worked as a secretary. The annual epimeletai performed sacred priestly duties being equivalents of the city-state’s hieropoioi. The zakoros, a lower official was always a metic in the Athenian association of the Sarapiastai. Of lower officials the kleidoukhos and oneirokrites may be mentioned, but they do not appear in the Athenian association of the Egyptian gods until the year 116/5–95/4 BC. In Delos we meet them more often, because Sarapieion A kept up the traditions of the Egyptian-based rites, while Sarapieion C was clearly ‘Athenian’ representing that city’s authority and organizations on the island.

The cult of Isis was financed in various ways: The associations collected money and sacrificial goods from their members for entering into the festivals organized by it. The associations also seem to have expected financial support from their officials. Thus private financing was of foremost importance in the associations. Thiasoi honoured their philotimoi for eusebeia, arete, euergesia and so on in the same manner as individual supporters of the city-state’s religious festivals had been honoured on marble.
4. The Problem of the Mysteries

The mysteries of antiquity, and especially those of Hellenistic times, have been treated as a separate type of religion which flourished among people seeking new and more satisfying religious experiences; nevertheless, it is worth defining the concept more properly. Ancient authors discuss the mysteries in various contexts and use varying terminology: μυείν, μυστήρια, τέλείν, τέλετή and δργα illustrate the mysteries or their rites. They regarded mysteries as an individual group of religious practices, however. The modern use of the term ‘mystery religions’ as a pervasive and exclusive name for a closed system is inappropriate. The word *mysteria* designates festivals including initiation ceremonies. *Mysteria* must be distinguished from ‘mystic’, because it was only through the development of Neo-Platonic and Christian metaphors that *mystikos* acquired this meaning. Historians of religion have defined the mysteries largely on the model of the Eleusinian Mysteries of Demeter, but there are still some aspects of the mysteries that do not fit the Eleusinian picture. I have listed the aspects of the mysteries in general, and then considered how suitable they are as adapted to the Eleusinian mysteries and the cult of Isis, which has also been called a mystery cult. The mysteries always include a shared secrecy which had much to do with questions concerning death and after-life, but which also created a supra-individual social coherence offering cognitive and emotional-affective effects. A fertility aspect is present in the mysteries linking birth and death together. Ritualized purification adds to the picture as well, because it included situations with a possibility for psychological and social purification. There seems always to be some foreign element belonging to the mythico-religious system of the mysteries, usually a non-Greek deity. The myths of the mysteries are aetiological to the cult practices, because the myths provided the explanatory contents for the rites and thus made the cultic practices understandable. In the mysteries the vegetation duality is expressed in an active divine couple which represents a dualistic dichotomy of the basic polarities of human life. The dimension of death and after-life belongs to the mysteries in one form or another, but it always dealt with an individual’s personal questions, thus bringing the individualistic dimension into the mysteries. There were mysteries demanding a life-long devotion to the cult, but the Eleusinian mysteries, for example, were not one of these. This demand seems rather to have become the norm in Roman times.

If we suppose that the mysteries should contain the above-mentioned aspects, the cult of Isis in early Hellenistic Athens was not a mystery cult. Only the foreign element in its mythology, as well as the divine couple who create a vegetative duality, and the aetiological function of the myths are to be found in the system of the religious cult of the Athenian *thiasos*. But, on the other hand, the cult of Isis in Rome in the third century AD as described by Apuleius of Madauros in his *Metamorphoses* was clearly a mystery cult with all the aspects of the mysteries. It even had sacred writings, *hieroi logoi*. Apuleius calls the mysteries *religionis secreta* and the rites of the mysteries are for him *teletae* or *ritus*. The cult stressed its exclusive character by symbolism which was expressed in the special vestments, habits and requirements for the adherents to have a special life-style.

From what date may the cult of Isis be called a Mystery cult in Greece? The development of the Mystery festival of Isis in Greece was due both to earlier Egyptian cult practices and the Greek practices of the mystery cults. Thus there was syncretism on the
cultic level presupposing parallelism and identification of the deities and their cults. The epigraphical material supports the view that the mysteries of Isis came into existence in Greece at the end of the last century BC and had an established position in the first century AD. The Aretalogy of Maronea from the early first century AD gives a *terminus ante quem*, because in it the mysteries of Isis may be observed. Isis and her festival is identified with Demeter and her Mysteries, so that the cult of Isis seems to be dependent of the cult of Demeter. The hypothesis is further supported by an Athenian inscription from the end of the first century AD which regulates that in the month of the Mysteries, the *Boedromion*, sacrifices typical to the Eleusinian deities had to be made in honour of the Egyptian gods. The two deities are identified totally, and Isis is said to have revealed the fruits of the earth in Eleusis. The Demetrian mysteries provided a structural model for the mysteries of Isis in Greece.

