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In a paper published in 1994 I argued that despite recent suggestions to the contrary the distinction between Olympian and chthonian divinities and rituals remains both valid and useful, provided that we approach it not as an absolute dualism but as a true polarity, with given gods and rituals located not only at the two poles but at various degrees between them. I would like to consider here some inscriptional evidence suggesting that combinations of or compromises between Olympian and chthonian modes of ritual may well have been far more common than is generally recognized, and to discuss a recent suggestion about Greek sacrificial terminology.

The sacred law from Selinous published by Jameson, Jordan and Kotansky in 1993 attests two sacrifices which I would classify as "modified chthonian" rites. I reproduce the section of Column A in question (A.9-20):

Lines 9-12 prescribe that "one of the ninth portions" of the sacrificial victim be burnt for the "polluted" Tritopatores "as to the heroes," ἵπποπερ τοῖς ἥρωισι, and concludes "let those for whom it is sanctioned sacrifice and consecrate," ἕστω ὁ ὅσπερ τοῖς ἥρωισι. The editors suggest that the portion in question is from two full-grown sheep prescribed in the preceding lines as victims for Zeus Eumenes and the Eumenides and for Zeus Meilichios, but Kevin Clinton has argued persuasively that this is not so, pointing out that in this text new prescriptions invariably begin, as that for the Tritopatores does, with the name of the deity and in asyndeton. The θύμα for the polluted Tritopatores is a separate but unspecified victim, of which a ninth is to be burnt; it follows that the remaining eight portions are eaten, as is also indicated by the contrast between the verbs θύειν and καταγίζειν, "unmarked" and

* The present paper is a revised version of a talk at the 1997 convention of the American Philological Association. The following abbreviations are used:


I am indebted to the late Prof. Birgitta Bergquist and to Prof. Robert Parker for kindly sending me scripts of their papers at the Göteborg conference (below, nn. 5, 9), and to Dr. Gunnel Ekroth for sending me her 1999 Stockholm doctoral dissertation, *The sacrificial rituals of Greek hero-cults in the Archaic to the early Hellenistic periods*, from all of which I have profited.

1 S. Scullion, "Olympian and Chthonian", CA 13 (1994) 75-119.


3 Jameson et al. (above, n. 2) 31; Kevin Clinton, "A New Lex Sacra from Selinus: Kindly Zeuses, Eumenides, Impure and Pure Tritopatores, and Elasteroi", *CP* 91 (1996) 159-79, at 170f.
"marked" sacrificial terms indicating respectively Olympian and chthonian offerings. A subsequent entry prescribing "normal" Olympian sacrifice for the "pure" Tritopatores ends in line 17 with the phrase "let them perform the ancestral sacrifices as to the gods," θυόντο ἡόπερ τοῖς θεοῖς τὰ πατρότα. The second passage I would like to draw special attention to follows immediately in lines 17-20: a ram is to be sacrificed to Zeus Meilichios, of which it is specified that a whole thigh (Ὑφέκα, line 19) be burnt and that the remaining meat not be carried out of the sanctuary, τὸ κραμερέπετο.

In the case of the "polluted" Tritopatores the terms θείαιν and καταγίζειν describe the contrasting treatment of victims for the same recipient. We have a parallel for this procedure in the cult of Herakles at Sikyon: Pausanias 2.10.1 reports that the thighs of a lamb are placed in the fire on the altar and that "they eat some of the meat as though from a (normal) victim, some they consecrate (i.e. burn) as to a hero," καὶ γυν ἦτι ἄρνα ὁ Σικυώνιοι εφάζαντες καὶ τοὺς μηροὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ κούσαντες τὰ μὲν ἐκθουσιν ὡς ἀπὸ ἱερείου, τὰ δὲ ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν κρεῶν ἐνδαγίζουσι. The Selinous text also confirms Stengel’s view that the verb ἐνατεύειν, "to ninth-sacrifice," known from the cult of Herakles on Thasos and of Semele on Mykonos, means to burn a ninth portion–Stengel would add: for a chthonian recipient. The burning of a whole thigh for Zeus Meilichios at Selinous is a comparable procedure, and there are probable parallels for this in cult of Hermes at Athens and Herakles at Miletos.

