Divine Images and Human Imaginations in Ancient Greece and Rome

Edited by

Joannis Mylonopoulos

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2010

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Divine images and human imaginations in Ancient Greece and Rome / edited by Joannis Mylonopoulos.
p. cm. – (Religions in the Graeco-Roman world, ISSN 0927-7633 ; v. 170)
Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
ISBN 978-90-04-17930-1 (hardback : alk. paper)
1. Greece–Religion. 2. Rome–Religion. 3. Divine images and cult statues–Greece. 4. Divine images and cult statues–Rome. I. Mylonopoulos, Joannis. II. Title. III. Series.

BL785.D58 2010
292.2'18–dc22

2009041612

ISSN 0927-7633
ISBN 978 90 04 17930 1

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

AR	*Archaeological Reports*
ARV²	J.D. Beazley, *Attic red-figure vase-painters*, 2nd edition, Oxford 1963
CEG	*Carmina epigraphica Graeca*
CIL	*Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*
CMS	*Corpus der minoischen und mykenischen Siegel*, Berlin 1964–
CVA	*Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*
FGrHist	*Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, ed. F. Jacoby, Berlin 1923–1929
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae*
ILLRP	*Inscriptiones Latinae liberae rei publicae*
LGPN	*A lexicon of Greek personal names*, ed. P.M. Fraser – E. Matthews, Oxford 1987–2005
LIMC	*Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae*, Zürich 1981–1999
LSAM	F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*, Paris 1955
LSCG	F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques*, Paris 1969
LSJ	H.G. Liddell – R. Scott – H.S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexikon*, 9th edition, Oxford 1996
LSS	F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplément*, Paris 1962
OGIS	W. Dittenberger, *Orientis Graeci inscriptiones selectae*, 2 vols, Leipzig 1903–1905
Pf	*Callimachus*, 2 vols, ed. R. Pfeiffer, Oxford 1949–1953
RE	*Real-Encyclopaedie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart – Munich 1839–1978
SEG	*Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum*
SH	*Supplementum Hellenisticum*, ed. H. Lloyd-Jones – P. Parsons, Berlin – New York 1983
ThesCRA	*Thesaurus cultus et rituum antiquorum*, Los Angeles 2004–2006
West	*Iambi et Elegi Graeci*, 2 vols, ed. M. West, 2nd edition, Oxford 1989

GREEK PRIESTS AND "CULT STATUES": IN HOW FAR ARE THEY UNNECESSARY?*

Vinciane Pirenne-Delforge

Introduction

The title of this paper, mentioning priesthood, on the one hand, and the image of a god, a so-called cult statue, on the other hand, opens the way to a double problem. In fact, neither the priest[1] nor the image of a god is a necessary intermediary for worshipping the divine world in ancient Greece.[2] Regarding sacrifice, the main part of the ancient ritual practice, anyone may perform it with full powers as long as he respects the local tradition of the community to which he belongs.[3] This ritual leadership merely implies a certain authority and, if animal sacrifice is at stake, economic power. The leader of the procedure may be the head of the house, of the family, of a local community, or of a specific group of society. On the other hand, a divine image is an optional accessory in a sanctuary, in contrast with the altar, which is at the centre of the communication with the gods because of its role during any sacrificial procedure.

Be that as it may, priests and statues are omnipresent within the religious life of every Greek city. When they are attested, their role is significant enough to justify a civic interest in priestly office and also, though to a lesser degree, in the installation or conservation of divine images within sanctuaries. Thus, it would be untenable to sustain the view that priests and statues are unimportant components of ancient religious life because they are somehow "unnecessary".

---

* I would like to warmly thank Joannis Mylonopoulos for inviting me to present this paper at the Erfurt conference in July 2007.

[1] I use the term "priest" as the English translation of the Greek *hiereus* and "priestess" as the translation of the Greek *hiereia* throughout this paper. I do not take into account the cult-personal as a whole.

[2] *e.g.* Burkert 1985, 88–92 and 95–98 and Price 1999, 67–76.

[3] Herodotos (1.132) gives an *a contrario* definition of Greek sacrifice in describing Persian practice. He underlines the fact that the Persians must call on a *magus* for each sacrifice, implicitly placing this in contrast with the Greek situation.

This paper will support the assumption that priests and statues are, in their respective agency, efficient tools for human communication with the divine sphere. Understanding more deeply and comparing aspects of this agency might help us to grasp some aspects of the Greek representation of the divine.

A sacerdotal profile

The nature of the Greek priesthood has been deeply questioned for some years, based in part on the old assumption that Greek cults were a mere expression of civic life and, consequently, that the Greek priest had simply to be labelled a "civic magistrate". Various facts support this assertion. The Greek priesthood seems to be embedded within the secular life of the Greek polis. Also, Greek priests seem to lack expertise, they certainly lack dogma and they do not form a homogeneous group. All these ideas have been heavily supported since the nineteenth century, mainly in order to show how different the Greek priesthood was from its Christian counterpart.[4] The fear of an anachronistic reconstruction of a polytheistic religion has certainly played a major part in that evaluation. Another explanation is the prevalent sociological perspective that has concentrated its analysis on the "polis-controlled-religion" or on ritual as self-oriented practice without taking into account its recipients.[5] I will return to this point later.

Some qualification of such assumptions has recently been proposed. On a human level, real authority is surely implied by the office, as attested by many inscriptions regulating the appointment of priests or by the prestige linked to priestly status even after the term of office.[6] B. Dignas has also underlined the importance of income related to priesthood. "Priesthood is about receiving priestly shares", she writes in her dissertation.[7] As divine and priestly shares produced by sacrifices are often proportional or even identical, a kind of symbolic link must have existed between the priest and the god whose cult he serves. Our main difficulty is to eval-

[4] Martha 1882, 8–10; Legrand 1911, 936; qualifications in Woodhouse 1918 and Gschnitzer 1989. Brief presentation of the problem in Price 1999, 67–69.

[5] *Cf.* Sourvinou-Inwood 1988 and Sourvinou-Inwood 1990 (= 2000); criticism in Dignas 2003, 35–36 and Connelly 2007, introduction.

[6] Price 1999, 70; Dignas 2003; Stavrianopoulou 2005b.

[7] Dignas 2002, 249. *Cf.* also Dignas 2003.

uate the nature of such a link, that is to say the nature of that specific interaction between the human and the divine sphere.[8]

Before returning to this issue, let us bear in mind that priesthood is not a general status, even for the priests in Plato's ideal city.[9] In Greek cities, to be a priest or priestess implies a particular service of a specific god in a defined sanctuary, often for a limited term. Some epigraphic records attest to the obligation of the priest's intervention if a sacrifice is performed within the sanctuary he serves, be the ritual private or official. A qualification is to be made if the priest is absent.[10] In the Amphiareion of Oropos, for instance, the priest prays and puts down the *hiera* on the altar, when he is present. If the priest is not present, the leader of the sacrifice may proceed himself with his own *hiera*, but every public performance requires the action of the priest.[11] Epigraphic evidence regarding priesthood shows that the priest's agency is expected as soon as a ritual act is performed in order to honour the deity he serves on behalf of the whole community.[12] On the one hand, this illustrates the fact that "the polis anchored, legitimated, and mediated all religious activity".[13] On the other hand, a city searching for communication with deities needs to use the mediation of *one* voice during the prayer and of *one* efficient gesture when divine parts are set up on the altar.[14]

In public cults, for which servants are elected or chosen by lot,[15] this intermediary status of the priest or priestess is underlined by the procedure of the appointment itself. He or she is an emanation of the civic body. Even when priesthood is purchased, the sacerdotal profile is clearly

---

[8] *Cf.* Dignas 2002, 246–271; Pirenne-Delforge 2005; Motte 2005; Georgoudi – Pirenne-Delforge 2006; Connelly 2007, introduction and *passim*.

[9] Plat. *Leg.* 759a–d. *Cf.* Plat. *Plt.* 290c–e; Arist. *Pol.* 1299a14–20. For these philosophers, however, priests are a specific category of state officers. *Cf.* also Dignas 2003 regarding the specific dignity of priests who are no longer in charge in Rhodes.

[10] *LSS* 129 = Graf 1985, Chios no. 4 (fifth century BCE). *Cf.* Sourvinou-Inwood 1988 (= 2000, 39–40).

