

# THE PHREARRHIAN *LEX SACRA* AN INTERPRETATION

MNHMEION ETKAEI ANAPI

IN 1970 EUGENE VANDERPOOL PUBLISHED a fragmentary *lex sacra* of the Attic deme Phrearrhoi.<sup>1</sup> This was not only the first inscription of the deme to come to light but also the first evidence of any kind on the cult activities of the Phrearrhians. Its finding place, moreover, about halfway between the villages of Olympos and Anevysos, provided the first real indication of the deme's location. Vanderpool's *editio princeps* was closely followed by a restoration of the inscription with appended notes by Franciszek Sokolowski.<sup>2</sup> Nothing has appeared since this effort, and clearly the "adequate commentary" originally called for by Vanderpool has yet to appear. In this paper I should like to make a start toward such a commentary, through a systematic tabulation and interpretation of the *res sacrae* on the fragment. My hope is to extract tentative, but supportable, conclusions about the identity of the rites there described.

To facilitate discussion, Vanderpool's text, with restorations by Vanderpool, Sokolowski, and myself, is reproduced below. Unidentified restorations are Vanderpool's.<sup>3</sup>

ΣΤΟΙΧ.

	[... <sup>6</sup> ... τῶν ἱεροποιῶν α[----- Δή]-
	[μητρι Θεσμο]φόρῳ ὕν πρ[ωτοτόκον?-----]
	[... <sup>6</sup> ... πρ]οιστάντωσαν κα[-----]
	[... λαμπ]άδος τῷ λαμπαδε[ίωι -----]
5	[ιερεῶσ]υνα κωλῆν πλευρὸν ἰ(σ)χ[ίον ----- οἱ ἱ]-
	[εροποι]οι? καὶ ὁ κῆρυξ δαινύσθω[σαν-----]
	[... Π]λούτωνι θυόντωσαν χρ(ὶδ)[ν----- τοῖς]
	[δημ]όταις μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ <sup>v</sup> [-----]
	[.. τ]ὸν ἐν τῷ Ἐλευ(σ)ινίῳ βωμὸν [-----]
10	[..]οὔθωμ ἱεροποιὸς ἀφιέτω τας[-----]
	[.. ἐ]πειδὰν αἱ ἱέρειαι ποιήσω[σι----- τ]
	[ῶν] Φρεα(ρ)ρίων θυόντωσαν τῇ Δή[μητρι----- Φρεα]-
	[ρρ]ίῳ? καὶ τῇ Κόρηι βοῦμ ἄρρε[να-----]
	[.] καὶ ἐάν τι ἄλλο βούλωνται <sup>w</sup> [-----]
15	μι(.)όν ἐστιν· ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς βωμοὺς[-----]
	ι μηροὺς μασχαλίσματα ἡμίκ(ρ)α[ίραν----- μ]-
	ηροὺς μασχαλίσματα ἡμίκραιρ[αν-----]
	ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ[ι----- τῷ τ]-
	οὔ Πλούτωνος βωμῷ ἱερεῶσυν[α----- ἀπὸ ἀμφ]-
20	οῖν τῶν βω(μ)ῶν τῇ ἱερείᾳ κα[ί----- πλε]-
	υρὸν ἰσχίον III τοῦ ἱερέου [----- ξ]-
	ύλα ἐπὶ τὸν χύτρον παρε[----- ἐν τῇ]-

<sup>1</sup> Vanderpool 1970 (= *SEG* XXXV 113). For the deme name, see Traill 1986, pp. 145–146 *et passim*. For my approach to this inscription I am indebted to Professor Jon D. Mikalson. I am also grateful for the comments and material aid of this article's two anonymous referees.

<sup>2</sup> 1971, pp. 217–219. This restoration, while facile, correct, and yielding a connected text, should be treated with extreme caution.

<sup>3</sup> I have worked from Vanderpool's photograph of the inscription (1970, pl. 15), having not been able, unfortunately, to inspect the stone (Athens EM 13384) itself.

ι αὐλῆι τοῦ Ἐλευσινιο[υ-----]  
 υσ<.)ν δαῖδα καὶ τῶν ηγ[-----δ]-  
 25 αἶδα διδόντωνσαν γ[-----]  
 [. ]ς καὶ τοῦ Ἰάκχου ι[-----]  
 [. ] οι<.) τῇ δὲ ἐβδό[μηι ἐπὶ δέκα-----]  
 [. . ] καὶ τῆς μουσι[κῆς-----]  
 [. .<sup>5</sup> . . ] τὸν βωμ[ὸν-----]  
 30 [. .<sup>6</sup> . . ] ἐνοι[-----]  
 [. . .<sup>7</sup> . . ] ἐμι[-----]  
 [. . . . .<sup>8</sup> . . ] ο[-----]

Line 2: πρ[ωτοτόκων] Simms: see below. πρ[οθυόντωνσαν] Sokolowski.

Line 4: [λαμπ]άδος Sokolowski.

Lines 5–6: [οἱ ἱεροποι]οί? Vanderpool, Sokolowski.

Lines 7–8: [τοῖς δημ]όταις? Vanderpool, Sokolowski.

Line 8: *v* indicates an uninscribed space that possibly contained a letter rendered in paint (cf. *vv*, 14).

Lines 12–13: (Δήμητρι) [Φρεαρρ]ωί? Simms: see below. (Δήμητρι) [Θεσμοφρ](<ρ)ωί Sokolowski (cf. Φρεα-<ρ)ρων < Φρεαιρων, 12; ἡμικ<ρ)α[ιρα] < ἡμικια[ιρα], 16).

Line 15: punctuation added by Sokolowski.

Lines 16–17: ἡμικραιρα Vanderpool, corrected to -αν by Sokolowski (cf. μηρούς).

Lines 19–20: [ἀπὸ ἀμφ]οῖν τῶν βωμῶν Sokolowski. [τοῖν θε]οῖν Vanderpool.

Line 20: κα[ι] Sokolowski.

Line 27: τῇ δὲ ἐβδό[μηι ἐπὶ δέκα] Simms: see below.

This text is unfortunately lacunate in epithets of Demeter. The goddess of line 2 is almost certainly Demeter Thesmophoros, given the surviving letters. Demeter Karpophoros, while also possible (and a state goddess elsewhere in the Greek world<sup>4</sup>), is known in Attic inscriptions only from two private dedications (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4587, line 3; 4730, line 3) of, respectively, the 4th century B.C. and the 1st century A.C. The next goddess named, together with Kore ( ]ωι, line 13), could possibly be Demeter Thesmophoros as well, since the inscription has other instances (lines 12, 16) of rho incompletely carved and thus masquerading as iota.<sup>5</sup> This identification is, however, unlikely: first, Demeter Thesmophoros has already received a sacrifice in line 2;<sup>6</sup> second, the male victim is wholly inappropriate and unattested for this goddess (see discussion below, p. 94); and third, there is an attractive candidate for the ending -ωι as written: Demeter φρεάρριος, the deme's eponym, whose priestess held a seat in the theater of Dionysos (Δήμητρ[ος] Φρεάρρο[υ], *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 5155). Vanderpool restored another reference to Demeter and Kore as τῶ θεῷ in lines 19–20: the resulting collocation [τοῖν θε]οῖν τῶν βω(μ)ῶν τῇ ἱερεῖαι, however, does not easily submit to translation. First, τῇ ἱερεῖαι can hardly govern the preceding genitives: no title “priest/priestess of the altars (of the two goddesses)” is otherwise attested (the nearest is ὁ ἐπὶ βωμῷ ἱερεύς at Eleusis: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 6, face C, line 47; *SEG* XXX 61, face B, fragment *f*, line 4), while “priestess of the two goddesses,” although possibly extant (τὴν ἡ[ι]ερέ[α]ν [καὶ τὸν] φαῖδυν[τὴν τοῖν θεοῖν]?, *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 231, fragment *a*, lines 13–14; τοῖ[σιν] ἡιερεῦσι τοῖν θεοῖν]?, *SEG* XIII 4, line 5), is impossible here because of the order and the separation of [θε]οῖν and ἱερεῖαι. But even if the priestess is removed from this combination, an acceptable translation of the rest remains problematic. “The altars [genitive] of the two goddesses” requires, so far as I can see, a preposition (e.g., ἐπὶ) or some other word to govern the genitive, but [ἐπὶ τοῖν θε]οῖν τῶν βω(μ)ῶν would be most bizarre, not only for this inscription but for Greek. Sokolowski's [(ἀπὸ) ἀμφ]οῖν τῶν βω(μ)ῶν is therefore preferable.