5. Syncretism

Syncretism has often been treated as the most obvious characteristic of Hellenistic religion. Yet it has rarely been studied on the basis of actual material remains. Syncretism is a theoretical term which usually has negative connotations in the literature. The term must be released from these overtones. The authors of antiquity did not use the term. Syncretism starts with an evolutionary process which leads to a syncretism of a stable stage. Thus it involves progressive syncretism which is a category of its own. Therefore, I have constructed a chronology which includes a typology of syncretism: 1) first separate religious systems adapted functionally into surrounding culture may be 2) parallelized because of cultural and religious contacts which may further become 3) assimilated, causing a new religious entity still open to changes; finally there may be found 4) a stable syncretistic religion which may be created consciously. This religion is a complete and separate system again. Examples of separate religious systems are the Greek Demeter with her own roles and epithets and the Egyptian Isis, whose roles were quite different from those of Demeter: Demeter was a Mother goddess of earth and fertility and Isis the patroness of civilization. When they became parallelized the interaction between these cultural systems is presupposed, but the old individual elements of the goddesses are still kept alive so that some equivalents, analogical elements between them, are noted and considered side by side. The analogies in the case of the two goddesses are, for example, their shared role as Mothers and the equivalence of their myths. In the case of identification, the identities of deities or their cults merge into each other to such a degree that it is difficult to distinguish their previously characteristic elements. This is to be seen in Demeter–Isis and in the cult of the Greek mysteries of Isis from the first century BC onwards. The cult of Sarapis represents a fully syncretistic religion, because it was a consciously created complete religious system in which the elements of both Greek and Egyptian religion were amalgamated and which functioned independently.
6. Monotheistic Trend

Monotheism is also an abstract formation of researchers and intimately connected with a Christian-centred point of view. When studying the religions of antiquity it seems more appropriate to speak about a monotheistic trend rather than monotheism, because as a term monotheism excludes even the potential existence of other gods. The Greeks only knew, on the one hand, synthesis of all or most of the gods, or, on the other hand, philosophical or theological principle. Thus the term henotheism, an attitude which includes monotheistic content without involving rejection or neglect of other gods, must be remembered in this connection. The monotheistic tendency may be chronologized in the following way: 1) syncretism which is followed by 2) henotheism finally evolving into 3) the monotheistic trend.

In Greek religion the monotheistic trend often means that one divine power is seen as supreme over the other gods, so that it unifies the essences of these others in itself and represents them all. Gods now become manifestations of power. This was expressed vaguely among the people, and more precisely among the philosophers and intellectuals. One such case in the thinking of the political elite is the theory of self-sufficient control, which was coloured with the idea of an over-ruling Fate with its transcendental aspects. Demetrius of Phalerum’s text *Peri Tyches* serves as an example. For those who criticized religion, the transcendental theories of religion were consequences of their search for authority outside the institutionalized offices and structures of the society.

Among more concrete religious thought, the wide range of names of the different gods were put one after another, and one deity was elevated over the others by using prefixes such as *poly-* and *pan-* in his/her epithets. The Isidorus’ hymn to Isis serves as an example of this. Sometimes the gods were grouped together in the inscriptions by calling them *synnaoi theoi* and later as *theoi megaloi* in order to underline their special powerful nature.

7. Individualism

Individualism is one of the most often repeated generalizations about Hellenistic religion. The emergence of individualism has often been claimed to have arisen in the Hellenistic world, and the Hellenistic era has been regarded as an age of the discovery of the individual. Individualism in Hellenistic times was caused by more heterogeneous populations mixing together, travelling (which even though not a new phenomenon was perhaps more common than before), diffusion of foreign cults and political instability. Hellenistic individualism represents individualism which may be called ‘inworldly individualism’ according to L. Dumont’s terminology, because an individual of that time was social and was defined by society’s presuppositions; he did not leave the society behind him like the so-called ‘outworldly individual’. This is shown in the individualism manifesting itself as the possibility of choice which culminates in a man’s liberty to choose his own religious reference group. Together with this it became possible for a person to form his own group-identity free from predeterminated kinship and ethnic restrictions, such as gender, family and social position. Religious associations preserved their social character, and so individualism was also social in character. The individualism
of Hellenistic religion is also interpreted as personal faith which was expressed in seeking liberation from troubles such as serious illness. These cases form contexts in which individual kinds of religiosity were expressed by the practice of giving votives, prayer (the indicator of which is kneeling down before a deity), using terms like *therapeutes* or *latris* about a believer, or expressing a submissive attitude towards the *dynamis* of a god.

Both Demeter and Isis were the objects of individual religiosity expressed in these ways. But complete devotion to a deity was a phenomenon which belongs to later Hellenism, more precisely to the Roman world. This is seen in the cult of Isis' mysteries as described by Apuleius of Madauros in his *Metamorphoses*, the Isis-Book (book XI). It also expresses the cult's development into the mysteries proper. In the Mysteries of Demeter, life-long devotion was at no time required.

8. Cosmopolitanism

Cosmopolitanism is an implicit phenomenon in all of the above concepts of syncretism, the monotheistic tendency and individualism, because there was a movement towards the internationalization of values and conceptualization of structures larger than the *polis* continuing in early Hellenistic times. Independence and cosmopolitical attitudes are seen in the orientation and life-style of the intellectuals, for example in the Cynics and other philosophers of Hellenistic Athens. Cosmopolitanism may be interpreted as an openness of attitude towards new forms of religious life. It was a readiness to accept new cults and incorporate them into a social and political context so that they became integral parts of the culture and society. In Athens the need to obtain permission from the city-boule to build a sanctuary for a new religious association still prevailed, but permission was easily granted; the number of religious associations increased considerably, especially during the third and second centuries BC.

