

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expository-times\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

It expresses itself in trances which come partly within the physical range, as well as in specific operations on the body, which come largely within that range. To that extent they belong to the field of scientific investigation. And they meet the demands of science. As phenomena, as facts, they are as fully and as credibly attested as science can reasonably demand. The letters of St. Paul to the Galatians and Corinthians have been sifted by the most thorough criticism, and pronounced authentic. Their date has been fixed at not more than thirty years after the crucifixion. St. Paul, as an eye-witness of what he relates, is just as trustworthy as Pliny. His account of the extraordinary things which occurred under his own observation are as much entitled to credence

as Pliny's account of the eruption of Vesuvius. In fact, St. Paul's evidence is the more valuable, because it is so incidental. His letters are not written on the subject of miracles, or to prove them. They are written to people who, like himself, experienced such things, and his allusion to them grows out of the necessary discussion of Church affairs. In short, the miracles to which St. Paul bears witness carry all the credibility to science that past events can ever carry. If science rejects that evidence, it is not because it is insufficient for that part of the miraculous which comes within the range of scientific search; it is because science has ceased to be science, and, becoming philosophy falsely so called, has pronounced that miracles do not occur.

## The Greek of the Early Church and the Pagan Ritual.

BY PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., ABERDEEN.

### III. THANKING THE GOD.

THE first class of votive inscriptions takes the simple form, 'I, so-and-so, thank the goddess.' This is one of the most widespread votive formulæ. At Hierapolis, in the Lycos Valley, *Φλαβιανὸς εὐχαριστῶ τῇ θεῷ* (*C.B.*,<sup>1</sup> No. 17); at Ephesus, *εὐχαριστῶ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι, Στέφανος, and εὐχαριστῶ σοι, Κύρια Ἀρτεμι, Γ. Σκάπτιος* (*C.B.*, p. 90; *Inscr. Brit. Mus.*, 578, 579); in the Katakekaumene, *δυνατῇ θεῷ εὐχαριστῶ Δητῷ* (*C.B.*, p. 90); at Dionysopolis, *εὐχαριστῶ Μητρὶ Δητῷ* (*C.B.*, No. 53).

No phrase is more characteristic of Pauline expression and thought than 'I thank God' (or 'my God'), *εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ (μου)*—the same words rise to the mouth of Paul in addressing the Colossians, for example, that must have been familiar to them in their pagan days.

The word *εὐχαριστῶ* is not confined to inscriptions of this simple form. Sometimes, in those of the third class, the participle takes the place of the finite tense, *εὐχαριστοῦσα ἀνέστησεν* (*Smyrn.*

*Mouseion*, No. φο'), which is really equivalent to *εὐχαρίστησε καὶ ἀνέστησε*. Sometimes the dedicatory inscription is called a 'thanksgiving,' *εὐχαριστήριον*: this word is not used in the New Testament.

In Christian inscriptions of Syria a similar formula occurs. Compare le Bas-Waddington, No. 1917, *Ἰωάννης Σεουήρου χαρτουλάριος εὐχαριστῶν τῷ Θεῷ μου ἐκ θεμελίων ἐκτίσα, and No. 2459, εὐχαρίστου αἰὲν οὖν τῷ παντοκράτορι Θεῷ.*

### IV. BLESSING THE GOD.

A rare class of votive inscription is found in the Katakekaumene. 'We bless (the god) on behalf of Hermophilus,' *εὐλογοῦμεν ὑπὲρ Ἑρμοφίλου* (*Smyrn. Mous.*, No. φοβ'). This inscription might at the first glance be taken for Christian; it expresses the same thought as Luke in the last words of his Gospel (24<sup>53</sup>): 'They were continually in the temple blessing God,' *εὐλογοῦντες τὸν Θεόν*, or 1<sup>64</sup>, 'He spake, blessing God,' *ἐλάλει εὐλογῶν τὸν Θεόν*. The word is common and characteristic in the Synoptic Gospels. James (3<sup>9</sup>) has *εὐλογοῦμεν τὸν Κύριον καὶ πατέρα*. Paul, on the other hand, tends to use

<sup>1</sup> As I shall frequently have to refer to the text of inscriptions published in my *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, I use the abbreviation *C.B.* to denote it.