<sup>4</sup> Tegea (Pausanias 8.53.7), Didyma (*I.Didyma* 504 [= *SEG* XXVIII 852], lines 11–12), Ephesos (*Ephesos* IX 1, D1 [= *LSCG Suppl.* 121, *SEG* XXVIII 866], lines 28–29), Miletos (*MDAI* [I] 1980, pp. 230–233, col. C, lines 4–5).

<sup>5</sup> See Vanderpool 1970, p. 49; Sokolowski 1971, pp. 218–219.

<sup>6</sup> Sokolowski (1971) deals with this objection by understanding the sacrifice of line 2 as a πρόθυμα, but in this case it is difficult to understand why Demeter would receive the *prothyima* alone but later (lines 12–13) share the (putatively) main sacrifice with Kore.

Among the sacrificial offerings, my supplement ὕν πρ[ωτοτόκον] (line 2) for Demeter Thesmophoros is paralleled for Demeter (without epithet) in a *lex sacra* of Mykonos (*LSCG* 96, line 16 [ca. 200 B.C.]) to be discussed further below (p. 95). *Pregnant* sows, moreover, are standard for Demeter Thesmophoros (see Table 2, pp. 96–97 below), and πρ[ωτοτόκον] would suggest that specification here.

Vanderpool dated the *lex Phrearrhia* to ca. 250 B.C., noting, however, that its letter forms and morphology could support a date as early as the late 4th century.<sup>7</sup> In this connection two morphological features should be mentioned that were perhaps in Vanderpool's mind but not specifically stated.<sup>8</sup> First, three of the inscription's four verbal imperative endings (πρ[ο]ιστάντωσαν [line 3], θυόντωσαν [line 12], and διδόντωσαν [line 25]) are transitional between the -ντων of classical times and the later -τωσαν.<sup>9</sup> Three Attic parallels for such transitional endings exist: καθελόντωσαν (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 204, lines 47–48 [352/1 B.C.]), ὀφειλόντωσαν (*REG* 91, 1978, pp. 289–306 [= *SEG XXVIII* 103], line 43 [332/1]), and μισθωσάντωσαν (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1241, line 52 [300/299]). The fourth imperative, δαινύσθωσαν (line 6), is a "pure" late form, for which no secure Attic parallel is attested before 300 B.C.<sup>10</sup> Considering, then, the transitional imperative forms of the inscription (parallels ca. 350–300) and its one imperative of later type (no parallel before 300), I should like to propose a date higher than Vanderpool's though still within his range of possibilities, that is, ca. 300 B.C.<sup>11</sup>

As Vanderpool recognized, this inscription contains "a set of cult regulations . . . dealing with the rites of the Eleusinian goddesses, Demeter and Kore and their associates: sacrifices, perquisites, procedure and the like."<sup>12</sup> The salient elements of the inscription are categorized in Table 1, with line numbers appended in parentheses.

The first question that can be addressed via Table 1 is the source of our inscription. Vanderpool assumed that the regulations in question were an official *lex* of the deme Phrearrhoi.<sup>13</sup> This assumption has been challenged, however, by Robin Osborne, who raises the possibility that the inscription is "a set of regulations for a local Eleusinion and not a deme decree at all."<sup>14</sup> Where, as here, the preamble of a text does not survive, the question of its origin is difficult to settle: locally issued cult regulations, in fact (e.g., *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1364, 4962), are concerned with many of the same matters, and use the same terminology, as polis or deme decrees. But some elements of the inscription do suggest deme, rather than local, origin. First, all the characteristics of a typical public sacred calendar are found: sacrifices in calendrical order, divinities, victims, perquisites of officials, and valuation. Second, among the functionaries governed by these regulations are hieropoioi, officials of a deme or polis, not a sanctuary. These indications of deme origin, while not conclusive, should help allay the doubts raised by Osborne.

The elements of the *lex Phrearrhia* as set out in Table 1 can next be addressed in turn. First are the divinities and their offerings; in Table 2 are listed all comparanda for these from inscriptions describing public cult activity. The divinities of the *lex* to be considered, again, are Demeter (Thesmophoros, Phrearrhios[?]<sup>15</sup>), Kore, Plouton, and Iacchos. One quasi-parallel is in the Delian

<sup>7</sup> Vanderpool 1970, p. 47.

<sup>8</sup> I owe these observations and epigraphical parallels to one of the referees of this article.

<sup>9</sup> Meisterhans 1900, §63.d.10–11.

<sup>10</sup> Our inscription also uniformly employs -ηι rather than -ει for the dative of α-stem nouns and adjectives (τῇι, lines 12, 13, 20, 27; Κόρηι, line 12; ἀλλῇι, line 23); the post-Euclidian replacement of -ηι by -ει begins around 380 B.C. and predominates after 300: Meisterhans 1900, §§15.8–9, 48.10; Threatte 1980, §23.00. Since, however, this replacement was never complete, its presence or absence in a given inscription is useless for dating.

<sup>11</sup> This is, in fact, the date adopted by the editor of the text in *SEG XXXV* 113.

<sup>12</sup> Vanderpool 1970, p. 49.

<sup>13</sup> Vanderpool 1970, p. 50.

<sup>14</sup> Osborne 1985, pp. 177, 251, note 39.

<sup>15</sup> We would not, of course, expect to find this very local Demeter in another setting.

TABLE 1

<i>Divinities</i>	<i>Offerings</i>
Demeter Θεσμο]φόρῳι (line 2)	ὕν πρ[ωτοτόκον?]
[Demeter Φρεαρρ]ῳι? + Kore (lines 12–13)	βοῦμ ἄρρε[να]
Plouton (line 19)	κρ[ύ]ον (μηρούς μασχαλίσματα ἡμίκραι[αν]: thighs, haunches w/shoulder meat, half heads) (lines 16–17)
Iakkhos (line 26)	
<i>Sacred Officials</i>	<i>Perquisites</i>
hieropoios (line 10), -oi (line 1)	κωλῆν πλευρὸν ἰ(σ)χ[λον]
keryx (line 6)	(the ham, ribs, haunch) (line 5)
priestess (line 20), -es (line 11)	[πλε]υρὸν ἰσχ[λον] (ribs, haunch) (lines 20–21)
<i>Structures</i>	<i>Sacral Implements</i>
Eleusinion	lamp and lampstand (line 4)
with single altar (lines 9, 18)	torch (lines 24–25)
with court (line 23)	<i>khytros</i> (line 22)
altars (lines 15, 20)	
altar of Plouton (line 19)	
<i>Valuation</i>	<i>Dates</i>
3 obols (line 21)	a day beginning with “seven” (line 27)

Thesmophoria (nos. 1, 4, 5[?]; 2, 3 also to Thesmophoroi);<sup>16</sup> another is the specifically Eleusinian grouping (nos. 11–21) in the Mysteries or the Eleusinia (no. 14 in the Proerosia). We turn now to the sacrifices themselves: a pregnant(?) sow<sup>17</sup> for Demeter Thesmophoros, a male bovid for Demeter Phrearrhios(?) and Kore, and a ram for Plouton. Numbers 1–9 below show parallels for the sow and demonstrate that this is a typical sacrifice to Demeter, especially as *Thesmophoros*<sup>18</sup> (nos. 1–4, 5[?]) and as *Chloe* (nos. 6–8; contra no. 23). Bovids, on the other hand (nos. 11–18), are concentrated in sacrifices to Demeter *Eleusinia* at the Eleusinian Mysteries, Eleusinia, and (once) Proerosia, and many of these are male (certainly nos. 13–16; cf. the male piglets of no. 10 to Demeter *Eleusinia* at Sparta).<sup>19</sup> The inscription, then, seems to reproduce a basic disjunction in the data below, that is, between sacrifices at the Thesmophoria and the Chlōia, emphasizing pregnant sows,<sup>20</sup> and at the Mysteries and Eleusinia, emphasizing bovids (often male). But while the comparanda below may be simply classified as *either/or* (i.e., unequivocally on one side or the other of the disjunction), the *lex Phrearrhia* represents and encompasses both sides. For this reason, I suspect that the inscription has to do with rites of more than usual complexity and length. If,

<sup>16</sup> This parallel is attested likewise for Athens in Aristophanes, *Th.* 295–298: the two Thesmophoroi, Plouton, Kalligeneia, Kourotophos (= Ge), Hermes, and the Graces.

<sup>17</sup> Given that female victims were regular for goddesses, one should assume that all the goddess-associated (σ)ύες, χοῖροι, βόες, and even δελφάκια above are feminine if otherwise unspecified (δέλφαξ, on the other hand, is feminine by nature).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Burkert 1985, p. 13.