The tension between old conservative attitudes and openness in religious matters in Athens is seen in the *asebeia* legislation. *Asebeia* was sanctioned by the Athenian law against foreign gods and against offences concerning official religion. The philosophers Theophrastus, Theodorus of Cyrene and Stilpon, among others, were condemned because of *asebeia* legislation. They had refused to acknowledge the gods recognized by the *polis*, or tried to introduce new gods or beliefs into the city. These kinds of *asebeia* accusations were linked to politics, because *asebeia*-legislation was also a symbol of the old conservatism. But its use in the cases of accepting foreign gods was not at all systematic; political and economic needs made it reasonable to respect loyalty towards the ever-increasing number of foreigners and their religious cults in early Hellenistic Athens. Thus the existence of *asebeia* was practically 'forgotten', but not in principle. Cosmopolitanism caused also more open attitudes towards religious matters.
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acceptance of 55–56, 124, 127–128
members of 54–56
official status of 54–55, 74
officials of 58ff.
hierarchy of 58–59
participation into 54–56
position of women in Athens and on Delos 56
popularity of 50–51
priests of 55, 58, see → hiereia, hiereus
portrait of 55 n.186
statue of 55 + n.186
upper class status of cult of 55–56
wealth of 56 n.192
in Roman world 70
according to Apuleius 75–78
adherents/devotees of 76–77, 80
attributes of 78 n.72
rules for: chastity, abstinence, diet, vestments 76–77 + nn.63–65
women 79–80 n.77
devotion to 76–77
notion of death and after-life in 78, 82
priesthood of 76, 96–97
vestments of 97 n.84
rules of 76
on Delos
arrival to 50 + n.157
mystery character of 75
official status of 75
participation in 79–80 n.77
women 57 + n.199, 79–80 n.77
priests of 97 n.84
duties of 97 n.84
two types of cults on 82
on Cyclades 51 n.167
epithets of see → epithets
identified with Demeter 92, 94, 99–100
identity of 96
'Isiac' costume 78 n.72, 97
'Isis-propaganda' 50 n.157
Isis reliefs 56 + n.192
knot of 97
might of 107–108
omnipotence of 107–108
paralleled with Demeter 79, 91, 97–98
roles of 79, 91, 97–98
as creator goddess 102
as Mother 96, 99, 102
as ruler over death 108–109
as Salvatrix 97, 115 + n.190
Egyptian 50 n.157, 96, 98 + n.92
listening role of 117 + n.205
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Method
- Empirically orientated (2, 14, 20, 86)
- For studying monotheistic trend (101-102)
- For studying religious and social change (20-21)
- For studying syncretism (85-88)
- Of the history of religions (13)
- Of the science of religions (13)
- Metics (23, 52 n.169, 60)
- Migration (122)

Mystes
- In Eleusinian cult (40, 73 n.46)
- In religious associations (62)

Mithra
- Mysteries of (69)
- Mithraism (70)
- Mnemosyne (26, n.15, 27)
- Moirai (26, n.15, 27)
- Monotheism
  - As final stage of development of religions (100)
  - Bound to syncretism (100)
  - Chronology of (101)
  - Concept of (100)
  - Idea of (101)
  - Term of (100)
- Monotheistic trend (2, 82, 85, 100-109, 118, 121)
  - In epithets of gods (106-109)
  - Methodology for studying (101-102)

Mother of Gods
- Association of (28)
  - In Piraeus (orgeon/thiasos) (49 n.154, 52 n.169, 53 n.174, 58 n.207, 59 n.215)
  - Tamias (59 n.210)
  - Connected with Isis (90)

Musai 27
- Myeo (65-66 + nn.3-5)
- Myo (65-66 + nn.3-5)
- Mystagogos (45)
- Mystes (65-66)

Mysteries
- As own type of religions (65, 58)
  - Aspects of (68-71)
  - Fertility (70)
  - Concept of (65ff.)
  - Definition of (65ff.)
  - Extatism in (70)
  - Foreign element in (69)
  - Graeco-Roman M. of Isis (81-82)
  - Individual appeal of (34)

Statue of her priestess (49-50 n.156)
- Votives of ears to (117)

Isocrates
- On aparchai (41 +n.116, 44 +n.134)
- On Eleusinian Mysteries (30 n.42, 32)

Isodaites
- Cult of (49, n.154)

Ister
- On Eleusinian officials (37 n.81)

Juvenal
- On vows (116 n.192)

Kaneaphore 81 n.83
- Kaneaphoros (81 n.83)

Karpos
- In Eleusinian cult (42)

Katharos/katharsios (72 + n.39)

Kerykes (31ff., 71, see genos)

Kiste (45 n.136)

Kistephoros (45 n.136)

Kleidoukhos (59-60)

Kneeling before God/s (119 + nn.219-220)
- Demeter and Kore (119)
- Women (119)