The new evidence raises the question of how common such procedures may have been. The Selinunte inscription not only increases our attested examples of such rites, but perhaps more importantly associates them with a wider range of recipients, adding the Tritopatores and Zeus Meilichios to Hermes, Semele and, in three cases, Herakles. In the cases both of the Tritopatores, who are ancestral spirits, and of Herakles, the burning of a portion is described with the phrase "as to a hero or heroes" and with the related verbs ἐνατεύειν and καταγίζειν, which are most often used of offerings to heroes; the other recipients too are usually classified as heroes or chthonian divinities. Attested sacrifices to such recipients are therefore the appropriate comparison group for these rites, and the sacrificial calendars are the natural place to turn for a sampling of sacrificial procedures. Robert Parker has compiled statistics from sacred calendars that distinguish some sacrifices for heroes as holocausts: in the calendar from Erchia two sacrifices for heroes are specified as holocausts as against seven which are not (one of these being "sober"); in the Salaminioi inscription one heroic sacrifice is a holocaust, thirteen are not; in the Thorikos calendar, which specifies that one offering to a god is "to be burnt," all sixteen heroic sacrifices are non-holocausts. These data appear to cohere with the findings of Nock, who collected four-
teen examples of banquet-sacrifices for heroes. On the traditional, radically dualistic view of the Olympian/chthonian distinction heroic sacrifices which are not holocausts or involve a banquet can be taken, as they are by Parker and Nock, as evidence against the validity of a distinction between what I have called "participatory" sacrifices for Olympians and "renunciatory" sacrifices for chthonians. If, however, as I suggest, we adopt a more flexible approach to the distinction, recognizing a wide range of compromises between Olympian and chthonian sacrificial modes corresponding to the ambiguous character of chthonian divinities, we can perhaps see this evidence in a new light.

I have previously suggested that the prohibition on carrying meat out of the sanctuary, of which we have a new example in the Selinuntine offering for Zeus Meilichios, represents a compromise between holocaust sacrifice and the natural human desire to eat the meat of sacrificial victims: the meat is eaten, but under the ritual constraint of being consumed immediately within the confines of the sanctuary (Scullion [above, n. 1] 98-112). I would now suggest that such on-the-spot banquets were frequently accompanied by burning of a substantial portion of the victim such as a thigh or a ninth—what one might call a 'moirocaust'.

The sacrifice for Zeus Meilichios at Selinous would be a prime case: the recipient clearly belongs among those traditionally classified as chthonians, and meat is eaten on the spot—but not all of it: a whole thigh, far more than the usual bones and fat, is burnt on the altar. Catalogues of offerings such as the sacrificial calendars are generally much sparer in the provision of ritual detail than the Selinuntine text, and it may well be that most or all of the sacrifices to heroes that are not specified as holocausts were in fact moirocausts rather than straightforward Olympian banquet-sacrifices. The calendar from Erchia is fuller in ritual detail than the others, and therefore provides the best control. Of the nine heroic sacrifices in it, only two are holocausts, but six are explicitly to be eaten on the spot—οὗ φοράς in the language of the calendar—and may well have been moirocausts. The only sacrifice for a hero which is neither holocaust nor on-the-spot is a sheep offered to a hero Alochos, but this forms part of a festival on the citadel at Erchia at which the Nymphs, the river-god Acheloos and Hermes also receive a sheep, and a pregnant sheep which is οὗ φοράς is offered to Ge. It is possible that at this major event the most obviously chthonian offering, Ge's pregnant sheep, was felt to provide sufficient chthonian ambience, and was therefore the only victim required to be eaten on the spot, perhaps with the burning of a portion. The pattern of this evidence suggests that eating heroic banquets on the spot was the normal procedure, and if, as I have suggested, this represents a compromise between chthonian holocaust and Olympic participatory sacrifice it is parallel with moirocaust, which serves the same end in a more obvious way.

