


DOSSIER OF REGULATIONS FROM APOLLONIA IN ILLYRIA

Date :

ca. 425-375 BC

Justification: alphabet and lettering (Cabanès). The absence of *omega* would tend to date the inscription before the end of the 5th century; the letterforms are otherwise comparable with the other tablet edited by Cabanès (no. 1, with ph. fig. 1). Η seems to always stand for the aspirate, not for eta, except apparently in ΔΕΚΗΣΘΑΙ; but line A5 below. This appears to conform with the hymn to Asclepius on the other tablet (Cabanès 2013: no. 1), where line 1 should surely read [χαῖ]ρέ μοι ἰίλαον, not ἠίλαον.

Provenance

[Apollonia](#) , in Illyria. The findspot is described by Cabanès only as the portico bordering the agora.

Support

Lead tablet, broken into fragments and inscribed in the same hand on both faces (A and B).

Height: 6 cm

Width: 10.7 cm

Depth: 1 mm

Layout

Letters, face A: 5 mm high; on face B: 4-6 mm high.

Bibliography

Edition here based on [Cabanès 2013](#): 51-54 no. 2, with ph. figs. 2-3. We include a full *apparatus criticus* (Carbon) at the beginning of the commentary: new readings and restorations (Carbon; Quantin) are based on the published photograph and with the kind consultation of F. Quantin, whose readings are based on autopsy (2014).

Further bibliography: [Edelstein - Edelstein 1945](#): 190 n. 23; [Guarducci 1978](#): 123-125; Casevitz 2004; [Casevitz 2006](#); [Flower 2008](#): 211-239; [Hitch 2011](#); [Carbon 2015a](#).

Face A

θεός, τ[ύ]χα ἀγαθά· δεδόχθ]-
 αι τοῖς Ἀπολλονιά[ταις·]
 ἡ μάντις τὸν κλάρ[ον ..]
 ἀπαγόρεσε τὸν Ἀσχ[λα]-
 5 πὶὸν δέκησθαι ΚΑΙ[^{c.4}]
 καὶ ἡ[.]ΟΛΙΑΝ καὶ [^{c.4}]-
 ΝΕΣ ΑΥ[.] καὶ [^{c.4}]
 καὶ Π[[?]]

Face B

[...]ΛΑΝ ἀρχαία[ν]· τᾶι Διό-
 [ναι] ἐσθᾶτα, ζόναν, πόρνα·
 [Δὶ Ν]αῖοι βὸν, οἷας τ[ρε]ῖς [V]
 [...]ρρανιοὶ βὸν· Θέμιτι V
 5 [...]· Ἐνυάλιοι οἷ[α]ς ἐνόρχα-
 [ς]⁶· ἡερόεσσ[ι]ν ξένια
 [.....]⁸ αἶγα· [V Ἄ]θανᾶ V
 [.....]⁸ ἀμ[ν]ᾶς
 [.....][?]Θ[.....]

Apparatus

Line A1: δεδόχθ]αι sugg. but not adopted by Cabanes, Quantin (other sugg. are reported). || Line A2: Ἀπολλονιά[ταις] Cabanes, Quantin. || Line A3: κλάρ[ον] Carbon, sugg. Quantin: ΚΛΑ] ph., κλά[δον] Cabanes. || Line A4: i.e. ἀπαγόρεσε: ἀπαγόρε(υ)σε Cabanes, Quantin; Ἀσχ[λα] | πὶὸν Cabanes, Quantin. || Line A5: ΔΕΚΗΣΘΑΙ ph., δέκησθαι Cabanes, Quantin: perhaps δέκ(ε)σθαι was in some way implied or intended; ΚΑ] ph., Quantin: ΚΑ Cabanes. || Line A6: ἡ[.]ΟΛΙΑΝ ph.: ἡ[μ]ιολίαν Cabanes, Quantin. || Lines B1-2: Διό|[ναι] Cabanes, Quantin. || Line B3: [Δὶ Ν]αῖοι Quantin, alternatively [τῶι Ν]αῖοι might also be envisaged; οἷας τ[ρε]ῖς Carbon: οἷας [..]ΙΣ[.] Quantin, οἷας [..]ΙΣΟ[.] Cabanes, but the trace of omicron cannot be absolutely confirmed on the ph. || Line B4: [Τυ]ρρανιοὶ Cabanes; Θέμιτι ph., Quantin: Θέμι(σ)τι Cabanes. || Lines B5-6: οἷ[α]ς ἐνόρχα|[ς] Carbon and Quantin: οἷ[ς] ἐν ὄρχα|[τοι] Cabanes; ἡερόεσσ[ι]ν ξένια Carbon: ΗΕΡΟΕΣΣ[.]ΞΕΝΙΑ Quantin, ἑροες σ[ύ]ν Cabanes.

Translation

Face A

God, good fortune. [It was resolved] by the citizens of Apollonia. The female seer from the lots (drawn) forbids that Asclepius receive [...] and [...] and [...] and [...] and [...]

Face B

[...] ancient. To Diona, a vestment, a girdle, a pin. To [Zeus] Naios, an ox, [three] sheep. To [...]rhanios, an ox. To Themis [...]. To Enyalios, non-castrated male sheep (i.e. rams; number missing). To the heroes, gifts of hospitality. [To ...], a goat. To Athena [...] female lambs [...]

Traduction

Face A

Dieu, bonne fortune. Les Apolloniates [ont décidé]. La devineresse interdit, à la suite du tirage au sort, qu'Asclépios reçoive [...] et [...] et [...] et [...] et [...]

Face B

[...] ancienne. À Dionè, un vêtement, une ceinture, une épingle. À [Zeus] Naios, un bovin, [trois] moutons. À [...]rhanios, un bovin. À Thémis [...]. À Enyalios, des béliers (le nombre manque). Aux héros, des cadeaux d'hospitalité. [À ...], un caprin. À Athéna [...] des agnelles [...].

Commentary

Though fragmentary, this tablet is of a notable interest for the study of the development of ritual norms and their forms of authority. The tablet was found together with another one, with which it is probably contemporary: this second tablet contains a fragment of a hymn to Asclepius, known from copies at Dion and Ptolemais, cf. Guarducci and the discussion in Cabanes. As it is preserved, the present tablet is also concerned with the cult of Asclepius in the city. The first lines of the text on face A must preserve an official enactment, or alternatively an oracular consultation of the citizens of Apollonia (in the latter case, a restoration is more elusive). At any rate, the substance of the text clearly derives from another source of authority than the city: a female seer (line A5) forbids that Asclepius receive certain of rituals norms: cp. [NGSL 4](#), in which the god Pan forbids the entry of different things in the sanctuary (lines 7-8: ἀπαγορεύει ὁ θεός etc.), or [IG II² 1289](#), in which the goddess of a group of *orgeones* together with her prophet Kallistratos, seek to protect their property (lines 9-10: ἀπαγορεύει δὲ καὶ ἡ θεὸς καὶ ὁ προφήτης Καλλίστρατος). A more enigmatic comparison is provided by [IG II² 1362](#) in which "the" priest of Apollo Erithasios

(without any further specification of his name or the date) forbids (ἀπαγορεύει, line 3) the use of wood from the trees in the sanctuary. For the priest as an authoritative figure on instructions concerning sacrifice, see also [CGRN 189](#) (Lykosoura), line 6 (verb missing). For a study of proclamations by priestly personnel and "embedded speech" in ritual norms, see Hitch. A further specification of the source of the prohibition is seemingly provided by the genitive τῶν κλά[ον]. The restoration of lots seems the most plausible inference here, though the syntax is not particularly clear. Does the genitive plural qualify the seer as an interpreter "of the lots"? Or does it go belong with the verb ἀπαγορεύω and an implicit preposition ἀπό, meaning to "make a proclamation from" (i.e. from a text written somewhere), as we find it in the Law Code of Gortyn, [IC IV 72](#), col. X, line 36, col. XI, lines 12-13 where a particular declaration is to be made ἀπό τῶ λάο ὃ ἀπαγορεύοντι, "from the stone from which proclamations are made". The latter option seems less likely, since we would still expect the preposition ἀπό to be present. A yet further possibility would be to take τῶν κλά[ον] as a genitive *causae*, expressing that the seer has made these prohibitions "on the basis of the lots". Whatever the best interpretation of the syntax is, in any case it seems that a form of cleromancy lies at the basis of the proscribed objects or offerings that followed from line A5, but the substance of the apparent list of is now regrettably lost.

Equally intriguingly, face B of the tablet appears to preserve a list of sacrificial prescriptions and other offerings. These may have been a continuation of what the female seer expounds with authority on the basis of the lots of face A, though this side of the tablet is clearly distinct: it is prescriptive and not proscriptive. Alternatively, these prescriptions were perhaps the result of another oracular consultation, in the context of the cult of Asclepius. The precise connection of both faces of the tablet is not obvious. The prescriptions on this Face also display a remarkable affinity with the oracle of Dodona, especially in the probable presence of both Diona and Zeus Naios as recipients (lines B1-2). For a study of similar oracular responses containing sacrificial prescriptions from Dodona, see Carbon. Overall, the list of offerings presented on face B raises several questions, which are not helped by the fact that the beginning of line B1 is fragmentary and refers to something "ancient" (ἀρχαῖος, see below ad loc.). Was this a copy of a more ancient text, now reinscribed in the context of face A? As Casevitz explains, the term ἀρχαῖος refers to a past that should be considered as linked to the present and thus still relevant to it (as opposed to παλαιός, for example, which refers to a past that is already completed). Referring to "ancient" ways of doing things is thus another authority statement. The inscribing of face B is either a record of one-time offerings made at Apollonia/Dodona, or, more tentatively, a text which had a more long-lasting value as a ritual norm: the prescriptions will then have had an impact in shaping cultic practice at Apollonia, as face A manifestly did and was intended to. On the question of the impact of oracles on ritual practice in Greek cities, see again Carbon, with further refs.

A further lead tablet has now been found during excavations at Apollonia in 2014, apparently containing another fragment of the hymn to Asclepius. Thus, it may yet shed further light on this subject. Taken together, the tablets may have formed a dossier concerning the introduction or the elaboration of the cult of Asclepius at Apollonia, though of course face B of the present tablet may

be of a different or only ancillary character. For a complex lead tablet with a similarly bipartite character and whose interpretation is equally (though differently) problematic, see here the inscriptions from Selinous, [CGRN 13](#).

Archive 2018

Restorations suggested in the edition here by Carbon incorporate and develop the efforts and suggestions of Cabanes and Quantin. They also hinge on the probability that very little of the tablet is now missing. Indeed, from the most certain supplements in lines A2 and A4, it seems clear that little is missing to the right of this face: probably 2-4 letters. The restoration proposed for line A1 (δ[εδόχθαι]) of five letters may fit into this hypothesis, because, while lines A2-5 all contain 15 preserved letters, in line A1 only the first 14 letters are secure. Similarly, we would thus expect ca. 3 letters to be missing to the left of face B, and this is well confirmed by some of the most certain restorations on this side: cf. lines B2-3.

Lines A1-2: The first text begins with what appears to be a standard preamble with a twofold invocation of the deity and good fortune and then maybe traces of a verb followed by the dative plural of the ethnic, *Apolloniatai*. The most attractive restoration would be an enactment formula employing the verb δ[εδόχθ] | αι. Other possibilities are elusive; if we are to think of an oracular response, as suggested by the presence of the seer and by face B, then perhaps a form of δείκνυμι might be envisaged, e.g. δ[εδείκτ] | αι, though this is rather longer (for this verb in a question to the oracle of Dodona, see now [DVC 973A](#)).

Line A3: On female seers, see the detailed discussion in Flower, p. 211-239. It is unclear if the female ritual expert here is to be seen as an unnamed "freelance" agent such as a chresmologue, or perhaps to be identified with one of the female cult personnel from the oracular sanctuary at Dodona (for the latter, known by various titles, see Hdt. 2.55.1, Paus. 7.21.2, 10.12.10; cf. Strabo 7.7.12; cf. also [DVC 70A](#), oracular selection of an ἀμφίπολος at the sanctuary).

Lines A4-5: There are few alternatives for making sense of these lines, though the syntax remains highly unusual: after the verb of interdiction, ἀπαγόρεσε, we would surely have expect μὴ δεκῆσθαι (i.e. δέχεσθαι, or perhaps δέκη(ε)σθαι), followed then by a series of restrictions in the form μήδε ... μήδε or οὐδέ ... οὐδέ, rather than with καὶ... καὶ as we clearly seem to have. At the end of line 5, it is implausible that the apparent list which is found in the remainder of the text begins with καὶ. We might instead think of animals that are proscribed from the precinct or from sacrifice to the god, e.g. κά[ρον] (a boar, whether wild or domesticated; for this animal, cp. [CGRN 63](#) (Lindos), line 3, [CGRN 199](#) (Delos), line 3, and [CGRN 222](#) (Andania), lines 34 and 69). Καλαΐδα, a cock, would not fit the traces and would moreover be unexpected: this animal is attested in the cult of Apollo and Asclepius in Epidauros, [CGRN 34](#) (Epidauros), lines 5 and 24 (for further explanation on the sacrifice of cocks to Asclepius, see Edelstein - Edelstein). But any restoration must remain highly tentative here. The form of ἀπαγόρεσε warrants an explanation, though no satisfactory one can be provided here. The apparent lack of an aorist augment for the third person indicative form, i.e. ἀπηγόρευσε, is puzzling, though again we may note that the

text does not appear to represent eta. If so, we might have expected the verb to appear as ἀπεγόρεσε. The diphthong ευ might be replaced by eta (here represented by long e) in some inscriptions from the Corinthian colonies in Northern Greece; cf. e.g. the form καταγορησαι (for καταγορευσαι) at [SEG 35, 665](#) (Ambrakia, ca. 160 BC), line 34.

Line A6: As suggested by Cabanes, virtually the only plausible interpretation of the traces is the word ἡμιολία, though the first letter must be the aspirate and not *eta*. The expected form would thus be η[εμι]ολίαν. Yet only two letters appear to be missing in the lacuna, which makes this reading problematic. And what a "measure of one and a half", either as an adjective or as a substantive, might mean in the general context of the tablet, is mystifying.

Line A7: A precise restoration remains difficult to propose with any certainty, though perhaps a trace of sense may be discerned. The traces νεξ + αυ suggest perhaps a masculine nominative or accusative plural form (an accusative would be expected; see also line A7), followed e.g. by αὐ[τόν]. For instance, we might tentatively think of: καὶ [γο] | νῆς (for γονεῖς, from γόνος) αὐ[τόν], thus: "and their children/products". This might hypothetically refer to the "offspring" or "derivative products" of the prohibited animals or other restrictions mentioned in A4-6 above.

Line B1: If the first two fragmentary words of this face are a heading, then it is odd, though perhaps not impossible, that it appears in the accusative rather than the nominative. If a heading, something like [βό]αν or [βό]αν or [γνό]μὰν ἀρχαία[ν] might hesitatingly be suggested. The text on face B might then be a copy of an earlier one. Yet given the accusative case, a continuation with the preceding face of the tablet is perhaps even more plausible.

Line B2: The offerings listed for Diona do not include any sacrifices but are presumably to be used to clothe and adorn a statue of the goddess during the ritual; for similar rites, cf. here [CGRN 24](#) (Athens), line 11.

Line B3: The reading ὄϊας "sheep" is to be preferred to Cabanes' οἴας, "from which..."; sheep are also found as a sacrificial offering in line B5. The combination of an ox with the sacrifice of three sheep (as restored here) represents a highly significant offering and probably the largest sacrifice in this list. For the combination, cp. here the sacrifice to Athena Hellotis in Hekatombaion at [CGRN 56](#) (Marathonian Tetrapolis), col. II, lines 35-36 (also including a piglet); and to Zeus Machaneus during the Karneia at [CGRN 86 D](#) (Kos), lines 14-15.

Line B4: As Cabanes suggests (though originally thinking of an ethnic), [Τυ]ρρανίο is a possible restoration, especially of an epithet relating to Zeus, probably implicitly following the mention of Zeus Naios in line B3; the epithet is unattested in that form, but cf. perhaps Zeus Tyrannos, albeit very uncertainly read in a much later inscription from Dorylaion ([MAMA V 11](#)). Alternatives, however, are few and less likely, including perhaps the epithet Ouranios, though with an unusual and quite inexplicable form: e.g. [οὐ]ρρανίο (see e.g. [Hdt. 6.56](#) for Zeus Ouranios at Sparta).

Lines B5-6: At the beginning of line B5, we have a small lacuna for the offering to Themis mentioned in line B3. Given the available space of ca. 3 letters, this is likely to have been an ox (or cow) or a sheep (or ewe): [βόν] or [ῥῖν]. Given that there is not much space at the beginning of B6 and that we would expect a number to quantify the male, non-castrated sheep offered to Enyalios (see line B3), we could presume to restore a small and short number, e.g. [δύο], followed by the article preceding the next recipients in the list, viz. [τοῖς]. For the Epic/poetic spelling of the heroes adopted here, cp. CGRN 13 (Selinous), line A10: ἡόσπερ τοῖς ἡερόεσ(σ)ι. For ξένια and other analogous rites of hospitality (ξένισμος, *theoxenia*) offered to heroes, see again the tablet from Selinous and also CGRN 32 (Thorikos), lines 13-24; esp. CGRN 96 (Kos), lines 61-62 and 110; and CGRN 102 (Athens), line 15.

Line B7: As an alternative, the restoration ἀῖγα[ς] is not impossible, but again we might expect the number of goats to have been precisely quantified (see line B3), for which space is here missing. Accordingly, a singular goat followed by an empty space seems preferably. Since approximately 8 letters are missing in the gap to the left, we could plausibly think of [Ἄρτέμιτι] or [Διονύσοι], two deities who are especially frequently the recipients of goats.

Publication

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike International License [4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/) .

All citation, reuse or distribution of this work must contain somewhere a link back to the URL <http://cgrn.ulg.ac.be/> and the filename, as well as the year of consultation (see “Home” for details of how to cite).

Authors

Jan-Mathieu Carbon

Saskia Peels

Project Director

Vinciane Pirenne-Delforge