Koinon (48ff., 114)
- Number of inscriptions of (48)
- Ton dekatiston (Delos) (57)
- Ton enatiston (Delos) (57)
- Ton eraniston (63 n.238)
- Ton myston (73 n.49)
- Ton thiasiston (48 + n.147, 63 n.237)

Kore
- As hagnos (72-73 n.40)
- Mysteria of (67, 70)
- Offerings to (80)
- Telete of (66-67 + n.10)
- With Demeter as to theo (dual.) (106)

Krokidai (genos of) (73 n.43)

Krokosis (73)

Kronia, Kronos (24 n.4), Kronos (26)

Latris (77 n.66, 119)

Legomena (36)

Macedonian rulers (3-4 + n.7)
- Deified (103 + n.120)
- In Eleusinian cult (47)

Medimnos (42 n.120, 95)

Meleager (122 n.235)

Memphis (75)

Temple of Sarapis in (79 n.73, 96-97 n.82)

Menander (8)
- On individuals in Epitreponetes (110)
- On Sarapis (50 n.159)
of Demeter 29 ff.
in Eleusis (Attica) 3ff. see → Great Mysteries
as model in defining mysteries 69
at Alexandrian Eleusis 9 n.26, 93 n.57
devotion to 119–121
in Roman Egypt 33–34
of Isis 74ff.
Greek M. of Isis 78–82
in Athens 2, 47ff. see → Isis
in Rome 4, 74–78 see → Isis
Oriental element in 69
Orphic Mysteries 66 n.11
popularity of 65
sexuality in 70
significance of (in Athens) 71–75
mysterion 66 nn.3, 5, 7
mysteriotides 73
mystes 66 nn.4–5, 67 n.16, 80 + n.79
in Eleusinian cult 34 n.68, 37
in cult of Isis (in Rome) 76 n.62
mystic/ism 67 + n.11, 68
mystikos 66
myth 69–70
aetiological function of 69–70, 72 n.37
of Demeter and Isis 98
parallel elements in 98
mythology 16, 26, 70, 87
Eleusinian 73 + n.44
Egyptian, of Isis 98 + n.92
nemei 98, 102 n.113
Nemesis 27
at Rhamnous 26 (n.15), 101–102 n.113
statue of 101–102 n.113
temple of 101–102 n.113
cult of 101–102
on Delos (connected with Isis) 90
neokoros 55–56 n.191, 60 n.216
duties of 59–60, 72 n.38
nomination of 60, n.216
Nephtys 26
offerings for 80
Nike 27
niIometer 75 n.55
nomizein theous 126
changes in contents of 126
nymphs 27, 110
offerings
as finances in Eleusinian cult 39, 42, 44
in mysteries 71
in religious associations 59
quantity of 116 + n.196
private 26
votive/s 39, 115–116
as indicators when studying
individualism 115
anatomical 116–118
from Athens 116–117
from Delos to Egyptian gods 117
from Eleusis 118
statue of Nunnius Nigrius 45 n.137
oikos 48, 113 + n.178, 114
as formulator of social ideas 113
Olympieta 25 + n.9
oneirokrites 59–60
duties of 59–60
oracle of Delphoi 41
orgeones 48ff., 49 n.154, 52 n.169, 53 +
n.174, 176, 54, 59 nn.213, 215, 61 nn.224,
226
orgia
as term 65–67, 76 n.61
of Dionysus 67
do mystai 80 n.79
o. semne 95 n.70
orgiazai 67 n.12
Orphic hymns 95 nn.65–66, 96 n. 74, 107
+ n.146
Orphic Mysteries 66 n.11, 69–70
Osiris 26, 93 n.48
cult practices of 80
identified with Sarapis 93
mysteries of 78, 80
offerings to 80
priests of (in Rome) 76 n.58
paps of 'hestias 38–39 + 39 n.99
panges 39 + n.100
Panathenaia 3, 24 n.4, 25 + n.7, 122
kanePhoros of 81 n.83
ship used in procession of 25 n.7
stadium, Panathenaic 42 n.123
Panhellenic festivals 25, 30
pantheism 102
parallels
in myths of Demeter and Isis 98
in religions 15
parallelization 89–92, 97–98, 109
in syncretistic process 87, 89
of Demeter and Isis and their rites 79, 81, 82
n.89, 97–98, 100
particularism 29 n.40, 30
Pausanias 6–8
on Eleusinion 32 n.56
on Eumolpidai 30 n.46
on famous festivals 33
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on Krokidai and krokosis 73 n.43
on Panathenaia and city-Dionysia 25 n.7
on personified abstractions 27 nn.17–23
on Rhamnous 27 n.23, 101 n.113
on statue of Iacchus 45 n.135
on temple of Asclepius at Corinth 116 n.196
on theoi megaloi 67 n.10
using word hagne 72 n.40
using word mysteria 67 n.11
using word orgia 67 n.12
using word telete 66 + n.10