Indeed, the two types of compromise may well have been regularly associated, as they are in the case of Zeus Meilichios at Selinous. The ninth-sacrifice of a yearling attested for Semele on Mykonos on the eleventh of Lenaion is followed on the twelfth by offerings of a yearling to Dionysos Leneus and, for the sake of the crops, of black yearlings whose skins are to be removed (δερτά) for Zeus Chthonios and Ge Chthonia. These sacrifices doubtless form part of a two-day festival, and the concluding requirements that no foreigner take part and that banqueting take place on the spot presumably apply to the nine heroic sacrifices in it, only two are holocausts, but six are explicitly to be eaten on the spot—οὗ φοράς in the language of the calendar—and may well have been moirocausts. The only sacrifice for a hero which is neither holocaust nor on-the-spot is a sheep offered to a hero Alochos, but this forms part of a festival on the citadel at Erchia at which the Nymphs, the river-god Acheloos and Hermes also receive a sheep, and a pregnant sheep which is οὗ φοράς is offered to Ge. It is possible that at this major event the most obviously chthonian offering, Ge's pregnant sheep, was felt to provide sufficient chthonian ambience, and was therefore the only victim required to be eaten on the spot, perhaps with the burning of a portion. The pattern of this evidence suggests that eating heroic banquets on the spot was the normal procedure, and if, as I have suggested, this represents a compromise between chthonian holocaust and Olympic participatory sacrifice it is parallel with moirocaust, which serves the same end in a more obvious way.

Indeed, the two types of compromise may well have been regularly associated, as they are in the case of Zeus Meilichios at Selinous. The ninth-sacrifice of a yearling attested for Semele on Mykonos on the eleventh of Lenaion is followed on the twelfth by offerings of a yearling to Dionysos Leneus and, for the sake of the crops, of black yearlings whose skins are to be removed (δερτά) for Zeus Chthonios and Ge Chthonia. These sacrifices doubtless form part of a two-day festival, and the concluding requirements that no foreigner take part and that banqueting take place on the spot presumably apply to the nine heroic sacrifices in it, only two are holocausts, but six are explicitly to be eaten on the spot—οὗ φοράς in the language of the calendar—and may well have been moirocausts. The only sacrifice for a hero which is neither holocaust nor on-the-spot is a sheep offered to a hero Alochos, but this forms part of a festival on the citadel at Erchia at which the Nymphs, the river-god Acheloos and Hermes also receive a sheep, and a pregnant sheep which is οὗ φοράς is offered to Ge. It is possible that at this major event the most obviously chthonian offering, Ge's pregnant sheep, was felt to provide sufficient chthonian ambience, and was therefore the only victim required to be eaten on the spot, perhaps with the burning of a portion. The pattern of this evidence suggests that eating heroic banquets on the spot was the normal procedure, and if, as I have suggested, this represents a compromise between chthonian holocaust and Olympic participatory sacrifice it is parallel with moirocaust, which serves the same end in a more obvious way.

Indeed, the two types of compromise may well have been regularly associated, as they are in the case of Zeus Meilichios at Selinous. The ninth-sacrifice of a yearling attested for Semele on Mykonos on the eleventh of Lenaion is followed on the twelfth by offerings of a yearling to Dionysos Leneus and, for the sake of the crops, of black yearlings whose skins are to be removed (δερτά) for Zeus Chthonios and Ge Chthonia. These sacrifices doubtless form part of a two-day festival, and the concluding requirements that no foreigner take part and that banqueting take place on the spot presumably apply to the nine heroic sacrifices in it, only two are holocausts, but six are explicitly to be eaten on the spot—οὗ φοράς in the language of the calendar—and may well have been moirocausts. The only sacrifice for a hero which is neither holocaust nor on-the-spot is a sheep offered to a hero Alochos, but this forms part of a festival on the citadel at Erchia at which the Nymphs, the river-god Acheloos and Hermes also receive a sheep, and a pregnant sheep which is οὗ φοράς is offered to Ge. It is possible that at this major event the most obviously chthonian offering, Ge's pregnant sheep, was felt to provide sufficient chthonian ambience, and was therefore the only victim required to be eaten on the spot, perhaps with the burning of a portion. The pattern of this evidence suggests that eating heroic banquets on the spot was the normal procedure, and if, as I have suggested, this represents a compromise between chthonian holocaust and Olympic participatory sacrifice it is parallel with moirocaust, which serves the same end in a more obvious way.
the whole sequence, so that the ninth-sacrificed yearling for Semele is also eaten on the spot; in any case the two features are again closely associated in a ritual sequence of markedly chthonian colouring.

