Eidinow, E. (2020). 'What Will You Give Me?': Narratives of Religious Exchange. In A. Collar, & T. M. Kristensen (Eds.), *Pilgrimage and Economy in the Ancient Mediterranean* (pp. 187-203). (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World; Vol. 192). Brill Academic Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004428690_009

Peer reviewed version

License (if available):
Unspecified

Link to published version (if available):
10.1163/9789004428690_009

Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research
PDF-document

This is the accepted author manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Brill Academic Publisher at https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004428690. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available: http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/

'What Will You Give Me?': Narratives of Religious Exchange
Esther Eidinow

[in *Pilgrimage and Economy in the Ancient Mediterranean*, edited by Anna Collar and Troels Myrup Kristensen, 187-203. Leiden: Brill, 2020.]

1. Introduction: Dynamics of *Do ut Des*

The quotation that heads this chapter is from the Epidaurian iamata (A8) and is a question posed by the god Asklepios to one Euphanes, a boy from Epidauros who suffered, we are told, from stone. The boy slept in the sanctuary there and 'it seemed to him the god came to him and said "What will you give me if I should make you well?" The boy replied "Ten dice?" and the god laughing said that he would 'make it stop' (which may mean the pain or the stone), and the account concludes happily, 'When day came, he left well.'[1] I start with this story because it provides an example of a narrative concerning divine-mortal interaction (one of a number found in the iamata), in which an exchange takes place: divine power or knowledge in return for a material object of value to the giver. This chapter focuses on the idea of gift exchange (both material and metaphysical) to contribute to the theme of sacred economies.

The Greeks themselves were well aware of the paradigms of exchange that underpinned – in various ways – their religious practices, in terms of interactions between both mortals, and mortals and divinities. Among them was the crucial concept of *charis*, which William Furley takes as a description of the beneficence that the worshipper/giver requested in the future, rather than in the moment of worship/giving itself.[2] In relations between mortals and gods, charis created a link between the metaphysical and the mundane; it was an abstract quality that emerged from a very human process of trade involving material objects. As Plato, slightly tongue in cheek, reminds Euthyphro, in the dialogue of that name, piety is an *emporike techne* (a 'trading skill'). Plato notes that we give the gods honour and praise and *charis*; the gods are gratified (they are, as it were '*charis*-ed' from these transactions).[3] Even if such an explicit

analysis of *charis* is rare in our sources, epigraphic evidence suggests that most ancient people treated their interactions with the gods as rooted in a relationship of expectant exchange. The language of numerous ex-votos indicates a widely shared narrative in which one side gave to please the other, and felt justified in asking that something be given in return.
But although, at first sight, this paradigm of exchange seems to have been common and straightforward – *do ut des* – its underlying nature was likely to have been more intricate in a number of dimensions. Recent research on the significance of the gift draws our attention to the complex social dynamics that comprise the giving and receiving of gifts and the related network of emergent meanings.[4] The giving of a gift is an assertion of identities about both giver and recipient: as Schwartz notes, '… to accept a gift is to accept (at least in part) an identity, and to reject a gift is to reject a definition of oneself'.[5] Moreover, the implications of this interaction may reach well beyond the momentary response of giver and recipient, and

[1] Trans. LiDonnici 1995. Edelstein – Edelstein 1945 (i), 223.
[2] Furley 2010, 155; cf. Day 2010, 232–3, who sees it as generated in a (repeatable) 'now', which merges past, present and future encounters with the god. See Parker 1998, 109 for the way in which the term came to acquire the meaning 'gratitude'.
[3] Pl. *Euthphr*. 15a and 14c–15b.
[4] I have explored these dynamics in more detail in Eidinow 2015b, 143–4 (see also Eidinow 2016, 205–32) in the context of analysis of mortal and divine *phthonos*.
[5] Schwartz 1967, 3.

not only for those immediately involved. As an example, research on the 'biographies' of gifts of aid following a tsunami in Sri Lanka in 2003 reveals the dynamics of their meaning – and its manipulation. The authors of the research show how, in this context, 'the altruistic gift implied by the humanitarian discourse … inevitably collides with divergent discourses, practices, and expectations associated with 'gift' when it enters a local domain.'[6] As this demonstrates, the meanings attributed to a gift may be shaped by 'divergent gift rationales' as different actors, at different social levels, employ diverse 'strategies to negotiate, bend, or circumvent the contradictions' between them.[7] Such an example concerns the network of relations of meaning between gift, giver and recipient, and, as it illustrates, these are likely to diverge according to the specific cultural context in which the gift-giving takes place. In the case of divine and mortal interactions, however, a further set of questions must be raised because of the nature of those involved: if one player in a relationship of exchange in fact does not exist, how does that affect how we understand the emergent network of meanings and its manipulation?