Pepo 27
Pericles 29 n.40
phaid(ry)ntes 39
Philochorus 8
on Panathenaia and city-Dionysia 25 n.7
on religious cults in Athens 26–27
nn.14 –16, 124
Philonian stoa 33 n.59
philosophers 102, 104
accused of asebeia 127
cynical/sceptical attitudes of 104
monotheistic tendency expressed by 102 + n.117
philosophy 68, 101, 104
'epoptic' 68
philotia 43 ff.
philotimos 43 + n.125, 53 n.174, 59 + n.213, 61 n.226, 63 + n.238
Phocion 25 n.9
phratria 48, 49 n.153, 52 n.169, 53 n.72, 112–113
cults of 45–50, 49, n.156, 52 n.169
membership of the cults of 49, n.153, 61 n.228, 112 n.177
religious offices of 112 n.177
thiasoi of 49 n.153
Phryne 127
phyle 41, 112
pietas 19 n.43
piety 113 n.181, 114, 118
Piraeus 4
eranoi in 53 n.176, 63 n.238
orgenees in 53 n.174, 59 n.210, 60
n.219, 61 + nn. 226, 229
thiasoi in 49, 53 + n.176, 58 n.207, 62 n.234
of Isis in 49ff.

Plato 7
atheos of 125–126
demiurgoi of 104 n.128
god of 125 n.253
on asebeia 125–126
on Bendis 49 n.154
on offerings 116 n.192
on religious observances 119 n.221
on self-sufficiency 112
on telete 66 n.9
to theion of 104 n.128
using word mysteria 66 + n.6

Plutarch 8
as sympathizer of Isis 98
on Alexander the Great and Demetrius
Policrates 103 n.123 and 124
on Demeter and Isis 99 n.96
on Demetrius Policrates as initiated 45 + n.139
on Demosthenes 127 n.264
on 'epoptic' nature of philosophy 68
on hieroi logos 77 n.68
on hierophantes and hieria of Eleusinian Mysteries 36 nn.75 and 77, 38, n.88
on initiants of Isis 76 n.63
on Isis and Osiris (De Iside et Osiride) 98
describing Isis 96 +n.81, 98
on priests of Isis 76 n.64, 77 n.65, 97 n.84
on procession to Eleusis 45 n.137
on Ptolemies and Sarapis 51, n.165
on purificative water 73 n.45
on Sarapis 93 nn.49 and 57
on Soteres 103 n.120
on telete 67 + n.17
using word sykretismos 86 a.10

Pluto
identified with Sarapis 93
Polyaenus
on elasis 73 n.42
Polybius 105 n.133
polytheism 100, 102
pompe
Eleusinian 35, 39 n.99, 45+ n.137
of Bendis 61 n.226
of festival of Dionysus 25 n.7
of Lenaia 24 n.5
of Panathenaia 25 n.7, 38
of religious associations 59
see → procession/s

Pistis 115
Poseidon
  festival of 24
  Poseideia for 24
  private offerings to 26 + n.14
prayer/s 77, 116, 126
priestess of Demeter and Kore 37
duties of 37
procession/s 29
cistae used in 78 n.72
  of Eleusinian cult 35, 37, 39 n.100, 44–45, 71, 73 n.43
Proerosia (of Demeter) 24–25 nn.6 and 6, 42 n.122
proetanistria 56
proskynema 119 nn.219–220
proskynesis 119
  + n.220
prostagma 118 + n.215
Prytaneion 36, 39 n.99
psephisma 62 n.235
Ptolemies 4 n.7, 51, 55, 58, 121
  as supporters of Sarapis cult 58
  propaganda of 51–52 + n.167
purification/s
  in Egyptian rites 75 + n.55
  in Eleusinian Mysteries 34, 72–73
  in Mysteries of Isis 77, 78, 80
  rites 72–73
  social p. 73 n.43
purity
  concept of in Eleusinian cult 72–73
  in Mysteries of Isis 75, 77–78
pyrphoros 36 n.74, 39 + n.100
religion
  as mark of particularist identity 30
  as practical and act orientated 124
  as process 101
  as system 16
  as 'ultimate concern' 18
astral 124
attitudes towards
  changes in 51, 104–105
  ironical 105 n.131
  changes in 1, 106, 122–124
comparative 14
concept of 16–17, 19
  'family-resembling concept' of 18–19
cosmic 123
crisis of Greek r. 122 + n.242
critique of 105
definition of 16–17
  a priori d. of 17
  generalized 65
  open d. of religion 17
encounter of religions 87–88
essence of 14, 18
evolutionary theories of 100 n.107
individual 109, 114, 121
individualistic element in 70–71, 120–121
institutional aspect of 21
official religion of city-state 6, 24–25, 26
  44, 46, 49 + n.153, 51–54, 71–73, 111, 114, 121, 123–128
documents concerning 24
festivals 24–25
phenomenology of 13–14
  hermeneutically orientated 14–15
philosophy of 14
private religion 23, 27–29, 49 n.153, 112–115
process of development of 101
sociology of 14
stages of 101
structure of 16
system of 15
traditional religion 3, 45, 46
typologies of 89–94
understanding it 14–15, 18
religiosity 17, 19
  as category 17
  as possibility of choice 112–115
  as 'relative a priori' 17
expressions of in cases of illnesses 116
individual 109–122
religious
  choice 54
  despair 123
dimension in human life 13, 15, 17
experiences 72, 74
pluralism 102
purity 72–73, 78
specialists (Rome) 76, 77
renatus 78 + n.70
ruler cult 47 n.141, 66–67 n.10, 102–104
  as manifestation of power 109
  characteristics of 103
  motivation of 103
rulers 121
godship of 47, 103–104, 108 n.154
  immanence of divine power in 104
  in Eleusinian cult 45
Macedonian 4 + n.7
Sabazius
  association of 28 + n.28, 49 n.154
  priestess of, accused of asebeia 127
sacramentum 66 n.7

