

SCOTT SCULLION

HEROIC AND CHTHONIAN SACRIFICE: NEW EVIDENCE FROM SELINOUS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 132 (2000) 163–171

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

HEROIC AND CHTHONIAN SACRIFICE: NEW EVIDENCE FROM SELINOUS*

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.¹ 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.² I reproduce the section of Column A in question (A.9-20):

- τοῖς Τρ-
- 10 ιτοπατρεῦσι · τοῖς · μιαιοῖς ἡόπερ τοῖς ηερόεσι, φοῖνον ὑπολθει-
 ψας · δι' ὀρόφο · καὶ τᾶν μοιρᾶν · τᾶν ἐνάταν · κατακα-
 ἰεν · μίαν. θύοντο θῦμα : καὶ καταγιζόντο ἡοῖς ἡοσία · καὶ περιρά-
 ναντες καταλινάντο : κέπειτα : τοῖς κ<α>θαροῖς : τέλεον θύοντο : μελίκρατα ὑπο-
 λείβον · καὶ τράπεζαν καὶ κλῖναν κένβαλέτο καθαρὸν ἡἡμα καὶ στεφά-
 15 νος ἐλαίας καὶ μελίκρατα ἐν καιναῖς ποτερίδε[ς]ι καὶ · πλάσματα καὶ κρᾶ κάπ-
 αρξάμενοι κατακαάντο καὶ καταλινάντο τὰς ποτερίδας ἐνθέντες.
 θύοντο ἡόπερ τοῖς θεοῖς τὰ πατρῷα · τῶι ἐν Εὐθυδάμο : Μιλιχίοι : κριὸν θ[υ]-
 ὄντο. ἔστω δὲ καὶ θῦμα πεδὰ φέτος θύεν. τὰ δὲ ἡιαρὰ τὰ δαμόσια ἐξἡ<α>ιρέτο καὶ τρά[πεζα]-
 ν · προθέμεν καὶ Φολέαν καὶ τὰπὸ τᾶς τραπέζας : ἀπάργματα καὶ τόστέα κα[τα]-
 20 κᾶι · τὰ κρᾶ μέχφερέτο. καλέτο [ἡ]όντινα λει. ἔστω δὲ καὶ πεδὰ φέτ[oc φ]-
 οῖφοι θύεν :

Lines 9-12 prescribe that "one of the ninth portions" of the sacrificial victim be burnt for the "polluted" Tritopatores "as to the heroes," ἡόπερ τοῖς ηερόεσι and concludes "let those for whom it is sanctioned sacrifice and consecrate," θύοντο θῦμα καὶ καταγιζόντο ἡοῖς ἡοσία. 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.³ The θῦμα 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:

LS F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques* (Paris 1969).

LSS F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques: Supplément* (Paris 1962).

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.

² M.H. Jameson, D. R. Jordan and R.D. Kotansky, *A Lex Sacra from Selinous* (Durham 1993 [Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Monographs 11]).

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.⁴ 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 πατρῶια*. 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 (*Φολέα*, line 19) be burnt and that the remaining meat not be carried out of the sanctuary, *τὰ κρᾶ μέχφερέτο*.

In the case of the "polluted" Tritopatores the terms *θύειν* 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 νῦν ἔτι ἄρνα οἱ Σικυώνιοι φάξαντες καὶ τοὺς μηροὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ καύσαντες τὰ μὲν ἐσθ[ουοῦσιν ὡς ἀπὸ ἱερείου, τὰ δὲ ὡς ἥρωι τῶν κρεῶν ἐναγίζουσι*. 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.⁵ 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.⁶

The new evidence raises the question of how common such procedures may have been. The Selinuntine 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 *ἐναγίζειν* and *καταγίζειν*, which are most often used of offerings to heroes;⁷ the other recipients too are usually classified as heroes or chthonian divinities.⁸ 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.⁹ These data appear to cohere with the findings of Nock, who collected four-