<sup>19</sup> The ram, of course, is also male, and its distribution above is interesting in showing frequent association with Kore (nos. 12, 21–23; cf. the boars of nos. 5 and 11). Plouton and his surrogate, Zeus (Eu)bouleus, on the other hand, receive mostly pigs (nos. 3, 5, 11), but as Polyxenos, a sheep (no. 21); these also are either certainly (no. 11) or probably male. In our inscription, the ram to Plouton in line 7 perhaps suggests his link to Kore, or even that Kore should be restored as co-recipient of this victim. Note, however, the absence of this, or any other demonstrably male victim, in the Delian Thesmophoria.

<sup>20</sup> Burkert 1985, p. 13.

This approach receives some support from a *lex sacra* of Mykonos (Table 2, no. 5), which warrants attention for its parallel to the conjectural ὕν[ρωτοτόχον] in line 2 of our inscription. The relevant lines (15–22 of Sokolowski’s transcription, *LSCG* 96) are quoted below.

**Ληναίωνος δεκάτη**

ἐπὶ ὠιδῇ ὑπερ καρποῦ Δήμητρι ὕν ἐγκύμονα πρωτοτόκον,  
Κόρη κάπρον τέλεον, Διί Βουλει̃ χοϊρον· ταῦτα διδόντων ιε-  
ροποιιοὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀργυρίου καὶ ξύλα διδόντων καὶ ὀλάς·  
ἐπιμελέσθων δὲ τῶν ἱερῶν ὅπως καλά ᾗ ἄρχοντες καὶ ιε-  
ρεῖς· ἐὰν δέ τι δέη καλλιιερεῖν, ἱεροποιοὶ διδόν[τ]ων· εἰς δὲ  
τὴν ἐορτὴν [βα]διζέτω Μυχονιάδων ἢ βουλολ[μ]έ[ν]ην κ[αι] τῶν οἰ-  
κουσῶν ἐμ Μυχό[ν]ω θσαι ἐπὶ Δήμητρα τετέλ[η]νται.

These sacrifices, scheduled “after[?] the song about the *χαρπός*” (line 16), were conducted at a women’s festival (lines 20–22).<sup>21</sup> Because of the “Eleusinian triad” of Demeter, Kore, and (Eu)Bouleus, which received sacrifice on this occasion (lines 16–17), and the reference to female participants who “have been initiated/consecrated to Demeter” (line 22), one might at first think that the rites in question were mysteries. Numbers 1–3 of Table 2, however, show that this triad in fact appears most often in Thesmophoria, not Mysteria, while the limitation to female participants also suggests rites like the Thesmophoria rather than mysteries of Eleusinian type.<sup>22</sup> On the other hand, not only the administration (lines 17–20) but even more intimate aspects (τῶν ἱερῶν: line 19) of the festival seem to be in the hands of males; particularly noteworthy is the ἐπιμέλεια of ἀρχοντες and ἱερεῖς (lines 19–20), instead of ἀρχοῦσαι and ἱέρεια as in the well-known Athenian *lex sacra* on the Thesmophoria, *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1184, lines 3–6:

5 τὰς δὲ ἀρχούσας κοινεῖ ἀμφο-  
 ῖρας διδόναι τῆς ἱερείας (vitiō pro τῇ ἱερείᾳ) εἰς  
 τὴν ἑορτὴν καὶ τὴν ἐπιμέλεια-  
 ν τῶν Θεσμοφορίων ἡμιεκτεῖον

These indications, together with the connotations of τετέλ[η]νται in line 22, should not be dismissed and suggest that in the *lex sacra* from Mykonos, as in the *lex Phrearrhia*, we see rites that in some sense meld Thesmophoria and Mysteria.<sup>23</sup>

When we consider the sacred personnel of the *lex Phrearrhia*—hieropoioi, a keryx, and priestesses—we are led once again to the conclusion that the rites described cannot be exactly those of Thesmophoria, for the male hieropoioi and keryx would have been totally excluded from that festival. Hieropoioi, officials charged with managing and conducting rites and festivals throughout the Greek world,<sup>24</sup> were numerous in Athens and Attica. Among the demes, their existence is

<sup>21</sup> The rubric about ol καρποι is again reminiscent of Demeter Karpophoros. Yet, considering the obscurity of this goddess's cult in Greece and the inscription's silence about Demeter's epithet, the identification as Karpophoros rather than, e.g., Thesmophoros, would be excessively speculative. It is even possible that these two goddesses were conflated: *I.Eph* 213, lines 3–6 (A.D. 83/84): μυστήρια καὶ θυσίαι . . . καθ' ἑκαστον ἐνιαυτον ἐπιτελοῦνται ἐν ᾿Εφέσῳ Δήμητρι Καρποφόρῳ καὶ Θεσμοφόρῳ καὶ θεοῖς Σέβαστοῖς ὑπὸ μυστῶν. . .

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Nilsson 1906, p. 328. For the Thesmophoria as an exclusively women's festival, see *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 1184, lines 3–6; Isaios 8.19; Burkert 1985, p. 242.

<sup>23</sup> This melding is also seen in the epistolary inscription from Ephesus quoted in note 21 above.

<sup>24</sup> *RE* VIII, 1913, cols. 1583–1588, s.v. 'Ἱεροποιοί (J. Oehler); Whitehead 1986, pp. 142–143.

TABLE 2

OFFERING	DIVINITY	CIRCUMSTANCES	SOURCE
<b>1</b> ὕς ἐγκύμων	The Thesmophoroi	Posideon (line 111) Thesmophoria (cf. <i>ID</i> II 372, face A, lines 94, 103–104)	Delos: <i>ID</i> I 316 (231 B.C.), line 120*
<b>2</b> ὕς ἐγκύμων	Demeter Thesmophoros (sacrifices also to Kore, Zeus Eubouleus)	Metageitnion   	Delos: <i>IG</i> XI ii 287 (250 B.C.), col. A, line 69
<b>3</b> ὕς ἐγκύμων δελφάκιον, χοῖρος δελφάκιον, χοῖρος	Demeter Thesmophoros  Zeus Eubouleus (= Plouton)	Metageitnion   	Delos: <i>ID</i> I 290 (246 B.C.), lines 88, 90–91
<b>4</b> ὕς ἐγκύμων δελφάκιον	Demeter Thesmophoros Kore (sacrifice also to Zeus Eubouleus)	Posideon? (line 52) Thesmophoria? (cf. 1 above)	Delos: <i>ID</i> I 338 (224 B.C.), col. A, fragment ab, lines 58–59
<b>5</b> ὕς ἐγκύμων πρωτοτόκος κάπρος τέλεος χοῖρος	Demeter  Kore Zeus <i>Bouleus</i> (= Eubouleus = Plouton)	Lenaion 10 (ἐπὶ ᾧδῃ ὑπὲρ καρποῦ) (women's festival)   	Mykonos: <i>LSCG</i> 96 (ca. 200 B.C.), lines 15–16 line 17 line 17
<b>6</b> ὕς κύουσα ὕς κύουσα	Demeter <i>Eleusinia</i> Demeter <i>Chloe</i>	Anthesterion (biennial sacrifices)	Tetrapolis: <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1358 (400–350 B.C.), col. II, lines 48–49
<b>7</b> ὕς κύου[σα]	Demeter <i>Chloe</i>	Anthesterion	Tetrapolis: <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1358 (400–350 B.C.), col. II, line 49
<b>8</b> ὕες δύο καλλιστεύουσαι· ἡ ἑτέρα ἐγκύμ[ων]	Demeter <i>Chloe</i>	Posideon 12	Mykonos: <i>LSCG</i> 96 (ca. 200 B.C.), lines 11–13
<b>9</b> σὺς ἐπιτόκα	Demeter	late spring, in procession of Mysteries at Andania (sacrifices also to Hermes, the Great Gods, Apollo Karneios, Hagne)	Andania: <i>IG</i> V i 1390 (92–91 B.C.), col. A, line 68
<b>10</b> χοιρίδια δύο ἄρσενα χοῖρος ἄρσην χοῖρος ἄρσην	Demeter <i>Eleusinia</i>  Kore Plouton	ἐν Ἑλευσυνίας (sacrifices also to Despoina, Tyche) 	Sparta: <i>IG</i> V i 364 (undated), lines 8–9
<b>11</b> βῶς τρεῖς χοῖροι κριός	Demeter <i>Eleusinia</i> Kore	Metageitnion (biennial sacrifices, perhaps reflecting state Eleusinia†)	Tetrapolis: <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1358 (400–350 B.C.), col. II, lines 43–44

\* Also *ID* 2 372, face A, lines 103–104; 398, face A, line 9; 440, face A, line 36; 442, face A, line 200; 444, face A, line 31; 447, line 16; 459, line 61; 460, fragment t, line 69.

