THE PHREARRHIAN *LEX SACRA*

AN INTERPRETATION

MNHMEION EYKLAEI ANΔΡΙ

IN 1970 EUGENE VANDERPOOL PUBLISHED a fragmentary *lex sacra* of the Attic deme Phrearrhio.¹ 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 Anaevysos, 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.² 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.³

ΣΤΟΙΧ.

[... 6... τόν ἰ]ροποιών [α] [ ]
[μητρὶ Θεσιο]ρφώι ὑν τρ[ωτοτόχον] [ ]
[... 6... πρ]οστάτωσαν [α] [ ]
[... λαμπ]όδος τοῖς λαμπάδι[ωι] [ ]

5 ἑπεόδω[να] νω ἀλήνη πλευρὰν ι(σ)χ[ ]
[ἐροπα]οι[; καὶ ὁ χάτρικ δανύσθωσαν [ ]
[... Π]λούτων θυόντωσαν κρ(ι)ν [ ]
[δημ]ίσταις μετὰ τῶν ἀλλῶν καὶ [ ]

10 [ ...]οὐζωμ ἱεροπούς ἀριέτω ταξ[ ]
[ ...]επειδάν αἱ θέρειαι πουκωσι[ ]
[δὲν] Φρεά(ρ)ριον θυόντωσαν τῇ Δῆ[μ]ητρι [ ]
[πρε]ωχ[; καὶ τῇ Κόρη βοὺμ ἄρρε[ ]
[ ...] καὶ ἐὰν τοῖς βουλουσι [ ]

15 μ[.]ον ἐστιν ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦς βουλου[ ]
[ ...]κροὺς μασαχλασματα] ήμικ(ρ)α[ ]
[ ...]τοῦ βουλου ἐν τοῖς Εὐερσυνω[ ]
[ ...] οὐ Πλούτωνος βοὐμ θερεόνσυν[ ]

20 σύν τῶν βω(μ)ο[ν] τῇ λεπεὶ κα[ ]
[ ...] ὑρδὸν ἰχθύ[ν 111 τοῦ ιερείου [ ]
[ ...] υλα ἐπὶ τοῖς χύτρον παρε[ ]

¹ 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.

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

³ I have worked from Vanderpool's photograph of the inscription (1970, pl. 15), having not been able, unfortunately, to inspect the stone (Athens EM 13984) itself.