⁴ Since I applied the linguistic distinction of markedness to Greek sacrificial terminology at Scullion (above, n. 1) 97 with n. 57, 117 (I find from Ekroth's dissertation [see note of acknowledgement] that I was anticipated in this by Gregory Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans* [Baltimore, 1979] 308 § 10 n. 4) some scholars have begun to refer to the sacrificial procedures themselves as "marked" or "unmarked": see e.g. Albert Henrichs, "Anonymity and Polarity: Unknown Gods and Nameless Altars at the Areopagos", *Illinois Classical Studies* 19 (1994) 27-58, at 43 with n. 74; Clinton (above, n. 3) 169. This seems to me a potentially misleading practice, and I would enter a plea for limiting the application of the markedness distinction to the sacrificial terms as such.

⁵ P. Stengel, *Opferbräuche der Griechen* (Leipzig 1910) 132. Herakles: *LSS* 63, *IG XII Suppl.* 353; Semele: *LS* 96.23-4. In a paper forthcoming in the proceedings of the Sixth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult at Göteborg Birgitta Bergquist has on the basis of the new evidence withdrawn her previous interpretation of *ἐνατεύειν* as a taxation term (*Herakles on Thasos* [Uppsala 1973] 70-80).

⁶ Hermes: Aristoph. *Plutos* 1128, cf. Homer *Od.* 14.434-6, where Hermes and the Nymphs receive a seventh portion; this practice may be relevant to the interpretation of *h. Hom. Herm.* 128. Herakles: F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure* (Paris 1955) no. 42. For the front thigh as a common perquisite see Jameson et al. (above, n. 2) 38 ad A19.

⁷ See J. Casabona, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en Grec* (Aix-en-Provence, 1966) 200-208.

⁸ There are full accounts in Jameson et al. (above, n. 2) of the cults of Zeus Meilichios (81-103) and the Tritopatores (107-14).

⁹ Parker in a forthcoming paper in the proceedings of the Sixth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, where he argues more fully the conclusions briefly stated in his article "chthonian gods" in *OCD*³. Erchia: Georges Daux, "La grande démarchie: Un nouveau calendrier sacrificiel d'Attique (Erchia)", *BCH* 87 (1963) 603-34 (*LS* 18); Salaminioi: William S.

teen examples of banquet-sacrifices for heroes.¹⁰ 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'.¹¹ 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—ὄφορά in the language of the calendar—and may well have been moirocausts.¹² 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 ὄφορά is offered to Ge.¹³ 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 Olympian 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 (δερτὰ) for Zeus Chthonios and Ge Chthonia.¹⁴ 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

Ferguson, "The Salaminioi of Heptaphylai and Sounion", *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 1-74 (LSS 19); Thorikos: Georges Daux, "Le calendrier de Thorikos au Musée J. Paul Getty", *AC* 52 (1983) 150-74.

¹⁰ A.D. Nock, "The Cult of Heroes", *HThR* 37 (1944) 141-74, also in *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, ed. Z. Stewart (Oxford 1972) 2.575-602.

¹¹ In "normal" Olympian sacrifice only thigh-bones, fat, offal and sometimes tongue, chine or tail are burnt on the altar: see K. Meuli, "Griechische Opferbräuche", in *Phyllobolia. Festschrift Peter Von der Mühl* (Basel 1946) 185-288, at 214-23, also in *Gesammelte Schriften* (Basel & Stuttgart 1975) 2.907-1021, at 937-47.

¹² Erchia calendar (above, n. 9) A.17ff., Heroinei, ὄφορά; B.40ff., Herakleidai, ὄφορά (added after the original inscription: see Daux 628); B.55ff., Aglauros, ὄφορά (also added); Γ.48ff., Leukaspis, "sober," ὄφορά; Δ.18ff., Epops, holocaust, "sober"; Δ.52ff., Menedeios, ὄφορά; E.1ff., Heroinei, ὄφορά; E.9ff., Epops, holocaust, "sober."