[11] *I.Oropos* 277 = *IG* VII 235 = *LSCG* 69 (fourth century BCE).

[12] *e.g. SEG* 44, 904 = Merkelbach – Stauber 1998, 01/01/10 (Knidos, fourth century BCE); *LSS* 94 (Rhodes, third century BCE); *LSAM* 48 (Miletos, 276/5 BCE).

[13] Sourvinou-Inwood 1990 (= 2000, 15).

[14] *Cf.* Porph. *De abst.* 4.22.7, who makes a distinction between offerings ἐν κοινῷ following tradition and private offerings κατὰ δύναμιν.—In his ideal city, Plato (*Leg.* 909d–e) emphasises the status of priests and priestesses by making their intervention absolutely necessary when any sacrifice is to be performed.

[15] On different modes of appointing priesthood, see Martha 1882, 24–33; Turner 1983; Wörrle 1990.

defined in order to be sure that the male or female candidate will be efficient in establishing a link between the city and the god or the goddess he or she will serve in a specific sanctuary. Some particular rules are often specified.[16] As far as patrimonial priesthoods are concerned, time and tradition are key references to validating an efficient mediation, which can be reinforced by a specific area of expertise, as in the case of mystery cults like in Eleusis.[17] But even in this case, the official cult status implies a civic profile for holding priesthood.[18] When a city hesitates regarding the best procedure to follow for appointing a priest or a priestess, an oracular sanction has to be delivered.[19] When a public cult requires specific ritual expertise, as in the case of Egyptian deities for whom an Egyptian intervention is expected, the priest appointed by the city remains the prevalent authority within the sanctuary.[20]

Notions of mediation and mediator seem to be an adequate way of describing the position of a priest within a Greek city.[21] Nevertheless, they have recently been discussed and their validity, as conceptual tools for studying priesthood in a comparative perspective, denied. This stands in comparison with the notion of social control, which would more adequately support a comparative study between different religious fields.[22] Without opening a broad theoretical debate on the subject, I would like

[16] On the sale of priesthood, see Segre 1936 and Segre 1937; Parker – Obbink 2000 and Parker – Obbink 2001; Wiemer 2003.—In 44 CE, the Roman proconsul Paullus Fabius Persicus issued an edict to the city of Ephesos in order to reorganize temple finances (*I.Ephesos* Ia, 18b). Among many considerations, he complains (l. 16–18) that "they … sell the priesthoods as if it were an auction, and they call together men of all types to buy them and do not choose the most appropriate candidates, who would deserve to wear the crown (οὐκ ἐγλέγονται τούς ἐπιτηδειοτάτους, ὧν ταῖς κεφαλαῖς ὁ πρέπων ἐπιτεθήσεται στέφανος)". Translation and commentary in Dignas 2002, 150–151. *Cf.* Stavrianopoulou 2005b, 226–227.

[17] Aleshire 1994.

[18] Sourvinou-Inwood 1988 (= 2000, 41).

[19] A wonderful example appears in Wörrle 1990.

[20] *LSAM* 36 l. 9–17 and 20–25, with commentary by Stavrianopoulou 2005a.

[21] Supported by Beard – North 1990, part. 6–9, and extensively used by Sourvinou-Inwood 1988 (= 2000, 38–42), who insists on a double mediation: the symbolic one assumed by the priest between men and gods, and the authority of the community (polis), which determined the form of the relationship between man and god.

[22] Rüpke 1996, 245–246, arguing that "mediation is a central feature of the Christian concept of priest", which presupposes an individual relationship between God (gods) and man. He strongly supports the notion of "social control" instead of the concept of "mediation" because "*Religionswissenschaft* can analyse its objects, religions, only as

to keep these terms available for thinking about priesthood in a vertical perspective, as far as communication between spheres is concerned. On a horizontal level, the question of a social control of symbols may also be interesting to address. A public sacrifice performed on behalf of a city is a social occasion that underlines many social roles among the actors, and religious agents act for the proper working of the ritual system, giving "horizontal" messages in this direction. But public religious rituals are also an occasion to establish communication between the city and the deity of a specific sanctuary,[23] be it the sacrificial procedure or, for instance, rituals involving the manipulation of a statue, as we will see below. Vertical and horizontal communications are not mutually exclusive. Despite the fact that, for us, Greek deities do not have any real existence, they are an essential part of the relationship created by ritual from an insider's point of view. Studying Greek religion without taking this into account reduces dramatically the possibility of understanding the system in its complexity.

Accordingly, analysing the priest-god-relationship in Greece implies the restoring of something other than civic duties or social control, even though these features are not negligible. The simple fact that women are engaged in this type of religious obligation, while only men could hold civic office and enjoy full political rights, shows that other implications are at stake, notably the presumed expectations of the cult-recipient.[24] Merely arguing the power of gender, which would imply a strict analogy between sacred servant and deity, is partly true but is also contradicted by a large amount of epigraphic evidence.[25] We have rather to look elsewhere, especially at the relationship that links a *hiereus* or a *hiereia* with *hiera*, be it during the sacrificial procedure and then in evaluating the sacrificial income or when the priest has something to do with the god's image, the so-called cult statue.

---

systems of social actions or, paying more attention to the cognitive dimension, as systems of symbols." Therefore, religious specialists, in a comparative perspective, are examples of control for stabilising the symbolic universe.

[23] Bremmer 1996; Graf 2002, on sacrifice as "a chain of signs for communication"; Mylonopoulos 2006, 73–76.

[24] Sourvinou-Inwood 1995, 114–116; Georgoudi 2003; Georgoudi 2005; Connelly 2007, part. 1–6. *Cf*. Martha 1882, 20–23.

[25] Hupfloher 2000, 220–221.

A 'cult statue': what is this supposed to be?[26]

In Aristophanes' *Peace*, when Trygaios wants to restore in his city the goddess who gives her name to the play, he speaks of the goddess' "installation" with pots of green-stuff before finally choosing a sheep and sacrificing it.[27] The *scholia* to this passage explain that a god might be set up by boiling cereals in pots or by choosing a more expensive offering. The expression used to designate the procedure is: "setting up with an ox, a goat, or small cattle". As usual in such cases, different scholiasts and lexicographers give very similar versions of this comment. The *Suda* offers a more elaborate explanation than the others, saying that the setting up of statues and altars and the cooking of green-stuff in pots aim at recalling the first human alimentation. We are also told that a lost play of Aristophanes put on stage a character calling to witness "the pots of the Herkeios by which this altar had been set up" (*i.e.* the altar near which he was swearing the oath). It was possible to offer more expensive animals, but in order to go on faster and not to delay the setting up of pillars before a door or other installation of this type pots of green-stuff are used.[28] "Setting up with pots" is therefore a cheap and fast procedure, which is a structural equivalent of a sacrificial procedure involving an animal. The lexicographers also attest that the same procedures are reserved for statues and for altars. Evoking in Greek the ceremonial setting up of an altar or of a divine image implies therefore the semantic area of *hidryein, hidryesthai, hidrysis*. The verb insists on the foundation and gives us a first key to defining a "cult statue". Even if no Greek word does exactly correspond to such a translation, a "cult statue" is a statue, which has been set up in a community.[29] Two textual passages confirm

---

[26] The argument is summarised here from a longer study in French: Pirenne-Delforge 2008a.

[27] Aristoph. *Pax* 922–924: OI. Ἄγε δή, τί νῷν ἐντευθενὶ ποητέον; | TP. Τί δ' ἄλλο γ' ἢ ταύτην χύτραις ἱδρυτέον; | OI. Χύτραισιν, ὥσπερ μεμφόμενον Ἑρμῆδιον;.