† For the Eleusinian *agones*, or Eleusinia, see Van der Loeff 1903, Simms 1975.

OFFERING	DIVINITY	CIRCUMSTANCES	SOURCE
<b>12</b> βοῦς	Demeter/Kore	sacrifice of Milesian <i>theoroi</i> at Greater(?) Mysteries	Athens: <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 992 (2nd century B.C.), line 4
<b>13</b> βοῦς (m.pl.)	Demeter/Kore?	general sacrifices at Greater Mysteries	Athens: <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1028 (100–99 B.C.), lines 10–11‡
<b>14</b> βοῦς (m.pl.)	Demeter/Kore?	general sacrifices at Eleusinian Proerosia	Athens: <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1028 (100–99 B.C.), lines 28–29
<b>15</b> βοῦς τροφίης (m.) δῶο	Demeter/Kore?	general sacrifices at Eleusinia	Athens: <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1028 (100–99 B.C.), lines 15–16
<b>16</b> ταῦρος	Demeter/Kore?	sacrifice of Epimeletai of Mysteries at the Eleusinia	Athens: <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 847 (ca. 215–214 B.C.), lines 24–26
<b>17</b> βοῦς	Demeter/Kore?	sacrifice on behalf of Technitai περὶ τὸν Διόνυσιον at the Eleusinia	Athens: <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1330 (163–130 B.C.), lines 51–52
<b>18</b> τρίττοα βόαρχος	Demeter/Kore/ Plouton/Dolichos	at the Eleusinia or Mysteries	Eleusis: <i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 5 (ca. 500 B.C.), line 5 (cf. <i>IG</i> I <sup>3</sup> 78 [ca. 422 B.C.], lines 37–38)
<b>19</b> οἷς	Demeter	Metageitnion 12 in City Eleusinion (perhaps preparatory to the Eleusinia)	Erchia: Daux 1963, p. 607 (375–350 B.C.; = <i>SEG</i> XXI 541), col. B, lines 1–5
<b>20</b> οἷς κριός	Demeter Kore	in connection with Mysteries	Athens: <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1673 (327/326 B.C.), line 62
<b>21</b> οἷς κριός οἷς	Demeter Kore Polyxenos (= Plouton)	at the Eleusinia (sacrifices also to many other divinities)	Athens: State Calendar, <i>Hesperia</i> 4, 1935, p. 21 (410–399 B.C.; cf. <i>SEG</i> XXI 540, lines 62–64, 68)
<b>22</b> κριοῦ ΚΔ	Kore		Erythrai: <i>IEry</i> 207, line 47, (cf. lines 57, 78)
<b>23</b> οἷς κύοσα	Demeter <i>Chloe</i>	Elaphebolion	Thorikos: <i>SEG</i> XXXIII 147 (380–375 B.C.), line 39 lines 44–45
οἷς κύοσα	Demeter	Mounichion	
<b>24</b> οἷς ἐπίτεξ	Demeter		Gortyn: <i>IC</i> IV 3 (ca. 650–500 B.C.), line 3
<b>25</b> οἷς τέλεως καὶ τελέα κυέοσα	Demeter	Batromios 22 ἐς Ἀλκηίδας	Kos: <i>LSCG</i> 151 (350 B.C.), side A, lines 59–60
<b>26</b> οἷς κυεῦσα	<i>Demeteres</i> (Demeter/Kore)	Zminthios 4	Kamiroi: <i>LSCG</i> Suppl. 95 (1st century B.C.)
<b>27</b> κριός θῆλ[ε]α(?)	(Demeter) <i>Achaia</i>	Thargelion	Tetrapolis: <i>IG</i> II <sup>2</sup> 1358 (400–350 B.C.), col. II, line 27

‡ Also *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1008, lines 8–9; 1029, lines 7–8; 1030, lines 7–8; *SEG* XV 104, lines 11–12.

specifically attested for Aixone, Paianeia, Rhamnous, and Eleusis.<sup>25</sup> Thus, the hieropoioi of the inscription may indeed belong to Phrearrhoi, as its directions to them (lines 5–6?, line 10) suggest.

The herald is also likely to be a deme functionary.<sup>26</sup> Beyond the great *genos* of Kerykes, which held sacral responsibilities in Eleusinian cult and elsewhere at Athens,<sup>27</sup> other “ordinary” heralds played an important role in Attic religion. In the decree concerning the *genos* of Salaminioi,<sup>28</sup> a herald receives perquisites along with the priests of the *genos* (lines 43–46, 63–65), and his office is termed a *ἱερωσύνη* (line 64). Likewise, in the Athenian state calendar of 410–399 B.C.,<sup>29</sup> a herald receives priestly perquisites from sacrifice along with the *phylobasileis* of the tribe of *Geleontes* (lines 39–43, 52–56).<sup>30</sup> To receive such emoluments, the herald must have taken part in the sacrifices from which they were derived, and indeed, a herald’s role as “master of ceremonies” is both attested and easily imagined. Kleidemos (*FGrHist* 323 F5 = *Athenaios* 14.78, 660a–b) reports ἔδρων δ’ οἱ κήρυκες ἄχρι πολλοῦ βουθυτοῦντες . . . καὶ σκευάζοντες καὶ μιστύλλοντες, ἔτι δ’ οἰνοχοοῦντες. *Athenaios* (14.79) also traces back to Homer the appropriateness for heralds “to bring the items for oaths and for sacrifice,” and further relates (5.49) a ceremony at Athens in the time of Mithridates Eupator in which a herald proclaimed the *spondai* at the conclusion of the *thysiai*.<sup>31</sup> A master of ceremonies is really necessary whenever large groups perform complex rituals. The exertions of the paid sacrificer in Menander’s *Colax*<sup>32</sup> illustrate the need for someone to keep a ceremony moving, orderly, and thus pleasing to the divinities honored:

σπονδῇ· δίδου σὺ σπλάγχν’ ἀκολουθῶν. ποῖ βλέπεις;  
σπονδῇ. φέρ’ ὦ παῖ Σωσία. σπονδῇ. καλῶς  
ἔχει. θεοῖς Ὀλυμπίοις εὐχόμεθα  
Ὀλυμπίασι, πᾶσι πάσαις—λάμβανε  
τὴν γλώτταν ἐν τούτῳ—διδόναι σωτηρίαν,  
ὕγεια, ἀγαθὰ πολλά, τῶν ὄντων τε νῦν  
ἀγαθῶν ὄνησιν πᾶσι. ταῦτ’ εὐχόμεθα.

Not every sacrifice will have warranted the services of a herald. That the rites in the *lex Phrearrhia* did require one is another indication of their extent and complexity.

Priestesses are our inscription’s third category of sacral personnel, and their distinctive contribution to the identification of the festival represented is their naming of goddesses, that is, Demeter and Kore, as its focus.

The inscription’s personnel, then, are probably local to the deme Phrearrhoi and are thus nonspecific to known rites, although we may gather from the existence of both male and female officials that the festival honored goddesses but was not the Thesmophoria. For the time being, it seems appropriate simply to keep these personnel in mind until other evidence suggests a particular rite and then ask whether they are compatible with it.

<sup>25</sup> Aixone: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1199, line 5; Paianeia: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 250, lines 9–10; Rhamnous: *SEG* XV 112, lines 16–18; Eleusis: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 391, lines 10–11, 17–18.

<sup>26</sup> For *kerykes* generally, see *RE* XI, 1921, cols. 349–357, s.v. *Keryx* (J. Oehler); Whitehead 1986, pp. 141–142.

<sup>27</sup> Dittenberger 1885, pp. 1–40; Roussel 1934, pp. 819–834; Foucart 1914, pp. 143–148, 156–159; Töpffer [1889] 1973, pp. 80–92. For extra-Eleusinian involvement of this *genos*, see *Athenaios* 6.26, 234e; *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 241, line 17 (note 30 below).

<sup>28</sup> Ferguson 1938, pp. 3–5.

<sup>29</sup> Oliver 1935, pp. 19–32, no. 2.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. κέρυκσιν *hoi* Διπολιεῖ[ο]ι[ς] (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 241, line 17); ἡ γλώττα τῷ κήρυκι . . . τέμνεται (*Aristophanes*, *Pl.* 1110 and schol. Καλλίστρατος τῶν θυομένων φησὶ τὰς γλώσσας τοῖς κήρυξιν ἀπονέμεσθαι).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. also schol. *Iliad* 18.558: Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ καὶ νῦν τοὺς περὶ ἱεουργίαν πονομένους Κήρυκας (leg. potius κήρ., cf. Jacoby, *FGrHist* III 1, 64–65) φασιν.