*Hesperia* 67.1, 1998
This text is unfortunately lacunate in epithe\(\text{s 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\textsuperscript{4}), is known in Attic inscriptions only from two private dedications (\textit{IG} II\textsuperscript{2} 4587, line 3; 4730, line 3) of, respectively, the 4th century B.C. and the 1st century A.D. The next goddess named, together with Kore (\textit{]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.\textsuperscript{5} This identification is, however, unlikely: first, Demeter Thesmophoros has already received a sacrifice in line 2,\textsuperscript{6} 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 \textit{]-ωι as written: Demeter \textit{φεράρριος, the deme's eponym, whose priestess held a seat in the theater of Dionysos (Δήμητρος[ος] \textit{Φεράρδο[υς]}, \textit{IG} II\textsuperscript{2} 5155). Vanderpool restored another reference to Demeter and Kore as \textit{τω θεω in lines 19–20: the resulting collocation \textit{[τοιν \textit{θε}]οιν \textit{των \betaω(μ)ων \τη}; αρ\textit{ελε\textit{α}, however, does not easily submit to translation. First, \textit{τη} αρ\textit{ελε\textit{α} can hardly govern the preceding genitives: no title \textit{priest/priestess of the altars (of the two goddesses)} is otherwise attested (the nearest is \textit{δ \επι \betaω[μ\iota] αρε\textit{ελε\textit{α} at Eleusis: \textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{2} 6, face C, line 47; \textit{SEG} XXX 61, face B, fragment f, line 4), while \textit{priestess of the two goddesses,} although possibly extant (\textit{τεν \textit{h}ερε\textit{α}[\textit{αγν [κατ \textit{των} \φαι\textit{δυ[ντεν \textit{των \θεον\textit{?}, \textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{3} 231, fragment a, lines 13–14: \textit{τοι} σον \textit{αρε\textit{ελε\textit{α} των \θεο\textit{ν}\?}, \textit{SEG} XIII 4, line 5), is impossible here because of the order and the separation of \textit{θε}ο\textit{ν and \textit{αρ\textit{ελε\textit{α. But even if the priestess is removed from this combination, an acceptable translation of the rest remains problematic. \textit{The altars \textit{genitive} of the two goddesses} requires, so far as I can see, a preposition (e.g., \textit{επι}) or some other word to govern the genitive, but \textit{επι \textit{τοιν \textit{θε}ο\textit{ν \textit{των \betaω(μ)ων would be most bizarre, not only for this inscription but for Greek. Sokolowski's \textit{[(επι) \textit{φερ\textit{αρ]}ο\textit{ν \textit{των \betaω(μ)ων is therefore preferable.}}\textsuperscript{4} Tegea (Pausanias 8.53.7), Didyma (\textit{Didyma} 504 [= \textit{SEG} XXVIII 852], lines 11–12), Ephesus (\textit{Ephesos} IX 1, D1 [= \textit{LSCG Suppl.} 121, \textit{SEG} XXVIII 866], lines 28–29), Miletos (\textit{MDAI} [I] 1980, pp. 230–233, col. C, lines 4–5).\textsuperscript{5} See Vanderpool 1970, p. 49; Sokolowski 1971, pp. 218–219.\textsuperscript{6} Sokolowski (1971) deals with this objection by understanding the sacrifice of line 2 as a \textit{προθ\textit{ιμα}, but in this case it is difficult to understand why Demeter would receive the \textit{prothyma} alone but later (lines 12–13) share the (putatively) main sacrifice with Kore.
Among the sacrificial offerings, my supplement ὑν πρ[ωτότοκον] (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[ωτότοκον] 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. In this connection two morphological features should be mentioned that were perhaps in Vanderpool’s mind but not specifically stated. First, three of the inscription’s four verbal imperative endings (πρ]ωστάντωσαν [line 3], θυόντωσαν [line 12], and διδόντωσαν [line 25]) are transitional between the -νων of classical times and the later -τους-ναί. Three Attic parallels for such transitional endings exist: καθελόντωσαν (IG Π2 204, lines 47–48 [352/1 B.C.]), ὧρελόντωσαν (REG 91, 1978, pp. 289–306 [= SEG XXVIII 103], line 43 [332/1]), and μοσθοσάντωσαν (IG Π2 1241, line 52 [300/299]).

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.” 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 Phrearrhioi. 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.” 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 Π2 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[?])

7 Vanderpool 1970, p. 47.
8 I owe these observations and epigraphical parallels to one of the referees of this article.
9 Meisterhans 1900, §63.d.10–11.
10 Our inscription also uniformly employs -ται rather than -ει for the dative of α-stem nouns and adjectives (τηει, lines 12, 13, 20, 27; Κόρει, line 12; αιλείτι, line 23); the post-Euclidian replacement of -ταί by -ει begins around 380 B.C. and predominates after 300: Meisterhans 1900, §§15.8–9, 48.10; Thratte 1980, §23.00. Since, however, this replacement was never complete, its presence or absence in a given inscription is useless for dating.
11 This is, in fact, the date adopted by the editor of the text in SEG XXXV 113.
12 Vanderpool 1970, p. 49.
14 Osborne 1985, pp. 177, 251, note 39.
15 We would not, of course, expect to find this very local Demeter in another setting.
TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divinities</th>
<th>Offerings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demeter Θεσμων</td>
<td>φόρωι (line 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Demeter Φρεαρ][ωι? + Kore (lines 12–13)]</td>
<td>βούδι δέρρε[να]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plouton (line 19)</td>
<td>χρ(δ)[ν]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iakkkos (line 26)</td>
<td>(μηρούς μασχάλησματα ἰμίκραι[αν]: thighs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>haunches w/shoulder meat, half heads)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(lines 16–17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sacred Officials</th>
<th>Perquisites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hieropoios (line 10), -oi (line 1)</td>
<td>κωλήν πλευρών τ(σ)χ[ιαν]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keryx (line 6)</td>
<td>(the ham, ribs, haunch) (line 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priestess (line 20), -es (line 11)</td>
<td>[πλε]υρών ιχια[ιον]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ribs, haunch) (lines 20–21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structures</th>
<th>Sacral Implements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eleusinion</td>
<td>lamp and lampstand (line 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with single altar (lines 9, 18)</td>
<td>torch (lines 24–25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with court (line 23)</td>
<td>khytros (line 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>altars (lines 15, 20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>altar of Plouton (line 19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 obols (line 21)</td>
<td>a day beginning with “seven” (line 27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thesmophoria (nos. 1, 4, 5[?]; 2, 3 also to Thesmophoroi), 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 for Demeter Thesmophoroi, a male bovid for Demeter Phrearrhos(?) 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 Thesmophoroi (nos. 1–4, 5[?]) and as Chloes (nos. 6–8; contra no. 23). Bovids, on the other hand (nos. 11–18), are concentrated in sacrifices to Demeter Eleusina 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 Eleusina at Sparta). The inscription, then, seems to reproduce a basic disjunction in the data below, that is, between sacrifices at the Thesmophoria and the Chlothia, emphasizing pregnant sows, 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,

