

RELIGIONS IN THE  
GRAECO-ROMAN WORLD

---



# Greek Sacred Law

2nd Edition with a Postscript

*A Collection of  
New Documents  
(NGSL)*



ERAN LUPU

---

BRILL

## Greek Sacred Law

# Religions in the Graeco-Roman World

*Editors*

H.S. Versnel

D. Frankfurter

J. Hahn

VOLUME 152

# Greek Sacred Law

A Collection of New Documents (NGSL<sup>2</sup>)

(2nd Edition with a Postscript)

*By*  
Eran Lupu



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON  
2009

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Lupu, Eran.

Greek sacred law : a collection of new documents (NGSL) / by Eran Lupu. -- 2nd ed. with a postscript.

p. cm. -- (Religions in the Graeco-Roman world, ISSN 0927-7633 ; v. 152)

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 978-90-04-17317-0 (hardback : alk. paper) 1. Rites and ceremonies--Greece--Sources. 2. Religious law and legislation--Greece--History--Sources. 3. Greece--Religion--Sources. 4. Inscriptions, Greek. I. Title. II. Series.

BL788.L87 2009

292.8'4--dc22

2009002036

ISSN 0927-7633

ISBN 978 90 04 17317 0

Copyright 2009 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.

Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

IN MEMORIAM  
PATRIS CARISSIMI

YEHUDA LUPU

8 Nov. 1937   22 Oct. 1980



## CONTENTS

List of Figures .....	x
Preface .....	xi
Acknowledgments .....	xvii
List of Abbreviations.....	xix

### PART ONE: GREEK SACRED LAW: AN INTRODUCTION

The Corpus of Greek Sacred Laws .....	3
The Contents and Forms of Greek Sacred Law .....	9
Sanctuaries and Sacred Space .....	9
Comprehensive and Specific Documents .....	9
Entry into Sanctuaries .....	14
Protection of Sanctuaries .....	21
Dedications .....	31
Founding, Construction, Repair, and Maintenance of Sanctuaries .....	33
Cult Officials .....	40
Priesthoods .....	40
Comprehensive and Specific Regulations.....	41
Mode of Acquisition .....	44
Varia .....	52
Other Religious Officials .....	53
Cult Performance .....	54
Sacrifice .....	55
Undated Sacrifices .....	56
Periodic Sacrifices .....	65
Sale of Sacrificial Meat and Skins.....	71
Participation in Cult .....	72
Varia .....	73
Funerary Laws .....	75
Purification .....	77
Cult Finances .....	79



Cult Foundations .....	81
Associations .....	88
Festivals and Ceremonies .....	90
Specific and Comprehensive Regulations .....	93
Some Problems with the Evidence .....	103
The Nature of the Evidence .....	110

## PART TWO: NEW DOCUMENTS

1. ( <i>SEG XXXIII</i> 147). Attica. Thorikos. Sacri cial Calendar....	115
2. ( <i>SEG XXVIII</i> 103 ( <i>XXVI</i> 134)). Attica. Eleusis. Two Deme Decrees. Funding for the Cult of Heracles in Akris .....	151
3. ( <i>SEG XXXV</i> 113). Attica. Phrearrhioi. Fragmentary Sacri cial Regulations .....	159
4. ( <i>SEG XXXVI</i> 267). Attica. Marathon. Cave of Pan. Dedication to Pan with a Prohibition .....	171
5. ( <i>SEG XXXI</i> 122). Attica. Paeania(?). Statutes of an <i>Eranos</i> ....	177
6. ( <i>SEG XXX</i> 380). Argolis. Tiryns. Fragmentary Cult(?) Regulations .....	191
7. ( <i>SEG XXVIII</i> 421). Arcadia. Megalopolis. Sanctuary Regulations .....	205
8. ( <i>SEG XXXVI</i> 376). Arcadia. Lycosura. Fragmentary Sanctuary Regulations .....	215
9. ( <i>I.Oropos</i> 278; <i>SEG XLVII</i> 488). Boeotia. Oropus. Fragmentary Sacri cial Regulations .....	219
10. ( <i>I.Oropos</i> 279; <i>SEG XLVII</i> 49). Boeotia. Oropus. Fragmentary Sacri cial Regulations .....	225
11. ( <i>SEG XXXII</i> 456). Boeotia. Haliartus. Decree on Cult .....	227
12. ( <i>SEG XXVI</i> 524). Boeotia. Hyettus. Rule for an Oracle .....	239
13. ( <i>SEG XLIV</i> 505). Macedonia. Amphipolis. Regulations Pertaining to the Cult of Asclepius .....	243
14. ( <i>SEG XXVII</i> 261). Macedonia. Beroia. Gymnasiarchal Law	249
15. ( <i>SEG XLVI</i> 923). Chersonesus. Fragmentary Regulations Mentioning the Hermaia .....	269
16. ( <i>SEG XXXVIII</i> 786). Rhodes. Lindus. Sacri cial Regulations .....	271
17. ( <i>SEG XXXIX</i> 729). Rhodes. Lindus (Charaki). Decree Concerning Suppliants .....	277
18. ( <i>SEG XXVII</i> 545; <i>IG XII</i> 6, 169). Samos. Charter of the Shopkeepers in the Heraion .....	285

19.	( <i>IG XII 6</i> , 170). Samos(?). Sale of a Priesthood .....	299
20.	( <i>SEG XXXV 923</i> ). Chios. Two Decrees Concerning the Priesthood of Eileithyia .....	303
21.	( <i>SEG XXXVIII 853</i> ). Thasos. Fragmentary Sacri cial Regulations .....	317
22.	( <i>SEG XLI 739</i> ). Crete. Eleutherna. Law on drinking.....	323
23.	( <i>SEG XLI 744</i> ). Crete. Eleutherna. Sacri cial Calendar .....	327
24.	( <i>SEG XXVIII 750</i> ). Crete. Lissos. Dedication to Asclepius with Sacri cial Regulations.....	337
25.	( <i>SEG XXVI 1084</i> ). Sicily. Megara Hyblaea. Sacri cial Law ..	341
26.	( <i>SEG XXX 1119</i> ). Sicily. Nakone. Decree of Reconciliation ..	347
27.	( <i>SEG XLIII 630</i> ). Sicily. Selinus. Sacri ce to Chthonian Divinities; Puri cation from <i>Elasteroi</i> .....	359

## APPENDICES

Appendix A: The Punic Marseilles Tariff. ( <i>CIS I 165</i> ; <i>KAI 69</i> ) .....	391
Appendix B: Checklists .....	397
Concordances .....	405
Bibliography .....	423
Indices .....	435
Figures: following page 499	
Postscript .....	501

## LIST OF FIGURES

1. *Corinth VIII* 1, 1 face A
2. *Corinth VIII* 1, 1 face B
3. No. 1 front
4. No. 1 back
5. No. 1 left side
6. No. 1 right side at the level of line 12
7. No. 1 right side at the level of line 44
8. No. 2
9. No. 2 lines 18 53
10. No. 3
11. No. 4
12. No. 5
13. No. 6 blocks 1 3
14. No. 6 block 7 B
15. No. 6 block 8
16. No. 6 block 15 A: a squeeze
17. No. 7: a squeeze
18. No. 8: a squeeze
19. No. 8: a squeeze in different light
20. No. 9
21. No. 11
22. No. 11: lower left part (lines 18 27): a squeeze
23. No. 12
24. No. 15
25. No. 16
26. No. 16: a squeeze
27. No. 17: a squeeze
28. No. 18
29. No. 21
30. No. 24: a squeeze
31. No. 25
32. No. 27: the tablet with the bronze bar
33. No. 27: drawing of column A
34. No. 27: drawing of column B

## PREFACE

The present work, for which I tentatively suggest the abbreviation NGSL,<sup>1</sup> is divided into two parts. Part I was conceived as a practical guide to the corpus of Greek sacred laws for the general classicist rather than a theoretical exposition. It is meant to introduce the evidence by means of the evidence itself, and I therefore had to limit the footnotes and the references to scholarship.

My primary aim in part II was to collect and republish the sacred laws from mainland Greece, the colonies, and the islands, with the exception of Cos, published after the appearance of Sokolowski's *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* in 1969. I have, nevertheless, included two inscriptions (nos. 11 and 13) which were published in the 1960s. Inscriptions from Cos and Asia Minor are not included, but I have added checklists of significant new documents. I have left out any inscriptions included in Sokolowski's corpus, even when they were enriched by new fragments or improved considerably in respect to readings. A list of some such inscriptions is to be found, however, in Appendix B 3. Also added are concordances for the various parts of the corpus (for which see Part I pp. 3–4).

The principles that guided me in making the present selection are stated in part I pp. 4–9. It suffices to note here that an occasional stipulation on the subject of religion or cult practice does not necessarily qualify a document as a sacred law. Some cases are admittedly undecided. On the whole, I have avoided including here a number of fragments where identification as sacred laws depends entirely upon inference or restorations and/or is not backed up by definite parallels.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> N(ew) G(reek) S(acred) L(aws); this abbreviation was suggested to H.S. Versnel by A. Chaniotis; I am grateful to both.

<sup>2</sup> *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 230. Athens. Sacred Law?

*SEG* XXVI 137. Attica. Agrileza. A Calendar. With no trace of references to either offerings or events (see Part I pp. 65–69), the meaning of this address to Hermes with a list of months remains obscure in my opinion.

*SEG* XXXII 86. Athens. Even if this document is classified as festival regulations and this does not seem beyond question to me—the treatment of actual cult perfor-

I have also avoided particularly small fragments which in and of themselves did not seem to justify a full commentary.<sup>3</sup>

Like my predecessors, I have not included here documents that deal explicitly with the cult of the dead and those that deal with ruler cult. The exclusion is somewhat artificial; rectifying the situation must, however, await a revision of the entire corpus.

### *Format*

Each chapter comprises the following parts: lemma, text, translation, restorations, epigraphical commentary, and commentary.

*Lemma.* The lemma contains a brief description of the stone, its findspot, including, when this is possible, the archaeological context, measurements, current location of the stone, and a list of publications of the text, relevant discussions, and published photographs of the stone. Derivative editions (i.e. those not based on an autopsy) are listed in parentheses.

I have done my best to find editions and discussions of the documents included here. I may have failed to do so in more than one case. As for discussions, I have listed only relevant discussions, be they short or long. I am afraid that I have not found an ideal way to treat reviews or short notices regarding works that discuss the inscriptions in question. On the whole, they are mentioned in the lemma if they add something to the discussion by opposing a given author's point or by a reasoned endorsement of it or when the work cited cannot be considered readily available. The bulk of Part II was finished by early 2002. I

---

mance does not seem to me to justify its inclusion (see in this respect Part I p. 101).

*SEG* XL 123. Athens. Sacred Regulations?

*SEG* XXXVI 703 = *SEG* XL 624. Gorgippia. Financial Measures of a Cult Association?

*SEG* XLV 1876. Vani. Even if the object of this fragment was to protect a document inscribed above and now lost (J.G. Vinogradov, *The Inscribed Bronze from Vani*, *VDI* 1995, 3, 48–71 = *Pontische Studien*, Mainz, 1997, 577–601), I am not sure that this lost document was necessarily a sacred law.

T.B. Mitford, *The Inscriptions of Kourion*, Philadelphia, 1971, 83–84 no. 36: A Lex Sacra?

<sup>3</sup> *Agora* XVI 57: fragment of an enactment concerning Eleusinian First Fruits. It is pointless to discuss this tiny fragment independent of the more substantial documents (see Part I p. 104) belonging to the First Fruits dossier.

*SEG* XXXII 150. Athens. Phratry decree. [τὰ δὲ ἱερέ] | ὥσυνα λαμβάνειν τ[ὸν ἱερέα?] in lines 7–8 do not justify inclusion.

have tried to incorporate works covered by the *Bulletin Épigraphique* for the year 1999 and *SEG XLVII* (1997). Later bibliography has been cited only occasionally. This is probably most notable in such popular documents as nos. 1 and 27 which have generated a great deal of discussion.<sup>4</sup>

Works cited in the lemma are usually discussed in the appropriate place in the commentary. When this is not the case, and/or when the contents of the work cited are not immediately clear from its title, they are indicated in a footnote.

*Measurements.* All measurements are in meters.

*Editorial Conventions.* I have followed the Leiden system as revised by Sterling Dow in his *Conventions in Editing*, Durham, NC, 1969, 3 13.<sup>5</sup>

*Stoichedon* and *boustrophedon* inscriptions are clearly marked as ΣΤΟΙΧ. or ΒΟΥΣΤΡΟΦΗΔΟΝ (no. 6 is *Schlangenschrift*). The rubric NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ. has only been used to mark non-*stoichedon* inscriptions, where the *stoichedon* order could be expected (the sides of no. 1; nos. 9, 13, 21). Otherwise, non-*stoichedon* inscriptions are not marked as such.

*Restorations.* When most of the restorations belong to the same person(s), it has seemed best to state this at the beginning (i.e. suppl(emit/everunt) X). It is to be understood that all unnamed restorations that follow belong to this primary authority. Otherwise, restorations are marked by the name of the restorer. Thus (e.g.) in no. 1, line 11 the reading **11** Daux would indicate that everything in line 11 was restored by Daux. My own restorations or comments, when this is not clear from the context, are marked by L. Restorations are traced to their origin. Obsolete restorations are generally avoided.

I have, on the whole, attempted not to indulge in gratuitous restorations only to note that they are doubtful and that alternatives are equally possible. One might complain that I have exercised too much caution with restorations and that, in certain cases, I print less text than previous editions, thus forcing the user to sh for restorations in the apparatus and reattach them to the text. It seems to me that

---

<sup>4</sup> In this respect I particularly regret that I have not been able to use G. Ekroth, *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-Cults in the Archaic to the Early Hellenistic Periods* (Kernos Suppl. 12), Liege, 2002, of which I was informed as the present work was going to press.

<sup>5</sup> I have not used Dow's first/second text (ibid. 7 8) notation, printed above the line, for rasurae. The reader should consult the epigraphical commentary for text printed within double square brackets. I have also not followed Dow's suggested system (ibid. 29 31) of question marks noting the level of certainty in restorations.

an editor should make a clear distinction between interpretation and restoration. On the whole, many sacred laws use identical, well-defined formulas much less frequently than certain kinds of decrees. In many cases, a correct restoration depends upon a correct understanding of a cultic context, where details are not always fully known. Even when several documents deal with one cult, sharing, perhaps, similarities in the way they regulate it, they may still formulate these regulations independently. Comparative evidence, which may prove invaluable for the interpretation of a certain fragmentary document, will thus not necessarily yield much help for the actual restoration of the text.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* When possible, the epigraphical commentary is based on my own autopsy. Otherwise, it is derivative and meant to serve little more than the reader's immediate needs. I have normally not described letter forms when I was able to provide a readable photograph. Comments on dotted letters in a secure textual context (e.g. [μ]ηδέ in 4.9) have generally been avoided.

*Translations.* Translations are mine. I must, nevertheless, stress my debt to former translations (whenever these exist). I have attempted to make the translations literal yet readable. It may be claimed that in some cases my translation is too similar to a former one. It should, however, be noted that in some cases there are only so many ways to translate a word or a phrase literally. In such cases there seemed to be no point in attempting a different translation merely for the sake of variation. I have used square brackets ([ ]) only occasionally in the translations. Wholly restored words are included within square brackets, but I avoided using them in partially restored words when I found the restoration convincing. Interpretative additions to the translations are included in parentheses. The translations should be seen as an integral part of the commentary; they thus represent my interpretation of the texts. It cannot be overstressed that the translations should never be used without the text.

*Commentary.* In most chapters, the commentary includes general remarks followed by line-by-line commentary. On the whole, I tried to concentrate on the religious aspects of the documents. Nevertheless, when the context is less familiar, I have included comments on other aspects as well. Thus, it seemed proper to comment on references to (e.g.) Rhodian tribes or the Samian calendar, whereas similar comments on (e.g.) Attic archons or demes seemed superfluous.

*Date.* The date is discussed in the commentary at the end of the general remarks, where it is also noted if the date is discussed elsewhere.

*Bibliography.* To keep the general bibliography within reasonable limits, I have usually avoided incorporating into it works, mainly books but occasionally articles, which are cited only once or twice or those which are used in a limited context only. When a work is cited more than once in a particular context, I have sometimes referred to it by *ibid.* or *op. cit.* I have, however, done so only in consecutive or adjacent footnotes, so that tracing the original reference should not be difficult.

Short notes and reviews are ordinarily not cited in the general bibliography.

*Bibliographical References.* Reference in the commentary is given primarily to works that are included in the lemma and to those that I have used as the basis for my arguments. I have tried to refer to works that include further bibliographical references and mostly to works that are generally accessible but it seemed pointless to refer the reader constantly to standard works such as *RE*, or *LIMC*, which are referred to only when I relied on them myself.

I have attempted to credit works that referred me to relevant sources (ordinarily in parentheses). I do not doubt that I have failed to do so occasionally. Normally, I have not credited works in such a way when I reached my sources independently.

*Epigraphical References.* When reference is made to a restoration, it appears normally in square brackets (e.g. [*LSCG* 151 A 62]).

When the date cited for an inscription included in Sokolowski's corpus differs from the date assigned to it therein, the source for the date is commonly cited in parentheses (e.g. *LSCG* 15 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 7; ca. 460–450)). Standard corpora references for inscriptions included in Sokolowski's corpus are otherwise rarely cited in the text; they can be found in Concordance 1 below. Reference to one or more later editions is usually cited in Part I for inscriptions included in *LGS* but not in Sokolowski's corpus.

*Old Testament and Mishnaic References.* All Old Testament and Mishnaic citations refer to the original texts.

In reference to the Mishnah I have, for the benefit of the uninitiated, cited both the tractate (in italics) and (in parentheses) the order, e.g. Mishnah (Qodashim) *Midot* 3.4.

*Abbreviations.* Abbreviations of works and periodicals are primarily those given in *AJA* 104, 2000: 10–24. Otherwise, for periodicals, abbreviations are those used in *L'année philologique*; for authors and works, those used in the *OCD*<sup>3</sup> and, if they are not mentioned there, those used in *LSJ*. Abbreviations of epigraphical corpora are those used in



J.H.M. Strubbe (with the assistance of M.J. Bakker), *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum. Consolidated Index to Volumes XXXVI–XLV (1986–1995)*, Amsterdam, 1999, 677–688. The list of abbreviations (p. XIX) includes corpora not cited there, abbreviated differently, or cited among publications in lemmata.

*Transliteration.* I make no exclusive claim to consistency. Regarding names, I have tried to follow the forms used in the second and third editions of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Otherwise, names are usually transliterated. In such cases k is used for Greek κ, y for Greek υ, and ch for Greek χ. Greek words are, on the whole, transliterated, but I have tried to avoid discrepancies such as Hecate/Hekataion or even Dionysus Bromios. As for modern Greek diacritical marks, I have retained whatever system individual authors were using.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank H.S. Versnel for his interest in my work, for his enthusiasm and, not less, for his criticism, and Brill Academic Publishers, their editors and typesetters, for undertaking the publication of such a complex manuscript and for so generously accommodating my requests. I regret that my intention, accepted by Brill, to have all the inscriptions included in Part II illustrated could not be realized as some of the necessary permits could not be secured.

I am grateful to the Greek Ministry of Culture and to the Greek Archaeological Service for permission to study stones in Greece. For facilitating this study and for the lively interest they so often expressed in my work I am grateful to staff at ephorias, museums, and sites in Athens (Epigraphical Museum), the Piraeus (Archaeological Museum), Eleusis, Vrana, Tiryns, Megalopolis, Lycosura, Thebes, Rhodes, Samos, Thasos, and Chania. To the Greek Ministry of Culture and the Greek Archaeological Service I am also grateful for permission to publish the results of my studies, my photographs, and photographs of my squeezes. For permission to study *SEG* VIII 169 I am grateful to David Mevorah, Curator of Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine Archaeology, The Israel Museum, Jerusalem; for permission to study *Corinth* VIII 1, 1 I am grateful to Ioulia Tzonou-Herbst, Curator, The Corinth Excavations, The American School of Classical Studies at Athens; for permission to study nos. 1 and 5 below I am grateful to Janet Grossman, Associate Curator of Antiquities, The J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu.

For providing me with photographs or with permits to reproduce them I would like to thank The Corinth Excavations, The American School of Classical Studies, and Ioulia Tzonou-Herbst, Curator; The J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu and Jacklyn Burnes, Assistant Registrar, Rights and Reproductions Coordinator; The Epigraphical Museum, Athens and Charalambos Kritzas, Director; the Deutsches Arch ologisches Institut, Athens, Hans Goette and Michael Krumme, former and present Directors of Photographic Archives; the cole Fran•aise d Ath•nes and Dominique Mulliez, Director; *VDI* and G.M. Bongard-Levin, Editor-in-Chief; Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Rome; *GRBS*

and Kent Rigsby, Senior Editor; David Jordan, Michael Jameson, and Ioannis Papachristodoulou. For reproduction photographs I am grateful to Marie Mauzy; for photographs of squeezes to David Hagen.

My work in Greece would have been impossible without the endorsement of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, and I thank the School, Stephen Tracy, Director, Robert Bridges, Secretary, and Maria Pilali, Assistant to the Director. Thanks are also due to the Department of Classics, Tel Aviv University and to the Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae, particularly to Benjamin Isaac and Hannah Cotton for help and support during an extended stay in Tel Aviv; to Alice-Mary Talbot, Director of Byzantine Studies, Dumbarton Oaks, for permission to use the Dumbarton Oaks research library; to Faia Babayev for translations from Russian; and to David Jordan for help in various matters.

Many people have answered my questions, whether in person or in writing, sent me copies of works otherwise not available to me, or assisted me in other ways. In the hope I do not forget any of them, I would like to thank Nancy Bookidis, Deb Brown, Richard Burgi, Angelos Chaniotis, Wendy Closterman, Kevin Daly, Phyllis Graham, Klaus Hallof, Dimos Kouvidis, Stephen Lambert, Carol Lawton, Stephanie Larson, Angelos Matthaiou, Graham Oliver, Olga Palagia, Paula Perlman, Molly Richardson, Alexandra Roosevelt-Dworkin, Adele Scafuro, Feyo Schuddeboom, Peter Schultz, Leslie Threatte, John Traill, and Jere Wickens. I am indebted to Marcel Detienne and likewise to Alan Shapiro for comments and criticism on an earlier version of much of Part II. I have also profited much from comments and suggestions made by Michael Jameson, Georg Luck, and Nora Dimitrova.

*Amicus certus in re incerta cernitur*: Ben Millis read the manuscript and suggested numerous improvements in both style and substance. Kevin Clinton not only read the manuscript at different stages, always to its advantage, but was also available whenever I needed his advice.

It is with pleasure that I acknowledge here a debt to my family, particularly to my mother, Nava Lupu. Above all, I am grateful to Catherine Keesling, my wife, who is always as concerned with my work as she is with her own.

Responsibility for any errors that remain rests with me.

Eran Lupu  
Washington, DC, January 2004

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>ANET</i>	J.M. Pritchard (ed.), <i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i> <sup>3</sup> , Princeton, 1969.
Arena, <i>Iscrizioni I</i> <sup>2</sup>	R. Arena, <i>Iscrizioni greche archaiche di Sicilia e Magna Grecia: Iscrizioni di Sicilia, I, Iscrizioni di Megara Iblea e Selinunte</i> , second ed., Pisa, 1996.
Buck, <i>GD</i>	C.D. Buck, <i>The Greek Dialects: Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Glossary</i> , Chicago, 1955.
BE	Bulletin épigraphique (in <i>REG</i> ).
<i>CIS</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum</i> .
<i>COS I</i>	W.W. Hallo (ed.), <i>The Context of Scripture I: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World</i> , Leiden/New York/Cologne, 1997.
<i>DNWSI</i>	J. Hoftijzer and K. Jongeling, <i>Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions</i> (Handbuch der Orientalistik 21), Leiden, 2001.
EBGR	A. Chaniotis et al., Epigraphical Bulletin of Greek Religion (in <i>Kernos</i> ).
<i>Eleutherna II 1</i>	H. van Effenterre, Th. Kalpaxis, A.B. Petropoulou, E. Stavrianopoulou, <i>Ἐλεύθερνα II 1: Ἐπιγραφές ἀπό τό Πυργί καί τό Νησί</i> , Rethymnon, 1991.
<i>IGDS</i>	L. Dubois, <i>Inscriptions grecques dialectales de Sicile: Contribution à l'étude du vocabulaire grec colonial</i> , Rome, 1989.
<i>Iscr.Cos</i>	M. Segre, <i>Iscrizioni di Cos</i> , Rome, 1993.
<i>I.Beroia</i>	L. Gounaropoulou and M.B. Hatzopoulos, <i>Ἐπιγραφές κατά Μακεδονίας</i> , vol. I: <i>Ἐπιγραφές Βεροίας</i> , Athens, 1998.
<i>I.Oropos</i>	V.C. Petrakos, <i>Οἱ ἐπιγραφές τοῦ Ὁρωποῦ</i> , Athens, 1997.
<i>KAI</i>	H. Donner and W. Röllig, <i>Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften</i> <sup>2</sup> , Wiesbaden, 1966.

- Koerner, *Gesetzestexte* R. Koerner, *Inscriptliche Gesetzestexte der frühen griechischen Polis*, herausgegeben von K. Hallof, Cologne/Weimar/Vienna, 1993.
- LGS *Leges Graecorum Sacrae*, pt. I *Fasti Sacri* by J. von Prott, pt. II *Leges Graeciae et Insularum* by L. Ziehen, Leipzig, 1896–1906.
- LSAM F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie mineure*, Paris, 1955.
- LSCG , *Lois sacrées des cités grecques*, Paris, 1969.
- LSS , *Lois sacrées des cités grecques. Supplement*, Paris, 1962.
- Materiali e contributi Materiali e contributi per lo studio degli otto decreti da Entella, *AnnPisa* III 12, 771–1102.
- New Docs.* G.H.R. Horsley (ed.), *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, North Ryde, 1981.
- Nilsson, *GGR* M.P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, Munich, I<sup>3</sup>, 1967, II<sup>3</sup>, 1974.
- Nomima* H. Van Effenterre and F. Ruz , *Nomima: Recueil d'inscriptions politiques et juridiques de l'archaïsme grec*, two vols., Rome, 1994–1995.
- Thorikos* H.F. Mussche et al. (eds.), *Thorikos, 1963– Rapport préliminaire sur la campagne de fouilles*, Bruxelles/Ghent, 1968.
- Threatte, *GAI* L. Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, vol. I *Phonology*, vol. II *Morphology*, Berlin/New York, 1980–1996.

PART ONE

## GREEK SACRED LAW

An Introduction



### *The Corpus of Greek Sacred Laws*

The first attempt to collect the Greek sacred laws into a corpus was undertaken by Hans<sup>1</sup> von Prott and Ludwig Ziehen in the late nineteenth century. Prott was responsible for sacrificial calendars and laws governing the cult of the Hellenistic monarchs. The first fascicle containing the calendars was published in 1896, but the author died before completing the second; ruler cult has subsequently been kept out of the corpus. Ziehen, entrusted with all other documents, published a first volume containing the laws of Greece and the islands in 1906; a projected second volume, containing the laws of Asia Minor, was never published. Incomplete as it is and by now outdated in many respects, Prott and Ziehen's *Leges Graecorum Sacrae* (*LGS* I and II) has never quite been surpassed and remains invaluable today.

In the second half of the twentieth century Greek sacred law came to be associated first and foremost with a single scholar, Franciszek Sokolowski. Sokolowski's first undertaking was to supplement *LGS* by collecting the sacred laws of Asia Minor which resulted in the publication of *Lois sacrées de l'Asie mineure* (*LSAM*) in 1955. This volume was followed in 1962 by *Lois sacrées des cités grecques: Supplément* (*LSS*), including new documents not included in *LGS* and *LSAM*, but excluding Coan documents. Seven years later, in 1969, Sokolowski published the last volume of his corpus, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (*LSCG*), constituting a revision of *LGS*, which it never meant to replace entirely,<sup>2</sup> and including Coan documents.<sup>3</sup>

Sokolowski's volumes, especially *LSCG*,<sup>4</sup> have attracted much criticism. Though some of the points commonly raised are undeniably true, particularly the tendency to introduce into the text restorations which, as ingenious as they sometimes are, may (inter alia) be in disagreement with the stones, anyone who has tried to produce a corpus of his own cannot but admire the author for his unparalleled knowledge of Greek religion, his profound understanding of the documents

---

<sup>1</sup> Latin Ioannes.

<sup>2</sup> *LSCG* p. VII.

<sup>3</sup> Among them those first published by Rudolf Herzog in *Die Heilige Gesetze von Cos*, though omitting no. 16, which had been liberally restored by Herzog, and nos. 13a-x which do not belong in the corpus.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. K. Clinton *AJP* 92, 1971, 496–499; P. Roesch *AntCl* 40, 1971, 201–209. For an assessment of the merits of *LSAM* see note in F. Bérard et al., *Guide de l'épigraphiste*<sup>3</sup>, Paris, 2000, no. 995.



and the skill shown in their selection, and his very ability to cope with the vast undertaking and bring it to fulfillment in a relatively short time. Sokolowski's three volumes with their succinct indices are a useful research tool.

The latest addition to the corpus is Georges Rougemont's masterly 1977 collection of Delphic documents, *Lois sacrées et règlements religieux*, published as the first volume of the *Corpus des inscriptions de Delphes* (*CID I*).

The various editors have briefly accounted for the principles which guided them in making their selections, in their introductions.<sup>5</sup> It is advisable to summarize such principles and discuss the definition of sacred law here.

Since a set of rules governing Greek cult practice has not been handed over to us, an obvious way of getting closer to attaining it is to collect the surviving individual documents, inscribed mainly on stone,<sup>6</sup> which record such rules directly. These documents, commonly classified as *leges sacrae* (vel sim.) in epigraphical corpora, may indeed form the core of the corpus of Greek sacred laws, and relevance to actual cult practice is usually a good criterion for the inclusion or exclusion of ambiguous cases. But the corpus of Greek sacred laws is, in fact, much more diverse, and the term sacred law<sup>7</sup> itself, as it is used inclusively in this corpus, transcends common epigraphical genres, being, to an extent, an artificial modern construct, albeit drawing upon ancient precedents.<sup>8</sup> The corpus contains a diverse assortment of laws, decrees, statutes, regulations, proclamations, treaties, contracts, leases, testaments, foundation documents, and oracles. These may be issued by federations, states, civic subdivisions and magistrates, royalty, sanctuaries, religious organizations, or private individuals. The documents come from throughout the Greek world, from around the beginning of the sixth century B.C.<sup>9</sup> to the Roman Imperial period, varying in length from a few words to the 194 lines of the regulations of the Andanian mysteries, *LSCG* 65.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>5</sup> *LGS* I p. 1; *LGS* II pp. III–IV; *LSAM* p. 5; cf. 184; *LSS* p. 5; *LSCG* pp. VII–VIII; *CID I* pp. 1–4.

<sup>6</sup> Documents which survived in one form or another in literary sources (such as Athenaeus 234e–f) have never been included in the corpus.

<sup>7</sup> *Lex sacra*; cf. *loi sacré*, *heilige Gesetz*, *Kultusgesetz*, vel sim.

<sup>8</sup> A discussion of the contents of the modern corpus seems to me to be a prerequisite for a discussion (not pursued here) of *ἱερός νόμος* in antiquity.

<sup>9</sup> As below no. 6.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Chaniotis 1997, 145–146.

Generally speaking, some of the inscriptions can be formally identified as legislation, usually decrees, or other legal documents of a determinable source.<sup>11</sup> Others put forth customs, usages, rules, laws, all of which are entailed in the term νόμος, directly and with little to no formal mediation.<sup>12</sup> Their source may be determinable; the term by which they were referred to in antiquity is, in the majority of cases, conjectural at best.<sup>13</sup> Both types of documents govern cult performance and religious activities, for the most part, of a recurrent nature.<sup>14</sup> The second type, which tends to be the first to be associated with the term sacred law, commonly regulates entry into sanctuaries and cult performance; the first may regulate such matters as well as others, including the function of cult personnel or the management of sanctuaries; it may also govern performance of occasional actions pertaining to religion and cult practice, such as sacred building activities and melting down of dedications. What links all of these documents together is neither a formal definition, let alone a formal definition of law which in and of itself has little bearing upon the nature of the evidence nor of genre. It is rather their subject matter on the whole sacred and the means for the most part of a tangibly legal character by which it is handled. Even if ideally one would identify individual documents according to their respective genres, a common term is bound to be used. Sacred law may be misleading, and should not be taken at face value in all cases; nevertheless, it has, for better or for worse, prevailed. Coining a new term should any be coined at all is pointless.

The most basic requirements which documents ought to meet in order to be classified as sacred laws can, on the whole, be reduced to two, whether the term is used exclusively or inclusively: (1) The documents must be prescriptive; they must set out rules and regulations, syntactically, by means of imperative forms, written or implied.<sup>15</sup> In

<sup>11</sup> E.g. a state or an individual.

<sup>12</sup> That is, not in the form of or through a (e.g.) decree.

<sup>13</sup> The obvious case in which such a document (albeit introduced by a decree) is actually entitled νόμος is *LSCG* 136.19–22 (discussed below pp. 14–15). *LSS* 59 evidently refers to its predecessor as a public notice (προγ[ραφή]; see below p. 18).

<sup>14</sup> Being recurrent is, of course, inherent in the concept of cult: Un culte, en effet, n'est pas simplement un ensemble de précautions rituelles que l'homme est tenu de prendre dans certaines circonstances; c'est un système de rites, de fêtes, de cérémonies diverses qui présentent toutes ce caractère qu'elles reviennent périodiquement: E. Durkheim, *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse*, Paris, Le Livre de Poche, 1991, 133–134 [originally published 1912] (the italics are original).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Guarducci 1967–1978, IV, 4.

practice imperative in natives and imperatives are normal; the future indicative may also be used<sup>16</sup> as may the present.<sup>17</sup> (2) Their subject matter, the object of their prescriptions, must be or pertain to religion and particularly to cult practice. When Greek sacred law is concerned, these must be Greek, and relevant documents such as the law from the Herodian temple in Jerusalem<sup>18</sup> are to be left out.

These basic requirements are, however, not enough and deserve further qualification, as might be illustrated through an examination of two documents. Both are decrees regarding construction or repair of sanctuary fountain houses; one, *LSCG* 75, is included in the corpus; the other, *I.Oropos* 290, is not.

The third-century B.C. decree from Orchomenus, *LSCG* 75, very briefly prescribes the construction of a fountain house for the benefit of citizens offering sacrifice at a sanctuary of Zeus Meilichios. The much longer Athenian decree, *I.Oropos* 290 (369/8 B.C.), which honors Antikrates of Decelea, a priest of Amphiaraus, discusses several measures to be taken on the occasion of repair work to be made to the fountain and the baths at the Amphiareum and the installation of a marble stele inscribed with *syngraphai* (appended in lines 29–77), and describes in great detail the work and the conditions according to which it has been leased out. The decree prescribes the use of sacred money, collected in the sanctuary's *thesauros* (treasury box), and money from shops for inscribing the stele, for an *aresterion* (a special sacrifice upon making alterations to divine property),<sup>19</sup> and for reimbursing the *neokoros*; the remaining sums are to be transferred to a contractor through those in charge of the repair works (lines 13–25).

Both documents meet the two basic requirements outlined above: they contain prescriptions of, as it happens, occasional actions pertaining to religion and cult practice. Yet while the measures specified in *LSCG* 75 are the core of the document, the professed object of *I.Oropos* 290 is neither the allocation of sacred monies nor the offering of the

<sup>16</sup> As in *LSCG* 133.3 (ca. 400 B.C.), 134.8 (fourth century B.C.), and the Roman Imperial *LSCG* 52.5, 21, 24 and *LSAM* 88.4–5; cf. *IG* XII 5, 15. For the future in leases and in sales of priesthoods see below p. 49.

<sup>17</sup> This is characteristic of calendars and calendar extracts or comparable simple sacrificial regulations. See (e.g.) *LSCG* 20 B 39; *LSS* 10 A 30; 94; *LGS* I 25 (quoted below p. 93); *LSCG* 114–115 (both from Thasos). The calendar of Cos, *LSCG* 151, is notable for mixed constructions.

<sup>18</sup> *OGIS* 598 and *SEG* VIII 169 quoted below.

<sup>19</sup> See Stengel, 1920, 134; Rudhardt 1992, 269.

*aresterion*, but the works and more precisely the publication of the *syn-graphai*. The religious measures, important as they are, consist of actions performed for this end, and thus occupy a secondary place in the entire document. The inscription is an indispensable piece of evidence for certain aspects of Greek cult practice; it is not, however, a clear-cut case of a sacred law but at best a borderline case. A line must be drawn somewhere, however, and Sokolowski is justified in leaving *I.Oropos* 290 out of the corpus.

To the basic principles discussed above one must therefore add that it is incumbent upon documents which are to be included in the corpus that matters pertaining to religion and cult practice be less a means to an end and more an end in their own right, occupying an indisputable first place. As a result, some of the documents included in the corpus (as traditionally constituted) are, in fact, excerpts from longer inscriptions. This was avoided in the present collection, out of the belief that an inscription is better presented and studied as a whole.

Another issue should also be observed, though its application is not quite consistent. Traditionally, not each and every document regulating cult performance is included in the corpus of sacred laws. The corpus usually avoids documents that regulate extraordinary sacrifices and even festivals which, divine sponsorship aside, do not assume the form of straightforward divine worship. A famous example (and one which is not beyond question in my mind) is the Coan decree of ca. 278 B.C., *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 398, regarding a thanksgiving sacrifice to Pythian Apollo at Delphi and corresponding festivities for him, Zeus Soter, and Nike in Cos, on the occasion of the expulsion of the Gauls from Delphi.<sup>20</sup> Another example is the Coan decree *SEG XXXIII* 675 (= *Ischr.Cos* ED 5; ca. mid first half of the second century B.C.) on sacrifice to all the gods and goddesses, in particular Zeus Megistos, Homonoia, and Zeus Boulaios (inter alios), for the safety of the demos and the Cappadocian royal couple, Ariarathes IV Eusebes and Antiochis, which I have not listed among new Coan sacred laws in Appendix B 2. On the other hand, *LSAM* 81 and no. 26 below have been included in the corpus, because they institute festivals to be incorporated into the local religious calendars; although these festivals commemorate events of a primarily civic impetus, they do so within the framework of the cult of Homonoia.

---

<sup>20</sup> See S.M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos* (Hypomnemata 51), Göttingen, 1978, 107-108.

*LSAM* 15 (lines 31–61 of *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 694; Elaea;<sup>21</sup> 129 B.C.) is included despite regulating what appears to be an ephemeral celebration on an extraordinary occasion (the installation of plaques bearing a treaty with the Romans), because the celebration is subject to a form of ordinary worship (mainly the cult of Demeter and Kore, the tutelary goddesses of the polis: lines 48–51) rather than being subservient to an extraordinary occasion.<sup>22</sup> Certain cult foundations may seem problematic in this respect. One notes, however, that all the cases included in the corpus, even those which bluntly commemorate the founders or their relatives,<sup>23</sup> set the cult within a recognized framework of divine worship.<sup>24</sup> Documents concerned with the straightforward cult of the living or of the dead,<sup>25</sup> including all documents concerned with *bona fide* ruler cult,<sup>26</sup> are left out of the corpus.

To sum up, to qualify as a sacred law, in the way this term is used in the existing corpus of Greek sacred laws, an inscription must be prescriptive; its subject matter and main focus must be or pertain to religion and particularly to cult practice, on the whole recurrent in nature, or at least set within the framework of ordinary worship. Reality is, however, more complex and leaves some room for interpretation. Though many cases are sufficiently clear, the final decision as to whether or not to admit a given document into the corpus may at times depend on a variety of factors, including personal judgment. *LGS* includes not less than seventeen documents which Sokolowski preferred, for better and for worse, to leave out.<sup>27</sup> *CID* I includes two more such documents,<sup>28</sup> and excludes five others.<sup>29</sup> I would have avoided

<sup>21</sup> Rather than Pergamum: L. Robert *BCH* 108, 1894, 489–496 (= *Documents d'Asie Mineure*, Paris, 1987, 489–496).

<sup>22</sup> It may be easier to talk about religious and non-religious festivals or celebrations. The examples reviewed here indicate, however, how relative these terms can be. I suspect that if *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 398 had dealt with details of cult performance to the extent that *LSAM* 81 does, it would have been included in the corpus of sacred laws.

<sup>23</sup> See below pp. 83–87.

<sup>24</sup> One notes the heroization in the foundations of Kritolaos and more clearly of Epicteta (below pp. 85, 87). See also below p. 75 with n. 389.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. below p. 75.

<sup>26</sup> *LSCG* 106 is an obvious exception. For royal festival foundations see, however, below p. 84.

<sup>27</sup> *LGS* I 16, 17, 19, 25, 27; II 31, 55, 60, 61, 64, 66, 103, 120, 126, 131, 136, 142; *LGS* II 15 A is also omitted from *LSCG* 16.

<sup>28</sup> I and 11.

<sup>29</sup> *LSCG* 79, 80, 81; *LSS* 43, 44.

*LSCG* 180 and probably *LSAM* 87,<sup>30</sup> and I am not sure that everyone would subscribe to the selection I have made in part II.

### *The Contents and Forms of Greek Sacred Law*

Even once a document has been identified as sacred law, further classification remains difficult, since, as we have seen, sacred law, in the way in which the term is used here, hardly constitutes a well-defined genre. A classification of the documents according to their respective genres may be justified, though misleading, as documents of different genres may deal with similar matters. Here we concentrate rather on the range of issues covered by the documents assembled in the corpus, on the whole adhering to the scheme of four main classes, namely sacred space (mainly sanctuaries), sacred officials (mostly priests), performance of cult (a particularly diverse class), and religious events (festivals and ceremonies).<sup>31</sup> Admittedly, there are numerous cases in which more than one subject is handled by a single document, and much in the evidence defies clear-cut classification. We follow the sacred space-sacred officials-cult performance-religious events scheme here if only for the sake of a general review. Though we mainly aim at reviewing issues recurring in the documents, it is worthwhile, as far as possible, to attempt to consider the formal classification of the documents and, to an extent, the range of genres associated with the respective issues.

#### *Sanctuaries and Sacred Space*

##### Comprehensive and Specific Documents

A handful of documents have reached us which discuss the management of individual sanctuaries in a general and comprehensive way. The best example is the great set of regulations (the document does

---

<sup>30</sup> See below pp. 34–35; on the other hand, I would have liked the corpus to be more inclusive in respect to documents prescribing the building and furnishing of sanctuaries and temples.

<sup>31</sup> With some variations, this scheme is of course not uncommon; Stengel's *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer* is particularly noteworthy; cf. also the arrangement used in the section on religion in the third volume of the *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*.

not refer to itself by a more specific term)<sup>32</sup> from the Amphiareum at Oropus, *LSCG* 69.<sup>33</sup> As comprehensive as it is, it still takes into account through cross-reference a law which, judging from the context, expounded upon (perhaps *inter alia*) the activity of a cult official, namely the *neokoros*. The priest of Amphiaraus, who is required (lines 2–6) to visit the sanctuary from the end of the winter until the period of the ploughing, missing no more than three days at a time<sup>34</sup> and staying at the sanctuary for not less ten days per month, is instructed (lines 6–8):

ἐπαναγκάζειν τὸν νε-  
εωκόρον τοῦ τε ἱεροῦ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι κατὰ τὸν  
νόμον καὶ τῶν ἀφικνεμένων εἰς τὸ ἱερόν·

to compel the *neokoros* (sanctuary attendant) to take care of the sanctuary and of the visitors to the sanctuary according to the law.<sup>35</sup>

The document goes on to discuss (lines 9–20) offences committed on the premises, related fines for offenders, their payments, cases tried at the sanctuary and presided over by the priest, and those tried elsewhere. There follow (lines 20–24, 36–48) some basic rules for incubation, the staple cult activity of the Amphiareum, including a stipulation regarding the publication of the names of the incubants; in between (lines 25–36) there is a discussion of public and private sacrifice, including a reference to the local festival; the function and prerogatives of the priest are considered and on the spot consumption of the meat is prescribed. Little can be made of the remains on the stone past line 48, but the scope of the surviving part suggests that the document was envisioned, and doubtless functioned, as a general code touching upon most, if not all, aspects of day-to-day administration of the activities at the Amphiareum.

The decree of Demetrias concerning the oracular sanctuary of Apollo at Korope in Magnesia (*LSCG* 83; ca. 100 B.C.) gives a similar im-

<sup>32</sup> Unless the νόμοι in line 39 refer back to the regulations of lines 20–24.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. the fragmentary *LSS* 35.

<sup>34</sup> Buck's *GD* p. 195 translation.

<sup>35</sup> This νόμος is probably an actual written law (or an injunction in a law) although, as A.B. Petropoulou has noted (commentary ad loc. in 'The *Eparche* Documents and the Early Oracle at Oropus', *GRBS* 22, 1981, 39–63 at 51), this may not be mandatory. The νόμοι in line 39 are evidently regulations (Petropoulou *ibid.* 56). B. Le Guen-Pollet, *La vie religieuse dans le monde grec du V au IIIe siècle avant notre ère. Choix de documents épigraphiques traduits et commentés*, Toulouse, 1992, 131 maintains that the νόμος is a regulation featured in *LSS* 35.

pression, but its scope is much more limited. While it contains interesting details about the cult (lines 30–49), it is not quite interested in the function of the oracle. As Louis Robert has shown,<sup>36</sup> its main objective is maintaining orderly behavior (εὐκοσμία lines 17, 51 cf. κοσμίως line 39) and proper procedure in consultation, if need be, through the aid of ῥαβδούχοι (staff-bearers, i.e. security officers, lines 24–26, 50–51), though it is not so much concerned with worshippers as with ensuring that magistrates perform their proper duties. Comprehensive documents comparable to the Amphiareum law (to be distinguished from cases in which different documents relating to the same sanctuary are inscribed on the same stone, like *LSAM* 12 and 35) are, in fact, rare, though the state of preservation of many of the stones may bear some of the blame for that. Here we will consider two more cases.

*LSCG* 36 (mid-fourth century B.C.) is a decree of the deme of Peiraeus regulating activities at the local Thesmophorion which, as we learn from the publication clause, was to be set up πρὸς τῇ ἀναβάσει (ascent) τοῦ Θεσμοφορίου (23–24). The stone, the upper part of which is lost, forbids (lines 3–12), probably out of a concern for the rights of the priestess, the freeing of slaves, gatherings of *thiasoi*, setting up dedications, performing purification, or approaching the altars or the *megaron* without the priestess, unless on festival days (the Thesmophoria, the Prerosia, the Kalamaia, and the Skira), καὶ εἴ τινα ἄλλην ἡμέραν συνέρχονται αἱ γυναῖκες καὶ τὰ τὰ πάτρια.<sup>37</sup> Cross-reference is employed for the discussion of transgressions. The demarch is instructed to impose fines and take the transgressors to court according to the laws governing such matters (χρῶμενον τοῖς νόμοις οἱ κείνται περὶ τούτων lines 16–17). The ancient laws governing such matters (τοὺς ἀρχαίους νόμους οἱ κείνται περὶ τούτων lines 19–21) are also to be applied in cases of gathering wood on sanctuary grounds.<sup>38</sup>

A different type of document is *LSCG* 55, coming from a sanctuary founded by one Xanthus, a Lycian slave employed in the Laurion silver mines in southern Attica.<sup>39</sup> It records the foundation, but is more interested in setting up a basic code for the sanctuary. Another, non-identical version of this document, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1365, evidently earlier,<sup>40</sup> is

<sup>36</sup> *Hellenica* V, Paris, 1948, 16–28.

<sup>37</sup> Or on whatever other day the women gather according to the ancestral customs (lines 10–12).

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Dillon 1997a, 16 and see below pp. 26–27.

<sup>39</sup> See E.N. Lane, *CMRDM* III, 107.

<sup>40</sup> See Lane, *CMRDM* III, 8.



not included in the corpus. Xanthus records his foundation (line 2), for which he had been chosen by the god,<sup>41</sup> and proceeds to enumerate cathartic requirements to be met upon entry.<sup>42</sup> He lists the rules governing sacrifice, prerogatives, distribution of the victims' parts, and sacrificial occasions. Sacrifice is to be performed only in the presence of the founder who takes care to assert his rights: failure to comply would render sacrifice unacceptable to the god. Those who wish to found an *eranos*<sup>43</sup> are welcome to it with good luck as long as they comply with the rules. Xanthus' intimate relations with the god enable him to interweave the regulations with exhortations such as *καὶ εὐεῖλατος | γένοιτο ὁ θεὸς τοῖς θεραπεύουσιν ἀπλῇ τῇ ψυχῇ*,<sup>44</sup> the likes of which are more suggestive of the Bible than of Greek sacred law.<sup>45</sup>

Despite obvious differences, Xanthus' document shares basic features with the documents from the Amphiareum and from the Piraeus Thesmophorion. All present the sanctuary as functioning according to a given set of rules, be they divine, human, or a combination of both; immediate jurisdiction exists, exercised by specific functionaries, accountable as they may be to a higher authority. This highest authority is the one issuing the documents. At the time when *LSCG* 69 was enacted, the highest authority at the Amphiareum was the city of Oropus, though the control over the sanctuary kept changing for the next hundred years or so.<sup>46</sup> Immediate authority is invested in the *neokoros* and in the priest. The body issuing *LSCG* 36 is the deme of Peiraeus; legal matters are the province of the demarch;<sup>47</sup> day-to-day authority over cult performance is evidently invested in the priestess. In the case of *LSCG* 55 the issuer is a private individual who also possesses immediate jurisdiction, acting, as he emphasizes, on behalf of the god himself. The considerable differences between the three documents, manifest in their respective issuing bodies, are further evident in the type and

<sup>41</sup> See Lane loc. cit.

<sup>42</sup> For cathartic requirements see below p. 15.

<sup>43</sup> See below commentary on no. 5.

<sup>44</sup> May the god be very merciful to those serving him with innocent soul (lines 11–12).

<sup>45</sup> See S. Wide, *ΑΩΡΟΙ ΒΙΑΙΟΘΑΝΑΤΟΙ*, *ARW* 12, 1909, 224–233; cf. G.H.R. Horsley, *New Docs.* III, 23–26. More generally for the passage cited one notes 1 Chronicles 28:9 *וְעָבְדוּהוּ בְּלֵב שָׁלֵם וּבְנוֹשֶׁף הַפֶּצֶה*: *LXX* καὶ δούλευε αὐτῷ ἐν καρδίᾳ τελείᾳ καὶ ψυχῇ θελούσῃ (worship him with a whole heart and a willing soul). Cf. Deut. 6:5 (N.T. Matt. 22:37) etc.

<sup>46</sup> See V.C. Petrakos in *I.Oropos* pp. 495–502.

<sup>47</sup> See R. Garland, *The Piraeus from the Fifth to the First Century B.C.*, London, 1987, 74–75.

scope of the local activities. Each document attempts to touch the main aspects of these activities, and this ultimately accounts for the respective idiosyncrasies.

Type and scope of local activities are to be counted among the formative elements which characterize evidence elsewhere. This is as discernible in comprehensive documents as it is in less comprehensive ones, be their primary focus cult performance<sup>48</sup> or matters of an administrative character. The regulations concerning *theoroi* from Andros (*LSS* 38) elaborating on their maintenance and conduct; the treaty between Delphi and Skiathos (*LSS* 41), discussing cultic taxes and granting Skiathos (lines 24–27) the provision of a *hestiatorion*,<sup>49</sup> wood, vinegar, and salt for sacrificial meals; the document regulating the cultic tax of Phaselis (*LSS* 39); or the decree of the *koinon* of the Asclepiadai of Cos and Cnidus (*LSS* 42)<sup>50</sup> are all dependent upon the status of Delphi, the scope of local cult activities, and the ensuing need to regulate and accommodate the activity of foreign visitors. They are, by nature, as immediately related to the function of Delphi as an oracular sanctuary and a site of celebration of a Pan-Hellenic festival as *LSCG* 69 depends upon the healing cult practiced at the Oropian Amphiareum (and the scope of the local festival celebrated there), or as the Andania regulations depend on the mysteries they regulate.<sup>51</sup> Documents from such sanctuaries are bound to concern, besides cult performance, issues pertaining to administration and managing and accommodating masses of visitors. Such issues are likely to affect documents coming from other popular, massively attended sanctuaries serving less specific cultic ends, such as the Samian Heraion.<sup>52</sup> The range of documents coming from all such sanctuaries is, on the other hand, likely to differ from those emanating from local sanctuaries serving a specific constituency such as the unknown, privately founded Attic sacred precinct of Asclepius and Hygieia which produced the eleven-line boundary marker with cult regulations, *LSCG* 54 (1st century A.D.), addressing farmers and neighbors who are encouraged to sacrifice to the gods according to custom (ἡ θέμις line 6).

---

<sup>48</sup> Discussed below.

<sup>49</sup> Dining room; see (e.g.) M.S. Goldstein, *The Setting of the Ritual Meal in Greek Sanctuaries; 600–300 B.C.*, Dissertation, Berkeley, 1978, 294–296.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. also *CID* I 1 and 11.

<sup>51</sup> See below pp. 105–106.

<sup>52</sup> For which see below no. 18.

Alongside distinctly local documents there exist, however, a great number of sacred laws dealing with issues common to most sanctuaries which are met time and again, usually with only minor differences. We will here review documents dealing, generally speaking, with entry into sanctuaries (ritual purity and protection of sanctuaries from pollution, restricted and forbidden entry, asylum), and with protection of sanctuaries and their property, as well as those governing the treatment of dedications, the founding and construction of sanctuaries, other construction works, and the leasing of sacred real estate. The identity of the body issuing the first class of documents, governing entry into sanctuaries, is frequently not indicated, as they are not presented as legislation. Documents belonging to the other classes are usually legislation, mostly decrees, and, preservation permitting, they allow the issuing body to be identified.<sup>53</sup>

### Entry into Sanctuaries

*Ritual Purity.* The obvious way to maintain purity is for a sanctuary to inform worshippers of its cathartic policies upon entry by means of inscriptions.<sup>54</sup> The Andania Mysteries regulations, *LSCG* 65, are very explicit in this respect (line 37):

ἀναγραφάντω δὲ καὶ ἀφ' ὧν δεῖ καθαρίζειν καὶ ἃ μὴ δεῖ ἔχοντας εἰσπορεύεσθαι.

They shall write and post things which require purification and whatever one ought not to have when entering the sanctuary.

Inscriptions bearing such information may be placed in more than one location in the sanctuary, particularly at entrances, in order to achieve maximum exposure. In fact, a few such laws have reached us in more than one copy.<sup>55</sup> A document from Ialysus, *LSCG* 136, from around 300 B.C., is instructive in this respect. It features a law (lines 19–35) entitled (19–21):

<sup>53</sup> As regards prohibitions and requirements from worshippers, a number of the issues reviewed here have been recently discussed in Dillon 1997, mainly chapter 6, which also discusses requirements related to cult performance reviewed below in the section on cult performance.

<sup>54</sup> Such inscriptions are akin to signs still posted in places of worship regarding such matters as dress or conduct.

<sup>55</sup> Examples are mentioned below.

νόμος ἃ οὐχ ὅσιον εἰσῆμιν οὐδὲ  
εἰσφέρειν ἐς τὸ ἱερόν καὶ τὸ τέ-  
μενος τᾶς Ἀλεκτρώνας.

Law; things of which entering or carrying into the sanctuary and precinct of Alektrona<sup>56</sup> is not allowed.<sup>57</sup>

The list mentions pack animals, footwear and anything made from pigs (sheep are discussed in lines 30–33) as sources of pollution.<sup>58</sup> The law is preceded by a decree (1–18), which not only states its purpose as purifying the sanctuary and precinct of Alektrona according to the ancestral customs (lines 3–5), but also ordains that three different stones be inscribed with the law and be placed at the entrance on the city side, above the *hestiatorion*,<sup>59</sup> and at the descent from the acropolis of Ialysus (lines 5–18).<sup>60</sup> As the quote from the Andania regulations suggests, cathartic requirements and forbidden items are most frequently listed in comparable documents. More rare are prohibitions concerning specific classes of people. A given document may deal with a single topic or more, varying in particular details depending upon the cult and the personal taste and preferences of the divinities in question.<sup>61</sup>

*Cathartic Requirements.* Documents listing cathartic requirements typically list the source of pollution contracted (most frequently sexual intercourse, menstruation, childbirth, miscarriage, contact with a corpse, or certain foods) and, in most cases, the amount of time needed to pass before entry to the sanctuary is allowed; a purificatory measure such as a shower is sometimes prescribed. See *LSCG* 55.3–7 and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1365.8–11; *LSCG* 95; 124; 139; 171.16–17; *LSS* 54; 59; 91; 106, 108; 119; cf. 118; *LSAM* 12 I; 18; 29; 51; cf. 20; below no. 7 and commentary for a discussion.

Alongside detailed prerequisites, there are a few laws which are satisfied with a general requirement such as *LSAM* 35.3–5:

<sup>56</sup> See Morelli 1959, 89–90. For ἱερόν see below p. 282 n. 23.

<sup>57</sup> Less literally: The following are not allowed to enter or be carried into the sanctuary. For the use of εἰσφέρειν see commentary on 4.8 below.

<sup>58</sup> In this respect this document differs from a number of otherwise comparable documents reviewed below in connection with protection of sanctuaries: Ziehen *LGS* II p. 359; Morelli 1959, 91.

<sup>59</sup> See above p. 13.

<sup>60</sup> Sokolowski's commentary p. 234; V. Gabrielsen, 'The Synoikized *Polis* of Rhodes', in P. Flensted-Jensen, T. Heine Nielsen, and L. Rubinstein (eds.), *Polis and Politics: Studies in Greek History Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen on his Sixtieth Birthday, August 20, 2000*, Copenhagen, 177–205 at 192.

<sup>61</sup> Documents concerned primarily with prohibitions against sacrificing particular animals are discussed below.

Εἰσῖναι εἰς [τὸ]  
 ἱερὸν ἄγνόν ἐ[ν]  
 ἐσθῆτι λευκ[ῇ].

Enter into the sanctuary pure in white clothes.

Cf. *LSAM* 82; *I.Manisa* 24; for a negative stipulation see *LSCG* 130.

*Forbidden Items.* Items forbidden in the sanctuary may be listed together with cathartic requirements (*LSCG* 124; *LSS* 59; 91) or independently as in *SEG XXXVI* 1221 from the Letoon in Xanthus<sup>62</sup> (late third-early second century B.C.):

Ἄ μὴ νομίζεται εἰς τὸ  
 ἱερὸν καὶ τὸ τέμενος  
 εἰφέρειν ὄπλον μη-  
 4 θέν, πέτασον, καυσί-  
 αν, πόρπην, χαλκόν,  
 χρυσόν, μηδὲ δακτύ-  
 λιον ὑπόχρυσον, μηδὲ  
 8 σκεῦος μηθέν, ἔξω  
 ἱματισμοῦ καὶ ὑπο-  
 δέσεως τοῦ περὶ τὸ  
 σῶμα, μηδ' ἐν ταῖς  
 12 στοαῖς καταλύειν  
 μηθένα ἀλλ' ἢ τοὺς  
 θύοντας.

Things which it is not customary to carry into the sanctuary and precinct: no weapon, *petasos*, *kausia*,<sup>63</sup> brooch, brass (objects), gold (objects), nor gold-plated rings and any equipment at all except for clothes and footwear (worn) around one's body; nor shall anyone camp in the stoas except those offering sacrifice.

The concern with weapons and metal objects is common (cf. *LSS* 60; *LSAM* 68).<sup>64</sup> Items made of the skin of particular animals, clothes of certain colors (see commentary on no. 4 below), and makeup or luxury items in general are not welcome.<sup>65</sup>

In a very few cases requirements pertaining to purity and apparel or accessories are featured alongside prescriptions pertaining to the performance of cult. As it is, all of the relevant documents, *LSCG* 68

<sup>62</sup> C. Le Roy, Un règlement religieux au Letoon de Xanthos, *RA* 1986, 279–300, with ample commentary on the issues touched upon in this inscription.

<sup>63</sup> Wide-brimmed and round, Bat hats respectively. See Le Roy *ibid.* 289–293.

<sup>64</sup> For prohibitions against lodging see below.

<sup>65</sup> See *LSS* 33 addressing women; transgression will require the culprit to have the sanctuary purified.

(cf. no. 8 below) from Lycosura, *LSAM* 84 from Smyrna, *LSAM* 14 and *I.Perg* III 161 A 11 14<sup>66</sup> from the Pergamene Asclepieum, come from mystery cult or healing cult sanctuaries.<sup>67</sup> In the two Pergamene cases, the regulations are directly related to participation in incubation,<sup>68</sup> and the same seems to hold true of the prescriptions of *LSAM* 84 (*I.Smyrna* 728; second century A.D.) and the mysteries to which they relate.<sup>69</sup> A connection between *LSCG* 68<sup>70</sup> (or no. 8 below) and the mysteries celebrated at the sanctuary of Despoina at Lycosura may not be as clear.<sup>71</sup>

*Spiritual Purity.* Some laws call for purity in mind.<sup>72</sup> *LSS* 82 (Mytilene; Roman Imperial period<sup>73</sup>) is very general:

ἀγνὸν πρὸς τέμενος στείχειν  
ὅσια φρονέοντα.

Enter the precinct pure, purely minded.

*SEG* XLIII 710 from Euromus, comprised of three elegiac distichs, urges spiritual purity in greater detail. Other laws (*LSCG* 139; *LSS* 59; 91) may append a statement about purity in mind to a more or less usual list of sources for pollution, time needed for purification, and forbidden items. *LSS* 108 from Rhodes (1st century A.D.) lists the sources for pollution (sexual intercourse, beans, and heart), then in an elegiac distich stresses that purity is to be achieved in mind, not through bathing (sacral regulations follow).<sup>74</sup> The elegiac distich is evocative of the one inscribed, according to Porphyry (*Abst.* 2.19.5), on the temple of Asclepius at Epidaurus.<sup>75</sup> The inscription from Euromus

<sup>66</sup> For the text see below pp. 61–63. Both Pergamene documents date to the Roman Imperial period.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. *LSCG* 65.15–26 from Andania.

<sup>68</sup> For incubation see below commentary on no. 13.

<sup>69</sup> See M.P. Nilsson, *The Dionysiac Mysteries of the Hellenistic and Roman Age* (ActaAth-8° 5), Lund, 1957, 133–143; cf. particularly A.D. Nock, A Cult Ordinance in Verse, *HSCP* 63, 1958, 415–421 (= *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, Z. Stewart ed., Cambridge, Mass. 1972, II, 847–852).

<sup>70</sup> For the date see below commentary on no. 8.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. below commentary on no. 8.

<sup>72</sup> See Chaniotis 1997.

<sup>73</sup> Chaniotis 1997, 152, 164.

<sup>74</sup> See discussion below p. 59.

<sup>75</sup> Morelli 1959, 116. The question whether the Epidaurian inscription should be taken as a sacred law of sorts (cf. Chaniotis 1997, 152) or rather as a maxim, exhortation,

might be as early as the second century B.C.<sup>76</sup> The majority of comparable inscriptions are relatively late.<sup>77</sup> The Delian *LSS* 59 (*LGS* 91), probably from 116/5 B.C., is evidently a copy of an older inscription.<sup>78</sup> The exact word by which it refers to the older text survives only partially, but Adolf Wilhelm s<sup>79</sup> προγ[ραφή], i.e. public notice, is very likely. Lucian s *On sacrifices* (13) refers to the same thing as προγραμμα.<sup>80</sup>

καὶ τὸ μὲν πρόγραμμα φησι μὴ παριέναι εἰς τὸ εἶσω τῶν περιωραντηρίων  
δοσις μὴ καθαρὸς ἐστὶν τὰς χεῖρας· ὁ δὲ ἱερεὺς αὐτὸς ἐστηκεν ἡμαγμένος  
καὶ ὥσπερ ὁ Κύκλωψ ἐκείνος κτλ.

The notice says that anyone whose hands are not clean should not enter within the lustral basins,<sup>81</sup> but the priest stands himself stained with blood like the Cyclops, etc.

*Restricted and Forbidden Entry.* In a few cases, access to a sanctuary is denied to specific classes of people.<sup>82</sup> *LSCG* 124 excludes traitors,<sup>83</sup> *galloi* (lines 10–11), and women except the priestess and the prophetess (lines 18–20). *LSS* 56 (Egyptian divinities) denies access to women and

---

general precept vel sim., not quite meant to govern actual practice (cf. Ziehen *LGS* II pp. 364–365) cannot be discussed here. The tendency of inscriptions exhorting spiritual purity to do so in verse has been frequently noticed (for recent discussions see the article by Voutiras (next note) and Chaniotis 1997). On the problem of verse cult regulations in general see A.D. Nock, *A Cult Ordinance in Verse*, *HSCP* 63, 1958, 415–421 at 417–418 (= *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, Z. Stewart ed., Cambridge, Mass. 1972, II, 850–852). The inscription from Euromos is relevant in this respect; cf. also *IC* I iii 3 from Phaestus.

<sup>76</sup> So dated on the basis of letter forms by the first editor, M. Errington, *Inschriften von Euromos*, *EpigAnat* 21, 1993, 15–31 no. 8 at 29–30. E. Voutiras *Zum einer metrischen Inschrift von Euromos*, *EpigAnat* 24, 1995, 15–19 (at 17–18) seems justified in considering the first century A.D.

<sup>77</sup> Besides those already mentioned see *LSCG* 139; *LSS* 91. Cf., however, *LSCG* 124.1 (second century B.C.) with Chaniotis 1997, 155–156.

<sup>78</sup> See P. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*, Paris, 1970, 228–229. The inscription has also been dated to the Roman Imperial period. This date, somewhat preferable from a purely contextual point of view, requires a different restoration of the opening formula and was adopted by Sokolowski in *LSS*.

<sup>79</sup> A. Wilhelm, *Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde*, Vienna, 1909, 315.

<sup>80</sup> See Sokolowski's commentary.

<sup>81</sup> See below commentary on no. 7.

<sup>82</sup> This is to be distinguished from cases where specific classes of people are denied participation in the performance of cult (see below) rather than entry. For women in both cases see Cole 1992, 105–107.

<sup>83</sup> See Chaniotis 1997, 163.

men wearing woolen clothes; *LSCG* 82.5 6 excludes women; *LSCG* 109 excludes women and the uninitiated. The uninitiated are denied access to the sanctuary<sup>84</sup> at Samothrace in two inscriptions, *LSS* 75 and *LSS* 75a,<sup>85</sup> which includes prohibitions in both Latin and Greek:

Deorum sacra  
2 qui non accepe-  
runt non intrans.  
4 Ἀμύητον μὴ εἰ-  
σιέναι.

Those who have not taken part in the rites of the gods shall not enter.  
The uninitiated shall not enter.

Foreigners are prohibited in a document from Delos, *LSS* 49 (*IDélos* 68), which survived in two copies:<sup>86</sup>

ξένων οὐχ ὁσίη εἰσιέναι].

It is religiously not permitted for a foreigner to enter.

Dorians seem to be excluded in a fragmentary ca. 450 B.C. inscription from Paros, *LSCG* 110.<sup>87</sup> In the Herodian temple in Jerusalem, so we learn from Josephus (*Bḡ* 5.193–194), the second enclosure in the temple, called Holy (τὸ ἅγιον), was surrounded by a δρύφακτος, a stone balustrade onto which were fixed at equal distances inscribed steles, some in Greek and some in Latin, with the law of purity denying entry to non Jews.<sup>88</sup> Two different copies of such Greek inscriptions were actually found: *OGIS* 598 (complete)<sup>89</sup> and *SEG* VIII 169 (fragmentary):

<sup>84</sup> See K. Clinton, Stages of Initiation in the Eleusinian and Samothracian Mysteries, in M.B. Cosmopoulos (ed.), *Greek Mysteries: The Archaeology and Ritual of Ancient Greek Secret Cults*, London and New York, 2003, 50–78 at 61–65.

<sup>85</sup> For both inscriptions see N. Dimitrova, *Theoroi and Initiates in Samothrace*, Diss., Cornell University, 2002, nos. 159–160.

<sup>86</sup> See *SEG* XLIV 678 for the text of both. One should mention here P.A. Butz, Prohibitionary Inscriptions, Ξένοι, and the Influence of the Early Greek Polis, in R. Hagg (ed.), *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis* (ActaAth-4<sup>o</sup> 14), Stockholm, 1996, 75–79.

<sup>87</sup> *LSAG*<sup>2</sup> pp. 305, 412 no. 39.

<sup>88</sup> For the prohibition cf. *Ant.* 15.17; Mishnah (Tohorot) *Kelim* 1.8.

<sup>89</sup> See L. Boffo, *Iscrizioni greche e latine per lo studio della bibbia* (Biblioteca di storia e storiografia a dei tempi biblici 9), Brescia, 1994, 283–294 no. 32 with commentary.



## OGIS 598

Μηθένα ἄλλογενῇ εἰσπο-  
 2 ρεύεσθαι ἐντὸς τοῦ πε-  
 ρὶ τὸ ἱερόν τρυφάκτου καὶ  
 4 περιβόλου· ὃς δ' ἂν λη-  
 φθῇ ἐαυτῷ αἴτιος ἔσ-  
 6 ται διὰ τὸ ἐξακολου-  
 θεῖν θάνατον.

SEG VIII 169<sup>90</sup>

[Μη]θένα ἄλλ[ογενῇ εἰσπορεύεσθαι]  
 [ἐν]τὸς τοῦ περὶ τὸ ἱερόν τρυ-  
 [φάκ]του καὶ [περιβόλου· ὃς δ' ἂν]  
 [λ]ηφθῇ αὐ[τῷ αἴτιος ἔσται]  
 [δ]ιὰ τὸ ἐξ[ακολουθεῖν]  
 θάνατ[ον].

No gentile shall enter within the balustrade and the fence around the sanctuary. Anyone caught will be the cause for the ensuing death for himself.

A τρύφακτος is also encountered in a second-century A.D. decree of Mylasa from Labraunda, *I.Labraunda* 60:

ὁμοίως δεδόχθαι προ-  
 12 σωτέρῳ τοῦ τρυφάκτου του μετὰξὺ τοῦ τε ἁρ-  
 [γ]υροῦ θυμιατηρίου βωμοῦ καὶ τῆς τραπέζης  
 τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ μηδεμί ἐξεῖναι παριέ-  
 16 γαι πλὴν τῶν προγεγραμμένων κτλ.

Likewise it shall be decided that at all times no one be allowed to enter inside farther than the balustrade between the silver incense altar and the table of the god except those listed above etc.

The decree denies the general public direct access to the priest, the god, and parts of the temple, and the τρύφακτος, marking the sacred part of the temple, functions here similarly to the way it does in Jerusalem. It is attested elsewhere, though not in sacred laws.<sup>91</sup>

Access to a particular sacred space may be denied altogether. The space may be considered an ἄβατον and a simple boundary marker like the one from the Athenian Acropolis, *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 4964 (400–350 B.C.) would be enough to prevent entry:

Διὸς Κα[ταί]-  
 βάτο ἄβ[ατον]-  
 ἱερόν.

A sacred place of Zeus Kataibates, not to be entered.

<sup>90</sup> Now at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem, Inv. no. 36 989 (I have seen the stone. The inner bars of the thetas in lines 1 and 6 are now barely, if at all, discernible).

<sup>91</sup> See M.-C. Hellmann, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire de l'architecture grecque, d'après les inscriptions de Délos*, Paris, 1992, 210–212. For the construction of a τρύφακτος (inter alia) see the decree of a Mylasan *syngeneia*, *I.Mylasa* 502; cf. in this respect the δρύφακτος in the decree concerning the Athena Nike temple on the Athenian Acropolis, *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 644.

Despite the implied imperative, such inscriptions are not included in the corpus although cult is known to have been performed in ἄβατα of Zeus Kataibates, implying that access was allowed for this purpose, probably to authorized personnel.<sup>92</sup> In the inscriptions included in the corpus the forbidden space is believed to have constituted a sanctuary of whatever sort. *LSCG* 121 from Chios (Ἱερὸν. οὐκ ἔ|σοδος)<sup>93</sup> seems a borderline case. The qualification of the forbidden space as a sanctuary is clearer in the fifth-century B.C. document from Kallion in Aetolia, *LSS* 128 (lines 1–2 Ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ | μὴ παρήμεν,<sup>94</sup> which fines violators four staters. Sokolowski suggests that the sanctuary was opened only on festival days.<sup>95</sup> A fine is also imposed in the short and largely obscure early-fifth-century *LSS* 34 from Corinth, implying a sanctuary or sacred space which (in the first preserved line) seems to proclaim itself the first of its kind to do so<sup>96</sup> ἄστυλος, i.e. inviolable.

*Asylum.* Other documents concerned with asserting territorial inviolability of sanctuaries tend to be more detailed (less so *LSAM* 85). *SEG XXXIX* 1290,<sup>97</sup> the boundary stone of the sanctuary of Artemis at Sardis, contains a decree of Caesar of March 4, 44 B.C., unfortunately largely fragmentary, which confirms the sanctuary's right of asylum. The inscription which is said to have come from a sanctuary of Dionysus at Tralles, *LSAM* 75, though dating to the first century A.D., presents its right of asylum as much older.<sup>98</sup>

### Protection of Sanctuaries

Protection of the territory of sanctuaries might be done by means of specific prohibitions inscribed on boundary stones marking their territory. A fourth-century B.C. stone marking the boundary of the Amphiareum at Oropus, *LGS* II 66 (*I.Oropos* 284), opens with the ubiquitous ὄρος which is followed by a note prohibiting private construction within the marked boundaries:

<sup>92</sup> See below commentary on 1.10.

<sup>93</sup> A sanctuary (or simply: sacred place); no entry.

<sup>94</sup> Do not enter into the sanctuary.

<sup>95</sup> For opening temples see below p. 74.

<sup>96</sup> Guarducci 1967–1978, IV, 69.

<sup>97</sup> Rigsby 1996, 434–437 no. 214.

<sup>98</sup> See Sokolowski's commentary ad loc.; Rigsby 1996, 416–417. For asylum see also the largely restored *LSCG* 158 from the Coan Asclepieum; cf. *LSCG* 73 (on which see below p. 94–95, 101).

[Ὡ]ρος· μὴ τοιχοδομεῖν  
ἐντὸς τῶν ὄρων ἰδιώ-  
την.

*Horos.* No private person shall build within the boundaries.

A comparable fourth-century B.C. boundary marker from Heracleia Pontica, *LSAM* 83, is concerned with preventing burial on sanctuary grounds.<sup>99</sup>

Alongside these boundary markers there are a great number of inscriptions concerned with the protection of sanctuaries which tend to discuss concrete issues resulting from human activity, both religious and profane, on sanctuary grounds. The 112/11 B.C. inscription recording the Magnesian arbitration between Itanos and Hierapytna, *IC* III iv 9.81 82,<sup>100</sup> mentions νόμοι ἱεροί, ἀραί (imprecations), and ἐπίτιμα (penalties), preventing anyone from feeding cattle, making a fold, sawing, or cutting wood in the sanctuary of Dictaean Zeus near Itanos in Crete. None of these survives but we do have actual documents inscribed with prohibitions, accompanied by occasional penalties and sporadic imprecations, aiming to protect sanctuaries, their property, and grounds from such or comparable actions.<sup>101</sup>

The Delian decree of ca. 180 166 B.C., *LSS* 51/*SEG* XLVIII 1037, now augmented by a new fragment (B), is worth considering in this respect despite its fragmentary state, as it features prohibitions, an imprecation, and penalties, recalling the Cretan νόμοι ἱεροί, ἀραί, and ἐπίτιμοι:

- A** Ἔδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ· Χαῖρ-  
μίδης Θεοπρώ[του εἰπ]εν· ὅπως [μη]-  
θεῖς ἐν τοῖς [ἱεροῖς οἱ]χοῖς(?) τοῦ Ἀπ[όλλω]-  
4 νος ἀτάκτως [ἀναστραφ]εῖ μηδὲ εἰς [τὰ]  
ἐσπιατόρια Ε[-<sup>ca. 7</sup>]-υρᾶς, μηδὲ [εἰς τοὺς θαλά]-  
μους(?) ΕΡ[. . . . . τοῦ]ς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ χο[ι]-  
μήσοντας ἦ [-<sup>ca. 7</sup>]-ας εἰσφέρει,  
8 μηδὲ οἰκέτας μηθείς, μήτε ἐν τοῖς *vacat*  
οἴκοις μήτε [ἐν τόπῳ] ὑπαιθρίῳ ΘΕΩ . . .  
[- - ]ΙΩΤΩΝΚΑΙΝ . Κ . . . ΕΠΙΩΝΤ . [- - -]

<sup>99</sup> Regarding burial, *LSS* 120 (Cumae; fifth century B.C.) allows burial in a specific place only to persons initiated into Dionysiac mysteries. For boundary stones cf. also below p. 39 with n. 188.

<sup>100</sup> *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 685; S.L. Ager, *Interstate Arbitration in the Greek World, 337–90 B.C.*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1996, 431–446 no. 158.

<sup>101</sup> For a recent general discussion see Dillon 1997, chapter 8.



always be [pious] and especially most just. (16) Okyneides son of Anaxandros brought to vote: The priests and the priestesses imprecate (as follows) according to the ancestral customs: Whoever leads out from Delos a slave, whether [unwillingly] or willingly, from the [sacred] precincts [of the god], with damage to the master, [shall suffer utter destruction], he, and his descendants, and [his house]. Anyone who knows [and does not report] this to the *astynomoi*, [shall be liable] to the same, [and if anyone] violates [anything else against the ancestral customs of the Delians, he shall suffer utter destruction] and his descendants [and his house - - -]

The document states its basic purpose – involving the prevention of disorderly conduct in the sanctuary – at the outset; ensuring the relations between the Delians and their gods is an additional concern. Its scope was evidently wide: it features prohibitions concerning the *hestiatoria*<sup>103</sup> and sleeping in the sanctuary; though the text becomes all too lacunose and breaks up, it seems clear that more abuses were discussed. Where it picks up again (fragment B) it contains a prohibition against allowing pigs and other animals into the precinct (literally within the *perirhanteria*)<sup>104</sup> except for the sake of sacrifice; offenders are to be liable both to imprecations and to penalties, the procedure concerning which is described. The document then turns to consider an imprecation against leading slaves out of the sanctuary to the detriment of their masters.<sup>105</sup> Its inclusion is ultimately done with a view to maintaining good working relations between the Delians and the gods. The surviving fragmentary copy was not the only one, judging from the reference to steles in the plural (B 11–12). The first editors of fragment B, Ch. Feyel and F. Prost,<sup>106</sup> reasonably suggest that these were to be placed at each entrance to the sanctuary.

Comprehensive documents, comparable to the present one in scope, if not precisely in subject matter, seem to have existed elsewhere; the early fifth-century B.C. Hecatompedon inscription from the Athenian Acropolis, *LSCG* 3 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 4B), is an obvious example.<sup>107</sup> Most surviving sacred laws dealing with protection of sanctuaries tend, however, to limit themselves to handling either very few issues or a single one.

<sup>103</sup> See above p. 15.

<sup>104</sup> See below commentary on no. 7.

<sup>105</sup> Analogous to *IG* XI 4, 1296 (Feyel and Prost *ibid.* 468).

<sup>106</sup> Feyel and Prost *ibid.* 1998, 468.

<sup>107</sup> The 203 B.C. letter of Zeuxis to the army regarding protection of the sanctuary, *I.Labraunda* 46, also seems to have been quite comprehensive in its scope.

Damage to sanctuaries by fire, littering, and lodging, protection of trees and vegetation, water sources, movables, and animals are all recurrent concerns. Offences result in most cases in penalties, reports of offenders being commonly solicited from witnesses; failing to report may constitute an offence in and of itself (so in *LSCG* 116); slaves are usually flogged; free persons tend to be subject to hefty fines (e.g. *LSCG* 37), of which the beneficiary may be the injured divinity (*LSCG* 100.5–6; 116), the state (*LSCG* 84.14), or both, the money being divided equally between them (*LSCG* 67.21–23); bringing an offender to justice may also be rewarded by a share in the fine (*LSS* 53.15–20).

*Fire.* Restrictions may be placed upon lighting fires in sanctuaries in an attempt to prevent the devastating effects of fire gone out of control. A second-century B.C. fragment from Paros, *LSCG* 112.5–6, lists restrictions and prohibitions (now rather incomplete) concerning fire and, should we accept the restorations, states their purpose as: [ὅ]ς μὴ τὸ ἱερὸν κινδυνεύει μηδὲ τὰ ἀναθήματα βλάπτηται;<sup>108</sup> despite the miserable state of the stone, it is clear that penalties for offenders were prescribed. Concern with fire is evident in more inclusive documents like the variably restored Hecatompedon inscription (*LSCG* 3.6–11) and the late-fifth to early-fourth-century B.C. inscription from the sanctuary of Athena Alea at Tegea *LSCG* 67.21–22 (concerned in its surviving part mostly with rights of pasture; see below). Both inscriptions prescribe fines not less than twelve drachmas in Tegea, where the temple had actually burnt down in 395/4.<sup>109</sup> The short fifth-century B.C. decree from Arkesine on Amorgos, *LSCG* 100, is devoted to protecting a sanctuary of Hera from fire in its entirety: no one is allowed to light fire in prescribed places; offenders are subject to a fine of (probably) ten drachmas. Another short decree from Roman Camirus, *LSS* 105, forbids lighting fires in the hall of the *hierothytai* and in the adjacent stoa.<sup>110</sup>

<sup>108</sup> In order that the sanctuary may not be in danger nor the dedications be harmed.

<sup>109</sup> Pausanias 8.45.4; Jost 1985, 145. For the date of the inscription see G. Thier and H. Tauber, *Prozessrechtliche Inschriften der griechischen Poleis: Arkadien* (*SBWien* 607), Vienna, 1994, 12, who note that it need not necessarily postdate the fire.

<sup>110</sup> The stoa was probably used for sacrificial dining; cf. in this respect *LSS* 111 with Sokolowski's commentary (p. 180). The stoas in the sanctuaries of Artemis at Brauron and of Demeter (west stoa) in Pergamum housed dining rooms. See in general B. Bergquist *Sympotic Space: A Functional Aspect of Greek Dining-Rooms*, in O. Murray (ed.), *Symptica: A Symposium on the Symposium*, Oxford, 1990, 37–65. For protection of stoas cf. *LSS* 43 (*CID* IV 85). For no fire see also *SEG* XXX 1037.80–82.

*Lodging.* Overnight encampment in stoas and elsewhere in sanctuaries seems to have posed a continuing problem. The inscription from the Letoon at Xanthus, *SEG XXXVI* 1221.11 14,<sup>111</sup> allows those offering sacrifices to encamp in the stoa. Other laws tended to be more severe. The third-century B.C. decree from the temple of Hera at Arkesine on Amorgos, *LSCG* 101, inscribed on the same stele with *LSCG* 100 (mentioned above),<sup>112</sup> commissions the *neokoros* to prevent any foreigners (ξένοι) from staying in the sanctuary;<sup>113</sup> failing to do so would result in a penalty of ten drachmas per day; the decree is to be inscribed in front of the sanctuary's gates.<sup>114</sup> In the decree from Cnidus, *LSAM* 55,<sup>115</sup> the prohibition against men or women lodging in the sanctuary of Dionysus Bacchus aims at maintaining its purity; the initiative came from what the inscription refers to as 'The Bacchi',<sup>116</sup> probably cult personnel<sup>117</sup> or perhaps a college of worshippers.<sup>118</sup>

*Trees and Vegetation.* Sanctuary groves and vegetation seem to have been incessantly in danger of damage, probably being regarded as a readily available source for firewood and timber and evidently exploited for grazing.<sup>119</sup> Prohibitions protecting them may appear in general documents such as the decree concerning the Piraeus Thesmophorion discussed above (*LSCG* 36.19–21), the Andania Mysteries regulations (*LSCG* 65.78–80), or the statutes of an Attic cult association (no. 5.45 below). Three specific documents are considered here: *LSCG* 37 (Ath-

<sup>111</sup> Quoted above p. 16.

<sup>112</sup> See previous subsection. The lower part of the stone bears *IG XII* 7, 68.

<sup>113</sup> The verb in question (4–5) is damaged; F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *IG XII* 7, 2, who consulted the squeeze, preferred κατά[ι]εσθαι. Ziehen's explanation that the foreigners are sailors putting to shore at Amorgos is attractive, though, from Hiller's account, his restoration seems to disagree with the remains on the stone (or the squeeze), as does Sokolowski's.

<sup>114</sup> Another decree, *LSCG* 102, dealing with the conduct of women at this sanctuary and instigated by a report of the priestess, is unfortunately all too fragmentary. The preamble of *SEG XXXVIII* 681 from Paros, referring to a report by the *neokoros* about occurrences in the sanctuary of Sarapis, is similar to the preamble of this inscription. Unfortunately almost nothing survives below.

<sup>115</sup> *ICnidios* 160; ca. second half of the fourth century B.C.

<sup>116</sup> Lines 3–4: περί ὧν τοι Βάκ[χοι] | ἐπῆλθον (Concerning the things about which the Bacchoi made an approach/motion (to the Cnidians); cf. Nilsson *GGR* II<sup>3</sup> 73. I do not follow the interpretation of Dillon 1997, 150–151.

<sup>117</sup> Hirschfeld's commentary ad loc. in *GIBM* IV 789.

<sup>118</sup> Dittenberger ad loc. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 978.

<sup>119</sup> For trees in general see B. Jordan and J. Perlin, 'On Protection of Sacred Groves,' in *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow on his Eightieth Birthday* (*GRBM* 10), Durham, NC, 1984, 153–159; Dillon 1997a, esp. 115, 121, 127.

ens; late fourth century B.C.) prohibits deforesting the sanctuary of Apollo Erithaseus and carrying away wood, twigs or rewood, and fallen leaves. The prohibition is a proclamation of the priest who makes it on behalf of himself, the demesmen, and the Athenian people. It functions in tandem with decree of the state, which steps in for the penal procedure.<sup>120</sup> A decree from the oracular sanctuary of Apollo at Korope, *LSCG* 84 (ca. 100 B.C.), is particularly revealing in regard to its background, purpose, and publication: the trees in the sanctuary have been decimated; out of a concern for the greatness of the sanctuary the city of Demetrias empowers the *neokoros* to ensure that it be made clear upon entry that no one is allowed to fell or cut trees or to lead in herds;<sup>121</sup> a copy of the decree is to be posted in the sanctuary for all visitors to see (it was inscribed on the same stone as *LSCG* 83).<sup>122</sup> Hefty fines for free persons and flogging for slaves are specified in both this and the Athenian document. The fourth-century B.C. fragment from Tamynai in Euboea, *LSCG* 91.9–12, imposes a one-hundred drachma fine for cutting or carrying away wood; grazing would result in confiscation of the animals.<sup>123</sup>

*Pasture.* Pasturing animals may, nevertheless, be allowed under certain conditions.<sup>124</sup> The inscription from the sanctuary of Athena Alea in Tegea,<sup>125</sup> *LSCG* 67, which discusses the rights and duties regarding pasturing animals by cult personnel, concedes the right of pasture to visitors, an exception specified, who attend the local festival. Pasturing animals, obviously would-be victims, is allowed to whoever visits the sanctuary for the purpose of offering sacrifice; outsiders are entitled to pasture their pair of yoke animals for no longer than a night

<sup>120</sup> Cf. Guarducci 1967–1978, IV, 19.

<sup>121</sup> Sheep and goats in particular are potentially as devastating to trees as to other vegetation because they eat foliage (cf. Dillon 1997a, 120–121); goats are even known to eat the bark off trees.

<sup>122</sup> See above pp. 10–11 and the article by L. Robert mentioned there. Cf. Dillon 1997a, 118–117, 120–121.

<sup>123</sup> For protection of vegetation see also *LSCG* 111, 148, 150; *TAM* V 590; cf. *LSS* 36 and the liberally restored *LSS* 81 (*IG* XII 6, 171). For protection of groves cf. the two Latin inscriptions found near Spolegium, *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 366 and 2872 with J. Bodel, *Graveyards and Groves: A Study of the Lex Lucerina* (*AJAH* 11, 1986), Cambridge, Mass. 1994, 24–29. For pasture cf. Parker and Obbink 2001, 237–238 no. 4A 19–23, which requires the priest to prevent pasturing in the sanctuary.

<sup>124</sup> In general see S. Isager, *Sacred Animals in Classical and Hellenistic Greece*, in T. Linders and B. Alroth (eds.), *Economics of Cult in the Ancient Greek World: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1990* (*Boreas* 21), Uppsala, 1992, 15–20; cf. Dillon 1997a, 121–123.

<sup>125</sup> See above p. 25.



and a day.<sup>126</sup> Failure, on the part of cult personnel and visitors, to comply with any of the stipulations would result in fines. A neat distinction between private and sanctuary-owned animals is found at Delphi in an amphictyonic decree of 178/7, *LSCG* 79,<sup>127</sup> which reserves a portion, its boundaries specified, of the sacred land for the sacred cows and horses. Grazing by privately owned animals is forbidden, and trespassing would result in a punishment (now lost); the decree is to be displayed in the sanctuary.<sup>128</sup>

*Dumping and Littering.*<sup>129</sup> The fourth-century B.C. decree from Chios, *LSCG* 116, which sets out mainly to protect the sacred groves where it was displayed, is concerned with two offences: pasturing and dumping manure; a penal procedure is prescribed for both. Regulations concerning manure, mainly prohibitions against dumping it on sanctuary grounds (contrast the 380 B.C. law of the Delphic amphictyony, *LSCG* 78.21, which appears to forbid carrying manure out from the sacred land), are, in fact, quite common. *LSS* 53, a 202 B.C. decree from Delos clearly declares its purpose: purification has been taken near the altar of Dionysus; in order to maintain the purity of the place and of the precinct of Leto, dumping of [κό]προ[ν], here probably waste from sacrificial animals, and of σποδός (ashes) is forbidden (lines 7–8); penalties are prescribed as usual.<sup>130</sup> In *LSCG* 67 responsibilities concerning manure at the sanctuary of Athena Alea in Tegea are assigned to the *damiourgos*. The stone is damaged, but these responsibilities seem to have involved discarding manure on a given date. As for littering in general, the sale of a priesthood from Calchedon, *LSAM* 5.26 (1st century B.C.–1st century A.D.), requires the priest, who is to open the temple of Asclepius daily, to keep the adjacent stoa clean.

<sup>126</sup> Cf. Xenophon, *Anabasis*, 5.3.11–12.

<sup>127</sup> For a full amphictyonic list see *CID* IV 108.

<sup>128</sup> For pasture cf. also *LSCG* 105.

<sup>129</sup> Cf. Dillon 1997a, 125–127.

<sup>130</sup> For the date and the interpretation of this inscription see P. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*, Paris, 1970, 210, 305–308. For animal waste cf. *LSCG* 9. In general and particularly on the meaning of κόπρος and on the vocabulary of animal waste see G. N. Mithras, Μεδ' ὄνθον ἐγβάλλειν: Regulations Concerning Everyday Life in a Greek *Temenos*, in R. Hagg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence* (ActaAth-8° 13), Stockholm, 59–64 (the quote is from the Hecatompædon inscription, *LSCG* 3.11). For manure see also *LSCG* 57; for littering and dumping cf. *LSCG* 108 (the classification of this document as a sacred law is not beyond question; see: *Nomima* II p. 330).

*Water Sources.*<sup>131</sup> Sanctuaries also had to resort to prohibitions in an attempt to protect their water sources. These may be polluted by offerings. A fourth-century B.C. decree from the Coan Asclepieum,<sup>132</sup> *LSCG* 152, attempts to divert offerings to the Nymphs from the springs<sup>133</sup> to an altar. Those who nevertheless hang on to this evidently stubborn practice had this not been the case there would have been no need for the decree and throw cakes or anything else into the water are required to purify the sanctuary as is customary. More mundane activities are discussed elsewhere. A Delian document of the fifth century B.C., *LSS* 50, forbids washing anything, dipping, or dumping in the spring Minoe, the penalty for which is two drachmas.<sup>134</sup> The Athenian *LSS* 4 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 257; 440–430 B.C.) is concerned with the prevention of soaking and tanning of skins – probably of sacrificial victims<sup>135</sup> in the Ilissus upstream (καθύπερθεν) from the precinct of Heracles. The fragmentary and overly restored Samian second-century A.D. *LSS* 81<sup>136</sup> seems to forbid (line 6) drawing water from the spring Imbrasos in the sacred grove of Hera; preventing the exploitation of this grove is the document's primary concern.

*Sacred Animals.* Certain gods had sacred animals (distinguished from sanctuary-owned herds, for which see above on pasture). We hear of pigeons which are to remain free as the sole possession of Aphrodite<sup>137</sup> at Aphrodisias in the fragmentary decree of Silius Italicus, *LSAM* 86 (A.D. 77). More relevant here are the sacred fish in a sanctuary of an unnamed goddess in the ca. first-century B.C. law from Smyrna, *LSAM* 17 (*I.Smyrna* 735). That divine-owned animals are not immune from human harm is already suggested by the slaughter and consumption of Helius cattle by Odysseus comrades in *Odyssey* 12 (340–402). The sacred fish of Smyrna were likewise a possible target for human mischief. The law concerning them discusses the treatment of a fish which

<sup>131</sup> Cf. Dillon 1997a, 125–126; Cole 1988, esp. 161–162. For the management of sanctuary water resources cf. below p. 80.

<sup>132</sup> See S.M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos* (Hypomnemata 51), Göttingen, 1978, 328.

<sup>133</sup> Cf. perhaps *LSAM* 57.

<sup>134</sup> Cf. *IG* XII 5, 569.

<sup>135</sup> Sokolowski *LSS* p. 19.

<sup>136</sup> See *IG* XII 6, 171 for a better text.

<sup>137</sup> I follow the interpretation of L. Robert, 'Les colombes d'Anastase', *JSAV* 1971, 81–105 (= *OMS* VII, 159–105) at 91–97 (169–175). Cf. F. Chamoux, 'Un pigeonnier antique près d'Apollonia en Cyrénaïque', *CRAI* 1972, 623–642 at 640.

has died of natural causes; it invokes divine favor upon those contributing to the goddess valuables and shpond; it opens, however, with a prohibition against harming the sh and damaging or stealing divine-owned equipment (see immediately below) enforced by the following imprecation (lines 5–8):

ὁ τούτων τι ποιῶν  
κακὸς κακῇ ἐξωλείαι ἀπό-  
λοιτο, ἰχθυόβρωτος γενόμε-  
νος.

May the evil person doing any such thing perish in an evil destruction having himself become food for sh.

*Sacred Equipment.* The provision aiming at protecting the goddess equipment in *LSAM* 17.2–3 recalls a few other inscriptions. A fragmentary document from Cyrene, *LSS* 117 (1st-second century B.C.) sets out to ensure that sanctuary-owned implements that worshippers may borrow for cooking or dining would not be purloined;<sup>138</sup> an inventory is appended.<sup>139</sup> Protection of sacred implements, not necessarily those which may be of use to worshippers, and of dedications (as in *LSAM* 74)<sup>140</sup> is encountered elsewhere. One of the earliest known sacred laws, *LSS* 27<sup>141</sup> from Argos (575–550?),<sup>142</sup> aims to protect sacred implements dedicated to Athena Polias from private use outside the precinct (cf. *LSCG* 116.22–25); they are to be used by the state for cult performance. The law stipulates their repair in the event of damage, assigning care for these matters to the *amphipolos*, a cult official probably identical with the better known *neokoros*.<sup>143</sup> Cult officials are frequently charged with responsibility for sacred equipment. *LSS* 127 (Athens; Roman Imperial period) provides a good illustration for a παράδοσις<sup>144</sup> requiring a priestess to hand over to her successor an inventory of the equipment with which she is entrusted upon entering her office. *LSAM* 11.18–22 and the fragmentary *LSCG* 144 are also significant in this respect. For furnishing equipment see *Iscr.Cos* ED 2B (a new fragment of *LSCG* 62).

<sup>138</sup> Cf. *LSS* 111.8–10 with J. and L. Robert *BE* 1955 no. 210.

<sup>139</sup> The list is missing in *LSS*; see *SEG* IX 73.

<sup>140</sup> Cf. immediately below.

<sup>141</sup> The names of the *damiourgoi* are omitted in *LSS*; see *SEG* XI 314; Buck, *GD* 83 and *Nomima* I no. 88 with further bibliography.

<sup>142</sup> *LSAG*<sup>2</sup> 168 no. 8; cf. 158.

<sup>143</sup> Sokolowski's commentary p. 65.

<sup>144</sup> Cf. Aleshire 1994, 15.

## Dedications

Sacred laws concerning dedications tend to deal with three main topics: protection of dedications, the actual dedication of objects and their placement, mostly discussed in an attempt to protect sanctuaries from being cluttered with unwanted dedications, and the reuse of old dedications.

*Protection.* Abuse of dedications may be covered by documents which protect sacred equipment in general.<sup>145</sup> A short document from Loryma, *LSAM* 74, (third century B.C.) is concerned with dedications in its entirety. They should not be carried out nor should they be harmed. The rest of the stone is badly damaged; if the rather reasonable restorations are accepted, it also restricted their placement.

*Dedication and Placement of Objects.* Dedication of objects in certain sanctuaries was so extensive that it had to be restricted and regulated to prevent the sanctuaries or specific areas inside them from being covered or cluttered up with dedications. A third-century B.C. decree from Rhodes, *LSS* 107, aims at stopping requests to dedicate statues and other objects in the sanctuary of Asclepius; requests for dedications in a defined area and where they block the *peripatoi* (covered walkways) are forbidden; dedications nevertheless placed there shall be relocated; the decree shall be displayed in the precinct. A contemporary decree from Miletus, *LSS* 123, forbids placing in the sanctuary of Apollo Delphinios any votive tablet (πίναξ)<sup>146</sup> or other dedications in the so-called new stoa, where they damage the woodwork or the columns; an alternative location is specified; offenders face a fine of ten staters sacred to Apollo.<sup>147</sup> A second-century B.C. document from Athens, *LSCG* 43, ordains the removal to a stoa of dedications which obstruct the cult statue or are not worthy of the sanctuary.<sup>148</sup>

An entirely different aspect of dedications is treated in *LSAM* 62 from Mylasa (*IMylasa* 301; end of the second century B.C.), a decree of the tribe of Hyarbesytai requiring tribesmen whom the tribe honors to dedicate within six months to Zeus of Hyarbesytai a silver cup

<sup>145</sup> See above pp. 25 (re) and 30 (sacred implements). For the treatment and protection of dedications see also *LSAM* 59.8–10 (discussed below p. 42).

<sup>146</sup> See A. Wilhelm, *Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde*, Vienna, 1909, 325–326.

<sup>147</sup> Cf. also *LSS* 43; *SEG* XXX 1037.82–83.

<sup>148</sup> For no dedication without authorization cf. also *LSCG* 50 A 12–14. The fragmentary *Iscr.Cos* ED 257 is relevant here although the prohibited location seems to be a gymnasium.

(ποτήριον) or *phiale* worth one-hundred drachmas. The dedication formula to be inscribed on the objects is specified; it ought to include the name of the dedicator, that he dedicated it to Zeus after being honored, and the weight. The prescriptions affect also members of other tribes honored by the present one, but the number of objects and their worth is tripled. An attempt to undo the decree would result in a penalty of 3000 drachmas. The practice prescribed is not exceptional; the document is.<sup>149</sup>

*Reuse of Dedications.* Whereas damaging or stealing dedications is a grave offence,<sup>150</sup> they may be reused for a higher cause. The corpus contains three documents, all of them decrees, *LSCG* 41 (221–220 B.C.) and 42 (second century B.C.), both from the sanctuary of the Hero Doctor at Athens,<sup>151</sup> and *LSCG* 70 (*I.Oropos* 324; late third century B.C.) from the Amphiareum at Oropus, concerning the creation of new cult implements through melting down metal dedications.<sup>152</sup> A certain procedure is followed with few changes in all three cases. It can be summarized as follows: inasmuch as some cult implements have become worn and are no longer of use, or the offering of new objects is otherwise desired, it is decided to furnish the divinity with new implements by melting down old dedicated objects; a special committee is appointed to compile an inventory of these, recording the weight of each object and should it be inscribed the details of the dedicator; repairs may be made when possible; otherwise, objects are melted down to create the new implements; inventories of the melted objects (omitted in *LSCG*) are published together with the decrees describing the procedure. To keep the Hero Doctor content, *LSCG* 41.45–47 adds a special sacrifice, an *aresteron*,<sup>153</sup> to the program. Evidently the purpose of the publication of these decrees is not quite to prescribe the procedure: the inventories, if nothing else, suggest publication *post factum*<sup>154</sup> but to account for the proper execution of what might be seen as an abuse of divine property (with respect to the actions of those involved) and to

<sup>149</sup> W.H.D. Rouse, *Greek Votive Offerings: An Essay in the History of Greek Religion*, Cambridge, 1902, 260–261.

<sup>150</sup> E.g. Plato *Leg.* 853d–854a.

<sup>151</sup> Cf. the fragmentary 244/3 B.C. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1534 B (+ 1535 + Aleshire 1991, 5–11; see *SEG* XXXIX 166 and XLI 107) from the city Asclepieum.

<sup>152</sup> See T. Linders, 'The Melting Down of Discarded Metal Offerings in Greek Sanctuaries', *ScAnt* 3.4, 1989–1990, 281–285.

<sup>153</sup> See above p. 6.

<sup>154</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1539.1–11 is particularly instructive in this respect.

perpetuate the original idea behind the dedication of objects, the physical existence of which has been forfeited, as it happens, without the consent of the original dedicator.<sup>155</sup>

The A.D. 22 decree from Lindus, *LSS* 90, envisions an entirely different mode of exploiting old dedications. Apparently the city had run out of money to support the cult of Zeus Polieus and Athena Lindia. A few measures were, accordingly, taken to restore the sacred funds. Alongside soliciting donations and gratuitous performance of cult on the part of cult officials, these measures included, inter alia, selling bronze and iron objects stored in the *neokoreion* (lines 18–30) and selling the right to dedicate old statues in the sanctuary on the acropolis of Lindus by inscribing their bases, in order that it be known that they are dedicated to the gods (lines 30–44). The document is unparalleled; not so the practice of rededicating old portrait statues, even those with inscribed bases, as novel as the idea might appear; it existed elsewhere and seems to have been common enough on the Athenian Acropolis in the Roman period.<sup>156</sup>

#### Founding, Construction, Repair, and Maintenance of Sanctuaries

Some sanctuaries are founded by gods. Such is the case of the sanctuary at Delphi, founded, as we learn from the Homeric Hymn, by Apollo, who is also known to have used his construction skills to build his famous horn altar on Delos (Callimachus *Hymn to Apollo* 59–64).<sup>157</sup> In several other cases, the founding and building of sanctuaries are left to humans as are their routine maintenance and random repair, which ultimately became the case at Delphi and Delos as well. The tendency to record such matters at different stages has left us a variety of inscriptions, including a fair number of those which can be counted as sacred laws concerning them. The function of such documents is not necessarily uniform. The actions specified might have been completed in the past or (in the case of construction) are to be completed in the future (in both cases the inscription is ultimately a record); they may also be recurrent, i.e. in the case of maintenance and performance of cult.

<sup>155</sup> Cf. Linders *ibid.* 83–84.

<sup>156</sup> See e.g. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3850 and 4159, 3916 and 4915, 4189 and 4323; C.M. Keesling, *Early Hellenistic Portrait Statues in Athens: Survival, Reuse, Transformation*, in P. Schultz and R. von den Hoff (eds.), *Early Hellenistic Portraiture: Image, Style, Context* (forthcoming).

<sup>157</sup> On the horn altar cf. below commentary on 16.1–2.

*Founding Sanctuaries.* While cult may be performed without a sanctuary, sanctuaries are territories consecrated to the performance of cult<sup>158</sup> and their foundation tends to be discussed together with the foundation of cult. Endowed foundation documents are discussed below. Here we should mention the very few documents which focus more on a sanctuary than on prescribing the details of cult activity and on ensuring the means for perpetuating its performance.

The 333/2 B.C. *LSCG* 34 records decrees of the Athenian council and assembly (Lycurgus made the motion) granting Phoenician merchants from Citium residing in the Piraeus the right of tenure of land (ἐγκτησις)<sup>159</sup> for founding a sanctuary to Aphrodite. The cult itself is not discussed.<sup>160</sup> *LSCG* 180 from Paros (mid-third century B.C.)<sup>161</sup> records responses of the Delphic oracle to a certain Mnesiepes regarding founding altars and offering sacrifices, in the precinct that he is preparing, to the poet Archilochus and poetry-related gods, and to a number of other gods, instructing him to send *soteria* (sc. offerings) to Delphi. A statement that Apollo's instructions have been followed and that sacrifice to Archilochus and to the other gods is offered at the so called Archilocheion is added (lines 16–19):

χρήσαντος δὲ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ταῦτα τὸν τε τόπον  
καλοῦμεν Ἀρχιλόχειον καὶ τοὺς βωμοὺς ἰδρῦμεθα  
καὶ θύομεν καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ Ἀρχιλόχοι καὶ  
τιμῶμεν αὐτόν, καθ' ἃ ὁ θεὸς ἐθέσπισεν ἡμῖν.

Apollo having so declared, we call this place the Archilocheion, we have founded the altar, and we sacrifice both to the gods and to Archilochus and we honor him according to what the god has prophesied to us.

Perhaps it is possible to assume that, despite the indirect imperatives, the inscription did not merely record the foundation, authorized as it was by the oracle, but also that it functioned as a sacred law governing

<sup>158</sup> Cf. e.g. W. Burkert, *Greek Temple-Builders: Who, Where, Why?* in R. Hägg (ed.), *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis* (ActaAth-4<sup>o</sup> 14), Stockholm, 1996, 21–29.

<sup>159</sup> J. Pecirka, *The Formula for Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions* (Acta Universitatis Carolinae Philosophica et Historica Monographia 15), Prague, 1966, 59–61.

<sup>160</sup> In a preamble to a decree dated to 261/0 B.C. (cf. below p. 88 with n. 468), *LSCG* 46.4–9, the Piraeus Thracian Orgeones of Bendis proudly recall rights of land tenure and of founding a sanctuary alongside the right to hold a procession in honor of the goddess. See Pecirka *ibid.* 122–130.

<sup>161</sup> Fontenrose 1978, 266 H74.

subsequent cult practice.<sup>162</sup> Such a double function is more evident in *LSS* 17, recording the dedication of a sanctuary to the river Cephissus by one Xenokrateia, encouraging those who wish to sacrifice there.<sup>163</sup>

A similar state of affairs can be encountered in a few other foundation documents, though their ultimate concern tends to gravitate toward prescribing the cult and ensuring cult activity. The second-century B.C. *LSCG* 171 from Isthmus on Cos records the foundation of a precinct to Artemis (epithet missing), Zeus Hikesios, and the Theoi Patrooi, an individual having been dedicated to their service;<sup>164</sup> local activities are to follow instructions in the sacred tablet (ἱερὰ δέλτος) and other instructions left upon founding which evidently provided more details. The present stele, the scope of which appears more limited, nonetheless lists the essential cathartic requirements for entry:

ἀγνὸν εἰσπορεύεσθαι τὸ δὲ ἱερὸν ἔστω  
τῶν υἱῶν πάντων κοινόν ἀπὸ λεχοῦς καὶ  
ἐγ δια(φθ)ορᾶς ἁμέρας δέκα, ἀπὸ γυναικὸς τρεῖς[ς].

Enter pure the sanctuary shall be forever common to all sons after a birth and abortion/miscarriage<sup>165</sup> ten days; after sexual intercourse with a woman three.

<sup>162</sup> I personally doubt this very much and would rather not include comparable documents in the corpus (in fact, including this inscription in *LSCG* seems to have been an afterthought). Other oracles of this kind such as *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 735 (cf. below p. 106), *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4969, and *SEG* XXIV 1031 (= *XLV* 912; cf. the article by Avram and Lefèvre cited immediately below) where direct control over the performance of cult is not self-evident, have been left out (cf., however, *LSAM* 47). I suspect that the undated and very fragmentary *LSAM* 87 (cf. *SEG* XII 478 (no text); *BE* 1954 no. 229 p. 170) from Caunus could be an oracle of this sort. Lines 34–35 of this inscription read [- -] δὲ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι - - [- -] πέμπειν. ὅ ἐπειδὴ - - [-]. Considering Πυθῶδε τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι σωτήριᾳ πέμπειν in lines 7 and 13 of the Parian document, the restoration [Πυθῶ]δε τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι | σωτήριᾳ] πέμπειν. ὅ ἐπειδὴ - - [-] might be possible (perhaps also in line 43: [- -] πέμπειν. ὅ ἐπ[ειδὴ] - - [-]). (The restoration must remain tentative, however; the editor, G.E. Bean, (*JHS* 73, 1953 28–29 no. 9) asserts that the average length of the lines is ca. 36–37, and the line break eludes me). A. Avram and F. Lefèvre (*Les cultes de Callatis et l'oracle de Delphes*, *REG* 108, 1995, 7–23 at 10) tentatively restore the same phrase in *I.Kallatis* 48 B b 3 (*SEG* XLV 911B). For the *soteria* see there.

<sup>163</sup> See at length A.L. Purvis, *Founders and Innovators of Private Cults in Classical Greece*, Diss., Duke University, 1998, 24–54.

<sup>164</sup> The foundation belongs together with endowed family foundations (S.M. Sherwin-White, *Inscriptions from Cos*, *ZPE* 24, 1977, 205–217 at 213), but the document itself is not characteristic of such foundations (see below pp. 86–87), for which reason it is discussed here.

<sup>165</sup> See on 7.6–7 below.



*Foundations Prohibited.* A different aspect of foundations is discussed in the rider to the so-called Athenian First Fruits Decree *LSCG* 5.54–59 (*IG I<sup>3</sup>* 78; ca. 422 B.C.):<sup>166</sup>

τὸν δὲ βασιλέα χορίσαι τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ ἐν τ[ῷ]-  
 ι Πελαργικῷ, καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν μὲ ἐνῆιδρύεσθαι βομὸς ἐν τῷ Πελα-  
 ργικῷ ἄνευ τῆς βολῆς καὶ τοῦ δέμο, μεδὲ τὸς λίθος τέμνειν ἐκ τοῦ [Π]-  
 ἐλαργικῷ, μεδὲ γένεσθαι ἐξάγειν μεδὲ λίθος.

The king archon shall x the boundaries of the sanctuaries/sacred precincts in the Pelargikon, and in the future no one shall found altars, cut the stones from the Pelargikon or take out earth or stones without (the authorization of) the council and the demos.

Offenders, it is added, would have to face a 500 drachma penalty and impeachment. The exact significance of parts of the text and the historical context within which the prohibitions should be placed have given rise to much discussion.<sup>167</sup> It is indeed likely for the measures specified here to have addressed specific exigencies. They do not have a close parallel in the corpus of sacred laws.

*Construction of Temples.* The corpus of sacred laws is rather selective in regard to temple construction. Only a handful of documents which govern the construction of temples in some detail<sup>168</sup> and allow an insight into the underlying procedure is included. Factors such as the scale of the work and its sponsorship, individual or public, affect the range of issues discussed; as it is, undertakings are preceded or inspired by divine consultation, and records, in the form of the inscriptions we have, are required to be published.

A second-century B.C. inscription from Anaphe, *LSCG* 129, features a decree and incorporates other documents. A certain Timotheos, who sought an oracular response<sup>169</sup> to the question whether he should obtain the city's permission to build in the sanctuary of Asclepius or Apollo Asgelatas a temple, which would be public, to Aphrodite, was instructed to build the temple in the sanctuary of Apollo, and to have the decree, the oracle, and the request, embodying a fairly detailed plan for the work, for which older materials were used, inscribed on a

<sup>166</sup> Or the early-mid 430s B.C.: M.B. Cavanaugh, *Eleusis and Athens: Documents in Finance, Religion and Politics in the Fifth Century B.C.*, Atlanta, 1996, 73–95.

<sup>167</sup> Cavanaugh *ibid.* 89–92; S.B. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion: The People, Their Dedications, and The Inventories*, Amsterdam 1989, 9 n. 1.

<sup>168</sup> It may be prescribed or mentioned in documents such as *LSCG* 12 A 11–13 or *LSS* 86 (see below p. 59) where it is not the main focus.

<sup>169</sup> Fontenrose 1978, 261 H54.

stele once construction has been completed. The publication, dependent in the oracle upon completion of the construction, is *post factum*. The inscription does not quite prescribe the work but serves as a record, accounting for it and for the conditions under which it was undertaken. In this sense this document is both similar to and different from a ca. 335 B.C. document of the Chian phratry of the Klytidai, *LSCG* 118.<sup>170</sup> The construction in question is not quite a temple but what the text calls a sacred house (οἶκος τεμένιος ἱερός/ἱερός οἶκος) built in the precinct of the phratry to lodge permanently the κοινὰ or πατρῷα ἱερά, probably statues and/or other cult-related paraphernalia,<sup>171</sup> transferred from private houses. The inscription, placed near the entry to the house (lines 40 41), is at once a record and an active sacred law. It includes three decrees: the first, the beginning of which is lost, concerns the building of the house and the transfer of the *hiera*; in the second (10 22) the Klytidai decree that the *hiera* should lodge in the house permanently; the third (22 36) is the only one which actually functions as a sacred law, as it governs the use of the house, now lodging the *hiera*; it is to sustain no private use, at the risk of a penalty and imprecations. The construction of the house and transfer of the *hiera* required divine consultation, and omens had to be obtained from sacri ces before the passing of the first and second decrees. From the publication clause (36 41) we learn that the stele, now broken above, was similar in format to the inscription from Anaphe, recording the consultations in addition to the decrees.

Neither one of these documents discusses any financial aspects of the construction; in the Anaphe case this may be because the construction was a private endeavor, enabled to an extent by the relatively minor scale of the project and the reuse of old material.<sup>172</sup> This was probably not the case in the ca. 400 B.C.<sup>173</sup> decree from Erythrae, *SEG* XXXVI 1039, on the subject of constructing a temple and a statue for Aphrodite Pandemos, inspired by an oracular consultation (line 3). The text is unfortunately all too fragmentary; the care for the works is to be entrusted to a committee of five elected men. The ca. 230–220 B.C.

<sup>170</sup> Graf 1985, 428–429 and 32–37.

<sup>171</sup> Ziehen *LGS* II p. 295 n. 4.

<sup>172</sup> Cf. L. Migeotte, *Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités grecques*, Geneva/Québec 1992, 80.

<sup>173</sup> Or later. See *SEG* XXXIX 1238.

decree from Tanagra, *LSCG* 72, is much more informative.<sup>174</sup> It discusses the relocation of the suburban sanctuary of Demeter and Kore into the city, after Apollo had first been consulted. An ad hoc committee is elected; subscription is employed to ensure the speedy construction of the sanctuary, and pledges are encouraged from women; public funds would be used should additional money be needed.<sup>175</sup> Pledges are also encouraged in two ca. 200 B.C. decrees, published by Parker and Obbink 2001a, 253–265 no. 1, to complete the stalled construction of a temple of Apollo in Halasarna.

*Other Construction.* *LSCG* 75 prescribed the construction of a fountain house;<sup>176</sup> *LSCG* 155 the construction of a *thesauros* in the Asclepieum at Cos.<sup>177</sup> One should also mention here the three fragments from Olymus *SEG* XXXIX 1135–1137, on furnishing a temple of Leto with various cult objects (table, incense altar, *phiale* (1135.14–16) are certain; a stone altar (1135.15) is probable; a statue (1135.10) possible).

*Repair Works.* The most complete sacred law on this subject is *LSCG* 44, a 52/1 B.C. Athenian decree granting the chosen priest of Asclepius and Hygieia his request to make repairs in the city Asclepieum at his own cost and dictating the formulas by which the priest is to dedicate the works upon completion.<sup>178</sup> The decree regarding the repair of the statue of Athena Nike, *LSCG* 35 (mid-fourth century B.C.), while not too instructive about the works due to its fragmentary state, is revealing in respect to the concomitant ritual, as it prescribes the offering of an *aresterion*, a sacrifice needed upon alterations made to divine property which, as has been said above, was prescribed for the repairs at the Oropian Amphiareum and for the melting down of dedications of the Hero Doctor.<sup>179</sup> Financial aspects of sacred repair works seem to have

<sup>174</sup> T. Reinach, Un temple élevé par les femmes de Tanagra, *REG* 12, 1899, 53–115; Migeotte (above n. 172) 75–81 no. 28.

<sup>175</sup> There follows a second decree with a list of women and their pledges. Ninety-two women pledged 5 drachmas; two pledged 3 drachmas; three 2 drachmas and one 1 drachma: Reinach *ibid.* 62–63, 78. An older list (ca. 260–250 B.C.) of women who dedicated garments and gold objects survives on the other side of the stone. For the text and the date see M. Casevitz, Remarques sur la langue des inventaires de Tanagra, *Boeotia Antiqua* 3, Amsterdam 1993, 3–9 (= *SEG* XLIII 212).

<sup>176</sup> See above pp. 6–7.

<sup>177</sup> See also *LSAM* 73.29–35 discussed below pp. 51–52.

<sup>178</sup> See S.B. Aleshire, *The Athenian Asklepieion: The People, Their Dedications, and The Inventories*, Amsterdam 1989, 32–34.

<sup>179</sup> See above pp. 6, 32.

been discussed in the fragmentary decree from Iasus, *I.Iasos* 219.<sup>180</sup> Cf. perhaps *I.Labraunda* 56.

*Maintenance.* An early third-century B.C. Athenian decree, *LSCG* 39, prescribes the purification of the sanctuary of Aphrodite Pandemos to be performed before her procession. A dove is to be offered for purification; the altars are to be anointed (i.e. plastered or whitewashed),<sup>181</sup> the doors covered with pitch, the ἑδῆ (evidently seated statues<sup>182</sup>) washed. The much discussed 380 B.C. law of the Delphic amphictyony, *LSCG* 78, concerns repair works to be performed before the Pythia among other matters pertinent to sanctuary management.

*Leasing Sacred Property.* Leasing of sacred property was common enough in ancient Greece; pertinent documents are not particularly rare.<sup>183</sup> Their inclusion in the corpus of sacred laws is justified, as Ziehen has established,<sup>184</sup> only insofar as they actually govern cult practice.

*Sanctuaries.* A 418/7 B.C. Athenian decree, *LSCG* 14, prescribes letting out the sanctuary of Kodros, Neleus, and Basile. The period of the lease is twenty years; the rent is ultimately to be handed over to the Treasurers of the Other Gods and used for religious purposes. An appended lease handles the use of the land: it is to be planted with olives;<sup>185</sup> matters pertaining to water use are elaborately discussed. Before leasing, the boundaries of the precinct have to be fixed. As in the earlier case of the Pelargikon,<sup>186</sup> the state's highest religious authority, the archon basileus,<sup>187</sup> is involved in this. As *LSCG* 32 (352/1 B.C.) reveals, a sweeping initiative concerning the care of all divine-owned Athenian territories would appear in the next century (lines 16–23), resulting from the controversy over the boundaries of the Sacred Orgas at Eleusis, its cultivation, and the wish (or so it seems) to lease it out (24–25).<sup>188</sup>

<sup>180</sup> For a general interpretation of this document see J. and L. Robert *BE* 1973 no. 428.

<sup>181</sup> Cf. below commentary on 27 A 13.

<sup>182</sup> *LSJ* s.v. I 3.

<sup>183</sup> See commentary on no. 18 below.

<sup>184</sup> *LGS* II pp. II–IV, 123.

<sup>185</sup> See Dillon 1997a, 117.

<sup>186</sup> See above p. 36.

<sup>187</sup> *Athenaion Politeia* 57.

<sup>188</sup> In a wider context see H. Bowden, 'The Function of the Delphic Amphictyony before 346 BCE', *SCI* 22, 2003, 67–83 at 73–75. For the related oracular consultation see Fontenrose 1978, 251 H21. Boundary stones are evidently the concern of *LSCG* 149; interpretation is, however, difficult. See P. Roesch *AntCl* 40, 1971, 208–209.

The leasing of a private Athenian sanctuary, that of Egretes, let out by this hero's *orgeones*, is governed by *LSCG* 47 (307/6 B.C.), not a sacred law proper, as Ziehen noted,<sup>189</sup> but an actual lease which the lessee was required to publish. The period of the lease is ten years, and the lessee takes upon himself to repair and maintain the property,<sup>190</sup> not to interfere with cult activity, and, moreover, to facilitate the *orgeones*' annual sacrifice to the hero.<sup>191</sup>

*Other Sacred Property.* The fourth-century B.C. Thasian *LSCG* 115 governs the leasing out of a so-called garden of Heracles including an area where manure was dumped. It is primarily concerned with keeping this area clean, entrusting, at the risk of a fine, the supervision to pertinent civic and religious officials.<sup>192</sup> Sacred property of a different type, sanctuary shops, are leased out in the Samian decree known as the Charter of the Shopkeepers at the Heraion; it gives a particularly vivid picture of the everyday realities of a major Greek sanctuary. See no. 18 below.<sup>193</sup>

### *Cult Officials*

Documents discussing cult performance of different kinds or sanctuary management may direct their attention to cult officials as needed. Here, however, we should review those documents where cult officials are the primary focus. Although the variety of officials mentioned in one way or another in the corpus is not particularly small, such documents are, with few exceptions, concerned with priests.

### Priesthoods

One may distinguish between two basic groups of documents: priesthood regulations, i.e. documents governing the actual function of priests and their appointment, and a few other documents<sup>194</sup> whose primary concern lies elsewhere. Documents belonging to the second

<sup>189</sup> *LGS* II p. 123.

<sup>190</sup> Special attention is devoted to trees: Dillon 1997a, 116–117.

<sup>191</sup> The otherwise comparable leases of the *orgeones* of Hypodektes, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2501, and of the *orgeones* of the Hero Doctor, *Nouveau Choix* no. 27, are not as detailed in respect to cult performance and are therefore not included in the corpus. For *LSCG* 47 and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2501 cf. Mikalson 1998, 147 nos. 8 and 10.

<sup>192</sup> See further *IG* XII Suppl. 353.

<sup>193</sup> For the future in leases cf. p. 49 with n. 241 below.

<sup>194</sup> Notably those stipulating the creation of priestly catalogs (see *Varia* p. 53 below).

group are by and large specific. Priesthood regulations can, on the other hand, be comprehensive and discuss various aspects of the priesthood, or specific, discussing a particular aspect, mostly priestly prerogatives. Legislation, mostly in the form of decrees, is the norm; contracts (vel sim.)<sup>195</sup> appear in the case of sale of priesthoods. As regards the priesthoods themselves, one can distinguish between hereditary priesthoods, entitlement to which is gained through birth into a priestly family, and priesthoods acquired in a different way.

### Comprehensive and Specific Regulations

*Comprehensive Regulations.* In most cases the fragmentary state of some documents precludes certainty—comprehensive regulations tend to be issued upon entry into office, upon the creation of a priesthood, or upon revisions, mostly in the mode of acquisition. The majority of such documents come from places where the sale of priesthoods was common, inter alia due to a need for repeated publication whenever a priesthood was sold. Naturally, factors such as the character and significance of the cult, local customs, the mode of acquisition, and the issuing body (public or private) affect the scope of the documents and the range of issues discussed; payments, for example, would only be discussed when the priesthood is sold. Nevertheless, since most documents are first and foremost concerned with the rights and duties of priests and since ordinarily the basic functions of priests tend to be similar—cultic variations permitted—, comprehensive regulations are primarily geared toward a similar repertoire of topics. Among these topics sacral prerogatives occupy a place of honor, to the extent that they may be discussed independently in specific documents (see below). The second-century B.C. *LSAM* 37, a contract for the sale of the priesthood of Dionysus Phleus from Priene, is a convenient example for the range of other issues commonly discussed. Besides addressing matters directly related to the sale (namely payment), the document discusses recurrent matters like exemptions from taxes and duties (here dependent upon the amount paid for the priesthood: lines 24–30), priestly prerogatives, sacral accessories,<sup>196</sup> entitlement to a front seat at the games, clothes and apparel, and cult activity.

<sup>195</sup> See further below pp. 49–50.

<sup>196</sup> Cf. below commentary on 19.2.

Two Coan documents, *LSCG* 154 (250–240 B.C.(?)) and 156 (*Iscr.Cos* 55; 370–360 B.C.(?)),<sup>197</sup> are in a way a class onto themselves. They start by prescribing purity rules for priests but contain much other information and seem to represent extensive religious legislation.<sup>198</sup> Both are very fragmentary, Rudolf Herzog's restorations being ingenious to the extent of hardly admitting partial endorsement or rejection. *LSCG* 156 A concerns the priesthood of Zeus Polieus, listing purity rules and rules governing the installation of the priest. **B** lists rules governing the priesthood of Apollo Dalios. *LSCG* 154 is notable for the evident role Coan *exegetai* played in its publication.<sup>199</sup> **A** sets out to ensure (5–6) that the purity and purification [and sacrifices(?)] be accomplished according to the ancestral and sacred laws,<sup>200</sup> stipulating the publication of steles bearing (line 9) what is written in the sacred laws<sup>201</sup> regarding the subject matter (lines 7–9) in specific locations. Purity rules—sadly fragmentary—in two cults of Demeter are then listed (21–46 (II)). **B** (III) seems concerned with various cases of ritual pollution<sup>202</sup> but becomes very fragmentary.

*Specific Regulations.* From the opening statement of *LSAM* 59 from Iasus (*I.Iasos* 220; ca. 400 B.C.); κατὰ τάδε ἱερᾶσθω ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Μεγίστου,<sup>203</sup> one might expect a general discussion of the priestly function. Nevertheless, what follows is mainly concerned with prerogatives due to the priest from a variety of sacrifices.<sup>204</sup> These prerogatives, which are usually prominently featured in comprehensive regulations, are indeed the most frequent topic of specific ones. The publication clause of the third-century B.C. regulations for the priest of Zeus (epithet lost) and Poseidon from Thebes at Mycale, *LSAM* 40, which discusses little more than priestly prerogatives, requires that they be inscribed on a stele and placed in the sanctuary of Athena near the altar of Zeus Polieus. Perhaps governing sacrificial activity thereon

<sup>197</sup> The dates are according to Parker and Obbink 2000, 420.

<sup>198</sup> See *LSCG* p. 275; Parker and Obbink 2000, 421.

<sup>199</sup> See (e.g.) F. Jacoby, *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*, Oxford, 1949, 237 n. 2.

<sup>200</sup> ὅπως ταῖ τε ἀγνεῖαι καὶ τοῖ κα[θαρμοὶ καὶ ταῖ θυσίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐ]||ροὺς καὶ πατρίους νόμους συντελῶντα[ι κτλ].

<sup>201</sup> τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς νόμοις.

<sup>202</sup> See summarily Nilsson *GGR* II<sup>3</sup> 73–74; cf. below n. 407.

<sup>203</sup> The priest of Zeus Megistos shall serve according to the following.

<sup>204</sup> The treatment of dedications, the priest's punishment in case of transgression on his part (cf. below), and the protection of the document are also briefly discussed.

was taken into account.<sup>205</sup> At least some of the regulations governing priestly prerogatives specifically functioned in such a way. The most obvious object of such documents is to ensure the priests their sacrificial dues.<sup>206</sup> *LSAM* 45 (Miletus; 380/379 B.C.), which supplements an existing document listing prerogatives and sets a penal procedure for those denying the priestess of Artemis her prerogatives, certainly points in this direction. But punishments may be prescribed not only for worshippers but also for priests who take more than their due (*LSS* 113; Axos; fifth century B.C.).<sup>207</sup> The publication of the rules governing distribution of the sacrificial meat between the priests and other partakers in the sacrifice is therefore beneficial for both sides. Should controversies arise and punishments suggest that they did both can refer to the written regulations, especially those posted at the very place where the sacrifice is performed, to assert their rights.<sup>208</sup> The regulations thus ensure the maintenance of proper sacrificial procedure. As it is, most of the pertinent evidence comes from Chios and it must be admitted that some of the fragmentary documents might have belonged originally to more comprehensive sets of regulations.<sup>209</sup> This might be true also of the substantial fragment from Miletus *LSAM* 46 (ca. 300 B.C.) envisioning a variety of public and private sacrificial occasions and appropriate prerogatives. The fragmentary Athenian *LSCG* 11 B (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 255; ca. 430 B.C.) and 28 (*SEG* XLVI 173; early fourth century B.C.) regulate priestly prerogatives in a more comprehensive way, listing together prerogatives of various priesthoods. *LSCG* 28, the more substantial one,

<sup>205</sup> Cf. T. Wiegand, *Priene*, Berlin 1904, 471. The sale of a priesthood of Aphrodite Pandamos and Pontia, Parker and Obbink 2000 no. 1, is also published near the altar (line 46). The central location of altars in sanctuaries is of course a consideration.

<sup>206</sup> Cf. Aristophanes *Plutus* 1173–1175, where the priest who, as sacrifice is no longer offered, is deprived of sacrificial prerogatives complains that: Ἄφ' οὗ γὰρ ὁ Πλοῦτος οὗτος ἤρξατο βλέπειν, | ἀπόλωλ' ὑπὸ λιμοῦ καταφαγεῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἔχω, | καὶ τὰτα τοῦ σωτήρος ἱερεὺς ὢν Διός. Ever since this Plutus started to see (and people stopped offering sacrifice), I am dying of starvation. I have nothing to eat, despite being a priest of Zeus Soter.

<sup>207</sup> See also *LSCG* 107 and in general commentary on 20.21–23 below; in *LSAM* 59.67 infringement of the regulations would cost the priest his office.

<sup>208</sup> For a controversy in which priestly prerogatives were involved see *ILabraunda* 1.

<sup>209</sup> See Chios: *LSCG* 117 (fragmentary); 119 (genos); 120; *LSS* 76 (fragmentary); 129; 130 (fragmentary); below no. 20. Athens: *LSCG* 19 (the phratry of the Demotionidai); *LSCG* 30 (fragmentary). Ialysus: *LSS* 93 (probably a part of a larger document). Cf. also *LSAM* 44 from Miletus (fragmentary; see below p. 52) and *LSS* 78 from Chios prescribing prerogatives for sold priesthoods. *LSAM* 21 from Erythrae probably belongs here too, judging from the reference to the tongue (on the tongue see Kadletz 1981) and the right leg (see Puttkammer 1912, 24).



is from the deme of Aixone. *LSCG* 29, dated to the mid fourth century B.C., ought to have had a similar format.

Of the remaining specific regulations one, *LSCG* 123, is concerned directly with cult, being a popular decree allowing a priest to continue his ritual begging for Isis. The others are concerned with the mode of acquisition of a priesthood.<sup>210</sup> We should also mention here the *παράδοσις* for which the priestess is responsible in *LSS* 127 from Roman Imperial Athens.<sup>211</sup>

### Mode of Acquisition

As stated above,<sup>212</sup> Greek priesthoods can be divided into two basic groups if one makes a distinction between priesthoods to which entitlement is gained by birth, that is into a priestly family,<sup>213</sup> and priesthoods which are acquired in other ways, mostly by election, allotment, and sale (where allotment between interested buyers is possible). It is worthwhile to review the range of documents associated with each one of these modes of acquisition.

*Hereditary Priesthoods.* We have a few documents governing the function of hereditary priesthoods, issued upon their creation or upon endorsement of the right of inheritance. Comparable documents governing ancient family cults nationalized<sup>214</sup> early on are lacking. This is probably not coincidental. Priestly families might not feel the need to share internal matters with the public by means of inscriptions, and the publication of relevant documents, which, one way or the other, tends to be a state matter,<sup>215</sup> might result more from their interaction with the state, collaborating in the management of the cult.<sup>216</sup> Such interaction seems to have motivated the publication of the now battered, much restored and interpreted,<sup>217</sup> and difficult to date *LSCG* 15 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup>

<sup>210</sup> See immediately below.

<sup>211</sup> See above p. 30.

<sup>212</sup> p. 41.

<sup>213</sup> How exactly the priesthood is transmitted within the family is a different matter which may now depend upon inference. See for example the appropriate sections on the mode of appointment of Eleusinian officials in Clinton 1974. On the problem of information regarding internal administration of hereditary priesthoods cf. immediately below.

<sup>214</sup> By this I mean nothing more than state administration of specific aspects of the cult. On the problem see Aleshire 1994.

<sup>215</sup> On the matter of state-family interaction cf. Clinton 1974, 14 n. 19.

<sup>216</sup> Cf. Aleshire 1994, 12.

<sup>217</sup> Cf. Jameson 1997, 181.

7; ca. 460–450), concerning the *genos* Praxiergidai, whose women wove the peplos for Athena; it features a decree governing the publication, an oracular response evidently asserting the family's rights, and a very fragmentary set of regulations.

The reasons for the creation of a hereditary priesthood might vary. The right that the founder's family has to it may simply be given legal recognition. So in the Pergamene decree, *LSAM* 13, dated before the death of Attalus III in 133 B.C.,<sup>218</sup> the city grants the priesthood of Asclepius and other cults at the Asclepieum to Asclepiades son of Archias and future descendants of Archias, the original founder; whoever of them actually serves as a priest is to wear a crown.<sup>219</sup> The document contains a set of prescriptions governing the priestly function (lines 12–25): the crown-bearer, that is the priest, is entitled to specific sacral prerogatives including table offerings;<sup>220</sup> he seems to be accorded the right to exploit sanctuary land, probably for cultivation; he is exempt from all civic obligations and entitled to a front seat at all the games. So much for his privileges, which are similar to those encountered elsewhere. As for his duties, he is in charge of the sacred slaves and must care, in the way he thinks appropriate, for order in the sanctuary. The grant is reinforced by an oath; three copies of the decree are to be published, including one at the Asclepieum. Moreover, the decree is to be listed among the laws of the city, in force forever as a law. The decree does not expand upon the transmission of the priesthood.<sup>221</sup> The family foundations of Posidonius, *LSAM* 72.18–20, Epicteta *IG* XII 3, 330.57–61, and, so it seems, Diomedon, *LSCG* 177.23–25,<sup>222</sup> name future-born sons as priests. A similar state of affairs is evident in the second-century B.C. foundation of Pythokles from Cos, *Ischr. Cos* ED 82.7–11 (*LGS* II 131);<sup>223</sup> the cult is public, and the city granted the relevant priesthoods to the family of the founder at his request (if we accept Mario Segre's plausible restoration). This principle seems also evident in the decree of the Piraeus association of Dionysi-

<sup>218</sup> J. and L. Robert, *La Carie* II, Paris, 1954, 298 n. 5. R.E. Allen, *The Attalid Kingdom: A Constitutional History*, Oxford, 1983, 162, returns to a date after the death of Attalus III (suggested by M. Frankel *I.Perg* II p. 179; see also *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> III p. 142).

<sup>219</sup> The priesthood had probably been hereditary since the foundation, a right which is being confirmed here: Allen *ibid.* 162–163.

<sup>220</sup> For sacral prerogatives see below commentaries on 3.5 and 20.7.

<sup>221</sup> The problem of transmission of an inherited priesthood has been noted above n.

213.

<sup>222</sup> See below pp. 86–87.

<sup>223</sup> See below p. 84.

astai, *LSCG* 49 (ca. 176/175 B.C.),<sup>224</sup> though the transmission of the post of the deceased priest to his son appears to require ratification by the members.

The creation of a hereditary priesthood at Gytheum in the first century B.C. appears to have had a different motivation. A decree, *LSCG* 61, hands the authority over a sanctuary of Apollo and over all matters pertaining to its administration to a certain Philemon son of Theoxenos and his son, named Theoxenos after his grandfather, who, having been granted permission, restored at their own expense the ruined sanctuary. They and their descendants are to serve as priests for life for eternity. The priesthood is to have the same status as other hereditary priesthoods. The existence of these might be explained as the privatization of cults by the city which can no longer finance them.<sup>225</sup> Here too, as at Pergamum, the city, which assumes the costs of publishing the document, refers to it in the publication clause as νόμος. Unlike at Pergamum, however, specific rules governing the function of the priests are not added; by and large they are now the business of the family.

*Elected Priesthoods.* In the fourth century B.C. (337 or 358 B.C.) the Xanthians and their *perioikoi* decided to found a cult for Basileus Kaulnios and Arkesimas, recording their decree in Greek, Lycian, and Aramaic on the so-called trilingual stele from the Letoon, *SEG* XXVII 942.<sup>226</sup> As priest they elected one Simias son of Kondorasis and whoever is closest to Simias for the time to come (lines 8–11). The priesthood is therefore not quite elected but hereditary. Elected priesthoods would imply a term of office. In *LSAM* 78 the office is held for life; in *LSCG* 103 B 16–18 for ten years; yearly elections are specified in *SEG* XL 956. *LSAM* 78 (ca. 100 B.C.), featuring decrees from Tlos, governs elections directly though it serves as a record, elections having preceded publication. In **B** 4–11, the city of Tlos decides to elect a priest of Zeus. The office is held for life, and the priest would serve under the same conditions as his predecessor. The elected priest, Eirenaios, is also named in the next decree in which the city delegates an experienced

<sup>224</sup> See Mikalson 1998, 204–205.

<sup>225</sup> See Sokolowski's commentary p. 116. For a somewhat similar notion in relation to the sale of priesthoods cf. Dignas 2002, 33–34. For handing over a priesthood to a person who restored a sanctuary cf. the A.D. 142–161 inscription published by A. Wilhelm *ÖJhBeibl* 18, 1915, 23–32 with p. 32.

<sup>226</sup> See discussion below pp. 82–83.

priest to assist in the performance of all sacrifices and feasts.<sup>227</sup> *SEG XL* 956 from Heraclea under Latmus (ca. 100–75 B.C. to early first century A.D.) contains, besides a decree and a catalog of priests, an oracle governing repeated elections. We learn that the people decided to seek an oracular response to the question of whether the priesthood of Athena Latmia should be sold for life or subject to yearly elections (*IIA* 1 7). The god replied as follows (*IIA* 9 16):

Ὡς ἂν Πάλλαδος εὐόπλου Τριτωνίδος ἀγνῆς  
 ἱερὰ δρῶντα θεᾶι τε φιλῶς σύμπαντι τε δήμῳ  
 θῆσθε σὺν ἐσθλαῖσιν γνώμῃς βουλῇ τε κρατίστη[ι.]  
 12 κέκλυτε Φοιβείην παναληθέα θέσφατον αὐδὴν·  
 ὃς γένει ἡδὲ βίῳ τάξει προφερέστατός ἐστιν,  
 αἰρεῖσθε ἐκ πάντων ἀστών λυκάβαντος ἐκάστου  
 [φρ]οντίδα καὶ σπουδὴν ἥν χρεὶ θέμενοι περὶ τῶνδε,  
 16 [το]ίους γὰρ θέμις ἐστὶ θεᾶς πρὸς ἀνάκτορα βαίνειν.

That you may appoint a performer of the cult of the well-armed Pallas, the pure Tritonis, in a manner pleasing to the goddess and to the entire people, with excellent judgements and most valiant counsel, listen to the all true, divine voice of Phoebus: Whoever is distinguished for his family and conduct of life elect each year from among all the citizens applying the care and attention appropriate to these matters, for it is right that such men approach the temple of the goddess.

The lists of priests starting beneath the text of the oracle and continuing onto other blocks testify that these rules remained in effect for quite some time.

*Allotment.* Three comprehensive sets of regulations can be shown to govern allotted priesthoods. The earliest is the variably restored *LSCG* 12 featuring two related decrees (**A** = *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 35; ca. 448 B.C.(?)<sup>228</sup> **B** = *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 36: 424/3 B.C.) prescribing the prerogatives and the salary of the priestess of Athena Nike,<sup>229</sup> in addition to stipulating the furnishing of the sanctuary with doors and the construction of the temple; the reference to allotment in **A** 3–4 is almost entirely restored, though evidently correct.<sup>230</sup> In the third-century B.C. royal letter from Pergamum, *LSAM*

<sup>227</sup> As regards expert priests, one ought to mention *LSAM* 36 from Priene dealing with the cult of the Egyptian divinities and noted for the engagement of an Egyptian expert alongside the priest. The inscription is, unfortunately very fragmentary. The surviving part is mostly concerned with the priesthood. See (e.g.) Nilsson *GGR* II<sup>3</sup> 127.

<sup>228</sup> The date is much debated and 448 B.C. may well be too early.

<sup>229</sup> See Loomis 1998, 76–77, 78.

<sup>230</sup> See Parker 1996, 125–127.

11,<sup>231</sup> allotment is clear from the reference to the priest as λαχών (lines 1, 9). The priest is to wear a white *chlamys* and an olive crown with a purple band; he is exempt from liturgies as long as he wears the crown, i.e. throughout his term of office; besides his sacral prerogatives, he receives proceeds from workshops which the writer of the letter had dedicated to an unidentified god; these he must maintain, lease, and return upon leaving office; he is instructed to care for the god's silver vessels and dedications and hand them over to his successor.<sup>232</sup> *LSAM* 79 (1st century B.C. from Pednelissos(?)) discusses duties and rights of the priestess called Galato.<sup>233</sup> She is to keep pure, holding her office as long as she lives. Upon her death the city is required to hold a lottery for the appointment of a new priestess.<sup>234</sup>

*Sale of Priesthoods.* The sale of priesthoods is first documented in the 5th century B.C. (*LSAM* 44; Miletus).<sup>235</sup> The custom was on the whole geographically and chronologically limited. As is amply documented, during the Hellenistic period, it became very common in parts of Asia Minor, most cases coming from Ionia, Caria, and Cos. Even then, it is only rarely attested elsewhere and appears to have been avoided on the mainland, the one exception being 5.16 20 below.<sup>236</sup> The num-

<sup>231</sup> Welles, *RC* 24.

<sup>232</sup> For this cf. above p. 30.

<sup>233</sup> Sokolowski's commentary p. 186.

<sup>234</sup> The last two lines of the first part of *LSAM* 35 (lines 1–2) name a priest who has been allotted the priesthood (lines 3–5 are discussed above pp. 15–16). In *LSCG* 175 the allotment might be employed to choose one of several interested buyers.

<sup>235</sup> See below p. 52.

<sup>236</sup> See the following (ruler cult excluded): Chalcedon: *LSAM* 2 5; Cyzicus *LSAM* 7; Skepsis: *SEG* XXVI 1334; Alexandria Troas: *SEG* XLVI 1574; Erythrae *LSAM* 23 + XLVII 1628; *LSAM* 25; *SEG* XXXVII 921; *IG* XII 6, 1197(?); Ephesus: *IEphesos* 1263 (see below Appendix B 1.18); Magnesia on the Maeander: *LSAM* 34; Priene: *LSAM* 37; 38 (the full dossier includes three different exemplars: *IPriene* 201 203); Miletus: *LSAM* 44; 48; 49; 52; Hyllarima: *LSAM* 56; Mylasa: *LSAM* 63; 66; Kassos: *LSAM* 71; Halicarnassus: *LSAM* 73; Theangela: *SEG* XXIX 1088; Seleucia ad Calycadnum: *ÖjhBeibl* 18, 1915, 23 32 (cf. above n. 225). Cos: *LGS* II 136; *LSCG* 160 162; (163 164?); 166; 167; 172; *Iscr.Cos* ED 3; 15; 32; 85; 109; 145 + Parker and Obbink 2001 no. 6; 165; 177; 178; 180; 215; 216; 236; 237; 238; 261; 262(?); Parker and Obbink 2000, no. 1, 2001, nos. 3–5. Chios: *LSS* 77 78 and see L. Robert, *BCH* 58, 1933, 468 (= *Opera Minora Selecta* I, 456) (ineditum). Samos (?) no. 19 below. Andros: *LSS* 47 (lease (sublease? For possible explanations see Sokolowski's note ad loc.; Segre 1937, 94–96) of a priesthood). Thasos: *LSS* 71 (sale of the eponymic title of an association of Sarapists). Tomi (a colony of Miletus): *LSCG* 87. For Athens see 5.16 20 below. For ruler cult (not inclusive) see Miletus: *SEG* XXXVII 1048; Cos: *Iscr.Cos* ED 182; 266(?). The custom is also documented in Egypt (W. Otto, Kauf und Verkauf von Priestertümern bei den Griechen, *Hermes* 44, 1909, 593–599; Debord 1982: 338 n. 117).

ber of documents from the Roman Imperial period is relatively small. The Heracleian document discussed above suggests that sale and other methods of acquiring priesthoods could alternate. The reasons for preferring one to the other are not clear; it is, however, risky to overestimate the weight of religious or moral factors. Underlying motives may equally be social or financial.<sup>237</sup>

*Contracts and Enactments.* Most documents governing the sale of priesthoods list the rules for the office, its term being usually for life,<sup>238</sup> and the conditions of the transaction (price and payment plan); as long as it is borne in mind that assorted announcements and records of sales may be involved, these documents may be referred to as contracts (or job descriptions).<sup>239</sup> Similarly to leases<sup>240</sup> and other contractual documents,<sup>241</sup> such contracts may use the future (not in Cos) alongside (perhaps especially when the buyer is not the subject of the verb) imperatives and infinitives.<sup>242</sup> An opening formula ὁ πριάμενος τὴν ἱερωσύνην (vel sim.) commonly introduces the list of the pertinent articles. It may be preceded by ἀγαθὴ τύχη or a dating formula.<sup>243</sup> At Cos documents tend to record the committee which drafted them at the

<sup>237</sup> On this see especially Segre 1937, 89; M. W. Rörle, *Inscriben von Herakleia am Latmos II: Das Priestertum der Athena Latmia*, *Chiron* 20, 1990, 19–58 (publication of SEG XL 956 discussed above) at 43–50; Dignas 2002, 31–34 (I was unable to consult the author's *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Oxford, 2003). In general see Nilsson GGR II<sup>3</sup> 77–78, cf. I<sup>3</sup> 732; Debord 1982, 63–71; Parker and Obbink 2000 and 2001.

<sup>238</sup> Cf. Dignas 2002, 33. In LSAM 52.10–13 the buyer or his descendants are to serve for fifty years. LSAM 63.4 appears to ordain that the buyer serve διὰ γένους, i.e. that the sold priesthood become hereditary: Segre 1936, 830.

<sup>239</sup> Parker and Obbink 2000.

<sup>240</sup> LSCG 47; LSCG 115 and IG XII Suppl. 353; no. 18 below. Cf. (e.g.) IG II<sup>2</sup> 2493, 2494, 2498; Buck, GD no. 42; IG XII 7, 62; I.Erythrai 510; I.Mylasa 810; IG XIV 645 I 94–187.

<sup>241</sup> See (e.g.) IG II<sup>2</sup> 1668, 1675; I.Oropos 292; IG VII 3073 (building *syngraphai* and contracts); SEG XIII 557; IG XII 7, 55 (sales); SEG XXVII 631 (*Nomima* I no. 22) B 11, 14 (contract with the scribe Spensitheos from Littos(?) in Crete. Although B is concerned with religious matters, I do not think this document qualifies for inclusion in the corpus of sacred laws). For the future in leases and building contracts cf. K. Meisterhans, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*<sup>3</sup>, Berlin, 1900, 88.5 (p. 241).

<sup>242</sup> LSCG 87; LSAM 2, 3; 4, 5, 23 + SEG XLVII 1628, 37, 38, 49, 66, 71, SEG XXVI 1334; XXIX 1088; XLVI 1574; below no. 19; also in the sale from Thasos LSS 71. In LSAM 36 the future is used for the priest (*passim*) but also for the *neopoies* (line 18). Admittedly, one should be careful in identifying a given priesthood as sold only on the basis of the use of the future (cf. LSAM 79).

<sup>243</sup> LSCG 87; [LSS 77]; LSAM 2; 37; 38; 49; SEG XXVI 1334.

outset;<sup>244</sup> *Iscr.Cos* ED 32 also ends with a resolution formula indicating the ratification of the draft by the council and people.<sup>245</sup> Some documents record the buyer's name, which may appear at the beginning<sup>246</sup> or at the end;<sup>247</sup> others are left open, which might have been the custom at Cos.<sup>248</sup> The validity of all these observations depends, of course, upon the state of preservation of documents that often lack their beginning, their end, or both. *LSAM* 37 (Priene; second century B.C.) is entitled διαγραφή; other documents, especially from Cos, may refer to themselves or to other documents as *diagraphai*.<sup>249</sup> As a result, the term *diapraphe* is sometimes used generically for comparable inscriptions.<sup>250</sup> The range of issues covered in the documents may vary considerably. Sacri ce and sacri cial prerogatives are paramount; other topics, even the conditions of sale, can be treated rather sparingly.<sup>251</sup> To some extent, such variations might be due to the fact that in some cases we are not dealing with the full version of the documents but rather with limited summaries of the most pertinent points, especially those directly governing cult performance, particularly sacri ce. In some cases, a reference may even be made to other documents for more details.<sup>252</sup>

The transition from other modes of acquisition to sale in a given priesthood is hard to document on the basis of contracts, as they are primarily oriented toward a transaction. So *LSCG* 175.6 7 (Antimacheia; third century B.C.)<sup>253</sup> refers to the priesthood in question

<sup>244</sup> *LSCG* 162; 166; *Iscr.Cos* ED 145; 177; 178; 180; 215; 238; Parker and Obbink 2001, no. 2.

<sup>245</sup> See Parker and Obbink 2000, 426.

<sup>246</sup> *LSAM* 56 (lines 7–8); *SEG* XXVI 1334; XXIX 1088. These documents may be taken as records of sales.

<sup>247</sup> *LSCG* 87; *LSAM* 3, 4, 5, 37; cf. below 19.10. Such documents may therefore be regarded as combinations of announcements and records of sales.

<sup>248</sup> The buyer's name is recorded at the end in *LSCG* 161 B. See Parker and Obbink 2000, 426 no. 19.

<sup>249</sup> *Iscr.Cos* ED 85.8–9; 178 a (A) 8; 216.16; cf. 3 B 4, 15; Parker and Obbink 2000, 38; *LSAM* 34.24 (Magnesia on the Maeander); below no. 19; *IG* XII 6, 1197.22–23, 33, 40 (Erythrae (?)); *SEG* XXXVI 1048.5 (Miletus; the priesthood is of Eumenes II).

<sup>250</sup> Strictly speaking, the term *diapraphe* may be used for announcements of sales: Segre 1937, 86–87 n. 4. But when the announcements also record the name of the buyer, they may in practice be functioning as records of sales; cf. Parker and Obbink 2000, 426 no. 19.

<sup>251</sup> For an extreme case see *LSS* 78 from Chios.

<sup>252</sup> *LSCG* 161 B 1–2; *Iscr.Cos* ED 178 a (A); below no. 19; cf. *Iscr.Cos* ED 216 (B) 19–20. Cf. below commentary on 19.4–5, 12.

<sup>253</sup> The date is according to Parker and Obbink 2000, 420 n. 10.

(Demeter) as formerly not sold, but the enactment by which the change was brought about is lacking.<sup>254</sup> Legislation ordaining the sale of new posts is known, however. The ca. early-second-century A.D.<sup>255</sup> Milesian *LSAM* 52 presents itself as a law (νόμος) set up by the *strategoi* for the sale of an all-embracing priesthood of Asclepius καὶ τῶν ἐντεμενίων αὐτοῦ θεῶν πάν|των, χωρὶς εἴ τι προπέπραται ὑπὸ τοῦ δή|μου,<sup>256</sup> the institution of sale thus not being new in and of itself.<sup>257</sup>

A third-century B.C. decree from Halicarnassus regarding the priesthood and cult of Artemis Pergaia, *LSAM* 73, contains an actual contract but also discusses various matters pertaining to the cult connected directly or indirectly to the priestly function. It opens with a common preamble, including the dating formula and (lines 3–4) a resolution formula:

ἔδοξεν

4 [τῇ βουλῇ] καὶ τῷ δήμῳ, γνώμη πρυτάνεων

The council and the people have decreed; the *prytaneis* made the motion.

A formulaic contract, somewhat similar to the third-century B.C. contract for the sale of the priesthood of Zeus Nemeios from Theangela, *SEG* XXIX 1088, follows with the verbs in the future (lines 4–14):

4 [ὁ] πριάμε-  
[νο]ς [τῇ]ν ἱερῆτείαν τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Περγαίας πα-  
[ρέ]ξεται ἱέρειαν ἀσπὴν ἐξ ἀσπῶν ἀμφοτέρων ἐπὶ  
[τρεις] γενεάς γεγενημένην καὶ πρὸς πατρός καὶ πατρός  
8 [μὴ]τρός· ἡ δὲ πριαμένη ἱεράσεται ἐπὶ ζωῆς τῆς αὐτῆς  
καὶ θύσει τὰ ἱερά τὰ δημό[σι]α καὶ τὰ ἰδιωτικά, καὶ λήψε-  
ται τῶν θυομένων δημοσίου ἀφ' ἑκάστου ἱερείου κω-  
12 λῆν καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ κωλῇ νεμόμενα καὶ τεταρτημορί-  
δα σπλάγχων καὶ τὰ δέρματα, τῶν δὲ ἰδιωτι-  
κῶν λήψεται κωλῆν καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ κωλῇ νεμόμενα  
καὶ τεταρτημορίδα σπλάγχων.

<sup>254</sup> The fragmentary decree of a Mylasan *syngeneia*, *LSAM* 66, might, however, be significant in this respect. For the coexistence of sale alongside other modes cf. *LSCG* 119.14–17.

<sup>255</sup> M.N. Tod, *Gnomon* 28, 1956, 459.

<sup>256</sup> And of all his precinct-mate gods, except if something has been sold before by the people.

<sup>257</sup> Cf. the decree of an association of Sarapists from Thasos, *LSS* 71, to sell the eponymic title of the association and the decree from Andros, *LSS* 47, concerning the lease (see above n. 236) of a priesthood. Cf. perhaps *LSAM* 34 from Magnesia on the Maeander (second century B.C.) concerning the cult of Sarapis (see Sokolowski's commentary).



The buyer of the priesthood of Artemis Pergaia will furnish a priestess who is a townswoman, descending from townsmen both on her father's side and on her mother's side for three generations; the buyer<sup>258</sup> will be a priestess for her entire life; she will perform the public and the private sacrifices, and receive from each victim sacrificed publicly a thigh, the parts distributed with the thigh, a fourth of the *splanchna*,<sup>259</sup> and the skins; from private victims she will receive a thigh, the parts distributed with the thigh, and a fourth of the *splanchna*.

At this point the document turns to other matters involving other officials, using the accusative and infinitive expected after ἔδοξεν (lines 14–21); imperatives are then used in several stipulations governing the sacrificial performance by the priestess and the construction of a *thesauros* for the goddess and the use of money deposited therein at sacrifices (lines 16–35 where the text breaks off).

Such a comprehensive format<sup>260</sup> is particularly characteristic of a number of Coan sales which, to a certain extent, are a class unto themselves in respect to the range of issues discussed and the amount of detail given;<sup>261</sup> some can encompass fairly detailed regulations governing various aspects of the management and even performance of the cult in which the priest in question happens to be involved.<sup>262</sup>

### Varia

*Other Documents Relating to the Sale of Priesthoods.* A bottom part of a stele from Miletus, *LSAM* 44, dated to ca. 400 B.C. and thus the earliest surviving inscription relating to the sale of priesthoods, collectively prescribes sacrificial prerogatives for bought offices.<sup>263</sup> An inscription

<sup>258</sup> The clause is somewhat puzzling. See Segre 1937, 94–95, 101–104; Sokolowski *LSAM* pp. 171–172.

<sup>259</sup> For the *splanchna* see below commentary on 11.14; cf. commentary on 21.7–9.

<sup>260</sup> In the present case, the comprehensive format is probably due to the cult of Artemis of Perge being newly-instituted at Halicarnassus (cf. Segre 1936, 827). The actual introduction of the cult is not discussed here and could have been dealt with elsewhere.

<sup>261</sup> These have been conveniently sorted by Parker and Obbink 2000, 423–429.

<sup>262</sup> *Iskr.Cos* ED 145 is particularly noteworthy for the festival-pertinent information. *LSAM* 49 from Miletus (the priesthood of the People of Rome and Roma) is an example of a distinctively comprehensive contract elsewhere.

<sup>263</sup> Cf. Puttkammer 1912, 6; Segre 1936, 824; Parker and Obbink 2000, 422 n. 16. I find the interpretation (Sokolowski *LSAM* p. 117; Debord 1982, 336 n. 111), which makes τὰς ἱερεῖ[ω]σύνας (line 2) cult prerogatives and the subject of ἐπράαγ[τ|ο] (lines 1–2) those who bought the rights to them, less convincing (for τὰ ἱερεῖωσυνα meaning prerogatives see below commentary on 3.5).

from Cyzicus, *LSAM* 7, lists a number of sold priesthoods together with sums of public money to be dispensed to the priests. The extensive early-third-century B.C. *LSAM* 25 and the fragmentary fourth-century B.C. *SEG* XXXVII 921 from Erythrae are not sacred laws at all but rather lists of sales of priesthoods, recording the transactions and the amounts paid.<sup>264</sup>

*Cataloging Priests.*<sup>265</sup> Catalogs of priests like the one following the oracle in the Heracleian *SEG* XL 956<sup>266</sup> are common enough. The corpus includes two documents which govern the composition and publication of such lists: a ca. 100 B.C. extract of a decree of the Rhodian state, *LSCG* 138,<sup>267</sup> and a 21 B.C. decree from Halasarna, *LSCG* 174, followed by a list.

### Other Religious Officials

The corpus includes only a few documents which in their entirety regulate the function of cult officials other than priests. A rather fragmentary 181 B.C. Delian decree, *LSS* 52, treats the office of the *neokoros* in an unknown sanctuary.<sup>268</sup> Prerogatives are specified in connection with certain sacrifices (B 1 10), and eligibility for the office and allotment mechanism through which it was acquired are evidently discussed (B 15 20).<sup>269</sup> The first (ca. 183/2 B.C.) of two decrees of the Piraeus *Orgeones* of the Mother, *LSCG* 48, empowers the priestess, appointed each year by allotment, to appoint a former priestess as ζάκορος (temple attendant) to assist her with her obligations during her year of office; no one is to be appointed twice before a full cycle of former priestesses has been completed. The second decree (ca. 175/4 B.C.) commends the former priestess, Metrodora, for her performance as a *zakoros*, honoring

<sup>264</sup> See lately Dignas 2002, 32–33.

<sup>265</sup> See Nilsson II<sup>3</sup> 80–81.

<sup>266</sup> See above p. 47.

<sup>267</sup> V. Gabrielsen, 'The Synoikized *Polis* of Rhodes', in P. Flensted-Jensen, T. Heine Nielsen, and L. Rubinstein (eds.), *Polis and Politics: Studies in Greek History Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen on his Sixtieth Birthday, August 20, 2000*, Copenhagen, 177–205 at 194.

<sup>268</sup> For the date and for a discussion see P. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*, Paris, 1970, 502–503.

<sup>269</sup> Regarding *neokoroi* cf. also the decree from Amyzon, *Amyzon* no. 2 (below Appendix b 1.1), which might be considered for inclusion in the corpus (cf. next note).

her with the post for life.<sup>270</sup> *LSS* 121,<sup>271</sup> a late document from Ephesus entitled κεφάλαιον (summary) νόμου πατρίου it includes, in fact, two parts dated to the late second or third century A.D., first enumerates cult duties to be performed by the *prytanis*, and also elaborates upon related duties of the *hierophant*; the second part is concerned with prerogatives mentioning additional cult personnel.

### *Cult Performance*

The performance of cult lies in the background or even stands in the foreground in many of the documents reviewed in the previous sections; one might even be tempted to say, at least to an extent, that it is almost by definition the main concern of sacred law, other issues being treated with a view toward facilitating it.<sup>272</sup> Here, we ought, however, to review documents which govern the performance of cult directly. Most of these documents contain single or multiple sets of regulations governing the performance of single actions even when these are collected and published together.<sup>273</sup> Such regulations tend to be short and laconic, containing only the information necessary for a correct performance of the actions they govern. Even the few sets of regulations which govern complex rituals are not much different in this respect: they list the actions, which, performed in a sequence, constitute a ritual, and pay only the minimum necessary attention to the details of individual actions.

The variety of issues reviewed in this section is considerable. The most substantial group of documents deals with sacrifices. To these should be added documents which are related to sacrificial activity by regulating the sale of sacrificial meat and skins and participation in cult. Very few other issues are treated separately and they are reviewed here under the subheading of *varia*. A discussion of the small but distinct group of documents governing funerary rites and mourning fol-

<sup>270</sup> See Sokolowski *LSCG* pp. 89–90; Mikalson 1998, 203; N.F. Jones, *The Associations of Classical Athens: The Response to Democracy*, New York/Oxford, 1999, 265. Cf. the decree from Amyzon, *Amyzon* no. 2, regarding conferring the office of *neokoros* of Artemis, listed below Appendix B 1.1. Though from a cult performance point of view this inscription might not be considered significant enough for inclusion in the corpus, it is to an extent comparable to *LSCG* 48 or to *LSAM* 78.

<sup>271</sup> See A.L. Connolly in *NewDocs*. IV, 106–107.

<sup>272</sup> Cf. above p. 4.

<sup>273</sup> Notably, but not only, in the case of sacrificial calendars.

laws. Attention is then directed to cathartic regulations, or rather the one document belonging to this small group of poorly-preserved documents that allows a discussion, the cathartic code from Cyrene. A few documents focusing on cult nance are then reviewed. This section ends with a review of cult foundations and documents of religious associations. These can be rather comprehensive and may discuss various issues pertaining to cult management alongside cult performance. Though documents governing the performance of festivals and ceremonies belong here too, they form a distinct group and are so reviewed separately. As usual, the nature of the evidence sometimes prevents absolute classification.

Regarding form, in many of the cases the identity of the body issuing sacrificial regulations depends upon inference. Some of these regulations may well be official, but, even so, they very seldom present themselves as such. This is not the case with documents dealing with attendant matters, namely the sale of sacrificial meat or skins, and participation in cult. The few funerary regulations which have reached us are without fail legislative acts. The cathartic code of Cyrene, *LSS* 115, doubtless an official document, is presented as an oracular response. As for foundations, they are represented in the corpus by either the foundation documents themselves or by enactments. The origin and genre of financial documents and of documents belonging to religious associations can usually be determined, depending upon the state of preservation, though it may involve inference made on the basis of content.

### Sacrifice

Information about Greek sacrificial practice in sacred law does not necessarily come from sacrificial regulations, i.e. regulations which simply prescribe or authorize an act of sacrifice. Priesthood regulations are often explicit about the distribution of the parts of the sacrificial victim.<sup>274</sup> Festival regulations can also be revealing in this respect as they may prescribe, sometimes in great detail, rules pertaining to the victims and the distribution of their meat among officials and the general public.<sup>275</sup> Sacrificial regulations tend, on the other hand, to be laconic, geared toward the act itself rather than dictating the details of performance. Ordinarily they are not concerned with anything which can

<sup>274</sup> See above pp. 42–43.

<sup>275</sup> See below p. 100.

be taken to be common practice but rather highlight modifications or deviations from it. Special information is given to the extent that it is ritually desirable;<sup>276</sup> when it is not given, there is little reason to suppose that it is desirable. For example, if the type, age, sex, or color of a victim is specified, it is important; otherwise, we may assume that any victim can be offered or, possibly, that the identity of the victim is well known. When consumption of sacrificial meat on the spot is prescribed, it means that it is ritually desirable; when it is not prescribed, there is reason to assume that meat may be taken away.<sup>277</sup>

Sacrificial regulations can be classified according to different parameters. One can distinguish, for example, between public and private sacrifices or between sacrifices in which the victim is eaten and those in which it is destroyed. Here we use frequency as a basic parameter, distinguishing between sacrifices performed on a given date and those which are not. In the documents assembled in the corpus of Greek sacred law, sacrifices belonging to the second group may be offered by private individuals or by the public; those belonging to the first are usually not private.<sup>278</sup> On the whole, periodic sacrifices may be assembled and listed consecutively together to form a calendar or prescribed individually at the place of performance. Sacrifices which can be performed as wished or as needed are commonly handled in regulations published at the place where they are to be performed.

### Undated Sacrifices

The simplest type of sacrificial regulations are inscriptions, commonly short, published at the place where the sacrifice is to be performed, sometimes even inscribed on altars, indicating that offerings can or should be made. Where the motive or occasions are not indicated, the language uninformative, and the cultic context unknown, it may be difficult to say whether they merely provide a venue for the performance of sacrifice or whether sacrifice is actually prescribed.

The first-century A.D. *LSCG* 54 from Attica,<sup>279</sup> urges the farmers and neighbors to sacrifice where it is allowed (ἤι θεῖμυς) in a sanctuary of Asclepius and Hygieia, as long as two rules are observed: the founder

<sup>276</sup> Jameson's 1997 expression.

<sup>277</sup> Cf. below p. 100.

<sup>278</sup> Cult associations are a notable exception; see below pp. 86–89.

<sup>279</sup> Mentioned above p. 13.

of the sanctuary and the priest must receive their assigned share in the sacrifice, and the meat must not be carried away. This prohibition is encountered in this type of regulation elsewhere,<sup>280</sup> as in no. 24 below from Lissos, appended to a dedication inscribed on the base of a statue of Asclepius, encouraging anyone who wishes to sacrifice, as long as the skin is left for the god and the meat of the victim is not taken away. It is significant that in both cases, as in the foundation of Xenokrateia, *LSS* 17A,<sup>281</sup> no reference is made to the animal; its choice is evidently left to the discretion of the worshippers. Had this not been the case, the choice would have been limited, as it is in a number of comparable regulations.

An animal may be prescribed, as a goat is to Apollo in *LSCG* 170 (Isthmus; third century B.C.); a bovine or a goat (after which the text breaks off) to Dionysus in *LSS* 67 (Thasos; fourth century B.C.); particular animals may also be prohibited. The choice of animal evidently depends on the taste and sensibilities of the recipient and the cultic context.<sup>282</sup> Goats and pigs are among the most commonly prohibited victims.<sup>283</sup> The first (A) of the two early-fifth-century B.C. sets of regulations from the so called Passage of the Theoroi near the Agora of Thasos, *LSCG* 114, inscribed on a relief depicting Apollo and the Nymphs, allows the worshipper to sacrifice to them any animal, either female or male, except a sheep and a pig;<sup>284</sup> the second set (B), inscribed on one of two reliefs depicting Hermes and the Charites, forbids the sacrifice of a goat and a pig to the Charites.<sup>285</sup> Similarly, the second-century *LSCG* 126 from Mytilene allows anyone who wishes to offer on the altar of Aphrodite Peitho and Hermes any victim except a pig and any bird, at which point the text breaks off; a particular kind of bird was probably named and excluded.<sup>286</sup> Again on Thasos the laconic second-century

<sup>280</sup> See commentary on 16.6 below.

<sup>281</sup> See above p. 35.

<sup>282</sup> Cf., however, below n. (329).

<sup>283</sup> For no goats see also *POxy.* XXXVI 2797.6 with L. Robert, *Sur un décret d'Ilion et sur un papyrus concernant des cultes royaux*, *American Studies in Papyrology* 1, 1966, 175–211 (= *Opera Minora Selecta* VII, Amsterdam, 1990, 599–635) at 192–210.

<sup>284</sup> Paian chanting is also prohibited and, together with the use of the verb προσέειπεν, to sacrifice beside/ in addition, it might indicate that the sacrifice is performed in connection with another sacrifice or even a different activity: Sokolowski's commentary *LSCG* p. 208 (for dependent sacrifices see below).

<sup>285</sup> For the monument and the problems of its significance see Y. Grandjean and F. Salviat, *Guide de Thasos*, Paris, 2000, 82–87.

<sup>286</sup> Ziehen *LGS* II pp. 307–308.

B.C. *LSS* 73 simply says that it is not allowed (that is, to sacrifice) a goat and a pig to Peitho;<sup>287</sup> goat alone is forbidden in *LSS* 74, the recipient being Hera Epilimnia. On Delos Semitic divinities show similar sensitivities. The second-century B.C. inscribed altar *LSS* 55 dedicated to Zeus Ourios and Astarte Palaestina, also known as Aphrodite Ourania, excludes goats, pigs, and female bovines. The altar was dedicated by a certain Damon from Ascalon, after he had been saved from pirates.<sup>288</sup> The sacrifice of goats and pigs is similarly prohibited on another altar from Delos, *LSS* 58 (*I.Délos* 1720; ca. 100 B.C.), dedicated by another Ascalonite<sup>289</sup> to Poseidon of his native city.<sup>290</sup> Goats were evidently a problem for Heracles and Hauronas, the gods of the neighboring Palestinian city of Iamnia, to judge from the prohibition to sacrifice them in the contemporary *LSS* 57 (second century B.C.).<sup>291</sup>

Divinities may have other sensibilities too. A late-fifth-century inscription from Elatea, *LSCG* 82, does not restrict the choice of victim sacrificed at a sanctuary of the Anakes but prohibits the presence of women. Women are also excluded in the most substantial individual set of sacrificial prohibitions, the mid-fourth-century *LSS* 63 from Thasos, which forbids the sacrifice of goats and pigs to Thasian Heracles,<sup>292</sup> and lists three restrictions pertaining to the distribution of the meat that have been variously interpreted.<sup>293</sup> Such prohibitions, whether regarding animals, participants in the sacrifice, or consumption of the meat, attempt to prevent a breach of what is religiously correct in a given cultic context.<sup>294</sup> In this they are comparable to prohibitions, which control entry into sanctuaries and aim at protecting the sacred space from pollution by preventing pollution from reaching it in the first place.

<sup>287</sup> Πειθοῖ ἄγχα οὐ | δὲ χοῖρον οὐ θέμ[ις].

<sup>288</sup> *LSS* omits the dedication; see *I.Délos* 2305. See P. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*, Paris, 1970, 347, 474.

<sup>289</sup> The banker Philostratus, who was naturalized in Naples: *I.Délos* 1724.

<sup>290</sup> See Bruneau locc. cit.

<sup>291</sup> See Bruneau *ibid* 475. One recalls the dispute in Aristophanes *Ach.* 792–795 over the prohibition to sacrifice pigs to Aphrodite, which is enough to show that such prohibitions were not as geographically restricted as the epigraphical evidence might be thought to suggest.

<sup>292</sup> Cf. the reference to women in the fragmentary *LSAM* 42, which also refers to Heracles. On women and gender differences in cult regulations see in general Cole 1992.

<sup>293</sup> See recently Scullion 2000.

<sup>294</sup> I follow in this H. Seyrig *BCH* 51, 1927, 197.

*Sacrificial Tariffs.* The first-century B.C. *LSS* 72 from the agora of Thasos requires those offering sacrifice to the local athlete, Theogenes,<sup>295</sup> to pay no less than an obol into the *thesauros* (treasury box). The money collected therein would ultimately be used for a dedication or other work for Theogenes. Reluctance to pay would give rise to religious scruples. Similarly, *LSS* 86 from the acropolis of Lindus (ca. A.D. 200) requires worshippers (who must be of good conscience), sacrificing or consulting the oracle at the many-columned temple (a minor structure nevertheless),<sup>296</sup> which Seleucus constructed for Psythiros, to pay a drachma; the money paid is to be used each year for the maintenance of the temple of Athena. In both cases payments stand at a flat rate. Payment according to a differential scale is required, sometimes alongside specific parts of the victim, in a number of other documents, commonly depending upon the size and/or age of the animal. Such documents are called sacrificial tariffs. Though most Greek tariffs constitute sections in priesthood regulations, a few independent documents survive.<sup>297</sup> *LSCG* 125 from Mytilene (second century B.C.) envisions the sacrifice of two different animals. The first is unknown; the second is a hare. Specific parts are required to be placed on the cult table and sums (now lost) to be put in a *thesauros*. The destination of the money is unknown. Some tariffs undoubtedly governed independent sacrifices offered as one wished, but, as the Lindian *LSS* 86 suggests, sacrifices regulated in tariffs may depend upon a different activity.<sup>298</sup> The lack of context makes certain cases indecisive: *LSS* 108 (Rhodes; first century A.D.) opens with cathartic prescriptions<sup>299</sup> and continues with a short tariff for the offering of bovines, other quadrupeds, and a rooster (lines 8–12) in sacrifices performed in an *adyton*<sup>300</sup> in a sanctuary and seems connected to some other activity performed at this place. The

<sup>295</sup> See J. Pouilloux, 'Thogon's de Thasos É quarante ans après', *BCH* 118, 1994, 199–206; cf. Y. Grandjean and F. Salviat, *Guide de Thasos*, Paris, 2000, 73–76.

<sup>296</sup> See Morelli 1959, 179.

<sup>297</sup> See *LSCG* 45.4–6; *LSCG* 88 (the sums are thought to be paid for the animals rather than as sacrificial fees: Sokolowski's commentary); *LSCG* 163.17–21; *LSS* 110; *LSAM* 12 II; 22.10–11, cf. 25, 27; 73.29–32; *SEG* XLVII 1638.10–11; *Iscr.Cos* ED 216 B 2–8; Parker and Obbink 2000, no. 1.10–12; idem 2001, no. 5.6–9. Cf. below no. 11. These sacrificial tariffs are to be distinguished from the Delphic *pelanos* tariffs, governing cult fees paid by specific cities and their inhabitants; see *LSS* 38 A 25–32 (*CID* I 7); 39 (*CID* I 8), 41.8–12 (*CID* I 13); cf. *CID* I 1; for these documents cf. above p. 13.

<sup>298</sup> Cf. *Dependent Sacrifices* immediately below.

<sup>299</sup> Discussed above p. 17.

<sup>300</sup> See commentary on 23 A 22 below.



most extensive sacrificial tariff is not Greek but Punic. It was discovered in Marseilles and therefore came to be known as the Marseilles Tariff; the original provenance is, however, probably Carthage, where fragments of other tariffs were subsequently found. A text and a minimalist translation are given in Appendix A below. For a Latin tariff see the fragmentary inscription from Rome, *CIL* VI 820 (= *ILS* 4916).

*Dependent Sacrifices.* The motive for many of the sacrifices discussed so far is unknown and might vary considerably. Nevertheless, most of these sacrifices seem to have been performed at will, at the discretion of those offering them and for their own motives; together with an ensuing sacrificial meal they also appear to have constituted a self-contained event.<sup>301</sup> Such sacrifices are to be distinguished from sacrifices which might have been performed as needed or wished but which were required as a stage in connection with a specific cult activity for the most part, oracular consultation or, at the very least, in a sequence in which a preliminary sacrifice preceded a main one. Such sacrifices often involve, in one stage or another, non-blood offerings, mainly cakes.<sup>302</sup>

A fragmentary decree from Lebadeia, *LSCG* 74, surviving in conflicting transcriptions, prescribes the offering of ten cakes (called εἰλύται) alongside the payment of ten drachmas before consulting the oracle of Trophonius. Three, if not four, sacred laws can be shown to govern pre-incubation sacrifices in the cult of Asclepius. A fourth-century B.C. document from Epidaurus, *LSS* 22,<sup>303</sup> does not prescribe the sacrifice but rather the payment for items needed for the πρόθυσις<sup>304</sup> in all probability a preliminary sacrifice offered before incubation including half an obol for firewood needed for the sacrifice of a suckling animal and an obol for firewood for the sacrifice of a full-grown animal.<sup>305</sup> No. 13 below from Amphipolis (second half of the fourth century B.C.) is very fragmentary and might be taken to regulate various sacrifices in

<sup>301</sup> Besides the sacrificial tariffs just mentioned, *LSCG* 114 A is possibly a notable exception (above n. 57). The laconic character of the documents renders the validity of these observations relative.

<sup>302</sup> On cakes see below commentary on 23 B 3.

<sup>303</sup> More complete text in W. Peek, *Inchriften aus dem Asklepieion von Epidaurus* (*AbhLeip* 60.2) 1969, no. 336.

<sup>304</sup> See A.B. Petropoulou, *Prothesis and Altar: A Case Study*, in R. Étienne and M.-Th. le Dinahet (eds.) *L'Espace sacrificiel dans les civilisations méditerranéennes de l'antiquité*, Paris, 1991, 25–31.

<sup>305</sup> Cf. *LSS* 7 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 129) envisioning the provision of firewood (alongside a payment?) for the sacrifice of a suckling pig, offered for purification in an unknown context.

a sanctuary of Asclepius. The references to sacrifice, payments, and incubation suggest that pre-incubation sacrifice must at least be one of them.

The most revealing document is *I.Perg* III 161 from the Asclepieum at Pergamum. It is a general code of sorts addressing prospective incubants,<sup>306</sup> both new and returning patients, designed to give them an idea of the procedure they are about to undergo by outlining the rituals and enumerating requirements. The comprehensive format should not conceal the basic similarity to individual regulations discussed above. The law does not dictate the details of the actions but rather highlights the most essential points. It has survived in two fragmentary copies, dated on the basis of letter-forms to the second century A.D. From the last two lines (35–36) of the more extensive one (A), discovered in the street leading to the sanctuary's propylon, we learn that the stone was set up by Clodius Glycon when he held the office of *hieronomos* ([<sup>ca. 2</sup> K]λώδιος Γλύκων | [ιερ]ονομῶν ἀνέθηκεν).<sup>307</sup> The regulations themselves are likely to be quite a bit earlier. One doubts very much, however, that they were originally conceived as a comprehensive code. The document is rather a compilation of rules and regulations prevailing at the sanctuary, some of which were published through the years at locations within the sanctuary where single actions were performed.<sup>308</sup> Whether the compilation was done in connection with the present publication or the dedication consisted in publishing an updated version of a pre-existing document is hard to say.<sup>309</sup> Lines 1–23 of the more substantial fragment (A) read:

-----  
 [- - - - -] καὶ τραπεζοῦσθω σκ[έ]-  
 [λος δεξιὸν κ]αὶ σπλάγχνα κα[ὶ] λαβὼν ἄλλον στέφανον ἐλάας π[ρο]-  
 [θύεσθω Διὶ] Ἀποτροπαίωι πόπανον ῥαβδωτὸν ἐννεόμφαλον καὶ <sup>vac.</sup>  
 4 [Διὶ Μειλιχίω]ι πόπανον ῥαβδωτὸν ἐννεόμφαλον καὶ Ἀρτέμιδι  
 [. . . <sup>ca. 7</sup> . . .] καὶ Ἀρτέμιδι Προθυραῖαι καὶ Γῆι ἐκάστηι πόπανον <sup>vac.?</sup>  
 [ἐννεόμφ]αλον. <sup>v1/2</sup> ταῦτα δὲ ποιήσας θυέτω χοῖρον γάλαθηνον <sup>vac.</sup>  
 [τῶι Ἀσκλη]πιῶι ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ καὶ τραπεζοῦσθω σκέλος δεξι[α]-  
 8 [ὸν καὶ σπ]λάγχνα. ἐμβαλλέτω δὲ εἰς τὸν θησαυρὸν ὀβολοὺς τρεῖς].

<sup>306</sup> Rather than cult officials; see F. Sokolowski, *On the New Pergamene Lex Sacra*, *GRBS* 14, 1973, 407–413.

<sup>307</sup> The (abbreviated) praenomen is obviously lost in the lacuna; see M. W. Rrie's commentary, *I.Perg* III p. 190.

<sup>308</sup> *LSCG* 21 from the Piraeen Asclepieum discussed immediately below suggests such a process.

<sup>309</sup> See W. Rrie's commentary, pp. 169–170, 188. For sacred law dedications cf. below p. 173 n. 12.