<sup>32</sup> Sandbach 1972, p. 172, fragment 1.



Now let us consider location. Both original editors of the *lex Phrearrhia* asserted with more or less confidence that its rites belonged to, and were conducted in, the deme Phrearrhoi.<sup>33</sup> I think that this is at least debatable. Two distinctive elements of the inscription are relevant: The first is a phrase that distinguishes the Phrearrhians from “others”: [τοῖς δημ]όταις μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ [...] (line 8) suggests something shared between the two groups. David Whitehead<sup>34</sup> interprets these “others” as local metics, etc., who are being granted certain limited rights of participation in this deme festival, and in fact, one other deme *lex sacra* (of Skambonidai: *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 244, col. C, lines 7–9) does explicitly mention metics. This very explicitness, however, is important and makes the two cases less comparable than might be thought. In fact, no Greek civic inscription, so far as I have been able to discover, fails to identify groups designated οἱ ἄλλοι wherever they are mentioned, as, for example, οἱ ἄλλοι πρυτανεῖς or οἱ ἄλλοι οἱ. . . . The placement of καὶ immediately following τῶν ἄλλων in the *lex Phrearrhia*, on the other hand, precludes further definition. It may be that “the others” here were deemed to have been sufficiently identified at some earlier point in the inscription, but there is no evidence elsewhere for such tolerance of even momentary ambiguity. Another possibility is that “the others” are undefined precisely because they were, in fact, an unidentifiable mass—a group of casual festival attendees from many places whose identity was not important. If the rites in question took place within the deme Phrearrhoi, we should then have to suppose a relatively major festival there with a polydemic or “international” clientele, but (although the point can hardly be pressed) if such a festival did take place, there is no evidence of it.

The second distinctive element of the inscription is its extensive preoccupation with minute details of procedure. Many *leges sacrae* include procedural matter<sup>35</sup> but none in such detail or in so narrative a style as this. This point can best be illustrated by a tabulation in Table 3 of the inscription’s *extraordinary* references to sacred officials, ritual actions, and places. By “extraordinary” I mean “beyond what is typical of sacred laws”: omitted, therefore, are (1) all general indications of location, bare statements of sacrifice to particular divinities, perquisites, and prices; (2) all extra-ritual details (i.e., the provision or selection of, or payment for, victims or ritual equipment); and (3) all *secular* participants in rites (e.g., archons, public slaves, etc.).

In 112 words, the *lex Phrearrhia* gives 5 priestly categories, 6 arguably ritual directions, and 5 different ritual places, some of which—let us conservatively say 2—will have entailed still further ritual directions that have been lost. Adding the numbers above, we may compute a rough index of ritual specification (*r*) per hundred words:  $18/112 = r/100$ ;  $r = 16.07$ . Considering the same extraordinary categories in other similar *leges sacrae*, we find that the narrative *lex* from Mykonos discussed above (p. 95; *LSCG* 96) contains in 287 words 6 priestly categories, 17 ritual directions, and 2 different ritual places:  $25/287 = r/100$ ;  $r = 8.71$ . Another very fragmentary narrative *lex*, *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 334, in 225 words contains 1 priestly category, 7 ritual directions, and 3 different ritual places:  $11/225 = r/100$ ;  $r = 4.88$ . The standard tabular (nonnarrative) sacred calendar of Erchia (Daux 1963), on the other hand, has in two of its columns (Δ, Ε) the following: in 201 words, 3 priestly categories, 20 ritual directions, and 1 ritual place (omitting, as noted above, indications of place designating nothing more specific than “hill,” “sanctuary,” or “agora”):  $24/201 = r/100$ ;  $r = 11.94$ . The uniqueness of the *lex Phrearrhia* is equally striking if we consider the sum of extraordinary priestly categories, ritual directions, and ritual places *per day*. Under the assumption (see p. 103 below) that lines 1–27 describe the rites of one day, the inscription’s index of per-diem ritual specification is 18. For *LSCG* 96, the index reaches 10 on the most densely specified day (lines 5–15), while Daux (1963, cols. Α–Ε) reaches 6 (in cols. Γ and Δ, lines 1–12).<sup>36</sup> These crude

<sup>33</sup> Vanderpool 1970, p. 49; Sokolowski 1971, pp. 218–219.

<sup>34</sup> 1986, p. 205.

<sup>35</sup> See Dow 1968, pp. 170–171.

<sup>36</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 334 mentions the ἑορτή (lines 5, 30) of the Panathenaia, which may have occupied three or more of the event’s eight(?) days, but specifically names the procession (lines 16–18, 31–34) and *pannychis* (lines 31–33), which

TABLE 3

<i>Official</i>	<i>Action</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>line(s)</i>
? of hieropoioi	?	?	1
?	erect ____ in front of ____	?	3
hieropoioi(?)/herald	dine	?	6
?	____ to/for the demesmen?	?	7–8
	together with the others		
?	?	to/on (e.g.) the altar in the Eleusinion	9
the following(?) priest	leave the ____	?	10
the priestesses	do/make ____	?	11
?	is customary/righteous	?	14–15
?	?	(on)to the altars	15
?	?	on the altar in the Eleusinion	18
?	?	on/beside (e.g.) the altar of Plouton	18–19
?	?	of/on (e.g.) both of the altars	19–20
to the priestess and the ____	?	?	20
?	place money for(?) wood on the <i>khytros</i>	?	21–22
?	provide ____ (?)	?	22
?	?	in the court of the Eleusinion	22–23
?	? to a torch	?	24

attempts at quantification are intended only to focus attention on a genuine peculiarity of the *lex Phrearrhia* that might otherwise be taken lightly or go unnoticed. Other *leges sacrae* assume that cult officials know their local sanctuaries, normal procedures, and their own roles and that, therefore, they need no script apart from reminders about the occasional anomalies of particular rites. Our *lex*, by contrast, does not seem to assume such knowledge.

Two things that might explain this peculiarity may be suggested. The first is rites that are new or revised. Two of the *leges* above, in fact, owe their relatively elaborate statements of procedure to such novelty: the preamble (lines 1–4) of *LSCG* 96 attributes its compilation to a recent synoecism of the *poleis* on Mykonos around 200 B.C. that led to the introduction of new and/or revised ceremonies. *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 334, on the other hand, describes an elaboration of the program of the Lesser Panathenaia supported by the leasing of some newly acquired land (lines 16–17). Both these inscriptions contain phrasing that links the new rites to previous or customary practice: τάδε ἔδοξεν Μυκονίοις ἱερ[ά] θύειν πρὸς τοῖς πρότερον καὶ ἐπηνορθώθη περὶ τῶν προτέρων (*LSCG* 96, lines 2–3); καθάπερ πρότερον, κατὰ <τὰ> εἰω[θότα], καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις κρεανομίαις (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 334, lines 10, 15, 25). The *lex Phrearrhia*, however, shows no reference to earlier practice, although this is hardly conclusive in view of its incomplete preservation, and in any case its procedure is given in significantly greater detail than is that of either comparandum above. There is, of course, a second possible explanation for this exhaustive detail, this unwillingness to assume priestly knowledge, that is, that our *lex* is describing rites outside the sphere of priestly local knowledge and experience: rites long, complicated, infrequently (e.g., annually) observed, and in a relatively unfamiliar setting outside the deme. While this possibility lacks parallels, I think it merits attention nonetheless.

---

occupied the *Haupttag* of the festival (see Mikalson 1975, p. 34). Thus the number of days represented by this inscription is uncertain: if we conservatively take the possible range as between 1 and 3 days, the rate will vary from 3.67 to 11 (in contrast, once again, to the *lex Phrearrhia*'s 18).

More promising than these feeble indications of an extra-deme venue is the inscription's mention of the god Iacchos (line 26). This god is unattested outside the Athens–Eleusis axis, where he is a creature of the great procession of the Eleusinian Mysteries.<sup>37</sup> Originally a personification of the cry ἰαχχε uttered by the *mystai* in procession from Athens to Eleusis, this divinity had essentially no function elsewhere.<sup>38</sup> His mention here, then, provides a further, and perhaps more solid, indication that the *lex Phrearrhia* does describe a festival whose venue is either Athens<sup>39</sup> or Eleusis, not Phrearrhoi. Moreover, it makes the Mysteries, as Vanderpool thought possible,<sup>40</sup> a prime candidate for the festival in question. Let us see what, if any, indications our remaining evidence provides.

