Pagan Priests. Religion and Power in the Ancient World

Article *in* Numen · January 1993

DOI: 10.2307/3270400

7 authors, including:

Andreas Bendlin
University of Toronto
21 PUBLICATIONS **64** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

John North
UCL
49 PUBLICATIONS **508** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

NUMEN Vol. 40 (1993)

PRIESTHOODS IN MEDITERRANEAN RELIGIONS

TÜBINGEN WORK GROUP[1]

Review article

MARY BEARD-JOHN NORTH (Eds.), *Pagan Priests. Religion and Power in the Ancient World.* London: Gerald Duckworth 1990 (XI, 266 p., 31 fig.) ISBN 0 7156 2206 4 £ 13.00

1. *The Book*

1.1 The present work is one of the first comparative descriptions of priesthood of the classical Mediterranean high cultures from the 6th century B.C. to the 4th century A.D., along with an abrupt excursion into the Mycenean period.[2] The book originated in a series of seminars on "Priests and Power" at the Institute of Classical Studies in London. Hence behind the themes there is—as a leitmotiv of the book—the problem of connection or separation of religion and politics in the ancient world.[3] The framework is provided by the "forms of power in the state" in their entirety, among which priestly power is to be located. This "theory", however, has not been fully developed in this volume (p. 14). It is within this framework of constitution and law that "the category of priest in the individual society" (p. 2) is to be defined. Here again "not a complete general theory of priesthood" (p. 1) is to be developed, but common features and some general conclusions of the nature of pagan priesthood "as a whole". The most important category is the specifically Christian idea of mediation between men and gods, once explicitly rejected by Georg Wissowa[4] (see 3.3). Sometimes the word 'communication' is used instead of 'mediation'; it is striking that the authors seem to take account only of 'vertical' relations between gods and men, and not of communication between men.

It is quite understandable that the Judean and Christian counterparts of pagan priesthood are not dealt with. Less understandable is the absence of the graeco-oriental priesthoods, the so-called mystery religions, as well as of the 'societies' (*thiasoi, collegia*).[5] It does not become entirely clear, therefore, what types of 'congregation' could emerge within the non-Christian cults or how the roles of the teacher, pastor, or spiritual guide were able to develop.[6] The cult of Juppiter Dolichenus provides an example of the diversity of offices which developed in the non-Christian cults:

documented are a high priest, full-time priest, candidates for the priesthood and their guides (*pater candidatorum*), a *curator* of the temple, and various cult-workers; the 'congregation' is referred to as *colitores*.[7]

The material used for the development of terminology and theory is, for the most part (about one half of the volume), the religion of the Roman Republic (pp. 17-71) and of imperial Rome (pp. 177-255). The oriental cultures are represented by relatively late and selective material—Nabonidus and the priests of Babylon in the 6th century, the high priests of Memphis in the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C. Bronze-age Pylos and classical Athens in the 5th century represent the countless cults of Hellas (pp. 157-174; 73-91).[8]

The selection is held together by the introduction presenting theories of priesthoods as well as by editorial inserts preceding the individual contributions which provide helpful synchronisms between the Mediterranean cultures, establish comparative relationships, and moderate the terminological discrepancies.

An index and a rather disparate "bibliography" conclude the volume.

1.2. The State of Research

a) The editors and authors are well known through numerous studies in the field of ancient Roman religion and are pursuing comprehensive plans for comparative studies and the development of theory (p. 28, n. 30). Thanks to numerous analyses of specific material as well as a number of general monographs on Roman religion, there is now a good opportunity for a comparative work (cf. section IV: Bibliography). G.J. Szemler (1972), L. Schumacher (1973/78) and J. Scheid (1975, 1990) have followed the tradition of C. Cichorius, F. Münzer, and T.R.S. Broughton and collected the prosopographies of the Roman priests, interpreting them under pre-dominantly historical and sociological aspects: background, career, sequence of political and priestly offices, the distribution of patricians and plebeians, "old" and "new" families among the various priesthoods, thus contributing important groundwork to the topic 'priests and power'. The authoritative monograph on a single priesthood has come from Ronald Syme (1980); it also deals with the status of the Arval-Brotherhood in Roman society ("Ritual and Society") and provides crucial references regarding the history of the transmission of the Dea Dia.[9]