[28] *Suda* s.v. Χύτραις ἱδρυτέον (Adler IV, 1935, 836): Ἀριστοφάνης· τί δ' ἄλλο γ', ἢ ταύτην χύτραις ἱδρυτέον; τουτέστι τὴν εἰρήνην· ὁπότε γὰρ μέλλοιεν βωμοὺς καθιδρύειν ἢ ἀγάλματα θεοῦ, ἕψοντες ὄσπρια ἀπήρχοντο τούτων τοῖς ἀφιδρυμένοις, χαριστήρια ἀπονέμοντες τῆς πρώτης διαίτης. Ἀριστοφάνης Δαναΐσι· μαρτύρομαι δὲ Ζηνὸς Ἑρκείου χύτρας, μεθ' ὧν ὁ βωμὸς οὗτος ἱδρύσθη ποτέ. ἔστι δ' ὅτε καὶ πολυτελεστέρῳ ἱερείῳ ἀφιδρύοντο. ἑρμᾶς δὲ ἱδρύοντες πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ ἱδρύματα, ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ βραδύνειν τὴν ἀνάστασιν, χύτραις ἀθάρας ἱδρύεσθαι. μεμφόμενοι δὲ ὡς πολυτίμητον οὖσαν ἄλλαις ἱερωσύναις αὐτὴν ἱδρύσαντο. ὡς οἱ μὲν νέφος ἐχθρὸν ἀπωσάμενοι πολέμοιο, εἰρήνην εἵλοντο, ἱδρύσανθ' ἱερείῳ. ὡς τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ χύτραισιν ἱδρυμένου.

[29] *Contra* any use of the term: Donohue 1997.

this assumption. In *Iphigenia in Tauris*, Euripides shows Orestes led by Apollon and searching for the old image of Artemis. Once arrived in Tauris, he explains to the priestess, who is his own sister that "Phoebus cried out a golden voice from the tripod, and sent me here, to get the image Zeus hurled down, and set it up in Athena's land".[30] The statue is a miraculous object, but Apollon's order aims at giving it a specific rooting, that is to say that it will be transformed into a "cult statue". On the other hand, an inscription from Pergamon, dating to the second century BCE, grants Asklepios' priesthood to the cult-founder's son and his descendants. The regulation explicitly refers to the priesthood of Asklepios "and of the other gods 'installed' in the Asklepieion".[31] We are not told whether that means altars or statues, but this surely implies a close association between the sanctuary's "owner" and the other gods who are partaking of the honours of the worshippers. That is the very meaning of the *hidrysis*, be it presented on the tragic stage or in an epigraphic prescription.

Orestes does not describe the precise ritual he will perform in order to "install" Artemis' statue in Athens, but Aristophanes' pots and sheep imply that sacrificial offering, with animal slaughter or mere vegetable, was the concrete content of this *hidrysis*. As we can deduce for many other aspects of Greek cult, there is no universal rule applied to such a foundation. But what does such a *hidrysis* mean for the worshippers? Is it a "consecration" and, in this case, what is the difference between what is implied by that precise semantic area, which would be different from the action performed in the sphere of the *anathemata*, another form of "consecration"?[32]

In order to address this question, it would be useful to call to mind some general considerations about the Greek representation of the divine world. There is no theological definition of what a Greek god is, except for the double assumption of immortality and power.[33] This power is

[30] Eurip. *IT* 976–978: ἐντεῦθεν αὐδὴν τρίποδος ἐκ χρυσοῦ λακὼν | Φοῖβός μ' ἔπεμψε δεῦρο, διοπετὲς λαβεῖν | ἄγαλμ' Ἀθηνῶν τ' ἐγκαθιδρῦσαι χθονί.

[31] *LSAM* 13 l. 7–10: τὴν μὲν ἱερωσύνην | τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν τῶν ἐν τῶι | Ἀσκληπιείωι ἱδρυμένων εἶναι Ἀσκληπιάδου | τοῦ Ἀ[ρχί]ου καὶ τῶν ἀπογόνων τῶν Ἀσκληπιάδου, κτλ.

[32] For a range of hypotheses on this subject, see: Bettinetti 2001, 7; Graf 2001, 230; Linand de Bellefonds *et al.* 2004, 418. *Cf.* Gladigow 1985–1986 and Gladigow 1990.

[33] A. Henrichs, "What is a Greek god?", a paper delivered at the conference *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformation*, Edinburgh, 1–4 November 2007 (forthcoming). He adds anthropomorphism to the list. This third characteristic is not as essential to defining a god as the others.

closely connected to the idea of honour: Greek gods need to receive honours from humans, their *time*, to be and feel completely divine.[34] On a mythical level, the Hesiodic succession story specifies different modalities of attribution of such *time* to each deity.[35] This attribution is put into real practice on a cultic level, when historical cities pay homage to their gods. At a local level, some stories recall that powerful gods had struggled in the past to become the main deity of a city. The opposition of Athena and Poseidon in Athens is well known.[36] There are other examples of divine disputes of a bygone and founding age for the cities.[37]

The Greek words used to designate such procedures are very significant: be it a sanctuary, an altar or a statue, the *hidrysis* refers to the installation of a deity among humans. It aims to integrate the god within a city or some other community and to create good conditions for receiving the benefits of his divine benevolence. Defining a sacred place is important and the very name of *hieron* underlines this, but the semantic area of 'installation' and 'foundation' adds another dimension to the relationship with the divine sphere: the very first occasion of communication. *Hidrysis* implies the opening of all the future honours to be reserved for the divine recipient. The well-known inscription of Magnesia on the Maeander about the re-installation of Artemis' *xoanon* in its new sanctuary is a good example of such a situation.[38] The *kathidrysis* of Artemis Leukophryene is defined by a sacrifice that is as beautiful as possible, and the anniversary of this ritual will be celebrated every year under the name of *Isiteria*, "day of the inaugural celebrations." The first celebration held on the sixth of Artemision sets up Artemis' statue by assuring the goddess of the future honours she will receive from the inhabitants of Magnesia.

In the context of this setting up, local prescriptions certainly prevailed, but we are never told what was concretely done, except for the *hidrysis* of the token of Zeus Ktesios, in a poor-quality fragment from an Athenian *Exegetikon* preserved by Athenaios.[39] In order to define what a "kadiskos" is, Athenaios refers to a vessel used to set up the Zeus Ktesios, just before

[34] Rudhardt 1981, 227–244.
[35] Hes. *Theog. passim*.
[36] Eurip. *Phoen*. 854; Hdt. 8.55; Paus. 1.26.5.
[37] Paus. 2.15.5 (Argos); 2.30.6 (Troezen).
[38] *LSAM* 33.
[39] Ath. 11.473b–c: ἀγγεῖον δ' ἐστὶν ἐν ᾧ τοὺς κτησίους Δίας ἐγκαθιδρύουσιν, ὡς Ἀντικλείδης φησὶν ἐν τῷ Ἐξηγητικῷ γράφων οὕτως (*FGrHist* 140 F 22 Jacoby and 353 F 1 Jacoby under Autokleides' name): "Διὸς κτησίου σημεῖα ἱδρύεσθαι χρὴ ὧδε …" *Cf.* Jaillard 2004, 873–874; Parker 2005, 15–16; Pirenne-Delforge 2008a.

producing the fragment that gives the ritual receipt to establish, as he writes, "the *semeia* of Zeus Ktesios". Without giving all the details of this text, one may insist on the fact that the *semeia*, the symbols, the tokens of the god are established by a ritual manipulation, paving the way to all the other ritual actions in honour of the god.

The *hidrysis* of a god, be it his altar or his image, establishes the time of veneration in a community, the very first time that the god is assured that his *time* will be respected in the future. It is for this reason that sacrifice, the very core of the Greek honours, is often at stake in the *hidrysis*. On the other hand, the use of the term *semeion* linked with the *hidrysis* of Zeus Ktesios shows how a ritual can contribute to identifying the god, not only in an oral performance, but also in the use of concrete symbols. These symbols point to the specific identity of the god whose benevolence is expected. That is the "non-verbal address", closely associated with the gestures and the objects used in that context. When a specific statue has been created for a particular sanctuary, divine attributes can also refer to such identification.[40]

The foundation, the ceremonial setting up of an altar or a statue—both of them have to be joined in the reflexion[41]—aims at good communication between the community of the worshippers and the worshipped god. The god has to be sure of being regularly honoured and the community has to be sure of being protected. Altars and statues, when set up in a traditional specific process, are efficient places for such a potential mediation. The *hidrysis* does not transform a statue into a god—as shown by the similarity with the setting up of the altar—but creates the positive conditions for an interaction between the human and divine sphere by the mediation of an object. It is for this reason that an anthropomorphic representation is often at stake but this is not necessarily the rule. An "installed" *agalma*, whatever its form, is a beautiful present that has been "activated".

Just as Hesiod depicts gods needing human honours to feel fully their divine nature, an image of a god requires human honours to become what we call a "cult statue". In a public sanctuary, where many godlike images can be displayed, the setting up of one—or more than one—statue refers to an official decision, just like in Magnesia on the Maeander. In this case, we may be authorised to use the term "cult statue". On a

[40] For a more detailed examination of this question, with other examples, see Pirenne-Delforge 2008a. See also Joannis Mylonopoulos' article in the present volume.