---

16 This parallel is attested likewise for Athens in Aristophanes, Th bribios–298: the two Thesmophoroi, Plouton, Kalligeneia, Kourotrophos (= Ge), Hermes, and the Graces.

17 Given that female victims were regular for goddesses, one should assume that all the goddess-associated (σ)φειες, χροίριοι, βἀκς, and even δελφάκια above are feminine if otherwise unspecified (δελφακες, on the other hand, is feminine by nature).


19 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)bolus, 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.

moreover, we are to identify them at all plausibly with a known festival, we must seek a festival that itself encompassed both sides of the disjunction, that is, a festival that embodied elements of both Thesmophoria and (understood most generally) Eleusinia.

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

15 Ασαίωνος δεκάτη
έπι ὀδηγῇ ὑπὲρ χαρποῦ Δήμητρι ὑν ἐννύμωνα πρωτοτόκον,
Κόρης κάτρον τέλεον, Διὸ Βουλείτ φρονῦν ταῦτα διδόντων ἱε-
ροποιοῖ οἷο τοῦ ίεροῦ ἄργυρον καὶ ἔλαια διδόντων καὶ ὀλάς'
ἐπιμελέσθων δὲ τῶν ίερῶν ὅπως καλὰ ἄι ἄρχοντες καὶ ἱε-
ρεῖς· ἅν δὲ τι δεῖ καλλιερεῖν, ἱεροποιοὶ διδόντων· εἷς δὲ
τὴν ἐθρήναν ἃ[βα]διζέτω Μυχοναύδων ἢ βουλο[μ]ένη καὶ τῶν ὀδ-

20

These sacrifices, scheduled “after?” the song about the χαρπός” (line 16), were conducted at a women’s festival (lines 20–22).21 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.22 On the other hand, not only the administration (lines 17–20) but even more intimate aspects (τῶν ίερῶν: line 19) of the festival seem to be in the hands of males; particularly noteworthy is the ἐπιμέλεια of ἄρχοντες and ἱερεῖς (lines 19–20), instead of ἄρχουσαι and ἱερεῖα as in the well-known Athenian lex sacra on the Thesmophoria, IG II² 1184, lines 3–6:

τὰς δὲ ἄρχουσας κοινεὶ ἄμορτ-
έρας διδόναι τῆς ἱερείας (vitio pro τῆς ἱερείας) εἷς
5 τὴν ἐθρήναν καὶ τὴν ἐπιμελεία-
γ τῶν Θεσμοφορίων ἑμιεκτεῖνα

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

When we consider the sacred personnel of the lex Phraerhia—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,24 were numerous in Athens and Attica. Among the demes, their existence is

21 The rubric about οἱ χαρποὶ is again reminiscent of Demeter Karpophoros. Yet, considering the obscurity of this goddess’s cult in Greece and the inscription’s sile[ ] 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: L.Eph 213, lines 3–6 (a.d. 83/84): μυστήρια καὶ θυσίαι . . . κἀθ’ ἐκαστὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπιτελοῦνται ἐν ἐφεσίῳ Δήμητρι
Καρποφόρῳ καὶ Θεσμοφόρῳ καὶ θεοῖς Σέλβαστοις ὑπὸ μυστῶν. . .