b) A theological counter-piece to the sociological and comparative approaches of the philologists and historians is the work of the Würzburg archaeologist Erika Simon. Two decades after "Die Götter der Griechen" (1969) we now have the sequel: "Die Götter der Römer" (1990). The

author's long-time and intimate acquaintance with the monuments have resulted in a unified and personal work which illuminates purposefully and convincingly the non-visual classic works by Georg Wissowa (1st edition 1902) and—despite an appendix of plates—of Kurt Latte (1960), without duplicating or replacing *The Iconography of Roman Religion* by Robert Turcan (1988).

The basic data regarding festivals and rites are treated briefly; the focus is on interpreting the meaning of mythical figures and personifications in their artistic form. Isolated, in alphabetical order, and without historical narrative, gods are made visible, as it were, as being and form, as effect and element. Attention is being focused on, and limited to, works of art. Their architectonic context, the implements used for the veneration of the cult image, and the people presenting themselves in these symbolic acts remain at the periphery. Another notable difference compared to the volume by Beard-North is the archaic perspective: "... in religion the older tends to be superior to the younger" (Simon, p. 9). The assumption that at the beginning there is the essence, points back to prehistory, to the primeval, "to matriarchic times" (Simon, p. 44). This results in a noticeable discrepancy between the visual material which provides the richest documentation for the period of Augustus, and an interpretation intended to lead back to the "earliest possible levels" (Simon, p. 13).

2. *The Contributions*

2.1 "Priesthood in the Roman Republic" (Mary Beard) and "Diviners and Divination at Roman" (John North)

a) M. Beard deals with the priests of the Roman Republic in toto. She starts out with the well-known "diversity of Roman priesthoods" and the diffusion of their authority and focuses her investigation on the "function of mediation between gods and men" (p. 29). According to her thesis, none of the priesthoods but rather the Senate plays the central role as mediator. The augurs who have direct contact with the gods are subordinate to the Senate. The *pontifices* have little to do with divine contact but mediate rather between the central authorities and individuals; they, too, are subordinate to the Senate. This confirms what has been known for some time (e.g. cf. G.J. Szemler): the Roman priests are specialists assigned to the Senate, which has the highest, although not clearly defined, religious authority. Despite their special knowledge the priests have no power of their own because of the "fragmentation of priestly authority" (p. 42). Hence we see a broad dissemination of that power among the leading elite and a corresponding lack of a clear priestly hierar-

chy as well as of a generic concept of "priest". That *sacerdos* achieved that meaning "rather late" and only through hellenistic influences (p. 46 f.) in the absence of any pre-hellenistic documents, is as difficult to prove as it is to disprove.

b) J. North refers to the wide spread of divination and investigates the well-known connection between the exercise of power and divination. A subordinate may not make use of divination against his master (p. 60). But the frequent practice of divination in routine situations speaks against the general interpretation of divination as an aid in reaching critical decisions. Divination does have a stabilizing effect in crisis situations, but that is a function of all rituals. An important characteristic of Roman divination is its anonymity. According to North, the auspices serve as an indication of political power and as a source of legitimacy. Yet they do not contribute to the concentration but rather to the distribution of the power of the individual. Once again, Roman religion is shown to be the construct of an elite for the purpose of exercising political control.

c) An interpretation of ancient priesthoods within the framework of a given political system is fruitful but necessarily incomplete. By choosing that framework the presentation concentrates on *pontifices, augures, haruspices*, and *decemviri*, but excludes many other priesthoods (*flamines, Vestales, Salii, fetiales, arvales*). They, too, contribute to the variety and diffusion of priestly authority, but the apparently lesser degree of interaction on their part with the political system is not being examined. Hence these significant priesthoods have been excluded from an investigation of pagan priests. Beard limits society to the ruling elite of urban Rome. North makes only brief mention of private divination and of the impact of State divination on the so-called masses. Those limitations, too, exclude important aspects of Roman priesthood, such as the participation of women in public, private and state cults.

2.2 "Priests and Power in Classical Athens" (Robert Garland)

Garland organizes his investigation along the following questions: 1) Who represents the state religion (authority, control)? 2) How are innovations introduced? 3) What was the status and influence of oracles and seers? 4) Through what channels was mediation between gods and men conducted?

The general results of this study of democratic 5th century Athens are the same as in the case of the Roman Republic: "Religious function and religious authority in classical Athens were diffused and non-centralized" (p. 75), and this is the case on the social as well as on the political level. The religious specialists have no exclusive powers. The diffusion of religious authority in classical Athens, according to Garland, mirrors the

diffusion of political authority (p. 91). Directives regarding religious matters are issued by the *demos*, which "arrogated to itself as much power as possible".

2.3 "The High Priests of Memphis under Ptolemaic Rule" (Dorothy J. Thompson)

The subject of this chapter is a prosopographically well documented and well researched priestly family which shows the intertwining of political and religious power over a time-span of 300 years.[10]

Normally, the son inherited the priestly office from the father. Since in two documented cases the office holders are very young, the author concludes that family tradition was more important than professional qualification. The taking on of additional priestly offices as well as the employment of wives as priestesses or musicians shows that social and financial prestige were the main reasons for taking over priesthoods.

The arrangement between the priesthood and the new dynasty was advantageous for both parties: by recognizing the Ptolemies as 'Pharaos' the priests possessed the needed 'guarantees of carrying out the cult',[11], retained control over their temple properties, but had to pay taxes (ca. 10% of the annual income; they did, however, receive royal subventions for financing the cult). The advantage for the Ptolemies lay in the reconciliation of the native population to foreign rule, e.g. through subvention of the cult and financing of building temples, but above all in the religious legitimization of their rule and the establishment of their own cult. The reciprocity of religious and political power recognizable, for example, in the dual coronation of Ptolemy V—secular in Alexandria, priestly in Memphis—led, as in the case described above, to a mutually lucrative "collaboration". This aspect has been given too little attention in previous studies of the family of the high priests of Ptah in Memphis. Nevertheless, for the purpose of a general work on "pagan priests" the author places too much emphasis on a special case under particular political conditions—in spite of a helpful series of general definitions pertaining to priesthood in Egypt (pp. 98 ff.). The cultic responsibilities of the priests, their hierarchical division into classes, their strict regulations regarding dress and tonsure which identified them as a socially notable group, again do not fit the'political' frame.

2.4 "Nabonidus and the Babylonian Priesthood" (Amélie Kuhrt)

The title of Kuhrt's article makes clear that the author commences her study of the Neo-Babylonian priesthood with the historical events surrounding the fall of the same. Since the "verse account",[12] a description

of the political upheavals in Mesopotamia at that time and written from a Persian point of view, came to light it was believed that Cyrus II could reckon with the support of a priesthood dissatisfied with the religious policies of Nabonidus when he conquered Babylon in 539 B.C. Kuhrt's study concerns itself mainly with this historical question in order to reach a definition of priesthood.

Since it would be inappropriate here to present the results of Kuhrt's investigation of the historical situation, only her definition of priesthood based upon those results shall be dealt with in the following. Basing her hypothesis on the inscriptions of both Nabonidus and the Persian kings as well as the Nabonidus Chronicle and the Verse Accounts, Kuhrt's investigation of the historical situation at the end of the Neo-Babylonian empire proposes a new model: one that relativizes the role of the priesthood. Her second step is to test the theory as to whether there was a theological conflict between Nabonidus and the Babylonian priesthood and whether there is any textual evidence for dissatisfaction on the part of the priesthood which the Persians might have been able to exploit. The rest of the article examines whether or not there is any proof of royal interference in the temple economy during Nabonidus' reign.

Her investigations conclude by questioning the validity of the term 'priest' during the Neo-Babylonian period. This, in turn, raises the question as to whether one may presuppose a dichotomy between 'Church' and State similar to that of the Middle Ages and the modern period which includes a division of interests and power between monarchy and priesthood. By examining this question she hopes to elucidate whether a conflict between these two power bases might have led to the downfall of Babylonia.[13]

In the final part of her work Kuhrt investigates the cultic personnel. She points out that there is no term in Akkadian for "priest" per se. However, this does not have to mean that certain terms used in different contexts cannot have specific connotations. It has already been noted that the Akkadian word *šangu* has a much larger field of definition than just 'cultic specialist'.[14] In the Nabonidus Inscription the *mār bānê*[15] (free men) and *šangu* surely represent the owners of landed estates and the temple personnel (with both cultic and administrative duties) as representatives of two different social groups opposing one another. The meaning of this term can be more precisely defined when one notes that the Neo-Assyrian kings used it as one of their titles, i.e. they called themselves *šangu*.[16] This term expresses above all the cultic duties which they had to carry out for the deity, such as evident from the Neo-Assyrian rituals, in which the king had the most important role.[17]

The description of the bureaucratic apparatus and the cultic personnel is based largely on the work of H.M. Kümmel.[18] As Kuhrt points out the temple employees, with the exception of the craftsmen and temple slaves, came from the group known juristically as *mār bānê*. Many families belonging to this group had a traditional connexion with certain temple offices. The bearer of a specific office, or his representative, was obliged to carry out cultic duties alongside of his religious ones. The transferability of such offices as well as the sources of income and investments which went along with them show that no clear differentiation can be made between 'secular' and religious spheres. If one were to investigate whether or not there was a class in Babylonia during the first millenium B.C. which could be described by "priesthood", then one must not only pay attention to the economic condition, but also whether there is any evidence of rituals, on the religio-cultic level, such as initiation rites, in which a certain group was differentiated from the rest of the cultic personnel. K. Deller, in his treatise on the temple personnel of the Assur Temple during the Neo-Assyrian era, shows that the LÚ.GAL NINDA.MEŠ, the "chief of the bakers" of the Assur Temple was obligated to take part in an initiation ceremony (*gallubu*).[19] This seems to indicate that, at least for this type of ceremony, artisans and bureaucratic personnel were obliged to purview themselves. This can be used as further evidence for Kuhrt's view that "priesthood", in the Judeo-Christian sense, cannot be applied to Babylonia. On the other hand there must have been a group of people who were chiefly concerned with the fixation of rituals and theological works, having such a high degree of specialization that they stood out among the other bureaucrats in the temple administration. This becomes clear when one examines the colophons which describe certain texts as secrets only be made available to certain specialists. The said group of persons is neither described nor dealt with any further by Kuhrt. It is questionable, however, whether or not this group would have been able to gain any political weight.

Compared with earlier discussions in which the downfall of Babylonia was considered to have been the product of a priesthood collaborating with the foe, Kuhrt manages to provide a more complex assessment of the causes leading to the end of the Babylonian Empire by placing more emphasis on the historico-military events. A separate investigation of the temple personnel on the socio-economic level leads her to a different point of view with regard to the structure of the temple personnel, which prohibits any definition of "priesthood" in the traditional sense of the word.

2.5 "Cult-Personnel in the Linear B Text from Pylos" (James Hooker)

J. Hooker's lucid study with its rich material shows the complexity of the

development of the cult and its connection to diverse segments of the population already in the 13th century B.C. According to Hooker's rather forced interpretation there was "a clear demarcation" between the religious and political spheres (p. 168-Ep. 704).[20] The task of a history of Mycenaean religion—especially in a collection of comparative essays—to establish a connection between the old-oriental centers and the succeeding and border cultures of the late old-oriental period has not been realized here. The appendixed Mycenaean original texts are impressive but of no use for the prospective readers of this volume since a translation has not been provided.