[41] On the epiphanic potentiality of altars, see Pironti forthcoming.

domestic level, as attested by the Zeus Ktesios depicted by Athenaios, the ritual operation can be the same, to "activate" the *semeia* of a god. It is for this reason that I would not be as strict as some scholars, who have recommended the eradication of the notion of "cult statue" from our scientific vocabulary. There is a difference between a 'cult statue' and an *anathema* in a sanctuary, even though both of them are divine images. That very difference is the *hidrysis*, the setting up, which officially creates the conditions of the god's benevolence and protection for the community. On a private level, however, any worshipper in a sanctuary may give preference to any statue representing the deity to whom he or she wants to pray, whatever status this image assumes within this sanctuary. One can easily imagine a personal devotion to an *anathema* in the form of a human size divine statue. In this peculiar case, the *anathema* becomes a cult statue in a very loose sense.[42] Nevertheless, it seems to be more useful to maintain the expression to identify a statue officially set up in a public sanctuary. Structurally, this object is not so different from an altar, for which *hidrysis* is also attested.

At this point, both priesthood and cult statue, as defined above, appear in the role of a potential mediator between human and divine sphere, principally in a public and official context. Let us try to identify more closely such a mediation.

Priest, statue, and the representation of the divine

The link between the priest and the god *via* the image of the god can be studied along two lines: ritual action performed with a statue or occasional *mimesis* between the priest and the god. Let us start with the second point.[43]

One of the best examples of such a *mimesis* is found in a Hellenistic war episode between Aitolians and the city of Pellene, transmitted by Polyainos.[44] The priestess of Athena was the most beautiful and the tallest of all the girls in the city. As usual, on a given day, she was in full armour with a helmet. Seeing the girl coming out of the temple, the enemies were

[42] This sense is advocated by Scheer 2000, 143–146.
[43] Useful elements can be found in Connelly 2007, 104–115.
[44] Polyainos, *Strat*. 8.59.

persuaded that Athena herself was helping the city of Pellene. Therefore, they ran away before gazing upon her for too long. There are variations on that theme in literary evidence, but Polyainos is interestingly connecting the likeliness of the priestess with the goddess, such a *mimesis* being constructed for a fixed ritual about which we know nothing else.

In Pausanias, we read that, in the procession in honour of Diana/Artemis at Patrai, the maiden officiating as priestess rides on a chariot drawn by deer, probably constructing an epiphanic image of Artemis herself.[45] Such a hypothesis can be sustained by the reference to Antheia, the fictional heroine of Xenophon of Ephesos, exact contemporary of Pausanias.[46] Antheia is not labelled as a priestess in the text but is chosen to walk in the first line of the procession with a fawn skin and a quiver hanging down from her shoulders, with a bow, a javelin, and dogs running at her heels. This situation constructs a pattern similar to the procession at Patrai. This type of ceremonial elaboration finds a well-known parallel in the scenario planned by Peisistratos in coming back to Athens after his first period of exile. The tale is found in Herodotos and Aristoteles.[47] There was in an Attic deme a woman called Phye, which in Greek means "fine growth, noble stature". She was very tall and well formed. Peisistratos and Megakles equipped her in full armour and put her in a chariot, giving her the correct attitude (*schema*) to make the most impressive spectacle, and so she drove into the city. Heralds had to proclaim that Athena herself was bringing Peisistratos back to her own acropolis. Even if Herodotos finds the tale incredible because of the supposed cleverness of the Athenians, he explains that the townsfolk believed that the woman was the goddess and that they worshipped this human creature.

Whether such a plan to deceive the Athenians is real or fictional, it shows how anthropomorphism works and what an ancient man sees when he sees a god, to quote the title of an article of H. Versnel on that subject.[48] The keyword of the text is the word *schema* because it could refer to the goddess statue. The *schema* is, among other significations, one of the Greek ways of designating the attitude given by the sculptor

[45] Paus. 7.18.12.

[46] Xen. Eph. 1.2.5–7.

[47] Hdt. 1.60: ταύτην τὴν γυναῖκα σκευάσαντες πανοπλίῃ, ἐς ἅρμα ἐσβιβάσαντες καὶ προδέξαντες σχῆμα οἷόν τι ἔμελλε εὐπρεπέστατον φανέεσθαι ἔχουσα; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 14.4: τὴν θεὸν ἀπομιμησάμενος τῷ κόσμῳ. On the manipulation and its cultural background, see Connor 1987 = 2000, 60–68 and Blok 2000.

[48] Versnel 1987.

to his creation.[49] As far as Athena is concerned, the full armour, be it in Pellene or in Athens, easily calls to mind specific attributes pointing to that specific goddess. The *schema* must refer to the way of possessing these attributes. Another story, rarely connected to that point, is told by Athenaios. It concerns the trial of Phryne, the courtesan loved by Praxiteles. Accused of profaning the Eleusinian mysteries, Phryne was defended by another of her lovers, the orator Hypereides. When it seemed as if the verdict would be unfavourable, Hypereides tore open her robe and displayed her breast, so that "he caused the judges to feel superstitious fear (*deisidaimonesai*) of this handmaid and ministrant (*hypophetis kai zakoros*) of Aphrodite, and indulging their feeling of compassion, they refrained from putting her to death".[50]

Once more, even though the story might be fictional, it is interesting to see that it closely connects, firstly, a goddess, Aphrodite; secondly, a human whose attributes are godlike and whose close association to the goddess is underlined by a sacerdotal vocabulary; and, finally, a statue, *i.e.* the naked Aphrodite carved by Praxiteles and for which Phryne is thought to have been the model.[51] The judges' change of heart was not simply founded on the girl's exceptional beauty. They acquitted her because such a beauty was seen as a mark of divine favour, full of epiphanic potentialities. A last female example: at Tegea, in a ritual context once a year, the priestess pretending to be Artemis would chase after a man pretending to be Leimon, the son of the eponym king Tegeates.[52] This ritual re-enacted during the festival—metaphorically we hope—the punishment of Leimon, who had killed his brother and was put to death by the goddess herself.

On the male priest's side, we do not have so much evidence. Nevertheless, the example of the servant of Heracles on Kos is explicit in the *Greek questions* of Plutarch. The question is: "why is it that, among the Koans, the priest of Herakles at Antimacheia dons a woman's garb, and fastens upon his head a woman's head-dress at the beginning of the sac-

[49] *e.g.* Paus. 3.10.8; 4.31.7; 7.27.4.

[50] Athen. 13.590e: ὁ δὲ Ὑπερείδης συναγορεύων τῇ Φρύνῃ, ὡς οὐδὲν ἤνυε λέγων ἐπίδοξοί τε ἦσαν οἱ δικασταὶ κατα ψηφιούμενοι, παραγαγὼν αὐτὴν εἰς τοὐμφανὲς καὶ περιρήξας τοὺς χιτωνίσκους γυμνά τε τὰ στέρνα ποιήσας τοὺς ἐπιλογικοὺς οἴκτους ἐκ τῆς ὄψεως αὐτῆς ἐπερρητόρευσεν δεισιδαιμονῆσαί τε ἐποίησεν τοὺς δικαστὰς τὴν ὑποφῆτιν καὶ ζάκορον Ἀφροδίτης ἐλέῳ χαρισαμένους μὴ ἀποκτεῖναι (Translation C.B. Gulick). *Cf.* Cooper 1995.

[51] See Stewart 1997, 104–106.

[52] Paus. 8.53.3. *Cf.* Jost 1985, 483–484.

rifice?"[53] Coming back from Troy, Herakles encountered a storm. When his other ships had been destroyed, he was driven in the only remaining one by the gale to Kos. He was cast ashore and finally a mighty battle was engaged in between the Greeks and the Meropes, the inhabitants of Kos. Being exhausted by the multitude of his adversaries, Herakles fled to the house of a Thracian woman and took a feminine garment to escape detection. Later, when he had overcome the Meropes in another encounter, and had been purified, he married the Thracian woman and assumed a flowered garment. "Wherefore", concludes Plutarch, "the priest sacrifices on the spot where it came about that the battle was fought, and bridegrooms wear feminine raiment when they welcome their brides". As usual in the *Roman* or *Greek Questions* of Plutarch, the aetiological tale does not exactly match the point. On the one hand, Plutarch does not refer to the priestly dress, but only to the bridegroom's garment (*stole*). On the other hand, the sacrifice merely appears in association with battle because of the spot where the ritual takes place. Martial and marital patterns seem to be artificially connected but, even if Plutarch does not say so explicitly, when the priest begins the sacrifice, his garment seems to point to Herakles himself.

As far as epigraphic evidence is concerned, we sometimes find explicit guidelines to prevent worshippers from offending the god or the goddess by wearing inadequate clothes in his or her sanctuary.[54] Moreover, so-called sacred laws display a large number of requirements for priestly ritual dress or even priestly everyday garments.[55] The requirements for worshippers may be connected with ritual purity or aimed at preventing ostentation. Purity is also a priestly concern found in inscriptions but, in that case, ostentation does not necessarily imply a similar restriction. Priestly dress was often associated with symbols of power, as were the colour purple, a sceptre, a wreath, and golden jewellery. Homeric poems describe kings and priests alone as "honoured among the people as a god".[56] Priestly dress does not necessarily imply, strictly speaking, a divine identification. However, the connection with divine power could be called to mind when the priest or priestess was appearing with a specific garment during the feast of the god he or she served. The priest

[53] Plut. *mor*. 304b–e (Translation F.C. Babbitt).

[54] *e.g. LSCG* 65 l. 14–26 (*cf*. Deshours 2006). *Cf*. Mills 1984, 258–262.

[55] Some evidence is collected in Georgoudi – Pirenne-Delforge 2006, 29–31; Connelly 2007, 90–92.

[56] Kings: Hom. *Il*. 10.33. 11.58. 13.218; priests: Hom. *Il*. 5.76–78. 16.603–605. *Cf*. Connelly 2007, 105.

could appear as a god, by virtue of the Greek anthropomorphic divine look. Moreover, divine epiphany always had an element of virtuality.

At the level of the representations, to which a large part of this literary evidence belongs, we are told that priests and priestesses may be intermittent vectors of divine manifestation, just as cult statues may be too. This does not imply that each ritual theatrically activates this virtuality, as epigraphic evidence demonstrates. But such virtuality, on the one hand, and specific attributes, on the other hand confirm that they are powerful instances of mediation and ritual communication.[57]

Priestly perquisites are also a good indication of such a mediation, which would need a deeper analysis than the present paper is able to propose. Let us simply underline the fact that some epigraphic regulations explicitly assimilate to the priestly share the offerings placed on the holy table next to the altar.[58] In Chios, the entrails put into the statue's hands or onto its knees are also given to the priest.[59] As far as income is concerned, we are well aware of where all these items are destined. As far as ritual action is concerned, all these items are offerings to the god and this should not be forgotten. Economic considerations are not the whole picture, just as a divine appearance in a festival is not simply a theatrical component based on a particular garment. From a religious point of view, when an offering remains unburnt and is given to the priest, the priest stays in the middle ground between the divine (because he has received divine meat) and the human condition (because he is eating). It is for this reason that we read in the *Oneirokritikon* of Artemidoros "robbing a temple or stealing the votive offerings of the gods indicates bad luck for everyone, except for priests and prophets. This is because custom allows them to take the offerings to the gods and thus, in a certain sense, they are supported by the gods".[60] If we agree that the occasion of a sacrifice is one of the most efficient times of communication between both the human and divine spheres, priests and priestesses are situated at the core of this interaction, particularly when the whole community is involved: they put

[57] An interesting comparison might be found in Rome, see Scheid 1986.

[58] *LSAM* 48 l. 15–18 (Dionysos. Miletos, 276/5 BCE): διδότω γέρη τῆι ἱερείαι … ἱερὰμ μοῖραν …; *LSAM* 24 l. 23–25 (Asklepios. Erythrai, 380/360 BCE): ὅσα δὲ ἐπὶ [τὴν] | τράπεζαν παρατεθῇ ταῦτα εἶναι γέ|ρα τῷ ἱρεῖ. On the *trapezomata*, see Gill 1974 and Gill 1991.

[59] *LSCG* 119 l. 3–7 = Graf 1985, Chios no. 5 (Herakles. fourth century BCE): γλώσσας καὶ σπλάγ|χνα, τὰ εἰς χεῖρας καὶ μερίδ|α δίκρεων καὶ τὰ δέρματ[α]; *LSS* 78 l. 4–8 (unknown deity. 2nd century BC): τῶι ἵρ|εωι γίνεσθαι σπλ|άγχνα, τὰ ἐς γόν|ατα καὶ γλάσσαι | καὶ γέρας. *Cf.* Le Guen-Pollet 1991, 15–17 with further references.

[60] Artemid. *Oneirokritikon* 3.3.2.

the *hiera* on the altar whilst saying a prayer and they may receive some animal parts to set out on a table. They are active mediators in transforming some animal parts into smoke for the gods.

A Hellenistic inscription from Kos regulating the purchase of the priesthood of Dionysos Thyllophoros[61] attests to this agency, related to any animal offering. The honorific parts (γέρη) received by the priestess when an animal was sacrificed are described. If these *gere* are not given, the regulation stipulates that "the *hiera* will be ἄθυτα", the elements situated at the core of the sacred operation will therefore stay "unsacrificed".[62] Interpreting this expression is not self-evident: this could mean either that the divine part will not be burnt at all or that, even if it is burnt, this part will not produce the effect expected by the sacrificial procedure, that is to say an efficient communication with Dionysos. The solution depends on sacrificial timing connected to the practicalities of how the meat was divided and distributed: when were the *gere* given to a priest? In the fourth *mimiambos* of Herodas, two women sacrificing to Asklepios on Kos offer a rooster to the god and give his honorific part to the *neokoros* at the very end of the sacrificial procedure just before leaving the sanctuary.[63] If the timing had been the same for Dionysos Thyllophoros on Kos, the benefits of the procedure would have been annihilated even if the god's part had been burnt because his priestess' interests would have been injured. Whichever of the two solutions is correct, the regulation outlines an interesting relationship between the divine part burnt on the altar and the priestly share to be given by each sacrificer. Such an agency and parallelism might explain why priests are also the most frequent recipients of cooked or even raw meat displayed for the gods, as much as they are of cakes and different foods, as seen earlier. Aristophanes confirms this fact on a comic level with a very significant technical vocabulary. In *Ploutos*, the priest of Asklepios takes unburnt cakes from the altars and other pastries and figs from the sacred *trapeza*; putting them in his bag, he "consecrates" them (ἁγίζειν).[64] The verb plays with the technical term καθαγίζειν, which means combustion within sacrificial fire.[65]

---

[61] *I.Cos* ED 216 (= former version of *LSCG* 166 dated in the second / first century BCE).

[62] Lines 10–12: … τᾶι δὲ μὴ ἀποδούσαι τὰ γέρη ὡς γέγραπτ[αι | τ]ὰ ἱερὰ ἔστω{ι} ἄθυτα. ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν βωμὸν ἐπιβαλλέτω πά|[σ]αις τὰ ἱερὰ ἃ ἱέρη ἢ ἃ ὑφιέρεια ἄν κα ἀποδε[ίξ]ῃ ἃ ἱέρη.

[63] Herod. *Mimiambi* 4.88–90.

[64] Aristoph. *Plut*. 676–681.

[65] Rudhardt 1992, 236–238; Casabona 1966, 200–204.

The second line of this point about the link between priest and god is the ritual action performed with a statue, and here the question of divine power and honour re-emerges. Let us go again to Pellene, where the Aitolian soldiers were seized by panic in front of the priestess of Athena. Plutarch, in his *Life of Aratos*,[66] tells more or less the same story in two different episodes. A captive woman, conspicuous for her beauty and stateliness of person, had been placed in the sanctuary of Artemis. The captain had seized her for his prize and set his three-crested helmet upon her head—a way to show that the girl was his own. When she ran forth to view the tumult outside the Artemision, she seemed to the citizens a divine vision, while the enemy thought they saw an epiphany and were struck with amazement and terror.