- [εἰς δὲ τῇ]ν ἑσπέραν ἐπιβαλλέ[σ]θω πόπανα τρία ἐννεόμφαλα,  
 [τούτων μὲ]ν δύο ἐπὶ τὴν ἔξω θυμέλην Τύχηι καὶ Μνημοσύνηι, <sup>vac.2</sup>  
 [τὸ δὲ τρίτ]ον ἐν τῷ ἐγκοιμητήριῳ Θέμιδι. <sup>v</sup> ἄγνενέτω δὲ ὁ <sup>vac.</sup>  
 12 [εἰσπορευ]όμενος εἰς τὸ ἐγκοιμητήριον ἀπὸ τε τῶν προειρημέ- <sup>vac.2</sup>  
 [νων πάν]των καὶ ἀφροδισίων καὶ αἰγείου κρέως καὶ τυροῦ κα[ὶ]  
 [. . . <sup>ca. 7</sup> . . .]ΙΑΜΙΔΟΣ τριταῖος. <sup>v1/2</sup> τὸν δὲ στέφανον ὁ ἐγκοιμώμενος  
 [ἀποτιθέμ]εγος καταλείπτω ἐπὶ τῆς στιβάδος. <sup>v</sup> ἂν δὲ τις βού-  
 16 [ληται ὑπὲρ] τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐπερωτᾶν πλεονάκεις, προθυέσθω χοῖρο[ν],  
 [ἂν δὲ καί] ὑπὲρ ἄλλου πράγματος ἐπερωτᾶ, προθυέσθω χοῖρο[ν]  
 [ἄλλον κατὰ] τὰ προγεγραμμένα. εἰς δὲ τὸ μικρὸν ἐγκοιμητήριον  
 [ὁ εἰσὼν ἀγ]νείαν ἄγνενέτω τὴν αὐτήν. <sup>v1/2</sup> προθυέσθω δὲ Διὶ Ἀποτ[ρο]-  
 20 [παίῳ πόπ]ανον ῥαβδωτὸν ἐννεόμφαλον καὶ Διὶ Μειλιχίῳ πόπ[α]-  
 [νον ῥαβδω]τὸν ἐννεόμφαλον καὶ Ἀρτέμιδι Προθυραίαι καὶ Ἀρτέμ-  
 [ιδι . . . <sup>ca. 6</sup> . . .]ι καὶ Γῇ ἑκάστη πόπανον ἐννεόμφαλον. ἐμβαλλέ-  
 [τω δὲ καί] εἰς τὸν θησαυρὸν ὀβολοὺς τρεῖς. περιθυέσθωσαν  
 24 [δὲ ἀλφίτ?]ις <sup>310</sup> μέλιτι καὶ ἐλαίῳ δεδευμένοις καὶ λιβανωτῷ  
 [πάντες οἱ θ]εραπεύοντες τὸν θεὸν ἐπόμενοι τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ ΙΕ . <sup>(vel vac.2)</sup>  
 [. . . <sup>ca. 9</sup> . . .] εἰς δὲ τὴν ἑσπέραν ἐπιβαλλέσθωσαν οἱ τε ΠΡΟ . <sup>(vel vac.2)</sup>  
 [. . . <sup>ca. 8</sup> . . .]εἰς <sup>311</sup> τὸ ἐγκοιμητήριον καὶ οἱ περιθυσάμενοι πάν- <sup>vac.</sup>  
 28 [τες πόπα]να τρία ἐννεόμφαλα Θέμιδι, Τύχηι, Μνημοσύνηι ἐ- <sup>vac.2</sup>  
 [κάστη πό]πανον.

[- - -] and on the cult table he shall put the right leg and the *splanchna*. (2) And, having taken another olive wreath, he shall offer a preliminary sacrifice of a nine-knobbed, ribbed *popanon* to Zeus Apotropaios, a nine-knobbed, ribbed *popanon* to [Zeus Meilichios] and to Artemis [- - -] and to Artemis Prothyraia and to Ge a nine-knobbed, ribbed *popanon* each. (6) Having done so, he shall sacrifice a suckling pig to Asclepius on the altar and put the right leg and the *splanchna* on the cult table. (8) He shall put three obols in the *thesauros*. (9) In the evening he shall put three nine-knobbed *popana*, two [of which] on the outer *thymele* (sacri- cial hearth) for Tyche and Mnemosyne and the third in the *enkoimeterion* for Themis. (11) Whoever enters the *enkoimeterion* shall be pure from all the above mentioned (sources of pollution) and from sexual intercourse, goat meat and cheese, and [- - -] (on) the third day. (14) The incubant shall put away the wreath and leave it on the straw mat. (15) If someone wishes to consult about the same (ailment) several times, he shall offer a preliminary sacrifice of a piglet. If he consults about a different matter, he shall offer a preliminary sacrifice of [another] piglet according to what has been written above. (18) Whoever enters the small *enkoimeterion* shall keep the same purity. He shall offer a preliminary sacrifice of a nine-knobbed, ribbed *popanon* to Zeus Apotropaios, a nine-knobbed, ribbed *popanon* to Zeus Meilichios and to Artemis Prothyraia and to Artemis [- - -] and to Ge a nine-knobbed *popanon* each. He shall put three obols

<sup>310</sup> Sokolowski op cit. (? adieci): [πελανο(?)]ις Habicht (*I.Perg.*).

<sup>311</sup> προ[ο] [θυσάμενοι εἰς] W rrlle dubitanter (*I.Perg* III pp. 183-184 n. 82).

in the *thesauros*. (23) [All of] those attending(?) the god shall sacri ce around(?) with [barley?] moistened with honey and olive oil and with frankincense following the priest and [- - -]. (26) In the evening those who [have performed preliminary sacri ce?] in(?) the *enkoimeterion* and all those who have sacri ced around(?) shall put three nine-knobbed *popana* to Themis, Tyche, (and) Mnemosyne, a *popanon* each.<sup>312</sup>

Reconstruction of the rituals cannot concern us here. We should note, however, that the verb προθύεσθαι is used in this inscription both for a subordinate offering before a main one (so in lines 2-8) and for the entire sacri cial sequence before incubation (so evidently in lines 15-18).<sup>313</sup> Whether προθύεσθαι and περιθύεσθαι in lines 19 and 23 are parallel to προθύεσθαι and θύειν of lines 2-3 and 6 is a more complex question, as are the signi cance of περιθύεσθαι and the identity of the οἱ θεραπεύοντες τὸν θεόν.<sup>314</sup> None of the sacri cial procedures prescribed is independent, however; the sacri ces are not an end unto themselves but are performed as an essential stage in a sequence calling for preliminary offerings on the way toward a speci c end, incubation.

The role of cakes in these preliminary sacri ces is noteworthy. A number of Athenian documents originating from the Piraeus and the city Asclepieia prescribe comparable cake offerings. *LSCG* 21 from the Piraeus Asclepieum bears different texts, inscribed on the four sides of a single block (numbered **A**, **B**, **C**, and **D**) at different times during the fourth century B.C.,<sup>315</sup> it therefore allows some insight into the realistic need to facilitate cult performance and maintain proper practice, combined, perhaps, with developments in the cult, which underlie the formation of an inscribed cultic code. **A** lines 1-10 date to the early fourth century B.C. The opening lines, **A** 1-3, read: Θεοί. | Κατὰ τάδε προθύεσθαι|ι;<sup>316</sup> the following lines, **A** 3-10, list offerings of *popana* to a number of divinities associated with Asclepius.<sup>317</sup> **A** 11-17, added somewhat later in the century, record an addition by the priest of Asclepius, Euthydemus of Eleusis,<sup>318</sup> meant to facilitate the offering of *popana*, as it consisted of steles (now lost) bearing graphic representations of these cakes

<sup>312</sup> Instructions for thanksgiving offering of an animal and for payment for the cure follow.

<sup>313</sup> Cf. on this W rle *I.Perg* III pp. 172-173.

<sup>314</sup> For possible answers see W rle *I.Perg* III 182-184 and Sokolowski's article.

<sup>315</sup> Sokolowski *LSCG* p. 51; Guarducci 1967-1978, IV, 15.

<sup>316</sup> Gods. The preliminary sacri ces shall be performed as follows.

<sup>317</sup> (Apollo) Maleates, Hermes, Iaso, Akeso, and Panakeia (daughters of Asclepius), The Dogs, and The Dog-Leaders.

<sup>318</sup> The father of Moirokles of no. 2 below.

which were placed near the altars on which they would be offered. **B**, **C**, and **D** are still later. **B** 18–25 list more offerings of cakes (not *popana* this time) to Helios and Mnemosyne; **B** 26–28, **C**, and **D** prohibit the libation of wine on altars which evidently flanked the inscribed block. The motive for these preliminary offerings is typically not indicated. They have been interpreted at different times as pre-incubation offerings or as preliminary to an animal sacrifice to Asclepius.<sup>319</sup> From the early fourth-century B.C. decree found at the Piraeus, *LSS* 11 (= *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 47.22–39; the upper part includes an inventory), Euthydemus is known to have formulated *προθύματα* to be offered (at public expense) perhaps before animal sacrifice to Asclepius on the occasion of a festival.<sup>320</sup> There is no certainty, however, that these *προθύματα* are identical with the ones mentioned in *LSCG* 21,<sup>321</sup> which, whether followed by an animal sacrifice or not, could still be offered by individuals before incubation.

Cake offerings for a number of divinities are also prescribed on a group of small altars, *LSCG* 22–27 (fourth-third centuries B.C.), most, if not all, of which are thought to have originated either in the Piraeus Asclepium or the city Asclepium on the south slope of the Acropolis.<sup>322</sup> The divinities receiving the cakes, some of whom are present in the Pergamene and Piraeus regulations,<sup>323</sup> appear either as indirect objects in the dative or as owners of the altars in the genitive.

A comprehensive document from Erythrae, *LSAM* 24 (first part of the fourth century B.C.), regulates sacrifices offered on different occasions to Asclepius and his sanctuary-mate, Apollo, by both private individuals and the public. The document is inscribed on both sides of one stele which is damaged above. Preliminary sacrifices are regulated here too, private preliminary sacrifice being prohibited during the festival (*A* 27–28). The offering of sacrifice after incubation or following a vow is

<sup>319</sup> See e.g. Ziehen *LGS* II p. 71; Sokolowski *LSCG* p. 51; Edelstein and Edelstein 1945, II, 186–187; M. W. Rieu *LPerg* III 171 n. 1, 173–174; J.D. Mikalson, *Prothyma*, *AJP* 93, 1972, 577–583 at 580–581; Guarducci 1967–1978, IV, 16–17; Parker 1996, 182.

<sup>320</sup> I.e. if the *προθύματα* and ἡ ἄλλη θυσία are offered on the same occasion, where meat distribution is held (lines 10–16), which is not necessarily mandatory.

<sup>321</sup> *Contra*: Mikalson loc. cit. (above n. 319).

<sup>322</sup> One recalls the incubation scene in Aristophanes *Plutus* where a priest is scouring the altars and tables for leftover cakes; cf. below commentary on 23 B 3.

<sup>323</sup> The Moirai (*LSCG* 22), Artemis (*LSCG* 23; an undecided case), Heracles (*LSCG* 24), Pythian Apollo (?; *LSCG* 25), Mnemosyne (*LSCG* 26); the recipient is missing in *LSCG* 27.

to be accompanied by a paian, which is, quite remarkably, dictated, to be first chanted three times around the altar of Apollo, when the divine portion is put on it.<sup>324</sup>

### Periodic Sacrifices

*The Sacrificial Calendar.*<sup>325</sup> Sacrificial calendars are among the earliest and latest documents in the corpus of Greek sacred laws. The origins of calendars are relatively diverse. Alongside state calendars, we have deme calendars, the fourth-century Attic deme calendars forming a coherent group;<sup>326</sup> the so-called Accord of the Salaminians, *LSS* 19, outlines the calendar of a *genos*;<sup>327</sup> *LSAM* 39 from Thebes at Mycale seems to have belonged to a sanctuary serving a small pastoral community; the Roman Imperial specimen from Athens, *LSCG* 52, is probably a calendar of a cult association, to judge from the limited scope of the activities considered and their character.<sup>328</sup>

A typical entry in a sacrificial calendar includes the month, the recipient, and the type of victim to be offered;<sup>329</sup> the date within the month may or may not be indicated. This basic form is recognizable in the earliest calendar known to me, *Corinth VIII* 1, 1 (*IG IV* 1597) dated to around 600 B.C. (Figures 1–2):<sup>330</sup>

<sup>324</sup> For placing the divine portion on the altar cf. below commentary on 21.7–9.

<sup>325</sup> See the following (an asterisk (\*) signifies documents which strictly speaking might not be calendars but resemble calendars in format): Attica: *LSCG* 1; 2; 7; \*10; 11 A; *LGS* II 15 A (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 238)?, *LSCG* 16, 17; *LSS* 9, 10; *SEG* XLVII 71 (state calendar); *LSCG* 18; 20; 52; *LSS* \*18; 19.79–96; 132; below no. 1. Corinth: *Corinth VIII* 1, 1 (= *IG IV* 1597). Sparta: *LSCG* 62. Messenia: *LSCG* 64. Callatis: \**LSCG* 90 (= *I.Kallatis* 47). Myconos: *LSCG* 96. Chios: *LSS* 130. Thera: \**LGS* I 19 (= *IG XII* 3, 450). Crete: *LSCG* 146 (Gortyn); below no. 23 (Eleutherna). Cos: *LSCG* 151; \*153; (Cos); 169 (Isthmus); 176 (Cos). Erythrae: \**LSAM* 26 + *SEG* XXX 1327; \**LSAM* 27. Thebes at Mycale: *LSAM* 39. Miletus: *LSAM* 41. Stratonicea: \**LSAM* 67. Miletupolis: *I.Kyz.* II 1. For *LSCG* 128, 165, and *LGS* I 15 see next subsection. One of the great losses for the corpus is *LGS* I 16 from Tegea (fourth century B.C.). The first line, the only one to survive, Νόμος ἑρὸς ἐν ἅμαρτα πάντα a sacred law for all the days i.e., as Prott notes, of the year, probably implies that a cult calendar followed.

<sup>326</sup> See commentary on no. 1 below.

<sup>327</sup> For the calendar of a gymnasium from Cos, *LSCG* 165, see next subsection.

<sup>328</sup> Cf. Prott *LGS* I pp. 12–13. For *LSCG* 128 see next subsection.

<sup>329</sup> One should note – and this is especially pertinent to public sacrifice and calendar entries – that when a few animals are acceptable for a divinity, the final choice between them might not be always religiously meaningful and may sometimes depend on the scale of the occasion for sacrifice. This must be borne in mind when the evidence is tabulated for statistical purposes.

<sup>330</sup> The arrangement of the text follows S. Dow, *Corinthiaca*, *AJA* 46, 1942, 69–72.

ca. 600 a.

## ΒΟΥΣΤΡΟΦΗΔΟΝ

Latus A	Φοινυζ[αίο - - - <sup>dies(?)</sup> - - - <sup>nomen divinum</sup> - - - <sup>animal</sup> - - ]	←
	[ - - - <sup>dies(?)</sup> - - - <sup>nomen divinum</sup> - - - - - τέτο]ρες χο	→
	ἱοι[ - - - - - - - - - - - ]	←
Latus B	[ - - - - - - - - - - - ]ται	←
	κε Ϻ[ - - - - - - - - - - - ]	→
	h[ - - - - - - - - - - - ] <sup>331</sup>	←

In the month of Phoinikaios [on (date?); for (divinity)] four piglets.<sup>332</sup>

This basic formula is generally followed elsewhere though documents may vary considerably with respect to details.<sup>333</sup> It may be accompanied by information regarding the victim, such as age, color, sex (a pregnant female might be required), or price, and by details regarding the performance of the sacrifice (such as burning the victim completely), the consumption (which may be required to be done on the spot), and the distribution of the meat; the occasion for the sacrifice may be identified,<sup>334</sup> as may be the place of performance and the officiants; other pertinent information can be added, such as the prohibition against the participation of foreigners in the calendar of Mykonos, *LSCG* 96.26. Some calendars are very thrifty, adding scarcely any such details, while others may be much more informative. The Attic deme calendars of the Marathonian Tetrapolis (*LSCG* 20) and of Erchia (*LSCG* 18) are common examples of non-informative calendars. The calendar of Mykonos, *LSCG* 69, which on two occasions even states the motive for a sacrifice,<sup>335</sup> and the Coan calendar *LSCG* 151 which, even in its fragmentary

<sup>331</sup> Latus A: The kappa is dotted in *Corinth* VIII 1, 1 but I doubt that any traces are now visible; following the last omicron *Corinth* VIII 1, 1 has a dotted iota; I could see only an incision which is not likely to belong to an intentional stroke. Latus B: The tau is put in brackets in *Corinth* VIII 1.1; a lower part of a vertical stroke is visible on the stone: *LSAG* 404 no. 18 has [- - ]ς αι κ|ε μ[- - -] κτλ. For a non-joining fragment of this inscription see *SEG* XXVI 392. For a Corinthian inscription on a lead plaque, comparable to the present calendar in both contents and poor state of preservation, see *SEG* XXXII 359.

<sup>332</sup> In Attica piglet sacrifice *en masse* is mentioned in sacred laws in an Eleusinian context. See *LSCG* 20 B 44 (Marathonian Tetrapolis; three animals); *LS* 18 A 31, B 27 (Paiania; two animals). Elsewhere see *LSCG* 65.68 (Andania; three χοίρῳσκοι; cathartic); *LSCG* 62.19 (Sparta; unknown number and context); 63.8 (Laconia; two animals for Demeter), *LSAM* 26.65 (Erythrae; two animals, unknown divinity).

<sup>333</sup> For a representative example see the calendar of Thorikos, no. 1 below.

<sup>334</sup> On this see next subsection.

<sup>335</sup> Ὑπὲρ καρποῦ (for the crops) lines 16 and 25.



form, is still one of the cases in which a ritual is prescribed in relatively great detail, are often given as examples of informative calendars.<sup>336</sup>

The differences between detailed and concise calendars may to some extent depend upon the circumstances surrounding their publication. As it states clearly, the calendar of Myconos, *LSCG* 96 (ca. 200 B.C.), was occasioned by the island's synoecism, which involved a religious reform (lines 2–5). This calendar, in all likelihood the learned work of a professional committee—the work of Nicomachus on the revision of the state calendar in Athens in the last decade of the fifth century B.C. comes to mind<sup>337</sup>—reflects the reform in noting additional sacrifices not an unlikely result of the consolidation of local cults and traditions and changes in preexisting ones. The connection between political unification and the consolidation of individual cults is noted by Aristotle (*Politics* 1319b 24), and there is reason to believe that it contributed to the composition and publication of the calendar of Cos following the synoecism of 366.<sup>338</sup> If the detailed format is a result of such circumstances, it should not necessarily be expected elsewhere, let alone from calendars of geographically limited civic bodies like the Athenian demes, with their decidedly local focus and relatively narrow scope.<sup>339</sup>

Some insight into the function of such calendars and the reasons underlying their publication can be found in the Accord of the Salaminians, *LSS* 19, the second part of which incorporates a sacrificial calendar carefully noting the prices of the victims (lines 84–93). These prices are said (lines 81–84) to be recorded to enable officials to estimate the sums they have to contribute for the sacrifices. Prices are similarly noted in the calendars of the Marathonian Tetrapolis and of Erchia. The Erchian calendar, comprising five different sets of sacrifices, even indicates the subtotal expenses. All three calendars could therefore be seen as financial rather than as religious documents. Expediting the management of cult finances is, however, not the end of the Accord of

---

<sup>336</sup> The abundance of details in Coan official religious documents has been noted above (p. 52) in respect to priesthood regulations.

<sup>337</sup> Cf. Dow 1953–1957, 21, 23–24.

<sup>338</sup> See S.M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos* (Hypomnemata 51), Göttingen, 1978, 292–293.

<sup>339</sup> The revision of the Athenian state calendar, though conscious and expert work, had its own motives; see Dow 1953–1957; K. Clinton, 'The Nature of the Late Fifth-Century Revision of the Athenian Law Code,' in *Studies in Epigraphy, History, and Topography Presented to Eugene Vanderpool* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 19), 27–37; P.J. Rhodes, 'The Athenian Code of Laws, 410–399 B.C.,' *JHS* 111, 1991, 87–100. For Solon's calendar and its successors see also Parker 1996, 43–55.



the Salaminians but rather the means to an end: the document enabled the reconciliation between the two factions of Salaminians which interrupted the proper performance of cult, as indicated by the preamble to the calendar, ὅπως Σαλαμίνιοι τὰ ἱερὰ θύωσι αἰεὶ τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἥρωσι κατὰ τὰ πάτρια<sup>340</sup> (line 79; cf. 19 20, 24 27). The financial motive for the publication is therefore offset by religious motives. This is doubtless the case with the calendars of Erchia and the Marathonian Tetrapolis as well. Both do not merely list the victims and their prices. To keep the performance in line with custom, prerequisites of a purely religious value are noted.<sup>341</sup> The publication of these calendars makes the necessary information available to those responsible for cult performance; it has an added value in the way of accountability: like the publication of priesthood regulations, publication enables the worshippers to check the performance against the written record, establishing them as an interested party in the process and so contributing to the ultimate goal of the publication, that is, to ensure the proper performance of cult.

*Festival Calendars.* Generally speaking, a typical peculiarity of sacrificial calendars is their general lack of interest in the occasion for the sacrifice. Festivals may be named,<sup>342</sup> but we are commonly confronted with a great variety of unnamed sacrifices, the scope, character, and significance of which – doubtless obvious to the ancient audience – are now by and large a matter for inference drawn from the date, the type and size of the victim, and any additional information regarding performance.<sup>343</sup> We have, on the other hand, a very small number of calendars which do not list sacrifices at all but rather occasions. For lack of a better term, they may be called festival calendars.<sup>344</sup> *LSCG* 128 (Roman

<sup>340</sup> In order that the Salaminians may keep sacrificing to the gods and the heroes according to the ancestral customs. Cf. Ferguson 1938, 43.

<sup>341</sup> The calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis, *LSCG* 20, prescribes an all black victim in B 18 and a pregnant victim in lines A 28, 43; B 9, 12, 48, 49. The calendar of Erchia, *LSCG* 18, prescribes, inter alia, color (A 9 10; B 17 18), wineless libations (A 41 43; B 19 20; Γ 24 25; 52; Δ 22 23; 45 46; E 14 15; Δ 63), a pregnant victim (Δ 19 20), and frequently forbids carrying sacrificial meat away. For prices and their significance in the state calendar (*LSCG* 17, *LSS* 10, *SEG* XLVII 71; *LSS* 9) see Dow 1953 1957. For the lists of sacrifices from Erythrae *LSAM* 26 + *SEG* XXX 1327 (first half of the second century B.C.) and probably *LSAM* 27 (early fourth century B.C.) see below p. 80.

<sup>342</sup> Though not necessarily with exact dating which may, in fact, not be needed, the festival being indicative in and of itself.

<sup>343</sup> Cf. more generally Parker 1996, 50–55.

<sup>344</sup> The regulations of the Attic deme Paiania, *LSS* 18 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 250; 450 430 B.C.), listing offerings in connection with certain festivals, resembles a sacrificial calendar

Imperial period), now in the Louvre and generally ascribed to Dardanus in the Troad (though sometimes considered to have originated from Mytilene),<sup>345</sup> reads:

-----  
 μηνὸς Δείου ☿ δ' ☿, ἡ ἀνάβασις τῆς θεοῦ τῇ ζ',  
 ἡ ὕδροποσία μηνὸς Ἰουλαίου νομηγία ☿,  
 ἡ πομπὴ ἐκ πρυτανείου ☿ ι',  
 4 τὰ νεώματα μηνὸς Ἀπολλωνίου ☿ ιε',  
 ἡ δύσις τῆς θεοῦ μηνὸς Ἡφαιστίου ☿ δ',  
 ἡ κατάκλησις μηνὸς Ποσιδείου ☿ ιε'.  
 κατὰ κέλευσιν τῆς θεοῦ Ἀριστίππος Ἀριστίππου  
 8 ἐπέγραψα.

[ - - ] on the 4th of the month of Deios, the ascent of the goddess on the seventh; the *hydroposia* on the new moon of the month of Ioulaios; the procession from the prytaneion on the tenth; the *neomata* (breaking of fallow land) on the 15th of the month of Apollonios; the descent of the goddess on the 4th of the month of Hephaistios; the invocation on the 15th of the month of Posideios. I, Aristippos son of Aristippos, inscribed (this) at the command of the goddess.

The calendar, commonly taken to belong to an association dedicated to the cult of a goddess (probably Kore in one of her guises),<sup>346</sup> emphasizes occasions rather than offerings, and might seem more evocative of Roman calendars than most of its Greek counterparts.<sup>347</sup> The second-century B.C. calendar from Cos, *LSCG* 165, has a similar format and lists occasions relevant to a gymnasium. The Pergamene *LGS* I 17 (before 133 B.C.) reminds one of the A.D. 4 14 *Feriale Cumanum*<sup>348</sup> as it seems to commemorate historical events.<sup>349</sup>

*Calendar Extracts.* A number of inscriptions appear to be extracts from a public calendar of *sacri ces*, published individually at the place where the *sacri ces* prescribed were to be performed. These inscriptions are referred to as calendar extracts. With virtually no exceptions,<sup>350</sup> all

---

because of the preoccupation with offerings. Cf. *LSAM* 67 from Stratonicea (third century B.C.).

<sup>345</sup> Sokolowski's commentary p. 224.

<sup>346</sup> Protz *LGS* I p. 40; Sokolowski *LSCG* p. 224.

<sup>347</sup> See G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*<sup>2</sup>, Munich, 1912, 2 3; M. Beard, J. North, and S. Price, *Religions of Rome*, Cambridge 1998, I, 5 6; II, 60 61.

<sup>348</sup> A. Degraffi, *I Italiae*, XIII, II 48.

<sup>349</sup> Cf. also *LGS* I 27 which might find its way to a more inclusive corpus. The same may hold true of the fragment dated to the Severan period, *Milet* VI 2, 944, which has not been listed in Appendix B below.

<sup>350</sup> *LSCG* 133 (see next subsection); *IG* XII 5, 15.

are Rhodian, mostly Hellenistic, the earliest ones (*LSS* 89; cf. 88a) dating to the fourth century, i.e. after the synoecism of 408/7.<sup>351</sup> They are inscribed on comparatively small stones and comprise relatively few short lines, commonly listing the date or dates (though not the occasion), recipient divinities and victims, and naming the officiants who are to perform the sacrifices; additional information, mainly the requirement to consume sacrificial meat on the spot, may also be included; *LSS* 88–89 from Lindus excludes women. See *LSCG* 140, 141; *LSS* 87–89 (Lindus); *LSS* 94–97, 99–102, 104 (Camirus); *LSS* 110 (the Rhodian Peraea); cf. 16 below (Lindus); *LSS* 92 (Ialysus).<sup>352</sup> *LSS* 103 from Camirus (third century B.C.) prescribes sacrifice *ὅκκα δέηι* (whenever needed). The lack of a precise date may be explained by the function of the recipient, Zeus Hyetios (rain-giver): the sacrifice is to be performed in periods of drought.<sup>353</sup>

*Other Periodic Sacrifices.* *LSCG* 142 from Lindus and *LSS* 98 from Camirus look like calendar extracts but belong to private cults, and the same probably holds true of the Thera ca. 400 B.C. *LSCG* 133.<sup>354</sup> Column A of the law from Selinus, no. 27 below (first half of the fifth century B.C.), prescribes quadrennial sacrificial rituals and considers repetition after a year and after two years. A fifth-century B.C. document from Thasos, *LSCG* 113, prescribes the performance of a sacrifice<sup>355</sup> to Athena Patroia every other year; women are allowed to participate. A pentaeteric sacrifice is prescribed in the fifth-century B.C. *LSS* 30 from Thalamai in Laconia. The recipient, Zeus Kataibates,<sup>356</sup> suggests that the sacrifice is offered at a place struck by lightning that might have killed the person whose name, Gaihylos, appears in the last line. The obscure and diversely restored epigram, which follows the heading from an oracle of Hygieia and Asclepius<sup>357</sup> in the Athenian late *LSS* 16 (ca. first-

<sup>351</sup> For which cf. commentary on 16.3–4 below.

<sup>352</sup> The deme Pantoreis.

<sup>353</sup> Morelli 1959, 146–147.

<sup>354</sup> See commentaries ad locc.

<sup>355</sup> The interpretation *ἔρδεται τέλη* (lines 2–4) is contested (e.g. Sokolowski ad loc.; Guarducci 1967–1978, IV, 12; *SEG* XXXV 956 (referring to C. Gallavotti *BollClass* 6, 1985, 46–49 which I was not able to consult)). Even if it is translated perform ceremonies rather than sacrifices, the ceremonies are likely to include sacrifices.

<sup>356</sup> The descender. See below commentary on 1.10.

<sup>357</sup> *Ἐκ χορημοῦ Ὑγίης καὶ Ἀσκληπι[οῦ]*. F. Hiller von Gaertringen (*Ein Asklepiosorakel aus Athen*, *ARW* 32, 1935, 367–370) restored a complete hexameter: *Ἐκ χορημοῦ Ὑγίης καὶ Ἀσκληπι[οῦ] Ἡρακλέης τε*.

second century A.D.), speaks (lines 2–4) of a mid-month wineless offering; much depends upon conflicting restorations.

*Compulsory Sacrifices.* A sizable stone from Cos, *LSCG* 168 (1st century B.C.), broken above and below, contains a long list of persons of various professions who are required to perform sacrifice, notably tax farmers and persons of sea-related occupations. Comparable requirements appear in Coan sales of priesthoods.<sup>358</sup> This practice appears elsewhere although not on such a large scale (*LSAM* 49, 52). A preamble of a third-century B.C. Athenian decree, *LSCG* 40, mentions a custom requiring public doctors to sacrifice twice a year to Asclepius and Hygieia. It is reasonable to conclude (Sokolowski *LSCG* p. 75) that the aim of the decree was to give the custom a legal form.

*Some Undecided Cases.* *LSCG* 60 from Epidaurus, dating to the late 5th century B.C., embodies two analogous sets of regulations for sacrifices to Apollo (with his temple-mates) and Artemis and Leto, and to Asclepius and his temple-mates, receiving bovines,<sup>359</sup> parts of which are assigned to various cult personnel (*hieromnamones*,<sup>360</sup> singers, and sanctuary custodians). The rest of the meat would be distributed among other participants in the sacrifice, perhaps the general public, but the occasion is unknown. Distribution of parts of multiple victims in an unknown context is evident in the fragments from Delphi *CID* I 4 6, joined as *LSS* 40 (second half of the 5th century B.C.). *LSS* 116 from Cyrene (second century B.C.) contains two fragments listing offerings to a number of divinities, some rather obscure; the format resembles a sacrificial calendar, but no dates appear. *LSS* 80 from Samos prescribes the provision (παράσχε[ευνάζειν], line 3) of different cakes, evidently to be used for sacrifice.<sup>361</sup>

### Sale of Sacrificial Meat and Skins

The sale of meat from public sacrifices is stipulated in Athens in the sacred law of the deme Skambonidai, *LSCG* 10 C 17–22 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 244; 470–460 B.C.), and in the calendar of Thorikos, below no. 1, where in a

<sup>358</sup> See Parker and Obbink 2000: 427–429.

<sup>359</sup> And chickens (if this is what is meant by *καλαίς*; see LSJ with Supplement s.v.).

<sup>360</sup> See below commentary on nos. 6 and 26.27–28; for the passage cf. commentary on 11.24.

<sup>361</sup> See also the following fragments, some of which might well have belonged to priestly or festival regulations: *LSCG* 6; 147; *LSS* 66; 67; 70; 109; *LSAM* 21; *SEG* XXX 1283; below no. 21; cf. 3; 9; 10. Unfortunately precious little has survived of the law of the Achaian confederacy from Epidaurus regarding the cult of Hygieia *LSS* 23.

number of cases a victim is referred to as *πρατόν* i.e. to be sold.<sup>362</sup> A short fragment from Didyma, *LSAM* 54, ordains the sale by weight, evidently of sacrificial meat; snouts and extremities (*ἀκροζώλια*) are discussed alongside sheep heads.<sup>363</sup>

The sale of skins of sacrificial victims is specified occasionally in sacred laws.<sup>364</sup> It is discussed in a fragmentary Magnesian decree concerning sacrifice to Zeus Akraios, *LSCG* 85, which assigns part of the proceeds to the priest for safekeeping, and in the Pergamene *LSAM* 12. III (second century B.C.) directing the proceeds to the sacred funds, a part having been used to remunerate various cult personnel.<sup>365</sup> The stone, set up by a former cult official (*hieronomos*) named Dionysius, includes three different documents pertaining to the cult of Athena Nikephoros. The first part (I) lists cathartic requirements for entry into the sanctuary. The other two (II and III) are popular decrees regarding sacrifice or rather sacrificial fees.

### Participation in Cult

Participation in cult is a right reserved in many cases for a specific group, if for no other reason than because, when sacrifice is involved, the participants are entitled to a share in the meat<sup>366</sup> otherwise a rather rare commodity and because the right to participate in a cult may confer upon the participants an entitlement to cult offices and associated privileges.<sup>367</sup> The corpus includes two documents explicitly dealing with participation in cult. *LSCG* 173 (ca. 200 B.C.), a decree of the tribes sharing the cult of Apollo and Heracles at Halasarna,<sup>368</sup> stipulates the preparation of a new list (for which see Paton-Hicks, *I.Cos* 368) of those who are entitled to a share. The main objective of the list emerges in lines 86–95: the list is to be checked when sacrificial meat

<sup>362</sup> Lines 9 with commentary; 11, 23, 25.

<sup>363</sup> Cf. also *SEG* XLV 1508 A 23–25 from Bargylia with n. 517 below.

<sup>364</sup> *LSS* 61.63 (Aigiale); *LSAM* 72.44–45 (Halicarnassus; private cult; sale of Beece); *SEG* XLV 1508.13–14 (Bargylia); cf. *LSS* 23.3–4 (Epidaurus). The Athenian Dermatikon Accounts, (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1496) are an essential piece of evidence; see Rosivach 1994, esp. 48–64, 110–112. For the treatment of skins cf. below commentaries on 3.5; 20.7; 24.5.

<sup>365</sup> *Neokoros*, flute-playing girls, *δολύκτριαι* (women performing the ritual cry at sacrifices), gatekeeper.

<sup>366</sup> M. Detienne, Culinary Practices and the Spirit of Sacrifice, in Detienne and Vernant 1989, 1–20; Rosivach 1994, 1–8.

<sup>367</sup> Cf. Ziehen *LGS* II 323–324.

<sup>368</sup> Lines 3–6: ἔδο[ξ]ε ταῖς φυλαῖς αἷς | μέτεστι τῶν ἱερῶν Ἄ | πόλλωνος καὶ Ἡρακλεῦς | ἐν Ἀλασσάρναι.

is distributed and when lots for the priesthood are drawn. A decree of Olymus, *LSAM* 58,<sup>369</sup> sets out to determine entitlement to participation in specific cults (Apollo and Artemis) limited to members of the three old tribes (lines 8–9).

### Varia

*Libation.* Libation, as an accessory to sacrifice, is mentioned in sacrificial regulations as needed, namely, when the ritual calls for libation that is not ordinary. Libation of wine being the most common type, it is ordinarily prohibited where it is not desirable rather than prescribed where it is; libation of other liquids is prescribed when desirable.<sup>370</sup> Libation is rarely treated in sacred laws without specific reference to sacrifice. *LSS* 62 from Paros, dated to the sixth or fifth century B.C., prescribes libation of honey on an altar of Zeus Elasteros.<sup>371</sup> The Thasian fourth-century B.C. *LSS* 68 seems to authorize offerings to Agathos Daimon, prohibiting offerings to Agathe Tyche; the inscription is inscribed on a libation altar.<sup>372</sup> A fourth-century B.C. inscription from Chios, *LSS* 79, prohibits the use of wine in the cult of the Moirai and Zeus the Leader of the Moirai. The exact expression used is (lines 1–2) οἶνον μὴ προσφέρε[ν].<sup>373</sup> For wine-related prohibition see below commentary on no. 22.

*Incense.* From third-century B.C. Cyrene comes a comparable prohibition, *LSS* 133, against carrying frankincense (λιβανωτός) into a sanctuary of Hecate. For incense cf. also *Daily Service* below.

*Oaths.* Sacred laws of different kinds may occasionally order the taking of an oath and may even dictate the actual words, as in the decree from Korope,<sup>374</sup> *LSCG* 83.51–58, or the calendar of Thorikos, below no. 1.57–64, where the provision of the oath victims (lines 11; 52) is also prescribed. We should mention here two cases where specific directions pertaining to the performance of an oath ceremony are given, one Archaic, the other Roman Imperial. The latter, *LSAM* 88, from Laodicea in Phrygia, inscribed on an altar, instructs those wishing to

<sup>369</sup> *IMylasa* 861; second half of the second century B.C.

<sup>370</sup> Cf. below no. 27 A 10–11, 13–14 with commentary (where the libations are probably additional to the ones accompanying the sacrifices).

<sup>371</sup> Cf. commentary on 27 B 1 below.

<sup>372</sup> Sur le long côté d'un autel ou fosse à libation: G. Daux, *BCH* 50, 1926, 236. For Agathos Daimon and Agathe Tyche see Sfameni Gasparro 1997, esp. 78–91.

<sup>373</sup> Do not carry wine into, the divinities appearing in the genitive.

<sup>374</sup> Discussed above pp. 10–11.

have an oath taken to keep pure and to sacrifice an oath victim (σφαγίον ὄρσιον, σφαγίον referring to the method by which the victim is to be slaughtered).<sup>375</sup> The other is *LSAM* 30 B, one of two surviving fragments of blocks from Ephesus, evidently Archaic but variably dated,<sup>376</sup> belonging to what might have been a code of laws.<sup>377</sup> The surviving verse lines seem to have belonged to a procedural law, stipulating that oaths be taken by court witnesses and that a boar<sup>378</sup> be provided as a victim for this purpose.<sup>379</sup>

*Augury.* The other fragment (A) of *LSAM* 30 is the only surviving sacred law which gives exact prescriptions for any kind of divination. The thirteen partially surviving lines contain rules for the interpretation of the flight of birds.<sup>380</sup>

*Daily Service.*<sup>381</sup> *LSS* 25 (third-second century B.C.) contains fragments of what must have been an extensive document, which evidently regulated the daily service at the sanctuary of Asclepius at Epidaurus. Reference is made inter alia to altars around which someone is supposed to go (3; cf. 35), to libations (5<sup>2</sup>, 10 (in the evening)), to carrying a censer (13), and to sacrifice (29, 45). Daily service is not a characteristic Greek practice and might have reached Greece from the Near East.<sup>382</sup> Most ordinary Greek temples were commonly opened on special days only.<sup>383</sup> The Epidaurian document does not have a direct parallel, but *LSAM* 28<sup>384</sup> preserves the material part of a decree from Teos, dated to the reign of Tiberius, prescribing daily<sup>385</sup> hymn-singing by the ephebes in honor of Dionysus. A late and rather detailed decree from Stratonicea, *LSAM* 69 (late second century A.D.), on the cult of Zeus and Hecate, stipulates the appointment and management of a choir of children to

<sup>375</sup> See below commentary on 23 A 21.

<sup>376</sup> Ca. 500–475?; *LSAG*<sup>2</sup> 344 no. 55 with pp. 339–340. A date after 400 B.C. has also been proposed; see *Nomima* II p. 66.

<sup>377</sup> Sokolowski *LSAM* p. 85; *Nomima* I p. 66.

<sup>378</sup> κάρπος: possibly a piglet. Cf. commentary on 5.37–38 below.

<sup>379</sup> Sokolowski, *LSAM* pp. 85–86. I note here *LSAM* 19 (= *CMRDM* 53) regarding the observation of a vow: Lane, *CMRDM* III 23.

<sup>380</sup> See Sokolowski's commentary pp. 85–86.

<sup>381</sup> See M.P. Nilsson, Pagan Divine Service in Late Antiquity, *HTR* 38, 1945, 63–69; idem *GGR* II<sup>3</sup> 381–384.

<sup>382</sup> See e.g. Mishnah (*Qodashim*) *Tamid* which describes in minute detail the morning service and sacrifice in the temple at Jerusalem.

<sup>383</sup> E.g. Stengel 1920, 28; Sokolowski *LSS* p. 62.; cf. *LSAM* 15.42–44.

<sup>384</sup> Cf. below n. 537.

<sup>385</sup> *Contra*: Sokolowski *LSAM* p. 82, taking every day (line 8) to mean every festival day.

sing hymns. The practice is mentioned elsewhere occasionally.<sup>386</sup> The sale of the priesthood of Asclepius from Chalcedon, *LSAM* 5 (1st century B.C.), requires the priest to open the temple each day and keep the adjacent stoa clean (23–26).<sup>387</sup> In the fragmentary *Ischr.Cos* ED 236.8–11 (1st century B.C.), the priestess is required to open the temple and burn incense but only on certain days.

### Funerary Laws

The corpus of sacred laws is somewhat inconsistent in its treatment of laws governing the cult of the dead. The few cases prescribing straightforward private offerings for the dead are left out,<sup>388</sup> while cult foundations, in which commemoration of the dead is handled in a more elaborate fashion,<sup>389</sup> are included.<sup>390</sup> Also included are three funerary laws.<sup>391</sup> All are legislative acts. The first two, the 5th-century B.C. *LSCG* 97 from Iulis on Ceos, consisting of two different documents, and the third-century B.C. *LSAM* 16 from Gambreion are state-issued. The third is a section (*LSCG* 77 C) from the regulations of the Delphic phratry of the Labyadai, *CID* I 9 C 19–52, inscribed in the first part of the fourth century B.C.<sup>392</sup> To a certain extent, all three betray a tension between practice and custom. Legislation is not interested in spelling out the details of funerary practice; common knowledge of the essential details is taken for granted, as in the case of sacrificial regulations. It appears rather to attempt to protect practice from personal modifications, restricting it so as to keep it within the confines of what is considered proper custom.<sup>393</sup>

<sup>386</sup> See Sokolowski *LSAM* p. 164. cf. also *LSS* 121.12–17 (for this inscription see above p. 54).

<sup>387</sup> This policy would make good practical sense if incubation was practiced at the sanctuary.

<sup>388</sup> A number of such inscriptions (e.g. *TAM* II 636–637) are known from Teos and the adjacent region. See L. Robert, *Études Anatoliennes*, Paris, 1937, 391; C. Naour, *Inscriptions de Lycie*, *ZPE* 24, 1977, 265–290 at 276–280, 289–290.

<sup>389</sup> Whether by means of public or private cult performance. Though the case is not at all clear-cut, documents included in the corpus tend to associate commemoration with some form of divine worship, as has been pointed out above (p. 8). Cf. W. Kamps, *Les origines de la fondation cultuelle dans la Grèce ancienne*, *Archives d'histoire du droit oriental* 1, 1937, 145–179 at 156–157, 161, 168–172.

<sup>390</sup> See below pp. 383–387 *passim*.

<sup>391</sup> Cf. also the law of a Piraeen *thiasos*, *LSS* 126 (ca. 200 B.C.), of which only the end survives; *IG* XII 3, 87; *IG* XII 7, 17.

<sup>392</sup> The text itself might possibly be earlier. See Rougemont *CID* I pp. 42, 87–88.

<sup>393</sup> Cf. on this point Ziehen *LGS* II pp. 261–262.



This is most evident in the main text (A) of *LSCG* 97, entitled νόμοι<sup>394</sup> regarding the dead,<sup>395</sup> which is the most detailed of these three inscriptions. The text consists mainly of restrictions concerning, inter alia, the costs of shrouds, and the amounts of wine and oil that may be taken to the grave (for libation). The funeral should proceed quietly – that is, with no lamentations – up to the grave;<sup>396</sup> women and men are to keep apart on the way back; the number of women allowed in the house is limited; thirtieth-day memorial rites are prohibited. Some prescriptions accompany these restrictions: sacrifice at the grave is to be performed according to the ancestral customs; evidently no directions are needed. Prescriptions regarding the number and color of the shrouds and the bier are more detailed. Great care is taken to prescribe the purification of the house where death has occurred and of those polluted as a result. Significantly, purity is also the concern of the following short popular decree (B). *CID* I 9 C 19 52, identified in the heading as a θεσμός regarding funerary paraphernalia,<sup>397</sup> enforced at the risk of a hefty fine, features a few restrictions comparable to the Cean law; prescriptions regarding the shrouds also appear. The scope is more limited and the document is particularly concerned with restricting lamentation.

*LSAM* 16 from Gambreion in Mysia explicitly identifies itself as a νόμος (lines 4, 22–23, 29), put forward by one Alexon son of Damon. It differs from the other two documents in regulating mourning alone and paying no attention to the funeral itself. It specifies the color of mourning apparel and sets a clear time limit for completion of the funerary rites (τὰ νόμῳα line 10). It is particularly concerned with women<sup>398</sup> (it is to be published at the Thesmophorion and the sanctuary of Artemis Lochaia).<sup>399</sup> Great care is taken to ensure obedience, at the risk of an imprecation pronounced by the *gynaikonomos* at the purifications before the Thesmophoria – rather than of a penalty. A punishment

<sup>394</sup> Paragraphs in a single law; regulations: A.B. Petropoulou, 'The *Eparche* Documents and the Early Oracle at Oropus', *GRBS* 22, 1981, 39–63 at 56.

<sup>395</sup> Οἷδε νόμοι περὶ τῶν καταφθιμ[έ]νων[v].

<sup>396</sup> Ziehen *LGS* II p. 264. For a discussion of the epigraphic evidence alongside the literary evidence see R. Garland, 'The Well-Ordered Corpse: An Investigation into the Motives behind Greek Funerary Legislation', *BICS* 36, 1989, 1–15.

<sup>397</sup> ἡδὲ ὁ τεθμός περὶ τῶν ἐντοφίμων. See Rougemont *CID* I pp. 52–53.

<sup>398</sup> See N. Loraux, *Mothers in Mourning. With an Essay On Amnesty and Its Opposite*, Trans. C. Pache (French original 1990, 1988), Ithaca and London, 1998, 22–23; cf. Cole 1992, 115.

<sup>399</sup> For the Thesmophoria cf. below commentary on 3; for Artemis relations to childbirth cf. commentary on 20.

also awaits disobedient women: they are forbidden, as impious (ὥς | ἀσεβούσαις lines 25–26), to offer sacrifice to any god for ten years.

To these three documents, one should add the Thasian *LSS* 64, dated to the mid-fourth B.C. The stone, broken above and below, contains a state enactment regulating the treatment of those fallen in battle, called The Good Men or simply The Good, and their families.<sup>400</sup> Grieving is severely restricted, disobedience giving rise to religious scruples and resulting in penalties. The families, as sometimes still happens today, are further charged with distinctive commemorative privileges.

### Purification

As has been seen in the previous section, the funerary law from Ceos prescribes a purificatory procedure for a house and for persons polluted by death. It stands in contrast to documents discussed above presenting worshippers with requirements regarding their purity upon entering a sanctuary. The scope of such documents is rather limited. They are not interested in the pollution *per se* but in protecting the sanctuary and preventing pollution from reaching it. A simple remedy may be prescribed, but worshippers are mostly expected to avoid entry before the pollution is gone. A number of documents interested in the pollution itself and therefore in remedies have reached us. *LSCG* 154 from Cos,<sup>401</sup> relating mainly to the purity of priestesses and sanctuaries, seems to have envisioned different kinds of pollution and specified appropriate remedies.<sup>402</sup> Its miserable state of preservation is, regrettably, indicative of the entire genre. All but one of the relevant inscriptions are so badly preserved as to raise doubts regarding the exact nature of their contents.<sup>403</sup> Even the one exception, the extensive inscription from Cyrene, *LSS* 115, is imperfectly preserved and its interpretation is further compounded by obscurities of language and context.

The inscription is dated to the late-fourth-century B.C.; parts of the contents may be earlier.<sup>404</sup> From the title we learn that the ensuing

<sup>400</sup> See *Nouveau Choix* 105–109 no. 19 (106–107 for the date); cf. W.K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War* IV, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1985, 105–106; Y. Grandjean and F. Salviat, *Guide de Thasos*, Paris, 2000, 224, 232.

<sup>401</sup> Discussed above p. 42.

<sup>402</sup> See Nilsson *GGR* II<sup>3</sup> 73.

<sup>403</sup> See *LSCG* 56; 99(?); *LSS* 65; 112; 114(?); cf. 31; *LGS* II 61 (= Buck, *GD* 64; *Nomima* I no. 109). Cf. *LSAM* 20 (well-preserved; conduct of participants in a private cult; cf. below p. 89).

<sup>404</sup> See Parker 1983, 334.

precepts are an oracle of Apollo. Without doubting Apollo's experience in the subject, it is likely that he did not formulate what follows himself, that is, a draft was presented to him for ratification.<sup>405</sup> In respect to format, the document is similar to law codes known from the ancient Near East and from Gortyn.<sup>406</sup> Like them, it is casuistic, it presents a list of possible cases, envisioning problems and specifying solutions.<sup>407</sup> The cases all involve, in one way or another, pollution of various kinds and from various sources. Some of these, like sexual intercourse (A 11 15), childbirth (A 16 20), miscarriage (B 24 27), uncustomary sacrifice (A 26 29), or even abuse of divine-owned wood (A 8 10), are more or less familiar; others, particularly those discussed in the long paragraph on tithing (A 33 72), but also some involving women (B 2 23), are not, and these have been variously interpreted. The code concludes with a semi-independent section discussing three cases of what it calls *hikesioi*, with the text becoming more and more damaged over the course of the third case.<sup>408</sup>

The code approaches pollution in various ways. It may limit itself to diagnosis, prescribe a course of action to avert pollution, or specify a remedy. In the case of childbirth (A 16 20), the code is little more than diagnostic, stating that a woman in labor will pollute the house, and defining who may contract the pollution, namely only those inside the house.<sup>409</sup> Remedy is not called for since the pollution will pass after three days. In the case of wood growing in a sacred place (lines 8 10), using it is allowed, provided that one pays the god its price; pollution contracted from abuse of divine property is not mentioned directly but seems to be taken for granted, a procedure by which it may be avoided being suggested rather than a remedy. Remedies may, however, also be prescribed. If someone sacrifices a victim which is not customary—a situation which sacrificial regulations attempt to prevent by prescribing

<sup>405</sup> See Parker 1983, 334; cf. Fontenrose 1978, 252–253 H26.

<sup>406</sup> Cf. also the Roman Twelve Tables. In general see R. Westbrook, 'Codification and Canonization,' in E. Lévy (ed.), *La codification des lois dans l'antiquité: Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg 27–29 novembre 1997*, Paris, 2000, 33–47, esp. 34–37.

<sup>407</sup> *LSCG* 56, Cleonae (*LSAG*<sup>2</sup> 150 no. 6; 575–550 B.C.<sup>2</sup>), might have had a similar format. Cf. also *LSCG* 154 B (III) with Nilsson *GGR* II<sup>3</sup> 73, 74 n. 4.

<sup>408</sup> See below commentary no. 17 and Additional Note; no. 27 commentary on column B.

<sup>409</sup> *LSS* 112, Lato, second century B.C., is also diagnostic, defining the purity status of those causing involuntary physical damage to others.

or prohibiting certain animals<sup>410</sup> the code prescribes a remedial procedure consisting of a few stages. Most of the details are, however, left out. As regards the affected sanctuary, the person is simply required to purify it.<sup>411</sup> The identity of the transgressor here is not specified. If he is a common worshipper (although cult officials themselves are not immune from mistakes), purification might be carried out through the participation of cult officials. As in the case of sacrificial regulations and funerary laws,<sup>412</sup> the code builds upon familiarity with common practice on the part of the performers. It seems more interested in maintaining proper procedure than in dictating details. The performance of specific actions and their order is therefore prescribed. Details are spelled out in cases where they are particularly important or where knowledge cannot be assumed due to the identity of the performers or due to the singularity or complexity of the actions. This tendency to take familiarity with the subject matter for granted renders considerable parts of the code all the more obscure, where the context is unclear and parallels are not obvious.

*Purification of a Homicide.* The last paragraph of the cathartic code discussing the murderer *hikesios* has been interpreted as dealing with the purification of a homicide. This interpretation is maintained below in the commentaries on nos. 17 and 27 B, both of which are taken to deal with comparable situations. Purification of a homicide might come under consideration in the badly preserved Archaic law from Cleonae *LSCG* 56,<sup>413</sup> and possibly in the fourth century B.C. fragment from Thasos, *LSS* 65.

### Cult Finances

Financial issues are almost always present in sacred law, met with varying degrees of prominence<sup>414</sup> in many of the documents reviewed thus far, whether their primary interest was sanctuary management,

---

<sup>410</sup> Cf. above pp. 57–58.

<sup>411</sup> Purification of a sanctuary (which is to be followed by sacrifice) is prescribed elsewhere in the code in the passage dealing with tithes (A 33–72) and in B 5–6. See also *LSS* 31, Tegea, fourth century B.C.; *LSCG* 154 (discussed above p. 42) which gives precise directions regarding the mode of purification (see below commentary on 27 B 11). Cf. *LSCG* 39 (discussed above p. 39); *LSCG* 136.27–30 (discussed above pp. 14–15); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1035.

<sup>412</sup> See above pp. 55–56 and 75.

<sup>413</sup> Cf. above n. 407.

<sup>414</sup> As in priestly prerogatives (cf. above pp. 42–44).

functions of cult officials, or even cult performance. Here we review the few other documents considering cultic expenses or measures to support cults.

*Cultic Expenses.* One of the earliest documents from Athens, of which various fragments have survived, *LSS* 2 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 510 480 B.C.), mentions Zeus Polieus (Aa 15, Ac 12 13), Kourotrophos (Aa 5), and a priestess (Aa 6) alongside amounts, in dry and liquid measures, of a variety of substances that may be used in sacrifice (grains, wine, olive, honey, cheese); one can assume that this is some kind of a financial document dealing with cultic expenses.<sup>415</sup> Tabulation of such expenses is, as has been said above, one of the issues motivating the publication of certain sacrificial calendars, particularly in Attica. The extensive inscription from Erythrae, dated to the first half of the second century B.C., *LSAM* 26 + *SEG XXX* 1327 (cf. *LSAM* 27; early fourth century B.C.), is, in fact, more a list of sacrificial expenses in a calendar format than a *bona fide* sacrificial calendar.<sup>416</sup>

*Cultic Taxes.*<sup>417</sup> *LSCG* 178 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 256; 440 430 B.C.) imposes a payment for drawing water from the well Halykos in the territory of the Attic deme of Lamptraia and ones reluctant payers; the sums are payable to the cult of the Nymphs, which is to be performed according to a prophecy of the Pythian Apollo.<sup>418</sup> A Lindian decree found in Tymnus in the Rhodian Peraea and dated to the late fifth century B.C., *LSS* 85, sets out to sustain the cult of the military god Enyalios, demanding that soldiers and mercenaries taking the field from Lindus pay one-sixtieth of their wages to him. The financial measures are accompanied, however, by stipulations regarding the cult,<sup>419</sup> which is the main reason for the document's inclusion in the corpus.<sup>420</sup> A yearly sacrifice of a boar, a dog, and a kid is to be performed for Enyalios and a procession is to be attended by hoplites. It is also stipulated that a house (οἶκος) be built for him, utilizing voluntary private donations.<sup>421</sup>

<sup>415</sup> Sokolowski *LSS* p. 12; cf. also Dow's 1953–1957 discussion of the state calendar.

<sup>416</sup> This is not to say that it is not invaluable for the study of religion. See Graf 1985, 162–196.

<sup>417</sup> Cf. the sacrificial tariffs discussed above pp. 59–60.

<sup>418</sup> Regarding management of water resources in sanctuaries see G. Panessa, *Le risorse idriche dei santuari greci nei loro aspetti giuridici ed economici*, *AnnPisa* III 13, 1983, 359–387 (365–367 for the present document).

<sup>419</sup> See Morelli 1959, 132–133.

<sup>420</sup> *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 138, which imposes a comparable tax, is not explicitly concerned with cult performance and is therefore excluded from the corpus.

<sup>421</sup> The ca. A.D. 22 Lindian *LSS* 90 aiming at restoring the dwindling funds of Zeus

*Collections.* Holding a collection (ἀγρομός, ἀγροσις, λογεία) to raise money was employed in certain cults,<sup>422</sup> notably with added ritual significance.<sup>423</sup> Collections are discussed in a number of sacred laws, mostly priesthood regulations,<sup>424</sup> in a partially preserved decree from Miletus, *LSAM* 47 (prior to 228/227 B.C.), passed after an oracular response regarding collections for Artemis Skiris had been obtained, and in *LSCG* 143, a very fragmentary decree from Physkos in the Rhodian Peraia (ca. 100 B.C.).

### Cult Foundations

A few cases of the foundation of sanctuaries are discussed above.<sup>425</sup> Here, however, the term foundation is used strictly to denote the endowment of capital or property, mostly landed, its yield used for continuous realization of a specific enterprise,<sup>426</sup> namely (in the present case) cult activity.<sup>427</sup> The founders may be royalty, or, in most cases included in the corpus of sacred laws, private individuals. The activity may be private, limited to a gentilitial group, or public. The cult supported is new or pre-existing. Foundations are mostly geared toward the periodical celebration of a sacrifice or a full-fledged festival. The corpus of sacred laws includes both documents recording the actual foundation and enactments endorsing and administering it, provided that they transcend the financial level to govern cult performance in a more or less direct form.<sup>428</sup> Depending upon the type of endowment and the activity funded, the documents can be quite detailed, typically handling finances alongside cultic matters, which are sometimes dictated in relatively great detail to ensure exact realization of the founder's intentions and because these may involve certain idiosyncrasies. Only the few documents that consider several basic aspects of the cult belong

---

Polieus and Athena Lindia is discussed above p. 33.

<sup>422</sup> See Debord 1982, 196.

<sup>423</sup> See N. Robertson, Greek Ritual Begging in Aid of Woman's Fertility and Child-birth, *TAPA* 113, 1983, 143–169.

<sup>424</sup> *LSCG* 48 A 7–8; 123; 175.12; *LSAM* 73.26–28; 77.1; *Iscr.Cos.* ED 178 a A 27–31; ED 215 A 23; ED 236.5–9. Cf. *LSCG* 64.14; *LSAM* 32.62.

<sup>425</sup> pp. 34–35.

<sup>426</sup> Cf. B. Laum, *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike: Ein Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte*, Leipzig/Berlin, 1914, I, 1–2; Guarducci 1967–1978, II, 418.

<sup>427</sup> See esp. Laum op. cit. 60–74. The present review is naturally religiously rather than legally oriented.

<sup>428</sup> In this regard Sokolowski is justified in excluding *LGS* II 64 from his corpus.

here. Those dealing with a single aspect (namely sanctuary and priesthood) have been mentioned in the appropriate sections. Earlier precedents notwithstanding,<sup>429</sup> endowed foundations are by and large a phenomenon of the Hellenistic period, and most of the relevant documents included in the corpus are indeed Hellenistic. Alongside these documents we may discuss the one or two documents plainly dealing with state foundations which are earlier.<sup>430</sup>

*State Foundations.* The term state foundation is used here to denote not merely the introduction of new cults but cases in which cults are founded and provided upon foundation with means of state support. Only a very small number of documents decisively belongs here. The battered Athenian decree on the cult of Bendis, *LSS* 6 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 136; 413/2?), has been interpreted as such a case or, alternatively, as intending to bolster an already existing cult. As far as this can be judged, its consideration of various aspects of the cult is consistent with foundation documents. But the date i.e. if it is correct is too late for this.<sup>431</sup> A clearer case is the foundation of a cult of Basileus Kaunios and Arkesimas at Xanthus. It is known from a decree of the Xanthians and their *perioikoi*, inscribed in Greek, Lycian, and imperial Aramaic on one stele known as the trilingual stele from the Letoon, dating to 337 (or 358) B.C.<sup>432</sup> The Greek text was included as no. 942 in *SEG* XXVII.<sup>433</sup> Despite its conciseness, the decree considers all the essential matters involved in the foundation of the cult. The defining act is the foundation of an altar; a priesthood is also created; it is to be handed down in the family of the first elected priest, Simias son of Kondorasis. The city has also allocated land and funds to maintain the cult; a yearly sum of three half minai, would, as the Lycian version suggests, finance the priest's salary;<sup>434</sup> a tax of two drachmas would be levied from slaves

<sup>429</sup> See the private foundations discussed below. If no. 21 below is a private foundation, it is the earliest.

<sup>430</sup> When the historical context cannot be established, it may be difficult to say whether a given inscription is a foundation document or handles a pre-existing cult based on its contents alone.

<sup>431</sup> *LSS* p. 22; J. Pec'rká, *The Formula for Grant of Enktesis in Attic Inscriptions* (Acta Universitatis Carolinae Philosophica et Historica Monographia 15), Prague, 1966, 59–61; Parker 1996, 172.

<sup>432</sup> See summarily Debord 1982, 203.

<sup>433</sup> For the entire monument see H. Metzger, E. Laroche, A. Dupont-Sommer, and M. Mayrhofer, *La stèle trilingue du Létéon (Fouilles de Xanthos VI)*, Paris, 1979.

<sup>434</sup> I rely on Emmanuel Laroche's translation, *CRAI* 1974, 119; *Fouilles de Xanthos* VI, 76.

upon emancipation. As for the performance of cult, it consists of a sacrifice of a victim (ἱερεῖον)<sup>435</sup> on the first of each month and of a bovine once a year.<sup>436</sup>

*Private Foundations: Public Cult.* In the fifth book of the *Anabasis* (3.7 13), Xenophon reports a consecration he had made to Artemis of a territory at Skillous near Olympia.<sup>437</sup> On a stone which recorded the consecration he ordered whoever held it and enjoyed its fruits to use a tithe<sup>438</sup> for an offering to Artemis each year and to use the remainder for repairs of a temple he had built for her; the goddess herself would attend to those who fail to do so. The corpus includes an identical copy of this inscription, *LSCG* 86, which was found inscribed on a boundary marker at Ithaca, dating to the second century B.C. The fourth-century B.C. *LSCG* 134 from Thera records a comparable foundation made by one Archinos, who dedicated a plot of land to the Mother of the Gods, prescribing a sacrifice twice a year including offering the first fruits of the land.<sup>439</sup>

A more complex type of foundation, the endowment consisting in capital, is documented in *LSCG* 58 from Calauria (modern Poros), dating to the third century B.C. A woman named Agasigratis dedicated (ἀνέθηκε) to Poseidon on behalf of herself, her evidently deceased husband Sophanes, her son, and her two daughters three hundred silver drachmas, the interest from which is to fund a biennial sacrifice of two adult victims to Zeus Soter and Poseidon respectively on the seventh of the month Artemision. Though Zeus and Poseidon are named as the recipients, Agasigratis ordains that the victims be offered on an altar placed near the statue of her husband. The foundation is therefore commemorative. The periodic performance of cult is to perpetuate the husband's memory, not without commemorating Agasigratis

<sup>435</sup> The Aramaic text (line 15) has *nqwh*, evidently a sheep. See below commentary on 27 B 10.

<sup>436</sup> At least one more document might come under consideration: *LSAM* 34 from Magnesia on the Maeander (early second century B.C.: Nilsson *GGR* II<sup>3</sup> 126 127). It deals with the introduction of an official cult of Sarapis and is likely to have been quite comprehensive; the preserved part is mostly concerned with the priesthood.

<sup>437</sup> See at length A.L. Purvis, *Founders and Innovators of Private Cults in Classical Greece*, Diss., Duke University, 1998, 110 218 esp. 210 218.

<sup>438</sup> Cf. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 990 with J. and L. Robert *BE* 1954 no. 228 pp. 165 166 (discussing *SEG* XII 437 = *I.Knidos* 502).

<sup>439</sup> The identity of the participants is by and large a matter for inference. See especially Ziehen *LGS* II pp. 317 318; B. Laum, *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike: Ein Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte*, Leipzig/Berlin, 1914, I, 62 advocating a family cult.



herself and other family members, as their statues are to be washed and crowned for the occasion.<sup>440</sup> The contemporary Calaurian decree *LSCG* 59 documents a similar foundation, the endowment consisting in this case of capital and land dedicated, again, to Poseidon, to fund a yearly sacrifice to him and Zeus Soter on an altar placed in front of statues, evidently of the founders,<sup>441</sup> Agasikles and Nikagora, standing near the bouleuterion.

The cultic boundary between gods and men is further blurred in the testamentary foundation of Alkesippos of Calydon, *LSCG* 81. In 182 B.C. he dedicated to Pythian Apollo and to the city of Delphi a considerable sum to fund a yearly posthumous festival, consisting of a procession (its course dictated), sacrifice, and a public banquet.<sup>442</sup> Formally it is celebrated for Pythian Apollo; it is named, however, the Alkesippeia after the founder. Alkesippos' foundation seems to have served as a model for the Delphic foundations of Attalos II and of Eumenes II.<sup>443</sup> Both are administered in decrees of Delphi, *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 672 (partially reproduced as *LSCG* 80) and *LSS* 44, dating to 160/59 B.C., to be inscribed on the bases of the statues of the founders. The Attaleia and the Eumeneia consist of a procession, sacrifice to Apollo, Leto and Artemis, and a public banquet. The Eumeneia also includes a torch race.<sup>444</sup>

The second-century B.C. foundation of Pythokles from Cos<sup>445</sup> is known from *LGS* II 131, evidently an enactment (likely a decree), which has been fully restored by M. Segre (*Ischr.Cos* ED 82). The cult is divine and includes priesthoods of the concerned gods, Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira, which are to be passed down in the family of the founder.<sup>446</sup> But Pythokles' foundation is primarily geared toward the celebration of a yearly agonistic festival with procession, sacrifice, and evidently public feasting, in addition to a gymnastic competition. Although these are performed in honor of Zeus and Athena, the festival again commemorates the founder, Pythokles, named the Pythokleia after him.<sup>447</sup>

<sup>440</sup> See Ziehen *LGS* II, pp. 156–157; Sokolowski *LSCG* p. 11; Guarducci 1967–1978, III, 250.

<sup>441</sup> Rather than of the two gods; cf. Ziehen's commentary ad loc. *LGS* II p. 158.

<sup>442</sup> For festival foundations cf. in general P. Schmitt Pantel, *La cité au banquet. Histoire de repas publics dans les cités grecques*, Rome, 1992, 295–303.

<sup>443</sup> Sokolowski *LSCG* 165.

<sup>444</sup> Royal foundations dedicated to royal cult per se are not included in the corpus. See e.g. the foundation of Antiochus I Theos of Commagene, *OGIS* 383.

<sup>445</sup> See S.M. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos*, (*Hypomnemata* 51), Göttingen, 1978, 111.

<sup>446</sup> Cf. above p. 45.

<sup>447</sup> As has been noted (*I.Cos* comm. ad no. 34), the festival is mentioned in the Coan

A different type of commemorative foundation is epitomized in the foundation of Kritolaos from Aigiale on Amorgos who bequeathed a sum of 2000 drachmas to fund a festival to commemorate his deceased son, Aleximachos. The foundation is known from a law of Aigiale, *IG* XII 7, 515, dated to the late second century B.C., concerning the administration of the endowment, together with regulations for the festival (lines 39–86), reproduced as *LSS* 61. It involved a public banquet and gymnastic competitions from which the *pankration* was excluded; the deceased Aleximachos, heroized and receiving a heroic *sacri ce*<sup>448</sup> in front of his statue (74–78), was announced the winner of this event (lines 83–84).<sup>449</sup>

A number of foundations are noted for supporting more straightforward divine cult, mostly pre-existing.<sup>450</sup> The foundation of Hegesarete, the wife of Hermokrates from Minoa on Amorgos, is recorded in *LSCG* 103, a first-century B.C. enactment regarding the cult of the Mother and her festival of the Metroia, which specifies, inter alia, honors for Hegesarete for her endowment (B 25–33). The enactment from Lamp-sacus, *I.Lampsakos* 9, administers a foundation to support the celebration of the Asclepieia regulated in lines 16–30, reproduced as *LSAM* 8. The decree from Ilium, *LSAM* 9, administers a foundation by Hermias,

---

gymnasium Calendar *LSCG* 165 B 11–12; A. Chaniotis also spotted it in the first-century A.D. *Iscr.Cos* EV 134 (EBGR 1993–1994 no. 219 (*Kernos* 10, 1997)); cf. *Nova Sylloge* 462. For agonistic festivals see also *SEG* XXXVIII 1462, a dossier of five documents concerning the foundation of C. Iulius Demosthenes. C, a decree of Oenoanda (July 5, A.D. 125), is relevant here as it regulates cult performance at a quadrennial agonistic festival of the Demosthenia. Cf. below p. 101.

<sup>448</sup> To be inferred from the modes of slaughtering (*sphagia*; see below commentary on 27 A 20–21) and cooking (the victim, a ram, is to be cooked whole).

<sup>449</sup> Cf. the fragmentary Coan *Iscr.Cos* ED 86 (second century B.C.), ED 257, and ED 263 (both Roman Imperial). All three are commemorative agonistic foundations, in the first two cases commemorating, as in Kritolaos' case, the sons of the founders. In their present state, only ED 86 still actually touches upon cult performance, Hermes evidently being named as the recipient of *sacri ce*. It is therefore the best candidate for inclusion in the corpus of sacred laws though, as has been noted above (n. 148), ED 257, the most extensive of the three, is notable for its concern with the placement of dedications. For these documents see A. Chaniotis EBGR 1993–1994 no. 219 (*Kernos* 10, 1997). The Roman Imperial foundation of Phainippos from Iasos benefiting a gymnasium (see W. Blümel *I.Iasos* II p. 16) and the very fragmentary but evidently comparable foundation of Hierokles, *I.Iasos* 244 and 245, included in *LSAM* as 60 A and B, barely belong in the present corpus of sacred laws as the cult they set out to ensure is plainly funerary.

<sup>450</sup> Beside the inscriptions discussed below see the royal foundation for a priesthood from Pergamum, *LSAM* 11 (cf. above pp. 47–48).

a priest of all the gods (line 1), funding a procession and sacrifice in honor of Athena at the festival of the Ilieia.<sup>451</sup> These two documents are dated to the second century B.C. as is the fragmentary Coan decree published by Parker and Obbink 2001a 266–277 no. 3. The latter manages a foundation of a certain Teleutias probably to support the Coan Asclepieia.<sup>452</sup> Another Coan second-century B.C. foundation, that of Phanomachos, who dedicated land and houses to Zeus and the Demos, is administered in a decree, *Inscr. Cos* ED 146, which includes fragmentary festival regulations (namely for a procession; fragment B). Here the festival is probably new and the decree also features stipulations regarding the construction of a sanctuary (fragment C).

*Private Foundations: Family Cult.*<sup>453</sup> A distinct type of enterprise is represented in the corpus in the foundations of Diomedon from Cos, *LSCG* 177, Posidonius from Halicarnassus, *LSAM* 72, and Epicteta from Thera, *IG XII* 3, 330.<sup>454</sup> The last is dated to ca. 210–195 B.C.; the first two to the early third century B.C. The cults present a mixture of divine and ancestral attributes, ancestors having been assimilated to divinities and divinities adopted into the family. Diomedon, Posidonius, and Epicteta all founded in one way or another associations devoted to ancestral cult, participation in which is limited to family members, the priesthood being passed down among the descendants of the founder.<sup>455</sup> The foundation of Diomedon<sup>456</sup> consisted in dedicating to Heracles Diomedonteios a plot of land, lodging facilities, and a slave and his descendants, to remain free as long as they perform their related obligatory services.<sup>457</sup> Statues and cult paraphernalia were also included. The foundation of Posidonius, recommended to the founder by an oracle of Apollo, is dedicated to the cult of Zeus Patroos, Apollo of Telmessus, the Moirai, the Mother of the gods, and the Agathos Daimon of the founder and his wife; the Agathe Tyche

<sup>451</sup> Line 17; P. Frisch *I.Ilion* p. 130.

<sup>452</sup> Or possibly a new festival (Parker and Obbink 2001a, 270).

<sup>453</sup> See in general W. Kamps, *Les origines de la fondation cultuelle dans la Grèce ancienne*, *Archives d'histoire du droit oriental* 1, 1937, 145–179. I do not follow the distinction (145 n. 1) between cult foundation devoted to private ancestral cult and sacred foundation, cases of which are treated here in the previous subsection.

<sup>454</sup> *LSCG* 135 and *LGS* II 129 contain only a part of the text.

<sup>455</sup> Cf. above p. 45.

<sup>456</sup> See S.M. Sherwin-White, *Inscriptions from Cos*, *ZPE* 24, 1977, 205–217 at 210–213 who also discusses *LSCG* 171 (above p. 35).

<sup>457</sup> See Kamps (above n. 453) 155; Debord 1982, 204.

of his parents is added to the list when sacrifice is prescribed.<sup>458</sup> The oracle of Apollo is published together with the rules for the management of the association it brought about.<sup>459</sup> We here limit ourselves to considering in some detail only the foundation of Epicteta. It is known from *IG XII 3, 330*,<sup>460</sup> the so-called *Testamentum Epictetae*, a long text inscribed in eight columns (I VIII See postscript) on four slabs (A D), originally belonging to a base displaying the statues of the foundress and her deceased husband and sons, Phoenix, Kratesilochos, and Andragoras. The inscription contains, in fact, two documents. The first (lines 1 108 = A B) is the actual testament of Epicteta, bequeathing an endowment to found an association of her relatives dedicated to the worship of the Muses and of heroes, convening once a year in the so-called Mouseion, set in its own precinct, and left for this purpose to Epiteleia, Epicteta's daughter.<sup>461</sup> The second document (lines 109 288 = C) contains the statutes of the association. C 1 94 (i.e. lines 109 202), reproduced as *LSCG* 135, governs the administration and actual details of cult performance. The association is to convene yearly for a three day meeting; on each day sacrifice is offered to the Muses, the heroes Phoenix and Epicteta, and the heroes Kratesilochos and Andragoras, respectively. The heroes, that is, the statues of Epicteta and her family members, are crowned for the occasion. As in the foundations of Diomedon and Posidonius, the statutes can be very precise regarding offerings. To some extent, this is called for to accommodate idiosyncrasies characteristic of the cult in question. Heroes can be very particular about their culinary preferences, and Epicteta takes care to note that three fish (ὀψάρια) must be offered to them alongside pastries and the customary divine parts of the victim (189 191 = *LSCG* 135.81 83).<sup>462</sup> Fish offerings (ἀπόπυρις) are also prescribed in the foundation of Diomedon (*LSCG* 177.42, 62), where they are to be handled according to the ancestral customs (κατὰ τὰ πάτρια).<sup>463</sup>

<sup>458</sup> See Sfameni Gasparro 1997, 89 90.

<sup>459</sup> Lines 49 51. The oracle: Fontenrose 1978, 256 H36.

<sup>460</sup> A. Wittenburg, *Il testamento di Epikteta*, Trieste, 1990.

<sup>461</sup> The Mouseion may be used in addition for celebrating marriage of Epicteta's descendants (lines 50 51). Cf. the foundation of Diomedon, *LSCG* 177.115.

<sup>462</sup> For the divine parts cf. below commentary on 3.16 17, 16.3 4, 21.12, 27 A 12.

<sup>463</sup> See Ziehen *LGS* II p. 322. On fish offering in the cult of the dead and in hero cult see in general F.J. Dölger, *Der heilige Fisch in den antiken Religionen und im Christentum* (*IXΘΥΣ* II), Münster, 1922, 377 386.

## Associations

In this category we may list not only documents of cult associations, *thiasoi*, *eranoi*, associations of *orgeones*, and others, formally devoted to the worship of certain divinities, but also the few documents governing the cult activity of phratries and gene.<sup>464</sup> In both cases, the most frequent types of documents are enactments, mostly decrees, and also statutes of the respective organizations.

*Cult Associations.* We can distinguish between comprehensive and specific documents. Comprehensive documents govern various aspects of the association's religious life and matters of a more administrative character. They may touch upon a number of the issues reviewed above, whether related to sanctuaries, priesthoods, or cult performance, as well as upon issues related to membership (introduction of new members, conduct) and various financial matters, more related to the religious life of the association, or less related, namely in associations engaged in finances alongside cult. No. 5 below is a representative example; see commentary there for discussion. Specific documents have already been discussed above as needed. Assigning them to associations rather than to states or other organizations is sometimes difficult, because, when the issuer is unknown, assignment may depend solely upon context, as in the case of the two late calendars from Athens and Dardanus, *LSCG* 52 and 128 respectively.<sup>465</sup>

As it is, most of the documents included in the corpus are from Athens, the majority of them stemming from associations devoted to the cult of foreign gods. The earliest document is *LSCG* 45, a comprehensive law (line 13), evidently of the Piraeus citizen *orgeones* of Bendis, dating to the second half of the fourth century B.C.<sup>466</sup> The 307/6 lease of the sanctuary of Egretes by his *orgeones*, *LSCG* 47, is discussed above.<sup>467</sup> A few documents date to the third century B.C. *LSCG* 46 (261/0) is a decree of the Thracian *orgeones* of Bendis in the Piraeus on the subject of a procession in honor of the goddess, to be arranged together with her city *orgeones*.<sup>468</sup> *LSS* 20, a partially preserved

---

<sup>464</sup> I avoid the distinction between voluntary vs. hereditary associations because membership in some cult associations can be hereditary (cf. the family foundations discussed above). Cf. Aleshire 1994, 10.

<sup>465</sup> See above pp. 65, 68–69.

<sup>466</sup> N.F. Jones, *The Associations of Classical Athens: The Response to Democracy*, New York/Oxford, 1999, 259–261; Mikalson 1998, 140–143.

<sup>467</sup> p. 40.

<sup>468</sup> Jones *ibid.* 256–259, 261–262 (date). Cf. above n. 160.

stone belonging to the *orgeones* of Echelos and Heroines, found on the north slope of the Areopagus, still contains almost all of the first of ancient decrees (lines 8–9) on the subject of cult finances and cult performance.<sup>469</sup> *LSS* 127, dated to the late third-early second century B.C., features the end of a law (line 14) of a *thiasos* which dealt with funerals of members.<sup>470</sup> The second-century B.C. decrees of the Piraeus *orgeones* of the Mother, *LSCG* 48,<sup>471</sup> focus on women cult officials and are discussed above, as is the ca. 176/5 decree of the Piraeus Dionysiastai, also regarding their priesthood, *LSCG* 49.<sup>472</sup> The Roman Imperial *LSCG* 51, the new statutes of the Iobacchi, preceded by the minutes of the meeting where they had been ratified,<sup>473</sup> the law of the unidentified *eranistai*, *LSCG* 53, and the statutes of the Heracliastai, no. 5 below, together with the calendar *LSCG* 52, form the core of the small group of Athenian sacred laws from this period.<sup>474</sup>

Only a few other documents are included in the corpus. *LSCG* 181 from Physkos in Lokris, dated to the second century A.D., is a partially preserved law (lines 1–2) of a Dionysiac *thiasos* founded by a certain Amandos. The third-century B.C. *LSAM* 2 from Chalcedon is a fragmentary sale of a priesthood of the twelve gods of a *koinon* of *thiasotai*<sup>475</sup> founded by one Nicomachus. *LSAM* 80 from the environs of Elaïoussa in Cilicia, dated to the Augustan period, is a decree of an association of *Sabbatistai* on the subject of dedications. The second to first-century B.C. *LSAM* 20 from Philadelphia in Lydia stands out for its subject matter. It is an extensive set of regulations concerned with the moral conduct and the purity of members of an association, which seems to have been revealed to the founder, Dionysius, in a dream.<sup>476</sup>

*Phratrïes and Gene.* Only a few documents can be attributed with certainty to such organizations.<sup>477</sup> Most have been discussed above. Two are from Athens: *LSCG* 19, and *LSS* 19. The first, specifying priestly prerogatives, comprises, in fact, only the first eight lines of the exten-

<sup>469</sup> Mikalson 1998, 147–148 no. 13; Jones *ibid.* 251–254.

<sup>470</sup> Mikalson 1998, 150 no. 21; Jones *ibid.* 266.

<sup>471</sup> Jones *ibid.* 265.

<sup>472</sup> See above pp. 45–46.

<sup>473</sup> For a full English translation see M.N. Tod, *Ancient Inscriptions: Sidelights on Greek History*, Oxford 1932, 86–91.

<sup>474</sup> See below commentary on no. 5.

<sup>475</sup> See F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, Leipzig, 1909, 166 with n. 33.

<sup>476</sup> See Chaniotis 1997, 159–162.

<sup>477</sup> Cf. the sales of priesthoods of the Mylasan *syngeneiai* (Jones 1987, 328–332), *LSAM* 66 (cf. above 51 n. 254) and 63(?).

sive *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1237, which bears three decrees (first part of the fourth century B.C.) of the phratry of the Demotionidai.<sup>478</sup> The second is the decree of the Salaminians spelling out the details of the reconciliation on cultic matters between the Salaminians of the seven phylai and of Sounion. The calendar has been discussed above;<sup>479</sup> it is preceded by a rather detailed discussion of sacrifices, mainly in relation to priestly prerogatives. The Delphic statutes of the Labyadaei have also been mentioned.<sup>480</sup> *LSCG* 77 contains two sections from the last two parts of statutes of this phratry, governing funerals (discussed above) and festivals. For the full document see *CID* I 9. The decrees of the Chian phratry of the Klytidai, regarding their sacred house, *LSCG* 118, are discussed above.<sup>481</sup> The fourth-century B.C. Chian *LSCG* 119 regulations for a priesthood of Heracles were evidently issued by a *genos* (lines 2–3). The organization into which the fourth-century law from Tenos *LSS* 48 discusses introduction of new members may be a gentilitial group rather than a phratry.<sup>482</sup>

### *Festivals and Ceremonies*

Following the so-called Allied War of 220–217 B.C. that ended with the peace of Naupactus, the Acarnanian town of Anaktorion was no longer able to sustain the Actias, an agonistic festival in honor of Apollo celebrated at his sanctuary at Actium, which was under its control. The Acarnanian confederacy, interested in increasing its piety and rendering the god his due honors, approached Anaktorion, suggesting to make the sanctuary shared in common by all the Acarnanians and so to enable the celebration of the festival according to the ancestral customs (κατὰ τὰ πάτρια). Anaktorion agreed on certain conditions, and a treaty was drafted.

<sup>478</sup> C.W. Hedrick, *The Decrees of the Demotionidai*, Atlanta, 1990; S.D. Lambert, *The Phratries of Attica*<sup>2</sup>, Ann Arbor, 1998, T 3; Jones, *The Associations of Classical Athens*, 208–210. *LSS* 125, a particularly fragmentary decree on the subject of sacrifices, was attributed by Sokolowski (*LSS* p. 210) to an association of *orgeones* but may belong to a phratry. See Lambert *ibid.* T 4 with a better text.

<sup>479</sup> pp. 67–68.

<sup>480</sup> Above pp. 75–76.

<sup>481</sup> p. 37.

<sup>482</sup> See P. Gauthier, *BE* 1991, no. 431.

This is the gist of the first twenty-six lines containing the preamble of a decree of the Acarnanian confederacy, *LSS* 45<sup>483</sup> (dated to 216).<sup>484</sup> The next twenty-six lines (26–52) list the articles of the contract and can be summarized as follows: 1 (lines 26–30) the confederacy assumes the costs of the repair of the sanctuary along with the games (ἁγῶνες), the sacrifices (θυσίαι), and the festival (πανάγυρις), not lagging behind the standard previously met by Anaktorion. 2 (30–31) Hiring Bute-players is left to the discretion of the confederacy. 3 (31–34) The revenues from taxes levied at the festival and from selling slaves are to be split equally between the confederacy and the city. 4 (34–36) The same number of customs officers, secretaries, and *agoranomoi* are to be appointed by each of the two parties. 5 (36–38) Anaktorion is to retain possession of sacred monies and dedications formerly belonging to it, while dedications made henceforth shall belong to the confederacy. 6 (38–41) The so called Helenion (probably a residential facility for guests)<sup>485</sup> and some constructions in the grove (the text is mutilated here) are to remain in the possession of Anaktorion; encampments (παρεμβολαί) belonging to other cities and communities (τᾶν τε πολίων καὶ τῶν [ἐ]θνέων) shall retain their former status. 7 (41–43) A mutilated clause dictates the order of the participants in the procession (to be held at the festival); their apparel seems to have been prescribed; some evidently let their hair grow. 8 (43–45) Anaktorion is entitled to harbors and other revenues except for income from the festival (split in half in 3). 9 (45–50) The confederacy is to hold the games each year unless hindered by war or by encampment of a friendly army at the sanctuary; in the event of such or comparable hindrances, Anaktorion is allowed to celebrate the festival in the city according to its customs, following deliberation between the parties. 10 (50–52) A failure on the side of the confederacy to fulfill its obligations would result in the sanctuary and sacred property returning to the possession of Anaktorion as before.

There follows a decree of the confederacy accepting the conditions and forbidding the appropriation of money for the sanctuary's restoration for other causes. After a publication clause it is stated (lines 68–70) that:

<sup>483</sup> *IG IX 1<sup>2</sup> II 583*; *Staatsverträge* 523. I was not able to consult O. Dany, *Akarnanien im Hellenismus: Geschichte und Völkerrecht in Nordwestgriechenland*, Munich, 1999.

<sup>484</sup> C. Habicht, Eine Urkunde des akarnanischen Bundes, *Hermes* 85, 1957, 86–122, at 98.

<sup>485</sup> Commentary ad loc. in *LSS* p. 96.



ποτὶ δὲ τοὺς ἀγῶνας καὶ τὰμ πανάγυριν καὶ τὸ καθόλου περ[ι] τῶν κατὰ τὰς Ἀκτιάδας χρῆσθαι τοὺς Ἀκαρνᾶνας τοῖς ἱεροῖς νόμοις, οὓς εἴλε ἡ πόλις τῶν Ἀνακτοριέων, καθὼς διώρθωσαν οἱ παρ' ἐκατέρων κτλ.

In respect to the games and the festival and in general regarding matters concerning the Actias, the Acarnanians shall employ the sacred laws which the city of the Anaktorians established, as revised by the representatives of the two parties.

While the integrity of the agreement is ensured, with attempts to dissolve it resulting in penalties, a revision of the ἱεροὶ νόμοι through legislation is allowed, as long as it does not contradict the inscribed stipulations.

We have reviewed this document at such length because, though it is not a typical set of festival regulations, it is characteristic of the genre not only in respect to the nature of the festival itself, but also in respect to the nature of festival regulations and the range of issues with which they tend to be concerned. Moreover, it gives a clear account of circumstances under which festival regulations may be published, illustrating, despite the seemingly great detail, the limits of the information that can be had from comparable documents, and, to an extent, from cult regulations in general.

At the time of publication, the Actias was not an obscure festival. It had a regional significance and was attended by other cities and communities (ἔθνη 6)<sup>486</sup> for whom permanent facilities existed at the sanctuary. The two parties envision commercial activity and tax revenues generated by this attendance on a scale justifying the discussion in clauses 3, 4, and 8.<sup>487</sup> And yet, unlike its successor, the Pan-Hellenic Actia founded by Augustus, the festival is known in literature only from cursory remarks.<sup>488</sup> Whatever substantial knowledge we have of it is therefore derived from the present document. It was of course an agonistic festival but the document says nothing of the competitions.<sup>489</sup> Like many typical Greek festivals, agonistic or not, the Actias involved sacrifice and a procession. Though the order and apparel of the participants in the procession is considered ( 7), no other details about the performance of the festival are given.

<sup>486</sup> Confederacy members which are not cities; Habicht, *ibid.* 101–102, 109–110.

<sup>487</sup> For markets during festivals see in general L. De Ligt and P.W. De Neeve, *Ancient Periodic Markets, Festivals and Fairs*, *Athenaeum* 66, 1988, 391–416. Cf. below commentary on no. 18.

<sup>488</sup> See Habicht *ibid.* 102–103.

<sup>489</sup> See *ibid.* 103.

As often happens, the document is primarily concerned with administrative matters. Its main objective is to ensure the celebration through a consideration of the ways and means by which it may be guaranteed. The celebration itself is not the issue here. It suffices to say in this context that the games and the festivals are to be performed *κατὰ τὰ πάτρια* (lines 25–26). What these ancestral customs might be we are not told. They surely provided some of the subject matter for the *ἔργοι νόμοι* of line 69 which are to govern actual performance of the Actias. Though this does not necessarily suggest substantial changes in the cult, of which the text gives no indication, these *ἔργοι νόμοι* have been revised in connection with the reorganization, and revision is envisioned in the future. In fact, the city of Anaktoria had previously deliberated concerning the *ἔργοι νόμοι* employed for the celebration of the Actias, to judge from the expression οὕς εἴλε ἅ | πόλιν.<sup>490</sup> Listing the *ἔργοι νόμοι* here would have been of great interest for us. Regrettably, it was not essential for the purposes of the document and was therefore avoided.

The remainder of this review of the contents of the corpus of Greek sacred laws attempts to apply to other festival regulations the basic principles employed in evaluating the preceding document. In doing so, one has to consider the types of documents available and the issues with which they deal, and attempt to assess the nature of the evidence and its relation to the circumstances under which the documents were published.

### Specific and Comprehensive Regulations

The most concise sets of festival regulations are the mid-fourth-century B.C. *LSS* 5, cut into the rock on the north slope of the Athenian Acropolis, prescribing, in not more than eight words, the date and the month for the festival of Eros, and the slightly longer Roman Imperial *LGS* I 25 (*PAES* IIIA 353–354 no. 765; *SEG* VII 1233) from near Canatha in Syria which reads:

Ἡ ἐορτὴ τῶν Σ-  
οαδηνῶν ἄγε-  
ται τῷ θεῷ Λόου λ'

The festival of the Soadeni is held<sup>491</sup> for the god on 30 of the month Loos.

<sup>490</sup> Cf. Habicht *ibid.* 105.

<sup>491</sup> For the present indicative see above p. 6 with n. 17.

Both documents note little more than the date and may be regarded as calendar extracts.<sup>492</sup> Other festival regulations are more extensive. As usual, we can distinguish between comprehensive documents, dealing with several issues relating to a particular festival, and specific documents concerning individual aspects—whether pertaining directly to performance or not—of one or more festivals. Legislation, mostly in the form of decrees, is more or less the rule here; as usual, the fragmentary state of some of the documents may preclude exact identification. Since most ordinary Greek festivals tend to comprise similar elements, the same issues are recurrent in the documents. Three of the most basic ones, sacrifice, procession, and—in agonistic festivals—games, are evident in the Acarnanian treaty. A fourth would be the sacred truce. Due to the nature of the evidence, which tends to discuss several issues together, we pursue the discussion by following these issues here, at the risk of oversimplification, and by dissecting documents, a practice which has been so far generally avoided. The few documents regulating performance of ceremonies—usually by cult colleges—on specific occasions, not necessarily festivals, are also considered here.

*Truce.* The term 'sacred truce' is somewhat misleading. It is used to translate three different Greek words, *ἐκεχειρία*, *σπονδαί*, and *ἱερομηνία*, which denote a period accompanying a festival, usually starting before it and ending sometime after its completion, involving two complementary but somewhat different institutions: a suspension of hostilities and a certain suspension of official business, namely particular judicial activities.<sup>493</sup> The corpus includes a few documents which discuss these institutions, the nature of which depends on the question of whether a festival is celebrated on a local, regional, or national level.

The Amphictyonic law of 388, *LSCG* 78.44–49, appears to have discussed both the *ἐκεχειρία* and the *ἱερομηνία* connected to the Delphic Pythian games. The *ἱερομηνία*, evidently a partial suspension of official business, is to last a year; unfortunately the discussion of the *ἐκεχειρία*, i.e. suspension of hostilities, is all but lost.<sup>494</sup> The Amphictyonic decree *LSCG* 73, issued upon the reorganization of the Acraephian Ptoia in the 220s B.C., when the festival became pan-Boeotian,<sup>495</sup> which establishes the inviolability of the sanctuary of Apollo Ptoius, also enacts

<sup>492</sup> Or festival calendar extracts; cf. Prott *LGS* I p. 45.

<sup>493</sup> G. Rougemont, *La hiéroménie des Pythia*, *BCH* 97, 1973, 75–106.

<sup>494</sup> See Rougemont *ibid.* (and commentary ad loc. in *CID* I pp. 118–119).

<sup>495</sup> See commentary on no. 11 below.

ἐπεχειρία and ἀσφαλία, that is a truce allowing safe passage for the festival (lines 9–12).<sup>496</sup> The σπονδαί of the Eleusinian Mysteries, a truce aiming, so it seems, at the national level,<sup>497</sup> is discussed in a section in the ca. 460 B.C. Athenian regulations, *LSS* 3 B 4 43. The discussion in the comprehensive fourth-century (ca. 367–348 B.C.) regulations for the mysteries, *Agora* XVI 56 A 1–20 (*LSS* 12), appears to have been more detailed, opening with the announcement of the truce and its announcers (σπονδοφόροι).<sup>498</sup> The document is unfortunately very fragmentary. What a local truce may entail is suggested in the second-century B.C. regulations for the Asclepieia from Lampsacus, *LSAM* 8 (lines 16–30 of *I.Lampsakos* 9).<sup>499</sup> Children are to be released from schools and slaves from labor (17–18).<sup>500</sup> Certain judicial activities are suspended (lines 24–28):

μὴ εἶναι δὲ μῆθεν[ι μῆθ'έν]

[ἐ]νεχυράσαι ἐν [τ]αῖς ἡμέραις τῶν Ἀσκληπιείων, εἰ δὲ μὴ, ὃ ἐνεχυράσας  
ξέν[οχος]

[ἐ]στω τῷ νόμῳ τῷ περὶ τῶν παρανόμων ἐνεχυράσαντων· μὴ κ[α]ρ[ι]ν[έ]τωσαν  
[δ]ὲ μὴδὲ οἱ ἐπιγνώμονες ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις, μὴδὲ οἱ εἰσαγωγ[εῖ]ς  
συ[λλε]-

[γ]έτωσαν [δικ]α[σ]τ[ή]ρι[ον].

It shall not be allowed to anyone to take anything in pledge during the days of the Asclepieia. Otherwise, the pledge-taker shall be liable to the law on unlawful pledge-taking. The *epignomones* shall not give judgement on these days nor shall the *eisagogeis* assemble a court.

In a similar vein, the late-fourth-century B.C. *SEG* XVII 415 (lines 1–3 = *LSS* 69) from Thasos lists festival days on which denunciations are not allowed. In both of these cases suspension of activities seems to be connected to the festival days proper. The Ephesian decree *LSAM* 31, the second (B) of three documents inscribed on a statue base from Ephesus, *I.Ephesos* Ia 24 (A.D. 162/3 or 163/4), declares the whole month of Artemision sacred to Artemis for the annual performance of the celebrations, the festival of the Artemisia, and the ἱερομηνία,<sup>501</sup> i.e. the festal days kept throughout the month.<sup>502</sup> Both the preceding and

<sup>496</sup> See Rougemont *ibid.* 88–89, 95 n. 69.

<sup>497</sup> Possibly also at the local level. See Rougemont *ibid.* 95–98.

<sup>498</sup> See Clinton 1980, 275–277.

<sup>499</sup> Cf. above p. 85.

<sup>500</sup> Not an infrequent practice; see *LSAM* 15.54; 33 A 30; 81.14 and p. 26.

<sup>501</sup> Lines 30–31.

<sup>502</sup> See Rougemont *ibid.* 82 with n. 22 for the lexicographical evidence.

following inscriptions (A 14 16; C 6 10) refer explicitly to the enactment of ἐνεχειρία, i.e. a local truce,<sup>503</sup> for the entire month.

*Procession.* As has been seen, the treatment of the procession in the Acarnanian decree is unusual as it is the only ceremony performed at the Actias for which exact details are included. This care is indicative of processions elsewhere. Though their character and significance depend upon the cultic context, processions are a fundamental ritual for Greek religion and a defining moment in many Greek festivals.<sup>504</sup> Comprehensive festival regulations may therefore be relatively precise regarding processions that may also be discussed in specific documents as needed. The best example for such a specific case is the ca. A.D. 220 Athenian decree on the procession at the Eleusinian mysteries, *LSCG* 8 (though it is not quite concerned with the procession as a whole but rather with the participation of the ephebes in it).<sup>505</sup> Among the most commonly discussed issues regarding processions are the identity of the participants, their order, their apparel, and items carried along. The Eretrian decree regarding the agonistic festival of the Artemisia, *LSCG* 92,<sup>506</sup> prescribes the order of victims led at the procession (lines 35–38). Another Eretrian document, *LSS* 46, requires all the Eretrians and other inhabitants to wear ivy crowns in a procession in honor of Dionysus.<sup>507</sup> The route itself may be dictated, as in the Delphic festival foundations.<sup>508</sup> The procession at the Alkesippeia at Delphi (*LSCG* 81.6–8), attended by the priests of Apollo, the archon, the *prytaneis*, and all of the citizens, is required by the founder to leave from a specific location at Delphi; the foundation of Attalos (*LSCG* 80.12–16) adds the temple of Apollo as the destination; the foundation of Eumenes (*LSS* 44.8–11), which seems to follow the same route, even prescribes the time at which the procession ought to begin.

<sup>503</sup> See L. Robert *Études Anatoliennes*, Paris 1937, 178; R. Oster, *New Docs.* VI 78–79.

<sup>504</sup> See summarily Graf 1996.

<sup>505</sup> The fragmentary first-century B.C. *LSS* 15 is evidently also concerned with the procession at the mysteries. At least in its fragmentary state, the ca. 300 B.C.? *LSCG* 93 from Eretria (for the date see D. Knoepfer, *Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté* (Eretria. Fouilles et recherches XI), Lausanne, 2001, 37 n. 56, 279 n. 43) seems to be predominantly interested in the participation of children in a procession in a festival in honor of Asclepius. For more comprehensive treatments of processions, see the decree of the Piraeen Orgeones of Bendis, *LSCG* 46 (first part of the third century B.C.) and the decree from Antiochia ad Pyramum, *LSAM* 81 (mid second century B.C.).

<sup>506</sup> See below p. 101.

<sup>507</sup> See further below p. 110.

<sup>508</sup> See above p. 84.

One of the most detailed sets of festival regulations is the decree from Magnesia on the Maeander, *LSAM* 32, on the organization of a festival, instituted after 185/4 B.C. on the occasion of the peace with Miletus,<sup>509</sup> in honor of Zeus Sosipolis, who, so it was hoped, would bless the city with peace and prosperity. The festival, likely to take place around springtime,<sup>510</sup> includes a procession and a ritual of *theoxenia*, in which images of the gods are entertained at a meal. The bull led in the procession is to be bought in the fall, consecrated solemnly in a special ceremony, and then nurtured during the winter. The procession is prescribed in lines 32–46:<sup>511</sup>

- 32 τὸν στεφανηφόρον τὸν αἰεὶ γινόμενον μετὰ τοῦ ἱε-  
 ρεω καὶ τῆς ἱερείας τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος τῆς Λευκοφρυην(ῆ)ς ἑξά-  
 [γ]ειν τὴν πομπὴν τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ Ἀρτεμισιῶνος τῇ δω-  
 δεκάτῃ καὶ θύειν τὸν ταῦρον τὸν ἀναδεικνύμενον,  
 36 συμπομπεύειν δὲ τὴν τε γερουσίαν καὶ τοὺς  
 ἱερεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας τοὺς τε χειροτονητοὺς καὶ  
 τοὺς κληρωτοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἐφήβους καὶ τοὺς νέους καὶ  
 τοὺς παῖδας καὶ τοὺς τὰ Λευκοφρυηνά νικῶντας καὶ  
 40 τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς νικῶντας τοὺς στεφανίτας ἀγῶνας·  
 ὁ δὲ στεφανηφόρος ἄγων τὴν πομπὴν φερέτω ξόα-  
 να πάντων τῶν δώδεκα θεῶν ἐν ἐσθῆσιν ὥς καλλίσ-  
 ταις καὶ πηγνύτω θόλον ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ πρὸς τῷ βωμῷ  
 44 τῶν δώδεκα θεῶν, στρωνύτω δὲ καὶ στρωμνὰς τρεῖς ὥς  
 καλλίστας, παρεχέτω δὲ καὶ ἀκροάματα, ἀγλητὴν, συρι-  
 στήν, κιθαριστήν.

The *stephanophoros* in office with the priest and the priestess of Artemis Leucophryene shall lead the procession on the twelfth of the month of Artemision and sacrifice the bull which has been consecrated. The *gerousia*, the priests, the magistrates, both elected and allotted, the ephebes, the young men, the boys,<sup>512</sup> the winners at the Leucophryena, and other winners in crown-bearing competitions shall march along in the procession. The *stephanophoros* shall lead the procession carrying the wooden images of all twelve gods in their most beautiful attire; he shall x a

<sup>509</sup> For the historical circumstances and the date see R.M. Errington, 'The Peace Treaty between Miletus and Magnesia (*LMilet* 148)', *Chiron* 19, 1989, 279–288.

<sup>510</sup> Bischoff's (*RE* X 1586, s.v. Kalendar) order of the months in the Magnesian year is not entirely secure: Samuel 1972, 121–122. Tr mpy (1997, 110–111) equates the Magnesian Artemision with either the Athenian Elaphebolion or Mounichion. Cf. also Sokolowski *LSAM* p. 91; cf. Nilsson 1906, 23.

<sup>511</sup> For even more detailed procession prescriptions, again in a new festival, see *SEG* XXXVIII 1462 C 69–80, 85–87 (the foundation of C. Iulius Demosthenes; cf. above n. 447; below p. 101).

<sup>512</sup> Cf. commentary on 14 B 10 below.

*tholos* in the agora near the altar of the twelve gods, spread out three couches, as beautiful as possible, and provide musical entertainment, a Bute-player, a syrinx player, and a cithara player.

Though it is performed in honor of Zeus Sosipolis and actively attended by other gods (or their *xoana*), the procession, led by the chief civil magistrate of Magnesia, the eponymous *stephanophoros*, seems to have some bearing on the rank and honor of its human participants.<sup>513</sup> As happens elsewhere, we ought to note that participation has an added practical value: it would entitle the participants to a share in the ensuing sacrifice, in the present case, as will be seen below, of the bull led along. We should not, however, underestimate the religious significance of the procession. It is an essential element in a ritual sequence building up toward a climax consisting of a sacrifice and a *theoxenia*, a joint celebration for both divine and human participants.

*Sacrifice.* The range of issues discussed in connection with sacrifice in festival regulations is again neatly summarized in the same document, where sacrifice is discussed immediately after the procession. Lines 46–64 read:

παριστανέτωσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ οἰκονόμοι οἱ ἐν  
 τῷ μηνὶ τῷ Ἀρτεμισίωνι τῇ δωδεκάτῃ ἱερεῖα τρία,  
 48 [ἄ] θύσουσιν τῷ τε Διὶ τῷ Σωσιπόλει καὶ τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι  
 [τ]ῇ Λευκοφρυγῇ καὶ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τῷ Πυθίῳ, τῷ μὲν  
 [Διὶ] κριὸν ὡς κάλλιστον, τῇ δὲ Ἀρτέμιδι αἶγα, τῷ δὲ Ἀπόλλ[ω]-  
 νι ἄττηγόν, θύοντες τῷ μὲν Διὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τοῦ Διὸς[ε]  
 52 τοῦ Σωσιπόλιος, τῇ δὲ Ἀρτέμιδι καὶ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι ἐπὶ τ[οῦ]  
 βωμοῦ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος· λαμβάνειν δὲ τὰ γέρα τὰ ἱθισμέν[α]  
 τοὺς ἱερεῖς τῶν θεῶν τούτων· τὸν δὲ βούν ὅταν θύσωσιν  
 [δ]ιανεμέτωσαν τοῖς συμπομπεύσασιν, τὸν δὲ κριὸν καὶ τὴν  
 56 αἶγα καὶ τὸν ἄττηγόν διανεμέτωσαν τῷ τε στεφανηφό-  
 [ρ]ῳ καὶ τῇ ἱερεῖαι καὶ τοῖς πολεμάρχοις καὶ τοῖς προέδροις  
 [κα]ὶ νεωποῖαις καὶ εὐθύνοις καὶ τοῖς λητουργήσασιν, διανε-  
 [μέ]τωσαν δὲ ταῦτα οἱ οἰκονόμοι· ὅταν δὲ ἀναδειχθῇ ὁ ταῦ-  
 60 [ρ]ος, ἔγδοσιν ποιείσθωσαν οἱ οἰκονόμοι ὅπως τρέφεται ὑπὸ  
 τοῦ ἐργολαβήσαντος· ἀγέτω δὲ ὁ ἐργολαβήσας τὸν ταῦρον  
 εἰς τὴν ἀγοράν καὶ ἀγειρέτω παρὰ τε τῶν σιτοπωλῶν  
 καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀγοραίων ἃ ἀνήκει εἰς τὴν τροφήν, καὶ ἄ-  
 64 μινον εἶναι τοῖς διδοῦσιν.

<sup>513</sup> Cf. on this aspect Graf 1996, 58–61; A. Chaniotis, 'Sich selbst feiern? Städtische Feste des Hellenismus,' in M. Wörle and P. Zanker (eds.), *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus* (Vestigia 47), Munich, 1995, 147–172 esp. at 156–157, 160–161 with bibliography.

On the twelve of the month Artemision, the *oikonomoi* shall produce three victims, which they will sacrifice to Zeus Sosipolis, Artemis Leukophryene, and Pythian Apollo (as follows:) a ram as beautiful as possible to [Zeus], a goat to Artemis, and a he-goat to Apollo, the sacrifice to Zeus taking place on the altar of Zeus Sosipolis and to Artemis and Apollo on the altar of Artemis. The priests of these gods shall receive their customary prerogatives. When they sacrifice the bull, they shall distribute its meat among the participants in the procession; as for the ram, the goat, and the he-goat, they shall distribute them to the *stephanophoros*, the priestess, the *polemarchoi*, the *prohedroi*, the *neopoiai*, the *euthynoi*, and those performing services. The *oikonomoi* shall distribute these (victims). Once the bull is consecrated, the *oikonomoi* shall let out a contract for it to be reared by the contractor. The contractor shall lead the bull to the agora and collect from the grain sellers and the other merchants what is needed for his nurture, and it shall be better (i.e. advantageous) to the givers.

The document is typically not interested in spelling out the details of sacrifice itself; those involved are familiar with the performance; it is enough to ensure a correct match between the victims and the gods. Far greater concerns are the issues that precede and follow the act of sacrifice, i.e. procuring the victims and distribution of the sacrificial meat. Such pre- and post-sacrifice issues are recurrent elsewhere.

*Provision and Inspection of Victims.* Inspection of the victims, only alluded to here,<sup>514</sup> is to be discussed in more detail in other documents.<sup>515</sup> Victims may be bought and/or reared especially for the occasion. We may mention a few other representative examples. The Andania Mysteries regulations, *LSCG* 65, contain a detailed section (lines 64–73) regarding furnishing (παροχή, which is farmed out) and inspection (δοκιμασία) of the sheep and pigs needed for the festival. Buying and selecting the processional cattle is referred to in the Lesser Panathenaea dossier,<sup>516</sup> *LSCG* 33 B 16–24. An explicit treatment of cattle-rearing, under the rubric βουτροφία, is found in the first to second-century B.C. dossier of decrees from Bargylia, regulating a new annual sacrificial festival of Artemis Kindyas, *SEG XLV* 1508 + *EpigAnat* 32, 2000, 89–93.<sup>517</sup> A second-

<sup>514</sup> In the reference to the bull (when it is bought in line 12) and to the ram (line 50) as 'as beautiful as possible'.

<sup>515</sup> For inspection see below commentary on 26.31–32.

<sup>516</sup> Cf. immediately below.

<sup>517</sup> Below Appendix B 1.2. It is also concerned with the provision of a dedicatory silver statue of a deer for the goddess (*SEG XLV* 1508 A 16–22) and with a bovine sacrifice to Artemis for the sake of the city. The meat from this sacrifice, minus prerogatives, is to be sold (A 23–25). For interpretation of this dossier see P. Gauthier BE 1997 no. 541, 1998 no. 396, 2001, nos. 410, 411; C. Brixhe BE 1998 no. 395;



century B.C. decree from Astypalaia, *LSS* 83, is also worth mentioning in relation to pre-sacri ce activities. It ordains branding in advance all victims to be led along in a procession<sup>518</sup> and, at the risk of an imprecation, demands that all victims processed therein be sacri ced.<sup>519</sup>

*Distribution and Consumption of Meat.*<sup>520</sup> Cult personnel and dignitaries are the first concern in this respect. Participants in a procession may likewise be considered, as at Magnesia. Distribution of meat to the general public, that is κρεανομία, may also be prescribed. The *locus classicus* is probably the decree (B) from the law and decree dossier regarding the Lesser Panathenaea, *LSCG* 33.<sup>521</sup> The dossier from Bargylia<sup>522</sup> is more concise yet equally revealing. A 9 13 reads:

θύσαντες δὲ καὶ ἐξελόντες τὰ νομιζόμενα  
γέρα τῷ ἱερεῖ οἳ τε νεωποῖαι καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι προγεγραμμένοι τὰ λοιπὰ  
κρέα κοινῇ διανεμίσαντες τοῖς πολίταις τῇ ἐχομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ  
ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ πρὸς ὥραν τρίτην ποιούμενοι τὴν κρεανομίαν κατὰ  
φυλὰς.

having sacri ced and having removed the customary prerogatives for the priest, the *neopoiai* and the others inscribed above shall distribute publicly the remaining meat to the citizens<sup>523</sup> on the next day at the agora at the third hour, performing the *kreanomia* (meat distribution) according to tribes.

It should be noted that wherever consumption on the spot is not specifically prescribed, we may assume the meat may be taken away and consumed elsewhere.<sup>524</sup> If a banquet is involved it may be prescribed. A good example is the third-century B.C. decree from Coressia on Ceos regulating an unnamed agonistic festival, *LSCG* 98.9 16; see also the foundation of Kritolaos, *LSS* 61, and further below commentary on 14 B 65 67.

---

A. Chaniotis EBGR 1994 1995 no. 36 (*Kernos* 11, 1998), 1997 no. 32 (*Kernos* 13, 2000); K. Zimmermann, Sp thellenistische Kultpraxis in einer karischen Kleinstadt: Eine neue lex sacra aus Bargylia, *Chiron* 30, 2000, 451 485.

<sup>518</sup> In all probability after they had been inspected and found suitable for sacri ce (lines 17 18) as at Andania.

<sup>519</sup> Cf. L. Robert, *Hellenica* XI XII, Paris, 1960, 122 123.

<sup>520</sup> The post-sacri ce issue of sale of meat and skins was discussed above pp. 71 72.

<sup>521</sup> See also *LSS* 11.10 17; *LSAM* 32.53 59; 70; cf. *LSCG* 151 A 23. Cf. below commentary on 14 B 65 67.

<sup>522</sup> Appendix B 1.2.

<sup>523</sup> For the *metoikoi* cf. B 17 19.

<sup>524</sup> Unless consumption on the spot is self-evident and need not be mentioned. See below commentary on 14 B 65 67; cf., however, Zimmermann, *Chiron* 30, 2000, 472 478, 484.

*Competitions.* The religious significance of competitions is a complex matter. Torch races are as much a religious event as they are sportive.<sup>525</sup> But even in cases where their religious significance is in and of itself questionable, competitions are set in a context in which the sacred is in essence ever present through performance of cult, not to mention the notion of divine hospitality and endorsement. Inclusion of regulations for agonistic festivals in the corpus is justified inasmuch as they pertain to cultic aspects of the festival under discussion. Consider, for example, two of the documents included in the dossier concerning the agonistic festival foundation of C. Iulius Demosthenes at Oenoanda, *SEG XXXVIII* 1462 (A.D. 124–125/6). The last part of the second document (**B**; lines 38–46) lists the competitions, the dates they are to be held, and the prizes to be awarded, but does not quite regulate attendant cult performance. The third document (**C**), on the other hand, governs cult performance directly, including regulations for cult performance during the festival of the Demosthenia.<sup>526</sup>

Not all of the documents pertaining to agonistic festivals included in the corpus are actual regulations, that is governing performance directly rather than other matters relating to the respective festivals. This problem has already been seen in relation to the Actias. It is exemplified by the dossier of documents relating to the Ptoia.<sup>527</sup> The decree of the Delphic Amphictyony is concerned with establishing the inviolability of the sanctuary of Apollo Ptoius and the sacred truce for the festival. *LSCG* 71 is only concerned with the participation of Oropus.<sup>528</sup> A set of festival regulations is missing. Depending upon the scope of the festival, the few sets of regulations for agonistic festivals included in the corpus may be quite detailed. A particularly notable case is the Eretrian ca. 340 decree regulating the Artemisia, *LSCG* 92.<sup>529</sup> Like practically all relevant documents it shows a distinct interest in prizes. These differ from one competition to the other and may consist of money (*LSCG* 92; musical competitions), weapons (*LSCG* 98; below no. 14; sports), and even parts of sacrificial victims (*LSCG* 98; *LSS*

<sup>525</sup> See below commentary on no. 14.

<sup>526</sup> See M. Wörle, *Stadt und Fest im Kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien: Studien zu einer agonistischen Stiftung an Oinoanda* (Vestigia 39), Munich, 1988, 227–285.

<sup>527</sup> For the festival see below commentary on no. 11. Cf. above pp. 94–95.

<sup>528</sup> Cf. the decree from Haliartus below no. 11. Truce: *LSCG* 73 (above pp. 94–95).

<sup>529</sup> For the date see D. Knoepfner, *Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté* (Eretria. Fouilles et recherches XI), Lausanne, 2001, esp. pp. 33, 37 n. 56, 72 n. 280, 85 n. 365, 95, 330.

61).<sup>530</sup> Treatment of prizes by those who won them may be prescribed. No. 14 B 67 below requires that they be dedicated; the third-century B.C. *LSCG* 98 from Ceos forbids selling them.

*Ceremonies.* The corpus includes a relatively small number of documents governing the performance of specific ceremonies. The occasion of performance cannot always be easily determined.

The best known and most discussed case is probably the so-called Orgia of the Molpoi, *LSAM* 50, in fact a dossier of documents<sup>531</sup> pertaining to the administration of the cult college of the Molpoi and its responsibilities, consisting above all in the performance of the transfer of two so-called γυλλοί and procession along a route which is outlined. The college was directly related to the state,<sup>532</sup> which took an interest in preserving its activities: a late first-century A.D. Milesian decree, *LSAM* 53, sets out to ensure that the feasts of the Molpoi and the college of the Kosmoi be performed κατὰ τὰ π[ά]τρια ἔθνη, καθὼς προνομιοθέτηται καί | προεψήφισται.<sup>533</sup>

One suspects that the *platiwoinoi* and the *platiwoinarchoi* of the Archaic fragments from Tiryns, no. 6 below, formed a comparable cult college;<sup>534</sup> administering the activities of this college – probably performed at or related to a public feast – and its relation with the state seems to have been the aim of these rather obscure regulations.

A number of documents regulate ceremonies performed by women. All are fragmentary, which makes identification of the context difficult. See *LSCG* 63; 66; 127; *LSAM* 6; cf. *LSS* 29,<sup>535</sup> *LSAM* 61.<sup>536</sup> A fourth-century B.C. decree of the deme Cholargos in Athens, *LSS* 124, lists duties of special female priestesses in connection with the festival of the Thesmophoria.<sup>537</sup>

<sup>530</sup> An honorific decree with the possibility of an additional statue is mentioned in *SEG XXXVIII* 1462 C 66–67.

<sup>531</sup> Inscribed ca. 100 B.C.; the regulations themselves go back to the early to mid fifth century B.C.: Nilsson *GGR* II<sup>3</sup> 71.

<sup>532</sup> Graf 1996, 60–61.

<sup>533</sup> According to the ancestral customs, following what has been legislated and decreed before (lines 16–18). See Sokolowski's commentaries ad loc.; J. Fontenrose, *Didyma: Apollo's Oracle, Cult and Companions*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1988, 52–53, 60–61. The *gyllai* are commonly taken to be sacred stones but offering baskets have also been suggested (see Fontenrose).

<sup>534</sup> Differing, of course, in function.

<sup>535</sup> *LSS* 28 might be referred to here, but its interpretation is extremely doubtful: *Nomima* I p. 278.

<sup>536</sup> Cf. below commentary on 20.3.

<sup>537</sup> For the hymn singing in *LSAM* 28 and *LSAM* 69 see above pp. 74–75.

### Some Problems with the Evidence

The evidence, as can be seen from this review, is reasonably representative in respect to the basic types of Greek festivals. The corpus includes regulations for agonistic festivals,<sup>538</sup> mysteries,<sup>539</sup> and other festivals, mostly conforming to a basic procession-sacri ce-distribution of meat and/or sacri cial banquet type, sometimes with little added value in the way of ritual.<sup>540</sup>

The evidence is at the same time misleading in a way which is not entirely uncharacteristic of signi cant parts of the corpus. The only

---

<sup>538</sup> (Prescriptions do not necessarily pertain to competitions): Athens *LSCG* 13 (Hephaestia); 31 (festival of Poseidon); 33 (Panathenaia); (regarding the identification of the festival of *LSCG* 4 as the Eleusinia see n. 544 and Clinton 1979); Epidaurus: *LSS* 23 (depends on a restoration). Acraephia: *LSCG* 71; 73 (Ptoia: possibly no. 11 below). Acarnania: *LSS* 45 (Actias); Beroia: no. 14 below (Hermaia); Chersonesus: no. 15 below (Hermaia); Eretria: *LSCG* 92 (Artemisia). Ceos: *LSCG* 98 (agonistic festival at Coressia). Cos: *Isr.Cos* ED 16 (Hermaia); ED 82 (*LGS* II 131; foundation of Pythokles: cf. above p. 84); cf. ED 86. Asia Minor: *LSAM* 9 (festival of Athena at Ilium); 10 (Ilium; federal festival of Athena); 15 (Elaea (see above p. 8; for the running course (lines 55–58) see L. Robert *BCH* 108, 1984, 491 with n. 11 (= *Documents d'Asie Mineure*, Paris, 1987, 479)); *SEG* XXXVIII 1462 C (Demosthenia at Oenoanda).

<sup>539</sup> Eleusis *LSCG* 8; *LSS* 1; 3; 15; *Agora* XVI 56 (*LSS* 12); cf. *LSCG* 5; *LSS* 13; *Agora* XVI 57 (1st fruits). Andania: *LSCG* 65. Phanagoria: *LSCG* 89. Cf. Minoa on Amorgos *LSCG* 103 (with p. 198).

<sup>540</sup> See Athens: *LSCG* 46 (Orgeonic procession); 179 (Dipolieia?); *LSS* 5 (festival of Eros); 8 (sacri ce to Apollo); 11 (festival of Asclepius); 14 (Thargelia); 124 (Thesmophoria); no. 2 below (festival of Heracles at Eleusis). Epidaurus: *LSCG* 60 (sacri ce; at a festival?); see above p. 71). Laconia and Messenia: *LSCG* 63 and 66 (ceremonies; feminine cult). Delphi: *LSCG* 77 (*CID* I 9) D (festivals of the phratry of the Labyadai); 80 (Attaleia); 81 (Alkesippeia); *LSS* 44 (Eumeneia). Eretria: *LSCG* 93 (Asclepieia) *LSS* 46 (festival of Dionysus). Amorgos: *LSS* 61 (foundation of Kritolaos at Aigiale). Samos *LSCG* 122 (organization of sacri ces at the Heliconium). Thasos: *LSS* 69 (truce for several festivals). Lesbos: *LSCG* 127 (Methymna; *pannychis*). Thera: *LSCG* 135 (foundation of Epicteta). Astypalaia: *LSS* 83 (sacri cial procession). Rhodes: *LSCG* 137 (Sminthia at Lindus). Cos: *LSCG* 159 (Asclepieia) cf. the calendar *LSCG* 151; 177 (foundation of Diomedon); *Isr.Cos* ED 25 (festival of Artemis); ED 146 (foundation of Phanomachos: see above p. 86); Parker and Obbink 2001a, 266–271 no. 3 (Asclepieia). Asia Minor: *LSAM* 6 (Cius; ceremonies; feminine); 8 (Asclepieia at Lampsacus); 28 (ceremonies in honor of Dionysus at Teos); 31 (Artemisia at Ephesus); 32 (Magnesia; Zeus Sosipolis); 33 (Eisiteria at Magnesia); 50 and 53 (Molpoi and Kosmoi at Miletus); 57 (Hyllarima; pentaeteric festival of Zeus?); 61 (Mylasa; ceremonies for Demeter); *ILabraunda* 53–54 (unknown festival); *LSAM* 69 (hymn singing at Stratonicea); *LSAM* 70 (meat distribution at Chalketor); 76 (Isinda; fragmentary); 81 (Athena and Homonoia at Antiochia ad Pyramum); *SEG* XLV 1508 + *EpigAnat* 32, 2000: 89–93 (festival of Artemis Kindyas at Bargylia: cf. above p. 100); Appendix B 1.23 below (Panionium; the Panionia(?)). Syria: *LGS* I 25 (festival of the Soadeni at Canatha). Sicily: no. 26 below (Nakone).

major Greek festival more or less adequately represented in the corpus is the Eleusinian mysteries. The Eleusinian dossier includes two comprehensive laws, *LSS* 3 and the more extensive *Agora* XVI 56,<sup>541</sup> which, as Kevin Clinton has shown, was envisioned as a general code for the festival.<sup>542</sup> Also included are *LSCG* 8, a decree concerned specifically with ephebic participation in the procession,<sup>543</sup> the fragmentary *LSS* 15, also concerned with the procession, *LSS* 1 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 231; ca. 510–500 B.C.) which, as much as can be judged from its present fragmentary state, dealt with provisions and cult personnel, and the decree regarding sacrifices, *LSCG* 4 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 5; ca. 500 B.C.).<sup>544</sup> To these one should add the related documents regarding the Eleusinian first fruits, the so called First Fruits Decree *LSCG* 5,<sup>545</sup> the law of 353/2, *LSS* 13, and the meager fragment *Agora* XVI 57.

This stands in sharp contrast to the four great Panhellenic festivals. Cult regulations pertaining directly to the Olympic games are yet to be published,<sup>546</sup> and the same holds true for the Nemean and Isthmian games. The Delphic Pythian games are represented only indirectly through two injunctions in the Amphictyonic law of 388, *LSCG* 78.34–49, concerning the renovation works to be executed before the festival and the sacred truce.<sup>547</sup> The situation is not much better for the well-known old Athenian festivals. The Panathenaic festival is represented in the corpus only by the law and decree regarding the Lesser Panathenaia, *LSCG* 33, published in connection with an essentially financial reorganization in the mid-late 330s B.C.<sup>548</sup> The Thesmophoria are represented by *LSS* 124, the scope of which is, however, very limited.<sup>549</sup> The Thargelia are dealt with in *LSS* 14 but only in relation to its resuscitation in 129/8.<sup>550</sup> Besides references in the Athenian calendars, we hear

---

<sup>541</sup> Discussed in relation to the sacred truce above. For the two documents see below p. 109.

<sup>542</sup> Clinton 1980, 271–275. *LSS* 3 B. 32–43 also makes a consideration of the lesser mysteries (in respect to the sacred truce).

<sup>543</sup> See above p. 96.

<sup>544</sup> I.e. accepting Clinton's 1979 identification of the ἐορτή (line 4) as the mysteries rather than the Eleusinia.

<sup>545</sup> See above p. 36.

<sup>546</sup> Or perhaps fully published, considering *SEG* XLII 370 and 373. For Olympia cf., however, *LGS* II 60 and 61.

<sup>547</sup> See above p. 94.

<sup>548</sup> See below pp. 108–109.

<sup>549</sup> See above p. 102.

<sup>550</sup> Mikalson 1998, 272–274.

nothing of the Diasia, the Plynteria, the Pyanopsia, or the Dionysia; other festivals are all or almost all but absent from the corpus.

The vast majority of pertinent documents included in the corpus govern a number of local festivals. By local one should not imply unimportant; these festivals must have been important enough to those who celebrated them. Most, however, have left little trace in literature. The haphazard nature of the evidence is particularly striking if we consider the case of the Andanian Mysteries. This festival, which Pausanias (4.33.5) considered second in sanctity only to the Eleusinian mysteries, is otherwise barely known from literature. As the location where the mysteries were held has yet to be excavated, the festival would have remained practically unknown if it had not been for the discovery of *LSCG* 65. This inscription starts *in medias res*; the beginning is evidently missing. Even so, it is the longest and most detailed sacred law in existence, comprising 194 almost perfectly preserved lines. It refers to itself as a δῆλον (lines 25, 28, 113, 114), evidently an enactment, comprising numerous paragraphs arranged by subject matter and identified by appropriate sub-headings, and covering most issues that the administration of the festival might entail. A detailed analysis cannot be pursued here; it is enough to note that these involve logistic, legal, and financial issues pertaining to the practical management of the festival resulting from the accommodation of what is evidently a considerable crowd of worshippers and the significant variety of officials (sacred, policing, financial, legal) and performers (73–74) engaged in the production. Some of these issues, such as the size of the tents of the worshippers and their furnishings (34–39), administration of the market (99–103), the supply of hot water (103–110), the handling of funds, offenses and legal procedure (40–45, 81–83, 116–190), or the publication of the *diagramma* (113–115) may seem more mundane; others, such as the transfer of the sacred books of the mysteries (11–15), the dress code (both of officials and of worshippers), the procession and its order (28–34), furnishing of victims (67–73),<sup>551</sup> or the sacred banquet (95–98), relate more directly to cult practice.

One ought to ask oneself why such detail is needed. The reason is without doubt a certain change in the status or a reorganization of the festival. The origin and development of the festival is a famous crux. It seems clear, however, that it underwent a thorough reorganization in

---

<sup>551</sup> See above p. 99.

which its administration became the business of the Messenian state, a certain prominence having been nevertheless accorded to Mnasistratos, known as the Hierophant from the related oracle (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 735), and to his descendants.<sup>552</sup> It is otherwise hard to explain why the stipulations attempt to define the status of each of the parties in the administration and protect the rights of Mnasistratos and his family.<sup>553</sup> Quite like the case of the Actias, the publication of the present document depended upon this reorganization.

*Publication.* Reorganization is indeed a frequent reason for publication. In and of itself it may be motivated by different factors. We should briefly consider some possible types of revisions and a few other occasions on which festival documents may be published.<sup>554</sup>

*New Festivals.* When the state of preservation allows this, new festivals are usually easy to detect. A typical document would account in one way or the other for the reasons which brought about the institution of the festival and include a relatively detailed set of regulations outlining the new ceremonies. In this respect, such documents are similar to other documents governing newly instituted cults whether their main focus be on cult officials or on cult practice. The motives for instituting new festivals may differ. As seen above,<sup>555</sup> festivals may be instituted by individuals to perpetuate their memory. We may consider a few other cases. Historical events may be involved. Festivals may commemorate external or internal reconciliation. Such is the case of the festival of Zeus Sosipolis, *LSAM* 32,<sup>556</sup> of the Antiochia ad Pyramum (Magarsus) festival in honor of Athena and Homonoia commemorating the reconciliation between it and Antiochia ad Cydnum (Tarsus) and regulated by the decree *LSAM* 81 (mid second century B.C.),<sup>557</sup> or the festival instituted to perpetuate the memory of a local act of reconciliation in the decree of Nakone, no. 26 below. *LSAM* 15,<sup>558</sup> a decree dating to 129 B.C. from Elaea,<sup>559</sup> prescribes a sacrificial celebration (one-time, or

<sup>552</sup> See at length Deshours 1999, suggesting a restoration of the mysteries.

<sup>553</sup> See especially the management of the treasuries in lines 89–95.

<sup>554</sup> For a detailed study of festivals in the Hellenistic period see A. Chanotis, *Sich selbst feiern? Städtische Feste des Hellenismus*, in M. Wörle and P. Zanker (eds.), *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus* (Vestigia 47), Munich, 1995. pp. 164–168 contain a list of new and renewed festivals with their motives.

<sup>555</sup> p. 84.

<sup>556</sup> Discussed above pp. 97–99.

<sup>557</sup> Cf. below commentary on no. 26.

<sup>558</sup> Discussed above pp. 7–8.

<sup>559</sup> See above p. 8.

so it seems) in honor of Demeter, Kore, Roma and all other gods and goddesses on the occasion of the installation of inscriptions bearing a treaty of alliance with the Romans.

A different impetus – an epiphany of Artemis Leucophryene – underlay the institution of the festival of the Eisiteria at Magnesia on the Maeander. Commemoration of an epiphany of Artemis Kindyas in a time of adversity also seems to have been the reason for the institution of the festival in her honor at Bargylia.<sup>560</sup> The Magnesians Eisiteria seems, to an extent, a relative of the Leucophryena, and together with the two complementary decrees regarding the Eisiteria that have reached us in *LSAM* 33 (late third century B.C.),<sup>561</sup> the dossier of documents regarding the Leucophryena enables reconstruction of the historical circumstances.<sup>562</sup> In the course of events that followed an epiphany of the goddess in 221/0 B.C. and an ensuing oracular consultation,<sup>563</sup> which inspired the Magnesians to solicit asylum grants for their city and territory and to institute the Leucophryena,<sup>564</sup> the cult statue of Artemis was introduced into her temple, probably somewhere in the late third century.<sup>565</sup> The first (A) of the two decrees regarding the Eisiteria, proposed by Diagoras son of Isagoras, contains a set of regulations for the festival instituted to commemorate the consecration of the statue. It is to be celebrated on six Artemision.

*Resuscitation.* The second decree (B) included in *LSAM* 33 points to another factor underlying publication. As it turns out (or so it seems), the festival soon fell into neglect<sup>566</sup> or simply failed to inspire the anticipated enthusiasm in the first place. A decree was passed to ensure that it be celebrated and the goddess be rendered her appropriate honors. Both this and the former decree regarding the administration (διοίκησις line 81) of the festival are to be published. Moreover,

<sup>560</sup> Below Appendix B 1.2; cf. above pp. 99–100. For the epiphany see P. Gauthier *BE* 2001 nos. 410 and 411 with C 1–2; cf. *I.Iasos* 613.2–5 (K. Zimmermann, *Sp. thellenistische Kultpraxis in einer karischen Kleinstadt: Eine neue lex sacra aus Bargylia*, *Chiron* 30, 2000, 451–485 at 452).

<sup>561</sup> P. Gauthier *RPhil* 64, 1990, 63 n. 7.

<sup>562</sup> Beginning with the Magnesians *I.Magnesia* 16 (= *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 557; Rigsby 1996 no. 66) and including a great number of documents. See Rigsby 1996, 179–279 nos. 66–131.

<sup>563</sup> Fontenrose 1978, 258–259 H45.

<sup>564</sup> First as a cash-prize competition for the Greeks of Asia and then in 208 as a crowned panhellenic competition: *I.Magnesia* 16 with Rigsby 1996, 179–185.

<sup>565</sup> *LSAM* 33.3–5.

<sup>566</sup> Sokolowski *LSAM* p. 96.



ἵνα δὲ πάντες γινώσκωσιν ὥ[ς]

καθηκόν ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς Εἰσιτηρίοις τὰς τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος συνεπαύξειν  
 76 [26] τιμὰς, τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς τὸν ἀεὶ κατασταθησόμενον  
 καὶ τὸν ἀντιγραφέα καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ Ἀρτεμισιῶ-  
 νος τῇ δευτέρᾳ μετὰ τὴν αἵρεσιν γενέσθαι τῆς τε ἱερείας  
 καὶ τοῦ στεφανηφόρου παραναγινώσκειν ἐπάναγ[κ]ες τὸ [ψ]ήφισ-  
 80 [30] μα τὸ εἰσενεχθὲν ὑπὸ Διαγόρου τοῦ Ἰσαγόρου τὸ περὶ τῆ[ς τῶν Εἰ]-  
 σιτηρίων διοικήσεως.

In order that everyone may know that it is t to increase the honors of Artemis on the occasion of the Eisiteria each year, on the second of the month of Artemision, after the elections of the priestess (of Artemis) and the *stephanophoros*, the appointed secretary of the council and the *antigraphus* shall be compelled to read the decree proposed by Diagoras son of Isagoras regarding the administration of the Eisiteria.

A failure to follow this ordinance would result in an astronomical ne. As active participation is expected from the inhabitants who must offer sacri ce on this occasion in front of their houses, bad luck is wished upon those reluctant to do so.

These exact measures are not paralleled. But the decree is partially comparable to a number of decrees aiming at resuscitating neglected cults. Most if not all of them date from the second century B.C. onward.<sup>567</sup> The motives for resuscitation are commonly expressed in elaborate preambles. Apollo had been observant of the Athenians (*LSS* 14; 189/8 B.C.);<sup>568</sup> Dionysus of the Lindians (*LSCG* 137; late rst century A.D.); Zeus and Hecate of the Stratoniceans (*LSAM* 69; late second century A.D.).<sup>569</sup> The cities are struck by a realization that the honor of these gods must be increased, piety and regard to ancestral custom be made manifest, and ceremonies and festivals be revamped and revitalized.

*Refinancing.* Financial difficulties and new means to nance certain festivals may lead to nancial reorganizations. The point of view of documents instituting such reorganizations is naturally predominantly nancial. Such is the case of the law and decree regarding the lesser Panathenaia, *LSCG* 33, dating to the mid-late 330s B.C., issued when the festival became a bene ciary of the revenues from the so-called

<sup>567</sup> The religious renaissance of the second century B.C. is perhaps best documented in Athens. See Mikalson 1998, 242–287.

<sup>568</sup> For Apollo and the Acarnanians see the decree regarding the Actias, *LSS* 45, discussed above pp. 90–92.

<sup>569</sup> Cf. above pp. 74–75. Cf. *LSAM* 31 (ca. A.D. 160 (cf. above pp. 95–96; below 110 n. 582)), stressing that Artemis had always been of special signi cance to the Ephesians.

Nea, i.e., as L. Robert has shown,<sup>570</sup> the coastal plain of Oropus. Athena is also the patron of the festivals of which the financing is discussed in two different documents from Ilium, *LSAM* 9 and 10. The first, a decree of Ilium, was occasioned by a private foundation.<sup>571</sup> The second is an agreement of the Ilian confederacy regarding the federal *panegyris*, dated to 77 B.C., which, apparently grounded in finances, is quite detailed in various other aspects. Cf. also the foundation of Hegesarete from Amorgos, *LSCG* 103.<sup>572</sup>

*Upgrade.* Local festivals may for different reasons be upgraded to regional festivals. The upgrade of the Acraephian Ptoia from a local to pan-Boeotian festival occasioned at least two documents included in the corpus.<sup>573</sup> See above pp. 94, 101 and commentary on no. 11 below.

*Increasing Popularity of the Cult.* As has been seen above, the Eleusinian dossier includes two separate general laws, *LSS* 3 and the more extensive *Agora* XVI 56, dated respectively to ca. 460 B.C. and ca. 367–348 B.C., the newer one being much more detailed than the older. One may wonder what prompted the new law. The answer ought to be sought, as Kevin Clinton has suggested,<sup>574</sup> in the increasing popularity of the cult. Growing attendance had an inevitable effect on the administration of the festival; the limited scope of the old law rendered it obsolete and brought about a need for a new and more comprehensive law.

*Cultic Modifications.* Cultic changes, namely additions, are probably the most difficult thing to detect without a specific statement as to their introduction. We may consider some cases.

The earliest relevant document is the 421/0 B.C. Athenian decree regarding the organization of a pentaeteric agonistic festival in honor of Hephaestus, *LSCG* 13 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 82). The festival has been considered to be new; it is probably not. Its celebration is rather given here a new format.<sup>575</sup> The motives for this were probably discussed in the preamble, now all but lost. Despite the overall fragmentary state of the remainder of the decree, it is possible to envision its scope. It concerns financing and the appointment and function of officials in charge of the pro-

<sup>570</sup> *Hellenica* XI XII, Paris, 1960, 194–200. *Contra*: M.K. Langdon, *Hesperia* 56, 1987, 56–58.

<sup>571</sup> See above pp. 85–86.

<sup>572</sup> See above p. 85.

<sup>573</sup> Cf. the case of the Actias in *LSS* 45 discussed above pp. 90–93.

<sup>574</sup> 1980, 274–275.

<sup>575</sup> See Parker 1996, 154; Parke 1977, 172; Deubner 1932, 212–213.

duction and outlines the proceedings, i.e. the procession, sacrifice with *καθαινομία* (a ceremony of bovine-lifting is involved: line 31),<sup>576</sup> and competitions (a torch race and, so it seems, a musical competition (line 16)).

The early-fourth-century decree from the Piraeus *LSS* 11<sup>577</sup> stipulates the performance of a newly formulated sacrifice at a festival of Asclepius. Though the festival cannot be too old (the cult of Asclepius having been introduced to the Piraeus in 420/19 B.C.), it seems to predate the decree.<sup>578</sup> A decree from Eretria, *LSS* 46,<sup>579</sup> known only from a copy made by Cyriacus of Ancona, seems to add a new motive to an existing festival, stipulating that a procession in honor of Dionysus during which the city had been liberated – an event Denis Knoepfeler dates to 285 B.C.<sup>580</sup> – commemorate the liberation.

Two Roman Imperial copies, *ILabraunda* 53–54, record a much earlier decree (fourth century B.C.) on the subject of reorganization of a certain festival under Mausolus, consisting in extending its duration from one to five days. The combined text of the two decrees (*ILabraunda* 54 A) is still fragmentary. It evidently prescribed a concise day-by-day list of the activities. One notes a parallel to the day-by-day format in the equally fragmentary Punic inscription *KAI* 76 (*CIS* I 166), listing offerings for different days, evidently of a festival.<sup>581</sup> As seen above, the foundation of Epicteta (*IG* XII 3, 330; *LSCG* 135) also lists the activities for each one of the three days of the meeting of the family association, though in greater detail.<sup>582</sup>

### The Nature of the Evidence

Whatever may be the reasons for publication, the documents are subject to certain limitations. This is clear in respect to specific regulations which view a given festival from the limited spectrum of a particular issue. But comprehensive documents are limited too because of their overwhelmingly administrative character (this is stated explicitly in

<sup>576</sup> For the practice see van Straten 1995, 109–113.

<sup>577</sup> See above p. 64.

<sup>578</sup> See above p. 64 with n. 320. Cf. *LSCG* 31 (sacrifice and competitions added(?) to a festival of Poseidon).

<sup>579</sup> Mentioned above p. 96.

<sup>580</sup> Rather than to 308: *Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté* (Eretria. Fouilles et recherches XI), Lausanne, 2001, pp. 116 with n. 55, 216 n. 726, 342 n. 285.

<sup>581</sup> See commentary ad loc. in *KAI* II p. 94.

<sup>582</sup> *LSAM* 31 (cf. above pp. 95–96; 108 n. 569) might have been necessitated by the transfer of the date of the festival: Sokolowski's commentary p. 31.

LSAM 33 B). They touch upon points in cult performance as needed, rarely if at all dictating it, let alone in detail. To illustrate this problem we may turn back to the Andanian *diagramma*.

The *diagramma* was, as has been said above,<sup>583</sup> occasioned by a reorganization. This reorganization must have been predominantly administrative. There is little to suggest that the cult itself underwent any substantial changes. On the contrary, sacred books that Mnasiastros had provided (and which likely predated the reorganization) are to be transferred each year from one college of cult administrators to the other, evidently to ensure the preservation of proper practice. The *diagramma* and the books are therefore complementary. The *diagramma* may touch upon points of cult performance but was not meant to prescribe it directly. Rather it sets the administrative framework within which cult may be practiced in keeping with proper procedure. The cult itself depended upon the precepts of the sacred books.

Like other cult regulations considered in this review, festival regulations may generally be compared to professional cookbooks, to the extent that they tend to list the ingredients, on the whole leaving out practical instructions. Cult performance is very much the product of tradition,<sup>584</sup> i.e. the accumulation of practices, customs, usages, rules, all of which, as has been pointed out above,<sup>585</sup> are entailed in the term νόμος. These are the primary source for and substance of cult regulations,<sup>586</sup> standing behind what the documents may (inter alia) refer to as τὰ πάτρια or τὰ νομιζόμενα.<sup>587</sup> Basic knowledge of cult performance may be gained through experience;<sup>588</sup> when it is prescribed by epigraphical means, only the necessary details need be mentioned.<sup>589</sup>

<sup>583</sup> pp. 105–106.

<sup>584</sup> Cf. Burkert 1985, 10. This is by no means to preclude development and innovation.

<sup>585</sup> p. 5.

<sup>586</sup> Including any documents found in the corpus (such as requirements for entry into sanctuaries or priesthood regulations) which wholly or partially govern actual cult practice.

<sup>587</sup> Cf. recently Aleshire 1994, 14; Deshours 1999, 479–480.

<sup>588</sup> Newly formulated cults may build upon knowledge of traditional practice when an action in the sequence they prescribe consists of traditional elements.

<sup>589</sup> It may well have been expounded orally or in specialized literature, represented for us by the tantalizingly fragmentary remains collected in A. Tresp, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Kultuschriftsteller* (RVV 15.1), Giessen, 1914. Tresp's work could benefit from a revision, if only in light of Jacoby's discussion in *Atthis*, Oxford, 1949, 1–70 (for the *exegetai* see, however, J.H. Oliver, *Jacoby's Treatment of the Exegetes*, *AJP* 75, 1954, 160–174; Clinton 1974, 89–93).

The limitations of the evidence being a given, the study of the subject matter of the documents only starts with the documents themselves. It must consider their context and, to the extent that this is possible, must make recourse to any available evidence, whether literary, epigraphical, archaeological, or, should it be deemed pertinent, comparative. This review was limited to an attempt to show what types of documents are assembled under the title sacred law, their substance, i.e. the issues with which they are concerned, and the ways in which these may be handled. Detailed interpretation could not be considered. In so far as the twenty-seven documents assembled below are concerned, this has been attempted in Part II.

PART TWO

NEW DOCUMENTS



## SEG XXXIII 147

## ATTICA. THORIKOS. SACRIFICIAL CALENDAR.

380 375 OR 440 430/430 420(?) B.C.

(Figures 3 7)

A rectangular stele of white marble. The stone is cut above on the left (the right corner survives) and below (without affecting the text) and broken on the right below line 22; the left side is intact. The back is badly bruised as a result of a later use as a threshold. With the possible exception of a narrow patch along the left margin, none of the original finish of the back is preserved. The stone is inscribed on the front with additional entries on both sides. The front is fairly well preserved with occasional damage and weathering; the left side is well preserved excluding the left margin; surviving parts of the right side are damaged intermittently. The stone is known to have come from around the territory of the Attic deme Thorikos, where an incomplete and inaccurate copy of it was made by D.F. Ogden at the modern village of Keratea in 1960.<sup>1</sup> Ogden's copy was used by Vanderpool as a source for his edition. Another copy, somewhat more complete but still not wholly accurate, was used by Dunst for his edition. The stone eventually appeared on the antiquities market and was purchased by the J. Paul Getty Museum in the late 1970s.<sup>2</sup>

H. 1.312; W. 0.555; Th. ca. 0.174 0.18 (left side), ca. 0.195 (thickest point on the right side). L.H. ca. 0.012 0.13; Θ, O, and Ω ca. 0.01 0.011; Ζ ca. 0.008; Ξ ca. 0.009. Stoichoi ca. 0.018 (horizontal), ca. 0.019 (vertical). Margins 0.019 (top), ca. 0.012 (left), ca. 0.01 (right); surviving space below the text ca. 0.078. *Left Side* L.H. at the level of line 31: ca. 0.01 0.012, O and Ω 0.007; between lines 31 and 32: 0.006 (smaller omicron) to 0.013 (Σ); at the level of line 42: 0.006 (Ω) 0.009; at the level of line 58: 0.005 (Ω) 0.01. *Right Side* L.H. at the level of lines 4 6: ca. 0.01 (N) 0.015 (H); at the level of line 12: ca. 0.01; at the level of line 44: ca. 0.007 (Ω) 0.01.

Malibu, The J. Paul Getty Museum. Inv. 79.AA.113.

<sup>1</sup> Vanderpool 1975, 33 35.

<sup>2</sup> On the history of the stone see Daux 1980, 463 465.



Ed. Vanderpool 1975, 33 41;<sup>3</sup> Dunst 1977;<sup>4</sup> (= *SEG XXVI* 136; Labarbe 1977, 56 64 no. 50); Daux 1983,<sup>5</sup> with corrections of some misprints in Daux 1984, 399 400; Daux 1984a;<sup>6</sup> (= *SEG XXXIII* 147).

Cf. Mikalson 1977 *passim*; Daux 1980; Brum eld 1981, 57 59; Osborne 1985, esp. 35, 78 n. 33; Robertson 1983, 281 282;<sup>7</sup> Parker 1984; Lewis 1985, n. 3;<sup>8</sup> Whitehead 1986, esp. 194 199; Whitehead 1986a, 218; Parker 1987, esp. 144 147; van Straten 1987, 164 167 *passim*; Jameson 1988, 89 90, esp. 115 n. 7;<sup>9</sup> Kearns 1989, esp. 37; Henrichs 1990, 260 264; Mattingly 1990, esp. 118 120; Bingen 1991, 28 31, 35;<sup>10</sup> Christopoulos 1992, 35; Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 81;<sup>11</sup> *IG I<sup>3</sup>* 256 bis; Rosivach 1994, 22 29; Scullion 1994, 88;<sup>12</sup> J. Larson, *Greek Heroine Cults*, Madison/London, 1995, esp. 31 34, 38 40; van Straten 1995, 171 186 *passim*; C. Calame, *Thésé et l'imaginaire athénien: Légende et culte en Grèce antique*<sup>2</sup>, Lausanne, 1996, 320;<sup>13</sup> Parker 1996, esp. 46;<sup>14</sup> Robertson 1996, 348 350, 352 356; Threatte, *GAI* I 40.021 (pp. 479 480),<sup>15</sup> II 51.0331 (p. 99);<sup>16</sup> Loomis 1998, 77, 85, 273;<sup>17</sup> Scullion 1998, 116 121.<sup>18</sup>

Photograph: Daux 1983, pls. I and II facing pp. 154 and 155; 1984a, 146 g. 1;<sup>19</sup> Whitehead 1986, 195 (all excellent).

<sup>3</sup> From a copy made by D.F. Ogden (facsimile included) of another copy.

<sup>4</sup> From a different, more complete copy.

<sup>5</sup> From the stone.

<sup>6</sup> From the stone.

<sup>7</sup> See *Restorations*.

<sup>8</sup> Date.

<sup>9</sup> Date.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. below commentary on line 6.

<sup>11</sup> Zeus Meilichios.

<sup>12</sup> See below commentary on line 14.

<sup>13</sup> See below n. 107.

<sup>14</sup> The context of Athenian sacrificial calendars.

<sup>15</sup> See *Restorations* 5–6.

<sup>16</sup> Date.

<sup>17</sup> On lines 4–5.

<sup>18</sup> See below commentary on line 14.

<sup>19</sup> Daux 1983 pl. I = Daux 1984 g. 1a = Figure 3; Daux 1984 g. 1b = Figure 5. For details of the left side see Daux 1983 pl. II; for an overall view of the right side see Daux 1984 g. 1c.

## Latus Sinistrum

## Latus Adversum

## Latus Dextrum

## NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ.

## ΣΤΟΙΧ. 30

## NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ.

380 375 vel 440 430/430 420(?) a.

*vacat spatium*  
30 vv.

[. . . . .<sup>19</sup> . . . . . Ἐκ]ατομβαίων-  
[ος, . . . . .<sup>19</sup> . . . . .]ΑΚΙ καὶ τοῖ-  
[ς . . . . .<sup>18</sup> . . . . . ἄ]ριστοι παρέ-  
4 [χεν . . . . .<sup>14</sup> . . . . . δρ]α]χμὴν ἑκατε-  
[ο . . . . .<sup>19</sup> . . . . .]ΑΙ τὴν προηρο[σ]-  
[ίαν . . . . .<sup>14</sup> . . . . . Δελ]φίνιον αἶγ[α]  
[. . . . .<sup>20</sup> . . . . .]ΕΑΙ Ἑκάτη Δ  
8 [. . . . .<sup>22</sup> . . . . .]ΗΝΟΣΑΤΗ[.]  
[. . . . .<sup>18</sup> . . . . .] τέλεον προτό[ν].  
[Μεταγεινιώνος, Δι Κατ]αβάτη ἐν τ-  
ῶι σηκῶι π[αρ]ά τὸ [Δελφί]νι[ον] τέλεον προ-  
12 ατόν· ὀρχωμόσιον π[α]ρ[έ]χεν ἐς εὐθύνας.  
Βοηδρομιώνος, Προηρόσια : Δι Πολιεῖ κρι-  
τόν οἶν, : χοῖρον κριτόν, ΕΠΑΥΤΟΜΕΝΑΣ  
χοῖρον ὠνητόν ὀλόκαυτον, τῶι ἀκολου-  
16 θόντι ἄριστοι παρέχεν τὸν ἱερέα : Κεφ-  
άλωι οἶν κριτόν, : Πρόκριδι τράπεζαν·<sup>v</sup>  
Θορίκωι κριτόν οἶν, : Ἡρώϊνσι Θορίκο  
τράπεζαν : ἐπὶ Σούνιον Ποσειδῶνι ἀμν-  
20 ὄν κριτόν, : Ἀπόλλωνι χίμαρον κριτόν, Κ-  
οροτρόφωι χοῖρον κριτήν, : Δήμητρι τέλ[εο]-  
[ν], Δι Ἑρκείωι τέλεον, Κοροτρόφωι χοῖρ[ον],  
[[Ἀθηναίαι οἶν προτόν]] ἐφ' ἄλλῃ : Ποσ[ειδῶνι]  
24 τέλεον, Ἀπόλλωνι χοῖρον.<sup>vacat</sup>  
Πυανοπιώνος, Δι Καταβάτη ἐμ [Φιλομ]-  
η(λ)ιδῶν τέλεον προτόν, ἔκτῃ ἐπὶ δέξα

*vacat spatium*  
3 vv.

Ι Μυκηνο[ν - - -]  
[.]ΑΝ οἶν [..]Ν[- - -]  
[.]ΙΣΦ[- - -]  
*vacat spatium*  
4 vv.

Φοίνικι τέλ[εον]  
*vacat spatium*  
31 vv.

Daux<sup>1</sup> = Daux 1983Parker<sup>1</sup> = Parker 1984Robertson<sup>1</sup> = Robertson 1983Daux<sup>2</sup> = Daux 1984a<sup>20</sup>Parker<sup>2</sup> = Parker 1987Robertson<sup>2</sup> = Robertson 1996

*Restorations. Latus Adversum:* **1-2** [τάδε θύεται Θορικίοις, Ἑκα]τομβαίων|[ος Vanderpool || **2-3** fortasse [τῶι φύλ]ακι καὶ τοῖ|[ς ἀκολουθοῖς αὐτὸ πᾶσι ἄ]ριστοι Daux || **3** [. . .<sup>6</sup> . . . τῶι ἀκολοθῶντι ἄρ] Dunst || **4** [χεν τὸν ἱερέα . . . ? . . . δρ]α Dunst || **4-5** ἑκατερ[ο] (vel ω)] Daux<sup>1</sup> post Dunst || **5** ΑΙ: dativus est nominis divini, utrum Hera? an Athena? Daux: [κ]αὶ Dunst: [Δαίω]αι Robertson<sup>2</sup> || **5-6** τὴν προηρο[σ|ίαν] Daux post Vanderpool: fortasse προηρο[σιάδα] Threatte: fortasse προρό[α]ρχον vel προηρο[σ|ίαρχον? *agnam*] Robertson<sup>2</sup> || **6** [Δελ]φίνιον αἶγ[α] Daux. || **7** n. fortasse δάμαλιν (vel αἶγα; vid. adn. epigr.) Daux || **8** ΗΝΟΣΑΤΗ[.]: fortasse [μ]ηνός Ἀτῆν[η]σιν Daux || **9** προτό[ν] Daux post Vanderpool || **10** [Μεταγεινιώνος] Daux, [Δι Κατ]αβάτη Vanderpool || **11** Daux || **12** π[α]ρ[έ]χεν Daux post Vanderpool et Burkert apud Dunst || **14** ΕΠΑΥΤΟΜΕΝΑΣ lapis: ἐπαυτομένας Daux: ἐπ' Αὐτομένας (vel ἐπ' Ἀυτομένας: fortasse nomen loci) amicus apud Daux<sup>1</sup>: ἐπ' αὐτὸ μένας Scullion; cf. v. 47. et vid. adn. || **21** Daux || **25-26** ἐμ [Φιλομ]|η(λ)ιδῶν Daux<sup>1</sup>: ἐ[. . . . .]|ημιδῶν Daux<sup>2</sup> || **26** ἐπὶ δέξα Daux: Ἑ[πὶ]χῶι<sup>v</sup> Graf apud Dunst.

*Latus dextrum:* Suppl. Daux. || **4** cf. ἐπὶ Μυκηνον v. 45.<sup>20</sup> Only disagreements between the two editions are noted.

- Νεανίαί τέλεον, Πυανοψίοις, Π[. . .<sup>6</sup>. . .].
- 28 Μαμακτηριῶνος, Θορίκωι βοῦ[ν μῆλατ]-  
τον ἢ τετταράκοντα δραχμῶν [μέχρι πε]-  
ντήκοντα, Ἡρωῖνῃσι Θορίκο τ[ράπεζαν].
- ωνι τέλεον Πυ- 31 Ποσιδεῖωνος, Διονύσια. <sup>vacat</sup>  
ανοψίοις
- vacat spatium 10 1/2 v.* 32 Γαμηλιῶνος, Ἡραῖ, Ἱερῶι Γάμωι [. . .<sup>7</sup>. . .].  
Ἀνθησθηριῶνος, Διονύσωι, δω[δεκάτη],  
αἶγα λειπεγνώμονα πυρρὸν ἢ [μέλανα· Δ]-  
ιασίοις, Διὶ Μιλιχίοι οἶν πρα[τόν. <sup>vacat</sup>]
- 36 Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος, Ἡρακλείδα[ις τέλεον],  
Ἀλκμήνῃ τέλεον, Ἀνάκωιν τ[έλεον, Ἐλέ]-  
νῃ τέλεον· Δήμητρει, τὴν χλο[ῖαν, οἶν κρ]-  
ιτὴν κυδσαν, Διὶ ἄρνα κριτόν. <sup>vacat</sup>
- 40 Μονυχιῶνος, Ἀρτέμιδι Μονυχ[ῖαι τέλε]-  
{ε}ον, ἐς Πυθίῳ Ἀπόλλωνος τρίτ[τοαν, Κορ]-  
-ι Ἐρκεῖωι : οἶν στροφῶι χοῖρον, Λητοῖ αἶγα, Ἀρτέμιδι  
*vacat spatium 15 v.* αἶγα, Ἀπόλλωνι αἶγα λειπογνώ[μονα, Δή]-  
μητρει : οἶν κυδσαν ἄνθειαν, Φύλ[ωνίδι τρ]- [Διὶ Ἐρκεῖωι : οἶν  
άπεξαν, Διονύσωι, ἐπὶ Μυκηνον, [τράγον] <sup>vacat</sup>  
πυρρὸν ἢ μέλανα. <sup>vacat</sup>
- Θαρηγιῶνος, Διὶ ΕΠΑΥΤΟΜΕΝΑΣ [κριτόν]
- 48 ἄρνα, Ὑπερπεδίωι οἶν, Ἡρωῖνῃσι[ν Ὑπερ]-  
πεδίῳ τράπεζαν, Νίσωι οἶν, Θρασ[. . .<sup>5</sup>. . .]  
οἶν, Σωσινέωι οἶν, Ῥογίωι οἶν, Πυλ[όχωι]  
χοῖρον, Ἡρωῖνῃσι Πυλοχίοις τρά[πεζαν].
- 52 Σκιροφοριῶνος, ὀρκωμόσιον <π>αρ[έχεν· Π]-  
λυντηριοῖς Ἀθηναίωι οἶν κρι[τόν, Ἀγλ]-

*Latus Adversum:* 27 in extr. π[ρατόν] Dunst: π[ρατόν] Daux: Π[οσειδ]ῶνι τέλεον Πυανοψίοις idem, sententia mutata (verbis a lat. sin. v. 31 huc translatis) vid. adn. || 28-29 Dunst || 30 Merkelbach apud Dunst || 32 in extr. Dunst, qui in suo exemplari Ἡραῖ Ἱερῶν Γάμων legit, [πομπή] sive [ἐορτή] in apparatu supplevit. || 33 Dunst || 34 λειπεγνώμονα lapis: λειπογνώμονα Vanderpool (cf. v. 43); [μέλανα, Δ]- Vanderpool || 35 Dunst || 36 Parker: Ἡρακλεῖ δά[μαλιν, οἶν] Daux (δά[μαλιν σὺν] idem 1980, 468, exempli gratia): ΕΛΑΦΗΒΟΛΙΩΝΟΣΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΑ lapis || 37 Dunst || 38 Daux: χλο[αίαν ὕν vel οἶν κρ] Robertson<sup>2</sup> || 40-41 Μονυχ[ῖαι τέλε]ον, ἐς Πυθίῳ Ἀπόλλωνος Labarbe ([τέλε] || {ε}ον Daux): Μονυχ[ῖαι· (numerus) ἢ πλ]|| έονες Πυθίῳ Ἀπόλλωνος Dunst || 41-42 τρίτ[τοαν] Daux post Labarbe: τρί[ποδες] Dunst; [Κορ]|| στροφῶι idem || 42 Dunst || 44-45 Φύλ[ωνίδι] Daux; [τρ]|| άπεξαν Dunst post τράπεζαν Vanderpool v. 26 || 45 Graf apud Dunst || 47 ΕΠΑΥΤΟΜΕΝΑΣ lapis: ἐπαυτομένης Daux: ἐπ' Αὐτομένης (vel ἐπ' Ἀυτομένης: fortasse nomen loci) amicus apud Daux: ἐπ' αὐτὸ μένας Scullion; cf. v. 14; [κριτόν] Daux || 48 Daux post Dunst et Labarbe || 49 si talia apud demon Thoriscensium reperta essent, Θρασ[υκλεῖ] vel Θρασ[ύλλωι] retituere licitum fuisse censuit Daux || 50 Graf apud Dunst || 51 Dunst || 52-53 <π>αρ[έχεν] Daux; [Π]|| λυντηριοῖς Dunst || 53 κρι[τόν] Daux post Dunst; [Ἀγλ]- Burkert apud Dunst

*Latus Sinistrum:* 31 ὦνι τέλεον Πυ|ανοψίοις; [Ποσειδ]ῶνι vel [Ἀπόλλ]ωνι Dunst: Π[οσειδ]ῶνι τέλεον Πυ|ανοψίοις Daux vid. lat. adv. v. 27. || 42 -ι Ἐρκεῖωι : οἶν; [Δι]|| Ἐρκεῖωι : οἶν Daux post Dunst (vid. adn.).

*Latus Dextrum:* 44 cf. lat. sin. v. 42.

αύρωι οἶν, Ἀθηναίαι ἄρνα κριτ[όν, Κεφά]-  
 λωι βοῦν μῆλ'άπτονος ἢ τεττα[ράκοντα]  
 56 δραχμῶν μέχρι πεντήκοντα, Π[ρόκριδι]  
 οἶ[Α]ν : τὸν δ' εὐθύνον ὁμόσαι καὶ τ[ὸς παρεδ]-  
 -ωῖνησιν Κορωνέων : οἶν  
*vacat*  
 ρος εὐθύνῳ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἣν ἔλαχ[ον εὐθύν]-  
 εν κατὰ τὰ ψηφίσματα ἐφ' οἷς ἐ[γκαθέστ]-  
 60 ηκεν ἡ ἀρχή, ὁμνύναι Δία, Ἀπόλλ[ω, Δήμητρ]-  
 α ἐξώλειαν ἐπαρώμενον, καὶ τ[ὸς παρεδ]-  
 ρος κατὰ ταῦτά, ἀναγρά[ι]ψαι [δὲ τὸν ὄρκ]-  
 [ο]ν ἐστήληι καὶ καταθεῖναι π[αρά τὸ Δελ(φί)]-  
 64 [ν]ιον, ὅσα δ' ἂν ἀρχαὶ αἰρεθῶ- [*vacat*]  
 σιν ὑπευθύνος ἔναι ἀπάσα[ς. *vacat*]  
*vacat*

*Latus adversum:* 54 κριτ[όν] Daux post Dunst; [Κεφά]- Daux || 55 Dunst || 56 Π[ρόκριδι]  
 Parker<sup>2</sup> (cf. v. 16 17): Π[οσειδῶνι] Daux: fortasse Π[ανδρόσωι] (supplemento a Robert-  
 son<sup>1</sup> reiecto) vel Π[ανδώραι] Scullion || 57 οἶ[Α]ν Daux: οἶ[Α]ν Dunst, Labarbe; vid.  
 adn. || 57-58 τ[ὸς παρεδ]||ρος Graf apud Dunst || 58-59 ἔλαχ[ον εὐθύν]||εν Daux:  
 ἔλαχ[εν εἰ ἡρχ]||εν Dunst: ἔλαχ[εν εἰ ἡρχ]|| (ε)ν Labarbe || 59-60 Daux post Labarbe ||  
 60-61 Ἀπόλλ[ω] Daux post Dunst (et Vanderpool); [Δήμητρ]||α Daux || 61 Daux;  
 verba, si non voces, primum restituit Graf apud Dunst. || 62-63 [δὲ] Daux; [τὸν  
 ὄρκ|ο]ν idem post Labarbe || 63-65 Daux.

*Latus sinistrum:* 58 -ωῖνησιν Κορωνέων : οἶν: [Ἡρ]ωῖνησιν Κορωνέων : οἶν Daux post  
 Dunst et Labarbe.

### Epigraphical Commentary

I have seen the stone and made use of excellent photographs provided by the J. Paul Getty Museum. I have not noted differences between Daux's two editions. The colon (:), used as a punctuation mark, appears between the stoichoi. Paragraphs are marked by a line of varying length (3-6 letters) inscribed above each month.<sup>21</sup> In the entries on the sides the letters are engraved at the same level as the lines of the front except for the first entry on the left side, where they are engraved at the level of line 31 and in the interlinear space between it and line 32. On both sides the tricolon (:) is used for punctuation.

### *Latus Adversum* (Figure 3)

- 1 Daux does not dot the alpha; I could only detect the right stroke along the break.
- 4 End: part of the vertical stroke of the rho survives along the break.
- 6 The gamma was not dotted by Daux. Strictly speaking, a pi is possible.
- 7 End: Daux read only a left stroke of a triangular letter (Α, Δ, Λ, Μ). A lower left corner of a triangle seems secure to me.

<sup>21</sup> See Figure 3.

- 9** The legible letters are inscribed in a rasura and are a little more tightly spaced than the stoichoi. The underlined letters survive only in Ogden's copy, which reads TEAEOMIPATO. This probably indicates that the lost letters were also inscribed in a rasura.
- 10** [Κατ]αβάτη: The underlined letters survive only in Ogden's copy. Daux does not dot the eta and the iota; I could see only upper tips of strokes (the old photograph shows the same). ξυ τ: I could detect no surviving part of Daux's dotted nu; it is possible that the surface has chipped off at the break since his editions. The top stroke of the epsilon is secure and possibly also the lower tip of the tau.
- 11** ου τ: The omicron survives only in Ogden's copy. Daux does not dot the next two letters. I could detect only the bottom tips of the first stroke of the nu and of the vertical stroke of the tau.
- 21** End: the letters past the rho were inscribed in a rasura and are more tightly spaced than the stoichoi. I could see nothing after the epsilon and I could not read Daux's lambda at the end.
- 23** The first letter is now lost. In the first three words, a vertical line has been inscribed through the middle of the letters reaching just past the first stroke of the nu of *πρωτόν*. In *ἄλῃ* a small lambda was inscribed in the upper part of the space between the stoichoi. End: *Προειδῶν*: If, as Daux asserts, the restoration is certain, one of the two iotas should have been inscribed either between the stoichoi or in one stoichos with another letter.
- 24** I could only detect very insecure traces of the first letter.
- 25** End: I could see no traces of the mu on the stone or in a photograph taken before it had been put on display.
- 26** At the beginning the stone has *ΗΜΙΑΔΩΝ*.
- 32** Although it had been properly inscribed initially, the first Γ was eventually made into a square.
- 52** <π>αθ[έχεν]: Daux detected a very small pi; I could see no such thing.
- 57** οἱ δ' ν: The two small deltas were inscribed between the stoichoi.
- 59–60** Daux (1983, 169–170) noted traces of H inscribed between the E (beginning of line 59) and the K, after the E had been altered. I was unable to verify this beyond doubt. In his 1984 edition Daux printed [η]ζεν.
- 61** End: the left tip of the tau is secure.
- 62** Daux notes that a iota, which had been inscribed by mistake, was deleted by the stone cutter himself by means of a small chisel stroke, and was further damaged by someone else. A tip of a diagonal stroke might perhaps be detected in the lower part of the stoichos.
- 64** The *vacat* was postulated by Daux whom I follow, though with some doubt, since the stone is broken here.

*Latus Sinistrum* (Figure 5)

The three entries might have been inscribed at different times.

- 31** The letters are similar to those of the front but they are less widely cut, and the diagonals of the psi are straight here and curving in the front. Daux (1983, 156) attributes the letters to the cutter of the front. Both lines, especially the second, tilt to the lower right. Daux notes that the Πυ is hardly visible; I could see practically nothing.

- 42** The letters are similar to those of the front but smaller and the omega is more open.
- 58** The letters appear to have been somewhat inexpertly inscribed. They are tightly packed and the line tilts to the lower right. The omega is completely square.

*Latus Dextrum*

The letters are shallowly and somewhat clumsily cut. As much as this can be judged, they belong to a single hand. Daux notes (1984a, 150) that the letters were probably added much later than the front; I am not sure how much later this might be. In the first and less so in the second entries, the nu has a shorter right vertical, as in the front (possibly also in the third entry).

- 4** The mu is faded but secure. I could not assign the traces before it to an intentional stroke; Daux reads a dotted iota. Little could have preceded it.
- 5** Daux notes that his readings are doubtful. For his alpha I could see only insecure traces.
- 6** Daux notes that the readings are even more doubtful. A theta might possibly be read for the dotted omicron.
- 12** See Figure 6.
- 44** See Figure 7. Dotted letters (undotted by Daux); I could see only insecure traces.

*Translation*

*Front*

[ - - - ] In Hecatombaion: [ - - - ] for(?) [ - - - ] and for(?) [ - - - ] (3) [shall] provide a lunch (4) [ - - - ] a drachma each (5) [ - - - ] the Prerosia (6) [ - - - ] at(?) the Delphinion a goat (7) [ - - - ] for Hecate [ - - - ] (9) a full-grown victim, to be sold.

(10) [In Metageitnion:] for Zeus Kataibates in the sacred enclosure at the Delphinion a full-grown victim, to be sold. An oath-victim shall be provided for the *euthynai*.

(13) In Boedromion: the Prerosia; for Zeus Polieus, a choice sheep, a choice piglet, at/to Automenai(?) a bought piglet to be wholly burnt; the priest shall provide a lunch for the attendant; for Cephalus, a choice sheep; for Procris, a table; for Thorikos, a choice sheep; for the Heroines of Thorikos, a table; to<sup>22</sup> Sounion, for Poseidon, a choice lamb; (20) for Apollo, a choice young he-goat; for Kourotrophos, a choice female piglet; for Demeter, a full-grown victim, for Zeus Herkeios, a full-grown

---

<sup>22</sup> Or at; cf. commentary on line 14.

victim, for Kourotraphos a piglet, [[for Athena, a sheep, to be sold]]; at the Salt Works, for Poseidon, a full-grown victim, for Apollo, a piglet.

(25) In Pyanopsion: for Zeus Kataibates, on the land of the Philomelidai, a full-grown victim, to be sold, on the sixteenth;(?)<sup>23</sup> for Neanias, a full-grown victim, at the Pyanopsia [- - -]

(28) In Maimakterion: for Thorikos, a bovine worth not less than forty up to fifty drachmas; for the Heroines of Thorikos, a table.

(31) In Posideion: the Dionysia.

(32) In Gamelion: for Hera, at the Hieros Gamos [- - -]

(33) In Anthesterion: for Dionysus, on the twelfth, a tawny or [black] goat, lacking its age-marking teeth; at the Diasia, for Zeus Meilichios, a sheep, to be sold.

(36) In Elaphebolion: for the Heraclidae [a full-grown victim]; for Alcmena, a full-grown victim; for the Anakes a full-grown victim; for Helen a full-grown victim; for Demeter, as the Chloia offering, a choice pregnant [ewe]; for Zeus a choice lamb.

(40) In Mounichion: for Artemis Mounichia, a full-grown victim; to the sanctuary of Pythian Apollo, a triple offering; for Kourotraphos, a piglet; for Leto, a goat; for Artemis, a goat; for Apollo a goat lacking its age-marking teeth; for Demeter, a pregnant ewe as the Antheia (blossom) offering(?); for Philonis, a table; for Dionysus, to<sup>24</sup> Mykenos (or Mykenon) a tawny or black [he goat].

(47) In Thargelion: for Zeus, at/to Automenai(?) a [choice] lamb; for Hyperpedios, a sheep; for the Heroines of Hyperpedios, a table; for Nisus, a sheep; for Thras[- - -], a sheep; for Sosineos, a sheep; for Rhogios, a sheep; for Pylochos, a piglet; for the Pylochian heroines, a table.

(52) In Skirophorion: an oath-victim shall be provided; at the Plynteria, for Athena, a choice sheep; for Aglauros, a sheep; for Athena, a choice lamb; for Cephalus a bovine worth not less than forty up to fifty drachmas; for Procris a sheep worth 20 drachmas(?).

(57) The *euthynos* (scrutinizer) and his assistants shall take (the following) oath: I shall scrutinize the office which was allotted to me for scrutiny in accordance with the decrees by which this office was instituted. He shall swear by Zeus, Apollo, and Demeter, invoking utter destruction, and the assistants (shall swear) in the same way. The [oath] shall be inscribed on a stele and placed [beside the Delphinion]. All offices for which officials are elected shall be subjected to scrutiny.

<sup>23</sup> For punctuation see commentary ad loc.

<sup>24</sup> Or at; cf. commentary on line 14.

*Left Side*

<i>At the level of line 31 and between it and line 32</i>	for [Apollo], a full-grown victim at the Pyanopsia.
<i>At the level of line 42</i>	for [Zeus] Herkeios, a sheep.
<i>At the level of line 58</i>	for the Heroines of (?), a sheep.

*Right Side*

<i>At the level of lines 5–7</i>	[to?] <sup>25</sup> Mykenos (or Mykenon) [- - -]   a sheep [- - -]
<i>At the level of line 12</i>	for Phoenix, a full-grown victim.
<i>At the level of line 44</i>	for [Zeus] Herkeios, a sheep.

*Commentary*

Despite the lacunae, this calendar is one of the best specimens of its kind. As usual, it consists of a list of months and sacri ces to be performed in them. Virtually all months of the Athenian year are present in a chronological order.<sup>26</sup> Information includes most commonly the name of the divinity and the type of victim. Qualitative attributes (e.g. choice (*passim*), pregnant (lines 39, 44)) or value of victims (28 30, 54 57) are mentioned occasionally, as are other details such as their age (full grown (*passim*), their color (lines 34, 46), the mode of sacri ce (a holocaust (line 15)), its purpose (an oath victim for the *euthynai* (lines 12, cf. 52)), and additional expenses (lunch for officials (lines 3 4(?), 16)). The date within the month (line 33), the occasion (a particular festival (*passim*), and the place (e.g. at the Salt Works (line 23), to Sounion (line 19))<sup>27</sup> may be mentioned. The ending of the document is somewhat unusual: it contains regulations pertaining to the local *euthynai*, a feature which seems to emphasize the local character of this document. A particularly local character is further emphasized by the independent commemoration of certain festivals (the Prerosia; line 13 with commen-

<sup>25</sup> Or at; cf. commentary on line 14.

<sup>26</sup> The chronological order supports the restoration of the month name Metageitnion on line 10. See commentary ad loc.

<sup>27</sup> Or at; cf. commentary on line 14.



tary), the Plynteria (52–53), and possibly the Pyanopsia (27). A focus on local traditions is also evident in the sacrifices to local heroes (lines 16–19, 28–30, 54–57(?)) and in the detectable cycle of related agricultural festivals (see commentary on line 13).

*Provenance.* Ever since its first publication, the calendar has been attributed to the deme of Thorikos. In his masterly 1997 paper M.H. Jameson noted, however, that the stone itself preserved no real reference to the deme or the demesmen and that the document could be attributed to a larger regional grouping (1997, 193 n. 20, cf. 183). Considering the broad scope of the calendar and its ostensibly local, perhaps regional (cf. below commentary on *Front* 16–19), character, this suggestion is attractive; nevertheless, it seems to be questionable considering the reference to the *euthynai* (*front* 12, cf. 52, 57–65). As Jameson notes (*ibid.*), the office of *euthynos* is known at the state and deme levels only. Since the present calendar is not likely to be a state document, it is most likely a deme document. The endpoint and the reference to the hero Thorikos do suggest that the deme in question is indeed Thorikos.

*Date.* Daux dated the inscription to the first half of the fourth century B.C., perhaps 385–370, on paleographical and orthographical grounds.<sup>28</sup> A higher date was promoted by others on similar grounds, namely letter forms<sup>29</sup> and the Archaic dative plural in -ησι.<sup>30</sup> The evidence for a higher date is summed up by Mattingly 1990. Daux's date was supported, however, by Threatte, suggesting 380–375, and taking the dative plural Ἡρώωνησι to be an intentional archaism used like comparable forms in the Athenian law on the Eleusinian mysteries, (*Agora* XVI 56 (*LSS* 12)),<sup>31</sup> where they appear to be quotations from the earlier version of the law.<sup>32</sup> The same (see immediately below) is not entirely impossible here. One should note that the closest parallels, the local calendars of Erchia (*LSCG* 18), the Marathonian Tetrapolis (*LSCG* 20), Teithras (*LSS* 132), and the calendar from Eleusis (*LSCG* 7) all come from the fourth century; their publication may have well been triggered by the revisions to the state calendar (*LGS* II 15 A (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 238)?; *LSCG* 16,

<sup>28</sup> Daux 1983, 152; *idem* 1984a, 45 with n. 5.

<sup>29</sup> 440–430 B.C.: Lewis 1985, n. 3 (hand of this inscription is similar to that of *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 52). The thirties or twenties of the fifth century B.C.: Jameson 1988, n. 7 on p. 115 (cf. *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 256 bis), based on autopsy.

<sup>30</sup> In Ἡρώωνησι (lines 18, 30, 48, 51, *Left Side* 58); the normal ending until ca. 420 B.C.: Parker 1987, 138 n. 11.

<sup>31</sup> Clinton 1980, 258–288.

<sup>32</sup> Threatte, *GAI* II 51.0331 (p. 99).

17; *LSS* 9, 10; *SEG* XLVII 71) carried out between 410 and 399.<sup>33</sup> The later date, which would set the present document in the same historical context, may accordingly seem more attractive, and I am not entirely convinced that the lettering precludes it.

*The Entries on the Sides.* Despite their fragmentary state, there is nothing about the entries on the right side of the stone (Figs. 6–7) to suggest that they are not simply additions to the main text, as Daux (1984a, 150) reasonably concluded. The entries on the left side and their relation to the main text are the real crux. Despite Daux's attempts (see restorations), it is impossible to determine with any certainty to which sections in the main text these entries might relate. It should be noted that, unlike the additions on the right, those on the left do not start at the beginning of a word, i.e. the name of a divinity, but rather in the middle of words. In addition, the first letters of these entries are inscribed near the left margin of the left side,<sup>34</sup> i.e. they appear to align themselves to the back of the stone rather than to the front. The most reasonable solution to this problem was pointed out to me by Kevin Clinton. The back of the stone (Figure 4) shows clear traces of its later use as a threshold. As practically none of the original finish survives, it is impossible to say whether or not it was ever inscribed. If it was inscribed, the entries on the left may belong together with a now lost text originally inscribed on it. This explains their placement on the stone (close to the back) and the fact that the first words are truncated. These words are simply continuations of words inscribed on the back. It is impossible to connect them to the main text because the entries on the left side do not relate to the main text at all. The exact contents of the text on the back of the stone are a matter for further conjecture, but so much can be said: for reasons which remain unknown, there was a need to add words to this text. The right (our left) margin was naturally used for this purpose. One notes that the additions, listing offerings, recipients, and in the first case, an occasion, the Pyanopsia, look like typical entries in a sacral calendar. It may follow that the text on the back was indeed a sacral calendar, just like the text on the front. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the texts, both written on the

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Dow 1953–1957, 9; Parker 1996, 46; for the dates see P.J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Code of Laws, 410–399 B.C.*, *JHS* 111, 1991, esp. 88–89; on the relationships between the deme and the state calendars see Mikalson 1977.

<sup>34</sup> The exact size of the original margin is unknown because of the damage to the back.

same stele, were somehow related.<sup>35</sup> Whatever the exact relationships between them would have been, emulation of an older version might account at least for the archaisms of the present text.

### *Front*

Hecatombaion (Lines 1–9)

#### *Lines 1–9*

*Restorations.* Considering the size of the lacuna here and the fact that no two sacri cial calendars are entirely identical, all of the more substantial restorations suggested here, as reasonable as they may be, should be taken as *exempli gratia*. Vanderpool's restoration of line 1 recalls headings in the most substantial fragment of the Athenian state calendar, *LSS* 10 A 30 and in the Marathonian Tetrapolis calendar, *LSCG* 20 B 39.

#### *Lines 3–4*

For the ἄριστον cf. the calendar of Eleusis, *LSCG* 7.3 7, with Dow & Healey 1965, 18. Despite the lacuna, and although Daux's restoration is not secure enough to be admitted into the text, it seems reasonable that the one drachma speci ed refers to the sum that was to be spent on the meal; cf. Loomis 1998, 77. *Contra*: Whitehead 1986, 194 n. 101.

#### *Line 5*

*The Proerosia.* The Proerosia, the pre-ploughing offering, was connected primarily to the cult of Demeter, although at Myrrhinus we find Zeus as a recipient.<sup>36</sup> As Parker has shown,<sup>37</sup> we are dealing here with an old rural Attic rite, whose date<sup>38</sup> and recipient (as we have just seen)

<sup>35</sup> There are a few actual cases where two versions, both old and revised, of a sacred law survived. The reasons for this might vary. Cf. esp. *LSS* 3 and *LSS* 12/*Agora* XVI 56; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1365 and *LSCG* 55; *CID* 9 D (*LSCG* 77) and *CID* 9 bis.

<sup>36</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1183.32–33 τῇ [δὲ πέμπτ] | εἰ θνέτω τὴν πληροσίαν ὁ δῆμαρχος τῶ[ι] Διὶ κατλ (É on the fth day the demarch shall sacri ce the pre-ploughing offering to Zeus etc.). For Demeter cf. *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 250 (*LSS* 18) A 8, 18, B 4; Libanius *Decl.* 13.1.46; Schol. in Arisitid. 55.24–56.5 Dindorf (105.18.16–Jebb); and perhaps *LSCG* 36.9. Cf. also the triad Ζεὺς οὐμβριος (of rain), Δημήτηρ προηροσία, Ποσειδῶν φυτάλμιος (nourishing) in Plutarch, *Septem sapientium convivium* 158E and the θεοὶ προηροσίοι in *Adversus Colotem* 1119E and Max. Tyr. 30 (24).4K. Τὸν Δία in Lycurgus fr. 87 (84) (= *Suda* s.v. Προηροσία) seems to be a corruption of some sort. On Zeus Polieus of line 13 see below.

<sup>37</sup> 1987, 141 and n. 39. Cf. also Mikalson 1977, 434; Dow and Healey 1965, 16–17; Whitehead 1986, 197.