Certainly relevant to any discussion of place is the *lex Phrearrhia*'s reference to "the Eleusinion," a sanctuary certainly containing one altar (lines 9, 18) and possibly three others as well: two of uncertain attribution (line 15) and a third of Plouton (line 19).

At Eleusis, according to Otto Rubensohn, the name *Eleusinion* appears to have applied not to the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore as a whole but only to the huge initiation hall known to modern scholarship as the Telesterion.<sup>41</sup> If Rubensohn is correct, this Eleusinion is immediately excluded from consideration as the venue of our rites, since in the Telesterion there will have been no altar, and at any rate it would be quite incredible for a rite other than the Mysteries to have been allowed into this ultra-sacred space, which was also almost certainly *abaton* to the uninitiated (Livy 31.14; Proclus, in *Alcib.* 1.11). If, on the other hand, one deems Rubensohn not to have completely disposed of the view of Ludwig Deubner,<sup>42</sup> who argued that τὸ Ἐλευσίνιον at Eleusis did denote the sanctuary as a whole, then even so, the phrase [τ]ὸν ἐν τῷ Ἐλευ(σ)ίνιῳ βωμόν of our inscription (line 9) does not accord with what we know of the sanctuary, with its βωμῷ (τοῖν βομοῖν Ἐλευσῖνι, *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 32, lines 17–18).

Deme Eleusinia filial to that of Eleusis are attested for the Tetrapolis (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1358, line 17) and Brauron (*Anecd. Bekk.* 242) and, with less certainly, for Paianeia (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 250, lines 15–18, 26, etc.) and Phaleron (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 32, line 34). Thus, without additional information about the deme Phrearrhoi, one could not exclude the possibility that an Eleusinion existed there, too.<sup>43</sup> But we are not completely without information: we know that the deme had its own eponymous Demeter Phrearrhios (see p. 92 above), whose cult will almost certainly have been dominant there (cf. Artemis Brauronia at Brauron, Zeus Olympios at Olympia, etc.), with a relatively elaborate sanctuary and festival. While of course hardly out of the question, it seems rather improbable that a deme would also support the Eleusinion of another and competing "major" Demeter (Demeter Eleusinia).

There exist, moreover, some specific, and perhaps striking, correspondences of the data above with what is known or suspected about the Eleusinion at Athens. Neither the testimonia for this

<sup>37</sup> Herodotos 8.65; Plutarch, *Alc.* 34; Pausanias 1.2.4; Pollux 1.32; schol. Aristophanes, *Ra.* 326; *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 847, lines 20–21; 1006, line 122; 1008, line 8; 1011, line 8; 1028, lines 9–10; Oliver 1941, pp. 65–72, no. 31 (= *LSCG Suppl.* 15), lines 42–43; *RE* IX, 1914, cols. 613–618, s.v. Iakchos (O. Kern); *GGR* I, p. 664.

<sup>38</sup> He was invoked as "son of Semele" (= Dionysos) in a ceremony of the Lenaia at Athens: ἐν τοῖς Ἀθηναῖκοις ἀγῶσι τοῦ Διονύσου ὁ δαδοῦχος κατέχων λαμπάδα λέγει· καλεῖτε θεόν, καὶ οἱ ὑπακούοντες βοῶσι· Σεμελή! Ἰαχχε πλουτοδότα (schol. Aristophanes, *Ra.* 479). This ceremony has been attributed to either a relatively late conflation of Iacchos with Dionysos (Mylonas 1961, p. 308; Parke 1977, p. 105) or a fundamental connection between the Lenaia and Eleusinian cult (Deubner [1932] 1969, pp. 125–126). In fact, the Dadouchos and the epithet *ploutodotas*, which evokes the Eleusinian Ploutos, do suggest an Eleusinian cult connection, despite the Dionysiac ambiance and the presence of Semele.

<sup>39</sup> For the Iaccheion at Athens, Plutarch, *Arist.* 27.3; Alciphro 3.59 (23).1; cf. Pausanias 1.2.4.

<sup>40</sup> 1970, p. 49.

<sup>41</sup> Rubensohn 1955, pp. 1–23.

<sup>42</sup> Deubner 1948, pp. 3–6.

<sup>43</sup> Sokolowski (1971, p. 219) is quite certain that the inscription "informs us that an Eleusinion existed also in the deme Phrearrhoi."

shrine<sup>44</sup> nor its partial excavation has so far produced much certainty about what it contained, but the more secure indications are listed below.

#### IN<sup>45</sup> THE ELEUSINION AT ATHENS

a. *An Altar*, located at the place where the Boule met each year on the day after the Eleusinian Mysteries (Andokides 1.110–116).

1. an altar foundation found just east of a small temple (2, below), identified by Homer Thompson and Richard Wycherley<sup>46</sup> as altar (a) above.
2. a small temple on the western side of the excavated area,<sup>47</sup> often considered (wrongly, I believe) to be the temple of Triptolemos mentioned in Pausanias 1.14.<sup>48</sup> In the southeast corner of the Agora, Pausanias notes ὑπὲρ τὴν κρήνην [Ἐννεάκρουνον] two temples, one of Demeter and Kore and the other of Triptolemos. He next proceeds to tell all about Triptolemos and then reports that a dream has prevented him from “rushing to go still farther into this story and [describe] as many things as contains the sanctuary at Athens called the Eleusinion.” Pausanias then returns to Triptolemos, finishing his description of the hero’s temple. I think that this sequence clearly indicates temples that were associated with, *but not inside*, the Eleusinion.

b. *Two Altars*(?) with ritual inscriptions, unequal in size, 510–480 B.C.<sup>49</sup>

1. τοὺς βωμοὺς τοῖν θεῖ[ν]οῖν (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1672, lines 140–141). Sterling Dow and Robert Healey<sup>50</sup> refer these lines to the sanctuary at Eleusis. The reference, however, is in the inscription’s accounts for the sixth prytany (lines 137–212), which generally focus on the City Eleusinion (lines [129], 148–150 [cf. 162], 162, 165, 167, 170, 182, 194, 203). In fact, between lines 129 and 203 there is no reference to anything certainly at Eleusis, except an allowance for a workman making steps(?) (προσβάθραι) for the Haloa (lines 143–144).<sup>51</sup>

c. *A Sanctuary of Plouton* provisioned by a priestess of Demeter Thesmophoros, Satyra, early 2nd century B.C.<sup>52</sup>

- ἔπεσκεύακεν δὲ [ἡ ἱέρεια] καὶ τοὺς ναοὺς πά[ν]  
 5 [τὰς τοὺς ἐν τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ, παρε]σκεύακεν δὲ καὶ πά[ν]τα ἐν τῷ  
 τοῦ Πλ[ού]του  
 [τωνος ἱερῳ].  
 [δοῦναι δὲ αὐτῇ καὶ εἰκόνοσ ἀ]νάθεσιν ἐν πίνακι, καθάπερ  
 [δέδοται καὶ ἄλλαις ἱερείαις ἐν τῷ ναῷ] τῆς Δήμητρος καὶ τῆς Κόρη[ς]  
 [ἀναγράφαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν ταμίαν] τῶν δημοτῶν ἐν στήλῃ λ[ι]  
 10 [θίνει καὶ στήσαι πρὸς τῷ Ἐλευσινίῳ].

Granted that all references to the Eleusinion in these lines are restored, the inscription was found in the vicinity of the Eleusinion, and its sanctuary of Plouton is likely enough to have been very closely associated with the Eleusinion.

<sup>44</sup> *Agora III*, pp. 74–85; Thompson 1960, pp. 334–338; *Agora XIV*, pp. 150–155; Davis 1931, pp. 57–67; Rubensohn 1955, pp. 1–23.

<sup>45</sup> In fact, of significant cult artifacts only the single altar (a), below, is demonstrably *in* the Eleusinion: for other items, the sorry state of the evidence compels frequent scholarly recourse to such phrases as “either in, or very closely associated with, the Eleusinion.”

<sup>46</sup> *Agora XIV*, p. 153.

<sup>47</sup> *Agora XIV*, pp. 150–153.

<sup>48</sup> *Agora XIV*, p. 152; Miles 1981, p. 276.

<sup>49</sup> Jeffery 1948, pp. 90–92.

<sup>50</sup> 1965, p. 36.

<sup>51</sup> For the Haloa at Eleusis, see Deubner [1932] 1969, pp. 62–67; Parke 1977, pp. 98–100.

<sup>52</sup> Broneer 1942, p. 265, no. 51.