A short and pithy inscription of the mid-fifth century from Thasos may provide further evidence that the burning of a substantial portion, what I am calling a moirocaust, was a regular feature of offerings to heroes. The interpretation of this text is however controversial (LSS 63 [IG XII Suppl. 414]):

[Hephaistos]kalei Theos iotai
[aites ou thymoi ou-
[de] khoron oudè gen-
[ou]nyaki theimis ou-

5 [o]t' enostematai ou-
[de] geera temeneta-
t ou dhlaetai

"To Herakles Thasios it is not permitted [to sacrifice] a goat, nor a piglet; nor is it permitted for a woman [to participate]; nor is ninth-sacrifice to be performed; nor are perquisites to be cut, nor contest-prizes offered15 / a contest held." Birgitta Bergquist has argued that this regulation is designed by a series of prohibitions to produce a "normal" participatory sacrifice, but I would like to make a fresh case for the opposite view that it is a holocaust that is being required.16 The Selinous inscription shows that moirocausts were not uncommon; this being so, a prohibition on ninth-sacrifice could be shifting the rite in one of two directions: either towards full participatory sacrifice or towards total holocaust. The prohibitive flavour of the text seems to me to tell in favour of the holocaust alternative. Moreover, ninth-sacrifice is a variation on holocaust, an established compromise between holocaust and consumption of the meat. It therefore seems more probable that the prohibition means "perform a true holocaust, not the standard compromise" than that it means "don't perform a ninth-sacrifice—nor for that matter any other modified holocaust, nor a full-scale holocaust; on the contrary, perform an ordinary participatory sacrifice." The straightforward way to require an Olympian offering would be to prescribe sacrifice to Herakles "as a god," óc theoun, a phrase applied to him elsewhere in this sense, in contrast to offerings to him "as a hero," óc ἕρωι. I suggest that the mention of ninth-sacrifice is natural here because a distinction is being made between established modes of sacrifice to heroes: on the one hand a form of modified holocaust well-attested for Herakles, on the other the full-scale rite.

Bergquist argues that the prohibition on perquisites excludes the possibility that a holocaust is being required, but this conclusion seems firmer than the evidence warrants (Herakles on Thasos [above, n. 5] 71-2). Prima facie one wouldn’t expect a holocaust offering to involve any perquisites, so what is the point of prohibiting them? In the inscription from Mykonos discussed above (n. 14) we find a probable example of a modified-chthonian sacrifice involving perquisites. The yearlings to be sacrificed to Zeus Chthonios and Ge Chthonia are black and dertã, a word Stengel interprets as (hostias) pelle spoliandas,

15 ἀπλεται is generally reckoned to represent ἀπλετταί, with e for the spurious diphthong (see L. Thraete, The Grammar of Attic Inscription I [Berlin 1980] 172ff., 299ff.). The use of portions of sacrificial meat as prizes in contests is attested in two Hellenistic inscriptions, LS 98.32-6 and LSS 61.79-81, of which the second deals specifically with heroic cult; hence Sokolowski ad loc. speaks of "portions affectées aux ἄλκα." Cf. also IG XII Suppl. 353, Pindar Ol. 7.77ff., Hdt. 6.38.1, Thuk. 5.11.1, all quoted below.

16 Bergquist offers detailed studies of this and a second inscription (IG XII Suppl. 353) both in Herakles on Thasos (above, n. 5) 65-90 and in her Göteborg paper (above, n. 5); further bibliography in Bergquist, who helpfully summarizes earlier studies, and in Sokolowski, LSS. In the first edition of the inscription, Ch. Picard, "Un Rituel Archaique du Culte d’Héraclès Thasien Trouvé à Thasos", BCH 47 (1923) 241-74, Picard concluded from the prohibition of ninth-sacrifice that "le culte n’était pas surtout ‘herique’ et chthonien" (252), but from the prohibition of perquisites that the sacrifice was "laissé sans doute intégralement à Héraclès" (253). H. Seyrig, "Quatre cultes de Thasos II: Héraclès", BCH 51 (1927) 185-98 and 369-71, at 193-8, followed by almost all scholars other than Bergquist, interpreted the inscription as requiring a holocaust sacrifice, but on very different grounds from those I suggest. Going well beyond the evidence, Seyrig assumes that perquisites were always taken from sacrificial victims that were eaten: "l’interdiction des γέφας est donc incompatible avec tout autre rituel que celui de l’holocauste."
"victims whose skins will be removed," which must mean that someone got the skin of these black chthonian victims as a perquisite. Several passages in the Erchia calendar point in the same direction: twice there are prescribed sacrifices for heroines with on-the-spot dining and the skin going as perquisite to the priestess; so also, and closely comparable with the Mykonos sequence, goats for Semele and Dionysos "on the same altar," "to be handed over to the women," with on-the-spot dining and the skin to the priestess. By contrast, in two cases of on-the-spot sacrifices for Artemis, it is specified that the skin be consecrated by fire. I conclude that even if perquisites were seldom or never taken from full-holocaust victims they could be taken from modified-chthonian victims. My comparanda all happen to involve the skin, but it seems reasonable to suppose on this specific basis as on general grounds that when a ninth-sacrifice or other moirocaust was offered perquisites from the meat that was to be consumed might be taken. We can in fact get a little beyond general grounds, and with evidence from Thasos. Picard, the first editor of the Herakles Thasios inscription, suggested that the prohibition of perquisites is paired with that of ninth-sacrifice because in normal cases of ninth-sacrifice perquisites might be taken from the remaining eight portions (Picard [above, n. 17] 255). Fourteen years later Launey published a fragment of a lease of the "garden of Herakles" on Thasos which might be taken as confirmation of Picard's suggestion. Only the right side of the text survives, and a probably large number of letters is missing to the left. Lines nine to eleven are preserved as follows (IG XII Suppl. 353):