<sup>38</sup> Hecatombaion here, Boedromion line 13. Both dates but especially the first ap-

may differ from one deme to another. It was not celebrated in central Athens. The Athenians were invited to take part in pre-ploughing celebrations at Eleusis.<sup>39</sup> The word itself can be found in at least four different spelling variations<sup>40</sup> with both feminine and neuter attested.<sup>41</sup> The mythological background is laid out in the Scholia to Aristophanes<sup>42</sup> and Aristides<sup>43</sup> and in the *Suda*:<sup>44</sup> As the land was oppressed by hunger or plague,<sup>45</sup> the God, namely the Pythian Apollo,<sup>46</sup> pronounced that a remedy be granted, should the Athenians offer a pre-ploughing sacrifice to Demeter<sup>47</sup> on behalf of all the Greeks.

Daux (1983, 162–163) compared τὴν πρηροσίαν to τὴν χλοΐαν (line 38) and developed a hypothesis that the dates of both these rites, marking the beginning of the fall and of the spring respectively, would be decided upon by the deme's assembly each year according to the weather. He understood both as temporal accusatives and translated here accordingly dans la journée dite Prerosia. Considering the evidence, this seems unnecessary, since the accusative τὴν πρηροσίαν is used several times as a direct object.<sup>48</sup> As has been noted, the sense here might therefore be something like [θύειν] τὴν πρηροσίαν [sc. θυσίαν] plus recipient.<sup>49</sup> Regarding the relationship between τὴν πρηροσίαν here and προηρόσια in line 13, we may perhaps assume with Parker (1987,

---

pear to be rather early for a pre-ploughing rite. Cf. Whitehead 1986, 197; Parker 1987, 141 and n. 39.

<sup>39</sup> *LSCG* 7 A 6 with Dow and Healey 1965, 15 but see Mikalson's reservations 1975, 68. Cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1006.10, 79, 1028.28, 1029.16; [*SEG* XXI 467.6] (ephebic inscriptions; bovine-lifting at Eleusis); Libanius *Decl.* 13.1.49; Schol. in Aristid. 55.24–56.5 D. (105.18.16 J.).

<sup>40</sup> πρηρο-, πρηρ-, πληρ-, προηρο-.

<sup>41</sup> See further Threatte, *GAI* I 40.021 (pp. 479–480); Parker 1987, 141 n. 39; Dow and Healey 1965, 16–18.

<sup>42</sup> Schol. in Ar. *Eq.* 725, *Plut.* 1054.

<sup>43</sup> 55.24–56.5 D. (105.18.16 J.), 340.31–341.2 D. (196.12.3 J.).

<sup>44</sup> S.v. εἰρεσιώνη.

<sup>45</sup> λοιμός; Schol. in Aristid., *Suda*. λιμός/λοιμός; Schol. in Ar.

<sup>46</sup> Schol. in Ar. *Eq.* For this oracle see Fontenrose 1978, 294–295 Q79.

<sup>47</sup> Demeter is not mentioned in Schol. in Ar. *Eq.* and in Schol. in Aristid. 340.31–341.2 D. (196.12.3 J.).

<sup>48</sup> προηροσίαν: Lycurgus fr. 87 (84) (= *Suda* s.v. Προηροσία); Libanius *Decl.* 1.1.179, 13.1.49; Schol. in Aristid. 56.3–4 D. (105.18.15–16 J.), 341.1 D. (196.12.6 J.); Schol. in Ar. *Plut.* 1054; τὴν πληροσίαν: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1183.33 (Myrrhinus; cited above n. 36).

<sup>49</sup> [to sacri ce] the pre-ploughing offering [to (recipient)] or, by a different analogy to ll. 38–39, to sacri ce [a (an animal)] as the pre-ploughing offering [to (recipient)]. See Parker 1987, 141 with n. 41; cf. Dunst 1977, 261; Labarbe 1977, note on line 13 p. 60.

141 n. 39) a two-stage offering, or understand here *a* pre-ploughing-offering and in line 13 *the* Proerosia, i.e. the festival, the word there being a neuter plural comparable to Dionysia (line 31). As such, there is a chance that it is an independent entry, not necessarily related to Zeus Polieus.<sup>50</sup> The position of the dicolon seems to support this.<sup>51</sup>

On the Proerosia see Brumfield 1981, 54–69; especially at Eleusis, cf. Parke 1977, 73–75. Robertson 1996 includes comprehensive reference to ancient sources and modern scholarship.

Daux's idea of successive agricultural rites<sup>52</sup> was expanded by Parker (1987, 141–142): as in *LSS* 18 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup>, Paiania), a series of rites celebrating the life-cycle of the grain is evident in this calendar. After the Proerosia in the fall, the appearance of green shoots would be marked by the Chloia (line 38);<sup>53</sup> then, forty days before the harvest, the blossom, particularly of the grain, would be marked by the Antheia (line 44). An intermediate celebration, occurring between the Chloia and the Antheia, is attested in two demes.<sup>54</sup> This is the Kalamaia, which would mark the formation of the grain's stalk (καλάμη).<sup>55</sup>

#### Line 6

Unfortunately, all occurrences of a Delphinion in this calendar are uncertain as they rely on restorations, at times very tentative.<sup>56</sup> They seem, however, to make good sense.

#### Line 7

An altar with a dedication to Hecate, dated to the early fifth century B.C., was found in the Delphinion at Miletus.<sup>57</sup> A priestess of Hecate

<sup>50</sup> See Dunst 1977, 251, 261; Labarbe 1977, 60 n. 7; Daux 1983, 164; Parker loc. cit., but Whitehead 1986, 196; Scullion 1994, 88; Robertson 1996, 349–350; 356.

<sup>51</sup> Though the position of the dicolon in this inscription is not entirely consistent; cf. line 44 (and possibly in line 23 with commentary ad loc.).

<sup>52</sup> Daux 1983, 162–163; cf. above.

<sup>53</sup> This festival is, however, particularly difficult to date. Theoretically it should take place in late winter-early spring with the greening of the fields. See Brumfield 1981, 132–136.

<sup>54</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 949.9, Eleusis; *LSCG* 36.9, Piraeus. See Parker 1987, 142 n. 44; K. Clinton *LMC* VIII 663, s.v. Kalamites.

<sup>55</sup> To support his argument Parker cites Theophrastus, *Historia Plantarum*, 8.2.4.7. See 1987, 141 n. 43.

<sup>56</sup> Lines 10–11 ξν τ|ῶι σηῶι π[αρ]ὰ τὸ [Δελφίνι]ον and 63–64 π[αρ]ὰ τὸ Δελ(φί)|νιον. This last one, postulating the omission of two letters, is especially problematic and was rejected by Bingen 1991, 35 n. 31. Cf. also Whitehead 1986, 196.

<sup>57</sup> The temple is later than the altar. The inscription: *Milet* I 3, 151–152 no. 129;

is mentioned in the sacred law from Paiania, referred to above in relation to the Proerosia.<sup>58</sup> Apart from curse tablets, the other main epigraphic evidence for the cult of Hecate in Attica comes from the Erchian calendar, *LSCG* 18 B 7 13 (sacri ces to Kourotrophos in the [sanctuary] of Hecate and to Artemis Hecate).<sup>59</sup>

### Line 8

If only for the lack of context, Daux's tentative restoration [μ]ηνός Ἀτιγ[ησιν] cannot be admitted into the text.

### Line 9

Full-grown is the common meaning of τέλειος/τέλεος when referring to animals. Nevertheless, it has another, generally speaking earlier meaning, namely, perfect/without blemish.<sup>60</sup> It is noteworthy that this last meaning corresponds to the Hebrew תָּמִים (*tamim*), without blemish in sacri cial context.<sup>61</sup> In sacred laws this sense may be expressed by δλόκληρος, referring to lack of physical imperfections in both victims (*LSCG* 65.170; 85.1; [*LSAM* 42 B 6]) and priests (e.g. *LSAM* 5.10; *Iscr.Cos* ED 145 A 5; 178 A 7; cf. Anaxandrides, *Poleis*, fr. 40.10 (*PCG*)). Τέλειος is used generally to distinguish between mature and young animals.<sup>62</sup> The precise age is not easy to gure out and is likely to have depended on the type of the animal. See Ziehen 1939, 595–597.

It appears that the verbal adjective κρατόν (lines 11, 23–24, 26) ought not to be taken as sold (Rosivach 1994, 23 n. 40) but as to be sold.<sup>63</sup>

*DGE* 724; *LSAG*<sup>2</sup> no. 34 (and p. 335). The altar: Yavis 1949, 53.1 p. 137. Cf. also *LSAM* 50.25–26, 28–29, 36–37.

<sup>58</sup> *LSS* 18 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 250) A 33–34 (on which all restorations rely).

<sup>59</sup> On the Hecataion at the Kerameikos see U. Knigge, *Der Kerameikos von Athen: Führer durch Ausgrabungen und Geschichte*, Athens, 1988, 129–131; Travlos 1971, 302. On Hecate in Attica cf. also E. Simon, *AthMitt* 100, 1985, 271–284. On the question of Hecate at Eleusis see Clinton 1992, 116–120.

<sup>60</sup> Hom. *Il.* 1.66, 24.34; *LSJ* s.v.

<sup>61</sup> E. Ben Yehuda, *Thesaurus Totius Hebraicitatis, et Veteris et Recentioris*, Berlin/New York/London, [1908–1956] (in Hebrew) s.v. See (e.g.): Exod. 12:5 שֶׁה תָּמִים זָכָר בֶּן שָׁנָה (a one year old, unblemished male lamb); *LXX* πρόβατον τέλειον ἄρσεν ἐνιαύσιον. Lev. 4: 28 (cf. 23) שְׁעִירַת עִזִּים תָּמִימָה נִקְיָה (a she-goat, an unblemished female); *LXX* χίμαιραν ἑξ αἰγῶν, θήλειαν ἄμωμον (an unblemished female); on this example cf. S. Daniel, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans le Septante* (tudes et Commentaires 61), Paris, 1966, 123–124 n. 18.

<sup>62</sup> For some obvious examples see the sacri cial tariffs listed in Part I p. 59.

<sup>63</sup> *LSJ* (and supplement) s.v. κρατός. Cf. Daux 1983 and 1984a, translations. For Parker's arguments see 1987, 145.

The whole victim would not be sold but rather what remains after the god's portion is consecrated and perhaps after the priest's share is removed.<sup>64</sup> Interested buyers are likely to be found easily.<sup>65</sup> Sale of the meat of two victims is prescribed in the sacred law of the deme Skambonidai, *LSCG* 10 C 17 22; *LSAM* 54 is more detailed; cf. also *SEG XLV* 1508 A 23 25 with Part I p. 99 n. 517. See Berthiaume, 1982, 62 70.<sup>66</sup>

Metageitnion (Lines 10 12)

*Line 10*

The restoration of the month's name here is attractive. It fits the context and appears to fit the space. Nevertheless, strictly speaking, it could be restored in one of the three preceding lines.

*Ζεὺς Καταιβάτης* (*the Descender*).<sup>67</sup> Places struck by lightning were consecrated to Zeus Kataibates. They were considered ἐηλύσια or ἡλύσια, were enclosed, and became ἄβατα (or ἄδυτα), i.e. not to be entered.<sup>68</sup> See e.g. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 4964 from the Athenian Acropolis.<sup>69</sup> Entrance was obviously allowed on certain occasions: Artemidorus (2.9) notes that Ἐ the lightning renders insignificant places significant through establishment of altars and offering of sacrifices, but, on the other hand, it renders fertile places desolate and not to be entered (for no one likes to linger in them) Ἐ<sup>70</sup> Sacri- cial activity in such enclosures is supported by further evidence. Pausanias (5.14.10) mentions a fenced altar of Zeus

<sup>64</sup> For the god's share see commentary on 27 A 12; for priestly prerogatives see commentaries on 3.5 and 20.7. The victim's *splanchna* would probably be eaten as a part of the ritual; see Ziehen 1939, 616 619; for the *splanchna* cf. commentary on 11.24 below.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Jameson 1988, 87 88.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. M. Isenberg, 'The Sale of Sacri- cial Victims', *CP* 70, 1975, 271 273; Part I pp. 71 72.

<sup>67</sup> See at length Nilsson *GGR I<sup>3</sup>* 71 73, 392; A.B. Cook, *Zeus: A Study of Ancient Religion*, Cambridge, 1914 1940, II, 13 32; W.K. Pritchett, *Pausanias Periegetes I*, Amsterdam, 1998, 119 121. For references see Adler *RE* X, 2461 2462, s.v. Kataibates; Schwabl 1972, 322 (Parker 1987, 145). Cf. Hewitt 1909, 85; Burkert 1996, 28.

<sup>68</sup> *Etym. Magn.* s.v. ἐηλύσια; Hesych. s.vv. ἐηλύσια and ἡλύσιον; *Suda* s.v. ἡλύσιον; Pollux 9.41. On ἄδυτα see below commentary on 23 A 22.

<sup>69</sup> Quoted in Part I p. 20. Cf. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 4965 (=Syll.<sup>3</sup> 992). For ἄβατος σηκός cf. Eur. *Bacch.* 10 11 with E.R. Dodds' commentary (pp. 62 63, note on ll. 6 12). Cf. Hewitt 1909, 88.

<sup>70</sup> ὥσπερ οὖν ὁ κεραινὸς τὰ μὲν ἄσημα τῶν χωρίων ἐπίσημα ποιεῖ διὰ τοὺς ἐνιδρυμένους βωμοὺς καὶ τὰς γινομένας ἐν αὐτοῖς θυσίας, τὰ δὲ πολυτελεῖ χωρία ἔρημα καὶ ἄβατα ποιεῖ (οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐνδιατρίβειν ἔτι θέλει), οὕτως κτλ.

Kataibates at Olympia.<sup>71</sup> *LSS* 30 prescribes a pentaeteric sacrifice to Zeus Kataibates.<sup>72</sup> Sacrifice was, according to Clearchus,<sup>73</sup> offered every year in Tarentum on the day in which some infamous local residents had been struck by lightning. The sacrifices mentioned here and in line 25 are probably to be understood in a similar context.

House altars were also dedicated to Zeus Kataibates. One such altar was found in Thera, bearing the inscription Διὸς Κα|ταϊβάτα.<sup>74</sup>

*Line 12*

Ὅρκωμόσιον (cf. line 52), oath victim, (oath sacrifice in *LSAM* 13.28) is used as a direct object of πα[ρ]έ]χεν; cf. ὀρκω|μόσια παρασχεῖν τοῖς πολίταις Tit. Cal. no. 12.7–8. It should not be identified with the Ὅρκωμόσιον mentioned in Plut. *Thes.* 27.5 as a place in Athens where oaths were taken.<sup>75</sup> See Whitehead 1986, 117.

From Pausanias (5.24.9–11), citing *Iliad* 19.266–268 where the pieces of boar flesh are thrown into the sea after the oath has been taken, we learn that the ancient custom did not permit mortals to consume an oath victim. There is accordingly good reason to think that oath victims were usually destroyed rather than consumed. Interestingly enough, the question whether or not to eat the victim did bother Pausanias in at least one case: after describing (ibid.) an oath ceremony taken over pieces of boar's flesh at Olympia, he asserts that the ancient custom forbade consumption of oath victims, admitting at the same time that he had forgotten to ask what would be done with the meat after the ceremony.<sup>76</sup>

For the *euthynai* see below commentary on lines 57–65.

<sup>71</sup> τοῦ δὲ Καταιβάτου Διὸς προβέβληται μὲν πανταχόθεν πρὸ τοῦ βομοῦ φράγμα, ἔστι δὲ πρὸς τῷ βομῷ τῷ ἀπὸ τῆς τέφρας τῷ μεγάλῳ (A fence runs around the altar of Zeus Kataibates on all sides; it is near the great ash altar).

<sup>72</sup> See Part I p. 70.

<sup>73</sup> Fr. 48 Wehrli (= Athenaeus 12.522d).

<sup>74</sup> Of Zeus Kataibates: *IG* XII 3 Suppl. 1360. On this and other house altars from Thera see M.E. Wiencke, *Greek Household Religion*, Dissertation, Johns Hopkins, 1947, 126–128. Cf. Yavis 1949, 65–45–85 (pp. 174–175), 66.62 (p. 176), 175 n. 23.

<sup>75</sup> So Dunst 1977, 252; followed by Osborne 1985, 78.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Burkert 1985, 252 with n. 19; Rosivach 1994, 24–25 n. 43. On Athenian practice cf. Casabona 1966, 220–225 esp. 222–224. Boars are mentioned elsewhere as oath victims. Cf. *LSAM* 30 B; Pausanias 4.15.18; Ar. *Lys.* (the boar and its blood are represented by a jar full of Thasian wine). A triple offering of a bull, a boar, and a ram, is mentioned in Xen. *An.* 2.2.9 and Demosthenes 23.68. On triple offerings cf. below, commentary on line 41; on boars cf. below commentary on 5.37–38.



Boedromion (Lines 13–24)

*Line 13*

For the Prerosia see above commentary on line 5.

*Lines 13–15*

Offerings to Zeus Polieus. On Zeus in his poliad capacity cf. below commentary on 23 A 9. As we learn from Pausanias (1.24.4; cf. 1.28.10.), Zeus Polieus had an altar on the Acropolis in Athens. In the Erchia calendar Zeus Polieus receives sacrifices on the Acropolis in the city as well as on the local Acropolis (*LSCG* 18 Γ 15 18, 61 64). Dunst (1977, 256) and Labarbe (1977, 60) may be right in suggesting that the Zeus Polieus mentioned here was connected to the local acropolis at Thorikos where sacrifices to him would be offered.

*Line 14*

ΕΠΑΥΤΟΜΕΝΑΣ.<sup>77</sup> Daux's suggestion, ἐπαυτομένας,<sup>78</sup> seems possible but farfetched, considering the scanty to almost non-existent parallels. His anonymous friend's suggestion to read ἐπ' Αὐτομένας<sup>79</sup> i.e. at or to (a place called) Automenai, is attractive since it is comparable to ἐπὶ Σούνιον (line 19), ἐφ' ἁλῇ (line 23), and ἐπὶ Μυκηνοῶν (line 45; cf. *Right Side* 4).<sup>80</sup> Like Mykenos or Mykenon, the place is unknown. If this interpretation is accepted, two different offerings should take place, as

<sup>77</sup> Cf. below line 47.

<sup>78</sup> I.e. mid. ppl. < ἐπαυτέω des femmes acclamant le dieu; cf. the δολύκτρια of *LSAM* 12.25–26 (Part I p. 72) and *LSCG* 89.22.

<sup>79</sup> The form may be better left unaccented: Daux 1983, 171–174; Scullion 1998, 116.

<sup>80</sup> See Daux 1983, 171–174 for both the suggestion and Daux's objections. After Daux see: *For*: Parker 1987, 145; Robertson 1996, 349–350. *Against*: Rosivach 1994, 28 n. 56; Scullion 1998, 116–117 (see below). Cf. Whitehead 1986, 194–196 n. 102, 349–350. Scullion's (1998, 116–119) ἐπ' αὐτὸ μένας (staying at the same place i.e. a sanctuary: a way of requiring the sacrificial meat to be consumed on the spot) seems improbable to me. I am not sure that his comparison with αὐτὸ in ἐξ αὐτὸ ἴτο in the law from Selinus, below 27 B 5, is relevant. The syntax of the present document, which, unlike that of the Selinuntine law, is quite straightforward, can hardly admit a nominative here, and it is far from clear that αὐτὸ in ἐξ αὐτὸ ἴτο refers to a place (i.e. a sanctuary: see commentary ad loc.). Furthermore, there is no assurance that Scullion's etymology Sametown or Selftown for the rejected Automenai is correct. The existence of a similarly formed personal name, Αὐτομένης, suggests that even if it were correct, it would not be impossible. The name is fairly well documented in Attica. See s.vv. in *LGPV* II 80; J.S. Traill, *Persons of Ancient Athens* IV, Toronto, 1995, 73–74. I am grateful to the author of the latter work who pointed this out to me.

Daux understood: one in the deme, the other in the specified place.<sup>81</sup> This may explain why two different piglets are specified here. While the second is to be wholly burnt, it is notable that neither the purpose nor mode of sacrifice is specified for the first. There is thus no particular reason to assume that it too was burnt. On the contrary, like the preceding sheep, it may very well have been eaten.<sup>82</sup>

*Line 15*

ὄνητόν: Labarbe's suggestion (1977, 60) that the specified piglet was not to be allocated from a domestic herd should be taken into account though the exact significance of this specification remains obscure.

*Lines 16–19*

On Cephalus, an inhabitant of Thorikos, and his wife Procris, Erechtheus' daughter<sup>83</sup> (cf. perhaps below lines 54–57), see Labarbe 1977, nos. 19–21; Kearns 1989, 177, 195. On Thorikos, the deme's somewhat obscure eponymous hero<sup>84</sup> and his heroines (cf. below lines 28–30), see Labarbe 1977, nos. 12, 13, 2 A (for the accentuation of his name); Kearns 1989, 169. On the heroines see further Parker 1987, 145. On the custom of offering tables to heroes see Gill 1991, 10, suggesting that what is referred to by *τράπεζα* is not an actual table but food which was offered on it.<sup>85</sup>

In his *Rationes Centisimarum*, Amsterdam, 1997, 203, S.D. Lambert tentatively takes the present offering to Cephalus as an indication that the location of the *genos* Cephalidae was in the area of Cephale and Thorikos.<sup>86</sup> This is particularly attractive since the two demes formed the fifth Athenian coastal *trittys*.<sup>87</sup> On the other hand (Parker 1996, 300), this *genos* might be associated with the sanctuary of Apollo at Daphne.

On the sanctuary of Poseidon at Sounion see J.S. Boersma, *Athenian Building Policy from 561/0 to 405/4 B.C.*, Groningen, 1970, 36–37, 142,

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Scullion 1994, 88 n. 3. A possible trip to the place could, perhaps, account for the need for an attendant and the provision of a meal.

<sup>82</sup> In a forthcoming article K. Clinton shows that the assumption that piglets were normally not meant to be eaten (Rosivach 1994, 15 with n. 19) is wrong.

<sup>83</sup> Pherecydes *FGHist* 3 F 34 (= Labarbe 1977, no. 19).

<sup>84</sup> He is otherwise known only from Hesychius (s.v. *Θοριζός* = Labarbe no. 12).

<sup>85</sup> Cf. Labarbe 1977, 60.

<sup>86</sup> I am grateful to the author for drawing my attention to this point.

<sup>87</sup> J.S. Traill, *The Political Organization of Attica: A Study of the Demes, Trittyes, and Phylai, and Their Representation in the Athenian Council* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 14), Map 1.

195. For possible activities in this sanctuary cf. the unfortunately very fragmentary *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 8 (Whitehead 1986, 196 n. 4).

As Parker noted (1987, 146), line 20 might be taken together with line 19. It may be coincidental that Poseidon and Apollo are coupled together below, lines 23–24.

*Line 20*

On Apollo and χίμαροι see below commentary 16.2.

*Lines 20–21*

Kourotrophos prominent place in Athenian cult belies her mythological obscurity.<sup>88</sup> Perhaps an independent goddess at first, she was later subordinated to Ge and Demeter.<sup>89</sup> According to the *Suda*, Erichthonius was the first to sacrifice to Ge Kourotrophos on the Acropolis and to establish an altar for her. He also instituted a custom that whoever sacrifices to some god offer a preliminary sacrifice to Kourotrophos.<sup>90</sup> Daux suggested that the six piglet sacrifices to her at Erchia are indeed preliminary;<sup>91</sup> Dunst assumed the same for the three piglet sacrifices in this calendar (here, lines 22, 41–42).

*Line 21*

Demeter had a special connection to Thorikos. In the Homeric hymn to Demeter (line 126) the disguised goddess names it as the landing place of the pirates who brought her from Crete, as she talks to Celeus daughters. Remains of a building, which some have identified as a temple of Demeter and Kore, were discovered at Thorikos<sup>92</sup> and a

<sup>88</sup> As noted by Burkert 1985, 244. In general see Th. Hadzisteliou-Price, *Kourotrophos: Cults and Representations of the Greek Nursing Deities*, Leiden, 1978.

<sup>89</sup> Nilsson *GGR* I<sup>3</sup> 457 with notes and cf. Hesych. s.v. Κουροτρόφος. See, however, Hadzisteliou-Price, *Kourotrophos*, esp. 107–112.

<sup>90</sup> *Suda* s.v. Κουροτρόφος γῆ: ταύτη δὲ θύσαι φασὶ πρῶτον Ἐριχθόνιον ἐν ἀκροπόλει καὶ βοῶν ἰδρύσασθαι, ἔπειτα καταστήσαι δὲ νόμιμον τοὺς θύοντάς τινα θεῶν, ταύτη προθύειν.

<sup>91</sup> In his edition of the Erchian calendar, *BCH* 87, 1963, 631.

<sup>92</sup> On the temple see H.F. Mussche *Thorikos* 2, 1964, 73–74; J.S. Boersma, *Athenian Building Policy from 561/0 to 405/4 B.C.*, Groningen, 1970, esp. 78–81, 137, 188; N.R. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Oxford, 1974, 188–189. On Demeter here see also Dunst 1977, 254–255. Parts of the building, including a cult statue of a Demeter type are supposed to have been reused in the first century A.D. in a temple on the southeast corner of the Athenian Agora (see H.A. Thompson and R.E. Wycherley *Agora* XIV 167). Cf., however, M.M. Miles in *Agora* XXXI 49 n. 35.

boundary stone of their *temenos* was found in the vicinity of the deme.<sup>93</sup> The Thorikian building is of unusual design. According to H. Mussche (*Thorikos* II 74), its exact function remains unknown.

*Line 22*

Protection of a household was one major duty of Zeus as a house god, referred to in this case as Zeus Herkeios (of the courtyard). Sacrifice to him on an altar in the house's courtyard is evident already in Homer.<sup>94</sup> According to the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia* (55.3), at the *dokimasia* of the nine archons in Athens a candidate was required to answer several formulaic questions including Ἐν εἰ ἔστιν αὐτῷ Ἀπόλλων Πατρῶος καὶ Ζεὺς Ἑρκείος, καὶ ποῦ ταῦτα τὰ ἱερά ἐστιν.<sup>95</sup> Harpocration says that both Hyperides, in a speech whose authenticity he doubts, and Demetrius have shown that those who had a Zeus Herkeios had a share in citizenship.<sup>96</sup> On Zeus Herkeios see further M.E. Wiencke, *Greek Household Religion*, Dissertation, Johns Hopkins, 1947, 129–148; Nilsson *GGR* I<sup>3</sup> 403. On the possible connection between him and Demeter see Dunst 1977, 254; cf. Parker 1987, 146. Demeter and Zeus Herkeios are mentioned together in *LSS* 10 A 61–62.

*Line 23*

A cult of a Hero at the Salt Works is evident in *LSS* 19.37–38, 53–54, 85 cf. 17 and Ferguson 1938, no. 2.36.<sup>97</sup> Cf. Nilsson *GGR* I<sup>3</sup> 188. On the Salt Works see Ferguson 1938, 54–55. The location of the present Salt Works is unknown, and it is difficult to say which sacrifice or sacrifices were offered there. Athena should probably be counted out; otherwise it is difficult to understand why the entire entry was not erased, location included.<sup>98</sup> Poseidon seems a logical recipient.<sup>99</sup> While the placement of

<sup>93</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2600 λόγος τεμένους τοῖν θεοῖν.

<sup>94</sup> Most notably *Od.* 22.333–336.

<sup>95</sup> Whether he had an Apollo Patroos (ancestral) and a Zeus Herkeios and where. Cf. Harpocration s.v. Ἑρκείος Ζεὺς. See P.J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford, 1981, 617–618; cf. Parker 1996, 6.

<sup>96</sup> Harpocration s.v. Ἑρκείος Ζεὺς = Hyperides F 94 J; Demetrius of Phalerum *FGrHist* 228 F 6.

<sup>97</sup> *LSS* 19 (The accord of the Salaminians) = *Agora* XIX L 4a; Ferguson 1938, no. 2 = *Agora* XIX L 4b.

<sup>98</sup> One notes that the mode of erasure is very peculiar; cf. Daux 1983, 164–165.

<sup>99</sup> So Parker 1987 in his translation (p. 144); cf. however *ibid.* 146 (considering Athena).

the dicolon may preclude this (cf. line 19), the use of the dicolon in this inscription is somewhat inconsistent.<sup>100</sup>

Pyanopsion (Lines 25–27)

*Lines 25–27*

As Parker noted (1987, 146), punctuation is rather elusive in this section. This might be ascribed to an error of the scribe or his copy, but alternatives should be considered. Daux's suggestion (1983, 156–157, 166–167) that the first entry on the left side belongs together with line 27 makes little sense. It is hard to see why the addition was written on the left side and at such a distance, and it is not clear why the  $\omega$  at the end of Daux's restored line 27 ( $\Pi[\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\delta\omega]$ ) is repeated at the beginning of the first entry on the left side ( $-\omega\nu\iota$ ).<sup>101</sup> It is possible to place a semicolon after  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu$  in line 27 and take  $\Pi\nu\alpha\nu\omicron\psi\iota\omicron\iota\varsigma$  together with the last word at the lost end of this line. This, however, creates a new problem, since the space of seven letters (including the preserved  $\Pi$ ) seems hardly sufficient for both an offering and its recipient (cf. Parker 1987, 146). It is still not entirely unthinkable that a special kind of offering was prescribed here but any restoration depends on a correct understanding of a postulated ritual.<sup>102</sup> It might, therefore, be advisable to leave the semicolon at the end of line 26. In this case line 27 would be taken independently. Dunst's  $\pi[\rho\alpha\tau\acute{o}\nu]$ , (supported by Parker) is possible, although it requires one space to have been left empty at the end of line 27, and, if the recipient is Neanias, creates an awkward word order. It should also be pointed out that the festival of the Pyanopsia was held in Athens on 7 Pyanopsion.<sup>103</sup> If line 27 is taken independently, a distorted order of offerings has to be understood, unless (Parker 1987, 142, 146) these are local Pyanopsia, celebrated after the city festival. Considering the local Prerosia (lines 5–6), the local Plynteria (52–53), and perhaps the Hieros Gamos (line 32), this might be possible.

*Line 25*

On Zeus Kataibates see above commentary on line 10.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. above n. 51. It is equally difficult to say whether the sacrifice to Apollo was also to be offered at the Salt Works.

<sup>101</sup> For a possible solution see discussion above pp. 125–126.

<sup>102</sup> For example,  $\pi[\rho\acute{o}\theta\upsilon\mu\alpha]$  fits the space nicely but does not appear to make any clear sense.

<sup>103</sup> Mikalson 1975, 69–70.

*Line 27*

Neanias receives a rather signi cant triple offering<sup>104</sup> of a bovine, a sheep, and a piglet in the calendar of the Marathonian Tetrapolis, *LSCG* 20 B 21,<sup>105</sup> in Mounichion. A [*heroon*] of Neanias is mentioned in *Agora* XIX L6.141. The location of this possible sanctuary is unknown.<sup>106</sup> Some have preferred to see in this hero's name (Youth) not a real name but rather a generic title comparable to Kore.<sup>107</sup>

*Lines 28–30*

For Thorikos see commentary on lines 16–19. In the fourth-century calendars of the Marathonian Tetrapolis (*LSCG* 20 A 40; B 6, 9, 20, 35, 43, 56) and of the *genos* Salaminioi (*LSS* 19.85; 363/2 B.C.), bovines are valued at 90 and 70 drachmas respectively. The lower price here (and in lines 54–56) might advocate a fifth-century date for the present calendar. But the strict limit put on the price here is noteworthy, and a less expensive animal may simply be required. The two bovines lacking their age marking teeth<sup>108</sup> in the state calendar (*LSS* 10 A 50–51; 403–399 B.C.) cost 50 drachmas.<sup>109</sup> One notes that price tags are attached in the present calendar only to animals offered to local heroes, namely Thorikos and the couple Cephalus and Procris (lines 54–57).<sup>110</sup>

## Posideion (Line 31)

*Line 31*

The reference is obviously to the so-called Rural Dionysia which the Attic demes held on various dates in Posideion.<sup>111</sup> The lack of offerings in this month can be explained by a concentration of the sacrificial activity around the festival (cf. Daux 1983, 164)<sup>112</sup> which appears to

<sup>104</sup> Cf. below commentary on line 41.

<sup>105</sup> Parker 1987, 146. Nevertheless, making him a brother of Oinoe (comm. ad loc.) appears to be a result of an incorrect reading of Pausanias 1.33.8, as Parker (*ibid.*) has shown.

<sup>106</sup> But see M.B. Walbank's commentary in *Hesperia* 52 1983, 122–123; cf. Parker 1987, 146.

<sup>107</sup> Roscher *Lex. s.v.*; cf. Kearns 1989, 188; on Neanias here cf. also C. Calame, *Thésé et l'imaginaire athénien: Légende et culte en Grèce antique*<sup>2</sup>, Lausanne, 1996, 320.

<sup>108</sup> See below commentary on line 34.

<sup>109</sup> For animal prices in Athenian sacrificial calendars see van Straten 1995, 175–186.

<sup>110</sup> For the couple see commentary on lines 16–19.

<sup>111</sup> See Whitehead 1986, 213 for attestations at Brauron and Salamis.

<sup>112</sup> This festival could have been dealt with in a different document.

have included a sacrificial procession.<sup>113</sup> At Thorikos one would like, if not to make the local theater a destination of some such procession, to regard it as a center of activities for the festival, at least in the Classical period. The original structure of this unusually shaped theater (oval rather than round) goes back to the late sixth century B.C. Stone benches were constructed in works undertaken in the middle of the fifth century, during which a small temple of Dionysus and an altar appear to have been added.<sup>114</sup> The seating space was further expanded around the middle of the fourth century with the addition of the upper *koilon*, enabling the theater to accommodate a considerable crowd.<sup>115</sup>

### Gamelion

#### *Line 32*

The festival of the Hieros Gamos was held in Gamelion which is clear from the reference here celebrating the marriage of Zeus and Hera and, through it, marriage itself.<sup>116</sup> It appears to have been held on 27 Gamelion,<sup>117</sup> a day on which sacrifices are offered in the Erchian calendar (*LSCG* 18) to Kourotrophos (in the sanctuary of Hera) and Hera (B 32–39), and to Zeus Teleios (in the sanctuary of Hera: Γ 38–41).<sup>118</sup> All of these sacrifices are local, to be performed in the deme itself. This festival may be matched with the Theogamia,<sup>119</sup> a festival which, as Deubner suggested (1932, 177–178), should be further equated with the Gamelia, from which the month's name, Gamelion, had been derived. From Hesychius we learn that the month of Gamelion was

<sup>113</sup> A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*<sup>2</sup>, Oxford, 1988, 42–55, 361; Whitehead 1986, 212–222. For a comparable procession at Eleusis cf. Clinton 1992, 124–125.

<sup>114</sup> The temple is somewhat difficult to date; see T. Hackens, *Thorikos* 3, 1965, 93, 95; H.F. Mussche, *Thorikos: A Guide to the Excavations*, Brussels, 1974, 41. The temple might perhaps be identified with the Διονύσιον mentioned in *Agora* XIX P29.15 (Labarbe 1977, no. 40; *SEG* XXVIII 130) with M. Crosby's note ad loc. *Hesperia* 19, 1950, 266.

<sup>115</sup> Hackens, *Thorikos* 1, 1963, esp. 113–118; 3, 1965, 75–69, esp. 94–96 with plan V; Mussche *ibid.* 29–41; Travlos 1989, 430–431; cf. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dramatic Festivals*<sup>2</sup>, 52–53; Whitehead 1986, 219–220.

<sup>116</sup> Hesychius s.v. Ἱερὸς γάμος: ἑορτὴ Διὸς καὶ Ἥρας; (cf. Photius, *Etym. Magn.* s.v. Ἱερὸν γάμον); *Lex. Rhet. Cant.* s.v. Ἱερὸς γάμος: οἱ γαμοῦντες ποιοῦσι τῷ Διὶ καὶ τῇ Ἥρᾳ ἱεροῦς γάμους (Those who get married celebrate Sacred marriage to Zeus and to Hera).

<sup>117</sup> Menander fr. 225 *PCG*.

<sup>118</sup> Mikalson 1975, 107–108.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. Schol. Hes. *Op.* 782–784.

sacred to Hera.<sup>120</sup> A piglet is offered to Zeus Heraios in this month in the oldest surviving Athenian calendar.<sup>121</sup> See A. Avagianou, *Sacred Marriage in the Rituals of Greek Religion*, Bern-New York, 1991, esp. 19–21, 27–36.

As Parker noted, considering the Erchian evidence (above), where local sacrifices are offered on the day of the Hieros Gamos to related deities, there may be reason to believe that this festival was celebrated locally at Thorikos.<sup>122</sup>

Anthesterion (Lines 33–35)

Lines 33–34

For the Athenians, Anthesterion 12 marked the date of the central part of the Anthesteria, namely, the Choes. This is well illustrated by Harpocration s.v. Χόες:

ἐορτή τις ἦν παρ' Ἀθηναίοις ἀγομένη Ἀνθεστηριῶνος δωδεκάτῃ. φησὶ δὲ Ἀπολλόδορος Ἀνθεστήρια μὲν καλεῖσθαι κοινῶς τὴν ὅλην ἐορτὴν Διονύσω ἀγομένην, κατὰ μέρος δὲ Πιθοίγια, Χόας, Χύτροις.

Choes . . . This was a festival in Athens, held on twelve Anthesterion. Apollodorus (*FGHist* 244 F 133) says that the festival, which was celebrated for Dionysus, is jointly called Anthesteria as a whole, but Pithoi-gia, Choes, and Chytroi in parts.<sup>123</sup>

The Choes appear to have focused on private symposia, involving drinking contests.<sup>124</sup> Parker's suggestion that the sacrifice here could be a local, official, minor-scale contribution, prompting the demesmen's private activities, is attractive.<sup>125</sup>

For goat sacrifice to Dionysus cf. αἴξ (goat): *LSCG* 18 Δ 35 36; [177.27]; ἔριφος (kid): *LSCG* 18 Α 17 18(?); 18 Γ 44 47; 141.3 4; 151 Α 45, 57 58, 62; τράγος (he-goat): *LSS* 104.3 5 (τράγος πρᾶτῆνιος (yearling));

<sup>120</sup> S.v. Γαμηλιών· ὁ <ζ> τῶν μηνῶν, τῆς Ἡρας ἱερός.

<sup>121</sup> *LSCG* 1. 20–21 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 234) [- - -Δ]||μ : Ἡεραίοι : χο[ί]τος - - -].

<sup>122</sup> Parker 1987, 142 with reference to F. Salviat *BCH* 88, 1964, 647–654 who discusses the Erchian evidence.

<sup>123</sup> R. Hamilton, *Anthesteria and Choes: Athenian Iconography and Ritual*, Ann Arbor, 1992, T57. Cf. *Suda* s.v. (Hamilton *ibid.* T11), Schol. Ar. *Ach.* (Hamilton T12). The three parts of the Anthesteria are usually considered to have been held consecutively on the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth of Anthesterion. Hamilton *ibid.* 42–50 suggested that the Choes and the Chytroi were held on the same day.

<sup>124</sup> Perhaps generated by a public one: Hamilton *ibid.* 14, cf. 118.

<sup>125</sup> Parker 1987, 142. This does not preclude Henrichs' suggestion (1990, 263) that, while some Thorikians may have celebrated the Choes at home, others could attend events elsewhere. In general see Hamilton *ibid.* 9–33, 113–121.



cf. *LSCG* 90.4; χίμαρος ((young) he-goat): *LSCG* 96.27. For a review of the relevant literary evidence see W. Richter *RE* X A 423 424, s.v. Ziege.

### Line 34

The adjective λειπογνῶμων appears to be used as an age indicator, referring to an animal lacking its age-marking teeth, the γνῶμονες. Theoretically, the animal could be either (1) a newborn whose γνῶμονες have not yet appeared, or (2) a mature animal which has already lost them. Such an animal is qualified as τέλειος by the *Etymologicum Magnum* (s.v. ἄβολος) and Eustathius (1404.59–62). H. Hansen (*GRBS*, 14, 1973, 325–332) advances the first possibility, Rosivach (1994, 148–153) the second, asserting that the adjective refers to an old animal, past its prime, older than τέλειος. Rosivach's argument is in and of itself convincing, but a requirement to sacrifice animals past their prime seems peculiar.<sup>126</sup> The spelling λειπε- may be ascribed to a scribal error (cf. λειπο- in line 43; see above *Restorations*).

*The Color of Victims.* The color of victims is occasionally specified in sacred laws.<sup>127</sup> The significance of this specification is not always easy to grasp. For a general discussion of the evidence see Stengel 1920, 151–152 and *Opferbräuche der Griechen*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1910, 187–190.<sup>128</sup> Although an ancient distinction between Chthonian deities who receive dark-colored victims and Olympian or heavenly deities who receive light-colored ones should be taken into account, it is not always very helpful.<sup>129</sup> On the one hand, in *Iliad* 3.103–104, before the duel of Paris and Priam, a white ram is to be sacrificed to the sun and a black ewe to the earth. On the other hand, Poseidon receives a

<sup>126</sup> Particularly considering requirements concerning the quality of sacrificial victims. On this point cf. above commentary on line 7; below commentary on 26.31–32.

<sup>127</sup> E.g. *LSCG* 20 B 18; 96.6, 9; 142.4–7; *LSS* 97.2–4; 115 A 7; *LSAM* 41.6; below 26.28; cf. below lines 45–46.

<sup>128</sup> Cf. Rosivach 1994, 16 n. 24.

<sup>129</sup> See Porphyry *De philosophia ex oraculis haurienda* F. 314.27 Smith (p. 361; p. 114 Wolff = Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* 4.9.2): φαιδρὰ μὲν οὐρανίοις, χθονίοις δ' ἐναλίγκια χροῖῃ (Bright (colored) to heavenly (gods), but to earthly ones (victims) of a like color). The *locus classicus* appears to be Arnobius *Adversus Nationes* 7.19: Quia superis diis, inquit, atque omnium dexteritate pollentibus color laetus acceptus est ac felix hilaritate candoris, at vero diis laevis sedesque habitantibus inferas color furvus est gratior et tristibus suffectus e fucis (Because, he said, to the heavenly gods, the skilfully all-powerful, bright color is acceptable and favorable in cheerfulness of luster, but to the unpropitious gods, inhabiting the nether parts, a dark and the red-stained color is more pleasing). Cf. Schol. Hom. *Il.* 3(Γ) 103, 23 (Ψ) 30a.

hecatomb of black bulls in *Od.* 3.6, a red (φοῖνιξ: or tawny cf. Schol.) herd of bulls in Pindar *Pyth.* 4.205 (365), and a white ram and lamb in *LSCG* 96.6, 9. Whereas here (and more securely in line 46) tawny (πυρρός) is an alternative to black, thus marking the recipient, Dionysus, as chthonian, in *LSS* 97.2 4 Helios receives twice an ox, either white or tawny (πυρρός), the white alternative marking him as Olympian. If something should be salvaged from the ancient generalizing statements, it may be that the choice of color is not influenced merely by a classification of a deity as chthonian or Olympian but by particular qualities and the associations which this or that deity assumes in a specific cultic context.

*Lines 34–35*

*Zeus Meilichios and the Diasia.* Much of our knowledge about the Diasia depends on a passage in Thucydides (1.126.6), as supplemented by an entry in the Erchian calendar, *LSCG* 18 A 37–43, discussed by Jameson 1965, 164–165.<sup>130</sup> The festival appears to have been celebrated centrally at Agrai on 23 Anthesterion.<sup>131</sup> Many people attended, celebrating, or so it seems, with their families, offering their sacrifices, be these sacrificial animals or not; it may be that others celebrated elsewhere with their families. The entry in the Erchian calendar suggests (ἐν | ἄσται ἐν Ἄγρας lines 38–39) that the deme of Erchia contributed a victim to the event at Agrai. Parker 1987, 140 inferred that other demes acted similarly and that the offering here could represent some such local contribution to the central celebration.<sup>132</sup> A geographical designation for the offering might, however, be expected in this case. On the Diasia see Deubner 1932, 155–157; on Zeus Meilichios and

<sup>130</sup> Thuc. 1.126.6: ἔστι γὰρ καὶ Ἀθηναίους Διάσια ἃ καλεῖται Διὸς ἑορτὴ Μελιχίου μεγίστη ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, ἐν ᾗ πανδημεὶ θύουσι πολλοὶ οὐχ ἱερεῖα ἀλλὰ θύματα ἐπιχώρια (For the Athenians have a very great festival, called the Diasia, outside of the city, in which many sacrifice communally not sacrificial victims but local(?) or: ancestral, customary offerings?). The θύματα ἐπιχώρια are said in the Scholia to be pastries shaped into the forms of animals (τινὰ πέμματα εἰς ζώων μορφάς τετυπωμένα), which, by analogy to Herodotus 2.47, are assumed to have been offered by the poor instead of animals. See Jameson 1965, 165–166. *LSCG* 18 A 37–43: Ἀνθεστηριῶνος, Διασίους, ἐν | ἄσται ἐν Ἄγρας, | Διὶ Μελιχίῳ, | οἷς, νηφάλιος | μέχρι σπλάγχ||[ν]ων, ΔΕΕ (In Anthesterion, at the Diasia, in the city, at Agrai, to Zeus Meilichios, a sheep, wineless until (the roasting of) the splanchna, 12 drachmas).

<sup>131</sup> Schol. Ar. *Nub.* 408: Διάσια ἑορτὴ Ἀθήνησι Μελιχίου Διὸς· ἄγεται μηνὸς Ἀνθεστηριῶνος ἢ φθίνοντος (The Diasia is a festival of Zeus Meilichios at Athens. It is held on the 23rd of Anthesterion): Mikalson 1975, 117.

<sup>132</sup> Cf. Jameson 1965, 165.

the Diasia and Thucydides account see further Jameson 1965, 165 167; more particularly on Zeus Meilichios see Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 81 103 esp. 92 96. In Athens see also Jameson 1997, 173.<sup>133</sup>

Elaphebolion (Lines 36 39)

*Lines 36–37*

Parker's 1984 objections to Daux's  $\text{Ἡρακλεῖ δά[μαλιν, οἶν]}$  seem valid: a  $\deltaάμαλις$  is not mentioned elsewhere in this document (but cf. *Restorations* line 7), and heroes appear to receive only one victim. On the cult of the Heraclidae in Attica see *ibid.* and Kearns 1989, 166 167. Both the Heraclidae and Alcmena had a cult at Aixone where Alcmena shared a priestess with Hebe at the latter's sanctuary.<sup>134</sup> Alcmena also receives a sheep in *LSS* 19.84; otherwise she does not appear to have been particularly popular in Attica.

*Lines 37–38*

The  $\text{Ἄνακε}$  are the Dioscuri, Castor and Pollux. This makes Dunst's restoration of their sister's name,  $[\text{Ἑλέ}]\nu\eta$ , quite plausible. On the Dioscuri in Attica see Kearns 1989, 148 149; Mikalson 1998, 225;<sup>135</sup> on their festival, the Anakeia, about which next to nothing is known, see Deubner 1932, 216. On Helen, not a particularly prominent cult figure in Attica, see Parker 1987, 139;<sup>136</sup> Kearns *ibid.* 158. On the Dioscuri and Helen in general see J. Larson, *Greek Heroine Cults*, Madison/London 1995, 69 70.

*Lines 38–39*

A pregnant ewe offering to Demeter (cf. below, line 46). With almost no exceptions, sacrifices of pregnant animals are offered in sacred laws to divinities which are most readily affiliated with fertility, perhaps not surprisingly.<sup>137</sup> In *LSCG* 96.16 a pregnant sow is explicitly said to be

<sup>133</sup> Cf. commentary on 27 A below.

<sup>134</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1199.22 25.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. Dunst 1977, 254.

<sup>136</sup> With note 22 for a sacrifice to her and to the Anakes.

<sup>137</sup> One notes the following: Pregnant ewe: *LSCG* 18 E 19 20: to Ge; 20 A 28: (recipient missing), B 12: to Daeira; 146.3: to Demeter(?); 151 A 60: to Demeter; *LSS* 95.4 5: to the Demeters (Demeter and Kore); cf. *LSS* 19.92: to Athena Skiras. Pregnant sow: *LSCG* 20 A 43 (recipient missing), B 48 49 two victims: to Demeter Eleusinia and Demeter Chloe; 96.11 13: to Demeter Chloe, 16: to Demeter for the crop; *LSCG* 65.33,

offered to Demeter ὑπὲρ καρποῦ (for the crop).<sup>138</sup> See on this subject Clinton forthcoming.

τὴν γλο[ῖαν].<sup>139</sup> As with τὴν προηρο[σίαν] (line 5), Daux (1983, 167) understood τὴν γλο[ῖαν] here to be a temporal accusative, meaning dans le jour dit Chloia. But, as has been said above, τὴν προηρο[σίαν] could rather refer to an offering and it may be better to understand with Parker<sup>140</sup> To Demeter, as the Chloia offering, a pregnant ewe. The same principle should probably be applied to ἀνθειαν (line 44), an offering which would relate to the Antheia; the syntax in this case still seems somewhat awkward. On the Chloia see Brumfield 1981, 132–138; cf. Deubner 1932, 67.

Mounichion (Lines 40–46)

#### Line 40

The offering to Artemis Mounichia should probably be connected to the Mounichia, a festival in honor of Artemis held on 16 Mounichion which, as we learn from Plutarch, also marked the Greek victory at Salamis.<sup>141</sup> For a collection and a study of the literary evidence, in relation to the sanctuary of Artemis Mounichia see L. Palaiokrassa, *Τὸ ιερό τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος Μουνιχίας*, Athens, 1991, esp. 24–41, 90–96.

#### Line 41

Sanctuaries of the Pythian Apollo are attested in several places in Attica.<sup>142</sup> It may thus be reasonable to assume (Parker 1987, 146) that one existed at Thorikos as well. The preposition ἐς seems, however, to imply that the victim is to be sent to a sanctuary of the Pythian Apollo and sending makes better sense if the sanctuary is outside the deme.

68: to Demeter; *LSS* 87 A 3–4 [B 2]: [to Demeter]. Pregnant cow: *LSCG* 20 B 9; to Ge. The possible exception is the pregnant ewe offered to Athena Polias in *LSCG* 151 A 56.

<sup>138</sup> Line 25 specifies another offering for the crops, this time a black sheep for Zeus Chthonios and Ge Chthonia.

<sup>139</sup> See discussion above, commentary on line 5.

<sup>140</sup> 1987, 145, cf. 141 n. 41.

<sup>141</sup> Plut. *Mor.* 349F: τὴν δ' ἔκτιν ἐπὶ δέκα τοῦ Μουνιχιῶνος Ἀρτέμιδι καθιέρωσαν, ἐν ᾗ τοῖς Ἑλλήσι περὶ Σαλαμίνα νικῶσιν ἐπέλαμψεν ἡ θεὸς πανσέληνος ((The Athenians) dedicated the sixteenth to Artemis Mounichia, a date on which the goddess had shone forth as a full moon upon the Greeks who were winning around Salamis). Cf. Mikalson 1975, 143–144.

<sup>142</sup> See E. Meier *RE* XXII 552–562, s.v. Python; Travlos 1970, 91 with g. 540 (north slope of the Acropolis; disputed), 10–103, 578 with g. 379 (near the Ilissus); 1989, 177 (Daphne).

The destination may or may not be the sanctuary at Daphne (suggested by Labarbe 1977, 62 n. 27) which is said to have been founded by the descendants of Cephalus (on whose Thorikian connections see above, commentary on lines 18–19).

The spelling τριττοα for τρίττοια is attested in *LSCG* 4.5.<sup>143</sup> The word, referring to an offering of three victims, appears in Attic sacred laws in an Eleusinian context,<sup>144</sup> modified by the adjective βόαρχος (i.e. a sacrifice of three animals, headed by a bovine). Testimonies regarding the exact meaning of the word and the particular animals that would be offered are confusing.<sup>145</sup> The choice of animals may have been dictated by the cultic context. See L. Ziehen *RE* VII A 1, 328–330, s.v. Τρίττοια. Even if the restoration is correct, the significance of this offering here seems obscure.<sup>146</sup>

#### *Lines 41–44*

On Kourotrophos see above commentary on lines 20–21. Cult of Leto seems to be attested in *LSS* 125.2 though not according to Sokolowski's restoration of the text. For a better text see S.D. Lambert, *The Phratries of Attica*<sup>2</sup>, Ann Arbor, 1998, T 4. For λειπογνώ[μωνα] see above commentary on line 34. On ἄνθειαν see above commentary on lines 5 and 38–39.

#### *Line 44–45*

Daux's Φιλ[ωνίδι] is supported by the fact that Philonis is mentioned by Conon<sup>147</sup> as a native of Thorikos, being the daughter of Heosphoros and Kleoboia and the mother of Philammon. Nevertheless, Pherecydes<sup>148</sup> makes her an inhabitant of Parnassus, the daughter of Deion,

<sup>143</sup> LSJ s.v. τριττώα; cf. Threatte, *GAI* I 17.0216 (p. 326).

<sup>144</sup> *LSCG* 4.5; 5.37.

<sup>145</sup> E.g. *Etym. Magn.* (cf. Photius) s.v. τριττύαν θυσίαν. Καλλίμαχος μὲν τὴν ἐκ κριοῦ καὶ ταύρου καὶ κάπρου Ἰστρος δὲ ἐκ βοῶν, αἰγῶν, ὄων ἀρσένων, πάντων τριετῶν (A Sacrifice. As Callimachus (fr. 578) says, of a ram, a bull, and a boar; as Istros (*FGH* I 423 fr. 34), of bovines, goats, and pigs, all three years old). Eustathius 1676.30 Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ἡ τοιαύτη θυσία τριττύα λέγεται παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς, οἱ τριττύαν ἔλεγον τὴν ἐκ τριῶν ζώων θυσίαν, οἷον δύο μῆλων καὶ βοός, ὡς Ἐπίχαρμος, ἢ βοός καὶ αἰγὸς καὶ προβάτου, ἢ κάπρον καὶ κριοῦ καὶ ταύρου (It should be known that such an offering was called a *trititya* among the ancients; who referred to a *trititya* as a sacrifice of three animals, such as two sheep and a bovine, according to Epicharmus, or a bovine, a goat, and a sheep, or a boar, a ram, and a bull).

<sup>146</sup> But cf. Labarbe 1977, 62 n. 27.

<sup>147</sup> *FGHist* 26 F 1.7; Labarbe 1977, no. 14.

<sup>148</sup> *FGHist* 3 F 120 and see Jacoby's commentary.

and the mother of Philammon from Apollo and of Autolycus from Hermes.<sup>149</sup> See M.C. van der Kolf *RE* XX 1, 74–75, s.v. Philonis; Parker 1987, 146; Kearns 1989, 203.

*Line 45*

The location of Μυκηνος or Μυκηνον is unknown and the form is better left unaccented.

*Line 46*

On the color of the victim see above commentary on line 34.

Thargelion (Lines 47–51)

*Line 47*

ΕΠΑΥΤΟΜΕΝΑΣ: see above commentary on line 14.

*Lines 48–51*

On this passage see Kearns 1989, 37. As has been noted, Sosineos (line 50) could have something to do with seafaring, as his name suggests (σώζω + ναῦς). See Parker 1987, 147; Kearns 1989, 37, 199. Nothing signi cant is known about Hyperpedios, Thras[ - - ], Rhogios, and Pylo(u)chos. Cf. Dunst 1977, 253; Parker 1987, 139; Kearns 1989, 202, 169, 196, 197.

*Line 49*

*Nisus.* The Atthidographers agree, according to Strabo,<sup>150</sup> that, when Attica was divided among the four sons of Pandion, Nisus was allotted the Megarid and founded Nisaea. According to Philochorus (*FGrHist* 328 F 107), his territory extended from the Isthmus to the sanctuary of the Pythian Apollo; according to Andron (*FGrHist* 10 F 14), it reached Eleusis and the Thriasian plain. His grave was located at Athens, behind the Lyceum.<sup>151</sup> Dunst (1977, 258) assumed, accordingly, that the sacri ce to Nisus would be performed at this location.<sup>152</sup> Nisus may, however, have had some local signi cance at Thorikos. As has been

<sup>149</sup> Cf. Hesiod fr. 64 Merkelbach-West.

<sup>150</sup> 9.1.6 = *FGrHist* 329 F 1; cf. Sophocles *TGrF* 24.

<sup>151</sup> Pausanias 1.19.4.

<sup>152</sup> On problems relating to the connection between graves and hero cult in Attica cf. Parker 1987, 147, who refers to A.D. Nock *HThR* 37, 1944, 162–166 (= *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, Z. Stewart ed., Cambridge, Mass. 1972, II, 593–597).

suggested, if the Pythian sanctuary mentioned by Philochorus is the one at Daphne, Nisus could have gained significance in Thorikian cult due to his relations with the founders of this sanctuary, the descendants of the Thorikian hero Cephalus. See Labarbe 1977, 63 n. 30; Parker 1987, 139, 146–147.

#### Skirophorion (Lines 52–65)

##### *Line 52*

On the oath victim see above commentary on line 11. The oath victim obviously belongs together with the oath of the *euthynos* and his attendants. Cf. below lines 57–65.

##### *Lines 52–53*

The festival of the Plynteria appears to have been held in central Athens in Thargelion, the previous month, probably on the twenty-fifth.<sup>153</sup> Its commemoration here in Skirophorion shows that it was celebrated locally like the Prerosia (line 13) and possibly the Pyanopsia (line 27). It would be interesting to know something about the nature of this local festival and its relations, if any, to the central Athenian Plynteria which came to focus on a particular object – the ancient image of Athena – and its bath.<sup>154</sup>

##### *Lines 53–54*

*Aglauros*. According to the more prevalent version, Aglauros was a daughter of Cecrops and a sister of Pandrosos and Herse. Following Apollo's oracular response, she sacrificed herself for Athens' sake by jumping from the Acropolis. The ephebes consequently took their oath in her sanctuary.<sup>155</sup> She was a priestess of Athena<sup>156</sup> who, according to another version, handed over the infant Erichthonius, concealed in a basket, to the three daughters of Cecrops for nurturing. Disobeying her, they looked in the basket, and, upon seeing its content, cast themselves from the Acropolis.<sup>157</sup> Cult of Aglauros is documented in

<sup>153</sup> Mikalson 1975, 160–161; cf. 163–164.

<sup>154</sup> Cf. Robertson 1983, 281–282; Christopoulos, 1992, 35–36; Larson 1995, 39–40; Scullion 1998, 120–121.

<sup>155</sup> Philochorus *FGHist* 328 F 5; G.E. Dontas, 'The True Aglaurion', *Hesperia* 52, 1983, 48–63 at 61.

<sup>156</sup> Philochorus *FGHist* 328 F 5, F 6.

<sup>157</sup> Amelesagoras *FGHist* 330 F 1. Written and iconographic sources dealing with Erichthonius and the daughters of Cecrops were collected by B. Powell, *Erichthonius*

Attica in Erchia<sup>158</sup> and among the genos of the Salaminioi, where she shares a priestess with her sister, Pandrosos, and apparently with Kourotophos.<sup>159</sup> Hesychius<sup>160</sup> and an entry in the *ΑΕΞΕΙΣ ΠΕΤΟΠΙ-ΚΑΙ*<sup>161</sup> connect Aglauros with the Plynteria. Although both are likely to refer to the city festival, an offering to her at (or around) the Plynteria here can hardly be coincidental.

*Lines 54–56*

On Cephalus and Procris see above, commentary on lines 16–17.

*Line 57*

οἷον: Daux (1983, 169) took the two small deltas as a reference to the price of the sheep, i.e. twenty drachmas. Parker and van Straten objected on the grounds that this price is too high, considering that bovines (lines 28–30, 54–56) cost 40–50 drachmas.<sup>162</sup> This is a valid objection, but it is not said that the sheep has to cost exactly twenty drachmas and besides, this could be a very special sheep. At any rate, it is unlikely for such a combination to have been inscribed by mistake; it ought rather to be an abbreviation.<sup>163</sup>

*Lines 57–65*

The passage concerning the oath of the *euthynos* and his assistants evidently belongs together with the oath victim listed in line 52. The pas-

---

*and the Daughters of Cecrops* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 17), Ithaca, 1906 (on Aglauros see 30–37); see now U. Kron in *LIMC* I 283–298, s.v. Aglauros, Herse, Pandrosos. An interpretation of the sources may be found in D. Boedeker, *Descent from Heaven: Images of Dew in Greek Poetry and Religion*, Chico, CA, 1984, 100–124. The versions related above are by no means the only ones. For other and conflicting accounts and for the spelling variations Aglauros/Agraulos see, in addition to works referred to above, T. Puffer *RE* I 826–828, s.v. Aglauros; Kearns 1989, 140; Christopoulos 1992, 29–31. For more on Aglauros and especially on her relation with the Athenian ephebes see Dontas *Hesperia* 52, 1983, 61 whose relocation of her sanctuary from the north to the east slope of the Acropolis, following the discovery of *SEG* XXXIII 115, has raised some havoc.

<sup>158</sup> *LSCG* 18 B 57–58.

<sup>159</sup> *LSS* 19.12, 45. Human sacrifice was purportedly offered to Aglauros in Cyprus as we learn from Porphyry *Abst.* 2.54.3–55.1; (cf. Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* 4.16.2, *De Laudibus Constantini* 13.646.6; see notes in Bouffartigue and Patillon's Budé edition).

<sup>160</sup> S.v. πλυντήρια.

<sup>161</sup> Bekker *Anecdota Graeca* I 270.2.

<sup>162</sup> Parker 1987, 147; van Straten 1987, 167 n. 22; idem 1995, 177.

<sup>163</sup> Whether this is to be credited to a need to abbreviate at the end of the stone (so Daux 1983, 169; note, however, the vacant space below the text) is another question. The abbreviation may go back to the cutter's copy.



sage is otherwise self-contained, and its placement six lines after the appropriate victim seems somewhat peculiar.<sup>164</sup> As Daux and Whitehead noted,<sup>165</sup> we are concerned here with the appointment of the *euthynos* and his assistants, who are to present their report in Metageition (line 12). At Halai Aixionides the demarch appears to administer the oath to the *euthynos* and his assistants.<sup>166</sup> For the oath cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1183 (Myrrhinous).<sup>167</sup> A concern with *euthynai* is evident in the sacred law of the deme Skambonidai, *LSCG* 10 B, which also preserves an oath formula (though not of the *euthynos*).<sup>168</sup> For a documented discussion of deme *euthynai* see Whitehead 1986, 116–119.

### *Left Side*

#### *Line 31*

A sacrifice to Poseidon at the Pyanopsia is not entirely impossible, but Apollo, the main divinity of this festival, is a more natural candidate.<sup>169</sup>

#### *Line 42*

Considering the epithet, the restoration [Δι] is certain. On Zeus Herkeios see above commentary on *Front* line 22. Daux's idea (1983, 157–158) that this entry belongs at the end of *Front* line 22, that the syllable ΔΙ was thus shared,<sup>170</sup> for abbreviation's sake, by both divine names,

<sup>164</sup> To add speculation to a hypothesis, it would not be surprising if this gap of six lines was an outcome of a revision of an older version of this calendar (see discussion of the entries on the sides pp. 125–126 above). The oath passage, which had not been included in the older version, might have been added in the new version immediately following the older list of sacrifices to be offered in Skirophorion whose order was thus left undisturbed.

<sup>165</sup> Daux 1983, 164; Whitehead 1986, 118 n. 172.

<sup>166</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1147 with Whitehead 1986, 118. The reference to the demarch (line 15) is wholly restored.

<sup>167</sup> With Whitehead 1986, 119.

<sup>168</sup> For oath-taking in sacred laws see especially *LSAM* 30 B; cf. *LSAM* 88; Part I pp. 73–74.

<sup>169</sup> Harpocration s.v. Πυανόψια: Ἀπολλώνιος καὶ σχεδὸν (πάντες) οἱ περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησιν ἑορτῶν γεγραφότες Πυανειψιώνος ἑβδόμη τὰ Πυανέψια Ἀπόλλωνι ἄγεσθαί φασι (Apollonius and almost all those who have written about Athenian festivals say that the Pyanopsia is held on the seventh of Pyanopsion in honor of Apollo). Cf. *FGH Hist* 365 F 2; 368 F 3. See Mikalson 1975, 69–70; on the Pyanopsia cf. C. Calame, *Thésé et l'imaginaire athénien: Légende et culte en Grèce antique*<sup>2</sup>, Lausanne, 1996, 150–153 and, at a greater length, 291–324.

<sup>170</sup> I.e. one would read ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΙ|ΙΕΡΚΕΙΩΙ for ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΙ|ΔΙΙΕΡΚΕΙΩΙ.

and that these words, which had been mistakenly inscribed here, were then aptly repeated in *Right Side* line 44, is ingenious but farfetched.

*Line 58*

The identity of the heroines, undoubtedly obvious to contemporary local residents, is, as Daux remarked (1983, 158–159), entirely obscure to us. It would be tempting to connect them to the promontory of Κορώνεια, modern Koroni, not far from Thorikos,<sup>171</sup> but, as Parker notes (1987, 147), the use of what appears to be a genitive plural is peculiar in this case. Daux's attempt to connect them to the Boeotian town of Coronea is not particularly satisfying.<sup>172</sup> If I am right in my hypothesis that the entries on the left supplemented the text which was once inscribed on the back (see above pp. 73–74), one should expect these heroines to be preceded by some hero(es).<sup>173</sup> Such heroes as Κορωνεῖς are, however, unknown.

*Right Side*

*Line 4*

For Mykenos or Mykenon see *Front* line 45 with commentary.

*Line 12*

Phoenix could be identified as either Achilles' companion or Europa's father, but, as Parker noted (1987, 147), neither one can be shown to have had any physical connection with Athens. Alternatively, Parker suggested that the present Phoenix could simply be a Phoenician buried at Thorikos who thus came to be 'The Phoenician Hero'. The lack of context makes a definite identification conjectural. See Parker *ibid.*; Kearns 1989, 204.

*Line 44*

On Zeus Herkeios see above commentary on *Front* line 22.

<sup>171</sup> Stephanus of Byzantium s.v.; J.R. McCredie in *PECS* 462–463; Dunst 1977, 256 reading Κορωνε[ῖδες]; cf. Parker 1987, 147.

<sup>172</sup> Daux 1983, 159; cf. Parker 1987, 147; Larson 1995, 33.

<sup>173</sup> Cf. *Front* lines 29–30, 48–49, 51 (Thorikos, Hyperpedios, and Pylochos with their heroines).



SEG XXVIII 103 (XXVI 134)<sup>1</sup>ATTICA. ELEUSIS. TWO DEME DECREES.  
FUNDING FOR THE CULT  
OF HERACLES IN AKRIS. 332/1 B.C.

(Figures 8–9)

A tapered stele of white marble with a molding, intact except for damage to the molding on which the first line of the text was engraved; the back is rough-picked. The stone was found in Eleusis on January 7, 1970, at the intersection of Nikolaidou and Hygieias (Georgiou Pavlou) streets,<sup>2</sup> during the excavation of the house of the Liaskos brothers. It had been used in the wall of a house of the late Roman period. A large part of it was covered with mortar, most of which was removed without real damage to the text. Parts of the inscribed face (especially the first and last stoichoi of lines 2–17) are still covered with a thin layer of mortar which makes the reading particularly difficult at times. In addition, a number of letters are rather worn. The two decrees are separated by a relief of a volute crater on a stand surrounded by a crown of olive branches.

H. 0.93; W. 0.39 (top), 0.457 (bottom); Th. 0.087 (top), 0.121 (bottom). L.H. 0.008 (line 1), 0.007 (lines 2–17), 0.006. (lines 18–53). Round letters are somewhat smaller; triangular letters are sometimes somewhat smaller. Stoichoi: lines 2–17: 0.0111 (horizontal), 0.0108 (vertical); lines 18–53: 0.0093 (horizontal), 0.0094 (vertical).

Eleusis, Eleusis Museum. Inv. E1140. (The stone is actually located in the storeroom of the Archaeological Service).

Ed. Coumanoudis and Gofas 1978; (= SEG XXVIII 103; C.J. Schwenk, *Athens in the Age of Alexander: The Dated Laws and Decrees of 'the Lykourgan Era' 338–322 B.C.*, Chicago, 1985, 212–219 no. 43).

Cf. J. and L. Robert BE 1979 no. 185;<sup>3</sup> van Straten 1979 (= SEG XXIX 131); Ampolo 1979, 176–178; Ampolo 1981 (= SEG XXXI 109A); Ampolo 1982 (=

<sup>1</sup> Referring to S.N. Koumanoudis, , Θησέως σηκός, *ArchEph* 1976, 194–205 at 205 no. 3, quotations from the not yet published text.

<sup>2</sup> For a map see Wolf 1998, 54.

<sup>3</sup> On Coumanoudis and Gofas 1978.

SEG XXXII 145); Osborne 1985, esp. 54, 77 78, 104 105; Whitehead 1986, esp. 89 90, 116, 124, 157 158, 163 164, 169 170, 180, 183, 255 n. 2, 269 270, 288 290, 424, 427, 428; Koumanoudis and Matthaïou 1987, 17 18; Aleshire 1991, 244 246; E. Tagalidou, *Weihreliefs an Herakles aus klassischer Zeit* (SIMA-PB 99), Jonsæred, 1993, pp. 44 45 (*non vid*);<sup>4</sup> Clinton 1994, 30 31;<sup>5</sup> Threatte, *GAI* II 66.02221 a.β (p. 463);<sup>6</sup> Wolf 1998, 54 56, 84 85.<sup>7</sup>

Photograph: *ArchDelt* 29, 1973 1974, B, p 1121a<sup>8</sup> (= Wolf 1998, 56 g. 5; too small to be readable); van Straten 1979, 195 no. 1 (relief only).

332/1 a. ΣΤΟΙΧ. 35, ll. 2 17; ΣΤΟΙΧ. 43, ll. 18 53

Θ [ε ο] ι

- Ἐπιγένης εἶπεν· τύχη ἀγαθῇ τῶν δημοτῶν·<sup>v</sup>  
 ἐπειδὴ Φιλόκωμος εἰσηγήσατο τοῖς δῆμότα-  
 4 ις περὶ τῆς Ἀκριδος ἀποδόσθαι τῷ θεῷ τὴν  
 λιθ[οτομ]ίαν, ὅπως ἂν ἡ θυσία γίγνηται ὡς καλ-  
 λίστη, [καὶ ἐώ]νηται παρὰ τῶν δημοτῶν Μοιροκ-  
 λῆς [εἰς] πέγτε ἔτη τριῶν ἡμιμ[αί]ων τοῦ ἐνι[α]-  
 8 υτοῦ καὶ ἑκατὸν δραχμὰς ἐπέ[δωκ]εν εἰς τὰ πέ-  
 γτε ἔτη, [δε]δόχθαι Ἐλευσινίο[ις]· ἐπαινέσαι [μ]-  
 ἐν Φιλόκωμον Φαλανθίδου καὶ [στ]εφανῶ(σα)ι χρ[υ]-  
 [σ]ῶι στεφάγῳι ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα κα[ὶ] εὐνοίας τῇ[ς]  
 12 εἰς τοὺς δῆμους, εἰς δὲ τὸν στέφανον τὸ [ἀργ]-  
 ῦριον δοῦναι Φιλοκώμῳ ἐναντίον τῶν δημ[ο]-  
 τῶν ἑκατὸν δραχμὰς Μοιροκλέα, ἐπαινέσαι δ-  
 ἐ Μοιροκλέα Εὐθυδήμου, ὅτι τοῖς δῆμοις ἐ-  
 16 πιμελεῖται, ὅπως ἂν ἡ πρόσσδος ὡς πλείστη,  
 καὶ στεφάγῳσι θαλλοῦ στεφάνῳι.<sup>vacat</sup>

*anaglyphum*

- Φιλόκω[μ]ος Φαλανθίδου Ἐλευσίνιος εἶπεν· τύχη ἀγαθ-  
 ῇ τῶν δημοτῶν· ὅπως ἂν τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ τῷ ἐν Ἀκριδι πρόσ-  
 20 σδος ᾗ ὡς πλείστη καὶ ἡ θυσία θύηται ὡς καλλίστη, ἐψη-  
 φίσθαι τοῖς δῆμοις· τὰς λιθοτομίας τὰς Ἐλευσῖνι, Ε

*Restorations.* Suppl. Coumanoudis et Gofas. || 8–9 verba primum recte legit Clinton (Ἡ[ρ]ο[ά]κ[λ]εια C. -G.); vid. adn. || 21–22 ἐ[π]εῖδῃ . . . . C. -G: ἐ[π]εῖ ἐκ προγ[ό]γῳν et Daux et Gauthier apud C. -G.; cf. adn.

<sup>4</sup> See commentary on lines 8 9 below. I owe this reference to Kevin Clinton.

<sup>5</sup> Prosopography (both this and the previous two citations). See introductory remarks below.

<sup>6</sup> The imperative endings in lines 42 43.

<sup>7</sup> See commentary on lines 8 9 below. I owe this reference to Kevin Clinton.

<sup>8</sup> This photograph accompanies the report (pp. 167 168) about the excavation during which the stone was discovered.

Π . [ . . . <sup>6</sup> . . ] . . ΙΩΝ εἰσὶν ἱερὰ τοῦ Ἡρακλέως τοῦ ἐν Ἄκροι-  
 δι, μ[ισ]θῶν τὸν δῆμαρχον ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ τῶν δημοτῶν τῶ-  
 24 ι τὸ π[λείσ]τον διδόντι· τὸν δὲ μισθωσάμενον ἀποδιδόν-  
 αι τὴν μίσθωσιν τὴν μὲν ἐπὶ Νικίτου ἄρχοντος ἐν ᾧ ἄν  
 χρόνῳ τοὺς δημότας πε[ρ]ίθι, πρὸ τῆς θυσίας, μετὰ δὲ Νι-  
 κήτην ἄρχοντα εἰς τὸν Μεταγεινιώνα μῆνα ταῖς ἀρχα-  
 28 ιρεσίαις, ὅταν οἱ δημόται ἀγοράζωσιν ἐν τῷ Θησείῳ·  
 ἐγγυητά[ς] δ[ἐ] καταστησάτω ὁ μισθωσάμενος δύο ἄνδρας  
 [ὁμουμεν]ους ἢ μὴν ἀποδώσιν τὴν μίσθωσιν πᾶσαν ἐν τῶ-  
 ι χρόνῳ τῷ εἰρημένῳ· τὸν δὲ δῆμαρχον λαβόντα τοῦτ-  
 32 ο τὸ ἀργύριον παρέχειν εἰς τὴν ἐορτὴν τοῦ Ἡρακλέως τ-  
 οῦ ἐν Ἄκριδι· διαχειροτονῆσαι δὲ αὐτίκα μάλα τοὺς δη-  
 μότας ἕαν τε εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν δοκεῖ μισθοῦν, ἕαν τε εἰς πλ-  
 έω χρόνον, ὁπότερα δ' ἄν δοκεῖ, ταῦτα κύρια εἶναι καὶ μι-  
 36 σθῶν πρὸς ταῦτα τὸν δῆμαρχον· μὴ ἐξέστω δὲ εἰπεῖν μη-  
 θένα τοῦτο τὸ ἀργύριον ὥς δει ἄλλοθί που τρέψαι ἢ εἰς  
 τὴν θυσίαν τοῦ Ἡρακλέως, μηδὲ τοῖς ἱερομνήμοσιν ἐπι-  
 ψηφίσαι, μηδὲ τῷ δημάρχῳ· ἕαν δὲ τις ἢ εἴπει ἢ ἐπιψηφ-  
 40 ίσει παρὰ τὸδε τὸ ψήφισμα, ὀφειλέτω τῷ θεῷ τὸ διπλά-  
 σιον ἢ ὅσον ἄν εἴπει ἢ ἐπιψηφίσει· καὶ ὁ εὐθυνοὺς καὶ ὁ σ-  
 υνήγορος ἐπάναγκες αὐτῶν καταγιγνωσκόντων τοῦτο  
 τὸ ἀργύριον ἢ αὐτοὶ ὀφειλόντωςαν· ἀναγρᾶναι δὲ τὸδε  
 44 τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν δῆμαρχον ἐν στήλει λιθίνει καὶ στήσα-  
 ι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἡρακλέως τοῦ ἐν Ἄκριδι, ὅπως ἂν τὰ ἐψ-  
 ηφισμένα ὑπὸ τῶν δημοτῶν κύρια εἴη εἰς τὸν αἰεὶ χρόνον  
 κ[αὶ] μ[ὴ] παραλύηται· συνεπιμεληθῆναι δὲ τῆς στήλης ὁπ-  
 48 ως ἄν σταθεῖ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὸν ἱερέα τοῦ Ἡρακλέως Ἀν[τ]ι-  
 φά[ν]ην πρὸ τῆς θυσίας τῆς ἐπὶ Νικίτου ἄρχοντος· εἰς δὲ  
 τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης δοῦναι τὸν δῆμαρχον δέκα . .  
 [δ]ραχμ[ῶν] τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ προσόδου· κύριον δὲ εἶναι τὸδ-  
 52 [ε] τὸ ψήφισμα ἀπὸ Νικίτου ἄρχοντος, ἀφ' ἧς ἂν ἡμέρας οἱ δ-  
 ημόται ψηφίσωνται. <sup>vacat</sup>

*vacat ca. 0.072*

*Restorations.* 29 δ[ἐ] L. dubitanter: τ[ε] C. -G (vid. adn. epigr.) || 47 παραλύηται primum recte legit Clinton: καταλύηται C. et G.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have seen the stone; I was not able to read securely some previously read letters which are therefore dotted. Most sigmas are very faint. It is usually almost impossible to distinguish between H and N; A, Δ, and Λ; and Θ and O. Dotted Hs and Ns lack a middle stroke; dotted As and Δs are identical with Δs; dotted Θs are identical with Os.

10-11 [ . ]ΕΦΑΝΩΙΧΡ[ . | . ]ΩΙΣΤΕΦΑΝΩΙ lapis (i.e. στεφάνωι χρυσῶι στεφάνωι for στεφανῶσαι χρυσῶι στεφάνωι).

22 Some traces appear in the lacuna. Second stoichos: perhaps a round letter; ninth stoichos: possibly a triangular letter; tenth stoichos: confusing traces.

29 δ[ἐ]: The traces of the first letter are doubtful but do not seem to allow τ[ε].

*Translation*

## Gods

Epigenes made a motion; for the good fortune of the demesmen.

Whereas Philokomos proposed to the demesmen regarding the Akris that the stone quarries be leased out for the sake of the god, in order that the sacrifice might be performed in the best possible way, (6) [and] Moirokles has leased them from the demesmen [for] five years for three half minae a year<sup>9</sup> and contributed one hundred drachmas for the five years, (9) let it be decided by the Eleusinians to commend Philokomos son of Phalanthides, and to crown him with a golden crown, on account of his virtue and his good will toward the demesmen. (12) Let Moirokles give the money for the crown, in the amount of one hundred drachmas, to Philokomos in front of the demesmen, (14) and let them commend Moirokles son of Euthydemos, as he takes care, for the sake of the demesmen, that the revenue be the highest, and let them crown him with an olive crown.

*(Relief)*

(18) Philokomos the Eleusinian, son of Phalanthides made a motion; for the good fortune of the demesmen.

In order that the revenue for Heracles in Akris may be the highest possible and the sacrifice may be performed in the best possible way, (20) let the demesmen vote that the demarch lease out in the assembly of the demesmen to the highest bidder the stone quarries in Eleusis, [- -] are the sacred property of Heracles in Akris.

(24) Let the lessee make the payment in the archonship of Niketes, at the date for which he obtains the demesmen's consent,<sup>10</sup> before the sacrifice; and after the archonship of Niketes, during the elections of magistrates, in the month of Metageitnion, when the demesmen meet in assembly in the Theseion. (29) As sureties the lessee shall provide two men who will swear in truth to pay back the contract price in full on the aforementioned date. The demarch shall take this money and provide it for the festival of Heracles in Akris.

(33) Let the demesmen choose on the spot, by showing of hands,

---

<sup>9</sup> I.e. 150 dr. (100 dr. = 1 mina).

<sup>10</sup> I.e. on a date agreed upon between him and the demesmen.

whether it seems right to lease out the stone quarries for a year or for a longer period of time. Whichever of the two seems right shall be authoritative and the demarch shall lease out the stone quarries accordingly.

(36) Let it be impossible for anyone to make a motion that this money be directed elsewhere instead of to the sacrifice of Heracles. Let neither the *hieromnemes* nor the demarch put it to a vote. If someone brings a motion or puts the matter to a vote against this decree, let him owe to the god twice as much as he suggested in his motion or put to a vote. (41) Let the *euthynos* (scrutinizer) and the *synegoros* (public advocate) bring a charge for this money against such persons on compulsion, or else they shall owe it themselves.

(43) Let the demarch inscribe this decree on a stone stele and place it in the sanctuary of Heracles in Akris in order that what the demesmen have decreed may be authoritative for ever [and may not] be abolished. Let Antiphanes, the priest of Heracles, see to it, jointly (with the demarch), that the stele be placed in the sanctuary before the sacrifice, in the archonship of Niketes. (49) For inscribing the stele, let the demarch give ten drachmas from the revenues of the god. Let this decree be authoritative from the archonship of Niketes, from the day in which the demesmen approve it by vote.

### *Commentary*

This set of decrees is presented in an inverse chronological order. The first is a decree honoring Philokomos and Moirokles, the proposer of the second decree and the person who has successfully brought the plan prescribed therein to fruition respectively. Philokomos, who proposed that the festival of Heracles in Akris, obviously a deme festival consisting of a public sacrifice, be funded by quarry revenues, is to be honored with a golden crown paid for by Moirokles, who himself receives an olive crown for his role.

The non-religious contents of the inscription have been amply discussed. The following points should be noted here.

Some of the juridical and civic questions, addressed by Coumanoudis and Gofas in their *commentaire juridique* (1978, 297–306), were dealt with by Whitehead 1986, especially 124 (the assembly's prohibition related to the demarch (lines 38–39), 157 (sureties), 164 (stipulation against other usage of the revenues), 169–170 (cult finance).



On the leasing of the quarries see Ampolo 1982 and cf. Osborne 1985, 103–107.

The discussion of questions relating to the *agora* of the demesmen (line 23), the election in the Theseion (obviously at Athens and not at Eleusis), and their relation to *Athenaion Politeia* 62.1 (Coumanoudis and Gofas 1978, 298–299) was expanded by the Roberts (BE 1979 no. 185), Osborne (1985, 77), and Whitehead.<sup>11</sup>

For prosopography, discussed by Coumanoudis and Gofas on pages 294–296, see also appropriate entries in Whitehead 1986, 424, 427, 428. The career of Moirokles was thoroughly studied by Ampolo 1981, 190–193, suggesting that the two persons referred to as Moirokles in *PA*<sup>12</sup> are in fact one person. This, however, remains questionable. For prosopography see further Koumanoudis and Matthaïou 1987, 17–18; Aleshire 1991, 245–246; Clinton 1994, 30–31. Of the various details known about Moirokles it is interesting to note here that the connection between stone quarries and cult may run in his family. His father, Euthydemos,<sup>13</sup> was a priest of Asclepius at Zea, where the cult appears to have benefited quarry revenues.<sup>14</sup>

The religious content of the inscription is unfortunately rather obscure. We hear of a sanctuary of Heracles in Akris, a priest (lines 43–49), and a festival, but the document is not interested in any of these in their own right but rather in financing the festival and the sacrifice to Heracles.<sup>15</sup> Practically no other evidence for the cult exists.

*Date.* The date is indicated by the archonship of Niketes.

### *Lines 8–9*

Coumanoudis and Gofas Ἡ[ρ]ο[ῶ]ς[λ]εῖα, to be found in all current editions, is attractive but does not agree with the remains on the stone. It should also be noted that in lines 32–33 below the festival is not referred to as Heracleia but rather as ἡ ἑορτὴ τοῦ Ἡρακλέως τοῦ ἐν

<sup>11</sup> 1986, 89–90, 116 n. 154, 268–270, 288–290. Whitehead suggests that the Eleusiniacs were in town for a meeting of their tribe.

<sup>12</sup> 5535 (son of Euthydemos) and 10400.

<sup>13</sup> *PA* 5533.

<sup>14</sup> *LSS* 11; *LSCG* 21 A 11–13 with commentary (cf. Part I pp. 63–64); Coumanoudis and Gofas 1978, 295; Ampolo 1981, 196 with n. 3, 199 with n. 1 (more skeptical as to the exact role Euthydemos played in directing the revenues to the cult). See also Ampolo 1982, 254; Rosivach 1994, 117–118. On the family, with ample bibliography, see Aleshire 1991, 244–246.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. on this problem Part I pp. 110–111.

Ἄκριδι: the festival of Heracles in Akris; in lines 5, 20, 26, 38, 49 it is simply referred to as the *sacri ce*. Van Straten (1979) suggested that the volute crater (or *lebes*) represented in the relief that separates the two decrees is distinctly connected to the cult of Heracles. It was used particularly in the οἰνιστήρια, a ceremony in which ephebes poured libations to Heracles upon cutting their long hair.<sup>16</sup> A relief (probably votive; Athens, National Archaeological Museum 1462) found in Eleusis in the late 1800s near the church of St. Zachary<sup>17</sup> depicts a reclining, drunken Herakles with a flute-playing satyr and various Herakles attributes on a tree and a rock formation or cliff in the background. Wolf (1998, 54–56) follows Tagalidou<sup>18</sup> in relating this relief to the sanctuary of Herakles in Akris, to be located in the vicinity of the *ndspots* of both the relief and the present stele, and suggests (1998, 84–85)<sup>19</sup> wine as the connection between the relief and the relief on the stele.

Heracles' connection with Eleusis is advocated by a number of literary sources, documenting his initiation there.<sup>20</sup> It is also supported by iconographical evidence. The literary evidence is discussed by H. Lloyd-Jones, *Heracles at Eleusis: P. Oxy. 2622 and PSI 1391, Maia* 19, 1967, 206–229. For discussion of the iconographical evidence see Clinton 1992, 68, 69, 81–84, (cf. 43, 89), with figures 20–21, 24, 30, 31, 33, 34.

Festivals of Heracles are documented elsewhere in Attica.<sup>21</sup> The most celebrated is perhaps the one at Cynosarges, involving *nothoi* (bastards and individuals without full citizen status) as *parasitoi*, i.e. Heracles' table mates.<sup>22</sup> Although it shares common elements, the cult of Heracles in

<sup>16</sup> van Straten 1979, 190 and see Woodford 1971, 214.

<sup>17</sup> Not far from the *ndspot* of the stele.

<sup>18</sup> E. Tagalidou, *Weihreliefs an Herakles aus klassischer Zeit* (SIMA-PB 99), Jönsered, 1993, 45 n. 187 (cited by Wolf 1998, 55 n. 25).

<sup>19</sup> Through a study of two red-figure vases with Heracles scenes.

<sup>20</sup> As most sources indicate, this initiation took place before Heracles' descent into Hades. See Eur. *HF* 610–613; Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.6 (on this passage see Clinton 1992, 69 n. 33); [Plato] *Axiochus* 371c; Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.5.12; Diod. Sic. 4.25.1: Ἐπαρήλθεν εἰς Ἀθήνας καὶ μετέσχε τῶν ἐν Ἐλευσίνι μυστηρίων, Μουσαίου τοῦ Ὀρφέως υἱοῦ τότε προεστηκότος τῆς τελετῆς (É he went to Athens and took part in the Eleusinian Mysteries, Musaeus son of Orpheus being in charge of the rite at that time. Cf., however, 4.14.3 where Demeter is said to have instituted the Lesser Mysteries for him); Plut. *Thes.* 30.5 (cf. 33.1). Cf. also Tzetzes *Chiliades* 2.396–397.

<sup>21</sup> See the detailed study by Woodford 1971, 215–225.

<sup>22</sup> Athenaeus 6.234d–f (= Polemon, *FHG* III 137–139 fr. 78); Woodford 1971, 215–216; Parke 1977, 51. Cf. below p. 200.

Attica tends to be diverse and to have local characteristics.<sup>23</sup> Comparative evidence may thus not yield much help in reconstructing the nature of the Eleusinian cult or Heracles' festival-cum-sacrifice. It may be fair to assume that it had a local significance, perhaps connected in part to the special relations between Heracles and Eleusis.

*Line 19*

Coumanoudis and Gofas suggested that the sanctuary of Heracles in Akris was located near the place where the stone had been found, close to the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore, perhaps on a hill. The word ἄκρως, ἰος (< ἄκρος), meaning a hill-top, height, is used several times in the *Odyssey*.<sup>24</sup> Accordingly, the Akris could be identified with the hill just above the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore.<sup>25</sup> Kevin Clinton pointed out to me that this hill, parts of which have been consumed by the local cement factory, has never been systematically excavated; the quarries at its northern side are evidently ancient.

*Lines 21–22*

Coumanoudis and Gofas suggest (1978, 293) that the main part of the decree starts here, that ἐ[πειδή] should be restored, and that some adverbial expression should follow. As is, the syntax is still somewhat awkward. Daux and Gauthier's ἐ[π[εὶ ἐκ προγό]ρων gives good sense but may be incompatible with the remains on the stone especially since the placement of the vertical stroke to the left of the omega suggests a iota.

*Line 38*

For *hieromnemones* cf. below commentary on 6 block 5 and on 26.27.

<sup>23</sup> Woodford 1971, 212. On Heracles in Attica cf. A. Verbanck-Pierrard, 'Heracles l'Athénien', in A. Verbanck-Pierrard and D. Viviers (eds.), *Culture et Cité: L'avènement d'Athènes à l'époque archaïque*, Bruxelles, 1995, 103–125.

<sup>24</sup> δι' ἄκρως 9. 400, 10.281, 14.2; ἐπ' ἄκρως 16.365.

<sup>25</sup> Coumanoudes and Gofas 1978, 296–297; cf. van Straten 1979, 190.

ATTICA. PHREARRHIOI. FRAGMENTARY  
SACRIFICIAL REGULATIONS. CA. 300–250 B.C.

(Figure 10)

Fragment of a white marble stele, said to have been found in southern Attica, south of the village of Olympos, between it and the village of Anavyssos. The stone is broken above, below, and on the right. Part of the left margin survives at the level of lines 16–23. Part of the rough-picked back survives. Despite signs of weathering, the inscribed face is fairly well preserved.

H. 0.0251, W. 0.226., Th. 0.098. L.H. ca. 0.005,  $\Omega$  and  $\Omega$  usually smaller, ca. 0.003. Stoichoi ca. 0.0085 (horizontal), 0.0082 (vertical). Left margin (lines 16–23) 0.017.

Athens, Epigraphical Museum. Inv. 13384.

Ed. Vanderpool 1970 (= SEG XXXV 113; Sokolowski 1971<sup>1</sup> = SEG XXXVI 206; Simms 1998); Lupu 2003a.

Cf. J. and L. Robert BE 1972 no. 150; Osborne 1985, 177; Parker 1984a; Whitehead 1986, esp. 79 n. 54, 205; Le Guen-Pollet 1991, 20; van Straten 1995, 127; Detienne 1996, 35;<sup>2</sup> Threatte, *GAI* I 41.03 no. 15 (pp. 491–492),<sup>3</sup> II 66.02221b (pp. 463–464);<sup>4</sup> Clinton 1996a, 122; Robertson 1996, 351 n. 93; 358.<sup>5</sup>

Photograph: Vanderpool 1970, pl. 15 (excellent).

---

<sup>1</sup> NB: In his *GRBS* article F. Sokolowski published a virtually complete restoration of this inscription. This was severely criticized by J. and L. Robert in BE 1972 no. 150, asserting that the line's length, estimated by Sokolowski to allow 35 letters, could not be established and that the restored text is often unintelligible. Unfortunately, Sokolowski provided neither a thorough account for his restorations nor a translation of his text. Although his restoration of the end of line 12 seems feasible and a line of 35 letters is therefore not altogether inconceivable, his conjectures are too extensive to be discussed here. The reader is advised to consult his article directly.

<sup>2</sup> See below n. 32.

<sup>3</sup> See commentary on lines 9–10 and 13.

<sup>4</sup> Date.

<sup>5</sup> On the Eleusinion.

ca. 300 250 a. ΣΤΟΙΧ.

- [. . .<sup>6</sup> . . . τῶν ἱε]ροποιῶν Ἀ[ ----- Δή]-  
 [μητρὶ Θεσμο]φόρῳι ὅν περ[ -----]  
 [. . .<sup>6</sup> . . . περ]οιστάντωσαν κα[ -----]  
 4 [. . .<sup>6</sup> . . .] . αδος τῷ λαμπαδεῖ[ωι -----]  
 [ἱερεῶσ]υνα κωλῆν πλευρὸν ἰ(σ)χ[ίον ----- οἱ ἱε]-  
 [ροποι]οὶ καὶ ὁ κῆρυξ δαινύσθωσ[αν -----]  
 [. . . Π]λούτωνι θυόντωνσαν κρ(ί)ο[ν ----- τοῖς]  
 8 [δημ]όταις μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ <sup>v</sup> [- -----]  
 [. . . τ]ὸν ἐν τῷ Ἐλευ(σ)ινίῳ βωμόγ [- ---- τῶν ἀκ]-  
 [ολ]ούθωμ ἱεροποιὸς ἀφιέτω ΤΑΣ[ -----]  
 [. . .]πειδὰν αἱ ἱερεῖαι ποιήσω[σι -----]  
 12 [. . .] Φρεα(ρ)ρίων θυόντωνσαν τῇ Δή[μητρὶ -----]  
 [. . .]ιω καὶ τῇ Κόρηι βοῦμ ἄρρε[να -----]  
 [. . .] καὶ ἐάν τι ἄλλο βούλωνται <sup>iv</sup> [- ----- νό]-  
 μι(μ)ὸν ἔστιν· ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς βωμοὺς [- -----]  
 16 Ἰ μηροὺς μασχαλίσματα ἡμίκ(ρ)α[ιραν ----- μ]-  
 ηροὺς μασχαλίσματα ἡμίκραιρ[αν -----]  
 ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ[ι ----- τῷ τ]-  
 οῦ Πλούτωνος βωμῷ ἱερεῶσυν[α -----]  
 20 οἷν τῶν βω(μ)ῶγ τῇ ἱερεῖα κα[ι ----- πλε]-  
 υρὸν ἰσχίον ΠΙ τοῦ ἱερέου [- ----- ξ]-  
 ὕλα ἐπὶ τὸν χύτρον παρρε[χ ----- ἐν τῇ]-  
 ι αὐλῇ τοῦ Ἐλευσινίου[υ -----]  
 24 ΥΣ<sup>2</sup>Ν δαῖδα καὶ τῶγ ΗΓ[- ----- δ]-  
 αῖδα διδόντωνσαν Γ[- -----]  
 [. . .] καὶ τοῦ Ἰάκχου Ι[- -----]

*Restorations.* 2 περ[οθυόντωνσαν κτλ] Sokolowski: περ[ωτοτόχον]? Simms vid. adn. || 3–15 Vanderpool || 3 κα[ι κτλ] Sokolowski || 4 in. [λαμ]βάδος (i.e. vulgo pro λαμπαδος) Sokolowski || 5 πλευρὸν ἰ(σ)χ[ίον - - -] Vanderpool: πλευρὸν ἰ(σ)χ[ίον - - -] vel ἰ(σ)χ[ίον - - -] Le Guen-Pollet; vid. adn. || 10 pro ἀφιέτω maluit Sokolowski αἰ(ρ)έτω. || 12–13 (Δήμητρὶ) [Θεσμο|φó|(ρ)οι Sokolowski: (Δήμητρὶ) [Φρεα|ρρ]ίωι? Simms; vid. adn. || 14 ita primum interpunxit Sokolowski. || 14–15 [θε]μ(τ)ὸν vel [νό]μ(μ)ον vel tale quid Vanderpool; cf. adn. || 16–17 ἡμίκραιραν Sokolowski: ἡμίκραιρα Vanderpool || 18–20 Vanderpool || 19–20 [τοῖν θε] | οἷν Vanderpool: [ἀπὸ ἀμφ] | οἷν Sokolowski; vid. adn. || 20 n. Sokolowski || 21–29 Vanderpool || 22 παρρε[χόντωνσαν κτλ] Sokolowski; vid. adn. || 24 τῶν Vanderpool (cf. adn. epigr.): τῷ Sokolowski

[. .]ΟΙ[.] τῇ δὲ ἐβδό[μ]ηι - - - - -]  
 28 [. . .] καὶ τῆς μουσι[κ]ῆς - - - - -]  
 [. . .<sup>5</sup> . .] τὸν βομ[όν] - - - - -]  
 [. . .<sup>6</sup> . . .]ΕΝΟΙ[ - - - - -]  
 [. . .<sup>7</sup> . . .]ΕΜΙ[ - - - - -]  
 32 [. . . . .<sup>8</sup> . .]Ο[ - - - - -]  
 - - - - -

*Restorations.* 27 τῇ δὲ ἐβδό[μ]ηι ἐπὶ δέκα] Simms. || Sokolowski (1971) titulum ita restituit (= SEG XXXVI 206): ΣΤΟΙΧ. 35(?) - - - [- - τῶν ἱε]ροποιῶν α[. . . . .<sup>10</sup> . . . τῇ Δή]μητρι Θεσμο|φόροι ὅν προ|θυόντωνσαν καὶ τῆς | ἐορτῆς προ|ριστάντωνσαν κα[ὶ παρεχόντωνσαν μ|ετὰ λαμπ]άδος τῷ λαμπαδεῖ[ωι λύχ]ονος· τάδε ||<sup>5</sup> ἱερε[ώ]σ]υνα· κωλῆν, πλευρόν, ἰ(σ)χ[ί]ον, Π· οἱ δὲ ἱε|ροποι|οὶ καὶ ὁ κῆρυξ δαινύσθω[σαν· ὁμοίως δὲ | τῷ Π]λούτωνι θυόντωνσαν κρ[ί]ον ἢ οἶν· τοῖς δὲ | δημ]όταις μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ <sup>v</sup> [τὰ τιθέμενα ἐ|πὶ τ]ὸν ἐν τῷ Ἑλευ(σ)ινίωι βομόν· [ὁ δ' αὐτοῖς ἀκ||<sup>10</sup>ολ]ουθῶμι ἱεροποιὸς ἀφιέτω (vel potius αἰ(ρ)έτω: 1971, 219) τὰς [αὐτοῦ μερίδ]ας· ἐ]πειδὰν αἱ ἱέρειαι ποιήσω[σι τὰ ἱερά τὰ τ|ὼν] Φρεα(ρ)ρίων θυόντωνσαν τῇ Δή[μητρι Θεσμο|φό](ρ)οι καὶ τῇ Κόρηι βοῦμι ἄρρε[να καὶ πρόβατ|ον] καὶ ἂν τι ἄλλο βούλωνται <sup>w</sup> [καὶ θῦειν νό]||<sup>15</sup>μ(μ)όν ἐστιν ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς βομὸν[ς παρατιθέν]α||ι μηρούς, μασχαλίσματα, ἡμίκ(ρ)α[ί]ραν, σάρκα, μ|ι]ηρούς, μασχαλίσματα, ἡμίχραιρ[αν, κρέα, τὰ δὲ] |ἐπὶ τοῦ βομοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἑλευσινίωι, τὰ ἐπὶ τῷ τ|οῦ Πλούτωνος βομῶν· ἱερεῶσυν[α τάδε ἀπὸ ἀμφ]||<sup>20</sup>οῖν τῶν βο(μ)ῶν τῇ ἱερείᾳ κα[ὶ τῷ ἱερεῖ· πλε|]υρόν, ἰσχίον, ΠΙ τοῦ ἱερείου [ἐκάστου πρὸς ξ|]ύλα ἐπὶ τὸν χύτρον· παρε[χόντωνσαν δὲ πρὸς τῇ]ι αὐλῇ τοῦ Ἑλευσινίου[ν εἰς ἀνάθεμα περιχρ|]ύσ[η]ν δάδα καὶ τῷ ΠΙΕ[. . . . .<sup>14</sup> . . . . . τὴν δ]||<sup>25</sup>αἶδα διδόντωνσαν Γ[. . . . .<sup>9</sup> . . . . . ὁ δὲ τῆς Σεμέλ[ι]ης καὶ τοῦ Ἰάκχου ἱερεῦς προκρινέτω τράγο|ν ἢ] οἷ[ν]· τῇ δὲ ἐβδό[μ]ηι τιθέντων τὸν τῆς χορε[ί]ας καὶ μουσι[κ]ῆς ἀγῶνα - - - | . πρὸς τὸν βομ[όν] τοῦ Διονύσου - - - ||<sup>30</sup>μελ[όμ]ενοι [τὸν θεὸν - - - | . . . . .<sup>7</sup> . . .]εμ[ - - ] - - -

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have seen the stone. Θ identical with Ο; the two bracketed rhos in lines 12 and 16 lack a loop; some letter spaces were left empty, presumably to be painted.

- 2 φ: I could not verify the loop. Vanderpool does not dot this letter.
- 3 φ: Only traces of the upper right part survive. End: α: a lower part of a diagonal stroke.
- 4 Beginning: Before the alpha Vanderpool saw traces of a rounded letter: Θ or Ο.
- 5 End: Ι<sup>x</sup>.
- 7 End: KP <sup>w</sup>.
- 9 <σ>: One vacant space on the stone; end: γ: only the lower part of the left vertical stroke survives.
- 12 End: η: only the left vertical seems secure.
- 15 End: the third stroke of the sigma survives.
- 20 <μ>: One vacant space on the stone.
- 22 End: α: perhaps a part of a diagonal stroke; ε: Ι.
- 24 The last ν looks more like a left part of Υ (which would give no sense). Iota (i.e. τῷ) might not be excluded. Sokolowski's reading ΠΙΕ for ΗΓ on the basis of the photograph is unwarranted.
- 25 The last letter appears to be a gamma.
- 28–32 The stoichedon order is somewhat interrupted.
- 28 ι: Faint traces at the top of the stoichos.
- 32 Only the upper part of the letter survives.

*Translation*

[- - -] of [the] *hieropoioi* [- - -] (2) a sow to [Demeter Thesmo]phoros [- - -] (3) [- - -] they shall set before [- - -] (4) [- - -] the torch holder [- - -] (5) The priestly prerogatives are: the ham, the side/rib, the ischium [- - -] (6) [- - -] The [*hieropoioi*] and the herald shall eat [- - -] (7) [- - -] They shall sacrifice [a ram] to Plouton[- - -] (8) for(?) [the demesmen] together with others and [- - -] (9) [- - -] the altar at the Eleusinion [- - -] (10) of(?) [the attendants] the *hieropoios* shall give up [- - -] (11) [- - -] Once the priestesses made [- - -] (12) [- - -] of the Phrearrhians(?), they shall sacrifice to Demeter [- - -] (13) [- - -] and to Kore a male bovine [- - -] (14) [- - -] and if they wish something else [- - -] (15) it is [allowed]. But/And (δέ) upon(?) the altars [- - -] (16) thighs, pieces cut off from the shoulders, half the head [- - -] (17) thighs, pieces cut off from the shoulders, half the head [- - -] (18) on the altar at the Eleusinion [- - -] (19) altar of Plouton. The priestly prerogatives are: [- - -] (20) [- - -] of(?) the altars for(?) the priestess [- - -] (21) the side/rib, the ischium, three obols, of(?)<sup>6</sup> the victim [- - -] (22) [provide?] wood for(?) the pot [- - -] (23) [in] the court of the Eleusinion [- - -] (24) [- - -] a rebrand and of the [- - -] (25) They shall give a rebrand [- - -] (26) [- - -] and of Iacchus [- - -] (27)[- - -] on (?) the seventh [- - -] (28) [- - -] and of music [- - -] (29) [- - -] the altar [- - -]

*Commentary*

This set of regulations concerned with the cult of the Eleusinian gods, Demeter, Kore, Plouton, and Iacchus alongside, so it seems, Demeter Thesmophoros, was attributed by Vanderpool to the deme Phrearrhioi mentioned in line 12.<sup>7</sup> Vanderpool understood that the reference here is to a local cult. Thus the Eleusinion (lines 9 and 18) would be the deme's Eleusinion and not the city Eleusinion in Athens.<sup>8</sup> Sokolowski (1971, 218–219) followed Vanderpool in assuming a local cult. He added that we have here prescriptions for a Phrearrrian celebration of the Thesmophoria. Osborne suggested that we may be concerned here not

<sup>6</sup> Or: for; see below commentary on lines 21–22.

<sup>7</sup> For the identification of the deme and its geographical location see Vanderpool 1970, 48, 52–53.

<sup>8</sup> Vanderpool 1970, 49.

with a deme decree but with regulations for a local Eleusinion.<sup>9</sup> Simms argued (1998, 101–106) for the city Eleusinion<sup>10</sup> as the location and for the ἱερεῖα δεῦρο and the Epidauria as the events. Clinton (1996a, 122) identified here a sacrifice to Demeter Thesmophoros in an Eleusinion.

It seems clear that these regulations govern the performance of public cult, most likely during a celebration of a festival involving Eleusinian gods and Demeter Thesmophoros. The document itself is, however, too fragmentary to allow exact identification of the particular occasion with which it is concerned.

*Date.* For the date, based largely on the endings of the imperative, see Vanderpool 1970, 47; cf. Threatte, *GAI* II 66.02221b (pp. 463–464). Simms (1998, 93) favored a slightly earlier date, ca. 300 B.C.

*Line 1*

On deme *hieropoioi* see Whitehead 1986, 142–143.

*Line 2*

Pig (or rather χοῖρος, piglet) is a customary sacrifice in both the Thesmophoria and the Eleusinian mysteries.<sup>11</sup> As Sokolowski (1971, 219) noted, the pig sacrifice here might be considered an introductory sacrifice. Preliminary sense may be hinted at by [πρ]οστάντωσαν (line 3); Sokolowski's conjecture ἔν πρ[οθυόντωσαν] might therefore be right. Simms πρ[ωτοτόκον] makes good sense but currently available evidence does not suggest that this word was a part of the Athenian sacrificial vocabulary.

*Line 4*

Α λαμπαδεῖον is attested in two temple inventories from Eleusis.<sup>12</sup> Cf. also δαίς in lines 24–25 below. Torches have close connections to Deme-

<sup>9</sup> Osborne 1985, 177 and note 39 (p. 251). Cf. Simms 1998, 93.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Robertson 1996, 351 n. 93.

<sup>11</sup> See Burkert 1985, 242–245, 286; idem 1983, 256–264; Parke 1977, 62–63, 83–84, 159–160; also M. Detienne, 'The Violence of Wellborn Ladies: Women in the Thesmophoria', in Detienne and Vernant 1989, 129–147; Jameson 1988, 98–99; C. Rolley, *BCH* 89, 1965, 470–471 (gurines found at the Thesmophorion in Thasos with reference to other sites). On piglets, the Mysteries and the Thesmophoria at Eleusis see Clinton 1988 and 1993, 113, 118. On pig sacrifice for Demeter and in general see above all idem forthcoming.

<sup>12</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1541.15 and 1543.16.



ter and Kore both in cult practice and in myth.<sup>13</sup> They are also a trademark of their associate, Hecate.<sup>14</sup>

*Line 5*

Τὰ ἱερε(ι)ώσυνα or ἱερώσυνα<sup>15</sup> are the priestly prerogatives for the sacrifici ces.<sup>16</sup> Although money is sometimes included (e.g. *LSCG* 19; 28) or even featured exclusively (notably in *LSCG* 20),<sup>17</sup> these prerogatives usually comprise specific parts of the victim. Among these the victim's thigh or leg and its skin are customary,<sup>18</sup> but even ears may be included.<sup>19</sup> This sense of the word is clear from usages such as in *LSCG* 19.4 5. It is also supported by the lexicographers.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, in Phrynichus the word is said to denote parts of the victim chosen for the gods.<sup>21</sup> This may be the sense of the word in Amipsias, *Connus* fr. 7.<sup>22</sup> The confusion between these two meanings is probably due to the

<sup>13</sup> See accounts of the Eleusinian festival in Burkert 1985, 285–290 esp. 288; Parke 1977, 55–72; Clinton 1993. Also Parke 1977, 87 with note 97 (Thesmophoria); Burkert 1983, 267–268 n. 16, 275–277, 279, 281 with note 34.

<sup>14</sup> See Burkert 1985, 222 with notes 59–60; Detienne in Detienne and Vernant 1989, 134 with note 42; Clinton 1992, 112, 118 with ss. 74–76. Cf. also Deubner 1932, 44 with plate 2 and *contra* E. Simon, *Festivals of Attica: An Archaeological Commentary*, Madison, 1983, 20 with note 12.

<sup>15</sup> For spelling variations see LSJ under ἱερώσυνος, η, ον; Puttkammer 1912, 2 n. 3; Threatte, *GAI* II 7.03, 3d (p. 154).

<sup>16</sup> On priestly prerogatives and portions see Puttkammer 1912, 1–16; Gill 1991, 15–19; Le Guen-Pollet 1991; van Straten 1995, 154–155; cf. Sokolowski 1954; Kadletz 1981; Debord 1982, 68–70; below commentary on 20.7. For interesting Near-Eastern parallels cf. the Punic inscriptions known as the Marseilles and Carthage Tariffs (see below Appendix A). See also Lev. 7: 8–9, 31–32, Deut. 18: 3; cf. Jenson in Beckwith and Selman 1995, 26; see in general Sch rer 1979, 257–274, esp. 259–261. Following Deut. 18: 3 strictly, Samaritan priests are given the front leg of each victim offered during the Passover sacrifice still today.

<sup>17</sup> For money in priestly prerogatives (ἱερε(ι)ώσυνα appears alongside ἀπόμετρα) in Classical Athens see Loomis 1998, 76–87, 273–275.

<sup>18</sup> Puttkammer 1912, 7–8; for the skin cf. below commentary on 20.7.

<sup>19</sup> *LSCG* 19.5 7; 151 A 61. For other parts see especially works by Puttkammer and Le Guen-Pollet cited above note 11.

<sup>20</sup> Hesych. s.v. ἱερώσυνα: τὰ τῷ ἱερεῖ διδόμενα ἱερεῖα (the (parts of the) victims given to the priest); *ΑΕΞΕΙΣ ΠΗΤΟΠΙΚΑΙ* (Bekker *Anecdota Graeca*, I 266.7): ἱερώσυνα: τὰ εἰωθότα δίδοσθαι ἑξαίρετα τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἱερωσύνης (what is customarily chosen and given to the priests on account of their priesthood); the versions in Photius and the *Etym. Magn.* are more or less identical with this.

<sup>21</sup> Phryn. *PS* (p. 77.5 von Borries): ἱερώσυνα: τὰ τοῖς θεοῖς ἑξαίρουμένα μέρη καὶ θυμώμενα (parts chosen and burnt for the gods).

<sup>22</sup> *PCG* II note ad loc.; see Puttkammer 1912, 25, but cf. van Straten 1995, 154; cf. also Gill 1991, 16–17.

fact that in practice priests were commonly entitled to divine portions as well as to priestly ones.<sup>23</sup>

In *LSCG* 28.4, 9 11, 19, 23 (*SEG* XLVI 173; cf. also *LSCG* 29.8), the parts intended for the cult table are κωλή, πλευρὸν ἰσχίου, and ἡμίκραια χορδῆς. The term πλευρὸν ἰσχίου denotes here one part. Its exact identification is difficult.<sup>24</sup> Although attractive, Le Guen-Pollet's (1991, 20) conjecture πλευρὸν ἰ(σ)χ[ίου] is rebuffed by [πλε]υρὸν ἰσχίον lines 21–22.

#### Line 6

On the κῆρυξ (herald) in Attic demes see Whitehead 1986, 141–142; at Eleusis see Clinton 1974, especially 79–81.

#### Line 7

Plouton was a common cult name for Hades.<sup>25</sup> On the complexity of the equation Plouton-Hades see Clinton 1992, 59–63. Worshipped also under such titles as Zeus Eubuleus, related to Zeus Chthonios,<sup>26</sup> Plouton is closely connected to the cult of Demeter and Kore. He had a special importance at Eleusis where he had his own priestess.<sup>27</sup> In art he is often represented holding a cornucopia.<sup>28</sup> Hesiod advises the farmer to pray to Zeus Chthonios and Demeter.<sup>29</sup> An inscription from Paros mentions Zeus Eubuleus together with Hera, Demeter Thesmophoros, Kore, and Baubo.<sup>30</sup>

#### Line 8

For possible implications of the phrase [τοῖς δημ]όταις μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων for the question of outsiders in deme cult see Whitehead 1986, 205–206.

<sup>23</sup> Puttkammer 1912, 17; Gill 1991, 15–19; Le Guen-Pollet 1991, 16–17; van Straten 1995, 154–155.

<sup>24</sup> See Ziehen, *LGS* II p. 81; Le Guen-Pollet 1991, 19–20.

<sup>25</sup> Nilsson *GGR* I<sup>2</sup> 452–453; 471; Clinton 1992, 105.

<sup>26</sup> M.P. Nilsson, *Die eleusinischen Gottheiten*, *Opuscula Selecta* II, Lund, 1952, 542–623, at 554; Clinton 1992, 60. For a list of titles see Farnell 1896–1909, III, references on pp. 367–368.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. *LSCG* 7 B with Dow and Healey 1965, 35–37; Clinton 1974, 97; Nilsson *GGR* I<sup>3</sup> 471. On the location of his sanctuary, the Ploutonion, see Clinton 1992, 18–21; 1993, 118; and 1996a, 123.

<sup>28</sup> E.g. Farnell 1896–1909, III pl. VIIIa (facing p. 226), pl. XXXIIa (facing p. 287) = Nilsson *GGR* I<sup>3</sup> pl. 42a. For a thorough treatment see Clinton 1992, 105–113.

<sup>29</sup> *Op.* 465 and see note ad loc. in West's commentary pp. 275–276.

<sup>30</sup> *IG* XII 5, 227. On Zeus Eubuleus and the Thesmophoria see also M.P. Nilsson, *Die eleusinischen Gottheiten*, (above n. 26) esp. 553–554.

*Lines 9–10*

For the Eleusinion see introductory remarks.

[ἀκ|ολ]ούθωμ: Both here and in in βοῦμ (line 13) the nal μ might be an error. See Threatte, *GAI* I 41.03 (pp. 491–492).

*Lines 12–13*

Sokolowski's (Δήμητρι) [Θεσμο|φó|ϑ]ωι makes sense and fits the context; it appears to me preferable to Simms' tentative and sparsely documented (Δήμητρι) [Φρεα|ρε]ίωι.

*Line 13*

βοῦμ: Threatte (*GAI* I 41.03 no. 15 (p. 492)) notes that the mu is a copying error.

On bovine sacrifice at Eleusis see Burkert 1983, 292; idem 1985, 288–289; Clinton 1988, 71, 78; idem 1993, 119.

*Lines 14–15*

It is difficult to choose between Vanderpool's [θε]μ(τ)όν and [νό]μ(μ)ον. For νόμμον cf., however, the contemporary *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1214.17.

*Line 15*

Considering the particle δέ, Sokolowski's semicolon seems to be required.

*Lines 16–17*

As Vanderpool has noted (1970, 49), this is the only attestation of the word *μασχαλίσματα* in its secondary sense, except in the lexicographers. The entry in the *Suda* reads (s.v.):

(Μασχαλίσματα· Ἐ ) σημαίνει δὲ ἡ λέξις καὶ τὰ τοῖς μηροῖς ἐπιτιθέμενα ἀπὸ τῶν ὤμων κρέα ἐν ταῖς τῶν θεῶν θυσίαις.<sup>31</sup>

The word also denotes the flesh from the shoulders which is placed on the thighs at the sacrifices of the gods.

The reference to thighs is striking, as thighs, likely thighbones, are mentioned together with the *μασχαλίσματα* in the present inscription. It is also noteworthy, as Parker (1984) and van Straten (1995, 127) observed, that in this meaning, the word *μασχαλίσματα* refers to a

<sup>31</sup> The versions in Hesychius and Photius are practically the same; all of them ultimately go back to Aristophanes of Byzantium fr. 412 Slater (fr. 78 p. 221 Nauck).

practice somewhat similar to the one expressed by the verb ὠμοθετέω in Homer, i.e. placing pieces of raw meat cut off from all the limbs of the animal, again on the thighbones, which are then burnt on the altar. *Od.* 14.427–428 reads:

ὁ δ' ὠμοθετεῖτο σὺβώτης,  
πάντων ἀρχόμενος μελέων, ἐς πίονα δημόν.

And the swineherd placed pieces of raw flesh on the rich fat cutting them off from all the limbs.<sup>32</sup>

Parker and van Straten (*ibid.*) have likewise suggested that the lexicographical reference to shoulder(s) (ὤμος) might be ascribed to a confusion between ὠμός (raw) and ὤμος (shoulder). Indeed, Eustathius (134.35) states that there were those who derived the verb ὠμοθετεῖν from ὠμός (raw) rather than from ὤμος (shoulder).<sup>33</sup> I have suggested elsewhere (2003a) that there might, in fact, be no confusion: the shoulder and the armpit (μασχάλη) of the sacrificial animal could, from a culinary point of view, be seen as two parts of the same cut, an approximate parallel to the chuck, including both the blade meat and the upper portion of the arm<sup>34</sup> (hence armpit)<sup>35</sup> as well as neck meat.<sup>36</sup> The offering which had been named after the armpit was explained by the lexicographers with a reference to the shoulders. In reality both are parts of the same cut.

The offering expressed by ὠμοθετεῖν is commonly taken as a first fruits offering (cf. Eustathius 134.30), that is, small bits of meat are offered to the god and burnt on the altar, in the course of what is otherwise an eaten sacrifice where the victim is consumed. Similar offerings are attested elsewhere in Homer. In *Il.* 9.219 the pieces of the victim's meat are referred to as θυηλαί. The word ἄργματα is used later

<sup>32</sup> Cf. *Il.* 1.460–462, 2.424; *Od.* 3.458, 12.361. Cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus 7.15, 17. On the practice see also Burkert 1983, 6 with note 25; 1985, 57. On μασχαλίσματα cf. Detienne 1996, 34–35. On the sacrifice of Eumaeus see Petropoulou 1987.

<sup>33</sup> Considering that the passage quoted from the *Odyssey* clearly shows that ὠμοθετεῖν consisted in cutting pieces from all limbs, this derivation seems wrong.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. LSJ s.v. ὤμος: the shoulder with the upper arm.

<sup>35</sup> The armpit, μασχάλη, may in turn provide the link between the meaning of μασχαλίσματα discussed here and the other meaning of the word, referring to a custom practiced by ancient murderers consisting in cutting off their victim's extremities and tying these on a string under the victim's armpit. See *Suda* s.v. μασχαλισθῆναι and μασχαλίσματα; *Ehym. Magn.* s.v. ἀπάσματα etc.; Parker 1984; above all G.L. Kittredge, Arm-Pitting among the Greeks, *AJP* 6, 1885, 151–169.

<sup>36</sup> See (e.g.) *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* s.v. Beef. Cf. I.S. Rombauer and M. Rombauer Becker, *The Joy of Cooking*, Indianapolis, 1967, 391.

in the scene from *Od.* 14 (line 446) discussed above; A. Petropoulou<sup>37</sup> suggested that the ἄργματα, offered at the beginning of the meal, ought to be taken from the portions of meat already roasted and distributed. I have suggested (2003a) that comparison with the Homeric passages suggests that the offering of *maschalismata* should be understood as a first-fruit offering where, although the victim would be consumed, small pieces of its meat would, nevertheless, be offered to the god and burnt on the altar.

The actual destruction of meat is probably connected to the character of the divinities involved, who are clearly concerned with agricultural fertility and wealth. Cf. the several cases of destruction of meat in 27 A below (including firstlings in lines 15–16, 19) in sacrifices to divinities of possibly similar character.

For ἡμίχραιρα see below commentary on 20.19; cf. above commentary on line 5. As for the repetition, this may not necessarily be dittography as Sokolowski noted (1971, 219). Altars in the plural are mentioned in line 15 and two altars may be referred to here. Lack of sentence connectives and the fragmentary state of the text allow, however, little certainty.

#### Lines 19–20

Without sufficient context, Vanderpool's [τοῖν θεῖ]|οῖν cannot be ascertained. Sokolowski's ἱερεῶσιν[α τάδε ἀπὸ ἁμφ]|οῖν τῶν βο(μ)ῶν τῇ ἱερείᾳ καὶ τῷ ἱερεῖ<sup>38</sup> could make sense; good attestations for such a phrase as ἱερεῶσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ/τῶν βομοῦ/ῶν are desirable, however. Ἄμφοιν τῶν βομῶν for ἁμφοῖν τοῖν βομοῖν is matched by ἁμφοῖν τῶν γονέων in the much later *SEG XIX* 127 II 66 (A.D. 174/5). For a more contemporary example see Aristotle *APr* 61a 23.

#### Line 21

For ἱερεῖον see below commentary on 27 B 10.

<sup>37</sup> 1987, esp. 139, 143, 146, 148. The word appears to be now echoed in the ἀπάγματα of the *theoxenia* ritual of the law from Selinus, 27 A 19 below. Cf. Lupu 2003a, 75–76 n. 23. Note, however, that while the *theoxenia* offerings would be destroyed, the sacrifice as a whole would involve consumption of the victim's meat by human participants.

<sup>38</sup> These (are the) priestly prerogatives for the priestess and the priest from both altars (if I understand correctly).

*Lines 21–22*

On wood see Gill 1991, 17. Wood, i.e. rewood, is likely to form here a part of the items due to the priestess.<sup>39</sup> Ξύλα ἐπὶ τὸν βωμόν (wood for the altar) is mentioned in *LSCG* 7 B 25 (Dow and Healey 1965) among items to be purchased with the ἀπόμετρα (money given to priests for cultic expenses). The exact same phrase occurs in *LSS* 19.92.<sup>40</sup> The text here seems to have a similar sense: wood for the pot could indicate a requirement to supply the priestess with wood which would be used for re to boil water inside the pot where meat would be cooked.<sup>41</sup>

It is interesting to note that, following the building of the second temple in Jerusalem, supplying wood for the altar was established as a public service: Concerning the offering of wood, we cast lots for the priests, the Levites, and the people to bring it to the house of our Lord, the house of our forefathers, on appointed times each year (Nehemia 10:35). See Sch rer 1979, 273.

*Line 22*

παρε[χ - -]: Although it seems clear that some form of παρέχω ought to be restored here, and Sokolowski's παρε[χόντωσαν] may be correct, the fragmentary state of the text might not preclude an imperative in nitive.

*Line 26*

On Iacchus, a companion of the Eleusinian goddesses, see Burkert 1983, 279 with notes and 1985, 287–288; Clinton 1992, especially 64–71 and 1993, 119. His name might have originated from the cultic cry

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Σχίζαι: *LSCG* 55.11; *LSS* 22.7 (see below n. 36). Ξύλα: *LSCG* 7 B 25; 17 A b 6; 96.18; cf. 177.39; *LSS* 7.5; 19.86–92 *passim*. Φρύγανα: *LSCG* 2 A 2, 8–9, B 6, D 5–6; 28 (*SEG* XLVI) 2–8 *passim*, 22; 151 C 13–14.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. *LSCG* 55.10–11 ἔλαιον | ἐπὶ βωμόν (oil for the altar).

<sup>41</sup> Simms (1998, 100) suggests that what we have here is a stipulation requiring some official to place money for(?) wood on the *klytros*. Sokolowski (1971) restored III τοῦ ἱερείου [ἐκλάστου πρὸς ξ]|ύλα ἐπὶ τὸν χύτρον i.e. three obols for each victim for wood for(?) the pot. I assume that he had in mind something like *LSS* 22 from Epidauros (cf. below commentary on 13.4), instructing the priest to collect sums of money from worshippers for wood used for the sacrifice of a full-grown or a suckling victim respectively. If this is correct, the money here would probably be still used, as at Epidauros, to reimburse the priestess for the purchase of wood for (cooking in) the pot rather than be placed on it.

Ἰακχ' ὦ Ἰακχε shouted during the procession from Athens to Eleusis during the Eleusinian festival.<sup>42</sup>

*Line 27*

Any restoration of the date, such as Simms τῇ δὲ ἑβδό[μῃ ἐπὶ δέκα], depends upon exact identification of the event(s) in question; cf. above, introductory remarks.

*Line 28*

The importance of music and dance in civic sacrifices is emphasized in Plato, *Leg.* 799a-b. Plato's discussion, utopian as it may be, is still based on actual precedents; see Demosthenes, *Meid.* (21) 51–52.<sup>43</sup> On music at sacrifices see also G.C. Nordquist, 'Some Notes on Musicians in Greek Cult', in R. Hagg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence* (ActaAth-8° 13), Stockholm, 1994 81–93.

---

<sup>42</sup> Parke 1977, 65; Burkert 1983, 30 n. 2; Clinton 1992, 65. Clinton, 1992 67, n. 25, points out that Σεμελή' Ἰακχε πλουτοδότα (son of Semele, Iacchus, giver of wealth) of the Lenaia (Schol. Ar. *Ran.* 479c) does not mean that Iacchus was equated with Dionysus but rather that Dionysus is evoked here under two different epithets.

<sup>43</sup> Rudhardt 1992, 181.

ATTICA. MARATHON. CAVE OF PAN. DEDICATION  
TO PAN WITH A PROHIBITION. 61/60 B.C.

(Figure 11)

The upper part of a small stele of Pentelic marble. It is broken below but otherwise there is no damage to the inscribed face. The stele has a pediment which is broken at the top. Parts of two acroteria survive at the corners of the pediment. The back is smooth-picked and has been worked with a claw chisel. The stone was found during the excavations of the cave of Pan in 1958.

H. 0.22, W. 0.207 (0.229 at the base of the pediment), Th. 0.044. L.H. 0.01 0.012; Ω 0.005 0.006; Φ 0.015. Interlinear space 0.002 0.004.

Vrana. Marathon Museum. Inv. Λ 231.

Ed. Petrakos 1987, 305 306 n. 30; (= SEG XXXVI 267); Petrakos 1993, 69 70; Petrakos 1996, 88 90;<sup>1</sup> Lupu 2001.

Photograph: Petrakos 1993, 70; Petrakos 1996, 90, g 37 (excellent).

61/60 a.

Ἀγαθὴ τύχη ἐπὶ Θεοῦ<sup>v</sup>-  
φήμου ἄρχοντος<sup>v v v</sup>  
Πυθαγόρας καὶ Σωσι<sup>v</sup>-  
4 κράτης καὶ Λύσανδρος  
οἱ συνέφηβοι Πανὶ καὶ  
Νύμφαις ἀνέθηκαν. {α}  
Ἀπαγορεύει ὁ θεὸς μὴ  
8 [εἰ]σφέρειν χρωμάτιν[ον]  
[μ]ηδὲ βαπτὸν μηδὲ Δ[. .]  
[<sup>ca. 5-6</sup>. . . .]ΕΙΣΠ[<sup>ca. 7-8</sup>. . . .]  
-----

*Restorations.* Suppl. P. || **6** n. A: secl. P, *SEG* || **9-10** λ[εγ|νωτόν]; εἰσπ[ορεύει<sup>v</sup> | θα - -  
-] L., illud magna, hoc aliqua cum dubitatione; vid. adn.

<sup>1</sup> Adapted from the author's 1993 article.



*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have seen the stone. The letters seem somewhat crowded; Alpha with a broken crossbar; smaller, suspended omega; some serifs. The line's length seems to be fixed at sixteen letters, allowing up to eighteen letters with several iotas. Syllabic division is apparently observed (see lines 1 and 3). An obvious attempt to divide the dedication from the actual law may account for the superfluous alpha at the end of line 6: the letter-cutter appears to have started inscribing the first word of the law only to realize his mistake and start again without erasing the alpha.

**6** Νύμφαις *sic*.

**10** In the first break there is room for five letters or six including a iota; in the second there is room for seven letters or eight including a iota. If εἰσπορεύεσθαι is correct, syllabic division requires the letters to be disposed on the stone with a vacant space at the end of this line.

### *Translation*

Good Luck. In the archonship of Theophemos, the fellow ephebes Pythagoras, Sosikrates, and Lysandros dedicated (this stele) to Pan and the Nymphs. (7) The god forbids to carry in either colored (garments) or dyed (garments) or [- -]

### *Commentary*

This inscription belongs to a group of sacred laws which regulate entry to sanctuaries by listing, at times alongside cathartic requirements (for these see 7 below), items which are forbidden inside.<sup>2</sup> Garments of certain materials may be prohibited, as may makeup or items such as footwear or jewelry. See *LSCG* 68.1 11; 124.17 18; 136.25 26; *LSS* 32.1 2; 33 A 1 8; 56.2; 91.7 10; *LSAM* 6.4 7; 14.9 11; cf. 35.5; 84.10; *SEG* XXXVI 1221.1 11;<sup>3</sup> cf. *LSCG* 65.15 27.

*Date.* The date is indicated by the archonship of Theophemos.

### *The Findspot, the Cult, the Dedicators, and the Dedication*

The cave where the inscription was found was discovered late in 1958;<sup>4</sup> subsequent small-scale excavations led the excavator I. Papadimitriou

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Part I pp. 16 17.

<sup>3</sup> Cited above Part I p. 16. For *LSAM* 35 see 15 16.

<sup>4</sup> Report in *Ergon* 1958, 15 22. On the discovery see Petrakos 1993, 67 68 who adds (cf. 1996, 86) that the cave had been evidently known in the nineteenth century.

to identify it, no doubt correctly, with the cave of Pan described by Pausanias (1.32.7).<sup>5</sup> It is located about three kilometers west of the modern village of Marathon on the north slope of a hill which in antiquity was the acropolis of the deme Oenoe, one of the four members of the Marathonian Tetrapolis.<sup>6</sup>

Pan's relationship with the nymphs, frequently worshipped together with him in caves, is asserted by the god himself in Menander's *Dyskolos* 36–37. The cult of Pan in Attica is archaeologically documented from around the beginning of the fifth century B.C.,<sup>7</sup> corresponding on the whole to Herodotus' report (6.105) relating Pan's arrival in Attica to the battle of Marathon. The cult of Pan and the nymphs at the Marathon cave seems to have started around this date: although remains suggest human activity from the Neolithic era onwards, the evidence for cult dates to the Classical and Roman periods.<sup>8</sup>

Ephebic activity in the cave is probably linked to Pan's affinities to the battle of Marathon<sup>9</sup> and to the role the commemoration of the Persian Wars played in the ephebic curriculum.<sup>10</sup> The three ephebes<sup>11</sup> are unlikely to have formulated the law; their dedication consisted rather in inscribing and setting up a stone bearing regulations representing a local custom.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>5</sup> See *Ergon* 1958, 16–17 with photographs; J.M. Wickens, *The Archaeology and History of Cave Use in Attica, Greece from Prehistoric through Late Roman Times*, Dissertation, Indiana University, 1986, II, 230–231; Petrakos 1996, 86–88 (idem 1993, 69); Lupu 2001, 119 with further bibliography.

<sup>6</sup> *Ergon* 1958, 15; Wickens *ibid.* II, 224; Petrakos 1996, 86 (cf. 1993, 69). For a map see Petrakos 1996, 4–5, g. 1.

<sup>7</sup> See Wickens *ibid.* I, 170; Parker 1996, 164 with n. 38. For a possible cultic use of Pan-Nymph caves in the Archaic period see Wickens *ibid.* I, 166–167, 173. On their cult in Attica down to late antiquity see *ibid.* esp. I, 168–186, 197–200, 205–208, 210–214. Cf. also P. Borgeaud, *The Cult of Pan in Ancient Greece*, Trans. K. Atlass and J. Redfield, Chicago and London, 1988 (French original 1979), esp. 133–156.

<sup>8</sup> Petrakos 1996, 88–89 with photographs (idem 1993, 69); Wickens *ibid.* II, 229–230. For photographs of finds see also the report in *Ergon* 1958, 18–22.

<sup>9</sup> So Wickens *ibid.* I, 179; Petrakos 1987, 305–306; cf. *ibid.* 1993, 68.

<sup>10</sup> On the ephebes and the Persian Wars see Mikalson 1998, 248–249; cf. C. P. I. -kidis, *Histoire de l'éphébie attique des origines à 31 avant Jésus-Christ*, Paris, 1962, 253; cf. also Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* 42.3 with P.J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford, 1981, note ad loc. (pp. 505–506).

<sup>11</sup> Πυθαγόρας; *LGP* II s.v. 4; Σωσιγόνης; *ibid.* s.v. 11; Λύσανδρος; *ibid.* s.v. 14.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Petrakos 1996, 88 (1993, 70). Note below nos. 10 and 21.

*Line 7*

Ascribing the prohibition to the god himself is noteworthy; cf. 25.1–2 and commentary on 7.1–3. The cathartic code from Cyrene, *LSS* 115, presents itself as an oracle of Apollo; Xanthus, the author of *LSCG* 55, was chosen by the god, Men; the prescriptions of *LSAM* 20 appear to have been revealed in a dream.<sup>13</sup>

*Line 8*

Εἰσφέρειν, literally ‘carry in,’ is used, when governing clothing items, in the sense of ‘wear.’ Cf. *LSCG* 124.17; 136.25–26; *SEG XXXVI* 1221.8–11; cf. Lupu 2001, 122.<sup>14</sup>

*Line 8–9*

χρωμάτιν[ον] and βαπτόν: Whereas χρωμάτινος is likely to refer generally to any color-bearing garments, i.e. printed,<sup>15</sup> woven, or embroidered,<sup>16</sup> βαπτός seems to refer specifically to dyed garments.<sup>17</sup> A white-only dress code is prescribed in a few comparable documents.<sup>18</sup> I have elsewhere suggested (2001, 122–123) that if a similar notion was, as Petrakos observed (1996, 90 (1993, 70)), operative here, the restoration μηδὲ λ[εγ] | νωτόν] forbidding garments with colored borders would make some sense.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Part I pp. 77–79, 11–12, 89.

<sup>14</sup> *LSJ* does not record this sense of the word. For *SEG XXXVI* 1221 see part I p. 16.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. R.J. Forbes, *Studies in Ancient Technology*<sup>2</sup>, Leiden, 1964–1972, IV, 138–139.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Forbes *ibid.* 225–250 esp. 235–236. On the color of clothes see G. Losfeld, *Essai sur le costume grec*, Paris, [1991], 183–190 (men’s clothes; including a discussion of border ornaments), 262–267 (women’s clothes). On dyeing in general see Forbes *ibid.* 99–150.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Forbes *ibid.* 128, 132.

<sup>18</sup> *LSAM* 35.5 is the clearest case; cf. *LSCG* 65.15–16 (Andania): initiates’ clothes are to be white; σαμεῖα (ornaments, probably fringe ornaments: Sokolowski’s note *ad loc.*) of a specific size are nevertheless allowed; *LSAM* 14.9: incubants at the Pergamene Asclepieion are ordered to wear white clothes; *LSS* 91.8: only white footwear, and not made of goat skin.

<sup>19</sup> The word λεγνοτός is rare but attention paid to the border of clothes is not particularly surprising: *LSCG* 65 (Andania), authorizes border ornaments (lines 16, 21) of specific dimensions only. For Jewish prescriptions regarding fringes see Num. 15.38 (Forbes *ibid.* 121).

*Line 10*

If a form of εἰσπορεύεσθαι ought to be restored here, the infinitive is most probable. The verb is frequently used in comparable documents.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> See *LSCG* 55.4–5, 6; *LSAM* 14.[1], 7; 18.13; [20.32]; *OGIS* 598.1–2 and *SEG* VIII 169.1 (two copies of the sacred law from the Herodian temple in Jerusalem; see Part I p. 20); below 7.3–4, 17, 18; cf.; *LSCG* 65.37–171.15 (see Part I p. 35). If λεγνωτόν is correct, the space has no room for a negative and the restored verb ought to have started a new, positive stipulation involving a shift from indirect to direct speech. See Lupu 2001, 123–124.



ATTICA. PAIANIA(?). STATUTES OF AN *ERANOS*.  
CA. EARLY SECOND CENTURY A.D.

(Figure 12)

A virtually intact, slightly tapered stele of white marble consisting of two joined fragments. It is topped by a pediment crowned by three acroteria, one at the apex and two at the lower corners, of which the left one is broken. In the middle of the pediment there is a shield. The left edge of the stone is slightly damaged. The back is rough picked, as is the socket, the front of which is fully preserved. The stone, which had passed through several hands during the 1960s and 1970s before it was donated to the J. Paul Getty Museum, is said to have come from Liopesi, a village in central Attica, the site of the deme Paiania.

H. 0.745; W. 0.43 (top), 0.447 (bottom); Th. ca. 0.047 (top right), ca. 0.075 (bottom left). L.H. ca. 0.01;  $\Phi$  ca. 0.017 (line 1), 0.012 (line 46). Interlinear Space: practically none in lines 1–36; ca. 0.002 in lines 37–46. Margins ca. 0.009 (top), ca. 0.021 (bottom), ca. 0.002 (sides; varying). Socket H. 0.056, W. 0.285, Th. ca. 0.075.

Malibu, The J. Paul Getty Museum. Inv. 78.AA.377.

Ed. Raubitschek 1981 (= SEG XXXI 122).

Cf. J. and L. Robert BE 1984 no. 185; Pritchett 1987, 188 n. 25 (=SEG XXXVI 198);<sup>1</sup> Follet 1989, 40–41 (=SEG XXXIX 311); Aleshire 1991, 228–229;<sup>2</sup> Arnaoutoglou 1994.

Photographs: Raubitschek 1981, 93 g. 1,<sup>3</sup> 92 g. 2 (excellent but too small).

---

<sup>1</sup> See below commentary on lines 23–27.

<sup>2</sup> See below commentary on lines 1–2.

<sup>3</sup> = Figure 12.

ca. init. saec. II p.

*manus  
prima*

- Ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ. Ἐπὶ Τίτου Φλαβίου Κόνωνος ἄρχοντο-  
καὶ ἱερέως Δρούσου ὑπάτου, Μουνιχιῶνος ὀκτώ  
καὶ δεκάτῃ· ἔδοξεν τῷ ἀρχεραριστῇ [Μάρκω] Αἰμιλίω *manus altera  
in rasura*  
4 Εὐχαρίστῳ Παιαν<ι>εῖ συνόδου τῆς τῶν Ἑρακλισταῶν τῶν  
ἐν Λίμναις )( τάδε δογματίσαι· ἐάν τις ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ  
μάχῃν ποιήσῃ, τῇ ἐχομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀποτινέτω προστείμ-  
ου ὁ μὲν ἀρξάμενος δραχμὰς δέκα, )( ὁ δὲ ἐξακολουθ-  
8 ῆσας δραχμὰς πέντε )( καὶ ἐξάνανκα πραττέσθω τῶν σ-  
[υ]νεραμιστῶν ψήφον λαβόντων ἐκβιβάσαι· )( τῆς δὲ ἐνθήκ-  
ης τῆς τεθείσης ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχεραριστοῦ καὶ ὅση ἂν ἄλλη ἐν-  
θήκῃ ἐπισυναχθῇ, ταύτης μηθεὶς κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον ἀπ-  
12 [έ]σθω πλείω τοῦ τόκου τοῦ πεσομένου, )( μὴ πλέω δὲ δαπανάτ-  
[ω] ὁ ταμίης δραχμῶν [Τ· ἔδοξε] ἐκ τοῦ τόκου· )( ἐάν δέ τι πλείων- *manus altera  
in rasura*  
[ο]ς ἄψῃται ἢ ἐκ τῆς ἐνθήκης )( ἢ ἐκ τοῦ τόκου ἀποτινέτω προσ-  
[τ]είμιον τὸ τριπλοῦν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἂν ταμεύσας τις ἐπιδειχθῇ  
16 [ν]εοσφιόμενος )( ἀποτινέτω τὸ τριπλοῦν· περὶ δὲ ἱερεωσυν-  
[ω]ν ὧν ἂν τις ἀγοράσῃ παραχρηῖμα κατατιθέσθω )( ἐν τῷ ἐχ-  
[ο]μένῳ ἐνιαυτῷ )( αὐτῷ τῷ ἀρχεραριστῇ, καὶ λαμβανέτω πρὸς-  
[γ]ραφον παρὰ τοῦ ἀρχεραριστοῦ, λαμβάνων δὲ ἐξ ἔθους τὰ διπλᾶ  
20 [μ]έρη ἐκτὸς τοῦ οἴνου· οἱ δὲ ἐργολαβήσαντες ὕκον ἢ οἰνικὸν μ-  
ῆ ἀποκαταστήσαντες ἐν ᾧ )( δειπν[οῦ]σιν ἐνιαυτῷ ἀποτινέτω- *manus altera  
in rasura*  
σαν τὸ διπλοῦν· οἱ δὲ ἐργολαβοῦντες ἐγγυητὰς εὐαρέστους  
παρατιθέτωσαν τῷ ταμίᾳ καὶ τῷ ἀρχεραριστῇ καταστάνεσθαι δὲ Γ  
24 [παννυχιστὰς] τοὺς δυναμένους· ἐάν δὲ μὴ θέλωσιν τότε ἐκ πάντ- *manus altera  
in rasura*  
ων κληροῦσθωσαν καὶ ὁ λαχὼν ὑπομενέτω· ἐάν δὲ μὴ ὑπομένῃ ἢ  
μὴ θέλῃ παννυχιστὴς εἶναι λαχὼν ἀποτινέτω προστείμιον δραχμὰς ἐκ-  
28 ατὸν· )( καταστάνεσθαι {ωσαν} καὶ δὲ ἐπάνανκες ἐκ τῆς συνόδου πράκ-  
τορες δέκα· )( ἐάν δὲ τινες μὴ θέλωσιν πράκτορες ὑπομένειν κληροῦσθω-  
σαν ἐκ τοῦ πλήθους δέκα· )( ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐάν ὁ ταμίης ἀποδιδοῖ λόγον ἀγ-  
ορᾶς γενομένης καταστάνεσθαι ἐγλογιστὰς τρεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἐγλογιστὰς ὁμ-  
νύειν αὐτόν τε τὸν Ἑρακλῆν καὶ Δήμητρα κα[ὶ] Κόρην· )( κληροῦσθαι δὲ τῆς ἡμέρ-  
32 ας ἐκάστης ἐπὶ τὰ κρεῖα ἀνθρώπους δύο· )( ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς σ[τρε]πτοῦ- *manus altera  
in rasura*  
ς ἀνθρώπους δύο· )( ἐάν δὲ τις τῶν πεπιστευμένων εὐρεθῇ ὀυπαρόν τ-  
[ι] πεποιηκὸς ἀποτινέτω δραχμὰς εἴκοσι· )( αἰρεῖσθω δὲ ὁ ἀρχεραριστὴς  
οὗς ἂν βούλῃται ἐκ τῆς συνόδου [εἰς τὸ συνεγ]δανίσαι τὴν ἐνθήκην μετ' αὐτοῦ *manus altera  
in rasura*  
36 ἀνθρώπους Γ· διδόντωσαν δὲ τὴν σιμίδαλιν πάντες τῇ δημοσίᾳ χοίνικι . .  
*manus  
altera* ἐγδίδοσθαι δὲ καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ ταμ[ι]οῦ θύμα τῷ θεῷ  
κάπρον ᾧ Κ<sup>1</sup>· ἐάν δὲ τις τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἐράνου τέκνον [.]. Σ . θέλῃ ἰσάγειν  
διδότω ὕκον ᾧ Ις (ἴ, ἐάν δὲ τις ἐμβῇ τὴν θέλῃ διδότω ὕκον ᾧ ΛΓ·  
40 καταβύλλεσθαι δὲ τὸν λόγον ὅταν οἱ ἐγλογισταὶ ὁμόσαντες[ς]  
ἀποδῶσι τῷ ἀρχεραριστῇ τὸν λόγον καὶ ἐπιδίξωσι εἴ τι ὀφίλῃ ὁ τα-  
μίης· ξύλα δὲ ἐγδίδοσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ καθ' ἔτος ταμίου· < τὰς δὲ φορὰς  
καταφέρειν τῷ ταμίᾳ ἐπάνανκες ἰς τὰς ἐγδόσεις· ὁ δὲ μὴ κατενένκας  
44 ἀποτινέτω τὸ διπλοῦν· < ὁ δὲ μὴ δοὺς τὸ κάθολον ἐξέρανος  
ἔστω / μὴ ἐξέστω δὲ τῶν ἐν τῷ ἄλλοις ξύλων ἄπτεσθαι· < στέφα-  
[νο]ν δὲ φέριν τῷ θεῷ ἕκαστον. ▮ *vacat*

*vacat ca. 0.021*

*Restorations.* Suppl. Raubitschek || **13** T̄: τ (CCC) || **23** Γ γ (III) || **38** K<sup>L</sup>: κ (minae XX);  
[.] . Σ.: [τ]ῖσι (= τίσει) R. dubitanter || **36** Γ γ (III) || **39** Ις<sup>L</sup>: vid. adn. ad loc.; n. ΔΓ:  
λγ' (minae XXXIII).

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have seen the stone and I made use of excellent study photographs provided by the J. Paul Getty Museum. The stone was inscribed by two hands: lines 1–36 belong to the first; 37–46 to the second. Corrections in the several erasures in lines 1–36 were probably made by the second hand. The letters of the first hand are somewhat uneven; they are particularly crowded with practically no interlinear space. Alpha with a broken crossbar and square lunate sigma are employed, and there are no serifs. The sign )( is used for punctuation. The second hand is somewhat more orderly and the letters are not as closely packed. A with a broken crossbar, Σ, serifs. The sign < is used for punctuation (cf. also the sign / in line 45; for the larger < in line 39 see commentary ad loc.). Unlike the first hand, the second hand uses ι for ει. Raubitschek does not dot a few doubtful letters where the readings are secured by the context.

- 4** Παανει: The stone (and the photographs). Raubitschek prints Παανεῑ.  
**13** T̄: The T is followed by a dot placed in the middle of the line (for the dot cf. Threatte *GAI* I 4.021 no. 3 (p. 88)).  
**19** λανβάνων: Raubitschek prints λαμβάνων, but the stone (and the photograph) have a nu. The nu for mu is probably a copying mistake (Threatte *GAI* I 41.03 (pp. 491–492)).  
**21** Raubitschek brackets the first eta. The lower tip of the right vertical seems secure to me.  
**30–31** Raubitschek's division ἐγλογιστάς | ὀμνύειν must be a mistake.  
**36** End: Raubitschek prints [.] . As he says, the traces visible on the stone might belong to a Γ (i.e. γ) which had been erased.  
**38** K<sup>L</sup>: Raubitschek's κ< / appears to be a misprint. [.] . Σ.: before the sigma the stone has a bottom part of a vertical stroke. I thought I could see secure traces of iota after the sigma but this may be wrong and Raubitschek has [τ]ῖσι.  
**41–42** Raubitschek's division ὁ | ταμίαις must be a mistake.  
**44** I follow Raubitschek in printing < though on the stone the sign looks somewhat like a small Y placed in the middle of the line. It looks somewhat the same in line 45, where it might be damaged by a small break.  
**45** A diagonal stroke appears in the middle of the line between the first two words. It seems intentional and might be interpreted as a punctuation mark.  
**46** End: for Ξ (for the sign see commentary below) Raubitschek has <sup>L</sup>; this must be a misprint.

### Translation

To good luck. When Titus Flavius Conon was an archon and priest of the consul Drusus, on the eighteenth of Mounichion, Marcus Aemilius Eucharistus of the deme Paiania, the archeraniest of the association of the Heracliastai in the Marshes, has decreed that the following be laid down:

(5) If anyone engages in a ght in the association, on the following day the one who started the ght shall pay a fine of ten drachmas; the one who joined it (shall pay) ve drachmas. (8) Such a person shall on compulsion be subjected to expulsion from the association, following the votes of the fellow members.



(9) No one shall touch the endowment deposited by the archeranist or any possible added endowment in any way beyond the accrued interest, nor shall the treasurer spend more than 300 drachmas, he (the archeranist) has decreed, of the interest. If he lays hold of more, either from the endowment or from the interest, he shall pay as a fine three times as much. (15) Likewise, if someone is shown to have appropriated (funds) for himself while acting as a treasurer, he shall pay three times as much.

(16) With regard to whatever priesthoods someone may buy at once(?), the buyer shall make a payment, in the following year, to the archeranist himself, and shall receive a receipt from the archeranist. As is customary, he shall receive double portions, with the exception of wine.

(20) If those contracting the (supply of) pork and wine do not hand (them) over during the year in which they furnish meals, they shall pay twice as much. The contractors shall provide the treasurer and the archeranist with satisfactory sureties.

(23) Three able men shall be appointed as *pannychistai*. If they refuse, then these shall be chosen by lot from among all, and whoever is chosen shall comply. If he does not comply or refuses to be a *pannychistes* although chosen by lot, he shall pay a fine of one hundred drachmas.

(27) Ten *praktōres* shall be appointed on compulsion from the association. If some members do not wish to serve as *praktōres*, ten shall be chosen by lot from the body of members.

(29) Likewise, when the treasurer renders an account, a meeting (*ἀγορά*) having been called, there shall be appointed three auditors, and the auditors shall swear by Heracles himself, by Demeter, and by Kore.

(31) Two people in charge of meat shall be chosen by lot every day and likewise two people in charge of pastries. If any of those entrusted is found to have done something sordid, he shall pay 20 drachmas.

(34) The archeranist shall choose which three association members he wishes to join him in lending out the endowment.

(36) All shall give one wheaten flour (measured) according to the public *choinix*.

(37) The treasurer shall take care that a boar of 20 minae be provided each year as a sacrificial victim for the god.

(38) If any association member wishes to enter a child [- - -], he shall give 16½(?) minae of pork. If anyone wishes to join (himself), he shall give 33 minae of pork.

(40) The account shall be deposited when the sworn auditors render

their account to the archeraniast and show if the treasurer owes something.

(42) The annual treasurer shall take care that wood be provided.

It shall be required to pay the dues to the treasurer for letting out contracts. Whoever does not pay, shall pay twice as much in fines. Whoever does not pay at all shall be expelled from the *eranos*.

(45) It shall be forbidden to touch the trees at the grove.

Everyone shall wear a wreath for the god.

### Commentary

Any addition to the somewhat limited group of Athenian sacred laws of the Roman Imperial period<sup>4</sup> is welcome, all the more so when it happens to be a fully preserved, substantial document like the present one. It is therefore regrettable that this inscription has attracted so little attention since its publication, especially because it is, as the Roberts observed (BE 1984 no. 185), not without problems. The inscription is full of details which ought to have been obvious to its target audience. Most of them are mentioned by passing reference only, without sufficient context. As a result, they remain at times both unclear, further obscured by the haphazard style, and difficult to elucidate, especially since comparable documents are relatively rare. Thus, while allowing us a glimpse (perhaps not nearly as revealing or as entertaining as the one given by the Iobacchi inscription, *LSCG* 51),<sup>5</sup> into the mundane reality of an association with its intricate combination of finance and religion, this document may also serve as an indication of the gaps in our knowledge of matters pertaining to contemporary Athenian associations, cult practice, topography, and prosopography.

This is not the place for a discussion of the full range of meanings covered by the word *ἐγανός*. It should suffice to mention here the two basic meanings: (1) a meal consisting of contributions made by those participating in it;<sup>6</sup> (2) a particular kind of loan, perhaps friendly, but not necessarily interest-free.<sup>7</sup> At least to a certain extent, the social and

<sup>4</sup> *LSCG* 8; 51–55 (and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1365); *LSS* 16; 127.

<sup>5</sup> For which cf. Part I p. 89.

<sup>6</sup> *LSJ* s.v. [I]; P. Millett, *Lending and Borrowing in Ancient Athens*, Cambridge, 1991, 154; E. Cohen, *Athenian Economy and Society: A Banking Perspective*, Princeton, 1992, 208.

<sup>7</sup> *LSJ* s.v. II; Millett *ibid.* 153–159 (with note 33 for bibliography); Cohen, *ibid.* 207–215 esp. 214, who questions the common labeling of such a loan as friendly.

nancial aspects embedded in these two meanings seem to characterize associations called ἔρανος. Associations of ἐρανισταί were already known to Aristotle (see below). They appear to have gained popularity in Athens during the Hellenistic era.<sup>8</sup> At first glance, an *eranos* may seem to have existed mainly for financial reasons, i.e. to offer to its members loans, presumably on terms better than those offered by bankers.<sup>9</sup> But the situation must have been more complex than this. In the *Nicomachean Ethics* (8.9.5 (1160a 20)) Aristotle gives a different reason for the existence of associations of ἐρανισταί: like the associations of θιασῶται, they exist θυσίας ἔνεκα καὶ συνουσίας.<sup>10</sup> These elements, loaning money, cultic activity, and socializing, are evident in the present document. The paramount concern with finance indicates that the association was not founded merely for cultic purposes and socializing but had preeminent financial interests.<sup>11</sup> We might even say that the concern with cultic matters is, if not super cial, at least secondary.<sup>12</sup> It would still be wrong to assume that the cultic, social, and financial elements were not looked upon as complementary by the founder and the members of the association. To them, a cultic framework may have appeared to provide a natural setting for socializing, and this framework, secondary perhaps, may have not been wholly super cial. On the contrary, it may have been regarded as essential to the financial interests of the association.<sup>13</sup>

*Date.* On the date see below commentary on lines 1–2.

#### *Lines 1–2*

The office of ἱερεὺς Δρούσου ὑπάτου, created in Athens following the death of Drusus in 9 B.C., was held by the eponymous archon who, after 9/8 B.C., was thus to be known also as The Priest of the Consul Drusus. The priesthood is first documented in *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1722. It seems to have disappeared during the reign of Hadrian: the last archon documented to have borne this double title appears to be T. Fl. Alcibiades of *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 3589.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>8</sup> For a review of the epigraphic evidence see N.F. Jones, *The Associations of Classical Athens: The Response to Democracy*, New York/Oxford, 1999, 308.

<sup>9</sup> I follow Vondeling 1961, 161–162; Raubitschek 1981, 96.

<sup>10</sup> For the sake of sacrifice and socializing.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Raubitschek 1981, 69; see below.

<sup>12</sup> For a fair assessment of the role of religion in comparable Attic organizations see Jones, *The Associations of Classical Athens*, 228.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Vondeling 1961, 161; Raubitschek 1981, 98.

<sup>14</sup> I follow P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste*, Cairo, 1927, 157; idem, *Athènes sous Hadrien*, Cairo, 1934, 171; D.J. Geagan, *The Athenian Constitution after Sulla* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 12),

The date of the archon T. Fl. Conon is, unfortunately, far from secure. The stemma of his family, the Flavii of Sounion, which had occupied several scholars during the twentieth century, has been more recently reconsidered by Aleshire 1991, 123–130.<sup>15</sup> T. Fl. Conon could have been the younger brother of T. Fl. Sophocles, who was an archon in the first years of the second century A.D. (between 100/1 and 105/6).<sup>16</sup> The two could possibly be identified as the Sophocles and Conon mentioned in the ephebic catalog *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1992.3–4. The relationship between them and the Conon who was an archon in the fifth decade of the first century A.D. is not certain. They could be his sons, aged sixty to seventy at the time of the present document, or grandsons, aged around thirty, which is more plausible since in contemporary Athens a person was unlikely to serve as archon at such an advanced age as sixty or seventy. If they were grandsons, it is not clear whether they were indeed brothers or perhaps cousins.<sup>17</sup>

Whatever restoration of the stemma we might prefer, Raubitschek's date of ca. A.D. 120 may be somewhat too late, although it should be taken as a *terminus ante quem*, since the priesthood of the Consul Drusus does not appear to be documented afterwards. Aleshire has reasonably advocated a date between A.D. 90 to A.D. 110.<sup>18</sup> If the present archon is indeed the younger brother (or even the cousin) of T. Fl. Sophocles, the consul of the beginning of the second century A.D., and the two are the grandsons of Conon, the archon of the fifth decade of the first century A.D., a date in the early second century A.D. and following the archonship of T. Fl. Sophocles is probable.

### *Lines 3–5*

The archerapist, Marcus Aemilius Eucharistus, is otherwise unknown. Similarly, nothing concrete may be said about the Λίμναι. They are probably not to be identified with the famous site of the sanctuary of Dionysus ἐν Λίμναις (Raubitschek 1981, 95).<sup>19</sup> As Raubitschek noted

---

Princeton, 1967, 8; (Raubitschek 1981, 95); cf. Follet 1989, 37–38. *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 3589 is currently dated to A.D. 121/2 (Aleshire 1991, 229 n. 1).

<sup>15</sup> For bibliographical references see 225 n. 2.

<sup>16</sup> Follet 1989, 40–41.

<sup>17</sup> Raubitschek 1981, 95; Aleshire 1991, 227–230 with table XI for the stemma.

<sup>18</sup> Aleshire 1991, 228–230 who points out that, regarding letter forms, only the square sigma of the first hand precludes a date as early as A.D. 80. A date around the beginning of the second century A.D. seems to have also been preferred by the Roberts in their short notice (BE 1984 no. 185).

<sup>19</sup> On the location of the sanctuary of Dionysus see Travlos 1971, 332.

(1981, 95–96), it may be significant that the law of the *eranistai*, *LSCG* 53, was also discovered at Liopesi, the site of Eucharistus' home deme of Paiania.<sup>20</sup> It is tempting to assume an affinity between the two documents. One should note, however, that the date of *LSCG* 53 is not secure (either in the second or third centuries A.D.),<sup>21</sup> and that the archeranist (line 35) is not identified in that document. If the two documents refer to the same association, there could be a chance, as Raubitschek suggested, that the archeranist of *LSCG* 53.35 was not necessarily Eucharistus himself but his son or grandson. Raubitschek also noted (*ibid.*) that it is interesting that both documents date themselves to Mounichion 18, which could be the date of the annual meeting of the association.<sup>22</sup> Still, this might be coincidental.

Arnaoutoglou's assertion (1994, 108, 109–110) that in Athens, unlike in Rhodes, an ἀρχεραμιστής is found mostly in groups whose members do not call themselves ἐραμισταί, and that, accordingly, the preeminence of the archeranist in the context of an association is doubtful, since it is only inferred from the meaning of the word itself, is, as the author himself admits, not pertinent to the present association in which the archeranist appears to have extensive authority.

#### *Lines 5–9*

Fights among association members appear to have been a serious problem (cf. Raubitschek 1981, 96, 98). The two most closely related Attic documents also contain clauses which deal with them. See *LSCG* 51.72–102 and 53.40–44 with commentary.

#### *Line 8*

ἐξάνανκα: an adverb. See Threagles *GAI* II 64.0667 (p. 410).

#### *Lines 9–16, 34–36*

*Finances.* The exact financial details, referred to here in passing, can only be inferred. It is understood that the archeranist deposited an endowment (ἐνθήκη lines 9–10)<sup>23</sup> for the sake of providing loans (lines

<sup>20</sup> For the site see Travlos 1989, 192.

<sup>21</sup> See S. Follet, *Athènes au II<sup>e</sup> et au III<sup>e</sup> siècle: Études chronologiques et prosopographiques*, Paris, 1976, 158 n. 2, 512, 518.

<sup>22</sup> At least five decrees of the Orgeones of the Magna Mater (third-second century B.C.) date themselves to Mounichion: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1314, 1315, 1327, 1328–1329 (= *LSCG* 48); (Raubitschek 1981, 95); see also *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1343.

<sup>23</sup> See also below commentary on line 43.

34 36).<sup>24</sup> As Raubitschek noted (1981, 96, 98), no more than three hundred drachmas of the accrued interest may be spent, while the principal itself is never to be touched. The association may also earn income from the following sources: (1) Fines (lines 6 8, 14 15, 25 27, 33 34); (2) Sale of priesthoods (lines 16 18); (3) Membership fees (lines 42 45). Raubitschek observed (1981, 96; cf. Vondeling 1961, 161) that it was nowhere stated that the archeranist made any profit for himself. It is still worth noting that, while the membership fee is paid to the treasurer, payment for priesthoods goes directly to the archeranist. One wonders whether this has any significance.

### Line 13

The insertion of ἔδοξε is perplexing. It seems (Raubitschek 1981, 96) to represent some afterthought regarding the sum of the fine.

### Line 16

For νοσφίζομαι, meaning 'to put aside for oneself' etc. (LSJ s.v. νοσφίζω II 3) see C. Spicq, *Notes de lexicographie néo-testamentaire*, Göttingen, 1978, s.v. (II 584).

### Lines 16–20

Perhaps παραχρήμα goes with κατατιθέστω. On the sale of priesthoods see Part I pp. 48–53. Raubitschek's accent probably makes this the first documented case from mainland Greece. The buyer would obviously receive here a double portion of any offering. The reference to such a dispensation as customary (ἐξ ἔθους line 19) may serve as a sad reminder of our limited knowledge of contemporary local cult practice.<sup>25</sup> If we read ἱερεωσύν|[ω]ν, the reference here would probably be to buying priestly prerogatives (see above commentary on 3.5; cf. Part I 52 n. 263) rather than priesthoods.

<sup>24</sup> Presumably on easier terms than those offered by bankers, and presumably to members, although this is not mentioned in the present document. See Raubitschek 1981, 96; Vondeling 1961, 159–161.

<sup>25</sup> Distribution of portions has been understood in the law of the Iobacchi, *LSCG* 51 (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1368, *LGS* II 46) 121–122; but the context is difficult. See Ziehen's and Kirchner's commentaries ad loc. On sacrificial portions cf. below commentary on 14 B 65–66; on assigning portion(s) of the victim to the priest see below commentary on 20.7. For distribution of portions cf. also *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1343.32.

*Lines 18–19*

There can be little doubt that the word πρόσγραφον means here a receipt. A few actual receipts, labeled πρόσγραφον, survive on papyri. See *POxy.* XVI 1997, 1998 (cf. 1934).

For λανβάνων see *Epigraphical Commentary* above.

*Lines 20–23*

The interpretation of this sentence seems to depend on the meaning of the verb ἀποκαθίστημι. Raubitchek (1981, 316–317) noted that two different processes might be envisioned: (1) If the verb is translated to restore,<sup>26</sup> one has to assume that the contractors receive the money for buying the goods from the treasurer, sell the meals to the members, and thus restore the funds. (2) If the verb is translated to hand over/give,<sup>27</sup> the contractors receive the money from the treasurer and use it to provide meals, either free or not, to the members.

*Lines 23–27*

It is not clear what exactly is meant by the word παννυχισταί. Raubitchek (1981, 97) took these all-nighters to be night watchmen entrusted with the task of watching over the property of the association and its members on nights of meeting days. Pritchett (1987, 188 n. 25) preferred to regard them as ancient precursors of modern nightclub bouncers, whose duty was to maintain order during night meetings. The qualification of the παννυχισταί as able support both these suggestions.

*Lines 27–28*

The exact function of the *praktores* here remains conjectural. A board of *praktores* whose members were chosen by lot<sup>28</sup> is known to have existed in Classical Athens. The function of these officials can be inferred mainly from references in the orators, where they are mentioned as tax collectors with whom public debtors were registered.<sup>29</sup> The office

<sup>26</sup> This appears to be the more prevalent meaning; cf. Welles, *RC* 316–317.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. I. Avotins, *On the Greek of the Novels of Justinian: A Supplement to Liddell-Scott-Jones together with Observations on the Influence of Latin on Legal Greek*, Hildesheim/Zürich/New York, 1992, s.vv. ἀποκαθίστημι and ἀποκατάστασις (pp. 26–27).

<sup>28</sup> ΔΙΚΩΝ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΑ (Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca*, I 190.26–27): κληροταί ἀρχαὶ πρακτόρων, ἐκλογέων καὶ ἀντιγραφῆ (the office of the ἀντιγραφεὺς; cf. M.H. Hansen *GRBS* 21, 1980, 157).

<sup>29</sup> See esp. decree *apud* Andocides 1.77–79 (cf. D.M. Macdowell, *Andokides*, *On the Mysteries*, Oxford, 1962, 113–119); Demosthenes 25.28; law *apud* 43.71; 58.20, 48. Full reference in H. Schaefer, *RE* XXII 2, 2538–2548 s.v. Πράκτωρ. To the Athenian

is documented elsewhere, its function varying according to time and place. To Hesychius and the *Suda* (s.vv.) the *praktores* were known merely as tax collectors, probably due to their function in Roman Egypt.<sup>30</sup>

Raubitschek's note (1981, 97) that the function of the present *praktores* ought not to have been to collect membership fees which were paid directly to the treasurer (lines 42–43) but to collect fines, is reasonable.

### *Lines 30–31*

*The Oath of the Auditors.* Swearing by Heracles is self-explanatory. The presence of Demeter and Kore is obscure. Heracles had a special significance at Eleusis (above no. 2) but I doubt that it is relevant here. The end of the auditing procedure appears to be referred to in lines 40–42, which seem, accordingly, to belong together with this clause.

### *Lines 31–34*

Raubitschek might be right in assuming that every day refers to every feast day.

The *streptoi* were twisted pastries in the form of a flat cake.<sup>31</sup> They appear to have been popular in Athens.<sup>32</sup>

### *Line 36*

Σεμίδαλις was the wheat flour. Bread made from it is mentioned by Hippocrates<sup>33</sup> and in Athenaeus<sup>34</sup> as invigorating. See E. Battaglia, *ARTOS: Il lessico della panificazione nei papiri greci*, Milan, 1989, 66–67. The requirement to contribute food or ingredients seems to recall the contributive character of the archetypal ἔρανος. It may be that the entrance fee paid in pork rather than money (lines 38–39) should be interpreted in this context.<sup>35</sup> The δημοσία χοίνιξ should probably be the

---

attestations should be added *Agora* XVI 56.34 (cf. Clinton, 1980, 283); cf. M.H. Hansen *GRBS* 21, 1980, 160.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Schaefer *ibid.* 2545–2546; Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 89–90. For a list of attestations see also N. Lewis, *The Compulsory Public Services of Roman Egypt*<sup>2</sup>, Florence, 1997, 42–43.

<sup>31</sup> πλακοῦντος εἶδος: Harpocration and the *Suda* s.v. στρεπτοῦς; Pollux 6.77.

<sup>32</sup> Demosthenes *De Cor.* (18) 260; Athenaeus 4.130d.

<sup>33</sup> *Vict.* 2.42.20.

<sup>34</sup> 3.115d, cf. 115c, 109b, 112b; (Raubitschek 1981, 97).

<sup>35</sup> Cf. above introductory remarks. For contributions in wine in associations which are not formally called *eranos* cf., however, Sokolowski 1954, 160.



public grain measure.<sup>36</sup> Raubitschek (1981, 97) noted that it may have been followed by a number, namely Γ (i.e. 3), which has been erased.

*Lines 37–38*

For θυμα see below commentary on 19.8. Although κάρπος may be used for a domestic pig, I do not see any reason to doubt<sup>37</sup> that the present κάρπος is indeed a wild boar. Acquiring the victim should not have been particularly difficult since, according to Pausanias (1.32.1), wild boars (σὺς ἄγριος) were hunted (alongside bears) on mount Parnes in this period. Handling the victim should have also been fairly easy, since, as is indicated by its weight (ca. twenty pounds), it must not have been a full-grown boar but a piglet, and a relatively small one.

The choice of a wild boar for a sacrifice to Heracles should not be particularly surprising considering Heracles' wild attributes.<sup>38</sup> Boars are occasionally sacrificed to other divinities elsewhere.<sup>39</sup>

*Lines 38–39*

Raubitschek himself considered his restoration [τ]ῖσι (i.e. for τίσει, dative of τίσις), which he translated by making a payment, uncertain. One can only concur with his reservations<sup>40</sup> and hope that a better restoration will be suggested in the future.

It seems more probable that the minae refer to the weight of the victim than to its price since the price of twenty minae would be astronomical. In the combination ὑἱοῦ § (line 39) the minae ought to refer to the weight of the pork meat. On the payment in pork cf. above, commentary on line 36. The statutes of the Iobacchi, *LSCG* 51, discuss introduction of new members in greater detail (lines 32–62).

<sup>36</sup> Cf. L. Foxhall and H.A. Forbes *Chiron* 12, 1982, 51–62 and 84 Table 1.

<sup>37</sup> As Raubitschek (1981, 97) does.

<sup>38</sup> See Burkert 1985, 209.

<sup>39</sup> With the provision that some may well be domestic pigs see e.g. *LSCG* 65.34, 69 (Andania; to Apollo Karneios); 96.17 (Mykonos; to Kore); *LSS* 85.29–30 (Lindus; to Enyalios, together with a dog and a kid); 89.3 (Lindus; to Zeus Amalos); Pausanias 8.38.8 (a boar sacrificed to Apollo Epikourios at the agora of Megalopolis and consumed at the sanctuary of Apollo Parrhasios). Boars were used as oath victims: See e.g. *Iliad* 19.266–268; Pausanias 4.15.8, 5.24.9 (oaths taken over pieces of boar flesh); cf. Ar. *Lys.* 202; Xen. *An.* 2.2.9; *LSAM* 30 B 3–4 with commentary; cf. also above commentary on 1.12.

<sup>40</sup> See LSJ s.v. τίσις: payment by way of return or recompense, retribution, vengeance; power to repay or require.

*Line 39*

As Raubitschek translated it, the numeric notation likely stands for 16½. It should probably be deciphered as follows:

Ιϛ = 16

⟨ = ½

<sup>1</sup> = numeric marker<sup>41</sup>

On  $\varsigma = 6$  see M.N. Tod *BSA* 45, 1950, 135. For the <sup>1</sup> as numeric marker cf. K<sup>1</sup> in line 38. For the use of ⟨ for ½ see Threatte *GAI* I 5.0124 (p. 107); cf. Tod *ibid.* 129. This sign is here larger than the < evidently used for punctuation in lines 42, 44, and 45 (cf. *Epigraphical Commentary* above).

*Lines 40–42*

This clause refers to the last stage of the auditing procedure and seems to belong together with lines 29–31 (Raubitschek 1981, 97).

*Line 43*

It seems more likely that ἐκδοσις refers to letting out contracts than to making loans, preferred by Raubitschek (1981, translation and p. 97). From lines 33–36 it seems clear that the endowment is used for providing loans. Letting out a contract is referred to in lines 20–23; it is also likely that the victim (line 38) and the wood (line 42) would be provided through a contract let out by the treasurer. This meaning (LSJ s.v. 3) is quite common.<sup>42</sup> The cognate verb is used in exactly the same sense in the Andania regulations, *LSCG* 65.64–66 (supply of victims), 108 (supply of wood).

*Line 45*

The prohibition against touching the trees in the grove, which seems to have been issued to protect the grove of the association and which may well relate to the prescription regarding the provision of wood, is potentially very telling. As comparative evidence suggests, the association is likely to have been lodged in a small sanctuary, which included a grove and a piece of land, parts of which could be leased out.<sup>43</sup> In fact,

<sup>41</sup> Or, perhaps more correctly, punctuation mark signaling numbers.

<sup>42</sup> E.g. *LSCG* 70.28; 83.68; 84.21.

<sup>43</sup> For leasing out a sanctuary see *LSCG* 47 (Part I p. 40). For sanctuaries of associations in Attica see esp. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1322.1–6; 1327.24–27; 1343.41–42; *LSCG* 47; 51.101; *LSS* 20

this *temenos* or the rent earned from leasing parts of it could have constituted the archerani's endowment or at least a part of it, obviously with additional capital.

*Line 46*

For the sign  $\pi$  minus the internal dot see Threatte *GAI* 5.0124 (p. 107). Its use here must be strictly ornamental.

---

(*Agora* XVI 161) 6–7; *SEG* XXIV 203. Cf. F. Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, Leipzig, 1909, esp. 453–454. For protection of sacred groves see Part I pp. 26–27.

## SEG XXX 380

ARGOLIS. TIRYNS. FRAGMENTARY CULT(?)  
 REGULATIONS. LATE SEVENTH EARLY SIXTH  
 CENTURY B.C.<sup>1</sup>

(Figures 13 16)

Nineteen blocks of limestone, found in late 1962 among blocks covering two (northern and southern) Mycenaean underground passages originally used for water supply on the northwest side of the Cyclopean walls of the lower Acropolis of Tiryns. By the time the inscriptions were written, the passages seem to have already gone out of use, at least as far as water supply is concerned.<sup>2</sup> Blocks 5 and 6 were the only ones found *in situ*, at the lower and upper sections of the southern passage respectively. The rest of the blocks had been removed before it was discovered that they were inscribed. It appears that none of the relevant blocks was used to cover the northern underground passage. The question of whether the fragments come from one or several texts remains unanswered.

The size of the blocks varies from  $0.50 \times 0.30$  to  $2 \times 1.50$ .<sup>3</sup> L.H. ca. 0.08–0.10.; Θ, Ο, and sometimes Δ are smaller; 0.04–0.05.

Ancient Tiryns. Around the storeroom; *in situ* (blocks 5 and 6).

Ed. Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975 (= SEG XXX 380; Koerner, *Gesetzestexte* no. 31 (blocks 1–4 and 7 only); *Nomima* I no. 78).<sup>4</sup>

Cf. Verdelis 1963, 73; Dubois 1980; van Effenterre 1982;<sup>5</sup> Hansen 1984; Koerner 1985 (= SEG XXXV 275); M. Gagarin, *Early Greek Law*, Berkeley/Los

---

<sup>1</sup> Although these fragments are clearly concerned with religious matters, classifying them as sacred law(s) is questionable. They are included here due to the possibility that they governed actual cult performance.

<sup>2</sup> On the underground passages see Verdelis 1963, 66–73; Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975, 150–153.

<sup>3</sup> For detailed measurements see Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975, 154–161.

<sup>4</sup> The end of block 3 and the beginning of 4 are also reproduced in Rhodes 1997, 77.

<sup>5</sup> The present fragments and the slave community in Tiryns (Herodotus 6.83).

Angeles/London, 1986, 81 n. 2;<sup>6</sup> Pilar Fernández Alvarez 1986; Foley 1988, 126–128, 147; *LSAG*<sup>2</sup> 443; Pierrat 1991, 569–570 (= *SEG XLI* 294);<sup>7</sup> Jameson 1992, 183 n. 20; P. Schmitt Pantel, *La cité au banquet. Histoire de repas publics dans les cités grecques*, Rome, 1992, 100–101;<sup>8</sup> C.A. Salowey, *The Peloponnesian Herakles: Cult and Labors*, Dissertation, Bryn Mawr, 1995, 20–21; Osborne 1997, 75, 78.<sup>9</sup>

Photograph: Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975, pls. 46–51 (good).<sup>10</sup>

Drawings: Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975 (including drawings of the blocks); (= *Nomima* I 298–299 (9–11, 14, 16, 18 only)).

### *Text*

*Sigla.* In the following text, bold numbers represent blocks (**1–19**) and lines (**1.1** etc.); when a single block is inscribed on two or three sides, bold capital letters (**A**, **B**, **C**) represent the different sides. The changes from one block to another are marked by a double vertical line (||); line breaks and transitions from one side to another within a single block are marked by a single vertical line (|).

*Joins.*<sup>11</sup> Blocks 1–4 belonged originally to the same stone, as is confirmed by the direction of the veins in the stones. A composite text is therefore possible, although the placement of **2B** is conjectural; it may perhaps be placed between lines 5 and 6 of **2A**. Blocks 1–4 are probably connected to block 5 and were originally situated at the lower (western) section of the southern passage.<sup>12</sup> Blocks 6–10 and 19 probably belong together. They ought to have been located at the upper (eastern) section of the same passage. There is a probable connection between blocks 12–14. The lower part of block 19 bears some resemblance to block 10. It should probably be placed somewhere to the right of the latter. It should be noted again that it is not clear whether the fragments belonged to one or more texts.

<sup>6</sup> The context of early law.

<sup>7</sup> Arguing against ed. pr. for the dependence of Tiryns on Argos.

<sup>8</sup> Summary.

<sup>9</sup> The context of early law.

<sup>10</sup> Pl. 48a = *LSAG*<sup>2</sup> pl. 74.7 = Figure 13; pl. 50b = Figure 15.

<sup>11</sup> I repeat the conclusions of Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975, 162–184; summary on 184.

<sup>12</sup> For the location of block 5 see above lemma.

*Script.*<sup>13</sup> The letters are engraved in a style known as *Falsch/Urbustrophedon* or, perhaps more appropriately, *Schlangenschrift*. The alphabet is similar to that of Argos and Mycenae;<sup>14</sup> Σ = Μ (σάν); Ψ and Β are not represented; in **15A** I read a possible tricolon (:) used for punctuation.

*Restorations.* All restorations and interpretations in the text and the apparatus belong to Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou, with the exception of Koerner's restoration of **2A6** (the restored phrase seems to me to be somewhat incomplete).

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have seen the blocks, but **5** and **6** were said to be *in situ* and were inaccessible, and I have not been able to make a positive identification of **10**, **14**, **18**, and **19**.<sup>15</sup> The state of preservation and the conditions of the work prevented me from ascertaining all of the readings of the first edition to which the reader is referred for a full account of dotted letters and for the interpretation of traces. The text presented below is meant to supplement the first edition but by no means to replace it.

In most cases little or no attempt has been made to smooth the inscribed faces. The letters are large, clearly and deeply cut (wherever the inscribed face is well preserved), and ably executed, though this is not necessarily the impression given by the photographs and the drawings.

<sup>13</sup> Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975, 184–189.

<sup>14</sup> See *LSAG*<sup>2</sup> g. 37 n. 1 p. 151; Foley 1988, g. 18.

<sup>15</sup> The blocks are conveniently arranged outside of the apothiki in ancient Tiryns; no. **15** is in the storage shed.

ca. n. saec. VII-init. saec. VI a.

SCHLANGENSCHRIFT

**1, 2A, 3, 4**

<sup>1.1</sup>[- - -] . ρα [- - -] || <sup>2A1</sup>φετέον ταιδε || <sup>1.2</sup>[. <sup>3-4</sup> .] αφρε[-<sup>1-2</sup>] γ τόνς πλ || <sup>2A2</sup>[ατ]φοι-  
 νάρχονς ἐνς . . [- - - | <sup>2A3</sup> - - -] . ν δαο .(?) οἰφαχτον ταμιον || <sup>1.3</sup>[τόν]ς  
 πλατιφοίνον[ς || <sup>2A4</sup> ρ]εκάστε. αἱ μ' ἐξσθῳάσαμεν ὀφλῆν ἐν[ς || <sup>3A1</sup> Δί]φα κά-  
 θαναίαν τρῳάφοντα μ || <sup>2A5</sup>[ε]δίμμιονς α[- - - | <sup>2A6</sup> - - - διπλ]άσιον || <sup>3A2</sup>  
 [. .]ποσταντον πλατιφοίναρχον ταδ || <sup>2A7</sup>[- - -] . . . [- - - | <sup>3A3</sup> ᾠ]ποδόμεν  
 τῷ ἱερομινάμονι τόνς πρα[- - - | <sup>3A4</sup> - - -]ς. τὸν δ' ἱερομινάμον[α - - - | <sup>3A5</sup>  
 - - -]εν τ || <sup>3B</sup>ᾠ δαμόσια ἡό || <sup>4-1</sup>πυι κα δοκεῖ τῷ δάμοι ἀλμυαίαν θεν .(?)ια. αἰδ  
 . [- - - | <sup>4-2</sup> - - -] ἀπα θαυεατρα α . . <sup>vacat</sup>

**2B**

[- - -]ι χαγνον . . . [- - -]  
 [- - -] τα γράθματα τα .(?) [- - -]

*Restorations.* Suppl. Verdelis, Jameson, et Papachristodoulou. || **2A1** ταιδε: τᾱδε (= τηδε) vel ταιδε (= αἶδε) || **1.2** αφρε[.γ: αφρεν (originem huius verbi ab αἴρω noli repetere) vel . . . . αι φρεν(?) (= ῥήν) || **2A3** . ν δ' ᾠ .(?) οἰφαχτον vel δαμοι φακτον(?); ταμιον: <ζ>αμιον (inf.) || **2A4** ἐξσθ[ο]άσαμεν: opt. aor. ab ἐξσθῳάω vel ἐξσθῳάζω (= ἐκθῳάω/ἀζω) || **3A1** κάθαναίαν: καὶ Ἀθαναίαν || **2A5-6** α[- - - | <sup>2A6</sup> - - - διπλ]άσιον: ᾠ[υ]τόνς ὀφλῆν διπλ]άσιον Koerner || **3A2** [. .]ποσταντον: [hυ]ποσταντον vel [ᾠ]ποσταντον || **3A3-4** πρα[- - - | - - -]ς: παρα[τονς- - -] vel πρα[τενιον]ς(?) (cf. πρατήνιος = πρητήν) et cf. πρατός; [α- - -]: [α ἀλμυαίαι vel ἀλμυαίαν](?) cf. infra **5** || **3A5** [- - -]εν: [ἐπευθύν]εν (inf.?) cf. ἐπευθ[- - -] infra **15.1** || **4.1** θεν .(?)ια: θέμ(ε)ν vel θέ(σ)θ(α) (ια pro αι) || **4.2** θαυεατρα = θέατρα(?) || **2B2** γράθματα = γράμματα

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have seen the stones, but cf. general comments above.

- 1** The block comprises three lines inscribed on one side. The letters are worn but on the whole readable.
- 1.1** Only the upper parts of the letters are preserved. A horizontal stroke is certainly traceable before the dotted rho; ed. pr. suggest an upper part of a pi.
- 1.2** Only a vertical stroke is traceable after the digamma; ed. pr. note that it could be followed by one or two letters.
- 1.3** Ed. pr. note that a mu can be read for the σάν.
- 2** The block is inscribed on two sides (**A-B**). **A** comprises seven lines; **B** comprises two lines; it might be placed between lines 5 and 6 of **2A** (cf. above).
- 2A** The letters are worn but on the whole readable.
- 2A1** Before the digamma ed. pr. consider traces of one or two letters
- 2A2** At the end of the line ed. pr. read a vertical stroke followed by a diagonal stroke and consider IA.
- 2A3** For the first trace ed. pr. consider an epsilon or a similar letter. They detected a possible vertical stroke after the dotted rho: iota or perhaps a tau. I could not ascertain any intentional strokes for the rho; the following traces I found confusing. The upper diagonal of the kappa is uncertain.
- 2A4** After the theta there are probable traces of an omicron.
- 2A7** Only traces of the upper parts of three letters are visible.
- 2B** I could detect only occasional letters; ed. pr. s readings are reported.

- 3 The block is inscribed on two sides (**A-B**). Both are well preserved. The text begins on **A**; in line 5 it moves gradually to **B** (the actual change occurs within the alpha) where it breaks after a few letters.
- 3A1 The superscript line above the two iotas in τροπαζοντα can hardly be unintentional. As ed. pr. note (p. 166), it is less clear whether it is an orthographic sign.
- 4 The first four letters of the text, which continues from the previous block, were inscribed on the lower part of the stone, the surface of which had been leveled, perhaps for this purpose (ed. pr. 167). I could read securely only the first part of line 1. In light of the state of preservation, I report the readings of the first editors.

## 5

[- - - τὸν] δ' ἱερομινάμονα ἄλυσαι [- - -]

*Epigraphical commentary.* This block is composed of two fragments. I have not seen it. I report ed. pr. s readings.

## 6

[- - -]κα τὸν ἐπιγνόμονα ἐξστράφεται αἱ δεραμοισ.(?) φερε.(?)τα [':-']ι h[ο]δε πλατιφοίναρχος α[- - -]

*Restorations.* init. [hoπο]κα vel [αἱ] κα; ἐξστράφεται: aor. subiun. ab ἐκ-στράφω (vel ἐκ-τράφω); αἱ δεραμοισ(?): coniectura de errore lapicidae facta, ἐρά(ν)οις hic potest legi (cf. infra 8).

*Epigraphical commentary.* I have not seen the stone. Ed. pr. s readings are reported. Regarding traces, they note that before the φερε there may be room for one letter, that between the h and the δε there may be room for one or two letters, and that the last letter is probably an alpha.

## 7

- 1 <sup>Λ</sup>[- - -] . ι ἡδοφοιλῆοηνεμ[':-']δφ[- - -]
- 2 [- - -]ας ἡονα . [':-'] τὸν πλατιφοινάρχον [τὰ]ν ζαμίαν παρσχε[ν] τοον  
φ[']ο[ι]νον· αἱ δὲ μὲ ἡπερπαρσχ[ο]μεν φοίφοθεν ἡο ἐπιγνόμον ἐπελ[ά]στο  
τογ οῖλον <sup>vacat?</sup>

Varia Lectio: [- - -]ας ἡονα . [- - -] δφ[- - -] . ι ἡδοφοιλῆοηνεμ [':-'] τὸν πλατιφοινάρχον κτλ. The first editors assumed that the first reading is better because the *Schlangenschrift* of these inscriptions has a closed appearance.

*Restorations.* ι ἡδο φοιλῆοην (i.e. ὁδοῦ κοίλων), sed licet tibi φοιγῆο, φοιγῆοον, ἡο ρνεμ[- - -] legere; vid. ed. pr. 175. || 2 φοίφοθεν = οἶκοθεν (= ἐκ τῶν ιδίων); ἐπελ[ά]στο = ἐπελάσθω; οῖλον: ab ὄχλος; utrum acc. sg. an gen. pl.?

*Epigraphical Commentary.* The stone, consisting of two fragments, is inscribed on two sides. The (current) upper side (**A**) is very worn and I could barely verify ed. pr. s readings (which are doubtless correct). See there (p. 175) for full account of traces and dotted letters. The Bank (**B**) is well-preserved and the letters are very clear.



- A2** After ἡὼνα there are traces of a vertical stroke: perhaps the first leg of a σάν.  
**B** Ed. pr. suggest that, since no letter was inscribed after the break, a *vacat* is probable after οφλον.

## 8

- 1 [πλατιφοί]νονς(?) αἰ μ' ἐξστ[- -]  
 2 [- -] . ας ἔραν[ος - -] (vel ἔραν[ίξειν - -])?

*Epigraphical Commentary.* The block is broken into two fragments; both are very worn. I report the readings of ed. pr. who trace an upper part of a vertical stroke at the beginning of line 2 which is followed by an alpha missing its middle stroke.

## 9

- A1** [- - - ἐ]πιγνό[ν?]ς ε[- - -]  
**2** [- -]σπ[- - - - -]  
**B** [- -]ο[- - -]

*Restorations.* [- - - ἐ]πιγνό[ν]ς: i.e. (si haec lectio vera est) ἐπιγνούς (pt. aor. ab ἐπιγινώσκω).

*Epigraphical Commentary.* The block, broken into two fragments, is inscribed on two sides. Both are very worn and I could only read securely **A2** and the last two letters in **A1**.

## 10

- [- -]ν αἰ τις ἐξῶ[- -]

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I could not make a positive identification of this block. I report the readings of the first editors who note that the inscribed part of the stone seems to have been trimmed to receive the inscription and that the upper parts of the letters τι extend beyond the inscribed face.

## 11

- 1 ^[- - -]πλατιφοινάρχονς διπλεσαν ὀφ[λεν - - -]  
 2 [- -] . . νονς ηυιρερτα[- -]  
 3 [- - - h]οπόκα |<sup>n</sup> φοινά . [ .(?) ] ατοπ .(?) [- -]

*Restorations.* **2** [πλατιφ]οίνονς?; ηυιρερτα: utrum nomen viri an adverbium? fortasse ηυι- (π)ερτα[- -], i.e. ὡς περ τα[- -]. || **3** in.: ὀπόκα, ὅπω κα? φοινάματο? vel φοινά[ι]ατο? vel φοινάχ[ρ]ατοπ[οιεν] (ab \*φοινακρατο-ποτ- (cf. μελίκρατον))?

*Epigraphical Commentary.* The block is inscribed on two sides. The top (**A**) is well-preserved but I could not verify all possible traces detected by the first editors on it and on the Bank (**B**).

- A2** Ed. pr. suggest possible οἰ at the beginning.

**I2**

- 1 [- - - πλατιφ]οινά[ρχο - - -]  
 2 [- - -]ο . α γενομ[- - -]  
 3 [- - -]ς δε ζαμ[ι - - -]

*Restorations.* 2 γένος? || 3 ζαμ[ία] vel ζαμ[ιον]? cf. 2A et fortasse I3.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I could securely read only part of line 2. Ed. pr. s readings are reported.

**I3**

- A [- - - ζ]αμιας ἔνστε . (?) [- - -]  
 B [- - -]τ[.]ι ανδρ[- - -]  
 [- - -]ι[.] ηι[- - -]

*Restorations.* A ἔνστε = ἔστε

*Epigraphical Commentary.* The block is inscribed on two sides; both are very worn; I report ed. pr. s readings.

- A At the end ed. pr. trace a possible narrow nu.  
 B1 After the dotted tau ed. pr. consider an alpha.  
 B2 Ed pr. note that the beginning of the line is difficult to read and might constitute the conjunction between sides A and B.

**I4**

- 1 [- - - α]ρχονς [- - -]  
 2 [- - -] α ενστ[ε] α[- - -]  
 3 [- - -] ιαρά τράπ[εζα(?) - - -]

*Restorations.* 1 [πλατιφοίνα]ρχον σ[- - -] vel [πλατιφοινά]ρχονς

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I could not make a positive identification of this block; ed. pr. s readings are reported.

**I5**

- A [- - -]α το ηερακλειο : επευθ[- - -]  
 B [- - -]ο δε αγ[.(?)]θηγ δ[- - -]  
 C [- - -] . . επο . [- - -]

*Restorations.* A ηερακλειο: Ἡράκλειον (fanum Herculis) vel Ἡράκλειος (mensis). ἐπ' εὐ-  
 θ[εῖαν]? vel ἔπευθ[ύνεν]? B ἀν[έ]θηγ? vel Ἀγ[ό]θηγ?

*Epigraphical Commentary.* The block is inscribed on three sides. A (top) is very well-preserved; I could see little on B and C where I report the readings of the first editors. They note that it is uncertain if and how A connects to B and how C joins B.

- A As ed. pr. noted, what looks like an alpha missing its crossbar at the beginning might be the right part of a σάν. C.M. Keesling first pointed out to me that

a tricolon (:) clearly appeared on the stone between *ἡρακλεος* and *επευθ*. It also came out clearly in the squeeze. It was not noted by the first editors, and punctuation is otherwise not used in these fragments. I doubt, however, that it may be taken for damage to the stone.<sup>16</sup> At the end of the line ed. pr. note possible traces of letters.

**B** Ed. pr. tentatively consider an epsilon after the first dotted nu.

## 16

αεεν πο . [- - -]

*Epigraphical Commentary.* Only a small section of the block was inscribed. The inscribed face is rather worn and I report ed. pr. s readings. They note that nothing was inscribed before the α.

## 17

^[- - -]θ |<sup>B</sup> ηεντ[- - -]

*Restorations.* [ἀνα]θηέντ[ον]? [τυ]θηέντ[ον]? [με] θ' ηεν τ[- - -]?

*Epigraphical Commentary.* The block is inscribed on two sides. **A** is inaccessible; ed. pr. report probable traces before the theta. The letters on **B** are worn but clear enough.

## 18

[- - -]εκαα[- - -]

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I could not make a positive identification of this block; I report ed. pr. s reading. They note possible traces before the epsilon.

## 19

[- - -]ν[- - -]

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I could not make a positive identification of this block; I report ed. pr. s reading. They note a possible epsilon before the nu.

## Translation

1, 2A, 3, 4

[- - -] years [- - -] the *platiwoinarchoi* shall [- - -] ne the *platiwoinoi* in each case. If they do not ne them, they shall owe to Zeus and Athena

<sup>16</sup> For the use of punctuation in general and of the tricolon in particular in Tiryns and the Argolid see *LSAG*<sup>2</sup> 145, 153.

thirty *medimnoi* (of grain?) [- - -] twice as much. The *platiwoinarchoi* [leaving their office (?)] [- - -] give back to the *hieromnamon* the [- - -] the *hieromnamon* [- - -] shall [administer(?)] the public goods(?) wherever the people decide. Assembly [shall be held(?)]<sup>17</sup> [- - -] theater(?) [- - -]

2B

[- - -] pure [- - -] writings (or: letters?) [- - -]

5

[- - - the] *hieromnamon* to the assembly(?)

6

[- - -] the *epignomon* (arbiter?) change(?) [- - -] the *platiwoinarchos* [- - -]

7.2

[- - -] the *platiwoinarchoi* shall provide the ne of (from?) the public goods(?). If they do not provide it (on behalf of someone? or: substantially?) from their own resources, the *epignomon* shall drive the crowd.

11.1

[- - - the] *platiwoinarchoi* shall owe double(?)

14.3

[- - -] sacred table [- - -]

---

<sup>17</sup> Or: É wherever the people decide [to hold?] an assembly.

*Commentary**Date, Script, Language*

On the basis of the script and the forms of the letters, the first editors dated these fragments to the late seventh century.<sup>18</sup> Jeffery-Johnston (*LSAG*<sup>2</sup> 443) suggested a slightly later date: ca. 600–550(?). Argive influence may be evident in both script and dialect. Nevertheless, as Michael Jameson has pointed out to me, the similarities between the Argive and Tirynthian scripts and dialects are not necessarily due to Argive influence; both could simply have developed from a common source. On the script cf. above and see Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975, 184–189; Foley 1988, 126–127; Pitarakis 1991, 569–570. On the dialect see Pilar Fernández Álvarez 1986.

*The πλατιφοῖνοι and the πλατιφοῖναρχοι*

Among the several obscurities of these fragments, the question of what is referred to by the words πλατιφοῖναρχος and πλατιφοῖνοι is one of the more puzzling. The first editors assumed that the fragments deal with meetings associated with Zeus and Athena, where wine and probably food are consumed.<sup>19</sup> They identify πλατι- with Dor. πλατι- = Att. πλησι-, as in πλατίον/πλησίον (near). Thus πλατι-/πλησι- is in fact equivalent to παρά. The πλατιφοῖνοι are those who take wine near or beside, i.e. beside a person or a god. The πλατιφοῖναρχος would be their head or supervisor.<sup>20</sup> They are comparable to the Athenian ἄρχοντες and παράσιτοι (in the pre-comic sense of the word, i.e. those who eat beside a god)<sup>21</sup> or to the Peloponnesian (ἐν)σίταρχοι/ἔνοιτοι.<sup>22</sup> It is unclear whether these symposia or common meals are connected to an occasional religious ceremony or form a regular institution like the Spartan and Cretan συσσίτια or φειδίτια. One way or the other, failure to provide contributions (ἔρanos(?)) nos. 6 and 8) to them would result in a fine.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975, 184–189.

<sup>19</sup> Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975, 202, 205.

<sup>20</sup> Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975, 165–166; cf. 169.

<sup>21</sup> On the Athenian institution see P. Schmitt Pantel, *La cité au banquet. Histoire de repas publiques dans les cités grecques*, Rome, 1992, 100–104.

<sup>22</sup> Citing *IG V 1 passim* (see index p. 343); *SEG XXX* 351; *IG V 2*, 266.36–37.

<sup>23</sup> Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975, 195–199, 202; cf. English summary on page 205. For documentation see 195–199. On the meaning of ἔρanos cf. above commentary on no. 5.

This interpretation was essentially adopted by Koerner (1985) who, carrying it further, attempted a reconstruction of Tirynthian institutions on the basis of these fragments. Van Effenterre and Ruz also follow it (*Nomima* I no. 78), translating πλατιφοίναρχοι as chefs-convives and πλατιφοίνοι as convives.

Both Koerner<sup>24</sup> and Van Effenterre and Ruz<sup>25</sup> rejected Dubois' interpretation connecting, through an elaborate etymological study, πλατι- with πλαθύω (Attic πληθύω to be/become full). According to this interpretation, the πλατιφοίνοι would be a college of priests, sacred cup-bearers, in a cult of Zeus or Athena, in charge of libation at ceremonies, comparable to the so-called sacred men of the Andania mysteries regulations, *LSCG* 65.1 3, who take their oath while libating blood and wine.<sup>26</sup> The comparison, as Kevin Clinton pointed out to me, is invalid: the libation of blood and wine at Andania is merely a part of the oath ritual, not a duty of the office. Dubois' interpretation was employed by Hansen (1984) in an attempt to reconstruct a religious amphictyony in Tiryns on the basis of the reference to a *hieromnemon*.

It is worth noting that dignitaries whose title is a compound of wine and lord (or master) are not unheard of in the ancient Near East. In a series of Hittite texts, we meet an official entitled GAL.GEsTIN (wine lord. Sumerograms are used throughout; the exact Hittite wording is unknown). The reference is mostly to a military office although civilian office is also documented.<sup>27</sup> The Akkadian *rab karani* (= Sumerian GAL.GEsTIN) is attested in neo-Assyrian documents.<sup>28</sup> This title appears to be echoed in the Old Testament's רַב־שֶׁקֶה (Rab-shakeh; Chief of Cup-Bearers).<sup>29</sup>

It is beyond question that the *platiwoinoi* are subjected to the *platiwoinarchoi*. But the internal dynamics within the two parties constituting the group remain a matter of conjecture with varying degrees of probability. It is quite clear, however, that the group plays a role in the community. The existence of a community, obviously a polis, and its institutions, is evident from the references to officials i.e. *epignomon* (6 and 7) and *hiaromnamon* (3 and 5), to a ἀλυσία (4 (meeting in a theater?))

<sup>24</sup> Koerner 1985, 453 n. 4.

<sup>25</sup> *Nomima* I p. 296.

<sup>26</sup> Dubois 1980, 256. Cf. LSJ suppl. s.v. πλατιφοίναρχος and πλατιφοίνοι.

<sup>27</sup> See R.H. Beal, *The Organization of the Hittite Military*, Heidelberg, 1992, 342–357.

<sup>28</sup> *The Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, K 206. I owe the Akkadian reference to Raymond Westbrook.

<sup>29</sup> 2Kings 18 19; Is. 36 37 *passim*.

and 5), to a δᾶμος with its power to issue resolutions (4), to δαμοσua, to φοινά (7),<sup>30</sup> and perhaps to ὄφλος. All of these may not explain the exact relations between the group and the polis but they are unlikely to have been mentioned unless the group were subject to the authority of the polis. The public dimension and the religious context suggest a college obviously hierarchic possibly of officials in charge of or at least engaged in a particular cultic activity regulated by the city and performed on its behalf;<sup>31</sup> the fact that these texts were inscribed in a rather secluded location (instead of being displayed in a public place) suggests an exclusive activity, though public cult performance is likely to have been involved on occasion.

*The hieromnemon (5); Zeus and Athena*

The *hieromnemon* mentioned here is very likely a sanctuary official.<sup>32</sup> In the Archaic period *hieromnemes* are documented elsewhere in the Argive plain. Four of them, representing the four Argive tribes, are known from the Argive Heraion.<sup>33</sup> *Hieromnemes* are also known from the *heroon* of Perseus in Mycenae.<sup>34</sup> It is reasonable to assume that the

<sup>30</sup> The meaning public goods for δαμοσua by which provisions or property rather than money may be meant in this early period seems better than public affairs, as the context appears to be nancial. See Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975, 194; Koerner, *Gesetzestexte* p. 92. For an example see *SEG* XI 244.1 2 (*LSAG*<sup>2</sup> 143 no. 8; Sicyon, ca. 500 B.C.): τοῦτονδε κοινὰ ἔστο τὸ ἐστιατόριον καὶ τὰ ὄρε καὶ ἡ χαλκιδὼν καὶ τᾶλα, κτλ (The following items shall be the common property of the following (members of an association): the dining hall, and the wooden implements for pressing olives and the copper cauldron and the rest etc.). I owe this reference to M.H. Jameson. On public property cf. D.M. Lewis, Public Property in the City, in O. Murray and S. Price (eds.), *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*, Oxford, 1990, 245–263.

<sup>31</sup> See Part I p. 102.

<sup>32</sup> Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975, 194–195. This appears to be the earliest known attestation: Parker 1996, 52 n. 37. Cf. below commentary on 26.27–28.

<sup>33</sup> *LSAG*<sup>2</sup> 32 (p. 170; = *IG* IV 517; *DGE* 669.1; Buck, *GD* no. 82) ca. 460–450 B.C.(?). See also *LSAG*<sup>2</sup> 21 (p. 196, cf. 161–162; plate 28; = *DGE* 96.3) c. 480–475 B.C.(?) and perhaps *LSAG*<sup>2</sup> 36 (p. 170 cf. 166; = *SEG* XVI 244; *DGE* 96.2) ca. 460–450 B.C.(?); *SEG* XXXIII 275 ca. 475–425. For later inscriptions see *IG* IV 516, 521, 530.

<sup>34</sup> *IG* IV 493 (= *DGE* 98; Buck, *GD* 81); early fifth century B.C. A capital of a column from Mycenae. Now in Athens, Epigraphical Museum, Inv. No. 218. (I have seen the stone).

Αἰ μὲ δαμιογία εἶε τὸς ἱερομνάμονας τὸς ἐς Περσεὶ το(ῖ)σι γονεῦσι κοιτέρας ἔμεν κα(ῖ) τὰ φεφεμένα.

If the office of *damiourgos* is not manned, the *hieromnamones* designated to the *heroon* of Perseus shall judge between the parents,\* according to the decrees.

\* Of the children who participate in the cult. See Frankel (*IG*) and Buck's commen-

present *hieromnemon* handles sanctuary finances or property.<sup>35</sup> A sanctuary is not mentioned. Its existence is implied by the phrase ὀφλὲν ἐν[ς || Δι]φα κα̣θαναίαν (2A-3). The debt to Zeus and Athena is probably paid to a sanctuary of the gods, in all probability in their poliad capacity. The existence of a sanctuary of Athena in Tiryns, perhaps on the Acropolis and so probably of Athena Polias, as the first editors have argued, is supported by a few other finds, all from the Acropolis or its immediate surroundings. Among these is a potsherd bearing the inscription Ἀθαναίᾱς ἐμὶ (I belong to Athena).<sup>36</sup> Nevertheless, the sanctuary on the Acropolis of Tiryns had previously been attributed to Hera and the first editors' reattribution to Athena has been questioned.<sup>37</sup> True, literary sources say nothing about a cult of Athena in Tiryns. Pausanias (2.17.5), on the other hand, saw a wooden statue of Hera at the Argive Heraion that had been brought from Tiryns.<sup>38</sup> But considering Argos' subsequent complete subjugation of Tiryns, it is entirely possible for a local cult of Athena to have been terminated without leaving any traces in the literary tradition. Accordingly, even if the dialect and the script could betray Argive influence – and this is in and of itself questionable –<sup>39</sup> these fragments strongly suggest that in this period Tiryns was religiously independent of Argos; its poliad divinities were not Hera but rather Zeus and Athena.

### Block 5

For the *hieromnemon* see above.

---

taries ad loc. and esp. M.H. Jameson, 'Perseus, the Hero of Mykenai', in R. Högg and G.C. Nordquist (eds.), *Celebrations of Death and Divinity in the Bronze Age Argolid* (ActaAth-4° 40), Stockholm, 1990, 213–223.

<sup>35</sup> Koerner, *Gesetzestexte* p. 92. Cf. *LSCG* 91.6–8.

<sup>36</sup> Sixth century B.C.(?) *LSAG*<sup>2</sup> p. 150 no. 9 (photograph in Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975, pl. 48b). On the finds see Karo *RE* VI A 2, 1466, s.v. Tiryns; Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975, 199 with n. 3; Foley 1988, 147. Further on the sanctuary see Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975, 199–201.

<sup>37</sup> See Foley 1988, 127–128, 145–147; Pierrat 1991, 569–570.

<sup>38</sup> On this passage see Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975, 200–201; Foley 1988, 146.

<sup>39</sup> See above p. 200.



*Block 14 line 3*

If the restoration ἰαθὰ τράπ[εζα] is correct (as it seems), this is probably a reference to a cult table. Sacri cial activity may therefore be inferred.<sup>40</sup>

*Block 15A*

ἡερακλειο may be taken as a reference to a sanctuary of Heracles (or to a month).<sup>41</sup> Heracles had close connections with the Argolid since he was enslaved to Eurystheus, the ruler of the region.<sup>42</sup> Diodorus 4.10.1 2 implies that Heracles was born at Tiryns prior to his mother and stepfather's flight to Thebes, his more common birthplace.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> On cult tables see Gill 1991; Jameson 1994, esp. 39–41 (as used in *theoxenia*) and 56–57. It is tempting yet somewhat too risky to take the possible reference to a table as an indication of *theoxenia* and to connect this further with the direct or indirect reference to Heracles (see note on 15A), a favorite *theoxenia* guest (on this see Jameson 1994 *passim*). It is likewise impossible to decide whether the table and a possible *theoxenia* are related to the communal meals which may be referred to here (cf. above), and, if so, in what way.

<sup>41</sup> Verdelis, Jameson, and Papachristodoulou 1975, 183.

<sup>42</sup> *Il.* 19.95–133 and see Foley 1988, 127, 147.

<sup>43</sup> On Heracles at Tiryns see C.A. Salowey, *The Peloponnesian Herakles: Cult and Labors*, Dissertation, Bryn Mawr, 1995, 20–22.

## SEG XXVIII 421

ARCADIA. MEGALOPOLIS. SANCTUARY  
REGULATIONS. CA. 200 B.C.

(Figure 17)

An upper part of a slightly tapered limestone stele badly weathered, worn, and scratched, found in 1975, 700 meters northeast of the ancient theater at Megalopolis where it had been left by a shepherd. The original provenance is unknown. The stone is unevenly broken below; the top, left, and right sides are preserved; the preserved back is rough-picked. The inscribed face is worn to the extent of being at times almost unreadable. The stone is now cemented into a base which conceals the lower part of the letters in the last line.

H. 0.64, W. 0.545 (top), 0.572 (bottom), Th. 0.14 (top), 0.154 (bottom) L.H. ca. 0.02,  $\Phi$  0.024, O,  $\Theta$ , and some  $\Omega$ s ca. 0.012–0.015. Interlinear space 0.01. Upper margin ca. 0.035.

Megalopolis, Archaeological Museum. Inv. 133.

Ed. Te Riele 1978 (= SEG XXVIII 421; A.L. Connolly, *New Docs.* IV, 110–111).

Cf. J. and L. Robert BE 1979 no. 196; G.H.R. Horsley, *New Docs.* III, 23;<sup>1</sup> Parker 1983, 353–355; Jost 1985, 543;<sup>2</sup> Cole 1992, 110 with note 66, 111 with note 76; Lupu 2001, 123 note 32.

Photograph: Te Riele 1978, 327 (fair).

ca. 200 a.

Στάλα Ἰσιος Σαράπιος.  
Θεός· τύχα ἀγαθὰ. Ἱερὸν ἅγιον Ἰσιος  
Σαράπιος Ἀνούβιος. <sup>ν</sup> Εἰσπορεύεσ-  
4 θαι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τὸν βουλόμενον  
θύειν καθαρίζοντα ἀπὸ μὲν  
λέχ[ο]υς ἐγκαταίαν, ἀπὸ δὲ δι-  
αφθέρματος <sup>ν</sup> τεσσαράκοντα

<sup>1</sup> Summary.

<sup>2</sup> Egyptian cults in Arcadia.

- 8 καὶ τέσσαρας ἡμέρας, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶ[ν]  
 φ<sup>υ</sup>σικῶν ἑβδομαίαν, ἀπὸ φό[ν]ου(?)  
 ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας, ἀπὸ δὲ αἰγέου καὶ  
 προβατέου τριταῖον, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν  
 12 λοιπῶν βρωμάτων ἐκ κεφαλᾶς  
 λουσάμενον αὐθημερί, ἀπὸ δὲ  
 ἀφροδισίῳ αὐθημερί<sup>ν</sup> λουσά-  
 μενον, ἀπὸ ΠΑΘΙΝ[.]ΙΑΜΕΠΓΑΝ  
 16 ΜΟΑΝ αὐθημερί λουσάμε[ν]ον .  
 [- - - - -]υεσθαι μηδεγ[- - - - -]  
 [- - - - -] εἰσπορεύεσθα[ι - - - - -]  
 [- - - - -] . ΕΩΝΠΙΟ[- - - - -]  
 20 [- - - - -]ΣΘΕ[- - - - -]  
 - - - - -

*Restorations.* Suppl. Te Riele. || **17** fortasse [μηδὲ (vel sim.) εἰσπορε]ύεσθαι μηδέγ[α- - -] L.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have seen the stone. I have not given an account of each and every disagreement with the first edition in respect to dotted letters. A small middle point appears in some of the omicrons. Alpha with a broken crossbar; some serifs.

- 7** A crack in the stone coincides with the vacant space.  
**9** The vacant space coincides with a crack. ἑβδομαίαν: ΕΒΔΟΜΑΙΑΝ. The iota which had been left out was inscribed above the line. The stone is extremely worn past ΑΠΟ. Te Riele prints φό[ν]ου. The only secure letter seemed to me to be an omicron, 0.055 to the right of ΑΠΟ. The upsilon-like traces visible in Te Riele's photograph to the right of this secure omicron may not be an upsilon, which has a different shape in this inscription. If this is a genuine upsilon, and it is the last letter of a word, a *vacat* has to be assumed at the end of the line. A possible loop appears 0.025 to the right of ΑΠΟ preceded by what could be an upper part of a vertical stroke but the traces are confusing.  
**15** The lacuna is followed by a vertical stroke which could be a part of a letter. E: the vertical and the outer horizontal strokes seem secure. Te Riele suggests that a N or an H might be possible. II: A rather slim N or, less likely, H is perhaps not entirely impossible.  
**16** ΜΟΑΝ: A dot appears in the middle of the O; Α: Λ; Ν (so Te Riele): doubtful traces. Last trace: Υ Te Riele.  
**17** γ: a bottom of a left vertical seems to appear: Μ Te Riele.  
**19** First trace: Μ Te Riele.

### Translation

Stele of Isis and Sarapis. God! Good luck. A sanctuary sacred to Isis, Sarapis, Anoubis. (3) Whoever wishes to sacrifice shall enter the sanctuary, being pure: From<sup>3</sup> childbirth on the ninth day; from an

<sup>3</sup> Or: after.

abortion, for forty-four days; from menstruation, on the seventh day; from bloodshed(?), for seven days; (10) from (eating) goat meat and mutton, on the third (day); from other foods, having washed oneself from the head down, on the same day; from sexual intercourse, on the same day, having washed oneself; (15) from [- - -] on the same day, having washed oneself [- - -] (17) no one shall enter(?) [- - -] enter [- - -]

### Commentary

This inscription belongs to a group of sacred laws which must have stood at entrances to sanctuaries listing cathartic requirements to be met upon entering. Most, though not all, of the concerns common to this group of laws are evident here.<sup>4</sup> That a purifying measure was required from anyone entering a sanctuary is clear from Hippocrates statement (*De morbo sacro* VI 364 Littr ):<sup>5</sup>

Ἐ αὐτοί τε ὄρους τοῖσι θεοῖσι τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τῶν τεμενέων ἀποδεικνύμενοι, ὥς ἂν μηδεὶς ὑπερβαίνειν ἦν μὴ ἀγνέειν, εἰσιόντες τε ἡμεῖς περιρρανόμεθα οὐχ ὥς μαινόμενοι, ἀλλ' εἴ τι καὶ πρότερον ἔχομεν μύσος, τοῦτο ἀφαγνισόμενοι.

Ἐ we ourselves both affix boundaries to the sanctuaries and the sacred precincts of the gods in order that no one may cross them unless he is pure and, upon entering, sprinkle ourselves with water not as if de ling ourselves but as ridding ourselves from any pre-existing pollution we may have.

This simple action is not commonly prescribed speci cally in comparable documents<sup>6</sup> and is likely to have been taken for granted. Otherwise, the documents may be quite speci c, enumerating particular types of pollution and measures to be taken before entering. As is quite common, the source of pollution is followed here by the number of days needed for puri cation, expressed by the cardinal or the ordinal.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> See Part I p. 15. For a study with bibliographical references to these laws as a group see Parker 1983, 352–356 (for the code from Cyrene, *LSS* 115, (above Part I pp. 77–79) see *ibid.* 334–351); cf. Chaniotis 1997, esp. 145–148.

<sup>5</sup> Rudhardt 1992, 172.

<sup>6</sup> For exceptions see below commentary on lines 12–13. For the *perirrhantēria* as marking the sacred area of a sanctuary cf. *SEG* LXVIII 1937 B 2 (new fragment of *LSS* 51; for the text see Part I pp. 22–24); *LSS* 91.2; Lucian *Sacr.* 13; see also Cole 1988, 162.

<sup>7</sup> This does not seem to affect the sense beyond distinguishing between women and men (the masculine adj. is used for both; cf. Te Riele 1978, 329, 330). Cf., however, Connolly, *New Docs.* IV, 110–111.

Except in the cases of bloodshed (rarely mentioned and doubtful here) and death (very common though not mentioned in the surviving part of this inscription), the pollution is on the whole contracted through bodily functions.<sup>8</sup> It is either primary, i.e. contracted through one's own body or secondary, i.e. contracted through the body of another person, more specifically (excluding contact with a corpse),<sup>9</sup> the body of a woman, as in the case of childbirth and abortion/miscarriage.<sup>10</sup> Pollution being taken as a given, these documents aim at avoiding sacrilege by taking measures to prevent the pollution from reaching the sanctuary. Sprinkling upon entry aside, the lapse of time is mostly enough to remove the pollution; in certain cases a simple additional remedy (namely a wash) may be prescribed.

*Date.* Te Riele's reasonable date, ca. 200 B.C., is based upon letter forms and upon the dialect, Doric koine rather than Arcadian.

*Lines 1–3*

Θεός and τύχα/η appear together as a heading in a number of Arcadian official documents.<sup>11</sup> Their appearance here may suggest that this document is also official. Provided that the date is correct, it may indeed be, as Te Riele has pointed out, the earliest known evidence for an organized cult of the Egyptian gods in this area.<sup>12</sup> The emphasis on divine interest in the inscription is noteworthy. Ascribing the ownership of the stele listing regulations for entry into the sanctuary to the gods seems somewhat similar to presenting the prohibition in no. 4 above as a divine pronouncement.<sup>13</sup>

*Line 2*

Ἱερὸν ἅγιον is, to the best of my knowledge, not attested in documents of this kind. For the meaning 'a sanctuary sacred to' cf. Herodotus 2.41 and 44.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Chaniotis 1997, 147.

<sup>9</sup> Not represented in the surviving part of the present inscription.

<sup>10</sup> Discussed by Cole 1992, 109–110.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *IG* V 2, 1, 11, 391–393, 396, 429. Θεός· τύχα/η αγαθά/ή appears as the heading in *IG* V 2, 395; *SEG* XI 1051, XXV 447, XXXVII 340. Cf. Sfameni Gasparro 1997, 83–84.

<sup>12</sup> Te Riele 1978, 329–330. On the cult of the Egyptian gods in Arcadia see Jost 1985, 542–544.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. in this respect no. 25 below.

<sup>14</sup> *LSJ* s.v. ἅγιος I 1; for further discussion see Connolly, *New Docs.* IV, 111–112.

*Line 6*

*Childbirth.*<sup>15</sup> Pollution is contracted by contact with a woman giving birth (λεχώ, οὔς) or from the function itself which pollutes the woman (λέχος, οὐς; a form of τίκτω makes things clearer).<sup>16</sup> Cf. *LSCG* 124.5 8;<sup>17</sup> 171.16<sup>18</sup> (10 days); *LSS* 54.5 (7 days);<sup>19</sup> 91.15 (3 days after contact with childbirth; 21 days for the woman); 119.6 (?; 14 days if the child was exposed;<sup>20</sup> cf. 11 12(?));<sup>21</sup> *LSAM* 12.7 (2 days plus a wash);<sup>22</sup> 14.2 (the text is mutilated); below 8.3. Cf. also *LSCG* 154 A 24;<sup>23</sup> *LSS* 115 A 16 20 (3 days for a man present in a house with a woman in childbirth), cf. B 15 23.<sup>24</sup>

Pollution may be contracted not only from human birth. *LSAM* 51.6 9 mentions a dog: ([ἀ]πὸ Ἐ ) γυναικὸς [λ]ε|[χοῦ]ς καὶ κυνὸς|[τε]το[κυ]ίας τ[ο]ι[τα]ίου[ς] λουσα|[μ]ένους κτλ.<sup>25</sup>

*Lines 6–7*

*Abortion (or Miscarriage).*<sup>26</sup> Cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1365.22 (40 days for the woman); *LSCG* 55.7 (40 days);<sup>27</sup> 139.12 (abortive drugs; 40 days); 171.17 (?; 10 days); *LSS* 54.6 (40 days);<sup>28</sup> 119.4 ((?)), 5, 10 (40 days);<sup>29</sup> *LSAM* 84.5

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Parker 1983, esp. 48 55, 59 60, 63 64; also Cole 1992, 109 110.

<sup>16</sup> I follow here Te Riele 329; Connolly, *New Docs.* IV, 110; Parker 1983, 352 353.

<sup>17</sup> A difficult passage; see Ziehen's note ad loc. (*LGS* II pp. 305 306). For possible interpretations see Parker 1983, 354 355.

<sup>18</sup> Quoted in Part I p. 35.

<sup>19</sup> The number of days is expressed by a masculine adjective.

<sup>20</sup> 40 days are required after exposure in *LSAM* 84.3 4.

<sup>21</sup> The state of the text does not allow any certainty. It may well be that the reference here is only to abortion and miscarriage, rather than to childbirth. Cf. note on lines 6 7 below.

<sup>22</sup> The number of days is expressed by a masculine adjective.

<sup>23</sup> On this document cf. Part I pp. 42, 77.

<sup>24</sup> The cathartic code from Cyrene; cf. Parker 1983, 336, 345 346.

<sup>25</sup> (From Ἐ ) a woman giving birth and a dog giving birth on the third day, having washed oneself etc. (I am grateful to L.T. Brown). On childbirth as well as contact with a corpse and bloodshed as sources for pollution see also Euripides *IT* 380 384; Theophrastus *Char.* 16.9 (the Superstitious); Porphyry *Abst.* 4.16.6; cf. Diogen. Laert. 8.33 (= Kern *Orph. frag.* Test. 214).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Parker 1983, 354 356; also Cole 1992, 110.

<sup>27</sup> For the woman; by analogy to *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1365 which is an earlier version of the same law (cf. Part I pp. 11 12).

<sup>28</sup> The number of days is expressed by a masculine adjective.

<sup>29</sup> The text is mutilated.

(40 days);<sup>30</sup> cf. *LSCG* 154 A 24; *LSS* 115 B 24 27;<sup>31</sup> *LSAM* 20.20.<sup>32</sup> The word διάφθορα is not documented elsewhere although derivatives of the same root are usually used to denote abortion or miscarriage. As in the case of childbirth, the pollution may not be limited to the women undergoing a miscarriage/abortion; it may be contracted through contact with her (see *LSS* 115 B 24 27). A person may contract pollution not only from a human miscarriage. A third-century A.D. inscription from Lindus mentions a miscarriage of a woman, a dog, and a donkey: [ἀ]πὸ φθορᾶς γυναικὸς ἢ κυνὸς ἢ ὄνου ἡμε. μ' (40 days).<sup>33</sup>

### Lines 8–9

*Menstruation.*<sup>34</sup> There is no doubt that menstruation is meant by τὰ φυσικά, as Te Riele noted (1978, 329–330), although it is may be elsewhere referred to as τὰ καταμήνια or τὰ γυναικεῖα. Seven days<sup>35</sup> are a common requirement and appear also in *LSS* 119.13 (καταμήνια) and *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1365.20 and, in a more elaborate form, in the parallel *LSCG* 55.5 (γυναικεῖα) which, like *LSS* 119.13, also requires a wash. Nine days are prescribed in *LSS* 54.7 8 (γυναικεῖα).<sup>36</sup>

### Lines 9–10

*Bloodshed(?).* I doubt very much that φόνου can indeed be read here.<sup>37</sup> If it can, it is likely, as the Roberts have asserted (*BE* 1979 no. 196), to refer not to murder but rather to killing of an animal or hunting.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>30</sup> The same number of days is prescribed for exposure of an infant (lines 3–4). 14 days are prescribed in this case in *LSS* 119.17.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. above n. 24.

<sup>32</sup> For this document cf. Part I p. 89.

<sup>33</sup> *LSS* 91.11. Sokolowski (comm. ad loc.) seems to be wrong in understanding φθορά as s. duction. See Ziehen's note (*LGS* II p. 151) on *LSCG* 55.7, Parker 1983, 355, Cf. S. Wide, ΑΩΡΟΙ ΒΙΑΙΟΘΑΝΑΤΟΙ, *ARW* 12, 1909, 224–233 esp. 226–227; Soranus 1.56 (A 18.75); Galen 17 (I) 800 (lines 4 and 5). Sokolowski himself understood φθορείων in *LSCG* 139.12 and διαφθορᾶς in *LSS* 54.6 as an abortion. Cf. also *LSAM* 51.7 mentioned above note on line 6.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Parker 1983, 100–103, 153–154; also Cole 1992, 111.

<sup>35</sup> Responding, perhaps, to the seven days of menstruation viewed as a purification process; cf. Philo *Legum Allegoriae* 1.13: καὶ γυναιξὶ δὲ αἱ καταμήνιοι καθάρσεις ἅχρ' ἑβδομάδος παρατείνουσιν (and the monthly cleansing of women extends to seven days).

<sup>36</sup> Parker (1983, 101–102) notes that this requirement appears only late and in non-Greek cults; cf. however, Cole 1992, 111. *LSS* 54 (Delos; Syrian divinity) is dated to the late second century B.C.; *LSS* 119 (Ptolemais in Egypt) to the first century B.C.; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1365/*LSCG* 55 (Attica; Men) to the second century A.D.

<sup>37</sup> See above epigraphical commentary and note the asyndeton which occurs again only in 15.

<sup>38</sup> *LSJ* s.v. φόρος 4: blood when shed, gore.

In *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1365.22 23, an ἀνδροφόνος (evidently a homicide) is not allowed into the area of the sanctuary. Other laws, at least in their surviving parts, are practically silent.<sup>39</sup> As Ziehen noted (*LGS* II p. 151), exclusion of homicides from sanctuaries requires little elaboration.<sup>40</sup> Pollution contracted from murder is far more serious than the types of pollution usually dealt with by such laws; it is not temporary, may not be discarded by ordinary means, and purification from it calls for particular measures. Cf. below commentary on 17 and 27 B.

*Lines 10–12*

*Goat Meat, Mutton, Other Foods.*<sup>41</sup> Prohibitions regarding the goat are not uncommon. Prohibitions against sacrificing it appear mostly in cults of oriental divinities; see Part I pp. 57–58; *LSS* 91.8–9 prohibits footwear or anything else made of goat skin. As for consumption of goat meat, three days are also required in *LSCG* 139.10 and probably in *I.Perg* III 161 A 13.<sup>42</sup> The sheep (along with the pig) is forbidden in *LSCG* 114 A 2. A number of Greek sources talk about exclusion of sheep in Egyptian cults.<sup>43</sup>

A general stipulation regarding food seems unparalleled. It is possible that βρῶμα refers only to meat.<sup>44</sup> For specific prohibitions see *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1365.10–11 (garlic; pork; entrance on the same day following a wash from the head down is added in *LSCG* 55.3); 139.9 (lentil dish (φακή); 3 days), 11 (cheese; 1 day);<sup>45</sup> *LSS* 54.2–3 (a sh (ὀψάριον); 3 days) 3–4 (pork; a wash); 108.2–3;<sup>46</sup> *I.Perg* III 161 A 13 (goat meat and cheese); 3 days(?)). Cf. also the regulations pertaining to the cult of Dionysus Bromius, *LSAM* 84.12–15.

<sup>39</sup> Φονέας in *LSCG* 124.10 (cf. Chaniotis 1997, 155) is wholly restored.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. below commentary on 27 B 10.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Parker 1983, 357–365.

<sup>42</sup> Quoted in Part I pp. 61–63.

<sup>43</sup> (Following Te Riele 1978, 330): Herodotus 2.42: ὅσοι μὲν δὴ Διὸς Θηβαίος ἴδρυνται ἰρὸν ἢ νομοῦ τοῦ Θηβαίου εἰσὶ, οὗτοι μὲν νῦν πάντες ὁῖον ἀπεχόμενοι αἴγας θύουσι κτλ. (All those who have a sanctuary of the Theban Zeus or live in the nome of Thebes abstain from sheep and sacrifice goats). Sextus Empiricus *Pyrr.* 3.220: πρόβατον ἴσιδι θύειν ἄθεσμον (it is unlawful to sacrifice a sheep to Isis). Cf. *ibid.* 3.223; Plutarch *De Is. et Os.* 4 (352 D); Strabo 17.1.40 (812).

<sup>44</sup> *LSJ* s.v.

<sup>45</sup> In addition to goat meat (line 10).

<sup>46</sup> See Part I p. 17.



*Lines 12–13*

*Washing Oneself.*<sup>47</sup> A wash κατακέφαλα or κατὰ κεφαλῆς, i.e. from the head down,<sup>48</sup> is required in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1365.24; *LSCG* 55.4, 5 6; cf. *LSS* 65.8. Lustral sprinkling (περιρραίνεσθαι)<sup>49</sup> is mentioned in *LSAM* 12.8. In *LSCG* 139.15 17 it is to be preceded by anointment with olive oil. Other laws use λούεσθαι without specific details. See *LSCG* 124.4, 9; *LSAM* 12.6; 14.3; 18.12; 51.9 10, 11 12; cf. *LSS* 115 A 12. A shower is mostly required for purification after sexual intercourse (cf. below). It is interesting that here (as in *LSS* 54.3 4; cf. *LSCG* 55.3) it is mentioned after eating. As Ziehen has noted (*LGS* II p. 151) about the shower from the head down, the meaning of washing oneself lies beyond the mere act of cleaning; it is a ritual which obviously has a solemn cathartic significance.<sup>50</sup>

*Lines 13–15*

Sexual intercourse.<sup>51</sup> In contrast to the general reference here and elsewhere,<sup>52</sup> some laws may further qualify their requirements. *LSAM* 12.4 6 distinguishes between intercourse with one's own spouse and with a spouse of another;<sup>53</sup> *LSAM* 29.5 7 mentions a wife vs. a *hetaira*.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Parker 1983, 19–20.

<sup>48</sup> The expression goes back to Homer. An interesting example is *Il.* 18.24 where the grieving Achilles drenches himself by pouring dust on his body κατὰ κεφαλῆς. Cf. Parker 1983, 68.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. above general remarks.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Theophrastus *Char.* 16.12 13 (14 15 Diels Oxford text) (the Superstitious): καὶ τῶν περιρραϊνομένων ἐπὶ θαλάττης ἐπιμελῶς δόξειεν ἂν εἶναι. κἄν ποτε ἐπίδῃ σκοροδόφῳ ἐστεμμένον τῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς τριόδοις ἀπελθὼν κατὰ κεφαλῆς λούσασθαι καὶ ἱερείας καλέσας σκίλλῃ ἢ σκύλακι κελεῦσαι αὐτὸν περιζαθᾶραι (He would seem to be one of those who sprinkle themselves diligently on the sea shore, and if ever he sees one of the garlic-wreathed offerings on crossroads, he goes away to wash himself from the head down, and, having summoned a priestess, he orders her to purify him all over with a squill or a puppy). Cf. *ibid.* 16.2. Cf. Porphyry *De philos. ex orac. haur.* F. 314.36–37 Smith (p. 362; p. 116 Wolff).

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Parker 1983, esp. 91–92, 94; Cole 1992, 107–109. On sexual purity see also M.L. West, *Hesiod, Works and Days*, Oxford, 1978, 336–337.

<sup>52</sup> See also *LSCG* 55.4; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1565. 23–25 (same day; wash from the head down); *LSCG* 95.5; 124.9 (same day; wash); 171.17 (3 days); *LSS* 54.4 (3 days); 59.16; 108.1; 119.8 9 (2 days); *I.Perg* III 161. A 13; cf. *LSCG* 151 A 42; *LSS* 31.6. For sexual intercourse in a sanctuary see *LGS* II 61 (Buck, *GD* 64); cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1035.10–11.

<sup>53</sup> ἀπὸ ἰδίας γυναι|κόος καὶ ἰδίου ἀνδρός κτλ. (same day/second day plus a wash).

<sup>54</sup> (2 days/3 days). On a *hetaira* cf. *LSS* 91.18 (30 days); requirement from a *hetaira*: *LSAM* 18.13–14.

ἀπὸ συνουσίας νομίμου<sup>55</sup> is speci ed in the Lindian second-century A.D. *LSCG* 139.14;<sup>56</sup> in the third-century A.D. *LSS* 91.19, also from Lindus, we encounter the sinister ἀπὸ τῶν παρὰ νόμων οὐδέποτε καθαρός.<sup>57</sup> The Cyrene code (*LSS* 115 A 10–12) distinguishes between sexual intercourse at night or during the day.<sup>58</sup> In most cases a wash is required<sup>59</sup> and entrance to a sanctuary is frequently allowed on the same day.<sup>60</sup>

*Line 16*

It seems that the lost word starting with ΠΑΘΙΝ ought to be related to πάθος/πάσχω. Nevertheless, no solution seems possible to me without replacing some of the letters visible on the stone in this line.

*Line 17*

Condition or conditions under which one is not allowed into the sanctuary might have been dealt with here; see e.g. *LSCG* 124.10–22. For the use of εἰσπορεύεσθαι in laws of this kind see Lupu 2001, 123–124; cf. commentary on 4.11 above.

---

<sup>55</sup> This was taken to be a distinction between heterosexual and other types of intercourse. See Ziehen's com. ad loc. *LGS* II p. 365.

<sup>56</sup> Same day; lustral sprinkling and first anointment with olive oil.

<sup>57</sup> From that which is unlawful, never pure.

<sup>58</sup> See Parker 1983, 335–336.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Herodotus 2.64.

<sup>60</sup> For sexual conduct cf. also *LSAM* 20.25–28, 35–41.



## SEG XXXVI 376

ARCADIA. LYCOSURA. FRAGMENTARY SANCTUARY  
REGULATIONS. CA. SECOND CENTURY B.C.

(Figures 18 19)

A bottom left corner of a limestone stele, found in the early 1970s, built into the chapel of Hagios Elias (Άγιος-Λιάς), situated on a hilltop, ca. 200 m. east of the archaeological site of Lycosura.<sup>1</sup> The stone is built into a window frame on the south side of the chapel. It is cut on the right and somewhat unevenly on top; the left side and probably the bottom are intact. The text covers less than one half of the preserved stele. The inscribed face is fairly well preserved but a fresh coat of stucco applied just before my visit in August 2001 made letters at the edges difficult to read and concealed the left side.

H. 0.40, W. 0.42, Th. 0.14. L.H. 0.015 0.02. Interlinear space ca. 0.01

Ed. Matthaiou and Pikoulas 1986 (= SEG XXXVI 376; Loucas and Loucas 1994).

Cf. L. Dubois BE 1988 no. 627; SEG XLVII 435.<sup>2</sup>

Photograph: Matthaiou and Pikoulas 1986, pls. 10 and 12 (good).

ca. saec. II a.

-----  
Q[ ----- Δεσπ]  
2 οῖναι ἰδίοι μὲν δέκα ἁμ[έρας ---- γυναικί]  
δὲ λεχοῖ ἄποθι ἔμεν ΑΝ[-----]  
4 δέκα ἡμέρας· ἄλλοιτοῖοι δὲ[----- πέν]-  
τε ἡμέρας· τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ΕΥ[-----]  
6 θύην καθὼς ἂν ὁ ἱερεὺς [εἴπηι (vel sim.)---]

*vacat* 0.225

*Restorations.* Suppl. Matthaiou et Pikoulas.

<sup>1</sup> For a photograph of the chapel before the restoration during which the inscription was discovered see Jost 1985, pl. 42 g. 2.

<sup>2</sup> On Loucas and Loucas 1994.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have seen the stone. The letters are quite thick but not very deeply cut. Alphas with both straight and broken crossbars appear; some omicrons have a middle dot; no serifs. In lines 2 and 4 Dubois (BE 1988 no. 627) read  $\omega\iota$  for  $\omicron\iota$  in the photograph. The omicrons are, however, clear on the stone.

### Commentary

This is the second sacred law coming from the sanctuary of Despoina in Lycosura, the first being the better, though still imperfectly preserved, *LSCG* 68.<sup>3</sup> The indications of numbers of days (lines 2, 4, 5) and the reference to childbirth (line 3) suggest that the present document belongs to the same class as no. 7 above. In its present state the text deserves translation. Only line 6 makes any coherent sense: [- - -] (shall) sacrifice according to what the priest (says, prescribes, vel sim.). Although it seems clear, as the first editors realized,<sup>4</sup> that the fragment deals with cathartic requirements, the details remain conjectural.<sup>5</sup> For  $\dot{\iota}\delta\dot{\iota}\omicron\iota$  vs.  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\dot{\iota}\omicron\iota$  (lines 2, 4) cf. *LSCG* 124.4; *LSS* 119.3;<sup>6</sup> *LSAM* 12.4 6.<sup>7</sup>

*Language.* The dialect is on the whole Arcadian, but the Doric infinitive  $\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu$  (i.e.  $\tilde{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu$ ) is found alongside the Arcadian infinitive  $\theta\upsilon\eta\nu$ . Dubois (BE 1988 no. 627) postulated, accordingly, that the letter cutter was Dorian.<sup>8</sup> The adverb  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\theta\iota$  (line 3; far away, apart)<sup>9</sup> is altogether new. Matthaiou and Pikoulas (1986, 76) suggested that  $\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}$  δὲ λεχῶν  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\theta\iota$  =  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$   $\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$   $\lambda\epsilon\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ .<sup>10</sup> It would therefore have the force of a postpositive rather than that of an adverb. Dubois pointed out that  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\theta\iota$  may equally be taken with  $\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu$  which would thus be an imperative infinitive. The restoration  $[\Delta\epsilon\sigma\pi]\omicron\iota\nu\alpha\iota$  in lines 1–2 is almost

<sup>3</sup> See further immediately below.

<sup>4</sup> Matthaiou and Pikoulas 1986, 76–77.

<sup>5</sup> For cathartic requirements see above no. 7.

<sup>6</sup> Referring to pollution contracted through contact with a corpse, the dead being a family member vs. someone else. Cf. *LSAM* 18.7 9; 84.6 9.

<sup>7</sup> Distinguishing between sexual intercourse with one's own/not one's own spouse as a source for pollution.

<sup>8</sup>  $\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu$  appears in an inscription from Tegea (*IG* V 2, 159 (= Buck, *GD* no. 70) 4, 6), but the dialect of that inscription is not Arcadian. See Hiller von Gärtringen and Buck's commentaries ad loc. On the Arcadian infinitive see Buck, *GD* 163; L. Dubois, *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1986, I 111 (p. 175).

<sup>9</sup> *LSJ suppl.* s.v.

<sup>10</sup> *LSAM* 51.5 8. On  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$  with the dative see Buck, *GD* 136.1. For childbirth as a source of pollution see above commentary on 7.6.

inevitable not only because of the ndspot, but also because other words in -οιῶ-α make much less sense here.

*Date.* Matthaïou and Pikoulas dated the fragment to the second century B.C. on the basis of letter forms, which are somewhat rustic looking. If so, it postdates, as they suggest, the other sacred law from Lycosura, the neatly and elegantly inscribed *LSCG* 68, commonly dated to the third century B.C.<sup>11</sup> This inscription opens with regulations for entry into the sanctuary. The same can be assumed for the present fragment but, in so far as this can be judged, the two documents might have been somewhat different. Whereas what survives here deals with cathartic requirements, *LSCG* 68 lists various restrictions with respect to clothing, jewelry, and hair style, also prohibiting pregnant and nursing women from being initiated. It ends presently with sacri cial regulations;<sup>12</sup> concern with sacri ce is also evident at the end of the present fragment though the details of the older inscription have been left out. The documents seem therefore somewhat complementary.

Loucas and Loucas 1994 assume that the publication of the two documents in relatively close succession reflects a wish to reassert the sanctuary's rules in face of a growing influx of worshippers and/or to put them on a par with the rules of contemporary great sanctuaries.

### *The Cult*

The Arcadians worship Despoina (the Mistress) more than any other god, saying that she is a daughter of Poseidon and Demeter. Thus says Pausanias,<sup>13</sup> adding that he dares not reveal her real name to the uninitiated.<sup>14</sup> In the preceding paragraphs he had described meticulously the sanctuary of Despoina at Lycosura with its imposing cult statue group. This, a work of the Messenian sculptor Damophon,<sup>15</sup> represented Despoina, her mother, Demeter, her stepfather, the titan Anytus,

<sup>11</sup> Matthaïou and Pikoulas 1986, 75; E. Voutiras, Opfer f r Despoina: Zur Kultsatzung des Heiligtums von Lykosura *IG* V 2, 415, *Chiron* 29, 1999, 233–246 at 133–134 (the present fragment is mentioned in 134 n. 4); cf. Loucas and Loucas 1994, 98. The date of the sanctuary is of not much help as it is itself disputed. Jost 1985 advocates late fourth/early third century B.C.; see esp. 174–175.

<sup>12</sup> See Voutiras op. cit.

<sup>13</sup> 8.37.8 ταύτην μάλιστα θεῶν σέβουσιν οἱ Ἀρκάδες τὴν Δέσποιναν, θυγατέρα δὲ αὐτὴν Ποσειδῶνός φασιν εἶναι καὶ Δῆμητρος.

<sup>14</sup> 8.37.9 τῆς δὲ Δεσποίνης τὸ ὄνομα ἔδεισα ἔς τοὺς ἀτελέστους γράφειν.

<sup>15</sup> On Damophon see A.F. Stewart, *Greek Sculpture: An Exploration*, New Haven, 1990, 303–304; cf. *SEG* XLI 332, a decree in his honor by the people of Lycosura.

and Artemis, Demeter's daughter according to a local Arcadian version.<sup>16</sup> Significant pieces of this monument were discovered and are on display at the National Archaeological Museum in Athens and at the museum in Lycosura. Among these are the heads of Artemis, Demeter, and Anytus, as well as a remarkable fragment of marble drapery, belonging to the robe of Despoina, with reliefs depicting, inter alia, animals, or rather humans masked as animals and wearing long dresses, some of whom are playing musical instruments, and others dancing.<sup>17</sup>

Pausanias informs us that the Arcadians carry into the sanctuary fruits of all cultivated trees except the pomegranate.<sup>18</sup> As for the method of sacrifice practiced in the *megaron* where the mysteries were celebrated, he says that each of the Arcadians sacrifices whatever he owns, but instead of slashing the victim's throat, as in other sacrifices, they cut off whatever limb of the sacrificial animal each happens to grab.<sup>19</sup> While practically nothing else may be said with certainty, it is still conceivable that the dancing scene described above and other scenes engraved on the robe of Despoina might reflect some of the activities taking place at the mysteries.<sup>20</sup>

The temple in Lycosura is quite small. It is flanked on the south by a small theatral area facing a side entrance. In the adjacent large stoa of the sanctuary Pausanias saw a *πινάκιον γεγραμμένον* (inscribed tablet), containing things regarding the mysteries<sup>21</sup> of Despoina. Jost's argument against identifying this *πινάκιον* with *LSCG* 68 – besides the exclusion of pregnant and nursing women from the mysteries, it might not be concerned specifically with the mysteries – might also apply to the present inscription.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Pausanias 8.37.4–6.

<sup>17</sup> See Frazer's comm. ad loc. (IV 375–379); Jost 1985, 328–329 with plates 44–45; Stewart, *Greek Sculpture*, 94–96 with figs. 788–792. The cult group is also represented on a Roman imperial period coin from Megalopolis. See Jost 1985, 175 with pl. 44.

<sup>18</sup> 8.37.7: τῶν δὲ ἡμέρων οἱ Ἀρκάδες δένδρων ἀπάντων πλὴν ῥοιᾶς ἐσκομίζουσιν ἐς τὸ ἱερόν.

<sup>19</sup> 8.37.8: θύει μὲν δὴ αὐτῶν ἕκαστος ὃ τι κέκτηται· τῶν ἱερείων δὲ οὐ τὰς φάρυγγας ἀποτέμνει ὥσπερ ἐπὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις θυσίαις, κῶλον δὲ ὃ τι ἂν τύχῃ, τοῦτο ἕκαστος ἀπέκοψε τοῦ θύματος.

<sup>20</sup> See Jost's discussion (reference below). On dancing in mysteries cf. C. Karadima-Matsa and K. Clinton *ZPE* 138, 2002, 89 with n. 8.

<sup>21</sup> τὰ ἐς τὴν τελετήν: 8.37.2.

<sup>22</sup> Jost 1985, 329–330; Voutiras (*Chiron* 29, 1999) 247–248. Further on Lycosura and Despoina see Jost 1985, esp. 172–178, 326–337.

BOEOTIA. OROPUS. FRAGMENTARY SACRIFICIAL  
REGULATIONS. FOURTH CENTURY B.C.

(Figure 20)

A small, weathered fragment of a white marble stele broken on all sides. The original rough-picked back seems to survive. Discovered behind [i.e. north of] the Curio monument.<sup>1</sup> The letters are not deeply cut, and the inscribed face is rather worn. The lower part of the last letter in line 7 is covered by a drop of what appears to be cement, and the left side, which may be cut rather than broken, seems covered by some rough, corroded matter. There is vacant space above the first line; it may establish it as the original first line, or, less likely, represent a space between paragraphs or different documents.

H. 0.27, W. 0.071 (top) 0.08 (bottom), Th. 0.08. L.H. 0.007 0.008, O, Θ, and Ω 0.005. Interlinear Space 0.009. Surviving uninscribed surface above the first line ca. 0.023 0.028.

Piraeus, Archaeological Museum, Inv. 408.

Ed. Petrakos *I.Oropos* 278 (= A. Chaniotis *SEG* XLVII 488). Lupu 2003, 326 334.

Cf. Petrakos *I.Oropos* p. 182; A. Chaniotis EBGR 1997 no. 296 (*Kernos* 13, 2000).

Photograph (of the squeeze): Lupu 2003, 327 g. 3 (very good).

---

<sup>1</sup> B. Leonardos *apud* Petrakos, *I.Oropos* p. 183. For the monument see *ibid.* no. 444 and plate E no. 15.



saec. IV a.      NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ.

-----  
*vacat*

[ - - - ] ας με . [ - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] τραπεζ[ - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] τὴν δεξι[άν κωλῆν - - - ]  
 4 [ - - - ] τριποδι τω[ - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] α <sup>uuuu</sup> Ε[ - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] ἐμβά[λλειν τ . (?) [ - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] ὄρνιθος ὀβ[ολόν - - - - ]  
 8 [ - - - ] ος δύο ὀβ[ολούζ/ώ - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] βοός δε[ - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] ὡν χρεία [ - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] μισθωμ[ - - - - - - - - ]  
 12 [ - - - ] σχιζῶ[ν - - - - - - - - ]  
 [ - - - ] Θ[ - - - - - - - - ]  
 -----

*Restorations.* **1** [τ]ὰς με[ρίδας?] Chaniotis (*SEG* XLVII 488) || **2** [ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν] τραπεζ[αν] L. e.g. || **3** δεξι[άν] supplevit Petrakos [κωλῆν - - -] C. || **6** [ἐμβά]λλειν τ[ὸ ἀργύριον?] C. vid. adn. || **7** [ - - ὄρνιθος P.; ὀβ[ολόν - - -] L. || **8** in. vid. adn.; n. ὀβ[ολούζ/ώ - - -] L.: ὀβ[ολ- - -] Petrakos || **9** δὲ [ - - -] C. || **12** P.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have seen the stone. The letters are, on the whole, nicely executed albeit with a few irregularities. They seem more crowded and at times relatively smaller in the lower part of the fragment.

- 1** What looked like the upper left and bottom tips of T seemed to me to appear on the stone. The upper left tip was closer to the preceding E than T is elsewhere, and a scratch could not be ruled out. A Σ turned up to be more or less traceable in my photograph and might possibly be read.
- 6** The last trace might be taken for a lower tip of a somewhat slanting stroke. The closest parallel is the left lower stroke of the Ω in line 10 but a scratch is likely.
- 7** β: The lower part of the letter is concealed by what looks like a drop of cement, and the right part is damaged by the break. P (so Petrakos) is possible.
- 9** Before the β there is a trace, very likely a scratch, which seems like a middle part of a vertical stroke.

### *Translation*

(3) the right thigh (4) tripod (6) put [in the *thesauros*] (7) for a bird  
 an obol (8) for a (animal) two obols (9) for a bovine(?) (10) of which  
 there is a need(?) (12) rewood

## Commentary

Petrakos dated the inscription to the fourth century B.C. He noted that it was a sacred law enumerating offerings and sacrifices to a divinity,<sup>2</sup> and referred to it in his note on the stipulation in *LSCG* 69.30–31 (*I.Oropos* 277) that allows worshippers at the Amphiareum to sacrifice whatever animal they wish, noting that this license was due to the broader policy of the sanctuary.<sup>3</sup> In EBGR 1997 no. 296 (*Kernos* 13, 2000, 206) Chaniotis noted the concern with sacrifices and references to a table of offerings, animals, an amount of two obols, and the lease of an item (μισθωμ in line 11). In *SEG XLVII* 488 he further interpreted this reference and suggested a number of restorations (see commentary below). I have elsewhere suggested that lines 5–9, which are separated from the previous text by a *vacat*, consist of a sacrificial tariff listing fees to be paid by worshippers for the sacrifice of specific animals.<sup>4</sup>

## Line 2

Τραπεζῆς is doubtless a reference to a cult table. For the [ἐπὶ (δὲ) τὴν] τραπεζῆ[αν] see *LSCG* 28 (*SEG XLVI* 173) 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 22 (where the restorations are secure).<sup>5</sup> On cult tables see Gill 1991.

## Line 3

Δεξι[άν] evidently refers to a part of a victim, probably to a κωλῆ (thigh) as Chaniotis realized (*SEG XLVII* 488). This κωλῆ is likely a priestly

<sup>2</sup> *I.Oropos* p. 183.

<sup>3</sup> *I.Oropos* p. 182.

<sup>4</sup> Lupu 2003. As for the occasion, pre-incubation sacrifice is not inevitable. The tariff would give the unparalleled stipulation in *LSCG* 69.30–31 that allowed each person to sacrifice whatever he wished a more definite form (the closest parallel to *LSCG* 69.30–31, *LSS* 67.3–4, is wholly restored and somewhat unwarranted in my mind; even if it is correct, it is to be explained by a departure from the rule(s) listed in lines 1–2). From Pausanias' description of the sanctuary and cult of Amphiaraus at Oropus (1.34.5), a ram on whose skin incubants would sleep seems mandatory. But, as has been noted (see A.B. Petropoulou Pausanias 1.34.5: Incubation on a Ram Skin, in G. Argoud and P. Roesch, (eds.), *La Béotie antique. Lyon—Saint-Étienne 16–20 Mai 1983* (Colloques internationaux du CNRS), Paris, 1985, 169–177, at 175–176; van Straten 1995, 73–74), the incubant in the Archinos relief is lying on a piece of cloth. There is therefore reason to believe that pre-incubation ram sacrifice was the norm at the Amphiareum but not necessarily the rule while *LSCG* 69 was in effect. The rule might have allowed more choice, at least in the fourth century B.C.

<sup>5</sup> For some representative cases see *LSCG* 90.5 (= *I.Kallatis* 47.3); 163.17; *LSAM* 24 A 15–20. Chaniotis (*SEG XLVII* 488) noted that forms of τραπεζῶμα and τραπεζῶω were also possible here. The second possibility is better attested in sacred laws.

prerogative: it is particularly common as such, and, should right legs be distinguished from left legs, they usually go to the priest.<sup>6</sup>

*Line 4*

The possible tripod could be a three-legged stand for a cauldron used to cook the meat of the victims, as is iconographically documented.<sup>7</sup>

*Lines 5–9*

This is evidently a sacrificial tariff. The general sense of the original could have been approximately εἰς δὲ τὸν θησαυρὸν ἐμβάλλειν τ[οὺς θύοντας (lacuna?) ὄρ]νιθος ὀβ[ολόν, (lacuna)]- -]ος δύο ὀβ[ολούς, (lacuna)] βοὸς δε[- -].<sup>8</sup>

*Line 6*

Chaniotis [ἐμβάλλειν, referring to money put in the *thesauros* (treasury/offertory box),<sup>9</sup> is doubtless correct. For the Amphiareum's *thesauros* see *LSCG* 69.13, 23, 40; *LSS* 35.4; *I.Oropos* 324.33–39 (*LSCG* 70)<sup>10</sup> and 290.16–25.

<sup>6</sup> See Puttkammer 1912, 23–25; for the right thigh see also Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 38. In *LSCG* 55.9–10 (cf. Part I pp. 11–12) the right leg might reach the founder of the sanctuary by way of the cult table. Left legs may go to divinities (though they might have to settle for the bones alone) as might a left half of the head (ἡμίκερα: *LSCG* 28.4, 9, [11], [15], 19, [23]; 29.8; above 3.16, 17; cf. also Amipsias, *Connus*, fr. 7 *PCG*: above commentary on 3.5), which is a less likely possibility here. For priestly prerogatives see part I pp. 42–43; above commentary on 3.5; below commentary on 20.7.

<sup>7</sup> See Lupu 2003, 328–329. Tripods were dedicated at Oropus at the sanctuary of the nymph Halia (B.C. Petrakos, *Ὁ Ὡρωπὸς καὶ τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀμφιαρέου*, Athens 1968, 54–58; for inscribed bases (some are now at the Amphiareum) see *I.Oropos* nos. 511–516). The sanctuary was located in the town (Petrakos *ibid.* 55–56; *I.Oropos* pp. 401–402).

<sup>8</sup> Those who offer sacrifice shall put in the *thesauros* [- -] an obol for a bird [- -] two obols for a [- -] for a bovine [- -]. For sacrificial tariffs see Part I pp. 59–60.

<sup>9</sup> For a study of which see G. Kaminski, *Thesaurus: Untersuchungen zum antiken Opferstock*, *JdI* 106, 1991, 63–181; cf. K. Tsakos, *Θησαυρός Αφροδίτης Ουρανίας: η επιγραφή*, *Horos* 8–9, 1990–1991, 17–28; K.N. Kazamiakis, *Θησαυρός Αφροδίτης Ουρανίας: η κατασκευή*, *ibid.* 29–44 (the inscription on this *thesauros* is *SEG* XLI 182); K. Tsakos, *Exploitation of Religious Sentiment*, in D. Vasilikou and M. Lykian-dropoulou, *Coinage and Religion: The Ancient World, the Byzantine World: Proceedings of a One-Day Colloquium*, Athens, 1997, 48–59 (I do not accept the author's (p. 56 n. 27) classification of *I.Beroia* 16 as a sacred law); D. Knoepfer, *Le tronc d'offrandes d'un nœtre r trien*, *AntK* 41, 1998, 101–115.; Parker and Obbink 2000, 436–438.

<sup>10</sup> Discussed in part I p. 32.

## Line 7

ὄρνις usually, but not exclusively refers to chickens.<sup>11</sup>

## Line 8

A number of animals are possible. These include a hare (i.e. δασύπους, [δασύποδ]ος),<sup>12</sup> a goat (αἴξ, [αἰγ]ός)<sup>13</sup> or, should the bird not be a chicken, a chicken or rooster (ἀλεκτρονών, [ἀλεκτρονών]ος, κάλαῖς, [καλαῖδ]ος,<sup>14</sup> ἀλέκτωρ, [ἀλέκτορ]ος).<sup>15</sup> None of these possibilities seems entirely satisfactory.

## Line 9

The δε would ideally distinguish the bovine from smaller animals. This, however, may require a μὲν perhaps already after [ῥο]νθος in line 7.<sup>16</sup>

## Line 10

For [- -]ων χορεία [- - -] cf. below 26.28 29.

<sup>11</sup> See L. Robert, Sur un decret d'Ilion et sur papyrus concernant des cultes royaux, *American Studies in Papyrology* 1, 1966, 175–211 (= *Opera Minora Selecta* VII, 599–635) at 196 with note 127. Cf. LSJ s.v. ὄρνις III. For bird sacrifice in the ancient Near East cf. below Appendix A lines 11–12 with Delcor 1990, 89–92.

<sup>12</sup> See LSCG 125.

<sup>13</sup> A common victim but perhaps too large if it is to follow the bird directly.

<sup>14</sup> For the accent see LSJ s.v. Identification as a chicken may not be entirely secure.

<sup>15</sup> LSS 108.12; cf. Aristophanes, *Amphiaraios*, fr. 17 (PCG). Chickens are more characteristic of private than of public sacrifice. In public sacrifice they are commonly offered together with other victims: The rooster (ἀλεκτ[ρονόνα]) in LSAM 67 B 3 is offered alongside a number of other, larger victims; the chickens/roosters (κάλαῖς) in LSCG 60.5 6, 23 are offered in connection with cattle sacrifice; in LSCG 172.4 καλαῖδια are offered together with a goat. LSCG 51 (cf. Part I p. 65) calls for three chickens/roosters; the first (ἀλεκτρονών, line 5) seems to be wholly burnt; the others (ἀλέκτορες line 27) are offered together.

<sup>16</sup> Δέ[χα] is possible but unlikely if it refers to a sum of money; the sum of ten obols is not a fraction of a drachma (six obols per drachma); the sum of ten drachmas is surely too high.

*Line 11*

Μισθωμ may stand for both nominal (i.e. from μίσθωμα) and verbal forms (perfect middle/passive of μισθόω). Leasing of sacred property<sup>17</sup> or contracting services essential for the performance of cult<sup>18</sup> are possible inter alia.<sup>19</sup>

*Line 12*

Σχίζαι: rewood; ξύλα and φρύγανα are common; for attestations see commentary on 3.21–22 above. As Chaniotis noted, this is evidently a reference to the provision of wood for sacrifice.

---

<sup>17</sup> Perhaps including, by analogy to no. 18 below, leasing of shops such as those mentioned in *I.Oroφος* 290.18.

<sup>18</sup> If μίσθωμα is used in the meaning 'contract price', as in the regulations for the Lesser Panathenaia, *LSCG* 33 B 28.

<sup>19</sup> A lease of a priesthood (so Chaniotis, *SEG* XLVII 488, citing *LSS* 47) seems unlikely to me considering the date and the location. See on this Part I pp. 48–49.

*I.Oropos* 279; *SEG* XLVII 497

BOEOTIA. OROPUS. FRAGMENTARY SACRIFICIAL  
REGULATIONS. ROMAN IMPERIAL PERIOD

An unfluted marble *kioniskos*. The inscribed part is smoothed. The stone was found in 1957 in ancient Oropus where it was seen and copied by I. Papadimitriou. B.C. Petrakos could not locate it.

H. 1.00, Diameter 0.26. L.H. 0.02 0.025.

Publications: Petrakos, *I.Oropos* 279 (= *SEG* XLVII 497).

Cf. A. Chaniotis, *EBGR* 1997 no. 296 (*Kernos* 13, 2000).

aet. imp.

PIAE[ - - - - - αὐτο]-  
 κρᾶτορος [ - - - - - ]  
 ἱεράζειν [ - - - τοῦ ἐνιαυ]-  
 4 τοῦ [ - - - - - ]  
 ΓΕΥΙ[ - - - - - ]  
 ρίου Ι[ - - - - - ]  
 καὶ ἄ[γειν εἰς τὴν θυσίαν]  
 8 βοῦν [ - - - - - ]  
 ΩΝ[ - - - - - ]  
 ΠΙΟΝ[ - - - - - ἰ(?)]-  
 σχίον Ι[ - - - - - ]  
 12 ΠΙΟΝ[ - - - - - ]  
 εὐσεβ[ - - - - - ]  
 ΚΗΣ[ - - - - - ]  
 Ὀροπι[ - - - - - ]  
 16 νους ὑ[ - - - - - ]  
 ἀνέθηκε.

*Restorations.* Suppl. Petrakos dubitanter || **10** L. (cf. supra 3.5, 21) || **11-12** [πλευ]|ρίον?  
 idem (cf. infra 21.8) L. || **13-14** fortasse Ὀροπί[ους] vel Ὀροπί[ων] P.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* The epigraphical comments are derived from Petrakos' edition.  
 In the first three lines the alpha has a broken crossbar.

*Commentary*

Very little can be said about this inscription. It may be a private foundation (line 17),<sup>1</sup> perhaps for an event including a public sacrifice: if ἀ[γειν εἰς τὴν θυσίαν] | βοῦν (lines 7–8) is correct, it would imply a sacrificial procession.<sup>2</sup> A priesthood, perhaps yearly (lines 3–4) seems likewise involved; cf. the regulations for the priesthood featured in *LSCG* 103 B 16–18. Distribution of parts of the bovine (line 8) might have been discussed (lines 10–12). The reference to an emperor does not necessarily imply imperial cult; it might have been used for dating. The *eusebeia* of a particular person directed at the Oropians – an emperor cannot be ruled out – together or not with other virtues might have been involved (lines 13–15).

---

<sup>1</sup> Though the subject of ἀνέθηκε might have simply set up the stone bearing the regulations. For foundations see Part I pp. 81–87.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. L. Robert, *Hellenica* XI–XII Paris, 1960, 120 (Gauthier 1996, 20 n. 53).

SEG XXXII 456

BOEOTIA. HALIARTUS. DECREE ON CULT. CA.  
235 B.C. OR A LITTLE LATER

(Figures 21 22)

A limestone stele found in 1966 near the acropolis of Haliartus. The stone which has moldings above and below is broken on the right; the top and the left side are smooth-picked; the back is broken unevenly. In its present condition, the stone is shaped like a quarter of a cylinder; originally it might have been shaped like a cylinder or a semi-cylinder, in which case it could have formed a part of a cylindrical monument. The inscribed face is badly weathered and worn to the point of being almost entirely illegible. The text starts 0.03 below the upper molding and ends 0.16 above the lower one. Roesch noted that faded traces of another text (or texts) appeared on the side, the only readable words being τὰν πόλιν situated on the right, a little below line 27. It is clear that these words belong to a text which had a different line spacing.

H. 0.88, W. (i.e. surviving circumference) 0.525, Th. (lower left) 0.215. L.H. ca. 0.01; smaller, suspended O, Θ, and Ω, ca. 0.007. Interlinear space ca. 0.01. Upper margin 0.03. Lower margin 0.016. Left margin 0.01.

Thebes, Archaeological Museum. Unnumbered.<sup>1</sup>

Ed. Vatin 1968<sup>2</sup> (= SEG XXV 556); Roesch 1982, 203 255; *Teiresias* 13, 1983, E.82.71 (= SEG XXXII 456; Rigsby 1987).

Cf. Stephanis 1982; J. and L. Robert BE 1984 no. 209; Schachter 1981 1994, esp. I, 71, 116; III, 19, 20 21, 93 94, 101; SEG XXXVII 380;<sup>3</sup> D. Knoepfer, Review of SEG XXXI, XXXII, and XXXIII, *Gnomon* 60, 1988, 222 235 at 234;<sup>4</sup> Tr heux 1990, 121 122 n. 24; D. Knoepfer, Sept ann es de recherches

<sup>1</sup> In July 2002 the stone was located in the courtyard of the museum in the inscription storage area between the inscription storage shed and the museum. Vassilis Aravantinos, director, the Eighth Ephoria of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities, kindly allowed me to look for it.

<sup>2</sup> Only a partial decipherment. Completely superseded by the following.

<sup>3</sup> On Rigsby 1987.

<sup>4</sup> On Ἀγίατος vs. Ἀγίατος: *Restorations* line 7.



sur l'igraphie de B otie (1985 1991), *Chiron* 22, 1992, 411 503 at 480 481;<sup>5</sup> M. Na ssi, Un decreto di Haliartos ed il culto di Athena Itonia, *AFLPer.* 29, 1991 1992 (*non vidi*);<sup>6</sup> Rhodes 1997, 125, 514.<sup>7</sup>

Photograph: Vatin 1968, 619 g. 1 (good), 621 g. 2 (part of the squeeze; very good); Roesch 1982 pl. XV (good).<sup>8</sup>

ca. 235 a. vel paulo post

- Ἀρχ[ο]ντος Ἑμ]πεδιώνδα[ο],  
Ἑρμαῖος Ἐπιτέλεος ἔλεξε προβεβω-  
λευμένον εἶ]μεν αὐτῷ [πὸτ]
- 4 [τ]ὸν δᾶμον· ἐπιδεῖ ἅ πόλις Ἀκρη[φ]ιείω[ν] περ[ι]σ-  
γεῖας ἀποστεύλασα Δαμό[φι]λον Ἀλε[ξί]αο,  
Δευξίλαον Θάλ[λ]ω, [Α]πολλώνιο[ν *nomen patris*],  
παρακαλῖ μὲν τὰν πόλιν Ἀρια[ρτίων ὅπ]ως
- 8 θουσίαν σουντέλει ἐν τῷ [Α]θανᾶς Ἰτω-  
νίας κῆ Διὸς Καρα[ίω] τεμέν[ει], ἀξι[οῖ] δὲ  
πεμπέμεν ἀπὸ πόλιος ἱππ[έα]ς [ἐν τὸν] ἀ[γῶ]ν[α]  
τὸν ἀπὸ τελέων ἐν τῷ Πτωίων ἀ[γῶ]νι·
- 12 ὅπως διακείμενα τὰ πὸτ τὼς θεὸς εὐσ[ε]β[ῶς]  
κῆ ἐν τὸν λυπὸν χρόνον δια[μ]εῖνει ἀκό-  
λουθα πράττωσα τῇ ἡρέσ· δε[δ]όχθη τῷ  
δάμν τὰς τε θουσίας σουντελέ[μεν τὼς ἀντι]-
- 16 τουνχάνοντας ἐπὶ Δα[μο]κλ[ε]ῖος ἐνά[ρχ]ω[ς]  
[κ]ῆ ἀποδόσθη βοῦν ὅστις παρεσχέ[θ]ει π[ὸτ]  
τὼς κατόπτας· δόμεν δὲ κῆ ἀνάλ[ω]μα [τὼς τα]-  
μίας δραχμῶν ἑκατὸν πεντεῖκο[ν]-
- 20 τα καθάπερ κῆ ἐν τὰ Μωσεῖα· τὸν δὲ ἄρ-  
[χ]οντά τ' ἀπὸ τὰς πόλιος κῆ τὼς [τε]-  
[θ]μοφούλακας παρεῖμεν κῆ σουνπομπὰν [πεμ]-  
πέμεν· διδόσθη δὲ τῷ ἀρχῷ κῆ τῷς πολεμά[ρχ]ω[ς] κῆ τῷς
- 24 τεθμοφουλάκεσσι τὰ οὐπέρπουρα  
πάντα κῆ τὰν κωλίαν· πό[ρ]ον δ' εἴμ[εν]  
ἐν οὗτο τὸ ἄλωμα ἀπὸ τὰς ἐμφορᾶς  
τὰς ἐψαφισμένας.

*vacat 0.016 (vestigia incerta)*

*Restorations.* Suppl. Roesch. || 4 [τ]ὸν Vatin || 7 Ἀ Knoepfer: Ἀ Roesch || 20–21 τὸν δὲ ἀρ[χ]ὸν τὰ [sc. πεμπόμενα] τ' ἀπὸ Stephanis post Roesch ([.]ONTATAΠO lapis) || 21–22 [τε]||[θ]μοφούλακας Roesch post Vatin.

<sup>5</sup> See previous note.

<sup>6</sup> Cited on p. 149 n. 1 in Na ssi's article mentioned below n. 11.

<sup>7</sup> I was unable to consult a work by G. Vottero referred to in *SEG* XLV 440.

<sup>8</sup> Due to the condition of the stone the only legible photograph is that of the squeeze.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have seen the stone, but in its deteriorating state I could not verify all of Roesch's readings. As Roesch noted, the lettering displays a transition between an older style and that of the late third century: A with a straight, and sometimes broken crossbar; M with parallel outer strokes; Π with a short right vertical; smaller, suspended O, Θ, and Ω; Σ with both slanting and parallel outer strokes; Φ with an oval loop; both small and developed serifs appear. Syllabic division is observed and may account in part for the fact that the lines vary in length.

### *Translation*

In the archonship of Empediondas, Hermaios son of Epiteles said that he had a *probouleuma* (to present) to the people.

(4) Whereas the city of Acraephia, having sent Damophilos son of Alexias, Deuxilaos son of Thallos, and Apollonius [son of - - -] as ambassadors, invites the city of Haliartus to celebrate the sacrifice in the precinct of Athena Itonia and Zeus Karaios, and expects it to send from the city cavalymen to the contest by teams at (or: during) the contest of the Ptoia, (12) in order that, being piously disposed with respect to things concerning the gods, (the city of Haliartus) may continue to behave in accordance with its course of action in future time as well, (15) let it be decided by the people that the magistrates who happen to be in office under Damokles should celebrate the sacrifices and that a bovine, which has been furnished (for inspection) before the comptrollers, should be provided; (18) the treasurers should assign one hundred and fifty drachmas for the expenses, in the same way as for the Mouseia; the archon and the *thesmophylakes* should be present from the city and escort the procession; all the roasted meat and the thigh should be given to the archon, the polemarchs, and the *thesmophylakes*; (25) the means for these expenses should come from the *emphora* which has been voted.

*Commentary*<sup>9</sup>

The interpretation of this difficult document involves two basic questions, namely: (1) Where was the sacrifice to Athena and Zeus supposed to take place? (2) Did the Acraephian ambassadors invite the Haliartans to participate in one event or two? These questions must be addressed against the background of the Ptoia.

The history of the Ptoia may be roughly summarized as follows. As we know it, the Ptoia was a musical competition in honor of the Ptoan Apollo. It was celebrated in his oracular sanctuary, the Ptoion, at modern Perdikovrysi. This sanctuary is not to be confused with the nearby sanctuary of the hero Ptoios at modern Kastraki.<sup>10</sup> The festival was founded at an unknown date. It underwent two reorganizations: one in the 220s,<sup>11</sup> the other in ca. 120 B.C. In the first reorganization the Ptoia became Pan-Boeotian when, under the auspices of the Delphic amphictyony, the city of Acraephia formally invited Boeotian cities to share in it. A number of inscriptions document this reorganization. These include the amphictyonic decree and a related oracle<sup>12</sup> and a series of decrees of Boeotian cities accepting Acraephia's invitation: one from Oropus<sup>13</sup> and fragments of four more from Acraephia

<sup>9</sup> I append here a short list of select difficult Boeotian forms:

*Line 3.* αὐτῷ = Att. αὐτῷ (Buck, *GD* 30, 106.2); πότε = πρὸς (ibid. 135.6).

*Lines 4–5.* πριωγεῖας: Acc. pl. < πριωγεῦς i.e. Att. πρέσβυς (ibid. 68.1, 86.3, and cf. no. 40.18).

*Line 7.* παρακαλῖ = παρακαλεῖ (ibid. 29).

*Line 9.* κή = καί (ibid. 26).

*Line 11.* τῷ = τῷ (ibid. 30, 106.2. Cf. αὐτῷ above).

*Line 12.* τὼς θεῶς = τοὺς θεούς (ibid. 25, 104.8 etc.).

*Line 13.* λυπὸν = λοιπὸν (ibid. 30. Cf. αὐτῷ above).

*Lines 14.* τῇ ἡρέσι: Dat. sg. < ἡ αἴρεσις (ibid. 104.3 etc.); δεδόχθῃ = δεδόχθαι.

*Line 17.* ἀποδόσθῃ: see next note.

*Line 23.* διδόσθῃ = διδόσθαι (cf. κή above); τῷς etc. = τοῖς (ibid. 106.4 etc.).

*Line 24.* οὐπέρπουρα: ου = υ (ibid. 24).

<sup>10</sup> On the two deities and their sanctuaries see Schachter 1981 1994, I, 52 126, III, 11 21; on the sites cf. also P. Roesch *PECS* 741 742.

<sup>11</sup> Considering the virtual lack of earlier evidence for the festival, it has been suggested that we are concerned here with its foundation rather than reorganization. See S. Lauffer *RE* XXIII 2, 1547 1548, s.v. Ptoion; M. Nafissi, Zeus Basileus di Lebadeia. La politica religiosa del *Koinon* beotico durante la guerra cleomenica, *Clio* 77, 1995, 149 169, 156 167 with n. 27 with bibliography.

<sup>12</sup> *LSCG* 73 = Rigsby 1996, nos. 2 3 with pp. 59 67; *CID* IV 76.

<sup>13</sup> *LSCG* 71.

which include decrees from Oropus and Haliartus,<sup>14</sup> and Orchomenus and Lebadeia.<sup>15</sup>

Roesch attempted to show that the ambassadors presented a double invitation: the Haliartans were to join them in a sacrifice in a *temenos* of Athena on the Acropolis of Haliartus itself,<sup>16</sup> and to send cavalrymen to a contest *at* the Ptoia and a bovine to be sacrificed there. He dated the inscription to ca. 235–230 B.C.<sup>17</sup> This date is mainly based on letter forms and on a possible identification of the proposer of the decree, Hermaios son of Epiteles, with the Hermaios who was a federal archon ca. 235–215.<sup>18</sup> His father might have been the Epiteles who was one of the two Boeotian *hieromnemes* at Delphi ca. 230.<sup>19</sup> As has been said above, the decrees that document the first reorganization of the Ptoia include two which were passed by the city of Oropus. Rejecting Feyel's inference that the fragment from Acraephia is a copy of the inscription from Oropus, Roesch (1982, 237–241) postulated a two-decree mechanism: one decree, designed for the Ptoion at Acraephia, should have dealt with accepting only; the other, designed for Oropus, should have dealt with specific details. Since a decree from Haliartus exists among the above-mentioned decrees from Acraephia, he applied this mechanism to Haliartus, connecting the present document to the reorganization of the Ptoia.

The validity of Roesch's arguments was questioned by Stephanis (1982, 221–222), who suggested Acraephia as the site, the Ptoia as the event, and Zeus and Athena as the recipients of the sacrifice. It was further challenged by Rigsby, who maintained that one polis would not invite another to join in a sacrifice at the other's sanctuary, and suggesting that the embassy delivered one invitation: to send cavalrymen to a contest *during* the Ptoia and a bovine to be sacrificed at that event to Zeus and Athena. Not only was the Ptoia a musical contest in honor of Apollo, but the location where it was held, on the western

<sup>14</sup> Feyel 1942, 133–147 no. I; Roesch 1982, 236–237 nos. 3–4.

<sup>15</sup> Feyel loc. cit. no. II; Roesch loc. cit. nos. 1–2; cf. Schachter 1981–1994, I, 71. Also relevant are two boundary stones, *IG* VII 4153–4154; see Rigsby 1996, 67. For a conspectus of later inscriptions, namely catalogues of victors, see Roesch, 1982, 225–229.

<sup>16</sup> On the *temenos* cf. Schachter 1981–1994, I, 116.

<sup>17</sup> Roesch 1982, 207; for the date see also Roesch's 1982, 246 discussion in relation to the Mouseia (see below).

<sup>18</sup> Mentioned in a proxy decree from Oropus, *I.Oropos* 66 (Roesch 1982, 207 n. 10).

<sup>19</sup> *SEG* II 260, 6.7–8 Βοιωτῶν Ἀσωπίχου, Ἐπιτέ[λεος]. On the date cf. Roesch 1982, 207 n. 11.

slopes of Mount Ptoon, is hardly suitable for cavalry races. The contest and the sacrifice should be held at a *temenos* of Athena Itonia and Zeus Karaïos. A cavalry contest in honor of Athena Itonia would make more sense, since she was a military divinity and delighted in horses.<sup>20</sup> It would be a local rehearsal competition for the games of the Pamboeotia which were held at the sanctuary of Athena Itonia in Coronea. The document is to be dated somewhere between the 230s and the 200s, after the Pan-Hellenization of the Mouseia<sup>21</sup> and before the Ptoia were made Pan-Boeotian. It is not to be connected to the Haliartan decree from Acraephia, and the two decree mechanism postulated by Roesch should be discarded.<sup>22</sup>

Schachter (1981 1994, III, 20 21) accepted Rigsby's arguments regarding the location of the sacrifice. However, he too assumed two different requests. The first, which occasioned the present decree, would be to join in a sacrifice to Zeus and Athena. The second would be to send cavalymen to a contest at the Ptoia; this should have been dealt with in another decree. The motive for the sacrifice is to be adduced from the presence of the *thesmophylakes*. In charge of legal matters, these magistrates were instrumental in settling some dispute between the two cities. The sacrifice to Zeus and Athena celebrated this settlement. Developing Roesch's hypothesis (1982, 242 243), Schachter postulated that cavalry contests in honor of the hero Ptoios were held in the sixth and fifth centuries.<sup>23</sup> This would still have been the case in the third century. The reorganization of the contest thus should have consisted in a transformation of the cavalry Ptoia in honor of the hero Ptoios into the Ptoia known to us, i.e. a musical contest in honor of Apollo. It would have taken place after the present document was issued.

It is true that small bronzes of horsemen and charioteers, miniature bronze wheels, and chariots were discovered, among other sixth to fifth-century B.C. votive offerings, during the excavations of the sanctuary of the hero Ptoios.<sup>24</sup> The discovery of comparable objects during the exca-

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Pindar *Parthenia* 2 (fr. 94b) 38 47 and perhaps Callimachus *Hymn.* 5.60 64.

<sup>21</sup> On the date of the re-organization of the Mouseia see below.

<sup>22</sup> Rigsby 1987, 735 737. Rigsby adds (p. 739) that a joint military success like a victory of the Boeotians and Demetrius II in the Megarid ca. 236 could have prompted the invitation. The evidence which places this Demetrius in the Megarid at this time may be inconclusive. See F.W. Walbank *CAH*<sup>2</sup> VII, I, 450.

<sup>23</sup> 1981 1994, III, 19, 20 21. Roesch in his turn had followed P. Guillon and M. Feyel (see next note). He postulated that this cavalry contest was in honor of either the hero Ptoios or the Ptoan Apollo. For references see loc. cit.

<sup>24</sup> Roesch 1982, 242 243; Schachter 1981 1994, III, 14. Both refer to P. Guillon, *Les*

uations of the Ptoion<sup>25</sup> suggests that an immediate connection between such objects and the deity or the sanctuary in which they have been discovered does not necessarily exist.<sup>26</sup> In and of itself, their presence at the hero sanctuary can hardly be taken as evidence for cavalry races. One should note, on the other hand, that cavalry competitions held at a festival should not necessarily be expected to take place on the grounds of the sanctuary where the festival is celebrated. The Amphiareum at Oropus does not seem suitable at all for cavalry competitions, yet the local festival featured them.<sup>27</sup> They ought to have been held somewhere in the vicinity. A similar situation is not unthinkable for the Ptoion. Accordingly, the location of the cavalry race referred to in the present document remains, in my opinion, undecided. Strictly speaking, both the hero sanctuary and the Ptoion may be possible.

*Date.* For the date see above pp. 231, 232; cf. 229.

*Line 2–4*

For the formula [ὁ δεῖνα] ἔλεξε προβεβουλευμένον εἶμεν αὐτῷ πòτ τὸν δᾱμον see Buck, *GD* commentary on no. 43.10 (p. 253); Tr heux 1990; Rhodes 1997, 124 who translates: that it should have been made a *probouleuma* for him (sc. the proposer) to the people.

*Lines 8, 15*

As Roesch noted, the context implies that the stock phrase θυσίαν συντελεῖν<sup>28</sup> is used in the present case to the effect of celebrate the sacrifice with/join in the sacrifice.<sup>29</sup> The singular here and the plural

*trépieds du Ptoion*, Paris, 1943, II, 152 n. 6 (no photographs) with M. Feyel's comments in his review of that work in *REG* 56, 1943, 363–364, and to G. Daux *BCH* 88, 1964, 856 with p. 861–862.

<sup>25</sup> J. Ducat, *Les kouroi du Ptoion: le sanctuaire d'Apollon Ptoieus à l'époque archaïque*, Paris, 1971, no. 39 (p. 59) pl. XII; no. 51a (p. 91) pl. XXI; no. 191d (p. 327) pl. CVI; no. 317 (p. 434) pl. CLV. Cf. Roesch 1982, 242 n. 169.

<sup>26</sup> Dedicatory miniature wheels can be also found at other sanctuaries. See W.H.D. Rouse, *Greek Votive Offerings: An Essay in the History of Greek Religion*, Cambridge, 1902, 390; for the Samian Heraion see P. Brize, *Archaische Bronzevotive aus dem Heraion von Samos*, *ScAnt* 3 4, 1989–1990, 317–326 at 321–323; cf. H. Kyrieleis, *Offerings of the Common Man in the Heraion at Samos*, in R. Hgg, N. Marinatos, and G.C. Nordquist (eds.), *Early Greek Cult Practice* (ActaAth-4<sup>o</sup> 38), Stockholm, 1988, 215–221 at 218 n. 18.

<sup>27</sup> See B.C. Petrakos, *Ὁ Ὁρωπὸς καὶ τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀμφιαράου*, Athens, 1968, 121–122 nos. 16 and 17 with pls. 38–39, 194–198.

<sup>28</sup> In this collection see 14 B 64.

<sup>29</sup> See Roesch 1982, 206, 208–210, 244; Rigsby 1987, 730. Cf. *LSAM* 33.7–8.

θυοσίας in line 15 suggest two different events, unless one assumes that they are used interchangeably.

*Lines 8–9*

Athena Itonia was a goddess of military character whom the Boeotians had brought with them from Thessaly.<sup>30</sup> Her federal sanctuary, the Itonion, where the games of the Pamboeotia were held, was located in the territory of Coronea, although its exact site is disputed.<sup>31</sup> Both she and Zeus Karaios<sup>32</sup> were the principal deities of the Boeotian league.<sup>33</sup> Direct evidence for the worship of Zeus Karaios comes from Acraephia (where he shared a precinct with Athena Itonia), Anthedon, Orchomenus, and Thespieae.<sup>34</sup> His cult in Boeotia must have been preeminent enough to leave as lasting an impression as is indicated by the remark in Hesychius Καραίος· Ζεὺς παρὰ Βοιωτοῖς οὕτω προσαγορεύεται.<sup>35</sup>

*Line 11*

On τέλος meaning a team see Feyel 1942, 60–65 (cf. 76) and cf. *IG VII* 2871.17; *SEG III* 354.

*Lines 17–18*

On the *katoptai* see Roesch 1965, 207–209. They would be given an account of the purchase of the bovine, ensuring that budgetary restrictions have been kept. The stipulation seems, however, to require that the actual animal be presented before them. The purpose is evidently inspection: the *katoptai* would ascertain that its quality matches the price paid for it: if the quality were lower, this may indicate misappropriation of some of the money.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Strabo 9.2.29 (cf. 9.5.14): R.J. Buck, *A History of Boeotia*, Edmonton, 1979, 77.

<sup>31</sup> See P. Krentz, Athena Itonia and the Battle of Koroneia, in H. Beister and J. Buckler (eds.), *Boiotica* (M nch.Arb.z.Alt.Gesch. 2) Munich, 1989, 313–317.

<sup>32</sup> Or Keraios and perhaps even Akraios; see Schachter 1981–1994, III, 97, 153.

<sup>33</sup> Schachter 1981–1994, III, 93–94.

<sup>34</sup> To which should be added Haliartus if we accept Roesch's interpretation.

<sup>35</sup> Karaios: Zeus is thus called among the Boeotians: Hesych. s.v. Καραίος; cf. Photius s.v. Κάριος Ζεὺς. The preeminence of the cult of Athena Itonia seems to be equally expressed by the phrase (Hesych. s.v.) Ἰτωνία· Ἀθηνᾶ ἐν Βοιωτίᾳ. Further on Athena Itonia and her sanctuary see Schachter 1981–1994, I, 117–127; Roesch 1982, 217–224; Rigsby 1996, 55–59. On Zeus Karaios see Schachter 1981–1994 (in addition to the places already mentioned) III, 151, 104–106, 146–147; Roesch 1982, 104–112.

<sup>36</sup> See Roesch 1982, 245–246. In general see Gauthier 1984; below commentary on 26.31–32; cf. Part I p. 99.

*Lines 18–20*

The Mouseia were an agonistic festival of the Muses at Thespieae. At the time the present document was issued,<sup>37</sup> the competition, for which there is no direct evidence before the middle of the third century B.C., were facing a significant reorganization.<sup>38</sup> It took place in the last two decades of the third century. As the sum of 150 drachmas allocated here for the Ptoia was obviously to be spent on the victim (and related sacrificial expenses), it has been reasonably assumed that the same held true for the Mouseia.<sup>39</sup>

*Line 20–21*

Roesch suggested (1982, 249) that the words ἀπὸ τᾶς πόλιος were misplaced by the stone cutter. The meaning is that local magistrates are to escort the bovine in a procession from the city to its destination. Stephanis' alternative interpretation (1982, 222) that the Haliartan archon is to be followed in the procession at the Ptoia by *the things sent* from the city (τὰ [sc. πεμπόμενα]), namely the cavalrymen headed by the polemarchs and the bovine, and by the *thesmophylakes*, was dismissed by the Roberts (BE 1984 no. 209) on the grounds that all of these are not likely to be expressed by one neutral term.<sup>40</sup>

*Lines 20–24*

*Magistrates.* The archon and the polemarchs referred to here are local magistrates. Both offices entailed religious duties, and a local archon and polemarchs are mentioned in comparable documents.<sup>41</sup> As for the *thesmophylakes*, the reference here is apparently to local magistrates; federal ones are better documented. The office is known from other

<sup>37</sup> If, indeed, it is dated correctly.

<sup>38</sup> For this reorganization, see works cited in the next note.

<sup>39</sup> Schachter 1981 1994, II, 163 164; Roesch 1982, 246 247. For the complicated question of the date and nature of the re-organization cf. Rigsby 1987, 735 736. On the Mouseia and on the cult of the Muses at Thespieae, the origins of which go back to Hesiod (*Op.* 650 659; in the grove of the Muses at Thespieae Pausanias (9.31.3) saw an ancient tripod which was said to be the one which Hesiod had won at Chalcis and dedicated to the Muses of Helicon), see Schachter 1981 1994, II, 147 179.

<sup>40</sup> The conjecture, in fact, had first been considered by Roesch himself (1982, 249), who rejected it.

<sup>41</sup> Further on the local archon and polemarchs and for documentation see Roesch 1965, 157 179; on their religious duties see *ibid.* 158 (archon), 173 174 (polemarchs).



parts of the Greek world. It is obvious that the *thesmophylakes* dealt with legal matters.<sup>42</sup> Nevertheless, their exact function remains, on the whole, conjectural,<sup>43</sup> and the precise role they play here is obscure.<sup>44</sup> Their presence among the magistrates escorting the bovine may have no religious significance.<sup>45</sup>

#### Line 24

*Distribution of the Sacrificial Meat.* The meaning roasted or grilled over a fire for (ο)ὑπέρπ(ο)υρα is very poorly documented; ὑπέρπυροι ἀπαρχαί (roasted or burnt first-fruit (offerings)) are mentioned twice by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 2.31, 6.14), describing two Roman sacrificial scenes.<sup>46</sup> Through a study of sacrificial scenes in Homer and in vase paintings, Roesch (1982, 249–254) has shown convincingly that what is meant here by this word has no relation to first fruits and must describe parts of the sacrificial animal which are to be roasted over a fire. The evidence seems to allow us to go one step further and to identify these parts.

A series of vase paintings depicting sacrificial scenes portray one or more persons who roast pieces of meat on long spits directly over the fire.<sup>47</sup> From the Elder Pliny we learn that the one who performed this task was referred to as *splanchnoptes*, i.e. *splanchna*-roaster.<sup>48</sup> The roasted *splanchna* are the first parts of the sacrificial animal to be consumed.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Diod. Sic. 5.67.4 Ἐθεςμοφύλακας καὶ θεσμοθέτας ὀνομάζεσθαι τοὺς τὰ περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ὅσια καὶ τοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων νόμους διαφυλάττοντας (*Thesmophylakes* and *thesmothetai* are called those who watch over the laws of gods and men).

<sup>43</sup> Cf. R.J. Buck, *A History of Boeotia*, Edmonton, 1979, 157.

<sup>44</sup> But see Schachter 1981–1994, III, 21 (cf. above p. 232).

<sup>45</sup> Still, it might be worth noticing that Philochorus (*FGrHist* 328 F 64 α, F 64 β, and F 64 in the commentary volume) mentioned the Athenian *nomophylakes* in a similar (though much more specific) circumstance, i.e. arranging and escorting the procession when the wooden image of Pallas was carried to the sea (at the Plynteria). Further on the *thesmophylakes* see Roesch 1965, 145–152, 1982, 249, 382–386.

<sup>46</sup> The more common meaning is, exceedingly fiery. As a substantive the word also refers to a Byzantine gold solidus. See *LSJ* s.v. and the detailed discussion in Roesch 1982, 250–254.

<sup>47</sup> van Straten 1995, 131–139 with plates.

<sup>48</sup> *HN* 34.81, cf. 22.44. The word does not appear to be otherwise documented.

<sup>49</sup> It should be admitted that in Classical times the *splanchna* were not always the only parts to be roasted on spits. While a different method of cooking was customarily used for other parts, they too were occasionally roasted. The Homeric evidence is not very helpful in this respect, because Homeric sacrificial practice differed from the Classical in roasting both the *splanchna* and the rest of the parts. See *Il.* 1.457–466, 2.419–429; *Od.* 3.447–463, 14.418–456 (cf. above commentary on 3.16–17), and

This is followed by division, and, when a sacrificial meal ensues,<sup>50</sup> cooking and consumption of the remaining parts of the sacrificial animal.<sup>51</sup> Since in this document the roasted meat given to the magistrates cannot come from the leg, and would probably not come from other parts, which are likely to go to other participants in the sacrifice, it might be safe to assume that the pieces referred to here as οὔπερπουρα to be roasted or grilled over the fire are the *splanchna*: the heart, lungs, liver, spleen, and kidneys.<sup>52</sup>

The thigh is customarily assigned to magistrates in cases where they are mentioned among those who take part in the sacrifice. See Puttkammer 1912, esp. 31–35; cf. *LSCG* 60.13–17 (and 30–34; Epidauros; cult personnel).<sup>53</sup>

#### Line 26

The ἐμφορά was, according to Rhodes,<sup>54</sup> an extraordinary tax, comparable to the Athenian εἰσφορά.

---

van Straten 1995, esp. 147–148 and 152; M. Detienne, *Dionysus Slain*, Translated by M. and L. Muellner, Baltimore, 1979 (French original 1977), esp. 74–78. Cf., however, Berthiaume's reservations, 1982, 15–16.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. commentary on 14 A 65–66 below.

<sup>51</sup> On the whole process see esp. J.-L. Durand, 'Greek Animals: Toward a Typology of Edible Bodies,' in Detienne and Vernant 1989, 90–104; van Straten 1995, 115–153.

<sup>52</sup> Aristotle, *De partibus animalium* 665 a 28–672 b 10; van Straten 1995, 131 with n. 51.

<sup>53</sup> Ἐ τοῦ δευτέρου β|οὺς τοῖς ἀοιδοῖς δόντο | τὸ σκέλος, τὸ δ' ἄτερον σκ|έλος τοῖς φρουροῖς δόν|το καὶ τ' ἐνδοσθίδια (Ἐ of the second ox, they shall give one thigh to the singers, and the other, as well as the internal organs, they shall give to the sanctuary guards).

<sup>54</sup> 1997, 125, 514.



## SEG XXVI 524

BOEOTIA. HYETTUS. RULE FOR AN ORACLE.  
LATE HELLENISTIC PERIOD

(Figure 23)

A limestone cippus roughly hewn, discovered by Étienne and Knoepfner in November 1972 and examined again by them in June 1975. There is no real damage to the inscribed face; the text is complete.

H. 0.65, W. 0.36, Th. 0.25. L.H. 0.03 0.035.

The stone was probably removed to the Archaeological Museum in Thebes where I could not find it.<sup>1</sup>

Ed. Étienne and Knoepfner 1976, 182–185 (= SEG XXVI 524, P. Roesch *Teiresias* 7, 1977, E.77.29; Bousquet 1977 = SEG *loc. cit.*, P. Roesch *Teiresias* 9, 1979, E.79.05).

Cf.<sup>2</sup> Schachter 1981–1994, II, 2–3 (= SEG XXXVI 421); III, 163–164 (= SEG XLIV 411).

Photograph: Étienne and Knoepfner 1976, 183–fig. 93 (= Figure 23), Bousquet 1977, 453 (too light).

*Text according to Étienne and Knoepfner*

aet. Hell. tarda

1	ΟἶΑΝΕΙΣ	ὁ ἀνείς	The one who has made a consecration <sup>3</sup>
2	ΕΠΙΤΩ	ἐπίτω	shall approach

<sup>1</sup> I am particularly grateful to V. Aravantinos, director, the Eighth Ephoria of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities, for allowing me to look for the stone.

<sup>2</sup> The following contain new word divisions and may formally be placed among the editions.

<sup>3</sup> I.e. consecrated an offering: Étienne and Knoepfner 1976, 185. For this meaning of ἀνίημι see LSJ s.v. II 6.

3 ΜΑΝΤΕΙΩ     μαντεῖω     the oracle.

*vacat*

2 *vel* ἐπίτω <τῶ> E. -K.

### *Commentary*

Despite tienne and Knoepfer's assertion (1976, 184–185) that it was impossible to read Ὁ [μ]ᾶνεις in line 1, Bousquet (1977), using another print, reading M in line 1 and maintaining that, on the basis of the photograph, it was also impossible to read Π in line 2, suggested the following transcription:

1	Ὁ μανεις	The madman
2	ἐξίτω	shall exit
3	μαντεῖω	the oracle. <sup>4</sup>

Since the published photographs do not allow any definite reading, only an autopsy of the stone will settle the controversy. Until then, we ought to prefer the reading made from the stone. At any rate, Roesch's remark (*Teiresias* E.77.29) that the inscription is enigmatic and its interpretation very doubtful seems true.

*Date.* tienne and Knoepfer's dating of the inscription to the late Hellenistic period is based on letter forms.<sup>5</sup> Bousquet's note that the lettering suggested approximately the first century B.C. was rejected by Roesch (*Teiresias* E.79.05), as being incompatible with the former's interpretation of μαντεῖω as a dialectical genitive, if it was a genitive at all.

*The Oracle.* It is impossible to say exactly to which oracle this inscription refers. tienne and Knoepfer's tentative suggestion that this was an oracle of Heracles is, however, worth considering: Pausanias (9.24.3) mentions a healing sanctuary of Heracles in Hyettus where the cult image was an unwrought stone. Hyettus is also mentioned by the Elder Pliny (*HN* 36.128) as a source for one of the five kinds of magnetite.

tienne and Knoepfer have therefore suggested that the unwrought stone mentioned by Pausanias was, in fact, magnetic, that healing pow-

<sup>4</sup> Schachter 1981–1994, II, 3 n. 3 pointed out that the nonsensical reading ὁ μᾶνεις | ἐπὶ τῶ | μαντεῖω was also possible. In III, 163–164 he suggested the following reading: ὁ μᾶνεις | ἐξί τῶ | μαντεῖω (The madman shall keep out of the oracle).

<sup>5</sup> 1976, 184 n. 598.

ers were attributed to it, and that this was the origin of the expression λίθος Ἡράκλεια, one of the Greek expressions for magnet.<sup>6</sup> The oracle referred to in this inscription would, accordingly, be some sort of a healing oracle<sup>7</sup> and this cippus, resembling a boundary stone, would have been placed at the entrance to the sanctuary of Heracles.<sup>8</sup> It seems to me that this hypothesis stands without the suggestion concerning the magnetic stone, which I find to be too speculative; a connection between the inscription and the healing oracle of Heracles may be tentatively suggested on the evidence of Pausanias alone.

---

<sup>6</sup> tienne and Knoepfer 1976, 176–181. This is incompatible with the essentially geographical explanation to be found in the *Etymologicum Magnum* (s.v. Μαγνήτις) and Hesychius (s.v. Ἡράκλεια λίθος) which are rejected by tienne and Knoepfer (1976, 179–180).

<sup>7</sup> tienne and Knoepfer 1976, 182. On Heracles' medical affinities and on his possible connections with Asclepius (*IG* VII 2808 documents a sacred *gerusia* of Asclepius Soter at Hyettus in the Roman imperial period) see *ibid.* 185–188, but *contra* cf. Schachter 1981–1994, I, 107; II, 3. On the predominantly healing oracle (Schachter 1981–1994, I, 23) of Amphiaraus at Oropus cf. above no. 9; on the oracle of Trophonius in Lebadeia see L.A. Turner, *The History, Monuments and Topography of Ancient Lebadeia in Boeotia, Greece*, Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1994, esp. 465–480 (with copious references); Schachter 1981–1994, III, 66–89 esp. 79–83; cf. C.A. Meier, *Ancient Incubation and Modern Psychotherapy*, trans. M. Curtis, Evanston (German original 1949), 1967, 93–112. For oracular healing in the cult of Asclepius see below no. 13.

<sup>8</sup> tienne and Knoepfer 1976, 185.



## SEG XLIV 505

MACEDONIA. AMPHIPOLIS.  
REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO THE CULT  
OF ASCLEPIUS. CA. 350 300

Fragment of a white marble stele, discovered in spring 1965, at the site of the ancient city of Amphipolis. The stone is broken above, below, and on the right; the left side is only slightly damaged. The back is smooth.

H. 0.27, W. 0.17, Th. 0.10. L.H. 0.01, O and Ω<sup>1</sup> ca. 0.006 0.007. Interlinear space 0.002 0.005.

Amphipolis Museum. Inv. Α 694.

Ed. G.B. Kaftantzis, *Ιστορία της πόλεως Σερρών και της περιφέρειάς της* I, Athens, 1967, 370 no. 606 (*non vidi*); Veligianni 1994;<sup>2</sup> (= A. Chaniotis *SEG* XLIV 505).

Cf. D. Lazaridis *Prakt* 1965, 47; Voutiras 1993, 253;<sup>3</sup> M.B. Hatzopoulos *BE* 1994 no. 413; E. Stavrianopoulou *EBGR* 1993 1994 no. 258 (*Kernos* 10, 1997, 311).<sup>4</sup>

Photograph: Veligianni 1994, pl. XXIIa.

---

<sup>1</sup> And obviously Θ (Veligianni 1994, 392).

<sup>2</sup> Veligianni presents a virtually complete restoration of this fragment. I am not convinced that the line's length can be restored nor that comparative evidence supplies definite formulas which enable establishing a coherent text. Consequently Veligianni's text is printed in the apparatus and the reader is urged to consult her article directly.

<sup>3</sup> Note in passing.

<sup>4</sup> Last two citations: on Veligiani 1994.



ca. 350 300 a. NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ.

-----  
 [. . .<sup>6.7</sup>. . .]ΣΘΕ[ ----- ]  
 [. <sup>3.4</sup>.]γηι ταυ[ ----- ]  
 μ[η]δ' ἐγκαθεύ[δεν ----- ]  
 4 δραχμὴν τε[λείν(?) ----- ]  
 [ι]ερὸν τὸμ βου[λόμενον --- ]  
 [θ]ύειν τοῖς θε[οῖς ----- ]  
 ἄλλο τι ἂν ΑΥ[ ----- ]  
 8 [ἐ]γκαθεύδειν [ ----- ]  
 θύειν καὶ τιθέν[αι ----- ]  
 κωλέαις ἅμα τε[ ----- ]  
 τὸ ἀργύριον ΕΠΙΤ[ ----- ]  
 12 ὅς δ' ἅμ μὴ παρ[ ----- ]  
 τῷ θεῷ διπλᾶς [ ----- ]  
 θύηι θεῷ ΕΝΤΕΜ[ ----- ]  
 τελείτω τὰ νομ[ιζόμενα --- ]  
 16 Ἀσκληπιῷ θυ[ ----- ]  
 τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ [ ----- ]  
 [. <sup>3.4</sup>.]α ἄν δὲ μ[ὴ ----- ]  
 -----

1 Veligianni: non habet Kaftantzis. || 3 init. V., n. K.; ἐγκαθεύ[δεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ] Chaniotis post Veligianni || 4 τε[ V.: τρ[ K. || 5 K. || 6 V.: [θ]ύσειν τοῖς θε[οῖς K. || 7 ἄλλο V.: ἄλλο K.; n. αὐ[τοῖς K. || 8 V.: καὶ ἐγκαθεύδειν K. || 9 V.: θύει γ' καὶ τιθε[μεν K. || 10 V.: ]ω λέαις ἅμα τι[ K. || 11 ἐπι[ K. || 12 n. [- - - ὀφειλέτω?] L. || 13 τῷ V.: ]γῶι K. || 14 n. ἐν τεμ[ένει K. || 15 V.: νόμ[μα K. || 16 θυ[ V.: ρ[ K. || 17 in. V.: ]οι K. || 18 K. || Veligianni titulum ita restituit: [Ἱερὰ τοῖς θε[οῖς ἂν δὲ μὴ προσ|αγά]γηι ταῦ[τα, μὴ ἐξέστω θύειν] | μ[η]δ' ἐγκαθεύ[δεν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν] | δραχμὴν τε[λείν ἐλθόντα εἰς τὸ ||<sup>5</sup> ἱερὸν τὸμ βου[λόμενον θύειν | θ]ύειν τοῖς θε[οῖς ἱερεῖα καὶ] | ἄλλο τι ἂν αὐ[τὸς βούληται | καὶ ἐ]γκαθεύδειν [ταῦτα ποιοῦντα] | θύειν καὶ τιθέν[αι σκέλη σὺν] ||<sup>10</sup> κωλέαις ἅμα τε [δοῦναι τῷ ἱερεῖ] | τὸ ἀργύριον ἐπιτ[άξαντι αὐτῶν] | ὅς δ' ἅμ μὴ παρ[αθῆι ἱεράς μοίρας] | τῷ θεῷ, διπλᾶς [ἀποτινέτω ἂν δὲ] | θύηι θεῷ ἐντεμ[ενίῳ ἐτέρωι.] ||<sup>15</sup> τελείτω τὰ νομ[ιζόμενα καὶ τῷ] | Ἀσκληπιῷ θύ[ειν καὶ τιθέναι] | τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ [ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ τὰ | αὐτ]ᾶ ἄν δὲ μ[ὴ - - ]

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have not seen the stone; the epigraphically-related information is derived from Veligianni's edition. Alpha with a straight crossbar, smaller theta, omicron and omega, kappa with short diagonals, pi with a short right vertical, mu and sigma with diagonal outer strokes; serifs seem visible in the photograph.

*Translation*<sup>5</sup>

(3) not sleep (4) pay(?) a drachma (5) sanctuary(?) whoever wishes  
 (6) sacrifice to the gods (7) something else (8) sleep (9) sacrifice and  
 place (10) thighs together with (11) the money (12) whoever does  
 not (13) [shall pay/owe] double to the god (14) sacrifice to a god(?)  
 (15) pay/present the customary (16) to Asclepius sacrifice/offering-  
 ings?] (17) to Asclepius (18) and if not

*Commentary*

This inscription is a chance find, discovered during trial excavations in Amphipolis at Bezesteni (Μπεζεστένι), very near an excavated colonnade. Further trial excavations revealed only walls of a later building, evidently Byzantine.<sup>6</sup> A fragment of an Ionic column was discovered in the process of re-filling the excavated area.<sup>7</sup>

Restorations aside, it seems obvious that this fragment regulates activities in a sanctuary of Asclepius, where incubation is practiced (ἐγκαθεύδειν lines 3, 8), and where other gods are worshipped together with him (line 6). Worshippers, or more likely prospective incubants, seem to be required to provide both sacrificial offerings (lines 6, 9-10) and money (lines 4, 11). In these requirements a reference may be made to divine and priestly portions, although precise attribution seems difficult. For pre-incubation sacrifice in other Asclepieia see particularly *LSS* 22 (Epidaurus)<sup>8</sup> and *I.Perg* III 161.<sup>9</sup>

*Date.* Veligianni dated the inscription to ca. 350-300 B.C. on the basis of letter forms.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Due to the lack of sufficient context, I have not attempted to express the voice of the verbal forms. It is likely that some infinitives have an imperative force and that the subjunctives stand in protaseis.

<sup>6</sup> Photograph in *Prakt* 1965, pl. 55.

<sup>7</sup> D. Lazaridis *Prakt* 1965, 47; cf. idem *ArchDelt* 21, 1966, B 365; A.H.S. Megaw *AR* 12, 1965-1966, 16.

<sup>8</sup> Below Appendix B 3.8. See A.B. Petropoulou, *Prothesis and Altar: A Case Study*, in R. Étienne and M.-Th. Le Dinahet (eds.) *L'espace sacrificiel dans les civilisations méditerranéennes de l'antiquité*, Paris, 1991, 25-31.

<sup>9</sup> See Part I pp. 61-63.

<sup>10</sup> Veligianni 1994, 392-394. Cf. D. Lazaridis *ArchDelt* 21, 1966, B 365.

*Lines 3, 8*

*Incubation.* It is difficult to say how incubation worked exactly. Normally the patients would come to the sanctuary; following purificatory measures,<sup>11</sup> they would offer sacrifice;<sup>12</sup> they would sleep there and dream; in their dreams the god would appear to them; he would speak to them,<sup>13</sup> prescribe a cure for their ailments,<sup>14</sup> touch them,<sup>15</sup> or even perform surgery;<sup>16</sup> some had a different dream in which the ailment left them without the god's direct intervention;<sup>17</sup> at any rate, once awake, most would be cured instantaneously; some would be healed by applying the prescribed treatment.<sup>18</sup>

The location where the incubation takes place is referred to by the sources as ἄβατον,<sup>19</sup> ἄδυτον,<sup>20</sup> or ἐγκοιμητήριον.<sup>21</sup> Such a location might have been mentioned in the lost part of line 3. Even so, the exact restoration remains open to question since this location could have been referred to by any one of these three terms or perhaps another.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. in this respect *LSAM* 14.1 6 (= Edelstein and Edelstein 1945, I no. 513; a less adventurous text).

<sup>12</sup> See Part I pp. 60–65.

<sup>13</sup> E.g. *IG* IV 1<sup>2</sup> 121 VIII (ll. 68–79) = L.R. LiDonnici, *The Epidaurian Miracle Inscriptions: Text, Translation and Commentary*, Atlanta 1995, A 8.

<sup>14</sup> E.g. Cicero *De Divinatione* 2.59.123 (= Edelstein and Edelstein 1945, I no. 416); this type of divine epiphany may be referred to as an oracle.

<sup>15</sup> E.g. *IG* IV 1<sup>2</sup> 122 XXXI (ll. 60–63) = LiDonnici *ibid.* B 11.

<sup>16</sup> E.g. *IG* IV 1<sup>2</sup> 122 XXVII (ll. 38–45) = LiDonnici *ibid.* B 7.

<sup>17</sup> E.g. *IG* IV 1<sup>2</sup> 121 XIV (ll. 104–106) = LiDonnici *ibid.* A 14. *IG* IV 1<sup>2</sup> 121 XVII (ll. 113–119) = LiDonnici *ibid.* A 17 gives an explanation for the cure: while a man dreamt that a youth had sprinkled his inflicted toe with a drug, it was in fact a serpent that healed him with his tongue as he was sleeping. The afflicted may even have someone else dream on their behalf: e.g. *IG* IV 1<sup>2</sup> 122 XXI (ll. 1–6) = LiDonnici *ibid.* B 1.

<sup>18</sup> *IG* IV 1<sup>2</sup> 126 is particularly instructive. On incubation see Graf 1992, 186–195. On incubation and temple medicine see Edelstein and Edelstein 1945, I nos. 414–442, II, 139–180 with B.G. Ferngren's reservations in the introduction to the 1998 reprint pp. xviii–xxii. Cf. C.A. Meier, *Ancient Incubation and Modern Psychotherapy*, Trans. M. Curtis, Evanston, 1967, 53–72 (German original 1949). On the famous incubation scene in Aristophanes *Plutus* 653–747 see Roos 1960. The basic work on incubation, medical and otherwise, is still L. Deubner, *De incubatione capita quatuor*, Leipzig, 1900. For iconography see U. Hausmann, *Kult und Heilum: Untersuchungen zu den griechischen Asklepiosreliefs*, Potsdam, 1948, esp. 38–60.

<sup>19</sup> As in the Epidaurian miracle inscriptions; literally *not to be entered* (vel. sim. Cf. Part I pp. 20–21; commentary on 1.10 and 23 A 22).

<sup>20</sup> *IC* I xvii 9.9; the innermost part of a sanctuary; cf. below commentary on 23 A 22.

<sup>21</sup> *LSAM* 14; *I.Perg* III 161; literally *a sleeping place* (vel. sim); also known from the Asclepieum in Beroia: *I.Beroia* 18.4; cf. Voutiras 1993, 257 n. 30 (the other inscription mentioned therein is *I.Beroia* 16). For a discussion of these three terms see Graf 1992, 186–187.

Incubation was practiced both in celebrated sanctuaries such as those of Epidaurus, Cos, or Pergamum, and in local ones.<sup>22</sup> It is tempting to assume that this inscription originates from some such local sanctuary, where the people could seek medical attention without traveling to one of the famous centers.<sup>23</sup>

*Lines 4, 11, (cf. 15)*

*Money and Payment.* The Edelsteins have firmly asserted that admission fees for incubation in sanctuaries of Asclepius were uncommon;<sup>24</sup> all or a part of the sums mentioned here could, strictly speaking, be a part of prerogatives due to cult officials or, as in *LSS* 22 where money is paid for specific items needed for the pre-incubation sacrifice (wreaths, barley groats, wood for sacrifice), exacted to cover incubation-related costs. At the same time, this document together with *I.Perg* III 161 A 8, 22–23,<sup>25</sup> which requires, among the pre-incubation sacrifices, that three obols be paid to the temple treasury,<sup>26</sup> suggests that pecuniary compensation for incubation was expected.<sup>27</sup>

*Line 6*

Asclepius was frequently worshipped in association with other gods, especially with Hygieia and Apollo.<sup>28</sup> This may explain the reference to *gods* in the plural here (and perhaps in line 1). It seems that under the

---

<sup>22</sup> Edelstein and Edelstein 1945, II, 148; cf. 233–234. For a documented checklist of known sanctuaries of Asclepius from mainland Greece and the islands see Semeria 1986; for a discussion of some of the more important sanctuaries and their locations see Graf 1992. For the cult of Asclepius in Macedonia see Voutiras 1993 (the present inscription is mentioned on p. 253). Asclepius of course did not have exclusive rights for the practice of incubation.

<sup>23</sup> For the site of discovery see above. The present inscription is mentioned in Semeria 1986, 937–938, although there seems to be some confusion in the reference to Lazaridis' article.

<sup>24</sup> Edelstein and Edelstein 1945, II, 149 with n. 17 and cf. 175–178; cf. G.B. Ferngren's reservations in the introduction to the 1998 reprint pp. xviii–xix. A fee was demanded from those wishing to consult the oracles of Trophonius in Lebadeia (*LSCG* 74) and Amphiaraus in Oropus (*LSCG* 69.20–24, 40); see Schachter 1981–1994, III, 81 n. 6. For Oropus cf. above commentary on no. 9.

<sup>25</sup> One must keep in mind that these two pieces of evidence were unknown to the Edelsteins.

<sup>26</sup> A payment of a phocais and whatever else the god may ask is expected after the cure in lines 31–32. Sureties are mentioned in lines 29–30. Cf. *LSAM* 24.16–17, 20 with Sokolowski 1954, 153.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Sokolowski 1954, 153–154.

<sup>28</sup> In sacred laws see e.g. Attica: *LSCG* 21 (Asclepius and several other gods), 40, 44,

Macedonian kings the priest of Asclepius was eponymous in Amphipolis,<sup>29</sup> which perhaps was also the case in Kalindoia and Beroea and possibly elsewhere in Macedonia.<sup>30</sup> In Kalindoia Asclepius appears to have shared a priest with Apollo,<sup>31</sup> while in Beroea both gods shared a priest with Hygieia.<sup>32</sup> It may well be that in Amphipolis too the priest of Asclepius was also a priest of Apollo.<sup>33</sup> I am not sure, however, that this justifies Veligianni's restoration ἐντεμ[ενίωι ἐτέρωι] in line 14.<sup>34</sup>

*Line 15*

Cf. above commentary on line 4, 11.

---

54, *LSS* 16 (Asclepius and Hygieia); Epidaurus: *LSCG* 60 (Asclepius, Apollo, Artemis, and Leto) *LSS* 22 (below Appendix B 3.8; Asclepius and Apollo), 23 (Hygieia and Asclepius), 25 (Asclepius, Apollo, and others); Cos: *LSCG* 162 (Asclepius and Hygieia); Pergamum: *LSAM* 13 (Asclepius and other, unspecified gods), *I.Perg* III 161 (Asclepius and several other gods); Erythrae: *LSAM* 24 (Asclepius and Apollo); cf. Edelstein and Edelstein 1945, II, 186–188.

<sup>29</sup> *SEG* XLI 557 (Hatzopoulos 1996, II no. 84) 11–13.

<sup>30</sup> See Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 152–156; cf. Voutiras 1993, 259–261.

<sup>31</sup> Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 152 with II no. 62 (*SEG* XXXVI 62 and cf. XLI 584).

<sup>32</sup> Hatzopoulos 1996, I, 152 with II no. 82 (*SEG* XL 530).

<sup>33</sup> Veligianni 1994, 399–405, esp. 402; cf. Hatzopoulos BE 1994 no. 431 and 1996, I, 152.

<sup>34</sup> The exact restoration seems to me questionable. The two cited attestations (*LSAM* 46.3–4 and 52 A 7–8) employ the article. This is the case in other attestations which I have managed to find, except, not surprisingly, in dedications. It should also be noted that in all these places the word ἐντεμένιος is attested in the plural. The following is a list of secure attestations; dedications are marked by an asterisk (\*): Thessalonica: \**IG* X 2, 1, 38.6–9 Ἰοῖδι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς | τοῖς ἐντεμενίοις πᾶσι | καὶ πάσσαις; \**ibid.* 84.5 6 θεοῖς | ἐντεμενίοις; \**ibid.* 109.5 7 Ἐ Ὀσίριδι καὶ τοῖς | ἄλλοις θεοῖς τοῖς ἐντεμενίοις πᾶσι | καὶ πάσσαις; \**ibid.* 116.2 [– –]ς θεοῖς ἐν[τεμενίοις – –]. Delos: \**IG* XI 4, 1215.6 7 [Σαρά]πι, Ἰοι, θεοῖς ἐν[τεμενίοις – –]; \**ibid.* 1239.3 4 Ἐ Σαράπι, Ἰοι, Ἀνούβ[ι], | θεοῖς ἐντεμενίοις. Miletus: *LSAM* 46.3–4 τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν τῶν | [ἐν]τεμενίων; *ibid.* 52 A 7–8 τῶν ἐντεμενίων αὐτοῦ θεῶν πά[ντων]; \**Milet* I 3, 1592 [Ἀπόλλωνι Δε]λφινίωι καὶ θεοῖς ἐντεμενίοις. Priene: *I.Priene* 123.10 τοῖς ἐντεμενίοις θεοῖς. Amyzon: J. and L. Robert. *Amyzon* 27.5 6 Ἐ τῶι τε Ἀπόλλ[ωνι – καὶ τοῖς] | ἐντεμενίοις θεοῖς.

MACEDONIA. BEROIA. GYMNASIARCHAL LAW.  
FIRST THIRD OF THE SECOND CENTURY B.C.<sup>1</sup>

A tapered, opisthographic stele of white marble with a molding on top. Below line 20 face A is badly damaged by erosion. The stone, which had been used as the covering, probably of an early Christian tomb, was discovered in 1949 by the brothers E. and C. Karantoumani on their land at Palaiophoros, at the south entrance to Beroia. It was then used by the owners as a ramp in their garden and eventually removed to the Museum at Thessaloniki and from there to the newly built museum in Beroia. The inscription, first published in a provisional form by Cormack, had been known to a number of scholars, including M.P. Nilsson<sup>2</sup> and J. and L. Robert,<sup>3</sup> through copies made by B.G. Kallipolitis and C. Makaronas. Makaronas' copy of face A<sup>4</sup> includes parts which, as the latest editors affirm, cannot be read now, and may never have been legible. I have followed the latest editors in underlining these parts and in translating them only where their sense is clear.<sup>5</sup>

H. 1.755; W. 0.407, (top), 0.450 (bottom); Th. 0.142 (top), 0.165 (bottom), 0.195 (molding). L.H. 0.015 (lines 1–2), ca. 0.005, 0.01 (last line on face B). Interlinear space 0.002–0.005.

Beroia. Museum. Inv. Α 488.

Ed. Cormack 1977 (= *SEG* XXVII 261); Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993 (A = *SEG* XLIII 381); Hatzopoulos 1996, II, 75–83 no. 60; *I.Beroia* no. 1.

---

<sup>1</sup> The present work is concerned only with the regulations for the Hermaia (B 45–87). A text and translation with a condensed apparatus of the entire inscription and some notes (consisting mainly of references to Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993) on parts not dealt with here have nevertheless been included so as to facilitate the reading of the entire document. The lemma lists all editions of the text but only discussions pertaining to the Hermaia are mentioned. For a full bibliography down to 1994 see Gauthier and Hatzopoulos and *I.Beroia* 1. I should stress my debt to Austin's translation; as usual, I avoided introducing a different translation when the existing translation seemed preferable.

<sup>2</sup> Nilsson 1955, V.

<sup>3</sup> BE 1978 no. 276 (p. 432 ad n.).

<sup>4</sup> See Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, pls. II–III.

<sup>5</sup> For a detailed history of the stone and the events which preceded its publication see Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 13–16.

Cf. Nilsson 1955, 38, 62, 79; L. Robert *Ann. Collège de France 74e année* 1974, 535 537;<sup>6</sup> J. and L. Robert, BE 1978 no. 274 (p. 434);<sup>7</sup> Knoepfer 1979, 173 175, 177 178;<sup>8</sup> Austin 1981, 203 207 no. 118; Crowther 1985, 289 290; idem 1991, 303 304; Gauthier 1995, passim; Gauthier 1995a, esp. 582; A. Chaniotis EBGR 1993 1994 no. 87 (*Kernos* 10, 1997);<sup>9</sup> Arnaoutoglou 1998, no. 98; Pleket 1999, 235.

Photograph: Cormack 1977, pl. 1 3 (good); Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, pls. VIII XIV (all good to very good). M.B. Hatzopoulos, L. tat mac donien antique, *CRAI* 1997, 7 25, pl. 3 (A only); *I.Beroia* p. 531 (very good).

Facsimile of Face A (by C. Trochides): Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, pls. IV VII

Latus Anticum (A) ca. init. saec II a.

- Ἐπὶ στρατηγοῦντος Ἱπποκράτου τοῦ  
 Νικοκράτου, <sup>vac.</sup> Ἀπελλαίου <sup>vac.</sup> ΙΘ. <sup>vacat</sup>  
 συναχθείσης ἐκκλησίας Ζώπυρος Ἀμύντου,  
 4 ὁ γυμνασίαρχος, Ἀσκληπιάδης Ἡρᾶ, Κάλλιππος  
 Ἱπποστράτου εἶπαν· ἐπεὶ καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι ἀρχαὶ πᾶσαι  
 κατὰ νόμον ἄρχουσιν καὶ ἐν αἷς πόλεσιν γυμνασία  
 ἔστιν καὶ ἄλεμμα συνέστηκεν οἱ γυμνασιαρχί-<sup>v</sup>  
 8 κοὶ νόμοι κεῖνται ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις, καλῶς ἔχει καὶ πα-  
 ρ' ἡμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ συντελεσθῆναι καὶ τεθῆναι ὃν δεδω-<sup>v</sup>  
 καμεν τοῖς ἐξετασταῖς ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ ἀναγραφέν-  
 τα εἰς στήλην ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ δημόσιον· τοῦ-<sup>v</sup>  
 12 του γὰρ γενομένου οἱ τε νεώτεροι μᾶλλον αἰσχυρνή-  
 σονται καὶ πειθαρχήσουσι τῷ ἡγουμένῳ αἱ τε πρόσο-  
 δοὶ αὐτῶν οὐ καταφθαρήσονται τῶν αἰρουμένων ἀεὶ  
 γυμνασιάρχων κατὰ τὸν νόμον ἀρχόντων καὶ ὑπευθύ-<sup>v</sup>  
 16 νων ὄντων· <sup>vac.</sup> ἔδοξεν τῇ πόλει τὸν γυμνασιαρχικὸν  
 νόμον ὃν εἰσηνέγκατο Ζώπυρος Ἀμύντου ὁ γυμνασί-  
 αρχος, Ἀσκληπιάδης Ἡρᾶ, Κάλλιππος Ἱπποστράτου κύ-  
 [ρ]ιον εἶναι καὶ τεθῆναι εἰς τὰ δημόσια καὶ χρησθῆαι τοὺς  
 20 γυμνασιάρχους τούτῳ, τεθῆναι δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν τῷ <sup>v</sup>  
 γυμνασίῳ ἀναγραφέντα εἰς στήλην· ἐκυρώθη Περιτίου <sup>v</sup>  
 νομηνία. <sup>v</sup> Νόμος γυμνασιαρχικός· <sup>vac.</sup> ἡ πόλις αἰρέσθω  
 γυμνασίαρχον ὅταν καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρχὰς μὴ νεώτερον ἐ-<sup>v</sup>  
 24 τῶν τριά[κοντα] μηδὲ πρεσβύτερον ἐξήκοντα· ὁ δὲ αἰρεθεὶς

*Restorations.* A 19 Gauthier et Hatzopoulos post Makaronas et Cormack || A 24 idem

<sup>6</sup> On the ἀκρόαμα; *non vidi*: BE 1976 no. 354.

<sup>7</sup> On Cormack's text.

<sup>8</sup> See commentary on B 46 47 and 60 61.

<sup>9</sup> On Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993.

- γυμνασίαρχος ἀρχέτω ὁμόσας τὸν ὑπογεγραμμένον ὄρκον·  
 [ὀ]μν[ύ]ω Δία, Γῆν, Ἥλιον, Ἀπόλλω, Ἡρακλῆν, Ἐρμῆν γυμνασιαρχήσω  
 κατὰ τὸν νόμον τὸν γυμνασιαρχικόν, ὅσα δὲ μὴ ἐν τῷ νό-  
 28 μωι γέγραπται γνώμη τῇ [ἐ]μαντοῦ χρόμενος ὥς ἂν δύ-  
 νωμαι [ὀ]σι(ώ)τατα καὶ δικαιοτάτα, οὔτε φίλοι χαριζόμενος οὔ-  
 τε ἐχθρὸν βλάπτων παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τῶν ὑπαρχουσῶν  
 προσόδων τοῖς νέοις οὔτε αὐτὸς νοσφιοῦμαι οὔτε ἄλλωι  
 32 ἐπιτρέψω εἰδῶς τρῶπῳ οὐδὲ παρευρέσει οὐδεμιᾷ· εὐορ-  
 κοῦντι μὲν μοι εἴη πολλὰ καὶ ἀγαθὰ, ἐφιορκοῦντι δὲ τάναν-  
 τία· ὁ δὲ [α]ῖ[ρ][ε]θ[ε]ῖς γυμνασίαρχος ὅταν εἰσπορεύηται εἰς  
 τὴν [ἀ]ρχ[ὴ]ν ἀγαγὼν [τ]οῦ Δίου μηνὸς τῇ νομηνίᾳ ἐκκλησίαν  
 36 ἐν τῷ [γ]υμνασίῳ προβαλεῖται ἄνδρας τρεῖς οἵτινες χειροτονη-  
 θέντες καὶ ὁμόσαντες τὸν ὑπογεγραμμένον ὄρκον συνεπιβλέ-  
 ψονται τοὺς [νεωτέρ]ους καθὼς ἂν πρὸς [α]ὐτοὺς τάξωνται  
 καὶ [τ]ῷ γυμ[ν]ασίῳ [ἀ]ρχῳι ἀ[κ]ολουθήσουσιν καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ γυ-  
 40 μνασίῳι· - - - - -] τοῦ γυμνασίαρχου μεθ' ὧν δεήσει[ι]  
 [κ]αὶ τὴν [- - -] ΕΓΓΑΙΔΟ[- - -] τῇ δὲ ὑστέραι τοῦ Δίου προσπαρ-  
 [- - - - -] ΑΙ πολιάρχας καὶ ἐξεταστάς  
 [- - - - -] τὸ γ[υμν]άσιον μετὰ τῶν προεξημένων ἀνδρῶν  
 44 [- - - - -] τὸ ἀποτιγέν ὑπὸ τούτων δ[ι]-  
 [δ]ῶται ἀπὸ τῶν προ[ο]σόδων ὧν ἀναλαμβάνη εἰς τὸ ἀλεμμα καὶ οὕτως  
 ἐκ [τ]οῦ ΚΑΤΑΛΕΙΠΟΥ[- - - - -] ἔαν δὲ τις μὴ ποιήσῃ τῶν προεξη-  
 μένων, ἀποτινέτω [- - - - -] ἢ δὲ πρῶξις γινέσθω διὰ τοῦ πολι-  
 48 τικοῦ πράκτορος [παραγραφάντων] τῶν ἐξεταστών· ἔαν δὲ μὴ παρα-  
 γράψωσιν, ἀποτινέτωσαν καὶ οὗτοι τὸ ἴσον ἐπίτιμον καὶ τῷ ἐγδικασ[α]μέ-  
 νῳι διδῶσθω τὸ τρίτον μέρος - - - - -] ξύλων παρασκευῇ· ὁ[ι] . . . ]  
 [- - - - -] μετὰ τῶν ἐξε[τ]ασ[τ]ῶν Δ[- - -] ΝΑ[- - -] ντων ἀνδρῶν καὶ μὴ πλεί[ο]ν . . . ]  
 52 [- - - - -] τὰς ὑπαρχ[ο]ούσας κτήσε[ι]ς  
 [- - - - -] ΙΟΣΟΔΙΟΝΩΣΑΡΧΩΙΚΑ[- . . . ]  
 [- - - - -] δι[κ]η κρίνων  
 [- - - - -] ὁμνύομεν Δία, Γῆν, Ἥλιον, Ἀπόλλω, Ἡρακλ[ῆ]ν,  
 56 Ἐρμῆν - - - - -] ΧΟΙ[- . . . ] Ε  
 [- - - - -] γνώμη τῇ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν] χρόμενο[ι]  
 [ὥς ἂν δυνώμεθα ὀσιώτατα καὶ δικαιοτάτα - - - - -] μένων  
 [- - - - -] οὐδὲ τῶν ὑπα[ρχου]σῶν προσ[ο]δῶν  
 60 [τοῖς νέοις νοσφιοῦμεθα, οὔτε φίλοι χαριζιόμενοι] οὔτε ἐχθρὸν βλάπτον-  
 [τες παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον τρῶπῳ οὐδὲ παρευρέσει οὐδεμιᾷ·] εὐορκοῦσιν μὲν ἡ-

*Restorations.* **A 25** G. -H. || **A 26** G. -H. post Makaronas et Cormack || **A 28** G. -H. ||  
**A 29** idem **A 34** G. -H. post Makaronas et Cormack || **A 35** G. -H.: [ἀ]ρχ[ὴ]ν G. -  
 H. post Makaronas; [ἀ]γαγὼν G. -H.: [συναγέτω] J. et L. Robert || **A 36** G. -H. post  
 Makaronas || [νεωτέρ]ους J. et L. Robert; [α]ὐτοὺς G. -H. post J. et L. Robert || **A 39**  
 G. -H. || **A 40** Makaronas || **A 41** in. Makaronas; ad n. verba primum interpretati  
 sunt J. et L. Robert || **A 42** [διδόν]αι J. et L. Robert || **A 43-fin.** non habet Cormack ||  
**A 43** Makaronas || **A 44-45** J. et L. Robert || **A 46** [ἐκ τ] J. et L. Robert || **A 47**  
 [ἢ δὲ] idem || **A 48** Makaronas || **49-50** G. -H.: [γ]ράψωσιν αὐτοὶ ἀποτινέτω[σαν] τὸ  
 [. . .] [τε] J. et L. Robert) ἐπίτιμον καὶ τῷ ἐγδικασα[μέ]ν[ο]ι διδῶσθω τὸ ἡμισυ - - -]  
 Makaronas || **51** Makaronas || **A 52-63** G. -H. || **A 54** n. ἐτῶν Cormack || **A 60** n.  
 βλάπτων Cormack



[μῖν εἴη πολλά καὶ αγαθὰ, ἐφιορκοῦσιν δὲ τάναντια - - - - -]ς παίδων, ὁ δὲ α[ί]-  
[ρεθεῖς γυμνασίαρχος - - - - -]

*sequuntur vestigia vv. fere 44*

*Restorations.* **A 62** παίδων primum legit Cormack || **post A 63** sequuntur vestigia vv. fere 44; ex imagine a Trochides delineata hauriunt G. -H. haec: **A 64** ΓΑΠΛΛΑΒΩΝΤΩΝ: παραλαβὸν τῶν? || **A 65** in. ΟΝΣΒΥΤ: πρεσβυτέρων? || **A 84** ταμίας || **A 86** τῶν νεωτέρων legit Cormack

### Latus Posticum (B)

- ἐπεγδύεσθαι δὲ μηθὲν ἐξέστω τῶν ὑπὸ τὰ τριάκοντα ἔτη  
τοῦ σημείου κειμένου, ἐὰν μὴ ὁ ἀφηγούμενος συνχωρήσῃ. <sup>vac.</sup>  
ὅταν δὲ τὸ σημεῖον ἀρθῇ, μηδὲ ἄλλωι μηθὲν, ἐὰν μὴ ὁ ἀφηγούμε-  
4 νος συνχωρήσῃ, μηδὲ ἐν ἄλλῃ παλαιστοὶ ἀλειφέσθω μηθεὶς ἐν τῇ  
αὐτῇ πόλει· εἰ δὲ μή, κωλύτω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος καὶ ζημιούτω δρα-  
χμ{ν}αῖς πεντήκοντα· ὃν ἂν δὲ καταστήσῃ ὁ γυμνασίαρχος ἀφηγεῖ-  
σθαι, τοῦτωι πειθαρχεῖτωσαν πάντες οἱ φοιτῶντες εἰς τὸ γυμνά-  
8 [σ]ιον, καθάπερ καὶ τῷ γυμνασίᾳρχῳ γέγραπται· τὸν δὲ μὴ πειθαρχοῦν-  
τα, τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ τὴν ῥάβδον μαστιγούτω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος, τοὺς <sup>v</sup>  
δὲ ἄλλους ζημιούτω. <sup>vac.</sup> ἀκοντίζειν δὲ καὶ τοξεύειν μελετάτωσαν οἳ  
τε ἔφηβοι καὶ οἱ ὑπὸ τὰ δύο καὶ εἴκοσιν ἔτη καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, ὅταν  
12 οἱ παῖδες ἀλείφονται, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐὰν ἕτερόν τι ἀναγκαῖον φαίνη-  
ται τῶν μαθημάτων. <sup>vac.</sup> περὶ παίδων· εἰς τοὺς παῖδας μὴ εἰσπορευ-  
έσθω τῶν νεανίσκων μηθεὶς, μηδὲ λαλεῖτω τοῖς παισίν, εἰ δὲ μή, ὁ γυ-  
μνασίαρχος ζημιούτω καὶ κωλύτω τὸν ποιοῦντά τι τούτων· ἀπαν-  
16 τάτωσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ παιδοτρίβαι ἑκάστης ἡμέρας δις εἰς τὸ γυμνάσιον  
τὴν ὥραν ἣν ἂν ὁ γυμνασίαρχος ἀποδείξῃ, ἐὰν μὴ τις ἀρρωστήσῃ <sup>v</sup>  
ἢ ἄλλῃ τῇ ἀναγκαίᾳ ἀσχολίᾳ γένηται· εἰ δὲ μή, ἐμφανισάτω τῷ γυ- <sup>v</sup>  
μνασίᾳρχῳ· ἐὰν δὲ τις δοκῇ ὀλιγωρεῖν τῶν παιδοτριβῶν καὶ μὴ παραγίνε-  
20 σθαι τὴν τεταγμένην ὥραν ἐπὶ τοὺς παῖδας, ζημιούτω αὐτὸν καθ' ἡμέ-  
[ρ]αν δραχμαῖς πέντε· κύριος δὲ ἔστω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος καὶ τῶν <sup>v</sup>  
παίδων τοὺς ἀτακτοῦντας μαστιγῶν καὶ τῶν παιδαγωγῶν, <sup>v</sup>  
ὅσοι ἂν μὴ ἐλευθέροι ᾦσιν, τοὺς δὲ ἐλευθέρους ζημιῶν· ἐπαναγ-  
24 καζέτω{ι} δὲ καὶ τοὺς παιδοτρίβας ποιεῖσθαι ἀπόδειξιν τῶν παίδων <sup>v</sup>  
[τ]οῖς ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ κατὰ τετράμηνον καὶ καθιστάτω αὐτοῖς κριτάς,  
[τ]ὸν δὲ νικῶντα στεφανοῦτω θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι. <sup>vac.</sup> οἷς οὐ δεῖ μετεῖ-  
ναι τοῦ γυμνασίου· μὴ ἐγδυέσθω δὲ εἰς τὸ γυμνάσιον ὁ[ι]υ[λ]ος μηδὲ ἀπε-  
28 [λ]εύθερος μηδὲ οἱ τούτων υἱοὶ μηδὲ ἀπάλαιστρος μηδὲ ἡταιρευνκῶς μη-  
[δ]έ τῶν ἀγοραίων τέχνην κεχορηγμένων μηδὲ μεθύων μηδὲ μαινόμενος· ἐὰν  
[δ]έ τινα ὁ γυμνασίαρχος ἑάσῃ ἀλειφέσθαι τῶν διασαφουμένων εἰδώς,  
[ἦ] ἐμφανίζοντός τινος αὐτῷ καὶ παραδείξαντος, ἀποτινέτω δραχμάς  
32 χιλίας· ἵνα δὲ καὶ εἰσπραχθῇ, δότω ὁ προσαγγέλλων ἀπογραφὴν τοῖς ἔξε- <sup>v</sup>  
[τ]ασταῖς τῆς πόλεως, οὗτοι δὲ παραγραφάτωσαν τῷ πολιτικῷ πράκτορι· ἐ- <sup>v</sup>  
[ἀ]ν δὲ μὴ παραγράψωσιν ἢ ὁ πράκτωρ μὴ πράξῃ, ἀποτινέτωσαν καὶ οὗτοι τὸ ἴσον  
[ἐ]πίτιμον καὶ τῷ ἐγδικασαμένῳ διδόνθω τὸ τρίτον μέρος· ἐὰν δὲ δοκῇ ἀδίκως  
36 [π]αραγεγράφθαι ὁ γυμνασίαρχος, ἐξέστω αὐτῷ ἀντίπαινον ἐν ἡμέραις

*Restorations.* literas hic illic deperditas restituerunt Makaronas (secundum G. -H.) et  
Cormack || **B 35** [ἐ]πίτιμον Makaronas: [ἀν]τίτιμον Cormack

- [δ]έκα διακριθῆναι ἐπὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος δικαστηρίου· κωλυέτωσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐπιγινόμενοι γυμνασίαρχοι τοὺς δοκοῦντας παρὰ τὸν νόμον ἀλείφεσθαι·  
 40 [εἰ] δὲ μή, ἔνοχοι ἔστωσαν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐπιτίμοις. <sup>vac</sup> μὴ ἐξέστω δὲ τὸν γυμνα-  
 [σ]ίαρχον ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ κακῶς εἰπεῖν μηθενί, εἰ δὲ μή, ζημιούτω αὐτὸν δρα-<sup>v</sup>  
 [χ]μαῖς πεντήκοντα· ἐὰν δὲ τις τύπτῃ τὸν γυμνασίαρχον ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ, <sup>v</sup>  
 [κ]ωλυέτωσαν οἱ παρόντες καὶ μὴ ἐπιτρεπέτωσαν, καὶ ὁμοίως ζημιούτω  
 τὸν τύπτοντα δραγμαῖς ἑκατὸν καὶ χωρὶς ὑπόδικος ἔστω αὐτῷ κατὰ τοὺς  
 44 [κ]οινοὺς νόμους· καὶ ὃς ἂν τῶν παρόντων μὴ βοιωθήσῃ δυνατὸς ὢν, ζημιού-  
 [σ]θω δραγμαῖς πεντήκοντα. <sup>vac</sup> περὶ Ἑρμαίων ποιεῖτω δὲ ὁ γυμνασίαρχος τὰ Ἑρ-<sup>v</sup>  
 [μ]αῖα τοῦ Ὑπερβερεταίου μηνὸς καὶ θυέτω τῷ Ἑρμεί καὶ προτιθέτω ὄπλον καὶ  
 ἄλλα τρία εὐεξίας καὶ εὐταξίας καὶ φιλοπονίας τοῖς ἕως τριάκοντα ἐτῶν· <sup>v</sup>  
 48 τοὺς δὲ κρινούστας τὴν (εὐεξίαν) ἀπογραφέτω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος τῶν ἐκ τοῦ  
 [τ]όπου ἄνδρας ἐπτά καὶ τοὺτους κληρωσάτω καὶ τοὺς λαχόντας τρεῖς ὀρκιάστω  
 [τ]ὸν Ἑρμῆν δικαίως κρινεῖν, ὃς ἂν αὐτῷ δοκῇ ἄριστα τὸ σῶμα διακείσθαι, οὕτε  
 χάρι-  
 τος ἔνεκεν οὕτε ἔχθρας οὐδεμιᾶς· ἐὰν δὲ οἱ λαχόντες μὴ κρίνωσιν  
 52 [μ]ηδὲ ἐξομόσωνται ἀδύνατοι εἶναι, κύριος ἔστω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος ζημιῶν  
 τὸν ἀπειθοῦντα δραγμαῖς δέκα καὶ ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνλείποντος  
 ἀποκληρωσάτω· τῆς δὲ εὐταξίας καὶ φιλοπονίας ὁμοσᾶς ὁ γυμνασίαρχος  
 τὸν Ἑρμῆν κρινάτω τῆς εὐταξίας, ὃς ἂν αὐτῷ δοκῇ εὐτακτότατος εἶναι· <sup>v</sup>  
 56 [τ]ῶν ἕως τριάκοντα ἐτῶν, τῆς δὲ φιλοπονίας, ὃς ἂν αὐτῷ δοκῇ φιλοπονώτατα  
 ἄλειφθαι ἐν τῷ ἐνεστώτι ἐνιαυτῷ τῶν ἕως τριάκοντα ἐτῶν· οἱ δὲ νικήσαντες  
 [ἐ]κείνην τὴν ἡμέραν στεφανηφορεῖτωσαν καὶ ἐξέστω ταινοῦν τὸν βουλόμενον·  
 [π]οιεῖτω δὲ καὶ λαμπάδα ἐν τοῖς Ἑρμαίοις τῶν παίδων καὶ τῶν νεανίσκων· ἡ δὲ εἰς  
 τὰ  
 60 [ὀ]πλα δαπάνη γινέσθω ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχουσῶν προσόδων. <sup>vac</sup> ἀγέ <sup>v</sup> τωσαν  
 δὲ τὰ Ἑρμαῖα καὶ οἱ ἱεροποιοὶ λαμβάνοντες παρ' ἐκάστου τῶν φοιτῶντων· <sup>v</sup>  
 [εἰ]ς τὸ γυμνάσιον μὴ πλεῖον δραχμῶν δύο καὶ ἰστιώντων ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ· ἀγ[α]-<sup>v</sup>  
 64 [με]ῖ· συντελείτωσαν δὲ τὴν θυσίαν τῷ Ἑρμεί καὶ οἱ παιδοτρίβαι, ὅταν καὶ οἱ  
 ἱεροποιοί, <sup>vac</sup>  
 [λ]αμβάνοντες παρὰ τῶν παίδων μὴ πλεῖον δραχμῆς παρ' ἐκάστου καὶ ποιεῖτωσαν· <sup>v</sup>  
 μερίδας τῶν θυθέντων τὰ κρέα ὡμά· οἱ δὲ ἱεροποιοὶ καὶ ὁ γυμνασίαρχος ἀκρόαμα· <sup>v</sup>  
 68 μὴθὲν παραγέτωσαν εἰς τὸν πότον. <sup>vac</sup> τὰ δὲ ἄθλα ἃ ἂν λαμβάνωσιν οἱ νικῶντες,  
 ἀνατιθέτωσαν ἐπὶ τοῦ εἰσιόντος γυμνασίαρχου ἐμ μηνὶ ὀκτώ· εἰ δὲ μή, ζεμιού-  
 τω αὐτοὺς ὁ γυμνασίαρχος δραγμαῖς ἑκατὸν καὶ τοὺς λυμαγνοῦντας καὶ μὴ δι-  
 χαίως ἀγωνιζομένους τοὺς ἀγῶνας κύριος ἔστω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος μαστιγῶν καὶ  
 ζημιῶν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐὰν τις νίκην ἐτέρῳ παραδῶι. <sup>vac</sup> λαμπαδαρχῶν αἵρεσις·  
 72 αἵρεῖσθω δὲ ὁ γυμνασίαρχος τῶν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου λαμπαδάρχας τρεῖς ἐν τῷ  
 Γορπιαίῳ μηνί, οἱ δὲ αἵρεθέντες παρεχέτωσαν ἔλαιον τοῖς νεανίσκοις ἕκαστος  
 [ἡ]μέρας δέκα· αἵρεῖσθω δὲ καὶ τῶν παίδων λαμπαδάρχας τρεῖς, οἱ δὲ αἵρεθέντες  
 παρεχέ-  
 τω{ι}σαν ἔλαιον τὰς ἴσας ἡμέρας· ἐὰν δὲ τις ἀντιλέγῃ τῶν αἵρεθέντων ἢ πατὴρ αὐ-  
 76 [τ]οῦ ἢ ἀδελφοὶ ἢ ὀρφανοφύλακες, ὥς οὐ δυνατὸς ἐστὶν λαμπαδαρχεῖν, ἐξομοσάσθω  
 ἐ-  
 ν ἡμέραις πέντε ἅψ' ἤς ἂν αἵρεθῇ· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ λαμπαδαρχῇ ἢ μὴ ἐξομώσῃται, ἀποτινέ-

Restorations. **B 46** intra ὄπλον et καί: (μακροῦ δρόμου) Knoepfer; vid. adn. || **48**  
 (εὐεξίαν) Cormack: εὐταξίαν lapis || **B 63–64** G. -H.

- τω ὁ αἰρεθεὶς δραχμὰς πεντήκοντα καὶ ὁμοίως ἀλειφέτω καὶ λαμπαδαρχεῖτω· ὥσαύ-  
 τως δὲ καὶ ἂν ὁ ἐξομοσάμενος φανῇ μὴ δεόντως ὁμωμοκέναι, ἐλεγχθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ  
 80 γυμνασιάρχου καὶ τῶν νέων, ἀποτινέτω δραχμὰς πεντήκοντα καὶ ὁμοίως ἅ-  
 γαγκάζεσθω τιθέναι τὸ ἄλειμμα καὶ λαμπαδαρχεῖν· ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ δικαίως ἐξομο-  
 σαμένου ἄλλον ἀποδεικνύτω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος, ποιεῖτω δὲ τὴν τῶν παιδῶν λαμ-  
 πᾶδα ἐκ τῶν φοιτῶντων, οἳ ἂν αὐτῷ δοκῶσιν ἐπιτήδειοι εἶναι, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τῶν νε-  
 84 ἀνίσκων. <sup>v</sup> ὑπὲρ βραβευτῶν· καθιστάτω δὲ ὁ γυμνασίαρχος βραβευτὰς οἳ ἂν αὐτῷ  
 δοκῶσιν ἐπιτήδειοι εἶναι, ἔν τε τῇ λαμπάδι τῶν Ἑρμαίων καὶ τῷ μακρῷ δρόμῳ καὶ  
 ἐν <sup>v</sup>  
 τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀγῶσιν· ἂν δὲ τις ἐνκαλῇ τινὶ τῶν βραβευτῶν φάσκων ἡδικῆσθαι ὑπὸ τι-  
 γος εὐθυνέτω αὐτὸν κατὰ τοὺς κοινούς νόμους. <sup>vac</sup> κυριευέτω δὲ ὁ γυμνασίαρχος  
 88 τῶν προσόδων τῶν ὑπαρχουσῶν τοῖς νέοις καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων ἀναλισκέτω· ὅταν δὲ  
 [ἐ]ξέλθῃ ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς τὸ πλῆθος τῆς προσόδου καὶ εἴ τι ἐκ τῶν ζεμιῶν ἢ εὐθυνῶν εἰ-  
 [σ]περάχθῃ{ι} καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ τούτων ἀναλωθὲν ἀναγράψας εἰς σανίδα ἐκθέτω ἐν τῷ  
 γυμνασί-  
 ωι ἐν μηνὶ Δίῳ τοῦ εἰσιόντος ἔτους, τοῖς δὲ ἐξετασταῖς τῆς πόλεως κατὰ τετράμη-  
 92 νον ἀποδιδότω καὶ ἐξέστω, ἂν τινες βούλωνται, μετὰ τούτων συνεγλογίζεσθαι  
 αὐτόν· τὸ δὲ περὶ τῆς προσόδου ἀποδιδότω τῷ μετ' αὐτὸν γυμνασιάρχῳ ἐν ἡμέραις  
 [τ]ριάκοντα, ἀφ' ἧς ἂν ἡμέρας ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀπολυθῇ· ἂν δὲ μὴ ἀποδῶι τοὺς λόγους  
 ἢ τὰ  
 περὶόντα καθ' ᾧ γέγραπται, ἀποτινέτω τοῖς νέοις δραχμὰς χ <sup>v</sup> ἰλίας καὶ πρᾶξάτω αὐτὸν  
 ὁ <sup>v</sup>  
 96 [π]ολιτικὸς πρᾶ(κ)τορ παραγραψάντων τῶν ἐξεταστῶν καὶ ὁμοίως τὸν λόγον  
 ἀποδότω καὶ <sup>v</sup>  
 τὰ περιόντα. <sup>v</sup> ὁ δὲ τὴν τοῦ γλοιοῦ πρόσοδον <sup>v</sup> ἀγοράσας παρεχέσθω τὴν τοῦ παλαιστρο-  
 [φ]ύλακος χρεῖαν, ποιῶν τὰ προστασσόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ γυμνασιάρχου ὅσα καθήκει ἐν τῷ  
 [γ]υμνασίῳ· ἂν δὲ μὴ πειθαρχῇ ἢ ἀτακτῇ τι μαστιγούσθω ὑπὸ τοῦ γυμνασιάρχου. <sup>vac</sup>  
 ἐὰν δέ  
 100 [τ]ις κλέψῃ τι τῶν ἐκ τοῦ γυμνασίου, ἔνοχος ἔστω ἱεροσυλίας δίκη νικηθεὶς ἐπὶ τοῦ καθή-  
 [κ]οντος δικαστηρίου. <sup>vac</sup> ταῖς δὲ ζημίαις ἀπάσας ἐπιγραφέτω τὴν αἰτίαν ὁ γυμνασίαρχος  
 δι [ῆν]  
 [ἐ]ξημίωσεν κα[ῖ] ἀγκηρυσσέτω ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ καὶ ἐκτιθέτω τοὺς ἐξημωμένους  
 π[άν]-  
 [τα]ς ἐν λευκώματι καὶ παραγραφέτω τῷ πολιτικῷ πράκτορι, ὁ δὲ πράκτωρ εἰσπράξας  
 ἀποκ[α]-  
 104 [τ]ασησάτω τῷ ἐνεστῶτι γυμνασιάρχῳ· ἂν δὲ τις φήσῃ μὴ δικαίως ἐξημῶσθαι, ἐξέ-  
 [σ]τω ἀντείπαντι αὐτῷ διακριθῆναι ἐπὶ τῶν καθηκόντων ἀρχείων καὶ ἂν νικήσῃ τῇ  
 κρίσει ὁ ζη-  
 [μ]ιωθεὶς, ἀποτινέτω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος τὸ ἡμιόλιον τῷ νικήσαντι, προσαποτινέτω τὸ  
 ἐπίπεμ-<sup>v</sup>  
 πτον καὶ ἐπιδέκατον. <sup>vac</sup> εὐθυνέτω δὲ τὸν γυμνασίαρχον ὁ βουλούμενος ὅταν ἐξέλθῃ  
 αὐτῷ ὁ  
 108 ἔνιαυτός, ἔμ μηνὶν εἴκοσι τέσσαρσιν, αἱ δὲ περὶ τούτων κρίσεις γινέσθωσαν ἐπὶ τῶν  
 καθηκόν-  
 των δικαστηρίων. <sup>vacat</sup>  
 παρὰ τῶν πολιταρχῶν. <sup>v</sup> τοῦ ψηφίσματος· 'οὐ' εἴς. <sup>vacat</sup>

Restorations. **B 96** πρᾶ(κ)τορ: ΠΡΑΒΤΩΡ lapis.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have not seen the stone. The epigraphical notes are based on Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993 and *I.Beroia*. Alpha with a broken crossbar, epsilon with the vertical extending above and below beyond the horizontals, kappa with short diagonals, smaller theta, omicron and omega, pi with a shortened right vertical, mu and sigma with parallel outer strokes; serifs.

**A 29** The omega in pointed brackets seems more like a theta.

**B 12** ἀναγκαῖον: the second, third, and fourth letters were inscribed in a rasura.

**B 13** εἰς τοῦς: the last letter of the first word and the first three of the second were inscribed in a rasura.

**B 32** προσαγγέλλων: the omicron was inscribed above the sigma.

**B 76** ὀρφανοφύλακες: inscribed in a rasura except the first two and last three letters.

**B 105** νικήση: the letter cutter had first inscribed νεικήση only to erase the superfluous epsilon.

### Translation

#### Front (A)

In an assembly held on 19 Apellaios, when Hippocrates son of Nikokrates was *strategos*, Zopyros son of Amyntos, the gymnasiarch, Asclepiades son of Heras, and Kallipos son of Hippostrates proposed:

(5) Since both all other magistrates rule according to a law, and in cities where there are gymnasia and where anointing with oil exists gymnasiarchal laws are deposited in the public archives, it is good that the same be accomplished among us too and (the law) which we have given to the *exetastai* be inscribed on a stele and placed in the gymnasium and likewise in the public archives; for, once this has been done, the young men will have more sense of shame and will obey the gymnasiarch, and their revenues will not be lost, as the elected gymnasiarchs will serve according to the law and will be liable to be sued.

(16) The city has decided that the gymnasiarchal law brought forward by Zopyros son of Amyntos, the gymnasiarch, Asclepiades son of Heras, and Kallipos son of Hippostrates be valid, that it be placed in the public archives, that the gymnasiarchs use it, and that it be inscribed on a stele and be placed also in the gymnasium. It was ratified on the first of Peritios.

(22) Gymnasiarchal Law: Whenever the city elects other magistrates, it shall elect a gymnasiarch, neither younger than thirty nor older than sixty. The elected gymnasiarch shall hold office after taking the oath inscribed below: I swear by Zeus, Ge, Helios, Apollo, Heracles, and Hermes (that) I will act as gymnasiarch according to the gymnasiarchal law. (27) As for anything which is not written in the law, I shall use my own judgment to the best of my ability, in the most pious and just

way, neither favoring a friend nor harming a foe unjustly, and I shall neither steal myself from the revenues accruing to the young men nor knowingly allow another, in no way and under no pretext. If I take a true oath let many and good things happen to me; if I take a false oath, the opposite.

(34) Upon entering office, the elected gymnasiarch will call together an assembly at the gymnasium on the first of Dios and nominate three men who, once they have been elected by show of hands and have taken the oath inscribed below, will monitor jointly (with him) the young men accordingly as they are assigned to them and follow the gymnasiarch every day in the gymnasium [- - -] of the gymnasiarch with whatever (whomever?) he will need and the [- - -] on the second day of Dios [- - -] (42) the politarchs and the *exetastai* [- - -] the gymnasium with the above mentioned men (44)[- - -] by them [- - -] (45) for anointing and thus (46) from [- - -] of the above mentioned things (47) [he shall pay - - -] and the collection (of fines) shall be through the civic *praktor*, [following a written notice made by] the *exetastai*; if they do not [make a notice, they too shall pay the same penalty and a third shall be given to the accuser - - -]

(50) Furnishing of wood: [- - -] (51) and not more [- - -] (52) the existing properties [- - -] (54) in lawsuit judging [- - -] (56) we swear by Zeus, Ge, Helios, Apollo, Heracles, [and Hermes - - -] we shall use [our own judgment to the best of our ability, in the most pious and just way, - - -] (59) and we shall not steal from the revenues accruing [to the young men, neither favoring a friend nor] harming a foe [unjustly, in no way and under no pretext.] If we take a true oath [let many and good things happen to us; if we take a false oath, the opposite - - -] (of?) boys, the elected [gymnasiarch - - -]

### *Back (B)*

No one of those under thirty years of age shall be allowed to strip off while the sign is down unless the superintendent authorizes it. Once the sign has been raised, no other shall be allowed (to do so) unless the superintendent allows it, nor shall anyone anoint himself in another palaestra in the same city. Otherwise, the gymnasiarch shall deny him access and fine him fifty drachmas. All those who use the gymnasium shall obey anyone whom the gymnasiarch appoints to be superintendent, as is also prescribed for the gymnasiarch. If someone does not obey, the gymnasiarch shall whip a person subject to the whip and fine others.

(10) The ephebes and those under twenty-two years of age shall practice javelin-throwing and archery every day, when the boys have anointed themselves, and likewise if some other sort of practice seems necessary.

(13) Regarding boys: None of the young men shall enter among the boys nor talk to the boys. Otherwise, the gymnasiarch shall fine and prevent any one who does any of these things. (15) The *paidotribai* (gymnastic trainers) shall come to the gymnasium twice every day, at a time determined by the gymnasiarch, unless one (of them) is ill or has some other inevitable business. Otherwise, he shall report to the gymnasiarch. If one of the *paidotribai* seems to be negligent and is not present before the boys at the designated time, he (the gymnasiarch) shall fine him five drachmas a day. (21) The gymnasiarch shall have the authority to whip both disorderly boys and *paidotribai* who are not free; he shall fine the free ones. He shall compel the *paidotribai* to make a review of the boys three times a year, every four months; he shall appoint judges for them and crown the victor with a crown of olive branches.

(26) Those who ought not to share the gymnasium: The following shall not strip off (to exercise) in the gymnasium: a slave, a freedman and their sons, an *apalaistros*, a prostitute, anyone of those who have business at the marketplace, a drunk, and an insane person. (29) If the gymnasiarch knowingly allows any of those specified to anoint himself or after someone has reported or indicated (this) to him, he shall pay a thousand drachmas. To ensure collection (of the fine), the informer shall hand a (written) charge to the *exetastai* of the city, and they shall submit his name to the civic *praktor*. If they do not submit his name or the *praktor* does not collect (the fine), they too shall pay the same penalty, and a third shall be given to the prosecutor. (35) If the gymnasiarch seems to have been accused unjustly, he shall be allowed to appeal within ten days and to be judged before the appropriate court. Future gymnasiarchs shall also prevent those who seem to anoint themselves against the law. Otherwise, they shall be liable to the same penalties.

(39) No one shall be allowed to insult the gymnasiarch in the gymnasium. Otherwise, (the gymnasiarch) shall fine him fifty drachmas. If someone strikes the gymnasiarch in the gymnasium, those present shall prevent him and not permit him, and (the gymnasiarch) shall likewise fine the person who strikes him one hundred drachmas, and, in addition, he shall be liable (to a private action) from him according to the public laws, and any of those present who does not help (the gymnasiarch), although being able, shall be fined fifty drachmas.

*The Hermaia (B 45–87)*

(45) Regarding the Hermaia: The gymnasiarch shall celebrate the Hermaia in the month of Hyperberetaios; he shall sacrifice to Hermes and designate a weapon as prize and three others for command appearance (*euexia*), discipline (*eutaxia*), and endurance (*philoponia*) for those up to thirty years of age. (48) The gymnasiarch shall set up a list of seven men from among the men of the place to be judges in the (competition of) (command appearance); he shall draw lots among them and have the three allotted men swear by Hermes to judge justly who seems to them to be in the best bodily condition, with neither favoritism nor hostility of any sort. (51) If the allotted men do not judge and decline serving by oath, (swearing) that they are unable (to serve as judges), the gymnasiarch shall have the authority to fine any disobedient person ten drachmas and draw lots among the rest to replace the one failing. (54) Concerning the (competitions of) discipline and endurance, the gymnasiarch shall swear by Hermes and judge, in discipline, who seems to him to be most disciplined among those up to thirty years of age, and in endurance, who seems to him to have anointed himself most enduringly in the present year among those up to thirty years of age. (56) The winners shall wear crowns on that day, and anyone who wishes shall be allowed to put on a head-band. (The gymnasiarch) shall also hold a torch-race at the Hermaia, (one) of boys and (one) of young men. The costs of the (prize) weapons shall be covered by the accruing revenues.

(60) The *hieropoioi* too shall hold the Hermaia, collecting from each of the visitors to the gymnasium not more than two drachmas, and hold a meal in the gymnasium. They shall designate others to replace them as *hieropoioi* for Hermes in the following year. The *paidotribai* too shall celebrate the sacrifice to Hermes at the same time as the *hieropoioi*. They shall collect from the boys not more than a drachma each and divide the sacrificed (victims) into portions of raw meat. The *hieropoioi* and the gymnasiarch shall introduce no performance during the drinking.

(67) As for the prizes which the winners receive, they shall dedicate them under the following gymnasiarch within eight months. Otherwise, the gymnasiarch shall fine them one hundred drachmas. He shall also have the authority to whip and fine those who introduce foul play, those who compete unjustly in the competitions, and likewise if anyone hands over the victory to another.

(71) Election of lampadarchs: The gymnasiarch shall elect three lampadarchs from among the men of the place in the month of Gorpaios,



and those elected shall supply the young men with oil, each for ten days. He shall also elect three lampadarchs from the among the boys, and those elected shall supply oil for an equal number of days. (75) If one of those elected or his father or brothers or orphan guardians (opposes the election), claiming that he is unable to serve as a lampadarch, he shall decline serving by oath within five days after being elected. If he does not serve as a lampadarch and does not decline serving by oath, the lampadarch elect shall pay fifty drachmas and shall all the same supply oil and serve as lampadarch. (78) Likewise, if someone who has declined serving by oath appears to have sworn without justification, he shall, after having been convicted by the gymnasiarch and the young men, pay fifty drachmas and shall all the same be compelled to furnish the oil and serve as a lampadarch. The gymnasiarch shall appoint another instead of the one who has justly declined serving by oath. He shall organize the torch-race of the boys, (choosing) from the visitors (to the gymnasium) those who seem to him to be qualified, and likewise (he shall organize the torch-race) of the young men.

(84) Regarding judges: The gymnasiarch shall appoint judges who seem to him to be qualified for the torch-race at the Hermaia, the long race, and the other competitions. If someone brings a charge against one of the judges, asserting that he has been treated unjustly by someone, he shall sue him according to the public laws.

(87) The gymnasiarch shall be in charge of the revenues accruing to the young men and shall use them for expenditures. Upon leaving his office he shall write the amount of the revenue, anything which has been collected in fines or from legal suits, and the amount spent from these on a board and display it in the gymnasium in the month of Dios of the following year. He shall hand over (his accounts) to the *exetastai* of the city every four months, and anyone who wishes shall be allowed to participate in checking his accounts with them. (93) He shall give the surplus of the revenue to the next gymnasiarch within thirty days from the day on which he was released from office. If he does not hand over his accounts or the surplus monies as is prescribed, he shall pay the young men a thousand drachmas, and the civic *praktor* shall collect (the fine from him), the *exetastai* having submitted his name, and he shall likewise hand over his account and the surplus monies.

(97) The buyer of the revenue from the *gloios* shall provide the service of a keeper for the palaestra, acting upon the orders of the gymnasiarch for everything that is appropriate in the gymnasium. If he does not obey or does something disorderly, he shall be whipped by the gymnasiarch.



(99) If anyone commits any act of theft in the gymnasium, he shall be liable to an action for sacrilege, having been convicted before the appropriate court. For all the ones the gymnasiarch shall inscribe the motive for which he imposed them; he shall both make a proclamation in the gymnasium and display (the names of) all who have been fined on a white board, and submit them to the civic *praktor*. The *praktor* shall collect (the fines), and hand (the money) over to the present gymnasiarch. (104) If someone says that he was fined unjustly, he shall be allowed to oppose (the fine) and to be judged before the appropriate magistrates; if the fined person wins his case, the gymnasiarch shall pay the winner one-and-a-half times (the fine) and an additional fine of one-fifth and one-tenth. (107) Anyone who wishes shall sue the gymnasiarch when his year (of office) has expired, within twenty-four months; the cases about these matters shall be (held) before the appropriate courts.

By the politarchs; regarding the decree, Nay one (voice).

### *Commentary*

#### *Date*

The recent publication of a letter of Antigonus Doson to be dated probably to 223 B.C., *I.Beroia* 4 (=SEG XLVI 729),<sup>10</sup> helps to date the present inscription on a prosopographical basis. The Hippostratos son of Kallippos mentioned in this letter (lines 11–12), has been identified by Gauthier and Hatzopoulos (1993, 40–41) as the father of Kallippos son of Hippostratos, one of the promulgators of the gymnasiarchal law. The present inscription should accordingly date to the first third of the second century B.C., perhaps around 180 and probably before 168.

#### *Front (A)*

#### **A** 7

ἄλειμμα: Anointing with oil, i.e. for gymnastic training; similarly the verb ἀλείφω (**B** *passim*). See Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 57–58.

<sup>10</sup> I was not able to consult the first edition by V. Allamani-Souri and E. Voutiras in *Ἐπιγραφὲς τῆς Μακεδονίας*, Thessaloniki, 1996. I have relied on the discussion in SEG XLVI 729 and 730, taking into consideration Hatzopoulos' reservations regarding dates in BE 1997 no. 370 (p. 545).

**A** 10

*Exetastai*: comptrollers, although in this first reference to them in this document their function seems not merely financial: *ibid.* 42–43.

**A** 15–16

ὑπεύθυνος: here liable to be sued/liable to be taken to court. Similarly εὐθύνω (B 87 and 107): to sue/to take to court, and εὐθυναί (B 89) legal suits: *ibid.* 138–139.

**A** 32

τρόποι οὐδὲ παρεργέσει οὐδεμίᾳ: cf. below commentary on 18.3.

**A** 47–48

Civic *praktor*: the city's tax collector: *ibid.* 42, 89–90; cf. commentary on 5.27–28 above.

*Back* (**B**)**B** 1

Strip off: i.e. for gymnastic training: See Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 57–58.

**B** 2

While the sign is down: The gymnasium is open when the sign is up: *ibid.* 59–61. Superintendent: Second to the gymnasiarch and appointed by him: *ibid.* 62–65 (but cf. Pleket 1999, 234).

**B** 9

Subject to the whip: subject to corporal punishment: not a free person, as opposed to the others who are free persons: Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 65–68.

**B** 10–15

Ephebes, boys, young men: on age groups see Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 76–78, who distinguish between three categories: young men (νέοι, νεώτεροι, νεανίσκοι), ephebes, and boys (παῖδες).

**B** 16

*Paidotribai*: gymnastic trainers: *ibid.* 73, 75.

**B 28**

*Apalaistros*: probably a person unfit for or incapable of gymnastic training: *ibid.* 81–84.

**B 45–87: Regulations for the Hermaia**

The question of how Hermes became involved with sport and competitions and particularly how he became a patron god of gymnasia does not seem to have a single, clear-cut answer.<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless, by Hellenistic times, if not before, he is found well established in this capacity, often in close association with Heracles.<sup>12</sup> Both gods are mentioned in an agonistic context as early as Pindar (*Nem.* 10.51–53), and Hermes' association with gymnasia might be even earlier, if we accept Pausanias' report (3.24.7) that at Las in Laconia he saw an Archaic statue (ἄγαλμα ἀρχαῖον) of Hermes near a gymnasium. The Homeric Hymns, however, seem to know nothing of this.<sup>13</sup>

Hermes' patronage of the gymnasium proved beneficial for all sides. Despite his importance, Hermes could claim for himself practically no major public festival.<sup>14</sup> But at local gymnasia, which are to be counted among the hallmark institutions whose very existence made a Greek city a Greek city<sup>15</sup> and are thus known to have existed all over the Greek world, Hermes was at last honored with his very own festival, the Hermaia. The gymnasium may be portrayed as a crossroads of Greek civic life, where exercise, education, and socializing all come together. While we hear nothing real of education in the present document, it is still notable that the young men's gymnastic and military<sup>16</sup> curriculum alone would not be complete without a religious dimension. This is

<sup>11</sup> But cf. (e.g.) Farnell 1896–1909, V, 29–30; H. Herter, *RhM* 119, 1976, 229–230.

<sup>12</sup> Both are included among the oath-gods listed in A 26, [55–56].

<sup>13</sup> Farnell 1896–1909, V, 29. In his capacity as patron of competitions Hermes may be entitled ἀγωνιος and ἐναγωνιος.

<sup>14</sup> Nilsson 1906, 388; for the few exceptions see 392–394. Cf. J. and L. Robert *BE* 1962 no. 248.

<sup>15</sup> In this respect cf. G. Cordiano, *La ginnasiarchia nelle 'poleis' dell'occidente mediterraneo antico*, Pisa, 1997, 23–24. This of course does not mean that each and every Greek city had a full-fledged gymnasium. On the Hellenistic gymnasium see the discussion by Gauthier 1995. On the role of the gymnasiarch see also Cordiano *ibid.* 21–37 with copious general bibliography. I was unable to consult E. Fontani, *Ricerche sulla ginnasiarchia nelle città della Provincia d'Asia*, Diss., Florence, 1995.

<sup>16</sup> Evident from the reference to javelin throwing and archery (A 10–11): Gauthier and Hatzopoulos *comm. ad loc.* p. 84, and their *Conclusion*. Cf., however, Pleket's comments, 1999, 233.

provided by the cult of Hermes<sup>17</sup> and his festival, the Hermaia. By Hellenistic times the diffusion of the Hermaia was as wide as was the diffusion of gymnasia. The festival is documented all around the Greek world, and one may assume that, as it was as essential for gymnasia as gymnasia were for a Greek city, it existed even in places where documentation is currently lacking.<sup>18</sup>

The high point of the competitions at the Hermaia and of the festival itself appears to be the torch-race. The end of this race would be the lighting of the fire on the altar of Hermes (see below). This done, the sacrifice to Hermes would be performed and a sacrificial banquet would follow. The festival was celebrated in Hyperberetaios, the last month of the official year. The competitions, the sacrifice, and the sacrificial banquet thus solemnized the end of a year of training for the frequenters of the gymnasium and the end of his tenure for the gymnasiarch (Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 97).

As this document has been amply commented upon, the commentary discusses only a few points.<sup>19</sup>

## B 46

Despite the lack of a time indicator (such as *πρό*) with the verb *θύω*, the sacrifice referred to here may be some preliminary sacrifice rather than the sacrifice referred to later following the torch-race. Gauthier and

---

<sup>17</sup> Which, as has been said, may elsewhere be practiced alongside other cults, including that of human benefactors; see in this respect Gauthier 1996, 20–27. In general see also Nilsson 1955, esp. 62–67; for ruler cult cf. 71–75. I was unable to consult H. Siska, *De Mercurio ceterisque deis ad artem gymnica pertinentibus*, Diss., Halle, 1933 (Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 95 n. 4).

<sup>18</sup> I follow J. and L. Robert BE 1962 no. 248; Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 95–96. On gymnasium festivals cf. 78–80.

<sup>19</sup> The most relevant sacred laws dealing with gymnasia, duties of gymnasiarchs, and gymnastic contests are: *LSCG* 98 (banquet and competitions: Part I pp. 101, 102–103; commentary on lines 65–67 below); 165 (calendar of a gymnasium); *LSS* 44 (the Eumeneia at Delphi: Part I p. 84); 61 (foundation of Kritolaos; Part I p. 85; cf. Gauthier's commentary 1980, 210–218); no. 15 below; *LGS* II 131 (*Isocr.Cos* ED 82; foundation of Pythokles: Part I p. 84); *SEG* XXXVIII C (the Demosthenia in Oenoanda: Part I p. 101); *Isocr.Cos* ED 16 (fragmentary regulations concerning the Hermaia; cf. A. Chaniotis EBGR 1993–1994 no. 219 (*Kernos* 10, 1997); ED 86 (see Part I p. 85 n. 449; A. Chaniotis, *ibid.*, p. 302); ED 145 (sale of the priesthood of Hermes Enagonios); ED 215 (sale of the priesthood of Zeus Alseios; for both see Gauthier 1995a). Cf. the recently published *Isocr.Cos* ED 257, 263 (see Part I p. 85 n. 449); *SEG* LXVI 1721 and 1722 (honorary decree for a gymnasiarch from the Letoon in Xanthus; Gauthier 1996).

Hatzopoulos suggest (1993, 97–98) a purificatory offering or an oath sacrifice for the oath of the judges.<sup>20</sup> The use of θύω for an uneaten sacrifice is possible.<sup>21</sup>

### **B 46–47**

In its present state, the text is defective; something seems to have been omitted after ὄπλον where one would expect a reference to the competition for which this prize, distinguished from the three others, is designated. Knoepfer<sup>22</sup> suggested δολίχου or more likely μακροῦ δρόμου (long race).<sup>23</sup> This was rejected by Pleket (1999, 235), pointing out that the close connection between μακρὸς δρόμος and the torch-race for boys in *Iscr.Cos* ED 145.52 and in line 85 below suggests that the long race would be here out of context. Perhaps, as Gauthier and Hatzopoulos argued (1993, 98–99), a whole part of a phrase which had dealt with prizes for all competitions referred to here was left out by the letter-cutter. Alternatively, Pleket suggests (ibid.) with much hesitation that ὄπλον be taken either as a collective singular of sorts or as a symbol for all prizes for victors at all competitions, the ἄλλα τρία having been added merely because they were prizes *sui generis*, for which after careful and protracted scrutiny juries and the gymnasiarch designated the victors.

For arms and other prizes in comparable sacred laws see Part I p. 101; for documented general discussion see Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 100–101.

### **B 47**

Euexia (*command appearance*), eutaxia (*discipline*), philoponia (*endurance*). For these competitions see Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 102–108, Crowther 1985, 289–291 (*euexia*) and 1991. The *eutaxia* appears to have concentrated on fitness rather than on mere beauty. The gymnasiarch judges alone in the competitions of discipline (*eutaxia*) and endurance (*philoponia*) because, unlike the judgement of command appearance (*euexia*), success in these branches is based on the young men's conduct during the entire year. The winners in these two competitions would

<sup>20</sup> On oath victims cf. commentary on 1.2 above.

<sup>21</sup> Summarily see Rudhardt 1992, 213–214.

<sup>22</sup> 1979, 173 n. 28, 177 with n. 54 (Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 99).

<sup>23</sup> Mentioned below, line 85. As Knoepfer pointed out, a exact parallel occurs in *OGIS* 339.82–83.

thus be announced at the Hermaia, as has been suggested (Crowther 1991, 303–304; Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 105–106).

### **B<sub>48</sub>**

Cormack s (1977, 149) conjecture <εὐξίαν> for the stone s εὐταξίαν seems required by the context.<sup>24</sup>

### **B<sub>48–49</sub>**

The men of the place (οἱ ἐκ τοῦ τόπου) are the young men (νέοι, νεώτεροι, νεανίσκοι) aged twenty to thirty; Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 78.

### **B<sub>59</sub>**

As is implied from the role of the torch-race in the present Hermaia, the Greek torch-race had a religious significance extending beyond the realm of sports. It was fundamentally connected to altars, used as both starting point and finish line of torch races, as is suggested by both written and iconographic sources. The torch would be lit at the altar used as a starting point and used to light an altar used as the end mark.<sup>25</sup> In *LSS* 44.15–16<sup>26</sup> (Delphi, the Eumeneia)<sup>27</sup> the real purpose in lighting the altar is explicitly sacrificial:

ὁ δ[ὲ] δρόμος γινέσθω ἐκ τοῦ γυμνασίου ἄχρι ποτὶ τὸν βωμόν, ὁ δὲ νικέων ὑφαπτέτω τὰ ἱερά.

The race shall be from the gymnasium to the altar, and the winner shall set a fire underneath the offerings.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Ben Millis notes (personal communication) that one may rather print εὐ(ε)ξίαν.

<sup>25</sup> See in general J. J. Thner, *Die athletischen Leibesübungen der Griechen* (SBWien 249 I–II), Vienna, 1965–1968, II, 134–156 with documentation; Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 109, 120; Gauthier 1995a. I make no claim of understanding what exactly the torch race symbolized for the Greeks. A symbolic significance is evident, however, in the opening torch race of the modern Olympics which was introduced at the Nazi-sponsored Berlin games of 1936. Cf. J. J. Thner *ibid.* 134–135 with n. 308.

<sup>26</sup> Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 109 n. 3. J. J. Thner, *ibid.* 143; Stengel 1920, 224. For torch-races in other sacred laws see *LSCG* 13.33–35; 98.22–23; *LSS* 61 (= *IG* XII 7, 515 lines 39–86) 84–86; *LSAM* 49 B 12–16; *Isocr.* *Cos* ED 145; ED 215; *SEG* XXXVIII C 65–67; cf. *LSAM* 37.25–26.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Part I p. 84.

<sup>28</sup> The ἱερά are not likely to be the edible parts of the victims but the parts designated for the god. Cf. Casabona 1966, 13–14. For the divine share and its offering on the altar cf. below commentary on 21.

Although it is not stated explicitly, the fact that the present torch-race is to be followed by sacrifice and a sacrificial banquet seems to imply that the goal of the torch-race was to light the fire on the altar of Hermes; sacrifice would ensue, the divine share being offered on the altar and meat solemnly consumed. Two torch-races are mentioned here, however, and the exact logistics remain obscure.

### **B 60–61**

*The Hieropoioi.* The *hieropoioi* here<sup>29</sup> must be members of the gymnasium (hence young men) and not city officials as Knoepfer (1979, 178) realized. Similarly, an agonistic inscription from Chalcis, *SEG XXIX* 809,<sup>30</sup> lists children who served as *hieropoioi* at local Hermaia.<sup>31</sup> This is not surprising, as the office of *hieropoios* (most references are to a college of *hieropoioi*) is defined by its function chiefly cult administration not by the functionaries and their affiliation; the office may be encountered in a variety of organized bodies, including cities, sanctuaries, and ad hoc organizations,<sup>32</sup> as long as cultic activity plays a part in their agenda.

### **B 63**

τοῦπιόν: τὸ ἐπιόν (sc.) ἔτος.

### **B 65–66**

*Division of the Meat and Banquets.* The mode of meat division prescribed here, reminiscent of the Homeric so-called δαῖς ἴση (equal feast), is evidently employed to ensure a certain degree of equality. Its hallmark is that, though the animal undergoes a primary division according to its natural parts, by the time butchery is completed, it has been entirely divided into portions of meat, evidently equal in weight (rather than in quality). Another mode common in ordinary Greek eaten sacrifice leaves some parts of the victim whole; it is met perhaps more often than the mode employed here in sacred laws.<sup>33</sup> Generally speaking, in that case specific parts or cuts are assigned as prerogatives to cult personnel, preeminently priests, or other officials (namely in public sacrificial

<sup>29</sup> See Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 110–112.

<sup>30</sup> Knoepfer 1979 and see *ibid.* 178–179 for children *hieropoioi*.

<sup>31</sup> Note, however, that here the sacrifice following the torch-race of the boys is taken care of by the *paidotribai*. Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 112.

<sup>32</sup> See (e.g.) Stengel 1920, 48–49.

<sup>33</sup> In the present collection see especially nos. 3, 9, 20, 21.

ce); remaining meat may be divided into portions (μερίς and μοῖρα are used frequently)<sup>34</sup> and distributed between other participants including, in public sacri ce, the general public. Officials may sometimes receive such portions as or as a part of their prerogatives.<sup>35</sup> Unless consumption on the spot is required, the meat in certain cases clearly distributed raw may be taken away and consumed elsewhere.<sup>36</sup>

Here, on the other hand, no prerogatives are prescribed; those who are to share the meat contribute equally toward the costs of the animal, and the meat is to be distributed among them in equal portions. The reference to portions of raw meat is probably related to this. The meat would not be distributed raw; rather it would be weighed raw. The portions would then be cooked and distributed among the participants in the sacri cial banquets.<sup>37</sup> Weighing meat while raw is explicitly prescribed in a comparable context in *LSCG* 98 from Coressia on Ceos, as Gauthier and Hatzopoulos have noted (1993, 112–113): a banquet is to be held; the refreshments include wine and dried fruits; meat serving per person consists of a given amount *weighed raw* per person;<sup>38</sup> weighing is assigned to the appropriate officials (lines 11–16).<sup>39</sup> As for the banquets, one ought to agree with Gauthier and Hatzopoulos (1993, 113) that two such banquets were held, probably in two separate rooms, one for the boys with their *paidotribai* and one for the young men with the

<sup>34</sup> But cf. *LSS* 14.55 where μερίδες refer more generally to parts of the victims.

<sup>35</sup> As in 20.7 below (private sacri ce). For distribution of meat see particularly *LSCG* 33 B 8–27 (two sacri ces and two distributions; equal portions distributed among officials in the first; no prerogatives in the second); 151 A 49–55; *LSAM* 39.20–25; 70.4–8; *SEG* XLV 1508 A 9–13. Cf. commentary on 3.5, 11.24 above; commentary on 20.7 and 19 below with bibliographical references. For division and butchery see Berthiaume 1982, 44–53. The basic work on distribution of parts is still Puttkammer 1912. On the sacri cial process see especially J.-L. Durand in Detienne and Vernant 1989, 90–104; van Straten 1995, 115–153. In general see Ziehen 1939.

<sup>36</sup> Except if consumption on the spot is obvious. Cf. Puttkammer 1912, 47–65; van Straten 1995, 145–146; Jameson 1997, 178–179. On the prohibition to take away meat see commentary on 16.5–6 below. For distribution of the meat while raw see *LSCG* 13.25–26 [hoi h] | ιεροποιοι | νεμόντων | ἀντοῖς ὁμὰ τὰ κρέα (the *hieropoioi* shall distribute the meat to them raw); *LSS* 19.23–24: νέμεσθαι τὰ κρέα ὁμ|ά. For κρεανομία see *LSCG* 33 B 24–25; *LSS* 11.10–17; *SEG* XLV 1508 A 9–13 with Part I p. 100.

<sup>37</sup> But cf. Nilsson 1955, 62.

<sup>38</sup> Ἐ κρεὼν σταθμὸν κατὰ | τὸν ἄνδρα ὁμὰ ἰσάντα μὴ ἔλαττον : MM (two minae) καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐγκοι | λίων ὅσα ἂν ἔχει τὰ ἱερεῖα (all of the victims' intestines).

<sup>39</sup> δοκιμάζειν δὲ τὰ ἱερεῖα τοὺς προβούλους || καὶ τὸν ταμίαν καὶ τὸν κήρυκα καὶ ἀρίστασθαι τὰ κρέα κτλ (The *probouloi* shall inspect the victims with the treasurers and the herald and weigh the meat). For weighed portions cf. *I.Priene* 123.5–6 (cf. 10–11; Berthiaume 1982, 112 n. 59). For raw meat cf. *LSCG* 10 C 18–22 (sale of meat); 13.24–25; *LSS* 19.22–24 (see above note 36).



gymnasiarch. More specific details (namely, the prohibition against performances) are given only regarding the banquet of the young men.

**B 66–67**

*No Performances in the Banquet of the Young Men.* In Plato's *Protagoras* (347 c–d) the introduction of artistic performances into a symposium is denounced as fitting only lewd (φαῦλοι) and vulgar (ἀγοραῖοι) men. While moral reasons may underlie the ban against them here too, the prohibition against performances during the sacrificial banquet seems to represent a more direct attempt to preserve discipline and order.<sup>40</sup> This attempt is equally evident in the exclusion of a *hetaireukos* from the gymnasium (B 28 with Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 84–85) and elsewhere.<sup>41</sup> The preoccupation with discipline is neither philosophical nor coincidental: as is implied from A 11–16 (with Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 95, 126–127), together with mishandling the gymnasium's finances, lack of discipline among the young men was the primary reason for the introduction of the present law.

**B 87, 89, 107**

εὐθύνω, εὐθύναι: See above commentary on A 15–16.

**B 97**

*Gloios*: The mixture of oil, sweat, and dirt, scraped off with a strigil or floating in the bath. J. and L. Robert, BE 1978 no. 274 (for the use of this substance see their discussion on pp. 434–435; Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 129).

**B 100–101**

A person convicted of theft could be liable to an action for sacrilege since an offence against the gymnasium or its users was seen as an offence against the god to whom the gymnasium was consecrated. See Gauthier and Hatzopoulos' commentary ad loc. especially 131–137.

**B 110**

By the politarchs: i.e. the decree and the law were transmitted to the authorities of the gymnasium by the politarchs: Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993: 43.

<sup>40</sup> See Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 113–114; Pleket 1999, 234.

<sup>41</sup> See Crowther 1991, 303.

## SEG XLVI 923

CHERSONESUS. FRAGMENTARY REGULATIONS  
MENTIONING THE HERMAIA. SECOND HALF OF  
THE SECOND CENTURY B.C.

(Figure 24)

A fragment of grayish marble found by chance by workers on the coast in construction ll in 1989. The stone is broken above, below, and on the right. The inscribed face is poorly preserved with some parts being almost entirely obliterated.

H. 0.135, W. 0.13, Th. 0.08. L.H. 0.008 0.01. Interlinear space 0.005.

Unspeci ed location (Chersonesus?). Inv. 74/36504.

Ed. Solomonik 1996, 44 no. 2; Makarov 2000<sup>1</sup> (=SEG XLVI 923).

Photograph: Solomonik 1996, pl. 2 (= Figure 24).

Text according to Solomonik  
pars alt. saec II a.

Text according to Makarov

[ - - - - - ]	[ - - - e.g. ἀκολούθως τοῖς τε νόμοις καὶ τοῖς τοῦ
[ τοῦ δ]άμου ψαφι[σ]μα - - - - - ]	[ δ]άμου ψαφι[σ]μασιν - - - - - ἐν τῷι γυμνα-
ΣΙΩΙ τοῖς Ἑρμαίοις[ - - - - - ]	σίωι τοῖς Ἑρμαίοις ἀγῶνας τίθεσθαι - - ποιῆσαί]
4 ΖΕΤΑ . ΕΑΡΑΤΑΙ[ - - - - - ]	τε ταῦτα κατὰ τὰ[ν] μαντείαν τοῦ θεοῦ Δία Κτήσ]-
. . ΟΝΚΑΙΚΑΘΥΠΕΡ[ - - - - - ]	ιον καὶ Καθυπερ[δέξιον] ἰλάσασθαι - - - - - τῷ]
θεῶι Ἑρμ[εῖ - - - - - ]	θεῶ Ἑρμ[εῖ] θυσίαν συντελλεῖν - - - - - ]
Σ . ΑΤ[ - - - - - ]	[ . .]ΑΤ[ - - - - - ]
8 ΣΑ[ - - - - - ]	ΣΑ[ - - - - - ]
ΠΑΡΑ . ΕΣΙ . . Ε . ΟΙΕΡΜ[ - - ]	παρ' ἀμές . . . Ξ . ΟΙΦΙ[ - - - - - e.g. τοὺς ἐφήβους]
παραπέμπε[ι] τοὺς Ε[ - - - - - ]	παραπέμπ[οντα]ς [τὰ ἱερά - - - - - ]
[ - - - - - ]	[ - - - - - ]

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have not seen the stone; the epigraphical comments are based on Solomonik and Makarov's editions. Note the considerable differences between the two. The letters have distinct serifs and are rather crowded. The alpha is open above and has a broken crossbar; K with short diagonals; smaller O; Π with a short right vertical; elliptical Ω.

<sup>1</sup> I infer that the author saw the stone from his discussion.

- 10 Solomonik prints ΠΑΡΑΠΕΜΠΕ . ΟΥΣΕ in majuscules, restoring παραπέμπε[ι τ]οὺς ε. As far as this can be judged, the majuscule version agrees with the photograph. It follows that one of the two letters in square brackets should be dotted, the other put in triangular brackets.

### Translation

[In accordance with the laws and the] decrees of the people [- - - in the] gymnasium [to hold competitions(?)] at the Hermaia [- - -] this according to the(?) [- - -] (5) and [- - -] (6) to [the] god Hermes [- - -] (9) among us [- - -] (10) escort the [- - -]

### Commentary

It is obvious that this fragment concerns the Hermaia, a gymnasium festival, for which see above no. 14. Little more can be said with any degree of certainty.

Solomonik dated the inscription to the second century B.C. according to letter forms, citing *IOSPE* I<sup>2</sup> 348, 349, 352 (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 709), and 353 and E.I. Solomonik, *Novye epigraficheskie pamjatniki Khersonesa (NEPKh)* I, Kiev, 1964, no. 1 as parallels. Makarov identified it as a decree or a sacred law concerned with the activity of the gymnasiarch and the ephebes. He dates the document to shortly before 110 B.C., around the time when, at the end of the period of the Scythian-Chersonesian wars, as is vividly described in the ca. 107 B.C. Chersonesian decree for the Mithridatic general Diophantos, *IOSPE* I<sup>2</sup> 352 (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 709),<sup>2</sup> the city went under the rule of Mithridates Eupator. Makarov adds that a concern with the institution of the ephebia is appropriate in this period.<sup>3</sup> He thinks that the appearance, probably through the agency of Delphi, of a postulated cult of Zeus Kathyperdexios, an epithet documented once in *SEG* XV 427,<sup>4</sup> which he assumes, mainly on the basis of the somewhat rare cult of Zeus Hyperdexios, had both gymnastic and military characteristics, also belongs to the period.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> For bibliography see A. Avram *I.Kallatis* 41 n. 158.

<sup>3</sup> 2000, 113, 118–119.

<sup>4</sup> Διὸς Πορίσου Κτηρίου καὶ Καθυπερδεξίου; a Roman imperial period altar of an unknown provenance in Istanbul; see Schwabl 1972, 318.

<sup>5</sup> 2000, 115–119.

## SEG XXXVIII 786

RHODES. LINDUS. SACRIFICIAL REGULATIONS.  
CA. 250 B.C.

(Figures 25 26)

A fragment of a mottled gray plaque of Lartian stone, found in March 1982 lying in the yard of a private house. It is not clear how the stone reached its finding place; original provenance remains unknown. The stone is broken above, below, and on the right. The back is rough-picked. The inscribed face is fairly well preserved. There was probably nothing inscribed in the vacant space under the text, and Kostomitsopoulos seems correct in observing that not much is missing on the top.

H. 0.20, W. 0.21 (top) 0.09 (bottom), Th. 0.075. L.H. 0.014 0.017, round letters somewhat smaller; 0.012 0.013. Interlinear space 0.01. Left margin 0.01.

Rhodes, Archaeological Museum. Inv. E 2273.

Ed. Kostomitsopoulos 1988, 121 123; (= SEG XXXVIII 786).

Photograph: Kostomitsopoulos 1988, 121 (good).

ca. 250 a.

-----  
 Ἀπόλλωνι ΕΝΘ . [.]  
 2 χίμαρος· θυέτ[ω]  
 τῶν φυλετᾶ[ν]  
 4 ὁ γεραίτατ[ος]  
 τὰ θυθέντ[α αὐτέϊ]  
 6 καταχρη[σθαι.]

*vacat*

-----

*Restorations.* Suppl. Kostomitsopoulos. || 1 Ἐνοῖ[ι] vel Ἐνοῖ[μῖ] K. dubitanter: ἔνοο-  
 [χος] (cf. *LSS* 98.3 (Camirus) L.) Fraser apud K.; vid. adn.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have seen the stone. Nice, large letters; small serifs; the strokes tend to widen toward the edges of the letters.

- Last two traces: a lower part of a smaller round letter (O or Θ), followed by a lower part of a diagonal stroke. There are no signs of a serif at the bottom and the stroke itself does not widen toward the edge. If it is intentional, A and Λ might be possible; X is somewhat less likely because the stroke begins too close to the preceding traces to allow sufficient room for the upper part of the other stroke. A Δ seems to me unlikely since there are no traces of the bottom bar.

### *Translation*

To Apollo [- - -] a young he-goat; the eldest of the tribesmen shall sacri ce (it); the sacri ced meat shall be consumed [on the spot].

### *Commentary*

This fragment is very close to a number of Rhodian sacred laws which may generally be described as calendar extracts, commonly listing the recipient divinity and the animal to be sacri ced; the officiant and the motive or occasion for the sacri ce are typically not mentioned. In addition to similarity in contents these documents tend to share some physical features: they comprise a small number of comparatively short lines and are commonly inscribed on small stones.<sup>1</sup> The major difference between the calendar extracts and the present fragment is its lack of a date (cf. *LSS* 88a). One might assume that the date was inscribed in the part now lost above, but the stone gives the impression that not much is missing on the top. The fragment may be regarded as an independent document, and the fact that nothing was inscribed below the preserved text seems to corroborate this. Kostomitsopoulos assumption that the stone could originally have been built into a wall or an altar is plausible.

*Date.* Kostomitsopoulos plausible dating of the inscription to the mid-third century B.C. is based upon letter forms and orthography.

### *Lines 1–2*

The fragmentary word in line 1 probably referred to Apollo or to the victim (ed. pr. 122). Ἐνόλμιος (sitting at the tripod), which might be

---

<sup>1</sup> See Part I pp. 69–70.

epigraphically possible, is an epithet of Apollo attested in Sophocles *Fr.* 1044.<sup>2</sup> The epithet Ἐνόδιος is unattested and probably inappropriate for Apollo.<sup>3</sup> It also seems to me epigraphically impossible. Ἐνορχος (or rather ἐνόρχας uncastrated) gives fairly good sense, but seems incompatible with the remains on the stone and may also be too long. Ed. pr. notes (122) that a place name is also possible.

The goat has close relations with Apollo and seems to be a favorite sacrificial animal of his.<sup>4</sup> Apollo's altar in Delos, which enjoyed great renown in antiquity, was made of goat horns.<sup>5</sup> Remains of horns of sacrificed young goats were discovered during the excavations of a Geometric sanctuary of Apollo at Dreros, Crete.<sup>6</sup>

Kostomitsopoulos argued that the word χίμαρος retains here its literal meaning, a one winter-old he-goat,<sup>7</sup> and, accordingly, that the sacrifice would take place in early spring. Nevertheless, χίμαρος may be used here merely to indicate relative age: a he-goat older than a kid (ἔριφος) and already having small horns, but still not a fully developed τράγος.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>2</sup> = *Etym. Magn.* s.v. ἐνολμῖς; Zenobius 3.63 (*Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum* I 72) has ἔνολμος. See *LSJ* s.v. ἐνολμος; Kostomitsopoulos 1988, 122 with notes 5 and 6, noting the connection between this epithet and the cult of Pythian Apollo, which is prevalent at Lindus (and well-attested elsewhere on Rhodes: see attestations in Morelli 1959, 25–27).

<sup>3</sup> It is suitable for divinities who had their statues by the side of the road or at crossroads, mainly Hecate: *LSJ* s.v. ἐνόδιος II.

<sup>4</sup> This is not to say that it is not associated with other gods such as Aphrodite (W. Richter *RE* X A 427, s.v. Ziege) or Dionysus (Richter *ibid.* 423–424; cf. above commentary on 1.33–34). Regarding Apollo see: αἶξ (goat): *LSCG* 7 A 9; 18 A 33–36, B 47–49, E 40–43; 20 A 26; *LSS* 116 A 3–5; above 1.43. χίμαρος (young he-goat): *LSS* 115 A 6–7; above 1.20. He-goat: *LSAM* 32.51 (ἄπιγγός). Cf. also Theocritus *Ep.* 1.5–6; Antoninus Liberalis *Met.* 20.8 (cf. 2); Pausanias 10.11.5 and Stephanus of Byzantium s.v. Τραγία. On Apollo's role as a pasture god see Nilsson *GGR* I<sup>3</sup> 536–538; on Rhodes see Morelli 1959, 103–104, 105–106, 108, 182.

<sup>5</sup> Callimachus *Hymn. Ap.* 59–64; Plutarch *De sollertia animalium* 35 (983 E), *Theseus* 21.1; Martial *Liber de spectaculis* 1.4. In general: P. Bruneau, *CRAI* 1995, 321–339.

<sup>6</sup> S. Marinatos *BCH* 60, 1936, 224, 241–244; cf. Yavis 1949–34.2. The cult of Apollo was especially important on Rhodes, where he was worshipped under a wide variety of titles; see Morelli 1959, 21–28, 102–110.

<sup>7</sup> Cognate with χεῖμα, χεῖμών: *LSJ* s.v.

<sup>8</sup> The goat horns discovered at Dreros (S. Marinatos *BCH* 60, 1936, 244 with fig. 18 on p. 243) are relatively small and belonged to young animals, not more than one year old in age, i.e. ἔριφοι and χίμαροι. At Camirus a yearling he-goat (offered to Dionysus) is referred to as τράγος παραήνιος in *LSS* 104.4–5, and the same word is mentioned in relation to the same place by Photius s.v. προτήνιον (for the (obviously wrong) spelling cf. Guarducci 1967–1978, IV, 43).

*Lines 3–4*

*The eldest of the tribe.* Regrettably, one must admit that the circumstances under which the present sacrifice is to be performed are by no means clear: it is not entirely self evident why the sacrifice is to be performed by the eldest of the tribe. To a certain extent, this obscurity relates to the scantiness of unambiguous information regarding the tribal organization of Rhodes, both before and after the synoecism of 408/7. Much has been written about this problem. Nevertheless, proposed explanations, as reasonable as they are, and as much as they help to clarify the problem, involve a great deal of assumptions and deductions.<sup>9</sup> Kostomitsopoulos suggested (1988, 122) that the sacrifice is to be performed by the eldest of the tribe instead of a priest because it took place at the annual meeting of the tribe, when the tribesmen elected their officials. The he-goat is to be offered to Apollo since he would help the process with his mantic power. This may or may not be the case. At any rate, the role of the eldest of the tribe was probably to preside over the sacrificial event and perhaps to take an active part in whatever stages of it were essential parts of the ritual (as opposed to (e.g.) mere butchery and division of the victim's meat), such as placing offerings on the altar, saying prayers, and pouring libations. See below commentary on 21.12–13 and 27 A 12.

*Lines 5–6*

Kostomitsopoulos' restoration is secured by analogy to *LSS* 88a 3–4 (τὰ θυθέντα | αὐτεῖ καταχοῆσθαι) and b 4–5 (τὰ θυ|θέντα αὐτεῖ καταχοῆσθαι(ν)); cf. also *LSCG* 142.6–7.

*On the Spot Consumption of Sacrificial Meat.* The requirement to consume the sacrificial meat on the spot is to be found elsewhere,<sup>10</sup> expressed

<sup>9</sup> G. Pugliese Carratelli, La formazione dello stato rodio, *SCO* 1, 1951, 77–88, at 78–80; idem, Sui damoi e le phylai di Rodi, *SCO* 2, 1953, 69–78, at 74–78; P.M. Fraser, The Tribal-Cycles of Eponymous Priests at Lindos and Kamiros, *Eranos* 51, 1953, 23–47; Jones 1987, 242–244, 248–250; V. Gabrielsen, *The Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes*, Aarhus, 1997, 29–31; Papachristodoulou 1999. The nature of the synoecism of Rhodes has been recently questioned by Vincent Gabrielsen, *The Synoikized Polis of Rhodes*, in P. Flensted-Jensen, T. Heine Nielsen, and L. Rubinstein (eds.), *Polis and Politics: Studies in Greek History Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen on his Sixtieth Birthday, August 20, 2000*, Copenhagen, 177–205.

<sup>10</sup> For a comprehensive collection of Greek and other evidence (understandably out-

by other verbs: (κατ)ἀναλίσκω as in *LSS* 94.13 14,<sup>11</sup> *LSAM* 34.7,<sup>12</sup> and below 20.8),<sup>13</sup> cf. Pausanias 2.27.1,<sup>14</sup> 8.38.8;<sup>15</sup> δαίνυμι as in *LSCG* 96.26 29;<sup>16</sup> cf. probably σκάνεω in *LSCG* 82.4<sup>17</sup> and the requirement to chop up (κατακόπτειν) the victim (minus prerogatives) in the sanctuary in *LSCG* 55.18.<sup>18</sup> This requirement is more commonly expressed negatively as a prohibition. Most frequent are the expressions οὐκ ἀποφορά and οὐκ ἐκφορά<sup>19</sup> as in *LSCG* 69.31 32,<sup>20</sup> 151,<sup>21</sup> below 23 A B *passim*, and 24.4; cf. Aristophanes *Plutus* 1136 1138;<sup>22</sup> Theopompus fr. 70

dated with respect to epigraphic evidence) see A. Thomsen, *Der Trug des Prometheus*, *ArchRW* 12, 1909, 460 490 at 466 468 (Greek) 468 472 (other). From among later discussions one may single out Ziehen 1939, 622; Nilsson *GGR* I<sup>3</sup> 79, 88 89; M.S. Goldstein, *The Setting of the Ritual Meal in Greek Sanctuaries*: 600 300 B.C., Diss., Berkeley, 1978, 50 54, 322 345; Scullion 1994, 98 117 (particularly on the connection between consumption on the spot and chthonian cult; cf. idem 1998, 119; 2000, 165); Jameson 1994, 55 56; idem 1997, 178 179. The following list of examples draws upon sources other than sacred laws only to illustrate similar usage of the specialized vocabulary.

<sup>11</sup> κρη αὐτεῖ | ἀναλοῦται.

<sup>12</sup> τὰ θυθέντα καταναλισκέ[τ]ω[σαν αὐτοῦ] (They shall consume the sacri ces on the spot).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. commentary.

<sup>14</sup> τὰ δὲ θυόμενα, ἣν τέ τις Ἐπιδαυρίων αὐτῶν ἦν τε ξένος ὁ θυῶν ἧ, καταναλίσκουσιν ἐντὸς τῶν ὄρων· τὸ αὐτὸ γινόμενον οἶδα καὶ ἐν Τιτάνῃ (The sacri ces performed (in the sacred grove of Asclepius), be the sacri cer an Epidaurian or not, they consume within the boundaries of the grove. I know that the same is practiced also in Titane).

<sup>15</sup> καὶ τὰ τε μηρία ἐκτεμόντες καίουσι καὶ δὴ καὶ ἀναλίσκουσιν αὐτόθι τοῦ ἱερείου τὰ κρέα (Ἐ and, having cut off the thighs, they burn them and, indeed, consume the meat of the victim there (in the Lycaean; the sacri ce is to Apollo Parrhasios)). Cf. also 10.4.1 and 10.38.8.

<sup>16</sup> δαινύσθων δὲ αὐτοῦ (They shall eat on the spot). Cf. Cato *Agr.* 83: votum pro bubus, uti valeant, sic facito: Marti Silvano in silva interdus in capita singula boum votum facito; Ἐ ubi res divina facta erit, statim ibidem consumatio (Perform the vow for the cattle, that they may be healthy, thus: make a votive offering to Mars Silvanus in the wood, during the day, for each head of cattle; Ἐ Once the ceremony has been completed, consume (the offering) at once on the spot.).

<sup>17</sup> For the expression cf. *LSAM* 54.1 2 with Sokolowski's commentary.

<sup>18</sup> See Ziehen's note ad loc., *LGS* II p. 152; E.N. Lane, *CMRDM* III 13.

<sup>19</sup> Right of carrying away/out.

<sup>20</sup> τῶν δὲ κρεῖων μὴ εἶναι ἐκφορὴν ἕξω τοῦ τεμένεος (No sacri cial meat shall be carried out of the precinct).

<sup>21</sup> οὐκ ἀποφορά: A 45, 58, 60, 62, B 4, 24; οὐκ ἐκφορά: B 10. On the other hand B 7 8 explicitly allows to take away meat of the choice heifer (δάμ|αλις κριτά ll. 5 6). Although both a piglet and a kid are required to be sacri ced in A 44 45, 57 58, 62, it is forbidden to take away meat of the piglet alone (cf. Ziehen 1939, 622); cf. D [2], 4. For οὐκ ἀποφορά cf. also *LSCG* 157 A 5, 7.

<sup>22</sup> Εἰ μοι πορίσας ἄρτον τιν' εὖ πεπεμμένον | δοῖς καταφαγεῖν καὶ κρέας νεανι-  
κὸν | ὦν θύεθ' ὑμεῖς ἔνδον. Κα. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκφορά (Hermes: Would you pick up and give



(*PCG*).<sup>23</sup> A verb may be used as in *LSCG* 54.10–11<sup>24</sup> and 27 A 20 below;<sup>25</sup> οὐ φορά is used frequently in *LSCG* 18.<sup>26</sup>

The requirement to consume sacrificial meat on the spot has been much discussed.<sup>27</sup> The basic underlying factors must be religious and are likely to have something to do with the notion of eating in a holy place<sup>28</sup> and with the character of the cult in question. I am not sure, however, that a single explanation can account successfully for all occurrences. Several factors – first religious but also practical<sup>29</sup> – may be operative in particular cases.

---

me to eat some well-baked bread and a nice piece of meat from what you sacrifice inside. Cario: But there is no carrying out.) Cf. Schol. ad loc.

<sup>23</sup> (= Schol. Ar. *Plut.* 1138): εἶσω δρομῶν αἴτησον. (B.) ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκφορά (Run inside and ask for it! (B.) But there is no carrying out).

<sup>24</sup> τῶν δὲ κρεῶν μὴ | φέρεσθαι ((Portions) of the meat shall not be carried away).

<sup>25</sup> τὰ κρεῖ μὲχφερέτο (The meat shall not be carried out). Cf. *CIL* VI 576 (= *ILS* II 4915) extra · hoc · limen · aliquid · de sacro | Silvani efferre fas non est (It is not allowed to carry out of this precinct anything from Silvanus' sacrifice).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Rosivach 1994, 18–19.

<sup>27</sup> See above note 10.

<sup>28</sup> As in the Israelite חַטָּאת (*ḥaṭṭat*; purification a.k.a. sin offering) and אָשָׁם (*'ašam*; reparation, a.k.a. guilt offering; on their introduction see Milgrom 1991, 176–177). They were to be consumed by priests alone, considered most holy, and could be eaten only in a holy place (Leviticus 7:5–6) which, after ritual activity had been constricted to the Jerusalem temple, was the priestly part of this temple (see Schaller 1979, 261–262, 270). One should note that these two offerings are not quite comparable to the Greek sacrifices discussed here. These involve consumption of the victim by *both* priests *and* worshippers and should rather be compared to the Israelite שְׁלָמִים (*'šlamim* well-being a.k.a. peace offering). For the notion of communion (odious to many nowadays) in this offering see Jenson in Beckwith and Selman 1995, 30–31 cf. 26. The requirement to consume sacrificial meat on the spot in the Passover sacrifice, Exodus 12:8–10 (cf. 29:31–34 and Deuteronomy 16:14 see further Alexander in Beckwith and Selman 1995, esp. 8–9), may perhaps be taken into account here.

<sup>29</sup> Such as the risk of becoming impractical in sacrifices involving large crowds (see Jameson 1997, 178–179). As in most cases cited above, the requirement governs here the sacrifice of a single victim.

RHODES. LINDUS (CHARAKI). DECREE  
CONCERNING SUPPLIANTS. THIRD CENTURY B.C.

(Figure 27)

A left lower part of a stele of lightish, mottled Lartian stone, discovered in 1952 or 1953 in the territory of the deme Κλάσιοι or Πεδαιεῖς, at the small coastal town of Charaki near Malonas, north of Lindus.<sup>1</sup> The stone is broken above and on the right. The inscribed face is fairly well preserved. The back is smoothed-picked and has four holes suggesting secondary use as a threshold block, probably on two occasions. The more secure restorations (lines 4, 7) suggest that the stone was originally twice as wide.

H. 0.406, W. 0.284, Th. somewhat uneven, 0.0101 (upper left) 0.104 (lower right). L.H. 0.009 0.011, O and Θ relatively slightly smaller, 0.009. Interlinear space 0.006 0.007. Left margin 0.009. Lower margin 0.165.

Rhodes. Archaeological Museum. Inv. 359.

Ed. Kontorini, 1989, 17–29 no. 1 (French summary 187–189); (= *SEG XXXIX* 729).

Cf. Kontorini 1987 (= BE 1988 no. 1014; EBGR 1987 (*Kernos* 4, 1991)); Erskine 1991, 200; A. Chaniotis EBGR 1989 no. 60 (*Kernos* 6, 1993);<sup>2</sup> idem 1996, 67–68 n. 11, 71 n. 20; Giuliani 1998, 73–74.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For a map see Papachristodoulou 1999, 34, g. 2 with the author's comment on page 33. Remains of tombs, fortifications, and of an early Christian basilica were located in the wider territory. Drums of columns and a number of inscriptions, including a list of priests of Poseidon Hippius, are said to have come from the same area, where another, still unpublished, sacred law (no. 484) has also been found. A brief report by P. Courbin in *BCH* 78, 1954, 157 mentions that traces of the cult of Dionysus had previously been detected at Charaki and that both sacred laws came from a sanctuary of Dionysus. Such a sanctuary is, however, yet to be discovered, and Kontorini (1989, 18) asserts that existing evidence shows that the cult of Dionysus in the area was connected to groups such as the *koinon* mentioned in *IG XII* 1, 937 and others mentioned in the unpublished sacred law.

<sup>2</sup> On Kontorini 1989.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. below introductory remarks.

Photograph: Kontorini 1989, pl. 1 (very good).

saec. III a.

-----  
 [- - -] ἐκάσ[τ]ω[ν] ----- ]  
 [ύ]πάρχουσιν ΠΑΡΟ[ ----- ]  
 πράσσεσθαι πλέονα δραχμᾶν ----- ]  
 4 ὅ τι δέ κά τις παρὰ τόδε [τὸ ψάφισμα ποιή]-  
 σι ἀφικετέων ἢ δεκόμενος τοὺς ἐκέτας,  
 χιλίας δραχμὰς ἀποτείσ[ατω ἱερὰς ταῖ θε]  
 ῶν τοὶ δὲ ἱερεῖς ἢ τοὶ κάρ[υκες αἱ κά τι ἐπι]-  
 8 τάσσωντι παρὰ τὰ ἐσαφισμένα . . .<sup>ca. 7</sup> . . .]-  
 ντι τοὺς ἐκέτας κατὰ τὰ [γεγραμμένα, ἔ]-  
 νοχοι ἐόντω τῶι νόμῳ τ[ῶι τᾶς ἐκετεῖ?]-  
 ας· γραφέσθω δὲ ὁ χρήζ[ων αὐτοὺς κατὰ τὸν]  
 12 νόμον· τὸ δὲ ψάφισμα τόδε[ε ἀναγράψαι]  
 ἐστάλαν λιθίναν, ἀποδόσ[θων δὲ τοῖ πωλη]-  
 ταὶ καθά κα ὁ ἀρχιτέκτων [συγγράψη],  
 καὶ θέμειν. <sup>vac.</sup>

*vacat* 0.165

*Restorations.* Supplevit Kontorini, coniecturis de vv. 4, 7, 11 12, 14 a G. Dontas factis adiuta. || **2** παρ' οἰδενός (sc. ἐκέτα)? K. || **3** δραχμᾶν *numerus* vel δι[ακοσιᾶν δραχμᾶν] K. || **8-9** [ἢ μὴ καθάϊρω] ντι vel ἀγνίζω ντι; K. vid. adn. || **9** vel τὰ [δεδογμένα] K. || **10-11** Kontorini in textu [ἱεροσυλί?]| ας, in adn. [ἐκετεῖ?]| ας habet.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have seen the stone. Disagreements with the first edition regarding dotted letters are not noted. Neat letters with strokes showing a tendency to widen toward the edges.

- 1** The restored tau is not impossible although the space between the sigma and the omega is tight and I could see no markings in it.  
**13** Nothing exists now or in the photograph in the first edition after the last sigma.

### *Translation*

(3) exact more than [- - -] drachmas; if someone does something against this decree, either acting as an agent in supplication or receiving the suppliants, he shall pay a thousand drachmas [sacred to the] goddess.  
 (7) If the priests and the heralds order something against what has been decreed [- - -] the suppliants according to the [written (regulations vel sim.)], they shall be liable to the law [of supplication(?)]. Whoever wishes shall bring a charge against [them according to the] law. (12) This decree [shall be inscribed] on a stone stele [the *poletai* shall] lease out (the contract) according to whatever the architect [specifies] and set it up.

## Commentary

Kontorini noticed the striking similarities between this difficult fragment and the section on *hikesioi* in the cathartic law from Cyrene, *LSS* 115 B 28 59.<sup>4</sup> Her equation of the heralds (ἄρ[υκας]) (line 7) with the announcer mentioned in the third Cyrene paragraph seems perceptive and correct. She is surely right in recognizing that the ἀφικετεύων ἢ δεκόμενος] (line 5) should be understood as referring to one and the same person, and that this person is to be identified with the Cyrene intermediary whom Wilamowitz<sup>5</sup> had understood as the subject of the infinitive ἀφικετεύειν in *LSS* 115 B 50.<sup>6</sup> But identifying this person further with the host of the first Cyrene paragraph, recognizing all three categories of *hikesioi* in the present document, and thus proving that all three *hikesioi* are human beings<sup>7</sup> is too complex.<sup>8</sup> Similarities between the two documents are rather confined to the third Cyrene paragraph dealing with a homicide (αὐτοφόνος) *hikesios*. The ἀφικετεύων ἢ δεκόμενος] should be identified only with the Cyrene subject of the infinitive ἀφικετεύειν (*LSS* 115 B 50) who hosts the homicide and purifies him. His role in the proceedings conforms, in fact, to the role of a host in the purification of a homicide, the essentials of which procedure are known from literary sources. The homicide was required to find a host, commonly in a different city, who would act as his purifier, as is evident

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Part I pp. 77-79. The best commentary is Parker 1983, 347-351; Servais 1960 has the most reasonable text. Lines 50-59 are quoted here with slight changes (the translation owes much to Buck, *GD* no. 115, Servais, and Parker): ἱέσσιος τρίτος, αὐτοφόρος· ἀφικετεύεν ἐς [. . .<sup>ca.4</sup>.] πολίαν καὶ τρυφυλίαν. ὥς δὲ καὶ καταγράφει[ ἐξέ]σθαι, ἴσσαντα ἐπὶ τῷ ὁδοῖ ἐπὶ νάκει λευκ[ῶι, νύ] ζεν καὶ χρίσαι, καὶ ἐξιμεν ἐς τὸν δαμοσί[αν] | ὁδὸν καὶ σιγὲν πάντας, ἧ κα ἔξοι ἔωντ[ι, . . .<sup>ca.4</sup>.]<sup>55</sup>. ὅ]ποδεκομένους τὸν προαγγελετ[ῖρα . . .<sup>ca.5</sup>.]. .]ν παρίμεν τὸν ἀφικετευ[ό]μενο[ν . . .<sup>ca.5</sup>.] | . .]εον καὶ τὸς ἐπομένους [. . .<sup>ca.6</sup>. . .]. .] θῆρσει θύη καὶ ἀλλ[α - - - | - - - αἰ δὲ μὴ [- - -] | - - - A third *hikesios*, a homicide: he shall plead (his case), presenting him to the [- - -] cities(?) and the three tribes. When he announces that he (the homicide) has come as a suppliant, he shall have him sit on the threshold on a white Beece, wash him, and anoint him, and they shall go forth to the public road, and all shall keep silent while they are outside, [- - -] listening to (or: receiving?) the announcer; [- - -] the suppliant shall pass by (or: proceed?) [- - -] and the followers [- - -] he shall sacrifice offerings (probably cakes: Casabona 1966, 112) and other [- - -] if not [- - -]

<sup>5</sup> *SBBerl* 1927, 171; cf. Parker 1983, 350.

<sup>6</sup> Kontorini 1989, 22–25.

<sup>7</sup> Kontorini 25–29. On the *hikesioi* of Cyrene see further additional note below.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Giuliani 1998, 73–74; Erskine 1991, 200.

in *Iliad* 24.480–483.<sup>9</sup> According to Herodotus (1.35),<sup>10</sup> the procedure was common to all Greeks.<sup>11</sup> Its basic elements appear also in the second column of the law from Selinus (27 below) discussing the purification of a homicide (αὐτορρέκτας) from vengeful spirits (*elasteroi*) through a host (ὑποδεκόμενος). The procedure might not have been completely uniform and the documentary evidence may not always be in agreement with the literary tradition, which is more detailed in respect to the actual purification. It is also noteworthy that the Cyrene document is mainly interested in the procedure itself, originally private, now state-endorsed.<sup>12</sup> While the present document is likely to have shown a similar interest, the punitive measures suggest that a concern for abuses of the procedure contributed to its promulgation.

*Date.* Kontorini (1989, 18) dated the inscription to the third century B.C. on the basis of an agreement between letter forms and the general character of the writing.

#### *Line 5*

ἀφικετεύων ἢ δεκόμενος]: The two participles refer to two actions performed by one and the same individual. Δεκόμενος] corresponds to the [ὑ]ποδεκόμενος at Selinus (27 B 3–4 below), and refers to hosting the homicide, as it seems, at home.<sup>13</sup> Ἀφικετεύειν ought to mean something like act as an agent in supplication as is suggested by the requirement at Cyrene (*LSS* 115 B 50–51) that the homicide's arrival be announced, in all probability by the host, to some sort of a

<sup>9</sup> ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἄνδρ' ἄτη πυκινὴ λάβῃ, ὅς τ' ἐνὶ πάτρῃ | φῶτα κατακτείνας ἄλλων ἐξίκετο δῆμον | ἄνδρὸς ἐς ἀφνειοῦ, κτλ (And as when sore infatuation takes over a man who, having killed a mortal in his land, would come (as a suppliant) to another land to (the house) of a wealthy man, etc.).

<sup>10</sup> Παρελθὼν δὲ οὗτος ἐς τὰ Κροίσου οἰκία κατὰ νόμους τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους καθαροῖον ἐδέετο ἐπικυρῆσαι, Κροῖσος δὲ μιν ἐκάθηρε. ἔστι δὲ παραπλησίη ἡ κάθαρος τοῖσι Λυδοῖσι καὶ τοῖσι Ἑλλήσι. ἐπεῖτε δὲ τὰ νομιζόμενα ἐποίησε ὁ Κροῖσος, ἐπυνθάνετο ὁκόθεν τε καὶ τίς εἴη, κτλ (After he (Adrastus) had come to Croesus' house, he asked to obtain purification according to the local customs, and Croesus purified him. Now, the Lydian purification is very similar to the Greek. Once Croesus had performed the customary actions, he asked him who he was, etc.).

<sup>11</sup> This explains the similarities (which Kontorini (1989, 29; cf. 1987) ascribes to the influence of Rhodians participating in the so-called second colonization of Cyrene) between practices at Lindus and Cyrene. On the purification of a homicide, see in general Parker 1983, 370–374 (cf. 386–388). For the host Clinton (1996a, 176–177) adds Aesch. *Choe.* 291–296. On supplication see especially Gould 1973; Freyburger 1988.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. below commentary on 27 B 10.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Clinton 1996a, 176.

civil body (ἀφικετεύεν ἐς [. . .] | πολίαν καὶ τριφυλίαν). The host's most important action, purification, is unfortunately not referred to here. It seems to include washing at Selinus<sup>14</sup> and at Cyrene, where the host seats the homicide on a white Beece (B 52–54). The use of the blood of a slaughtered animal, namely a piglet, in the purification is prevalent in the literary tradition and described vividly by Aeschylus<sup>15</sup> and, at greater length, by Apollonius Rhodius.<sup>16</sup> Epigraphy is, however, silent on this detail.<sup>17</sup>

*Lines 6–7*

*The Goddess.* Kontorini (1989, 25) seems right in asserting that, owing to the relative importance of the decree, the deity referred to here ought to be Athena Lindia, the most important deity of Lindus. She seems to have been a pre-Greek divinity whom the Dorian settlers identified with Athena. Her priest was the eponymous magistrate of Lindus.<sup>18</sup>

*Lines 7–9*

*Heralds and Priests.* As Kontorini noted, the Lindian heralds are to be matched with the announcer (προαγγελτήρ) of the third Cyrene paragraph,<sup>19</sup> who seems to be leading a sort of silent procession, obviously announcing the presence of the homicide and the danger of pollution (LSS 115 B 53–55; cf. Parker 1983, 371).<sup>20</sup> There is no mention of a public crier at Selinus, but the importance of a public proclamation is manifest in B 2–3; see further commentary on no. 27 below.

In the reference to priests Kontorini recognized the second Cyrene paragraph, assuming that the priests are to purify the suppliants and, accordingly, supplementing [ἢ μὴ καθαίρω] | ντι or [ἢ μὴ ἀγνίζω] | ντι.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>14</sup> See further below commentary on 27 B 4–5.

<sup>15</sup> *Eum.* 280–283, 448–450; cf. *LIMC* III 64 s.v. Erinyes, VII 48 s.v. Orestes. See Parker 1983, 386–388.

<sup>16</sup> *Arg.* 4 especially 703–709.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. below commentary on 27 B 4–5.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. above commentary on 16.3–4. On Athena Lindia see further Morelli 1959, 80–88.

<sup>19</sup> Kontorini 1989, 24–25.

<sup>20</sup> For the announcement see also Euripides *IT* 1207–1211 (Giuliani 1998, 73). On the herald cf. A. Maiuri, *Nuova silloge* p. 35 (commentary on 20.13); C. Blinkenberg, *I.Lindos* p. 720 (commentary on 378 b 75).

<sup>21</sup> Kontorini 1989, 25, 27. This seems to have little support in the text: priests

If similarities between the two documents are confined to the third Cyrene paragraph, this restoration is permissible – though it may be somewhat too long for the space – only if purification is not taken literally, since actual purification is the responsibility of the host. The priests might be instrumental at other stages of the procedure. Conceivably, the suppliant first takes refuge in a sanctuary (cf. below commentary on 18.8–9); in this case, the priests might have to help in matching him with a host. They can also step into the process if it ends with sacrifice at a sanctuary (cf. the sacrifice on the public altar at Selinus, 27 B 10 with commentary). The fact that they are mentioned together with the heralds is possibly significant and suggests the preeminence of the host notwithstanding – that religious authorities take part in the procedure.<sup>22</sup>

*Lines 10–11*

Kontorini tentatively prefers the restoration [ἱεροσυλί] | ας (cf. Chaniotis 1996, 71 n. 20) to [ἱκετεῖ] | ας, assuming a revision of the clause on *hiketeia* in a general law on *hierosylia*.<sup>23</sup> Perhaps the present decree could supplement a narrower law on supplication, possibly in a sanctuary,<sup>24</sup> which had not considered the special case of supplication of a homicide or had done so unsatisfactorily.

*Lines 13–15*

By analogy to three other Rhodian inscriptions that mention *poletai* (financial officials, documented mostly in Athens, Rhodes, and Cos) in

---

are nowhere to be found in the second Cyrene paragraph. Their presence might be inferred from the reference to a public sanctuary, but their function in the bizarre proceedings remains unknown; no allusion seems to me to be made to their participation in purification.

<sup>22</sup> The verb ἄδικέω (ἱκέτην μὴ ἄδικεῖν *LSAM* 75.7, 9; cf. Pausanias 7.25.1; Chaniotis 1996, 83–85 with n. 74) would give some sense here and [ἢ ἄδικῶ] | ντι almost fits the space. This would require, however, taking κατὰ τὰ [γεγραμμένα] with [ἔ] | νοχοὶ ἐόντω which seems unidiomatic. A construction with μὴ seems preferable; the verb should generally mean something like ‘treat, handle or assist (ὠφελεῖν | ντι).

<sup>23</sup> Kontorini 1989, 26 with n. 32. For *hierosylia* cf. Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 129–130. For the psilosis see Buck, *GD* 58b, 261.8.

<sup>24</sup> The sanctuary of Athena Lindia on the acropolis of Lindus (cf. above commentary on lines 6–7) seems the natural candidate. Cf. the concern with suppliants in no. 19 below.

a very similar context,<sup>25</sup> Kontorini's restoration, printed in her commentary,<sup>26</sup> appears secure enough to be included in the text.

### *Line 15*

As Kontorini suggested (1989, 26), the stone could have been placed near another stone which bore a related inscription, perhaps the law referred to in line 10 (cf. 12).

### *Additional Note*

#### *The Suppliants of Cyrene*

The identity of the Cyrene suppliants is controversial. Most earlier scholars including Servais (1960) preferred to see them as real human suppliants. H.J. Stukeley<sup>27</sup> suggested that they were all supernatural beings. R. Parker (1983, 344–351) accepted this for the first *hikesios*, maintaining that the other two, and certainly the third, were human. W. Burkert<sup>28</sup> reasserted that all three *hikesioi* were supernatural beings. Parker's interpretation still seems best to me. Demanding that all three *hikesioi* belong to one and the same category is understandable but somewhat simplistic, as the arrangement of ancient legal texts may not follow modern logic.<sup>29</sup> While dwelling on the differences between them, we have forgotten that all three *hikesioi* are related semantically and by their potential to pollute. A modern code would not group under the same heading a supernatural visitant and a human suppliant. But this does not mean that the promulgators of this code (ascribed to Apollo in the heading)<sup>30</sup> would have not done so. They seem to have applied

<sup>25</sup> *LSS* 107.22–26 and *ArchDelt* 18, 1963, A 15, 21.3–7 (both from the city of Rhodes); *IC* III iii 3 a 97 (an alliance between Rhodes and Hierapytna): τοὶ πολλοὶ ἀποδόσθων κατὰ καὶ ὁ ἀρχιτέκτων συγγράφηι. On the Athenian *poletai* see M.K. Langdon, *Agora* XIX 53–69.

<sup>26</sup> 1989, 27 with discussion.

<sup>27</sup> The Cyrenean Hikesioi, *CP* 32, 1937, 32–43.

<sup>28</sup> *The Orientalizing Revolution: Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age*, Trans. M.E. Pinder and W. Burkert, Cambridge, Mass. (German orig. 1984), 1992, 68–73.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. R. Westbrook, The Coherence of the *Lex Aquilia*, *RIDA* III 42, 1995, 437–471, esp. 450–456.

<sup>30</sup> See Part I pp. 77–78.



the word *hikesios* to different yet semantically related phenomena. *Hikesioi* arrive (cf. ἵκω, ἱκνέομαι, ἱκάνω; Freyburger 1988, 504). Furthermore, their arrival, be they ghosts or humans, is potentially polluting and calls for cathartic measures. Treating them under a single subheading in a code aiming to cover various kinds of pollution is only appropriate.

## SEG XXVII 545; IG XII 6, 169

SAMOS. CHARTER OF THE SHOPKEEPERS  
IN THE HERAION. CA. 245/4 B.C.

(Figure 18)

A large stele of white marble comprising two joining fragments (*a-b*). Fragment *b* (lower part) was found in 1927 in a Byzantine wall in a north-south road between the north stoa of the Heraion and the main temple (H 7 on the map of the Heraion published in *AthMitt* 74, 1959). Fragment *a* (upper part) was found in 1952 or 1953 in debris in the same area. The stone is damaged above on the right; the bottom, including the socket, is preserved. The left margin is preserved only under the inscribed area; the right margin is lost. The inscribed face is rather badly corroded and seems to be deteriorating, especially at the margins and around the break between the two fragments. The surviving back is rough-picked. On the right side there is a  $0.01 \times 0.01$  dowel hole at 0.06 from the top and from the front which is probably the result of secondary use.

H. (without the socket) 1.38, W. 0.36 (top) 0.60 (bottom), Th. 0.22. Socket H. 0.095, W. 0.23 m. L.H. 0.01, O and Θ slightly smaller, 0.009. Interlinear space 0.011. Upper margin 0.04. Empty space below the text 0.54.

Samos Town (Vathy). Archaeological Museum. Inv. J 284 (*a*) and J 35 (*b*).

Ed. Habicht 1972, 210–225 no. 9; Dunst 1975;<sup>1</sup> Th 1 and Tauber 1978;<sup>2</sup> (*SEG* XXVII 545; D.F. McCabe, J.V. Brownson, B.D. Ehrman, *Samos Inscriptions: Texts and List*, Princeton, 1986, no. 123); K. Hallof *IG* XII 6, 169.

Cf. Koenen 1977; Sokolowski 1978; Shipley 1987, 217; Franke 1984, 119–122 (= *SEG* XXXIV 864);<sup>3</sup> G. Nenci *Messana* 1, 1990, 9–15 (*non vidi*; = R.D. Tybout and A. Chaniotis *SEG* XLIV 700);<sup>4</sup> Tracy 1990, 75 (= *SEG* XL 726); Soverini 1991;<sup>5</sup> Sinn 1993, 95; Chaniotis 1996, esp. 81; Rigsby 1996, 365; Hallof and Mileta 1997, 264–268 (= P. Gauthier *BE* 1998 no. 313; *SEG* XLVII 1315–1316);<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Using a squeeze.

<sup>2</sup> Using a squeeze provided by Dunst.

<sup>3</sup> See *Restorations* lines 26–27.

<sup>4</sup> See *Restorations* lines 8–9.

<sup>5</sup> Reproducing the *SEG* text.

<sup>6</sup> Date.

Dillon 1997, 216–217; Rhodes 1997, 280 no. 123, 285; Arnaoutoglou 1998, no. 46; Hallof 1999, 202; Gauthier 2001, 222–223.

Photograph: Habicht 1972, 87, 1972, pl. 79, 80 (close-up of *a*); Tracy 1990, 96 g. 27 (close-up of *b*); *IG* XII 6 pt. II pl. XXIX (lines 31–38); (all very good).

Drawing (from a squeeze): Th r and Tauber 1978 between pp. 224 and 225.<sup>7</sup>

N.B. The text printed here is rather close to the *SEG* text which appears to me to be the most sensible. It leaves to the apparatus most restorations which, however plausible, are not sufficiently documented or do not seem to fit the space. In places where the general sense (though not the exact Greek words) is clear enough from the context I have tried to convey the sense of the lost words in the translation, without necessarily translating a given restoration literally. The division into paragraphs is that of Th r and Tauber 1978.

ca. 245/4 a.

- a* [Ἐπὶ -----]ιῶνος ἑνδεκάτη[ι, ἐκκλησίας - - -]  
 [----- τῶ]ν ἀρχαιρεσιῶν ἐν τῷ [θεάτρῳ, ἐπιστά]-  
 [τοῦντος -----]-υ. <sup>v</sup> Τάδε εἰσήνεγκαν οἱ νεφ[ποῖαι περὶ]  
 4 [τῶν κατηλείων, διορθωσά]μενοι τὴν διαγραφὴν τῶν κατή[λων ἐν]  
 1 [τῷ τῆς Ἡρας ἱερῷ κατ]ὰ τὸ ψήφισμα, καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἐκύρωσεν ἀπομι-  
 [σθοῦν κατηλεία ἐν] (τ)ῷ τῆς Ἡρας τέσσαρα, ἔφ' ὧι οὐκ ἔξουσ[ία ἐσ]-  
 [ται πλείονα ἔχειν κ]ατηλείου ἐνός, ἔφ' οὗ καὶ ἐπ' οἰκήσει οἱ μ[ισθω]-  
 2 8 [σάμενοι μενῶσιν πάντ]α τὸν ἐνιαυτόν· παρακατηλ[ε]ύσει δὲ Α[- - -]

D. = Dunst 1975

Hall. = Hallof

N. = Nenci (= *SEG* XLIV 700)

Daux = Daux 1975

(apud Hall. = *IG* app. crit.)

S. = Sokolowski 1978

F. = Franke 1984

K. = Koenen 1977

T. -T. = Th r and Tauber 1978

H. = Habicht 1972

*Restorations.* 1–2 [Ἐπὶ - - - <sup>ca. 12</sup> - - - Κρον]ιῶνος ἑνδεκάτη[ι, ἐκκλησίας νομαίας | οὔσης καὶ γενομένων τῶν] H.: ἑνδεκάτη[ι ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν ἐκ κλησιῶν γενομένων τῶν] T. -T.: [Ἐπὶ - - - Ἀρτεμισ]ιῶνος ἑνδεκάτη[ι, ἐκκλησίας κατὰ νόμον | συναχθείσης περὶ τῶν] Hall. || 2 **fin.**–5 H. || 2–3 (ἐπιστατοῦν|τος) T. -T. || 3–4 (περὶ τῶν | κατηλείων) T. -T. || 4–5 κατη[λείων | τῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ κατ]ὰ D.: κατή[λων τῶν ἐν | τῷ ἱερῷ τῆς Ἡρας κατ]ὰ T. -T. || 5–6 L. dubitanter post ἐκύρωσεν <sup>v</sup> (quod solum in imagine invenies) ἀπο|μισθοῦν κατηλεία ἐν] τῷ T. -T.: ἐκύρωσεν ἀπο|μισθοῦν τὰ κατηλεία τὰ ἐν] H.: ἐκύρωσεν ἀπο|μισθοῦν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ] D.: ἐκύρωσεν ἀπομισθ|οῦν κατηλεία ἐν τῷ ἱε] (q)ῷ Hall. || 6–7 D.: ἔξουσ[ίαν εἰ|vai μηδενὶ εἰ μὴ κ] H.: ἔξουσ[ία ἔσται | μηδενὶ πλείονα ἔχειν κ] T. -T. || 7–8 T. -T.: ἐπ' οἰκήσει οἱ μ[ισθωσά]μενοι μὲν φέρουσιν] H.: ὁ μ[ισθω]σάμενος παρ' (δ' apud Hall.) ἄπαντ] D. || 8 med. H. || 8–9 ἀ[ντ' αὐτῶν | οὔτε δοῦλος οὔτε σ|τρατιώτης H.: ἄ[λ|λος οὐδεὶς, οὔτε σ|τρατιώτης D.: ἀ[ν]τοῖς | οὔτε δοῦλος οὔτε σ|τρατιώτης K. (ἀ[ν]τοῖς S. apud K.): ἀ[μισθ]ι | ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ οὔτε σ|τρατιώτης S.: ἀ[ν]θι | οὔτε παρσ|τρατιώτης N. (quod nimium breve videtur)

<sup>7</sup> This drawing incorporates restorations. This shows that some of them are suspect; in certain lines it is evident that the restored letters are spaced either more densely or more widely than those surviving on the stone.

- [- - - - - σ]τρατιώτης οὔτε ἄπεργος οὔτε ἰκέτης [οὔτε - - -]  
 [- - - - - ]ς τρόπωι οὐδὲ παρευρέσει οὐδεμίᾱ πλη[ν τῶν]  
 [μισθωσαμένων· ὁ δὲ] παρακατηλεύων ἀποτεῖσει τοῖς μισθω[σαμένοις]  
 3 12 [δραχμὰς - *numerus* - ζη]μίαν· οἱ δὲ μισθωσάμενοι οὐ παραδώσου[σιν - - -]  
 [- - - - - ἀπέ]ργωι οὔτε ἰκέτηι τρόπωι οὐδὲ παρευρέσει[οὐδεμι]-  
 [ᾱ· - - - - -] τούτων τινί, ἀποτεῖσει τῇ θεῷ δραχμὰς [ἱερὰς - *numerus* -·]  
 [ἡ δὲ ζημία εἰσπράσ]σεται ὑπὸ τῶν νεωποιῶν καὶ τοῦ ταμίου [τῶν ἱε]-  
 4 16 [ρῶν· οἱ δὲ μισθωσάμε]νοι οὐχ ὑποδέξονται παρὰ δούλου οὐθὲν [οὐδὲ παρὰ]  
 [ἰκέτου οὐδὲ παρὰ σ]τρατιώτου οὐδὲ παρὰ ἀπέργου οὐδὲ ἀγορῶσι[ν]  
 [- - - - - τ]ῆς χώρας γινομένων οὔτε ἄλλο οὐθὲν τρόπ[ωι οὐ]-  
 [δὲ παρευρέσει] οὐδεμίᾱ, πλην ἂν τινες τῶν γεούχων ἢ τῶ[ν - - -]  
 5 20 [- - - - -] ΩΝΩΝ πωλώσιν τινα τῶν ἐγκαρπίων· οὐχ ὑπ[οδέξον]-  
 [ται δὲ ἐν τοῖς κα]τηλείαις τοὺς καθίζοντας οἰκέτας εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ο[ὐδὲ παρ]-  
 [έξουσιν οὔτε ἔργα ο]ὔτε σῖτα οὐδ' ὑποδέξονται παρ' αὐτῶν οὐθὲν [τρόπωι]  
 [οὐδὲ παρευρέσει] οὐδεμίᾱ· ἂν δὲ τινες τῶν ἐπεστηκότων [- - -]  
 24 [- - - - -] τῶν ἀπειρημένων, ὑπόδικος ἔστω ὁ [- - - τῇ]  
 6 b [θεῷ δραχμῶν - *numerus* -· ἐὰν] δὲ τι ἐ[γ]χαλῇ ὁ ἰδιώτης τῷ κατήλωι ἢ [ὁ  
 κάπηλος]

*Restorations.* **9–10** οὔτε τις | ἀπόρως διακείμενος H.: οὔτε | δούλος οὐδεῖς D.: οὔτε | ἄλλος τις τοιοῦτος K. e. g.: οὔτε δοῦλος οὔτε ἄλλος οὐδεῖς S.: [οὔτε ἄλ|λος κάπη-  
 λος ουδεῖς T. -T.: οὔτε τῶν | ἐπιδημούντων οὐδεῖς Kirsten apud T. -T. || **10–11** H. (τῶν μι|σθωσαμένων T. -T.) || **11–12** μισθω[σαμένοις | τῆς βλάβης τὴν ἡμο]λίαν Kuss-  
 maul apud H.: μισθ[ω]σασιν | δραχμὰς -*numerus*- ζη]μίαν D.: μισθω[σαμένοις | δραχμὰς  
 -*numerus*- ζη]μίαν K.: μισθω[σαμέ]νοις δραχμῶν -*numerus*- ζη]μίαν T. -T. || **12–13** παρα-  
 δώσου[νται οὐ]τε δούλοι οὔτε ἀπέρ]γωι H.: παραδώσου[σιν | στρατιώτῃ οὔτε ἀπέρ]γωι  
 D.: παραδώσου[σιν οὐθὲν | στρατιώτῃ οὔτε ἀπέρ]γωι K.: παραδώσου[σιν τὰ κα]τηλεία  
 οὔτε ἀπέρ]γωι Behrend apud T. -T.: παραδώσου[σιν δοῦ]λοι οὐθὲν οὔτε ἀπέρ]γωι Van-  
 gelatou apud T. -T.: παραδώσου[σιν οὐ]τε δούλοι οὔτε παραστρατιώτῃ οὔτε ἀπέρ]γωι N.  
 (quod sane nimum longum est) || **13–14** παρευρέσει[οὐδεμι]ᾱ· ἂν δὲ τις παραδιδῶι  
 H.: παρευρέσει[οὐδεμιᾱ· ὁ δὲ | παραδιδούς] D.: παρευρέσει[οὐδεμι]ᾱ· ὁ δὲ παρα-  
 δούς τι K.: παρευρέσει[οὐδεμι]ᾱ· ὁ δὲ παραδιδούς] T. -T. || **14** n. δραχμὰς [ἱερὰς  
 -*numerus*-] T. -T. || **14–15** δραχμὰς ἱερὰς | ...<sup>ca. 7–8</sup> καὶ ζημωθή]σεται H.: δραχμὰς ἱερὰς  
 -*numerus*-. ἡ δὲ | τμὴ εἰσπρά]σεται D. || **15** in. T. -T.: [εἰσπρά]σεται: [εἰσπραχθή]σεται  
 W rle apud Hall of || **15 fin.–17 in.** H. || **16** [ρῶν· οἱ μισθωσάμε] T. -T. **16–17** || [οὐδὲ  
 παρὰ | ἰκέτου οὐδὲ παρὰ παρασ]τρατιώτου N. (quod nimum longum videtur). παρὰ:  
 παρ' T. -T. || **17** n. ἀγορῶσι[ν] Daux || **17–18** ἀ(π)όρως [έχομέ]νου οὐθὲν τῶν ἐκ  
 τ]ῆς H. (ἀ(π)όρως Kussmaul): ἀγορῶσουσιν οὐθὲν | τῶν σίτων τῶν (ἐκ apud Hall.) D.:  
 ἀγορῶσι[ν σῖ]τον(?) παρὰ τῶν ἀπὸ τ]ῆς K.: ἀγορῶσι[ν οὐθὲν | τῶν σίτων τῶν ἐκ τ]ῆς  
 S. || **18–19** οὐ[δὲ] T. -T.: τρόπ[ωι vac.?] | οὐδὲ παρευρέσει] H. || **19–20** τ[ῶν ἄλλων |  
 πολιτῶν ἀπὸ ἰδίων?] ὧν H.: τ[ῶν κληροῦ]χων(?) ἢ τῶν σιτ[ωνῶν] D.: τ[ῶν γεωρ]γῶν  
 διὰ ἐγγράφων] ὧν H.: τ[ῶν | σιτωνῶν ἢ τῶν καρπ]ωνῶν S.: τῶ[ν ἀπο]δειχθέντων  
 σιτ[ωνῶν] T. -T. || **20 fin.–23 in.** H. || **20–21** ὑπ[οδέξονται δὲ τοῖς | ἑαυτῶν κα] D  
 apud Hall. || **21–22** οὔτε ὕδωρ παρ[έχοντες ο]ὔτε D.: οὔδὲ παρ[έξουσιν ἔργα ο]ὔτε T.  
 -T. || **23–24** [ἀρχεῶν | ἁλώσιν (ἐλώσιν T. -T.) τινα ποιοῦντα τι] H.: [τοῖς κα]τηλείαις  
 ποιούσι τι] D. || **24–25** [ποιήσας τῇ] κτλ H.: [ἀδικῶν ([ἀδικῶν vac.] apud Hall.) κτλ D.:  
 [ποιήσας | τοῖς νεωποῖαις. Ἐὰν] T. -T. || **25** in Hall.: [ἐὰν] δὲ [ἐν]καλῇ Kussmaul apud  
 H.: ἐπ[ι]καλῇ T. -T.: [ἐὰν δὲ] ἸΑΕΡΙ ἐγκαλῇ D. apud Hall. || **25 fin.–27 in.** H. || **25–26**  
 [τοῦναντίον, | τοὺς μὲν μι]σθώσαντας δ[εῖξαι] D.: [καὶ τοῦν]αντίον, γραφ[έσθωσαν] T. -T.

- [τῷ ιδιώτῃ, γραφ]έσθωσαν τὰς δι[κας] ἐπὶ τῶν νεωποιῶν ἕως ▲ [- - -]  
 [- - - - - οἱ δ]ὲ νεωποῖαι τὰς γρα[φείσας δι]κας εἰσαγέ[τ]ωσαν [- - -]  
 28 [- - - - - δικαστ]ήριον, ἀφ' ἧς ἂν ἡμέρας γραφῶσιν, ἐν ἡμ[έ]ραις - *numerus* -]  
 [- - - - -] περὶ τὴν εἰσαγωγὴν ποιείτωσαν κατὰ τὸν ἱ[ε]ρὸν(?) νόμον  
 [- - - - -]ε μισθὸν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ φέρειν τὸν ἐκκ τοῦ ὑ[ό]μου [- - -]  
 7 [- - - - -] τὴν δίκην, γίνεσθαι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ἡσσηθέντος· ἐὰν δὲ τ[ι]νας  
 32 [μὴ δικαίως οἱ] νεωποῖαι ζημώσωσιν περὶ τίνος τῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀπ[ειρη]-  
 [μένων καὶ οἱ ζη]μιωθέντες ἀντείπωσιν, εἰσάγεσθαι τὰς γραφείσας [παρὰ]-  
 8 [γραφὰς ὑπὸ τ]ῶν ἐξεταστῶν εἰς τὸ πολιτικὸν δικαστήριον κατὰ ταῦ[τά] τὸν  
 [δὲ μισθὸν] καταβαλοῦσιν οἱ μισθωσάμενοι τῷ ταμίᾳ τῶν ἱερῶν κατ'  
 [ἔτος(?) - - -]  
 9 36 [- - -]ικοῦντες οὐθὲν οὐδ' ὑπόλογον φέροντες· οἱ μισθωσάμενοι Ε[- - -]  
 [- - -]ήσουσιν τῷ ταμίᾳ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀτελεῖς ἔσονται ὧν ἂν ὦνῶν(?) [- - -]  
 10 [- - -] ἔν τῷ ἱερῷ· μὴ ἐξουσία δὲ ἔστω τῶν ἱερῶν παίδων καπηλεύειν. [*vac*]

*vacat* 0.54

*Restorations.* **26–27** δ[εκάτης ἡμέ]ρας. οἱ δ]ὲ D.: δ[εκάτης ἐκάσ]τοτε ἡμέρας· οἱ δ]ὲ S.: δ[ραχμῶν | Σαμίον -*numerus*- οἱ δ]ὲ T. -T.: δ[ραχμῶν γ' ὀβολῶν β' vel δ[ραχμῶν β' ὀβολῶν ε' F. || **27** med. D. || **27–28** γρα[φὰς ταύτ]ας εἰσαγέ[τ]ωσαν εἰς τὸ πο[λιτικὸν δικαστ]ήριον H.: εἰσαγέ[τ]ωσαν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν | δικαστ]ήριον D. (ἱε|ρὸν T. -T.): εἰσαγέ[τ]ωσαν εἰς τὸ | κατ]ήκον δικαστ]ήριον S. || **28–29** ἐν ἡ[μέ]ραις εἴκοσιν | καὶ τὴν κρείσιν H.: ἐν δέ[κα ἡμέ]ραις. οἱ δὲ δι[κασταὶ] D.: ἐν ἡμ[έ]ραις εἴκοσι καὶ | πάντα τὰ] T. -T.: ἐν ἡ[μέ]ραις τριάκοντα | καὶ ἐπιμέλειαν S. || **29–30** [νόμον· ἐκα]τέρους δὲ τὸν τ] H.: [ἱερὸν νό|μον· | τὸν δ]ὲ D.: [ἀγορανομ]ικὸν νόμον· τὸν δ]ὲ S.: [ἱερὸν νόμον· | ἐκατέρους δ]ὲ T. -T. || **30–31** τοῦ νό[μου καὶ οὗτω ποιέ]σθαι τ]ὴν H.: τοῦ γ[ίνεσθαι] (vel εἰσαγεσ[θαι] τ]ὴν D.: τοῦ νό[μου ἐκὰ] τερον γραψαντα τ]ὴν S.: τοῦ γ[όμου γρα|φομένους] τ]ὴν T. -T. || **31 fin.–35 in.** H. || **31–32** [οἱ δικασταὶ | ἡ οἱ] D.: [οἱ ἀγο|ρανόμοι ἡ] S.: τ[ι]νας ἀ|δίκως οἱ] T. -T. || **32–33** ἀγ[όμων | καὶ οἱ ζη]μιωθέντες T. -T. || **33–34** [δίκας | ὑπὸ τ]ῶν D.: [ἐ|λέγξεις ὑπὸ τ]ῶν S. || **34–35** ταῦ[τά] τὸν | φόρον] T. -T. || **35–36** [ἐνιαυ]τόν· ἂ δὲ ἀδι|κοῦντες H.: [ἐνιαυ-τόν | ἀδι|κοῦντες D.: [ἔτος | ἅπαντα, ἀδι|κοῦντες S.: [ἔτος ἀν|τιδι|κοῦντες T. -T. quod brevis esse spatio lacunae suspicor. || **36** ita primus interpunxit D. || **36–37** μισθωσα-μένοι κ[ἀπ]η|λοι πολ[ι]ήσουσιν, H.: μισθωσαμένοι [δέ - - - D.: οἱ <δὲ> μισθωσάμενοι κ[ἀθὰ | εὐτακτ]ήσουσιν S.: ἐ[φ' ὧ] κα[ταθ]ήσουσιν T. -T. || **37–38** [πω|λῶσιν ἐ]ν H.: ὦνῶνται | ἐ]ν D. (quod sane nimium est breve): ὦνῶν[ται πάν]των ἐ]ν S.: [πωλῶ|σιν] ἐν T. -T.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have seen the stone. The letters have small serifs and the strokes tend to be somewhat curved; for a detailed description of the letters see Tracy 1990, 75. The inscribed face is deteriorating; Hallof underlined letters which he could read only in an old squeeze. In the following cases I could not see on the stones letters which had been read by him: **8** rst α; **10** end η; **13** rst γ (in addition to the rho underlined by Hallof); **30** end γ. I have not accounted for all dotted letters or for letters dotted here but un-dotted in *IG*.

- 4** First M (dotted in *IG*) seems to lack only the rst stroke.  
**6** After the lacuna the stone seems to have ΙΩΙ. For the <τ> Habicht and Dunst print τ; Th r and Tauber τ.  
**29** Last ι: Only a bottom tip of a vertical stroke seems to appear on the stone.  
**32** Last π: only a part of a vertical stroke with a lower serif appears on the stone.  
**36** The last surviving letter appears to be an epsilon (Th r and Tauber, Hallof) rather than a kappa (Habicht).

## Translation

[Under the *demiourgos*<sup>8</sup> - - -] on the eleventh of [- - -, when a meeting of the assembly was held - - - regarding(?)] the elections of magistrates in the [theater, under the presidency of - - -]. The *neopoiai*, having revised the charter of the shopkeepers [in the sanctuary of Hera] according to the decree, brought forward the following (measures) regarding the shops, and the people ratified (them).

1 (6) Four [shops shall be leased out in the sanctuary] of Hera, under the condition that [no one] will be allowed [to have more than] one shop, at which the lessees [will remain] in residence for the [entire] year.

2 (8) [No one] will engage in retail trade in addition<sup>9</sup> [- - - whether a slave(?)], a soldier, an unemployed person,<sup>10</sup> a suppliant or [- - -] in any way or under any pretext [except the lessees]. Whoever engages in retail trade in addition (to the authorized shopkeepers) will pay the lessees [(so many) drachmas] as a fine.

3 (12) The lessees will not hand [the shop] over [whether to a - - -], to an unemployed person, or to a suppliant in any way or under any pretext. [If anyone hands over the shop] to any of these, he will pay [(so many)] drachmas (sacred) to the goddess. [The fine] will be exacted by the *neopoiai* and the treasurer [of the sacred funds].

4 (15) The lessees will neither accept anything from a slave, [from a suppliant, from] a soldier, or from an unemployed person, nor will they buy [- - -] those from the land or any other thing in any way [or under] any [pretext], except if any of the *geouchoi* or [- - -] put some produce for sale.

5 (20) The shopkeepers will not host [in their] shops slaves who take refuge in the sanctuary, will [offer them neither employment] nor food, and will not receive anything from them in any [way or under] any [pretext]. If any of [the magistrates] who are in charge [catches

<sup>8</sup> Habicht 1972, 216; see below commentary on line 1.

<sup>9</sup> The verb *παράκαπηλέειν* seems otherwise not documented. *Παρά* is likely to have here the force of not merely besides but of against the law and the compound would thus mean to engage in retail trade unlawfully, without authorization/license. See Habicht 1972, 218; Koenen 1977, 212; Soverini 1991, 69–70.

<sup>10</sup> The unemployed may be not only ordinary unemployed persons (Dunst 1975, 173; cf. Sokolowski 1978, 144–145), but also veterans and soldiers not on active duty (Habicht 1972, 218 with n. 93, supported by *OGIS* 266.7; 11. Cf. Hallof and Miletta 1997, 265–266, and see especially Soverini 1991, 82–83).

someone doing any] of the forbidden things, the [person caught] shall be liable [- - - to the goddess (so many) drachmas].

6 (25) If a private person brings a charge against a shopkeeper or [vice versa], they shall submit their charges in writing to the *neopoiai* up to [- - -]; the *neopoiai* shall present the written charges [- - -] court, [within (so many) days] from the day in which the written charge was brought, [- - -] shall make<sup>11</sup> regarding bringing the case according to the [sacred(?) law]. [Both sides] shall bring the payment prescribed by law for the court [when they - - -?] the charge, but it shall be (exacted) from the losing party.<sup>12</sup>

7 (31) If the *neopoiai* ne [someone unjustly] with regard to one [of the things which are forbidden] in the sanctuary [and the] ned persons make an appeal, the written [pleas] shall be brought by the *exetastai* to the city court following the same (procedure).

8 (34) The lessees will pay the rent to the treasurer of the sacred funds each [year, - - -] and receiving no discount.

9 (36) The lessees will [- - -] to(?) the treasurer of the sacred funds and will have tax exemption from whatever [- - -] in the sanctuary.

10 (38) The temple slaves shall not be allowed to engage in retail trade.

### Commentary

As Habicht noted (1972, 213), leasing out sacred property was a common practice in Greece.<sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, most comparable documents deal with leasing out sacred land or sometimes sanctuaries; unfortunately we do not have any document quite parallel to the present one. The information about retail trade in Greek sanctuaries is also limited. Discussion of the subject matter in sacred laws is by and large confined to festival fairs. The Andanian mysteries regulations, *LSCG* 65, devote one paragraph (lines 99–103) to the subject; *LSCG* 92.32–35 (Eretria) is

<sup>11</sup> Plural.

<sup>12</sup> Both parties are required to deposit the payment for the court; the winning party gets his deposit back.

<sup>13</sup> There are numerous examples. *IG* XIV 645 (Habicht *ibid.*) is particularly notable. For a discussion and bibliography see Soverini 1991, 62–63, 86–94 *passim*. Add M. Walbank in *Agora* XIX, discussion on pp. 149–169 with documents L2, L6–7, L9–12, L14, L16, LA 1 (cf. Soverini 1991, 90 n. 262).

less detailed; cf. also *LSCG* 66.26–27 (Tegea); *LSS* 45.31–34 (Actium).<sup>14</sup> Shops (καπηλεία), evidently permanent, at the sanctuary of Amphiaraus are mentioned in *I.Orophos* 290.18; *IG XI* 2, 161 A 16 refers to Ephesian shops (τῶν οἰκημάτων ἐν οἷς Ἔφεσος καπηλεύει) on Delos.<sup>15</sup> See Habicht 1972, 213–214; Soverini 1991, 78 and in general 86–94; Dillon 1997, 214–221 (the present inscription is mentioned on pp. 216–217).

It is notable that the document does not discuss some of the details of the lease, such as duration and sureties. They ought to have been specified elsewhere, probably in the *diagraphe* to which this seems to be a supplement (lines 4–5).<sup>16</sup> Conceivably the publication was directed not only at the lessor and the lessees, i.e. the authorities and the shopkeepers, but also at visitors to the sanctuary, both welcome and unwelcome. The document emphasizes points which may concern its entire audience: prohibiting unwanted elements from engaging in retail trade (2) protects the licensed shopkeepers against competition; it may also be addressed at the unwanted elements themselves, in an attempt to scare them away.<sup>17</sup> Similarly, prohibiting the shopkeepers from handing over their shops to unwanted elements (3) and from assisting runaway slaves (5), though formally addressing the shopkeepers, is equally relevant to these unwelcome persons, encouraging them in fact to avoid the sanctuary altogether.<sup>18</sup> The stipulations concerning settling disputes (7–9) certainly concern not only the shopkeepers and the officials but also visitors.

Even though the archaeological evidence allows reconstructing the development of the Heraion with some degree of accuracy,<sup>19</sup> knowledge of Samian cult practice remains meager due to lack of adequate evidence. A coherent exposition on the local religion, possible to a certain extent for islands such as Cos or Rhodes, is thus impossible for Samos.<sup>20</sup> Regrettably, the present inscription is of little help in this respect. Even

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Part I p. 92 and the article by de Ligt and de Neeve cited there.

<sup>15</sup> The ἐργαστήρια leased out in *LSAM* 11.7–14 (Pergamum) are probably workshops; Welles, *RC* p. 117, commentary ad loc.

<sup>16</sup> For a discussion see Habicht 1972, 215; Soverini 1991, 63. For *diagraphe* cf. Part I p. 50.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Habicht 1972, 219.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Koenen 1977, 216.

<sup>19</sup> For a concise discussion see Kyrieleis 1993, 126–134.

<sup>20</sup> See Shipley 1987, 4. Even literary evidence concerning the Heraion itself is frustratingly scanty; see Kyrieleis 1993, 125.



so, it is a remarkable piece of evidence, allowing a somewhat rare and rather vivid illustration of everyday reality in a major Greek sanctuary.<sup>21</sup>

*Date.* The date is essentially based on letter forms. The hand is quite similar to that of *IG XII 6, 156* which dates itself to the reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes.<sup>22</sup> Hallof and Mileta argued that this inscription dates to the period between the beginning of Ptolemy III's rule in 246 and the establishment of the cult of the Θεοὶ Εὐεργέται in 243. They conclude that the present inscription, which dates to ca. 245/4 B.C., reflects a Samian attempt (in response to Ptolemy's command) to have the administration of the Heraion conform to the mode of administration practiced in Alexandria.<sup>23</sup>

Since this document has been amply commented upon elsewhere, the commentary here is limited to a few points.

#### *Line 1*

The eponymous magistrate of Hellenistic Samos was the *demiourgos*. The office was held by one or two magistrates at a time. See Shipley 1987, 211 with note 39, 221–222 with note 85, 305; Habicht 1972, 216 and no. 10 (*IG XII 6, 2*).

The Samian year appears to have begun, like the Athenian, with the first moon after the summer solstice. On the succession of the months see Hallof 1999. Gauthier<sup>24</sup> makes a case for preferring Habicht's Kro-nion (twelfth month of the year) to Hallof's Artemision (eighth month of the year).

#### *Line 3*

The Samian *neopoiai* were a board of temple curators of the Heraion. In this document the office seems to have an overall legal character: the *neopoiai*, who brought forward the present charter (lines 2–3), impose fines (3, 7), listen to claims, and take actions to court (6). Their

<sup>21</sup> In general see Sinn 1993, esp. 95–97; Dillon 1997, 204–221, 227.

<sup>22</sup> Fragments *a* and *b* of this inscription were first published by Habicht 1957, no. 59 (pl. 134); fragment *c* by Hallof and Mileta 1997. Habicht (1972, 212) was the first to notice the similarity in the hands. In his study of Samian hands Tracy (1990, 75) has independently reached the same conclusion, ascribing both stones to the same cutter.

<sup>23</sup> Hallof and Mileta 1997, 263–264. See also Hallof in *IG XII 6 I* p. 133. Cf. below commentary on lines 8–9.

<sup>24</sup> 2001, 222–223; cf. 226.

connection to a court is referred to in IG XII 6, 156.4 5.<sup>25</sup> The office was held for a year<sup>26</sup> and the *neopoiai* came from the wealthiest class.<sup>27</sup> The end of the Athenian cleruchy and the return of the exiles<sup>28</sup> seem to have been commemorated at Samos by a construction of a hall of the *neopoiai* (νεωποιεῖον) at the Heraion.<sup>29</sup>

*Lines 8–9, 12–13, 16–17; Line 21*

*Suppliants and Runaway Slaves.* The right of asylum enabled anyone, including *pessimi servitorum*, *obaerati*, *suspecti capitalium criminum*,<sup>30</sup> as Tacitus puts it,<sup>31</sup> to enjoy it by taking refuge at a sanctuary. Once a person had presented himself as a suppliant, the sanctuary's authorities were forced to investigate whether the suppliant's cause was just, and if so, to offer him legal help and to mediate between him and his pursuers.<sup>32</sup> Suppliants thus became a real burden for sanctuaries. It is therefore all the more interesting to see how the authorities of the Heraion try to deal with this problem.

The inscription seems to distinguish between two types of suppliants:<sup>33</sup> (1) runaway slaves (line 21) and (2) all other suppliants, obviously free persons. Both appear to be unwelcome, but the treatment of runaway slaves seems more strict. The shopkeepers are to offer them neither employment<sup>34</sup> nor food. As for other suppliants, taking their residence at the sanctuary as a given,<sup>35</sup> the authorities appear to attempt to make their living conditions harder: they are not allowed to engage

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Hallof and Miletà 1997, 67–68.

<sup>26</sup> IG XII 6, 156.11–12.

<sup>27</sup> Th 1 and Tauber 1978, 217–218; Shipley 1987, 223.

<sup>28</sup> In 323–322, 321, or even 320 B.C. (Soverini 1991, 65). On the dates see Shipley 1987, 166–168.

<sup>29</sup> Shipley 1987, 169–170; cf. 202; Habicht 1972 no. 1. with pp. 193–194. On the νεωποιεῖον cf. L. Robert *BCH* 59, 1935, 472–488 no. 3.10–11 (the word is spelled νεωποεῖον) with pp. 484–485. On Samian *neopoiai* see E. Buschor, *Samische Tempelpfeger*, *Ath-Mitt* 68, 1953, 11–24 (the present inscription is mentioned on p. 12); K. Hallof, *Das Kollegium der samischen Neopoiai*, *Tyche* 13, 1998, 111–113. More generally see Soverini 1991, 63–64.

<sup>30</sup> The worst slaves, debtors, and those suspected of capital offences.

<sup>31</sup> *Annales* 3.60 (cited by Sokolowski 1978, 145).

<sup>32</sup> Sinn 1993, 91–92. Cf. Soverini 1991, 83–84; Rigsby 1996, 9–10.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Soverini 1991, 105 n. 199.

<sup>34</sup> Habicht's restoration (1972, 221) is secured by a parallel in the Andanian mysteries regulations, *LSCG* 65.81. Cf. Sinn 1993, 95. For ἔργα παρέχειν Habicht (ibid.) cites B. Haussoulier, *Traité entre Delphes et Pellèna: Étude de droit grec*, Paris, 1917, 40 with n. 1.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Sinn 1993, 94–95.

in retail trade (8 9), and the shopkeepers are not allowed to hand their shop over to them (12 13) or to receive anything from them (16 17, a restoration). These restrictions make it clear that living at the sanctuary will be very difficult, if not impossible, for prospective suppliants, and it is conceivable that they were listed, at least in part, in the hope that suppliants, like other unwelcome visitors, would avoid the Heraion in the first place. In other words, the authorities of the sanctuary appear to try to eliminate the problem before it arises.<sup>36</sup>

As is evident from *IG XII* 6, 156,<sup>37</sup> runaway slaves in the precinct of the Heraion<sup>38</sup> and the jurisdiction of the *neopoiai* were discussed in a letter of Ptolemy III around the time of the present inscription.<sup>39</sup> Much later, in A.D. 23, the inviolability of the Heraion was ratified by the Roman senate.<sup>40</sup>

*Line 13*

On the formula *τρόπωι οὐδὲ παρευρέσει οὐδεμῶι* see J. Crampa *I.Labraunda* I p. 56.<sup>41</sup>

*Line 17*

ἀγορῶσιν: Future active < ἀγοράζω. See Daux 1975.

*Lines 17–20*

Although some of the proposed restorations are credible, none may be admitted into the text with a reasonable degree of certainty, since they postulate circumstances<sup>42</sup> which are, in fact, unknown.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. above introductory remarks. On the problem in general see Chaniotis 1996. Regarding the runaway slaves cf. Hallof and Mileta 1997, 67. For some innovative ways to get rid of suppliants once they had already taken refuge at a sanctuary see (besides Chaniotis 1996) Gould 1973, 83; cf. Sinn 1993, 92–93. I do not follow Soverini's argument regarding the runaway slaves (1991, 75–77 with Appendix I pp. 112–114).

<sup>37</sup> Habicht 1957, no. 59; Hallof and Mileta 1997. Cf. Soverini 1991, 64, 84–85; Rigsby 1996, 395; Chaniotis 1996, 80–81.

<sup>38</sup> Lines 9–10.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. above *Date*.

<sup>40</sup> Rigsby 1996 no. 184 with pp. 364–366.

<sup>41</sup> Habicht 1972, 219.

<sup>42</sup> A requirement that the shopkeepers do not receive produce from the unwanted elements (Habicht 1972, 220), or that they buy only from farmers and write a contract when buying produce (Koenen 1977, 214–215), or that they buy only from producers and city officials (Sokolowski 1978, 145–146), all aiming at deterring thieves and avoiding dealing in stolen goods (which in and of itself is plausible). Dunst (1975, 175) postulated a shortage which resulted in rationing and grain control. Cf. Soverini 1991, 71–74.

*Line 19*

The *geouchoi* could be owners of larger or smaller pieces of land as in Ptolemaic Egypt (Habicht 1972, 220), or lessees of the land of the sanctuary (Soverini 1991, 73–74). This second possibility, although somewhat remote from the literal meaning of the word (LSJ s.v.), might give a better sense in the context, as far as this is not obscured by the lacuna.

*Lines 27–28*

As attractive as Dunst's [ἐξὸν | δικαστ]ήριον is (cf. the possible [ἐξὸν νόμον] in line 29), direct evidence for the existence of this court is currently lacking. See especially the discussion of Th 1 and Tauber 1978, 219–222 (supporting Dunst) and cf. Chaniotis 1996, 80–81. As peculiar as it may seem at first glance, Sokolowski's [καθηκον δικαστ]ήριον has a parallel in 14 B 37 above (see Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 91–92). This, however, is not enough to validate it.

*Line 34*

The *exetastai* seem to function here as directors of the city court. They are otherwise known as financial officials;<sup>43</sup> IG XII 6, 14 entrusts them with its publication.<sup>44</sup> See Habicht 1972, 223–224; Th 1 and Tauber 1978, 219.

*Line 38*

The *ἱεροὶ παῖδες*. Sacred slaves were persons who had become the property of a divinity in some way. They could have been dedicated like any other material dedication; they could have been born at the sanctuary or foundlings raised there; the sanctuary could simply have bought them; some could also have been under an obligation to priests who had been instrumental in their manumission.<sup>45</sup> Euripides *Ion* 309–311 is particularly instructive:

Ιω.	τοῦ θεοῦ καλοῦμαι δοῦλος εἰμὶ τ', ὃ γύναι.
Κρ.	ἀνάθημα πόλεως, ἣ τινος πραθεῖς ὕπο;
Ιω.	οὐκ οἶδα πλὴν ἔν· Λοξίου κεκλήμεθα.

<sup>43</sup> In the Samian grain law, IG XII 6, 172.60–63, 76–78, they audit public accounts.

<sup>44</sup> Lines 57–58. A similar formula is used in IG XII 6, 42.65–67.

<sup>45</sup> I follow Hepding *RE* VIII 2, 1459–1460 s.v. Hierodouloi; Y. Garlan, *Les esclaves en Grèce ancienne*<sup>2</sup>, Paris, 1995, 116–118; Debord 1982, 86–87. See these works for documentation and further bibliography.

- Ion: I am called the slave of the god and I am, my lady.  
 Creousa: A city's dedication or sold by someone?  
 Ion: I do not know, except one thing: I am Loxias.<sup>46</sup>

Ion is, in fact, a foundling raised at the sanctuary; three of the above mentioned cases are accordingly represented in this passage. Sacred slavery is documented in the ancient Near East,<sup>47</sup> and the Hellenistic East is the source of much of the Greek evidence.<sup>48</sup>

It should be noted that, although slaves could be called παῖδες, they are elsewhere in this document referred to as δοῦλοι. This might suggest that the ἱεροὶ παῖδες are not sacred slaves but sacred children. Ἱεροὶ παῖδες are mentioned, however, in a decree from Pergamum, *LSAM* 13.25, and ἱεροὶ καὶ δημόσιοι παῖδες are mentioned in a fragment of a decree from Olymus, *I.Mylasa* 862.2. In both of these documents ἱεροὶ παῖδες appear to be temple slaves rather than children.<sup>49</sup> The ἱεροὶ παῖδες of *I.Didyma* 40.7 8, 41.60<sup>50</sup> must be slaves. It is conceivable that the word παῖδες is used here as a quasi-technical term, distinguishing between temple slaves and other slaves (δοῦλοι).<sup>51</sup> Some of these sacred slaves could have been runaway slaves, like those mentioned in line 21, who reached this status after they had taken refuge at the Heraion.<sup>52</sup> Excluding them from retail trade protects the licensed shopkeepers from competition<sup>53</sup> while allowing the authorities better control over them and over commercial activity in the sanctuary.

<sup>46</sup> Hepding *ibid.* 1464; Garlan *ibid.*

<sup>47</sup> M.A. Dandamaev, *Slavery in Ancient Babylonia. From Nabopolassar to Alexander the Great (626–331 B.C.)*, Translated by V.A. Powell, edited by M.A. Powell, D.B. Weisberg, co-editor, DeKalb, Ill., 1984, 469–557; De Vaux 1961, 89–90, 382–383; Sch rer 1979, 250–251, 290–291.

<sup>48</sup> Garlan *ibid.* For a considerable collection of sources see Hepding *ibid.* 1460–1468. In general see F. B mer, *Untersuchungen über die Religion der Sklaven in Griechenland und Rom II: Die sogenannte sakrale Freilassung in Griechenland und die (δοῦλοι) ἱεροί*, Wiesbaden, 1960, 149–186; Debord 1982, esp. 76–90, 95–100 and Appendix III (pp. 117–124).

<sup>49</sup> See Hepding in *RE* 82 1476 and nn. ad locc. in *LSAM* and *I.Mylasa*. Cf. B mer *ibid.* 173.

<sup>50</sup> B mer *ibid.* 171–172, 179–180; Debord 1982, 87. Ὁ ἱερός τῆς θεοῦ Πελεύσιος mentioned in the Heraion inventory *IG* XII 6, 261.39 may be a sacred slave of some sort (B mer *ibid.* 158), although he has been taken to be a priest (J.P. Barron, *The Silver Coinage of Samos*, London 1966, 134 n. 13 (Hallos s *IG* comm. ad loc.)). On ἱεροί see also L. Robert, *Hellenica* VI, Paris 1948, 49–50.

<sup>51</sup> I owe this point to Ben Millis.

<sup>52</sup> See Habicht 1972, 225; cf. Chaniotis 1996, 81–83; Hallos and Milet 1997, 265.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Habicht 1972, 224; Th r and Tauber 1978, 216 n. 36.

ἐξουσία: The construction of ἐξουσία with the genitive is difficult. There can, however, be little doubt as to the meaning. See Soverini's discussion (1991, 79–80).



SAMOS(?). SALE OF A PRIESTHOOD. FIRST-SECOND  
CENTURY B.C.

A fragment of a gray marble stele broken on all sides. The stone was discovered in 1924 in a building in Pithagorio (ancient Samos) by Albert Rehm who copied it, made a squeeze, and had it transferred to the museum where it seems to have to been lost. The squeeze survives in the collection of the *Inscriptiones Graecae* in Berlin.

H. 0.18, W. 0.19, Th. 0.085. L.H. 0.012. Interlinear Space 0.003.

Ed. K. Hallof, *IG XII 6, 170* with p. 608 (pt. II, Addenda).

saec. II I a.

-----  
 [- - - - -] ^ [- - -] - I [.] - [- - -]  
 [- - - ὁ ἱερεὺς παρέξει πατ[ - - - - -]  
 [- - - κ]αὶ τιμὰς ἔξει καὶ ἀτ[έλειαν - - -]  
 4 [- - - κ]αθότι ἐν τῇ κοινῇ [διαγραφῇ]  
 [διαγράφεται, τὸν βωμὸν τα[ῖς - - - - -]  
 [- - - ἡμέρ]αις στεφανώσε[ι - - - - -]  
 [- - - - -] ἐκ χοίνικος πατρ[ῆος - - - - -]  
 8 [- - - - -] εἰς τὰ θύματα καὶ τὸ ὕ[ - - - - -]  
 [- - - δραχ]μὰς δύο ἐκάστου μην[ὸς - - -]  
 [- - - τῇ]ν ἱερωσύνην Νίκος Νικ[ - - - - -]  
 [- - - πό]λει κοινῇ διαγραφῇ ὕ[ - - - - -]  
 -----

*Restorations.* Suppl. Rehm apud Hallof || **2** πατ[ρί - - -] Dunst apud Hallof || **3** ἀτ[έλ-  
 - -] Rehm, plenius Dunst || **5** Dunst: [συγγέγραπ]ται Rehm || **5-6** fortasse τα[ῖς προ-  
 γεγραμ]μέναις ἡμέρ]αις Hallof || **7** in. fortasse ἑλαττον vel tale quid L.; πατρὶ H (ῆ?)  
 Dunst: fortasse πατρί[ς - - -] Hallof || **8** τὸν vel τοῦ[ς - - -] idem || **9** Rehm || **10** in. ὁ  
 προάμενος vel ἐπρίωτο(?) Hallof; Νικ[ου - - -](?) Rehm.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* The stone is lost. Hallof's *IG* edition is based on Rehm's notes and squeeze. The division of the lines is arbitrary.

**11** Last trace: X or Y.



*Translation*

(2) [- - -] the priest will furnish [- - -] he will have honors(?) and exemption [- - -] (4) according to [what is written] in the public [*diagraphē*], he will garland the altar(?) on (6) the [prescribed (vel sim.)] days [- - - cake/cakes (made)] from a *choinix* [- - -] (8) for the offerings and [- - -] two drachmas each month [- - -] (10) the priesthood Nikos [son of?] Nik[- - -] the city [- - -] the public *diagraphē*.

*Commentary*

This is one of two inscriptions dealing with the sale of priesthoods known from Samos. The other one, *IG XII* 1197,<sup>1</sup> first published by P. Herrmann, *Eine pierre errante in Samos: Kultgesetz der Korybanten*, *Chiron* 32, 2002, 157–172, probably reached Samos from Erythrae. The present stone is also likely to have reached the island (perhaps due to use as ballast or some such thing) from a mainland location where the sale of priesthoods was practiced.<sup>2</sup> The use of the future indicative in lines 2–3 alongside the likely indication of the buyer's name in line 10 suggests that the present document is a contract for sale.<sup>3</sup>

*Date.* The date is based on letter forms.<sup>4</sup>

*Line 2*

Παρέχω is mostly used in sales of priesthoods when priests are assigned to furnish sacri cial paraphernalia (grain, incense, cakes, rewood);<sup>5</sup> items due to the priest are ordinarily governed by a form of λαμβάνω.<sup>6</sup> See *LSCG* 87.4; *LSAM* 1.4; 37.10; 38 [A 15], B 10; cf. *Ischr.Cos* ED 236.11; *LSCG* 151 A 45–46, 50, 56, 58, 61, 62–63, B 4, 7, 16–17, D 2–3, 4–5, 20; *LSCG* 156.20–21.

<sup>1</sup> Appendix B 1.21 below.

<sup>2</sup> Hallof *IG XII* 6 II Addenda p. 608.

<sup>3</sup> See Part I pp. 49–50.

<sup>4</sup> K. Hallof *per epistulam electronicam*.

<sup>5</sup> The verb is used differently in *LSAM* 73.5–6 (quoted in Part I pp. 51–52).

<sup>6</sup> L. Robert *BCH* 59, 1935, 433 (= *Opera Minora Selecta* I, 190).

*Line 3*

ἀτ[έλειαν]: Exemption from a variety of duties for buyers of priesthoods is very common. These may include military service (*LSAM* 1.14; 5.2) and certain liturgies (as in *LSAM* 37.28–30).<sup>7</sup> Exemption from public duties would understandably be applicable mainly to men. As Parker and Obbink have noted (2000, 424), exemption (from taxes?) is granted to a woman in *LSCG* 120.11.

*Lines 4–5, 12*

κοινὴ διαγραφή: The present document is evidently a concise or modified version of another, more detailed document referred to as the κοινὴ διαγραφή.<sup>8</sup> This is likely to have been a sort of a master document containing the full set of regulations governing the priesthood in question, used as a basis for subsequent documents, promulgated and published whenever the priesthood would be put on the market for sale.<sup>9</sup>

*Lines 5–9*

Matters regarding the performance of cult are probably referred to here.

*Line 7*

Ἐκ χοίνικος probably refers to the amount of grain used for one or more sacrificial cakes.<sup>10</sup> On cakes see commentary on 23 B 3 below.

*Line 8*

The specific force of θῦμα/θύματα (generally offering) is a matter for conjecture. The word is not frequent in sacred laws. In *LSCG* 65.33, 64–73 *passim*, 86, 75, in *LSCG* 68.18, in 5.37 above, and probably in 27

<sup>7</sup> See Parker and Obbink 2000, 424; 2001, 232–233.

<sup>8</sup> I am not aware of direct parallels. Cf., however, the κοινοὶ νόμοι: public, i.e. city laws, above 14 B 44, 87 (Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, 94).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *LSAM* 34.22–25 with Sokolowski's note p. 99; Segre 1937, 86–87; Parker and Obbink 2000, 419, 421, 424.

<sup>10</sup> I note that the amount of grain needed for (one or more) of the sizable, Bat cakes (cf. Hesychius s.v. ἐλατήρ; Kearns 1994, 66–67) known as ἑλατρον (this form, attested at Miletus and Priene, would be preferable here) or ἐλατήρ is always indicated in sacred laws: *LSAM* 37.10–12 (Priene) παρέξεται (the buyer (ὁ ποιῶμε|νος lines 3–4) shall provide) Ἐ ἐλατρα, Ἐ ἐκ τεταρτέως, Ἐ ἐξ ἡμέκτου, Ἐ ἐγ δύο χοίνικων; 50.36 (Miletus) ἑλατρα ἐξ ἡμεδίμνο Ἐ πλακόντινα (Bat); *LSCG* 151 B 9–10 (Cos) ἐλατήρ ἐξ ἡμέκτου [σπ|υρῶν (wheat); cf. the ἐλατήρ χοινικα|ῖος (of a *choinix*) in *LSCG* 19.7–8 (Athens). Other possibilities exist (see e.g. *LSCG* 135.71–73, 78–79; *LSAM* 38 A 14, B 10).

A 12 below, it denotes victims (similarly in the treaty between Cnossus and Tylissus, Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* 42 B 31 (*IC* I viii 4, I xxx 1; *Nomima* I 54).<sup>11</sup> In *LSS* 113.13 14 from Axos it denotes rather the offering of victims, i.e. *sacri ces*.<sup>12</sup> Both meanings are possible here.

*Line 9*

The two drachmas per month could perhaps be a reference to an allowance given to the priest for cultic or other expenses. Cf. *LSAM* 7.9 10, 14 16, 20 23, 26 27; 49 A 13 16.

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *IC* IV 145.9 with Casabona 1966, 153. The meaning in 23 D 4 below is unclear.

<sup>12</sup> See Casabona 1966, 150 151 and in general 146 154.

## SEG XXXV 923

CHIOS. TWO DECREES CONCERNING THE  
PRIESTHOOD OF EILEITHYIA. CA. 400 B.C.

A block of gray marble, brought from Myloi Kastellou to the museum at Chios in 1983. A stripe runs along the top and the two sides which appear to be rough-picked. The inscribed face is broken on the upper left and the lower right where the stone is also particularly worn. The back is rough-picked and a large part of it appears to have been detached. The stone has probably been re-used as a step in stairs. The advanced attrition makes the letters especially difficult to read.

H. 0.58, W. 0.485, Th. 0.25. L.H. 0.013 . Interlinear space 0.003.

Chios, Archaeological Museum. Inv. 3568.

Ed. Koumanoudis and Matthaïou 1985 (= *SEG XXXV* 923).

Cf. Sarikakis 1989, A 306, Π 92; Osborne 1993, 401–402 (= *SEG XLIII* 1310); Rhodes 1997, 230; Sarikakis 1998, 292.<sup>1</sup>

Photograph: Koumanoudis and Matthaïou 1985, 106 (fair).

ca. 400 a.

ΣΤΟΙΧ. 24

**A** [. . . . . γν]ώμη· ἰ[ε]ρέ[αι] Ἐλει-  
[θίη]ς· ἐ[π]ήν ἡ πόλις ποιῇ, γί[ν]εσθ-  
[αι] παρὰ τὸ ἀγωγ[ὸ] ἀλφίτων ἡμυσ-  
4 ὑκτέως [σ]ί[τ]ο ἡμίεχτον· ἦν δὲ ἰδ-  
ιώτης ποι[ῇ], δίδοσθαι ἀπὸ τὸ ἱε-  
ρ[ὸ], ὥστε ἐξ [τὸ] λ[ί]κνον ἐνθεῖ[ν]αι  
[μ]οῖραν καὶ γέρας καὶ γλῶσσαν  
8 [καὶ] τὰδε ἀναλ[ί]σκεσθαι αὐτὸ μ-  
[ε]τὰ τῶν γυναικῶν τῶν π[ο]ι[η]σας-  
έ[ων] τὰ ἰρά· εἶναι [δὲ] ταῦτὰ ταῦτ-

*Restorations.* Suppl. Koumanoudis et Matthaïou || **1** [Πρυτάνεων γν]ώμη K. -M. vid. adn. || **1-2** ἰ[ε]ρέ[αι] Ἐλει|θίη]ς Oikonomides apud K. -M.

<sup>1</sup> The *agogos*.

- α καὶ ὅταν ἱρὸν καθαιρέωσιν κ-  
 12 αἱ σπ[ον]δ[άς] πο[ιέωνται(?)].<sup>uuuuu</sup>  
**B** Ἐπὶ Π[ερ]ικλέος· Λε[υ]καθέωνος ὁ-  
 γδό[η]· ἡ βουλή ξγν[ω] βασιλέων ψ-  
 ἦφον θε[μ]έν[ω]ν· [τ]ῆι ἱερέει τῆς Ἐ-  
 16 λειθίης, [ὁ]ταγ ἡ πόλις π[ο]ῆι, γ[ί]ν-  
 εσθαι τὰ ἐν [τ]ῆι στήλῃ [γ]ε[γ]ρα[μ]-  
 μένα κα[ὶ] ἀπὸ [τ]οῦ ἱερέ[ο]υ [ἁ]ποδ[ό]-  
 σ[θ]αι [κ]εφαλῇ· ἡ[ν] δὲ ἰδ[ὲ] [τ]ῆς π[ο]-  
 20 ῆι, γίνεσθαι αὐτῇ τὰ [ἐν τ]ῇ σ-  
 τήλῃ γεγραμμένα· ἡ[ν] δέ τ[ι] ἄ[λλ]-  
 ο λάβῃ, [ζ]ημιουσθ[α]ι, [ὥ]ς ο[ἱ] θύον(?)-  
 τες τὰ [ἱ]ε[ρ]ε[ῖ]α· ταῦτα [δὲ] ποροσγ[ο]-  
 24 ἀψαι πρὸς τῇ[ν] στήλῃ [παρὰ τῶι  
 [Ἡ]ραίων· ἐπιμεληθήναι [δὲ] τοῦ[ς]  
 [ἱ]εροποιοῦς ANTI . N[. . . . .]

*vacat*

*Restorations.* 12 σπ[ον]δ[άς] L.: σπ[ον]δ[ήν] K. -M.; n. K. -M. in textu πο[ιέωσιν].<sup>uuuuu</sup> in adn. πο[ιέωνται].<sup>uuuuu</sup> habent || 22–23 [θύον]|τες ((?) adieci): [ἄγον]|τες Oikonomides apud K. -M. || 26 n. Ἀντίων[α] (nomen alicuius hieropoioi)? ἀντὶ ᾧν Q? ἀντίων Q? prima verum lectio ipsis editoribus melior esse videtur (cf. Sarikakis 1989, A 306).

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have not seen the stone; the epigraphical notes are based on the 1st edition.

- 26 End: ANTI . N[. . . . .<sup>8</sup>]; The letters are very worn; ANTIQN[. . . . .<sup>8</sup>] or ANTIQNQ[. . . . .<sup>8</sup>] could be read.

### *Translation*

**A** Decree [of - - -]: Whenever the city performs (a sacri ce), the priestess of Eleithia shall receive from the *agogos* a *hemiekteus* of [grain] of (=for) a *hemisykteus* of barley groats. (4) If a private person performs (a sacri ce), a portion (of meat) shall be given from the victim, so as to be placed in the *liknon*, and the priestly prerogative, and the tongue. These shall be consumed on the spot with the women who performed the sacri ce (or: rites). (10) The same rules shall be also in effect when they slaughter a victim and perform libations.

**B** Under Pericles; on the eighth of Leukatheon; the council decreed; the *basileis* put the matter to the vote: (15) Whenever the city performs (a sacri ce), the priestess of Eleithia shall receive whatever is inscribed on the stele, and of the victim the head shall be given to her. (19) If

a private person performs (a sacri ce), she shall receive whatever is inscribed on the stele. (21) If she takes something else, she shall be ned, [as those sacri cing the victims(?)]. (23) This shall be written in addition on the stele [at the] Heraion. The *hieropoioi* shall take care [- -]

### Commentary

The chronological relationship between these two rather difficult decrees (**A-B**) is clear: the second is later than the first. It cannot be much later, since the letters of both decrees appear to be similar.<sup>2</sup> The exact reasons that brought the local religious authorities to revise the regulations within a short period of time are unknown. The two essential points in **B** are the assignment of the victim's head to the priestess at a public sacri ce (lines 18-19), where she had not received any part of the victim in **A**, and the punishment clause (lines 21-23). **B** is evidently an afterthought, reflecting some general dissatisfaction with **A**. Considering the addition of an actual part of the victim to the grain given to the priestess in **A** and the punishment, **B** could also reflect a more particular dissatisfaction on the part of the cult personnel with the distribution of the sacri cial parts prescribed in **A**, being an attempt to deal with the possible outcomes (i.e. cult personnel taking additional portions) of this dissatisfaction.

*Date.* Koumanoudis and Matthaïou dated the inscriptions on the basis of the genitive singular in ο, the omission of ι in ποίη (lines 2, [5]; note, however, the transition to *scriptio plena* in **B**),<sup>3</sup> and on the shortened introductory formulas.<sup>4</sup>

### Line 1

Rhodes (1997, 230) found Koumanoudis and Matthaïou's [πρυτάνεων γνῶμη] unsatisfactory: the word πρυτάνεις (in the plural) is not attested in contemporary Chian inscriptions;<sup>5</sup> surviving Chian documents em-

<sup>2</sup> Koumanoudis and Matthaïou 1985, 109.

<sup>3</sup> Although ηι>η occurs in the dative singular of the first declension, it seems extremely rare at this time in the third singular subjunctive. H.W. Smyth, *The Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects: Ionic*, Oxford, 1894, 240; Thumbs-Kieckers-Scherer, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, Heidelberg, 1932-1959, II 311.8b; Buck, *GD* 38. In Attic cf. Threatte, *GAI* I 22.021 (p. 360), 23.012b (p. 380); II 66.03 (p. 466).

<sup>4</sup> Koumanoudis and Matthaïou 1985, 109.

<sup>5</sup> Except for *I.Erythrai* 15.21 which cannot be attributed to Chios with certainty. On the problem of such *pierres errantes* at Chios see Graf 1985, 11. *Prytaneis* are mentioned

ploy as a dating device a reference by name to a single πρύτανις, obviously an eponymous magistrate;<sup>6</sup> γνώμη (i.e. decree) or a form of γιγνώσκω is not used with the proposers but rather with the deciding body.<sup>7</sup> By analogy to line 13 one would like to make this body the council, but βουλῆς cannot be restored here without assuming a *vacat* of three letters.<sup>8</sup> The restoration would be easier, if information about contemporary Chios and its institutions were not so limited.

[ἰε]ρε[α]: For the form cf. F. Bechtel, *Die griechischen Dialekte*, Berlin, 1921 1924, III 11.2.

Ἐλειθίη is a variant of Εἰλειθυῖα whose name appears in no less than seven other spelling variations.<sup>9</sup> As *e-re-u-ti-ja* her name is attested in a Linear B tablet from Cnossus.<sup>10</sup> Εἰλειθυῖαι (in the plural) are mentioned in the *Iliad*.<sup>11</sup> Although her cult is fairly widely attested, this is, to the best of my knowledge, the only Greek sacred law devoted to it.<sup>12</sup> Eileithyia shares her function as a birth goddess with other deities, notably with Artemis-Hecate.<sup>13</sup> On the practical details of her cult see Pingiatoglou 1981, esp. 77–81. As the publication clause at the end of the second decree implies, her cult here seems connected to the cult of Hera.<sup>14</sup> Private sacri ce referred to here would presumably be connected to childbirth or perhaps marriage, the latter being also

---

in *SEG* XII 390 A 30 dated to the last quarter of the fourth century B.C. For the date (perhaps ca. 320) cf. *SEG* XXX 1070.

<sup>6</sup> G. Busolt–H. Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde*, Munich, 1920 1927, I, 505; Sarikakis 1998, 323. Chian documents (Rhodes, 1997, 228–230): *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 283 (Tod, *GHI* 192) 1; 286.1; *LSCG* 118.10, 22–23 [*SEG* XIX 571.1; 580.1].

<sup>7</sup> Rhodes 1997, 230.

<sup>8</sup> [ἡ τῆς βολῆς γν]ώμη seems too awkward.

<sup>9</sup> Koumanoudis and Matthaïou 1985, 110.

<sup>10</sup> KN Gg 705.1 (J. Chadwick et al., *Corpus of Mycenaean Inscriptions from Knossos* I, p. 268); cf. Pingiatoglou 1981, 30.

<sup>11</sup> 11.269, 19.119 (but singular in 16.187, 19.103; *Od.* 19.188). See in general R. Olmos *LIMC* III 1, 685–699 s.v. Eileithyia; for a comprehensive review of the evidence see Pingiatoglou 1981; an older collection of sources is P.V.C. Bauer, *Eileithyia* (The University of Missouri Studies vol. I no. 4), [Chicago], 1902.

<sup>12</sup> She is mentioned (as Ἰλειθύα) in *LSS* 17 B 5 and (as Ἰλειθυῖα) in *LKyz* II 1.5 (cf. below Appendix B 1.31).

<sup>13</sup> E.g. Aesch. *Supp.* 676–677 Ἄρτεμιν δ' Ἐκάταν γυναι|κῶν λόχους ἐφορεῖν (We always pray that) Artemis-Hecate watch over the women's childbirth). Plutarch *Quaest. Conviv.* 3.10, 659A Ἐ τὴν Ἄρτεμιν Λοχείαν καὶ Εἰλειθυῖαν, οὐκ οὖσαν ἑτέραν ἢ τὴν σελήνην, ὀνομάσθαι (Artemis is called Locheia and Eileithyia, being none other than the moon (i.e. Selene-Hecate)). Cf. Catullus 34.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. below commentary on lines 24–25.

the domain of Hera.<sup>15</sup> In Plato's *Laws* (784a) the women supervising procreation are required to meet in the temple of Eileithyia where they would discuss cases of young couples attending to matters other than the rules set at the sacrifices and rites performed at the marriage. Regarding public cult, it is worth noting that on Delos Eileithyia was honored with a special festival.<sup>16</sup>

*Line 2, 5, 9–10*

ποιῆ: The context suggests that sacrifice performed through priestly agency should be understood with ποιῆ.<sup>17</sup> In lines 9–10 the meanings rites and sacrifices are practically indistinguishable as the rites clearly involve sacrifice.

*Line 3*

ἄγωγός: As Koumanoudis and Matthaïou suggested,<sup>18</sup> it is reasonable that the otherwise unattested ἄγωγός supervises (or, perhaps, manages) the sacrifice. They are probably right in assuming that his title evolved from his task of leading victims to sacrifice. Although the actual cult practice appears to be managed by women (cf. lines 9–10),<sup>19</sup> the *agogos* seems to be a man. His function is probably auxiliary. *LSAM* 61.8 9 appears to authorize a man to assist in slaughtering victims in a cult that otherwise seems to be run by women; a similar state of affairs might be detected in *LSAM* 6.2 3.<sup>20</sup>

*Line 3–4*

The ἄλφιτα are barley groats used for sprinkling the sacrificial victim or offered on the altar.<sup>21</sup> A custom of sprinkling roast meat with ἄλφιτα can be traced back to Homer.<sup>22</sup> In *Od.* 14.429 Eumaeus, the swineherd, sprinkles barley meal (ἄλφιτου ἀκτῆ) over the pieces of meat which he had cut off all limbs of the victim before throwing them into the fire.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>15</sup> On Hera and marriage cf. above commentary on 1.32.

<sup>16</sup> See P. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*, Paris, 1970, 215–219; Pingiatoglou 1981, 79–80.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Casabona 1966, 11–12 and more generally 5–18.

<sup>18</sup> 1985, 108; cf. Sarikakis 1998, 292.

<sup>19</sup> For parallels see Pingiatoglou 1981, 78.

<sup>20</sup> For the exclusion of men from feminine cults cf. also *LSCG* 63.10; 127.5–10.

<sup>21</sup> Explicitly so (with other substances) in the calendar of Cos, *LSCG* 151 A 47.

<sup>22</sup> *Il.* 18.558–560 (the interpretation of this passage is disputed; see M. Edwards (in G.S. Kirk ed.), *The Iliad: A Commentary*, Cambridge 1985–1993, V, 224; *Od.* 14.76–77.

<sup>23</sup> On this passage see Burkert 1985, 66–67; Petropoulou 1987; cf. above commentary



The difference between ἄλφιτα and οὐλαί (barley groats or corns; Att. ὀλαί) may lie in their use,<sup>24</sup> the οὐλαί being destined for sprinkling over the altar and the head of the victim *before* killing,<sup>25</sup> the ἄλφιτα being used *after* the kill.

Ἡμισυκτέως is a hapax.<sup>26</sup> As Koumanoudis and Matthaïou suggested (1985, 108), the meaning would be ἥμισυς<sup>27</sup> ἔκτεϋς plus a ἔκτεϋς, i.e.  $1\frac{1}{2}$  ἔκτεϋς = 3 ἡμίεκτα =  $\frac{3}{12}$  or  $\frac{1}{4}$  μέδιμνος. The priestess would thus receive one half of a *hekteus* of grain for each three *hemiekta* (i.e. *hemysykteus*) of barley groats (i.e. one third). Σίτος (grain; either wheat or barley) is, to the best of my knowledge, not attested in comparable regulations.<sup>28</sup> Its use here is not so clear but the amount seems commensurate with the amount of barley groats which in turn may depend on the number of victims.<sup>29</sup>

### Lines 5–6

Ἱερὸν is not used frequently in the singular for an offering.<sup>30</sup> The meaning victim (= ἱερεῖον)<sup>31</sup> is particularly difficult.<sup>32</sup> But, considering the repetition of the phrase in lines 18–19, this is likely a mere spelling variation and the meaning victim, whether a spelling variation or not, also seems unavoidable in line 11.

### Line 6

The *liknon* was an oval, shovel-shaped, wickerwork basket used as a winnowing fan.<sup>33</sup> It functioned as a basket in the cult of Dionysus,

on 3.16–17. More generally see van Straten 1995, 141–144.

<sup>24</sup> LSJ s.vv.

<sup>25</sup> On this use of barley groats see Burkert 1985, 66; Detienne in Detienne and Vernant 1989, 10; van Straten 1995, 32–33, 37–38.

<sup>26</sup> Although Koumanoudis and Matthaïou (1985, 108) suggest [ἥμισυ]κτέως A[- -] in LSS 76.8.

<sup>27</sup> Ἡμισυς (assimilation) is documented; see LSJ s.v. ἥμισυς.

<sup>28</sup> The word is used differently in LSS 38 (CID I 7 with note on p. 22).

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Koumanoudis and Matthaïou 1985, 108.

<sup>30</sup> See LSCG 133.4 with Casabona 1966, 11.

<sup>31</sup> On the meaning of ἱερεῖον see below commentary on 27 B 10.

<sup>32</sup> Casabona 1966, 15–16; cf., however, LSS 10 B 5, 8.

<sup>33</sup> In general see J. Schelp, *Das Kanoun: der griechische Opferkorb*, W rzburg, 1975, 11 with n. 16, cf. 60. A large collection of literary and iconographic evidence may be found in J.A. Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*<sup>3</sup>, Cambridge, 1922, esp. 517–538, 546–548. See also M.P. Nilsson, *The Dionysiac Mysteries of the Hellenistic and Roman Age* (ActaAth-8° 5), Lund, 1957, esp. 21–38, 108–109, 115; C. B rard, *AntK* 19, 1976, 101–114; Kroll *RE* XIII 538–541, s.v. Liknon. On the *liknon* at Roman period Eleusis see Nilsson

and in the marriage rite,<sup>34</sup> and was also used as a cradle.<sup>35</sup> The *liknon* and the far more regular sacrificial basket, the *κανοῦν*, may have been interchangeable.<sup>36</sup> But, considering Eileithyia's role as a birth goddess, her connection to Hera, and the latter's close affinities with marriage, the usage of the *liknon* which may be related both to birth (as a cradle) and marriage might be meaningful here.

### Line 7

Γέρας (mostly in the plural: γέρα or γέρα) is used frequently for priestly prerogatives, especially in Asia Minor, the Ionian islands, and Cos.<sup>37</sup> When the contents of the γέρας are specified, they comprise mostly parts of the victim(s). Money is possible.<sup>38</sup> There are some instances,

---

ibid. 36 with n. 38; idem *GGR* I<sup>3</sup> pl. 43.2. For a possible connection between ritual baskets and the cult of Eileithyia in Athens see Pingiatoglou 1981, 78.

<sup>34</sup> Zenobius 3.98 (*Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum* I p. 82): Ἀθηνησοὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς γάμοις ἔθος ἦν, ἀμφιθαλῇ παῖδα ἀκάνθας (Hesych.: ἀκάνθας) μετὰ δρυῖνων καρπῶν στέφεσθαι, καὶ λίκνον ἄρτον πλήρες περιφέροντα λέγειν, Ἐφυγον κακόν, εὖρον ἀμεινον (There was a marriage custom at Athens for a boy who had both his parents alive to be crowned with a crown of thorns(?) and oak fruits and, carrying around a *liknon* full of bread, to say: I (or: they) have been bad and found better). Cf. Hesychius s.v. ἐφυγον κακόν, εὖρον ἀμεινον etc. See Harrison ibid. 532–533; Nilsson, *The Dionysiac Mysteries*, 36; J.H. Oakley and R.H. Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*, Madison, 1993, 28–29. On the *liknon* in marriage rites cf. also A.-M. Virlhac and C. Vial, *Le mariage grec du VI<sup>e</sup> siècle av. J. -C. à l'époque d'Auguste* (BCH suppl. 32), Paris, 1998, 353.

<sup>35</sup> In the Homeric hymn to Hermes the baby Hermes goes back innocently to his *liknon* (l. 150 (cf. 21, 63, 254, 290, 358)) after he had stolen the cattle of Apollo. The cattle stealing scene is depicted on an Attic red-figure fragment (*LIMC* V 2 s.v. Hermes 242a) which shows the baby Hermes equipped with his hat and staff, lying in his *liknon* with one member of the stolen herd to his right. See Harrison ibid. 523.

<sup>36</sup> Hesychius s.v. λίκνον· κανοῦν. Cf., however, Harpocration s.v. λικνοφόρος: τὸ λίκνον πρὸς πᾶσαν τελετὴν καὶ θυσίαν ἐπιτήδειόν ἐστιν· ὁ τοῦτο οὖν φέρων λικνοφόρος λέγεται ἄν (The *liknon* is suitable for every mystery rite; whoever carries it may be called a *liknophoros*). It seems clear that a *mystery rite*, rather than simply a *rite* is meant here by τελετή. This is a gloss on Demosthenes *De Cor.* 260, where the author ridicules Aeschines, presenting him as an accomplice in his mother's superstitious mystery rites. Cf. Harrison ibid. 533; Nilsson, *The Dionysiac Mysteries*, 23. On the meaning of τελετή see K. Clinton, *Stages of Initiation in the Eleusinian and Samothracian Mysteries*, in M.B. Cosmopoulos (ed.), *Greek Mysteries: The Archaeology and Ritual of Ancient Greek Secret Cults*, London and New York, 2003, 50–78.

<sup>37</sup> Less frequently in Athens: *LSCG* 2 A 3; 18 E 55–56; [*LSS* 8.9]; *LSS* 19.28. On priestly prerogatives see commentary on 3.5 above.

<sup>38</sup> It is formally included in the γέρα in *LSAM* 23.10 12 + *SEG* XLVII 1638.6 11 (Appendix B 3.11 below). Only money is assigned to the priest in the Chian *LSS* 77.10 12 when the city holds a banquet.

both Chian<sup>39</sup> and other,<sup>40</sup> where an unspecified γέρας is prescribed, as here, together with other, specific parts of the victim. Some documents refer to customary γέρας/η<sup>41</sup> or to those which were recorded elsewhere.<sup>42</sup> It is possible that a customary γέρας would consist of the most common prerogatives: a thigh or leg of the victim and its skin.<sup>43</sup> The same is possible for an unspecified γέρας.<sup>44</sup> At any rate, the phrase ἀπὸ τῷ ἐξ[ο][δ] (lines 5–6) implies a part of the victim here.

The μοῖρα is perhaps a portion of the rest of the remaining meat (i.e. minus the γέρας) which has been divided into portions to be distributed among the participants.<sup>45</sup> A double portion of meat is commonly assigned to the priest in other Chian priesthood regulations.<sup>46</sup>

The tongue is frequently given to the priest.<sup>47</sup> If any general conclusion may be drawn from the few comparable Chian laws which have reached us, this seems to have been a local norm. Four out of seven assign the tongue to the priest (*LSCG* 119.3, 7; *LSS* 77.7; 78.7; 129.2–3). The remaining three (*LSCG* 117; 120; *LSS* 130) are too fragmentary to draw any conclusions.

#### *Lines 8–10*

On the requirement to consume the sacrificial meat on the spot see commentary on 16.5–6 above. To the best of my knowledge, this is the only instance in which it is documented on Chios. Osborne pointed out

<sup>39</sup> *LSCG* 120.4: [- -] καὶ γέρας (even without endorsing the restorations); *LSS* 78.4–8.

<sup>40</sup> *LSAM* 46.1.

<sup>41</sup> γέρη τὰ εἰδιόμενα *LSAM* 32.53; τὰ ἐθιζόμενα γέρα *SEG* XXXIX 1135.26; τὰ νομιζόμενα γέρα *SEG* XLV 1508 A 9–10, 24; cf. Aristophanes *Plutus* 1185. For a similar expression cf. also τὰ γέρα τὰ γινόμενα in *LSAM* 45.17; *ILabraunda* 1.4.

<sup>42</sup> τὰ γέρα/η τὰ γεγραμμένα *LSS* 19.28; *LSAM* 45.8–10 (cf. 17); 49 A 28; γέρη κατὰ τὰ γεγραμμένα *LSCG* 161 A 20–21; γέρη τὰ (δια)τεταγμένα *LSAM* 49 B 30–31, 36–37; (cf. 60 A 3–4, [B 3–4]).

<sup>43</sup> Puttkammer 1912, 7–8; cf. above commentary on 3.5. The skin may be exempted from priestly prerogatives in private sacrifices (*LSAM* 44.13–15; 73.9–16 (Part I pp. 51–52)); skins from public sacrifices may also be sold (see Part I pp. 71–72).

<sup>44</sup> Sokolowski *LSS* p. 140.

<sup>45</sup> See Berthiaume 1982, 49–50. Cf. Puttkammer 1912, 14–15; Le Guen-Pollet 1991, 19–20. Generally on distribution see commentary on 14 B 66–67 above.

<sup>46</sup> *LSS* 76.7; 129.6; 130.2 μοίρας δύο; 77.7–8 Ἐ κρ[ε]ῶν δύο μοίρας δι[ι]κρεως (two portions of a double portion of meat); *LSCG* 119.4–5, 8–9 μερίδα (portion) δίκρεας. The δίκρεας may be two cuts of two kinds of meat; see Sokolowski *LSS* p. 139; Ziehen *LGS* II p. 298; Le Guen-Pollet 1991, 22). One notes that the combination μοῖρα καὶ γέρας (without any connection to sacrificial meat) appears once in Homer, *Od.* 11.534: μοῖραν καὶ γέρας ἐσθλὸν ἔχον ((Achilles) having a share (of the booty) and his noble γέρας).

<sup>47</sup> Puttkammer 1912, 13; Kadletz 1981.

(1993, 402 n. 45) that a requirement to consume priestly prerogatives on the spot is unparalleled.

The women who performed the *hiera* (cf. above commentary on line 2) can be both worshippers<sup>48</sup> and cult personnel. Each one of these possibilities is supported by the use of ποιεῖν τὰ ἱερά in Chian priesthood regulations, the first by *LSS* 77.5–6, the second by *LSS* 129.10–11. The requirement for the priestess to share her prerogatives with the worshippers is odd since, in a way, it renders prerogatives meaningless. There is reason to believe that the cult involved more personnel than a single priestess.<sup>49</sup> Perhaps sharing the priestly prerogatives with these cult personnel is possible.

On the significance of these lines to the question of the part taken by women in Greek animal sacrifice see Osborne 1993, 401–402.

#### *Lines 11–12*

The verb καθαιρέω is, as Koumanoudis and Matthaïou noted (185, 109), used by Euripides in the sense ‘to slaughter, slay’ in a (rather more gruesome) sacrificial context in the *Electra*.<sup>50</sup>

For ἱόν see above commentary on lines 5–6.

The present stipulation evidently concerns a special sacrificial occasion distinct from those covered above. As Koumanoudis and Matthaïou understood, the sacrifice is offered by the city but the prerogatives are the same as those prescribed for private sacrifice. Otherwise, it is difficult to see the need for a separate stipulation.<sup>51</sup> If, as it appears, this occasion consists of a libation ceremony combined with sacrifice, σπονδαί seems preferable to σπονδή.<sup>52</sup> As regards the verb, the middle is used in the calendar of Cos, *LSCG* 151 A 40:<sup>53</sup> ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ σπονδάς

<sup>48</sup> Koumanoudis and Matthaïou 1985, 108.

<sup>49</sup> Pausanias (2.35.11) discussion of the sanctuary and worship of Eileithyia in Hermione seems to imply the same. In Athens cf. the *Ersephoroi* of Eileithyia at Agrai mentioned in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 5099 (Pingiatoglou 1981, 78).

<sup>50</sup> 1142–1143: κανοῦν δ’ ἐνήχεται καὶ τεθηγμένη σφαγίς, | ἥπερ καθεῖλε ταῦρον, κτλ. (The *kanoun* is here ready and the knife has been sharpened, the one which slew the Bull (i.e. Aegisthus)).

<sup>51</sup> Alternatively one may understand ‘The same rules shall be in effect both when they slaughter a victim and when they perform libation(s)’. It is hard to say how the rules prescribed for sacrifice would apply for libation(s). One notes that σπ[ον]δ[ή/άς] is ambiguous. Autopsy of the stone was, however, impossible for me.

<sup>52</sup> See Casabona 1966, 259. These libations are distinct from the ordinary sacrificial libations; cf. in this respect commentary on 27 A 11–12 (the context is of course different).

<sup>53</sup> Cited by Koumanoudis and Matthaïou 1985, 109.

π[ουή]σ[ω]νται (the reference is to the banquet of the cult officials). It therefore looks slightly preferable to me, although the case is indecisive.<sup>54</sup>

#### *Lines 13–14*

Nothing else is known of Pericles (Sarikakis 1989, Π 92).

On the Chian calendar see Tr mpy 1997, 102–105; Graf 1985, 18–21 (cf. 145); cf. Samuel 1972, 124–125; Sarikakis 1998, 305–306. The month of Leukatheon is attested in other North-Ionic cities. Tr mpy tentatively matches the Chian Leukatheon with the Athenian Hecatombation.

#### *Line 14*

*The Basileus.* The office of *basileus* is mentioned in the so-called *Constitution of Chios*<sup>55</sup> line 4 (mid-sixth century B.C.), and a *basileus*, perhaps the head of a college,<sup>56</sup> is referred to in *DGE* 688 C 8 (fifth century B.C.). A college of *basileis* is attested in *LSCG* 116.8 (ca. 400 B.C.). In *DGE* 688 the *basileus* is to imprecate in his official imprecation a curse upon one who makes sales invalid. In *LSCG* 116 the *basileis* are to receive reports about those damaging sacred groves (namely by grazing and dumping) and, although this is not explicitly stated, they are likely to deal with punishing the wrongdoers. These two attestations suggest a religious-juridical function compatible with the concern with religious matters evident in the present inscription, as Koumanoudis and Matthaiou noted (1985, 110), in the fact that the *basileis* brought the matter before the council.

#### *Line 19*

*The Head of the Victim.* The head or a half of it is a relatively common priestly prerogative.<sup>57</sup> When given to the priest, it might not include the tongue. In fact, in *LSS* 121.20 (Ephesus) the head, the tongue, and the

<sup>54</sup> The middle seems prevalent in Casabona's 1966, 261–262 review of the literary evidence. See also *IKalch* 13.11; [*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1325, 29–30]. For the active see *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1297, 13–14; *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 705.45; *IGDidyma* 375.7.

<sup>55</sup> Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* 8; *Nomima* I 62. The original provenance of the stone is disputed; it might be attributed to Erythrae. See Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* p. 17, *Nomima* I p. 264.

<sup>56</sup> L.H. Jeffery, *BSA* 51, 1956, 165. The Chian evidence is discussed in Sarikakis 1998, 314–315 and in a wider context in P. Carlier, *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre*, Strasbourg, 1984, 446–450.

<sup>57</sup> Puttkammer 1912, 12–13; Le Guen Pollet 1991, 20–21, cf. 14.

skin are given to a hierophant and from Aristophanes we learn that πανταχοῦ τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἥ | γλῶττα χωρὶς τέμνεται.<sup>58</sup> It has been suggested that this was not necessarily the case elsewhere,<sup>59</sup> but the tendency of the tongue to be treated independently of the head points in this direction.<sup>60</sup> Besides the tongue, cheekbones, snouts, and ears appear to have been gastronomically attractive, although the last two seem to be treated independently of the head.<sup>61</sup> One wonders what else in the victim's head could be deemed desirable. Le Guen-Pollet (1991, 20–21) makes a good case for the victim's brain. The brain is rarely mentioned in sacred laws. In *LSCG* 151 A 54 it is given to coppersmiths and potters who seem lowest in the hierarchical list of those specially entitled to a part of the victim. In *LSS* 93.2 the brain is listed among other parts that are very likely to be priestly prerogatives, although this is not stated. The fact that it is not explicitly mentioned elsewhere may be ascribed to a prohibition against eating the brain or even mentioning it by name discussed in Athenaeus 2.65f 66c.<sup>62</sup> This prohibition was nevertheless ignored. In Athenaeus 4.147d a whole, boiled head of a milk-fed kid is served cut in halves. Even though the brain is not mentioned, there could be little doubt that its consumption is the point. The first-century B.C. *agoranomos* inscription from the Piraeus, *SEG* XLVII 196, plainly lists brains (A 11, 16, 29, B 15, 18, 24, with Steinhauer 1994, 64). We can therefore conclude that brain-eating was practiced and tolerated even in cases when explicit reference to it was avoided and that there is a good chance that, perhaps together with the cheekbones, it was the unspoken end of assigning the head, all the more a snout-, ear-, and perhaps tongue-less head, to a priest.<sup>63</sup>

<sup>58</sup> Everywhere in Attica the tongue is cut (off from the head) separately: *Av.* 1704 1705; cf. *Pax* 1060; *Pl.* 1110 etc.; see N. Dunbar, *Aristophanes*, Birds, Oxford 1995, 743–744.

<sup>59</sup> Puttkammer 1912, 13.

<sup>60</sup> See Ziehen *LGS* II p. 297; Berthiaume 1982, 51–52. In general on the tongue see Kadletz 1981.

<sup>61</sup> Snouts: *LSCG* 151 B 20; *LSAM* 21.4; 54.4 5 (and trotters); ears: *LSCG* 19.5 6, 7; 151 A 61. Ears and cheekbones (σιαγόνες) are mentioned in Athenaeus 3.94c where they are served on a platter together with feet, heads, guts, tripe, and tongues, all cooked in water in the fashion of the cook-shops (ἐφθοπώλια) of Alexandria. Cf. in this respect the *agoranomos* inscription from the Piraeus, *SEG* XLVII 196 with Steinhauer 1994. For snouts and pig ears cf. Alexis fr. 115 (K.-A.).

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Le Guen-Pollet 1991, 21.

<sup>63</sup> On half the head cf. commentary on 3.5 above. For Near Eastern parallels cf. D.E. Fleming, *The Installation of Baal's High Priestess at Emar*, Atlanta, 1992, 136. (I owe the reference to this work to J.S. Cooper). According to Herodotus (2.39) the Egyptians, who did not consume any part of a head of a living being, used to imprecate curses

*Lines 21–23*

*Punishment.* Koumanoudis and Matthaïou explain (1985, 109–110) that the priestess is to be punished according to a procedure prescribed elsewhere for  $\varphi[\iota \theta \upsilon \omicron \nu] | \tau \epsilon \varsigma \tau \acute{\alpha} [\iota \epsilon] \varrho [\epsilon] \iota [\alpha]$ , understood as butchers who misappropriate a part of the victim.<sup>64</sup> *LSAM* 70.8–10, which fines officials for misappropriating sacrificial meat, comes to mind in this respect. The corpus of sacred laws contains a few other punishment clauses for cult personnel.<sup>65</sup> None is exactly parallel. The rather difficult *LSS* 113.1–8<sup>66</sup> prescribes a fine to be exacted from priests who take something against  $\tau \acute{\alpha} \eta \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \acute{\epsilon} \nu \alpha$  (what is written), unless someone gives it himself free of pressure. *LSCG* 107.2–5 stipulates that a priestess who charges to a private person more than what is written in the law be liable to lawsuits.<sup>67</sup> In *LSAM* 59.6–7, predominantly occupied with sacrificial prerogatives, the priest of Zeus Megistos is warned that he will lose his priesthood and be barred from the sanctuary if he does not act according to the rules.<sup>68</sup> More generally, Parker and Obbink 2000 no. 1 lines 33–35<sup>69</sup> heavily fines the priestess of Aphrodite Pandamos and Pontia for failure to perform any of her inscribed duties and makes her liable to lawsuits. An interesting parallel can be found in the Punic inscription known as the Marseilles Tariff, *KAI* 69.20–21 (below Appendix A). It fines priests who charge worshippers against what is set in the tariff and evidently proceeds to fine reluctant worshippers.<sup>70</sup> The exact fines remain unknown as the stone is damaged. In 1 Samuel 2:12–17, Hophni and Phinehas, Eli's sons, are reported to have confused the sacrificial process, sending their servant to the worshippers sacrificing at the Shiloh sanctuary to grab sacrificial portions which did not belong to

---

upon the head of the sacrificial animal and then get rid of it by selling it to Greeks or, where this was impossible, by throwing it into the Nile.

<sup>64</sup>  $\Sigma \varphi \acute{\alpha} \zeta \omega$  would have of course been better but does not fit the space.

<sup>65</sup> The greedy priest of Asclepius, immortalized by Aristophanes in the *Plutus* (676–681), might come to mind in this context; in fact he is only collecting his due share. See below commentary on 23 B 3.

<sup>66</sup> *IC* II v 9; see Guarducci's commentary ad loc.

<sup>67</sup>  $\epsilon \acute{\alpha} \nu \delta \epsilon \tau \iota \varsigma \iota \epsilon \rho \epsilon \iota \alpha \pi \lambda \epsilon \acute{\iota} \omega \tau \acute{\omega} | \nu | \gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho \alpha | \mu \acute{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu \epsilon \nu \tau \acute{\omega} \iota \nu \acute{\omicron} \mu \omega \iota \pi \rho \omicron \sigma \sigma \acute{\tau} \alpha \sigma \sigma \eta \tau \acute{\omicron} \varsigma \iota \delta \acute{\iota} \omega \tau \alpha \iota \varsigma$   $\acute{\epsilon} \upsilon \pi \acute{\omicron} \delta \iota \kappa \iota \omicron \varsigma | [\epsilon \sigma \tau \omega] \kappa \tau \lambda$ . Cf. Sokolowski 1954, 158.

<sup>68</sup>  $\eta \nu \delta \epsilon \mu \eta [ \chi ] \alpha \tau \acute{\alpha} \tau \acute{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \acute{\epsilon} \nu \alpha \pi \omicron \iota [ \eta \iota \mu \eta ] \epsilon \rho \acute{\alpha} \sigma \theta \omega \kappa \alpha \iota \tau \acute{\omicron} \upsilon | \iota \epsilon \rho \omicron \upsilon \epsilon \rho \gamma \acute{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \omega$ . For this inscription cf. Part I p. 42.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. commentary ad loc. p. 444.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. the parallel clauses in *KAI* 75.3–4.

their prerogatives.<sup>71</sup> The punishment in their case is divine and severe: both are subsequently (4:11) killed in battle.

*Lines 24–25*

The reference to a sanctuary of Hera where the stone bearing the two decrees seems to have stood and where, accordingly, the cult would be performed, is understandable.<sup>72</sup> Eileithyia was taken to be a daughter of Zeus and Hera,<sup>73</sup> who, indignant at her husband's extra-marital affairs, is known to have attempted to prevent her daughter from attending a birth, as in the birth of Apollo and Artemis.<sup>74</sup> The two goddesses may even be equated: Hesychius (s.v. Εἰλειθυία) mentions Eileithyia as Ἡρα ἐν Ἀργεῖ.

---

<sup>71</sup> According to the traditional interpretation (traceable back to the Medieval biblical commentator Isaiah of Trani, if not farther), these are the breast (חֶזֶה) and the right thigh (שֵׁוֹק הַיְמָיִן: shoulder Sch rer 1979, 258), since this is obviously a שְׁלָמִים (*šlamim*) type sacrifice; see Leviticus 7:31–32 and cf. Jenson in Beckwith and Selman 1995, 26.

<sup>72</sup> See Koumanoudis and Matthaïou 1985, 110 with n. 6. Cf. Pingiatoglou 1981, 78. This is probably the most substantial evidence for the cult of Hera on Chios, attested otherwise through theophoric names: Graf 1985, 42.

<sup>73</sup> Hom. *Il.* 11.270–271, Hes. *Theog.* 921–923. See R. Olmos *LIMC* III 1, 685.

<sup>74</sup> *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 97–101.





## SEG XXXVIII 853

THASOS (NEAR POTOS). FRAGMENTARY  
SACRIFICIAL REGULATIONS. CA. 430 420 B.C.

(Figure 29)

A lower part of a tapered stele of Thasian marble found in Thasos in 1969 near the coast, south of Potos, among the excavated remains of a post-Byzantine chapel which had utilized building materials of the early Christian period in its construction. A relief of Roman times was also discovered among these remains.<sup>1</sup> The stone is broken above and about one quarter is missing on the upper right down to about the level of line eight. The back is rough-picked and was somewhat crudely hollowed to create a wider base. In the middle of the bottom there is a shallow cutting of roughly 0.06 in length into which a stabilizing metal tenon might have been inserted. The inscribed face is worn and considerable parts have peeled off. The last two words are somewhat bigger than the rest of the inscription and 0.05 was left uninscribed below the text. The inscription is written in the Parian alphabet.<sup>2</sup>

H 0.325, W. 0.431 (bottom) 0.428 (at the level of line 8), Th. 0.145 (at the base) ca. 0.95. L.H. ca. 0.015 0.017; O, Θ ca. 0.007 0.01. Last two words ca. 0.02; Θ ca. 0.017. Interlinear space ca. 0.003 0.005. Bottom margin 0.05.

Thasos (Limenas), Archaeological Museum. Inv. Λ 2726.

Ed. Veligianni 1988 (= SEG XXXVIII 853; Duch•ne 1992, 127 128 no. 29).

Cf. J. Pouilloux BE 1989 no. 480.

Photograph: Veligianni 1988, pl. XIXa; (= Duch•ne 1992, pl. XX); (good).

---

<sup>1</sup> Ch. Koukouli-Chrysanthaki *AD* 25, 1970, B 2, 40 (cf. 22, 1967, B 2 423); (Veligianni 1988, 191).

<sup>2</sup> See below epigraphical commentary.

ca. 430 420 a. NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ.

-----  
 [ ----- ]  
 [ <sup>ca. 2-4</sup> ΑΧΩΣΤ <sup>ca. 19</sup> ]  
 [θυέτ]ω [β]όν καὶ λαμ[βανέτω <sup>ca. 10</sup> ]  
 4 μοῖραν Τ[. ] <sup>ca. 18</sup> ΤΑ <sup>ca. 13</sup> [ ----- ]  
 [.] <sup>ca. 4</sup> ΑΓΥ <sup>ca. 13</sup> ΤΟΙ ἐπιπρ[ο]σθ <sup>ca. 10</sup> σπεσάτ[ω] τὸν τρίτον [ ----- ἀπον  
<sup>ca. 11</sup> ]  
 8 [κωλ]ῆν καὶ πλευρί[ο]ν <sup>ca. 13</sup> [ ----- ]  
 σπλάνχνων καὶ ἄρτ[ον/ς] <sup>ca. 9</sup> ]ΤΕΙ[. σ]-  
 πενδ[ <sup>ca. 3-4</sup> ] τὸ τρίτον [ ----- ]ΣΗΧΣ <sup>ca. 8</sup> [. ]-  
 χσεται [ <sup>2-3</sup> ] ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ ΕΠ[ <sup>ca. 7</sup> ]ΕΝΘΑΟ[. ]  
 12 ΤΩΝ . ΠΓ[.]ΕΝ τὸ τρίτον σπένδει καὶ ἰρὰ ἄ-  
 πονέμει· Ἀντίοχος ἀνέθηγεν. <sup>vac.</sup>

*vacat 0.05*

*Restorations.* Suppl. Veligianni. || **1** vid. adn. epigr. || **8** n. [μέρος] vel sim. L. (vid. adn.) || **9** ἄρτ[ος] V. || **10-11** [δ]έ|χσεται vel [ἄ]|χσεται eadem (vid. *SEG*).

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have seen the stone. My readings differ from ed. pr. in several places; an account of the differences is given where needed. The letters are rather crowded and somewhat crudely inscribed. Vertical strokes have sometimes been lined up, occasionally creating a semi-stoichedon impression. The inscription employs the Parian alphabet which uses Γ for Λ, Λ for Γ, Ο for Ω, and Ω for Ο. *These forms have been retained in the text for capital letters.*

- 1** Whatever remains of line (not counted by V.) is affected by attrition.  
**2** Ω (= ο): Ο (= ω) might be considered. Last traces: probably Ω missing its upper part. For this line V. prints - - ΧΩΣ- - and restores [δύν]χος. One is tempted to take what appears to be Α for Λ (= γ) and read [δ]ύγχος,<sup>3</sup> but alpha appears a more obvious reading and, moreover, upsilons in this inscription (lines 5, 8, 10) do not have pronounced stems, if they have stems at all.  
**4** The lacuna after the first tau might allow one letter plus a iota.  
**5** Second letter: Α, Δ, or Λ (= γ) are possible. After the upsilon V. detected traces of a Φ or a Β. End: I could not see any traces after the doubtful rho.  
**7** The first lacuna allows about three letters, perhaps with an extra iota. V. s καὶ gives good sense but may be too long.  
**9** First word: ω: ed. pr. (followed by subsequent editions) mistakenly transcribed the stone's Ο as an omicron.  
**10** First Σ: traces of bottom strokes seem clear (not read by V.). Η: traces of verticals: V. reads an epsilon lacking a middle horizontal.  
**10-11** V. prints the restoration [δ]|έχσεται, but the chi seems too close to the left edge to be preceded by any letter.  
**11** The epsilon in ἐπί: insecure traces (V. tentatively detected a vertical stroke). End: V. finds a theta more likely for the dotted Ο.

<sup>3</sup> For snouts cf. commentary on 20.16 above.

- 12     Τ: The horizontal and perhaps a part of the vertical seem secure. Q: strictly speaking, Θ is possible. Fourth letter: perhaps a lower part of an epsilon or of a somewhat irregular sigma. Last letter: ▲.

### Translation

[- - -] (3) shall sacri ce a bovine and take [- - -] (4) portion [- - -] (5) before [- - -] (6) shall libate the third(?) [- - -] (7) shall assign/allocate(?) and place a portion [- - -] (8) thigh and rib(?) [- - - a part] (9) of the *splanchna* and bread [- - -] (10) libate(?) [- - -] third(?) [- - -] (11) [- - -] onto(?) the re [- - -] (12) libates for the third time(?) and assigns offerings(?) (13) Antiochus dedicated.

### Commentary

This fragment probably regulates a cult founded by one Antiochus, listing oblations, libations, and distribution of parts,<sup>4</sup> though it is possible that Antiochus merely dedicated the stone,<sup>5</sup> or perhaps something to which the sacri ce relates. Pouilloux (BE 1989 no. 480) pointed to similarities between this fragment and the almost equally fragmentary, very short *LSS* 70.<sup>6</sup> If this is a cult foundation, the ritual(s) in question may well have been prescribed by the founder as is quite normal in such cases.<sup>7</sup> Possible resulting idiosyncrasies may render the interpretation of such a fragmentary document all the more difficult. Sacri ce accompanied by a triple libation seems probable. Τὸ τρίτον σπένδει καὶ ἱδὰ ᾧ πονέμει in lines 12–13 may refer back<sup>8</sup> to σπασάτ[ω] τὸν τρίτον [- - - ἄπον] | ἐμέτ[ω] in lines 6–7.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Veligianni 1988, 193–194.

<sup>5</sup> Like the three ephebes in no. 4 above; for the problem cf. also 10.17.

<sup>6</sup> (= J. Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos I* (tudes Thasiennes 3), Paris, 1954, 344 no. 129).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. B. Laum, *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike: Ein Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte*, Leipzig/Berlin 1914, I, 61–65 and see Part I pp. 81–87. One notes some similarities in respect to offerings and details of performance between this fragment and the sacri cial prescriptions in the foundation of Epicteta, *LSCG* 135.69–90.

<sup>8</sup> As in a subordinate clause.

<sup>9</sup> Τὸ τρίτον is probably adverbial here and in line 10. In τὸν τρίτον it might be possible to see a reference to a crater (i.e. κρατήρα). In *LSCG* 151 A 48–49 the priest libates over the offerings three craters of wine (καὶ ἐπισπένδει ὃ ἱε[ρ] | ἐνὶ τούτοις οἶνον

*Date.* Veligianni dated the inscription on the basis of the use of the Parian alphabet, employed in Thasos down to about 430–425, on characteristic letter forms, on the use of ΧΣ for Ξ, and on the loose semi-stoichedon style.<sup>10</sup> Duch<sup>•</sup>ne noted (1992, 128) that such a date might be a little too low.

#### *Line 4*

For the μοῖρα see next note.

#### *Lines 7–9*

All or most of the items mentioned here may go to a priest, perhaps placed on a cult table or possibly on an altar (though not in the *re*). Cf. especially *LSAM* 21.

For μοῖρα cf. commentary on 20.7 above.<sup>11</sup> The word πλευρίον appears to be otherwise not attested in sacred laws (unless it is restored in 10.11–12 above). It is a diminutive of πλευρόν (rib, side),<sup>12</sup> but a more exact definition is difficult. Κωλή is a common, if not the most common, priestly prerogative.<sup>13</sup> For the *splanchna* see commentary on 11.24 above. Priests get a fourth of the *splanchna* in *LSAM* 59.3–4, 72.39, 73.14,<sup>14</sup> and *SEG* XXIX 1088.9–10. Σπλ[άνχων] τέταρτον μέρος is employed in the first instance; τεταρτημορίς σπλάνχων in the other three. Cf. Ziehen s

---

κρατήρας τρεῖς). For the banquet libation of three craters, the first to Zeus Olympios (or Zeus Olympios and the Olympians), the second to the heroes, and the third to Zeus Soter who may be also referred to as Teleios see Schol. Pind. *Isthm.* 6.10; Schol. Plat. *Phileb.* 66d; Hesychius s.v. τρίτος κρατήρ; cf. Plato *Resp.* 583b; Photius s.vv. τρίτος κρατήρ and τρίτου κρατήρος; *Suda* s.v. τρίτου κρατήρος; Schol. Plat. *Charm.* 167a. cf. Burkert 1985, 70–71 with n. 38.

<sup>10</sup> Similar Υ (V shaped) and Θ (full-sized) are used in around 430–425; similar Α and (more clearly) Ρ are used earlier in the fifth century: Veligianni 1988, 191–192 with reference to Pouilloux *Recherches* – – (*Thasos*), 443 with n. 2, 445. The inscriptions used for comparison are Pouilloux *ibid.* 86 no. 13 (450–425 B.C.), 87 n. 14 (ca. 430 B.C.), 116 no. 15 (ca. 440–420 B.C.), 139 no. 18 (ca. 415–400); *BCH* 88, 1964, 270–271 (459–440 B.C.).

<sup>11</sup> Perhaps it is to be placed on the cult table or on the altar (though not necessarily in the *re*). The ἱερὰ μοῖρα which is evidently placed on the altar (and probably burnt) in *LSAM* 24 A 33–34, is explicitly assigned to the priest in *LSAM* 40.5, 44.6–7, 48.17, 52 B 6, and evidently 63.7. See Puttkammer 1912, 18–19; cf. Graf 1985, 254. For priestly entitlement to table offerings see Gill 1991, 15–19.

<sup>12</sup> For which cf. commentary on 3.5 above.

<sup>13</sup> Priests tend to get the right leg when a distinction between right and left legs is made. See commentary on 3.5 and 9.3 above.

<sup>14</sup> See Part I pp. 51–52.

restoration [μέρος] σπλάνχνων in *LSCG* 125.4.<sup>15</sup> I have little doubt that some such phrase should be restored here, but the exact amount and the wording are better left open. Bread seems to be listed alongside parts of a victim offered to a divinity but destined to reach the priest in *LSAM* 21.<sup>16</sup> In *LSCG* 151 A 47–48 it is sacrificed on the altar.

*Line 11*

For ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ cf. perhaps *LSCG* 69.25–27 (Oropus): κατεύχεσθαι δὲ τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν ἐπιτιθεῖν, ὅταν παρῇ, τὸν ἱερέα.<sup>17</sup>

*Lines 12–13*

Ἰ(ε)ρά ἀπονέμειν is baffling. The lack of an article may point to a collective reference to sacrificial accessories<sup>18</sup> or items offered alongside a victim,<sup>19</sup> but the uncertain context calls for caution.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>15</sup> In *Iscr.Cos* ED 236.1–5 a priestess gets a fourth (τὰ τέταρτα μέρη) of the cakes and splanchna put on the cult table for the god. Sokolowski's restoration of *LSCG* 120.9–10 assigns a priestess a sixth of the splanchna. In the foundation of Epicteta, *LSCG* 135.86–90, those officiating in the sacrifices are to distribute all the cakes and one half (τὰ ἡμίση) of the splanchna keeping the rest for themselves. Cf. also *LSAM* 66.12.

<sup>16</sup> For priestly consumption of pastries see commentary on 23 B 3 below; cf. the treatment of the Skiras bread distributed in *LSS* 19.41–46. *LSAM* 79.16 appears to forbid selling sacred bread.

<sup>17</sup> When he is present, the priest shall pray over the divine portions and place them on the altar.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. the ἱερά in ἱερά παρέχειν used in the Coan *LSCG* 151 A 20, 45–46, 50, 56, 58, 61, 63, B 4, 7, 17, D 2–3, 4–5, [17], 20 and 156 A 20–21 (Casabona 1966, 12–13).

<sup>19</sup> *LSCG* 135.71, 78 (*Testamentum Epictetae*): (θνήτω) Ἐ ἱερεῖον καὶ ἱερά where the ἱερά are evidently the cakes specified thereafter (see Ziehen *LGS* II p. 321).

<sup>20</sup> One would like to take ἱερά for parts of the victim burnt on the altar for the god (as in *LSCG* 69.25–27 (quoted above) or in the *Testamentum Epictetae*, *LSCG* 135.75–76, 81–82), especially because pouring libations over them is appropriate (e.g. *Iliad* 11.772–775; Ziehen 1939, 613–614; van Straten 1995, 134–136; cf. commentary on 3.16–17 and 16.3–4 above; commentary on 27 A 12 below). The article is desirable, however, in this case. In general see Casabona 1966, 5–18. cf. Ziehen *LGS* II pp. 65, 321 (also for τὰ ἱερά in *LSCG* 135.90–91).



## SEG XLI 739

CRETE. ELEUTHERNA. LAW ON DRINKING.  
LATE SIXTH CENTURY B.C.

A slightly tapered stele of local limestone broken above and below; the sides survive with intermittent damage. The stone was found in 1987 in the eastern apse of the late Roman/early Christian building at the site called Pyrgi (see *Eleutherna* II 1, 13 g. 3). The text is inscribed *boustrophedon* in two paragraphs (**A-B**), the first starting from the left, the second from the right, between deeply cut guidelines. Traces of a inner vertical line, probably a margin marker, appear on the right at the level of lines 7-9, 0.005 from the right margin. There is a vacant line above the text.

H. 0.30, W. 0.27-0.272,<sup>1</sup> Th. 0.105. L.H. (= distance between guidelines) 0.023.

Rhethymnon Museum. Inv. E 125.

Ed. H. van Effenterre, *Eleutherna* II 1, 17-21 no. 1;<sup>2</sup> (= SEG XLI 739); *Nomima* II no. 98.

Photograph: *Eleutherna* II 1, pl 1 (= *Nomima* II p. 345); (excellent).

n. saec. VI a.      ΒΟΥΣΤΡΟΦΗΔΟΝ

-----  
*vacat spatium 1 v.*  
**A** Μὴ ἰνπίνεν· Α[.] →  
       . μέ<ν> δρομέα <ι>σ- ←  
       ς Δῖον Ἄκρον σ- →  
       4 υνινπίνοντα ←  
       πίνεν· *vacat* →  
**B** ἰαρέα δὲ μή· αἰ δ' ←  
       ἰαρόφφοι τοῖ θ- →

*Restorations.* Suppl. van Effenterre || **2-3** variae lectiones: δρομέας | <ι>ς; δρομέα <ι>σ|ς v. E. || **6-7** minus probabiliter αἰ δ|ιαρόφφοι v. E. || **8** αἰ μή [Ϝ]ι<ν> v. E. dubitanter: αἰμ[ατ]ι. J.-E. Perpillou apud v. E. quod vestigiis non respondet.

<sup>1</sup> *Nomima* II p. 347 has 0.27-0.22.

<sup>2</sup> Henceforth ed. pr.



8 ιῶι, AIM . [.]Ι τεκγ- ←  
 [ό]φστέν ἀρχαῖ- →  
 ὄν ἐστι ὄσσι[ς] ←  
 [. . .]τῆρας τε[ - - -] →  
 12 [. . .]ΜΗΙ[ - - - - -] ←  
 -----

*Restorations.* **11** [αρχα]τῆρας idem.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have not seen the stone; the epigraphical notes are based on the first edition. The letters tend to occupy the entire space between the guidelines. Ed. pr. mentions *IC* II xii 3 as a parallel for the lettering.

- 1** End: room for one not very large letter.
- 2** The stone has . MEAPOMEΑΣ. Beginning: traces of a left diagonal stroke: A, Σ (ed. pr.), or E (*Nomima*). Last letter: less likely a nu.
- 4** End: if any letter is lost after the alpha, the room allows only a iota.
- 8** After AIM: traces of a vertical stroke as in eta.
- 12** Only the upper part of the letters survives.

### *Translation*

One shall not drink. [- - -] a *dromeus* at Dion Akron, drinking at a symposium shall drink. (6) Nor shall the priest. But if he performs cult for the god - - -

### *Commentary*

It seems that the inscription is a city law, as has been noted (ed. pr. 18; *Nomima* II p. 346), and that it is concerned with drinking, evidently of wine. Despite the vacant space at the end of line 5 (and what may be understood as a general heading in line 1), the two paragraphs should probably not be interpreted as two independent sets of regulations but as two clauses in a single set, as the δέ in line 6 suggests, dealing with the same circumstances, i.e. cult performance at Dion Akron (a place mentioned in Ptolemy *Geog.* 3.15.5 (cf. on 23 A 7); see ed. pr. 18–19). **A** would concern the citizens, allowing sympotic drinking at a festival; **B** would concern the priest, requiring him to stay sober, though it seems to have discussed additional cultic matters as well; see further ed. pr. 18–21. The document appears to have no immediate parallel. For prohibitions concerning wine cf. *LSCG* 94 (do not enter after consuming wine); *LSS* 79 (forbidding libations of wine; see Sokolowski s

commentary). The famous Delphian law, *LSCG* 76 (*CID* I 3), prohibits carrying wine out of the stadium (see Rougemont s *CID* I commentary).

For the language see ed. pr. 18.

*Date.* van Effenterre dated the inscription to the late sixth century B.C. on the basis of the lettering.

*Line 1*

ἰνπίνεν = Att. ἐμπίνειν: ed. pr. 19.

*Line 2*

δομεύς: an adult citizen: *Nomima* II p. 346.

*Line 3*

For Dion Akron see introductory remarks.

*Line 7*

ἰαρόφφοι = ἰερέυοι: ed. pr. 18 cf. 20.

*Line 8*

van Effenterre (ed. pr. 21) suggested to restore αἰ μὴ [Ϝ]ί(ν) translating quiconque offrirait un sacri ce alors qu'il n'est pas traditionnel pour lui d'op rer, - - -. Perpillou s (ibid.) alternative αἰμ[ατ]ι is attractive but, as van Effenterre points out, it does not agree with the remains on the stone.

*Lines 8-10*

τεκν[ό]φστεν in nitive from \*τεχνουστέω(?): ed. pr. 18; *Nomima* II p. 347; ἀρχαῖον = ἀρχαῖον: ed. pr. 18.



## SEG XLI 744

CRETE. ELEUTHERNA. SACRIFICIAL  
CALENDAR. CA150 100 B.C.

Four fragments (**A D**) of fine limestone, each broken on all sides, which are likely to have belonged to the same stone. Fragments **A C** were discovered during the 1987 and 1988 excavation seasons in the late Roman/early Christian building at the site called Pyrgi (see *Eleutherna* II 1, 13 g. 3); fragment **D** was discovered there in 1986. **A** and **D** were built into different walls in this structure; **B** was discovered over a late Roman mosaic floor; **C** was discovered in a rubble heap.

**A:** H. 0.385, W. 0.18, Th. 0.08. **B:** H. 0.12, W. 0.13, Th. 0.08. **C:** H. 0.10, W. 0.08, Th. 0.08. **D:** H. 0.14, W. 0.08, Th. 0.10. L.H. 0.01, O and Θ 0.007 0.008. Interlinear Space 0.002 0.005.

Ed. E. Stavrianopoulou, *Eleutherna* II 1, 31 50 (henceforth ed. pr.) nos. 5α, 5β, 5γ, 5δ; (= SEG XLI 744); **D:** Kalpaxis and Petropoulou 1988/1989, 127 129.

Cf. Stavrianopoulou 1993.

Photographs: *Eleutherna* II 1, pls. 5, 6α-γ (excellent).

Drawing (of **D**): Kalpaxis and Petropoulou 1988/1989, 129.

Rhethymnon Museum. Inv. E 115, E 120, E 121, E 118.

ca. 150 100 a.

**A** -----  
 [- ---- -]N[-----]  
 2 [- ---- -]M[-----]  
 [- ---- -]ANOYM[-----]  
 4 [- ---- -] . ιπποι δι[-----]  
 [- ---- -]ια κριὸν οὐκ [ἀποφορά ---]

*Restorations.* Supplevit Stavrianopoulou (praeter **D** 5) || **A** 3 [ἀμν]άν οὐ μ[έλανα] vel [οὐκ ἀποφορ]ά νομ[ηγία] S. || **A** 4 fortasse [Λευ]γίπποι (heros) vel [λεν]γίπποι (cognomen Proserpinae apud Pindarum *Ol.* 6.95 (160)) S.; Δι[κτυνναίω] (mensis)? eadem || **A** 5 [ἐνόρχ]ια (= ἐνόρχεα non castratum S.; cf. infra 26.31 32 adn.).

6 [- - - - -]ηι ἥρωτι τέλ[εον? - - - - -]  
 [- - - μηνὸς Δ]αματρίω ἰμ [πόλι - - - - -]  
 8 [- - - - -]ι βῶν, ὧι ἐς τρις [- - - - -]  
 [- - - τῶι] Ζηνὶ Πολιαό[χῳι - - - - -]  
 10 [- - - - -] ἧ κα τᾷ λύμφα<ι> Π[ - - - - -]  
 [- - - - -] οὐκ ἀποφορά ΑΔ[ - - - - -]  
 12 [- - - - -]ον ἧ κα τᾷ ΑΡΙΗ . [- - - - -]  
 [- - - καθι]στάντανς ἰμ πό[λι - - - - -]  
 14 [- - - - -] . ΟΣ Ἄρτεμίσιον χί[μαρον - - -]  
 [- - - κριὸ]ν τέλεον λευκὸν τῶ[ι - - - - -]  
 16 [- - - μ]έλανα, ὃς κα μετρ[ - - - - -]  
 [- - - θύ]εν τῶι Ζηνὶ τέλεον τ[αῦρον - - -]  
 18 [- - - - -] . το Μатέρσι τὸν ἰα . [- - - - -]  
 [- - - - -]αται ἰν τᾷ ἀπὸ ΠΑ[ - - - - -]  
 20 [- - - - -] Ι φέκαστα φάννα [- - - - -]  
 [- - - αἶ δὲ κα] μὴ θύνη ἀνδρακ[άς - - - - -]  
 22 [- - - ἐς τ]ὰ ἄδυττα <τὰ> Ἄρτέ[μιδος - - -]  
 [- - - - -]ι οἶν ἧ καταγ[έγραπται - - - - -]  
 24 [- - - - -]ΕΙ δαῖτα Ν[ - - - - -]  
 [- - - - -]ΔΕ ὁπόκ[α - - - - -]  
 26 [- - - - -]ΜΜΩΙ . [- - - - -]  
 [- - - - -]ΝΩΜ[ - - - - -]  
 - - - - -

**B** - - - - -  
 [- - - - -]ΑΛΛ[ - - - - -]  
 2 [- - - - -] τέλεον [- - - - -]  
 [- - - - -]ρωτι δόλπ[ας - - - - -]  
 4 [- - - θῆ]λυς χοῖρος τρ[ - - - - -]  
 [- - - - -]ΑΣΚΟΙ, ἧ κα Α[ - - - - -]  
 6 [- - - - -]ατωι πάνσ[α - - - - -]  
 [- - - - -] τρίτω φέ[τους - - - - -]  
 8 [- - - οὐκ ἀ]ποφο[ρά - - - - -]  
 [- - - - -] . [- - - - -]  
 - - - - -

*Restorations.* **A 7** vel [ἐν τῶι Παντ]αματρίω μ[ηνὸς - - -] S. || **A 11** ἀλ[λαχᾶι]/[ἀλ[λαχῶι] vel οὐκ ἀποφορά· Ἄλ[- - -ω μηνός] S. || **A 12** in. [κρ]ιόν, [τέλε]ον, [λευκ]όν? S.; n. de verbo ἀριήκοος agitur (Apollonius Rhodius 4.1702, Callimachus, *Hymn.* IV 308) eadem || **A 19** ἰν τᾷ ἀπὸ Πα[νταματρίω πομπᾶι] cf. v. 4 S. || **A 20** [τῶν φυλῶν θύε]ι φέκαστα φάννα S. || **A 23** in.: dativus nominis alicuius deae S. || **A 24** fortasse [παρέχεν τοῖς ἱαρεῦ](<σ>)ι δαῖτα ν[εμονίαι.] S. || **A 27** in. [- - -]γφ: fortasse genitivus alicuius mensis S. || **B 1** [οὐκ ἀποφορά] ἀλλ[αχᾶι] cf. A 11 S. || **B 3** [- - - Δάματρι Μεγαλά]ρωι cf. *IG IX* 2.418 S. || **B 4** τρ[ίς], τρ[ιάκαδι], τρ[ίται] S. || **B 6** [Ζηνὶ Θεν]άτωι vel [ἰν ἀβα]άτωι S.

**C** -----  
 [- - - - -]ΠΟ[- - - - -]  
 2 [- - - - -]ΑΑΙΜ[- - - - -]  
 [- - - - -]ΟΗΚ[- - - - -]  
 4 [- - - - -]ΜΑΤ[- - - - -]  
 [- - - - -]ἱστα[μένου - - -]  
 -----

**D** -----  
 [- - - - -] . [- - - - -]  
 2 [- - - - -] Ζηγ[- - - - -]  
 [- - - - -] . ἡ κα Ε[- - - - -]  
 4 [- - - - -]αι θύμα[τα - - - - -]  
 [- - - Ζ]ηνι Μα[χανῆι - - - - -]  
 6 [- - - Ἀρτέμιδι Ἀγορ[τέραι - - -]  
 [- - - - -] . [- - - - -]  
 -----

*Restorations.* **C 1** [οὐκ ἀποφορά] vel [ἰμ] πό[λι] S. || **C 2** [- - -]αἱ μ[ή - - -] (pro αἱ δὲ μῆ? (cf. **A 21**) L.) S. || **D 4** [θύετ]αι vel dativus nominis alicuius deae S. || **D 5** [Ζ]ηνι vel [Τ]ηνι Μα[χανῆι] vel [μ]ήνυμα Kalpaxis et Petropolou: Μα[χανῆι] vel minus probabiliter Μα[τέραι] S. || **D 5** K. et P; minus probabiliter [iv] ἀγορ[τς] S.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have not seen the stones; the epigraphical notes are based on ed. pr. Alpha with a broken crossbar, kappa with short diagonals, smaller omicron and theta, pi with a full-length right vertical, mu and sigma with parallel outer strokes, Γ = Ϝ; serifs; strokes tend to widen toward their tips.

**A 4** First trace: A or K.  
**10** ΑΥΜΦΑ lapis.  
**22** ΑΔΥΤΤΑΑΡΤΕ lapis.

### Translation

**A** (5) a ram, not [to be carried away] (6) (to the) hero, a [full grown]  
 (7) in the month of Damatrios(?) in [the city] (8) a bovine to  
 which(?) (9) to Zeus Poliaouchos (10) as to the Nymph(?) (11) not to  
 be carried away (12) as to (13) in the city (14) Artemision a young  
 he-goat (15) a white, full grown [ram] to (16) black (17) sacri ce to  
 Zeus a full-grown [bull] (18) to the Mothers (19) at the (20) each  
 a lamb/sheep (21) [and if he does] not sacri ce, (than + verb) man by  
 man(?)<sup>1</sup> (22) [to the] *adyta* of Artemis(?) (23) [to - - -] a sheep as is  
 prescribed (24) feast

<sup>1</sup> For a possible sense see ed. pr. 37.

**B** (2) full-grown (3) *dolpai* (4) [female] piglet (7) third year (8) [not to be] carried away

**C** (5) [on the (day)]

**D** (2) Zeus (4) offering[s] (5) to Zeus Machaneus (6) [to Artemis] Agrotera(?)

### *Commentary*

There could be little doubt that the four fragments belong to the same document and that the document in question is a sacrificial calendar. Little else can be said with certainty. A considerable variety of sacrifices is involved and they are to be performed in more than one place (**A** 7, 13, 14, 22(?)). Stavrianopoulou is probably correct in arguing that this was a calendar of the city of Eleutherna.<sup>2</sup> If so, the incompleteness of the surviving pantheon stands out: Zeus (**A** 9, 17; **D** 2, 5) and Artemis (**A** 14, 22(?); **D** 6(?)) seem prominent,<sup>3</sup> but Apollo, the chief divinity of Eleutherna,<sup>4</sup> is missing.

Stavrianopoulou puts forward many restorations, at times suggesting alternative ones, whether in the text or the commentary. Practically all of these are well considered; all are included in the apparatus. Since too often the fragmentary state of the text precludes any definite conclusions, only a few of these restorations are discussed in the commentary below.

*Date.* The fragments were dated by Stavrianopoulou to the second half of the second century B.C. on the basis of letter forms and of the appearance of the digamma; see discussion in ed. pr. 31–32.

### *Fragment A*

#### **A** 6

ἥρωτι = ἥρωι: dative of ἥρως. See ed. pr. 34. On τέλεος (also below **A** 17 and **B** 2) see commentary on 1.9 above.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. pr. 34–35, 36, 39–41.

<sup>3</sup> See further ed. pr. 42–43; on Artemis cf. below commentary on **D** 6.

<sup>4</sup> Ed. pr. 41–43; Willetts 1962, 275.

**A 7**

Stavrianopoulou suggests two alternative restorations: [- - - μηνὸς Δ]αματρῷ ἡ [πόλι - - -] and [ἐν τῷ Παντ]αματρῷ μ[ηνὸς - - -]. Her choice of a month's name (known from Boeotia: *I.Oropos* 177.30) appears more secure than a name of a place which is thought to have been the port of Eleutherna (ed. pr. 34). A place called Παντομάτριον is mentioned by Ptolemy *Geog.* 3.15.5, between Dion Akron and Rhethymnon. In Stephanus of Byzantium (502.4) Παντομάτριον is described as πόλις Κρήτης.

**A 8**

Stavrianopoulou suggests (ed. pr. 35) that ὦι ought to refer to an act preceding the sacrifice, like the preliminary action taken prior to the sacrifice of the ox in the calendar of Cos, *LSCG* 151 A 28-32.

**A 9**

Poliaochos/Poliouchos is attested alongside the better known Polieus as a title of Zeus in his poliad capacity, i.e. as protector of cities and their institutions, a function he shares with Athena.<sup>5</sup> Whereas the cult of Athena Polias is attested in a number of Cretan cities, this seems to be the first attestation of Zeus in this capacity in Crete. See ed. pr. 43; Willetts 1962, 280-281. Athena Poliouchos is mentioned in oaths at Dreros and Gortyn: Willetts 1962, 281.

**A 10**

λύμφα = νύμφα, at Stavrianopoulou's suggestion, by comparison to Latin *lymp̄ha*, *ae* water nymph (*OLD* s.v.); see ed. pr. 35 and cf. Varro *Ling.* 7.87 Ἐ (lymp̄ha) a Nympha, etc. Stavrianopoulou points out that the adverb ἤ which is used in Cretan inscriptions in modal (how), local (where), and temporal (when) senses, is to be understood as modal here and in line 23, and as temporal in **D** 3.<sup>6</sup>

**A 11**

On not carrying away sacrificial meat see above commentary on 16.5-6.

<sup>5</sup> See in general Nilsson, *GGR* I<sup>3</sup> 417-418; for a list of attestations see Schwabl 1972, 354-355 (cf. idem *RE* XV suppl. 1052-1053).

<sup>6</sup> Ed. pr. 35, 38-39 with note 113; F. Bechtel, *Die griechischen Dialekte* II, 761; cf. Buck, *GD* 132.7 (p. 103).



**A 13**

As Stavrianopoulou notes (ed. pr. 36), the exact meaning of [καθι]στημι here is dubious. For ἡ πόλι cf. ἐν ἄστει in the calendar of Erchia, *LSCG* 18 A 4 5, 38 39, B 4, Γ 16 17, Δ 16.

**A 14**

With Stavrianopoulou (ed. pr. 36) one would expect the Ἀρτεμίσιον a sanctuary of Artemis to be a place designation but, in the present state of the stone, the syntax is baffling. For χίμαρος see commentary 16.2 above. If Artemis is the recipient here, the feminine, χίμαιρα, seems equally possible.<sup>7</sup>

**A 15**

On the color of victims see above commentary on 1.34.

**A 16**

In ὅς κα μετῶ[- -] Stavrianopoulou (ed. pr. 36) detects a reference to the distribution of meat.

**A 18**

Evidence concerning the cult of the Materes has been thoroughly studied by Stavrianopoulou (ed. pr. 43 49 and 1993). Summarily, a sanctuary of them is known from literary sources, primarily Diodorus Siculus 4.79.5 80.6,<sup>8</sup> to have existed in Engyon in Sicily, where their cult is said to have been brought from Crete. This inscription appears to be the first epigraphical attestation. As to their identity, Stavrianopoulou prefers to identify the Mothers as divinities who nurtured the baby Zeus after his birth in the Idaean cave in Crete, which follows Diodorus (4.80.1 2, citing Aratus 30 35) and accounts for the Cretan connections of the cult. The possibility that Demeter might be worshipped here alongside the Mothers under a different title, Megalartos (**B** 3; ed. pr. 49 50, Stavrianopoulou 1993, 173 175), does not in and of itself seem to me to provide sufficient grounds for rejecting Demeter and Kore as candidates.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Jameson 1991, 210, 214.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Plutarch *Marcellus* 20.2 4; Cicero *Verr.* 5.72.186.

**A** 20

φάννα = ἄφνα, accusative of ἀρήν (LSJ s.v); for φν > νν see Bile 1988, 152 (ed. pr. 37); cf. Buck, *GD* 86.5 (p. 74).

**A** 22

Stavrianopoulou suggests that the doubling of tau in ΑΔΥΤΤΑ is a scribal error standing either for ἄδυτα or ἄδυτα (τά), in which case she supplies Ἀρτέ[μυδος]. The word ἄδυτον, literally, a sacred place, not to be entered, is commonly understood as the innermost or back chamber in a temple accessible only from the cella, and by extension, the sanctuary or temple itself.<sup>9</sup> Stavrianopoulou (ed. pr. 38) has noted another reference to *adyta* of Artemis, the ἀγνὰ ἄδυτα referred to in a suspect line (1155) in Euripides *Iphigenia Taurica*, where foreigners are to be burnt. Stengel (1920, 26) suggested that these *adyta* could only be sacri cial pits, comparable to *megara*, in which the victim would be burnt whole. The two terms are, in fact, used interchangeably (together with χάσματα) in the famous scholion on Lucian 80, 2.1 (275–276 Rabe), discussing the rite at the Athenian Thesmophoria of depositing piglets in sacri cial pits from which their putre ed remains were later recovered (Stengel loc. cit.; Stavrianopoulou 43).<sup>10</sup> Uncovering the realities behind the suspect Euripidean passage is, however, not simple.<sup>11</sup> It is not clear that sacri cial pits rather than sanctuary/temple should be understood. Euripides is, in fact, consistent in preferring the plural, and it may simply be poetic.<sup>12</sup> Sacri cial pits where victims are destroyed, but not burnt, are well known in the cult of Demeter and Kore;<sup>13</sup> a clear-cut proof for their existence in the cult of Artemis has yet to surface.<sup>14</sup> Considering the obscure context here, it seems best to understand *adyta* literally as sacred places, not to be entered – that is by anyone other than authorized personnel<sup>15</sup> – comparable to ἄβατα on which cf. above Part I pp. 20–21 and commentary on 1.10.

<sup>9</sup> Stengel 1920, 25–26; Welles, *RC* pp. 309–310; M.B. Hollinshead, *Against Iphigenia's Adyton in Three Mainland Temples*, *AJA* 89, 1985, 419–440 at 419. For a sacri ce performed in an *adyton* see *LSS* 110.8.

<sup>10</sup> The bibliography on the Lucian scholion is vast. See works cited above, p. 163 n. 11.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Hollingshead *ibid.* esp. 438–439.

<sup>12</sup> See E.B. England, *The Iphigenia Among the Taurians of Euripides*, London, 1886, 233.

<sup>13</sup> See Clinton 1996.

<sup>14</sup> For possible sacri cial pits in the cult of Hecate, see, however, E. Simon, *Festivals of Attica: An Archaeological Commentary*, Madison, 1983, 20 with n. 12.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Stengel 1920, 26.

*Fragment B***B 3**

δόλπαι· πλακούντια μικρά. Κῶοι:<sup>16</sup> Hesychius s.v. (ed. pr. 38).

Sacri cial cakes are discussed in Kearns 1994;<sup>17</sup> for iconography see van Straten 1995, esp. 70–71, 163–164. Cakes may be referred to generally (πέμματα is rather common) or speci cally, varying in shape and size. Among the better known varieties are the φθόϊς (e.g. *LSCG* 151 A 30–37), the ἑβδομος βοῦς (e.g. *LSCG* 25 A 2, B 2), the ἑλατρον/ἐλατήρ (see commentary on 19.7 above), or the knobbed πόπανον, decorated with one knob (μονόμφαλον *LSS* 80.5 6), with nine (ἐννεόμφαλον *I.Perg* III 161),<sup>18</sup> or even with twelve (δωδεκόνφαλον *LSCG* 52.2 3, 10 13, 17 19). Cakes were commonly, though not exclusively, offered in connection with animal sacri ce. Not all cakes were burnt on the altar in all cases: in Aristophanes *Plutus* 676–681 a priest is said to collect *phthois* cakes and dried gs from the cult table, proceeding to scour the altars for leftover *popana*. As has been noted,<sup>19</sup> the priest is collecting here what was in fact his share. Priestly entitlement to cakes is in fact documented.<sup>20</sup> Israelite practice is relevant here. Baked and cooked cereal offerings are prominent in Israelite sacri ce, grouped with other cereal offerings under the category of מִנְחָה (*minḥah*; Lev. 2; 6:7 11; 7:9 10; Mishnah, (Qodashim) *Menaḥot*). These offerings would either accompany animal sacri ce or be offered independently. A considerable amount of each offering was not burnt on the altar but rather assigned to the priests as their prerogative (Lev. 2:3, 10; 6:7 11, 7:9 10, cf. 12 16; Mishnah, (Qodashim) *Menaḥot* 6.1 2).<sup>21</sup> The treatment of the bread of Presence (לֶחֶם הַפָּנִים (*leḥem ḥapanim*) also known as shewbread) is particularly signi cant:<sup>22</sup> a batch of twelve loaves was placed on the god's table in the temple (Ex. 25:30) every Sabbath; the loaves were

<sup>16</sup> *Dolpai*: small Bat cakes; Coan.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Stengel 1920, 98–101; Rudhardt 1992, 131–134.

<sup>18</sup> See Part I pp. 61–63.

<sup>19</sup> See Roos 1960, 77–87; van Straten 1995, 154.

<sup>20</sup> Asia Minor: *LSAM* 24 A 22 (table offering); 50.38; 59.3 4; 66.12; see Debord 1982, 69 with 342 n. 159. Chios: *LSS* 77.9.

<sup>21</sup> Milgrom 1991, 202. See in general *ibid.* 195–202 with reference to other relevant Near Eastern evidence. On the high priest's daily cereal offering see Sch rer 1979, 301–302.

<sup>22</sup> As Roos 1960, 81 noted; cf. the distribution of the Skiras bread in *LSS* 19.41–46.

distributed among the priests for consumption upon the deposit of the new batch (Lev. 24:5-10; Mishnah (Mo'ed) *Sukkah* 5.7-8).<sup>23</sup>

#### **B 4**

For piglet sacrifice see Clinton forthcoming.<sup>24</sup>

#### **B 7**

Stavrianopoulou (ed. pr. 38) assumes a triennial festival such as those documented in Gortyn (*IC* IV 80.2-3) and Axos (*LSS* 113.11-14 (= *IC* II v 9)).

#### *Fragment D*

#### **D 4**

On θῦμα see commentary on 19.8 above; the exact meaning here cannot be determined.

#### **D 5**

[Ζ]ηνὶ Μα[χανῆι] seems certain here, although the cult of Zeus Machaneus is otherwise not directly documented in Crete. Μαχανεύς (alone)<sup>25</sup> is mentioned as a recipient of sacrifice in the treaty between Cnossus and Tylissus under the aegis of Argos, Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* 42 B 29 (*IC* I viii 4, I xxx 1; *Nomima* I 54).<sup>26</sup> The exact meaning of this title is open to interpretation. See ed. pr. 39, 43; H. Verbruggen, *Le Zeus crétois*, Paris, 1981, 129-130.

#### **D 6**

The epithet Agrotera, which most commonly characterizes Artemis in her military capacity, is perhaps best known from Sparta. It is, however, also documented in other cities including Athens. See further in Jameson 1991, 209-210. The cult of Artemis must have been important at Eleutherna. She is represented as a huntress on the earliest coins of the city: Head, *Hist. Num.* 464; Willetts 1962, 277; Kalpaxis and Petropoulou 1988/1989, 128-129; ed. pr. 42-43.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. 1Sam. 21:4-7. See De Vaux 1961, 422; Milgrom 1991, 411-412; Schaller 1979, 261; for the table (cf. Ez. 41:22; Josephus *Ant.* 3.139-143) see *ibid.* 298 with n. 19. For bread cf. above commentary on 21.7-9.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Part I p. 66 n. 331; commentary on 3.2 with n. 11 above.

<sup>25</sup> See Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI* p. 103.

<sup>26</sup> Willetts 1962, 244; Kalpaxis and Petropoulou 1988/1989, 131 n. 8; ed. pr. 43.



## SEG XXVIII 750

CRETE. LISSOS. A DEDICATION TO ASCLEPIUS  
WITH SACRIFICIAL REGULATIONS FROM THE  
ASCLEPIEUM. HELLENISTIC (OR ROMAN?) PERIOD

(Figure 30)

A statue of Asclepius on a rectangular base of blue marble, found at the Asclepieum at Lissos in 1957. The base is inscribed with an epigram (lines 1–2) and a short law (lines 3–5). The statue is unpublished and cannot be discussed here;<sup>1</sup> the entire monument is currently on display in the Archaeological Museum in Chania.

Dimensions of the base: H. 0.174, W. 0.655, Depth 0.44. L.H. lines 1–2: 0.011 0.017, O, Θ, 0.011 0.014, Ω 0.008; lines 3–5: 0.016 0.018, O, Θ, 0.008 0.009, Ω 0.007. Upper margin ca. 0.015; left margin: line 1: 0.018 m., line 2: 0.015, lines 3–5: 0.182; lower margin 0.052 0.066. Interlinear space: lines 1–3: 0.014 0.015, lines 3–4: 0.003 0.005, lines 4–5: 0.002 0.006.

Chania, Archaeological Museum. Inv. Α 135.

Ed. Peek 1977, 80–81 no. 10 (= H.W. Pleket *SEG XXVIII* 750); (Bile 1988, 56 no. 56).

Photograph (of the squeeze) Peek 1977, pl. XIX 1 (excellent).

aet. Hell. (vel Rom.?)

- Θυμίλος ἴσσατο τόνδ' Ἀσκληπιὸν ἐνθάδε πρῶτος·  
2 Θαρσύτας δ' υἱὸς τόνδ' ἀνέθηκε θεῶι.  
    Θύην τὸν βωλόμενον.  
4 κρεῶν οὐκ ἀποφορά.  
    τὸ δέγμα τῷ θεῶι.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have seen the stone. The arrangement of the lines of the printed text corresponds roughly with their arrangement on the stone. The letters are nicely cut but the stone is somewhat carelessly inscribed. It is clear that the letter-cutter wanted to separate the hexameter from the pentameter in the epigram and the epigram from the law that follows. In the first line he seems, however, to have miscalculated

<sup>1</sup> But see *BCH* 82, 1958, 798–799 with plates.

the relationship between the space and the size of the letters which decreases toward the end with the last sigma practically touching the right edge of the inscribed face. Lines 3–5 show a tendency toward slanting upward. This results in irregular interlinear spacing and affects the bottom margin as well. Smaller  $\omicron$ ,  $\theta$ , and  $\omega$ . Small, triangular serifs appear at the tips of vertical strokes.

### *Translation*

Thymilos first had this (statue of) Asclepius set up, and Tharsytas, his son, dedicated this to the god.

(3) Whoever wishes shall sacrifice. Meat shall not be carried away. The skin goes to the god.

### *Commentary*

This document comes from the sanctuary of Asclepius at Lissos, excavated in the late 1950s by N. Platon but otherwise unknown, as it is not mentioned in literary sources.<sup>2</sup> The sanctuary, which is rather small, is located near the chapel of Hagios Kirkos, about an hour and a half walk from Souya in south-western Crete. It includes a small Doric temple constructed mostly of ashlar masonry, with polygonal masonry used in the lower east wall built against the slope of a mountain. The temple, which is entered from the south, has a mosaic floor. A base, perhaps large enough for two statues, is located at the north end. To its left there is a basin with a drain.<sup>3</sup> A source of water with therapeutic qualities is known to exist in the area; some such source may have been the reason for the foundation of the sanctuary on this spot.<sup>4</sup> Under (i.e. to the west of) the temple there are remains of a fountain house built of massive polygonal masonry. The water appears to have flowed into it passing beneath the floor of the temple.

<sup>2</sup> See N. Platon, *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 11, 1957, 336–337; 12, 1958, 465–467; 13, 1959, 376–378; 14, 1960, 515–516; Semeria, 1986, 955; M.S.F. Hood *AR* 1957, 20; 1958, 15–16; G. Daux *BCH* 82, 1958, 798–799; 83, 1959, 753–754.

<sup>3</sup> For various interpretations of this structure see G. Kaminski, *Thesaurus: Untersuchungen zum antiken Opferstock*, *JdI* 106, 1991, 63–181, at 126–127.

<sup>4</sup> Platon's 1957 report p. 337. For the use of water for cures in contemporary Asclepieia see J.H. Croon, *Hot Springs and Healing Gods*, *Mnemosyne*, 20, 1967, 225–246; cf. Cole 1988, 162, 163.

A considerable number of statues and statuettes, mostly Hellenistic and Roman, among them representations of Asclepius, Hygieia, and Plutus, as well as of children, were discovered at the site. Some are on display in the Archaeological Museum in Chania. A few are said to have inscribed bases.<sup>5</sup> Other inscriptions were also discovered; a few are still on the site.<sup>6</sup> The excavation also revealed a broken, reddish, inscribed table of Asclepius which is currently on display at the museum in Chania.

On the cult of Asclepius cf. no. 13 above; Part I pp. 60–65. For a more or less comparable document see the sacral regulations from an Attic precinct of Asclepius and Hygieia, *LSCG* 54.<sup>7</sup> Although both come from sanctuaries of Asclepius and the sacrifices may therefore be taken to be incubation-related,<sup>8</sup> there is little in the way they put forth their rules to suggest this exclusively. The sacrifices involved may be independent, performed at will at the discretion of the worshippers.

*Date.* The inscription was dated by H.W. Pleket to the early Hellenistic period, according to letter forms as seen in the published photograph. The date appears correct enough, but exact dating may depend upon the date of the statue and may have to wait until it and the rest of the material from the sanctuary is published.

#### *Line 1*

Τόνδ' in the first line of the epigram most likely refers to Asclepius; it is not entirely clear what is referred to by τόνδ' in the second line. Since an altar does not appear to have been included in the dedication, it seems inevitable that the law assumes the existence of an altar in the sanctuary.<sup>9</sup> It is thus noteworthy that Tharsytas was in a position to publish a law which regulates the use of this altar. Accordingly, Peek's unargued assumption (1977, 80) that both the father who had installed the statue and son who made the dedication were priests of Asclepius seems reasonable.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Platon's 1958 report (p. 466) gives detailed information about the statues.

<sup>6</sup> See especially Platon's 1959 report p. 377.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Part I pp. 56–57. For the first stipulation cf. *LSS* 17 A 6.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. commentary on no. 13 above.

<sup>9</sup> Unless an altar (βωμός) is meant by the second τόνδε, which seems somewhat unlikely to me.

<sup>10</sup> The priesthood could, perhaps, be hereditary (cf. on this Part I pp. 44–46). I avoid further speculation because not all factors affecting the date are in the public domain and it is not yet possible to reconstruct the history of the sanctuary and the cult.



ἱσσαντο: For the form see Bile 1988, 32.50 p. 237.

*Line 4*

On the prohibition to take away meat see commentary on 16.5 6 above.

*Line 5*

As divine property, the skin would go to whoever controls the sanctuary,<sup>11</sup> handed over or left by the worshippers.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> For the skin as a priestly prerogative cf. commentaries on 3.5 and 20.7 above; for skin given to the god (and from there probably to the founder of the sanctuary) see *LSCG* 55.9 10 (cf. Part I pp. 11 12).

<sup>12</sup> In case there is no priest (or another cult official) on duty. For sacrifice performed in the absence of a priest see *LSCG* 69.25 27; *LSS* 129.7 11 (cf. *LSCG* 119.9 11).

## SEG XXVI 1084

SICILY. MEGARA HYBLAEA.  
 FRAGMENTARY SACRIFICIAL LAW.  
 FIRST HALF OF SIXTH CENTURY B.C.

(Figure 31)

A large limestone block found in 1953. The stone, which is tapered on the right and badly corroded, was reused in a wall dated to the second to third centuries B.C. near the south-west gate of the Hellenistic city. The letters are deeply cut. The inscription begins on the front (*a*) and continues on the left side (*b*).

H. 1.085, W. 0.44 (top) 0.625 (bottom), Th. 0.22 (top) 0.39 (bottom). L.H. 0.04 0.075 (*a*), 0.05 0.058 (*b*).<sup>1</sup>

Megara Hyblaea, Antiquarium.

Ed. Manni Piraino 1975, 141 143 no. 5 (= SEG XXVI 1084); Guarducci 1986 1988, 13 18 no. 2; (Arena, *Iscrizioni* I<sup>2</sup> no. 13 with Addenda p. 99;<sup>2</sup> Dubois, *IGDS* no. 20; Koerner, *Gesetzestexte* no. 85).

Cf. Gallavotti 1977, 107 109; G. Manganaro in *Le origini della monetazione di bronzo in Sicilia e in Magna Grecia*,<sup>3</sup> 304 305 (cf. 306); Manni Piraino, *ibid.* 372 373; (both restated their opinions in *Kokalos* 26 27, 1980 1981, 457 (Manganaro) and 464 (Manni Piraino)); G. Valla, *ibid.* 466 467<sup>4</sup> (= SEG XXXI 833); *LSAG*<sup>2</sup> 460; Lejeune 1991, 200 201; *idem* 1993, 3 4; Arena 1996; L. Dubois BE 1997 no. 727.<sup>5</sup>

Photograph: Manni Piraino 1975 pl. XXX XXXI A; *a* only: *Kokalos* 26 27, 1980 1981 pl. XXV (= Guarducci 1986 1988, pl. III; *LSAG*<sup>2</sup> pl. 77.6; Arena, *Iscrizioni* I<sup>2</sup> pl. VI).<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For a drawing of the block with detailed dimensions see Guarducci 1986 1988, pl. II 2.

<sup>2</sup> The author refers to an article by Manganaro which I was not able to consult.

<sup>3</sup> *Atti del VI convegno del centro internazionale di studi numismatici, Napoli 17–12 aprile 1977*, Rome, 1979.

<sup>4</sup> Date.

<sup>5</sup> On Arena 1996.

<sup>6</sup> = Figure 31.

Drawing (*a* only): Guarducci 1986 1988, g. 3; Arena 1996 g. 1.

Megara, Antiquarium.

in. saec. VI a.	ΒΟΥΣΤΡΟΦΗΛΟΝ	
Latus Adversum ( <i>a</i> )	Πᾶσι : ἀρὰ : τῷ [θ-]	→
	2 [ε]ῶ : ἡάδε : ἡὸς κ-	←
	ἀ(τ) τῷ ἀρχομ-	→
	4 ἄο θύε : ὀγδ-	←
	όαν ἀποτει-	→
	6 σάτο : αἰ δέ [- - -]	←
	[- - -]N[- - -]A[- - -]	→
	8 [- - -]A Θ[- - -] δέ-	←
Latus Sinistrum ( <i>b</i> )	κα λίτρας : ἄ-	←
	10 ποτεισάτο.	→

*Restorations.* **1-2** Guarducci: Πασαράτ|ο Manni Piraino: Πασάδατο[ς h|]ο ἡάδεος Manganaro || **2-4** Gallavotti: κ|α(τὰ) τὸ ἀρχομ|α ὁ θύε Manni Piraino: κ|α(τὰ) τὸ ἀρχὸ M[α|λ]άφου Manganaro: κ|α(τ) ἀρχομ|ἄο θύε(ι), Arena (*Iscrizioni* I<sup>2</sup> no. 13): ἡάδε ἡὸς κ|α τὸ Ἀρχομ|ἄο θύε Dubois: ἡὸς κ|α τὸ ἀρχὸ μ|ἄφούε Arena (1996): [- - -]|ο ἡάδε· ἡὸς κ|α τὸ ἀρχὸ μ|ἄφούε(ι) (vel μ|ἄφούε(ι)) idem (*Iscrizioni* I<sup>2</sup> Addenda p. 99) || **5-6** ἀποτε[ι]|σάτο M.-P. || **8-9** [τί]ν[εσθ]α|ι λῆ ἀν|ἄ h[ε(κ)καί]δε|κα vel αἰ δέ[κα λῆ πρ]ᾶ[ξαι] ἀν|ἄ κτλ Gallavotti || **7-10** non habet Guarducci.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have not seen the stone; the epigraphical comments are based on Manni Piraino and Guarducci's editions.

**5** ἀποτε[ι]|σάτο Manni Piraino.

### Translation

This is the imprecation of the god for all: Whoever sacri ces against the (will/directions of) the *archomaos* shall pay the eighth (part). But if[- - -] (10) he shall pay ten litras.

### Commentary

This fragmentary and largely obscure inscription appears to regulate sacri ce in an unknown sanctuary of an unknown divinity, where it is likely to have stood in a conspicuous place and perhaps near an altar, as Guarducci (1986 1988: 17 18) points out, favoring a local

sanctuary of Olympian Zeus.<sup>7</sup> Two clauses can be distinguished. The first (lines 1–6) states the rule; the second (lines 6–10), probably a conditional clause starting with αἰ δέ, might have added modifications, exceptions, or possibly dealt with infringements of the preceding rule. The poor condition of the stone seems to preclude, however, any conclusive restorations. The inscription has, to the best of my knowledge, no immediate parallels. For a law presented as a pronouncement of a god see no. 4 above with commentary on line 7.<sup>8</sup>

*Date.* The date is based upon the forms of the letters and seems compatible with the archaeological context of the findspot. See Manni Piraino 1975, 142, Guarducci 1986–1988 13–14, and Valla's note.

*Lines 1–4*

Manni Piraino, who read in lines 1–2 Πασαράτ|ο, i.e. a genitive of a personal name, interpreted the present document as expressing the proposal (βουλή, γνώμη or the like should be understood with ἡάδε) or will of one Pasaratos, imposing a fine on anyone who does not (ὁ i.e. οὐ) sacrifice according to the law (the unattested ἄρχομα). Her reading of a personal name was accepted by Gallavotti, reading in lines 2–4 κ|ἄ(τ) τῷ ἄρχομ|ῶ θύε, and, with modifications, by Dubois, reading Πασαράτ|ο ἡάδε: ἡός κ|α τῷ Ἀρχομ|ῶ θύε: (Cult) of Pasaratos; (one shall sacrifice) according to the following prescriptions (ἡάδε relative adverb): whoever sacrifices in the month of Archomaos, during which one ought not to sacrifice.<sup>9</sup> The interpretation of this document as a sacred law was opposed by Manganaro who took it to be a mortgage boundary stone, demanding a payment in agricultural produce from a certain individual in accordance with the judgement of an *archos* whose name began with M. In Manganaro's interpretation, the stone comes from Syracuse and is to be dated to ca. 460. His interpretation, which calls for rather suspect readings, was in turn rejected by Manni Piraino and has found virtually no followers. Neither, to the best of my knowledge, have Arena's revised readings (1996; *Iscrizioni* I<sup>2</sup> Addenda p. 99), which are translated 'whoever does not obey the *archos*.'<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Gallavotti 1977, 108.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. commentary on 7.1–3.

<sup>9</sup> *IGDS* p. 27.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. L. Dubois BE 1997 no. 727.

Although ἀρχόμαος is not documented elsewhere, Guarducci's interpretation seems preferable to me. Besides giving a reasonably good sense, it is the only one that takes into account the dicolon (:), used as a punctuation mark, which appears twice in the first line and makes its decipherment as a continuum unlikely.<sup>11</sup>

*Line 1*

For ἀγαί in the context of sacred law see Part I p. 22. The meaning law (i.e. divine or sacred: Guarducci 1986–1988, 16) is stretched but perhaps possible here.

*Lines 3–4*

Galavotti's conjectured ἀρχόμαος, adopted by Guarducci,<sup>12</sup> is perhaps a religious official (*LSJ* supplement s.v.), comparable to Hesychius ἱερόμαος· τῶν ἱερῶν ἐπιμελούμενος (in charge of religious matters). *Hieromaoi* are known from Olympia.<sup>13</sup> Guarducci suggests (1986–1988, 16–17) that the present ἀρχόμαος would be a city magistrate or a head of a college of magistrates.

*Lines 4–5*

ὄγδ|όαν: It is not entirely clear what exactly is meant by ὄγδόαν. One may follow Gallavotti (1977, 108; see below) in understanding μερίδα with it or Guarducci (1986–1988, 16) in taking this to be a part of the victim.

*Lines 9–10*

λίτρα: This appears to be the earliest known reference to the *litra*, which is known down to the third century B.C. as a weight and monetary unit in Sicily (Lejeune 1993, 2–3, 9–10). Gallavotti (1977, 108) suggested that the eighth in lines 4–5 ought to be an eighth part of a weight unit divided into ten pounds, like the δεκάλιτρος στατήρ known from the fifth-century comic poet Epicharmus (fr. 10 (cf. 9) *PCG*). This attractive solution may, however, be anachronistic, as the inscription seems to

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Koerner, *Gesetzestexte* pp. 324–325.

<sup>12</sup> Gallavotti 1977, 107–108; Guarducci 1986–1988, 16.

<sup>13</sup> *IO* 1.2; 4.4–5; 10.6; [13.7 (*Nomima* I no. 36)].

antedate currency (Dubois, *IGDS* p. 27).<sup>14</sup> Accordingly, unless the dates involved are allowed some flexibility, the *litra* here is probably a metal bar used as currency (*LSJ suppl.* s.v. I).

---

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Guarducci 1986–1988, 16; Manni Piraino 1975, 142–143. But note Lejeune 1993, 4 n. 12; idem 1991, 200–201 (ὀγδόα: monetary-weight unit); *LSJ suppl.* s.v. ὀγδοός: monetary unit.



## SEG XXX 1119

SICILY. NAKONE. DECREE ON RECONCILIATION.  
CA. MID (OR EARLY?) THIRD CENTURY B.C.

A bronze tablet with a molding above. The upper right corner is missing; the rest seems virtually intact. The first three lines are indented to the right. The lower part of a nail hole appears just under the break, between lines 2 and 3, above the last two letters of this line.<sup>1</sup> The tablet belongs to the nine decrees (plus one fake) inscribed on bronze tablets, forming a dossier known as the bronze tablets of Entella, which surfaced through copies in the late 1970s, having been discovered under mysterious circumstances at a single site, or so it is believed.<sup>2</sup> The original provenance of the tablets is known from their contents, the present tablet standing out as the only one from Nakone. All of the editions published so far are based on transcriptions or on a photograph. Dimensions have never been published.

Ed. Nenci 1980, 1272–1273 no. III; SEG XXX 1119; Asheri in *Materiali e contributi*, 776–777 no. III; Asheri 1989, 136; (Dubois, *IGDS* no. 206);<sup>3</sup> L. Porciani in Ampolo 2001, 27–28, Nakone A.

Cf.<sup>4</sup> Alessandr<sup>o</sup> 1982; Asheri 1982; Giangiulio 1982, 970–992; Lejeune 1982 *passim*; Savalli 1982 (= SEG XXXII 914); Asheri 1984; Daux 1984, 393–394.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Asheri 1984, 1260.

<sup>2</sup> For the (modern) history of the dossier see M.I. Gulletta in Ampolo (ed.) 2001, 33–41.

<sup>3</sup> To the best of my knowledge, this edition is not based on a transcription or on a photograph.

<sup>4</sup> N.B. The Entella dossier has generated a staggering amount of discussion. I have attempted to make myself acquainted with whatever parts of the bibliography are essential for the interpretation of religious aspects of the present document. I doubt that I was able to cover each and every contribution. There also seems to be little justification in discussing here matters which are of less immediate relevance, particularly since synthetic discussions with specific bibliographies as well as a general bibliography for the entire dossier are available in Ampolo (ed.) 2001. In respect to matters not covered here, reference is primarily given to this work. *Haec non vidi*: V. Giustolisi, *Nakone ed Entella alla luce degli antichi decreti recentemente apparsi e di un nuovo decreto inedito*, Palermo, 1985 (SEG XXXV 999); D. Knoepfer, *La Sicile occidentale entre Carthage et Rome à la lumière des nouvelles inscriptions grecques d'Entella*, *Annales Université de Neuchâtel*, 1985–1986, 4–29 (SEG XXXVI 825); M. Lombardo, *Osservazioni sul decreto di Nakone*, in *Giornate internazionali di studi sull'area elima: Atti del convegno, Gibellina 1991*, Pisa–Gibellina, 1992, 421–442 (SEG XLII 1619).



396; Gauthier 1984 (= *SEG XXXIV* 934); Amiotti 1985; Dubois 1986, 102 105;<sup>5</sup> van Effenterre 1989, 2, 4 5;<sup>6</sup> Asheri 1989 (= *SEG XXXIV* 934); van Effenterre and van Effenterre 1988;<sup>7</sup> Nenci 1990; Th riault 1996, 22 26, 69 70; Rhodes 1997, 320; U. Fantasia in Ampolo (ed.) 2001, esp 62 63; Ampolo in Ampolo (ed.) 2001 XI XII, 203 205; C. Michelini in Ampolo (ed.) 2001, 71; N. Loraux, *The Divided City: On Memory and Forgetting in Ancient Athens*, New York, 2002, 215 228 (French original, 1997).<sup>8</sup>

Photograph: Ampolo (ed.) 2001, 26.

Unknown location.

ca. med. (vel init.?) saec. III a.

- Ἐπὶ Λευκίου τοῦ Καισίου καὶ Φιλωνίδα Φιλ[- -].  
 Ἀδωνίου τετάρται ἱσταμένον· ἔδοξε  
 ταὶ ἁλῖαι καθὰ καὶ ταῖ βουλᾶ· ἐπειδὴ τᾶς  
 4 τύχας καλῶς προαγημένας διώρθωται τὰ χο[ινά]  
 τῶν Νακωναίων, συμφέρει δὲ καὶ ἐς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ὁμογ[ο]-  
 οῦντας πολιτεύεσθαι, πρέσβεις τε Ἑγεσταίων παργεναθ[έ]ν-  
 8 τεσ Ἀπέλλιχος Ἀλείδα, Ἀττικὸς Πίστωνος, Διονύσιος Δεκ[ί]-  
 ου ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινᾶ συμφερόντων π(ᾱ)σι τοῖς πολίταις συνεβο[ύ]-  
 λευσαν, δεδόχθαι τοῦ Ἀδωνίου ταῖ τετάρται ἱσταμένου ἁλίαν  
 τῶν πολιτᾶν συναγαγεῖν, καὶ ὅσοις ἅ διαφορὰ τῶμ πολιτᾶν  
 γέγονε ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῶν ἀγωνιζομένοις ἀνακληθέντας ἐς  
 12 τὰν ἁλίαν διάλυσιν ποιήσασθαι αὐτοὺς ποτ' αὐτοὺς προγρα-  
 φέντας ἑκατέρων τριάκοντα· οἱ δὲ ὑπεναντίοι γεγονότες ἐν  
 τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις ἑκάτεροι ἑκατέρων προγραψάντων· οἱ δὲ  
 ἄρχοντες τὰ ὀνόματα κλαρογραφήσαντες χωρὶς ἑκατέ-  
 16 ρων ἐμβalόντες ἐς ὑδρίας δύο κλαρώντων ἓνα ἐξ ἑκα-  
 τέρων, καὶ ἐκ τῶν λοι[π]ῶν πολιτᾶν ποτικλαρώντων τρεῖς  
 ποτ' τοὺς δύο ἕξω τᾶν ἀγχιστεῖαν ἄν ὁ νόμος ἐκ τῶν δικασ-  
 τηρίων μεθίστασθαι κέλεται· καὶ ἐς τὸν αὐτῶντα οἱ συν-

*Restorations.* Suppl. Nenci (1980). || 1 Φιλ[ωνίδα(?)] Asheri (Materiali e contributi) || 7 idem || 9 ἁλίαν Asheri, *SEG XXX* || 19 fortasse intellig. esse ἐς τὸν (κλαῖον?) αὐτῶντα Asheri

<sup>5</sup> See below n. 11.

<sup>6</sup> Reproducing Nenci's ed. pr.

<sup>7</sup> Reproducing Asheri's 1989 text. This article was published later than van Effenterre 1989.

<sup>8</sup> General discussion; cf. n. 64 below.

- 20 λαχόντες ἀδελφοὶ αἵρετοὶ ὁμονοοῦντες ἀλλήλοις με-  
 τὰ πάσας δικαιοτάτος καὶ φιλίας· ἐπεὶ δὲ κα οἱ  
 ἐξήκοντα πάντες κλᾶροι ἀερθέωντι καὶ οἱ ποτὶ  
 τούτους συλλαχόντες, τοὺς λοιποὺς πολίτας  
 24 πάντας κατὰ πέντε συγκαλῶντω, μὴ συγκαλα-  
 ρῶντες τὰς ἀγχιστείας καθὰ γέγραπται, καὶ ἐς  
 τὸν αὐτῶντα ἀδελφοὶ καὶ οὗτοι καθὰ [κ]αὶ τοῖς ἔμπροσ-  
 θεν αὐτοῖστα συνλελογότες· οἱ δὲ ἱερομνάμονες τῷ θυσ[ί]αι  
 28 θυόντω αἰ(γ)α λευκάν, καὶ τὰ ποτὶ τὰν θυσίαν ὅσων χρεία ἐστὶ  
 ὁ ταμίας παρεχέτω· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ αἱ κατὰ πόδας ἀρχαὶ  
 πᾶσαι θυόντω καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ταῦται τῷ ἀμέραι τοῖ[ς]  
 γενετόρεσσι καὶ τῷ Ὀμνο(ί)αι ἱερεῖον ἐκατέρους, ὃ κα δοκιμάζων-  
 32 τι, καὶ οἱ πολῖται πάντες ἐορταζόντω παρ' ἀλλήλοις  
 κατὰ τὰς ἀ(δ)ελφοφθετίας· τὸ δὲ ἄλίσμα τόδε κολαψάμε-  
 νοι οἱ ἄρχοντ(ε)ς ἐς χάλκωμα ἐς τὸ πρόγαον τοῦ Διὸς [τοῦ] Ὀλυμπίου  
 ἀναθέντω.

*Restorations.* 20 ἀλλήλοις Asheri, *SEG XXX* || 26 fortasse intellig. esse ἐς τὸν (κλᾶρον?) αὐτῶντα Asheri || 27 δὲ ἱερομνάμονες τῷ θυσ[ί]αι Asheri, *SEG XXX* || 31–32 ὅκα δοκιμάζωντι idem (ὅκα δ(ο)κίμασ[ι]ται Nenci): ὃ κα Gauthier.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* Nenci's first edition was based on a copy; a photograph was used indirectly for the *SEG* and for Asheri's 1982 texts. Words first read by Asheri and the *SEG* have been noted above. The present text follows Porciani's edition. Diversions from this edition have been noted, but I have generally avoided noting earlier readings not made directly from the photograph. The lettering shows a number of irregularities, some letters having more than one form. Alpha with a straight crossbar; smaller, suspended Θ, Ο, and Ω; sigma vacillating between parallel and somewhat slanting strokes; no serifs. The scribe evidently ran out of space toward the end, struggling to squeeze the last two lines into the limited space available.

- 8 If I see correctly, the photograph suggests that the last nu of συμφερόντων and the pi of π(ᾶ)σι were written above what looks somewhat like a Λ: συμ-φερόντω(ν π)ᾶσι *SEG*.  
 13 ὑπεναντίου: Porciani dots the upsilon. The photograph shows confusing traces but suggests an upsilon written with something else, above an epsilon: (ὑπ)εναν-τίου *SEG*.  
 22 ἐξήκοντα: ἐξήκο(ν)τα Porciani, *SEG*. The photograph shows nu with a short slanting stroke (or a scratch?) between it and the tau, touching the upper right vertical of the nu.  
 28 αἰ(γ)α: From the photograph I cannot quite make a letter from the traces between the iota and the last alpha (perhaps a kappa?); they do not seem to suggest a gamma, however.  
 33 τὰς ἀ(δ)ελφοφθετίας: The upper stroke of the first tau does not seem entirely secure. In ἀ(δ)ελφοφθετίας the scribe evidently omitted the alpha. The photograph seems to show a small sigma written above the line between the preceding alpha and the delta.: τὰς ἀ(δ)ελφοφθετίας *SEG*.  
 34 The iota seems visible in the photograph. ἀρχοντ(ε)ς: The photograph has ΑΡΧΟΝΤΟΣ.

*Translation*

In the year of Leukios son of Kaisios and Philonidas son of Phil[- -], on the fourth of the month of Adonios, the assembly has decided accordingly as the council: (3) Whereas fortune has taken a favorable course and order has been restored to the public affairs of the Nakonians and it is fit for them to govern themselves harmoniously in the future, and whereas the Segestan ambassadors, Apellichos son of Aleidas, Attikos son of Piston, and Dionysius son of Dekios arrived (at Nakone) and advised all the citizens regarding matters of public interest, (9) let it be decided to call an assembly of the citizens on the fourth of the month of Adonios and to summon to the assembly all those citizens among whom the disagreement arose as they were fighting (for control) over the public affairs so that they put an end to hostilities among them, the two factions having each presented a list of thirty names of (members of) the other. (13) Those who have previously been enemies shall write their names each before the other. (14) The archons shall transcribe the names of each faction separately on ballots, put them in two hydrias, and chose by lot one (member) of each faction. They shall then choose by lot three men from the rest of the citizens in addition to the (former) two, avoiding relationships which the law states deviate from the (practice of the) courts. (19) Those united into the same group (shall live) as elective brothers with each other harmoniously in full justice and friendship. (21) When all the sixty ballots have been drawn and those united by lot in addition to them, they (the archons) shall allot all the rest of the citizens into groups of five, avoiding in the allotment the relationships as has been written (above). Those united by lot into the same group (shall) also (live) as brothers like the former ones.

The *hieromnamones* shall sacrifice at the sacrifice a white goat and the treasurer shall provide whatever is needed for the sacrifice. Similarly all subsequent magistrates shall sacrifice each year on the same day to the ancestors and to Homonoia a victim for each whichever they inspect and all the citizens shall celebrate among themselves according to the *adelphothetiai*. The archons shall engrave this decree on a bronze tablet and set it up in the *pronaos* of (the temple of) Olympian Zeus.

## Commentary

*Date.* The bronze tablets of Entella have been variously dated to the mid-late fourth-early third century B.C. or to the mid-third century, before and after the Roman penetration into Sicily respectively, on the basis of references to external events.<sup>9</sup> The town of Nakone, mentioned in Stephanus of Byzantium (468.3 = Philistus *FGrHist* 556 F 26) and the *Suda* (s.v. Νακώνη) is otherwise known from its coins of the late fifth and first half of the fourth century B.C. It was situated in western Sicily but its exact location is unknown.<sup>10</sup> With no substantial reference to datable historical events, the date of the present document, the only one to come from Nakone, remains very much uncertain, depending upon the date of the entire Entella dossier and possibly upon letter forms.<sup>11</sup>

Though from a cultic point of view the significant part of the document is confined to a few lines (27–33, it is important for the study of Greek cult practice because it governs the institution of a festival, regardless of its civic impetus. The closest parallel in the corpus of sacred laws is *LSAM* 81 which establishes, in much greater detail, a yearly festival for Athena and Homonoia to commemorate the reconciliation between Antiochia ad Pyramum (Magarsus) and Antiochia ad Cydnum (Tarsus).<sup>12</sup> The present festival was clearly instituted to commemorate the reconciliation discussed in the first part of the document. Unfortunately, the document is very sparing in respect to details, offering little more than an outline of the celebration. Obscurities abound, accordingly, not the least because the meaning of the hapax ἀδελφοθετία and therefore the construction with κατά are unclear.

<sup>9</sup> Primarily, though not solely, a war with the Carthaginians, as has been noted, referred to in *SEG XXX* 1117 and 1118 (= Ampolo (ed.) 2001 Entella C2 and C3). The lack of explicit reference to Rome, particularly in the context of a war with the Carthaginians, might suggest an earlier date, though the appearance of a Roman *epimeletes*, Tiberius Claudius son of Gaius in *SEG XXX* 1120.4 (= Ampolo 2001 Entella B1), is significant and could point to the first Punic war (264–241) and its ultimate phase (254–241) as a date for the decrees. See discussions by Ampolo in Ampolo (ed.) 2001, xi–xii and L. Porciani in Ampolo (ed.) 2001, 43–47 with bibliography.

<sup>10</sup> See A. Facella in Ampolo (ed.) 2001, 197–205 with bibliography.

<sup>11</sup> See esp. Asheri 1989, 137. One must note that the paucity of parallels, practically confined to the rest of the dossier, calls for particular caution.

<sup>12</sup> See Thériault 1996, 85–88 with bibliography.

The first part of the document has been thoroughly discussed and cannot concern us in any detail.<sup>13</sup> We therefore limit ourselves to outlining its contents, mainly the reconciliation procedure.

*Lines 1–27*<sup>14</sup>

It appears that in the mid-third century B.C. the city of Nakone was undergoing a period of *stasis* (or at the very least some civil unrest), strife (ἡ διαφορά of line 10)<sup>15</sup> having broken out between two opposing factions that fought over public affairs.<sup>16</sup> Once order had eventually been restored<sup>17</sup> and once Segestan arbitrators had arrived at Nakone and been heard,<sup>18</sup> a reconciliation scheme was at length devised:<sup>19</sup> each of the two opposing factions is required to submit a list of thirty names of members of the opposing faction. These are inscribed on ballots and put in two separate hydrias. Two ballots are then to be drawn. Three more citizens are to be added to these, chosen by lot from the rest of the citizens. A group of five non-related elective brothers would thus be created; no group is to include members related by direct ties of the type avoided in court, evidently, that is, for jurors.<sup>20</sup> This process is to be repeated for all the names submitted by the opposing factions and then

<sup>13</sup> See Alessandr<sup>o</sup> 1982; Asheri 1982; Savalli 1982; Amioti 1985; van Effenterre and van Effenterre 1988; Asheri 1989; Ampolo in Ampolo (ed.) 2001, 203–205.

<sup>14</sup> For Adonis and the month Adonios see Lejeune 1982, 789; Savalli 1982, 1056–1057; Asheri 1989, 139; A. Corretti in Ampolo (ed.) 2001, 89–90. For onomastics see Lejeune 1982 (esp. 794–796 for Καίσιος and Λεύκιος); B. Garozzo in Ampolo (ed.) 2001, 75–80 under appropriate entries). For language see especially Dubois, *IGDS*.

<sup>15</sup> Asher used euphemistically for *stasis*: Savalli 1982, 1061.

<sup>16</sup> The strife does not seem to have included the entire citizen body, however: Asheri 1982, 1035–1036; Savalli 1982, 1061. Ampolo (in Ampolo (ed.) 2001, 205) considers the possibility that if the decree dates to the first Punic war, the two opposing factions can consist of supporters of Rome and Carthage respectively.

<sup>17</sup> It has been suggested that διώρθωται τὰ ζο[ινά] | τῶν Νακωναίων (lines 4–5) equals διόρθωσις τῶν νόμων and refers to a constitutional reform: Alessandr<sup>o</sup> 1982, 1047; Savalli 1982, 1059–1060; cf., however, van Effenterre and van Effenterre 1988, 698 n. 41.

<sup>18</sup> A Segestan rather than Nakonian initiative has been suggested: Asheri 1982, 1034–1035; idem 1989, 139–140; Savalli 1982, 1058–1059. Nenci 1990, 174–177 *passim* stress the role of Segesta in devising the reconciliation procedure.

<sup>19</sup> See Alessandr<sup>o</sup> 1982, 1050–1052; Asheri 1982, 1037–1039; Savalli 1982, 1061–1063; Asheri 1989, 140–141; Amioti 1985, 121; Dubois, *IGDS* pp. 259–261; Thriault 1996, 24–26; Ampolo in Ampolo (ed.) 2001, 203–204.

<sup>20</sup> Alessandr<sup>o</sup> 1982, 1051; Savalli 1982, 1063 n. 35 citing *SEG* XXIX 1130 bis B 37–41 from Clazomenae listing who should not judge whom; the forbidden degrees of relationship go beyond the immediate family. Dubois 1986, 103–104, *IGDS* p. 260 followed Asheri's tentative κλάρον in lines 19 and 26, taking κλάρος as a plot of land:

for the remaining citizens, resulting in an artificial civic body based on the newly constituted groups of five so-called elective brothers rather than on family relations.

*Lines 27–33*<sup>21</sup>

Once the allotment procedure has been completed, the reconciliation is solemnized through a sacrifice of a white goat, the care for which is assigned to the *hieromnamones* with costs defrayed by the treasurer. To commemorate the reconciliation, an annual celebration is to take place in the future on 4 Adonios; the magistrates are to offer sacrifice to Homonoia and to the ancestors and the citizens are to celebrate according to the *adelphothetiai*.

So much is clear, but the conciseness of the text raises some questions as to the recipient of the goat sacrifice,<sup>22</sup> the force of ὁμοίως (line 29),<sup>23</sup> αἱ κατὰ πόδας ἀρχαὶ πασαι,<sup>24</sup> the identity of the ἐξεῖον (line 31), the antecedent of ἐκατέροις, and, since it refers, so it seems, to the ancestors and Homonoia,<sup>25</sup> the number of victims to be offered in the future.<sup>26</sup>

*Lines 27–28*

The office of the *hieromnemon/hiaromnamon* is documented as early as the Tiryns regulations, no. 5 above. A *hieromnamon*<sup>27</sup> appears as the eponymous magistrate in two of the decrees of Entella, SEG XXX 1117 and 1118 (= Ampolo 2001 Entella C2 and C3).

ταῖς θυσι[ί]αι | θυόντω: For the dative cf. (e.g.) 1.27, 32 above where it is used to denote the events at which the sacrifices are to be performed.

---

the groups of five would share a plot of land parcelled out to them. *Contra* see esp. van Effenterre and van Effenterre 1988, 689, 692–693.

<sup>21</sup> Dubois, *IGDS* p. 261; Thériault 1996, 26; U. Fantasia in Ampolo (ed.) 2001, 63–64; C. Michelini *ibid.* 71.

<sup>22</sup> Probably the ancestors and Homonoia as in the future.

<sup>23</sup> Used generally or implying exact repetition of the initial sacrifice which would make future victims a white goat.

<sup>24</sup> It is attractive to assume that the reference is only to all successive *hieromnamones* (and treasurers), but this may be impossible: Giangiulio 1982, 981; Fantasia in Ampolo (ed.) 2001, 62.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Amiotti 1985, 121. One can translate ‘for each of one of the two parties’, but it seems unlikely for these to be the two rival groups. I do not follow the interpretation of van Effenterre and van Effenterre 1988, 695–696.

<sup>26</sup> Two if all the magistrates (or just the *hieromnamones*) offer one victim to each of the two parties. More if each magistracy offers one victim to each.

<sup>27</sup> The mixed-dialect form documented here too.

*Line 28*

As happens occasionally, the color of the victim is specified. White seems appropriate for the festive occasion.<sup>28</sup> The significance of the choice of the animal, a goat, is less clear.<sup>29</sup> The sacrifice of a single goat implies a limited distribution of meat.<sup>30</sup>

*Lines 28–29*

τὰ ποτὶ τὰν θυσίαν ὅσων χρεῖα ἐστί: i.e. (besides funds for purchasing the victim) wood and sacrificial paraphernalia (such as wine for libations, barley groats). The costs are to be defrayed by the treasurer since this is a public sacrifice. In private sacrifices, provision of such items may be assigned to worshippers.<sup>31</sup>

*Lines 30–31*

*Homonoia*<sup>32</sup> and *The Ancestors*. The cult of Homonoia, the personification of Concord, gathers momentum in the Hellenistic period (having emerged in the fourth century B.C.), a phenomenon which is commonly, and perhaps all too easily, considered an outcome of the political upheavals of the Hellenistic world.<sup>33</sup> She may first appear in a given location in an identifiable context involving strife and reconciliation or, as in the calendars from Isthmus, *LSCG* 169 A 4, and Erythrae<sup>34</sup> *LSAM* 26.101, *SEG* XXX 1327.7, as a member of a local pantheon. Even the first category should not necessarily imply a new cult. The ignorance

<sup>28</sup> On the color of victims see commentary on 1.34 above.

<sup>29</sup> One notes that for all intents and purposes the goat is more readily available in pure white than other sacrificial animals (which is not to deny the existence of requirements to sacrifice white sheep and cows). Savalli 1982, 1055 n. 1 tentatively relates the choice of a goat for sacrifice to the possible derivation of the toponym Nakone from νάκος (pelle di capra or rather Beece).

<sup>30</sup> See van Effenterre and van Effenterre 1988, 649–696, adducing a small civic body from this and from the fact that the deliberations at the council and at the assembly (and possibly the Segestan consultation), the realization of the reconciliation scheme, and the sacrifice all took place on the same day. As regards the sacrifice, one cannot be absolutely sure, however, that each and every one of the participants got a share in the meat (for distribution to dignitaries with possible leftovers assigned to the rest of the citizens see *LSCG* 33 B 9–16; cf. above Part I p. 100; commentary on 14 B 65–66). Note that at least two victims are offered in the future.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. commentaries on 3.21–22; 20.3–4 above.

<sup>32</sup> For Homonoia see Thériault 1996; Giangulio 1982, 981–992 with an emphasis on Sicily.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Giangulio 1982, 991; Thériault 1996, 70.

<sup>34</sup> Probably a list in a calendar format rather than a calendar. Cf. Part I p. 80.

of all things Nakonian precludes a definite answer here.<sup>35</sup> One way or another, her association with the ancestors is appropriate. I would take the ancestors as the communal forefathers of the city,<sup>36</sup> the sacrifice and the celebration thus commemorating the reconciliation which allows the harmonious perpetuation of the city's communal heritage.

*Line 31*

Ἰεγεῖον may retain here its usual force meaning either a generic victim of an unspecified type or, by virtue of its ubiquitous sacrificial use, a sheep.<sup>37</sup> The identity of the victim may not be as important so long as it is inspected and found good for sacrifice (see below).

*Lines 31–32*

δοκιμάζων|τι: Inspection of the victim here has been thoroughly discussed by Gauthier (1984), correcting the temporal ὅχα to ὅχα.<sup>38</sup> Inspection of sacrificial animals, considered in a battered passage of the Amphictionic law of 380, *LSCG* 78.14–15,<sup>39</sup> is prescribed occasionally in Greek sacred laws in the context of festivals. The most precise cases are the *diagramma* of the Andanian mysteries, *LSCG* 65.70–72, and the festival regulations from Coressia on Ceos, *LSCG* 98.14–15. All three inscriptions, as here, use the verb δοκιμάζω. So does Herodotus 2.38,<sup>40</sup> cited by Gauthier (1984, 847–848), describing an inspection in Egypt which likely bears upon the Greek custom.<sup>41</sup> Ἐπισκοπέω is used in the scholia to Demosthenes 21.171 (584; II 238 Dilts). The verb κρίνω and its compounds may be employed in respect to selection and/or inspection of sacrificial bovines.<sup>42</sup> See the decree regarding the Lesser Panathenaia, *LSCG* 33 B 20–21,<sup>43</sup> and the calendar of Cos, *LSCG* 151

<sup>35</sup> Possibly preexisting: Thériault 1996, 26, following Giangiulio 1982, esp. 981.

<sup>36</sup> Rather than the original members of the groups of five: Alessandrini 1982, 1053.

<sup>37</sup> See commentary on 27 B 10 below.

<sup>38</sup> Alessandrini (1982, 1048) was the first to understand that the object of δοκιμάζων|τι was Ἰεγεῖον, i.e. that this was inspection of victims rather than *dokimasia* (scrutiny) of humans (so Asheri 1982, 1036–1037, 1044, correction in 1984, 1261; Savalli 1982, 1064–1065 considering δοκιμάζων|τ(α)ι).

<sup>39</sup> Sokolowski's text is unreliable; see *CID* 10.

<sup>40</sup> See A.B. Lloyd ad loc. in *Commentary on Herodotus Book II* II, Leiden, 1976, 173.

<sup>41</sup> Victims found worthy of sacrifice are marked (see also Plutarch, *De Is. et Os.* 31: Sokolowski *LSS* p. 145), similarly to Andania and Bargylia (*EpigAnat* 32, 2000, 89–93 lines 23–24; cf. the decree from Astypalaia *LSS* 83).

<sup>42</sup> See Part I pp. 99–100.

<sup>43</sup> Προκρίνω: (advance) selection of one of the most beautiful cows bought for the occasion.



A 10 18.<sup>44</sup> The dossier from Bargylia, *SEG* XLV 1508 + *EpigAnat* 32, 2000, 89 93,<sup>45</sup> employs δοκιμάζω<sup>46</sup> in respect to inspection of pre-reared bovines and κρίνω in respect to appraisal of best breeders.<sup>47</sup> Κρίνω is evidently used in the Myconos calendar *LSCG* 96.13, stipulating the choice (by the assembly) of two sows, one of which must be pregnant. *LSAM* 32.12 is less implicit but doubtless no less binding than such documents when simply qualifying the bull to be reared and eventually sacrificed to Zeus Sosipolis at Magnesia on the Maeander as ὡς κάλλιστος.<sup>48</sup> In fact, inspection and selection of victims for public sacrifice is commonly implied even when it is not prescribed by means of adjectives such as (e.g.) τέλειος/τέλεος,<sup>49</sup> λειπογνώμων,<sup>50</sup> ἐπίποκος,<sup>51</sup> ἐνόρχης,<sup>52</sup> κυοῦσα (vel sim.),<sup>53</sup> ὁλόκληρος,<sup>54</sup> κριτός (vel sim.)<sup>55</sup> or clauses describing specifically the age and physical attributes (including color, not to mention gender), or generally the quality of the victims.

At Andania (*LSCG* 65.70) the inspection of the victims is to ensure that they are generally εὐίερα (worthy of sacrifice),<sup>56</sup> καθαρὰ (pure), and ὁλόκλαρα (sound; lacking physical imperfections)<sup>57</sup> and that they conform to specific requirements (listed in lines 67–69),<sup>58</sup> in 11.17–18 above the implied inspection seems more financially oriented.<sup>59</sup> Here the inspection would probably consist in ascertaining the general quality; if the victim is a white goat, consideration will have to be made

<sup>44</sup> Κρίνω: a few rounds of selection. It has been suggested that the animal selects itself; see Scullion 1994, 84 with n. 20.

<sup>45</sup> Appendix B 1.2 below.

<sup>46</sup> A 4 5; C 22–23. C 21 uses the noun δοκιμασία; cf. B 15–16.

<sup>47</sup> Τὸν ἀριστα βεβουτρο|φηκότα A 7 8/οἱ ἀριστα βεβουτροφηκότες C 31. C 24 uses the noun κρισίς generally in respect to the animals; cf. B 15–16.

<sup>48</sup> As beautiful as possible; same for the ram sacrificed in line 50. For this inscription see Part I pp. 97–99.

<sup>49</sup> Full-grown. See commentary on 1.9 above.

<sup>50</sup> Lacking its age-marking teeth. See commentary on 1.34.

<sup>51</sup> Evidently wooly (*LSJ* s.v.): *LSCG* 169 A 6, (restored *ibid.* 15; 154 B 6 7; 156 B 11).

<sup>52</sup> Uncastrated: *LSCG* 96.6, 9 (both victims must also be white); *LSS* 98.3; *LSAM* 50.20; 67 B 10; (restored above 19.1; 23 A 5).

<sup>53</sup> Pregnant: see commentary on 1.38–39.

<sup>54</sup> Without imperfections/wholesome/blemishless: *LSCG* 85.1; cf. 65.70; [*LSAM* 42 B 5 6]. Cf. commentary on 1.9.

<sup>55</sup> Choice. See e.g. above 1.14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 39, [47], 54; *LSCG* 92.8 (ἐγκριτος), 27.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. θύσιμος in *Hdt.* 1.50 and more clearly in *Ar. Ach.* 784–785.

<sup>57</sup> See commentary on 1.9 above.

<sup>58</sup> Gender, color, age; a sow (line 68) must be ἐπίτοξ (about to give birth).

<sup>59</sup> Cf. *LSCG* 98.14–15.

of its color. One way or another, the inclusion of the stipulation that inspection be held seems to point to the importance of the *sacri ce*.

*Line 33*

The meaning of *κατὰ τὰς (ἀ)δελφοθετίας* is not sufficiently clear, mainly because the word *ἀδελφοθετία* is a hapax. Various attempts at explanation have been made,<sup>60</sup> taking *κατὰ* to denote distribution,<sup>61</sup> conformity,<sup>62</sup> and time within which<sup>63</sup> respectively. Since the festival is clearly meant to commemorate the reconciliation, it makes sense to take the *adelphothetiai* as referring to the groups of *ve*, with the celebration prescribed here carried out by each group and its descendants. There is no assurance that this is correct, however. As the document is unfortunately silent regarding the practical implications of the reconciliation mechanism, it is impossible to give a definite answer to such questions as whether the newly constituted groups were merely artificial or viable entities and, if so, how they functioned, particularly in respect to real families.<sup>64</sup> We have, of course, no way to verify the persistence of the institution or of the festival with its yearly *sacri ce* to the ancestors and *Homonoia*.<sup>65</sup> As the case of the Magnesian *Eisiteria* seems to suggest,<sup>66</sup> new festivals in particular ran the risk of losing popularity within a fairly short time.

<sup>60</sup> Asheri noted (1982, 1041–1045; 1989, 141–145) that the *adoptio in fratrem* as a legal institution, otherwise unknown in the Greek world and considered invalid (*irritum*) in *Cod. Just.* 6.24.7, was common enough in the ancient Near East. As he further noted (considering Italic and Greek explanations), whether Nakone's *adelphothetiai* can (alongside the month name *Adonios*: Ampolo in Ampolo (ed.) 2001, 204) represent Near Eastern, namely Phoenician, influence is a different question. See Alessandrini 1982, 1051–1053; Asheri 1982, 1041–1045 with 1984, 1260–1261; idem 1989, 141–145; Savalli 1982, 1065–1067; Amioti 1985, 121–126; van Effenterre and van Effenterre 1988, 698–700; Dubois, *IGDS* p. 61; Ampolo 2001, 204–205.

<sup>61</sup> Association par association, the association being the associated *ve* and their descendants: Dubois, *IGDS* p. 261 and translation on p. 162.

<sup>62</sup> Selon les rites d'affranchissement: Asheri 1989, 141.

<sup>63</sup> Pendant les adelphothetias: Daux 1984, 396.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. van Effenterre and van Effenterre 1988; 699–700; N. Loraux, *The Divided City: On Memory and Forgetting in Ancient Athens*, New York, 2002, 222–227.

<sup>65</sup> Contra: Giangiulio 1982, 991–992; Thériault 1996, 26, 69–70.

<sup>66</sup> See Part I pp. 107–108.

*Line 34*

The *pronaos* apparently belongs to a temple of Zeus Olympios, evidently chosen for posting the decree due to its importance.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> For the temple cf. Alessandr<sup>o</sup> 1982, 1049–1050; for the problem of Zeus Olympios in the area see Giangiulio 1982, 970–981.

## SEG XLIII 630

SICILY. SELINUS.

SACRIFICE TO CHTHONIAN DIVINITIES;  
 PURIFICATION FROM *ELASTEROI*. FIRST HALF  
 OF THE FIFTH CENTURY B.C.

(Figures 32–34)

A large lead tablet, given as a gift to the J. Paul Getty Museum in 1981 and returned to Italy in 1992. The use of the epichoric alphabet of Selinus suggests it as the original provenance. The tablet, which is broken on all sides, is inscribed in two columns (**A**, **B**) both of which had been pre-inscribed with horizontal guidelines. The columns are positioned upside down relative to one another, separated by a bronze bar with three nail-holes spaced at equal intervals at both ends and in the middle; both the bar and the tablet could originally have been larger.<sup>1</sup>

H 0.597, W. 0.23, Th. 0.002. Average distance between guidelines 0.008.

The tablet was returned to Italy.

Ed. Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993; (= SEG XLIII 630; Arena, *Iscrizioni* I<sup>2</sup> no. 53 *bis*).

Cf. L. Dubois BE 1995 no. 692; idem 1995;<sup>2</sup> Graham 1995; Clinton 1996a; Cordano 1996; B. Jordan 1996; Kingsley 1996; North 1996; Schwabl 1996; Arena 1997;<sup>3</sup> Brugnone 1997; A. Chaniotis EBGR 1993–1994 no. 121 (*Kernos* 10, 1997);<sup>4</sup> idem EBGR 1996 no. 45 (*Kernos* 12, 1999);<sup>5</sup> Cordano 1997;<sup>6</sup> D. Jordan 1997;<sup>7</sup> Giuliani 1998; Lazzarini 1998; Matthaïou 1992–1998, 429–430;<sup>8</sup> W. Burkert, Von Selinus zu Aischylos, *Berlin-Brandenburgische Akad. d. Wiss.*

<sup>1</sup> See Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 4. For more details see below *Epigraphical Commentary*.

<sup>2</sup> An expanded version of the author's BE lemma of the same year; containing text.

<sup>3</sup> Reproducing Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski's text.

<sup>4</sup> On ed. pr.

<sup>5</sup> Mainly on Clinton 1996a.

<sup>6</sup> Adapted from the author's 1996 review.

<sup>7</sup> The Tritopatores.

<sup>8</sup> The *elasteros*.



- 20 κᾶαι · τὰ κρᾶ μέμφερέτο· καλέτο [h]όντινα λει· ἔστο δὲ καὶ πεδᾶ φέ[τος f]-  
οῖφοι θύνεν : σφαζόντο δὲ : καὶ βῶ[v πρ]ὸ ἀγαλμάτων [. . .] ΔΕΣ[. . .] <sup>ca. 2-3</sup> [<sup>ca. 6-7</sup>]  
Ο θῦμα ἡότι κα προχορεῖ τὰ πατρῶ[ια . . .] ΕΞΑΙ[. . .] <sup>ca. 24</sup> ----- ]  
Τ[. . .] ΠΤΟΙΑΠΤΟΧΟΙ τῖτοιοι φέτ[ει] Ε[. . .] ----- ]  
24 [<sup>ca. 7-8</sup>] ΕΥΣΥΝΒ[. . .] ----- ]

*vacat*

## B

- [<sup>ca. 2-3</sup> α]ῖ κ' ἄνθροπος [αὐτορέκ]τα[ς ἐλ]αστέρον ἀποκα[θαίρεσθ]-  
[αι], προειπὼν ἡόπο κα λει καὶ τὸ φέ[τ]εος ἡόπο κα λει καὶ [τὸ μενὸς]  
ἡοπέιο κα λει καὶ <τᾶι> ἡμέραι ἡοπέιο κα λ(ῆ)ι, π{ο}ροειπὼν ἡόπι κα λει,  
καθαίρεσθ. [ho δὲ hv]-  
4 ποδεκόμενος ἀπονίψασθαι δότο κἀκρατίξασθαι καὶ ἡάλα τῶι αὐ[τορέκται]  
[κ]αὶ θύσας τῶι Δι χοῖρον ἐξ αὐτῷ ἴτο καὶ περιστ{ι}ραφέσθo *vacat*  
καὶ ποταγορέσθo καὶ σῖτον ἡαιρέσθo καὶ καθευδέτο ἡόπε κ-  
α λει αἶ τίς κα λει ξενικὸν ἐ πατρῶιον, ἐ ἡακουστὸν ἐ ἡορατὸν  
8 ἐ καὶ ἡόντινα καθαίρεσθαι, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καθαίρεσθo  
ἡόνπερ ἡούτορέκτας ἐπεὶ κ' ἐλαστέρο ἀποκαθάρεται. *vacat*  
ἡαρεῖον τέλεον ἐπὶ τῶι βομῶι τῶι δαμοσίῳ θύσας καθαρο-  
ς ἔστο· διορίζας ἡαλὶ καὶ χρυσῶι ἀπορανάμενος ἀπίτο·  
12 ἡόκα τῶι ἐλαστέροι χρεῖζει θύνεν, θύνεν ἡόσπερ τοῖς *vacat*  
ἀθανάτοισιν· σφαζέτο δ' ἐς γᾶν. *vacat*

*vacat spatium vv. 10*

*Restorations.* **A 21-22** e.g. [θύνοντ] | ο θῦμα, [τ] | ὁ θῦμα, vel ἐ σ[φα]ζό[ντο ἄλλ] | ο θῦμα J. -J. -K. || **A 22** n. fortasse [μ]ῆ ἐξαο[ρέτο] J. -J. -K. || **A 23** fortasse [ἔσ] | τ[ο] τ[ῖ]τοιοα πτοχοι vel [τ]ῶ | Δι τῶι Ἀπτοχοι (cognomen Iovis ignotum) J. -J. -K. dubitanter. || **A 24** εὔσυνβ[ολος] vel εὔσυνβ[λετος]? J. -J. -K. || **B 1** [<sup>ca. 2-3</sup> α]ῖ κ' ἄνθροπος [αὐτορέκ]τα[ς ἐλ]αστέρον· minus probabliliter [αἶ τ]ῖς ἄνθροπός [κα λει ἂ]πὸ τῶ[ν ἐλ]αστέρον vel [αἶ] κ' ἄνθροπος [τὸν αὐ]τὸ [ἐλ]αστέρον ἀποκα[θαίρεσθαι | λει] J. -J. -K.; [αὐτορέκ]τα[ς]: ἀνθρόπο Burkert || **B 3** <τᾶι> ἡμέραι: fortasse <τ>ἡμέραι vel <θ>ἡμέραι Schwabl; [ho δὲ hv] | ποδεκόμενος J. -J. -K. (1993, 56 adn. 2): [καὶ ho hv] | ποδεκόμενος (ibid. 41): fortasse [εἶτ hv] | ποδεκόμενος: Schwabl; [χὸ] | ποδεκόμενος Burkert || **B 4** αὐ[τορέκται] Clinton: αὐ[τῶι] J. -J. -K. || **B 9** ἡούτορέκτας· ἐπεὶ κ' ἐλαστέρο ἀποκαθάρεται, κτλ Burkert || **B 11** διορίζας, ἡαλὶ κτλ Dubois. || **B 11** χρεῖζει: χρε(ί)ζει Arena.

*Epigraphical Commentary.* I have not seen the tablet; the epigraphical notes are based on the 1st edition. The inscription employs the Selinuntine alphabet, with ϕ used only in column A. Horizontal guidelines, inscribed before the text, appear in both columns. They cover the entire length of column B but only the first eighteen lines of column A, affecting the horizontal orientation of the remaining six lines of text. A few graffiti appear written across the guidelines in the unscripted area of column B. In both columns no straight right margin has been observed, and the inscribed lines vary in length. Two vertical lines appear in the middle of the tablet marking the left margins of both columns. The observance of these margins in an attempt to use the entire available surface of the tablet might explain why the two columns are written upside down with respect to one another (Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 3

4).<sup>14</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski (1993, 4–5) identified provisionally three different hands: I: **A** 1–3, II: **A** 4–24 (in lines 4–6 the rasura prevents definite identification), and III: column B. They suggested that the tablet might originally have been fixed to a table or a board which could be turned around, without ruling out the possibility, taken further by Clinton, of an immovable table around which the reader would have turned upon finishing reading column A.<sup>15</sup> Nenci (1994) suggested a *kyrbis*.

- A 1** First trace: possibly right bottom of a loop; O or Θ are possible.  
**A 2** Beginning: a letter space with no visible traces.  
 Δ: a semicircle open to the left; Θ, O, or Φ are possible.  
 First Α: lower part of Α or Ν.  
 Δ: lower tip of Α or Λ but possibly corrected from O or vice versa.  
 Ε: less likely O.  
 Q: rather large; possibly Π with an unusually long right vertical.  
**A 3** Beginning: a letter space with no visible trace followed by complete B or a right part of M. In *κατῆταιγίζεν* the h was written over the Α.  
**A 4–6** The letters seem to belong to an earlier inscription.  
**A 4** The dotted iota is followed by an isosceles: Α, Λ, Μ, or Ν.  
**A 6** Traces before the H: Π or T; Θ or O; Δ, Ε, Η, Ι, Κ or Π.  
**A 7** The φ is written over Π.  
**A 13** The second Ν was written above an older Ν.  
**A 21** The sequence of letters from Κ to O involves confusing corrections and secondary writing which seem to have resulted finally in KAIBO.  
*ἀγαμάτων*: written ΑΓΑΑΜΤΝ by the first writer and corrected by the second.  
 Δ: possibly O or Θ.  
 The Σ might be followed by a vertical stroke.  
 End, between the two lacunae: a gap for one or two letters followed by an upper part of a rightward slanting stroke.  
**A 22** . ΕΞΑΙ .: First trace: Ε, or rather angular O or Θ. Last trace: top left tip of Ε, Π or Ρ.  
**A 23** T: left tip of the crossbar.  
 Before the iota: trace of a right curved tip: a circular letter, Δ, or Ρ.  
**A 24** Ε: a high horizontal.  
 Β: downward-slanting vertical and a sharp angle; ΙΑ is physically possible.  
**B 1** Between *ἀγθοροπος* and the Α of [ἐλ]αστέρον the tablet reads [-<sup>α</sup>6-7] . . Ι (probably T) . [-<sup>2-3</sup>-].  
**B 2** Beginning: the Ρ was omitted then added below the letters between Π and O. ΝΗΟΠΟΚ was written over ΗΟΠΕΚΑΛΕΙ.  
**B 3** Right of the break: ΗΟΠΕΙΑΙΚΑΛΠΟΡΟΕΙΠΟΝΗΟΠ was written over ΚΑΛΕΙΚΑΙΗΟΠΕΙΑΙΚΑΛΕΙ (the Λ appears to have been written on top of Ε) and ΥΙΚΑΛΕΙ written backward under ΠΟΝΗΟΠ.  
**B 4** The second Π was written in a rasura.  
 In the fourth word Ρ was made into the first Κ by erasing the top diagonal.  
**B 7** In *πατῳδιον* the T was omitted then inserted.  
**B 9** Second-to-last word: the Λ was omitted with ΛΑ being subsequently written over Α.

<sup>14</sup> Curti and van Bremen 1999, 21–22 reject the irregular outer margins theory.

<sup>15</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 4, 5; Clinton 1996a, 162. *Contra*: Curti and van Bremen 1999, 22–23 who consider that the strange arrangement of the text had a symbolic meaning.

- B 10** Fifth word: the B was omitted then written over O.  
**B 11** In *ἡλί* the *AI* were first written joined as *N* then written over this letter.  
 In *χουοῖ* the *P* was omitted then written over *Y*.  
**B 13** The last *Σ* was written over a vertical.

*Translation*

*A*

(3) [- - -] leaving behind, but the *homosepuoi* shall perform the consecration [- - -] (7) The offering of the sacri ces before (the festival of) the Kotytia and the truce on the fifth year in which the Olympiad also takes place. Sacri ce to Zeus Eumenes [and] to the Eumenides a full-grown (victim) and to Zeus Meilichios in the (sanctuary?) of Myskos a full-grown (victim). (Sacri ce) to the polluted Tritopatores as to the heroes, having poured wine through the roof, and burn one of the ninth portions. (12) Those to whom it is permitted shall sacri ce (the) victim and perform the consecration. And having sprinkled around with water, they shall anoint (the altar?) and then they shall sacri ce a full-grown (victim) to the pure (Tritopatores). Pouring down honey mixture, (he shall set out) a table and a couch and throw over a pure cloth and (place on it) olive wreaths and honey mixture in new cups and cakes and meat. And having sampled firstlings, they shall burn them and perform anointment, having put the cups on (the altar). (17) They shall sacri ce the ancestral sacri ces as to the gods. To Meilichios in the (sanctuary?) of Euthydamos they shall sacri ce a ram. It shall also be possible to sacri ce a victim after a year. And he shall take out the public *hiara* and set out a table and burn the thigh and the firstlings from the table and the bones. No meat shall be carried away; he shall invite whomever he wishes. It shall also be possible to sacri ce at home (or: in the *oikos*) after a year. They shall also slaughter a bovine in front of the statues [- - -] whatever victim (or sacri ce) the ancestral customs permit [- - -] the third year [- - -]

*B*

[If a] person, [a homicide, wishes] to purify himself from *elasteroi*, having made a proclamation from wherever he wishes, and in whatever year he wishes, and in whatever [month] he wishes, and on whatever day he wishes, having made a proclamation in whatever direction he wishes, he shall purify himself. (4) The one hosting him shall offer (lit.



give) the [homicide] to wash himself and something to eat and salt; and, having sacrificed a piglet to Zeus, he (the homicide) shall go away from him, and turn around, and he shall be spoken to, and take food, and sleep wherever he wishes. (7) If someone wishes to purify himself with respect to a guest/host (? or: foreign?) or ancestral (*elasteros*), either heard or seen or any whatsoever, he shall purify himself in the same way as the homicide when he purifies himself from an *elasteros*. Having sacrificed a full-grown victim on the public altar, he shall be pure. Having marked a boundary with salt and having sprinkled around with gold (i.e. a golden vessel), he shall go away. (12) Whenever one needs to sacrifice to the *elasteros*, sacrifice as to the immortals. But he shall slaughter the victim with the blood pouring onto the earth.

*Commentary*<sup>16</sup>

This document stands out as one of the few cases where rituals are dictated in relatively great detail in a Greek sacred law. It is, however, not safe to put too great an emphasis on the details. The law is manifestly interested in establishing a sequence of actions which, performed in order, constitute a ritual. It is, however, not much more interested in singular actions than comparable Greek sacred laws; like them it takes for granted a basic familiarity with ordinary cult practice. Details are given only when deviation from common practice is required or when the proceedings are particularly complex. One is tempted to ascribe the amount of detail to unfamiliarity with rites which have been newly formulated. But the rituals may not be new; this could rather be the first time the information pertaining to their performance is made accessible. The detailed format may be due to the inherently idiosyncratic, complex nature of the rituals, or, particularly in **B**, to their extraordinariness and to the seriousness of the subject matter.

---

<sup>16</sup> This document has been much discussed since its publication and it is impossible to review in detail all of the discussions here. In what follows we therefore confine ourselves to general considerations and to a condensed running commentary, attempting to highlight what seem to be substantial contributions to interpretation, referring, where the same or similar points were made by different scholars, mainly to whoever first made these points. Disagreement in particular matters aside, Jameson, Jordan, and Kotansky's readily available first edition remains indispensable; the reader is directed to it for detailed discussion of particular points.

*Date*

The date is based on letter forms. Jameson, Jordan and Kotanski 1993, 46–48 suggest mid-5th century or somewhat earlier; Cordano (1996, 137–138; 1997, 422) points out that this date may be too high; Graham (1995, 367) cautions that the first half of the 5th century seems reasonable.

*Language*<sup>17</sup>

For a systematic study see Dubois 1999; for a summary of notable phenomena see also Arena *Iscrizioni* I<sup>2</sup> 114–115; idem 1997, 438–439.

*Structure*

It is agreed that each of the two columns deals with separate rituals. The proceedings in column B evidently concern purification from *elasteroi* and the identifiable protagonists are private individuals. The first editors have suggested that the rituals in column A would likewise be purificatory but, as the protagonists in column B are private individuals, column A would be concerned with the cult of groups, probably gentilitial. The entire document, likely to have been formulated to deal with a state of pollution caused by *stasis*, would thus be concerned with purification.<sup>18</sup> Clinton, on the other hand, suggested that the document could have been arranged according to the chronological repetition of the rituals involved. If, as the first editors suggested, the tablet was meant to be viewed as it appears today with the intentional rasura of lines 4–6,<sup>19</sup> the first two words in line 7 are more likely to belong together with the following sentence than with a sentence begun in the rasura. **A** 7–24 is to be taken as a self-contained section; it deals with quadrennial rituals; **A** 18, 20–21 envision repetition after a year; **A** 23 envisions repetition after two years, although it is not clear of what. Column B deals with rituals to be performed independently of a fixed date. The

<sup>17</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski, 1993, esp. 48–49.

<sup>18</sup> See Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, Ch. III; 113–114, 123. North (1996, 298–299) considers an outbreak of a disease or a period of infertility. For a postulated role of travelling religious experts such as Empedocles in formulating the rituals (Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 59) cf. Kingsley 1996, 282.

<sup>19</sup> See Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 20–21 with their explanation of this problem (words lost in the rasura were for some reason not re-inscribed).

tablet might originally have been larger; the entire document, which might have likewise not been confined to a single tablet, could have dealt with annual, biennial, triennial, quadrennial rituals and with rituals which can recur as needed.<sup>20</sup> Clinton has furthermore doubted that the two columns shared a thematic connection. While **B** is concerned with purification, there is little in **A**, except the reference to polluted and pure Tritopatores, to suggest a similar concern. Nor does the fact that **B** deals with the purification of an individual imply that **A** is concerned with the cult of groups.<sup>21</sup>

We should note that it may be rare, but entirely possible, for documents that are not immediately related to each other to be inscribed and published together for a variety of reasons.<sup>22</sup> As in the case of the two Archaic fragments from Ephesus, *LSAM* 30,<sup>23</sup> it is safer to treat each column as the sum of its parts. As such, the two columns do not seem to have much in common with one another.

### Column A

The comprehensible part of column A – the precise relationship of lines 1–3 to the main part cannot be determined – opens with a heading (lines 7–8) followed by four sets of prescriptions (lines 8–9, 9–13, 13–17, 17–22 where the text becomes too fragmentary). Excluding the third set, connected to the second with a καί, each set begins with an asyndeton, naming the divinities (in the dative) to whom the sacrifices are to be performed.<sup>24</sup> Each of the two sets concerned with sacrifices to the polluted and pure Tritopatores is summed up by an independent statement. The protagonists in the actions are only identified twice in the entire column (lines 3 and 12). The number of the verbs vacillates, however, between third singular and third plural. The significance of this is not clear.

<sup>20</sup> Clinton 1996a, 160–162.

<sup>21</sup> Clinton 1996a, 162–163. See further commentary on **A** (*Nature of the Cult*) below.

<sup>22</sup> One can only imagine the explanations for the relations between the First Fruits decree and Lampon's rider published together with it in *LSCG* 5 (see Part I p. 36), had the connecting passage (lines 47–54) not survived. *LSAM* 12 (documents belonging to the same sanctuary) is another notable example.

<sup>23</sup> The fragments, which belonged to the same document, are not related to one another thematically; see Part I p. 74.

<sup>24</sup> Clinton 1996a, 173; Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 43.

*Location of Cult Performance*

Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski (1993, 52, 132–136) suggested that the rituals in column A took place in particular plots in the so-called Campo di Stele, an area west of the precinct assigned to Zeus Meilichios at the north-east corner of the Malophoros sanctuary at the Gaggera where a number of aniconic or semi-iconic stones have been found. Some of these proclaim themselves by means of inscriptions to be the Meilichios of so-and-so, to belong to Meilichios, or to be given to Meilichios by so-and-so; others appear to bear personal names.<sup>25</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski conjectured that beyond being mere embodiments of the god, these stones marked places where groups would engage in the performance of cult.<sup>26</sup> The designations ἐν Μύσσο (line 9) and ἐν Εὐθυδάμο (line 17) are to be understood as referring to some such plots. Myskos and Euthydamos would be names of the forefathers of important gentilitial groups; their Meilichios cults would have acquired significance for the entire community or for the groups for whose sake the present rituals were composed.<sup>27</sup> The name Myskos is in fact attested on a late seventh-century gravestone from Selinus (*IGDS* 71); this person who might have belonged to the first settlers of Selinus could be identified as the Myskos of ἐν Μύσσο or as a descendant of his.<sup>28</sup> Clinton suggested, however, that, while Myskos and Euthydamos might have been founders promoted to the status of local heroes, ἐν Μύσσο and ἐν Εὐθυδάμο would designate not plots but sanctuaries<sup>29</sup> comparable to a sanctuary of an eponymous local hero, Pamphylos, at Megara, the grandmother city of Selinus, which had an incorporated or attached sanctuary of Zeus Meilichios. The rituals prescribed here would accordingly take place not in the sanctuary of Zeus Meilichios on the Gaggera but in a few sanctuaries, the sanctuary of Zeus Eumenes and the Eumenides, the precinct of Zeus Meilichios in the sanctuary of Myskos, the sanctuary perhaps double of the Tritopatores, and the precinct of Zeus Meilichios in the sanctuary of Euthydamos.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>25</sup> See Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski's catalogue, 1993, 89–90.

<sup>26</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 201–202.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.* 29, 53.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.* 28–29.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Dubois 1995, 134; *idem* 1999, 343. For Myskos and Euthydamos cf. also Cordano 1996, 139 (*eadem* 1997, 426–427).

<sup>30</sup> Clinton 1996a, 163–165 with reference to Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993,

### *Nature of the Cult*

The first editors assumed a thematic unity for the entire document with the rituals of column A dealing with the purification of groups (see *Structure* above). Clinton seems correct, however, in denying explicit concern with purification; the sacrifices here are performed for chthonian divinities, by which designation one should not necessarily understand netherworld divinities concerned with death or the like, but rather earthly agrarian divinities whose realm of operation is fertility. The cult is public, that is, performed by the city and on its behalf, and the protagonists may include religious officials.<sup>31</sup> It is still possible that the rituals draw upon ancestral family cults (namely of Myskos and Euthydamos; cf. B. Jordan 1996, 327). This could account for some of the cultic idiosyncrasies, particularly for the elements characteristic of hero cult and the cult of the dead and, if the families retained some of their cultic prerogatives, for the prominence of those to whom it is allowed (line 12) and (provided that lines 1–7 relate to the rest of A) the *ἡμοσέπνοι* (line 3; see commentary below).

### A 3

*καταγαίξεν*: Despite spelling variations, this is likely to be the same verb as *καταγίζόντο* in line 12 rather than *καταγίξειν*. See further below commentary on line 12.<sup>32</sup>

*ἡμοσέπνοι* = *ἡμοσίπνοι*, glossed by Hesychius (s.v.) as *ἡμοτράπεζοι* (messmates LSJ). Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski (1993, 20)<sup>33</sup> advance

---

84 for the Megarean evidence. For more on possible cultic relations between Selinus and its maternal cities see Curti and van Bremen 1999, 24–26. They understand (29–31) *ἐν Μύσσο* and *ἐν Εὐθυδάμο* as sacred areas, taking Myskos and Euthydamos to be opposing symbolic names of imaginary mythic-historical heroes or founders. Myskos would symbolize pollution and death (Hesych. s.v. *μύσκος*: *μίασμα. κήδος*), Euthydamos something positive. In 30–31 they point out the existence of an underground double structure beneath the foundation blocks of the Mellichios *naiskos* consisting of a possible tomb with a hole in its cover slab (I) and cylinders allowing the channeling of liquids (II). (I) would be the *heroon* of Myskos; (II) the receptacles of the Tritopatores' libations. They place the sanctuary of Euthydamos in the agora of Selinus. For column A they suggest a ritual of renewal and purification of the whole community, accepting a thematic link between it and column B.

<sup>31</sup> Clinton 1996a, 163, cf. 168 n. 39; 173 (*contra*: Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 8).

<sup>32</sup> But cf. Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 18–19; Dubois 1995, 131.

<sup>33</sup> See further *ibid.*; cf. Bru gnone 1997, 123–124; the term might refer to a group wider than a family: Clinton 1996a, 165 n. 19.

the extended sense members of an *oikos* ascribed by Aristotle *Pol.* 1252b 14 to Charondas of Catane.

#### A 7–8

Time designation for the rituals.

#### A 7

Τὸν ἡιαρῶν ἡα θυσία is to be taken as the nominal equivalent of θύειν τὰ ἱερά<sup>34</sup> and understood as a heading governing all of the rites prescribed here.<sup>35</sup>

#### A 7–8

φοτυτίον: This is the first epigraphic reference to the festival of the Kotyt(t)ia. The festival and its goddess, Kotyto, assigned a Thracian origin by Strabo (10.3.16), have been maligned as involving obscene rites and mocked in Eupolis *Baptai*. More relevant here is a note in [Plutarch] *Proverbia* 1.78 (= *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum* I 333) stating that the Κοτύττια ἑορτή τις ἐστὶ Σικελική, ἐν ᾗ περὶ τινὰς κλάδους ἐξάπτοντες πόπανα καὶ ἀκρόδρνα ἐπέτραπον ἀρπάζειν.<sup>36</sup> The branches of the Sicilian festival bear a remarkable resemblance to the Athenian *eiresione* featured at the Pyanopsia<sup>37</sup> and probably at the Thargelia.<sup>38</sup> See Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 23–26.<sup>39</sup>

Ἐχεχειρία = ἐκεχειρία, the sacred truce, likely to have started at the first full moon after the summer solstice, a month before the Olympic games, probably held at the second full moon after the summer solstice. The Kotytia were held before or around the beginning of the truce; double dating is employed here probably to accommodate calendar

<sup>34</sup> See Casabona 1966, 9–12 and in general 5–18.

<sup>35</sup> See Clinton 1996a, 160–161; cf. Graham 1995, 367; Dubois 1995, 131. This interpretation was considered and dismissed by Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 20–23. Curti and van Bremen (1999, 26) translate the sacri- cing of the victims.

<sup>36</sup> The Kotytia is a Sicilian festival in which they used to hang cakes and fruits on branches and let (people) snatch them.

<sup>37</sup> Plut. *Theseus* 22; *Suda* s.v. εἰρεσιώνη; Πυανειψιώνος; Schol. Ar. *Eq.* 724; Plut. 1054.

<sup>38</sup> *Suda* s.v. εἰρεσιώνη; Schol. Ar. *ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> Summarily, Eupolis' mockery is directed at the Corinthians (Hesych. s.v. Κοτυτ-τώ). Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski consider a non-Thracian origin for the Sicilian festival. *Contra* see Dubois 1995, 132 rejecting their unlikely derivation (1993, 25) from Heb./Aram. *qt'/qt'*, and preferring the view which takes Corinth as the mediator between Thrace and Sicily. One notes (inter alia) that the Heb./Aram. derivation does not account for the third consonant of the root.

discrepancies. As the text states, the sacrifices prescribed are to be held before the Kotytia and the Olympic truce in the Olympic year, that is every fourth (Greek fifth) year. Some of the sacrifices may be repeated after a year (18, 20–21); repetition after two years also seems to have been considered (third year in 23). See Clinton 1996a 161.<sup>40</sup>

hόκα = ὅτε; hόκα i.e. hόκα κα (ὅταν) is possible; ἡδῖπερ hόκα: pleonasm; ποτεῖε = προσεῖη (<προόσεμν): Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 28; subjunctive missing a iota < προσιέναι: Dubois 1995, 133; idem 1999, 340–341.

### A 8–9

Sacrifice to Zeus Eumenes, the Eumenides and Zeus Meilichios in the sanctuary of Myskos.

*Zeus Eumenes and the Eumenides.*<sup>41</sup> The relationship between the Eumenides and the Erinyes is much debated. The question is whether they are to be seen as a single group of divinities whose two aspects, kindly and harmful, are addressed by different names or as originally two distinct groups fused into one at a later stage, not the least under the influence of Aeschylus. The first editors (1993, 79) favor the first option; Clinton (1996a, 166–170) the second: The Eumenides are here kindly chthonian deities; the sacrifice to them is evidently ordinary and they have nothing to do with the destructive Erinyes. Their associate, the previously unattested Zeus Eumenes (Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 77), ought to have a similar nature.<sup>42</sup>

*Zeus Meilichios.*<sup>43</sup> The most prevalent symbol connected to Zeus Meilichios (occasionally referred to only as Meilichios) is the snake as is appropriate for a manifestly chthonian divinity. The first editors stressed his popularity among individuals and groups and the scarcity of his cult at the state level<sup>44</sup> which, like his concern with purification from

<sup>40</sup> Curti and van Bremen 1999, 26–27 suggest that the reference to the Olympiad had a cultic significance: prior to participation or to sending a delegation to Olympia the entire community had to undergo a collective ritual, possibly purificatory. Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski (1993, 27) suggest that the performance of the rites could have started at any year.

<sup>41</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, Ch. V.1.

<sup>42</sup> Clinton 1996a, 166–170. For possible relations between the cult of Zeus and the Eumenides here and at Ain el Hofra, near Cyrene (*SEG* IX 325–346, XX 723) see Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 77–79; Lazzarini 1998.

<sup>43</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, Ch. V.2–3.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. on the Diasia 1.34–35 above.

bloodshed referred to by Pausanias (2.20.1–2) and the lexicographers,<sup>45</sup> seems consistent with their interpretation of the rites in this column. On the other hand, Zeus Meilichios' concern with wealth, as a kindly chthonian divinity, is not any less consistent with Clinton's interpretation.<sup>46</sup>

For Myskos see *Location of Cult Performance* above.

For τέλεον see commentary on 1.9 above. Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski (1993, 28) suggest that without a reference to an animal it would signify a sheep like ἱερεῖον (see commentary on B 10).

#### A 9–13

Sacri ce to the polluted Tritopatores as to the heroes, involving libation of wine through the roof and division of the victim into nine portions, one of which is to be burnt on the altar. The ritual is presided over by those to whom it is allowed who are instructed to perform the consecration themselves. Following the sacri ce, water is sprinkled around and anointment – probably of the altar – is performed.

#### A 9–10

*The Tritopatores.*<sup>47</sup> Φανόδημος (*FGrHist* 325 F 6) φησὶν ὅτι μόνοι Ἀθηναῖοι θύουσί τε καὶ εὔχονται αὐτοῖς ὑπὲρ γενέσεως παίδων, ὅταν γαμεῖν μέλλωσιν: Harpocration s.v. Τριτοπάτορες.<sup>48</sup> This is the most complete account of the realm of action – procreation – of these rather obscure ancestral deities.<sup>49</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski (1993, 110) are correct in doubting Phanodemos' exclusive statement, although the cult of the Tritopatores is not particularly widespread and the bulk of the evidence does come from Athens, where the cult is documented at the gentilitial level (genos/phratry as probably in *LSCG* 2 D 8–10),<sup>50</sup> the deme level (*LSCG* 18 Δ 41–46 (Erchia)); *LSCG* 20 B 32, 52–53 (Marathon)), and at the state level (the sanctuary of the Tritopatores in the Kerameikos).<sup>51</sup>

<sup>45</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 83 v.

<sup>46</sup> See also N. Cusumano, *Zeus Meilichios, Mythos* 3, 1991, 19–47.

<sup>47</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, Ch. V.4.

<sup>48</sup> Phanodemos says that the Athenians alone sacri ce and pray to them for the generation of children when they are about to marry.

<sup>49</sup> Literally 'great-grandfathers' *LSJ* s.v.; Arist. *Fr.* 415 (Rose) = Pollux 3.17.

<sup>50</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 108 also cite *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 2615 and *Agora* XIX H20. Both are boundary markers of precincts of groups identifiable as either gene or phratries. See on this Parker 1996, 323.

<sup>51</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 107–108 citing the boundary markers *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 1066 A–C and 1067.



In accordance with their designation of this column as devoted to the cult of groups, the first editors favored the gentilitial level here, the Tritopatores being ancestral spirits of a group or a family transformed in the process of the rites from polluted into pure.<sup>52</sup> Clinton preferred the city level and rejected the transformation:<sup>53</sup> there simply exist two groups of Tritopatores referred to as polluted and pure; if they were to become pure after the first sacrifice, the law would not say *ἔπειτα τοῖς κ(α)θαροῖς* (and then the pure ones) but *ἔπειτα ὅς καθαροῖς* (and then as pure). The two groups, which might have had two precincts, ought to have shared a single altar.<sup>54</sup>

### A 10

ἡόσπερ τοῖς ἡερόεσι: As ἡόσπερ τοῖς θεοῖς (A 17) and ἡόσπερ τοῖς ἄθανάτοισι (B 12–13; cf. commentary on B 1), this designation seems to be used here technically, referring to ritual performance.<sup>55</sup> Such designations appear occasionally in literature<sup>56</sup> referring mostly to the status of the recipient.<sup>57</sup> Here these designations are likely to govern not only the sacrifice of the animal proper but the entire ritual.

### A 10–11

ὑπολθείψας · δι' ὀρόφο: The requirement to pour the wine down through the roof (Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 30 suggest the same procedure for lines 13–14) probably implies libation into a subterranean or partially subterranean structure, most likely a *heroon*. Pausanias witnessed a similar custom of pouring blood into the grave of a hero through a hole in the roof in Phocis.<sup>58</sup> Pouring liquids onto or into the ground is typical of hero cult and of the cult of the dead.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>52</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 29–30, 53–54, 111; cf. D. Jordan 1997, 70–73. For the purification of the Tritopatores cf. North 1996, 299–300.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Curti and van Bremen 1999, 32.

<sup>54</sup> Clinton 1996a, 172.

<sup>55</sup> Perform the sacrifice as you perform sacrifice to heroes.

<sup>56</sup> See Stengel 1920, 141–143; Scullion 2000, 168–171 stresses the predominance of the status of the recipient over ritual performance.

<sup>57</sup> Sacrifice to X as a hero/god. Both designations appear in the case of Heracles as in Herodotus 2.44, using *θύω* for divine sacrifice and *ἐναγίζω* for heroic (ὡς ἀθανάτω θύουσι, ὡς ἦρωι ἐναγίζουσιν; similarly Pausanias 2.10.1).

<sup>58</sup> 10.4.10. Jameson, Jordan and Kotanski (1993, 30–31) cite the so-called Paestum *hypogeion* as a possible parallel structure. Note Curti and van Bremen's 1999, 30–31 discussion of the complex underneath the *naiskos* of Meilichios and the feasibility of channeling liquids into it (cf. above 368 n. 30).

<sup>59</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 30–31, 70–71; Rudhardt 1992, 246–248; in

Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski (1993, 70) seem right in assuming that the prescription for an extraordinary type of libation does not preclude performance of ordinary libations here.<sup>60</sup> For λείβω (essentially pouring drop by drop) and ὑπολείβω see Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 71; cf. Arena *Iscrizioni* I<sup>2</sup> 108; idem 1997, 434.

#### A 11–12

As is implied, nine parts are to be apportioned. One of these, doubtlessly considered a divine share, is to be burnt entirely for the polluted Tritopatores (as would be other, more common divine portions such as the thighbones and fat); the other eight are likely to be eaten. Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski (1993, 31) suggested that the ninth part came from the two victims offered to Zeus Eumenes and the Eumenides and to Zeus Meilichios. Clinton (1996a, 170–171) is right in finding such a procedure highly unlikely and in suggesting that the polluted Tritopatores receive their own victim expressed by θυμία (line 12).<sup>61</sup> The custom referred to here seems to be echoed in three other inscriptions by the verb ἐνατεύειν. The calendar of Myconos, *LSCG* 96.23–24, specifies τοῦτο ἐνα|τεύεται for a yearling offered to Semele. The two other attestations come from Thasos: *LSS* 63.5 forbids ἐνατεύεσθαι of a victim offered to Thasian Heracles; *IG* XII Suppl. 353.9–10 has βοῦν | [---] [ἐ]νατευθῆι, also in a cult of Heracles. The treatment of the ninth part is not specified in Myconos and Thasos nor is burning it mentioned; it may fall to cult officials, supposedly having been placed on the cult table (cf. Sokolowski *LSS* p. 121). The burning of its counterpart here cannot refute this assumption unequivocally. Sacrificial regulations assume basic familiarity with ordinary practices, highlighting modifications or deviations.<sup>62</sup> Here no instruction is given regarding division into nine parts, and the cursory reference to the ninth parts seems to assume knowledge of this practice in a sacrificial ritual designated as to the heroes. While burning one of the parts as the divine share may be prescribed explicitly to ensure exact performance,

---

general see also F. Graf, Milch, Honig, und Wein: Zum Verständnis der Libation im griechischen Ritual, in *Perennitas: Studi in honore di Angelo Brelich*, Rome, 1980, 209–221; A. Henrichs, The Sobriety of Oedipus: Sophocles *OC* 100 Misunderstood, *HSCP* 87, 1983, 87–100 especially 99–100.

<sup>60</sup> For which see also van Straten 1995, 133–141.

<sup>61</sup> For the word see commentary on 19.8 above.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Part I pp. 55–56.

it can equally well be prescribed because it is extraordinary, perhaps as extraordinary as the peculiar form of libation alongside which it is mentioned.<sup>63</sup>

### A 12

θυόντο θῦμα : καὶ καταγιζόντο hoῖς hoσία: This sentence sums up the entire sacrificial ritual performed for the polluted Tritopatores. While θύω is used generally, referring to the entire sequence of actions, καθαγίζω refers back specifically to burning (κατακαίεν lines 11–12) the ninth portion on the altar.<sup>64</sup> Those to whom it is allowed are to officiate; they would preside over the entire event without necessarily being personally involved in the performance at each stage (the victim may well be divided by a professional).<sup>65</sup> They themselves are required, however, to place the ninth part on the altar<sup>66</sup> and to consecrate it through burning.<sup>67</sup>

### A 13

Καταλίνω has the same meaning as καταλείφω (Jameson, Jordan and Kotanski 1993, 33; Hesychius s.v. ἀλίνειν· ἀλείφειν). The object of the verb is most likely the altar.<sup>68</sup> The action itself should consist in either anointing it with oil or in applying a coat of plaster. Oil for the altar is mentioned in *LSCG* 55.10–11 without specifying its use.<sup>69</sup> Plastering (or whitewashing) the altars in the course of preparing the sanctuary of Aphrodite Pandamos for her procession is mentioned in *LSCG* 39.24–25.<sup>70</sup> Clinton (1996a, 171) adduces further comparable evidence from Eleusis (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 386.153–156 with Clinton 1992, 23; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1672.140–141). Cf. the anointment of the Tabernacle altar with oil upon its

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 70.

<sup>64</sup> See in general Rudhardt 1992, 236–238; Casabona 1966, 200–204; Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 18–20. For the general force of θύω here cf. θυσία in the heading (line 7).

<sup>65</sup> For a comparable distribution of tasks cf. Eur. *IT* 40.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski, 1993, 32. For placing parts on the altar cf. *LSCG* 69.25–26; *LSAM* 24 A 33–34; *Isr.Cos* ED 145.10–11; ED 216 B 11–12.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. commentary on 16.3–4 and 21.12 above. Dubois 1995, 135 and Scullion 2000, 163–164 understand καθαγίζω here as a synonym of ἐναγίζω (cf. n. 57 above).

<sup>68</sup> But see Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 33–35 for alternatives. Curti and van Bremen 1999, 27 translate ‘let them anoint (themselves?) here and in line 16.’

<sup>69</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 34. Cf. *LSCG* 7 B 25 ξύλα (wood) ἐπὶ τὸν βομῶν καὶ ἔ[λαιον].

<sup>70</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski *ibid.*

consecration in Numbers 7:1, 10<sup>71</sup> and the routine application of a coat of lime to the altar in the Herodian temple discussed in the Mishnah (Qodashim) *Midot* 3.4. As Clinton notes, the sacrifices to both sets of Tritopatores would be performed on the same altar after it had been refurbished.<sup>72</sup> Performance in very close succession is unlikely especially if plastering is involved.

#### A 13–17

Sacrifice to the pure Tritopatores as to the gods, performed on the same altar. *Theoxenia*: The divinities are invited to recline on a couch and put on olive wreaths. They are offered a honey mixture to drink in new cups, cakes, and meat. Firstlings are taken from these and placed on the altar where they are burnt together with the cups. Anointment probably of the altar is performed.

#### A 13–14

μελίκρατα: Μελίκρατον δὲ οἱ παλαιοὶ μίγμα φασι μέλιτος καὶ γάλατος ἐνταῦθα. οἱ μέντοι μεθ' Ὅμηρον μέχρη καὶ ἐσάρτι κράμα μέλιτος καὶ ὕδατος τὸ μελίκρατον οἶδασιν.<sup>73</sup> Eustathius on *Od.* 11.10, 1668.23–25. See further Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 72. As they note, the ritual as to the gods would be expected to follow more common patterns than the one as to the heroes. The use of honey mixture rather than wine here is therefore notable: wineless libations (νηφάλια) attested also in the wineless sacrifice to the Tritopatores in Erchia (*LSCG* 18 Δ 41–46) are generally less common than libations of wine used in ordinary Olympian sacrifice (as Jameson, Jordan and Kotanski noted 1993, 72–73). Their use appears to indicate here the recipients less than Olympian character.<sup>74</sup>

#### A 14–16

*Theoxenia*. Although divinities are assigned a share in any ordinary Greek sacrifice, in a *theoxenia* ritual they – the pure Tritopatores here – are formally entertained at a meal with actual food and drink set before

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Exodus 29:36–37 with Milgrom 1991, 278–279.

<sup>72</sup> Clinton 1996a, 171.

<sup>73</sup> The ancients call *melikraton* a mixture of milk and honey. Those after Homer and down to the present time know it as a mixture of honey and water.

<sup>74</sup> Libations are not discussed in the sacrifice to the Tritopatores in *LSCG* 20 B 32 (52–53 is a table offering; the context in *LSCG* 2 D 8–10 is unclear) and may accordingly be ordinary.

them on a table. The ritual must have been common enough: adorning (κοσμήσαι) the table, obviously for *theoxenia*,<sup>75</sup> was a common task of Athenian priests, to judge from frequent references in priestly honorary decrees.<sup>76</sup> Gods may be represented by their actual images as in *LSAM* 32.41 46 (ξόανα).<sup>77</sup> The list of objects dedicated by Diomedon as a part of his foundation (*LSCG* 177.120 130) includes several items to be used in a *theoxenia*: a table, golden crowns for the statues (ἀγάλματα lines 124 125), and a couch (127). See further Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 67 70; Jameson 1994. Actual divine consumption of the food can hardly be expected here as consecration is achieved through burning samples on the altar. As Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski note (1993, 67; cf. Dubois 1995, 136), the couch and the table should probably be understood as direct objects of an omitted προθέμεν used in line 19.

#### A 15

ἐν καιναῖς ποτερίδε[σ]ι: The cups, burnt in the next line, are to be used in this ritual for the first and last time. Ποτηρίς is a new word; see Jameson, Jordan and Kotanski 1993, 35 who note (35 36) that the use of new vessels is prescribed three times in *LSCG* 151 A 60 61, B 25 26, and C 6.

πλάσματα: Clinton has shown (1996a 171 n. 48) that Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski's suggestion (1993, 69) that shaped cakes are meant here is corroborated by the well known *scholion* to Lucian (276.11 16 Rabe), where the same word is used to denote shaped pastries. On cakes see commentary on 23 B 3 above.

κρά: κρέα: Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 36; Dubois 1995, 137; idem 1999, 338.

<sup>75</sup> Dow and Healey 1965, 28; Mikalson 1998, 163; Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 199, 68. The other telltale expression is στρώνυμι vel sim. (spread) referring to the preparation of a couch.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 676.14 15 (sacred officials: Zeus Soter and Athena Soteira); 775.18; [976.6] (priest of Asclepius); 776.12 (priestess of Athena Polias); *SEG* XXXIII 115.29 30 (priestess of Aglauros). Cf. the calendar of Eleusis, *LSCG* 7.12 13.

<sup>77</sup> For the text see Part I pp. 97 98.

**A 15–16, 19**

ἀπ|αρχάμενοι, ἀπάργματα: Ἀπάργματα seem to echo the Homeric sacrificial first fruits ἄργματα of *Od.* 14.446. The use of the noun suggests that the cognate verb denotes here an action consisting in taking samples of the food placed on the table and offering them as firstlings for the divinities. Offerings of firstlings appear elsewhere in eaten sacrifice in Homer, and I have elsewhere suggested that the μασχαλίσματα of 3.16–17 above (cf. commentary ad loc.) might be interpreted in the same context. For ἀπάργματα and ἀπαρχαί cf. Pollux 1.28.

**A 16–17**

The object of the anointment is probably once again the altar (Clinton 1996a 171)<sup>78</sup> and not the cups (Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 62, 69–70) that would be placed on the altar prior to its anointment. The syntax is difficult (Clinton 1996a, 171–172) but possible, and the cups ought to be burnt together with the portions of the offerings used for the *theoxenia* of which they form an integral part.

**A 17**

Θυόντο ὡςπερ τοῖς θεοῖς τὰ πατρώια should be taken as a general statement governing the preceding sacrifice.<sup>79</sup> As in the case of sacrifice as to the heroes, the law names the specific type of sacrificial ritual to be performed, explicitly providing whatever details about the performance are not self-explanatory.

**A 17–21**

Sacrifice to Meilichios in the sanctuary of Euthydamos. *Theoxenia* involving the public *hiara* followed by burning on the altar of the victim's thigh, bones, and firstlings from the table. Meat must be consumed on the spot. Anyone can be invited to participate at will. Repetition after a year at an *oikos* is permitted.

As Clinton noted, the present rituals ought to concern (Zeus) Meilichios. As elsewhere, the set of prescriptions opens with an asyndetic heading with the names of the concerned divinities in the dative.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Dubois 1995, 136.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 36.

**A 17**

Euthydamos: See on *Location of Cult Performance* above.

**A 18**

ἔξῃ(α)ιέτο is probably from ἐξαιρέω (take out): Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski (1993, 22).<sup>80</sup>

τὰ ἡιὰρὰ τὰ δαμόσια: Considering line 7 above, sacri ces might seem preferable for ἡιὰρά,<sup>81</sup> but the word has a wide range of meanings and Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski's (1993, 21–23) public sacred objects, including images,<sup>82</sup> to be used at the sacri ce, is possible considering the *theoxenia* context. B. Jordan contends (1996, 327) that the reference to ἀγάλματα in line 21 obviates the interpretation of the *hiara* as images here, but a distinction between ἀγάλματα, i.e. statues, and portable images is possible. Unless other, unnamed divinities are invited,<sup>83</sup> Meilichios would be the sole guest at the *theoxenia*, as Clinton noted (1996a, 173), since this paragraph appears to concern him alone; the public *hiara* might include his image alongside other objects.

**A 20**

τὰ κρᾶ μὲχφερέτο · καλέτο [h]όντινα λῆι: On the requirement to consume meat on the spot see on 16.5–6 above. Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 39 tentatively took the open invitation as providing the sacri cer and his gentilitial group with an opportunity for re-integration into the community through the participation of non-group members. Clinton's suggestion (1996a, 173–174) that it is connected to the need to consume a considerable amount of meat on the spot is easier. For an invitation to partake in a public sacri cial feast see *LSCG* 98.9–11.

<sup>80</sup> Other possibilities (ibid. 1993, 21, 22) ἐξῃ(κ)έτω (let him go out to the public shrines cf. Chaniotis EBGR 1993/1994 no. 121 (p. 280)) and ἐξῃ(ε)ιέτω from ἐξείρω (put forward; cf. Arena *Iscrizioni* I<sup>2</sup> 110–111; idem 1997, 436: ἐξῃιέτω) are less convincing.

<sup>81</sup> Graham (1995, 367) understanding ἐξῃ(α)ιέτο as remove.

<sup>82</sup> For this meaning see Casabona 1966, 8.

<sup>83</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski (1993, 64) take the recipients of this sacri ce to be the Tritopatores and Zeus ἐν Εὐθυδάμῳ (or perhaps all the figures mentioned so far).

**A** 20–21

As Clinton noted (1996a, 174), the first repetition concerns the victim, the second the place of cult performance.<sup>84</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski's interpretation (1993, 39–40) of *oikos* as home is the use of the locative.<sup>85</sup> Clinton (1996a, 174) may nevertheless be justified in considering a sacred building, perhaps the public *hiara*-depot or even a temple. This could fit the next restored stipulation requiring a bovine to be slaughtered in front of statues. Sacrifice in front of statues is prescribed in the foundation of Kritolaos, *LSS* 61.74–81, where the same mode of slaughtering is employed. For sacrifice on altars placed in front of statues see the two private foundations from Calauria *LSCG* 59.11–14 (πρὸ τῶν εἰκόνων); 58.5–8 (παρὰ τὴν εἰκόνα).<sup>86</sup> For ἀγάλματα see commentary on line 18 above. The sacred house (οἶκος τεμένι-ος ἱερός/ἱερὸς οἶκος) lodging κοινὰ or πατρῷα ἱερά, perhaps statues and/or cult implements of the phratry document from Chios, *LSCG* 118, discussed in Part I p. 37, may be relevant here.<sup>87</sup>

σφαζόντο: The action expressed in the verb refers to a particular mode of slaughtering in which the animal's throat is pierced with the blood flowing down.<sup>88</sup> Whereas slaughtering of this sort may be practiced in ordinary eaten sacrifice where the blood would be made to flow onto the altar or be collected in a vessel<sup>89</sup> and thrown on it,<sup>90</sup> it is commonly associated with a variety of uneaten sacrifices—especially in the cult of the dead, in hero cult, and before battle,<sup>91</sup> where blood plays a central role serving a variety of ends. The destination of the flow of the blood, frequently expressed by εἰς plus the accusative as in **B** 13, depends on the aim or on the context of the sacrifice and

<sup>84</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 29, 53, have the sacrifice involving the public *hiara* concern the Tritopatores.

<sup>85</sup> Curti and van Bremen 1999, 26–27 assume a collective ritual for the whole community, envisioning follow-ups at home on a private or group level.

<sup>86</sup> For these three foundations see Part I pp. 83–84.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 37.

<sup>88</sup> The cognate noun σφάγιον, mostly used in the plural σφάγια, may be employed for victims and for the ritual. The mode of slaughtering is particularly well illustrated on a vase from Cleveland: Jameson, 1991, 218 g 1; van Straten 1995, g 112 with p. 106. In general see Casabona 1966, esp. 154–174, 180–186; Rudhardt 1992, 272–281.

<sup>89</sup> Namely a σφαγεῖον (ἄμνιον in Homer); cf. Photius s.v. σφαγεῖον· τὸ ἀγγεῖον εἰς ὃ τὸ αἷμα τῶν σφαζομένων ἱερείων δέχονται (the vessel in which they receive the victims' blood). Cf. Casabona 1966, 180.

<sup>90</sup> See van Straten 1995, 104–105.

<sup>91</sup> On which see Jameson 1991.



may include the earth,<sup>92</sup> a river,<sup>93</sup> the sea,<sup>94</sup> or vessels.<sup>95</sup> All of these are evidently mentioned in the second century A.D. in a single sentence in the Mishnah ((Qodashim) *Hulin* 2.9) that warns its readers against slaughtering into seas, rivers, or vessels, as into a pit, due to the danger of imitating heathen worship. In **B** 13 below the use of this mode of slaughtering in what is otherwise an ordinary eaten sacrifice suggests a mixed ritual. An eaten context is not impossible here: although destruction of an animal would be in line with the destruction of the leg in line 19 or the ninth part in line 11, destroying a whole bovine seems too extraordinary. One way or the other, in the case of such a large animal as a bovine, the victim's throat would probably have been pierced after it had first been knocked out with a blow to the head.<sup>96</sup>

### Column B

This column appears to comprise two main sections. One sets out ritual proceedings for a purification from *elasteroi*; the other discusses further applications in particular cases; the text ends with a stipulation concerning sacrifice to an *elasteros*. Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski (1993, 54–56, 58–59, 75–76, 119) equated the procedure in lines 1–7 with the first paragraph of the section on *hikesioi* in the cathartic law of Cyrene (*LSS* 115 B 29–59),<sup>97</sup> prescribing a ritual to rid a person of a visitant ghost, referred to as *ἰκέσιος ἐπακτός*, through hosting *gurines* (*κολοσ(σ)οί*) at a meal. They matched the Selinus [*ἡ*]ποδεκόμενος (lines 3–4) with the Cyrene host (*ὑποδεξάμενον* B 36), the *elasteroi* with the Cyrene *ἰκέσιος ἐπακτός*, and the offering of the water for washing, a

<sup>92</sup> As in **B** 13 below. Cf. the slaughtering over a grave in *Hdt.* 5.5. In *Od.* 11.35–36 a similar action seems to be expressed with the blood collected in a hole in the ground, although ἀποδειροτομέω is used there. In a purificatory context cf. the slaughtering (ἐπισφάζω) of the piglet for purification at meetings of the assembly in Athens: Schol. in *Aeschin.* 1.23.

<sup>93</sup> As the Strymon in *Hdt.* 7.13 into which the magi slaughter white horses to obtain good omens *en route* to Ennea Hodoi.

<sup>94</sup> As in *Hdt.* 6.76 where Cleomenes slaughters (σφαγάζομαι is used) a bull into the sea (σφαγιασάμενος δὲ τῇ θαλάσῃ ταύρον) *en route* to Sepeia.

<sup>95</sup> As in *Xen. An.* 2.2.9 where the blood of a bull, a boar, and a ram is collected in a shield and used in an oath ceremony or in *Hdt.* 3.11 where the blood of Phanes children is collected in a crater, mixed with wine and water and drunk before a battle. For oaths cf. also *LSAM* 88.

<sup>96</sup> I follow van Straten 1995, 107–109. This method is used on a pig in the sacrifice of Eumaeus in *Od.* 14.425–426.

<sup>97</sup> See above pp. 283–284 Additional Note to no. 17.

meal, and salt at Selinus (line 4) with serving the Cyrene *gurines* a portion of everything (ὑποδεξάμενον παρτιθ[έ]μεν τὸ μέρος πάντων B 36 37). Clinton noted, however, that with a change of subjects the [ἡ]ποδεκόμενος at Selinus functions more like the person who in the third Cyrene paragraph hosts the homicide (αὐτοφόνος) suppliant and puri es him;<sup>98</sup> αὐ[τορέκται] should be restored in line 4 instead of αὐ[τῷ]; the purpose of the present regulations is to purify a murderer from *elasteroi*, vengeful spirits comparable not to the ἰκέσιος ἐπακτός of the first Cyrene paragraph but to the better known Erinyes.<sup>99</sup> The host is also identifiable as the ἀφικετεύων ἢ δεκόμε[ενος], doubtless functioning similarly in the decree from Lindus, no. 17 above (see commentary there), although in contrast to the Cyrene and Lindus documents, at Selinus the homicide is not presented as a suppliant and the pronounced end of the present process is rather narrowly defined as purification from *elasteroi*. Despite disagreement in some details, all three documents share key elements and are evidently modeled upon the procedure pan-Greek (so Herodotus 1.35) though not entirely uniform of purifying a homicide.<sup>100</sup> The protagonists in the action here are for the most part private individuals.<sup>101</sup> Some of them may be familiar with the basics of the present procedure. It is, however, extraordinary by nature, and this, alongside the seriousness of the subject matter and the relative complexity of the performance, justifies the detailed format.

### **B** 1–7

A homicide wishing to purify himself from *elasteroi* is to make an announcement declaring his wish. A host is to offer him water to wash himself, food, and salt. The homicide sacrifices a piglet to Zeus (this is not a purificatory sacrifice). He then departs from the host. As an unpolluted person, he is free to act normally and may be spoken to by others.

<sup>98</sup> The change of subjects is less peculiar considering the changes from plural to singular and vice versa and the lack of subjects for most of the verbs in **A**.

<sup>99</sup> Clinton 1996a, 174–179.

<sup>100</sup> See commentary on 17 above. Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 56 n. 2, 76 considered and discarded a similar interpretation.

<sup>101</sup> But see commentary on line 10.

**B 1**

The word αὐτορ(ε)έκτας is otherwise unknown. Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski s (1993, 44–45) homicide has been contested but is compatible with other αὐτο- compounds referring to homicide,<sup>102</sup> ts the context, and seems preferable to the alternatives.<sup>103</sup>

*Elasteros*:<sup>104</sup> Ελάστερος is otherwise known only as an epithet of Zeus on Paros where he receives a libation of honey in *LSS* 62.<sup>105</sup> As Jameson, Jordan and Kotanski realized, the word is related to ἀλάστωρ or ἀλάστορος attested as an epithet of Zeus.<sup>106</sup> Ἀλάστωρ is identified with a vengeful Zeus by Cornutus (10.20–11.4) and Hesychius (s.v.).<sup>107</sup> Relations between the *elasteroi* and Zeus are suggested here too by the sacrifice to Zeus in line 5 that ends the purification process in the first section. An *elasteros* appears to be a divine being as he may receive sacrifices as to the immortals in lines 12–13. But this designation does not necessarily express the divine status of the recipient but merely describes the type of ritual to be performed (cf. commentary on **A** 10). The fact that a homicide may need to get purified from *elasteroi* and the requirement that the blood of the victim flow onto the ground reveal the true character of the *elasteroi*. Divine though they are, they are not Olympians but harmful netherworld divinities;<sup>108</sup> their task is evidently to pursue

<sup>102</sup> Αὐτοφόνος, αὐτόχειρ, αὐθέντης, αὐτουργός/ια (containing the same elements as αὐτόρρεκτας).

<sup>103</sup> Dubois (1995, 1999) translates coupable (agent responsable 1995, 139); Schwabl 1996 similarly suggests Schuldige. Giuliani (1998, 78) understands autore diretto or colui che materialmente/personalmente compiuto l'azione and similarly to Dubois (1995, 139–140) notes (1998, 71–74) that homicide is too serious for the city to leave purification private; the spirit-ridden *autorrektas* would not be a homicide. One should note, however, that the purification proper here strictly speaking only from *elasteroi* does not necessarily absolve a homicide from the act of killing and is different from a trial.

<sup>104</sup> Jameson, Jordan and Kotanski 1993, Ch. V.6.

<sup>105</sup> To Jameson, Jordan and Kotanski s 1993, 116–117 list of other Parian attestations should now be added *SEG* XLVIII 1136 and 1183 (= Matthaïou 1992–1998, 424–430 nos. 1 and 2).

<sup>106</sup> Jameson, Jordan and Kotanski 1993, 117–118, citing for Zeus Alastoros the two inscriptions from Paros colony Thasos published by C. Rolley, *BCH* 89, 1965, 442–446 nos. 1, 4. On the vocalization see A.M. Matthaïou, Ἐλάστερος Ἀλάστορος, *Horos* 13, 1999, 241–242.

<sup>107</sup> Jameson, Jordan and Kotanski 1993, 118.

<sup>108</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 116. Clinton (1996a, 179) is more cautious. North (1996, 299–300) suggests that by the end of the column the *elasteros* undergoes a transformation (comparable to that suggested by the first editors for the Tritopatores in column A (see above) into a divine figure.

murderers.<sup>109</sup> As Clinton has noticed (1996a, 175–177), Jameson, Jordan and Kotanski's equation of the *elasteros* with the Cyrene *ἰκέσιος ἐπακτός*, a visitant of an unclear divine status purposely sent by one person against another, is problematic. Clinton's (1996a, 179) equation with the Erinyes is more likely, especially considering Euripides *IT* 970–971 where Orestes mentions the Erinyes who kept driving *ἡλάστρουν* him.

### **B** 2–3

I have followed Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 40–41 in referring the place, time, and direction to the circumstances of the proclamation. Dubois 1995, 41 (for the forms see idem 1999, 339, 342) refers them to the contents of the proclamation (i.e. the place, time etc. of the purification), which appears to make the meaning of *λόπι* more difficult. An announcement is evident at Cyrene (*LSS* 115 B 51–52); cf. the participation of an announcer at a later stage (B 55) and the reference to heralds at Lindus (17.7 above).

### **B** 3

*π{ο}ροειπόν*: For the additional omicron see Dubois 1995, 129–130; idem 1999, 337.

### **B** 4–5

The offering of water (for washing), food, and salt by a host to a guest is very common.<sup>110</sup> Here water for washing is obviously provided for purification purposes. At Cyrene (*LSS* 115 B 52–53) the host seats the suppliant on a white *beece* at the threshold, washes him, and anoints him. Washing is evident in the regulations of the Athenian eupatrids.<sup>111</sup> The offering of food and salt at the very outset of the process is probably a token of hospitality.<sup>112</sup> A shared meal, to be counted among

<sup>109</sup> Clinton 1996a, 179.

<sup>110</sup> See Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 42. Salt is entitled the purifying table-mate of hosts and guests (τὸν ξένοις σύνδορπον ἀγνίτην πάγον) in Lycophron's *Alexandra* 134–135 and the scholia expound (inter alia) εἶχον γὰρ πάλαι τοὺς ἄλας ἐν ταῖς τραπέζαις σύμβολον ξενοδοχίας (in the old times they used to have salt on their tables as a token of hospitality). For salt as a purifying agent cf. commentary on line 11 below. For offerings of food and water for washing see e.g. *Od.* 172–176 (cf. Gould 1973, 79 with note 35); Genesis 18:4–9.

<sup>111</sup> Athenaeus 9.410a–b = *FGrHist* 356 F 1; F. Jacoby, *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*, Oxford, 1949, 27–28; Parker 1983, 317; Burkert 2000, 211.

<sup>112</sup> Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 42; Burkert 2000, 211.

the elements marking the integration or reintegration of the homicide into society,<sup>113</sup> is implied in the eupatrids regulations reference to those who eat the *splanchna*. Here it would follow the sacrifice of the piglet. Despite the use of the blood of slaughtered piglets in the purification of murderers, as is so vividly illustrated by Apollonius Rhodius,<sup>114</sup> there is nothing here to suggest that the present one is not consumed;<sup>115</sup> it most probably is and, furthermore, the sacrifice marks the culmination of the ritual.<sup>116</sup> This sacrifice is not purificatory but a normal sacrifice. It is not performed as a part of the purificatory ritual but rather after purification is completed, indicating that the homicide is now engaging in normal activity as an unpolluted person.<sup>117</sup>

### B 5

Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski (1993, 42) saw in ἐξ αὐτῷ a reference to a sanctuary where the public altar of line 10 is likely to have stood. Clinton has shown that it is more likely to refer to the host.<sup>118</sup> Deciding upon the location of the sacrifice ought to have been his prerogative and it may have taken place in front of his house.<sup>119</sup>

περιστ{ι}ραφέσθω: For the additional iota see Dubois 1995, 129–130; idem 1999, 337.

### B 6

ποταγορέσθω: ἀγορέω (previously undocumented) = ἀγορεύω: Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 43; from προσηγορέω: Dubois 1995, 141.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. Clinton 1996a, 176.

<sup>114</sup> *Arg.* 4 esp. 703–709. See also Aesch. *Eum.* 280–283, 448–450; *LIMC* III 64 s.v. Erinyes, VII 48 s.v. Orestes; Parker 1983, 386–388; cf. Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 42–43. Piglets may of course be used for purification in other cases.

<sup>115</sup> Had a sacrifice other than eaten been envisioned, the law – exceptionally careful with sacrificial terminology – would probably not have used θύω here or would have at least been more specific.

<sup>116</sup> Burkert (2000, 210–211) maintains that both purification with blood and eating are meant here. The reference to sacrifice at Cyrene (*LSS* 115 B 58) is unfortunately very obscure but could possibly be interpreted in a similar context. The lower part of the stone is completely defaced and should caution against assuming that the procedure ended where the text breaks off.

<sup>117</sup> Cf. Clinton forthcoming.

<sup>118</sup> Dubois (1995, 141) suggests a separation between the subject and the vengeful spirit or rather a representation of it used in the ritual. Burkert (2000, 211) translates from his own, understanding that the purifier is required to pay for the piglet.

<sup>119</sup> Clinton 1996a, 176.

The silence of the homicide prior to completion of his purification is stressed in Aeschylus *Eum.* 448.<sup>120</sup> It is also evident in Cyrene (*LSS* 115 B 54) where, as the homicide marches along the public road, all are required to keep silent: obviously no one is allowed to talk to the murderer or vice versa.

### **B 7–11**

The ritual proceedings set out in the first section are applied in particular cases in this section.<sup>121</sup> The crux is the qualification of the *elasteros* as ξενικός, πατρῷος, ἐπακουστός, ἐφορατός, and any whatsoever (lines 7–8). Clinton makes a good case for seeing here a gradation in the gravity of the act, proceeding from uncharacterized homicide to more serious cases of homicide of a ξένος, i.e. a guest (or a host), and homicide of a blood relative.<sup>122</sup> In these cases the *elasteros* might make its presence known, i.e. affect the mind or body of the pursued, as seen, heard, or in any other way.<sup>123</sup> Purification is to be obtained in the way outlined above but gradation is evident here too. The sacrificial victim is upgraded from a piglet to (in all probability) a full-grown sheep offered now (probably to Zeus again) on the public altar and the sacrifice is to be followed by an additional marking of a boundary and sprinkling.<sup>124</sup> Others have suggested, on the other hand, that the second sacrifice would govern both the purification of the *autorrektas* and of the cases mentioned in lines 7–8.<sup>125</sup> If this is correct, it follows that the purification of the *autorrektas* not completed with the piglet sacrifice would be repeated in the case of persons wishing to rid themselves of other *elasteroi*, of various origins, heard or seen.<sup>126</sup>

<sup>120</sup> Burkert 2000, 210; Parker 1983, 371 for further references.

<sup>121</sup> North (1996, 297) considers that neither section deals with homicides who are only referred to as a parallel or that both sections deal with a single, two-stage process for which cf. also Giuliani 1998, esp. 75–78, focusing on the sacrifices and understanding the first (line 5) to be cathartic (*contra* see commentary ad loc.).

<sup>122</sup> Similarly Dubois 1995, 141–142 citing Apoll. Rhod. *Arg.* 4.716–717.

<sup>123</sup> For the maddening effect of vengeful spirits on a killer one only need recall Orestes.

<sup>124</sup> Clinton 1996a, 177–179.

<sup>125</sup> Burkert 2000, 212; cf. Giuliani 1998, 75–78; North 1996, 297. For the *autorrektas* see commentary on **B 1** above.

<sup>126</sup> Burkert (2000, 209) suggests that the ξενικός is sent like the Cyrene ικέσιος ἐπακτός by magic from outside and that the πατρῷος is from within a family. He notes (2000, 212) that while the process is private at the outset, the city steps in for the concluding public sacrifice. Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski (1993, 44) understand foreign or ancestral, taking heard or seen to be manifestations other than through declarations of the

**B 9**

Burkert's punctuation<sup>127</sup> is possible but not mandatory. If it is accepted, the translation of the two sentences would run: If someone wishes to purify himself with respect to a guest/host (? or: foreign?) or ancestral (*elasteros*), either heard or seen or any whatsoever, he shall purify himself in the same way as the homicide. When he has purified himself from an *elasteros*, having sacrificed a full-grown victim on the public altar, he shall be pure. This does not preclude the possibility that the sacrifice in line 10 belongs only to the cases discussed in lines 7–8. The law may merely distinguish between purification proper and the sacrifice marking the apex of the procedure.

**B 10**

ἱερεῖον is glossed in the *Etymologicum Magnum* (s.v.) as τὸ πρόβατον (sheep). This is consistent with *LSCG* 88.13–14 βοὸς μὲν χιλίους διακοσίους | ἱερείου δὲ καὶ αἰγὸς τριακοσίους (for a bovine 1200; for a sheep and for a goat 300).<sup>128</sup> Note, however, Hesychius and the *Suda* s.v. ἱερεῖον· θύμα, πᾶν τὸ θυόμενον (anything sacrificed) θεῶ. Cf. commentary on **A 9** above.

ἐπὶ τῷ βομῷ τῷ δαμοσίῳ: The sacrifice on the public altar<sup>129</sup> implies an interest in the proceedings on the part of the city and may involve priests (cf. the reference to priests at Lindus in 17.7 above). The absence of the city in the first section should not be taken as lack of interest but rather as an indication for a civic endorsement of a procedure enacted by private protagonists (cf. Burkert 2000). The possible involvement of priests here may be due to the relative gravity of the offence, though even it should not overshadow the importance of the host in the procedure.

---

dead man's relatives. B. Jordan (1995, 328) tentatively takes all adjectives as referring to persons; ἑπακουστός and ἐφορατός refer to a man overheard or seen committing the crime. Giuliani (1998, esp. 81–82) takes ξενικός and πατρῷος as referring to the source of pollution.

<sup>127</sup> 2000, 208; cf. Giuliani 1998, 75.

<sup>128</sup> Ziehen *LGS* II p. 249 n. 1; Stengel 1920, 123. The Aramaic of the trilingual stele from the Letoon at Xanthus (see Part I pp. 82–83), has (line 15) *nqwh* for the Greek ἱερεῖον (line 25). The word seems to denote a sheep rather than a generic victim; see *DNWSI* s.v.

<sup>129</sup> From which a homicide would be barred before purification: Aesch. *Choe.* 291; Eur. *IT* 381–383.

**B 11**

διορίζας ἡλὶ καὶ χρυσοῖ ἀπορανάμενος: Χρυσοῖ probably refers to a golden vessel. Cf. the similar use of ἀπὸ χρυσίου in *LSCG* 154 A 30 and *passim* (χρυσίωι in B 15 is an even closer parallel) and Iamblichus, *VP* 153 ἢ χρυσῶ ἢ θαλάττῃ (sea water) περιορραίνεσθαι.<sup>130</sup> Sprinkling is prescribed after a sacrificial act in A 12 13. Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski (1993, 45) suggest that the purpose of boundary marking – perhaps to be taken with sprinkling as a single action – is here to separate the subject from the altar.<sup>131</sup> The use of salt, particularly sea water (θάλασσα κλύζει (washes) πάντα τὰνθρώπων κακά: Euripides *IT* 1193), is common and well-attested. See e.g. Theophrastus *Char.* 16.12 13; Lycophron *Alex.* 134 135 with scholia; Schol. *Il.* 1.314; *LSCG* 97 A 14 16; Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski, 1993, 45; Parker 1983, 227.

**B 13**

For σφαζέτο see above commentary on A 20 21. The mixed sacrificial ritual – ordinary divine sacrifice with the blood flowing onto the ground – is explained by the identity of the recipient: a divine being of netherworld affiliation (cf. commentary on line 1 above). The motive for the sacrifice is not mentioned. If an *elasteros* is the recipient of the sacrifice on the public altar, the stipulation might refer back to it. Otherwise, some *elasteroi* may persist and require recurrent sacrifices.<sup>132</sup>

<sup>130</sup> See further Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, 33, 45.

<sup>131</sup> Dubois 1995, 142 takes διορίζας separately (see above *Restorations*).

<sup>132</sup> Dubois (1995, 142) takes the *elasteros* here to be Zeus Elasteros. For the sacrifice see also Schwabl 1996, 286; Burkert 2000, 211–212.





## APPENDICES



## APPENDIX A

### THE PUNIC MARSEILLES TARIFF *CIS* I 165; *KAI* 69. CA. THIRD CENTURY B.C.

The so-called Marseilles Tariff, as it came to be known after its findspot, was discovered in early 1845 or late 1844 in the foundations of an old house near the port of Marseilles. Fragments of similar documents were subsequently discovered at Carthage.<sup>1</sup> Considering that the type of stone used seems to point to Carthage, Carthage appears to be the original provenance. This is therefore likely to be a *pietre errante*, which reached Marseilles on board a ship where it might have been used as ballast.<sup>2</sup> In its current form, the inscription comprises two conjoined fragments (*a-b*). The top, bottom, and right sides survive with intermittent damage; a substantial piece is lost on the left, broken diagonally from top to bottom. The remainder seems to amount to about three-fourths of the original stone. It comprises some twenty-one lines, which become progressively lacunose from top to bottom; the last line appears to have been the last line of the original.<sup>3</sup>

H. 0.40, W. 0.555, Th. 0.04.

I present here a text<sup>4</sup> based on the the text in *KAI* and a minimally interpretative translation with a few notes. For commentaries and basic bibliography see *CIS* I 165; *KAI* 69; M.G. Guzzo Amadasi, *Le iscrizioni fenicie e puniche delle colonie in occidente*, Rome 1967, 169–183 no. 3; F. Rosenthal *ANET* pp. 656–657; D. Pardee *COS* I 98 (pp. 305–309).

ca. saec III a.

*b*

*a* בת בעלצפן בע[ת המש]אתת אש טנ[א שלשם האש אש על המשא]תת עת [ר חלצ]בעל השפט  
בן בדתנת בן בד[אשמן וחלצבעל]

השפט בן בדאשמן בן חלצבעל וח[ברנם] *vacat*

באלף כלל אם צועת אם שלם כלל לכהנם כסף עשרת 10 באחד ובכלל יכן לם עלת פן  
המשאט 1 ש[אר משקל שלש מאת 300]

<sup>1</sup> The so-called Carthage Tariff(s), *CIS* I 167 (*KAI* 74), 169, 170, 3915, 3916 (*KAI* 75), 3917; for an English translation of different fragments as a single document see *ANET* p. 657 (F. Rosenthal). See the commentary in *KAI*.

<sup>2</sup> *KAI* II 83.

<sup>3</sup> *CIS* I p. 220.

<sup>4</sup> I have allowed myself to employ Classical editorial conventions to denote vacant spaces and lacunae. The superlinear circellus equals the Classical sublinear dot.

- 4 ובצועת קצרת ויצלת וכן הערת והשלבם והפעמם ואחרי השאר לבעל הזבח *vacat*  
 בעגל אש קרני למבמחרסר באטומטא אם באיל כלל אם צו[עת] אם שלם כלל לכהנם כסף  
 חמשת [5] באחד ובכלל יכן לם על-  
 ת פן המשאת ז שאר משקל מאת וחמשם 150 ובצועת קצרת ויצלת וכן הערת והשלבם  
 והפע[מם] ואחרי השאר לבעל הזבח  
 ביבל אם בעז כלל אם צועת אם שלם כלל לכהנם כסף שקל 1 זר 2 באחד ובצועת יכן  
 לם עלת פן המשאת ז קצרת  
 8 ויצלת וכן הערת והשלבם והפעמם ואחרי השאר לבעל הזבח *vacat*  
 באמר אם בגדא אם בצרב איל כלל אם צועת אם שלם כנ[ל] ל לכהנם כסף רבע שלשת זר  
 2] באחד ובצועת יכן לם על-  
 [ת] פן המשאת ז קצרת ויצלת וכן הערת והשלבם והפעמם ואחרי השאר לבעל [הזבח *vacat*  
 [בצ]פר אננן אם צץ שלם כל[ל] אם שצף אם חזות לכהנם כסף רבע שלשת זר 2 באחד וכן  
 השנאר לבעל הזבח  
 12 [ע]ל צפר אם קדמת קדשת אם זבח צד אם זבח שמן לכהנם כסף א[גרת] 10 לבאחד [- - -]  
 [ב]כל צועת אש יעמס פנת אלם יכן לכהנם קצרת ויצלת ו[ב]צועת [- - -]  
 [ע]ל בלל ועל חלב ועל חלב ועל כל זבח אש אדם לזבח במנח[ת] י[כן] לכהנים [- - -]  
 בכל זבח אש יזבח דל מקנא אם דל צפר בל יכן לכהנם מנם *vacat*  
 16 כל מזרח וכל שפח וכל מרוח אלם וכל אדם אש יזבח [- - -]  
 האדמם המת משאת על זבח אחד כמדת שת בכתב[ת] [- - -]  
 [כ]ל משאת אש איבל שת בפס ז ונתן לפי הכתבת אש [כתב] - - - האשם אש על המשאתות עת  
 ר חלצבעל בן בדתנ-  
 ת וחלצבעל בן בדאשמן וחברנם *vacat*  
 20 כל כהן אש יקה משאת בדץ לאש שת בפס ז ונענ[ש] [- - -]  
 [כ]ל בעל זבח אש איבל יתן את כ[. . .] ל המשאת אש [- - -]

### Translation

Temple of Ba'al Šaphon. Tariff of fees which [the thirty men in charge of fees] set up in the time of Hillešba'al<sup>5</sup> the *suffet* son of Bodtinnit son of Bodesmun, [head(?)], [and Hillešba'al] the *suffet* son of Bodesmun son of Hillešba'al and their colleagues.

(3) For an ox, whether *kll* (offering), *šw't* (offering), or *šlm kll* (offering), the priests (shall receive) ten (shekels) silver for each (sacri ce). And for *kll* (offering) they shall receive in addition to this fee meat [weighing three hundred]. And for *šw't* (offering) the *qsrt* and the *yšlt* and likewise the skins and the *šlbm* and the *p'mm* and the rest of the meat (shall belong) to the one offering the sacri ce.

(5) For a calf that is missing his horns naturally (? *ʔwmtʔ*), or for a deer (? or: ram), whether *kll*, *šw't*, or *šlm kll*, the priests shall receive ve

<sup>5</sup> Pardee's transcriptions of names have been followed; vocalization might be disputed in some cases.

(shekels of) silver [for each and for a *kll* they shall receive] in addition to this fee meat weighing one hundred and fty. And for *šw't* the *qšrt* and the *yšlt* and likewise the skins and the *šlbm* and the *p'mm* [and the rest of the meat (shall belong) to the one offering the sacri ce].

(7) For a ram or a goat, whether *kll*, *šw't*, or *šlm kll*, the priests shall receive one shekel of silver (and) two *zr* for each. And for *šw't* they shall receive [in addition to this fee the *qšrt*] and the *yšlt* and likewise the skins and the *šlbm* and the *p'mm* and the rest of the meat (shall belong) to the one offering the sacri ce.

(9) For a lamb, a kid, or a *šrb yl*, whether *kll*, *šw't*, or *šlm kll*, the priests shall receive three-fourths of (a shekel of) silver (and) [two *zr* for each and for *šw't* they shall receive in] addition to this fee the *qšrt* and the *yšlt* and likewise the skins and the *šlbm* and the *p'mm* and the rest of the meat (shall belong) to the one offering the [sacri ce].

(11) For a bird, whether *'gm* or *šš*, whether *šlm kll*, *ššp*, or *hzt*, the priests shall receive three-quarters of a (shekel) of silver (and) two *zr* for each and the meat shall belong [to the one offering the sacri ce].

(12) For a bird, whether *kdmt kdšt*, a game (bird) sacri ce, or (bird?) fat sacri ce, the priest shall receive ten *'grt* of silver for each [- - -]

(13) For every *šw't* which (anyone) brings before the god the priests shall receive the *qšrt* and *yšlt* and for *šw't* [- - -]

(14) For mixed flour and oil(?) offerings and for milk and for fat (offerings) and for each sacri ce which a man may sacri ce as an offering to the god(?) [the priests] shall receive [- - -]

(15) For each sacri ce which a person poor in cattle or in birds sacri ces the priests shall not receive [a thing].

(16) Any association, any clan, any fellow-drinkers association (in honor) of a god (*mrzḥ 'lm*), and any men who sacri ce [- - -] (17) these men [shall pay] a fee for each sacri ce according to what is set in the document [- - -]

(18) Any fee which is not set in this tablet shall be given according to the written document which [the men in charge of fees in the time of Ḥillešba'al son of Bodtinnit, head(?),] and Ḥillešba'al son of Bodesmun and their colleagues [wrote].

(20) Any priest who takes a fee against what is set in this tablet shall be ned [- - -] (21) Any person who offers sacri ce who does not give the [- - -] the fee which [is set in this tablet - - -].

## Notes

Despite its fragmentary state, the contents of the document are quite clear. It lists animals and types of offerings, and discusses priestly prerogatives and the distribution of parts between priests and worshippers. There is no mention of divine portions. The officiating priests receive prerogatives in cash and kind. Cash prerogatives seem to be paid to them directly. Among the Greek sacrificial tariffs,<sup>6</sup> a similar situation might be detected in *LSCG* 45.2–7 and *Ischr.Cos* ED 216 B 2–8, but worshippers are commonly instructed to put the money in a *thesauros*. The animals appear to be listed in a hierarchical order according to size and age.<sup>7</sup> The list of animals (lines 3–12) opens with full-grown bovines and ends with birds. We note a similarity in Parker and Obbink 2000, lines 10–12 and in no. 9 above. Most Greek sacrificial tariffs are arranged hierarchically; the order might, however, be descending (as here) or ascending (notably *Ischr.Cos* ED 216 B 2–8). In line 13 the Marseilles Tariff considers specifically the *sw't* offering; line 14 discusses a particular non-blood offering. Line 15 makes a special consideration of the poor: the priests receive no prerogative from their sacrifice. Offerings by groups are discussed in lines 16–17. Lines 18–19 consider fees not covered in the present document. The tariff ends with punishment clauses for greedy priests (line 20) and reluctant worshippers (line 21); these appear also in Greek sacred laws.<sup>8</sup>

*Date.* The date depends entirely upon letter forms, and the inscription has been assigned both to the late fourth-early third century and to the third century B.C.<sup>9</sup>

*Line 1*

Tariff of fees: *b' [t hms] 'tt*. There is disagreement as to the exact translation of these two heading words by which the document identifies itself. The label 'Tariff' was deemed inaccurate (Delcor 1990, 87–89). It has persisted, for better or for worse.

In the time of Hillešba'al É , [head(?)] : *'t [r Hls] b'l*. *'t [r]* is secure considering *CIS* I 170.1. Less so is the significance of *r* (*DNWSI* s.v. r<sub>1</sub>). For the meaning 'head' see Pardee *COS* I 306 n. 7; 'lord/great' (i.e. in

<sup>6</sup> See Part I pp. 61–62.

<sup>7</sup> The following analysis is based on that of Pardee (*COS* I no. 98).

<sup>8</sup> See Part I p. 43 and 20.21–23 with commentary.

<sup>9</sup> Pardee *COS* I p. 305; *KAI* II 83.

the time of the lord(s) Ḥillešba'al etc.) have also been understood (*CIS* I p. 261; *KAI* II 83; *ANET* 656).

*Lines 3–4*

Attempts to reconstruct the sacrificial categories evident in the tariff have primarily relied upon comparison with the Israelite system as evident in the Levitical code. Etymology of its first component renders the Punic *šlm kll*<sup>10</sup> a likely counterpart of the Israelite *šlamim* (well being, also known as peace offering), equaling the common Greek eaten sacrifice; the Punic *šlm kll* would be a whole well being offering. Less clear are the cases of the Punic *kll*<sup>11</sup> and the diversely interpreted *šw't*. See especially Pardee in *COS* I 98 (pp. 305–309).

Both the *qšrt* and the *yšlt* are parts of the victim. Multiple suggestions have been made regarding their identity. See *DNWSI* svv. *qšrh* and *yšlh*.

As the *p'mm* are likely to be feet of the victim, the *šlbm* might be the legs/thighs though other suggestions have been made. See *DNWSI* svv. *p'm<sub>2</sub>* 1 and *slb<sub>2</sub>*.

*Line 5*

*ʔwmʔ*: This word is commonly considered to be a loan word from Greek. Several derivations have been attempted including, perhaps most convincingly, one from *αὐτόματος*: the horns missing naturally/of their own accord would serve as an age marker.<sup>12</sup> See *DNWSI* s.v.

*Line 9*

*šrb ʔl*: A ram, deer, and several other possibilities have been suggested. See *DNWSI* s.vv. *ʔl<sub>2</sub>* and *šrb<sub>1</sub>*.

*Lines 11*

*ʔgn* and *šš* are birds, again of disputed identities. See *DNWSI* s.vv. *ʔgn* and *šš<sub>1</sub>*.

*ššp* and *ḥzt* may refer to the type of the sacrifices. *ḥzt* (*DNWSI* s.v. *ḥzh*) might be divination/augury-related sacrifice which, inter alia, has

<sup>10</sup> M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, *Ugarit-Forschungen* 7, 1975, 561, take the second *kll* with the following *lkhnm* (as a general rule, to the priests ten silver [pieces]), but see Pardee *COS* I pp. 306–307 n. 13.

<sup>11</sup> Whole and therefore perhaps wholly burnt offering.

<sup>12</sup> For age markers cf. above commentary on 26.31–32.



also been suggested for *šp* (ibid. s.v. *šp*<sub>2</sub>). For the bird sacrifice see Delcor 1990, 89–92.

*Line 12*

The identification of *špr* as bird here has been contested. See M. Delcore, A propos du sens de *špr* dans le tarif sacrificiel de Marseilles (*CIS* I, 165, 12): Parfume d'origine végétale ou parfume d'origine animale?, *Semitica* 33, 1983, 33–39.

*kdm̄t kdšt*: holy first fruit (*DNWSI* s.v. *kds*<sub>3</sub> 3.), i.e. offering?

*Line 14*

Mixed flour and oil offering: *bl̄l*. See *DNWSI* s.v. *bl̄l*.

For milk and fat: *ʾl ḥlb wʾl ḥlb*; either dittography or two distinct substances. See *DNWSI* s.vv. *ḥlb*<sub>3</sub> and *ḥlb*<sub>4</sub>.

Offering to the god: *mnḥh*. See *DNWSI* s.v. *mnḥh*<sub>1</sub>.

*Line 17*

Document: *ktbt* (*DNWSI* s.v. *ktbh*<sub>1</sub>); evidently a cross reference to a different document.

*Lines 20–21*

For the punishment clause see above commentary on 20.21–23.

## APPENDIX B

### CHECKLISTS

#### 1. *Significant New Documents from Asia Minor*<sup>1</sup>

	<i>SEG</i> vel sim.	Provenance	Contents	Date
1	<i>Amyzon</i> no. 2	Amyzon	Amyzon decrees Bagadates a <i>neokoros</i> of Artemis <sup>2</sup>	321/320 B.C.
2	A B: <i>SEG</i> XLV 1508; C: <i>EpigAnat</i> 32, 2000, 89-93	Bargylia	Decrees concerning a festival of Artemis Kindyas <sup>3</sup>	II/I B.C.
3	<i>I.Knidos</i> 161 <sup>4</sup>	Cnidus	Fragmentary decree concerning the cult of Aphrodite	III/II B.C.
4	<i>SEG</i> XLIII 710	Euromus	Regulations for entry into the temple of Zeus <sup>5</sup>	I A.D.
5	<i>SEG</i> XVI 1225	Halicarnassus	Boundary stone of a sanctuary of Apollo restricting entry to the <i>akra</i>	Hellenistic period
6	<i>SEG</i> XL 956	Heraclea under Latmus	An oracle concerning the priesthood of Athena Latmia with a list of priests <sup>6</sup>	ca. 100 75 B.C.-early I A.D.

<sup>1</sup> Geographical order as in *SEG*. An asterisk (\*) denotes particularly doubtful or fragmentary cases.

<sup>2</sup> Including this document in the corpus might be found objectionable. See Part I p. 54 n. 270.

<sup>3</sup> See Part I p. 100, 107.

<sup>4</sup> A. Chaniotis, *EBGR* 1992 no. 25 (*Kernos* 9, 1996) suggests that *I.Knidos* 173 could be a fragment of a sacred law rather than a dedication.

<sup>5</sup> See Part I pp. 17-18.

<sup>6</sup> See Part I p. 47.

	<i>SEG</i> vel sim.	Provenance	Contents	Date
7	<i>I.Iasos</i> 219	Iasus	Fragmentary decree mentioning priests and the restoration of temples <sup>7</sup>	
8	<i>I.Labraunda</i> 46	Labraunda	Letter of Zeuxis regarding the protection of the sanctuary	203 B.C.
9	Ibid. 53, 54, 54 A	Ibid.	Roman Imperial period copies of IV B.C. festival regulations <sup>8</sup>	
10*	Ibid. 58	Ibid.	Decree of Mylasa on preservation of order in the sanctuary	II A.D.
11	Ibid. 59	Ibid.	Decree of Mylasa on services to be performed by cult personnel	II A.D.
12	Ibid. 60	Ibid.	Decree of Mylasa containing sanctuary prohibitions <sup>9</sup>	II A.D.
13*	<i>I.Mylasa</i> 344	Mylasa	Fragment mentioning sacri ce	
14	<i>SEG</i> XXXIX 1135 1137	Olymus	Decrees on building activities and sacri ces in the temple of Leto <sup>10</sup>	ca. 150 100 B.C.
15	<i>EpigAnat</i> 34, 2002, 1 2 no. 1	Stratonicea	Decree for the priest Leros	2nd half of IV B.C.
16	<i>SEG</i> XXIX 1088	Theangela	Sale of a priesthood of Zeus Nemeios <sup>11</sup>	III B.C.
17	<i>SEG</i> XXX 1283	Didyma	Fragmentary sacri cial regulations	2nd half of VI B.C.

<sup>7</sup> See Part I pp. 38–39.

<sup>8</sup> See Part I p. 110.

<sup>9</sup> See Part I p. 20.

<sup>10</sup> See Part I p. 38.

<sup>11</sup> See Part I p. 51.

	<i>SEG</i> vel sim.	Provenance	Contents	Date
18	<i>I.Ephesos</i> 1263	Ephesus	Fragmentary priesthood regulations <sup>12</sup>	
19	<i>SEG XXXVI</i> 1039	Erythrae	Decree on building a temple of Aphrodite	ca. 400 B.C.
20	<i>SEG XXXVII</i> 921	Ibid.	Fragmentary list of sales of priesthoods <sup>13</sup>	IV B.C.
21	<i>IG XII</i> 6, 1197	Ibid.(?)	Sale of the priesthood of the Corybantes	II B.C.
22	<i>I.Ephesos</i> 3418A ( <i>SEG XXXII</i> 1167)	Metropolis	Fragmentary regulations concerning cult of Ares	
23	G. Kleiner, P. Hommel, and W. Müller-Wiener, <i>Panionion und Melie</i> ( <i>JdI</i> , Ergänzungsheft 23), Berlin 1967, 45–63.	Panionium	Regulations for cult at the Panionium <sup>14</sup>	Mid IV B.C.
24*	<i>TAM V</i> 590	Emre (Maeonia)	Fragmentary prohibition against harming trees (possibly in a sanctuary)	Roman Imperial period
25*	<i>I. Manisa</i> 24	(Manisa)	Fragmentary sanctuary regulations <sup>15</sup>	Roman Imperial period
26*	<i>SEG XXXIX</i> 1290	Sardis	Boundary stone of the sanctuary of Artemis with a decree of Caesar confirming the right of asylum <sup>16</sup>	March 44 B.C.

<sup>12</sup> Line 3 reads λήψεται[ι]. The verb is most likely to govern items due to the priest (cf. comm. ad loc.; L. Robert *BCH* 59, 1935, 433 (= *Opera Minora Selecta* I, 190)); the use of the future is characteristic of sales of priesthoods (see Part I p. 49).

<sup>13</sup> See Part I p. 53. For 19 see 37.

<sup>14</sup> D.F. McCabe et al., *Priene Inscriptions: Texts and List*, Princeton, 1987, no. 11. Ed. pr. and F. Sokolowski (Règlement relatif à la c l l bration des Panionia, *BCH* 94, 1970 109–116) suggest regulations for the Panionia; J. and L. Robert (BE 1968 no. 469, 1970 no. 582) are more cautious.

<sup>15</sup> See Part I p. 16.

<sup>16</sup> See Part I p. 21.

	<i>SEG</i> vel sim.	Provenance	Contents	Date
27	<i>SEG</i> XXIX 1205	Ibid.	Edict of Artaxerxes II Memnon concerning the cult of Zeus Baradates	ca. A.D. 150
28	<i>SEG</i> XLVI 1547 ( <i>I.Alexandria Troas</i> 9)	Alexandria Troas	Sale of a priesthood	Late Hellenistic/Early Roman
29*	<i>SEG</i> XXXVIII 1251	Assos	Sacri cial regulations(?)	ca. 530–500
30	<i>SEG</i> XXVI 1334	Skepsis	Sale of a priesthood of Dionysus Bambyleius	II B.C.(?)
31	<i>I.Kyz.</i> II 1	Miletupolis	Fragmentary sacri cial calendar	Late IV-early III B.C.
32	<i>I.Perg</i> III 161	Pergamum	Incubation at the Asclepieum <sup>17</sup>	II A.D.
33	<i>SEG</i> XLVII 1806	Derek y	Regulations concerning the cult of Zeus (sacri ces; festivals)	A.D. 138 or shortly after
34*	<i>SEG</i> XXVII 930	Oenoanda	Part of temple regulations	Not later than early II B.C
35	<i>SEG</i> XXXVIII 1462 C	Ibid.	Regulations for the Demosthenia <sup>18</sup>	July 5, A.D. 125
36	<i>SEG</i> XXVII 942	Xanthus	Decree of the Xanthians and the <i>perioikoi</i> on the foundation of a cult for Basileus Kaunios and Arkesimas <sup>19</sup>	337 (or 358) B.C.
37	<i>SEG</i> XXXVI 1221	Ibid.	Regulations for entry into the Letoon <sup>20</sup>	Late III-early II B.C.
38	<i>I.Mylasa</i> 931	Unknown	Fragment of a decree regulating sacri ces	

<sup>17</sup> See Part I pp. 61–63.

<sup>18</sup> See Part I p. 101.

<sup>19</sup> See Part I pp. 82–83.

<sup>20</sup> See Part I p. 16.

2. *New Documents from Cos*.<sup>21</sup>

	Ed. pr or <i>SEG</i>	Provenance	Contents	Date
1	Parker and Obbink 2001, 233–237 no. 3	Cos	Sale of a priesthood (of Asclepius?)	ca. 275 B.C.
2	<i>Ischr.Cos</i> ED 15		Sale of a priesthood	Early III B.C.
3	ED 211		Fragment mentioning purification	Early III B.C.
4*	ED 92		Fragment mentioning depositing money in a <i>thesauros</i> <sup>22</sup>	III B.C.
5*	ED 99		Doubtful fragment	III B.C.
6*	ED 164		Fragment of sacrificial regulations	III B.C.
7*	ED 175		Priesthood regulations(?)	III B.C.
8*	ED 261		Sale of a priesthood(?)	III B.C.
9*	ED 262		Sale of a priesthood(?)	III B.C.
10	ED 216		Sale of the priesthood of Dionysus Thyllophorus	ca. 225 (or ca. 175) B.C. <sup>23</sup>
11	Parker and Obbink 2001, 229–233 no. 2		Sale of a priesthood of the Symmachidai	ca. 225 (or ca. 175) B.C.
12	<i>Ischr.Cos</i> ED 177		Sale of the priesthood of the Kyrbanthes	Late III B.C.
13	ED 238		Sale of the priesthood of Heracles Kallinikos	Late III B.C. <sup>24</sup>
14*	ED 112, ED 60		Financial measures relating to a sanctuary(?)	ca. 200 B.C.
15	ED 16		Regulations for the Hermaia	III–II B.C.
16*	ED 219		Fragment of a testamentary(?) foundation	III–II

<sup>21</sup> An asterisk (\*) denotes particularly doubtful or fragmentary cases. For a general review of the documents included in *Ischr.Cos* see A. Chaniotis EBGR 1993–1994 no. 219 (*Kernos* 10, 1997).

<sup>22</sup> See above Part I p. 59; commentary on 9.6.

<sup>23</sup> Parker and Obbink 2000, 422; 2001, 230–232.

<sup>24</sup> Parker and Obbink 2000, 422.

	Ed. pr or <i>SEG</i>	Provenance	Contents	Date
17	ED 178		Sale of the priesthood of Aphrodite Pandamos and Pontia	Shortly after 198 B.C. <sup>25</sup>
18	ED 3		Sale of a Priesthood	First half of II B.C.
19	ED 145 + Parker and Obbink 2001, 245 246 no. 6		Sale of the priesthood of Hermes Enagonios	ca. 180/70 (or mid III) B.C. <sup>26</sup>
21	<i>Iscr.Cos</i> ED 25		Regulations for a festival of Artemis <sup>27</sup>	II B.C.
22	ED 85		Sale of a priesthood	II B.C.
23	ED 86		Foundation: commemorative: sacri ce to Hermes <sup>28</sup>	II B.C.
24	ED 109		Sale of a priesthood	II B.C.
25	ED 146		Foundation of Phanomachos <sup>29</sup>	II B.C.
26*	ED 166		Fragment mentioning construction and altar	II B.C.
27	ED 237		Sale of a priesthood	II B.C.
28*	ED 239		Decree concerning the sanctuary of Aphrodite <sup>30</sup>	II B.C.
29	Parker and Obbink 2001, 245 no. 5		Sale of a priesthood	II B.C.
30	Parker and Obbink 2001a 266 271 no. 3		Foundation of Teleutias <sup>31</sup>	II B.C.

<sup>25</sup> Parker and Obbink 2000, 422.

<sup>26</sup> Parker and Obbink 2000, 422.

<sup>27</sup> Lines 15 17 ([- - - τὰ δὲ] | λοιπὰ κρ[έατα - - -] | τοῖς π[- - -]) evidently deal with meat distribution of a victim led along in a procession (see Part I p. 98). The restoration [- - - τὰ δὲ] | λοιπὰ κρ[έατα διανεμάντω (vel sim.)] | τοῖς π[ολίταις - - -] therefore comes to mind (for the verb cf. ED 145.60). Τοῖς π[ομπεύσασι - - -] is attractive considering the procession, but one may rather expect συμπομπεύω (as in *LSAM* 32.55 quoted in Part I p. 98; *LSCG* 177.158 159).

<sup>28</sup> See Part I p. 85 n. 449.

<sup>29</sup> See Part I p. 86.

<sup>30</sup> See Segre's note.

<sup>31</sup> See Part I p. 86.

	Ed. pr or <i>SEG</i>	Provenance	Contents	Date
31	Parker and Obbink 2000 no. 1		Sale of the priesthood of Aphrodite Pandamos and Pontia	ca. 125 B.C.?
32	<i>Isr. Cos</i> ED 32		Sale of a priesthood	II/I B.C.
33	ED 180		Sale of the priesthood of Heracles Kallinikos	II/I B.C. <sup>32</sup>
34	ED 165		Sale of a priesthood	I B.C.
35	ED 215		Sale of the priesthood of Zeus Alseios	I B.C.
36	ED 236		Sale of a priesthood (perhaps of Artemis)	I B.C.
37	Parker and Obbink 2001, 237 243 no. 4A		Sale of the priesthood of Asclepius	I B.C.
38	Parker and Obbink 2001, 237 243 no. 4B		Sale of the priesthood of Asclepius	II/I B.C.
39*	ED 121		Doubtful fragment <sup>33</sup>	Roman Imperial period
40*	<i>SEG</i> XXVIII 700	Cephalus	Fragmentary decree concerning offerings(?)	2nd half of III B.C.
41	Parker and Obbink 2001a, 253 256 no. 1	Halasarna	Decrees concerning the completion of the construction of the temple of Apollo <sup>34</sup>	ca. 200 B.C.
42*	Parker and Obbink 2001a, 265 266 no. 2		Decree concerning the sanctuary of Apollo	175 100 B.C.

<sup>32</sup> Parker and Obbink 2000, 423.

<sup>33</sup> One wonders whether [- - - ἰ|ερε]ῖον could be restored in lines 2 3.

<sup>34</sup> See Part I p. 38.



3. *Some significantly expanded or improved texts of inscriptions included in Sokolowski's corpus.*<sup>35</sup>

	Sokolowski	SEG	Other
1	<i>LSCG</i> 28	XLVI 173	
2	38	XLIV 42	
3	90	XLV 914	<i>I.Kallatis</i> 47
4	103 A 1 9		<i>IG XII</i> Suppl. p. 144 (245 + 237)
5	<i>LSS</i> 10	XLVII 71	All the published fragments have now been reedited by S.D. Lambert, <i>The Sacred Calendar of Athens</i> , <i>BSA</i> 97, 2002, 353–399.
6	12	XXX 61	Agora XVI 56
7	18		<i>IG I<sup>3</sup></i> 250
8	22		W. Peek, <i>Inchriften aus dem Asklepieion von Epidauros</i> ( <i>AbhLeip</i> , 60.2) 1969, no. 336
9	51	XLVIII 1037	(Text: Part I pp. 22–24)
10	162		<i>Iscr.Cos</i> 2
11	<i>LSAM</i> 23	SEG XLVII 1628 <sup>36</sup>	
12	26	XXX 1327	

<sup>35</sup> NB The following list includes mainly inscriptions of which new fragments have been published; in no. 3 the fragments have been rearranged; no. 7 includes significant new and improved readings. For other *IG I<sup>3</sup>* inscriptions see concordances.

<sup>36</sup> See Dignas 2002.

## CONCORDANCES

- 1**    *LSCG* → *LGS* → Standard Corpora
- 2**    *LGS* I → *LSCG*
- 3**    *LGS* II → *LSCG*
- 4**    *LSS* → Standard Corpora
- 5**    *LSAM* → Standard Corpora
- 6**    Sokolowski → *CID* I
- 7**    *CID* I → Sokolowski
- 8**    NGSL → *SEG* → Varia
- 9**    *SEG* → NGSL
- 10**   Varia → NGSL

### I

<i>LSCG</i>	<i>LGS</i>	Standard Corpora <sup>1</sup>
1	I 1	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 234
2	I 2	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 246
3	II 1	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 4B
4	II 2	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 5
5	II 4	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 78
6	II 5	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 251
7	II 6	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1363
8	II 7	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1078
9	II 8	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 982
10	II 9	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 244
11	II 10	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 255
12 A	II 11 A	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 35
12 B	II 11 B	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 36
13	II 12	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 82
14	II 13	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 84
15	II 14	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 7
	II 15 A	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 238
16	II 15 B	<i>IG</i> I <sup>2</sup> 845
17 A	II 16 A	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 241
17 B	II 16 B	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1357a
17 C	II 16a	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1357b
18		<i>SEG</i> XXI 541

---

<sup>1</sup> Multiple corpus references are given only when one of the works cited is relatively rare or new.

<i>LSCG</i>	<i>LGS</i>	Standard Corpora
19	II 17	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1237
20	I 26	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1358
21	II 18	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 4962
22	II 19	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 4971
23	II 20	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 4970
24	II 21	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 4986
25	II 22	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 4962
26		<i>SEG</i> XXI 786
27	II 23	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 4988
28	II 24	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1356
29	II 25	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1359
30	II 26	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1360
31	II 27	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1146
32	II 28	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 204
33	II 29 (B only)	<i>Agora</i> XIX L7 <sup>2</sup>
34	II 30	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 337
35	II 32	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 403
36	II 33	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1177
37	II 34	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1362; <i>SEG</i> XLIV 42
38	II 35	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1195
39	II 36	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 659
40	II 37	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 772
41	II 38a	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 839
42	II 38b	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 840
43	II 39	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 995
44	II 40	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1046
45	II 41	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1361
46	II 42	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1283
47	II 43	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 2499
48 A	II 44 A	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1328
49	II 45	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1326
50		<i>SEG</i> XXII 114
51	II 46	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1368
52	I 3	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1367
53	II 47	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1369
54	II 48	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1364
55	II 49	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1366
56	II 50	<i>IG</i> IV 1607
57	II 51	<i>IG</i> IV 557
58	II 52	<i>IG</i> IV 840
59	II 53	<i>IG</i> IV 841
60	II 54	<i>IG</i> IV 1 <sup>2</sup> 40
61	II 56	<i>IG</i> V 1, 1144

<sup>2</sup> *LSCG* 33 A = *SEG* XVIII 13; *LSCG* 33 B = *LGS* II 29 = *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 334.

<i>LSCG</i>	<i>LGS</i>	Standard Corpora
62	I 14	<i>IG</i> V 1, 363
63	II 57	<i>IG</i> V 1, 364
64	I 15	<i>IG</i> V 1, 1447
65	II 58	<i>IG</i> V 1, 1390
66	II 59	<i>IG</i> V 1, 1498
67	II 62	<i>IG</i> V 2, 3
68	II 63	<i>IG</i> V 2, 514
69	II 65	<i>IG</i> VII 235; <i>I.Oropos</i> 277
70	II 67	<i>IG</i> VII 303; <i>I.Oropos</i> 324
71	II 68	<i>IG</i> VII 351; <i>I.Oropos</i> 304
72	II 69	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1185
73	II 70	<i>IG</i> VII 4135; <i>CID</i> IV 76
74	II 71	<i>IG</i> VII 3055
75	II 72	<i>IG</i> VII 3169
76	II 73	<i>CID</i> I 3
77	II 74	<i>CID</i> I 9
78	II 75	<i>CID</i> I 10; <i>CID</i> IV 1
79	II 76	<i>CID</i> IV 108
80	II 77	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 672
81	II 78	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 631
82	II 79	<i>IG</i> IX 1, 129
83	II 80	<i>IG</i> IX 2, 1109 I
84	II 81	<i>IG</i> IX 2, 1109 II
85	II 82	<i>IG</i> IX 2, 1110
86	II 83	<i>IG</i> IX 1, 654; <i>IG</i> IX 1 <sup>2</sup> IV 1700
87	II 84	<i>I.Tomis</i> 1
88	II 85	<i>IOSPE</i> I <sup>2</sup> 76
89	II 86	<i>CIRB</i> 1005
90	I 22	<i>SEG</i> XLV 914; <i>I.Kallatis</i> 47
91	II 87	<i>IG</i> XII 9, 90
92	II 88	<i>IG</i> XII 9, 189
93	II 89	<i>IG</i> XII 9, 194
94	II 90	<i>IG</i> XI 4, 1300
95	II 92	<i>I.Delos</i> 2367
96	I 4	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1024
97	II 93	<i>IG</i> XII 5, 593
98	II 94	<i>IG</i> XII 5, 647
99		<i>IG</i> XII 5, 646
100	II 95	<i>IG</i> XII 7, 1
101	II 96	<i>IG</i> XII 7, 2
102	II 97	<i>IG</i> XII 7, 4
103	II 98	<i>IG</i> XII 7, 237
104	II 99	<i>IG</i> XII 5, 1
105	II 100	<i>IG</i> XII 5, 52 A
106	II 101	<i>IG</i> XII 5, 1008 A

<i>LSCG</i>	<i>LGS</i>	Standard Corpora
107	II 102	<i>IG</i> XII 5, 1012
108	II 104	<i>IG</i> XII 5, 107
109	II 105	<i>IG</i> XII 5, 183
110	II 106	<i>IG</i> XII 5, 225
111	II 107	<i>IG</i> XII 5, 108
112	II 108	<i>IG</i> XII 5, 126
113		<i>LSAG</i> <sup>2</sup> p. 466 K
114	II 109	<i>IG</i> XII 8, 358
115	II 110	<i>IG</i> XII 8, 265
116	II 111	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 986
117		<i>SEG</i> XXII 497
118	II 112	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 987
119	II 113	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1013
120	II 114	<i>SGDI</i> 5564
121		<i>SEG</i> XVII 394
122	II 115	<i>IG</i> XII 6, 168
123	II 116	<i>IG</i> XII 6, 3
124	II 117	<i>IG</i> XII Suppl. 126
125	II 118	<i>IG</i> XII 2, 72
126	II 119	<i>IG</i> XII 2, 73
127	II 121	<i>IG</i> XII 2, 499
128	I 18	<i>CIG</i> 6850 A
129	II 122	<i>IG</i> XII 3, 248
130	II 123	<i>IG</i> XII 3, 183
131	II 124	<i>IG</i> XII 3 Suppl. 1369
132	II 125	<i>IG</i> XII 3, 378
133	II 127	<i>IG</i> XII 3, 452
134	II 128	<i>IG</i> XII 3, 436
135	II 129	<i>IG</i> XII 3, 330
136	II 145	<i>IG</i> XII 1, 677
137	II 146	<i>IG</i> XII 1, 762
138	II 147	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 723
139	II 148	<i>IG</i> XII 1, 789
140	I 23	<i>IG</i> XII 1, 905
141	I 24	<i>IG</i> XII 1, 906
142	II 149	<i>IG</i> XII 1, 892
143	II 150	<i>I.Rhod.Per.</i> 501
144	II 152	<i>IC</i> I xvii 2
145		<i>SEG</i> XXIII 566 <sup>3</sup>
146	I 20	<i>IC</i> IV 3
147	II 151	<i>IC</i> IV 65
148	II 153	<i>IC</i> IV 186 A

<sup>3</sup> One doubts very much that this is a sacred law; both readings and interpretation are doubtful: P. Roesch *AntCl* 40, 1971, 207; van Effenterre 1989, 5 7.

<i>LSCG</i>	<i>LGS</i>	Standard Corpora
149		<i>SEG XX</i> 256
150 A		Herzog, <i>Die heilige Gesetze von Cos</i> 11
150 B		Ibid. 12; (12-end: <i>Iscr.Cos.</i> ED 181)
151 A	I 5	Herzog ibid. 1; <i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1025
151 B	I 6	Herzog ibid. 2; <i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1026; <i>Iscr.Cos.</i> ED 241
151 C	I 7	Herzog ibid. 3; <i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1027; <i>Iscr.Cos.</i> ED 140
151 D		Herzog ibid. 4
152		
153		
154		Ibid. 8
155		Ibid. 14
156	I 8	Ibid. 5; <i>Iscr.Cos</i> ED 55 (A 16-end; B12-end only)
157	I 9	Paton Hicks, <i>I.Cos</i> 41
158		Herzog ibid.13
159		Herzog ibid. 15
160	II 139	Paton Hicks, <i>I.Cos</i> 29; <i>Iscr.Cos</i> ED 144
161	II 140 141	<i>Iscr.Cos</i> ED 62
162	II 135	Paton Hicks, <i>I.Cos</i> 30; <i>Iscr.Cos</i> ED 2
163		Maiuri, <i>Nuova Silloge</i> 441; <i>Iscr.Cos</i> ED 89
164		Maiuri, <i>Nuova Silloge</i> 442; <i>Iscr.Cos</i> ED 58
165	I 13	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1028; <i>Iscr.Cos</i> ED 45
166	II 133	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1012
167	II 134	Paton Hicks, <i>I.Cos</i> 28
168	II 137	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1000
169	I 10 12	Paton Hicks, <i>I.Cos</i> 401 403
170		<i>SEG XVIII</i> 328
171		<i>SEG XIV</i> 529
172	II 138	Paton Hicks, <i>I.Cos</i> 369
173	II 130	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1023
174	II 143	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 793
175	II 132	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1006
176	I 21	Paton Hicks, <i>I.Cos</i> 42; Herzog. ibid. 7
177	II 144	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1106; <i>Iscr.Cos</i> ED 149
178		<i>IG I</i> <sup>3</sup> 256
179		<i>Agora XVI</i> 67
180		
181		<i>IG IX</i> 1 <sup>2</sup> 670

**2**

<i>LGS</i> I	<i>LSCG</i>	Standard Corpora <sup>4</sup>
1	1	
2	2	
3	5 <sup>2</sup>	
4	9 <sup>6</sup>	
5	15 <sup>1</sup> A	
6	15 <sup>1</sup> B	
7	15 <sup>1</sup> C	
8	15 <sup>6</sup>	
9	15 <sup>7</sup>	
10	16 <sup>9</sup> A	
11	16 <sup>9</sup> B	
12	16 <sup>9</sup> C	
13	16 <sup>5</sup>	
14	6 <sup>2</sup>	
15	6 <sup>4</sup>	
16		<i>IG</i> V 2, 5
17		<i>I.Perg.</i> I 247
18	12 <sup>8</sup>	
19		<i>IG</i> XII 3, 45 <sup>0</sup>
20	14 <sup>6</sup>	
21	17 <sup>6</sup>	Paton Hicks, <i>I.Cos</i> 42
22	9 <sup>0</sup>	
23	14 <sup>0</sup>	
24	14 <sup>1</sup>	
25		<i>SEG</i> VII 1233
26	20	
27		<i>I.Perg.</i> II 374
28	<i>LSAM</i> 27	

**3**

<i>LGS</i> II	<i>LSCG</i>	Standard Corpora <sup>5</sup>
1	3	
2	4	
3	<i>LSS</i> 3	
4	5	
5	6	
6	7	

<sup>4</sup> Cited only for inscriptions not included in Sokolowski's corpus; otherwise use Concordance **I**.

<sup>5</sup> Cited only for inscriptions not included in Sokolowski's corpus; otherwise use Concordance **I**.

<i>LGS</i> II	<i>LSCG</i>	Standard Corpora
7	8	
8	9	
9	10	
10	11	
11	12	
12	13	
13	14	
14	15	
15 A		<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 238
15 B	16	
16	17	
17	19	
18	21	
19	22	
20	23	
21	24	
22	25 A	
22b	25 B	
23	27	
24	28	
25	29	
26	30	
27	31	
28	32	
29	33 B	
30	34	
31		<i>IG</i> VII 4252; <i>I.Oropos</i> 296
32	35	
33	36	
34	37	
35	38	
36	39	
37	40	
38a	41	
38b	42	
39	43	
40	44	
41	45	
42	46	
43	47	
44	48	
45	49	
46	51	
47	53	
48	54	



<i>LGS</i> II	<i>LSCG</i>	Standard Corpora
49	55	
50	56	
51	57	
52	58	
53	59	
54	60	
55		<i>IG</i> V 1, 1155
56	61	
57	63	
58	65	
59	66	
60		<i>I<sup>VO</sup></i> 5
61		<i>I<sup>VO</sup></i> 6
62	67	
63	68	
64		<i>IG</i> VII 43
65	69	
66		<i>IG</i> VII 422; <i>I.Oropos</i> 284
67	70	
68	71	
69	72	
70	73	
71	74	
72	75	
73	76	
74	77	
75	78	
76	79	
77	80	
78	81	
79	82	
80	83	
81	84	
82	85	
83	86	
84	87	
85	88	
86	89	
87	91	
88	92	
89	93	
90	94	
91	<i>LSS</i> 59	
92	95	
93	97	

<i>LGS</i> II	<i>LSCG</i>	Standard Corpora
94	98	
95	100	
96	101	
97	102	
98	103	
99	104	
100	105	
101	106	
102	107	
103		<i>IG</i> XII 5, 150
104	108	
105	109	
106	110	
107	111	
108	112	
109	114	
110	115	
111	116	
112	118	
113	119	
114	120	
115	122	
116	123	
117	124	
118	125	
119	126	
120		<i>IG</i> XII 2, 7
121	127	
122	129	
123	130	
124	131	
125	132	
126		<i>IG</i> XII 3 Suppl. 377
127	133	
128	134	
129	135	
130	173	
131		<i>Isr. Cos</i> 82
132	175	
133	166	
134	167	
135	162	
136		Paton    Hicks, <i>I. Cos</i> 32
137	168	
138	172	

<i>LGS</i> II	<i>LSCG</i>	Standard Corpora
139	160	
140	161 A	
141	161 B	
142		Herzog, <i>Koische Forschungen</i> 134 no. 211
143	174	
144	177	
145	136	
146	137	
147	138	
148	139	
149	142	
150	143	
151	147	
152	144	
153	148	

#### 4

<i>LSS</i>	Standard Corpora
1	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 231
2	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 232
3	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 6
4	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 257
5	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 1382a
6	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 136
7	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 129
8	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 137
9	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 240
10	cf. <i>SEG</i> X 348; XXI 540; XL 146
11	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 47
12	<i>SEG</i> XXX 61; <i>Agora</i> XVI 56
13	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 140
14	<i>SEG</i> XXI 469C
15	<i>SEG</i> XXI 494
16	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 4997
17	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 4547 4548
18	<i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 250
19	<i>Agora</i> XIX L4a
20	<i>Agora</i> XVI 161
21	<i>SEG</i> XXI 813
22	<i>SEG</i> XI Addenda 419
23	<i>IG</i> IV 1 <sup>2</sup> 73
24	<i>IG</i> IV 1 <sup>2</sup> 45
25	<i>IG</i> IV 1 <sup>2</sup> 742
26	<i>SEG</i> XI 369

<i>LSS</i>	Standard Corpora
27	<i>SEG</i> XI 314
28	<i>IG</i> V 1, 772
29	<i>IG</i> V 1, 1511
30	<i>IG</i> V 1, 1316
31	<i>IG</i> V 2, 4
32	<i>SEG</i> XI 1112
33	<i>DGE</i> 429
34	<i>Corinth</i> VIII 1, 22
35	<i>I.Oropos</i> 276
36	<i>SEG</i> II 185
37	<i>CID</i> I 2
38	<i>CID</i> I 7
39	<i>CID</i> I 8
40 A	<i>CID</i> I 6
40 B	<i>CID</i> I 5
40 C	<i>CID</i> I 4
41	<i>CID</i> I 13
42	<i>CID</i> I 12
43	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 523; <i>CID</i> IV 85
44	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 671 A; <i>FDelphes</i> III 3, 238
45	<i>IG</i> IX 1 <sup>2</sup> II 538
46	<i>IG</i> XII 9, 192
47	<i>IG</i> XII 5, 721
48	<i>IG</i> XII Suppl. 303
49	<i>I.Délos</i> 68
50	<i>I.Délos</i> 69
51	<i>IG</i> XI 4, 1030; <i>SEG</i> XLVIII 51
52	<i>IG</i> XI 4, 1032
53	
54	<i>I.Délos</i> 2530
55	<i>I.Délos</i> 2305
56	<i>I.Délos</i> 2180
57	<i>I.Délos</i> 2308
58	<i>I.Délos</i> 1720
59	<i>I.Délos</i> 2529
60	<i>IG</i> XII 7, 220
61	<i>IG</i> XII 7, 515
62	<i>IG</i> XII 5, 1027
63	<i>IG</i> XII Supl. 414
64	<i>Nouveau Choix</i> 19
65	<i>Recherches</i> —( <i>Thasos</i> ) I 82 85 no. 10
66	<i>SEG</i> XVIII 340
67	<i>IG</i> XII Suppl. 398
68	<i>IG</i> XII Suppl. 378
69	<i>SEG</i> XVII 415

## LSS Standard Corpora

70	<i>Recherches—(Thasos)</i> I 344 no. 129
71	<i>IG XII Suppl.</i> 365
72	cf. <i>SEG XXIX</i> 774
73	<i>IG XII Suppl.</i> 394
74	<i>IG XII Suppl.</i> 409
75	<i>SEG XII</i> 395; <i>I.Samothrake</i> 62
75a	<i>I.Samothrake</i> 63
76	<i>SEG XXII</i> 501
77	<i>DGE</i> 694
78	<i>DGE</i> 692
79	<i>DGE</i> 696
80	<i>IG XII</i> 6, 260
81	<i>IG XII</i> 6, 171
82	<i>IG XII Suppl.</i> 23
83	<i>IG XII Suppl.</i> 150
84	<i>GIBM II</i> 300
85	<i>I.Rhod.Per.</i> 251
86	<i>I.Lindos</i> 484
87	<i>I.Lindos</i> 181 182
88	<i>Suppl.Epigr.Rh.</i> II no. 20
89	<i>I.Lindos</i> 26
90	<i>I.Lindos</i> 419
91	<i>I.Lindos</i> 487
92	<i>I.Lindos</i> 680
93	<i>Suppl.Epigr.Rh.</i> II no. 14
94	<i>Tit.Cam.</i> no. 153
95	<i>I.Lindos</i> 671
96	<i>Tit.Cam.</i> no. 148
97	<i>Tit.Cam.</i> no. 152
98	<i>Tit.Cam.</i> no. 146
99	<i>Tit.Cam.</i> no. 149
100	<i>Tit.Cam.</i> no. 150
101	<i>Tit.Cam.</i> no. 151
102	<i>Tit.Cam.</i> no. 155
103	<i>Tit.Cam.</i> no. 154
104	<i>Tit.Cam.</i> no. 156
105	<i>Tit.Cam.</i> no. 112
106	<i>Suppl.Epigr.Rh.</i> I no. 112b
107	<i>Suppl.Epigr.Rh.</i> I no. 1
108	
109	<i>I.Rhod.Per.</i> 1
110	<i>I.Rhod.Per.</i> 292
111	<i>I.Rhod.Per.</i> 201
112	<i>IC I</i> xvi 6
113	<i>IC II</i> v 9

*LSS* Standard Corpora

114	<i>IC</i> IV 214 no. 146
115	<i>SEG</i> IX 72
116	<i>SEG</i> XX 719
117	<i>SEG</i> IX 73
118	<i>SEG</i> IX 347
119	<i>SB</i> 3451; cf. <i>SEG</i> VIII 639
120	<i>SEG</i> IV 92
121	<i>I.Ephesos</i> 10
122	<i>SEG</i> XVI 715
123	<i>Milet</i> I 3, 32
124	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1184
125	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1242
126	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1275
127	<i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1346
128	<i>SEG</i> XVI 368
129	<i>SEG</i> XVII 377
130	<i>SEG</i> XVII 378
131	<i>SEG</i> XVII 379
132	<i>SEG</i> XX 542
133	<i>SEG</i> XX 718

## 5

*LSAM* Standard Corpora

1	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1017
2	<i>I.Kalch</i> 13
3	<i>I.Kalch</i> 10
4	<i>I.Kalch</i> 11
5	<i>I.Kalch</i> 12
6	<i>I.Kios</i> 19
7	<i>I.Kyz.</i> 195
8	<i>I.Lampsakos</i> 9
9	<i>I.Ilion</i> 52
10	<i>I.Ilion</i> 10
11	<i>I.Perg</i> 40
12	<i>I.Perg</i> 255
13	<i>I.Perg</i> 251
14	<i>I.Perg</i> 264
15	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 694
16	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1219
17	<i>I.Smyrna</i> 735
18	<i>TAM</i> V 1, 530
19	<i>TAM</i> V 1, 536
20	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 985
21	<i>I.Erythrai</i> 203

*LSAM* Standard Corpora

22	<i>I.Erythrai</i> 204
23	<i>I.Erythrai</i> 206
24	<i>I.Erythrai</i> 205
25	<i>I.Erythrai</i> 201
26	<i>I.Erythrai</i> 207
27	<i>I.Erythrai</i> 208
28	<i>CIG</i> 3062
29	<i>I.Ephesos</i> 3401
30	<i>I.Ephesos</i> 1678
31	<i>I.Ephesos</i> 24B
32	<i>I.Magnesia</i> 98
33	<i>I.Magnesia</i> 100
34	<i>I.Magnesia</i> 99
35	<i>I.Priene</i> 205
36	<i>I.Priene</i> 195
37	<i>I.Priene</i> 174
38 A	<i>I.Priene</i> 201
38 B	<i>I.Priene</i> 202
39	<i>I.Priene</i> 362
40	<i>I.Priene</i> 364
41	<i>Milet</i> I 3, 31a; <i>DGE</i> 725
42	<i>Milet</i> I 3, 132; <i>LSAG</i> <sup>2</sup> 414 no. 39
43	<i>SEG</i> XV 675
44	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1002
45	<i>SGDI</i> 5496
46	<i>Milet</i> I 3, 133; <i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1037
47	<i>Milet</i> I 3, 117; <i>SGDI</i> 5498
48	cf. <i>SEG</i> XV 679
49	<i>Milet</i> VI 1, 203
50	<i>Milet</i> I 3, 133; <i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 57
51	<i>Milet</i> VI 1, 202
52	<i>Milet</i> VI 1, 204
53	<i>Milet</i> I 3, 134; cf. <i>SEG</i> XV 685
54	<i>I.Didyma</i> 482
55	<i>I.Knidos</i> 160
56	<i>I.Rhod.Per.</i> Appendix no. V
57	cf. <i>SEG</i> XV 644
58	<i>I.Mylasa</i> 861
59	<i>I.Iasos</i> 220
60 A	<i>I.Iasos</i> 245
60 B	<i>I.Iasos</i> 246
61	<i>I.Mylasa</i> 303
62	<i>I.Mylasa</i> 301
63	<i>I.Mylasa</i> 304
64	<i>I.Mylasa</i> 309

*LSAM* Standard Corpora

65	<i>I.Mylasa</i> 305
66	<i>I.Mylasa</i> 302
67	<i>I.Stratonikeia</i> 1+39a
68	<i>I.Stratonikeia</i> 2
69	<i>I.Stratonikeia</i> 1101
70	<i>I.Mylasa</i> 914
71	<i>I.Mylasa</i> 942
72	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1044
73	<i>Syll</i> <sup>3</sup> 1015
74	<i>I.Rhod.Per.</i> 3
75	<i>I.Tralleis</i> 3
76	<i>TAM</i> I 65
77	<i>SEG</i> VI 775
78	<i>TAM</i> II 548
79	<i>SEG</i> II 710
80	<i>OGIS</i> 573
81	<i>SEG</i> XII 511
82	cf. <i>SEG</i> XV 783
83	<i>I.Heraclea Pontica</i> 70
84	<i>I.Smyrna</i> 728
85	<i>I.Ephesos</i> 1520
86	<i>MAMA</i> VIII 411
87	cf. <i>SEG</i> XII 478
88	<i>I.Laodikeia am Lykos</i> 64

## 6

Sokolowski *CID* I

<i>LSCG</i> 76	3
<i>LSCG</i> 77	9
<i>LSCG</i> 78	10
<i>LSCG</i> 79	
<i>LSCG</i> 80	
<i>LSCG</i> 81	
<i>LSS</i> 37	2
<i>LSS</i> 38	7
<i>LSS</i> 39	8
<i>LSS</i> 40 A	6
<i>LSS</i> 40 B	5
<i>LSS</i> 40 C	4
<i>LSS</i> 41	13
<i>LSS</i> 42	12
<i>LSS</i> 43	
<i>LSS</i> 44	



## 7

CID I Sokolowski

1	
2	<i>LSS</i> 37
3	<i>LSCG</i> 76
4	<i>LSS</i> 40 C
5	<i>LSS</i> 40 B
6	<i>LSS</i> 40 A
7	<i>LSS</i> 38
8	<i>LSS</i> 39
9	<i>LSCG</i> 77 (C 19 52 and D only)
10	<i>LSCG</i> 78
11	
12	<i>LSS</i> 42
13	<i>LSS</i> 41

## 8

NGSL	SEG	Varia
1	XXXIII 147	
2	XXVIII 103	
3	XXXV 113	
4	XXXVI 267	
5	XXXI 122	
6	XXX 380	Koerner, <i>Gesetzestexte</i> 31 <i>Nomima</i> I 78
7	XXVIII 421	<i>New Docs.</i> IV p p 110 111
8	XXXVI 376	
9	XLVII 488	<i>I.Oropos</i> 278
10	XLVII 497	<i>I.Oropos</i> 279
11	XXXII 456	
12	XXVI 524	
13	XLIV 505	
14	XXVII 261	<i>I.Beroia</i> 1
15	XLVI 923	
16	XXXVIII 786	
17	XXXIX 729	Kontorini, 1989, 17 29 no. 1
18	XXVII 545	<i>IG</i> XII 6, 169 D.F. McCabe et al., <i>Samos Inscriptions: Texts and List</i> , Princeton, 1986, no. 123
19	<i>IG</i> XII 6, 170	
20	XXXV 923	
21	XXXVIII 835	
22	XLI 739	<i>Eleutherna</i> II 1, 1 <i>Nomima</i> II 98
23	XLI 744	<i>Eleutherna</i> II 1, 5α, 5β, 5γ, 5δ

NGSL	SEG	Varia
24	XXVIII 750	Bile 1988, 56 no. 56
25	XXVI 1084	Arena, <i>Iscrizioni</i> I <sup>2</sup> 13
		<i>IGDS</i> 20
		Koerner, <i>Gesetzestexte</i> 85
26	XXX 1119	<i>IGDS</i> 206
27	XLIII 630	Arena, <i>Iscrizioni</i> I <sup>2</sup> 53 <i>bis</i>
Appendix A	CIS I 165	
		<i>KAI</i> 69

**9**

SEG	NGSL
XXVI 524	12
XXVI 1084	25
XXVII 261	14
XXVII 545	18
XXVIII 103 (XXVI 134)	2
XXVIII 421	7
XXVIII 750	24
XXX 380	6
XXX 1119	26
XXXI 122	5
XXXII 456	11
XXXIII 147	1
XXXV 113	3
XXXV 923	20
XXXVI 267	4
XXXVI 376	8
XXXVIII 786	16
XXXVIII 835	21
XXXIX 729	17
XLI 739	22
XLI 744	23
XLIII 630	27
XLIV 505	13
XLVI 923	15
XLVII 488	9
XLVII 497	10

**10**

Varia	NGSL
Arena, <i>Iscrizioni</i> I <sup>2</sup>	
13	25
53 <i>bis</i>	27

Varia	NGSL
Bile 1988	
56 no. 56	24
<i>CIS</i>	
I 165	Appendix A
<i>Eleutherna</i> II 1	
I	22
5α, 5β, 5γ, 5δ	23
<i>I.Beroia</i>	
I	14
<i>IG</i> XII 6	
169	18
170	19
<i>IGDS</i>	
20	25
206	26
<i>I.Oropos</i>	
278	9
279	10
<i>KAI</i>	
69	Appendix A
Koerner, <i>Gesetzestexte</i>	
31	6
85	25
Kontorini, 1989	
17 29 no. 1	17
D.F. McCabe et al., <i>Samos Inscriptions: Texts and List</i> , Princeton, 1986	
123	18
<i>New Docs.</i>	
IV pp. 110 111	7
<i>Nomima</i>	
I 78	6
II 98	22

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aleshire, S.B. 1991. *Asklepios at Athens: Epigraphic and Prosopographic Essays on the Athenian Healing Cults*, Amsterdam.
- . 1994. Toward a Definition of State Cult for Ancient Athens, in R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence* (ActaAth-8<sup>o</sup> 13), Stockholm, 9–16.
- Alessandrini, S. 1982. Sul terzo decreto da Entella, in *Materiali e contributi*, 1047–1054.
- Amiotti, G. 1985. Un singolare istituto di pace: Λάδελφοθετία di Nacone, in *La pace nel mondo antico* (CISA 11), 119–126.
- Ampolo, C. 1979. Un politico euergete del IV secolo A.C. *PP* 34, 176–178.
- . 1981. Tra nobiltà e politica: Carriera e affari del signor Moirokles, *RFIC* 109, 187–204.
- . 1982. Le cave di pietra dell Attica: Problemi giuridici ed economici, *Opus* 1, 151–260.
- . (ed.) 2001. *Da un'antica città di Sicilia: I decreti di Entella e Nakone* (Exhibition Catalogue), Pisa.
- Arena, R. 1996. Per la lettura di un'iscrizione di Megara Iblea, *PP* 51, 46–48.
- . 1997. Review of Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, *PP* 52, 428–439.
- Arnaoutoglou, I. 1994. Ἀρχεραμιστής and its Meaning in Inscriptions, *ΖΡΕ* 104, 107–110.
- . 1998. *Ancient Greek Laws: A Sourcebook*, London and New York.
- Asheri, D. 1982. Osservazioni storiche sul decreto di Nakone, in *Materiali e contributi*, 1033–1045.
- . 1984. Il decreto da Nakone (*SEG* XXX, nr. 1119): Addenda et corrigenda, *AnnPisa* III 14, 1259–1261.
- . 1989. Formes et procédures de conciliation dans les cités grecques: Le décret de Nakone, in F.J. Fernández Nieto (ed.), *Symposion 1982: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte* (Santander, 1.–4. September 1982), Cologne and Vienna, 135–145.
- Austin, M.M. 1981. *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*, Cambridge.
- Beckwith, R.T. and Selman, M.J. (eds.) 1995. *Sacrifice in the Bible*, Carlisle/Grand Rapids.
- Berthiaume, G. 1982. *Les rôles du mégéiros: Étude sur le boucherie, la cuisine et la sacrifice dans la Grèce ancienne* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 70), Leiden.
- Bile, M. 1988. *Le dialecte crétois ancien: Étude de la langue des inscriptions; recueil des inscriptions postérieures aux IC* (Études crétoises 27), Paris.
- Bingen, J. 1991. Pages d'épigraphie grecque: Attique-Égypte (1952–1982), 4. Thorikos ou l'épigraphie d'un domaine, *Epigraphica Bruxellensia* 1, 27–39.

- Bousquet, J. 1977. Notes épigraphiques (Athènes, Paros, Hyettos), *BCH* 101, 453–454.
- Brugnone, A. 1997. Una laminetta iscritta da Selinonte, *SicArch* 60, 121–130.
- Brumfield, A.C. 1981. *The Attic Festivals of Demeter and their Relation to the Agricultural Year*, New York.
- Burkert, W. 1983. *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrifice, Ritual, and Myth*, Trans. P. Bing, Berkeley (German original 1972).
- . 1985. *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, Trans. J. Raffan, Oxford and Cambridge, Mass. (German original 1977).
- . 1996. Greek Temple-Builders: Who, Where, Why?, in R. Hägg (ed.), *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis* (ActaAth-4° 14), Stockholm, 21–29.
- . 2000. Private Needs and Polis Acceptance: Purification at Selinous, in P. Flensted-Jensen, T. Heine Nielsen, and L. Rubinstein (eds.), *Polis and Politics: Studies in Greek History Presented to Mogens Herman Hansen on his Sixtieth Birthday, August 20, 2000*, Copenhagen, 207–216.
- Casabona, J. 1966. *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec des origines à la fin de l'époque classique*, Aix-en-Provence.
- Chaniotis, A. 1996. Conflicting Authorities: Asylia between Secular and Divine Law in the Classical and Hellenistic Poleis, *Kernos* 9, 65–86.
- . 1997. Reinheit des Körper Reinheit der Seele in den griechischen Kultusgesetzen, in J. Assmann and T. Sundermeyer (eds.), *Schuld, Gewissen und Person: Studien zur Geschichte des inneren Menschen* (Studien zum Verstehen fremder Religionen 9), Göttersloh, 142–179.
- Christopoulos, M. 1992. ΟΡΓΙΑ ΑΠΟΡΡΗΤΑ : Quelques remarques sur les rites des Plynteries, *Kernos* 5, 27–39.
- Clinton, K. 1974. *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (TAPhS NS, 64.3), Philadelphia.
- . 1979. The Eleusinia and the Eleusinians, *AJP* 100, 1–12.
- . 1980. A Law in the City Eleusinion Concerning the Mysteries, *Hesperia* 49, 258–288.
- . 1988. Sacrifice at the Eleusinian Mysteries, in R. Hägg, N. Marinatos, and G.C. Nordquist (eds.), *Early Greek Cult Practice* (ActaAth-4° 38), Stockholm, 69–80.
- . 1992. *Myth and Cult: The Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (ActaAth-8° 9), Stockholm.
- . 1993. The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis, in N. Marinatos and R. Hägg (eds.), *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, London and New York, 110–124.
- . 1994. The Epidauria and the Arrival of Asclepius in Athens, in R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence* (ActaAth-8° 13), Stockholm, 17–34.
- . 1996. The Thesmophorion in Central Athens and the Celebration of the Thesmophoria in Attica, in R. Hägg (ed.), *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis* (ActaAth-4° 14), Stockholm, 111–125.
- . 1996a. A New *Lex Sacra* from Selinus: Kindly Zeus, Eumenides, Impure and Pure Tritopatores, and Elasteroi, *CP* 91, 159–179.

- . forthcoming. Pig in Greek Rituals, in R. Hagg (ed.), 'Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian,' *International Seminar, Göteborg, 25–27 April 1997*.
- Cole, S.G. 1988. The Use of Water in Greek Sanctuaries, in R. Hagg, N. Marinatos, and G.C. Nordquist (eds.), *Early Greek Cult Practice* (ActaAth-4° 38), Stockholm, 161–165.
- . 1992. *Gunaiki ou Themis*: Gender Difference in the Greek *Leges Sacrae*, *Helios* 19, 104–122.
- Cordano, F. 1996. Review of Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, *Aevum* 70, 137–141.
- . 1997. Review of Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, *PP* 52, 423–427.
- Cormack, J.M.R. 1977. The Gymnasiarchal Law of Beroia, *Ancient Macedonia* 2, 138–149.
- Coumanoudis, S. and Gofas, D. 1978. Deux dactyles in dactylus, *REG* 91, 289–306.
- Koumanoudis, S. and Matthaïou, A.P. 1985. Δύο ἱεροὶ νόμοι Χίων, *Horos* 3, 105–111.
- Koumanoudis, S. and Matthaïou, A.P. 1987. Κατάλογος Ἀθηναίων διατητῶν, *Horos* 5, 15–23.
- Crowther, N.B. 1985. Male Beauty Contests in Greece, *AntCl* 54, 285–291.
- . 1991. *Euexia, Eutaxia, Philoponia*: Three Contests of the Greek Gymnasium, *ζPE* 85, 301–304.
- Curti, E. and van Bremen, R. 1999. Notes on the *Lex Sacra* from Selinous, *Ostraca* 8, 21–33.
- Daux, G. 1975. Korrekturnote zum samischen κάπηλοι Gesetz, (*ζPE* 18, 175), *ζPE* 19, 19.
- . 1980. Calendrier sacré de Thorikos, *CRAI*, 1980, 463–470.
- . 1983. Le calendrier de Thorikos au musée J. Paul Getty, *AntCl* 52, 150–174.
- . 1984. Notes de lecture, *BCH* 108, 391–405.
- . 1984a. Sacrifices à Thorikos, *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 12, 145–152.
- Debord, P. 1982. *Aspects sociaux et économiques de la vie religieuse dans l'Anatolie gréco-romaine*, Leiden.
- Delcor, M. 1990. Le tarif dit de Marseille (*CIS* I, 165): Aspects du système sacré punique, *Semitica* 38, 87–93.
- Deshours, N. 1999. Les Messéniens, le règlement des mystères et la consultation de l'oracle d'Apollon Pythéen à Argos, *REG* 112, 463–484.
- Detienne, M. 1996. Le doigt d'Oreste, in M. Cartry and M. Detienne (eds.), *Destins de meurtriers*, Paris, 23–38.
- . and Vernant, J.P. 1989. *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks*, Trans. P. Wissing, Chicago (French original Paris, 1979).
- Deubner, L. 1932. *Attische Feste*, Berlin.
- de Vaux, R. 1961. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*, Trans. J. McHugh, London/New York (French original Paris, 1958–1960).
- Dignas, B. 2002. Priestly Authority in the Cult of the Corybantes at Erythrae, *EpigAnat* 34, 29–40.
- Dillon, M.P.J. 1997. *Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece*, London and New York.

- . 1997a. The Ecology of the Greek Sanctuary, *ΖΠΕ* 118, 113–127.
- Dow, S. 1953–1957. The Law Codes of Athens, *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 71, 4–35.
- and Healey, R.F. 1965. *A Sacred Calendar of Eleusis* (Harvard Theological Studies 21), Cambridge, Mass.
- Dubois, L. 1980. Un nouveau nom de magistrat à Tirynthe, *REG* 93, 250–256.
- . 1986. Actualités dialectologiques, *RPhil* 60, 99–105.
- . 1995. Une nouvelle inscription archaïque de S linonte, *RPhil* 69, 127–144.
- . 1999. La nouvelle loi sacrée de S linonte: Bilan dialectologique, in A.C. Cassio (ed.), *Katà diálekton: Atti del III colloquio internazionale di dialettologia greca, Napoli—Fiaiano d'Ischia, 25–28 settembre 1996*, *AION* (101) 19, 1997 [1999], 331–346.
- Duchêne, H. 1992. *La stèle du port, fouilles du port 1: Recherches sur une nouvelle inscription thasienne* (*Études thasiennes* 14), Paris.
- Dunst, G. 1975. Zu dem samischen κάπηλοι Gesetz, *ΖΠΕ* 18, 171–177.
- . 1977. Der Opferkalender des attischen Demos Thorikos, *ΖΠΕ* 25, 243–264.
- Edelstein, E.J. and Edelstein, L. 1945. *Asclepius: Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies*, Baltimore (Reprint, two vols. in one, with an introduction by G.B. Ferngren, Baltimore, 1998).
- tienne, R. and Knoepfer, D. 1976. *Hyettos de Béotie et la chronologie des archontes fédéraux* (*BCH* Supplement 3), Paris.
- Erskine, A. 1991. Review of Kontorini 1989, *CR* 41, 199–201.
- Farnell, L.R. 1896–1909. *The Cults of the Greek States*, (4 vols.), Oxford.
- Ferguson, W.S. 1938. The Salaminioi of Heptaphylai and Sounion, *Hesperia* 7, 1–74.
- Feyel, M. 1942. *Contribution à l'épigraphie béotienne*, Le Puy.
- Foley, A. 1988. *The Argolid 800–60 B.C.: An Archaeological Survey, together with an Index of Sites from the Neolithic to the Roman Period* (Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 80), Göteborg.
- Follet, S. 1989. Contribution à la chronologie attique du premier siècle de notre ère, in S. Walker and A. Cameron (eds.), *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire: Papers from the Tenth British Museum Classical Colloquium* (*BICS* Supplement 55), London.
- Fontenrose, J. 1978. *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations with a Catalogue of Responses*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London.
- Franke, P.R. 1984. Die κάπηλοι Inschrift von Samos und der στατήρ πάτριος, *ΖΠΕ* 54, 119–124.
- Freyburger, G. 1988. Supplication grecque et supplication romaine, *Latomus* 47, 501–525.
- Gallavotti, C. 1977. Scritture della Sicilia ed altre epigrafe archaiche, *Halkion* 17, 97–136.
- Gauthier, P. 1980. Études sur des inscriptions d'Amorgos, *BCH* 104, 197–220.
- . 1984. La dokimasia des victimes. Note sur une inscription d'Entella, *AnnPisa* III 14, 845–848.

- . 1995. Notes sur le rôle du gymnase dans les cités hellénistiques, in M. Wörle and P. Zanker (eds.), *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus* (Vestigia 47), Munich, 1–11.
- . 1995a. Du nouveau sur les courses aux flambeaux d'après deux inscriptions de Cos, *REG* 108, 576–585.
- . 1996. Bienfaiteurs du gymnase au Léontion de Xanthos, *REG* 109, 1–33.
- . 2001. Les assembléeslectorales et le calendrier de Samos à l'époque hellénistique, *Chiron* 31, 211–227.
- and Hatzopoulos, M.B. 1993. *La loi gymnasiarchique de Béroia* (Meletemata 16), Athens, 1993.
- Giangiulio, M. 1982. Edifici pubblici e culti nelle nuove iscrizioni da Entella, in *Materiali e contributi*, 787–799.
- Gill, D. 1991. *Greek Cult Tables*, New York and London.
- Giuliani, A. 1998. La purification dagli ἐλάστεροι nella legge sacra di Selinonte, *Aevum* 62, 67–89.
- Gould, J. 1973. Hiketeia, *JHS* 93, 74–103. (Reprinted with a postscript in *Myth, Ritual, Memory, and Exchange: Essays in Greek Literature and Culture*, Oxford, 2001, 22–77).
- Graf, F. 1985. *Nordionische Kulte: Religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulte von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai, und Phokaia*, Rome.
- . 1992. Heiligtum und Ritual: das Beispiel der griechisch-römischen Asklepieia, in O. Reverdin and B. Grange (eds.), *Le sanctuaire grec* (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique 37), Geneva, 159–199.
- . 1996. *Pompai in Greece*, in R. Hägg (ed.), *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis* (ActaAth-4° 14), Stockholm, 55–65.
- Graham, A.J. 1995. Review of Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, *Phoenix* 49, 366–367.
- Guarducci, M. 1967–1978. *Epigrapha graeca*, (4 vols.), Rome.
- . 1986–1988. Epigrafi di Siracusa e di Megara Iblea, *ArchClass* 38–40, 1–26.
- Habicht, C. 1957. Samische Volksbeschlüsse der hellenistischen Zeit, *AthMitt* 72, 152–274.
- . 1972. Hellenistische Inschriften aus dem Heraion von Samos, *AthMitt* 87, 191–228.
- Hallof, K. 1999. Der samische Kalender, *Chiron* 29, 193–204.
- and Mileta, C. 1997. Samos und Ptolemaios III. Ein neues Fragment zu dem samischen Volksbeschluss *AM* 72, 1957, 226 Nr. 59, *Chiron* 27, 255–285.
- Hansen, O. 1984. Some Possible Evidence for an Amphictyony in Tiryns, *AAH* 17.1–2, 162–163.
- Hatzopoulos, M.B. 1996. *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings: A Historical and Epigraphic Study* (Meletemata 22), Athens.
- Henrichs, A. 1990. Between Country and City: Cultic Dimensions of Dionysus in Athens and Attica, in M. Griffith and D. Mastronarde (eds.), *Cabinet of the Muses: Studies in Honor of T.G. Rosenmeyer*, Atlanta, 257–277.
- Hewitt, J.W. 1909. Major Restrictions on Access to Greek Temples, *TAPA* 40, 83–91.



- Jameson, M.H. 1965. Notes on the Sacri cial Calendar from Erchia, *BCH* 89, 154-172.
- . 1988. Sacri ce and Animal Husbandry in Classical Greece, in C.R. Whittaker (ed.), *Pastoral Economies in Classical Antiquity*, Cambridge, 87-119.
- . 1991. Sacri ce before Battle, in V.D. Hanson (ed.), *Hoplites: The Classical Greek Battle Experience*, London, 197-227.
- . 1992. Agricultural Labor in Ancient Greece, in B. Wells (ed.), *Agriculture in Ancient Greece* (ActaAth-4° 42), Stockholm, 135-146.
- . 1994. *Theoxenia*, in R. H. gg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence* (ActaAth-8° 13), Stockholm, 35-37.
- . 1997. Religion in the Athenian Democracy, in I. Morris and K.A. RaaBaub (eds.), *Democracy 2500? Questions and Challenges* (Archaeological Institute of America Colloquia and Papers 2), Dubuque, Iowa, 171-195.
- , Jordan, D.R., and Kotanski, R.D. 1993. *A Lex Sacra from Selinous* (GRBM 11), Durham, NC.
- Jones, N.F. 1987. *Public Organization in Ancient Greece*, Philadelphia.
- Jordan, B. 1996. Review of Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, *AJP* 117, 326-328.
- Jordan, D.R. 1997. Πρώμη γραφή ως μαγεία, in A.P. Christidis and D.R. Jordan (eds.), *Γλώσσα καί μαγεία. Κείμενα από την αρχαιότητα*, Athens, 65-74.
- Jost, M. 1985. *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie* ( tudes P lophonniennes 9), Paris.
- Kadletz, E. 1981. The Tongues of Greek Sacri cial Victims, *HTHR* 74, 21-29.
- Kalpaxis, T. and Petropoulou, A.B. 1988/1989. Τμήματα δύο επιγραφών από την Έλεύθερνα, *Kretika Chronika*, 28/29, 127-133.
- Kearns, E. 1989. *The Heroes of Attica* (BICS Supplement 57), London.
- . 1994. Cakes in Greek Sacri ce Regulations, in R. H. gg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence* (ActaAth-8° 13), Stockholm, 65-70.
- Kingsley, P. 1996. Review of Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, *CR* 46, 281-282.
- Knoepfer, D. 1979. Contributions ^ l' pigraphie de Chalcis II: Les couronnes de Th okl's ls de Pausanias, *BCH* 103, 165-188.
- Koenen, L. 1977. The Samian Statute on Κάπηλοι in the Precinct of Hera, *ΖPE* 27, 211-216.
- Koerner, R. 1985. Tiryns als Beispiel einer fr hen dorischen Polis, *Klio* 67, 452-457.
- Kontorini, V. 1987. Influence de Lindos sur le droit sacr de Cyr•ne: Les suppliants de Cyr•ne ^ la lumi•re d'une inscription in dite de Lindos, *L'Africa romana* IV 2, 579-580.
- . 1989. *Ανέκδοτες Έπιγραφές Ρόδου* II, Athens.
- Kostomitsopoulos, P. 1988. Lindian Sacri ce: An Evaluation of the Evidence based on new Inscriptions, in S. Dietz and I. Papachristodoulou (eds.), *Archaeology in the Dodecanese*, Copenhagen, 121-128.
- Koumanoudis: See under Coumanoudis.
- Kyrieleis, H. 1993. The Heraion at Samos, in N. Marinatos and R. H. gg (eds.), *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, London and New York, 125-153.
- Labarbe, J. 1977. *Thorikos: Les Testimonia* (FdTh 1), Ghent.

- Lazzarini, M.L. 1998. Zeus Meilichios e le Eumenidi: Alcune considerazioni, in E. Catani and S.M. Marengo (eds.), *La Cirenaica in età antica: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Macerata, 18–20 maggio 1995*, Macerata, 311–317.
- Le Guen-Pollet, B. 1991. Espace sacré ciel et corps des bêtes immolés: remarques sur le vocabulaire designant la part du prêtre dans la Grèce antique, de l'époque classique à l'époque impériale, in R. Étienne and M.-T. Le Dinahet (eds.), *L'espace sacrificiel dans les civilisations méditerranéennes de l'antiquité*, Paris, 3–23.
- Lejeune, M. 1982. Noms grecs et noms indigènes dans l'épigraphie hellénistique d'Entella, in *Materiali e contributi*, 787–799.
- . 1991. Un huitième dans le lexique métrologique grec, *REG* 104, 198–201.
- . 1993. Le nom de mesure LITRA, *REG* 106, 1–11.
- Lewis, D. 1985. A New Athenian Decree, *ΣPE* 60, 108.
- Loomis, W.T. 1998. *Wages, Welfare Costs and Inflation in Classical Athens*, Ann Arbor.
- Loucas, I. and Loucas, E. 1994. The Sacred Laws of Lykosoura, in R. Hägg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence* (ActaAth-8° 13), Stockholm, 97–99.
- Lupu, E. 2001. The Sacred Law from the Cave of Pan at Marathon (*SEG* XXXVI 267), *ΣPE* 137, 119–124.
- . 2003. Sacrifice at the Amphiarceion and a Fragmentary Sacred Law from Oropos, *Hesperia* 72, 321–340.
- . 2003a. *Maschalismata*: A Note on *SEG* XXXV 113, in D.R. Jordan and J.S. Traill (eds.), *Lettered Attica. A Day of Attic Epigraphy: Proceedings of the Athens Symposium 8 March 2000*, Toronto, 69–77.
- Makarov, I.A. 2000. On the Interpretation of a New Chersonesian Document, *VDI* 2000 fasc. 1, 112–119. (In Russian).
- Manni Piraino, M.T. 1975. Koino alfabetica fra Siracusa, Megara Iblea e Selinunte?, *Kòkalos* 21, 121–153.
- Matthaïou, A.P. and Pikoulas, G. 1986. Τερὸς νόμος ἀπὸ τῆς Λυκόσουρας, *Horos* 4, 75–78.
- Matthaïou, A.P. 1992–1998. Τρεῖς ἐπιγραφές Πάρου, *Horos* 10–12, 423–436.
- Mattingly, H. 1990. Some Fifth-Century Attic Epigraphic Hands, *ΣPE* 83, 110–122.
- Mikalson, J.D. 1975. *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year*, Princeton.
- . 1977. Religion in the Attic Demes, *AJP* 98, 424–435.
- . 1998. *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London.
- Milgrom, J. 1991. *Leviticus 1–16. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible III), New York/London.
- Morelli, D. 1959. *I culti in Rodi* (SCO 8), Pisa.
- Nenci, G. 1980. Sei decreti inediti da Entella, *AnnPisa* III 10, 1271–1275.
- . 1990. *Klarographia e adelphothesia*: Osservazioni sul decreto di Nacogna, in G. Nenci and G. Thier (eds.), *Symposion 1988: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Siena—Pisa, 6.–8. Juni 1988)*, Cologne and Vienna, 173–177.

- . 1994. La KYPBIΣ selinuntina, *AnnPisa* III 24, 459-466.
- Nilsson, M.P. 1906. *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung*, Leipzig.
- . 1951-1960. *Opuscula selecta*, (3 vols.) Lund.
- . 1955. *Die hellenistische Schule*, Munich.
- North, J.A. 1996. Pollution and Purification at Selinous, *SCI* 15, 293-301.
- Osborne, R. 1985. *Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attika*, Cambridge.
- . 1993. Women and Sacrifice in Classical Greece, *CQ* 43, 392-405.
- . 1997. Law and Laws: How Do We Join up the Dots, in L.G. Mitchell and P.J. Rhodes (eds.), *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, London/New York, 74-82.
- Papachristodoulou, I. 1999. The Rhodian Demes within the Framework of the Function of the Rhodian State, in V. Gabrielsen et al. (eds.), *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society*, Aarhus.
- Parke, H.W. 1977. *Festivals of the Athenians*, London.
- Parker, R. 1983. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, Oxford.
- . 1984. The Herakleidai at Thorikos, *ΣΠΕ* 57, 59.
- . 1984a. A Note on φόνος, θυσία and μασχαλισμός, *LCM* 9, 38.
- . 1987. Festivals of the Attic Demes, in T. Linders and G. Nordquist (eds.), *Gifts to the Gods: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1985* (*Boreas* 15), 137-147.
- . 1996. *Athenian Religion: A History*, Oxford.
- and Obbink, D. 2000. Sales of Priesthoods on Cos I, *Chiron* 30, 415-449.
- and Obbink, D. 2001. Sales of Priesthoods on Cos II, *Chiron* 31, 229-252.
- and Obbink, D. 2001a. Three Further Inscriptions Concerning Coan Cults, *Chiron* 31, 253-275.
- Peek, W. 1977. Kretische Vers-Inschriften II, *ArchCl* 29, 64-85.
- Petrakos, B.C. 1987. Τὸ Νεμέσιον τοῦ Ραμνοῦντος, in *Φύλια ἔπη εἰς Γεώργιον Ε. Μυλωνᾶν διὰ τὰ 60 ἔτη τοῦ ἀνασκαφικοῦ τοῦ ἔργου*, vol. II, Athens, 295-326.
- . 1993. Ἡ ἀλεποῦ ἦταν ἀρχαιοκάπηλος (τὸ σπήλαιον τοῦ Πανὸς στὸν Μαθαῶνα), *Ὁ Μέντωρ* 25, 67-70.
- . 1996. *Marathon*, Trans. A. Doumas, Athens (Greek original 1995).
- Petropoulou, A.B. 1987. The Sacrifice of Eumaeus Reconsidered, *GRBS* 28, 135-149.
- Pierrat, M. 1991. Critique et identité culturelle: Les cités du Ploponnès nord-oriental, in C. Baurain, C. Bonnet, and V. Krings (eds.), *Phoinikeia Grammata: Lire et écrire en Méditerranée*, Namur, 565-576.
- Pilar Fernández Alvarez, M. 1986. Notas lingüísticas sobre una inscripción arcaica de Tirinto, *HABIS* 17, 9-20.
- Pingiatoglou, S. 1981. *Eileithyia*, Würzburg.
- Pleket, H.W. 1999. Review of Gauthier and Hatzopoulos 1993, *Gnomon* 71, 231-236.
- Pritchett, W.K. 1987. The Παννυχίς of the Panathenaia, in *Φύλια ἔπη εἰς Γεώργιον Ε. Μυλωνᾶν διὰ τὰ 60 ἔτη τοῦ ἀνασκαφικοῦ τοῦ ἔργου*, vol. II, Athens, 179-188.

- Puttkammer, F. 1912. *Quo modo Graeci victimarum carnes distribuerint*, Diss., K nigsberg.
- Raubitschek, A.E. 1981. A New Attic Club (*Eranoi*), *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 9, 93–98. (Reprinted in *The School of Hellas: Essays on Greek History, Archaeology and Literature*, (D. Obbink and P.A. Vander Waerdt (eds.), New York/Oxford, 1990, 134–142).
- Rhodes, P.J. with Lewis, D.M. 1997. *The Decrees of the Greek States*, Oxford.
- Rigsby, K.J. 1987. A Decree of Haliartus on Cult, *AJP* 108, 729–740.
- . 1996. *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London.
- Robertson, N. 1983. The Riddle of the Arrhephoria at Athens, *HSCP* 87, 241–288.
- . 1996. New Light on Demeter's Mysteries: The Festival Proerosia, *GRBS* 37, 319–379.
- Roesch, P. 1965. *Thespies et la confédération béotienne*, Paris.
- . 1982. *Études béotiennes*, Paris.
- Roos, E. 1960. De incubationis ritu per ludibrium apud Aristophanem detorto, *OpAth* 3, 55–97.
- Rosivach, V.J. 1994. *The System of Public Sacrifice in Fourth-Century Athens*, Atlanta.
- Rudhardt, J. 1992. *Notions fondamentales de la pensée religieuse et actes constitutifs du culte dans la Grèce classique*<sup>2</sup>, Paris [Geneva, 1958].
- Samuel, A.E. 1972. *Greek and Roman Chronology: Calendars and Years in Classical Antiquity*, Munich.
- Sarikakis, T.C. 1989. *Χιακή προσοπογραφία*, Athens.
- . 1998. *Η Χίος στην ἀρχαιότητα*, Athens.
- Savalli, I. 1982. La terza iscrizione di Entella, in *Materiali e contributi*, 1055–1067.
- Schachter, A. 1981–1994. *Cults of Boiotia* (*BICS Supplement* 38), 4 vols., London.
- Scherrer, E. 1979. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)* II, Revised by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Black, Edinburgh.
- Schwabl, H. 1972. Zeus, I. Epiklesen, *RE* X, 253–376.
- . 1996. Review of Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski 1993, *WS* 109, 284–286.
- Scullion, S. 1994. Olympian and Chthonian, *ClAnt* 13, 75–119.
- . 1998. Three Notes on Attic Sacrificial Calendars, *ΣPE* 121, 116–122.
- . 2000. Heroic and Chthonian Sacrifice: New Evidence from Selinous, *ΣPE* 132, 163–171.
- Segre, M. 1936. Osservazioni epigrafiche sulla vendita di sacerdozio, *RendIstLomb* II 69, 811–830.
- . 1937. Osservazioni epigrafiche sulla vendita di sacerdozio, *RendIstLomb* II 70, 83–105.
- Semeria, A. 1986. Per un censimento degli *Asklepieia* della Grecia continentale e delle isole, *AnnPisa* III 16, 931–958.
- Servais, J. 1960. Les suppliants dans la loi sacrée de Cyrène, *BCH* 84, 112–147.
- Sfameni Gasparro, G. 1997. Daimon and Tuchos in the Hellenistic Religious

- Experience, in P. Bilde et al. (eds.), *Conventional Values of the Hellenistic Greeks*, Aarhus, 67–109.
- Shipley, G. 1987. *A History of Samos, 800–188 B.C.*, Oxford.
- Simms, R.M. 1998. The Phrearrhian *Lex Sacra*: An Interpretation, *Hesperia* 67, 91–107.
- Sinn, U. 1993. Greek Sanctuaries as Places of Refuge, in N. Marinatos and R. Hägg (eds.), *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, London and New York, 88–109.
- Sokolowski, F. 1954. Fees and Taxes in the Greek Cults, *HTHR* 47, 153–164.
- . 1971. On the *Lex Sacra* of the Deme Phrearrhioi, *GBRS* 12, 217–220.
- . 1978. The *καπηλοι* in the Heraion of Samos, *ΖΠΕ* 29, 143–147.
- Solomonik, E.I. 1996. Greek Inscriptions from the Chersonesus, *VDI* 1996 fasc. 4, 44–53. (In Russian).
- Soverini, L. 1991. Il commercio nel tempio: Osservazioni sul regolamento dei *καπηλοι* a Samo (*SEG XXVII*, 545), *Opus* 9, 10, 59–121.
- Stavrianopoulou, E. 1993. Der MATERES-Kult in Eleutherna und der MHTERES-Kult in Engyon: Ein gemeinsamer Ursprung?, *PP* 48, 161–175.
- Steinhauer, G. 1994. Inscription agoranomique du Pirée, *BCH* 118, 151–168.
- Stengel, P. 1920. *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*<sup>3</sup>, Munich.
- Stephanis, I.E. 1982. Ἡ συμμετοχὴ τῶν Ἀλιαρτίων στὰ Πτώια, *Hellenika* 34, 220–222.
- Te Riele, G.-J.-M.-J. 1978. Une nouvelle loi sacrée en Arcadie, *BCH* 102, 325–331.
- Thériault, G. 1996. *Le culte d'Homonoia dans les cités grecques*, Lyon/Quebec.
- Thier, G. and Tauber, H. 1978. Prozessrechtlicher Kommentar zur Krömerinschrift aus Samos, *AnzWien* 115, 205–225.
- Tracy, S.V. 1990. Hands in Samian Inscriptions of the Hellenistic Period, *Chiron* 20, 59–96.
- Travlos, J. 1971. *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*, New York/Washington.
- . 1989. *Bildlexikon zur Topographie des antiken Attika*, Tübingen.
- Tréheux, J. 1990. La prise en considération des décrets en Grèce à l'époque hellénistique, in C. Nicolet (ed.), *Du pouvoir dans l'antiquité: Mots et réalités* (Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz 1), Geneva, 117–127.
- Trümper, C. 1997. *Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Monatsnamen und Monatsfolgen*, Heidelberg.
- Vanderpool, E. 1970. A *Lex Sacra* of the Attic Deme Phrearrhioi, *Hesperia* 39, 47–53.
- . 1975. A South Attic Miscellany, *MIGRA* 1, 21–42.
- van Effenterre, H. 1989. Préliminaires épigraphiques aux études d'histoire du droit grec, in F.J. Fernández Nieto (ed.), *Symposium 1982: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte (Santander, 1.–4. September 1982)*, Cologne and Vienna, 1–8.
- . and van Effenterre, M. 1988. L'acte de fraternisation de Nakone, *MÉFRA* 100, 687–700.
- van Straten, F.T. 1979. The Lebes of Herakles: Note on a New Decree Stele from Eleusis, *BABesch* 54, 189–191.

- . 1987. Greek Sacri cial Representations: Livestock Prices and Religious Mentality, in T. Linders and G. Nordquist (eds.), *Gifts to the Gods: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1985* (Boreas 15), 160-170.
- . 1995. *Hiera kala: Images of Animal Sacrifice in Archaic and Classical Greece*, Leiden/New York/K ln.
- Vatin, C. 1968. Un d cret d Haliarte sur le culte d Athena It nia, *BCH* 92, 616-624.
- Veligianni, C. 1988. Lex Sacra aus Thasos, *ΖΡΕ* 71, 191-194.
- . 1994. Lex sacra aus Amphipolis, *ΖΡΕ* 100, 391-405.
- Verdelis, N. 1963. Ἀνασκαφή Τίρυνθος: Ἀποκάλυψις δύο νέων Συρίγγων, *AD* 18 B 1, 66-73.
- , Jameson, M.H. and Papachristodoulou, I. 1975. Ἀρχαῖκα ἐπιγραφὰ ἐκ Τίρυνθος, *ArchEph* 1975, 150-205.
- Vondeling, J. 1961. *Eranos*, Groningen. (In Dutch; English summary used).
- Voutiras, E. 1993. Η λατρεία του Ασκληπιού στην αρχαία Μακεδονία, *Ancient Macedonia* 5, 251-265.
- Whitehead, D. 1986. *The Demes of Attica, 508/7-ca. 250 B.C.*, Princeton.
- . 1986a. Festival Liturgies in Thorikos, *ΖΡΕ* 62, 213-220.
- Willets, R.F. 1962. *Cretan Cults and Festivals*, London.
- Woodford, S. 1971. Cults of Heracles in Attica, in D.G. Mitten, J.G. Pedley and J.A. Scott (eds.) *Studies Presented to George M.A. Hanfmann*, Mainz, 211-225.
- Yavis, C.G. 1949. *Greek Altars: Origins and Typology*, St. Louis.
- Wolf, S. 1998. Unter dem Einßuss des Dionysos: Zu einem hellenistischen Weihrelief an Herakles, *JdI* 113, 49-90.
- Ziehen, L. 1939. Opfer, *RE* XVIII, 579-627.



## INDICES

### GREEK INDEX

Page numbers are given in bold type. Square brackets and sublinear dots have been avoided when possible. Restorations in the texts are cited within square brackets; restorations in the Restoration sections cited in the index are marked Rest. (e.g. 1.2 3 Rest.).

#### 1. *Gods and Heroes*

- Ἄγλαυρος  
[Ἀγλ.]αύρωι οἶν 1.53 54
- Ἀθήνα  
Ἀθηναίαι 1.5 Rest., 23 (οἶν πρα-  
τόν), 53 (οἶν κριτόν), 54 (ἄρνα κρι-  
τόν); ὀφλῆν ἐν[ς Δί]φα κάθαναιάν  
6.2A4 3A1; ἐν τῷ Ἀθανᾶς Ἰτωνίας  
κῆ Διὸς Καραῖω τεμένει 11.8 9
- Ἀλκμήνη  
Ἀλκμήνηι τέλεον 1.37
- Ἄνακτες  
Ἀνάκοιν τ[έλεον] 1.37
- Ἄνουβις  
ἱερὸν ἄγιον Ἰσιος Σαράπιος  
Ἄνούβιος 7.2 3
- Ἀπόλλων  
Ἀπόλλωνι 1.20 (χίμαρον κριτόν),  
24 (χοῖρον), Lat. Sin. 31 Rest.  
(τέλεον); ἐς Πυθίῳ Ἀπόλλωνος  
(the snactuary of) 1.41; ὁμνύναι  
Δία, Ἀπόλλ[ω, Δήμητρ]α 1.60 61;  
ὁμνύω Δία, Γῆν, Ἥλιον, Ἀπόλλω,  
Ἡρακλῆν, Ἑρμῆν 14 A 26, [55  
56]; Ἀπόλλωνι (Ἐνφδ[ίωι/  
Ἐνφλ[μίωι] Rest.) χίμαρος 16.1 2
- Ἄρτεμις  
Ἀρτέμιδι Μονυχ[ίαι τέλε]{ε}ον  
1.40 41; Ἀ[ρτέμιδι] αἶγα 1.42 43;  
[ἐς τ]ᾶ ἄδυττα (τὰ) Ἀρτέ[μιδος]  
23 A 22; [- - - Ἀρτέμιδι] Ἄγρο-
- [τέραι - - -] 23 D 6
- Ἀσκληπιός  
Ἀσκληπιῷ θυ[- - -] 13.16; τῷ  
Ἀσκληπιῷ 13.17; Θυμῖλος ἴσατο  
τόνδ' Ἀσκληπιόν 24.1
- Γῆ  
ὁμνύω Δία, Γῆν, Ἥλιον, Ἀπόλλω,  
Ἡρακλῆν, Ἑρμῆν 14 A 26, [55  
56]
- Δαῖρα  
[Δαίρ]αι 1.5 Rest.
- Δέσποινα  
[Δεσπ]οίνα 8.1 2
- Δημήτηρ  
Δήμητρι 1.21 22 (τέλ[εον]), 38 39  
(τὴν χλο[ῖαν, οἶν κρ]ιτὴν κυδσαν),  
43 44 (οἶν κυδσαν ἄνθειαν);  
ὁμνύναι Δία, Ἀπόλλ[ω, Δήμητρ]α  
1.60 61; [Δήμητρι Θεσμο]φόρῳ  
ὑν 3.1 2; θυόντωνσαν τῇ Δή[μητρ]ι  
3.12; ὁμνύειν Ἡρακλῆν, Δήμητρα,  
Κόρην 5.30 31
- Διόνυσος  
Διονύσωι 1.33 (αἶγα), 45 ([τράγον])
- Εἰλειθνια  
ἰ[ε]ρέ[αι] Ἐλειθίης 20.1 2; [τ]ῇ  
ἱερέ[αι] τῆς Ἐλειθίης 20.15 16



Ἐκάτη

Ἐκάτη 1.7

Ἐλένη

[Ἐλέ]νη τέλεον 1.37 38

Ἐποχος

Ἐ[πό]χωι 1.26 Rest.

Ἐρμῆς

ὀμνύω Δία, Γῆν, Ἥλιον, Ἀπόλλω,

Ἡρακλῆν, Ἐρμῆν 14 A 26, [55

56]; θυέτω (ὁ γυμνασίαρχος) τῷ

Ἐρμῇ 14 B 46; ὀρκισάτω τὸν

Ἐρμῆν δικαίως κρινεῖν 14 B 49

50; ὁμόσας ὁ γυμνασίαρχος τὸν

Ἐρμῆν κρινάτω 14 B 54 55;

(ἀναδεικνύτωσαν ἑτέρους) οἵτινες

Ἐ ἱεροποιήσουσιν Ἐρμῇ 14 B 63

64; συντελείτωσαν δὲ τὴν θυσίαν

τῷ Ἐρμῇ καὶ οἱ παιδοτρίβαι

14 B 64; θεῷ Ἐρμ[ᾶι] 15.6

Εὐθύδαμος

τῷ ἐν Εὐθυδάμο Μιλιχίοι κριὸν

θ[υ]όντο 27 A 17 18

Εὐμενίδες

τῷ Διὶ τῷ Εὐμενεῖ θυ[ε]ν [καί]

ταῖς Εὐμενίδεσι τέλεον 27 A 8 9

Ζεύς

Διὶ Καταβάτηι 1.10, 25 (τέλεον

πρατόν); Διὶ Πολιεῖ 1.13 (κριτὸν

οῖν κτλ); Διὶ Ἐρκαίῳ 1.22 (τέ-

λεον), Lat. Sin. 42, Lat. Dex.

44 (οῖν); Διὶ Μιλιχίοι 1.35 (οῖν)

Δί 1.39 (ἄρνα κριτόν); Διὶ 1.47;

ὀμνύναι Δία, Ἀπόλλ[ω, Δήμητρ]α

1.60 61; ὀφλ[ε]ν ἐν[ς Δί]φα ἀάθα-

ναίαν 6.2A4 3A1; ἐν τῷ Ἀθα-

ναῖς Ἰτωνίας κῆ Διὸς Καραιῷ

τεμένει 11.8 9; ὀμνύω Δία, Γῆν,

Ἥλιον, Ἀπόλλω, Ἡρακλῆν Ἐρμῆν

14 A 26, [55 56]; [τῷ] Ζηνὶ Πολι-

αό[χ]ωι 23 A 9; [θύ]εν τῷ Ζηνὶ

τέλεον τ[αῦ]ρον 23 A 17; Ζην[ι]-

- -] 23 D 2; [Ζ]ηνὶ Μα[χ]ανῆι ]

23 D 5; ἔς τὸ πρόναον τοῦ Διὸς

[τοῦ] Ὀλυμπίου 26.34; τῷ Διὶ

τῷ Εὐμενεῖ θυ[ε]ν [καί] ταῖς Εὐ-

μενίδεσι τέλεον 27 A 8 9; τῷ

Διὶ τοῖ Μιλιχίοι τῷ ἐν Μύσφο τέ-

λεον 27 A 9; θύσας τῷ Διὶ χοῖρον

27 B 5

Ἥλιος

ὀμνύω Δία, Γῆν, Ἥλιον, Ἀπόλλω,

Ἡρακλῆν, Ἐρμῆν 14 A 26, [55

56]

Ἡρα

Ἡραι 1.5 Rest., 32; [ἐν τῷ τῆς

Ἡρας ἱερῶι] 18.4 5; [ἐν] <τ>ῶι τῆς

Ἡρας τέσσαρα 18.6

Ἡρακλειδα

Ἡρακλειδα[ις τέλεον] 1.36

Ἡρακλῆς

Ἡρακλεῖ 1.36 Rest.; τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ

τῷ ἐν Ἀκριδι 2.19; (αἱ λιθοτομί-

αι) εἰσὶν ἱεραὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλέως τοῦ

ἐν Ἀκριδι 2.22; τὴν ἑορτὴν τοῦ

Ἡρακλέως τοῦ ἐν Ἀκριδι 2.32

33; τὴν θυσίαν τοῦ Ἡρακλέως

2.38; ἐν τῷ ἱερῶι τοῦ Ἡρακλέ-

ως τοῦ ἐν Ἀκριδι 2.45; τὸν ἱερέα

τοῦ Ἡρακλέως Ἀντιφάνην 2.48

49; ὀμνύνει Ἡρακλῆν, Δήμητρα,

Κόρην 5.30 31; ὀμνύω Δία, Γῆν,

Ἥλιον, Ἀπόλλω, Ἡρακλῆν, Ἐρ-

μῆν 14 A 26, [55 56]

Ἡρωῖναι Θεορίκου

Ἡρωῖνησι Θεορίκο τράπεζαν 1.18,

30

Ἡρωῖναι Κορωνέων

-ωῖνησιν Κορωνέων οῖν 1 Lat. Sin.

58

Ἡρωῖναι Πυλουχίδες

Ἡρωῖνησι Πυλοχίσι τρά[πεζαν]

1.51

Ἡρωῖναι Ὑπερπεδίου

Ἡρωῖνησι[ν Ὑπερ]πεδίο τράπεζαν

1.48 49

Θορίκος

Θορίκωι 1.18 (κριτὸν οῖν), 28

(βοῦν)

Θρασ[- -]

Θρασ([υκλεῖ] or Θρασ[ύλλωι]

Rest.) οῖν 1.49 50

- Ἰακχος  
τοῦ Ἰάκχου 3.26
- Ἰσις  
στάλα Ἰσιος Σαράπιος 7.1; ἱερὸν  
ἅγιον Ἰσιος Σαράπιος Ἀνούβιος  
7.2 3
- Κέφαλος  
Κεφάλωι 1.16 17 (οἶν κριτόν), 54  
55 (βοῦν)
- Κόρη  
τῇ Κόρηι βοῦμ ἄρρενα 3.13;  
ὁμνύειν Ἡρακλῆν, Δήμητρα,  
Κόρην 5.30 31
- Κουροτρόφος  
Κουροτρόφωι 1.20 21 (χοῖρον  
κριτήν), 22, 41 42 (χοῖρον)
- Λητώ  
Λητοῖ αἶγα 1.42
- Μειλίχιος. *See also* Ζεύς  
τοῖ ἐν Εὐθυδάμο Μιλιχίοι κριὸν  
θ[υ]όντο 27 A 17 18
- Μητέρες  
Ματέρσι 23 A 18
- Μύσκος  
τοῖ Διὶ τοῖ Μιλιχίοι τοῖ ἐν Μύσφο  
τέλεον 27 A 9
- Νεανίας 1.27  
Νεανίαί τέλεον
- Νίσος  
Νίσωι οἶν 1.49
- Νύμφαι  
Πανὶ καὶ Νύνφαις (ἀνατίθημι)  
4.5 6
- Ὀμόνοια  
θυόντω Ἐ τοῖς γενετόρεσσι καὶ  
ταῖ Ὀμονο(ί)αι 26.30 31
- Πάν  
Πανὶ καὶ Νύνφαις (ἀνέθηκαν) 4.5  
6
- Πάνδροσος  
Π[ανδρόσωι] 1.56 Rest.
- Πανδώρα  
Π[ανδώραι] 1.56 Rest.
- Πλούτος  
Πλούτωνι θυόντωσαν κρ(ιό)[ν]  
3.7; [τῶι τ]οῦ Πλούτωνος βωμῶι  
3.19
- Ποσειδῶν  
Ποσειδῶνι 1.19 (ἄμνον κριτόν),  
23 (τέλεον), 56 Rest., Lat. Sin. 31  
Rest.
- Πρόκρις  
Πρόκριδι 1.17 (τράπεζαν), 56 (οἶν)
- Πυλοῦχος  
Πυ[λόχωι] χοῖρον 1.50 51
- Ῥόγιος  
Ῥογίωι οἶν 1.50
- Σάραπις  
στάλα Ἰσιος Σαράπιος 7.1; ἱερὸν  
ἅγιον Ἰσιος Σαράπιος Ἀνούβιος  
7.2 3
- Σωσίνεως  
Σωσινέωι οἶν 1.50
- Τριτοπάτορες  
τοῖς Τριτοπατρεῦσι τοῖς μιαιοῖς  
27 A 9 10
- Ὑπερπέδιος  
Ὑπερπεδίωι οἶν 1.48
- Φιλωνίς  
Φιλ[ωνίδι τρ]άπεζαν 1.44 45
- Φοῖνιξ  
Φοίνικι τέλ[εον] 1 Lat. Dex. 12

2. *Festivals*

- Διάσια  
Διασίσις 1.34 35
- Διονύσια  
1.31  
Ἑρμαῖα  
περὶ Ἑρμαίων 14 B 45; ποιείτω ὁ

- γυμνασίαρχος τὰ Ἑρμαῖα 14 B 45  
 46; ποιείτω δὲ καὶ λαμπάδα ἐν τοῖς  
 Ἑρμαίοις 14 B 59; ἀγέτωσαν δὲ τὰ  
 Ἑρμαῖα καὶ οἱ ἱεροποιοὶ 14 B 60  
 61; ἐν τε τῇ λαμπάδι τῶν Ἑρμαίων  
 Ἑ 14 B 85; [ἐν τῷ γυμνα]σίῳ  
 τοῖς Ἑρμαίο[ις ἀγῶνας τίθεσθαι]  
 15.2 3  
 Ἱερὸς Γάμος  
 Ἱερῷ Γάμῳ 1.32  
 Κοτύττια  
 πρὸ ροτυτίον καὶ τὰς ἐχεχερίας  
 27 A 7  
 Μουσεία  
 τὰ Μωσεῖα 11.20
- Ὀλυμπιάς  
 πένπ[τοι] φέτει ἡδιπερ ἡόκα ἡα  
 Ὀλυνπιάς ποτεῖε 27 A 7 8  
 Πλυντήρια  
 Πλυντηρίους 1.52 53  
 Πρηρόσια  
 1.13  
 Πτώια  
 πεμπέμεν ἱππ[έα]ς [ἐν τὸν]  
 ἀ[γῶ]ν[α] τὸν ἀπὸ τελέων  
 ἐν τῷ Πτωίων ἀ[γ]ῶνι 11.10 11  
 Πυανοψία  
 Πυανοψίους 1.27, Lat. Sin.  
 31
3. Months
- Ἀδώνιος  
 Ἀδωνίου τετάρται ἱσταμένον  
 26.2; τοῦ Ἀδωνίου τῇ τετάρται  
 ἱσταμένου 26.9  
 Ἀνθεστηριών  
 Ἀνθεστηριῶνος 1.33  
 Ἀπελλαῖος  
 Ἀπελλαίου ΙΘ 14 A 2  
 Ἀρτεμισιών  
 [Ἀρτεμισ]ιώνος ἑνδεκάτη[ι] 18.1  
 Rest.  
 Βοηδρομιών  
 Βοηδρομιῶνος 1.13  
 Γαμηλιών  
 Γαμηλιῶνος 1.32  
 Γορπιαῖος  
 ἐν τῷ Γορπιαίῳ μηνί 14 B 72 73  
 Δαμάτριος  
 [μηνὸς Δ]αματρίῳ 23 A 7 (cf.  
 Rest.)  
 Δῖος  
 τ[οῦ] Δίου μηνὸς τῇ νομηνίαι  
 14 A 35; τῇ ὑστέραι τοῦ Δίου  
 14 A 41; ἐν μηνὶ Δίῳ τοῦ εἰσιόντος  
 ἔτους 14 B 91  
 Ἑκατομβαιών  
 Ἑκατομβαιῶνος 1.1 2  
 Ἑλαφηβολιών  
 Ἑλαφηβολιῶνος 1.36
- Ἡράκλειος  
 6.15 A Rest. (ἡερακλειου)  
 Θαργηλιών  
 Θαργηλιῶνος 1.47  
 Κρονιών  
 [Κρον]ιώνος ἑνδεκάτη[ι] 18.1 Rest.  
 Λευκαθεών  
 Λε[υ]καθεῶνος ὀγδό[η] 20.13 14  
 Μαμακτηριών  
 Μαμακτηριῶνος 1.28  
 Μεταγειτινών  
 [Μεταγειτνιῶνος] 1.10; εἰς τὸν  
 Μεταγειτνιῶνα μῆνα 2.27  
 Μουνυχιών  
 Μουνυχιῶνος 1.40; Μουνιχιῶνος  
 ὀκτῶ καὶ δεκάτῃ 5.2 3  
 Περίτιος  
 ἐκυρώθη Περιτίου νομηνίαι  
 14 A 21 22  
 Ποσειδεών  
 Ποσιδειῶνος 1.31  
 Πυανοψιών  
 Πυανοψιῶνος 1.25  
 Σκιροφοριών  
 Σκιροφοριῶνος 1.52  
 Ὑπερβερεταῖος  
 ποιείτω Ἑ τὰ Ἑρμαῖα τοῦ  
 Ὑπερβερεταίου μηνὸς 14 B 45 46

4. *Geographical Names*

- Ἀτίνη  
[μ]ηνὸς Ἀτίν[ησιν] 1.8 Rest.  
Ἄκρις (Eleusis) **156–158**  
π[ερὶ τ]ῆς Ἄκριδος 2.4; τῶι Ἡρα-  
κλεῖ τῶι ἐν Ἄκριδι 2.19; (αἱ λιθο-  
τομῖαι) εἰσὶν ἱεραὶ τοῦ Ἡρακλέως  
τοῦ ἐν Ἄκριδι 2.22; τὴν ἑορτὴν  
τοῦ Ἡρακλέως τοῦ ἐν Ἄκριδι  
2.32 33; ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ Ἡρα-  
κλέως τοῦ ἐν Ἄκριδι 2.45  
Ἄργος  
Ἀργόθην 6.16 A Rest.  
Ἀυτομεναι (Attica; doubtful) **132–**  
**133**  
ἐπ' Αὐτομένας/ἐπ' Αὐτομένας  
1.14, 47 Rest.  
Δῖον Ἄκρον (Crete) **324**  
(ἰ)ς Δῖον Ἄκρον 22.2 3  
Ἐλευσίς  
τὰς λιθοτομίας τὰς Ἐλευσῖνι 2.21  
Λίμναι (Attica)  
(σύνδοδος) τῶν Ἡρακλιαστῶν τῶν  
ἐν Λίμναις 5.4 5  
Μυκηνον/ς (Attica)  
ἐπὶ Μυκηνον 1.45, Lat. Dex. 4  
Σούνιον (Attica)  
ἐπὶ Σούνιον 1.19

5. *Tribes, Demes, Clans, Associations, etc. (including demotics etc.)*

- Ἀκραιφιεῖς  
ἃ πόλιν Ἀκρηφιεῶν 11.4  
Ἀλιάρτιοι  
παρακαλῖ τὰν πόλιν Ἀρια[ρτίων]  
11.7  
Ἐγεσταῖοι  
πρέσβεις Ἐγεσταίων παργεναθέν-  
τες E 26.6 7  
Ἐλευσίνιοι  
Φιλόκωμος Φαλανθίδου Ἐλευσί-  
νιος 2.18; δεδόχθαι Ἐλευσινίοις  
2.9  
Ἡρακλιασταί  
(σύνδοδος) τῶν Ἡρακλιαστῶν τῶν  
ἐν Λίμναις 5.4 5  
Νακωναῖοι  
τὰ χο[ρινὰ] τῶν Νακωναίων 26.4 5  
Παιανεύς  
ἔδοξεν τῷ ἀρχεραριστῇ Μάρκῳ  
Αἰμιλίῳ Εὐχαρίστῳ Παιαν(ι)εῖ  
5.3 4  
Φίλομηλίδαι  
ἐμ [Φίλομ]η(λ)ιδῶν 1.25 26  
Φρεάρριοι  
Φρεαρρίων 3.12  
Ὠρόπιοι  
Ὠροπί[ους/ων] 10.15 Rest. (Ὠρο-  
πι[- -])

6. *Personal Names*

- Ἀντίοχος 21.13  
Ἀντιφάνης 2.48 49  
Ἀπέλλιχος Ἀλεΐδα 26.7  
Ἀπολλώνιος 11.6  
Ἀσκληπιάδης Ἡρᾶ 14 A 4, 18  
Ἀττικὸς Πίστωνος 26.7  
Δαμοκλῆς 11.16  
Δαμόφιλος Ἀλεξίαι 11.5  
Δευξίλαος Θάλλω 11.6  
Διονύσιος Δεκίου 26.7 8  
Δροῦσος (brother of Tiberius) 5.2  
Ἐμπεδιώνδας 11.1  
Ἐπιγένης 2.2  
Ἐρμαῖος Ἐπιτέλεος 11.2  
Ζώπυρος Ἀμύντου 14 A 3, 17  
Θαρσύτας 24.2  
Θεόφημος 4.1 2  
Θυμῖλος 24.1  
Ἴπποκράτης Νικοκράτου 14 A 1 2  
Κάλλιππος Ἴπποστράτου 14 A 4 5, 18

Λεύκιος Καισίου 26.1  
 Λύσανδρος 4.4  
 Μάρκος Αιμίλιος Εὐχάριστος Παι-  
 νεύς 5.3 4  
 Μοιροκλῆς Εὐθυδῆμου 2.6 7, 14, 15;  
**63 n. 318, 156**  
 Νικήτης 2.25, 26 27, 49, 52  
 Νίκος Νικ[- - -] ([Νίκ[ου] Rest.) 19.10

Περικλῆς 20.13  
 Πυθαγόρας 4.3  
 Σωσιγένης 4.3 4  
 Τίτος Φλάβιος Κόνων 5.1; **182-183**  
 Φιλόκωμος Φαλανθίδου Ἐλευσίνιος  
 2.3, 10, 13, 18  
 Φιλωνίδας Φιλ[- - -] 26.1

### 7. Significant Words and Phrases

ἄβατον **20-21, 130-131, 246, 333**

ἀγαθός

τύχη ἀγαθῇ τῶν δημοτῶν 2.2,  
 18 19; ἀγαθὴ τύχη 4.1; 5.1; Θεός·  
 τύχα ἀγαθὰ 7.2; εὐορκοῦντι μέν  
 μοι εἴη πολλά καὶ ἀγαθὰ 14 A 32  
 33, cf. 61 62

ἀγαλμα

σφαζόντο βδ[ν πρ]ὸ ἀγαλμάτων  
 27 A 21

ἀγερός **81**

ἄγερσις **81**

ἅγιος

ἱερὸν ἅγιον Ἰσῖος Σαράπιος  
 Ἀνούβιος 7.2 3  
 τὸ ἅγιον **19**

ἀγνίζω

[ἦ μὴ ἀγνίζω]ντι (τοὺς ἱκέτας) 17.8  
 Rest.

ἀγνός

ἡγνον 6.2B1

ἀγορά

ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ τῶν δημοτῶν 2.23;  
 ἀγορᾶς γενομένης 5.29 30

ἀγοράζω

ὅταν οἱ δημόται ἀγοράζωσιν  
 2.28; περὶ ἱερεωσυνῶν ὧν ἄν τις  
 ἀγοράσῃ 5.16 17; ὁ τὴν τοῦ γλοιοῦ  
 πρόσδοτον ἀγοράσας 14 B 97; οὐδὲ  
 ἀγορῶσι[v] 18.17

ἀγοραῖος

(μὴ ἐγδυνέσθω Ἐ ) μηδὲ τῶν ἀγο-  
 ραῖαι τέχῃ κεχηρμένων 14 B 28 29

ἀγχιστεία

ἔξω τῶν ἀγχιστειᾶν ἄν ὁ νόμος Ἐ  
 κέλεται 26.18 19; μὴ συγκλαρῶν-

τες τὰς ἀγχιστείας 26.24 25

ἄγω

ἄ[γειν εἰς τὴν θυσίαν] βοῦν 10.7 8;  
 [ἀγαγόν] τ[οῦ] Δίου μηνὸς τῇ  
 νομηνίαι ἐκκλησίαν 14 A 35;  
 ἀγέ τωσαν δέ τὰ Ἑρμαῖα καὶ οἱ  
 ἱεροποιοὶ 14 B 60 61; ὁ[ἰ] ἄγον]τες  
 ([θῦον(?)]τες Text) τὰ [ε]ρ[ε]τ[ι]α]  
 20.22 23 Rest.; [ἄ]χσεται 21.10 11  
 Rest.

ἀγωγός

γί[ν]εσθ[αι] παρὰ τὸ ἀγωγ[ὸ] Ἐ  
 20.2 3

ἀγών

πεμπόμεν ἱπ[έ]ας [ἐν τὸν] ἀ[γῶ]-  
 ν[α] τὸν ἀπὸ τελέων ἐν τῷ Πτωίων  
 ἀ[γ]ῶνι 11.10 11; τοὺς μὴ δικαίως  
 ἀγωνιζομένους τοὺς ἀγῶνας  
 14 B 69 70; ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀγῶσιν  
 14 B 85 86; [ἐν τῷ γυμνα]σίῳ  
 τοῖς Ἑρμαίο[ις] ἀγῶνας τίθεσθαι]  
 15.2 3

ἀγωνίζομαι

τοὺς μὴ δικαίως ἀγωνιζομένους  
 τοὺς ἀγῶνας 14 B 69 70; ὅσοις  
 Ἐ ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῶν ἀγωνιζόμενοις  
 26.10 11

ἀδελφοθετία

ἐορταζόντω Ἐ κατὰ τὰς <ἁ>δελ-  
 φοθετίας 26.32 33

ἀδελφός

ἐάν τις ἀντιλέγῃ Ἐ ἡ ἀδελφοί  
 14 B 75 76; ἀδελφοὶ αἵρετοὶ ὁμο-  
 νοῦντες ἀλλήλοις 26.20; Ἐ ἀδελ-  
 φοὶ καὶ οὗτοι Ἐ συνελογχοῦτες  
 26.26 27

- ἀδικέω  
φάσκων ἡδικῆσθαι ὑπό τινος  
14 B 86 87; [ἀδι]κουῦντες οὐθέν  
18.36 Rest.
- ἄδικος  
ἐὰν δοκῇ ἀδίκως παραγεγράφθαι  
ὁ γυμνασίαρχος 14 B 35 36
- ἄδυνατος  
ἐὰν οἱ λαχόντες Ἐ μηδὲ ἐξομό-  
σωνται ἄδύνατοι εἶναι 14 B 51 52
- ἄδυτον **130, 246, 333**  
[ἐς τ]ὰ ἄδυττα <τὰ> Ἀρτέ[μιδος]  
23 A 22
- αἰέρω  
ἐπεὶ δέ κα οἱ Ἐ κλᾶροι ἀερεθέντι  
26.21 22
- ἄθάνατος  
θύεν ὅσπερ τοῖς ἀθανάτοισι  
27 B 12 13
- ἄθλον  
τὰ ἄθλα ἃ ἂν λαμβάνωσιν οἱ  
νικῶντες, ἀνατιθέτωσαν Ἐ  
14 B 67 68
- αἰγέως  
ἀπὸ αἰγέου καὶ προβατέου τρι-  
ταῖον 7.10 11
- αἶξ  
αἶγα 1.6, 7 Rest., 42 (Ἀητοῖ), 43  
(Ἀρτέμιδι); αἶγα λειπεγνώμονα  
πυρρὸν ἢ [μέλανα] (Διονύσι)  
1.34; αἶγα λειπογνώμονα (Ἀπόλ-  
λωνι) 1.43; τᾷ θυσίαι θυόντω  
αἶ(γ)α λευκάν 26.27 28
- αἶρεσις  
ἀκόλουθα πράττωσα τῇ ἡρέσει  
11.13 14; λαμπαδαρχῶν αἶρεσις  
14 B 71
- αἰρετός  
ἀδελφοὶ αἰρετοὶ ὁμονοοῦντες  
ἀλλήλοις 26.20
- αἰρέω  
ὄσαι δ' ἂν ἀρχαὶ αἰρεθῶ<sup>vacat</sup>σιν  
1.64 65; αἰρεῖσθω ὁ ἀρχερα-  
στής οὗς ἂν βούληται ἀνθρώ-  
πους 5.34 36; τῶν αἰρουμένων  
ἄει γυμνασιάρχων 14 A 14 15;  
ἢ πόλις αἰρεῖσθω γυμνασίαρχον  
14 A 22 23; ὁ αἰρεθεὶς γυμνασίαρ-  
χος ἀρχέτω 14 A 24 25; ὁ αἰρεθεὶς  
γυμνασίαρχος ὅταν εἰσπορεύηται  
εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν Ἐ προβαλεῖται Ἐ  
14 A 34 36, cf. 62 63; αἰρεῖσθω  
ὁ γυμνασίαρχος Ἐ λαμπαδάρ-  
χας τρεῖς 14 B 72; οἱ αἰρεθέντες  
παρεχέτωσαν ἔλαιον 14 B 73 74,  
74 75; αἰρεῖσθω δὲ καὶ τῶν παί-  
δων λαμπαδάρχας τρεῖς 14 B 74;  
τις τῶν αἰρεθέντων 14 B 75; ἐν  
ἡμέραις πέντε ἀφ' ἧς ἂν αἰρεθῇ  
14 B 76 77; ἀποτινέτω ὁ αἰρεθεὶς  
δραχμὰς πεντήκοντα 14 B 77 78;  
σίτον χαίρεσθω 27 B 6
- αἶρω  
ὅταν δὲ τὸ σημεῖον ἀρθῇ 14 B 3
- αἰσχύνω  
οἱ νεώτεροι μᾶλλον αἰσχυνθήσον-  
ται 14 A 12 13
- αἰτία  
ταῖς ζημίαις ἀπάσαις ἐπιγραφέτω  
τὴν αἰτίαν 14 B 101
- ἀκολουθέω  
τοῖς ἀκολουθοῖς αὐτὸ πᾶσι ἄρι-  
στομ παρέχεν 1.2 3 Rest.; [τῶν  
ἀκολ]οῦθωμ ἱεροποιοὺς ἀφιέτω  
3.10; [τ]ῶι γυμ[ν]ασί[αρχω] ἀ[κο]-  
λουθήσουσιν 14 A 39
- ἀκόλουθος  
ἀκόλουθα πράττωσα τῇ ἡρέσει  
11.13 14; [ἀκολούθως τοῖς τε  
νόμοις καὶ τοῖς τοῦ δ]άμου ψαφί-  
[σμασιν] 15.1 2
- ἀκοντίζω  
ἀκοντίζειν καὶ τοξεύειν μελετάτω-  
σαν 14 B 10
- ἀκρατίζομαι  
κἀκρατίξασθαι (δότο) 27 B 4
- ἀκρόαμα  
ἀκρόαμα μηθὲν παραγέτωσαν εἰς  
τὸν πότον 14 B 66 67
- ἄλεμμα  
ἐν αἷς πόλεσιν Ἐ ἄλεμμα συν-  
έστηκεν 14 A 6 7; εἰς τὸ ἄλεμμα  
14 A 45; τιθεῖναι τὸ ἄλεμμα  
14 B 81

## ἀλείφω

μηδὲ ἐν ἄλλῃ παλαιστοῖσι ἀλει-  
φῆσθω μηθεὶς É 14 B 4; ὅταν οἱ  
παῖδες ἀλείφονται 14 B 11 12;  
ἐὰν δέ τινα ὁ γυμνασίαρχος ἐάσῃ  
ἀλείφεσθαι 14 B 29 30; κωλύε-  
τωσαν É τοὺς δοκοῦντας παρὰ  
τὸν νόμον ἀλείφεσθαι 14 B 37 38;  
ὅς ἂν αὐτῷ δοκῇ φιλοπονώτατα  
ἀλείφθαι 14 B 56 57; καὶ ὁμοί-  
ως ἀλειφέτω καὶ λαμπαδαρχεῖτω  
14 B 78

## ἀλή

ἐφ' ἀλῇ 1.23

## ἀλία

[ἀλυσιαίαι vel ἀλυσιαῖαν](?) 6.3A4  
Rest.; (ἡόπυι κα δοκεῖ τῷ δάμοι)  
ἀλυσιαῖαν θεν (θέμ(ε)ν vel θέ(σ)-  
θ(αι) Rest.) 6.4.1; ἀλυσια 6.5;  
ἔδοξε τῷ ἀλίας καθὰ καὶ τῷ  
βουλάι 26.2 3; δεδόχθαι É ἁλίαν  
τῶν πολιτῶν συναγαγεῖν 26.9 10;  
ἀνακληθέντας ἔς τὴν ἀλίαν 26.11  
12

## ἀλίασμα

τὸ ἀλίασμα É κολαψάμενοι É ἔς  
χάλκωμα É 26.33 34

## ἄλλος

ἄλλο τι 13.7; [τοῖς δημ]όταις μετὰ  
τῶν ἄλλων 3.7 8; ἐὰν τι ἄλλο  
βούλωνται 3.14; ἦ[ν τι] ἄ[λλ]ο  
λάβῃ 20.21 22

## ἀλλότριος

ἀλλοτρίοι 8.4

## ἅλς

ἡάλα (δότο) 27 B 4; διορίξας ἡαλί  
καὶ χρυσίδι 27 B 11

## ἄλσος

μὴ ἐξέστω τῶν ἐν τῷ ἄλσι ξύλων  
ἄπτεσθαι 5.45

## ἄλφιτον

ἀλφίτων ἡμυσσυκτέως 20.3 4

## ἄλωμα

πό[ρ]ον εἴμ[εν] ἐν οὗτο τὸ ἄλωμα  
ἀπὸ τᾶς ἐμποροῦς 11.25 27

## ἄμα

κωλέαις ἄμα τε[- -] 13.10

## ἄμνός

ἄμὸν κριτόν 1.19 20 (Ποσειδῶνι)

## ἄμφο

[ἀπὸ ἀμφ]οῖν τῶν βωμῶν 3.19 20  
Rest.

## ἀναγκάζω

καὶ ὁμοίως ἀναγκαζέσθω τιθέναι  
τὸ ἄλειμμα É 14 B 80 81

## ἀναγκαῖος

ἐὰν ἔτερόν τι ἀναγκαῖον φαίνεται  
τῶν μαθημάτων 14 B 12 13; ἄλλῃ  
τις ἀναγκαῖα ἀσχολία γένηται  
14 B 18

## ἀναγραφή

εἰς τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης  
δοῦναι É δραχμᾶς 2.49 50

## ἀναγράφω

ἀναγράφαι [τὸν ὄρο]ν ἐστίλῃ  
1.62 63; ἀναγράφαι τὸ ψήφισμα  
ἐν στήλει 2.43 44; (νόμον) ἀνα-  
γραφέντα εἰς στήλην 14 A 10 11,  
21; ἀναγράφας εἰς σανίδα 14 B 90;  
τὸ ψάφισμα τόδε[ε ἀναγράφαι]  
ἐστάλαν λιθίναν 17.12 13

## ἀναδείκνυμι

ἀναδεικνύτωσαν ἀνθ' αὐτῶν  
ἐτέρους 14 B 62 63

## ἀνακαλέω

ἀνακληθέντας ἔς τὴν ἀλίαν 26.11  
12

## ἀνακηρύσσω

ἀνακηρυσσέτω ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ  
14 B 102

## ἀναλίσκω 274-275

ἀπὸ τούτων ἀναλίσκετω 14 B 88;  
τὸ ἀπὸ τούτων ἀναλωθέν 14 B 90;  
τάδε ἀναλ[ί]σκεσθαι αὐτὸ 20.8

## ἀνάλωμα

δόμην ἀνάλ[ωμ]α [τὸς τα]μίας  
11.18 19

## ἀνατίθημι 83

ἀνέθηκον (Πανὶ καὶ Νύνφαις)  
4.6; ἀν[έ]θεγ 6.15B Rest.; (οἱ  
συνέφηβοι) [ἀνα]θήνεν[ον] 6.17  
Rest.; ἀνέθηξε 10.17; τὰ ἄθλα  
É ἀνατιθέτωσαν É 14 B 67  
68; Ἀντίοχος ἀνέθηκεν 21.13;

- Θαρσύτας Ἐ τόνδ' ἀνέθηκε  
θεῶι 24.2; τὸ ἁλίστημα Ἐ ἐς τὸ  
πρόναον τοῦ Διὸς [τοῦ] Ὀλυμπίου  
ἀναθέντω 26.33 35
- ἀνδρακάς  
23 A 21
- ἄνθεια  
οἷν κυῶσαν ἄνθειαν (offering?)  
1.44
- ἄνθρωπος  
κληροῦσθαι ἐπὶ τὰ κρέα ἀνθρώ-  
πους δύω 5.31 32; (κληροῦσθαι)  
ἐπὶ τοὺς στρεπτοὺς ἀνθρώπους  
δύω 5.32 33; αἰρεῖσθω ὁ ἀρχε-  
ρανιστῆς οὗς ἂν βούληται ἀν-  
θρώπους 5.34 36; ἄνθρωπος  
[αὐτορέκ]τα[ς] 27 B 1
- ἀνῆρ  
ἐγγυητάς δὲ καταστησάτω Ἐ δύο  
ἄνδρας 2.29; προβαλεῖται ἄνδρας  
τρεῖς οἵτινες Ἐ 14 A 36; τῶν ἐκ  
τοῦ τόπου ἄνδρας ἐπτά 14 B 48 49
- ἀνῆμι  
Ὅ ἀνεῖς ἐπίτω μαντεῖω 12
- ἀντεῖπον  
ἐξέστω αὐτῶι ἀντεῖπαντι Ἐ  
διακριθῆναι 14 B 36 37, 104  
105; (ἐάν Ἐ ) [καὶ οἱ ζη]μωθέντες  
ἀντεῖπωσιν 18.33
- ἀντιδικέω  
[ἀντιδ]μοῦντες οὐθέν 18.36 Rest.
- ἀντιλέγω  
ἐάν τις ἀντιλέγη 14 B 75
- ἀντίος  
ἐφιορκοῦντι δὲ τὰναντία 14 A 33  
34, cf. 62
- ἀντιτυγχάνω  
τάς θουσίας συντελέ[μεν τῶς  
ἀντι]τουγχανόντας Ἐ ἐνά[ρχως]  
11.15 16
- ἄξιόω  
ἄξι[οῖ] πεμπέμεν ἱπ[έα]ς 11.9 10
- ἀπαγορεύω  
ἀπαγορεύει ὁ θεός 4.7; τῶν ἀπει-  
ρημένων 18.24 (cf. Rest.); περὶ  
τινος τῶν ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι ἀπ[ειρη-  
μένων] 18.32 33
- ἀπάλαιστρος  
(μὴ ἐγδυνέσθω Ἐ ) μηδὲ ἀπάλαι-  
στρος 14 B 28
- ἀπαντάω  
ἀπαντάτωσαν οἱ παιδοτρίβαι Ἐ  
εἰς τὸ γυμνάσιον 14 B 15 16
- ἄπαργμα  
τὰπὸ τὰς τραπέζας ἀπάργματα  
(κατακάαι) 27 A 19
- ἀπάρχομαι  
κάπαρξάμενοι κατακαάντο Ἐ  
27 A 15 16
- ἀπειθέω  
ζημιῶν τὸν ἀπειθοῦντα δραχμαῖς  
δέκα 14 B 52 53
- ἄπειμι  
ἀπίτο 27 B 11
- ἀπελεύθερος  
(μὴ ἐγδυνέσθω Ἐ ) μηδὲ ἀπελεύθε-  
ρος 14 27 28
- ἄπεργος  
(παρακαπηλ[ε]ύσει Ἐ ) οὔτε ἄπερ-  
γος 18.9; (οὐ παραδώσου[σιν])  
[ἀπ]εργω 18.13; οὐχ ὑποδέξονται  
Ἐ οὐθέν Ἐ οὐδὲ παρὰ ἀπέργου  
18.16 17, cf. 12 13 Rest.
- ἀπό  
ἀπὸ λέχους 7.5 6; ἀπὸ διαφθέρμα-  
τος 7.6 7; ἀπὸ τῶν φυσικῶν 7.8 9;  
ἀπὸ φῶ[ν]οι(?) 7.9; ἀπὸ αἰγέου  
καὶ προβατέου 7.10 11; ἀπὸ τῶν  
λοιπῶν βρωμάτων 7.11 13; ἀπὸ  
ἀφροδισίων 7.13 14; ἀπὸ ΠΑΘΙΝ  
7.15
- ἀπογραφὴ  
δότω ὁ προσαγγέλλων ἀπογραφὴν  
Ἐ 14 B 32
- ἀπογράφω  
τοὺς κρινοῦντας Ἐ ἀπογραφέτω ὁ  
γυμνασίαρχος 14 B 48
- ἀποδείκνυμι  
τὴν ὥραν ἣν ἂν ὁ γυμνασίαρχος  
ἀποδείξῃ 14 B 17; ἄλλον ἀποδει-  
κνύτω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος 14 B 82
- ἀπόδειξις  
ποιεῖσθαι ἀπόδειξιν τῶν παιδῶν  
14 B 24



## ἀποδίδωμι

ἀποδόσθαι τὴν λιθοτομίαν 2.4 5;  
τὸν μισθωσάμενον ἀποδιδόναι τὴν  
μίσθωσιν 2.24 25; [ῥ]μουμέν]ους  
ἀποδώσειν τὴν μίσθωσιν 2.30; ἐὰν  
ὁ ταμίης ἀποδιδῷ λόγον 5.29;  
ὅταν οἱ ἐγλογισταὶ Ἐ ἀποδῶσι Ἐ  
τὸν λόγον 5.40 41; [ἀ]ποδόμεν  
τῷ ἱερομνιάμονι τὸν πρᾶ[-  
] 6.3A3; (δεδοχθῇ) ἀποδόσθη  
βοῦν Ἐ 11.17; τοῖς ἐξετασταῖς τῆς  
πόλεως Ἐ ἀποδιδότω 14 B 91  
92; τὸ δὲ περιὸν Ἐ ἀποδιδότω  
14 B 93; ἐὰν μὴ ἀποδῶι τοὺς  
λόγους ἢ τὰ περιόντα 14 B 94  
95; τὸν λόγον ἀποδότω καὶ τὰ  
περιόντα 14 B 96 97; ἀποδόσ[θ]ων  
τοὶ πωλη]ταί 17.13 14; ἀπὸ [τ]οῦ  
ἱερέ[ο]υ [ἀ]ποδ[ό]σ[θ]αι [κ]εφαλὴν  
20.18 19

## ἀποθι

[γυναικί] λεχοῖ ἀποθι ἔμεν 8.2 3

## ἀποκαθαίρω

[ἐλ]αστέρον ἀποκα[θαίρεσθαι]  
27 B 1 2; ἐπεὶ κ' ἐλαστέρο ἀποκα-  
θάρεται 27 B 9

## ἀποκαθίστημι

οἱ ἐργολαβήσαντες Ἐ μὴ ἀποκα-  
ταστήσαντες 5.20 21; (ὁ πράκτωρ)  
ἀποκ[ατ]αστησάτω τῷ Ἐ γυμνα-  
σιάρχῳ 14 B 103 104

## ἀποκληρώω

ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν Ἐ ἀποκληρωσάτω  
14 B 53 54

## ἀπολύω

ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀπολυθῇ 14 B 94

## ἀπομισθόω

[ἀπομισθοῦν κατηλεῖα ἐν] <τ>ῷ  
τῆς Ἡρας τέσσαρα 18.5 6

## ἀπονέμω

[ἀπον]εμέτ[ω] 21.6 7; ἱρὰ ἀπονέμει  
21.12 13

## ἀπονίζω

ἀπονίψασθαι δότο 27 B 4

## ἀπορραίνω

ἀπορρανάμενος 27 B 11

## ἀποστελλω

ἀ πόλις Ἀκρηφιδίων πρισιγείας

ἀποστεύλασα 11.4 5

## ἀποτινώ

ἀποτινέτω προστείμου δραχμὰς  
δέκα Ἐ δραχμὰς πέντε 5.6; ἀπο-  
τεινέτω προτείμου τὸ τριπλοῦν  
5.14 15; ἀποτινέτω τὸ τριπλοῦν  
5.16; ἀποτινέτωσαν τὸ διπλοῦν  
5.21 22; ἀποτινέτω προστείμου  
δραχμὰς ἑκατὸν 5.26 27; ἀποτι-  
νέτω δραχμὰς εἴκοσι 5.34; ἀποτι-  
νέτω τὸ διπλοῦν 5.44; ἀποτινέτω  
δραχμὰς χιλίας 14 B 31 32, 95;  
ἀποτινέτωσαν τὸ ἴσον ἐπίτιμον  
14 B 34 35; ἀποτινέτω δραχμὰς  
πεντήκοντα 14 B 77 78, 80; ἀπο-  
τινέτω Ἐ τὸ ἡμόλιον τῷ νικῆ-  
σαντι 14 B 106; χιλίας δραχμὰς  
ἀποτεισ[άτω] 17.6; ἀποτεισεὶ τοῖς  
μισθω[σ]αμένοις δραχμὰς - *numerus*  
- ζη]μίαν 18.11 12; ἀποτεισεὶ τῇ  
θεῷ δραχμὰς[ς ἱερὰς - *numerus* -]  
18.14; ὀγδόαν ἀποτεισάτο 25.4 8;  
δέκα λιτρὰς ἀποτεισάτο 25.10  
12

## ἀποφορά 275-276

οὐκ ἀποφορά 23 A [5], 11, B 8;  
κρεῶν οὐκ ἀποφορά 24.4;

## ἄπτω

μηθεὶς ἀπτέσθω (τῆς ἐνθήκης  
πλεῖω τοῦ τόκου) 5.11 12; ἐὰν  
τι πλείωνος ἄψῃται 5.13 14; μὴ  
ἐξέστω τῶν ἐν τῷ ἅλσι ξύλων  
ἄπτεσθαι 5.45

## ἀρά 22, 344

ἀρὰ τὸ [θε]ῶ 25.1 2

## ἄργματα 167-168

## ἀργύριον

τὸ ἀργύριον δοῦναι 2.12 13;  
λαβόντα τοῦτο τὸ ἀργύριον 2.31  
32; τρέψαι 2.37; αὐτῶν κατα-  
γιγνωσκόντων 2.42 43; [ἐμ-  
βά]λλειν τ[ὸ] ἀργύριον?]) 9.6 Rest.;  
ΕΠΙΤ[- -] 13.11

## ἀρετή

ἐπαινεσάι Ἐ ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ  
εὐνοίας Ἐ 2.9 11

- ἀορὴν  
 ἄρνα κριτόν 1.39 (Δύ), 47 48 (Δύ),  
 54 (Ἀθηναίαι); φάννα 23 A 20
- ἄριστον  
 ἄριστομ παρέχεν 1.3 4, 16
- ἄριστος  
 ἄριστα τὸ σῶμα διακείσθαι  
 14 B 50
- ἀρωστέω  
 ἐὰν μὴ τις ἀρωστήσῃ 14 B 17
- ἄρσην  
 βοῦμ ἄρρενα (τῇ Κόρη) 3.13
- Ἀρτεμίσιον  
 Ἀρτεμίσιον χί[μαρον] 23 A 14
- ἄρτος  
 [- -] σπλάνχνων καὶ ἄρτ[ον/ς]  
 21.9
- ἀρχαῖος  
 ἀρχαῖόν ἐστι 22.9 10
- ἀρχαιρεσία  
 (ἀποδιδόναι τὴν μίσθωσιν) ταῖς  
 ἀρχαιρεσίαις 2.27 28; [τῶ]ν ἀρχαι-  
 ρεσιῶν 18.2
- ἀρχεῖον  
 διακριθῆναι ἐπὶ τῶν καθηκόντων  
 ἀρχείων 14 B 105
- ἀρχερανιστής  
 ἔδοξεν τῷ ἀρχερανιστῇ 5.3; τῆς  
 ἐνθήκης τῆς τεθείσης ὑπὸ τοῦ  
 ἀρχερανιστοῦ 5.9 10; κατατιθέστω  
 αὐτῷ τῷ ἀρχερανιστῇ 5.17 18;  
 λαμβανέτω πρόσγραφον παρὰ τοῦ  
 ἀρχερανιστοῦ 5.18 19; ἐνγυητάς  
 παρατιθέτωσαν τῷ ταμίᾳ καὶ τῷ  
 ἀρχερανιστῇ 5.22 23; αἰρείσθω  
 ὁ ἀρχερανιστής οὗς ἂν βούληται  
 ἀνθρώπους 5.34 36
- ἀρχή  
 εὐθυνῶ τὴν ἀρχήν 1.58; ἐ[γκα-  
 θέστ]ηγεν ἡ ἀρχή 1.59 60; ὅσαι δ'  
 ἂν ἀρχαὶ Ἐ 1.64; ἐπεὶ καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι  
 ἀρχαὶ πᾶσαι κατὰ νόμον ἄρχουσιν  
 14 A 5 6; ἡ πόλις αἰρείσθω γυμνα-  
 σίαρχον ὅταν καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρχάς  
 14 A 22 23; (ὁ γυμνασίαρχος)  
 ὅταν εἰσπορεύηται εἰς τὴν ἀρχήν  
 14 A 34 35; ὅταν ἐξέλθῃ ἐκ τῆς  
 ἀρχῆς 14 B 88 89; ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς  
 ἀπολυθῇ 14 B 94; αἱ κατὰ πόδας  
 ἀρχαὶ πᾶσαι 26.29 30
- ἀρχιτέκτων  
 καθά κα ὁ ἀρχιτέκτων [συγγρά-  
 ψη] 17.14
- ἀρχόμαος  
 ἡὸς κα(τ) τὸ ἀρχομάο θύε 25.2 4
- ἄρχω  
 [ἦρχ]εν/[ἦρξ]εν 1.58 59 Rest.;  
 ἀποτινέτω προστείμου ὁ μὲν ἀρξά-  
 μενος (μάχης) Ἐ 5.6 7; ἐπεὶ καὶ  
 αἱ ἄλλαι ἀρχαὶ πᾶσαι κατὰ νόμον  
 ἄρχουσιν 14 A 5 6; τῶν αἰρουμέ-  
 νων αἱ γυμνασιάρχων κατὰ τὸν  
 νόμον ἀρχόντων 14 A 14 15; ὁ αἰ-  
 ρεθεὶς γυμνασίαρχος ἀρχέτω Ἐ  
 14 A 24 25
- ἄρχων  
 ἐπὶ Νικίτου ἄρχοντος 2.25; 49;  
 μετὰ Νικίτην ἄρχοντα 2.26  
 27; ἀπὸ Νικίτου ἄρχοντος 2.52;  
 ἐπὶ Θεοφίμου ἄρχοντος 4.1  
 2; ἐπὶ Τίτου Φλαβίου Κόνω-  
 νος ἄρχοντος καὶ ἱερέως Δρού-  
 σου ὑπάτου 5.1 2; ἀρχ[ο]ντος  
 [Ἐμ]πεδιώνδα[ο] 11.1 τὸν ἄρχοντα  
 κῆ τὼς [τεθ]μοφούλακας παρῆ-  
 μεν Ἐ 11.20 22; διδόσθῃ τῷ ἀρχῷ  
 κῆ Ἐ τὰ οὐπέρπουρα πάντα κῆ  
 τὰν κωλίαν 11.23 25; οἱ ἄρχοντες  
 Ἐ κλαρώντων 26.14 16; τὸ ἀλία-  
 σμα Ἐ οἱ ἄρχοντ(ε)ς Ἐ ἀναθέντω  
 26.33 35
- ἀσχολία  
 ἐὰν μὴ ἄλλη τις ἀναγκαῖα ἀσχολία  
 γένηται 14 B 18
- ἀτακτέω  
 τῶν παιδῶν τοὺς ἀτακτοῦντας  
 μαστιγῶν 14 B 21 22; ἐὰν μὴ  
 πειθαρχῇ ἡ ἀτακτῇ τι 14 B 99
- ἀτέλεια  
 [κ]αὶ τιμὰς ἔξει καὶ ἀτ[έλειαν] 19.3
- ἀτελής  
 ἀτελεῖς ἔσονται 18.37
- αὐθημερί  
 ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν βρωμάτων ἐκ

- κεφαλᾶς λουσάμενον αὐθημερὶ  
7.11 13; ἀπὸ ἀφροδισίων αὐθημερὶ  
λουσάμενον 7.13 15; αὐθημερὶ  
λουσάμενον 7.16
- αὐλή  
[ἐν τῇ] αὐλῇ τοῦ Ἐλευσινίου  
3.22 23
- αὐτοκράτωρ  
[αὐτο]κράτορος 10.1 2
- αὐτορέκτας  
ἄνθρωπος [αὐτορέκ]τα[ς] 27 B 1;  
[ho hυ]ποδεκόμενος Ἐ δότο Ἐ  
τῷ αὐ[τορέκτα] 27 B 3 4 (cf.  
Rest.); (τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον) ὁνπερ  
hoῦτορέκτας Ἐ 27 B 9
- ἀφηγέομαι  
ἐὰν μὴ ὁ ἀφηγούμενος συνχωρήσῃ  
14 B 2, 3 4; ὃν ἂν δὲ καταστήσῃ ὁ  
γυμνασάσας ἀφηγεῖσθαι 14 B 6 7
- ἀφιήμι  
[τῶν ἀκολ]ούθωμι ἱεροποιὸς ἀφι-  
έτω 3.10
- ἀφικετεύω  
ἀφικετεύων ἢ δεκόμενος τοὺς  
ἰκέτας] 17.5
- ἀφίστημι  
[ἀ]ποστάντων (πλατιφαιναρχον)  
6.3A2 Rest.
- ἀφροδίσια  
ἀπὸ ἀφροδισίων αὐθημερὶ λουσά-  
μενον 7.13 15
- βαπτός  
μηδὲ βαπτόν (εἰσφέρειν) 4.9
- βασιλεύς  
βασιλέων ψῆφον θε[μ]έν[ω]ν  
20.14 15
- βλάπτω  
οὔτε φίλῳ χαριζόμενος οὔτε  
ἐχθρὸν βλάπτων 14 A 29 30, cf.  
60 61
- βοηθέω  
ὅς ἂν Ἐ μὴ βοηθήσῃ δυνατὸς ὢν  
14 B 44
- βουλή  
[ἡ] βουλὴ ἔγν[ω] 20.14; ἔδοξε ταῖ  
αἰαίαι καθὰ καὶ ταῖ βουλαῖ 26.2 3
- βούλομαι  
ἐὰν τι ἄλλο βούλωνται 3.14;  
αἰρεῖσθω ὁ ἀρχεραμιστὴς οὗς ἂν  
βούληται 5.34 35; εἰσπορεύεσθαι  
εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τὸν βουλούμενον θύειν  
7.3 5; τὸν βου[λόμενον] (θύειν  
Rest.) 13.5; ἐξέστω ταινιοῦν τὸν  
βουλούμενον 14 B 58; ἐὰν τινας  
βούλωνται (ἐξέστω Ἐ ) 14 B 92;  
εὐθυνέτω τὸν γυμνασάσας ὁ  
βουλούμενος 14 B 107; θύειν τὸν  
βουλούμενον 24.3
- βοῦς  
Θορίκῳ βούν μῆλαττον ἢ τετταρά-  
κοντα δραχμῶν μέχρι πενήκοντα  
1.28 30; [Κεφάλῳ] βούν μῆλατ-  
τονος ἢ τετταράκοντα δραχμῶν  
μέχρι πενήκοντα 1.54 56; καὶ  
τῇ Κόρῃ βούμ ἄρρενα 3.13; βοός  
9.9; ἀ[γειν] εἰς τὴν θυσίαν] βούν  
10.7 8; (δεδόχθη) ἀποδόσθη βούν  
ὅστις παρεσχέ[θη] π[ότ] τὼς κατό-  
πτας 11.17 18; [θυέτ]ω [β]όν 21.3;  
βών 23 A 8; σφαζόντο βό[ν] Ἐ  
27 A 21
- βουτροφία **99–100**
- βραβευτής  
ὑπὲρ βραβευτῶν 14 B 84; καθι-  
στάτω ὁ γυμνασάσας βραβευτάς  
14 B 84; ἐὰν τις ἐγκαλῇ τινὶ τῶν  
βραβευτῶν 14 B 86
- βρώμα  
ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν βρωμάτων ἐκ  
κεφαλᾶς λουσάμενον αὐθημερὶ  
7.11 13
- βωμός  
τὸν ἐν τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ βωμόν 3.9;  
ἐπὶ τοὺς βωμούς 3.15; ἐπὶ τοῦ  
βωμοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ 3.18;  
[τῷ τ]οῦ Πλούτωνος βωμῷ 3.19;  
τῶν βωμῶν 3.20 ([ἀπὸ ἀμφ]οῖν  
τῶν βωμῶν Rest.); τὸν βωμόν  
3.29; τὸν βωμόν τα[ῖς] - - - ἡμέραις  
στεφανώσε[ι] 19.5 6; ἡραεῖον  
τέλεον ἐπὶ τῷ βομῷ τῷ δαμοσίοι  
θύσας 27 B 10

## γενέτωρ

θυόντω Ἐ τοῖς γενετόρεσσι καὶ  
ταῖ Ὀμονο(ι)αι ἱερεῖον 26.30 31

## γένος

γένος 6.12.2 Rest.

## γεοῦχος

ἐάν τινες τῶν γεούχων Ἐ πωλώσιν  
Ἐ 18.19 20 (cf. Rest.)

## γεραιός

θυέτ[ω] τῶν φυλετᾶ[ν] ὁ γεραί-  
τατ[ος] 16.2 4

## γέρας

(δίδοσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐξ[ῆ] μοῖραν  
καὶ γέρας καὶ γλώσσαν 20.7

## γῆ

σφαζέτο δ' ἐς γᾶν 27 B 13

## γίγνομαι

ὅπως ἂν γίγνηται ἡ θυσία ὡς καλ-  
λίστη 2.5 6; ἀγορᾶς γενομένης  
5.29 30; γενομή[ - ] 6.12.2; τούτου  
γάρ γενομένου 14 A 11 12; γινέ-  
σθω 14 A 47; ἄλλη τις ἀναγκαῖα  
ἀσχολία γένηται 14 B 18; ἡ δαπάνη  
γινέσθω ἀπὸ Ἐ 14 B 59- 60; αἱ  
περὶ τούτων κρίσεις γινέσθωσαν  
Ἐ 14 B 108; [τ]ῆς χώρας γινομέ-  
νων 8.18 (cf. Rest.); γίνεσθαι δὲ ἐκ  
τοῦ ἡσσηθέντος 18.31; γί[ν]εσθ[αι]  
παρὰ τοῦ ἀγωγ[ῆ] Ἐ 20.2 3; γίνε-  
σθαι τὰ ἐν τῇ στήλῃ γεγραμμένα  
20.16 18, 20 21; ὅσοις ἂ διαφο-  
ρὰ τῶν πολιτῶν γέγονε 26.10 11;  
οἱ ὑπεναντίοι γεγονότες 26.13

## γινώσκω

[ἡ] βουλή ἔγν[ω] 20.14

## γλοιός

ὁ τὴν τοῦ γλοιοῦ πρόσδοτον ἀγορά-  
σας 14 B 97

## γλώσσα

(δίδοσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐξ[ῆ] μοῖραν  
καὶ γέρας καὶ γλώσσαν 20.7

## γνώμη

γνώμη τῇ [ἐ]μαυτοῦ χρώμενος  
14 A 28, cf. 57; [γν]ώμη ([πρυτά-  
νων γν]ώμη Rest.) 20.1

## γράμμα

γράμματα 6.2B2

## γράφω

ὅσα δὲ μὴ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγρα-  
πται 14 A 27 28; καθάπερ καὶ τῷ  
γυμνασιάρχῃ γέγραπται 14 B 8;  
ἐάν μὴ ἀποδῶι Ἐ καθ' ἃ γέ-  
γραπται 14 B 94 95; κατὰ τὰ  
[γεγραμμένα] ([δεδογμένα] Rest.)  
17.9; γραφέσθω ὁ χρηίζ[ων] αὐ-  
τοὺς κατὰ τὸν νόμον 17.11  
12; [γραφ]έσθωσαν τὰς δί[κας]  
18.26; τὰς γρα[φείσας] δί[κας]  
εἰσαγέ[τωσαν] 18.27; ἀφ' ἧς ἂν  
ἡμέρας γραφῶσιν 18.28; εἰσά-  
γεσθαι τὰς γραφείσας [παρα-  
γραφᾶς] Ἐ 18.33 34; γίνεσθαι  
τὰ ἐν τῇ στήλῃ γεγραμμένα  
20.16 18, 20 21; καθὰ γέγραπται  
26.25

## γυμνασιαρχέω

ὁμνύω Ἐ γυμνασιαρχήσω κατὰ  
τὸν νόμον 14 A 26 27

γυμνασιάρχης. *See* γυμνασιάρχος

## γυμνασιαρχικός

οἱ γυμνασιαρχικοὶ νόμοι κεῖνται  
ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις 14 A 7 8; τὸν  
γυμνασιαρχικὸν νόμον Ἐ κύριον  
εἶναι 14 A 16 19; νόμος γυμνα-  
σιαρχικός 14 A 22; ὁμνύω Ἐ  
γυμνασιαρχήσω κατὰ τὸν νόμον  
τὸν γυμνασιαρχικόν 14 A 26  
27

## γυμνασιάρχος/γυμνασιάρχης

Ζώπυρος Ἀμύντου, ὁ γυμνασί-  
αρχος 14 A 3 4, 17 18; τῶν αἰ-  
ρουμένων αἰεὶ γυμνασιάρχων Ἐ  
14 A 14 15; χρῆσθαι τοὺς γυμνασι-  
άρχους τούτῳ 14 A 19 20; ἡ πόλις  
αἰρεῖσθω γυμνασίαρχον Ἐ μὴ νεώ-  
τερον Ἐ 14 A 22 23; ὁ αἰρεθείς  
γυμνασιάρχος ἀρχέτω Ἐ 14 A 24  
25; ὁ αἰρεθείς γυμνασιάρχος Ἐ  
προβαλεῖται Ἐ 14 A 34 36, cf.  
62 63; [τ]ῷ γυμ[ν]ασί[αρχῳ]  
ἀ[πο]λουθήσουσιν 14 A 39; τοῦ  
γυμνασιάρχου μεθ' ὧν δεήσει  
14 A 40; κωλυέτω ὁ γυμνασιάρ-  
χος καὶ ζημιούτω 14 B 5; δν ἂν

δὲ καταστήσῃ ὁ γυμνασίαρχος ἀφηγείσθαι 14 B 6 7; καθάπερ καὶ τῷ γυμνασίᾳρχῃ γέγραπται 14 B 8; μαστιγούτω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος 14 B 9; ὁ γυμνασίαρχος ζημιούτω καὶ κωλύετω Ἐ 14 B 14 15; τὴν ὥραν ἣν ἂν ὁ γυμνασίαρχος ἀποδείξῃ 14 B 17; ἐμφανισάτω τῷ γυμνασίᾳρχῃ 14 B 18 19; κύριος ἔστω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος Ἐ 14 B 21, 52, 70; ἐὰν δέ τινα ὁ γυμνασίαρχος ἐάσῃ ἀλείφεισθαι 14 B 29 30; ἐὰν δοκῇ ἀδίκως παραγεγράφθαι ὁ γυμνασίαρχος 14 B 35 36; κωλύετωσαν οἱ ἐπιγινόμενοι γυμνασίαρχοι τοὺς Ἐ 14 B 37 38; μὴ ἐξέστω τὸν γυμνασίαρχον Ἐ κακῶς εἰπεῖν μηθενί 14 B 39 40; ἐάν τις τύπτῃ τὸν γυμνασίαρχον 14 B 41; ποιεῖτω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος τὰ Ἑρμαῖα 14 B 45 46; τοὺς κρινούστας Ἐ ἀπογραφέτω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος 14 B 48; ὁμόσας ὁ γυμνασίαρχος τὸν Ἑρμῆν κρινάτω 14 B 54 55; οἱ ἱεροποιοὶ καὶ ὁ γυμνασίαρχος ἀκρόαμα μηθὲν παραγέτωσαν Ἐ 14 B 66 67; ἐπὶ τοῦ εἰσιόντος γυμνασίαρχου 14 B 68; ζεμούτω αὐτοὺς ὁ γυμνασίαρχος 14 B 68 69; αἰρεῖσθω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος Ἐ λαμπαδάρχας τρεῖς 14 B 72; ἐλεγχθεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ γυμνασίαρχου Ἐ 14 B 79 80; ἄλλον ἀποδεικνύτω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος 14 B 82; καθίστάτω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος βραβευτάς 14 B 84; κυριευέτω δὲ ὁ γυμνασίαρχος τῶν προσόδων Ἐ 14 B 87 88; τὸ δὲ περιὸν Ἐ ἀποδιδότω τῷ μεθ' αὐτὸν γυμνασίᾳρχῃ 14 B 93; τὰ προστασσόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ γυμνασίαρχου 14 B 98; μαστιγούσθω ὑπὸ τοῦ γυμνασίαρχου 14 B 99; ταῖς ζημίαις Ἐ ἐπιγραφέτω τὴν αἰτίαν ὁ γυμνασίαρχος 14 B 101; (ὁ πράκτωρ) ἀποκ[ατ]ραστησάτω τῷ ἐνεστώτι γυμνασίᾳρχῳ 14 B 103 104; ἀποτινέτω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος τὸ

ἡμόλιον Ἐ 14 B 106; εὐθυνέτω τὸν γυμνασίαρχον ὁ βουλόμενος 14 B 107

#### γυμνάσιον

ἐν αἷς πόλεσιν γυμνάσιά ἐστιν 14 A 6 7; ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ 14 A 10, 20 21, 39 40, B 40, 41, 62, 90 91, 98 99, 102; εἰς τὸ γυμνάσιον 14 B 7 8, 27, 62; οἷς οὐ δεῖ μετεῖναι τοῦ γυμνασίου 14 B 26 27; ἐάν τις κλέψῃ τι τῶν ἐκ τοῦ γυμνασίου 14 B 99 100; [ἐν τῷ γυμνα]σίῳ τοῖς Ἑρμαίο[ις] ἀγῶνας τίθεσθαι 15.2 3

#### γυνή

[γυναικί] λεχοῖ ἀποθι ἔμεν 8.2 3; μ[ε]τὰ τῶν γυναικῶν τῶν π[ο]ι[η]-σασέ[ων] τὰ ἱρὰ 20.8 10

#### δαίνυμι 274-275

[οἱ ἱεροποιοὶ] καὶ ὁ κῆρυξ δαινύσθωσ[αν] 3.5 6

#### δαῖς

δαῖδα 3.24 ([περιχρ]ύσ[η]ν Rest.), 25

#### δαῖς

δαῖτα 23 A 24

#### δάμαλις

δ[άμαλιν] 1.7 Rest.; δά[μαλιν οἶν] 1.36 Rest.

#### δαπανάω

μὴ πλέω δαπανάτω ὁ ταμίας 5.12 13

#### δαπάνη

ἢ δὲ εἰς τὰ ὅπλα δαπάνη γινέσθω ἀπὸ Ἐ 14 B 59 60

#### δεῖ

μὴ ἐξέστω εἰπεῖν Ἐ τὸ ἀργύριον ὥς δεῖ ἄλλοθι που τρέφαι 2.36 37; μεθ' ὧν δεῖσει 14 A 40; οἷς οὐ δεῖ μετεῖναι τοῦ γυμνασίου 14 B 26 27

#### δειπνέω

οἱ ἐργολαβήσαντες ὑἱκὸν ἢ οἶνικὸν μὴ ἀποκαταστήσαντες ἐν ᾧ δειπνοῦσιν ἐνιαυτῷ 5.20 21

#### Δελφίνιον

[Δελ]φίνιον αἶγ[α] 1.6; ἐν τῷ

σῆκῳ π[αρ]ὰ τὸ [Δελφίνι]ον 1.10  
 11; π[αρ]ὰ τὸ Δελ(φί)νιον 1.63 64  
 δεξιός  
 τὴν δεξι[άν] κωλῆν 9.3  
 δεόντως  
 ἔαν ὁ ἑξομοσάμενος φανῇ μὴ  
 δεόντως ὁμωμοκέναι 14 B 79  
 δέρμα  
 τὸ δέρμα τῷ θεῷ 24.5  
 δέχομαι  
 ἀφικετέων ἢ δεκόμενος τοὺς  
 ἰκέτας 17.5; [δέ]χσεται 21.10 11  
 Rest.  
 δῆμαρχος  
 (τάς λιθοτομίας) μ[ισ]θοῦν τὸν  
 τὸν δῆμαρχον 2.23, 35 36; τὸν δὲ  
 δῆμαρχον λαβόντα Ἐ τὸ ἀργύριον  
 παρέχειν Ἐ 2.31 32; μὴ ἐξέστω  
 δὲ εἰπεῖν Ἐ μὴδὲ τῷ δημάρχῳ  
 (ἐπιψηφίσαι) 2.36 39; ἀναγράψαι  
 τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν δῆμαρχον  
 2.43 44; εἰς τὴν ἀναγραφὴν Ἐ  
 δοῦναι τὸν δῆμαρχον Ἐ 2.49 50  
 δῆμος  
 δαμοί 6.2A3 Rest.; ὁπύνη κα δοκεῖ  
 τῷ δάμοι 6.4.1; προβεβωλευμένον  
 [πὸτ τ]ὸν δάμον 11.2 4; δεδόχθη  
 τῷ δάμῳ 11.14 15; [ἀ]κολούθως  
 τοῖς τε νόμοις καὶ τοῖς τοῦ δ[ά]μου  
 ψαφί[σμασιν] 15.1 2; ὁ δῆμος  
 ἐκύρωσ[εν] 18.5  
 δημόσιος  
 διδότησαν τὴν σιμίδαλιν τῇ δημο-  
 σία χοίνικι 5.36; τὰ δαμόσια  
 6.3A5 3B; οἱ γυμνασιαρχικοὶ  
 νόμοι κεῖνται ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις  
 14 A 7 8; ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸ  
 δημόσιον 14 A 11; (τὸν γυμνασιαρχ-  
 ικὸν νόμον) τεθῆναι εἰς τὰ δημό-  
 σια 14 A 19; τὰ ἡιαρὰ τὰ δαμόσια  
 27 A 18; ἐπὶ τῷ βομδί τῷ δαμοσίοι  
 27 B 10  
 δημότης  
 ὅταν οἱ δημόται ἀγοράζωσιν 2.28;  
 ἀφ' ἧς ἂν ἡμέρας ψηφίσωνται  
 2.52 53; ἐναντίον τῶν δημοτῶν  
 2.13 14; ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ 2.23

παρὰ (ὠνεῖσθαι) 2.6; τύχη  
 ἀγαθῇ 2.2, 2.18 19; τὰ ἐψηφι-  
 σμένα ὑπὸ 2.45 46; εἰσηγήσατο  
 τοῖς δημόταις 2.3, ἐπιμελεῖται  
 2.15 16, ἐψηφίσθαι 2.20 21;  
 ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας τῆς εἰς  
 τοὺς δημότας 2.11 12; ἐν ᾧ ἂν  
 χρόνῳ πεῖθει 2.25 26; δια-  
 χειροτονῆσαι 2.33 34; [τοῖς  
 δημ]όταις μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων 3.7 8  
 διαγραφή 50, 301  
 [διορθωσά]μενοι τὴν διαγραφὴν  
 τῶν κατή[λων] 18.4; [κ]αθότι  
 ἐν τῇ κοινῇ [διαγραφῇ] διαγέ-  
 γραπ[τα]ι 19.4 5; κοινῇ διαγραφῇ  
 19.11  
 διαγράφω  
 [κ]αθότι ἐν τῇ κοινῇ [διαγραφῇ]  
 διαγράφ[τα]ι 19.4 5  
 διάκειμαι  
 διακείμενα τὰ πὸτ τὼς θεῶς εὐσ[ε]-  
 β[ῶς] 11.12; ἄριστα τὸ σῶμα  
 διακεῖσθαι 14 B 50  
 διακρίνω  
 διακριθῆναι ἐπὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος  
 δικαστηρίου 14 B 37; διακριθῆναι  
 ἐπὶ τῶν καθηκόντων ἀρχείων  
 14 B 105  
 διάλυσιν  
 διάλυσιν ποιήσασθαι 26.12  
 διασαφένω  
 τινα Ἐ τῶν διασαφουμένων  
 14 B 30  
 διάφθερμα  
 ἀπὸ διαφθέρματος τεσσαράκοντα  
 καὶ τέσσαρας ἀμέρας 7.6 8  
 διαφορὰ  
 ὅσοις ἂ διαφορὰ τῶν πολιτῶν  
 γέγονε 26.10 11  
 διαχειροτονέω  
 διαχειροτονῆσαι Ἐ τοὺς δημότας  
 (ἔαν δοκεῖ) 2.33 34  
 δίδωμι  
 (τάς λιθοτομίας μισθοῦν) τῷ τὸ  
 π[λεισ]τον διδόντι 2.23 24; εἰς  
 τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης δοῦναι  
 2.49 50; διδόντωςαν (δαίδα) 3.25;

- διδότησαν τὴν σιμίδαλιν πάντες  
 5.36; διδότη ὕκου Ἐ 5.39; ὁ  
 μὴ δοὺς τὸ κάθολον 5.44; δόμεν  
 ἀνάλωμα [τὼς τα]μίας 11.18 19;  
 διδόσθη τὰ οὐπέρεπουρα πάντα Ἐ  
 11.23 25; ὃν (νόμον) δεδώκαμεν  
 τοῖς ἐξετασταῖς 14 A 9 10; δότω  
 ὁ προσαγγέλλων ἀπογραφὴν  
 Ἐ 14 B 32; τῶι ἐγδικασαμένωι  
 διδόσθω τὸ τρίτον μέρος 14 B 35;  
 δίδοσθαι ἀπὸ τῷ ἐρ[ῶ] 20.5 6; [ho  
 δὲ hu]ποδεκόμενος Ἐ δότο Ἐ  
 27 B 3 4
- δίκαιος  
 [ό]σι(ώ)τατα καὶ δικαιοτάτα  
 14 A 29, cf. 58; παρὰ τὸ δίκαιον  
 14 A 30, cf. 61; δικαίως κρινεῖν  
 14 B 50; τοὺς μὴ δικαίως ἀγωνιζο-  
 μένους τοὺς ἀγῶνας 14 B 69 70;  
 ἀντὶ τοῦ δικαίως ἐξομοσαμένου  
 14 B 81 82; μὴ δικαίως ἐζημιώ-  
 σθαι 14 B 104; ἐάν τ[ι]νας μὴ δικαί-  
 ως Ἐ ζημιώσωσιν 18.31 32
- δικαιοτής  
 μετὰ πάσας δικαιοτάτος καὶ φιλίας  
 26.20 21
- δικαστήριον  
 διακριθῆναι ἐπὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος  
 δικαστηρίου 14 B 37; νικηθεὶς  
 ἐπὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος δικαστη-  
 ρίου 14 B 100 101; αἱ Ἐ κρίσεις  
 γινέσθωσαν ἐπὶ τῶν καθηκόν-  
 των δικαστηρίων 14 B 108 109;  
 εἰσαγέ[τωσαν εἰς τὸ πολιτικὸν/ἱερὸν-  
 ν/καθῆκον δικαστ]ήριον 18.27 28  
 Rest.; μισθὸν τῶι δικαστηρίῳ φέ-  
 ρειν 18.30; εἰσάγεσθαι Ἐ εἰς τὸ  
 πολιτικὸν δικαστήριον 18.33 34;  
 ὁ νόμος ἐκ τῶν δικαστηρίων μεθί-  
 στασθαι κέλεται 26.18 19
- δίκη  
 [δί]κη κρίνων 14 A 54; ἔνοχος  
 ἔστω ἱεροσυλίας δίκη 14 B 100;  
 [γραφ]έσθωσαν τὰς δί[κας] 18.26;  
 τὰς γρα[φείας] δί[κας] εἰσαγέ[τω-  
 σαν] 18.27; τὴν δίκην 18.31 (cf.  
 Rest.)
- διορθῶ  
 [διορθωσά]μενοι τὴν διαγραφὴν  
 18.4; ἐπειδὴ Ἐ διωρθῶται τὰ  
 κο[ινὰ] τῶν Νακωναίων 26.4 5
- διορίζω  
 διορίζας ἡλὶ καὶ χρυσὶ 27 B 11
- διπλάσιος  
 ὀφειλέτω τῶι θεῶι τὸ διπλά-  
 σιον 2.40 41; α[- - - διπλ]άσιον  
 6.2A6 (cf. Rest.)
- διπλεία  
 πλατιφεινάρχων διπλεεαν ὀφ[λεν]  
 6.11.1
- διπλῶς  
 λαμβάνων τὰ διπλᾶ μέρη 5.19 20;  
 ἀποτίνω τὸ διπλοῦν 5.21 22, 44;  
 τῶι θεῶι διπλᾶς 13.13
- δογματίζω  
 (ἔδοξεν τῷ ἀρχεραμιστῇ) τάδε  
 δογματῖσαι 5.5
- δοκέω  
 δεδόχθαι Ἑλευσινίοις 2.9; ἐάν  
 δοκεῖ μισθοῦν 2.34; ὁπότερα δ'  
 ἂν δοκεῖ 2.35; ἔδοξεν τῷ ἀρχερα-  
 μιστῇ 5.3; ἔδοξε 5.13; λόπυι κα  
 δοκεῖ τῷ δάμοι 6.4.1; δεδόχθῃ τῷ  
 δάμν 11.14 15; ἔδοξεν τῇ πόλει  
 14 A 16; ἐάν τις δοκῇ ὀλιγωρεῖν  
 τῶν παιδοτριβῶν 14 B 19; ἐάν  
 δοκῇ ἀδίκως παραγεγράφθαι ὁ  
 γυμνασίαρχος 14 B 35 36; τοὺς  
 δοκοῦντας παρὰ τὸν νόμον ἀλεί-  
 φεσθαι 14 B 38; ὅς ἂν αὐτῶι δοκῇ  
 Ἐ 14 B 50, 55, 56; οἱ ἂν αὐτῶι  
 δοκῶσιν ἐπιτήδειοι εἶναι 14 B 83,  
 84 85; κατὰ τὰ [δεδογμένα] 17.9  
 Rest.; ἔδοξε τῷ ἀλίῳ καθὰ καὶ  
 τῷ βουλᾷ 26.2 3; δεδόχθαι Ἐ  
 ἄλλῃαν τῶν πολιτῶν συναγαγεῖν  
 26.9 10
- δοκιμάζω  
 (ἱερεῖον) ὃ κα δοκιμάζωντι 26.31
- δοκιμασία **99-100**
- δόλποι  
 δόλ[φας] 23 B 3
- δοῦλος  
 οὐχ ὑποδέξονται παρὰ δούλου



οὐθέν 18.16, cf. 8 9 Rest., 9 10 Rest, 12 13 Rest.  
 δραχμή  
 δραχμὴν ἑκατερ[οῦ] 1.4 5 (cf. Rest.); βοῦν μῆλαττον/μῆλάττονος ἢ τετταράκοντα δραχμῶν μέχρι πεντήκοντα 1.28 30, 55 56; ἑκατὸν δραχμάς ἐπέδωκεν 2.8; (τὸ ἀργύριον δοῦναι) ἑκατὸν δραχμάς 2.14; δοῦναι τὸν δήμαρχον δέκα δραχμάς 2.50 51; ἀποτινέτω προστείμου δραχμάς δέκα Ἐ δραχμάς πέντε 5.6 8; μὴ πλέω δὲ δαπανάτω ὁ ταμίης δραχμῶν Ἐ 5.12 13; ἀποτινέτω προστείμου δραχμάς ἑκατὸν 5.26 27; ἀποτινέτω δραχμάς εἴκοσι 5.34; δόμεν ἀνάλωμα Ἐ δραχμῶν ἑκατὸν πεντείκοντα 11.18 20; δραχμὴν τε[λεῖν(?)] 13.4; ζημιούτω δραχμαῖς πεντήκοντα 14 B 5 6, 40 41, 44 45; ζημιούτω Ἐ καθ' ἡμέραν δραχμαῖς πέντε 14 B 20 21; ἀποτινέτω δραχμάς χιλίας 14 B 31 32, 95; ζημιούτω Ἐ δραχμαῖς ἑκατὸν 14 B 42 43, 68 69; ζημιῶν Ἐ δραχμαῖς δέκα 14 B 52 53; λαμβάνοντες Ἐ μὴ πλεῖον δραχμῶν δύο 14 B 61 62; λαμβάνοντες Ἐ μὴ πλεῖον δραχμῆς 14 B 65; ἀποτινέτω δραχμάς πεντήκοντα 14 B 77 78, 80; πράσσεσθαι πλέονα δρ[αχμῶν] 17.3; χιλίας δραχμάς ἀποτεισ[άτω ἱερὰς τῷ θεῷ] 17.6 7; ἀποτείσει Ἐ [δραχμάς - *numerus* - ζη]μίαν 18.11 12; ἀποτείσει τῇ θεῷ δραχμά[ς ἱερὰς - *numerus* -] 18.14, cf. 24 25 Rest.; [δραχ]μάς δύο ἑκάστου μην[ός] 19.9  
 δρομεύς  
 δρομέα Ἐ συνινπίνοντα πίνεν 22.2 5  
 δρόμος  
 ἐν τε Ἐ καὶ τῷ μακρῷ δρόμῳ 14 B 85  
 δρύφακτος **19–20**

δύναμαι  
 καταστάνεσθαι Ἐ παννυχιστὰς τοὺς δυναμένους 5.23 24; γνώμη τῇ [ἐ]μαυτοῦ χρώμενος ὡς ἂν δύνωμαι 14 A 28 29, cf. 57 58  
 δυνατός  
 ὅς ἂν Ἐ μὴ βοηθήσῃ δυνατὸς ὢν 14 B 44; (ἐάν τις ἀντιλέγῃ) ὡς οὐ δυνατὸς ἐστὶν λαμπαδαρχεῖν 14 B 76  
 εἶα  
 ἐάν δέ τινα Ἐ εἴσῃ ἀλείφεσθαι 14 B 29 30  
 ἐβδομαῖος  
 ἀπὸ τῶν φυσικῶν ἐβδομαίαν 7.8 9  
 ἐγγυητής  
 ἐγγυητὰς καταστησάτω Ἐ 2.29; ἐγγυητὰς παραιθέτωσαν 5.22 23  
 ἐγκαθεύδω  
 μ[η]δ' ἐγκαθεύ[δειν] 13.3; ἐγκαθεύδειν 13.8  
 ἐγκαθίστημι  
 κατὰ τὰ ψηφίσματα ἐφ' οἷς ἐ[γκα-θέστ]ηκεν ἡ ἀρχή 1.59 60  
 ἐγκαλέω  
 ἐάν τις ἐνκαλῇ τινὶ τῶν βραβευτῶν 14 B 86; [ἐά]ν τι ἐ[γ]καλῇ ὁ ἰδιώτης τῷ κατήλῳ Ἐ 18.25  
 ἐγκάρπιος  
 ἐάν τινες Ἐ πωλῶσιν τινα τῶν ἐγκαρπίων 18.19 20 (cf. Rest.)  
 ἐγκοιμητήριον **246**  
 ἐθέλω  
 ἐάν μὴ θέλωσιν (παννυχιστὰς εἶναι) 5.24; ἐάν μὴ ὑπομένη ἢ μὴ θέλῃ παννυχιστὴς εἶναι 5.25 26; ἐάν τινες μὴ θέλωσιν πράκτορες ὑπομένειν 5.28; ἐάν τις τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἐράνου τέκνον θέλῃ ἰσάγειν 5.38; ἐάν τις ἐμβῆναι θέλῃ 5.39  
 ἔθος  
 λαμβάνων ἐξ ἔθους τὰ διπλᾶ μέρη 5.19 20  
 εἰδώς. *See* οἶδα  
 εἰμί  
 ὅσαι δ' ἂν ἀρχαὶ Ἐ ὑπευθύνος



ἔναι 1.64 65; ὅπως ἂν ἦι πρό-  
σοδος ὡς πλείστη 2.16, 19 20;  
(αἱ λιθοτομῖαι) εἰσὶν ἱεραὶ τοῦ  
Ἡρακλέως 2.22; κύριός ἐμι 2.35,  
46, 51; 14 A 18 19, B 21, 52, 70;  
[νό]μι(μ)όν ἐστιν 3.14 15; ἐάν  
μὴ ὑπομένη ἢ μὴ θέλῃ παννυχι-  
στής εἶναι 5.25 26; ἐξέρανός ἐστω  
5.42; ἔνστε 6.13A (cf. 6.14.4 45);  
[γυναικί] λεχοῖ ἄποθι ἔμειν 8.2 3;  
ἔλεξε προβεβωλευμένον εἶμεν αὐ-  
τῷ 11.2 3; πό[ρ]ον εἶμ[εν] ἐν οὗτο  
τὸ ἄλωμα É 11.25 26; ἐν αἷς πό-  
λεσιν γυμνάσιά ἐστιν 14 A 6 7;  
τῶν αἰρουμένων ἀεὶ γυμνασιάρχων  
É ὑπευθύνων ὄντων 14 A 14 16;  
εὐορκοῦντι μέν μοι εἴη πολλὰ καὶ  
ἀγαθὰ 14 A 32 33, cf. 61 62; τῶν  
παιδαγωγῶν, ὅσοι ἂν μὴ ἐλεύθε-  
ροι ᾧσιν 14 B 22 23; ἐνοχός ἐμι  
14 B 39, 100, 17.9 10; ὑπόδικος  
ἔστω 14 B 43; 18.24; δυνατός ἐμι  
14 B 44, 76; ἐάν É μηδὲ ἐξομό-  
σωνται ἀδύνατοι εἶναι 14 B 51 52;  
ὅς ἂν αὐτῷ δοκῇ εὐτακτότατος  
εἶναι 14 B 55; οἱ ἂν αὐτῷ δοκῶσιν  
ἐπιτήδαιοι εἶναι 14 B 83, 84 85;  
οὐκ ἔξου[σία] ἔσται 18.6 7; ἀτελεῖς  
ἔσονται 18.37; μὴ ἔξουσία ἔστω  
18.38; εἶναι ταῦτα ταῦτα 20.10  
11; τὰ ποτὶ τὰν θυσίαν ὅσων χρεῖα  
ἐστὶ É 26.28; ἔστο É πεδὰ φέτος  
θύεν 27 A 18, 20 21; καθαρὸς  
ἔστο 27 10 11

εἶμι

ἔξ αὐτῷ ἴτο 27 B 5

εἶπον

(ὁ δεῖνα) εἶπεν 2.18; μὴ ἐξέστω  
εἰπεῖν μηθένα É 2.36 37; ἐάν  
τις ἢ εἴπει ἢ ἐπιψηφίσει παρὰ  
τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα 2.39 40; ὅσον  
ἂν εἴπει ἢ ἐπιψηφίσει (ὀφειλέτω  
τῷ θεῷ) 2.41; θύην καθὼς ἂν  
ὁ ἱερεὺς [εἴπη] 8.6; Ζώπυρος  
Ἀμύντου, Ἀσκληπιάδης Ἡρά,  
Κάλλιππος Ἰπποστράτου εἶπαν  
14 A 3 5

εἶρω

ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τῷ εἰρημένῳ 2.31

εἶς

ἐς (to the sanctuary of) Πυθίῳ  
Ἀπόλλωνος 1.41; ἐνς 6.2A2; ἐν[ς]  
Δί[φ]α κα̑θαναιάν (ὀφλῆν) 6.2A4  
3A1; εἰς τὸ ἱερόν (εἰσπορεύεσθαι)  
7.3 4; [εἰς τὴν θυσίαν] (βοῦν  
ἄ[γειν]) 10.7

εἰσάγω

ἐάν τις τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἐράνου τέκνον  
θέλῃ ἰσάγειν 5.38; [οἱ] νεωποῖαι τὰς  
γρα[φείας] δι[κ]ας εἰσαγέ[τωσαν]  
18.27; εἰσαγέσθαι τὰς γραφείας  
[παραγραφάς] É 18.33 34

εἰσαγωγή

περὶ τὴν εἰσαγωγὴν ποιεῖτωσαν  
κατὰ τὸν [ἐρὸν(?)] νόμον 18.29

εἴσεμι

ἐπὶ τοῦ εἰσιόντος γυμνασιάρχου  
14 B 68; ἐν μηνὶ Δίῳ τοῦ εἰσιόντος  
ἔτους 14 B 91

εἰσηγόμαι

εἰσηγήσατο τοῖς δημόταις περὶ τῆς  
Ἄκριδος É 2.3 4

εἰσπορεύω **175, 213**

εἰσ[πορεύεσθαι] 4.10 Rest.; εἰσ-  
πορεύεσθαι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν τὸν βου-  
λόμενον θύειν 7.3 5; [μηδὲ εἰσ-  
πορε]ύεσθαι μηδέγ[α- -] 5.17  
Rest.; εἰσπορεύεσθα[ι] 7.18; ὅταν  
εἰσπορεύηται εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν 14 A  
34 35; εἰς τοὺς παῖδας μὴ εἰσπο-  
ρευέσθω τῶν νεανίσκων μηθεὶς  
14 B 13 14

εἰσπράσσω

ἵνα δὲ καὶ εἰσπραχθῇ 14 B 32;  
εἴ τι ἐκ τῶν ζεμιῶν ἢ εὐθυνῶν  
εἰ[σ]πράχθη{ι} 14 B 89 90; ὁ  
πράκτωρ εἰσπράξας ἀποχ[ατ]αστη-  
σάτω É 14 B 103 104; [ἡ] ζημία  
εἰσπράσ[σ]εται ([εἰσπραχθῇ]σεται  
Rest.) ὑπὸ τῶν νεωποίων É 18.15

εἰσφέρω **174**

μὴ εἰσφέρειν χρωμάτινον É 4.7  
8; τὸν γυμνασιαρχικὸν νόμον ὃν  
εἰσηνέγκατο Ζώπυρος Ἀμύντου

Ἐ 14 A 16 17; τάδε εἰσήνεγκαν  
 οἱ νεω[ποῖται περὶ τῶν κατηλείων]  
 18.3 4  
 ἐκ  
 ἐκ κεφαλᾶς (λουσάμενον) 7.12  
 ἐκβιβάζω  
 πραπτέσθω ἐκβιβάσαι 5.8 9  
 ἐκδίδωμι  
 ἐγδίδοσθαι θυμα τῷ θεῷ κάπρον  
 5.37 38; ξύλα ἐγδίδοσθαι 5.42;  
**189**  
 ἐκδικάζω  
 τῷ ἐγδικασαμένῳ διδόσθω τὸ  
 τρίτον μέρος 14 B 35  
 ἐκδοσις  
 τὰς φορὰς καταφέριν τῷ ταμίᾳ ἰς  
 τὰς ἐγδόσις 5.42 43  
 ἐκδύω  
 μὴ ἐγδυσθῶ εἰς τὸ γυμνάσιον  
 ὁ[ο]ῦ[λ]ος Ἐ 14 B 27  
 ἐκχειρία **94-96**  
 πρὸ φορτύγιον καὶ τὰς ἐκχειρίας  
 27 A 7  
 ἐκκλησία  
 συναχθείσης ἐκκλησίας 14 A 3;  
 [ἐκκλησίας] 18.1 (cf. Rest.)  
 ἐκλογιστής  
 καταστάνεσθαι ἐκλογιστὰς τρεῖς  
 5.30; τοὺς ἐκλογιστὰς ὀμνύειν  
 5.30 31; ὅταν οἱ ἐκλογισταὶ ὁμό-  
 σαντες Ἐ 5.40 41  
 ἐκστρέφω  
 [hoπο]κα (or [αἰ] κα) ἐκστράφεται  
 6.6 Rest.  
 ἐκτίθημι  
 ἀναγράψας εἰς σανίδα ἐκθέτω  
 ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ 14 B 90 91;  
 ἐκτιθέτω τοὺς ἐξημωμένους  
 π[άντα]ς ἐν λευκώματι 14 B 102  
 103  
 ἐκτρέφω  
 [hoπο]κα (or [αἰ] κα) ἐκστράφεται  
 6.6 Rest.  
 ἐκφέρω  
 τὰ κρᾶ μέχφερέτο 27 A 20  
 ἐλαία  
 καὶ στεφάνος ἐλαίας Ἐ 27 A 14 15

ἔλαιον  
 παρεχέτωσαν ἔλαιον 14 B 73, 74  
 75  
 ἐλάστερος  
 [ἐλ]αστέρον ἀποκα[θαίρεσθαι]  
 27 B 1 2; ἐπεὶ κ' ἐλαστέρο ἀποκα-  
 θάρεται 27 B 9; ἡὸκα τῷ ἐλαστέ-  
 ροι χρέζει θύνειν 27 B 12  
 ἔλατρον  
 19.7 Rest.  
 ἐλέγχω  
 ἐλεγχθεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ γυμνασιάρχου  
 καὶ τῶν νέων 14 B 79 80  
 ἐλεύθερος  
 ὅσοι ἂν μὴ ἐλεύθεροι ᾦσιν 14 B 23;  
 τοὺς ἐλευθέρους ζημιῶν 14 B 23  
 Ἐλευσίνιον  
 τὸν ἐν τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ βωμόν 3.9;  
 ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ  
 3.18; [ἐν τῇ] αὐλῇ τοῦ Ἐλευσινίου  
 3.22 23  
 ἐλλείπω  
 ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνλείπον-  
 τος ἀποκληρωσάτω 14 B 53 54  
 ἐμβαίνω  
 ἐάν τις ἐμβῆναι θέλῃ 5.39  
 ἐμβάλλω **222**  
 [ἐμβά]λλειν (τ[ὸ ἀργύριον?] Rest.)  
 9.6; ἐμβalόντες ἐς ὕδριας δυόω  
 26.16; κένβαλέτο καθαρόν ἡἡμα  
 27 A 14  
 ἐμπίνω  
 μὴ ἱνπίνεν 22.1  
 ἐμφανίζω  
 ἐμφανισάτω τῷ γυμνασιάρχῳ  
 14 B 18 19; ἐμφανίζοντός τινος  
 αὐτῷ 14 B 31  
 ἐμπορά  
 πό[ρ]ον εἴμ[εν] Ἐ ἀπὸ τὰς ἐμ-  
 πορὰς τὰς ἐψαφισμένας 11.25  
 27  
 ἐν  
 ἐν = εἰς 11.10, 20, 26; τῷ Διὶ τῷ  
 Μιλιχίοι τῷ ἐν (in the sanctuary  
 of?) Μύσο 27 A 9; τῷ ἐν (in the  
 sanctuary of?) Εὐθυδάμο Μιλιχίοι  
 27 A 17

ἐναρχος

[τὼς ἄντι]τουνρχάνοντας ἐπὶ Δα-  
[μο]κλ[ε]ῖος ἐνά[ρχος] 11.15  
16

ἐναταῖος

ἀπὸ λέχους ἐναταῖαν 7.5 6

ἐνατεῦω **373-374**

ἐνατος

τὰν μοιρᾶν τὰν ἐνάταν κατακαίεν  
μίαν 27 A 11 12

ἐνθήκη

τῆς ἐνθήκης τῆς τεθείσης ὑπὸ  
τοῦ ἀρχερατιστοῦ καὶ ὅση ἂν  
ἄλλη ἐνθήκη ἐπισυναχθῇ (μηθεὶς  
ἀπτέσθω) 5.9 11; ἐάν τι πλείωνος  
ἄψηται ἢ ἐκ τῆς ἐνθήκης ἢ ἐκ τοῦ  
τόκου 5.13 14; τὸ συνεγδανίσαι  
τὴν ἐνθήκην 5.35

ἐνιαυτός

ἐώνηται εἰς πέντε ἔτη τριῶν ἡμι-  
μαίων τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ 2.7 8; δια-  
χειροτονῆσαι ἐάν τε εἰς ἐνιαυ-  
τὸν δοκεῖ μισθοῦν Ἐ 2.33 35;  
κατατιθέστω ἐν τῷ ἐχομένῳ ἐνι-  
αυτῷ 5.17 18; ἐγδίδοσθαι καθ'  
ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν θῦμα 5.37;  
[τοῦ ἐνιαυ]τοῦ 10.3 4; ποιείσθαι  
ἀπόδειξιν Ἐ τρίς ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυ-  
τῷ 14 B 24 25; ἐν τῷ ἐνεστῶτι  
ἐνιαυτῷ 14 B 57; ὅταν ἐξέλ-  
θῃ αὐτῷ ὁ ἐνιαυτός 14 B 107  
108; ἐπ' οἰκήσῃ Ἐ [μενῶσιν  
πάντ]α τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν 18.7 8;  
θυόντω καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν  
Ἐ 26.30

ἐνίστημι

ἐν τῷ ἐνεστῶτι ἐνιαυτῷ 14 B 57;  
ἀποχ[ατ]ασησάτω τῷ ἐνεστῶτι  
γυμνασιάρχῳ 14 B 103 104

ἐνορχος

ἐνορχ[χος]/ἐνόρχ[χας] (χίμαρος) 16.1  
Rest.; [ἐνόρχ]ια 23 A 5 Rest.

ἐνοχος

ἐνοχοὶ ἔστωσαν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐπιτί-  
μοις 14 B 39; ἐνοχος ἔστω ἱεροσυ-  
λῖαι δίκῃ 14 B 100; [ἐ]νοχοὶ ἐόντω  
τῷ νόμῳ 17.9 10

ἐντεμένιος

θύμῃ θεῶι ἐντεμ[ενίῳ ἐτέρῳ] 13.14  
Rest.

ἐντίθημι

ὥστε ἐς [τὸ] λ[ί]κνον ἐνθεῖ[ν]αι  
20.6; τὰς ποτερίδας ἐνθέντες  
27 A 16

ἐξαιρέω

τὰ ἡιαρὰ τὰ δαμόσια ἐξῆ(α)ιρέτο  
27 A 18

ἐξακολουθέω

ὁ μὲν ἀρξάμενος (μάχης) Ἐ ὁ δὲ  
ἐξακολουθήσας Ἐ 5.7

ἐξάνανκα

ἐξάνανκα πρᾶπτέσθω ἐκβιβάσαι  
5.8 9

ἔξεμι. *See* ἐξέρχομαι

ἐξέρανος

ὁ μὴ δοῦς Ἐ ἐξέρανος ἔστω 5.44

ἐξέρχομαι

Ὁ μανεῖς ἐξίτω μαντεῖω 12 Com-  
mentary; ὅταν ἐξέλθῃ ἐκ τῆς ἀρ-  
χῆς 14 B 88 89; ὅταν ἐξέλθῃ αὐ-  
τῷ ὁ ἐνιαυτός 14 B 107 108

ἔξεστι

μὴ ἐξέστω εἰπεῖν μηθέν 2.36 37;  
μὴ ἐξέστω τῶν ξύλων ἀπτεσθαι  
5.45; ἐπεγδύεσθαι δὲ μηθενὶ ἐξέ-  
στω 14 B 1; ἐξέστω αὐτῷ ἀντεί-  
παντι Ἐ διακριθῆναι 14 B 36 37,  
104 105; μὴ ἐξέστω τὸν γυμνα-  
σίαρχον Ἐ κακῶς εἰπεῖν μηθενὶ  
14 B 39 40; ἐξέστω ταινιοῦν τὸν  
βουλόμενον 14 B 58; ἐξέστω (συνε-  
γλογίζεσθαι) 14 B 92

ἐξεταστής

(τὸν νόμον) ὃν δεδώκαμεν τοῖς ἐξ-  
ετασταῖς 14 A 9 10; πολιτάρχας  
καὶ ἐξεταστάς 14 A 42 (cf. 48); τοῖς  
ἐξετασταῖς τῆς πόλεως 14 B 32 33  
(δότω), 91 (ἀποδιδότω); παραγρα-  
ψάντων τῶν ἐξεταστῶν 14 B 96;  
τὰς γραφείσας [παραγραφὰς ὑπὸ  
τ]ῶν ἐξεταστῶν Ἐ 18.33 34

ἐξομνῶ

ἐάν οἱ λαχόντες Ἐ μηδὲ ἐξομό-  
σωνται ἀδύνατοι εἶναι 14 B 51 52;

- ἐξομοσάσθω ἐν ἡμέραις πέντε Ἐ  
14 B 76 77; ἐάν μὴ λαμπαδαρχῇ ἢ  
μὴ ἐξομώσῃται 14 B 77; ἐάν ὁ ἐξο-  
μοσάμενος φανῇ μὴ δεόντως ὁμο-  
μοκέναι 14 B 79; ἀντὶ τοῦ δικαίως  
ἐξομοσαμένου 14 B 81 82
- ἐξουσία  
οὐκ ἐξου[σία] ἔσται πλείονα ἔχειν  
κ]απηλείου ἑνός 18.6 7; μὴ ἐξου-  
σία ἔστω τῶν ἱερῶν παιδῶν καπη-  
λεύειν 18.38
- ἐξοφάσαιεν Aor. opt. from ἐξσθω-  
άω or ἐξσθώζω (= ἐκθώαω/άζω)  
6.2A4 Rest.
- ἐξώλεια  
ἐξώλειαν ἐπαρώμενον 1.61
- ἐορτάζω  
οἱ πολῖται Ἐ ἐορταζόντων Ἐ 26.32
- ἐορτή  
παρέχειν (τὸ ἀργύριον) εἰς τὴν  
ἐορτὴν τοῦ Ἡρακλέως τοῦ ἐν  
Ἄκριδι 2.32 33
- ἐπαινέω  
ἐπαινέσαι Φιλόκωμον καὶ στεφα-  
νῶ(ς)ι χρυσῶι στεφάνῳι 2.9 11;  
ἐπαινέσαι Μοιροκλέα Ἐ 2.14 15
- ἐπακουστός  
ἐ' πακουστόν ἐ' φορατόν 27 B 7
- ἐπαναγκάζω  
ἐπαναγκαζέτω τοὺς παιδοτρίβας  
ποιεῖσθαι ἀποδείξειν 14 B 23 24
- ἐπάναγκες  
ἐπάναγκες αὐτῶν καταγινωσκόν-  
των τοῦτο τὸ ἀργύριον 2.42 43;  
καταστάνεσθαι ἐπάνανκες Ἐ προ-  
κτορες Ἐ 5.27 28; τὰς φορὰς  
καταφέρειν ἐπάναγκες 5.42 43
- ἐπαράομαι  
ἐξώλειαν ἐπαρώμενον 1.61
- ἐπαυτέω  
ἐπαυτομένας 1.14, 47 Rest.
- ἐπειμι  
Ὁ ἀνεῖς ἐπίτω μαντεῖω 12; εἰς  
τοῦπιόν 14 B 63
- ἐπεκδύω  
ἐπεγδύεσθαι δὲ μηθὲν ἐξέστω  
14 B 1
- ἐπελαύνω  
ho ἐπιγνόμεον ἐπελ[ά]στο του  
οφλον 6.7.2
- ἐπευθύνω  
ἐπευθύνεν 6.3A5 Rest., 15A Rest.
- ἐπί  
*With gen.* ἐπ' αὐτὸ μένας 1.14,  
47 Rest.; ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ ἐν τῷ  
Ἑλευσινίῳ 3.18; *With dat.* ἐφ'  
ἀλῇι 1.23; *With acc.* ἐπ' Αὐτομέ-  
νας/Αὐτομένας 1.14, 47 Rest.; ἐπὶ  
Σούνιον 1.19; ἐπὶ Μυκηθον 1.45  
(cf. Lat. Dex. 4 Rest.); ἐπὶ τοὺς  
βωμούς 3.15; ἐπὶ τὸν χύτρον (ξύ-  
λα) 3.22 [ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν] τράπεζ[αν]  
9.2 Rest.
- ἐπιγίγνομαι  
κωλυέτωσαν οἱ ἐπιγινόμενοι  
γυμνασίαρχοι τοὺς Ἐ 14 B 37  
38
- ἐπιγινώσκω  
[ἐ]πιγνόν[ν?]ς 6.9A
- ἐπιγνώμων  
ho ἐπιγνόμεον ἐπελ[ά]στο του  
οφλον 6.7.2
- ἐπιδείκνυμι  
ἂν ταμεύσας τις ἐπιδειχθῇ νενο-  
σφισμένος 5.15; ὅταν οἱ ἐγλογισαί  
Ἐ ἐπιδίξωσι εἴ τι ὀφίλη ὁ ταμίας  
5.40 42
- ἐπιδέκατον  
προσαποτινέτω τὸ ἐπίπεμπτον καὶ  
ἐπιδέκατον 14 B 106 107
- ἐπιδίδωμι  
ἐκατὸν δραχμὰς ἐπέ[δωκ]εν 2.8
- ἐπιμελέομαι  
ἐπαινέσαι Μοιροκλέα, ὅτι τοῖς  
δημόταις ἐπιμελεῖται 2.14 16;  
ἐπιμεληθῆναι [το]ῦ[ς] ἐ[ε]ρσοποιούς  
20.25 26
- ἐπιορκέω  
ἐφιορκοῦντι δὲ τάναντία 14 A 33  
34, cf. 62
- ἐπίπεμπτον  
προσαποτινέτω τὸ ἐπίπεμπτον καὶ  
ἐπιδέκατον 14 B 106 107
- ἐπισκοπέω **355**

ἐπιστατέω

[ἐπιστατοῦντος] 18.2 3

ἐπιτάσσω

[αἱ κά τι ἐπι]τάσσωντι παρὰ τὰ  
ἐψαφι[σμένα] 17.7 8

ἐπιτήδειος

οἱ ἄν αὐτῷ δοκῶσιν ἐπιτήδειοι  
εἶναι 14 B 83, 84 85

ἐπίτιμον

ἀποτινέτωσαν τὸ ἴσον ἐπίτιμον  
14 B 34 35; ἔνοχοι ἔστωσαν τοῖς  
αὐτοῖς ἐπιτίμοις 14 B 39

ἐπιτρέπω

οὔτε ἄλλω ἐπιτρέψω εἰδώς  
14 A 31 32; μὴ ἐπιτρεπέτωσαν  
14 B 42

ἐπιψηφίζω

ἐάν τις ἢ εἴπει ἢ ἐπιψηφίσει 2.39  
40; ὅσον ἂν εἴπει ἢ ἐπιψηφίσει  
ὀφειλέτω τῷ θεῷ 2.40 41

ἐρανίζω

ἐραν[ίζειν] 6.8.2

ἔρανος

ἐάν τις τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἐράνου τέκνον  
θέλῃ ἰσάγιν 5.38; ἐρά(ν)οις 6.6  
Rest.; ἔραν[ος] 6.8.2

ἐργολαβέω

οἱ ἐργολαβήσαντες ὕικὸν ἢ οἰνικόν  
5.20; οἱ ἐργολαβοῦντες ἐγγυητάς  
παρατιθέτωσαν 5.22 23

ἔργον

οἷδὲ παρέξουσιν οὔτε ἔργα οἷτε  
σῖτα 18.21 22

ἐστιάω

ἰστιώντων ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ  
14 B 62

ἐταιρεύω

(μὴ ἐγδυέσθω Ἐ ) μηδὲ ἡταιρευκώς  
14 B 28

ἔτος

ἐώνηται εἰς πέντε ἔτη 2.6 9; τοῦ  
καθ' ἔτος ταμίου 5.42; φετέον  
6.2A1; γυμνασάρχον Ἐ μὴ νεώτε-  
ρον ἐτῶν Ἐ μηδὲ πρεσβύτερον Ἐ  
14 A 23 24; τῶν ὑπὸ τὰ τριάκοντα  
ἔτη 14 B 1; οἱ ὑπὸ τὰ δύο καὶ εἴ-  
κοσι ἔτη (μελετάτωσαν) 14 B 11;

(προτιθέτω ὄπλον) τοῖς ἔως τριά-  
κοντα ἐτῶν 14 B 47; (ὃς ἂν αὐτῷ  
δοκῇ) τῶν ἔως τριάκοντα ἐτῶν  
14 B 56, 57; ἐν μηνὶ Δίῳ τοῦ εἰσι-  
όντος ἔτους 14 B 91; κατ' [ἔτος(?)]  
- - -] 18.35; τρίτῳ φέ[τους] 23 B 7;  
πένπ[τοι] φέτει ἡδιπερ ἡόκα ἡα  
Ὀλυνπιάς ποτεῖε 27 A 7 8; ἔστο  
Ἐ πεδὰ φέτος θύεν 27 A 18,  
19 20; τρίτῳ φέτ[ει] 27 A 23; τὸ  
φέ[τ]ρος ἡόπο κα λῆι 27 B 2

εὐεξία

προτιθέτω ὄπλον Ἐ εὐεξίας  
καὶ εὐταξίας καὶ φιλοπονίας Ἐ  
14 B 46 47; τοὺς κρινούοντας  
τὴν <εὐεξίαν> (εὐταξίαν lapis)  
ἀπογραφέτω ὁ γυμνασάραχος  
14 B 48

εὐθύναι

ὀρκωμόσιον παρέχεν ἐς εὐθύνας  
1.12; εἰ τι ἐκ τῶν ζεμῶν ἢ εὐθυνῶν  
εἰ[σ]επράχθη{ι} 14 B 89 90

εὐθυνοσ

τὸν εὐθυνον ὁμόσαι 1.57; ὁ εὐθυ-  
νος καὶ ὁ συνήγορος καταγυγνο-  
σκότων 2.41 42

εὐθύνω

εὐθυνώ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἣν ἔλαχ[ον]  
εὐθύ[ν]εν 1.58 59; εὐθυνέτω αὐτὸν  
κατὰ τοὺς κοινοὺς νόμους 14 B 87;  
εὐθυνέτω τὸν γυμνασάραχον ὁ  
βουλόμενος 14 B 107

εὐνοια

ἐπαινέσαι Φιλόκωμον ἀρετῆς  
ἐνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας Ἐ 2.9 12

εὐορκέω

εὐορκοῦντι μέν μοι εἴη πολλὰ καὶ  
ἀγαθὰ 14 A 32 33, cf. 61 62

εὐρίσκω

ἐάν τις εὐρεθῇ ῥυπαρόν τι πεποι-  
κώς 5.33 34

εὐσεβής

διακείμενα τὰ πὸτ τὼς θεῶς εὐσεβ[ε]-  
β[ῶς] 11.12; cf. εὐσεβ[- - -] 10.13

εὐτακτος

ὃς ἂν αὐτῷ δοκῇ εὐτακτότατος  
εἶναι 14 B 55

## εὐταξία

προτιθέτω ὄπλον Ἐ εὐεξίας  
καὶ εὐταξίας καὶ φιλοπονίας Ἐ  
14 B 46 47; εὐταξίαν 14 B 48  
Rest.; τῆς εὐταξίας καὶ φιλοπονίας  
Ἐ ὁ γυμνασίαρχος Ἐ κρινάτω τῆς  
εὐταξίας Ἐ τῆς δὲ φιλοπονίας Ἐ  
14 B 54 56

## ἐφηβος

οἱ ἐφηβοι (μελετάωσαν) 14 B 10  
11; [τοὺς ἐφηβους] παραπέμπ[ον-  
τα]ς [τὰ ἱερά] 15.9 10

## ἐφίστημι

ἐάν τινες τῶν ἐπεστηκότων 18.23  
(cf. Rest.)

## ἐφορατός

ἐ ᾧ πακουστόν ἐ ᾧ φορατόν 27 B 7

## ἐχθρα

οὔτε χάριτος ἔνεκεν οὔτε ἔχθρας  
οὐδεμᾶς 14 B 50 51

## ἐχθρός

οὔτε φίλοι χαριζόμενος οὔτε  
ἐχθρόν βλάπτων 14 A 29 30, cf.  
60 61

## ἐχω

τῇ ἐχομένη ἡμέρᾳ (ἀποτινέτω) 5.6;  
ἐν τῷ ἐχομένῳ ἐνιαυτῷ (κατατι-  
θέστω) 5.17 18; καλῶς ἔχει καὶ  
παρὶ ἡμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ συντελεσθῆναι  
14 A 8 9; οὐκ ἔξουσ[ία] ἔσται πλεί-  
ονα ἔχειν κ[α]πληλείου ἐνός 18.6 7

## ζημία

[τὰ]ν ζημίαν παρέχε[ν] 6.7A2;  
ζαμ[ία]/ζαμ[ιον] 6.12.3 Rest.;  
[ζ]αμιας 6.13A; εἴ τι ἐκ τῶν  
ζεμιῶν ἢ εὐθυνῶν εἰ[σ]επράχθη{ι}  
14 B 89 90; ταῖς ζημίαις ἀπάσαις  
ἐπιγραφέτω τὴν αἰτίαν 14 B 101;  
ἀποτεῖσει τοῖς μισθω[σ]αμένοις  
δραχμαῖς - *numerus* - ζη[μ]ίαν 18.11  
12; [ἡ] ζημία εἰσπράσ[σ]εται ὑπὸ  
τῶν νεωποίων Ἐ 18.15

## ζημιώω

⟨ζ⟩αμιδν ([τὸν]ς πλατιφοίνους)  
6.2A3 Rest.; κωλύετω Ἐ καὶ  
ζημιούτω δραχμαῖς πεντήκοντα

14 B 5 6; (τὸν μὲν Ἐ ) τοὺς δὲ  
ἄλλους ζημιούτω 14 B 9 10;  
ζημιούτω Ἐ τὸν ποιοῦντά τι  
τούτων 14 B 15; ζημιούτω αὐτὸν  
καθ' ἡμέραν δραχμαῖς πέντε  
14 B 20 21; τοὺς δὲ ἐλευθέρους  
ζημιῶν 14 B 23; ζημιούτω αὐτὸν  
δραχμαῖς πεντήκοντα 14 B 40 41;  
ζημιούτω τὸν τύπτοντα δραχμαῖς  
ἐκατόν 14 B 42 43; ζημιούσθω  
δραχμαῖς πεντήκοντα 14 B 44 45;  
ζημιῶν τὸν ἀπειθοῦντα δραχμαῖς  
δέκα 14 B 52 53; ζημιούτω αὐτοὺς  
Ἐ δραχμαῖς ἐκατόν 14 B 68  
69; κύριος ἔστω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος  
μαστιγῶν καὶ ζημιῶν 14 B 70 71;  
(ἐπιγραφέτω τὴν αἰτίαν) δι[ὲ] ἣν  
ἐζ[η]μιώσεν 14 B 101 102; ἐκτιθέτω  
τοὺς ἐζημιωμένους π[άντα]ς ἐν  
λευκώματι 14 B 102 103; ἐάν  
τις φήσῃ μὴ δικαίως ἐζημιώσθαι  
14 B 104; ἐάν νικήσῃ τῇ κρίσει  
ὁ ζημωθεὶς 14 B 105 106; ἐάν  
τ[ι]νας μὴ δικαίως οἱ νεωποῖαι  
ζημιώσωσιν 18.31 32; (ἐάν Ἐ )  
[καὶ οἱ ζη]μιωθέντες ἀντεῖπωσιν  
18.33; (ἦν Ἐ ) [ζη]μιούσθ[α]ι  
20.22

## ἡγέομαι

(οἱ νεώτεροι) πειθαρχήσουσι τῷ  
ἡγούμενῳ 14 A 13

## ἡμα

κένβαλέτο καθαρὸν ἡμα 27 A 14

## ἡμέρα

ἀφ' ἧς ἂν ἡμέρας οἱ δημόται ψηφί-  
σονται 2.52 53; τῇ ἐχομένη ἡμέρᾳ  
(ἀποτινέτω) 5.6; κληροῦσθαι τῆς  
ἡμέρας ἐκάστης 5.31 32; ἀπὸ δια-  
φθέρματος τεσσαράκοντα καὶ τέσ-  
σaras ἡμέρας 7.6 8; δέκα ἡμέρας  
8.2, 4; [πέν]τε ἡμέρας 8.4 5; καθ'  
ἡμέραν 14 A 39, B 20 21; καθ'  
ἐκάστην ἡμέραν 14 B 11; ἀπαν-  
τάωσαν οἱ παιδοτρίβαι ἐκάστης  
ἡμέρας δις Ἐ 14 B 15 16; ἐν ἡμέ-  
ραις δέκα 14 B 36 37; ἐκείνην

- τὴν ἡμέραν στεφανηφορεῖτωσαν  
14 B 58; (παρεχέτωσαν ἔλαιον)  
ἕκαστος ἡμέρας δέκα 14 B 73 74;  
(παρεχέτωσαν ἔλαιον) τὰς ἴσας  
ἡμέρας 14 B 75; ἕξομοσάσθω ἐν  
ἡμέραις πέντε *É* 14 B 76 77; ἀπο-  
διδότω *É* ἐν ἡμέραις τριάκοντα,  
ἀφ' ἧς ἂν ἡμέρας ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς  
ἀπολυθῇ 14 B 93 94; ἀφ' ἧς ἂν  
ἡμέρας γραφῶσιν, ἐν ἡμέραις -  
*numerus* -] 18.28; τὸν βωμὸν τα[ῖς  
- - ἡμέρ]αις στεφανώσε[ι] 19.5  
6; θυόντω *É* ταῦτα τῇ ἀμέραι  
26.30; <ταῖ> ἀμέραι ἡοπεῖται κα λῆι  
27 B 3
- ἡμίεκτον  
[σ]ί[τ]ο ἡμίεκτον 20.4
- ἡμίκραρα  
μηροὺς μασχαλίσματα ἡμίκραραν  
3.16, 17
- ἡμίμναϊον  
ἐώνηται εἰς πέντε ἔτη τριῶν ἡμι-  
μαίων τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ 2.7 8
- ἡμιόλιον  
ἀποτινέτω *É* τὸ ἡμιόλιον τῷ  
νικήσαντι 14 B 106
- ἡμυσυκτεὺς  
ἀλφίτων ἡμυσυκτέως 20.3 4
- Ἡραῖον  
[παρὰ τῷ Ἡ]ραίῳ 20.24 25
- Ἡράκλειον  
15 A Rest. (ἡερακλειο lapis)
- ἥρως  
ἥρωπι τέλ[εον?] 23 A 6; τοῖς  
Τριτοπατρεῦσι *É* ὡςπερ τοῖς  
ἡερόεσι 27 A 9 10
- ἡσάομαι  
γίνεσθαι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ἡσσηθέντος  
18.31
- θαλλός  
θαλλοῦ στεφάνῳ στεφανῶσαι  
2.17; τὸν νικῶντα στεφανοῦτω  
θαλλοῦ στεφάνῳ 14 B 26
- θέατρον  
ἐν τῷ [θεάτρῳ] 18.2; cf. θαυεα-  
τρα 6.4.2
- θέλω. *See* ἐθέλω
- θεμιτός  
[θε]μι(τ)όν ἐστιν 3.14 15 Rest.
- θεός  
Θ[εο]ί 2.1; τῷ θεῷ ἀποδόσθαι τὴν  
λιθ[οτομ]ίαν 2.4 5; τῷ θεῷ ὀφει-  
λέτω τὸ διπλάσιον 2.40 41; [τοῖν  
θε]οῖν 3.19 20 Rest.; ἀπαγορεύει  
ὁ θεός 4.7; ἐγδίδοσθαι θῦμα τῷ  
θεῷ κάπρον 5.37 38; στέφανον  
φέρειν τῷ θεῷ ἕκαστον 5.45 46;  
Θεός· τύχα ἀγαθὰ 7.2; διακείμενα  
τὰ πὸτ τὼς θεὸς εὐσ[ε]β[ῶς] 11.12;  
[θ]ῦναι τοῖς θεοῖς 13.6; τῷ θεῷ  
διπλὰς 13.13; θῦναι θεῷ ENTEM[-  
-] (ἐν τεμ[ένει]/ἐντεμ[ενίῳ] ἐτέρῳ)  
Rest.) 13.14; κατὰ τὰν μαντείαν  
τοῦ θεοῦ 15.4; θεῷ Ἐρμ[αῖ] 15.6;  
χιλίας δραχμὰς ἀποτεισάτω ἱερὰς  
τῇ θεῷ 17.6 7; ἀποτείσει τῇ  
θεῷ δραχμὰς ἱερὰς - *numerus* -]  
18.14, cf. [24 25]; αἱ δ' ἱερόφοι  
τῷ θιδοῖ 22.6 8; Θαρσύτας *É*  
τόνδ' ἀνέθηκε θεῷ 24.2; τὸ δέσμα  
τῷ θεῷ 24.5; ἀρὰ τῷ [θε]ῷ 25.1  
2; θυόντο ὡςπερ τοῖς θεοῖς *É*  
27 A 17
- θεσμοφύλακες  
τὸν ἄρχοντα καὶ τὼς [τεθ]μοφύ-  
λακας παρεῖμεν *É* 11.21 23; διδό-  
σθαι *É* καὶ τὴς τεθμοφουλάκεσσι  
τὰ οὐτέρπουρα πάντα καὶ τὰν  
κωλίαν 11.23 25
- θῆλυς  
[θῆλ]υς χοῖρος 23 B 4
- Θησεῖον  
ὅταν οἱ δημόται ἀγοράζωσιν ἐν τῷ  
Θησεῖῳ 2.28
- θυηλαί **167-168**
- θῦμα **301-302, 373**  
ἐγδιδόσθαι θῦμα τῷ θεῷ κάπρον  
5.37 38; [εἰ]ς τὰ θύματα 19.8;  
θύμα[τα] 23 D 4; θυόντο θῦμα  
*É* ἡοῖς ἡοσία 27 A 12; ἔστο  
δὲ καὶ θῦμα πεδὰ φέτος θύεν  
27 A 18; θῦμα ὅτι κα προχορεῖ  
τὰ πατρῶ[ια] 27 A 22



## θυσία

ὅπως ἂν ἡ θυσία γίγνηται ὥς καλίστη 2.5 6; ὅπως ἂν ἡ θυσία θύηται ὥς καλλίστη 2.19 20; πρὸ τῆς θυσίας τῆς ἐπὶ Νικίτου ἄρχοντος 2.49; τὴν θυσίαν τοῦ Ἡρακλέως 2.38; ἄ[γειν εἰς τὴν θυσίαν] βοῦν 10.7 8; παρακαλῖ [ὄπ]ως θουσίαν συντέλει 11.7 8; δεδόχθη τὰς θουσίας συντελέ[μεν] 11.14 15; συντελείτωσαν τὴν θυσίαν 14 B 64; θεῶ Ἑρμ[ῆ] θυσίαν συντελλεῖν 15.6; τῇ θυσίᾳ θυόντω αἰ(γ)α λευκάν 26.27 28; τὰ ποτὶ τὰν θυσίαν ὄσων χρεῖα ἐστὶ Ἐ 26.28; τὸν ἡιαρὸν ἡα θυσία 27 A 7

θύω **263, 353, 384 n. 115**

[τάδε θύεται Θεορικίσις] 1.1 Rest.; ὅπως ἂν ἡ θυσία θύηται ὥς καλίστη 2.19 20; θυόντωσαν (κρίον Πλούτωνι) 3.7; (τῇ Δή[μητρι]) 3.12; εἰσπορεύεσθαι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τὸν βουλόμενον θύειν 7.3 5; θύην καθὼς ἂν ὁ ἱερεὺς [εἴπη] 8.6; τὸμ βου[λόμενον θύειν] 13.5 Rest.; [θ]ύειν τοῖς θε[οῖς] 13.6; θύειγ καὶ πθύν[αι] 13.9; θύηι θεῶι ENTEM[- -] (ἐν τεμ[ένει]/ἐντεμ[ένει]ω ἐτέρωι) Rest.) 13.14; Ἀσκληπιῶι θυ[- -] 13.16; θυέτω (ὁ γυμνασίαρχος) τῶι Ἑρμῇ 14 B 46; ποιείτωσαν μερίδας τῶν θυθέντων τὰ κρέα ὡμά 14 B 65 66; θυέτ[ω] τῶν φυλετᾶ[ν] ὁ γεραίτατ[ος] 16.2 4; τὰ θυθέντ[α αὐτεῖ] καταχρῆ[σθαι] 16.5 7; οἱ θύον(?)τες ([ἄγον]τες Rest.) τὰ [ἱε]ρ[ε]ῖ[α] 20.22 23; [θυέτ]ω [β]ῶν 21.3; [θ]ύεν τῶι Ζηνὶ τέλεον τ[αῦρον] 23 A 17; [αἰ δὲ κα] μὴ θύη 23 A 21; θύην τὸν βωλόμενον 24.3; ἡὸς κα(τ) τὸ ἀρχομάο θύε 25.2 4; τῇ θυσίᾳ θυόντω αἰ(γ)α λευκάν 26.27 28; θυόντω Ἐ τοῖς γενετόρεσι καὶ τῇ Ὀμονο(ι)αῖ ἱερεῖον 26.30 31; τοῖ Διὶ τοῖ Εὐμενεῖ θύ[ε]ν

Ἐ τέλεον 27 A 8 9; θυόντω θῦμα Ἐ hoῖς hoσία 27 A 12; τοῖς κ(α)θαροῖς τέλεον θυόντω 27 A 13; θυόντω Ἐ τὰ πατρῷα 27 A 17; τοῖ ἐν Εὐθυδάμιο Μιλιχίοι κριὸν θ[υ]όντω 27 A 17; ἔστο Ἐ πεδὰ φέτος θύεν 27 A 18, 19 20; θύσας τοῖ Διὶ χοῖρον 27 B 5; ἡιαρεῖον τέλεον Ἐ θύσας 27 B 10; ἡόκα τοῖ ἐλαστέροι χρεῖζει θύεν 27 B 12; θύεν ἡόσπερ τοῖς ἀθανάτοισι 27 B 12 13

## ἴδιος

ἴδιοι μὲν δέκα ἄμ[ερας] 8.2

## ιδιώτης

[ἐά]ν τι ἐ[γ]καλῇ ὁ ιδιώτης τῶι καπήλωι ἢ [ὁ κάπηλος τῶι ιδιώτῃ] 18.25 26; ἦν ιδιώτης ποιῇ 20.4 5, 19 20 (ποιῇ)

## ἱεράζω

ἱεράζειν 10.3

## ἱέρεια

ἐπειδὰν αἱ ἱέρεια ποιήσωσι 3.11; τῇ ἱερείᾳ 3.20; [ἱε]ρέ[αι Ἑ]λειθί[ης] 20.1 2; [τ]ῇ ἱερείᾳ τῆς Ἑλειθί[ης] 20.15 16

ἱερεῖον **83, 353, 371, 386**

πλευρὸν ἰσχύον ΠΙ τοῦ ἱερεῖου 3.20 21; ἀπὸ [τ]οῦ ἱερέ[ο]υ [ἀ]πο-δ[ό]σ[θ]αι [κ]εφαλὴν 20.18 19; οἱ θύον(?)τες ([ἄγον]τες Rest.) τὰ [ἱε]ρ[ε]ῖ[α] 20.22 23; θυόντω Ἐ τοῖς γενετόρεσι καὶ τῇ Ὀμονο(ι)αῖ ἱερεῖον 26.30 31; ἡιαρεῖον τέλεον Ἐ θύσας 27 B 10

## ἱερεὺς

τὸν ἱερέα (ἄριστομ παρέχεν) 1.16, 4 Rest.; συνεπιμεληθῆναι τῆς στήλης Ἐ τὸν ἱερέα 2.47 48; ἐπὶ Τίτου Φλαβίου Κόνωνος ἄρχοντος καὶ ἱερέως Δρούσου ὑπάτου 5.1 2; θύην καθὼς ἂν ὁ ἱερεὺς [εἴπη] 8.6; τοῖ ἱερεῖς Ἐ [αἰ καὶ τι ἐπι]τάσσωντι παρὰ τὰ ἐψαφι[ομένα] 17.7 8; [ὁ] ἱερεὺς παρῆξει 19.2; ἱαρέα δὲ μὴ 22.6



ἱερεῦω

αἱ δ' ἱερόφοι τοῖ θιδοῖ 22.6 8

ἱερεῶσυνος **164–165**, cf. **52, 185**

ἱερεῶσυνα κωλῆν πλευρὸν ἰσχίον

3.5; ἱερεῶσυνα 3.19;

ἱερομηνία **94–96**

ἱερομνήμων

μὴ ἐξέστω δὲ εἰπεῖν μνηθῆνα Ἐ  
μηδὲ τοῖς ἱερομνήμοσιν ἐπιψηφίσαι  
2.36 39; [ἀ]ποδόμεν τοῖ ἱερομηνά-  
μονι τὸνς πρᾶ[- -] 6.3A3; τὸν δ'  
ἱερομηνάμονα 6.3A4, 6.5; οἱ ἱερο-  
μνάμονες τᾷ θυσίαι θυόντω Ἐ  
26.27 28

ἱεροποιέω

(ἀναδεικνύτωσαν ἑτέρους) οἵτινες  
Ἐ ἱεροποιήσουσιν Ἑρμεῖ 14 B 63  
64

ἱεροποιός **265–266**

[τῶν ἱεροποιῶν 3.1; [οἱ ἱεροποιοί]οι  
καὶ ὁ κῆρυξ δαινύσθωσ[αν] 3.5  
6; [τῶν ἀκολ]ούθωμι ἱεροποιός  
ἀφιέτω 3.10; ἀγέτωσαν δὲ τὰ  
Ἑρμαῖα καὶ οἱ ἱεροποιοί 14 B 60  
61; ὅταν καὶ οἱ ἱεροποιοί 14 B 64;  
οἱ ἱεροποιοί Ἐ ἀκρόαμα μνηθὲν  
παραγέτωσαν Ἐ 14 B 66 67;  
ἐπιμεληθῆναι [το]ῦ[ς] ἱεροποιούς  
20.25 26

ἱερός

*Adjective* τὰς λιθοτομίας τὰς Ἑλενοσῖνι,  
[- -] εἰσὶν ἱεραὶ τοῦ Ἑρακλέως  
2.21 22; ἱερά τράπ[εζα(?) ] 6.14.3;  
χιλίας δραχμὰς ἀποτεῖσ[άτω] ἱεράς  
τᾷ θεῷ 17.6 7; ἀποτεῖσει τῇ  
θεῷ δραχμὰ[ς] ἱεράς - *numerus* -]  
18.14; εἰσαγέ[τωσαν] εἰς τὸ ἱερόν  
δικαστ[ήριον] 18.27 28 Rest.;  
ποιεῖτωσαν κατὰ τὸν ἱ[ερόν(?)  
νόμον] 18.29; μὴ ἐξουσία ἔστω  
τῶν ἱερῶν παίδων κατηλευεῖν  
18.38

*Substantive* ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ (τοῦ Ἑρακλέ-  
ως τοῦ ἐν Ἀκρίδι στησαι τὴν στη-  
λην) 2.45; 48; ἱερόν ἄγιον Ἱσίοις  
Σαράπιος Ἀνούβιος 7.2 3; εἰσπο-  
ρεύεσθαι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν τὸν βουλόμε-

νον θύειν 7.3 5; [ἱ]ερόν 13.5; [τοὺς  
ἐφήβους] παραπέμπ[οντα]ς [τὰ  
ἱερά] 15.9 10; [ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἑρας  
ἱερῷ] 18.4 5 (cf. Rest); ὁ ταμί-  
ας τῶν ἱερῶν 18.15 16, 35, 37;  
τοὺς καθίζοντας οἰκέτας εἰς τὸ  
ἱερόν 18.20 21; περὶ τινος τῶν ἐν  
τῷ ἱερῷ ἀπ[ειρημένων] 18.32  
33; ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ 18.38; δίδοσθαι  
ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱερ[οῦ] 20.5 6; τῶν γυναι-  
κῶν τῶν π[ο]λ[ι]τ[ῶ]ν σασι[ων] τὰ ἱερά  
20.9 10; ὅταν ἱερόν καθαιρέωσιν  
20.11; ἱερά ἀπονέμει 21.12 13; τὸν  
ἱερόν ha θυσία 27 A 7; τὰ ἱερά  
τὰ δαμόσια ἐξh(α)ιρέτο 27 A 18;  
τὰ ἱερά **37, 265 n. 28, 308, 311,  
320–321, 369, 378**

ἱεροσυλία

ἐνοχος ἔστω ἱεροσυλίας δίκη  
14 B 100; [ἔ]νοχοι ἐόντω τῷ νόμῳ  
τ[ῷ] τὰς ἱεροσυλί[ας] 17.9 11  
Rest.

ἱερωσύνη

περὶ ἱερωσυνῶν ὧν ἄν τις ἀγορά-  
σῃ 5.16 17; [(ὁ πριάμενος vel ἐπρί-  
ατο Rest.) τῇ]ν ἱερωσύνην 19.10

ἵζω

Θυμίλος ἴσατο τόνδ' Ἀσκληπιόν  
24.1

ἱκετεία

[ἔ]νοχοι ἐόντω τῷ νόμῳ τ[ῷ] τὰς  
ἱκετεῖ[ας] 17.9 11

ἱκέτης

ἀφικετεύων ἢ δεκόμενος τοὺς  
ἱκέτας] 17.5; (παρακατηλ[ε]ύσει  
Ἐ ) οὐτε ἱκέτης 18.9; (οὐ παρα-  
δώσου[σιν]) οὐτε ἱκέτη 18.13; οὐχ  
ὑποδέξονται Ἐ οὐθὲν Ἐ [οὐδὲ  
παρὰ ἱκέτου] 18.16 17

ἱλάσκομαι

[Δία Κτήσ]ιον καὶ Καθυπερ[δέξιον]  
ἱλάσασθαι] 15.4 5

ἱλπεύς

πεμπόμεν ἀπὸ πόλιος ἱλπ[έα]ς 11.9

ἵσος

ἀποτινέωσαν τὸ ἴσον ἐπίτιμον  
14 B 34 35

## ἴστημι

ἀναγράφαι τὸ ψήφισμα Ἐ καὶ  
στήσαι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ 2.43 45;  
συνεπιμεληθῆναι τῆς στήλης ὅπως  
ἂν σταθεῖ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ Ἐ 2.47 48

ἰστιάω *See* ἐστιάω

## ἰσχίον

ἱερεῶσυνα κωλῆν πλευρὸν ἰσχίον  
3.5 (πλευρὸν ἰ(σ)χ[ί(ο)ου] Rest.);  
πλευρὸν ἰσχίον 20 21; [ἰ(?)σχίον  
10.10 11

## καθαγίζω

κατῆαιγίζεν τὸς ἡομοσεπύος  
27 A 3; Ἐ καταγιζόντο ἡοῖς ἡοσία  
27 A 12

## καθαιρέω

ὅταν ἱρὸν καθαιρέωσιν 20.11

## καθαίρω

[ἦ μὴ καθαίρω]ντι (τοὺς ἰκέτας)  
17.8 9 Rest.; καθαιρέσθω 27 B 3;  
αἱ τίς κα λῆι Ἐ καθαίρεσθαι  
27 B 7 8; τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον  
καθαιρέσθω Ἐ 27 B 8

## καθαρίζω

εἰσπορεύεσθαι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν Ἐ  
καθαρίζοντα ἀπὸ μὲν Ἐ δὲ Ἐ  
7.3 6

## καθαρός

τοῖς κ(α)θαροῖς τέλεον θυόντο  
27 A 13; κένβαλέτο καθαρὸν  
ἡῆμα 27 A 14; (ἡαρεῖον θύσας)  
καθαρός ἔστο 27 B 10 11

## καθεύδω

καθευδέτο ἡότε χα λῆι 27 B 6 7

## κατήκω

ἐπὶ τοῦ κατήκοντος δικαστηρίου  
14 B 37 (διακριθῆναι), 100 101 (νικη-  
θεῖς); (αἱ κρίσεις γινέσθωσαν) ἐπὶ  
τῶν κατηκόντων δικαστηρίων 14 B  
108 109; τὰ προστασόμενα Ἐ ὅσα  
κατήκεν ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ 14 B 98  
99; εἰσαγέ[τ]ωσαν εἰς τὸ κατήκον  
δικαστ[ή]ριον 18.27 28 Rest.

## καθίζω

οὐχ ὑπ[ο]δέξονται Ἐ τοὺς καθί-  
ζοντας οἰκέτας εἰς τὸ ἱερόν 18.20 21

## καθίστημι

ἀναγράφαι Ἐ ἐστήλῃ καὶ κατα-  
θῆναι Ἐ 1.62 63; ἐγγυητάς κατα-  
στηράτω 2.29; καταστάνεσθαι  
παννυχιστάς 5.23 24; κατα-  
στάνεσθ[ωσαν]αι πράκτορες  
5.27 28; καταστάνεσθαι ἐγλογι-  
στάς τρεῖς 5.30; ὃν ἂν δὲ κατα-  
στήσῃ ὁ γυμνασίαρχος ἀφη-  
γεῖσθαι 14 B 6 7; καθιστάτω  
αὐτοῖς κριτάς 14 B 25; καθι-  
στάτω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος βραβευτάς  
14 B 84; [καθι]στάντανς ἱμ πό[λι]  
23 A 13

## κάθολον

ὁ μὴ δοὺς τὸ κάθολον 5.43

## καινός

καὶ μελίκρατα ἐν καιναῖς ποτερί-  
δε[σ]ι Ἐ 27 A 15

## κακός

κακῶς εἰπεῖν 14 B 40

## καλέω

καλέτο [h]όντινα λῆι 27 A 20

## καλός

ὅπως ἂν ἡ θυσία γίγνηται ὡς  
καλλίστη 2.5 6; καλῶς ἔχει καὶ  
παρ' ἡμῖν 14 A 8 9; τὰς τύχας  
καλῶς προαγημένας 26.3 4

κανοῦν **309**

## καπηλεῖον

τάδε εἰσήνεγκαν οἱ νεω[ποῖται  
περὶ τῶν καπηλείων] 18.3 4;  
[ἀπομοσθοῦν καπηλεῖα ἐν] (τ)ῶι  
τῆς Ἡρας τέσσαρα 18.5 6; οὐκ  
ἐξου[σία] ἔσται πλείονα ἔχειν  
κ]απηλείου ἐνός 18.6 7; οὐχ  
ὑπ[ο]δέξονται ἐν τοῖς κα]πηλείοις  
Ἐ 18.20 21

## καπηλεύω

μὴ ἐξουσία ἔστω τῶν ἱερῶν παίδων  
καπηλεύειν 18.38

## κάπηλος

τὴν διαγραφὴν τῶν καπή[λων]  
18.4 5; [ἐά]ν τι ἐ[γ]καλήῃ ὁ ἰδι-  
ώτης τῷ καπήλῳ ἢ [ὁ] κάπηλος  
τῷ ἰδιώτῃ 18.25 26; cf. 18.9 10  
Rest.

κάπρος  
   ἐγιδιδόσθαι θῦμα τῷ θεῷ κάπρον  
   5.37 38  
 καταβάλλω  
   καταβάλλεσθαι τὸν λόγον 5.40;  
   [τὸν μισθὸν] καταβαλοῦσιν οἱ  
   μισθωσάμενοι 18.34 35  
 καταγινώσκω  
   καταγινωσκόντων αὐτῶν τὸ  
   ἀργύριον 2.42 43  
 καταγράφω  
   ἢ καταγ[έγραπται] 23 A 23  
 κατακαίω  
   τὰν μοιρᾶν τὰν ἐνάταν κατα-  
   καίεν μίαν 27 A 11 12; ἀπαρξά-  
   μενοι κατακαάντο Ἐ 27 A 15  
   16; φολέαν καὶ Ἐ κα[τα]κᾶαι  
   27 A 19 20  
 καταλείπω  
   καταλ[ε]ίποντας 27 A 3  
 καταλίνω  
   περιάναντες καταλινάντο  
   27 A 12 13; καὶ καταλινάτο  
   27 A 16  
 κατατίθημι  
   κατατιθέστω αὐτῷ τῷ ἀρχεραμιστῇ  
   5.18  
 καταφέρω  
   τὰς φορὰς καταφέριν τῷ ταμίᾳ  
   5.42 43; ὁ μὴ κατενένκας ἀποτι-  
   νέτω 5.43 44  
 καταφθείρω  
   αἱ πρόσοδοι οὐ καταφθαρήσονται  
   14 A 13 14  
 καταχράομαι  
   τὰ θυθέντ[α αὐτεῖ] καταχρῆ[σθαι]  
   16.5 7  
 κατόπτειν  
   ἀποδόσθαι βουὴν ὅστις παρεσχέ[θ]ει  
   π[ότ] τὼς κατόπτας 11.17 18  
 κεῖμαι  
   οἱ γυμνασιαρχικοὶ νόμοι κεῖνται  
   ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις 14 A 7 8; τοῦ  
   σημείου κεμένου 14 B 2  
 κέλωμαι  
   ὁ νόμος ἐκ τῶν δικαστηρίων  
   μεθίστασθαι κέλεται 26.18 19

κεφαλή  
   ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν βρωμάτων ἐκ  
   κεφαλᾶς λουσάμενον αὐθημε-  
   ρί 7.11 13; ἀπὸ [τ]οῦ ἱερῆ[ο]ν  
   [ἀ]ποδ[ό]σ[θ]αι [κ]εφαλὴν 20.18  
   19  
 κῆρυξ  
   [οἱ ἱεροποιοὶ] καὶ ὁ κῆρυξ δαινύ-  
   σθωσ[αν] 3.5 6; Ἐ τοὶ κάρ[υ]κες  
   αἱ κά τι ἐπι[τ]άσσωντι παρὰ τὰ  
   ἐψαφι[σμένα] 17.7 8  
 κλέπτω  
   ἐάν τις κλέψῃ τι τῶν ἐκ τοῦ γυμνα-  
   σίου 14 B 99 100  
 κληρογραφέω  
   τὰ ὀνόματα κληρογραφήσαντες  
   26.15  
 κληροσ  
   ἐπεὶ δέ κα οἱ Ἐ κλᾶροι ἀερθέωντι  
   26.21 22  
 κληρόω  
   ἐκ πάντων κληροῦσθωσαν 5.24  
   25; κλερούσθωσαν ἐκ τοῦ πλήθους  
   δέκα 5.28 29; κληροῦσθαι ἐπὶ τὰ  
   κρέα ἀνθρώπους δύο 5.31 32;  
   τούτους κληρωσάτω 14 B 49; οἱ  
   ἄρχοντες Ἐ κλαρώντων 26.14 16  
 κλίνη  
   καὶ (προθέτο) Rest.) τράπεζαν  
   καὶ κλιναν 27 A 14  
 κοῖλος  
   φοιλοῖον (κοίλων) 6.71A Rest.  
 κοινός  
   τοὺν φο[ί]νον 6.7.2; ὑπόδικος  
   ἔστω αὐτῷ κατὰ τοὺς κοινούς  
   νόμους 14 B 43 44; εὐθυνέτω  
   αὐτὸν κατὰ τοὺς κοινούς νόμους  
   14 B 87; [κ]αθότι ἐν τῇ κοινῇ  
   [διαγραφῇ] διαγέγραπ[τ]αι 19.4 5;  
   κοινῇ διαγραφῇ 19.11; τὰ κοινά]  
   τῶν Νακωναίων 26.4 5; ὑπὲρ τῶν  
   κοινῶν συμφερόντων 26.8; ὅσοις  
   Ἐ ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῶν ἀγωνίζομενοι  
   26.10 11  
 κολάπτω  
   τὸ ἁλίσμα Ἐ κολαψάμενοι Ἐ ἐς  
   χάλκωμα Ἐ 26.33 34

κρεανομία **100**

κρέας

κλιροῦσθαι ἐπὶ τὰ κρέα ἀνθρώ-  
πους δύω 5.31 32; ποιείτωσαν  
μερίδας τῶν θυθέντων τὰ κρέα  
ὠμά 14 B 65 66; κρεῶν οὐκ ἀπο-  
φορά 24.4; καὶ πλάσματα καὶ  
κρᾶ 27 A 15; τὰ κρᾶ μέχφερέτο  
27 A 20

κρίνω **355–356**

[δι]κῇ κρίνω 14 A 54; τοὺς κρι-  
νοῦντας τὴν <εὐεξίαν> ἀπογρα-  
φέτω 14 B 48; δικαίως κρινεῖν  
14 B 50; ἐὰν οἱ λαχόντες μὴ κρίνω-  
σιν 14 B 51; κρινάτω τῆς εὐταξίας  
Ἐ 14 B 55

κρίος

θυόντωνσαν Πλούτωνι κρίον 3.7;  
κρίον 23 A 5; [κριὸ]ν τέλεον  
λευκόν 23 A 15; τοῖ ἐν Εὐθυδάμο  
Μιλχίοι κρίον θ[υ]όντο 27 A 17

κρίσις

ἐὰν νίκησῃ τῇι κρίσει ὁ ζημιωθείς  
14 B 105 106; αἱ περὶ τούτων  
κρίσεις γινέσθωσαν Ἐ 14 B 108

κριτής

καθιστάτω αὐτοῖς κριτάς 14 B 25

κριτός

ἄμνον κριτόν (Ποσειδῶνι) 1.19 20;  
ἄρνα κριτόν 1.39, [47 48] (Δί),  
54 (Ἀθηναίαι); οἷν κριτόν 1.13 14  
(Δί), 17 (Κεφάλωι), 18 (Θορίκωι),  
53 (Ἀθηναίαι); [οἷν (ῥν Rest.)]  
κριτὴν κυδσαν (Δήμητρι) 1.38  
39; χίμαρον κριτόν (Ἀπόλλωνι)  
1.20; χοῖρον κριτόν (Δί Πολιεῖ)  
1.14; χοῖρον κριτὴν (Κοροτρόφωι)  
1.21

κυριεύω

κυριεύετω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος τῶν  
προσόδων Ἐ 14 B 87 88

κύριος

ταῦτα κύρια εἶναι 2.35; ὅπως  
ἂν τὰ ἐψηφισμένα κύρια εἴ εἰς  
τὸν αἰὲ χρόνον 2.45 46; κύριον  
εἶναι τὸ ψήφισμα 2.51 52; τὸν  
γυμνασιαρχικὸν νόμον Ἐ κύριον

εἶναι 14 A 16 19; κύριος ἔστω ὁ  
γυμνασίαρχος Ἐ 14 B 21, 52

κυρόω

ἐκυρώθη Περιτίου νομηνία  
14 A 21 22; ὁ δῆμος ἐκύρωσ[εν]  
18.5

κύω

[οῖν] ([ῥν] Rest.) κριτὴν κυδσαν  
(Δήμητρι) 1.38 39; οἷν κυδσαν  
ἄνθειαν (Δήμητρι) 1.44

κωλῇ

ἱερώσυνα κωλῇν πλευρὸν ἰσχίον  
3.5; τὴν δεξι[αν] κωλῇν] 9.3; διδό-  
σθῃ τῷ ἀρχῷ Ἐ τὰ οὐπέρπουρα  
πάντα κῇ τὰν κωλίαν 11.23 25;  
κωλέαις ἅμα τε[- -] 13.10; [κωλ]ῇν  
καὶ πλευρίο[ν] 21.8; ρολέαν καὶ Ἐ  
κα[τα]κᾶαι 27 A 19 20

κωλύω

κωλύετω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος καὶ  
ζημιούτω 14 B 5; ζημιούτω καὶ  
κωλύετω τὸν ποιούντα τι τούτων  
14 B 15; κωλύετωσαν οἱ ἐπιγινό-  
μενοι γυμνασίαρχοι 14 B 37 38;  
κωλύετωσαν οἱ παρόντες 14 B 42

λαγχάνω

εὐθυνῶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἣν ἔλαχ[ον] εὐ-  
θύν[εν] 1.58 59; ὁ λαχὼν ὑπομε-  
νέτω 5.25; ἐὰν μὴ ὑπομένη ἢ μὴ  
θέλῃ παννυχιστὴς εἶναι λαχὼν  
5.25 26; τοὺς λαχόντας τρεῖς ὀρκι-  
σάτω 14 B 49; ἐὰν οἱ λαχόντες μὴ  
κρίνωσιν 14 B 51

λαλέω

μηδὲ λαλείτω τοῖς παισίν 14 B 14

λαμβάνω **300**

τὸν δῆμαρχον λαβόντα τοῦτο  
τὸ ἀργύριον Ἐ 2.31 32; τῶν  
συνεραμιστῶν ψῆφον λαβόντων  
5.8 9; λαμβανέτω πρόγραμμα  
παρὰ τοῦ ἀρχεραμιστοῦ 5.18 19;  
λανβάνων τὰ διπλᾶ μέρη 5.19  
20; λανβάνοντες παρ' ἐκάστου Ἐ  
μὴ πλεῖον δραχμῶν δύο/δραχμῆς  
14 B 61 62, 65; τὰ ἄθλα ἃ ἂν  
λαμβάνωσιν οἱ νικῶντες 14 B 67;

- ἦ[ν δέ τ]ι ἄ[λλ]ο λάβῃ 20.21 22;  
[θυέτ]ω [β]ῶν καὶ λαμ[βανέτ]ω 21.3
- λαμπαδαρχέω  
(ἐάν τις ἀντιλέγῃ) ὥς οὐ δυνατός  
ἐστιν λαμπαδαρχεῖν 14 B 76; ἐάν  
μὴ λαμπαδαρχῇ ἢ μὴ ἐξομώσῃται  
14 B 77; καὶ ὁμοίως ἀλειφέτω  
καὶ λαμπαδαρχεῖτω 14 B 78; καὶ  
ὁμοίως ἀναγκαζέσθω Ἐ καὶ  
λαμπαδαρχεῖν 14 B 80 81
- λαμπαδάρχης  
λαμπαδαρχῶν αἴρεσις 14 B 71;  
αἰρείσθω Ἐ λαμπαδάρχας τρεῖς  
14 B 72; αἰρείσθω δὲ καὶ τῶν  
παίδων λαμπαδάρχας τρεῖς 14 B 74
- λαμπαδεῖον  
τῶι λαμπαδεῖ[ωι] 3.4
- λαμπάς  
[λαμ]βάδος 3.4 Rest.; ποιεῖτω δὲ  
καὶ λαμπάδα ἐν τοῖς Ἑρμαίοις  
14 B 59; ποιεῖτω τὴν τῶν παίδων  
λαμπάδα 14 B 82 83; ἐν τε τῇ  
λαμπάδι τῶν Ἑρμαίων Ἐ 14 B 85
- λεγωντός  
μηδὲ λ[εγωντόν] (εἰσφέρειν) 4.9 10  
Rest.
- λέγω  
Ἑρμαῖος ἔλεξε Ἐ 11.2
- λειπογνώμων  
αἶγα λειπεγνώμονα πυρρὸν ἢ  
[μέλανα] (Διονύσῳ) 1.34 αἶγα  
λειπογνώμονα (Ἀπόλλωνι) 1.43
- λευκός  
[κριὸ]ν τέλεον λευκόν 23 A 15;  
τῶι θυσίαι θυόντω αἰ[γ]α λευκάν  
26.27 28
- λεύκωμα  
ἐκτιθέτω τοὺς ἐξημωμένους  
π[άντα]ς ἐν λευκώματι 14 B 102  
103
- λέχος  
ἀπὸ λέχους ἐναταίαν 7.5 6
- λεχὼ  
[γυναικί] λεχοῖ ἄποθι ἔμεν 8.2 8
- λίθινος  
ἀναγράψαι τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν στήλει  
λιθίνῃ 2.43 44; τὸ ψάφισμα τόδε
- ἀναγράψαι] ἐστάλαν λιθίναν  
17.12 13
- λιθοτομία  
(Φιλόκωμος εἰσηγήσατο) ἀποδό-  
σθαι τὴν λιθοτομίαν 2.4 5; τὰς  
λιθοτομίας τὰς Ἑλευσῖνι (μυσθοῦν)  
2.21
- λίκνον  
ᾧστε ἐς [τὸ] λ[ί]κνον ἐνθεῖ[ν]αι  
20.6
- λίτρα  
δέκα λίτρας ἀποτεισάτο 25.10 12
- λογεῖα **81**
- λόγος  
ἐάν ὁ ταμίας ἀποδίδῃ λόγον  
5.29; καταβάλλεσθαι τὸν λόγον  
5.40; ὅταν οἱ ἐγλογιστῇ ἀποδῶσι  
Ἐ τὸν λόγον 5.40 41; ἐάν μὴ  
ἀποδῶι τοὺς λόγους ἢ τὰ περιόντα  
14 B 94 95; τὸν λόγον ἀποδότω  
καὶ τὰ περιόντα 14 B 96 97
- λοιπός  
ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν βρωμάτων 7.11  
12; τὰ λοιπὰ 8.5; ὅπως κῆ ἐν τὸν  
λυπὸν χρόνον διαμείνει 11.12 13;  
ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνλείπον-  
τος ἀποκληρωσάτω 14 B 53 54; ἐν  
τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀγῶσιν 14 B 85 86;  
ἐς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον 26.5; ἐκ τῶν  
λοιπῶν πολιτῶν ποτικλαρώντω Ἐ  
26.17; τοὺς λοιποὺς πολίτας Ἐ  
συγκλαρώντω 26.23 24
- λούω  
ἀπὸ τῶν λοιπῶν βρωμάτων ἐκ  
κεφαλᾶς λουσάμενον αὐθημερὶ  
7.11 13; ἀπὸ ἀφροδισίων αὐθημερὶ  
λουσάμενον 7.13 15; αὐθημερὶ  
λουσάμενον 7.16
- λυμαγωνέω  
τοὺς λυμαγωνοῦντας Ἐ μαστιγῶν  
καὶ ζημῶν 14 B 69 71
- λύμφα. *See* νύμφη
- λῶ  
καλέτο [h]όντινα λει 27 A 20;  
hόπο/hοπεῖο/hοπεῖαι/hόπυ/hόπε  
κα λει 27 B 2 3, 6 7; αἱ τίς κα λει  
Ἐ καθαίρεσθαι 27 B 7 8

## μάθημα

ἐὰν ἕτερόν τι ἀναγκαῖον φαίνεται  
τῶν μαθημάτων 14 B 12 13

## μαίνομαι

Ὁ μανεῖς ἐξίτω μαντεῖω 12 Com-  
mentary; (μὴ ἐγδυέσθω Ἐ) μὴδὲ  
μαινόμενος 14 B 29

## μακρός

ἐν τε Ἐ καὶ τῷ μακρῷ δρόμῳ  
14 B 85

## μαντεία

κατὰ τὰ[ν μαντείαν] 15.4

## μαντεῖον

Ὁ ἀνεῖς ἐπίτω μαντεῖω 12

## μαστιγόω

τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ τὴν ῥάβδον μαστι-  
γοῦτω 14 B 9; τοὺς ἀτακτοῦντας  
μαστιγῶν 14 B 22; κύριος ἔστω ὁ  
γυμνασίαρχος μαστιγῶν καὶ ζημι-  
ῶν 14 B 70 71; ἐὰν μὴ πειθαρχῇ  
Ἐ μαστιγοῦσθω 14 B 99

## μασχαλίσματα

μηροὺς μασχαλίσματα ἡμίκραιραν  
3.16, 17

## μάχη

ἐὰν τις ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ μάχην ποιήσῃ  
5.5 6

## μεδίμνος

ὁφλὲν τριαάφοντα μεδίμνους  
6.2A4 2A5

## μεθίστημι

ὁ νόμος ἐκ τῶν δικαστηρίων  
μεθίστασθαι κέλεται 26.18 19

## μεθύω

(μὴ ἐγδυέσθω Ἐ) μὴδὲ μεθύων  
14 B 29

## μείζ

[μ]ηνὸς Ἀτήγ[ησιν] 1.8 Rest.; εἰς  
τὸν Μεταγειτνιώννα μῆνα 2.27;  
τὰ ἄλλα Ἐ ἀνατιθέτωσαν Ἐ ἐμ  
μησὶν ὀκτώ 14 B 67 68; ἐν τῷ  
Γορπιαίῳ μηνί 14 B 72 73; ἐμ  
μησὶν εἴκοσι τέσσαρσιν 14 B 108;  
[δραχ]μὰς δύο ἐκάστου μην[ός]  
19.9; [μηνὸς Δ]αματρίῳ 23 A 7 (cf.  
Rest.); [τὸ μενός] ἡοπεῖο κα λει  
27 B 2 3

## μέλας

αἶγα λειπεγνώμονα πυρρὸν ἢ  
[μέλανα] (Διονύσοι) 1.34; [τράγον]  
πυρρὸν ἢ μέλανα (Διονύσοι) 1.45  
46; [μ]έλانا 23 A 16

## μελετάω

ἀκοντίζειν καὶ τοξεύειν μελετάτω-  
σαν Ἐ 14 B 10

## μελίκρατον

μελίκρατα ὑπολείβον 27 A 13  
14; καὶ μελίκρατα ἐν καιναῖς  
ποτερίδε[σιν] Ἐ 27 A 15

## μένω

ἐπ' αὐτὸ μένας 1.14, 47 Rest.; ἐπ'  
οἰκήσει Ἐ [μενῶσιν πάντ]α τὸν  
ἐνιαυτόν 18.7 8

## μερίς

[τ]ὰς με[ρίδας?] 9.1 Rest.; ποιεί-  
τωσαν μερίδας τῶν θυθέντων τὰ  
κρέα ὡμά 14 B 65 66

## μέρος

λανβάνων τὰ διπλᾶ μέρη 5.19 20;  
τῷ ἐγδικασαμένῳ διδόσθω τὸ  
τρίτον μέρος 14 B 35; cf. 21.8 Rest.

## μέτεμι

οἷς οὐ δεῖ μετεῖναι τοῦ γυμνασίου  
14 B 26 27

## μηρός

μηροὺς μασχαλίσματα ἡμίκραιραν  
3.16, 17

## μαρός

τοῖς Τριτοπατρεῦσι τοῖς μιαιοῖς  
27 A 9 10

## μισθός

μισθὸν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ φέρειν Ἐ  
18.30; [τὸν μισθὸν] καταβαλοῦσιν  
οἱ μισθωσάμενοι 18.34 35

## μισθώ

μισθοῦν (τάς λιθοτομίας) 2.23,  
34, 35 36; τὸν μισθωσάμενον  
ἀποδιδόναι τὴν μίσθωσιν 2.24  
25; ἐγγυητάς καταστησάτω ὁ  
μισθωσάμενος 2.29; ἐπ' οἰκήσει οἱ  
μ[ισθωσάμενοι μενῶσιν] Ἐ 18.7 8;  
πλή[ν τῶν][μισθωσαμένων] 18.10  
11; ἀποτεῖσει τοῖς μισθω[σαμένοις]  
Ἐ 18.11; οἱ μισθωσάμενοι οὐ

παραδώσου[σιν] 18.12; [οἱ μισθω-  
σάμε]γοι οὐχ ὑποδέξονται παρὰ  
δούλου οὐθέν ἔ 18.16; [τὸν  
μισθὸν] καταβαλοῦσιν οἱ μισθω-  
σάμενοι 18.34 35; οἱ μισθωσάμενοι  
Ε[- -]ήσουσιν 18.36 37 (cf. Rest.);  
cf. μισθωμ 9.11

μίσθωμα. Cf. μισθωμ 9.11  
μίσθωσιν

ἀποδιδόναι τὴν μίσθωσιν 2.24 25,  
30

μοῖρα **310, 320**

(δίδοσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱερ[οῦ]) μοῖραν  
καὶ γέρας καὶ γλώσσαν 20.7;  
μοῖραν 21.4; μοῖραν τιθ[έτω] 21.7;  
τὰν μοιρᾶν τὰν ἐνάταν κατακαίεν  
μίαν 27 Α 11 12

μουσική

τῆς μουσικῆς 3.28

νεανίσκος

εἰς τοὺς παῖδας μὴ εἰσπορευέσθω  
τῶν νεανίσκων μηθεῖς 14 Β 13 14;  
ποιεῖτω λαμπάδα ἔ τῶν παίδων  
καὶ τῶν νεανίσκων 14 Β 59; οἱ  
αἰρεθέντες παρεχέτωσαν ἔλαιον  
τοῖς νεανίσκοις 14 Β 73; ὁμοίως δὲ  
καὶ τῶν νεανίσκων 14 Β 83 84

νέος

τῶν ὑπαρχουσῶν τοῖς νέοις προσ-  
όδων 14 Α 30 31, cf. 59 60, Β 88;  
ἐλεγχθεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ γυμνασιάρχου  
καὶ τῶν νέων 14 Β 79 80; ἀπο-  
τινέτω τοῖς νέοις δραχμὰς χιλίας  
14 Β 95

νεωποίης

τάδε εἰσήνεγκαν οἱ νεφ[ποῖαι]  
18.3 4; [ἡ ζημία εἰσπράσ]σεται  
ὑπὸ τῶν νεωποίων ἔ 18.15; [γρα-  
φ]έσθωσαν τὰς δι[κας] ἐπὶ τῶν  
νεωποίων 18.26; [οἱ] νεωποῖαι τὰς  
γρα[φείσας δι]κας εἰσαγέ[τωσαν]  
18.27; ἐὰν τ[ῖνας μὴ δικαίως οἱ]  
νεωποῖαι ζημιώσωσιν 18.31 32

νεώτερος

οἱ νεώτεροι μᾶλλον αἰσχυνθήσον-  
ται 14 Α 12 13; γυμνασιάρχον ἔ

μὴ νεώτερον ἐτῶν ἔ μηδὲ πρε-  
σβύτερον ἔ 14 Α 23 24; συνε-  
πιβλέψονται τοὺς [νεωτέρ]ους ἔ  
14 Α 37 38

νικάω

τὸν νικῶντα στεφανοῦτω θαλλοῦ  
στεφάνωι 14 Β 26; οἱ νικήσαντες  
ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν στεφανηφορεῖ-  
τωσαν 14 Β 57 58; τὰ ἄθλα ἃ ἂν  
λαμβάνωσιν οἱ νικῶντες 14 Β 67;  
νικηθεῖς ἐπὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος δικα-  
στηρίου 14 Β 100 101; ἐὰν νικήσῃ  
τῇ κρίσει ὁ ζημιωθείς 14 Β 105  
106; ἀποτινέτω ἔ τῷ νικήσαντι  
14 Β 106

νίκη

ἐὰν τις νίκην ἐτέρωι παραδῶι  
14 Β 71

νομίζω

τελείτω τὰ νομ[ιζόμενα] 13.15; τὰ  
νομιζόμενα **III**

νόμιμος

[νό]μι(μ)όν ἐστιν 3.14 15

νόμος **5, 10, 11, 46, 51, 76**

ἐπεὶ καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι ἀρχαὶ πᾶσαι  
κατὰ νόμον ἀρχοῦσιν 14 Α 5 6;  
οἱ γυμνασιαρχικοὶ νόμοι κείν-  
ται ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις 14 Α 7 8;  
τῶν αἰρουμένων ἀεὶ γυμνασιάρ-  
χων κατὰ τὸν νόμον ἀρχόντων  
14 Α 14 15; τὸν γυμνασιαρχικὸν  
νόμον ἔ κύριον εἶναι 14 Α 16 19;  
νόμος γυμνασιαρχικός 14 Α 22;  
γυμνασιαρχήσω κατὰ τὸν νόμον  
τὸν γυμνασιαρχικόν 14 Α 26 27;  
ὅσα δὲ μὴ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται  
14 Α 27 28; τοὺς δοκοῦντας παρὰ  
τὸν νόμον ἀλείφεσθαι 14 Β 38;  
ὑπόδικος ἔστω αὐτῷ κατὰ τοὺς  
κοινούς νόμους 14 Β 43 44; εὐ-  
θυνέτω αὐτὸν κατὰ τοὺς κοινούς  
νόμους 14 Β 87; [ἀκολούθως τοῖς  
τε νόμοις καὶ τοῖς τοῦ δ]άμου  
ψαφί[σμασιν] 15.1 2; [ἐ]νοχοι  
ἐόντω τῷ νόμῳ τ[ῷ τᾶς ἱκετεῖς?]ας  
([ἱεροσυλίς?]) **ας Rest.** 17.9 11; γρα-  
φέσθω ὁ χρητίζ[ων αὐτοῦς κατὰ

- τόν] νόμον 17.11 12; ποιείτωσαν  
κατὰ τὸν [ἐρὸν(?) νόμον] 18.29;  
μισθὸν Ἐ τὸν ἐκκ τοῦ γ[όμου]  
18.30; ἱερὸς νόμος **22, 42, 65 n.**  
**325, 92-93, 295**
- νοσφίζομαι  
ἂν ταμεύσας τις ἐπιδειχθῇ νενο-  
σφισμένος 5.15 16; τῶν ὑπαρχου-  
σῶν Ἐ προσόδων οὔτε νοσφισ-  
μαι Ἐ 14 A 30 31, cf. 59 60
- νουμηνία  
ἐκυρώθη Περιτίου νουμηνία  
14 A 21 22; τ[οῦ] Δίου μηνὸς τῇ  
νουμηνία 14 A 35
- νύμφη  
ταὶ λύμφα(ι) 23 A 10
- ξενικός  
ξενικὸν ἔ πατρῷον 27 B 7
- ξύλον  
ξύλα ἐπὶ τὸν χύτρον παρε[χ- -]  
3.21 22; ξύλα ἐγιδιδόσθαι 5.42;  
μὴ ἐξέστω τῶν ἐν τῷ ἄλλοι ξύλων  
ἄπτεσθαι 5.45; ξύλων παρασκευή  
14 A 50
- ὀβολός  
[ὄρ]νιθος ὀβ[ολόν] 9.7; δύο ὀβ[ο-  
λούς/ῶ] 9.8
- ὀγδοος  
ὀγδόαν ἀποτεισάτο 25.4 8
- ὀδός  
hodo (ὀδοῦ) 6.7.1 Rest.
- οἶδα  
οὔτε ἄλλωι ἐπιτρέψω εἰδὼς  
14 A 31 32; ἐὰν Ἐ ἐάσῃ ἀλεί-  
φεισθαι Ἐ εἰδὼς 14 B 29 30
- οἰκέτης  
οὐχ ὑπ[οδέξονται] Ἐ τοὺς καθί-  
ζοντας οἰκέτας εἰς τὸ ἱερόν 18.20  
21
- οἰκησις  
ἐπ' οἰκήσει οἱ μ[ισθωσάμενοι  
μενῶσιν ] Ἐ 18.7 8
- οἰκοθεν  
αἱ δὲ μὲ ὑπερπαρσχ[ο]μεν φοί-  
ροθεν 6.7.2
- οἴκοι  
ἔστο δὲ καὶ πεδὰ ρέ[τος ρ]οῖροι  
θύεν 27 A 20 21
- οἰνικός  
οἱ ἐργολαβήσαντες οἶκόν ἢ οἰνικόν  
5.20
- οἶνος  
λανβάνων τὰ διπλᾶ μέρη ἐκτὸς τοῦ  
οἶνου 5.19 20; φοῖνον ὑπολθεί-  
ψας δι' ὀρόφο 27 A 10 11
- οἶς  
οἶν 1.48 (Ὑπερπεδίω), 49 (Νίσωι),  
50 (Θρασ[. . . .], Σωσινέωι, Ῥο-  
γίωι), 54 (Αγλαύρωι), 57 (Π[ρό-  
κριδι]), Lat. Sin. 42 (Διὶ Ἑρκεῖωι),  
58 (Ἡρωῖνῃσι Κορωνέων), Lat.  
Dex. 5, 44 (Διὶ Ἑρκεῖωι); 23 A 23;  
οἶν κριτόν 1.13 14 (Διὶ Πολιεῖ),  
17 (Κεφάλωι), 18 (Θορίκωι), 53  
(Αθηναίωι); [οἶν] κριτὴν κυδσαν  
(Δήμητρι) 1.38 39; οἶν κυδσαν ἄν-  
θειαν (Δήμητρι) 1.44; οἶν πρᾶτόν  
1.23 (Αθηναίωι), 35 (Διὶ Μιλιχίωι)
- ὀλιγωρέω  
ἐὰν τις δοκῇ ὀλιγωρεῖν τῶν παιδο-  
τριβῶν Ἐ 14 B 19
- ὀλόκαυτος  
χοῖρον ὠνητόν ὀλόκαυτον (Διὶ  
Πολιεῖ) 1.15
- ὀμνυμι  
τὸν εὐθυνον ὁμόσαι καὶ τ[ὸς  
παρέδ]ρος 1.57 58; ὁμνῦναι Δία,  
Ἀπόλλ[ω, Δήμητρι]α 1.60 61;  
[ὁμουμέν]ους ἀποδῶσιν τὴν μί-  
σθωσιν 2.30; ὁμνύειν Ἡρακλῆν,  
Δήμητρα, Κόρην 5.30 31; ὅταν οἱ  
ἐγλογισταὶ ὁμόσαντες ἀποδῶσι τὸν  
λόγον 5.40 41; ἀρχέτω ὁμόσας τὸν  
ὑπογεγραμμένον ὄρκον 14 A 25;  
ὁμνύω Δία, Γῆν, Ἥλιον, Ἀπόλλω,  
Ἡρακλῆν, Ἑρμῆν 14 A 26 (cf. 55  
56); ὁμόσαντες τὸν ὑπογεγραμ-  
μένον ὄρκον 14 A 37; ὁμόσας ὁ  
γυμνασίαρχος τὸν Ἑρμῆν κρινάτω  
14 B 54 55; ἐὰν ὁ ἐξομοσάμενος  
φανῇ μὴ δεόντως ὁμομοκέαν  
14 B 79



ὁμονοέω

συμφέρει Ἐ ὁμονοοῦντας πολι-  
τεύεσθαι 26.5 6; ἀδελφοὶ αἵρετοὶ  
ὁμονοοῦντες ἀλλήλοις 26.20

ὁμοσίπυος

καθηταιγίζεν τὸς ἡμοσεπύος  
27 A 3

ὄνομα

τὰ ὀνόματα κλαρογραφήσαντες  
26.15

ὄπλον

προτιθέτω ὄπλον Ἐ εὐεξίας Ἐ  
14 B 46 47; ἡ δὲ εἰς τὰ ὄπλα  
δαπάνη 14 B 59 60

ὀρκίζω

ὀρκισάτω τὸν Ἑρμῆν δικαίως  
κρινεῖν 14 B 49 50

ὄρκος

ἀναγράψαι [τὸν ὄρκο]ν ἐστήλην  
1.62 63; ἀρχέτω ὁμόσας τὸν  
ὑπογεγραμμένον ὄρκον 14 A 25;  
ὁμόσαντες τὸν ὑπογεγραμμένον  
ὄρκον 14 A 37

ὀρκωμόσιον

ὀρκωμόσιον παρέχεν ἐς εὐθύνας  
1.12; ὀρκωμόσιον <π>αρ[έχεν] 1.52

ὄρνις

[ὄρ]νιθος ὀβ[ολόν] 9.7

ὄρφορος

ροῖνον ἡυποληείφας δι ὀρόφο  
27 A 10 11

ὀρφανοφύλαξ

ἐάν τις ἀντιλέγη Ἐ ἡ ὀρφανοφύ-  
λακες 14 B 75 76

ὀσία

θυόντο θυμα Ἐ ἡοῖς ἡοσία  
27 A 12

ὅσιος

[ὁ]σι(ώ)τατα καὶ δικαιοτάτα  
14 A 29, cf. 58

ὀστέον

τὸστέα (κατακαῖαι) 27 A 19

οὐλαί **308**

ὀφείλω

ὀφειλέτω τῷ θεῷ τὸ διπλάσιον  
2.40 41; καταγιγνωσκόντων Ἐ  
τὸ ἀργύριον ἢ αὐτοὶ ὀφειλόντω-

σαν 2.42 43; ὅταν οἱ ἐγλογισταὶ  
ἐπιδίξωσι εἴ τι ὀφίλι ὁ ταμίας  
5.40 42; ὀφλὲν ἐν[5 Δί]φα καθά-  
ναίαν Ἐ 6.2A4 3A1; ἀ[υτὸν]  
ὀφλὲν διπλ[άσιον] 6.2A5 6 Rest.;  
πλατιφονάρχον διπλεεαν οφ[λεν]  
6.11.1

ὄχλος

ἡ ὀπιγνόμον ἐπελ[ά]στο τοῦ  
οφλον 6.7.2

παιδαγωγός

τῶν παιδαγωγῶν, ὅσοι ἂν μὴ  
ἐλεύθεροι ᾖσιν 14 B 22 23

παιδοτρίβης

ἀπαντάτωσαν οἱ παιδοτρίβαι Ἐ  
εἰς τὸ γυμνάσιον 14 B 15 16; ἐάν  
τις δοκῇ ὀλιγωρεῖν τῶν παιδοτρι-  
βῶν Ἐ 14 B 19; ἐπαναγκαζέτω  
τοὺς παιδοτρίβας ποιεῖσθαι ἀπό-  
δειξιν 14 B 23 24; συντελείτωσαν  
δὲ τὴν θυσίαν Ἐ καὶ οἱ παιδοτρί-  
βαι 14 B 64

παῖς

παίδων 14 A 62; ὅταν οἱ παῖδες  
ἀλείφωνται 14 B 11 12; περὶ παί-  
δων 14 B 13; εἰς τοὺς παῖδας μὴ  
εἰσπορευέσθω τῶν νεανίσκων  
μηθεῖς 14 B 13 14; μηδὲ λαλείτω  
τοῖς παισὶν 14 B 13 14; παραγίνε-  
σθαι Ἐ ἐπὶ τοὺς παῖδας 14 B 19  
20; τῶν παίδων τοὺς ἀτακτοῦντας  
μαστιγῶν 14 B 21 22; ποιεῖσθαι  
ἀπόδειξιν τῶν παίδων 14 B 24;  
ποιεῖτω λαμπάδα Ἐ τῶν παίδων  
καὶ τῶν νεανίσκων 14 B 59; λαμ-  
βάνοντες παρὰ τῶν παίδων Ἐ  
14 B 65; αἰρείσθω δὲ καὶ τῶν παί-  
δων λαμπαδόρχας τρεῖς 14 B 74; μὴ  
ἐξουσία ἔστω τῶν ἱερῶν παίδων  
καπηλεύειν 18.38

παλαιστρα

μηδὲ ἐν ἄλλῃ παλαιστραι ἀλειφέ-  
σθω μηθεῖς Ἐ 14 B 4

παλαιστοροφύλαξ

παρεχέσθω τὴν τοῦ παλαιστοροφύ-  
λακος χρεῖαν 14 B 97 98

## παννυχιστής

καταστάνεσθαι Ἐ παννυχιστάς  
τοὺς δυναμένους 5.23 24; ἐάν Ἐ  
μὴ θέλῃ παννυχιστὴς εἶναι 5.25  
26

## παραγίγνομαι

ἐάν τις δοκῇ Ἐ μὴ παραγίνεσθαι  
Ἐ ἐπὶ τοὺς παῖδας 14 B 19 20;  
πρέσβεις Ἑγεσταίων παργεναθέν-  
τες Ἐ 26.6 7

## παραγραφή

εἰσάγεσθαι τὰς γραφείσας [παρα-  
γραφάς] Ἐ 18.33 34

## παραγράφω

οὗτοι παραγραφάψωσαν τῷ πολι-  
τικῷ πράκτορι 14 B 33; ἐάν μὴ  
παραγράφωσιν 14 B 33 34; ἐάν  
δοκῇ ἀδίκως παραγεγράφθαι  
ὁ γυμνασίαρχος 14 B 35 36;  
παραγραφάντων τῶν ἐξεταστῶν  
14 B 96; παραγραφέτω τῷ πολιτι-  
κῷ πράκτορι 14 B 103

## παράγω

ἀκρόαμα μὴθὲν παραγέτωσαν εἰς  
τὸν πότον 14 B 66 67

## παραδείκνυμι

ἐμφανίζοντός τινος αὐτῷ καὶ  
παραδείξαντος 14 B 31

## παραδίδωμι

ἐάν τις νίκην ἐτέρῳ παραδῶι  
14 B 71; οἱ μισθωσάμενοι οὐ  
παραδώσου[σιν] 18.12

## παρακαλέω

παρακαλῖ τὰν πόλιν Ἐ [ὅπ]ως  
θυοσίαν σουντέλει 11.7 8

## παρακαπηλεύω

παρακαπηλ[ε]ύσει 18.8; [ὁ] παρα-  
καπηλεύων ἀποτείσει Ἐ 18.11

## παραλύω

ὅπως ἂν (τὰ ἐψηφισμένα) μὴ  
παραλύηται 2.45 47

## παραπέμπω

παραπέμπε(ι) τοὺς 15.10 (οἱ [τοὺς  
ἐφήβους] παραπέμπ[οντα]ς [τὰ  
ἱερά] 9 10)

## παρασκευή

ξύλων παρασκευή 14 A 50

## παραστρατιώτης

[οὔτε παρασ]τρατιώτης 18.8 9  
Rest; [οὔδὲ παρὰ παρασ]τρατιώ-  
του 18.17 Rest.

## παρατίθημι

ἐνγυητὰς παρατιθέτωσαν τῷ ταμία  
Ἐ 5.22 23

## παραχρῆμα

5.17

## πάρεδρος

τὸς παρέδρος ὁμόσαι 1.57 58, 61  
62

## πάρεμι

τὸν ἄρχοντα καὶ τὼς [τεθ]μοφού-  
λακας παρείμεν 11.21 22; κωλυ-  
έτωσαν οἱ παρόντες 14 B 42; ὅς  
ἂν τῶν παρόντων μὴ βοηθήσῃ Ἐ  
14 B 44

## παρεὔρεσις

τρόπῳ οὐδὲ παρευρέσει οὐδεμῶι  
14 A 32, [61]; 18.10, 13 14, 18 19,  
22 23

## παρέχω 300

ἄριστον παρέχεν 1.3 4, 16; ὁρ-  
κωμόσιον παρέχεν 1.12, 52; παρέ-  
χειν (τὸ ἀργύριον) εἰς τὴν ἐορ-  
τὴν 2.31 32; παρε[χ - - ] 3.22  
(παρε[χόντωσαν] Rest.); [τὰ]ν  
ζαμίαν παρσχέ[ν] 6.7A2; ἀποδό-  
σθη βοῦν ὅστις παρεσχέ[θ]ει π[ὸ]τ[ι]  
τὼς κατόπτας 11.17 18; παρεχέτω-  
σαν ἔλαιον 14 B 73, 74 75; παρε-  
χέσθω τὴν τοῦ παλαιστοροφύλακος  
χρεῖαν 14 B 97 98; οἱ οὐδὲ παρέξου-  
σιν οὔτε ἔργα οἱ οὔτε σῖτα 18.21 22;  
[ὁ ἱ]ερεὺς παρέξει 19.2

## πατήρ

ἐάν τις ἀντιλέγῃ Ἐ ἡ πατήρ αὐτοῦ  
14 B 75 76

## πάτριον

(κατὰ) τὰ πάτρια **11, 68, 87, 90,**  
**102, 111**

## πατρώος

θυόντο Ἐ τὰ πατρώδια 27 A 17;  
θύμα ὅτι κα προχορεῖ τὰ πα-  
τρῶδια 27 A 22; ξενικὸν ἔ πα-  
τρῶδιον 27 B 7

## πειθαρχέω

(οἱ νεώτεροι) πειθαρχήσουσι  
τῷ ἡγουμένῳ 14 A 13; τούτῳ  
πειθαρχείτωσαν πάντες Ἐ 14 B 7;  
τὸν δὲ μὴ πειθαρχοῦντα, τὸν μὲν  
Ἐ τοὺς δὲ Ἐ 14 B 8 10; ἐὰν μὴ  
πειθαρχῇ ἢ ἀτακτῇ τι 14 B 99

## πεῖθω

ἐν ᾧ ἂν χρόνῳ τοὺς δημότας  
πεῖθει 2.25 26

## πέμπω

ἄξι[οῖ] πεμπέμεν ἀπὸ πόλιος  
ἱπ[έ]α]ς 11.9 10; (τὸν ἄρχοντα  
κὴ τῶς [τεθ]μοφούλακας) συν-  
πομπάν [πεμ]πέμεν 11.21 23

## περίεμι

τὸ περιὸν τῆς προσόδου 14 B 93;  
ἐὰν μὴ ἀποδῶι τοὺς λόγους ἢ τὰ  
περιόντα 14 B 94 95; τὸν λόγον  
ἀποδότω καὶ τὰ περιόντα 14 B 95  
96

## περιγραίνω

περιγράφοντες καταλινάντο  
27 A 12 13

## περιστρέφω

περιστρίψατο 27 B 5

## περίχρυσος

[περιχρ]ύσ[η]ν (δαίδα) 3.23 24  
Rest.

## πίνω

δρομέα Ἐ συνινπίνοντα πίνεν  
22.2 5

## πίπτω

τοῦ τόκου τοῦ πεσομένου 5.12

## πιστεύω

ἐάν τις τῶν πεπιστευμένων εὐρεθῇ  
Ἐ 5.33

## πλάσσω

καὶ πλάσματα καὶ κρᾶ 27 A 15

## πλατιφοινάρχος

τὸν πλατιφοινάρχον 6.2A2, 7A2;  
[. .]ποσταντον ([hυ]/[ᾱ]ποσταντον  
Rest.); πλατιφοινάρχον 6.3A2;  
πλατιφοινάρχος 6.6; πλατιφοινά-  
ρχος διπλεαν οφ[λεν] 6.11.1; for  
partially preserved and restored  
forms see 6.12.1, 14.1 Rest.

## πλατιφοῖνοι

((ξ)αμῶν) [τὸν]ς πλατιφοῖνον  
6.1.3 (cf. Rest.); πλατιφοῖνον  
[6.8.1, 11.2 Rest.]

## πλευρίον

[πλευ] | ρίον? 10.11 12 Rest.;  
[κωλ]ῆν καὶ πλευρίο[ν] 21.8

## πλευρόν

ἰερεῶσυνα κωλῆν πλευρόν ἰσχίον  
3.5 (πλευρόν ἰ(σ)χ[ί]ο[ου] Rest.);  
πλευρόν ἰσχίον 3.20 21

## πληθος

κλερούσθωσαν ἐκ τοῦ πλήθους  
δέκα 5.28 29; τὸ πλήθος τῆς  
προσόδου 14 B 89

## ποιέω

ἐπειδὰν αἱ ἰέρειαι ποιήσωσι 3.11;  
ἐάν τις ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ μάχην ποιή-  
σῃ 5.5 6; ἐάν τις εὐρεθῇ ὄνταρόν  
τι πεπονηκώς 5.33 34; ζημιούτω  
καὶ καλυέτω τὸν ποιούντα τι τού-  
των 14 B 15; ποιείσθαι ἀπόδειξιν  
τῶν παίδων 14 B 24; ποιείτω ὁ  
γυμνασίαρχος τὰ Ἑρμαῖα 14 B 45  
46; ποιείτω δὲ καὶ λαμπάδα ἐν  
τοῖς Ἑρμαῖοις 14 B 59; ποιείτω-  
σαν μερίδας τῶν θυθέντων τὰ  
κρέα ὡμά 14 B 65 66; ποιείτω  
τὴν Ἐ λαμπάδα Ἐ 14 B 82 83;  
ποιῶν τὰ προστασόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ  
γυμνασιάρχου 14 B 98; [ποιήσαι]  
τε ταῦτα κατὰ τὰ[ν] μαντείαν τοῦ  
θεοῦ] 15.3 4; ὅ τι δὲ κά τις παρὰ  
τόδε [τὸ ψάφισμα ποιή]σῃ 17.4 5;  
ποιείτωσαν κατὰ τὸν ἰ[ερόν(?) νό-  
μον] 18.29; ἐπὶ ἡ πόλις ποιῇ 20.2,  
16 (ὅταν ποιῇ); ἢ ἰδιώτης ποιῇ  
20.4 5, 19 20 (ποιῇ); τῶν γυναι-  
κῶν τῶν π[ο]ι[η]σασέ[ων] τὰ ἱρά  
20.8 10; ὅταν Ἐ καὶ σπ[ον]δ[ας]  
πρ[ι]έωνται(?) (πρ[ι]έωσιν). Rest.)  
20.11 12; διάλυσιν ποιήσασθαι  
26.12

## πολέμαρχος

διδόσθῃ Ἐ κὴ τῆς πολεμά[ρχου]  
Ἐ τὰ σὺτέρπουρα πάντα κὴ τὰν  
κωλίαν 11.23 25

## πόλις

ἡ πόλις Ἀκρηφειῶν 11.4; παρακαλῇ τὰν πόλιν Ἀρια[ρτίων] 11.7; ἄξι[οι] πεμπέμεν ἀπὸ πόλιος ἱπ[έ]α[ς] 11.9 10; τὸν ἄρ[χ]οντὰ τ' ἀπὸ τᾶς πόλιος κῆ τὼς [τεθ]μοφύλακας παρεῖμεν 11.20 23; ἐν αἷς πόλεσιν γυμνασία ἐστιν Ἐ 14 A 6 7; ἔδοξεν τῇ πόλει 14 A 16; ἡ πόλις αἰρεῖσθω γυμνασίαρχον Ἐ 14 A 22 23; μηδὲ ἐν ἄλλῃ παλαιστραί ἄλειφέσθω μηθεῖς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει 14 B 4 5; τοῖς ἔξετασταῖς τῆς πόλεως 14 B 32 33 (δότω), 92 (ἀποδιδότω); [πό]λει 19.11; ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν ποιῇ 20.2, 16 (ὅταν); ἡ [πό]λι 23 A 7; [καθι]στάντανς ἡ πό[λι] 23 A 13

## πολιάρχης

πολιάρχης καὶ ἔξεταστάς 14 A 42; παρὰ τῶν πολιταρχῶν 14 B 110

## πολιτεύω

συμφέρι Ἐ ὁμονοοῦντας πολιτεύεσθαι 26.5 6

## πολίτης

τοῖς πολίταις συνεβούλευσαν 26.8 9; δεδόχθαι Ἐ ἄλλαν τῶν πολιτῶν συναγαγεῖν 26.9 10; ὅσοις ἂ διαφορά τῶν πολιτῶν γέγονε 26.10 11; ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν πολιτῶν ποτικλαρώντω Ἐ 26.17; τοὺς λοιποὺς πολίτας Ἐ συγκλαρώντω 26.23 24; οἱ πολῖται Ἐ ἐορταζόντω Ἐ 26.32

## πολιτικός

οὗτοι παραγραψάτωσαν τῷ πολιτικῷ πράκτορι 14 B 33; πραξάτω αὐτὸν ὁ [π]ολιτικός πρά(κ)τορ 14 B 95 96; παραγραφέτω τῷ πολιτικῷ πράκτορι 14 B 103; εἰσαγέ[τ]ωσαν εἰς τὸ πολιτικὸν δικαστήριον 18.27 28 Rest.; εἰσαγεσθαι Ἐ εἰς τὸ πολιτικὸν δικαστήριον 18.33 34

## πόρος

πό[ρ]ον εἶμ[εν] ἐν οὗτο τὸ ἄλλωα

Ἐ 11.25 26

## ποτηρίς

καὶ μελίκρατα ἐν καιναῖς ποτερίδε[σ]ι Ἐ 27 A 15; τὰς ποτερίδας ἐνθέντες 27 A 16

## πότος

ἀκρόαμα μηθὲν παραγέτωσαν εἰς τὸν πότον 14 B 66 67

## πούς

αἱ κατὰ πόδας ἀρχαί 26.29

πρα[- -] 6.3A3 see Rest.

## πράκτωρ

καταστάνεσθαι ἐπ' ἀνάνκες πράκτορες δέκα 5.27 28; ἐάν τις μὴ θέλωσιν πράκτορες ὑπομένειν 5.28; οὗτοι παραγραψάτωσαν τῷ πολιτικῷ πράκτορι 14 B 33; (ἐάν) ὁ πράκτωρ μὴ πράξῃ 14 B 34; πραξάτω αὐτὸν ὁ [π]ολιτικός πρά(κ)τορ 14 B 95 96; παραγραφέτω τῷ πολιτικῷ πράκτορι 14 B 103

## πράσσω

πραττέσθω ἐκβιβάσαι 5.8 9; ἀκόλουθα πράττωσα τῇ ἡρέσι 11.13 14; (ἐάν) ὁ πράκτωρ μὴ πράξῃ 14 B 34; πραξάτω αὐτὸν ὁ [π]ολιτικός πρά(κ)τορ 14 B 95 96; πράσσεσθαι πλέονα δρ[αχμῶν] 17.2

## πρατός

π[ρατόν] 1.27 Rest.; οἷν πρατόν 1.23 (Ἀθηναῖαι), 35 (Διὶ Μιλιχίωι); τέλεον/ν πρατόν 1.9, 11 12 (Διὶ Καταιβάτηι), 26 (Διὶ Καταιβάτηι)

## πρέσβυς

ἡ πόλις Ἀκρηφειῶν πρισεγείας ἀποστείλασα 11.4 5; γυμνασίαρχον Ἐ μὴ νεώτερον ἐτῶν Ἐ μηδὲ πρεσβύτερον Ἐ 14 A 22 24; πρέσβεις Ἑγεσταιῶν παργενανθέντες Ἐ 26.6 7

## πρηροσία ἢ (offering)

πρηροσίαν 1.5 6 (cf. Rest.)

## \*πρίαιμαι

[ὁ πρίαιμενος vel ἐπρίατο τῇ]ν ἱερωσύνην 19.10 Rest.

προάγω

τᾱς τύχας καλῶς προαγήμενας

26.3 4

προβάλλω

προβαλεῖται ἄνδρας τρεῖς 14 A 36

προβάτειος

ἀπὸ αἰγέου καὶ προβατέου τρι-  
ταῖον 7.10 11

προβουλεύω

προβεβωλευμένον [πὸτ τ]ὸν δᾱμον  
11.2 4

πρόγονος

τὰς λιθοτομίας, ἐπ[εῖ ἐκπρογό]γων  
εἰσὶν ἱεραὶ 2.21 22 Rest.

πρόγραμμα **18**

προγραφή **18**

προγράφω

προγραφέντας ἐκατέρων τριά-  
κοντα 26.12 13; ἐκάτεροι ἐκατέ-  
ρων προγραψάντω 26.14

προεῖπον

προειπὸν ἡόπο κα λῆι 27 B 2;  
π{ο}ροειπὸν ἡόπυι κα λῆι 27 B 3

προθύω

πρ[οθυόντωνσαν] (ὑν) 3.2 Rest.

προΐστημι

[πρ]οιστάντωνσαν 3.3

πρόναος

τὸ ἁλίστημα Ἐ ἐς τὸ πρόναον  
τοῦ Διὸς [τοῦ] Ὀλυμπίου ἀνα-  
θέντω 26.33 35

προσαγγέλλω

δότω ὁ προσαγγέλλων ἀπογραφὴν  
Ἐ 14 B 32

προσαγορεύω

ποταγορέσθω 27 B 6

προσαποτίνω

προσαποτινέτω τὸ ἐπίπεμπτον καὶ  
ἐπιδέκατον 14 B 106 107

πρόσγραφον

λαμβανέτω πρόσγραφον 5.18 19

προσγράφω

ταῦτα [προσ]γ[ρ]ᾶσαι πρὸς τῇ[ν]  
στήλῃν 20.23 24

πρόσεμι

πένπ[τοι] φέτει ἡδιπερ ἡόκα ἡα  
Ὀλυντιάς ποτεῖε 27 A 7 8

προσκληρόω

ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν πολιτᾶν ποτικλα-  
ρώντω Ἐ 26.17

πρόσοδος

ὅπως ἂν ἦι πρόσοδος ὡς πλεί-  
στη 2.16, 19 20; δοῦναι δέκα  
δραχμὰς ἐκ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ προσ-  
όδου 2.50 51; αἱ πρόσοδοι οὐ  
καταφθαεῖσονται 14 A 13 14;  
τῶν ὑπαρχουσῶν προσόδων  
(οὔτε νοσφιοῦμαι Ἐ ) 14 A 30  
31, cf. 59 60; ἡ δαπάνη γινέσθω  
ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχουσῶν προσό-  
δων 14 B 59- 60; (κυριενέτω)  
τῶν προσόδων τῶν ὑπαρχουσῶν  
τοῖς νέοις 14 B 88; τὸ πλήθος  
τῆς προσόδου 14 B 89; τὸ περι-  
ὸν τῆς προσόδου 14 B 93; ὁ τὴν  
τοῦ γλοιοῦ πρόσοδον ἀγοράσας  
14 B 97

προσάσσω

τὰ προστασσόμενα Ἐ ὅσα καθῆ-  
κεν ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ 14 B 98 99

πρόστιμον

ἀποτινέτω προστείμου δραχμὰς  
δέκα Ἐ δραχμὰς πέντε 5.6 8;  
ἀποτινέτω προτείμου τὸ τριπλοῦν  
5.14 15; ἀποτινέτω προστείμου  
δραχμὰς ἑκατὸν 5.26 27

προτίθημι

προτιθέτω ὅπλον Ἐ εὐεξίας  
Ἐ 14 B 46 47; καὶ <προθέτο>  
τράπεζαν καὶ κλίναν 27 A 14  
Rest.; τρά[πεζα]ν προθέμεν Ἐ  
27 A 18 19

προχωρέω

θῦμα ἡότι κα προχωρεῖ τὰ πα-  
τροῖα 27 A 22

πρύτανις

[πρυτάνεων γν]ώμη 20.1 Rest

πρωτοτόκος

πρ[ωτοτόκον] (ὑν) 3.2 Rest.

πῦρ

ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ 21.11

πυρρός

αἶγα λειπεγνώμονα πυρρὸν ἢ [μέ-  
λανα] (Διονύσῳι ) 1.34; [τράγον]

πυρρὸν ἢ μέλανα (Διονύσοι )  
 1.45 46  
 πωλέω  
 ἔαν τινες Ἐ πωλῶσιν τινα τῶν  
 ἐγκαρπίων 18.19 20 (cf. Rest.)  
 πωλητῆς  
 ἀποδόσ[θων τοῖ πωλη]ταί 17.13 14  
 ῥάβδος  
 τὸν μὲν ὑπὸ τὴν ῥάβδον μαστι-  
 γούτω 14 B 9  
 ῥήν 6.1.2 Rest.  
 ῥύγχος 21.2 Epigraphical Commen-  
 tary  
 ῥυπαρός  
 ἔαν τις εὗρεθῇ ῥυπαρόν τι πεποιη-  
 κώς 5.33 34  
 σανίς  
 ἀναγράψας εἰς σανίδα 14 B 90  
 σεμίδαλις  
 διδότησαν τὴν σιμίδαλιν Ἐ 5.36  
 σηκός  
 ἐν τῷ σηκῷ π[αρ]ὰ τὸ [Δελφί]νον  
 1.10 11  
 σημεῖον  
 τοῦ σημείου κειμένου 14 B 2; ὅταν  
 δὲ τὸ σημεῖον ἀρθῇ 14 B 3  
 σῖτος  
 ο[ὐ]δὲ παρέξουσιν οὔτε ἔργα ο[ὐ]τε  
 σῖτα 18.21 22; [σ][ι][τ]ο ἡμέζον  
 20.4; σῖτον χαιρέσθω 27 B 6  
 σπένδω  
 σπεσάτ[ω] τὸν τρίτον 21.6; [σ]πεν-  
 δ[- - -] τὸ τρίτον 21.9 10; τὸ τρίτον  
 σπένδει 21.12  
 σπλάγχνον  
 σπλάγχνων καὶ ἄρτ[ον/ς] 21.9 (cf. 8  
 Rest.); σπλάγχνα **236–237**  
 σπονδή  
 ὅταν Ἐ καὶ σπ[ον]δ[άς] (σπ[ον]-  
 δ[ῆν] Rest.) πο[ιέ]νται(?) 20.11  
 12; σπονδαί **94–96**  
 στεφανηφορέω  
 οἱ νικῆσαντες ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν  
 στεφανηφορεύωσαν 14 B 57  
 58

στέφανος  
 χρυσοῖ στεφάνωι στεφανῶσαι  
 2.10 11; θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι στε-  
 φανῶσαι 2.17; στέφανον φέριν τῷ  
 θεῷ ἕκαστον 5.45 46; τὸν νικῶντα  
 στεφανοῦτω θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι  
 14 B 26; καὶ στεφάνος ἐλαίας Ἐ  
 27 A 14 15  
 στεφανῶω  
 στεφανῶσαι χρυσοῖ στεφάνωι  
 2.10 11; θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι 2.17;  
 τὸν νικῶντα στεφανοῦτω θαλλοῦ  
 στεφάνωι 14 B 26; τὸν βωμόν τα[ῖς]  
 - - - ἡμέρ]αις στεφανώσε[ι] 19.5 6  
 στήλη  
 ἀναγράφαι [τὸν ὄρκο]ν ἐστήληι  
 1.62 63; ἀναγράφαι τὸ ψήφι-  
 σμα ἐν στήλει λιθίνει 2.43 44; εἰς  
 τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τῆς στήλης δοῦ-  
 ναι Ἐ δέκα δραχμᾶς 2.50 51;  
 συνεπιμεληθῆναι τῆς στήλης Ἐ  
 τὸν ἱερέα 2.47 48; στάλα Ἱσῖος  
 Σαράπιος 7.1 ἀναγραφέντα εἰς στή-  
 λην 14 A 10 11, 21; τὸ ψάφιαμα  
 τόδ[ε ἀναγράφαι] ἐστάλαν λιθίναν  
 17.12 13; γίνεσθαι τὰ ἐν τῇ στή-  
 λῃ γεγραμμένα 20.16 18, 20 21;  
 ταῦτα [προσ]γ[ρ]άψαι πρὸς τῇ[ν]  
 στήλην 20.23 24  
 στρατιγέω  
 ἐπὶ στρατηγοῦντος Ἱπποκράτου  
 τοῦ Νικοκράτου 14 A 1 2  
 στρατιώτης  
 (παρακαπηλ[ε]ύσει Ἐ [οὔτε]) [στ]ρα-  
 τιώτης 18.9; οὐχ ὑποδέξονται Ἐ  
 οὐθὲν Ἐ [οὐδὲ παρὰ σ]τρατιώτου  
 18.16 17, cf. 12 13 Rest.  
 στρεπτός  
 (κληροῦσθαι) ἐπὶ τοὺς στρεπτοὺς  
 ἀνθρώπους δὺω 5.32 33  
 συγγράφω  
 καθά κα ὁ ἀρχιτέκτων [συγγρά-  
 ψη] 17.14  
 συγκληρόω  
 τοὺς λοιποὺς πολίτας Ἐ συγκα-  
 ρώντω 26.23 24; μὴ συγκαρῶντες  
 τὰς ἀγχιστείας 26.24 25

## συνχωρέω

ἐάν μὴ ὁ ἀφηγούμενος συνχωρήσῃ

14 B 2, 3 4 (συνχωρήσῃ)

## συλλάγγανω

ἐς τὸν αὐτῶντα οἱ συνλαχόντες

26.19 20; οἱ ποτὶ τούτους συλλα-

χόντες 26.22 23; Ἐ ἀδελφοὶ καὶ

οὔτοι Ἐ συνλελογχότες 26.26

27

## συλλογίζομαι

μετὰ τούτων συνελογίζεσθαι

αὐτόν 14 B 92 93

## συμβουλεύω

τοῖς πολίταις συνεβούλευσαν 26.8

9

## συμπομπή

(τὸν ἄρχοντα καὶ τὴν [τεθ]μοφού-

λακας) σουμπομπάν [πεμ]πέμεν

11.22 23

## συμφέρω

συμφέρει Ἐ ὁμονοοῦντας πολιτεύ-

εσθαι 26.5 6

## συνάγω

συναχθείσης ἐκκλησίας 14 A 3;

δεδοχθαι Ἐ ἀλίαν τῶν πολιτῶν

συναγαγεῖν 26.9 10

## συνεκδανείζω

εἰς τὸ συνεκδανίσαι τὴν ἐνθήκην

(αἰρεῖσθω ἀνθρώπους) 5.35

## συνεμπίνω

δρομέα Ἐ συνινπίνοντα πίνεν

22.2 5

## συνεπιβλέπω

συνεπιβλέπονται τοὺς [νεωτέρ]ους

14 A 37 38

## συνεπιμελέομαι

συνεπιμεληθῆναι τῆς στήλης Ἐ τὸν

ἱερέα 2.47 48

## συνερανισταί

τῶν συνερανιστῶν ψῆφον λαβόν-

των 5.8 9

## συνέφηβος

οἱ συνέφηβοι Πανὶ καὶ Νύνφαις

ἀνέθηκαν 4.5 6

## συνήγορος

ὁ εὐθυνος καὶ ὁ συνήγορος Ἐ

2.41 42

## σύννοδος

(ἀρχερανιστής) συνόδου τῆς τῶν

Ἡρακλειαστῶν τῶν ἐν Λίμναις

4 5.3; καταστάνεσθαι Ἐ ἐκ τῆς

συνόδου πράκτορες Ἐ 5.27 28;

αἰρεῖσθω Ἐ οὓς ἂν βούληται ἐκ

τῆς συνόδου 5.34 35

συντελέω **233**

παρακαλῶ [ὄπ]ως θουσίαν συντε-

λει 11.7 8; δεδόχθαι τὰς θουσίας

συντελέ[μεν] 11.14 15; καλῶς

ἔχει καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ συντελε-

σθῆναι 14 A 8 9; συντελείτωσαν

τὴν θουσίαν 14 B 64; θεῶ Ἐρμ[ῆ]

θουσίαν συντελλεῖν] 15.6

## σφάζω

σφαζόντο βδ[ν πρ]ὸ ἀγαλμάτων

27 A 21; σφαζέτο δ' ἐς γὰν 27 B 13

## σχίζω

σχίζω[ν] 9.12

## σῶμα

ἄριστα τὸ σῶμα διακεῖσθαι

14 B 50

## ταινόω

ἐξέστω ταινιοῦν τὸν βουλόμενον

14 B 58

## ταμίας

μὴ πλέω δαπανάτω ὁ ταμίας 5.12

13; ἐγγυητὰς παρατιθέτωσαν τῷ

ταμίᾳ καὶ τῷ ἀρχερανιστῇ 5.22 23;

ἐὰν ὁ ταμίας ἀποδιδῶι λόγον 5.29;

ἐγδίδοσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ ταμίου θῦμα

τῷ θεῷ 5.37; ὅταν οἱ ἐγλογιστοὶ

ἐπιδίξωσι εἴ τι ὀφίλι ὁ ταμίας

5.40 42; ξύλα ἐγδίδοσθαι ὑπὸ

τοῦ καθ' ἔτος ταμίου 5.42; τὰς

φορὰς καταφέρειν τῷ ταμίᾳ ἰς τὰς

ἐγδόσεις 5.42 43; δόμεν ἀνάλωμα

[τὴν τα]μίας 11.18 19; [ἡ ζημία

εἰσπράσ]σεται ὑπὸ τῶν νεωποιῶν

καὶ τοῦ ταμίου [τῶν ἱερῶν] 18.15

16; [τὸν μισθὸν] καταβαλοῦσιν Ἐ

τῷ ταμίᾳ τῶν ἱερῶν 18.34 35; [-

-]ῆσουσιν τῷ ταμίᾳ τῶν ἱερῶν

18.37; τὰ ποτὶ τὰν θουσίαν Ἐ ὁ

ταμίας παρεχέτω 26.28 29

ταμεύω

ἂν ταμεύσας τις ἐπιδειχθῇ νενο-  
σφισμένος 5.15

τάσσω

συνεπιβλέψονται τοὺς [νεωτέρ]ους  
καθὼς ἂν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τάξων-  
ται 14 A 38 39; παραγίνεσθαι  
τὴν τεταγμένην ὥραν 14 B 19  
20

ταῦρος

[θύ]εν τῷ Ζηνὶ τέλεον τ[αῦρον]  
23 A 17

τέκνον

ἔάν τις τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἐράνου τέκνον  
θέλῃ ισάγιν 5.38

τεκν[ό]φστεν

22.8 9

τέλειος **129, 371**

τέλεον 1.21 22 (Δήμητρι), 22 (Διὶ  
Ἑρκείῳ), 24 (Ποσειδῶνι), 27  
(Νεανίαι), [36] (\*Ἡρακλείδα[ις]), 37  
(Ἀλκμήνη, Ἀνάκοιν), 38 ([Ἑλέ]-  
νη), 40 41 (Ἀρτέμιδι Μονυ-  
χίαι), Lat. Sin. 31, Lat. Dex. 12  
(Φοίνικι); 23 B 2; τέλεον/ν πρᾶτόν  
1.9, 11 12 (Διὶ Καταιβάτη), 26 (Διὶ  
Καταιβάτη); [κρῖδ]γ τέλεον λευκόν  
23 A 15; [θύ]εν τῷ Ζηνὶ τέλεον  
τ[αῦρον] 23 A 17; τῷ Διὶ τῷ Εὐ-  
μενεῖ θύ[ε]γ [καί] ταῖς Εὐμενίδεσι  
τέλεον 27 A 8 9; τῷ Διὶ τῷ Μιλι-  
χίῳ τῷ ἐν Μύσοφ τέλεον 27 A 9;  
τοῖς κ(α)θαροῖς τέλεον θυόντο  
27 A 13; ἡιαρεῖον τέλεον Ἐ θύσας  
27 B 10

τελετή **309 n. 36**

τελέω

τελείτω τὰ νομ[ιζόμενα] 13.15

τέλος

πεμπέμεν ἱππ[έα]ς [ἐν τὸν] ἄ[γῶ]-  
ν[α] τὸν ἀπὸ τελέων 11.10 11

τέμενος

ἐν τῷ Ἀθανᾷς Ἰωνίας κῆ Διὸς  
Καραῖω τεμένει 11.8 9; θύηι θεῶι  
ἐν τεμ[ένει] 13.14 Rest.

τετράμηρος

τρις ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ κατὰ τετρά-

μηνον 14 B 25; κατὰ τετράμηνον  
ἀποδιδότω Ἐ 14 B 91 92

τέχνη

(μὴ ἐγδυέσθω Ἐ ) μηδὲ τῶν ἀγο-  
ραῖαι τέχνη κεχρημένων 14 B 28  
29

τίθημι

τῆς ἐνθήκης τῆς τεθείσης ὑπὸ τοῦ  
ἀρχερανοστοῦ 5.9 10; ἀλμυαῖαν  
θέμ(ε)ν vel θέ(σ)θ(αι) 6.4.1 Rest.;  
[τι]θήν[ον] 6.17 Rest.; θύειγ καὶ  
τιθέν[αι] 13.9; τεθῆναι (τὸν νόμον)  
ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ 14 A 9 10, 20;  
(τὸν γυμνασιαρχικὸν νόμον)  
τεθῆναι εἰς τὰ δημόσια 14 A 19;  
τιθέναι τὸ ἄλεμμα 14 B 81; [ἐν τῷ  
γυμνα]σίῳ τοῖς Ἑρμαιοῖς ἀγῶνας  
τίθεσθαι 15.2 3; καὶ θέμειν (τὸ  
ψάφιαμα) 17.15; βασιλέων ψῆφον  
θε[μ]έν[ω]ν 20.14 15; μοῖραν  
τιθ[έτω] 21.7

τιμή

[κ]αὶ τιμὰς ἔξει καὶ ἀτ[έλειαν] 19.3

τόκος

τοῦ τόκου τοῦ πεσομένου 5.12;  
ἔάν τι πλείωνος ἀνηται ἢ ἐκ τῆς  
ἐνθήκης ἢ ἐκ τοῦ τόκου 5.13 14

τοξεύω

ἀκοντίζειν καὶ τοξεύειν μελετάτω-  
σαν 14 B 10

τόπος

τῶν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου 14 B 48 49, 72

τράγος **273**

[τράγον] πυρρὸν ἢ μέλανα (Διονύ-  
σῳ) 1.45 46

τράπεζα **133**

Πρόκριδι τράπεζαν 1.17; Ἡρωῖνησι  
Θορίκο 1.18 19, 30; Ἡρωῖνησι  
Πυλοχίσι 1.51; Ἡρωῖνησιν  
Ἑπερπεδίῳ 1.48 49; Φιλωνίδι  
1.44 45; ἡαρά τράπεζ[αν] (?)  
6.14.3; [ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν] τράπεζ[αν]  
9.2 Rest.; καὶ (προθέτο) Rest.)  
τράπεζαν καὶ κλίναν 27 A 14;  
τρά[πεζα]ν προθέμεν Ἐ 27 A 18  
19; τὰπὸ τὰς τραπέζας ἀπάργματα  
(κατακάαι) 27 A 19



## τρέπω

μη ἐξέστω εἰπεῖν Ἐ τὸ ἀργύριον  
ὥς δεῖ ἄλλοθι ποῦ τρέψαι 2.36

37

## τριπλός

τὸ τριπλοῦν ἀποτίνω 5.14 15, 16

## τρίπους

[τρ]ίποδι 9.4

## τριταῖος

ἀπὸ αἰγέου καὶ προβατέου τρι-  
ταῖον 7.10 11

## τρίτος

τῷ ἐγδικασαμένῳ διδόσθω τὸ  
τρίτον μέρος 14 B 35; σπεσάτ[ω]  
τὸν τρίτον 21.6; [σ]πενδ[- -] τὸ  
τρίτον 21.10; τὸ τρίτον σπένδει  
21.12; τρίτῳ φέ[τους] 23 B 7; τρίτοι  
φέτ[ει] 27 A 23

## τρίττοια

ἐς Πυθίῳ Ἀπόλλωνος τρίττοαν 1.41

## τρόπος

κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον 5.11; τρόπῳ  
οὐδὲ παρευρέσει οὐδεμιᾷ 14 A 32,  
[61]; 18.10, 13 14, 18 19, 22 23;  
τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον χαθαίρεσθῃ Ἐ  
27 B 8

τρούφακτος. *See* δρύφακτος

## τύπτω

ἐάν τις τύπτῃ τὸν γυμνασίαρχον  
14 B 41; ζημιούτω τὸν τύπτοντα  
Ἐ 14 B 42 43

## τύχη

τύχη ἀγαθῇ τῶν δημοτῶν 2.2,  
18 19; ἀγαθὴ τύχη 4.1; 5.1; Θεός·  
τύχα ἀγαθὰ 7.2; τὰς τύχας καλῶς  
προαγημέναις 26.3 4

## ὕδρια

ἐμβalόντες ἐς ὕδριας δυόω 26.16

## ὕϊκός

οἱ ἐργολαβήσαντες ὕϊκον ἢ οἰνικόν  
5.20; διδότην ὕϊκου Ἐ 5.39

## υἱός

(μη ἐγδυέσθῳ Ἐ) ὁ[ο]ῦλ[ος] μηδὲ  
ἀπε[λ]εῦθερος, μηδὲ οἱ τούτων υἱοί  
14 B 27 28; Θαρσύτας δ' υἱός Ἐ  
ἀνέθηκε 24.2

## ὑπάρχω

τῶν ὑπαρχουσῶν προσόδων  
14 A 30 31, 59, B 88; [ὑ]πάρ-  
χουσιν 17.2

## ὑπατος

ἐπὶ Τίτου Φλαβίου Κόνωνος  
ἄρχοντος καὶ ἱερέως Δρούσου  
ὑπάτου 5.1 2

## ὑπεναντίος

οἱ ὑπεναντίοι γεγονότες 26.13

## ὑπερπαρέχω

αἱ δὲ μὲ ὑπερπαρσχ[ο]μεν φοίρο-  
θεν 6.7.2

## ὑπέρπυρα

διδόσθῃ τῷ ἀρχῷ Ἐ τὰ οὐπέρ-  
πυρα πάντα κῆ τὰν κωλίαν  
11.23 25

ὑπεύθυνος **260, cf. 23**

ὅσαι δ' ἂν ἀρχαὶ Ἐ ὑπευθύνος  
ᾗναι 1.64 65; τῶν αἰρουμένων  
ἀεὶ γυμνασιάρχων Ἐ ὑπευθύνων  
ὄντων 14 A 14 16

## ὑπογράφω

ὁμόσας τὸν ὑπογεγραμμένον  
ὄρκον 14 A 25; ὁμόσαντες τὸν  
ὑπογεγραμμένον ὄρκον 14 A 37

## ὑποδέχομαι

[οἱ μισθωσάμε]νοι οὐκ ὑποδέ-  
ξονται παρὰ δούλου οὐθὲν Ἐ  
18.16; οὐκ ὑπ[ο]δέξονται ἐν τοῖς  
κα[π]ηλείοις Ἐ 18.20 21; οὐδ' ὑπο-  
δέξονται παρ' αὐτῶν οὐδέν 18.22;  
[ho δὲ hu]ποδεκόμενος Ἐ δότο Ἐ  
27 B 3 4

## ὑπόδικος

ὑπόδικος ἔστω 14 B 43 44; 18.24

## ὑπολείβω

φοῖνον ὑπολθείψας δι' ὀρόφο  
27 A 10 11; μελίκρατα ὑπολείβον  
27 A 13 14

## ὑπόλογος

οὐδ' ὑπόλογον φέροντες 18.36

## ὑπομένω

ὁ λαχὼν ὑπομενέτω· ἐάν δὲ μὴ  
ὑπομένη 5.25; ἐάν τινες μὴ θέλω-  
σιν πράκτορες ὑπομένειν  
5.28

- ὅς, σὺς  
 [ὑν κρ]ιτήν κυδσαν (Δήμητρι)  
 1.38 39 Rest.; [Δήμητρι Θεσμο]-  
 φόρῳ ὅν 3.1 2 (ὑν πρ[ωτοτόκον]  
 Rest.)  
 ὕστερος  
 τῇ ὕστερᾳ τοῦ Δίου 14 A 41  
 ὑφίστημι  
 [hy]ποστάντον (πλατιφοιναρχον)  
 6.3A2 Rest.  
 φαίνω  
 ἐὰν ἕτερόν τι ἀναγκαῖον φαίνεται  
 τῶν μαθημάτων 14 B 12 13; ἐὰν  
 Ἐ φανῇ μὴ δεόντως ὁμωμοκέναι  
 14 B 79  
 φάσκω  
 φάσκων ἡδικοῦσθαι ὑπό τινος  
 14 B 86 87  
 φέρω  
 στέφανον φέριν τῷ θεῷ ἕκαστον  
 5.45 46; μισθὸν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ  
 φέρειν 18.30; οὐδ' ὑπόλογον  
 φέροντες 18.36  
 φημί  
 ἐὰν τις φήσῃ μὴ δικαίως ἐξημιῶ-  
 σθαι 14 B 104  
 φιλία  
 μετὰ πάσας δικαιοτάτος καὶ φιλίας  
 26.20 21  
 φιλοπονία  
 προτιθέτω ὄπλον Ἐ εὐεξίας  
 καὶ εὐταξίας καὶ φιλοπονίας Ἐ  
 14 B 46 47; τῆς εὐταξίας καὶ  
 φιλοπονίας Ἐ ὁ γυμνασίαρχος  
 Ἐ κρινάτω τῆς εὐταξίας Ἐ τῆς δὲ  
 φιλοπονίας Ἐ 14 B 54 56  
 φιλόπονος  
 ὃς ἂν αὐτῷ δοκῇ φιλοπονώτατα  
 ἀλείφθαι 14 B 56 57  
 φίλος  
 οὔτε φίλοι χαριζόμενος οὔτε  
 ἔχθρον βλάπτων 14 A 29 30, cf.  
 60 61  
 φοιτάω  
 πάντες οἱ φοιτῶντες εἰς τὸ γυμνά-  
 σιον 14 B 7 8; τῶν φοιτῶντων εἰς  
 τὸ γυμνάσιον 14 B 61 62; ποιείτω  
 τὴν Ἐ λαμπάδα ἐκ τῶν φοιτῶντων  
 14 B 82 83  
 φόνος  
 ἀπὸ φό[ν]ου(?) ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας 7.9 10  
 φορά  
 τὰς φορὰς καταφέρειν τῷ ταμίᾳ Ἐ  
 5.42 43  
 φύλαξ  
 [τῷ φύλ]ακι 1.2 Rest.  
 φυλέτης  
 θυέτ[ω] τῶν φυλετᾶ[ν] ὁ γεραί-  
 τατ[ος] 16.2 4  
 φυσικός  
 ἀπὸ τῶν φυσικῶν ἑβδομαίαν 7.7 8  
 χάλκωμα  
 τὸ ἄλίσμα Ἐ κολαψάμενοι Ἐ ἐς  
 χάλκωμα Ἐ 26.33 34  
 χαρίζομαι  
 οὔτε φίλοι χαριζόμενος οὔτε  
 ἔχθρον βλάπτων 14 A 29 30, cf.  
 60 61  
 χάρις  
 οὔτε χάριτος ἔνεκεν οὔτε ἔχθρας  
 οὐδεμιᾶς 14 B 50 51  
 χειροτονέω  
 ἄνδρας τρεῖς οἵτινες χειροτονηθέν-  
 τες Ἐ 14 A 36 37  
 χίμαρος **273**  
 χίμαρον κριτόν (Ἀπόλλωνι) 1.20;  
 χίμαρος (Ἀπόλλωνι) 16.2  
 χλοῖα, ἡ (offering)  
 Δήμητρι, τὴν χλοῖαν, (χλοαίαν  
 Rest.) οἶν (ὑν Rest.) κρ]ιτήν κυδ-  
 σαν 1.38 39  
 χοῖνιξ  
 διδότησαν τὴν σμιδαλιν τῇ δη-  
 μοσίᾳ χοίνικι 5.36; ἐκ χοίνικος  
 19.7  
 χοῖρος  
 χοῖρον 1.22 (Κοροτρόφῳ), 24  
 (Ἀπόλλωνι), 42 (Κοροτρόφῳ),  
 51 (Πυ[λόχῳ]); χοῖρον κριτόν  
 (Διὶ Πολιεῖ) 1.14; χοῖρον ὠνητόν  
 ὀλόκαυτον (Διὶ Πολιεῖ) 1.15;  
 χοῖρον κριτήν (Κοροτρόφῳ) 1.21;

[θηλυ]ς χοῖρος 23 B 4; θύσας τῷ  
Δι χοῖρον 27 B 5

χράω

χρησθαι τοὺς γυμνασιάρχους  
τούτῳ 14 A 19 20; γνώμη τῇ  
[ἐ]μιαυτοῦ χρώμενος 14 A 28,  
cf. 57; (μὴ ἐγδυέσθω Ε ) μηδὲ  
τῶν ἀγοραῖαι τέχνη κεχρημένων  
14 B 28 29

χρεία

[- -]ων χρεία 9.10; τὴν τοῦ παλαι-  
στροφύλακος χρείαν 14 B 97 98;  
τὰ ποτὶ τὰν θυσίαν ὅσων χρεία  
ἐστὶ Ε 26.28

χρηζω

γραφέσθω ὁ χρηζ[ων] αὐτοὺς  
κατὰ τὸν νόμον 17.11 12; ἡκόα  
τῷ ἐλαστέροι χρέξει θύεν 27 B 12

χρόνος

ἐν ᾧ ἂν χρόνῳ τοὺς δημότας  
πείθει 2.25 26; ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ  
τῷ εἰρημένῳ 2.31; ἔάν τε εἰς  
ἐνιαυτὸν δοκεῖ μισθοῦν, ἔάν τε  
εἰς πλέω χρόνον 2.34 35; ὅπως ἂν  
τὰ ἐψηφισμένα κύρια εἰ εἰς τὸν αἰ  
χρόνον 2.45 46; ὅπως κῆ ἐν τὸν  
λυτὸν χρόνον διαμείνει 11.12 13;  
ἐς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον 26.5; ἐν τοῖς  
ἐμπροσθεν χρόνοις 26.13 14

χρυσός

χρυσῶι στεφάνῳι στεφανῶσαι  
2.10 11; διορίζας χαλκὶ καὶ χρυσῶι  
27 B 11

χρωμάτινος

μὴ εἰσφέρειν χρωμάτινον 4.7 8

χώρα

[τ]ῆς χώρας γινομένων 8.18 (cf.  
Rest.)

ψηφίζω

ἐψηφίσθαι τοῖς δημόταις 2.20 21;  
ὅπως ἂν τὰ ἐψηφισμένα κύρια  
εἰ εἰς τὸν αἰ χρόνον 2.45 46;

ἀφ' ἧς ἂν ἡμέρας οἱ δημόται  
ψηφίσωνται 2.52 53; τὰς ἐμφορὰς  
τὰς ἐψηφισμένας 11.26 27; τοὶ  
ιερεῖς Ε [αἱ] καὶ τι ἐπιτάσσωνται  
παρὰ τὰ ἐψηφισμένα 17.7 8

ψηφισμα

τὰ ψηφίσματα ἐφ' οἷς ἐ[γκαθέστ]η-  
κεν ἡ ἀρχή 1.59 60; ἔάν τις ἡ εἴπει  
ἡ ἐπιψηφίσει παρὰ τὸ ψηφισμα  
2.39 40; ἀναγράψαι τὸ ψηφισμα  
ἐν στηλῇ 2.43 44; κύριον εἶναι τὸ  
ψηφισμα 2.52; τοῦ ψηφίσματος  
'οὐ' εἰς 14 B 110; [ἀκολούθως τοῖς  
τε νόμοις καὶ τοῖς τοῦ δ[ά]μου  
ψηφίσμασιν] 15.1 2; ὁ τι δέ  
κά τις παρὰ τόδε [τὸ ψάφισμα  
ποιή]σῃ 17.4 5; τὸ ψάφισμα τόδε[ε  
ἀναγράψαι] ἐστάλαν λιθίναν  
17.12 13; [διορθωσά]μενοι τὴν  
διαγραφὴν Ε [κατ]ὰ τὸ ψηφισμα  
18.4 5

ψηφος

τῶν συνερανιστῶν ψηφον λαβόν-  
των 5.8 9; βασιλέων ψηφον  
θε[μ]έν[ω]ν 20.14 15

ὁμοθετέω **166–168**

ὁμός

ποιεῖτωσαν μερίδας τῶν θυθέντων  
τὰ κρέα ὁμά 14 B 65 66

ὠνέομαι

[ἐώ]νηται παρὰ τῶν δημοτῶν 2.6

ὠνή

ἀτελεῖς ἔσσονται ὧν ἂν ὠνῶν(?)  
18.37, cf. 20 Rest.

ὠνητός

χοῖρον ὠνητὸν ὀλόκαυτον (Διὶ  
Πολιεῖ) 1.15

ῶρα

τὴν ὥραν ἣν ἂν ὁ γυμνασιάρχος  
ἀποδείξῃ 14 B 17; παραγίνεσθαι  
τὴν τεταγμένην ὥραν 14 B 19 20

## SOURCE INDEX

1. *Literary Sources*

- Aeschines  
 Scholia 1.23: 380 n. 92
- Aeschylus  
*Eum.* 280 283: 281  
 448 450: 281, 385  
*Supp.* 676 677: 306 n. 13
- Amipsias  
*Connus* fr. 7 (*PCG*) 164
- Apollonius Rhodius  
*Argon.* 4.703 709: 281, 383
- Aristides  
 Schol. 55.24 56.5, 340.31 341.2  
 (D): 127
- Aristophanes  
*Ach.* 784 785: 356 n. 56  
 792 795: 58 n. 291  
*Av.* 1704 1705: 313  
*Plut.* 653 747: 246 n. 18  
 676 681: 64 n. 322, 314 n. 65,  
 334  
 1136 1138: 275  
 1173 1175: 43 n. 206  
 Schol. *Eq.* 725: 127  
 Schol. *Nub.* 408: 141 n. 131  
 Schol. *Plut.* 1054: 127  
 Schol. *Ran.* 479: 170 n. 42
- Aristotle  
*Ath. Pol.* 55.3: 135  
*Pol.* 1252b 14: 66  
 1319b 24: 67  
*Eth. Nic.* 1160a 20: 182
- Arnobius  
*Adv. Nat.* 7.19: 140 n. 129
- Artemidorus 2.9: 130
- Athenaeus 2. 65f-66c: 313  
 3.94c: 313 n. 61  
 4.147d: 313  
 9.410a-b (*FGrHist* 356 F 1): 383
- Callimachus  
*Hymn* 2 (*Ap.*) 59 64: 33
- Cato  
*Agr.* 83: 275 n. 16
- Clearchus  
 Fr. 48 (Wehrli): 131  
*Codex Iustinianus* 6.24.7: 357 n. 60
- Conon  
*FGrHist* 26 F 1.7: 144 145
- Demosthenes  
*De Cor.* 309 n. 36  
 Schol. 21.171: 355
- ΔΙΚΩΝ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΑ*  
 Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca*, I 190.26  
 27: 186 n. 28
- Diodorus Siculus 4.10.1 2: 204  
 4.25.1: 157 n. 20  
 4.80.1 2: 332  
 5.57.4: 236 n. 42
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus  
*Ant. Rom.* 2.31, 6.14: 236
- Epicharmus  
 Fr. 10 (*PCG*): 344
- Etymologicum Magnum*  
 s.v. ἐνολμῖς: 273  
 s.v. ἱερεῖον: 386  
 s.v. Μαγνήτις: 241 n. 6  
 s.v. τριπύαν: 144 n. 145
- Euripides  
*El.* 1142 1143: 311  
*Ion* 309 311: 295 296  
*IT* 970 971: 383  
 1155: 333  
 1193: 387
- Eustathius 134.35: 167  
 1668.23 25: 375  
 1676.30: 144 n. 145
- Harpocration  
 s.v. Ἐρχεῖος Ζεὺς: 135  
 s.v. λιανοφόρος: 309 n. 36  
 s.v. Πυανόψια: 148 n. 169  
 s.v. στρεπτοῦς: 187 n. 31  
 s.v. Τριτοπάτορες: 371  
 s.v. Χόες: 139

Herodotus 1.35: 281, 381

1.50: 356 n. 56

2.38: 355

2.39: 313 314 n. 63

2.42: 211 n. 43

2.44: 372 n. 57

2.47: 141 n. 130

3.11: 380 n. 95

6.76: 380 n. 94

6.105: 173

7.13: 380 n. 93

Hesychius

s.v. ἀλίνειν: 374

s.v. Γαμηλιών: 138 139

s.v. Εἰλειθυίας: 315

s.v. ἔφυγον κακόν, εὖρον ἄμεινον:  
309 n. 34

s.v. Ἡρακλεία λίθος: 251 n. 6

s.v. ἱερεῖον: 386

s.v. ἱερόμαος: 344

s.v. ἱερώσυνα: 164 n. 20

s.v. Ἱερὸς γάμος: 138 n. 116

s.v. Ἱτωνία: 234 n. 35

s.v. λίκνον: 309 n. 36

s.v. μύσχος: 368 n. 30

s.v. ὁμοσίπνοι: 368

s.v. Πλυντήρια: 147

Hippocrates

*Morb. Sacr.* VI 364 Littr :

207

Homer

*Il.* 3.103 104: 140

9.219: 167 168

18.558 560: 307 n. 22

19.266 268: 131

24.480 483: 280 281

*Od.* 3.6: 141

11.35 36: 380 n. 92

11.534: 310 n. 46

12.340 402: 29

14.427 428: 167 168

14.429: 307

14.449: 377

Homeric Hymns

*Ap.* 33

*Cer.* 126: 134

*Merc.* 150: 309 n. 35

Iamblichus

*VP* 153: 387

Josephus

*BJ* 5.193 194: 19

*ΛΕΞΕΙΣ ΠΗΤΟΠΙΚΑΙ*

Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca* I 270.2:

147

266.7: 164 n. 20

Lexicon Rhetoricum Cantabrigiense

s.v. Ἱερὸς γάμος: 138 n. 116

Lucian

*Sacr.* 13: 18

Schol. 80, 2.1: 333, 376

Lycophron

*Alex.* 134 135 (and Schol.): 383 n.

110

Menander

*Dys.* 36 37: 173

Mishnah

*Sukkah* 5.7 8: 335

*Menaḥot* 6.1 2: 334

*Hulin* 2.9: 380

*Tamid*: 74 n. 382

*Midot* 3.4: 375

*Kelim* 1.8: 19 n. 88

Old Testament

Ex. 12:5: 129 n. 61

Lev. 2:3, 10: 334

4:28: 129 n. 61

6:7 11: 334

7:5 6: 276 n. 28

7:9 10: 334

7:31 32: 315 n. 71

24:5 10: 335

Num. 7:1, 10: 374 375

1 Sam. 2:12 13, 4:11: 314 315

Neh. 10:35: 169

1 Chr. 28:9: 12 n. 45

Pausanias 1.32.1: 188

1.34.5: 221 n. 4

2.27.1: 275

3.24.7: 261 262

- 4.33.5: 105  
 5.14.10: 130 131  
 5.24.9 11: 131  
 8.37.8 9: 217  
 8.38.8: 275  
 9.24.3: 240 241  
 9.31.3: 235 n. 39  
 10.4.10: 372  
 Phanodemos  
   *FGrHist* 325 F 6: 371  
 Pherecydes  
   *FGrHist* 3 F 120: 144 145  
 Philo Judaeus  
   *Legum Allegoriae* 1.3: 210 n. 35  
 Philochorus  
   *FGrHist* 328 F 64: 236 n. 45  
 Photius  
   *Lexicon* s.v. προτήγιον: 273 n. 8  
   s.v. σφαγεῖον: 379 n. 89  
 Phrynichus  
   *PS* 77.5 (von Borries): 164 n. 21  
 Pindar  
   *Pyth.* 4.205: 141  
 Plato  
   *Leg.* 784a: 307  
   799a-b: 170  
   *Prt.* 347c-d: 267  
 Pliny the Elder  
   *HN* 34.81: 236 n. 48  
 Plutarch  
   *Mor.* 349F: 143 n. 141  
   659A: 306 n. 13  
   *Thes.* 27.5: 131  
 [Plutarch]  
   *Prov.* 178: 369  
 Porphyry  
   *Abst.* 2.19.5: 17  
   2.543 55.1: 147 n. 159  
   *De philosophia ex oraculis hau-*  
   *rienda* fr. 314.27 (Smith) 140  
   n. 129  
   *P.Oxy* XXXVI 2797: 57 n. 283  
 Ptolemy  
   *Geog.* 3.15.15: 324, 331  
*Septuagint*  
   Ex. 12:5: 129 n. 61  
   Lev. 4:28: 129 n. 61  
   1 Chr. 28:9: 12 n. 45  
 Sextus Empiricus  
   *Pyr.* 3.220: 211 n. 43  
 Sophocles  
   Fr. 1044: 272 273  
 Stephanus Byzantium 468.3: 351  
   502.4: 331  
 Strabo 9.1.6. 145  
   10.3.16369  
*Suda*  
   s.v. εἰρεσιώνη: 127  
   s.v. ἱερεῖον: 386  
   s.v. Κουρσοτρόφος γῆ: 134  
   s.v. μασχαλίσματα: 166 168  
   s.v. στρεπτούς: 187 n. 31  
 Tacitus  
   *Ann.* 3.60: 293  
 Theophrastus  
   *Char.* 16.12 13: 212  
 Theopompus  
   Fr. 70 (*PCG*): 275 276  
 Thucydides 1.126.6: 141 n. 130  
 Varro  
   *Ling.* 7.87: 331  
 Xenophon  
   *An.* 5.3.7 13: 83  
   2.2.9: 380 n. 95  
 Zenobius 3.38: 309 n. 34  
   3.63: 273 n. 2

## 2. Inscriptions

- Agora XVI  
   56: 95, 104  
   57: xii n. 3, 104, 109  
 Amyzon  
   2: 54  
   27: 248 n. 34

- CID* I  
     9: 76, 90  
*CIL* I<sup>2</sup>  
     366: 27 n. 123  
     2872: 27 n. 123  
*CIL* VI  
     576: 276 n. 25  
     820: 60  
*CIS* I  
     166: 110  
*COMIK*  
     705: 306  
*Corinth* VIII  
     1, 1: 65 66  
  
*DGE* 688c: 312  
  
*EpigAnat* 32, 2000, 89 93: 99, 107,  
     355 n. 41, 356. Cf. *SEG* XLV  
     1508  
  
*I.Iasos*  
     219: 39  
     244 245: 85 n. 449  
*I.Beroia*  
     4: 260  
     16: 222 n. 9  
     18: 246 n. 21  
*IC*  
     III iii 3 a 97: 283 n. 25  
     iv 9: 22  
*I.Didyma*  
     40 41: 296  
*I.Ephesos*  
     24: 95 96  
     1263: 399 n. 12  
*I.Erythrai*  
     15: 305 n. 5  
*IG* I<sup>3</sup>  
     138: 80 n. 420  
     230: xi n. 2  
     644: 20 n. 91  
*IG* II<sup>2</sup>  
     1365: 11, 210 n. 36, 211, 212  
     2501: 40 n. 191  
     2600: 135  
     4964: 20 21, 130  
     4969: 35 n. 162  
*IG* IV  
     493: 202 203 n. 34  
*IG* IV I<sup>2</sup>  
     121 122: 246 n. 17  
     126: 246 n. 18  
*IG* VII  
     2808: 241 n. 7  
*IG* X 2 I  
     38: 248 n. 34  
     84: 248 n. 34  
     109: 248 n. 34  
     116: 248 n. 34  
*IG* XI 2  
     161: 291  
*IG* XI 4  
     1215: 248 n. 34  
     1239: 248 n. 34  
*IG* XII 3  
     330 (*LSCG* 135): 45, 86 87, 110,  
         319, 321  
*IG* XII 3 Suppl.  
     1360: 131  
*IG* XII 5  
     227: 165  
*IG* XII 6  
     14: 295  
     261: 296  
     292: 293, 294  
     1197: 300  
*IG* XII 7  
     515: 85  
*IG* XII Suppl.  
     353: 373  
*IGDS*  
     71: 367  
*I.Kallatis*  
     48B: 35 n. 162  
*I.Knidos*  
     173: 397 n. 4  
*I.Labraunda*  
     1: 43 n. 208, 310 n. 41  
     46: 24 n. 107  
     53 54: 110  
     60: 20  
*I.Lampsakos*  
     9: 85

*I.Mylasa*

502: 20 n. 91

862: 296

*I.Oropos*

284: 21 22

290: 6 7, 291, 224 n. 17

*IOSPE I<sup>2</sup>*

352: 270

*I.Perg. III*

161: 17, 61 63, 211, 247, 334

*I.Priene*

123: 248 n. 36

*I.Italiae*

XIII, II 48: 69

*Iscr.Cos*ED 2: *See* LSCG 162

ED 5: 7

ED 25: 402 n. 27

ED 82: 45, 84

ED 86: 85 n. 449

ED 121: 403 n. 33

ED 145: 263 264

ED 146: 86

ED 246: 86

ED 216: 394

ED 236: 75, 321 n. 15

ED 257: 31 n. 148,

85 n. 449

ED 263: 85 n. 449

EV 134: 84 85 n. 447

*KAI*

76: 110

*LGS*

I 16: 65 n. 325

I 17: 69

I 25: 93 94

I 27: 69 n. 349

II 15 A: 124 125

II 61: 212 n. 52

II 64: 81 n. 428

II 66: 21 22

II 91: *See* LSS 59II 131: *See* *Iscr.Cos* ED 82*LSAG<sup>2</sup>*

150 n. 9: 203

*LSAM*

2: 89

5: 28, 75

6: 307

8: 85, 95

9: 85 86, 109

10: 109

11: 30, 47 48

12: 72, 212, 366 n. 22

13: 45, 131, 296

14: 17

15: 8

16: 76 77

17: 29 30

20: 89, 174

21: 43 n. 209, 320, 321

24: 64 65, 320 n. 11

25: 53

26: 68 n. 341, 80

27: 68 n. 341, 80

28: 74

29: 212

30: 74, 366

31: 95 96, 108 n. 569, 110 n. 582

32: 97 99, 106, 310 n. 41, 356, 376

33: 107 108, 357

34: 51 n. 257, 275

35: 15 16

36: 47 n. 227

37: 41, 50, 301 n. 10

39: 65

40: 42, 320 n. 11

44: 52, 320 n. 11

45: 43, 310 n. 42

46: 43, 248 n. 34

47: 35 n. 162, 81

48: 320 n. 11

49: 310 n. 42

50: 102, 301 n. 10

51: 209

52: 51, 248 n. 34

54: 72

55: 26

58: 73

59: 42, 43 n. 207, 314, 320

60: 85 n. 449

61: 307



- 62: 31 32  
 66: 51 n. 254  
 67: 223 n. 15  
 69: 74 75, 108  
 70: 314  
 72: 45, 86 87  
 73: 51 52  
 74: 31  
 75: 21, 282 n. 22  
 78: 46 47  
 79: 48, 321 n. 16  
 80: 89  
 81: 7, 8 n. 22, 106, 351  
 83: 22  
 84: 17  
 85: 21  
 86: 29  
 87: 35 n. 162  
 88: 73 74  
*LSCG*  
 1: 139  
 3: 24, 25  
 4: 104  
 5: 36, 104, 366 n. 22  
 7: 124, 169  
 8: 69, 104  
 10: 71, 130, 148  
 11 B: 43  
 12: 36 n. 168, 47  
 13: 109 110, 267 n. 36  
 14: 39  
 15: 44 45  
 16: 124 125  
 18: 66 68, 124, 132, 138, 141, 276,  
     332, 375  
 19: 89 90, 142  
 20: 66 68, 124, 375 n. 74  
 21: 63 64  
 22 24: 64  
 25: 64, 334  
 26 27: 64  
 28: 43 44, 165  
 29: 44  
 32: 39  
 33: 99, 100, 104, 108 109, 224 n.  
     18, 266 n. 35, 354 n. 30, 355  
 34: 34  
 35: 38  
 36: 11, 12, 26  
 37: 25, 26 27  
 39: 39, 374  
 40: 71  
 41: 32  
 42: 32  
 43: 31  
 44: 38, 265  
 45: 88, 394  
 46: 34 n. 160, 88  
 47: 40, 88  
 48: 53 54, 89  
 49: 45 46, 89  
 50: 31 n. 148  
 51: 89, 181, 185 n. 25, 188, 223 n.  
     15  
 52: 65, 88, 89, 333  
 53: 25, 183 184  
 54: 13, 56 57, 276, 339  
 55: 11 13, 174, 210 n. 36, 212, 222  
     n. 6, 275  
 56: 78 n. 56, 79  
 57: 28 n. 130  
 58: 83 84  
 59: 84  
 60: 71, 223 n. 15, 237  
 61: 46  
 62: 30  
 65: 4, 13, 14, 26, 99, 105 106, 111,  
     189, 201, 290, 355, 356  
 67: 25, 27 28  
 68: 17, 216, 217, 218  
 69: 9 10, 12 13, 221, 275, 321  
 70: 32  
 71: 101, 230  
 72: 37 38  
 73: 94 95, 101  
 74: 60  
 75: 6 7, 38  
 77: *See CID* I 9  
 78: 28, 39, 94, 104, 355  
 79: 28, 325  
 80: 84  
 81: 84  
 82: 58, 275  
 83: 10 11, 27, 73

84: 25, 27  
 85: 72  
 86: 83  
 88: 59 n. 297, 386  
 91: 27  
 92: 96, 101, 290 292  
 93: 96 n. 505  
 94: 324  
 96: 66 67, 141, 142 143, 221 n. 4,  
     356, 373  
 97: 75 76, 77  
 98: 100, 101 102, 267, 355, 378  
 100: 25, 26  
 101: 26  
 102: 26  
 103: 46, 85, 109  
 105: 25  
 106: 8 n. 26  
 107: 314  
 108: 28 n. 130  
 110: 19  
 112: 25  
 113: 70  
 114: 57, 60 n. 301, 211  
 115: 40  
 116: 25, 28, 312  
 118: 37, 379  
 119: 90, 301 n. 10, 310 n. 46  
 120: 301, 310 n. 39, 321 n. 15  
 121: 21  
 123: 44  
 124: 18  
 125: 59, 320 321  
 126: 57  
 127: 89  
 128: 68 69, 88  
 129: 36 37  
 130: 16  
 133: 70  
 134: 83  
 135: 110, 319, 321. *See also IG XII*  
     3, 330  
 136: 5. n. 13, 14 15  
 137: 108  
 139: 17, 211, 212, 213  
 140 142: 70  
 143: 81

144: 30  
 145: 408 nn. 3  
 151: 6 n. 17, 66 67, 275, 301 n. 10,  
     311 312, 313, 319 320 n. 9, 320  
     n. 28, 331, 355 356, 376  
 152: 29  
 154: 42, 77, 79 n. 411, 387  
 155: 38  
 156: 42, 321 n. 18  
 161: 310 n. 42  
 165: 69, 84 85 n. 447  
 168: 71  
 170: 57  
 171: 35  
 173: 72 73  
 174: 53  
 175: 50  
 177: 45, 86 87, 111 n. 588, 376  
 178: 80  
 181: 89

*LSS*

1: 104  
 2: 80  
 3: 95, 104, 109  
 4: 29  
 5: 93 94  
 7: 60 n. 305  
 9: 124 125  
 10: 124 125  
 11: 64, 110  
 12: *See Agora XVI* 56  
 14: 104, 108  
 16: 70 71  
 17: 35, 57  
 18: 68 69 n. 344, 128  
 19: 65, 67 68, 90, 321 n. 16  
 20: 88 89  
 22: 60, 169 n. 41, 247  
 25: 74  
 27: 30  
 28: 102 n. 535  
 30: 70, 131  
 34: 21  
 38: 13  
 39: 13  
 40: 71  
 41: 13

- 42: 13  
 44: 84  
 45: 90 93; cf. 96  
 46: 96, 110  
 47: 48 n. 236, 49 n. 242, 51 n. 257  
 48: 90  
 49: 19  
 50: 29  
 51: *See* SEG XLVIII 1037  
 52: 53  
 53: 28  
 55: 58  
 56: 18 19  
 57: 58  
 59: 5 n. 13, 17, 18  
 61: 85, 100  
 62: 73, 382  
 63: 58, 373  
 64: 77  
 65: 79  
 67: 57, 221 n. 4  
 68: 73  
 69: 95  
 70: 319  
 71: 48 n. 236, 51 n. 257  
 72: 59  
 73: 58  
 74: 58  
 75: 19  
 75a: 19  
 76: 310 n. 46  
 77: 310 n. 46, 311  
 79: 324 325  
 80: 71, 333  
 81: 27 n. 123, 29  
 82: 17  
 83: 99 100, 355 n. 41  
 85: 80  
 86: 36 n. 168, 59  
 87: 70  
 88: 69 70, 274  
 89: 69 70  
 90: 33  
 91: 211, 212  
 92: 70  
 93: 43 n. 409, 313  
 94: 70, 275  
 95 96: 70  
 97: 70, 141  
 98 103: 70  
 104: 70, 273 n. 8  
 107: 31  
 108: 17 18, 59  
 112: 78 n. 409  
 113: 314  
 115: 55, 77 79, 174, 213, 279 284  
     *passim*, 380 381, 383, 384 n. 116  
 116: 71  
 117: 30  
 119: 209, 311  
 120: 22 n. 99  
 121: 54  
 123: 31  
 125: 144  
 127: 30, 44  
 128: 21  
 129: 310 n. 46  
 130: 310 n. 46  
 132: 124  
 133: 73  
 Meiggs-Lewis, *GHI*  
     8: 312  
     42: 302, 335  
 Milet I 3  
     129: 128  
     1592: 248 n. 34  
 Milet VI 2  
     944: 69 n. 349  
 Nouveau Choix  
     27: 40 n. 191  
 OGIS  
     598: 6, 19 20  
 ÖjhBeibl 18, 1915, 23 32: 46 n. 225  
 Parker and Obbink 2000  
     no. 1: 314, 394; cf. 43 n. 205  
 Parker and Obbink 2001  
     237 238 no. 4A: 27 n. 124  
 Parker and Obbink 2001a  
     253 265 no. 1: 38  
     266 277 no. 3: 86

Paton-Hicks, *I.Cos* 368: 72 73

### SEG

II 260, 6: 231 n. 19  
 VIII 169: 6, 19 20  
 IX 73: 30  
 XI 244: 202 n. 30  
 XII 390: 306  
 XV 427: 270  
 XXIV 1031: 35 n. 162  
 XXVI 137: xi n. 2  
 392: 66 n. 331  
 XXVII 631: 49 n. 241  
 XXIX 806: 265 266  
 1088: 51, 320  
 1130 bis: 352 n. 20  
 XXX 1037: 25 n. 110  
 1327: 68 n. 341, 80  
 XXXII 86: x xii n. 2  
 359: 66 n. 331  
 XXXIII 675: 7  
 XXXVI 1039: 37  
 1221: 16, 26  
 XXXVII 921: 53  
 XXXVIII 681: 26 n. 114  
 XXXIX 1135: 38, 310 n. 41

1136 1137: 38  
 1290: 21  
 1462: 85 n. 447, 97, 101  
 XL 123: xii n. 2  
 624 (XXXVI 703): xiv n. 2  
 956: 47, 49, 53  
 XLIII 212: 38  
 710: 17 18  
 XLIV 678: 19 n. 86  
 XLV 911 912: 35 n. 162  
 1508: 99, 100, 107, 310 n. 41, 356.  
*Cf. EpigAnat* 32, 2000, 89 93  
 1876: xii n. 2  
 XLVI 173: *See LSCG* 28  
 XLVII 196: 313  
 XLVIII 1037: 22 24

### Syll.<sup>3</sup>

398: 7, 8 n. 22  
 457: 235 n. 38  
 672: 84  
 735: 35 n. 162, 106

### TAM II

636 637: 75 n. 388  
 Tit.Cam.  
 12: 131

## GENERAL INDEX

*abaton*, 20 21, 130 131, 333  
 abortion  
   polluting, 209 210  
 Acarnanian confederacy, 90 93  
 accountability  
   cult performance and, 68  
 Acropolis, Athens, 24, 33  
 Actias, 90 93  
*adyton*, 59, 333; cf. 130, 246  
 Agathe Tyche, 73, 86 87  
 Agathos Daimon, 73, 86 87  
 Aglauros, 146 147  
 Alektrona  
   sanctuary at Ialysus, 14 15  
 Alkesippeia, 84, 96  
 altar  
 anointment of, 39, 374 375; cf. 377

house, 131  
 placed near statues, 83 84, 379  
 regulating sacri ce and, 42 43; cf.  
   342 343  
 torch race and, 265  
 Amphiarus  
   sanctuary at Oropus, 6 7, 9 10,  
   13, 32, 221, 233  
 Anakes, 58, 142  
 Anaktorion, 90 93  
 ancestors  
   cult of, 368; cf. 371 372  
   at Nakone, 354 355  
 Andania  
   mysteries 105 106, 111  
   regulations 4, 13, 14, 26, 99, 111,  
   189, 201, 290, 355, 356

## animals

- polluting, 15
- pasturing, 27 28
- sacred, 29 30
- sacri ce prohibited, 57 58

## Antheia, 128

## Anthesteria, 139

## Aphrodite

- Ourania, 34 (Piraeus), 58 (Delos)
- Pandemos, 39 (Athens); 37 (Erythrae)
- Peitho, 57
- pigs and, 58 n. 291
- sacred pigeons (Aphrodisias), 29

## Apollo

- Asgelatas (Anaphe), 36 37
- birth of, 315
- at Cyrene, 77 78
- Dalios, priesthood at Cos, 42
- Delphinios, sanctuary at Miletus, 31, 128
- at Eleutherna, 330
- Enodios, 273
- Enolmios, 272 273
- Erithyaseus, sanctuary of, 27
- festivities for (Cos), 7
- goats and, 273
- at Halasarna, 38, 72 73
- nymphs and, 57
- Patroos at Athens, 135
- priesthood at Gytheum, 46
- Ptoan, sanctuary of, 94 95, 101, 230 233
- Pythian, 84, 127, 143 144 (sanctuaries in Attica)
- relations with Athens, 108
- sanctuary at Actium, 90 93
- sanctuary at Delos. *See* Delos
- sanctuary at Delphi. *See* Delphi
- sanctuary at Dreros, 273
- sanctuary at Korope, 10 11, 27
- Telmessian, 86 87

## Archilochus

- cult on Paros, 34
- aresterion*, 6 7, 32, 38

## Artemis

- Agrotera, 334

## Artemis-Hecate, 306

- birth, of 315
- at Eleutherna, 330, 333
- at Ephesus, 95 96, 108 n. 569
- Kindyas (Bargylia), 99 100, 107
- Lochaia (Gambreion), 76
- at Magnesia on the Maeander, 107 108
- Mounichia, 143
- Pergaia (Halicarnassus), 51 52
- sanctuary at Sardis, 21
- Skiris, 81
- Xenophon and, 83

## Artemisia

- at Ephesus, 95 96
- at Eretria, 96, 101

## ʾašam (אֲשָׁם), 276 n. 28

## Asclepius

- cult of, 60 65
- fellow deities and, 61 64, 71, 247 248
- festival at Lampsacus, 85, 95
- festival at Cos, 86
- festival at the Piraeus, 110
- Hygieia and, 13, 56 57, 70 71
- in Macedonia, 247 248
- priesthood at Pergamum, 45
- sanctuary at Amphipolis, 60 61, 245
- sanctuary at Athens, 38, 64
- sanctuary at Calchedon, 28, 74
- sanctuary at Erythrae 64 65
- sanctuary at Epidaurus, 17, 60, 71, 74
- sanctuary at Lissos, 338 339
- sanctuary at Pergamum, 17, 61 63
- sanctuary at the Piraeus, 62 64
- sanctuary at Rhodes, 31

associations. *See* cult associations

## Astarte Palaestina, 58

## asylum, 21, 293 294

## Attaleia, 84, 96

## Athena

- festivals at Ilium, 86 87, 109
- Homonoeca and, festival at Antiochia ad Pyramum, 7, 106, 351
- Itonia, 235

- Latmia, 47
- Lindia, 33, 59 (sanctuary), 281
- Nike (Athens), 20 n. 91, 35, 47, 83
- Nikephoros, 72
- peplos* of, 44 45
- Patroia, 70
- sanctuary at Tegea, 25, 27 28
- Soteira, 84
- Zeus and, at Tiryns, 203
- augury, 74
- banquet. *See also* dining
  - public, 84, 85, 100, 266 267
  - entertainment at, 267 268
- basileus*
  - Athens, 36, 39
  - Chios, 312
- Basileus Kaunios and Arkesimas, 46, 82 83
- baskets
  - sacri cial, 307 308
- barley
  - in sacri ce, 307 308
- battle
  - fallen in, 77
  - sacri ce before, 379 380
- Bendis
  - in Athens, 82
  - orgeones*, of 34 n. 160, 88
- Bible
  - and Greek sacred law, 12
- birds. *See also* chickens
  - sacri ce, 57, 223, 395
- blood
  - libation, of 201
  - in puri cation, 281
  - in *sphagia*, 379 380
- boars
  - as oath victims, 74, 131
  - sacri ce, 188
- body
  - as source of pollution, 208
- books
  - sacred, 111; cf. 105
- bread, 321, 333 334. *See also* cakes
- cakes 71, 301, 334 335
  - to Asclepius and fellow deities, 61 62
  - to Nymphs, 29
  - to Trophonius, 60
- calendar
  - Athenian state, 67, 124 125
  - Attic demes, 67 68, 124 125
  - commemorative, 69
  - extracts, 69 70, 93 94, 272
  - festival, 68 69; cf. 354
  - informative vs. uninformative, 66 68
  - publication, of 67 68, 80
  - sacri cial, 65 68; cf. 123 124, 330
- catalogs
  - of priests, 53
- Cephisus, 35
- ceremonies, 102
- Charites, 57
- Chersonesus, 270
- chickens. *See also* birds
  - sacri ce, 59 (rooster), 71 n. 359, 223
- childbirth 306 307
  - polluting, 78, 209; cf. 216
- Choes, 139
- chthonian deities
  - consumption of meat and, 274 275 n. 10
  - destruction of meat and, 168
  - vs. Olympian, 140 141
  - sacri ce to, 368
- clothing
  - entry into sanctuaries and, 16; cf. 172
- collections, 81; cf. 44
- color
  - of clothing, 16, 174 (entry into sanctuaries)
  - in funerary laws, 76
  - of victims, 140 141, 354; 353
- communion
  - sacri ce, 276 n. 28
- contracts
  - future tense in, 49
- Cos
  - Asclepieum, 29, 38

- calendar of, 66–67. *See also Source Index under LSCG 151*
- eviction of Gauls from Delphi and, 7
- informative documents from, 52
- priesthoods, 42
- sales of priesthoods, 49–51, 52
- cows
  - sacrifice prohibited, 58
- cult
  - ancestral, 86
  - associations. *See* cult associations
  - divine vs. human, 7–8, 84, 86; cf. 85
  - expenses, 80
    - nances, 79–81
  - funerary, 85 n. 449
  - officials, 40–54
  - participation in, 18 n. 82 (restricted), 72–73
  - performance, 54–90; cf. 4–5, 54 (and sacred law); 54–55 (nature of documents)
  - personnel, 54, 71 (prerogatives); 72 (remuneration)
  - practice and tradition, 111
  - recurrent by nature, 5 n. 14
  - consolidation of, 67
  - taxes. *See* tax
- cult associations, 88–90
  - documents concerning, 88
    - nances and religion in, 182
  - sanctuaries in Attica, 189–190 n. 43
- cult foundations, 81–87; cf. 226, 319
  - commemorative, 8, 83–85 passim
  - corpus of sacred laws and, 8, 75, 81
  - documents concerning, 81–82, 319
  - of Agasigratis (Calauria), 83–84, 379
  - of Agasikles and Nikagora (Calauria), 84, 379
  - of Alkesippos (Delphi), 84, 96
  - of Archinos (Thera), 83
  - of Attalos (Delphi), 84, 96
  - of C. Iulius Demosthenes (Oenonanda), 85 n. 447, 97 n. 511, 101
  - of Diomedon (Cos), 45, 86–87, 111 n. 588, 376
  - of Epicteta (Thera), 45, 86–87, 110
  - of Eumenes (Delphi), 84, 96
  - of Hegesarete (Minoa), 85, 109
  - of Hermias (Ilium), 85–86, 109
  - of Hierokles (Iasus), 85 n. 449
  - of Kritolaos (Aigiale), 85, 100, 379
  - of Phainippos (Iasus), 85 n. 449
  - of Phanomachos (Cos), 86
  - of Posidonius (Halicarnassus), 45, 86–87
  - of Pythokles (Cos), 45, 84
  - of Teleutias (Cos), 86
  - of Xenophon (Skillous), 83
  - private, 83–86 (public cult), 86–87 (family cult)
  - priesthoods in, 45
  - state, 82–83
- daily service, 74–75
- Damophon of Messene, 217–218
- dead, cult of, 372–373, 379. *See also* cult, funerary
  - corpus of sacred law and, xii, 8, 75
- death
  - polluting, 76, 208; cf. 216 n. 6
- decrees
  - cult associations and, 88
  - festivals and, 94
  - as law, 43
  - priesthood regulations and, 41
  - sales of priesthoods and, 49–52
  - sanctuary management and, 14
- dedications, 31–33; cf. 89, 91
  - compulsory, 31–32
  - damage to, 32
  - of documents, 173 n. 12
  - of miniature wheels, 232–233
  - placement of, 31
  - protection of, 31
  - reuse of, 32–33
- deer

- sacri ce, 395  
 statue of, 99 n. 517  
 Delos, sanctuary of Apollo, 22–24;  
   cf. 58  
   altar of Dionysus, 28–29  
   horn altar, 33, 273  
 Delphi, sanctuary of Apollo, 13, 28,  
   33, 39  
   eviction of Gauls from, 7  
   festival foundation at, 84, 96  
   Pythian games, 94, 104; cf. 39  
 Demeter  
   Coan priestesses of, 42  
   Kore and, 7–8, 106–107; (at  
     Elaea); 38–39 (at Tanagra);  
     163–164 (torches); 165 (and  
     Plouton); 332 (as the Mothers);  
     333 (sacri cial pits)  
   pigs and, 163  
   pregnant victims and, 142–143  
   Prerosia and, 126–127  
   Thesmophoros, 162–163  
   at Thorikos, 134  
*demiourgos*, 292; cf. 202 n. 34  
 Demosthenia, 85 n. 447, 97 n. 511,  
   101  
 Despoina  
   sanctuary at Lycosura, 16–17,  
     217–218  
*diagramma*, 105, 111  
*diagraphē*, 50, 291, 391  
 Diasia, 141–142  
 dining. *See also* banquet; *hestiatorion*  
   at sanctuaries, 25 n. 110, 30  
 Dionysia  
   rural, 137–138  
 Dionysiastai, 87  
 Dionysus  
   Bacchus, sanctuary at Cnidus, 26  
   festival at Eretria, 96, 110  
   goats and, 139–140; cf. 57  
   Lindus and, 108  
   sanctuary at Tralles, 21  
 doctor  
   Hero. *See* Hero Doctor  
   public, 71  
 dogs  
   birth of, 209  
   miscarriage of, 210  
   sacri ce, 80  
 donkeys  
   miscarriage of, 210  
 doves. *See* pigeons  
 drought  
   sacri ce during, 70  
 dream  
   regulations revealed in, 89  
   incubation and, 246  
 ears. *See* victim  
 Echelos and Heroines  
   *orgeones* of, 89  
 Egretes  
   sanctuary and *orgeones* of, 40, 88  
 Eileithyia, 306–307, 309, 315  
*eiresione*, 369  
 Eisiteria, 107–108, 357  
*elasteroi*, 380–383, 385, 386, 387  
 Eleusis  
   cult of Heracles at, 156–158  
   mysteries, 95 (truce); 96 (proces-  
     sion); 103–104, 109 (dossier)  
   Sacred Orgas, 39  
 Eleutherna  
   pantheon of, 330  
 Entella  
   bronze tablets of, 315  
 Enyalios, 80  
 ephebes  
   battle of Marathon and, 173  
 Epidauria, 163  
 Epidauros. *See* Asclepius, sanctuary  
   at Epidauros  
 epiphany  
   of Artemis, 107  
 eponymic title  
   sale of, 48 n. 236, 51 n. 257  
*eranistai*, 89, 181–182  
*eranos*, 181–182, 187  
 Erinyes, 370, 381, 383  
 Eros  
   festival of, 93  
 Eumeneia 84, 96  
 Eumenides, 370



- Euthydamos (Selinus), 367  
 Euthydemus of Eleusis (priest of Asclepius), 63 64  
   family of 156  
*euthynai*, 124, 147 148  
*exegetai*, 42 (Cos), 111 n. 589 (Athens)  
*exetastai*, 260, 295
- fees  
   sacri cial, 72. *See also* tariffs
- festivals, 90 111  
   agonistic, 84 85, 91 93, 101 102  
   Athenian, 104 105  
   attestations, 103 nn. 538 540  
   calendars. *See* calendar  
   commemorative, 106 107  
   documents, 93 94, 106 110  
     (publication)  
   modi cations to, 109 110  
   new, 106, 351  
   Panhellenic, 104  
   re nancing of, 108 109  
   "religious" vs. "non-religious," 8 n. 22  
   revival, 107 108  
   sacri cial calendars and, 68  
 nes. *See* penalties
- rst fruits  
   offerings, 83, 166 168, 377
- sh  
   sacred, 29 30  
   sacri ce, 87; cf. 111 n. 588
- food  
   hospitality and, 383  
   polluting, 211  
   in puri cation of homicides, 383 384
- Flavii of Sounion, 183
- foreigners  
   excluded from sanctuaries, 19  
   excluded from cult performance, 66  
 foundations. *See* cult foundations
- fountain houses. *See* sanctuaries
- funerals. *See also* law, funerary  
   of members of a *thiasos*, 89
- future tense  
   in contracts and leases, 49  
   in sacred laws, 5 6  
   in sales of priesthoods, 49
- Galato, 48
- GAL.GEsTIN, 201
- gene*, 89 90; cf. 44 45, 67 68
- goat  
   Apollo and, 273  
   Dionysus and, 139 140; cf. 57  
   kid sacri ce, 80  
   polluting, 211  
   sacri ce, 57 58 (prohibited); cf. 223  
   trees and, 27 n. 121  
   white, 353, 354
- groves. *See* trees and vegetation
- gymnasium  
   calendar, 69  
   foundations bene ting, 85 n. 449  
   religion, 261 263, 264 268 pas-sim; cf. 270
- Hades. *See* Plouton
- hare  
   sacri ce, 59; cf. 223
- ḥaṭṭat* (חַטָּאת), 276 n. 28
- Hauronas, 58
- Hecate  
   Artemis-Hecate, 306  
   in Attica, 129  
   aversion to incense, 73  
   sacri cial pits and, 333 n. 14  
   at Stratonicea, 74 75, 108  
   torches and, 163 164
- Hephaestia, 109 110
- Hera  
   at Argos, 202 203; cf. 315  
   Eileithyia and, 306 307, 309, 315  
   Epilimnia, 58  
   Hieros Gamos and, 138 139  
   sanctuary at Arkesine, 25, 26  
   sanctuary at Samos. *See* Samos  
   at Tiryns, 202 203
- Heracles  
   in the Argolid, 204

- boar sacri ce to, 188  
 at Cynosarges, 157; cf. 200  
 Diomedonteios, 86  
 at Eleusis, 156 158  
 festivals in Attica, 157 158  
 gymnasia and, 261  
 at Halasarna, 72 73  
 of Iamnia, 58  
 oracle at Hyettus, 240 241  
 priesthood of (Chios), 90  
 sanctuary near Ilissus (Athens), 29  
 Thasian, 58, 373  
*theo xenia* and, 204 n. 40  
 women and, 58  
 Heracliai tai 89  
   in the Marshes, 183 184  
 Hermaia 261 262  
   at Beroia, 263 268  
   at Chersonesus, 270  
 Hermes, 57, 309 n. 33  
   gymnasia and, 261 263  
 Hero Doctor  
   *orgeones* of, 40 n. 191  
   sanctuary of, 32  
 heroes, 87 (foundation of Epicteta)  
   ritual and, 372 374, 375, 379  
 heroization, 85; cf. 87  
*hestiatorion*, 13, 15  
*hetaira*, 212  
*hieromnemes*  
   in the Argolid, 202 203  
   at Nakone, 353  
*hieropoioi*, 265 266  
 Hieros Gamos, 138 139  
*hikesioi*, 78, 79, 279 280, 283 284,  
   380 381, 383 384  
 homicide  
   barred from sanctuaries, 210 211,  
   386 n. 129  
   puri cation of, 79, 279 282, 283  
   284, 380 387  
 Homonoeca, 354 355  
   at Antiochia ad Pyramum, 11,  
   106, 351  
   at Nakone, 354 355  
 honey,  
   libations of, 375, 382  
 hospitality, 383 384  
 house  
   sacred, 37, 80, 90, 379  
 Hygieia. *See* Asclepius  
 hymns, 74 75  
 Iacchus, 169 170  
 Ilieia, 86  
 imperative mood, 5 6, 49  
 impiety, 77  
 imprecations, 22, 24, 30, 76, 100, 344  
 incense, 73, 74  
 incubation, 10, 16 17, 245, 246 247;  
   cf. 339  
   at Oropus, 221 n. 4  
   payment for, 247  
   preliminary sacri ces, 60 64  
   thanksgiving sacri ce after, 63 n.  
   312, 64 65  
 in nitive mood, 6 5, 49  
 inspection. *See* victims  
 inventories. *See* temples  
 Iobacchi, 89, 181, 184  
 Isis  
   in Arcadia, 208  
   ritual begging for, 44  
 Isthmian games, 104  
 Jerusalem  
   temple, 6, 19 20, 169, 276 n. 28,  
   375; cf. 333 334  
 jewelry  
   banned in sanctuaries, 16, 172  
 Kalamaia, 128  
 Kodros, Neleus, and Basile 39  
 Kore. *See* Demeter  
*kosmoi*, 102  
 Kotyto, 369  
 Kotytia, 369 370  
 Kourotrophos, 134; cf. 80  
 lamentations, 76  
 law 10, 11  
   ancestral, 54  
   ancient, 11  
   codes, 78, 283 284 (arrangement of)

- decree with force, of 43  
 funerary, 75 77  
 sacred. *See* sacred law
- leases  
 as sacred laws, 39, 40  
 future tense in, 49
- leasing  
 of sacred property, 39 40, 290; cf. 189 190  
 of a priesthood, 48 n. 236
- leg. *See* victim
- lehem hapanim* (לֶחֶם הַפָּנִים), 334
- Leto  
 in Attica, 144  
 at Olymus, 38  
 sanctuary at Xanthus, 16, 26; 46, 82 83 (trilingual stele)
- Leucophryena, 107
- libation, 73, 311 312, 319, 321 n. 20, 372 373, 375; cf. 201  
 banquet, 320 n. 9
- loans  
 in cult associations, 183; cf. 184 185, 186
- Lycosura. *See* Despoina
- magistrates  
 in processions, 96, 98  
 sacri cial prerogatives, 237
- Magnesia on the Maeander  
 festivals of Artemis, 107 108  
 festival of Zeus Sosipolis, 97 99, 106
- magnet, 240 241
- makeup  
 entry into sanctuaries and, 16; cf. 172
- manure, 28, 40
- Marathon  
 battle and ephebes, 173  
 cave of Pan at, 172 173
- marriage, 138 139, 306 307, 309; cf. 87 n. 461, 371
- meat of sacri cial victims  
 consumption of, 100, 266 267; 274 276, 310 311 (on-the-spot)  
 cooking of, 169, 222, 236 237, 267
- destruction of, 168, 236 237, 313  
 distribution of, 71, 72 73, 100, 266 267; cf. 185, 354  
 division of, 266 267, 310  
 entitlement to, 72  
 sale of, 71 72, 129 130
- Meilichios. *See* Zeus
- Men, 11 13
- menstruation  
 polluting, 210
- Metroia, 85
- minḥah* (מִנְחָה), 334
- miscarriage  
 polluting, 209 210
- Moirai, 73, 86
- molpoi*, 102
- Mother, 83, 85, 86  
 orgeones of, 53 54, 89
- Mothers, 332
- Mounichia, 143
- mourning, 76
- Mouseia, 235
- mouseion*, 87
- Muses, 87
- music  
 at sacri ces, 170
- Myconos  
 calendar of, 66 67. *See also* *Source Index under LSCG 96*
- Myskos, 367
- Mysteries. *See also* Andania; Eleusis; Despoina; Samothrace  
 attestations, 103 n. 539  
 regulations concerning, 16 17; cf. 22 n. n. 99
- Nakone, 351, 352 353, 354 355
- Neanias, 137
- Nemean games, 104
- neokoros*, 53
- neopoiai*, 292 293
- Nisus, 145 146
- Nymphs, 29, 80; cf. 331
- oath, 73 74  
 victims, 131
- Oinisteria, 157

- Olympian gods  
 chthonian deities and, 140 141  
 heroes and, 372, 375  
 Olympic games, 104  
 torch race (modern), 265 n. 25  
 truce, 369 370  
 oracles  
 as sacred laws, 35 n. 162; cf. 47,  
 70, 77 78, 81, 87  
 temple construction and, 36 38  
*passim*  
 Orgas. *See* Eleusis, Sacred Orgas  
*orgeones*, 40, 53 54, 88 89. *See also*  
 Bendis; Mother; Ergetes; Hero  
 Doctor; Echelos and Heroines  
  
*paian*, 57 n. 284, 65  
 Pambocotia, 232, 234  
 Pan  
 cave at Marathon, 172 173  
 cult in Attica, 172 173  
*parasitoi*, 157, 200  
 Panathenaea 104  
 Lesser, 99, 100, 108 109  
*panegyris*, 109  
 Passover  
 sacri ce, 164 n. 16 (Samaritan),  
 276 n. 28  
 pasture  
 sanctuaries and, 27 28  
 Peitho, 58 59  
 Pelargikon, 36, 39  
 penalties, 22 30 *passim*, 40, 76, 77; cf.  
 342 343  
 peplos. *See* Athena  
*perirhanteria*  
 sanctuaries and, 207; cf. 27  
 Perseus  
*heroon* at Mycenae, 202 203 n. 34  
 Philonis, 144 145  
 phratries, 89 90  
 Demotionidai (Athens), 89 90  
 Klytidai (Chios), 37, 90  
 Labyadai (Delphi), 76, 90  
 Phrearrhioi, 162 163  
 pigs  
 Demeter and, 163  
 piglet sacri ce *en masse*, 66; cf. 134  
 polluting, 211; cf. 15  
 pregnant sow, 142 143  
 puri cation and piglets, 281, 380  
 n. 92, 384  
 sacri ce, 57 58 (prohibited), 133  
 pigeons  
 sacred to Aphrodite, 29  
 sacri ce, 39  
 piglets. *See* pigs  
 Plouton, 165  
 Plynteria, 146; cf. 263 n. 45  
*poletai*, 282 283  
 pollution, 76, 77 79. *See also* puri ca-  
 tion; purity  
*pophanon*, 61 64, 334  
 Poseidon  
 of Ascalon, 58  
 at Calauria, 83 84  
*praktor*, 186 187, 260  
 Praxiergidai, 44 45  
 present indicative, 5 6  
 priesthoods, 40 53. *See also* priests  
 allotted, 47 48  
 changes in mode of acquisition,  
 46, 47, 50 51  
 comprehensive regulations, 41 42  
 of consul Drusus, 182 183  
 elected, 46 47  
 entitlement to, 72 73  
 lease of, 48 n. 236  
 hereditary, 44 46  
 publication of regulations, 42 43,  
 44 45, 46  
 sale of. *See* sale of priesthoods  
 speci c regulations, 42 44  
 term of office, 46, 49  
 types of, 40 42  
 priests. *See also* priesthoods  
 apparel, 45, 48  
 cakes and, 334 335  
 catalogs of, 53  
 death of, 48  
 exemptions, 41, 45, 48, 301  
 expert, 47  
 puri cation of a homicide and,  
 281 282, 387

- purity and (Cos), 42; cf. 78  
 rights and duties, 41, 45, 48, 300;  
     cf. 11  
 salary, 47; cf. 52 53, 82, 302  
 sacri cial prerogatives, 42 44,  
     45, 52, 185, 305, 308, 309  
     310, 312 313, 320 321; cf. 89  
     (Greek); 164 n. 16 (Samaritan);  
     314 315 (Israelite)  
 prizes, 101 102; cf. 263 264  
 procession, 84, 91 92, 96 98, 99  
     100, 226  
 Proerosia, 126 128  
 Psythyros, 59  
 Ptoia, 94 95, 101, 230 233  
 Ptoios (hero), 230 233  
 puri cation, 77 79  
     after death, 76  
     entry into sanctuaries and, 76,  
         207 211  
     of a homicide. *See* homicide  
     sanctuaries and, 16, 42, 77, 79  
     use of blood in, 281; cf. 380 n. 92,  
         384  
     *See also* pollution; purity  
 purity. *See also* pollution; puri cation  
     moral conduct and, 89  
     priests and, 42  
     sanctuaries and, 14 16, 207 208  
     spiritual, 17 18  
 Pyanopsia, 136, 148, 369  
 Pythian games. *See* Delphi  
 Pythokleia, 84  
  
 Rab-shakeh (רַב־שָׁקֵה), 201  
 Rhodes  
     calendar extracts, 69 70, 272  
     synoecism, 69 70, 274  
     tribes, 274  
 ritual begging. *See* collections  
 rituals  
     prescriptions for. *See* sacred law,  
         prescribing rituals  
 Roma, 106 107; cf. 7 8  
 ruler cult  
     corpus of sacred law and, xii, 8,  
         84 n. 444  
     sales of priesthoods in, 48 n. 236  
 Sabbatistai, 89  
 sacred law (Greek)  
     common practice and, 55 56, 73,  
         75, 79, 99, 111, 364, 373 374  
     corpus of, 3 4  
     de ned, 4 9  
     exclusions from corpus, of xii,  
         7 8  
     formation of, 61, 63  
     *hieros nomos*, 4, 22, 42, 92, 295  
     laconicity of, 54, 68, 79  
     leases as. *See* leases  
     limitation of, 56, 68, 92 93, 103  
         106, 110 112  
     nature of, 54 56, 111; cf. 12  
     oracles as. *See* oracles  
     prescribing rituals, 54, 66 67, 364  
     prohibitive, 58  
     publications of, 43, 68  
     retroactive, 32, 33, 37  
     sources for, 111, 173; cf. 174  
     verbal moods and tenses used in,  
         5 6  
     in verse, 17 18; cf. 70 n. 357  
 sacri ce, 55 73; cf. 12, 307, 320 321,  
     339, 342 343, 353, 354, 368, 379  
     380, 384 *See also* banquet; cakes;  
     dining; meat; *sphagia*; victim  
     absence of a priest, 340  
     accessories to, 321, 354  
     barley in, 307 308  
     baskets used in, 307 308  
     classi cation of, 5  
     communion, 276 n. 28  
     compulsory, 71  
     divine share in, 166 168, 222 n.  
         6, 265 (n. 28), 320 n. 11, 321 n.  
         21, 374 375  
     dependent, 60 65  
     during drought, 70  
     eaten vs. destroyed, 66  
     exclusion from, 76 77  
     extraordinary, 7 8  
     at festivals, 98 100  
     heroic, 85, 373 374

- Homeric vs. Classical, 236 237 n. 49  
 Israelite, 276 n. 28, 314 315, 334 335, 394 395  
 joint, 233  
 libation accessory to, 73  
 lists of, 68 n. 341, 80  
 officiants in, 274, 374  
 partaking in, 378  
 periodic, 65 71  
 in pits, 333  
 preliminary, 60 64  
 prerogatives from: civic officials 237; cult personnel: 54, 71, 72; priests: 42 44, 52 53, 57, 164 165, 315; cf. 89, 221 222, 266 267, 305, 308, 309 310, 312 313, 320 321  
 cf. 307, 320 321, 339, 342 343, 353, 354, 368, 379 380, 384  
 Punic, 393 396  
 regulations for, 55 56  
 Samaritan, 164 n. 16  
 statues and, 83, 84, 85, 379  
 table offerings. *See* table  
 thanksgiving, 63 n. 312, 64 65  
 unacceptable, 12  
 uncustomary, 78 79  
 undated, 56 65  
 sacrilege, 208, 268; cf. 58  
 sale of priesthoods, 48 53, 135, 300  
 attestations, 48 n. 236  
*diagraphai*, 50  
 documents associated with, 49 51  
 future tense in, 49  
 lists of, 53  
 transition to and from, 47, 49, 50 51  
 salt  
 token of hospitality, 383  
 purification and, 387  
 Samaritans  
 Passover sacrifice, 164 n. 16  
 Samos  
 calendar, 292  
 Heraion, 13, 29, 40, 291 292  
 Samothrace, 19  
 sanctuaries, 9 40  
 accommodation of visitors, 13  
 asylum and. *See* asylum  
 boundaries of, 22 23, 36, 39  
 burial in, 22  
 construction and, 33, 36 39, 86  
 dedications in, 31 32  
 dining in, 25 n. 110  
 dumping and, 28  
 documents associated with, 9 10, 13 14  
 entry into, 14 21, 172  
 re and, 25  
 founding of, 33, 34 36  
 fountain houses at, 6 7, 38  
 implements belonging to, 30  
 items forbidden in, 16 17; cf. 172  
 leasing of, 39 40; cf. 189 190  
 lodging in, 26  
 maintenance of, 39  
 management of, 9 13, 291  
 pasture and, 27 28  
 protection of, 21 30  
 purification of, 79. *See also* purification, sanctuaries and  
 purity rules for entry, 14 18, 207 208; cf. 216  
 relocation (Tanagra), 37 38  
 repair, 38 39; cf. 46  
 retail trade in, 290 291  
 treasury boxes. *See thesauros*  
 trees in, 26 27  
 water sources, 29  
*šlamim* (שְׁלָמִים), 276 n. 28, 315 n. 71  
 sexual intercourse  
 polluting, 212 213  
 in sanctuaries, 212 n. 52  
 sheep  
 polluting, 211; cf. 15  
 sacrifice prohibited, 57  
 trees and, 27 n. 121  
 Shiloh, 314  
 shower  
 purification and, 212  
 skin. *See* victim  
 slaves  
 refuge at sanctuaries, 293 294

- dedication of, 35, 86
- emancipation, 82–83; cf. 11
- sacred, 295–296; cf. 45
- snakes
  - and Zeus Meilichios, 370
- snout. *See* victim
- Soadeni, 93
- soldiers
  - taxation of, 80
- sow. *See* pigs
- space
  - sacred. *See* sanctuaries
- sphagia*, 379–380; cf. 74
- sprinkling
  - lustral, 207, 212; cf. 387
- splanchna*, 236–237, 320–321
- splanchnoptes*, 236
- statues. *See also xoana*
  - construction, 37; cf. 38
  - cult, 37
  - cult foundations and, 83–84, 85, 86–87
  - deer, 99 n. 517
  - group at Lycosura, 217–218
  - repair of (Athena Nike), 38
  - reuse, of 33
  - seated, 39
  - sacri ce in front of, 83–84, 85, 379
- stoas
  - protection of, 25 n. 110
- subscriptions, 38
- suppliants, 279–281, 281–282, 283–284, 293–294. *See also hikesioi*
- synoecism
  - calendars and, 67
  - of Cos, 67
  - of Myconos, 67
  - of Rhodes, 69–70, 274
- table
  - cult, 133, 204, 221, 320, 373
- tamim* (תמים), 129
- tariffs
  - Greek sacri cial, 59–60, 222, 393–394
  - pelanos*, 59 n. 297
  - Punic sacri cial, 60, 391, 393–394
  - Roman sacri cial, 60
- tax
  - cultic, 13, 80
  - emancipations and, 81–82
  - exemption for priests, 41, 45, 48, 301
- temples
  - construction of, 33, 36–37; cf. 47
  - inventories, 30
  - opening of, 21, 28, 74
- Thargelia, 104, 369
- Theogenes, 59
- theoroi*, 13
  - Passage of the (Thasos), 57
- theoxenia*, 97, 204 n. 40, 375–376
- thesauros*, 6–7, 59, 222, 393–394
  - construction of, 38; cf. 52
- Thesmophoria, 76 (Gambreion); 102, 104, 162–163, 333 (Athens)
- Thesmophorion, 11, 12 (Piraeus); 163 n. 11 (Thasos)
- thiasos*, 89; cf. 182
- thiasotai*, 89
- thigh. *See* victim
- Tiryns, 200, 202–203
- Thorikos (deme), 124, 133; cf. 134–135, 138
- thymelic competitions, 235 n. 38
- tongue. *See* victim
- torches, 163–164
- torch race, 84, 265
- trees. *See also* wood
  - sanctuaries and, 26–27, 78, 189; cf. 11, 22
- tripod, 222
- Tritopatores, 371–372
- Trophonius, 60
- Truce
  - sacred, 94–96; cf. 369–370
- Twelve Tables, 78 n. 406
- vegetation. *See* trees
- victim (sacri cial). *See also* meat; sacri ce
  - age of, 129, 140, 371, 395
  - attributes of, 56, 66, 123, 356–357

- brain of, 313
- branding, 99 100, 355 n. 41
- cheekbones of, 313
- choice of, 56, 57 58
- color of. *See* color
- cooked whole, 85 n. 448
- divided into nine parts, 373 374
- ears of, 164
- head of, 312 313; cf. 72; 165
- inner organs of. *See* *splanchna*
- inspection of, 99, 234, 355 356
- killing of, 308, 380
- legs of, 43 n. 209, 164, 221 222, 310; cf. 320
- meat of. *See* meat
- nourishment of, 97, 99 100
- pregnant, 142 143 cf. 163
- provision of, 99
- skin of, 71 72 (sale), 164 (priestly prerogative); cf. 29, 340
- shoulders of, 166 168
- slaughtering of, 379 380
- snout of, 313; cf. 72; 318
- thighs of, 164, 221 222, 310, 320
- tongue of, 43 n. 209, 310, 312 313
- uncastrated, 273
- uncustomary, 78 79
- Cf. 301 302, 308, 355, 386
- water
  - healing sanctuaries and, 338
  - sanctuaries and, 29, 80
- weapons
  - barred from sanctuaries, 16
- wine. *See also* libation
  - regulations concerning, 73, 324 325
  - official titles and, 201
- women. *See also* abortion; childbirth; *hetaira*; menstruation; sexual intercourse
  - barred from sanctuaries, 18 19
  - cult performers, 102, 307; cf. 11, 51 52, 53 54
  - excluded from sacri ce, 58, 70
  - funerary laws and, 76 77
  - participation in sacri ce, 70; cf. 311
  - pollution and, 78, 208; cf. 16 n. 65
  - at Tanagra, 38
  - wood. *See also* trees
    - for sacri ce, 60, 169; cf. 13, 224
  - worshippers
    - priestly prerogatives and, 43; cf. 396
    - status in sacred laws, 43, 68, 79
- Xanthus (slave). *See* Men
- xoana*, 97 98, 376, 378
- zakoros*, 53 54
- Zeus
  - Athena and (Tiryns), 203
  - Chthonios, 165
  - Dictaian, 22
  - Elasteros, 73, 382
  - at Eleutherna, 330
  - Eubuleus, 165
  - Eumenes, 370
  - Hecate and (Stratonicea), 74 75, 108
  - Herkeios, 135
  - Hikesios and Theoi Patrooi, 35
  - household god, 135; cf. 130 131
  - of the Hyarbesytai, 31 32
  - Hytios 70
  - Hyperdexios 270
  - Karaios, 234
  - Kataibates, 21, 70, 130 131
  - Kathyperdexios, 270
  - leader of the Moirai, 73
  - Machaneus, 335
  - Meilichios, 370 371 cf. 5, 141 142, 367
  - Nemeios, 51
  - Ourios, 58
  - Patroos, 86
  - priesthood at Tlos, 46 47
  - Polieus, 42, 80, 132
  - Poliouchos, 331
  - sanctuary at Labraunda, 20
  - Sosipolis, 97 99, 106
  - Soter, 83 84 (Calauria; Cos)





## POSTSCRIPT

### SOME CORRECTIONS AND SECOND THOUGHTS

Immediately following the publication of NGSL, I found a number of errors that deserved correction. As time has gone by, I have found a few more mistakes to correct, though I have not looked for them systematically, and naturally have rethought (and will likely keep rethinking) some of my positions. I find it appropriate to make these corrections and second thoughts available here. It must be stressed that they by no means represent an attempt, let alone systematic, to supplement or update NGSL (which is impossible at this time).<sup>1</sup>

**P. XI n. 2:** Regarding *SEG XXXII* 86: Even with some uncertainties cleared up by autopsies (I personally carried out one in 1999), it remains questionable whether, even accepting it as a set of festival regulations, this text should be included in the corpus of Greek sacred laws. I note that comparable regulations (e.g. *SEG XVI* 55 or perhaps *IG I*<sup>3</sup> 3) have previously been excluded. The reasons were, possibly, the lack or paucity of information they add to our knowledge of cult practice (which may well be due to the fragmentary state of the documents),

---

<sup>1</sup> Where possible, emendations have been made in the text of the work itself. The present postscript omits occasional typographical errors, and I allow myself only one more footnote in addition to the present one. For comments and discussions I am grateful to Jan Mathieu Carbon, Kevin Clinton, Nora Dimitrova, Philip Forsythe, Catherine Keesling, and Adele Scafuro. I am likewise indebted to Jan Mathieu Carbon and Corpus Christi College Oxford for inviting me to deliver a talk entitled 'What is Greek About Greek Sacred Law?' given in March 2005; I am grateful to those who attended my talk for their comments, particularly to Beate Dignas, Sally Humphreys, Riet van Bremen, and Scott Scullion. Responsibility for errors that remain in the book – and errors, experience teaches, remain – rests, of course, with me. As for one possible error: J.M. Carbon tells me that *SEG XLVI* 1157, which forbids defecation by women, should be considered a sacred law. But the place where defecation is forbidden is not mentioned and, for my part, I would expect more compelling evidence that the findspot was a sanctuary or a sacred place of some sort before classifying this inscription as a sacred law. (Cf. in this respect quite probably *CIRB* 939, which evidently forbids defecating in a sanctuary and is therefore a likely candidate for inclusion in the corpus, despite being omitted by Sokolowski. Cf. also *SB I* 4531–4532, which have so far been excluded from the corpus, perhaps because they seem to be borderline cases between curses and regulations.)

or because the events regulated were not considered to be primarily of religious meaning (always a tricky matter in my mind). Whether exclusion is justified in such cases is a considerably complex question, which the editors of a new corpus will have to address, as they sift through the evidence.

### **Part I, first section: The Corpus of Greek Sacred Laws**

I realize that my attempt to explain which documents have ordinarily been included in the corpus of Greek sacred laws, and that are therefore termed sacred laws, could be stated more concisely (I attempted to explain after-the-fact principles employed by others who had accounted for their own methods laconically, if at all). Put more loosely (and at the risk of oversimplification), the main points are as follows:<sup>2</sup>

1. Although ancient precedents should not be underestimated, the corpus as we have it is by and large a modern construct.

2. The documents included in the corpus can be said very generally to fall into two main groups (cf. Parker (above n. 2); in a sense, this division is already noticeable in Protts brief introduction to *LGS I*):

- i. Actual legislative acts, above all by states, formally speaking, mostly in the form of decrees. These legislative acts may deal with whatever realm of religious activity the legislators wished to regulate: the management of sanctuaries, the function of cult officials, and issues relating to festivals, appearing to be most prevalent.
- ii. Documents that are perhaps the first to be associated with the term sacred law, putting forth rules governing cult activity and religious customs (regarding, e.g. sacrificial performance or maintaining the ritual integrity of sacred spaces). Formally, using the term law for such documents is a bit of a stretch: from whatever source they may emanate, they do not necessarily represent actual legislation; νόμος is not entirely inappropriate in this respect (suggesting by no means that all documents of this sort were referred to as such in antiquity). Although this trait may make them appear

---

<sup>2</sup> The definition of Greek sacred law was discussed at about the same time as the publication of my book or shortly thereafter in two important articles by Robert Parker (What are sacred laws?, in E.M. Harris and L. Rubinstein (eds.), *The Law and the Courts in Ancient Greece*, London 2004, pp. 57–70; Law and Religion, in M. Gagarin and D. Cohen, (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law*, Cambridge 2005, pp. 61–81). I have attempted to take Parker's discussions into account here. I seem to share basic agreement with him, differing in some specific points.

to be deficient in authority, I doubt that they were necessarily viewed as mere suggestions: at least where transgression was possible, its potential results, if nothing else, could be an incentive for would-be transgressors to contemplate the consequences of their actions.

These groupings should, however, be treated with caution for several reasons. It is possible to note a few examples where the two groups may intermix (cf. Parker (above n. 2)): documents seemingly falling into the second group could be determined to be official even when minimal or no official formulation is evident, while actual legislative acts may regulate the performance of cult or prescribe religious customs; occasionally both official and non-official documents may employ imprecations as a means (or additional means) of enforcement; documents under discussion may emanate from sources other than states, and when these are private individuals or organizations, their authority is naturally limited; some documents may involve official endorsement of private initiatives; a single document might deal with more than one main subject. The result may seem to border upon a formal mayhem. But documents which have found their way into the modern corpus, and are thus referred to for better or worse as sacred laws (and calling them *leges sacrae* neither changes nor improves the situation) do share in common at the very least two basic traits: (1) their subject matter and (2) the way in which it is handled: they are by and large prescriptive, whether they represent formal legislation or not.

Further qualification is needed, and as I have pointed out (**p. 9, 2nd paragraph, lines 12–13**) much in the evidence deserves clear-cut classification. This is of course not an inherent characteristic of all the documents assembled in the corpus of Greek sacred laws. I think it should be sufficiently clear from my review of the contents of the corpus that classes of documents emerge (and these may even have sometimes been in the minds of the promulgators). And yet, though it would naturally follow the internal rules of given forms (such as decrees), the context under which a document is promulgated, the authority it relies upon, its purpose or function largely determine the range of issues it attempts to address and determine its character, not just a need to conform to a specific class of sacred laws, let alone to a theoretical model. I therefore personally do not see any reason to brush aside this trait. Admittedly, the issue deserves further discussion. Part I, however, did not mean to set in stone classes of documents (and I am not sure

that complete agreement regarding such classes is realistic) but aimed at a general review of the evidence, aiming at making the contents of the corpus of Greek sacred laws more accessible to the general classicist.

**Pp. 5–6:** Regarding language, it goes without saying that besides these general observations, the documents may express rules and particularly prohibitions in a variety of ways.

**P. 7, 7<sup>th</sup> line from bottom:** (regarding *Iscr.Cos* ED 5 *SEG* XXXIII 675): *inter alios*: it seems that more gods have been mentioned in the lacuna in line 14 (including the one(s) restored at the end and the beginning of line 15).

**P. 9: last paragraph:** Though this should be clear enough from the opening sentence and even more so from the introductions to the various subsections, perhaps a general statement is due here that most documents discussed in this section deal *mutatis mutandis* and in the most general sense with aspects of *management* or *administration* of sanctuaries and sacred spaces, perhaps above all, but not only, with maintaining and protecting their ritual integrity (or purity) and physical integrity.

Comprehensive vs. *speci c* documents: It is worth emphasizing that the terms *comprehensive* and *speci c*, as used in my general review of the contents of the corpus, do not relate to any innate differences between the documents under discussion save their scope. It goes without saying that the circumstances under which documents of each group are issued can be similar.

**Pp. 9–10:** The fact that *LSCG* 69 does not quite refer to itself by a *speci c* term should not preclude referring to it as a law.

**P. 11, 2nd paragraph:** Ensuring the rights of the priestess is probably not the sole motivation behind prohibiting activities in her absence in *LSCG* 36.

**P. 12, lines 3–4:** Strictly speaking, only not *sacri cing* in the presence of the founder will result in the *sacri ce* not being accepted, not violations of all the rules in *LSCG* 55.

**Pp. 14–15:** *LSCG* 136: in reference to the following law the decree mentions laws regarding the subject matter. Penalties are to be published with the decree and the law. *Πρόβατα* (cattle/herds, not necessarily sheep) may be barred merely to prevent grazing rather than pollution.

**P. 21, 2nd paragraph:** regarding *SEG* XXXIX 1290, in retrospect I doubt that this document belongs in the corpus of Greek sacred laws (more than e.g. *SEG* XLIV 1227 does).

**P. 22, 1st paragraph: regarding *LSAM* 83:** burial or, literally, holding funerary rites. For burial (cf. n. 99) see the new document from Paros, *SEG* LI 1071 (I leave the question of whether this inscription should be included in the corpus of Greek sacred laws or excluded (as *IG* XII 3.87) to the future editors of the corpus).

**P. 27, 1st paragraph: *LSCG* 84:** the punishment clauses are partially restored.

**P. 27, line 11:** upon entry: my addition.

**Pp. 27–28:** The discussion of *LSCG* 67 is somewhat confusing. See *IPark* 2 for a discussion.

**P. 28, 2nd paragraph:** While in some cases manure or dung are probably the correct terms for *kopros*, where regulations prohibit dumping it on sanctuary grounds, these terms may be too specific, since the origin of the *kopros* could be both animals and humans. Cf. above note 1.

Regarding the Delian document, I assume that purification has taken place at the specified location from the reference to it as καθαρθέντα (line 6).

**P. 32, 2nd paragraph (the melting of dedications):** Regarding the appended lists (missing in Sokolowski), the list is different in *LSCG* 42 (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 840.38–43; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 841–842 are among the documents that have not made it into the corpus, doubtless due to their fragmentary state).

**P. 34:** To make my point relating to the oracular responses regarding the cult of Archilochus more clear: oracles that do not prescribe rules directly, but rather include reports of divine pronouncements indirectly (so and so asked the god answered that É ), have for the most part been excluded from the corpus. I would prefer to keep this state of things as it stands and include oracles as long as they are directly prescriptive. Prescriptive documents that base their prescriptions upon oracular pronouncements or those that cite oracular prescriptions directly should not, of course, be excluded. I would likewise prefer not to see in the corpus narratives relating to the performance of cult such as ones which may appear in certain honorific decrees. This is by no means to underestimate the value of such pieces of evidence as *testimonies* for the study of cult activity; but *testimonies* is exactly what they are and in my mind the corpus should not include testimonies. One might argue that all oracles are by nature prescriptive and that the question whether, when published, the prescriptions are expressed directly or indirectly is immaterial. I wonder whether this

can be proved beyond doubt in all cases: it remains possible for oracles, when not given formal legal recognition, to be published for other reasons, commemoration or documentation being just two possibilities. The matter is admittedly complex, and one, as usual, must try to examine the context of the publication – regrettably all too often unknown. Individual cases deserve specific consideration. The document in question, I note again, is a borderline case, and its inclusion in *LSCG* (rather than in *LSS*, where one would rather expect to see it considering the date of the first edition), seems to have been an afterthought on Sokolowski's part.

**Pp. 37–38:** Regarding *LSCG* 72, the discussion may seem a bit haphazard and it would have been better to remain less precise about the date (see cross-reference in *SEG* XLIII 212 for dating problems).

**P. 39, last paragraph:** Regarding *LSCG* 14, the sanctuary (? *hieron*) is to be enclosed and precinct (*temenos*) leased; while the *basileus* is very instrumental in the proceedings, marking the boundaries is of course the province of the *horistai*. The use of the rent is actually not quite stated. Matters pertaining to irrigation: water use.

**Ibid.:** The sweeping initiative affected the general care of sacred lands (or sanctuaries), not necessarily just their boundaries.

**P. 42, 1st paragraph:** For *LSCG* 154 see S. Sherwin-White, *Ancient Cos*, pp. 305–306 with n. 142.

**P. 45, 2nd paragraph:** Regarding *LSAM* 13, I note that the text mentions specifically Asclepiades and the descendants of Asclepiades (the point evidently still being granting the priesthood to the descendants of Archias).

**P. 49, n. 238:** The sale in *LSAM* 49 is for three years and eight months.

**P. 49 n. 242:** I note again that the future may be used not only in sales of priesthoods. Cf. *LSAM* 78; cf. also *LSAM* 36.

**P. 52:** *LSAM* 73, translation: distributed with or: on.

**P. 52 n. 263 (cf. p. 299 n. 19):** Regarding ἱερῶσυνα and ἱερῶσύνη, see Puttkammer 1912 p. 2.

**P. 56:** It cannot be overstressed that statements regarding the classification of documents involve generalizations – a necessary evil unto themselves (cf. *inter alia* dependent sacrifices, p. 60). Almost by necessity the study of individual documents may leave room for modifications (an obvious example is *LSS* 63: p. 58).

I hope that it goes without saying that a statement that *x* or *y* is religiously, or better, ritually desirable, does not necessarily entail a wholesale definition but may depend upon context.

**P. 59, 1st paragraph:** My account of *LSS* 86 seems to follow Sokolowski's commentary too closely. If *Psythiros* is an oracular deity, I assume that sacrifice would be offered in connection with consultation, but this is not necessarily the case.

**P. 60, last paragraph:** Regarding *Trophonius* and his fee, much has been done to attempt to make sense of the difficult text of *LSCG* 74; various solutions have been offered. I have followed what seems to be the simplest one, which is, nevertheless, not foolproof.

**P. 64 n. 320:** Regarding *LSS* 11, the exact sense of ἐξηγέομαι here (direct, prescribe, interpret, report, expound?) is difficult, as is the relationship between the sacrifices mentioned.

**Pp. 65–70:** It goes without saying that the amount of detail in calendars may *inter alia* have something to do with the complexity of the rituals involved.

**P. 65: 2nd paragraph:** *LSAM* 39 can only partially be referred to as a calendar (cf. Sokolowski's commentary).

**Ibid. n. 325 end:** Prott's inference is logical but may be at odds with the physical features of the stone.

**P. 66 with note 331:** Regarding *Corinth* VIII, i, 1: In retrospect, my comments on the kappa and iota are not necessarily relevant. Other editors spent more time with the stone and early squeezes, and the inscribed surface could have deteriorated over time. The iota should therefore be dotted, not put in square brackets, or at least a dot should be placed in its stead.

**P. 67, 3rd paragraph:** my discussion of *LSS* 16.81–84 seems somewhat oversimplifying. The inscription requires to inscribe the sacrifices though not explicitly the prices of victims and incidentals which are recorded in the calendar. On the other hand, it specifically requires to record the τιμαί (fees, stipends, allowances vel sim.) of the priests which (Ferguson 1938: 56, 64) have already been specified.

**P. 68 n. 341:** The requirement to sacrifice pregnant animals may be viewed as financial rather than religious due to the price of the animals.

**P. 75: 2nd paragraph:** Regarding burial, cf. above note on p. 22.

**P. 76, 1st paragraph, 4<sup>th</sup> line from the bottom:** funerary paraphernalia or, with Rougemont's *CID* I Addenda et Corrigenda p. 158, funerals. The one mentioned affects the first clause.

**P. 80 2nd paragraph:** Cultic Expenses: Regarding *LSS* 2 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 232), the *IG* text should have been used for references; inter alia, what divine names are fully restored may be questionable (except for *Zeus Polieus*). *LSS* 1 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 231) should have been discussed here as well (perhaps more



naturally than with the Eleusinian dossier on p. 104). At least in form, such documents may remind one of some Linear B texts.

**P. 81, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph:** Whether *LSAM* 47 was passed after the oracular consultation depends on the (reasonable) restoration of the last line.

**Pp. 82–83:** State Foundations: The first two sentences of this subsection constitute an unnecessarily confusing deviation from foundation as discussed in the previous introductory paragraph. Considering this, these two sentences (and the remark on state foundations in the previous paragraph) should be virtually ignored. It would probably have been better to treat here only the Xanthus document perhaps not quite a full-fledged foundation but a likely precursor, and change the title of the subsection (A Public Precursor or the like?). Perhaps the document could have also been discussed with other early foundations. One might alternatively argue that it could have been handled with foundations of sanctuaries. As for *LSS* 6, it would have been better discussed elsewhere, probably, at least in its fragmentary state, in the section on re-nancing of festivals (pp. 108–109). I note that my no. 2 could possibly have been mentioned therein. I should add that I decided to include this inseparable pair of two decrees in *NGSL* because funding the cult, and specifically the festival of Heracles, is ultimately the goal of the second decree; it is not merely about leasing.

**P. 84, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph:** The course of the procession of the Alkessippeia is not fully dictated (this is more the case with the Attaleia), and something could have been said about the relations between the Eumeneia and the Attaleia (cf. below note on **p. 103, n. 540**).

**P. 86: 6<sup>th</sup> line from bottom:** as long as they perform: literally: performing.

**P. 87, line 6:** Regarding *IG* XII 3, 330, I should have made clear that capital letters (A–C) are commonly used to denote the different texts (A: name labels of the statues, B: testament (= first document, lines 1–108, columns I–III), C: statues (= second document, lines 109–288, columns IV–VIII)). Thus *LSCG* 135 reproduces lines 1–94 of text C. (The reference to slabs in the 1st edition is irrelevant.)

**P. 90:** Festivals and ceremonies: It is worth emphasizing that the section on festivals and ceremonies is, by definition, an extension of the section on cult performance.

**Pp. 94–95:** The question of the re(?)-organization of the Ptoia and the documents involved is considerably more complex than it appears from the discussion here (and in the commentary on no. 11). See Rigsby 1996: 59–67.

**P. 100, lines 3–4:** at the risk of an imprecation and a ne.

**P. 102, 3rd paragraph:** *LSAM* 50 is not quite a dossier but a multi-layered composite (the present copy being evidently Hellenistic). (Note also that Fontenrose's interpretation of the γυλλοί had been considered before.) See A. Herda's massive *Der Apollon-Delphinios-Kult in Milet und die Neujahrsprozession nach Didyma: Ein neuer Kommentar der sog. Molpoi-Satzung* (Milesische Forschungen 4), Mainz am Rhein 2006.

**P. 103, n. 540:** *LSS* 44 includes a torch race and, strictly speaking, could have been mentioned in note 538. Such a problem may be encountered elsewhere, especially if documents are incomplete or more laconic (cf. in this respect *LSCG* 80).

**P. 104, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph:** For *LSS* 1 see above note on p. 80.

**Ibid. 2nd paragraph:** for the Panathenaea see below note on **no. 1, Right Side**.

**P. 105, 10<sup>th</sup> line from bottom:** Some of the references to *LSCG* 65 seem to have gone through an Enigma machine and some clarification is needed here: lines 103–106 deal with water; lines 106–110 with anointment and bathing. For offences and legal procedure read, officials, offences, and legal procedure and note that only some examples have been cited; for the handling of funds see 45–64; for the transfer of the books: 11–13. I also note regarding publication that we do not deal here with the typical publication clause of epigraphic documents as the text deals rather with copying.

**Pp. 107–108:** New festivals, resuscitated festivals: Regarding the Eisiteria I note that my moderate attempt to make some sense of the considerably problematic formation of the Leukophryena and the date, as affecting the Eisiteria, may be misleading. In general I note that the classification of festivals as new, resuscitated, revitalized and so on may be tentative, depending on the internal evidence of the documents themselves, whether unambiguous or interpreted (cf. Nilsson 1906: 251). In principle, a similar problem could arise where the question whether a given festival is new or simply placed on new financial footing depends mostly or solely on internal evidence. As for resuscitation, in some cases revitalization is the real issue, and the section on resuscitated festivals should have been entitled resuscitated and revitalized festivals.

**Pp. 108–109:** Re-nancing: cf. above notes on pp. 82–83 and 107–108. Regarding *LSAM* 9 and 10 and the relations, if any, between them (two festivals or one?), and its/their name(s), is complex, as has been routinely noted (e.g. Nilsson 1906: 92–93, Sokolowski's commentaries ad locc.).

**No. 1**

Note that what I said about hyphens in the first edition is better ignored: Daux's use of them was strictly typographical; I was wrong to understand the small horizontal stroke touching the first iota in the second entry as a hyphen.

**Right Side:** Regarding the first additions, I have full confidence in the late M.H. Jameson's readings (The Spectacular and the Obscure in Athenian Religion, in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge 1999: 321–340, at 330 n. 32 (and see 329 n. 29 for the left side)) Μυκηνηω[ι] τέ[λεον - - - | - - -] | αν οἷν Παναθηναί[οις] θύεν πρατ[όν], based, as they are, on his exhaustive study of the stone. Most of the letters can be verified in the photograph the J. Paul Getty Museum has kindly sent me (with the proviso that some letters must be dotted). Although I remain extremely grateful to the J. Paul Getty Museum, particularly to Janet Grossman, for allowing access to the stone during the very short period in which it was accessible, I must note that given the limitation of time and the conditions of my inspection (including inability to use water and charcoal), which was pursued all too close to the submission of my manuscript, the inspection could consist in little more than checking Daux's readings. I should add that, although I expect no dramatic changes to the main text, further study of the stone is likely to result in further modifications of Daux's ideas. Note in this respect that the placement of the additions in NGSL in relation to the lines of the main text is approximate. I have, again, followed Daux in numbering them. I should also like to caution that the hypothesis that the additions on the left side belong to a text once inscribed on the back of the stone remains a hypothesis: in a conversation, M.H. Jameson, though not altogether dismissing the idea, was not quite convinced.

**Lines 14–16:** Even if the second piglet is sacrificed in another place, its recipient is probably still Zeus Polieus (otherwise the offering has no recipient). It may also not be entirely inevitable that (like the first piglet) it is still connected to the Prerosia. Regarding the priest's provision of an *ariston* to the attendant (lines 15–16), G. Ekroth's (*The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-Cults in the Archaic to the Early Hellenistic Periods. Kernos Supplément* 12. Liège 2002, 218–219) highlights the need for a meal in the uneaten sacrifice, is much better than my very tentative association of the *ariston* with a possible trip (as I have pointed out in *SCI* 24, 2005, 285 n. 1).

**P. 131, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph:** Regarding the relevance of the passage from Clearchus to the Thorikian evidence, I should have cited again Parker 1987 (cited at the beginning of the discussion on p. 130 n. 67).

**P. 140, n. 129:** The translation of Arnobius is not very accurate, particularly: said: says; skillfully all-powerful: all-powerful with readiness to help/readily helping, all powerful; and those should stand before inhabiting ; red-stained: or simply gloomy hue.

**P. 148, n. 164:** Regarding the order of sacri ces in this month, it is not quite clear which are offered at the Plynteria; in principle, all of the sacri ces could be, though I doubt this. In hindsight, I would, however, include the choice lamb prescribed for Athena with the Plynteria offerings despite the seemingly awkward order of recipients, Athena Aglauros Athena again.

**P. 149:** Regarding the heroines, they are here evidently not related to any hero(es). They are probably to be associated with a locality, as difficult as this option may be.

## No. 2

See above comments on pp. 82–83. Kevin Clinton's edition of this inscription should now be considered definitive (*Eleusis, The Inscriptions on Stone: Documents of the Sanctuary of the Two Goddesses and Public Documents of the Deme*, Athens 2005, no. 85).

## No. 3

**P. 167:** Although ὁμοθετεῖν is commonly taken to involve pieces cut from all the limbs of the animal, this is only put forward more or less explicitly in Homer in *Od.* 427–428.

**Ibid.:** In this passage (*Od.* 14.427–428), ἀρχόμενος (starting cutting/sampling rstlings), seems again echoed by the ἀπάργματα of Selinus (though see below, note on 27.15, 19).

**P. 168:** commentary on lines 19–20: I am aware that the use of ἀμφοῖν with a noun in the (genitive) plural in Sokolowski's restoration is not problematic (in fact, this is the point of my note). But ἐν ἀμφοῖν τοῖν ἱεροῖν in *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1252.11 may be worth mentioning.

## No. 4

**P. 174:** commentary on line 7: For ἀπαγορεύει ὁ θεός cf. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1289.9.

**Ibid.:** commentary on line 8: considering the belt in line 21 (and possibly the ring in the previous line), *LSS* 59 should be added to the list of references. The rest of the items mentioned there are not

necessarily worn on one's body but rather carried. In this regard, I add that, as should be clear from my translation, the basic meaning of εἰσφέρειν remains 'to carry in'; when governing clothing items it may be used loosely to refer *inter alia* to such items worn by visitors. I should have mentioned that Petrakos (1996: 89–90) thinks garments would be carried in as offerings. Regarding the commentary on line 9, I should note that the Andania regulations refer generally to stripes, not to borders *per se*.

**P. 175, n. 20:** If a change in construction should occur here at all, it would involve a shift not quite from indirect to direct speech, but more so from a negative (in 'nitive + μή after ἀπαγορεύω) to a positive stipulation (at the time I obviously had in mind some such combination as in *LSAM* 35.3–5 and *LSCG* 171.15). This point was not well treated in my 2001 article, where a semicolon was placed in the text in line 7 after ἀπαγορεύει ὁ θεός – a less natural construction with ἀπαγορεύω (*LSJ* s.v., K. Høner-Gerth II p. 208).

S. Follet (BE 2003 no. 311) reads in lines 6–7 ἄ (for A secluded by Petrakos, the *SEG*, and myself) | ἀπαγορεύει ὁ θεός, taking the in 'nitive μή [ε]ἰσφέρειν in apposition to the relative. She restores in line 10 εἰς Π[ανὸς οἶκον] vel sim. (οἶκον may come to mind, recalling Pausanias' description of the cave: 1.32.7, though this is not a compelling argument in its favor). This restoration seems attractive because it makes what must have been a fairly short document self-contained with a minimal number of letters. I am not sure that it can be admitted into the text with certainty, however.

For a suggestion why this inscription was set up by ephebes see A. Chaniotis *EBGR* 2001 no. 115 (*Kernos* 17, 2004: 218–219).

## No. 5

**Translation, lines 29–30:** It is possible to translate *agora* with Raubitschek as 'sale'.

**Pp. 182–183:** I suspect that my discussion of the dating formula and of the Flavii of Sounion is deficient and leaves room for corrections.

## No. 7

**Translation:** Abortion – or – miscarriage (as should be clear from the commentary).

**P. 207:** Quotation from Hippocrates: for – as dealing ourselves – one could translate – as being dealt.

**No. 12**

D. Knoepfer (BE 2006 no. 199) notes that J. Bousquet's reading of this text should be considered conclusive, the date being not later than the end of the 2nd century B.C.

**Nos. 14–15**

**No. 14.** I understand that the inclusion of the entire text may seem questionable. It was done merely to answer the immediate needs of those interested in the section on the Hermaia. As for the regulations of the Hermaia, it would have been unfortunate to exclude from the corpus regulations, agonistic notwithstanding, featuring as an integral part such significant rules regarding meat distribution, albeit brief, and bizarre to include the meat distribution regulations in isolation, without the context (Hermaia regulations) to which they belong.

Regarding **no. 15**, I add that although little can be had from this fragment, it seems fairly clear, despite the miserable state of preservation, that it dealt with Hermaia performance – the reference to Hermes in the dative makes him a likely recipient of sacrifice (or of the celebration). Personal preferences aside, inclusion seemed preferable to exclusion, if only as what would otherwise be a little-noticed piece of evidence.

**No. 17**

In general the tone of my commentary seems too assertive for such a fragmentary document. In lines 10–11, as much as I would prefer my speculation regarding *hiketeia* to be correct, *hierosylia* remains possible. It may also be possible that the document discussed cases of supplication other than that of a murderer.

**279 lines 5–6:** In principle it is possible that the ἀφικετεύων ἢ δεκόμε[ενος] are two different persons.

**No. 18**

**Line 15:** εἰσπράχθησεται is naturally preferable to εἰσπράσσειται but seems too long for the space.

**Line 36:** for ὑπόλογος perhaps credit.

**No. 19**

**Line 3:** for τιμαί cf. τιμὰς τῶν ἱερῶν in LSS 19.

**P. 301: Commentary 4–5, 12:** Considering LSAM 44, the κοινή (perhaps common/general) διαγραφή could have taken into account other sales.

**No. 20**

**Line 8–10:** In retrospect the women who performed (made) the sacrifice are probably worshippers, as peculiar as the provision in question seems to be.

**P. 305:** Introductory remarks: the second decree could reflect lack of satisfaction on the part of cult personnel. But I ought to note again that the modifications could simply reflect general dissatisfaction with the first decree, emanating solely from the officials involved.

**Pp. 305–306 n. 5:** *SEG* XII 390 is irrelevant.

**P. 308, 1st paragraph, last sentence:** The grains allocated to the priestess may be used entirely for sacrificial performance. As for the amount of barley groats, reading the text without interpretation, it is fixed rather than dependent on anything else.

**P. 311, n. 51:** one could argue that the stipulation, whether or not expressed by a both when Ἐ and when Ἐ (if the non-repetition of ὄταν is not an impediment) could be logical if it applied only to public sacrifice. Perhaps it could be argued that it applied to a private occasion. At any rate, it appears somewhat futile to argue about libation vs. libations and about the voice of the following (almost wholly restored) verb. The arguments are hardly conclusive, the reading σπ[ον]δ[ήν] seeming in and of itself a bit problematic as it is nearly entirely restored.

**No. 21**

**Line 3:** Part of the first word may have started on line 2.

**No. 23**

**P. 331, 1st paragraph:** For Pantomatrimon as the possible port of Eleutherna see P. Perlman in M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford 2004: 1159.

**No. 24**

**Lemma:** To the list of editions, add *CEG* II 847 where the inscription is dated to ca. 300 B.C. (but with no discussion of the date).

**No. 25, pp. 344–345:** seems to antedate currency or rather coinage.

**No. 26**

As time goes by, my grasp of this decree seems to become more and more tenuous. I assume that there are points in my discussion, par-

ticularly the summary of the first part of the decree, which were not presented tentatively enough but should be taken as tentative.

**Lemma:** add to discussions Rhodes 1997: 315, 320.

**Lines 5–6:** ὁμονοοῦντας πολιτεύεσθαι: perhaps to share in the government harmoniously.

**Line 8:** The alpha printed in triangular brackets should not be bracketed (cf. epigraphical commentary ad loc., p. 349), but either dotted or possibly not even dotted.

**Line 13 (and epigraphical commentary p., 349):** ὑπενάντιοι: the upsilon or an upper part of it and, so it seems, something looking like a pi, were evidently written above the epsilon and nu respectively, although the traces are strange and perhaps justify dots.

**Line 27:** the translation at the sacri ce is inconclusive.

**Line 33 (with epigraphical commentary p., 349):** The dotted tau may not need to be dotted after all. The alpha printed in triangular brackets should not be bracketed: it appears to have been originally omitted by the scribe/engraver, but the photograph seems to show what looks like superscript lambda (following the superscript sigma; cf. epigraphical commentary). The alpha should either be dotted or possibly not dotted at all.

**Line 34 (epigraphical commentary ad loc. p., 349):** Contrary to what was said in the first edition, Porciani did not bracket any iota.

**Pp. 335–336:** for κρίνω cf. also *LSCG* 92.

## No. 27

**Translation Lines 15 and 19:** Regarding ἀρξάμενοι and ἀπάργματα, although I think that we deal here with firstlings, we may prefer the more general offerings as the first editors do.

**P. 371:** I must stress that my references to the levels of cult of the Tritopatores at Athens are entirely derived from Jameson, Jordan, and Kotanski's (1993) discussion of the evidence. For state cult see now the new fragment of the state calendar (L. Gawlinski, 'The Athenian Calendar of Sacri ces: A New Fragment from the Athenian Agora', *Hesperia* 76, 2007, 37–55), at B line 12. (For previously published fragments of the Athenian state calendar see the article by S.D. Lambert cited on p. 404, Checklist 3, no. 5.)

**P. 373, commentary on A 11–12:** The verb ἐνατεύω (In Pass., *have the ninth part removed for sacrifice*: *LSJ* s.v.) is also attested in J. Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos* I, (Paris 1954), 82–85 no. 10a, which, however, does not seem to add much.



**P. 382, 2nd paragraph:** In the discussion of designation of sacrifice as to the immortals, the question here is not whether *elasteroi* are divine beings or not – they are, as is stated – but whether the designation as to the immortals qualifies them as Olympians or not. That status refers to the class of the divine being under discussion is indicated in the commentary on *A* 10 (p. 272).

### Checklist 1

As stated, the list is not finite. Future editors will decide what documents (e.g. P. Herrmann, *Klio* 52 (1970) 165–173; certain Labraunda texts) could have been included or excluded (as no. 26, for which see above, note on p. 21).

### Figures

**Figure 4:** in the first edition the photograph has been printed upside-down.