¹³ Erchia Γ.26ff., cf. A.14ff. (Nymphs); B.21ff. (Acheloos); Δ.24ff. (Hermes); E.16ff. (Ge).

¹⁴ *LS* 96.22-6: ἐνδεκάτη, ἐπὶ το(ῦ)τ[ο] πλῆθος, Σεμέληι ἐτήσιον · τοῦτο ἐνατεύεται · δυωδεκάτη Διονύσῳι Ληυνεῖ ἐτήσιον · ὑπὲρ[ρ] κα[ρ]πῶν Διὶ Χθονίῳι, Γῆι Χθονίῳι δερτὰ μέλανα ἐτήσι[α] · ξένῳι οὐ θέμις · δαινύσθων αὐτοῦ.

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]):

[Ἡρα]κλει Θαείωι
[αἶγ]α οὐ θέμις οὐ-
[δὲ] χοῖρον · οὐδὲ γ-
[υ]ναικὶ θέμις · οὐ-
5 [δ]’ ἐνατεύεται · οὐ-
δὲ γέρα τέμνεται-
ι · οὐδ’ ἄθλεται

"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," ὡς θεῶι, a phrase applied to him elsewhere in this sense, in contrast to offerings to him "as a hero," ὡς ἥρωι. 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 δερτά, a word Stengel interprets as (*hostias*) *pelle spoliandas*,

¹⁵ ἀθλεται is generally reckoned to represent ἄθλεται, with ε for the spurious diphthong (see L. Threatte, *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 ἄθλα." 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 Archaïque 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 'heroique' 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 γέρα est donc incompatible avec tout autre rituel que celui de l'holocauste."

"victims whose skins will be removed,"¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ 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]	---	βούν
10			ἐ]νατευθῆι. Ὅτι δ' ἄν ἀπόσταθμον γίνηται, τῶμ μὲν
11]ει τοῖς πολεμάρχοις, ὥστε τῆι τάξει τῆι νικώσῃ

Launey reasonably concluded that an ox was ninth-sacrificed, and that the remaining eight portions constituted the ἀπόσταθμον. 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 τάξις 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.¹⁹ 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.²⁰

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 ἵοπερ τοῖς ηερόεσι.

We have mentioned the phrases ὡς θεῶι and ὡς ἥρωι 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 Selinuntine 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"

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

¹⁸ *LS* 18: Heroines: A.19ff, E.3ff.; Semele and Dionysos: A.46ff., Δ.35ff.; Artemis: Γ.8ff., Δ.8ff.

¹⁹ M. Launey, "Le Verger d'Héraklès à Thasos", *BCH* 61 (1937) 380-409, at 394-99.

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 *ὡς θεῶι* / *ὡς ἥρωι* distinction, together with some passages where one or the other, or a similar phrase, occurs on its own:

1. Pindar, *Ol.* 7.77-80: *τόθι λύτρον κυφορᾶς οἰκτρᾶς γλυκὺν Τλαπολέμωι
ἴταται Τιρυνθίων ἀρχαγέται,
ὥσπερ θεῶι,
μήλων τε κνιάεσσα πομπὰ καὶ κρίσις ἀμφ' ἀέθλοι.*
2. Hdt. 1.168: *καὶ ἐνθαῦτα ἔκτισαν πόλιν Ἄβδηρα, τὴν πρότερος τούτων Κλαζομένιος
Τιμήσιος κτίσας οὐκ ἀπόνητο, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ Θρηϊκῶν ἐξελασθεὶς τιμὰς νῦν ὑπὸ Τηϊῶν τῶν ἐν
Ἄβδήροισι ὡς ἥρωι ἔχει.*
3. Hdt. 2.44.5: *καὶ δοκέουσι δέ μοι οὗτοι ὀρθότατα Ἑλλήνων ποιέειν, οἷον διζὰ Ἡράκλεια
ἰδρυσάμενοι ἔκτηνται, καὶ τῶι μὲν ὡς ἀθανάτῳ, Ὀλυμπίῳ δὲ ἐπωνυμίην θύουσι, τῶι δὲ
ἑτέρῳ ὡς ἥρωι ἐναγίζουσι.*
4. Hdt. 5.114.2: *... Ὀνησίλωι δὲ θύειν ὡς ἥρωι ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος...*
5. Hdt. 6.38.1: *καὶ οἱ τελευτήσαντι (sc. Miltiadi) Χερσονησίται θύουσι ὡς νόμος οἰκιστῆι,
καὶ ἀγῶνα ἵππικόν τε καὶ γυμνικὸν ἐπιτεταί...*
6. Hdt. 7.117.2: *... ἐτυμβοχόεε δὲ πᾶσα ἡ στρατιή. τούτῳ δὲ τῶι Ἄρταχαίῃ θύουσι
Ἀκάνθιοι ἐκ θεοπροπίου ὡς ἥρωι, ἐπονομάζοντες τὸ οὐνομα.*
7. Thuk. 5.11.1: *περιεΐξαντες αὐτοῦ (viz Brasidae) τὸ μνημεῖον ὡς ἥρωι τε ἐντέμνουσι
καὶ τιμὰς δεδώκασι ἀγῶνας καὶ ἐτησίους θυσίας, καὶ τὴν ἀποικίαν ὡς οἰκιστῆι προσέ-
θεσαν καταβαλόντες τὰ Ἀγώνεια οἰκοδομήματα . . .*
8. Isok., *Helen* 63: *ἔτι γὰρ καὶ νῦν ἐν Θεράπναις τῆς Λακωνικῆς θυσίας αὐτοῖς (viz. Hele-
nae et Menelao) ἀγίας καὶ πατρίας ἀποτελοῦσιν οὐχ ὡς ἥρωισιν ἀλλ' ὡς θεοῖς ἀμφοτέροισι
οὖσιν.*
9. Xen. *Hell.* 7.3.12: *ἔθαψάν τε (sc. Euphronem) ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ καὶ ὡς ἀρχηγέτην τῆς πό-
λεως κέβονται.*
10. Xen. *Lak. Pol.* 15.9: *αἷον δὲ τελευτήσαντι τιμαὶ βασιλεῖ δέδονται, τῆι δὲ βούλονται δη-
λοῦν οἱ Λυκούργου νόμοι, ὅτι οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώπους ἀλλ' ὡς ἥρωας τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίων
βασιλεῖς προτετιμήκασι.*
11. Hyp. *Epitaph.* 21: *φανερὸν δ' ἐξ ὧν ἀναγκαζόμεθα καὶ νῦν ἔτι... καὶ τοὺς τούτων
(viz. Macedonum) οἰκέτας ὥσπερ ἥρωας τιμᾶν ἡμᾶς ἀναγκαζομένους.*
12. Paus. 2.10.1: *Φαίετον ἐν Σικυωνίαι λέγουσιν ἐλθόντα καταλαβεῖν Ἡρακλεῖ σφᾶς ὡς
ἥρωι ἐναγίζοντας· οὐκ οὐκ ἤξιον δρᾶν οὐδὲν ὁ Φαίετος τῶν αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς θεῶι θύειν.
καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἄρνα οἱ Σικυώνιοι σφάξαντες καὶ τοὺς μηροὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ καύσαντες τὰ
μὲν ἐσθίουσιν ὡς ἀπὸ ἱερείου, τὰ δὲ ὡς ἥρωι τῶν κρεῶν ἐναγίζουσι.*
13. Paus. 2.11.7: *τῶι δὲ Ἀλεξάνορι καὶ Εὐαμερίωνι—καὶ γὰρ τούτοις ἀγάλματά ἐστι—
τῶι μὲν ὡς ἥρωι μετὰ ἥλιον δύναντα ἐναγίζουσιν, Εὐαμερίωνι δὲ ὡς θεῶι θύουσιν.*
14. Philostr. *Heroikos* 53.11: *προσελθόντων δὲ τῶι σήματι μετὰ τὸν ὕμνον ἀπὸ μὲν ὥσπερ
ἐν πολέμῳ ἐδουπεῖτο, δρόμοις δὲ ἐρρυθμιμένοις συνηλάλαζον ἀνακαλοῦντες τὸν*

