**Dionysiac Associations among the Dedicants of Hosios kai Dikaios**

Revisiting Recently Published Inscriptions from the Mihalıççık District in North-West Galatia

Altay COŞKUN

**I. Introduction**

From 2014 to 2019, Hale Güney conducted epigraphic surveys in the Mihalıççık District and adjacent counties (Eskişehir Province) located between the northern bend of the Sangarios River (Sakarya Irmağı) and the Tembris / Tembrogios River (Porsuk Çayı). She has brought to light important new evidence especially for the rural cults and imperial estates in northwest Galatia during the 2nd and 3rd centuries. We have to be grateful for her swift publication of the materials on the *Choria Considiana* at Yukarı İğde Ağaç as well as on the cults of Hosios kai Dikaios, Zeus Sarnendenos, Zeus Akreinenos, Zeus Heptakomeiton, and Potamos.\(^1\) They add to the quickly growing body of scholarship on divine epithets and epicleses in Anatolia.\(^2\)

The evidence for the divine pair *Hosios kai Dikaios* deserves closer attention. Güney (2018a) has catalogued five inscriptions representing dedications to those gods. Four of them are her recent discoveries, whereas no. 5 offers an extended re-reading of a text previously published by J. G. C. Anderson and Stephen Mitchell.\(^3\) Some 176 inscriptions mentioning *Hosios* and / or *Dikaios* had been accessible beforehand, most of all thanks to the exhaustive collections produced by Marijana Ricl. They include the recently published monuments by Tomas Lochmann and N. Eda Akyürek Şahin, though not yet the ones presented by Hale Güney, Emre Erten and Georg Petzl. If we maintain Ricl’s practice to count in dedications to *Theoi Dikaioi*, the number is up to 185.\(^4\)

---

\(^{1}\) Güney 2016 and 2018b on the *Choria Considiana* (cf. Mitchell 1988 = RECAM II 34); for the same and large estates such as of the Plancii, also see 2018c and 2018d; further 2018a on *Hosios kai Dikaios*; 2019a on *Zeus Sarnendenos* and *Akreinenos*; 2019b on *Potamos*; forthcoming on *Zeus Heptakomeiton*.

\(^{2}\) E.g., Chiai 2009, 85-98; Harland 2014, 143-149; Avram 2016a; Ricl 2017; Mitchell 2017; Piso 2018.


\(^{4}\) Ricl 1991; 1992a; 1992b; 1994, adding up to 118 inscriptions, updated 2008 (nos. 8, 9, 10, 19, 21, 36, 40 = Akyürek Şahin 2004), though with confusing numbers (p. 563), with 58 further items (nos. 46-58 = Lochmann 2003). Güney 2018a (see below, part III); Erten 2018 (from Dorylaion); Petzl 2019b, 129 = I.Sardis II 473, *Theoi Dikaioi*: I.Kibyra I 96 = Ricl 2008, no. 41; add two inscriptions found at Termessos by R. Fleischer (SEG LIV 1380.1-2: Θεοίς Δικαιοίς ἐπηκόοις; 1381: ἐπιφανεστάτους θεοίς Δικαιοίς) and one from the Antalya Museum of unknown provenance, published by Gökalp Özdiş 2016, no. 10; The latest publication by N.E. Akyürek Şahin – H. Uzunoğlu (also in Gephyra 19) increase the number to nearly 200. The new evidence is not yet considered here, but will not change my conclusions.
The new texts invite us to reflect on some aspects of the dedication formulae used in Phrygia, to gain some insights into the social texture of the adherents of the cult in northeast Phrygia, and eventually reconsider aspects of the cult organization or the lack thereof. As I shall try to argue, scholars have been too quick to understand Anatolian or Phrygian proper names ending on -enoi or -eanoi as ethnics denoting villagers and have thereby inadvertently downplayed the prevalence of associations (Greek thiasoi) that used similarly-construed names.5

I shall begin my investigation by surveying previous scholarship on the cult of Hosios kai Dikaios, as catalogued by Ricl, to provide the necessary background for our inquiry and classify elements of the dedication formulae (II).6 The main part will quote, discuss and revise the five (mostly) new inscriptions (III). In the conclusion, I shall try to redress the balance between village communities and cult associations among the dedicants to Hosios kai Dikaios and make some further inferences on how such groups were organized (IV).

II. Dedications to Hosios kai Dikaios:

Some General Trends of the Phrygian Cult

Most evidence for Hosios kai Dikaios is from Phrygian territories in the Roman provinces of Asia and Galatia, with a particular concentration around the Türkmen Dağları between Eskişehir (Dorylaion) and Kütahya (Kötyaiion).7 As Ricl has rightly noted, the Lydian material differs in presenting Hosios kai Dikaios as a single deity, often represented as riding on a horse or an angel-like divine messenger. In contrast, Phrygian Hosios kai Dikaios seem to be two distinct gods, sometimes visually represented as twins holding scales and a staff (or measuring rod) respectively to symbolize their care for justice. They mostly appear jointly, at times in combination with other deities, especially Helios or Apollo, though in a few cases also individually.8 The epigraphic material further includes several instances in which the gender (Hosia kai Dikaia, Hosion kai Dikaion)
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The comparison with the distinctive evidence from Lydia further points to some different tendencies among those who made offerings to the god(s). Ricl realizes a higher proportion of priests among the dedicants in the south-west. One may add the observation that women, who rarely functioned as sole dedicants in Phrygia, seem to have had much more prominent roles in the cult activities among the Lydians. At any rate, in most of the cases catalogued by Ricl, dedicants can be identified as private individuals, whether they acted alone or with others, mostly relatives.

The typical verbs are ἀνέστησαν and ἀνέθηκαν (‘have put up, erected’), although such expressions are often omitted. Even more frequently, the direct object τὸν βωμόν (‘the altar’) or τὴν στήλην (‘the stele’) remains implicit. Many cases end with a formulaic εὐχήν (‘vow’): the accusative would seem to make it the direct object of a verb like ἐπετέλησαν (‘have fulfilled / performed’), but no such case is attested in the evidence for Hosios kai Dikaios or some other representative material from Phrygia, Galatia and Lydia. Instead, some examples would rather be compatible with a physical understanding of εὐχή(ν) as ‘votive monument’, hence the object of ἀνέστησαν and ἀνέθηκαν.

A few isolated instances from Sardis may warrant such a reading, but cases with two accusatives prevail, so that we may perhaps read τὸν βωμόν ἀνέστησαν (ἐπιτελοῦντες or ἐπιτελήσαντες) εὐχήν (‘in fulfillment of a vow’) or βωμόν ἀνέστησαν εὐχήν (ὀντα) (‘as (the fulfillment of) a vow’). A non-physical interpretation of εὐχή(ν) is further encouraged by more elegant expressions such as εὐχής χάριν ἀνέστησαν.13

---


11 See Ricl 2008, 565 f. on the dedicants, with reference to nos. 3 and 5 (cf. no. 42 from Kibyra = Corsten – Ricl 2012) for priests; no. 5 attests a priestess (three priestesses were previously attested in Phrygia: Ricl 1991, nos. 44, 92, 96; cf. 1992a, 89). The new evidence slightly conflicts with her previous observation (Ricl 1992a, 84 f.) that most of the Lydian dedicants were private people.

