

SCOTT SCULLION

THREE NOTES ON ATTIC SACRIFICIAL CALENDARS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 121 (1998) 116–122

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THREE NOTES ON ATTIC SACRIFICIAL CALENDARS

I. Thorikos Calendar 14, 47

The sacrificial calendar of the Attic deme Thorikos¹ twice presents us with the same quandary in articulation of the text:

- 13 Βοηδρομιῶνος, Πρηρόσια : Διὶ Πολιεὶ κρι-
τὸν οἶν : χοῖρον κριτόν, ΕΠΑΥΤΟΜΕΝΑΣ
χοῖρον ὠνητὸν ὀλόκαυτον, τῶι ἀκολου-
θῶντι ἄριστομ παρέχεν τὸν ἱερέα κτλ.
- 47 Θαρρηλιῶνος, Διὶ ΕΠΑΥΤΟΜΕΝΑΣ [κριτὸν]
ἄρνα κτλ.

In both places Georges Daux reads ἐπαυτομένας and translates “des femmes acclamant le dieu”. “Les chanteuses”, according to Daux, are exercising a special ritual privilege reserved for the cults of Zeus Polieus and of “Zeus tout court”². The middle of the verb ἐπαυτέω is however both hard to account for here and otherwise unattested,³ and the syntax on this reading is rather abrupt.

Many will prefer to follow Parker in reading the name of a previously unknown Attic locality, an alternative canvassed by Daux. Parker suggests ἐπ’ Αὐτομενας without accent,⁴ Daux ἐπ’ Αὐτομένας,⁵ but the place name, parallel in form to Ἀκεσαμεναί, Ἀλαλκομεναί, Εὐρυμεναί and Κλαζομεναί, would almost certainly be oxytone: ἐπ’ Αὐτομενάς.⁶ There are however difficulties with this reading too. Although it is a perfectly well-formed place name, ‘Sametown’ or ‘Selftown’ seems an unlikely appellation.⁷ The more compelling objection is raised by Daux and implicitly acknowledged by Parker himself, who translates:

For ZEUS POLIEUS a selected sheep (and?) a selected piglet.
(For ZEUS?) to Automenai a bought piglet, to be burnt whole.

The following abbreviations are used: *LS* = F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Paris, 1969); *LSS* = Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques: Supplément* (Paris, 1962); Thorikos = the calendar from Thorikos (see note 1).

¹ *SEG* 33.147 = Georges Daux, Le Calendrier de Thorikos au Musée J. Paul Getty, *AntCl* 52 (1983) 150–74 (less detailed treatment in: Sacrifices à Thorikos, *Getty Museum Journal* 12 [1984] 145–52), which was the first edition to be based directly on the stone and therefore superseded Jules Labarbe, *Thorikos: Les Testimonia* (Gent, 1977 [*Fouilles de Thorikos / Opgravingen van Thorikos* 1]) no. 50, pp. 56–64, and Günter Dunst, Der Opferkalender des attischen Demos Thorikos, *ZPE* 25 (1977) 243–64. The commentaries of Labarbe and Dunst, though based on inadequate texts, are still important. In the addenda to the second fascicule of *IG I³* (p. 958) D. M. Lewis assigns the calendar a fifth-century number, *IG I³ 256bis*, having convincingly redated it to the 430s at *ZPE* 60 (1985) 108 n. 3; see also Parker (below, n. 4) 138 n. 11.

² Daux (above, n. 1) 173.

³ Daux (above, n. 1) 171f. suggests reading the middle participle in G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus collecta* (Berlin, 1878) 1013.5, but even if accepted this would hardly render the middle form in our text less anomalous.

⁴ Robert Parker, Festivals of the Attic Demes, in Tullia Linders & Gullög Nordquist, edd., *Gifts to the Gods* (Uppsala, 1987 [*Boreas. Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations* 15]) 137–47 at 144 with note on 145.

⁵ Daux (above, n. 1) 172.

⁶ The only apparent exception seems to be Καμμένα in Thuk. 6.5; see Henry W. Chandler, *A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation* (Oxford, 1881) §§ 143–4.

⁷ We know of several place names beginning with Αὐτο-, but none consisting merely of that root plus place-name suffix.

Daux points out that all other indications of place in the calendar immediately precede or follow the name of a recipient,⁸ and that we should therefore expect a named recipient to accompany a specified location here; Parker appears to acknowledge this difficulty by suggesting that “For Zeus” is perhaps to be understood. Just as (on Parker’s reading of ΕΠΑΥΤΟΜΕΝΑΣ) we have in 47f. “For ZEUS to Automenai a selected lamb”, so we should expect Διὶ in line 14.

Fewer problems will confront us if we articulate the letters ΕΠΑΥΤΟΜΕΝΑΣ differently, as a specification not of place but of ritual procedure: ἐπ’ αὐτῷ μένας (= ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ μείνας) “remaining on the spot/within the sanctuary”. The orthographical features ο for ου and ε // ει for the short vowel and its lengthened form // the original diphthong are regular in the calendar.⁹ The tense and number of the participle and the syntax of its case, as well as the general sense of the phrase, require some discussion.

The best parallels for the syntax and sense of the suggested reading are to be found in the newly-published sacral law from Selinous, which is mid-fifth-century and thus only about twenty-five years older than our text.¹⁰ The tense of the participle μένας in my suggested articulation may seem odd at first glance, but not seldom in Greek there seems to be an aspectual rather than a temporal distinction between present and aorist participles. A particularly good example involving the verb μένω is at Her. 2.121 d 4, τοὺς δὲ . . . καὶ ἐκεῖνον παραλαμβάνειν καὶ κελεύειν μετ’ ἐωυτῶν μείναντα κυμπίνειν.¹¹ The same phenomenon seems to occur in the Selinous calendar. A table and couch are to be set out, and a clean cloth, crowns of olive, honey-mixture in new cups (ποτηρίς, a previously unattested word), cakes and meat are to be placed on the table: κάπαρξάμενοι κατακαάντο καὶ καταλινάντο τὰς ποτερίδας ἐνθέντες (15f.). The editors translate: “and having made offerings let them burn (them), and let them perform the anointing having put the cups in”, and comment as follows: “The cups used . . . are to be ‘put in’ and then anointed with oil (A16). If they are to be put in the fire, the order of procedure is strange. One would expect the cups to have been anointed first. It may be that some other place is referred to by the participle ἐνθέντες . . .”¹² It is surely the case here that the aorist participle is aspectual rather than temporal,¹³ since in such a context ἐνθέντες without further specification must imply “into the fire”. So too the phrase κάπαρξάμενοι κατακαάντο presumably does not mean that offerings should be “made” and then “burnt”, but simply that the officiants are to “burn first-fruits” of the offerings they have placed on the table. On these grounds, the aorist participle in ἐπ’ αὐτῷ μένας should occasion no surprise.

The use of a masculine singular participle may seem unlikely, but the Selinous inscription provides abundant parallels for such syntax, exhibiting several participles, both singular and plural, in agreement not only with imperatives but in one case apparently with an omitted imperatival infinitive:

τῶι Διὶ : τῶι Εὐμενεῖ θύ[ε]ν [καὶ]
 ταῖς : Εὐμενίδεσι : τέλειον, καὶ τῶι Διὶ : τῶι Μιλιχίοι τῶι : ἐν Μυσοῖ : τέλειον : τοῖς Τρ-
 10 ιτοπατρεῦσι : τοῖς : μιανοῖς ἡόσπερ τοῖς ἡερόεσι, φοῖνον ἠυπολῆει-

⁸ Daux (above, n. 1) 172f. argues against reading a place name.

⁹ The ε in μένας would represent the lengthened form of the short vowel as with ἔναι for εἶναι in line 65; in both cases a preceding short -e- has undergone compensatory lengthening before an -ns- cluster: see e.g. Leonard R. Palmer, *The Greek Language* (Atlantic Highlands, 1980) 205f., 236f. On the distribution of ε/ει in inscriptions contemporary with ours see Leslie Threatch, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions I: Phonology* (Berlin/New York, 1980) 172–77. On the date of the calendar (430s) see n. 1 above.

¹⁰ Michael H. Jameson, David R. Jordan & Roy D. Kotansky, *A Lex Sacra from Selinous* (Durham, NC, 1993); 48 on the date.

¹¹ Cf. e.g. 7.222 καταμείναντες συναπέθανον; 7.139 ad fin. ἀλλὰ καταμείναντες ἀνέσχοντο τὸν ἐπιόντα ἐπὶ τὴν χόρην δέξασθαι (contrast 7.173.3 μηδὲ μένοντας ἐν τῇ ἐκβολῇ καταπατηθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ στρατοῦ τοῦ ἐπιόντος). See Jacob Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax. Erste Reihe* (Basel 1926) 151–7; also e.g. K. J. Dover, *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum* (Berkeley, 1968) 106.

¹² Jameson et al. (above, n. 10) 69.

¹³ This might be classified as a “coincident” aorist participle: Smyth 1872.3.c.2; Kühner–Gerth II §389, A. 8.

ψας : δι' ὄροφο : καὶ τᾶν μοιρᾶν : τᾶν ἐνάταν : κατακα-
 ἴεν : μίαν. θύοντο θύμα : καὶ καταγιζόντο *hoīs hoσία* : καὶ περιρά-
 ναντες καταλινάντο : κῆπειτα : τοῖς κ(α)θαροῖς : τέλεον θύοντο : μελίκρατα *hypo-*
λείβον : καὶ τράπεζαν καὶ κλίναν (*sc. προθέμεν Jameson 67*) κένβαλέτο καθαρὸν *hēma* καὶ
 στεφά-
 15 vos ἐλαίας κτλ. (A.8–15).¹⁴

While *περιράναντες* in 12f. agrees with an expressed imperative, *hypoλθείψας* in 10f. agrees with the subject of the omitted imperative to be understood from *θύεν* in the previous clause, and like *hypoλείβον* in 13f. is singular. The variation in tense of participles of the same verb is instructive also from the point of view of verbal aspect. The meaning in 13f. can hardly be that the officiant is simultaneously to pour the libation and set out the table and couch, so that the present participle should be taken as purely aspectual. So too in 10f. *hypoλθείψας* probably does not indicate that the libation is temporally prior to the sacrificial rite that is ordered; it is surely one of two specific requirements of the sacrificial procedure itself, immediately preceding or accompanying the burning of one of the “ninth parts”. The variation of singular and plural verbs and participles suggests a certain indifference to the distinction between the individual who performs the specific ritual act and the group to which he belongs; Jameson et al. (66) note the possibility that the alternations in number are “entirely casual”, and this seems likeliest. The consequence of this for our purposes is that a singular aorist participle in agreement with the subject of an unexpressed imperative is syntactically plausible in a sacrificial calendar.

The syntax of the Thorikos inscription is of the elliptical type common in cultic calendars, where lists of recipients in the dative and sacrificial victims in the nominative or, less commonly in Athenian inscriptions, the accusative are unaccompanied by verbs. Where there are verbs, the mood is normally imperative throughout, but nominatives with imperatives alternate freely with the imperatival accusative + infinitive.¹⁵ When victims are listed in the nominative,¹⁶ a third-person passive imperative is normally to be understood; a good example is provided by the Erchia calendar, where a victim in the nominative is followed immediately by an imperatival accusative + infinitive clause: Ἐρμῆι, ἐν ἀγορᾷ Ἐρχιάκι, κριός, τούτῳ ἱερεῶσθαι τὸν κήρυκα καὶ τὰ γέρα λαμβάνεν καθάπερ ὁ δήμαρχος, Δ.¹⁷ It is possible that in some cases, such as the Athenian state calendar headed *τάδε τὸ ἕτερον ἔτος θύεται*,¹⁸ we are to understand rather a third-person passive indicative. A Delphic inscription of about 400 abruptly introduces third-person singular imperatives with no specified subject after a series of imperatival accusatives + infinitive: αἰ δέ τι τούτων παρβάλλοιτο, ἀποτεινάτω πεντήκοις δραχμάς.¹⁹ A first-century A.D. Athenian inscription listing offerings in the accusative has as its underlying syntax second-person singular future indicatives without a specified subject but in one case with nominative participles in agreement: Βοηδρομιῶνος γ' ἰ. Νέφθῃ καὶ Ὀσίριδ[ι] | ἀλεκτρούνα καρπώσεις σπεύρων πυρ[οῦς] |

¹⁴ Jameson et al. (above, n. 10) 15 translate: “To Zeus Eumenes [and] the Eumenides sacrifice a full-grown (sheep), and to Zeus Meilichios in the (plot) of Myskos a full-grown (sheep). (Sacrifice) to the Tritopatores, the impure, as (one sacrifices) to the heroes, having poured a libation of wine down through the roof, and of the ninth parts burn one. Let those to whom it is permitted perform sacrifice and consecrate, and having performed aspersion let them perform the anointing, and then let them sacrifice a full-grown (sheep) to the pure (Tritopatores). Pouring down a libation of honey mixture, (let him set out) both a table and a couch, and let him put on (them) a pure cloth and crowns of olive etc.”

¹⁵ See K. Meisterhans, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*³ (Berlin, 1900) § 89.C.5.

¹⁶ See e.g. *LS* 1, 11 (both Athens), 18 (Erchia), 20 (Marathonian Tetrapolis); *LSS* 10 (‘Nikomachos Calendar’).

¹⁷ *LS* 18.E.49–58.

¹⁸ *LSS* 10.30. The indicative is not infrequently employed in inscriptions from Kos, e.g. *LS* 151, 156, 157.

¹⁹ *LS* 77.7–9; C. D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects* (Chicago, 1955) 244 translates: “If one transgresses any of these things, he shall pay fifty drachmas.” In lines 11ff. the inscription goes on to specify funeral procedures in the same syntactical mode, with a switch to the plural: *τρῶμα δὲ ἡ|ν hypoβαλέτω καὶ ποικεφάλαιον ἡ|εν ποτθέτω. τὸν δ|ὲ νεκρὸν κεκαλυμμένον φερέτω σιγᾷ κ|ῆν ταῖς τρ|οφαῖς μὴ καττιθέντων μη|[δ]αμει κτλ.*

καὶ κριθάς, σπένδων μελίκρατον.²⁰ The new sacred law from Selinous provides fresh parallels for varying syntactical constructions with non-specified, indifferently singular or plural subjects. Although we also have inscriptions in which lists of victims in the accusative are explicitly governed by θύειν,²¹ it is perfectly possible that in the Thorikos calendar we are to understand some such phrase as θυέτω ὁ ἱερεὺς;²² indeed, since it is more common Athenian practice to list victims in the nominative with a third-person passive imperative understood, it is probable that a third-person active imperative rather than an imperatival infinitive is to be supplied in such texts as the Thorikos calendar.

The second column of the Selinous inscription provides a useful parallel for the other part of the phrase I suggest we read in the Thorikos calendar, ἐπ' αὐτῷ. The last component of the purification from *elasteroi* at Selinous is as follows: θύσας τῷ Διὶ χοῖρον ἐξ αὐτῷ ἴτο καὶ περιττ(ι)ραφέεθο κτλ. (B.5).²³ Jameson et al. assume that ἐξ αὐτῷ ἴτο means that “the subject is to go out from the sanctuary” (43), and no alternative interpretation suggests itself, even though a sanctuary has not been mentioned, but only the god’s name as recipient. This seems natural enough as Greek, especially in the context of a sacrificial inscription, and is a precise parallel for the phrase ἐπ' αὐτῷ in the sense “within the sanctuary”.

The requirement that the officiant ‘remain within the sanctuary’ is most likely intended to compel consumption of the sacrificial victim on the spot, a restriction well attested elsewhere in various formulations, as for example δαινύσθων αὐτοῦ, τῶν δὲ κρεῶν μὴ εἶναι ἐκφορὴν ἔξω τοῦ τεμένεος, οὐκ ἀποφορά, οὐ φορά, and most recently in the Selinous inscription in the form τὰ κρᾶ μέχφερέτο.²⁴ I have argued elsewhere that this restriction is applied to sacrifices for chthonian or semi-chthonian recipients, and that it represents a compromise between the carrying away of portions from Olympian offerings and the total destruction within the sanctuary of chthonian holocaust sacrifices. Zeus Polieus, the first of the two recipients in the Thorikos calendar, receives “on-the-spot” offerings elsewhere; here we would have on-the-spot offerings of sheep and piglet followed by a holocaust piglet, and this combination of sacrificial modes is characteristic of his cult.²⁵

II. Thorikos Calendar 56

The final group of entries in the sacred calendar from Thorikos has been more extensively discussed than most of the others. I give the text according to the first publication from the stone by Georges Daux, omitting one of his supplements:²⁶

- 52 Σκιροφοριῶνος, ὀρκωμόσιον (π)αρ[έχεν, Π]-
 λυντηρίοις Ἀθηναίαι οἶν κρι[τόν, Ἀγλ] -
 ἀύρωι οἶν, Ἀθηναίαι ἄρνα κρι[τόν, Κεφά]-
 55 λωι βοῦν μῆλάττονος ἢ τετρα[ράκοντα]

²⁰ *LS* 52.4–6; cf. 21, 24f.

²¹ *LS* 4 (Eleusis, V B.C.); *LSS* 19.86, 93 (Salaminioi inscription); Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1955) 72.33ff. Other lists of victims in the accusative are *LS* 2; *LSS* 9, 132. *LS* 96 (Mykonos, 200 B.C.), 147 (Gortyn, V B.C.) and 151 (Kos, IV B.C.) list victims in both the nominative and the accusative.

²² *LS* 172.9 (Halasarna, III B.C.).

²³ The editors translate: “having sacrificed a piglet to Zeus, let him go out from it, and let him turn around etc.”

²⁴ *LS* 96.26; 69.31f.; 151.A.45, 58, 60, 62; 18 *passim*; Selinous inscr. (above, n. 10) A.20. I have discussed and collected examples of this provision in: Olympian and Chthonian, *CA* 13 (1994) 75–119 at 99–112; see also Ada Thomsen, *Der Trug des Prometheus*, *ARW* 12 (1909) 460–90; Ludwig Ziehen, *RE* 18.1 (1939) 621–2, s.v. “Opfer (Mahl)”; Walter Burkert, *Greek Tragedy and Sacrificial Ritual*, *GRBS* 7 (1966) 87–121 at 104 n. 36; Michael S. Goldstein, *The Setting of the Ritual Meal in Greek Sanctuaries: 600–300 B.C.* (diss. Berkeley, 1978) at 322–55. The passage in the Selinous inscription should be added to these collections; see also the editors’ comments ad loc.

²⁵ See Scullion (above, n. 24) *ibid.*; on Zeus Polieus 81–9, 106–7.

²⁶ Daux (above, n. 1).

δραχμῶν μέχρι πενήκοντα, Π[.]
 οῖν :

The text is stoichedon, and a seven-letter supplement would therefore be expected at the end of line 56. Noel Robertson and Robert Parker have rejected Daux's eight-letter supplement Π[οσειδῶνι] as one letter too long.²⁷ This in fact misrepresents the practice of the stone-cutter, who not only regularly inscribes contiguous iotas in a single stoichos, but in the next line of the inscription (57) does so also with an iota and a tau.²⁸ Daux's supplement or other similar suggestions involving one or more iotas therefore cannot be ruled out, even if seven-letter supplements are bound to seem more likely. It may be salutary to reconsider the sacrificial prescriptions with this in mind.

It is impossible to conclude with any certainty how the five sacrifices are related. Parker suggests that the offerings of sheep for Athena and Aglauros belong to Plynteria – Aglauros figures very prominently in the testimonia for the festival²⁹ – and appears to conclude that the lamb is offered to Athena on a separate occasion.³⁰ The fourth and fifth offerings he regards as related to a third occasion. Daux's supplement [Κεφά]λωι in 54f. is convincing: according to local tradition Kephalos was a resident of Thorikos,³¹ and he receives a sheep earlier in the calendar (16f.), where a subsidiary offering is made to his wife Prokris (17). Parker suggests that she accompanies him here too, and proposes the seven-letter supplement Π[ρόκριδι] in 56.

This seems irresistible at first glance, but entails an anomaly that ought to give us pause. In the earlier passage Kephalos had received a sheep, Prokris a τράπεζα or table of vegetarian offerings such as fruits and cakes³² – and a τράπεζα is in fact the offering invariably prescribed in the calendar for heroines subordinated to heroes (18f., 28–30, 48f., 50f.). Two exceptions are only apparent: Alkmene with the Herakleidai³³ and Helene with the Anake (= Dioskouroi) receive adult victims (36–8), but both are on an equal footing with their male counterparts. On the left side of the stone a sheep is prescribed for the Heroinei Koroneon, but they receive offerings in their own right.³⁴ The recipient of the sheep in our passage ought therefore to be other than a female subordinate of the hero.

There would be nothing surprising in the principal divinity of a festival receiving more than one offering in the course of it, and it is therefore possible that both sacrifices to Athena belong to Plynteria. The sacrifice for Kephalos could be regarded as a distinctively Thorikian component of the same festival: he was according to Ps. Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.14.3 the son of Hermes and the Kekropid Herse – who

²⁷ Noel Robertson, *The Riddle of the Arrhephoria at Athens*, *HSCP* 87 (1983) 241–88, 281 n. 112; Parker (above, n. 4) 147 ad Thorikos 56.

²⁸ Contiguous iotas: Thorikos 13, 22, 25, 32, 35, 47; see Daux (above, n. 1) 162, who does not draw attention to the iota-tau combination in καὶ τ[ὸς] at the end of line 57.

²⁹ Hesychios p 2632 Schmidt s.v. πλυντήρια; *Anecd.* 1.270 Bekker s.v. Κάλλιον. The evidence for the festival is collected by Ludwig Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin 1932) 17–22. Robertson (above, n. 27) 281 made the probable suggestion, on the basis of the new evidence from Thorikos, that the sacrifices for Kourotrophos, Athena Polias, Aglauros, Zeus Polieus and Poseidon specified for 3 Skirophorion in the cult calendar of Erchia (*LS* 18) refer to Plynteria, which will have been celebrated in the demes in the month following the city observance in Thargelion. Jameson, Burkert and others had associated the Erchian sacrifices with Arrhephoria.

³⁰ Parker (above, n. 4) 144f. in his translation brackets the offerings for Athena and Aglauros; the following specification, perhaps by a printing error, is left untranslated, but it seems probable that Parker does not associate it with the preceding or subsequent entries.

³¹ Ps. Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.4.7; *Ant. Lib.* 41. The evidence for Kephalos as Attic hero is now conveniently assembled by Emily Kearns, *The Heroes of Attica* (London, 1989 [*BICS* Suppl. 57]) 177.

³² On these offerings, usually termed τραπεζώματα, see S. Dow & D. H. Gill, *The Greek Cult Table*, *AJA* 69 (1965) 103–14; D. H. Gill, *Trapezomata: A Neglected Aspect of Greek Sacrifice*, *HTHR* 67 (1974) 117–37.

³³ So, surely rightly, Parker, *ZPE* 57 (1984) 59: Ἡρακλείδα[ις τέλειον]; Daux reads Ἡρακλεῖ δά[μαλιν, οῖν].

³⁴ Daux (above, n. 1) 158f. edits and discusses this addition.

may herself have been honored in the Athenian festival³⁵ – and thus a nephew of Aglauros, whose importance at Plynteria is second only to Athena's.

If all five sacrifices belong to Plynteria, Daux's supplement Π[οσειδῶνι] is perfectly plausible. We happen to have in the sacrificial calendar of Erchia a parallel set of prescriptions for a deme's local version of Plynteria, with offerings on the local acropolis of a piglet for Kourotrophos and sheep for Athena Polias, Aglauros, Zeus Polieus and Poseidon.³⁶ Another prescription belonging to the same occasion has probably been lost, and Jameson suggested that this was for Pandrosos.³⁷ She too might be restored in our text, Π[ανδρόσῳ], though the addition of an iota to the right of an omega in a single stoichos seems rather unlikely. We have Athenian evidence for a close association between Athena and Pandrosos as recipients of sacrifice; Jacoby prints Philochoros *FGrHist* 328 F 10 as follows:

Harpokr. s.v. ἐπίβοιον· Λυκοῦργος ἐν τῷ Περὶ τῆς ἱερείας (F 35 B1). Φιλόχορος δ' ἐν β' φησὶν οὕτως· “ἐὰν δέ τις τῆι Ἀθηναίῃ θύῃ βούν, ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστι καὶ τῆι Πανδρόσῳ θύειν ὄν, καὶ ἐκαλεῖτο τὸ θῦμα ἐπίβοιον”. ὁμοίως καὶ Στάφυλος ἐν α' τῶν Περὶ Ἀθηναίων (269 F 1).

Athena does not receive a cow in our text, but the companion recipient in the particular type of sacrifice described by Philochoros might be expected to be linked with Athena elsewhere, and Plynteria would be an obvious occasion.

There is however another reading in the manuscripts of Harpokration: Πανδώραι, a goddess with the gifts of the earth in store. Editors have preferred Πανδρόσῳ because of her close association with Athena,³⁸ but it is Pandora who seems the more probable recipient of subordinate sacrifices, a goddess similar in nature to the Kourotrophos who receives them very commonly.³⁹ That Pandora was familiar to Athenians in a role similar to that of Kourotrophos is suggested by Arist. *Birds* 971, where the oracle of Bakis recommends a specific against marauding wolves and crows from the Peloponnesos: πρῶτον Πανδώραι θύσαι λευκότριχα κριόν. Π[ανδώραι] might therefore be put forward as another plausible supplement in our text, slightly preferable to Π[οσειδῶνι] and Π[ανδρόσῳ] for being, like Parker's Π[ρόκριδι], only seven letters in length.

Of course it may be that the offering for Kephalos in our text has no connection with Plynteria, and on this assumption Parker's supplement, despite the anomalous offering, is certainly the likeliest. It is however essential to reckon with the possibility that all the offerings belong to Plynteria, and to remind ourselves that we are not entitled to rule out anything other than a seven-letter supplement. The conjectures Π[ανδώραι], Π[οσειδῶνι], Π[ανδρόσῳ] and Π[ρόκριδι] are all worthy of serious consideration.

III. Marathon Calendar A.28

A third passage may be dealt with much more briefly. A fourth-century sacrificial calendar of the Marathonian tetrapolis was published by Rufus B. Richardson in 1895.⁴⁰ He prints col. A lines 27f. as follows:

³⁵ See Robertson (above, n. 27) 282, who plausibly connects *Anecd.* 1.239 Bekker s.v. δειπνοφορία with Photios and Hesychios s.v. ἡγητηρία.

³⁶ *LS* 18.A.57–65, B.55–9, G.59–64, D.56–60; see n. 29 above for Robertson's identification of the festival at Erchia as Plynteria.

³⁷ Michael Jameson, Notes on the Sacrificial Calendar from Erchia, *BCH* 89 (1965) 154–72, at 156–8; Jameson was operating under the assumption that the festival in question was Arrhephoria (see n. 29 above), but Pandrosos may be associated with Plynteria as well (see n. 35 above).

³⁸ See Jacoby ad loc., and in particular *IG* II² 1039.58, where the ephebes sacrifice on the akropolis to Athena Polias, Kourotrophos and Pandrosos.

³⁹ In the Thorikos calendar at 20f., 22 and 41f. It is not safe to assume that the Thorikian mason put the individual offerings of a ritual sequence in the correct order.

⁴⁰ A Sacrificial Calendar from the Epakria, *AJA* 10 (1895) 209–26. The text has been published also by Kirchner as *IG* II² 1358 and Sokolowski as *LS* 20.

δευτέραϑ τριμῆνο Πυανοψιδῶνοϑ
 -----]ων οἰϑ κύουϑα ΔΓΗΗ
 τετάρτηϑ τριμῆνο Μουνηχιῶνοϑ

Our only clue to the identity of the recipient is provided by the offering, but it is a very valuable clue. Pregnant victims are characteristic of the cult of earth goddesses, above all Demeter.⁴¹ The only plausible candidate in the Marathonian inscription – both the previous and the subsequent lines require eleven-letter supplements – is Ῥέαι Μητηρὶ θε]ῶν. There is no precise cultic parallel for this nomenclature, but it is clear that Rhea and the Mother of the Gods had already been identified in the fifth century, as is indicated for example by *Bakchai* 59 and 128. In a fourth-century Koan inscription Rhea receives a pregnant sheep,⁴² and in a third-century calendar of the Koan deme Isthmos Protton convincingly restored the same victim in a sacrifice to Mater Theon.⁴³ The cult of the Mother of the Gods is of course well-attested at Athens, where she was particularly associated with the soothing milk-offering called *galaxia*.⁴⁴

Union College, Schenectady (New York)

Scott Scullion

⁴¹ Most of the evidence is collected by Paul Stengel, *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*³ (Munich 1920) 155 with n. 7; Martin P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* I³ (Munich 1967) 151. Add now from the Salaminioid inscription (*LSS* 19.92) a pregnant sheep for Athena Skiras, from the Erchia calendar (*LS* 18.E.16–21) a pregnant sheep for Ge, and from the Thorikos calendar (38f., 43f.) pregnant sheep for Demeter. The first truly complete collection of evidence has been made by Jan Bremmer in a paper forthcoming in the proceedings of the Sixth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult at Göteborg.

⁴² *LS* 151.B.3.

⁴³ J. v. Protton, *Leges Graecorum Sacrae* I (Leipzig, 1896) no. 11.A.6f. = *LS* 169.B I.6f.

⁴⁴ See the collection of testimonia in L.R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States* (Oxford, 1896–1909) 3.382f. n. 19: add *IG* II² 1011.13, 1028.40.