9 ]
10 ἐνατευθῇ. Ὁ τι δ᾽ ἄν ἀπόστασιν γίνηται, τόμ μὲν
11 ἐτοί τοῖς πολεμάρχοις, ὡκτε τῇ τάξει τῇ νικώτη

Launey reasonably concluded that an ox was ninth-sacrificed, and that the remaining eight portions constituted the ἀπόστασις. Although he plausibly suggested that some of these portions were given as perquisites, there is no evidence for this on the stone; it is clear enough, however, that the polemarchs distribute one or more of them to the τάξει victorious in some contest. Launey thus claims to find here the positive counterpart to the prohibition of ninth-sacrifice, perquisites and prize-portions in the Herakles Thasios inscription. Whether or not perquisites were taken from this particular ninth-sacrifice, there is every reason to believe that if contest-prizes could be taken from such victims perquisites could also.

If this line of argument is cogent, it becomes probable that the prohibition in the Herakles Thasios inscription is forbidding a typical form of modified holocaust: "sacrifice to Herakles as a hero—not a modified heroic ninth-sacrifice, but a full-scale heroic holocaust." Thus this text both supports and is illuminated by the suggestion that moirocaust offerings were common practice in the cult of heroes and chthonian divinities generally. The new text from Selinous provides further support for this conclusion by applying to the ninth-sacrifice for the polluted Tritopatores the rubric ἡσπερ τοῖς ἑρώεσι.

We have mentioned the phrases ὁς θεός and ὁς ἱερός in their application to opposite aspects of Herakles, the preeminent example of a divinity who crosses the Olympian/chthonian boundary, and similar phrases occur three times in the Selinunte inscription. I would like in conclusion to consider the significance of these phrases; Parker has suggested that they are the native terms for distinguishing sacrificial ritual as "divine" or "heroic", and that they should therefore replace the terms "Olympian" and "chthonian", which in their application to ritual are modern (Parker as in n. 9 above). Parker has yet to discuss in detail how he would classify the phenomena of Greek religion under the headings "divine" and "heroic".

---

17 P. Stengel, "Zu den griechischen Sacralalterthümern", *Hermes* 39 (1904) 611-17, at 611-14; cf. id. (above, n. 5) 131 n. 3.


20 Bergquist in her Göteborg paper (above, n. 5) suggests that in the lease ἐνατευθῇ may have been negated as in the Herakles Thasios inscription. She may of course be right, but her principal argument, which is that holocaust-victims are normally smaller animals, is perhaps not very compelling: the natural reluctance to burn an ox whole would not be elicited by the prospect of burning only a ninth portion of one.
and "heroic," but one advantage he sees in the Greek terms is that they correspond to the distinction he detects between sacrifice to heroes and other forms of what is traditionally called chthonian sacrifice. I have already suggested that moirocaust, which may well have been the standard form of heroic banquet-sacrifice, is a modification of chthonian ritual, and it is attested for chthonian gods as well as for heroes. This I think goes some way toward meeting Parker’s objections, and I would be surprised if in the end his classification of sacrificial practice under the Greek rubrics differs very much from the traditional model, but I would like to make a few observations about the suggested terminology itself.

It will be useful to gather here the principal literary attestations of the ὰκ θεῶι / ὰκ ἠρωι distinction, together with some passages where one or the other, or a similar phrase, occurs on its own:

1. Pindar, Ol. 7.77-80: τὸθ λύτρον συμφορὰς οἰκτρὰς γλυκὸς Τλαπολέμοι ἵππας ἀρχαγέται, ὀκεῖροι θεῶι, μῆλον τε κνικάεσσα ποιμᾶ καὶ κρίεις ἀμφ’ ἄεθλοις.

2. Hdt. 5.136: καὶ ἐνθεῦτα ἐκτείσει πόλιν Ἀθηναῖοι, τὴν πρότερον τούτον Κλασιμάκας Καρπάδους κτίσας οὐκ ἀπόνητον, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ Θηρήκων ἐξελαθεῖε τιμᾶς νῦν ὑπὸ Τησιά τοῦ ἐν Ἀθηναίοις ὁ Ἱπποκράτης ἦσει.

3. Hdt. 5.244: καὶ δοκεῖοι δὲ μοι οὗτοι ὁρθῶτα Ἑλλήνων ποιεῖν, οὐ διὲ Ἡράκλεια ἵππων οἴκειται, καὶ τῶι μὲν ὡς ἀνθανάτωι, Ὅλυμπιοι δὲ ἐπονυμίην θοῦντι, τοῖς δὲ ἐπερίοις ὁ Ἱπποκράτης ἔνασι ζωῆι.

4. Hdt. 5.114: … ὄντες δὲ ἦσεν ὁ Ἱπποκράτης ἀνὰ πᾶν ἐκο …

5. Hdt. 6.38.1: καὶ οἱ τελευτῆσαι (sc. Miltiadi) ἁρκανάτι Θεῶι ὡς νόμος οἰκιστῇ, καὶ ἀγάνα ἑπικόν τε καὶ γυμνικὸν ἐπιτάσι …

6. Hdt. 7.117: … ἐνμυρωφοῦσε δὲ πᾶσα ἡ εστρατηγία, τούτῳ δὲ τῷ Ἀρταχαῖτί Θεῶι Ἀκάνθοι οἱ ἐκ θεοπροπίου ὁ Ἱπποκράτης ἐπονυμάζοντε τὸ οὔνομα.

7. Thuk. 5.11.1: περιείροντες αὐτοῖς (viz Brasidae) τὸ μνημεῖον ὁ Ἱπποκράτης ἐν τῇ ἐπάνω, καὶ τιμᾶς διδοκαίων ἀγάνακας καὶ ἐπίτευκτος ἔθειας, καὶ τὴν ἀποκαίνα ὡς οἰκιστῇ προκεχείον καταβαλόντες τὰ Ἀγαθανεία οἰκοδομήματα …


12. Paus. 2.10.1: Φαίστεων ἐν Σκυθονίᾳ λεγομένων ἐδόθησα καταλαβεῖν Ἦρακλεὶ εφας ὁ Ἱπποκράτης ἐναχείζονσα: οἷον κατ’ άρθρα δρᾶς οἴσιν οἶοι ὃ Φαίστως τῶν αὐτῶν, ἀλλ’ ὁ θεῖος θεοῖσσε καὶ νῦν ἐτί ἄρα οἱ Σκυθικοὶ εφαξάμεντες κατ’ αὐτοὺς θεοὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ βομβίου κατεσκαντε τῷ μὲν ἐκτελέσαν ὡς ἀπὸ ἱερείου, τὰ δὲ ὁ Ἱπποκράτης τῶν κρεῶν ἔναχεβλησσε.

13. Paus. 2.11.7: τοῖς δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ καὶ Εὐσκεριῶν—καὶ γὰρ τούτοις ἀγάλματα ἐστὶ—τῶι μὲν ὁ Ἱπποκράτης μετὰ ἤλιον δύναται ἐναγχείζουσιν, Ἐυσκεριῶν δὲ ὁ θεῖος θεοῖσσε