Petra Pakkanen
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept/Entity</th>
<th>Page References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sacred animals</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>character of mysteries</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>law</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peace</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>78 n.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writings (hieroi logoi)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sacrifices in Eleusinian cult</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in religious associations</td>
<td>59, 61–62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarapiastai in Athens 50ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration of 58–60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finances of 60–63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private 61–63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>official status of 50–55, 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officials of 50, 55–60, 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chosen yearly by vote 50, 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization of 55, 58ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popularity of 50–52, 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priests of 50, 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on Delos members of 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>official status of 50 + n.157 (p.50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priests of 50 n. 157, 56 n.194, 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarapias (Delos) A character of 57, 60, 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members of 57 relief found in 91 + n.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rituals in 75 therapeutai in 57, 120 n.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B character of 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Athenian influence in 57, 74–75, 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>character of 60, 75 dedications to theoi epekooi in 117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nn.205, 206, 208</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gods worshipped in 57 n.198, 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscriptions of therapeutai in 120 n.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officials of 57 + n.198, 74–75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chosen annually in Athens 75 rituals in 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarapis arrival to Athens 49–52, 93, 124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as healer god 116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as patron of Ptolemies 58, 93–94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as semnos theos (in Menander) 50 n.159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>association of 28, 49ff. 'Chronicle' for 50, n.157, 97 n.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 'creation story' of 93 cult of 50–52 ff. as syncretistic 88 used for political and social goals 88, see → Sarapiastai identified with other gods 93 name of 93 etymology of 93 n.48 priests of in Athens and Delos 50 + n.157, 56 + n.194 procession of 81 votives to 116 Sceptics 104 attitudes of self control of 104 sebas 114 secrecy as socially determined 71 function of 70–72 in cult of Isis in Rome 76 in mysteries 70–71 Eleusinian 9, 34 secret by Christian Fathers 66 n.7 rite/s 66–67 n.10 semnos 95 n.70 Seth 98 sitesis 36 Skira (dedicated to Demeter) 24 Solon 31 n.49 Sophocles on Eleusinian Mysteries 34 n.65, 71 n.35 Soter/Soteira Alexander the Great as 103 as epithet of ruler gods 108 + n.154 Demeter as 95 + n.70, 118 Demetrius of Poliorcetes as 103 Isis as 108 + n.154, 118 source criticism 5–6, 9–10 textual criticism 6 sponde 62 spondophoroi 36 Stenia 24 n.4, 43 n.125 stephano in Eleusis 43 in religious associations 52–53, 62 Stilpon accused of asebeia 127 Stoics as cosmopolitans 112 Strabo 8 on Kotys 49 n.154 Suetonius on aparchai 41 n.116 on Augustus as initiated 33 n.61 on Eleusinian Mysteries 30 n.42 summa honoraria 61–62
Supreme Being 101
syncretism 67–100
  bound to monotheistic trend 101, 109
  characterizing Hellenistic religion 85
  chronology of 87–88, 100–101
  concept of 85–87, 121
  as tool for interpretation 87
  definition of 87
  etymology of the word 86 + n.10
  in Athens and Delos 87–88ff.
  of Demeter and Isis 94–100
  stages of 87–88ff.
  systemic view of 87 n.12
  term of 85–86
  as theoretical 86–87
  negative overtones of 86
typologizing s. 87–88
syncretistic
  process 86–88
  of Demeter and Isis 94–100
  religion 85, 92–94
syndikos 47 n.144
  Synesius 68 n.20
synodos 48 ff., 114
  number of inscriptions of 48
  ton myston 74 n.49
Tacitus
  on Sarapis 93 n.57
  tamiai toin theoin (Eleusis) 38, 40
duties of, at Eleusis 38, 40
tamias
  in Eleusinian cult 40
  of cult of Isis and Sarapis (Athens) 58
  duties of 58–59
  position of 58–59
  of religious associations 47 n.144
telein 66
  Teles 111, 121
Teles terion 66
  of Eleusis 33 n.59, 36
telestes 66
  telete 43, 65–66, 66–67 nn.9–10, 80 n.80
  of Isis 76 + n.61
  Tenos 41 n.110, 61 n.228
theia 20, 28
theon 100
  with prefix mono 100
theism 101
Themis
  at Rhamnous 27 n.23, 101–102 n.113
  statue of 101 n.113
  temple of 101 n.113
Theocritus
  describing Demeter 95 n.65
Theodorus of Cyrene
  as atheos 127
theoi 106–107
  at openings of inscriptions 107 n.141
epekooi 117 nn.205–206
megaloi 66–67 + n.10, 107 + n.142
megistoi 107 + n.143
synnaoi/synnaoi kai symbomoi 107 n.141,
  108 n.154, 119 n.219
Theophrastus 7–8
  accused of asebeia 127
  attitude towards religion 105 n.131
deisidaimonia 7, 119
  on Adonis 49 n.154
  on offerings 116 n.192
theoroi 45
  Therapeutes (Delos) 57 + n.201, 118, 120
  n.223,
  devotion of 120
  Thermuthis 91 nn.41–42
thesauros 40–41
Theseion 26 n.14
Theseus
  private offerings to 26 + n.14
Thesmophoria 34 n.67, 42 n.122
Thesmophoros
  Demeter T. 99 + nn.97–98
  Isis T. 96, 99 n.98
thiasos 47ff., 113–114
  attitude towards 52 n.169
  emergence of 53–54
  in Athens 47ff., 53
  in Piraeus 49ff., see → Pireus
  individualism in 114–115
  of Egyptian gods 49–52 + n.157 p.50
thiasotes 50 n.157, 74
  funerals of 58 n.207, 61, 74
Thucydides
  funerary speech of Pericles 29 n.40
transcendence 101–102, 110 n.162
  concept of 101–102
  element of 101
  of gods 104
transcendental
deities 101, 104
  elements in thought 105
  omnipotence 105
  power and order 103
  theories 101–102
  visions in civilization 102–103
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trapeza
  in Eleusinian cult 40 n.109
  travelling 121–122
Tyche
  Demetrius Phalerum on 105–106
  temple of in Athens 42 n.123
vocatio 77 n.66
votive/s see → offerings
Xenophon
  on cavalry exercises 25 n.9
  on Eleusinian officials 38 n.94
  on extatic cults 126 n.258
zakoros
  of Isis and Sarapis 60 + nn.217, 219
  post of
    in Athens 59–60 + n.219
    on Delos 60
  of Sarapiastai (Athens) 50, 55–56 n.191,
    59–60 + nn.208, 216
    duties of 59
Zeus
  Alexander the Great as 103 + n.123
  identified with Sarapis 93
  Kataibates 103 n.124
  MeiIichius 119–120 n.222
  Soter 24 n.3, 25, 28
    Diisoteria of 24 n.3
    sanctuary of 42 n.123
Appendix