εὐλογεῖν in the sense of blessing men; and he employs εὐλόγητος ἔστω when he blesses God.

But, though only one example of this formula in the votive inscriptions is known, yet the verb εὐλογέω is sufficiently common in the next class, in which the person who has been chastised for his sin by the god, dedicates a stele, blessing the god or the wonderful works of the god (εὐ)λογῶν σου τὰς δυνάμ(ε)ις). The stele which is dedicated is in one case called εὐλογία, 'I dedicated a blessing' (sec. xiii.).

The following case stands midway between the two classes. Metrophanes and Flavianus, the two orphan sons of Philippicus, had been plundered and ill-treated in their helplessness; and the god had destroyed (διέφθειρε) their enemies, and the village had punished them. Wherefore, when the god demanded it, one of them, in 210 A.D., dedicated an inscribed stele, blessing the divine power, because [etc.]: [δι ὃ ἀπαιτηθε]ις ἐστηλλογράφησα [εὐλογῶν τὰς θε]ας δυνάμ(ε)ις, ὅτι [—].<sup>1</sup>

Here no sin has been committed by the dedicator (which would place it in the following class,) but a debt has been incurred by him, and payment is demanded by the god. But a debt approximates closely to a sin; and in the inscriptions one instance of the close connexion between the two ideas occurs in the phrase used by the Lycian slave Xanthos, ἀμαρτίαν ὀφ(ε)ιλέτω Μηνί Τυράννω, ἣν οὐ μὴ δύνηται ἐξειλᾶσθαι, 'Let him be a debtor to Men in respect of a sin (i.e. let him be guilty of a sin) which he shall not be able to expiate.' The same approximation of the terms 'debt' and 'sin' is found in Lk 13<sup>2-4</sup>, where the expression changes from ἀμαρτωλός to ὀφειλέτης, without any real change of sense, apparently from mere aiming at variety in verbal expression.<sup>2</sup>

The inexpressible sin, which is mentioned in the quotation from Xanthos, made in the preceding paragraph, consists in prying curiously into the things of the god, ὃς ἂν πολυπραγμονήσῃ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ περιεργάσῃται, ἀμαρτίαν ὀφειλέτω κ.τ.λ. There is an interesting parallel in the Gospels

<sup>1</sup> The restoration is mine, and seems required by the sense and the spaces, though involving one of those awkward changes of person which are common in Anatolian inscriptions. In the inscription as published in *Athenische Mittheilungen*, vi. p. 273, no restoration is given. Buresch (*Aus Lydien*, p. 113) gives one which is quite unusual in form.

<sup>2</sup> I think little stress can be laid on Ewald's conjecture, making these eighteen workmen into debtors of the treasury.

(Mk 3<sup>29</sup>), ὃς ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον . . . ἔνοχος ἔσται αἰωνίου ἀμαρτήματος (comp. Mt 12<sup>31f.</sup>, Lk 12<sup>10</sup>): here the whole formula has precisely the form in which hundreds of threats and denunciations against the guilty are expressed in the inscriptions of Asia Minor (see sec. v. *ad. fin.*).

Deissmann's note on the words of Xanthos bring out some other noteworthy biblical parallels, which I need not repeat (*Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 52).

It must be remembered in estimating all these cases and parallels, that we have not merely to put the question, What did Paul (or any other writer concerned) mean by these words? It would often be impossible to frame a reply to that question. But in such cases the question can often be put with profit, What meaning would the recipients of the letter gather from these words? They would understand the words in the light of the usage familiar to them throughout their life. Then those who believe (as I do) that Paul's expression was adapted to, and to a large extent determined by, the character and mind of his correspondents, will be slow to believe that he had no regard to the sense which their previous circumstances and education would lead them to take from his words.

The inscription of Metrophanes and Flavianus, just quoted, should be compared with that of Skollos and Tatias (see sec. viii.), which belongs to the following class and ends with a blessing: εὐλογεῖ Μηνί 'Ατίμυτι καὶ Μηνί Τιάμου.

#### V. INSCRIPTIONS OF CONFESSION.

By far the most common and noteworthy class of votive inscriptions is what may be called the *Confessions*. 'In the inscriptions of this class found at Dionysopolis, the authors are represented as having approached the temple, or engaged in the service of the deity, while polluted with some physical or moral impurity, and therefore unfit to appear before the god; they are chastized by the god, generally with some disease, sometimes through their property, or, perhaps, their children; they confess and acknowledge their fault; they appease the god by sacrifice and expiation, or by some gift or dedication; they are freed by the god from their chastisement; finally, they narrate the whole circumstances in a public inscription as a warning and an exemplar to all men not to treat the god lightly' (*C.B.*, p. 134 f.).

In the Katakekaumene many examples of this class of inscriptions are found. In them the procedure is much the same. There is not the same stress laid on the fact that the authors approached the temple while impure; they are merely said to have committed some fault and been punished by the god.

Before discussing these inscriptions word by word, it is well to point out a parallel in the New Testament to the general thought in them. Remembering that the commonest form of punishment inflicted by the god was bodily disease, we must be struck with the inscription *C.B.* 43. The beginning of this text is unluckily lost; but the conclusion shows that the sin consisted in eating the flesh of the sacred unsacrificable goat; and the following explanation (given in my text, *C.B.*, p. 138) has been accepted by Professor Robertson Smith.<sup>1</sup> The goat was a sacred animal, and therefore forbidden to be used in the ordinary sacrifice (*θυσία*), the flesh of which was eaten by the worshippers; it might be offered only as the most solemn sacrifice, which was not eaten but given whole to the gods. The sin in this inscription lay in treating the goat as an ordinary sacrifice and eating the flesh; hence the warning, *παραγγέλλω μηθένα ιερὸν ἄθρον αἰγοτόμιον ἔσθειν*. 'The offerer of this sacrifice was punished with bodily illness. By purificatory ceremonies and sacrifices he propitiated the Lord, *καθαροῦς κὲ θυσίας εἰλασάμην τὸν Κ[ύριον] ἵνα μὴ (i.e. μοι) τὸ ἐμὸν σῶ[μα] σώσ[ω]ι (i.e. σώσῃ)*; and the god restored him to his normal physical condition (*ἀποκαθέστησε [τῷ ἐμ]ῷ σώματι*). Anyone who commits a like sin is warned that he will suffer the same punishment (*παθίτε τὰς ἐμὰς {ἐμὰς} κολάσεις*).

Another explanation, suggested by my friend Professor Paterson, takes the important words in the sense 'no one should eat the meat of the sacred animal, the goat, when it has not been offered in sacrifice'; there were animals which it was not permissible to eat, except on certain rare occasions, when they were offered as a specially solemn sacrifice. After the sacrifice 'the worshippers partake of the sacred flesh, which at other times it would be impious to touch.'<sup>2</sup> The objection which makes me shrink from adopting this

<sup>1</sup> I possess the letter in which he approved the explanation, based on his own teaching, which I had submitted to his judgment many years ago.

<sup>2</sup> Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 294.

suggestion is, that all animals of this class were unclean, as Robertson Smith points out, and were eaten only as an exceptional act in connexion with the solemn sacrifice. But a similar objection applies to my own explanation. It supposes that the goat was not allowed to be eaten at all. Does the inscription introduce us to a state of society in which people were beginning to rebel against the religious prohibition against eating the flesh of the goat (which seems to have been sacred, as its head is one of the hieroglyphic symbols in the ancient Anatolian or 'Hittite' system of writing)? though superstitious persons, after infringing the religious law by eating the goat, began sometimes to be troubled by scruples of conscience, and to fancy that any illness which subsequently occurred was a punishment for their impiety.

But the exact sense does not affect the aptness of the following remarkable parallel, for which I am indebted to Professor Paterson. In 1 Co 11<sup>29, 30</sup>, Paul says, 'Whosoever shall eat the bread . . . of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty, *ὃς ἂν ἐσθῆι τὸν ἄρτον . . . τοῦ Κυρίου, ἔνοχος ἔσται, . . .* Let a man prove himself, and so let him eat. . . . For he that eateth . . . eateth . . . judgment unto himself, if he discern not the body, *μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα*. For this cause many among you are weak and sickly (*ἀσθενεῖς καὶ ἄρρωστοί*), and not a few sleep (*i.e.* are dead).'

The thought here is strikingly close in form and character. They who commit a fault in the celebration of the most holy ceremonial act in the worship of the Lord are guilty, and suffer bodily punishment in the form of sickness and disease, and even death. The form of the denunciation is exactly that of hundreds of denunciations of divine wrath in the sepulchral and other inscriptions, *ὃς ἂν ἐσθῆι, ἔνοχος ἔσται*. Compare, for example, *C.B.*, 40, *ὃς ἂν ἐπενκαλέσῃ, θήσει εἰς [τὸν θεὸν οἱ φίσκει]*, and *C.B.*, p. 273, No. 193, *ἔνοχος ἔσται τυμβωρυχία*.

## VI. THE SIN.

The beginning of each incident described in this class of temple inscriptions is some fault, which caused guilt or impurity in the eyes of the god. In some cases the fault is described in detail, in other cases it is merely expressed in general terms by some part of the verb *ἀμαρτάνω*. Thus, at Dionysopolis, *C.B.*, No. 45, *βαθ(ε)ῖσα ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ κὲ ἡμάρτησα*; *C.B.*, Nos. 48 and 49 (which are expressed in Greek

so bad as to be almost or quite unintelligible<sup>1</sup> in many places), contain the phrases δι τὸ ἡμαρτηκέναι, δὲ τὸ ἡμαρτηκέναι, which are apparently intended for διὰ τὸ ἡμαρτηκέναι. Instead of this phrase, in the Katakekaumene, when Ammias was punished after having spoken a sinful word, δι' ἁμαρτίαν λόγον λαλήσασα is the expression, showing that ἁμαρτία is exactly equivalent to τὸ ἡμαρτηκέναι. Again, 'when Phœbus sinned (ἡμάρτησεν), Great Artemis required of him an offering' in the Katakekaumene; and in *C.B.*, No. 51, ἡμάρ[τησεν or τηκεν] occurs at Dionysopolis.

The noun ἁμαρτία is rarely found in the inscriptions, but a second example occurs in the Laurian inscriptions of Xanthos: ἁμαρτίαν ὀφειλέτω (see sec. iii.).

The adjective ἁμαρτωλὸς occurs in another class of inscriptions, denouncing penalties against him who violates the terms of a will and sins against the gods who guard the rights of the grave: ἁμαρτωλὸς ἔστω θεῶν πάντων καὶ Δητοῦς· καὶ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς (*C.I.G.*, 4259); ἁμαρτωλὸς ἔστω εἰς τὴν Δητῶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς λοιποὺς θεοὺς πάντας (*C.I.G.*, 4303).

Besides the simple words, παραμαρτάνειν is used in two inscriptions of the Katakekaumene in the sense of committing a fault against the right of the grave (Buresch, *Asus Lydien*, p. 116).

In outward form this use of ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμαρτωλός, and ἁμαρτία closely resembles the use of these words in the New Testament, where they are very frequent. In inner meaning and life there is, of course, the most profound difference: the contrast between paganism and Christianity turns most of all on the conception of ἁμαρτία. A few cases taken from the New Testament will show at once the resemblance in form and the contrast in meaning.

Such ideas as those which suggested the questions—Jn 9<sup>2</sup>, 'Who did sin, this man or his parents,<sup>2</sup> that he should be born blind?' τίς ἡμαρτεν οὗτος ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ; Lk 13<sup>4</sup>, 'Think you these Galileans were sinners, ἁμαρτωλοί, above all the Galileans because they have suffered πεπόνθασιν (a bloody death)?'—repeat exactly the thought and the language of the votive

inscriptions: physical suffering or death is the result of sin against the god. In Lk 13<sup>2</sup>, the verb πάσχω is used exactly as in the warning *C.B.*, No. 43, παθίτε (*i.e.* παθείται, a false form of the future tense) τὰς ἐμὰς κολάσεις, 'Whoever sins as I have done will suffer my chastisement.' But the doctrine, common to the old Jews<sup>3</sup> and to the hieratic inscriptions of Asia Minor, is quoted by Christ in the above passages, only to be rejected.

Again, we find the construction, εἰς Χριστὸν ἁμαρτάνετε (1 Co 8<sup>12</sup>), as the inscriptions say, ἁμαρτωλοὶ εἰς Δητῶ. In He 1<sup>3</sup>, καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος; 2<sup>17</sup>, ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας<sup>4</sup> τοῦ λαοῦ; 7<sup>27</sup>, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτιῶν θυσίας ἀναφέρειν; 12<sup>4</sup>, ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν προσενέγκας θυσίαν, the resemblance in form to the inscriptions is very marked (ἱλάσκεσθαι is very common in them; and καθαρισμός and θυσία occur and may, of course, be supposed in all cases, even where not expressly mentioned), but the difference in intention is really as complete as in 10<sup>6</sup>, ὀλοκαντώματα περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ εὐδόκησας, 'In whole burnt offerings for sin thou hadst no pleasure.'

To review some of the special sins, for which atonement has been demanded by the god, will better illustrate the character of the cultus. Metrodorus, Glykon's slave, broke, without intending it (ἀκούσως), a little stele, the property of the god, who demanded its restitution (κατεάξας στηλλάριον, unpublished inscription). Stratonicus, in ignorance (κατ' ἀγνοίαν), cut from the grove the trees that belonged to Zeus and Artemis. Glykon raised his hands against his foster-mother (see sec. vi.). Hermogenes slandered Artemidorus as regards wine.

In an unfortunately defective inscription (*C.B.*, No. 42) Onesimos paid a vow to Apollo on behalf of his ox, which had been punished because Onesimos had failed in his duty and not presented himself (*i.e.* for the service of the god at the *hieron*), διὰ τὸ ὑσ[τερηκέν]ε<sup>5</sup> καὶ μὴ παραγεγον[ένε]. The meaning of the inscription requires some explanation. Evidently, Onesimos was bound to present himself at the temple of Apollo for some duty (comp. Jn 8<sup>2</sup>, παρεγένετο εἰς τὸ ἱερόν; Ac 17<sup>10</sup>, παραγενόμενοι εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν). Now there was no idea

<sup>1</sup> The form ἐξοπρᾶρει[ον], *i.e.* ἐξοπλᾶριον, Latin *exemplar*, is a typical example of the corrupted language of these inscriptions.

<sup>2</sup> The old Jewish doctrine that the sin of the fathers is visited on the children, is exactly the teaching of the Asia Minor inscriptions (see sec. ix.).

<sup>3</sup> It has, of course, a long history, which we do not here enter upon.

<sup>4</sup> On this phrase see below (sec. xi.).

<sup>5</sup> Compare the phrase διὰ τὸ ἡμαρτηκέναι, quoted in an earlier part of this section.

in ancient paganism that ordinary persons ought to appear regularly for worship at the temple. Onesimos, therefore, must have occupied some position which entailed service in the temple on certain special occasions; and in one case he had failed to appear for this duty. In all probability he was one of the peculiar class called *hieroi* (probably a Hellenized form of an originally Asiatic institution, the *hierodouloi*), on whose position and duties see *C.B.*, pp. 135, 147, and authorities there quoted.

The use of *ύστερείν* in this inscription is very characteristic of the New Testament,<sup>1</sup> e.g. He 4<sup>1</sup>, *μή ποτε δοκῆ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ύστερηκέναι*.

There is another class of inscriptions differing to some extent in character, but not always distinguishable from this, in which the god is represented, not as directly angry with the sin, but as helping the sufferer to whose loss the sin has been committed. The sufferer asks the god's help by invoking a curse on the wrong-doer, and the punishment which falls on the latter is not merely retribution for his faults, but also a favour granted to the prayer of the person whom he has injured. But even in such cases the wrong-doer can appease the god, and partly or wholly escape from the punishment. The god is represented as a judge, whose action has to be set in motion by a formal appeal before he intervenes to punish the guilty parties. Hence we find in one case the statement that the sufferer made way for the goddess and left his case to the goddess as his champion, *παρεχώρησεν τῇ θεῷ*, (see sec. viii.). In many others the appeal to the god may probably be understood as made at an early stage of the matter, even though it is not expressly mentioned.