2.6 "From Republic to Principate"-"The Veil of Power"-"Religion in the Roman Empire" (Richard Gordon)

a) For his contribution Richard Gordon establishes his own basis by sketching the religion of imperial Rome with sociological and religio-critical concepts. For him, sacrifice is the reflection of a labor-sharing society; Roman iconography, therefore, does not depict the communicative aspect of sacrifice (p. 205 f.). The sacrificial system masks the lack of political structures, fixates the reciprocity between unequals, furthers providential beneficence, and creates changelessness (p. 229). Philanthropy is a part of the technique of rulership, humanism a mask of Roman imperialism (pp. 228 f., 231, 235 ff.). In this view, the utopian content of the stoic teaching regarding reason, goodness, equality, and educability of all human beings is being suppressed; still, realpolitical reduction is preferable to humanistic educational jargon.

b) After these general and stimulating observations Gordon proceeds to the topic of the volume by limiting the religion of imperial Rome to the sacrificial system and to the ruling political elite. In Gordon's view, sex roles, family structure, rules for food, "in short, our way of life" (p. 252) are fixated in that system—which seems a rather unmediated and undialectical connection between religion and society as well as an overburdening of the sacrificial system. At the center of the system Gordon sees the emperor as sacrificer "or/and" priest (p. 201 f.), a combination which reveals the breakdown of the terminology. The emperor is said to cumulate the "sacerdotal roles" (p. 183) and thus represents "the close nexus between sacrifice, benefaction, and domination by the elite" which, according to Gordon (p. 235), is the Roman model of priesthood. The sacrificial system is part of imperial euergetism, constitutes an important link between center and periphery (p. 231),[21] and serves the Romans to camouflage their power. The Romans tried to impose their model of priesthood and religious organization on the varied cultures of the Empire

(p. 233 f.); the conquerors, as Gordon supposes, eradicated "competing religious alternatives" (p. 233 f.).

The history of pre-Roman Asia Minor, however, shows that the Greeks already tried to control the so-called temple-states. Whether the Druids or the Jews, the only examples of eradication cited by Gordon, constitute borderline cases or especially well known normal cases (thus Gordon, p. 243 f.), is left open.

c) A few comments on this encompassing and interesting construction are in order here, especially with regard to the specific topic of the volume. The reduction of Roman religion and its priesthoods to a sacrificial system or "civic religion" is problematic. By such a restriction those priesthoods that are not part of the political elite are being excluded. Those priests, however, did not engage exclusively in magic and superstition.[22]

The cumulation of sacerdotal roles by the emperor has been observed correctly, but the emperor also had many other roles (orator, military commander-in-chief, god). Only 20 of the 230 extant statues of Augustus depict him as sacrificer. How many depict him as a priest, Gordon does not say (p. 212). The depiction of the sacrificing ruler "at the same time evoked the euergetes", but none of the numerous and useful illustrations provided by Gordon show any connection between sacrifice and benefaction, nor do they depict the imperial priest in the service of his euergetism. Not even the distribution of the sacrifice is documented; the act of sacrificing as work, order, billing seems to be the decisive issue for the Romans of the imperial period (cf. p. 205). The connection between euergetism and priesthood is nowhere documented; the inaugural meal of a priest is not a feeding of the people, and the *summa honoraria* at the inauguration cannot be documented by an anecdote from Suetonius' *Caligula*. It seems, then, that the central thesis, namely that in his role as priest and sacrificer the emperor was originator as well as guarantor of the euergetistic system, has not been proven. Especially noteworthy is the fact that Gordon does not deal at all with the various kinds of priests of the imperial cult itself.

3. *Retrospect and Prospect*

3.1 A general view of the illustrations, the discussion of women, and conceptional developments in the volume as a whole shall conclude this review.