Concordance of used inscriptions

In the concordance are shown only those correspondences of the inscriptions that have been consulted. Next to the numbers of IG I (Lewis) and II/III (Kirchner) are the numbers of the older editions IG I (Kirchhoff), I² (Hiller van Gaertringen), II and III (Koehler).

After IG, ID and SEG the following collections of inscriptions are in alphabetical order in their own columns, and abbreviated as following (compare the list of the edited inscriptions and of literature above):

Poland, F. 1967: Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens.
Roussel, P. 1916: Les cultes égyptiens à Délos du IIIe au Ier siècle av J-C.
1969: Lois sacrées de cités grecques.

In the researches of K. Clinton, F. Mora and F. Poland all the inscriptions numbered are not written completely in edited form, but the synopsis and commentaries of them are given. The same concerns the numbers of Delos inscriptions (CE) in L. Vidman's Sylloge.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1° 6; I Suppl. 1</td>
<td>X 6; XVII 2</td>
<td>pp. 10–13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1906:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1° 42</td>
<td></td>
<td>1969:6</td>
<td>31, 33, 34, 39–42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1° 32</td>
<td>X 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1° 34</td>
<td>X 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1° 62; II 59</td>
<td>X 110</td>
<td>XI: 14–16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1906:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1° 83</td>
<td></td>
<td>1969:5</td>
<td>31–33, 38, 41–42, 44, 107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1° 79; 1° 81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37, 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1° 78; I Suppl. 27b; 1° 76</td>
<td>V 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1906:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1969:13</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1° 82; 1° 84; I 46</td>
<td>V 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1° 130; 1° 128; I 68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1° 259; 1° 191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1° 285; 1° 220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1° 292; 1° 232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1° 296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1° 953</td>
<td>X 321</td>
<td>III: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37, 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Suppl. 225k vol.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33, 38, 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33, 38, 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 204; II 5 104a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 334; II 163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 337; II 168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28, 49, 55, 56, 106, 124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 657; II 314; II 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24, 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 847; II 385d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42–43, 73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 1006; II 471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 1008; II 469</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 1011; II 470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 1028; II 467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV 188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35, 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 1029; II 468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 1030; II 466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 1035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 1072; III 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 1077; III 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 1078; III 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 1092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 1230; II 597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/II 1231; II 597b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31, 31, 37, 43, 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1236; II/III 605; II 605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III² 1096</td>
<td>49bis</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III² 1095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1253; II/III 617e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28, 49, 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28, 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1256; II/III 573b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28, 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1257; II 607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1258; II 609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1259</td>
<td></td>
<td>A62a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1261; II 511b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28, 48-49, 59, 62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1263; II 611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48, 53, 59, 62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1265; II 615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47, 53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1271; II 613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28, 49, 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1273; II 614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1275</td>
<td></td>
<td>A17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III¹ 1099</td>
<td></td>
<td>1962:126</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1277; II 615b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52-53, 56, 62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28, 49, 53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1282; II 616b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III¹ 1105</td>
<td></td>
<td>1969:46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1283</td>
<td></td>
<td>A71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25, 28, 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1291; II 616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25, 28, 50, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1292; II 617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1293; II 617b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1294</td>
<td></td>
<td>A33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52, 53, 56, 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28, 48, 53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1298; II 618b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1299; II 614b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53, 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1301; II 618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28, 49, 52, 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1314; II 619</td>
<td></td>
<td>A21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28, 49, 52, 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 1315; II 622</td>
<td></td>
<td>A2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A2e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III 1317; II 620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III 1318; II 623c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III 1319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III 1323; II 623b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III 1324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III 1325; II 623d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III 1326; II 623e</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 3707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 3727; III 1355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38,79,80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 3764; III 737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 3811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 3814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4075; III 928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4083; III 610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4213; III 610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4372; III 1453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4407; III 1482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4422; III 1511c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4429; III Add. 132q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4575; III 1558c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4576; III 