23 This melding is also seen in the epistolary inscription from Ephesos quoted in note 21 above.

24 RE VIII, 1913, cols. 1583–1588, s.v. ‘Ιεροποιοί (J. Oehler); Whitehead 1986, pp. 142–143.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offering</th>
<th>Divinity</th>
<th>Circumstances</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 üς ἔγχύμων</td>
<td>The Thesmophoroi</td>
<td>Posideon (line 111)</td>
<td>Delos: ID I 316 (231 B.C.), line 120*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesmophoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(cf. ID II 372, face A, lines 94, 103–104)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 üς ἔγχύμων</td>
<td>Demeter Thesmophoros</td>
<td>Metageitnion</td>
<td>Delos: IG XI ii 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sacrifices also to Kore, Zeus Eubouleus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(250 B.C.), col. A, lines 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 üς ἔγχύμων</td>
<td>Demeter Thesmophoros</td>
<td>Metageitnion</td>
<td>Delos: ID I 290 (246 B.C.), lines 88, 90–91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delφάκιον, χοίρος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delφάκιον, χοίρος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zeus Eubouleus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(= Plouton)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delφάκιον</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thesmophoria?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(sacrifice also to Zeus Eubouleus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cf. 1 above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 üς ἔνυμων</td>
<td>Demeter</td>
<td>Lenaion 10</td>
<td>Mykonos: LSCG 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρωτοτόκχος</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ἐπὶ οὐδήτερ ὑπὲρ καρποῦ)</td>
<td>(ca. 200 B.C.), lines 15–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κάρπος τέλεος</td>
<td>Kore</td>
<td>(women’s festival)</td>
<td>line 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χοίρος</td>
<td>Zeus Bouleus</td>
<td></td>
<td>line 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(= Eubouleus = Plouton)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 üς κόουσα</td>
<td>Demeter Eleusinia</td>
<td>Anthesterion</td>
<td>Tetrapolis: IG II² 1358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>üς κόουσα</td>
<td></td>
<td>(biennial sacrifices)</td>
<td>(400–350 B.C.), col. II, lines 48–49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 üς κόουσα[σα]</td>
<td>Demeter Chloe</td>
<td>Anthesterion</td>
<td>Tetrapolis: IG II² 1358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(400–350 B.C.), col. II, lines 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 üς δύο καλλιστεύουσαι·</td>
<td>Demeter Chloe</td>
<td>Posideon 12</td>
<td>Mykonos: LSCG 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ ἐτέρα ἔγχυμαι[ων]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ca. 200 B.C.), lines 11–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 σὺς ἐπίτόκα</td>
<td>Demeter</td>
<td>late spring, in</td>
<td>Andania: IG V i 1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>procession of Mysteries</td>
<td>(92–91 B.C.), col. A, line 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at Andania (sacrifices also to Hermes, the Great Gods, Apollo Karneios, Hagne)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 χοιρίδια</td>
<td>Demeter Eleusinia</td>
<td>ἐν ἑλεοσουνλάξ</td>
<td>Sparta: IG V i 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δύο ἄρσενα</td>
<td></td>
<td>(sacrifices also to</td>
<td>(undated), lines 8–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χοίρος ἄρσην</td>
<td>Kore</td>
<td>Despoina, Tyche)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χοίρος ἄρσην</td>
<td>Plouton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 βός</td>
<td>Demeter Eleusinia</td>
<td>Metageitnion</td>
<td>Tetrapolis: IG II² 1358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τρεῖς χοίροι</td>
<td>Kore</td>
<td>(biennial sacrifices,</td>
<td>(400–350 B.C.), col. II, lines 43–44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρύος</td>
<td></td>
<td>perhaps reflecting state Eleusinia†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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 agonia, or Eleusinia, see Van der Loeff 1903, Simms 1975.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offering</th>
<th>Divinity</th>
<th>Circumstances</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>βοῶς</td>
<td>sacrifice of Milesian theoroi at Greater(??) Mysteries</td>
<td>Athens: <em>IG II²</em> 992 (2nd century B.C.), line 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>βοῶς (m.pl.)</td>
<td>general sacrifices at Greater Mysteries</td>
<td>Athens: <em>IG II²</em> 1028 (100–99 B.C.), lines 10–11‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>βοῶς (m.pl.)</td>
<td>general sacrifices at Eleusinian Proerosia</td>
<td>Athens: <em>IG II²</em> 1028 (100–99 B.C.), lines 28–29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>βοῶς τροφίες (m.) δύο</td>
<td>general sacrifices at Eleusinia</td>
<td>Athens: <em>IG II²</em> 1028 (100–99 B.C.), lines 15–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ταιρός</td>
<td>sacrifice of Epimeletai of Mysteries at the Eleusinia</td>
<td>Athens: <em>IG II²</em> 847 (ca. 215–214 B.C.), lines 24–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>βοῶς</td>
<td>sacrifice on behalf of Technitai περὶ τῶν Διόνυσον at the Eleusinia</td>
<td>Athens: <em>IG II²</em> 1330 (163–130 B.C.), lines 51–52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>τρίττος βόραχος</td>
<td>Demeter/Kore/Plouton/Dolichos at the Eleusinia or Mysteries</td>
<td>Eleusis: <em>IG I²</em> 5 (ca. 500 B.C.), line 5 (cf. <em>IG I²</em> 78 [ca. 422 B.C.], lines 37–38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>οἶς</td>
<td>Demeter Kore in connection with Mysteries</td>
<td>Athens: <em>IG II²</em> 1673 (327/326 B.C.), line 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>χρυός ΚΑ</td>
<td>Kore</td>
<td>Erythrai: <em>IEry</em> 207, line 47, (cf. lines 57, 78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>οἶς χύσα</td>
<td>Demeter <em>Chloe</em> Elaphebolion</td>
<td>Thorikos: <em>SEG</em> XXXIII 147 (380–375 B.C.), line 39 lines 44–45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>οἶς χύσα</td>
<td>Demeter Mounichion</td>
<td>Gortyn: <em>IC</em> IV 3 (ca. 650–500 B.C.), line 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>δις ἐπίτεξ</td>
<td>Demeter Batromios 22 ἐς Ἀλκηδιὰς</td>
<td>Kos: <em>LSCG</em> 151 (350 B.C.), side A, lines 59–60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>οἶς κυνεύα</td>
<td>Demeter <em>Demeteres</em> (Demeter/Kore) Zminthios 4</td>
<td>Kamiros: <em>LSCG</em> Suppl. 95 (1st century B.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>χρυός θῆλα[α] (?)</td>
<td>(Demeter) <em>Achaia</em> Thargelion</td>
<td>Tetrapolis: <em>IG II²</em> 1358 (400–350 B.C.), col. II, line 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‡ Also *IG II²* 1008, lines 8–9; 1029, lines 7–8; 1030, lines 7–8; *SEG* XV 104, lines 11–12.
specifically attested for Aixe, Paiane, Rahm, and Eleusis.\textsuperscript{25} 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.\textsuperscript{26} Beyond the great genos of Kerykes, which
held sacral responsibilities in Eleusinian cult and elsewhere at Athens,\textsuperscript{27} other “ordinary” heralds
played an important role in Attic religion. In the decree concerning the genos of Salaminioi,\textsuperscript{28}
a herald receives perquisites along with the priests of the genos (lines 43–46, 63–65), and his office is
termed a τερεσον (line 64). Likewise, in the Athenian state calendar of 410–399 b.c.,\textsuperscript{29} a herald
receives priestly perquisites from sacrifice along with the phylobasileis of the tribe of Geleontes (lines 39–
43, 52–56).\textsuperscript{30} 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 (\textit{FGHist} 323 F5 = Athenaios 14.78, 660a–b) reports ἕδρων δι’ οἱ
χήρως ἀχρι πολλοῦ βουθυτουντες ... καὶ σκευάζοντες καὶ μουκίλουντες, ἐτι δ’ οἰνοχούντες.
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 thy siai.\textsuperscript{31} A master of
ceremonies is really necessary whenever large groups perform complex rituals. The exertions
of the paid sacrificer in Menander’s \textit{Colax}\textsuperscript{32} illustrate the need for someone to keep a ceremony
moving, orderly, and thus pleasing to the divinities honored:

\textit{σπονδή θ} διδού σὺ σπλάγχνυ ἀξολοθών. ποί βλέπεις;
σπονδή, φέρ’ ὡ παί Σώση. σπονδή, χαλός
ἐξει. θεοίς ‘Ολυμπίους εὐχόμεθα
‘Ολυμπίασι, πάσι πάσαις—λάμβανε
τῇ γλυτταν ἐν τούτῳ—διδόναι σωτηρίαν,
ὕγειαν, ἀγάθα πολλά, τῶν ὄντων τε νῦν
ἀγαθῶν ὄνησιν πάσι. ταύτ’ εὐχόμεθα.

Not every sacrifice will have warranted the services of a herald. That the rites in the \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{25} Aixone: \textit{IG} II\textsuperscript{2} 1199, line 5; Paianeia: \textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{3} 250, lines 9–10; Rahm: \textit{SEG} XV 112, lines 16–18; Eleusis:
\textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{3} 391, lines 10–11, 17–18.

\textsuperscript{26} For keryres generally, see \textit{RE} XI, 1921, cols. 349–357, \textit{z.e.} Keryx (J. Oehler); Whitehead 1986, pp. 141–142.

\textsuperscript{27} 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; \textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{3} 241, line 17 (note 30
below).

\textsuperscript{28} Ferguson 1938, pp. 3–5.

\textsuperscript{29} Oliver 1985, pp. 19–32, no. 2.

\textsuperscript{30} Cf. κέρυχον κοι Δυσολε[ν][οι]ς (\textit{IG} I\textsuperscript{3} 241, line 17); ἡ γλύτα τῷ κέρυκι ... τέμνεται (Aristophanes, \textit{Pl.} 1110
and schol. ἐκλάσσερας τῶν θυμῶν γιοι τὰς γλώσσας τοῖς κέριμοι ἀπονέμεονται).

\textsuperscript{31} Cf. also schol. \textit{Iliad} 18.558: Ἀθηναίοι δὲ καὶ νῦν τοὺς περὶ λειτουργίαν πονομένους Κέρυκας (leg potius κήρ.,
cf. Jacoby, \textit{FGHist} III 1, 64–65) φασον.

\textsuperscript{32} 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.\textsuperscript{33} 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": \[τοῖς ὑμῖν ἔταξι μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ \] (line 38) suggests something shared between the two groups. David Whitehead\textsuperscript{34} interprets these "others" as localmetics, etc., who are being granted certain limited rights of participation in this deme festival, and in fact, one other deme lex sacra (of Skambonidae: IG I\textsuperscript{3} 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 of ἄλλοι wherever they are mentioned, as, for example, ὀἱ ἄλλοι προτανεῖς or ὀἱ 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\textsuperscript{35} 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\textsuperscript{2} 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. A–E) reaches 6 (in cols. Γ and Δ, lines 1–12).\textsuperscript{36} These crude


\textsuperscript{34} 1986, p. 205.

\textsuperscript{35} See Dow 1968, pp. 170–171.

\textsuperscript{36} IG II\textsuperscript{2} 334 mentions the ἐκπερί (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 ἀναμνήσει (lines 31–33), which
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 II² 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 ἐδοξεῖτο Μυκονίων ἵερ[...] θύειν πρὸς τοῖς πρότερον καὶ ἐπηνορθάθη περὶ τῶν προτέρων (LSCG 96, lines 2–3); καθάπερ πρότερον, κατὰ (τὰ) εἰω[θότα], καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις κρασανομίαις (IG II² 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.

---

*Table 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>line(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>? of hieropoioi</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>erect ____ in front of ____</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hieropoioi(?)/herald</td>
<td>dine</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>____ to/for the demesmen?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>7–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>together with the others</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>7–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the following(?) priest</td>
<td>leave the ____</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the priestesses</td>
<td>do/make ____</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>is customary/righteous</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>14–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>(on)to the altars</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>on the altar in the</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eleusinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>on/beside (e.g.) the</td>
<td>18–19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>altar of Plouton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>of/on (e.g.) both of the altars</td>
<td>19–20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the priestess and the ____</td>
<td>place money for(?)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>wood on the kythros</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>21–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>provide ____(?)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>in the court of the</td>
<td>22–23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eleusinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>? to a torch</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. Originally a personification of the cry ἵαχει uttered by the mystai in procession from Athens to Eleusis, this divinity had essentially no function elsewhere. 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 or Eleusis, not Phrearrhoi. Moreover, it makes the Mysteries, as Vanderpool thought possible, 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. 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, who argued that τὸ Ἐλευσιόν αυτὸν at Eleusis did denote the sanctuary as a whole, then even so, the phrase τὸν Ἐλευσ(σ)νων βομόν of our inscription (line 9) does not accord with what we know of the sanctuary, with its βομό (τοῦ βομοῦ Ἐλευσιον, IG I3 32, lines 17–18).