14. Philostr. Heroikos 53.11: προσεβληθῶντος δὲ τοῦ σήματι μετὰ τῶν ὑμῶν ἀκτᾶς μὲν ὀκεῖρο ἐν πολέμῳ ἐδοξεῖσθαι. δρόμοι δὲ ἐρρυθμισμένοι συνθήλαζον ἀνακαλοῦντες τὸν
In all the Classical passages here the terms ὡς θεῶι and ὡς ἥρωι are being applied to the recipient rather than the ritual; in Hdt. 2.44.5 and Isok. they are paired to distinguish opposite aspects of the same recipient or to emphasize the recipients’ unexpected status. In Pindar there is an implicit contrast between Tlepolemos’s status as hero-founder and the Olympian offerings he receives at the great public festival of the founding of Rhodes, and much the same sort of contrast is made by Thukydides. In all these cases the phrases ought to be translated not "as to a god or hero" in the sense "as one sacrifices to a god or hero," but simply "as a god or hero," referring to the recipient’s status. In Isokrates ἔρωςίν and θεοί are in agreement with the participle οὐίν, which spells out the reference to the recipient that is to be understood elsewhere; ὡς ἥρως in the nominative in Hdt. 1.168, the contrast with men rather than gods in Xen. Lak. Pol. and the frequent use of the phrases with non-sacrificial verbs such as τιμῶν and ἐβείων (Hdt. 1.168, Thuk., Xen., Hyp.) all point to the same conclusion. The phrase θύωσιν ὡς νόμος oἰκετήθη in Hdt. 6.38.1 is the only earlier passage that refers to the ritual, and it is significant that Herodotos feels the need to make that clear by adding the word νόμος. In all the passages where the terms are paired, both earlier and later, they are accompanied by verbs of sacrifice such as ἐβείων and ἐνεργεῖζεν which mark the specifically ritual distinction.21 ὡς θεῶι and ὡς ἥρωι / ὡς τεθνεότι in the passages from Pausanias and Philostratos might also be read as referring to the recipient, but in particular the final underscored clauses in Paus. 2.10.1 and Philostr. are perhaps more naturally read as referring to the ritual—somewhat superfluously, given the specificity of the sacrificial verbs employed. It looks as though the ritual application of these phrases originated sometime in the five hundred years between Hypereides and Pausanias.

In the new attestations from Selinous, however, it is clear that ἕσπερ τῶι ἥροις and ἕσπερ τῶι θεοῖς are referring to ritual and must be understood in the sense "as one does to heroes or gods." But the use of the article with the plural here is a clear difference from the contemporary literary sources,22 and like Herodotos’s ὡς νόμος linguistically distinguishes these phrases as applying to the ritual. Yet even here the status of the recipient is prominent, and in the first two cases the contrast between "heroic" and "divine" sacrifice corresponds to the change from "polluted" to "pure" Tritopatores. In column B of the inscription we encounter a similar ritual phrase: ἱεύρεθη ὃν ἐλαστέροι χρέει θύειν, ἥρων ἕσπερ τῶι ἀθανάτωι, ἐφαράξετο δ’ ἐκ γὰν (12-13). Sacrifices to the ἐλάστερος or revenging spirit23 are to be performed "as to the immortals," but with the proviso that the throat be cut in such a way as to produce a flow of blood onto the ground, a traditional component of chthonian sacrifice.24 In this case there is no explicit contrast in the status of the recipient, but the clause "let him slaughter into the earth" is equivalent to "let him slaughter as to the heroes," and we have here a new example of a mixed rite combining Olympian and chthonian elements.

21 When Herodotos uses only one of the phrases at 5.114.2 and 7.117.2 he employs the "unmarked" term θεοῖς, but ἐνεργεῖζεν in 7.117.2 shows that chthonian sacrifice is meant.
22 The use of ἕσπερ too is different. In Pindar the -περ component seems to mark loose or approximate usage (LSJ ὡς-περ II), "as though to a god": the sacrifices and contests for Tlapolemos bring to mind the Panhellenic athletic festivals, three of which were dedicated to gods, and it seems very unlikely that the phrase is in any sense technical here. In Hypereides the -περ is ironic, "as though they were heroes, indeed." Only at Selinous is the sense "just as one does for the gods."
23 On the ἐλάστερος see Jameson et al. (above, n. 2) 116-20.
24 See e.g. Scullion (above, n. 1) 97f. n. 60 with further references.
A number of the passages quoted above raise serious doubts about whether these phrases were ever well-established technical terms. The variety of sacrificial and non-sacrificial verbs used with them, the occurrence of ὀψερ ἑοὺς and θεός, and the pretty clearly non-technical comparison in Pindar all make against the notion that we have here a bipolar technical distinction.

A fragment of Aristophanes’s Tagenistai (504.12-14 KA) which has not been brought to bear on this issue supports the conclusions that these terms normally refer to recipients and that they had no established ritual significance:

καὶ ἰδομεν ἦντοι τοῖς ἐναγίμασιν
ὕστερ θεοῖς, καὶ χοῖς γε χεύμενοι
αἰτούμεθ' αὐτοῖς δευρ' ἀνίεναι τάγαθα.

The passage is full of technical religious vocabulary, specifying ἐναγίματα and chthonian libations, χοῖς, as offered to the dead—but offered to them ὄσπερ θεοῖς. The speaker is praising the benefits of the underworld, whose inhabitants—so I would judge the flavour of the joke—live “like gods,” a witticism which would fall rather flat if the Athenian audience recognized the phrase as precisely the wrong ritual term for these markedly non-Olympian rites.

The passages employing such phrases are not very numerous, but they do suggest certain conclusions. In almost all cases the terms refer to the status of the recipient rather than the ritual as such, and even in the Selinuntine text the reference to contrast of status remains operative. It seems clear therefore that terms normally referring to recipients have been transferred—certainly in Selinous and perhaps generally in the imperial period—to the corresponding rituals, but without entirely losing their primary sense. It is important too that neither the Tritopatores nor the elasteros are heroes, and that much the same procedure as in the case of the polluted Tritopatores, the burning of a larger than usual portion, is employed in the offering to the chthonian god Zeus Meilichios: there the phrase ἑόρει τοῖς ἠρόεσι is not employed, but then neither is there any contrast of status in that case. It looks as though both in actual procedure and in terminology the heroes belong together with chthonian gods, spirits of the dead and underworld bogeys, which is precisely the group to which the term “chthonian” is traditionally applied (Scullion [above, n. 1] 89-95). The Selinuntine terms, then, however native, do not serve to distinguish heroic sacrifice from other types of chthonian procedure.

The modern terminological distinction between Olympian and chthonian sacrificial procedures is a transference to the ritual realm of terms that are abundantly attested as native classifications of divinities, but the usage at Selinous of the phrases ἑόρει τοῖς ἠρόεσι and ἑόρει τοῖς θεοῖς is exactly the same sort of transference of recipient-terms to ritual that those who use the Olympian/chthonian distinction are currently being asked to repent of. Moreover, even if these terms have the attraction of having been transferred by Greeks, on present evidence this happened in the pre-imperial period in a single Greek city, and the terms themselves are rather less common in the ancient evidence than the terms “Olympian” and “chthonian.” They are also far less clear and precise: so far we have seen ἑόρει τοῖς ἠρόεσι as a ritual term connected only with divine beings who are not heroes, and it has yet to be shown that specific ritual features regularly distinguish offerings to heroes from those to chthonian gods. Both the heroes and the gods are clearly connected with the earth, and in that sense “chthonian” is semantically the more inclusive term. So too ἑόρει τοῖς θεοῖς in the Selinuntine usage is less precise

25 The phrase δεύρ’ ἀνίεναι τάγαθα is also technical in prayers directed to the chthonian realm: see A. Henrichs, “Namenlosigkeit und Euphemismus: Zur Ambivalenz der chthonischen Mächte im attischen Drama”, in Heinz Hofmann, ed., Fragmenta Dramatica (Göttingen 1990 [Festschrift Radd]) 161-201, at 199 with n. 83.

26 For the debate see Renate Schlesier, “Olympian versus Chthonian Religion”, SCI 11 (1991/92) 38-51 and Scullion (above, n. 1), both with further references and summaries. The Sixth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult was devoted to the theme “Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian”, and the forthcoming publication edited by Robin Hägg contains a number of important papers on the topic.

27 An exception is the offering of wine, which seems to have been common for heroes (as for the dead) but very uncommon for chthonian divinities: see A. Henrichs, “The ‘Sobriety’ of Oedipus: Sophocles OC 100 Misunderstood”, HSCP 87 (1983) 87-100, at 98-9 with n. 58.
than "Olympian," since there are many gods of chthonian or semi-chthonian character to whose ritual it could not be applied.

We must wait to see whether Parker or others will offer a new typology of sacrifice to correspond to the new terms, and whether such a typology will differ significantly from contemporary forms of the traditional one. In the meantime, I for one am disinclined to prefer the Selinuntine reapplication of recipient-terms to the modern one, which classifies the phenomena in the same way and is semantically much the clearer. After all, the Selinuntine terminology didn’t exactly catch on among the Greeks themselves, and this is a case where modern scholarship can justifiably claim to have outdone a native attempt at the same thing. The great value of the new evidence, it seems to me, is not so much in the utility of the terms themselves as in the support they provide for the view that the Greeks recognized two basic types of sacrificial procedure.
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