1558d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4587; III 1545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4588; III 1559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4618; III 1579</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4729; III Add. 130a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4786; III 170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4962; II 1651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4964; II 1659c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4971; II 1662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4976; II 1665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4994; II 1671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 4998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 5000; III 261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 5093; III 313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 5137; III 357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 5150; III 370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 5154; III 374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 6311; III 2199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 6945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 9697; III 2723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 11674; III 1337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 11552; III 1341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 12418; III 1340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II/III² 13148; III 1338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III 1344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV 854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1 1390</td>
<td></td>
<td>A54</td>
<td>1906:58</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>102, 108</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>76, 77, 108, 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2 472</td>
<td></td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>1906:58</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>102, 108</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>76, 77, 108, 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2 254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>79, 96, 97, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1216–1222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57, 60, 61, 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1223</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63, 120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1227</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 20</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1228</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1229</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 27</td>
<td>48, 57, 63</td>
<td>48, 57, 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1232</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1235</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 44</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1247</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1251</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 10</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1253</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 49</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1254</td>
<td>362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 3</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1257</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 59</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1260</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 32</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1299</td>
<td>XIII 482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 3</td>
<td>57, 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II² 663</td>
<td>CE 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50, 57, 75, 89, 97, 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1305</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II³ 1138</td>
<td>CE 50a</td>
<td>1969:94</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 1306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI4 2131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CE 40</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII Suppl. p. 98f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII Suppl. 303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII Suppl. 739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII Suppl. p. 98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1430 | 1439 | 1441 | 1443 |
|------|-----|-----|---------|-----|------|------|-----|-------|------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| 2038 | 716 |     |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE138|       |        |       | 90    |
| 2040 | 676 |     |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE161|       |        |       | 90    |
| 2060 | 963 |     |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE124|       |        |       | 115   |
| 2068 | 115 |     |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE179|       |        |       | 90    |
| 2077 | 248 |     |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE115|       |        |       | 120   |
| 2078 |     | 117 |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE117|       |        |       | 120   |
| 2079 |     | 151 |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE151|       |        |       | 77,120|
| 2080 |     | 82  |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE82 |       |        |       | 90    |
| 2101 |     | 122 |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE122|       |        |       | 90    |
| 2103 |     | 169 |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE169|       |        |       | 107   |
| 2105 |     | 181 |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE181|       |        |       | 90    |
| 2107 |     | 15  |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE15 |       |        |       | 115,118|
| 2116 |     | 18  |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE18 |       |        |       | 115,118|
| 2117 |     | 122 |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE122|       |        |       | 90    |
| 2119 |     | 169 |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE169|       |        |       | 107   |
| 2120 |     | 151 |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE151|       |        |       | 77,120|
| 2123 |     | 117 |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE117|       |        |       | 90    |
| 2128 |     | 115 |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE115|       |        |       | 107   |
| 2130 |     | 122 |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE122|       |        |       | 107   |
| 2132 | 107 |     |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE107|       |        |       | 108   |
| 2146 | 192 |     |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE192|       |        |       | 90    |
| 2149 | 151 |     |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE151|       |        |       | 107   |
| 2153 |     | 147 |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE147|       |        |       | 107   |
| 2158 |     | 162 |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE162|       |        |       | 117   |
| 2173 |     | 16  |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE16 |       |        |       | 117   |
| 2180 |     | 16  |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE16 |       |        |       | 117   |
| 2181 |     | 325 |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE325|       |        |       | 73    |
| 2610 |     |     |         |     |      |      |     |       | CE73 |       |        |       | 21–5  |

**Notes:**

- VIII 548-551
- X 348 III:2
- XV 426
- XVI 50
- XVI 456
- XVI 732
- XVII 21
- XIX 93

**References:**

- 1962:10
- 1962:12
- 1969:107
- 99, 108–109, 115, 118
- 38
- 93
- 33, 34, 35
- 116
- 117
- 35, 40
- 32
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<tr>
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<td></td>
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<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>32</td>
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<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td>32</td>
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<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 13 20</td>
<td>120 80 120 80</td>
<td>41 41 35 44-45</td>
<td>61 77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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