Deme Eleusinia filial to that of Eleusis are attested for the Tetrapolis (IG II2 1358, line 17) and Brauron (Anecd. Bekk. 242) and, with less certainly, for Paianeia (IG I3 250, lines 15–18, 26, etc.) and Phaleron (IG I3 32, line 34). Thus, without additional information about the demi Phrearrhoi, one could not exclude the possibility that an Eleusinion existed there, too. But we are not completely without information: we know that the demi 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 demi 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

---

37 Herodotos 8.65; Plutarch, Alc. 34; Pausanias 1.2.4; Pollux 1.32; schol. Aristophanes, Ra. 326; IG II2 847, lines 20–21; 1001, line 112; 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 3 I, p. 664.

38 He was invoked as “son of Semele” (= Dionysos) in a ceremony of the Lenaia at Athens: ἐν τοῖς Διονύσιοις ἐγγέω τοῦ Διονύσου ὁ δρόβυχος κατέχων λαμπάδα λέγει: καλέτε θεόν, καὶ οἱ υπακούοντες βουάϲ: Σεμελή, ἤ ἵαχει πλουτοτόκα (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 ploutodotos, which evokes the Eleusinian Ploutos, do suggest an Eleusinian cult connection, despite the Dionysiac ambiance and the presence of Semele.

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

40 1970, p. 49.

41 Rubensohn 1955, pp. 1–23.

42 Deubner 1948, pp. 3–6.

43 Sokolowski (1971, p. 219) is quite certain that the inscription “informs us that an Eleusinion existed also in the demi Phrearrhoi.”
shr ine\textsuperscript{44} nor its partial excavation has so far produced much certainty about what it contained, but the more secure indications are listed below.

\textbf{In}\textsuperscript{45} the \textbf{Eleusinion at Athens}

\textit{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\textsuperscript{46} as altar (a) above.

2. a small temple on the western side of the excavated area,\textsuperscript{47} often considered (wrongly, I believe) to be the temple of Triptolemos mentioned in Pausanias 1.14.\textsuperscript{48} In the southeast corner of the Agora, Pausanias notes \textit{ύπερ τήν χρήσην} [\textsuperscript{1}Έννεάξρουνον] 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.

\textit{b. Two Altars(?)} with ritual inscriptions, unequal in size, 510–480 B.C.\textsuperscript{49}

1. τοὺς βοωμοὺς τοῖν θεί{ν}οῖν (IG II\textsuperscript{2} 1672, lines 140–141). Sterling Dow and Robert Healey\textsuperscript{50} 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(?)(προσβάθραυ) for the Haloa (lines 143–144).\textsuperscript{51}

\textit{c. A Sanctuary of Plouton} provisioned by a priestess of Demeter Thesmophoros, Satyría, early 2nd century B.C.\textsuperscript{52}

\begin{verbatim}
5 [τάς τοὺς ἐν τῷ 'Ελευσσινωί, παρέ]σκεύασκεν δὲ καὶ πά[ν]τα ἐν τῷ Πλ[ού]
[τοῦ Ἁλω.]
[δεύναι δὲ αὐτῇ καὶ εἰκόνας ἄναθεσιν ἐν πίνακι, καθάπερ
[δεδομαὶ καὶ ἀλλὰς ἑρείας ἐν τῷ ναὸ ἀπὸ τῆς Δήμητρος καὶ τῆς Κόρης]
[ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψῆφισμα τῶν ταμίαν] τῶν δημοτῶν ἐν στῆλει λί[πει]
10 [δίνει καὶ στήσαι πρὸς τῷ 'Ελευσσινωί

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.

\textsuperscript{44} Agora III, pp. 74–83; Thompson 1960, pp. 334–338; Agora XIV, pp. 150–155; Davis 1931, pp. 57–67; Rubensohn 1955, pp. 1–23.

\textsuperscript{45} 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.”

\textsuperscript{46} Agora XIV, p. 153.

\textsuperscript{47} Agora XIV, pp. 150–153.

\textsuperscript{48} Agora XIV, p. 152; Miles 1981, p. 276.