This chapter sets out to explore the dynamics of mortal/divine reciprocity in ancient Greek religion, suggesting that the paradigm of exchange in this context is one that we not only trace through narratives that have survived in our sources, but that also itself crucially comprised stories – and, importantly, co-existing and competing stories. This chapter focuses on the creation of narratives at both the individual and the social level – and the relationships between the two. At the level of the individual, it employs a relational sociological approach to establish how interpersonal relationships create meaning through the development of individual and social narratives (in the next section) and how this may bear on our conceptual approach to ancient Greek religion. As noted above, individual narratives shape and are shaped by social narratives, and this chapter will then – in the third section – examine some of the ways in which such narratives about divine/mortal exchange were communicated and instantiated, and how this may shape our perception of ancient Greek ritual phenomena.

But this process of relational story-telling is not to be understood only as a descriptive process; it is also creative. Mirroring the dynamic of gift-giving, the development of a narrative is also itself the construction of a relationship that defines the individuals involved and their roles. Like gift-giving, it is likely to comprise different rationales, producing multiple stories. Focusing on contexts of oracular consultation and healing, the fourth section of this chapter will examine how the multiple narratives that describe sanctuary activities, in turn, generated diverse social roles not only for worshippers, but also for the gods they worshipped. This returns the chapter to the theme of the ontological status of the divine in these relationships of exchange, and the question of the development of a relationship of exchange in which one player does not exist. To explore these questions, in the fifth section, this chapter uses theory of mind to examine the role of narratives of gift-giving in the generation of the divine, before drawing some overall conclusions about 'Narratives, Networks, and the Generation of the Sacred'.

2 Negotiating Narratives and Networks

Individuals exist in networks of relations; those relations between individuals create meaning and identity, and vice versa, and they constitute, and are constituted by, stories. In making this

[6] Korf et al. 2010, 61.
[7] Korf et al. 2010, 71.

argument, I am drawing on the work of Harrison White, who argues that all interaction is driven by uncertainty, which prompts individuals to establish 'footing' and to try to gain 'control' in social contexts.8[8] In the process of that struggle, individuals tell stories, thus defining both their identities and their relations to each other. White's extensive work – and the development of that work by his students and collaborators – analyses the scope and operation of a network in both space and time, revealing how meaning is developed not only through those first dyadic interrelations but 'across a mesh of interrelations'; such a network develops a story set that not only multiplies meanings, but also allows for what he describes as 'explainings away' that 'reaffirm context'. In this way, a network can be said to emerge almost intermittently, as individuals interact in particular ways in particular domains, and in doing so, 'switch' between different identities, generating fresh meanings – and building the network.[9]

Looking at ancient society as a network of narrativised relations between individuals may help to nuance our approach to ancient Greek religious activities in particular. Specifically, it may further develop the current concept of 'embeddedness', which draws on a paradigm of exchange borrowed from economic research and focuses on social institutions.[10] Introducing instead the key role of interactions between individuals, rather than (or than only) social structures, has the potential to offer a more nuanced understanding of the individual dynamics involved.[1111] If, as White has argued, such networks are crucially created by narratives, then a picture of ancient Greek religion emerges as comprising a network of individuals in which relational ties were developed through narratives that emerged in the formation of identities (and vice versa). The process of 'embedding' may also be clarified: these relationships could be negotiated, denied, or become a focus of competition; in turn, they would also create expectations that governed the development of new relationships.[12]

This approach does not mean that we abandon the level of the social group in favour only of myriad emergent relationships among individuals: our own experiences, let alone the theories of sociologists, demonstrate that both individual and group activity is shaped by more broadly shared ideas, and comes to achieve stable patterns of activity. Interpersonal relationships are shaped by self-descriptions that draw on public narratives, and these draw on background knowledge: scripts, frames, schemata, which allow us to make inferences in complex situations – to evaluate and act, interpret the past and plan for the future.[13] In turn, within society a certain level of stability is achieved through the bedding-in of social institutions. White includes this in his theory of relationality, and argues that social institutions are sustained by the emergence of shared story-sets – he calls them 'rhetorics' – which make a particular institution explicit.[14] We can use this to describe the behaviours of exchange in discussion here: it was the rhetorics of reciprocity, the shared stories about giving and

[8] See further Eidinow 2011a.
[9] White et al. 2007, 50; Godart – White 2010, 567–71.
[10] See Parker 1986 for the borrowing of the idea of embedded religion from economic approaches.
[11] The development of the idea of embeddedness as comprising a network of individual relations is already current in economic research: see Granovetter 1985. I have developed this idea at greater length in Eidinow 2015a and so keep my remarks here brief.
[12] Fuhse 2009, 54: 'the definitions of identities and relationships emerge in the course of transactions. The expectations embodied in these definitions in turn guide future transactions. To be more precise: Every transaction is laden with meaning. And the meaning structure of a network exists only as embodied in transactions'.
[13] See Eidinow 2011b for use of cultural models in a context of Greek religion.
[14] White 2008, 171.

receiving gifts to and from the gods, which established the concept of *charis* and helped to sustain the social institutions of dedication/worship. Using the setting of a sanctuary as a case study, the focus of the next section is on the process of this instantiation of social meanings and their communication through various media, including embodied information, creating a variety of 'sanctuary narratives'.