We welcome, in principle, the inclusion of 31 illustrations in this volume. However, the coordination of pictures and text does not always work. Classical Athens is represented by two vase paintings and a relief: a young woman—but not a priestess—at a sacrifice; a man and a woman from the Parthenon-frieze, "probably a magistrate, perhaps a

priestess''—this does not elucidate the problem of how to distinguish between participants in the cult, actors, and functionaries. Finally, there is a sacrifice to Dionysos by two women, ''probably maenads'': this is not exactly a contribution to the iconography of Greek priesthoods. Not one of the many pictures of sacrifices from imperial Rome illustrates the topic 'emperor-priesthood-euergetism'.

A *culullus* is not an axe (fig. 3). L. Lartius, the priest of Bellona, supposedly rolls his eyes and dances ecstatically (fig. 31): but he stands relaxed and dignified; what is referred to as a ''whip'' is just a branch, and also his so-called double-axes do not serve for ''self-flagellation''. The most important sign of his dignity is not even mentioned: Lartius is wearing a laurel wreath with three medaillons.

3.2 The methodological principle of the ''inseparability of religion and politics'' (pp. 7, 33 and passim) leaves little room for social groupings with priestly functions outside the political happenings. The treatment of women with priestly functions—after all, a group in the religions of antiquity that cannot be neglected—may be seen as an indicator of the methodological onesidedness of the contributions. The description of a Vestal funeral at the beginning of the book and a compelling characterization of the witch Erichtho at the end, do give the volume a decorative frame. However, gender does not even emerge thematically in connection with the problem of translating the word *sacerdos*. As for the rest, female 'priests' are being excluded by the political screen; this screen turns the special case, the unusual, into normality. Closer consideration of the inscriptions, however, gives us a different picture. Gordon, who deals with the imperial period and provincial societies, has not explained female *sacerdotes* even when they appear unexpectedly in inscriptions; for him they are ''honorary men'' (p. 230). The role of the cult of empresses and its significance for the female segments of society is not mentioned at all, neither is the increase in priestly positions for women in the provinces.

One of the concerns of Beard/North, namely, ''to pinpoint 'priesthood' within the social and political structure of the ancient city'' (p. 9) is evidently aimed more at the political than at the social realm. The investigations are limited to priestly functions insofar as they are of significance for the socio-political public and, therefore, leave no room for gender-oriented questions. But as long as male-oriented measures of what is of political and public significance constitute the sole criteria, then inevitably only those women can be dealt with who have left the typically 'female' realms of activity and who constitute exceptional or borderline cases that cannot be considered representative. The *virgines Vestae* and the witch Erichtho, along with the illustrations seem, therefore, to serve a

decorative and exotic purpose in this volume, and to provide another shiny facet of the "lure" described by Beard in the introduction. But they do not contribute to any fruitful discussion leading to a deeper understanding of the activities of women in Roman religion. The sought-after gender-neutrality of this volume remains very much a surface decoration.

3.3 The editors' criticism of the usual terminology is justified (p. 2 ff.). The label 'priest' (Priester, prêtre, prete) covers up the religious and functional differences within and between the various cultures. The conceptional field developed by Max Weber—magi, charismatics, prophets—is insufficient for the non-Jewish and non-Christian cultures of antiquity. For that reason, the editors and some of the authors introduce the expression "mediation between gods and men" which is meant to serve as a general category which would span the various cultures.[23] This expression, however, is neither explained nor embedded in a field of conceptions, nor is it made operative by indicating criteria of application to different cultures.[24] The principle, that "we cannot apply our society's criteria"[25] is, as such, objectionable. If allowed to stand initially then it must be noted that the use of the term "mediation" contradicts this principle, because "mediation" is a specific concept of Western Christianity. *Mediator-MESITES* is a Christian term based on Hebrews 6-8, where the CHRISTOS is called the true ARCHIEREVS "in the succession of Melchizedek". As Son of God, etc. he is a priest "for ever" (Ps. 110) and, therefore, exceeds the Jewish priesthood after the order of the Levites or of Aaron. This Christ is the "guarantor" (*EGGYOS*) of the "new covenant".[26] For that reason, "mediation" as a general term is inappropriate for the comparative history of religion.

The editors are not unaware of this difficulty; they propose to use the word mediation "relatively restrictively"; if not "we would be in the unhelpful (if not absurd) position of calling every Roman adult male (!) a priest" (p. 9). This relation and restriction, however, as has been said, is not pointed out. That is why in this volume, as we have shown, a distinction between participant, sacrificer and priest cannot be realized.

In spite of these scruples the reviewers are convinced that this book will help to move the comparative history of religion away from divinities and towards the inquiry into fundamental institutions of the religious systems.[27]

4. *Bibliography*

Beard, Mary, "The Sexual Status of Vestal Virgins", in: *JRS* (1980) 12-27

Cancik, Hubert, "Theokratie und Priesterherrschaft. Die mosaische Verfassung bei Flavius Josephus, contra Apionem 2", 157-198, in: J. Taubes (ed.), *Theokratie. Religionstheorie und politische Theologie* II, 1987, 65-77

Cancik, Hubert-Cancik-Lindemaier, Hildegard, "Senecas Konstruktion des Weisen Zur Sakralisierung der Rolle des Weisen im 1 Jh. n. Chr,", in: Aleida Assmann (ed.), *Weisheit, Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation,* München 1991, 205-222

Cancik-Lindemaier, Hildegard, "Kultische Privilegierung und gesellschaftliche Realität. Ein Beitrag zur Sozialgeschichte der Virgines Vestae", in: *Saeculum* 41 (1991) 1-16

Guerra Gomez, Manuel, *El sacerdozio femenino en las religiones greco-romanas y en el cristianismo de los primeros siglos*, Toledo 1987.

Harrison, James G. *The Official Priests of Rome in the Reigns of Trajan and Hadrian*, 1974.—rec. L. Schumacher, in: *Gnomon* 49 (1977), 809-81.

Ladage, Dieter, "Städtische Priester- und Kultämter im lateinischen Westen des Imperium Romanum zur Kaiserzeit", PhD thesis, Köln 1971

Lewis, M.W.H. *The Official Priests of Rome under the Julio-Claudians*, Rom 1955

Mora, Fabio, *Prosopografia Isiaca*, 2 vols., Leiden 1990

Paladino, Ida, *Fratres Arvales. Storia di un collegio sacerdotale romano*, Roma 1988—rec. J. Linderski, in: *Class. Philol.* 86 (1991), 84-87

Porte, Danielle, *Les donneurs de sacré. Le prêtre à Rome*, Paris 1989.—rec. G. Radke, in: *Gnomon* 63 (1991) 124-127.

Scheid, John, *Les Frères Arvales. Recrutement et origine sociale sous les Julio-Claudiens*, Paris 1975

Scheid, John, "Les prêtres officiels sous les empereurs julio-claudiens", in: *ANRW* II 16.1, 1978, 610-654.

Schumacher, Leonhard, "Prosopographische Untersuchungen zur Besetzung der vier hohen Priesterkollegien im Zeitalter der Antonine und der Severer (96-235 n. Chr.)", PhD thesis, Mainz 1973

Simon, Erika, *Die Götter der Römer*, München 1990

Syme, Ronald, *Some Arval Brethren*, Oxford 1980

Szemler, G.J., *The Priests of the Roman Republic. A Study of Interactions between Priesthoods and Magistrates*, Bruxelles 1972

Tübinger Autorenkollektiv
Universität Tübingen
Philologisches Seminar
Wilhelmstr. 36
D - 7400 Tübingen

[1] Andreas Bendlin, Hubert Cancik, Ulrike Egelhaaf, Gudrun Fischer, Christoph Rottler, Jörg Rüpke.—Beate Pongratz-Leisten (2.4); Sabine Schloz (2.3).

[2] The announcement of "two thousand years before the rise of Christianity" forgets, on the one hand, the contributions of R. Gordon who treats the post-Christian period and, on the other hand, disappoints expectations of studies on the priesthoods of Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, Syria or Egypt during the Bronze Age in this volume.