\textsuperscript{49} Jeffery 1948, pp. 90–92.

\textsuperscript{50} 1965, p. 36.


\textsuperscript{52} Broneer 1942, p. 265, no. 51.
1. τό τοῦ Πλούτωνος (sc. ἱερὸν): *IG II²* 1672, lines 168–169, 172, 177, 185–186; a series interspersed with references to the City Eleusinion. φ Philip Davis and Wycherley support placement of the Ploutonion here. 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 ὀροφὰς) and "doors" (τὰς θύρας) attributed to this shrine in *IG II²* 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. 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, substantially the makeup of the Eleusinion as it is now known.

d. An αὐλή: there is no inscriptive 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 II²* 1672, line 164 (*Agora* III, p. 80, no. 215).

f. Α θησαυρός: *IG II²* 1672, lines 201–202 (*Agora* III, p. 80, no. 215).

g. An ἵππων (kitchen): *IG II²* 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. 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 ἕβδομ[ε]—— 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 ἕβδομ[ε] ἰστάμενον], 16th and 17th (τῇ δὲ ἕβδομ[ε] ἱπτι δέκα], or 23rd and 24th (τῇ δὲ ἕβδομ[ε] ἱπτι ἱκάδαξ) 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 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

---

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

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


58 1975, pp. 18, 188.
The 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 ἔξις ἡμέρᾳς. 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. 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 ἀγυρμός and πρόφρησις took place on Boedromion 15, and the ἄλαδε μῦσται 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 πρόφρησις and the ἑρεία δεύρο, and were accompanied by a second set of sacrifices, corresponding to the earlier ἑρεία δεύρο, for the benefit of latecomers to the Mysteries (τὰ δὲ Ἑπιδαυρία μετὰ πρόφρησιν τε καὶ ἑρεία δεύρο μετὰ Ἀθηναίους πάτριου ἑπὶ θυσία δευτέρα). Thus, if the ἑρεία δεύρο fell on the 16th (together with the ἄλαδε μῦσται), 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 μῦσται. The sacrifices, then, must be those of the ἑρεία δεύρο, which is thus shown to occur on the night of Boedromion 16, with the ἄλαδε μῦσται following on the day of the 16th. The Epidauria, accordingly, will fall on the 17th. 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. The whole program is set out in Table 5.
George Mylonas objects to the combination of ἀλαδε 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.”64 This objection is obviated by the arrangement suggested above, in that the ἱερεῖα δεῦρο occurs at night, leaving a significant interval before the ἀλαδε 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.65 A παννυχίς66 and even an ἀφρηροφορά67 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 μουσῆς (sc. τέχνης) in line 28: this may possibly be associated with παρθενικός χόροι in SEG XVII 26, line 22, based on a new reading of IG II² 974. In this honorary decree a priest of Asklepios

```greek
ἔδωκε ... καὶ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ θυγατ[έραν] ἐς τὲ τὰ Ἀσκληπεία καὶ τὰ;
'Επιδαύρια ἀφρηροφούσαν· βουλόμενος [παρθενικός] καὶ ἐπὶ πλέον ἀξίειν τὰς;
20 πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς τιμᾶς καὶ τὴν τῆς πόλεως σωτηρίαν ἔρουσεν τῆς;
καὶ ψυχήσας ταῦταν [καὶ ἐκσώσιμον τὴν τράπεζαν]
καὶ παννυχίδα συνετέλεσεν παρθ[ερίας χορών]
```

The priest's accomplishments after ἀφρηροφούσαν, 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 παννυχίς were finished off with one or more maiden choruses. Such choruses could be the event indicated by the inscription’s τῆς μουσῆς, whether the Phrearrhian delegation itself provided a chorus or merely observed.

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

64 Mylonas 1961, p. 250.
65 Philostratos, Vita Apollonii 4.18 (p. 104 above); IG II² 974, lines 11–12. For these sacrifices, a kanephoros: IG II² 3457, line 2; 3554, lines 19–22.
66 IG II² 974, lines 12–13; 975, lines 5–8.
67 IG II² 974, lines 18–19. A procession is also attested: Aristotle, AthPol 56.4.
I have argued above that the Phrearrhian inscription describes just such a set of offerings and ceremonies at, respectively, the ἵερεξ φρέαρ 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.
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