1. τ[ὸ τ]οῦ Πλούτωνος (sc. ἱερόν): *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1672, lines 168–169, 172, 177, 185–186; a series interspersed with references to the City Eleusinion.<sup>53</sup> Philip Davis and Wycherley support placement of the Ploutonion here.<sup>54</sup> This sanctuary of Plouton will certainly have had an altar.

As restored (lines 4–5), the Satyra inscription above also suggests the presence of multiple temples within the Eleusinion, a suggestion that the “roofs” (τὰς ὀροφάς) and “doors” (τὰς θύρας) attributed to this shrine in *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1672, lines 170–171 may be thought to support. One should not, however, overestimate the conjectures of line 5, and certainly the shrine’s ancillary structures (e–g below), together with its small temple (a.2, above), can provide the requisite roofs and doors without the necessity of positing multiple temples. One may even question Margaret Miles’ confidence that the major cult structures of the Eleusinion are yet to be found.<sup>55</sup> The *hieron* at Eleusis, which surely provided a model for its Athenian outpost, is hardly rife with temples: only the Temple of Demeter and Kore and the Ploutonion are attested, together with a good number of ancillary buildings,<sup>56</sup> substantially the makeup of the Eleusinion as it is now known.

d. *An αὐλή*: there is no inscriptional evidence, but the clear space within the peribolos of the portion of the Eleusinion so far excavated is an *aule*.

---

e. *A νεωχόριον* (sacristy): *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1672, line 164 (*Agora III*, p. 80, no. 215).

f. *A θησαυρός*: *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1672, lines 201–202 (*Agora III*, p. 80, no. 215).

g. *An ἱπνόν* (kitchen): *IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1672, line 194 (cf. line 189).

Although it may be purely an accident of the archaeological finds and documentary analyses to date, the sacral elements (a)–(d) listed above for the City Eleusinion are identical to those associated with the Eleusinion of our inscription.

Another aspect of the City Eleusinion that has bearing upon the *lex Phrearrhia* is its close, if obscure, association with the Athenian Thesmophoria. The inscription honoring Satyra noted above possibly records the repair and provisioning of the sanctuary by a priestess of Demeter Thesmophoros, and Oscar Broneer argued that the Eleusinion *was* the venue of the city Thesmophoria.<sup>57</sup> There does seem to be a connection between the City Eleusinion and Demeter Thesmophoros, and the *lex Phrearrhia* can be reproducing that connection with its sacrifice to this goddess in an Eleusinian context.

There is thus some reason to believe that the City Eleusinion is the venue of our inscription and also, in view of the presence of Iacchos, that the Mysteries are the specific rite described. Let us now consider the inscription’s date rubric in this connection. τῇ δὲ ἐβδό[μει—] in line 27 shows that the text as a whole is organized following the calendar and suggests that the surviving portion describes events on two successive days, the first in lines 1–27 and the second in lines 27–32. These day pairs are the 6th and 7th (τῇ δὲ ἐβδό[μει ἰστάμενου]), 16th and 17th (τῇ δὲ ἐβδό[μει ἐπὶ δέχα]), or 23rd and 24th (τῇ δὲ ἐβδό[μει μετ’ εἰκάδας]) of a month. Given, however, that the inscription describes rites of Demeter on the first day and unidentified but associated rites on the second, two of these three day pairs may be eliminated at the outset. Jon Mikalson<sup>58</sup> has shown (1) that the sixth day of each month was a festival day of Artemis and that no part of any festival that did not involve Artemis ever occurred on that day, and (2) that no festival is attested for the 24th of any

<sup>53</sup> Pace Dow and Healey (1965, p. 36), who refer all references to Plouton in inscriptions to the *hieron* at Eleusis.

<sup>54</sup> Davis 1931, pp. 61–66; *Agora III*, p. 80, no. 215.

<sup>55</sup> Miles 1981, p. 286.

<sup>56</sup> Mylonas 1961, *passim* and esp. pp. 130–154.

<sup>57</sup> 1942, pp. 250–264.

<sup>58</sup> 1975, pp. 18, 188.

TABLE 4

Boedromion				
15	16		17	
	night	A.M.	noon	P.M.
		Lines 1–27 Rites		( <i>lex Phrearrhia</i> ) Lines 27–32 Rites
ἄγυρμός (assembly)		ἄλαδε μύσται ( <i>mystai</i> sacrifice pigs)		( <i>Greater Mysteries</i> ) ἱερεῖα δεῦρο(?) Epidauria(?)
πρόρρησις (preliminary announcement)		ἱερεῖα δεῦρο(?) (general sacrifices)		(rites of Asklepios/ repetition of general sacrifices for latecomers)

month of the year. Thus the 6th and 7th and 23rd and 24th are eliminated, and only the 16th and 17th remain: the date rubric of line 27, accordingly, should be restored as *τῇ δὲ ἑβδό[μη] ἐπὶ δέκα*. These are among the days of the Eleusinian Mysteries (Boedromion 15–18) in which ceremonies were conducted at Athens in and around the City Eleusinion.<sup>59</sup> Some remaining data from the *lex Phrearrhia* will suggest further conclusions about the date and events within that Athenian period.

First, the implements of the rite described—lamp, lampstand, and torches—are obviously designed for the production of light and thus suggest that the rites on the 16th took place after dark. Owing to the Athenian practice of reckoning days from sunset to sunset, however, the ceremonies would be conducted on the night *before* the day of the 16th, as shown in Table 4. Table 4 sets out the ceremonies in the *lex Phrearrhia* by date and time in relation to events of the Greater Mysteries.

As Table 4 shows, the existing schedule of the Athenian portion of the Mysteries is not yet perfectly clear. It is generally agreed that the ἄγυρμός and πρόρρησις took place on Boedromion 15,<sup>60</sup> and the ἄλαδε μύσται is securely attested for the 16th (Polyainos 3.11.2). According to Philostratos (*Vita Apollonii* 4.18), in the order of events the Epidauria came third, after the πρόρρησις and the ἱερεῖα δεῦρο, and were accompanied by a second set of sacrifices, corresponding to the earlier ἱερεῖα δεῦρο, for the benefit of latecomers to the Mysteries (*τὰ δὲ Ἐπιδαύρια μετὰ πρόρρησιν τε καὶ ἱερεῖα δεῦρο μυεῖν Ἀθηναίοις πάτριον ἐπὶ θυσίᾳ δευτέρᾳ*).<sup>61</sup> Thus, if the ἱερεῖα δεῦρο fell on the 16th (together with the ἄλαδε μύσται), the Epidauria was on the 17th; if on the 17th, the Epidauria occupied the 18th. The *lex Phrearrhia* can decide this question. Lines 1–27 describe part of a major sacrificial exercise, one that does not at all correspond with the simple and individually oriented ἄλαδε μύσται. The sacrifices, then, must be those of the ἱερεῖα δεῦρο, which is thus shown to occur on the night of Boedromion 16, with the ἄλαδε μύσται following on the day of the 16th. The Epidauria, accordingly, will fall on the 17th.<sup>62</sup> This arrangement happens to leave Boedromion 18 clear of festival events and thus free for meetings of the Athenian Ekklesia, of which five are securely attested.<sup>63</sup> The whole program is set out in Table 5.

<sup>59</sup> Mikalson 1975, pp. 55–58; Mylonas 1961, pp. 247–251.

<sup>60</sup> See Mikalson 1975, pp. 54–56.

<sup>61</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4960, lines 2–8; Pausanias 2.26.8; Aristotle, *AthPol* 56.4; Mylonas 1961, p. 251; Parke 1977, pp. 64–65.

<sup>62</sup> This arrangement is accepted by Foucart (1914, pp. 317–323), Graindor (1934, p. 153), and Dow (1937, p. 113).

<sup>63</sup> Mikalson 1975, pp. 57–58.

TABLE 5

## Boedromion

15	16				17			
	night	A.M.	noon	P.M.	night	A.M.	noon	P.M.
ἀγυρμός (assembly)	ἱερεῖα δεῦρο (general sacrifices)	ἄλλαδε μύσται ( <i>mystai</i> sacrifice pigs)			Epidauria (rites of Asklepios/ repetition of general sacrifices for latecomers)			
πρόρρησις (preliminary announcement)	[ <i>lex Phrearrhia</i> , lines 1–27]				[ <i>lex Phrearrhia</i> , lines 27–32] (for “night,” see παννυχίς, below)			

George Mylonas objects to the combination of ἄλλαδε μύσται and ἱερεῖα δεῦρο on the same day, on the grounds that “the return from the sea, a rather disorderly affair, and the killing and sacrifice of so many little pigs, were not conducive to the solemn atmosphere required for the major sacrifices on behalf of the city.”<sup>64</sup> This objection is obviated by the arrangement suggested above, in that the ἱερεῖα δεῦρο occurs at night, leaving a significant interval before the ἄλλαδε μύσται.