12 Ricl 2008, 565 f. generally comments on gender disparity. For the exceptional attestation of women, she references nos. 10, 32? from Phrygia, although women are documented much more often together with their husband (or whole family), for which Ricl cites nos. 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 22, 24, 33; add 40. But note that the five Lydian examples of Ricl’s catalogue feature Elpis (no. 2), Melite (no. 4), and the priestess Auge (no. 5) as sole dedicants, and further Gaiane after her husband, the priest Telesphoros (no. 3). Based on her first catalogue, Ricl 1992a, 86-87 observed full gender parity.

13 E.g., Ricl 2008, nos. 29, 40, 46, 50: εὐχήν. And nos. 21 (= part III, H): εὐχής χάριν, 27: [῾Υ]πὲρ εὐχής. For further variation, see nos. 14, 22; Chiai 2009, 76, n. 64. I also compared all other dedications to Hosios and Dikaios (as above, n. 4 - the plural εὐχάς is discussed below, in part III, L and M), besides the indices of Mitchell 1988 = RECAM II and I.Ankara as well as Petzl, I.Sardis II and 2019a (Supplement to the Beicht-inschriften), and further the collection of examples by Chiai 2009, 75, n. 57, and 76, ns. 62 f. For ἐπιτελεῖν, see, however, LSJ 1996, 739 s.v. εὐχή; there is also an uncommented quotation from a Phrygian inscription.
Multiple beneficiaries of the divine blessing could be named, whether or not in combination with a previous vow. Such composite formulae became particularly fashionable in 3rd-century Phrygia, with most of our evidence coming from Yaylababa Köyü in Kütahya Province. That the beneficiaries were the dedicants themselves can be taken for granted whenever the text is complete without anyone else being named. More often, however, the intended beneficiaries of the divine blessing are spelled out. This is regularly done with the formulae ὑπὲρ + genitive of person (1), ὑπὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας + genitive of person (2), περὶ + genitive of person (3), or περὶ τῆς σωτηρίας + genitive of person (4). Divine protection is thus mostly requested for the dedicant(s)’ children (including foster children) (a), wife (b), husband (c), or other relative(s) or individual(s) close to the dedicant(s) (d). Often a formulaic expression such as ‘for his own (kinsmen / family / people)’ (e) is used instead of writing out names or relations. Only rarely, the group of beneficiaries is extended to a larger community, such as the whole village or ‘fatherland’ (f) of the dedicant(s). At all events, whenever sponsors of a dedication want to make sure that they, too, be included in the blessing, they express this by adding a reflexive pronoun (g), such as in ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἑαυτῶν κέ ... (example G).

There are of course further variations, such as the expansion of the dedicating subject instead of naming beneficiaries. Besides, some of the inscriptions are more verbose or even poetic; these instances tend to include similar elements, while using a less formulaic diction. They occasionally allude to the challenge in which the god(s) came to help and normally praise the divine supporters. I address only in passing that very few dedications to Hosios kai Dikaios are from funerary contexts; these are not my focus here.

The following selection of more or less typical examples has been drawn from Ricl’s 2008 catalogue. The bracketed number refers to the grammatical formula specifying the beneficiaries, with a capital E indicating the expression of εὐχήν or something similar. The subsequent minuscule letters classify the beneficiaries of the dedication as explained above.

(εὐχὴν ἀνέστησεν), which has been deleted in the Supplement, p. 139. Physical interpretations of εὐχή are likely in rare cases, such as I.Sardis II 151.13 f.: τὴν εὐχὴν ἀνέστησεν; 153.6 f.: εὐχήν τήνδε ἀνέστησεν; Petzl translates: ‘hat ... das Ex-voto ... aufgestellt.’

See Ricl 2008, nos. 7, 10, and the ones she quotes from Lochmann 2003 (Ricl 2008, nos. 48, 49, 51). But note one exception of unknown provenance, previously catalogued in Izmir (now lost), with an inverse order of the standard wording (no. 28, 2nd or 3rd century AD): Ὀνησίων ᾿Οσίῳ καὶ Δικαίῳ | εὐχὴν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ | ------. Another exception is known from Afyon (no. 31, 3rd century AD). For more examples, see below, part III.

Ricl 2008, e.g., nos. 8, 11 and further the examples H, I, J, K below.

For a survey of the beneficiaries of cultic dedications in rural Asia Minor, see Chiai 2009, 70-72, also 77 for the notion of soteria.

This can either be done by listing more nominatives (Ricl 2008, nos. 12, 13) or adding further dedicants of lesser status with the preposition μετά + genitive or σύν + dative (Ricl 2008, nos. 5, 16, 19).

E.g., Ricl 2008, nos. 1, 22, 35.

E.g., Ricl 1991, no. 88 from Phrygia and no. 103 from Mysia as well as Ricl 2008, no. 43 from Lycia (on a little monument for Hosios kai Dikaios): Ἑὔτυχίων τῷ τέκνῳ ᾿Επαφρο- | δεῖτε μνε(ία) | ς ἑνεκεν; perhaps also no. 44 from Thessaly.
A = no. 1 from Mağazadamları / Manisa Museum (Lydia): (4) (g+e): ... περὶ τῆς ἑαυτῶν | σωτηρίας καὶ τῶν ἰδίων τέκνων ...

B = no. 4 from Philadelphia? / Manisa Museum (Lydia): (1) (b): ... Μελτίνη ευξαμένη ὑπέρ τῶν εἰδί- | ἔρ Γλαύκου τοῦ συνβίου ...

C = no. 7 from Yaylababa Köyü / Kütahya Museum (Phrygia): (1E) (e): [Ἀ]ντίπας ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων | [ὦ]ν Ὥσίου Δικαίου εὐχήν.

D = no. 10 from Yaylababa Köyü, Kütahya Museum (Phrygia): (1E) (a): Αὐρ. Περγαμ- | ὑπὲρ τῶν | παιδίων | Ὅσίου Δικ- | ἔρ εὐχήν.

E = no. 22 from Yenikent (Phrygia): (3) (g+a): ... περὶ ἑαυτῶν κὲ τεκέεσσιν ...

F = no. 49 from Yaylababa Köyü, Kütahya Province (Phrygia): (1E) (e): Αὔρ. Γαλυμας Διογέ|νου ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων | πάντων Ὅσίῳ κὲ Δικέῳ | εὐχήν.

Ricl’s 2008 catalogue includes only one example that specifies the larger community of the dedi-

G = no. 24 from Doğanlar (Phrygia): (2) (g+a+f): [ - - Ὅσίου] | κὲ Δικέου ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἑαυτῶν | κὲ τέκνων κὲ τῆς πατρίδος Ζίνγοτος ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων τὸν βω- | ἀνέστην.

When village communities seek the benevolence of Hosios kai Dikaios, they are normally pre-

H = no. 21 from Muratlar Köyü near Kotyaion / Kütahya, 3rd century AD: (-E) (-): Ὅσίῳ Δικαῖ[ῳ] | Κοροσοκωκμήται | εὐχής χάριν ἀνέστησαν.

I = no. 30, probably from Lagna / Ilgın, now in the Konya Museum, 2nd-3rd century AD: Κονισκουμενή- | Ὅσίῳ καὶ Δικέῳ εὐχήν.

Less clear are the two remaining cases, which are generally understood as dedications by villagers as well. While it is compatible with this view that they refrain from singling out beneficiaries, too, I am uncertain about the first case but am sure that the second relates to a cult association:

J = no. 37 from Ören Mevkii by Cuma Camii in Sansipahiler (Hadrianeia), dated to the 2nd cen-

tury AD: (-) (-): Κομμῆ / νο[ι] Ὅσίῳ | Δικαῖῳ.

20 The author of this inscription was apparently not fully literate: note the confusion of genitive and dative for the theonyms (which is frequent in Phrygian inscriptions though); the clumsy connection ἑαυτῶν κὲ τέκνων (the former should either refer to the subject Zivγοτος and be singular, or if it is to be understood as τῶν ἰδίων, the singling out of the children is - at least grammatically, not of course emotionally - super-

fluous); ἀνέστην would be medio-passive, but active ἀνέστη <σε> is required.

21 Cf. Ricl 2008, 506, with no. 37 = J.
K = no. 20 (first published by Erten – Sivas 2011 = SEG 63, 1225)\(^{22}\) from Akçakaya, near Avdan, where the ancient village Μαρλακκος/ν was located.\(^{23}\) Both modern villages are situated along the northern foothills of the Türkmen Dağları in-between the cities of Kotyaion / Kütahya, Dorylaion / Eskişehir and Nakoleia / Seyitgazi: Ἡλίῳ Ὁσίῳ | Δικαίῳ Ἀπ- | ὅλλωνι | Μασικην- | οἱ εὐχήν.\(^{24}\)

The latter document is quite complex. Its first editors have identified the three male figures in the relief on top of the stele with Helios, Apollo and Hosios-Dikaios, while accepting the traditional view that the Masikenoi hailed from an unlocated, but nearby village *Masika.\(^{25}\) As I shall try to show elsewhere, this interpretation is problematic, not only because the visual and textual representation of the divinities would be incompatible, but also since the Lydian concept of the unity of Hosios (kai) Dikaios cannot simply be surmised in Phrygia without compelling indicators. Moreover, the gestures of the three figures are those of praying and sacrificing men. Therefore their divine attributes do not make them gods, but rather partakers in the divine nature as mystai.\(^{26}\) Two further pieces of evidence confirm that the Masikenoi were indeed members of a Dionysiac association: (example K-a) Νέαρχον Μασικηνον κὲ Βάκχος Διὶ Βροντῶντι εὐχήν (Aşağıılıca, 7 km south of Akçakaya)\(^{27}\) and (example K-b) Μασικηνοι ὑπὲρ καρπῶν καὶ τῶν ἰδίων ἰδίω[ν] πάντων Διὶ [B]ροντῶντι εὐχήν (Avdan, 5 km south-south-east of Akçakaya)\(^{28}\).

\(^{22}\) Cf. P. Hamon in BE 2012, 408; Avram 2016b, 100.


\(^{24}\) ’To Helios, Hosios, Dikaios, Apollo the Masikenoi (have erected this stele, fulfilling their) vow.’ (my translation).


\(^{26}\) The first figure (embodifying Helios Hosios?) holding his chest / heart with his right hand may be confessing, the second (embodifying Dikaios Apollo? - his identification with Apollo is also doubted by T. Corsten in SEG 63, 2013, 1225) is about to sacrifice an animal with a labrys; the third (bearded), who raises his arms in the typical prayer gesture is invoking the gods. On hands or arms, see comparative evidence in Ricl 1991, nos. 103 (Ὁ]σίῳ καὶ Δικαίῳ χεῖρας ἀεί[ρω), 104, 107; cf. Hazzikostas 1998; Chiai 2009, 82. On the nimbus of mystai, see Keyßner 1936, esp. 595-597; cf. Weidle 1971/94; Willers 2006 with further references. On the iconography of the gods, also see the references above, in 8.

\(^{27}\) Haspels 1971, vol. 1, 351 no. 137, with photo in vol. 2, ill. 636, on which the inscription is readable as of Νέαρχον, her reading is confirmed by Avram 2016b, 101 (Νέαρχον). I suggest translating: ’The (association) Masikenon of Nearchos (or: of the Nearchoi?) and Bakchos (on whom see below, under example P) (erected this) to Zeus Bronton (in fulfilment of a) vow.’ Aşağıılıca is mapped as (Sanctuary of) Zeus Bronton 2 in Talbert 2000, 62, D2, but the information is not compatible with Google Maps. For a useful map, see, e.g., Avram 2016b, 95 f. with fig. 3 (including Ilıca); cf. Ricl 1991, 51-53 (very useful, but without Aşağıılıca).

\(^{28}\) See MAMA V no. 126 = Avram 2016b, 100 (with further references). I suggest translating it as follows: ’The Maskenoi (have dedicated this) for (the prosperity of) their crops and for (the well-being of) all their own (people / kin) to Zeus Bronton (in fulfilment of their) vow.’ Avdan is mapped as (Sanctuary of) Zeus Bronton 1 in Talbert 2000, 62, E2. Avdan and Aşağıılıca are separate by a northern foothill of the Türkmen Dağları, on and around which several minor and perhaps even (for rural standards) major sanctuaries were located; see Haspels 1971, vol. 1, 164 and vol. 2, ill. 250-254; Ricl 1992a, 89; Avram 2016b, 95 f.
III. Five Dedications to Hosios kai Dikaios in the Mihalıççık District

We can now turn to the new evidence from the Mihalıççık District. I begin with two inscribed limestone altars set up by the imperial slave Chryseros:

I (figs. 1-2) = Güney 2018a, no. 2, from Oğuz Pınarı on the road from Kayı (itself the first village on the road from Mihalıççık to Alpu in its west) to Aydınlar in its north, now in Kayı. The stone is inscribed at the top and at the bottom, with a large free space in-between:

a) Χρυσέρως αὐτοκρατόρων δοῦλος.

b) Απόλλωνι Ὁσίῳ κὲ Δεικείῳ Χρυσέρως κὲ κωμήται ὑπὲρ τῆς ἑυτῶν σωτηρίας ἀνέστησαν εὐχάς.

‘Chryseros, slave of the emperor.’

‘To Apollo, Hosios and Dikaios Chryseros and (the) villagers have erected (this altar) for their own (well-being) (in fulfilment of their) vows.’

M (fig. 3) = Güney 2018a, no. 3, also found in Oğuz Pınarı and now kept in Kayı:

[- - - - - - Ἀπόλ]όλλωνι Ὁσίῳ κὲ Δεικείῳ Χρυσέρως κὲ κωμήται ὑπὲρ τῆς κώμης ἀνέστησαν εὐχάς.

‘[...] to Apollo, Hosios and Dikaios Chryseros and (the) villagers have erected (this altar) for the (well-being of the) village (in fulfilment of their) vows.’

Chryseros’ status as imperial slave reminds us of the nearby imperial estates, the Choria Considiana, as they are called in a dedication which a certain Eutyches had ordered to be inscribed. It was found in Yukarı İğde Ağaç in the Beylikova District, to the south of Mihalıççık. That inscription characterizes Eutyches as the oikonomos of two Sebastoi, and since the same place also provides an inscription honouring Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, the dedication of Eutyches is dated to AD 177-180. Güney plausibly relates Chryseros to the same imperial estate and cautions us not to posit the role of oikonomos for him. This is indeed not necessary, although Chryseros must have played the most prominent role in the village mentioned in the two inscriptions. If so, all of its inhabitants were of unfree status, with Chryseros being their leader.

As far as chronology is concerned, Güney dates his dedication after that of Eutyches based on the letter shapes. But palaeography is no safe criterion, especially if the comparative evidence comes from a relatively distant location. It is also uncertain whether the plural αὐτοκρατόρων is to imply

---

29 Güney reads Χρυσέρως; her comment makes it clear that the first υ is an error by the stone cutter, who got the name right in ll. 5 f.; the σ, though weathered, is clearly visible on the photo; the second ρ is written over an ω, and then ω is repeated.

30 Güney translates: ‘Chryseros, slave of the emperor. Chryseros and the villagers performed a vow to Apollo, Hosios and Dikaios and set this up for their safety.’

31 Güney translates: ‘Chryseros? and the villagers? performed a vow to Apollo, Hosios and Dikaios [Chryseros] and (the) villagers have [erected] (this altar) for the (well-being of the) village (in fulfilment of their) vows.’

32 See Mitchell 1988 = RECAM II 34 and 36, with Güney 2016 on Eutyches. Güney, forthcoming suggests that there were probably seven villages when the Choria Considiana were established, together with the cult of Zeus Heptakomeiton.
that Chryseros had served under more than one emperor successively or was currently serving under two co-ruling emperors. If the latter, these could be Marcus Aurelius and his brother Lucius Verus or his son Commodus, or Septimius Severus and Caracalla, if not Caracalla and his brother Geta. Hence, nearly any year in the later-2nd or early-3rd centuries is possible.

Of particular interest are the minor variations of the formulaic language. Chryseros and the villagers both appear as the dedicants, instead of the village(s) alone, with Chryseros in the role of an executor (epimeletes). The first mention of Chryseros emphasizes his elevated status, but the undistinguished use of the reflexive pronoun (ὑπὲρ τῆς ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίας) and then of the village in connection with the beneficiaries makes it clear that Chryseros was one of them. Moreover, the fact that the village is not even named implies that the dedication was made on the territory of the village.

Another noteworthy variation of the standard formula is the plural of εὐχάς. Reference to a vow is normally made in the singular. The plural is certainly meaningful: either two vows made simultaneously by two different subjects (namely Chryseros and the villagers) are to be distinguished here or vows had been made in at least two different situations. Since there were (at least) two vows, there were (at least) two altars, located in the same place for the same divine triad of Apollo, Hosios and Dikaios.\(^{33}\)

N (fig. 4) = Güney 2018a, no. 4 is from a damaged marble altar, also stored in Kayı, but having been brought in from Yukarı Dudaş, which is a few km further west on the road to Alpu. There is a relief of a horse-mounted deity underneath the inscription. It is broken off under the god’s elbow (see Güney 2018a, 114, fig. 4). Güney leaves open whether it is Helios or Apollo. I am inclined to opt for Apollo, because there is no radiant crown visible and the longer name would also fit the lacuna better. The inscription reads:

[ca. 11] Ὑσ[ιω] | (2) κα[ὶ Δ][ικ][ἀνέστη] | τη[σ] | ὑπ[ὲρ] | (4) τῆς | [ca. 7] Α[-?][Σ34]

‘N. N. has erected to [...] Hosios and Dikaios (the Altar) for (the well-being) of [...]’

One may assume that the initial lacuna in line 1 began with the name of the dedicant, unless [...]ον in line 3 was the subject of ἀνέστησεν. If the name of the sponsor was very short (E.g., Bas, Ges, Mas), the list of the divine recipients of the dedication might even have included Apollo (as in L and M also from nearby Kayı) or potentially even Helios and Apollo (as in K from Akçakaya, though in a different order). In line 3, [ca. 4]ον could then have been the ending of the object. A tentative choice might be [βωμ]όν, consisting of three large letters. The two curves of B might even be seen on the photo, but if these are indeed traces of a B, then the lacuna was more likely to have

\(^{33}\) This is more likely than assuming that there was a third, to mirror the divine triad. Otherwise, each altar would probably have been dedicated to only one god.

\(^{34}\) Güney reads: - - - - - - - Ὑσ[ιω] | (2) κα[ὶ Δ][ικ][ἀνέστησεν] | τη[σ] | ὑπ[ὲρ] | (4) τῆς | [...], and translates: ‘N. N. set this up (and performed a vow) to Hosios and Dikaios for their [...].’ Güney’s indications of what is left are unclear. While she seems to be implying that the first seven letters have been lost, I suggest that the initial lacuna was closer to 11 letters, given that ΟΣ are above ΕΣ of line 2. By the same count, the lacuna in line three before ON ΥΠ (the latter two stand below ΕΣ) comprised about 11-7 = 4 letters, while nearly everything is uncertain in line 4.
4-5 rather than 3 letters. Add to this that the explicit mention of a sponsored altar in a dedicatory inscription requires the definite article.35

Hence, a better alternative is needed.36 We may let the first line begin, just as in L and M, with Ἀπόλλωνι, either after a free space or followed by καὶ. Although καὶ would be a slight variation of L and M, the supplement would add up to exactly 11 letters. If this is accepted, then [ca. 4]ον would automatically have to be the subject of ἀνέστησεν. The lost noun would denote an association. Β[ακχί]ον would be an excellent solution, starting with B, consisting of seven letters altogether and pointing to a Dionysiac thiasos, for which there is more evidence in the area, as indicated above (K-a, K-b) and explained further below (O, P).37

The reading ἀνέσ- | τησεν is plausible, although it requires us to leave the space of two letters free at the end of line 2, in contrast to line 1 (Οσ[ιω]). But this vacat will gain probability, when we see that it was repeated at the end of line 3, with the letters EP opening line 4. Most of this last line is in fact lost and Güney’s τῆς is very uncertain, since it is hard to tell intentional strokes and damage apart. However, the upper bar of E and the vertical stroke of P are visible, and perhaps even the latter’s (small) bow. The next letter is entirely uncertain, the subsequent one is Α or Δ, followed by T, before the shade of O or Ω may be visible underneath EN (of line 3). If correct, this would imply smaller and thus more letters in line 4, up to ca. 18 instead of 13/15. Towards the end of the line, the upper left part of another O or Ω can be discerned, which we may complete to a genitive plural ending. The preceding letter is uncertain, but the one before that was either Α or Δ. In conclusion, I suggest the tentative reading:


‘To [Apollo and] Hosios an[D]ik[aios] has the Bakchion erected (the altar) for thems[elves and their o]wn.’

O (fig. 5) = Güney 2018a, no. 5 is a revised inscription of a marble altar, which C. G. J. Anderson had seen in Yukarı Dudaş (Anderson 1899, 80 no. 44 = Mitchell 1988, RECAM II 45 = Ricl 1991, no. 86), but which is now also in Kayı.

[Ἀ]γαθῇ τύ- | (2) vac. χῃ·vac. | [Ὁσί]ῳ καὶ Δικέῳ Παρ- | (4) [..] διατέ ὑπὲρ ἑαυ- | [τ]ῶν κὲ τῶν ἰδίων | (6) πάντων εὐχήν.

With good fortune! Par[---]diatai (erected this altar) to Hosios and Dikaios for (the well-being) of themselves and all their own (families), (fulfilling) a vow.38

Anderson, following Ramsey, understood the corrupt word in lines 2-3 as παραγωδιᾶτε, i.e., ‘wearers of the παραγωδίης’, which men bore as ‘one of the insignia of office’.39 Güney is, however,

\[^{35}\] I.Ankara I, p. 510 lists 17 examples, all with article. Also see above, G.

\[^{36}\] Yet another option would be Αγαθῇ τύχῃ plus some free space - but this formula normally stands apart from the main text.

\[^{37}\] See below, my discussion of Π, also addressing the abovementioned Masikenon from Aşağınlıca.

\[^{38}\] Güney translates: ‘With good fortune! N. N. … on behalf of themselves and their whole family performed a vow to Hosios and Dikaios.’

\[^{39}\] Anderson 1899, 80.
inclined to follow Mitchell’s suggestion that we have to do with an incomplete, otherwise unknown ethnic, and therefore holds back from a tentative completion of the name.\textsuperscript{40} What tips the balance against an ethnic interpretation is how the beneficiaries of the dedication are expressed: ‘for (the well-being) of themselves and all their own (families)’. We should therefore add this inscription from Yukarı Dudaş to the potential evidence for associations among the dedicants to \textit{Hosios kai Dikaios}.

I remain unsure as to the supplementation. Ramsey’s and Anderson’s reading Παρ[αγω]διάται is only a theoretical possibility; the term might then hypothetically denote men distinguished by certain insignia, although the same restored word might also evoke a ritual procession in which a sacred object was paraded (παράγεσθαι). But the ending -διάτε cannot easily be explained as Greek. For this reason, I abstain from a supplementation, other than accepting, with all previous commentators, that the ending -τε is to be read as -ται. The Παρ[. . .]διατε should at least tentatively be added to our growing list of obscure names for associations in Phrygia.\textsuperscript{41} Many such groups in the area were devoted to Zeus Bronton\textsuperscript{42} or Dionysos, the latter of which may be alluded to in the reliefs on the monument from Yukarı Dudaş.\textsuperscript{43}

\textit{P} (fig. 6) = Güney 2018a, no. 1 is a marble altar that was reused in an ancient church building in Kayapınar, 2.2 km northeast of Otluk in the northeastern corner of the Mihalıççık District. Note-worthy is the (fragmentary) relief on top depicting Helios, holding four bridles attached to horses pulling his quadriga. Güney reads the inscription as follows:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
1 & Ἀγαθῆ τύχη \\
2 & Κταηνοῖ Βακχίων  \\
& τὸ περὶ Τύραννο- \\
3 & Ὅσίω Δικέω υπῆ[ρ] \\
& ἐτῶν κὲ τῶν ἰδ[ἰων] \\
4 & εὐχήν, ἐπιμ[ελο]- \\
& θυμένου Ἀπ[. .] \\
& [. .]θου κὲ Κλ[. .] \\
& [. . .]τυρ[. . .] \\
& - - - - - - - - - - - -
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

'With good fortune! The Ktaenoi Bachion around Tyrannis performed a vow for Hosios Dikaios on behalf of themselves and their families; App(as?) son of (Anthos?) and Cl(audius) son of Tyrannos? . . . took care of it."

(Transl. Güney)

\textsuperscript{40} Thus also Ricl 1991, 39 f., no. 86.

\textsuperscript{41} RECAM IV 25 exemplifies the risk of supplementing a \textit{hapax legomena}, see appendix.

\textsuperscript{42} Cf. Haspels 1971, vol. 1, 353, no. 142: Οἱ αὐτοὶ ἀδελ- | φοὶ Διὶ Βροντῶ- | ντο εὐχήν. For further references, see above, ns. 2, 7, 27 f.

\textsuperscript{43} See (without this conclusion) the description of Güney 2018a, 106: ‘figures clasping hands? and wearing chiton below the inscription, one of which holds the staff of justice; a bunch of grape with long stalk on the left side of the stone, a crater on the right depicted; fitted to the ground as used as pedestal for a flower-pot.’ For similar objects, cf. the altar put up by the \textit{Mystai Koroseanoi Neobachchoi} for Zeus Dionysios at Marlakkos/n: Haspels 1971, vol. 1, p. 354, no. 144; vol. 2, fig. 638.
In her commentary, Güney mentions an inscription from Akmonia that attests a Κταηνῶν κώμη, though she hesitates to identify those villagers with the Ktaenoi from Kayapınar, given a distance of about 240 km. I agree with her hesitation, but not with her suggestion that there was a homonymous village near Kayapınar. Less clear is her understanding of Βαχιον. She notes: ‘Bachos as a name and a community related to the cult of Dionysos (νεόβαχχοι) is known in Phrygia.’ But LGPN VC 84 (with MAMA V 168, from the countryside of Dorylaion) suggests reading the name from Dorylaion as Βάχιον, i.e. the theonym in a secondary use as personal name. I am thus inclined to correct this to read Βάχιον. Still, this does not yet account for the ending -ον, which renders the name neuter singular. The Νεόβαχχοι are putting us on a trail to solve the problem. They are attested in an inscription from the village of Avdan (Μαρλακκος/ν), an area that was particularly sacred to Zeus Bronton (see K-a, K-b), for whom various sanctuaries may have existed and over two dozen inscribed dedications have been found. Occasionally the god is also addressed as ‘Zeus Dionysos’, a conflation most likely due to the similar meaning of Bronton and Bakchios, besides the shared etymology of Zeus (Dios) and Dionysos. The inscription Güney is referring to reads as follows: Μύσται Κοροσε- | ναοι Νεοβάχχοι | ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῶν κὲ κώμης Διὶ Διο- | θύντες εὐχήν. Koroseanoi is generally regarded as an ethnic, and in view of the attestation of Korosokometai in Muratlar Köyü near Kotyaion / Kütahya, this would indeed be a plausible assumption. Akyürek Şahin hesitates from connecting the two names because of the distance to Avdan, but ultimately concludes that the home of the Korosokometai is likely to be found near Muratlar, where the Mystai Koroseanoi have been attested.

Without denying that both names are etymologically related, a more plausible explanation would be that the Koroseanoi present themselves as a particularly defined subgroup of a Bacchic association in Marlakkos/n / Avdan. They appear to hail from or live in the same village, which is implied by the unspecified mention of κώμης (‘their village’) as secondary beneficiary after themselves. We can thus infer that the Koroseanoi were an association (whose adherents were not necessarily

45 She is now inclined to accept Klaenoi as a cult collegium (email, 2 Feb. 2020).
46 Cf. Coşkun 2011 on theophoric personal names.
47 The letter(s) between B and X are difficult to read; most clearly visible is A or Λ, which might be preceded or followed by I, but these vertical strokes touch the subsequent letters, which otherwise only happen where the stone cutter intended a ligature. The strokes therefore appear to be unintended damage.
48 I was initially inclined to read omega instead of omicron, to overcome the grammatical problem (‘Klaenoi of the Bakchioi’) and believed to find support for that in what seemed to be the two bottom hastae in the photo published by Güney. But the higher-resolution photos she kindly sent me confirm omicron.
49 See above, ns. 2, 7, 27 f.
50 Both epithets allude to the noisefulness of the ecstatic cult rites, as does Bromios, the epithet of Dionysos known from his mystery cult in Smyrna: I.Smyrna 728; cf. Harland 2013, 58.
52 Akyürek Şahin 2004, 140. Ricl 2008, no. 21 does not draw a connection with the inscription from Avdan, while Güney 2018a does not refer to the inscription from Muratlar Köyü; both leave the home location of the respective group open. Avram 2016b, 98 locates the Koroseanoi near Avdan, without specification.
all designated mystai) and that they were living in Marlakkos/n. If this is the case, then these Koroseanoi have to be distinguished from the Korosokometai in Muratlar. At any rate, the dedication of the latter was likely made outside their own village territory, for otherwise they would barely have used a form of an ethnic that emphatically identifies them as villagers through the ending -κωμήται. It is at least possible that they wanted to avoid being confused with a similarly named association. The inscription from Avdan thus attests that a cohort of new initiates to the Bacchic mysteries (Νεοβάχχοι)53 fulfilled their vow, expecting divine blessing for themselves and their village.

Perhaps the Masikenoi, who are also attested in Açıkkaya (K: Ἡλίῳ Ὅσιῳ | Δικαίῳ Ἀπόλλωνι | Μασικηνοί οἱ εὐχήν), Avdan (K-a: Μασικηνοι υπέρ καρπῶν καὶ τῶν ἱδίων πάντων Διὶ Βροντῶντι εὐχήν) and Aşağıülca (K-b: Νέαρχον Μασικηνον κε Βάκχος Διὶ Βροντῶντι εὐχήν), formed a similar association at the village level, just as the ΚΗΙΟΥΕΡΗΝΟΙ μόσται, who are likewise attested as having made a dedication to Zeus Dionysos in Aşağıülca.54

The inscription from Aşağıülca (K-b) is further of interest due to the unique combination of dedicants: the Νεορχον Μασικηνον and Bakchos. Is the latter the name of a high official within the cult organization (such as the leaders of the temple of Kybele in Pessinus are called Attis or Bat-takes), or is he the god Dionysos himself, meaning that part of the expenses had been covered from the treasury of (a sanctuary of) this god? Also remarkable is the juxtaposition of the nominative singular neuter (Νεορχον Μασικηνον) with the nominative singular masculine (Bakchos). This seems to imply that the former denotes a unit within the Masikenoi community. If we can take Νέαρχον literally, then we might be looking at the ‘New Leadership’ level of the organization. However, a connection with an individual called Nearchos who held a prominent position in the association is likewise possible.

At all events, the inscription from Aşağıülca (K-b) mentioning the Νεορχον Μασικηνον together with Bakchos as well as the obscure neuter subject ending -ον attested in Kayı, most likely to be read as Βακχίον, allow for a better understanding of the Κταηνοῖ Βακχίον from Kayapınar: the nominative plural Κταηνοῖ is the subject of the sentence, as recognizable from the reflexive pronoun ἑαυτῶν, and Βακχίον, a generic term for a Dionysiac circle, serves as its apposition. The latter is complemented by a prepositional complement, τὸ περὶ Τύραννον. This implies that there were more Dionysiac associations in the area, possibly even more than one with the name Κταηνοῖ. Tyrannos may either have been the spiritual leader of this group or a perhaps a divine epithet for Dionysos (although it is also attested for Men and Zeus).55

Regarding the remainder of the inscription, it shows once more a twofold structure of the beneficiaries of the dedication: υπὲρ ἑαυτῶν κε τῶν ἱδίων. This is a plausible formulation from the point of view of the members of an association, but not for a collective of villagers.

Güney further proposes to restore the fragmentary names of the executors as App[as], son of [An]thos or [PA]thos, and Kl[audios], son of Tyr[annos]. This reconstruction is possible, but it is

53 On neoi and the likes, see below, n. 57.
more likely that the two epimeletai were Roman citizens with a gentile name followed by a cognomen. Such an elevated social status would be fitting for their prominent roles, and the stone leaves sufficient space for the one additional I in line 7 or rather for the Y in line 8. *Klaudios Tyrannos* or *Tyrannios* is barely identical with or the son of the Tyrannos mentioned above in line 3, who does not bear a gentile name. Otherwise, *Klaudios Tyrann(i)os* would likely have been mentioned before *App[ios] [An]?thos*. We should therefore once more conclude that *Tyrannos* in line 3 is a divine epithet, whereas *Tyrann(i)os* suitably serves as cognomen of one of the god’s devotees.

Güney adds a dashed line at the bottom, to indicate that the inscription might have continued on the now-lost part of the stone. But she has confirmed to me that no letter traces of another line are visible. Grammatically, the dedication appears to be complete, if the regular omission of the predicate (ἀνέστησαν) is admitted. We can thus restore the text as follows:

`Ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ· | (2) Κταηνοῖ Βακχίον | τὸ περὶ Τύραννον | (3) Ὁσίῳ Δικέῳ ὑπὲρ | ἑα(υ)τῶν κὲ τῶν | ἱδ[ιων] | (6) εὐχήν, ἐπιμέλους | (7) ἐπιμελο- | υμένου Ἀπ[ίος] | (8) Ἄν[θου κὲ Κλαυ-] | [δίου] Τυρ[άννου].`

‘With good fortune! The Ktaenoi, a Bacchic circle around Tyrannos, (fulfilled their) vow to Hosios Dikaios for (the well-being of) themselves and their own (families); App(as?), son of Anthos (?), and Klaudios, son of Tyrannos, took care of it.’

### IV. Conclusions and Outlook

My discussion of the five (mostly) new inscriptions recently published by Güney has started with the two dedications by Chryseros (Güney 2018a, nos. 2, 3 = L, M). Besides some minor improvements of the text, I have tried to enhance our understanding of the formulae and the implications of their variations, especially if the dedicants were (or included) a political community, such as a village. The inscriptions illustrate that dedications by a village community on its own territory do not need to use an ethnic or toponym. The use of either on home soil is the exception rather than the rule. Güney (2018a, no. 4 = N) explains one of the three remaining inscriptions as a private dedication, while the other two seem to give us the ethnic of a public dedication (Güney 2018a, nos. 5, 1 = O, P). Instead, I propose that all three inscriptions rather attest associations, a Βακχίον (N), the Παρ[---]διᾶται (O), and the Κταηνοῖ, further specified as the Βακχίον τὸ περὶ Τύραννον (P).

In the course of the argument, I also revisited some of the dedicatory inscriptions for Zeus Brontos or Zeus Dionysos in the sanctuary area on and around the Türkmen Mountains: while the intensive activity of associations is generally acknowledged for this region, I have questioned the standard practice of understanding - often obscure - names ending on -εανοι or -ηνοι regularly as toponymic ethnics, unless they are explicitly labeled as μύσται. The overall results of the present study warrant further development of this criticism.

In her seminal studies of the cult of *Hosios kai Dikaios* from 1991/92, Ricl only acknowledges two instances of dedications by ‘une association cultuelle’, both from Yaılababa Köyü, the hotspot near the Türkmen Baba, the peak of the Türkmen Dağları. She contrasts them with nine dedications

---

56. A clear exception is *Marlakkos/n* / Avdan, for which see the references above, n. 23, and below, n. 62.

(also all from Phrygia) ‘élévé soit par l’ensemble d’une communauté villageoise, soit par des particuliers pour la prospérité de leur village’. In her update from 2008, Ricl points to only one new public dedication, that of the Kommenoi in Mysia (no. 37 = J). But from her catalogue, we certainly have to add the dedications by the Korosokometai attested in Muratlar (no. 21 = H), the Koniskomenon demos known from Lagina (no. 30 = I), and also the Masikenoi attested on the monument from Akçakaya (no. 20 = K), at least as long as we accept the prevailing views on them. To be consistent with Ricl’s broad definition, we should moreover consider the mention of the patris among the beneficiaries in a private dedication from Doğanlar (no. 24 = G). Finally, four of the five inscriptions adduced by Güney have to be counted in, although the dedication from Yükari Dudaş first published by Anderson already forms part of Ricl’s corpus (L, M, O = Ricl 1991, no. 86, P). Accordingly, current scholarship acknowledges up to 17 dedications to Hosios kai Dikaios involving a village.

We should, however, exclude from this count a highly fragmentary inscription that cannot have any weight in the present study. When it comes to the dedicants proper, we ought to detract, moreover, three cases in which the village is not in charge. Twice it is meant to benefit from the invoked divine protection: once in Kuyacak (between Dorylaion and Nakoleia), where the dedicants are concerned about their katoikia, and once in Doğanlar (no. 24 = G, mentioning the patris). These two cases are, again, good examples to highlight that toponyms were not needed in inscriptions on one’s own village territory. A third document comes from İnönü, in which the ethnic Sakleanoi does not credit the whole village with a dedication, but only tells us that the two stone masons Diomas and Eutyches hail from ‘Sakle’.

has shown, also adding a hitherto unpublished inscription from the Manisa Museum that records a dedication of the Neoi Philanpeloi to Meter Leto (AD 161/62). We are thus looking at a community of ‘Vine-Lovers’, which Malay connects with viticulture in the area (Strab. Geogr. 13.4.11), without, however, pointing out that the association was of a cultic nature: ‘They describe themselves as νέοι, and it is not clear whether this adjective was employed to make a distinction between two rival associations of vine-lovers or points to a new organization replacing the older.’ Malay’s new reading is accepted by Ricl 2008, 566 (without further comment) and together with his interpretation also by Harland 2014, 143-145. But I suggest we take neoi and neoterai as ‘new’ or ‘recent initiates’ of an association (also see above, ns. 27 and 53), and acknowledge moreover that the vine points to a Dionysiac thiasos. This would be in line with the rest of our evidence for Phrygian associations making dedications to Hosios kai Dikaios, see below, part IV, after n. 63 and with ns. 66 f.

58 Ricl 1991, 85: nos. 25, 29, 33, 37, 40, 80, 81, 86, 96. One might count as 8th the dedication based on the decree of the city council and assembly of Nicopolis ad Istrum (JHS 45, 1925, 96 = Ricl 1991, no. 110), but I confine my investigation to the rural areas, for which all of Ricl’s examples are from the Phrygian lands, mostly in northwestern Galatia.

59 Ricl 1991, 80 from Zemme = JHS 8, 1887, 513, no. 94.

60 Ricl 1991, no. 33 = MAMA V 184.

Two other instances are spurious, because it is not the community that sponsors the dedication, but ‘the best men of the village Marlakkos/n’ (Ricl 1991, no. 29) and ‘those who pray among the Apokometai’ (Ricl 1991, no. 37, from Nakoleia / Seytigazi). Conspicuously, in both of these cases, the dedicants ask the gods ‘for the salvation of all of their kin’. I next detract the cases that are better explained as evidence for Bacchic circles instead of ethnics: the Masikenoi from Akçakaya (Ricl 2008, no. 20 = Erten – Sivas 2011 = K), the Παρ[---]διατε from Yukan Dudaş (Güney 2018a, no. 5 = O), and the Κταηνοῖ Βα(κ)χῖον τὸ περὶ Τύραννον from Kayapınar (Güney 2018a, no. 1 = P). Accordingly, the remaining total of dedications to Hosios kai Dikaios by entire villages is down from 17 to 8. The number is reduced even further to 6, if we also exclude dedicants for whom we have no solid basis to decide whether their name denotes a village community or an association. This pertains to the Pontanenoi attested in Akın south of Nakoleia as well as to the Kommenoi from near Hadrianeia.

The limited evidence that does involve entire village communities approaching the divine couple falls into two groups. Three instances show a combination of an ethnic and generic term specifying that the proper name refers to an ethnic community: the Korosokometai from Muratlar near Kotaion (Ricl 2008, no. 21 = H), the Koniskoumenon demos from Lagina / Ilgın and the Alianon katoikia from Kırgıl northwest of Çavdarhisar (Ricl 1991, no. 81 = REG 3, 1890, 51, no. 1). None of these three instances has a ὑπὲρ or περὶ formula to specify a beneficiary: it is obvious that the whole village is making a dedication for the well-being of the whole village. The second group does not even name the settlement type or its inhabitants: the dedicant Chryseros is twice followed by anonymous kometai (L and M in Oğuz Pınarı near Kayi), where the purpose is once specified as ὑπὲρ τῆς ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίας and once as ὑπὲρ τῆς κώμης. Either expression is quite unspecific and in line with my proposal that a formula like ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων would be unsuitable. The third example is from Karaağaç (Hadrianopolis) and mentions the anonymous demos, besides the priest Manes as its executor.

At the same time, the number of ascertained associations is up from two to six. Since the dedications from Y aylaba Köyü are now considered to involve a Φιλανπέλων συνβίωσις (rather than Philangeloi), they, too, conform with the description as Bacchic thiasoi, as with the other four

---


64 Ricl 1991, no. 40 = Haspels 1971, no. 152 and Ricl 2008, no. 37 = J. Note that the name of the Kommenoi is clearly theophoric. It is certainly related to Ma, the Anatolian Mother Goddesses, whose most prestigious sanctuaries were in Kommana Pontike and Kommana Hierapolis, but who also gave her name to Pisidian Komama; cf. Zgusta 1984, § 562 f.; Mutlu 2016.


66 See above, n. 57.
attested associations. The evidence for these associations is now as numerous as the proven cases of village communities making dedications to Hosios kai Dikaios. Two (O, P) or possibly three (N) cases mention their kin generically among the beneficiaries, whereas the other half abstains from mentioning them. We should therefore avoid assuming that all unknown proper names with the suffix -enoi or -eanoi represent villagers. Based on the documentation and arguments I have presented here, we should rather expect that about half of the (likewise unspecific) dedications (not only) for Hosios kai Dikaios likely involve associations, or probably even more, since most cases in which a formula like ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων is used should tentatively be attributed to associations. It would seem to be a promising undertaking to revise our epigraphic and onomastic data in accordance with this hypothesis. Moreover, we should also rethink the practice of identifying proper names as toponymic ethnics as soon as etymologically related toponyms from near or even far are known. The same logic would require us to identify all proper names with plural endings derived from theonyms as denoting associations devoted to such deities. Apparently, such a practice would lead to a dilemma, as names derived from the goddess Ma might illustrate.

I would like to conclude with some remarks on the organization of groups devoted to Hosios kai Dikaios. Not only is the total number of dedications by villages, associations or priests relatively low, if compared to the 185 documented cases. Our overall evidence also suggests that the cult of Hosios kai Dikaios was not normally administered by a designated priest or that a political community took regular care of sanctuaries for this divine pair. Nor is there evidence that such cults followed a calendar for sacrifices or celebrated specific holidays, or further that a thiasos was centred around Hosios kai Dikaios. The most outspoken exception is a monument from Kibyra attesting three priests who sponsored the construction of a ‘temple for Herakles, his newly-born child Hosios and Dikaios and the Golden Virgin’, with one of the priests even serving as ‘temple warden’ (neokoros). This was obviously a new and highly imaginative creation.

For the rest, nothing seems to deserve the classification of cult organization, at least if that implies established institutions with funds belonging to the gods and personnel dedicated to their regular service. Offerings and prayers were of an irregular nature, mostly following private and only occasionally public initiatives. In the face of this lack of an established organization, the strong body of extant evidence for the Phrygians’ devotion to Hosios kai Dikaios is all the more impressive.

---

67 A potential further case is Ricl 1991, no. 52 (Διονυσ[...]|Ὃσι[...]), but the fragment should not be pressed.
69 See my considerations on Kommenoi above, n. 64.
70 Note that the three categories are not mutually exclusive. See, e.g., the case of the priest Manes acting on behalf of his demos (above, n. 66) or consider that mystery cults were not rarely sponsored publicly (cf. Harland 2014, 183-185).
71 Ricl 2008, no. 41 = Corsten – Ricl 2012. Another possible exception might be the monument from Akçakaya (K), for which I claim a mystery ritual involving Hosios kai Dikaios; at the same time, the Masikenoi rather appear as a Bacchic thiasos, see above.
72 See Ricl 1992a, 88-90 and 2008, 566 on our very limited understanding of the cult organization, though she misleadingly conveys the impression that the priests were those of the cult of Hosios kai Dikaios, for which there is no evidence. On the priests and priestesses, also see above, with n. 11.
simply a setting in which to pray to the gods who ostensibly had the power to bring justice and salvation; they offered a context in which to contribute substantial offerings to these deities and to fall under the umbrella of their protection.73

V. Appendix: A Votive Offering to Dikaios by Another Thiasos in Konya (RECAM IV 25)?

The discussion of the obscure Παρ[. . .]διατε (example O) is sometimes connected with a no less problematic inscription from the Konya Museum, for which many alternative readings have been proposed. The letters appear as ΤΗϹΠΑΡΘΕ | ΚΑΙΔΙΚΑΙΩ | ΧΗΝ. In the ed. pr., Calder 1911, 192-194, no. L (cf. SEG 6, 1932, 409) transcribed line 2 as ΚΑΙΔΙΚΑΙΩ and read Γῆς παρθε- | κα Γδίκαι ώ- | χήν, understanding πάρθεκα as a Phrygian dialectal form of παρέθεκε(ν) and Γδ- as a local variant for Δ. Ricl 1991, no. 99 remained uncommitted between this and other readings, but accepted the dedication as one directed to Dikaios without Hosios (see above, n. 4).

A major variation has been suggested by Laminger-Pascher (1984, 49 no. 62): Παρθέ(νω) | καὶ Δικαίω, whereby the Virgin is identified with Artemis. McLean (2002 = RECAM IV 25, with photo, fig. 37) has reduced speculation and presented a more conservative reading: Τῆς ΠΑΡΘΕ | ΚΑΙ Δικαίῳ | <εὐ>χήν. He is certainly right to point out that the veneration of Artemis as Virgin would be very unusual in Asia Minor. There was likewise no need to abbreviate the divine name or title, since the stone offers sufficient free space. But McLean too rashly rejects I instead of Γ before Δ. His choice would require us to accept that the horizontal bar of Γ touched the Δ (as Calder saw it and for which he offered a questionable morphological explanation), although this would be inconsistent with the remainder of the inscription, which avoids ligatures of any kind.

None of the previous approaches has yielded a satisfactory reading so far, and this is perhaps because of the premise that the text is largely complete, with only few letters lost or abbreviated. I wonder, however, if there is not a better solution, even if it is admittedly hypothetical. To me, it seems that the stone cutter, who obviously did not understand Greek, was working from a note sheet whose left half had been lost. This view is not only supported by the difficult ending of line 1 and beginning of line 2, but also by the blank before ΧΗΝ, which is conspicuously centered in line 3. Accordingly, the intended text might well have been quite unspectacular, e.g., [Ὅνυσκ-ρά]τῆς Παρθε- | [νίου Ὁσίῳ καὶ Δικαίῳ | [vac. εύ]χήν. The supplementation of the name and patronymic of the dedicant is just a random example, but the assumption that the votive offering had been for Hosios and Dikaios together is very likely.

73 See Ricl 1992a, 87 and 2008, 565 f. on the (low) social strata of the dedicants. Harland 2013, 19-23 is of course right to caution against the view that members of any associations were typically poor; while he sees a preponderance of the middle classes, he concludes: ‘Some [associations] could be more homogeneous, others more heterogeneous, in terms of the social standing and gender of group members.’ A good example for an association’s potential of levelling out social difference is the ‘constitution’ of a Dionysiac cult in Lydian Philadelphia, see SIG² 985 = TAM V 1539 = Harland 2014, 178-193, no. 117, mentioning free and slaves side by side.
Bibliography


Anderson 1899  J. C. G. Anderson, Exploration in Galatia Cis Halym, JHS 19, 1899, 52-134.


Avram 2016a  A. Avram, Two Phrygian Gods between Phrygia and Dacia, Colloquium Anatolicum 15, 2016, 71-83.


Güney 2019b  H. Güney, A New Dedication to Potamos from Parsibey in Northeast Phrygia, Philia 5, 2019, 41-44.


Mitchell 1988  S. Mitchell, Regional Epigraphic Catalogues of Asia Minor II: The


Mutlu 2016 S. Mutlu, Tanrıça Ma (Mâ) ve Kappadokia Komana’sı, Phaselis 2, 2016, 311-322.


Hosios kai Dikaios'a Adak Sunanlar İçindeki Dionysos Dernekleri
Kuzeybatı Galatia Bölgesi’ndeki Mihalıççık’tan Yeni Yayımlanan Yazıtları Tekrar İncelemek

Öz

Anahtar Sözcükler: Hosios ve Dikaios, Apollon, Helios, adak (εὐχή), adak yazıtı formülü, Khoria Konsidiana, Khryseros, Dionysos kült derneği, Bakkhion, Doğu Phrygia, Türkmen Dağları, Mihalıççık, Esşişehir, Kütahya.

Dionysiac Associations among the Dedicants of Hosios kai Dikaios
Revisiting Recently Published Inscriptions from the Mihalıççık District in North-West Galatia

Abstract
Four new epigraphic finds from the Mihalıççık District encourage us to reconsider the role that villages and associations played among those who made dedications to the divine pair Hosios kai Dikaios. According to the distribution of the evidence, the cult originated and remained concentrated on the north-east of Phrygia Epiktetos, but spread all over western Asia Minor and even beyond. After surveying the documents known previously especially thanks to M. Ricl (1991; 1992a; 2008) and classifying elements of the dedication formula, slightly improved readings and interpretations are offered for the five inscriptions (re-) published by H. Güney (2018a): twice, the imperial slave Chrysersos is attested as fulfilling vows to the gods together with his fellow villagers (nos. 2, 3); three other instances, however, involve associations: perhaps a Β[ακχῖον, the obscure Παρ[---]διᾶται, and the Κταηνοῖ, further specified as the Βακχῖον τὸ περὶ Τύραννον (nos. 4, 5, 1). The combined evidence catalogued by Ricl and Güney adds up to some 185 dedications to Hosios kai Dikaios, including, in their views, 17 cases that originated from village communities, compared to only two by associations. The present study argues instead that the ascertained evidence for villages is only six and that this is on par with the documentation of associations. All six of the latter can be identified as Dionysiac thiasoi.

Keywords: Hosios and Dikaios, Apollo, Helios, votive (εὐχή), dedication formula, Choria Konsidiana, Chrysersos, Dionysiac Association, Bakchion, East Phrygia, Türkmen Mountains, Mihalıççık, Esşişehir, Kütahya.
Fig. 1) First Chryseros Inscription from Kayı, top part (L-a). Photo: Hale Güney, 2015, with permission.

Fig. 2) First Chryseros Inscription from Kayı, bottom part (L-b). Photo: Hale Güney, 2015, with permission.

Fig. 3) Second Chryseros Inscription from Kayı (M). Photo: Hale Güney, 2015, with permission.
Fig. 4) New Dedication to Hostos kai Dikaios from Yukarı Dudaş (N).
Photo: Hale Güney, 2015, with permission.

Fig. 5) Dedication to Hostos kai Dikaios first published by C. G. J. Anderson (O).
Photo: Hale Güney, 2015, with permission.

Fig. 6) Dedication by the Ktaioi Ba(k)chion (P). Photo: Hale Güney, 2015, with permission.