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TWO NOTES ON ATTIC LEGES SACRAE

1. IG i³ 255 and Marathon

IG i³ 255 is a fragmentary lex sacra of c. 430, detailing offerings and their recipients on Face A (probably in calendar order), priestly perquisites on Face B. It was found in Chalkis on Euboea, but, following Wilhelm, most scholars, including Jameson in his exemplary edition for IG i³, have recognised it as an Attic pierre errante.² It is fairly clearly the product of a local group rather than the central state, and, since Ziehen, the tendency has been to suspect that the group was based in the area of Attica closest to Euboea, the Marathon plain. Xouthos ([K]pôloiov, recipient of cult at A13) was father of Ion and founder of the Marathonian Tetrapolis;³ and Apollo Pythios ([A]πόλλων Πυθίων, A15) had a sanctuary in the Tetrapolis deme Oinoe, at which sacrifices and divination took place in connection with theoriai to Delphi.⁴ Jameson, however, is cautious: “sane nescimus quo ex loco Atticae titulus originem duxerit et caveamus ne ad Marathonem temere relegemus.” Such hesitation arises above all perhaps from A11, where, since Wilhelm, the recipient of an offering has been taken to be [Δι[r] Tropaioi sn Kuno[-]. As Jameson observes, while Kynosoura here might be the promontory at the north-east end of Marathon bay, known from Hesychius to have had this name in antiquity, the trophy commemorating the battle of Marathon was not situated on that promontory, nor is any cult of Zeus Tropaios attested there.⁵ Salamis, on the other hand, not only boasts a trophy suitably sited on a promontory (admittedly not known to have been called Kynosoura in anti-

¹ This is a companion piece to Tetrapolis Calendar (cf. n. 1 of that paper). Thanks are again due to the staff of the Epigraphical Museum, the British School at Athens and the Cotton Foundation for support in 1998/9, and to Michael Jameson for invaluable comments on a draft; on this occasion also to Merle Langdon and John Traill for helpful discussion of specific points. I alone am responsible for any remaining flaws. In addition to the abbreviations in Tetrapolis Calendar, the following are used:

Daux: G. Daux, BCH 87 (1963), 603–34 (ph.); corrigenda at BCH 88 (1964), 676–77;
Dow: S. Dow, BCH 89 (1965), 180–213;
Jameson: M. H. Jameson, BCH 89 (1965), 154–72;
Meisterhans–Schwyzer: K. Meisterhans, Grammatik der attischen Inschriften (3rd edn., revised E. Schwyzer, Berlin, 1900);
Phratries: S. D. Lambert, The Phratries of Attica (2nd edn., Ann Arbor, 1998);
Tetrapolis Calendar: S. D. Lambert, ZPE 130 (2000) 43–69;
Wilhelm: A. Wilhelm, Eph. Arch. 1902, 135–42. Cf. 1904, 103–10;

² The hand is identifiable as that of an Attic cutter. To the bibliography in IG i³ add now H.B. Mattingly, ZPE 83 (1990), 110–19 (on the cutter); M.H. Jameson in ed. R. Hägg, Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence (Stockholm, 1994), 35–57 (on Theoxenia). The following notes on readings arise from autopsy of the stone in the Chalkis museum in 1999: A10–11. Before οι in 10, uncertain trace of right side of Υ or О. On these lines see further below. A12. In τοι the iota is damaged; only the lower section is visible. See further n. 19. A14–15, 17–18 and 18–19. I confirm all three paragraphi. A19. [Ν]ματικις και [Α]ξιων [We] IG i³. The upper diagonals of the Υ are visible. Of the Ε, Τ is visible. B1. B IG i³. Very unclear. Possibly upper section of A? B4. ντερπ[.]φορ IG i³. The shape and extent of vacant space to the left at start of line dictates πι. After the first rho, iota is faint but certain. Upper half of following O clear. Confirms the suggestion of Sokolowski, no. 11, δε[.]τερπ[.] B8. Final tau severely damaged. B9. I cannot confirm initial α, B10. Initial τ, might alternatively be top right corner of πi. B14. In τιτ, both verticals of the nu are clear, the right extending slightly higher and not to bottom of stoichos. B23. -[Ε] [. . .] IG i³. Can not confirm EA (but the surface in this area is now obscured by paint from the display base). T, alternatively perhaps top right of pi? Upper half of rho follows.

³ Strabo 8.7.1, p. 383. The name is restored, but there would seem to be no plausible alternative cult figure in -othos or -outhos.

⁴ Similar observations for theoriai to Delos took place at the Delion at Marathon. Soph. OC 1047–48 with Σ; FGH 328 Philochoros F 75.

⁵ For the trophy, located a little inland from the bay, E. Vanderpool, Hesp. 35 (1966), 93–106.
quity), but also demonstrable cult of Zeus Tropaios. Cult on Salamis would certainly be surprising for a Marathon-based group.

I suspect, however, that Zeus Tropaios is irrelevant here. A more likely restoration is indicated by the 4th century sacrificial calendar of the Tetrapolis, in which, on a date early in Hekatombaion, a goat worth 12 drachmas was to be offered (\[\text{Απόλλωνι}\]) (Tetrapolis Calendar, A1, 26). The structure of this column of the Tetrapolis calendar text lends confirmation. A1, 26 belongs to the second of three sets of sacrifices, marked off by quarter rubrics (in our case, πρόθες τριμήον) set in from the normal column edge (20–22; 23–31; 32–37). I have argued in Tetrapolis Calendar that these three sections correspond to three locations of inscribed sources of authority specified in 13–19. The second of these locations is ἐν Κυνοσοῦραι (18). I suggest, therefore, that lines A10–11 of IG i3 255 should be restored:

10 \[\ldots \text{οι Ποσιδόεοι τ[}- \text{ Ἀπόλλωνι}]\]
\[\text{[Από]}τροπαίοι ἐν Κυνο[σοῦραι].\]

Both here and in the 4th century calendar the deity should be Apollo, who alone is attested as Apotropaioi in Attica; he had a strong presence in the Tetrapolis, connecting, as we have seen, with Delphi and Delos; and one also thinks immediately of the temple of Apollo (epithet unknown) at another coastal site further south at Prasiai, which, with its associated tomb of Erysichthon, also connected with Delos. On a promontory, indeed, “Apotropaioi” may have looked specifically to perils of marine origin; perhaps it is not coincidental that one of the two offerings recorded in our calendars was in the middle of the sailing season, in the summer month Hekatombaion, the other apparently at or around the time of the sea god’s festival Posideia, in the winter month Posideon.

Of the other cult figures mentioned, both Poseidon (A18) and Artemis (her priestess at B16, cf. 20) would be at home in a coastal region; and if -αις in B11 was Athena or Hera, both deities occur in the

---

7 On the excellent photograph in Papabasileiou’s editio princeps, 29–30, what might be interpreted as the right section of an omicron appears to the left of the tau in 11. However, at autopsy it is apparent that this represents not an inscribed mark, but the line along which the stone has broken away. It is too far to the right to be likely to be a break along the path of a letter stroke, at least along its exact path.
8 See Tetrapolis Calendar, note on A1, 23–26.
9 Apollo temple and tomb of Erysichthon: Paus. 1.31.2. Perhaps the priesthood of the Prasiai temple was held by the genos Erysichthonidai, which, in the Augustan period, (also?) held the priesthood of Apollo on Delos (for which see Parker, 289–90).
10 Where on the 2.3 km. long Kynosoura promontory an Apollo cult site might have been situated is an interesting question. It is steep, rocky and inhospitable and, except for some fortification walls of uncertain date, few signs of ancient activity remain (see J. R. McCredie, Hesp. Suppl. 11 [1966], 41–46). One possibility might be the highest peak, McCredie’s point F, where, on the steep east and west slopes immediately down from the summit, he records loose rubble (no worked stones) from structures and sherds, some of them classical/early hellenistic. These (mostly coarse) sherds (including roof tiles) were confirmed when I walked the promontory in early spring 1999 with Michael Dixon and Victoria Buck. We also noted what may be a mooring point (with a few associated sherds) on the west (bay) coast, below this summit a little to the south. There is at present nothing to indicate, however, that this summit site was of a religious rather than a military character. (It is, however, too steep/in hospitable for ordinary domestic habitation to be plausible). Other possibilities for the Apollo site might be the area at the seaward end of the promontory, where there are remains of structures ancient and modern (none apparently of a religious nature; McCredie, p. 45); or, as Jameson suggests per ep., the hill immediately landward of the base of the promontory, at one time enclosed by walls, where, however, no sherds were noted by McCredie (pp. 44–45). It may not be necessary to envisage the Apollo site as consisting of more than an altar; A1, 18 of the 4th century calendar might be restored ἐν τῷ Ἀποτροπαίῳ ἐν Κυνοσοῦραι. The closest Attic parallel may be IG ii2 5009, an altar of Apollo Apotropaioi from caves (the “Serangeion”) close to the shore in Piraeus (cf. R. Garland, The Piraeus [1987], 159). The cave entrance to the east side of Kynosoura towards the shore might profitably be investigated.

11 Other Attic cult sites of Artemis on or near the east coast of Attica were at Halai (Artemis Tauropolos), Brauron (Artemis Brauronia) and Myrrhinus (Artemis Kolainis). Parker, 25, sees coastal locations as appropriate to the wildness of this deity. For Artemis in this area cf. also IG ii2 5001; 13196; B. Kallipolitis, Arch. Delt. 19 (1964) B1, 74.
4th century Tetrapolis calendar.\footnote{12} Minor cult figures did not always confine themselves within political and institutional boundaries, and the nautical hero Glaukos (A14), associated with neighbouring Boeotia and Euboea, as well as Delos,\footnote{13} would be no surprise in the Marathon area, nor cult of Apollo under two epithets, Pythios and Apotropaioi, which also occur (among others) in the sacrificial calendar of Erchia, south and inland from the Tetrapolis.\footnote{14} For two other configurations, Aphrodite(-)Eros-Hippolytos (A4–7)\footnote{15} and the Nymphs and Acheloos (A19),\footnote{16} the closest known parallels are in the city; but it is not implausible that there were separate Marathonian cult centres mirroring the city ones (a very common feature in Attica); alternatively, the observances here mentioned might actually have taken place in the city cult locations.\footnote{17}

There is one remaining problem case, Herakles εν τοι Ἐλαεῖ (A11–12), also known (as Herakles ὁ ἐν Ἐλαείᾳ) from the Parthenon accounts.\footnote{18} The small deme Elaious (boul. quota 1) was of uncertain location in, probably the coastal or inland trittys of Hippothontis, a tribe to which none of the Tetrapolis demes belonged.\footnote{19} If the Herakles of our inscription was located in this deme, therefore, prima facie he was not in the Tetrapolis area; indeed Vanderpool’s tentative suggestion\footnote{20} (followed by Traill) that the settlement site c. 4 km north of Eleusis (in a Hippothontid area, therefore) “in the midst of an extensive olive grove” might be identified as Elaious is not unattractive. Some of the architectural remains discovered there might belong to a Heraklean shrine, with which a dedication of thisiosatou found in the area might also be connected.\footnote{21}

Nevertheless, a Herakles cult in Elaious, so located, might not be inconsistent with a base for our
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group in the Tetrapolis area. The sacrifice might have been extra-territorial, like for example that to Zeus Epakrios on Hymettos by the Erchians or that to Poseidon at Sounion by the Thorikians;\(^{22}\) though admittedly such extra-territorial cult observances (other than in the city) are rare in most of the Attic sacrificial calendars; and there would not be the close proximity to the base of the group that existed in the case of Hymettos and Erchia or Sounion and Thorikos. Alternatively, the group may have been genuinely multi-local, like the genos Salaminioi, which had cult-locations down at Sounion (e.g. Heralikes at Porthmos) and in the Phaleron area (Athena Skiras) as well as in the city (Eurysakes);\(^{23}\) our inscription is too fragmentary to rule out the possibility that some of the group’s other cults might also have been located in north-west Attica.

Another possibility is that deme and Herakles cult-site had the same or a similar name, but were not identical. The theory may not be the most economical; only one place with a name in Elai- is certainly attested on the Attic mainland.\(^{24}\) But generally names in Elai- were common enough; there was an identical. The theory may not be the most economical; only one place with a name in Elai- is certainly

22 Thorikians: SEG 33.147, 19–20; Erchians: see below, sect. 2. Cf. also Tetrapolis Calendar, Postscript.

23 See most recently Salaminioi and Lambert (n. 21). It is important to bear in mind that Attic corporate groups (not excluding demes, but even more so groups of pre-Cleisthenic origin) were in the first place groups of people, not tracts of territory. That their cult activities were not always confined within a single bounded area of territory, therefore, should not surprise us.


26 For indications that the Tetrapolis may have had a presence outside the areas of its equivalent Cleisthenic demes cf. Tetrapolis Calendar, n. 6 with Postscript. The position of Elaious in IG ii\(^{3}\) 255 was based wholly or mainly in the Marathon area; and cult of Herakles év Ἐλαιοῦ can also be explained consistently with that hypothesis. The possibilities as to the group’s institutional identity remain frustratingly wide. -ια τριττοι : ἀπο in A9 raises the possibility that it was a

27 Thus E. Vanderpool, AJA 70 (1966), 319–23; J. Travlos, Bildlexicon zur Topographie des antiken Attika (Tübingen, 1988), 219. For a different view on the location of the Marathonian Herakleion, see Photiou.
trrittys, whether Cleisthenic or Ionian, but in the dative it scarcely proves it. It might be the Tetrapolis itself, or to judge from other groups known to have produced inscriptions of comparable content, a deme or a genos.28

2. Erchiana

Though the letters are smallish and in places rather worn, the five-column sacrificial calendar from Erchia (c. 375–50), with its enigmatic heading δημαρχία ἡ μέγη,29 can mostly be read from the stone without undue difficulty. Where readings at first seem doubtful, careful consideration almost invariably vindicates Daux’s fine editio princeps,30 and my own autopsy in 1999 yielded only minor adjustments.31

Only at the ends of columns A, Γ and E, where the break of the stone has taken short sections of text with it, is there any scope for conjecture. As Daux noted, however, A lacks only the figure for the total cost of the sacrifices in the column, 111 dr. [HΔΦ] (cf. 108 dr. in B, 110 in Δ). The total cost of the 11 fully preserved sacrifices in Γ is 103 dr; comparison with the totals in other columns suggests that just one sacrifice is missing,32 of which tantalising traces remain.33 Similar reasoning suggests that, at the end of column E, two sacrifices are probably missing.34

---

28 The Archegetes of B8 may have been an official (thus Papabasileiou), or perhaps rather an object of cult (thus Zichen), i.e. the group’s eponym or founder (cf. in this area of Attica the “Archegetes” at Rhamnous, SEG 43.6 and 51, 44.78; Tetrapolis Calendar, Postscript). That, however, does not help determine the type of group. Cf. Parker, 120–21.

29 In my view the only plausible explanation of it proposed hitherto is that of Parker: δημαρχία refers to the period of office of a demarch (i.e. one year) and this one was ‘greater’ in that it contained more sacrifices than the ‘lesser demarchy’, with which it can be presumed to have alternated in sequence. See D. Whitehead, AW 14 (1986), 57–64.

30 Daux. Some minor textual points (from ph. and squeezes only) were made by Dow, especially 185–87. Jameson also had some textual implications. Cf. SEG 21.541 and 22.131.

31 On the paragraphi see Daux, 611. I can not confirm those shown by him above A, lines 40, 55 and 60 (the horizontal rather to the right, i.e. above the left side of the theta, in 55 is a casual mark), which would in any case be unexpected in the middle of a description of a sacrifice; nor those marked at the start of each column (the mark above A1 is probably casual). There is a paragraphus before Ι65. There is punctuation (:) before the figures in A27 and between the two words in E51, and possibly before the figure in A51. I tend to agree with Dow’s rejection of the first punctuation read by Daux in Ι30. Daux often shows the initial letter of month names in square brackets. From the stone I read these letters clearly in lines Γ1, 13, 26, 31, 42, 48, 54, 59, dotted at A52. The following letters, square bracketed by Daux, I would read undotted: [δ] B2, [Ε] B8; dotted: [c] A35, [u] A55, [α] E37, [α] E60, [η] E62. In E52 τ requires no dot. A19–20. Dow hesitates, but, lit from various directions at autopsy, /€/ looked certain, not /£/. B28. Προσώποιος. At first sight, when lit from the left, the initial letter appeared more like pi, but on closer examination, especially when lit from the right, eta seemed correct. B31. The final Ι= “est très légèrement gravé sur la ligne même de séparation des colonnes” (Daux, 611). I believe rather that the figure is inscribed just above the previous one, slightly to the right. The mu in A53 and possibly the alpha at the end of E14 (though at the latter point the surface is worn) were never inscribed. The second letter in A65 is a clear iota, in the centre of the stoichos, confirming Daux’s αν/τι/βους and ruling out Sokolowski’s (in any case highly implausible) αν(α)/βι/ει αος(α) (Sokolowski, no. 18, p. 43). On Ι66–67 see n. 33.

32 Daux, 632; cf. Dow, 187.

33 The beginning of the description, as read by Daux (BCH 1964; I adjust slightly his printed text), runs (the month is Skirophorion):

65 ἐκτητη[ι ι]ἐκτι ὡς [. . . . . 6 . . . . . [. . . . .

For the last letter of 66 Daux detected a vertical to the left of the stoichos, e.g. of a K or P, preceded by “une lettre occupant un carré (E, H, K, Γ par exemple)”; at the end of 67 a vertical and possibly the upper diagonal of Κ. I have nothing to add on 67. In 66, after the alpha, there is what might be the bottom of a vertical, slightly to the right of centre. At the top of the space (but perhaps too high to be likely to be letter strokes) are marks like the left and, less clearly, right tip of Y, i.e. perhaps I, T, Υ, Φ, or Ψ. In the next stoichos a left vertical appears in some lights, very uncertain, perhaps of an eta. At the end of the line, I detected what may be the diagonals of Κ, in addition to the vertical, and in the previous stoichos perhaps the top section of Τ/Κ. Daux prudently observed that “aucune restitution ne peut ni ne doit être tirée de ces données fragmentaires et incertaines”; though on 16th of a month one might think of Artemis-Hekate (PGH 328 Philochoros F86 with Jacoby’s commentary; cf. B6–13).

34 Dow, 187. The total cost of the sacrifices down to E64 was 89 or 90 dr, including the unpreserved cost of a lamb in
One aspect of the Erchia calendar which, though partially treated in earlier papers by Vanderpool\(^{35}\) and Bicknell,\(^{36}\) has not been fully explored, is its relationship to other evidence for Erchian topography, cults and institutions. It is to discussion of this subject that I wish to contribute here.\(^{37}\)

The horos IG ii\(^2\) 2609 from Spata shows that there was a temenos of Herakles in the area of Erchia (cf. n. 52). Herakles does not appear in the “greater demarchy” calendar (though the Herakleidai do). Perhaps he was in that of the “lesser demarchy”; or perhaps, in characteristic Attic fashion, this cult of Herakles was not the responsibility of the deme, but of a dedicated thiasos of Herakles.\(^{38}\)

In Isaeus 12 Euphiletos, ejected from the deme Erchia apparently at the diapsephismos (deme scrutiny) of 346/5, seeks to overturn the decision in court. The deme, of course, features in the speech. We learn that the case had previously been decided in Euphiletos’ favour by two arbitrators and that the demarch then in office had since died (sects. 11–12; for the Erchian demarch in our calendar cf. the heading and E 52–58); and there is reference in conventional terms to Euphiletos’ introduction to a phratry as supporting his claim to citizenship (sect. 3, cf. 8). But unfortunately the twelve chapters of this speech preserved for us by Dionysius of Halicarnassus contain none of the vivid local colour which is a feature of the other surviving speech challenging the ejection of someone from his deme at this scrutiny, Demosthenes 57 (for Euxitheos of Halimous). We learn nothing, for example, about the extent to which membership of the deme Erchia and Euphiletos’ phratry overlapped; and there is just one, oblique, connection with the calendar. At sect. 9 the speaker (Euphiletos’ half-brother) states that Euphiletos was a child of herself and “our father”. The Delphinion intended here, in a case before an Athenian jury, must be the one in Athens, referred to in a precisely similar context, involving an oath before an arbitrator by a woman on a question of legitimacy, at Dem. 40.11. It is interesting, however, that there were in fact local Delphinia both at Thorikos, the deme of Dem. 40,\(^{39}\) and, as we learn from our calendar, Erchia. Why these oaths were located at the (city) Delphinion, otherwise known as the place where cases of justifiable homicide were tried, has not been easy to elucidate. It has been suggested either that this was where the arbitrators in these two cases (i.e. the panels for Akamantis and Aeges) happened to sit; or that, for some reason, it was thought an appropriate place for oaths of affiliation.\(^{40}\) The fact, however, that at Erchia it was a sacrifice to the ancient Attic maternal deity Kourotrrophos, “nourisher of kouroi”, that was explicitly located in the Delphinion,\(^{41}\) would seem to support the second of these explanations.\(^{42}\) Kourotrrophos is a common recipient of sacrifices in the

---

\(^{35}\) BCH 89 (1965), 21–26, on the locations of the deme centre of Erchia and the Erchian polis and paqos referred to in the calendar, and on the Vourva settlement site.

\(^{36}\) REG 89 (1976), 599–603. Note also Dow, 180–182, on the deme, its size (more than averagely large), bouleutic quota (6; 10 after 307/6) and population (perhaps around 500 adult males).

\(^{37}\) For completeness, I mention here two items of written evidence which I shall not discuss further: (a) among a number of comic plays with deme-names in their titles, there appears to have been one called Ἐρχιταῖας, from the period of New Comedy. Nothing is known about it. See SEG 25.194, 81; Whitehead, 338; (b) Petrakos has now shown that IG ii\(^2\) 1181, mentioning an Erchian, is neither a deme decree of Erchia, nor of Sounium (where it was mistakenly recorded as having been found), but belongs to a monument from Rhamnous set up by the ephebes of Aeges of 331/0 and their sophronistes, the Erchian. See G. R. Stanton, ABSA 91 (1996), 344–45.

\(^{38}\) Cf. Lambert (n. 21); A. P. Matthaiou, Horos 7 (1989), 12,.

\(^{39}\) See SEG 33.147.


\(^{41}\) It took place on 7 Gamelion ἐν Δαλοφυίαυ Ἐρξ and consisted of a piglet (A, 23–27). On the same day there were sacrifices of sheep to Apollo Delphinios (A, 28–30) and to Apollo Lykeios (E, 31–38), the latter Πυθα˛/στος παρ/δοσιμος. M.H. Jameson, Archaiologia 1 (1980), 227–28, plausibly associates these sacrifices in a group with those to Apollo Apotropaios and Apollo Nymphaghetes with the Nymphs on the following day.

\(^{42}\) Cf. Wyse (n. 40): “It might be suggested that the legendary connexion of the Dephinium with Aeges and Theseus made it a fit place for oaths of affiliation.” On the Aeges/Theseus connection see the testimonia conveniently collected by
Attic calendars jointly with other individual deities or groups with a connotation of family or rearing of the young, e.g. elsewhere in the Erchia calendar with Artemis/Artemis Hekate, strongly associated with the upbringing of girls; the siblings Hera, Zeus Teleios and Poseidon; and another group including Athena Polias, Zeus Polieus, Poseidon and, in addition, the daughter-figure(s) Aiglauros and possibly Pandrosos. Here, Kouroutophos is grouped on the same day not only with Apollo Delphinios but appropriately also with Apollo Lykeios, a deity apparently associated with passage of men into adult military and civic participation. 

On 16 Thargelion the Erchians sacrificed to Zeus Epakrios on Hymettos (Ε 59–64). It is one of the calendar’s more remarkable entries, for though Erchia was not far from the eastern slopes of Hymettos, another deme, Painia, intervened. This sacrifice was not, therefore, in deme territory; nor was it, like most extra-territorial observances in the Attic sacrificial calendars, including several in ours, in the city. It may be this cult site that the poet of Old Comedy, Polyzcloes, had in mind in a fragment of his play Mouson gona preserved by the lexicographers: ἵζειν γὰρ ἐντεύχον Σὲλευκὸς Ἑπακριὸς Δίος (F8 K–A), for no other site of Zeus with this epithet is securely attested in Attica, and it may also be identifiable with the summit sanctuary on Hymettos published by Langdon, with its extensive deposits of archaic votive sherds, some inscribed with the name of Zeus. In any case it is notable that we also know of a group of (probably phratric) orgeones who were connected in some way with this deity; most likely

Boegehold (especially perhaps Paus. 1.19.17).

33 See Jameson (n. 41).

34 Comparable is the sacrifice by the Thorikians to Poseidon at Sounion, SEG 33.147, 19–20. Cf. also sect. 1 above on Herakles in Elaious, and Tetrapolis Calendar, Postscript. M. H. Jameson in C. R. Whittakers, Pastoral Economics in Classical Antiquity (PCPS Suppl. 14, 1988), 103, suggests a link between our sacrifice and the opening of summer pastures.

35 Et. Mag. s.v. Ἑπάκριος Ζεύς states that altars of Zeus were placed on summits of mountains, οὐν τοῦ Ὑμηττοῦ, τοῦ Πάρνηθου, but it does not state that all such altars (i.e. on Parnes as well as Hymettos) were specifically of Zeus Epakrios and indeed this is doubtful, since this passage is related, directly or indirectly, to Pausanias’ discussion of mountain-top sanctuaries of Zeus on Hymettos and Parnes at 1.32.2, in all of which Pausanias gives Zeus epithets other than Ἑπάκριος. IG ii² 1294 was found κοιτῇ τῆς Πλάκας ἐν ὀδῷ κημένῳ (Ziebarth, Rh. Mus. 55 [1900], 502 no. 3), but (pace R. E. Wycherley, GRBS 5 [1964], 176 and n. 7, cf. Langdon [n. 48]) it is questionable whether we can infer from this a precinct of Zeus Epakrios “at some high point in the city”. For another inscription supposedly found “in the Plaka”, but actually originating in Athenedon, Boeotia, cf. P. Roesch, Études Béotiennes (Paris, 1982), 112–17, no. ii (= SEG 32.454; S. D. Lambert, ABSA 95 [forthcoming, 2000], E16). There are many ways that an inscription might end up “lying in the street”, euphemistically or otherwise, in this market district of central Athens.

36 Hesp. Suppl. 16 (1976). In favour of Langdon’s site being of Zeus Epakrios can be adduced: (a) the particular suitability of the mountain-top location for Zeus with this epithet; (b) the attraction of identifying a cult-site attested archaeologically as active from the 12th to the 6th centuries B.C. with one associated with phratric orgeones, which perhaps possessed land sold off in the Lykourgan public land-sale programme (cf. Ratioes, 237), may have been referred to in Old Comedy, and was the location of an unusual extra-territorial deme sacrifice by the Erchians; (c) the ceramic graffito no. 42 in Langdon’s catalogue, probably to be restored [Λαμπρίας], and the fact that the Epigonos mentioned on IG ii² 1294 was from the deme Lamptraii, south-east of Hymettos. Against an association with Zeus Epakrios, Langdon notes (p. 99) that “the Erchia inscription belongs to the 4th century B.C., when the altar of Zeus on the summit lay unused”. But our 4th century calendar will represent sacrificial practices of much older origin; and the absence of inscribed ceramic votive deposits datable to the classical period may rather be evidence for a change in votive practices (e.g. because writing was no longer a sort of magical novelty), or (as Langdon himself suggests to me) that the votives from the classical period were deposited at another, undiscovered, location, than for the disuse of the site in the classical period. Langdon also points out to me the absence of apparent easy access to the site from the east; but many Erchians may have had residences in the city (cf. Dow, 181–82 and the sacrifices in our calendar in the city), and in any case ancient standards of ease of access were perhaps less stringent than ours (cf. e.g. above n. 10). Pausanias refers to a cult of Zeus Ombrios on Hymettos (identified by Langdon, Hesp. Suppl. 16, with his site). One suspects (as Jameson suggests to me) that different individuals/groups might have worshipped Zeus there under different epithets. Certainly, ceramic graffito no. 42 is for neither Epakrios nor Ombrios, but Σήματος Δ� (an epithet of Zeus mentioned by Pausanias in connection with Parnes, but not Hymettos). It may be that epithets also changed over time (a possible implication of the texts discussed above, n. 45). To my mind “Ombrios”, of Zeus, has a post-classical flavour. Cf. the evidence for Zeus with this epithet discussed by A. B. Cook, Zeus iii (1) (Cambridge, 1940), 525–27, none of it pre-Hellenistic, and A. E. Raubitschek, Hesp. 12 (1943), 72–73 nos. 19–21 (3 altars of Zeus Ombrios from the Agora, c. 100 A.D.).

37 On orgeones in general see Phratries, 74–77; Parker, 109–11.
perhaps they were responsible for the Hymettos shrine. The very fragmentary IG ii² 1294 mentions them in the nominative, an Epigonos son of Endios (from Lamptrai, a dème neighbouring Hymettos) in the dative and Zeus Epakrios in the genitive in the surviving portions of lines 1, 2 and 3 respectively, in a context which, from line 4, looks financial (a lease?)\(^{48}\) and a group which may be these same orgeones sold an eschatia in the great Lykourgan public land sale programme.\(^{49}\) It might be tempting to interpret them as an Erchia-based group, possibly even as a subgroup of Euphiletos’ phratri; but there is no firm evidence of a link with Erchia. Epigonos was from Lamptrai, the property sold in the Lykourgan programme was at Phlya and the agent of the selling group was from Athmonon. Perhaps therefore this is another case of a cult site being shared by more than one group.\(^{50}\)

... crown and apparel (στέφανον καὶ κόσμιον) ... the altars and wood (τοὺς βωμοὺς καὶ ξύλα) ... / ... (females) in office (ταῖς ἀρχούσασι) ... / ... from the trikomoi (παρὰ τῶν τρικόμων) ... / ... six drachmas of silver (ἀργυρίου Γ' ὀρίζοντο) ... / ... the trikomarch (τὸν τρικόμαρχον) ... / ... the demos (τὸν δήμον).” (IG ii² 1213). The stone is alleged to have been found in the Bala area, to the west of modern Spata; Milchhöfer was not permitted to study it properly and it has apparently not been seen since.\(^{51}\) It was just to the south of Spata, at Pousiri, that our sacrificial calendar was found, a location perhaps identifiable, therefore, as site of ancient Erchia.\(^{52}\) However, in the absence (it has been thought) of other evidence for a trikomia in this area, Schlaifer’s suggestion\(^{53}\) that this hand-sized fragment may have wandered from the area of the trikomia of Eupyridai west of Acharnai, attested by Stephanus of Byzantium, has been found attractive by many scholars, including recently Parker.\(^{54}\) That this is not very satisfactory is due not so much to the distance between Eupyridai and Spata (stones could of course wander further than this, cf. IG i³ 255, discussed in sect. 1 above); nor to the fact that, since there may, in the 4th century, have been around 70 komai in Attica, most as yet unattested, it is not unlikely that there was more than one set which was arranged in a group of three.\(^{55}\) It is more that one is reminded by the striking feminine, τοῖς ἀρχούσαις (3), of all those priestesses who loom so large in the Erchia calendar.\(^{56}\) More importantly, one is reminded of a mid-5th century inscription from Spata (ἐγγὺς κτήματος Κομπῆν\(^{57}\)), IG i³ 247. The text is too fragmentary for continuous sense to be made; it may have related in some way to institutional property.\(^{58}\) There are just three lines, however, which particularly interest us, 1, 9 and 10. The Corpus text and relevant commentary is as follows:

\(^{48}\) Fundamental on this inscription is now the careful treatment of M. Langdon, AJA 77 (1973), 195–96 (ph.; not yet in SEG). In the light of the Lamptrai connection, and the absence of plausible alternative, the restoration Διός τοῦ Ἐπακρίου ... (3–4) seems secure. From my autopsy I note: 4, διοῦνομη Langdon. I see the right vertical and most of the diagonal of the nu; 6, before Langdon’s -] te I detect an iota (cf. Meritt ap. W. S. Ferguson, HTR 37 [1944], 93 no. 11) preceded by some uncertain marks (right end of bottom horizontal adjoining at right start of an upward stroke?). There are some uncertain traces of a seventh line, including perhaps a mark as of top of left diagonal of Υ under the Ο in 6 (may alternatively be a casual mark).

\(^{49}\) Rationes, F11A, 1–4 with pp. 157–58 and 197.

\(^{50}\) Cf. n. 21 above. Perhaps the orgeones owned the shrine (cf. the orgeones of Egetes, Parker, 109–10) and the dème were “guest” users. For the possibility that orgeones might have quasi-public cult functions cf. Parker, 110–111.

\(^{51}\) AM 12 (1887), 87 no. 27.

\(^{52}\) Thus Vanderpool (n. 35). The findspot of the Tetrapolis calendar, however, apparently in situ outside the Marathon plain at Kukunari (cf. Tetrapolis Calendar, n. 6), casts a slight shadow of doubt on Vanderpool’s inference.

\(^{53}\) HSCP 54 (1943), 45 n. 39.

\(^{54}\) p. 330. Similarly H. Lauter (n. 25), 137 (on this point, as on some others, too categorical). Recently only Bicknell (n. 36) has argued fully for an Erchian trikomia (but see also P. Siewert, Die Trittyen Attikas [Munich, 1982], 173).

\(^{55}\) Cf. n. 25.

\(^{56}\) Priestesses are mentioned 5 times in the calendar, priests not at all. The reason for their explicit mention seems to be that, in each of these cases, they are to receive the hide of the sacrificial victim. Roussel (n. 25), 230–31, however, associates τοῖς ἁρχούσαις with the Thesmophoria.


\(^{58}\) Some of the vocabulary can be paralleled in SEG 24.151, in which the dème Teithras, tightening up on its finances, inscribes details of leases of dème land.
Two Notes on Attic Leges Sacrae
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As the IG i3 editors note, κόμαρχον is a perfectly possible restoration in 9–10. Indeed, at autopsy I have thought that there might be a very faint suggestion of the μ (the left diagonal along the break of the stone), though I am not inclined to give this much weight.

Certainly, it would strengthen the case for a trikonia in this area if we could identify plausible components for the association. Bicknell’s suggestion59 of a trikonia of Kytherros consisting of Erchia, Kytherros and another deme, possibly Konthyle, and accounting for the Kytherros in Philochoros’ list of the 12 ancient cities of Attica (F 94) was never wholly convincing; there is no other evidence for a connection between Erchia and Kytherros. Now that Kytherros is also known to belong to the coastal trittys of Pandionis and has been plausibly located with other demes of the trittys a good way south-east of Erchia, the other side of Philaidai, at a site with suitable Mycenaean remains,60 it seems that the theory must fall. There are, however, other candidates.

One is the group mentioned in line 10 of IG i3 247. The dotted nu at the preserved start was not in the ed. princ. and has crept into IG i3 unexplained. My squeeze and autopsy reveal that the basis for it is a very faint suggestion of an upper vertical stroke on the very break of the stone, and perhaps the faintest hint of an adjoining diagonal, interpreted in the light of -]αντ[-, a possible group name in 1, as from a nu, I am inclined to agree that the mark probably represents an inscribed stroke; and the uninscribed surface between it and the centre of the following stoichos, 1.2 cm., is comparable with the space between the right bar of the nu and the centre of the following stoichos (also occupied by tau) in line 1. Iota and pi are perhaps also epigraphically just possible (on this stone iotas move around quite a bit in their stoichoi),61 but in any case nu is more plausible in this position for an Attic corporate group; none attested (I think) ends -itidai or ptidai, while there are several in -ntidai.62 Whether we may infer from line 1 that this group ended -antidai is more uncertain. As the IG i3 apparatus makes clear, there are alternatives even if, with Mitsos and IG i3, we take it as the first line of the inscription. If, as may be the case, it is not the original first line,63 the possibilities are wide indeed. Whether -(n?)tidai or -antidai, it is impossible to say whether the group should be identified with any of the several attested with these endings. It may, of course, be a phratry, a genos or even a deme; but in the light of the possibility of restoring κόμαρχον in 9–10 it is at least possible that we have here the name of a kome in the Erchia area.

59 Bicknell (n. 36).
60 Traill, 47–51.
61 I was initially attracted to reading Σύτιδον or Σούτιδον (cf. below), but, even discounting the likely trace of the vertical, the extent of vacant space to the left of the tau makes this very unlikely. Elsewhere the distance between the right edge of O and the centre of the following stoichos is c. 8 mm. (here 12 mm. is vacant). I am grateful to John D. Morgan for examining the stone with me at this point.
62 Kydantidai (deme; cf. IG i3 and A. P. Matthaiou, Horos 7 [1989], 10–13); Medontidai (phratry, Phratries, T7–10); Apheidantidai (genos or phratry, Rationes, 205, Parker, 319); Zeuxantidai (genos, Parker, 298); -ntidai (probably genos, Parker, 298). Note also Hesych. s.v. Κροντιδαι - μαντεων γένος (not obviously Attic). Cf. Phratries, T36.
63 The current upper face has been finished (mixed oblique edge and point marks); but it is uncertain that this finish is original. There are signs that the stone has been reworked, e.g. a wedge has been removed from the reverse face at its left edge, taking part of the adjoining lateral face with it. The reduction in the width of the lateral face is uniform; the width of reverse face removed decreases from the top. The chipping away of the inscribed surface above and in lines 1–3 might also have been caused by reworking. For an upper face of an inscription which, though finished in comparable fashion, is not original, cf. S. D. Lambert (n. 45) E6 = IG ii2 488.
A second candidate can be identified in our calendar itself. Two sacrifices in the Erchia calendar take place at Erchia ἐκ Σωτιδῶν.64 Daux comments (624) that this “doit représenter un téménos consacré par une famille locale, les Sotidai.” I tend to think rather of those properties in the Rationes Centesimarum sold at Aphidna ἐν Πεταλίδῶν etc., i.e. in the komai of which Petalidai was one of several in the Aphidna area.65

A third candidate for status as an Erchian komai is the Dekadistai. Long known as lenders (of 130 dr.) on the security marker from Spata, IG ii² 2701,66 Parker, 335, lists them among those “dining and drinking clubs” who were named for the day of the month on which they met, like the Noumeniastai or the Tetradistai. However, the case of the Eikadeis (see Rationes, 199–201) shows that groups named for days in this way could be formal and permanent (the Eikadeis may have been a genos vel sim.); and the Dekadistai are good candidates for restoration as a “territorial” group in Aigeis (i.e. a deme or, since we know they were not such, a komai), selling two or more properties on the new F1 of the Rationes Centesimarum.67 Admittedly, no other Attic komai certainly has a name in -istai;68 and unlike Sotidai this name does not appear in the Erchian deme calendar (nor does -(n?)tidai). Sotidai, though ex hypothesi a komai, could still be described in the calendar as ‘in Erchia’, however, just as the properties in the Rationes Centesimarum were ‘in Aphidna in Petalidai’; so it would perhaps be possible that some of the other locations described in the calendar as ‘in Erchia’ were also in fact in one of the Erchian komai.

We have three candidate names, therefore, for components of an Erchian trikomenia: -(n?)tidai, Sotidai and Dekadistai. We need not choose more than two of them, for Erchia itself would perhaps have been the chief member, like Marathon in the Tetrapolis, or Eupyridai in the trikomenia of Eupyridai.69 One of the Erchian komai might have been located at Vourva, the settlement site north-east of Spata identified by Vanderpool70 and currently nameless following Traill’s shifting of Myrrhinoutta to Nea Makri.71

---

64 Γ4–5 and 8–9. As Daux, 624, noted, there is assimilation of the final nu of év. Cf. Threatte I, 634.
65 E.g. Rationes F7B, 24, with p. 233 n. 69. Cf. e.g. SEG 33.147, 25–26. It may be that ἐν Δημοτιωνιδῶν at Phratries T3, 21, should also be interpreted in this sense; i.e. that Demotionidai, as well as a phratric group, was also a toponym.
66 Co-creditors were a certain Hieromnemon of Halai, “according to the agreement lodged with Lysistratos”, and a group of eranistai lead by Theopeithes of Ikaria.
67 Rationes F1, 13; p. 184.
68 Note, however, the Dipoliastai (Rationes, 197) and the Sabaziastai (Parker, 335), both apparently formal, permanent groups.
69 Alternatively three small komai, none of them called “Erchia”, might together have made up “Erchia”; but there would seem to be no certain Attic parallel for such an arrangement, unless perhaps Aphidna was like that (but not quite all the properties in Aphidna in Rationes were located by komai. One, sold by the Aphidnaean komai Hyporeia, was at Aphidna ὑπὸ τοῦ Φανερίου [F7B, 16], which might suggest that it was not within any komai); or Acharnai (for an apparent komai there see IG ii² 3104, omitted in error from the list of komai at Rationes, 220–21, n. 15; cf. Roussel [n. 25], 228).
70 (n. 35), 24–26. The suggestion that Vourva might have been site of an Erchian komai has also been made by Siewert (n. 54), 173.
71 Vanderpool suggested that the site was one of the demes Kydantidai, Ioniidai, Erikeia or Myrrhinoutta; J. S. Traill, Hesp. Suppl. 14 (1975), 40–41, inclined towards Myrrhinoutta, but in Demos and Tritys, 147, he switched Myrrhinoutta to the Nea Makri site, with all Vanderpool’s other candidates also allocated to sites other than Vourva (127–28). I take this opportunity to note that, as Sean Byrne points out to me, it seems from newly discovered funerary monuments that the deme Oe was not, as previously thought, in the area of other Oineis demes in north-western Attica, but was an Oineis enclave to the south-west of Spata, just north of Koropi. See O. Kakavogiannis, ‘Επίστημονική Συνάντηση Νοτιοανατολικῆς Ἀττικῆς, Koropi: 19–22 Οκτωβρίου 1995 (Koropi, 1998), 68–84 (where, however, the funerary monuments, which have demotics ΟΗΘΕΝ, are incorrectly interpreted as evidence for the location of Oa). Cf. R. Étienne, BCH 99 (1975), 379–84. This is not the place to explore the implications of this relocation of Oe, including for the interpretation of Soph. OC 1061 (Ὀιώτιδος ἐκ νομοῦ. Ὑδ. σὲν νομοῦ. ὑδ. σὲν νομοῦ.) and for the phenomenon of out-of-phyle deme enclaves.