[3] The terminology is inconsistent, as may be demonstrated by a small choice: interrelationship, overlap, fusion, interaction, interplay, interdependence and so on.

[4] *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, München [2]1912, 479f.

[5] One of the few texts provided for this topic does not deal (as indicated on p.

12) with the request "to become a priest (of Isis)" and not with any "priestly calling" for Lucius; at issue for Apuleius, *Met.* 11, 21 is initiation into the mystery, not initiation into the priesthood.

[6] The difference sacrificial/non-sacrificial is not the decisive difference between the non-Christian/Christian role of the priest.

[7] Cf. CIL VI 406 = 30758.

[8] Surprisingly there is a considerable diachronic gap between the articles on Classical Athens (V BC) and Republican Rome (I BC). Thus major changes in Hellenistic religious mentality are missed, esp. the evolution of ruler-cult, its beginnings within the framework of Classical Greece and the subsequent instrumentalisation and concentration of hitherto "diffused religious authorities" (2.2).

[9] But see M. Beard's justly critical remarks on Syme's limitations in her review of John Scheid, *Romulus et ses Frères. Le collège des Frères Arvales, modèle du culte public dans la Rome des Empereurs*, Rome 1990, in *TLS* 25/10/1991, p. 7.

[10] Cf. Janet H. Johnson, "The Role of the Egyptian Priesthood in Ptolemaic Egypt", in: Leonard H. Lesko (ed.), *Egyptological Studies in Honor of Richard A. Parker* Hannover, N.H., 1986; Thompson, *Memphis under the Ptolemies*, Princeton, N.J. 1888 and the review of this book by R. Bogaert, in *Gnomon* 61 (1990) 609-612.

[11] Cf. Erich Winter, "Der Herrscherkult in den ägyptischen Ptolemäertempeln", in: Herwig Maehler, Volker Michael Strocka (eds.), *Das ptolemäische Ägypten*, Mainz 1978, 147.

[12] S. Smith, *Babylonian Historical Texts*, New York 1975 (reprint), Pl. V-X.

[13] With regards to the Nabonidus Inscription of the historical events s. P.-A. Bedaulieu, *The Reign of Nabonidus* (New Haven and London 1989) not yet available to Kuhrt. A new work dealing with this complex of questions is P. Högemann, Das Alte Vorderasien und die Achämeniden. Die vorderasiatischen Herrschaftsformen und ihre Rezeption durch die Perser von Kyros dem Großen bis Dareios I, *TAVO* B. 98, 150 (in print).

[14] B. Menzel, *Assyrische Tempel*, vol. 1 (Rom 1981) 130 ff. K. Deller, *BAM* 16 (1985) 243.

[15] Concerning the term *mār bānê* s. M. Dandamev, "The Neo-Babylonian Citizens", *Klio* 63 (1981) 45-48.

[16] Cf. M.-J. Seux, *Epithètes royales*, Paris 1967, 287 f.

[17] Cf. the collection of ritual texts in B. Menzel, *Assyrische Tempel*, Bd. 2, Rom 1981.

[18] H.M. Kümmel, *Familie, Beruf und Amt im spätbabylonischen Uruk: Prosopographische Untersuchungen zu Berufsgruppen des 6. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. in Uruk*, Berlin 1979.

[19] K. Deller, *BAM* 16 (1985) 369. B. Menzel, a.a.O., 191.

[20] Cf. M. Ventris-J.H. Chadwick, Documents nr. 135; cf. nr. 140.

[21] Cf. Paul Veyne, Le pain et le cirque, 1976.

[22] Cf. pp. 234 ff., 244 ff., 247 f., 252.

[23] Cf. pp. 29, 33, 41, 75.

[24] The following differentiation among agents of symbolic actions may be proposed: actor, participant, expert, official, sacerdotal role, cult-worker, virtuoso (e.g. ascetic), pastor.

[25] p. 6: cf. p. 157.

[26] Cf. the encyclica "Mediator Dei" on liturgy, in: *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 39, 1947.

[27] Cf. p. 201.