Ἀχιλλέα, στεφανώσαντες δὲ τὴν κορυφὴν τοῦ κολωνοῦ καὶ βόθρους ἐπ' αὐτῇ ὀρύξαντες τὸν ταῦρον τὸν μέλανα ὡς τεθνεῶτι ἔσφαττον. ἐκάλουν δὲ καὶ τὸν Πάτροκλον ἐπὶ τὴν δαίτα, ὡς καὶ τοῦτο ἐς χάριν τῷ Ἀχιλλεῖ πράττοντες. ἐντεμόντες δὲ καὶ ἐναγίσαντες κατέβαινον ἐπὶ τὴν ναῦν ἤδη, καὶ θύσαντες ἐπὶ τοῦ αἰγιαλοῦ τὸν ἕτερον τῶν ταύρων Ἀχιλλεῖ πάλιν, κανοῦ τε ἐναρξάμενοι καὶ σπλάγγων ἐπ' ἐκείνῃ τῇ θυσίαι (ἔθνον γὰρ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην ὡς θεῶι), περὶ ὄρθρον ἀπέπλεον ἀπάγοντες τὸ ἱερεῖον, ὡς μὴ ἐν τῇ πολεμίαι εὐωχοῖντο.

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 ἥρωσιν and θεοῖς are in agreement with the participle οὔσιν, which spells out the reference to the recipient that is to be understood elsewhere; ὡς ἥρωος 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 τιμᾶν and cέβειν (Hdt. 1.168, Thuk., Xen., Hyp.) all point to the same conclusion. The phrase θύουσι ὡς νόμος οἰκιστῆι 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 θύειν and ἐναγίζειν which mark the specifically ritual distinction.²¹

ὡς θεῶι and ὡς ἥρωι / ὡς τεθνεῶτι 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 *hόσπερ τοῖς ἡερόεσι* and *hόσπερ τοῖς 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: *hόκα τῷ ἐλακτέροι χρέζει θύεν, θύεν hόσπερ τοῖς ἄθανάτοις, φραζέτο δ' ἐς γᾶν* (12-13). Sacrifices to the ἐλάκτερος 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 θύειν, but ἐτυμβοχόεε in 7.117.2 shows that chthonian sacrifice is meant.

²² The use of *hόσπερ* 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 Tlepolemos 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 ἐλάκτερος 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 οἰκιστής and ἀρχηγέτης alongside ἥρωας 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 θύομεν †αὐτοῖσι τοῖς ἐναγίσμασιν
ὥσπερ θεοῖσι, καὶ χοάσ γε χεόμενοι
αἰτούμεθ' αὐτοὺς δεῦρ' ἀνιέναι τὰγαθά.

The passage is full of technical religious vocabulary, specifying ἐναγίσματα and chthonian libations, χοαί, as offered to the dead²⁵—but offered to them ὥσπερ θεοῖσι. 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 ὥσπερ τοῖς ἡρώεσσι 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 ὥσπερ τοῖς ἡρώεσσι and ὥσπερ τοῖς θεοῖσι 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.²⁶ 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 ὥσπερ τοῖς ἡρώεσσι 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.²⁷ 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 ὥσπερ τοῖς θεοῖσι in the Selinuntine usage is less precise

²⁵ The phrase δεῦρ' ἀνιέναι τὰγαθά 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 Radt]) 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.

Union College
Schenectady, New York

Scott Scullion