Afterwards, Plutarch presents a version by the Pellenians themselves, without saying where he had found the preceding tale. The statue of the goddess usually stood untouched. Even if Plutarch does not identify the goddess, we may presume that it was Artemis whose sanctuary he had mentioned just before. When the statue was removed by the priestess and carried forth from the temple, no man looked upon it, but all turned their gaze away. The statue was dangerous to human beings, but also to trees and plants. During the battle against the Aitolians, the priestess carried the image forth from the temple and by always turning it in the faces of the Aitolians she made them crazy.

Accordingly, Plutarch tells the same story twice. There is a structural equivalence between the fear of the army facing the epiphany of the alleged goddess with the helmet and the madness of the same soldiers caused by the priestess holding the powerful *bretas* of Artemis. As regards Polyainos' story presented earlier, it combines all the patterns: the beautiful girl resembling a goddess, the priestess causing fear and even madness in the Aitolian rows, the sudden divine appearance, be it the presumed goddess or her statue. Could we find another piece of evidence regarding that maleficent statue? Pausanias, visiting the city, mentions a temple of Athena, a sacred grove of Artemis Soteira, and a temple of Artemis depicted as a huntress.[67] He does not tell the Aitolian story nor does he evoke the statue of the saving goddess, whose *epiklesis* could, however, be related to such a warlike intervention. His silence is puzzling, as are other silences and omissions in the *Periegesis*, but the restriction of admittance into the *alsos* is perhaps connected to the problematic statue. Be that as

[66] Plut. *Arat*. 32.2. *Cf*. Ellinger 1993, 222–223.
[67] Paus. 7.27.2–3.

it may, these different texts offer a significant example of the structural equivalence between priestess and statue, the divine manifestation acting through both of them. This was also the case in the Spartan ritual in honour of Artemis Ortheia. During the whipping of boys at the altar of the goddess, the priestess held the old *xoanon*, which became still heavier if the whipping remained too light, as if the goddess herself was communicating her will to the statue, interpreted by the priestess.[68]

To qualify this comment, another document needs to be produced. This is an honorary decree of the year 60/59 BCE proclaimed via the priests of Kore in the Arcadian city of Mantineia for a woman named Nikippa.[69] We are told that Nikippa has piously attended the successive priests of Kore in their duties. At the occasion of the Koragia, she led the procession, presided over the sacrifice to Kore, and presented the *peplos* to the goddess. Nikippa also contributed to some restoration works in the sanctuary of Kore. Finally, we are informed that she welcomed the goddess at home, as was the custom for those who were successively priests, and that she lavishly accomplished what the custom prescribed for the opening of the temple on the thirtieth day. The manipulation of the goddess' image played an important part in the *leitourgia* accepted by Nikippa in the context of the Koragia, which is literally the festival where "Kore has to be carried off". The goddess statue was led off, kept in a private house and then brought back to the temple, which was open for the occasion. In an indirect way, we are told that priests are normally closely connected to the statue in that context. Nevertheless, in the first century BCE, such a priestly duty could be assumed by someone else, including at a ritual level, if the priest was unable to bear the financial implication of the operation. A lot of ritual information is missing in an inscription aiming at honouring a benefactor. This is very significant, however, of the Greek flexibility in the assessment of religious obligations. Just as a priest needs or does not need to be there when a sacrifice is performed, the ritual manipulation of a statue may be his traditional duty but may be attributed also to a pious worshipper, whose financial involvement is rewarded by a prestigious play in the religious arena of the city. Be that as it may, the *ethos* here contradicted by the authoritative decision of the city normally implies a manipulation and conservation by the priest.

---

[68] Paus. 3.16.10–11.

[69] *IG* V 2, 265 l. 21–23 (60/59 BCE). *Cf.* Jost 1985, 346–349 and Jost 1996.

A final text has to be called to mind. In the Boiotian book of Pausanias' *Periegesis*, we are told that, of the gods, the people of Chaironeia honour most the sceptre that Hephaistos made for Zeus. They worship this sceptre, calling it Spear (*Dory*). The expression used by Pausanias is perfectly in accordance with the way he usually shows the most honoured anthropomorphic god in a city (*malista timôsin*). In his words, the sceptre *is* the god. The next sentence qualifies that amazing statement: "That there is something peculiarly divine about this sceptre is most clearly shown by the fame it brings to the Chaeroneans".[70] Then, Pausanias proceeds and concludes with the worship itself: there is no public temple built for the sceptre and its priest keeps it for one year in a house (we may suppose that the house is that of the priest); "sacrifices are offered to it every day, and by its side stands a table full of meats and cakes of all sorts".[71] Fame (*to epiphanes*) and divine nature are closely connected in the interpretation Pausanias gives of that particular cult, probably referring to Zeus himself. The sceptre works in the city just like a powerful image. It is not a statue of the god, but there is no real difference between each of these as far as function is concerned. It works as a medium between the divine world and the worshippers among whom the priest has a specific role to play.

It is for this reason that, when Strabo tells the story of the foundation of Marseille,[72] the religious part of the setting up implies two elements. Let us recall the context. When the Phokaians were about to leave their country, an oracle commanded them to take from Artemis of Ephesos a leader for their voyage. Arriving at Ephesos, they therefore inquired how they might obtain from the goddess what the oracle had enjoined them. Artemis appeared in a dream to Aristarche, one of the most honourable women of the city, and commanded her to accompany the Phokaians,

---

[70] Paus. 9.40.10–12: θεῶν δὲ μάλιστα Χαιρωνεῖς τιμῶσι τὸ σκῆπτρον ὃ ποιῆσαι Διί φησιν Ὅμηρος Ἥφαιστον, παρὰ δὲ Διὸς λαβόντα Ἑρμῆν δοῦναι Πέλοπι, Πέλοπα δὲ Ἀτρεῖ καταλιπεῖν, τὸν δὲ Ἀτρέα Θυέστῃ, παρὰ Θυέστου δὲ ἔχειν Ἀγαμέμνονα· τοῦτο οὖν τὸ σκῆπτρον σέβουσι, Δόρυ ὀνομάζοντες. καὶ εἶναι μέν τι θειότερον οὐχ ἥκιστα δηλοῖ τὸ ἐς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐπιφανὲς ἐξ αὐτοῦ· φασὶ δ' ἐπὶ τοῖς ὅροις αὐτῶν καὶ Πανοπέων τῶν ἐν τῇ Φωκίδι εὑρεθῆναι, σὺν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ χρυσὸν εὕρασθαι τοὺς Φωκεῖς, σφίσι δὲ ἀσμένοις ἀντὶ χρυσοῦ γενέσθαι τὸ σκῆπτρον. κομισθῆναι δὲ αὐτὸ ἐς τὴν Φωκίδα ὑπὸ Ἠλέκτρας τῆς Ἀγαμέμνονος πείθομαι. ναὸς δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ δημοσίᾳ πεποιημένος, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἔτος ἕκαστον ὁ ἱερώμενος ἐν οἰκήματι ἔχει τὸ σκῆπτρον· καί οἱ θυσίαι ἀνὰ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν θύονται, καὶ τράπεζα παράκειται παντοδαπῶν κρεῶν καὶ πεμμάτων πλήρης.

[71] Translation W.H.S. Jones.

[72] Strabo 4.14.4 (C179).

and to take with her "some *aphidryma* among the *hiera*" (ἀφίδρυμά τι τῶν ἱερῶν), that means, something ritually efficient to transfer into the colony the benevolence and protection of the goddess. We do not know if this is a statue or something else, as I. Malkin has correctly shown,[73] but the notion of *aphidryma* implies a sacred component, which will ritually create the conditions of a good mediation between the community in its new territory and the goddess whose protection was ensured in the metropolis.

What becomes of the priesthood in that respect? It is not by chance that Aristarche was made priestess of Artemis after the colony of Marseille had been settled. Through her dream, she had become a medium before the sea voyage, ensuring success to the expedition. Such mediation was still expected in the colony itself. In that case, Strabo specifies that all colonies sent out from Marseille hold this goddess in peculiar reverence, preserving both the shape of the *xoanon*, and also every rite (*nomima*) observed in the metropolis. All these cults of Artemis are *aphidrymata*, not necessarily because of the shape of the statue, but because of the identity of the ritual acts between the cult of the metropolis and the one in the colony.[74] In this respect, attention directed towards the priesthood is one way to control ritual continuity and efficacy.[75]

Conclusions

According to the analysis of dreams by Artemidoros, "seeing Zeus himself in the form that we have imagined him to be or seeing a statue of him in which he is wearing his proper attire (ἔχον τὴν οἰκείαν σκευήν) is auspicious for a king or a rich man". Further on, in relation to Artemis, he writes, "it makes no difference whether we see the goddess herself as we have imagined her to be or a statue of her. For whether gods appear in the flesh or as statues fashioned out of some material, they have the same meaning. But when the gods have been seen in person, it signifies that the good and bad fulfilments will take place more quickly than they would have if statues of them had been seen".[76] Seeing the god himself

[73] Malkin 1991, 78–87. *Cf.* Rolley 1997, 37–43; Bettinetti 2001, 54–63.
[74] Anguissola 2006, 643–646.
[75] *Cf.* Stavrianopoulou 2005a.
[76] Artemid. *Oneirokritikon* 2.35: οὐδὲν ⟨δὲ⟩ διαφέρει τὴν θεὸν ἰδεῖν ὁποίαν ὑπειλήφαμεν ἢ ἄγαλμα αὐτῆς· ἐάν τε γὰρ σάρκινοι οἱ θεοὶ φαίνωνται ἐάν τε ὡς ἀγάλματα ἐξ

implies an immediate consequence. Seeing the statue implies a mediated effect, which takes much more time to come into being. The statue is not the deity but may be a convenient tool for approaching it.

As far as priesthood is concerned, R. Parker recently remarked, "the functional equipollence of magistrate with priest as representatives of the city before the gods is central to the embeddedness of religion within the city". But, as a very good connoisseur of Greek religion, he immediately qualifies the statement: "Priest and magistrates come at the same job from different angles: the magistrates represent the city, before the gods as other spheres; the priest communicates with the divine, for the city as for other clients. But the point remains that there is no concern to preserve or enhance or underline any such functional differentiation".[77] It is for this reason that Nikippa of Mantineia was allowed by the city to keep the statue of Kore at home. However, elements of differentiation must not be underestimated, *i.e.* the priestly income and the close connection between *hiereus* or *hiereia* and *hiera*, even though they were intermittent or unnecessary when a ritual merely implied an individual, a "private" concern.

Since statues and priests may be good mediators between worshippers and the divine, the comparison between their respective agency offers a working analogy for thinking about the Greek representation of the divine. Sacrificial imagery refers to smoke rising from the altars, which is a wonderful tool for encapsulating the god's incorruptibility. In this context, the function of the priest is principally ritual: he presides over sacrifices and receives a share closely connected to the unburnt divine part. Anthropomorphism, therefore, opens the door to some paradoxical splitting between separated cosmic levels: even if the Greek gods do not eat like human beings, they receive a lot of food, just like humans. This mimetic act of honouring gods as if they were human eaters results in a very concrete end, that is to say in their priest's stomachs. Even though very concrete and economically attractive, this situation also attests to a symbolic link between priest and god, which confirms the mediating action of the priest in the ritual, especially when the whole community is involved in the performed ritual. Accordingly, human imagery of paying honour and respect is difficult to escape on sacrificial occasions.

ὕλης πεποιημένα, τὸν αὐτὸν ἔχουσι λόγον. θᾶττον δὲ καὶ τὰ ἀγαθὰ καὶ τὰ κακὰ σημαίνουσιν αὐτοὶ οἱ θεοὶ ὁρώμενοι ἢπερ τὰ ἀγάλματα αὐτῶν (Translation White 1975, 114).

[77] Parker 2005, 98.

Regarding cult statues, standards of humanity are also difficult to escape in producing them. In order to make the invisible become visible, materiality of wood, stone or metals is inescapable, and human shape is often privileged. J.-P. Vernant described this process several years ago with the untranslatable French neologism "présentifier l'invisible".[78] According to the level of religious consciousness of its viewer, a statue will be identified with the god it represents, or it will be considered as an elective place where the deity can manifest itself in intermittency, or merely as a piece of wood or an artisanal product. Be that perception as it may, a statue is a present to a deity, which becomes a cult statue by virtue of a collectively supported offering ritual. This is a human way to pay homage to supra-human powers, and such a material representation is rooted in human standards, just like raw meat displayed on a sacred table next to the altar or cooked food placed on a table as part of a *theoxenia* ceremony.[79]

Creative human imagination perceives the felicity of the gods, comparing it with its own: a musical feast where perfect human bodies are eating, drinking, dancing, merely living in the present that is a human equivalence of divine eternity. This human representation is the very condition that makes communication with non-human powers possible, even though the fluidity of this polytheistic system implies many concrete variations in ritual practice, which often defy generalization. Both "cult statues" and priests take part in such a representation.

[78] Vernant 1983.
[79] On the issue of raw or cooked meat offered to the gods, see Ekroth 2008, 95–98.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

S. Aleshire, "The Demos and the Priests: the Selection of Sacred Officials at Athens from Cleisthenes to Augustus," in R. Osborne, S. Hornblower (eds.), *Ritual, Finance, Politics. Athenian Democratic Accounts presented to D.M. Lewis*, Oxford 1994, 325-337

A. Anguissola, "Note on *Aphidruma* 1: Statues and their Function; 2: Strabo on the transfer of cults," *CQ* 56, 2006, 641-646.

M. Beard – J. North (eds.), *Pagan Priests. Religion and Power in the Ancient World*, Ithaca 1990.

S. Bettinetti, *La statua di culto nella pratica rituale greca*, Bari 2001.

J.H. Blok, "Phye's Procession: Culture, Politics and Peisistratid Rule," in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (ed.), *Peisistratos and the Tyranny: A Reappraisal of the Evidence*, Amsterdam 2000, 18-48.

J.N. Bremmer, "Modi di comunicazione con il divino: la preghiera, la divinazione ed il sacrificio nella civiltà greca," in S. Settis (ed.), *I Greci. Storia, Cultura, Arte, Società I. Noi e i Greci*, Torino 1996, 248-279.

W. Burkert, *Greek Religion. Archaic and Classical*, Harvard Mass. 1985 [Germ. or. 1977].

R. Buxton (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*, Oxford 2000.

J. Casabona, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en Grèce des origines à la fin de l'époque classique*, Aix-en-Provence 1966.

J.B. Connelly, *Portrait of a Priestess. Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece*, Princeton 2007.

W.R. Connor, "Tribes, Festivals, and Processions: Civic Ceremonial and Political Manipulation in Archaic Greece," *JHS* 107, 1987, 40-50 [reprinted in Buxton 2000, 56-75].

C. Cooper, "Hyperides and the Trial of Phryne," *Phoenix* 49, 1995, 303-318.

N. Deshours, *Les Mystères d'Andania. Étude d'épigraphie et d'histoire religieuse*, *Ausonius. Scripta Antiqua* 16, Bordeaux 2006.

B. Dignas, *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Oxford 2002.

B. Dignas, "Rhodian Priests after the Synoecism," *Ancient Society* 33, 2003, 35-51.

A.A. Donohue, "The Greek Images of the Gods. Considerations on terminology and methodology," *Hephaistos* 15, 1997, 31-45.

G. Ekroth, "Burnt, cooked or raw? Divine and human culinary desires at Greek animal sacrifice," in E. Stavrianopoulou, A. Michaels, Cl. Ambos (eds), *Transformations in Sacrificial Practices. From Antiquity to Modern Times*, Berlin 2008, 87-111.

P. Ellinger, *La légende nationale phocidienne. Artémis, les situations extrêmes et les récits de guerre d'anéantissement, BCH* supplément 27, Paris 1993.

St. Georgoudi, "Lysimachè, la prêtresse," in N. Loraux (ed.), *La Grèce au féminin*, Paris 2003, 167-213.

St. Georgoudi, "*Athanatous therapeuein.* Réflexions sur des femmes au service des dieux," *Kernos* suppl. 15, 2005, 69-82.

St. Georgoudi – V. Pirenne-Delforge, "Personnel du culte (Grèce)," *ThesCRA* V, 2006, 1-65.

D. Gill, "Trapezomata. A neglected aspect of Greek sacrifice," *HThR* 67, 1974, 117-137.

D. Gill, *Greek Cult Tables,* New York / London 1991.

B. Gladigow, "Epiphanie, Statuette, Kultbild. Griechische Gottesvorstellungen im Wechsel von Kontext und Medium," *Visible Religion* 7, 1990, 98-121.

B. Gladigow, "Präsenz der Bilder – Präsenz der Götter. Kultbilder und Bilder der Götter in der griechischen Religion," *Visible Religion* 4-5, 1985-1986, 114-133.

Fr. Gschnitzer, "Bemerkungen zum Zusammenwirken von Magistraten und Priestern in der griechischen Welt," *Ktema* 14, 1989, 31-38.

Fr. Graf, *Nordionische Kulte*. *Religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulten von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai und Phokaia, Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana* 21, Rome 1985.

Fr. Graf, "Der Eigensinn der Götterbilder in antiken religiösen Diskursen," in G. Boehm (ed.), *Homo Pictor. Colloquium Rauricum* 7, Leipzig 2001, 227-243.

Fr. Graf, "What is New About Greek Sacrifice," in H.F.J. Horstmanshoff *et al.* (eds.), *Kykeon. Studies in Honour of H.S. Versnel*, *Religions of the Graeco-Roman World* 142, Leiden 2002, 113-125.

A. Hupfloher, *Kulte im kaiserzeitlichen Sparta. Eine Rekonstruktion anhand der Priesterämter*, Berlin 2000.

I.Cos = M. Segre, *Iscrizioni di Cos*, Roma 1993.

I.Ephesos = H. Wankel, *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien* 11.1: *Die Inschriften fon Ephesos* Ia, Bonn 1979.

I.Oropos = B.C. Petrakos, *Οἱ ἐπιγραφὲς τοῦ Ὠρωποῦ*, Athens 1997.

D. Jaillard, "« Images » des dieux et pratiques rituelles dans les maisons grecques. L'exemple de Zeus Ktesios," *MEFRA* 116, 2004, 871-893.

M. Jost, *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie, Études péloponnésiennes* 9, Paris 1985.

M. Jost, "Évergétisme et tradition religieuse à Mantinée au Ier siècle avant J.-C.," in A. Chastagnol – S. Demougin – C. Lepelley (eds.), *Splendissima ciuitas. Études d'histoire romaine en hommage à F. Jacques*, Paris 1996, 193-200.

Ph.-E. Legrand, "Sacerdos-Grèce," in Daremberg – Saglio – Pottier, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités* IV, 1911, 934-942.

Br. Le Guen-Pollet, "Espace sacrificiel et corps des bêtes immolées. Remarques sur le vocabulaire désignant la part du prêtre dans la Grèce antique de l'époque classique à l'époque impériale," in R. Etienne – M.-Th. Le Dinahet (eds.), *L'espace sacrificiel dans les civilisations méditerranéennes de l'Antiquité*, Paris 1991, 13-23.

P. Linand de Bellefonds *et al.*, "Cult images/Images de culte/Kultbilder/Immagini di culto," *ThesCRA* II, 2004, 417-507.

LSCG = Fr. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques*, Paris 1969.

LSS = Fr. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplément*, Paris 1962.

LSAM = Fr. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées d'Asie Mineure*, Paris 1955.

I. Malkin, "What is an aphidruma?," *Classical Antiquity* 10, 1991, 77-96.

J. Martha, *Les sacerdoces athéniens*, Paris 1882.

H. Mills, "Greek clothing regulations: sacred and profane?", *ZPE* 55, 1984, 255-265.

A. Motte, "Figures du prêtre dans la littérature grecque," in A. Motte – P. Marchetti (eds.), *La figure du prêtre dans les grandes traditions religieuses*, Leuven 2005, 1-31.

J. Mylonopoulos, "Greek Sanctuaries as Places of Communication through Ritual: An Archaeological Perspective," in E. Stavrianopoulou, *Ritual and Communication in the Graeco-Roman World, Kernos* supplément 16, Liège 2006, 69-110.

R. Parker – D. Obbink, "Aus der Arbeit der 'Inscriptiones Graecae' VI. Sales of Priesthoods on Cos I," *Chiron* 30, 2000, 419-429.

R. Parker – D. Obbink, "Sales of Priesthoods on Cos II," *Chiron* 31, 2001, 229-252.

R. Parker, *Polytheism and Society at Athens*, Oxford 2006.

V. Pirenne-Delforge, "La cité, les *dêmotelê hiera* et les prêtres," *Kernos* suppl. 15, 2005, 55-68.

V. Pirenne-Delforge, "Des marmites pour un méchant petit hermès ! ou comment consacrer une statue, » in S. Estienne, D. Jaillard, N. Lubtschansky, Cl. Pouzadoux (éds), *Image et religion dans l'Antiquité gréco-romaine. Actes du Colloque de Rome, 11-13 décembre 2003*, Naples 2008, 103-110.

G. Pironti, "Sous le ciel d'Éryx. À propos d'Élien, *Sur la nature des animaux*, X, 50," in M. Cartry – J.-L. Durand – R. Piettre (eds.), *Architecturer l'invisible. Modes de mise en présence et formes d'approches des instances, Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études*, Turnhout, forthcoming.

S. Price, *Religions of the Greeks*, Cambridge 1999.

Cl. Rolley, "Encore les ἀφιδρύματα : sur la fondation de Marseille, de Thasos et de Rome," *AION(ArchStAnt)* n.s. 4, 1997, 35-43.

J. Rudhardt, *Du mythe, de la religion grecque et de la compréhension d'autrui*, Geneva 1981.

J. Rudhardt, *Notions fondamentales et actes constitutifs du culte dans la Grèce classique*, Paris 1992² [or. ed. 1958].

J. Rüpke, "Controllers and Professionals. Analyzing Religious Specialists," *Numen* 43, 1996, 241-262.

T. Scheer, *Die Gottheit und ihr Bild. Untersuchungen zur Funktion griechischer Kultbilder in Religion und Politik*, *Zetemata* 105, München 2000.

J. Scheid, "Le flamine de Jupiter, les Vestales et le général triomphant. Variations romaines sur le thème de la figuration des dieux," *TR* 7, 1986, 213-230.

M. Segre, "Osservazioni epigrafiche sulla vendita di sacerdozio," *RendIstLomb* 69, 1936, 811-830; 70, 1937, 83-105.

Chr. Sourvinou-Inwood, "What is *Polis* Religion?," in O. Murray – S. Price (eds.), *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*, Oxford 1990, 295-322 [reprinted in Buxton 2000, 13-37].

Chr. Sourvinou-Inwood, "Further Aspects of *Polis* Religion," *AION(ArchStAnt)* 10, 1988, 259-274 [reprinted in Buxton 2000, 39-55].

Chr. Sourvinou-Inwood, "Male and Female, Public and Private, Ancient and Modern," in E.D. Reeder (ed.), *Pandora*. *Women in Classical Greece,* Princeton 1995, 111-120.

E. Stavrianopoulou, "Priester gesucht, *Erfahrung* erwünscht!," in Cl. Ambos, *et al.* (eds.), *Die Welt der Rituale. Von der Antike bis heute*, Darmstadt 2005(a), 90-95.

E. Stavrianopoulou, "Die Würde des Priesters ist unantastbar," in Cl. Ambos, *et al.* (eds.), *Die Welt der Rituale. Von der Antike bis heute*, Darmstadt 2005(b), 226-232.

Steinepigramme = R. Merkelbach – J. Stauber, *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten,* 5 vols., Leipzig 1998-2004.

A. Stewart, *Art, Desire, and the Body in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge 1997.

J.A. Turner, *Hiereiai: Acquisition of Feminine Priesthoods in Ancient Greece*, Diss. Univ. of California 1983.

J.-P. Vernant, "De la présentification de l'invisible à l'imitation de l'apparence," in *id.*, *Entre mythe et politique*, Paris 1996, 359-377 [or. ed. in 1983].

H.S. Versnel, "What Did Ancient Man See When He Saw a God? Some Reflexions on Greco-Roman Epiphany," in D. van der Plas (ed.), *Effigies Dei,* Leiden 1987, 42-55.

H.-U. Wiemer, "Käufliche Priestertümer im hellenistischen Kos," *Chiron* 33, 2003, 263-310.

M. Wörrle, "Inschriften von Herakleia am Latmos II. Das Priestertum der Athena Latmia," *Chiron* 20, 1990, 44-50.

W.J. Woodhouse, "Priest, Priesthood, Greek," *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* X, 1918, 302-307.

L. Ziehen, "Hiereis," *RE* VIII 2, 1913, 1411-1424.