Lines 27–32 of the *lex Phrearrhia*, which, I suggest, are concerned with the Epidauria, have little to distinguish them: the altar of line 29 indicates that sacrifice took place, and there is ample evidence for this in the Epidauria.<sup>65</sup> A παννυχίς<sup>66</sup> and even an ἄρρηγορία<sup>67</sup> are also attested, and the first of these has interesting implications for the reconstruction of events set out above. If the ceremonies of the Epidauria were in some sense intended to replicate, for the benefit of latecomers, previous events in the schedule of the Mysteries, then their major sacrifices, like those of the ἱερεῖα δεῦρο, should have taken place at night; and indeed, the evidence for a παννυχίς in the Epidauria can support this suggestion. Thus, in Table 5 I have placed the *Hauptzeit* of the Epidauria on the night before the day of Boedromion 17.

The only other significant item in lines 27–32 is καὶ τῆς μουσι[κῆς (sc. τέχνης)] in line 28: this may possibly be associated with παρθενικοὶ χοροὶ in *SEG* XVII 26, line 22, based on a new reading of *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 974. In this honorary decree a priest of Asklepios

20 ἔδωκε . . . καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατ[έρα εἰς τε τὰ Ἀσκληπίεια καὶ τὰ]  
Ἐπιδαύρια ἄρρηγοροῦσαν· βουλόμε[νος δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ πλεον αὖξιν τὰς]  
πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς τιμὰς καὶ τὴν τ[ῆς πόλεως σωτηρίαν ἐβουθύτη]-  
σεν καλῶς καὶ ἐνδόξως ταῦρον [καὶ ἐκόσμησεν τὴν τράπεζαν]  
καὶ παννυχίδα συνετέλεσεν παρθ[ενικῶι χορῶι.]

The priest’s accomplishments after ἄρρηγοροῦσαν, like those of previous lines, seem to have been in connection with the Epidauria. If the new reading of θ in line 22 is accurate, it yields an important piece of new information about the festival, namely, that the general sacrifices of its *pannychis* were finished off with one or more maiden choruses. Such choruses could be the event indicated by the inscription’s τῆς μουσι[κῆς], whether the Phrearrhian delegation itself provided a chorus or merely observed.

Mikalson has set out the evidence from Attic sacred calendars for deme sacrifices εἰς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, that is, those “offerings and ceremonies provided to the state on behalf of the deme.”<sup>68</sup>

<sup>64</sup> Mylonas 1961, p. 250.

<sup>65</sup> Philostratos, *Vita Apollonii* 4.18 (p. 104 above); *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 974, lines 11–12. For these sacrifices, a kanephoros: *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3457, line 2; 3554, lines 19–22.

<sup>66</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 974, lines 12–13; 975, lines 5–8.

<sup>67</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 974, lines 18–19. A procession is also attested: Aristotle, *AthPol* 56.4.

<sup>68</sup> Mikalson 1977, p. 426.

I have argued above that the Phrearrhian inscription describes just such a set of offerings and ceremonies at, respectively, the ἱερεῖα δεῦρο and Epidauria of the Eleusinian Mysteries at Athens on Boedromion 16 and 17. I am all too aware that my argument has not been straightforward but has depended upon the assembling of evidence that, taken piece by piece, may seem unacceptably tenuous. If Eugene Vanderpool would not have approved, I know that he would have found a tactful and encouraging way of saying so.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agora* = *The Athenian Agora: Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*.  
 III = R. E. Wycherley, *Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia*, Princeton 1957.  
 XIV = H. A. Thompson and R. E. Wycherley, *The Agora of Athens*, Princeton 1972.  
 Broneer, O. 1942. "The Thesmophorion in Athens," *Hesperia* 11, pp. 250–274.  
 Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion*, J. Raffan, trans., Cambridge, Mass.  
 Daux, G. 1963. "La grande démarchie: Un nouveau calendrier sacrificiel d'Attique (Erchia)," *BCH* 87, pp. 603–634.  
 Davis, P. H. 1931. "Some Eleusinian Building Inscriptions of the Fourth Century Before Christ" (diss. Princeton University 1931).  
 Deubner, L. [1932] 1969. *Attische Feste*, repr. Darmstadt.  
 ———. 1948. *Zum Weihehaus der eleusinischen Mysterien* (*AbhBerl* 1945/1946 [1948]) Berlin.  
 Dittenberger, W. 1885. "Die eleusinischen Keryken," *Hermes* 20, pp. 1–40.  
 Dow, S. 1937. "Athenian Decrees of 216–212 B.C.," *HSCP* 48, pp. 105–126.  
 ———. 1968. "Six Athenian Sacrificial Calendars," *BCH* 92, pp. 170–186.  
 Dow, S., and R. F. Healey. 1965. *A Sacred Calendar of Eleusis* (*Harvard Theological Studies* 21), Cambridge, Mass.  
 Ferguson, W. S. 1938. "The Salaminioi of Heptaphylai and Sounion," *Hesperia* 7, pp. 1–74.  
 Foucart, P. 1883. "Le culte de Pluton dans la religion éleusinienne," *BCH* 7, pp. 387–404.  
 ———. 1914. *Les mystères d'Éleusis*, Paris.  
 Graindor, P. 1934. *Athènes sous Hadrien*, Cairo.  
 Jeffery, L. H. 1948. "The Boustrophedon Sacral Inscriptions from the Agora," *Hesperia* 17, pp. 86–111.  
 Kern, O. *RE* IX, 1914, cols. 613–618 (Iakchos).  
 Meisterhans, K. 1900. *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, 3rd ed., rev. E. Schwyzer, Berlin.  
 Mikalson, J. D. 1975. *The Sacred and Civil Calendar of the Athenian Year*, Princeton.  
 ———. 1977. "Religion in the Attic Demes," *AJP* 98, pp. 424–435.  
 Miles, M. 1981. "The Temple of Triptolemos in the City Eleusinion" (lecture, San Francisco 1981), abstract in *AJA* 86, 1982, p. 276.  
 Mylonas, G. 1961. *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Princeton.  
 Nilsson, M. P. 1906. *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung mit Ausschluss der Attischen*, Leipzig.  
 Oehler, J. *RE* VIII, 1913, cols. 1583–1588 (ἱεροποιοί).  
 ———. *RE* XI, 1921, cols. 349–357 (keryx).  
 Oliver, J. H. 1935. "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 4, pp. 5–70.  
 ———. 1941. "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 10, pp. 65–90.  
 Osborne, R. 1985. *Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attica*, Cambridge.  
 Parke, H. W. 1977. *Festivals of the Athenians*, Ithaca.  
 Roussel, P. 1934. "Un nouveau document concernant le genos des Kérykes," in *Mélanges Bidez* (*Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales* II), Brussels, pp. 819–834.  
 Rubensohn, O. 1955. "Das Weihehaus von Eleusis und sein Allerheiligstes," *JdI* 70, pp. 1–49.  
 Sandbach, F. H. 1972. *Menandri reliquiae selectae*, Oxford 1972.  
 Simms, R. 1975. "The Eleusinia in the Sixth to Fourth Centuries B.C.," *GRBS* 16, pp. 269–279.  
 Sokolowski, F. 1971. "On the *Lex Sacra* of the Deme Phrearrhioi," *GRBS* 12, pp. 217–220.  
 Thompson, H. A. 1960. "Activities in the Athenian Agora: 1959," *Hesperia* 29, pp. 327–368.  
 Threatte, L. 1980. *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, I, *Phonology*, Berlin/New York.  
 Töpffer, J. [1889] 1973. *Attische Genealogie*, repr. New York.  
 Traill, J. S. 1986. *Demos and Trittyes: Epigraphical and Topographical Studies in the Organization of Attica*, Toronto.  
 Van der Loeff, A. R. 1903. *De Ludis Eleusiniis*, Lyons.



- Vanderpool, E. 1970. "A *Lex Sacra* of the Attic Deme Phrearrhioi," *Hesperia* 39, pp. 47–53.  
Weniger, L. 1923–1924. "Theophanien, altgriechische Götteradvente," *ArchRW* 22, pp. 31–58.  
Whitehead, D. 1986. *The Demes of Attica*, Princeton.

ROBERT M. SIMMS

EMMA WILLARD SCHOOL  
285 Pawling Avenue  
Troy, NY 12180

and STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY