

GEPHYRA	2	2005	47-58
---------	---	------	-------

Ebru N. AKDOĞU ARCA*

THE GENITIVE CASE ON *ALTARES* FROM ASIA MINOR INDICATING A BOUNDARY INSCRIPTION

Abstract: The author aims to show that altars too were used for marking boundaries. In a first step altars from various regions in Asia Minor are presented, whose function as boundary stones is confirmed by the inscriptions on them. Proceeding from this evidence, Akdoğru Arca assumes that even small altars mentioning a deity in the genitive case served as boundary markers. To support this view, she adduces similar *stelae* whose inscriptions confirm this function. Large numbers of such small altars and *stelae* appear to have been buried in the ground along property boundaries, evidently as a precaution against boundary usurpation.

Unless they contain a word related to boundaries, *altares*, as an object that was written upon, bearing the name of a god/goddess in the genitive case, to date have been considered as votives or *altares* by scholars. There are two reasons for this: firstly, the inscription bearer formally represents an *altar* and therefore some epithets, like *soter*, *epekoos*, stir up disorder, and secondly, there are no words meaning boundary in these inscriptions. Moreover, the location of the stones does not provide any exact information about the purpose of these *altares*. This article aims to show that *altares*, bearing the name of a god/goddess in the genitive case, should be considered boundary stones. This will be suggested from examples given in this paper, together with the supporting evidence. In this context, firstly, it will be useful to make a general assessment within the context of the form of expression employed on them.

The use of ὄρος in Attike-Koine Greek, which means ‘*boundary, boundary stone*’ differs from region to region. The Ionian form is οὔρος¹, and the Cercyrian form ὄρφορ, ὄρβορ². It is documented in Crete and Argos as ὄρος³ and in the Megarian colony Herakleia Pontike as ὄρρορ⁴. The diminutive form of this word is ὄριον⁵.

* Arş. Gör. Ebru N. Akdoğru Arca, Akdeniz Üniversitesi; Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi; Eskiçağ Dilleri ve Kùltürleri Bölümü Kampus; TR – 07058 Antalya (ebruakdogu@akdeniz.edu.tr).

¹ H. von Gaertringen, *Inschriften von Priene*, Berlin 1906, no. 458 (=GDI 5493 b); H. Engelmann – R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai* (IK 2), Bonn 1973, no. 235; M. Ç. Şahin, *Five New Inscriptions from Halikarnassus*, ZPE 20, Bonn, 1976, p. 22-23, no. 5; W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Iasos II* (IK 28, 2), Bonn 1985, no. 233, 234 (=GDI 5518).

² IG IX(I) 698, 700.

³ Syll.³ 685, line 59.

⁴ L. Jonnes, *The Inscriptions of Heraclea Pontica. With a Prosopographia Heracleotica* by W. Ameling (IK 47), Bonn 1994, no. 70: ὄρρορ τῶ | ἱερῶ τότο | ἔνδορ μῆ | θάπτειν.

⁵ Liddell – Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, s.v. ὄρος, ὄριον; cf. H. Engelmann – R. Merkelbach, οὔρος, ὄρος, ZPE 8, 1971, 97.

Concerning the boundary stones, if there is not a boundary decree, one's attention is drawn to the fact that the inscriptions are most brief. These inscriptions were formulated generally either with abbreviations or through the joining of the description of the land in the genitive case beside the exact word related to boundary. The word "boundary" could be abbreviated as "o" or "op" and "opi" (= ὄριον).

However, there are some *horos* inscriptions which do not contain any word related to boundary. They are divided into four groups. In the first group are the inscriptions which define the temple lands in the style of Ἱερὸς | Διονύσου⁶ or Ἱερὸν | τῶν ἀπὸ | Πάννου⁷. In the second group are the votives of boundary stone quality⁸. In addition to these it is noteworthy that the word *horos* is *scilicet* and also the *ethnicon* of the said settlement had been used as an abbreviation in a limited number of rock-cut inscriptions⁹. In the fourth group are inscriptions which have the name of a god/goddess in the genitive case. Although the number of these is limited, they indicate that the people of antiquity did not always need to employ a descriptive word relating to boundaries (*horos, horia, fines etc.*) on boundary inscriptions, as is also the case in many other types of inscription.

There are two groups of inscription bearer related to inscriptions in the genitive case in the fourth group and they form the main subject of this article. The first group is *stelae* (columns, pillars, blocs, slabs) and the second group is *altares*. We know from both literary sources and inscriptions that *stelae* had been used as an instrument of boundary determination¹⁰. For example: περιορίσας τὴν πόλιν | τὰς στήλας | ἔταξεν¹¹; εὐθέως δὲ καὶ περιορίσαι καὶ στηλῶσαι τὴν χώραν καὶ [προσ]αναγράψ[αι] τὸν περιορισμὸν εἰς τὰς στήλας τὰς προειρημένους¹²; τὴν χώραν | ἀνέθηκεν | ὡς αἰ σ[τή]λα[ι] | ὁ[ρ]ίζο[υ]σιν¹³ etc.

⁶ Cf. F. Sokolowski, *Lois Sacrées de L'Asie Mineure*, Paris 1955, no. 85 = Syll.³ 989; H. Engelmann – R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai* (IK 2), Bonn 1973, no. 233; G. Petzl, *Die Inschriften von Smyrna II/1* (IK 24, 1), Bonn 1987, no. 723 = Syll.³ 990; E. Schwertheim – H. Wiegartz (ed.), *Neue Forschungen zu Neandria und Alexandria Troas* (AMS XI), Bonn 1994, 43-44, no. 4; M. Riel, *The Inscriptions of Alexandria Troas* (IK 53), Bonn 1997, no. 69, 70, 71.

⁷ D. Knibbe et al., *JÖAI* 62, 1993, Hauptblatt 133-134, no. 30 (= SEG XLIII, 1993, no. 797).

⁸ A votive stone from Phrygia, two metre in height, conglomerate-limestone quadrangular pillar, which also had the function of a boundary stone, for the safety and the everlasting of Emperor Hadrianus dedicated to θεοῖς Ἐπορίοις (*to the boundary gods*): IGR III 324; M. Christol – Th. Drew Bear, *Un castellum romain près d'Apamée de Phrygie*, Wien 1987 (ETAM 12), 13-19, no. 1 (= SEG XXXVII, 1987, no. 1100).

⁹ Βαλ(βουρέων): A.V.Çelgin – G. Çelgin, *Doğu ve Kuzeydoğu Lykia Araştırmaları*, in: O. Belli (ed.), *Türkiye Arkeolojisi ve İstanbul Üniversitesi, İstanbul 2000*, 437; H. Hellenkemper – F. Hild, *Lykien und Pamphylien*, TIB 8.2, Wien 2004, 477, s.v. Balbura; Κι(τανουρέων): B. İplikçioğlu, *Doğu ve Kuzeydoğu Likya - Güneybatı Pisidia Epigrafik-Tarihi Coğrafi Yüzey Araştırmaları Projesi 2000 Yılı Çalışmaları*, AST XIX 2, Ankara 2002, 131f; Με(λανπαγιτών): E. Doğer, *Some Boundary Stones in Southern Aiolis*, *Arkeoloji Dergisi* 3, 1995, no. 5; (SEG XLV 1995, no. 1657).

¹⁰ See Liddell - Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, s.v. στήλη.

¹¹ S. Şahin, *Die Inschriften von Arykanda* (IK 48), Bonn 1994, no. 25 (= SEG XXXIV, 1984, no. 1309, 1310).

¹² A. Rehm, *Didyma*, vol. 2: *Die Inschriften*, Berlin 1958, no. 492; OGIS 225; C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period. A Study in Greek Epigraphy*, Chicago 1974², 89-100, no. 18.

¹³ H. Malay, *Researches in Lydia, Mysia and Aiolis* (ETAM 23), Wien 1999, no. 3.

While such *stelae* erected as boundary stones, bear formal decrees which had been taken as boundary decision to determinate a certain area of land, on the other hand they bear a god's name in the genitive or an *ethnikon* beside the word *horos*, for example:

1) Boundary stone from Erythrai¹⁴:

οὔρος
2 [[Δίω]]ς.

2) Boundary stone of the Artemis Temple from Lydia-Hierokaisareia¹⁵:

ὄρος
2 ἱερός
ἄσυλο[ς]
4 [Ἀ]ρτέ[μι]-
[δος].

3) Boundary stone of the Athena Temple from Priene¹⁶:

ὄρο[ς]
2 Ἀθηνᾶς.

4) Boundary of Gabia, of Antiochos's lands and of Kaperkadachoi from Kommagene¹⁷:

	ὄριον	ὄριον	ὄριον
2	Γαβίας.	ἀγρ(ῶν)Ἀντι- όχου.	Καπερ- καδαχ- ων Ἀν- vac. - -
4			

5) Boundaries of Attioukome and another village from Phrygia¹⁸:

ὄροι Ἀτ-
2 τιουκώ-
μης και
[..]. . . .

6) Boundary of the village of Laginoi from Phrygia¹⁹:

ὄρος
2 Λαγι-
νων.

¹⁴ H. Engelmann – R. Merkelbach, Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai (IK 2), Bonn 1973, no. 235.

¹⁵ Maria Paz de Hoz, Die lydischen Kulte im Lichte der griechischen Inschriften, AMS 36, Bonn 1999, p. 131, no. 3.4.

¹⁶ H. von Gaertringen, Inschriften von Priene, Berlin 1906, no. 167.

¹⁷ SEG XLI 1991, no. 1498.

¹⁸ T. Drew Bear, Trois Villages de Phrygie, in: N. Başgelen-G. Çelgin-A. V. Çelgin (ed), Anatolien and Thracian Studies in Honor of Zafer Taşlıklioğlu Armağanı Anadolu ve Trakya Çalışmaları I, 1999, p.72, no. 5.

¹⁹ T. Drew Bear, Trois Villages de Phrygie, in: N. Başgelen-G. Çelgin-A. V. Çelgin (ed), Anatolien and Thracian Studies in Honor of Zafer Taşlıklioğlu Armağanı Anadolu ve Trakya Çalışmaları I, 1999, p. 72, no. 7.

7) Boundaries of Andeda and Pogla and lands of Plancii from Pisidia²⁰:

- ὄρ-
 2 ος
 Ἄν(δήδων)
 4 Πώ(γλων)
 Πλ(ανκιάνων).

Altars were also used to define boundaries as were *stelae* and bore similar inscriptions, for example:

1) *Altar* in the border area between *Leuke* and *Pteleon*, carrying an epigram cited by Demosthenes²¹:

- Τόνδε καθιδρύσαντο θεῶ περικαλλέα βωμὸν
 2 Λευκῆς καὶ Πτελεοῦ μέσσον ὄρον θέμενοι
 ἐνναέται, μοίρης σημήιον ἀμμορίης τε·
 4 αὐτὸς ἄναξ μακάρων ἐστὶ μέσος Κρονίδης.

2) *Altar* relief cut in the rock at the Cilician Gates²²:

- Imp. Caesar Marcus Au-
 2 relius [Antoninus pi]us
 felix, invictus Augu-
 4 stus montibus caesi[s]
 viam latiore[m] fecit.
 6 ὄ ρ ο ι Κ ι λ ι -
 κ ω ν.

3) Limestone *altar* from Arsameia ad Nymphaios²³:

- ὄρι(ον) τεμ(ένου)ς ἱερ(οῦ).
 2 κυδαίνω[ν]
 Φιλιάδελ-
 4 φος ἐτεύξα-
 το βωμὸν
 6 ἄναξιν.

4) Grey marble, round *altar* from Eymir in Phrygia²⁴:

- ὄροι Ἄραυ-
 2 κώμης.

²⁰ D. H. French, *The Definition of Territories: Cappadocia*, in: Le Guen-Pollet, B. Peron – O. Pelon (ed.), *La Cappadoce méridionale jusqu'à la fin de l'époque romaine. État des recherches (Actes du Colloque d'Istanbul [Institut Français d'Études Anatoliennes] 13-14 avril 1987)*, Paris 1991, appendix p. 52.

²¹ Demosthenes 7, 39f; *Anthologia Palatina* IX 786; B. D. Meritt – H. T. Wade-Gerry – M. F. McGregor, *The Athenian Tribute Lists I*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1939, 564f.

²² D. Berges – J. Nollé, *Tyana I* (IK 55), Bonn 2000, no. 135.

²³ S. Şahin, *Forschungen in Kommagene I*, EA 18, 1991, 107-108, no. 3.

²⁴ MAMA X, London 1993, no. 178.

5) Re-used? round *altar* from Sarayköy²⁵:

In h(onorem) d(ominorum) Imp(eratorum) Severi et Anton[ini] et [[Ge-
 2 tae]] Caesaris Aug(ustorum) n(ostorum trium) Max[imius Atti]-
 anus q(uaestor) pr(o) pr(aetore), missus [10-12 a Sem]-
 4 pronio Senecione [proconsule - - -]
 determin[avit].

6) Quadrangular *altar* from Phrygia²⁶:

Left face: ὄρος Ἀ|ποκό|μις.

Right face: ὄρος | Κολια|νοκό|μις.

7) Quadrangular *altar* shaped grave stone from Phrygia, re-used as a boundary stone²⁷:

ὄροι Σολοττέων.

Furthermore, there are also small *stelae* and *altares* which have only a god's name and an *ethnikon* in the genitive case. To date such *stelae* have been described as boundary stones; there are over twenty examples within and outside Asia Minor²⁸. Only one example from Stratonikeia, inscribed Ἀφροδείτης | ἐπηκώου, is doubtful. In contrast to this, no opinion has been proffered that *altares* also were used as boundary stones, especially for the purpose of defining sacred lands. On the contrary, although they bear similar inscriptions to *stelae* which have inscriptions in the genitive case, these small *altares* have been generally interpreted as “*Altar of such-a-such god*” or “*Votive for such-a-such one god*”²⁹. Margeritha Guarducci,

²⁵ L. Jones, *The Inscriptions of the Sultan Dağı*, (IK 62), Bonn 2002, no. 47.

²⁶ MAMA V, Manchester 1937, no. 209; T. Drew-Bear, *Nouvelles Inscriptions de Phrygie*, Zupthen 1978, 35 no. 2.

²⁷ D. H. French, *The Definition of Territories: Cappadocia*, in: Le Guen-Pollet, B. Peron – O. Pelon (ed.), *La Cappadoce méridionale jusqu'a la fin de l'époque romaine. État des recherches (Actes du Colloque d'Istanbul [Institut Français d'Études Anatoliennes] 13-14 avril 1987)*, Paris 1991, appendix p. 53-54.

²⁸ For examples of Asia Minor see below p. 53-56. For examples out of Asia Minor see:

- Syll.³ 991: Διὸς Ἐρκεῖ|ο Πατρῶ|ο καὶ Διὸς Κτησί|ο.

- M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca IV: Epigrafi Sacre Pagane e Cristiane*, Roma 1978, s.v. Cippi Terminali, p. 46-73: Διὸς | Αἰγλαῖο (Metaponto), Λυκεῖο (Attika), Διὸς Ἐλαστέρο (Paros), Κόρης (Thasos), Χίρῶνος (Posidonia), Ἴρης Θελεξίνης (Velia), Νυμφέ|ων Μυ|χιέ|ων. (Nasso), Κόρης (Tasos), Φασταδέων. | Διὸς Ἀλαστ|όρο Πατρῶ|ο. (Tasos).

- W. R. Paton – E. L. Hicks, *The Inscriptions of Cos*, Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 1990², no. 149: Διὸς Ἴκεσίου Σιμωνιδᾶν, no. 150: Δ|ιὸς Φατρί|ου καὶ Ἀθαναίας Εὐρυανακτ[ι]δᾶν.

- G. V. Lalonde, *Inscriptions Horoi, The Athenian Agora XIX*, Princeton, New Jersey 1991, no. H7: Διὸς Ἐ|λευθερί|ου, no. H8: τὸ ἱερὸ.

²⁹ Cf. Διὸς | Καρίου | []ου (M. Ç. Şahin, *Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia*, vol. I: Panamara (IK 21), Bonn 1981, no. 47), Διὸς | Παναμά|ρου (Die Inschriften von Stratonikeia, vol. II, 1: Lagina, Stratonikeia und Umgebung (IK 22, 1), Bonn 1982, no. 1105); Διὸς Λα|βρένδου (W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Mylasa I* (IK 34), Bonn 1987, no. 314): The inscription is dated to the second century B.C. First editors (Kontoleon and Judeich) are not all of one mind that the stone is a *stela* or an *altar*. But Blümel gives the title “*Altar*” to this stone.), Διονύσου | Ναρτακοφόρου (W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften der Rhodischen Peraia*, (IK 38), Bonn 1991, no. 4): The inscription is dated to the IVth-IIIrd century B.C. Although Blümel describes the stone as ‘Rechteckiger Block aus rötlichem Marmor, halb im Erdreich verborgen’, gives the title “*Altar des Dionysos Narthakophoros*”. Διὸς (W. Blümel, *Die Inschriften von Iasos II* (IK 28, 2), Bonn 1985, no. 232: As a matter of fact he describes this 20 cm high slab as an “*Altar of Zeus*”, but he says that “Nach der Beschreibung des Steins durch den ed. pr. ist

however, stated the following about *cippi terminali* (boundary inscriptions): ‘*Certe volte l’epigrafe consiste nel semplice nome della divinità, generalmente espresso in genitive, il quale di per sé denota che la tal divinità è proprietaria del terreno o dell’edificio o dell’altare di cui si tratta. A questa categoria di horoi appartengono molti esempi rinvenuti sia nella Grecia sia nella Magna Grecia*’³⁰. However, Guarducci emphasizes that boundary stones are either *cippi* or *stelae*³¹. She does not think that an *altar* can also be a boundary stone. She only states that a boundary stone inscribed Ὀλυμπία Καίρη, from Velia, dated to the fifth century B.C., is like an *altar* (come l’altare)³². She indicates that another boundary stone from Velia had been found in the fence zone, among the wreckage of a big *altar*³³. She says that on a *horos* from Paros, dated to the fifth century B.C., was written Διὸς Ἐλαστέρο and again on another *altar* from the same island and the same century, an inscription was restored with the same reading³⁴. On the other hand B. H. McLean, concerning this type of inscription, gives them the title “*Dedications and ex votos*” in his “Introduction to the Greek Epigraphy” published in 2002, and indicates that it needs to be understood that ‘*this (the objective genitive) form states that the object is now the property of the god*’ namely the object is in the ownership of that god. In order to exemplify this situation, he uses the inscriptions Ἄφροδίτης³⁵ and Διὸς Σωτήρος³⁶. He understands these inscriptions as indicating the “[property] of Aphrodite” and the “[property] of Zeus Soter”³⁷. But McLean does not clarify obviously what the said object is. As is known, there are two kinds of inscription bearers for votives, the first being *altares*, and the second *stelae*. We know that *stelae* bearing a god’s name in the genitive case are not votive stones but are boundary stones³⁸. In my opinion the genitive case indicates no object inscribed upon, namely no *stela* and *altar*, but boundaries of land ownership dedicated to the god in the locus where the *altar* was erected. It is necessary to understand that the word *horos* is *scilicet*, at least on most of *altares* bearing an inscription in the genitive case. Because, if people in antiquity could inscribe the inscription of an unholy boundary upon an *altar*³⁹, they would also have done this in the case of a holy boundary. *Altares* were being preferred probably when a boundary was associated with a god. For example, an inscription dated to the Roman period from Kommagene states the following: *The boundary of the sacred temenos. In order to display his respect to the masters,*

nicht sicher zu entscheiden, ob es sich um einen Miniaturaltar oder einen Grenzstein handelt”; also see the table below p. 53-56.

³⁰ M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia Greca IV: Epigrafi Sacre Pagane e Cristiane*, Roma 1978, s.v. *Cippi Terminali*, 46.

³¹ ‘*Aventi anch’essi forma di cippo o di stele*’ etc.

³² M. Guarducci, op. cit. s.v. *Cippi Terminali*, 51.

³³ *Ibidem*.

³⁴ M. Guarducci, op. cit. s.v. *Cippi Terminali*, 54 (restored inscription on the *altar*: Διὸς Ἐ[λαστέ]ρο).

³⁵ SEG XIII 1956, no. 424 (Delos, IInd-Ith century B.C.).

³⁶ *An Epigraphic Survey in the Kibyra-Olbasa Region*, in: N. P. Milner (ed.), *RECAM III; BIAAM 24*, Hertford 1998, no. 121.

³⁷ P. 248, under the heading of ‘*The Deity*’.

³⁸ See above p. 51 n. 28

³⁹ See above p. 50 with 7 boundary inscription examples on *altares*.

*Philadelphos erected the altar*⁴⁰. Furthermore, the *stelae* and *altares* that carry such inscriptions substantially resemble each other in their physical features:

The related characteristics of boundary *stelae* in Asia Minor bearing inscriptions in the genitive case are their height, approx. 18–71 cm and dating from the Classical-Hellenistic period. On the other hand the associated characteristics of the *altares* bearing inscriptions in the genitive case are a height of some 18–68 cm and dating generally from the Hellenistic period, but there are also inscriptions which belong to the Roman period. The material employed for the short *stelae* and the *altares* is generally marble. Examples are listed below:

STELAE**ALTARES**

<u>Gaertringen, I. v. Priene</u>	<u>Gaertringen, I. v. Priene</u> ⁴¹
<p>No. 164: Ἀθηνᾶς Πολιάδος. Marble <i>stela</i>, found in a house east of the fountain and south of the Agora street ht. 71 cm, w. 35 cm, d. 30 cm, letters: 2 cm. Date: Ist cent. B.C.</p>	<p>No. 184: Διὸς Αἰθρίου. Small marble <i>altar</i>. Profile at top and bottom. The back is rough. Found to the east of the Asklepeion. ht. 30 cm, w. 15 cm, letters: 1–1.7 cm. Date: after Ist cent. B.C.</p>
<p>No. 165: Ἀθηνᾶς Πολιάδος. White marble <i>stela</i>, found in a house east of the ‘<i>Musterhause</i>’, north of the Athenian temple and on the verge of Theatre street. ht. 23 cm, w. 33 cm, d. 22.5 cm, letters: 2 cm.</p>	<p>No. 190: [Διὸς Ὀ]λυμπίου. <i>Altar</i>, broken at top, profile at bottom. Found to the east of the Athena Propylaion, in the hall of a private house. The inscription is systematic. The leg of Pi is short. ht. 68 cm, w. 35 cm. Date: Presumably IInd cent. B.C.</p>
<p>No. 166: Ἀθηνᾶς Πολιάδος. White marble <i>stela</i>. Found in the late city wall, to the south of the large <i>altar</i> terrace. ht. 60 cm, w. 35 cm.</p>	<p>No. 191: Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς. In the late city wall, on the peristyle of the ‘<i>Musterhause</i>’ in the Theatre street. The inscription is superficial. The Sigma is C in the shape, the leg of Pi is not short. ht. 65 cm, w. ca. 33 cm, letters: line I: 3 cm, line II: 1.5- 2 cm.</p>
<p>No. 168: 1. Ἀθηνᾶς Πολιάδος. probably Ist cent. B.C.</p>	<p>No. 193: Ἰσιδος Σαράπιδος Ἀνούβιδος. Marble <i>altar</i> with profile. Found in the temple of the Egyptian gods.</p>

⁴⁰ See above p. 50 no. 3) among 7 boundary inscription examples on *altares*.

⁴¹ Von Gaertringen describes these stones as “*Altar*” or “*Hausaltar*”.

<p>2. ΓΜΟΙ . . / Σ . Κ. 3. [Γερμ]ανικ[ο]ῦ [Αὐ]τοκρά[[τορος]. 4. Ἀθηνᾶς ὄρος. Marble <i>stela</i>. Found to the east of Athena's precinct area. ht. 69 cm, w. 41 cm, d. 40 cm.</p>	<p>ht. 68 cm, w. 39 cm, d. 39 cm. ca. IIIrd cent. A.D. No. 197: Πάνοϲ. Marble <i>altar</i>. Found in the Asklepeion. ht. 31 cm, w. and d. 38 cm. Date: IIIrd cent. B.C.</p>
<p><u>C. Şahin, Stratonikeia (IK 22, 1)</u> No. 849: Ἀφροδείτης ἐπηκῶου. Marble, found in a field in Yava, of cubical form. ht. 18.3 cm, w. (upper) 12.1 cm, w. (lower) 12.7 cm, d. (upper) 11.2 cm, d. (lower) 11.7 cm, letters: 0.9–1.7 cm. Date: Hellenistic period.</p>	<p><u>Rehm, I. v. Didyma</u>⁴² No. 75: Ἀπόλλωνος Διδυμέως Σωτήρος. White, marble <i>altar</i>. The space of the inscription is in the form of a trapeze. ht. 41.7 cm, w. 30.2 cm, d. 17.2 cm, letters: 1.2 cm. Date: ca. IInd cent. B.C. No. 76: Ἀπόλλωνος Ἐφοπίου. White marble, hewn stone. Convex, of a round base. Damaged on the left side. Found to the north of the temple. ht. 48.5 cm, w. 77 cm, d. 23 cm, letters: 3.5 cm. Date: Presumably IIIrd cent. B.C.</p>
<p><u>Blümel, I. v. Iasos II (IK 28, 2)</u> No. 235: Διὸς Ὑψίστου. White marble. Found in the Turkish cemetery. diam. 66 cm. No. 236: Διὸς Ὑψίστου. Greyish-blue, marble bloc. Found near the</p>	<p><u>Rehm, I. v. Milet</u>⁴³ No. 275: Διὸς Λαβρα υνδέ ως. White, raw marble <i>altar</i>. Found to the east of the Asklepeion, in the hall with two aisle. Rough profile at the top and bottom. Letters are in the style of double axe to the right and left. ht. 21 cm, w. 13 cm, letters: 1.5 cm. Date: Late Hellenistic period. No. 276: Διὸς Λαβρα ύνδου. Found in the hall with two aisle. Profile at top and bottom. Most of the upper profile is</p>

⁴² Rehm gives the title “*Weihungen*” for these *altars*.

⁴³ Rehm gives the title “*Altäre und Votive*” for these *altars*.

<p>harbour, in the wall of a house. ht. 36 cm, w. 22 cm, d. 21 cm, letters: 4 cm.</p>	<p>broken. The inscription is beneath the double axe, superficial. ht. 27 cm (with profile), w. 20 cm, 18 cm, letters: 1.3 cm. Date: Late Hellenistic period.</p> <p>No. 278: Διὸς Κερα υνίου. White-grey marble <i>altar</i>. Rough profile at the top and bottom. There is a double axe. The inscription is in the cursive form and superficial. Found in the in-filling of the city wall of Iustinianus. ht. 30 cm, w. 14 cm, letters: 2.5 cm. Date: Late Hellenistic period.</p> <p>Nr. 279: Ἀπόλλωνος Διδυμέως Σωτήρος. Bluish marble <i>altar</i>. Found in the hall with two aisle. Profile at the top and bottom. The inscription is superficial. ht. 47 cm, w. 26–28.5 cm, letters: line I: 1 cm, line II, III: 0.8 cm. Date: Hellenistic period.</p> <p>No. 280: Ἀπόλλωνος Διδυμέως Σωτήρος. Front slab of an <i>altar</i> of a grey-bluish marble. Simple profile at the bottom. Found in the south of the agora area, re-used in the city wall. ht. 18 cm, w. 26 cm, letters: 1–0.12 cm Date: 1st cent. B.C.</p> <p>No. 281: Ἀπόλλωνος Διδυμέως Σωτήρος. Bluish marble <i>altar</i>. Simple profile at the top and bottom. Found to the east of the Faustina fountain. ht. 28 cm, w. 23 cm, letters: 1 cm. Date: Late Hellenistic period.</p>
---	--

<p>Ricl, Alexandra Troas (IK 53) no. 62: Ἀπόλλωνος Πατρῶου. Boundary stone of a <i>temenos</i>? Hellenistic period? (description and dimensions of the stone are not recorded).</p>	<p>Nollé, I. v. Side I (IK 43)⁴⁴ No. 18: Front Face: Διὸς Νωρι του. Right Face: Κλέ ας. Marble, small <i>altar</i>, the upper part is patera in shape. Damaged at the top and slightly at the bottom. ht. 17.5 cm, w. 8 cm, letters: 1.8–2 cm.</p>
---	--

Another important point is that, as mentioned above, the height of these *stelae* and these *altares* could be so small. This seems confusing at first sight. When all the boundary stones known to date and carrying a word relating to a boundary are examined, a slab 5 cm in height can be noted amongst them. There are boundary stones with heights of 17, 20, 27, 28 and 30 cm among the boundary stones belonging to the temple and land of the Ephesian Artemis. The use of such small stones as boundary stones also raises the question of how they were situated. In all probability, dozens of these small boundary stones encircled a limited area and, being many in number, they would have been difficult to remove. Just as an inscription referring to the boundary of Priene contains the expression: the “*eighty fourth boundary stone*”⁴⁵. In certain locales of the present Aegean Turkey, specific stones on which the parcel numbers are written, are buried in the ground for the purpose of determining the boundaries of houses. Perhaps as a precaution against boundary usurpation, these tiny boundary stones were buried in the ground and their position was recorded in the city archive. Some of these boundary stones with the usual dimensions were placed upright in the ground. The inscription was recorded on the top of such stones in a few lines; that is, only a small part of the stone could be seen above the ground. Another possibility is that the small sized stones could have been positioned in a sequence upon a wall enclosing a limited area⁴⁶. The great number of the boundary stones that define a limited area has provided the saving of the *horos*. In other words, for these inscriptions, the word *horos* must be understood as signifying *scilicet*. As a matter of fact the word *horia* was inscribed on one side of each of two boundary stones from Aiolia, which were inscribed on rocks; the other side showed an *ethnikon* in the genitive case⁴⁷.

The deployment of said boundary stones on the territory provides us with an illustrative example: It is obvious that the west side of the one rock belonged to the Heracleians and the east side to the Melanpagians. The two adjacent faces of one block from amongst five from

⁴⁴ Although Nollé gives the title for this two adjacent faces inscribed stone “*Weihung für Zeus Norit(es/os) und Klea*”, translates it as “(Altar) des Zeus Norit(es/os). - Der Klea.”

⁴⁵ H. von Gaertringen, *Inscripfen von Priene*, Berlin 1906, no. 155.

⁴⁶ Cf. O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Meander*, Berlin 1900, no. 236: ὁ τοῖχος - - | ὅροι [τ]ο[υ] --; K. J. Rigsby *Asyilia. Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1996, no. 182: τὸ τέμενος τῆς Ἀ[ρτέμιδος ἄσουλων] | πᾶν, ὅσον ἔσω περὶβόλου. ὃς δ’ ἂν | παραβαίνει, αὐτὸς [αὐτὸν αἰτιάσεται].

⁴⁷ SEG XLV, 1995, no. 1657: South face (towards Sipylos Mountain): ὄρια Μελανπαγιτῶν; North-west face (towards Hermos Valley): Ἡρακλεωτῶν; West face: ὄρια Ἡρακ(λ)εωτῶν; East face: Μελανπαγιτῶν.

Didyma, inscribed with “*The boundary of the Argaseis’ temenos*”⁴⁸ show a similar example. Hence we understand that this stone with the two adjoining inscribed faces stood in one corner of the *temenos*. The last example given in the table of *Altares* which is described by Nollé as “*Weihung für Zeus Norites(/os) und Klea*”⁴⁹ draws our attention from the fact that also its two adjoining faces (front and right) carry inscriptions. This makes us inclined to think that the land to the right side of the stone belonged to Klea and the land to the front side belonged to Zeus. This situation strengthens the probability that also this so-called *altar* was in fact a boundary stone.

Consequently, we can say that names of gods in the genitive case on these *stelae* and *altares* are not connected with an inscription bearer but with the word *horos* as *scilicet*. The minimal value of the small stone itself also proves this point.

⁴⁸ A. Rehm, *Didyma*, vol. 2: *Die Inschriften*, Berlin 1958, no. 66-69; H. Lohmann, *Survey in der Chora von Milet - Die Milesia in der Archaik und Hellenismus. Vorbericht über die Kampagnen der Jahre 1994-1995*, AA 1997, 299-304 (SEG XLVII 1997 no. 1615).

⁴⁹ See above p. 56.

ÖZET

Küçük Asya’da Sınırtaşı Olarak Kullanılan Genitivus Casus’lu Altarlar

Yazar, günümüze kadar “filanca tanrının altarı” ya da “filanca tanrıya adak” şeklinde tanımlanan, üzerlerinde *genitivus casus*’lu bir tanrı adı ile *epitheton*’unu taşıyan küçük ve orta boyutlu altarların aslında birer sınır taşı olabileceklerini kanıtlamaya çalışmaktadır. Bunun için öncelikli olarak altarların da, tıpkı steller gibi, sınır taşlarında yazıt taşıyıcısı olarak kullanıldığını Küçük Asya’nın çeşitli bölgelerinden kesin örneklerle kanıtlamaktadır. Bunun ardından *genitivus casus*’lu bir tanrı adı ile *epitheton*’unu taşıyan aynı boyutlardaki stellerin sınır taşı olarak kabul gördüğünü 20’nin üzerindeki örnekte göstermektedir. Buradan yola çıkarak da bu altarların üzerindeki *genitivus casus*’unun yazıt taşıyıcısı ile değil, *horos* sözcüğünün *scilicet* olması ile anlaşılması gerektiğini vurgulamaktadır. Bir tanrıya ait herhangi bir mekânı sınırlamak üzere onlarca sınır taşı kullanıldığını ve bu durumun da taşlardan bazılarında *horos* sözcüğünden tasarruf etme imkânını doğurduğunu söylemektedir. Yazar ayrıca bu küçük boyutlu stel ve altarlardan bazılarının dönemin sınır gasplarına karşı toprağa gömülmüş ya da sınırlanacak olan mekânın etrafına çekilen bir duvara belirli aralıklarla örülmüş olabileceklerini vurgulamaktadır.