3 Sanctuaries and 'Sanctuary Narratives'

There is a widely held general idea of what an ancient Greek sanctuary comprised. James Whitley describes this – and the problems with it: 'The image we have of the Classical Greek sanctuary – Delphi springs to mind – is of a temple and altar standing alone in rural Arcadia'. He goes on: 'No amount of scholarly effort will entirely erase this popular, Romantic misconception, which owes more to Western painting than it does to Greek reality. It is a picture the Greeks themselves would not have recognised. This is not because Greeks were insen- sitive to landscape and place – far from it. It is rather because sanctuaries were a part of the everyday. Sanctuaries, from simple altars to impressive temples, can be found in almost every public space.'[15]

But although Whitley challenges the way we make a sanctuary extraordinary, his response still focuses on material evidence – buildings, walls, offerings – as comprising the key elements of a sanctuary, although as the quoted passage itself acknowledges, this is not really a reliable index. More recent developments have added the body in movement. As Beate Dignas has suggested, we can get some sense of the individual and embodied interaction of individual and sacred space through ritual from other sources: the Sacred Journal inscription from Epidauros, for example, is an account, albeit unusual, of the ritual activity that shaped the sanctuary experience.[16] And, as Ioannis Mylonopoulos has suggested, we can also consider the role of contextual dynamics, such as 'violent interaction, social transformation, peaceful cultural communication, migrational waves, the introduction of new cults, the mobility of ethnic and religious groups, ideological and political factors, and rivalry between cult places' as factors that help shape a space over time.[17]

These are, indeed, all important elements in the creation of a sanctuary, but they still focus primarily on phenomenological aspects, such as buildings and activities. They overlook the ways in which a space and its meaning is created not, or not only, by the fact of the edifices erected or the rituals conducted, but specifically in the way that those who inhabit the space give it meaning.[18] In contrast, Hubert Cancik's examination of the nature of 'sacred landscape' in Roman religion brings objects (natural and man-made) together not only with ritual, but also, in turn, with perceptual experiences.[19] He argues that the sacred landscape may be 'conceived of as a "text", composed by natural, artificial, and religious signs according to rules, which direct sight, perception, movement'; this is, in effect, 'a materialized memory of society' and is 'a phenomenon of "long duration".'[20]

---

[15] Whitley 2001, 294. The Greeks had their own preconceptions (as van Straten observes, 1992, 264–5, when the Greeks portrayed themselves in votive offerings they tended to include votive sculpture 'of a more or less monumental nature'; in contrast, the 'majority of votive offerings depicted by vase painters are pinakes').

[16] Epidauros, *LSS* 25, see Dignas 2007, 163.

[17] Mylonopoulos 2008.

[18] As Hdt. 8. 144.2 reminds us.

[19] Cancik 1985–1986.

[20] Cancik 1985–1986, 260. See also Bodenhamer 2015 on the relationship between narrative, perceptions of

In what follows, I want to build on this approach and consider how social and individual cognitive processes may have prompted phenomenological and ideological factors to come together in a meaningful system, such that shared ideas were embodied in physical actions and objects, in the creation of a 'sacred' space – and vice versa. Whether constructed by a social group – a polis or deme – or by an individual, a sanctuary achieved its status as a temenos because it was marked off as separate by a community of interest, which might be drawn together by a variety of different factors, e.g., common citizenship or shared devotion.[21][21] My aim here is to reflect on sanctuaries as phenomena developed within relational networks – and not just mortal networks – which were expressed in different kinds of 'sanctuary narratives'.

The mortal owner(s) of a sanctuary was only a custodian; the consecrated land belonged to the gods. As Albert Schachter says, 'a sanctuary is a place where a person or people expects to come into contact with a supernatural force or being … the basic activity at a sanctuary was the establishment of contact with a deity for the benefit of the worshipper, which might range anywhere from the averting of divine anger to the granting of a divine favour.'[22] Such a meeting could be marked in a variety of different ways – it could for example, involve the setting up of an altar – and, as we will see with our final example, below, it was, often, already a moment marked by narratives.[23]

More commonly, however, we identify the site of a sanctuary nowadays by the remains of its votive offerings. A well-known inscription from Athens, which allows the priest to move the votive offerings blocking view of the cult statue, suggests the possible multiplicity of these objects.[24] Once within the sanctuary, these would become the property of the god and were never removed from the temenos. In this way they were marked by the relationship with the divine, and were, in turn, a marker of that relationship with the divine.[25] So Folkert van Straten describes votive offerings as constituting 'a sort of permanent link between the worshipper and his god.'[26]

It is worth dwelling on the nature of that link: the material presence of the offering was obviously crucial, but so was the meaning it conveyed. Votive offerings were sources of stories, insofar as they revealed to observers the existence of a particular relationship between mortal and divinity. In a sanctuary, this could occur directly, in the details of specific inscriptions; but objects could also convey their stories in other ways. Thus, as Harriet Flower has argued, Herodotus probably based key parts of his Lydian logos on stories related to the

---

space and place, and social interaction, and how the recent 'spatial turn' may enable a process of 'deep mapping' of heritage and culture.

[21] See Purvis 2003, 12. At the most basic level, the division of space is important – a temenos is a separate space/marked off – the creation of boundaries in both mortal and divine realms: it is the first thing done when a sanctuary is created.

[22] Schachter 1992, 56.

[23] Olympia's altar provides perhaps the best example of this: comprising bones and ash from hundreds of years of sacrifices to the god Zeus, we know it gradually grew to an enormous height (over 22ft, that is 7m or so, when Pausanias saw it; Paus. 5.13.9).

[24] *LSCG* 43 (Athens): further evidence for problems in the sanctuary created by too many votives: *LSS* 107 (Rhodes) and 123 (Miletus); see also Pl. *Leg*. 909e–910a.

[25] They might be discarded and/or used for landfill, or melted down to create new cult paraphernalia, but these changes must be ratified; see *IG* II[3] 1, 445 ll. 24–51 and *IG* II[3] 1, 1154. See discussion in Dignas 2007, 168.

[26] Van Straten 1992, 274.

dedications made by Kroisos at Delphi.[27] As she points out, 'It is not hard to imagine that Herodotus was only one among many visitors to Delphi who asked about the origins of these remarkable objects'.[28] Building on this, it is likely that there were stories about other objects dedicated at Delphi;[29] and that at most sanctuaries, visitors would discuss the stories – both historical and mythical – connected to particular objects.[30] Literary sources provide examples of characters discussing both the content and the context of particular offerings: for example, the chorus members in Euripides' Ion tell each other the stories of the images they see as they come into the sanctuary at Delphi. In Herondas' fourth mime, the conversation of Phile and Kynno as they look over the dedications in the Asklepios sanctuary on Kos reminds us of the real-world information that may have remained attached to such objects. Phile admires the statues and then asks her friend to tell her who made them and who dedicated them – both of which details Kynno supplies.[31]

These passages show how objects could instantiate narratives about relationships between gods and mortals. As the examples suggest, these narratives (and the relationships they described) were not static, but were likely to develop – told in different ways by different audiences, who would bring their own interpersonal experiences to bear on their telling.[32] In turn, the presence of these objects and the narratives associated with them were also likely to create and shape further relational ties between both gods and mortals, and between mortals and mortals. As a brief example, consider the competitive aspect of votive offerings and how they were likely to provide a prompt for others to act – to submit a more impressive dedication for example, or give thanks for individual success.[33] Each offering was an instantiation of a relationship between mortal and god, with a narrative to be shared.

If we look at a sanctuary in this light, then it becomes not just an assemblage of dedications, but a knot of multiple current and past narratives about individuals and communities, and their relationships with the divine. These 'sanctuary narratives' were many and various: there were those that were associated with the space itself and/or the establishment of the sanctuary; there were mythological stories represented on buildings or on votive offerings; moreover, the rituals conducted within the sanctuary might also articulate mythological and/or historical events. As an example of this multiplicity, we can consider the Samian Heraion: founded where the goddess was born, its location was evoked, and explained, by the story of her birth and marriage to Zeus; its rituals (such as the festival of the Tonaia) commemorated key physical objects of the sanctuary (the statue of Hera and the Lygos tree), while also referring back to the founding of the temple, and looking forward to the fertility of the celebrants.[34] Further stories could be found from among the sanctuary's myriad votives: not only the more monumental (such as the statues offered by Amasis, as reported by Herodotus, or the excavated larger-than-life kouros), or the exotic (among them an Egyptian ivory carving of a lion from Ramessid Egypt, and the bronze relief on a forehead piece of a war-chariot horse

[27] Flower 2013, 131.
[28] Flower 2013, 140.
[29] For example, Herodotus (Hdt. 2.135.4) tells us about the spits of iron that the *hetaera* Rhodopis dedicated there.
[30] Herodotus use of priests as a source of information in book 2 (on Egypt) perhaps provides a model of their role elsewhere.
[31] Eur. *Ion* 184–232; Herondas *Mime* 4.21–25.
[32] See Fuhse 2009, 61.
[33] See Snodgrass 1989–90, 293.
[34] Menodotus of Samos, 541 F 1 (= Athen. 15.672a–674b).

dedicated by Syrian ruler Hazael of Basan);[35] but also the myriad wooden objects, including miniature ships;[36] rock crystals; and pine cones.[37] The little ships are alluded to in a fragment of the local historian Leon of Samos, and it has been suggested that some of these objects may have memorialised epiphanies of Hera in foreign places.[38]

These narratives were likely to be multiple and dynamic. Even in the case of narratives that were more broadly shared – such as those concerning the foundation of the sanctuary itself – the evidence suggests that accounts varied and developed as they were told. The Samian Heraion again provides an example: Pausanias tells us that 'some say that the sanctuary of Hera in Samos was established by those who sailed in the Argo, and that these brought the image from Argos. But the Samians themselves hold that the goddess was born in the island by the side of the river Imbrasos under the willow that even in my time grew in the Heraion.'[39] Analysis of the evidence for local sacred histories provides some insight into at least one of the ways in which such variations may have developed: votives were used as points of reference around which writers compiled different kinds of material, including literary histories and priests' records, intertwining local myths with the master narratives of Homer and Herodotus (to fill out 'missing' information).[40] These offer a final illustration of the ways in which narratives could be used to describe relationships between mortals and gods, but they also offer a useful initial example of the ways in which all these narratives also created relationships between mortals and gods; the next section turns to this aspect in more detail.

4 Delphic Stories: Narratives That Conflict

If we are looking for narratives structured by a paradigm of exchange between mortal and god, those from oracular and healing sanctuaries are usefully explicit: gods were portrayed as possessing a precious resource of information that mortal visitors were seeking and were grateful to receive. But, as above, this is not to imply that this produced a single, simple type of narrative, which provided a straightforward model of exchange. As an example of the potential complexity of sanctuary narratives, the stories about Delphi portray it as playing a variety of roles for different individuals and communities. In doing so, they evoke a variety of potential and actual relationships between the sanctuary and its god, and mortals, that are diverse, nuanced, and even contradictory.[41] Thus, as Pindar notes, Delphi was described as a *pandokos naos* – a sanctuary that 'receives all'.[42] Yet, we know there were certain prerequisites for those who wanted to consult the oracle. To begin with, the Delphians reserved initial

[35] Kouros: Hdt. 2.182.1, see Kyreleis 1993, 119–120, fig. 7.16, p. 121. Lion: Inv. no. E133, see Kyreleis 1993, 114 and fig. 7.12, 116. Forehead piece: late ninth century bce; Inv. no. B 2579, see Kyreleis 1993, 115–6, and fig. 7.15, 119.
[36] The miniature ships of which c. 40 had been found in 1993 (Kyreleis1993, 217, suggesting hundreds more had been dedicated) are about 40cm in length and fairly abstract in shape; Kyreleis (1988, 217 and 1993, 212) suggests that they were not from individual sailors but had a symbolic meaning of some kind.
[37] Kyreleis 1988.
[38] Leon of Samos *FGrH* 540 F1; Chaniotis 1988, 308 E16; as also Dillery 2005, 513.
[39] Paus. 7.4.4. It seems likely that the surviving fragment of the historian Leon of Samos may allude to these contested stories; see also Diod. Sic. 5.62–63.
[40] Dillery 2005, 505–26.
[41] Just as an example, in the case of Delphi, its marginal position made it ideal for the resolution of community problems as poleis developed in the eighth century, but it was also a location for the displays of elite power, which, in that context, could no longer continue in those poleis (see Morgan 1990, 19–21, 183–4).
[42] Pind. Pyth. 8.61–2: Neer 2003, 136 traces the ideological origins of this idea; Kurke (2011) emphasises the way this message is undermined by the reality of the financial costs of visiting the sanctuary.

consultations for themselves and then allocated further consultations by precedence and lot.[43] Some narratives seem to allude to these requirements: the account of how *promanteia* was given to Kroisos after his extraordinary beneficence to the sanctuary seems to suggest that extravagant gifts were required in order to win this status.[44] The story of the Alcmaeonids' lavish expenditure at the sanctuary – and the resulting series of anti-Peisistratid oracular pronouncements it produced – suggests that it was not only the order of consultation which might be considered as susceptible, but even the content of resulting oracles.[45]

But even a straightforward consultation was far from cheap, from the pelanos that had to be offered on the main altar;[46] to unspecific taxes;[47] to the sacrifices within the sanctuary.[48] This is not to say that other sanctuaries did not have equivalent charges;[49] but, as Leslie Kurke has argued, the reputation for Delphic expense seems to have been complemented by a reputation for greed among the Delphians, according to the allusions made by later proverbs.[50] As inscriptions and literary sources indicate, the Delphians took a cut of the sacrifice for themselves.[51][51] Further evidence gives a glimpse of how that particular activity may have been regarded by some: for example, Callimachus compares a swarm of men to 'flies about a goatherd, or wasps from the ground, or the Delphians returning from a sacrifice';[52] and Kurke has argued for the ways in which the story of Aesop censures this reputed greed as part of a larger critique of elitist privileges at Delphi.[53] Finally, it is possible that the god himself was not considered immune to similar criticisms. The story of Aesop can be seen to parody and challenge Apollo's mantic authority, while some proverbs may also allude to his rapacity.[54] As we might expect, any implied charges here are more ambiguous. As Kurke points out, these points of apparent criticism are also characteristics of the god that we find in ostensibly eulogistic narratives: the Homeric Hymn to Hermes also tells us that Apollo is the god 'who loves booty'.[55]

---

[43] As Kurke notes 2011, 57–8; on *promanteia*, see Amandry 1950, 113–14; Roux 1976, 76–8.
[44] Hdt. 1.54.
[45] Hdt. 5.66.1.
[46] Eur. *Ion* 226–9. See arrangements between Delphi and Phaselis cID 8 (fifth century), and an agreement with Skiathos *CID* 13 (fourth century; Amandry 1939, 184 and 1950, 245, no. 16) in which the costs were much cheaper. It may be that the price had dropped in the time between the two treaties or that Skiathos was simply deemed to be a poorer state (see Parke – Wormell 1956(1), 32; Dillon 1997, 168). See also the chapter by Naiden in this volume.
[47] Alluded to in Syll.S 548, which also mentions the key role of the Delphic *proxenos* in performing preliminary sacrifice (see discussion Mack 2015, 69; and Roux 1976, 82–6).
[48] Plut. *De def. or.* 435b–c and 437a–b. Amandry 1950, 104–14. That there may have been a sacrifice to Athena as well is suggested by Aristid. *Athena* 2.14 (vol. 1, p. 23 Dindorf): Roux 1976, 85 offers further possible epigraphic evidence (e.g., see Bousquet 1956, 588, also published *LSCG* 42 and *SEG* 16.326) but it is not convincing.
[49] For a brief overview see Dillon 1997, 167–8.
[50] See Kurke 2011, 56–7. Proverbs: 'When you sacrifice at Delphi you'll have to buy meat' (Plut. *Quaest. Conv.* 709a); 'Delphic knife' is glossed as 'taking one share of the sacrificial victims, and [then] exacting another share for the knife' (von Leutsch – Schneidewin 1839, 393, no. 94 = Zenobius 147; briefer version at L-S 2, p. 155, Macarius 3.22). A further proverb (von Leutsch – Schneidewin 1839, 393, *App. Prov.* 1 no. 95) *Delphoisi thusas autos ou phagei kreas* is glossed as 'for those who spend a great deal of money but get no enjoyment from it. Since it used to happen that those sacrificing at Delphi, because of the number of people received at the hearth/participating in the feast, themselves got no taste [of the sacrifice]'.
[51] *Hom. Hymn Ap.* 532–9; see also Schol. ad Ar. *Vesp*. 1446, and *P.Oxy.* 1800 with Kurke 2011, 71–4.
[52] Call. frag. 191.26–8 (trans. Trypanis *et al.*).
[53] Kurke 2011, 53–95.
[54] *Vita* G, ch. 33; see Kurke 2011, 61. 'Without bronze, Phoebus doesn't prophesy', see Kurke 2011, 71 who observes that the text includes the gloss 'this signifies the power of gifts'.
[55] Kurke 2011, 79–80 on *Hom. Hymn Herm*. 335; See also Richardson (2010 ad ll. 176–81) on this theme in the

These multiple narratives still evoke a *techne emporike*, a science of giving and receiving, as Plato suggests, but they also complicate any straightforward model of exchange, and generate a range of potential roles and identities for mortal and god. Herodotus' account of the consultation made at Delphi by Kroisos provides a useful illustration. Despite his lavish offerings, Kroisos was not successful: his gifts were no help against the future that fate already had in store for him. The most he could obtain was some divine sympathy and a small delay arranged by a god. In effect, his story disrupts the straightforward paradigm of *charis* – as his own comment indicates when he describes the gods as *acharistoi*.[56] If, as discussed earlier, a relationship gives meaning to an exchange or gift, and vice versa, then this story models the unequal and uncertain nature of the relationship between mortals and the unseen powers that direct their lives. Apollo is described as having values and motivations different from those of Kroisos, which lead in turn to very different goals, and profoundly different outcomes from those expected. The unequal nature of this relationship is reflected in the form and content of the narrative, which, like many narratives about oracular consultation, includes a riddle. The narrative about this gift exchange evokes a relationship that is uncertain, unreliable, and fundamentally asymmetrical: mortal and immortal are portrayed as imbalanced not only in the sense of the god's cognitive powers and powers to grant gifts, but also in much broader cosmological terms.

As these examples suggest, the multiplicity of narratives about reciprocity that existed at a sanctuary were, on the one hand, descriptive, insofar as they evoked the variety of perceptions of the nature of divine/mortal relations. But these stories were also generative, that is, in the telling, they also created those relations. And this, finally, brings us to the question of how we understand the relational paradigm and the narratives that invoke it when one player in the relationship does not actually exist – to be explored in the next section.

5. Divine Minds: Narratives that Create

I want to approach this question through theory of mind (ToM), so-called because it involves an individual imputing mental states to herself and others.[57] At a basic level, I suggest, ancient sources offer us evidence for ToM among our subjects with regard to gods. Votive offerings, for example, do not only suggest the mental states of those who brought them, but indicate that those individuals, in turn, were attributing states of mind to divinities. They indicate an assumption that the divinity had knowledge, likes or dislikes, and, above all, intention; that a god could be swayed by the provision of a gift, responding to the institution of charis.[58] As this chapter has demonstrated, the narratives recounted about these objects confirm this analysis – but they also reveal a more advanced ToM.

Take, for example, a visitor to the sanctuary of Asklepios who read the story of Euphanes, described at the beginning of this chapter. That narrative describes a character who both exhibits and demonstrates ToM: by going to the sanctuary he can be said to exhibit a purposeful state of mind; in turn, by offering his dice to the god, he demonstrates some understanding or assumption about the mental state of the god whom he is addressing. A

poem, drawing attention to 335, 494–5, 549; and for this theme and the reputation for greed of the Delphic priests, to *Hom. Hymn Ap*. 535–7, 540–3nn. and Hom. *Il.* 9. 404–5.
[56] Hdt. 1.90.4.
[57] Premack – Woodruff 1978.
[58] Perner – Wimmer 1985.

visitor to the sanctuary who understood the story in this way would be exhibiting both ToM and second- order ToM. But the story of Euphanes as told in the iamata offers another level of recursiveness. Asklepios' laughter on receiving the answer 'ten dice' from Euphanes, also suggests that Euphanes, when he offered the gift, understood that the god would hold a particular understanding of Euphanes' state of mind in that moment. So, a visitor to the sanctuary who read this story is being led through a number of levels of theory of mind: the narrative suggests, first, Euphanes' own mental states of purpose and knowledge; second, Euphanes' assumption regarding Asklepios' mental states of knowledge and purpose; and, third, Euphanes' understanding regarding Asklepios' empathy and purpose concerning Euphanes' own state of mind.[59] Thus we see how this narrative – and others like it – described and instantiated a relational tie of charis between worshipper and worshipped, which established basic social roles. But in addition, the details of the story also provided a model for worshippers to think about the inner mental states of everyone involved – not only other worshippers, but also the presumed mental state of the god or goddess. In this way, sanctuary narratives, perhaps especially those that described transactions, provided a link with the divine; but, in addition to, or rather alongside, these processes, they were also responsible for engendering the divine in the first place.

6 Conclusion: Narratives, Networks, and the Generation of the Sacred

This chapter has set out to examine divine-mortal interactions in which an exchange takes place, where divine power or knowledge is sought in return for a material object of value to the giver. These interactions created relational ties between individuals and/or groups and divinities, and such relations were generated, sustained and expressed through stories or other narratives that were communicated in a range of ways through various media, including embodied information. From this perspective, a sanctuary, a sacred space, can be described as instantiating a 'knot' of stories about divine-mortal interactions. 'Sanctuary narratives' might be realised through various media, from a material and semi-permanent form, like a building; to a material and more temporary form, like a votive; to a more ephemeral form, such as a ritual. Individual stories shaped, and were shaped by, broader social narratives that helped to support social institutions: stories multiplied, some might reinforce each other's meanings, others might undermine and subvert them.

This model of the individual's role in developing broader social institutions and their narratives, and vice versa, helps to nuance our current model of 'embedded' religion, revealing the individual relational ties of action and meaning which it comprised. But not only does it elaborate the more performative aspects of religious practice, it also helps to illuminate the creation of the concepts that nurtured them. Analysis of sample narratives, and their inferences for theory of mind, suggests that it is through the network of individual relationships, and the concomitant exchange of narratives – which were in turn narratives of exchange – that conceptions of divinity itself were generated. With this point, we return to the story with which we started, and the healing of Euphanes at Epidauros. As we have seen, this narrative prompts a series of inferences about the inner mental world not only of Euphanes, but also of the god. Thus, when the god is depicted as asking Euphanes 'What will you give me if I should make you well?', what the god receives is not, or not only, dice, but, implicitly, the gift of existence.

[59] It can be argued that by making this observation, I am demonstrating fourth-order ToM: that is, I am expressing an understanding of the states of mind of my historical subjects concerning the mental state of Euphanes, etc.

Bibliography

Amandry, P. 1939. "Convention religieuse conclue entre Delphes et Skiathos", *Bulletin de Correspondance Héllenique* 63, 183–219.
Amandry, P. 1950. *La mantique apollinienne à Delphes. Essai sur le fonctionnement de l'oracle*, Paris.
Bodenhamer, J. 2015. "Narrating Space and Place," in *Deep Maps and Spatial Narratives*, eds. J. Bodenhamer, J. Corrigan, and T.M. Harris, Bloomington, IN, 7–27.
Bousquet, J. 1956. "Inscriptions de Delphes", *Bulletin de Correspondance Héllenique* 80, 579–83.
Cancik, H. 1985–6. "Rome as Sacred Landscape: Varro and the End of Republican Religion in Rome", *Visible Religion* 4.5, 250–65.
Chaniotis, A. 1988. *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften: Epigraphische Beiträge zur griechischen Historiographie*, Stuttgart.
Day, J. 2010. *Archaic Greek Epigram and Dedication: Representation and Reperformance*, Cambridge.
Dignas, B. 2007. "A Day in the Life of a Greek Sanctuary", in *A Companion to Greek Religion*, ed. D. Ogden, Oxford, 163–77.
Dillery, J. 2005. "Greek Sacred History", *American Journal of Philology* 126.4, 505–26.
Dillon, M. 1997. *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece*, London.
Eidinow, E. 2011a. "Networks and Narratives: A Model for Ancient Greek Religion", *Kernos* 21, 9–38.
Eidinow, E. 2011b. *Fate, Luck and Fortune. Antiquity and its Legacy*, London.
Eidinow, E. 2015a. "Embedded … and Embodied", in *Communities and Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, eds. C. Taylor and K. Vlassopoulos, Oxford, 54–79.
Eidinow, E. 2015b. *Envy, Poison, and Death: Women on Trial in Classical Athens*, Oxford.
Eidinow, E. 2016. "Popular Theologies: The Gift of Divine Envy", in *Theologies of Ancient Greek Religion*, eds. E. Eidinow, J. Kindt, and R. Osborne, Cambridge, 205–32.
Flower, H. 2013 [1991] "Herodotus and Delphic Traditions about Croesus", in *Herodotus: Volume 1: Herodotus and the Narrative of the Past*, ed. R.V. Munson, Oxford, 124–53.
Fuhse, J. 2009. "The Meaning Structure of Social Networks", *Sociological Theory* 27.1, 51–73.
Furley, W.D. 2010. "Life in a Line: A Reading of Dedicatory Epigrams", in *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram*, eds. M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic, and I. Petrovic, Cambridge, 151–66.
Godart, F.C. and White, H.C. 2010. "Switchings under Uncertainty: The Coming and Becoming of Meanings", *Poetics* 38.6, 567–86.
Granovetter, M. 1985. "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness", *American Journal of Sociology* 91.3, 481–510.
Korf, B. et al. 2010. "The Gift of Disaster: The Commodification of Good Intentions in Post-Tsunami Sri Lanka", *Disasters* 34 Suppl. 1, 60–77.
Kurke, L. 2011. *Aesopic Conversations: Popular Tradition, Cultural Dialogue, and the Invention of Greek Prose*. Martin Classical Lectures, Princeton – Oxford.
Kyrieleis, H. 1988. "Offerings of the 'Common Man' in the Heraion at Samos", in *Early Greek Cult Practice*, Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, eds. R. Hagg, N. Marinatos, and G. Nordquist, Stockholm, 215–21. Kyrieleis, H.

1993. “The Heraion at Samos”, in *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, eds. R. Hagg and N. Marinatos, London, 99–122.
von Leutsch, E. and Schneidewin, F.W. 1839. *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum*, Göttingen.
LiDonnici, L.R. 1995. *The Epidaurian Miracle Inscriptions: Text, Translation and Commentary*, Atlanta.
Mack, W. 2015. *Proxeny and Polis: Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, Oxford.
Morgan, C. 1990. *Athletes and Oracles: The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century*, Cambridge.
Mylonopoulos, I. 2008. “The Dynamics of Ritual Space in the Hellenistic and Roman East”, *Kernos* [Online] 21: DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.4000/kernos.1601.
Neer, R. 2003. “Framing the Gift: The Siphnian Treasury at Delphi and the Politics of Public Art”, in *The Cultures Within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*, eds. C. Dougherty and L. Kurke, Cambridge, 129–49.
Parke, H.W. and Wormell, D.E.W. 1956. *The Delphic Oracle*, Oxford.
Parker, R. 1986. “Greek Religion”, in *The Oxford History of Greece and the Hellenistic World*, eds. J. Boardman, J. Griffin, and O. Murray, Oxford, 306–29.
Parker, R. 1998. “Pleasing Thighs: Reciprocity in Greek Religion”, in *Reciprocity in Ancient Greece*, eds. C. Gill, N. Postlethwaite, and R. Seaford, Oxford, 105–26.
Perner, J. and Wimmer, H. 1985. “‘John Thinks That Mary Thinks That …’ Attribution of Second-order Beliefs by 5–10 Year Old Children”, *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology* 39, 437–471.
Premack, D. and Woodruff, G. 1978. “Does the Chimpanzee Have a Theory of Mind?”, *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 1.4, 515–26.
Purvis, A. 2003. *Singular Dedications: Founders and Innovators of Private Cults in Classical Greece*, London.
Richardson, N. 2010. *Three Homeric Hymns: To Apollo, Hermes, and Aphrodite. Hymns 3, 4, and 5*, Cambridge – New York.
Roux, G. 1976. *Son oracle et ses dieux*, Paris.
Schachter, A. 1992. “Policy, Cult and the Placing of Greek Sanctuaries”, in *Le sanctuaire grec*, ed. A. Schachter, Geneva, 1–64.
Schwartz, B. 1967. “The Psychology of the Gift”, *American Journal of Sociology* 73.1, 1–11.
Snodgrass, A. 1989–90. “The Economics of Dedication at Greek Sanctuaries”, in *Atti del Convegno internazionale Anathema: regime delle offerte e vita dei santuari nel Mediterraneo antico*, Roma, 15–18 giugno 1989, eds. G. Bartoloni, G. Colonna, and C. Grottanelli, Rome, 287–94.
van Straten, F. 1992. “Votives and Votaries in Greek Sanctuaries”, in *Le sanctuaire grec,* ed. A. Schachter, Geneva, 247–90.
Trypanis, C.A., Gelzer, T., and Whitman, C.H. ed. and trans. 1989. *Callimachus: Aetia, Iambi, Hecale and Other Fragments*. *Musaeus: Hero and Leander*, Cambridge, MA.
White, H.C. 2008. *Identity and Control. How Social Formations Emerge*, Princeton, NJ.
White, H.C. et al. 2007. “Networks and Styles and Switching”, *Soziale Systeme* 13.1/2, 543–55.
Whitley, J. 2001. *The Archaeology of Ancient Greece*, Cambridge.