The procedure is most explicitly and clearly stated in an inscription of the Katakekaumene (*C.I.G.*, 3442): 'When Hermogenes and (his wife?) Nitonis slandered Artemidorus regarding wine (*ἐλοιδόρησαν περὶ οἴνου*), Artemidorus dedicated a tablet—*πιττάκιον ἐ[ξέ]δωκε*<sup>2</sup> (i.e. making the god his avenger and champion). The god punished Hermogenes (*ἐκολάσεται*), and he propitiated the god (*εἰλάσεται*), and from henceforth (the god?) will be well pleased (*ἀπὸ νῦν εὐδόξει*).'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This parallel was pointed out to me by Professor Paterson.

<sup>2</sup> In Hamilton's copy the lacuna in *ἐ[ξέ]δωκε* is marked; but the older copies of Keppel and Prokesch have *ἔδωκε* only (*C.I.G.*, 3442).

<sup>3</sup> See Deissmann's note on the biblical use of *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*, in the same way as here (*Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 80 f.).

In the concluding phrase it seems better to understand a rather harsh change of subject (such as is common in these inscriptions). The interpretation, 'Artemidorus will acquiesce and be content with the situation,' which is also possible, seems weak and unsuited to the tone of these inscriptions. If Artemidorus is the subject, it would be better to take an unusual sense, 'he will be wise,' or to read *εὐδοξεῖ* from *εὐδοξέω*, 'he is approved' (by the god), in the sense of Xenophon, *Hist. Gr.* i. 1, 30.

In the more superstitious view, it was actually assumed that the god could be moved by any person to punish his enemies, quite apart from any guilt on their part; the proper ceremonies would compel the god to act in the way sought. But this was rather a belief of superstition and ignorance, and it is probably not right, as some authorities do, to take this as part of the theory of paganism. It was a consequence to which the pagan theory of prayer accommodated itself too readily; but there is in these inscriptions no proof that the respectable priesthood at the great temples lent themselves to such practices, but rather a presumption that they discountenanced them, and inculcated the idea that the god was a just god. There was some idea that such curses were a secret and unfair method, part of magic rather than of the religion of the gods, and they were often buried so as to be hid from all but the gods.

A curious group of inscriptions of cursing was found at Cnidos, scratched on leaden tablets, which were fixed on the walls of the temple of Demeter and Persephone, or against the basement of larger monuments. They contain curses against thieves, slanderers, poisoners, assassins, users of false weights, persons who would not give back money entrusted to them on deposit, persons who found and did not restore lost articles, etc. The belief among the Cnidians was that Demeter sent on the culprits subterranean fire, which affected them in the form of fever, and burned them up and forced them to confess: *πεπρημένη ἐξομολογοῦσα* is said of one woman.<sup>4</sup> These all belong probably to the second or last century before Christ, and the native Anatolian and Oriental character in them is much affected by Greek feeling. Hence, as Dr. Wuensch remarks,<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Compare the cases 1 Co 5<sup>b</sup> 11<sup>30</sup> quoted in sec. v., and lower down in the present section.

<sup>5</sup> *Corpus Inscr. Attic.*, Appendix.

they seem in some cases to fulfil the humble purpose of mere advertisement of lost articles. That such advertisement of lost property should take the form of a solemn curse on him that finds and restores not, shows to what an extraordinary degree the daily life and acts of the pagan world took a religious form. It was impossible for the Christian to live in ordinary society without being continually brought in contact with pagan ritual, for the very forms of common courtesy and politeness in social intercourse had a religious character. Hence the ordinary Christian was daily required to decide, in delicate cases, how far he should conform to, or protest against, pagan usages; and opinion, naturally and justifiably, varied very much as to what was right in such situations. A remarkable case, where this delicate problem seems to have been practically solved by a satisfactory compromise, until the experiment was ruthlessly destroyed by Diocletian with fire and sword, is described in *C. B.* pp. 502-509.

All the known inscription of the Katakekaumene were engraved on marble, and none on lead have yet been found, or are likely to be found, unless excavations, such as were made by Sir C. Newton at Cnidus, are instituted at the central *hieron* of the district.

The following inscription, however, approximates rather closely to the superstitious and magical view. In 156 A.D. Apollonius writes hereby, for destruction, *παραγράφει*,<sup>1</sup> τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ, him that struck the tablet and the aider and suggester.<sup>2</sup>

A curious and much mutilated inscription of the Katakekaumene should probably be restored so as to illustrate this subject: Θεοδότῃ Γλύκων[ι ἐπαράτο] θρεπτῷ, ἐπ(ε)ιδῆ ἀράμ[ενος] τὰς χ(ε)ῖρας αὐτῇ ἐκακώσατο· κὲ ἀποθανούσης [Θεοδότῃς] κὲ τοῦ Γλύκωνος, ὁ θεὸς ἐπέξῆτησε παρὰ [ . . . ] τοῦ ἐκγόνου αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀπέδωκε. καὶ ἀπὸ νῦν ἐ[ύλογοί] ἢ ὑδόξει'.<sup>3</sup> Theodote invoked a curse on the foundling child Glykon, when he had lifted his hands against her

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps *παραγράφει* means 'adds to the list,' *adscribit*, implying that the tablet was added to the others of the same purport at the *hieron*. Perhaps, however, it is equivalent to *καταγράφει* in the formula of cursing.

<sup>2</sup> Understanding that [δ]ηρκό[τ]α καὶ οὐστορα are the attempt of an ignorant person to write the perf. part. act. accus. sing. of *διαρκέω* and the accus. of *auctor*.

<sup>3</sup> Published by M. Fontrier in *Smryna Mouseion*, No φξθ': he restores rightly ἐκακώσατο and Θεοδότῃς; but has ἀραμένῃς and αὐτῇ, makes Glykon the father instead of the foundling child of Theodote, and leaves θρεπτῷ without any government.

and injured her; and after Theodote and Glykon had died, the god sought payment from her grandson (name lost), and he gave it, and from henceforth blesses the god. The death of Glykon is considered as an answer by the god to the imprecation invoked on him; and he therefore requires that payment be made for his fulfilling the prayer and vow which were involved in the curse. As Theodote, who had invoked the curse, is dead, the god demands payment from her grandson.

These appeals of the sufferers to the god recall the remarkable passage in 1 Co 5<sup>5</sup>, where the Church is bid assemble and deliver the offender unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh<sup>4</sup>: *παρὰδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός*. It cannot have been unknown to Paul that he was here using a form of words similar to the curses by which the Corinthians had formerly been accustomed to consign their personal enemies to destruction by the powers of the world of death. It seems not open to doubt that the Corinthians would understand by this phrase that the offender was to suffer disease and even death as a punishment for his sin; and Paul goes on to add that this punishment of the flesh is intended to bring salvation ultimately to his soul (*ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ*): by physical suffering he is to atone for his sin. In the parallel passage (1 Ti 1<sup>20</sup>) about Hymenæus and Alexander (*οὓς παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ ἵνα παιδευθῶσι μὴ βλασφημεῖν*) the same intention is marked with equal emphasis. The whole thought stands in the closest relation to the theory of the confession-inscriptions, in which those who have been punished by the god thank and bless him for the chastisement.

That the Corinthians would understand the words of Paul in this way seems clear; and, moreover, when we compare the language of Paul in 11<sup>30</sup> about disease and death being the consequence of participating in the sacrament in wrong (*i.e.* impure) manner, as quoted above (sec. γ.), it seems also clear that he intended the words to be taken in that sense.

The question that is most difficult to answer is as to the part to be played by Satan in this process, and how far he is conceived of as analogous to the gods to whom the pagans handed over their enemies for similar punishment. Here, it must be enough to put the question

<sup>4</sup> Here again I am indebted to Professor Paterson for the analogy.